

ON GALERKIN APPROXIMATIONS OF THE NAVIER–STOKES EQUATIONS IN THE LIMIT OF LARGE GRASHOF NUMBERS

CIPRIAN FOIAS, LUAN HOANG¹, AND MICHAEL S. JOLLY²

ABSTRACT. We examine how stationary solutions to Galerkin approximations of the Navier–Stokes equations behave in the limit as the Grashof number G tends to ∞ . An appropriate scaling is used to place the Grashof number as a new coefficient of the nonlinear term, while the body force is fixed. A new type of asymptotic expansion, as $G \rightarrow \infty$, for a family of solutions is introduced. Relations among the terms in the expansion are obtained by following a procedure that compares and totally orders positive sequences generated by the expansion. The same methodology applies to the case of perturbed body forces and similar results are obtained. We demonstrate with a class of forces and solutions that have convergent asymptotic expansions in G . All the results hold in both two and three dimensions, as well as for both no-slip and periodic boundary conditions.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Preliminaries	3
3. Main results	6
3.1. Implications for the NSE	8
4. General expansion results	10
4.1. A numerical demonstration for the 3D NSE	14
4.2. On the uniqueness of strict unitary expansions	15
4.3. Examples	16
5. Proofs of main results	18
5.1. Proof of Proposition 3.3	18
5.2. Proof of Theorem 3.5	19
5.3. Proof of Proposition 3.6	20
5.4. Proof of Proposition 3.7	22
6. Expanded force case	23
Appendix A.	33
References	35

Date: February 1, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35Q30, 76D05, 76F02, 35C20, 41A60.

Key words and phrases. Navier–Stokes equations, Galerkin approximation, large Grashof number, steady states, asymptotic expansion.

1. INTRODUCTION

Turbulent behavior of solutions to the Navier–Stokes equations (NSE) is generally expected for very large Grashof numbers G (see definition (2.9)) [5]. This is preceded by progressively complicated behavior typically observed as G increases (for an exception see [10]). In general, the unique, asymptotically stable steady state at very small values of G bifurcates. Depending on the particular body force, this produces multiple steady states and/or periodic solutions which in turn, often period double, breaking symmetries and leading to dynamics of increasing complexity [9]. That long time behavior is contained in the global attractor \mathcal{A} whose fractal dimension, $\dim_{\text{F}}(\mathcal{A})$, is bounded by cG , ($cG^{2/3}(\log G)^{1/3}$ for periodic boundary conditions) for some constant c [12].

The Galerkin approximation method plays an important role in the study of the NSE. It is used both to prove existence of solutions and as an approach to numerical simulations. As G increases, one can expect to need more terms in the Galerkin basis (at least comparable to $\dim_{\text{F}}(\mathcal{A})$) to obtain accurate numerical results. Nevertheless, in practice, one often seeks insight in the behavior of solutions for large G for a fixed Galerkin approximation.

In this paper we study the limit as $G_n \rightarrow \infty$ for sequences of steady state solutions $(v_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of a fixed Galerkin approximation of the NSE. The results apply to both periodic and no-slip boundary conditions in both two and three dimensions. (For certain properties of the set of steady state solutions of the NSE, see [3, 4, 7, 8, 11].) This is done through a new type of expansion in the form

$$v_n = v + \Gamma_{1,n}w_1 + \Gamma_{2,n}w_2 + \cdots + \Gamma_{k,n}w_k + \cdots,$$

where $\Gamma_{k,n}$'s are positive numbers converging to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and w_k 's are unit vectors. We show that any convergent sequence has a subsequence with such an expansion. The payoff is a collection of results that prescribe particular algebraic relations between the limit, v , and some of the fixed vectors w_k in the expansion. Since no assumptions are made on the body force, there are a multiple, yet finite number of possible cases, independent of the number of modes in the Galerkin approximation. Which case applies for a particular force can be suggested by comparing combinations of $\Gamma_{k,n}$ with G_n , as we demonstrate with a numerical simulation.

We now describe the progression of the paper. In Section 2, after recalling basic facts about the NSE, we rescale it, see (2.5), (2.9) and (2.10), to equation (2.11) with the body force having a fixed L^2 -norm. We state the main results in Section 3. Their proofs are left to Sections 4 and 5. The starting point is the asymptotic expansion (3.2) which leads to the formal equation (3.4). The idea is to order the sequences of coefficients in (3.4), as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Such an order is introduced in Definition 3.1. The rigorous treatment requires Lemma 3.2, Proposition 3.3 and a set of equivalence classes which finally lead to Definition 3.4. The main idea is summarized in the General Procedure (3.9). Our main results concerning the asymptotic expansion (3.2) for the NSE are Theorem 3.5 and Propositions 3.6, 3.7 in subsection 3.1.

To make rigorous the comparison of terms in different sequences requires some general results, independent of the NSE. In Section 4, a new notion of asymptotic expansions - called strict unitary expansions - is defined in Definition 4.1. It, in fact, is inspired by Lemma 4.2 which proves that any bounded sequence in a finite dimensional normed space has a subsequence that possesses such a strict unitary expansion. The proof of that lemma involves taking convergent subsequences on the unit sphere, which is where the finite dimensionality

of Galerkin approximations is needed. Numerical results are presented in subsection 4.1 for the 3D, periodic case, which demonstrate both the construction of the expansions as well as a particular case of Theorem 3.5. The strict unitary expansions turn out to be “asymptotically unique” as stated and proved in Proposition 4.3. Subsection 4.3 contains some examples which show that the strict unitary expansion can be very simple in \mathbb{R} , but can also be quite different from the Taylor expansion for the same sequence. With these facts at hand, we present in Section 5 the proofs of the main results that were stated in Section 3.

We then apply these ideas to the case of a perturbed force, g_n , in Section 6. The main result is Theorem 6.1, which relates expansions of both g_n and the solution v_n in (6.2) with the Grashof number G_n . Theorem 6.7 and Remark 6.8 show that in certain cases the procedure (3.9) in Section 3 works for equation (6.1). Theorem 6.12 and Remark 6.14 show that a different asymptotic expansion of g_n may lead to an unexpected expansion of the solution v_n . This section may be useful in interpreting numerical results or detecting when they are false. The reason is that the solutions solved numerically for the case of a fixed force g are, inevitably, inexact. Yet they can be viewed as satisfying the Galerkin approximation with a different force g_n , close to g . Some of the more technical proofs are gathered in the Appendix.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that the new type of asymptotic expansion in this paper can be applied to other nonlinear ordinary/partial differential equations. In particular, the Kuramoto–Sivashinsky, Rayleigh–Bénard, and magnetohydrodynamic equations can all be expressed in the same the functional form (2.1), for certain linear operators A and bilinear operators B [12].

2. PRELIMINARIES

The incompressible NSE for velocity $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t)$, pressure $p(\mathbf{x}, t)$ with a time-independent body force $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$, for the spatial variables $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ($d = 2, 3$) and time variable $t \geq 0$, are

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} - \nu \Delta \mathbf{u} + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u} + \nabla p = \mathbf{f}, \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0, \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

where $\nu > 0$ is the kinematic viscosity.

Periodic boundary condition. We consider the NSE with periodic boundary conditions in $\Omega = [0, L]^d$ for some $L > 0$. Let \mathcal{V} denote the set of \mathbb{R}^d -valued Ω -periodic divergence-free trigonometric polynomials with zero average over Ω . Define the spaces $H = \text{closure of } \mathcal{V} \text{ in } L^2(\Omega)^d$, $V = \text{closure of } \mathcal{V} \text{ in } H^1(\Omega)^d$.

No-slip boundary condition. Consider the NSE in an open, connected, bounded set Ω in \mathbb{R}^d with C^2 -boundary $\partial\Omega$. Let \mathbf{n} denote the outward normal vector on the boundary. Under the no-slip boundary condition

$$\mathbf{u} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega,$$

the relevant spaces are

$$H = \{\mathbf{u} \in L^2(\Omega)^d : \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0, \quad \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\}, \quad V = \{\mathbf{u} \in H_0^1(\Omega)^d : \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0\}. \quad (2.2)$$

The scalar product and its associated norm in H are those of $L^2(\Omega)^d$ and are denoted by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and $|\cdot|$, respectively. (We also use $|\cdot|$ for the modulus of a vector in \mathbb{C}^d ; we assume that the meaning will be clear from the context.)

Let \mathcal{P} be the Helmholtz-Leray projection, that is, the orthogonal projection in $L^2(\Omega)^d$ onto H . The Stokes operator is $A = -\mathcal{P}\Delta$ defined on $D(A) := V \cap H^2(\Omega)^d$ which is called the domain of A . The domain of $A^{1/2}$ is $D(A^{1/2}) = V$, and the natural norm on V is

$$\|u\| = |A^{1/2}u| = \left(\int_{\Omega} \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} u(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} u(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \right)^{1/2}.$$

The bilinear operator B is defined as

$$B(u, v) = \mathcal{P}((u \cdot \nabla)v), \text{ for } u, v \in D(A).$$

Assume $\mathbf{f} \in H$. The NSE (2.1) can be written as a differential equation in an appropriate functional space (see [1] or [12]),

$$\frac{du}{dt} + \nu Au + B(u, u) = f, \quad (2.3)$$

where $u(t) = \mathbf{u}(\cdot, t)$ and $f = \mathbf{f}(\cdot)$.

The operator A is positive, self-adjoint with a compact inverse, and its eigenvalues are positive numbers

$$\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \lambda_3 \leq \dots \text{ satisfying } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n = \infty.$$

Moreover, each eigenspace of A is finite dimensional. The bilinear term enjoys the orthogonality relations (see for instance [12])

$$\langle B(u, v), w \rangle = -\langle B(u, w), v \rangle, \text{ so that } \langle B(u, v), v \rangle = 0 \text{ for } u, v, w \in D(A). \quad (2.4)$$

We denote $\kappa_0 = \lambda_1^{1/2}$ and make the following change of variables

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t) &= \nu \kappa_0 \tilde{\mathbf{u}}(\kappa_0 \mathbf{x}, \nu \kappa_0^2 t) = \nu \kappa_0 \tilde{\mathbf{u}}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{t}), \\ p(\mathbf{x}, t) &= \nu^2 \kappa_0^2 \tilde{p}(\kappa_0 \mathbf{x}, \nu \kappa_0^2 t) = \nu^2 \kappa_0^2 \tilde{p}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{t}), \\ \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) &= \nu^2 \kappa_0^3 \tilde{\mathbf{f}}(\kappa_0 \mathbf{x}) = \nu^2 \kappa_0^3 \tilde{\mathbf{f}}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}), \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

to obtain

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \tilde{\mathbf{u}}}{\partial \tilde{t}} - \Delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}} \tilde{\mathbf{u}} + (\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \nabla_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}) \tilde{\mathbf{u}} + \nabla_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}} \tilde{p} = \tilde{\mathbf{f}}, \\ \operatorname{div}_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}} \tilde{\mathbf{u}} = 0, \end{cases} \quad (2.6)$$

for the new domain $\tilde{\Omega} = \kappa_0 \Omega$. One can verify that the corresponding boundary conditions for $\tilde{\Omega}$ are also satisfied. Similar to (2.3) we can rewrite (2.6) as

$$\frac{d\tilde{u}}{d\tilde{t}} + \tilde{A}\tilde{u} + \tilde{B}(\tilde{u}, \tilde{u}) = \tilde{f}, \quad (2.7)$$

where $\tilde{u}(\tilde{t}) = \tilde{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot, \tilde{t})$ and $\tilde{f} = \tilde{\mathbf{f}}(\cdot)$.

The corresponding Stokes operator is \tilde{A} which has positive, strictly increasing eigenvalues $\tilde{\lambda}_n$ that go to infinity as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

For the periodic boundary condition, $A = -\Delta$ on $D(A)$ and the eigenvalues of A are of the form

$$\left(\frac{2\pi}{L} \right)^2 \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{k}, \text{ where } \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}.$$

Therefore, $\lambda_1 = (2\pi/L)^2$, $\kappa_0 = 2\pi/L$, $\tilde{\Omega} = [0, 2\pi]^d$ and $\tilde{\lambda}_1 = 1$.

For the no-slip boundary condition, if λ is eigenvalue of A then

$$-\Delta \mathbf{u} = \lambda \mathbf{u} - \nabla q, \quad \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0, \quad \mathbf{u}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \quad \text{for } \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0. \quad (2.8)$$

Similar to (2.5), we make the following change of variables $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = \kappa_0 \mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}) = \tilde{\mathbf{u}}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})$ and $q(\mathbf{x}) = \kappa_0 \tilde{q}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})$. Then the eigenvalue problem (2.8) is equivalent to

$$-\Delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}} \tilde{\mathbf{u}} = \lambda \kappa_0^{-2} \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \nabla_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}} \tilde{q}, \quad \operatorname{div}_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}} \tilde{\mathbf{u}} = 0, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{u}}|_{\partial\tilde{\Omega}} = 0, \quad \text{for } \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \neq 0,$$

which is the eigenvalue problem for \tilde{A} . Thus $\tilde{\lambda}_1 = \lambda_1 \kappa_0^{-2} = 1$.

The dimensionless Grashof number is given by

$$G = \|\tilde{f}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})^d} = \left(\int_{\tilde{\Omega}} |\tilde{\mathbf{f}}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})|^2 d\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \right)^{1/2} = \frac{1}{\nu^2 \kappa_0^{3-d/2}} \left(\int_{\Omega} |\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})|^2 d\mathbf{x} \right)^{1/2}. \quad (2.9)$$

We set

$$\tilde{g} = \tilde{f}/G \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{v} = \tilde{u}/G. \quad (2.10)$$

Dividing (2.7) by G , using the bilinearity of \tilde{B} , and suppressing the tildes, we have

$$\frac{dv}{dt} + Av + GB(v, v) = g, \quad v \in H. \quad (2.11)$$

Note that g in (2.11) satisfies $\|g\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d} = 1$. Also, the Stokes operator A in (2.11) has the first eigenvalue $\lambda_1 = 1$, which implies

$$|Au| \geq \|u\| \geq |u| \quad \text{for all } u \in D(A). \quad (2.12)$$

The Galerkin approximation. Let $(\varphi_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ be an orthonormal basis of H for which each φ_k is an eigenfunction of A . (Such a basis exists thanks to the standard theory of the Stokes operator.) Define Π_N to be the orthogonal projection in H onto the subspace $\operatorname{span}\{\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_N\}$. The Galerkin approximation of (2.11) is

$$\frac{dv}{dt} + Av + G\Pi_N B(v, v) = \Pi_N g, \quad v \in \Pi_N H. \quad (2.13)$$

Let $\mathcal{H} = \Pi_N H$. Then \mathcal{H} is a finite dimensional Hilbert space with the scalar product and norm inherited from H . The corresponding steady state equation for (2.13), after suppressing projector Π_N , is

$$Av + GB(v, v) = g, \quad (2.14)$$

where $g, v \in \mathcal{H}$, and we re-denoted

$$B(u, v) = \Pi_N \mathcal{P}((u \cdot \nabla)v) \quad \text{for } u, v \in \mathcal{H}. \quad (2.15)$$

We will examine the behavior of solutions of (2.14) for Grashof number $G \rightarrow \infty$.

In the presentation below, for convenience, we denote

$$B_s(u, v) = B(u, v) + B(v, u).$$

Similar to (2.4), we have for B defined in (2.15) that

$$\langle B(u, v), w \rangle = -\langle B(u, w), v \rangle, \quad \text{and} \quad \langle B(u, v), v \rangle = 0 \quad \text{for } u, v, w \in \mathcal{H}. \quad (2.16)$$

Very often, $\Pi_N = \bar{P}_\Lambda$ for some eigenvalue Λ of A . Here, even for any number $\Lambda \geq \lambda_1$, \bar{P}_Λ is the orthogonal projection in H onto the sum of all eigenspaces of A corresponding to the eigenvalues that are less than or equal to Λ .

For the periodic boundary condition, we may express an element in H as a Fourier series

$$u = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}}, \text{ where } \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathbf{k}} \in \mathbb{C}^d, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_0 = 0, \overline{\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathbf{k}}} = \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{-\mathbf{k}}, \mathbf{k} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathbf{k}} = 0, \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 < \infty.$$

Then we explicitly have

$$\bar{P}_\Lambda u = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d, |\mathbf{k}|^2 \leq \Lambda} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}}.$$

Denote by $\{\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \mathbf{e}_3\}$ the standard canonical basis of \mathbb{C}^3 and \mathbb{R}^3 .

3. MAIN RESULTS

Assume that the Grashof number G takes the positive values α_n , for $n \geq 1$, with $\alpha_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For $n \geq 1$, let v_n be a solution of the corresponding steady state equation (2.14), i.e.,

$$Av_n + \alpha_n B(v_n, v_n) = g. \quad (3.1)$$

Throughout this section, the function g is a given, fixed element in $\mathcal{H} \setminus \{0\}$. In general, the H -norm $|g|$ needs not be 1, and hence, in that case, the real Grashof number is $\alpha_n |g|$.

