

WELL-POSEDNESS OF THE TWO-DIMENSIONAL STATIONARY NAVIER–STOKES EQUATIONS AROUND A UNIFORM FLOW

MIKIHIRO FUJII AND HIROYUKI TSURUMI

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we consider the solvability of the two-dimensional stationary Navier–Stokes equations on the whole plane \mathbb{R}^2 . In [6], it was proved that the stationary Navier–Stokes equations on \mathbb{R}^2 is ill-posed for solutions around zero. In contrast, considering solutions around the non-zero constant flow, the perturbed system has a better regularity in the linear part, which enables us to prove the unique existence of solutions in the scaling critical spaces of the Besov type.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we consider the two-dimensional stationary Navier–Stokes equations on the whole plane \mathbb{R}^2 :

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta v + (v \cdot \nabla)v + \nabla p = f, & x \in \mathbb{R}^2, \\ \operatorname{div} v = 0, & x \in \mathbb{R}^2. \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

Here $v = (v_1(x), v_2(x))$ and $p = p(x)$ denote the unknown velocity vector and the unknown pressure of the fluid at the point $x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, respectively, while $f = (f_1(x), f_2(x))$ is the given external force.

This system has been studied for a long time especially in the exterior domain $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega$, where Ω is a bounded domain with smooth boundary. In this case, the system (1.1) is considered in $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega$, and the following boundary conditions are assumed:

$$\begin{cases} v(x) = v_b(x), & x \in \partial\Omega, \\ v(x) \rightarrow v_\infty, & |x| \rightarrow \infty, \end{cases}$$

where v_b is a given boundary data and v_∞ is a constant vector. This problem becomes hard if $v_b \equiv 0$ and $v_\infty = 0$, since in the two-dimensional space, we cannot treat the nonlinear term $(v \cdot \nabla)v$ as a perturbation of the linear term at the spatial infinity. This problem stems from the fact that the stationary Stokes equations in the same situation have no solution, which is called the Stokes' paradox. Instead, Finn–Smith [5] solved this system with $f \equiv 0$ when v_∞ is small but non-zero, by analysis on the linearized term $-\Delta u + (v_\infty \cdot \nabla)u + \nabla p$, which is called Ossen operator. On the other hand, in the case $v_\infty = 0$, there are some studies solving this problem under special conditions. For example, Amick [1] solved when an exterior domain is invariant under the transformation $(x_1, x_2) \mapsto (-x_1, x_2)$, and this work was later generalized by Pileckas and Russo [19] for instance. For the disk $\Omega = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2; |x| < 1\}$, Hillairet and Wittwer [11] constructed stationary solutions around the swirl flow $\mu x^\perp / |x|^2$ for $f \equiv 0$ and $v_b = \mu x^\perp$ with a sufficiently large constant μ . Later on, Yamazaki [22] showed the existence of solutions for every $f = \operatorname{div} F$ with $F \in (L^2(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega))^4$ which

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35Q35, 76D03, 76D05.

Key words and phrases. the two-dimensional stationary Navier–Stokes equations; well-posedness; the scaling critical framework; anisotropic Besov spaces.

is invariant under some symmetric group action. For the rotating obstacle Ω , we refer to notable studies by Hishida [12], Higaki, Maekawa, and Nakahara [10], and Gallagher, Higaki, and Maekawa [7]. There are also several previous results on the whole plane \mathbb{R}^2 . For example, Yamazaki [21] solved (1.1) with $v \in L^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ when given external forces decay sufficiently and have some anti-symmetric forms. After that, Guillod [8] showed the existence of a pair (f, v) satisfying (1.1), where f is dependent on v and is around an arbitrarily given small vector field having zero integral and decaying faster than $|x|^{-3}$. Moreover, Guillod and Wittwer [9] found scaling invariant solutions to (1.1) with respect to a rotation conversion. Recently, Maekawa and the second author [18] showed the existence of classical solutions to external forces given around $\nabla^\perp \phi$, where ϕ is radial compactly supported function.

However, there still remains the problem on the unique existence of small solutions and those continuous dependence on given any small external forces in \mathbb{R}^2 . In this paper, we call it the well-posedness problem around $(f, v) = (0, 0)$. Such a problem in \mathbb{R}^n with $n \geq 3$ has been already investigated well by previous studies in the framework of critical spaces with regard to the invariant scaling $(f(x), v(x)) \mapsto (\lambda^3 f(\lambda x), \lambda v(\lambda x))$ ($\lambda > 0$) for (1.1). It is well-known as the Fujita–Kato principle (see [4]) that considering the solvability of partial differential equations in the scaling critical spaces is important, and there are many results for the non-stationary Navier–Stokes flow; see the works of Kato [14], Cannone–Planchon [2], and Koch–Tataru [15]. For the well-posedness of the stationary problem around zero flow on \mathbb{R}^n with $n \geq 3$ in the scaling critical framework, we refer to Chen [3] for the Lebesgue space, Kozono–Yamazaki [16] for the Morrey space, and Kaneko–Kozono–Shimizu [17] for the Besov space; as for the ill-posedness by the lack of continuity of the solution map $f \mapsto v$ in some large Besov norms, see the second author’s previous work [20]. In contrast, the well-posedness problem around $(f, v) = (0, 0)$ in \mathbb{R}^2 seems extremely difficult, because of a similar reason to the problem on exterior domains stated above. Indeed, the first author [6] recently showed the ill-posedness by the lack of continuity of the solution map $\dot{B}_{p,1}^{2/p-3}(\mathbb{R}^2) \ni f \mapsto u \in \dot{B}_{p,1}^{2/p-1}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with $1 \leq p \leq 2$, which is the strongest ill-posedness framework among scaling invariant Besov spaces, which implies that the solvability of the two dimensional solutions on the whole plane in just scaling critical spaces is almost hopeless unless we assume some spatial symmetric structure or some strong conditions presented in [8, 21, 22]. Therefore, it seems more hopeful to consider the well-posedness problem around the special solutions than around the trivial solution $v = 0$. In this sense, for example, the result of [18] can be regarded as the well-posedness around an exact solution to $f = \nabla^\perp \phi$. However, there seems to be very few previous results in this direction.

In this paper, we consider the unique existence of solutions around a non-zero uniform flow. Namely, we treat the well-posedness problem in the whole plane \mathbb{R}^2 around $(f, v) = (0, v_\infty)$, where $v_\infty \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ is a given constant vector. For this purpose, we aim to construct a solution $v = v_\infty + u$ with some perturbation u . Using the suitable orthogonal transformation, we may assume that $v_\infty = \alpha e_1 = (\alpha, 0)$, where $\alpha = |v_\infty| > 0$, and $e_1 := (1, 0)^T$. In addition, for the sake of simplicity of discussion, we assume here that the external force has the divergence form $f = \operatorname{div} F$ with some $F = \{F_{jk}(x)\}_{j,k=1,2}$. Then, the perturbation u should satisfy

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + \alpha \partial_{x_1} u = \mathbb{P} \operatorname{div}(F - u \otimes u), & x \in \mathbb{R}^2, \\ \operatorname{div} u = 0, & x \in \mathbb{R}^2, \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

where $\mathbb{P} = \{\delta_{jk} + \partial_{x_j} \partial_{x_k} (-\Delta)^{-1}\}_{j,k=1,2}$ denotes the Helmholtz projection. Then we show the well-posedness of the system (1.2) around $(F, u) = (0, 0)$ in critical spaces with respect to the invariant scaling $(F, u) \mapsto (\lambda^2 F(\lambda \cdot), \lambda u(\lambda \cdot))$. Here, the invariant scaling means that if (F, u) satisfies (1.2), then $(\lambda^2 F(\lambda \cdot), \lambda u(\lambda \cdot))$ satisfies (1.2) with α replaced by $\lambda \alpha$. Although there is a difference between the whole plane and the exterior domain, our result is similar to the result of Finn–Smith [5]. In contrast to their result, which only deal with a trivial external force $f \equiv 0$, it is significant in the sense that we can treat non-trivial external forces. Moreover, in the two-dimensional problem with few previous studies, our result presents a new category of the space of external force guaranteeing the existence of solutions.

