

# Non-uniqueness of Leray weak solutions of the forced MHD equations \*

Jun Wang<sup>†</sup>, Fei Xu<sup>‡</sup>, Yong Zhang<sup>§</sup>

## Abstract

In this paper, we exhibit non-uniqueness of Leray weak solutions of the forced magnetohydrodynamic (MHD for short) equations. Similar to the solutions constructed in [12], we first find a special steady solution of ideal MHD equations whose linear instability was proved in [21]. It is possible to perturb the unstable scenario of ideal MHD to 3D viscous and resistive MHD equations, which can be regarded as the first unstable "background" solution. Our perturbation argument is based on the spectral theoretic approach [35]. The second solution we would construct is a trajectory on the unstable manifold associated to the unstable steady solution. It is worth noting that these solutions live precisely on the borderline of the known well-posedness theory.

*Keywords:* MHD equations, Leray weak solution, non-uniqueness, megneto-rotational instability(MRI), constraction mapping principle

*AMS Subjection Classification(2020):* 76B15, 47J15, 76B03.

---

\*Wang was supported by National Key R&D Program of China (No. 2022YFA1005601), National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 12371114) and Outstanding Young foundation of Jiangsu Province (No. BK20200042). Xu was supported by the Postdoctoral Science Foundation of China (2023M731381). Zhang was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 12301133), the Postdoctoral Science Foundation of China (No. 2023M741441) and Jiangsu Education Department (No. 23KJB110007).

<sup>†</sup>School of Mathematical Sciences, Jiangsu University, Zhenjiang, 212013, P.R. China  
E-mail: wangmath2011@126.com

<sup>‡</sup>School of Mathematical Sciences, Jiangsu University, Zhenjiang, 212013, P.R. China  
E-mail: xufeiuj@s@126.com

<sup>§</sup>Corresponding author.

School of Mathematical Sciences, Jiangsu University, Zhenjiang, 212013, P.R. China  
E-mail: 18842629891@163.com

# 1 Introduction and main results

Consider the three-dimensional magnetohydrodynamic (MHD for short) system on  $\mathbb{R}^3$

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v + v \cdot \nabla v - \Delta v + \nabla p = H \cdot \nabla H + f_1 \\ \partial_t H + v \cdot \nabla H - \Delta H = H \cdot \nabla v + f_2, \\ \operatorname{div} v = \operatorname{div} H = 0, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where  $v(t, x) : (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ ,  $H(t, x) : (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ ,  $p(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}$  correspond to the velocity field, magnetic field and pressure of the fluid, respectively, and  $f = (f_1, f_2)$  is the given body force. We impose the initial condition

$$(v, H)(0, x) = (v^0, H^0)(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^3. \quad (1.2)$$

Among various hydrodynamic models, the viscous and resistive MHD system is a canonical macroscopic model to describe the motion of conductive fluid, such as plasma or liquid metals, under a complicated interaction between the electromagnetic phenomenon and fluid dynamical phenomenon (see [1]). We refer the reader to [2–5] for more physical interpretations of the MHD system. In particular, in the case without magnetic fields, the system (1.1) would reduce to the classical incompressible Navier-Stokes equation (NSE for short). When ignoring viscous and resistive effects, the system (1.1) would become the ideal MHD system, namely,

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v + v \cdot \nabla v + \nabla p = H \cdot \nabla H \\ \partial_t H + v \cdot \nabla H = H \cdot \nabla v, \\ \operatorname{div} v = \operatorname{div} H = 0, \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

with the initial condition

$$(v, H)(0, x) = (v^0, H^0)(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \quad (1.4)$$

The incompressible ideal MHD system (1.3) is the classical macroscopic model coupling the Maxwell equations to the evolution of an electrically conducting incompressible fluid [3, 4]. In the case  $H = 0$ , it's obvious that (1.3) reduces to the Euler equation.

The well-posedness problem of NSE and MHD has been extensively studied in the literature. For the initial data with finite energy, the existence of global weak solution  $u$  to NSE was first proved by Leray [6] in 1934 and later by Holf [7] in 1951 in bounded domains, which satisfies  $u \in \mathcal{C}_{weak}([0, +\infty); L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^2([0, +\infty); \dot{H}^1(\Omega))$  and obeys the following energy inequality

$$\|u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\nu \int_{t_0}^t \|\nabla u(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \leq \|u(t_0)\|_{L^2}^2 \quad (1.5)$$

for any  $t > 0$  and a.e.  $t_0 \geq 0$ . Similar to the Navier-Stokes equation, a global weak solution (in the sense of Definition 1.1) and local strong solution to (1.1) with the initial

boundary value condition were constructed by Duvant and Lions [8]. Later, the results were extended to the Cauchy problem by Sermange and Terman [5], where their main tools are regularity theory of the Stokes operator and the energy method.

Now let us first recall the notion of Leray weak solution of MHD system (1.1) for each divergence-free initial value  $(v^0, H^0)(x)$  and body force  $f_i \in L_t^1 L_x^2 (i = 1, 2)$ . Denote that  $L_\sigma^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$  is the space of divergence-free vector fields in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ .

**Definition 1.1.** *The pair  $(v, H) \in L^\infty(0, T; L_\sigma^2(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^2(0, T; W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3))$  is called as Leray weak solution in  $[0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^3$  if there holds that*

(1) *The pair  $(v, H)$  solves (1.1) in the distribution sense*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v \cdot \partial_t \varphi - v \cdot \nabla v \cdot \varphi + H \cdot \nabla H \cdot \varphi - \nabla u \cdot \nabla \varphi dx dt \\
&= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v^0 \cdot \varphi(\cdot, 0) dx - \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f_1 \varphi dt dx \\
& \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} H \cdot \partial_t \phi - v \cdot \nabla H \cdot \phi + H \cdot \nabla v \cdot \phi - \nabla H \cdot \nabla \varphi dx dt \\
&= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} H^0 \cdot \phi(\cdot, 0) dx - \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f_2 \phi dt dx
\end{aligned} \tag{1.6}$$

for all  $\varphi, \phi \in C_0^\infty([0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^3)$  and the initial data  $v^0, H^0 \in L_\sigma^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ .

(2) *Such solution pair  $(v, H)$  satisfies the energy inequality*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |v(t)|^2 + |H(t)|^2 dx + \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla v(t)|^2 + |\nabla H(t)|^2 dx dt \\
& \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |v^0|^2 + |H^0|^2 dx + \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f_1 v + f_2 H dx dt
\end{aligned} \tag{1.7}$$

It's known that Leray weak solutions of MHD system (1.1) enjoy several nice properties, including the partial regularity and weak-strong uniqueness. However, the uniqueness of the weak solutions still remains one of the most challenging problems. In this paper, we will answer the uniqueness question in the negative. Our main result can be stated as follows.

**Theorem 1.2.** *There exist two distinct Leray weak solutions  $(v_1, H_1), (v_2, H_2)$  to the forced viscous and resistive MHD system (1.1) on  $(0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^3$  with body force  $(f_1, f_2) \in (L_t^1 L_x^2)^2$ .*

Recall the scaling property of MHD equation, if  $(v(x, t), H(x, t), p(x, t))$  is a solution of (1.1) with force  $f_i(x, t) (i = 1, 2)$ , then for any  $\lambda > 0$ ,

$$v^\lambda(x, t) = \lambda v(\lambda x, \lambda^2 t), \quad H^\lambda(x, t) = \lambda H(\lambda x, \lambda^2 t), \quad p^\lambda(x, t) = \lambda^2 p(\lambda x, \lambda^2 t) \tag{1.8}$$

is also a solution with force  $f_i(x, t) = \lambda^3 f_i(\lambda x, \lambda^2 t)$ . A particular class of solution are the *self-similar* solutions, that is, the solutions of MHD equations on  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}$  invariant

under the scaling symmetry. We will finish the proof of Theorem 1.2 by following the similar techniques developed in recent work of Albritton-Brué-Colombo [12]. However, it is worth noting that the work is not just a parallel extension. The addition of magnetic field would bring some new difficulties. Especially, it is vital to construct a smooth and decaying unstable steady state of the forced MHD equations in three dimension. Considering the similarity variables

$$\xi = \frac{x}{\sqrt{t}}, \quad \tau = \log t, \quad (1.9)$$

the solutions can be expressed as follows in similarity variables by

$$\begin{aligned} v(x, t) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}V(\xi, \tau), \quad H(x, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}W(\xi, \tau), \\ f(x, t) &= \frac{1}{t^{\frac{3}{2}}}F(\xi, \tau), \quad p(x, t) = \frac{1}{t}P(\xi, \tau) \end{aligned}$$

If  $(v, H, p)$  satisfies (1.1) with force  $f_i(x, t)$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ), then profile  $(V, W, P)$  satisfies the time-dependent Leray equations

$$\begin{cases} \partial_\tau V - \frac{1}{2}(1 + \xi \cdot \nabla_\xi)V + V \cdot \nabla V - W \cdot \nabla W - \Delta_\xi V + \nabla P = F_1, \\ \partial_\tau W - \frac{1}{2}(1 + \xi \cdot \nabla_\xi)W + V \cdot \nabla W - W \cdot \nabla V - \Delta_\xi W = F_2. \end{cases} \quad (1.10)$$

