

# UNIQUENESS FOR 2D EULER AND TRANSPORT EQUATIONS VIA EXTRAPOLATION

ÓSCAR DOMÍNGUEZ AND MARIO MILMAN

ABSTRACT. Using extrapolation theory, we develop a new framework to prove the uniqueness of solutions for transport equations. We apply our methodology to unify and extend the classical results of Yudovich and Vishik for 2D Euler equations. In particular, we establish the uniqueness for the Euler flow whose vorticity belongs to new scales of function spaces that contain both Yudovich spaces and BMO. We give a self contained presentation.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Uniqueness of Euler flows	2
1.2. A novel methodology via extrapolation	5
1.3. Extrapolation and the role of the Yudovich functions: a preview	5
1.4. A priori estimates via extrapolation	8
1.5. Uniqueness of Lagrangian weak solutions	9
1.6. Summary of our approach to uniqueness	9
1.7. Extending Yudovich’s uniqueness theorem beyond BMO	10
1.8. Vishik’s uniqueness theorem	11
1.9. Active scalar equations	12
1.10. Road map	13
2. The spaces $Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}$	13
2.1. Characterizations	13
2.2. Proof of Theorem 1.2	17
2.3. Examples of vorticities in $Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}$ that are not in $Y_{p_0}^{\Theta}$	20
3. The spaces $\dot{B}_{\Pi}^{\beta}$	22
3.1. Characterizations	23
3.2. Uniqueness for a family of active scalar equations	26
3.3. Proof of Theorems 1.3 and 1.4	28
3.4. Comparison of Theorem 1.4 with the uniqueness result of Vishik	28
Appendix A. Interpolation and Extrapolation: An Atlas	30
A.1. Interpolation of Besov spaces via retraction revisited	30
A.2. Results from Section 1.3	31

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 76B03, 46M35. Secondary 46E30, 46E35.

*Key words and phrases.* 2D incompressible Euler equations, transport equations, Yudovich’s uniqueness theorem, Vishik’s uniqueness theorem, BMO, extrapolation.

*Acknowledgements.* Part of this research was carried out while the first-named author was a postdoc at the Institut Camille Jordan, Lyon, supported by the Labex Milyon and the French National Research Agency (ANR-10-LABX-0070), (ANR-11-IDEX-0007). It is our pleasure to thank Prof. Petru Mironescu for some helpful comments that helped to improve the presentation of the paper.

A.3. Computability of $K$ -functionals	34
References	35

## 1. INTRODUCTION

**1.1. Uniqueness of Euler flows.** The uniqueness of weak solutions of the Cauchy problem for the Euler equations of an ideal incompressible fluid on  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^2$  or  $\mathbb{T}^2$  still presents challenging open questions. In 2D the Euler equations can be formulated in terms of a transport equation

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} \omega_t + v \cdot \nabla \omega = 0, & \text{on } (0, \infty) \times \Omega, \\ v = k * \omega, & \text{on } (0, \infty) \times \Omega, \\ \omega(0, x) = \omega_0(x), & x \in \Omega, \end{cases}$$

where  $v : [0, \infty) \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  is the *velocity* of the flow,  $\omega = \text{curl}(v) = \partial_{x_1} v_2 - \partial_{x_2} v_1$  is the *vorticity*, and  $k$  is standard Biot-Savart kernel<sup>1</sup>. The equation  $v = k * \omega$  is the so-called *Biot-Savart law*, allowing to recover  $v$  from  $\omega$ . It follows (cf. [35, 26, 9]) that

$$(1.2) \quad \nabla v = \mathcal{K}\omega,$$

where  $\mathcal{K}$  is a certain Calderón–Zygmund operator (in short CZO).

The uniqueness of weak solutions to (1.1) with bounded vorticity was established in a celebrated paper by Yudovich [35], via a clever argument involving the energy method combined with sharp  $L^p$ -inequalities for CZO. To extend the uniqueness result to unbounded vorticities, Yudovich [36] proposed new function spaces, nowadays called *Yudovich spaces*, that are somewhat bigger than  $L^\infty$  (or  $L^{p_0} \cap L^\infty$  in the case of unbounded domains  $\Omega$ ). More precisely, these spaces are constructed by means of fixing a non-decreasing doubling function  $\Theta : (1, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  (“a growth function”) and  $p_0 \geq 1$ , and letting  $Y_{p_0}^\Theta(\Omega)$  to be the set of all  $\omega \in \cap_{p > p_0} L^p(\Omega)$  such that

$$(1.3) \quad \|\omega\|_{Y_{p_0}^\Theta(\Omega)} := \sup_{p > p_0} \frac{\|\omega\|_{L^p(\Omega)}}{\Theta(p)} < \infty.$$

In particular, if<sup>2</sup>  $\Theta(p) \approx 1$ , it is easy to see that (cf. Appendix A.3, Proposition 3)

$$(1.4) \quad Y_{p_0}^\Theta(\Omega) = L^{p_0}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega),$$

while if  $\Theta(p) \rightarrow \infty$ , as  $p \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $Y_{p_0}^\Theta(\Omega)$  contains unbounded functions. Although the definitions do not give explicit descriptions of the  $Y_{p_0}^\Theta$  spaces, it is relatively easy to construct examples of elements belonging to them. It is worthwhile to mention that the definition of  $Y_{p_0}^\Theta(\Omega)$  is independent of  $p_0$  if  $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^2$  (or more generally, if  $\Omega$  has finite measure), but if  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^2$  (cf. (1.4)) we only have the trivial embeddings<sup>3</sup>

$$Y_{p_0}^\Theta(\Omega) \hookrightarrow Y_{p_1}^\Theta(\Omega), \quad \text{if } p_1 > p_0.$$

<sup>1</sup>The expression of  $k$  is particularly simple in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , namely,  $k(x) = \frac{x^\perp}{2\pi|x|^2}$  for  $x = (x_1, x_2) \neq \mathbf{0}$ . Here  $x^\perp = (-x_2, x_1)$ .

<sup>2</sup>Given two non-negative quantities  $A$  and  $B$ , the notation  $A \lesssim B$  means that there exists a constant  $C$ , independent of all essential parameters, such that  $A \leq CB$ . We write  $A \approx B$  if  $A \lesssim B \lesssim A$ .

<sup>3</sup>Given two normed spaces  $X$  and  $Y$ , we write  $X \hookrightarrow Y$  if  $X \subset Y$  and the natural embedding from  $X$  to  $Y$  is continuous.

The uniqueness results for  $Y_{p_0}^\Theta$  vorticities are formulated in terms of functions associated with a growth function  $\Theta$ , which we shall term *Yudovich functions*<sup>4</sup>  $y_\Theta$ ,

$$(1.5) \quad y_\Theta(r) := \inf_{p>p_0} \{\Theta(p)r^{1/p}\}, \quad r > 0.$$

In the theory of [36], Yudovich functions appear naturally in the crucial differential inequality connecting  $Y_{p_0}^\Theta$  solutions with the energy method. Indeed, let  $(v_i, \omega_i), i = 1, 2$ , be two solutions of (1.1) and let  $E(t) = \|v_1(t, \cdot) - v_2(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2$ , from the definitions of weak solution and the norm of  $Y_{p_0}^\Theta(\Omega)$ , combined with the Biot-Savart law (1.2) together with the sharp  $L^p$ -norm estimates for CZO, one has

$$\frac{dE(t)}{dt} \leq c \|\omega_1\|_{Y_{p_0}^\Theta(\Omega)} E(t) y_{\Theta_1}(E(t)^{-1}),$$

where  $y_{\Theta_1}$  is the Yudovich function associated with the growth function  $\Theta_1$ ,

$$(1.6) \quad \Theta_1(p) := p\Theta(p).$$

Uniqueness (i.e.,  $v_1 = v_2$ ) is then achieved under the following Osgood condition on  $y_{\Theta_1}$  (cf. [36])

$$(1.7) \quad \int_0^1 \frac{dr}{ry_{\Theta_1}(\frac{1}{r})} = \infty.$$

It is easy to verify that (1.7) holds for  $\Theta(p) \approx 1$ , therefore from (1.4) we obtain the classical uniqueness result of [35]. It also holds for  $\Theta(p) \approx \log p$ , whose corresponding space  $Y_{p_0}^\Theta$  can be seen to include unbounded vorticities of the form  $\omega(x) \approx |\log |\log |x||$ . However, (1.7) places a severe restriction on  $\Theta$  and, indeed, it fails for linear growth  $\Theta(p) \approx p$ , which corresponds to vorticities  $\omega$  in the Orlicz space  $e^L$  of exponentially integrable functions. It follows that, by this method, uniqueness cannot be guaranteed for vorticities of the form  $\omega(x) \approx |\log |x||$ , the prototype of an unbounded function in BMO (cf. [21]). We mention that an alternative and elementary approach to the well-posedness of 2D Euler equations in  $Y_{p_0}^\Theta$  has been recently proposed by Crippa and Stefani [12].

Working in the full plane, the expected uniqueness result for vorticities with logarithmic singularities was obtained somewhat later by Vishik [32], using a different method. Interestingly, Vishik's method is also constructive and relies on the introduction of the "Vishik spaces"  $B_\Pi(\mathbb{R}^d)$  associated with "growth functions"  $\Pi$ , that control the growth of partial sums of the  $L^\infty$ -norm of dyadic frequency localizations  $\{\Delta_j f\}_{j \geq 0}$  of  $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Specifically,

$$(1.8) \quad \|f\|_{B_\Pi(\mathbb{R}^d)} := \sup_{N \geq 0} \frac{1}{\Pi(N)} \sum_{j=0}^N \|\Delta_j f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} < \infty.$$

Note that  $\Pi(N) \approx 1$  gives  $B_\Pi(\mathbb{R}^d) = B_{\infty,1}^0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , a classical Besov space.

In this approach the Osgood condition on  $\Pi$ , controlling uniqueness, is given by

$$(1.9) \quad \int_1^\infty \frac{dr}{\Pi(r)} = \infty.$$

Under this assumption, uniqueness of the Euler flow of is guaranteed provided that<sup>5</sup>

$$(1.10) \quad \omega \in L^\infty([0, T]; B_\Pi(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^2))$$

<sup>4</sup>In [36], the function  $y_\Theta$  is defined in slightly different way for  $r \in (0, 1)$ . However, this minor modification will not play a role in what follows, cf. (1.7).

<sup>5</sup>The result holds for  $d$  arbitrary, under the assumption  $p_0 \in (1, d)$ .

for some  $p_0 \in (1, 2)$ .

In particular,  $\Pi(p) \approx p$  satisfies (1.9) and uniqueness for vorticities satisfying<sup>6</sup>

$$(1.11) \quad \omega \in L^\infty([0, T]; \text{bmo}(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^2)), \quad p_0 \in (1, 2),$$

can be deduced from the embeddings

$$(1.12) \quad \text{bmo}(\mathbb{R}^2) \hookrightarrow B_{\infty, \infty}^0(\mathbb{R}^2) \hookrightarrow B_\Pi(\mathbb{R}^2).$$

Another approach to uniqueness in BMO is due to Azzam and Bedrossian [3]. In fact, these authors deal with a large class of active scalar equations, including Euler and Navier–Stokes equations and modified SQG equations. Their method (built on  $H^{-1}$  norms) may be considered as a further refinement of the energy method of [35], that takes into account not only the integrability, but also the inherited regularity properties of BMO functions.

In what concerns larger classes of vorticities, a challenging open problem in the theory is to decide whether uniqueness of solutions for (1.1) can be achieved for vorticities in  $L^p$ . In recent remarkable work [33, 34], Vishik (cf. also the lecture notes [1]) shows that, for any  $2 < p < \infty$ , there exist  $\omega_0 \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$ , and a force  $f$ , such that there exist infinitely many weak solutions of

$$\omega_t + v \cdot \nabla \omega = f,$$

with  $\omega \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$ , uniformly in time.

In view of the above discussion, an outstanding question in the area is to obtain sufficiently large classes of vorticities between  $L^p$  and BMO that still guarantee uniqueness for the 2D Euler flow. In this paper, we address such a question by introducing the *sharp Yudovich space*  $Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}(\Omega)$  (the precise definition will be postponed to Section 1.7, Definition 1). This space has some remarkable features. Indeed, we show that the Yudovich functions  $y_{\Theta_1}$  (cf. (1.5) and (1.6)) associated with  $Y_{p_0}^\Theta$  and  $Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}$  are the same, but now, for every growth<sup>7</sup>  $\Theta$ ,

$$(1.13) \quad Y_{p_0}^\Theta(\Omega) \cup \text{BMO}(\Omega) \subset Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}(\Omega).$$

As a consequence, we establish the following uniqueness assertion for  $Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}$ .

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{T}^2$ . Assume that the growth function  $\Theta$  satisfies the Osgood type condition (1.7). Then a (Lagrangian) weak solution  $\omega$  of (1.1), such that*

$$(1.14) \quad \omega \in L^\infty([0, \infty); Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}(\Omega)) \quad \text{for some} \quad p_0 \in (2, \infty),$$

*is uniquely determined by its initial value  $\omega_0$ .*

The previous result tells us that the uniqueness vorticity classes  $Y_{p_0}^\Theta$  and BMO considered in [36] and [32] can be considerably enlarged. Note that (1.14) holds provided that  $\omega_0 \in Y_{p_0}^\Theta(\Omega)$  (cf. (1.13)), while Theorem 1.1 with  $\Theta(p) \approx 1$  recovers uniqueness in

$$(1.15) \quad Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}(\Omega) = L^{p_0}(\Omega) \cap \text{BMO}(\Omega).$$

Hence, we improve the classical result (1.4) in the sense that  $L^\infty(\Omega)$  is now replaced by  $\text{BMO}(\Omega)$ . However, the applicability of Theorem 1.1 goes further beyond  $Y_{p_0}^\Theta$  and BMO. Indeed, the admissible growth  $\Theta(p) \approx \log p$  in Theorem 1.1 provides uniqueness for vorticities of type  $\omega(x) \approx (1 + |\log|x||) \log(1 + |\log|x||)$  (cf. Section 2.3, Example 4). Note that these vorticities do not belong to  $Y_{p_0}^\Theta$  nor to BMO (they do not even belong to the larger space<sup>8</sup>  $e^L$ ). In fact, they grow to

<sup>6</sup> $\text{bmo}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  refers to the local (a.k.a. inhomogeneous) version of  $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Recall that  $\text{bmo}(\mathbb{R}^d) \subsetneq \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .

<sup>7</sup>The space  $\text{BMO}(\Omega)$  in (1.13) should be replaced by  $\text{BMO}(\Omega) \cap L^{p_0}(\Omega)$  if  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^2$ .

<sup>8</sup>Recall that, as a consequence of the John–Nirenberg inequality [21], BMO is (locally) contained in  $e^L$ .

infinity faster than both  $\log(1 + |\log|x||)$  and  $1 + |\log|x||$ , which are the prototypes of vorticity in Yudovich’s and Vishik’s methods, respectively. Furthermore, for a general growth  $\Theta$ , we propose a simple approach to construct elements in  $Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}(\Omega)$  that are not in the classical scale  $Y_{p_0}^\Theta(\Omega)$ ; cf. Section 2.3. The limiting case for the  $Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}$  scale is once again the linear growth  $\Theta(p) \approx p$ . This suggests a possible route to settle the  $L^p$  uniqueness problem by means of showing a counterexample belonging to  $Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}$  with  $\Theta(p) \approx p$ .

In the forthcoming sections, we will adequately motivate and explain how the spaces  $Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}(\Omega)$  arise naturally in the study of Euler equations via techniques coming from extrapolation theory.

**1.2. A novel methodology via extrapolation.** In this paper, we apply the extrapolation theory of Jawerth–Milman [19] to develop a new methodology<sup>9</sup> that allows us to significantly enlarge the known uniqueness classes of vorticities for Euler equations and, at the same time, establish new uniqueness results for a large class of active scalar equations, including SQG equations and their generalizations. Furthermore, our framework includes the Yudovich and Vishik spaces as particular examples.