Focusing on the anisotropy of the system (1.2), we first introduce the anisotropic Besov spaces. More precisely, we consider the Littlewood–Paley decomposition $g = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \Delta_j g$ only for x_2 -direction, and we treat x_1 like a time variable. From this point of view, we apply the Fourier transform only on x_2 , and solve the equation as an ordinary differential equation on x_1 . In addition, in order to utilize the effect of αe_1 , we define the hybrid anisotropic Besov norms. Concretely, we decompose a function g into the high frequency part $\{\Delta_j g\}_{2^j > \alpha}$ and the low frequency part $\{\Delta_j g\}_{2^j \leq \alpha}$, and take the anisotropic Besov norm differently. Here we should multiply the norm of high frequency part by a coefficient α^{-1/p_1} (p_1 is the integrability index for x_1) in order to show the required estimates and to apply the Banach fixed point principle. This assumption implies that if α is large, then the required smallness condition for F becomes relaxed. Conversely, as $\alpha \rightarrow +0$, such smallness condition becomes severe.

This paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we will reformulate the problem so that we clarify our direction to prove the well-posedness. In the third section, we will define the hybrid anisotropic Besov norms and state our main theorem. After that, we show some key estimates in the fourth section, and using them, we prove our main theorem in the fifth section.

2. REFORMULATION OF THE PROBLEM

To rewrite the equation (1.2), we first consider the linearized problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + \alpha \partial_{x_1} u = \mathbb{P} \operatorname{div} F, & x \in \mathbb{R}^2, \\ \operatorname{div} u = 0, & x \in \mathbb{R}^2. \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

Here, it follows from $\partial_{x_1}^2 (-\Delta)^{-1} = -1 - \partial_{x_2}^2 (-\Delta)^{-1}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \operatorname{div} F &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 + \partial_{x_1}^2 (-\Delta)^{-1} & \partial_{x_1} \partial_{x_2} (-\Delta)^{-1} \\ \partial_{x_1} \partial_{x_2} (-\Delta)^{-1} & 1 + \partial_{x_2}^2 (-\Delta)^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \partial_{x_1} F_{11} + \partial_{x_2} F_{12} \\ \partial_{x_1} F_{21} + \partial_{x_2} F_{22} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} -\partial_{x_2}^2 (-\Delta)^{-1} & \partial_{x_1} \partial_{x_2} (-\Delta)^{-1} \\ \partial_{x_1} \partial_{x_2} (-\Delta)^{-1} & 1 + \partial_{x_2}^2 (-\Delta)^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \partial_{x_1} F_{11} + \partial_{x_2} F_{12} \\ \partial_{x_1} F_{21} + \partial_{x_2} F_{22} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} -\partial_{x_2}^2 (-\Delta)^{-1} (\partial_{x_1} F_{11} + \partial_{x_2} F_{12}) + \partial_{x_1} \partial_{x_2} (-\Delta)^{-1} (\partial_{x_1} F_{21} + \partial_{x_2} F_{22}) \\ \partial_{x_1} \partial_{x_2} (-\Delta)^{-1} (\partial_{x_1} F_{11} + \partial_{x_2} F_{12}) + (1 + \partial_{x_2}^2 (-\Delta)^{-1}) (\partial_{x_1} F_{21} + \partial_{x_2} F_{22}) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= - \begin{bmatrix} \partial_{x_2} F_{21} + (-\Delta)^{-1} \partial_{x_2}^3 (F_{12} + F_{21}) + \partial_{x_1} (-\Delta)^{-1} \partial_{x_2}^2 (F_{11} - F_{22}) \\ \{\partial_{x_2} + (-\Delta)^{-1} \partial_{x_2}^3\} (F_{11} - F_{22}) - \partial_{x_1} \{F_{21} + (-\Delta)^{-1} \partial_{x_2}^2 (F_{12} + F_{21})\} \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_{x_1}^2 u_1 - \alpha \partial_{x_1} u_1 + \partial_{x_2}^2 u_1 &= \partial_{x_2} F_{21} + (-\Delta)^{-1} \partial_{x_2}^3 (F_{12} + F_{21}) \\ &\quad + \partial_{x_1} (-\Delta)^{-1} \partial_{x_2}^2 (F_{11} - F_{22}), \\ \partial_{x_1}^2 u_2 - \alpha \partial_{x_1} u_2 + \partial_{x_2}^2 u_2 &= \partial_{x_2} (F_{11} - F_{22}) + (-\Delta)^{-1} \partial_{x_2}^3 (F_{11} - F_{22}) \\ &\quad - \partial_{x_1} \{F_{21} + (-\Delta)^{-1} \partial_{x_2}^2 (F_{12} + F_{21})\}.\end{aligned}$$

In order to obtain the explicit solution formula for the above equations, we consider the following equations:

$$\partial_{x_1}^2 w^{(0)} - \alpha \partial_{x_1} w^{(0)} + \partial_{x_2}^2 w^{(0)} = g, \quad (2.2)$$

$$\partial_{x_1}^2 w^{(1)} - \alpha \partial_{x_1} w^{(1)} + \partial_{x_2}^2 w^{(1)} = \partial_{x_1} g, \quad (2.3)$$

$$\partial_{x_1}^2 \tilde{w}^{(0)} - \alpha \partial_{x_1} \tilde{w}^{(0)} + \partial_{x_2}^2 \tilde{w}^{(0)} = (-\Delta)^{-1} g, \quad (2.4)$$

$$\partial_{x_1}^2 \tilde{w}^{(1)} - \alpha \partial_{x_1} \tilde{w}^{(1)} + \partial_{x_2}^2 \tilde{w}^{(1)} = \partial_{x_1} (-\Delta)^{-1} g. \quad (2.5)$$

Applying the Fourier transform of (2.2) with respect to x_2 , we see that

$$\partial_{x_1}^2 \widehat{w^{(0)}} - \alpha \partial_{x_1} \widehat{w^{(0)}} - \xi_2^2 \widehat{w^{(0)}} = \widehat{g} \quad (2.6)$$

and the corresponding eigen frequencies are given by

$$\lambda_{\pm}(\xi_2) = \frac{\alpha \pm \sqrt{\alpha^2 + 4\xi_2^2}}{2}.$$

Hence, solving the ordinary differential equation (2.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{w^{(0)}}(x_1, \xi_2) &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 4\xi_2^2}} \int_{-\infty}^{x_1} e^{\lambda_-(\xi_2)(x_1-y_1)} \widehat{g}(y_1, \xi_2) dy_1 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 4\xi_2^2}} \int_{x_1}^{\infty} e^{\lambda_+(\xi_2)(x_1-y_1)} \widehat{g}(y_1, \xi_2) dy_1 \\ &=: \widehat{\mathcal{D}^{(0)}}[g](x_1, \xi_2).\end{aligned}$$

