

# On the planar Taylor-Couette system and related exterior problems

Filippo GAZZOLA – Jiří NEUSTUPA – Gianmarco SPERONE

## Abstract

We consider the planar Taylor-Couette system for the steady motion of a viscous incompressible fluid in the region between two concentric disks, the inner one being at rest and the outer one rotating with constant angular speed. We study the uniqueness and multiplicity of solutions to the forced system in different classes. For any angular velocity we prove that the classical Taylor-Couette flow is the unique smooth solution displaying rotational symmetry. Instead, we show that infinitely many solutions arise, even for arbitrarily small angular velocities, in a larger, class of *incomplete* solutions that we introduce. By prescribing the transversal flux, unique solvability of the Taylor-Couette system is recovered among rotationally invariant incomplete solutions. Finally, we study the behavior of these solutions as the radius of the outer disk goes to infinity, connecting our results with the celebrated Stokes paradox.

**Mathematics Subject Classification:** 35Q30, 35B06, 76D03, 46E35, 35J91.

**Keywords:** incompressible fluids, rotationally invariant solutions, incomplete solutions, non-uniqueness, exterior domains.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Solutions for the generalized Taylor-Couette problem</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Non-uniqueness in a larger class of solutions</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Invading domains and a generalized Stokes paradox</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Appendix: bounds for Poincaré-Sobolev constants in the annulus</b>	<b>19</b>
	<b>References</b>	<b>24</b>

## 1 Introduction

In his survey article on unsolved problems in Mathematical Analysis [25, Problem 67], Maz'ya points out a classical but apparently forgotten issue about the stationary incompressible Navier-Stokes equations under Dirichlet boundary conditions in *simply connected domains*: to show that uniqueness of the solution fails for large data. In fact, multiplicity results were mostly obtained in the 1960's concerning *open flows*, that is, the flow was assumed periodic in at least one direction: we recall the works of Velte [30] and Yudovich [31] in 3D (the so-called *Taylor-Couette problem*), and the article by Golovkin [14] in a 2D strip. One of the few available examples in the literature for a 3D bounded domain is also due to Yudovich [32]. The significance of the works [30, 31], which deal with particular domains such as the (non-simply connected) region between two concentric unbounded 3D cylinders, is that they settled a long-standing question left open since the famous experiments of G.I. Taylor in 1923, see [29], illustrating the instability of the circular Couette flow. More recently, multiplicity results for large Reynolds numbers in a (planar, simply connected) square for the stationary Navier-Stokes equations under *Navier boundary conditions* have been obtained with computer assistance [2]. Nevertheless, as far as our knowledge goes,

the multiplicity question for the 2D Taylor-Couette problem has received little attention, and constitutes the main core of the present paper.

For any  $R > 1$ , define the annulus  $\Omega_R \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  as

$$\Omega_R = B_R \setminus \overline{B_1}, \quad (1.1)$$

with  $B_r$  being the open disk of radius  $r > 0$  centered at the origin, see Figure 1.1.




Figure 1.1: The annulus  $\Omega_R$  in (1.1).

Within the polar coordinate system  $(\rho, \theta) \in [0, \infty) \times [0, 2\pi)$ , let  $\{\hat{\rho}, \hat{\theta}\} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  be the usual orthonormal basis, namely

$$\hat{\rho} = (\cos(\theta), \sin(\theta)) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\theta} = (-\sin(\theta), \cos(\theta)) \quad \forall \theta \in [0, 2\pi), \quad (1.2)$$

see again Figure 1.1, and any point  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2$  is denoted by  $\xi = \rho\hat{\rho}$ .

We consider the following boundary-value problem associated with the steady-state Navier-Stokes equations in  $\Omega_R$  (the kinematic viscosity has been set equal to 1):

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + (u \cdot \nabla)u + \nabla p = f, & \nabla \cdot u = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_R, \\ u = \omega \hat{\theta} \quad \text{on } \partial B_R, & u = (0, 0) \quad \text{on } \partial B_1. \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

In (1.3),  $u : \Omega_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  is the velocity vector field,  $p : \Omega_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the scalar pressure and  $f : \Omega_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  is an external force acting on the fluid. The boundary conditions in (1.3)<sub>2</sub> dictate that the inner disk  $\partial B_1$  remains at rest, while the outer disk  $\partial B_R$  rotates with constant angular speed  $\omega \geq 0$ . Notice that the compatibility condition

$$\int_{\Omega_R} \nabla \cdot u = \int_{\partial \Omega_R} u \cdot \nu = \omega \int_{\partial B_R} \hat{\theta} \cdot \hat{\rho} = 0 \quad (1.4)$$

is satisfied for the solutions to (1.3). In (1.4),  $\nu$  denotes the outward unit normal to  $\Omega_R$ , so that  $\nu = -\hat{\rho}$  on  $\partial B_1$  and  $\nu = \hat{\rho}$  on  $\partial B_R$ . In the unforced case (when  $f = 0$ ), an explicit classical solution to (1.3) exists for every  $\omega \geq 0$ , and is given by

$$v_0(\xi) \doteq \frac{R\omega}{R^2 - 1} \left( \rho - \frac{1}{\rho} \right) \hat{\theta} \quad \text{and} \quad q_0(\xi) \doteq \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{R\omega}{R^2 - 1} \right)^2 \left( \rho^2 - \frac{1}{\rho^2} - 4 \log(\rho) \right) \quad \forall \xi \in \Omega_R, \quad (1.5)$$

known in the literature as the *Taylor-Couette flow* [21, Chapter II].

System (1.3) is the forced 2D version of the Taylor-Couette problem in a non-simply connected bounded domain and uniqueness/multiplicity are related to the magnitude of the force  $f$  and of the angular velocity  $\omega$ . Since it may be  $f \neq 0$ , we call the related solution to (1.3), the *generalized Taylor-Couette problem*, see (2.5).

We discuss the uniqueness and multiplicity of solutions to (1.3) from several points of view. In contrast with the 3D case [30, 31], in Section 2 we prove that, for arbitrarily large data, the generalized

Taylor-Couette flow is the unique strong solution to (1.3) displaying rotational symmetry, see Theorem 2.1 and Corollary 2.1. Instead, in Section 3 we show that infinitely many solutions do exist, even for arbitrarily small data, in a new and larger class of *incomplete* solutions, see Definition 3.1 and Theorem 3.2. Exploiting the non-simply connected feature of  $\Omega_R$  and following the ideas of Foias & Temam [7], the admissible test functions for the class of incomplete solutions have zero flux across each transversal section of  $\Omega_R$ . Unique solvability of (1.3) is then ensured also among rotationally invariant incomplete solutions provided that their transversal flux is prescribed, see Theorem 3.4.

On the other hand, without the rotational symmetry assumption, unique solvability of (1.3), in both classes of strong and incomplete solutions, is guaranteed only under smallness conditions on the data of the problem (angular speed, external force, transversal flux), which we quantify. Several Poincaré-Sobolev constants are used in literature to ensure uniqueness to inhomogeneous Dirichlet problems for forced Navier-Stokes equations, see [9, Section IX.4]. Most of these statements merely give rough qualitative bounds on these constants. Recently, in [8, 10, 11, 12] some *quantitative* (although not optimal) estimates for these constants in non-simply connected domains were found. This technical part is postponed to Appendix A, where we give quantitative bounds for these constants in the annulus  $\Omega_R$ .

Finally, by studying the behavior of the solutions to (1.3) as  $R \rightarrow \infty$ , we highlight a connection with the celebrated *Stokes paradox* [27]. The classical result by Chang & Finn [4] shows that the linear version of (1.3) with prescribed angular velocity at infinity has no solutions. In line with other problems of hydrodynamics in planar exterior domains [16], we raise the question on the solvability of the full nonlinear problem (1.3) in  $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \overline{B_1}$ , see (2.10): in Theorem (2.2) we show that it admits no rotationally invariant solutions, regardless of the angular velocity at infinity. In Remark 2.4 we leave unanswered the possibility of a *Navier-Stokes paradox*. In the same spirit, in Section 4 we study two related exterior Stokes problems and we propose some open questions on the existence of solutions with given growth rate at infinity.

## 2 Solutions for the generalized Taylor-Couette problem

For our purposes, we need to consider both the Sobolev space  $H_0^1(\Omega_R)$  and the larger space of scalar functions vanishing only on  $\partial B_1$ :

$$H_*^1(\Omega_R) \doteq \{v \in H^1(\Omega_R) \mid v = 0 \text{ on } \partial B_1\}.$$

This space is the closure of  $\mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\overline{B_R} \setminus \overline{B_1})$  with respect to the norm  $v \mapsto \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)}$ : since  $|\partial B_1|_1 > 0$  (the 1D-Hausdorff measure), the Poincaré inequality holds in  $H_*^1(\Omega_R)$ , showing that  $v \mapsto \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)}$  is indeed a norm on  $H_*^1(\Omega_R)$ . We also consider the two functional spaces

$$H_{*,\sigma}^1(\Omega_R) = \{v \in H_*^1(\Omega_R) \mid \nabla \cdot v = 0 \text{ in } \Omega_R\} \quad \text{and} \quad H_{0,\sigma}^1(\Omega_R) = \{v \in H_0^1(\Omega_R) \mid \nabla \cdot v = 0 \text{ in } \Omega_R\}.$$

They are Hilbert spaces if endowed with the  $L^2(\Omega_R)$ -scalar product of the gradients.

Given  $f \in L^2(\Omega_R)$ , a vector field  $u \in H_{*,\sigma}^1(\Omega_R)$  is called a *weak solution* to (1.3) if  $u$  verifies (1.3)<sub>2</sub> in the trace sense and

$$\int_{\Omega_R} \nabla u \cdot \nabla \varphi + \int_{\Omega_R} (u \cdot \nabla) u \cdot \varphi = \int_{\Omega_R} f \cdot \varphi \quad \forall \varphi \in H_{0,\sigma}^1(\Omega_R). \quad (2.1)$$

Since  $\partial\Omega_R$  and the boundary data in (1.3)<sub>2</sub> are of class  $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ , well-known regularity results [9, Theorem IX.5.2] imply that any weak solution satisfies  $u \in H^2(\Omega_R)$  and that there exists an associated pressure  $p \in H^1(\Omega_R)$  such that the pair  $(u, p)$  solves (1.3) in strong form. Therefore, since we always assume that  $f \in L^2(\Omega_R)$ , in the sequel we make no distinction between weak and strong solutions to (1.3).

Next, we observe that the functions in (1.5) are *rotationally invariant*, meaning that

$$v_0(\xi) = \mathcal{R}(\phi)^\top v_0(\mathcal{R}(\phi)\xi) \quad \text{and} \quad q_0(\xi) = q_0(\mathcal{R}(\phi)\xi) \quad \forall \xi \in \Omega_R, \quad \forall \phi \in [0, 2\pi],$$

where

$$\mathcal{R}(\phi) \doteq \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\phi) & -\sin(\phi) \\ \sin(\phi) & \cos(\phi) \end{bmatrix} \quad (2.2)$$

is the rotation matrix about the origin by an angle  $\phi$ . A rotationally invariant vector field  $f \in L^2(\Omega_R)$  can be expressed as

$$f(\xi) = f^\rho(\rho)\widehat{\rho} + f^\theta(\rho)\widehat{\theta} \quad \text{for a.e. } \xi \in \Omega_R, \quad (2.3)$$

for some scalar functions  $f^\rho, f^\theta \in L^2(1, R)$ . Then

$$\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)}^2 = \|f^\rho\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)}^2 + \|f^\theta\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)}^2 = 2\pi \int_1^R \rho \left( f^\rho(\rho)^2 + f^\theta(\rho)^2 \right) d\rho. \quad (2.4)$$

Henceforth, given any subspace  $X \subseteq L^2(\Omega_R)$  (of vector fields or scalar functions), we will denote by

$$\mathcal{R}[X] \text{ the subspace of } X \text{ comprising rotationally invariant functions.}$$

Let

$$A_R(\omega, f) \doteq \frac{R}{R^2 - 1} \left( \omega + \frac{R}{2} \int_1^R f^\theta(t) dt - \frac{1}{2R} \int_1^R t^2 f^\theta(t) dt \right),$$

and let  $\lambda(\Omega_R) > 0$  be the least Laplace-Dirichlet eigenvalue in  $\Omega_R$ , see (A.4). We then prove