A special self-similar solutions of (1.1) correspond to steady state of (1.10). We will find the first weak solution  $(\bar{V}(\xi), \bar{W}(\xi))$  of (1.10), which is linearly unstable steady solution. That is to say, the following linearized MHD equations around the steady state  $(\bar{V}, \bar{W})$

$$\begin{cases} \partial_\tau V - (\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\xi \cdot \nabla_\xi + \Delta_\xi)V + \mathbb{P}(\bar{V} \cdot \nabla V + V \cdot \nabla \bar{V} - \bar{W} \cdot \nabla W - W \cdot \nabla \bar{W}) = 0, \\ \partial_\tau W - (\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\xi \cdot \nabla_\xi + \Delta_\xi)W + \mathbb{P}(\bar{V} \cdot \nabla W + V \cdot \nabla \bar{W} - \bar{W} \cdot \nabla V - W \cdot \nabla \bar{V}) = 0 \end{cases} \quad (1.11)$$

have a nontrivial solution of the form  $(V(\xi, \tau), W(\xi, \tau)) = (e^{\lambda\tau}\tilde{V}(\xi), e^{\lambda\tau}\tilde{W}(\xi))$  with  $\lambda > 0$ . In addition, it follows from Section 3 that we can rewrite (1.11) as

$$\partial_\tau \Xi - \frac{1}{2}(1 + \xi \cdot \nabla_\xi)\Xi - \Delta_\xi \Xi + \mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{B}(\bar{\Xi}, \Xi) + \mathfrak{B}(\Xi, \bar{\Xi})) = 0, \quad (1.12)$$

where  $\Xi = (V(\xi, \tau), W(\xi, \tau))$  and  $\bar{\Xi} = (\bar{V}(\xi), \bar{W}(\xi))$ . We can also say  $\bar{\Xi}$  is linearly unstable for the dynamics of (1.12) if there exists an unstable eigenvalue for the linearized operator

$$-L_{ss}\Xi = -\frac{1}{2}(1 + \xi \cdot \nabla_\xi)\Xi - \Delta_\xi \Xi + \mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{B}(\bar{\Xi}, \Xi) + \mathfrak{B}(\Xi, \bar{\Xi})).$$

The second solution of (1.10) is a trajectory on the unstable manifold associated to the most unstable eigenvalue which will be constructed in Section 5.

Before making a comment on our result in more detail, let us review the literature on some significant progress towards the non-uniqueness of the Euler equations and Navier-Stokes equations. In recent two papers [9] and [10], Vishik answered the non-uniqueness of

Euler equation by constructing two Leray-Hopf weak solutions. One solution is an explicit unstable steady vortices for the Euler dynamics in similarity variables and another is a trajectory on the unstable manifold associated to the unstable steady state, which lives precisely on the borderline of the known well-posedness theory. Later, Albritton et. [11] followed the strategy of Vishik and made some improvement. Motivated by the Vishik's work, Albritton et. [12] then constructed a vortex ring which 'lifts' Vishik's unstable vortex to three dimensions, proving the nonuniqueness of Navier-Stokes equations in the same way. In addition, we also would like to mention two of particular important work. The first contribution was made by Jia [13–15], who developed a program towards non-uniqueness of Navier-stokes equation without external force. Compared to Vishik's approach, the self-similar solutions in [14] are far from explicit. Therefore, the spectral condition therein seems difficult to verify analytically, although it has been checked with non-rigorous numerics in [14]. Second, Buckmaster and Vicol constructed non-unique distributional solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations in [16] (see also [17]) and the ideal MHD [18] equations with finite kinetic energy via the powerful method of convex integration. Recently, the author in [19, 20] proved the sharp non-uniqueness of weak solutions to 3D viscous and resistive MHD with finite kinetic energy via method of convex integration. However, these results mentioned above using convex integration schemes are far from reaching the regularity  $\nabla u \in L^2_{t,x}$ .

In this paper, we will establish the non-uniqueness of MHD equations (1.1) based on the Leray equations (1.10). For better proceeding, we allow a force in (1.1), which gives us the freedom to search for a more explicit unstable profile. The rest of this paper is arranged as follows: In section 2, we mainly review the linear unstable of the axisymmetric ideal MHD equation around a rotating flow  $(v_0, H_0)$  in [21], which contributes to constructing a unstable steady state profile of (1.10) by choosing a suitable force. In section 3, we will show that the linearly unstable properties of axisymmetric case in Theorem 2.1 can be extended to the more general case. In section 4, we perturb this ideal MHD unstable scenario to 3D viscous and resistive MHD equations based on the spectral theoretic approach [35]. In other words, we will establish the linear instability of MHD equations. In section 5, we use the linear instability proved in Theorem 4.1 to construct the second Leray weak solution of the forced MHD equations.

## 2 Preliminaries

Firstly, let us pay attention to one simple axisymmetric steady solution  $(v_0, H_0)$  among explicit solutions of the incompressible ideal MHD equations (1.3) (see [22, 23]), where  $(v_0, H_0)$  is a rotating flow with a vertical magnetic field, that is,

$$\begin{cases} v_0(x) = v_0(r)e_\theta = r\omega(r)e_\theta, \\ H_0(x) = \epsilon b(r)e_z, \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

where  $\epsilon \neq 0$  is a constant,  $(r, \theta, z)$  are the cylindrical coordinates with  $r = \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}$ ,  $z = x_3$ ,  $(e_r, e_\theta, e_z)$  are unit vectors along  $r, \theta, z$  directions,  $\omega(r) \in C^3(R_1, R_2)$  is the angular velocity of the rotating fluid, the magnetic profile  $b(r) \in C^3(R_1, R_2)$  ( $0 \leq R_1 < R_2 = +\infty$ ) has a positive lower bound. We will require that  $(\omega(r), b(r))$  has an extra decay at infinity, which guarantees the finite energy. In [21], they give a rigorous proof of the sharp linear instability criteria of rotating flows (2.1) with magnetic fields. This smooth and decaying unstable scenario (2.1) can be regarded as the unstable "background" solution of (1.1) in similarity variables by choosing a non-standard force. In addition, the linear unstable properties of the rotating flow (2.1) play an important role in constructing non-unique energy weak solutions of (1.1).

The stability criterion for rotating flows with a magnetic field is generally different from the classical Rayleigh criterion for rotating flows without a magnetic field. The influence of a vertical and uniform magnetic field (i.e.,  $b(r) = \text{constant}$ ) on the stability of the rotating flows was first studied by Velikhov [27] and Chandrasekhar [28], who derived a sufficient condition for linear stability of a rotating flow in the limit of vanishing magnetic fields that the square of the angular velocity increases outwards, i.e.,

$$\partial_r(\omega^2) > 0, \quad \text{for all } r \in (R_1, R_2). \quad (2.2)$$

If the stability condition (2.2) fails, it was suggested in [27] and [28] that there is linear instability with small magnetic fields and they also showed that the unstable eigenvalues are necessarily real. Such instability of rotating flows induced by small magnetic fields is called magneto-rotational instability (MRI) in the literature, which has wide application in astrophysics, particularly to the turbulence and enhanced angular momentum transport in astrophysical accretion disks. We refer to the reviews [29–32] for the history and results of this important topic.

In [21], they answered three natural questions for MRI: Firstly, they give a sharp instability criterion for general vertical magnetic fields and angular velocities. Secondly, they show that MRI is due to discrete unstable spectrum, which is finite. Thirdly, they also prove that the sharp stability or instability criteria can imply nonlinear stability or instability respectively. The main proof is based on a local dispersion analysis and a framework of separable Hamiltonian systems which we will sketch below. The authors [21] considered the axisymmetric solution of the system (1.3) in the cylinder  $\Omega := \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid R_1 \leq \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2} \leq R_2, x_3 \in T_{2\pi}\}$ ,  $0 \leq R_1 < R_2 \leq \infty$ . In our paper, we will consider the case in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , that is,  $0 = R_1 < R_2 = \infty$ . In the cylindrical coordinates, we denote

$$H(t, r, z) = H_r(t, r, z)e_r + H_\theta(t, r, z)e_\theta + H_z(t, r, z)e_z$$

and

$$v(t, r, z) = v_r(t, r, z)e_r + v_\theta(t, r, z)e_\theta + v_z(t, r, z)e_z$$

Due to  $\text{div}H = 0$ , we can define magnetic potential  $\psi(t, r, z)$  of  $H(t, r, z)$  by

$$\begin{cases} H_r(t, r, z) = \frac{\partial_z \psi}{r}, \\ H_z(t, r, z) = -\frac{\partial_r \psi}{r}, \\ -\frac{1}{r} \partial_r \left( \frac{1}{r} \partial_r \psi \right) - \frac{1}{r^2} \partial_z^2 \psi = \frac{1}{r} \partial_r H_z - \frac{1}{r} \partial_z H_r. \end{cases}$$

The system (1.3) can be rewritten in the cylindrical coordinates as

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v_r + \partial_r p = \frac{\partial_z \psi}{r} \partial_r \left( \frac{\partial_z \psi}{r} \right) - \frac{\partial_r \psi}{r} \partial_r \left( \frac{\partial_z \psi}{r} \right) - \frac{H_\theta H_\theta}{r} - v_r \partial_r v_r - v_z \partial_z v_r + \frac{v_\theta v_\theta}{r}, \\ \partial_t v_\theta = \frac{\partial_z \psi}{r} \cdot \partial_r H_\theta - \frac{\partial_r \psi}{r} \partial_z H_\theta + \frac{H_\theta \partial_z \psi}{r} - v_r \partial_r v_\theta - v_z \partial_z v_\theta + \frac{v_\theta v_r}{r}, \\ \partial_t v_z + \partial_z p = \frac{\partial_z \psi}{r} \partial_r \left( -\frac{\partial_r \psi}{r} \right) - \frac{\partial_r \psi}{r} \partial_r \left( -\frac{\partial_r \psi}{r} \right) - v_r \partial_r v_z - v_z \partial_z v_z, \\ \partial_t \psi = -v_r \partial_r \psi - v_z \partial_z \psi, \\ \partial_t H_\theta = \frac{\partial_z \psi}{r} \partial_r (v_\theta) - \frac{\partial_r \psi}{r} \partial_r (v_\theta) - \frac{H_\theta v_r}{r} - v_r \partial_r H_\theta - v_z \partial_z H_\theta - \frac{v_\theta \partial_z \psi}{r}, \\ \frac{1}{r} \partial_r (r u_r) + \partial_z u_z = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

For steady state, we can take

$$\psi_0(r) = -\epsilon \int_0^r s b(s) ds.$$

Now let the perturbations be

$$\begin{aligned} u(t, x) &= v(t, x) - v_0(x); & B_\theta(t, x) &= H_\theta(t, x); \\ \mathcal{P}(t, x) &= p(t, x) - p_0(x); & \varphi(t, r, z) &= \psi - \psi_0. \end{aligned}$$

