

Non-uniqueness of Leray–Hopf solutions for the $3D$ fractional Navier–Stokes equations perturbed by transport noise

Theresa Lange*

Marco Rehmeier†

Andre Schenke‡

December 24, 2024

Abstract

For the $3D$ fractional Navier–Stokes equations perturbed by transport noise, we prove the existence of infinitely many Hölder continuous analytically weak, probabilistically strong Leray–Hopf solutions starting from the same deterministic initial velocity field. Our solutions are global in time and satisfy the energy inequality pathwise on a non-empty random interval $[0, \tau]$. In contrast to recent related results, we do not consider an additional deterministic suitably chosen force f in the equation. In this unforced regime, we prove the first result of Leray–Hopf nonuniqueness for fractional Navier–Stokes equations with any kind of stochastic perturbation. Our proof relies on convex integration techniques and a flow transformation by which we reformulate the SPDE as a PDE with random coefficients.

Keywords: Navier–Stokes equations; Leray–Hopf solutions; transport noise; fractional Laplacian; stochastic partial differential equations

2020 MSC: 60H15, 35Q30, 35A02

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Leray–Hopf solutions and main result	6
2.1	Leray–Hopf solutions	6
2.2	Main result	7
2.3	Reformulation via flow transformation	7
3	Structure and conclusion of the proof	10
4	Proof of Proposition 3.1	12
4.1	The flow map	12
4.2	The main iterative proposition	13
4.3	Proof of Proposition 3.1	14
5	Proof of Proposition 3.3	16
6	Convex integration scheme	16
6.1	Choice of parameters	16
6.2	Mollification	18
6.3	Modified Beltrami flows	18
6.4	The transport coefficients	19
6.5	The energy pumping term	20
6.6	The perturbations	20
6.7	The Reynolds stress and the new pressure	25
6.8	The divergence	29

*Scuola Normale Superiore Pisa, Piazza dei Cavalieri 7, 56126 Pisa, Italy. E-mail: theresa.lange@sns.it

†Faculty of Mathematics, TU Berlin, 10623 Berlin, Germany. E-mail: rehmeier@tu-berlin.de

‡Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University, 251 Mercer Street, New York, N.Y. 10012-1185, USA. E-mail: andreschenke90@gmail.com

6.9	The pressure	29
6.10	The kinetic energy	30
7	Proof of the main iterative proposition	30
7.1	C^0 estimates	30
7.2	C^1 estimates	32
7.3	Choice of the exponential parameters	34
7.4	Choice of a	35
7.5	Choice of M_v	38
7.6	Estimate of the regularity	38
8	Proofs	39
8.1	Core estimates	39
8.2	The principal part	50
8.3	The corrector w_c	51
8.4	The total perturbation	51
8.5	Transport error	52
8.6	Oscillation error	54
8.7	Flow error	55
8.8	Mollification error	62
8.9	Compressibility error	67
8.10	Dissipative error	72
8.11	Estimating the divergence	76
8.12	Estimating the pressure	77
8.13	Estimating the kinetic energy	77
8.14	Estimates for energy-dependent constants	78
A	An estimate for the fractional Laplacian	88
B	Besov Spaces	88

1 Introduction

In this work we prove local-in-time non-uniqueness for stochastic Leray–Hopf solutions to the 3D fractional incompressible Navier–Stokes equations (NSE) with Brownian transport noise

$$\begin{cases} du + ((u \cdot \nabla u) + (-\Delta)^\alpha u)dt + \nabla p dt + \sum_{k \in K} (\sigma_k \cdot \nabla u) \bullet dB^k = 0 \\ \operatorname{div} u = 0 \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

on the periodic torus \mathbb{T}^3 . Here u , an $L^2(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)$ -valued stochastic process, denotes the velocity field, p the scalar pressure, $(-\Delta)^\alpha$ the (nonlocal) fractional Laplace operator with $0 < \alpha < 1$, K a finite, non-empty index set, $\sigma_k : \mathbb{T}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ smooth divergence-free vector fields, B^k independent one-dimensional Brownian motions on an arbitrary but fixed filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$, and “ \bullet ” the Stratonovich stochastic integral.

Main result. More precisely, we prove: For each $0 < \alpha \ll 1$, there is a deterministic initial condition $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)$, a strictly positive stopping time τ and infinitely many analytically weak, probabilistically strong solutions $u_k, k \in \mathbb{N}$, to Equ. (1.1) with paths in $C([0, \infty), C^\theta(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3))$ for small $\theta > 0$, and $u_k(0, \cdot) = u_0$ which satisfy the pathwise energy inequality Equ. (1.3) on $[0, \tau]$. For the precise result, see Theorem 2.4.

State of the art: deterministic regime. The problem of existence and uniqueness of solutions for the 3D NSE (i.e. (1.1) with $\alpha = 1$ and $\sigma_k = 0$) poses notoriously difficult challenges. Since the existence of (necessarily unique) global-in-time smooth solutions remains famously unsolved, it is inevitable to turn to the much larger class of weak solutions. However, in [11] (see also [8, 6]) it was proven via convex integration techniques (discussed below) that for any smooth $e : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ there is a weak solution $u = u(e)$ whose kinetic energy profile equals e , i.e. $\frac{1}{2} \|u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 = e(t)$ for all $t \geq 0$. This implies non-uniqueness by considering distinct energies with initial value $e(0) = 0$. This drastic demonstration of non-uniqueness and the existence of physically anomalous solutions

suggests to restrict to subclasses with physically reasonable behavior, called *admissible solutions* and hopefully obtain well-posedness in such subclasses. A natural such class are *Leray–Hopf solutions* $u \in C_{\text{weak}}^0([0, \infty), L^2(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^2([0, \infty), H^1(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3))$ satisfying the *energy inequality*

$$\|u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + 2 \int_{[s,t] \times \mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla u(r, x)|^2 dr dx \leq \|u(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \quad (1.2)$$

for a.e. $s \geq 0$ and all $t > s$. Leray–Hopf solutions exist globally in time for all L^2 -initial data [33], but their uniqueness remains an open problem of remarkable difficulty.

In the light of this lack of uniqueness results, well-posedness has been studied for variants of the NSE, e.g. the *forced NSE* and the *fractional NSE*. The former differs from the classical NSE by an additional (suitably chosen, hence "free") force f , while for the latter the Laplacian is replaced by $(-\Delta)^\alpha$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ (a nonlocal operator). Both equations are interesting in itself, for instance from physics considerations or as models with a weakened and non-local diffusive behavior. Of course, both approaches lead to versions of Equ. (1.2), by adding an f -induced energy term or by replacing the H^1 -semi norm by a fractional Sobolev norm, respectively. Substantial progress in both directions has been achieved, see [1, 2, 18] and [12, 15, 22], respectively. For the former case, remarkably it was proven the existence of a force f such that the corresponding class of Leray–Hopf solutions contains at least two elements. For the latter case, non-uniqueness of Leray–Hopf solutions to the fractional NSE with $0 < \alpha < \frac{1}{3}$ was obtained. Note that larger values of α correspond to a stronger diffusion, hence a stronger smoothing effect, so that, at least intuitively, non-uniqueness results are increasingly difficult to obtain as α grows.

Stochastic regime. Since adding noise to deterministic systems can not only lead to more accurate models, but can also render ill-posed differential equations well-posed (*regularization by noise*), one might expect to overcome the notorious difficulties for the NSE by suitable stochastic perturbations. However, as shown in [26, 25, 27, 24], also the stochastic NSE is desperately ill-posed, even in the class of probabilistically strong solutions, for both additive and multiplicative noise, white in time and white or colored in space. Again, this raises the question of a physically reasonable subclass of solutions satisfying a stochastic version of Equ. (1.2). At this point one has to clarify what is meant by *stochastic version of (1.2)*. The inequality can be postulated in expectation or pathwise, where clearly the latter implies the former, but not vice versa. Depending on the choice of noise, an additional positive energy term may appear on the right hand side of Equ. (1.2), which accounts for a noise-induced increase of energy.

To date, we are not aware of any true well- or ill-posedness result for stochastic Leray–Hopf solutions to the (unforced) NSE with noise, regardless of the choice of noise and of the choice of stochastic version of Equ. (1.2). Recently, similarly to the deterministic case, interesting probabilistically strong local-in-time non-uniqueness results were obtained for stochastic Leray–Hopf solutions with specifically constructed force terms for linear multiplicative [28] as well as additive [7] Brownian noise. In both cases, the stochastic energy inequality holds in expectation. We also mention the very recent work [5] on global existence and nonuniqueness of ergodic Leray–Hopf solutions to power law flows perturbed by additive noise, which – even though not containing the fractional or classical NSE – constitutes another interesting class of equations in hydrodynamics.

Our contribution. As for the classical NSE ($\alpha = 1$), the uniqueness question for Leray–Hopf solutions to stochastic versions of the (unforced) fractional NSE seems to be entirely open (we point out that for the forced case and $1 < \alpha < \frac{5}{4}$, a non-uniqueness result is obtained in [7]). Our contribution is to provide a negative answer to this question, at least for $\alpha \ll 1$, by constructing a family of probabilistically strong global-in-time solutions to Equ. (1.1) with common deterministic initial datum, which satisfy up to a strictly positive stopping time τ the usual fractional energy inequality

$$\frac{1}{2} \|u(t, \omega)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_s^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u(r, x, \omega)|^2 dx dr \leq \frac{1}{2} \|u(s, \omega)\|_{L^2}^2, \quad \forall 0 \leq s \leq t \leq \tau(\omega) \quad (1.3)$$

pathwise, where ω denotes elements from the underlying arbitrary probability space Ω . The noise in Equ. (1.1) is usually referred to as *transport noise* and has received considerable attention in the

recent past, leading to a growing understanding of its use and plausibility, see for instance [19, 20, 17], the references therein as well as the introduction of [23] for further literature in this direction. In the present paper, using transport noise allows us to establish Equ. (1.3) without an additional positive noise-induced energy-term on its right hand side. Our solutions are θ -Hölder regular, where $\alpha < \theta \ll 1$. At the moment, an improvement to larger values of α and θ seems to require substantially new techniques.

We also mention that if we drop the energy inequality, our construction yields global in time probabilistically strong solutions with any prescribed energy profile (which may not satisfy (1.3)) for exponents $0 < \alpha < \tilde{\alpha}_0$ (cf. Equ. (7.22)), but due to the restrictive conditions due to the new terms from the interaction of the nonlocal fractional Laplacian and the flow reformulation of the problem, we can *not* cover the full range $0 < \alpha < \frac{1}{2}$. This is in contrast to the deterministic works [12, 15]. See Proposition 3.1, which improves the existence theory for (1.1) for the extended range $0 < \alpha < \tilde{\alpha}_0$.