Utilizing (2.12) and (2.16), we derive from (3.1) that $|v_n| \leq |g|$. Hence, $(v_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is a bounded sequence in the finite dimensional space \mathcal{H} . We consider a finite or infinite asymptotic expansion, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, of the sequence $(v_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ of the form

$$v_n = v + \Gamma_{1,n} w_1 + \Gamma_{2,n} w_2 + \cdots + \Gamma_{k,n} w_k + \cdots \quad (3.2)$$

where, for all k

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_{k,n} = 0, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Gamma_{k+1,n}}{\Gamma_{k,n}} = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad |w_k| = 1. \quad (3.3)$$

In Section 4, such an expansion (3.2) is defined precisely in Definition 4.1 and is proved to hold for a subsequence of v_n , which we can still denote by v_n itself (see Lemma 4.2). Substituting the expansion (3.2) of v_n into equation (3.1), one formally has

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha_n B(v, v) + (Av - g) + \Gamma_{1,n} Aw_1 + \cdots + \Gamma_{k,n} Aw_k + \cdots \\ & + \alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n} B_s(v, w_1) + \cdots + \alpha_n \Gamma_{k,n} B_s(v, w_k) + \cdots \\ & + \alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n} \Gamma_{1,n} B(w_1, w_1) + \cdots + \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_n \Gamma_{j,n} \Gamma_{k-j,n} B(w_j, w_{k-j}) + \cdots = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

Considering the sequences of coefficients in (3.4), we denote

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_0 &= (1)_{n=1}^\infty, & \sigma_k &= (\Gamma_{k,n})_{n=1}^\infty & \text{for } k = 1, 2, \dots, \\ \sigma_{0,0} &= (\alpha_n)_{n=1}^\infty, & \sigma_{0,k} &= (\alpha_n \Gamma_{k,n})_{n=1}^\infty & \text{for } k = 1, 2, \dots, \\ & & \sigma_{j,k} &= (\alpha_n \Gamma_{j,n} \Gamma_{k,n})_{n=1}^\infty & \text{for } j = 1, 2, \dots, k \geq j. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

The next idea is to compare the sequences in (3.5) as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Definition 3.1. Let \mathcal{X} be the collection of all sequences of positive numbers. Given two sequences $\xi = (\xi_n)_{n=1}^\infty$, $\eta = (\eta_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ in \mathcal{X} , we write $\xi \succ \eta$, if $\xi_n/\eta_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and $\xi \sim \eta$ if $\xi_n/\eta_n \rightarrow \lambda$, for some $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$. We write $\xi \succsim \eta$ if either $\xi \succ \eta$ or $\xi \sim \eta$.

A subset X of \mathcal{X} is called totally comparable if it holds for any $\xi, \eta \in X$ that $\xi \sim \eta$ or $\xi \succ \eta$ or $\eta \succ \xi$.

Clearly, the relation \sim in Definition 3.1 is an equivalence relation on \mathcal{X} but \succ is not an order on \mathcal{X} .

Since $\alpha_n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Gamma_{k,n} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and $(\Gamma_{k,n})_{n=1}^\infty \succ (\Gamma_{k+1,n})_{n=1}^\infty$ we have the following relations between the sequences in (3.5)

$$\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\sigma_0 & \succ & \sigma_1 & \succ & \sigma_2 & \succ & \cdots & \succ & \sigma_k & \succ & \cdots \\
\wedge & & \wedge & & \wedge & & & & \wedge & & \\
\sigma_{0,0} & \succ & \sigma_{0,1} & \succ & \sigma_{0,2} & \succ & \cdots & \succ & \sigma_{0,k} & \succ & \cdots \\
& & \Upsilon & & \Upsilon & & & & \Upsilon & & \\
& & \sigma_{1,1} & \succ & \sigma_{1,2} & \succ & \cdots & \succ & \sigma_{1,k} & \succ & \cdots \\
& & & & \Upsilon & & & & \Upsilon & & \\
& & & & \sigma_{2,2} & \succ & \cdots & \succ & \sigma_{2,k} & \succ & \cdots \\
& & & & & & & & \Upsilon & & \\
& & & & & & \ddots & & \vdots & & \\
& & & & & & & & \Upsilon & & \\
& & & & & & & & \sigma_{k,k} & \succ & \cdots
\end{array} \tag{3.6}$$

Let \mathcal{S} denote the set of sequences in (3.5). Then the set \mathcal{S} may not be totally comparable. However, by going through a diagonal process extracting successive subsequences, we may assume \mathcal{S} actually is. We express this rigorously in the following.

Let $(\varphi(n))_{n=1}^\infty$ be a subsequence of $(n)_{n=1}^\infty$. For $X \subset \mathcal{X}$, define

$$X_\varphi = \{(x_{\varphi(n)})_{n=1}^\infty \text{ with } (x_n)_{n=1}^\infty \in X\}.$$

We call X_φ a *subsequential set* of X . Note, for $(x_n)_{n=1}^\infty, (y_n)_{n=1}^\infty \in \mathcal{X}$, that if $(x_n)_{n=1}^\infty \succ (y_n)_{n=1}^\infty$, respectively, $(x_n)_{n=1}^\infty \sim (y_n)_{n=1}^\infty$, then, clearly,

$$(x_{\varphi(n)})_{n=1}^\infty \succ (y_{\varphi(n)})_{n=1}^\infty, \text{ respectively, } (x_{\varphi(n)})_{n=1}^\infty \sim (y_{\varphi(n)})_{n=1}^\infty.$$

Thus, if X is totally comparable, then so is the set X_φ .

We prove the following basic fact in the Appendix.

Lemma 3.2. *If X is a countable subset of \mathcal{X} , then it has a totally comparable subsequential set.*

By Lemma 3.2 and the fact \mathcal{S} is countable, we can assume, by using a subsequential set, that \mathcal{S} is totally comparable. Let $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}$ be the collection of equivalence classes of elements in \mathcal{S} with respect to the relation \sim in Definition 3.1. For each $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$, we use the standard notation $\langle \sigma \rangle$ for the equivalent class of σ . Define on $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}$ the relation $<$ by

$$\forall \sigma, \sigma' \in \mathcal{S} : \langle \sigma \rangle < \langle \sigma' \rangle \text{ if and only if } \sigma \succ \sigma'. \tag{3.7}$$

Then the relation \leq is an order on $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}$. Moreover, $(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}, \leq)$ is totally ordered.

We obtain the following important properties which will be proved in Section 5.

Proposition 3.3. *The following statements hold.*

- (i) *The cardinality of each equivalence class in $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}$ is finite.*
- (ii) *The set $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}$ is well-ordered with respect to \leq .*

Because $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}$ is well-ordered, it is order-isomorphic to an ordinal. This fact prompts the following key definition.

Definition 3.4. We associate to each $x \in \widehat{\mathcal{S}}$ a nonzero ordinal number $\text{ord}_{\widehat{\mathcal{S}}}(x)$ such that

$$x < y \text{ if and only if } \text{ord}_{\widehat{\mathcal{S}}}(x) < \text{ord}_{\widehat{\mathcal{S}}}(y) \text{ for any } x, y \in \widehat{\mathcal{S}},$$

and $\min\{\text{ord}_{\widehat{\mathcal{S}}}(x) : x \in \widehat{\mathcal{S}}\} = 1$.

Define the function $\text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}$ from \mathcal{S} to the set of ordinal numbers by $\text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma) = \text{ord}_{\widehat{\mathcal{S}}}(\langle \sigma \rangle)$ for any $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$.

Then one has, for any $\sigma, \sigma' \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$\sigma \succ \sigma' \text{ if and only if } \text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma) < \text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma'),$$

$$\sigma \sim \sigma' \text{ if and only if } \text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma) = \text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma'),$$

and

$$\min\{\text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma) : \sigma \in \mathcal{S}\} = 1.$$

Consequently, for each $\sigma_* \in \mathcal{S}$, we have equality of the sets

$$\{\text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma) : \sigma \in \mathcal{S}, \sigma \succ \sigma_*\} = \{\text{ordinal number } \zeta : 1 \leq \zeta < \text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_*)\}. \quad (3.8)$$

Based on Proposition 3.3 and Definition 3.4, we can naturally think of the following procedure.

General Procedure

$$\text{Given } x \in \text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{S}), \text{ use (3.4) to find an equation with finitely} \quad (3.9)$$

$$\text{many terms containing the sequences } \sigma \in \mathcal{S} \text{ with } \text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma) = x. \quad (3.10)$$

This procedure may involve ordinal numbers which are not finite. Denote by ω the first transfinite number beyond the positive integers. Recall that

$$\omega \cdot n = \underbrace{\omega + \cdots + \omega}_{n \text{ terms}} \text{ and } \omega^2 = \omega \cdot \omega = \omega + \omega + \omega + \cdots$$

3.1. Implications for the NSE. Throughout this subsection, we assume $(v_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$, satisfying (3.1), with $v_n \rightarrow v$ has a strict unitary expansion (see Definition 4.1). This amounts to $(v_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ satisfying (3.2) and (3.3) with additional properties. The proofs of each result in this subsection are in Section 5.

We start with the following result on the order of the sequences in (3.6) and how the order imposes certain algebraic relations on the limit v and expansion vector w_1 .

Theorem 3.5. *We have the following.*

- (i) $\text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_{0,0}) = 1$, $\text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma) > 1$ for any $\sigma \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \{\sigma_{0,0}\}$, and

$$B(v, v) = 0. \quad (3.11)$$

- (ii) If the expansion (3.2) is trivial, i.e., $v_n = v$ for all n , then

$$Av = g. \quad (3.12)$$

- (iii) If the expansion (3.2) is nontrivial, then comparing σ_0 and $\sigma_{0,1}$ gives the following.

- (a) If $\sigma_0 \succ \sigma_{0,1}$, then $\text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_0) = 2$, $\text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_{0,1}) = 3$ and (3.12) holds.

- (b) If $\sigma_{0,1} \succ \sigma_0$, then $\text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_{0,1}) = 2$,

$$\text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_0), \text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_{1,1}) \geq 3, \quad \text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_1) \geq 4, \quad (3.13)$$

and

$$B_s(v, w_1) = 0. \quad (3.14)$$

$$(c) \text{ If } \sigma_{0,1} \sim \sigma_0, \text{ then } \text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_0) = \text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_{0,1}) = 2, \\ \text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_1), \text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_{1,1}) \geq 3, \quad (3.15)$$

and

$$Av + \lambda B_s(v, w_1) = g, \text{ for some constant } \lambda > 0.$$

$$(iv) \text{ For all } k \geq 1, \\ k < \text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_{0,k}) \leq k(k+3)/2 + 1. \quad (3.16)$$

$$(v) \text{ For all } 1 \leq j \leq k, \\ k + j < \text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_{j,k}) \leq \omega \cdot (2j) + (k-j)(k-j+1)/2. \quad (3.17)$$

$$(vi) \text{ For all } k \geq 0, \\ k + 1 < \text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_k) \leq \omega^2 + k. \quad (3.18)$$

It was shown in [6] for the NSE that unless a nonzero force is in a special class, 0 cannot be on the global attractor. We next consider this matter for Galerkin approximations in the limit as $G \rightarrow \infty$, i.e., what are the consequences for steady states should $v = 0$ with $g \neq 0$?

For convenience, we use the short-hand writing

$$\xi_n \sim \eta_n, \text{ respectively, } \xi_n \succ \eta_n,$$

for sequences $(\xi_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and $(\eta_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$, to mean

$$(\xi_n)_{n=1}^{\infty} \sim (\eta_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}, \text{ respectively, } (\xi_n)_{n=1}^{\infty} \succ (\eta_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}.$$

In the case $\sigma_{1,1} \sim \sigma_0$, let

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n}^2 = \lambda_* \in (0, \infty) \text{ and set } \chi_n = 1 - \alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n}^2 / \lambda_*, \quad (3.19)$$

and, by the virtue of Lemma A.4 in the Appendix and using a subsequential set, we further assume that the sequence $(\chi_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ satisfies either

- (S1) $\chi_n = 0$ for all n , or
- (S2) $\chi_n > 0$ for all n and $\mathcal{S} \cup \{(\chi_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}\}$ is totally comparable, or
- (S3) $\chi_n < 0$ for all n and $\mathcal{S} \cup \{(-\chi_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}\}$ is totally comparable.

In the case $v = 0$ certain orderings of the sequences in (3.6) lead to certain algebraic relations for the expansion vectors. Although the H -norm $|\cdot|$ and V -norm $\|\cdot\|$ are equivalent in \mathcal{H} , note that the norm $\|w_1\|$ that appears twice in the next result is specifically the V -norm.

Proposition 3.6. *Assume $v = 0$. Then w_2 exists in (3.2), $\sigma_{1,1} \succsim \sigma_0$ and only the following mutually exclusive cases can hold.*

- (i) *Case $\sigma_{1,1} \succ \sigma_0$. Then $B(w_1, w_1) = 0$ and $\sigma_{1,2} \succsim \sigma_0$. In addition,*
 - (1) *if $\sigma_{1,2} \succ \sigma_0$, then $B_s(w_1, w_2) = 0$, while*
 - (2) *if $\sigma_{1,2} \sim \sigma_0$, then $\lambda B_s(w_1, w_2) = g$ for some $\lambda > 0$ and $\langle g, w_1 \rangle = 0$.*
- (ii) *Case $\sigma_{1,1} \sim \sigma_0$. Then $\lambda_* B(w_1, w_1) = g$ and $\sigma_{0,2} \succsim \sigma_0$.*
 - More specific cases are listed below.*
 - (1) *Case $\sigma_{0,2} \sim \sigma_0$. Then $\chi_n = 0$ for all n , or $\Gamma_{1,n} \succsim |\chi_n|$.*
 - (a) *If $\Gamma_{1,n} \sim |\chi_n|$, then*

$$\lambda_1 A w_1 + \lambda_2 B_s(w_1, w_2) = g \text{ for some } \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R} \text{ with } \lambda_1 \lambda_2 > 0, \\ \text{and } \lambda_* \lambda_1 \|w_1\|^2 = \lambda_2 \langle g, w_2 \rangle,$$

(b) If $\chi_n = 0$ for all n , or $\Gamma_{1,n} \succ |\chi_n|$, then

$$Aw_1 + \lambda_2 B_s(w_1, w_2) = 0 \quad \text{for some } \lambda_2 > 0$$

$$\text{and } \lambda_* \|w_1\|^2 = \lambda_2 \langle g, w_2 \rangle.$$

(2) Case $\sigma_{0,2} \succ \sigma_0$. Then $\chi_n = 0$ for all n , or $\alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n} \Gamma_{2,n} \succ |\chi_n|$.

(a) If $\alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n} \Gamma_{2,n} \sim |\chi_n|$, then $\lambda_2 B_s(w_1, w_2) = g$ for some $\lambda_2 \neq 0$,

(b) If $\chi_n = 0$ for all n , or $\alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n} \Gamma_{2,n} \succ |\chi_n|$, then $B_s(w_1, w_2) = 0$.

One has, in both cases (a) and (b), that $\langle g, w_2 \rangle = \langle B(w_2, w_2), w_1 \rangle = 0$.

We saw in Theorem 3.5 that we always have $B(v, v) = 0$, and moreover, if the expansion is trivial, then $Av = g$. We now consider the case where $Av = g$, but the expansion is nontrivial. The next result can also be seen as a further investigation of Theorem 3.5(iii)(a).

Proposition 3.7. *Assume $v = A^{-1}g$ and the expansion (3.2) is nontrivial. Then*

$$B_s(v, w_1) = 0 \tag{3.20}$$

and there exists w_2 in (3.2). In addition, comparing σ_1 , $\sigma_{0,2}$ and $\sigma_{1,1}$ gives only the following possibilities.

- (i) The cases $\sigma_1 \succ \sigma_{0,2}, \sigma_{1,1}$ and $\sigma_1 \sim \sigma_{1,1} \succ \sigma_{0,2}$ are impossible.
- (ii) If $\sigma_{0,2} \succ \sigma_1, \sigma_{1,1}$, then $B_s(v, w_2) = 0$.
- (iii) If $\sigma_{1,1} \succ \sigma_{0,2}, \sigma_1$, then $B(w_1, w_1) = 0$.
- (iv) If $\sigma_1 \sim \sigma_{0,2} \succ \sigma_{1,1}$, then $Aw_1 + \lambda B_s(v, w_2) = 0$, for some $\lambda > 0$.
- (v) If $\sigma_{0,2} \sim \sigma_{1,1} \succ \sigma_1$, then $B_s(v, w_2) + \lambda B(w_1, w_1) = 0$, for some $\lambda > 0$.
- (vi) If $\sigma_1 \sim \sigma_{0,2} \sim \sigma_{1,1}$, then $Aw_1 + \lambda_1 B_s(v, w_2) + \lambda_2 B(w_1, w_1) = 0$, for some $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 0$.

4. GENERAL EXPANSION RESULTS

In this section, we introduce a new type of asymptotic expansion in general normed spaces. Their existence is established in Lemma 4.2. Numerical results for the 3D NSE are presented in subsection 4.1 which demonstrate both the construction of the expansion as well as a particular case of Theorem 3.5. Examples showing a variety of such expansions are given subsection 4.3.