Indeed, using extrapolation we will construct new uniqueness spaces that contain BMO. Our new understanding of Yudovich spaces (cf. Section 1.3) motivated the construction of extrapolation spaces, where the role played by  $(L^{p_0}, L^\infty)$  in Yudovich’s theory is now replaced by the larger interpolation pair  $(L^{p_0}, \text{BMO})$ . In concrete terms, new spaces  $Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}(\Omega)$  (cf. Definition 1 below) are introduced by means of replacing  $\|\omega\|_{L^p(\Omega)}$  in (1.3) by  $\|M_\Omega^\#\omega\|_{L^p(\Omega)}$ , where  $M_\Omega^\#\omega$  denotes the *Strömberg–Jawerth–Torchinsky maximal operator* [20]

$$(1.16) \quad M_\Omega^\#\omega(x) := \sup_{\Omega \supset Q \ni x} \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} ((f - c)\chi_Q)^*(|Q|/\alpha).$$

Here,  $f^*$  is the *non-increasing rearrangement* of  $f$ ,  $Q$  is a cube with sides parallel to the axes of coordinates, and  $\alpha > 0$  is a sufficiently small fixed parameter. While this change worsens the  $L^p$  norm by a factor of<sup>10</sup> “ $p$ ”, this is compensated by the fact that CZO are bounded on BMO. However, there are obstacles when trying to implement this idea using the delicate energy method of [36]. We therefore avoid the energy method and apply extrapolation directly, exploiting the operators involved in the Biot-Savart law, to obtain a priori estimates for the modulus of continuity of the flow. This strategy naturally leads to the proof of uniqueness, in the Lagrangian formulation, under the assumption that a certain Osgood condition (cf. (1.7) and (1.9)) is satisfied. In our approach, the interplay between two extrapolation spaces arises. On the one hand, the extrapolation space related to the vorticities (say  $Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}$ ) and, on the other hand, the extrapolation space in the Besov scale (e.g. associated with the pair  $(L^\infty, \dot{W}_\infty^1)$ ). The latter controls the modulus of continuity of the flow and informs the corresponding Osgood condition. Breaking up the argument in this fashion allows to treat uniqueness not only for Euler equations, but also for a large class of active scalar equations, for which SQG equations and their generalizations are distinguished examples.

**1.3. Extrapolation and the role of the Yudovich functions: a preview.** To explain the connection of  $Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}$ , BMO, and CZO with extrapolation we need to develop some background information. This subsection contains some basic definitions with more details and documentation

<sup>9</sup>Our presentation was inspired by the Colombian writer García Márquez and his novel “Chronicle of a death foretold”, vintage publishers, 2003, that starts with a murder and then develops the plot backwards. In particular, further explanations and documentation on extrapolation theory will be given in due time.

<sup>10</sup>Recall that the classical Fefferman–Stein inequality [16] says, loosely speaking, that  $L^p$ -norms of  $\omega$  and  $M_\Omega^\#\omega$  are comparable, but the equivalence constant deteriorates as  $p$  when  $p \rightarrow \infty$ .

to follow (cf. Appendix A). Two important aspects regarding the level of generality that we require should be emphasized here:

- Since it is crucial for us to consider a variety of scales of function spaces (e.g.,  $L^p$ , BMO, Besov, Sobolev, Yudovich, Vishik) it will be necessary to formulate the definitions in a sufficiently general context.
- To deal with different types of scales of function spaces, that measure different characteristics of their elements (smoothness, integrability, oscillations, etc.), while at the same achieving a unified description, the Peetre  $K$ -functional *associated with each scale* (cf. (1.17) below) will be an invaluable tool. Indeed, using the  $K$ -functional the format of the formulae for the interpolation norms is the same for *all* the scales under consideration, since it is the particular  $K$ -functional that contains the quantitative information associated with the given scale. This explains the “universal” characterization of extrapolation spaces (cf. (1.21) below).

In an informal manner, in interpolation we start with a pair  $\bar{A} = (A_0, A_1)$  of compatible<sup>11</sup> Banach spaces and we wish to extract as information as possible on intermediate spaces from the end-points  $A_0$  and  $A_1$ . Let  $(\theta, p) \in (0, 1) \times [1, \infty]$ , the *real interpolation space*  $\bar{A}_{\theta, p}$  is the set of all  $f \in A_0 + A_1$  such that

$$\|f\|_{\bar{A}_{\theta, p}} := \left\{ \int_0^\infty [t^{-\theta} K(t, f; A_0, A_1)]^p \frac{dt}{t} \right\}^{1/p} < \infty$$

(with the usual modification if  $p = \infty$ ), where

$$(1.17) \quad K(t, f; A_0, A_1) := \|f\|_{A_0 + tA_1} = \inf \{ \|f_0\|_{A_0} + t \|f_1\|_{A_1} : f = f_0 + f_1, \quad f_i \in A_i, \quad i = 0, 1 \}$$

is the *Peetre  $K$ -functional* (cf. [5, 6]). It is convenient to normalize the spaces in order to have a continuous scale with respect to  $\theta$ . This is achieved by letting  $\bar{A}_{\theta, p}^\blacktriangleleft = c_{\theta, p} \bar{A}_{\theta, p}$ , where<sup>12</sup>  $c_{\theta, p} := (\theta(1 - \theta)p)^{1/p}$  (cf. [19]), and

$$(1.18) \quad \|f\|_{\bar{A}_{\theta, p}^\blacktriangleleft} := c_{\theta, p} \|f\|_{\bar{A}_{\theta, p}}.$$

The philosophy behind extrapolation may be viewed as the converse of interpolation, i.e., in extrapolation we start with a family of intermediate spaces and we wish to extract as information as possible on their end-points. The rigorous definition is as follows. Given a growth function  $\Theta$ , the  $\Delta$ -*extrapolation space*  $\Delta_{\theta \in (0, 1)} \left\{ \frac{\bar{A}_{\theta, p(\theta)}^\blacktriangleleft}{\Theta(\frac{1}{1-\theta})} \right\}$  is defined as the set of all  $f \in \bigcap_{\theta \in (0, 1)} \bar{A}_{\theta, p(\theta)}^\blacktriangleleft$  such that (cf. [18, 19])

$$(1.19) \quad \|f\|_{\Delta_{\theta \in (0, 1)} \left\{ \frac{\bar{A}_{\theta, p(\theta)}^\blacktriangleleft}{\Theta(\frac{1}{1-\theta})} \right\}} := \sup_{\theta \in (0, 1)} \frac{\|f\|_{\bar{A}_{\theta, p(\theta)}^\blacktriangleleft}}{\Theta(\frac{1}{1-\theta})} < \infty.$$

The characterization of these spaces hinges upon the fact that the second index  $p(\theta)$  can be replaced by  $\infty$ , in other words the second index is not important at the level of normalized norms (cf. [19])

$$(1.20) \quad \Delta_{\theta \in (0, 1)} \left\{ \frac{(A_0, A_1)_{\theta, p(\theta)}^\blacktriangleleft}{\Theta(\frac{1}{1-\theta})} \right\} = \Delta_{\theta \in (0, 1)} \left\{ \frac{(A_0, A_1)_{\theta, \infty}^\blacktriangleleft}{\Theta(\frac{1}{1-\theta})} \right\}.$$

<sup>11</sup>Informally speaking, this means that  $A_0 + A_1$  “makes sense”.

<sup>12</sup>If  $p = \infty$ , we let  $c_{\theta, p} = 1$ . Then  $\bar{A}_{\theta, \infty}^\blacktriangleleft = \bar{A}_{\theta, \infty}$  with equality of norms.

Thus, the commutation of the underlying suprema (“Fubini”!) yields<sup>13</sup>

$$(1.21) \quad \Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(A_0, A_1)_{\theta, p(\theta)}^{\blacktriangleleft}}{\Theta\left(\frac{1}{1-\theta}\right)} \right\} = \left\{ f : \sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \frac{K(t, f; A_0, A_1)}{t \varphi_{\Theta}\left(\frac{1}{t}\right)} < \infty \right\},$$

where

$$(1.22) \quad \varphi_{\Theta}(t) := \inf_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \Theta\left(\frac{1}{1-\theta}\right) t^{1-\theta} \right\}.$$

For the remaining of this section, we shall place ourselves under the conditions of [36] and focus our attention on the spaces  $Y_{p_0}^{\Theta}(\Omega)$ ,  $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^2$  (although there are analogous statements for  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^2$  or even general domains  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ). It is known that, with equivalence of norms independent of  $\theta$ ,

$$(1.23) \quad (L^{p_0}(\Omega), L^{\infty}(\Omega))_{\theta, p(\theta)}^{\blacktriangleleft} = L^{p(\theta)}(\Omega), \quad \frac{1}{p(\theta)} = \frac{1-\theta}{p_0}$$

(cf. [23, eq. (31), p. 61]). Using this fact, together with the monotonicity properties of the Lebesgue scale and (1.20), yields

$$(1.24) \quad Y_{p_0}^{\Theta}(\Omega) = \Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(L^{p_0}(\Omega), L^{\infty}(\Omega))_{\theta, p(\theta)}^{\blacktriangleleft}}{\Theta\left(\frac{p_0}{1-\theta}\right)} \right\} = \Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(L^{p_0}(\Omega), L^{\infty}(\Omega))_{\theta, \infty}^{\blacktriangleleft}}{\Theta\left(\frac{p_0}{1-\theta}\right)} \right\}.$$

Furthermore, comparing (1.5) and (1.22) via the change  $p \leftrightarrow \frac{p_0}{1-\theta}$ , we find that, with constants depending only on  $p_0$ ,

$$(1.25) \quad \varphi_{\Theta}(t) \approx y_{\Theta}(t).$$

To give a full characterization of  $Y_{p_0}^{\Theta}$  we recall that (cf. (A.9))

$$K(t, f; L^1(\Omega), L^{\infty}(\Omega)) = \int_0^t f^*(s) ds.$$

Consider the maximal function  $f^{**}(t) := \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t f^*(s) ds$ . This information combined with (1.20), (1.21), (1.24) and (1.25) yields<sup>14</sup>

$$(1.26) \quad \|f\|_{Y_{p_0}^{\Theta}(\Omega)} \approx \sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \frac{\int_0^t f^*(s) ds}{t \varphi_{\Theta}\left(\frac{1}{t}\right)} \approx \sup_{t \in (0,1)} \frac{f^{**}(t)}{y_{\Theta}\left(\frac{1}{t}\right)} \approx \sup_{t \in (0,1)} \frac{f^*(t)}{y_{\Theta}\left(\frac{1}{t}\right)},$$

where the last equivalence follows from (2.16) below. In this way Yudovich spaces are identified with the more familiar Marcinkiewicz spaces, that have been extensively studied in the literature (cf. [25, 5]).

**Example 1.** Let  $\Theta(p) \approx p$ , then  $Y_{p_0}^{\Theta}(\mathbb{T}^2) = e^L(\mathbb{T}^2)$  (cf. [18, 19]) with

$$\|f\|_{Y_{p_0}^{\Theta}(\mathbb{T}^2)} \approx \sup_{t \in (0,1)} \frac{f^{**}(t)}{1 - \log t} \approx \sup_{t \in (0,1)} \frac{f^*(t)}{1 - \log t}.$$

<sup>13</sup>See the discussion in Appendix A.2.

<sup>14</sup>Since  $|\Omega| < \infty$ , it is not hard to see that we can restrict to  $t \in (0, 1)$ . Indeed, observe that  $\int_0^t f^*(s) ds = \int_0^1 f^*(s) ds$  if  $t > 1$  and  $\sup_{t > 1} \frac{1}{t \varphi_{\Theta}\left(\frac{1}{t}\right)} < \infty$  because  $\Theta$  is a non-decreasing function.

**Example 2.** More generally, suppose that  $\Theta$  is a growth function such that  $p \in (p_0, \infty) \mapsto e^{p_0/p}\Theta(p)$  is a quasi-decreasing function<sup>15</sup> (i.e., equivalent to a decreasing function), then

$$\|f\|_{Y_{p_0}^\Theta(\mathbb{T}^2)} \approx \sup_{t \in (0,1)} \frac{f^{**}(t)}{\Theta(1 - \log t)} \approx \sup_{t \in (0,1)} \frac{f^*(t)}{\Theta(1 - \log t)}.$$

This is a consequence of (1.26) and Lemma 2 below.

**1.4. A priori estimates via extrapolation.** It will be instructive to revisit the main uniqueness result of [36] using our method. As a first step we use the Biot-Savart law to obtain a priori estimates for the modulus of continuity of the solutions.

To simplify the exposition, we work with  $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^2$  (but similar results hold for  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^2$  or  $\Omega$  a smooth domain in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ ). Fix  $p_0 > 2$ . By (1.23), (1.2), the sharp  $L^p$  norm inequalities for CZO, and the definition of  $Y_{p_0}^\Theta(\Omega)$ , we derive

$$(1.27) \quad \|\nabla v\|_{(L^{p_0}(\Omega), L^\infty(\Omega))_{\theta, p(\theta)}^\blacktriangleleft} \leq c_{p_0} \frac{1}{1 - \theta} \Theta\left(\frac{1}{1 - \theta}\right) \|\omega\|_{Y_{p_0}^\Theta(\Omega)}.$$

The interpolation theory of Sobolev spaces (cf. [13]) allows us to rewrite the left-hand side as

$$(1.28) \quad \|\nabla v\|_{(L^{p_0}(\Omega), L^\infty(\Omega))_{\theta, p(\theta)}^\blacktriangleleft} \approx \|v\|_{(\dot{W}_{p_0}^1(\Omega), \dot{W}_\infty^1(\Omega))_{\theta, p(\theta)}^\blacktriangleleft}.$$

Then, inserting this information in (1.27), and rewriting the right-hand side using the definition of  $\Theta_1$  (cf. (1.6)), we obtain

$$\|v\|_{(\dot{W}_{p_0}^1(\Omega), \dot{W}_\infty^1(\Omega))_{\theta, p(\theta)}^\blacktriangleleft} \leq c_{p_0} \Theta_1\left(\frac{1}{1 - \theta}\right) \|\omega\|_{Y_{p_0}^\Theta(\Omega)}.$$

Consequently,

$$(1.29) \quad \|v\|_{\Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(\dot{W}_{p_0}^1(\Omega), \dot{W}_\infty^1(\Omega))_{\theta, p(\theta)}^\blacktriangleleft}{\Theta_1\left(\frac{1}{1-\theta}\right)} \right\}} = \sup_{\theta \in (0,1)} \frac{\|v\|_{(\dot{W}_{p_0}^1(\Omega), \dot{W}_\infty^1(\Omega))_{\theta, p(\theta)}^\blacktriangleleft}}{\Theta_1\left(\frac{1}{1-\theta}\right)} \lesssim \|\omega\|_{Y_{p_0}^\Theta(\Omega)}.$$

The Sobolev embedding theorem (recall  $p_0 > d = 2$ , where  $d$  denotes the dimension of the ambient space) combined with (1.29) yields

$$\|v\|_{\Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(L^\infty(\Omega), \dot{W}_\infty^1(\Omega))_{\theta, p(\theta)}^\blacktriangleleft}{\Theta_1\left(\frac{1}{1-\theta}\right)} \right\}} \lesssim \|\omega\|_{Y_{p_0}^\Theta(\Omega)}.$$

The extrapolation norm that appears on the left-hand side can be computed explicitly using (1.21), (1.25) and the well-known fact that (cf. (A.11))

$$(1.30) \quad K(t, v; L^\infty(\Omega), \dot{W}_\infty^1(\Omega)) \approx \sup_{|x-y| \leq t} |v(x) - v(y)|.$$

It then follows that

$$(1.31) \quad |v(x) - v(y)| \lesssim |x - y| y_{\Theta_1}\left(\frac{1}{|x - y|}\right) \|\omega\|_{Y_{p_0}^\Theta(\Omega)},$$

where

$$(1.32) \quad y_{\Theta_1}(t) = \inf_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \Theta_1\left(\frac{1}{1 - \theta}\right) t^{1 - \theta} \right\}.$$

<sup>15</sup>Some examples are  $\Theta(p) \approx p^\alpha (\log p)^{\alpha_1} (\log_2 p)^{\alpha_2} \cdots (\log_m p)^{\alpha_m}$ , where  $\alpha, \alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\log_m p = \underbrace{\log \cdots \log p}_{m \text{ times}}$  for  $m \geq 2$ .



This is the main estimate of the modulus of continuity in [36, Theorem 2]. To obtain the corresponding result of [35], let  $\Theta(p) \approx 1$ . Then,  $Y_{p_0}^\Theta(\Omega) = L^{p_0}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$  (cf. (1.4)), and  $y_{\Theta_1}(t) \approx \log t$  if  $t > 1$ , yielding

$$|v(x) - v(y)| \lesssim |x - y| |\log |x - y|| \|\omega\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$$

if  $|x - y| < 1$ . See also [26, Section 4.1].

**1.5. Uniqueness of Lagrangian weak solutions.** The proof of uniqueness now appeals to the Lagrangian formulation, cf. [12]. Recall that  $(\omega, v)$  is said to be a *Lagrangian weak solution* to (1.1) if  $\omega$  is obtained via the usual *push-forward*

$$\omega(t, x) = \omega_0(\phi^{-1}(t, x)),$$

where  $\phi$  is the flow map relative to  $v$  according to

$$(1.33) \quad \frac{d}{dt}\phi(t, x) = v(t, \phi(t, x)), \quad \phi(0, x) = x.$$

To avoid unnecessary technical issues, throughout this paper, we shall restrict our attention to this class of solutions. However, this is not restrictive at all since, following [2], [10] and [7], every integrable weak solution of (1.1) is Lagrangian.