Proof and main novelties. By a flow transformation based on the flow of the Stratonovich-SDE of the vector fields σ_k , and akin to [23], we recast the SPDE Equ. (1.1) into a PDE with random coefficients, see Section 2.3 and in particular Equ. (2.5). Via this transformation, our main result is reformulated as Proposition 2.9. The proof of the latter relies on (pathwise) convex integration techniques, a powerful method used to construct wild solutions to fluid dynamical (S)PDEs, which has, most notably, led to a proof of Onsager’s conjecture for the deterministic Euler equations [32, 14, 9, 30, 10], as well as to the results from the list of papers mentioned before.

The main idea of the proof of Proposition 2.9 is to combine the work on stochastic Euler equations [23] with the work on (deterministic) Leray–Hopf solutions [12, 15]. As we are in the transport noise setting, we rely heavily on the groundwork laid by the first-mentioned reference. While this sounds simple in principle, there were a somewhat surprising amount of technical difficulties that needed to be resolved, of which we now list the most relevant:

- As we need a quantitative control of the Hölder norm to prove the energy inequality, we had to track closely the exact dependence of every constant on the energy profile (or rather, the profile’s main characteristics \underline{e} , \bar{e} and $|e|_{C^1}$). This entailed going through almost all of the proofs of [23]. In particular, we found that all relevant constants only depend on at most the first derivative of e , not the second.
- To prove the energy inequality, we have to weigh the parameters a and M_v against each other (see (5.3)), and a product of certain powers needs to be small for small energy profiles. Therefore, we also need to make sure that the constant M_v depends increasingly on the energy profile’s main characteristics. This, again, means that we have to very carefully track all instances of M_v throughout the convex integration scheme and optimize the corresponding estimates. As it turns out, this is indeed possible. M_v is determined by Equ. (7.24) below.
- The inclusion of the fractional Laplacian term to the Euler equations yields additional stress terms in the convex integration scheme. The most obvious is the “dissipative error”, which is handled in a similar way as in [12, 15]. But in addition, there are new contributions to the “flow error” and the “mollification error” of [23]. Because we are dealing with the “flow-transformed” equation for convex integration purposes, these terms are non-trivial to handle. In the end, a Besov space interpolation argument gave us the needed control on these terms, which resulted from a very helpful discussion with Antonio Agresti. For details, see Sections 6.7.3, 6.7.4.

Note that compared to [12, 15], we only obtain Leray–Hopf solutions up to a small stopping time. Also in the deterministic case, first, nonunique Leray–Hopf solutions were only constructed for a short time, but one could then extend them since in this case there is a good existence theory for Leray–Hopf solutions from arbitrary initial velocities. To the best of our knowledge, a stochastic counterpart to this global existence is not yet developed for (1.1). Note that our solutions themselves are defined on $[0, \infty)$, but we cannot prove the energy inequality beyond the stopping time.

Further literature. If one confines oneself to the question of non-uniqueness of weak solutions to stochastic fractional NSEs in the class of weak (not necessarily Leray–Hopf) solutions, results are

known for additive and linear multiplicative Brownian noise for $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ [40, 45]. A non-uniqueness result for weak (non-Leray–Hopf) solutions to the transport noise NSE ($\alpha = 1$) has been obtained in [39].

Additionally, the two-dimensional fractional NSE has recently been extensively studied. For instance, a deterministic Leray–Hopf non-uniqueness result for the 2D fractional NSE was obtained in [3], and analogous stochastic results are proven in [46]. We also mention the 3D Leray–Hopf non-uniqueness result for the Hall–MHD system of [13].

For the *hyperdissipative* case, i.e. fractional exponents $\alpha > 1$, above the critical value $\alpha = \frac{5}{4}$, smooth global-in-time solutions exist in the deterministic case, see [34] and also [44] for the endpoint case. Below $\frac{5}{4}$, non-uniqueness of weak solutions was proven in [37], and an analogue two-dimensional result is contained in [36]. In an additive and linear multiplicative noise regime, non-uniqueness results in the 3D case can be found in [47].

Finally, we mention that more generally the literature on convex integration results, in particular ill-posedness results in deterministic and stochastic regimes for a growing list of equations, has grown immensely in the last few years. Instead of presenting a necessarily incomplete reference list here, we only mention that such results have been obtained for, e.g., SQG, Boussinesq, transport(-diffusion), MHD, compressible and hydrostatic Euler equations and further equations.

Organisation of the paper. In Section 2 we present the definition of (Leray–Hopf-)solutions to Equ. (1.1), its reformulation as a random PDE, and state our main result, Theorem 2.4 and its PDE version, Proposition 2.9. We split the proof of the latter into several partial results (most notably the existence result Proposition 3.1) which we formulate and use to conclude the proof in Section 3. The proofs of the two key steps, Propositions 3.1 and 3.3, are given in Sections 4 and 5, respectively. The former is based on the main iterative proposition 4.1, which is proven in Section 4.2 via convex integration methods, which are discussed in detail in Sections 6 and 7. Several of the lengthy calculations and proofs are given in Section 8. The appendix contains an important estimate for the fractional Laplace operator and some results on Besov spaces.

Notation. We set $\mathbb{R}_+ = [0, \infty)$ and use $x \cdot y$ for the Euclidean inner product. We write $B_r(x)$ for the ball with radius r and center x in a Banach space. Let $\mathcal{S}^{3 \times 3}$ be the space of symmetric 3×3 matrices. $C(X, Y)$ is the space of continuous functions between topological spaces X and Y . For $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{+\infty\}$ and $C_{(c)}^k(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^m)$ is the Banach space of k -times (compactly supported) differentiable maps from \mathbb{T}^3 to \mathbb{R}^m with the usual norm $\|\cdot\|_{C^k}$. The subindex σ denotes divergence-free subspaces, for instance $C_\sigma^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)$. For $0 < \theta < 1$, a Banach space $(X, \|\cdot\|_X)$ and $U = \mathbb{T}^3$ or a subset of \mathbb{R}^m , $C^\theta(U, X)$ denotes the Banach space of Hölder continuous functions with norm

$$\|f\|_{C^\theta(U, X)} := \sup_{x \in U} \|f(x)\|_X + \sup_{x \neq y} \frac{\|f(x) - f(y)\|_X}{|x - y|^\theta},$$

shortly $\|\cdot\|_\theta$ when no confusion about U and X can occur. The corresponding seminorm, consisting only of the second summand above, is denoted by $[\cdot]_{C^\theta(U, X)}$ or simply $[\cdot]_\theta$.

For $p \in [1, \infty]$, $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ or $U = \mathbb{T}^3$, the usual spaces of measurable and p -integrable functions from U to X are denoted by $L^p(U, X)$ with usual norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^p}$, and we write $L_{\text{loc}}^p(U, X)$ for the corresponding local spaces. For $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $H^m(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^l)$ and $H^\alpha(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^l)$ are the usual Hilbert spaces of (fractional) functions from \mathbb{T}^3 to \mathbb{R}^l with integrability parameter $p = 2$, their usual norms are $\|\cdot\|_{H^1}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{H^\alpha}$. For all these spaces, we suppress the state space from the notation if it is \mathbb{R} .

Throughout, we use notation such as $\|\cdot\|_{C_{\leq s}^\theta}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{C_{\leq s}^\theta C_x}$ for the norm on $C^\theta((-\infty, s], \mathbb{R}^l)$ and $C^\theta((-\infty, s], C(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^l))$, respectively, or $[0, s]$ instead of $(-\infty, s]$, when no confusion about the appearing spaces can occur. In such cases we sometimes write C^0 instead of C .

We denote the spatial Besov spaces $B_{p,q}^s := B_{p,q}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$ for $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $p, q \in [1, \infty]$ as the subset of distributions $u \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d)$ such that

$$\|u\|_{B_{p,q}^s} := \left\| \left(2^{js} \|\Delta_j u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} \right)_{j \geq -1} \right\|_{\ell^q} < \infty.$$

Here, Δ_j denotes the j -th Littlewood–Paley block corresponding to a smooth partition of unity, cf. [4, 38]. For $p, q < \infty$, $B_{p,q}^s$ is separable and coincides with the closure of $C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{B_{p,q}^s}$. In terms of duality, we have $B_{p,q}^s = \left(B_{p',q'}^{-s}\right)^*$, with equivalence of norms, when $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{q'} = 1$, and also $B_{\infty,\infty}^s = C_x^s$ for every non-integer $s > 0$, again with equivalence of norms, namely

$$C^{-1} (\|u\|_\infty + [u]_{C_x^s}) \leq \|u\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^s} \leq C (\|u\|_\infty + [u]_{C_x^s}), \quad (1.4)$$

for some $C > 1$, cf. [43, 3.5.4 Theorem, p. 168 f.].

For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, the fractional Laplace operator $(-\Delta)^\alpha$ is the operator with symbol $|k|^{2\alpha}$ as a Fourier multiplier, i.e. for any $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^3)$ it has the (formal) Fourier series

$$(-\Delta)^\alpha f(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} |k|^{2\alpha} \hat{f}_k e^{ik \cdot x}.$$

2 Leray–Hopf solutions and main result

We begin with the definition and some preliminary observations for (Leray–Hopf) solutions to (1.1)

2.1 Leray–Hopf solutions

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$ be a filtered probability space, $B^k, k \in K$, a family of independent standard one-dimensional Brownian motions on Ω such that $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is the augmented filtration of the $|K|$ -dimensional Brownian motion $B = (B_k)_{k \in K}$. Recall that this filtration is right-continuous. Our notion of solution is analytically weak, but probabilistically strong in the following sense.

Definition 2.1. (i) $(u, p) : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{T}^3 \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}$ is a (*analytically weak, probabilistically strong*) solution to (1.1) with initial condition $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)$, if $(u, p) \in C(\mathbb{R}_+; L^2(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}))$ \mathbb{P} -a.s., (u, p) is $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted, $u(t, \omega) : \mathbb{T}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ is weakly divergence-free for all $t \geq 0$ \mathbb{P} -a.s., $u(0, \cdot) = u_0(\cdot)$ \mathbb{P} -a.s., and for every $t \geq 0$ and $\varphi \in C_\sigma^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} u(t) \varphi \, dx &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} u_0 \varphi \, dx + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} u(s) (u(s) \cdot \nabla \varphi - (-\Delta)^\alpha \varphi) \, dx \, ds \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \in K} \int_0^t \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} u(s) (\sigma_k \cdot \nabla \varphi) \, dx \right) \bullet dB_s^k, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

Often, we regard u instead of (u, p) as the solution.

(ii) For an (\mathcal{F}_t) -stopping time $\tau : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, a solution (u, p) to (1.1) is a τ -Leray–Hopf solution, if u has paths in $L_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}_+, H^\alpha(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3))$ and satisfies for \mathbb{P} -a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ the stochastic energy inequality (1.3) with exceptional zero set independent of s and t .

Note that a τ -Leray–Hopf solution satisfies (1.3) only up to the random time τ , but is a global in time solution in the sense of part (i) of the previous definition.