Definition 4.1. *Let $(Z, \|\cdot\|_Z)$ be a normed space over \mathbb{C} or \mathbb{R} . We say a sequence $(v_n)_{n=N_0}^\infty$ in Z , for some integer $N_0 \geq 1$, has a strict unitary expansion if it satisfies one of the following three exclusive conditions.*

- (1) There is $v \in Z$ such that $v_n = v$ for all $n \geq N_0$.
- (2) There are integer $K \geq 1$, vector $v \in Z$, unit vectors $w_k \in Z$, unit vectors $w_n^{(k)} \in Z$ and positive numbers $\Gamma_{k,n}$, for $n \geq N_0$ and $1 \leq k \leq K$, such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_{1,n} = 0, \tag{4.1}$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Gamma_{k+1,n}}{\Gamma_{k,n}} = 0 \tag{4.2}$$

for all $1 \leq k < K$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} w_n^{(k)} = w_k \tag{4.3}$$

for all $1 \leq k \leq K$,

$$v_n = v + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \Gamma_{j,n} w_j + \Gamma_{k,n} w_n^{(k)} \quad (4.4)$$

for all $n \geq N_0$, $1 \leq k \leq K$, and

$$w_n^{(K)} = w_K \text{ for all } n \geq N_0. \quad (4.5)$$

- (3) There are a vector $v \in Z$, unit vectors $w_k \in Z$, vectors $w_n^{(k)} \in Z$, numbers $\Gamma_{k,n} > 0$ and integers $N_k \geq N_0$ for all $n \geq N_0$, $k \geq 1$ such that one has (4.1), while (4.2), (4.3) hold for all $k \geq 1$, and (4.4) holds for all $k \geq 1$, $n \geq N_0$, and each $w_n^{(k)}$ is a unit vector in Z for $k \geq 1$ and $n \geq N_k$.

We say the expansion in Case (1) is trivial, the expansions in Cases (1) and (2) are finite, and the expansion in Case (3) is infinite.

We denote the strict unitary expansions by

$$v_n \approx v + \sum_k \Gamma_{k,n} w_k, \quad (4.6)$$

where the last summation can be void or finite or infinite.

Clearly, (4.6) implies

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} v_n = v, \quad (4.7)$$

and $\Gamma_{k,n}$, when exists, satisfies

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_{k,n} = 0.$$

If $(v_n)_{n=N_0}^\infty$ has the strict unitary expansion (4.6), then any subsequence $(v_{n_j})_{j=1}^\infty$ has the strict unitary expansion

$$v_{n_j} \approx v + \sum_k \Gamma_{k,n_j} w_k. \quad (4.8)$$

Thanks to property (4.8), whenever we use a subsequential set of \mathcal{S} in Section 3, the strict unitary expansion (3.2) is still valid.

The motivation for Definition 4.1 is the following result.

Lemma 4.2 (Expansion lemma). *Any bounded sequence in a finite dimensional normed space over \mathbb{C} or \mathbb{R} has a subsequence that possesses a strict unitary expansion.*

Proof. Let $(v_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be a bounded sequence in a finite dimensional normed space $(Z, \|\cdot\|_Z)$ over \mathbb{C} or \mathbb{R} . By the relative compactness of bounded subsets of Z , $(v_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ has a convergent subsequence. Hence there exist $v \in Z$ and a subsequence $(\varphi_0(n))_{n=1}^\infty$ of $(n)_{n=1}^\infty$ such that

$$\lim_{n \in \varphi_0(\mathbb{N}), n \rightarrow \infty} v_n = v. \quad (4.9)$$

If $v_n = v$ for all sufficiently large n , then we have Case (1) in Definition 4.1 for a subsequence of v_n .

Otherwise, define $\gamma_n^{(1)} = \|v_n - v\|_Z$ for $n \in \varphi_0(\mathbb{N})$. Then there is a subsequence $(\varphi_1(n))_{n=1}^\infty$ of $\varphi_0(n)_{n=1}^\infty$ such that $\gamma_n^{(1)} > 0$ for all $n \in \varphi_1(\mathbb{N})$. Define

$$w_n^{(1)} = \frac{1}{\gamma_n^{(1)}} (v_n - v) \text{ for all } n \in \varphi_1(\mathbb{N}).$$

Then, for all $n \in \varphi_1(\mathbb{N})$,

$$v_n = v + \gamma_n^{(1)} w_n^{(1)}, \quad \|w_n^{(1)}\|_Z = 1, \quad \lim_{n \in \varphi_1(\mathbb{N}), n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_n^{(1)} = 0. \quad (4.10)$$

By compactness of the unit sphere in Z , there exists a subsequence of $(\varphi_1(n))_{n=1}^\infty$, still denoted by $(\varphi_1(n))_{n=1}^\infty$ such that

$$\lim_{n \in \varphi_1(\mathbb{N}), n \rightarrow \infty} w_n^{(1)} = w_1 \in Z,$$

where the limit defines w_1 . Clearly, $\|w_1\|_Z = 1$.

Denote $w_0 = v$ and let $w_n^{(0)} = v_n$ for all $n \geq 1$.

For $k \geq 1$, we define the following statement (T_k) .

(T_k) There are subsequences $(\varphi_j(n))_{n=1}^\infty$ of $(n)_{n=1}^\infty$, for $1 \leq j \leq k$, with each $(\varphi_j(n))_{n=1}^\infty$ being a subsequence of $(\varphi_{j-1}(n))_{n=1}^\infty$, unit vectors w_j , positive numbers $\gamma_n^{(j)}$ and unit vectors $w_n^{(j)}$, for $n \in \varphi_j(\mathbb{N})$, defined by

$$\gamma_n^{(j)} = \|w_n^{(j-1)} - w_{j-1}\|_Z,$$

and

$$w_n^{(j)} = \frac{1}{\gamma_n^{(j)}} (w_n^{(j-1)} - w_{j-1}), \quad \text{i.e., } w_n^{(j-1)} = w_{j-1} + \gamma_n^{(j)} w_n^{(j)},$$

such that, for $1 \leq j \leq k$,

$$\lim_{n \in \varphi_j(\mathbb{N}), n \rightarrow \infty} w_n^{(j)} = w_j \in Z, \quad (4.11)$$

and

$$v_n = v + \gamma_n^{(1)} w_1 + \gamma_n^{(1)} \gamma_n^{(2)} w_2 + \cdots + \gamma_n^{(1)} \cdots \gamma_n^{(j-1)} w_{j-1} + \gamma_n^{(1)} \cdots \gamma_n^{(j)} w_n^{(j)} \quad (4.12)$$

for $n \in \varphi_j(\mathbb{N})$.

Observe, when (T_k) holds true and $1 \leq j \leq k$, that

$$\lim_{n \in \varphi_j(\mathbb{N}), n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_n^{(j)} = 0. \quad (4.13)$$

Indeed, (4.13) is true for $j = 1$ thanks to the limit in (4.10), and for $1 < j \leq k$, we have from (4.11) that

$$\lim_{n \in \varphi_j(\mathbb{N}), n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_n^{(j)} = \lim_{n \in \varphi_{j-1}(\mathbb{N}), n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_n^{(j)} = \lim_{n \in \varphi_{j-1}(\mathbb{N}), n \rightarrow \infty} \|w_n^{(j-1)} - w_{j-1}\|_Z = 0.$$

We already verified that (T_1) holds. Let $k \geq 1$. Assume (T_k) holds. In particular, with $j = k$ in (4.12), we have, for $n \in \varphi_k(\mathbb{N})$,

$$v_n = v + \gamma_n^{(1)} w_1 + \gamma_n^{(1)} \gamma_n^{(2)} w_2 + \cdots + \gamma_n^{(1)} \cdots \gamma_n^{(k-1)} w_{k-1} + \gamma_n^{(1)} \cdots \gamma_n^{(k)} w_n^{(k)}. \quad (4.14)$$

Case 1. $w_n^{(k)} = w_k$ for all large $n \in \varphi_k(\mathbb{N})$. Set $K = k$. Then there is a subsequence $(\varphi(n))_{n=1}^\infty$ of $(\varphi_k(n))_{n=1}^\infty$ such that

$$w_n^{(K)} = w_K \text{ for all } n \in \varphi(\mathbb{N}).$$

Let $V_n = v_{\varphi(n)}$, and for $1 \leq j \leq K$, $\Gamma_{j,n} = \gamma_{\varphi(n)}^{(1)} \gamma_{\varphi(n)}^{(2)} \cdots \gamma_{\varphi(n)}^{(j)}$, and $\tilde{w}_n^{(j)} = w_{\varphi(n)}^{(j)}$.

For $0 \leq j \leq K$, $(\varphi(n))_{n=1}^\infty$ is a subsequence of $(\varphi_j(n))_{n=j}^\infty$. Hence $(V_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is a subsequence of $(v_n)_{n=1}^\infty$, and more generally, of $(v_{\varphi_j(n)})_{n=1}^\infty$ for $0 \leq j \leq K$. We have from the limit in (4.10) that

$$\Gamma_{1,n} = \gamma_{\varphi(n)}^{(1)} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.15)$$

As a consequence of (4.13), we also have, for all $1 \leq j \leq K$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{\varphi(n)}^{(j)} = 0. \quad (4.16)$$

If $K > 1$ and $1 \leq j < K$, it follows (4.16) that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Gamma_{j+1,n}}{\Gamma_{j,n}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{\varphi(n)}^{(j+1)} = 0. \quad (4.17)$$

By (4.11), it holds for $1 \leq j \leq K$ that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{w}_n^{(j)} = w_j. \quad (4.18)$$

By (4.12), we have, for $1 \leq j \leq K$ and $n \geq 1$,

$$V_n = v_{\varphi(n)} = v + \Gamma_{1,n}w_1 + \cdots + \Gamma_{j-1,n}w_{j-1} + \Gamma_{j,n}\tilde{w}_n^{(j)}, \quad (4.19)$$

and $\tilde{w}_n^{(K)} = w_K$ for $n \geq 1$. Thus we obtain Case (2) in Definition 4.1 for the sequence $(V_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ with $\tilde{w}_n^{(j)}$ replacing $w_n^{(j)}$; we stop the induction.

Case 2. There is a subsequence $(\varphi_{k+1}(n))_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of $(\varphi_k(n))_{n=1}^{\infty}$ such that $w_n^{(k)} \neq w_k$ for all $n \in \varphi_{k+1}(\mathbb{N})$. Define, for all $n \in \varphi_{k+1}(\mathbb{N})$, $\gamma_n^{(k+1)} = \|w_n^{(k)} - w_k\|_Z > 0$ and

$$w_n^{(k+1)} = \frac{1}{\gamma_n^{(k+1)}}(w_n^{(k)} - w_k), \text{ which yields } w_n^{(k)} = w_k + \gamma_n^{(k+1)}w_n^{(k+1)}. \quad (4.20)$$

Substituting the last equation of (4.20) into (4.14), one has

$$v_n = v + \gamma_n^{(1)}w_1 + \gamma_n^{(1)}\gamma_n^{(2)}w_2 + \cdots + \gamma_n^{(1)} \cdots \gamma_n^{(k)}w_k + \gamma_n^{(1)} \cdots \gamma_n^{(k+1)}w_n^{(k+1)}.$$

Also, $\|w_n^{(k+1)}\|_Z = 1$ for $n \in \varphi_{k+1}(\mathbb{N})$.

By the compactness of the unit sphere in Z again, we can extract a subsequence of $(\varphi_{k+1}(n))_{n=1}^{\infty}$, but still denoted by $(\varphi_{k+1}(n))_{n=1}^{\infty}$, such that

$$\lim_{n \in \varphi_{k+1}(\mathbb{N}), n \rightarrow \infty} w_n^{(k+1)} = w_{k+1} \text{ with } \|w_{k+1}\|_Z = 1.$$

Thus, (T_{k+1}) holds.

If the induction does not stop at any step k , then by the Induction Principle, we have (T_k) holds for all $k \geq 1$. Let $\varphi(n) = \varphi_n(n)$ and $V_n = v_{\varphi(n)}$. For $j \geq 1$, $(\varphi(n))_{n=j}^{\infty}$ is a subsequence of $(\varphi_j(n))_{n=j}^{\infty}$. Hence $(V_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a subsequence of $(v_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$, and more generally, $(V_n)_{n=j}^{\infty}$ is a subsequence of $(v_{\varphi_j(n)})_{n=j}^{\infty}$ for $j \geq 1$. We define positive numbers $\Gamma_{k,n}$ and vectors $\tilde{w}_n^{(k)} \in Z$ as follows.

For $k = 1$, define

$$\Gamma_{1,n} = \gamma_{\varphi(n)}^{(1)} \text{ and } \tilde{w}_n^{(1)} = w_{\varphi(n)}^{(1)} \text{ for all } n \geq 1.$$

For $k \geq 2$, when $1 \leq n < k$ let

$$z_{k,n} = V_n - v - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \Gamma_{j,n}w_j$$

and define

$$\begin{cases} \Gamma_{k,n} = \|z_{k,n}\|_Z, & \tilde{w}_n^{(1)} = \frac{1}{\Gamma_{k,n}}z_{k,n} & \text{in the case } z_{k,n} \neq 0, \\ \Gamma_{k,n} = \frac{1}{2^{nk}}\Gamma_{k-1,n}, & \tilde{w}_n^{(1)} = 0 & \text{in the case } z_{k,n} = 0; \end{cases} \quad (4.21)$$

while when $n \geq k$, define

$$\Gamma_{k,n} = \gamma_{\varphi(n)}^{(1)} \gamma_{\varphi(n)}^{(2)} \dots \gamma_{\varphi(n)}^{(k)} \text{ and } \tilde{w}_n^{(k)} = w_{\varphi(n)}^{(k)}. \quad (4.22)$$

Note that we still have the limit (4.15), while the limit (4.16) is true for all $j \geq 1$, which implies that property (4.17) now holds true for all $j \geq 1$. Moreover, the limit (4.18) is true for all $j \geq 1$.

Set $N_k = k$ for all $k \geq 1$. For $k \geq 1$, by (4.22) and (\mathcal{T}_k) , we have $\|\tilde{w}_n^{(k)}\|_Z = 1$ for all $n \geq N_k$. By (4.12), we obtain (4.19) for $j \geq 1$, $n \geq N_j$. By definition (4.21), we also obtain (4.19) for $n < N_j$. Thus, the identity (4.19) holds true for all $j \geq 1$ and $n \geq 1$. Therefore, we obtain Case (3) in Definition 4.1 for the sequence $(V_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ with $\tilde{w}_n^{(k)}$ replacing $w_n^{(k)}$. The proof of Lemma 4.2 is complete. \square

4.1. A numerical demonstration for the 3D NSE. We next demonstrate the algorithm for the expansion in the proof of Lemma 4.2 numerically for the 3D NSE, with periodic boundary conditions. Considering equation (3.1), to generate a sequence of steady states, we choose one,

$$\mathbf{u}(x, y, z) = \begin{bmatrix} \sin(z) \\ \sin(x) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

to start, and let that define the fixed balancing force $g = \mathbf{g}(\cdot)$ at $\alpha_1 = 1$

$$\mathbf{g}(x, y, z) = -\mathbf{u} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \sin(z) \cos(x) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = -\mathbf{u} + \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \sin(z+x) + \sin(z-x) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

i.e., the Fourier coefficients are $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathbf{k}} = -\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathbf{k}} + \hat{\mathbf{B}}_{\mathbf{k}}$ where $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathbf{k}} = \hat{\mathbf{B}}_{\mathbf{k}} = \mathbf{0}$ except for

$$\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathbf{e}_1} = -\frac{i}{2}\mathbf{e}_2, \quad \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathbf{e}_3} = -\frac{i}{2}\mathbf{e}_1, \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mathbf{B}}_{(1,0,1)} = \hat{\mathbf{B}}_{(-1,0,1)} = -\frac{i}{4}\mathbf{e}_2,$$

and the reality condition $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{-\mathbf{k}} = \overline{\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathbf{k}}}$, $\hat{\mathbf{B}}_{-\mathbf{k}} = \overline{\hat{\mathbf{B}}_{\mathbf{k}}}$.

Note, in this case, that the H -norm $|\mathbf{g}| = \pi\sqrt{10\pi} \neq 1$. Then, strictly speaking, the Grashof number is $G_n = \alpha_n |\mathbf{g}|$.

We use a small Galerkin approximation ($\Pi_N = \bar{P}_9$) so we can work with a fairly long sequence. Since the number of modes is small, we compute the Fourier coefficients of the bilinear term $B(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u})$ directly through the convolution

$$\hat{\mathbf{B}}_{\mathbf{k}} = i \sum_{|\mathbf{j}| \leq 3} (\mathbf{k} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathbf{j}}) \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{j}} - (\mathbf{k} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathbf{j}}) (\mathbf{k} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{j}}) \frac{\mathbf{k}}{|\mathbf{k}|^2}$$

as opposed doing so by fast Fourier transform. By the reality condition, we may work with half the modes, which in this case results in a dynamical system with 366 real variables. Using the bifurcation software package AUTO [2], we compute a branch of steady states, whose norms are plotted in Figure 1. Due to the length factor in the Parseval identity, and using only half the modes, we relate

$$\|v\|_Z^2 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{|\mathbf{k}| \leq 3} |\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 = \frac{1}{16\pi^3} |v|^2,$$

when considering $Z = \mathcal{H}$ in Lemma 4.2.

