

SHARP NON-UNIQUENESS FOR THE NAVIER-STOKES EQUATIONS IN \mathbb{R}^3

CHANGXING MIAO, YAO NIE, AND WEIKUI YE

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we prove a sharp and strong non-uniqueness for a class of weak solutions to the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations in \mathbb{R}^3 . To be more precise, we exhibit the non-uniqueness result in a strong sense, that is, any weak solution is non-unique in $L^p([0, T]; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3))$ with $1 \leq p < 2$. Moreover, this non-uniqueness result is sharp with regard to the classical Ladyzhenskaya-Prodi-Serrin criteria at endpoint $(2, \infty)$, which extends the sharp nonuniqueness for the Navier-Stokes equations on torus \mathbb{T}^3 in the recent groundbreaking work (Cheskidov and Luo, *Invent. Math.*, 229 (2022), pp. 987-1054) to the setting of the whole space. The key ingredient is developing a new iterative scheme that balances the compact support of the Reynolds stress error with the non-compact support of the solution via introducing incompressible perturbation fluid.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we consider the Cauchy problem for the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u - \Delta u + \operatorname{div}(u \otimes u) + \nabla p = 0, & (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3, \\ \operatorname{div} u = 0, & (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3, \end{cases} \quad (\text{NS})$$

associated with initial data $u|_{t=0} = u_0$. Here $u : \mathbb{R}^3 \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ denotes the velocity of the incompressible fluid and $p : \mathbb{R}^3 \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ represents the pressure field.

For the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations (NS), Leray in the original work [28] proved the existence of global weak solutions in $C_w([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^2([0, T]; \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3))$ with the energy inequality

$$\|u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + 2 \int_0^t \|\nabla u(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \leq \|u_0\|_{L^2}^2, \quad \forall t \in [0, T].$$

And this result was further developed by Hopf [20] in general domains. This class of weak solutions is now called as *Leray-Hopf weak solutions*. The existence of Leray-Hopf weak solutions to the equations (NS) has been proven for nearly a century, but the issues of uniqueness and regularity for Leray-Hopf weak solutions of the equations (NS) remain open. In order to understand how far we are from addressing these challenging problems, many researchers are committed to seeking uniqueness or regularity criteria, which serve as sufficient conditions to ensure the uniqueness or regularity of Leray-Hopf weak solutions. There has been a variety of uniqueness criteria, such as the serrin type criterion, which was established by Prodi [36], Serrin [38], Ladyzhenskaya [27]

Date: December 16, 2024.

Key words and phrases. The Navier-Stokes equations; Weak solution; Sharp non-uniqueness; Cauchy problem; Convex integration.

and Kozono-Sohr [26]. This shows that Leray-Hopf weak solutions with the same initial data are consistent on $[0, T]$, provided one of Leray-Hopf weak solutions u satisfies

$$u \in L^p([0, T]; L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)), \text{ with } \frac{2}{p} + \frac{3}{q} \leq 1, \quad 3 \leq q \leq \infty. \quad (1.1)$$

The condition (1.1) can also serve as a regularity criterion for the Leray-Hopf weak solutions and readers can refer to [17, 27, 36] and references therein for more details.

As a matter of fact, Fabes, Jones and Rivière [18] proved that the condition (1.1) except for the endpoint case $q = 3$ also acts as uniqueness criterion for *very weak solution* of (NS). Later, Furioli, Lemarié-Rieusset and Terraneo [19] showed that the very weak solution is unique in the functional space $C([0, T]; L^3(\mathbb{R}^3))$. Here the very weak solution is defined as follows.

Definition 1.1 (Very weak solution). *Let $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ be divergence-free in the sense of distributions. We say that $u \in L^2([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3)$ is a very weak solution to the equations (NS) if*

- (1) *For a.e. $t \in [0, T]$, $u(\cdot, t)$ is divergence-free in the sense of distributions;*
- (2) *For all divergence-free test functions $\phi \in \mathcal{D}_T$,*¹

$$\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\partial_t - \Delta) \phi u + \nabla \phi : u \otimes u \, dx \, dt = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u_0 \phi(0, x) \, dx,$$

where $\nabla \phi : u \otimes u = \partial_i \phi_j u_i u_j$ under the Einstein summation convention.

On the non-uniqueness problems for different types of weak solutions, there have been major progresses in recent years. For the 3D incompressible Navier-Stokes equations in the periodic setting, Buckmaster and Vicol in [9] made the significant break-through via a L_x^2 -based intermittent convex integration scheme, demonstrating that weak solutions are not unique in $C([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{T}^3))$. Subsequently, Buckmaster, Colombo and Vicol [6] proved that the wild solutions can be generated by $H^3(\mathbb{T}^3)$ initial data, which implies the non-uniqueness of very weak solutions. However, the regularity of these weak solutions is far from the critical functional space $L^p([0, T]; L^q(\mathbb{T}^3))$ with $\frac{2}{p} + \frac{3}{q} = 1$. Recently, Cheskidov and Luo in the remarkable paper [10] proved the nonuniqueness of very weak solutions in the class $L^p([0, T]; L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3))$ for $1 \leq p < 2$ and this result implies the sharpness of the Ladyzhenskaya-Prodi-Serrin criteria $\frac{2}{p} + \frac{3}{q} \leq 1$ at the endpoint $(p, q) = (2, \infty)$. A series of works on Euler equations, e.g. [5, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16, 21, 22], is based on developing the method of convex integration, which was also successfully applied to study other fluid dynamics models, for instance, the stationary Navier-Stokes equations [30], the transport equations [4, 11, 12, 34, 35], the MHD equations [3, 29, 31], the Boussinesq equations [32, 39, 40]. Apart from using convex integration to construct non-unique weak solutions, mathematicians attempt to use spectral analysis methods to study the non-uniqueness of Leray-Hopf weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations. For example, Jia and Šverák [25] provided the spectral conditions as sufficient

¹Let $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ denote the space of rapidly decreasing functions on \mathbb{R}^n . We denote by \mathcal{D}_T those vector functions $\phi(x, t) = (\phi_1(x, t), \phi_2(x, t), \phi_3(x, t))$ such that $\phi_i(x, t) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^4)$, $\phi_i(x, t) = 0$ for $t \geq T$ and $\text{div} \phi = \sum_{i=1}^3 \partial_{x_i} \phi_i(x, t) = 0$ for all t .

conditions for non-uniqueness of Leray-Hopf weak solutions. Albritton, Brué and Colombo [1] proved the non-uniqueness of the Leray-Hopf weak solutions of the equations (NS) with a special forcing term.

To the best of our knowledge, the works (e.g. [6, 9, 10]) on the non-uniqueness of weak solutions for the Navier-Stokes equations within the convex integration scheme are established under the periodic setting, and the iterative scheme in these works cannot be directly applied to the case of unbounded domains, such as \mathbb{R}^3 . On the other hand, it has been shown that all very weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations (NS) with the same initial data are consistent in $L^2([0, T]; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3))$, while the counterexamples in [10] show the non-uniqueness of very weak solutions in $L^p([0, T]; L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3))$ for $1 \leq p < 2$. It is natural to ask whether one can show the sharp non-uniqueness of very weak solutions in $L^p([0, T]; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3))$ for $1 \leq p < 2$. In this paper, we aim to address this question. For convenience, we refer to very weak solution in Definition 1.1 as weak solution in the remaining part of this paper.

Before stating our results, we give two classes of non-uniqueness definitions in functional space X introduced in [10]:

- “Weak non-uniqueness”: there exists a non-unique weak solution in the class X .
- “Strong non-uniqueness”: any weak solution in the class X is non-unique.

Now we are in position to state our main theorem, which reveals a sharp non-uniqueness in a strong sense with regard to the classical Ladyzhenskaya-Prodi-Serrin criteria at endpoint $(2, \infty)$ in the whole space \mathbb{R}^3 .

Theorem 1.2 (Sharp and strong non-uniqueness). *Let $1 \leq p < 2$ and $T_0 > 0$. Any weak solution u of the equations (NS) in $L^p([0, T_0]; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3))$ is non-unique.*

Remark 1.3. *Given $1 \leq p < 2$, Cheskidov and Luo [10] showed the non-uniqueness of a weak solution u to the Navier-Stokes equations in $L^p([0, T_0]; L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3))$ if u has at least one interval regularity. Our result shows the non-uniqueness of any weak solution u in $L^p([0, T_0]; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3))$ without imposing the regularity assumption on u . More importantly, in the setting of the whole space, we develop a new iterative scheme via incompressible perturbation fluid, which is of independent interest.*

Let us outline the main ideas in \mathbb{R}^3 . The construction of weak solutions in Theorem 1.2 is based on an iteration scheme via the technique of convex integration, see e.g. [6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 15]. Our strategy is reducing Theorem 1.2 to Proposition 3.1 below. To prove Proposition 3.1, we construct a sequence of approximate solutions to the so-called Navier–Stokes–Reynolds system governed

by ²

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u_q - \Delta u_q + \operatorname{div}(u_q \otimes u_q) + \nabla p_q = \operatorname{div} \mathring{R}_q, \\ \nabla \cdot u_q = 0, \end{cases} \quad (\text{NSR})$$

associated with some initial data $u^{\text{in}} \in H^3(\mathbb{R}^3)$. The *Reynolds stress* \mathring{R}_q is trace-free symmetric matrix.

To construct weak solution u in $L_t^p L_x^\infty \cap L_{t,x}^2$, we design the perturbation $w_{q+1} \sim u_{q+1} - u_q$ such that $\|w_{q+1}\|_{L_t^p L_x^\infty \cap L_{t,x}^2} \rightarrow 0$ and $\mathring{R}_q \rightarrow 0$ in an appropriate sense. A key ingredient in reducing the size of \mathring{R}_{q+1} is to construct highly oscillatory perturbation w_{q+1} so that the Reynolds stress error \mathring{R}_q can be cancelled by the low frequency of $w_{q+1} \otimes w_{q+1}$, which naturally requires that \mathring{R}_q tends to 0 in $L_{t,x}^1$ on the iteration scheme. Unfortunately, compared with the periodic setting, such requirement makes it difficult to construct $L_{t,x}^2$ perturbations in the entire space. Roughly speaking, the perturbation w_{q+1} in [10] is constructed as

$$w_{q+1} \sim \sum_{k \in \Lambda} a_k \left(\operatorname{Id} - \frac{\mathring{R}_q}{\chi(\mathring{R}_q)} \right) \chi^{1/2}(\mathring{R}_q) \mathbf{W}_k(\sigma x) g(\nu t),$$

where \mathbf{W}_k are Mikado flows, g is temporal concentration function and $\chi : \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \times \mathbb{R}^+$ is a positive smooth function. Such χ guarantees $w_{q+1} \in L_{t,x}^2$ for $\mathring{R}_q \in L_{t,x}^1$ with compact spatial support, yet fail to ensure $w_{q+1} \in L_{t,x}^2$ when $\mathring{R}_q \in L_{t,x}^1$ without compact support.

From a technical perspective, the procedure of constructing perturbation via the geometric lemma imposes the Reynolds stress error to be compactly support at each iteration step. As we know, the inverse of the divergence operator preserves the periodic property of functions. This feature naturally ensures that the support of Reynolds stress errors display compactness in the periodic torus. However, in the setting of the whole space, when the inverse of the divergence operator acts on a function with compact support, the resulting function may not have compact support. Furthermore, even for smooth initial data with compact support, the solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations may not possess compact support. These facts imply that the iterative scheme utilized on \mathbb{T}^3 is not enough for ensuring Reynolds stress errors with compact support and divergence-form at each step in \mathbb{R}^3 . This compels us to develop a new iterative scheme.

As we know, there has no result on the non-uniqueness of weak solutions for the Navier-Stokes equations via the convex integration in \mathbb{R}^3 , but there has some progress for the Euler equations. For instance, Isett and Oh in an impressive work [24] constructed $C_{t,x}^{\frac{1}{5}-}$ Euler flow with compact space-time support in \mathbb{R}^3 via a new method of solving the symmetric divergence Equation, which allows them to obtain a new Euler–Reynold stress that is similarly localized in space. Different from their ideas, we are focused on developing a new iterative scheme to avoid the use of the divergence inverse operator. The main difficulty that follows is to ensure compatibility between the Reynolds stress error with compact support and divergence-form, and the non-compact support

²Here and below, $v \otimes u := (v_i u_j)_{i,j=1}^3$, and the divergence of a 3×3 matrix $M = (M_{ij})_{i,j=1}^3$ is defined by $\operatorname{div} M$ with components $(\operatorname{div} M)_j := \partial_i M_{ij}$.

property of the solution to (NSR) at each step. The core idea of overcoming this difficulty is to balance the non-compact support and non-divergence form parts of the new Reynolds stress by means of incompressible perturbation fluid $w_{q+1}^{(t)}$.

To put it roughly, we construct the perturbation w_{q+1} by three parts: $w_{q+1}^{(p)}$, $w_{q+1}^{(c)}$ and $w_{q+1}^{(t)}$. The main perturbation $w_{q+1}^{(p)}$ has compact support, and is composed by the shear intermittent flows and the temporal concentration function. $w_{q+1}^{(c)}$ is the incompressibility corrector and $w_{q+1}^{(t)}$ is the so-called incompressible perturbation fluid. In the new iterative scheme, we decompose u_q into two parts: u_q^{loc} with compact support and $u_q^{\text{non-loc}}$ without compact support. Then the new Reynolds stress \mathring{R}_{q+1} is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{div} \mathring{R}_{q+1} &\sim \text{div} \mathring{R}_q + \text{div} E_{q+1} + F_{q+1} \\ &+ \partial_t w_{q+1}^{(t)} - \Delta w_{q+1}^{(t)} + \text{div}(w_{q+1}^{(t)} \otimes w_{q+1}^{(t)}) + \text{div}(w_{q+1}^{(t)} \otimes u_q^{\text{non-loc}}) + \text{div}(u_q^{\text{non-loc}} \otimes w_{q+1}^{(t)}) + \nabla p_t. \end{aligned}$$

Here E_{q+1} consists of the parts stemming from $w_{q+1}^{(p)}$, $w_{q+1}^{(c)}$ or u_q^{loc} , hence E_{q+1} has compact support. The low frequency part of $w_{q+1}^{(p)} \otimes w_{q+1}^{(p)}$, one part of E_{q+1} , cancels the Reynolds stress \mathring{R}_q so that the size of the stress error $\text{div}(\mathring{R}_q + E_{q+1})$ can be reduced. For F_{q+1} which corresponds to the parts of the non-divergence form derived from $w_{q+1}^{(p)}$, $w_{q+1}^{(c)}$ or u_q , benefiting from the special structure of the shear intermittent flows such that the oscillation direction is perpendicular to the direction of flow, one could expect that F_{q+1} is small in a suitable sense. This in turn guarantees the existence of incompressible Navier-Stokes fluid $w_{q+1}^{(t)}$ that starts from the identically zero flow, is small in some space and cancels F_{q+1} . Consequently, part of E_{q+1} constitutes the new Reynolds tensor \mathring{R}_{q+1} , which maintains the divergence form and possesses compact support. Then $u_{q+1}^{\text{loc}} \sim u_q^{\text{loc}} + w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)}$ with compact support, and $u_{q+1}^{\text{non-loc}} \sim u_q^{\text{non-loc}} + w_{q+1}^{(t)}$ is small.

To show the strong non-uniqueness, we construct weak solution v that satisfies the prescribed $L^2([\frac{3}{4}T, T], L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$ -norm

$$\int_{\frac{3}{4}T}^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |v(x, t)|^2 dx dt = E$$

with the same initial data. In fact, the proof consists of three steps. The first step is mollifying the approximation solution u_q as u_{ℓ_q} for establishing higher regularity estimates of the perturbation. To avoid the mollification procedure interfering in initial data, we introduce \bar{u}_q by gluing u_q and u_{ℓ_q} in the second step. In the third step, we introduce incompressible perturbation fluid to construct the perturbation w_{q+1} of \bar{u}_q so that the iteration proceeds successfully in our iterative scheme. By developing the new iterative scheme, we firstly show non-uniqueness of weak solutions with non-compact space support for the Navier-Stokes equations through convex integration.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we compile several useful tools including geometric Lemma, an improved Hölder inequality and the definition of Lerner-Chemin spaces.

Lemma 2.1 (Geometric Lemma [3]). *Let $B_\sigma(\text{Id})$ denote the ball of radius σ centered at Id in the space of 3×3 symmetric matrices. There exists a set $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{S}^2 \cap \mathbb{Q}^3$ that consists of vectors k with associated orthonormal basis $(k, \bar{k}, \bar{\bar{k}})$, $\epsilon > 0$ and smooth function $a_k : B_\epsilon(\text{Id}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that, for every positive definite symmetric matrix $R \in B_\epsilon(\text{Id})$, we have the following identity:*

$$R = \sum_{k \in \Lambda} a_k^2(R) \bar{k} \otimes \bar{\bar{k}}.$$

Remark 2.2. *For instance, $\Lambda = \{\frac{5}{13}e_1 \pm \frac{12}{13}e_2, \frac{12}{13}e_1 \pm \frac{5}{13}e_3, \frac{5}{13}e_2 \pm \frac{12}{13}e_3\}$ and $(k, \bar{k}, \bar{\bar{k}})$ are as follows:*

k	\bar{k}	$\bar{\bar{k}}$
$\frac{5}{13}e_1 \pm \frac{12}{13}e_2$	$\frac{5}{13}e_1 \mp \frac{12}{13}e_2$	e_3
$\frac{12}{13}e_1 \pm \frac{5}{13}e_3$	$\frac{12}{13}e_1 \mp \frac{5}{13}e_3$	e_2
$\frac{5}{13}e_2 \pm \frac{12}{13}e_3$	$\frac{5}{13}e_2 \mp \frac{12}{13}e_3$	e_1

We provide an improved Hölder's inequality. In fact, the improved Hölder's inequality on periodic functions is established in [10, 34]. From its proof, one easily deduces the following improved Hölder's inequality for functions with compact support.

Lemma 2.3 ([10, 34]). *Assume that $d \geq 1$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, λ and L are positive integers. Let $\Omega = [-\frac{L}{2}, \frac{L}{2}]^d \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and smooth function f support on Ω . $g : \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth function and $\mathbb{T}^d = \mathbb{R}^d / (L\mathbb{Z})^d$. Then we have*

$$\left| \|fg(\lambda \cdot)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} - \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \|g\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \right| \lesssim L^{\frac{1}{p}} \lambda^{-\frac{1}{p}} \|f\|_{C^1(\Omega)} \|g\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)}.$$

Proposition 2.4. *For $0 < T_1 < T_2$, let u_1 and u_2 be weak solutions of the equations (NS) respectively on $[0, T_1]$ and $[T_1, T_2]$ in a sense of Definition 1.1 with $u_1(0) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $u_1(T_1) = u_2(T_1) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Then u defined by*

$$u(t) = u_1(t), \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T_1], \quad u(t) = u_2(t), \quad \text{for } t \in [T_1, T_2]$$

is a weak solution of (NS) in Definition 1.1 on $[0, T_2]$.