Lemma 2.2. For u as in Definition 2.1 (i), (2.1) is equivalent to the following property. For every semimartingale $h : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \Omega \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)$ of type

$$dh = H_0 dt + \sum_{k \in K} H_k \bullet dB^k, \quad (2.2)$$

with adapted processes $H_0, \{H_k\}_{k \in K} : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \Omega \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)$, the process $t \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} u(t, x) \cdot h(t, x) \, dx$ is a semimartingale and, \mathbb{P} -a.s.,

$$d \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} u \cdot h \, dx = \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} u \cdot (H_0 + (u \cdot \nabla - (-\Delta)^\alpha) h) \, dx + \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} p \operatorname{div} h \, dx \right) dt + \sum_{k \in K} \left[\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} u \cdot (H_k + (\sigma_k \cdot \nabla) h) \right] \bullet dB^k. \quad (2.3)$$

The equivalence can be proven via mollification and Itô's formula as in [16, App.A]. Equation (2.3) is convenient to prove the equivalence of solutions to (1.1) and (2.5) in Lemma 2.8 below.

Remark 2.3. (i) Note that, in contrast to the general case of (deterministic) Leray–Hopf solutions, we demand (and prove) (1.3) for all $0 \leq s \leq t (\leq \tau)$ instead of for only almost every $s \geq 0$ and every $s \leq t (\leq \tau)$.

(ii) We expect also higher order pathwise inequalities to hold, more precisely

$$\frac{1}{2} \|u(t, \omega)\|_{L^2}^{2q} + \int_s^t \|u(r, \omega)\|_{L^2}^{2(q-1)} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u(r, x, \omega)|^2 dx dr \leq \frac{1}{2} \|u(s, \omega)\|_{L^2}^{2q}, \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (2.4)$$

which are crucial for compactness arguments, since typically the set of solution path laws of those solutions satisfying (2.4) is compact in a suitable space of path measures, which in turn is needed for Markovian selections from this space. This way, a proof of non-uniqueness of Markovian selections among the class of Leray–Hopf solutions considered in this work seems possible, although we do not address this question. Note that non-uniqueness of Markovian selections from the larger class of (not necessarily Leray–Hopf) weak solutions was proven for related equations (see, for instance, [25]).

2.2 Main result

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$, K and B_k be as in the previous subsection. Our main result is the following theorem.

Theorem 2.4. Let $0 < \alpha < \alpha_0 := \frac{1}{2cb+1}$, where b and c are as in Section 4.2. There exists $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)$, an \mathbb{P} -a.s. strictly positive (\mathcal{F}_t) -stopping time $\tau_0 : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and infinitely many τ_0 -Leray–Hopf solutions to (1.1) with initial condition u_0 and paths in $C(\mathbb{R}_+, C^\theta(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3))$ for some $\theta > \alpha$. Moreover, any two of these solutions are distinct on $[0, \tau_0]$, \mathbb{P} -a.s.

Remark 2.5. (i) Clearly, it follows that $u_0 \in C^\theta(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)$. However, u_0 cannot be prescribed, but is an outcome of the proof. In particular, the size of the set of initial conditions for which Theorem 2.4 holds remains to be determined; we only know that this set contains uncountably many elements. Indeed, by varying the energy profile $e \in \mathcal{E}$ used in the construction, we see that for every ε sufficiently small, we can produce one initial datum $u_0^\varepsilon \in L^2$ with $\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{L^2} = \varepsilon$ and infinitely many solutions to this initial datum.

(ii) The solutions have spatial Hölder regularity with parameter θ for every $\alpha < \theta < \bar{\theta} := \alpha_0$.

(iii) We point out that Theorem 2.4 also improves the existence theory of analytically weak and probabilistically strong (not necessarily Leray–Hopf-)solutions for equation (1.1). Indeed, to our knowledge, this is the first paper concerned with solutions to (1.1).

(iv) As already said in the introduction, our result does not imply existence or non-uniqueness of global Leray–Hopf solutions. Indeed, the typical argument, i.e. to glue our nonunique local Leray–Hopf solutions u_k together (pathwise at the random time τ) with global in time Leray–Hopf solutions starting from the endpoints $u_k(\tau(\omega))$, does not work, since to date it is open whether such global Leray–Hopf solutions exist (not even for some initial velocity field, whereas for the gluing, one really needs existence from any initial velocity field).

2.3 Reformulation via flow transformation

For the proof of Theorem 2.4, similarly as in [23], we rewrite the SPDE (1.1) as an equivalent PDE with random coefficients. To this end, consider on the manifold \mathbb{T}^3 the SDE

$$\Phi(t, x) = x + \sum_{k \in K} \int_0^t \sigma_k(\Phi(s, x)) \bullet dB_s^k, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

The vector fields σ_k take values in the tangent bundle of \mathbb{T}^3 , which consists of the tangent spaces $T_x \mathbb{T}^3 = \mathbb{R}^3$, $x \in \mathbb{T}^3$. By assumptions on σ_k there exists a unique flow $\Phi = (\Phi(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ of probabilistically strong solutions such that each $\Phi(t)$ is a Lebesgue measure-preserving C^∞ -diffeomorphism of \mathbb{T}^3 , see [31]. We denote by Φ^{-1} the inverse flow, by $\Phi(t)^{-1}$ its evaluation at t , and set

$$\operatorname{div}_\Phi f := [\operatorname{div}(f \circ \Phi^{-1})] \circ \Phi, \quad (-\Delta)_\Phi^\alpha f := [(-\Delta)^\alpha (f \circ \Phi^{-1})] \circ \Phi, \quad \nabla_\Phi f := [\nabla(f \circ \Phi^{-1})] \circ \Phi,$$

and note that (unlike $\operatorname{div} f$, $(-\Delta)^\alpha f$ and ∇f) these operators depend on t . If f depends on $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we write

$$(-\Delta)_\Phi^\alpha f(t) := (-\Delta)_{\Phi(t)}^\alpha f(t),$$

and similarly for div_Φ and ∇_Φ . Consider the following random PDE, posed on the prescribed arbitrary, fixed filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v + (-\Delta)_\Phi^\alpha v + \operatorname{div}_\Phi(v \otimes v) + \nabla_\Phi q = 0 \\ \operatorname{div}_\Phi v = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.5)$$

Definition 2.6. (i) $(v, q) : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{T}^3 \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}$ is a (*analytically weak, probabilistically strong*) solution to (2.5) with initial condition $v_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)$, if $(v, q) \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, L^2(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}))$ \mathbb{P} -a.s., (v, q) is (\mathcal{F}_t) -adapted, $v(0, \cdot) = v_0$ \mathbb{P} -a.s.,

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v(t, x) \cdot \nabla_{\Phi(t)} \varphi(x) dx = 0, \quad \forall \varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3), t \geq 0$$

with exceptional set independent of t and φ , and for every semimartingale $h : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \Omega \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)$ of type

$$dh = H_0 dt + \sum_{k \in K} H_k \bullet dB^k$$

with progressively measurable processes $H_0, \{H_k\}_{k \in K} : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)$, the process $t \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v(t, x) \cdot h(x, t) dx$ is a semimartingale satisfying, \mathbb{P} -a.s.,

$$d \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v \cdot h dx = \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v \cdot (H_0 + (v \cdot \nabla_\Phi - (-\Delta)_\Phi^\alpha) h) dt + \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} q \operatorname{div}_\Phi h dt + \sum_{k \in K} \left[\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v \cdot H_k \right] \bullet dB^k.$$

Occasionally, we refer to v instead of (v, q) as the solution.

(ii) For an (\mathcal{F}_t) -stopping time $\tau : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\}$, a solution (v, q) to (2.5) is a τ -Leray-Hopf solution, if $t \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |(-\Delta)_\Phi^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} v(t, x)|^2 dx$ belongs to $L_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}_+)$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. and

$$\frac{1}{2} \|v(t, \omega)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_s^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |(-\Delta)_\Phi^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} v(r, x, \omega)|^2 dx dr \leq \frac{1}{2} \|v(s, \omega)\|_{L^2}^2, \quad \forall 0 \leq s \leq t \leq \tau(\omega), \quad (2.6)$$

for \mathbb{P} -a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$, with exceptional set independent of s and t . Here we shortened the notation by writing Φ instead of $\Phi(\omega)$.

Lemma 2.7. Let v be a solution to (2.5) with paths in $C(\mathbb{R}_+, C^\theta(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3))$, \mathbb{P} -a.s., such that $0 < \alpha < \theta$. Then

(i) \mathbb{P} -a.s., with exceptional set independent of t ,

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |(-\Delta)_\Phi^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} v(t)|^2 dx \leq C_t [v(t)]_\theta^2, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (2.7)$$

where $C_t > 0$ depends only on ω , $\Phi(t)$, α and θ , and is, for fixed ω , continuous in t .

(ii) $u = (u(t))_{t \geq 0}$, $u(t) := v(t) \circ \Phi(t)^{-1}$, has paths in $L_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}_+, H^\alpha(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)) \cap C(\mathbb{R}_+, C^\theta(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3))$, \mathbb{P} -a.s., and

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |(-\Delta)_{\Phi}^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} v(t)|^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u(t)|^2 dx, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad (2.8)$$

\mathbb{P} -a.s. Moreover, v and u have the same kinetic energy profile, i.e.

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |v(t)|^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |u(t)|^2 dx, \quad \forall t \geq 0$$

\mathbb{P} -a.s. For both assertions, the exceptional set is independent of t .

Proof. (i) By [42, Cor.B.2], we have, using the measure-preserving property of Φ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |(-\Delta)_{\Phi}^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} v(t)|^2 dx &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} | [(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} (v(t) \circ \Phi(t)^{-1})] \circ \Phi(t) |^2 dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} (v(t) \circ \Phi(t)^{-1})|^2 dx \leq C(\alpha, \theta) [v(t) \circ \Phi(t)^{-1}]_{\theta}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$[v(t) \circ \Phi(t)^{-1}]_{\theta} \leq \text{Lip}(\Phi(t)^{-1})^{\theta} [v(t)]_{\theta},$$

the claim follows with

$$C_t = \text{Lip}(\Phi^{-1}(t))^{2\theta} C(\alpha, \theta), \quad (2.9)$$

which is continuous in t for fixed ω , where $\text{Lip}(f)$ denotes the Lipschitz constant of $f : \mathbb{T}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^3$.

(ii) By the regularity of Φ , it is clear that $u \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, C^\theta(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3))$. Since $\theta > \alpha$ and for every $\varepsilon > 0$ the inequality

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} f|^2 dx \leq C(\varepsilon, \alpha) [f]_{\alpha+\varepsilon}^2$$

holds for every $f \in C^\theta(\mathbb{T}^3)$ and a constant $C(\varepsilon, \alpha) > 0$ independent of f (see [42, Cor.B.2]), $u \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}_+, H^\alpha(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3))$ follows. Concerning (2.8), we have \mathbb{P} -a.s.

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |(-\Delta)_{\Phi}^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} v(t)|^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} | [(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} (v(t) \circ \Phi(t)^{-1})] |^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u(t)|^2 dx, \quad \forall t \geq 0,$$

where the left hand side is finite by (i). The final claim follows directly from the measure-preserving property of each $\Phi(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$. □

As a consequence, we can prove the following important lemma.