The computed sequence of steady states v_n appears to converge, as α_n increases, to a limit close to v_{n^*} , where $\alpha_{n^*} = 200000$. We then set $\gamma_n^{(1)} = \|v_n - v_{n^*}\|_Z$ for $n \leq n^* - 1$ and

$$w_n^{(1)} = \frac{1}{\gamma_n^{(1)}}(v_n - v_{n^*}) \text{ for all } n \leq n^* - 1.$$

The sequence $w_n^{(1)}$ also appears to converge for this data; no subsequence is needed. We take as its limit $w_{n^*-1}^{(1)}$ and set $\gamma_n^{(2)} = \|w_n^{(1)} - w_{n^*-1}^{(1)}\|_Z$ for $n \leq n^* - 2$. This enables us to plot in Figure 2 the first six nontrivial elements in the left corner of (3.6). The rapid decay for each sequence that starts around $G = 190000$ is likely due to taking v_{n^*} in place of the true limit v (and similarly for $w_{n^*-1}^{(1)}$). AUTO uses Newton iteration to continue the sequence of steady states. We set its tolerance to both 10^{-7} and 10^{-9} and found no perceptible difference in the resulting plots in Figure 2. We plot in Figure 3 the ratios of pairs of these sequences which suggest the following ordering:

$$\sigma_{0,0} \succ \sigma_0 \sim \sigma_{0,1} \succ \sigma_1 \sim \sigma_{1,1} \sim \sigma_{0,2} \succ \sigma_2 \sim \sigma_{1,2}.$$

The ratio $\sigma_{0,1}/\sigma_0 = \sigma_{0,1}$ which is shown in Figure 2, is nearly constant, until $\alpha_n > 180000$. If instead, we were to interpret the plot of $\sigma_{0,1}/\sigma_0 = \sigma_{0,1}$ to be truly starting to decay toward 0, then we would have case (iii), (a) of Theorem 3.5. But we find that $\|Av_{n^*} - g\|_Z \approx 0.66$ which would contradict (3.12). We conclude that $\sigma_0 \sim \sigma_{0,1}$ and hence that this example demonstrates case (iii), (c) of Theorem 3.5. The next relation, $\sigma_{0,1} \succ \sigma_1$, must hold. This is confirmed by the clear decay in the plot of $\sigma_1/\sigma_{0,1}$. Since $\sigma_0 \sim \sigma_{0,1}$, we must also have $\sigma_1 \sim \sigma_{1,1}$ and $\sigma_2 \sim \sigma_{1,2}$ (the latter confirmed by the plot of $\sigma_{1,2}/\sigma_2$). Meanwhile, the plot of $\sigma_1/\sigma_{0,2}$, being fairly flat, suggests $\sigma_1 \sim \sigma_{0,2}$.

4.2. On the uniqueness of strict unitary expansions. Because there are no convergence rates specified for $\Gamma_{k,n}$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, a sequence $(v_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ may be written as different sums in the form of the right-hand side of (4.6). However, thanks to the condition $\|w_n^{(k)}\|_Z = 1$, for sufficiently large n , it turns out that the strict unitary expansions are unique for sufficiently large n . More precisely, we have the following ‘‘asymptotic uniqueness’’.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $(v_n)_{n=N_0}^\infty$ have a strict unitary expansion as in Definition 4.1. Denote*

$$\bar{N}_k = \begin{cases} N_0, & \text{in Case (2) for } 1 \leq k \leq K, \\ \max\{N_1, N_2, \dots, N_k\}, & \text{in Case (3) for all } k \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Then the vectors v , w_k , $w_n^{(k)}$ and positive numbers $\Gamma_{k,n}$ are uniquely determined for $k \geq 1$ and $n \geq \bar{N}_k$.

Proof. Suppose (4.6) is a strict unitary expansion in a normed space $(Z, \|\cdot\|_Z)$ over \mathbb{C} or \mathbb{R} . Then v is determined by the limit (4.7). If $v_n = v$ for all n , then this is the unique expansion for v_n . Otherwise, for $n \geq \bar{N}_1$, we have from (4.4) that

$$\|v_n - v\|_Z = \Gamma_{1,n} \|w_n^{(1)}\|_Z = \Gamma_{1,n},$$

hence $\Gamma_{1,n}$ is uniquely determined, and then $w_n^{(1)} = (v_n - v)/\Gamma_{1,n}$ is uniquely determined. Subsequently, $w_1 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} w_n^{(1)}$ is uniquely determined.

Recursively, for $k \geq 1$, suppose w_j , $w_n^{(j)}$ and $\Gamma_{j,n}$ are already uniquely determined for $1 \leq j \leq k$ and $n \geq \bar{N}_j$. If $w_n^{(k)} = w_k$ eventually as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then the expansion must fall to Case (2) in Definition 4.1 and the number K is k which means K is uniquely determined.




FIGURE 1. Bifurcation diagram.

In this case, $\bar{N}_j = N_0$ for all $1 \leq j \leq K$. Thus $v_n \approx v + \sum_{j=1}^K \Gamma_{j,n} w_j$ is the unique expansion of v_n .

Consider the case “ $w_n^{(k)} = w_k$ eventually as $n \rightarrow \infty$ ” does not hold. Then w_{k+1} , $\Gamma_{k+1,n}$, $w_n^{(k+1)}$ and \bar{N}_{k+1} exist. Let $n \geq \bar{N}_{k+1}$. We have $n \geq \bar{N}_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq k$, hence $\Gamma_{j,n}$ was already uniquely determined, and

$$\left\| v_n - \sum_{j=1}^k \Gamma_{j,n} w_j \right\|_Z = \Gamma_{k+1,n} \|w_n^{(k+1)}\|_Z = \Gamma_{k+1,n}$$

which implies $\Gamma_{k+1,n}$ is uniquely determined. Thus, $w_n^{(k+1)}$ is uniquely determined for $n \geq \bar{N}_{k+1}$ by

$$w_n^{(k+1)} = \frac{1}{\Gamma_{k+1,n}} \left(v_n - \sum_{j=1}^k \Gamma_{j,n} w_j \right),$$

and then $w_{k+1} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} w_n^{(k+1)}$ is uniquely determined. \square

4.3. Examples. We present some examples of strict unitary expansions.

- (a) Let $v_n \rightarrow v$ in \mathbb{R} . If $v_n > v$ for all $n \geq 1$ then $(v_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ has a unique strict unitary expansion

$$v_n = v + \Gamma_{1,n} w_1, \tag{4.23}$$

with $\Gamma_{1,n} = v_n - v$ and $w_1 = 1$.




FIGURE 2. Sequences in (3.6).




FIGURE 3. Sequence ratios.

If $v_n < v$ for all $n \geq 1$ then $(v_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ has the unique strict unitary expansion (4.23) with $\Gamma_{1,n} = v - v_n$ and $w_1 = -1$.

We can see that strict unitary expansions are not very useful in this case.

- (b) Let $v_n = (-1)^n/n$ in \mathbb{R} . Suppose $(v_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ has a strict unitary expansion. Then the terms $\Gamma_{1,n}$, w_1 and $w_n^{(1)}$ exist in Definition 4.1. Clearly, $\Gamma_{1,n} = |v_n| = 1/n$ and $w_n^{(1)} = v_n/\Gamma_{1,n} = (-1)^n$, which is divergent and contradicts Definition 4.1. Thus, $(v_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ does not have a strict unitary expansion. However, its subsequences $v_{2n} = 1/(2n)$ and $v_{2n+1} = -1/(2n+1)$ have finite strict unitary expansions as in part (a).
- (c) We give an example of infinite strict unitary expansions. Let $Z = \mathbb{C}$ and $v_n = e^{i/n}$. Clearly, we have the Taylor expansion $v_n = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{1}{k!n^k} i^k$. However, the strict unitary expansion is a different one which is found below. Note, for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, that

$$e^{ix} = 1 + (e^{ix} - 1) = 1 + e^{\frac{i}{2}x} (e^{\frac{i}{2}x} - e^{-\frac{i}{2}x}) = 1 + 2i \sin(x/2) e^{\frac{i}{2}x}.$$

Applying this formula repeatedly, we have

$$v_n = 1 + 2i \sin\left(\frac{1}{2n}\right) e^{\frac{i}{2n}} = 1 + 2i \sin\left(\frac{1}{2n}\right) + (2i)^2 \sin\left(\frac{1}{2n}\right) \sin\left(\frac{1}{2^2n}\right) e^{\frac{i}{2^2n}} = \dots$$

and, for any $k \geq 1$,

$$v_n = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^k (2i)^j \prod_{p=1}^j \sin\left(\frac{1}{2^p n}\right) + (2i)^{k+1} \prod_{p=1}^{k+1} \sin\left(\frac{1}{2^p n}\right) e^{\frac{i}{2^{k+1}n}}. \quad (4.24)$$

Then we have the infinite strict unitary expansion (4.6) with

$$w_k = i^k \text{ and } \Gamma_{k,n} = 2^k \prod_{p=1}^k \sin\left(\frac{1}{2^p n}\right).$$

Indeed, letting $w_n^{(k)} = i^k e^{\frac{i}{2^k n}}$, one has $|w_k| = |w_n^{(k)}| = 1$, $w_n^{(k)} \rightarrow w_k$,

$$\Gamma_{1,n} = 2 \sin\left(\frac{1}{2n}\right) \rightarrow 0 \text{ and } \frac{\Gamma_{k+1,n}}{\Gamma_{k,n}} = 2 \sin\left(\frac{1}{2^{k+1}n}\right) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Also, (4.24) implies (4.4).

5. PROOFS OF MAIN RESULTS

We present the proofs of Propositions 3.3, 3.6, 3.7 and Theorem 3.5 in this section. We recall that the assumptions throughout this section are $g \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{0\}$, $\alpha_n > 0$ for all n , $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n = \infty$, $v_n \in \mathcal{H}$ is a solution of (3.1), and $(v_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ has the strict unitary expansion (4.6) in \mathcal{H} .

5.1. Proof of Proposition 3.3.

Proof. In the case $(v_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ has a finite expansion, there are only finitely many sequences in (3.6). Hence, both statements (i) and (ii) are obviously true. Consider below the case of an infinite expansion.

(i) Let $\mathcal{C} \in \widehat{\mathcal{S}}$. If \mathcal{C} contains more than one sequence, it must contain one of the type $\sigma_{j,k}$. Note that there can be at most one sequence equivalent to $\sigma_{j,k}$ in each row of the array in (3.6) up to row $k+2$, i.e., the rows starting with $\sigma_0, \sigma_{0,0}, \sigma_{1,1}, \dots, \sigma_{k,k}$. Also, $\sigma_{j,k} \succ \sigma$ for any σ in the remaining rows. Therefore, \mathcal{C} has only finitely many elements.

(ii) Let \mathcal{F} be a nonempty subset of $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}$. Consider the case when all x 's in \mathcal{F} are of the type $\langle \sigma_k \rangle$ for some $k \geq 0$. Let k_0 be the minimum of all such k 's. Then $\langle \sigma_{k_0} \rangle$ is the minimum

of \mathcal{F} . Now, consider the case when there exists a sequence $\sigma_{j,k}$ such that $\mathcal{C} = \langle \sigma_{j,k} \rangle \in \mathcal{F}$. Define $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}$ to be the set of $x \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $x \leq \mathcal{C}$. By (3.6), the intersection of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}$ with each i th-row, for $1 \leq i \leq k+2$, starting with $\sigma_0, \sigma_{0,0}, \sigma_{1,1}, \dots, \sigma_{k,k}$ is either empty or has a minimum x_i . Also, the intersection of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}$ with the remaining rows in (3.6) is empty. Since $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}$, the set $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}$ is not empty. Then the set of the above x_i 's is not empty. Comparing finitely many x_i 's, we find their minimum, which is the minimum of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}$, and hence of \mathcal{F} . \square

5.2. Proof of Theorem 3.5.

Proof. The facts about $\text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_{0,0})$ and $\text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma)$ for $\sigma \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \{\sigma_{0,0}\}$ in (i) are clear from the relations in (3.6). Dividing (3.1) by α_n and passing $n \rightarrow \infty$ yield (3.11).

With $v_n = v$ and (3.11), we immediately have (3.12) from (3.1), giving (ii).

For (iii), we substitute the expansion $v_n = v + \Gamma_{1,n} w_n^{(1)}$ into the steady state equation (3.1) and use property (3.11) to obtain

$$Av - g + \alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n} B_s(v, w_n^{(1)}) + \alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n} \Gamma_{1,n} B(w_n^{(1)}, w_n^{(1)}) = 0. \quad (5.1)$$

For (a),(c) we can simply take $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (5.1), while for (b) we divide (5.1) by $\alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n}$ and then take $n \rightarrow \infty$. In each case the order of the sequences is clear.

For (iv), we note from the second row in (3.6) that there are at least k distinct numbers $\text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_{0,j})$, for $0 \leq j \leq k-1$, that are smaller than $\text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_{0,k})$. Thus we obtain the first inequality in (3.16).

We prove the upper bound in (3.16) by contradiction. Assume the contrary, i.e.,

$$\text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_{0,k}) > k(k+3)/2 + 1.$$

The possible entries σ such that $\sigma \succ \sigma_{0,k}$ are $\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{k-1}$ along with $\sigma_{j,m}$ with $0 \leq j \leq m \leq k-1$, i.e., the triangle of sequences in (3.6) with vertices $\sigma_{0,0}, \sigma_{0,k-1}$, and $\sigma_{k-1,k-1}$. Combining this fact with (3.8), we must have

$$\text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\{\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{k-1}, \sigma_{j,m} : 0 \leq j \leq m \leq k-1\}) \supset \{1, 2, \dots, k(k+3)/2 + 1\}. \quad (5.2)$$

Because the first set has at most

$$k + k(k+1)/2 = k(k+3)/2$$

elements, the inclusion (5.2) is impossible.

The lower bound in (3.17) is obtained by using the chain

$$\sigma_{0,0} \succ \sigma_{0,1} \succ \dots \succ \sigma_{0,k} \succ \sigma_{1,k} \succ \dots \succ \sigma_{j-1,k} \succ \sigma_{j,k}.$$

The proof of the upper bound in (3.17) is technical and will be presented in Appendix A.

It remains to prove (vi). Using the chain $\sigma_{0,0} \succ \sigma_0 \succ \dots \succ \sigma_{k-1} \succ \sigma_k$, we immediately establish the lower bound of $\text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_k)$ in (3.18). For the upper bound, denote $R = \{\sigma_m : m \geq 0\}$. By parts (iv) and (v),

$$\text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma) < \omega^2 \text{ for all } \sigma \notin R. \quad (5.3)$$

Given σ_k . If there is $\sigma \notin R$ such that $\sigma_k \lesssim \sigma$, then

$$\text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_k) \leq \text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma) < \omega^2 < \omega^2 + k.$$

Hence, we obtain the upper bound in (3.18) for this case.

Consider the remaining case when $\sigma \succ \sigma_k$ for all $\sigma \notin R$. Suppose $\text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_k) > \omega^2 + k$. By (3.8) applied to $\sigma_* = \sigma_k$ and (5.3), we must have

$$\text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\{\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{k-1}\}) \supset \{\omega^2, \omega^2 + 1, \dots, \omega^2 + k\}.$$

Comparing the numbers of elements in these two sets gives $k \geq k + 1$, which is impossible. Therefore, we must have $\text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_k) \leq \omega^2 + k$, that is, the upper bound of $\text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_k)$ in (3.18). \square

The following remarks on case (iii) of Theorem 3.5 are in order.

- (1) Taking the scalar product of (3.14) in H with w_1 gives $\langle B(w_1, w_1), v \rangle = 0$, that is, $B(w_1, w_1)$ and v are orthogonal in H .
- (2) If, in addition, w_2 exists, then instead of the first inequality in (3.13) one has

$$3 \in \{\text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_0), \text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_{1,1}), \text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_{0,2})\},$$

and instead of (3.15) one has

$$3 \in \{\text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_1), \text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_{1,1}), \text{ord}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_{0,2})\}.$$

These can easily be seen from (3.6).

5.3. Proof of Proposition 3.6.

Proof. We have $g \neq 0$, so $v_n \neq 0 = v$. Hence, expansion (3.2) is nontrivial. Consequently, w_1 exists and $|w_1| = 1$.

Using $v_n = \Gamma_{1,n}w_n^{(1)}$, we have from (3.1) that

$$\Gamma_{1,n}Aw_n^{(1)} + \alpha_n\Gamma_{1,n}^2B(w_n^{(1)}, w_n^{(1)}) = g. \quad (5.4)$$

If $\sigma_0 \succ \sigma_{1,1}$, then passing $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (5.4) gives $g = 0$, a contradiction. Thus, we must have $\sigma_{1,1} \succsim \sigma_0$.

We now prove w_2 exists by contradiction. Suppose expansion (3.2) stops at w_1 , that is $v_n = \Gamma_{1,n}w_1$. Then

$$\Gamma_{1,n}Aw_1 + \alpha_n\Gamma_{1,n}^2B(w_1, w_1) = g. \quad (5.5)$$

Case A. $\sigma_{1,1} \succ \sigma_0$. Dividing (5.5) by $\alpha_n\Gamma_{1,n}^2$ and then passing $n \rightarrow \infty$ yield $B(w_1, w_1) = 0$. Using this fact in (5.5) implies $\Gamma_{1,n}Aw_1 = g$, which yields $g = 0$, a contradiction.