For the solution to (2.3), by the similar computation and the integration by parts, there holds

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{w^{(1)}}(x_1, \xi_2) &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 4\xi_2^2}} \int_{-\infty}^{x_1} e^{\lambda_-(\xi_2)(x_1-y_1)} \partial_{y_1} \widehat{g}(y_1, \xi_2) dy_1 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 4\xi_2^2}} \int_{x_1}^{\infty} e^{\lambda_+(\xi_2)(x_1-y_1)} \partial_{y_1} \widehat{g}(y_1, \xi_2) dy_1 \\ &= -\frac{\lambda_-(\xi_2)}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 4\xi_2^2}} \int_{-\infty}^{x_1} e^{\lambda_-(\xi_2)(x_1-y_1)} \widehat{g}(y_1, \xi_2) dy_1 \\ &\quad - \frac{\lambda_+(\xi_2)}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 4\xi_2^2}} \int_{x_1}^{\infty} e^{\lambda_+(\xi_2)(x_1-y_1)} \widehat{g}(y_1, \xi_2) dy_1 \\ &=: \widehat{\mathcal{D}^{(1)}}[g](x_1, \xi_2).\end{aligned}$$

In order to consider (2.4) and (2.5), we remark that it holds

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_{x_2} [(-\Delta)^{-1} g](x_1, \xi_2) &= \mathcal{F}_{x_1}^{-1} \left[\frac{1}{\xi_1^2 + \xi_2^2} \mathcal{F}_{x_1, x_2} [g](\xi_1, \xi_2) \right] (x_1) \\ &= \frac{1}{2|\xi_2|} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-|\xi_2||x_1-y_1|} \widehat{g}(y_1, \xi_2) dy_1,\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_{x_2} [\partial_{x_1} (-\Delta)^{-1} g] (x_1, \xi_2) &= \mathcal{F}_{x_1}^{-1} \left[\frac{i\xi_1}{\xi_1^2 + \xi_2^2} \mathcal{F}_{x_1, x_2} [g] (\xi_1, \xi_2) \right] (x_1) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{sgn}(x_1 - y_1) e^{-|\xi_2||x_1 - y_1|} \widehat{g}(y_1, \xi_2) dy_1.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{w}^{(0)}(x_1, \xi_2) &= -\frac{1}{2|\xi_2|\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 4\xi_2^2}} \int_{-\infty}^{x_1} e^{\lambda_-(\xi_2)(x_1 - y_1)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-|\xi_2||y_1 - z_1|} \widehat{g}(z_1, \xi_2) dz_1 dy_1 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2|\xi_2|\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 4\xi_2^2}} \int_{x_1}^{\infty} e^{\lambda_+(\xi_2)(x_1 - y_1)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-|\xi_2||y_1 - z_1|} \widehat{g}(z_1, \xi_2) dz_1 dy_1 \\ &=: \widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(0)}[g](x_1, \xi_2)\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{w}^{(1)}(x_1, \xi_2) &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 4\xi_2^2}} \int_{-\infty}^{x_1} e^{\lambda_-(\xi_2)(x_1 - y_1)} \\ &\quad \times \int_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{sgn}(y_1 - z_1) e^{-|\xi_2||y_1 - z_1|} \widehat{g}(z_1, \xi_2) dz_1 dy_1 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 4\xi_2^2}} \int_{x_1}^{\infty} e^{\lambda_+(\xi_2)(x_1 - y_1)} \\ &\quad \times \int_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{sgn}(y_1 - z_1) e^{-|\xi_2||y_1 - z_1|} \widehat{g}(z_1, \xi_2) dz_1 dy_1 \\ &=: \widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(1)}[g](x_1, \xi_2).\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{u}_1(x_1, \xi_2) &= \widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(0)} [\partial_{x_2} F_{21}] (x_1, \xi_2) + \widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(0)} [\partial_{x_2}^3 (F_{12} + F_{21})] (x_1, \xi_2) \\ &\quad + \widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(1)} [\partial_{x_2}^2 (F_{11} - F_{22})] (x_1, \xi_2) \\ &=: \widehat{\mathcal{D}}_1[F](x_1, \xi_2), \\ \widehat{u}_2(x_1, \xi_2) &= \widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(0)} [\partial_{x_2} (F_{11} - F_{22})] (x_1, \xi_2) + \widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(0)} [\partial_{x_2}^3 (F_{11} - F_{22})] (x_1, \xi_2) \\ &\quad - \widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(1)} [F_{21}] (x_1, \xi_2) - \widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(1)} [\partial_{x_2}^2 (F_{12} + F_{21})] (x_1, \xi_2) \\ &=: \widehat{\mathcal{D}}_2[F](x_1, \xi_2).\end{aligned}$$

and let $\mathcal{D}[F] = (\mathcal{D}_1[F], \mathcal{D}_2[F])$, where $\mathcal{D}_m[F] := \mathcal{F}_{x_2}^{-1} [\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_m[F]]$ for $m = 1, 2$.

From the above calculations, we define the notion of the mild solution to (1.2).

Definition 2.1. For a given external force F , we say that a vector field $u = (u_1(x), u_2(x))$ is a mild solution to (1.2) if u satisfy

$$u = \mathcal{D}[F - u \otimes u]. \quad (2.7)$$

In the following of this paper, we consider the equation (2.7) instead of (1.2).

3. MAIN RESULTS

In order to state the main results precisely, we introduce some function spaces. Let $\phi_0 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}_{\xi_2})$ satisfy

$$\text{supp } \phi_0 \subset \{\xi_2 \in \mathbb{R} ; 2^{-1} \leq |\xi_2| \leq 2\}, \quad 0 \leq \phi_0(\xi_2) \leq 1,$$

and

$$\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \phi_j(\xi_2) = 1 \quad \text{for all } \xi_2 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\},$$

where $\phi_j(\xi_2) := \phi_0(2^{-j}\xi_2)$. Then, the Littlewood-Paley frequency localized operators $\{\Delta_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are defined by

$$\Delta_j f := \mathcal{F}^{-1} [\phi_j(\xi_2) \mathcal{F}[f]].$$

Now, for $1 \leq p_1, p_2, q \leq \infty$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$, we define the anisotropic Besov spaces as

$$\dot{B}_{p_1, p_2; q}^s(\mathbb{R}^2) := \left\{ f : \mathbb{R}_{x_1} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}_{x_2}) / \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}_{x_2}) ; \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p_1, p_2; q}^s} < \infty \right\},$$

$$\|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p_1, p_2; q}^s} := \left\| \left\{ 2^{sj} \|\Delta_j f\|_{L_{x_1}^{p_1} L_{x_2}^{p_2}} \right\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \right\|_{\ell^q(\mathbb{Z})},$$

where $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ denotes the set of all polynomials on \mathbb{R} and we have used the abbreviation $L_{x_1}^{p_1} L_{x_2}^{p_2} := L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}_{x_1}; L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}_{x_2}))$. For $\alpha > 0$, we define the hybrid anisotropic Besov norms as