Lemma 2.8. *Let $0 < \alpha < \theta$. If (v, q) is a τ -Leray–Hopf solution to (2.5) such that v has paths in $C(\mathbb{R}_+, C^\theta(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3))$ and initial condition v_0 , then (u, p) , $u = v \circ \Phi^{-1}$ and $p = q \circ \Phi^{-1}$, is a τ -Leray–Hopf solution to (1.1) such that u has paths in $C(\mathbb{R}_+, C^\theta(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3))$ and initial condition $u_0 = v_0$. In this case, v and u have the same pathwise kinetic energy profile \mathbb{P} -a.s.*

Proof. Appealing to Lemma 2.7 (ii), the measure-preserving property of Φ , and since $u(0, x) = v(0, \Phi(0)^{-1}(x)) = v(0, x)$, it remains to prove that u is a solution to (1.1) if v is a solution to (2.5). To this end, let h be as in (2.2) and note $\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} u \cdot h dx = \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v \cdot (h \circ \Phi) dx$. By Itô's formula, $h \circ \Phi$ is a semimartingale satisfying

$$d(h \circ \Phi) = (H_0 \circ \Phi) dt + \sum_{k \in K} [(H_k + (\sigma_k \cdot \nabla)h) \circ \Phi] \bullet dB^k(t). \quad (2.10)$$

Thus, the process $t \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} u(t, x) \cdot h(t, x) dx$ is a semimartingale satisfying \mathbb{P} -a.s.

$$\begin{aligned} d \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} u \cdot h dx &= \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v \cdot (H_0 \circ \Phi + (v \cdot \nabla_{\Phi} - (-\Delta)_{\Phi}^{\alpha}) h \circ \Phi) dx \right) dt \\ &\quad + \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} q \operatorname{div}_{\Phi}(h \circ \Phi) dx \right) dt + \sum_{k \in K} \left[\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v \cdot ((H_k + (\sigma_k \cdot \nabla) h) \circ \Phi) \right] \bullet dB^k \\ &= \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} u \cdot (H_0 + (u \cdot \nabla - (-\Delta)^{\alpha}) h) dx + \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} p \operatorname{div} h dx \right) dt \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \in K} \left[\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} u (H_k + (\sigma_k \cdot \nabla) h) \right] \bullet dB^k. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, (2.3) holds, which, by Lemma 2.2 completes the proof. \square

By Lemma 2.8, the following result is equivalent to Theorem 2.4.

Proposition 2.9. *For $0 < \alpha < \alpha_0 := \frac{1}{2cb+1}$, where b and c are as in Section 4.2, there exists $v_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)$, an \mathbb{P} -a.s. strictly positive (\mathcal{F}_t) -stopping time $\tau_0 : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and infinitely many τ_0 -Leray–Hopf solutions to (2.5) with initial condition v_0 and paths in $C(\mathbb{R}_+, C^{\theta}(\mathbb{T}^3))$ for some $\theta > \alpha$. Moreover, any two of these solutions are distinct on $[0, \tau_0]$ \mathbb{P} -a.s.*

Thus, the remainder of the paper is devoted to the proof of the previous proposition, which in turn proves our main result, Theorem 2.4.

3 Structure and conclusion of the proof

The proof of Theorem 2.4 consists in the proof of Proposition 2.9, which is divided into three main steps, as presented now.

Step 1: Construction of Hölder regular solutions. Set

$$\mathcal{E} := \left\{ e \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}) \mid \inf_{t>0} e(t) > 0, \|e\|_{C^1} < \infty \right\}.$$

This step consists in proving the following result, which seems to be new itself.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\alpha \in (0, \tilde{\alpha}_0)$ (where $\tilde{\alpha}_0 > \alpha_0$ is given in Equ. (7.22) below) and $e \in \mathcal{E}$. There is a \mathbb{P} -a.s. strictly positive (\mathcal{F}_t) -stopping time $\tau : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and a solution $v = v(e)$ to (2.5) with paths in $C(\mathbb{R}_+, C^{\theta}(\mathbb{T}^3))$ for some $\theta > 0$ and deterministic initial condition $v_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^3; \mathbb{R}^3)$ such that \mathbb{P} -a.s.*

$$\|v(t, \omega)\|_{L^2}^2 = e(t), \quad \forall 0 \leq t \leq \tau(\omega). \quad (3.1)$$

Moreover, if $e_1(0) = e_2(0)$, then $v(e_1)$ and $v(e_2)$ have the same initial condition.

Corollary 3.2. *For $0 < \alpha < \alpha_0 = \frac{1}{2cb+1} < \tilde{\alpha}_0$, where b and c are as in Section 4.2, the solutions v from the previous proposition are in $C_{\leq \tau}^0 C_x^{\theta}$ for $\alpha < \theta < \bar{\theta} := \alpha_0$.*

The proofs are given in Section 4. As we have pointed out before, v_0 cannot be prescribed a priori, and as of now we cannot make any statement about the set of initial conditions arising this way, except its non-emptiness.

Step 2: Choice of energies. Here we make a suitable choice for the energy profiles in Proposition 3.1 as follows. Its proof is given in Section 5.

Proposition 3.3. *For every $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, there is a family of non-increasing energy profiles $\{e_k^\varepsilon\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{E}$ such that*

- (i) $e_k^\varepsilon(0) = e_l^\varepsilon(0), \quad \forall k, l \in \mathbb{N}$,
- (ii) *for each $k \neq l$, there is a sequence $t_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ with $e_k^\varepsilon(t_n) \neq e_l^\varepsilon(t_n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*
- (iii) *there is $0 < r = r(\varepsilon)$ such that $(e_k^\varepsilon)'(t) \leq -\frac{1}{2}$ for all $t \in [0, r)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$,*
- (iv) $|e_k^\varepsilon|_{C^1(\mathbb{R}_+)} = 1, \inf_{t \geq 0} e_k^\varepsilon(t) = \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \sup_{t \geq 0} e_k^\varepsilon(t) = \varepsilon$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let $0 < \alpha < \alpha_0$. Denoting by v_k^ε the solution related to e_k^ε and by τ the stopping time from Step 1 (independent of ε and k), there is $\theta \in (\alpha, \alpha_0)$ such that we have \mathbb{P} -a.s.

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} \|v_k^\varepsilon(t)\|_{C^\theta}^2 \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} 0, \quad (3.2)$$

with convergence is uniform in $\omega \in \Omega'$, where $\Omega' \subseteq \Omega$ is the set of those ω for which the convergence holds.

Step 3: Conclusion. Via Steps 1 and 2, the proof of Proposition 2.9 is completed as follows.

Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, $0 < \alpha < \alpha_0$ as in Corollary 3.2, $(e_k^\varepsilon)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ a family of energies as in Step 2, and let $(v_k^\varepsilon)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and τ be the corresponding solutions and stopping time from Step 1. By the last assertion of Step 1 and (i) of Proposition 3.3, we have $v_k^\varepsilon(0) = v_l^\varepsilon(0)$ for all $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$, and we denote this common initial condition by v_0^ε . To finish the proof, it is now sufficient to find $\varepsilon > 0$ such that each v_k^ε satisfies (2.6) pathwise \mathbb{P} -a.s. on $[0, \tau_\varepsilon]$, where we set

$$\tau_\varepsilon := \tau \wedge \tau_{\text{Lip}} \wedge r(\varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon, \quad (3.3)$$

with $r(\varepsilon) > 0$ as in (iii) of Proposition 3.3 and the (\mathcal{F}_t) -stopping time τ_{Lip} is defined by

$$\tau_{\text{Lip}}(\omega) := \inf\{t > 0 : \text{Lip}(\Phi^{-1}(t, \omega)) > 2\}.$$

Note that $\tau_{\text{Lip}} > 0$ \mathbb{P} -a.s., since $\text{Lip}(\Phi^{-1}(0, \omega)) = 1$ and $t \mapsto \text{Lip}(\Phi^{-1}(t, \omega))$ is continuous. Thus, comparing with (2.9) and Lemma 2.7 (i), for $0 \leq t \leq \tau_\varepsilon$, the constant on the right hand side of (2.7) can be replaced by a constant $C > 0$, which depends on α, θ , but not on ω, ε or t .

Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$, write $v^\varepsilon = v_k^\varepsilon$ and let $0 \leq s \leq t \leq \tau_\varepsilon$. Lemma 2.7 (i) with the aforementioned ω - and t -independent constant C on its right hand side entails

$$2 \int_s^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |(-\Delta)_{\Phi}^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} v^\varepsilon(r, x)|^2 dx dr \leq (t-s)C \sup_{r \in [0, \tau_\varepsilon]} \|v^\varepsilon(r)\|_{\theta}^2,$$

\mathbb{P} -a.s. By (iii) of Proposition 3.3,

$$\|v^\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 - \|v^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 = e^\varepsilon(s) - e^\varepsilon(t) = - \int_s^t (e^\varepsilon)'(r) dr \geq \frac{t-s}{2}.$$

Thus it remains to obtain \mathbb{P} -a.s. the estimate

$$\sup_{r \in [0, \tau_\varepsilon]} \|v^\varepsilon(r)\|_{\theta}^2 \leq (2C)^{-1}.$$

Since C does not depend on ε or ω , this follows from (3.2) (recall that the latter holds uniformly in $\omega \in \Omega'$) by choosing ε sufficiently small. For such ε , we set

$$\tau_0 := \tau_\varepsilon,$$

where τ_ε is as in (3.3). Finally, (ii) of Proposition 3.3 implies $v_k^\varepsilon \neq v_l^\varepsilon$ pathwise \mathbb{P} -a.s. on $[0, \tau_0]$ for all $k \neq l$. \square

In the remainder of the paper, we prove Propositions 3.1 and 3.3.

4 Proof of Proposition 3.1

4.1 The flow map

4.1.1 Mollification of the noise

Recall that $B = (B_k)_{k \in I}$ is an $\mathbb{R}^{|K|}$ -valued Brownian motion. Let us assume that every realization of B has local C^γ time regularity, $\gamma \in (1/3, 1/2)$. This means that the associated flow ϕ should have the same time regularity in time, which is not sufficient for our purposes. Therefore, we introduce a sequence of mollified flows $(\phi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ for the convex integration scheme as follows.