Case B. $\sigma_{1,1} \sim \sigma_0$. By Lemma A.4 and using a subsequential set of \mathcal{S} , but still denoted by \mathcal{S} , we assume (3.19) and three possibilities (S1), (S2), (S3). Passing $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (5.5) gives

$$\lambda_*B(w_1, w_1) = g. \quad (5.6)$$

We can rewrite (5.5) as

$$\Gamma_{1,n}Aw_1 = \chi_n g. \quad (5.7)$$

- (α) If $\chi_n = 0$ for all n , or $\Gamma_{1,n} \succ |\chi_n|$, then we infer from (5.7) that $Aw_1 = 0$, which is a contradiction.
- (β) If $|\chi_n| \succ \Gamma_{1,n}$, then $g = 0$, a contradiction.
- (γ) If $\Gamma_{1,n} \sim |\chi_n|$, then $\lambda_1 Aw_1 = g$ for some $\lambda_1 \neq 0$. Combining this with (5.6) gives

$$\lambda_1 Aw_1 = \lambda_* B(w_1, w_1).$$

Taking scalar product of the last equation with w_1 , we deduce $w_1 = 0$, a contradiction.

Since both cases A and B yield contradictions, the expansion (3.2) cannot stop at w_1 . Thus, w_2 exists.

Now, we can substitute the expansion $v_n = \Gamma_{1,n}w_1 + \Gamma_{2,n}w_n^{(2)}$ into the steady state equation (3.1) to obtain

$$\Gamma_{1,n}Aw_1 + \Gamma_{2,n}Aw_n^{(2)} + \alpha_n\Gamma_{1,n}^2B(w_1, w_1) + \alpha_n\Gamma_{1,n}\Gamma_{2,n}B_s(w_1, w_n^{(2)}) + \alpha_n\Gamma_{2,n}^2B(w_n^{(2)}, w_n^{(2)}) = g. \quad (5.8)$$

(i) *Case* $\sigma_{1,1} \succ \sigma_0$. Since $\alpha_n\Gamma_{1,n}^2 \rightarrow \infty$ we have also $\alpha_n\Gamma_{1,n} \rightarrow \infty$. Dividing (5.4) by $\alpha_n\Gamma_{1,n}^2$ and take $n \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain $B(w_1, w_1) = 0$.

If $1 \succ \alpha_n\Gamma_{1,n}\Gamma_{2,n}$, then all terms on the left in (5.8) tend to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$, which would mean $g = 0$, a contradiction. Hence, $\sigma_{1,2} \succ \sigma_0$, and consequently, $\alpha_n\Gamma_{2,n} \rightarrow \infty$.

Having eliminated the term $\alpha_n\Gamma_{1,n}^2B(w_1, w_1)$ from (5.8), items (1) and (2) follow from dividing the equation by $\alpha_n\Gamma_{1,n}\Gamma_{2,n}$, passing $n \rightarrow \infty$ and applying both relations in (2.16).

(ii) *Case* $\sigma_{1,1} \sim \sigma_0$. We take $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (5.4) and use the limit in (3.19) to obtain (5.6).

Using identity (5.6), we rewrite (5.8) as

$$\Gamma_{1,n}Aw_1 + \Gamma_{2,n}Aw_n^{(2)} + \alpha_n\Gamma_{1,n}\Gamma_{2,n}B_s(w_1, w_n^{(2)}) + \alpha_n\Gamma_{2,n}^2B(w_n^{(2)}, w_n^{(2)}) = \chi_n g. \quad (5.9)$$

If $1 \succ \alpha_n\Gamma_{2,n}$, then $\Gamma_{1,n} \succ \alpha_n\Gamma_{1,n}\Gamma_{2,n} \succ \alpha_n\Gamma_{2,n}^2$. We next eliminate the three possibilities that follow.

(α') If $\chi_n = 0$ for all n , or $\Gamma_{1,n} \succ |\chi_n|$, then (5.9) implies $Aw_1 = 0$.

(β') If $|\chi_n| \succ \Gamma_{1,n}$, then (5.9) implies $g = 0$.

(γ') If $|\chi_n| \sim \Gamma_{1,n}$, then (5.9) implies $g = \lambda_1 Aw_1$, with $\lambda_1 \neq 0$.

Similar to (α), (β), (γ) above, none of these cases (α'), (β'), (γ') are possible. Therefore, we must have $\alpha_n\Gamma_{2,n} \succ 1$, that is, $\sigma_{0,2} \succ \sigma_0$. It remains to consider the following cases.

(1) *Case* $\sigma_{0,2} \sim \sigma_0$. Then $\Gamma_{1,n} \sim \alpha_n\Gamma_{1,n}\Gamma_{2,n} \succ \alpha_n\Gamma_{2,n}^2$. If $|\chi_n| \succ \Gamma_{1,n}$, then (5.9) implies $g = 0$, a contradiction.

(a) If $|\chi_n| \sim \Gamma_{1,n}$, then, since $w_n^{(2)} \rightarrow w_2$, equation (5.9) implies

$$g = \lambda_1 Aw_1 + \lambda_2 B_s(w_1, w_2), \quad \lambda_1 \lambda_2 > 0.$$

Thus

$$\lambda_* B(w_1, w_1) = \lambda_1 Aw_1 + \lambda_2 B_s(w_1, w_2).$$

Taking scalar product with w_1 gives

$$\lambda_1 \|w_1\|^2 = \lambda_2 \langle B(w_1, w_1), w_2 \rangle = (\lambda_2 / \lambda_*) \langle g, w_2 \rangle.$$

(b) If $\chi_n = 0$ for all n , or $\Gamma_{1,n} \succ |\chi_n|$, then (5.9) implies

$$Aw_1 + \lambda_2 B_s(w_1, w_2) = 0, \quad \lambda_2 > 0,$$

which yields

$$\|w_1\|^2 - \lambda_2 \langle B(w_1, w_1), w_2 \rangle = 0 \quad \text{and hence} \quad (\lambda_2 / \lambda_*) \langle g, w_2 \rangle = \|w_1\|^2.$$

(2) *Case* $\sigma_{0,2} \succ \sigma_0$. Then $\alpha_n\Gamma_{1,n}\Gamma_{2,n} \succ \Gamma_{1,n}$. If $|\chi_n| \succ \alpha_n\Gamma_{1,n}\Gamma_{2,n}$, then (5.9) implies $g = 0$ again.

- (a) If $|\chi_n| \sim \alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n} \Gamma_{2,n}$. Then (5.9) yields $g = \lambda_2 B_s(w_1, w_2)$ for some $\lambda_2 \neq 0$. Combining this with (5.6) gives

$$\lambda_* B(w_1, w_1) = \lambda_2 B_s(w_1, w_2). \quad (5.10)$$

On the one hand, taking scalar product of equation (5.10) with w_1 yields $\langle B(w_1, w_1), w_2 \rangle = 0$, hence, $\langle g, w_2 \rangle = 0$.

On the other hand, taking scalar product of equation (5.10) with w_2 gives $\langle B(w_2, w_2), w_1 \rangle = 0$.

- (b) If $\chi_n = 0$ for all n , or $\alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n} \Gamma_{2,n} \succ |\chi_n|$, then (5.9) gives

$$B_s(w_1, w_2) = 0. \quad (5.11)$$

Then, again, taking scalar product of (5.11) with w_1 yields $\langle g, w_2 \rangle = 0$, and taking scalar product of (5.11) with w_2 gives $\langle B(w_2, w_2), w_1 \rangle = 0$. \square

5.4. Proof of Proposition 3.7.

Proof. By (3.11) in Theorem 3.5, we have $B(v, v) = 0$. Substituting $v_n = v + \Gamma_{1,n} w_n^{(1)}$ into the steady state equation (3.1), we have

$$\Gamma_{1,n} A w_n^{(1)} + \alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n} B_s(v, w_n^{(1)}) + \alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n}^2 B(w_n^{(1)}, w_n^{(1)}) = 0, \quad (5.12)$$

The largest term $\alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n}$ gives (3.20).

Suppose expansion (3.2) stops at w_1 , that is, $v_n = v + \Gamma_{1,n} w_1$. We have (5.12) with w_1 replacing $w_n^{(1)}$, and with the use of (3.20), we obtain

$$A w_1 + \alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n} B(w_1, w_1) = 0. \quad (5.13)$$

- If $1 \succ \alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n}$, then (5.13) implies $A w_1 = 0$, a contradiction.
- If $\alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n} \succ 1$, then (5.13) implies $B(w_1, w_1) = 0$, which, thanks to (5.13) again, yields $A w_1 = 0$, a contradiction.
- If $1 \sim \alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n}$, then (5.13) implies

$$A w_1 + \lambda B(w_1, w_1) = 0 \text{ for some number } \lambda > 0.$$

Taking the scalar product of this equation with w_1 yields $w_1 = 0$, a contradiction.

In conclusion, expansion (3.2) cannot stop at w_1 , hence w_2 exists.

Next we insert $v_n = v + \Gamma_{1,n} w_1 + \Gamma_{2,n} w_n^{(2)}$ into the state equation to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{1,n} A w_1 + \Gamma_{2,n} A w_n^{(2)} + \alpha_n \Gamma_{2,n} B_s(v, w_n^{(2)}) + \alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n}^2 B(w_1, w_1) \\ + \alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n} \Gamma_{2,n} B_s(w_1, w_n^{(2)}) + \alpha_n \Gamma_{2,n}^2 B(w_n^{(2)}, w_n^{(2)}) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5.14)$$

For (i), it follows (5.14) that

- if $\Gamma_{1,n} \succ \alpha_n \Gamma_{2,n}, \alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n}^2$, then $A w_1 = 0$, so we immediately have $w_1 = 0$,
- if $\Gamma_{1,n} \sim \alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n}^2 \succ \alpha_n \Gamma_{2,n}$, then

$$A w_1 + \lambda B(w_1, w_1) = 0 \text{ for some } \lambda > 0.$$

Thus taking the scalar product with w_1 and applying (2.16), we find that, again $w_1 = 0$.

Therefore, these two cases are impossible.

The results for the remaining items (ii)–(vi) follow by considering the largest sequence among $\Gamma_{1,n}$, $\alpha_n\Gamma_{2,n}$ and $\alpha_n\Gamma_{1,n}^2$ in equation (5.14). \square

6. EXPANDED FORCE CASE

In this section, with positive numbers α_n 's as in Section 3, we consider a family of forces $(g_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ in \mathcal{H} and a family of corresponding steady states $(v_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{H}$ of the Galerkin approximation, i.e.,

$$Av_n + \alpha_n B(v_n, v_n) = g_n, \quad (6.1)$$

where, we recall, B is defined by (2.15). We assume that g_n is bounded in \mathcal{H} , so that v_n is as well. Using Lemma 4.2 we can find subsequences of v_n 's and g_n 's, still denoted by v_n and g_n , with the strict unitary expansions

$$v_n \approx v + \sum_k \Gamma_{k,n} w_k, \quad g_n \approx g + \sum_k H_{k,n} h_k. \quad (6.2)$$

Let \mathcal{S} be defined as in section 3. Denote

$$\beta_k = (H_{k,n})_{n=1}^\infty \in \mathcal{X} \text{ and } \tilde{\mathcal{S}} = \mathcal{S} \cup \{\beta_k \text{ with valid integers } k\text{'s}\}.$$

Since we work with subsequences, by the countability of $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ and the virtue of Lemma 3.2 and (4.8), we may assume that $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ is totally comparable. Then we can apply the idea of the procedure (3.9) in Section 3 to equation (6.1) and sequences in $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$.

Theorem 6.1. *Assume $g \neq 0$ and the strict unitary expansion of g_n in (6.2) is nontrivial. Then one has the following.*

- (i) $B(v, v) = 0$.
- (ii) *The strict unitary expansion of v_n in (6.2) is nontrivial.*
- (iii) *If $\alpha_n\Gamma_{1,n} \succ 1$, then*

$$B_s(v, w_1) = 0. \quad (6.3)$$

- (iv) *If $1 \succ \alpha_n\Gamma_{1,n}$, then $\alpha_n\Gamma_{1,n} \lesssim H_{1,n}$ and*

$$Av = g, \quad (6.4)$$

$$B_s(v, w_1) = \lambda_1 h_1 \text{ where } \lambda_1 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{H_{1,n}}{\alpha_n\Gamma_{1,n}} \in [0, \infty). \quad (6.5)$$

- (v) *If $\alpha_n\Gamma_{1,n} \sim 1$, then*

$$Av - g + \lambda_2 B_s(v, w_1) = 0, \text{ where } \lambda_2 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n\Gamma_{1,n} > 0. \quad (6.6)$$

Let $\chi_n = \alpha_n\Gamma_{1,n} - \lambda_1$. Assume (S1)–(S3) in Section 3 with $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ replacing \mathcal{S} .

- (1) *If*

$$\Gamma_{1,n} \succ H_{1,n} \text{ and } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\chi_n}{\Gamma_{1,n}} = 0, \quad (6.7)$$

then w_2 exists and $\alpha_n\Gamma_{2,n} \lesssim \Gamma_{1,n}$ and

$$\lambda_3(Aw_1 + \lambda_2 B(w_1, w_1)) + B_s(v, w_2) = 0, \text{ where } \lambda_3 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Gamma_{1,n}}{\alpha_n\Gamma_{2,n}} \in [0, \infty). \quad (6.8)$$

(2) *If*

$$H_{1,n} \succ \Gamma_{1,n} \text{ and } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\chi_n}{H_{1,n}} = 0, \quad (6.9)$$

then w_2 exists and $\alpha_n \Gamma_{2,n} \lesssim H_{1,n}$ and

$$B_s(v, w_2) = \lambda_4 h_1, \text{ where } \lambda_4 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{H_{1,n}}{\alpha_n \Gamma_{2,n}} \in [0, \infty). \quad (6.10)$$

(3) *If w_2 exists and*

$$\alpha_n \Gamma_{2,n} \succ \Gamma_{1,n}, H_{1,n} \text{ and } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\chi_n}{\alpha_n \Gamma_{2,n}} = 0, \quad (6.11)$$

then $B_s(v, w_2) = 0$.

(4) *Assume $|\chi_n| \succ \Gamma_{1,n}, H_{1,n}$. If w_2 does not exist, then (6.3) and (6.4) hold. If w_2 exists and $|\chi_n| \lesssim \alpha_n \Gamma_{2,n}$, then*

$$B_s(v, w_1) + \lambda_5 B_s(v, w_2) = 0, \text{ where } \lambda_5 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\alpha_n \Gamma_{2,n}}{\chi_n} \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (6.12)$$

(5) *Assume $\Gamma_{1,n} \sim H_{1,n} \sim |\chi_n|$. If w_2 does not exist then*

$$Aw_1 + \lambda_6 B_s(v, w_1) + \lambda_2 B(w_1, w_1) = \lambda_7 h_1, \quad (6.13)$$

where

$$\lambda_6 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\chi_n}{\Gamma_{1,n}} \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \lambda_7 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{H_{1,n}}{\Gamma_{1,n}} > 0.$$

If w_2 exists and $\Gamma_{1,n} \lesssim \alpha_n \Gamma_{2,n}$, then

$$Aw_1 + \lambda_6 B_s(v, w_1) + \lambda_2 B(w_1, w_1) + \lambda_8 B_s(v, w_2) = \lambda_7 h_1, \quad (6.14)$$

where

$$\lambda_8 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\alpha_n \Gamma_{2,n}}{\Gamma_{1,n}} \in [0, \infty).$$

Proof. We write

$$g_n = g + H_{1,n} h_n^{(1)} \text{ with } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h_n^{(1)} = h_1 \neq 0. \quad (6.15)$$

Part (i). Dividing (6.1) by α_n and letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ give $B(v, v) = 0$.

Part (ii). Suppose $v_n = v$ for all n . Then, together with part (i), we have from (6.1) that $Av - g = H_{1,n} h_n^{(1)}$. This yields $Av - g = 0 = H_{1,n} h_n^{(1)}$. The last identity contradicts the nonzero limit in (6.15).

Part (iii). Assume $\alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n} \succ 1$. Substituting $v_n = v + \Gamma_{1,n} w_n^{(1)}$ and (6.15) into (6.1) and using part (i) give

$$(Av - g) + \Gamma_{1,n} Aw_n^{(1)} + \alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n} B_s(v, w_n^{(1)}) + \alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n}^2 B(w_n^{(1)}, w_n^{(1)}) = H_{1,n} h_n^{(1)}. \quad (6.16)$$

Dividing this equation by $\alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n}$ and letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain (6.3).

Part (iv). Assume $1 \succ \alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n}$. Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (6.16) yields (6.4). Now, (6.16) becomes

$$\Gamma_{1,n} Aw_n^{(1)} + \alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n} B_s(v, w_n^{(1)}) + \alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n}^2 B(w_n^{(1)}, w_n^{(1)}) = H_{1,n} h_n^{(1)}. \quad (6.17)$$

Suppose $H_{1,n} \succ \alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n}$. By dividing (6.17) by $H_{1,n}$ and letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain $h_1 = 0$, which is a contradiction. Thus $\alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n} \lesssim H_{1,n}$. Dividing (6.17) by $\alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n}$ and letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain (6.3).

Part (v). Assume $\alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n} \sim 1$. Passing $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (6.16) gives (6.5) directly.

