

Geometric interpretation of the vanishing Lie Bracket for two-dimensional rough vector fields

*Rebucci A.,[†] Zizza M.,[‡]

June 5, 2024

Abstract

In this paper, we prove that if X, Y are continuous, Sobolev vector fields with bounded divergence on the real plane and $[X, Y] = 0$, then their flows commute. In particular, we improve the previous result of [11], where the authors require the additional assumption of the weak Lie differentiability on one of the two flows. We also discuss possible extensions to the BV setting.

Key words: Frobenius Theorem, Lie Bracket, rough vector fields, Regular Lagrangian Flows.

MSC2020: 35A24, 35D30, 35F35, 35Q49.

1 Introduction

The aim of this paper is to extend the classical result on commutativity of flows of smooth vector fields (in the Euclidean space) to the weak setting of Regular Lagrangian Flows. To this end, we first recall that, if $X, Y \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$ are two smooth vector fields, then their flows ϕ_t^X, ϕ_s^Y are the solutions of the following Cauchy Problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \phi_t^X(x) = X(\phi_t^X(x)), \\ \phi_0^X(x) = x, \end{cases}$$

$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, (and the same for the flow ϕ_s^Y). Then one of the classical results of differential geometry, ultimately leading to Frobenius theorem, states that

$$\phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y = \phi_s^Y \circ \phi_t^X, \quad \forall t, s \in \mathbb{R} \quad \iff \quad [X, Y] = 0, \quad (1.1)$$

where $[X, Y]$ can be defined pointwise as $[X, Y] = DYX - DXY$. The equivalence in (1.1) was proved for locally Lipschitz vector fields in [16], and the extension to Sobolev vector fields was analyzed in [11], where the authors prove that, if $X, Y \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$ with bounded divergence, then

$$\phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y = \phi_s^Y \circ \phi_t^X, \quad \forall s, t \in \mathbb{R}, \text{ for a.e. } z \in \mathbb{R}^n \quad (1.2)$$

\iff

$[X, Y] = 0$ and ϕ_t^X is weakly (Lie) differentiable w.r.t. Y with locally bounded derivative.

Here, the flows of the two vector fields are Regular Lagrangian Flows as in [13],[3] (see also Section 2). Moreover, we remark that the condition $\forall s, t \in \mathbb{R}$, for a.e. $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ in (1.2) means that for every s, t fixed, there exists $\Omega_{s,t}$ such that $\mathcal{L}^2(\Omega_{s,t}^c) = 0$ and the flows commute in $\Omega_{s,t}$. Hence, it is not restrictive to consider a bounded time interval, i.e. $t \in (-T, T)$ for some $T > 0$. We finally recall that the notion of weak Lie differentiability introduced in [11] has to be intended in the following sense:

*Max-Planck Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences

[†]annalaura.rebucci@mis.mpg.de

[‡]martina.zizza@mis.mpg.de

Definition 1.1. Let $F \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$ and let $Y \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$ be a vector field with $\operatorname{div} Y \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R})$. We say that F is weakly (Lie) differentiable w.r.t. Y if there exists $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$ such that for every $\varphi \in C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$ the following holds

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (F(z), D\varphi(z)Y(z)) + \operatorname{div}(Y)(z) (F(z), \varphi(z)) dz = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (f(z), \varphi(z)) dz. \quad (1.3)$$

We will say that f is the *weak (Lie) derivative* of F in direction of Y . If moreover $f \in L^\infty_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$ we will say that F is weakly (Lie) differentiable w.r.t. Y with locally bounded derivative.

In particular, if $F \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$, then F is weakly (Lie) differentiable. Indeed, the weak Lie derivative is a directional derivative where the direction is given by the vector field Y .

We point out that the weak Lie differentiability assumption is a non-trivial requirement in the non-smooth setting. Indeed, in the case of rough regularity of the vector field (being either Sobolev or BV), the flow may not be differentiable, namely may not belong to any Sobolev/BV space, as first proved in [14] through a random construction. We also quote [15], where the author provides an example where the RLF fails to be Sobolev/BV.

In this paper, we propose a purely geometric approach that allows us to remove the additional assumption of the weak Lie differentiability in the case of two-dimensional Hamiltonian vector fields. More precisely, we prove that the classical equivalence (1.1) holds in dimension $n = 2$, with the further assumption of the continuity of the two vector fields. Moreover, in Section 5 we explain how to generalize one of the implications in (1.1) to the BV setting.

We start by describing the heuristics of our approach, in order to show in particular how to drop the weak Lie differentiability assumption on the flow of X . Our construction draws inspiration from [15]. The core idea is that, if the vector field $X \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2) \cap C^0(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ is bounded, divergence-free and uniformly bounded from below, then its flow ϕ_t^X belongs to the Sobolev space $W^{1,p}$. In particular, the theorem proved in [15] is the following.

Theorem 1.2. [Theorem 1.4 in [15]] *Let $X \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ be a continuous divergence-free vector field with bounded support and let Ω be an open ball of radius $R > 0$ such that there exists $\delta > 0$ and $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{S}^1$ for which $X \cdot \mathbf{e} > \delta$ in Ω . Then for every $t > 0$ the Regular Lagrangian Flow of X has a representative $\phi_t^X \in C^0(\Omega) \cap W^{1,p}(\Omega)$.*

The proof of the previous result is based on the underlying Hamiltonian structure of the vector field and therefore the set Ω , which is a ball in [15], must be simply connected in order to guarantee the existence of a Lipschitz Hamiltonian H such that $X = \nabla^\perp H$. We remark also that, if we consider \mathbf{e} as in the statement of Theorem 1.2, then we have $|X| \geq \delta > 0$. A version of Theorem 1.2 in the BV setting is also available.

In virtue of Theorem 1.2, it is clear that, if $|X| \geq c > 0$ in some $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^2$, and the set Ω is invariant for the flows ϕ_t^X, ϕ_s^Y (meaning that the flows keep living in the set Ω), then ϕ_t^X is weakly Lie differentiable in Ω , since it is Sobolev, and therefore the two flows commute in Ω . On the other hand, if $|X| = 0$, then its flow is the identity map (at least for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$) and the commutativity simply follows by proving that $X \circ \phi_s^Y = 0$ for every s , i.e. the vector field X is forced to vanish along the trajectory of Y .

The proof of our main result relies on finding regions of the plane invariant for the flows ϕ_t^X, ϕ_s^Y where the two different behaviours occur. In this context, the condition $[X, Y] = 0$ prescribes very strict geometric properties on the flows of the two vector fields (see in particular Equation (1.6) below).

We finally remark that the study of the Lie Bracket for rough vector fields is of interest in the context of Magneto Hydrodynamics, for example [10]. Furthermore, the investigation of the commutativity of the flows in the non-smooth setting, together with the notion of Lie bracket for rough vector fields, arises naturally in various research fields, see for instance [17],[7].

The Hamiltonian case

In the first part of our work, namely Section 3, we restrict ourselves to the case of Hamiltonian dynamics, i.e. we assume $\operatorname{div} X = 0, \operatorname{div} Y = 0, n = 2$. Our main contribution here is the following result.

Proposition 1.3. *Let $X, Y \in W_{loc}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2) \cap C^0(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ be two bounded vector fields and assume that $\operatorname{div} X = \operatorname{div} Y = 0$ almost everywhere. Then*

$$[X, Y] = 0 \iff \phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y = \phi_s^Y \circ \phi_t^X, \quad \forall t, s \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \text{for a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^2. \quad (1.4)$$

The main idea behind the proof of Proposition 1.3 is to exploit the well-known fact that, if $X \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ with $\operatorname{div} X = 0$, then there exists a Lipschitz Hamiltonian $H : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$X = \nabla^\perp H = (-\partial_2 H, \partial_1 H).$$

Then, given two smooth Hamiltonian vector fields $X = \nabla^\perp H, Y = \nabla^\perp K$, we have

$$[X, Y] = 0 \iff \{H, K\} = \text{const},$$

where $\{\cdot, \cdot\}$ denotes the Poisson Bracket. In the two dimensional case, the vanishing of the Lie bracket corresponds in particular to the following property:

$$X \cdot Y^\perp = \text{const}. \quad (1.5)$$

Indeed, the following equation holds [5]:

$$[X, Y] = \operatorname{div} YX - \operatorname{div} XY - \nabla^\perp(X \cdot Y^\perp). \quad (1.6)$$

In Section 3, we show that the same equivalence between the vanishing of the Lie bracket and property (1.5) holds if we understand the Lie bracket in (1.6) in the distributional sense. Hence, we are left with proving that $X \cdot Y^\perp = \text{const} \Rightarrow \phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y = \phi_s^Y \circ \phi_t^X$, for every $t, s \in \mathbb{R}$, for a.e. in $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and therefore we can study separately the two different cases $X \cdot Y^\perp \neq 0$, and $X \cdot Y^\perp = 0$. In the first case, the commutativity of the flows is an almost direct consequence of the results proved in [15] (see also [11, Corollary 4.2]) for which we need the continuity assumption. On the contrary, the proof in the second case $X \cdot Y^\perp = 0$ is more delicate and relies on the geometry of the two vector fields. To be more precise, we rely on the observation that the condition $X \cdot Y^\perp = 0$ implies that the level sets of the two Hamiltonians H, K coincide, so that we can reduce the study of the commutativity of flows on each level set, in the spirit of what was done in [1]. In particular, the strict geometry of the two vector fields allows us to extend the result in [11] by means of purely geometric considerations, in order to recover the classical equivalence.