**Theorem 2.1.** *Given  $\omega \geq 0$  and  $f \in \mathcal{R}[L^2(\Omega_R)]$ , the generalized Taylor-Couette flow defined in  $\Omega_R$  by*

$$\begin{cases} v_*(\xi) \doteq \left[ A_R(\omega, f) \left( \rho - \frac{1}{\rho} \right) - \frac{\rho}{2} \int_1^\rho f^\theta(t) dt + \frac{1}{2\rho} \int_1^\rho t^2 f^\theta(t) dt \right] \widehat{\theta} \\ q_*(\xi) \doteq \int_1^\rho \frac{1}{t} \left[ A_R(\omega, f) \left( t - \frac{1}{t} \right) - \frac{t}{2} \int_1^t f^\theta(s) ds + \frac{1}{2t} \int_1^t s^2 f^\theta(s) ds \right]^2 dt + \int_1^\rho f^\rho(t) dt \end{cases} \quad (2.5)$$

solves (1.3). Moreover, (2.5) is the unique strong (and weak) solution to (1.3)

- in the space  $\mathcal{R}[H^2(\Omega_R)] \times \mathcal{R}[H^1(\Omega_R)]/\mathbb{R}$  for any  $\omega \geq 0$  and  $f \in \mathcal{R}[L^2(\Omega_R)]$ ;
- in the whole space  $H^2(\Omega_R) \times H^1(\Omega_R)/\mathbb{R}$  whenever

$$K_R(\omega, f) \doteq \omega + \frac{\sqrt{R-1}}{\sqrt{15}R} \sqrt{8R^4 - 7R^3 - 7R^2 + 3R + 3} \|f^\theta\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)} < \sqrt{\lambda(\Omega_R)}. \quad (2.6)$$

**Proof.** Let  $(v, p) \in \mathcal{R}[H^2(\Omega_R)] \times \mathcal{R}[H^1(\Omega_R)]$  be a strong solution to (1.3). Then,  $p$  depends only on  $\rho \in [1, R]$ , while the velocity field and external force may be written as

$$v(\xi) = v^\rho(\rho)\widehat{\rho} + v^\theta(\rho)\widehat{\theta} \quad \text{and} \quad f(\xi) = f^\rho(\rho)\widehat{\rho} + f^\theta(\rho)\widehat{\theta} \quad \text{for a.e. } \xi \in \Omega_R,$$

for some functions  $v^\rho, v^\theta \in H^2(1, R)$  and  $f^\rho, f^\theta \in L^2(1, R)$ . Since  $v^\theta$  is independent of  $\theta$ , the incompressibility condition becomes

$$\frac{d}{d\rho}(\rho v^\rho(\rho)) = 0 \quad \implies \quad v^\rho(\rho) = \frac{A}{\rho} \quad \text{for a.e. } \rho \in (1, R),$$

for some constant  $A \in \mathbb{R}$ . The boundary conditions (1.3)<sub>2</sub> imply  $A = 0$ , so that  $v(\xi) = v^\theta(\rho)\widehat{\theta}$  for a.e.  $\xi \in \Omega_R$ , where  $v^\theta(1) = 0$  and  $v^\theta(R) = \omega$ . Then, the first equation in (1.3)<sub>1</sub> reduces to

$$\frac{dp}{d\rho}(\rho) = \frac{1}{\rho} v^\theta(\rho)^2 + f^\rho(\rho) \quad \text{and} \quad -\frac{d^2 v^\theta}{d\rho^2}(\rho) - \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{dv^\theta}{d\rho}(\rho) + \frac{1}{\rho^2} v^\theta(\rho) = f^\theta(\rho) \quad \text{for a.e. } \rho \in (1, R),$$

thereby yielding  $(v, p) \equiv (v_*, q_*)$ , as defined in (2.5). Not only this proves that (2.5) solves (1.3) (which could have been obtained by direct computations), but also that it is the unique solution within the class of rotationally invariant solutions. We have so proved the first item, namely the unique solvability of (1.3) in the class of rotationally invariant solutions independently of the size of the data  $\omega$  and  $f$ .

Moreover, the explicit form (2.5) enables us to bound the maximum modulus of  $v_*$ . Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
|v_*(\xi)| &= \left| A_R(\omega, f) \left( \rho - \frac{1}{\rho} \right) - \frac{\rho}{2} \int_1^\rho f^\theta(t) dt + \frac{1}{2\rho} \int_1^\rho t^2 f^\theta(t) dt \right| \\
&\leq \frac{R}{R^2 - 1} \frac{\rho^2 - 1}{\rho} \left[ \omega + \frac{1}{2R} \int_1^R (R^2 - t^2) |f^\theta(t)| dt \right] + \frac{1}{2\rho} \int_1^\rho (\rho^2 - t^2) |f^\theta(t)| dt \\
&\leq \omega + \frac{1}{2R} \int_1^R (R^2 - t^2) |f^\theta(t)| dt + \frac{1}{2\rho} \int_1^\rho (\rho^2 - t^2) |f^\theta(t)| dt \\
&\leq \omega + \frac{1}{2R} \left[ \int_1^R (R^2 - t^2)^2 dt \right]^{1/2} \|f^\theta\|_{L^2(1,R)} + \frac{1}{2\rho} \left[ \int_1^\rho (\rho^2 - t^2)^2 dt \right] \|f^\theta\|_{L^2(1,\rho)} \\
&\leq \omega + \left[ \frac{\sqrt{R-1}}{2\sqrt{15}R} \sqrt{8R^4 - 7R^3 - 7R^2 + 3R + 3} + \frac{\sqrt{\rho-1}}{2\sqrt{15}\rho} \sqrt{8\rho^4 - 7\rho^3 - 7\rho^2 + 3\rho + 3} \right] \|f^\theta\|_{L^2(1,R)} \\
&\leq \omega + \frac{\sqrt{R-1}}{\sqrt{15}R} \sqrt{8R^4 - 7R^3 - 7R^2 + 3R + 3} \|f^\theta\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies (see (2.6)) that

$$\|v_*\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_R)} \leq K_R(\omega, f). \quad (2.7)$$

The second item is a variant of a well-known result, see [9, Section IX.4]: unique solvability for (1.3) under a smallness condition on the boundary velocity  $\omega$  and on the force  $f$ . The novelty here is the explicit bound involving the first eigenvalue of the Laplace-Dirichlet operator in  $\Omega_R$ , (A.4). In order to prove it, suppose that  $u \in H_{*,\sigma}^1(\Omega_R)$  is another strong solution to (1.3). Let  $z \doteq u - v_* \in H_{0,\sigma}^1(\Omega_R)$  and subtract the equations (2.1) corresponding to  $u$  and  $v_*$ , thereby obtaining

$$\int_{\Omega_R} \nabla z \cdot \nabla \varphi + \int_{\Omega_R} (u \cdot \nabla) z \cdot \varphi + \int_{\Omega_R} (z \cdot \nabla) v_* \cdot \varphi = 0 \quad \forall \varphi \in H_{0,\sigma}^1(\Omega_R).$$

By taking  $\varphi = z$  and noticing (after an integration by parts) that

$$\int_{\Omega_R} (u \cdot \nabla) z \cdot z = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Omega_R} (z \cdot \nabla) v_* \cdot z = - \int_{\Omega_R} (z \cdot \nabla) z \cdot v_*,$$

we deduce, from the Hölder inequality, from (A.5), and from (2.7), that

$$\|\nabla z\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)}^2 = \int_{\Omega_R} (z \cdot \nabla) z \cdot v_* \leq \|\nabla z\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)} \|z\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)} \|v_*\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_R)} \leq \frac{K_R(\omega, f)}{\sqrt{\lambda(\Omega_R)}} \|\nabla z\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)}^2,$$

so that unique solvability for (1.3) is ensured whenever (2.6) holds.  $\square$

A first straightforward consequence of Theorem 2.1 is

**Corollary 2.1.** *If  $f = 0$ , the Taylor-Couette flow (1.5) is the unique strong (classical) solution to (1.3)*

- *in the space  $\mathcal{R}[H^2(\Omega_R)] \times \mathcal{R}[H^1(\Omega_R)]/\mathbb{R}$  for any  $\omega \geq 0$ ;*
- *in the whole space  $H^2(\Omega_R) \times H^1(\Omega_R)/\mathbb{R}$  whenever  $\omega < \sqrt{\lambda(\Omega_R)}$ .*

A second consequence of Theorem 2.1 shows that the fluid remains at rest under the action of an arbitrarily large radial and rotationally invariant force.

**Corollary 2.2.** *Let  $\omega \geq 0$  and  $f \in \mathcal{R}[L^2(\Omega_R)]$ .*

- *If  $f^\theta = 0$  the velocity field  $v_*$  in (2.5) coincides with  $v_0$  in (1.5).*
- *If  $f^\theta = 0$  and  $\omega = 0$ , the generalized Taylor-Couette flow (2.5) becomes*

$$v_*(\xi) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad q_*(\xi) = \int_1^\rho f^\rho(t) dt \quad \forall \xi \in \overline{\Omega_R}.$$

Theorem 2.1 and Corollaries 2.1-2.2 deserve some comments.

**Remark 2.1.** *The inequality (2.6) or rotational invariance are sufficient conditions for the unique weak solvability of (1.3) which is guaranteed even for an arbitrarily large radial force, since the inequality in (2.6) only involves the angular component of the force; see Corollary 2.2. Related Liouville-type results for a generalized 3D Taylor-Couette problem have been recently published by Kozono et al. in [17]. When  $f \in \mathcal{R}[L^2(\Omega_R)]$ , in the next section we show that multiplicity arises in a wider class of solutions.*

**Remark 2.2.** *The violation of (2.6) may only lead to the existence of a non-rotationally invariant strong solution to (1.3). Furthermore, notice that if  $(u, p) \in H^2(\Omega_R) \times H^1(\Omega_R)$  is a strong solution to (1.3) with a given rotationally invariant external force (2.3), then the pair*

$$u^\phi(\xi) \doteq \mathcal{R}(\phi)^\top u(\mathcal{R}(\phi)\xi) \quad \text{and} \quad p^\phi(\xi) \doteq p(\mathcal{R}(\phi)\xi) \quad \forall \xi \in \Omega_R, \quad (2.8)$$

*is also a solution to (1.3), for every  $\phi \in [0, 2\pi)$ . This means that, if a bifurcation occurs, then infinitely many non-rotationally invariant strong solutions to (1.3) exist.*

**Remark 2.3.** *In favor of a possible unconditional uniqueness in the unforced case, notice that*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + (u \cdot \nabla)u + \nabla p = 0, & \nabla \cdot u = 0 \quad \text{in } B_R, \\ u = \omega \widehat{\theta} \quad \text{on } \partial B_R, \end{cases} \quad (2.9)$$

*has a unique classical solution for every  $\omega \geq 0$  and  $R > 0$ , given explicitly by*

$$\bar{u}(\xi) \doteq \frac{\omega \rho}{R} \widehat{\theta} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{p}(\xi) \doteq \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\omega \rho}{R} \right)^2 \quad \forall \xi \in B_R.$$

*This follows from the fact that  $\rho \widehat{\theta} = (-y, x)$  and the identity  $(z \cdot \nabla) \bar{u} \cdot z \equiv 0$  in  $B_R$ , for every  $z \in \mathbb{R}^2$ .*

Corollary 2.1 ensures unconditional uniqueness of weak solutions to (1.3) only if  $\omega > 0$  is sufficiently small (for a fixed  $R > 1$ ), or if  $R > 1$  is sufficiently small (for a fixed  $\omega > 0$ ), see (A.7). This is why we conclude this section by investigating what happens as  $R \rightarrow \infty$ , including the case  $R = \infty$ . This is related to the celebrated *invading domains* technique by Jean Leray [22] that we will analyze for the Stokes equations in Section 4.