Let $\varsigma_n > 0$ to be determined below such that at least ς_n is monotonically decreasing in n and satisfies $(n+1)\varsigma_n^{\gamma-\beta}$, $\beta \in (0, \gamma)$. Then, let $\Theta: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth mollified with support in $(0, 1)$ and set

$$\Theta_n(t) := \varsigma_n^{-1} \Theta(t\varsigma_n^{-1}), \quad B_n(t) := (B * \Theta_n)(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} B(t-s) \Theta_n(s) ds,$$

where by convention we set $B(t-s) = B(0) = 0$ for $t-s < 0$, and the convolution is component-wise, i.e. $(B_n)^k = B_n^k = (B^k * \Theta_n)$, $k \in I$. Then obviously B_n is smooth for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and identically zero for $t < 0$. Then define ϕ_n as the solution to the equation

$$\phi_n(t, x) := x + \sum_{k \in I} \int_0^t \sigma_k(\phi_n(s, x)) dB_n^k(s), \quad x \in \mathbb{T}^3, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (4.1)$$

where the integral is understood as a pathwise Riemann-Stieltjes integral. Note that $\phi_n(t, x) = \phi_n(0, x) = x$ for $t < 0$. We similarly extend the flow ϕ to $t < 0$ by setting $\phi(t, x) = \phi(0, x) = x$. As the σ_k are divergence-free, the map $\phi_n(t, \cdot)$ is measure-preserving with probability one. Finally note that by the Wong–Zakai theorem, ϕ_n is indeed an approximation to the (Stratonovich) flow ϕ .

4.1.2 Localisation

Following [23], we want to work in the framework of rough paths (cf. [21]). To this end, we enhance the Brownian motion B by its step-2 Stratonovich lift

$$\mathbb{B}(s, t) := \int_s^t (B(r) - B(s)) \otimes \circ dB(r),$$

and the mollified process B_n by its step-2 Lyons lift (given by the Riemann–Stieltjes integral)

$$\mathbb{B}_n(s, t) := \int_s^t (B_n(r) - B_n(s)) \otimes dB_n(r).$$

Then both $\mathbf{B} := (B, \mathbb{B})$, $\mathbf{B}_n := (B_n, \mathbb{B}_n)$ are geometric γ -Hölder rough paths.

As was shown in [23, Lemma 2.1, Lemma 2.2] (to which we refer for more details), there exist a suitable increasing and diverging sequence $(K_L)_{L \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $K_0 = K_1 \leq K_L$ for all $L \in \mathbb{N}$ and an associated stopping time $\mathfrak{s}_L \leq K_L$ with $\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{s}_L = \infty$ almost surely. Now define

$$\mathfrak{t}_L := \mathfrak{s}_L \wedge \inf \left\{ s \geq 0 : \|B\|_{C_{\leq s}^\gamma} > K_L \right\} \wedge \inf \left\{ s \geq 0 : \|\mathbb{B}\|_{C_{\leq s}^{2\gamma}} > K_L \right\}. \quad (4.2)$$

Then $(\mathfrak{t}_L)_{L \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of non-decreasing stopping times such that $\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{t}_L = \infty$ almost surely, and for a constant $C = C(K_0, \gamma, \beta)$ we have

$$\|\phi_{n+1} - \phi_n\|_{C_{\leq \mathfrak{t}_L}^\beta C_x^\kappa} \leq CL(n+1)\varsigma_n^{\gamma-\beta}, \quad \|\phi_n\|_{C_{\leq \mathfrak{t}_L}^\gamma C_x^\kappa} \leq CL, \quad (4.3)$$

$$\|\phi_{n+1}^{-1} - \phi_n^{-1}\|_{C_{\leq \mathfrak{t}_L}^\beta C_x^\kappa} \leq CL(n+1)\varsigma_n^{\gamma-\beta}, \quad \|\phi_n^{-1}\|_{C_{\leq \mathfrak{t}_L}^\gamma C_x^\kappa} \leq CL, \quad (4.4)$$

$$\|\phi_n\|_{C_{\leq \mathfrak{t}_L}^r C_x^\kappa} \leq CL\varsigma_n^{\gamma-r}, \quad \|\phi_n^{-1}\|_{C_{\leq \mathfrak{t}_L}^r C_x^\kappa} \leq CL\varsigma_n^{\gamma-r}. \quad (4.5)$$

4.2 The main iterative proposition

We make the following choices of parameters:

$$\delta_n := a^{1-b^n}, \quad D_n := a^{cb^n}, \quad L_n := L^{m^{n+1}},$$

where

$$a \geq 2, \quad b = m + \epsilon, \quad c = \frac{b^4(1+\epsilon) - 1/2}{b - 1 - \epsilon}, \quad \epsilon > 0,$$

and $m \geq 4$ is given in Proposition 4.1 below. The precise choice of these constants will be discussed in Remark 4.2 and proven in Section 7.3.

Consider the Euler–Reynolds system

$$\partial_t v + \operatorname{div}_\phi(v \otimes v) + \nabla_\phi q + (-\Delta)_\phi^\alpha v = \operatorname{div}_\phi \mathring{R}. \quad (4.6)$$

The following result is the key step for the proof of Proposition 3.1. Its proof will be given in Section 7.

Proposition 4.1 (Main iterative proposition). *Let $e \in \mathcal{E}$ and set*

$$\underline{e} := \inf_{t \in \mathbb{R}} e(t) > 0, \quad \bar{e} := \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} e(t) < \infty.$$

Then there exist constants ϵ, m as above, a constant $a \geq 2$ depending on $\underline{e}, \bar{e}, |e|_{C_t^1}, K_0$, a constant $\eta \in (0, 1)$ depending on \underline{e}, \bar{e} , a constant M_q depending on \underline{e}, \bar{e} , a constant M_v depending on \bar{e} , and a constant $A \in (0, \infty)$ depending on $\underline{e}, \bar{e}, |e|_{C_t^1}$ with the following property:

Fix ϕ_n as in (4.1) and let $(v_n, q_n, \phi_n, \mathring{R}_n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be a smooth solution of (4.6) such that v_n has mean zero, satisfying the inductive estimates

$$\left| e(t)(1 - \delta_n) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |v_n(t, x)|^2 dx \right| \leq \frac{1}{4} \delta_n e(t), \quad t \leq \mathfrak{t}, \quad (4.7)$$

and for every $L \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\|\mathring{R}_n\|_{C_{\leq \mathfrak{t}_L} C_x} \leq \eta L_n \delta_{n+1}, \quad (4.8)$$

$$\|q_n\|_{C_{\leq \mathfrak{t}_L} C_x} \leq M_q L_n \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \delta_k, \quad (4.9)$$

$$\|\operatorname{div}_{\phi_n} v_n\|_{C_{\leq \mathfrak{t}_L} B_{\infty}^{-1, \infty}} \leq L_n \delta_{n+2}^{5/4}, \quad (4.10)$$

$$\max \left\{ \|v_n\|_{C_{\leq \mathfrak{t}_L, x}^1}, \|q_n\|_{C_{\leq \mathfrak{t}_L, x}^1}, \|\mathring{R}_n\|_{C_{\leq \mathfrak{t}_L} C_x^1} \right\} \leq L_n D_n. \quad (4.11)$$

Then there exists a second quadruple $(v_{n+1}, q_{n+1}, \phi_{n+1}, \mathring{R}_{n+1})$ solving (4.6) satisfying (4.1) and the inductive estimates (4.7)–(4.11) with n replaced by $n+1$, and for every $L \in \mathbb{N}$, $L \geq 1$

$$\|v_{n+1} - v_n\|_{C_{\leq \mathfrak{t}_L} C_x} \leq M_v L_n^4 \delta_n^{1/2}, \quad (4.12)$$

$$\|q_{n+1} - q_n\|_{C_{\leq \mathfrak{t}_L} C_x} \leq M_q L_n \delta_n, \quad (4.13)$$

$$\max \left\{ \|v_{n+1}\|_{C_{\leq \mathfrak{t}_L, x}^1}, \|q_{n+1}\|_{C_{\leq \mathfrak{t}_L, x}^1}, \|\mathring{R}_{n+1}\|_{C_{\leq \mathfrak{t}_L} C_x^1} \right\} \leq A L_{n+1} \delta_n^{1/2} \left(\frac{D_n}{\delta_{n+4}} \right)^{1+\epsilon}. \quad (4.14)$$

Moreover, the quadruple $(v_{n+1}, q_{n+1}, \phi_{n+1}, \mathring{R}_{n+1})$ evaluated at time $t \in [0, \infty)$ depends only on $e(s)$, $\phi(y, s)$, $v_k(y, s)$, $q_k(y, s)$, $\phi_k(y, s)$, $\mathring{R}_k(y, s)$ for arbitrary $s \leq t$, $k \leq n$, and $y \in \mathbb{T}^3$, and v_{n+1} has zero mean.

The (important!) precise form of the constant a can be found in Equ. (7.23), η in Equ. (6.19), M_q in Equ. (6.36), M_v in Section 7.5, and A can be found in Equ. (7.14).

Remark 4.2. Let us briefly comment on the form of $b = m + \epsilon$. The idea is that $b > 1$ should be as close to 1 as possible, i.e. $b = 1 + \epsilon$ for ϵ small, as in the proof of the Onsager conjecture [30, 10]. However, due to technical limitations this is not possible at the current stage. In fact, in our case, $\epsilon = 15$ and $m = 23$, so $b = 38$, cf. Section 6.1. Advances in the methods of stochastic convex integration used here are expected to allow one to take smaller values for b .

4.3 Proof of Proposition 3.1

Given the main iterative proposition, the proof of Proposition 3.1 is obtained as follows.

Proof of Proposition 3.1. Let $e \in \mathcal{E}$. We start the convex integration scheme with the initial stage $(v_0, q_0, \mathring{R}_0) = (0, 0, 0)$. This triple trivially satisfy Equ. (4.6). The Equ. (4.8), (4.9) and (4.10), (4.11) hold trivially, and Equ. (4.7) holds because $\delta_0 = 1$, so the left-hand side equals zero.

We then apply Proposition 4.1 iteratively to obtain a sequence of $(v_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ that satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x} &\leq M_v \sum_{k \leq n} L_k a^{\frac{1}{2}(1-b^k)} \leq M_v L_n \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} 2^{\frac{1}{2}(1-4^k)} \leq 2M_v L_n, \\ \|v_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^1} &\leq L_n D_n, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the definition of c and the choice $a \geq A^{\frac{1}{\epsilon+1/2}}$ to get

$$A \delta_n^{1/2} \left(\frac{D_n}{\delta_{n+4}} \right)^{1+\epsilon} \leq D_{n+1}.$$

Concerning the increments of the velocity field, Proposition 4.1 ensures

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_{n+1} - v_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x} &\leq M_v L_n^4 \delta_n^{1/2} = M_v L^{4m^{n+1}} a^{\frac{1}{2}(1-b^n)}, \\ \|v_{n+1} - v_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^1} &\leq 2L_{n+1} D_{n+1} = 2L^{m^{n+2}} a^{cb^{n+1}}, \end{aligned}$$

which, by interpolation, implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_{n+1} - v_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^\theta} &\leq 2^\theta M_v^{1-\theta} L^{(1-\theta)4m^{n+1}} L^{\theta m^{n+2}} a^{\frac{1-\theta}{2}} a^{(\theta cb - \frac{1-\theta}{2})b^n} \\ &\stackrel{m \geq 4}{\leq} 2M_v^{1-\theta} L^{m^{n+2}} a^{\frac{1-\theta}{2}} a^{(\theta cb - \frac{1-\theta}{2})b^n}, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore also for $L = 1$

$$\|v\|_{C_{\leq t} C_x^\theta} \leq \sum_{n \geq 0} \|v_{n+1} - v_n\|_{C_{\leq t} C_x^\theta} \leq 2M_v^{1-\theta} a^{\frac{1-\theta}{2}} \sum_{n \geq 0} a^{(\theta cb - \frac{1-\theta}{2})b^n}. \quad (4.15)$$