The Nearly incompressible case

In the second part of our work (Section 4), we assume the more general hypothesis $\operatorname{div} X, \operatorname{div} Y \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R})$. A key observation in our analysis is that classical results state that, if we assume that X, Y have bounded divergence, then they are nearly incompressible in the sense of the following definition.

Definition 1.4 (Nearly incompressible). A bounded vector field $X \in L_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n) \cap W_{loc}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$ is called *nearly incompressible* if there exists a positive constant $C > 0$ and a density $\rho : I \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\partial_t \rho + \operatorname{div}(\rho X) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(I \times \Omega),$$

with $\rho \in [C^{-1}, C]$ \mathcal{L}^n -a.e. $(t, x) \in I \times \Omega$.

It is clear that divergence-free vector fields are nearly incompressible. We recall that nearly incompressible vector fields were introduced in the study of the hyperbolic system of conservation laws named after Keyfitz and Kranzer (for a systematic treatment of this topic, we refer the reader to [12]).

Also in this more general setting, Equation (1.6) provides strong geometric insights on the flows of the two vector fields. Indeed, under the hypothesis $[X, Y] = 0$, the vector field

$$W \doteq \operatorname{div} YX - \operatorname{div} XY \in L^\infty$$

is a Hamiltonian vector field, with Lipschitz Hamiltonian given by

$$H_W = X \cdot Y^\perp,$$

where Y^\perp denotes $(-Y_2, Y_1)$, namely the counterclockwise rotation of the vector field Y . As in the previous case of Hamiltonian vector fields, there is a clear distinction between the two behaviors occurring in the regions $\{X \cdot Y^\perp = 0\}$ and $\{X \cdot Y^\perp \neq 0\}$. To study the behaviour of the flows of X, Y , we prove two key results. The first one (Proposition 1.5 below) states that the flows of the two vector fields X, Y remain confined in the regions where H_W is bounded, namely the closed sets $\overline{\Omega}_\kappa = H_W^{-1}[C^{-1}\kappa, C\kappa]$. Indeed,

Proposition 1.5. *Let $X, Y \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ with bounded divergence. Moreover, assume that $[X, Y] = 0$. Then the following equation holds*

$$X \cdot Y^\perp \circ \phi_t^X = \det D\phi_t^X X \cdot Y^\perp \quad \text{a.e.}, \quad (1.7)$$

(and the same for the flow ϕ_s^Y). In particular, if $X \cdot Y^\perp > 0$, then there holds

$$\frac{1}{C} X \cdot Y^\perp \leq X \cdot Y^\perp \circ \phi_t^X \leq C X \cdot Y^\perp \quad \text{a.e.},$$

for some positive constant $C > 0$.

The proof of the previous proposition is a consequence of Equation (3.4) below and of the boundedness of $\det D\phi_t^X$, namely

$$\frac{1}{C} \leq \det D\phi_t^X \leq C, \quad \text{a.e.} \quad (1.8)$$

The second result (Proposition 1.7) states that the two vector fields X, Y are steady nearly incompressible in the sets Ω_κ . We recall that

Definition 1.6 (Steady nearly incompressible). A bounded vector field $X \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}^n)$ is called *steady nearly incompressible* in Ω if there exists a positive constant $C > 0$ and a time-independent density $\rho : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\operatorname{div}(\rho X) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\Omega),$$

with $\rho \in [C^{-1}, C]$ \mathcal{L}^n -a.e. $x \in \Omega$.

Then the following Proposition holds

Proposition 1.7. *Let $X, Y \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2) \cap W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ with bounded divergence such that $[X, Y] = 0$. Then for every $\kappa \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, the vector fields $X \llcorner_{\Omega_\kappa}, Y \llcorner_{\Omega_\kappa}$, are steady nearly incompressible. Moreover, they have the same Lipschitz and bounded density $\rho_\kappa : \Omega_\kappa \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by the function*

$$\rho_\kappa = \frac{1}{H_W},$$

that is

$$\operatorname{div}(\rho_\kappa(X - Y)) = 0, \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\Omega_\kappa).$$

This proposition allows us to study the problem of commutativity of the flows separately in the two regions $\Omega = \cup_{\kappa \neq 0} \Omega_\kappa$ and in $\{X \cdot Y^\perp = 0\}$, similarly to what previously done in the case of Hamiltonian vector fields. Also in this case, we expect that in the set Ω the flows of the two vector fields are differentiable in the spirit of [15], while in the complementary set $\{X \cdot Y^\perp = 0\}$ we exploit the geometry of the trajectories. We are now in a position to state the main result of this paper, namely

Theorem 1.8. *Let $X, Y \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2) \cap C^0(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ be two bounded vector fields with $\operatorname{div} X, \operatorname{div} Y \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$. Then we have*

$$[X, Y] = 0 \iff \phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y = \phi_s^Y \circ \phi_t^X, \quad \forall t, s \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \text{for a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^2.$$

It is clear that Proposition 1.3 follows immediately once we have established Theorem 1.8. However, we prefer to analyze first the Hamiltonian case in order to present the main ideas of the proof more clearly. Moreover, the Hamiltonian structure allows us to propose in Section 3 an alternative proof of the commutativity of the flows which relies on the analysis of level sets of Hamiltonians.

To summarize the above, the general idea is that, in the regions where $X \cdot Y^\perp \neq 0$, one of the two vector field plays the role of the direction e in Theorem 3.6 and therefore we have the differentiability

properties of the two flows. In the points where the direction \mathbf{e} cannot be found, we exploit the fact that the trajectories of the two vector fields are the same. In particular, we remark that the non-symmetric assumption ϕ_t^X is weakly Lie differentiable w.r.t. Y (without asking anything on the flow of the vector field Y) is in fact symmetric, since in the same region $X \cdot Y^\perp \neq 0$ the flow of the vector field Y is weakly Lie differentiable w.r.t. X .

We conclude this paragraph by emphasizing that, since $[X, Y] = 0$ imposes strict geometric conditions on the flows of the two vector fields, we expect that also in higher dimension the geometry of trajectories could be analyzed to improve the result in [11], since analogous of Equation (1.6) are available. On the other hand, it is not clear whether in higher dimension we can still expect Sobolev regularity results for the flows under study. Equation (1.6) turned out to be a surprisingly rich source of information about the geometric properties of the two vector fields, and we expect that it could be further investigated for our understanding of the underlying geometric structure given by the vanishing Lie bracket.

Extension to BV setting

In the final part of this work, namely Section 5, we briefly discuss how to generalize the previous results to BV vector fields, since the results of the previous discussion holds true also in this case. In our opinion, the extension to the BV setting is not trivial, and relies mainly on the following definition of distributional Lie Bracket.

Definition 1.9 (Distributional Lie bracket). Let $X, Y \in \text{BV}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$ be vector fields with bounded divergence. Then we define the (distributional) Lie bracket $[X, Y]$ by setting, for every $\varphi \in C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} ([X, Y], \varphi) dz \doteq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} ((X, D\varphi Y) + \text{div} Y(X, \varphi) - (Y, D\varphi X) - \text{div} X(Y, \varphi)) dz. \quad (1.9)$$

We remark that the Lie bracket in (1.9) is well-defined as we assume that the vector fields X and Y have bounded divergence. Moreover, we emphasize that our definition of Lie bracket is consistent with the classical one if X, Y are smooth vector fields and reduces to the one in [11] if we identify X and Y with their precise representative, by Vol'pert chain rule formula (see Sections 2 and 5). Owing to Definition 1.9, we prove the following proposition, which extends to the BV setting one of the implications in (1.1).

Proposition 1.10. *Let $X, Y \in \text{BV}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$ be vector fields with bounded divergence and let ϕ_t^X, ϕ_s^Y be their Regular Lagrangian Flows. Then the following implication holds true*

$$\phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y = \phi_s^Y \circ \phi_t^X, \quad \forall t, s \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \text{a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^n \quad \Rightarrow \quad [X, Y] = 0. \quad (1.10)$$

The proof of Proposition 1.10 is obtained by simply adapting the method used in [11]. In contrast to the Sobolev case studied in [11], it is our belief that it is not straightforward to prove the missing implication in Proposition 1.10. Indeed, a key point in order to show that the vanishing Lie bracket implies that the two flows commute, one would need to evaluate the function

$$t \rightarrow [X, Y] \circ \phi_t^X,$$

and to use the hypothesis on vanishing Lie Bracket on the trajectories. In the BV setting, where we need a distributional definition of Lie Bracket, it is not clear to us how to give meaning to the previous function. For this reason, the geometric approach we follow in Sections 3 and 4 can not be straightforwardly generalized to the BV setting (it is in particular not possible to employ Theorem 1.2 to deal with the case $X \cdot Y^\perp \neq 0$). This constitutes a key difference between the Sobolev and the BV case and therefore we left the other implication as an open problem.

