

# A Mathematical Foundation for QUMOND

Joachim Frenkler  
Fakultät für Mathematik, Physik und Informatik  
Universität Bayreuth  
D-95440 Bayreuth, Germany  
joachim.frenkler@uni-bayreuth.de

March 21, 2024

## Abstract

We link the QUMOND theory with the Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition and introduce a new formula for the gradient of the Mondian potential using singular integral operators. This approach allows us to demonstrate that, under very general assumptions on the mass distribution, the Mondian potential is well-defined, once weakly differentiable, with its gradient given through the Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition. Furthermore, we establish that the gradient of the Mondian potential is an  $L^p$  vector field. These findings lay the foundation for a rigorous mathematical analysis of various issues within the realm of QUMOND. Given that the Mondian potential satisfies a second-order partial differential equation, the question arises whether it has second-order derivatives. We affirmatively answer this question in the situation of spherical symmetry, although our investigation reveals that the regularity of the second derivatives is weaker than anticipated. We doubt that a similarly general regularity result can be proven without symmetry assumptions. In conclusion, we explore the implications of our results for numerous problems within the domain of QUMOND, thereby underlining their potential significance and applicability.

## 1 Introduction

About 40 years ago Milgrom (1983) proposed MOND (MODified Newtonian Dynamics), a non-linear modification of Newton's law of gravity motivated by profound challenges in astrophysics. The basic MOND paradigm introduces a critical acceleration  $a_0 = 1.2 \times 10^{-10} \text{ m s}^{-2}$ , stating that the real gravitational acceleration  $g_{real}$  of an object and its acceleration  $g_N$  expected from Newtonian gravity are related as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} g_{real} &\approx \sqrt{a_0 g_N} && \text{if } g_N \ll a_0, \\ g_{real} &\approx g_N && \text{if } g_N \gg a_0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, in the regime of large accelerations, MOND predicts behaviour consistent with Newtonian gravity. However, at extremely low accelerations MOND predicts that  $g_{real}$  is proportional to the square root of the acceleration  $g_N$  expected from Newtonian physics. With its single modification MOND offers explanations for many astrophysical phenomena (Famaey & McGaugh, 2012), most notably flat rotation curves (Gentile et al., 2011). While MOND very effectively describes dynamics on the scales of galaxies, it faces more serious problems on scales slightly larger than the solar system. Recent debates have emerged regarding whether the data from GAIA on wide binary stars supports MOND (Chae, 2023; Hernandez & Chae, 2023) or contradicts it (Banik et al., 2024).

The present paper focuses on mathematical questions, analysing the equations that are used to describe Mondian physics. We study in detail whether these equations are well posed, introduce a new formula for the Mondian gravitational field using the Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition, and analyse the regularity of the Mondian potential and its derivatives.

When considering to replace Newton's law of gravity by Mondian gravity, one is tempted, in view of the basic MOND paradigm, to simply replace the Newtonian field  $\nabla U_\rho^N$ , which corresponds to some density  $\rho$  on  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , by

$$\nabla U_\rho^N + \lambda (|\nabla U_\rho^N|) \nabla U_\rho^N \tag{1.1}$$

where  $\lambda : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is such that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(u) &\approx \sqrt{a_0}/\sqrt{u} && \text{if } u \ll a_0, \\ \lambda(u) &\approx 0 && \text{if } u \gg a_0. \end{aligned}$$

But then one runs into a problem. The field (1.1) is in general not the gradient of some potential, thus leading to a loss of classical conservation laws of physics like conservation of momentum (Famaey & McGaugh, 2012, §6).

A more refined approach is required. Milgrom (2010) proposed a theory, which is called QUMOND (QUasi linear formulation of MOND), where the Mondian potential  $U_\rho^M$  is defined as the solution of the partial differential equation (PDE)

$$\operatorname{div}(\nabla U_\rho^M) = \operatorname{div}(\nabla U_\rho^N + \lambda(|\nabla U_\rho^N|)\nabla U_\rho^N). \quad (1.2)$$

Is the above PDE well posed? Milgrom (2010) provided an explicit formula for its solution  $U_\rho^M$ . But is this  $U_\rho^M$  well defined? And if yes, which regularity properties does it have? These questions we answer in the present paper. To do so we develop a new mathematical foundation for the QUMOND theory using the Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition. Simply put, the Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition states that every well-behaved vector field  $v$  that vanishes at infinity can be uniquely decomposed into an irrotational vector field plus a solenoidal vector field. While the solenoidal field has a vector potential, the irrotational field has a scalar potential  $U$ , and  $U$  satisfies the PDE

$$\operatorname{div}(\nabla U) = \operatorname{div}(v). \quad (1.3)$$

Comparing the PDEs (1.2) and (1.3), we see that we can identify  $v$  with the vector field (1.1) and the potential  $U$  with  $U_\rho^M$ . Thus, the vector field  $\nabla U_\rho^M$  should be the irrotational part of the vector field (1.1).

In this paper we use the Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition in the form proven by Galdi (2011) for  $L^p$  vector fields<sup>1</sup> and introduce a new explicit formula for the irrotational part of a vector field on  $\mathbb{R}^3$  using singular integral operators. These operators are used to derive a new, explicit expression for the Mondian gravitational field  $\nabla U_\rho^M$  too. This new formulation is very useful to analyse the PDE (1.2) and the regularity properties of  $\nabla U_\rho^M$ . It enables us to prove the following theorem:

**Theorem 1.1.** *For every density  $\rho$  on  $\mathbb{R}^3$  that has finite mass and is an  $L^p$  function for some  $p > 1$ , the corresponding Mondian potential  $U_\rho^M$  – defined as in Milgrom (2010) – is well defined and once weakly differentiable with  $\nabla U_\rho^M$  being the irrotational part of the vector field (1.1) in the sense of the Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition.  $\nabla U_\rho^M = \nabla U_\rho^N + \nabla U_\rho^\lambda$  can be decomposed into an  $L^q$  vector field  $\nabla U_\rho^N$  plus an  $L^r$  vector field  $\nabla U_\rho^\lambda$  with  $q > 3/2$  and  $r > 3$ . The potential  $U_\rho^M$  solves the PDE (1.2) in distribution sense*

Further in this paper, we analyse second derivatives of  $U_\rho^M$ . Under the additional assumptions that  $\rho$  is bounded and spherically symmetric, we prove that  $U_\rho^M$  is twice weakly differentiable and  $D^2 U_\rho^M$  is an  $L^r$  function. Using handwaving arguments, one would expect that this should hold for  $1 < r < 6$ . But this is wrong. It is only possible to prove that  $D^2 U_\rho^M \in L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)$  for  $1 < r < 2$  and this result is really optimal. Through counterexamples, we show that it is impossible to achieve such a regularity result for  $r > 2$ . This is a surprising fact and it is due to the square root appearing above in the basic MOND paradigm. We discuss why achieving similarly general regularity results for the second derivatives of  $U_\rho^M$  without assuming spherical symmetry seems doubtful.

The regularity results for  $U_\rho^M$ ,  $\nabla U_\rho^M$  and  $D^2 U_\rho^M$  presented in this paper are essential for addressing further important questions. For example they enable us to examine whether initial value problems using Mondian gravity are well-posed, whether corresponding solutions conserve energy, or what the stability properties of stationary solutions are. The present paper forms the foundation for treating these questions with mathematical rigour.

The outline of this paper is as follows. In Section 2, we analyse Newtonian potentials, a prerequisite for analysing Mondian potentials later on, and we introduce the singular integral operators that are important for the rest of the paper. In Section 3, we study the Helmholtz-Weyl theory from Galdi (2011) and provide a new expression for the irrotational part of a vector field using the singular integral operators defined previously. In Section 4, we bring together the QUMOND theory from Milgrom (2010) and our new knowledge about the Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition to prove Theorem 1.1. In Section 5, we analyse the (non-)existence of second derivatives of the Mondian potential. In Section 6, we discuss how the results of this paper can be applied to many problems in QUMOND.

## 2 Newtonian potentials

In this paper Newtonian potentials will play an important role in two different ways. On the one hand when we have a certain mass distribution with density  $\rho$  then  $U_\rho^N$  is the Newtonian gravitational potential that belongs to the density  $\rho$ . On the other hand in the QUMOND theory we must understand how to decompose a vector field  $v$  in its irrotational and its solenoidal part. Here the Newtonian potentials of the three components  $v_i$  of the vector field play an important role. This we treat in Section 3.

---

<sup>1</sup>As usual, we say that some function  $f$  is an  $L^p$  function, i.e.,  $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  for some  $1 < p < \infty$ , if  $\int |f(x)|^p dx < \infty$ . We say that a vector field  $v \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  if all three components are  $L^p$  functions.

Given a density  $\rho = \rho(x)$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ , then the corresponding Newtonian gravitational potential  $U_\rho^N$  is given by

$$U_\rho^N(x) = -G \int \frac{\rho(y)}{|x-y|} dy, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^3, \quad (2.1)$$

provided the convolution integral exists. Since the concrete value of the gravitational constant  $G$  does not affect our analysis we set it to unity. Next we want to introduce some useful singular integral operators. For  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $i, j = 1, 2, 3$  and a measurable function  $g : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  we define

$$T_{ij}^\epsilon g(x) := - \int_{|x-y|>\epsilon} \left[ 3 \frac{(x_i - y_i)(x_j - y_j)}{|x-y|^5} - \frac{\delta_{ij}}{|x-y|^3} \right] g(y) dy, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^3,$$

provided that the convolution integral on the right hand side exists. Since

$$\partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} \frac{1}{|x|} = 3 \frac{x_i x_j}{|x|^5} - \frac{\delta_{ij}}{|x|^3},$$

the limit of  $T_{ij}^\epsilon g$  for  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  plays an important role in understanding the second derivatives of the Newtonian potential  $U_g^N$ . Further, it plays an important role for the Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition as we will see below and hence for the QUMOND theory. In the following two propositions we study this limit.

**Proposition 2.1.** *For every  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $g \in C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$*

$$T_{ij}^\epsilon g \in C(\mathbb{R}^3)$$

and the limit

$$T_{ij}g := \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} T_{ij}^\epsilon g$$

exists in  $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . In particular

$$T_{ij}g \in C(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

**Proposition 2.2.** *Let  $1 < p < \infty$ . There is a  $C_p > 0$  such that for every  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $g \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$*

$$\|T_{ij}^\epsilon g\|_p \leq C_p \|g\|_p$$

and the limit

$$T_{ij}g := \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} T_{ij}^\epsilon g$$

exists in  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  with

$$\|T_{ij}g\|_p \leq C_p \|g\|_p.$$

*Proof of Proposition 2.1 and 2.2.* The statements follow quite directly from the literature. To apply the results from the literature, we have to verify that

$$\Omega_{ij}(x) := 3 \frac{x_i x_j}{|x|^2} - \delta_{ij}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^3, x \neq 0,$$

satisfies the following four assumptions:

1.  $\Omega_{ij}$  must be homogeneous of degree 0, i.e.,  $\Omega_{ij}(\delta x) = \Omega_{ij}(x)$  for all  $\delta > 0$ ,  $x \neq 0$ . This is obviously true.
2.  $\Omega_{ij}$  must satisfy the cancellation property

$$\int_{|x|=1} \Omega_{ij}(x) dS(x) = 0.$$

If  $i \neq j$ , this is obviously true. If  $i = j$  this is also true, since

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|x|=1} \Omega_{ii}(x) dS(x) &= 3 \int_{|x|=1} x_i^2 dS(x) - 4\pi \\ &= \int_{|x|=1} |x|^2 dS(x) - 4\pi = 0. \end{aligned}$$

3.  $\Omega_{ij}$  must be bounded on  $\{|x| = 1\}$ . This is obviously true since  $\Omega_{ij}$  is continuous on  $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\}$ .