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p_1, p_2; q}^{h; \alpha}} &:= \left\| \left\{ 2^{sj} \|\Delta_j f\|_{L_{x_1}^{p_1} L_{x_2}^{p_2}} \right\}_{2^j > \alpha} \right\|_{\ell^q}, \\ \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p_1, p_2; q}^{\ell; \alpha}} &:= \left\| \left\{ 2^{sj} \|\Delta_j f\|_{L_{x_1}^{p_1} L_{x_2}^{p_2}} \right\}_{2^j \leq \alpha} \right\|_{\ell^q}. \end{aligned}$$

Using this we define the function spaces $D_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ as the sets of all distributions F and u on \mathbb{R}^2 satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \|F\|_{D_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} &:= \alpha^{-\frac{1}{p_1}} \|F\|_{\dot{B}_{p_1, p_2; q}^{h; \alpha} \frac{2}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} - 2} + \|F\|_{\dot{B}_{p_1, p_2; q}^{\ell; \alpha} \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} - 2} < \infty, \\ \|u\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} &:= \alpha^{-\frac{1}{p_1}} \|u\|_{\dot{B}_{p_1, p_2; q}^{h; \alpha} \frac{2}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} - 1} + \|u\|_{\dot{B}_{p_1, p_2; q}^{\ell; \alpha} \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} - 1} < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

respectively. We say $D_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ are the scaling critical data and solution spaces for (1.2), respectively. Here, see Remark 3.2 for the meaning of the scaling critical spaces.

Now, we state our main result of this article.

Theorem 3.1. *Let p_1, p_2 , and q satisfy*

$$\max \left\{ \frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p_2} \right) \right\} < \frac{1}{p_1} \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad 1 \leq p_2 < 4, \quad 1 \leq q \leq \infty.$$

Then, there exists a positive constant $\delta = \delta(p_1, p_2, q)$ and $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(p_1, p_2, q)$ such that for any $\alpha > 0$ and $F \in D_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with $\|F\|_{D_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} \leq \delta$, (1.2) possesses a unique mild solution u in the class

$$\left\{ u \in S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2) ; \|u\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} \leq \varepsilon \right\}.$$

Moreover, the data-to-solution map $D_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2) \ni F \mapsto u \in S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is Lipschitz continuous.

Remark 3.2. Let us mention some remarks on Theorem 3.1.

- (1) If (u, F) satisfies (1.2) with some α , then $(u_\lambda(x), F_\lambda(x)) := (\lambda u(\lambda x), \lambda^2 F(\lambda x))$ solves (1.2) with α replaced by $\lambda\alpha$ for all $\lambda > 0$. For this invariant scaling, there holds

$$\begin{aligned}\|F_\lambda\|_{D_{p_1, p_2; q}^{\lambda\alpha}} &= \|F\|_{D_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha}, \\ \|u_\lambda\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^{\lambda\alpha}} &= \|u\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha}\end{aligned}$$

for all dyadic numbers $\lambda > 0$, which means that the spaces $D_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ are the critical spaces for scalings F_λ and u_λ , respectively.

- (2) In the function space used in Theorem 3.1, the information on differentiability is given only for the x_2 direction; the study of solvability in a framework that can measure differentiability in both the x_1 and x_2 directions is a subject for future work.

4. KEY ESTIMATES

In this section, we prepare several estimates that play key roles in the proof of our main results.

Lemma 4.1. *There exist positive constants c and C such that*

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\Delta_j(\alpha^2 - \partial_{x_2}^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}f\right\|_{L^p} &\leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 2^{2j}}}\|\Delta_j f\|_{L^p}, \\ \|\Delta_j \lambda_\pm(D_2)f\|_{L^p} &\leq C|\lambda_\pm(2^j)|\|\Delta_j f\|_{L^p}, \\ \|\Delta_j e^{\mp\lambda_\pm(D_2)T}f\|_{L^p} &\leq C e^{\mp c\lambda_\pm(2^j)T}\|\Delta_j f\|_{L^p}, \\ \|\Delta_j e^{-|\partial_{x_2}|T}f\|_{L^p} &\leq C e^{-c2^j T}\|\Delta_j f\|_{L^p}\end{aligned}$$

for all $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $T > 0$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}_{x_2})$ with $\Delta_j f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}_{x_2})$.

Proof. The last estimate is shown in [13]. Thus, we prove the others. It follows from the Hausdorff–Young inequality and $\Delta_j = \widetilde{\Delta}_j \Delta_j$, where $\widetilde{\Delta}_j := \Delta_{j-1} + \Delta_j + \Delta_{j+1}$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\Delta_j(\alpha^2 - \partial_{x_2}^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}f\right\|_{L^p} &= \left\|\widetilde{\Delta}_j(\alpha^2 - \partial_{x_2}^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Delta_j f\right\|_{L^p} \\ &= \left\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\left[\widetilde{\phi}_j(\xi_2)(\alpha^2 + \xi_2^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right] * \Delta_j f\right\|_{L^p} \\ &\leq \left\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\left[\widetilde{\phi}_j(\xi_2)(\alpha^2 + \xi_2^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right]\right\|_{L^1} \|\Delta_j f\|_{L^p},\end{aligned}$$

where we have set $\widetilde{\phi}_j := \phi_{j-1} + \phi_j + \phi_{j+1}$. Here, we see by the change of the variable that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\left[\widetilde{\phi}_j(\xi_2)(\alpha^2 + \xi_2^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right](x_2)\right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}_{x_2})} \\ &= \left\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\left[\widetilde{\phi}_0(2^{-j}\xi_2)(\alpha^2 + \xi_2^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right](x_2)\right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}_{x_2})} \\ &= \left\|2^j \mathcal{F}^{-1}\left[\widetilde{\phi}_0(\xi_2)(\alpha^2 + 2^{2j}\xi_2^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right](2^j x_2)\right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}_{x_2})} \\ &= \left\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\left[\widetilde{\phi}_0(\xi_2)(\alpha^2 + 2^{2j}\xi_2^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right](x_2)\right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}_{x_2})}\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{1+x_2^2} dx_2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\| (1+x_2^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left[\tilde{\phi}_0(\xi_2) (\alpha^2 + 2^{2j} \xi_2^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right] (x_2) \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_{x_2})} \\
&= C \left\| \tilde{\phi}_0(\xi_2) (\alpha^2 + 2^{2j} \xi_2^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}_{\xi_2})} \\
&\leq C \left\| \tilde{\phi}_0(\xi_2) (\alpha^2 + 2^{2j} \xi_2^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_{\xi_2})} \\
&\quad + C \left\| \partial_{\xi_2} \tilde{\phi}_0(\xi_2) (\alpha^2 + 2^{2j} \xi_2^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_{\xi_2})} \\
&\quad + C \left\| \tilde{\phi}_0(\xi_2) 2^{2j} \xi_2 (\alpha^2 + 2^{2j} \xi_2^2)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_{\xi_2})} \\
&\leq C (\alpha^2 + 2^{2j})^{-\frac{1}{2}} + C 2^{2j} (\alpha^2 + 2^{2j})^{-\frac{3}{2}} \\
&\leq C (\alpha^2 + 2^{2j})^{-\frac{1}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of the first estimate.