Now we choose

$$0 < \theta < \frac{1}{2cb+1} = \frac{m-1}{2(1+\epsilon)(m+\epsilon)^5 - 1 - \epsilon} = \alpha_0, \quad (4.16)$$

which implies $\theta cb - \frac{1-\theta}{2} =: -r < 0$. Then we define

$$n_0 := \max \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N} : L^{m^{n+2}} > a^{r b^{n-1}} \right\},$$

where the maximum exists because $b > m$ and $r > 0$. We see that

$$n_0 < \frac{\log \log L + 2 \log m - \log r + \log b - \log \log a}{\log b - \log m} \leq C(1 + \log \log L)$$

for some constant $C = C(e)$ not depending on L . With this choice of n_0 , we can split the sum and estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|v_{n+1} - v_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^\theta} &= \sum_{n \leq n_0} \|v_{n+1} - v_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^\theta} + \sum_{n > n_0} \|v_{n+1} - v_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^\theta} \\ &\leq CM_v^{1-\theta} a^{1/2} \left(L^{m^{n_0+3}} + 1 \right) \leq CM_v^{1-\theta} a^{1/2} L^{m^{C(1+\log \log L)}}, \end{aligned}$$

where C varies from line to line. This then implies that v_n converges in $C_{\leq t_L} C_x^\theta \cap C_{\leq t_L}^\theta C_x$ to a limit v with a bound uniform in $\omega \in \Omega$:

$$\|v\|_{C_{\leq t_L, x}^\theta} \leq CM_v^{1-\theta} a^{1/2} L^{m^{C(1+\log \log L)}}.$$

One can easily convince oneself that v restricted to $(-\infty, t_{L-1}]$ is the limit of v_n in $C_{\leq t_{L-1}} C_x^\theta \cap C_{\leq t_{L-1}}^\theta C_x$ for every $L \in \mathbb{N}$. In this way, we can uniquely identify a limit in $C_{loc} C_x^\theta \cap C_{loc}^\theta C_x$, which we denote again by v , by gluing together limits for different values of L .

Note that, as $v_n(\cdot \wedge t_L)$ is progressively measurable for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $L \geq 1$, the limit process $v(\cdot \wedge t_L)$ is also progressively measurable, and therefore, v is progressively measurable. As $e(t) > 0$ for all t , the above convergence and Equ. (4.7) imply

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |v(t, x)|^2 dx = e(t), \quad t \leq \mathfrak{t}.$$

Note that $\mathfrak{t} = \mathfrak{t}_1$ does not depend on the energy profile e .

Now, in the same way as before, we see that q_n converges to a Hölder-regular limit. The exact regularity is a bit different, namely as $\|q_{n+1} - q_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C} \leq M_q L_n \delta_n = M_q L^{m^{n+1}} a^{1-b^n}$, we have

$$\|q_{n+1} - q_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C^{\theta'}} \leq 2M_q^{1-\theta'} L^{m^{n+2}} a^{1-\theta} a^{(\theta'cb - (1-\theta'))b^n}.$$

This implies that q is Hölder-continuous with Hölder exponent θ' such that

$$0 < \theta' < \bar{\theta}' := \frac{1}{cb + 1}, \quad (4.17)$$

which is approximately twice the Hölder regularity of v for large values of b . Up to choosing a smaller θ , we can then suppose $\theta' = 2\theta$ and therefore, the limit of $(q_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies a uniform-in- ω bound

$$\|q\|_{C_{\leq t_L, x}^{2\theta}} \leq CM_q^{1-2\theta} a L^{m^{C(1+\log \log L)}}.$$

Finally note that for every $L \in \mathbb{N}$, $\phi_n \rightarrow \phi$, $\phi_n^{-1} \rightarrow \phi^{-1}$ in $C_{\leq t_L} C_x^2$ almost surely by Equ. (4.3), (4.4), as well as $\mathring{R}_n \rightarrow 0$ a.s. in $C_{\leq t_L} C_x$ and $\text{div}_{\phi_n} v_n \rightarrow 0$ in $C_{\leq t_L} B_{\infty, \infty}^{-1}$ a.s. by using the iterative estimates Equ. (4.8), (4.10), respectively as well as $b > m$. This implies that (v, q) solves Equ. (2.5) on $[0, t_L]$. Since $L \in \mathbb{N}$ was arbitrary and $t_L \rightarrow \infty$ as $L \rightarrow \infty$, we get global in time solutions.

Moreover, we see that the stopping time is $\tau = \mathfrak{t} = \mathfrak{t}_1$, which is clearly independent of e and strictly positive, a.s., since $B(0) = 0$. Finally, if we take two energy profiles e_1, e_2 with $e_1(0) = e_2(0)$, we get by Proposition 4.1 that

$$v_n^{(1)}(0) = v_n^{(2)}(0) \quad (4.18)$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and that these initial values only depends on $e(s)$, $\phi(y, s)$, $v_k(y, s)$, $q_k(y, s)$, $\phi_k(y, s)$, $\mathring{R}_k(y, s)$ for $k < n$ and $s \leq 0$. As all of these are deterministic, we get that the initial condition for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is deterministic. Taking the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$ in Equ. (4.18), we find that $v^{(1)}(0) = v^{(2)}(0)$ and that the initial condition is deterministic. \square

5 Proof of Proposition 3.3

Proof of Proposition 3.3. The existence of non-increasing functions $e_k^\varepsilon : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ with properties (i)-(iv) follows from simple algebraic considerations, and we fix, for every $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, such a family. By Step 1 and assumption, there is a family of solutions $(v_k^\varepsilon)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ to (2.5) with paths in $C(\mathbb{R}_+, C^\theta(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3))$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. for $\theta > \alpha$, and a \mathbb{P} -a.s. strictly positive (\mathcal{F}_t) -stopping time $\tau : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, independent of ε and k , such that \mathbb{P} -a.s.

$$\|v_k^\varepsilon(t, \omega)\|_{L^2}^2 = e_k^\varepsilon(t), \quad \forall 0 \leq t \leq \tau(\omega).$$

Since all subsequent estimates involving e_k^ε and v_k^ε will only depend on the infimum and supremum of e_k^ε , which is independent of k by (iii) in Proposition 3.3, we now write e^ε and v^ε instead of e_k^ε and v_k^ε .

It remains to prove (3.2). By (7.14) and $\bar{e}^\varepsilon = \varepsilon$ and $\underline{e}^\varepsilon = \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, we have

$$A = 8\tilde{A}_e \left(\frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^2.$$

Thus, since $r = 9$, $\epsilon = 15$, we obtain (see (7.23))

$$a = 2^{\frac{44}{31}} \left(\tilde{A}_e \left(\frac{1 + \varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \right)^3 \right)^{\frac{2}{31}}. \quad (5.1)$$

Regarding M_v , since $\bar{e}^\varepsilon = \varepsilon$, we see $E = C\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} < 1$, so that by (7.25), for ε sufficiently small we have

$$M_v \in [\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}, 2\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}].$$

In particular $M_v < 1$. Therefore we can estimate (cf. Lemma 7.5)

$$1 < \tilde{A}_e \leq C\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (5.2)$$

Then, revisiting (4.15), we see, using the previous expressions and estimates for a , M_v and \tilde{A}_e

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} \|v^\varepsilon(t)\|_{C_x^\theta} &\leq M_v^{1-\theta} a^{\frac{1-\theta}{2}} \sum_{n \geq 0} a^{(\theta cb - \frac{1-\theta}{2})b^n} \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{1-\theta}{2}} \varepsilon^{-(1-\theta)\frac{3}{31}} \varepsilon^{-(1-\theta)\frac{1}{62}} \sum_{n \geq 0} \tilde{A}_e^{\frac{2}{31}(\theta bc - \frac{1-\theta}{2})b^n} \varepsilon^{\frac{6}{31}(\frac{1-\theta}{2} - \theta bc)b^n} \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^{(1-\theta)(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{3}{31} - \frac{1}{62})} \sum_{n \geq 0} \varepsilon^{\frac{6}{31}(\frac{1-\theta}{2} - \theta bc)b^n}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

Since $(1-\theta)(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{3}{31} - \frac{1}{62}) > 0$ and $\frac{6}{31}(\frac{1-\theta}{2} - \theta bc)b^n > 0$, we obtain (3.2). \square

6 Convex integration scheme

It remains to prove the main iterative proposition 4.1 via convex integration techniques. This is the content of this and the subsequent section.

6.1 Choice of parameters

In this section, we collect the parameters used in the convex integration scheme. First, recall that

$$\delta_n = a^{1-b^n}, \quad D_n = a^{cb^n}, \quad L_n := L^{m^{n+1}},$$

where

$$b = m + \epsilon, \quad c = \frac{b^4(1 + \epsilon) - \frac{1}{2}}{b - 1 - \epsilon},$$

and the coefficients $a \geq 2, m \geq 4, \epsilon > 0$ will be determined in Section 7. The parameter δ_n decays in n and determines the ‘‘amplitude’’ along the iteration of several quantities, cf. Equ. (4.7)–(4.10) as well as (4.12), (4.13). It will ensure that the energy profile is attained, that the stress term and the divergence of v_n vanish in the limit (making the limit a solution to the actual, incompressible fractional stochastic Navier–Stokes equations), and that the limiting vector field $v = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (v_{n+1} - v_n)$ and pressure $q = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (q_{n+1} - q_n)$ converge. The parameter D_n measures the growth of derivatives (with the heuristic that taking a derivative along the iteration should ‘‘cost’’ a factor of roughly D_n). By using the definition, it follows immediately that

$$\delta_{n+2}^{6/5} \delta_{n+1}^{-1/2} \delta_n^{-1/2} = a^{1/5} a^{-b^n (\frac{6}{5}b^2 - \frac{1}{2}b - \frac{1}{2})} \stackrel{b>1}{<} 1. \quad (6.1)$$

The parameter L_n controls the growth of the iterative estimates on increasingly large time intervals of the form $[0, t_L]$, $L \in \mathbb{N}$.