4.  $\Omega_{ij}$  must satisfy the following smoothness property: For

$$w(\delta) := \sup_{\substack{|x-x'| < \delta \\ |x|=|x'|=1}} |\Omega_{ij}(x) - \Omega_{ij}(x')|$$

must hold

$$\int_0^1 \frac{w(\delta)}{\delta} d\delta < \infty.$$

This is true since for  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^3$  with  $|x| = |x'| = 1$  and  $|x - x'| < \delta$  we have

$$|\Omega_{ij}(x) - \Omega_{ij}(x')| = 3|x_i x_j - x'_i x'_j| \leq 3|x_i||x_j - x'_j| + 3|x'_j||x_i - x'_i| \leq 6\delta.$$

Now Proposition 2.2 follows directly from (Stein, 1970, Chapter II, Theorem 3) and Proposition 2.1 follows from (Dietz, 2001, Satz 2.2). In the formulation of her theorem Dietz does not mention the continuity of the  $T_{ij}^\epsilon g$ , but studying her proof carefully one sees that she has proven the Hölder continuity of  $T_{ij}^\epsilon g$  under the assumption that  $\text{supp } g \subset B_1$ . This holds obviously also for every  $g \in C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$  after a suitable scaling. If however one is interested solely in the continuity of  $T_{ij}^\epsilon g$ , like we here in this paper, one could also simply apply the transformation  $y \mapsto x - y$  in the definition of  $T_{ij}^\epsilon g$  and use standard results to deduce that  $T_{ij}^\epsilon g$  is continuous.  $\square$

Next we formulate regularity results for the Newtonian potential. Note that we have set the gravitational constant  $G$  to unity.

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $g \in C_c^{1+n}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . Then the following holds*

a) *The Newtonian potential  $U_g^N \in C^{2+n}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . Its first derivative is given by*

$$\partial_{x_i} U_g^N = U_{\partial_{y_i} g}^N, \quad i = 1, 2, 3,$$

*which, using integration by parts, can be written as*

$$\nabla U_g^N(x) = \int \frac{x - y}{|x - y|^3} g(y) dy, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^3.$$

*The second derivative of  $U_g^N$  is given by*

$$\partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} U_g^N = T_{ij} g + \delta_{ij} \frac{4\pi}{3} g,$$

*where  $i, j = 1, 2, 3$ .*

b) *For every  $R > 0$  there is a  $C > 0$  such that*

$$\|U_g^N\|_\infty + \|\nabla U_g^N\|_\infty \leq C \|g\|_\infty.$$

*and*

$$\|D^2 U_g^N\|_\infty \leq C(\|g\|_\infty + \|\nabla g\|_\infty)$$

*provided  $\text{supp } g \subset B_R$ .*

c)  *$U_g^N$  is the unique solution of*

$$\Delta U_g^N = 4\pi g, \quad \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} U_g^N(x) = 0.$$

*in  $C^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$*

*Proof.* It is proven in (Rein, 2007, Lemma P1) that  $U_g^N \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$  if  $g \in C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$  and that the formulae for the first derivatives hold. If  $g \in C_c^{1+n}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  with  $n \geq 1$ , it follows directly from

$$\partial_{x_i} U_g^N = U_{\partial_{y_i} g}^N$$

that  $U_g^N \in C^{2+n}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . To prove a) it remains to verify the formula for the second derivatives. For every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} U_g^N(x) &= \partial_{x_i} U_{\partial_{y_j} g}^N(x) = \int \frac{x_i - y_j}{|x - y|^3} \partial_{y_j} g(y) dy = \\ &= - \int \frac{y_j}{|y|^3} \partial_{y_j} (g(x - y)) dy = \int \partial_{y_i} (|y|^{-1}) \partial_{y_j} (g(x - y)) dy. \end{aligned}$$

Dominated convergences and integration by parts then yield

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_{x_i}\partial_{x_j}U_g^N(x) &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{|y|>\epsilon} \partial_{y_i}(|y|^{-1})\partial_{y_j}(g(x-y)) dy \\ &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \left( T_{ij}^\epsilon g(x) + \int_{|y|=\epsilon} \frac{y_i y_j}{|y|^4} g(x-y) dS(y) \right);\end{aligned}$$

observe that the normal on  $\{|y| = \epsilon\}$  is pointing inward and that there is no border term at infinity due to the compact support of  $g$ .  $T_{ij}^\epsilon g$  converges uniformly to  $T_{ij}g$  after Proposition 2.1. If  $i \neq j$  then

$$\left| \int_{|y|=\epsilon} \frac{y_i y_j}{|y|^4} g(x-y) dS(y) \right| = \left| \int_{|y|=\epsilon} \frac{y_i y_j}{|y|^4} (g(x-y) - g(x)) dS(y) \right| \leq 4\pi \|\nabla g\|_\infty \epsilon.$$

Hence the border term vanishes. If  $i = j$  then

$$\int_{|y|=\epsilon} \frac{y_i^2}{|y|^4} g(x-y) dS(y) = \int_{|y|=\epsilon} \frac{y_i^2}{|y|^4} (g(x-y) - g(x)) dS(y) + g(x) \int_{|y|=\epsilon} \frac{y_i^2}{|y|^4} dS(y).$$

As above the first term vanishes, however, the second one evaluates to  $4\pi g(x)/3$ . In total we get

$$\partial_{x_i}\partial_{x_j}U_g^N(x) = T_{ij}g(x) + \delta_{ij} \frac{4\pi}{3} g(x).$$

Let us turn to b). Since  $\text{supp } g \subset B_R$  and  $g$  is bounded one sees directly that

$$\|U_g^N\|_\infty + \|\nabla U_g^N\|_\infty \leq C\|g\|_\infty.$$

That

$$\|D^2 U_g^N\|_\infty \leq C(\|g\|_\infty + \|\nabla g\|_\infty),$$

is proven in (Rein, 2007, Lemma P1).

It remains to show c). It is stated in (Rein, 2007, Lemma P1) that  $U_g^N$  is the unique solution of

$$\Delta U_g^N = 4\pi g, \quad \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} U_g^N(x) = 0,$$

however the proof is omitted. So let us briefly summarize the proof of this well known fact. Since

$$\sum_{i=1}^3 \left( 3 \frac{x_i^2}{|x|^5} - \frac{1}{|x|^3} \right) = 0,$$

we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^3 T_{ii}g = 0.$$

Thus

$$\Delta U_g^N = \sum_{i=1}^3 \partial_{x_i}^2 U_g^N = \sum_{i=1}^3 \left( T_{ii}g + \frac{4\pi}{3} g \right) = 4\pi g.$$

The asymptotic behaviour of  $U_g^N(x)$  for  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$  follows from the compact support of  $g$ . That  $g$  is the unique solution of the above PDE follows from the strong maximum principle (Gilbarg & Trudinger, 1977, Theorem 2.2).  $\square$

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $g \in L^1 \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  for a  $1 < p < \infty$ . Then  $U_g^N \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$  exists, is twice weakly differentiable and the formulae for  $\nabla U_g^N$  and  $\partial_{x_i}\partial_{x_j}U_g^N$  from Lemma 2.3 and the following estimates hold*

a) *If  $1 < p < \frac{3}{2}$  and  $3 < r < \infty$  with  $\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{p} = 1 + \frac{1}{r}$  then*

$$\|U_g^N\|_r \leq C_{p,r} \|g\|_p.$$

b) *If  $1 < p < 3$  and  $\frac{3}{2} < s < \infty$  with  $\frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{p} = 1 + \frac{1}{s}$  then*

$$\|\nabla U_g^N\|_s \leq C_{p,s} \|g\|_p.$$

c) For every  $1 < p < \infty$

$$\|D^2 U_g^N\|_p \leq C_p \|g\|_p.$$

*Proof.* With the formula for  $\nabla U_g^N$  as in Lemma 2.3 we have

$$U_g^N = -\frac{1}{|\cdot|} * g \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla U_g^N = \frac{\cdot}{|\cdot|^3} * g.$$

$1/|\cdot|$  and  $\cdot/|\cdot|^3$  are in the so called weak  $L^q$ -space with  $q = 3$  and  $q = \frac{3}{2}$  respectively since

$$\sup_{\alpha > 0} \alpha \mathcal{L} \left( \left\{ x : \frac{1}{|x|} > \alpha \right\} \right)^{1/3} = (4\pi/3)^{1/3} < \infty$$

and

$$\sup_{\alpha > 0} \alpha \mathcal{L} \left( \left\{ x : \frac{1}{|x|^2} > \alpha \right\} \right)^{2/3} = (4\pi/3)^{2/3} < \infty;$$

with  $\mathcal{L}(\Omega)$  we denote the Lebesgue measure of a measurable set  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Thus (Lieb & Loss, 2010, Remark 4.3(2)) implies that  $U_g^N \in L^r$  and  $\nabla U_g^N \in L^s$  with the desired estimates provided  $p < 3/2$  and  $p < 3$  respectively. If  $p \geq 3/2$ ,  $U_\rho^N \in L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)$  for every  $3 < r < \infty$  since  $\rho \in L^1 \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^3) \subset L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)$  for every  $1 < q < 3/2$ . The same argumentation holds for  $\nabla U_\rho^N$  if  $p \geq 3$ .

We have to check that  $\nabla U_g^N$  is indeed the weak derivative of  $U_g^N$ . For this take  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . The Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality (Lieb & Loss, 2010, Theorem 4.3) allows us to use Fubini:

$$\int U_g^N(x) \partial_{x_i} \phi(x) dx = - \iint \frac{g(y) \partial_{x_i} \phi(x)}{|x-y|} dx dy.$$

Now Lemma 2.3 implies

$$\begin{aligned} \int U_g^N(x) \partial_{x_i} \phi(x) dx &= \int g(y) U_{\partial_{x_i} \phi}^N(y) dy = \int g(y) \partial_{y_i} U_\phi^N(y) dy \\ &= \iint g(y) \frac{y_i - x_i}{|y-x|^3} \phi(x) dx dy \\ &= - \int \left( \int \frac{x_i - y_i}{|x-y|} g(y) dy \right) \phi(x) dx \\ &= - \int \nabla U_g^N(x) \phi(x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

So the weak gradient of  $U_g^N$  is given by the formula for  $\nabla U_g^N$  from Lemma 2.3.

Let  $1 < p < \infty$ . We study the second derivatives and take  $(g_k) \subset C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$  such that

$$g_k \rightarrow g \quad \text{in } L^p(\mathbb{R}^3) \text{ for } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Then Hölder, integration by parts and Lemma 2.3 give

$$\begin{aligned} \int U_g^N \partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} \phi dx &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int U_{g_k}^N \partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} \phi dx \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int (T_{ij} g_k + \delta_{ij} \frac{4\pi}{3} g_k) \phi dx \\ &= \int (T_{ij} g + \delta_{ij} \frac{4\pi}{3} g) \phi dx. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the weak second derivatives of  $U_g^N$  are given by the same formula as in Lemma 2.3. The desired estimate for  $\partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} U_g^N$  follows from Proposition 2.2. □

In the situation of spherical symmetry there is a second formula for the Newtonian field  $\nabla U_\rho^N$ , which often is quite useful.