(1) Assume (6.7). Suppose $w_n^{(1)} = w_1$ for all n . We rewrite (6.16) using (6.6) as

$$\Gamma_{1,n} A w_1 + \chi_n B_s(v, w_1) + \alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n}^2 B(w_1, w_1) = H_{1,n} h_n^{(1)}. \quad (6.18)$$

Note that $\Gamma_{1,n} \sim \alpha_n \gamma_{1,n}^2$. Dividing (6.18) by $\Gamma_{1,n}$, passing $n \rightarrow \infty$ and using condition (6.7), we obtain

$$A w_1 + \lambda_1 B_s(w_1, w_1) = 0. \quad (6.19)$$

This implies $w_1 = 0$, a contradiction. Therefore, w_2 exists. We rewrite (6.16) using (6.6) and the fact $\Gamma_1 w_n^{(1)} = \Gamma_{1,n} w_1 + \Gamma_{2,n} w_n^{(2)}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} & \Gamma_{1,n} A w_1 + \Gamma_{2,n} A w_n^{(2)} + \chi_n B_s(v, w_1) + \alpha_n \Gamma_{2,n} B_s(v, w_n^{(2)}) + \alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n}^2 B(w_1, w_1) \\ & + \alpha_n \Gamma_{1,n} \Gamma_{2,n} B_s(w_1, w_n^{(2)}) + \alpha_n \Gamma_{2,n}^2 B(w_n^{(2)}, w_n^{(2)}) = H_{1,n} h_n^{(1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.20)$$

We focus on the terms with coefficients $\Gamma_{1,n}$, χ_n , $\alpha_n \Gamma_{2,n}$, $H_{1,n}$ in (6.20).

If $\Gamma_{1,n} \succ \alpha_n \Gamma_{2,n}$, then dividing (6.20) by $\Gamma_{1,n}$ and letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain (6.19) again which yields a contradiction. Thus, $\alpha_n \Gamma_{2,n} \lesssim \Gamma_{1,n}$. Now, dividing (6.20) by $\alpha_n \Gamma_{2,n}$ and letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain (6.8).

(2) Assume (6.9). If $w_n^{(1)} = w_1$ for all n , then dividing (6.18) by $H_{1,n}$ and passing $n \rightarrow \infty$ give $h_1 = 0$, a contradiction. Thus w_2 exists. Similar to the rest of part (1), by dividing (6.20) by $H_{1,n}$ we derive $\alpha_n \Gamma_{2,n} \lesssim H_{1,n}$, and then by dividing (6.20) by $\alpha_n \Gamma_{2,n}$ we obtain (6.10).

(3) Assume w_2 exists and (6.11). Then dividing (6.20) by $\alpha_n \Gamma_{2,n}$ and letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain $B_s(v, w_2) = 0$.

(4) Assume $|\chi_n| \succ \Gamma_{1,n}, H_{1,n}$. If w_2 does not exist, then (6.18) implies (6.3). This and (6.6) then imply (6.4). If w_2 exists and $|\chi_n| \lesssim \alpha_n \Gamma_{2,n}$, then dividing (6.19) by χ_n and letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ yield (6.12).

(5) Similar to part (4), dividing (6.18) and (6.19) by $\Gamma_{1,n}$ yield (6.13) and (6.14), respectively. \square

We observe that the procedure (3.9) in Section 3, in fact, does not require $|w_k| = |w_n^{(k)}| = 1$. This prompts us to consider expansions of a more general class than those satisfying Definition 4.1.

Definition 6.2. Let $(v_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence in a normed space $(Z, \|\cdot\|_Z)$ over \mathbb{C} or \mathbb{R} .

- We say the sequence $(v_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ has a unitary expansion if, in Definition 4.1, condition $\|w_n^{(k)}\|_Z = 1$ is removed.
- We say the sequence $(v_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ has a pre-unitary expansion if in Definition 4.1, condition $\|w_k\|_Z = 1$ is replaced with $w_k \neq 0$, and condition $\|w_n^{(k)}\|_Z = 1$ is removed.

We still use (4.6) to denote the asymptotic expansions in Definition 6.2.

Remark 6.3. Suppose $(v_n)_{n=N_0}^\infty$ has a pre-unitary expansion (4.6). Then it has the following unitary expansion

$$v_n \approx v + \sum_k \widehat{\Gamma}_{k,n} \widehat{w}_k, \quad \text{where } \widehat{w}_k = \|w_k\|_Z^{-1} w_k, \quad \widehat{\Gamma}_{k,n} = \|w_k\|_Z \Gamma_{k,n}. \quad (6.21)$$

Indeed, let $\widehat{w}_n^{(k)} = \|w_k\|_Z^{-1} w_n^{(k)}$. Clearly, $\|\widehat{w}_k\|_Z = 1$, $\widehat{\Gamma}_{k,n} \rightarrow 0$ and

$$\widehat{\Gamma}_{k+1,n} / \widehat{\Gamma}_{k,n} = (\|w_{k+1}\|_Z / \|w_k\|_Z) \Gamma_{k+1,n} / \Gamma_{k,n} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Moreover, one has, for $n \geq N_0$ and $k \geq 1$, that $\Gamma_{k,n}w_k = \widehat{\Gamma}_{k,n}\widehat{w}_k$ and $\Gamma_{k,n}w_n^{(k)} = \widehat{\Gamma}_{k,n}\widehat{w}_n^{(k)}$. For $n \geq N_0$ and $m \geq 1$, we write

$$v_n = v + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \Gamma_{k,n}w_k + \Gamma_{k,n}w_n^{(m)} = v + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \widehat{\Gamma}_{k,n}\widehat{w}_k + \widehat{\Gamma}_{k,n}\widehat{w}_n^{(m)}.$$

Since $\widehat{w}_n^{(m)}$ converges to $\|w_m\|_Z^{-1}w_m = \widehat{w}_m$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have the unitary expansion (6.21).

Therefore, any pre-unitary expansion can be converted to a unitary one by a (natural) scaling specified in (6.21).

Remark 6.4. We have the following remarks on finite unitary expansions.

- (a) Suppose $(v_n)_{n=N_0}^\infty$ has a finite unitary expansion. Then taking $k = K$ in (4.4) and using (4.5), we obtain

$$v_n = v + \Gamma_{1,n}w_1 + \dots + \Gamma_{K,n}w_K, \text{ for all } n \geq N_0, \quad (6.22)$$

Now, suppose we have (6.22) with $\Gamma_{j,n}$ and w_j , for $1 \leq j \leq K$, being as in Definition 4.1. Then the sum in (6.22) is a unitary expansion of $(v_n)_{n=N_0}^\infty$. Indeed, we have (4.4) with

$$w_n^{(k)} = w_k + \sum_{j=k+1}^K \frac{\Gamma_{j,n}}{\Gamma_{k,n}} w_j.$$

Clearly, $w_n^{(k)} \rightarrow w_k$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

- (b) In the case of a finite unitary expansion (6.22) in a finite dimensional real linear space Z , by taking N_0 sufficiently large, we may assume $K \leq \dim(Z)$. Indeed, assume we have (6.22) for some $K > \dim(Z)$. Suppose w_1, \dots, w_k are linearly independent and $w_{k+1} \in \text{span}\{w_1, \dots, w_k\}$. Then

$$w_{k+1} = c_1w_1 + \dots + c_kw_k \text{ for some } c_1, c_2, \dots, c_k \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Setting $\widetilde{\Gamma}_{j,n} = \Gamma_{j,n} + c_j\Gamma_{k+1,n}$, for $1 \leq j \leq k$, we have

$$\Gamma_{1,n}w_1 + \dots + \Gamma_{k,n}w_k + \Gamma_{k+1,n}w_{k+1} = \widetilde{\Gamma}_{1,n}w_1 + \dots + \widetilde{\Gamma}_{k,n}w_k$$

For large enough n , we have $\widetilde{\Gamma}_{j,n} > 0$, and

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}_{j+1,n}/\widetilde{\Gamma}_{j,n} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty, \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, k-1.$$

Repeating the above argument finitely many times starting with $k = 1$, we obtain (6.22) with newly defined $\Gamma_{j,n}$, re-indexed w_j and new $K \leq \dim(Z)$.

A simple example for unitary expansions is the power series in Banach spaces, namely,

$$v_n = v + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda^{kn} w_k, \text{ for some number } \lambda \in (0, 1) \text{ and unit vectors } w_k\text{'s.}$$

This can be generalized as follow.

Lemma 6.5. *Let $\theta_n > 0$ and $\theta_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Suppose $(w_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ is a sequence in a Banach space $(Z, \|\cdot\|_Z)$ over \mathbb{C} or \mathbb{R} and there exist numbers $M > 0$ and $D_0 > 0$ such that*

$$\|w_n\|_Z \leq MD_0^n \text{ for all } n \geq 1.$$

Then there is $N_0 \geq 1$ such that $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \theta_n^k w_k$ converges absolutely to a vector $v_n \in Z$, for all $n \geq N_0$. Moreover, one has, for all $n \geq N_0$ and $m \geq 1$ that

$$v_n = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \theta_n^k w_k + \theta_n^m w_n^{(m)} \quad \text{with} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} w_n^{(m)} = w_m. \quad (6.23)$$

Proof. Let $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and integer $N_0 \geq 1$ be such that $D_0 \theta_n \leq \gamma$ for all $n \geq N_0$. We have

$$\theta_n^k \|w_k\|_Z \leq M(D_0 \theta_n)^k \leq M\gamma^k \quad \text{for } n \geq N_0. \quad (6.24)$$

This implies $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \theta_n^k w_k$ converges absolutely to a vector $v_n \in Z$ for any $n \geq N_0$.

For $n \geq N_0$ and $m \geq 1$, we write v_n as in (6.23) with $w_n^{(m)} = w_m + \sum_{k=m+1}^{\infty} \theta_n^{k-m} w_k$.

We estimate the last sum by

$$\sum_{k=m+1}^{\infty} \theta_n^{k-m} \|w_k\|_Z \leq M\theta_n^{-m} \sum_{k=m+1}^{\infty} (D_0 \theta_n)^k = M\theta_n^{-m} \frac{(D_0 \theta_n)^{m+1}}{1 - D_0 \theta_n} = \frac{MD_0^{m+1} \theta_n}{(1 - D_0 \theta_n)},$$

which goes to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} w_n^{(m)} = w_m$. \square

Returning to (6.2) and taking into account Lemma 6.5, we look for the following specific expansions. For $n \geq 1$, let

$$v_n = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n^{-k} w_k \quad \text{and} \quad g_n = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n^{-k} h_k. \quad (6.25)$$

Below, we use heuristic arguments to find the relations between w_k 's and h_k 's. Substituting expansions in (6.25) into (6.1) and collecting the α_n^{-m} -terms, for $m \geq -1$, we formally derive, for $m = -1$,

$$B(w_0, w_0) = 0, \quad (6.26)$$

and, for $m \geq 0$,

$$Aw_m + \sum_{k=0}^{m+1} B(w_k, w_{m+1-k}) = h_m, \quad (6.27)$$

i.e.,

$$Aw_m + B_s(w_0, w_{m+1}) + \sum_{k=1}^m B(w_k, w_{m+1-k}) = h_m. \quad (6.28)$$

In particular, when $m = 0$,

$$Aw_0 + B_s(w_0, w_1) = h_0, \quad (6.29)$$

and when $m = 1$,

$$Aw_1 + B_s(w_0, w_2) + B(w_1, w_1) = h_1. \quad (6.30)$$

We will show that the above constructions can be made rigorous. Let

$$M_A = \max\{|Av| : v \in \mathcal{H}, |v| = 1\} \quad \text{and} \quad M_B = \max\{|B(u, v)| : u, v \in \mathcal{H}, |u| = |v| = 1\}.$$

Then

$$|v| \leq |Av| \leq M_A |v|, \quad |B(u, v)| \leq M_B |u| |v| \quad \text{for all } u, v \in \mathcal{H}. \quad (6.31)$$

Definition 6.6. For $u \in \mathcal{H}$, we define a linear mapping L_u on \mathcal{H} by

$$w \in \mathcal{H} \mapsto L_u w := Aw + B_s(u, w) \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Denote $c_0 = 1/(4(M_B + 1)) > 0$. Let $u \in \mathcal{H}$ with $|u| \leq c_0$. By (6.31), one has

$$|L_u w| \geq |w| - 2M_B |u| |w| \geq |w|/2.$$

This implies L_u is invertible, and

$$|L_u^{-1} f| \leq 2|f| \text{ for all } f \in \mathcal{H}. \quad (6.32)$$

Theorem 6.7. *Given $w_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ that satisfies (6.26). Then there exist $h_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ and $w_k, h_k \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{0\}$ for all $k \geq 1$, and an integer $N_0 \geq 1$ such that (6.27) holds for all $m \geq 0$, v_n and g_n defined by (6.25) are absolutely convergent for all $n \geq N_0$ and satisfy equation (6.1) for all $n \geq N_0$. Moreover, the series in (6.25) are pre-unitary expansions of $(v_n)_{n=N_0}^\infty$ and $(g_n)_{n=N_0}^\infty$, that is,*

$$v_n \approx w_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Gamma_{k,n} w_k \text{ and } g_n \approx h_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Gamma_{k,n} h_k \text{ with } \Gamma_{k,n} = \alpha_n^{-k}. \quad (6.33)$$

Proof. First of all, we define h_0 by (6.29). Given any numbers $M \geq 1$ and $D_0 > 1$.

Step 1. We will find $w_k, h_k \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{0\}$, for all $k \geq 1$, that satisfy (6.27) and

$$|w_k| \leq MD_0^k \text{ for all } k \geq 1. \quad (6.34)$$

We consider two cases.

Case 1. The mapping $u \in \mathcal{H} \mapsto B_s(w_0, u)$ is not zero. We construct w_k 's and h_k 's recursively. First, choose $w_1 \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $0 < |w_1| \leq MD_0$ and define h_0 by (6.29).

Let $m \geq 1$. Suppose we already have w_1, \dots, w_m and h_1, \dots, h_{m-1} .

(a) If $Aw_m + \sum_{k=1}^m B(w_k, w_{m+1-k}) = 0$, choose $w_{m+1} \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $|w_{m+1}| \leq MD_0^{m+1}$ and $B_s(w_0, w_{m+1}) \neq 0$.

(b) If $Aw_m + \sum_{k=1}^m B(w_k, w_{m+1-k}) \neq 0$, choose $w_{m+1} \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{0\}$ so that $|w_{m+1}| \leq MD_0^{m+1}$ and

$$|B_s(w_0, w_{m+1})| < \left| Aw_m + \sum_{k=1}^m B(w_k, w_{m+1-k}) \right|.$$

For both cases (a) and (b), define h_m by (6.28). Then $h_m \neq 0$.

Case 2. $B_s(w_0, u) = 0$ for all $u \in \mathcal{H}$. Equation (6.28) for $m \geq 1$ now becomes

$$Aw_1 + B(w_1, w_1) = h_1, \text{ see (6.30) when } m = 1, \quad (6.35)$$

and, for $m \geq 2$,

$$Aw_m + B_s(w_1, w_m) + \sum_{2 \leq k \leq m-1} B(w_k, w_{m+1-k}) = h_m$$

which is equivalent to

$$L_{w_1} w_m = f_m := h_m - \sum_{2 \leq k \leq m-1} B(w_k, w_{m+1-k}). \quad (6.36)$$

We choose $h_1 \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $0 < |h_1| \leq c_0$. We solve for w_1 from the Galerkin NSE (6.35) with the body force h_1 . Taking scalar product (in \mathcal{H}) of (6.35) with w_1 , we have

$$|w_1|^2 \leq \langle Aw_1, w_1 \rangle = \langle h_1, w_1 \rangle \leq \frac{1}{2}|w_1|^2 + \frac{1}{2}|h_1|^2.$$

Hence, $0 < |w_1| \leq |h_1| \leq c_0$. Since $c_0 < 1$, we have $|w_1| \leq MD_0$.

Let $m \geq 2$. Suppose we already have h_k, w_k for $k = 1, \dots, m-1$. We choose $h_m \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{0\}$ such that the f_m defined in (6.36) satisfies $0 < |f_m| \leq MD_0^m/2$. Choose $w_m = L_{w_1}^{-1}f_m$. Then $w_m \neq 0$ and, by inequality (6.32), $|w_m| \leq 2|f_m| \leq MD_0^m$.

Step 2. For $m \geq 1$, we have from (6.27), (6.31) and (6.34) that

$$|h_m| \leq M_A|w_m| + \sum_{k=0}^{m+1} M_B|w_k||w_{m+1-k}| \leq M_A MD_0^m + (m+2)M_B M^2 D_0^{m+1}.$$

This implies that $\limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} |h_m|^{1/m} < \infty$. We apply Lemma 6.5 to both w_n and h_n using $\theta_n = \alpha_n^{-1}$. Then there exists $N_0 \geq 1$ such that the series in (6.25) converge absolutely for any $n \geq N_0$, and they are the pre-unitary expansions (6.33) of $(v_n)_{n=N_0}^\infty$ and $(g_n)_{n=N_0}^\infty$.