On the other hand, since

$$|\lambda_+(\xi_2)| > |\lambda_-(\xi_2)| = \frac{2\xi_2^2}{\alpha + \sqrt{\alpha^2 + 4\xi_2^2}} \geq \xi_2^2 (\alpha^2 + 4\xi_2^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$$

for every ξ_2 , it holds for $|\xi_2| \sim 1$ that

$$|\partial_{\xi_2}(\lambda_{\pm}(2^j \xi_2))| = 2(2^j)^2 \xi_2 (\alpha^2 + 4(2^j)^2 \xi_2^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq C |\lambda_{\pm}(2^j)|.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \tilde{\phi}_0(\xi_2) \lambda_{\pm}(2^j \xi_2) \right\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}_{\xi_2})} \\
&= \sum_{k=0,1} \left\| \partial_{\xi_2}^k \tilde{\phi}_0(\xi_2) \lambda_{\pm}(2^j \xi_2) \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_{\xi_2})} + \left\| \tilde{\phi}_0(\xi_2) \partial_{\xi_2}(\lambda_{\pm}(2^j \xi_2)) \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_{\xi_2})} \\
&\leq C |\lambda_{\pm}(2^j)|.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, since $\mp \lambda_{\pm}(\xi_2) T = -|\lambda_{\pm}(\xi_2)| T$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \tilde{\phi}_0(\xi_2) e^{\mp \lambda_{\pm}(2^j \xi_2) T} \right\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}_{\xi_2})} \\
&= \sum_{k=0,1} \left\| \partial_{\xi_2}^k \tilde{\phi}_0(\xi_2) e^{\mp \lambda_{\pm}(2^j \xi_2) T} \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_{\xi_2})} + \left\| \tilde{\phi}_0(\xi_2) \partial_{\xi_2}(e^{\mp \lambda_{\pm}(2^j \xi_2) T}) \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_{\xi_2})} \\
&\leq C e^{\mp c \lambda_{\pm}(2^j) T} + C |\lambda_{\pm}(2^j)| T e^{\mp c \lambda_{\pm}(2^j) T} \\
&\leq C e^{\mp c \lambda_{\pm}(2^j) T}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence by a similar method to the first estimate, we also obtain the second and third estimates. \square

Using the above lemma via the linear solution formula derived in Section 2, we obtain the estimate for the linear solution to (2.1).

Lemma 4.2. *There exists an absolute positive constant C such that*

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{D}[F]\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^{\alpha}} &\leq C \alpha^{-\frac{1}{p_1}} \|F\|_{\dot{B}_{p_3, p_2; q}^{\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} + \frac{1}{p_3} - 2}; \alpha} \\
&\quad + C \alpha^{\frac{1}{p_1} - \frac{1}{p_3}} \|F\|_{\dot{B}_{p_3, p_2; q}^{-\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} + \frac{2}{p_3} - 2}; \alpha}
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ C\alpha^{-1+\frac{1}{p_3}-\frac{1}{p_1}} \|F\|_{\dot{B}_{p_3, p_2; q}^{\ell; \alpha}}^{\frac{1}{p_3}+\frac{1}{p_2}-1}$$

for all $\alpha > 0$, $1 \leq p_1, p_2, q \leq \infty$, $1 \leq p_3 \leq p_1$, and F provided that the right hand side is finite.

Proof. For the estimate of $\mathcal{D}^{(0)}[\partial_{x_2}g]$, we see by Lemma 4.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta_j \mathcal{D}^{(0)}[\partial_{x_2}g](x_1)\|_{L_{x_2}^{p_2}} &\leq \frac{C2^j}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 2^{2j}}} \int_{-\infty}^{x_1} e^{c\lambda_-(2^j)(x_1-y_1)} \|\Delta_j g(y_1, \cdot)\|_{L^{p_2}} dy_1 \\ &\quad + \frac{C2^j}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 2^{2j}}} \int_{x_1}^{\infty} e^{c\lambda_+(2^j)(x_1-y_1)} \|\Delta_j g(y_1, \cdot)\|_{L^{p_2}} dy_1. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the Hausdorff-Young inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta_j \mathcal{D}^{(0)}[\partial_{x_2}g]\|_{L_{x_1}^{p_1} L_{x_2}^{p_2}} &\leq \frac{C2^j}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 2^{2j}}} (-\lambda_-(2^j))^{-1+\frac{1}{p_3}-\frac{1}{p_1}} \|\Delta_j g\|_{L_{x_1}^{p_3} L_{x_2}^{p_2}} \\ &\quad + \frac{C2^j}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 2^{2j}}} (\lambda_+(2^j))^{-1+\frac{1}{p_3}-\frac{1}{p_1}} \|\Delta_j g\|_{L_{x_1}^{p_3} L_{x_2}^{p_2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Using two estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 2^{2j}}} &\leq \begin{cases} 2^{-j} & (2^j > \alpha), \\ \alpha^{-1} & (2^j \leq \alpha), \end{cases} \\ \lambda_+(2^j) \geq -\lambda_-(2^j) &= \frac{2\xi_2^2}{\alpha + \sqrt{\alpha^2 + 4\xi_2^2}} \geq \begin{cases} c2^j & (2^j > \alpha), \\ c\alpha^{-1}2^{2j} & (2^j \leq \alpha), \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\|\Delta_j \mathcal{D}^{(0)}[\partial_{x_2}g]\|_{L_{x_1}^{p_1} L_{x_2}^{p_2}} \leq \begin{cases} C2^{(-1+\frac{1}{p_3}-\frac{1}{p_1})j} \|\Delta_j g\|_{L_{x_1}^{p_3} L_{x_2}^{p_2}} & 2^j > \alpha, \\ C\alpha^{-\frac{1}{p_3}+\frac{1}{p_1}} 2^{(-1+\frac{2}{p_3}-\frac{2}{p_1})j} \|\Delta_j g\|_{L_{x_1}^{p_3} L_{x_2}^{p_2}} & 2^j \leq \alpha. \end{cases}$$

For the estimate of $\mathcal{D}^{(1)}[g]$, we see by Lemma 4.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta_j \mathcal{D}^{(1)}[g](x_1)\|_{L_{x_2}^{p_2}} &\leq \frac{C|\lambda_-(2^j)|}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 2^{2j}}} \int_{-\infty}^{x_1} e^{c\lambda_-(2^j)(x_1-y_1)} \|\Delta_j g(y_1, \cdot)\|_{L^{p_2}} dy_1 \\ &\quad + \frac{C\lambda_+(2^j)}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 2^{2j}}} \int_{x_1}^{\infty} e^{c\lambda_+(2^j)(x_1-y_1)} \|\Delta_j g(y_1, \cdot)\|_{L^{p_2}} dy_1. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the Hausdorff-Young inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta_j \mathcal{D}^{(1)}[g]\|_{L_{x_1}^{p_1} L_{x_2}^{p_2}} &\leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 2^{2j}}} (-\lambda_-(2^j))^{\frac{1}{p_3}-\frac{1}{p_1}} \|\Delta_j g\|_{L_{x_1}^{p_3} L_{x_2}^{p_2}} \\ &\quad + \frac{C}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 2^{2j}}} (\lambda_+(2^j))^{\frac{1}{p_3}-\frac{1}{p_1}} \|\Delta_j g\|_{L_{x_1}^{p_3} L_{x_2}^{p_2}} \end{aligned}$$