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $1 < p < 3$  and  $\rho \in L^1 \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$ ,  $\geq 0$  be spherically symmetric. Then*

$$\nabla U_\rho^N(x) = \frac{M(r)}{r^2} \frac{x}{r}$$

for a.e.  $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$  with  $r = |x|$  and

$$M(r) := \int_{B_r} \rho(x) \, dx = 4\pi \int_0^r s^2 \rho(s) \, ds$$

denoting the mass inside the ball with radius  $r$ .

*Proof.* This lemma was first proven by Newton (1687) in a similar version. Below we give a proof of our modern version using  $L^p$  theory.

Assume that  $\rho$  would be continuous and compactly supported. Then  $M \in C^1([0, \infty))$  with

$$M'(r) = 4\pi r^2 \rho(r), \quad r \geq 0.$$

Further

$$|M(r)| \leq \|\rho\|_1$$

and

$$|M(r)| \leq \frac{4\pi}{3} \|\rho\|_\infty r^3$$

for  $r \geq 0$ . For  $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$  and  $r = |x|$

$$U(x) := - \int_r^\infty \frac{M(s)}{s^2} \, ds$$

is well defined. If  $r = |x| > 0$ ,  $U$  is continuously differentiable with

$$\nabla U(x) = \frac{M(r)}{r^2} \frac{x}{r}.$$

Since

$$|\nabla U(x)| \leq \frac{4\pi}{3} \|\rho\|_\infty r$$

we have

$$\nabla U \in C(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

Further

$$\partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} U(x) = 4\pi \rho(r) \frac{x_i x_j}{r^2} - 3M(r) \frac{x_i x_j}{r^5} + \frac{M(r)}{r^3} \delta_{ij}, \quad r > 0.$$

Since  $\rho$  is continuous,

$$\frac{M(r)}{r^3} = \frac{4\pi}{3} \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}(B_r)} \int_{B_r} \rho \, dx \rightarrow \frac{4\pi}{3} \rho(0)$$

and

$$\left| 4\pi \rho(r) - \frac{3M(r)}{r^3} \right| = 4\pi \left| \rho(r) - \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}(B_r)} \int_{B_r} \rho \, dx \right| \rightarrow 0$$

for  $r \rightarrow 0$ . Hence

$$D^2 U \in C(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

Thus

$$U \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

Further

$$\Delta U = 4\pi \rho$$

and

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} |U(x)| \leq \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|\rho\|_1}{|x|} = 0.$$

Since by Lemma 2.3  $U_\rho^N$  is a solution of this PDE, too, and this solutions is unique

$$U_\rho^N = U$$

and

$$\nabla U_\rho^N(x) = \nabla U(x) = \frac{M(r)}{r^2} \frac{x}{r}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^3. \quad (2.2)$$

If now  $\rho \in L^1 \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , we take a sequence  $(\rho_n) \subset C_c(\mathbb{R}^3)$  of spherically symmetric densities such that

$$\rho_n \rightarrow \rho \quad \text{in } L^p(\mathbb{R}^3) \text{ for } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

By Lemma 2.4

$$\nabla U_{\rho_n}^N \rightarrow \nabla U_{\rho}^N \quad \text{in } L^s(\mathbb{R}^3) \text{ for } n \rightarrow \infty \quad (2.3)$$

where  $s > 3/2$  with  $1/p + 2/3 = 1 + 1/s$ . Set

$$M_n(r) := \int_{B_r} \rho_n \, dx, \quad r \geq 0.$$

Then for every  $r \geq 0$

$$|M_n(r) - M(r)| \leq \|\rho_n - \rho\|_p \|1_{B_r}\|_{p/(p-1)}.$$

Hence for all  $0 < S < R$

$$M_n \rightarrow M \quad \text{uniformly on } B_R \text{ for } n \rightarrow \infty$$

and

$$\frac{M_n(r) x}{r^2 r} \rightarrow \frac{M(r) x}{r^2 r} \quad \text{uniformly on } \{S < |x| < R\} \text{ for } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Together with (2.2) and (2.3) this implies that for a.e.  $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$

$$\nabla U_{\rho}^N(x) = \frac{M(r) x}{r^2 r}.$$

□

Later on, we will make regular use of the following statement.

**Lemma 2.6.** *If  $\rho, \sigma \in L^{6/5}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  then*

$$-\frac{1}{8\pi} \int \nabla U_{\rho}^N \cdot \nabla U_{\sigma}^N \, dx = \frac{1}{2} \int U_{\rho}^N \sigma \, dx = -\frac{1}{2} \iint \frac{\rho(y)\sigma(x)}{|x-y|} \, dx \, dy.$$

*Proof.*  $\nabla U_{\rho}^N, \nabla U_{\sigma}^N \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$  and  $U_{\rho}^N \in L^6(\mathbb{R}^3)$  according to Lemma 2.4. Thus the first two integrals are well defined. By the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality (Lieb & Loss, 2010, Theorem 4.3) also the third integral is well defined. If  $\rho, \sigma \in C_c^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , integration by parts and  $\Delta U_{\sigma}^N = 4\pi\sigma$  give the above equalities of the integrals. Since  $C_c^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^3) \subset L^{6/5}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  is dense and all three integrals above are continuous maps from  $L^{6/5} \times L^{6/5} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , the above equalities hold for all  $\sigma, \rho \in L^{6/5}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . □

### 3 Irrotational vector fields

As stated in Theorem 1.1, we want to prove that the gradient of the Mondian potential  $U_{\rho}^M$  is the irrotational part of the vector field  $\nabla U_{\rho}^N + \lambda(|\nabla U_{\rho}^N|)\nabla U_{\rho}^N$ . In this section we specify what we mean with the ‘irrotational part of a vector field’. To do so, we make use of the singular integral operators  $T_{ij}$  introduced in the previous section about Newtonian potentials.

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $1 < p < \infty$  and  $v \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  be a vector field. For  $i = 1, 2, 3$  we define

$$H_i v := \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_{j=1}^3 T_{ij} v_j + \frac{1}{3} v_i.$$

We call the vector field  $Hv \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  the irrotational part of  $v$ .

We will see below that  $Hv$  is indeed the irrotational part of  $v$  in the sense of the the Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition:

**Theorem 3.2** (Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition). *For every vector field  $v \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$ ,  $1 < p < \infty$ , exist uniquely determined  $v_1 \in L_{irr}^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  and  $v_2 \in L_{sol}^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  such that*

$$v = v_1 + v_2,$$

where the two subspaces  $L_{irr}^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  and  $L_{sol}^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  of  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} L_{irr}^p(\mathbb{R}^3) &:= \left\{ w \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^3) \text{ such that } U \in W_{loc}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^3) \text{ exists with } w = \nabla U \right\}, \\ L_{sol}^p(\mathbb{R}^3) &:= \left\{ w \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^3) \text{ such that } \operatorname{div} w = 0 \text{ weakly} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$



*Remark.* The space  $W_{loc}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  denotes the Sobolev space of scalar functions  $U$  on  $\mathbb{R}^3$  that are once weakly differentiable and that are locally integrable if taken to the power  $p$ , i.e., for each compact domain  $K$  the integral  $\int_K |U|^p dx$  is finite. Further, also the gradient of  $U$  must be locally integrable if taken to the power  $p$ , but observe that in the definition of  $L_{irr}^p$  we additionally demanded that the gradient shall be an  $L^p$  vector field not only on every compact domain but on the entire space  $\mathbb{R}^3$ .

*Proof.* In (Galdi, 2011, Theorem III.1.2) it is proven that the Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition in the sense of (Galdi, 2011, equation (III.1.5)) holds. This form of the theorem makes use of a different definition of the space  $L_{sol}^p$ . However, in (Galdi, 2011, Theorem III.2.3) it is proven that our definition here coincides with the definition used in (Galdi, 2011, Theorem III.1.2).  $\square$

Let us study how the Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition looks like for smooth vector fields with compact support.

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $v \in C_c^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . For every  $1 < p < \infty$*

$$Hv = \frac{1}{4\pi} \nabla \left( \sum_{j=1}^3 \partial_{x_j} U_{v_j}^N \right) \in C^1 \cap L_{irr}^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$$

*is the uniquely determined, irrotational part of the vector field  $v$  according to the Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition. Further*

$$\operatorname{div} Hv = \operatorname{div} v \text{ and } \operatorname{rot} Hv = 0.$$

*Proof.* By Proposition 2.2  $Hv \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  for every  $1 < p < \infty$ . Since by Lemma 2.3

$$U_{v_j}^N \in C^3(\mathbb{R}^3), \quad j = 1, 2, 3,$$

we have also

$$Hv = \frac{1}{4\pi} \nabla \left( \sum_{j=1}^3 \partial_{x_j} U_{v_j}^N \right) \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

In particular  $Hv \in L_{irr}^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . Since  $Hv$  is a gradient, its rotation is zero. For the divergence we have with Lemma 2.3

$$\operatorname{div} Hv = \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_{j=1}^3 \Delta U_{\partial_{y_j} v_j}^N = \sum_{j=1}^3 \partial_{x_j} v_j = \operatorname{div} v.$$

Further we get

$$v_2 := v - Hv \in C^1 \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$$

for every  $1 < p < \infty$  with  $\operatorname{div}(v_2) = 0$  classically. Hence  $v_2 \in L_{sol}^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$ .  $\square$

We are particularly interested in the Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition of vector fields  $v \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . If  $p < 3$ , we can show that  $\partial_{x_j} U_{v_j}^N$  exists and, using the same formula as in Lemma 3.3, it is easy to deduce that in this situation, too, the Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition of  $v$  is given by  $Hv + (v - Hv)$ . If  $p \geq 3$  however (and this is the case of special interest in Mondian physics), the integral

$$\partial_{x_j} U_{v_j}^N = \int \frac{x_j - y_j}{|x - y|^3} v_j(y) dy$$

does not necessarily converge. Nevertheless, also in this situation the Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition of  $v$  is given by  $Hv + (v - Hv)$  but we can no longer make use of the formula from Lemma 3.3. The key ingredients to prove this explicit form of the Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition for  $v \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  is that  $L_{irr}^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  and  $L_{sol}^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  are closed subsets of  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . For  $L_{sol}^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  this is proven in Galdi (2011). For  $L_{irr}^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  Galdi leaves this as an exercise to the reader (Exercise III.1.2). This exercise can be solved using Poincaré's inequality. This leads to the following theorem:

**Theorem 3.4** (Explicit Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition). *Let  $1 < p < \infty$  and  $v \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  be a vector field. Then the uniquely determined Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition of  $v$  is given by*

$$v = Hv + (v - Hv)$$

*with*

$$Hv \in L_{irr}^p(\mathbb{R}^3) \quad \text{and} \quad v - Hv \in L_{sol}^p(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

*Proof.* We can approximate  $v \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  with a sequence  $(v_k) \subset C_c^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . By Lemma 3.3 the Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition of  $v_k$  is given by

$$v_k = H v_k + (v_k - H v_k)$$

with

$$H v_k \in L_{irr}^p(\mathbb{R}^3) \quad \text{and} \quad v_k - H v_k \in L_{sol}^p(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

By (Galdi, 2011, Exercise III.1.2)  $L_{irr}^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  is a closed subset of  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . By (Galdi, 2011, Theorem III.2.3)  $L_{sol}^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  is the closure of the set

$$\{v \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3) \text{ with } \operatorname{div} v = 0\}$$

with respect to the  $L^p$ -norm on  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Hence  $L_{sol}^p$  is a closed subset of  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . Since  $v_k \rightarrow v$  and  $H v_k \rightarrow H v$  in  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  for  $k \rightarrow \infty$

$$H v \in L_{irr}^p(\mathbb{R}^3) \quad \text{and} \quad v - H v \in L_{sol}^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$$

and

$$v = H v + (v - H v)$$

is the uniquely determined Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition of  $v$ .  $\square$

Thus the vector field  $H v$  as defined in Definition 3.1 is indeed the irrotational part of the vector field  $v$  in the sense of the Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition. Before we close this section we prove two useful lemmas. First: For spherically symmetric vector fields the Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition is trivial.