The uniqueness result then follows from a well-known

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $X$  be a function space and assume that there exists a continuous nondecreasing function  $L : (0, \varepsilon_L) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ , where  $\varepsilon_L \in (0, \infty]$ , such that*

$$|v(t, x) - v(t, y)| \leq L(|x - y|) \|\omega(t)\|_X \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in (0, \varepsilon_L),$$

where

$$\|\omega(t)\|_X \in L^1_{loc}(0, \varepsilon_L),$$

and  $L$  satisfies the Osgood condition

$$\int_0^{\varepsilon_L} \frac{dr}{L(r)} = \infty.$$

Then, the solution  $\phi$  to (1.33) must be unique.

*Proof.* Indeed, if  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  are two flows related to (1.33), then

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_1(t, x) - \phi_2(t, x)| &\leq \int_0^t |v(s, \phi_1(s, x)) - v(s, \phi_2(s, x))| ds \\ &\leq \int_0^t L(|\phi_1(s, x) - \phi_2(s, x)|) \|\omega(s)\|_X ds \end{aligned}$$

and the desired uniqueness follows immediately as an application of Osgood's lemma in the form stated in [4, Lemma 3.4].  $\square$

**1.6. Summary of our approach to uniqueness.** The method described above can be summarized as follows.

**Step 1:** Compute the extrapolation spaces involved.

**Step 2:** Use the Biot-Savart laws to obtain a priori estimates of the smoothness of solutions via extrapolation.

**Step 3:** Prove uniqueness via Osgood conditions.

**1.7. Extending Yudovich's uniqueness theorem beyond BMO.** As already announced in Theorem 1.1 (and, in particular, the subsequent discussion), in this paper we extend BMO uniqueness to spaces that contain *functions of unbounded mean oscillation*. This will be done through the introduction of the new (extrapolation) spaces  $Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}$ .

**Definition 1** (Sharp Yudovich spaces). Let<sup>16</sup>  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{T}^2$  and let  $p_0 \in [1, \infty)$ . Given a growth function  $\Theta$ , the *sharp Yudovich space*  $Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}(\Omega)$  is defined to be the set of all<sup>17</sup>  $f \in \cap_{p>p_0} (L^p)^\#(\Omega)$  such that

$$\|f\|_{Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}(\Omega)} := \sup_{p>p_0} \frac{\|f\|_{(L^p)^\#(\Omega)}}{\Theta(p)} < \infty.$$

As in the case of Yudovich spaces, the definition of  $Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}(\Omega)$ , with  $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^2$ , does not depend on  $p_0$ . When  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^2$ , we only have the trivial embeddings

$$Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow Y_{p_1}^{\#\Theta}(\Omega), \quad \text{if } p_1 > p_0.$$

For example, when  $\Theta(p) \approx 1$ ,

$$Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}(\mathbb{T}^2) = \text{BMO}(\mathbb{T}^2) \quad \text{and} \quad Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}(\mathbb{R}^2) = \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^2),$$

cf. (1.15). On the other hand, since  $\|f\|_{(L^p)^\#(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)}$ ,  $1 < p_0 < p \leq \infty$ , we have

$$(1.34) \quad Y_{p_0}^\Theta(\Omega) \hookrightarrow Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}(\Omega).$$

In Section 2.1 we show that  $Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}$  fits into the abstract extrapolation framework proposed above. In this context, BMO plays the same role as  $L^\infty$  in connection with  $Y_{p_0}^\Theta$ . In particular, we obtain characterizations of  $Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}$  corresponding to those for  $Y_{p_0}^\Theta$  (cf. Table 1).

$Y_{p_0}^\Theta$	$Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}$
$\left\{ f \in \cap_{p>p_0} L^p : \sup_{p>p_0} \frac{\ f\ _{L^p}}{\Theta(p)} < \infty \right\}$	$\left\{ f \in \cap_{p>p_0} (L^p)^\# : \sup_{p>p_0} \frac{\ f\ _{(L^p)^\#}}{\Theta(p)} < \infty \right\}$
$\Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(L^{p_0}, L^\infty)_{\theta, p(\theta)}^\blacktriangleleft}{\Theta(\frac{p_0}{1-\theta})} \right\}$	$\Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(L^{p_0}, \text{BMO})_{\theta, p(\theta)}^\blacktriangleleft}{\Theta(\frac{p_0}{1-\theta})} \right\}$
$\left\{ f : \sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \frac{K(t^{1/p_0}, f; L^{p_0}, L^\infty)}{t^{1/p_0} y_\Theta(\frac{1}{t})} < \infty \right\}$	$\left\{ f : \sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \frac{K(t^{1/p_0}, f; L^{p_0}, \text{BMO})}{t^{1/p_0} y_\Theta(\frac{1}{t})} < \infty \right\}$
$\left\{ f : \sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \frac{( f ^{p_0})^{**}(t)^{1/p_0}}{y_\Theta(\frac{1}{t})} < \infty \right\}$	$\left\{ f : \sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \frac{( M^\# f ^{p_0})^{**}(t)^{1/p_0}}{y_\Theta(\frac{1}{t})} < \infty \right\}$

TABLE 1. Yudovich vs. sharp Yudovich

<sup>16</sup>The definition can obviously be given in a more general context.

<sup>17</sup> $\|f\|_{(L^p)^\#(\Omega)} := \|M_\Omega^\# f\|_{L^p(\Omega)}$ . In particular,  $(L^\infty)^\#(\Omega) = \text{BMO}(\Omega)$  and  $(L^p)^\#(\Omega) = L^p(\Omega)$ ,  $p \in (1, \infty)$ , suitably interpreted modulo constants; cf. [20, Corollaries 2.5 and 2.6].

The usefulness of  $Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}$  emerges when establishing a priori estimates for the modulus of continuity of the velocity.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Assume that  $\omega \in Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}(\Omega)$  for some  $p_0 \in (2, \infty)$ . Then*

$$(1.35) \quad |v(x) - v(y)| \lesssim |x - y| y_{\Theta_1} \left( \frac{1}{|x - y|} \right) \|\omega\|_{Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}(\Omega)},$$

where  $y_{\Theta_1}$  is given by (1.32).

The proof of this result will be given in Section 2.2. In particular, (1.35) extends the classical Yudovich's estimate (1.31) from  $Y_{p_0}^{\Theta}$  to  $Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}$ . As a consequence (cf. Section 1.5), we achieve the desired uniqueness result for  $Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}$  stated in Theorem 1.1.

**1.8. Vishik's uniqueness theorem.** As already claimed in Section 1.2, we show that Vishik spaces  $B_{\Pi}(\Omega)$  (cf. (1.8)) are also special examples of extrapolation constructions in the sense of (1.19). In fact, we obtain several characterizations of Vishik spaces in terms of a variety of means (extrapolation, interpolation, Yudovich functions, and growths of classical Besov norms) showing the full analogy between  $B_{\Pi}$  and  $Y_{p_0}^{\Theta}$ . The results are collected in Table 2 (where, for simplicity again, we let  $p_0 = 1$  in the definition of  $Y_{p_0}^{\Theta}$ ) and the proofs may be found in Section 3.1 below.

$Y_1^{\Theta}$	$B_{\Pi}$
$\left\{ f \in \bigcap_{p>1} L^p : \sup_{p>1} \frac{\ f\ _{L^p}}{\Theta(p)} < \infty \right\}$	$\left\{ f \in \bigcap_{\alpha \in (-1,0)} B_{\infty,1}^{\alpha} : \sup_{\alpha \in (-1,0)} \frac{\ f\ _{B_{\infty,1}^{\alpha}}}{\Pi(-\frac{1}{\alpha})} < \infty \right\}$
$\Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(L^1, L^{\infty})_{\theta, \frac{1}{1-\theta}}^{\triangleleft}}{\Theta(\frac{1}{1-\theta})} \right\}$	$\Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(B_{\infty,1}^{-1}, B_{\infty,1}^0)_{\theta, \frac{1}{1-\theta}}^{\triangleleft}}{\Pi(\frac{1}{1-\theta})} \right\}$
$\left\{ f : \sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \frac{K(t, f; L^1, L^{\infty})}{t y_{\Theta}(\frac{1}{t})} < \infty \right\}$	$\left\{ f : \sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \frac{K(t, f; B_{\infty,1}^{-1}, B_{\infty,1}^0)}{t y_{\Pi}(\frac{1}{t})} < \infty \right\}$
$\left\{ f : \sup_{0 < t < \infty} \frac{f^{**}(t)}{y_{\Theta}(\frac{1}{t})} < \infty \right\}$	$\left\{ f : \sup_{N \geq 0} \frac{1}{\Pi(N)} \sum_{j=0}^N \ \Delta_j f\ _{L^{\infty}} < \infty \right\}$

TABLE 2. Yudovich vs. Vishik

Having at hand the information contained in Table 2, we are in a position to apply the extrapolation approach to uniqueness developed in Section 1.6. Our results are formulated in terms of homogeneous function spaces, rather than their inhomogeneous counterparts. As we will see later, this will result in several improvements.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Assume that the growth function  $\Pi \in \mathcal{P}_1$  (cf. Definition 3) and  $\omega \in \dot{B}_{\Pi}(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ . Then*

$$|v(x) - v(y)| \lesssim |x - y| y_{\Pi} \left( \frac{1}{|x - y|} \right) \|\omega\|_{\dot{B}_{\Pi}(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^2)},$$

where  $y_\Pi$  is the Yudovich function associated to  $\Pi$  (cf. (1.5)).

As a by-product, we arrive at the following uniqueness statement for Vishik spaces.

**Theorem 1.4.** *Assume that the growth function  $\Pi \in \mathcal{P}_1$  satisfies the Osgood condition*

$$(1.36) \quad \int_1^\infty \frac{dr}{ry_\Pi(r)} = \infty.$$

Then, a Lagrangian weak solution  $\omega$  of (1.1), such that

$$(1.37) \quad \omega \in L^\infty([0, T]; \dot{B}_\Pi(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^2))$$

is uniquely determined by its initial value  $\omega_0$ .

*Remark 1.5.* It follows from the trivial estimate  $y_\Pi(r) \lesssim \Pi(\log r)$  that

$$\int_1^\infty \frac{dr}{\Pi(r)} \lesssim \int_1^\infty \frac{dr}{ry_\Pi(r)}.$$

Therefore, the validity of the Osgood condition (1.9) implies<sup>18</sup> (1.36). Furthermore, the formulation (1.36) shows a connection with (1.7) via the exchange  $\Theta_1 \leftrightarrow \Pi$ .

In Section 3.4 we will show that Theorem 1.4 gives an improvement of Vishik's uniqueness theorem [32, Theorem 7.1] (cf. also (1.10)) in the following sense

$$B_\Pi(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^2) \hookrightarrow \dot{B}_\Pi(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^2),$$

for every growth  $\Pi$  and  $p_0 \in (1, 2)$ ; cf. Proposition 1. In particular, if  $\Pi(r) \approx r$  (so that  $y_\Pi(r) \approx |\log r|$  and thus (1.36) holds) then

$$\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^2) \hookrightarrow \dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^0(\mathbb{R}^2) \hookrightarrow \dot{B}_\Pi(\mathbb{R}^2);$$

compare with the inhomogeneous statement (1.12). According to Theorem 1.4, uniqueness of the Euler flow is guaranteed provided that

$$(1.38) \quad \omega \in L^\infty([0, T]; \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^2)).$$

As a consequence, we are able to extend Vishik's uniqueness condition (1.11) from  $\text{bmo}(\mathbb{R}^2)$  to  $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ . Moreover, we remove (at least, working with Lagrangian solutions) the decay at infinity of the vorticity inherited to the  $L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^2)$  assumption. Specifically, in Proposition 2 we prove the following embedding

$$\text{bmo}(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^2) \hookrightarrow \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^2), \quad p_0 \in (1, 2).$$

**1.9. Active scalar equations.** So far, we have discussed the role played by a variety of function spaces in connection with 2D Euler equations. However, it is also important to deal with the more general class of active scalar equations modelled by

$$(1.39) \quad \omega_t + TS\omega \cdot \nabla\omega = 0,$$

and equipped with the abstract Biot-Savart law described (at least, formally) as

$$(1.40) \quad TS : \omega \mapsto v = TS\omega.$$

Here,  $\omega = \omega(t, x)$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $t > 0$ , is a scalar function and  $T$  and  $S$  are (linear) operators such that  $TS = ST$ .

<sup>18</sup>In fact, under natural assumptions on  $\Pi$ , we have  $y_\Pi(r) \approx \Pi(\log r)$ ; cf. Lemma 2 below. Then, a simple change of variables gives  $\int_1^\infty \frac{dr}{\Pi(r)} \approx \int_1^\infty \frac{dr}{ry_\Pi(r)}$ .

Distinguished examples of (1.39)–(1.40) in 2D are given by

$$(1.41) \quad T = R = (R_l)_{l=1,\dots,d} \quad (\text{Riesz-type transforms}), \quad S = (-\Delta)^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}},$$

for<sup>19</sup>  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ . In particular, if  $\beta = 0$  then one recovers the classical 2D Euler equations in its vorticity form (cf. (1.1)), while  $\beta = 1$  corresponds to *surface quasi-geostrophic (SQG) equations*, and the range  $\beta \in (0, 1)$  refers to the so-called *intermediate SQG equations*. The SQG equations and their generalizations arise from applications in atmospheric science and have attracted a big deal of attention in recent times. In particular, Constantin, Majda and Tabak [11] established a remarkable connection between SQG equation and the 3D-Euler equation. We also refer the reader to the survey paper [24] (and the references therein), where the outstanding issue of singularity formation in SQG equations is discussed. We mention that singular<sup>20</sup> regimes  $\beta > 2$  are also of interest, e.g.  $\beta = 3$  is connected to Hall-magnetohydrodynamics (see e.g. [8]).

One of the advantages of the extrapolation method, described in previous sections for Euler equations, is its flexibility. Indeed, it allows us to consider in a unified fashion a variety of function spaces, and also works for the class of active scalar equations (1.39)–(1.41). In this regard, the basic observation is that  $S^{-1} = (-\Delta)^{\frac{1-\beta}{2}}$  plays the role<sup>21</sup> of  $\nabla$  when applying the Sobolev embedding theorem with  $\beta = 0$  (i.e., the Eulerian setting) in Section 1.4.

Based on the above considerations, in Section 3.2 we show that Theorem 1.4 is a special case (for the 2D Euler equations) of a more general phenomenon related to generalized SQG equations (or more generally, (1.39)–(1.40)). Our results will be formulated in terms of the Vishik spaces  $\dot{B}_{\Pi}^{\beta}$ , which are constructed in the same way as  $\dot{B}_{\Pi}$  (cf. (1.8)), but now with  $\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta}$  playing the role previously assigned to  $\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^0$  (cf. Definition 2).

In order to facilitate the reading for non experts, we close the paper with an Atlas on Interpolation and Extrapolation (cf. Appendix A), where we collect documentation and supplementary material.

We believe that the techniques developed in this paper could be useful in other related contexts.

**1.10. Road map.** We simply remark that the previous discussion and the table of contents show the local organization of the paper.

## 2. THE SPACES $Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}$

**2.1. Characterizations.** We establish several characterizations of  $Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}$  (cf. Definition 1) in terms of extrapolation of interpolation scales and  $K$ -functionals involving BMO, and maximal functions.

**Theorem 2.1** (Characterization via extrapolation). *Let  $p_0 \in [1, \infty)$ ,  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ , and let  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{T}^2$ . We have*

$$(2.1) \quad (L^{p_0}(\Omega), \text{BMO}(\Omega))_{\theta, p(\theta)}^{\blacktriangleleft} = (L^{p(\theta)})^{\#}(\Omega), \quad \frac{1}{p(\theta)} = \frac{1-\theta}{p_0},$$

with equivalence constants independent of  $\theta$ . As a consequence,

$$(2.2) \quad Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}(\Omega) = \Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(L^{p_0}(\Omega), \text{BMO}(\Omega))_{\theta, p(\theta)}^{\blacktriangleleft}}{\Theta(\frac{p_0}{1-\theta})} \right\}.$$

<sup>19</sup>Recall that  $R = \nabla^{\perp}(-\Delta)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ . Then  $v = \nabla^{\perp}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}-1}\omega$ .

<sup>20</sup>Note that  $TS = \nabla^{\perp}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}-1}$  and  $\lim_{|\xi| \rightarrow \infty} (-\Delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}-1}(\xi) = \infty$  if  $\beta > 2$ .

<sup>21</sup>Recall the informal assertion  $\nabla^{\perp} = "(-\Delta)^{1/2}$ .