1.0.1 Outline of the paper

The structure of the paper is the following. Section 2 is devoted to preliminaries: we collect some known results regarding BV functions, we introduce the notion of regular Lagrangian flow and we recall the structure of level sets of Lipschitz functions with compact support and gradient with bounded variation. In Section 3, we prove Proposition 1.3 through a dimension-reduction argument in the spirit of [1]. In Section 4 we generalize the previous arguments to the case of rough vector fields

with bounded divergence and we prove our main result, Theorem 1.8. Finally, some comments on the extension to the case of BV vector fields are presented in Section 5.

Acknowledgements. The authors acknowledge Riccardo Tione for suggesting the problem and Riccardo Tione, Giacomo del Nin and Elio Marconi for many useful discussions and insights on the topic.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we collect some preliminary results that will be used throughout the paper. We first give a quick overview of BV functions, Regular Lagrangian Flows and Commutator estimates. Finally, in the last subsection, we give a characterization of Level sets of Lipschitz functions with compact support.

2.1 BV functions

In this subsection, we recall some known results concerning functions of bounded variation. For a more comprehensive treatment of the topic, we refer the reader to [4]. Let $u \in \text{BV}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $Du \in \mathcal{M}_b(\Omega)^{n \times n}$ the $n \times n$ -valued measure representing its distributional derivative. We recall the canonical decomposition of the measure Du

$$Du = D^a u + D^s u = D^a u + D^c u + D^j u,$$

where $D^a u$ is the absolutely continuous part of Du with respect to the n -dimensional Lebesgue measure \mathcal{L}^n and $D^s u$ is the singular part of Du with respect to \mathcal{L}^n . Moreover, we split $D^s u$ into the jump part $D^j u$ and the Cantor part $D^c u$. Since $D^a u$ is an absolutely continuous function, we can write it as $D^a u = \nabla u \mathcal{L}^n$, i.e. we denote by $\nabla u = (\partial_i u^j) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ the density of $D^a u$ with respect to \mathcal{L}^n . We finally recall a structure theorem for BV vector fields from [4].

Theorem 2.1. *Let $u \in \text{BV}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$. Then there exists a partition of $\mathbb{R}^n = S_u \cup J_u \cup D_u$ such that the following properties hold true:*

1. $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(S_u) = 0$;
2. J_u is the union of the images of at most countably many Lipschitz curves and there exist Borel functions $\nu : J_u \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, $u^- : J_u \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that, for every $\bar{x} \in J_u$, we have

$$\int_{B_r^-(\bar{x})} |u(x) - u^-(\bar{x})| dx = o(1), \quad \int_{B_r^+(\bar{x})} |u(x) - u^+(\bar{x})| dx = o(1), \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow 0,$$

where $B_r^-(\bar{x}) \doteq \{x \in B_r : (x - \bar{x}, \nu) < 0\}$ and $B_r^+(\bar{x}) \doteq \{x \in B_r : (x - \bar{x}, \nu) > 0\}$;

3. for every $\bar{x} \in D_u$, there exists $\tilde{u}(\bar{x})$ such that

$$\int_{B_r(\bar{x})} |u(x) - \tilde{u}(\bar{x})| dx = o(1), \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow 0.$$

Taking advantage of the previous theorem, it is possible to assign a value to u at every point $x \notin S_u \setminus J_u$. More precisely, the precise representative of $u \in \text{BV}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$ is the Borel function u^* such that $u^*(x) = \tilde{u}(x)$ if $x \in D_u$ and $u^*(x) = (u^+(x) + u^-(x))/2$ if $x \in J_u$. The precise representative allows us to state the general Leibniz rule for the product of two BV functions. More precisely, if $u, v \in \text{BV}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$, then $uv \in \text{BV}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$ with

$$D(uv) = v^* Du + u^* Dv, \tag{2.1}$$

see [18] or [4, Theorem 3.96].

2.2 Regular Lagrangian Flows

Throughout this paper, we will consider autonomous vector fields $X, Y : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ in the space $BV_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$ (in short $X, Y \in BV_{\text{loc}} \cap L^\infty$) with $\text{div } X, \text{div } Y \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R})$. We first recall that, when the velocity fields X, Y are Lipschitz, then their *flows* are well-defined in the classical sense, i.e. they are the maps $\phi_t^X, \phi_s^Y : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \phi_t^X(x) = X(\phi_t^X(x)), \\ \phi_0^X(x) = x, \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

(and same for ϕ_s^Y). When dealing with rough vector fields, the notion of pointwise uniqueness of (2.2) is not any more the appropriate one and we only have uniqueness “in the selection sense”, as encoded in the following definition.

Definition 2.2. Let $X \in BV_{\text{loc}} \cap L^\infty$. A map $\phi_t^X : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a *Regular Lagrangian Flow* (RLF) for the vector field X if

1. for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ the map $t \rightarrow X_t(x)$ is an absolutely continuous integral solution of

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t x(t) = X(x(t)); \\ x(0) = x. \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

2. there exists a positive constant C independent of t such that

$$\mathcal{L}^2(X_t^{-1}(A)) \leq C \mathcal{L}^2(A), \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^2). \quad (2.4)$$

We recall that Regular Lagrangian flows were introduced in [13], where the authors prove their existence and uniqueness for vector fields $X \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$, $p \geq 1$, with bounded divergence. The theory was subsequently extended to BV vector fields with bounded divergence in [3]. Finally, uniqueness results in the more general class of nearly incompressible vector fields were established in [6]. Here we briefly recall the stability result for RLFs of BV vector fields, that is

Theorem 2.3 (Stability, Theorem 6.3 [2]). *Let $X_n, X \in BV_{\text{loc}} \cap L^\infty$ with $\text{div}(X_n)$ with bounded divergence and let ϕ^{X_n}, ϕ^X be their corresponding Regular Lagrangian Flows. Assume that*

$$\|X_n - X\|_{L^1} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad \|\text{div } X_n\|_\infty \leq C, \quad \forall n,$$

then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \sup_t |\phi_t^{X_n}(x) - \phi_t^X(x)| dx = 0.$$

From now on we denote by $\phi_t^X(\cdot)_\# \mathcal{L}^d$ the push-forward of the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^d via the function $\phi_t^X(\cdot)$. We observe, as already pointed out in [12], that Condition 1. in Definition 2.2 is equivalent to

$$\phi_t^X(\cdot)_\# \mathcal{L}^d \ll \mathcal{L}^d$$

for every $t \geq 0$. Then, for every RLF, there exists a $\xi \in L^\infty([-T, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)$, for every $T > 0$, such that $\phi_t^X(\cdot)_\# \mathcal{L}^d = \xi \mathcal{L}^d$. The function ξ will be called *density* of the flow ϕ_t^X and, by definition, it satisfies the following “change of variables” identity

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} \varphi(t, \phi_{-t}^X(z)) dz dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} \varphi(t, z) \xi(t, z) dz dt, \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{C}_c(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}). \quad (2.5)$$

In the smooth setting, clearly $\xi = \det D\phi_t^X$. Moreover, $\xi \in L^\infty([-T, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ for every $T > 0$ and it satisfies the analogous of Liouville Theorem, that is

$$\partial_t \xi = \text{div}(X) \circ \phi_t^X \xi \quad \text{distributionally.} \quad (2.6)$$

See [11] for the details, where the Stability Theorem is used to obtain this result.

2.3 Structure of level sets of Lip_c functions

In this subsection, we consider $X \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2) \cap \text{BV}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with $\text{div } X = 0$ a.e. and we additionally assume that X has compact support (this is not restrictive since we consider bounded vector fields). Then there exists $H \in \text{Lip}_c(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R})$ such that $X = \nabla^\perp H$, where $\nabla^\perp = (-\partial_2, \partial_1)$ is the orthogonal gradient. Before we give the characterization of the level sets of H (the results we state here are from [9] as in [8]), we recall that a curve Γ in \mathbb{R}^2 is the image of a continuous, non-constant $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$, thus it is a compact connected set. We say that Γ is a simple closed curve if there exists a parametrization $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$, injective on $[a, b)$ such that $\gamma(a) = \gamma(b)$.

Theorem 2.4. *We consider $X \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2) \cap \text{BV}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with $\text{div } X = 0$ a.e. and with compact support. Then there exists a set $C \subset H(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with $\mathcal{L}^1(H(\mathbb{R}^2) \setminus C) = 0$ and such that for every $h \in C$ the following properties hold:*

- $\mathcal{H}^1(H^{-1}(h)) < \infty$;
- there exists $N = N(h) \in \mathbb{N}$ and $C_i(h)$ with $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ disjoint simple closed curves such that

$$H^{-1}(h) = \cup_{i=1}^N C_i(h).$$

Furthermore, there exist Lipschitz parametrizations $\gamma_i(h) : [0, \ell_i(h)] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ with $|\frac{d}{dt}(\gamma_i(h))_t| = 1$ \mathcal{L}^1 -a.e. t and $\gamma_i(h)([0, \ell_i(h)]) = C_i(h)$.

