

# Stability and instability of Kelvin waves

Kyudong Choi\*

In-Jee Jeong<sup>†</sup>

April 8, 2022

## Abstract

The  $m$ -waves of Kelvin are uniformly rotating patch solutions of the 2D Euler equations with  $m$ -fold rotational symmetry for  $m \geq 2$ . For Kelvin waves sufficiently close to the disc, we prove nonlinear stability results in the  $L^1$  norm of the vorticity, for  $m$ -fold symmetric perturbations. This is obtained by proving that the Kelvin wave is a strict local maximizer of the energy functional in some admissible class of patches. Based on the  $L^1$  stability, we establish that long time filamentation, or formation of long arms, occurs near the Kelvin waves, which have been observed in various numerical simulations. Additionally, we discuss stability of annular patches in the same variational framework.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	Main results . . . . .	3
1.2	Previous works on stability of $V$ -states . . . . .	5
<b>2</b>	<b>Preliminaries</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1	Two-dimensional incompressible Euler . . . . .	6
2.2	Kelvin waves . . . . .	6
<b>3</b>	<b>Stability of Kelvin waves</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1	Outline of the proof . . . . .	7
3.2	Proof of stability . . . . .	8
3.3	Reduction to graph perturbations . . . . .	10
3.4	Spectral analysis . . . . .	12
<b>4</b>	<b>Refined stability and filamentation</b>	<b>16</b>
4.1	Outline of the proof . . . . .	16
4.2	Notations for Kelvin wave and simple estimates . . . . .	17
4.3	Only small jumps in $\Theta(t)$ . . . . .	18
4.4	Proof of Theorem 1.2 . . . . .	20
4.5	Proof of Corollary 1.3 . . . . .	24
4.6	Proof of Theorem 1.4 . . . . .	27

\*Department of Mathematical Sciences, Ulsan National Institute of Science and Technology, 50 UNIST-gil, Eonyang-eup, Ulsan-gun, Ulsan, Korea. Email: kchoi@unist.ac.kr.

<sup>†</sup>Department of Mathematical Sciences and RIM, Seoul National University, 1 Gwanak-ro, Gwanak-gu, Seoul 08826, Korea. Email: injee\_j@snu.ac.kr.

<b>A</b>	<b>Stability of the Annulus</b>	<b>30</b>
A.1	Admissible class and key proposition for the annulus . . . . .	30
A.2	Relative stream function . . . . .	31
A.3	Graph type perturbation . . . . .	32
A.4	Reduction to graph type perturbation . . . . .	32
A.5	Energy difference for graph type perturbation . . . . .	33

# 1 Introduction

In this paper, we revisit the  $m$ -waves of Kelvin, which are uniformly rotating patch solutions of the two-dimensional incompressible Euler equations on  $\mathbb{R}^2$ :

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \omega + u \cdot \nabla \omega = 0, \\ u = -\nabla^\perp (-\Delta)^{-1} \omega. \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

Here,  $\omega(t, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $u(t, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  denote the vorticity and velocity of the fluid at time  $t$ , respectively. For any  $m \geq 2$ , the Kelvin waves can be parametrized by  $\beta > 0$  (see [5]); for a sufficiently small  $\beta$ , we shall write

$$\omega^{m,\beta} = \mathbf{1}_{A^{m,\beta}}, \quad A^{m,\beta} = \{(r, \theta) : r \leq r_0 + g^{m,\beta}(\theta)\} \quad (1.2)$$

be the  $m$ -fold rotating vortex patch with a reference length  $r_0 > 0$ , characterized by the property

$$g^{m,\beta}(\theta) = \beta \cos(m\theta) + o(\beta),$$

where the  $o(\beta)$ -term consists of expressions  $\cos(km\theta)$  with  $k > 1$ . In the rest of the introduction, we fix  $r_0 = 1$  for simplicity, and take  $B$  to be the open ball centered at the origin with radius 1.

Kirchhoff has discovered that ellipses define uniformly rotating patch solutions for any aspect ratio [37], which correspond to the case  $m = 2$  in the above. For  $m \geq 3$ , the existence of  $m$ -fold symmetric rotating patches bifurcating from the disc was first hinted by Kelvin in 1880 (see [38]), who computed that an infinitesimal perturbation of the disc with period  $m$  rotates with the angular speed  $1/2 - 1/2m$ . Then, an argument of existence was given by Burbea [5] (who coined the term “ $m$ -waves of Kelvin”) and then rigorously by Hmidi, Mateu, and Verdera in [33]. See the work [31] of Hassainia, Masmoudi, and Wheeler where the authors study the behavior of the whole branch of solutions. Thanks to these works, we know that the boundary of these rotating patches are  $C^\infty$ -smooth and even real analytic.

The Kelvin waves, and more generally uniformly rotating patch solutions, commonly referred to as “ $V$ -states”, to Euler have been intensively studied in the past decades: existence and rigidity of  $V$ -states ([5, 33, 8, 20, 31, 21, 22, 28, 32, 45, 13, 12, 25, 29, 42, 27]), linear and nonlinear stability ([40, 46, 44, 10, 43, 47, 18]), instability ([30, 19, 16]), numerical computations ([11, 36, 21, 23, 49, 24]). In this paper, we focus on the stability and instability of the Kelvin waves which are sufficiently close to the disc, and obtain the following results:

I. *Orbital stability in  $L^1$  under support condition in the evolution* (Theorem 1.1)

There exists a larger ball  $D$  containing  $B$  such that the Kelvin wave is stable *up to some adaptive rotations* in the  $L^1$  norm with respect to  $m$ -fold symmetric patch perturbations as long as the perturbed solution stays inside  $D$  during the evolution.

II. *Refined stability: estimate on the required rotation* (Theorem 1.2)

The above perturbed solution rotates with an angular velocity similar to that for the Kelvin wave.

III. *Long time stability without an adaptive rotation and support condition* (Corollary 1.3)

For any  $T > 0$ , sufficiently localized perturbations of the Kelvin wave stay close in the time interval  $[0, T]$

without an adaptive rotation.

IV. *Instability: large perimeter growth* (Theorem 1.4)

For any  $M > 0$ , there exists an  $L^1$ -small patch perturbation of the Kelvin wave whose perimeter grows to become larger than  $M$  in finite time.

The precise statements will be given in §1.1, but see Figure 1 which illustrates both stable and instable behavior of a 3-fold rotating state. While the “bulk” of the patch seems to converge to a Kelvin wave, long arms are constantly growing in time.

## 1.1 Main results

Given a vorticity  $\omega$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ , we denote  $\omega_\alpha := \omega(R_{-\alpha}x)$  where  $R_\alpha$  is the counterclockwise rotation matrix by angle  $\alpha$  with respect to the origin. For the case of Kelvin waves, we remark that

$$\omega_{\Omega^{m,\beta}t}^{m,\beta}(x), \quad t \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \quad (1.3)$$

is the solution of the Euler equations (1.1), where  $\Omega^{m,\beta} \in \mathbb{R}$  is the angular velocity of the Kelvin wave  $\omega^{m,\beta}$ .

We first state the orbital stability result of the Kelvin waves for  $m$ -fold symmetric perturbations, which have appeared already in [46, Section 5, Theorem 7] without a proof. We would like to point out that by the time of [46], even the existence of Kelvin waves have not been rigorously established. The first rigorous existence proof came out 27 years later in [33].

**Theorem 1.1** (Orbital Stability). *For each integer  $m \geq 2$ , there exist constants  $\bar{r} > 1$  and  $\bar{\beta} > 0$  satisfying the following property:*

*Fix any  $0 < \beta < \bar{\beta}$ . Then, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that if  $\omega_0 = \mathbf{1}_{A_0}$  where*

$$A_0 \text{ is } m\text{-fold symmetric, } A_0 \subset B_{\bar{r}}, \text{ and } \|\omega_0 - \omega^{m,\beta}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq \delta,$$

*then the solution  $\omega(t) = \mathbf{1}_{A(t)}$  of (1.1) with initial data  $\omega_0$  is stable up to rotations as long as it is contained in  $B_{\bar{r}}$ ; more precisely, if for some  $0 < T \leq \infty$  we have*

$$\bigcup_{t \in [0, T)} A(t) \subset B_{\bar{r}}, \quad (1.4)$$

*then there exists a function  $\Theta(\cdot) : [0, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfying*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T)} \|\omega(t) - \omega_{\Theta(t)}^{m,\beta}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq \varepsilon. \quad (1.5)$$

*Here we say that a set  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  is  $m$ -fold symmetric if  $R_{2\pi/m}A = A$ , and  $B_r, r > 0$  is the open ball centered at the origin with radius  $r$ .*

The above theorem says that as long as the perturbed solution stays in the given ball (which contains the Kelvin wave strictly), the solution is  $L^1$ -close to *some* rotation of the Kelvin wave. There have been several orbital stability results of some other Euler solutions ([44, 46, 7, 1, 6, 14]). We also refer to [9] for the case of the generalized surface quasi-geostrophic equation.

One shortcoming of the above result is that the required amount of rotation  $\Theta(t)$  satisfying (1.5) is not explicitly given. This kind of issue is common when one obtains orbital stability by applying variational idea (*e.g.* see [1, 14]). Intuitively, it is natural to expect that the perturbed solution is close not only to *some*




Figure 1: Evolution of the patch initially defined by the region  $\{(r, \theta) : r < 2 + \sin(3\theta)\}$  at time moments  $t = 0, 3, 6, 9, 15, 20$ . Courtesy of Junho Choi.

*unknown*  $\Theta(t)$ -rotation of the Kelvin wave but also to the actual rotating Kelvin wave solution (1.3). In the next theorem, we overcome this problem by deriving an estimate on  $\Theta(t)$ : we show that if  $\Delta t \ll 1$ , then

$$\Delta\Theta(t) \text{ is close to } \Omega^{m,\beta}\Delta t,$$

that is, the perturbed solution *almost* rotates with the angular speed  $\Omega^{m,\beta}$  of the Kelvin wave.

For each integer  $m \geq 2$ , we denote  $\mathbb{T}_m = \mathbb{R}/(\frac{2\pi}{m}\mathbb{Z})$  by the torus of length  $2\pi/m$ , which we identify with the interval  $[-\frac{\pi}{m}, \frac{\pi}{m})$ . Since the Kelvin wave is  $m$ -fold symmetric, it is natural to assume that the rotation angle  $\Omega^{m,\beta}t$  in (1.3) belongs to  $\mathbb{T}_m$ . Similarly, we shall view the function  $\Theta$  as a map  $\Theta(\cdot) : [0, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_m$ . We denote the projection  $\mathcal{T}_m : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_m$  by

$$\mathcal{T}_m[\alpha] = \tilde{\alpha} \in \mathbb{T}_m \text{ if } \alpha - \tilde{\alpha} = 2k\pi/m \text{ for some integer } k.$$

Let us now state our refined stability result.

**Theorem 1.2** (Refined Stability). *For  $m \geq 2$ , there exist constants  $C_0, c_0, \beta_0 > 0$  such that if  $\beta \in (0, \beta_0]$  and if  $\varepsilon \in (0, c_0\beta^2]$ , then the function  $\Theta(\cdot)$  in Theorem 1.1 satisfies*

$$|\mathcal{T}_m[\Theta(t') - (\Theta(t) + \Omega^{m,\beta}(t' - t))]| \leq C_0 \cdot \varepsilon^{1/2} \text{ whenever } t, t' \in [0, T) \text{ satisfy } |t - t'| \leq c_0\beta. \quad (1.6)$$

Note that in the above stability results, the solution is required to be contained in a ball (see (1.4)), and it is not clear whether this condition will be satisfied for a sufficiently long time interval, even for very small perturbations. In the next corollary, we confirm that the support condition holds for a long time, as long as the initial perturbation is localized in space (see (1.8)).

**Corollary 1.3.** *Let  $m \geq 2$  be an integer. There are  $\beta_1 > 0$ ,  $r' > 1$  such that for  $\beta \in (0, \beta_1]$ , for  $\varepsilon' > 0$ , and for  $T > 0$ , there exists  $\delta' > 0$ , such that if  $\omega_0 = \mathbf{1}_{A_0}$  for some  $m$ -fold symmetric open set  $A_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  satisfying*

$$\|\omega_0 - \omega^{m,\beta}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq \delta', \quad (1.7)$$

and

$$A_0 \subset B_{r'}, \quad (1.8)$$

then

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\omega(t) - \omega_{\Omega^{m,\beta,t}}^{m,\beta}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq \varepsilon'. \quad (1.9)$$

As an application, we obtain perimeter growth for finite but arbitrary long time for certain perturbations of the Kelvin wave. This type of *filamentation* instability has been frequently observed in various numerical simulations [11, 36, 21, 23, 49, 24]; see Figure 1.

**Theorem 1.4** (Instability). *For each integer  $m \geq 2$ , there exists  $C' > 0$  such that if  $\beta > 0$  is sufficiently small, then for any  $M, \delta > 0$ , there exists an  $m$ -fold symmetric data  $\omega_0 = \mathbf{1}_{A_0}$  with  $C^\infty$  smooth boundary  $\partial A_0$  satisfying*

$$\|\omega_0 - \omega^{m,\beta}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq \delta, \quad \text{perim}(A_0) \leq 20$$

such that the corresponding solution  $\omega(t) = \mathbf{1}_{A(t)}$  satisfies

$$\sup_{t \in [0, C'M]} \text{perim}(A(t)) \geq M.$$

We remark that the *improved* stability statements, Theorem 1.2 and Corollary 1.3, are essential in the proof of above instability result. For other works on perimeter growth of perturbations, we refer to [16] for a disk patch, [17] for the Lamb dipole, [15] for the Hill's spherical vortex.

## 1.2 Previous works on stability of $V$ -states

Let us briefly review the existing results on the stability of  $V$ -states. The basic idea is to characterize a given  $V$ -state as the *unique* extremizer of a conserved quantity in an appropriate admissible class. Arnol'd [2] suggested to use the kinetic energy, which is natural since steady solutions are characterized by critical points of the energy. We also refer to the recent work ([26]) for discussions. Some serious work was necessary to apply this idea to the patch case, as it is not a smooth solution to Euler. For the case of the disc  $\omega = \mathbf{1}_B$ , this was achieved by Wan–Pulvirenti ([47]) and Tang ([44]): the circular patch is actually the unique energy maximizer under a *mass constraint*, which gives nonlinear stability for perturbations in  $L^1$ . A different approach is to observe that the circular patch is the unique impulse minimizer under a mass constraint, which again yields nonlinear stability ([43]). Indeed, the energy and impulse are two different coercive conservation laws for the two-dimensional vorticity equation. It turns out that, in the case of the ellipse, one can show that upon fixing *both* the mass and impulse, each ellipse for the aspect ratio between 1 and 3 is the unique local maximizer of the energy ([44]). The threshold 3 is sharp, as suggested by previous linear analysis ([40]) and nonlinear instability for larger aspect ratios ([30]).

Under the additional constraint of  $m$ -fold symmetry, Kelvin waves close to the disc (*i.e.*  $0 < \beta \ll 1$ ) for each  $m \geq 3$  can be characterized by the unique local maximum of energy, as stated in Wan [46]. Even though the stability requires  $m$ -fold symmetry of perturbations, this can be used to prove filamentation simply by taking symmetric perturbations (proof of instability requires stability). It is interesting that when  $m = 2$  (*i.e.* Kirchhoff's ellipses), the stability was obtained not only for small  $\beta > 0$  but also up to the aspect ratio 3. It is mainly due to the fact that the stream function for each ellipse is explicitly known (*e.g.* see [38]) so that the computation in spectral analysis in [44] is exact while the representation (1.2) of Kelvin waves for

$m \geq 3$  works only for small  $\beta$ .

Lastly, we note that when proving stability of steady solutions of the Euler equations, *monotonicity* of the profiles is frequently assumed (*e.g.* see [41, 39, 4, 50, 48, 35, 3, 18]) because this property gives coercivity in a certain sense. In the Appendix, we demonstrate that the same *spectral* approach can give nonlinear stability for patches supported on an *annulus* by imposing  $m$ -fold symmetry for large  $m$  to perturbations. It is interesting to study stability of such an annular patch since it is a *non-monotone*, radial steady solution.

## Organization of the paper

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In §2, we collect a few basic facts about the two-dimensional Euler equations and derive the asymptotic rotation speed of the Kelvin  $m$ -waves. Then, Theorem 1.1 is proved in §3. Lastly in §4, we prove Theorem 1.2, Corollary 1.3, and Theorem 1.4. Sections 3 and 4 begin with an overview of the proof. In the Appendix, we discuss stability of annular patches.