Proof. Let $\eta(t) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\eta(t) \equiv 1$ for $t \leq -1$ and $\eta(t) \equiv 0$ for $t \geq 0$. Suppose that $\epsilon < T_1$, we define $\eta_\epsilon^{(1)}(t) = \eta(\frac{t-T_1}{\epsilon})$ and $\eta_\epsilon^{(2)}(t) = \eta_\epsilon^{(1)}(-t)$. For any $\phi \in \mathcal{D}_T$, since u_1 is a weak solution of (NS) on $[0, T_1]$ and $u \equiv u_1$ on $[0, T_1]$, we have

$$\int_0^{T_1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} ((\partial_t - \Delta)(\eta_\epsilon^{(1)}(t)\phi))u + \nabla(\eta_\epsilon^{(1)}(t)\phi) : u \otimes u \, dx \, dt = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u_1(0)\phi(0, x) \, dx.$$

Noting the support of $\eta_\epsilon^{(1)}(t)$, the integration region in the above equality can be extended to $[0, T_2]$. Similarly, since u_2 is a weak solution of (NS) on $[T_1, T_2]$ and $u \equiv u_2$ on $[T_1, T_2]$, one obtains that

$$\int_{T_1}^{T_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} ((\partial_t - \Delta)(\eta_\epsilon^{(2)}(t)\phi))u + \nabla(\eta_\epsilon^{(2)}(t)\phi) : u \otimes u \, dx \, dt = 0,$$

where the integration region can be extended to $[0, T_2]$. Collecting these equalities together shows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{T_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} ((\partial_t - \Delta)((\eta_\epsilon^{(1)}(t) + \eta_\epsilon^{(2)}(t))\phi))u + \nabla((\eta_\epsilon^{(1)}(t) + \eta_\epsilon^{(2)}(t))\phi) : u \otimes u \, dx \, dt \\ &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u_1(0)\phi(0, x) \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

A direct computation yields that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{T_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} ((\partial_t - \Delta)((\eta_\epsilon^{(1)}(t) + \eta_\epsilon^{(2)}(t))\phi))u \, dx \, dt \\ &= \int_0^{T_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} ((\partial_t - \Delta)\phi)u(\eta_\epsilon^{(1)}(t) + \eta_\epsilon^{(2)}(t)) \, dx \, dt + \int_0^{T_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \phi u \partial_t(\eta_\epsilon^{(1)}(t) + \eta_\epsilon^{(2)}(t)) \, dx \, dt \\ &=: \text{I} + \text{II}. \end{aligned}$$

For I, owing to $u \in L^2([0, T_2] \times \mathbb{R}^3)$ and

$$\eta_\epsilon^{(1)}(t) + \eta_\epsilon^{(2)}(t) \rightarrow 1 \text{ in } L^2, \text{ as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0,$$

one deduces that

$$\text{I} \rightarrow \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (\partial_t - \Delta)\phi u \, dx \, dt, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

For II, by the definitions of $\eta_\epsilon^{(1)}(t)$ and $\eta_\epsilon^{(2)}(t)$, we have

$$\text{II} = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \int_{T_1-\epsilon}^{T_1} \eta' \left(\frac{t-T_1}{\epsilon} \right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u_1 \phi \, dx \, dt - \frac{1}{\epsilon} \int_{T_1}^{T_1+\epsilon} \eta' \left(\frac{t-T_1}{\epsilon} \right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u_2 \phi \, dx \, dt.$$

By [18, Theorem 2.1], the definition of weak solutions in Definition 1.1 is equivalent to the integral equation, from which we infer that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u_1 \phi \, dx \in C([0, T_1])$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u_2 \phi \, dx \in C([T_1, T_2])$. Therefore, T_1 is a Lebesgue point for $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u_1 \phi \, dx$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u_2 \phi \, dx$. By Lebesgue differentiation theorem, we have

$$\text{II} \rightarrow \eta'(0) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u_1(T_1)\phi(T_1) \, dx - \eta'(0) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u_2(T_1)\phi(T_1) \, dx = 0, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Thanks to

$$\eta_\epsilon^{(1)}(t) + \eta_\epsilon^{(2)}(t) \rightarrow 1, \forall t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \text{and} \quad u \otimes u \in L^1([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3),$$

one deduces by dominated convergence theorem that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{T_2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \nabla((\eta_\epsilon^{(1)}(t) + \eta_\epsilon^{(2)}(t))\phi) : u \otimes u \, dx \, dt \\ &= \int_0^{T_2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (\eta_\epsilon^{(1)}(t) + \eta_\epsilon^{(2)}(t)) \nabla \phi : u \otimes u \, dx \, dt \rightarrow \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \nabla \phi : u \otimes u \, dx \, dt, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{T_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} ((\partial_t - \Delta)((\eta_\epsilon^{(1)}(t) + \eta_\epsilon^{(2)}(t))\phi))u + \nabla((\eta_\epsilon^{(1)}(t) + \eta_\epsilon^{(2)}(t))\phi) : u \otimes u \, dx \, dt \\ & \rightarrow \int_0^{T_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} ((\partial_t - \Delta)\phi)u + \nabla \phi : u \otimes u \, dx \, dt \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

In conclusion, one has

$$\int_0^{T_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} ((\partial_t - \Delta)\phi)u + \nabla \phi : u \otimes u \, dx \, dt = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u_1(0)\phi(0, x) \, dx.$$

□

Next, we give the temporal and spatial mollifiers which we will use in Section 4.

Definition 2.5 (Mollifiers). *Let nonnegative functions $\varphi(t) \in C_c^\infty(-1, 0)$ and $\psi(x) \in C_c^\infty(B_1(0))$ be standard mollifying kernels such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi(t) \, dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \psi(x) \, dx = 1$. For each $\epsilon > 0$, we define two sequences of mollifiers as follows:*

$$\varphi_\epsilon(t) := \frac{1}{\epsilon} \varphi\left(\frac{t}{\epsilon}\right), \quad \psi_\epsilon(x) := \frac{1}{\epsilon^3} \psi\left(\frac{x}{\epsilon}\right).$$

In this paper, we will introduce the incompressible perturbation fluid in the following mixed time-spatial Besov spaces, the so-called Lerner-Chemin spaces.

Definition 2.6 ([2, 33]). *Let $T > 0$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $1 \leq r, p, q \leq \infty$. The mixed time-spatial Besov spaces $L_T^r B_{p,q}^s$ consists of all $u \in \mathcal{S}'$ satisfying*

$$\|u\|_{\tilde{L}_T^r B_{p,q}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\| \left(2^{js} \|\Delta_j u\|_{L^r([0,T]; L^p(\mathbb{R}^d))} \right)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \right\|_{\ell^q(\mathbb{Z})} < \infty,$$

where Δ_j is localization nonhomogeneous operator from the Littlewood-Paley decomposition theory. Particularly, $H^s(\mathbb{R}^d) \sim B_{2,2}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

We present a result describing the smoothing effect of the heat flow in the context of Besov spaces.

Lemma 2.7 ([2, 33]). *Let $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $1 \leq r_1, r_2, p, q \leq \infty$ with $r_2 \leq r_1$. Consider the heat equation*

$$\partial_t u - \Delta u = f, \quad u(0, x) = u_0(x).$$

Assume that $u_0 \in B_{p,q}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $f \in \widetilde{L}_t^{r_2}(B_{p,q}^{s-2+\frac{2}{r_2}}(\mathbb{R}^d))$. Then the above equation has a unique solution $u \in \widetilde{L}_t^{r_1}(\dot{B}_{p,q}^{s+\frac{2}{r_1}}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ satisfying

$$\|u\|_{\widetilde{L}_T^{r_1}(B_{p,q}^{s+\frac{2}{r_1}}(\mathbb{R}^d))} \leq C(1+T)(\|u_0\|_{B_{p,q}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \|f\|_{\widetilde{L}_T^{r_2}(\dot{B}_{p,q}^{s-2+\frac{2}{r_2}}(\mathbb{R}^d))}),$$

where C is a universal constant.

Notation For a \mathbb{T}^d -periodic function f , we denote

$$\mathbb{P}_{=0}f := \widehat{f}(0) = \frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}^d|} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} f(x) dx, \quad \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}f = f - \mathbb{P}_{=0}f.$$

In the following, the notation $x \lesssim y$ means $x \leq Cy$ for a universal constant that may change from line to line. We use the symbol \lesssim_N to express that the constant in the inequality depends on the parameter N . Without ambiguity, we will denote $L^m([0, T]; Y(\mathbb{R}^3))$ and $L^m([0, T]; L^m(\mathbb{R}^3))$ by $L_t^m Y$ and $L_{t,x}^m$ respectively.

3. INDUCTION SCHEME

3.1. Parameters. First of all, we introduce several parameters throughout this paper. Fixed $0 < T < 1$ with $T \in \mathbb{Q}$, N_Λ and M be positive integer and $1 \leq p < 2$, let K be integer number with $K > \max\{\frac{4}{T}, 2M\}$. We define $\epsilon_0, \sigma_0 \in \mathbb{Q}$ and α be positive constants

$$2\epsilon_0 \leq \min\{2^{-12}, \frac{2}{p} - 1\}, \quad \sigma_0 \leq \frac{\epsilon_0}{20}, \quad \alpha < \frac{\sigma_0}{100}. \quad (3.1)$$

Let $b \in \mathbb{N}$ with $b(1 - \epsilon_0) \in \mathbb{N}$, $b\sigma_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and

$$b \geq \frac{2^{20}}{\alpha}, \quad \beta = 2^{-20}\alpha b^{-1}. \quad (3.2)$$

Suppose that $a \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying that $\frac{a}{T} \in 4\mathbb{N}$ and $a > \max\{K, N_\Lambda\}$. We define

$$\lambda_q := a^{b^q}, \quad \delta_q := \lambda_q^{-2\beta}, \quad \ell_q := \lambda_q^{-50}, \quad q \geq 0, \quad (3.3)$$

and

$$\Omega_q := \left[-\frac{K}{2} + (\lambda_{q-1}\delta_{q-1}^{1/2})^{-1}, \frac{K}{2} - (\lambda_{q-1}\delta_{q-1}^{1/2})^{-1} \right]^3, \quad q \geq 1. \quad (3.4)$$

3.2. Iterative procedure. For given initial data $u^{\text{in}} \in H^3(\mathbb{R}^3)$, there exist $0 < T < 1$ and a smooth solution $u_1 \in C([0, T]; H^3(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^2([0, T]; H^4(\mathbb{R}^3))$ of the equations (NS). We choose the constant E such that

$$\int_{\frac{3}{4}T}^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u_1(x, t)|^2 dx dt + 2\delta_2 \leq E \leq \int_{\frac{3}{4}T}^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u_1(x, t)|^2 dx dt + 4\delta_2. \quad (3.5)$$

Furthermore, for given positive constant K , we define the spatial cut-off function $\chi_K \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3; [0, 1])$ such that

$$\chi_K(x) = 1, \text{ if } |x| \leq \frac{K}{8} \text{ and } \chi(x) = 0, \text{ if } |x| \geq \frac{K}{4}.$$

Then we decompose u_1 by

$$u_1 = u_1 \chi_K + u_1 (1 - \chi_K) := u_1^{\text{loc}} + u_1^{\text{non-loc}}.$$

Owing to $u_1 \in C([0, T]; H^3(\mathbb{R}^3))$, we have

$$\|u_1\|_{L^2([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^p([0, T]; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3))} \leq \frac{M}{4} \quad (3.6)$$

for a large enough constant M and there exists a large enough integer K such that

$$\|u_1^{\text{non-loc}}\|_{\tilde{L}^\infty([0, T]; B_{2,1}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap \tilde{L}^1([0, T]; B_{2,1}^{5/2}(\mathbb{R}^3))} \leq \frac{1}{2M}, \quad (3.7)$$

To employ induction, we suppose that the solution $(u_q, p_q, \mathring{R}_q)$ of the equations (NSR) on $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3$ satisfies the following conditions:

$$u_q = u_q^{\text{loc}} + u_q^{\text{non-loc}}, \quad (3.8)$$

$$\|u_q\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \leq M(1 - \delta_q^{1/2}), \quad \|u_q\|_{L_t^\infty H^3} \leq \lambda_q^5, \quad (3.9)$$

$$\|u_q^{\text{loc}}\|_{L_{t,x}^2 \cap L_t^p L^\infty} \leq \frac{M}{2}(1 - \delta_q^{1/2}), \quad \text{supp}_x u_q^{\text{loc}} \subseteq \Omega_q, \quad (3.10)$$

$$\|u_q^{\text{non-loc}}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,2}^3} \leq \lambda_q^5, \quad \|u_q^{\text{non-loc}}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,1}^{1/2} \cap \tilde{L}_t^1 B_{2,1}^{5/2}} \leq M^{-1} + \sum_{k=2}^q \delta_{k+1} \lambda_k^{-6\alpha}, \quad (3.11)$$

$$2\delta_{q+1} \leq E - \int_{\frac{3}{4}T}^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u_q|^2 dx dt \leq 4\delta_{q+1}, \quad (3.12)$$

$$\text{supp}_x \mathring{R}_q \subseteq \Omega_q, \quad \mathring{R}_q(t, x) = 0, \forall t \in [0, \frac{T}{4} + 4\lambda_{q-1}^{-1}], \quad (3.13)$$

$$\|\mathring{R}_q\|_{L_{t,x}^1} \leq \delta_{q+1} \lambda_q^{-4\alpha}, \quad \|\mathring{R}_q\|_{L_t^\infty W^{3,1}} \leq \lambda_q^5, \quad (3.14)$$

where M and E are consistent with these in (3.5)–(3.7). The following proposition shows that there exists a solution $(u_{q+1}, p_{q+1}, \mathring{R}_{q+1})$ of the equations (NSR) satisfying the above inductive conditions (3.8)–(3.14) with q replaced by $q + 1$, which guarantees the iteration proceeds successfully. Indeed, by employing the iterative proposition as presented below, we are able to prove Theorem 1.2.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $1 \leq p < 2$ and the parameters $M, T, \lambda_q, \delta_q, \Omega_q$ be as in (3.3)–(3.7). Then there exist a universal constant C_0 and a_0 such that for $a > a_0$, the following holds. Assume that $(u_q, p_q, \mathring{R}_q)$ solves (NSR) with $q \geq 1$. Then there exists a solution $(u_{q+1}, p_{q+1}, \mathring{R}_{q+1})$ of the equations (NSR) on $[0, T]$, satisfying (3.8)–(3.14) with q replaced by $q + 1$, and such that*

$$u_{q+1}(t) = u_q(t), \quad \forall t \in [0, \frac{T}{4} + 4\lambda_q^{-1}], \quad (3.15)$$

$$\|u_{q+1} - u_q\|_{L_{t,x}^2 \cap L_t^p L_x^\infty} \leq C_0 \delta_{q+1}^{1/2}. \quad (3.16)$$

3.3. Proof of Theorem 1.2. Given a weak solution $u \in L^p([0, T_0]; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3))$ with initial data u_0 , there exists $t_0 \in (0, T_0)$ such that $u(t_0) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$. By the well-posedness theory of

the Navier-Stokes equations, we have a unique local mild solution u_1 on $[t_0, t_{\text{local}}] \subseteq [0, T_0]$ with initial data $u_1(t_0) = u(t_0)$ and there exists $0 < 4\varepsilon < t_{\text{local}} - t_0$ such that

$$u_1(t_0 + \varepsilon) \in H^3(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

Let $u_1(t_0 + \varepsilon) \in H^3(\mathbb{R}^3)$ be the initial data u^{in} as given in Section 3.2, then u_1 is a smooth solution of the equations (NS) on $[t_0 + \varepsilon, t_0 + \varepsilon + T]$ with some $T \leq \min\{1, \frac{1}{2}(t_{\text{local}} - t_0)\}$. Obviously, by taking a large enough and combining (3.5)–(3.7), u_1 satisfies (3.8)–(3.12) and \mathring{R}_1 satisfies (3.13) and (3.14) due $\mathring{R}_1 = 0$ at $q = 1$.

Utilizing Proposition 3.1 inductively, we obtain a sequence of solutions $\{(u_q, p_q, \mathring{R}_q)\}$ of the equations (NSR) satisfying the inductive estimates (3.8)–(3.14). By the definition of δ_q , one can easily deduce that $\sum_{i=2}^{\infty} \delta_i^{1/2}$ converges to a finite number. This fact combined with (3.16) implies that $\{u_q\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^2([t_0 + \varepsilon, t_0 + \varepsilon + T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^p([t_0 + \varepsilon, t_0 + \varepsilon + T]; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3))$. Since $\|\mathring{R}_q\|_{L^1_{t,x}} \rightarrow 0$ as $q \rightarrow \infty$, the limit function \tilde{v} is a weak solution of (NS) and satisfies

$$\tilde{v} \in L^2([t_0 + \varepsilon, t_0 + \varepsilon + T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^p([t_0 + \varepsilon, t_0 + \varepsilon + T]; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)), \quad (3.17)$$

$$\int_{t_0 + \varepsilon + \frac{3}{4}T}^{t_0 + \varepsilon + T} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\tilde{v}|^2 dx dt = E. \quad (3.18)$$

Thanks to (3.15), we have $\tilde{v}(t_0 + \varepsilon) = u_1(t_0 + \varepsilon)$.

By virtue of (3.17), one infers that $\tilde{v}(x, t) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ for a.e. $t \in [t_0 + \varepsilon, t_0 + \varepsilon + T]$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\tilde{v}(x, t_0 + \varepsilon + T) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Then there exists a Leray-Hopf solution V of (NS) on $[t_0 + \varepsilon + T, \infty)$, which is also a weak solution of (NS) on $[t_0 + \varepsilon + T, \infty)$ with initial data $\tilde{v}(t_0 + \varepsilon + T)$.

Finally, we construct a weak solution v of (NS) on $[0, T_0]$ by letting

$$\begin{aligned} v(t) &= u(t) \text{ if } t \in [0, t_0]; & v(t) &= u_1(t) \text{ if } t \in [t_0, t_0 + \varepsilon]; \\ v(t) &= \tilde{v}(t) \text{ if } t \in [t_0 + \varepsilon, t_0 + \varepsilon + T]; & v(t) &= V(t) \text{ if } t \in [t_0 + \varepsilon + T, T_0]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that u, u_1, \tilde{v} and V are weak solutions of the (NS) with $u(t_0) = \tilde{u}(t_0)$, $\tilde{u}(t_0 + \varepsilon) = \tilde{v}(t_0 + \varepsilon)$ and $\tilde{v}(t_0 + \varepsilon + T) = V(t_0 + \varepsilon + T)$, one could deduce that v is a weak solutions of the equations (NS) on $[0, T_0]$ by Proposition 2.4. Since the weak solution v satisfies

$$\int_{t_0 + \varepsilon + \frac{3}{4}T}^{t_0 + \varepsilon + T} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |v(x, t)|^2 dx dt = E,$$

where there exist infinitely many constant E satisfying (3.5), we conclude that $v \neq u$. Therefore, we finish the proof of Theorem 1.2.

4. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.1

In this section, we are devoted to the proof of Proposition 3.1. More specifically, we construct $(u_{q+1}, p_{q+1}, \mathring{R}_{q+1})$ in Proposition 3.1 by the following three steps:

- Step 1: Mollification: $(u_q, p_q, \mathring{R}_q) \mapsto (u_{\ell_q}, p_{\ell_q}, \mathring{R}_{\ell_q})$. We define $(u_{\ell_q}, p_{\ell_q}, \mathring{R}_{\ell_q})$ by mollifying $(u_q, p_q, \mathring{R}_q)$ so that we obtain higher regularity estimates for the perturbation.
- Step 2: Gluing: $(u_{\ell_q}, p_{\ell_q}, \mathring{R}_{\ell_q}) \mapsto (\bar{u}_q, \bar{p}_q, \mathring{R}_q)$. We introduce \bar{u}_q by gluing u_q and u_{ℓ_q} , which is employed to achieve the condition (3.15).
- Step 3: Perturbation: $(\bar{u}_q, \bar{p}_q, \mathring{R}_q) \mapsto (u_{q+1}, p_{q+1}, \mathring{R}_{q+1})$. By making use of the shear intermittent flows, the temporal concentration functions and incompressible perturbation fluid, we construct the perturbation w_{q+1} . Then we define u_{q+1} by adding w_{q+1} on \bar{u}_q .

4.1. Mollification. We define the functions $(u_{\ell_q}, p_{\ell_q}, \mathring{R}_{\ell_q})$ by the spatial mollifier ψ_{ℓ_q} and the time mollifier φ_{ℓ_q} in Definition 2.5 as follows: For $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\ell_q}(x, t) &:= \int_t^{t+\ell_q} (u_q * \psi_{\ell_q})(x, s) \varphi_{\ell_q}(t-s) ds, \\ u_{\ell_q}^{\text{loc}}(x, t) &:= \int_t^{t+\ell_q} (u_q^{\text{loc}} * \psi_{\ell_q})(x, s) \varphi_{\ell_q}(t-s) ds, \\ u_{\ell_q}^{\text{non-loc}}(x, t) &:= \int_t^{t+\ell_q} (u_q^{\text{non-loc}} * \psi_{\ell_q})(x, s) \varphi_{\ell_q}(t-s) ds, \\ p_{\ell_q}(x, t) &:= \int_t^{t+\ell_q} (p_q * \psi_{\ell_q})(x, s) \varphi_{\ell_q}(t-s) ds, \\ \mathring{R}_{\ell_q}(x, t) &:= \int_t^{t+\ell_q} (\mathring{R}_q * \psi_{\ell_q})(x, s) \varphi_{\ell_q}(t-s) ds, \\ R_q^{\text{rem}} &:= u_{\ell_q} \otimes u_{\ell_q} - \int_t^{t+\ell_q} ((u_q \otimes u_q) * \psi_{\ell_q})(x, s) \varphi_{\ell_q}(t-s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

One easily verifies that $(u_{\ell_q}, p_{\ell_q}, \mathring{R}_{\ell_q}, R_q^{\text{rem}})$ solves the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u_{\ell_q} - \Delta u_{\ell_q} + \text{div}(u_{\ell_q} \otimes u_{\ell_q}) + \nabla p_{\ell_q} = \text{div} \mathring{R}_{\ell_q} + \text{div} R_q^{\text{rem}}, \\ \nabla \cdot u_{\ell_q} = 0, \\ u_{\ell_q}|_{t=0} = \int_0^{\ell_q} (u_q * \psi_{\ell_q})(x, s) \varphi_{\ell_q}(-s) ds \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

such that

$$\text{supp}_x u_{\ell_q}^{\text{loc}} \subseteq \Omega_q + [-\lambda_q^{-1}, \lambda_q^{-1}]^3, \quad (4.2)$$

$$\mathring{R}_{\ell_q}(t, x) = 0, \quad \forall t \in [0, \frac{T}{4} + 3\lambda_q^{-1}], \quad \text{supp}_x \mathring{R}_{\ell_q} \subseteq \Omega_q + [-\lambda_q^{-1}, \lambda_q^{-1}]^3. \quad (4.3)$$

Moreover, $(u_{\ell_q}, \mathring{R}_{\ell_q}, R_q^{\text{rem}})$ satisfies the following estimates.

Proposition 4.1 (Estimates for $(u_{\ell_q}, \mathring{R}_{\ell_q}, R_q^{\text{rem}})$). *For any integers $L, N \geq 0$, we have*

$$\|\partial_t^L u_{\ell_q}\|_{L_t^\infty H^{N+3}} \lesssim \lambda_q^5 \ell_q^{-N-L}, \quad (4.4)$$

$$\|\mathring{R}_{\ell_q}\|_{L_{t,x}^1} \leq \delta_{q+1} \lambda_q^{-4\alpha}, \quad (4.5)$$

$$\|\partial_t^L \mathring{R}_{\ell_q}\|_{L_t^\infty W^{N+3,1}} \lesssim \lambda_q^5 \ell_q^{-N-L}, \quad (4.6)$$

$$\|\mathring{R}_q^{rem}\|_{L_t^\infty H^{N+2}} \lesssim \lambda_q^{10} \ell_q^{-N+1}. \quad (4.7)$$

4.2. **Gluing procedure.** Let $\zeta_q(t) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be defined by

$$\zeta_q(t) = 1, \quad t \leq \frac{T}{4} + 2\lambda_{q-1}^{-1}; \quad \zeta_q(t) = 0, \quad t \geq \frac{T}{4} + 3\lambda_{q-1}^{-1}; \quad |\partial_t^N \zeta_q| \leq C\lambda_{q-1}^N. \quad (4.8)$$

We define \bar{u}_q by

$$\bar{u}_q = \zeta_q u_q + (1 - \zeta_q) u_{\ell_q}, \quad (4.9)$$

and

$$\bar{u}_q^{\text{loc}} = \zeta_q u_q^{\text{loc}} + (1 - \zeta_q) u_{\ell_q}^{\text{loc}}, \quad \bar{u}_q^{\text{non-loc}} = \zeta_q u_q^{\text{non-loc}} + (1 - \zeta_q) u_{\ell_q}^{\text{non-loc}}.$$

Thanks to (3.9)–(3.11), one immediately shows that

$$\|\bar{u}_q^{\text{loc}}\|_{L_{t,x}^2 \cap L_t^p L^\infty} \leq \frac{M}{2} (1 - \delta_q^{1/2}), \quad \text{supp}_x \bar{u}_q^{\text{loc}} \subseteq \Omega_q + [-\lambda_q^{-1}, \lambda_q^{-1}]^3; \quad (4.10)$$

$$\|\bar{u}_q^{\text{non-loc}}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,2}^3} \leq \lambda_q^5, \quad \|\bar{u}_q^{\text{non-loc}}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,1}^{1/2} \cap \tilde{L}_t^1 B_{2,1}^{5/2}} \leq M^{-1} + \sum_{k=2}^q \delta_{k+1} \lambda_k^{-6\alpha}; \quad (4.11)$$

$$\|\bar{u}_q\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \leq M(1 - \delta_q^{1/2}), \quad \|\bar{u}_q\|_{L_t^\infty H^3} \leq \lambda_q^5. \quad (4.12)$$

Moreover, we infer from (3.9) and (4.9) that

$$\|u_q - \bar{u}_q\|_{L_{t,x}^2 \cap L_t^p L^\infty} = \|(1 - \zeta_q)(u_q - u_{\ell_q}^{\text{loc}})\|_{L_{t,x}^2 \cap L_t^p L^\infty} \leq C\ell_q \|u_q\|_{L_t^\infty H^3} \leq \lambda_q^{-40}. \quad (4.13)$$

This estimate together with (3.12) yields that

$$\delta_{q+1} \leq E - \int_{\frac{3}{4}T}^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\bar{u}_q|^2 dx dt \leq 5\delta_{q+1}. \quad (4.14)$$

It follows from (3.13) and (4.3) that

$$\zeta_q \text{div} \mathring{R}_q = 0, \quad (1 - \zeta_q) \text{div} \mathring{R}_{\ell_q} = \text{div} \mathring{R}_{\ell_q}.$$

Therefore, one obtains that

$$\bar{u}_q(t) = u_q(t), \quad t \in [0, \frac{T}{4} + 2\lambda_{q-1}^{-1}] \quad (4.15)$$

and satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \bar{u}_q - \Delta \bar{u}_q + \text{div}(\bar{u}_q \otimes \bar{u}_q) + \nabla \bar{p}_q = \text{div} \mathring{R}_{\ell_q} + (1 - \zeta_q) \text{div} \mathring{R}_q^{rem} + \partial_t \zeta_q (u_q - u_{\ell_q}) \\ \quad + \zeta_q (1 - \zeta_q) \text{div}((u_q - u_{\ell_q}) \otimes (u_q - u_{\ell_q})), \\ \nabla \cdot \bar{u}_q = 0, \\ \bar{u}_q|_{t=0} = u^{\text{in}}. \end{cases} \quad (4.16)$$

4.3. **Perturbation.** *Intermittent shear velocity flow* Assume that $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth cutoff function supported on the interval $(0, \lambda_1^{-1}]$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi''(x) dx = 0$. We set $\phi = \frac{d^2}{dx^2} \psi$ and normalize

it in such a way that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi^2 dx = 1.$$

For any small positive parameter r such that $r^{-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $Q > 0$, we define

$$\phi_{r,Q}(x) := Qr^{-\frac{1}{2}}\phi(r^{-1}x), \quad \psi_{r,Q}(x) := Qr^{-\frac{1}{2}}\psi(r^{-1}x). \quad (4.17)$$

Particularly, we denote

$$\phi_r(x) := \phi_{r,K^{1/2}}(x), \quad \psi_r(x) := \psi_{r,K^{1/2}}(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\phi}_r(t) := \phi_{r,\frac{T^{1/2}}{4}}(t).$$

We periodize ϕ_r and ψ_r so that the resulting functions are periodic functions defined on $\mathbb{R}/K\mathbb{Z} =: \mathbb{T}$, and we still denote the \mathbb{T} -periodic functions by ϕ_r and ψ_r . On the other hand, we periodize $\tilde{\phi}_r$ so that the resulting function is periodic function defined on $\mathbb{R}/\frac{T}{4} =: \tilde{\mathbb{T}}$ and we denote the $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}$ -periodic functions by $\tilde{\phi}_r$.

Proposition 4.2 (Estimates for the Fourier coefficient). *For $\phi_r(x)$, we rewrite it by Fourier series as follows:*

$$\phi_r(x) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} c_{m,r} e^{i2\pi mx/K}$$

Then we have

$$|c_{m,r}| \leq CK^{9/2} r^{-\frac{9}{2}} m^{-4}. \quad (4.18)$$

Proof. By the definitions of $c_{m,r}$ and ϕ_r , we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_{m,r} &= \frac{1}{K} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \phi_r(x) e^{-i2\pi mx/K} dx = K^{-1/2} \int_0^K r^{-\frac{1}{2}} \phi(r^{-1}x) e^{-i2\pi mx/K} dx \\ &= K^{-1/2} \int_0^{r^{-1}K} r^{\frac{1}{2}} \phi(y) e^{-i2\pi mry/K} dy = K^{-1/2} r^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^{r^{-1}K} \phi(y) \frac{iK}{2\pi mr} de^{-i2\pi mry/K} \\ &= -K^{-1/2} r^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^{r^{-1}K} \frac{iK}{2\pi mr} e^{-i2\pi mry/K} \phi'(y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

By integration by parts, one infers that

$$\begin{aligned} c_{m,r} &= K^{-1/2} r^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^{r^{-1}K} \frac{K^2}{(2\pi mr)^2} \phi'(y) de^{-i2\pi mry/K} \\ &= -K^{-1/2} r^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^{r^{-1}K} \frac{K^2}{(2\pi mr)^2} e^{-i2\pi mry/K} \phi''(y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we show that

$$|c_{m,r}| \leq CK^{5/2} r^{-5/2} m^{-2}.$$

Using integration by parts twice again, we have

$$|c_{m,r}| \leq CK^{9/2} r^{-9/2} m^{-4}.$$

Hence, we complete the proof of Proposition 4.2. \square

Next, we choose a large number N_Λ such that $N_\Lambda k \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ for all $k \in \Lambda$. By (4.17), we introduce the following functions:

$$\phi_{(\epsilon_0, 1-\epsilon_0, k)}(x) := \phi_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x), \quad g_{(2, \sigma_0, k)}(t) := \tilde{\phi}_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-2}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{\sigma_0}(t - t_k)),$$

where we choose suitable shifts t_k with $k \in \Lambda$ so that $g_{(2, \sigma_0, k)} \cdot g_{(2, \sigma_0, k')} = 0$, $\forall k \neq k' \in \Lambda$. We immediately have that

$$\frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}^3|} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \phi_{(\epsilon_0, 1-\epsilon_0, k)}^2(x) dx = 1, \quad \frac{1}{|\tilde{\mathbb{T}}|} \int_{\tilde{\mathbb{T}}} \tilde{g}_{(2, \sigma_0, k)}^2(t) dt = 1. \quad (4.19)$$

Thanks to $\phi_r = r^2 \frac{d^2}{dx^2} \psi_r$ and $|k| = 1$, we obtain that

$$\phi_{(\epsilon_0, 1-\epsilon_0, k)}(x) = N_\Lambda^{-1} \lambda_{q+1}^{-1-\epsilon_0} \operatorname{div} \left(((\psi_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}})'(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x)) k \right).$$

In the following, we denote

$$\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0} ((\psi_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}})'(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x)) =: \psi'_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x).$$

Therefore, we have the relation

$$\phi_{(\epsilon_0, 1-\epsilon_0, k)}(x) = N_\Lambda^{-1} \lambda_{q+1}^{-1} \operatorname{div}(\psi'_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x) k)$$

Actually, $\phi_{(\epsilon_0, 1-\epsilon_0, k)} \bar{k}$ and $\phi_{(\epsilon_0, 1-\epsilon_0, k)} \bar{k}$ are the so-called *intermittent shear flows*, which are introduced in [3]. Moreover, it is well-known that the following estimates hold.

Proposition 4.3 ([3]). *For $p \in [1, \infty]$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we have the following estimates*

$$\begin{aligned} \|D^m \phi_{(\epsilon_0, 1-\epsilon_0, k)}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^3)} &\lesssim N_\Lambda^m K^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{2}{p}} \lambda_{q+1}^{m-\epsilon_0(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2})}, \\ \left\| \frac{d^m}{dt^m} g_{(2, \sigma_0, k)} \right\|_{L^p([0, T])} &\lesssim \lambda_{q+1}^{m(\sigma_0+2) - 2(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2})} \\ \|D^m \psi'_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^3)} &\lesssim N_\Lambda^m K^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{2}{p}} \lambda_{q+1}^{m-\epsilon_0(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2})}. \end{aligned}$$

Amplitudes Before constructing the perturbation, we define amplitudes firstly. Let $\chi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ be a smooth function satisfying

$$\chi(z) = \begin{cases} 1, & 0 \leq z \leq 1, \\ z, & z \geq 2, \end{cases} \quad (4.20)$$

with $z \leq 2\chi(z) \leq 4z$ for $z \in (1, 2)$. We define that

$$\chi_q := \frac{1}{TK^3} \chi \left(\left\langle \frac{\hat{R}_{\ell_q}}{\delta_{q+1} \lambda_q^{-4\alpha}} \right\rangle \right).$$

Next, the space cutoffs $\{\tilde{\eta}_q(x)\}_{q \geq 1} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ are defined by

$$\operatorname{supp} \tilde{\eta}_q = \Omega_{q+1}, \quad \tilde{\eta}_q|_{\Omega_{q+[-\lambda_q^{-1}, \lambda_q^{-1}]^3}} \equiv 1, \quad |D^N \tilde{\eta}_q| \lesssim \lambda_q^N, \quad (4.21)$$

where Ω_{q+1} is defined in (3.4). We introduce the time-space cutoffs $\{\eta_q\}_{q \geq 1}$ by

$$\eta_q(t, x) = (1 - \zeta_q(t))\tilde{\eta}_q(x), \quad (4.22)$$

where $\{\zeta_q(t)\} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is defined by (4.8).

Thanks to (4.2) and (4.3), one can easily deduce that

$$\eta_q \dot{R}_{\ell_q} = \dot{R}_{\ell_q} \quad (4.23)$$

We claim that

$$\int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \eta_q^2 \chi_q \, dx \, dt \in \left[\frac{1}{8}, 2 \right]. \quad (4.24)$$

Indeed, we deduce from the definitions of η_q and χ_q that

$$\int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \eta_q^2 \chi_q \, dx \, dt = \frac{1}{TK^3} \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{\Omega_{q+1}} \tilde{\eta}_q^2(x) \chi \left(\left\langle \frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\delta_{q+1} \lambda_q^{-4\alpha}} \right\rangle \right) \, dx \, dt.$$

On one hand, by (4.5), one has

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{TK^3} \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{\Omega_{q+1}} \tilde{\eta}_q^2(x) \chi \left(\left\langle \frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\delta_{q+1} \lambda_q^{-4\alpha}} \right\rangle \right) \, dx \, dt &\leq \frac{1}{TK^3} \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{\Omega_{q+1}} 4 \left(1 + \left| \frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\delta_{q+1} \lambda_q^{-4\alpha}} \right| \right) \, dx \, dt \\ &\leq \frac{1}{TK^3} (TK^3 + 4) \leq 2. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\frac{1}{TK^3} \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{\Omega_{q+1}} \tilde{\eta}_q^2(x) \chi \left(\left\langle \frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\delta_{q+1} \lambda_q^{-4\alpha}} \right\rangle \right) \, dx \, dt \geq \frac{1}{TK^3} \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{\Omega_q} 1 \, dx \, dt \geq \frac{1}{8}.$$

We set

$$\bar{\rho}_q = \frac{E - \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\bar{u}_q|^2 \, dx \, dt - 3\delta_{q+2}}{\int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \eta_q^2 \chi_q \, dx \, dt}. \quad (4.25)$$

Combining (4.14) with (4.24) shows that

$$\bar{\rho}_q \in \left[\frac{\delta_{q+1}}{8}, \frac{2\delta_{q+1}}{5} \right].$$

We give the temporal cutoff $\eta(t) \in C^\infty([0, T])$ by

$$\eta(t) = 1, \, t \in [0, \frac{T}{4}]; \quad \eta(t) = 0, \, t \in [\frac{3T}{4}, T]; \quad |\partial_t^N \eta| \leq CT^{-N}, \quad (4.26)$$

and define

$$\rho_q(t) = \delta_{q+1} \eta(t) + (1 - \eta(t)) \bar{\rho}_q. \quad (4.27)$$

We are in position to give the amplitudes $a_{(k,q)}(t, x)$ by

$$a_{(k,q)}(t, x) = \eta_q a_k \left(\text{Id} - \frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\chi_q \rho_q} \right) (\chi_q \rho_q)^{1/2}, \quad (4.28)$$

where a_k stems from Lemma 2.1.