Moreover, for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $C_\epsilon \subset H(\mathbb{R}^2)$, and a constant $c > 0$ such that $\mathcal{L}^1(H(\mathbb{R}^2) \setminus C_\epsilon) < \epsilon$ and for every $h \in C_\epsilon$ it holds

$$\forall x \in H^{-1}(h) \cap D_X, \quad |X(x)| \geq c.$$

Corollary 2.5. *In the assumption of the previous theorem, there exists a set $\tilde{E}_X \subset H(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with $\mathcal{L}^1(H(\mathbb{R}^2) \setminus \tilde{E}_X) = 0$ such that for every $h \in \tilde{E}_X$, there exists $c_h > 0$ such that $|X(x)| > c_h$ for every $x \in \{H = h\}$.*

Remark 2.6. We remark that a slightly different characterization is needed for vector fields that do not have compact support, where we lose the property for the level sets to be finite union of simple closed curves. In this paper we omit this description in order to avoid further technicalities.

We recall that, under this assumption, the Hamiltonian structure is compatible with the flow, namely

Theorem 2.7 (Theorem 2.6 in [8]). *Let $X = \nabla^\perp H$ be a BV vector field. If $\phi_t^X : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ is its unique RLF, then for \mathcal{L}^2 -a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$H(\phi_t^X(x)) = H(x).$$

In particular, if we fix a representative for the RLF of X , it holds that for every $h \in E_X$, for every $x \in C_i(h)$, where $C_i(h) \in H^{-1}(h)$ is some cycle, and $\gamma_i(h)$ is the parametrization of Theorem 2.4, then $\phi_t^X(x) = \gamma_i(h)(\bar{\tau})$, where $\bar{\tau} \in [0, \ell_i(h)]$ is uniquely determined by

$$t = N \int_0^{\ell_i(h)} \frac{1}{|X(\gamma_i(h)(\tau))|} d\tau + \int_{\gamma_i(h)^{-1}(x)}^{\bar{\tau}} \frac{1}{|X(\gamma_i(h)(\tau))|} d\tau, \quad (2.7)$$

where $N \in \mathbb{N}$.

3 Hamiltonian vector fields

In this section, we consider two autonomous divergence-free vector fields in the real plane. The analysis in this setting is facilitated by the Hamiltonian structure of the two vector fields. Indeed, if $X, Y \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$ with $\text{div } X = \text{div } Y = 0$ a.e., then there exist two Lipschitz Hamiltonians $H, K : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$X = \nabla^\perp H, \quad Y = \nabla^\perp K, \quad (3.1)$$

where $\nabla^\perp = (-\partial_2, \partial_1)$ is the orthogonal gradient. Here the main property that we want to exploit, requiring the Sobolev regularity of the vector fields, is the fact that the trajectories of particles advected

by X (resp. Y) are contained in the level sets of the Hamiltonian H (resp. K). Indeed, if X, Y have $W_{loc}^{1,p}$ regularity in space, the Hamiltonians are preserved by their RLFs (see Definition 2.2), namely

$$H \circ \phi_t^X = \text{const}, \quad K \circ \phi_s^Y = \text{const},$$

and the RLFs are uniquely determined by

$$\phi_t^X(x) = x, \quad \forall x \in H^{-1}(S_H),$$

where S_H denotes the singular values of H , namely

$$S_H = \{h \in \mathbb{R} : \exists x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : H(x) = h, X(x) = 0\},$$

which is a closed set, under the assumption that X is continuous with compact support. Clearly, the same holds for the Hamiltonian K along the flow of the vector field Y (under the same continuity assumption on the vector field Y). Moreover, the flow ϕ_t^X (resp. ϕ_s^Y) is the unique solution of $\partial_t \phi_t^X = X(\phi_t^X)$ (resp. $\partial_s \phi_s^Y = Y(\phi_s^Y)$), understood as a 1-dimensional problem on the level sets of the Hamiltonian H , see in particular Formula (2.7).

The aim of this section is to prove the following proposition.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $X, Y \in W_{loc}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2) \cap C^0(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ be two bounded vector fields and assume that $\text{div } X = \text{div } Y = 0$ almost everywhere. Then*

$$[X, Y] = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y = \phi_s^Y \circ \phi_t^X, \quad \forall t, s \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \mathcal{L}^2\text{-a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^2. \quad (3.2)$$

This result extends in particular [11, Corollary 4.2] to vector fields that can vanish on the real plane, so that the classical equivalence is established. As explained above, the main property used here is the following well-known fact in Hamiltonian dynamics

$$[X, Y] = 0 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \{H, K\} = \text{const}, \quad (3.3)$$

where $\{\cdot, \cdot\}$ denotes the Poisson Bracket. Such formula holds also in this weak context, as proved in Lemma 3.3. In the two-dimensional case, condition (3.3) is equivalent to the following property of the two vector fields:

$$X \cdot Y^\perp = \text{const}.$$

Remark 3.2. We point out that the condition $X \cdot Y^\perp = \text{const}$ can be written as $\det(\nabla K, \nabla H) = \text{const}$, connecting this problem to differential inclusions.

Before proving Proposition 3.1, we give the following general result

Lemma 3.3. *Let $X, Y \in W_{loc}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with $\text{div } X, \text{div } Y \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Then*

$$[X, Y] = \text{div } YX - \text{div } XY - \nabla^\perp(X \cdot Y^\perp), \quad \text{distributionally} \quad (3.4)$$

In particular, if $\text{div } X = \text{div } Y = 0$ then

$$[X, Y] = 0 \quad \text{iff} \quad X \cdot Y^\perp = \text{const}.$$

Proof. Let $\varphi \in C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Then, by definition (see Equation (1.9)), the distributional Lie Bracket reads as

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} ([X, Y], \varphi) dz = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (X, D\varphi Y) - (Y, D\varphi X) + \text{div } Y(X, \varphi) - \text{div } X(Y, \varphi) dz.$$

In the general case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (X, D\varphi Y) - (Y, D\varphi X) dz &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (Y_1 X_1 \partial_1 \varphi_1 + X_1 Y_2 \partial_2 \varphi_1 + Y_1 X_2 \partial_1 \varphi_2 + Y_2 X_2 \partial_2 \varphi_2) dz \\ &\quad - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (X_1 Y_1 \partial_1 \varphi_1 + Y_1 X_2 \partial_2 \varphi_1 + X_1 Y_2 \partial_1 \varphi_2 + X_2 Y_2 \partial_2 \varphi_2) dz \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (X_1 Y_2 \partial_2 \varphi_1 + Y_1 X_2 \partial_1 \varphi_2 - Y_1 X_2 \partial_2 \varphi_1 - X_1 Y_2 \partial_1 \varphi_2) dz \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (X \cdot Y^\perp)(-\partial_2 \varphi_1 + \partial_1 \varphi_2) dz, \end{aligned}$$

which immediately gives the statement. \square

Remark 3.4. We observe that Equation (3.4) and Lemma 3.3 hold also in the BV setting.

Remark 3.5. As anticipated before, the condition $[X, Y] = 0$ for Hamiltonian vector fields corresponds to $\{H, K\} = \text{const}$. In particular, this formula holds in any even dimension, giving strong geometric properties to the flows of Hamiltonian vector fields (that is, the Lie bracket of two Hamiltonian vector fields is itself a Hamiltonian vector field).

3.1 Analysis of $X \cdot Y^\perp = \text{const}$

This subsection is devoted to the proof of Proposition 3.1, which in turn implies Proposition 1.3 in virtue of [11, Theorem 1.1]. Thus, we are just left with proving that the vanishing of the Lie bracket implies the commutativity of flows in the case where the two vector fields X, Y are Hamiltonian and continuous with Sobolev regularity. As explained above, this boils down to discussing the two separate cases $X \cdot Y^\perp \neq 0$ and $X \cdot Y^\perp = 0$. In particular, if $X \cdot Y^\perp \neq 0$, under the assumption of continuity of the two vector fields, the commutativity is a corollary of the result in [15], that we recall here for the reader's convenience as stated in [11], namely

Theorem 3.6 ([15]). *Let $X \in W_{loc}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ be a continuous vector field with zero divergence. If $X \neq 0$, then its RLF $\phi_t^X \in L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}, W_{loc}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2))$.*

We remark that the continuity of the vector field is necessary to ensure that X is uniformly bounded from below. In the case $X \cdot Y^\perp = 1$, the assumptions of the previous theorem are trivially satisfied, as condition $X \cdot Y^\perp = 1$ implies that there exists a positive constant $c > 0$ such that $|X| \geq c$. Indeed,

$$1 \leq |X||Y| \quad \longrightarrow \quad |X| \geq \frac{1}{\|Y\|_\infty},$$

and therefore Theorem 3.6 guarantees the differentiability of the flow ϕ_t^X , which in turn implies the weak Lie differentiability (Definition 1.1).

According to the previous arguments, from now on we will analyze the more delicate case $X \cdot Y^\perp = 0$ everywhere. In this case, thanks to the boundedness of the vector fields, we can assume without loss of generality that X, Y have compact support, in order to make the analysis more transparent.

We first recall that S_H, S_K are the sets of singular values of H, K respectively, while R_H, R_K , defined as $R_H = H(\mathbb{R}^2) \setminus S_H$, $R_K = K(\mathbb{R}^2) \setminus S_K$, are the sets of regular values. The identity $X \cdot Y^\perp = 0$, at the level of Hamiltonians of the two vector fields, translates into the property that the level sets of the two Hamiltonians H, K coincide. This has to be intended in the following sense: consider a simple closed curve $C_i(h) \subset \{H = h\}$ with $h \in \tilde{E}_X \subset R_H$ (recall the definition of the set \tilde{E}_X from Corollary 2.5), and assume that $Y(x) \neq 0$ for $x \in \{H = h\}$. Then there exists $k \in \tilde{E}_Y$ such that $C_i(h) \subset \{K = k\}$. This crucial property of the level sets of the Hamiltonians will be clarified even further in the proofs of the upcoming propositions.