## 2 Preliminaries

### 2.1 Two-dimensional incompressible Euler

For the two-dimensional Euler equations, the stream function is defined by

$$G[\omega](x) = (-\Delta)^{-1}\omega(x) := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int \ln \frac{1}{|x-x'|} \omega(x') dx'.$$

When  $\omega$  is bounded and compactly supported in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , then we have that  $G[\omega] \in C_{loc}^{1,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^2)$  with any  $\alpha < 1$ . The energy functional is defined by

$$E[\omega] = \frac{1}{2} \langle \omega, G\omega \rangle = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \omega(x)\omega(x') \ln \frac{1}{|x-x'|} dx dx'.$$

For bounded solutions to (1.1) decaying sufficiently fast at infinity, it is not difficult to check that  $E$  is a conserved quantity in time. We just remark that, strictly speaking,  $E$  is not the kinetic energy of the fluid unless  $\omega$  is of mean zero in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ : in this case, we have

$$E[\omega] = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla G\omega|^2 dx \geq 0.$$

In general,  $E[\omega]$  is not positive and this quantity is sometime referred to as the *pseudo-energy* in the literature.

### 2.2 Kelvin waves

Let  $r_0 > 0$  and denote  $B$  by the open ball with radius  $r_0$  centered at the origin. Then, it is not difficult to check that in polar coordinates, the corresponding stream function is given by

$$G[\mathbf{1}_B](r, \theta) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{4}(r_0^2 - r^2) \ln r_0^2 - r^2, & 0 \leq r \leq r_0, \\ -\frac{1}{2}r_0^2 \ln r, & r > r_0. \end{cases}$$

Let us now revisit the computation of Kelvin, and assume that there exists a uniformly rotating patch  $\omega^{m,\beta}$  with boundary  $r_0 + g(\theta)$  with  $g \simeq \beta \cos(m\theta)$ . We shall derive the asymptotic formula for the rotation speed  $\Omega^{m,\beta}$  in the limit  $\beta \rightarrow 0$ . Then, for some  $C > 0$ , once we define the *relative stream function* by

$$\psi^{m,\beta} = G\omega^{m,\beta} + \frac{1}{2}\Omega^{m,\beta}r^2 + C, \tag{2.1}$$

so that for all  $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$ , we have

$$\psi^{m,\beta}(r_0 + g(\theta), \theta) \equiv 0.$$

Introducing for convenience  $\zeta := G(\omega^{m,\beta} - \mathbf{1}_B)$ , by differentiating the above relation in  $\theta$ , we obtain

$$0 = \left(-\frac{1}{2} + \Omega^{m,\beta}\right)r_0\partial_\theta g^{m,\beta}(\theta) + \partial_r\zeta\partial_\theta g^{m,\beta}(\theta) + \partial_\theta\zeta. \quad (2.2)$$

Note that

$$\zeta(r, \theta) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{S^1} \int_{r_0}^{r_0+g(\theta')} \ln \frac{1}{|re^{i\theta} - r'e^{i\theta'}|} r' dr' d\theta'.$$

Assuming  $\int \omega^{m,\beta} = \int \mathbf{1}_B$ , we may expand the above in the case  $r < r_0 - |g(\theta')|$  as follows: using  $g(\theta) = \beta \cos(m\theta) + o(\beta)$  and that the small term is orthogonal to  $1, \cos(m\theta)$ ,

$$\zeta(r, \theta) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{S^1} \int_{r_0}^{r_0+g(\theta')} \operatorname{Re} \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n} \left(\frac{r'}{r}\right)^n e^{in(\theta' - \theta)} r' dr' d\theta' = \frac{1}{2m} \frac{r_0^{m+1}}{r^m} \beta \cos(m\theta) + o(\beta).$$

Similarly, one may compute that

$$\partial_\theta\zeta(r, \theta) = -\frac{r_0^{m+1}}{2r^m} \beta \sin(m\theta) + o(\beta), \quad \partial_r\zeta(r, \theta) = -\frac{r_0^{m+1}}{2r^{m+1}} \beta \cos(m\theta) + o(\beta).$$

Since we know that  $\zeta \in C^{1,\alpha}$  for any  $\alpha < 1$ , these formulas can be justified up to the boundary of the rotating patch. Applying these to (2.2), we obtain that

$$\Omega^{m,\beta} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2m} + o(\beta).$$

Indeed, it can be proved that the remainder term is of order  $\beta^2$  (see [5]), although we shall not need this fact in what follows.

### 3 Stability of Kelvin waves

#### 3.1 Outline of the proof

This section is devoted to the proof of the stability result. To state the key proposition, let us first define the following class of perturbations, fixing some  $m \geq 2$  and  $\beta > 0$ . The value of  $\beta$  will be assumed to be sufficiently small whenever it becomes necessary, but in a way depending only on  $m$ . (Inspecting the proof, one can see that  $\beta \lesssim m^{-2}$  is sufficient.) We take

$$\mathcal{M}(\omega^{m,\beta}) := \left\{ \omega = \mathbf{1}_A : \int r^m \sin(m\theta)\omega(x)dx = 0, \int r^2(\omega(x) - \omega^{m,\beta}) = 0, \int (\omega(x) - \omega^{m,\beta}) = 0 \right\}.$$

Then, we say  $\omega \in \mathcal{M}_m(\omega^{m,\beta})$  if  $\omega \in \mathcal{M}(\omega^{m,\beta})$  and furthermore  $\omega$  is  $m$ -fold symmetric. Next, given an open set  $D$ , we define the class

$$\mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon,D}(\omega^{m,\beta}) := \{ \omega = \mathbf{1}_A : A \subset D, \|\omega - \omega^{m,\beta}\|_{L^1} < \varepsilon \}.$$

We are now ready to state the key technical result of this section, which shows that within the class  $\mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon,D} \cap \mathcal{M}_m(\omega^{m,\beta})$  for  $D = B_{\bar{r}r_0}$  with some  $\bar{r} > 1$ ,  $\omega^{m,\beta}$  is the *strict* maximizer of the energy. As before, we shall fix  $r_0 = 1$  for simplicity.

**Proposition 3.1.** *For any  $m \geq 2$ , there exist  $\beta_0 > 0$  and  $\bar{r} > 1$  depending on  $m$  such that the following statement holds. For the Kelvin  $m$ -wave with parameter  $0 < \beta < \beta_0$ , there exist  $C, \varepsilon > 0$  depending on  $m, \beta$  such that*

$$E[\omega^{m,\beta}] - E[\omega] \geq C \|\omega^{m,\beta} - \omega\|_{L^1}^2 \quad (3.1)$$

for any  $\omega \in \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon, B_{\bar{r}}} \cap \mathcal{M}_m(\omega^{m,\beta})$ .

In §3.2, we show how our main stability theorem follows from the above proposition, which is rather straightforward. Then, the remainder of this section is devoted to establishing Proposition 3.1. The structure of the argument is parallel to that for the ellipse stability by Tang [44], which corresponds to the case  $m = 2$ , and mainly consists of two steps: (i) reduction to a graph-type perturbation and (ii) energy comparison for graph type perturbations. To be more precise, given  $\omega$  satisfying the assumptions of Proposition 3.1, we shall find  $\tilde{\omega}$  such that

$$E[\omega^{m,\beta}] - E[\tilde{\omega}] \geq C \|\omega^{m,\beta} - \tilde{\omega}\|_{L^1}^2 \quad (3.2)$$

and

$$-E[\omega] + E[\tilde{\omega}] \geq C \|\omega - \tilde{\omega}\|_{L^1}^2 \quad (3.3)$$

holds. Combining the above two inequalities, we obtain (3.1). We shall identify such a  $\tilde{\omega}$  and prove (3.3) in §3.3. Then, (3.2) is proved in §3.4: this part is the heart of the matter and requires a spectral analysis of the linearized operator coming from the Green's function for the Laplacian.

In what follows, we shall use a simple change of variables  $(r, \theta) \rightarrow (\xi, \eta)$  near  $\{r = r_0\}$ , so that  $\eta(r, \theta) = \theta$  and  $\xi(r, \theta) = r - g^{m,\beta}(\theta)$ . Then,  $\{\xi = r_0\}$  corresponds to  $\partial A^{m,\beta}$ . The Jacobian  $J = J^{m,\beta}$  from  $x = (x_1, x_2)$  to  $(\xi, \eta)$  is  $\xi + g^{m,\beta}(\theta) = \xi + \beta \cos(m\theta) + o(\beta)$ .

## 3.2 Proof of stability

In this section, we show how Theorem 1.1 follows readily from Proposition 3.1. This procedure is straightforward, the key point being that the energy difference is controlled by the  $L^1$  difference of vorticities. First, we prove an intermediate result, namely nonlinear  $L^1$  stability under the natural constraints on the initial vorticity.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Fix some  $m \geq 2$  and assume that  $0 < \beta$  is sufficiently small. Then, for any sufficiently small  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that for  $\tilde{\omega}_0 \in \mathcal{M}_m \cap \mathcal{N}_{\delta, B_{\bar{r}}}(\omega^{m,\beta})$ , we have*

$$\|\tilde{\omega}(t, \cdot) - \omega_{t'}^{m,\beta}\|_{L^1} < \varepsilon, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad (3.4)$$

for some  $t' = t'(t)$ , provided that  $\text{supp}(\tilde{\omega}(s, \cdot)) \subset B_{\bar{r}}$  for all  $s \in [0, t]$ .

Note that for two vorticities  $\omega$  and  $\tilde{\omega}$  which are compactly supported in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , we have

$$|E[\omega] - E[\tilde{\omega}]| = \frac{1}{2} |\langle \omega - \tilde{\omega}, G[\tilde{\omega}] \rangle - \langle \omega, G[\tilde{\omega} - \omega] \rangle| \leq C \|\omega - \tilde{\omega}\|_{L^1} \quad (3.5)$$

where  $C > 0$  depends on the radius of the support (see [44, Lemma 5.1]).

*Proof of Lemma 3.2 assuming Proposition 3.1.* This is nothing but [44, Lemma 5.3], although we provide a simplified argument. Let us suppose that  $\tilde{\omega}_0$  verifies the assumptions in the above. Furthermore, it will be convenient to consider the Euler equations in a rotating frame in which  $\omega^{m,\beta}$  becomes a steady state, and denote  $\tilde{\omega}(t, \cdot)$  to be the solution defined under this frame. Note that the solution  $\tilde{\omega}(t, \cdot)$  belongs to the class  $\mathcal{M}_m$ , possibly except for the condition

$$\int r^m \sin(m\theta) \tilde{\omega}(t, \cdot) dx = 0. \quad (3.6)$$



Proof of (3.4) under the assumption of (3.6) and  $\tilde{\omega}(t) \in \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon, B_{\bar{r}}}$ . For the moment, assume that (3.6) holds at some time  $t$  and  $\tilde{\omega}(t) \in \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon, B_{\bar{r}}}$ . Then, from Proposition 3.1 and (3.5), we derive

$$\frac{1}{C} \|\omega^{m, \beta} - \tilde{\omega}_0\|_{L^1} \geq E[\omega^{m, \beta}] - E[\tilde{\omega}_0] = E[\omega^{m, \beta}] - E[\tilde{\omega}(t)] \geq C \|\omega^{m, \beta} - \tilde{\omega}(t)\|_{L^1}^2$$

and hence

$$\|\omega^{m, \beta} - \tilde{\omega}(t)\|_{L^1} \leq C \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} < \frac{\varepsilon}{4},$$

where the last inequality follows simply by taking  $\delta > 0$  small in a way depending on  $\varepsilon$ .

Removing the additional assumptions. We observe that the quantity  $\|\omega^{m, \beta} - \tilde{\omega}(t)\|_{L^1}$  is *Lipschitz continuous* in time, which follows from the fact that the boundary of the support of  $\omega^{m, \beta}$  is smooth and that the velocity of  $\tilde{\omega}(t)$  is uniformly bounded in time. Therefore, from the continuity, one can take some small  $T > 0$  such that on  $[0, T]$ , we have

$$\|\omega^{m, \beta} - \tilde{\omega}(t)\|_{L^1} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \quad (3.7)$$

Since the condition  $\text{supp}(\tilde{\omega}(s, \cdot)) \subset B_{\bar{r}}$  is given in the statement of the lemma, we obtain on  $[0, T]$  that  $\tilde{\omega}(t) \in \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon, B_{\bar{r}}}$ . Then, at  $t = T$ , it is not difficult to see that by rotating  $\tilde{\omega}(T)$  with some small angle  $\tau$  (taking  $\varepsilon$  smaller if necessary), we can arrange that

$$\int r^m \sin(m\theta) \tilde{\omega}_\tau(T, \cdot) dx = 0.$$

See the last part of the proof of Lemma 3.3 for the details of this argument. Recalling the argument in the above, this shows that we can actually upgrade the estimate (3.7) to

$$\|\omega_{-\tau}^{m, \beta} - \tilde{\omega}(T)\|_{L^1} = \|\omega^{m, \beta} - \tilde{\omega}_\tau(T)\|_{L^1} < \frac{\varepsilon}{4}.$$

Since we may choose  $T$  depending only on  $\omega^{m, \beta}$  and  $\varepsilon$  (using *Lipschitz continuity* in time of the quantity  $\|\omega^{m, \beta} - \tilde{\omega}(t)\|_{L^1}$ ), we may inductively obtain bounds of the  $L^1$  difference on time intervals  $[T, 2T]$ ,  $[2T, 3T]$ , and so on.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.1 from Lemma 3.2.* We first note that Lemma 3.2 works for general  $r_0 > 0$  by rescaling. Then the idea for proof of Theorem 1.1 is to simply “adjust” both the initial data  $\omega_0$  and the Kelvin wave  $\omega^{m, \beta}$  in a way that we are reduced to the setup of Lemma 3.2. Given  $\omega_0$  satisfying the assumptions of the theorem, we may find  $\lambda, \beta', \tau$  verifying

$$|\lambda - 1|, |\beta' - \beta|, |\tau| \ll 1$$

(from the inverse function theorem) such that the rotated initial data  $(\omega_0)_\tau(x) = \omega_0(R_{-\tau}x)$  and the rescaled,  $\beta$ -reparametrized wave  $\omega^{m, \beta', \lambda}(x) := \omega^{m, \beta'}(\lambda x)$  satisfy

$$\int r^m \sin(m\theta) (\omega_0)_\tau(x) dx = 0,$$

and

$$\int \omega_0(x) dx = \int \omega^{m, \beta', \lambda}(x) dx, \quad \int |x|^2 \omega_0(x) dx = \int |x|^2 \omega^{m, \beta', \lambda}(x) dx,$$

respectively, by taking  $\delta > 0$  smaller if necessary depending on  $m, \beta$ . We observe that if we set  $\tilde{\omega}_0 := (\omega_0)_\tau$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\omega}_0 - \omega^{m, \beta', \lambda}\|_{L^1} &= \|\omega_0 - \omega_{-\tau}^{m, \beta', \lambda}\|_{L^1} \\ &\leq \|\omega_0 - \omega^{m, \beta}\|_{L^1} + \|\omega^{m, \beta} - \omega^{m, \beta'}\|_{L^1} + \|\omega^{m, \beta'} - \omega^{m, \beta', \lambda}\|_{L^1} + \|\omega^{m, \beta', \lambda} - \omega_{-\tau}^{m, \beta', \lambda}\|_{L^1}, \end{aligned}$$

and the right hand side can be made arbitrarily small by assuming  $\delta > 0$  small again. Thus we get  $\tilde{\omega}_0 \in \mathcal{M}_m \cap \mathcal{N}_{\delta, B_{\bar{r}}}(\omega^{m, \beta', \lambda})$  so that we can apply Lemma 3.2 (for general  $r_0 > 0$ ) to  $\tilde{\omega}_0$  with the Kelvin wave  $\omega^{m, \beta', \lambda}$ , which gives

$$\|\tilde{\omega}(t) - \omega_{t'}^{m, \beta', \lambda}\|_{L^1} < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}$$

for some angle  $t' = t'(t)$ . (For this, we may take  $\bar{r} > 0$  in the statement of Theorem 1.1 slightly smaller than the original  $\bar{r} > 0$  given in Proposition 3.1.) Then by choosing appropriate angle  $t_1 = t_1(t')$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\omega(t) - \omega_{t_1 - \tau}^{m, \beta}\|_{L^1} &= \|\tilde{\omega}(t) - \omega_{t_1}^{m, \beta}\|_{L^1} \\ &\leq \|\tilde{\omega}(t) - \omega_{t'}^{m, \beta', \lambda}\|_{L^1} + \|\omega_{t'}^{m, \beta', \lambda} - \omega_{t'}^{m, \beta'}\|_{L^1} + \|\omega_{t'}^{m, \beta'} - \omega_{t_1}^{m, \beta}\|_{L^1} \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3} + \|\omega^{m, \beta', \lambda} - \omega^{m, \beta'}\|_{L^1} + \|\omega^{m, \beta'} - \omega^{m, \beta}\|_{L^1}. \end{aligned}$$

The last two terms on the right hand side can be taken to be less than  $\varepsilon/3$  by choosing  $\delta$  small. This finishes the proof.  $\square$

### 3.3 Reduction to graph perturbations

We set  $\mathcal{E}$  to be a sufficiently small neighborhood of  $\psi^{m, \beta}$  in the  $C^1$ -topology, where  $\psi^{m, \beta}$  is the relative stream function of  $\omega^{m, \beta}$  defined in (2.1). Before we proceed, observe that the set  $\{\psi^{m, \beta} > 0\}$  consists of two components, with the inner one describing the set  $A^{m, \beta}$ . Since the gradient of  $\psi^{m, \beta}$  is non-degenerate on  $\partial A^{m, \beta}$  for  $\beta$  small, we have that for any  $\psi \in \mathcal{E}$ , the inner component of  $\{\psi > 0\}$  is an open set close to  $A^{m, \beta}$ . Note that, as we take  $\beta \rightarrow 0$ , the relative stream functions  $\psi^{m, \beta}$  converge in  $C^{1, \alpha}$  to the limit  $\psi^{m, 0}$ :

$$\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} \psi^{m, \beta} = G[\mathbf{1}_B] + \frac{1}{2} \Omega^{m, 0} r^2 + C^{m, 0} = -\frac{1}{2} \ln r + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2m} \right) (r^2 - 1).$$

The function described on the right hand side is strictly positive on  $0 < r < 1$ , negative on  $1 < r < r^*$ , and again positive on  $r^* < r$ , for a constant  $r^* > 1$  depending only on  $m$ . We conclude that, once we pick any  $1 < \bar{r} < r^*$ , then there exists  $\bar{\beta} > 0$  such that for any  $0 < \beta < \bar{\beta}$ , the relative stream function  $\psi^{m, \beta}$  is strictly negative in the region  $B_{\bar{r}} \setminus A^{m, \beta}$ . When  $m = 2, 3, 4$ , we have that  $r^* \simeq 1.87, 1.46, 1.32$ , respectively.