4.3.1. *Construction the perturbation.* We construct the principal perturbation $w_{q+1}^{(p)}$ as follows:

$$w_{q+1}^{(p)} := \sum_{k \in \Lambda} a_{(k,q)} \phi_{(\epsilon_0, 1-\epsilon_0, k)}(x) g_{(2, \sigma_0, k)}(t) \bar{k}. \quad (4.29)$$

Since $w_{q+1}^{(p)}$ is not divergence-free, we need to construct the incompressibility corrector of $w_{q+1}^{(p)}$ to ensure that the perturbation is divergence-free. Noting that for any $k \perp \bar{k}$, we have

$$\operatorname{div}(\psi'_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x) \bar{k} \otimes k) = 0,$$

and

$$\phi_{(\epsilon_0, 1-\epsilon_0, k)}(x) \bar{k} = N_\Lambda^{-1} \lambda_{q+1}^{-1} \operatorname{div}(\psi'_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x) k \otimes \bar{k}).$$

Then we rewrite $w_{q+1}^{(p)}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} w_{q+1}^{(p)} &= \sum_{k \in \Lambda} N_\Lambda^{-1} \lambda_{q+1}^{-1} a_{(k,q)} g_{(2, \sigma_0, k)}(t) \operatorname{div}(\psi'_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x) k \otimes \bar{k}) \\ &= \sum_{k \in \Lambda} N_\Lambda^{-1} \lambda_{q+1}^{-1} a_{(k,q)} g_{(2, \sigma_0, k)}(t) \operatorname{div}(\psi'_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x) (k \otimes \bar{k} - \bar{k} \otimes k)). \end{aligned} \quad (4.30)$$

Based on this equality, we define $w_{q+1}^{(c)}$ by

$$w_{q+1}^{(c)} = \sum_{k \in \Lambda} N_\Lambda^{-1} \lambda_{q+1}^{-1} \psi'_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x) g_{(2, \sigma_0, k)}(t) \operatorname{div}(a_{(k,q)} (k \otimes \bar{k} - \bar{k} \otimes k)). \quad (4.31)$$

One easily deduces that

$$\begin{aligned} &\operatorname{div}(w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)}) \\ &= \sum_{k \in \Lambda} N_\Lambda^{-1} \lambda_{q+1}^{-1} \operatorname{div} \operatorname{div}(a_{(k,q)} g_{(2, \sigma_0, k)}(t) \psi'_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x) (k \otimes \bar{k} - \bar{k} \otimes k)) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that $\operatorname{div} \operatorname{div} M = 0$ for any anti-symmetric matrix M .

Finally, we define $w_{q+1}^{(t)}$ by solving the following Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t w_{q+1}^{(t)} - \Delta w_{q+1}^{(t)} + \operatorname{div}(w_{q+1}^{(t)} \otimes w_{q+1}^{(t)}) + \operatorname{div}(w_{q+1}^{(t)} \otimes \bar{u}_q^{\text{non-loc}}) \\ \quad + \operatorname{div}(\bar{u}_q^{\text{non-loc}} \otimes w_{q+1}^{(t)}) + \nabla p_t = F_{q+1}, \\ \operatorname{div} w_{q+1}^{(t)} = 0, \\ w_{q+1}^{(t)}|_{t=0} = 0, \end{cases} \quad (4.32)$$

where the force term F_{q+1} is determined by $\mathring{R}_q^{\text{rem}}$, $(u_q - u_{\ell_q})$ and some terms extracted from $\partial_t(w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)})$ and $\operatorname{div}(w_{q+1}^{(p)} \otimes w_{q+1}^{(p)})$, as in (4.35). To demonstrate the derivation of F_{q+1} clearly, we decompose $\partial_t(w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)})$ and $\operatorname{div}(w_{q+1}^{(p)} \otimes w_{q+1}^{(p)})$ firstly.

Proposition 4.4 (The decomposition of $\partial_t(w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)})$). *Let $w_{q+1}^{(p)}$ and $w_{q+1}^{(c)}$ be defined in (4.30) and (4.31) respectively, we have*

$$\partial_t(w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)}) = \operatorname{div} \mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(1)} + \operatorname{div} \mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(2)} + F_{q+1}^{(1)} + \nabla P_{q+1}^{(1)},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(1)} &= N_\Lambda^{-1} \lambda_{q+1}^{-1} \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \partial_t(a_{(k,q)} g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}(t)) \psi'_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x) (k \otimes \bar{k} + \bar{k} \otimes k), \\ \mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(2)} &= -2N_\Lambda^{-2} \lambda_{q+1}^{-2} \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \psi_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x) k \otimes \operatorname{div}(\partial_t(a_{(k,q)} g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}(t)) \bar{k} \otimes k), \\ F_{q+1}^{(1)} &= 2N_\Lambda^{-2} \lambda_{q+1}^{-2} \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \psi_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x) k \cdot \nabla \operatorname{div}(\partial_t(a_{(k,q)} g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}(t)) \bar{k} \otimes k), \\ P_{q+1}^{(1)} &= -\frac{2}{3} N_\Lambda^{-2} \lambda_{q+1}^{-2} \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \psi_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x) \operatorname{div}(\partial_t(a_{(k,q)} g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}(t)) \bar{k}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Thanks to (4.30) and (4.31), we have

$$w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)} = \sum_{k \in \Lambda} N_\Lambda^{-1} \lambda_{q+1}^{-1} \operatorname{div}(a_{(k,q)} g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}(t)) \psi'_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x) (k \otimes \bar{k} - \bar{k} \otimes k). \quad (4.33)$$

Therefore, one infers that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t(w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)}) &= \sum_{k \in \Lambda} N_\Lambda^{-1} \lambda_{q+1}^{-1} \operatorname{div}(\partial_t(a_{(k,q)} g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}(t)) \psi'_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x) (k \otimes \bar{k} - \bar{k} \otimes k)) \\ &= \sum_{k \in \Lambda} N_\Lambda^{-1} \lambda_{q+1}^{-1} \operatorname{div}(\partial_t(a_{(k,q)} g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}(t)) \psi'_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x) (k \otimes \bar{k} + \bar{k} \otimes k)) \\ &\quad - 2 \sum_{k \in \Lambda} N_\Lambda^{-1} \lambda_{q+1}^{-1} \operatorname{div}(\partial_t(a_{(k,q)} g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}(t)) \psi'_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x) \bar{k} \otimes k). \quad (4.34) \end{aligned}$$

For the second term, due to $k \perp \bar{k}$ and $|k| = 1$, one deduces that

$$\begin{aligned} &- 2 \sum_{k \in \Lambda} N_\Lambda^{-1} \lambda_{q+1}^{-1} \operatorname{div}(\partial_t(a_{(k,q)} g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}(t)) \psi'_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x) \bar{k} \otimes k) \\ &= - 2 \sum_{k \in \Lambda} N_\Lambda^{-1} \lambda_{q+1}^{-1} \psi'_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x) \operatorname{div}(\partial_t(a_{(k,q)} g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}(t)) \bar{k} \otimes k) \\ &= - 2 \sum_{k \in \Lambda} N_\Lambda^{-2} \lambda_{q+1}^{-2} \operatorname{div}(\psi_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x) k) \operatorname{div}(\partial_t(a_{(k,q)} g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}(t)) \bar{k} \otimes k) \\ &= - 2N_\Lambda^{-2} \lambda_{q+1}^{-2} \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \operatorname{div}(\psi_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x) k \otimes \operatorname{div}(\partial_t(a_{(k,q)} g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}(t)) \bar{k} \otimes k)) \\ &\quad + 2N_\Lambda^{-2} \lambda_{q+1}^{-2} \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \psi_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x) k \cdot \nabla \operatorname{div}(\partial_t(a_{(k,q)} g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}(t)) \bar{k} \otimes k) \\ &= - 2N_\Lambda^{-2} \lambda_{q+1}^{-2} \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \operatorname{div}(\psi_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x) k \otimes \operatorname{div}(\partial_t(a_{(k,q)} g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}(t)) \bar{k} \otimes k)) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{2}{3}N_\Lambda^{-2}\lambda_{q+1}^{-2}\nabla\left(\sum_{k\in\Lambda}\psi_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0}N_\Lambda k\cdot x)\operatorname{div}(\partial_t(a_{(k,q)}g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}(t))\bar{k})\right) \\
& + 2N_\Lambda^{-2}\lambda_{q+1}^{-2}\sum_{k\in\Lambda}\psi_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0}N_\Lambda k\cdot x)k\cdot\nabla\operatorname{div}(\partial_t(a_{(k,q)}g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}(t))\bar{k}\otimes k)
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that $v \otimes u := v \otimes u - \frac{1}{3}v \cdot u \operatorname{Id}$. Plugging this equality into (4.34) yields Proposition 4.4. \square

Proposition 4.5 (The decomposition of $\operatorname{div}(w_{q+1}^{(p)} \otimes w_{q+1}^{(p)})$). *Let $w_{q+1}^{(p)}$ be defined in (4.29), we have*

$$\operatorname{div}(w_{q+1}^{(p)} \otimes w_{q+1}^{(p)}) + \operatorname{div}\mathring{R}_{\ell_q} = \operatorname{div}\mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(3)} + F_{q+1}^{(2)} + F_{q+1}^{(3)} + \nabla(\eta_q^2(\chi_q\rho_q)^{1/2}),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(3)} &= -i\sum_{k\in\Lambda}\sum_{m,l\in\mathbb{Z}\setminus\{0\},m+l\neq 0}\frac{Kc_{l,\epsilon_0}c_{m,\epsilon_0}e^{i2\pi\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0}(l+m)N_\Lambda k\cdot x/K}}{2\pi\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0}(l+m)}k\otimes\operatorname{div}(a_{(k,q)}^2g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}^2\bar{k}\otimes\bar{k}) \\
&\quad -i\sum_{k\in\Lambda}\sum_{m,l\in\mathbb{Z}\setminus\{0\},m+l\neq 0}\frac{Kc_{l,\epsilon_0}c_{m,\epsilon_0}e^{i2\pi\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0}(l+m)N_\Lambda k\cdot x/K}}{2\pi\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0}(l+m)}\bar{k}\otimes\operatorname{div}(a_{(k,q)}^2g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}^2\bar{k}\otimes k), \\
F_{q+1}^{(2)} &= i\sum_{k\in\Lambda}\sum_{m,l\in\mathbb{Z}\setminus\{0\},m+l\neq 0}\frac{Kc_{l,\epsilon_0}c_{m,\epsilon_0}e^{i2\pi\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0}(l+m)N_\Lambda k\cdot x/K}}{2\pi N_\Lambda\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0}(l+m)}k\cdot\nabla\operatorname{div}(a_{(k,q)}^2g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}^2\bar{k}\otimes\bar{k}) \\
&\quad +i\sum_{k\in\Lambda}\sum_{m,l\in\mathbb{Z}\setminus\{0\},m+l\neq 0}\frac{Kc_{l,\epsilon_0}c_{m,\epsilon_0}e^{i2\pi\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0}(l+m)N_\Lambda k\cdot x/K}}{2\pi N_\Lambda\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0}(l+m)}\bar{k}\cdot\nabla\operatorname{div}(a_{(k,q)}^2g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}^2\bar{k}\otimes k), \\
F_{q+1}^{(3)} &= \sum_{k\in\Lambda}\operatorname{div}(a_{(k,q)}^2\mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}(g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}^2)\bar{k}\otimes\bar{k}).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Thanks to (4.19), one has

$$\mathbb{P}_{=0}(\phi_{(\epsilon_0,1-\epsilon_0,k)}^2) = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}_{=0}(g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}^2(t)) = 1.$$

According to (4.29), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{div}(w_{q+1}^{(p)} \otimes w_{q+1}^{(p)}) + \operatorname{div}\mathring{R}_{\ell_q} &= \sum_{k\in\Lambda}\operatorname{div}(a_{(k,q)}^2\phi_{(\epsilon_0,1-\epsilon_0,k)}^2g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}^2\bar{k}\otimes\bar{k}) \\
&= \sum_{k\in\Lambda}\operatorname{div}(a_{(k,q)}^2\bar{k}\otimes\bar{k}) + \operatorname{div}\mathring{R}_{\ell_q} + \sum_{k\in\Lambda}\operatorname{div}(a_{(k,q)}^2\mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}(g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}^2)\bar{k}\otimes\bar{k}) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k\in\Lambda}\operatorname{div}(a_{(k,q)}^2g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}^2\mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}(\phi_{(\epsilon_0,1-\epsilon_0,k)}^2)\bar{k}\otimes\bar{k}).
\end{aligned}$$

By the definition of $a_{(k,q)}$ in (4.28) and Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\sum_{k\in\Lambda}\operatorname{div}(a_{(k,q)}^2\bar{k}\otimes\bar{k}) + \operatorname{div}\mathring{R}_{\ell_q} = \operatorname{div}(\eta_q^2(\chi_q\rho_q)^{1/2}\operatorname{Id} - \eta_q^2\mathring{R}_{\ell_q}) + \operatorname{div}\mathring{R}_{\ell_q} = \nabla(\eta_q^2(\chi_q\rho_q)^{1/2}),$$

where we have used (4.23). By Proposition 4.2, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \operatorname{div}(a_{(k,q)}^2 g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}^2 \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}(\phi_{(\epsilon_0,1-\epsilon_0,k)}^2) \bar{k} \otimes \bar{k}) \\
&= \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \operatorname{div}(a_{(k,q)}^2 g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}^2 \bar{k} \otimes \bar{k}) \sum_{m,l \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}, m+l \neq 0} c_{l,\epsilon_0} c_{m,\epsilon_0} e^{i2\pi \lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} (l+m) N_{\Lambda} k \cdot x / K} \\
&= \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \operatorname{div}(a_{(k,q)}^2 g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}^2 \bar{k} \otimes \bar{k}) \sum_{m,l \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}, m+l \neq 0} c_{l,\epsilon_0} c_{m,\epsilon_0} e^{i2\pi \lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} (l+m) N_{\Lambda} k \cdot x / K} \\
&= -i \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \operatorname{div}(a_{(k,q)}^2 g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}^2 \bar{k} \otimes \bar{k}) \sum_{m,l \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}, m+l \neq 0} \frac{K \operatorname{div}(c_{l,\epsilon_0} c_{m,\epsilon_0} e^{i2\pi \lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} (l+m) N_{\Lambda} k \cdot x / K} k)}{2\pi N_{\Lambda} \lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} (l+m)} \\
&= \operatorname{div} \left(-i \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \sum_{m,l \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}, m+l \neq 0} \frac{K c_{l,\epsilon_0} c_{m,\epsilon_0} e^{i2\pi \lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} (l+m) N_{\Lambda} k \cdot x / K}}{2\pi \lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} (l+m)} k \otimes \operatorname{div}(a_{(k,q)}^2 g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}^2 \bar{k} \otimes \bar{k}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. -i \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \sum_{m,l \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}, m+l \neq 0} \frac{K c_{l,\epsilon_0} c_{m,\epsilon_0} e^{i2\pi \lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} (l+m) N_{\Lambda} k \cdot x / K}}{2\pi \lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} (l+m)} \bar{k} \otimes \operatorname{div}(a_{(k,q)}^2 g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}^2 \bar{k} \otimes k) \right) \\
&\quad + i \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \sum_{m,l \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}, m+l \neq 0} \frac{K c_{l,\epsilon_0} c_{m,\epsilon_0} e^{i2\pi \lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} (l+m) N_{\Lambda} k \cdot x / K}}{2\pi N_{\Lambda} \lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} (l+m)} k \cdot \nabla \operatorname{div}(a_{(k,q)}^2 g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}^2 \bar{k} \otimes \bar{k}) \\
&\quad + i \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \sum_{m,l \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}, m+l \neq 0} \frac{K c_{l,\epsilon_0} c_{m,\epsilon_0} e^{i2\pi \lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} (l+m) N_{\Lambda} k \cdot x / K}}{2\pi N_{\Lambda} \lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} (l+m)} \bar{k} \cdot \nabla \operatorname{div}(a_{(k,q)}^2 g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}^2 \bar{k} \otimes k) \\
&=: \operatorname{div} R_{q+1}^{(3)} + F_{q+1}^{(2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{div}(w_{q+1}^{(p)} \otimes w_{q+1}^{(p)}) + \operatorname{div} \mathring{R}_{\ell_q} \\
&= \operatorname{div} R_{q+1}^{(3)} + F_{q+1}^{(2)} + \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \operatorname{div}(a_{(k,q)}^2 \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}(g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}^2) \bar{k} \otimes \bar{k}) + \nabla(\eta_q^2 (\chi_q \rho_q)^{1/2}) \\
&=: \operatorname{div} R_{q+1}^{(3)} + F_{q+1}^{(2)} + F_{q+1}^{(3)} + \nabla(\eta_q^2 (\chi_q \rho_q)^{1/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Proposition 4.5. \square

Now we give the definition of $w_{q+1}^{(t)}$ in more details. Let $w_{q+1}^{(t)}$ be the solution of the equations (4.32), where F_{q+1} is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{q+1} &:= -F_{q+1}^{(1)} - F_{q+1}^{(2)} - F_{q+1}^{(3)} - (1 - \zeta_q) \operatorname{div} \mathring{R}_q^{rem} - \partial_t \zeta_q (u_q - u_{\ell_q}) \\
&\quad - \zeta_q (1 - \zeta_q) \operatorname{div}((u_q - u_{\ell_q}) \otimes (u_q - u_{\ell_q})).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.35}$$

Then we define the perturbation w_{q+1} by

$$w_{q+1} = w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)} + w_{q+1}^{(t)}.$$

4.3.2. *Estimates for the perturbation.* In order to estimate w_{q+1} , we give some preliminary estimates in terms of $\chi_q \rho_q$, $a_{(k,q)}$ and F_{q+1} .

Note that the smooth function $\chi \geq 1$ in (4.20), one can expect to obtain higher-order derivative estimates for $(\chi_q \rho_q)^{1/2}$ and $(\chi_q \rho_q)^{-1}$, which is shown by Proposition 4.6 as follows.