Assuming that  $f = 0$  and fixing  $\omega > 0$ , Corollary 2.1 states that the unique weak (classical) rotationally invariant solution to (1.3) is given by the Taylor-Couette flow (1.5), namely

$$v_R(\xi) \doteq \frac{R\omega}{R^2 - 1} \left( \rho - \frac{1}{\rho} \right) \widehat{\theta} \quad \text{and} \quad q_R(\xi) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{R\omega}{R^2 - 1} \right)^2 \left( \rho^2 - \frac{1}{\rho^2} - 4 \log(\rho) \right) \quad \forall \xi \in \Omega_R,$$

where we emphasized the dependence on  $R$ . It is straightforward that, if we extend  $v_R$  and  $q_R$  by

$$v_R(\xi) = \omega \widehat{\theta}, \quad q_R(\xi) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{R\omega}{R^2 - 1} \right)^2 \left( R^2 - \frac{1}{R^2} - 4 \log(R) \right) \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_R,$$

we obtain continuous functions defined over the whole exterior domain  $\Omega_\infty \doteq \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_1$  which satisfy

$$v_R, q_R \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\Omega_\infty) \quad \text{as } R \rightarrow \infty.$$

On the other hand, one may take directly  $R = \infty$ , without approximating through an invading domains procedure. We discuss whether there exists a classical solution  $(v, q) \in \mathcal{C}^2(\overline{\Omega_\infty}) \times \mathcal{C}^1(\overline{\Omega_\infty})$  to the following exterior problem:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta v + (v \cdot \nabla)v + \nabla q = 0, & \nabla \cdot v = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_\infty, \\ \lim_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} v(\xi) = \omega \widehat{\theta}, & v = (0, 0) \quad \text{on } \partial B_1. \end{cases} \quad (2.10)$$

Notice that (2.10) admits no solutions having a finite Dirichlet integral, since

$$|\nabla \widehat{\theta}(\xi)| = \frac{1}{\rho} \quad \forall \xi \in \Omega_\infty.$$

Hence, for every solution  $(v, q)$  to (2.10), we have that  $\nabla v \notin L^2(\Omega_\infty)$ . Moreover, the following holds:

**Theorem 2.2.** *Given  $\omega > 0$ , the exterior problem (2.10) admits no rotationally invariant solutions.*

**Proof.** Let  $(v, q) \in \mathcal{C}^2(\overline{\Omega_\infty}) \times \mathcal{C}^1(\overline{\Omega_\infty})$  be a rotationally invariant solution to (2.10). Then, the pressure  $q$  depends only on  $\rho \in [1, +\infty)$ , while the velocity field may be written as

$$v(\xi) = v^\rho(\rho)\widehat{\rho} + v^\theta(\rho)\widehat{\theta} \quad \forall \xi \in \Omega_\infty,$$

for some  $v^\rho, v^\theta \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(1, +\infty)$ . Since  $v^\theta$  is independent of  $\theta$ , the incompressibility condition becomes

$$\frac{d}{d\rho}(\rho v^\rho(\rho)) = 0 \quad \implies \quad v^\rho(\rho) = \frac{A}{\rho} \quad \forall \rho > 1,$$

for some constant  $A \in \mathbb{R}$ . The boundary conditions (2.10)<sub>2</sub> imply  $A = 0$ , so that  $v(\xi) = v^\theta(\rho)\widehat{\theta}$  for every  $\xi \in \Omega_\infty$ , with  $v^\theta(1) = 0$  and  $v^\theta \rightarrow \omega$  as  $\rho \rightarrow +\infty$ . Then, the first equation in (2.10)<sub>1</sub> reduces to

$$\frac{dp}{d\rho}(\rho) = \frac{1}{\rho} v^\theta(\rho)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad -\frac{d^2 v^\theta}{d\rho^2}(\rho) - \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{dv^\theta}{d\rho}(\rho) + \frac{1}{\rho^2} v^\theta(\rho) = 0 \quad \forall \rho > 1,$$

thereby yielding

$$v^\theta(\rho) = \frac{B}{\rho} + C\rho \quad \forall \rho \geq 1, \quad \text{for some constants } B, C \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Enforcing the boundary conditions (2.10)<sub>2</sub> gives  $B = C = 0$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

**Remark 2.4.** *In view of Remark 2.2, as a consequence of Theorem 2.2 we deduce that (2.10) is either not solvable, or it has infinitely many non-rotationally invariant solutions. Furthermore, with the same proof as Theorem 2.2, we deduce that the exterior problem (2.10) without condition at infinity only admits as rotationally invariant solutions the family of functions*

$$v(\xi) = K \left( \rho - \frac{1}{\rho} \right) \widehat{\theta}, \quad q(\xi) = \frac{K^2}{2} \left( \rho^2 - \frac{1}{\rho^2} - 4 \log(\rho) \right) \quad \forall \xi \in \Omega_\infty \quad (K \in \mathbb{R}). \quad (2.11)$$

### 3 Non-uniqueness in a larger class of solutions

Theorem 2.1 does not exclude multiplicity of weak solutions to (1.3) (in fact, strong solutions since we assume that  $f \in L^2(\Omega_R)$ ) in the class of non-rotationally invariant functions if (2.6) is violated. In view of (A.7), the latter occurs if  $\omega > 0$  is sufficiently large (for a fixed  $R > 1$ ), or if  $R > 1$  is sufficiently small (for a fixed  $\omega > 0$ ). But Theorem 2.1 also suggests to investigate whether multiplicity results for (1.3) in  $H_{*,\sigma}^1(\Omega_R)$  can be proved with a different notion of solution, e.g., by restricting the class  $H_{0,\sigma}^1(\Omega_R)$  of test functions in (2.1). To this end, we need a refinement of the classical Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition for vector fields [15], which states that

$$L^2(\Omega_R) = G_1(\Omega_R) \oplus G_2(\Omega_R), \quad (3.1)$$

where

$$G_1(\Omega_R) \doteq \{v \in L^2(\Omega_R) \mid \nabla \cdot v = 0 \text{ in } \Omega_R, \ v \cdot \nu = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega_R\},$$

$$G_2(\Omega_R) \doteq \{v \in L^2(\Omega_R) \mid \exists g \in H^1(\Omega_R), \ v = \nabla g \text{ in } \Omega_R\},$$

see [7, Section 1] and [20, Chapter 1]. Recall that a vector field  $v \in L_{\text{div}}^2(\Omega_R)$  has a normal trace in  $H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega_R)$  defined through the generalized Green formula

$$\langle v \cdot \nu, \varphi \rangle_{\partial\Omega_R} = \int_{\Omega_R} \varphi(\nabla \cdot v) + \int_{\Omega_R} v \cdot \nabla \varphi \quad \forall \varphi \in H^1(\Omega_R),$$

where the ‘‘boundary term’’  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\partial\Omega_R}$  denotes the duality product between  $H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega_R)$  and  $H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega_R)$ . Likewise, recall that the (weak) operator  $\text{curl} : L^2(\Omega_R) \rightarrow H^{-1}(\Omega_R)$  is defined as

$$\langle \text{curl}(v), \varphi \rangle_{\Omega_R} = \int_{\Omega_R} v \cdot \text{curl}(\varphi) \quad \forall v \in L^2(\Omega_R), \ \forall \varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega_R),$$

where  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\Omega_R}$  denotes the duality product between  $H^{-1}(\Omega_R)$  and  $H_0^1(\Omega_R)$ .

While  $G_2(\Omega_R) \subset \text{Ker}(\text{curl})$ , since the domain  $\Omega_R$  is not simply connected, smooth irrotational vector fields are not necessarily conservative (elements of  $G_2(\Omega_R)$ ) and, therefore,

$$G_c(\Omega_R) \doteq G_1(\Omega_R) \cap \text{Ker}(\text{curl}) \neq \{0\}.$$

The space  $G_c(\Omega_R)$  can be characterized by choosing a smooth line  $\Sigma_R \subset \Omega_R$  such that  $\Omega_R \setminus \overline{\Sigma_R}$  is simply connected. Roughly speaking,  $\Sigma_R$  connects  $\partial B_1$  with  $\partial B_R$  and cuts  $\Omega_R$ . We focus on the case where

$$\Sigma_R \doteq \{\xi \in \Omega_R \mid \theta = 0\} = \{(x, y) \in \Omega_R \mid x > 0, \ y = 0\}$$

and we explain below how to proceed for different choices of  $\Sigma_R$ , see Remark 3.3 at the end of this section. The open simply connected domain

$$\Omega_R^* \doteq \Omega_R \setminus \overline{\Sigma_R} \quad (3.2)$$

has a *double boundary* at  $\Sigma_R$ : an upper boundary  $\Sigma_R^+$  (when approached from the upper half plane  $y > 0$ ) and a lower boundary  $\Sigma_R^-$  (when approached from the lower half plane  $y < 0$ ), see Figure 3.1.




Figure 3.1: The cut annulus  $\Omega_R^*$  in (3.2).



For a continuous scalar function  $q : \Omega_R^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we denote by  $[q]_R : \Sigma_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  the *jump function* when going from  $\Sigma_R^-$  to  $\Sigma_R^+$  (upwards). Precisely,

$$[q]_R(x) \doteq \lim_{y \rightarrow 0^-} q(x, y) - \lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} q(x, y) \quad \forall x \in (1, R).$$

In particular, if  $[q]_R \equiv 0$ , then  $q$  can be extended continuously to the whole annulus  $\Omega_R$ . The following statement is a consequence of some results by Foias & Temam [7]:

**Proposition 3.1.** *The space  $G_c(\Omega_R)$  has dimension 1 and*

$$G_c(\Omega_R) = \text{span} \left\{ \frac{1}{\rho} \widehat{\theta} \right\}.$$

The orthogonal complement of  $G_c(\Omega_R)$  within  $G_1(\Omega_R)$  is characterized by

$$G_c(\Omega_R)^\perp = \{v \in G_1(\Omega_R) \mid \langle v \cdot \nu, 1 \rangle_{\Sigma_R} = 0\}, \quad (3.3)$$

where  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\Sigma_R}$  denotes the duality product between  $H^{-1/2}(\Sigma_R)$  and  $H^{1/2}(\Sigma_R)$ .

**Proof.** From [7, Lemmas 1.1-1.2-1.3] we know that the space  $G_c(\Omega_R)$  has dimension 1, and all the elements of  $G_c(\Omega_R)$  are proportional to the gradient of the unique (up to the addition of a constant) analytic function  $\bar{q} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega_R^*) \cap L^\infty(\Omega_R)$  such that

$$\Delta \bar{q} = 0 \text{ in } \Omega_R^*, \quad \frac{\partial \bar{q}}{\partial \nu} = 0 \text{ on } \partial \Omega_R, \quad [\bar{q}]_R = 1, \quad \left[ \frac{\partial \bar{q}}{\partial y} \right]_R = 0. \quad (3.4)$$

In our framework, a solution to (3.4) is explicitly given by

$$\bar{q}(x, y) = \frac{\theta}{2\pi} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2\pi} \arctan\left(\frac{y}{x}\right) & \text{if } x > 0 \text{ and } y > 0, \\ \frac{1}{2\pi} \arctan\left(\frac{y}{x}\right) + \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } x < 0, \\ \frac{1}{2\pi} \arctan\left(\frac{y}{x}\right) + 1 & \text{if } x > 0 \text{ and } y < 0, \end{cases} \quad \forall (x, y) \in \Omega_R,$$

extended by continuity on the two segments where  $x = 0$ , so that

$$\nabla \bar{q}(x, y) = \frac{1}{2\pi \sqrt{x^2 + y^2}} \widehat{\theta}(x, y) \quad \forall (x, y) \in \Omega_R^*.$$

From [7, Lemma 1.4] we deduce that the orthogonal complement of  $G_c(\Omega_R)$  within  $G_1(\Omega_R)$  is the space given in (3.3).  $\square$

In Section 2, see (2.1), we considered weak solutions to (1.3), which become strong solutions because  $f \in L^2(\Omega_R)$ . Here we define a new class of solutions for which we need to introduce the following spaces of vector fields:

$$\mathbb{H}(\Omega_R) \doteq \left\{ v \in H_0^1(\Omega_R) \mid \int_{\Sigma_R} v \cdot \nu = 0 \right\},$$

$$\mathbb{H}_\sigma(\Omega_R) \doteq G_c(\Omega_R)^\perp \cap H_0^1(\Omega_R) = \left\{ v \in H_0^1(\Omega_R) \mid \nabla \cdot v = 0 \text{ in } \Omega_R, \int_{\Sigma_R} v \cdot \nu = 0 \right\},$$

which, owing to the continuity of the trace operator, are closed subspaces of  $H_0^1(\Omega_R)$ .

**Definition 3.1.** Given  $\omega \geq 0$  and  $f \in L^2(\Omega_R)$ , we say that a vector field  $u \in H_{*,\sigma}^1(\Omega_R)$  is an incomplete solution to (1.3) if it verifies (1.3)<sub>2</sub> in the trace sense and

$$\int_{\Omega_R} \nabla u \cdot \nabla \varphi + \int_{\Omega_R} (u \cdot \nabla) u \cdot \varphi = \int_{\Omega_R} f \cdot \varphi \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathbb{H}_\sigma(\Omega_R). \quad (3.5)$$

Since  $\mathbb{H}_\sigma(\Omega_R) \subset H_{0,\sigma}^1(\Omega_R)$ , every weak (strong) solution to (1.3) is also an incomplete solution but, contrary to the standard framework (2.1), no general regularity theory holds in the class of incomplete solutions. In Theorem 3.3 below, we explicitly build infinitely many incomplete solutions (which are *not* weak solutions) to the unforced equation (1.3) where the velocity field is smooth in  $\Omega_R$  but the associated scalar pressure is *discontinuous* along  $\Sigma_R$ , although its gradient has no jump.