With these considerations at hand, we aim at giving a partition of the space \mathbb{R}^2 into sets where the commutativity of flows can be proved independently and with different ideas, up to \mathcal{L}^2 -negligible sets. Before starting our analysis, we recall that:

$$\phi_t^X(x) = x, \quad \forall x \in H^{-1}(S_H), \quad \phi_s^Y(x) = x, \quad \forall x \in K^{-1}(S_K). \quad (3.5)$$

Moreover, the RLFs ϕ_t^X, ϕ_s^Y are integral solution of the Cauchy Problem (2.3) for a.e. initial data $x \in A \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, $\mathcal{L}^2(A^c) = 0$. For our analysis, we will limit the study to the set A . We recall that in this work the commutativity of flows has to be intended in the following weak sense: we say that the flows ϕ_t^X and ϕ_s^Y commute if, for every s, t fixed, there exists $\Omega_{s,t}$ such that $\mathcal{L}^2(\Omega_{s,t}^c) = 0$ and the flows commute in $\Omega_{s,t}$. However, in this section, we rely on a stronger notion of commutativity, namely we prove that there exists a set Ω with $\mathcal{L}^2(\Omega^c) = 0$ such that

$$\phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y = \phi_s^Y \circ \phi_t^X, \quad \forall t, s \in \mathbb{R}, \forall x \in \Omega. \quad (3.6)$$

We recall the following property of the Structure Theorem 2.4:

$$\exists \tilde{E}_X \subset H(\mathbb{R}^2), \text{ with } \mathcal{L}^1(H(\mathbb{R}^2) \setminus \tilde{E}_X) = 0 : \quad \forall h \in \tilde{E}_X, X(x) \neq 0, \quad \forall x \in \{H = h\}.$$

Moreover, for such h , $\{H = h\}$ is finite union of simple closed curves $C_i(h)$, which are the connected components of the level set $\{H = h\}$.

We are now in a position to start our analysis. We partition the space \mathbb{R}^2 as follows:

$$\mathbb{R}^2 = (\{X \neq 0\} \cap E_X) \cup (\{X \neq 0\} \cap E_X^c) \cup \{X = 0\},$$

where the set $E_X = H^{-1}(\tilde{E}_X)$. We define in the same way \tilde{E}_Y and E_Y . By Coarea formula, it holds that $\mathcal{L}^2(\{X \neq 0\} \cap E_X^c) = 0$, since

$$\int_{\{X \neq 0\} \cap E_X^c} |\nabla H| dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{H}^1(\{X \neq 0\} \cap E_X^c \cap H^{-1}(t)) dt. \quad (3.7)$$

The RHS is clearly zero by definition of E_X and $|\nabla H| \neq 0$ in the LHS since $\nabla^\perp H = X$. Owing to this property, we give the following

Corollary 3.7. *The space \mathbb{R}^2 can be partitioned as follows*

$$[(\{X \neq 0\} \cap E_X) \cap (\{Y \neq 0\} \cap E_Y)] \cup \{X = 0\} \cup \{Y = 0\} \cup N, \quad (3.8)$$

where $\mathcal{L}^2(N) = 0$ and E_X, E_Y are the spaces defined above.

Proof. The proof follows easily from set-theoretical considerations and (3.7). \square

In virtue of the previous corollary, we are left with proving separately the commutativity of the flows on the two non-negligible sets in (3.8), as done in the two upcoming propositions.

Proposition 3.8. *In the set $\{X = 0\} \cup \{Y = 0\}$ the flows commute, in the sense that there exists $\Omega' \subset \{X = 0\} \cup \{Y = 0\}$ with $\mathcal{L}^2(\Omega'^c) = 0$ such that*

$$\phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y = \phi_s^Y \circ \phi_t^X, \quad \forall t, s \in \mathbb{R}, \forall x \in \Omega'.$$

Proof. We fix $x \in \{X = 0\} \cup \{Y = 0\}$ and w.l.o.g. we can assume $X(x) = 0$. If $Y(x) = 0$, then the flows ϕ_t^X, ϕ_s^Y clearly commute for every t, s being the flow maps the identity. Hence, we assume that $X(x) = 0$ and $Y(x) \neq 0$. By the same reasoning as in (3.7), we first observe that it holds that $\mathcal{L}^2(\{x : X(x) = 0, Y(x) \neq 0, x \in E_Y^c\}) = 0$, by the monotonicity of the Lebesgue measure.

Thus, we are left with analyzing the case $X(x) = 0, Y(x) \neq 0$, and $x \in E_Y$. Since $x \in E_Y$, by definition of E_Y , we have that $Y(y) \neq 0$ for every $y \in \{K = K(x)\}$. We now denote by \mathcal{C}_k the connected component of $\{K = K(x)\}$ containing both x and y (we recall that \mathcal{C}_k is a simple closed curve by Theorem 2.4). If $X(y) = 0$ for every $y \in \mathcal{C}_k$, then in particular $X \circ \phi_s^Y(x) = 0$ for every $s \in \mathbb{R}$, thus the commutativity of flows would follow immediately. Observe that there exists $h \in H(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that $\mathcal{C}_k \subset \{H = h\}$, since $X \cdot Y^\perp = 0$. As a consequence, if there exists $y \in \mathcal{C}_k$ such that $X(y) \neq 0$, then it must be that $y \in \{X \neq 0\} \cap E_X^c$ (if not, we would have $X(x) \neq 0$ by definition of E_X). Observe that

$$\mathcal{L}^2(E) = \mathcal{L}^2(\{y \in H^{-1}(h) : \exists x : X(x) = 0, X(y) \neq 0, \exists \mathcal{C}_k \text{ connected component: } x, y \in \mathcal{C}_k\}) = 0,$$

since E is a subset of $\{X \neq 0\} \cap E_X^c$, which we proved to be \mathcal{L}^2 -negligible. Notice that, since X is continuous and $X(y) \neq 0$, for the connected component \mathcal{C}_k satisfying the previous property, there exists $\gamma_k : [-T_k, T_k] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ with $\gamma_k([-T_k, T_k]) \subset \mathcal{C}_k$ and $\gamma_k(0) = y$ such that $X(\gamma_k(t)) \neq 0$ for all $t \in [-T_k, T_k]$. In terms of flows, this means that there exists $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ rational number such that $X(\phi_q^Y(x)) \neq 0$. Therefore

$$\{x : X(x) = 0, Y(x) \neq 0, x \in E_Y\} \subset \cup_{q \in \mathbb{Q}} (\phi_q^Y)^{-1}(E).$$

Since Y is incompressible and $\mathcal{L}^2(E) = 0$, this immediately gives that $\mathcal{L}^2(\{x : X(x) = 0, Y(x) \neq 0, x \in E_Y\}) = 0$, which concludes the proof. \square

Remark 3.9. Since the previous proof only relies on geometric considerations on level sets and does not use the regularity of the vector fields X, Y , it is in particular valid also in the BV setting. However,

we remark that in the case of Sobolev regularity, the previous result is an easy corollary of Gronwall's lemma. Indeed, we have

$$\frac{d}{ds}|X \circ \phi_s^Y|^2 = 2\langle X \circ \phi_s^Y, DX(\phi_s^Y)Y \circ \phi_s^Y \rangle = 2\langle X \circ \phi_s^Y, DY(\phi_s^Y)X \circ \phi_s^Y \rangle \leq 2|X \circ \phi_s^Y|^2|DY(\phi_s^Y)|,$$

where the second inequality follows from $[X, Y] = 0$. In particular, the previous inequality and Gronwall's lemma imply that $X(\phi_s^Y(x)) = 0$ if $X(x) = 0$ and one concludes the same result as before. We also remark that the previous inequality holds also for vector fields with bounded divergence, so that the vector field remains zero on the trajectories of the second vector field.

In order to prove Proposition 3.1, we are now left with proving the following result.