Proposition 4.6 (Estimates for $(\chi_q \rho_q)^{1/2}$ and $(\chi_q \rho_q)^{-1}$). *For any $N \geq 2$, we have*

$$\|(\chi_q \rho_q)^{1/2}\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \leq C_N (TK^3)^{-1/2} \delta_{q+1}^{-N+1/2} \lambda_q^{5N+4N\alpha} \ell_q^{-N}, \quad (4.36)$$

$$\|(\chi_q \rho_q)^{-1}\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \leq C_N TK^3 \delta_{q+1}^{-N-1} \lambda_q^{5N+4N\alpha} \ell_q^{-N}, \quad (4.37)$$

$$\|\partial_t (\chi_q \rho_q)^{1/2}\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \leq C_N (TK^3)^{-1/2} \delta_{q+1}^{-N-1/2} \lambda_q^{5N+5+4(N+1)\alpha} \ell_q^{-2N}, \quad (4.38)$$

$$\|\partial_t (\chi_q \rho_q)^{-1}\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \leq C_N TK^3 \delta_{q+1}^{-N-2} \lambda_q^{5N+5+4(N+1)\alpha} \ell_q^{-2N}. \quad (4.39)$$

Proof. Since $\chi(x) \geq 1$, $\rho_q \sim \delta_{q+1}$ and

$$\chi_q \rho_q = \frac{1}{TK^3} \chi \left(\left\langle \frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\delta_{q+1} \lambda_q^{-4\alpha}} \right\rangle \right) \rho_q,$$

we infer from (4.6) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\chi_q \rho_q)^{1/2}\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} &= \|\chi_q^{1/2}\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \|\rho_q^{1/2}(t)\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leq C_N (TK^3)^{-1/2} \delta_{q+1}^{1/2} \left(1 + \left\| \frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\delta_{q+1} \lambda_q^{-4\alpha}} \right\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \right)^{N-1} \left\| \frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\delta_{q+1} \lambda_q^{-4\alpha}} \right\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \\ &\leq C_N (TK^3)^{-1/2} \delta_{q+1}^{-N+1/2} \lambda_q^{5N+4N\alpha} \ell_q^{-N} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\chi_q \rho_q)^{-1}\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} &\leq C_N TK^3 \delta_{q+1}^{-1} \left(1 + \left\| \frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\delta_{q+1} \lambda_q^{-4\alpha}} \right\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \right)^{N-1} \left\| \frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\delta_{q+1} \lambda_q^{-4\alpha}} \right\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \\ &\leq C_N TK^3 \delta_{q+1}^{-N-1} \lambda_q^{5N+4N\alpha} \ell_q^{-N}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.40)$$

With the aid of (4.6) and $T^{-1} \leq \lambda_q$, one deduces that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\partial_t (\chi_q \rho_q)^{1/2}\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \\ &\leq \|\partial_t \chi_q^{1/2}\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \|\rho_q^{1/2}(t)\|_{L^\infty} + \|\chi_q^{1/2}\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \|\partial_t \rho_q^{1/2}(t)\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leq C_N (TK^3)^{-1/2} \delta_{q+1}^{1/2} \left\| \frac{\partial_t \dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\delta_{q+1} \lambda_q^{-4\alpha}} \right\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \left(1 + \left\| \frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\delta_{q+1} \lambda_q^{-4\alpha}} \right\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \right)^{N-1} \left\| \frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\delta_{q+1} \lambda_q^{-4\alpha}} \right\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \\ &\quad + C_N (TK^3)^{-1/2} T^{-1} \delta_{q+1}^{1/2} \left(1 + \left\| \frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\delta_{q+1} \lambda_q^{-4\alpha}} \right\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \right)^{N-1} \left\| \frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\delta_{q+1} \lambda_q^{-4\alpha}} \right\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \\ &\leq C_N (TK^3)^{-1/2} \delta_{q+1}^{-N-1/2} \lambda_q^{5N+5+4(N+1)\alpha} \ell_q^{-2N}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|\partial_t (\chi_q \rho_q)^{-1}\|_{L_t^\infty H^N}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \|\partial_t \chi_q^{-1}\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \|\rho_q^{-1}(t)\|_{L^\infty} + \|\chi_q^{-1}\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \|\partial_t \rho_q^{-1}(t)\|_{L^\infty} \\
&\leq C_N T K^3 \delta_{q+1}^{-1} \left\| \frac{\partial_t \dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\delta_{q+1} \lambda_q^{-4\alpha}} \right\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \left(1 + \left\| \frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\delta_{q+1} \lambda_q^{-4\alpha}} \right\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \right)^{N-1} \left\| \frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\delta_{q+1} \lambda_q^{-4\alpha}} \right\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \\
&\quad + C_N T K^3 T^{-1} \delta_{q+1}^{-1} \left(1 + \left\| \frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\delta_{q+1} \lambda_q^{-4\alpha}} \right\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \right)^{N-1} \left\| \frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\delta_{q+1} \lambda_q^{-4\alpha}} \right\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \\
&\leq C_N T K^3 \delta_{q+1}^{-N-2} \lambda_q^{5N+5+4(N+1)\alpha} \ell_q^{-2N}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we complete the proof of Proposition 4.6. \square

Proposition 4.7 (Estimates for $a_{(k,q)}$). *For $N \geq 2$, we have*

$$\|a_{(k,q)}\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \leq C_N \ell_q^{-2N}, \quad (4.41)$$

$$\|\partial_t a_{(k,q)}\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \leq C_N \ell_q^{-6N}. \quad (4.42)$$

Proof. Combining with (4.6) and (4.37), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\chi_q \rho_q} \right\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} &\leq \|\dot{R}_{\ell_q}\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \|(\chi_q \rho_q)^{-1}\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} + \|\dot{R}_{\ell_q}\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \|(\chi_q \rho_q)^{-1}\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \\
&\leq C_N T K^3 \delta_{q+1}^{-N-1} \lambda_q^{5N+4N\alpha} \ell_q^{-N} + C T K^3 \delta_{q+1}^{-1} \lambda_q^5 \ell_q^{-N} \\
&\leq C_N T K^3 \delta_{q+1}^{-N-1} \lambda_q^{5N+4N\alpha} \ell_q^{-N}.
\end{aligned} \quad (4.43)$$

This inequality together with (4.6) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| a_k \left(\text{Id} - \frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\chi_q \rho_q} \right) \right\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} &\leq C_N \left(1 + \left\| \frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\chi_q \rho_q} \right\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \right)^{N-1} \left\| \frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\chi_q \rho_q} \right\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \\
&\leq C_N (T K^3)^N \delta_{q+1}^{-2N} \lambda_q^{10N+4N\alpha} \ell_q^{-N}.
\end{aligned} \quad (4.44)$$

Since $a_{(k,q)} = \eta_q a_k \left(\text{Id} - \frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\chi_q \rho_q} \right) (\chi_q \rho_q)^{1/2}$, we have by (4.36), (4.43) and (4.44) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|a_{(k,q)}\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} &\leq \left\| a_k \left(\text{Id} - \frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\chi_q \rho_q} \right) \right\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \|(\chi_q \rho_q)^{1/2}\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} + C \|(\chi_q \rho_q)^{1/2}\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \\
&\leq C_N (T K^3)^N \delta_{q+1}^{-2N} \lambda_q^{10N+4N\alpha} \ell_q^{-N} + C_N (T K^3)^{-1/2} \delta_{q+1}^{-N+1/2} \lambda_q^{5N+4N\alpha} \ell_q^{-N} \\
&\leq C_N (T K^3)^N \delta_{q+1}^{-2N} \lambda_q^{10N+4N\alpha} \ell_q^{-N}.
\end{aligned}$$

Owing to

$$T < 1, \quad \alpha < \frac{1}{4}, \quad K^3 < \lambda_q, \quad \delta_{q+1}^{-4} < \lambda_q^\alpha, \quad \ell_q = \lambda_q^{-50}, \quad (4.45)$$

we obtain (4.41) by the above estimate.

By (4.6), (4.37) and (4.39), we have that

$$\left\| \partial_t \left(\frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\chi_q \rho_q} \right) \right\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \leq \|\partial_t \dot{R}_{\ell_q}\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \|(\chi_q \rho_q)^{-1}\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} + \|\dot{R}_{\ell_q}\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \|\partial_t (\chi_q \rho_q)^{-1}\|_{L_t^\infty H^N}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C_N T K^3 \delta_{q+1}^{-N-2} \lambda_q^{5N+10+4(N+1)\alpha} \ell_q^{-3N} \\
&\quad + C_N T K^3 \delta_{q+1}^{-N-2} \lambda_q^{5N+10+4(N+1)\alpha} \ell_q^{-3N+1} \\
&\leq C_N T K^3 \delta_{q+1}^{-N-2} \lambda_q^{5N+10+4(N+1)\alpha} \ell_q^{-3N}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.46}$$

Therefore, one infers from (4.6), (4.43) and (4.46) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \partial_t a_k \left(\text{Id} - \frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\chi_q \rho_q} \right) \right\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} &\leq \left\| (a'_k) \left(\text{Id} - \frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\chi_q \rho_q} \right) \right\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \left\| \partial_t \left(\frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\chi_q \rho_q} \right) \right\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \\
&\lesssim \left(1 + \left\| \left(\frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\chi_q \rho_q} \right) \right\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \right)^{N-1} \left\| \left(\frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\chi_q \rho_q} \right) \right\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \left\| \partial_t \left(\frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\chi_q \rho_q} \right) \right\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \\
&\leq C_N (TK^3)^{N+1} \delta_{q+1}^{-3N-2} \lambda_q^{15N+10+4(2N+1)\alpha} \ell_q^{-4N}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.47}$$

Collecting (4.36), (4.38), (4.44) and (4.47) together shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \partial_t a_{(k,q)} \right\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} &\leq \left\| \partial_t \eta_q \right\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \left\| a_k \left(\text{Id} - \frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\chi_q \rho_q} \right) \right\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \left\| (\chi_q \rho_q)^{1/2} \right\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \\
&\quad + \left\| \eta_q \right\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \left\| \partial_t a_k \left(\text{Id} - \frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\chi_q \rho_q} \right) \right\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \left\| (\chi_q \rho_q)^{1/2} \right\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \\
&\quad + \left\| \eta_q \right\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \left\| a_k \left(\text{Id} - \frac{\dot{R}_{\ell_q}}{\chi_q \rho_q} \right) \right\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \left\| \partial_t (\chi_q \rho_q)^{1/2} \right\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \\
&\leq C_N T^{-1/2} (TK^3)^{N+1} \delta_{q+1}^{-4N-3/2} \lambda_q^{21N+10+4(3N+1)\alpha} \ell_q^{-5N},
\end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that $\left\| \partial_t \eta_q \right\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \lesssim K^{3/2} T^{-1} \lambda_q^N$ and $\left\| \eta_q \right\|_{L_t^\infty H^N} \lesssim K^{3/2} T^{-1} \lambda_q^N$. Thanks to (4.45), we prove (4.42). Thus, we complete the proof of Proposition 4.7. \square

Proposition 4.8 (Estimates for F_{q+1}). *Let F_{q+1} be defined in (4.35), then*

$$\left\| \int_0^T e^{(t-s)\Delta} F_{q+1}(s) \, ds \right\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,1}^{1/2} \cap \tilde{L}_t^1 B_{2,1}^{5/2}} \leq \lambda_q^{-20}, \tag{4.48}$$

$$\left\| F_{q+1} \right\|_{L_t^\infty H^2} \lesssim N_\Lambda K^{10} \ell_q^{-12} \lambda_{q+1}^{3+8\epsilon_0}. \tag{4.49}$$

Proof. We firstly prove (4.48). By Lemma 2.7, we have for $T < 1$ that

$$\left\| \int_0^T e^{(t-s)\Delta} F_{q+1}^{(1)}(s) \, ds \right\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,1}^{1/2} \cap \tilde{L}_t^1 B_{2,1}^{5/2}} \lesssim \left\| F_{q+1}^{(1)} \right\|_{L_t^1 B_{2,1}^{1/2}}.$$

The fact that $\text{supp } x a_{(k,q)} \subseteq \Omega_{q+1} \subseteq \left[-\frac{K}{2}, \frac{K}{2} \right]^3$ implies that $F_{q+1}^{(1)}$ has spatial compact support. Therefore, we obtain by the definition of \mathbb{T}^3 that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| F_{q+1}^{(1)} \right\|_{L_t^1 B_{2,1}^{1/2}} &\lesssim \left\| F_{q+1}^{(1)} \right\|_{L_t^1 L^2}^{1/2} \left\| F_{q+1}^{(1)} \right\|_{L_t^1 H^1}^{1/2} \\
&\lesssim \lambda_{q+1}^{-2} \left\| \psi_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}} (\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x) \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}^{1/2} \left\| \psi_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}} (\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x) \right\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}^3)}^{1/2} \\
&\quad \times \left\| \partial_t (a_{(k,q)} g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}(t)) \right\|_{L_t^1 W^{3,\infty}}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 4.3 and Proposition 4.7, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\partial_t(a_{(k,q)}g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}(t))\|_{L_t^1 W^{3,\infty}} \\ & \lesssim \|a_{(k,q)}\|_{L_t^\infty W^{3,\infty}} \|\partial_t g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}(t)\|_{L_t^1} + \|\partial_t a_{(k,q)}\|_{L_t^\infty W^{3,\infty}} \|g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}(t)\|_{L_t^1} \\ & \lesssim \ell_q^{-12} \lambda_{q+1}^{1+\sigma_0}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\|\psi_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}^{1/2} \lesssim N_\Lambda^{1/2} K^{3/4},$$

and

$$\|\psi_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}^3)}^{1/2} \lesssim N_\Lambda^{1/2} K^{3/4} \lambda_{q+1}^{1/2}.$$

Hence, one gets

$$\left\| \int_0^T e^{(t-s)\Delta} F_{q+1}^{(1)}(s) ds \right\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,1}^{1/2} \cap \tilde{L}_t^1 B_{2,1}^{5/2}} \lesssim N_\Lambda K^{3/2} \ell_q^{-12} \lambda_{q+1}^{\sigma_0-1/2}. \quad (4.50)$$

By the definition of $F_{q+1}^{(2)}$ in Proposition 4.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_{q+1}^{(2)}\|_{L_t^1 B_{2,1}^{1/2}} & \lesssim \|F_{q+1}^{(2)}\|_{L_t^1 L^2}^{1/2} \|F_{q+1}^{(2)}\|_{L_t^1 H^1}^{1/2} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \sum_{m, l \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}, m+l \neq 0} K \|a_{(k,q)}^2 g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}^2\|_{L_t^1 W^{3,\infty}} \\ & \quad \times \left\| \frac{c_{l,\epsilon_0} c_{m,\epsilon_0} e^{i2\pi \lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} (l+m) N_\Lambda k \cdot x / K}}{2\pi N_\Lambda \lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} (l+m)} \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}^{1/2} \left\| \frac{c_{l,\epsilon_0} c_{m,\epsilon_0} e^{i2\pi \lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} (l+m) N_\Lambda k \cdot x / K}}{2\pi N_\Lambda \lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} (l+m)} \right\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}^3)}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\|e^{i2\pi \lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} (l+m) N_\Lambda k \cdot x / K}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}^3)} \lesssim K^{1/2} N_\Lambda \lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} |l+m|,$$

together with Lemma 2.7, Proposition 4.2–4.3 and Proposition 4.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \int_0^T e^{(t-s)\Delta} F_{q+1}^{(2)}(s) ds \right\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,1}^{1/2} \cap \tilde{L}_t^1 B_{2,1}^{5/2}} \lesssim \|F_{q+1}^{(2)}\|_{L_t^1 B_{2,1}^{1/2}} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \sum_{m, l \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}, m+l \neq 0} K^2 |c_{l,\epsilon_0}| |c_{m,\epsilon_0}| |l+m|^{-1/2} \|a_{(k,q)}^2\|_{L_t^\infty W^{3,\infty}} \lambda_{q+1}^{-(1-\epsilon_0)/2} \\ & \lesssim K^{11} \lambda_q^{5+4\alpha} \ell_q^{-10} \lambda_{q+1}^{-1/2+10\epsilon_0}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.51)$$

Now we estimate $\int_0^t e^{(t-s)\Delta} F_{q+1}^{(3)}(s) ds$. Firstly, we denote

$$h_{\sigma_0}(t) = \lambda_{q+1}^{-\sigma_0} \int_0^{\lambda_{q+1}^{\sigma_0} t} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}(g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}^2(s)) ds. \quad (4.52)$$

Then we have

$$\int_0^t e^{(t-s)\Delta} F_{q+1}^{(3)}(s) ds = \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\Delta} \operatorname{div}(a_{(k,q)}^2 \bar{k} \otimes \bar{k}) dh_{\sigma_0}(s)$$

$$= \operatorname{div}(a_{(k,q)}^2(t)\bar{k} \otimes \bar{k})h_{\sigma_0}(t) - \int_0^t h_{\sigma_0}(s)\partial_s(e^{(t-s)\Delta}\operatorname{div}(a_{(k,q)}^2\bar{k} \otimes \bar{k})) \, ds.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^t h_{\sigma_0}(s)\partial_s(e^{(t-s)\Delta}\operatorname{div}(a_{(k,q)}^2\bar{k} \otimes \bar{k})) \, ds \\ &= \int_0^t h_{\sigma_0}(s)e^{(t-s)\Delta}\partial_s(\operatorname{div}(a_{(k,q)}^2\bar{k} \otimes \bar{k})) \, ds + \int_0^t h_{\sigma_0}(s)\partial_s(e^{(t-s)\Delta})\operatorname{div}(a_{(k,q)}^2\bar{k} \otimes \bar{k}) \, ds \\ &= \int_0^t h_{\sigma_0}(s)e^{(t-s)\Delta}\partial_s(\operatorname{div}(a_{(k,q)}^2\bar{k} \otimes \bar{k})) \, ds - \int_0^t h_{\sigma_0}(s)\Delta(e^{(t-s)\Delta}\operatorname{div}(a_{(k,q)}^2\bar{k} \otimes \bar{k})) \, ds, \end{aligned}$$

we obtain by Proposition 4.7 that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\Delta}F_{q+1}^{(3)}(s) \, ds \right\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,1}^{1/2} \cap \tilde{L}_t^1 B_{2,1}^{5/2}} &\lesssim (\|a_{(k,q)}^2\|_{L_t^\infty H^4} + \|\partial_t(a_{(k,q)}^2)\|_{L_t^\infty H^2}) \|h_{\sigma_0}(t)\|_{L_t^\infty} \\ &\lesssim \lambda_q^{5+4\alpha} \ell_q^{-16} \lambda_{q+1}^{-\sigma_0}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.53)$$

Moreover, by (3.9) and (4.7), we have

$$\|(1 - \zeta_q)\operatorname{div}\mathring{R}_q^{rem}\|_{L_t^1 B_{2,1}^{1/2}} \lesssim \|\mathring{R}_q^{rem}\|_{L_t^\infty H^2} \lesssim \lambda_q^{10} \ell_q \lesssim \lambda_q^{-40}.$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\partial_t \zeta_q(u_q - u_{\ell_q}) + \zeta_q(1 - \zeta_q)\operatorname{div}((u_q - u_{\ell_q}) \otimes (u_q - u_{\ell_q}))\|_{L_t^1 B_{2,1}^{1/2}} \\ & \lesssim \ell_q \|u_q\|_{L_T^\infty H^2} + \ell_q \|u_q\|_{L_t^\infty H^3} (\|u_q\|_{L_t^\infty H^2} + \|u_{\ell_q}\|_{L_t^\infty H^2}) \\ & \lesssim \lambda_q^{10} \ell_q \lesssim \lambda_q^{-40}. \end{aligned}$$

Collecting the above two estimates with (4.50)–(4.53) together shows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \int_0^T e^{(t-s)\Delta}F_{q+1}(s) \, ds \right\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,1}^{1/2} \cap \tilde{L}_t^1 B_{2,1}^{5/2}} \\ & \lesssim N_\Lambda K^{3/2} \ell_q^{-12} \lambda_{q+1}^{-1/2+\sigma_0} + K^{11} \lambda_q^{5+4\alpha} \ell_q^{-10} \lambda_{q+1}^{-1/2+10\epsilon_0} + \lambda_q^{5+4\alpha} \ell_q^{-16} \lambda_{q+1}^{-\sigma_0} + \lambda_q^{-40} \\ & \lesssim K^{11} N_\Lambda \lambda_q^{-40} \leq \lambda_q^{-20}. \end{aligned}$$

Thereby, we obtain (4.48) for large enough a .