Let us first explain how a pressure  $p \in L^2(\Omega_R)/\mathbb{R}$ , associated to an incomplete solution, arises.

**Theorem 3.1.** For  $\omega \geq 0$  and  $f \in L^2(\Omega_R)$ , let  $u \in H_{*,\sigma}^1(\Omega_R)$  be an incomplete solution to (1.3). Then, there exists a unique scalar pressure  $p \in L^2(\Omega_R)/\mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\int_{\Omega_R} \nabla u \cdot \nabla \varphi + \int_{\Omega_R} (u \cdot \nabla) u \cdot \varphi - \int_{\Omega_R} p(\nabla \cdot \varphi) = \int_{\Omega_R} f \cdot \varphi \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathbb{H}(\Omega_R). \quad (3.6)$$

**Proof.** We follow closely the proof of [9, Theorem III.5.3] (see also [13, Lemma 2.1]). Denote by  $\mathbb{H}^{-1}(\Omega_R)$  the dual space of  $\mathbb{H}(\Omega_R)$  and by  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\Omega_R}^*$  the duality product between  $\mathbb{H}^{-1}(\Omega_R)$  and  $\mathbb{H}(\Omega_R)$ . The (weak) gradient  $\nabla(\cdot) : L^2(\Omega_R) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^{-1}(\Omega_R)$  of a scalar function  $q \in L^2(\Omega_R)$  is defined by

$$\langle \nabla q, \varphi \rangle_{\Omega_R}^* = - \int_{\Omega_R} q(\nabla \cdot \varphi) \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathbb{H}(\Omega_R),$$

so that it is the adjoint of the (strong) divergence operator  $\operatorname{div} : \mathbb{H}(\Omega_R) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega_R)$ . Therefore, the Banach Closed Range Theorem can be applied to deduce that

$$\operatorname{Range}(\nabla) = \operatorname{Ker}(\operatorname{div})^\perp = \mathbb{H}_\sigma(\Omega_R)^\perp \doteq \{ \mathcal{Q} \in \mathbb{H}^{-1}(\Omega_R) \mid \langle \mathcal{Q}, \varphi \rangle_{\Omega_R}^* = 0 \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathbb{H}_\sigma(\Omega_R) \}.$$

Given an incomplete solution  $u \in H_{*,\sigma}^1(\Omega_R)$  of (1.3), we define  $\mathcal{F}_u \in \mathbb{H}^{-1}(\Omega_R)$  by

$$\mathcal{F}_u(\varphi) \doteq \int_{\Omega_R} \nabla u \cdot \nabla \varphi + \int_{\Omega_R} (u \cdot \nabla) u \cdot \varphi - \int_{\Omega_R} f \cdot \varphi \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathbb{H}(\Omega_R).$$

In view of (3.5) we deduce that  $\mathcal{F}_u \in \operatorname{Range}(\nabla)$ . This ensures the existence of a scalar pressure  $p \in L^2(\Omega_R)/\mathbb{R}$  verifying (3.6).

Suppose that there exists another scalar function  $q \in L^2(\Omega_R)/\mathbb{R}$  verifying (3.6), thereby implying

$$\int_{\Omega_R} (p - q)(\nabla \cdot \varphi) = 0 \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathbb{H}(\Omega_R). \quad (3.7)$$

Fix any  $\varepsilon \in (0, \pi)$ , consider the domain

$$\Omega_R^\varepsilon \doteq \{ \xi \in \Omega_R \mid \varepsilon < \theta < 2\pi - \varepsilon \}, \quad (3.8)$$

so that  $\partial\Omega_R^\varepsilon = \partial B_1^\varepsilon \cup \partial B_R^\varepsilon \cup \Sigma_R^{\varepsilon,1} \cup \Sigma_R^{\varepsilon,2}$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} \partial B_1^\varepsilon &\doteq \{ \xi \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid \rho = 1, \quad \varepsilon < \theta < 2\pi - \varepsilon \}, & \partial B_R^\varepsilon &\doteq \{ \xi \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid \rho = R, \quad \varepsilon < \theta < 2\pi - \varepsilon \}, \\ \Sigma_R^{\varepsilon,1} &\doteq \{ \xi \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid \theta = \varepsilon, \quad 1 \leq \rho \leq R \}, & \Sigma_R^{\varepsilon,2} &\doteq \{ \xi \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid \theta = 2\pi - \varepsilon, \quad 1 \leq \rho \leq R \}, \end{aligned}$$

see Figure 3.2.




Figure 3.2: The domain  $\Omega_R^\varepsilon$  in (3.8).

The Divergence Theorem implies that

$$\int_{\Omega_R} \nabla \cdot \varphi = 0 \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathbb{H}(\Omega_R). \quad (3.9)$$

If we put

$$\lambda_\varepsilon \doteq \int_{\Omega_R^\varepsilon} (p - q) \quad \forall \varepsilon \in (0, \pi),$$

we see that

$$\int_{\Omega_R^\varepsilon} \left( p - q - \frac{\lambda_\varepsilon}{|\Omega_R^\varepsilon|} \right) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \lambda_\varepsilon = 0, \quad (3.10)$$

while (3.7) and (3.9) imply

$$\int_{\Omega_R} \left( p - q - \frac{\lambda_\varepsilon}{|\Omega_R^\varepsilon|} \right) (\nabla \cdot \varphi) = 0 \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathbb{H}(\Omega_R). \quad (3.11)$$

By using the convention that any vector field  $\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega_R^\varepsilon)$  is trivially extended by zero to the whole  $\Omega_R$  so that  $\varphi \in \mathbb{H}(\Omega_R)$ , from (3.11) we deduce

$$\int_{\Omega_R^\varepsilon} \left( p - q - \frac{\lambda_\varepsilon}{|\Omega_R^\varepsilon|} \right) (\nabla \cdot \varphi) = 0 \quad \forall \varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega_R^\varepsilon). \quad (3.12)$$

On the other hand, from (3.10)<sub>1</sub> and [3] we know that there exists a vector field  $J_\varepsilon \in H_0^1(\Omega_R^\varepsilon)$  such that

$$\nabla \cdot J_\varepsilon = p - q - \frac{\lambda_\varepsilon}{|\Omega_R^\varepsilon|} \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega_R^\varepsilon.$$

By taking  $\varphi = J_\varepsilon$  in (3.12), we infer

$$p = q + \frac{\lambda_\varepsilon}{|\Omega_R^\varepsilon|} \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega_R^\varepsilon, \quad \forall \varepsilon \in (0, \pi).$$

By letting  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$  and by (3.10)<sub>2</sub>, this implies that  $p = q$  almost everywhere in  $\Omega_R$ . Together with (3.9), this shows that  $p \in L^2(\Omega_R)/\mathbb{R}$  is uniquely defined.  $\square$

For any vector field  $v \in H^1(\Omega_R)$ , we define its *flux across*  $\Sigma_R$  as the quantity

$$\Phi_v \doteq \int_{\Sigma_R} v \cdot \nu.$$

Given  $\omega \geq 0$ , a vector field  $v \in H^1(\Omega_R)$  satisfying

$$\nabla \cdot v = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_R, \quad v = (0, 0) \quad \text{on } \partial B_1, \quad v = \omega \hat{\theta} \quad \text{on } \partial B_R, \quad (3.13)$$

has *constant flux* across each angular sector of  $\Omega_R$ . Indeed, for any  $\alpha \in [0, 2\pi)$ , define the segment

$$\Sigma_R^\alpha \doteq \{\xi \in \overline{\Omega_R} \mid 1 \leq \rho \leq R, \theta = \alpha\}.$$

By the Divergence Theorem and the boundary conditions in (3.13) we have that

$$\int_{\Sigma_R} v \cdot \nu = \int_{\Sigma_R^\alpha} v \cdot \nu \quad \forall \alpha \in [0, 2\pi).$$

The main result of this section, providing infinitely many incomplete solutions to (1.3), is obtained by showing the existence of an incomplete solution to (1.3) with a *prescribed flux*  $\Phi$ , for every  $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**Theorem 3.2.** *For any  $\omega \geq 0$  and  $f \in \mathcal{R}[L^2(\Omega_R)]$ , there exist infinitely many rotationally invariant incomplete solutions to (1.3).*

**Proof.** We first build a *flux carrier* as an incomplete solution of a (linear) Stokes problem. For  $\omega \geq 0$  and  $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}$ , put

$$\lambda_* \doteq \frac{18(R+1)}{R^4 + R^3 - R - 6R^2 \log(R) - 1} \left[ \Phi - \frac{R\omega}{R^2 - 1} \left( \frac{R^3}{3} - R + \frac{2}{3} \right) \right]. \quad (3.14)$$

By direct computation one can check that the couple

$$V_*(\xi) = \left[ \frac{R}{R^2 - 1} \left( \omega + \frac{\lambda_* R}{2} \log(R) \right) \left( \rho - \frac{1}{\rho} \right) - \frac{\lambda_* \rho}{2} \log(\rho) \right] \hat{\theta}, \quad Q_*(\xi) = -\lambda_* \theta \quad \forall \xi \in \overline{\Omega_R} \quad (3.15)$$

is the unique incomplete solution (up to an additive constant for  $Q_*$ ) of the unforced Stokes system

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta v + \nabla q = 0, & \nabla \cdot v = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_R, \\ v = \omega \hat{\theta} \quad \text{on } \partial B_R, & v = (0, 0) \quad \text{on } \partial B_1, \end{cases} \quad (3.16)$$

having flux  $\Phi$ . Indeed,

$$\int_{\Omega_R} \nabla V_* \cdot \nabla \varphi - \int_{\Omega_R} Q_* (\nabla \cdot \varphi) = 0 \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathbb{H}(\Omega_R) \quad (3.17)$$

and, by linearity, the unique solvability of (3.16) in the class of incomplete solutions having flux  $\Phi$  follows, since the difference of any two such solutions is an element of  $\mathbb{H}(\Omega_R)$ .

For any  $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}$ , let  $V_* \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\overline{\Omega_R})$  be as in (3.15). We now prove the existence of a rotationally invariant incomplete solution  $u \in \mathcal{R}[H_{*,\sigma}^1(\Omega_R)]$  to (1.3) having flux  $\Phi$ . This amounts to showing the existence of  $\hat{u} \in \mathcal{R}[\mathbb{H}_\sigma(\Omega_R)]$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega_R} \nabla \hat{u} \cdot \nabla \varphi + \int_{\Omega_R} (\hat{u} \cdot \nabla) \hat{u} \cdot \varphi + \int_{\Omega_R} (\hat{u} \cdot \nabla) V_* \cdot \varphi + \int_{\Omega_R} (V_* \cdot \nabla) \hat{u} \cdot \varphi + \int_{\Omega_R} (V_* \cdot \nabla) V_* \cdot \varphi \\ &= \int_{\Omega_R} f \cdot \varphi \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathbb{H}_\sigma(\Omega_R), \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

and the solution will then be  $u = \hat{u} + V_*$ , see again (3.17). From [20, Chapter 5, Theorem 1] and the Leray-Schauder Principle [33, Chapter 6], it suffices to show that any  $v^t \in \mathcal{R}[\mathbb{H}_\sigma(\Omega_R)]$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega_R} \nabla v^t \cdot \nabla \varphi + t \int_{\Omega_R} [(v^t \cdot \nabla) v^t + (v^t \cdot \nabla) V_* + (V_* \cdot \nabla) v^t + (V_* \cdot \nabla) V_*] \cdot \varphi \\ &= t \int_{\Omega_R} f \cdot \varphi \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathbb{H}_\sigma(\Omega_R) \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

is uniformly bounded in  $\mathbb{H}_\sigma(\Omega_R)$  with respect to  $t \in [0, 1]$ : to this end, we need an a priori bound. Given  $t \in [0, 1]$  and  $v^t \in \mathcal{R}[\mathbb{H}_\sigma(\Omega_R)] \setminus \{0\}$  such that (3.19) holds, an integration by parts yields

$$\int_{\Omega_R} (v^t \cdot \nabla) v^t \cdot v^t = \int_{\Omega_R} (V_* \cdot \nabla) v^t \cdot v^t = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Omega_R} (v^t \cdot \nabla) V_* \cdot v^t = - \int_{\Omega_R} (v^t \cdot \nabla) v^t \cdot V_* \quad (3.20)$$