*Proof.* Using the Jawerth–Torchinsky formula (cf. (A.10))

$$(2.3) \quad K(t, f; L^{p_0}(\Omega), \text{BMO}(\Omega)) \approx \left( \int_0^{t^{p_0}} [(M_\Omega^\# f)^*(\xi)]^{p_0} d\xi \right)^{1/p_0},$$

where the maximal function  $M_\Omega^\#$  is defined by (1.16), we have

$$(2.4) \quad \|f\|_{(L^{p_0}(\Omega), \text{BMO}(\Omega))_{\theta, p(\theta)}} \approx \left\{ \int_0^\infty \left( \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t [(M_\Omega^\# f)^*(\xi)]^{p_0} d\xi \right)^{p(\theta)/p_0} dt \right\}^{1/p(\theta)}.$$

Applying the sharp version of Hardy’s inequality (note that  $p(\theta) = \frac{p_0}{1-\theta} > p_0$ ) stated in [31, Appendix A.4, page 272], we can estimate (2.4) as follows

$$(2.5) \quad \|f\|_{(L^{p_0}(\Omega), \text{BMO}(\Omega))_{\theta, p(\theta)}} \lesssim \theta^{-1/p_0} \|f\|_{(L^{p(\theta)})^\#(\Omega)}.$$

Conversely, one can invoke the reverse Hardy inequality (cf. [28] and the references therein). Indeed

$$(2.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \|f\|_{(L^{p(\theta)})^\#(\Omega)} &= \|(M^\# f)^*\|_{L^{p(\theta)}(0, \infty)} = \|(M^\# f)^{p_0*}\|_{L^{p(\theta)/p_0}(0, \infty)}^{1/p_0} \\ &\lesssim \theta^{1/p(\theta)} \|[(M^\# f)^{p_0}]^{**}\|_{L^{p(\theta)/p_0}(0, \infty)}^{1/p_0} \approx \theta^{1/p(\theta)} \|f\|_{(L^{p_0}(\Omega), \text{BMO}(\Omega))_{\theta, p(\theta)}}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last estimate we have used (2.4). Combining (2.5) and (2.6) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{(L^{p_0}(\Omega), \text{BMO}(\Omega))_{\theta, p(\theta)}^\blacktriangleleft} &\lesssim c_{\theta p(\theta)} \theta^{-1/p_0} \|f\|_{(L^{p(\theta)})^\#(\Omega)} \\ &\lesssim \theta^{-\theta/p_0} \|f\|_{(L^{p_0}(\Omega), \text{BMO}(\Omega))_{\theta, p(\theta)}^\blacktriangleleft} \approx \|f\|_{(L^{p_0}(\Omega), \text{BMO}(\Omega))_{\theta, p(\theta)}^\blacktriangleleft}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, (2.1) follows readily since  $c_{\theta p(\theta)} = (\theta(1-\theta)p(\theta))^{1/p(\theta)} \approx \theta^{1/p(\theta)} \approx \theta^{1/p_0}$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 2.2** (Characterization via  $K$ -functional and maximal function). *Let  $p_0 \in [1, \infty)$  and  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{T}^2$ .*

(i) *We have*

$$(2.7) \quad \|f\|_{Y_{p_0}^\# \Theta(\Omega)} \approx \sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \frac{K(t^{1/p_0}, f; L^{p_0}(\Omega), \text{BMO}(\Omega))}{t^{1/p_0} y_\Theta(\frac{1}{t})} \approx \sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \frac{[(M_\Omega^\# f)^{p_0}]^{**}(t)^{1/p_0}}{y_\Theta(\frac{1}{t})},$$

where  $y_\Theta$  is given by (1.5).

(ii) *Assume that the map*

$$(2.8) \quad p \in (p_0, \infty) \mapsto e^{p_0/p} \Theta(p) \quad \text{is quasi-decreasing.}$$

*Then*

$$(2.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \|f\|_{Y_{p_0}^\# \Theta(\Omega)} &\approx \|f\|_{(L^{p_0})^\#(\Omega)} + \sup_{t \in (0, e^{-1})} \frac{K(t, f; L^{p_0}(\Omega), \text{BMO}(\Omega))}{t \Theta(-\log t)} \\ &\approx \|f\|_{(L^{p_0})^\#(\Omega)} + \sup_{t \in (0, e^{-1})} \frac{[(M_\Omega^\# f)^{p_0}]^{**}(t)^{1/p_0}}{\Theta(-\log t)}. \end{aligned}$$

In the proof of Theorem 2.2 we will make use of the following lemma, which provides an explicit characterization of  $y_\Theta$  in terms of  $\Theta$ .

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $y_\Theta$  be the Yudovich function relative to  $\Theta$  (cf. (1.5)).*

(i) *We have*

$$(2.10) \quad y_\Theta(r) = \Theta(p_0) r^{1/p_0}, \quad \text{if } r \in (0, 1).$$

(ii) Suppose that  $\Theta$  satisfies (2.8). Then

$$y_{\Theta}(r) \approx \Theta(\log r), \quad \text{if } r > e^{p_0}.$$

*Proof.* (i) The formula (2.10) is an immediate consequence of the fact that for each  $r \in (0, 1)$ , the map  $p \in (p_0, \infty) \mapsto \Theta(p)r^{1/p}$  is increasing.

(ii) Note that  $y_{\Theta}(r) \leq \Theta(\log r) r^{1/\log r} \approx \Theta(\log r)$ . Conversely, given any  $p > p_0$ ,

$$\Theta(p)r^{1/p} \geq \Theta(\log r) \quad \text{if } p > \log r.$$

If  $p \in (p_0, \log r)$ , then

$$\Theta(p)r^{1/p} = e^{p_0/p}\Theta(p)\left(\frac{r}{e^{p_0}}\right)^{1/p} \gtrsim e^{p_0/\log r}\Theta(\log r)\left(\frac{r}{e^{p_0}}\right)^{1/\log r} \approx \Theta(\log r).$$

Hence,

$$y_{\Theta}(r) = \inf_{p > p_0} \{\Theta(p)r^{1/p}\} \gtrsim \Theta(\log r).$$

□

*Proof of Theorem 2.2.* (i) By the reiteration property of the  $\Delta$ -extrapolation method (cf. (A.3)), we have

$$(2.11) \quad \Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(L^{p_0}(\Omega), \text{BMO}(\Omega))_{\theta, p(\theta)}^{\blacktriangleleft}}{\Theta(\frac{p_0}{1-\theta})} \right\} = \Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(L^{p_0}(\Omega), \text{BMO}(\Omega))_{\theta, \infty}^{\blacktriangleleft}}{\Theta(\frac{p_0}{1-\theta})} \right\}.$$

Then (cf. (A.4) and (A.5))

$$(2.12) \quad \|f\|_{\Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(L^{p_0}(\Omega), \text{BMO}(\Omega))_{\theta, p(\theta)}^{\blacktriangleleft}}{\Theta(\frac{p_0}{1-\theta})} \right\}} \approx \sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \frac{K(t^{1/p_0}, f; L^{p_0}(\Omega), \text{BMO}(\Omega))}{t^{1/p_0} y_{\Theta}(\frac{1}{t})}.$$

Combining with (2.2) we obtain the first equivalence in (2.7). The second equivalence now follows from (2.3).

(ii) Suppose now that  $\Theta$  satisfies (2.8). By Lemma 2 and (2.3), we have

$$(2.13) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \frac{K(t^{1/p_0}, f; L^{p_0}(\Omega), \text{BMO}(\Omega))}{t^{1/p_0} y_{\Theta}(\frac{1}{t})} \approx \\ & \sup_{t \in (0, e^{-p_0})} \frac{K(t^{1/p_0}, f; L^{p_0}(\Omega), \text{BMO}(\Omega))}{t^{1/p_0} y_{\Theta}(\frac{1}{t})} + \sup_{t \in (1, \infty)} \frac{K(t^{1/p_0}, f; L^{p_0}(\Omega), \text{BMO}(\Omega))}{t^{1/p_0} y_{\Theta}(\frac{1}{t})} \\ & \approx \sup_{t \in (0, e^{-p_0})} \frac{K(t^{1/p_0}, f; L^{p_0}(\Omega), \text{BMO}(\Omega))}{t^{1/p_0} \Theta(-\log t)} + \sup_{t \in (1, \infty)} K(t^{1/p_0}, f; L^{p_0}(\Omega), \text{BMO}(\Omega)) \\ & \approx \sup_{t \in (0, e^{-1})} \frac{K(t, f; L^{p_0}(\Omega), \text{BMO}(\Omega))}{t \Theta(-\log t)} + \|M_{\Omega}^{\#} f\|_{L^{p_0}(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, one can show that

$$(2.14) \quad \sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \frac{[(M_{\Omega}^{\#} f)^{p_0}]^{**}(t)^{1/p_0}}{y_{\Theta}(\frac{1}{t})} \approx \sup_{t \in (0, e^{-1})} \frac{[(M_{\Omega}^{\#} f)^{p_0}]^{**}(t)^{1/p_0}}{\Theta(-\log t)} + \|M_{\Omega}^{\#} f\|_{L^{p_0}(\Omega)}.$$

Combining (2.7) with (2.13) and (2.14), we complete the proof of (2.9). □

When  $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^2$ , the characterizations provided by Theorem 2.2 can be supplemented as follows.

**Theorem 2.3.** *Let  $p_0 \in [1, \infty)$  and suppose that  $\Theta$  satisfies (2.8). Then*

$$(2.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \|f\|_{Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}(\mathbb{T}^2)} &\approx \sup_{t \in (0, e^{-1})} \frac{K(t, f; L^{p_0}(\mathbb{T}^2), \text{BMO}(\mathbb{T}^2))}{t\Theta(-\log t)} \\ &\approx \sup_{t \in (0, e^{-1})} \frac{[(M_{\mathbb{T}^2}^{\#} f)^{p_0}]^{**}(t)^{1/p_0}}{\Theta(-\log t)} \approx \sup_{t \in (0, e^{-1})} \frac{(M_{\mathbb{T}^2}^{\#} f)^*(t)}{\Theta(-\log t)}. \end{aligned}$$

*Remark 2.4.* Note that the last expression in (2.15) is independent of  $p_0$ . This is in accord with the fact that the definition of  $Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}(\mathbb{T}^2)$  does not depend on  $p_0$ .

*Proof of Theorem 2.3.* Using (2.3) we can write

$$K(e^{-1}, f; L^{p_0}(\mathbb{T}^2), \text{BMO}(\mathbb{T}^2)) \approx [(M_{\mathbb{T}^2}^{\#} f)^{p_0}]^{**}(e^{-1}) \approx \|f\|_{(L^{p_0})^{\#}(\mathbb{T}^2)}.$$

Accordingly, the first and second equivalences in (2.15) are consequences of (2.9).

We now prove the last equivalence in (2.15). We claim that

$$(2.16) \quad \int_0^t y_{\Theta}\left(\frac{1}{s}\right)^{p_0} ds \lesssim t y_{\Theta}\left(\frac{1}{t}\right)^{p_0}, \quad t \in (0, 1).$$

Assuming momentarily the validity of (2.16), we have

$$\begin{aligned} [(M_{\mathbb{T}^2}^{\#} f)^{p_0}]^{**}(t)^{1/p_0} &= \left[ \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \left[ \frac{(M_{\mathbb{T}^2}^{\#} f)^*(s)}{y_{\Theta}\left(\frac{1}{s}\right)} y_{\Theta}\left(\frac{1}{s}\right) \right]^{p_0} ds \right]^{1/p_0} \\ &\leq \left[ \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t y_{\Theta}\left(\frac{1}{s}\right)^{p_0} ds \right]^{1/p_0} \sup_{t \in (0, 1)} \frac{(M_{\mathbb{T}^2}^{\#} f)^*(t)}{y_{\Theta}\left(\frac{1}{t}\right)} \\ &\lesssim y_{\Theta}\left(\frac{1}{t}\right) \sup_{t \in (0, 1)} \frac{(M_{\mathbb{T}^2}^{\#} f)^*(t)}{y_{\Theta}\left(\frac{1}{t}\right)}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\sup_{t \in (0, 1)} \frac{[(M_{\mathbb{T}^2}^{\#} f)^{p_0}]^{**}(t)^{1/p_0}}{y_{\Theta}\left(\frac{1}{t}\right)} \lesssim \sup_{t \in (0, 1)} \frac{(M_{\mathbb{T}^2}^{\#} f)^*(t)}{y_{\Theta}\left(\frac{1}{t}\right)}.$$

The converse estimate is a simple consequence of the fact that  $(M_{\mathbb{T}^2}^{\#} f)^*$  is decreasing. This completes the proof of the last equivalence in (2.15), under the assumption that (2.16) holds true.

Next we turn to the proof of (2.16). For this purpose we need the following easily established fact:

$$(2.17) \quad y_{\Theta}(r) \approx \tilde{y}_{\Theta}(r) := \inf_{p > 2p_0} \{\Theta(p)r^{1/p}\}, \quad \text{for } r > 1.$$

Indeed, the estimate  $y_{\Theta}(r) \leq \tilde{y}_{\Theta}(r)$  is obvious. Conversely, let  $p > p_0$ , then  $2p > 2p_0$ , and using the doubling property of  $\Theta$  we see that, for  $r > 1$ ,

$$\Theta(p)r^{\frac{1}{p}} \approx \Theta(2p)r^{\frac{1}{p}} \geq \Theta(2p)r^{\frac{1}{2p}} \geq \tilde{y}_{\Theta}(r).$$

Therefore, taking the infimum over all  $p > p_0$ , we obtain  $y_{\Theta}(r) \gtrsim \tilde{y}_{\Theta}(r)$ , completing the proof of (2.17).

Let  $\varepsilon \in (\frac{1}{2p_0}, \frac{1}{p_0})$ . Observe that

$$(2.18) \quad r \in (1, \infty) \mapsto r^{-\varepsilon} \tilde{y}_{\Theta}(r) = \inf_{p > 2p_0} \{\Theta(p)r^{-\varepsilon+1/p}\} \quad \text{is a decreasing function.}$$



Let  $t \in (0, 1)$ , then by (2.17) and (2.18), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t y_\Theta \left( \frac{1}{s} \right)^{p_0} ds &\approx \int_0^t \tilde{y}_\Theta \left( \frac{1}{s} \right)^{p_0} ds = \int_0^t s^{-\varepsilon p_0} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{s} \right)^{-\varepsilon} \tilde{y}_\Theta \left( \frac{1}{s} \right) \right]^{p_0} ds \\ &\leq \left[ \left( \frac{1}{t} \right)^{-\varepsilon} \tilde{y}_\Theta \left( \frac{1}{t} \right) \right]^{p_0} \int_0^t s^{-\varepsilon p_0} ds \\ &\approx t^{1-\varepsilon p_0} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{t} \right)^{-\varepsilon} \tilde{y}_\Theta \left( \frac{1}{t} \right) \right]^{p_0} \approx t y_\Theta \left( \frac{1}{t} \right)^{p_0}, \end{aligned}$$

this concludes the proof of (2.16) and consequently the theorem is proved.  $\square$

**2.2. Proof of Theorem 1.2.** We shall assume that all function spaces are defined on  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^2$  (cf. Remark 2.5 below for the modifications needed to deal with  $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^2$ ).

Let  $p_0 \in (1, \infty)$ . Recall that CZOs act boundedly on  $L^{p_0}$  and BMO (cf. [30]), in particular, for  $\mathcal{K}$  given by (1.2) we have,

$$\mathcal{K} : L^{p_0} \rightarrow L^{p_0} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{K} : \text{BMO} \rightarrow \text{BMO}.$$

By interpolation we find that, with norm independent of  $\theta$ ,

$$\mathcal{K} : (L^{p_0}, \text{BMO})_{\theta, p(\theta)}^{\blacktriangleleft} \rightarrow (L^{p_0}, \text{BMO})_{\theta, p(\theta)}^{\blacktriangleleft},$$

where  $p(\theta) = p_0/(1 - \theta)$ . This implies (cf. (1.2))

$$(2.19) \quad \|\nabla v\|_{(L^{p_0}, \text{BMO})_{\theta, p(\theta)}^{\blacktriangleleft}} \lesssim \|\omega\|_{(L^{p_0}, \text{BMO})_{\theta, p(\theta)}^{\blacktriangleleft}}$$

with constant independent of  $\theta$ .

Next we show that

$$(2.20) \quad \|f - f_\infty\|_{(L^{p_0}, L^\infty)_{\theta, p(\theta)}^{\blacktriangleleft}} \lesssim (1 - \theta)^{-1} \|f\|_{(L^{p_0}, \text{BMO})_{\theta, p(\theta)}^{\blacktriangleleft}},$$

where  $f_\infty := \lim_{|Q| \rightarrow \infty} f_Q$  and  $f_Q$  denotes the *integral average* of  $f$  related to the cube  $Q$ , i.e.,  $f_Q := \frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q f$ .

We start by reformulating the following quantitative version of the John–Nirenberg embedding [21], which asserts that BMO is locally embedded into  $e^L$  (cf. [5, Proposition 8.10, p. 398])

$$(2.21) \quad (f - f_\infty)^{**}(t) \lesssim \int_t^\infty f^{\#\#}(s) \frac{ds}{s}.$$

Here  $f^\#$  is the *sharp maximal function of Fefferman–Stein*<sup>22</sup> [16]. Indeed, for our purposes, it is convenient to rewrite (2.21) in terms of  $M^\# f$  rather than  $f^\#$ . The connection between these maximal functions is given by (cf. [20, Lemma 3.4])

$$(2.22) \quad f^{\#\#}(t) \approx (M^\# f)^{**}(t).$$

Therefore, (2.21) can be expressed as

$$(2.23) \quad (f - f_\infty)^{**}(t) \lesssim \int_t^\infty (M^\# f)^{**}(s) \frac{ds}{s}.$$

<sup>22</sup>Recall that  $f^\#(x) = \sup_{Q \ni x} \frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q |f - f_Q|$ .