Now we turn to estimate $\|F_{q+1}\|_{L_t^\infty H^2}$. Firstly, we estimate $\|F_{q+1}^{(1)}\|_{L_t^\infty H^2}$, $\|F_{q+1}^{(2)}\|_{L_t^\infty H^2}$ and $\|F_{q+1}^{(3)}\|_{L_t^\infty H^2}$ respectively.

For $F_{q+1}^{(1)}$ defined in Proposition 4.4, using Proposition 4.3 and Proposition 4.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_{q+1}^{(1)}\|_{L_t^\infty H^2} &\lesssim \lambda_{q+1}^{-2} \|\psi_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x)\|_{H^2(\mathbb{T}^3)} \|\partial_t(a_{(k,q)}g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}(t))\|_{L_t^\infty W^{4,\infty}} \\ &\lesssim K^{3/2} N_\Lambda^2 \ell_q^{-12} \lambda_{q+1}^{3+\sigma_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Owing to (4.18), Proposition 4.3 and Proposition 4.7, we bound $F_{q+1}^{(2)}$ by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|F_{q+1}^{(2)}\|_{L_t^\infty H^2} \\
& \lesssim K \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \sum_{m, l \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}, m+l \neq 0} \frac{|c_{l, \epsilon_0}| |c_{m, \epsilon_0}|}{\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} |l+m|} \|e^{i2\pi \lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} (l+m) N_\Lambda k \cdot x / K}\|_{W^{2, \infty}(\mathbb{T}^3)} \|a_{(k, q)}^2 g_{(2, \sigma_0, k)}^2\|_{L_t^\infty H^4} \\
& \lesssim N_\Lambda K^{10} \sum_{m, l \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}, m+l \neq 0} \lambda_{q+1}^{1+8\epsilon_0} |l+m|^{-3} \|a_{(k, q)}^2\|_{L_t^\infty H^4} \|g_{(2, \sigma_0, k)}^2\|_{L_t^\infty} \\
& \lesssim N_\Lambda K^{10} \ell_q^{-8} \lambda_{q+1}^{3+8\epsilon_0}.
\end{aligned}$$

For $F_{q+1}^{(3)}$, by Proposition 4.3 and Proposition 4.7, we have

$$\|F_{q+1}^{(3)}\|_{L_t^\infty H^2} \leq \|a_{(k, q)}^2\|_{L_t^\infty H^2} \|\mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}(g_{(2, \sigma_0, k)}^2)\|_{L_t^\infty} \lesssim \lambda_q^{5+4\alpha} \ell_q^{-4} \lambda_{q+1}^2.$$

Using (3.9) and (4.7), one deduces that

$$\|\operatorname{div} \hat{R}_q^{rem}\|_{L_t^\infty H^2} \lesssim \lambda_q^{10}.$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\partial_t \zeta_q (u_q - u_{\ell_q}) + \zeta_q (1 - \zeta_q) \operatorname{div}((u_q - u_{\ell_q}) \otimes (u_q - u_{\ell_q}))\|_{L_t^\infty H^2} \\
& \lesssim \ell_q \|u_q\|_{L_t^\infty H^3} + (\|u_q\|_{L_t^\infty H^3} + \|u_{\ell_q}\|_{L_t^\infty H^3})^2 \lesssim \lambda_q^{10}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|F_{q+1}\|_{L_t^\infty H^2} & \lesssim K^{3/2} N_\Lambda^2 \ell_q^{-12} \lambda_{q+1}^{3+\sigma_0} + N_\Lambda K^{10} \ell_q^{-8} \lambda_{q+1}^{3+8\epsilon_0} + \lambda_q^{5+4\alpha} \ell_q^{-4} \lambda_{q+1}^2 + C \lambda_q^{10} \\
& \lesssim N_\Lambda K^{10} \ell_q^{-12} \lambda_{q+1}^{3+8\epsilon_0}.
\end{aligned}$$

We obtain (4.49), so that we finish the proof of Proposition 4.8. \square

Proposition 4.9 (Estimates for $w_{q+1}^{(t)}$). *Let $w_{q+1}^{(t)}$ be the solution of the equations (4.32), then we have*

$$\|w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,1}^{1/2} \cap \tilde{L}_t^1 B_{2,1}^{5/2}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \delta_{q+2} \lambda_{q+1}^{-6\alpha}, \quad (4.54)$$

$$\|w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,2}^3} \lesssim N_\Lambda K^{10} \ell_q^{-12} \lambda_{q+1}^{3+8\epsilon_0}. \quad (4.55)$$

Proof. With the aid of Duhamel formula, we write the equations (4.32) in the integral form

$$\begin{aligned}
w_{q+1}^{(t)}(x, t) & = \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\Delta} \mathcal{P} \operatorname{div}(w_{q+1}^{(t)} \otimes w_{q+1}^{(t)} + u_q^{\text{non-loc}} \otimes w_{q+1}^{(t)} + w_{q+1}^{(t)} \otimes u_q^{\text{non-loc}})(s) \, ds \\
& \quad - \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\Delta} \mathcal{P} F_{q+1}(s) \, ds,
\end{aligned} \quad (4.56)$$

where \mathcal{P} is the Leray projector onto divergence-free vector fields.

Thanks to (3.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\Delta} \mathcal{P} \operatorname{div} (u_q^{\text{non-loc}} \otimes w_{q+1}^{(t)} + w_{q+1}^{(t)} \otimes u_q^{\text{non-loc}}) \, ds \right\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,1}^{1/2} \cap \tilde{L}_t^1 B_{2,1}^{5/2}} \\
& \lesssim (\|u_q^{\text{non-loc}} \otimes w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^1 B_{2,1}^{3/2}} + \|w_{q+1}^{(t)} \otimes u_q^{\text{non-loc}}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^1 B_{2,1}^{3/2}}) \\
& \lesssim \|u_q^{\text{non-loc}}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,1}^{1/2} \cap \tilde{L}_t^1 B_{2,1}^{5/2}} \|w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,1}^{1/2} \cap \tilde{L}_t^1 B_{2,1}^{5/2}} \\
& \leq CM^{-1} \|w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,1}^{1/2} \cap \tilde{L}_t^1 B_{2,1}^{5/2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 4.8, one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\Delta} \mathcal{P} F_{q+1}(s) \, ds \right\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,1}^{1/2} \cap \tilde{L}_t^1 B_{2,1}^{5/2}} \\
& \lesssim \left\| \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\Delta} F_{q+1}(s) \, ds \right\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,1}^{1/2} \cap \tilde{L}_t^1 B_{2,1}^{5/2}} \lesssim \lambda_q^{-20} \leq \delta_{q+2} \lambda_{q+1}^{-8\alpha}.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking M large enough such that $CM^{-1} \leq \frac{1}{2}$, for large enough a , we collect the above two estimates together to obtain

$$\|w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,1}^{1/2} \cap \tilde{L}_t^1 B_{2,1}^{5/2}} \lesssim \|w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,1}^{1/2} \cap \tilde{L}_t^1 B_{2,1}^{5/2}}^2 + \lambda_q^{-20} \leq \delta_{q+2} \lambda_{q+1}^{-8\alpha}.$$

By the Banach fixed point theorem and the continuity method, this estimate implies that as long as a is large enough, the equation (4.56) admits a unique mild solution $w_{q+1}^{(t)}$ on $[0, T]$ with

$$\|w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,1}^{1/2} \cap \tilde{L}_t^1 B_{2,1}^{5/2}} \lesssim \delta_{q+2} \lambda_{q+1}^{-8\alpha} \leq \frac{1}{2} \delta_{q+2} \lambda_{q+1}^{-6\alpha}. \quad (4.57)$$

Note that $F_{q+1}(t) = 0$ for $t \in [0, \frac{T}{4} + 2\lambda_{q-1}^{-1}]$ and $w_{q+1}^{(t)}|_{t=0} = 0$, the above inequality implies that

$$w_{q+1}^{(t)}(t) = 0, \quad \forall 0 \leq t \leq \frac{T}{4} + 2\lambda_{q-1}^{-1}. \quad (4.58)$$

Moreover, by (3.11), (4.49) and (4.57), note that $L_t^\infty H^2 \hookrightarrow \tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,2}^1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,2}^3} & \lesssim \|w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{\infty,\infty}^{-1}} \|w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,2}^3} + \|u_q^{\text{non-loc}}\|_{L_t^\infty L^\infty} \|w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,2}^2} \\
& \quad + \|u_q^{\text{non-loc}}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,2}^2} \|w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{L_t^\infty L^\infty} + \|F_{q+1}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,2}^1} \\
& \lesssim \|w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,1}^{1/2}} \|w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,2}^3} + \|u_q^{\text{non-loc}}\|_{L_t^\infty L^\infty} \|w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,2}^3}^{3/5} \|w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,1}^{1/2}}^{2/5} \\
& \quad + \|u_q^{\text{non-loc}}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,2}^2} \|w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,2}^3}^{2/5} \|w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,1}^{1/2}}^{3/5} + \|F_{q+1}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,1}^2} \\
& \leq C(\delta_{q+2} \lambda_{q+1}^{-6\alpha} \|w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,2}^3} + \delta_{q+2} \lambda_{q+1}^{-6\alpha} \lambda_q^{20} + N_\Lambda K^{10} \ell_q^{-12} \lambda_{q+1}^{3+8\epsilon_0}) + \frac{1}{2} \|w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,2}^3}.
\end{aligned}$$

This inequality shows that

$$\|w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{L_t^\infty H^3} \leq \|w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,2}^3} \lesssim N_\Lambda K^{10} \ell_q^{-12} \lambda_{q+1}^{3+8\epsilon_0}.$$

□

Proposition 4.10 (Estimates for w_{q+1}). *For $1 \leq p < 2$, there exists a constant C_0 such that*

$$\|w_{q+1}^{(p)}\|_{L_{t,x}^2 \cap L^p L^\infty} + \lambda_{q+1}^{-9/2} \|w_{q+1}^{(p)}\|_{L^\infty H^3} \leq \frac{1}{4} C_0 \delta_{q+1}^{1/2}, \quad (4.59)$$

$$\|w_{q+1}^{(c)}\|_{L_{t,x}^2 \cap L^p L^\infty} + \lambda_{q+1}^{-4} \|w_{q+1}^{(c)}\|_{L^\infty H^3} \leq \lambda_{q+1}^{-1+\frac{\epsilon_0}{2}}, \quad (4.60)$$

$$\|w_{q+1}\|_{L_{t,x}^2 \cap L^p L^\infty} + \lambda_{q+1}^{-9/2} \|w_{q+1}\|_{L_t^\infty H^3} \leq \frac{1}{2} C_0 \delta_{q+1}^{1/2}. \quad (4.61)$$

Moreover,

$$\|w_{q+1}^{(p)}\|_{L_t^\infty L^2} \lesssim \ell_q^{-4} \lambda_{q+1}, \quad \|w_{q+1}^{(c)}\|_{L_t^\infty L^2} \lesssim \ell_q^{-6}. \quad (4.62)$$

Proof. By the definition of $w_{q+1}^{(p)}$ in (4.29) and Lemma 2.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_{q+1}^{(p)}\|_{L_{t,x}^2} &\lesssim \|a(k,q)\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \|g(2,\sigma_0,k)(t)\|_{L_t^2} \|\phi_{(\epsilon_0,1-\epsilon_0,k)}(x)\|_{L_x^2} \\ &\quad + \lambda_{q+1}^{-\frac{\sigma_0}{2}-\frac{1-\epsilon_0}{2}} \|a(k,q)\|_{C_{t,x}^1} \|g(2,\sigma_0,k)(t)\|_{L_t^2} \|\phi_{(\epsilon_0,1-\epsilon_0,k)}(x)\|_{L_x^2} \\ &\lesssim K^2 \|a(k,q)\|_{L_{t,x}^2} + K^{3/2} \lambda_{q+1}^{-\frac{\sigma_0}{2}} \|a(k,q)\|_{C_{t,x}^1}. \end{aligned}$$

From the definition of $a(k,q)$, one deduces that

$$\|a(k,q)\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \lesssim \|\chi_q \rho_q\|_{L_{t,x}^1}^{1/2} \lesssim \delta_{q+1}^{1/2}.$$

By Proposition 4.7, we have

$$\|a(k,q)\|_{C_{t,x}^1} \lesssim \ell_q^{-12}.$$

Hence, there exists a universal constant $C_0 > K^2$ such that

$$\|w_{q+1}^{(p)}\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \lesssim K^2 \delta_{q+1}^{1/2} + K^{3/2} \ell_q^{-12} \lambda_{q+1}^{-\frac{\sigma_0}{2}-\frac{1-\epsilon_0}{2}} \leq \frac{1}{8} C_0 \delta_{q+1}^{1/2}.$$

Thanks to Proposition 4.3, one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_{q+1}^{(p)}\|_{L^p L^\infty} &\leq \|a(k,q)\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \|g(2,\sigma_0,k)(t)\|_{L^p} \|\phi_{(\epsilon_0,1-\epsilon_0,k)}(x)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)} \\ &\lesssim K^{3/2} \lambda_q^{5+4\alpha} \lambda_{q+1}^{-2(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2})+\frac{\epsilon_0}{2}} \leq \frac{1}{8} C_0 \delta_{q+1}^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.63)$$

We infer from Proposition 4.7 that

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_{q+1}^{(p)}\|_{L_t^\infty H^3} &\leq \|a(k,q)\|_{L_t^\infty H^3} \|g(2,\sigma_0,k)(t)\|_{L_t^\infty} \|\phi_{(\epsilon_0,1-\epsilon_0,k)}(x)\|_{H^3(\mathbb{T}^3)} \\ &\lesssim N_\Lambda^3 K^{3/2} \ell_q^{-6} \lambda_{q+1}^4 \leq \frac{1}{8} C_0 \lambda_{q+1}^{9/2} \delta_{q+1}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Collecting the above three estimates together shows (4.59).

Applying Lemma 2.3 and Proposition 4.3 to $w_{q+1}^{(c)}$ in (4.31), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_{q+1}^{(c)}\|_{L_{t,x}^2} &\lesssim \lambda_{q+1}^{-1} \|a(k,q)\|_{L_t^2 H^1} \|g(2,\sigma_0,k)(t)\|_{L_t^2} \|\psi'_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)} \\ &\quad + \lambda_{q+1}^{-\frac{\sigma_0}{2}-\frac{1-\epsilon_0}{2}-1} \|a(k,q)\|_{C_{t,x}^1} \|g(2,\sigma_0,k)(t)\|_{L_t^2} \|\psi'_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\lesssim K^{3/2} \lambda_{q+1}^{-1} \|a_{(k,q)}\|_{L_t^\infty H^1} + K^{3/2} \lambda_{q+1}^{-\frac{\sigma_0}{2} - \frac{1-\epsilon_0}{2} - 1} \|a_{(k,q)}\|_{C_{t,x}^1}.$$

Then utilizing Proposition 4.7 yields that

$$\|w_{q+1}^{(c)}\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \lesssim K^{3/2} \ell_q^{-2} \lambda_{q+1}^{-1}.$$

By Proposition 4.3 and Proposition 4.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_{q+1}^{(c)}\|_{L^p L^\infty} &\leq \lambda_{q+1}^{-1} \|a_{(k,q)}\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \|g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}(t)\|_{L^p} \|\psi'_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)} \\ &\lesssim K^{1/2} \lambda_q^{5+4\alpha} \lambda_{q+1}^{-1-2(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2})+\frac{\epsilon_0}{2}} \end{aligned} \quad (4.64)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_{q+1}^{(c)}\|_{L_t^\infty H^3} &\leq \lambda_{q+1}^{-1} \|a_{(k,q)}\|_{L_t^\infty H^3} \|g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}(t)\|_{L^\infty} \|\psi'_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x)\|_{H^3(\mathbb{T}^3)} \\ &\lesssim N_\Lambda^3 K^{3/2} \ell_q^{-6} \lambda_{q+1}^3. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain (4.60). Due to

$$L_t^\infty B_{2,1}^{1/2} \cap L_t^1 B_{2,1}^{5/2} \hookrightarrow L_{t,x}^2 \cap L_t^p L^\infty, \quad 1 \leq p < 2,$$

the estimates (4.54), (4.59) together with (4.60) imply (4.61). Moreover, by Proposition 4.3 and Proposition 4.7, we obtain that

$$\|w_{q+1}^{(p)}\|_{L_t^\infty L^2} \lesssim \|a_{(k,q)}\|_{L_t^\infty L^\infty} \|g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}(t)\|_{L_t^\infty} \|\phi_{(\epsilon_0,1-\epsilon_0,k)}(x)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)} \lesssim \ell_q^{-4} \lambda_{q+1},$$

and

$$\|w_{q+1}^{(c)}\|_{L_t^\infty L^2} \lesssim \lambda_{q+1}^{-1} \|a_{(k,q)}\|_{L_t^\infty W^{1,\infty}} \|g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}(t)\|_{L_t^\infty} \|\psi'_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)} \lesssim \ell_q^{-6}.$$