On the other hand, since  $v^t \in \mathcal{R}[\mathbb{H}_\sigma(\Omega_R)]$ , it may be written as

$$v^t(\xi) = v_t^\rho(\rho) \widehat{\rho} + v_t^\theta(\rho) \widehat{\theta} \quad \text{for a.e. } \xi \in \Omega_R,$$

for some  $v_t^\rho, v_t^\theta \in H_0^1(1, R)$ . Since  $v_t^\theta$  is independent of  $\theta$ , the incompressibility condition becomes

$$\frac{d}{d\rho}(\rho v_t^\rho(\rho)) = 0 \quad \implies \quad v_t^\rho(\rho) = \frac{A}{\rho} \quad \text{for a.e. } \rho \in (1, R),$$

for some  $A \in \mathbb{R}$ . Conditions (1.3)<sub>2</sub> imply  $A = 0$ , so that  $v^t(\xi) = v_t^\theta(\rho) \widehat{\theta}$  for a.e.  $\xi \in \Omega_R$ , which yields

$$(v^t \cdot \nabla) v^t \cdot V_* = (V_* \cdot \nabla) V_* \cdot v^t = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_R. \quad (3.21)$$

Therefore, taking  $\varphi = v^t$  in (3.19) and enforcing (3.20)-(3.21), we get

$$\|\nabla v^t\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)}^2 = t \int_{\Omega_R} f \cdot v^t \leq \frac{\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)}}{\sqrt{\lambda(\Omega_R)}} \|\nabla v^t\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)},$$

as a consequence of Hölder's inequality and (A.5). Hence,

$$\|\nabla v^t\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)} \leq \frac{\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)}}{\sqrt{\lambda(\Omega_R)}} \quad \forall t \in [0, 1],$$

which is the sought a priori bound. In conclusion, for every  $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}$  there exists (at least) one rotationally invariant incomplete solution to (1.3) having flux  $\Phi$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.1.** *Theorem 3.2 explains the uniqueness of strong rotationally invariant solutions proved in Theorem 2.1, regardless of the magnitude of the angular velocity  $\omega$ . Recalling the bifurcation result in the region between two concentric unbounded 3D cylinders [30], having  $\Omega_R$  as planar cross-section, Theorem 2.1 states that if the pressure is not allowed to vary along the vertical axis, then the rotationally invariant solution cannot bifurcate. On the other hand, in view of Proposition 3.1, Theorem 3.2 suggests that, perhaps, an helicoidal solution in the region between the two cylinders may be constructed through the Riemann surfaces of the multivalued function  $\xi \mapsto \theta$ .*

An interesting situation arises when

$$f(\xi) = \frac{\lambda}{\rho} \widehat{\theta} \quad \forall \xi \in \overline{\Omega_R}, \text{ for some } \lambda \in \mathbb{R},$$

and the generalized Taylor-Couette flow (2.5) becomes

$$\begin{cases} v_*(\xi) = \left[ \frac{R}{R^2 - 1} \left( \omega + \frac{\lambda R}{2} \log(R) \right) \left( \rho - \frac{1}{\rho} \right) - \frac{\lambda \rho}{2} \log(\rho) \right] \widehat{\theta} \\ q_*(\xi) = \int_1^\rho \frac{1}{t} \left[ \frac{R}{R^2 - 1} \left( \omega + \frac{\lambda R}{2} \log(R) \right) \left( t - \frac{1}{t} \right) - \frac{\lambda t}{2} \log(t) \right]^2 dt \end{cases} \quad \forall \xi \in \overline{\Omega_R}. \quad (3.22)$$

In the particular case when  $f = 0$  we can prove Theorem 3.2 in a direct way, making use of the explicit generalized Taylor-Couette flow (3.22) with  $\lambda = 0$ . This allows to show that a smooth rotationally invariant incomplete solution to (1.3) may have an associated pressure that is not necessarily rotationally invariant, and not even continuous in  $\Omega_R$ .

**Theorem 3.3.** For any  $\omega \geq 0$  there exist infinitely many incomplete solutions to the unforced system (1.3) (with  $f = 0$ ), given by the family

$$\begin{cases} v_\lambda(\xi) = \left[ \frac{R}{R^2-1} \left( \omega + \frac{\lambda R}{2} \log(R) \right) \left( \rho - \frac{1}{\rho} \right) - \frac{\lambda \rho}{2} \log(\rho) \right] \widehat{\theta} \\ q_\lambda(\xi) = \int_1^\rho \frac{1}{t} \left[ \frac{R}{R^2-1} \left( \omega + \frac{\lambda R}{2} \log(R) \right) \left( t - \frac{1}{t} \right) - \frac{\lambda t}{2} \log(t) \right]^2 dt - \lambda \theta \end{cases} \quad \forall \xi \in \overline{\Omega_R}, \text{ with } \lambda \in \mathbb{R}.$$

**Proof.** Given  $\varepsilon \in (0, \pi)$ , consider again the domain  $\Omega_R^\varepsilon \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  defined in (3.8). For any vector field  $\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega_R)$ , an integration by parts yields

$$\int_{\Omega_R^\varepsilon} \theta(\nabla \cdot \varphi) = - \int_{\Omega_R^\varepsilon} \frac{1}{\rho} \widehat{\theta} \cdot \varphi + (2\pi - \varepsilon) \int_{\Sigma_R^{\varepsilon,2}} \varphi \cdot \widehat{\theta} - \varepsilon \int_{\Sigma_R^{\varepsilon,1}} \varphi \cdot \widehat{\theta} \quad \forall \varepsilon \in (0, \pi).$$

By the Dominated Convergence Theorem, if we take the limit as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$  in this identity, we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega_R} \theta(\nabla \cdot \varphi) = 2\pi \int_{\Sigma_R} \varphi \cdot \widehat{\theta} - \int_{\Omega_R} \frac{1}{\rho} \widehat{\theta} \cdot \varphi \quad \forall \varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega_R).$$

In particular we have

$$\nabla \theta = \frac{1}{\rho} \widehat{\theta} - 2\pi \delta_{\Sigma_R} \widehat{e}_2 \quad \text{in distributional sense,} \quad (3.23)$$

and also

$$\int_{\Omega_R} \theta(\nabla \cdot \varphi) = - \int_{\Omega_R} \frac{1}{\rho} \widehat{\theta} \cdot \varphi \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathbb{H}(\Omega_R). \quad (3.24)$$

Given  $\omega \geq 0$  and  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ , let  $(v_*, q_*) \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\overline{\Omega_R}) \times \mathcal{C}^\infty(\overline{\Omega_R})$ , be the generalized Taylor-Couette flow defined in (3.22), which satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta v_* + (v_* \cdot \nabla) v_* + \nabla q_* = \frac{\lambda}{\rho} \widehat{\theta}, & \nabla \cdot v_* = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_R, \\ v_* = \omega \widehat{\theta} \quad \text{on } \partial B_R, & v_* = (0, 0) \quad \text{on } \partial B_1, \end{cases}$$

or equivalently,

$$\int_{\Omega_R} \nabla v_* \cdot \nabla \varphi + \int_{\Omega_R} (v_* \cdot \nabla) v_* \cdot \varphi - \int_{\Omega_R} q_* (\nabla \cdot \varphi) = \int_{\Omega_R} \frac{\lambda}{\rho} \widehat{\theta} \cdot \varphi \quad \forall \varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega_R). \quad (3.25)$$

Identities (3.24)-(3.25) imply that

$$\int_{\Omega_R} \nabla v_* \cdot \nabla \varphi + \int_{\Omega_R} (v_* \cdot \nabla) v_* \cdot \varphi - \int_{\Omega_R} (q_* - \lambda \theta) (\nabla \cdot \varphi) = 0 \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathbb{H}(\Omega_R),$$

so that  $v_*$  is also an incomplete solution to (1.3) (with  $f = 0$ ) with associated pressure  $q_* - \lambda \theta$ , which is a *discontinuous* function on  $\Sigma_R$ . Hence, since  $q_*$  is rotationally invariant, we infer  $q_* - \lambda \theta \notin H^1(\Omega_R)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.2.** As an example, given  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ , the pair

$$\begin{cases} v_\lambda(\xi) = \lambda \left[ \frac{R^2 \log(R)}{2(R^2-1)} \left( \rho - \frac{1}{\rho} \right) - \frac{\rho}{2} \log(\rho) \right] \widehat{\theta} \\ q_\lambda(\xi) = \lambda^2 \int_1^\rho \frac{1}{t} \left[ \frac{R^2 \log(R)}{2(R^2-1)} \left( t - \frac{1}{t} \right) - \frac{t}{2} \log(t) \right]^2 dt - \lambda \theta \end{cases} \quad \forall \xi \in \overline{\Omega_R}$$

is a nontrivial incomplete solution (with associated pressure) of the unforced Navier-Stokes system (1.3) when  $\omega = 0$ .

**Remark 3.3.** Consider a simple smooth line  $\Sigma_R \subset \Omega_R$  such that  $\Omega_R \setminus \overline{\Sigma_R}$  is simply connected. Following [7, Lemme 1.2], let  $\bar{q} \in C^\infty(\Omega_R^*) \cap L^\infty(\Omega_R)$  be the unique scalar function satisfying (3.4). Therefore, since  $\bar{q}$  is discontinuous along  $\Sigma_R$  (but its gradient can be extended continuously to the whole  $\Omega_R$ ), its distributional derivative involves a Dirac delta as in (3.23). In this case, incomplete solutions to the unforced Navier-Stokes system (1.3) can be built in a similar way as in Theorem 3.3, where the function  $\bar{q}$  induces a singularity on  $\Sigma_R$  in the scalar pressure.

The multiplicity result of Theorem 3.2 can be partly explained because the difference of two incomplete solutions to (1.3) is not necessarily an element of  $\mathbb{H}_\sigma(\Omega_R)$ . Nevertheless, the difference between two incomplete solutions to (1.3) having a *prescribed* flux across  $\Sigma_R$  indeed becomes a test function in  $\mathbb{H}_\sigma(\Omega_R)$  and, therefore, one would expect unique solvability of (1.3) in this class of incomplete solutions (namely, with prescribed flux across  $\Sigma_R$ ) under an appropriate smallness assumption on the data. With the notation as in (3.15), given any  $\omega \geq 0$  and  $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}$ , let us put

$$K_R(\omega, \Phi) \doteq \|\nabla V_*\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)}^2 = 2\pi \left[ \frac{R^2 + 1}{R^2 - 1} \left( \omega + \frac{R\lambda_*}{2} \log(R) \right)^2 + \frac{\lambda_*^2}{8} (2R^2 \log(R)^2 + R^2 - 1) - \frac{\lambda_* R (R^2 + 1) \log(R)}{R^2 - 1} \left( \omega + \frac{R\lambda_*}{2} \log(R) \right) \right].$$

Defining  $\mathcal{S}_4 > 0$  as in (A.1), we now prove:

**Theorem 3.4.** For any  $\omega \geq 0$ ,  $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $f \in \mathcal{R}[L^2(\Omega_R)]$ , there exist at least one rotationally invariant incomplete solution  $V_\Phi \in \mathcal{R}[H_{*,\sigma}^1(\Omega_R)]$  to (1.3) having flux  $\Phi$ , with associated pressure  $Q_\Phi \in L^2(\Omega_R)/\mathbb{R}$ . Then,  $(V_\Phi, Q_\Phi)$  is the unique incomplete solution to (1.3) having flux  $\Phi$

- in the space  $\mathcal{R}[H^1(\Omega_R)] \times L^2(\Omega_R)/\mathbb{R}$  for any  $\omega \geq 0$ ,  $f \in \mathcal{R}[L^2(\Omega_R)]$ ,  $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}$ ;
- in the whole space  $H^1(\Omega_R) \times L^2(\Omega_R)/\mathbb{R}$  whenever

$$\frac{\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)}}{\sqrt{\lambda(\Omega_R)}} + \sqrt{K_R(\omega, \Phi)} < \mathcal{S}_4. \quad (3.26)$$

**Proof.** From the proof of Theorem 3.2 we know that there exists at least one rotationally invariant incomplete solution  $V_\Phi \in \mathcal{R}[H_{*,\sigma}^1(\Omega_R)]$  of (1.3) having flux  $\Phi$ . Then, Theorem 3.1 ensures the existence of a uniquely associated scalar pressure  $Q_\Phi \in L^2(\Omega_R)/\mathbb{R}$ .