The linearized MHD system around a given steady state  $(v_0(x), H_0(x), p_0(x))$  in the cylindrical coordinates can be reduced to the following system

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u_r = \epsilon b(r) \partial_z \left( \frac{\partial_z \varphi}{r} \right) + 2\omega(r) v_\theta - \partial_r \mathcal{P}, \\ \partial_t u_\theta = \epsilon b(r) \partial_z (B_\theta) - \frac{u_r}{r} \partial_r (r^2 \omega^2(r)), \\ \partial_t u_z = \epsilon b(r) \partial_z \left( -\frac{\partial_r \varphi}{r} \right) - \partial_z \mathcal{P} + \frac{\epsilon \partial_r b(r)}{r} \partial_z \varphi, \\ \partial_t \varphi = \epsilon r b(r) u_r, \\ \partial_t B_\theta = \epsilon r b(r) \partial_z u_\theta + \partial_r \omega(r) \partial_z \varphi, \\ \frac{1}{r} \partial_r (r u_r) + \partial_z u_z = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.4)$$

We impose the system (2.4) with conditions

$$\begin{cases} (u_r, u_\theta, u_z, \varphi, B_\theta)(t, r, z)|_{t=0} = (u_r^0, u_\theta^0, u_z^0, \varphi^0, B_\theta^0)(r, z), \\ (u_r, u_\theta, u_z, \varphi, B_\theta)(t, r, z) \rightarrow (0, 0, 0, 0, 0), \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow \infty, \\ (u_r, u_\theta, u_z, \varphi, B_\theta)(t, r, z) = (u_r, u_\theta, u_z, \varphi, B_\theta)(t, r, z + 2\pi). \end{cases} \quad (2.5)$$

It is obvious that the linearized axisymmetric MHD equations (2.4) can be written in a Hamiltonian form

$$\frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{JL} \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.6)$$

where  $u_1 = (u_\theta + \frac{\partial_r \omega(r)}{\varepsilon b(r)} \varphi, \varphi)$ ,  $u_2 = (\mathbf{u}, B_\theta)$  with  $\mathbf{u} = (u_r, u_z)$ . Consider the energy spaces  $\mathbf{X} = X \times Y$  with  $X = L^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \times Z$ ,  $Y = L_\sigma^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , where  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$  is the cylindrically symmetric  $L^2$  space on  $\mathbb{R}^3$ ,

$$L_\sigma^2(\mathbb{R}^3) := \{\mathbf{u} = u_r(r, z)e_r + u_z(r, z)e_z \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \mid \operatorname{div} u = 0\}.$$

and

$$Z = \{\varphi(r, z) \in H_{mag}^1(\mathbb{R}^3) \mid \|\varphi\|_{H_{mag}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} < \infty\}$$

with

$$\|\varphi\|_{H_{mag}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} = \left( \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{r^2} |\partial_z \varphi|^2 + \frac{1}{r^2} |\partial_r \varphi|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

The off-diagonal anti-self-dual operator  $\mathbf{J}$  and diagonal self-dual operator  $\mathbf{L}$  are defined by

$$\mathbf{J} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbb{B} \\ -\mathbb{B}' & 0 \end{pmatrix} : X^* \rightarrow X, \quad \mathbf{L} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{L} & 0 \\ 0 & A \end{pmatrix} : X \rightarrow X^*, \quad (2.7)$$

in which

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{B} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u} \\ B_\theta \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} -2\omega(r)u_r + \varepsilon b(r)\partial_z B_\theta \\ \varepsilon r b(r)u_r \end{pmatrix} : Y^* \rightarrow X, \\ \mathbb{B}' \begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ f_2 \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{P} \begin{pmatrix} -2\omega(r)f_1 + r\varepsilon b(r)f_2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ -\varepsilon b(r)\partial_z f_1 \end{pmatrix} : X^* \rightarrow Y, \\ \mathbb{L} = \begin{pmatrix} Id_1 & 0 \\ 0 & L \end{pmatrix} &: X \rightarrow X^*, \quad A = Id_2 : Y \rightarrow Y^*, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$L := -\frac{1}{r} \partial_r \left( \frac{1}{r} \partial_r \cdot \right) - \frac{1}{r^2} \partial_z^2 + \mathfrak{F}(r) : Z \rightarrow Z^*,$$

and

$$\mathfrak{F}(r) := \frac{\partial_r \omega^2}{\varepsilon^2 b(r)^2 r} + \left( \frac{\partial_r^2 b(r)}{r^2 b(r)} - \frac{\partial_r b(r)}{r^3 b(r)} \right), \quad (2.8)$$

where  $Id_1 : L^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \rightarrow (L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))^*$  and  $Id_2 : Y \rightarrow Y^*$  are the isomorphisms, the operator  $\mathbb{P}$  is the Leray projection from  $L^2(\Omega)$  to  $L_\sigma^2(\Omega)$ . As proved in [21, Theorem 2.1], when  $(\mathbb{L}, A, \mathbb{B})$  satisfies the conditions (G1)-(G4) of general separable Hamiltonian PDEs, the unstable spectra of (2.6) are all real discrete and the dimension of the unstable subspace corresponding to positive (negative) eigenvalues can be determined.

A complete description of the instability spectra and semigroup growth of the linear axi-symmetric MHD equations (2.4) can be stated as follows:

**Theorem 2.1.** (refer to [21]) *Assume that the steady state  $(v_0, H_0)(x)$  is given by (2.1), in which  $\omega(r) \in C^3(R_1, R_2)$ ,  $b(r) \in C^3(R_1, R_2)$  with a positive lower bound.*

(1) *If  $R_1 = 0$ ,  $\partial_r(\omega^2) = O(r^{\beta-3})$ ,  $\partial_r b = O(r^{\beta-1})$  for some constant  $\beta > 0$ , as  $r \rightarrow 0$ .*

(2) If  $R_2 = \infty$ ,  $\partial_r(\omega^2) = O(r^{-3-2\alpha})$ ,  $\partial_r b = O(r^{-1-2\alpha})$ , for some constant  $\alpha > 0$ , as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ .

The operator  $\mathbf{JL}$  defined by (2.6) generates a  $C^0$  group  $e^{t\mathbf{JL}}$  of bounded linear operators on  $\mathbf{X} = X \times Y$  and there exists a decomposition

$$\mathbf{X} = E^u \oplus E^c \oplus E^s$$

of closed subspace  $E^{u,s,c}$  with the following properties:

(i)  $E^c$ ,  $E^u$  and  $E^s$  are invariant under  $e^{t\mathbf{JL}}$ .

(ii)  $E^u(E^s)$  only consists of eigenvector corresponding to positive (negative) eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{JL}$  and

$$\dim E^u = \dim E^s = n^-(\mathbb{L}|_{\overline{R(\mathbb{B})}}),$$

where the unstable eigenvalues of the linearized operator  $\mathbf{JL}$  are all discrete and the number of unstable mode equals  $0 < n^-(\mathbb{L}|_{\overline{R(\mathbb{B})}}) < \infty$ , that is, the number of negative direction of  $\langle \mathbb{L}\cdot, \cdot \rangle$  restricted to  $\overline{R(\mathbb{B})}$  which is shown to be

$$\overline{R(\mathbb{B})} = \{(g_1, g_2) \in X | g_j(r, z) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{ikz} \tilde{\varphi}_{k,j}(r), j = 1, 2\}.$$

It follows that  $n^-(\mathbb{L}|_{\overline{R(\mathbb{B})}}) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} n^-(\mathbb{L}_k)$ , where the operator  $\mathbb{L}_k : H_{mag}^r \rightarrow (H_{mag}^r)^*$  is defined by

$$\mathbb{L}_k := -\frac{1}{r} \partial_r \left( \frac{1}{r} \partial_r \cdot \right) + \frac{k^2}{r^2} + \mathfrak{F}(r) \quad (2.9)$$

for any  $k \geq 0$ , with  $\mathfrak{F}(r)$  defined in (2.8).  $n^-(\mathbb{L}_k)$  denotes the number of negative directions of  $\langle \mathbb{L}_k \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ . In particular,  $n^-(\mathbb{L}_k) = 0$  when  $k$  is large enough.

(3) If there exists  $r_0 \in (R_1, R_2)$  such that  $\partial_r(\omega^2)|_{r=r_0} < 0$ , then for  $\epsilon^2$  small enough the steady state  $(v_0, H_0)(x)$  in (2.1) is linearly unstable to axi-symmetric perturbations.

(iii) The sharp exponential growth estimate for the linearized MHD equation (2.6) along the most unstable modes

$$\|e^{t\mathbf{JL}}(u_1, u_2)(0)\|_{\mathbf{X}} \lesssim e^{\Lambda t} \|(u_1, u_2)(0)\|_{\mathbf{X}} \quad (2.10)$$

where  $\Lambda > 0$  determined the maximal growth rate.

**Remark 2.2.** (i) In this paper, we will consider the case  $R_2 = \infty$  and study the nonlinear instability of (1.1) to construct non-uniqueness Leray weak solution, which is located in finite energy class  $L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^2(0, T; H^1(\mathbb{R}^3))$ . Indeed, here we need to require a stronger condition  $\omega = O(r^{-1-\alpha})$  for  $\alpha > 0$  as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ , which ensure that  $\nabla(v_0, H_0) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ .

(ii) It follows from [21] that any order derivative of  $(u_1, u_2)$  can be written in a Hamiltonian form

$$\frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} \partial_z^\alpha u_1 \\ \partial_z^\alpha u_2 \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{JL} \begin{pmatrix} \partial_z^\alpha u_1 \\ \partial_z^\alpha u_2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.11)$$

where  $u_1 = (u_\theta + \frac{\partial_r \omega(r)}{\varepsilon b(r)} \varphi, \varphi)$ ,  $u_2 = (\mathbf{u}, B_\theta)$  with  $\mathbf{u} = (u_r, u_z)$ . Together with the fact  $\|(u, B)(t)\|_{L^2} \sim \|(u_1, u_2)(t)\|_X$  and  $\|\partial_z^\alpha(u, B)\|_{L^2} \sim \|\partial_z^\alpha(u, B)\|_X$ . One can get

$$\|(u, B)(t)\|_{L^2} \lesssim e^{\Lambda t} \|(u, B)(0)\|_{L^2} \quad (2.12)$$

and

$$\|\partial_z^\alpha(u, B)(t)\|_{L^2} \lesssim e^{\Lambda t} \|\partial_z^\alpha(u, B)(0)\|_{L^2}, \quad |\alpha| \leq s \ (s \geq 0). \quad (2.13)$$

It also follows [21] that  $\|\partial_r^\alpha(u, B)(t)\|_{L^2} \lesssim e^{\Lambda t} \|(u, B)(0)\|_{H^s}$  for  $|\alpha| = s$ .

### 3 The linear instability and semigroup estimates of ideal MHD system

In this subsection, we are going to show that the linearly unstable properties of axisymmetric case in Theorem 2.1 can be extended to the more general case. To this end, we first linearize the ideal MHD equations (1.3) around the axisymmetric steady solution  $(v_0, H_0)(x)$  to obtain the following system (3.3). Then we will obtain the linear instability of (3.3) as in Theorem 3.1.

Assume axisymmetric steady solution  $(v_0, H_0)(r, z)$  is perturbed by a small disturbance

$$\begin{aligned} v(t, r, z) &= v_0(r, z) + \varepsilon u(t, r, z), & H(t, r, z) &= H_0(r, z) + \varepsilon B(t, r, z), \\ p(t, r, z) &= p_0(r, z) + \varepsilon \mathcal{P}(t, r, z). \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

We shall rewrite the ideal MHD system (1.3) in following perturbation form:

$$\begin{cases} \varepsilon \partial_t u + \varepsilon v_0 \cdot \nabla u + \varepsilon u \cdot \nabla v_0 - \varepsilon H_0 \cdot \nabla B - \varepsilon B \cdot \nabla H_0 + \varepsilon \nabla \mathcal{P} = \varepsilon^2 B \cdot \nabla B - \varepsilon^2 u \cdot \nabla u, \\ \varepsilon \partial_t B + \varepsilon v_0 \cdot \nabla B + \varepsilon u \cdot \nabla H_0 - \varepsilon H_0 \cdot \nabla u - \varepsilon B \cdot \nabla v_0 = \varepsilon^2 B \cdot \nabla u - \varepsilon^2 u \cdot \nabla B, \\ \operatorname{div} \varepsilon u = \operatorname{div} \varepsilon B = 0, \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

Then we obtain the following linearized system of the MHD system (1.3) around steady solution  $(v_0, H_0, p_0)(x)$  by estimating (3.2) at order  $\varepsilon$

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u + v_0 \cdot \nabla u + u \cdot \nabla v_0 - H_0 \cdot \nabla B - B \cdot \nabla H_0 + \nabla \mathcal{P} = 0, \\ \partial_t B + v_0 \cdot \nabla B + u \cdot \nabla H_0 - H_0 \cdot \nabla u - B \cdot \nabla v_0 = 0, \\ \operatorname{div} u = \operatorname{div} B = 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

Moreover, (3.3) can be rewritten as (2.4) in cylindrical coordinates, which is equivalent to the linearized system (2.6). If we define

$$(u, B, \mathcal{P})(x, t) = (u, B, \mathcal{P})(x) e^{\Lambda_0 t} = (u, B, \mathcal{P})(r, z) e^{\Lambda_0 t} \quad (3.4)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} u_r &= \tilde{u}_r(r) \cos(kz) \cdot e^{\Lambda_0 t}, & u_\theta &= \tilde{u}_\theta(r) \cos(kz) \cdot e^{\Lambda_0 t}, & u_z &= \tilde{u}_z(r) \sin(kz) \cdot e^{\Lambda_0 t}, \\ \varphi &= \tilde{\varphi}(r) \cos(kz) \cdot e^{\Lambda_0 t}, & B_\theta &= \tilde{B}_\theta(r) \sin(kz) \cdot e^{\Lambda_0 t}, & \mathcal{P} &= \tilde{\mathcal{P}}(r) \cos(kz) \cdot e^{\Lambda_0 t}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

where  $\Lambda_0$  is one of the unstable eigenvalues of (2.6) and  $(u, B, \mathcal{P})(x, t)$  will satisfy equation (2.4). Naturally, the nontrivial (3.4) with  $\Lambda_0 > 0$  is a linear unstable solution of (3.3). We call the pair  $(u, B)$  solve (3.3) in the distribution sense if

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u \cdot \partial_t \varphi - v_0 \cdot \nabla u \cdot \varphi - u \cdot \nabla v_0 \cdot \varphi + H_0 \cdot \nabla B \cdot \varphi + B \cdot \nabla H_0 \cdot \varphi dx dt \\
&= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u^0 \cdot \varphi(\cdot, 0) dx, \\
& \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} B \cdot \partial_t \phi - v_0 \cdot \nabla B \cdot \phi - u \cdot \nabla H_0 \cdot \phi + H_0 \cdot \nabla u \cdot \phi + B \cdot \nabla v_0 \cdot \phi dx dt \\
&= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} B^0 \cdot \phi(\cdot, 0) dx
\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

for initial data  $u^0, B^0 \in L^2_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^3)$  and test function  $\varphi, \phi \in \mathcal{D}_T$ , where  $\mathcal{D}_T := \{\varphi \in C_0^\infty((0, T); \mathbb{R}^3), \operatorname{div} \varphi = 0\}$ .

In order to deal with nonlinear term conveniently, we will introduce a trilinear form  $\mathfrak{B}_\circ$ . First, we define a trilinear form by setting

$$b(u, v, \omega) = \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \int_{\Omega} u_i \partial_i v_j \omega_j dx = \int_{\Omega} u \cdot \nabla v \cdot \omega dx. \tag{3.7}$$

We can easily get by a direct calculation

$$b(u, v, \omega) = -b(u, \omega, v).$$

In order to write (3.4) as a simpler form, we define a trilinear form  $\mathfrak{B}_\circ$  as

$$\mathfrak{B}_\circ(\Phi^1, \Phi^2, \Phi^3) = b(u, v, \omega) - b(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{V}, \omega) + b(u, \mathbb{V}, \mathbb{W}) - b(\mathbb{U}, v, \mathbb{W}),$$

where  $\Phi^1 = (u, \mathbb{U}), \Phi^2 = (v, \mathbb{V}), \Phi^3 = (\omega, \mathbb{W})$ . Due to the continuous  $b$ , one derives that  $\mathfrak{B}_\circ$  is trilinearly continuous. This let us give a continuous bilinear operator  $\mathfrak{B}$  as

$$\langle \mathfrak{B}(\Phi^1, \Phi^2), \Phi^3 \rangle = \mathfrak{B}_\circ(\Phi^1, \Phi^2, \Phi^3).$$

If we choose  $\varphi, \phi \in C_{0,\sigma}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , one can rewrite (3.4) as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \partial_t(u, \varphi) + b(v_0, u, \varphi) + b(u, v_0, \varphi) - b(H_0, B, \varphi) - b(B, H_0, \varphi) = 0, \\
& \partial_t(B, \phi) + b(v_0, B, \phi) + b(u, H_0, \phi) - b(H_0, u, \phi) - b(B, v_0, \phi) = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

with  $(f, g) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f \cdot g dx$ . Then this system can be equivalent to the following formula

$$\partial_t(\Gamma, \Psi) + \mathfrak{B}_\circ(\Gamma_0, \Gamma, \Psi) + \mathfrak{B}_\circ(\Gamma, \Gamma_0, \Psi) = 0, \tag{3.8}$$

where  $\Gamma = (u, B), \Gamma_0 = (v_0, H_0)$ . Using the operator  $\mathfrak{B}$  previously defined, (3.2) is equivalent to the following formula

$$\partial_t \Gamma + \mathfrak{B}(\Gamma_0, \Gamma) + \mathfrak{B}(\Gamma, \Gamma_0) = 0. \tag{3.9}$$

It is obvious that (3.8) is a weak formulation of the problem (3.9). In the sense of distribution, the system (3.3) can be expressed as (3.9).

Suppose  $\Gamma_0$  is linearly unstable for the dynamics of (3.3), there exists an unstable eigenvalue for the linearized operator

$$-A\Gamma = \mathfrak{B}(\Gamma_0, \Gamma) + \mathfrak{B}(\Gamma, \Gamma_0) \quad (3.10)$$

whose domain

$$\mathcal{D}(A) := \{\Gamma \in L^2_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^3) : \Gamma_0 \cdot \nabla \Gamma \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)\}.$$

in which  $\Gamma = (u, B)$ ,  $\Gamma_0 = (v_0, H_0)$ . It is easy to see that  $A$  at least has a unstable eigenvalue  $\Lambda_0 > 0$  from (3.3) and (3.4). The main results can be stated as follows:

**Theorem 3.1.** *Assume that the steady state  $(v_0, H_0)(x)$  is given by (2.1), in which  $\omega(r) \in C^3(R_1, R_2)$  and  $b(r) \in C^3(R_1, R_2)$  satisfy the conditions (1), (2) and (3) in Theorem 2.1, then the linearized operator  $A$  defined by (3.10) generates a  $C^0$  group  $e^{At}$  of bounded linear operator on  $\mathcal{D}(A) \subset L^2_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^3) \rightarrow L^2_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . And there exists a decomposition*

$$L^2(\Omega) = E^u \oplus E^c \oplus E^s$$

of closed subspaces  $E^{u,s,c}$  with the following properties:

- i)  $E^u, E^c, E^s$  are invariant under  $e^{At}$ .
- ii) The operator  $A$  defined by (3.10) is linear instability and the unstable spectra are all real and discrete.  $E^u(E^s)$  only consists of eigenvectors corresponding to positive (negative) eigenvalues of  $A$  and dimension is finite.
- iii) The sharp exponential growth estimate for the  $C^0$  group  $e^{At}$  along the most unstable modes

$$\|e^{At}\Gamma_0\|_{L^2} \lesssim e^{\Lambda t} \|\Gamma_0\|_{L^2}$$

where  $\Lambda > 0$  is the maximum instability eigenvalue.