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $1 < p < \infty$ . Then for every spherically symmetric vector field  $v \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$*

$$H v = v.$$

*Proof.* Let  $v \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  be a spherically symmetric vector field. There exists a sequence  $(v_k) \subset C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$  of spherically symmetric vector fields with

$$v_k \rightarrow v \quad \text{in } L^p(\mathbb{R}^3) \text{ for } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Since the  $v_k$  are spherically symmetric

$$\operatorname{rot} v_k = 0.$$

Hence, by standard results for vector calculus, there exist potentials  $(U_k) \subset C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$  such that for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$v_k = \nabla U_k,$$

in particular  $v_k \in L_{irr}^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  and the uniqueness of the Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition implies

$$H v_k = v_k.$$

Since  $H : L^p(\mathbb{R}^3) \rightarrow L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  is continuous

$$H v = v.$$

$\square$

And last in this section we prove the useful fact that the operator  $H$  is symmetric.

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $1 < p, q < \infty$  with  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$ , and let  $v \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$ ,  $w \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)$  be vector fields. Then*

$$\int v \cdot H w \, dx = \int H v \cdot w \, dx.$$

*Proof.* Assume that  $v \in L^1 \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  and  $w \in L^1 \cap L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . Since  $v, w \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$  we can apply Fubini and get that for every  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $i, j = 1, 2, 3$

$$\begin{aligned} \int T_{ij}^\epsilon v_j w_i \, dx &= - \iint_{|x-y|>\epsilon} \partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} \left( \frac{1}{|x-y|} \right) v_j(y) \, dy w_i(x) \, dx \\ &= - \int v_j(y) \int_{|x-y|>\epsilon} \partial_{y_i} \partial_{y_j} \left( \frac{1}{|x-y|} \right) w_i(x) \, dx \, dy \\ &= \int v_j T_{ij}^\epsilon w_i \, dy. \end{aligned}$$

Hence by Hölder

$$\begin{aligned}
\int H v \cdot w \, dx &= \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int T_{ij}^\epsilon v_j w_i \, dx + \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i=1}^3 \int v_i w_i \, dx \\
&= \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int v_j T_{ij}^\epsilon w_i \, dx + \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i=1}^3 \int v_i w_i \, dx \\
&= \int v \cdot H w \, dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $L^1 \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^3) \subset L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  and  $L^1 \cap L^q(\mathbb{R}^3) \subset L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)$  are dense, and  $H$  is continuous, it follows that for every  $v \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  and  $w \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)$

$$\int H v \cdot w \, dx = \int v \cdot H w \, dx.$$

□

## 4 Mondian potentials

Milgrom (2010) introduced the QUMOND theory where the Mondian potential  $U_\rho^M$  belonging to some density  $\rho$  is given as the solution of the PDE (1.2). Milgrom gave an explicit formula for the solution of this PDE. Here in this paper we take another way to approach the Mondian potential  $U_\rho^M$ . This new approach enables us to place the entire QUMOND theory on a more robust, mathematical foundation. We define

$$\nabla U_\rho^M \text{ is the irrotational part of } \nabla U_\rho^N + \lambda(|\nabla U_\rho^N|) \nabla U_\rho^N.$$

The theory of the previous section guarantees that the field  $\nabla U_\rho^M$  is indeed the gradient of some potential  $U_\rho^M$ . Further, it guarantees that  $\nabla U_\rho^M$  is an  $L^p$  vector field for some  $p > 1$ . To bring this new definition of  $\nabla U_\rho^M$  together with the theory from Milgrom (2010), we have to take a closer look on the potential  $U_\rho^M$ . How do we get an explicit formula for it? In Lemma 3.3 we have seen that for a vector field

$$v \in C_c^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$$

$Hv$  is the gradient of

$$\frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_{j=1}^3 \partial_{x_j} U_{v_j}^N. \quad (4.1)$$

But if  $\rho \in L^1 \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  for a  $1 < p < 3$ , then

$$\nabla U_\rho^N \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)$$

for a  $3/2 < q < \infty$ . If now  $\lambda(\sigma) \approx \sqrt{a_0}/\sqrt{\sigma}$  then

$$v := \lambda(|\nabla U_\rho^N|) \nabla U_\rho^N \in L^{2q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$$

with  $2q > 3$ . But then  $\partial_{x_j} U_{v_j}^N$  is not well defined; for this it would be necessary that  $v$  is an  $L^p$  vector field for some  $p < 3$ . However we can still recover a slight variation of Lemma 3.3. If we compare equation (4.1) with the formula for the Mondian potential in Milgrom (2010), we see that both are quite similar. We prove that the formula of Milgrom really yields a well defined potential and that its gradient is given by  $\nabla U_\rho^M$  as defined above.

For better readability we decompose  $U_\rho^M$  and write  $U_\rho^M = U_\rho^N + U_\rho^\lambda$  where the gradient of  $U_\rho^N$  is  $\nabla U_\rho^N$  and the gradient of  $U_\rho^\lambda$  shall be  $H(\lambda(|\nabla U_\rho^N|) \nabla U_\rho^N)$ . In the next lemma we analyse  $U_\rho^\lambda$ .

**Lemma 4.1.** *Assume that  $\lambda : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  is measurable and that there is  $\Lambda > 0$  such that  $\lambda(\sigma) \leq \Lambda/\sqrt{\sigma}$ , for every  $\sigma > 0$  (thus the function  $\lambda$  remains in its physically motivated regime). Let  $\rho \in L^1 \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  for a  $1 < p < 3$  and let  $3/2 < q < \infty$  with  $2/3 + 1/p = 1 + 1/q$ . Set*

$$U_\rho^\lambda(x) := \frac{1}{4\pi} \int \lambda(|\nabla U_\rho^N(y)|) \nabla U_\rho^N(y) \cdot \left( \frac{x-y}{|x-y|^3} + \frac{y}{|y|^3} \right) dy, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^3.$$

Then

$$U_\rho^\lambda \in W_{loc}^{1,2q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$$

and

$$\nabla U_\rho^\lambda = H(\lambda(|\nabla U_\rho^N|) \nabla U_\rho^N) \in L^{2q}(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

*Remark.* The formula for  $U_\rho^\lambda$  above is the one given by Milgrom (2010). Observe its similarity with (4.1).

*Proof.* Let  $R > 0$ . First we prove that for

$$I(x, y) := \lambda (|\nabla U_\rho^N(y)|) \nabla U_\rho^N(y) \cdot \left( \frac{x-y}{|x-y|^3} + \frac{y}{|y|^3} \right), \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^3,$$

holds

$$\iint_{|x| \leq R} |I(x, y)| \, dx \, dy < \infty. \quad (4.2)$$

Let  $p, q$  be as stated above and let  $r$  be the dual exponent of  $2q$ . Since  $3 < 2q < \infty$ ,

$$1 < r < \frac{3}{2}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{|x| \leq R, |y| \leq 2R} |I(x, y)| \, dx \, dy &\leq \Lambda \iint_{|x| \leq R, |y| \leq 2R} |\nabla U_\rho^N(y)|^{1/2} \left( \frac{1}{|x-y|^2} + \frac{1}{|y|^2} \right) \, dx \, dy \\ &\leq 2\Lambda \mathcal{L}(B_R) \|\nabla U_\rho^N\|_q^{1/2} \left\| \frac{1}{|y|^2} \right\|_{L^r(B_{3R})} < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Next observe that for all  $y \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $i, j = 1, 2, 3$

$$\left| \partial_{y_i} \frac{y_j}{|y|^3} \right| = \left| \frac{\delta_{ij}}{|y|^3} - 3 \frac{y_i y_j}{|y|^5} \right| \leq \frac{4}{|y|^3}.$$

Thus for  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^3$  with  $|x| \leq R$ ,  $|y| > 2R$  holds

$$\left| \frac{x_j - y_j}{|x - y|^3} - \frac{y_j}{|y|^3} \right| = \left| \int_0^1 \frac{d}{ds} \frac{y_j - sx_j}{|y - sx|^3} \, ds \right| \leq R \int_0^1 \frac{ds}{|y - sx|^3}.$$

Since for all  $0 \leq s \leq 1$

$$|y - sx| \geq \frac{|y|}{2},$$

we estimate further

$$\left| \frac{x_j - y_j}{|x - y|^3} - \frac{y_j}{|y|^3} \right| \leq \frac{8R}{|y|^3}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{|x| \leq R, |y| > 2R} |I(x, y)| \, dx \, dy &\leq C \iint_{|x| \leq R, |y| > 2R} |\nabla U_\rho^N(y)|^{1/2} \frac{1}{|y|^3} \, dy \\ &\leq C \mathcal{L}(B_R) \|\nabla U_\rho^N\|_q^{1/2} \left\| \frac{1}{|y|^3} \right\|_{L^r(\{|y| > 2R\})} \\ &< \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus (4.2) holds. Fubini then implies that

$$U_\rho^\lambda \in L_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

Hence the potential  $U_\rho^\lambda$  as given by the formula from Milgrom (2010) is well defined. It remains to prove that

$$\nabla U_\rho^\lambda = H(\lambda (|\nabla U_\rho^N|) \nabla U_\rho^N).$$

We write shortly

$$v := \frac{1}{4\pi} \lambda (|\nabla U_\rho^N|) \nabla U_\rho^N \in L^{2q}(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

Let  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . Then

$$\int U_\rho^\lambda \partial_{x_i} \phi \, dx = \iint v(y) \cdot \left( \frac{x-y}{|x-y|^3} + \frac{y}{|y|^3} \right) \partial_{x_i} \phi(x) \, dy \, dx.$$

Thanks to (4.2) we can apply Fubini and, since

$$\int \partial_{x_i} \phi(x) \, dx = 0,$$

we have

$$\int U_\rho^\lambda \partial_{x_i} \phi \, dx = - \int v \cdot \nabla U_{\partial_{x_i} \phi}^N \, dy = - \sum_{j=1}^3 \int v_j \partial_{y_i} \partial_{y_j} U_\phi^N \, dy.$$

Lemma 2.3 and Proposition 2.2 imply

$$\int U_\rho^\lambda \partial_{x_i} \phi \, dx = - \sum_{j=1}^3 \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int v_j \left( T_{ij}^\epsilon \phi + \delta_{ij} \frac{4\pi}{3} \phi \right) \, dy.$$