Concerning the first item of the statement, suppose that  $V \in \mathcal{R}[H^1(\Omega_R)]$  is another incomplete solution to (1.3) having flux  $\Phi$ . Repeating the argument of the proof of Theorem 3.2, we deduce there exist two functions  $G_\Phi, G \in H^1(1, R)$  such that  $G_\Phi(1) = G(1) = 0$ ,  $G_\Phi(R) = G(R) = \omega$  and

$$V_\Phi(\xi) = G_\Phi(\rho)\hat{\theta} \quad \text{and} \quad V(\xi) = G(\rho)\hat{\theta} \quad \text{for a.e. } \xi \in \Omega_R. \quad (3.27)$$

Let  $z \doteq V - V_\Phi \in \mathbb{H}_\sigma(\Omega_R)$  and subtract the equations (3.5) corresponding to  $V$  and  $V_\Phi$ , thereby obtaining

$$\int_{\Omega_R} \nabla z \cdot \nabla \varphi + \int_{\Omega_R} (V \cdot \nabla) z \cdot \varphi + \int_{\Omega_R} (z \cdot \nabla) V_\Phi \cdot \varphi = 0 \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathbb{H}_\sigma(\Omega_R).$$

By taking  $\varphi = z$ , integrating by parts, and using (3.27), we get

$$\int_{\Omega_R} (V \cdot \nabla) z \cdot z = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Omega_R} (z \cdot \nabla) V_\Phi \cdot z = - \int_{\Omega_R} (z \cdot \nabla) z \cdot V_\Phi = 0,$$

and we deduce that  $z = 0$  in  $\Omega_R$ . Then, Theorem 3.1 ensures that the associated pressures coincide a.e. in  $\Omega_R$  as well.

Concerning the second item of the statement, by taking  $\varphi = V_\Phi - V_* \in \mathbb{H}_\sigma(\Omega_R)$  in both weak formulations (3.5) and (3.17), and noticing that

$$(V_\Phi \cdot \nabla)V_\Phi \cdot (V_\Phi - V_*) = 0 \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega_R,$$

we deduce

$$\|\nabla V_\Phi - \nabla V_*\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)}^2 = \int_{\Omega_R} f \cdot (V_\Phi - V_*) \leq \frac{\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)}}{\sqrt{\lambda(\Omega_R)}} \|\nabla V_\Phi - \nabla V_*\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)},$$

as a consequence of Hölder's inequality and (A.5). Therefore,

$$\|\nabla V_\Phi\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)} \leq \|\nabla V_\Phi - \nabla V_*\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)} + \|\nabla V_*\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)} \leq \frac{\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)}}{\sqrt{\lambda(\Omega_R)}} + \|\nabla V_*\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)}. \quad (3.28)$$

Now, suppose that  $V \in H_{*,\sigma}^1(\Omega_R)$  is another incomplete solution to (1.3) (not necessarily rotationally invariant) having flux  $\Phi$ . Let  $z \doteq V - V_\Phi \in \mathbb{H}_\sigma(\Omega_R)$  and subtract the equations (3.5) corresponding to  $V$  and  $V_\Phi$ , thereby obtaining

$$\int_{\Omega_R} \nabla z \cdot \nabla \varphi + \int_{\Omega_R} (V \cdot \nabla)z \cdot \varphi + \int_{\Omega_R} (z \cdot \nabla)V_\Phi \cdot \varphi = 0 \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathbb{H}_\sigma(\Omega_R).$$

By taking  $\varphi = z$  and noticing (after an integration by parts) that

$$\int_{\Omega_R} (V \cdot \nabla)z \cdot z = 0,$$

we deduce, from the Hölder inequality, from (A.2) and (3.28), that

$$\|\nabla z\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)}^2 = - \int_{\Omega_R} (z \cdot \nabla)V_\Phi \cdot z \leq \left( \frac{\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)}}{\sqrt{\lambda(\Omega_R)}} + \|\nabla V_*\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)} \right) \frac{\|\nabla z\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)}^2}{\mathcal{S}_4},$$

so  $z = 0$  a.e. in  $\Omega_R$  whenever (3.26) holds.  $\square$

Theorem 3.4 shows that if we enlarge the class of solutions by dropping one space dimension in the space of test functions, see Definition 3.1, we may recover the same uniqueness result as in Theorem 2.1. Roughly speaking, the additional degree of freedom is deleted by the flux constraint.

## 4 Invading domains and a generalized Stokes paradox

Let  $\Omega_\infty \doteq \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \overline{B_1}$ . The classical *Stokes paradox* [27] states that the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta v + \nabla q = 0, & \nabla \cdot v = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_\infty, \\ \lim_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} v(\xi) = (1, 0), & v = (0, 0) \quad \text{on } \partial B_1, \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

has no solution, see also [9, Chapter V] and [16]. Even more, Chang & Finn [4] proved that the only solution to the exterior problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta v + \nabla q = 0, & \nabla \cdot v = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_\infty, \\ v = (0, 0) \quad \text{on } \partial B_1, \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

such that  $|v(\xi)| = o(\log(\rho))$  as  $\rho \rightarrow \infty$ , is the trivial solution. Notice that (4.1) may be obtained by letting  $R \rightarrow \infty$  in the annulus  $\Omega_R$  (see (1.1)) for the steady-state Stokes equations

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta v + \nabla q = 0, & \nabla \cdot v = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_R, \\ v = (1, 0) \quad \text{on } \partial B_R, & v = (0, 0) \quad \text{on } \partial B_1, \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$



that have an explicit solution. Indeed, consider the constants (which depend on  $R > 1$ )

$$\begin{aligned} C_1 &\doteq \frac{-1}{2(1 - R^2 + \log(R) + R^2 \log(R))}, & C_2 &\doteq \frac{R^2}{2(1 - R^2 + \log(R) + R^2 \log(R))}, \\ C_3 &\doteq \frac{1 - R^2}{2(1 - R^2 + \log(R) + R^2 \log(R))}, & C_4 &\doteq \frac{R^2 + 1}{1 - R^2 + \log(R) + R^2 \log(R)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

Then, a direct computation proves the following result:

**Proposition 4.1.** *The unique (classical) solution  $(v_R, q_R) \in \mathcal{C}^2(\overline{\Omega_R}) \times \mathcal{C}^1(\overline{\Omega_R})/\mathbb{R}$  of (4.3) reads*

$$\begin{cases} v_R(\xi) = \left( C_1 \rho^2 + \frac{C_2}{\rho^2} + C_3 + C_4 \log(\rho) \right) \cos(\theta) \widehat{\rho} - \left( 3C_1 \rho^2 - \frac{C_2}{\rho^2} + C_3 + C_4(1 + \log(\rho)) \right) \sin(\theta) \widehat{\theta}, \\ q_R(\xi) = \left( 8C_1 \rho - \frac{2C_4}{\rho} \right) \cos(\theta), \end{cases}$$

where  $C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 \in \mathbb{R}$  are defined in (4.4).

From (4.4) we infer that, as  $R \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$C_1(R) \rightarrow 0, \quad C_2(R) \rightarrow 0, \quad C_3(R) \rightarrow 0, \quad C_4(R) \rightarrow 0, \quad (4.5)$$

so that Proposition 4.1 shows that  $(v_R$  and  $p_R$  being extended trivially in  $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_R$ )

$$v_R, p_R \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\Omega_\infty) \quad \text{as } R \rightarrow \infty.$$

This is why the Leray invading domains technique [22] does not allow to find solutions to (4.1), giving an interpretation to the Stokes paradox. From a physical point of view, this paradox can be explained as follows:

a fixed inflow is too weak to maintain the movement of a highly viscous fluid  
when the domain becomes too large.

The failure of the Leray invading domains technique, together with the appearance of the Stokes paradox, suggest to modify (4.3) by enlarging also the (inflow/outflow) boundary data and to consider the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta v + \nabla q = 0, & \nabla \cdot v = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_R, \\ v = (\log(R), 0) \quad \text{on } \partial B_R, & v = (0, 0) \quad \text{on } \partial B_1. \end{cases} \quad (4.6)$$

By linearity, we obtain the following straightforward consequence of Proposition 4.1:

**Corollary 4.1.** *The unique (classical) solution  $(v^R, q^R) \in \mathcal{C}^2(\overline{\Omega_R}) \times \mathcal{C}^1(\overline{\Omega_R})/\mathbb{R}$  of (4.6) reads*

$$\begin{cases} v^R(\xi) = \log(R) \left[ \left( C_1 \rho^2 + \frac{C_2}{\rho^2} + C_3 + C_4 \log(\rho) \right) \cos(\theta) \widehat{\rho} - \left( 3C_1 \rho^2 - \frac{C_2}{\rho^2} + C_3 + C_4(1 + \log(\rho)) \right) \sin(\theta) \widehat{\theta} \right], \\ q^R(\xi) = \log(R) \left( 8C_1 \rho - \frac{2C_4}{\rho} \right) \cos(\theta), \end{cases}$$

where  $C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 \in \mathbb{R}$  are defined in (4.4).

The fundamental difference with (4.5) is that, as  $R \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$C_1(R) \log(R) \rightarrow 0, \quad C_2(R) \log(R) \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}, \quad C_3(R) \log(R) \rightarrow -\frac{1}{2}, \quad C_4(R) \log(R) \rightarrow 1.$$

Hence, the invading domains technique applied to (4.6) yields

**Proposition 4.2.** *The couple of functions*

$$\begin{cases} v(\xi) = \left( \frac{1}{2\rho^2} - \frac{1}{2} + \log(\rho) \right) \cos(\theta) \widehat{\rho} + \left( \frac{1}{2\rho^2} - \frac{1}{2} - \log(\rho) \right) \sin(\theta) \widehat{\theta} & \forall \xi \in \Omega_\infty, \\ q(\xi) = -\frac{2}{\rho} \cos(\theta) & \forall \xi \in \Omega_\infty, \end{cases}$$

is a (nontrivial) solution to the exterior problem (4.2).

The solution in Proposition 4.2 satisfies  $|v(\xi)| \asymp \log(\rho)$  as  $\rho \rightarrow \infty$ , showing that the nonexistence result of [4] is sharp and complementing the physical interpretation of the Stokes paradox:

to maintain a visible movement of a highly viscous fluid when the domain becomes larger, an inflow of increasing magnitude is needed which, at the limit, is not physically attainable.