*Proof.* We mainly prove the operator  $A$  can inherit the instability nature of the operator  $\mathbf{JL}$ . Note that in the cylindrical coordinates, the linearized system (3.3) can be rewritten as (2.4), which is equivalent to the linearized system (2.6) with  $b_r = \frac{\partial_z \varphi}{r}, b_z = \frac{\partial_r \varphi}{r}$ . According to Theorem 2.1, the unstable spectra of (2.6) are all discrete and finite, we can denote the maximum instability eigenvalue of the operator  $\mathbf{JL}$  as  $a > 0$ , where  $a^2 = \max\{\sigma(-\mathbb{B} \mathbb{L} \mathbb{B} A)\}$ . We can construct a maximal growing normal mode of the linear equation (2.4) with  $\Lambda_0 = a$  as (3.4). It's known that  $(u, B, \mathcal{P})$  so defined is also the solution of (3.3). It can be proved that the operator  $A$  has maximum unstable eigenvalue  $a > 0$ . Then, there holds

$$\|e^{At}\Gamma_0\|_{L^2} \lesssim e^{at} \|\Gamma_0\|_{L^2}. \quad (3.11)$$

where  $a = \sup\{\lambda : \lambda \in \sigma(A)\}$  is the spectral bound of  $e^{At}$  equaling to growth bound  $\omega_0(e^{At}) := \inf\{\omega \in \mathbb{R} : \|e^{At}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq M(\omega)e^{\omega t}\}$ .

□

## 4 Linear instability: from the ideal MHD equation to MHD equation

In this section, we concern the linear instability of the following Leray equation around steady state  $(\beta V_0(\xi), \beta W_0(\xi))$  ( $\beta \gg 1$ )

$$\begin{cases} \partial_\tau U - \frac{1}{2}(1 + \xi \cdot \nabla_\xi)U + \beta \mathbb{P}(V_0 \cdot \nabla U + U \cdot \nabla V_0 - W_0 \cdot \nabla W - W \cdot \nabla W_0) - \Delta_\xi U = 0, \\ \partial_\tau W - \frac{1}{2}(1 + \xi \cdot \nabla_\xi)W + \beta \mathbb{P}(V_0 \cdot \nabla W + U \cdot \nabla W_0 - W_0 \cdot \nabla U - W \cdot \nabla V_0) - \Delta_\xi W = 0, \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

in which  $(V_0(\xi), W_0(\xi))$  is the axisymmetric velocity profile and magnetic profile associated with  $(v_0(x), H_0(x))$ . That is to say, they are equal under the similarity variables (1.9) as  $t = 1$ . Using the same method introduced in Section 3, we can rewrite (4.1) as

$$\partial_\tau \Xi - \frac{1}{2}(1 + \xi \cdot \nabla_\xi)\Xi - \Delta_\xi \Xi + \beta \mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{B}(\Xi_0, \Xi) + \mathfrak{B}(\Xi, \Xi_0)) = 0, \quad (4.2)$$

where  $\Xi = (V(\xi, \tau), W(\xi, \tau))$  and  $\Xi_0 = (V_0(\xi), W_0(\xi))$ . In this section, we concern ourselves with instability for the operator

$$-L_{ss}^\beta \Xi = -\frac{1}{2}(1 + \xi \cdot \nabla_\xi)\Xi - \Delta_\xi \Xi + \beta \mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{B}(\Xi_0, \Xi) + \mathfrak{B}(\Xi, \Xi_0)) \quad (4.3)$$

whose domain is

$$\mathcal{D}(L_{ss}^\beta) := \{\Xi \in L_\sigma^2(\Omega) : \Xi \in H^2(\Omega), \xi \cdot \nabla_\xi \Xi \in L^2(\Omega)\}.$$

Indeed, we *claim* that  $\beta \Xi_0$  is linearly unstable for the dynamics of (4.3), namely, there exists an unstable eigenvalue  $\widetilde{\lambda}_\beta > 0$  for the linearized operator  $L_{ss}^\beta$ .

It is difficult to study the unstable eigenvalue for the linearized operator  $L_{ss}^\beta$  directly. Thus, multiplying both sides of (4.3) by  $\frac{1}{\beta}$ , we can obtain that

$$-T_\beta \Xi := -\frac{1}{\beta} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \xi \cdot \nabla_\xi \right) + \Delta_\xi \right] \Xi + \mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{B}(\Xi_0, \Xi) + \mathfrak{B}(\Xi, \Xi_0))$$

The main terms in the operator  $-T_\beta$  are arising from the nonlinearity of the equation; the extra term, including the Laplacian, can be considered as perturbations. In the following, we will prove the existence of the unstable eigenvalue  $\lambda_\beta$  of  $T_\beta$ . Then  $\widetilde{\lambda}_\beta = \beta \lambda_\beta$  would be taken as an unstable eigenvalue of the linearized operator  $L_{ss}^\beta$ .

Let us firstly define

$$-T_\infty \Xi := \mathfrak{B}(\Xi_0, \Xi) + \mathfrak{B}(\Xi, \Xi_0). \quad (4.4)$$

It follows from Theorem 3.1 that the operator  $T_\infty$  is linearly unstable and exist unstable eigenvalue. Now let us state our main result in this section as follows.

**Theorem 4.1. (*the instability of self-similar MHD*)** *Let  $\Lambda_0$  be an unstable eigenvalue of  $T_\infty$  with  $\Lambda_0 > 0$ . For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\beta_0 > 0$  such that, for all  $\beta > \beta_0$ ,  $T_\beta|_{\mathbf{x}_{sub}}$  has an unstable eigenvalue  $\lambda_\beta > 0$  satisfying  $|\lambda_\beta - \Lambda_0| < \varepsilon$ . We can conclude that  $L_{ss}^\beta$  has unstable eigenvalue  $\widetilde{\lambda}_\beta$  with  $\widetilde{\lambda}_\beta = \beta \lambda_\beta$  and the corresponding unstable modes belongs to  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ .*

Before showing the proof of Theorem 4.1, we first give a spectral perturbation Lemma due to Kato [35].

**Lemma 4.2.** *Consider the operator  $T$  in the finite dimensional space, assume  $T(\tau)$  be continuous at  $\tau = 0$ , then the eigenvalues of  $T(\tau)$  are continuous at  $\tau = 0$ .*

Now let us prove Theorem 4.1.

*Proof.* We define the following operator

$$-T_\tau \Xi := -\tau \left[ \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \xi \cdot \nabla_\xi + \Delta_\xi \right] \Xi + \mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{B}(\Xi_0, \Xi) + \mathfrak{B}(\Xi, \Xi_0))$$

with domain

$$\mathcal{D} := \{ \Xi \in L^2_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^3) : \Xi \in H^2, \xi \cdot \nabla_\xi \Xi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \}.$$

For any  $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\Xi \in \mathcal{D}$ , it's not difficult to check that

$$\|T_{\tau_1} \Xi - T_{\tau_2} \Xi\|_{L^2} \leq |\tau_1 - \tau_2| \|\Xi\|_{\mathcal{D}}, \quad (4.5)$$

which gives the continuity of  $T(\tau)$  with respect to  $\tau$ .

For our perturbation argument, we will consider a new finite dimensional subspace

$$\mathbf{X}_{sub} = \mathcal{D} \cap E^u$$

by taking  $\tau = \frac{1}{\beta}$ , where  $E^u$  defined in Theorem 3.1 only consists of eigenvectors corresponding to positive eigenvalues of  $T_\infty$ . Since  $\Lambda_0$  is an unstable eigenvalue of  $T_\infty$  with  $\Lambda_0 > 0$ , then we use Kato's perturbation Lemma 4.2 on  $\mathbf{X}_{sub}$  to deduce that there is an unstable eigenvalue  $\lambda_\beta$  of  $T_\beta$ . So  $\widetilde{\lambda}_\beta = \beta \lambda_\beta$  would be an unstable eigenvalue of the linearized operator  $L_{ss}^\beta$ .  $\square$

## 5 Nonlinear instability

In this section, we demonstrate how to use the linear instability established in Theorem 4.1 to construct non-unique Leray weak solution to the forced MHD equations. The refined non-uniqueness Theorem can be stated as follows:

**Theorem 5.1.** *There exists a smooth decaying unstable velocity and magnetic profile  $\beta \Xi_0 = (\beta V_0(\xi), \beta W_0(\xi))$  of (1.10) with force profile*

$$F(\xi, \tau) = -\frac{\beta}{2} (1 + \xi \cdot \nabla_\xi) \Xi_0 - \beta \Delta_\xi \Xi_0 + \beta^2 \mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{B}(\Xi_0, \Xi_0) + \mathfrak{B}(\Xi_0, \Xi_0))$$

satisfying the following properties:

(A) *The linearized operator  $L_{ss}^\beta$  defined in (4.3) ( $\beta$  sufficiently large) has real discrete*

unstable eigenvalue  $\lambda_\beta$ . Then a ( $a > 0$ ) can be chosen to be the maximally unstable, the corresponding non-trivial smooth eigenfunction  $\eta$  belonging to  $H^k(\mathbb{R}^3)$  for all  $k \geq 0$ :

$$L_{ss}^\beta \eta = a\eta. \quad (5.1)$$

We can look for another solution  $\Xi$  to (1.10) that vanishes as  $\tau \rightarrow -\infty$  with the ansatz

$$\Xi = \beta\Xi_0 + \Xi^{lim} + \Xi^{per},$$

where

$$\Xi^{lim} = e^{a\tau}\eta \quad (5.2)$$

solves the linear equation

$$\partial_\tau \Xi^{lim} = L_{ss}^\beta \Xi^{lim}. \quad (5.3)$$

(B) Substituting this ansatz into (1.10), there exists  $T \in \mathbb{R}$  and a velocity field and magnetic profile  $\Xi^{per}$  satisfying (5.25) and

$$\|\Xi^{per}\|_{H^k} \leq Ce^{2a\tau} \quad \forall \tau \in (-\infty, T) \quad (5.4)$$

for all  $k \geq 0$ . Correspondingly, in the similarity variable (1.9), we construct the first Leray weak solution of the equation (1.1) is

$$(v_1, H_1)(x, t) = \left( \frac{\beta}{\sqrt{t}} V_0(\xi), \frac{\beta}{\sqrt{t}} W_0(\xi) \right)$$

with force  $f_i(x, t) = \frac{1}{t^{\frac{3}{2}}} F_i(\xi, \tau)$  for  $(i = 1, 2)$  on a time interval  $[0, e^T]$ . Based on this, the second weak solution of the MHD equations (1.1) constructed is

$$(v_2(x, t), H_2(x, t)) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \Xi(\xi, \tau)$$

on  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, e^T)$  with zero initial data and same forcing term  $f_i(x, t)$  for  $(i = 1, 2)$ .