**Lemma 3.3** (The reduction lemma). *Given  $\omega_1 = \mathbf{1}_{A_1} \in \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon, B_{\bar{r}}} \cap \mathcal{M}_m(\omega^{m, \beta})$ , there exists a  $C^1$ -smooth  $\tilde{\psi}$  close to  $\psi^{m, \beta}$  defined in (2.1) such that if we denote the inner component of  $\{\tilde{\psi} \geq 0\}$  by  $\tilde{A}$ , then*

$$\tilde{\omega} := \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{A}} \in \mathcal{M}_m(\omega^{m, \beta}) \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \tilde{\omega} - \omega_1, G\omega_1 - \tilde{\psi} \rangle = 0.$$

*Proof.* Given  $\psi \in \mathcal{E}$ , we define

$$\psi_\mu := \psi + \frac{1}{2} \mu_1 r^2 + \mu_2.$$

Given  $\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2)$  which is close to  $\mathbf{0} = (0, 0)$ , we may set  $A_{\psi, \mu}$  to be the inner component of  $\{\psi_\mu \geq 0\}$  and  $\omega_{\psi, \mu} = \mathbf{1}_{A_{\psi, \mu}}$ . Define for a small neighborhood  $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  of the origin,

$$F = (F_1, F_2) : \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$$

by

$$F_1(\psi, \mu) := \int r^2 (\omega_{\psi, \mu} - \omega^{m, \beta}) dx, \quad F_2(\psi, \mu) := \int (\omega_{\psi, \mu} - \omega^{m, \beta}) dx.$$

Assuming that  $\mathcal{O}$  is smaller if necessary, we have that  $\partial A_{\psi, \mu}$  is described by a graph  $h = h_{\psi, \mu} : S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with

$$\psi_\mu(r_0 + h(\eta), \eta) = 0.$$

In particular, we have that  $h_{\psi^{m,\beta},0} \equiv 0$ . Based on this, we compute

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_h \psi_\mu|_{(\psi,\mu)=(\psi^{m,\beta},0)} &= \partial_\xi \psi^{m,\beta}|_{\xi=r_0} = \partial_r \psi^{m,\beta}(r_0 + g^{m,\beta}(\theta), \theta) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2m}(r_0 + \beta \cos(m\theta)) + \partial_r G(\omega^{m,\beta} - \mathbf{1}_B)(r_0 + g^{m,\beta}(\theta), \theta) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2m}(r_0 + \beta \cos(m\theta)) - \frac{1}{2}\beta \cos(m\theta) + o(\beta).\end{aligned}$$

Then, from

$$\partial_{\mu_j} h = \frac{\partial_{\mu_j} \psi_\mu}{\partial_h \psi_\mu}$$

we obtain that

$$\partial_{\mu_1} h = \frac{r^2}{2\partial_h \psi}, \quad \partial_{\mu_2} h = \frac{1}{\partial_h \psi}.$$

This allows us to compute  $\partial_\mu F$  at  $(\psi^{m,\beta}, \mathbf{0})$ . For convenience we introduce the notation  $f = o^\perp(A)$  to mean that the function  $f$  satisfies  $|f| \ll A$  and  $f$  is orthogonal in  $L^2(S^1)$  with 1 and  $\cos(m\theta)$ . To begin with,

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_{\mu_1} F_1 &= \int_0^{2\pi} (r^2 J)|_{\xi=r_0} \partial_{\mu_1} h d\eta = \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{(r_0 + \beta \cos(m\theta))^4 (r_0 + \beta \cos(m\theta) + o^\perp(\beta))}{-\frac{1}{m}r_0 - (1 + \frac{1}{m})\beta \cos(m\theta) + o^\perp(\beta)} d\theta \\ &= -m \int_0^{2\pi} (r_0^4 + 4r_0^3\beta \cos(m\theta) + 6r_0^2\beta^2 \cos^2(m\theta) + o(\beta^2))(1 + \frac{\beta}{r_0} \cos(m\theta) + o^\perp(\beta)) \\ &\quad \times (1 - (1+m)\frac{\beta}{r_0} \cos(m\theta) + (m+1)^2 \frac{\beta^2}{r_0^2} \cos^2(m\theta) + o(\beta^2)) d\theta.\end{aligned}$$

Then, this gives

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_{\mu_1} F_1 &= -mr_0^4 \int_0^{2\pi} 1 + (4 - 5(1+m) + 6 + (1+m)^2) \frac{\beta^2}{r_0^2} \cos^2(m\theta) d\theta + o(\beta^2) \\ &= -mr_0^4 \left( 2\pi + (m(m-3) + 6) \frac{\beta^2}{r_0^2} \pi \right) + o(\beta^2).\end{aligned}$$

Next, one can similarly compute that

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_{\mu_2} F_1 &= \int_0^{2\pi} (r^2 J)|_{\xi=r_0} \partial_{\mu_2} h d\eta = -mr_0^2 \left( 2\pi + (1-m+m^2) \frac{\beta^2}{r_0^2} \pi \right) + o(\beta^2), \\ \partial_{\mu_1} F_2 &= \int_0^{2\pi} J|_{\xi=r_0} \partial_{\mu_1} h d\eta = -mr_0^2 \left( 2\pi + (1-m+m^2) \frac{\beta^2}{r_0^2} \pi \right) + o(\beta^2),\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\partial_{\mu_2} F_2 = \int_0^{2\pi} J|_{\xi=r_0} \partial_{\mu_2} h d\eta = -m \left( 2\pi + (1+m+m^2) \frac{\beta^2}{r_0^2} \pi \right) + o(\beta^2).$$

Therefore, we conclude that

$$\det(\nabla F) = (2\pi mr_0^2)^2 \left( \frac{5}{2} \frac{\beta^2}{r_0^2} + o(\beta^2) \right).$$

In particular, there exists some  $\beta_0 > 0$  so that for  $\beta \in (0, \beta_0)$ ,  $\det(\nabla F) > 0$ . Fixing such a  $\beta$  and applying the inverse function theorem to the map  $F$  at  $(\psi, \mu) = (\psi^{m,\beta}, \mathbf{0})$ , we obtain existence of a unique

$$\tilde{\psi} := (G\omega_1)_\mu = G\omega_1 + \frac{1}{2}\mu_1 r^2 + \mu_2.$$

close to  $\psi^{m,\beta}$  such that the corresponding vorticity  $\tilde{\omega}$  satisfies  $F(G\omega_1, \mu) = 0$ , namely

$$\int r^2(\tilde{\omega} - \omega^{m,\beta})dx = 0, \quad \int (\tilde{\omega} - \omega^{m,\beta})dx = 0. \quad (3.8)$$

It is clear that  $\tilde{\psi}$  (and therefore  $\tilde{\omega}$ ) is  $m$ -fold rotationally symmetric. For  $\tilde{\omega}$  to belong to the class  $\mathcal{M}_m$ , it still remains to verify the condition

$$\int r^m \sin(m\theta)\tilde{\omega}dx = 0.$$

This is done by rotating  $\tilde{\psi}$  around the origin; that is, define  $\tilde{\psi}_\tau(r, \theta) := \tilde{\psi}(r, \theta + \tau)$  in polar coordinates and denote the corresponding vorticity (defined as the characteristic set of the inner component of  $\{\tilde{\psi}^\tau \geq 0\}$ ) by  $\tilde{\omega}^\tau$ . Observe that

$$\int r^m \sin(m\theta)\omega^{m,\beta}dx = 0$$

and since  $\tilde{\psi}$  is close to  $\psi^{m,\beta}$  in the  $C^1$  topology, we have

$$\left| \int r^m \sin(m\theta)\tilde{\omega}dx \right| \ll 1, \quad \left| \frac{d}{d\tau} \left( \int r^m \sin(m\theta)\tilde{\omega}_\tau dx - \int r^m \sin(m\theta)\omega_\tau^{m,\beta} dx \right) \right| \ll 1.$$

Here,  $\ll 1$  means that the constant can be arbitrarily small by taking  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  where  $\varepsilon$  is from  $\mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon, B_{\bar{r}}}$ . Since

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} \int r^m \sin(m\theta)\omega_\tau^{m,\beta} dx = \frac{d}{d\tau} \int r^m \sin(m\theta - m\tau)\omega^{m,\beta} dx = \int r^m m \cos(m\theta - m\tau)\omega^{m,\beta} dx$$

is strictly positive at  $\tau = 0$ , we can find some  $\tau$  satisfying  $|\tau| \ll 1$  such that

$$\int r^m \sin(m\theta)\tilde{\omega}_\tau dx = 0.$$

Observe that rotating around the origin does not alter (3.8). The proof is complete.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4.** *Given  $\omega_1$  satisfying the assumptions of Lemma 3.3, let  $\tilde{\omega}$  to be the associated graph-type vorticity from Lemma 3.3. Then, we have*

$$E[\tilde{\omega}] - E[\omega_1] \geq C\|\tilde{\omega} - \omega_1\|_{L^1}^2.$$

*Proof.* Using the formula for the energy difference, we proceed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} E[\tilde{\omega}] - E[\omega_1] &= \langle \tilde{\omega} - \omega_1, G\omega_1 \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \tilde{\omega} - \omega_1, G(\tilde{\omega} - \omega_1) \rangle \geq \langle \tilde{\omega} - \omega_1, G\omega_1 \rangle \\ &= \langle \tilde{\omega} - \omega_1, \tilde{\psi} \rangle = \int_{\tilde{A} \setminus A_1} \tilde{\psi} - \int_{A_1 \setminus \tilde{A}} \tilde{\psi} \geq \int_{\tilde{A} \setminus A_1} \tilde{\psi}. \end{aligned}$$

It is important to note that the assumption  $\text{supp}(\omega_1) \subset B_{\bar{r}}$  is used to guarantee that  $\tilde{\psi} \leq 0$  on  $A_1 \setminus \tilde{A}$ . From a uniform lower bound for  $\partial_r \tilde{\psi}$  near  $\partial \tilde{A}$ , it is not difficult to show that the last expression has a lower bound of the form  $C\|\tilde{\omega} - \omega_1\|_{L^1}^2$ , since  $\tilde{\psi} = 0$  on  $\partial \tilde{A}$  and  $|\tilde{A} \setminus A_1| \gtrsim \|\tilde{\omega} - \omega_1\|_{L^1}$ .  $\square$

### 3.4 Spectral analysis

In this section, we shall consider *graph-type* perturbations of  $\omega^{m,\beta}$ . For this purpose, it will be convenient to work on the coordinate system  $(\xi, \eta)$  adapted to  $\omega^{m,\beta}$ , after fixing some  $(m, \beta)$  with  $m \geq 2$  and  $\beta > 0$  sufficiently small in a way depending on  $m$ . Furthermore,  $S^1$  will denote the set  $\{(\xi, \eta) : \xi = r_0, 0 \leq \eta < 2\pi\}$

in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , unless otherwise specified. Let  $h \in C^1(S^1)$  be a function with sufficiently small  $C^1$ -norm in the  $\eta$  variable. In this section, let us use the notation

$$\omega_h := \mathbf{1}_{A_h}, \quad A_h := \{(\xi, \eta) : \xi \leq r_0 + h(\eta)\}.$$

For  $h$  sufficiently small in  $C^1$ , the closed set  $A_h$  is well-defined and close to the set  $A^{m,\beta}$ . In this notation, note that we have  $\omega^{m,\beta} = \omega_{\mathbf{0}}$  where  $\mathbf{0}$  is the zero function on  $S^1$ .

Now observe that  $\omega_h$  is  $m$ -fold symmetric in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  if and only if  $h$  is  $m$ -fold symmetric in the sense that  $h(\eta) = h(\eta + \frac{2\pi}{m})$  for any  $\eta \in S^1$ . For such a function  $h$ , we have the following simple result.

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $h$  be  $m$ -fold symmetric on  $S^1$ . Then for any integer  $0 < n < m$ , we have that*

$$\int_{S^1} e^{in\eta} h(\eta) d\eta = 0.$$

*Proof.* With the change of variables  $\eta \rightarrow \eta + \frac{2\pi}{m}$ ,

$$\int_{S^1} e^{in\eta} h(\eta) d\eta = \int_{S^1} e^{in\eta + 2\pi i \frac{n}{m}} h(\eta + \frac{2\pi}{m}) d\eta = \int_{S^1} e^{in\eta + 2\pi i \frac{n}{m}} h(\eta) d\eta.$$

This gives

$$(1 - e^{2\pi i \frac{n}{m}}) \int_{S^1} e^{in\eta} h(\eta) d\eta = 0.$$

When  $0 < n < m$ , we have that  $e^{2\pi i \frac{n}{m}} \neq 1$  and we are done.  $\square$

The following result from Tang [44] gives the expansion of the energy for graph-type perturbations. Since it applies to general rotating solutions of Euler, the Lemma is directly applicable in our case.

**Lemma 3.6** ([44, Lemma 4.1]). *Let  $\omega^* = \mathbf{1}_{A^*}$  be a rotating patch solution where  $\partial A^*$  is described by a smooth graph  $g^*$ . Let  $\psi^*$  be the relative stream (2.1) of the rotating patch  $\omega^*$ . Furthermore, let  $(\xi, \eta)$  be a coordinate system defined near  $\partial A^*$  satisfying  $\eta = \theta$  and  $\{\xi = r_0\} = \partial A^*$ , and  $J_0$  is the Jacobian of  $x \mapsto (\xi, \eta)$  restricted to  $S^1 := \{\xi = r_0\}$ . Consider  $C^1$  graph-type perturbations of  $\omega^*$ , namely  $\omega_h$  satisfying  $\|h\|_{C^1(S^1)} \ll 1$ . Furthermore, assume that we have*

$$\int (\omega_h - \omega^*) dx = 0, \quad \int x(\omega_h - \omega^*) dx = 0, \quad \int |x|^2 (\omega_h - \omega^*) dx = 0. \quad (3.9)$$

Then, we have that for  $q(\eta) := J_0(\eta)h(\eta)$ ,

$$E[\omega_h] - E[\omega^*] = \frac{1}{2} \langle q, \mathcal{L}q \rangle + o(\|h\|_{L^2}^2), \quad (3.10)$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}q := I_0 q + \int_{S^1} K(\eta, \eta') q(\eta') d\eta'$$

with

$$I_0 := \frac{\partial_\xi \psi^*|_{\xi=r_0}}{J_0}, \quad K(\eta, \eta') := \frac{1}{2\pi} \ln \frac{1}{|x(r_0, \eta) - x(r_0, \eta')|}.$$

Here,  $\langle, \rangle$  denotes the  $L^2$  inner product on  $S^1$ .

Given the above key lemma, we are in a position to conclude the main result of this section.

**Proposition 3.7.** For  $\omega_h \in \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon, B_r}(\omega^{m,\beta}) \cap \mathcal{M}_m(\omega^{m,\beta})$  with  $h \in C^1(S^1)$ , we have

$$E[\omega^{m,\beta}] - E[\omega_h] \geq C \|\omega^{m,\beta} - \omega_h\|_{L^1}^2$$

for some  $C > 0$ .

*Proof.* Note that  $\|h\|_{L^2}$  and  $\|q\|_{L^2}$  are equivalent up to constants. We apply Lemma 3.6 with  $\omega^* = \omega^{m,\beta}$  and proceed in several steps.