Proposition 3.10. *In the set $(\{X \neq 0\} \cap E_X) \cap (\{Y \neq 0\} \cap E_Y)$ the two flows commute, in the sense of (3.6).*

Proof. We fix a point $x \in (\{X \neq 0\} \cap E_X) \cap (\{Y \neq 0\} \cap E_Y)$, then, by definition of the two sets, there exist $c_{H(x)} > 0$, $c_{K(x)} > 0$ such that $|X(y)| \geq c_{H(x)} > 0$ for every $y \in \{H = H(x)\}$ and $|Y(y)| \geq c_{K(x)} > 0$ for every $y \in \{K = K(x)\}$. In particular, there exists a simple closed curve C with $\phi_t^X(x), \phi_s^Y(x) \in C$ for every $t, s \in \mathbb{R}$ and therefore we can restrict ourselves to study the commutativity of the flows along each curve C . We observe that, since the flows of the two vector fields live in the same curve, we can define a function $\tau = \tau(t, y)$ time-periodic satisfying

$$\phi_t^X(y) = \phi_{\tau(t, y)}^Y(y), \quad \forall y \in C.$$

In particular,

$$\phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y(y) = \phi_{\tau(t, \phi_s^Y(y))}^Y \circ \phi_s^Y(y) = \phi_{\tau(t, \phi_s^Y(y)) + s}^Y(y) \quad \forall s, t \in \mathbb{R}, \forall y \in C,$$

while

$$\phi_s^Y \circ \phi_t^X(y) = \phi_{s + \tau(t, y)}^Y(y) \quad \forall s, t \in \mathbb{R}, \forall y \in C,$$

which follow by the semigroup properties of the flows, being the two vector fields autonomous. We claim that $\tau \circ \phi_s^Y = \text{const}$, which gives a proof of the commutativity of the two flows along each curve C . Observe that, since $X \cdot Y^\perp = 0$, in a ϵ -neighbourhood C^ϵ of C it holds that

$$X(x) = \alpha_\epsilon(x)Y(x),$$

where $\alpha_\epsilon \doteq \frac{X \cdot Y}{|Y|^2}$, defined for every $x \in C_\epsilon$, is continuous, bounded and $\alpha_\epsilon \geq c > 0$. Being $X, Y \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(C^\epsilon)$, also α_ϵ inherits the same regularity. In particular, since $\text{div}(\alpha_\epsilon Y) = \text{div} X = 0$, we get that $\nabla \alpha_\epsilon \cdot Y = 0$ a.e. and

$$\frac{d}{ds} \alpha_\epsilon \circ \phi_s^Y(x) = (\nabla \alpha_\epsilon \cdot Y) \circ \phi_s^Y = 0.$$

In particular, thanks to the continuity assumption, the map α_ϵ is constant along the trajectories of the vector field X (up to a set of measure zero). Then the function $\tau(t, y) = \alpha_\epsilon(y)t$ is constant along ϕ_s^Y and by Formula 2.7 we find, for every $y \in C$,

$$\begin{aligned} t &= N \int_0^{\ell(C)} \frac{1}{|X(\gamma(s))|} ds + \int_{\gamma^{-1}(y)}^{\bar{\tau}} \frac{1}{|X(\gamma(s))|} ds \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha_\epsilon} \left(N \int_0^{\ell(C)} \frac{1}{|Y(\gamma(s))|} ds + \int_{\gamma^{-1}(y)}^{\bar{\tau}} \frac{1}{|Y(\gamma(s))|} ds \right) = \tau(t, y), \end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma(s)$ is the Lipschitz parametrization of the curve C given by Theorem 2.4 and $\gamma(\bar{\tau}) = \phi_t^X(y) = \phi_{\tau(t, y)}^Y(y)$. \square

4 Nearly incompressible vector fields

Here we extend the ideas of the previous section to the more general setting of continuous vector fields $X, Y \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ with bounded divergence. We recall that, thanks to the boundedness of the divergence, we can assume that the two vector fields X, Y are nearly incompressible (see, for instance,

[6]) in the sense of Definition 1.4. We rewrite the equation defining the Hamiltonian vector field W , which follows by Equation (3.4) with $[X, Y] = 0$:

$$W \doteq \operatorname{div} Y X - \operatorname{div} X Y \in L^\infty.$$

Clearly, it follows immediately from (3.4) that W is a Hamiltonian vector field, with Hamiltonian given by the function

$$H_W = X \cdot Y^\perp.$$

In particular, being $W \in L^\infty$, the scalar product $X \cdot Y^\perp$ has a Lipschitz continuous representative. We start with the following

Proposition 4.1. *Let $X, Y \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ with bounded divergence such that $[X, Y] = 0$. Then*

$$X \cdot Y^\perp \circ \phi_t^X = \xi(t) X \cdot Y^\perp, \quad (4.1)$$

(and the same for the flow ϕ_s^Y), where ξ denotes the density of $(\phi_t^X)_\# \mathcal{L}^2$ w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure (see Subsection 2.2). In particular, if $X \cdot Y^\perp \geq 0$, then we have

$$\frac{1}{C} X \cdot Y^\perp \leq X \cdot Y^\perp \circ \phi_t^X \leq C X \cdot Y^\perp \quad \text{a.e.}, \quad (4.2)$$

where C is the constant in (1.8).

Proof. We derive the function $X \cdot Y^\perp \circ \phi_t^X$ and we find that

$$\frac{d}{dt} X \cdot Y^\perp \circ \phi_t^X = (\nabla(X \cdot Y^\perp) \cdot X) \circ \phi_t^X = (\nabla^\perp(X \cdot Y^\perp) \cdot X^\perp) \circ \phi_t^X = \operatorname{div} X \circ \phi_t^X (X \cdot Y^\perp) \circ \phi_t^X,$$

where we have used Equation (3.4). On the other side, by Liouville Theorem (see the discussion in the Preliminaries 2)

$$\partial_t \xi = \operatorname{div}(X) \circ \phi_t^X \xi.$$

Therefore the equality follows, since the two functions satisfy the same ODE (with the same initial data). Inequality (4.2) is a direct consequence of Equation (1.8). \square

Remark 4.2. We point out that these computations hold also in the BV setting.

For every $\kappa \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, we define the sets $\Omega_\kappa = H_W^{-1}(C^{-1}\kappa, C\kappa)$, if $\kappa > 0$ and $\Omega_\kappa = H_W^{-1}(C\kappa, C^{-1}\kappa)$, if $\kappa < 0$. Clearly, Ω_κ is the union of countably many connected components. In the sequel, when we will refer to Ω_κ , for simplicity we will refer to each single connected component. By inequality (4.2), we have that, if $X \cdot Y^\perp(x) = \kappa$, then $\phi_t^X(x) \in \overline{\Omega_\kappa}$.

We are now in a position to prove the main proposition of this section, that is

Proposition 4.3. *Let $X, Y \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2) \cap W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ with bounded divergence such that $[X, Y] = 0$. Then for every $\kappa \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, the vector fields $X_{\perp \Omega_\kappa}, Y_{\perp \Omega_\kappa}$, are steady nearly incompressible. Moreover, they have the same Lipschitz and bounded density $\rho_\kappa : \Omega_\kappa \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by the function*

$$\rho_\kappa = \frac{1}{H_W},$$

that is

$$\operatorname{div}(\rho_\kappa(X - Y)) = 0, \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\Omega_\kappa).$$

Proof. Since we are in the set Ω_κ , the function ρ_κ of the statement is well-defined, bounded (from above and below) and Lipschitz, being $X \cdot Y^\perp$ Lipschitz. In particular, by Equation (3.4) with $[X, Y] = 0$, it holds

$$\nabla^\perp(X \cdot Y^\perp) \cdot Y^\perp = \operatorname{div} Y (X \cdot Y^\perp),$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div}(\rho_\kappa Y) &= \operatorname{div} \left(\frac{1}{H_W} Y \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{H_W} \operatorname{div} Y - \frac{1}{H_W^2} \nabla(X \cdot Y^\perp) \cdot Y \\ &= \frac{1}{H_W} \operatorname{div} Y - \frac{1}{H_W^2} \nabla^\perp(X \cdot Y^\perp) \cdot Y^\perp \\ &= \frac{1}{H_W} \operatorname{div} Y - \frac{1}{H_W^2} \operatorname{div} Y H_W = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The same computation holds for the vector field X , being

$$\nabla^\perp(X \cdot Y^\perp) \cdot X^\perp = -\operatorname{div} X(Y \cdot X^\perp) = \operatorname{div} X(X \cdot Y^\perp).$$

□

We define now the set

$$\Omega = \cup_{\kappa \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \{0\}} \Omega_\kappa,$$

which is an open set such that $\Omega^c = \{H_W = 0\}$. Observe that, thanks again to inequality (4.2), if $x \in \Omega$, then $\phi_t^X(x) \in \Omega$ (and the same for the flow of the vector field Y), so that the set Ω is an invariant set for the two flows.

Taking advantage of the previous results, we can easily adapt the ideas of [15] to prove the following

Proposition 4.4. *Let X, Y be vector fields satisfying the hypotheses of the two previous propositions. Moreover, we assume that they are continuous. Then, for every t, s the RLFs of X, Y have representative $\phi_t^X, \phi_s^Y \in W^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap C^0(\Omega)$.*

Proof. We fix $\kappa \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ and we consider ρ_κ as in the statement of Proposition 4.3. Then, as ρ_κ is Lipschitz and bounded, the vector field $\rho_\kappa X$ belongs to the space $W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ and is continuous on the set Ω_κ . By Diperna-Lions Theory there exists a unique RLF

$$\phi_t^\kappa \doteq \phi_t^{\rho_\kappa X}$$

solving the Cauchy Problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \phi_t^\kappa(x) = (\rho_\kappa X)(\phi_t^\kappa(x)), \\ \phi_{t=0}^\kappa(x) = x. \end{cases}$$