This shows (4.62). Therefore, we complete the proof of Proposition 4.10. \square

4.3.3. *Estimates for the Reynolds stress \dot{R}_{q+1} .* Letting

$$\begin{aligned} u_{q+1} &= \bar{u}_q + w_{q+1}, \\ p_{q+1} &= p_t + \bar{p}_q - P_{q+1}^{(1)} - \eta_q^2 (\chi_q \rho_q)^{1/2} + \frac{2}{3} (w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)}) \cdot \bar{u}_q + \frac{2}{3} w_{q+1}^{(t)} \cdot \bar{u}_q^{\text{loc}} \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{3} w_{q+1}^{(p)} \cdot w_{q+1}^{(c)} + \frac{2}{3} w_{q+1}^{(p)} \cdot w_{q+1}^{(t)} + \frac{2}{3} w_{q+1}^{(t)} \cdot w_{q+1}^{(c)} + \frac{1}{3} w_{q+1}^{(c)} \cdot w_{q+1}^{(c)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $w_{q+1} = w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)} + w_{q+1}^{(t)}$, we have from (4.16) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t u_{q+1} - \Delta u_{q+1} + \text{div}(u_{q+1} \otimes u_{q+1}) + \nabla p_{q+1} \\ &= \partial_t w_{q+1} - \Delta w_{q+1} + \text{div}(w_{q+1} \otimes \bar{u}_q) + \text{div}(\bar{u}_q \otimes w_{q+1}) + \text{div}(w_{q+1} \otimes w_{q+1}) \\ &\quad + \nabla p_t + \text{div} \dot{R}_{\ell_q} + (1 - \zeta_q) \text{div} \dot{R}_q^{\text{rem}} + \partial_t \zeta_q (u_q - u_{\ell_q}) + \zeta_q (1 - \zeta_q) \text{div}((u_q - u_{\ell_q}) \otimes (u_q - u_{\ell_q})) \\ &= \partial_t (w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)}) - \Delta (w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)}) + \text{div}((w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)}) \otimes \bar{u}_q) + \text{div}(\bar{u}_q \otimes (w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)})) \\ &\quad + \text{div}(w_{q+1}^{(t)} \otimes \bar{u}_q^{\text{loc}}) + \text{div}(\bar{u}_q^{\text{loc}} \otimes w_{q+1}^{(t)}) + \text{div} \dot{R}_{\ell_q} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \partial_t w_{q+1}^{(t)} - \Delta w_{q+1}^{(t)} + \operatorname{div}(w_{q+1}^{(t)} \otimes \bar{u}_q^{\text{non-loc}}) + \operatorname{div}(\bar{u}_q^{\text{non-loc}} \otimes w_{q+1}^{(t)}) + \nabla p_t - \nabla P_{q+1}^{(1)} \\
& + \operatorname{div}(w_{q+1}^{(p)} \otimes w_{q+1}^{(p)}) - \nabla(\eta_q^2 (\chi_q \rho_q)^{1/2}) + (1 - \zeta_q) \operatorname{div} \mathring{R}_q^{\text{rem}} + \partial_t \zeta_q (u_q - u_{\ell_q}) \\
& + \operatorname{div}(w_{q+1}^{(p)} \overset{\circ}{\otimes} (w_{q+1}^{(c)} + w_{q+1}^{(t)}) + w_{q+1}^{(c)} \overset{\circ}{\otimes} w_{q+1} + w_{q+1}^{(t)} \overset{\circ}{\otimes} (w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)})) \\
& + \zeta_q (1 - \zeta_q) \operatorname{div}((u_q - u_{\ell_q}) \otimes (u_q - u_{\ell_q})).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $w_{q+1}^{(t)}$ satisfies the equations (4.32), by Proposition 4.4–4.5, we obtain from the above equality that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \partial_t u_{q+1} - \Delta u_{q+1} + \operatorname{div}(u_{q+1} \otimes u_{q+1}) + \nabla p_{q+1} \\
& = \operatorname{div} \mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(1)} + \operatorname{div} \mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(2)} - \Delta(w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)}) + \operatorname{div}((w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)}) \overset{\circ}{\otimes} \bar{u}_q) \\
& \quad + \operatorname{div}(\bar{u}_q \overset{\circ}{\otimes} (w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)})) + \operatorname{div}(w_{q+1}^{(t)} \otimes \bar{u}_q^{\text{loc}}) + \operatorname{div}(\bar{u}_q^{\text{loc}} \otimes w_{q+1}^{(t)}) + \operatorname{div} \mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(3)} \\
& \quad + \operatorname{div}(w_{q+1}^{(p)} \overset{\circ}{\otimes} (w_{q+1}^{(c)} + w_{q+1}^{(t)}) + w_{q+1}^{(c)} \overset{\circ}{\otimes} w_{q+1} + w_{q+1}^{(t)} \overset{\circ}{\otimes} (w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)})) \\
& = \operatorname{div}(\mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(1)} + \mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(2)} + \mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(3)} + (w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)}) \overset{\circ}{\otimes} \bar{u}_q + \bar{u}_q \overset{\circ}{\otimes} (w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)})) \\
& \quad + w_{q+1}^{(t)} \overset{\circ}{\otimes} \bar{u}_q^{\text{loc}} + \bar{u}_q^{\text{loc}} \overset{\circ}{\otimes} w_{q+1}^{(t)} - (\nabla(w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)})) + (\nabla(w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)}))^{\text{T}} \\
& \quad + w_{q+1}^{(p)} \overset{\circ}{\otimes} (w_{q+1}^{(c)} + w_{q+1}^{(t)}) + w_{q+1}^{(c)} \overset{\circ}{\otimes} w_{q+1} + w_{q+1}^{(t)} \overset{\circ}{\otimes} (w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)}) \\
& =: \operatorname{div} \mathring{R}_{q+1}. \tag{4.65}
\end{aligned}$$

Now we are focused on estimating \mathring{R}_{q+1} . According to the definition of \mathring{R}_{q+1} in (4.65), $\operatorname{supp}_x \mathring{R}_{q+1}$ is determined by the supports of $\mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(1)}$, $\mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(2)}$, $\mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(3)}$, $w_{q+1}^{(p)}$, $w_{q+1}^{(c)}$ and \bar{u}_q^{loc} . From $\mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(1)}$ and $\mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(2)}$ in Proposition 4.4, $\mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(3)}$ in Proposition 4.5, $w_{q+1}^{(p)}$ in (4.30) and $w_{q+1}^{(c)}$ in (4.31), we infer that

$$\operatorname{supp}_x \mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(1)}, \mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(2)}, \mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(3)}, w_{q+1}^{(p)}, w_{q+1}^{(c)} = \operatorname{supp}_x a_{(k,q)} \subseteq \Omega_{q+1}.$$

This relation together with (4.10) implies that

$$\operatorname{supp}_x \mathring{R}_{q+1} \subseteq \Omega_{q+1} \subseteq \left[-\frac{K}{2}, \frac{K}{2}\right]^3. \tag{4.66}$$

Proposition 4.11 (Estimates for \mathring{R}_{q+1}). *Let \mathring{R}_{q+1} be defined in (4.65), it holds that*

$$\|\mathring{R}_{q+1}\|_{L_{t,x}^1} \leq \delta_{q+2} \lambda_{q+1}^{-4\alpha}, \tag{4.67}$$

$$\|\mathring{R}_{q+1}\|_{L^\infty W^{3,1}} \leq \lambda_{q+1}^5. \tag{4.68}$$

Proof. By the definitions of $\mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(1)}$ and $\mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(2)}$ in Proposition 4.4, we infer from Proposition 4.3, Proposition 4.7 and (4.66) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(1)}\|_{L_{t,x}^1} & \lesssim \lambda_{q+1}^{-1} \|\partial_t g(2, \sigma_0, k)\|_{L^1} \|a_{(k,q)}\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \|\psi'_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^3)} \\
& \quad + \lambda_{q+1}^{-1} \|g(2, \sigma_0, k)\|_{L^1} \|\partial_t a_{(k,q)}\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \|\psi'_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^3)} \\
& \lesssim K^{5/2} \ell_q^{-12} \lambda_{q+1}^{\sigma_0 - \frac{\epsilon_0}{2}}, \tag{4.69}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(2)}\|_{L^1_{t,x}} &\lesssim \lambda_{q+1}^{-2} \|\psi_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^3)} \|a_{(k,q)}\|_{L^\infty_t W^{1,\infty}} \|\partial_t g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}\|_{L^1} \\ &\quad + \lambda_{q+1}^{-2} \|\psi_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^3)} \|\partial_t a_{(k,q)}\|_{L^\infty_t W^{1,\infty}} \|g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}\|_{L^1} \\ &\lesssim K^{5/2} \ell_q^{-18} \lambda_{q+1}^{\sigma_0 - \frac{\epsilon_0}{2} - 1}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.70)$$

By the definition of $\mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(3)}$ in Proposition 4.5, using (4.18), Proposition 4.3 and Proposition 4.7, one gets that

$$\begin{aligned} \|R_{q+1}^{(3)}\|_{L^1_{t,x}} &\lesssim K \sum_{m,l \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}, m+l \neq 0} \frac{|c_{l,\epsilon_0}| |c_{m,\epsilon_0}|}{\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} |l+m|} \|a_{(k,q)}^2\|_{L^\infty_t W^{1,\infty}} \|g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}^2\|_{L^1_t} \\ &\lesssim K^{10} \sum_{m,l \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}, m+l \neq 0} |l+m|^{-5} \lambda_{q+1}^{-1+10\epsilon_0} \lambda_q^{5+4\alpha} \ell_q^{-6} \\ &\lesssim K^{10} \lambda_{q+1}^{-1+10\epsilon_0} \lambda_q^{5+4\alpha} \ell_q^{-6}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.71)$$

With the aid of (4.33), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla(w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)})\|_{L^1_{t,x}} &\lesssim \lambda_{q+1}^{-1} \|a_{(k,q)} g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}(t) \psi'_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x)\|_{L^1_t W^{2,1}} \\ &\lesssim \lambda_{q+1}^{-1} \|g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}\|_{L^1} \|a_{(k,q)}\|_{L^\infty_t W^{2,\infty}} \|\psi'_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x)\|_{W^{2,1}(\mathbb{T}^3)}. \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 4.3 and Proposition 4.7, one obtains that

$$\|\nabla(w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)})\|_{L^1_{t,x}} \lesssim K^{5/2} \ell_q^{-8} \lambda_{q+1}^{-\frac{\epsilon_0}{2}}.$$

Making use of (4.12), (4.60) and (4.63), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)}) \mathring{\otimes} \bar{u}_q + \bar{u}_q \mathring{\otimes} (w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)})\|_{L^1_{t,x}} \\ &\lesssim K^{3/2} (\|w_{q+1}^{(p)}\|_{L^1_t L^\infty} + \|w_{q+1}^{(c)}\|_{L^1_t L^\infty}) \|\bar{u}_q\|_{L^\infty_t L^2} \\ &\lesssim K^{3/2} M \lambda_q^{5+4\alpha} \lambda_{q+1}^{-1+\frac{\epsilon_0}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.72)$$

By virtue of (4.10) and (4.54), we easily deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_{q+1}^{(t)} \mathring{\otimes} \bar{u}_q^{\text{loc}} + \bar{u}_q^{\text{loc}} \mathring{\otimes} w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{L^1_{t,x}} &\lesssim K^{3/2} \|w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{L^1_t L^\infty} \|\bar{u}_q^{\text{loc}}\|_{L^\infty_t L^2} \\ &\lesssim K^{3/2} M \delta_{q+2} \lambda_{q+1}^{-6\alpha}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.73)$$

With the aid of Proposition 4.9 and Proposition 4.10, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|w_{q+1}^{(p)} \mathring{\otimes} (w_{q+1}^{(c)} + w_{q+1}^{(t)})\|_{L^1_{t,x}} + \|w_{q+1}^{(c)} \mathring{\otimes} w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{L^1_{t,x}} + \|w_{q+1}^{(t)} \mathring{\otimes} (w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)})\|_{L^1_{t,x}} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{2} C_0 \delta_{q+1}^{1/2} \delta_{q+2} \lambda_{q+1}^{-6\alpha} + \frac{1}{2} C_0 \delta_{q+1}^{1/2} \lambda_{q+1}^{-1+\frac{\epsilon_0}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.74)$$

Collecting (4.69)–(4.74) together, we arrive at

$$\|\mathring{R}_{q+1}\|_{L^1_{t,x}} \lesssim K^{10} \delta_{q+2} \lambda_{q+1}^{-6\alpha}.$$

For large enough a , this estimate combined with (3.1) and (3.2) yields (4.67).

Now we are focused on estimating $\|\mathring{R}_{q+1}\|_{L_t^\infty W^{3,1}}$. By Proposition 4.3 and Proposition 4.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(1)}\|_{L_t^\infty W^{3,1}} &\lesssim \lambda_{q+1}^{-1} \|\partial_t g(2, \sigma_0, k)\|_{L_t^\infty} \|a(k, q)\|_{L_t^\infty W^{3,\infty}} \|\psi'_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x)\|_{W^{3,1}(\mathbb{T}^3)} \\ &\quad + \lambda_{q+1}^{-1} \|g(2, \sigma_0, k)\|_{L_t^\infty} \|\partial_t a(k, q)\|_{L_t^\infty W^{3,\infty}} \|\psi'_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x)\|_{W^{3,1}(\mathbb{T}^3)} \\ &\lesssim K^{5/2} \ell_q^{-10} \lambda_{q+1}^{5+\sigma_0-\frac{\epsilon_0}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Proposition 4.3 and Proposition 4.7 to $\mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(2)}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(2)}\|_{L_t^\infty W^{3,1}} &\lesssim \lambda_{q+1}^{-2} \|\psi_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x)\|_{W^{3,1}(\mathbb{T}^3)} \|a(k, q)\|_{L_t^\infty W^{4,\infty}} \|\partial_t g(2, \sigma_0, k)\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\quad + \lambda_{q+1}^{-2} \|\psi_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x)\|_{W^{3,1}(\mathbb{T}^3)} \|\partial_t a(k, q)\|_{L_t^\infty W^{4,\infty}} \|g(2, \sigma_0, k)\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim K^{5/2} \ell_q^{-12} \lambda_{q+1}^{4+\sigma_0-\frac{\epsilon_0}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

For $\mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(3)}$, with the aid of (4.18), Proposition 4.3 and Proposition 4.7, one shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(3)}\|_{L_t^\infty W^{3,1}} &\lesssim K^3 N_\Lambda^3 \sum_{m, l \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}, m+l \neq 0} \lambda_{q+1}^{4-2\epsilon_0} |c_{l, \epsilon_0}| |c_{m, \epsilon_0}| |l+m|^2 \|a_{(k, q)}^2\|_{L^\infty H^4} \\ &\lesssim K^{12} N_\Lambda^3 \sum_{m, l \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}, m+l \neq 0} |l+m|^{-2} \lambda_q^{5+4\alpha} \ell_q^{-8} \lambda_{q+1}^{4+9\epsilon_0} \\ &\lesssim K^{12} N_\Lambda^3 \lambda_q^{5+4\alpha} \ell_q^{-8} \lambda_{q+1}^{4+9\epsilon_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking advantage of (4.33), Proposition 4.3 and Proposition 4.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla(w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)})\|_{L_t^\infty W^{3,1}} &\lesssim \lambda_{q+1}^{-1} \|a(k, q) g(2, \sigma_0, k)(t) \psi'_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x)\|_{L_t^\infty W^{4,1}} \\ &\lesssim \lambda_{q+1}^{-1} \|g(2, \sigma_0, k)\|_{L^\infty} \|a(k, q)\|_{L_t^\infty H^4} \|\psi'_{\lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon_0}}(\lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda k \cdot x)\|_{H^4(\mathbb{T}^3)} \\ &\lesssim K^{3/2} \ell_q^{-8} \lambda_{q+1}^4. \end{aligned}$$

By virtue of (4.12), (4.59) and (4.60), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)}) \overset{\circ}{\otimes} \bar{u}_q + \bar{u}_q \overset{\circ}{\otimes} (w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)})\|_{L_t^\infty W^{3,1}} \\ &\lesssim (\|w_{q+1}^{(p)}\|_{L_t^\infty H^3} + \|w_{q+1}^{(c)}\|_{L_t^\infty H^3}) \|\bar{u}_q\|_{L_t^\infty H^3} \lesssim \lambda_q^5 \lambda_{q+1}^{9/2}. \end{aligned}$$

By (4.12) and (4.54), we have

$$\|w_{q+1}^{(t)} \overset{\circ}{\otimes} \bar{u}_q^{\text{loc}} + \bar{u}_q^{\text{loc}} \overset{\circ}{\otimes} w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{L_t^\infty W^{3,1}} \lesssim \|w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{L_t^\infty H^3} \|\bar{u}_q^{\text{loc}}\|_{L_t^\infty H^3} \lesssim \lambda_q^5 \lambda_{q+1}^{9/2}.$$

By Proposition 4.9 and Proposition 4.10, one deduces that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|w_{q+1}^{(p)} \overset{\circ}{\otimes} (w_{q+1}^{(c)} + w_{q+1}^{(t)})\|_{L_t^\infty W^{3,1}} + \|w_{q+1}^{(c)} \overset{\circ}{\otimes} w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{L_t^\infty W^{3,1}} + \|w_{q+1}^{(t)} \overset{\circ}{\otimes} (w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)})\|_{L_t^\infty W^{3,1}} \\ &\leq \|w_{q+1}^{(c)}\|_{L_t^\infty L^2} (\|w_{q+1}^{(p)}\|_{L_t^\infty H^3} + \|w_{q+1}^{(c)}\|_{L_t^\infty H^3} + \|w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{L_t^\infty H^3}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \|w_{q+1}^{(c)}\|_{L_t^\infty H^3} (\|w_{q+1}^{(p)}\|_{L_t^\infty L^2} + \|w_{q+1}^{(c)}\|_{L_t^\infty L^2} + \|w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{L_t^\infty L^2}) \\
& + \|w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{L_t^\infty L^2} \|w_{q+1}^{(p)}\|_{L_t^\infty H^3} + \|w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{L_t^\infty H^3} \|w_{q+1}^{(p)}\|_{L_t^\infty L^2} \\
& \lesssim C_0 \ell_q^{-6} \delta_{q+1}^{1/2} \lambda_{q+1}^{9/2} + N_\Lambda K^{10} \ell_q^{-12} \lambda_{q+1}^{4+8\epsilon_0}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, collecting these estimates together imply that

$$\|\mathring{R}_{q+1}\|_{L_t^\infty W^{3,1}} \lesssim K^{12} \ell_q^{-12} \lambda_{q+1}^{5+\sigma_0-\frac{\epsilon_0}{2}}.$$

Thanks to the condition (3.2), we prove (4.68), so that we complete the proof of Proposition 4.11. \square

Proposition 4.12. *Let $u_{q+1} = \bar{u}_q + w_{q+1}$, we have*

$$\left| E - \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u_{q+1}|^2 dx dt - 3\delta_{q+2} \right| \leq \delta_{q+2} \lambda_q^{-\alpha}.$$

Proof. We write

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u_{q+1}|^2 dx dt &= \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\bar{u}_q|^2 dx dt + \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |w_{q+1}|^2 dx dt + 2 \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \bar{u}_q \cdot w_{q+1} dx dt \\
&=: \text{I} + \text{II} + \text{III}.
\end{aligned}$$

For III, we split w_{q+1} into three parts $w_{q+1}^{(p)}$, $w_{q+1}^{(c)}$ and $w_{q+1}^{(t)}$. Note that

$$\text{supp}_x w_{q+1}^{(p)} = \text{supp}_x w_{q+1}^{(c)} \subseteq \Omega_{q+1},$$

we obtain

$$|\text{III}| \lesssim \left| \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{\Omega_{q+1}} \bar{u}_q \cdot w_{q+1}^{(p)} dx dt \right| + \left| \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{\Omega_{q+1}} \bar{u}_q \cdot w_{q+1}^{(c)} dx dt \right| + \left| \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \bar{u}_q \cdot w_{q+1}^{(t)} dx dt \right|.$$

Thanks to (3.9), (4.4) and (4.54), one deduces that

$$\left| \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \bar{u}_q \cdot w_{q+1}^{(t)} dx dt \right| \leq \|\bar{u}_q\|_{L_t^\infty L^2} \|w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{L_t^1 L^2} \lesssim M \lambda_q^5 \lambda_{q+1}^{-\frac{\sigma_0}{2}}.$$

Moreover, by (4.63) and (4.64), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{\Omega_{q+1}} \bar{u}_q \cdot w_{q+1}^{(p)} dx dt \right| + \left| \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{\Omega_{q+1}} \bar{u}_q \cdot w_{q+1}^{(c)} dx dt \right| \\
& \lesssim K^3 \|\bar{u}_q\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} (\|w_{q+1}^{(p)}\|_{L_t^1 L^\infty} + \|w_{q+1}^{(c)}\|_{L_t^1 L^\infty}) \\
& \lesssim K^3 \lambda_q^5 \lambda_{q+1}^{-1+\frac{\epsilon_0}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