The solutions constructed above live at critical regularity. One may easily verify that for any  $p \in [2, +\infty]$ ,  $j, k \geq 0$  and  $t \in (0, e^T)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} t^{\frac{k}{2}} \|\nabla^k \Gamma_0(\cdot, t)\|_{L^p} + t^{\frac{k}{2}} \|\nabla^k \Gamma(\cdot, t)\|_{L^p} &\lesssim t^{\frac{1}{2}(\frac{3}{p}-1)}, \\ t^{j+\frac{k}{2}} \|\partial_t^j \nabla^k f(\cdot, t)\|_{L^p} &\lesssim t^{\frac{1}{2}(\frac{3}{p}-3)} \end{aligned}$$

This is enough to bootstrap  $\Gamma_0, \Gamma$  to smoothness in  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, e^T)$ . As mentioned above a second solution to (MHD) is sought as a trajectory on the unstable manifold of  $\beta\Xi_0$  associated to the most unstable eigenvalue  $a$  of  $L_{ss}^\beta$ .

## 5.1 The semigroup generated by $L_{ss}^\beta$

In this subsection, we introduce the  $C^0$  semigroup  $e^{\tau L_{ss}^\beta}$  generated by  $L_{ss}^\beta$ . We combine Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 4.1 to prove some results for the spectrum and the semigroup estimation of  $L_{ss}^\beta$ . It follows from [14, Lemma 2.1] that the spectrum of  $L_{ss}^0$  satisfies  $\sigma(L_{ss}^0) \subset \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \text{Re}(\lambda) \leq -\frac{1}{4}\}$ . According to Theorem 3.1, it is known that  $L_{ss}^\beta - L_{ss}^0$  has finite unstable discrete spectrum  $\lambda > 0$  and the unstable subspace is finite-dimensional.

We refer the reader to [34] for definition of the *spectral bound* of  $L_{ss}^\beta$  as

$$s(L_{ss}^\beta) =: \sup\{\text{Re}(\lambda) : \lambda \in \sigma(L_{ss}^\beta)\},$$

which is bounded by the *growth bound*

$$\omega_0(L_{ss}^\beta) := \inf\{\omega \in \mathbb{R} : \|e^{\tau L_{ss}^\beta}\|_{L_\sigma^2 \rightarrow L_\sigma^2} \leq M(\omega)e^{\tau\omega}\}$$

of semigroup. Then we can obtain the following result.

**Lemma 5.2.**  *$L_{ss}^\beta$  is the generator of a strongly continuous semigroup  $e^{\tau L_{ss}^\beta}$  on  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ .  $\sigma(L_{ss}^\beta) \cap \{\lambda : \text{Re}(\lambda) > 0\}$  consists of only finitely many eigenvalues with finite multiplicity, then the growth bound  $\omega_0(L_{ss}^\beta)$  of  $e^{\tau L_{ss}^\beta}$  equals*

$$s(L_{ss}^\beta) := \sup\{z_0 : z_0 \in \sigma(L_{ss}^\beta) < \infty\}.$$

In other words, assume  $a = s(L_{ss}^\beta) > 0$ , then  $a < \infty$ , and there exist  $\lambda \in \sigma(L_{ss}^\beta)$  and  $\eta \in D(L_{ss}^\beta)$  and  $L_{ss}^\beta \eta = \lambda \eta$ . Moreover, for every  $\delta > 0$ , there is a constant  $M(\delta)$  with the property that

$$\|e^{\tau L_{ss}^\beta} \Xi(0, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq M(\delta) e^{(a+\delta)\tau} \|\Xi(0, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}, \quad \forall \tau \geq 0, \Xi \in L^2. \quad (5.5)$$

**Lemma 5.3.** *By (5.2), we have the following energy estimate*

$$\|\Xi^{lim}\|_{H^k} \leq C(k, \eta) e^{a_0 \tau} \quad (5.6)$$

We consider the following system, the linearized system of the homogeneous MHD system (1.4) around the axisymmetric steady solution  $(\beta v_0, \beta H_0, \beta^2 p_0)(x)$  in (2.1) as

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u + \beta \mathbb{P}(v_0 \cdot \nabla u + u \cdot \nabla v_0 - H_0 \cdot \nabla B - B \cdot \nabla H_0) - \Delta u = 0, \\ \partial_t B + \beta \mathbb{P}(v_0 \cdot \nabla B + u \cdot \nabla H_0 - H_0 \cdot \nabla u - B \cdot \nabla v_0) - \Delta B = 0, \\ \text{div} u = \text{div} B = 0, \end{cases} \quad (5.7)$$

can be rewrite as

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \Gamma + A\Gamma + \beta \mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{B}(\Gamma_0, \Gamma) + \mathfrak{B}(\Gamma, \Gamma_0)) = 0 \\ \text{div} \Gamma = 0, \end{cases} \quad (5.8)$$

in the sense of distribution, endowed with the initial condition

$$(u, B)(0, x) = (u^0, B^0)(x) \quad (5.9)$$

where  $\Gamma = (u, B)$ ,  $\Gamma_0 = (v_0, H_0)$ ,  $\Gamma^0 = (u^0, B^0)$ . In this case, the solution to (5.8) is formally given by

$$\Gamma = e^{t\Delta}\Gamma^0 - \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\Delta}\beta\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{B}(\Gamma_0, \Gamma) + \mathfrak{B}(\Gamma, \Gamma_0))(s)ds. \quad (5.10)$$

**Lemma 5.4.** [36] *Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  is a smooth bounded domain or  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , Let  $1 < r \leq q < \infty$  and  $\sigma = \sigma(q, r) = \frac{3}{2}(\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{q}) \geq 0$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \|e^{t\Delta}\mathbb{P}f\|_q &\leq Ct^{-\sigma}\|f\|_r, \\ \|\nabla e^{t\Delta}\mathbb{P}f\|_q &\leq Ct^{-\sigma-\frac{1}{2}}\|f\|_r. \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

**Lemma 5.5.** (Parabolic regularity) *Assume  $a = s(L_{ss}^\beta) > 0$ , for any  $\sigma_2 \geq \sigma_1 \geq 0$  and  $\delta > 0$ , it holds*

$$\|e^{\tau L_{ss}^\beta}\Xi(0, \cdot)\|_{H^{\sigma_2}} \leq M(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \delta, \beta)e^{(a+\delta)\tau}\tau^{-\frac{\sigma_2-\sigma_1}{2}}\|\Xi(0, \cdot)\|_{H^{\sigma_1}} \quad (5.12)$$

for any  $\Xi(0, \cdot) \in L_\sigma^2 \cap H^{\sigma_1}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ .

*Proof.* Firstly, we prove for any  $0 \leq m \leq k$ ,  $\Xi(0, \cdot) \in L_\sigma^2 \cap H^m(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , it holds

$$\|e^{\tau L_{ss}^\beta}\Xi(0, \cdot)\|_{H^k} \leq M(k, m)\tau^{-\frac{k-m}{2}}\|\Xi(0, \cdot)\|_{H^m}, \tau \in (0, 2). \quad (5.13)$$

We study the problem in physical variables: setting

$$\begin{aligned} u(x, t) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{t+1}}U\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{t+1}}, \log^{(t+1)}\right), & B(x, t) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{t+1}}W\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{t+1}}, \log^{(t+1)}\right), \\ v_0(x, t) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{t+1}}V_0\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{t+1}}, \log^{(t+1)}\right), & H_0(x, t) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{t+1}}W_0\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{t+1}}, \log^{(t+1)}\right), \end{aligned}$$

satisfying equation (5.7), which can be expressed as (5.8). Since  $\Gamma_0$  is smooth function in bounded domain, we can easily prove that

$$\|\Gamma\|_2 + t^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla\Gamma\|_2 \leq C(\Gamma_0, \beta)\|\Gamma(0, \cdot)\|_2, \quad t \in (0, 10) \quad (5.14)$$

which gives

$$\|\Xi\|_2 + \tau^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla\Xi\|_2 \leq C(\Xi_0, \beta)\|\Xi(0, \cdot)\|_2, \quad \tau \in (0, 2) \quad (5.15)$$

The latter implies (5.12) for  $k = 1$  and  $m = 0, 1$ . The general case follows by induction studying the equation solved by  $\nabla^k\Xi$  which has a structure similar to (5.8) but with forcing and additional lower order terms.