Using two estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 2^{2j}}} &\leq \begin{cases} 2^{-j} & (2^j > \alpha), \\ \alpha^{-1} & (2^j \leq \alpha), \end{cases} \\ -\lambda_-(2^j) \leq \lambda_+(2^j) &= \frac{\alpha + \sqrt{\alpha^2 + 2^{2j+2}}}{2} \leq \begin{cases} C2^j & (2^j > \alpha), \\ C\alpha & (2^j \leq \alpha), \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\|\Delta_j \mathcal{D}^{(1)}[g]\|_{L_{x_1}^{p_1} L_{x_2}^{p_2}} \leq \begin{cases} C2^{(-1+\frac{1}{p_3}-\frac{1}{p_1})j} \|\Delta_j g\|_{L_{x_1}^{p_3} L_{x_2}^{p_2}} & 2^j > \alpha, \\ C\alpha^{-1+\frac{1}{p_3}-\frac{1}{p_1}} \|\Delta_j g\|_{L_{x_1}^{p_3} L_{x_2}^{p_2}} & 2^j \leq \alpha. \end{cases}$$

For the estimate of $\Delta_j \tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{(0)}[\partial_{x_2}^3 g]$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{(1)}[\partial_{x_2}^2 g]$, we see by Lemma 4.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \Delta_j \tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{(0)}[\partial_{x_2}^3 g](x_1) \right\|_{L_{x_2}^{p_2}} + \left\| \Delta_j \tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{(1)}[\partial_{x_2}^2 g](x_1) \right\|_{L_{x_2}^{p_2}} \\ & \leq \frac{C2^{2j}}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 2^{2j}}} \int_{-\infty}^{x_1} e^{c\lambda_-(2^j)(x_1-y_1)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-c2^j|y_1-z_1|} \|\Delta_j g(z_1, \cdot)\|_{L^{p_2}} dz_1 dy_1 \\ & \quad + \frac{C2^{2j}}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 2^{2j}}} \int_{x_1}^{\infty} e^{c\lambda_+(2^j)(x_1-y_1)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-c2^j|y_1-z_1|} \|\Delta_j g(z_1, \cdot)\|_{L^{p_2}} dz_1 dy_1. \end{aligned}$$

Using the Hausdorff–Young inequality twice, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \Delta_j \tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{(0)}[\partial_{x_2}^3 g] \right\|_{L_{x_1}^{p_1} L_{x_2}^{p_2}} + \left\| \Delta_j \tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{(1)}[\partial_{x_2}^2 g] \right\|_{L_{x_1}^{p_1} L_{x_2}^{p_2}} \\ & \leq \frac{C2^{2j}}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 2^{2j}}} (-\lambda_-(2^j))^{-1+\frac{1}{p_3}-\frac{1}{p_1}} 2^{-j} \|\Delta_j g\|_{L_{x_1}^{p_3} L_{x_2}^{p_2}} \\ & \quad + \frac{C2^{2j}}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 2^{2j}}} (\lambda_+(2^j))^{-1+\frac{1}{p_3}-\frac{1}{p_1}} 2^{-j} \|\Delta_j g\|_{L_{x_1}^{p_3} L_{x_2}^{p_2}} \\ & \leq \begin{cases} C2^{(-1+\frac{1}{p_3}-\frac{1}{p_1})j} \|\Delta_j g\|_{L_{x_1}^{p_3} L_{x_2}^{p_2}} & 2^j > \alpha, \\ C\alpha^{-1+\frac{1}{p_3}-\frac{1}{p_1}} \|\Delta_j g\|_{L_{x_1}^{p_3} L_{x_2}^{p_2}} & 2^j \leq \alpha, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

Remark 4.3. Let $2 \leq p_1 \leq \infty$ and $p_3 := p_1/2$ in Lemma 4.2. Then, since we see by $2/p_1 - 1 \leq 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^{-\frac{1}{p_1}} \|F\|_{\dot{B}_{p_3, p_2; q}^{\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} + \frac{1}{p_3} - 2}}^{h; \alpha} &= \alpha^{-\frac{1}{p_1}} \|F\|_{\dot{B}_{\frac{p_1}{2}, p_2; q}^{\frac{3}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} - 2}}^{h; \alpha} \\ \alpha^{\frac{1}{p_1} - \frac{1}{p_3}} \|F\|_{\dot{B}_{p_3, p_2; q}^{\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} + \frac{2}{p_3} - 2}}^{\ell; \alpha} &= \alpha^{-\frac{1}{p_1}} \|F\|_{\dot{B}_{\frac{p_1}{2}, p_2; q}^{\frac{3}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} - 2}}^{\ell; \alpha} \\ \alpha^{-1 + \frac{1}{p_3} - \frac{1}{p_1}} \|F\|_{\dot{B}_{p_3, p_2; q}^{\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} - 1}}^{\ell; \alpha} &= \alpha^{-1 + \frac{1}{p_1}} \|F\|_{\dot{B}_{\frac{p_1}{2}, p_2; q}^{\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} - 1}}^{\ell; \alpha} \leq \alpha^{-\frac{1}{p_1}} \|F\|_{\dot{B}_{\frac{p_1}{2}, p_2; q}^{\frac{3}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} - 2}}^{\ell; \alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

it holds

$$\|\mathcal{D}[F]\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} \leq C\alpha^{-\frac{1}{p_1}} \|F\|_{\dot{B}_{\frac{p_1}{2}, p_2; q}^{\frac{3}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} - 2}}.$$

Next, we provide lemmas for nonlinear estimates.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\alpha > 0$, and let p_1, p_2, q satisfy*

$$\max \left\{ \frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p_2} \right) \right\} < \frac{1}{p_1} \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad 1 \leq p_2 < 4, \quad 1 \leq q \leq \infty.$$

Then, there exists a positive constant $C = C(p_1, p_2, q)$ such that

$$\alpha^{-\frac{1}{p_1}} \|fg\|_{\dot{B}_{\frac{p_1}{2}, p_2; q}^{\frac{3}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} - 2}} \leq C \|f\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} \|g\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha}$$

for all $f, g \in S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

Proof. By the Bony paraproduct decomposition, it holds

$$fg = T_f g + R(f, g) + T_g f,$$

where

$$T_f g := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(\sum_{\ell \leq k-3} \Delta_\ell f \right) \Delta_k g, \quad R(f, g) := \sum_{|k-\ell| \leq 2} \Delta_k f \Delta_\ell g.$$