As in the proof of Lemma 3.6 we have

$$\int v_j T_{ij}^\epsilon \phi \, dy = \int T_{ij}^\epsilon v_j \phi \, dy.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \int U_\rho^\lambda \partial_{x_i} \phi \, dx &= -4\pi \int \left( \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_{j=1}^3 T_{ij} v_j + \frac{1}{3} v_i \right) \phi \, dy \\ &= -4\pi \int H_i v \phi \, dy. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\nabla U_\rho^\lambda = 4\pi H v = H \left( \lambda \left( |\nabla U_\rho^N| \right) \nabla U_\rho^N \right).$$

In particular, the Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition Theorem 3.4 implies

$$U_\rho^\lambda \in W_{loc}^{1,2q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$$

and

$$\nabla U_\rho^\lambda \in L^{2q}(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

□

Taking Lemma 4.1 and 2.4 together gives

**Corollary 4.2.** *Let  $\lambda$  be as in Lemma 4.1 and  $\rho \in L^1 \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  for some  $p > 1$ . Then*

$$U_\rho^M := U_\rho^N + U_\rho^\lambda$$

*is well defined and once weakly differentiable. The gradient  $\nabla U_\rho^M$  can be decomposed into an  $L^q$  plus an  $L^r$  vector field, where  $\nabla U_\rho^N$  is an  $L^q$  vector field for some  $q > 3/2$  and  $\nabla U_\rho^\lambda$  is an  $L^r$  vector field for some  $r > 3$ .*

*Proof.* When  $\rho \in L^1 \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  it follows from the interpolation formula that  $\rho \in L^{p'}$  for every  $1 < p' < p$ , in particular for  $p' < 3$ . Thus Lemma 2.4 and 4.1 imply that  $\nabla U_\rho^N$  and  $\nabla U_\rho^\lambda$  are both well defined and that  $\nabla U_\rho^N \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)$  for some  $q > 3/2$  and  $\nabla U_\rho^\lambda \in L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)$  for some  $r > 3$ . □

To summarize, we have now proven that the potential  $U_\rho^M$  as defined by Milgrom (2010) is really well defined. It is once weakly differentiable and its gradient  $\nabla U_\rho^M$  is the irrotational part of the vector field  $\nabla U_\rho^N + \lambda(|\nabla U_\rho^N|)\nabla U_\rho^N$  in the sense of the Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition. Further, when we write  $\nabla U_\rho^M = \nabla U_\rho^N + \nabla U_\rho^\lambda$ , we have that  $\nabla U_\rho^N$  is an  $L^p$  vector field for some  $p > 3/2$  and that  $\nabla U_\rho^\lambda$  is an  $L^p$  vector field for some  $p > 3$ . Lastly, from the definition of the operator  $H$  (Definition 3.1) we have a new explicit formula for  $\nabla U_\rho^\lambda$  using singular integral operators. And this new formula is not only useful to analyse the regularity of  $\nabla U_\rho^\lambda$  as done above but it is also very useful to verify that  $U_\rho^M$  is really a solution of the PDE (1.2) from the introduction. This we do in the last lemma of this section.

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $\lambda$  be as in Lemma 4.1 and  $\rho \in L^1 \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  for some  $p > 1$ , then  $U_\rho^M$  solves the PDE*

$$\operatorname{div}(\nabla U_\rho^M) = \operatorname{div}(\nabla U_\rho^N + \lambda(|\nabla U_\rho^N|)\nabla U_\rho^N)$$

*in distribution sense, i.e., for every  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$*

$$\int \nabla U_\rho^M \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx = \int (\nabla U_\rho^N + \lambda(|\nabla U_\rho^N|)\nabla U_\rho^N) \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx.$$

*Proof.* We have

$$\nabla U_\rho^M = H(\nabla U_\rho^N + \lambda(|\nabla U_\rho^N|)\nabla U_\rho^N).$$

Since  $\nabla U_\rho^N$  is already a gradient, we get  $H(\nabla U_\rho^N) = \nabla U_\rho^N$ . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \int \nabla U_\rho^M \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx &= \int H(\nabla U_\rho^N + \lambda(|\nabla U_\rho^N|)\nabla U_\rho^N) \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx \\ &= \int [\nabla U_\rho^N + H(\lambda(|\nabla U_\rho^N|)\nabla U_\rho^N)] \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

The operator  $H$  is symmetric (Lemma 3.6) and hence

$$\int \nabla U_\rho^M \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx = \int \nabla U_\rho^N \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx + \int \lambda(|\nabla U_\rho^N|)\nabla U_\rho^N \cdot H(\nabla \phi) \, dx.$$

$H(\nabla \phi) = \nabla \phi$  since  $\nabla \phi$  is already a gradient. Thus it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int \nabla U_\rho^M \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx &= \int \nabla U_\rho^N \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx + \int \lambda(|\nabla U_\rho^N|)\nabla U_\rho^N \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx \\ &= \int (\nabla U_\rho^N + \lambda(|\nabla U_\rho^N|)\nabla U_\rho^N) \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

This means that  $U_\rho^M$  solves the PDE

$$\operatorname{div}(\nabla U_\rho^M) = \operatorname{div}(\nabla U_\rho^N + \lambda(|\nabla U_\rho^N|)\nabla U_\rho^N)$$

in distribution sense. □

Taking all statements of the lemmas proven in this section together implies that Theorem 1.1 from the introduction holds.

## 5 Second derivatives of Mondian potentials

In the previous section we have shown that in QUMOND the potential  $U_\rho^M$ , which corresponds to some density  $\rho$  on  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , is well defined, once weakly differentiable and solves the second order PDE (1.2) in distribution sense. Does  $U_\rho^M$  also have second order derivatives?

Consider a density  $\rho \in L^1 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$  with finite support. Such a density is a reasonable model for the distribution of mass in systems like globular clusters or galaxies. If we have such a density the interpolation formula and Lemma 2.4 tell us that the second derivatives of the corresponding Newtonian potential are  $L^p$ -functions:

$$D^2 U_\rho^N \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$$

for every  $p \in (1, \infty)$ . Therefore

$$\nabla U_\rho^N \in C^{0,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^3)$$

for every  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  by Morrey's inequality; the space  $C^{0,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  denotes the space of bounded and Hölder continuous functions with Hölder exponent  $\alpha$  on  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Under quite general assumptions (see Lemma 5.2) the function

$$\mathbb{R}^3 \ni u \mapsto \lambda(|u|)u \in \mathbb{R}^3$$

is Hölder continuous with Hölder exponent  $\frac{1}{2}$ . Thus

$$\lambda(|\nabla U_\rho^N|)\nabla U_\rho^N \in C^{0,\beta}(\mathbb{R}^3)$$

for every  $\beta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ . Assuming for simplicity that we are in spherical symmetry, we have by Lemma 3.5

$$\nabla U_\rho^\lambda = \lambda(|\nabla U_\rho^N|)\nabla U_\rho^N \in C^{0,\beta}(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

Taking a second look on Morrey's inequality one could now expect that

$$D^2 U_\rho^\lambda \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$$

for all  $1 < p < 6$ . But this expectation proves deceptive. Why? Let us remain in the situation of spherical symmetry and for  $\rho = \rho(x)$  spherically symmetric study the divergence of

$$\nabla U_\rho^M = \nabla U_\rho^N + \lambda(|\nabla U_\rho^N|)\nabla U_\rho^N.$$

In view of Lemma 2.5

$$\lambda(|\nabla U_\rho^N(x)|)\nabla U_\rho^N(x) = \frac{\sqrt{M(r)}x}{r}, \quad r = |x|,$$

where for convenience we assumed  $\lambda(\sigma) = 1/\sqrt{\sigma}$ ,  $\sigma > 0$ . So

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div}(\nabla U_\rho^M(x)) &= \Delta U_\rho^N(x) + \frac{1}{r^2}(r\sqrt{M(r)})' \\ &= 4\pi\rho(r) + \frac{\sqrt{M(r)}}{r^2} + \frac{\sqrt{M(r)'}}{r}. \end{aligned}$$

$\rho$  is just fine, the second term can be controlled as expected above, but the third one will cause problems. We prove the following

**Proposition 5.1.** *Let  $R > 0$ ,  $1 < p, q < \infty$  and  $\rho \in C^1 \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$ ,  $\geq 0$ , spherically symmetric. Then*

$$\left\| \frac{\sqrt{M(r)}}{r^2} \right\|_{L^q(B_R)} \leq C\|\rho\|_p^{1/2}$$

if  $1 < q < 6$  and  $p > 3q/(6-q)$  with  $C = C(p, q, R) > 0$ , and

$$\left\| \frac{\sqrt{M(r)'}}{r} \right\|_{L^q(B_R)} \leq C\|\rho\|_p^{1/2}$$

if  $1 < q < 2$  and  $p > q/(2-q) + q$  with  $C = C(p, q, R) > 0$ . With  $\sqrt{M(r)'}$  we denote the function

$$\sqrt{M(r)'} := \begin{cases} \frac{2\pi r^2 \rho(r)}{\sqrt{M(r)}} & , \text{ if } M(r) > 0 \\ 0 & , \text{ if } M(r) = 0 \end{cases}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $1 < q < 6$  and  $1 < p < \infty$  with  $p > 3q/(6-q)$ . For  $r \geq 0$

$$M(r) = \int_{B_r} \rho(x) \, dx \leq \|\rho\|_p \|1_{B_r}\|_{p/(p-1)} \leq C\|\rho\|_p r^{3-3/p}.$$

Thus

$$\left\| \frac{\sqrt{M(r)}}{r^2} \right\|_{L^q(B_R)}^q = \int_{B_R} M(r)^{q/2} r^{-2q} \, dx \leq C\|\rho\|_p^{q/2} \int_{B_R} r^{\frac{3q}{2} - \frac{3q}{2p} - 2q} \, dx.$$

Since

$$\frac{3q}{2} - \frac{3q}{2p} - 2q > -3 \Leftrightarrow 3 - \frac{q}{2} > \frac{3q}{2p} \Leftrightarrow p > \frac{3q}{6-q}$$

we have

$$\left\| \frac{\sqrt{M(r)}}{r^2} \right\|_{L^q(B_R)} \leq C\|\rho\|_p^{1/2}.$$

Now we turn to the second estimate. Let  $1 < q < 2$ ,  $p > q/(2-q) + q$  and  $r_0 \geq 0$  be such that  $M(r_0) = 0$  and  $M(r) > 0$  for all  $r > r_0$ . Since  $\rho \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ ,  $M(r) \in C^1([0, \infty))$  with

$$M'(r) = \frac{d}{dr} 4\pi \int_0^r s^2 \rho(s) \, ds = 4\pi r^2 \rho(r).$$

Hence  $\sqrt{M(r)} \in C^1((r_0, \infty))$  with

$$\sqrt{M(r)'} = \frac{2\pi r^2 \rho(r)}{\sqrt{M(r)}}, \quad r > r_0.$$

Assume that  $R > r_0$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\sqrt{M(r)'}}{r} \right\|_{L^q(B_R \setminus B_{r_0})}^q &= \int_{B_R \setminus B_{r_0}} \left( \frac{2\pi r \rho(r)}{\sqrt{M(r)}} \right)^q \, dx \\ &\leq (2\pi R)^q \int_{B_R \setminus B_{r_0}} \rho(r)^\alpha \frac{\rho(r)^{q-\alpha}}{M(r)^{q/2}} \, dx \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\alpha := \frac{p}{p-1}(q-1).$$

Obviously  $\alpha > 0$ , and further  $\alpha < q$  since

$$\alpha = \frac{p}{p-1}(q-1) < q \Leftrightarrow 1 - \frac{1}{q} < 1 - \frac{1}{p} \Leftrightarrow q < p.$$