Applying  $L^p$ -norms on both sides of (2.23) and estimating the right-hand side using the pair of Hardy inequalities in [31, Appendix A.4, page 272], we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ \int_0^\infty [(f - f_\infty)^{**}(t)]^p dt \right\}^{1/p} &\lesssim \left\{ \int_0^\infty \left[ \int_t^\infty (M^\# f)^{**}(s) \frac{ds}{s} \right]^p dt \right\}^{1/p} \\ &\leq p \left\{ \int_0^\infty [(M^\# f)^{**}(t)]^p dt \right\}^{1/p} \\ &= p \left\{ \int_0^\infty \left[ \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t (M^\# f)^*(s) ds \right]^p dt \right\}^{1/p} \\ &\leq \frac{p^2}{p-1} \|f\|_{(L^p)^\#}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we have the following variant of the Fefferman–Stein inequality (cf. [5])

$$\|f - f_\infty\|_{L^p} = \left\{ \int_0^\infty [(f - f_\infty)^*(t)]^p dt \right\}^{1/p} \lesssim \frac{p^2}{p-1} \|f\|_{(L^p)^\#}.$$

In particular, since  $p_0 > 1$ , and  $\frac{1}{p(\theta)} = \frac{1-\theta}{p_0}$ ,

$$\|f - f_\infty\|_{L^{p(\theta)}} \lesssim \frac{(1-\theta)^{-1}}{p_0 - 1 + \theta} \|f\|_{(L^{p(\theta)})^\#} \lesssim (1-\theta)^{-1} \|f\|_{(L^{p(\theta)})^\#}.$$

In view of (1.23) and (2.1), the previous estimate can be rewritten as

$$\|f - f_\infty\|_{(L^{p_0}, L^\infty)_{\theta, p(\theta)}^\blacktriangleleft} \lesssim (1-\theta)^{-1} \|f\|_{(L^{p_0}, \text{BMO})_{\theta, p(\theta)}^\blacktriangleleft},$$

proving that (2.20) holds.

Applying (2.20) to  $f = \nabla v$  (and noting that  $(\nabla v)_\infty = 0$ ), combined with (2.19), yields

$$\|\nabla v\|_{(L^{p_0}, L^\infty)_{\theta, p(\theta)}^\blacktriangleleft} \lesssim (1-\theta)^{-1} \|\omega\|_{(L^{p_0}, \text{BMO})_{\theta, p(\theta)}^\blacktriangleleft}$$

uniformly with respect to  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ . Multiplying both sides of the above estimate by the factor  $(1-\theta)\Theta\left(\frac{p_0}{1-\theta}\right)^{-1}$  and taking the supremum over all  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ , we find

$$(2.24) \quad \|\nabla v\|_{\Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(L^{p_0}, L^\infty)_{\theta, p(\theta)}^\blacktriangleleft}{\Theta_1\left(\frac{p_0}{1-\theta}\right)} \right\}} \lesssim \|\omega\|_{\Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(L^{p_0}, \text{BMO})_{\theta, p(\theta)}^\blacktriangleleft}{\Theta\left(\frac{p_0}{1-\theta}\right)} \right\}} \approx \|\omega\|_{Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}},$$

where  $\Theta_1$  was introduced in (1.6) and we have also used (2.2) in the last step.

Now using (1.28), we rewrite the left-hand side of (2.24) as

$$\|\nabla v\|_{\Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(L^{p_0}, L^\infty)_{\theta, p(\theta)}^\blacktriangleleft}{\Theta_1\left(\frac{p_0}{1-\theta}\right)} \right\}} \approx \|v\|_{\Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(\dot{W}_{p_0}^1, \dot{W}_{p(\theta)}^1)_{\theta, p(\theta)}^\blacktriangleleft}{\Theta_1\left(\frac{p_0}{1-\theta}\right)} \right\}}.$$

Furthermore, the Sobolev embedding theorem  $\dot{W}_{p_0}^1 \hookrightarrow L^\infty$  (recall that  $p_0 > 2$ ), and the reiteration property of  $\Delta$ -extrapolation (cf. Appendix A.2, (A.3)) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(\dot{W}_{p_0}^1, \dot{W}_{p(\theta)}^1)_{\theta, p(\theta)}^\blacktriangleleft}{\Theta_1\left(\frac{p_0}{1-\theta}\right)} \right\} &\hookrightarrow \Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(L^\infty, \dot{W}_\infty^1)_{\theta, p(\theta)}^\blacktriangleleft}{\Theta_1\left(\frac{p_0}{1-\theta}\right)} \right\} \\ &= \Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(L^\infty, \dot{W}_\infty^1)_{\theta, \infty}^\blacktriangleleft}{\Theta_1\left(\frac{p_0}{1-\theta}\right)} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$(2.25) \quad \|v\|_{\Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(L^\infty, \dot{W}_\infty^1)_{\theta, \infty}}{\Theta_1(\frac{p_0}{1-\theta})} \right\}} \lesssim \|v\|_{\Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(\dot{W}_{p_0}^1, \dot{W}_\infty^1)_{\theta, p(\theta)}}{\Theta_1(\frac{p_0}{1-\theta})} \right\}}.$$

Updating (2.24) via (2.25) we arrive at

$$(2.26) \quad \|v\|_{\Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(L^\infty, \dot{W}_\infty^1)_{\theta, \infty}}{\Theta_1(\frac{p_0}{1-\theta})} \right\}} \lesssim \|\omega\|_{Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}}.$$

Next we compute the norm of the extrapolation space on the left-hand side of (2.26) and show that

$$(2.27) \quad \|v\|_{\Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(L^\infty, \dot{W}_\infty^1)_{\theta, \infty}}{\Theta_1(\frac{p_0}{1-\theta})} \right\}} \approx \sup_{x,y} \frac{|v(x) - v(y)|}{\inf_{t > |x-y|} ty_{\Theta_1(\frac{1}{t})}}.$$

The argument was already outlined in Section 1.4. For the sake of completeness, next we give full details. Indeed, in light of (1.5), we have (cf. (A.4) and (A.5))

$$(2.28) \quad \|v\|_{\Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(L^\infty, \dot{W}_\infty^1)_{\theta, \infty}}{\Theta_1(\frac{p_0}{1-\theta})} \right\}} \approx \sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \frac{K(t, v; L^\infty, \dot{W}_\infty^1)}{ty_{\Theta_1(\frac{1}{t})}}.$$

Applying the characterization of the  $K$ -functional for  $(L^\infty, \dot{W}_\infty^1)$  (cf. (1.30)) we find

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\|_{\Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(L^\infty, \dot{W}_\infty^1)_{\theta, \infty}}{\Theta_1(\frac{p_0}{1-\theta})} \right\}} &\approx \sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \frac{\sup_{|x-y| < t} |v(x) - v(y)|}{ty_{\Theta_1(\frac{1}{t})}} \\ &= \sup_{x,y} |v(x) - v(y)| \sup_{t > |x-y|} \frac{1}{ty_{\Theta_1(\frac{1}{t})}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the desired result (2.27) follows.

Putting together (2.26) and (2.27), we obtain

$$\sup_{x,y \in \Omega} \frac{|v(x) - v(y)|}{\inf_{t > |x-y|} ty_{\Theta_1(\frac{1}{t})}} \lesssim \|\omega\|_{Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}}.$$

In particular,

$$|v(x) - v(y)| \lesssim |x - y| y_{\Theta_1} \left( \frac{1}{|x - y|} \right) \|\omega\|_{Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}},$$

thus completing the proof of Theorem 1.2.  $\square$

*Remark 2.5.* The above proof can be easily adapted to deal with  $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^2$ . In particular, the periodic counterpart of (2.21) is given by (cf. [5, Corollary 7.4, p. 379]), for  $t \in (0, \frac{1}{6})$ ,

$$(f - f_{\mathbb{T}^2})^{**}(t) \lesssim \int_t^1 f^{\#\#}(s) \frac{ds}{s},$$

where  $f_{\mathbb{T}^2}$  denotes the integral mean of  $f$ . Accordingly, the fact that  $(\nabla v)_\infty = 0$  in the above proof is replaced by<sup>23</sup>  $(\nabla v)_{\mathbb{T}^2} = 0$ .

<sup>23</sup>Using the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus together with the continuity of  $v$  (recall that  $\omega \in L^p(\mathbb{T}^2)$  with  $p > 2$ ), we have  $(\nabla v)_{\mathbb{T}^2} = 0$ .

**2.3. Examples of vorticities in  $Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}$  that are not in  $Y_{p_0}^\Theta$ .** To simplify the exposition, throughout this section we assume that  $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^2$ . Recall that by construction, given a growth function  $\Theta$ ,  $Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}$  is a bigger space than  $Y_{p_0}^\Theta$  (cf. (1.34)). Furthermore, in the special case  $\Theta(p) \approx 1$ , we have  $Y_{p_0}^\Theta = L^\infty \subsetneq \text{BMO} = Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}$ . It is of interest to understand better the relationship between these spaces. In this section, we provide a method to construct explicit examples of functions  $\omega \in Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta} \setminus Y_{p_0}^\Theta$ , for a variety of growths.

**Example 3** (The case  $\Theta(p) \approx p^\alpha$ ,  $\alpha > 0$ ). Let

$$\omega(x) = |\log |x||^{\alpha+1}.$$

We will show that

$$(2.29) \quad \omega \in Y^{\#\Theta}, \quad \omega \notin Y^\Theta.$$

Indeed, basic computations lead to

$$(2.30) \quad \omega^*(t) \approx (-\log t)^{\alpha+1}$$

and (recall that  $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^2$ )

$$(2.31) \quad |\nabla \omega|^*(t) \approx t^{-1/2} (-\log t)^\alpha.$$

Next we are able to bound  $\omega^{\#\#}$  via the following pointwise estimate obtained in [15, Theorem 2.6]:

$$(2.32) \quad \omega^{\#\#}(t) \lesssim \sum_{l=0}^1 \left[ t^{-1/r_0} \left( \int_0^t (\xi^{1/r} |\nabla^l \omega|^*(\xi))^{r_0} \frac{d\xi}{\xi} \right)^{1/r_0} + \sup_{t < \xi < 1} \xi^{1/2} |\nabla^l \omega|^*(\xi) \right],$$

where  $r_0 > 2$  and  $r = \frac{2r_0}{2+r_0}$ . We treat the four terms appearing on the right-hand side of the previous estimate. Assume first that  $l = 0$  (i.e.,  $|\nabla^0 \omega|^* = \omega^*$ ). By (2.30), we have

$$\left( \int_0^t (\xi^{1/r} \omega^*(\xi))^{r_0} \frac{d\xi}{\xi} \right)^{1/r_0} \approx \left( \int_0^t [\xi^{1/r} (-\log \xi)^{\alpha+1}]^{r_0} \frac{d\xi}{\xi} \right)^{1/r_0} \approx t^{1/r} (-\log t)^{\alpha+1}$$

and

$$\sup_{t < \xi < 1} \xi^{1/2} \omega^*(\xi) \approx \sup_{t < \xi < 1} \xi^{1/2} (-\log \xi)^{\alpha+1} \approx 1.$$

Putting these estimates together, we obtain

$$(2.33) \quad t^{-1/r_0} \left( \int_0^t (\xi^{1/r} \omega^*(\xi))^{r_0} \frac{d\xi}{\xi} \right)^{1/r_0} + \sup_{t < \xi < 1} \xi^{1/2} \omega^*(\xi) \approx t^{1/2} (-\log t)^{\alpha+1} + 1 \approx 1.$$

Next we deal with the term on the right-hand side of (2.32) that corresponds to  $l = 1$ . Using (2.31), we get the following estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \int_0^t (\xi^{1/r} |\nabla \omega|^*(\xi))^{r_0} \frac{d\xi}{\xi} \right)^{1/r_0} &\approx \left( \int_0^t (\xi^{1/r_0} (-\log \xi)^\alpha)^{r_0} \frac{d\xi}{\xi} \right)^{1/r_0} \\ &\approx t^{1/r_0} (-\log t)^\alpha \end{aligned}$$

and (since  $\alpha > 0$ )

$$\sup_{t < \xi < 1} \xi^{1/2} |\nabla \omega|^*(\xi) \approx \sup_{t < \xi < 1} (-\log \xi)^\alpha = (-\log t)^\alpha.$$

Hence

$$(2.34) \quad t^{-1/r_0} \left( \int_0^t (\xi^{1/r} |\nabla \omega|^*(\xi))^{r_0} \frac{d\xi}{\xi} \right)^{1/r_0} + \sup_{t < \xi < 1} \xi^{1/2} |\nabla \omega|^*(\xi) \approx (-\log t)^\alpha.$$

Inserting (2.33) and (2.34) into (2.32), we obtain the following upper estimate for  $\omega^{\#\#}$ ,

$$\omega^{\#\#}(t) \lesssim (-\log t)^\alpha,$$

or equivalently (cf. (2.22))

$$(2.35) \quad (M^\# \omega)^{\#\#}(t) \lesssim (-\log t)^\alpha.$$

Since we are working on  $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^2$ , without loss of generality we may assume that  $p_0 = 1$ . Applying Theorem 2.3 and Example 2 (with  $\Theta(p) \approx p^\alpha$ ) and using (2.30) and (2.35), we compute

$$\|\omega\|_{Y^\Theta} \approx \sup_{t \in (0, e^{-1})} \frac{\omega^{\#\#}(t)}{\Theta(-\log t)} \approx \sup_{t \in (0, e^{-1})} \frac{(-\log t)^{\alpha+1}}{(-\log t)^\alpha} = \infty$$

and

$$\|\omega\|_{Y^{\#\Theta}} \approx \sup_{t \in (0, e^{-1})} \frac{(M^\# \omega)^{\#\#}(t)}{\Theta(-\log t)} \lesssim \sup_{t \in (0, e^{-1})} \frac{(-\log t)^\alpha}{(-\log t)^\alpha} = 1.$$

This concludes the proof of (2.29).

**Example 4** (The case  $\Theta(p) \approx \log p$ ). This example is motivated by the fact that  $\log(1 + |\log |x||)$  is a prototype of a function in  $Y^\Theta$ , while  $|\log |x||$  is a prototype of a function in BMO. We consider their product, namely,

$$\omega(x) = (1 + |\log |x||) \log(1 + |\log |x||),$$

and show that

$$(2.36) \quad \omega \in Y^{\#\Theta}, \quad \omega \notin Y^\Theta.$$

We follow closely the method of Example 3. Specifically, by elementary manipulations we find

$$(2.37) \quad \omega^*(t) \approx (1 - \log t) \log(1 - \log t)$$

and

$$|\nabla \omega|^*(t) \approx t^{-1/2} (1 + \log(1 - \log t)).$$

Recall that  $r = \frac{2r_0}{2+r_0}$ , where  $r_0 > 2$ . Therefore

$$t^{-1/r_0} \left( \int_0^t (\xi^{1/r} \omega^*(\xi))^{r_0} \frac{d\xi}{\xi} \right)^{1/r_0} + \sup_{t < \xi < 1} \xi^{1/2} \omega^*(\xi) \approx t^{1/2} (1 - \log t) \log(1 - \log t) + 1 \approx 1$$

and

$$t^{-1/r_0} \left( \int_0^t (\xi^{1/r} |\nabla \omega|^*(\xi))^{r_0} \frac{d\xi}{\xi} \right)^{1/r_0} + \sup_{t < \xi < 1} \xi^{1/2} |\nabla \omega|^*(\xi) \approx \log(1 - \log t).$$

Inserting these two estimates into (2.32), we obtain

$$(2.38) \quad \omega^{\#\#}(t) \lesssim \log(1 - \log t).$$

Invoking Theorem 2.3 and Example 2 (with  $\Theta(p) \approx \log p$ ) together with (2.37) and (2.38), we get

$$\|\omega\|_{Y^\Theta} \approx \sup_{t \in (0, e^{-1})} (-\log t) = \infty$$

and

$$\|\omega\|_{Y^{\#\Theta}} \lesssim \sup_{t \in (0, e^{-1})} \frac{\log(-\log t)}{\log(-\log t)} = 1.$$

Hence  $\omega$  fulfils (2.36).

*Remark 2.6.* It is possible to extend the methodology applied in Examples 3 and 4 to deal with more general growths  $\Theta$  of logarithmic type. Further details are left to the reader.

### 3. THE SPACES $\dot{B}_{\Pi}^{\beta}$

Let  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  denote the Schwartz space and  $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$  the space of tempered distributions. We consider the space  $\dot{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  formed by  $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with  $(D^{\alpha}\widehat{\varphi})(0) = 0$  for any multi-index  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ , where  $\mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ ; this space carries the natural Fréchet topology inherited from  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Let  $\dot{\mathcal{S}}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$  be its dual space, which can be identified with  $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$  modulo polynomials.