We will use two mollification parameters for the convex integration scheme, one for the temporal mollification of the noise, and one for the space-time mollification of the other quantities of the scheme to avoid loss of derivative. To this end, let us fix $\gamma \in (1/3, 1/2)$ close to $1/2$. Then we define

$$\ell^\gamma := \frac{c_{n,\ell} \delta_{n+3}^{\frac{4}{3}}}{C_\ell D_n}, \quad \varsigma_n^{\gamma_*} := \frac{1}{C_\varsigma} \frac{\delta_{n+3}^{\frac{4}{3}}}{n+1}, \quad (6.2)$$

where $C_\ell, C_\varsigma > 1$ are sufficiently large and $\gamma_* \in (0, \gamma)$ will be chosen sufficiently close to γ , and all independent of n , whereas $c_{n,\ell} \in [1, 2)$ is chosen such that ℓ^{-1} is an integer power of 2 (to apply Lemma B.14 in Sections 6.7.5, 6.7.6). The additional parameter γ_* is useful as an application of Equ. (4.3)–(4.5) in Section 6.7.3 will require us to pick a further parameter $\gamma' \in (\gamma_*, \gamma)$. From the definitions it is clear that

$$\ell \leq (n+1) \varsigma_n^{\gamma'}. \quad (6.3)$$

We will need to introduce two further large parameters $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{N}$ (depending on n) such that $\lambda/\mu \in \mathbb{N}$, which immediately implies that $\lambda \geq \mu$. These two parameters will determine the frequency of space-time oscillations of the building blocks of the convex integration scheme. Following [23], we choose $r_* \geq 7$ and

$$\mu := c_{n,\mu} C_\mu \ell^{-r_*},$$

where again $C_\mu > 1$ is possibly large but finite and independent of n , and $c_{n,\mu} \in (1, 2)$ is chosen such that $\mu \in \mathbb{N}$, and

$$\lambda := c_{n,\lambda} \mu^2 \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-2}$$

where $c_{n,\lambda} \in (1, 2)$ is chosen such that $c_{n,\lambda} \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-2} \in \mathbb{N}$, which implies $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lambda/\mu \in \mathbb{N}$.

We fix $\eta = \frac{\epsilon}{8C(1+\sqrt{\epsilon})}$, where C depends only on the mollifier χ , cf. Equ 6.19. Let us assume without loss of generality the following relations:

$$D_n \ell^\gamma \leq \eta \delta_{n+3}^{9/7} \delta_n \leq \eta \delta_{n+1} \leq \eta \delta_n, \quad (6.4)$$

$$D_n \leq \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1}, \quad (6.5)$$

$$\mu^2 \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-2} \leq \lambda \leq D_{n+1}, \quad (6.6)$$

$$(n+1) \varsigma_n^{\gamma'} \leq \delta_n^{1/2} \delta_{n+3}^{9/7}, \quad (6.7)$$

$$\lambda^r \geq \mu^{r+5} \varsigma_{n+1}^{(r+5)(\gamma-1)-2} \left(D_n \ell^{-r-4} + \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1} \right), \quad \forall r \geq r_*, \quad (6.8)$$

$$\frac{1}{\mu} \leq \delta_{n+2}^{6/5}. \quad (6.9)$$

The last condition immediately implies, as by definition $\lambda = c_{n,\lambda}\mu^2\varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-2} > \mu^2\varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-2}$ and $\varsigma_{n+1} \leq 1$, that

$$\frac{\mu\varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1}}{\lambda} \leq \frac{\varsigma_{n+1}}{\mu} \leq \frac{1}{\mu} \stackrel{\text{Equ. (6.9)}}{\leq} \delta_{n+2}^{6/5} \stackrel{\text{Equ. (6.1)}}{\leq} \delta_{n+1}^{1/2} \delta_n^{1/2}. \quad (6.10)$$

The first inequality in (6.4) will be used just once, namely in the proof of iterative estimate Equ. (4.10) using Proposition 6.19 below.

Notice that the condition $\lambda \leq D_{n+1}$ of Equ. (6.6) requires that the parameters A and ϵ in Proposition 4.1 are sufficiently large, cf. Equ. (7.10) and Equ. (7.17) below. More details on this and on the other parameter choices will be given in Section 7.

6.2 Mollification

Let $\chi \in C_c^\infty([0, 1] \times [-1, 1]^3)$ be a standard mollifier. Set $\chi_\ell(t, x) := \ell^{-4}\chi(\ell^{-1}t, \ell^{-1}x)$ and

$$v_\ell := v_n * \chi_\ell, \quad q_\ell := q_n * \chi_\ell, \quad \mathring{R}_\ell := \mathring{R}_n * \chi_\ell.$$

Note that v_n, q_n and \mathring{R}_n are also defined for negative times and thus satisfy (4.6) in an analytically strong sense. We shall need in the following that $v_\ell, q_\ell, \mathring{R}_\ell$ satisfy the equation

$$\partial_t v_\ell + \chi_\ell * \operatorname{div}_{\phi_n}(v_n \otimes v_n) + \chi_\ell * \nabla_{\phi_n} q_n + \chi_\ell * (-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha v_n = \chi_\ell * \operatorname{div}_{\phi_n} \mathring{R}_n. \quad (6.11)$$

Using standard mollification estimates, we have

$$\|v_\ell - v_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L}^0 C_x^0} \leq C\ell \|v_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L, x}^1} \stackrel{\text{Equ. (4.11)}}{\leq} C\ell L_n D_n \stackrel{\text{Equ. (6.4)}}{\leq} C\eta L_n \delta_n, \quad (6.12)$$

$$\|v_\ell\|_{C_{\leq t_L}^0 C_x^0} \leq \|v_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L}^0 C_x^0} \stackrel{\text{Equ. (4.12)}}{\leq} M_v L_{n-1}^4 \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \delta_k^{1/2} \leq 2M_v L_{n-1}^4 \leq 2M_v L_n, \quad (6.13)$$

$$\|v_\ell\|_{C_{t,x}^1} \leq \|v_n\|_{C_{t,x}^1} \stackrel{\text{Equ. (4.11)}}{\leq} L_n D_n \quad (6.14)$$

$$\|v_\ell\|_{C_{\leq t_L, x}^1} \leq C\ell^{-1} \|v_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L, x}^0} \stackrel{\text{Equ. (6.13)}}{\leq} C\ell^{-1} M_v L_n \quad (6.15)$$

$$\|v_\ell\|_{C_{\leq t_L}^0 C_x^{N+1}} \leq C_N \ell^{-N} L_n D_n, \quad (6.16)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_\ell\|_{C_t^0 C_x^\delta} &\stackrel{\text{Equ. (1.4)}}{\leq} C \left(\|v_\ell\|_{C_{\leq t_L}^0 C_x^0} + \sup_t [v_\ell]_{C_x^\delta} \right) \leq C \left(\|v_\ell\|_{C_{\leq t_L, x}^0} + \|v_\ell\|_{C_{\leq t_L, x}^0}^{1-\delta} \|v_\ell\|_{C_{\leq t_L}^0 C_x^1}^\delta \right) \\ &\stackrel{\text{Equ. (6.15)}}{\leq} C\ell^{-\delta} \|v_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L, x}^0} \leq CM_v L_n \ell^{-\delta}, \quad \delta \in [0, 1]. \end{aligned} \quad (6.17)$$

Similarly to the last estimate, we get from Equ. (4.11) and (4.12) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L}^0 C_x^\delta} &\stackrel{\text{Equ. (1.4)}}{\leq} C \left(\|v_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L, x}^0} + \|v_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L, x}^0}^{1-\delta} \|v_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L}^0 C_x^1}^\delta \right) \\ &\leq C (M_v + M_v^{1-\delta}) L_n D_n^\delta, \quad \delta \in (0, 1). \end{aligned} \quad (6.18)$$

6.3 Modified Beltrami flows

We follow [23, Section 3.3] in defining the fundamental building blocks of our convex integration scheme, based on the Beltrami flows of [14]. Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}^3 \setminus \{0\}$. We define

$$M_k := \operatorname{Id} - \frac{k}{|k|} \otimes \frac{k}{|k|}.$$

Let $\lambda_0 \geq 1$ and $A_k \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that $A_k \cdot k = 0$, $|A_k| = \frac{1}{2}$ and $A_{-k} = A_k$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ with $|k| = \lambda_0$. Let us further define the complex vectors

$$E_k := A_k + i \frac{k}{|k|} \times A_k \in \mathbb{C}^3.$$

By the symmetry condition on the coefficients, for any matching collection $\{a_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3, |k| = \lambda_0}$ of complex numbers $a_k \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $a_{-k} = \bar{a}_k$ for every k (\bar{a}_k denotes the complex conjugate of a_k), the vector field

$$E(t, x) := \sum_{|k| = \lambda_0} a_k E_k e^{ik \cdot \phi_{n+1}(t, x)}$$

is real-valued and satisfies the relations

$$\operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} E = 0, \quad \operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} (E \otimes E) = \nabla_{\phi_{n+1}} \left(\frac{|E|^2}{2} \right).$$

Moreover, the fact that ϕ_{n+1} is measure-preserving implies that

$$\frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} E \otimes E \, dx = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{|k| = \lambda_0} |a_k|^2 M_k.$$

Following [23], we shall call E a *modified Beltrami wave*. Note that since E is time-dependent, it is not a solution of the stationary Euler equations, unlike the classical Beltrami waves of [14].

6.4 The transport coefficients

We introduce a suitable decomposition of the state space of the velocity field: let c_1, c_2 be two universal constants such that $\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} < c_1 < c_2 < 1$, and let $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(B_{c_2}(0))$ identical to 1 on $B_{c_1}(0)$. Next, let $\mathcal{C}_j, j = 1, \dots, 8$, denote the eight equivalence classes of $\mathbb{Z}^3 / (2\mathbb{Z})^3$, then by defining

$$\varphi_k(x) := \varphi(x - k), \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}^3,$$

observe that if $k \neq l \in \mathcal{C}_j$, then $|k - l| \geq 2 > 2c_2$ and φ_k and φ_l have disjoint supports. Furthermore define the function

$$\varphi_\Sigma := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \varphi_k^2$$

which is smooth, bounded and bounded away from zero. Hence for $v \in \mathbb{R}^3, \tau \in \mathbb{R}$ set

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_k(v) &:= \frac{\varphi_k(v)}{\sqrt{\varphi_\Sigma}}, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}^3, \\ \psi_k^{(j)}(v, \tau) &:= \sum_{l \in \mathcal{C}_j} \alpha_l(\mu v) e^{-ik \cdot \frac{l}{\mu} \tau}, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}^3, j = 1, \dots, 8. \end{aligned}$$

As in [23, Section 3.4], we make use of the following properties:

$$\sum_{j=1}^8 \left| \psi_k^{(j)}(v, \tau) \right|^2 = 1$$

and for any $r \in \mathbb{N}, k \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ and $j = 1, \dots, 8$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{v, \tau} \left| D_v^r \psi_k^{(j)}(v, \tau) \right| &\leq C(r, |k|) \mu^r, \quad r \in \mathbb{N}, \\ \sup_{|v| \leq V, \tau} \left| D_v^r \partial_\tau^h \psi_k^{(j)}(v, \tau) \right| &\leq C(r, h, |k|) V^h \mu^r, \\ \sup_{|v| \leq V, \tau} \left| D_v^r \left(\partial_\tau \psi_k^{(j)}(v, \tau) + i(k \cdot v) \psi_k^{(j)}(v, \tau) \right) \right| &\leq C(r, |k|) \mu^{r-1} \end{aligned}$$

for any given $V > 0$.