Now we apply Hölder's inequality and get

$$\left\| \frac{\sqrt{M(r)'}}{r} \right\|_{L^q(B_R \setminus B_{r_0})}^q \leq C \|\rho\|_p^\alpha \left\| \frac{\rho(r)^{q-\alpha}}{M(r)^{q/2}} \right\|_{L^{p/(p-\alpha)}(B_R \setminus B_{r_0})};$$

note that  $0 < \alpha < q < p$ . Since

$$(q-\alpha)\frac{p}{p-\alpha} = 1 \Leftrightarrow q - \alpha = 1 - \frac{\alpha}{p} \Leftrightarrow q - 1 = \alpha \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \Leftrightarrow \alpha = \frac{p}{p-1}(q-1),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\rho(r)^{q-\alpha}}{M(r)^{q/2}} \right\|_{L^{p/(p-\alpha)}(B_R \setminus B_{r_0})} &= \left( \int_{B_R \setminus B_{r_0}} \rho(r) M(r)^{-pq/(2p-2\alpha)} dx \right)^{(p-\alpha)/p} \\ &= C \left[ \int_{r_0}^R \left( M(r)^{1-pq/(2p-2\alpha)} \right)' dr \right]^{(p-\alpha)/p}; \end{aligned}$$

here we have used that  $pq/(2p-2\alpha) < 1$  since

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{pq}{2p-2\alpha} < 1 &\Leftrightarrow \frac{q}{2} < 1 - \frac{\alpha}{p} = 1 - \frac{q-1}{p-1} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \frac{2-q}{2} > \frac{q-1}{p-1} \\ &\Leftrightarrow p > 1 + \frac{2(q-1)}{2-q} = \frac{2-q+2q-2}{2-q} = \frac{q}{2-q}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\left\| \frac{\sqrt{M(r)'}}{r} \right\|_{L^q(B_R \setminus B_{r_0})}^q \leq C \|\rho\|_p^\alpha \|\rho\|_{L^1(B_R)}^{(p-\alpha)/p-q/2}.$$

Since

$$\|\rho\|_{L^1(B_R)} \leq C \|\rho\|_p$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{q} \left( \alpha + \frac{p-\alpha}{p} - \frac{q}{2} \right) &= \frac{q-1}{q} \frac{p}{p-1} + \frac{1}{q} \left( 1 - \frac{q-1}{p-1} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \\ &= \frac{(q-1)p + (p-q)}{q(p-1)} - \frac{1}{2} \\ &= \frac{pq - q}{q(p-1)} - \frac{1}{2} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

we finally have

$$\left\| \frac{\sqrt{M(r)'}}{r} \right\|_{L^q(B_R \setminus B_{r_0})} \leq C \|\rho\|_q^{1/2}.$$

□

Now we can analyse derivatives of  $\lambda(|\nabla U_\rho^N|)\nabla U_\rho^N$ . However, before we do so, we need to strengthen the assumptions on  $\lambda$  that we made in Lemma 4.1. This we do in the next lemma, where we take a look on the derivative  $\lambda'$ . The assumptions of the next lemma imply that  $\lambda$  has the same regularity as in Lemma 4.1 and that additionally the function  $\mathbb{R}^3 \ni u \mapsto \lambda(|u|)u$  is Hölder continuous.



**Lemma 5.2.** Assume that  $\lambda \in C^1((0, \infty))$ ,  $\lambda(\sigma) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\sigma \rightarrow \infty$  and there is  $\Lambda > 0$  such that  $-\Lambda/(2\sigma^{3/2}) \leq \lambda'(\sigma) \leq 0$ , for  $\sigma > 0$ . Then

$$\lambda(\sigma) \leq \Lambda/\sqrt{\sigma}$$

for every  $\sigma > 0$  (as in Lemma 4.1) and there is a  $C > 0$  such that for all  $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^3$

$$|\lambda(|u|)u - \lambda(|v|)v| \leq C|u - v|^{1/2}$$

with  $\lambda(|u|)u = 0$  if  $u = 0$ .

We postpone the proof of this Lemma to the appendix and return our attention to the analysis of the second derivatives of  $U_\rho^M$ . Using Proposition 5.1 we can control  $L^q$ -norms of the derivatives of the Mondian part

$$\lambda(|\nabla U_\rho^N|)\nabla U_\rho^N$$

of the field  $\nabla U_\rho^M$  provided  $1 < q < 2$  and  $\rho \geq 0$  is spherically symmetric.

**Lemma 5.3.** Let  $1 < q < 2$ ,  $p > \frac{q}{2-q} + q$ ,  $R > 0$  and  $\rho \in L^1 \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$ ,  $\rho \geq 0$ , spherically symmetric. Assume that  $\lambda$  is as in Lemma 5.2, then

$$\lambda(|\nabla U_\rho^N|)\nabla U_\rho^N \in W_{loc}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$$

with

$$\|\nabla [\lambda(|\nabla U_\rho^N|)\nabla U_\rho^N]\|_{L^q(B_R)} \leq C\|\rho\|_p^{1/2}$$

where  $C = C(p, q, R) > 0$ .

*Proof.* Since we are in spherical symmetry, Lemma 2.5 gives

$$\lambda(|\nabla U_\rho^N|)\nabla U_\rho^N = \lambda\left(\frac{M(r)}{r^2}\right) \frac{M(r)}{r^2} \frac{x}{r}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^3, r = |x|;$$

for better readability we suppress the  $x$ -argument on the left side. Using the abbreviation

$$\tilde{\lambda}(\sigma) = \lambda(\sigma)\sigma, \quad \sigma \geq 0,$$

we have

$$\lambda(|\nabla U_\rho^N|)\nabla U_\rho^N = \tilde{\lambda}\left(\frac{M(r)}{r^2}\right) \frac{x}{r}.$$

Thanks to Lemma 5.2

$$|\tilde{\lambda}(\sigma) - \tilde{\lambda}(\tau)| \leq C|\sigma - \tau|^{1/2}, \quad \sigma, \tau \geq 0, \tag{5.1}$$

for a  $C > 0$  where

$$\tilde{\lambda}(0) = 0.$$

From this lemma follows further

$$0 \leq \tilde{\lambda}(\sigma) \leq \Lambda\sqrt{\sigma}, \quad \sigma \geq 0. \tag{5.2}$$

Using the bounds for  $\lambda$  and  $\lambda'$  we get

$$|\tilde{\lambda}'(\sigma)| \leq |\lambda'(\sigma)|\sigma + \lambda(\sigma) \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{\sigma}}, \quad \sigma > 0, \tag{5.3}$$

for a  $C > 0$ . Thanks to (5.2), for every  $R > 0$  holds

$$\|\lambda(|\nabla U_\rho^N|)\nabla U_\rho^N\|_{L^q(B_R)}^q \leq \Lambda^q \int_{B_R} \left(\frac{\sqrt{M(r)}}{r}\right)^q dx \leq C\|\rho\|_1^{q/2}.$$

Next we approximate  $\rho$  by smooth densities  $\rho_n$  and study the (weak) derivatives of  $\lambda(|\nabla U_{\rho_n}^N|)\nabla U_{\rho_n}^N$ . Let  $(\rho_n) \subset C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$  be a sequence of spherically symmetric densities such that

$$\rho_n \rightarrow \rho \quad \text{strongly in } L^1(\mathbb{R}^3) \text{ and } L^p(\mathbb{R}^3) \text{ for } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

As above  $\lambda(|\nabla U_{\rho_n}^N|)\nabla U_{\rho_n}^N \in L_{loc}^q(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . Denote by

$$M_n(r) = \int_{B_r} \rho_n dx, \quad r \geq 0,$$

the mass of  $\rho_n$  inside the ball with radius  $r$ . Then  $M_n \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$  with

$$\nabla(M_n(r)) = M'_n(r) \frac{x}{r} = 4\pi\rho_n(r)rx.$$

Let  $r_n \geq 0$  be such that  $M_n(r_n) = 0$  and  $M_n(r) > 0$  for all  $r > r_n$ . Then

$$\lambda(|\nabla U_{\rho_n}^N|) \nabla U_{\rho_n}^N \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{|x| = r_n\})$$

with

$$\partial_{x_i} [\lambda(|\nabla U_{\rho_n}^N|) \partial_{x_j} U_{\rho_n}^N] = 0 \quad (5.4)$$

if  $|x| < r_n$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{x_i} [\lambda(|\nabla U_{\rho_n}^N|) \partial_{x_j} U_{\rho_n}^N] &= \partial_{x_i} \left( \tilde{\lambda} \left( \frac{M_n(r)}{r^2} \right) \frac{x_j}{r} \right) \\ &= \tilde{\lambda}' \left( \frac{M_n(r)}{r^2} \right) M'_n(r) \frac{x_i x_j}{r^4} \\ &\quad - 2\tilde{\lambda}' \left( \frac{M_n(r)}{r^2} \right) M_n(r) \frac{x_i x_j}{r^5} \\ &\quad + \tilde{\lambda} \left( \frac{M_n(r)}{r^2} \right) \left( \frac{\delta_{ij}}{r} - \frac{x_i x_j}{r^3} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

if  $|x| > r_n$  and  $i, j = 1, 2, 3$ . Denote by

$$\partial_{x_i} [\lambda(|\nabla U_{\rho_n}^N|) \partial_{x_j} U_{\rho_n}^N]$$

the functions that are pointwise a.e. defined by (5.4) and (5.5). Using (5.2) and (5.3) we get for  $|x| > r_n$

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_{x_i} [\lambda(|\nabla U_{\rho_n}^N|) \partial_{x_j} U_{\rho_n}^N]| &\leq C \left( \frac{M'_n(r)}{2\sqrt{M_n(r)}} \frac{1}{r} + \frac{\sqrt{M_n(r)}}{r^2} \right) \\ &= C \left( \frac{\sqrt{M_n(r)'}}{r} + \frac{\sqrt{M_n(r)}}{r^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $p > q/(2-q) + q$  and

$$\frac{q}{2-q} = \frac{3q}{6-3q} > \frac{3q}{6-q},$$

we can apply Proposition 5.1 and get for every  $R > 0$

$$\|\partial_{x_i} [\lambda(|\nabla U_{\rho_n}^N|) \partial_{x_j} U_{\rho_n}^N]\|_{L^q(B_R)} \leq C \|\rho_n\|_p^{1/2}. \quad (5.6)$$

Now we prove that the functions given by (5.4) and (5.5) are indeed the weak derivatives of  $\lambda(|\nabla U_{\rho_n}^N|) \nabla U_{\rho_n}^N$ . For every  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$

$$\begin{aligned} \int \lambda(|\nabla U_{\rho_n}^N|) \partial_{x_j} U_{\rho_n}^N \partial_{x_i} \phi \, dx &= \lim_{s \searrow r_n} \int_{\{|x| \geq s\}} \lambda(|\nabla U_{\rho_n}^N|) \partial_{x_j} U_{\rho_n}^N \partial_{x_i} \phi \, dx \\ &= - \int \partial_{x_i} (\lambda(|\nabla U_{\rho_n}^N|) \partial_{x_j} U_{\rho_n}^N) \phi \, dx \\ &\quad + \lim_{s \searrow r_n} \int_{\{|x|=s\}} \lambda(|\nabla U_{\rho_n}^N|) \partial_{x_j} U_{\rho_n}^N \phi \frac{x_i}{|x|} \, dS(x). \end{aligned}$$