Secondly, we prove for any  $\delta > 0$  it holds

$$\|e^{\tau L_{ss}^\beta}\Xi(0, \cdot)\|_{H^k} \leq M(k, \delta)e^{\tau(a+\delta)}\|\Xi(0, \cdot)\|_{L^2}, \quad \tau \geq 2. \quad (5.16)$$

Using the semigroup property in Step 1 with  $m = 0$ , and (5.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|e^{\tau L_{ss}^\beta} \Xi(0, \cdot)\|_{H^k} &= \|e^{\kappa L_{ss}^\beta} (e^{(\tau-k)L_{ss}^\beta} \Xi(0, \cdot))\|_{H^k} \\
&\leq M(k) k^{-\frac{k}{2}} \|e^{\kappa L_{ss}^\beta} (e^{(\tau-k)L_{ss}^\beta} \Xi(0, \cdot))\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq M(k, \delta) k^{-\frac{k}{2}} e^{(\tau-k)(a+\delta)} \|\Xi(0, \cdot)\|_{L^2}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.17}$$

The claimed inequality (5.12) follows by choosing  $\kappa = 1$ .

It is immediate to see that the combination of (5.13) and (5.16) gives (5.12) for integers  $\sigma_2 \geq \sigma_1 \geq 0$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

## 5.2 Nonlinear construction

In the conditions of Theorem 3.1, we consider smooth, compactly supported velocity and magnetic profile  $(\beta v_0, \beta H_0)$ . Since  $(u^{lim}, B^{lim})$  satisfy (5.7), we can get  $(u^{per}, B^{per})$  satisfies the following nonlinear problem

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\partial_t u^{per} + \beta \mathbb{P}(v_0 \cdot \nabla u^{per} + u^{per} \cdot \nabla v_0 - H_0 \cdot \nabla H^{per} - H^{per} \cdot \nabla H_0) - \Delta u^{per} \\
= B \cdot \nabla B - u \cdot \nabla u, \\
\partial_t B^{per} + \beta \mathbb{P}(v_0 \cdot \nabla B^{per} + u^{per} \cdot \nabla H_0 - H_0 \cdot \nabla u^{per} - B^{per} \cdot \nabla v_0) - \Delta B^{per} \\
= B \cdot \nabla u - u \cdot \nabla B, \\
div u = div B = 0,
\end{array} \right. \tag{5.18}$$

we can write  $f_1 = B \cdot \nabla B - u \cdot \nabla u$  and  $f_2 = B \cdot \nabla u - u \cdot \nabla B$ , in which  $B(x, t) = B^{lim} + B^{per}$  and  $u(x, t) = u^{lim} + u^{per}$ . In similarity variable,

$$\begin{aligned}
\xi &= \frac{x}{t}, & \tau &= \log t, & f(x, t) &= \frac{1}{t^{\frac{3}{2}}} F(\xi, \tau) \\
u^{lim}(x, t) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} V^{lim}(\xi, \tau), & B^{lim}(x, t) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} W^{per}(\xi, \tau), \\
u^{per}(x, t) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} V^{per}(\xi, \tau), & B^{per}(x, t) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} W^{per}(\xi, \tau),
\end{aligned}$$

then (5.18) can be expressed as

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\partial_\tau V^{per} - \frac{1}{2}(1 + \xi \cdot \nabla_\xi) V^{per} - \Delta_\xi V^{per} + \beta \mathbb{P}(V_0 \cdot \nabla V^{per} + V^{per} \cdot \nabla V_0 - W_0 \cdot \nabla W^{per} \\
- W^{per} \cdot \nabla W_0) = F_1, \\
\partial_\tau W^{per} - \frac{1}{2}(1 + \xi \cdot \nabla_\xi) W^{per} - \Delta_\xi W^{per} + \beta \mathbb{P}(V_0 \cdot \nabla W^{per} + V^{per} \cdot \nabla W_0 - W_0 \cdot \nabla V^{per} \\
- W^{per} \cdot \nabla V_0) = F_2 \\
div V^{per} = div W^{per} = 0,
\end{array} \right. \tag{5.19}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
F_1 &= (W^{lim} + W^{per}) \cdot \nabla (W^{lim} + W^{per}) - (V^{lim} + V^{per}) \cdot \nabla (V^{lim} + V^{per}) \\
&= W^{lim} \cdot \nabla W^{lim} + W^{per} \cdot \nabla W^{lim} + W^{lim} \cdot \nabla W^{per} + W^{per} \cdot \nabla W^{per} - V^{lim} \cdot \nabla V^{lim} \\
&\quad - V^{per} \cdot \nabla V^{lim} - V^{lim} \cdot \nabla V^{per} - V^{per} \cdot \nabla V^{per}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.20}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
F_2 &= (W^{lim} + W^{per}) \cdot \nabla(V^{lim} + V^{per}) - (V^{lim} + V^{per}) \cdot \nabla(W^{lim} + W^{per}) \\
&= W^{lim} \cdot \nabla V^{lim} + W^{per} \cdot \nabla V^{lim} + W^{lim} \cdot \nabla V^{per} + W^{per} \cdot \nabla V^{per} - V^{lim} \cdot \nabla W^{lim} \\
&\quad - V^{per} \cdot \nabla W^{lim} - V^{lim} \cdot \nabla W^{per} - V^{per} \cdot \nabla W^{per}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.21}$$

Note that using the same method as in section 2, we can rewrite equation (5.19) as

$$\partial_\tau \Xi^{per} - \frac{1}{2}(1 + \xi \cdot \nabla_\xi) \Xi^{per} - \Delta_\xi \Xi^{per} + \beta \mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{B}(\Xi_0, \Xi^{per}) + \mathfrak{B}(\Xi^{per}, \Xi_0)) = F, \tag{5.22}$$

where  $\Xi^{per} = (V^{per}(\xi, \tau), W^{per}(\xi, \tau))$ ,  $\Xi_0 = (V_0(\xi, \tau), W_0(\xi, \tau))$ ,  $F = (F_1, F_2)$  and  $\mathbb{P}$  is the Leray projector. We define the total energy by

$$\|\Xi^{per}\|_{\mathbb{X}} = \|(V^{per}, W^{per})\|_{\mathbb{X}} := \sup_{\tau < T} e^{-(a+\varepsilon_0)\tau} (\|V^{per}(\cdot, \tau)\|_{H^N} + \|W^{per}(\cdot, \tau)\|_{H^N}).$$

**Proposition 5.6.** *Assume  $a = s(L_{ss}^\beta) > 0$  and  $N > \frac{5}{2}$  is an integer. Then there exist  $T = T(\Xi_0, \Xi^{lim})$ ,  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  and  $\Xi^{per} \in C((-\infty, T]; H^N(\mathbb{R}^3; \mathbb{R}^3))$ , a solution to (5.22), such that*

$$\|E^{per}(\cdot, \tau)\|_{H^N} \leq e^{(a+\varepsilon_0)\tau}, \quad \text{for any } \tau < T \tag{5.23}$$

*Proof.* Firstly, we introduce the Banach space

$$\mathbb{X} := \{\Xi^{per} \in C((-\infty, T]; H^N(\mathbb{R}^3; \mathbb{R}^3)) : \sup_{\tau < T} e^{-(a+\varepsilon_0)\tau} \|\Xi^{per}(\cdot, \tau)\|_{H^N} < \infty\}$$

with the norm

$$\|\Xi^{per}\|_{\mathbb{X}} := \sup_{\tau < T} e^{-(a+\varepsilon_0)\tau} \|\Xi^{per}(\cdot, \tau)\|_{H^N}$$

By Duhamel's formula, (5.22) can be expressed as the following functional

$$\mathcal{T}(\Xi^{per})(\cdot, \tau) = - \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} e^{(\tau-s)L_{ss}^\beta} \circ \mathbb{P} F ds \tag{5.24}$$

By parabolic regularity theory, any  $\Xi^{per} \in \mathbb{X}$  such that  $T(\Xi^{per}) = \Xi^{per}$  is a solution to (5.22) satisfying the statement of the Proposition by the following contraction mapping principle.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.7.** *Let  $B_{\mathbb{X}}$  be the closed unit ball of  $\mathbb{X}$ . Then for  $T$  sufficiently large and negative, and  $N > \frac{5}{2}$ ,  $\mathcal{T}$  map  $B_{\mathbb{X}} \rightarrow B_{\mathbb{X}}$  is a contraction.*

*Proof.* According to the definition of total energy,  $\mathcal{T}$  splits into three terms  $\mathcal{T}(E^{per}) \simeq B(E^{per}, E^{per}) + L(\cdot, E^{per}) + G$ , defined by

$$G = \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} e^{(\tau-s)L_{ss}^\beta} (W^{lim} \cdot \nabla E^{lim, \perp} - V^{lim} \cdot \nabla E^{lim}) ds = G^{0,1} + G^{0,2}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
L(\cdot, E^{per}) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} e^{(\tau-s)L_{ss}^{\beta}} (W^{lim} \cdot \nabla E^{per,\perp} + W^{per} \cdot \nabla E^{lim,\perp} - V^{lim} \cdot \nabla E^{per} - V^{per} \cdot \nabla E^{lim}) ds \\
&= L^{1,1} + L^{1,2} + L^{1,3} + L^{1,4}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$B(E^{per}, E^{per}) = \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} e^{(\tau-s)L_{ss}^{\beta}} (W^{per} \cdot \nabla E^{per,\perp} - V^{per} \cdot \nabla E^{per}) ds = B^{2,1} + B^{2,2},$$

where  $E^{\perp} = (W, V)$ ,  $G \in \mathbb{X}$ ,  $L : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}$  is a bounded linear operator and  $B : \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}$  is a bounded bilinear form. By a simple computation, we can obtain that

$$\|\mathcal{T}(E_1^{per} - E_2^{per})\|_{\mathbb{X}} \leq (2\|B\| + \|L\|)\|E_1^{per} - E_2^{per}\|_{\mathbb{X}}. \quad (5.25)$$

To prove the operator  $\mathcal{T}$  is contraction, it is sufficient for us to show  $2\|B\| + \|L\| < 1$ .