Step 1: Cancellation conditions. To begin with, we note that the first condition from (3.9) implies

$$0 = \int_0^{2\pi} \int_{r_0}^{r_0+h} J d\xi d\eta, \quad (3.11)$$

which gives after expanding  $J(\xi, \eta) = J_0(\eta) + O(|\xi - r_0|)$  and integrating in  $\xi$ ,

$$\int_{S^1} q(\eta) d\eta = O(\|h\|_{L^2}^2). \quad (3.12)$$

Similarly, the last condition from (3.9) gives

$$0 = \int_0^{2\pi} \int_{r_0}^{r_0+h} (\xi + g^{m,\beta}(\eta))^2 J(\xi, \eta) d\xi d\eta.$$

Writing  $\xi = r_0 + (\xi - r_0)$ , applying (3.11) and expanding  $J$  as above, we obtain that

$$2r_0 \int_{S^1} g^{m,\beta} q d\eta = O(\|h\|_{L^2}^2) + o(\beta \|h\|_{L^2}).$$

That is,

$$\int_{S^1} \cos(m\eta) q(\eta) d\eta = O(\beta^{-1} \|h\|_{L^2}^2) + o(\|h\|_{L^2}). \quad (3.13)$$

Next, from the condition

$$\int r^m \sin(m\theta) \omega_h dx = 0,$$

we obtain that

$$0 = \int_0^{2\pi} \int_{r_0}^{r_0+h} (r_0 + g^{m,\beta}(\eta) + (\xi - r_0))^m \sin(m\eta) J(\xi, \eta) d\xi d\eta.$$

Then, it follows

$$\int_{S^1} \sin(m\eta) q(\eta) d\eta = O(\beta \|h\|_{L^2}) + O(\|h\|_{L^2}^2). \quad (3.14)$$

Lastly, applying Lemma 3.5 to  $q$  (note that  $J_0$  is  $m$ -fold symmetric and so does  $q$ ) gives

$$\int_{S^1} e^{in\eta} q(\eta) d\eta = 0, \quad 0 < n < m. \quad (3.15)$$

Step 2: Computation for  $I_0$ . We compute that

$$I_0 = -\frac{1}{r_0 + \beta \cos(m\theta) + o(\beta)} \left( \frac{r_0}{2m} + \left( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2m} \right) \beta \cos(m\theta) + o(\beta) \right) = -\left( \frac{1}{2m} + \left( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2m} \right) \frac{\beta}{r_0} \cos(m\theta) + o(\beta) \right).$$

This gives

$$\|I_0 q + \frac{1}{2m} q\|_{L^2} \leq C\beta \|q\|_{L^2}. \quad (3.16)$$

Step 3: Computation for  $K$ . We shall replace  $K$  with  $K^*$  up to an  $O(\beta)$  error, which is the convolution operator arising in the disc case. The operator  $K^*$  simply corresponds to the case  $\beta = 0$ . To this end, we first note that using the condition (3.12), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} K[q](\eta) &:= \int_{S^1} K(\eta, \eta') q(\eta') d\eta' = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{S^1} \ln \left| (r_0 + g^{m,\beta}(\eta)) e^{i\eta} - (r_0 + g^{m,\beta}(\eta')) e^{i\eta'} \right| q(\eta') d\eta' \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{S^1} \ln \left| 1 - \frac{r_0 + g^{m,\beta}(\eta')}{r_0 + g^{m,\beta}(\eta)} e^{i(\eta' - \eta)} \right| q(\eta') d\eta' + O(\|h\|_{L^2}^2). \end{aligned}$$

We define

$$K^*[q](\eta) := -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{S^1} \ln \left| 1 - e^{i(\eta' - \eta)} \right| q(\eta') d\eta'.$$

Then, with pointwise bounds

$$\left| 1 - \frac{r_0 + g^{m,\beta}(\eta')}{r_0 + g^{m,\beta}(\eta)} \right| \leq C\beta |\eta' - \eta|, \quad \left| 1 - e^{i(\eta' - \eta)} \right| \geq c|\eta' - \eta|,$$

we obtain that

$$|K^*[q] - K[q]|(\eta) \leq C\beta \|q\|_{L^1} \leq C\beta \|q\|_{L^2}.$$

Step 4: Coercivity. From the previous step and (3.16), we have

$$\langle \mathcal{L}q, q \rangle \leq \langle I_0 q, q \rangle + \langle K^* q, q \rangle + C\beta \|q\|_{L^2}^2 \leq -\frac{1}{2m} \|q\|_{L^2}^2 + \langle K^* q, q \rangle + C\beta \|q\|_{L^2}^2.$$

We now expand  $q$  in Fourier series

$$q = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} q_n e^{in\eta}.$$

Since  $q$  is real, we have that  $q_{-n} = \overline{q_n}$ . Now, we recall the exact formula

$$\frac{1}{2n} = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \ln \left| 1 - e^{i\eta'} \right| e^{in\eta'} d\eta', \quad n > 0$$

so that

$$\langle K^* q, q \rangle = \alpha_0 |q_0|^2 + \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{1}{2n} |q_n|^2 = I + II, \quad \alpha_0 := K^* \mathbf{1},$$

where for some  $C_0 > 0$  depending on  $m$ , we have

$$II := \sum_{|n| > m} \frac{1}{2n} |q_n|^2 < \left( \frac{1}{2m} - C_0 \right) \sum_{|n| > m} |q_n|^2.$$

Next,

$$I := \alpha_0 |q_0|^2 + \sum_{0 < |n| \leq m} \frac{1}{2n} |q_n|^2 \leq C\beta^2 \|q\|_{L^2}^2,$$

using (3.12), (3.13), (3.14) and (3.15), and taking  $\|h\|_{L^2} \leq \beta^2$ . Then, using the Plancherel theorem, we continue estimating as follows:

$$\langle \mathcal{L}q, q \rangle \leq -\frac{1}{2m} \|q\|_{L^2}^2 + \left( \frac{1}{2m} - C_0 \right) \sum_{|n|>m} |q_n|^2 + C\beta \|q\|_{L^2}^2 \leq -\frac{C_0}{2} \|q\|_{L^2}^2,$$

by taking  $\beta > 0$  smaller if necessary in a way depending only on  $C_0$ . (Recall that  $C_0$  depends only on  $m$ .)

Step 5: Completion of the proof. From (3.10) in Lemma 3.6, we have that

$$E[\omega^{m,\beta}] - E[\omega_h] = -\frac{1}{2} \langle \mathcal{L}q, q \rangle + o(\|h\|_{L^2}^2) \geq \frac{C_0}{8} \|q\|_{L^2}^2.$$

However, it is clear that

$$\|\omega_h - \omega^{m,\beta}\|_{L^1} = \int_0^{2\pi} \left| \int_{r_0}^{r_0+h} J d\xi \right| d\eta \leq C \|q\|_{L^2} (1 + \|q\|_{L^2}).$$

For  $\|q\|_{L^2}$  small, we conclude that

$$E[\omega^{m,\beta}] - E[\omega_h] \geq \|\omega_h - \omega^{m,\beta}\|_{L^1}^2.$$

This finishes the proof. □

## 4 Refined stability and filamentation

In this entire section, we fix an integer  $m \geq 2$  so that every estimate and constant appeared in this section may depend on the choice of the integer  $m$  even though we do not specify the dependency on  $m$  for simpler presentation. When considering a Kelvin wave, we always assume  $r_0 = 1$  so that  $A^{m,\beta} = \{r < 1 + g^{m,\beta}(\theta)\}$ . Let us give an outline of the arguments.

### 4.1 Outline of the proof

#### Refined stability (Theorem 1.2)

To prove the refined estimate

$$|\mathcal{T}_m[\Delta\Theta(t) - \Omega^{m,\beta} \Delta t]| \lesssim \varepsilon^{1/2}, \quad \Delta t = \mathcal{O}(\beta), \quad (4.1)$$

we combine a bootstrap argument with the orbital stability result (Theorem 1.1). Indeed, we first show that the degree of adaptive rotation  $\Theta$  cannot change significantly over a *small* period of time (Lemma 4.3):

$$|\mathcal{T}_m[\Delta\Theta(t)]| \lesssim \varepsilon^{1/2}, \quad \Delta t = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) \quad \text{if} \quad \varepsilon \lesssim \beta^2.$$

It means that our perturbed solution behaves very similarly to the rotating Kelvin wave at least for a short period of time (of order  $\varepsilon$ ). Since the ‘‘Kelvin set’’  $A^{m,\beta}$  rotates exactly under its own flow map, we can show that if we leave the set  $A^{m,\beta}$  in the perturbed flow from the perturbed solution for a short time, then the set lies on a *small* neighborhood of the precisely rotated Kelvin set  $A_{\Omega^{m,\beta}t}^{m,\beta}$ :

$$\phi(t, A^{m,\beta}) \subset \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \text{dist}(x, A_{\Omega^{m,\beta}t}^{m,\beta}) \lesssim \beta \cdot \varepsilon^{1/2}\}.$$

This detailed information leads to the above conclusion (4.1).

#### Stability up to finite time without any adjusting rotation (Corollary 1.3)

For any fixed time  $T > 0$ , we show that the rotating Kelvin wave is stable in  $L^1$ -sense without any adjusting



rotation and without a condition on the evolution such as (1.4). To do this, we add the above refined estimate (4.1) for small time repeatedly to derive a finite time result:

$$|\mathcal{T}[\Theta(t) - \Omega t]| \lesssim \left(\frac{T}{\beta} + 1\right) \varepsilon^{1/2} \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T].$$

However, it requires that the perturbation should remain for the given time duration in a certain small ball containing the Kelvin wave (see the condition (1.4)). By observing the dynamics of the Kelvin wave and by comparing it with the perturbed one, we derive the *initial* condition (1.8) that guarantees the hypothesis during the evolution.

#### Filamentation (Theorem 1.4)

To prove perimeter growth of boundary, we recall that the Kelvin waves are close to the unit disk when the parameter  $\beta > 0$  is sufficiently small. We also note that the angular velocity of the disk has a non-trivial derivative in the radial direction outside the disk. As is well known, the further out of the disk, the slower the angular speed. This idea was already used in [16] when deriving an example of perimeter growth near the disk. Similarly, we take two points from the boundary of a perturbed patch, and trace their trajectories. From the above finite time stability, each trajectory remains arbitrary close to the original orbit from the Kelvin wave for a large desired amount of time. This process is possible by assuming that the perturbation is small enough in  $L^1$ . When considering any curve lying on the initial boundary connecting these points, the curve is transported by the perturbed flow so that its length increases by the difference multiplied by time.

## 4.2 Notations for Kelvin wave and simple estimates

If  $\beta > 0$  is small enough so that the Kelvin wave  $\omega^{m,\beta}$  exists, then we simply denote,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{T} &= \mathbb{T}_m, & \mathcal{T}[\cdot] &= \mathcal{T}_m[\cdot] : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_m, & \Omega &= \Omega^{m,\beta}, & g &= g^{m,\beta}, \\ \bar{A} &= A^{m,\beta}, & \bar{A}_\alpha &= \mathbf{R}_\alpha[\bar{A}] \quad \text{for } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{R}_\alpha$  is the (counter-clockwise) rotation map by the angle  $\alpha$ , and

$$\bar{\omega}_\alpha := \mathbf{1}_{\bar{A}_\alpha}, \quad \bar{\omega} = \bar{\omega}_0 := \mathbf{1}_{\bar{A}}.$$

We also set

$$\bar{I}_\alpha := \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{im\theta} \bar{\omega}_\alpha(x) dx = \int_{\bar{A}_\alpha} e^{im\theta} dx \in \mathbb{C}, \quad \bar{I} := \bar{I}_0 \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Here we use the polar coordinate  $(r, \theta)$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ . Then it is easy to check, for each  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\bar{I}_\alpha = \bar{I} e^{im\alpha} = \bar{I}_{\mathcal{T}[\alpha]}. \tag{4.2}$$

We collect some properties of Kelvin waves.

**Lemma 4.1.** *There exist constants  $c_i > 0$  for  $i = 1, \dots, 5$  such that*

$$c_1 \beta \leq |\bar{I}| \leq c_2 \beta, \tag{4.3}$$

$$c_3 \cdot |\mathcal{T}[\alpha]| \cdot \beta \leq |\bar{I} - \bar{I}_\alpha|, \quad \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{4.4}$$

$$\sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{T}} |g'(\theta)| \leq c_4, \tag{4.5}$$

$$|\bar{A} \setminus \bar{A}_\alpha| \leq c_5 \mathcal{T}[\alpha], \quad \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{4.6}$$

hold for any sufficiently small  $\beta > 0$ .

*Proof.* From the representation (1.2) of  $\bar{\omega}$ , we get (4.3). Then, by (4.2), we have

$$|\bar{I} - \bar{I}_\alpha| = |\bar{I}| |1 - e^{im\alpha}|,$$

which gives (4.4). Lastly, (4.5), (4.6) follow from  $g^{m,\beta} \rightarrow g^{m,0} \equiv 0$  in  $C^1$  as  $\beta \rightarrow 0$  (e.g. see [33]).  $\square$

For  $\eta \geq 0$  and for  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ , we denote the  $\eta$ -neighborhood of  $\bar{A}_\alpha$  by

$$\bar{A}_\alpha^\eta := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \text{dist}(x, \bar{A}_\alpha) \leq \eta\}, \quad \bar{A}^\eta := \bar{A}_0^\eta. \quad (4.7)$$

When  $\beta > 0$  is sufficiently small, then we observe that

$$\bar{A}^\eta \subset \{(r, \theta) : r \leq 1 + g(\theta) + C\eta\}$$

for some  $C > 0$  thanks to the estimate (4.5) in Lemma 4.1. It implies

**Lemma 4.2.** *There exists some  $C_1 > 0$  such that*

$$|\bar{A}_\alpha^\eta \setminus \bar{A}_\alpha| = |\bar{A}^\eta \setminus \bar{A}| \leq C_1\eta, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \quad (4.8)$$

holds for any sufficiently small  $\beta > 0$ .

We also denote  $\Omega^* = \Omega^*(m) = \frac{m-1}{2m} > 0$ , and observe

$$\Omega = \Omega^{m,\beta} \rightarrow \Omega^* \quad \text{as } \beta \rightarrow 0.$$

From now on, we always assume  $\beta > 0$  sufficiently small to have Lemmas 4.1, 4.2 and to satisfy  $\frac{1}{2}\Omega^* \leq \Omega \leq 2\Omega^*$ .

For any given  $(t_0, x) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}^2$ , we denote the trajectory map  $\bar{\phi}(\cdot_t, (t_0, x))$  from the Kelvin wave solution  $\bar{\omega}(t) = \mathbf{1}_{\bar{A}_{\Omega t}}$  with  $\bar{u} := K * \bar{\omega}$  by solving

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt} \bar{\phi}(t, (t_0, x)) = \bar{u}(t, \bar{\phi}(t, (t_0, x))), \\ \bar{\phi}(t_0, (t_0, x)) = x. \end{cases} \quad (4.9)$$

We remark that  $\bar{u}$  is Lipschitz in space-time from regularity of  $\partial \bar{A}$ , and

$$\bar{\phi}(t, (t_0, \bar{A}_{\Omega t_0})) = \bar{A}_{\Omega t}, \quad \forall t, \forall t_0 \geq 0.$$

Lastly, we take any constant  $\hat{C} > 0$  such that any function  $f \in L^1 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$  satisfies

$$\left\| \frac{1}{|x|} * f \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq \hat{C} (\|f\|_{L^1} \|f\|_{L^\infty})^{1/2} \quad (4.10)$$

(e.g. see Lemma 2.1 of [34]).

### 4.3 Only small jumps in $\Theta(t)$

When considering an initial data  $\omega_0 = \mathbf{1}_{A_0}$  for some  $m$ -fold symmetric open set  $A_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ , we set

$$I(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{im\theta} \omega(t, x) dx \in \mathbb{C},$$

where  $\omega(t) = \mathbf{1}_{A(t)}$  is the corresponding solution. As in (4.9), for given  $(t_0, x) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}^2$ , the trajectory map  $\phi(\cdot_t, (t_0, x))$  for the solution  $\omega(t)$  is defined by

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt} \phi(t, (t_0, x)) = u(t, \phi(t, (t_0, x))), \\ \phi(t_0, (t_0, x)) = x. \end{cases} \quad (4.11)$$

We observe that the adjusting function  $\Theta$  in Theorem 1.1 satisfying (1.5) may not be continuous. Even, it does not have to be uniquely determined. We first prove that the function  $\Theta$  is allowed to have *at most* small jumps of order  $\sqrt{\varepsilon}$  (up to  $2\pi/m$ -additions).