Let  $\varphi \in C_c^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  be a radial function with

$$\begin{aligned} \text{supp } \varphi &\subset \left\{ \xi : \frac{3}{4} < |\xi| < \frac{7}{4} \right\}, \\ \varphi(\xi) &= 1 \quad \text{for } \frac{7}{8} < |\xi| < \frac{9}{8}, \\ \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi(2^{-j}\xi) &= 1 \quad \text{for all } \xi \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\widehat{\Delta_j f}(\xi) := \varphi(2^{-j}\xi) \widehat{f}(\xi),$$

and

$$\Delta_j := \dot{\Delta}_j \quad \text{if } j > 0, \quad \Delta_0 := \text{Id} - \sum_{j > 0} \Delta_j.$$

**Definition 2.** Let  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ , and let  $\Pi$  be a growth function. Thus  $\dot{B}_{\Pi}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  will denote the (homogeneous) *Vishik space* formed by all  $f \in \dot{\mathcal{S}}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$  such that

$$\|f\|_{\dot{B}_{\Pi}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d)} := \sup_{N \geq 0} \frac{1}{\Pi(N)} \sum_{j=-\infty}^N 2^{j\beta} \|\dot{\Delta}_j f\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)} < \infty.$$

The inhomogeneous counterpart,  $B_{\Pi}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , is the set of all  $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$  such that

$$\|f\|_{B_{\Pi}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d)} := \sup_{N \geq 0} \frac{1}{\Pi(N)} \sum_{j=0}^N 2^{j\beta} \|\Delta_j f\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)} < \infty.$$

*Remark 3.1.* (i) Standard properties of multipliers can be used to show that Vishik spaces do not depend (up to equivalence of norms) on the chosen generator  $\varphi$ .

(ii) In the special case  $\beta = 0$ ,  $B_{\Pi}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  coincides with the classical space  $B_{\Pi}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  (cf. (1.8)).

(iii) Assume  $\Pi(N) \approx 1$ . Then  $\dot{B}_{\Pi}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d) = \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , the classical Besov space (cf. [6]) defined by

$$(3.1) \quad \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d)} := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} 2^{j\beta} \|\dot{\Delta}_j f\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

Analogously,  $B_{\Pi}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d) = B_{\infty,1}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with

$$\|f\|_{B_{\infty,1}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d)} := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0} 2^{j\beta} \|\Delta_j f\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

**3.1. Characterizations.** The goal of this section is to provide characterizations of the Vishik spaces as extrapolation spaces. We show analogs of the results obtained earlier for the  $Y_{p_0}^{\Theta}$  and  $Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}$  spaces (cf. Section 2.1).

We need to impose some natural restrictions on the growth functions used in this section.

**Definition 3.** Let  $\kappa > 0$ . We shall denote by  $\mathcal{P}_{\kappa}$ , the set of all growth functions  $\Pi$  satisfying the following conditions:

- (i)  $\Pi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  is non-decreasing,
- (ii)  $\Pi$  is doubling,
- (iii)  $e^{1/p} \Pi(p)$  is quasi-decreasing,
- (iv)  $\sum_{j=N}^{\infty} 2^{-j\kappa} \Pi(j) \lesssim 2^{-N\kappa} \Pi(N)$  for every  $N \geq 0$ .

Clearly,  $\Pi(p) = (p+1)^{\alpha} (\log(p+e))^{\alpha_1} (\log_2(p+e))^{\alpha_2} \cdots (\log_m(p+e))^{\alpha_m}$ , where  $\alpha, \alpha_i \geq 0$ , are examples of growth functions in  $\mathcal{P}_{\kappa}$ .

In dealing with interpolation of Besov spaces, we make use of the fact that the computation of  $K$ -functionals for the Besov pair  $(\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-\kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d))$  can be reduced, via the method of retracts (cf. Appendix A.1 for further details), to the computation of  $K$ -functionals for the vector-valued sequence spaces  $(\ell_1^{\beta-\kappa}(L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)), \ell_1^{\beta}(L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)))$  (cf. (A.1)).

Using the retract technique we proved Theorem A.1 below which, in particular, implies

$$(3.2) \quad (\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-\kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d))_{\theta,1}^{\blacktriangleleft} = \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)$$

with  $\alpha = (1-\theta)(\beta-\kappa) + \theta\beta$ . Here, the equivalence constant is independent of  $\theta$ .

**Theorem 3.2.** Let  $\Pi \in \mathcal{P}_{\kappa}$  and  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \|f\|_{B_{\Pi}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-\kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d)} &\approx \sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \frac{K(t, f; \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-\kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d))}{ty_{\Pi}(\frac{1}{t})} \\ &\approx \|f\|_{\Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-\kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d))_{\theta, \frac{1}{1-\theta}}^{\blacktriangleleft}}{\Pi(\frac{1}{1-\theta})} \right\}} \\ &\approx \sup_{\alpha \in (\beta-\kappa, \beta)} \frac{\|f\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)}}{\Pi(\frac{1}{\beta-\alpha})}. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $y_{\Pi}$  is given by (1.5) (with  $p_0 = 1$ ).

*Proof.* According to (A.3) and (A.4) (with  $p_0 = 1$ ),

$$(3.4) \quad \|f\|_{\Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-\kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d))_{\theta, \frac{1}{1-\theta}}^{\blacktriangleleft}}{\Pi(\frac{1}{1-\theta})} \right\}} \approx \sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \frac{K(t, f; \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-\kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d))}{ty_{\Pi}(\frac{1}{t})}.$$

This shows the second equivalence in (3.3).

We now prove the third equivalence in (3.3). We do this using the reiteration property for the  $\Delta$ -extrapolation method given in (A.3) and (A.6) (with  $p = 1$ )

$$\Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-\kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d))_{\theta, \frac{1}{1-\theta}}}{\Pi(\frac{1}{1-\theta})} \right\} = \Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-\kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d))_{\theta,1}}{\Pi(\frac{1}{1-\theta})} \right\}$$

combined with (3.2), and a change of variables, to obtain

$$\|f\|_{\Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-\kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d))_{\theta, \frac{1}{1-\theta}}}{\Pi(\frac{1}{1-\theta})} \right\}} \approx \sup_{\alpha \in (\beta-\kappa, \beta)} \frac{\|f\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)}}{\Pi(\frac{1}{\beta-\alpha})}.$$

Finally, we prove the first equivalence in (3.3). Note that in view of the properties of  $y_{\Pi}$ , proved in Lemma 2, and the monotonicity properties of  $K$ -functionals, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \frac{K(t, f; \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-\kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d))}{ty_{\Pi}(\frac{1}{t})} &\approx \sup_{t \in (0, 1/e)} \frac{K(t, f; \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-\kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d))}{t\Pi(-\log t)} \\ &\quad + \sup_{t \in (1/e, 1)} \frac{K(t, f; \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-\kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d))}{ty_{\Pi}(\frac{1}{t})} \\ &\quad + \sup_{t \in (1, \infty)} K(t, f; \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-\kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d)) \\ (3.5) \qquad \qquad \qquad &\approx I + II, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$I := \sup_{t \in (0, 1/e)} \frac{K(t, f; \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-\kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d))}{t\Pi(-\log t)}$$

and

$$II := \sup_{t \in (1, \infty)} K(t, f; \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-\kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d)).$$

The desired equivalence in (3.3) will then follow if we show the following

$$(3.6) \qquad I \approx \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{\Pi}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d)}$$

and

$$(3.7) \qquad II \approx \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-\kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

To prove these claims we revert to sequences of vector-valued functions using the method of retracts. Then we see that

$$\begin{aligned} I &\approx \sup_{t \in (0, 1/e)} \frac{1}{t\Pi(-\log t)} K(t, \{\dot{\Delta}_j f\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}; \ell_1^{\beta-\kappa}(L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)), \ell_1^{\beta}(L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d))) \\ &\approx \sup_{N \geq 0} \frac{1}{2^{-N\kappa} \Pi(N)} K(2^{-N\kappa}, \{\dot{\Delta}_j f\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}; \ell_1^{\beta-\kappa}(L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)), \ell_1^{\beta}(L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d))), \end{aligned}$$



where in the last step we have used the monotonicity properties of  $\Pi$  and  $K$ -functionals. Applying known characterizations for  $K$ -functionals (cf. (A.2)), we derive

$$\begin{aligned} I &\approx \sup_{N \geq 0} \frac{1}{2^{-N\kappa} \Pi(N)} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \min\{1, 2^{(j-N)\kappa}\} 2^{j(\beta-\kappa)} \|\dot{\Delta}_j f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &\approx \sup_{N \geq 0} \frac{1}{\Pi(N)} \sum_{j=-\infty}^N 2^{j\beta} \|\dot{\Delta}_j f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &\quad + \sup_{N \geq 0} \frac{1}{2^{-N\kappa} \Pi(N)} \sum_{j=N}^{\infty} 2^{j(\beta-\kappa)} \|\dot{\Delta}_j f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &=: I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned}$$

We claim that

$$(3.8) \quad I_2 \lesssim I_1,$$

from where it follows that (cf. Definition 2)

$$I \approx I_1 = \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{\mathbb{H}}^\beta(\mathbb{R}^d)},$$

i.e., (3.6) holds.

It remains to prove (3.8). Let  $N \geq 0$ . We use the assumption (iv) in the definition of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa$  (cf. Definition 3), to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=N}^{\infty} 2^{j(\beta-\kappa)} \|\dot{\Delta}_j f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} &\leq \sup_{j \geq 0} \{\Pi(j)^{-1} 2^{j\beta} \|\dot{\Delta}_j f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)}\} \sum_{j=N}^{\infty} 2^{-j\kappa} \Pi(j) \\ &\approx 2^{-N\kappa} \Pi(N) \sup_{j \geq 0} \{\Pi(j)^{-1} 2^{j\beta} \|\dot{\Delta}_j f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)}\} \\ &\leq 2^{-N\kappa} \Pi(N) I_1. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum over all  $N \geq 0$ , we arrive at the desired estimate (3.8).

We turn to the proof of (3.7). The estimate  $\lesssim$  follows trivially from the very definition of  $K$ -functional. The converse estimate can be obtained from (A.2). To be more precise, let  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} K(2^{N\kappa}, \{f_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}; \ell_1^{\beta-\kappa}(L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)), \ell_1^\beta(L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))) &\approx \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \min\{1, 2^{(j+N)\kappa}\} 2^{j(\beta-\kappa)} \|f_j\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &\geq \sum_{j=-N}^{\infty} 2^{j(\beta-\kappa)} \|f_j\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} K(2^{N\kappa}, \{f_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}; \ell_1^{\beta-\kappa}(L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)), \ell_1^\beta(L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))) \gtrsim \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} 2^{j(\beta-\kappa)} \|f_j\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

Using once again the retraction method, we obtain (cf. (3.1))

$$II \gtrsim \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-\kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

This ends the proof of (3.7).

Finally, putting together (3.5), (3.6) and (3.7),

$$\sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \frac{K(t, f; \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-\kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d))}{ty_{\Pi}(\frac{1}{t})} \approx \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{\Pi}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-\kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

This concludes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

*Remark 3.3.* The inhomogeneous counterpart of Theorem 3.2 also holds. Note that, in this case, the outcome is independent of  $\kappa > 0$  since

$$B_{\Pi}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap B_{\infty,1}^{\beta-\kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d) = B_{\Pi}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Indeed, for any fixed  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{B_{\infty,1}^{\beta-\kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d)} &= \sum_{j=0}^N 2^{j(\beta-\kappa)} \|\Delta_j f\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \sum_{j=N+1}^{\infty} 2^{j(\beta-\kappa)} \|\Delta_j f\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &\leq \sum_{j=0}^N 2^{j\beta} \|\Delta_j f\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \sum_{j=N+1}^{\infty} 2^{j(\beta-\kappa)} \|\Delta_j f\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &\leq \Pi(N) \|f\|_{B_{\Pi}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \left( \sum_{j=N+1}^{\infty} 2^{-j\kappa} \Pi(j) \right) \|f\|_{B_{\Pi}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &\lesssim \Pi(N) (1 + 2^{-N\kappa}) \|f\|_{B_{\Pi}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from the property (iv) in the definition of  $\mathcal{P}_{\kappa}$  (cf. Definition 3).

One may also show that the characterizations provided by Theorem 3.2 in the inhomogeneous setting are independent of  $\kappa$  via

$$\sup_{\alpha \in (\beta-\kappa, \beta)} \frac{\|f\|_{B_{\infty,1}^{\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)}}{\Pi(\frac{1}{\beta-\alpha})} \approx \sup_{\alpha \in (\beta-\kappa_0, \beta)} \frac{\|f\|_{B_{\infty,1}^{\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)}}{\Pi(\frac{1}{\beta-\alpha})}$$

for  $\kappa, \kappa_0 > 0$ . The latter is an immediate consequence of the trivial embedding  $B_{\infty,1}^{\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow B_{\infty,1}^{\alpha-\varepsilon}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ .

A third explanation to the independence of  $\kappa$  in Theorem 3.2, now from an extrapolation point of view, may be found in (A.7) below.

**3.2. Uniqueness for a family of active scalar equations.** Consider the class of active scalar equations on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  described in Section 1.9, namely,

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{cases} \omega_t + v \cdot \nabla \omega = 0, \\ v = R(-\Delta)^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} \omega, \end{cases}$$

where  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ . The main goal of this section is to establish the uniqueness result for (3.9) in the class of Vishik spaces. To do this, we will follow the extrapolation approach outlined in Section 1.6 adequately adapted to (3.9) and Vishik spaces. The corresponding Step 1 was already carried out in Section 3.1. Next, we turn our attention to Step 2, i.e., estimates for the modulus of continuity of  $v$ .

**Theorem 3.4.** *Assume that the growth function  $\Pi \in \mathcal{P}_1$ , and let  $\omega \in \dot{B}_{\Pi}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Then*

$$|v(x) - v(y)| \lesssim |x - y| y_{\Pi} \left( \frac{1}{|x - y|} \right) \|\omega\|_{\dot{B}_{\Pi}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-1}(\mathbb{R}^d)},$$

where  $y_\Pi$  is the Yudovich function associated to  $\Pi$  (cf. (1.5) with  $p_0 = 1$ ).

*Proof.* Recall the well-known fact that  $R$  (Riesz-type transforms) acts boundedly on the Besov space  $\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^\beta(\mathbb{R}^d)$  for all  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$  (see e.g. [17, Proposition 4.7]). By interpolation, it follows that

$$\|R\omega\|_{(\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-1}(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^\beta(\mathbb{R}^d))_{\theta, \frac{1}{1-\theta}}^{\blacktriangleleft}} \lesssim \|\omega\|_{(\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-1}(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^\beta(\mathbb{R}^d))_{\theta, \frac{1}{1-\theta}}^{\blacktriangleleft}}$$

uniformly with respect to  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ . Using the Biot–Savart law given in (3.9), we can rewrite the previous estimate as

$$(3.10) \quad \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{-\beta+1}{2}} v\|_{(\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-1}(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^\beta(\mathbb{R}^d))_{\theta, \frac{1}{1-\theta}}^{\blacktriangleleft}} \lesssim \|\omega\|_{(\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-1}(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^\beta(\mathbb{R}^d))_{\theta, \frac{1}{1-\theta}}^{\blacktriangleleft}}.$$

Furthermore, as a consequence of basic multiplier assertions (cf. [6, Lemma 6.2.1]), the operator  $(-\Delta)^{\frac{-\beta+1}{2}}$  acts as an isomorphism from  $\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^0(\mathbb{R}^d)$  onto  $\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and from  $\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  onto  $\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^\beta(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Once again by interpolation, we derive

$$\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{-\beta+1}{2}} v\|_{(\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-1}(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^\beta(\mathbb{R}^d))_{\theta, \frac{1}{1-\theta}}^{\blacktriangleleft}} \approx \|v\|_{(\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^0(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^1(\mathbb{R}^d))_{\theta, \frac{1}{1-\theta}}^{\blacktriangleleft}}.$$

Therefore we can update (3.10) as follows

$$(3.11) \quad \|v\|_{(\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^0(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^1(\mathbb{R}^d))_{\theta, \frac{1}{1-\theta}}^{\blacktriangleleft}} \lesssim \|\omega\|_{(\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-1}(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^\beta(\mathbb{R}^d))_{\theta, \frac{1}{1-\theta}}^{\blacktriangleleft}}.$$

It follows from the trivial embedding

$$(3.12) \quad \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^0(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$$

and the classical Bernstein inequality for entire functions of exponential type (cf. [29, p. 116]) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} &\lesssim \|\nabla v\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^0(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \|\nabla \dot{\Delta}_j v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} 2^j \|\dot{\Delta}_j v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \|v\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \end{aligned}$$

In other words,

$$(3.13) \quad \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow \dot{W}_\infty^1(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

According to (3.12) and (3.13),

$$\|v\|_{(L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{W}_\infty^1(\mathbb{R}^d))_{\theta, \frac{1}{1-\theta}}^{\blacktriangleleft}} \lesssim \|v\|_{(\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^0(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^1(\mathbb{R}^d))_{\theta, \frac{1}{1-\theta}}^{\blacktriangleleft}},$$

which implies (cf. (3.11))

$$\|v\|_{(L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{W}_\infty^1(\mathbb{R}^d))_{\theta, \frac{1}{1-\theta}}^{\blacktriangleleft}} \lesssim \|\omega\|_{(\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-1}(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^\beta(\mathbb{R}^d))_{\theta, \frac{1}{1-\theta}}^{\blacktriangleleft}}.$$

Multiplying this inequality by  $1/\Pi((1-\theta)^{-1})$  and taking supremum over all  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ , we arrive at the extrapolation inequality

$$(3.14) \quad \|v\|_{\Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{W}_\infty^1(\mathbb{R}^d))_{\theta, \frac{1}{1-\theta}}^{\blacktriangleleft}}{\Pi(\frac{1}{1-\theta})} \right\}} \lesssim \|\omega\|_{\Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-1}(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^\beta(\mathbb{R}^d))_{\theta, \frac{1}{1-\theta}}^{\blacktriangleleft}}{\Pi(\frac{1}{1-\theta})} \right\}}.$$

The right-hand side of (3.14) was computed in Theorem 3.2:

$$(3.15) \quad \Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-1}(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d))_{\theta, \frac{1}{1-\theta}}}{\Pi(\frac{1}{1-\theta})} \right\} = \dot{B}_{\Pi}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-1}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

While the left-hand side of (3.14) was already characterized in (2.27) (replace  $\Theta_1$  by  $\Pi$  and let  $p_0 = 1$ ) as

$$(3.16) \quad \|v\|_{\Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{W}_{\infty}^1(\mathbb{R}^d))_{\theta, \frac{1}{1-\theta}}}{\Pi(\frac{1}{1-\theta})} \right\}} \approx \sup_{x,y \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|v(x) - v(y)|}{\inf_{t > |x-y|} t y_{\Pi}(\frac{1}{t})}.$$

Inserting (3.15) and (3.16) into (3.14), we have

$$|v(x) - v(y)| \lesssim |x - y| y_{\Pi} \left( \frac{1}{|x - y|} \right) \|\omega\|_{\dot{B}_{\Pi}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-1}(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

□

To obtain a uniqueness result for transport equations (3.9) in Vishik spaces we impose an Osgood condition on the growth.