If  $r_n = 0$ , we use

$$|\lambda(|\nabla U_{\rho_n}^N|) \nabla U_{\rho_n}^N| \leq \frac{\Lambda \sqrt{M_n(r)}}{r} \leq \frac{\Lambda \|\rho\|_1^{1/2}}{r}$$

and get

$$\left| \int_{\{|x|=s\}} \lambda(|\nabla U_{\rho_n}^N|) \partial_{x_j} U_{\rho_n}^N \phi \frac{x_i}{|x|} \, dS(x) \right| \leq Cs \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{for } s \rightarrow 0.$$

If  $r_n > 0$ , we use

$$|\lambda(|\nabla U_{\rho_n}^N|) \nabla U_{\rho_n}^N| \leq \frac{\Lambda}{r_n} \left( \int_{r_n < |x| < s} \rho_n \, dx \right)^{1/2} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{for } s \rightarrow r_n,$$

and get, too, that the border term in the above integration by parts vanishes. Hence the by (5.4) and (5.5) pointwise a.e. defined functions are indeed the weak derivatives of

$$\lambda(|\nabla U_{\rho_n}^N|)\nabla U_{\rho_n}^N \in W_{loc}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

It remains to prove that

$$\lambda(|\nabla U_{\rho}^N|)\partial_{x_j} U_{\rho}^N \in W_{loc}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$$

and that the estimate (5.6) holds with  $\rho_n$  replaced by  $\rho$ . Using (5.1) and Hölder we have for  $R > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\lambda(|\nabla U_{\rho_n}^N|)\nabla U_{\rho_n}^N - \lambda(|\nabla U_{\rho}^N|)\partial_{x_j} U_{\rho}^N\|_{L^1(B_R)} &= \int_{B_R} \left| \tilde{\lambda}\left(\frac{M(r)}{r^2}\right) - \tilde{\lambda}\left(\frac{M_n(r)}{r^2}\right) \right| dx \\ &\leq C \int_{B_R} \frac{|M(r) - M_n(r)|^{1/2}}{r} dx \\ &\leq C \left( \int_{B_R} |M_n(r) - M(r)| dx \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq C \|\rho_n - \rho\|_1^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\lambda(|\nabla U_{\rho_n}^N|)\nabla U_{\rho_n}^N \rightarrow \lambda(|\nabla U_{\rho}^N|)\partial_{x_j} U_{\rho}^N \quad \text{strongly in } L^1(B_R) \text{ for } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Since

$$\|\rho_n\|_p \leq C$$

independent of  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , (5.6) implies that there is a subsequence (again denoted by  $(\rho_n)$ ) such that

$$\partial_{x_i} [\lambda(|\nabla U_{\rho_n}^N|)\partial_{x_j} U_{\rho_n}^N] \rightharpoonup V \quad \text{weakly in } L^q(\mathbb{R}^3) \text{ for } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

$V$  is the weak derivative of

$$\lambda(|\nabla U_{\rho}^N|)\partial_{x_j} U_{\rho}^N$$

with respect to  $x_i$  and hence

$$\lambda(|\nabla U_{\rho}^N|)\nabla U_{\rho}^N \in W_{loc}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

Since the  $L^q$ -norm is weakly lower semi-continuous, (5.6) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|V\|_{L^q(B_R)} &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\partial_{x_i} [\lambda(|\nabla U_{\rho_n}^N|)\partial_{x_j} U_{\rho_n}^N]\|_{L^q(B_R)} \\ &\leq C \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\rho_n\|_p^{1/2} \\ &= C \|\rho\|_p^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Thus, in spherical symmetry it follows from Lemma 5.3 (and Lemma 2.4) that the Mondian potential  $U_{\rho}^M$  is always twice weakly differentiable.

But, as we have argued in the introduction to this section, one might expect from a naive argumentation that

$$D^2 U_{\rho}^M \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)$$

for  $1 < q < 6$  if

$$\rho \in L^1 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

However, in Lemma 5.3 we were only able to prove an estimate of the type

$$\|D^2 U_{\rho}^M\|_q \leq C \|\rho\|_p^{1/2}$$

if  $1 < q < 2$ . In the following Lemma we show that this estimate is indeed optimal; there is no such estimate if  $q > 2$ . Further the subsequent Lemma will show that it is unlikely that any such estimate can be proven if we drop the assumption of spherical symmetry.

**Lemma 5.4.** *Let  $\lambda(\sigma) = 1/\sqrt{\sigma}$ ,  $\sigma > 0$ . Then there is a sequence of spherically symmetric densities  $(\rho_n) \subset L^1 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$  such that for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$   $\rho_n \geq 0$ ,  $\text{supp } \rho_n \subset B_2$  and  $\|\rho_n\|_\infty \leq 1$ , but*

$$\|D^2 U_{\rho_n}^M\|_q \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{for } n \rightarrow \infty$$

if  $2 < q < 6$ .

*Remark 5.5.* The idea behind the proof of Lemma 5.4 is the following: In  $\Delta U_\rho^M$  appears the term

$$\frac{\sqrt{M(r)'}}{r} = \frac{2\pi r \rho(r)}{\sqrt{M(r)}} = \frac{2\pi \rho(r)}{\sqrt{N(r)}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{r}}$$

where we have introduced the notion

$$N(r) := \frac{1}{r^3} M(r) = \frac{1}{r^3} \int_{B_r} \rho(x) dx.$$

(Rudin, 1999, Satz 7.7) implies that for a.e.  $y \in \mathbb{R}^3$

$$\frac{1}{r^3} \int_{B_r(y)} \rho(x) dx \rightarrow \frac{4\pi}{3} \rho(y) \quad \text{for } r \rightarrow 0.$$

So we could expect that

$$\frac{\sqrt{M(r)'}}{r} \approx \frac{\sqrt{3\pi} \rho(r)}{\sqrt{\rho(0)}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{r}} \quad \text{for } r > 0 \text{ small.}$$

Assuming for the moment that  $\rho(0) > 0$  and that  $\|\rho\|_\infty < \infty$  this would guarantee that  $\|\sqrt{M(r)'}/r\|_q$  is bounded for all  $1 < q < 6$ . Together with Proposition 5.1 this would give us a bound for  $\|D^2 U_\rho^M\|_q$  for all  $1 < q < 6$ . However, the pointwise representation of an  $L^p$ -function  $\rho$  is tricky:

Lets take an open set  $\Omega_n \subset [0, 2]$  such that for all  $\epsilon > 0$

$$\mathcal{L}(\Omega_n \cap [0, \epsilon]) \approx \frac{\epsilon}{n}$$

and set

$$\rho_n(r) := 1_{\Omega_n}(r).$$

Then there is no well defined value of  $\rho(0)$  and we get

$$N(r) \approx \frac{C}{n} \quad \text{for } r > 0 \text{ small}$$

with a constant  $C > 0$  independent of  $n$ . Thus

$$\frac{\sqrt{M(r)'}}{r} \approx \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{C}} \sqrt{n} 1_{\Omega_n}(r) \frac{1}{\sqrt{r}} \quad \text{for } r > 0 \text{ small,}$$

and when we send  $n \rightarrow \infty$  this is unbounded in  $L^q$  for  $2 < q < 6$ .

*Proof of Lemma 5.4.* For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  set

$$\Omega_n := \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} \left[ 2^{-i}, \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right) 2^{-i} \right)$$

and define

$$\rho_n(r) := \frac{1}{4\pi} 1_{\Omega_n}(r), \quad r \geq 0.$$

Denote by

$$M_n(r) := \int_{B_r} \rho_n dx$$

the mass of  $\rho_n$  inside the ball with radius  $r \geq 0$ . Let  $n, j \in \mathbb{N}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} M_n(2^{-j+1}) &= \sum_{i=j}^{\infty} \int_{2^{-i}}^{(1+1/n)2^{-i}} r^2 dr \leq \sum_{i=j}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} 2^{-i} (2^{-i+1})^2 = \frac{4}{n} \sum_{i=j}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{8}\right)^i \\ &= \frac{4}{n} \left( \frac{1}{1-1/8} - \frac{1-(1/8)^j}{1-1/8} \right) = \frac{4}{n} \left(\frac{1}{8}\right)^j \frac{8}{7} = \frac{C_0}{n} (2^{-j})^3. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $r \in [2^{-j}, 2^{-j+1})$  for a  $j \geq 0$ . Then

$$M_n(r) \leq M_n(2^{-j+1}) \leq \frac{C_0}{n} (2^{-j})^3 \leq \frac{C_0}{n} r^3.$$

Thus

$$N_n(r) := \frac{1}{r^3} M_n(r) \leq \frac{C_0}{n}$$

and

$$\frac{\rho_n(r)}{\sqrt{N_n(r)}} \geq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{4\pi\sqrt{C_0}} 1_{\Omega_n}(r). \quad (5.7)$$

Let now  $2 < q < 6$ , then

$$\|D^2 U_{\rho_n}^M\|_q \geq C \|\Delta U_{\rho_n}^M\|_q = C \left\| 4\pi\rho_n(r) + \frac{\sqrt{M_n(r)}}{r^2} + \frac{\sqrt{M_n(r)'}}{r} \right\|_q.$$

Since  $\rho_n, M_n \geq 0$  and  $M_n$  is monotonic increasing

$$\|D^2 U_{\rho_n}^M\|_q \geq C \left\| \frac{\sqrt{M_n(r)'}}{r} \right\|_q = C \left\| \frac{r\rho_n(r)}{\sqrt{M_n(r)}} \right\|_q = C \left\| \frac{\rho_n(r)}{\sqrt{N_n(r)}} r^{-1/2} \right\|_q.$$

Now we use the estimate (5.7) and get

$$\begin{aligned} \|D^2 U_{\rho_n}^M\|_q &\geq C\sqrt{n} \left\| r^{-1/2} 1_{\Omega_n}(r) \right\|_q \\ &= C\sqrt{n} \left( \int_{\Omega_n} r^{2-q/2} dr \right)^{1/q} \\ &= C\sqrt{n} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \int_{2^{-i}}^{(1+1/n)2^{-i}} r^{2-q/2} dr \right)^{1/q}. \end{aligned}$$

For  $2 < q \leq 4$  we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \int_{2^{-i}}^{(1+1/n)2^{-i}} r^{2-q/2} dr \geq \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} 2^{-i} (2^{-i})^{2-q/2} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (2^{-3+q/2})^i$$

and for  $4 < q < 6$

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \int_{2^{-i}}^{(1+1/n)2^{-i}} r^{2-q/2} dr \geq \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} 2^{-i} (2^{-i+1})^{2-q/2} = \frac{1}{n} 2^{2-q/2} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (2^{-3+q/2})^i.$$

Hence

$$\|D^2 U_{\rho_n}^M\|_q \geq Cn^{1/2-1/q},$$

and this is divergent if  $q > 2$ . □

So it is not possible for any  $q > 2$  to prove an estimate of the form

$$\|D^2 U_{\rho}^M\|_{L^q(B_R)} \leq C \|\rho\|_p^{1/2}$$

even if  $\rho$  is spherically symmetric (and non-negative). Will the situation get even worse if we leave spherical symmetry?