By [15], $\phi_t^\kappa \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega_\kappa)$. Indeed, we first consider a countable cover of Ω_κ by open balls, namely $\Omega_\kappa \subset \cup_j B_{r_j}(x_j)$, where $r_j > 0$ and $x_j \in \Omega_\kappa$. The countable cover can be chosen in such a way that $X \cdot Y^\perp \in (C^{-1}\kappa - \delta, C\kappa + \delta)$, for some $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small, thanks to the continuity of the two vector fields. Finally, we denote by Ω_κ^δ the set $H_W^{-1}((C^{-1}\kappa - \delta, C\kappa + \delta))$. To prove the assertion we just need to show that $\phi_t^\kappa \in W^{1,p}(B_{r_j}(x_j))$. This clearly holds true, since in each ball $B_{r_j}(x_j)$ there exists a Hamiltonian H_j such that $\rho_\kappa X = \nabla^\perp H_j$. We then denote $\tilde{\Omega}_n = H_\kappa^{-1}(\{h : \min_{H_j^{-1}(h)} |\rho_\kappa X| > \frac{1}{n}\})$. In particular, since Y is bounded, we have

$$\bar{B}_{r_j}(x_j) \subset \tilde{\Omega}_n.$$

The sets $\tilde{\Omega}_n$ are those defined in [15] (Section 3), where the flow has been proved to be Sobolev and therefore we have proved that $\phi_t^\kappa \in W^{1,p}(B_{r_j}(x_j))$. We now claim that, if we define $\tau_\kappa(t, x) \doteq t\rho_\kappa(x)$ (which is a Lipschitz function on Ω_κ^δ), we have that

$$\phi_{\tau(t,x)}^X = \phi_t^\kappa, \tag{4.3}$$

(where ϕ_t^X is the unique RLF of X), since

$$\dot{\phi}_{\tau(t,x)}^X = X(\phi_{\tau(t,x)}^X) \dot{\tau}(t, x)_{x=\phi_{\tau(t,x)}^X} = \rho_\kappa(\phi_{\tau(t,x)}^X) X(\phi_{\tau(t,x)}^X),$$

so that by uniqueness of RLFs the previous identity (Equation (4.3)) holds. This in particular gives that $\phi_t^X \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega_\kappa)$, and thus $\phi_t^X \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega)$. □

We are finally ready to prove our main theorem:

Theorem 4.5. *Let $X, Y \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2) \cap C^0(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ be two bounded vector fields with $\operatorname{div} X, \operatorname{div} Y \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$. Then it holds*

$$[X, Y] = 0 \iff \phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y = \phi_s^Y \circ \phi_t^X, \quad \forall t, s \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \text{for a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^2.$$

Proof of Theorem 4.5. Since $\phi_t^X, \phi_s^Y \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$, by the result in [11] we have the commutativity of the two flows in that set, being invariant for the flows (Proposition 1.5). In particular, if $\mathcal{L}^2(\Omega^c) = 0$, the proof is concluded.

If not, we observe that $W = 0$ a.e. in the set Ω^c , (since the gradient of Sobolev functions is strongly local), which in particular implies that

$$\operatorname{div} XY = \operatorname{div} YX \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega^c, \quad (4.4)$$

We prove now the commutativity of flows in the open set $\{X = 0\}^c$ (while in the set $\{X = 0\}$ it is a consequence of Gronwall's lemma as done in Remark 3.9). The condition $X \cdot Y^\perp = 0$ implies that in the set $\{X = 0\}^c$ there exists a continuous function α with $Y = \alpha X$ and $\alpha \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\{X = 0\}^c)$ defined as:

$$\alpha(x) = \frac{X \cdot Y}{|X|^2}.$$

Moreover, equation (4.4), implies that $(\nabla \alpha \cdot X)X = 0$, which in turn yields $\nabla \alpha \cdot X = 0$ a.e. in the set $\{Y = 0\}^c \cup \{X = 0\}^c$.

Always by a Gronwall-type argument, condition $\nabla \alpha \cdot X = 0$, together with the continuity of the function α , implies that the the function α is constant along the trajectories of the vector field X (up to a set of measure zero). Finally we observe that, if t is fixed, then

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_t^X(x) &= x + \int_0^t X(\phi_\tau^X(x))d\tau = x + \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_0^t \alpha X(\phi_\tau^X(x))d\tau = x + \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_0^t Y(\phi_\tau^X(x))d\tau \\ &= x + \int_0^{\frac{t}{\alpha}} Y(\phi_{\alpha\tau}^X(x))d\tau, \end{aligned}$$

which yields $\phi_t^X = \phi_{\frac{t}{\alpha}}^Y$. The commutativity follows by the same argument of the proof of Proposition 3.10. \square

5 Some remarks on BV vector fields

This section is devoted to the proof of Proposition 1.10, which we carry out by adapting the one in [11] to our case. We first briefly discuss the definition of Lie bracket we rely on in this work and we show that this definition is still suitable if we consider BV vector fields. More precisely, we point out that, if we identify X, Y with their precise representative, the Lie bracket defined in 1.9 reduces to the distributional one given in [11], namely

$$[X, Y] \doteq DYX - DXY, \quad \text{distributionally.}$$

Indeed, by the Leibniz rule (2.1), we can rewrite the first term in (1.9) as follows

$$(X, D\varphi Y) = \sum_{i,j=1}^n \partial_j (X^i \varphi^i Y^j) - (X^*, \varphi) \operatorname{div} Y - (DXY^*, \varphi),$$

where φ is a smooth test function. Integrating the previous expression and keeping in mind that $X = X^*$ \mathcal{L}^n -a.e., we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (X, D\varphi Y) dz = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (X, \varphi) \operatorname{div} Y dz - \sum_{i,j=1}^n \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi^i (Y^*)^j dD_j X^i.$$

Similarly, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (Y, D\varphi X) dz = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (Y, \varphi) \operatorname{div} X dz - \sum_{i,j=1}^n \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi^i (X^*)^j dD_j Y^i,$$

and therefore

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} ([X, Y], \varphi) dz = \sum_{i,j=1}^n \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi^i (X^*)^j dD_j Y^i - \sum_{i,j=1}^n \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi^i (Y^*)^j dD_j X^i.$$

For this reason, in the following, we will always identify X and Y with their precise representatives.

We finally remark that, in the smooth setting, the commutativity of the flows ϕ_t^X, ϕ_s^Y is equivalent to the following property

$$D\phi_t^X(z)Y(z) = Y(\phi_t^X(z)), \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^n, t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (5.1)$$

where the equality is obtained deriving in time both left and right hand side and observing that, thanks to the assumption $[X, Y] = 0$, they satisfy the same differential equation with the same initial data. In the BV setting, it is not at all clear the meaning that should be given to this equivalence. As in [11], Equation (5.1) motivates the definition of the following distribution, already introduced in [11]:

$$T_t[X, Y](\varphi) \doteq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (Y(\phi_t^X), \varphi) + (\phi_t^X, D\varphi Y) + \operatorname{div} Y(\varphi, \phi_t^X) dz, \quad \varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n) \quad (5.2)$$

which clearly equals $Y(\phi_t^X(z)) - D\phi_t^X(z)Y(z)$ if X and Y are smooth vector fields. We consider also the following family of distributions as in [11]

$$T_{t,s}[X, Y](\varphi) \doteq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (Y(\phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y), \varphi) + (\phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y, D\varphi Y) + \operatorname{div} Y(\varphi, \phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y) dz, \quad \varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n) \quad (5.3)$$

which represents the function $Y(\phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y)(z) - D(\phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y)(z)Y(z)$ in the smooth setting. The distributions defined in (5.2) and (5.3) play a crucial role in our analysis since they serve as an intermediate step in proving the following proposition.

Proposition 5.1. *Then the following hold:*

$$\phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y = \phi_s^Y \circ \phi_t^X, \quad \forall t, s \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and for a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^n \implies T_{t,s} = 0 \quad \forall t, s \in \mathbb{R} \implies T_t = 0 \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (5.4)$$

In addition, $T_t = 0$ for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$ implies $[X, Y] = 0$.

Proof. This part of the proof is identical to the one in [11] and we rewrite it for completeness. The only changes are in the proof of the last implication, where we make use of the definition of distributional Lie Bracket. We first point out that, if $T_{t,s} = 0$ for every $t, s \in \mathbb{R}$, then it is sufficient to evaluate $T_{t,s}$ at $s = 0$ to obtain $T_t = 0$ for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof of $\phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y = \phi_s^Y \circ \phi_t^X, \forall t, s \implies T_{t,s} = 0, \forall t, s$. As a first step, we aim at proving that

$$\phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y = \phi_s^Y \circ \phi_t^X, \forall t, s \implies \partial_s(\phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y) = Y(\phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y), \text{ for a.e. } s \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (5.5)$$

Indeed, if $\phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y = \phi_s^Y \circ \phi_t^X, \forall t, s$, then $s \mapsto \phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y$ is an absolutely continuous function which satisfies

$$\partial_s(\phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y) = \partial_s(\phi_s^Y \circ \phi_t^X) = Y(\phi_s^Y \circ \phi_t^X) = Y(\phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y), \quad \text{for a.e. } s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

We use this equivalence (5.5) to prove the desired claim. We first observe that equation $\partial_s(\phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y) = Y(\phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y)$ needs to be understood in the following sense

$$-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} (\partial_s \varphi(s, z), \phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y) ds dz = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} (Y(\phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y), \varphi(s, z)) ds dz, \quad \forall \varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}).$$