**Theorem 3.5.** *Assume that the growth function  $\Pi \in \mathcal{P}_1$  satisfies the Osgood type condition*

$$\int_1^{\infty} \frac{dr}{r y_{\Pi}(r)} = \infty.$$

*Then a Lagrangian weak solution  $\omega$  of (3.9), such that*

$$\omega \in L^{\infty}([0, T]; \dot{B}_{\Pi}^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{\beta-1}(\mathbb{R}^d))$$

*is uniquely determined by its initial value  $\omega_0$ .*

*Proof.* Apply the methodology developed in Section 1.5 together with Theorem 3.4. □

**3.3. Proof of Theorems 1.3 and 1.4.** Invoke Theorems 3.4 and 3.5 with  $d = 2$  and  $\beta = 0$  (cf. Remark 3.1(ii)).

**3.4. Comparison of Theorem 1.4 with the uniqueness result of Vishik.** As already mentioned in Remark 1.5, both conditions (1.9) and (1.36) are equivalent for  $\Pi \in \mathcal{P}_1$ . In this section, we investigate the relationships between the function spaces involved in (1.10) and (1.37), namely,

$$B_{\Pi}(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^2), \quad p_0 \in (1, 2),$$

and

$$\dot{B}_{\Pi}(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^2),$$

respectively.

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $p_0 \in (1, d)$ . Then*

$$B_{\Pi}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^d) \leftrightarrow \dot{B}_{\Pi}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

*Proof.* Assume  $f \in B_{\Pi}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . The norm of  $f$  in  $\dot{B}_{\Pi}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  can be estimated as follows. For each  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , we can apply the classical Nikolskii's inequality for entire functions of exponential type (cf. [29, Theorem 3.3.5, p. 126]) and basic multiplier assertions in order to get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=-\infty}^N \|\dot{\Delta}_j f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} &= \sum_{j=-\infty}^0 \|\dot{\Delta}_j f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \sum_{j=1}^N \|\dot{\Delta}_j f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{j=-\infty}^0 2^{jd/p_0} \|\dot{\Delta}_j f\|_{L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \Pi(N) \|f\|_{B_{\Pi}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \Pi(N) \|f\|_{B_{\Pi}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &\lesssim \Pi(N) \|f\|_{B_{\Pi}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$(3.17) \quad B_{\Pi}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow \dot{B}_{\Pi}(\mathbb{R}^d)$$

for any  $p_0 \in (1, \infty)$ .

On the other hand, the  $\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{-1}$ -norm of  $f$  can be split into

$$(3.18) \quad \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} 2^{-j} \|\dot{\Delta}_j f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} = I + II,$$

where

$$(3.19) \quad I := \sum_{j=-\infty}^0 2^{-j} \|\dot{\Delta}_j f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)}$$

and

$$(3.20) \quad II := \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{-j} \|\dot{\Delta}_j f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

We can estimate  $I$  applying Nikolskii's inequality:

$$(3.21) \quad I \lesssim \sum_{j=-\infty}^0 2^{-j(1-\frac{d}{p_0})} \|\dot{\Delta}_j f\|_{L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{j(1-\frac{d}{p_0})} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)},$$

where the last step follows from the assumption  $p_0 < d$ .

To estimate  $II$ , we can argue as follows. The fact that  $f \in B_{\Pi}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  implies that

$$\|\Delta_j f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \Pi(j) \|f\|_{B_{\Pi}(\mathbb{R}^d)}, \quad j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Therefore, taking into account that  $\Pi \in \mathcal{P}_1$  (cf. item (iv) in Definition 3), we obtain

$$(3.22) \quad II = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{-j} \|\Delta_j f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \|f\|_{B_{\Pi}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{-j} \Pi(j) \lesssim \|f\|_{B_{\Pi}(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

Inserting (3.21) and (3.22) into (3.18), one achieves

$$(3.23) \quad B_{\Pi}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

The combination of (3.17) and (3.23) yields the desired embedding

$$B_{\Pi}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow \dot{B}_{\Pi}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

□

We close this section by showing that Theorem 1.4 with  $\Pi(p) \approx p$  (cf. (1.38)) also improves the classical Vishik's uniqueness result formulated in terms of (1.11).

**Proposition 2.** *Let  $p_0 \in (1, d)$ . Then*

$$(3.24) \quad \text{bmo}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

*Proof.* Assume  $f \in \text{bmo}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . The Besov  $\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{-1}$ -norm can be expressed as in (3.18)–(3.20), with  $I$  satisfying (3.21). Hence

$$(3.25) \quad \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} = I + II \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)} + II.$$

Next we estimate  $II$ . The well-known embedding  $\text{bmo}(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow B_{\infty,\infty}^0(\mathbb{R}^d)$  (cf. (1.12)) implies

$$(3.26) \quad II = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{-j} \|\Delta_j f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \|f\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^0(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \|f\|_{\text{bmo}(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

According to (3.25) and (3.26),

$$\text{bmo}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

This together with the trivial embedding  $\text{bmo}(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  implies the desired result (3.24). □

## APPENDIX A. INTERPOLATION AND EXTRAPOLATION: AN ATLAS

In order to help non experts in extrapolation, in this appendix we give a summary of results used in the paper, with documentation, commentaries and examples. We keep the notation and assumptions laid out in the previous sections. For the sake of convenience we also recall the location of some basic definitions.

**A.1. Interpolation of Besov spaces via retraction revisited.** A common technique used in interpolation theory is to translate interpolation of function spaces into equivalent interpolation problems for sequence spaces (“the method of retracts”). In particular, in this paper the  $\ell_1^\beta(L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$  spaces of sequences of vector-valued functions play an important role. We say that  $\{f_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \ell_1^\beta(L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$  if

$$(A.1) \quad \|\{f_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}\|_{\ell_1^\beta(L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))} := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} 2^{j\beta} \|f_j\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} < \infty.$$

Their usefulness for us is that we can translate the interpolation of  $\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^\beta(\mathbb{R}^d)$  spaces into interpolation of  $\ell_1^\beta(L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$ . This is effected by showing that the map

$$f \mapsto \{\dot{\Delta}_j f\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$$

defines a retract from  $\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^\beta(\mathbb{R}^d)$  onto  $\ell_1^\beta(L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$  (cf. [6, Definition 6.4.1 and Theorem 6.4.3, pages 150–152]). In particular,  $K$ -functionals relative to vector-valued sequence spaces can be explicitly computed, cf. [6, p. 120].

**Example 5.** We have

$$(A.2) \quad K(t, \{f_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}; \ell_1^{\beta-\kappa}(L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)), \ell_1^\beta(L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))) \approx \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \min\{1, 2^{j\kappa} t\} 2^{j(\beta-\kappa)} \|f_j\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

In fact, more general statements are available in the literature. For example, (A.2) holds true with  $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  replaced by any Banach space  $X$ . However, for our purposes, it is enough to restrict attention to (A.2).

The next result is a (possible) slight improvement of a known result (cf. [6, Section 6.4]) since we provide sharp constants.

**Theorem A.1.** *Let  $-\infty < s_0 < s_1 < \infty$ ,  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ , and  $s = (1 - \theta)s_0 + \theta s_1$ . Then*

$$(\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{s_0}(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{s_1}(\mathbb{R}^d))_{\theta,1}^\blacktriangleleft = \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$$

with underlying equivalence constants independent of  $\theta$ .

*Proof.* We use the retraction method of interpolation, which implies that

$$\|f\|_{(\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{s_0}(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{s_1}(\mathbb{R}^d))_{\theta,1}} \approx \|\{\dot{\Delta}_j f\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}\|_{(\ell_1^{s_0}(L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)), \ell_1^{s_1}(L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)))_{\theta,1}}$$

with constants independent of  $\theta$ . On the other hand, it follows from (A.2) that, for  $\{f_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \ell_1^{s_0}(L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)) + \ell_1^{s_1}(L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\{f_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}\|_{(\ell_1^{s_0}(L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)), \ell_1^{s_1}(L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)))_{\theta,1}} &\approx \sum_{\nu=-\infty}^{\infty} 2^{-\theta\nu(s_1-s_0)} K(2^{\nu(s_1-s_0)}, \{f_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}; \ell_1^{s_0}(L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)), \ell_1^{s_1}(L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))) \\ &\approx \sum_{\nu=-\infty}^{\infty} 2^{-\theta\nu(s_1-s_0)} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \min\{2^{js_0}, 2^{js_1} 2^{\nu(s_1-s_0)}\} \|f_j\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &= \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} 2^{js_0} \|f_j\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \left( 2^{j(s_1-s_0)} \sum_{\nu=-\infty}^{-j} 2^{\nu(s_1-s_0)(1-\theta)} + \sum_{\nu=-j}^{\infty} 2^{-\theta\nu(s_1-s_0)} \right) \\ &\approx (\theta(1-\theta))^{-1} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} 2^{js} \|f_j\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{(\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{s_0}(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^{s_1}(\mathbb{R}^d))_{\theta,1}^\blacktriangleleft} &\approx (\theta(1-\theta)) \|\{\dot{\Delta}_j f\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}\|_{(\ell_1^{s_0}(L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)), \ell_1^{s_1}(L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)))_{\theta,1}} \\ &\approx \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} 2^{js} \|\dot{\Delta}_j f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,1}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)}, \end{aligned}$$

as we wished to show.  $\square$

*Remark A.2.* The above proof can be easily adapted to deal with the general scale of the Besov spaces  $\dot{B}_{p,q}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Namely, if  $1 \leq p, q \leq \infty$ ,  $-\infty < s_0 < s_1 < \infty$ ,  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ , and  $s = (1 - \theta)s_0 + \theta s_1$ , then

$$(\dot{B}_{p,q}^{s_0}(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{B}_{p,q}^{s_1}(\mathbb{R}^d))_{\theta,q}^\blacktriangleleft = \dot{B}_{p,q}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$$

with equivalence constants independent of  $\theta$ .

## A.2. Results from Section 1.3.

A.2.1. *Characterizations of  $\Delta$ -extrapolation spaces.* A very useful result for the computation of  $\Delta$ -extrapolation spaces is the formula (1.20), which for convenience we reproduce here

$$(A.3) \quad \Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(A_0, A_1)_{\theta, p(\theta)}^{\blacktriangleleft}}{\Theta\left(\frac{1}{1-\theta}\right)} \right\} = \Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(A_0, A_1)_{\theta, \infty}^{\blacktriangleleft}}{\Theta\left(\frac{1}{1-\theta}\right)} \right\}.$$

The result is used implicitly in [19] and a detailed proof can be found in [27, Theorem 21, page 44]. Further results and generalizations can be found in [23]. The import of (A.3) relies on the fact that the norm of the space on the right-hand side is a double supremum, which allows us to apply ‘‘Fubini’’ as follows

$$(A.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \|f\|_{\Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(A_0, A_1)_{\theta, \infty}^{\blacktriangleleft}}{\Theta\left(\frac{1}{1-\theta}\right)} \right\}} &= \sup_{\theta \in (0,1)} \sup_{t > 0} \frac{t^{-\theta} K(t, f; A_0, A_1)}{\Theta\left(\frac{1}{1-\theta}\right)} \\ &= \sup_{t > 0} \frac{K(t, f; A_0, A_1)}{t} \sup_{\theta \in (0,1)} \frac{t^{1-\theta}}{\Theta\left(\frac{1}{1-\theta}\right)} \\ &= \sup_{t > 0} \frac{K(t, f; A_0, A_1)}{t \inf_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \Theta\left(\frac{1}{1-\theta}\right) t^{-(1-\theta)} \right\}} \\ &= \sup_{t > 0} \frac{K(t^{1/p_0}, f; A_0, A_1)}{t^{1/p_0} \varphi_{\Theta}\left(\frac{1}{t}\right)}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\varphi_{\Theta}(t) = \inf_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \Theta\left(\frac{1}{1-\theta}\right) t^{\frac{1-\theta}{p_0}} \right\}, \quad p_0 > 0.$$

The  $\varphi_{\Theta}$  functions thus played a major role in [19]. Remarkably, as we pointed out in Section 1.3, although coming from completely different considerations they essentially coincide with the original Yudovich functions  $y_{\Theta}$  (cf. (1.5))

$$(A.5) \quad \varphi_{\Theta}(t) \approx y_{\Theta}(t);$$

see also (1.25).

In this paper we make a strong use of both (A.3) and (A.4). In particular, to give an explicit characterization of the Yudovich spaces  $Y^{\Theta}$  (cf. (1.24) and (1.26)) and the sharp Yudovich spaces  $Y^{\#\Theta}$  (cf. Theorem 2.2, specially (2.11) and (2.12)), to establish various characterizations of the Vishik spaces  $B_{\Pi}^{\beta}$  (cf. Theorem 3.2, in particular, (3.4)), and to get estimates for the modulus of smoothness (cf. (2.28)).

A.2.2. *Reiteration.* The scale  $\{(A_0, A_1)_{\theta, p(\theta)}\}_{\theta \in (0,1)}$  is an example of *interpolation scale of exact order  $\theta$* . We refer to [19, p. 7] for the precise definition. Another important example is given by  $\{(A_0, A_1)_{\theta, p}^{\blacktriangleleft}\}_{\theta \in (0,1)}$  for a fixed  $p \in [1, \infty]$  (cf. (1.18)). It turns out that the extrapolation formula (A.3) is only a special case of a more general phenomenon based on interpolation scales of exact order  $\theta$ . In particular, the formula is still valid when  $\{(A_0, A_1)_{\theta, p(\theta)}\}_{\theta \in (0,1)}$  is replaced by  $\{(A_0, A_1)_{\theta, p}^{\blacktriangleleft}\}_{\theta \in (0,1)}$ , namely,

$$(A.6) \quad \Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(A_0, A_1)_{\theta, p}^{\blacktriangleleft}}{\Theta\left(\frac{1}{1-\theta}\right)} \right\} = \Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(A_0, A_1)_{\theta, \infty}^{\blacktriangleleft}}{\Theta\left(\frac{1}{1-\theta}\right)} \right\}.$$

See [27, Theorem 21, page 44].