**Lemma 4.3.** *There exist constants  $\tilde{\beta} > 0$ ,  $\tilde{K} > 0$ , and  $\tilde{C} > 0$  satisfying the following statement:*

*Let  $\beta \in (0, \tilde{\beta}]$  and  $\bar{\omega} = \omega^{m,\beta}$  be the Kelvin wave with  $r_0 = 1$ . If a  $m$ -fold symmetric solution  $\omega(t) = \mathbf{1}_{A(t)}$  with a function  $\Theta : [0, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  for some  $0 < T \leq \infty$  satisfies*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T)} \|\omega(t) - \bar{\omega}_{\Theta(t)}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq \varepsilon \quad (4.12)$$

*for some  $\varepsilon \in (0, \beta^2]$ , then the function  $\Theta$  satisfies*

$$|\mathcal{T}[\Theta(t) - \Theta(t')]| \leq \tilde{K} \cdot \varepsilon^{1/2} \quad (4.13)$$

*whenever  $t, t' \in [0, T)$  satisfies  $|t - t'| \leq \tilde{C} \cdot \varepsilon$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\tilde{\beta} \in (0, \tilde{\beta}]$  be sufficiently small to satisfy all the estimates in §4.2, where  $\tilde{\beta} > 0$  comes from Theorem 1.1, and consider  $\beta \in (0, \tilde{\beta}]$ . For a simple presentation, we denote

$$\Theta = \Theta(t), \quad \Theta' = \Theta(t'), \quad \omega = \omega(t), \quad \omega' = \omega(t').$$

1. We first remark that

$$\bar{I}_{\mathcal{T}[\Theta - \Theta']} = \bar{I}_{\Theta - \Theta'} \quad \text{and} \quad |\bar{I} - \bar{I}_{\Theta - \Theta'}| = |\bar{I}_{\Theta} - \bar{I}_{\Theta'}|$$

so that the conclusion (4.13) follows once we prove

$$|\bar{I}_{\Theta} - \bar{I}_{\Theta'}| \leq c_3 \beta \tilde{K} \cdot \varepsilon^{1/2}$$

thanks to (4.4) in Lemma 4.1 ( $c_3 > 0$  is the constant from the lemma).

2. We begin the estimate

$$|\bar{I}_{\Theta} - \bar{I}_{\Theta'}| \leq |\bar{I}_{\Theta} - I(t)| + |I(t) - I(t')| + |I(t') - \bar{I}_{\Theta'}|. \quad (4.14)$$

By the stability assumption (4.12), we estimate the first term by

$$|\bar{I}_{\Theta} - I(t)| \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\bar{\omega}_{\Theta} - \omega| dx \leq \varepsilon.$$

Similarly,  $|\bar{I}_{\Theta'} - I(t')| \leq \varepsilon$ . For the term in the middle, we estimate

$$|I(t) - I(t')| \leq \|\omega - \omega'\|_{L^1} = |A(t') \Delta A(t)| = 2|A(t') \setminus A(t)|,$$

where  $|\cdot|$  is the Lebesgue measure in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . Then, for the particle trajectory map  $\phi$  (4.11) from the solution  $\omega(t)$ , we note

$$A(t') = \phi(t', (t, A(t))), \quad A(t) = (\bar{A}_{\Theta} \cap A(t)) \cup (A(t) \setminus \bar{A}_{\Theta}),$$

$$|\bar{A}_{\Theta} \setminus A(t)| \leq \|\bar{\omega}_{\Theta} - \omega(t)\|_{L^1} \leq \varepsilon,$$

and

$$|\phi(t', (t, (A(t) \setminus \bar{A}_{\Theta})))| = |A(t) \setminus \bar{A}_{\Theta}| \leq \|\bar{\omega}_{\Theta} - \omega(t)\|_{L^1} \leq \varepsilon.$$

Thus, we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |A(t') \setminus A(t)| &\leq |A(t') \setminus \bar{A}_{\Theta}| + |(\bar{A}_{\Theta} \setminus A(t))| \\ &\leq |\phi(t', (t, (\bar{A}_{\Theta} \cap A(t)))) \setminus \bar{A}_{\Theta}| + |\phi(t', (t, (A(t) \setminus \bar{A}_{\Theta})))| + \varepsilon \\ &\leq |\phi(t', (t, \bar{A}_{\Theta})) \setminus \bar{A}_{\Theta}| + 2\varepsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

3. We recall the flow speed is uniformly bounded for all time:

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \|u(t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C \sup_{t \geq 0} \|\omega(t)\|_{L^1}^{1/2} \|\omega(t)\|_{L^\infty}^{1/2} \leq C_2 < \infty$$

for some  $C_2 > 0$ . Now we take  $\tilde{C} := (2C_2C_1)^{-1}$  and  $\tilde{K} := 7/c_3$ .

As a consequence of the previous step, we get

$$\phi(t', (t, \bar{A}_\Theta)) \subset \bar{A}_\Theta^{C_2|t-t'|},$$

which gives, from (4.15) and from (4.8),

$$|A(t') \setminus A(t)| \leq |\bar{A}_\Theta^{C_2|t-t'} \setminus \bar{A}_\Theta| + 2\varepsilon \leq C_1C_2|t' - t| + 2\varepsilon.$$

Thus, from (4.14), for  $|t - t'| \leq \tilde{C}\varepsilon$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{I}_\Theta - \bar{I}_{\Theta'}| &\leq |I(t) - I(t')| + 2\varepsilon \leq 2|A(t') \setminus A(t)| + 2\varepsilon \\ &\leq 2C_2C_1\tilde{C}\varepsilon + 6\varepsilon = 7\varepsilon \leq 7\sqrt{\varepsilon}\beta \leq c_3\beta\tilde{K}\varepsilon^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof. □

#### 4.4 Proof of Theorem 1.2

Now we will prove *refined stability* (Theorem 1.2) using *orbital stability* (Theorem 1.1) and Lemma 4.3.

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* We prove the result by a bootstrap argument.

1. We set  $\beta_0 = \min\{\tilde{\beta}, \bar{\beta}\}$  where  $\tilde{\beta}, \bar{\beta} > 0$  are the constants from Lemma 4.3 and Theorem 1.1, respectively. We take  $c_0 \in (0, 1]$ , which will be chosen sufficiently small during the proof (see (4.28)). For  $\beta \in (0, \beta_0]$ , we consider a  $m$ -fold symmetric solution  $\omega(t) = \mathbf{1}_{A(t)}$  with a function  $\Theta : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\omega(t) - \bar{\omega}_{\Theta(t)}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq \varepsilon \tag{4.16}$$

for some  $0 < T \leq \infty$  and for some  $\varepsilon \in (0, c_0\beta^2]$ .

2. Fix any  $t_0 \in [0, T]$ . We will find some constants  $c_0, C_0 > 0$ , which are independent of the choice of  $t_0$ , satisfying the following property:

**Goal.** For all  $t \in [t_0, t_0 + c_0\beta] \cap [0, T]$ ,

$$|\mathcal{T}[\Theta(t) - (\Theta(t_0) + \Omega(t - t_0))]| \leq C_0 \cdot \varepsilon^{1/2}. \tag{4.17}$$

For the rest of the proof, every time variable is assumed to be on  $[0, T]$ .

3. First, we prove the following claim:

**Initial claim.** There exists a constant  $\eta = \eta(\varepsilon) > 0$  such that, for any  $t \in [t_0, t_0 + \eta]$ , we have

$$|\mathcal{T}[\Theta(t) - (\Theta(t_0) + \Omega(t - t_0))]| \leq \frac{1}{2}C_0 \cdot \varepsilon^{1/2}. \tag{4.18}$$

This estimate (4.18) directly follows from Lemma 4.3. Indeed, the lemma implies that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{T}[\Theta(t) - (\Theta(t_0) + \Omega(t - t_0))]| &\leq |\mathcal{T}[\Theta(t) - \Theta(t_0)]| + |\mathcal{T}[\Omega(t - t_0)]| \\ &\leq \tilde{K}\varepsilon^{1/2} + 2\Omega^*|t - t_0| \quad \text{whenever } |t - t_0| \leq \tilde{C}\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{C}, \tilde{K}$  come from Lemma 4.3. We just take any constants  $C_0 > 0$  large and  $\eta = \eta(\varepsilon) > 0$  small to satisfy

$$\tilde{K} \leq \frac{1}{4}C_0, \quad \eta \leq \tilde{C}\varepsilon, \quad \text{and} \quad 2\Omega^*\eta \leq \frac{1}{4}C_0\varepsilon^{1/2},$$

which gives (4.18).

4. From now on, we may assume that (4.17) is valid for  $t \in [t_0, t^*]$  with some  $t^* > t_0$ , *i.e.*

$$|\mathcal{T}[\Theta(t) - (\Theta(t_0) + \Omega(t - t_0))]| \leq C_0 \cdot \varepsilon^{1/2}, \quad \forall t \in [t_0, t^*]. \quad (4.19)$$

The existence of such a moment  $t^* > t_0$  is guaranteed by **Initial claim** (4.18). We shall prove the following *bootstrap claim*:

**Bootstrap claim.** There exists a small constant  $c_0 > 0$  such that if (4.19) holds for some  $t^* \leq t_0 + c_0\beta$ , then we have for all  $t \in [t_0, t^*]$ ,

$$|\mathcal{T}[\Theta(t) - (\Theta(t_0) + \Omega(t - t_0))]| \leq \frac{1}{2}C_0 \cdot \varepsilon^{1/2}. \quad (4.20)$$

We note that the coefficient of  $\sqrt{\varepsilon}$  in (4.19) is  $C_0$  while that in (4.20) is  $(1/2)C_0$ .

5. Before proving (4.20), we will perform a refined estimate for the trajectory map  $\phi$  (4.11) from the solution  $\omega(t)$ . First, we set the constant  $\gamma_0 > 0$  by

$$\gamma_0 := \left( \frac{1}{2}c_3 \frac{1}{2}C_0 \right) / (2C_1) > 0, \quad (4.21)$$

where  $C_1 > 0$  is the constant from (4.8) of Lemma 4.2. Then we claim, for any  $t \in [t_0, t^*] \subset [t_0, t_0 + c_0\beta]$ ,

$$\phi(t, (t_0, \bar{A}_{\Theta(t_0)})) \subset \bar{A}_{\Theta(t_0) + \Omega(t - t_0)}^{\gamma_0 \cdot \beta \cdot \varepsilon^{1/2}}. \quad (4.22)$$

Here, the superscript to a set  $\bar{A}_\alpha$  represents the neighborhood of the set (see (4.7)).

6. To prove (4.22), we fix any  $x_0 \in \bar{A}_{\Theta(t_0)}$  and consider

$$\psi(t) := \bar{\phi}((\Theta(t_0)/\Omega) + (t - t_0), (\Theta(t_0)/\Omega, x_0)), \quad (4.23)$$

where  $\bar{\phi}$  is the trajectory map (4.9) from the Kelvin wave the solution  $\bar{\omega}(t) = \mathbf{1}_{\bar{A}_{\Omega t}}$ . Then  $\psi$  defined in (4.23) satisfies  $\psi(t_0) = x_0$  and

$$\frac{d}{dt}\psi(t) = \bar{u}((\Theta(t_0)/\Omega) + (t - t_0), \psi(t)).$$

As a result, we observe

$$\psi(t) \in \bar{A}_{\Theta(t_0) + \Omega(t - t_0)} \quad \text{for any } t \geq t_0. \quad (4.24)$$

By denoting  $\phi(t) := \phi(t, (t_0, x_0))$ , we just need to show

$$|\phi(t) - \psi(t)| \leq \gamma_0 \cdot \beta \cdot \varepsilon^{1/2}.$$

7. First we decompose

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}(\phi(t) - \psi(t)) &= u(t, \phi(t)) - \bar{u}((\Theta(t_0)/\Omega) + (t - t_0), \psi(t)) \\ &= u(t, \phi(t)) - \bar{u}(\Theta(t)/\Omega, \phi(t)) \\ &\quad + \bar{u}(\Theta(t)/\Omega, \phi(t)) - \bar{u}(\Theta(t_0)/\Omega + (t - t_0), \phi(t)) \\ &\quad + \bar{u}(\Theta(t_0)/\Omega + (t - t_0), \phi(t)) - \bar{u}((\Theta(t_0)/\Omega) + (t - t_0), \psi(t)) \\ &=: I(t) + II(t) + III(t). \end{aligned} \quad (4.25)$$

From the stability assumption (4.16), we have

$$|I(t)| \leq \hat{C}\varepsilon^{1/2}.$$

For  $II(t)$ , we first find  $\tilde{\Theta}(t) \in \mathbb{R}$  satisfying

$$\tilde{\Theta}(t) = \Theta(t) + \frac{2\pi}{m} \cdot k \quad \text{for some integer } k \quad \text{and} \quad \left( \tilde{\Theta}(t) - (\Theta(t_0) + \Omega(t - t_0)) \right) \in \mathbb{T}. \quad (4.26)$$

We observe that  $\bar{u} = u^{m,\beta}$  is time-periodic of period  $\frac{2\pi}{m\Omega}$  and is Lipschitz (in space-time) of  $\bar{u} = u^{m,\beta}$  where the Lipschitz norm is uniformly bounded when  $\beta > 0$  is sufficiently small. Let's denote the Lipschitz constant by  $C_{Lip} = C_{Lip}(m) > 0$ . Then we get

$$\begin{aligned} |II(t)| &= |\bar{u}(\tilde{\Theta}(t)/\Omega, \phi(t)) - \bar{u}(\Theta(t_0)/\Omega + (t - t_0), \phi(t))| \leq \frac{C_{Lip}}{\Omega} |\tilde{\Theta}(t) - (\Theta(t_0) + \Omega(t - t_0))| \\ &= \frac{C_{Lip}}{\Omega} |\mathcal{T}[\tilde{\Theta}(t) - (\Theta(t_0) + \Omega(t - t_0))]| = \frac{C_{Lip}}{\Omega} |\mathcal{T}[\Theta(t) - (\Theta(t_0) + \Omega(t - t_0))]| \\ &\leq 2 \frac{C_{Lip}}{\Omega^*} \cdot (C_0 \cdot \varepsilon^{1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

where we used the assumption (4.19) in the last inequality. For  $III(t)$ , we simply have

$$|III(t)| \leq C_{Lip} |\phi(t) - \psi(t)|.$$

Thus we have, for  $t \in [t_0, t^*]$ ,

$$\frac{d}{dt} |\phi(t) - \psi(t)| \leq C_{Lip} |\phi(t) - \psi(t)| + C_3 \varepsilon^{1/2},$$

where  $C_3 > 0$  is some constant (depending only on  $m$ ). With Gronwall's inequality, we deduce when  $t \in [t_0, t^*] \subset [t_0, t_0 + c_0\beta]$  that

$$|\phi(t) - \psi(t)| \leq e^{C_{Lip}c_0\beta} \cdot \int_{t_0}^{t_0+c_0\beta} C_3 \varepsilon^{1/2} ds \leq (e^{C_{Lip}c_0\beta} C_3) \cdot c_0\beta \cdot \varepsilon^{1/2}.$$

We just take a small constant  $c_0 > 0$  satisfying

$$(e^{C_{Lip}c_0\beta_0} C_3) \cdot c_0 \leq \gamma_0$$

(see (4.21) for  $\gamma_0$ ), which gives

$$|\phi(t) - \psi(t)| \leq \gamma_0 \cdot \beta \cdot \varepsilon^{1/2}.$$

Thanks to (4.24), we have proved (4.22) for any  $t \in [t_0, t^*] \subset [t_0, t_0 + c_0\beta]$ . Now we are ready to show the **Bootstrap claim** (4.20) for  $t \in [t_0, t^*] \subset [t_0, t_0 + c_0\beta]$ .