We now perform the change of variable $\tilde{z} = \phi_s^Y(z)$ and rewrite the previous equation as follows

$$-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} (\partial_s \varphi(s, \phi_{-s}^Y(\tilde{z})), \phi_t^X(\tilde{z})) \xi(-s, \tilde{z}) ds d\tilde{z} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} (Y(\phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y), \varphi(s, z)) ds dz, \quad (5.6)$$

We now exploit the change of variable formula (2.5) to compute

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} (\partial_s (\varphi(s, \phi_{-s}^Y(\tilde{z}))), \phi_t^X(\tilde{z})) \xi(-s, \tilde{z}) ds d\tilde{z} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} (\varphi(s, \phi_{-s}^Y(\tilde{z})), \phi_t^X(\tilde{z})) \operatorname{div} Y \circ \phi_{-s}^Y \xi(-s, \tilde{z}) ds.$$

Taking advantage of the previous equation, together with

$$\partial_s (\varphi(s, \phi_{-s}^Y(\tilde{z}))) = \partial_s \varphi(s, \phi_{-s}^Y(\tilde{z})) - D\varphi(s, \phi_{-s}^Y(\tilde{z}))Y(\phi_{-s}^Y(\tilde{z})),$$

we can rewrite (5.6) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} & -\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} (D\varphi(s, \phi_{-s}^Y(\tilde{z}))Y(\phi_{-s}^Y(\tilde{z})), \phi_t^X(\tilde{z})) \xi(-s, \tilde{z}) ds d\tilde{z} \\ & -\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} (\varphi(s, \phi_{-s}^Y(\tilde{z})), \phi_t^X(\tilde{z})) \operatorname{div} Y \circ \phi_{-s}^Y \xi(-s, \tilde{z}) ds d\tilde{z} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} (Y(\phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y), \varphi(s, z)) ds dz. \end{aligned}$$

Performing back the change of variable, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} (D\varphi(s, z)Y, \phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y) ds dz \\ & - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} (\varphi(s, z), \phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y) \operatorname{div} Y ds dz = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} (Y(\phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y), \varphi(s, z)) ds dz. \end{aligned}$$

If we now choose test functions of the form $\varphi = \alpha(s)\beta(z)$, the previous equality is equivalent to state that for every $\beta \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and for a.e. $s \in \mathbb{R}$, there holds

$$- \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (D\beta(z)Y, \phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y) dz - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\beta(z), \phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y) \operatorname{div} Y dz = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (Y(\phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y), \beta(z)) dz. \quad (5.7)$$

We finally prove that (5.7) holds true for every $s \in \mathbb{R}$. To this end, we first observe that the terms that do not involve $\operatorname{div} Y$ are absolutely continuous in s , as can be seen performing again the change of variable $\tilde{z} = \phi_s^Y(z)$ and using the dominated convergence theorem. At the same time, the term involving $\operatorname{div} Y$ in equality (5.7) is also continuous in s , as, for every $\epsilon > 0$, we can rewrite it as

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\beta(z), \phi_t^X \circ \phi_s^Y) \operatorname{div} Y dz = \\ & - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\beta(z), (\phi_t^X * \rho_\epsilon) \circ \phi_s^Y) \operatorname{div} Y dz - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\beta(z), (\phi_t^X - \phi_t^X * \rho_\epsilon) \circ \phi_s^Y) \operatorname{div} Y dz, \end{aligned}$$

where ρ_ϵ denotes, as above, a mollifier. We now point out that the first term in the previous equality is continuous in s , while the second term converges to zero (as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$) locally uniformly in s . Thus, equality (5.7) holds true for every $s \in \mathbb{R}$. We eventually conclude observing that (5.7) is equivalent to $T_{t,s} \equiv 0$ for every $t, s \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof of $T_t = 0, \forall t \Rightarrow [X, Y] = 0$. We aim at showing that

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} T_t[X, Y] \right|_{t=0} = [X, Y], \quad (5.8)$$

which clearly implies the desired implication. To this end, we first observe that, performing the change of variable $\tilde{z} = \phi_t^X(z)$ and exploiting again (2.5), we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} (Y(\phi_t^X(z)), \varphi(s, z)) dz ds &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} (Y(\tilde{z}), D\varphi(s, \phi_{-t}^X(\tilde{z}))X(\phi_{-t}^X(\tilde{z}))) \xi(-t, \tilde{z}) d\tilde{z} ds \\ & - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} (Y(\tilde{z}), \varphi(s, \phi_{-t}^X(\tilde{z}))) \operatorname{div} X(\phi_{-t}^X(\tilde{z})) \xi(-t, \tilde{z}) d\tilde{z} ds. \end{aligned}$$

for every $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}, \mathbb{R}^n)$. Performing back the change of variable in the previous integrals, we infer that, for every $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}, \mathbb{R}^{n+1})$, there holds

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} (Y(\phi_t^X), \varphi) dz ds = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} (Y(\phi_t^X(z)), D\varphi(z)X(z)) dz ds - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} (Y(\phi_t^X(z)), \varphi(z)) \operatorname{div} X dz ds. \quad (5.9)$$

In particular, with the choice of functions $\varphi(s, z) = \alpha(s)\beta(z)$ as done in [11], for every $\beta \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$, it holds that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (Y(\phi_t^X), \beta) dz = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (Y(\phi_t^X(z)), D\beta(z)X(z)) dz - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (Y(\phi_t^X(z)), \beta(z)) \operatorname{div} X dz. \quad (5.10)$$

We next observe that, for any test function $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$, we can differentiate (5.2) under the integral sign with respect to t and exploit (5.10) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} T_t[X, Y](\varphi) &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (Y(\phi_t^X), D\varphi X) dz - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (Y(\phi_t^X), \varphi) \operatorname{div} X dz \\ & + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (X(\phi_t^X), D\varphi Y) dz + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \operatorname{div} Y(\varphi, X(\phi_t^X)) dz. \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

Since $T_t[X, Y] = 0$ for every t , Claim (5.8) then follows by evaluating (5.11) at $t = 0$ and by keeping in mind our definition of Lie bracket in (1.9). This concludes the proof of Proposition 5.1. \square

We conclude by pointing out that the expression (5.11) should encode, in our opinion, the distributional version of the function $[X, Y] \circ \phi_t^X$, that we leave as an open question.

References

- [1] Alberti G., Bianchini S., Crippa G. “A uniqueness result for the continuity equation in two dimensions”. In: *Journal of the European Mathematical Society* 16(2) (2014), pp. 201–234.
- [2] Ambrosio L. “Lecture notes on transport equation and Cauchy problem for BV vector fields and applications.” In: (2004). URL: <https://cvgmt.sns.it/paper/1573/>
- [3] Ambrosio L. “Transport equation and Cauchy problem for BV vector fields.” In: *Inventiones Mathematicae* 158 (2004), pp. 227–260.
- [4] Ambrosio L., Fusco N., Pallara D. *Functions of Bounded Variations and Free Discontinuity Problems*. Oxford University Press, 2000. ISBN: 0198502451.
- [5] Arnold V.I., Khesin B. A. *Topological methods in hydrodynamics*. 1998,2021.
- [6] Bianchini S., Bonicatto P. “A uniqueness result for the decomposition of vector fields in \mathbb{R}^d .” In: *Invent. Math.* 220(1) (2020), pp. 255–393.
- [7] Bonicatto P., Del Nin G., Rindler F. “ransport of currents and geometric Rademacher-type theorems”. In: (2022). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.03922>
- [8] Bonicatto P., Marconi E.. “Regularity estimates for the flow of BV autonomous divergence free vector fields in \mathbb{R}^2 ”. In: *Communications in Partial Differential Equations* 46:12 (2021), pp. 2235–2267.
- [9] Bourgain J., Korobkov M. , Kristensen J. “On the Morse-Sard property and level sets of Sobolev and BV functions.” In: *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.* 29(1) (2013), pp. 1–23.
- [10] Brenier Y. “Topology-preserving diffusion of divergence-free vector fields and magnetic relaxation.” In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 330 (2014), pp. 757–770.
- [11] Colombo M., Tione R. “On the commutativity of flows of rough vector fields”. In: *Journal des Mathematiques Pures et appliqués* 159 (2021), pp. 294–312.
- [12] De Lellis C. “Notes on hyperbolic systems of conservation laws and transport equations.” In: *Handb. Differ. Equ.* 3 (2007), pp. 277–382.
- [13] Diperna R. J., Lions P. L. “Ordinary differential equations, transport theory and Sobolev spaces.” In: *Inventiones Mathematicae* 98 (1989), pp. 511–547.
- [14] Jabin P.E. “Critical non-Sobolev regularity for continuity equations with rough velocity fields”. In: *Journal of Differential Equations* 260(5) (2016), 4739–4757.
- [15] Marconi E. “Differentiability properties of the flow of 2d autonomous vector fields”. In: *Journal of Differential Equations* 301 (2021), pp. 330–352.
- [16] Rampazzo F, Sussmann H.J. “Commutators of flow maps of nonsmooth vector fields”. In: *Journal of Differential Equations* 1 (2007), pp. 134–175.
- [17] Rigoni C., stepanov E. “Lie brackets of nonsmooth vector fields and commutation of their flows”. In: *Journal of the London Mathematical Society* (2022).
- [18] Vol’pert A. I. “Spaces BV and quasi-linear equations”. In: *Math. USSR Sb.* 17 (1967), pp. 225–267.