By $w_{q+1} = w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)} + w_{q+1}^{(t)}$, we rewrite II as

$$\text{II} = \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |w_{q+1}^{(p)}|^2 dx dt + 2 \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{\Omega_{q+1}} w_{q+1}^{(p)} \cdot (w_{q+1}^{(c)} + w_{q+1}^{(t)}) dx dt$$

$$+ \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (w_{q+1}^{(c)} + w_{q+1}^{(t)}) \cdot (w_{q+1}^{(c)} + w_{q+1}^{(t)}) \, dx \, dt.$$

With the aid of (4.54)–(4.59) and (4.63), one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} w_{q+1}^{(p)} \cdot (w_{q+1}^{(c)} + w_{q+1}^{(t)}) \, dx \, dt \right| + \left| \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (w_{q+1}^{(c)} + w_{q+1}^{(t)}) \cdot (w_{q+1}^{(c)} + w_{q+1}^{(t)}) \, dx \, dt \right| \\ & \leq \|w_{q+1}^{(p)}\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \|w_{q+1}^{(c)}\|_{L_{t,x}^2} + K^{3/2} \|w_{q+1}^{(p)}\|_{L_t^1 L^\infty} \|w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{L_t^\infty L^2} \\ & \quad + (\|w_{q+1}^{(c)}\|_{L_{t,x}^2} + \|w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{L_{t,x}^2}) (\|w_{q+1}^{(c)}\|_{L_{t,x}^2} + \|w_{q+1}^{(t)}\|_{L_{t,x}^2}) \\ & \lesssim \delta_{q+1}^{1/2} \lambda_{q+1}^{-1+\frac{\epsilon_0}{2}} + K^{3/2} \lambda_{q+1}^{-1+\frac{\epsilon_0}{2}-\frac{\sigma_0}{2}} + \lambda_{q+1}^{-\sigma_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that $\text{supp}_x w_{q+1}^{(p)} \subseteq [-\frac{K}{2}, \frac{K}{2}]^3 := D_K$, by the definition of $w_{q+1}^{(p)}$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |w_{q+1}^{(p)}|^2 \, dx \, dt = \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{D_K} \text{Tr}(w_{q+1}^{(p)} \otimes w_{q+1}^{(p)}) \, dx \, dt \\ & = \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{D_K} \text{Tr} \left(\sum_{k \in \Lambda} a_{(k,q)}^2 g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}^2(t) \bar{k} \otimes \bar{k} \right) \, dx \, dt \\ & \quad + \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{D_K} \text{Tr} \left(\sum_{k \in \Lambda} \sum_{m, l \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}, m+l \neq 0} a_{(k,q)}^2 g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}^2 c_{l,\epsilon_0} c_{m,\epsilon_0} e^{2\pi i \lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} (l+m)k \cdot x/K} \bar{k} \otimes \bar{k} \right) \, dx \, dt. \end{aligned}$$

The first term on the right-hand side of the above inequality can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{D_K} \text{Tr} \left(\sum_{k \in \Lambda} a_{(k,q)}^2 g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}^2(t) \bar{k} \otimes \bar{k} \right) \, dx \, dt \\ & = \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{D_K} \text{Tr} \left(\sum_{k \in \Lambda} a_{(k,q)}^2 \bar{k} \otimes \bar{k} \right) \, dx \, dt + \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{D_K} \text{Tr} \left(\sum_{k \in \Lambda} a_{(k,q)}^2 \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}(g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}^2) \bar{k} \otimes \bar{k} \right) \, dx \, dt \\ & = 3\rho_q \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{D_K} \eta_q^2 \chi_q \, dx \, dt + \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{D_K} \text{Tr} \left(\sum_{k \in \Lambda} a_{(k,q)}^2 \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}(g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}^2) \bar{k} \otimes \bar{k} \right) \, dx \, dt \\ & = E - \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\bar{u}_q|^2 \, dx \, dt - 3\delta_{q+2} + \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{D_K} \text{Tr} \left(\sum_{k \in \Lambda} a_{(k,q)}^2 \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}(g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}^2) \bar{k} \otimes \bar{k} \right) \, dx \, dt, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (4.25) and (4.27) in the last equality. Thanks to (4.52), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{D_K} \text{Tr} \left(\sum_{k \in \Lambda} a_{(k,q)}^2 \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}(g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}^2) \bar{k} \otimes \bar{k} \right) \, dx \, dt \right| \\ & = \left| \text{Tr} \left(\sum_{k \in \Lambda} \int_{D_K} \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T a_{(k,q)}^2 \, dh_{\sigma_0}(t) \, dx \, \bar{k} \otimes \bar{k} \right) \right| \\ & \lesssim \|h_{\sigma_0}(t)\|_{L_t^\infty} (\|a_{(k,q)}\|_{L_t^\infty L^2}^2 + \|a_{(k,q)}\|_{L_t^\infty L^2} \|\partial_t a_{(k,q)}\|_{L_t^\infty L^2}) \\ & \lesssim \ell_q^{-16} \lambda_{q+1}^{-\sigma_0}. \end{aligned}$$

With the aid of Proposition 4.2 and integration by parts, one deduces that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{D_K} \text{Tr} \left(\sum_{k \in \Lambda} \sum_{m, l \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}, m+l \neq 0} a_{(k,q)}^2 g_{(2,\sigma_0,k)}^2(t) c_{l,\epsilon_0} c_{m,\epsilon_0} e^{i2\pi \lambda_{q+1}^{1-\epsilon_0} N_\Lambda(l+m)k \cdot x / K} \bar{k} \otimes \bar{k} \right) dx dt \right| \\
& \lesssim K^4 \sum_{m, l \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}, m+l \neq 0} \|a_{(k,q)}^2\|_{L_t^\infty W^{1,\infty}} |c_{l,\epsilon_0}| |c_{m,\epsilon_0}| \lambda_{q+1}^{-1+\epsilon_0} \\
& \lesssim K^{13} \sum_{m, l \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}, m+l \neq 0} \lambda_q^{5+\alpha} \ell_q^{-6} \lambda_{q+1}^{-1+10\epsilon_0} l^{-4} m^{-4} \\
& \lesssim K^{13} \lambda_q^{5+\alpha} \ell_q^{-6} \lambda_{q+1}^{-1+10\epsilon_0}.
\end{aligned}$$

In conclusion, we obtain that

$$\left| E - \int_{\frac{3T}{4}}^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u_{q+1}|^2 dx dt - 3\delta_{q+2} \right| \lesssim K^{13} \ell_q^{-16} \lambda_{q+1}^{-\sigma_0},$$

which together with (3.1) and (3.2) shows Proposition 4.12. \square

4.4. Iterative estimates at $q+1$ level. Now we collect these estimates together to show that u_{q+1} and the Reynolds stress \mathring{R}_{q+1} satisfies (3.8)–(3.14).

Firstly, we define $u_{q+1} = \bar{u}_q + w_{q+1}$. Owing to

$$\bar{u}_q = \bar{u}_q^{\text{loc}} + \bar{u}_q^{\text{non-loc}} \quad \text{and} \quad w_{q+1} = w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)} + w_{q+1}^{(t)},$$

we give

$$u_{q+1}^{\text{loc}} = \bar{u}_q^{\text{loc}} + w_{q+1}^{(p)} + w_{q+1}^{(c)}, \quad u_{q+1}^{\text{non-loc}} = \bar{u}_q^{\text{non-loc}} + w_{q+1}^{(t)}.$$

Using (4.10)–(4.12), (4.54), Proposition 4.9–4.10, we infer from (3.1) and (3.2) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u_{q+1}^{\text{loc}}\|_{L_{t,x}^2 \cap L_t^p L^\infty} & \leq \frac{M}{2}(1 - \delta_q^{1/2}) + \frac{1}{2}\delta_{q+1}^{1/2} \leq \frac{M}{2}(1 - \delta_{q+1}^{1/2}), \\
\|u_{q+1}^{\text{non-loc}}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,2}^3} & \leq \lambda_q^5 + \lambda_{q+1}^{\frac{9}{2}} \leq \lambda_{q+1}^5, \\
\|\bar{u}_q^{\text{non-loc}}\|_{\tilde{L}_t^\infty B_{2,1}^{1/2} \cap \tilde{L}_t^1 B_{2,1}^{5/2}} & \leq M^{-1} + \sum_{m=2}^q \delta_{k+1} \lambda_k^{-6\alpha} + \delta_{q+2} \lambda_{q+1}^{-6\alpha} = M^{-1} + \sum_{m=2}^{q+1} \delta_{k+1} \lambda_k^{-6\alpha}, \\
\|u_{q+1}\|_{L_{t,x}^2} & \leq M(1 - \delta_q^{1/2}) + \frac{1}{2}\delta_{q+1}^{1/2} \leq M(1 - \delta_{q+1}^{1/2}), \\
\|u_{q+1}\|_{L_t^\infty H^3} & \leq \lambda_q^5 + \lambda_{q+1}^{\frac{9}{2}} \leq \lambda_{q+1}^5.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\text{supp}_x w_{q+1}^{(p)} = \text{supp}_x w_{q+1}^{(c)} \subseteq \Omega_{q+1}$ and $\text{supp}_x \bar{u}_q^{\text{loc}} = \Omega_q + [-\lambda_q^{-1}, \lambda_q^{-1}]^3 \subseteq \Omega_{q+1}$, we have

$$\text{supp}_x u_{q+1}^{\text{loc}} \subseteq \Omega_{q+1}.$$

Hence, we prove that estimates (3.8)–(3.9) hold with q replaced by $q+1$. Proposition 4.12 directly yields (3.12) at $q+1$ level.

Note that

$$a_{(k,q)}(t) = 0, \quad \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq \frac{T}{4} + 2\lambda_{q-1}^{-1},$$

this fact combined with (4.58) shows that, for $0 \leq t \leq \frac{T}{4} + 2\lambda_{q-1}^{-1}$,

$$\mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(1)}(t) = \mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(2)}(t) = \mathring{R}_{q+1}^{(3)}(t) = 0, \quad w_{q+1}^{(p)}(t) = w_{q+1}^{(c)}(t) = w_{q+1}^{(t)}(t) = 0. \quad (4.75)$$

Therefore, we obtain from the definition of \mathring{R}_{q+1} in (4.65) that

$$\mathring{R}_{q+1}(t) = 0, \quad 0 \leq t \leq \frac{T}{4} + 2\lambda_{q-1}^{-1}.$$

This fact together with (4.66) gives (3.13) at $q+1$ level. Proposition 4.11 directly shows that (3.14) holds for \mathring{R}_{q+1} . Thanks to (4.15) and (4.75), we obtain (3.15) by $u_{q+1} = \bar{u}_q + w_{q+1}$. By (4.13) and (4.61), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_{q+1} - u_q\|_{L_{t,x}^2 \cap L_t^p L^\infty} &\leq \|u_q - \bar{u}_q\|_{L_{t,x}^2 \cap L_t^p L^\infty} + \|w_{q+1}\|_{L_{t,x}^2 \cap L_t^p L^\infty} \\ &\leq \lambda_q^{-40} + \frac{1}{2} C_0 \delta_{q+1}^{1/2} \leq C_0 \delta_{q+1}^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds by (3.2), and thereby we give (3.16). Therefore, we complete the proof of Proposition 3.1.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work was supported by the National Key Research and Development Program of China (No. 2022YFA1005700).

REFERENCES

- [1] D. ALBRITTON, E. BRUÉ, and M. COLOMBO, *Non-uniqueness of leray solutions of the forced Navier-Stokes equations*, Ann. Math., 196 (1) (2022), 415–455.
- [2] H. BAHOURI, J.Y. CHEMIN, R. DANCHIN, *Fourier Analysis and Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations*, in: Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, vol. 343, Springer-Verlag, 2011.
- [3] R. BEEKIE, T. BUCKMASTER, V. VICOL, *Weak solutions of ideal MHD which do not conserve magnetic helicity*. Ann. PDE., 6 (1) (2020), Paper No. 1, 40 pp.
- [4] E. Bruè, M. Colombo, C. DeLellis, *Positive solutions of transport equations and classical nonuniqueness of characteristic curves*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 240 (2) (2021), 1055–1090,
- [5] T. BUCKMASTER, *Onsager's conjecture almost everywhere in Time*, Comm. Math. Phys., 333 (3) (2015), 1175–1198.
- [6] T. BUCKMASTER, M. COLOMBO, 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., 24 (9) (2021), 3333–3378.
- [7] T. BUCKMASTER, C. DE LELLIS, P. ISETT, L. SZÉKELYHIDI JR., *Anomalous dissipation for 1/5-Hölder Euler flows*, Ann. of Math., 182 (1) (2015), 127–172.
- [8] T. BUCKMASTER, C. DE LELLIS, L. SZÉKELYHIDI JR., *Dissipative Euler flows with Onsager's critical spatial regularity*, Commun. Pur. Appl. Math., 69 (9) (2016), 1613–1670.

- [9] T. BUCKMASTER, V. VICOL, *Nonuniqueness of weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equation*, Ann. of Math., 189 (1) (2019), 101–144.
- [10] A. CHESKIDOV, X. LUO, *Sharp nonuniqueness for the Navier-Stokes equations*, Invent. Math., 229 (3) (2022): 987–1054.
- [11] A. CHESKIDOV, X. LUO, *Nonuniqueness of weak solutions for the transport equation at critical space regularity*, Ann. PDE, 7 (1) (2021), Paper No. 2, 45 pp.
- [12] A. CHESKIDOV, X. LUO, *Extreme temporal intermittency in the linear Sobolev transport: almost smooth nonunique solutions*, [arXiv:2204.0895](https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.0895), 2022.
- [13] S. DANERI, L. SZÉKELYHIDI JR., *Non-uniqueness and h-principle for Hölder-continuous weak solutions of the Euler equations*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 224 (2) (2017), 471–514.
- [14] S. DANERI, E. RUNA, L. SZÉKELYHIDI JR., *Non-uniqueness for the Euler Equations up to Onsager’s Critical Exponent*, Ann. PDE, 7 (1) (2021), Paper No. 8, 44 pp.
- [15] C. DE LELLIS, L. SZÉKELYHIDI JR., *The Euler equations as a differential inclusion*, Ann. of Math., (2) 170 (3) (2009), 1417–1436.
- [16] C. DE LELLIS, L. SZÉKELYHIDI JR., *Dissipative Euler flows and Onsager’s conjecture*, J. Eur. Math. Soc., 16 (7) (2014), 1467–1505.
- [17] L. ESCAURIAZA, G. SEREGIN, V. ŠVERÁK, *$L_{3,\infty}$ -solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations and backward uniqueness*. Russ. Math. Surv., 58 (2) (2003), 211–250.
- [18] E. B. FABES, B. F. JONES, N. M. RIVIÈRE, *The initial value problem for the Navier-Stokes equations with data in L^p* , Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 45 (1972), 222–240.
- [19] G. FURIOLI, P. G. LEMARIÈ-RIEUSSET, E. TERRANELO, *Unicité dans $L^3(\mathbb{R}^3)$ et d’autres espaces fonctionnels limites pour Navier-Stokes*, Rev. Mat. Iberoam., 16 (3) (2000), 605–667.
- [20] E. HOPF, *Über die Anfangswertaufgabe für die hydrodynamischen Grundgleichungen*, Math. Nachr., 4(1-6)(1950), 213-231.
- [21] P. ISETT, *Hölder Continuous Euler Flows in Three Dimensions with Compact Support in Time*, Princeton University Press, (2017).
- [22] P. ISETT, *A proof of Onsager’s conjecture*, Ann. of Math., (2), 188 (3) (2018), 871–963.
- [23] P. ISETT, *Nonuniqueness and Existence of Continuous, Globally Dissipative Euler Flows*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 244 (3) (2022) 1223–1309.
- [24] P. ISETT, S. OH, *On Nonperiodic Euler Flows with Hölder Regularity*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 221 (2) (2016) 725–804.
- [25] H. JIA and V. ŠVERÁK, *Are the incompressible 3d Navier-Stokes equations locally ill-posed in the natural energy space?*, J. Funct. Anal., 268 (12) (2015), 3734–3766.
- [26] H. KOZONO, H. SOHR, *Remark on uniqueness of weak solutions to the Navier–Stokes equations*, Analysis, 16 (3) (1996), 255–271.
- [27] O. A. LADYŽENSKAJA, *Uniqueness and smoothness of generalized solutions of Navier–Stokes equations*, Zap. Naučn. Sem. Leningrad. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. 5 (1967), 169–185.
- [28] J. LERAY, *Sur le mouvement d’un liquide visqueux emplissant l’espace*, Acta math., 63 (1) (1934), 193–248.
- [29] Y. LI, Z. ZENG, D. ZHANG, *Non-uniqueness of weak solutions to 3D magnetohydrodynamic equations*, J. Math. Pures Appl., 165 (9) (2022), 232–285.
- [30] X. LUO, *Stationary solutions and nonuniqueness of weak solutions for the Navier–Stokes equations in high dimensions*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 233 (2) (2019), 701–747.
- [31] C. MIAO, W. YE, *On the weak solutions for the MHD systems with controllable total energy and cross helicity*, J. Math. Pures Appl., 181 (9) (2024), 190–227.

- [32] C. MIAO, Y. NIE, W. YE, *On Onsager's type conjecture for the inviscid Boussinesq equations*, J. Funct. Anal., 287 (7) (2024), doi.org/10.1016/j.jfa.2024.110527.
- [33] C. MIAO, J. WU, Z. ZHANG, *Littlewood-Paley Theory and Applications to Fluid Dynamics Equations*. volume 142, Monographs on Modern Pure Mathematics, 2012(Beijing: Science Press).
- [34] S. MODENA, Jr, L. SZÉKELYHIDI, *Non-uniqueness for the transport equation with Sobolev vector fields*, Ann. PDE, 4 (2) (2018): Paper No. 18, 38 pp.
- [35] S. MÜLLER, V. ŠVERÁK, *Convex integration for Lipschitz mappings and counterexamples to regularity*, Ann. of Math., (2) 157 (3) (2003), 715–742.
- [36] G. PRODI, *Un teorema di unicità per le equazioni di Navier-Stokes [A uniqueness theorem for the Navier-Stokes equations]*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl., 48 (1959): 173–182.
- [37] V. SCHEFFER, *An inviscid flow with compact support in space-time*, J. Geom. Anal., 3 (4) (1993), 343–401.
- [38] J. SERRIN, *On the interior regularity of weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 9 (1) (1962), 187–195.
- [39] T. TAO, L. ZHANG, *Hölder continuous solutions of Boussinesq equation with compact support*, J. Funct. Anal., 272 (10) (2017), 4334–4402.
- [40] T. TAO, L. ZHANG, *On the continuous periodic weak solutions of Boussinesq equations*, Siam. J. Math. Anal., 50 (1) (2018), 1120–1162.

(Changxing Miao) INSTITUTE OF APPLIED PHYSICS AND COMPUTATIONAL MATHEMATICS, BEIJING, CHINA.
Email address: miao_changxing@iapcm.ac.cn

(Yao Nie) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES AND LPMC, NANKAI UNIVERSITY, TIANJIN, CHINA.
Email address: nieyao@nankai.edu.cn

(Weikui Ye) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, SOUTH CHINA NORMAL UNIVERSITY, GUANGZHOU, CHINA
Email address: 904817751@qq.com