8. To prove, we simply denote

$$E_t := \phi(t, (t_0, \bar{A}_{\Theta(t_0)})), \quad t \geq t_0,$$

For instance, we observe  $E_{t_0} = \phi(t_0, (t_0, \bar{A}_{\Theta(t_0)})) = \bar{A}_{\Theta(t_0)}$ , and (4.22) gives

$$E_t \subset \bar{A}_{\Theta(t_0) + \Omega(t - t_0)}^{\gamma_0 \cdot \beta \varepsilon^{1/2}}, \quad \forall t \in [t_0, t^*] \subset [t_0, t_0 + c_0\beta].$$

Towards a contradiction, suppose that the property (4.20) on the interval  $[t_0, t^*] \subset [t_0, t_0 + c_0\beta]$  fails, *i.e.*

$$\text{there is some } t' \in [t_0, t^*] \text{ satisfying } |\mathcal{T}[\Theta(t') - (\Theta(t_0) + \Omega(t' - t_0))]| > \frac{1}{2} C_0 \cdot \varepsilon^{1/2}. \quad (4.27)$$

From now on, we will show

$$\|\omega(t') - \bar{\omega}_{\Theta(t')}\|_{L^1} \geq 2\varepsilon,$$

which gives a contradiction to the stability assumption (4.16). We begin the estimate with

$$\|\omega(t') - \bar{\omega}_{\Theta(t')}\|_{L^1} \geq \|\omega(t')\mathbf{1}_{E_{t'}} - \bar{\omega}_{\Theta(t')}\|_{L^1} - \|\omega(t')\mathbf{1}_{(E_{t'})^c}\|_{L^1} =: I(t') - II(t').$$

For  $II(t')$ , we estimate

$$\|\omega(t')\mathbf{1}_{(E_{t'})^c}\|_{L^1} = \|\omega(t_0)\mathbf{1}_{(E_{t_0})^c}\|_{L^1} = \|\omega(t_0) - \bar{\omega}_{\Theta(t_0)}\|_{L^1((E_{t_0})^c)} \leq \|\omega(t_0) - \bar{\omega}_{\Theta(t_0)}\|_{L^1} \leq \varepsilon.$$

For  $I(t')$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\omega(t')\mathbf{1}_{E_{t'}} - \bar{\omega}_{\Theta(t')}\|_{L^1} &\geq \|\bar{\omega}_{\Theta(t')}\|_{L^1((E_{t'})^c)} \geq \|\bar{\omega}_{\Theta(t')}\|_{L^1(\left(\bar{A}_{\Theta(t_0)+\Omega(t'-t_0)}^{\gamma_0 \cdot \beta \varepsilon^{1/2}}\right)^c)} \\ &\geq \|\bar{\omega}_{\Theta(t')}\|_{L^1(\left(\bar{A}_{\Theta(t_0)+\Omega(t'-t_0)}\right)^c)} - |\bar{A}_{\Theta(t_0)+\Omega(t'-t_0)}^{\gamma_0 \cdot \beta \varepsilon^{1/2}} \setminus \bar{A}_{\Theta(t_0)+\Omega(t'-t_0)}|. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by using (4.8), we continue to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \dots &\geq |\bar{A}_{\Theta(t')} \setminus \bar{A}_{\Theta(t_0)+\Omega(t'-t_0)}| - C_1 \cdot \gamma_0 \cdot \beta \varepsilon^{1/2} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} |\bar{A}_{\Theta(t')} \Delta \bar{A}_{\Theta(t_0)+\Omega(t'-t_0)}| - C_1 \cdot \gamma_0 \cdot \beta \varepsilon^{1/2} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} |\bar{I}_{\Theta(t') - (\Theta(t_0) + \Omega(t'-t_0))} - \bar{I}| - C_1 \cdot \gamma_0 \cdot \beta \varepsilon^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we can use (4.4) of Lemma 4.1 to get

$$\dots \geq \frac{1}{2} c_3 \beta |\mathcal{T}[\Theta(t') - (\Theta(t_0) + \Omega(t' - t_0))]| - C_1 \cdot \gamma_0 \cdot \beta \varepsilon^{1/2} \geq \frac{1}{2} c_3 \beta \frac{1}{2} C_0 \varepsilon^{1/2} - C_1 \cdot \gamma_0 \cdot \beta \varepsilon^{1/2},$$

where we used the hypothesis (4.27) in the last inequality. Thanks to the definition of  $\gamma_0$  in (4.21), we have obtained

$$\dots \geq \frac{1}{4} c_3 \beta \frac{1}{2} C_0 \varepsilon^{1/2},$$

which gives

$$\|\omega(t') - \bar{\omega}_{\Theta(t')}\|_{L^1} \geq \frac{1}{4} c_3 \beta \frac{1}{2} C_0 \varepsilon^{1/2} - \varepsilon.$$

We make  $c_0 > 0$  smaller than before (if necessary) to satisfy

$$3\sqrt{c_0} \leq \frac{1}{4} c_3 \frac{1}{2} C_0. \quad (4.28)$$

By this choice of  $c_0 > 0$ , we get, whenever  $0 < \varepsilon \leq c_0 \beta^2$ ,

$$\|\omega(t') - \bar{\omega}_{\Theta(t')}\|_{L^1} \geq 2\varepsilon,$$

which is a contradiction to (4.16). Hence, the hypothesis (4.27) cannot be true, which implies that we have proved **Bootstrap claim** (4.20) for  $[t_0, t^*] \subset [t_0, t_0 + c_0 \beta]$ .

9. Lastly, we are ready to show **Goal** (4.17) for any  $t \in [t_0, t_0 + c_0 \beta]$  since we can extend the interval satisfying **Goal** (4.17) by applying **Bootstrap claim** (4.20) with **Initial claim** (4.18). Indeed, we know that there is  $t^* \in (t_0, t_0 + c_0 \beta)$  such that **Goal** (4.17) on the interval  $[t_0, t^*]$  holds by using **Initial claim** (4.18). Then by applying **Bootstrap claim** (4.20) on the interval  $[t_0, t^*]$ , we get

$$|\mathcal{T}[\Theta(t) - (\Theta(t_0) + \Omega(t - t_0))]| \leq \frac{1}{2} C_0 \cdot \varepsilon^{1/2}, \quad \forall t \in [t_0, t^*].$$

Then we use **Initial claim** (4.18) by replacing  $t_0$  with  $t^*$  so that we get, for any  $t \in [t^*, t^* + \eta]$ ,

$$|\mathcal{T}[\Theta(t) - (\Theta(t^*) + \Omega(t - t^*))]| \leq \frac{1}{2} C_0 \cdot \varepsilon^{1/2}.$$

By adding the above two estimates, we get, for any  $t \in [t^*, t^* + \eta]$ ,

$$|\mathcal{T}[\Theta(t) - (\Theta(t_0) + \Omega(t - t_0))]| \leq C_0 \cdot \varepsilon^{1/2}.$$

In short, we have obtained **Goal** on the extended interval  $[t_0, t^* + \eta]$ . By repeating this process, we can get **Goal** on  $[t_0, t^* + n\eta]$  for each  $n \geq 1$  until the process eventually covers  $[t_0, t_0 + c_0\beta]$ .  $\square$

*Remark 4.4.* In Theorem 1.1, we can always take  $\Theta(0) = 0$  (by assuming  $\delta \leq \varepsilon$  if necessary). Then summing the estimate (1.6) of Theorem 1.2 gives

$$|\mathcal{T}[\Theta(t) - \Omega t]| \leq C_0 \cdot \varepsilon^{1/2} \left( \frac{t}{c_0\beta} + 1 \right) \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T].$$

## 4.5 Proof of Corollary 1.3

Here we will prove *finite time stability* (Corollary 1.3) by using *orbital stability theorem* (Theorem 1.1) with *refined stability* (Theorem 1.2). For  $\beta > 0$ , we denote

$$\bar{m} = \bar{m}(\beta) := \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{T}} (1 + g(\theta)) > 0. \quad (4.29)$$

The next lemma says that when  $\beta > 0$  is small enough, the trajectories induced from the Kelvin wave starting near the wave remain close.

**Lemma 4.5.** (I) For each  $\tau > 0$ , there exist  $\beta' > 0$  and  $\mu > 0$  such that if  $\beta \in [0, \beta']$ , then

$$\bigcup_{t \geq 0} \bar{\phi}(t, (0, \bar{A}^\mu)) \subset B_{\bar{m} + \tau},$$

where  $\bar{\phi}$  is the trajectory of  $\bar{\omega} = \mathbf{1}_{\bar{A}}$  as in (4.9), and  $\bar{A}^\mu := \{\text{dist}(x, \bar{A}) \leq \mu\}$  as in (4.7).

(II) There exists  $\kappa \in (0, 1)$  such that for any  $\tau > 0$ , there exists  $\beta' > 0$  such that if  $\beta \in [0, \beta']$ , then for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$  with  $1/2 \leq |x| \leq 1 + \kappa$ , we get, for any  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$\bar{\phi}(t, (0, x)) \in (B_{|x| + \tau} \setminus \overline{B_{|x| - \tau}}).$$

*Proof.* The first statement just follows from the second statement. The second statement simply follows the facts that

$$\psi^{m, \beta} \rightarrow \psi^{m, \beta}|_{\beta=0} \quad \text{in } C^0\text{-norm on } \overline{B_2} \quad \text{as } \beta \rightarrow 0$$

(e.g. see [33]), where  $\psi^{m, \beta}$  is the relative stream defined in (2.1), and that all the level sets of  $\psi^{m, \beta}|_{\beta=0}$  are circles. Indeed, we recall

$$-\partial_r \psi^{m, \beta}|_{\beta=0}(r, \theta) = -\partial_r (G \mathbf{1}_{B_1} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{m-1}{2m} r^2) = \begin{cases} (\frac{1}{2} - \frac{m-1}{2m}) r, & r \leq 1, \\ (\frac{1}{2r^2} - \frac{m-1}{2m}) r, & r > 1, \end{cases}$$

which gives

$$\inf_{r \in [1/3, 1+2\kappa]} (-\partial_r \psi^{m, \beta}|_{\beta=0}(r, \theta)) \geq c > 0$$

for some  $c = c(m) > 0$  and for some small  $\kappa = \kappa(m) > 0$ . We consider any small  $\tau > 0$  such that  $[(1/2) - \tau, 1 + \kappa + \tau] \subset [1/3, 1 + 2\kappa] \subset [0, 2]$ . Denote

$$\bar{\psi} := \psi^{m, \beta}, \quad \hat{\psi} := \psi^{m, \beta}|_{\beta=0}.$$



For any given point  $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$  satisfying  $1/2 \leq |x| \leq 1 + \kappa$ , we take any points  $y', y'' \in \mathbb{R}^2$  such that  $|y'| = |x| - \tau$  and  $|y''| = |x| + \tau$ . We observe that  $\hat{\psi}$  is radially symmetric and

$$\hat{\psi}(y') - \hat{\psi}(x) \geq c\tau, \quad \hat{\psi}(x) - \hat{\psi}(y'') \geq c\tau.$$

Then, by using the uniform convergence  $\bar{\psi} \rightarrow \hat{\psi}$ , we can take  $\beta > 0$  small enough to get

$$\sup_{|y|=|y'|} |\bar{\psi}(y) - \hat{\psi}(y')| \leq \frac{c\tau}{8}, \quad \sup_{|y|=|y''|} |\bar{\psi}(y) - \hat{\psi}(y'')| \leq \frac{c\tau}{8}, \quad |\bar{\psi}(x) - \hat{\psi}(x)| \leq \frac{c\tau}{8},$$

Thus we get

$$\sup_{|y|=|x|+\tau} \bar{\psi}(y) < \bar{\psi}(x) < \inf_{|y|=|x|-\tau} \bar{\psi}(y),$$

which implies that the connected component of the level set of  $\bar{\psi}$  containing the point  $x$  completely lies on the annulus  $B_{|x|+\tau} \setminus \overline{B_{|x|-\tau}}$ . Since the trajectory  $\bar{\psi}(t, (0, x))$ ,  $t \geq 0$  should lie on the connected component of the level set of  $\bar{\psi}$  containing the point  $x$ , we are done.  $\square$

To prove Corollary 1.3, we just need the first statement of the above lemma while the second one will be used in the next subsection when proving Theorem 1.4.

*Proof of Corollary 1.3.* 1. We first borrow the constant  $\beta_0 > 0$  from Theorem 1.2, and consider small  $\beta_2 \in (0, \beta_0]$  satisfying

$$\bar{m}(\beta) \leq 1 + 2\beta < \bar{r} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{n}(\beta) \geq 1 - 2\beta, \quad \forall \beta \in (0, \beta_2], \quad (4.30)$$

where  $\bar{m} = \bar{m}(\beta) \in (0, \bar{r})$  is defined in (4.29), where  $\bar{r} > 0$  is the constant required in (1.4) for orbital stability of Theorem 1.1, and where  $\bar{n}(\beta)$  is the minimum radius of the Kelvin wave:  $\bar{n} = \bar{n}(\beta) := \inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{T}} (1 + g(\theta)) > 0$ . Then we simply set

$$\tau := \frac{\bar{r} - (1 + 2\beta_2)}{2} > 0, \quad (4.31)$$

and take the two constants  $\beta' = \beta'(\tau) > 0$  and  $\mu = \mu(\tau) > 0$  from (I) of Lemma 4.5. Let  $\beta_1 > 0$  small enough to have

$$\beta_1 \leq \min(\beta_2, \beta') \quad \text{and} \quad 2\beta_1 \leq \frac{\mu}{2}. \quad (4.32)$$

We also set

$$r' := 1 + \frac{\mu}{2} > 1. \quad (4.33)$$

We may assume

$$r' < \bar{r} \quad (4.34)$$

(by redefining  $\mu > 0$  if necessary). Then, (I) of Lemma 4.5 says that

$$\cup_{t \geq 0} \bar{\phi}(t, (0, \bar{A}^\mu)) \subset B_{\bar{m}+\tau}. \quad (4.35)$$

2. From now on, we fix any  $\beta \in (0, \beta_1]$ . Let  $T, \varepsilon' > 0$ . We define  $C_4 = C_4(T, \beta) > 0$  by

$$C_4(T, \beta) := C_0 \cdot \left( \frac{T}{c_0\beta} + 1 \right),$$

where  $c_0, C_0 > 0$  are the constants from Theorem 1.2. We set  $C_5 = C_5(T, \beta) > 0$  by

$$C_5(T, \beta) := \hat{C} + \frac{2 \cdot C_{Lip}}{\Omega^*} \cdot C_4(T, \beta), \quad (4.36)$$

where  $\hat{C} > 0$  comes from (4.10). We consider any small  $\varepsilon \in (0, c_0\beta^2]$  satisfying

$$(e^{C_{Lip}T} C_5) \cdot T \cdot \varepsilon^{1/2} \leq \frac{T}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon + 2c_5 C_4 \varepsilon^{1/2} \leq \varepsilon', \quad (4.37)$$

where  $c_5 > 0$  is the constant of (4.6) in Lemma 4.1. Then, Theorem 1.1 together with summing the estimate (1.6) of Theorem 1.2 says that there is  $\delta' := \delta(\beta, \varepsilon) > 0$ , where  $\delta(\beta, \varepsilon)$  is the constant from Theorem 1.1, such that if a  $m$ -fold symmetric initial data  $\omega_0 = \mathbf{1}_{A_0}$  satisfies

$$\|\omega_0 - \bar{\omega}\|_{L^1} \leq \delta'$$

and if the corresponding solution  $\omega(t) = \mathbf{1}_{A(t)}$  satisfies

$$\textbf{Range hypothesis for } t': \quad \cup_{t \in [0, t']} A(t) \subset B_{\bar{r}} \quad (4.38)$$

for some  $t' \in (0, T]$ , then there exists a function  $\Theta : [0, t'] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$  such that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, t']} \|\omega(t) - \bar{\omega}_{\Theta(t)}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq \varepsilon \quad (4.39)$$

and

$$\sup_{t \in [0, t']} |\mathcal{T}[\Theta(t) - \Omega t]| \leq C_4 \varepsilon^{1/2}. \quad (4.40)$$

(e.g. see Remark 4.4).