The ordered case  $A_1 \hookrightarrow A_0$ . In this case we can achieve further simplifications for the computation of the  $\Delta$ -extrapolation spaces. In particular, we claim that

$$(A.7) \quad \Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(A_0, A_1)_{\theta, p(\theta)}^{\blacktriangleleft}}{\Theta(\frac{1}{1-\theta})} \right\} = \Delta_{\theta \in (\theta_0, 1)} \left\{ \frac{(A_0, A_1)_{\theta, p(\theta)}^{\blacktriangleleft}}{\Theta(\frac{1}{1-\theta})} \right\}$$

for every  $\theta_0 \in (0, 1)$ . This result may be considered as the extrapolation version of the fact that the definitions of  $Y_{p_0}^{\ominus}(\Omega)$  and  $Y_{p_0}^{\# \ominus}(\Omega)$  with  $|\Omega| < \infty$  are independent of  $p_0 \in [1, \infty)$ . Indeed, recall that  $Y_{p_0}^{\ominus}(\Omega)$  and  $Y_{p_0}^{\# \ominus}(\Omega)$  are the  $\Delta$ -extrapolation spaces relative to the pairs  $(L^{p_0}(\Omega), L^{\infty}(\Omega))$  and  $(L^{p_0}(\Omega), \text{BMO}(\Omega))$ , respectively; cf. (1.23)-(1.24) and (2.1)-(2.2).

*Proof of (A.7).* The non trivial part of the statement is the embedding  $\hookleftarrow$ . This can be derived as follows. We have

$$\|f\|_{\Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(A_0, A_1)_{\theta, p(\theta)}^{\blacktriangleleft}}{\Theta(\frac{1}{1-\theta})} \right\}} \leq \|f\|_{\Delta_{\theta \in (0, \theta_0)} \left\{ \frac{(A_0, A_1)_{\theta, p(\theta)}^{\blacktriangleleft}}{\Theta(\frac{1}{1-\theta})} \right\}} + \|f\|_{\Delta_{\theta \in (\theta_0, 1)} \left\{ \frac{(A_0, A_1)_{\theta, p(\theta)}^{\blacktriangleleft}}{\Theta(\frac{1}{1-\theta})} \right\}}.$$

To estimate the first term on the right-hand side of the previous inequality, we will make use of the fact that

$$(A.8) \quad (A_0, A_1)_{\theta_0, p(\theta_0)} \hookrightarrow (A_0, A_1)_{\theta, p(\theta)}^{\blacktriangleleft} \quad \text{if} \quad \theta < \theta_0,$$

where the embedding constant is independent of  $\theta$ . This result can be shown by using similar techniques as in [14, Lemma 4.5(ii)]. To make the presentation self-contained, we next provide full details. Using that  $A_1 \hookrightarrow A_0$ , it is plain to see that

$$K(t, f; A_0, A_1) \approx \|f\|_{A_0} \approx K(1, f; A_0, A_1), \quad \text{for} \quad t > 1.$$

Then, by Hölder's inequality (noting that  $p(\theta) = \frac{1}{1-\theta} < \frac{1}{1-\theta_0} = p(\theta_0)$ ) and monotonicity properties of  $K$ -functionals,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{(A_0, A_1)_{\theta, p(\theta)}^{p(\theta)}}^{p(\theta)} &= \int_0^1 [t^{-\theta} K(t, f; A_0, A_1)]^{p(\theta)} \frac{dt}{t} + \int_1^{\infty} [t^{-\theta} K(t, f; A_0, A_1)]^{p(\theta)} \frac{dt}{t} \\ &\approx \int_0^1 [t^{-\theta} K(t, f; A_0, A_1)]^{p(\theta)} \frac{dt}{t} + \frac{1}{\theta p(\theta)} \|f\|_{A_0}^{p(\theta)} \\ &\leq \left( \int_0^1 [t^{-\theta_0} K(t, f; A_0, A_1)]^{p(\theta_0)} \frac{dt}{t} \right)^{p(\theta)/p(\theta_0)} + \frac{1}{\theta p(\theta)} \|f\|_{A_0}^{p(\theta)} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\theta} \left( \int_0^1 [t^{-\theta_0} K(t, f; A_0, A_1)]^{p(\theta_0)} \frac{dt}{t} \right)^{p(\theta)/p(\theta_0)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\theta} \|f\|_{(A_0, A_1)_{\theta_0, p(\theta_0)}^{p(\theta_0)}}^{p(\theta)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have also used that  $\theta \in (0, \theta_0)$  (and so  $p(\theta) \approx 1$ ) in the penultimate estimate. The proof of (A.8) is finished.

It follows from (A.8) that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\theta \in (0, \theta_0)} \frac{\|f\|_{(A_0, A_1)_{\theta, p(\theta)}^{\blacktriangleleft}}}{\Theta\left(\frac{1}{1-\theta}\right)} &\lesssim \|f\|_{(A_0, A_1)_{\theta_0, p(\theta_0)}} \sup_{\theta \in (0, \theta_0)} \frac{1}{\Theta\left(\frac{1}{1-\theta}\right)} \\ &= \frac{\|f\|_{(A_0, A_1)_{\theta_0, p(\theta_0)}}}{\Theta(1)} \\ &\lesssim \sup_{\theta \in (\theta_0, 1)} \frac{\|f\|_{(A_0, A_1)_{\theta, p(\theta)}^{\blacktriangleleft}}}{\Theta\left(\frac{1}{1-\theta}\right)}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of (A.7). □

**A.3. Computability of  $K$ -functionals.** A central issue in interpolation theory is to find explicit expressions for  $K$ -functionals. Next we list some well-known examples of characterizations for  $K$ -functionals (see also Example 5) and we refer the interested reader to [5, 6] for further examples.

**Example 6.** Let  $(L^{p_0}(\Omega), L^\infty(\Omega))$ ,  $p_0 \in (0, \infty)$ . Then (cf. [6, Theorem 5.2.1, page 109] and [5, Theorem 1.6, page 298])

$$(A.9) \quad K(t, f; L^{p_0}(\Omega), L^\infty(\Omega)) \approx \left( \int_0^{t^{p_0}} (f^*(\xi))^{p_0} d\xi \right)^{1/p_0}.$$

Equality holds in (A.9) if  $p_0 = 1$ .

**Example 7.** Let  $(L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^d), \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ ,  $p_0 \in (0, \infty)$ . Then (cf. [20, Corollary 3.3])

$$(A.10) \quad K(t, f; L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^d), \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^d)) \approx \left( \int_0^{t^{p_0}} [(M_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\# f)^*(\xi)]^{p_0} d\xi \right)^{1/p_0},$$

where  $M_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\#$  is the maximal function given in (1.16). The local counterpart for function spaces defined on cubes also holds true. In order to suitably interpret  $(L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^d), \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^d))$  as an interpolation pair, it is necessary to factor out constant functions. Then  $L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  can be identified with  $L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)/\mathbb{C}$ , where  $\|f\|_{L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)/\mathbb{C}} = \inf_{c \in \mathbb{C}} \|f - c\|_{L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)}$ .

**Example 8.** The  $K$ -functional for the pair  $(L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{W}_\infty^1(\mathbb{R}^d))$  plays an important role in our work (cf. (1.30)) and can be characterized as (cf. [5, (4.42), p. 341] and [22, Theorem 1])

$$(A.11) \quad K(t, f; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), \dot{W}_\infty^1(\mathbb{R}^d)) \approx \sup_{|x-y| \leq t} |f(x) - f(y)|.$$

The corresponding formula for periodic functions is also true.

A natural assumption for  $(A_0, A_1)$  is to be *Gagliardo closed* in the sense that

$$\|f\|_{A_0} \approx \sup_{t>0} K(t, f; A_0, A_1) \quad \text{and} \quad \|f\|_{A_1} \approx \sup_{t>0} \frac{K(t, f; A_0, A_1)}{t}.$$

See [5, p. 320]. This condition is easily verified for many classical pairs of spaces, in particular, for the pairs given in Examples 6–8.

**Proposition 3.** *Suppose that  $(A_0, A_1)$  is Gagliardo closed, and let  $\Theta(p) \approx 1$ . Then*

$$\Delta_{\theta \in (0, 1)} \left\{ \frac{(A_0, A_1)_{\theta, p(\theta)}^{\blacktriangleleft}}{\Theta\left(\frac{1}{1-\theta}\right)} \right\} = A_0 \cap A_1.$$

*Proof.* Using (A.3) and the monotonicity properties of  $K$ -functionals (note that  $K(t, f; A_0, A_1)$  increases and  $\frac{K(t, f; A_0, A_1)}{t}$  decreases), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f\|_{\Delta_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{(A_0, A_1)_{\theta, p(\theta)}^\blacktriangleleft}{\Theta(\frac{1}{1-\theta})} \right\}} &\approx \sup_{\theta \in (0,1)} \sup_{t > 0} t^{-\theta} K(t, f; A_0, A_1) \\
&\approx \sup_{\theta \in (0,1)} \sup_{t > 1} t^{-\theta} K(t, f; A_0, A_1) + \sup_{\theta \in (0,1)} \sup_{t < 1} t^{-\theta} K(t, f; A_0, A_1) \\
&= \sup_{t > 1} K(t, f; A_0, A_1) \sup_{\theta \in (0,1)} t^{-\theta} + \sup_{t < 1} \frac{K(t, f; A_0, A_1)}{t} \sup_{\theta \in (0,1)} t^{1-\theta} \\
&= \sup_{t > 1} K(t, f; A_0, A_1) + \sup_{t < 1} \frac{K(t, f; A_0, A_1)}{t} \\
&\approx \|f\|_{A_0} + \|f\|_{A_1}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

The previous result can be used to readily justify the assertions made in (1.4) and (1.15) for  $Y_{p_0}^\Theta(\Omega)$  and  $Y_{p_0}^{\#\Theta}(\Omega)$  via the extrapolation formulae (1.24) and (2.2). For Vishik spaces, we have  $\dot{B}_\Pi^\beta(\mathbb{R}^d) = \dot{B}_{\infty,1}^\beta(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $\Pi(p) \approx 1$ , and one could apply Proposition 3 to obtain the corresponding result that appears in (3.3).

## REFERENCES

- [1] D. Albritton, E. Brué, M. Colombo, C. De Lellis, V. Giri, M. Janisch, and H. Kwon, *Instability and nonuniqueness for the 2d Euler equations in vorticity form, after M. Vishik*. IAS Lecture Notes, Princeton 2022 (to appear in *Annals of Math. Studies*). 4
- [2] L. Ambrosio and P. Bernard, *Uniqueness of signed measures solving the continuity equation for Osgood vector fields*. *Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Lincei Mat. Appl.* **19** (2008), 237–245. 9
- [3] J. Azzam and J. Bedrossian, *Bounded mean oscillation and the uniqueness of active scalar equations*. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **367** (2015), 3095–3118. 4
- [4] H. Bahouri, J.-Y. Chemin, and R. Danchin, *Fourier Analysis and Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations*. Springer, Heidelberg, 2011. 9
- [5] C. Bennett and R. Sharpley, *Interpolation of Operators*. Academic Press, Boston, 1988. 6, 7, 17, 18, 19, 34
- [6] J. Bergh and J. Löfström, *Interpolation Spaces. An Introduction*. Springer, Berlin, 1976. 6, 22, 27, 30, 31, 34
- [7] L. Caravenna and G. Crippa, *A directional Lipschitz extension lemma, with applications to uniqueness and Lagrangianity for the continuity equation*. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **46** (2021), 1488–1520. 9
- [8] D. Chae, P. Degond, and J.-G. Liu, *Well-posedness for Hall-magnetohydrodynamics*. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* **31** (2014), 555–565. 13
- [9] J.-Y. Chemin, *Fluides parfaits incompressibles*. *Astérisque* **230** (1995), 177 pp. 2
- [10] A. Clop, H. Jylhä, J. Mateu, and J. Orobitg, *Well-posedness for the continuity equation for vector fields with suitable modulus of continuity*. *J. Funct. Anal.* **276** (2019), 45–77. 9
- [11] P. Constantin, A.J. Majda, and E. Tabak, *Formation of strong fronts in the 2-D quasigeostrophic thermal active scalar*. *Nonlinearity* **7** (1994), 1495–1533. 13
- [12] G. Crippa and G. Stefani, *An elementary proof of existence and uniqueness for the Euler flow in localized Yudovich spaces*. Preprint (2021), <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2110.15648.pdf> 3, 9
- [13] R. DeVore and K. Scherer, *Interpolation of linear operators on Sobolev spaces*. *Ann. of Math.* **109** (1979), 583–599. 8
- [14] O. Domínguez and M. Milman, *Bourgain–Brezis–Mironescu–Maz’ya–Shaposhnikova limit formulae for fractional Sobolev spaces via interpolation and extrapolation*. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* **62** (2023), 37 pp. 33
- [15] O. Domínguez and S. Tikhonov, *New estimates for the maximal functions and applications*. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **375** (2022), 3969–4018. 20
- [16] C. Fefferman and E.M. Stein,  *$H^p$  spaces of several variables*. *Acta Math.* **129** (1972), 137–193. 5, 17

- [17] K. Gröchenig and M. Piotrowski, *Molecules in coorbit spaces and boundedness of operators*. Studia Math. **192** (2009), 61–77. [27](#)
- [18] B. Jawerth and M. Milman, *A theory of Extrapolation Spaces. First Applications*. Compt. Rend. Acad. Sc. Paris **308** (1989), 175–179; *A theory of Extrapolation Spaces. Further Applications*. Compt. Rend. Acad. Sc. Paris **309** (1989), 225–229. [6](#), [7](#)
- [19] B. Jawerth and M. Milman, *Extrapolation Spaces with Applications*. Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **89** (1991), 82 pp. [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [32](#)
- [20] B. Jawerth and A. Torchinsky, *Local sharp maximal functions*. J. Approx. Theory **43** (1985), 231–270. [5](#), [10](#), [17](#), [34](#)
- [21] F. John and L. Nirenberg, *On functions of bounded mean oscillation*. Commun. Pure Appl. Math. **14** (1961), 415–426. [3](#), [4](#), [17](#)
- [22] H. Johnen and K. Scherer, *On the equivalence of the  $K$ -functional and moduli of continuity and some applications*. In: Constructive Theory of Functions of Several Variables (Proc. Conf., Math. Res. Inst., Oberwolfach, 1976), pp. 119–140. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. **571**. Springer, Berlin, 1977. [34](#)
- [23] G. Karadzhov and M. Milman, *Extrapolation theory: New results and applications*. J. Approx. Theory **133** (2005), 38–99. [7](#), [32](#)
- [24] A. Kiselev, *Small scales and singularity formation in fluid dynamics*. In: Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians–Rio de Janeiro 2018, in: Invited lectures, vol. III, World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, 2018, pp. 2363–2390. [13](#)
- [25] S. G. Krein, Yu. I. Petunin, and E. M. Semenov, *Interpolation of Linear Operators*. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1982. [7](#)
- [26] P.-L. Lions, *Mathematical Topics in Fluid Mechanics. Vol. 1. Incompressible Models*. Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications, Oxford, 1996. [2](#), [9](#)
- [27] M. Milman, *Extrapolation and Optimal Decompositions with Applications to Analysis*. Lect. Notes Math. **1580**. Springer, Berlin, 1994. [32](#)
- [28] M. Milman, *A note on reversed Hardy inequalities and Gehring’s lemma*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **50** (1997), 311–315. [14](#)
- [29] S. M. Nikol’skiĭ, *Approximation of Functions of Several Variables and Imbedding Theorems*. Springer, New York, 1975. [27](#), [29](#)
- [30] J. Peetre, *On convolution operators leaving  $L^{p,\lambda}$  spaces invariant*. Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. **72** (1966), 295–304. [17](#)
- [31] E. M. Stein, *Singular integrals and differentiability properties of functions*, Princeton Univ. Press, 1970. [14](#), [18](#)
- [32] M. Vishik, *Incompressible flows of an ideal fluid with vorticity in borderline spaces of Besov type*. Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. **32** (1999), 769–812. [3](#), [4](#), [12](#)
- [33] M. Vishik, *Instability and non-uniqueness in the Cauchy problem for the Euler equations of an ideal incompressible fluid. Part I*, 2018. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1805.09426.pdf> [4](#)
- [34] M. Vishik, *Instability and non-uniqueness in the Cauchy problem for the Euler equations of an ideal incompressible fluid. Part II*, 2018. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1805.09440.pdf> [4](#)
- [35] V.I. Yudovich, *Non-stationary flows of an ideal incompressible fluid*. Z. Vycisl. Mat. i Mat. Fiz. **3** (1963), 1032–1066. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [9](#)
- [36] V.I. Yudovich, *Uniqueness theorem for the basic nonstationary problem in the dynamics of an ideal incompressible fluid*. Math. Res. Lett. **2** (1995), 27–38. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [7](#), [8](#), [9](#)

DEPARTAMENTO DE ANÁLISIS MATEMÁTICO Y MATEMÁTICA APLICADA, FACULTAD DE MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD COMPLUTENSE DE MADRID, PLAZA DE CIENCIAS 3, 28040 MADRID, SPAIN

*Email address:* [oscar.dominguez@ucm.es](mailto:oscar.dominguez@ucm.es)

INSTITUTO ARGENTINO DE MATEMATICA, BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINA

*Email address:* [mario.milman@icloud.com](mailto:mario.milman@icloud.com)

*URL:* <https://sites.google.com/site/mariomilman>