It follows from

$$\Delta_j T_f g = \Delta_j \sum_{|m| \leq 3} \left(\sum_{\ell \leq j+m-3} \Delta_\ell f \right) \Delta_{j+m} g$$

that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta_j T_f g\|_{L_{x_1}^{\frac{p_1}{2}} L_{x_2}^{p_2}} &\leq C \sum_{|m| \leq 3} \sum_{\ell \leq j+m-3} \|\Delta_\ell f\|_{L_{x_1}^{p_1} L_{x_2}^\infty} \|\Delta_{j+m} g\|_{L_{x_1}^{p_1} L_{x_2}^{p_2}} \\ &\leq C 2^{(1-\frac{1}{p_1})j} \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p_1, \infty; q}^{\frac{1}{p_1}-1}} \sum_{|m| \leq 3} \|\Delta_{j+m} g\|_{L_{x_1}^{p_1} L_{x_2}^{p_2}} \\ &\leq C 2^{(1-\frac{1}{p_1})j} \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p_1, p_2; q}^{\frac{1}{p_1}+\frac{1}{p_2}-1}} \sum_{|m| \leq 3} \|\Delta_{j+m} g\|_{L_{x_1}^{p_1} L_{x_2}^{p_2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying this by $\alpha^{-\frac{1}{p_1}} 2^{(\frac{3}{p_1}+\frac{1}{p_2}-2)j}$ and taking $\ell^q(\mathbb{Z})$ -norm, we have

$$\alpha^{-\frac{1}{p_1}} \|T_f g\|_{\dot{B}_{\frac{p_1}{2}, p_2; q}^{\frac{3}{p_1}+\frac{1}{p_2}-2}} \leq C \alpha^{-\frac{1}{p_1}} \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p_1, p_2; q}^{\frac{1}{p_1}+\frac{1}{p_2}-1}} \|g\|_{\dot{B}_{p_1, p_2; q}^{\frac{2}{p_1}+\frac{1}{p_2}-1}}.$$

Using

$$\|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p_1, p_2; q}^{\frac{1}{p_1}+\frac{1}{p_2}-1}} \leq \|f\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha}, \quad \alpha^{-\frac{1}{p_1}} \|g\|_{\dot{B}_{p_1, p_2; q}^{\frac{2}{p_1}+\frac{1}{p_2}-1}} \leq \|g\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha},$$

we have

$$\alpha^{-\frac{1}{p_1}} \|T_f g\|_{\dot{B}_{\frac{p_1}{2}, p_2; q}^{\frac{3}{p_1}+\frac{1}{p_2}-2}} \leq C \|f\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} \|g\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha}.$$

Similarly, it holds

$$\alpha^{-\frac{1}{p_1}} \|T_g f\|_{\dot{B}_{\frac{p_1}{2}, p_2; q}^{\frac{2}{p_1}+\frac{1}{p_2}-2}} \leq C \|f\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} \|g\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha}.$$

For the estimate of $R(f, g)$, we first consider the case $1 \leq p_2 \leq 2$. By the Bernstein inequality, we see that

$$\alpha^{-\frac{1}{p_1}} \|R(f, g)\|_{\dot{B}_{\frac{p_1}{2}, p_2; q}^{\frac{3}{p_1}+\frac{1}{p_2}-2}} \leq C \alpha^{-\frac{1}{p_1}} \|R(f, g)\|_{\dot{B}_{\frac{p_1}{2}, 1; q}^{\frac{3}{p_1}-1}}.$$

Using

$$\Delta_j R(f, g) = \Delta_j \sum_{k \geq j-4} \Delta_k f \sum_{|k-\ell| \leq 2} \Delta_\ell g,$$

we have

$$2^{(\frac{3}{p_1}-1)j} \|\Delta_j R(f, g)\|_{L_{x_1}^{\frac{p_1}{2}} L_{x_2}^1}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C \sum_{k \geq j-4} 2^{(\frac{3}{p_1}-1)(j-k)} 2^{(\frac{3}{p_1}-1)k} \|\Delta_k f\|_{L_{x_1}^{p_1} L_{x_2}^{p_2}} \sum_{|k-\ell| \leq 2} \|\Delta_\ell g\|_{L_{x_1}^{p_1} L_{x_2}^{p_2'}} \\
&\leq C \sum_{k \geq j-4} 2^{(\frac{3}{p_1}-1)(j-k)} 2^{(\frac{1}{p_1}+\frac{1}{p_2}-1)k} \|\Delta_k f\|_{L_{x_1}^{p_1} L_{x_2}^{p_2}} \sum_{|k-\ell| \leq 2} 2^{(\frac{2}{p_1}+\frac{1}{p_2}-1)\ell} \|\Delta_\ell g\|_{L_{x_1}^{p_1} L_{x_2}^{p_2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

It holds by the Hausdorff–Young inequality via $3/p_1 - 1 > 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha^{-\frac{1}{p_1}} \|R(f, g)\|_{\dot{B}_{\frac{p_1}{2}, 1; q}^{\frac{3}{p_1}-1}} \\
&\leq C \alpha^{-\frac{1}{p_1}} \left\| \left\{ 2^{(\frac{1}{p_1}+\frac{1}{p_2}-1)k} \|\Delta_k f\|_{L_{x_1}^{p_1} L_{x_2}^{p_2}} \sum_{|k-\ell| \leq 2} 2^{(\frac{2}{p_1}+\frac{1}{p_2}-1)\ell} \|\Delta_\ell g\|_{L_{x_1}^{p_1} L_{x_2}^{p_2}} \right\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \right\|_{\ell^q(\mathbb{Z})} \\
&\leq C \alpha^{-\frac{1}{p_1}} \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p_1, p_2; q}^{\frac{1}{p_1}+\frac{1}{p_2}-1}} \|g\|_{\dot{B}_{p_1, p_2; q}^{\frac{2}{p_1}+\frac{1}{p_2}-1}} \\
&\leq C \|f\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} \|g\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the case of $p_2 \geq 2$, it holds by a similarly argument as above $3/p_1 + 2/p_2 - 2 > 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha^{-\frac{1}{p_1}} \|R(f, g)\|_{\dot{B}_{\frac{p_1}{2}, p_2; q}^{\frac{3}{p_1}+\frac{1}{p_2}-2}} &\leq C \alpha^{-\frac{1}{p_1}} \|R(f, g)\|_{\dot{B}_{\frac{p_1}{2}, \frac{p_2}{2}; q}^{\frac{3}{p_1}+\frac{2}{p_2}-2}} \\
&\leq C \alpha^{-\frac{1}{p_1}} \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p_1, p_2; q}^{\frac{1}{p_1}+\frac{1}{p_2}-1}} \|g\|_{\dot{B}_{p_1, p_2; q}^{\frac{2}{p_1}+\frac{1}{p_2}-1}} \\
&\leq C \|f\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} \|g\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we complete the proof. \square

As a corollary of Lemmas 4.2 and 4.4, we have the followings.