- From now on, we consider any  $m$ -fold symmetric initial data  $\omega_0 = \mathbf{1}_{A_0}$  satisfying the initial conditions (1.7) and (1.8). We will show that **Range hypothesis** (4.38) is valid for  $t' = T$ . First, due to the initial assumption (1.8) with (4.34), the hypothesis is true for some  $t' > 0$  since the flow speed is uniformly bounded. For a contradiction, let's suppose that the hypothesis fails when  $t' = T$ . Then, there exists some moment  $T_0 \in (0, T)$  such that

$$\textbf{Range hypothesis} \text{ holds for } t' = T_0 \text{ while the hypothesis fails for every } t' > T_0. \quad (4.41)$$

- We note that since the hypothesis is true for  $t' = T_0$ , the estimates (4.39) and (4.40) hold for  $t' = T_0$ . For  $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , we denote  $\phi(t) := \phi(t, (0, x))$  from (4.11) and  $\bar{\phi}(t) := \bar{\phi}(t, (0, x))$  from (4.9). In the computations below, we consider  $t \in [0, T_0]$ . Similarly in (4.25), we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} (\phi(t) - \bar{\phi}(t)) &= u(t, \phi(t)) - \bar{u}(t, \bar{\phi}(t)) = u(t, \phi(t)) - \bar{u}(\Theta(t)/\Omega, \phi(t)) \\ &\quad + \bar{u}(\Theta(t)/\Omega, \phi(t)) - \bar{u}(t, \phi(t)) \\ &\quad + \bar{u}(t, \phi(t)) - \bar{u}(t, \bar{\phi}(t)) \\ &=: I(t) + II(t) + III(t). \end{aligned} \quad (4.42)$$

Then the estimate (4.39), we have

$$|I(t)| \leq \hat{C} \varepsilon^{1/2}.$$

For  $II(t)$ , as in (4.26), we first find  $\tilde{\Theta}(t)$  by

$$\tilde{\Theta}(t) = \Theta(t) + \frac{2\pi}{m} \cdot k \quad \text{for some integer } k \quad \text{and} \quad (\tilde{\Theta}(t) - \Omega t) \in \mathbb{T}.$$

Then, by using time-periodicity and (space-time) Lipschitz continuity of  $\bar{u}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} |II(t)| &= |\bar{u}(\tilde{\Theta}(t)/\Omega, \phi(t)) - \bar{u}(t, \phi(t))| \leq \frac{2 \cdot C_{Lip}}{\Omega^*} |\tilde{\Theta}(t) - \Omega t| \\ &= \frac{2 \cdot C_{Lip}}{\Omega^*} |\mathcal{T}[\tilde{\Theta}(t) - \Omega t]| = \frac{2 \cdot C_{Lip}}{\Omega^*} |\mathcal{T}[\Theta(t) - \Omega t]| \\ &\leq \frac{2 \cdot C_{Lip}}{\Omega^*} \cdot C_4 \varepsilon^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the estimate (4.40) in the last inequality. For  $III(t)$ , we get

$$|III(t)| \leq C_{Lip} |\phi(t) - \bar{\phi}(t)|,$$

which gives,

$$\frac{d}{dt} |\phi(t) - \bar{\phi}(t)| \leq C_{Lip} |\phi(t) - \bar{\phi}(t)| + C_5 \varepsilon^{1/2}.$$

where  $C_5 > 0$  was already defined in (4.36). With Gronwall's inequality and with the smallness assumption (on  $\varepsilon$ ) (4.37), we get

$$|\phi(t) - \bar{\phi}(t)| \leq (e^{C_{Lip} T} C_5) \cdot T \cdot \varepsilon^{1/2} \leq \frac{\tau}{2}.$$

Together with the fact (4.35) and the definition (4.31) of  $\tau$ , the argument above implies

$$\cup_{t \in [0, T_0]} \phi(t, (0, \bar{A}^\mu)) \subset B_{(\bar{m} + \tau) + (\tau/2)}.$$

which gives

$$\cup_{t \in [0, T_0]} \phi(t, (0, \bar{A}^\mu)) \subset \overline{B_{(\bar{m} + \tau) + (\tau/2)}}.$$

On the other hand, the definition (4.33) of  $r'$  together with (4.32) and (4.30) implies

$$B_{r'} \subset B_{\bar{n} + \mu} \subset \bar{A}^\mu.$$

Thus, our initial assumption (1.8)

$$A_0 \subset B_{r'}$$

gives

$$\cup_{t \in [0, T_0]} A(t) = \cup_{t \in [0, T_0]} \phi(t, (0, A_0)) \subset \cup_{t \in [0, T_0]} \phi(t, (0, \bar{A}^\mu)) \subset \overline{B_{(\bar{m} + \tau) + (\tau/2)}}.$$

On the other hand, we observe

$$(\bar{m} + \tau) + (\tau/2) < \bar{r}$$

thanks to (4.31), (4.30). By recalling that the flow speed is bounded, there should exist some moment  $T_1 > T_0$  such that **Range hypothesis** is true for  $t' = T_1$ , which contradicts the assumption (4.41). Hence, **Range hypothesis** (4.38) for  $t' = T$  is valid. As a result, we obtain the estimates (4.40), (4.39) for  $t' = T$ .

5. Lastly, by the estimate (4.6) of Lemma 4.1 and by (4.39), (4.40) for  $t' = T$ , we get, for any  $t \in [0, T]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\omega(t) - \bar{\omega}_{\Omega t}\|_{L^1} &\leq \|\omega(t) - \bar{\omega}_{\Theta(t)}\|_{L^1} + \|\bar{\omega}_{\Theta(t)} - \bar{\omega}_{\Omega t}\|_{L^1} \\ &\leq \varepsilon + 2|\bar{A}_{\Theta(t)} \setminus \bar{A}_{\Omega t}| \leq \varepsilon + 2c_5 |\mathcal{T}[\Theta(t) - \Omega t]| \leq \varepsilon + 2c_5 C_4 \varepsilon^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

By the smallness assumption (4.37) (on  $\varepsilon$ ), we get the stability (1.9). It finishes the proof of Corollary 1.3.  $\square$

## 4.6 Proof of Theorem 1.4

Now we are ready to prove *perimeter growth theorem* (Theorem 1.4) by using *finite time stability* (Corollary 1.3) and (II) of Lemma 4.5.

*Proof of Theorem 1.4.* 1. We recall that the angular velocity  $\hat{u}^\theta$  of  $\hat{u} := K * \mathbf{1}_{B_1}$  is

$$\hat{u}^\theta(r) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}, & r \leq 1, \\ \frac{1}{2r^2}, & r > 1 \end{cases}.$$

2. We borrow the constants  $\beta_1 > 0$ ,  $r' > 1$  from Corollary 1.3 and set  $\mu := r' - 1 > 0$ . We also take the constant  $\kappa > 0$  from (II) of Lemma 4.5. We set  $r_1 := 1$  and

$$r_2 := 1 + \frac{\min\{\mu, \kappa\}}{2}.$$

We note  $r_2 < r'$  and  $r_2 < 1 + \kappa$ . Then we consider any constant  $\tau \in (0, 1/4]$  satisfying

$$\tau \leq \frac{\min\{\mu, \kappa\}}{20},$$

which will be chosen again to be small during the proof.

3. We denote the intervals

$$I_i = [r_i - 2\tau, r_i + 2\tau], \quad I'_i = [r_i - \tau, r_i + \tau]$$

for  $i = 1, 2$ . We set

$$U^1 := \left( \inf_{r \in I_1} \hat{u}^\theta(r) \right) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad U^2 := \left( \sup_{r \in I_2} \hat{u}^\theta(r) \right) > 0.$$

Since  $\hat{u}^\theta(r_1) > \hat{u}^\theta(r_2)$  and  $\hat{u}^\theta$  is continuous, we can assume  $U^1 - U^2 > 0$  by making  $\tau > 0$  smaller than before (if necessary). By fixing such a constant  $\tau > 0$ , we take  $\beta' = \beta'(\tau) > 0$  from (II) of Lemma 4.5. We also denote

$$\bar{U}^1 := U^1 - \frac{U^1 - U^2}{4} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{U}^2 := U^1 + \frac{U^1 - U^2}{4},$$

and note that  $\Delta \bar{U} := \bar{U}^1 - \bar{U}^2 > 0$ .

4. Let  $M > 0$  and  $\delta > 0$ . We take any large  $T > 0$  such that

$$(T\Delta \bar{U} - 2\pi) > 2M. \tag{4.43}$$

Let  $\varepsilon' > 0$  be small enough to satisfy

$$\hat{C}(\varepsilon')^{1/2} \leq \frac{U^1 - U^2}{8}, \tag{4.44}$$

where  $\hat{C} > 0$  comes from (4.10), and

$$(e^{C_{Lip}T}) \cdot T \cdot \hat{C}(\varepsilon')^{1/2} \leq \tau. \tag{4.45}$$

5. From now on, we consider a sufficiently small  $\beta \in (0, \min\{\beta_1, \beta'\}]$  satisfying the following:

- (a) The perimeter of  $\partial \bar{A}$  is smaller than 10.
- (b)  $\partial \bar{A} \cap \{r = 1\} \neq \emptyset$
- (c) The velocity  $\bar{u} = K * \mathbf{1}_{\bar{A}}$  for the Kelvin wave with parameter  $\beta > 0$  is close enough to the velocity  $\hat{u}$  for the circular patch in the sense that

$$\|\bar{u} - \hat{u}\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{U^1 - U^2}{8}. \tag{4.46}$$

We may assume  $\delta > 0$  small enough to satisfy  $\delta \leq \delta'(\beta, \varepsilon', T)$ , where  $\delta'(\beta, \varepsilon', T) > 0$  is the constant from Corollary 1.3.

6. We take any initial data  $\mathbf{1}_{A_0}$  with the following properties:

- (a)  $A_0$  is an open  $m$ -fold symmetric set with  $C^\infty$ -smooth connected boundary  $\partial A_0$ .
- (b) The perimeter of  $\partial A_0$  is smaller than 20.

(c)  $A_0 \subset B_{r'}$  and  $\|\omega_0 - \bar{\omega}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq \delta$ .

(d) For each  $i = 1, 2$ ,  $\exists$  a point  $x^i = (r_i \cos \theta_i, r_i \sin \theta_i) \in \partial A_0$  satisfying  $|\theta_i| \leq \frac{2\pi}{m}$ .

Then, Corollary 1.3 implies that the perturbed solution  $\omega(t) = 1_{A_t}$  satisfies

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\omega(t) - \bar{\omega}_{\Omega t}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq \varepsilon'. \quad (4.47)$$

Set  $L_0 : [0, 1] \rightarrow \partial A_0$  be an injective parametrized curve lying on the sector  $\{(r, \theta) : \theta \in \mathbb{T}\}$  satisfying  $L_0(0) = x^1, L_0(1) = x^2$ , and consider  $L_t := \phi(t, (0, L_0))$ . We will show that the length of the curve  $L_T$  is larger than  $M$ , which finishes the proof thanks to  $L_T \subset \partial A_T$ .

7. For  $i = 1, 2$ , we denote

$$\phi^i(t) := \phi(t, (0, x^i)) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\phi}^i(t) := \bar{\phi}(t, (0, x^i)),$$

where  $\phi, \bar{\phi}$  are the trajectories from the perturbed solution  $\omega(t)$  and the Kevin wave solution  $\bar{\omega}(t) = \mathbf{1}_{\bar{A}_{\Omega t}}$  as in (4.11), (4.9), respectively. For any interval  $I = [a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ , we denote the annulus

$$R_I := \bar{B}_b \setminus B_a.$$

We observe

$$\bar{\phi}^i(t) \in R_{I_i}, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (4.48)$$

by using (II) of Lemma 4.5.

8. We claim

$$\phi^i(t) \in R_{I_i}, \quad \forall t \in [0, T] \quad (4.49)$$

for  $i = 1, 2$ . Thanks to (4.48), it is enough to show that

$$|\phi^i(t) - \bar{\phi}^i(t)| \leq \tau, \quad \forall t \in [0, T].$$

Similarly in (4.25), (4.42), we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} (\phi(t) - \bar{\phi}(t)) &= u(t, \phi(t)) - \bar{u}(t, \bar{\phi}(t)) = u(t, \phi(t)) - \bar{u}(t, \phi(t)) \\ &\quad + \bar{u}(t, \phi(t)) - \bar{u}(t, \bar{\phi}(t)) \\ &=: I(t) + II(t). \end{aligned}$$

From the stability (4.47), we have

$$|I(t)| \leq \hat{C}(\varepsilon')^{1/2}.$$

For  $II(t)$ , we note Lipschitz continuity of  $\bar{u}$  to get

$$|II(t)| \leq C_{Lip} |\phi(t) - \bar{\phi}(t)|.$$

Thus we get, for  $t \in [0, T]$ ,

$$\frac{d}{dt} |\phi(t) - \bar{\phi}(t)| \leq C_{Lip} |\phi(t) - \bar{\phi}(t)| + \hat{C}(\varepsilon')^{1/2}.$$

With Gronwall's inequality, we get

$$|\phi(t) - \bar{\phi}(t)| \leq (e^{C_{Lip} T}) \cdot T \cdot \hat{C}(\varepsilon')^{1/2}.$$

From the smallness assumption (4.45) on  $\varepsilon' > 0$ , we obtain the claim (4.49).

9. Lastly, we observe

$$|u(t, \phi^i(t)) - \hat{u}(\phi^i(t))| \leq |u(t, \phi^i(t)) - \bar{u}(t, \phi^i(t))| + |\bar{u}(t, \phi^i(t)) - \hat{u}(\phi^i(t))| \leq \frac{U^1 - U^2}{4},$$

where the last inequality follows from (4.47), (4.44), (4.46). Thus the above claim (4.49) implies that the angular velocity of  $u(t, \phi^1(t))$  is bigger than  $\bar{U}^1$  while that of  $u(t, \phi^2(t))$  is smaller than  $\bar{U}^2$ . Thus we simply observe that the difference between the winding number (with respect to the origin) of trajectory  $\phi^1(t)$  on  $[0, T]$  starting at  $x^1$  and the winding number of trajectory  $\phi^2(t)$  starting at  $x^2$  is bigger than

$$\frac{(T\Delta\bar{U} - 2\pi)}{2\pi}.$$

Since

$$\phi^i(t) \in R_{I_i} \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_{1/2}, \quad i = 1, 2$$

on  $[0, T]$ , our choice (4.43) of  $T$  implies that the length of  $L(T)$  should be larger than  $M$ .

The proof is complete.  $\square$

## Acknowledgment

We would like to thank Junho Choi for allowing the use of Figure 1. KC has been supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF-2018R1D1A1B07043065). IJ has been supported by the Samsung Science and Technology Foundation under Project Number SSTF-BA2002-04 and the New Faculty Startup Fund from Seoul National University.

## A Stability of the Annulus

In this section, we provide a sketch of the fact that any annulus is a strict local maximum of the energy within a suitable admissible class of patches. Based on this fact, one can derive nonlinear stability and instability results as in the Kelvin wave case. We believe that this is interesting at least for the following reasons:

- While it is known that monotone decreasing and radial vorticities define nonlinear stable steady states (*e.g.* see [18]), this seems to be a first instance where nonlinear stability for *non-monotone* radial solution can be obtained. Moreover, long time filamentation can be proved near any annulus using the nonlinear stability.
- It is likely that under certain mass, impulse, and  $m$ -fold symmetry constraint, there exist at least two strict local maximum of the energy, one given by an  $m$ -fold symmetric Kelvin wave and the other being an annulus, especially when both of them are sufficiently close to the disc. (Strictly speaking, we do not know the precise range of existence/stability in  $\beta$  for Kelvin waves with large  $m$ .)

### A.1 Admissible class and key proposition for the annulus

For  $0 < r_1 < r_2$ , we consider the annulus

$$\bar{\omega}_{r_1, r_2} := \mathbf{1}_{[r_1, r_2]}(r).$$

We shall often omit writing out the subscripts  $r_1$  and  $r_2$ , and define the admissible class of perturbations

$$\mathcal{A}[\bar{\omega}] := \left\{ \tilde{\omega} = \mathbf{1}_A : \int \tilde{\omega} = \int \bar{\omega}, \int |x|^2 \tilde{\omega} = \int |x|^2 \bar{\omega} \right\}$$

and set

$$\mathcal{A}^m = \mathcal{A}[\bar{\omega}] \cap \{\bar{\omega} \text{ is } m\text{-fold symmetric}\}.$$

It is interesting to note that, imposing the mass and impulse constraint simultaneously picks out (at most) one annulus. Next, we set

$$\mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon, D}[\bar{\omega}] := \{\bar{\omega} = \mathbf{1}_A : A \subset D, \|\bar{\omega} - \bar{\omega}\|_{L^1} < \varepsilon\}.$$

Let us now state our key proposition.

**Proposition A.1.** *For any  $0 < r_1 < r_2$ , there exist  $m \geq 2$ ,  $\bar{r} > 1$ ,  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ , and  $c_0 > 0$  such that*

$$E[\bar{\omega}_{r_1, r_2}] - E[\omega] \geq c_0 \|\bar{\omega}_{r_1, r_2} - \omega\|_{L^1}^2$$

for any  $\omega \in \mathcal{A}^m \cap \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon, B_{\bar{r}r_2}}[\bar{\omega}_{r_1, r_2}]$  with  $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ .

All of the constants  $m, \bar{r}, \varepsilon_0$ , and  $c_0$  depend on  $r_1$  and  $r_2$  in a rather complicated way. The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of the above proposition. We omit the details as the arguments are parallel to the case of the Kelvin waves.

## A.2 Relative stream function

We now modify the stream function of  $\bar{\omega}$  in a way that it vanishes on the boundary of the annulus. We recall that for any radial vorticity  $\bar{\omega}$ ,  $\bar{G} := G[\bar{\omega}] = \frac{1}{2\pi} \ln \frac{1}{|x|} * \bar{\omega}$  is given by

$$-\partial_r \bar{G} = \frac{1}{r} \int_0^r s \bar{\omega}(s) ds.$$

Indeed, using the above formula it is immediate to see that  $\Delta \bar{G} = (\partial_{rr} + \frac{\partial_r}{r}) \bar{G} = -\bar{\omega}$ . We see that

$$-\partial_r \bar{G}(r) = \begin{cases} 0 & r \leq r_1, \\ r/2 - r_1^2/(2r) & r_1 < r \leq r_2, \\ (r_2^2 - r_1^2)/(2r) & r_2 < r. \end{cases}$$

We have that  $\bar{G}(0) = \int_{r_1}^{r_2} r \ln \frac{1}{r} dr$  and  $\bar{G}(r)$  is monotone decreasing in  $r$ . We claim that there exists a unique pair of constants  $C_0, C_1$  such that the *relative stream function* defined by

$$\bar{\psi} = \bar{G} + C_0 + C_1 r^2 \tag{A.1}$$

satisfies

$$\bar{\psi}(r_1) = \bar{\psi}(r_2) = 0.$$

The unique choice is given by

$$\bar{\psi} = \bar{G} - \bar{G}(0) - C_1 r_1^2 + C_1 r^2, \quad C_1 := \frac{1}{4} - \frac{r_1^2}{2(r_2^2 - r_1^2)} \ln \frac{r_2}{r_1} > 0.$$

We note that

$$\partial_r \bar{\psi}(r_1) = 2C_1 r_1 > 0, \quad \partial_r \bar{\psi}(r_2) = 2C_1 r_2 + \bar{G}'(r_2) = -\frac{r_1^2 r_2}{r_2^2 - r_1^2} \ln \frac{r_2}{r_1} + \frac{r_1^2}{2r_2} < 0$$

for any  $0 < r_1 < r_2$ . See Figure 2 for a plot of  $\bar{G}$  and  $\bar{\psi}$  in the case  $r_1 = 1/2$  and  $r_2 = 1$ . Note that there is a critical radius  $r^* > r_2$  (depending on  $r_1$  and  $r_2$ ) such that  $\bar{\psi}(r^*) = 0$  and  $\bar{\psi}(r) < 0$  for  $r_2 < r < r^*$ . This determines  $\bar{r}$  in Proposition A.1; we need to take  $1 < \bar{r} < r^*/r_2$ .