Step 3. By the absolute convergence of series for v_n and (similar) Cauchy's product for $B(v_n, v_n)$, one can prove, with the use of relations (6.26) and (6.27), that v_n and g_n satisfy equation (3.1) for all $n \geq N_0$. \square

Remark 6.8. Thanks to Remark 6.3, we can convert the pre-unitary expansions in (6.33) to the following unitary ones

$$v_n \approx w_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \widehat{\Gamma}_{k,n} \widehat{w}_k, \quad \text{where } \widehat{w}_k = |w_k|^{-1} w_k, \quad \widehat{\Gamma}_{k,n} = |w_k| \alpha_n^{-k}, \quad (6.37)$$

$$g_n \approx h_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \widehat{H}_{k,n} \widehat{h}_k, \quad \text{where } \widehat{h}_k = |h_k|^{-1} h_k, \quad \widehat{H}_{k,n} = |h_k| \alpha_n^{-k}. \quad (6.38)$$

We have $1 \sim \alpha_n \widehat{\Gamma}_{1,n}$ and $\widehat{H}_{k,n} \sim \widehat{\Gamma}_{k,n} \sim \alpha_n \widehat{\Gamma}_{j,n} \widehat{\Gamma}_{k+1-j,n}$ for $k \geq 1, 1 \leq j \leq k$.

Substituting (6.37) and (6.38) into equation (6.1) and following the procedure (3.9) in Section 3 with the use of equivalent sequences, we obtain, for each $m \geq 0$,

$$\widehat{\Gamma}_{m,n} A \widehat{w}_m + \alpha_n \sum_{k=0}^{m+1} \widehat{\Gamma}_{k,n} \widehat{\Gamma}_{m+1-k,n} B(\widehat{w}_k, \widehat{w}_{m+1-k}) = \widehat{H}_{m,n} \widehat{h}_m$$

which is exactly equivalent to (6.27). This shows that the procedure (3.9) works precisely in this case.

The next Example 6.9 and Proposition 6.11 show that both Cases 1 and 2 in the proof of Theorem 6.7 are probable.

Consider the periodic boundary condition. For $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$, denote $E_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x}) = e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}}$ for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. For any nonempty, finite subset K of $\mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$ that is symmetric about the origin, we denote

$$E[K] = \{u \in H : u = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in K} \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathbf{k}} E_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x})\}.$$

We say \mathcal{H} covers a wave vector $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$ if $E[\{\mathbf{k}, -\mathbf{k}\}] \subset \mathcal{H}$. Clearly, \mathcal{H} covers \mathbf{k} if and only if it covers $(-\mathbf{k})$.

Example 6.9. Although Case 2 in the proof of Theorem 6.7 looks peculiar, it still holds true for some particular v and space \mathcal{H} which can have an arbitrary large dimension. Here is an example. Consider the periodic boundary condition. Let $M \geq 1$ be a real number, and \mathbf{k} be a given vector in \mathbb{Z}^d such that $|\mathbf{k}| > 2M$.

Set $K_1 = \{\mathbf{k}, -\mathbf{k}\}$ and $K_2 = \{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{Z}^d : 0 < |\mathbf{j}| \leq M\}$. Let K_3 be a finite subset of $\{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus K_2 : \mathbf{p} \neq 0, \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{k} = 0\}$ such that K_3 is symmetric about the origin.

Define $K = K_1 \cup K_2 \cup K_3$ and let $\mathcal{H} = E[K]$. Let v be any function in $E[K_1] \subset \mathcal{H}$.

Let u be any function in \mathcal{H} . Then $u = u_1 + u_2 + u_3$, where $u_j \in E[K_j]$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$. We have

$$B_s(v, u) = B_s(v, u_1) + B_s(v, u_2) + B_s(v, u_3).$$

Obviously, $B_s(v, u_1) = 0$.

Consider $B_s(v, u_2)$. Observe that the functions $(v \cdot \nabla)u_2$ and $(u_2 \cdot \nabla)v$ are complex linear combinations of functions $E_{\mathbf{j} \pm \mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x})$ with $\mathbf{j} \in K_2$. For $\mathbf{j} \in K_2$, one has $|\mathbf{j} \pm \mathbf{k}| \geq |\mathbf{k}| - |\mathbf{j}| > M$. Thus $\mathbf{j} \pm \mathbf{k} \notin K_2$. Also, $(\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{j}) \cdot \mathbf{k} \geq |\mathbf{k}|^2 - |\mathbf{j}||\mathbf{k}| \geq 2M|\mathbf{k}| - M|\mathbf{k}| > 0$, hence $\mathbf{j} \pm \mathbf{k} \notin K_3$. It follows that $\mathbf{j} \pm \mathbf{k} \notin K$ or $\mathbf{j} \pm \mathbf{k} \in K_1$. With both of these cases, we have, after projection to \mathcal{H} , $B(v, u_2) = B(u_2, v) = 0$.

Consider $B_s(v, u_3)$. Let $\mathbf{p} \in K_3$. Then, by the orthogonality, $|\mathbf{p} \pm \mathbf{k}| > |\mathbf{k}| > 2M$, which implies $\mathbf{p} \pm \mathbf{k} \notin K_2$. Also, $(\mathbf{p} \pm \mathbf{k}) \cdot \mathbf{k} = \pm|\mathbf{k}|^2 \neq 0$, hence $\mathbf{p} \pm \mathbf{k} \notin K_3$. Then, similar to the consideration of $B_s(v, u_2)$, we must have $B(v, u_3) = B(u_3, v) = 0$.

In conclusion, we have $B_s(v, u) = 0$. Finally, the large dimension of \mathcal{H} comes from the large size of K . This, in turn, comes from the large size of K_3 regardless of M and/or the fact that large number M gives a large size of K_2 .

When $\mathcal{H} = \bar{P}_\Lambda H$, Proposition 6.11 below is a general result for Case 1 in the proof of Theorem 6.7.

Lemma 6.10. *Consider the 2D case with the periodic boundary condition. Let $\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ be such that \mathbf{k}, \mathbf{j} are not parallel and $|\mathbf{k}| \neq |\mathbf{j}|$. Suppose \mathcal{H} covers $\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{j}$. Assume v is a nonzero function in $E[\{\mathbf{k}, -\mathbf{k}\}]$ and w is a nonzero function in $E[\{\mathbf{j}, -\mathbf{j}\}]$. Then the coefficient of $E_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{x})$ in $B_s(v, w)$ is nonzero, and, consequently, $B_s(v, w) \neq 0$.*

Proof. There are $z_{\mathbf{k}}, \zeta_{\mathbf{j}} \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ such that

$$v = z_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{e}_3 \times \mathbf{k})E_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x}) + \bar{z}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{e}_3 \times \mathbf{k})E_{-\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x}), \quad w = \zeta_{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{e}_3 \times \mathbf{j})E_{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{x}) + \bar{\zeta}_{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{e}_3 \times \mathbf{j})E_{-\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{x}).$$

We have

$$(v \cdot \nabla)w + (w \cdot \nabla)v = (\mathbf{a}E_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{x}) + \bar{\mathbf{a}}E_{-\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{x})) + (\mathbf{b}E_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{x}) + \bar{\mathbf{b}}E_{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x})),$$

with $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{C}^2$. Clearly, all vectors $\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{j}, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{j} - \mathbf{k}$ are nonzero and mutually distinct. Hence, the coefficient of $E_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{x})$ in $(v \cdot \nabla)w + (w \cdot \nabla)v$ is \mathbf{a} , which explicitly is

$$\mathbf{a} = iz_{\mathbf{k}}\zeta_{\mathbf{j}}((\mathbf{e}_3 \times \mathbf{k}) \cdot \mathbf{j})\mathbf{e}_3 \times \mathbf{j} + iz_{\mathbf{k}}\zeta_{\mathbf{j}}((\mathbf{e}_3 \times \mathbf{j}) \cdot \mathbf{k})\mathbf{e}_3 \times \mathbf{k}, \quad (6.39)$$

or equivalently,

$$\mathbf{a} = iz_{\mathbf{k}}\zeta_{\mathbf{j}}((\mathbf{e}_3 \times \mathbf{k}) \cdot \mathbf{j})\mathbf{e}_3 \times (\mathbf{j} - \mathbf{k}).$$

Therefore, the coefficient of $E_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{x})$ in $B_s(v, w)$ is

$$\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{a} - \frac{\mathbf{a} \cdot (\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{j})}{|\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{j}|^2}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{j}).$$

Note that $\mathbf{c} \times (\mathbf{j} + \mathbf{k}) = iz_{\mathbf{k}}\zeta_{\mathbf{j}}((\mathbf{e}_3 \times \mathbf{k}) \cdot \mathbf{j})[\mathbf{e}_3 \times (\mathbf{j} - \mathbf{k})] \times (\mathbf{j} + \mathbf{k})$.

Because \mathbb{Z}^2 -vectors \mathbf{k}, \mathbf{j} are not parallel, we have $(\mathbf{e}_3 \times \mathbf{k}) \cdot \mathbf{j} \neq 0$. Also,

$$[\mathbf{e}_3 \times (\mathbf{j} - \mathbf{k})] \times (\mathbf{j} + \mathbf{k}) = -(\mathbf{j} - \mathbf{k}) \cdot (\mathbf{j} + \mathbf{k})\mathbf{e}_3 = (|\mathbf{k}|^2 - |\mathbf{j}|^2)\mathbf{e}_3 \neq 0.$$

Therefore, $\mathbf{c} \neq 0$, which implies $B_s(v, w) \neq 0$. □

Proposition 6.11. *Consider the periodic boundary condition. Let $\Lambda \geq 5$ be an eigenvalue of A . Assume $\mathcal{H} = \bar{P}_\Lambda H$. Let v be any nonzero function in $\bar{P}_{(\sqrt{\Lambda}-1)^2} H$. Then there exists $w \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $B_s(v, w) \neq 0$.*

Proof. In this case, we have $\mathcal{H} = E[\{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d : 0 < |\mathbf{k}|^2 \leq \Lambda\}]$ and

$$v \in \bar{P}_{(\sqrt{\Lambda}-1)^2} H = E[\{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d : 0 < |\mathbf{k}| \leq \sqrt{\Lambda} - 1\}] \subset \mathcal{H}.$$

We use lexicographic order for the wave vectors in the finite Fourier series of v .

The 2D case. Let K be the set of wave vectors in the finite Fourier series of v with nonzero coefficients. Let $\mathbf{k} = \max K$, $K_0 = \{\mathbf{k}, -\mathbf{k}\}$ and $K_1 = K \setminus K_0$. We write $v = v_0 + v_1$ where $v_0 \neq 0$, $v_0 \in E[K_0]$ and $v_1 \in E[K_1]$.

We will choose w to be a nonzero function in $E[\{\mathbf{k}', -\mathbf{k}'\}]$ for a chosen wave vector \mathbf{k}' having nonnegative coordinates and at least one positive coordinate. We have

$$B_s(v, w) = B_s(v_0, w) + B_s(v_1, w).$$

Consider the coefficient of function $E_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{x})$ in $B_s(v, w)$. Observe that $B_s(v_1, w)$ is a finite sum of functions of modes $\mathbf{j} \pm \mathbf{k}$ with $\mathbf{j} \in K_1$. Let \mathbf{j} be any vector in K_1 . Then $\mathbf{j} < \mathbf{k}$ which yields $\mathbf{j} + \mathbf{k}' \neq \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}'$. Suppose $\mathbf{j} - \mathbf{k}' = \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}'$. Then $\mathbf{j} = \mathbf{k} + 2\mathbf{k}'$. Since $\mathbf{k}' > (0, 0)$, this implies $\mathbf{j} > \mathbf{k}$, a contradiction. Thus, $\mathbf{j} - \mathbf{k}' \neq \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}'$. We conclude that $B_s(v_1, w)$ does not contribute to the coefficient of $E_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{x})$. Therefore,

$$\text{coefficient of } E_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{x}) \text{ in } B_s(v, w) \text{ is exactly that in } B_s(v_0, w). \quad (6.40)$$

Suppose $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, k_2)$. Then $k_1 \geq 0$.

- If $k_1 \geq 2$ choose $\mathbf{k}' = (0, 1)$.
- If $k_1 = 1$, $|k_2| \geq 1$ choose $\mathbf{k}' = (0, 1)$.
- If $k_1 = 1$, $k_2 = 0$ choose $\mathbf{k}' = (0, 2)$. Then $|\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}'|^2 = 5$.
- If $k_1 = 0$, $|k_2| \geq 2$ choose $\mathbf{k}' = (1, 0)$.
- If $k_1 = 0$, $|k_2| = 1$ choose $\mathbf{k}' = (2, 0)$. Then $|\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}'|^2 = 5$.

Note that $|\mathbf{k}|^2 < \Lambda$ and $|\mathbf{k}'|^2 \leq 4$. Also, except for the case $|\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}'|^2 = 5$, the remaining cases have $|\mathbf{k}'| = 1$. The last case implies $|\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}'|^2 \leq (|\mathbf{k}| + 1)^2 \leq \Lambda$. Therefore, \mathcal{H} covers \mathbf{k} , \mathbf{k}' and $\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}'$. Observe that \mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}' are not parallel and $|\mathbf{k}| \neq |\mathbf{k}'|$. By the virtue of Lemma 6.10, the coefficient of $E_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{x})$ in $B_s(v_0, w)$ is nonzero. Combining this with (6.40), we obtain $B_s(v, w) \neq 0$.

The 3D case. We proceed as in the 2D case up to (6.40). In this case,

$$v_0 = \mathbf{a}_\mathbf{k} E_\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x}) + \bar{\mathbf{a}}_\mathbf{k} E_{-\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x}) \text{ with } 0 \neq \mathbf{a}_\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{C}^3, \mathbf{a}_\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{k} = 0. \quad (6.41)$$

We choose $w = (\mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{k}')(E_{\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{x}) + E_{-\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{x}))$, where $\mathbf{k}' \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ additionally satisfies it is not parallel with \mathbf{k} . Then, similar to (6.39), the coefficient of $E_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{x})$ in $(v_0 \cdot \nabla)w + (w \cdot \nabla)v_0$ is

$$i(\mathbf{a}_\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{k}')(\mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{k}') + i((\mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{k}') \cdot \mathbf{k})\mathbf{a}_\mathbf{k} = i(\mathbf{a}_\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{k}')(\mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{k}').$$

Since \mathbf{k}' is not parallel with \mathbf{k} , we have $\mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{k}'$ and $\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}'$ are nonzero and perpendicular to each other. Hence $(\mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{k}')$ is not parallel with $(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}')$.

We will select \mathbf{k}' so that $\mathbf{a}_\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{k}' \neq 0$. We do so for all possible scenarios of \mathbf{k} .

- Case \mathbf{k} is parallel with \mathbf{e}_1 . By the last condition in (6.41), $\mathbf{a}_\mathbf{k}$ is in $\mathbf{e}_2, \mathbf{e}_3$ -plane. So $\mathbf{a}_\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{e}_2 \neq 0$ or $\mathbf{a}_\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{e}_3 \neq 0$. We choose $\mathbf{k}' = \mathbf{e}_2$ or $\mathbf{k}' = \mathbf{e}_3$ correspondingly.
- Case \mathbf{k} is parallel with \mathbf{e}_2 . Choose $\mathbf{k}' = \mathbf{e}_1$ when $\mathbf{a}_\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{e}_1 \neq 0$, or $\mathbf{k}' = \mathbf{e}_3$ when $\mathbf{a}_\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{e}_3 \neq 0$.

- Case \mathbf{k} is parallel with \mathbf{e}_3 . Choose $\mathbf{k}' = \mathbf{e}_1$ when $\mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{k}} \cdot \mathbf{e}_1 \neq 0$, or $\mathbf{k}' = \mathbf{e}_2$ when $\mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{k}} \cdot \mathbf{e}_2 \neq 0$.
- Case \mathbf{k} is not parallel with $\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \mathbf{e}_3$. Then either $\mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{k}} \cdot \mathbf{e}_1 \neq 0$, or $\mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{k}} \cdot \mathbf{e}_2 \neq 0$, or $\mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{k}} \cdot \mathbf{e}_3 \neq 0$. Then choose $\mathbf{k}' = \mathbf{e}_1$, or $\mathbf{k}' = \mathbf{e}_2$ or $\mathbf{k}' = \mathbf{e}_3$, correspondingly.

Since $|\mathbf{k}'| = 1$, we have, same as in the 2D case, \mathcal{H} covers \mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}' and $\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}'$. Then the coefficient of $E_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{x})$ in $B_s(v_0, w)$ is not zero. By (6.40), we have $B_s(v, w) \neq 0$. \square

With the expansions in (6.25), we have $g_n \rightarrow g = h_0$ and $v_n \rightarrow v = w_0$. If $v = 0$, then by (6.29), we must have $g = 0$. However, as we will see in the next result, with a different design of expansions, it is possible that $v_n \rightarrow 0$ but $g_n \rightarrow g \neq 0$.

Theorem 6.12. *Suppose there exists $u \in \mathcal{H}$ such that*

$$B(u, u) \neq 0. \quad (6.42)$$

For any $M > 0$, there are $g_n \in \mathcal{H}$ and solutions v_n of (6.1), for all $n \geq 1$, such that $g_n \rightarrow g$ and $v_n \rightarrow 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, with $|g| = M$.

Proof. Take

$$v_n = \alpha_n^{-1/2} w_1 \text{ and } g_n = g + \alpha_n^{-1/2} h_1, \quad (6.43)$$

where

$$w_1 = \frac{\sqrt{M}}{\sqrt{|B(u, u)|}} u, \quad g = B(w_1, w_1), \quad h_1 = A w_1.$$

Direct calculations show that the conclusions of this theorem hold. \square

Example 6.13. Consider the periodic boundary condition. Clearly, condition (6.42) is not met if $\mathcal{H} = E[K]$ with all wave vectors in K being parallel to each other. We give explicit examples below where (6.42) does hold.