Corollary 4.5. *Let $\alpha > 0$, and let p_1, p_2, q satisfy*

$$\max \left\{ \frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p_2} \right) \right\} < \frac{1}{p_1} \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad 1 \leq p_2 < 4, \quad 1 \leq q \leq \infty.$$

Then, there exists a positive constant $C_0 = C_0(p_1, p_2, q)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{D}[F]\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} &\leq C_0 \|F\|_{D_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha}, \\
\|\mathcal{D}[u \otimes v]\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} &\leq C_0 \|u\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} \|v\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha}
\end{aligned}$$

for all $F \in D_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $u, v \in S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

Proof. Using Lemma 4.2 with $p_3 = p_1$, we obtain the first estimate. It follows from Lemma 4.2 with $p_3 = p_1/2$ and Lemma 4.4 that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{D}[u \otimes v]\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} &\leq C \alpha^{-\frac{1}{p_1}} \|u \otimes v\|_{\dot{B}_{\frac{p_1}{2}, p_2; q}^{\frac{3}{p_1}+\frac{1}{p_2}-2}} \\
&\leq C \|u\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} \|v\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we complete the proof. \square

5. PROOFS OF MAIN RESULTS

We are now in a position to present the proof of our main result.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Let C_0 be the positive constant appearing in Corollary 4.5 and let $F \in D_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfy

$$\|F\|_{D_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} \leq \frac{1}{8C_0^2}.$$

To construct a mild solution to (1.2), we consider a map

$$\Phi[u] := \mathcal{D}[F - u \otimes u]$$

on the complete metric space $(X_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha, d_{X_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha})$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} X_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha &:= \left\{ u \in S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2) ; \|u\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} \leq 2C_0 \|F\|_{D_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} \right\}, \\ d_{X_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha}(u, v) &:= \|u - v\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

Then it follows from Corollary 4.5 that for any $u, v \in X_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi[u]\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} &\leq C_0 \|F\|_{D_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} + C_0 \|u\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha}^2 \\ &\leq C_0 \|F\|_{D_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} + 4C_0^3 \|F\|_{D_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha}^2 \\ &\leq 2C_0 \|F\|_{D_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi[u] - \Phi[v]\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} &\leq C_0 \|u\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} \|u - v\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} + C_0 \|u - v\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} \|v\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} \\ &\leq 4C_0^2 \|F\|_{D_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} \|u - v\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|u - v\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

which is implied by $\Phi[u] - \Phi[v] = \mathcal{D}[u \otimes (u - v)] + \mathcal{D}[(u - v) \otimes v]$. Hence, Φ is a contraction map on $X_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha$, and thus it follows from the Banach fixed point principle that there exists a unique $u \in X_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha$ which yields a mild solution to (1.2).

For the uniqueness, if u and v are mild solution to (1.2) in the class

$$\left\{ u \in S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2) ; \|u\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} \leq \frac{1}{4C_0} \right\},$$

where we note that the above set includes $X_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha$. Then, by Corollary 4.5, it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - v\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} &= \|\Phi[u] - \Phi[v]\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} \\ &\leq C_0 \|u\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} \|u - v\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} + C_0 \|u - v\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} \|v\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|u - v\|_{S_{p_1, p_2; q}^\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $u = v$. Thus, we complete the proof. \square

Data availability.

Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

Conflict of interest.

The author has declared no conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgements.

The first author was supported by Grant-in-Aid for Research Activity Start-up, Grant Number JP23K19011. The second author was supported by Grant-in-Aid for JSPS Fellows and Early-Career Scientists, Grant Number JP22KJ1642 and JP24K16946, respectively.

REFERENCES

- [1] C.-J. Amick, Existence of solutions to the nonhomogeneous steady Navier-Stokes equations, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **33** (1984), no. 6, 817–830.
- [2] M. Cannone and F. Planchon, Self-similar solutions for Navier-Stokes equations in \mathbb{R}^3 . *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **21** (1996), no.1-2, 179–193.
- [3] Z. Chen, L^n solutions of the stationary and nonstationary Navier-Stokes equations in \mathbb{R}^n , *Pacific J. Math.* **158** (1993), no. 2, 293–303.
- [4] H. Fujita and T. Kato, On the Navier–Stokes initial value problem I, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **16** (1964), no.4, 269–315.
- [5] R. Finn and D.-R. Smith, On the stationary solution of the Navier-Stokes equations in two dimensions, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **25** (1967), 26–39.
- [6] M. Fujii, Ill-posedness of the two-dimensional stationary Navier–Stokes equations on the whole plane, *Ann. PDE*, **10** (2024), no. 1, Paper No. 10
- [7] I. Gallagher, M. Higaki, Y. Maekawa, On stationary two-dimensional flows around a fast rotating disk, *Math. Nachr.* **292** (2019), no. 2, 273–308.
- [8] J. Guillod, Steady solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations in the plane, preprint, arXiv:1511.03938 [Math. AP]
- [9] J. Guillod, P. Wittwer, Generalized scale-invariant solutions to the two-dimensional stationary Navier–Stokes equations. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **47** (2015), no. 1, 955–968.
- [10] M. Higaki, Y. Maekawa, Y. Nakahara, On stationary Navier-Stokes flows around a rotating obstacle in two-dimensions, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **228** (2018), no. 2, 603–651.
- [11] M. Hillairet and P. Wittwer, On the existence of solutions to the planar exterior Navier-Stokes system, *J. Differential Equations* **255** (2013), 2996–3019.
- [12] T. Hishida, An existence theorem for the Navier-Stokes flow in the exterior of a rotating obstacle, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **150** (1999), 307–348.
- [13] T. Iwabuchi, Global solutions for the critical Burgers equation in the Besov spaces and the large time behavior. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire* **32** (2015), no 3, 955–968.
- [14] T. Kato, Strong L^p -solutions of the Navier-Stokes equation in \mathbb{R}^m , with applications to weak solutions. *Math. Z.* **187** (1984) 471–480.
- [15] H. Koch and D. Tataru, Well-posedness for the Navier–Stokes Equations, *Adv. in Math.* **157** (2001), no. 1, 22–35.
- [16] H. Kozono and M. Yamazaki, The stability of small stationary solutions in Morrey spaces of the Navier-Stokes equation, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **44** (1995), no. 4, 1307–1336.
- [17] K. Kaneko, H. Kozono and S Shimizu, Stationary solution to the Navier-Stokes equations in the scaling invariant Besov space and its regularity, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **68** (2019), no. 3, 857–880.
- [18] Y. Maekawa and H. Tsurumi, Existence of the stationary Navier-Stokes flow in \mathbb{R}^2 around a radial flow, *J. Differential Equations* **350** (2023), 202–227.
- [19] K. Pileckas, R. Russo, On the existence of vanishing at infinity symmetric solutions to the plane stationary exterior Navier–Stokes problem. *Math. Ann.* **352** (2012), no. 3, 643–658.
- [20] H. Tsurumi, Well-posedness and ill-posedness problems of the stationary Navier-Stokes equations in scaling invariant Besov spaces, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **234** (2019), 911–923.
- [21] M. Yamazaki, The stationary Navier-Stokes equation on the whole plane with external force with antisymmetry, *Ann. Univ. Ferrara* **55** (2009), no. 2, 407–423.
- [22] M. Yamazaki, Two-dimensional stationary Navier-Stokes equations with 4-cyclic symmetry, *Math. Nachr.* **289** (2016), no. 17-18 2281–2311.

(M. Fujii) INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS FOR INDUSTRY, KYUSHU UNIVERSITY, FUKUOKA 819-0395, JAPAN

Email address, M. Fujii: `fujii.mikihiro.096@m.kyushu-u.ac.jp`

(H. Tsurumi) GRADUATE SCHOOL OF TECHNOLOGY, INDUSTRIAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES, TOKUSHIMA UNIVERSITY, TOKUSHIMA 770-8506, JAPAN

Email address, H. Tsurumi: `tsurumi.hiroyuki@tokushima-u.ac.jp`