Figure 2: Stream functions  $\bar{G}$  and  $\bar{\psi}$  for the annulus

### A.3 Graph type perturbation

We fix some  $\bar{\omega} = \bar{\omega}_{r_1, r_2}$  and consider graph type perturbations, which are described by a pair of functions defined on  $S^1$ ; given  $(h_1(\theta), h_2(\theta))$  which are assumed to be sufficiently small (depending on  $r_1$  and  $r_2 - r_1$ ) in the  $C^1$  norm, we set

$$\tilde{\omega}_{h_1, h_2} := \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{A}_{h_1, h_2}}, \quad \tilde{A}_{h_1, h_2} = \{(r, \theta) : r_1 + h_1(\theta) < r < r_2 + h_2(\theta)\}.$$

We easily compute that, with notation  $\|h_i\|^2 := \int_{S^1} |h_i|^2 d\theta$ ,

- Mass:

$$\int \tilde{\omega} dx = \int \bar{\omega} dx - r_1 \int h_1 d\theta + r_2 \int h_2 d\theta + \frac{1}{2} \int h_2^2 d\theta - \frac{1}{2} \int h_1^2 d\theta.$$

- Impulse:

$$\int |x|^2 \tilde{\omega} dx = \int |x|^2 \bar{\omega} dx + r_2^3 \int h_2 d\theta + \frac{3}{2} r_2^2 \int h_2^2 - r_1^3 \int h_1 d\theta - \frac{3}{2} r_1^2 \int h_1^2 + O(\|h_1\|^3 + \|h_2\|^3).$$

Based on these computations, we immediately see that the requirement  $\tilde{\omega} \in \mathcal{A}[\bar{\omega}]$  forces that

$$\int h_2 d\theta, \quad \int h_1 d\theta = O(\|h\|^2), \tag{A.2}$$

where  $\|h\|^2 := \|h_1\|^2 + \|h_2\|^2$ . This *small mass condition* will be used frequently in the following.

### A.4 Reduction to graph type perturbation

Given a fixed annulus  $\bar{\omega}$  and a (general) patch perturbation  $\omega^*$  belonging to the admissible class  $\mathcal{A}^m \cap \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon, B_{\bar{r}r_2}}$ , we need to find a graph type perturbation  $\tilde{\omega}$  which satisfies

$$E[\omega^*] - E[\tilde{\omega}] \leq 0, \quad E[\tilde{\omega}] - E[\bar{\omega}] \leq 0$$

and still belonging to the admissible class. The proof of the second inequality is the goal of the next section. For the first inequality, having  $\omega^*$  close to  $\bar{\omega}$  in  $L^1$  implies that the function  $G[\omega^*] + C_0 + C_1 r^2$  is close to  $\bar{\psi}$  in the  $C^{1, \alpha}$  topology with any  $0 < \alpha < 1$ , where  $C_0$  and  $C_1$  are the constants from (A.1). Then, there is a unique way to slightly perturb the constants  $C_0$  and  $C_1$  to  $C'_0$  and  $C'_1$  respectively, so that if we define  $\tilde{\omega}$  to be the patch supported on the inner component of the set  $\{G > 0\}$  where

$$\tilde{G} := G[\omega^*] + C'_0 + C'_1 r^2,$$



then  $\tilde{\omega}$  belongs to the admissible class. This can be proved using a determinant computation arising from matching the mass and impulse simultaneously. Then, proving  $E[\omega^*] - E[\tilde{\omega}] \leq 0$  is straightforward, using that  $\partial_r \bar{\psi}(r_1) > 0 > \partial_r \bar{\psi}(r_2)$ .

## A.5 Energy difference for graph type perturbation

Finally, we may assume that  $\tilde{\omega}$  is a graph type perturbation and write

$$E[\tilde{\omega}] - E[\bar{\omega}] = \langle \tilde{\omega} - \bar{\omega}, \bar{G} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \tilde{\omega} - \bar{\omega}, G(\tilde{\omega} - \bar{\omega}) \rangle = I + II.$$

Computation for I: Using that  $\tilde{\omega} \in \mathcal{A}$ , we may write

$$I = \langle \tilde{\omega} - \bar{\omega}, \bar{\psi} \rangle = \int \int_{r_2}^{r_2+h_2} \bar{\psi}(r) r dr d\theta - \int \int_{r_1}^{r_1+h_1} \bar{\psi}(r) r dr d\theta =: I_2 + I_1.$$

Then, we compute using that  $\bar{\psi}(r_2) = 0$

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= \int \int_{r_2}^{r_2+h_2} (\partial_r \bar{\psi}(r_2)(r - r_2) + o(r - r_2))(r_2 + r - r_2) dr d\theta \\ &= r_2 \partial_r \bar{\psi}(r_2) \int \int_{r_2}^{r_2+h_2} (r - r_2) dr d\theta + o(\|h_2\|^2) = \frac{r_2 \partial_r \bar{\psi}(r_2)}{2} \int h_2^2 d\theta + o(\|h_2\|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have that

$$I_1 = -\frac{r_1 \partial_r \bar{\psi}(r_1)}{2} \int h_1^2 d\theta + o(\|h_1\|^2).$$

Note the negative sign in the first term of the right hand side. Therefore, we have that

$$I \leq -2c_0 \|h\|^2 + o(\|h\|^2)$$

for some  $c_0 > 0$  depending only on  $r_1$  and  $r_2$ .

Computation for II: Next, we consider the quadratic expression  $II$  in polar coordinates after writing

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\omega} - \bar{\omega} &= (\tilde{\omega}_{h_2} - \bar{\omega}_{r_2}) - (\tilde{\omega}_{h_1} - \bar{\omega}_{r_1}), \quad G_j := G(\tilde{\omega}_{h_j} - \bar{\omega}_{r_j}); \\ II &= \frac{1}{2} \iint (\tilde{\omega}_{h_2} - \bar{\omega}_{r_2})(r, \theta) G_2(r, \theta) r dr d\theta - \frac{1}{2} \iint (\tilde{\omega}_{h_1} - \bar{\omega}_{r_1})(r, \theta) G_2(r, \theta) r dr d\theta \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \iint (\tilde{\omega}_{h_2} - \bar{\omega}_{r_2})(r, \theta) G_1(r, \theta) r dr d\theta + \frac{1}{2} \iint (\tilde{\omega}_{h_1} - \bar{\omega}_{r_1})(r, \theta) G_1(r, \theta) r dr d\theta \\ &=: II_{22} + II_{21} + II_{12} + II_{11}. \end{aligned}$$

As in [44], we see that

$$II_{jj} = (r_j)^2 \langle h_j, K h_j \rangle + o(\|h_j\|^2)$$

for  $j = 1, 2$  and

$$II_{12} = II_{21} = -r_1 r_2 \langle h_1, \tilde{K} h_2 \rangle + o(\|h\|^2).$$

Here,  $\tilde{K}$  is the convolution operator defined on  $S^1$  by

$$(\tilde{K} h_2)(\theta) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int \ln \frac{1}{|r_1 e^{i\theta} - r_2 e^{i\theta'}|} h_2(\theta') d\theta'.$$

Therefore, we have that

$$II = r_2^2 \langle h_2, Kh_2 \rangle + r_1^2 \langle h_1, Kh_1 \rangle - 2r_1 r_2 \langle h_1, \tilde{K}h_2 \rangle + o(\|h\|^2).$$

Under the small mass condition (A.2), we may replace  $\tilde{K}h_2$  with the convolution

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int \ln \frac{1}{|r_1 e^{i(\theta-\theta')}/r_2 - 1|} h_2(\theta') d\theta',$$

whose eigenfunctions are simply  $e^{in\theta}$  for  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ . The eigenvalues of this operator depend on  $r_1$  and  $r_2$  but decays to 0 as  $|n| \rightarrow \infty$ , just like those for  $K$ . Therefore, we deduce that for  $\tilde{\omega} \in \mathcal{A}_m[\tilde{\omega}]$ ,

$$|II| \leq o_m(1) \|h\|^2.$$

Conclusion. We have that

$$I + II \leq -c_0 \|h\|^2,$$

for  $m$  sufficiently large and  $\|h\|$  sufficiently small. This concludes the proof of Proposition A.1.  $\square$

## References

- [1] Ken Abe and Kyudong Choi. Stability of Lamb dipoles. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, to appear, *arXiv:1911.01795*.
- [2] V. I. Arnold. Sur la géométrie différentielle des groupes de Lie de dimension infinie et ses applications à l'hydrodynamique des fluides parfaits. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 16(fasc. 1):319–361, 1966.
- [3] J. Bedrossian, M. Coti Zelati, and V. Vicol. Vortex axisymmetrization, inviscid damping, and vorticity depletion in the linearized 2D Euler equations. *Ann. PDE*, 5(1):Paper No. 4, 192, 2019.
- [4] Jacob Bedrossian and Nader Masmoudi. Inviscid damping and the asymptotic stability of planar shear flows in the 2D Euler equations. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.*, 122:195–300, 2015.
- [5] Jacob Burbea. Motions of vortex patches. *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 6(1):1–16, 1982.
- [6] G. R. Burton. Compactness and stability for planar vortex-pairs with prescribed impulse. *J. Differential Equations*, 270:547–572, 2021.
- [7] G. R. Burton, H. J. Nussenzveig Lopes, and M. C. Lopes Filho. Nonlinear stability for steady vortex pairs. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 324:445–463, 2013.
- [8] Daomin Cao, Zhongyuan Liu, and Juncheng Wei. Regularization of point vortices pairs for the Euler equation in dimension two. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 212(1):179–217, 2014.
- [9] Daomin Cao, Guolin Qin, Weicheng Zhan, and Changjun Zou. Existence and stability of smooth traveling circular pairs for the generalized surface quasi-geostrophic equation. *arXiv:2103.04041*.
- [10] Daomin Cao, Jie Wan, and Guodong Wang. Nonlinear orbital stability for planar vortex patches. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 147(2):775–784, 2019.
- [11] J. A. Carrillo and J. Soler. On the evolution of an angle in a vortex patch. *J. Nonlinear Sci.*, 10(1):23–47, 2000.
- [12] Angel Castro, Diego Córdoba, and Javier Gómez-Serrano. Existence and regularity of rotating global solutions for the generalized surface quasi-geostrophic equations. *Duke Math. J.*, 165(5):935–984, 2016.

- [13] Angel Castro, Diego Córdoba, and Javier Gómez-Serrano. Uniformly rotating analytic global patch solutions for active scalars. *Ann. PDE*, 2(1):Art. 1, 34, 2016.
- [14] Kyudong Choi. Stability of Hill’s spherical vortex. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, to appear, *arXiv:2011.06808*.
- [15] Kyudong Choi and In-Jee Jeong. Filamentation near Hill’s vortex. *preprint, arXiv:2107.06035*.
- [16] Kyudong Choi and In-Jee Jeong. Growth of perimeter for vortex patches in a bulk. *Appl. Math. Lett.*, 113:106857, 9, 2021.
- [17] Kyudong Choi and In-Jee Jeong. Infinite growth in vorticity gradient of compactly supported planar vorticity near Lamb dipole. *Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl.*, 65:Paper No. 103470, 20, 2022.
- [18] Kyudong Choi and Deokwoo Lim. Stability of radially symmetric, monotone vorticities of 2d Euler equations. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, to appear, *arXiv:2103.11724*.
- [19] P. Constantin and E. S. Titi. On the evolution of nearly circular vortex patches. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 119(2):177–198, 1988.
- [20] Francisco de la Hoz, Zineb Hassainia, and Taoufik Hmidi. Doubly connected V-states for the generalized surface quasi-geostrophic equations. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 220(3):1209–1281, 2016.
- [21] Francisco de la Hoz, Zineb Hassainia, Taoufik Hmidi, and Joan Mateu. An analytical and numerical study of steady patches in the disc. *Anal. PDE*, 9(7):1609–1670, 2016.
- [22] Francisco de la Hoz, Taoufik Hmidi, Joan Mateu, and Joan Verdera. Doubly connected V-states for the planar Euler equations. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 48(3):1892–1928, 2016.
- [23] Gary S. Deem and Norman J. Zabusky. Vortex waves: Stationary ”v states,” interactions, recurrence, and breaking. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 40:859–862, Mar 1978.
- [24] David G. Dritschel. The repeated filamentation of two-dimensional vorticity interfaces. *J. Fluid Mech.*, 194:511–547, 1988.
- [25] Tarek M. Elgindi and In-Jee Jeong. On singular vortex patches, II: long-time dynamics. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 373(9):6757–6775, 2020.
- [26] T Gallay and V. Sverak. Arnold’s variational principle and its application to the stability of planar vortices. *preprint, arXiv:2110.13739*.
- [27] J. Gómez-Serrano, J. Park, and J. Shi. Existence of non-trivial non-concentrated compactly supported stationary solutions of the 2D Euler equation with finite energy. *arXiv:2112.03821*.
- [28] Javier Gómez-Serrano. On the existence of stationary patches. *Adv. Math.*, 343:110–140, 2019.
- [29] Javier Gómez-Serrano, Jaemin Park, Jia Shi, and Yao Yao. Symmetry in stationary and uniformly rotating solutions of active scalar equations. *Duke Math. J.*, 170(13):2957–3038, 2021.
- [30] Yan Guo, Chris Hallstrom, and Daniel Spirn. Dynamics near an unstable Kirchhoff ellipse. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 245(2):297–354, 2004.
- [31] Zineb Hassainia, Nader Masmoudi, and Miles H. Wheeler. Global bifurcation of rotating vortex patches. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 73(9):1933–1980, 2020.
- [32] Taoufik Hmidi and Joan Mateu. Bifurcation of rotating patches from Kirchhoff vortices. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 36(10):5401–5422, 2016.

- [33] Taoufik Hmidi, Joan Mateu, and Joan Verdera. Boundary regularity of rotating vortex patches. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 209(1):171–208, 2013.
- [34] Dragoş Iftimie, Thomas C. Sideris, and Pascal Gamblin. On the evolution of compactly supported planar vorticity. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 24(9-10):1709–1730, 1999.
- [35] A. Ionescu and H. Jia. Inviscid damping near the Couette flow in a channel. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 374(3):2015–2096, 2020.
- [36] James Russell Kamm. *Shape and stability of two dimensional uniform vorticity regions*. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 1987. Thesis (Ph.D.)—California Institute of Technology.
- [37] G Kirchhoff. Vorlesungen über mathematische physik, vol. 1. *Teubner, Leipzig*, 1876.
- [38] H. Lamb. *Hydrodynamics*. Cambridge Univ. Press., 3rd ed. edition, 1906.
- [39] Zhiwu Lin and Chongchun Zeng. Inviscid dynamical structures near Couette flow. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 200(3):1075–1097, 2011.
- [40] A. E. H. Love. On the Stability of certain Vortex Motions. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 25:18–42, 1893/94.
- [41] C. Marchioro and M. Pulvirenti. Some considerations on the nonlinear stability of stationary planar Euler flows. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 100(3):343–354, 1985.
- [42] J. Park. Quantitative estimates for uniformly-rotating vortex patches. *arXiv:2010.06754*.
- [43] T. C. Sideris and L. Vega. Stability in  $L^1$  of circular vortex patches. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 137:4199–4202, 2009.
- [44] Yun Tang. Nonlinear stability of vortex patches. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 304(2):617–638, 1987.
- [45] B. Turkington. On steady vortex flow in two dimensions. I, II. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 8:999–1030, 1031–1071, 1983.
- [46] Y. H. Wan. The stability of rotating vortex patches. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 107:1–20, 1986.
- [47] Y. H. Wan and M. Pulvirenti. Nonlinear stability of circular vortex patches. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 99:435–450, 1985.
- [48] Dongyi Wei, Zhifei Zhang, and Weiren Zhao. Linear inviscid damping for a class of monotone shear flow in Sobolev spaces. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 71(4):617–687, 2018.
- [49] Norman J. Zabusky, M. H. Hughes, and K. V. Roberts. Contour dynamics for the Euler equations in two dimensions. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 30(1):96–106, 1979.
- [50] Christian Zillinger. Linear inviscid damping for monotone shear flows. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 369(12):8799–8855, 2017.