The 2D case. Let $\mathbf{k} = 2\mathbf{e}_1$ and $\mathbf{j} = \mathbf{e}_2$. Assume \mathcal{H} covers $\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{j}$. Set $u = u_1 + u_2$, where

$$u_1 = (\mathbf{e}_3 \times \mathbf{k})(E_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x}) + E_{-\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x})) \text{ and } u_2 = (\mathbf{e}_3 \times \mathbf{j})(E_{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{x}) + E_{-\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{x})).$$

Then $B(u, u) = B_s(u_1, u_2)$. By Lemma 6.10, $B_s(u_1, u_2) \neq 0$ which implies (6.42).

The 3D case. Suppose \mathcal{H} covers $\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2$ and $\mathbf{e}_1 + \mathbf{e}_2$. Let

$$u = u_1 + u_2, \text{ with } u_1 = \mathbf{e}_2(E_{\mathbf{e}_1}(\mathbf{x}) + E_{-\mathbf{e}_1}(\mathbf{x})), \quad u_2 = \mathbf{e}_3(E_{\mathbf{e}_2}(\mathbf{x}) + E_{-\mathbf{e}_2}(\mathbf{x})).$$

Then $B(u, u) = B_s(u_1, u_2)$. The coefficient of $E_{\mathbf{e}_1+\mathbf{e}_2}(\mathbf{x})$ in $(u_1 \cdot \nabla)u_2 + (u_2 \cdot \nabla)u_1$ is

$$(\mathbf{e}_2 \cdot i\mathbf{e}_2)\mathbf{e}_3 + (\mathbf{e}_3 \cdot i\mathbf{e}_1)\mathbf{e}_2 = i\mathbf{e}_3.$$

This vector is not parallel with $\mathbf{e}_1 + \mathbf{e}_2$, hence $B_s(u_1, u_2) \neq 0$, and we have (6.42).

Remark 6.14. Recall from Proposition 3.6 for the case $g_n \equiv g$ that the expansion of v_n must contain the w_2 -term. This contrasts with the fact the expansion of v_n in (6.43) stops at w_1 .

APPENDIX A.

The proof of Lemma 3.2 needs the following preparations in Lemmas A.1–A.3.

Lemma A.1. *For any $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$, the set $\{x, y\}$ has a totally comparable subsequential set.*

Proof. Suppose $x = (x_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ and $y = (y_n)_{n=1}^\infty$. If x_n/y_n is unbounded, then there is a subsequence $(n_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ of $(n)_{n=1}^\infty$ such that $(x_{n_k})_{k=1}^\infty \succ (y_{n_k})_{k=1}^\infty$. Otherwise, there is a subsequence $(n_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ such that $x_{n_k}/y_{n_k} \rightarrow \lambda \in [0, \infty)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. If $\lambda > 0$ then $(x_{n_k})_{k=1}^\infty \sim (y_{n_k})_{k=1}^\infty$, otherwise $(y_{n_k})_{k=1}^\infty \succ (x_{n_k})_{k=1}^\infty$. \square

Lemma A.2. *Let X be a totally comparable, finite subset of \mathcal{X} and $y \in \mathcal{X}$. Then $X \cup \{y\}$ has a totally comparable subsequential set.*

Proof. By finite induction on the size of X and the use of Lemma A.1. \square

Lemma A.3. *Let X be a finite, non-empty subset of \mathcal{X} . Then it has a totally comparable subsequential set.*

Proof. Suppose $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N\}$ with $x_k = (x_{k,n})_{n=1}^\infty$. For $1 \leq k \leq N$, let $Y_k = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k\}$. Then $Y_{k+1} = Y_k \cup \{x_{k+1}\}$ for $1 \leq k \leq N-1$. Applying Lemma A.2 repeatedly, we obtain subsequences $(\varphi_k(n))_{n=1}^\infty$ such that $\varphi_1(n) = n$, $(\varphi_{k+1}(n))_{n=1}^\infty$ is a subsequence of $(\varphi_k(n))_{n=1}^\infty$, and $(Y_{k+1})_{\varphi_k} = (Y_k)_{\varphi_k} \cup \{(x_{k+1, \varphi_k(n)})_{n=1}^\infty\}$ has a totally comparable subsequential set $(Y_{k+1})_{\varphi_{k+1}}$. Therefore, $X_{\varphi_N} = (Y_N)_{\varphi_N}$ is totally comparable. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.2. The case X is finite was already proved in Lemma A.3. Consider X is infinite now. We proceed as in the proof of Lemma A.3. Suppose $X = \{x_k = (x_{k,n})_{n=1}^\infty : k \geq 1\}$ and let $Y_k = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k\}$ for $k \geq 1$. Then there exist subsequences $(\varphi_k(n))_{n=1}^\infty$ of $(n)_{n=1}^\infty$, for all $k \geq 1$, such that $(\varphi_{k+1}(n))_{n=1}^\infty$ is a subsequence of $(\varphi_k(n))_{n=1}^\infty$, and each $(Y_k)_{\varphi_k}$ is totally comparable. By setting $\varphi(n) = \varphi_n(n)$, we have X_φ is a subsequential set of X and it is totally comparable. \square

For $X, Y \subset \mathcal{X}$, we say $X \succ Y$ if $x \succ y$ for all $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$. Its negation is denoted by $X \not\succeq Y$.

Proof of the second inequality of (3.17) in Theorem 3.5, part (v). Let R be the first row in (3.6), that is, $R = \{\sigma_m : m \geq 0\}$. We state a refined version, namely, for any $j \geq 1$ and $k \geq j$,

$$\text{ord}_S(\sigma_{j,k}) \leq \begin{cases} \omega \cdot (2j) & \text{if } R \not\succeq \{\sigma_{j,k}\}, \\ \omega \cdot (2j) + (k-j)(k-j+1)/2 & \text{if } R \succ \{\sigma_{j,k}\}. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Below, we prove (A.1) by induction in j .

Step 1. Consider $j = 1$. We will prove, for all $k \geq 1$, that

$$\text{ord}_S(\sigma_{1,k}) \leq \begin{cases} \omega + \omega & \text{if } R \not\succeq \{\sigma_{1,k}\}, \\ \omega + \omega + (k-1)k/2 & \text{if } R \succ \{\sigma_{1,k}\}. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Given $k \geq 1$. We need to compare $\sigma_{1,k}$ with R .

Case 1. $R \not\succeq \{\sigma_{1,k}\}$, that is, there is m such that $\sigma_{1,k} \not\succeq \sigma_m$. Suppose

$$\text{ord}_S(\sigma_{1,k}) > \omega + \omega. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Let T be the triangle of sequences in (3.6) with vertices $\sigma_{1,1}$, $\sigma_{1,k-1}$, and $\sigma_{k-1,k-1}$. Explicitly, $T = \{\sigma_{j,p} : 1 \leq j \leq p \leq k-1\}$.

Thanks to part (iv), we observe that the possible entries σ that satisfy $\sigma \succ \sigma_{1,k}$ and $\text{ord}_S(\sigma) \geq \omega$ are $\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}$ along with the triangle T . From this fact, property (3.8) applied to $\sigma_* = \sigma_{1,k}$ and (A.3), we must have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ord}_S(\{\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}\} \cup T) &\supset \{\text{ordinal number } \zeta : \omega \leq \zeta < \text{ord}_S(\sigma_{1,k})\} \\ &\supset \{\text{ordinal number } \zeta : \omega \leq \zeta \leq \omega + \omega\} = \{\omega, \omega + 1, \dots, \omega + \omega\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Since the first set is finite and the last set is infinite, the inclusion is impossible.

Case 2. $R \succ \{\sigma_{1,k}\}$, that is, $\sigma_m \succ \sigma_{1,k}$ for all m . Assume the contrary of the second inequality in (A.2), that is,

$$\text{ord}_S(\sigma_{1,k}) > \omega + \omega + (k-1)k/2. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

In this case, the possible entries σ that satisfy $\sigma \succ \sigma_{1,k}$ and $\text{ord}_S(\sigma) \geq \omega$ are those in the row R and the triangle T . Combining this fact with (3.8) applied to $\sigma_* = \sigma_{1,k}$ and (A.5), we must have, similar to (A.4), that

$$\text{ord}_S(R \cup T) \supset \{\omega, \omega + 1, \dots, \omega + \omega, \omega + \omega + 1, \omega + \omega + 2, \dots, \omega + \omega + (k-1)k/2\}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

We study the order in $R \cup T$ next. We compare R and T . Decompose $T = T_1 \cup T_2$, where

$$T_2 = \{\sigma \in T : \sigma_m \succ \sigma \text{ for all } m\} \text{ and } T_1 = T \setminus T_2.$$

Note that all three sets T, T_1, T_2 are finite and $R \succ T_2$, which clearly implies $R \cap T_2 = \emptyset$. For $\sigma \in T_1$, there is the smallest number $m(\sigma)$ such that $\sigma \succ \sigma_{m(\sigma)}$. Let

$$m_* = \max\{m(\sigma) : \sigma \in T_1\}.$$

Then for $\sigma \in T_1$ we have $\sigma \succ \sigma_{m(\sigma)} \succ \sigma_{m_*}$. The set $R \cup T_1$ is partitioned into $R_1 \cup R_2$ with

$$R_1 = \{\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m_*}\} \cup T_1, \quad R_2 = \{\sigma_{m_*+p} : p \geq 1\}, \quad (\text{A.7})$$

We have $R_1 \succ R_2 \succ T_2$ and $R \cup T = R_1 \cup R_2 \cup T_2$.

From (A.6) and (A.7), the finite set R_1 can only cover the assigned ordinal numbers going from ω to $\omega + M$ with some finite number M . The infinite set R_2 will give ordinal numbers

$$\omega + M + 1, \omega + M + 2, \omega + M + 3, \dots, \text{ i.e., } \omega + M + p, \text{ for all integers } p \geq 1.$$

Thus, the finite set T_2 has assigned ordinal numbers $\omega + \omega, \omega + \omega + 1, \dots, \omega + \omega + K$, for some nonnegative integer K . Therefore, the maximum of $\text{ord}_S(R \cup T)$ is $\omega + \omega + K$. Note that $K + 1$ cannot exceed the number of elements in T_2 , which cannot exceed the number of elements in T which is $(k-1)k/2$. Thus, $K < (k-1)k/2$, which gives a contradiction to (A.6). Therefore, we obtain the second inequality in (A.2).

From both cases 1 and 2 above, one has that inequality (A.2) holds.

Induction step. Let $j \geq 2$. Assume, for all $1 \leq j' \leq j-1$ and $k' \geq j'$, that

$$\text{ord}_S(\sigma_{j',k'}) \leq \begin{cases} \omega \cdot (2j') & \text{if } R \not\succ \{\sigma_{j',k'}\}, \\ \omega \cdot (2j') + (k' - j')(k' - j' + 1)/2 & \text{if } R \succ \{\sigma_{j',k'}\}. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

As a consequence of hypothesis (A.8), we have

$$\text{ord}_S(\sigma_{j',k'}) < \omega \cdot (2(j-1)) + \omega = \omega \cdot (2j-1) \text{ for all } 1 \leq j' \leq j-1 \text{ and } k' \geq j'. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

That is all elements σ on the rows starting with $\sigma_{j',j'}$ for $1 \leq j' \leq j-1$ have $\text{ord}_S(\sigma) < \omega \cdot (2j-1)$.

Given $k \geq j$. Let \widehat{T} be the triangle in (3.6) with vertices $\sigma_{j,j}, \sigma_{j,k-1}, \sigma_{k-1,k-1}$.

Case 1. $R \not\asymp \{\sigma_{j,k}\}$. Then

$$\sigma_{j,k} \succsim \sigma_m \text{ for some } m \geq 0. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Suppose the first inequality in (A.1) fails, i.e., $\text{ord}_S(\sigma_{j,k}) > \omega \cdot (2j)$.

Combining this assumption with part (iv), (A.9), (A.10), and (3.8) applied to $\sigma_* = \sigma_{j,k}$ give

$$\text{ord}_S(\{\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}\} \cup \widehat{T}) \supset \{\omega \cdot (2j - 1), \omega \cdot (2j - 1) + 1, \omega \cdot (2j - 1) + 2, \dots, \omega \cdot (2j)\}.$$

Since the first set is finite and the second set is infinite, we have a contradiction. Thus, the first inequality in (A.1) holds.

Case 2. $R \succ \{\sigma_{j,k}\}$. One has, for all m , $\sigma_m \succ \sigma_{j,k}$. Assume the second inequality in (A.1) is false, that is,

$$\text{ord}_S(\sigma_{j,k}) > \omega \cdot (2j) + (k - j)(k - j + 1)/2. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Similar to (A.6), by using part (iv), (A.9), (A.11), and (3.8) applied to $\sigma_* = \sigma_{j,k}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ord}_S(R \cup \widehat{T}) \supset \{ & \omega \cdot (2j - 1), \omega \cdot (2j - 1) + 1, \omega \cdot (2j - 1) + 2, \dots, \\ & \omega \cdot (2j), \omega \cdot (2j) + 1, \omega \cdot (2j) + 2, \dots, \\ & \omega \cdot (2j) + (k - j)(k - j + 1)/2\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.12})$$

We proceed as in Case 2 of Step 1 after (A.6) with \widehat{T} replacing T . Then the maximum of $\text{ord}_S(R \cup \widehat{T})$ is

$$\omega \cdot (2j - 1) + \omega + K = \omega \cdot (2j) + K,$$

where integer K is smaller than the cardinality of \widehat{T} . This implies $K < (k - 1)(k - j + 1)/2$, which contradicts (A.12). Thus the second inequality of (A.1) holds. This completes the proof of (A.1) for the induction step.

Conclusion. By the Induction Principle (in j), (A.1) holds for all $j \geq 1$ and $k \geq j$. Hence, we obtain the second inequality in (3.17) for all $k \geq j \geq 1$. \square

Lemma A.4. *Let X be a countable, totally comparable subset of \mathcal{X} and $y = (y_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of real numbers. Then there exists a subsequence $(\varphi(n))_{n=1}^\infty$ of $(n)_{n=1}^\infty$ such that*

- (i) $y_{\varphi(n)} = 0$ for all n , or
- (ii) $y_{\varphi(n)} > 0$ for all n and $(X \cup \{y\})_\varphi$ is totally comparable, or
- (iii) $y_{\varphi(n)} < 0$ for all n and $(X \cup \{-y\})_\varphi$ is totally comparable.

Proof. Let I_0 , respectively, I_+ , I_- be the set of indices n such that $y_n = 0$, respectively, $y_n > 0$, $y_n < 0$. If I_0 is infinite then (i) holds. If I_+ is infinite, then there is a subsequence $(\psi(n))_{n=1}^\infty$ of $(n)_{n=1}^\infty$ such that $y_{\psi(n)} > 0$ for all n . Then apply Lemma 3.2 to $(X \cup \{y\})_\psi$ we obtain (ii). When I_- is infinite, we apply the argument in (ii) to X and the sequence $(-y)$, hence, obtain (iii). \square

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Constantin and C. Foias. *Navier-Stokes equations*. Chicago Lectures in Mathematics. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 1988.
- [2] E. Doedel. AUTO: a program for the automatic bifurcation analysis of autonomous systems. *Congr. Numer.*, 30:265–284, 1981.
- [3] C. Foias and R. Temam. A generic property of the set of stationary solutions of Navier Stokes equations. In *Turbulence and Navier-Stokes equations (Proc. Conf., Univ. Paris-Sud, Orsay, 1975)*, volume Vol. 565 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 24–28. Springer, Berlin-New York, 1976.

- [4] C. Foias and R. Temam. Remarques sur les équations de Navier-Stokes stationnaires et les phénomènes successifs de bifurcation. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4)*, 5(1):28–63, 1978.
- [5] C. Foias. What do the Navier-Stokes equations tell us about turbulence? In *Harmonic analysis and nonlinear differential equations (Riverside, CA, 1995)*, volume 208 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 151–180. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1997.
- [6] C. Foias, M. S. Jolly, R. Lan, R. Rupam, Y. Yang, and B. Zhang. Time analyticity with higher norm estimates for the 2D Navier-Stokes equations. *IMA J. Appl. Math.*, 80(3):766–810, 2015.
- [7] C. Foias and J.-C. Saut. Remarques sur les équations de Navier-Stokes stationnaires. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4)*, 10(1):169–177, 1983.
- [8] C. Foias and R. Temam. Structure of the set of stationary solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 30(2):149–164, 1977.
- [9] U. Frisch. *Turbulence*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995. The legacy of A. N. Kolmogorov.
- [10] C. Marchioro. An example of absence of turbulence for any Reynolds number. II. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 108(4):647–651, 1987.
- [11] J. C. Saut and R. Temam. Generic properties of Navier-Stokes equations: Genericity with respect to the boundary values. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal*, 29(3):427–446, 1980.
- [12] R. Temam. *Infinite-dimensional dynamical systems in mechanics and physics*, volume 68 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1997.

¹DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY, 1108 MEMORIAL CIRCLE, LUBBOCK, TX 79409–1042, U. S. A.

Email address: luan.hoang@ttu.edu

²DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIANA UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON, IN 47405, U. S. A.

Email address: msjolly@indiana.edu