With the Taylor-Couette boundary conditions (1.3)<sub>2</sub>, we generalize the Stokes paradox and we find a somehow surprising statement. First of all, notice that the results in [4] imply that the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta v + \nabla q = 0, & \nabla \cdot v = 0 & \text{in } \Omega_\infty, \\ \lim_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} v(\xi) = \widehat{\theta}, & v = (0, 0) & \text{on } \partial B_1 \end{cases} \quad (4.7)$$

has no solution. Then, in the annulus  $\Omega_R$  (see (1.1)), consider the Stokes equations

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta v + \nabla q = 0, & \nabla \cdot v = 0 & \text{in } \Omega_R, \\ v = \widehat{\theta} & \text{on } \partial B_R, & v = (0, 0) & \text{on } \partial B_1, \end{cases} \quad (4.8)$$

which is the linear version of (1.3). The counterpart of Proposition 4.1 reads:

**Proposition 4.3.** *The unique (classical) solution  $(V_R, Q_R) \in \mathcal{C}^2(\overline{\Omega_R}) \times \mathcal{C}^1(\overline{\Omega_R})/\mathbb{R}$  to (4.8) reads*

$$V_R(\xi) \doteq \frac{R}{R^2 - 1} \left( \rho - \frac{1}{\rho} \right) \widehat{\theta} \quad \text{and} \quad Q_R(\xi) \doteq 0 \quad \forall \xi \in \Omega_R. \quad (4.9)$$

Again, as  $R \rightarrow \infty$ , the solution (4.9), when trivially extended by  $\widehat{\theta}$  to  $\Omega_\infty$ , locally converges uniformly to zero, in line with what was observed for (4.3): the invading domains method produces a zero solution to (4.7). In order to find a nontrivial solution as  $R \rightarrow \infty$ , instead of (4.7) we consider the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta v + \nabla q = 0, & \nabla \cdot v = 0 & \text{in } \Omega_R, \\ v = R \widehat{\theta} & \text{on } \partial B_R, & v = (0, 0) & \text{on } \partial B_1. \end{cases} \quad (4.10)$$

By linearity, we obtain the following straightforward consequence of Proposition 4.3:

**Corollary 4.2.** *The unique (classical) solution  $(V^R, Q^R) \in \mathcal{C}^2(\overline{\Omega_R}) \times \mathcal{C}^1(\overline{\Omega_R})/\mathbb{R}$  to (4.10) reads*

$$V^R(\xi) \doteq \frac{R^2}{R^2 - 1} \left( \rho - \frac{1}{\rho} \right) \widehat{\theta} \quad \text{and} \quad Q^R(\xi) \doteq 0 \quad \forall \xi \in \Omega_R.$$

Hence, in the case of Taylor-Couette boundary conditions, the invading domains technique yields

$$V^\infty(\xi) \doteq \left( \rho - \frac{1}{\rho} \right) \widehat{\theta} \quad \text{and} \quad Q^\infty(\xi) \doteq 0 \quad \forall \xi \in \Omega_\infty,$$

as a (nontrivial) solution to the exterior problem (4.2) which satisfies  $|V_\infty(\xi)| \asymp \rho$  as  $\rho \rightarrow \infty$ . This solution should be compared with (2.11). Finally, going back to the flux carrier (3.15), a direct computation shows that the pair

$$U^\infty(\xi) \doteq \frac{\rho}{2} \log(\rho) \widehat{\theta} \quad \text{and} \quad P^\infty(\xi) \doteq \theta \quad \forall \xi \in \Omega_\infty,$$

is a solution to the exterior problem (4.2) in  $\Omega_\infty \setminus \overline{\Sigma_\infty}$  verifying  $|V_\infty(\xi)| \asymp \rho \log(\rho)$  as  $\rho \rightarrow \infty$ , where

$$\Sigma_\infty \doteq \{\xi \in \Omega_\infty \mid \theta = 0\} = \{(x, y) \in \Omega_\infty \mid x > 0, y = 0\}.$$

The results in the present section connect the original Stokes paradox with the Taylor-Couette problem and suggest the following open questions:

- (I) prove/disprove that the only solutions to (4.2) satisfying  $|v(\xi)| \asymp \log(\rho)$  as  $\rho \rightarrow \infty$  are such that  $v(\xi)/\log(\rho) \rightarrow U \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$  as  $\rho \rightarrow \infty$ ;
- (II) prove/disprove that the only solutions to (4.2) satisfying  $|v(\xi)| \asymp \rho$  as  $\rho \rightarrow \infty$  are such that  $v(\xi)/\rho \rightarrow \omega \widehat{\theta}$  for some  $\omega \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$  as  $\rho \rightarrow \infty$ ;
- (III) prove/disprove that there are no incomplete solutions (that are not smooth solutions) to (4.2) satisfying  $|v(\xi)| = o(\rho \log(\rho))$  as  $\rho \rightarrow \infty$ .

## A Appendix: bounds for Poincaré-Sobolev constants in the annulus

We denote the Sobolev constant of the embedding  $H_0^1(\Omega_R) \subset L^p(\Omega_R)$ , for every  $p \in [2, +\infty)$ , by

$$\mathcal{S}_p \doteq \min_{v \in H_0^1(\Omega_R) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)}^2}{\|v\|_{L^p(\Omega_R)}^2} \quad \forall p \in [2, +\infty), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

so that  $\mathcal{S}_p > 0$  and

$$\mathcal{S}_p \|v\|_{L^p(\Omega_R)}^2 \leq \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)}^2 \quad \forall v \in H_0^1(\Omega_R). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Inequality (A.2) is also valid for vector functions (with the same constant): if  $v = (v_1, v_2) \in H_0^1(\Omega_R)$  is a vector field, by the Minkowski inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\|_{L^p(\Omega_R)}^p &= \| |v_1|^2 + |v_2|^2 \|_{L^{p/2}(\Omega_R)}^{p/2} \leq \left( \|v_1\|_{L^p(\Omega_R)}^2 + \|v_2\|_{L^p(\Omega_R)}^2 \right)^{p/2} \\ &\leq \left( \frac{1}{\mathcal{S}_p} \right)^{p/2} \left( \|\nabla v_1\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)}^2 + \|\nabla v_2\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)}^2 \right)^{p/2} = \left( \frac{1}{\mathcal{S}_p} \right)^{p/2} \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)}^p. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Notice that, in particular,  $\mathcal{S}_p$  is a function of  $R > 1$ . We set

$$\lambda(\Omega_R) \doteq \mathcal{S}_2(R) \quad \forall R > 1, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

corresponding to the first eigenvalue of the Laplace-Dirichlet operator in  $\Omega_R$ , so that the Poincaré inequality in  $\Omega_R$  (when  $p = 2$  in (A.2)) reads

$$\|v\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda(\Omega_R)}} \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)} \quad \forall v \in H_0^1(\Omega_R). \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Let  $J_0 : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $Y_0 : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be, respectively, the Bessel functions of the first and second kind of order zero, see [1] and Figure A.1.




Figure A.1: Plots of the Bessel functions  $J_0$  and  $Y_0$ .

**Proposition A.1.** Let  $R > 1$  and let  $\alpha = \alpha(R) > 0$  denote the first root of the equation

$$Y_0(\alpha)J_0\left(\frac{\alpha}{R}\right) = J_0(\alpha)Y_0\left(\frac{\alpha}{R}\right). \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Then,

$$\frac{\pi^2}{2R^2} \leq \lambda(\Omega_R) = \left(\frac{\alpha}{R}\right)^2 \leq \frac{10}{(R-1)^2}. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

**Proof.** The function

$$F(\rho) \doteq Y_0(\alpha)J_0\left(\frac{\alpha}{R}\rho\right) - J_0(\alpha)Y_0\left(\frac{\alpha}{R}\rho\right) \quad \forall \rho \in [1, R]$$

vanishes both at  $\rho = 1$  and  $\rho = R$  and has constant sign in  $(1, R)$ . Moreover, a simple computation shows that

$$-\Delta F(\rho) = \left(\frac{\alpha}{R}\right)^2 F(\rho) \quad \forall \rho \in (1, R),$$

implying the equality in (A.7). The left inequality in (A.7) follows from the inclusion  $\Omega_R \subset (-R, R)^2$  and the (decreasing) monotonicity of the least Dirichlet eigenvalue of  $-\Delta$ : indeed, recall that in the square  $(-R, R)^2$  it equals  $\pi^2/2R^2$ . The right inequality in (A.7) follows by taking  $v(\xi) \doteq (\rho - 1)(R - \rho)$  for  $\xi \in \Omega_R$  and by computing the ratio in (A.1) for  $p = 2$ .  $\square$

Value of $R$	Value of $\alpha$	Value of $\lambda(\Omega_R)$
1.1	34.5535	986.7308
1.3	13.6017	109.4711
1.5	9.4053	39.3158
1.7	7.6028	20.0011
2	6.2461	9.7533
3	4.6453	2.3977
4	4.0976	1.0494
5	3.8159	0.5824
6	3.642	0.3684
7	3.5227	0.2532
8	3.4351	0.1843
9	3.3677	0.14002
10	3.3139	0.1098
15	3.1504	0.0441
20	3.0644	0.0234
100	2.8009	0.0007




Figure A.2: Estimating the first Laplace-Dirichlet eigenvalue  $\lambda(\Omega_R)$  of  $\Omega_R$  for different values of  $R > 1$ .

It appears out of reach to solve equation (A.6) in closed form. Therefore, for different values of  $R > 1$ , we give a numerical approximation for the solution  $\alpha$  of (A.6) and, in turn, for the eigenvalue  $\lambda(\Omega_R)$  in (A.7). This is complemented with a plot of the interpolating curve in Figure A.2.

We now turn our attention to bounds for a different Sobolev constant. We introduce

$$\mu_0 = \text{the first zero of } J_0 \approx 2.40483, \quad (\text{A.8})$$

and we prove

**Theorem A.1.** *Let  $\Omega_R$  be as in (1.1). For any scalar or vector function  $w \in H_0^1(\Omega_R)$  one has*

$$\|w\|_{L^4(\Omega_R)}^2 \leq \frac{1}{\mu_0} \sqrt{\frac{2}{3\pi}(R^2 - 1)} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)}^2. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

In particular, for  $\mathcal{S}_4$  as in (A.1), we have

$$\mu_0 \sqrt{\frac{3\pi}{2(R^2 - 1)}} \leq \mathcal{S}_4 \leq 24\sqrt{5\pi} \frac{[(R^2 + 1)\log(R) + 1 - R^2](R^2 - 1)\log(R)}{\sqrt{\kappa_1}}, \quad (\text{A.10})$$

where we have defined

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_1 = & -1080 + 5400R^2 - 10800R^4 + 10800R^6 - 5400R^8 + 1080R^{10} - 2025\log(R) + 6075R^2\log(R) \\ & - 4050R^4\log(R) - 4050R^6\log(R) + 6075R^8\log(R) - 2025R^{10}\log(R) - 1700\log(R)^2 \\ & + 3400R^2\log(R)^2 - 1700R^4\log(R)^2 + 1700R^6\log(R)^2 - 3400R^8\log(R)^2 + 1700R^{10}\log(R)^2 \\ & - 750(1 - R^2)\log(R)^3 + 750R^8\log(R)^3 - 750R^{10}\log(R)^3 - 144\log(R)^4 + 144R^{10}\log(R)^4. \end{aligned}$$

**Proof.** From (A.3) we know that it suffices to consider scalar functions  $w \in H_0^1(\Omega_R)$ . After combining the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  given by del Pino-Dolbeault [5, Theorem 1] with some Hölder inequality, the following interpolation inequality was obtained in [10, Theorem 2.3]:

$$\|w\|_{L^4(\Omega_R)}^2 \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{3\pi}} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)} \|w\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)} \quad \forall w \in H_0^1(\Omega_R), \quad (\text{A.11})$$

which improves previous bounds by Ladyzhenskaya [19] (see also [20, Lemma 1, p.8]) and [9, Equation (II.3.9)]. Let  $\Omega^* \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  be a disk having the same measure as  $\Omega_R$ , so that its radius is given by  $\sqrt{R^2 - 1}$ . Since the Poincaré constant (least eigenvalue) in the unit disk is given by  $\mu_0^2$ , see (A.8), the Poincaré constant of  $\Omega^*$  is given by  $\mu_0^2/(R^2 - 1)$ . In view of the Faber-Krahn inequality [6, 18] this means that

$$\min_{w \in H_0^1(\Omega_R)} \frac{\|\nabla w\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)}}{\|w\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)}} \geq \min_{w \in H_0^1(\Omega^*)} \frac{\|\nabla w\|_{L^2(\Omega^*)}}{\|w\|_{L^2(\Omega^*)}} = \frac{\mu_0}{\sqrt{R^2 - 1}}.$$

Therefore,

$$\|w\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)} \leq \frac{\sqrt{R^2 - 1}}{\mu_0} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)} \quad \forall w \in H_0^1(\Omega_R) \quad (\text{A.12})$$

which, once inserted into (A.11), yields (A.9) and, consequently, the lower bound in (A.10). The upper bound in (A.10) follows by considering the function (defined in polar coordinates)

$$X_0(\rho) \doteq \frac{1}{4} \left[ (R^2 - 1) \frac{\log(\rho)}{\log(R)} + 1 - \rho^2 \right] \quad \forall \rho \in [1, R]. \quad (\text{A.13})$$




Figure A.3: Left: Graph of  $X_0$  in (A.13) for  $R = 3$ . Right: plot of  $\kappa_1$  in (A.10) as a function of  $R > 1$ .