Let us look at the difficulties that one can encounter.  $D^2 U_{\rho}^M$  causes difficulties when  $\nabla U_{\rho}^N(x) = 0$  for an  $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$  because then

$$\lambda(|\nabla U_{\rho}^N(x+y)|) |\nabla U_{\rho}^N(x+y)| = |\nabla U_{\rho}^N(x+y)|^{1/2} \approx C\sqrt{y}$$

if  $|y|$  is small and  $\lambda(\sigma) = 1/\sqrt{\sigma}$  for  $\sigma > 0$ . Consider now the following, symmetry free situation: For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  place a point mass at position

$$x_n = (1 - 1/n, 0, 0).$$

Then for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  there is  $0 < \alpha_n < 1$  such that for

$$y_n = \alpha_n x_n + (1 - \alpha_n) x_{i+1}$$

we have

$$\nabla U^N(y_n) = 0;$$

$U^N$  denotes the Newtonian gravitational potential created by all the masses at the points  $x_n$ . So for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$   $D^2 U^N(y_n)$  will cause difficulties.

The exact treatment of such a non-symmetric situation is difficult. Can we perhaps mimic the above difficulties in spherical symmetry? The answer is yes, if we do not demand that  $\rho$  has to be non-negative. Then the next lemma shows that it is no more possible for any  $1 \leq p, q \leq \infty$  to prove an estimate of the form

$$\|D^2 U_\rho^M\|_{L^q(B_R)} \leq C \|\rho\|_p^{1/2}.$$

**Lemma 5.6.** *Let  $\lambda(\sigma) = 1/\sqrt{\sigma}$ ,  $\sigma > 0$ . Then there exists a  $\rho \in L^1 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , spherically symmetric, which takes positive and negative values, such that*

$$\nabla U_\rho^M \notin W_{loc}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

*Proof.* For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  set

$$a_n := \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{2}{i^2}$$

and let  $m_n$  be the center between  $a_n$  and  $a_{n+1}$ , i.e.,

$$m_n := a_n + \frac{1}{(n+1)^2}.$$

Then  $a_1 = 2$  and

$$a_n \rightarrow \frac{\pi^2}{3} < 4 \quad \text{for } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Set  $M(r) := 0$  if  $r \in [0, 2)$  or  $r \in [\pi^2/3, \infty)$ . If  $r \in [2, \pi^2/3)$  set

$$M(r) := \begin{cases} \alpha & \text{if } r \in [a_n, m_n) \text{ and } r = a_n + \alpha \\ 1/(n+1)^2 - \alpha & \text{if } r \in [m_n, a_{n+1}) \text{ and } r = m_n + \alpha \end{cases}.$$

Then  $M$  is continuous and

$$\begin{aligned} M(a_n) &= 0, \\ M(m_n) &= \frac{1}{(n+1)^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

Set  $\rho(r) := 0$  if  $r \in [0, 2)$  or  $r \in [\pi^2/3, \infty)$ . If  $r \in [2, \pi^2/3)$  set

$$\rho(r) := \begin{cases} 1/(4\pi r^2) & \text{if } r \in [a_n, m_n) \\ -1/(4\pi r^2) & \text{if } r \in [m_n, a_{n+1}) \end{cases}.$$

Then  $\rho \in L^1 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . Further for  $r \geq 0$

$$M'(r) = 4\pi r^2 \rho(r)$$

and thus

$$M(r) = \int_0^r 4\pi s^2 \rho(s) ds = \int_{B_r} \rho dx.$$

In view of (5.8)

$$\nabla U_\rho^N(x) = \frac{M(r)}{r^2} \frac{x}{r}$$

will have a zero for all  $x = (a_n, 0, 0)$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let us see how this troubles the second derivatives of the Mondian potential:

As in the introduction to this section we have

$$\operatorname{div}(\nabla U_\rho^M(x)) = \rho(x) + \frac{1}{r^2} (r\sqrt{M(r)})'$$

for  $r = |x| > 0$ . But

$$\frac{1}{r^2} (r\sqrt{M(r)})' \notin L^1(B_4)$$

since

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{B_4} \left| \frac{1}{r^2} (r\sqrt{M(r)})' \right| dx &= 4\pi \int_0^4 \left| (r\sqrt{M(r)})' \right| dr \\
&= 4\pi \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left[ \int_{a_n}^{m_n} (r\sqrt{M(r)})' dr - \int_{m_n}^{a_{n+1}} (r\sqrt{M(r)})' dr \right] \\
&= 8\pi \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} m_n \sqrt{M(m_n)} \geq 8\pi \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n+1} = \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\operatorname{div}(\nabla U_\rho^M) \notin L^1(B_4)$$

and

$$\nabla U_\rho^M \notin W_{loc}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

□

Since the density  $\rho$  constructed in Lemma 5.6 mimics the difficulties that one can encounter in a situation without symmetry assumptions, we suspect that it is impossible to prove the existence of weak, integrable derivatives of  $\nabla U_\rho^M$  for general  $\rho \in L^1 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ ,  $\rho \geq 0$ . Thus the assumption of spherical symmetry in Lemma 5.3 seems indeed to be necessary if one wants to prove that  $U_\rho^M$  is twice weakly differentiable.

## 6 Discussion

We have conducted an extensive analysis of the QUMOND theory, focusing initially on the gradient  $\nabla U_\rho^M$  of the Mondian potential instead of directly studying the potential  $U_\rho^M$ . Our investigation reveals that this gradient is the irrotational part of the vector field (1.1) in the sense of the Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition. This assures that  $\nabla U_\rho^M$  is an  $L^p$  vector field and indeed the weak gradient of a potential. Our findings show that the corresponding potential is given by the formula from Milgrom (2010) and that it is well defined.

These results were attained through a careful examination of the operator  $H$  responsible for extracting the irrotational part of a vector field. We developed a new, explicit expression for this operator using singular integral operators. Using the operator  $H$  also significantly aided in demonstrating that the Mondian potential solves the PDE (1.2) in distribution sense. Thus by linking the QUMOND theory with the Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition, we established a robust mathematical foundation for QUMOND.

Furthermore, we investigated second-order derivatives of the Mondian potential  $U_\rho^M$ . Under the additional assumption of spherical symmetry, we proved that the Mondian potential is twice weakly differentiable. However, the regularity of the second derivatives was found to be weaker than anticipated. Additionally, we illustrated why proving a similarly general regularity result for the second derivatives without symmetry assumptions seems impossible.

Our findings can be applied to many problems in QUMOND. For instance, in an accompanying paper (Frenkler, 2024), we establish the stability of a large class of spherically symmetric models. The perturbations permitted are still confined to spherical symmetry and removing this restriction draws heavily upon the results presented in this paper, a discussion of which is provided in the accompanying work. Moreover, our results can be applied to analyse initial value problems. Recent work by Carina Keller in her master's thesis demonstrates the existence of global weak solutions to the initial value problem for the collisionless Boltzmann equation. Her result is limited to spherically symmetric solutions. Generalizing it to solutions devoid of symmetry restrictions necessitates the use of the theory presented here and a further generalization of it: We have to use that the operator  $H$  also preserves Hölder continuity. This is work in progress.

Our research contributes to the investigation of solutions to the initial value problem for the collisionless Boltzmann equation in yet another way. Building upon the theory of DiPerna & Lions (1989), we have established that weak Lagrangian solutions conserve energy. This unpublished result, not imposing any symmetry restrictions, heavily relies on the results proven in this paper. Further, the question of whether every Eulerian solution of the collisionless Boltzmann equation is also a Lagrangian one, and vice versa, is of considerable interest. DiPerna & Lions (1989) have shown that this equivalence holds if the Mondian potential has second-order weak derivatives. Thus, our findings confirm this equivalence for spherically symmetric solutions, but cast doubt on extending this conclusion to nonsymmetric scenarios.

In summary, with QUMOND now placed on a robust mathematical foundation, it is possible to analyse many interesting yet unsolved questions with mathematical rigour.

## References

- Banik I., Pittordis C., Sutherland W., Famaey B., Ibata R., Mieske S., Zhao H., 2024, MNRAS, 527, 4573
- Chae K.-H., 2023, ApJ, 952, 128
- DiPerna R., Lions P., 1989, Invent. math., 98, 511
- Dietz S., 2001, PhD thesis, University of Munich, [https://edoc.ub.uni-muenchen.de/1/1/Dietz\\_Svetlana.pdf](https://edoc.ub.uni-muenchen.de/1/1/Dietz_Svetlana.pdf)
- Famaey B., McGaugh S. S., 2012, Living Reviews in Relativity, 15, 10
- Frenkler J., 2024, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2402.11043
- Galdi G. P., 2011, An introduction to the mathematical theory of the Navier-Stokes equations, 2. ed. edn. Springer monographs in mathematics, Springer, New York, NY
- Gentile G., Famaey B., de Blok W. J. G., 2011, A&A, 527, A76
- Gilbarg D., Trudinger N. S., 1977, Elliptic partial differential equations of second order. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Springer, Berlin
- Hernandez X., Chae K.-H., 2023, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2312.03162
- Lieb E., Loss M., 2010, Analysis, 2nd edn. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI
- Milgrom M., 1983, ApJ, 270, 365
- Milgrom M., 2010, MNRAS, 403, 886
- Newton I., 1687, Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica., doi:10.3931/e-rara-440.
- Rein G., 2007, Handbook of Differential Equations: Evolutionary Equations, pp 383–476
- Rudin W., 1999, Reelle und komplexe Analysis. Oldenburg, München
- Stein E. M., 1970, Singular Integrals and Differentiability Properties of Functions. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ

## A Appendix

We omitted the proof of Lemma 5.2 and we give it now in the appendix.

*Proof of Lemma 5.2.* Let  $\sigma > 0$ , then

$$\lambda(\sigma) = - \int_{\sigma}^{\infty} \lambda'(s) ds \leq \frac{\Lambda}{2} \int_{\sigma}^{\infty} \frac{ds}{s^{3/2}} = \frac{\Lambda}{\sqrt{\sigma}}$$

as desired. Further, the function  $\lambda(|u|)u$  is continuously differentiable on  $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\}$ , and for  $u \in \mathbb{R}^3$ ,  $u \neq 0$ , holds

$$D(\lambda(|u|)u) = \lambda(|u|)E_3 + \lambda'(|u|) \frac{uu^T}{|u|}$$

where  $E_3$  denotes the identity matrix of dimension 3. Using the bounds for  $\lambda$  and  $\lambda'$ , we have

$$|D(\lambda(|u|)u)| \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{|u|}}.$$

Let now  $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^3$  be such that for all  $t \in [0, 1]$

$$w_t := v + t(u - v)$$

is different from zero. Then

$$|\lambda(|u|)u - \lambda(|v|)v| \leq \int_0^1 \left| \frac{d}{dt} (\lambda(|w_t|)w_t) \right| dt \leq C \int_0^1 \frac{|u - v|^{1/2}}{|w_t|^{1/2}} dt |u - v|^{1/2}.$$



Set

$$a := \frac{v}{|u-v|} \quad \text{and} \quad b := \frac{u-v}{|u-v|}$$

then  $|b| = 1$  and we have

$$\int_0^1 \frac{|u-v|^{1/2}}{|u_t|^{1/2}} dt = \int_0^1 \frac{dt}{|a+tb|^{1/2}} \leq 2 \int_0^{1/2} \frac{ds}{\sqrt{s}} < \infty.$$

Thus for a.e.  $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\}$

$$|\lambda(|u|)u - \lambda(|v|)v| \leq C|u-v|^{1/2}.$$

By continuity this holds for all  $u, v \neq 0$  and due to the Hölder continuity this holds for all  $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^3$ . □