Firstly, we apply Lemma 5.5 to get

$$\|B^{2,1}\|_{H^{N+\frac{1}{2}}} \leq \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} (\tau-s)^{-\frac{3}{4}} e^{(\tau-s)(a+\delta)} \|(W^{per} \cdot \nabla E^{per,\perp})\|_{H^{N-1}}(s) ds. \quad (5.26)$$

Since the space  $H^{N-1}$  is an algebra, then

$$\|W^{per} \cdot \nabla E^{per,\perp}\|_{H^{N-1}} \leq C(N) \|E^{per}\|_{H^N}^2 \leq e^{2(a+\varepsilon_0)s} \|E^{per}\|_{\mathbb{X}}^2 \quad (5.27)$$

and, using that  $a + 2\varepsilon_0 - \delta > 0$ , we obtain

$$\|B^{2,1}\|_{H^{N+\frac{1}{2}}} \leq C(N, \delta) \|E^{per}\|_{\mathbb{X}}^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} \frac{e^{(\tau-s)(a+\delta)} e^{2(a+\varepsilon_0)s}}{(\tau-s)^{\frac{1}{2}}} ds \leq C(N, \delta) e^{2(a+\varepsilon_0)\tau} \|E^{per}\|_{\mathbb{X}}^2. \quad (5.28)$$

Hence,  $\|B^{2,1}\|_{\mathbb{X}} \leq e^{T(a+\varepsilon_0)} \|E^{per}\|_{\mathbb{X}}^2$ . As a consequence of Lemma 5.5, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|L^{1,1}\|_{H^N} &\leq M(N, \delta) \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} (\tau-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{(a+\varepsilon_0)(\tau-s)} \|W^{lim} \cdot \nabla E^{per}\|_{H^{N-1}} ds \\
&\leq M(N, \delta) \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} (\tau-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{(a+\varepsilon_0)(\tau-s)} e^{(2a+\varepsilon_0)s} \|E^{per}\|_{\mathbb{X}} ds
\end{aligned} \quad (5.29)$$

By employing Lemma 5.3 and Lemma 5.5, we deduce

$$\|L^{1,1}\|_{H^N} \leq C(N, \delta, a) e^{(2a+\varepsilon_0)\tau} \|E^{per}\|_{\mathbb{X}} \quad (5.30)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\|G^{0,1}\|_{H^N} &\leq \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} e^{(a+\delta)(\tau-s)} \|(W^{lim} \cdot \nabla E^{lim,\perp})\|_{H^N} ds \\
&\leq \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} e^{(a+\delta)(\tau-s)} e^{2as} ds \leq C(N, \delta, a) e^{2a\tau},
\end{aligned} \quad (5.31)$$

provided  $\delta < a$ , as a consequence of Lemma 5.3 and Lemma 5.5, which leads to the estimates

$$\|L^{1,1}\|_{\mathbb{X}} \leq C(N, \delta, a)e^{aT}\|E^{per}\|_{\mathbb{X}}, \quad \|G^{0,1}\|_{\mathbb{X}} \leq e^{(a-\varepsilon_0)T}.$$

Similar estimates can be carried on  $B^{2,2}(V^{per}, E^{per})$ ,  $L^{1,2}(W^{per}, E^{lim})$ ,  $L^{1,3}(V^{lim}, E^{per})$ ,  $L^{1,4}(V^{per}, E^{lim})$ ,  $G^{0,2}(V^{lim}, E^{lim})$ .

Based on these estimates above, it follows that for  $T$  sufficiently large and negative and  $\|E^{per}\|_{\mathbb{X}} \leq 1$ , we can make  $2\|B\| + \|L\| < 1$ , which gives  $\|\mathcal{T}(E^{per})\|_{\mathbb{X}} \leq 1$ . That is to say,  $\mathcal{T}|_{B(\mathbb{X})}$  is contractive. This finish the proof.  $\square$

In Theorem 5.1,  $\beta\Xi_0$  is the solution of (1.10) by choosing the force  $\tilde{F}(\xi, \tau)$ . Let  $E^{per} \in \mathbb{X}$  be the unique fixed point of  $\mathcal{T}$  guaranteed by Proposition 5.6 and showed that  $E^{per}$  decays as  $e^{(a+\varepsilon_0)\tau}$  as  $\tau \rightarrow -\infty$ . By induction, we can bootstrap it to  $O(e^{2a\tau})$  decay in  $H^N$  for  $N > \frac{5}{2}$ . We can construct  $E = \beta\Xi_0 + E^{lim} + E^{per}$  solving (1.10) which is not equal to  $\beta\Xi_0$ . Finally, undoing the similarity variable transform for both  $\beta\Xi_0$  and  $E$  gives a pair of distinct solutions of (1.1).

## Data Availability Statements

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

## References

- [1] T. Li and T. Qin, Physics and partial differential equations, Vol. II. Translated from the 2000 Chinese edition by Yachun Li. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA; Higher Education Press, Beijing, 2014.
- [2] D. Biskamp, Nonlinear Magnetohydrodynamics, Cambridge Monographs on Plasma Physics. Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- [3] D. Biskamp, Magnetohydrodynamic Turbulence, Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- [4] P. A. Davidson, An Introduction to Magnetohydrodynamics, Cambridge Texts in Applied Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- [5] M. Sermange and R. Temam, Some mathematical questions related to the MHD equations, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 36(5):635-664, 1983.
- [6] J. Leray, Sur le mouvement d'un liquide visqueux emplissant l'espace, Acta Math., 63(1):193-248, 1934.

- [7] E. Hopf, Über die Anfangswertaufgabe für die hydrodynamischen Grundgleichungen, *Math. Nachr.*, 4:213-231, 1951.
- [8] G.Duvaut and J.L.Lions, Inquations en thermolasticit et magnto-hydrodynamique, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 46:241-279, 1972.
- [9] M. Vishik, Instability and non-uniqueness in the Cauchy problem for the Euler equations of an ideal incompressible fluid, part i, 2018.
- [10] M. Vishik, Instability and non-uniqueness in the Cauchy problem for the Euler equations of an ideal incompressible fluid, part ii, 2018.
- [11] D. Albritton, E. Brué, M. Colombo, C. De Lellis, V. Giri, M. Janisch, and H. Kwon, Instability and nonuniqueness for the 2d Euler equations in vorticity form, after M. Vishik, 2021.
- [12] D. Albritton, E. Brué and M. Colombo, Non-uniqueness of Leray solutions of the forced Navier-Stokes equations, *Annals of Mathematics*, 196:415-455, 2022.
- [13] H. Jia and V. Šverák, Local-in-space estimates near initial time for weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations and forward self-similar solutions, *Invent. Math.*, 196(1):233-265, 2014.
- [14] H. Jia and V. Sverak, Are the incompressible 3d Navier-Stokes equations locally ill-posed in the natural energy space?, *J. Funct. Anal.*, 268(12):3734-3766, 2015.
- [15] J. Guillod and V. Šverák, Numerical investigations of non-uniqueness for the Navier-Stokes initial value problem in borderline spaces, arXiv:1704.00560.
- [16] T. Buckmaster and V. Vicol, Nonuniqueness of weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equation, *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 189(1):101-144, 2019.
- [17] T. Buckmaster, M. Colombo and V. Vicol, Wild solutions of the navier-stokes equations whose singular sets in time have hausdorff dimension strictly less than 1, *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)* 24, 2022.
- [18] R. Beekie, T. Buckmaster and V. Vicol, Weak solutions of ideal MHD which do not conserve magnetic helicity, *Ann. PDE*, 6(1), 2020.
- [19] Y. Li, Z. Zeng and D. Zhang, Non-uniqueness of weak solutions to 3D magnetohydrodynamic equations, *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 165:232-285, 2022.
- [20] Y. Li, Z. Zeng and D. Zhag, Sharp non-uniqueness of weak solutions to 3D magnetohydrodynamic equations, arXiv:2208.00624.
- [21] Z. Lin and Y. Wang, Dynamical magneto-rotational instability, arXiv:2310.10075.

- [22] A. J. Meir, The equations of stationary, incompressible magnetohydrodynamics with mixed boundary conditions, *Comput. Math. Appl.*, 25(12):13-29, 1993.
- [23] H. Tasso and G. N. Throumoulopoulos, Axisymmetric ideal magnetohydrodynamic equilibria with incompressible flows, *Physics of Plasmas*, 5(6):2378-2383, 1998.
- [24] L. Rayleigh, On the stability, or instability, of certain fluid motions. *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, 11:57-70, 1880.
- [25] P. G. Drazin and W. H. Reid. *Hydrodynamic stability*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.
- [26] J. L. Synge, The stability of heterogeneous liquids, *Trans. Roy. Soc. Canada*, 27(3):1-18, 1933.
- [27] E. P. Velikhov, Stability of an Ideally Conducting Liquid Flowing Between Cylinders Rotating in a Magnetic Field, *J. Exptl. Theoret. Phys.*, 36:1398-1404, 1959.
- [28] S. Chandrasekhar, The stability of non-dissipative Couette flow in hydromagnetics, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, 46(2):253-257, 1960.
- [29] S. Balbus, Enhanced angular momentum transport in accretion disks, *Annu. Rev. Astron. Astrophys*, 41, 555-597, 2003.
- [30] S. Balbus and J. Hawley, A powerful local shear instability in weakly magnetized disks. I-Linear analysis. II-Nonlinear evolution, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 376: 214-233, 1991.
- [31] S. Balbus and J. Hawley, Instability, turbulence, and enhanced transport in accretion disk, *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 70(1):1-53, 1998.
- [32] J. M. Stone, Astrophysical magnetohydrodynamics, *Bull. Astr. Soc. India*, 39:129-143, 2011.
- [33] Z. Lin and C. Zeng, Separable Hamiltonian PDEs and turning point principle for stability of gaseous stars, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 75(11):2511-2572, 2022.
- [34] K.-J. Engel and R. Nagel, *One-Parameter Semigroups for Linear Evolution Equations*, *Grad. Texts in Math.* 194, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000
- [35] T. Kato, *Perturbation theory for linear operators*, *Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften*, Band 132. Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., New York, 1966.
- [36] T. P. Tsai, *Lectures on Navier-Stokes equations*, *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*, 192. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2018.