Note that  $X_0 \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega_R})$  solves the torsion problem in  $\Omega_R$ :

$$-\Delta X_0 = 1 \quad \text{in } \Omega_R, \quad X_0 = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_R,$$

and can therefore be tested in the quotient (A.1).  $\square$

**Remark A.1.** From (A.10) we observe that, as expected,  $\mathcal{S}_4 \rightarrow 0$  as  $R \rightarrow \infty$ .

We then turn to the task of estimating the optimal Sobolev embedding constant  $\mathcal{S}_4$  defined in (A.1). By combining [23, Theorem 1.4] with [26, Proposition 1.2] (see also [24, Theorem 5.3]), we know that

$$\text{the function achieving the minimum in (A.1) is radial if } R \gg 1 \text{ and nonradial if } R \approx 1. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

This suggests to introduce the subspace of  $H_0^1(\Omega_R)$  comprising radial functions:

$$\mathcal{K}_0^1(\Omega_R) = \{v \in H_0^1(\Omega_R) \mid v(\xi) = v(\rho) \quad \forall \xi \in \Omega_R\},$$

and define the Sobolev constant of the embedding  $\mathcal{K}_0^1(\Omega_R) \subset L^4(\Omega_R)$  as

$$\mathcal{R}_0 \doteq \min_{v \in \mathcal{K}_0^1(\Omega_R) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)}^2}{\|v\|_{L^4(\Omega_R)}^2} = \sqrt{2\pi} \min_{v \in \mathcal{K}_0^1(\Omega_R) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\int_1^R \rho |v'(\rho)|^2 d\rho}{\sqrt{\int_1^R \rho |v(\rho)|^4 d\rho}}. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

We can then rephrase (A.14) as follows

**Corollary A.1.** For all  $R > 1$  we have  $\mathcal{S}_4 \leq \mathcal{R}_0$ . Moreover, there exist  $1 < R_* \leq R^* < \infty$  such that

$$\text{if } 1 < R < R_* \text{ then } \mathcal{S}_4 < \mathcal{R}_0, \quad \text{if } R > R^* \text{ then } \mathcal{S}_4 = \mathcal{R}_0.$$

For any  $R > 1$ ,  $\mathcal{R}_0$  provides an *upper bound* for  $\mathcal{S}_4$  and this upper bound becomes an *equality* if  $R$  is sufficiently large, in which case the positive function achieving the minimum in (A.1) is radial.

It is well-known [28, Chapter I] that any function  $v \in H_0^1(\Omega_R) \setminus \{0\}$  achieving the minimum in (A.1) satisfies the following semilinear elliptic equation:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta v = v^3, & v > 0 & \text{in } \Omega_R, \\ v = 0 & & \text{on } \partial\Omega_R. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.16})$$

The advantage of restricting to radial functions  $v \in \mathcal{K}_0^1(\Omega_R)$  is that (A.16) becomes the ODE:

$$\begin{cases} v''(\rho) + \frac{1}{\rho}v'(\rho) + v(\rho)^3 = 0, & v(\rho) > 0 & \forall \rho \in (1, R), \\ v(1) = v(R) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.17})$$

Value of $R$	Value of $a_*$	Value of $\mathcal{R}_0$
1.1	1004.0745	644.592
1.3	118.258	129.525
1.5	44.8402	62.5316
1.7	23.9763	39.057
2	12.5131	23.9345
3	3.70134	9.5259
4	1.87145	5.6654
5	1.16988	3.9517
6	0.8191	3.00219
7	0.61524	2.40486
8	0.48467	1.99753
9	0.39518	1.703
10	0.3307	1.48117
15	0.17205	0.8838
20	0.11095	0.622396
100	0.012	0.100268




Figure A.4: Estimating the *radial* Sobolev embedding constant (A.15) for different values of  $R > 1$ .

We determine the solution to (A.17) numerically. In order to avoid the obtainment of the trivial solution  $v \equiv 0$ , we apply a *shooting method*, that amounts to finding a solution to the problem

$$\begin{cases} v''(\rho) + \frac{1}{\rho}v'(\rho) + v(\rho)^3 = 0, & v(\rho) > 0 \quad \forall \rho \in (1, R), \\ v(1) = 0, & v'(1) = a_*, \end{cases}$$

for varying values of  $a_* > 0$ , which is modified until a numerical solution to (A.17) is found. With this procedure, for different values of  $R > 1$ , we obtained an approximation of the embedding constant  $\mathcal{R}_0$  given in (A.15). Our results are complemented with a plot of the interpolating curve in Figure A.4. We are then interested in comparing the data from Figure A.4 with the analytic bounds given in (A.10). This is displayed in Figure A.5 below.




Figure A.5: Behavior of the lower and upper bounds for  $\mathcal{S}_4$  as functions of  $R > 1$ .

As a mere curiosity, possibly suggesting conjectures on the behavior of  $\lambda(\Omega_R)$ , let us notice:

**Remark A.2.** By trivial extension and by the inclusions between  $L^q(\Omega_R)$  spaces we have, for any  $q \in [2, +\infty)$ , that

$$R \mapsto \mathcal{S}_q(R) \text{ is decreasing;} \quad \text{if } R \leq \sqrt{1 + 1/\pi}, \text{ then } q \mapsto \mathcal{S}_q(R) \text{ is decreasing,}$$

while we expect  $q \mapsto \mathcal{S}_q(R)$  to be increasing for large  $R$ . Moreover, by interpolation we have that

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \leq p < q < r < \infty &\implies \|w\|_{L^q(\Omega_R)}^2 \leq \|w\|_{L^p(\Omega_R)}^{2p(r-q)/q(r-p)} \|w\|_{L^r(\Omega_R)}^{2r(q-p)/q(r-p)} \quad \forall w \in H_0^1(\Omega_R) \\ &\implies \mathcal{S}_q(R) \geq \mathcal{S}_p(R)^{p(r-q)/q(r-p)} \mathcal{S}_r(R)^{r(q-p)/q(r-p)}, \end{aligned}$$

and also that

$$2 \leq q \leq \infty \implies \|w\|_{L^q(\Omega_R)}^2 \leq \|w\|_{L^2(\Omega_R)}^{4/q} \|w\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_R)}^{2-4/q} \quad \forall w \in L^\infty(\Omega_R).$$

**Acknowledgements.** The Department of Mathematics of the Politecnico di Milano was awarded by the MUR grant *Dipartimento di Eccellenza 2023-27* (Italy) who supported this research. The work of Filippo Gazzola and Gianmarco Sperone is part of the PRIN project 2022 ‘‘Partial differential equations and related geometric-functional inequalities’’, financially supported by the EU, in the framework of the ‘‘Next Generation EU initiative’’. Filippo Gazzola is also partially supported by INdAM. The work of Jiří Neustupa has been supported by the Grant Agency of the Czech Republic (grant No. 22-01591S) and by the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic (RVO 67985840).

The Authors declare that there is no conflict of interest. Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analyzed during the current study.

## References

- [1] M. Abramowitz and I. Stegun. *Handbook of Mathematical Functions with Formulas, Graphs, and Mathematical Tables*. United States Department of Commerce, National Bureau of Standards (NBS), 1964.
- [2] G. Arioli, F. Gazzola, and H. Koch. Uniqueness and bifurcation branches for planar steady Navier-Stokes equations under Navier boundary conditions. *Journal of Mathematical Fluid Mechanics*, 23(3):1–20, 2021.
- [3] M. Bogovskii. Solution of the first boundary value problem for the equation of continuity of an incompressible medium. *Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR*, 248(5):1037–1040, 1979.
- [4] I.-D. Chang and R. Finn. On the solutions of a class of equations occurring in continuum mechanics, with application to the Stokes paradox. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 7(1):388–401, 1961.
- [5] M. del Pino and J. Dolbeault. Best constants for Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequalities and applications to nonlinear diffusions. *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées*, 81:847–875, 2002.
- [6] G. Faber. Beweis, dass unter allen homogenen Membranen von gleicher Fläche und gleicher Spannung die kreisförmige den tiefsten Grundton gibt. *Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, pages 169–172, 1923.
- [7] C. Foias and R. Temam. Remarques sur les équations de Navier-Stokes stationnaires et les phénomènes successifs de bifurcation. *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa - Classe di Scienze*, 5(1):29–63, 1978.



- [8] I. Fragalà, F. Gazzola, and G. Sperone. Solenoidal extensions in domains with obstacles: explicit bounds and applications to Navier–Stokes equations. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 59(6):1–24, 2020.
- [9] G. P. Galdi. *An Introduction to the Mathematical Theory of the Navier–Stokes Equations: Steady-State Problems*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.
- [10] F. Gazzola and G. Sperone. Steady Navier–Stokes equations in planar domains with obstacle and explicit bounds for unique solvability. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 238(3):1283–1347, 2020.
- [11] F. Gazzola and G. Sperone. Bounds for Sobolev embedding constants in non-simply connected planar domains. In *Geometric Properties for Parabolic and Elliptic PDE’s*, pages 103–125. Springer, 2021.
- [12] F. Gazzola, G. Sperone, and T. Weth. A connection between symmetry breaking for Sobolev minimizers and stationary Navier–Stokes flows past a circular obstacle. *Applied Mathematics & Optimization*, 85(1):1–23, 2022.
- [13] V. Girault and P.-A. Raviart. *Finite Element Methods for Navier–Stokes Equations: Theory and Algorithms*, volume 5. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [14] K. K. Golovkin. Examples of the non-uniqueness and low stability of solutions of the equations of hydrodynamics. *USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics*, 5(4):115–132, 1965.
- [15] H. Helmholtz. Über Integrale der hydrodynamischen Gleichungen, welche den Wirbelbewegungen entsprechen. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, 55:25–55, 1858.
- [16] M. Korobkov and X. Ren. Stationary solutions to the Navier–Stokes system in an exterior plane domain: 90 years of search, mysteries and insights. *Journal of Mathematical Fluid Mechanics*, 25(3):55, 2023.
- [17] H. Kozono, Y. Terasawa, and Y. Wakasugi. Liouville-type theorems for the Taylor–Couette flow of the stationary Navier–Stokes equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.08451*, 2023.
- [18] E. Krahn. Über eine von Rayleigh formulierte Minimaleigenschaft des Kreises. *Mathematische Annalen*, 94(1):97–100, 1925.
- [19] O. A. Ladyzhenskaya. Solution “in the large” of the nonstationary boundary value problem for the Navier–Stokes system with two space variables. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 12:427–433, 1959.
- [20] O. A. Ladyzhenskaya. *The Mathematical Theory of Viscous Incompressible Flow*, volume 76. Gordon and Breach New York, 1969.
- [21] L. Landau and E. Lifshitz. *Theoretical Physics: Fluid Mechanics*, volume 6. Pergamon Press, 1987.
- [22] J. Leray. Étude de diverses équations intégrales non linéaires et de quelques problèmes que pose l’hydrodynamique. *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées*, 12:1–82, 1933.
- [23] S.-S. Lin. Semilinear elliptic equations on singularly perturbed domains. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 16:617–645, 1991.
- [24] S.-S. Lin. Existence of positive nonradial solutions for nonlinear elliptic equations in annular domains. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 332(2):775–791, 1992.

- [25] V. Maz'ya. Seventy five (thousand) unsolved problems in analysis and partial differential equations. *Integral Equations and Operator Theory*, 90:1–44, 2018.
- [26] A. I. Nazarov. The one-dimensional character of an extremum point of the Friedrichs inequality in spherical and plane layers. *Journal of Mathematical Sciences*, 102(5):4473–4486, 2000.
- [27] G. Stokes. On the effect of the internal friction of fluids on the motion of pendulums. *Transactions of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 9:8–106, 1851.
- [28] M. Struwe. *Variational Methods: Applications to Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations and Hamiltonian Systems*, volume 34. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [29] G. I. Taylor. Stability of a viscous liquid contained between two rotating cylinders. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Containing Papers of a Mathematical or Physical Character*, 223(605-615):289–343, 1923.
- [30] W. Velte. Stabilität und verzweigung stationärer lösungen der Navier-Stokesschen gleichungen beim Taylorproblem. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 22(1):1–14, 1966.
- [31] V. I. Yudovich. Secondary flows and fluid instability between rotating cylinders. *Journal of Applied Mathematics and Mechanics*, 30(4):822–833, 1966.
- [32] V. I. Yudovich. An example of loss of stability and generation of a secondary flow in a closed vessel. *Matematicheskii Sbornik*, 116(4):565–579, 1967.
- [33] E. Zeidler. *Nonlinear Functional Analysis and its Applications I: Fixed-Point Theorems*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.

Filippo Gazzola  
 Dipartimento di Matematica  
 Politecnico di Milano  
 Piazza Leonardo da Vinci 32  
 20133 Milan - Italy  
 filippo.gazzola@polimi.it

Jiří Neustupa  
 Institute of Mathematics  
 Czech Academy of Sciences  
 Žitná 25  
 115 67 Prague - Czech Republic  
 neustupa@math.cas.cz

Gianmarco Sperone  
 Dipartimento di Matematica  
 Politecnico di Milano  
 Piazza Leonardo da Vinci 32  
 20133 Milan - Italy  
 gianmarcosilvio.sperone@polimi.it