6.5 The energy pumping term

In view of prescribing the energy profile e , we introduce the following term to track the energy of the solutions constructed at each iteration:

$$\tilde{e}(t) := \tilde{e}_{n+1}(t) := \frac{1}{3(2\pi)^3} \left(e(t) (1 - \delta_{n+1}) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |v_\ell(t, x)|^2 dx \right).$$

Then, recalling from [23, Lemma 3.1], for

$$\eta := \frac{\underline{e}}{8C(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}})}, \quad (6.19)$$

where C only depends on the mollifier, we obtain the bounds almost surely for all $t \leq t$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{e}(t) &\leq \frac{1}{3(2\pi)^3} \left(\frac{5}{4} \bar{e} + C\eta(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}) \right) \delta_n, \\ \tilde{e}(t) &\geq \frac{\underline{e}}{24(2\pi)^3} \delta_n. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, let $\gamma_n: [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a function such that

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_n(t) &= \tilde{e}(t), \quad \forall t \leq t, \\ \frac{1}{2} \tilde{e}(t) &\leq \gamma_n(t) \leq \frac{3}{2} \tilde{e}(t), \quad \forall t \geq t, \\ \|\gamma_n\|_{C_t^k} &\leq C \|\tilde{e}_{\leq t}\|_{C_t^k}, \quad \forall k \leq 2. \end{aligned} \quad (6.20)$$

6.6 The perturbations

Recall the geometric lemma of [14, Lemma 3.2]:

Lemma 6.1. *For every $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists an $r_0 > 0$ and $\lambda_0 > 1$ such that there exist pairwise disjoint, finite subsets $\Lambda_j \subset \{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3: |k| = \lambda_0\}$, for $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, as well as smooth positive functions*

$$\gamma_k^{(j)} \in C^\infty(B_{r_0}(\text{Id})), \quad j \in \{1, \dots, N\}, k \in \Lambda_j,$$

such that $k \in \Lambda_j$ implies $-k \in \Lambda_j$ as well as $\gamma_{-k}^{(j)} = \gamma_k^{(j)}$. For each $R \in B_{r_0}(\text{Id})$ we have the identity

$$R = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in \Lambda_j} \left(\gamma_k^{(j)}(R) \right)^2 M_k, \quad \forall R \in B_{r_0}(\text{Id}).$$

We apply the lemma with $N = 8$ to obtain $\lambda_0 > 1$, $r_0 > 0$ and pairwise disjoint families Λ_j as well as positive functions $\gamma_k^{(j)} \in C^\infty(B_{r_0}(\text{Id}))$ for $k \in \Lambda_j, j \in \{1, \dots, 8\}$. Define

$$W(s, y, \tau, \xi) = \sum_{k \in \Lambda} a_k(s, y, \tau) E_k e^{ik \cdot \xi}, \quad (6.21)$$

where $\Lambda = \bigcup_{j=1}^8 \Lambda_j$, and we define the amplitude coefficients as (recall that γ_n was defined in Equ.

(6.20))

$$a_k(s, y, \tau) := 1_{\{k \in \Lambda_j\}} \sqrt{\rho_\ell(s, y)} \underbrace{\gamma_k^{(j)} \left(\frac{R_\ell(s, y)}{\rho_\ell(s, y)} \right)}_{=\Gamma(s, y)} \underbrace{\psi_k^{(j)}(\tilde{v}(s, y), \tau)}_{=\Psi(s, y, \tau)},$$

$$\begin{aligned} R_\ell(s, y) &:= \rho_\ell(s, y) \text{Id} - \dot{R}_\ell(s, y), \\ \rho_\ell(s, y) &:= \tilde{\rho}_\ell(s, y) + \gamma_n(s), \end{aligned} \tag{6.22}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}_\ell(s, y) &:= \frac{2}{r_0} \sqrt{\eta^2 \delta_{n+1}^2 + |\dot{R}_\ell(s, y)|^2}, \\ \tilde{v}(s, y) &:= v_\ell(y, s) + \dot{\phi}_{n+1}(y, s). \end{aligned} \tag{6.23}$$

First, we summarize the estimates on the functions $\tilde{\rho}_\ell$.

Lemma 6.2. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\rho}_\ell\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x} &\leq \frac{4}{r_0} L_n \eta \delta_{n+1}, \\ \|\tilde{\rho}_\ell\|_{C_{\leq t_L, x}^1} &\leq C L_n \ell^{-1} \eta \delta_{n+1}. \end{aligned}$$

For the proof see Section 8.1.

Hence we immediately obtain by the above lemma and the choice of η in Section 6.5

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho_\ell\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x} &\leq \frac{4}{r_0} L_n \eta \delta_{n+1} + \frac{1}{3(2\pi)^3} \left(\frac{5}{4} \bar{e} + C\eta(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}) \right) \delta_n \\ &\leq C L_n \left(\bar{e} + \eta(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}) \right) \delta_n \leq C L_n \bar{e} \delta_n, \\ \|\rho_\ell\|_{C_t C_x} &\geq C \underline{e} \delta_n. \end{aligned}$$

In the course of the convex integration analysis we need to control various norms of the amplitude a which we collect in the following proposition. The proof closely follows [23], however in our context, we need to specify the exact dependence on the energy profile.

Proposition 6.3. *For $\delta \in [0, 1]$ and $t \in [0, t_L]$*

$$\|a_k\|_{C_y^\delta} \leq C_e^{(1), \delta} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}} \mu^\delta \varsigma_{n+1}^{\delta(\alpha-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{6.24}$$

$$\|\partial_\tau a_k\|_{C_y^\delta} \leq C_e^{(2), \delta} (1 + M_v) L_n^{\frac{7}{2}} \mu^\delta \varsigma_{n+1}^{(\delta+1)(\alpha-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{6.25}$$

$$\|\partial_\tau a_k + i(k \cdot \tilde{v}) a_k\|_{C_y^\delta} \leq C_e^{(3), \delta} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}} \mu^{\delta-1} \varsigma_{n+1}^{\delta(\alpha-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{6.26}$$

$$\|\partial_s a_k\|_{C_y} \leq C_e^{(4), 0} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}} \mu \varsigma_{n+1}^{\alpha-2} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{6.27}$$

and for $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in [0, t_L]$,

$$\|a_k\|_{C_y^r} \leq C_e^{(5), r} L_n^{r+\frac{3}{2}} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu^r \varsigma_{n+1}^{r(\alpha-1)}, \tag{6.28}$$

$$\|\partial_\tau a_k\|_{C_y^r} \leq C_e^{(6), r} (1 + M_v) L_n^{r+2} \mu^r \varsigma_{n+1}^{(r+1)(\alpha-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{6.29}$$

$$\|\partial_\tau a_k + i(k \cdot \tilde{v}) a_k\|_{C_y^r} \leq C_e^{(7), r} L_n^{r+1} \mu^{r-1} \varsigma_{n+1}^{r(\alpha-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{6.30}$$

$$\|\partial_s a_k\|_{C_y^r} \leq C_e^{(8), r} L_n^{2r+\frac{5}{2}} \mu^{r+1} \varsigma_{n+1}^{r(\alpha-1)-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} (D_n \ell^{1-r} + \varsigma_{n+1}^{\alpha-1}), \tag{6.31}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
C_e^{(1),\delta} &= C \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} + \underline{e}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \eta^{1-\delta} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \eta^{1-\delta} \underline{e}^{-1} \right), \\
C_e^{(2),\delta} &\sim C_e^{(1),\delta}, \\
C_e^{(3),\delta} &\sim C_e^{(1),\delta}, \\
C_e^{(4),0} &= C \left(\frac{\eta(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}) + |e|_{C^1}}{\sqrt{\bar{e}}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} (1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \eta^{-1} |e|_{C^1}) \right) \right) \right), \\
C_e^{(5),r} &= C \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + C_e^{(r)} \eta + \eta^2 \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} C_e^{(j)} C_e^{(r-j)} \right), \\
C_e^{(6),r} &\sim C_e^{(5),r}, \\
C_e^{(7),r} &\sim C_e^{(5),r}, \\
C_e^{(8),r} &= C_e^{\partial_s(1),r} + C_e^{\partial_s(2),r} + C_e^{\partial_s(3),r},
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
C_e^{(r)} &= 1 + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\bar{e}} \sum_{j=1}^r \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^j \sim \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\bar{e}} \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^r, \\
C_e^{\partial_s(1),r} &= C \left(\frac{\eta(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}) + |e|_{C^1}}{\sqrt{\bar{e}}} + C_e^{\partial_s \sqrt{\bar{e}},r} \right) \left(1 + \eta C_e^{(r)} \right), \\
C_e^{\partial_s(2),r} &= C \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \eta C_e^{(r)} \right) \left(\left(1 + \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} (1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \eta^{-1} |e|_{C^1}) \right) \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} + C_e^{\partial_s \Gamma,r} \right), \\
C_e^{\partial_s(3),r} &= C \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \eta C_e^{(r)} + \eta^2 \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} C_e^{(j)} C_e^{(r-j)} \right), \\
C_e^{\partial_s \sqrt{\bar{e}},r} &= C \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \left(1 + C_e^{(r)} (\eta(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}) + |e|_{C^1}) \right), \\
C_e^{\partial_s \Gamma,r} &= C \left(\frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} (1 + \eta C_e^{(r)}) + \eta(1 + \eta) \left(\frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} \right)^2 (1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \eta^{-1} |e|_{C^1}) \left(C_e^{(r)} + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} C_e^{(i)} C_e^{(r-i)} \right) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

For the proof, see Section 8.1. Furthermore, note that the constants $C_e^{(r)}$ and $C_e^{(5),r}$ are monotone nondecreasing in r . Moreover, by this monotonicity, we see that all the r -dependent constants except for $C_e^{(1),r}$, $C_e^{(2),r}$ and $C_e^{(3),r}$ are monotone nondecreasing in $r > 0$.

Denote $C_e^{(j),r+\delta} := (C_e^{(j),r+1})^\delta (C_e^{(j),r})^{1-\delta}$. Furthermore it holds for $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_L]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(v_\ell \cdot \nabla_y) a_k\|_{C_y} &\leq C \|v_\ell\|_{C_y} \|a_k\|_{C_y^1} \leq C C_e^{(1),1} \mu \zeta_{n+1}^{\alpha-1} M_v L_n^{\frac{7}{2}} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\
[(v_\ell \cdot \nabla_y) a_k]_{C_s C_y^r} &\leq C \|v_\ell\|_{C_y} [a_k]_{C_y^{r+1}} + C \sum_{j=1}^r [v_\ell]_j [a_k]_{C_s C_y^{r+1-j}} \\
&\leq C M_v L_n^{r+\frac{5}{2}} C_e^{(5),r+1} \mu^{r+1} \zeta_{n+1}^{(r+1)(\alpha-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad + C \sum_{j=1}^r M_v L_n^{r-j+\frac{5}{2}} \ell^{-j} C_e^{(5),r+1-j} \mu^{r+1-j} \zeta_{n+1}^{(r+1-j)(\alpha-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C \left(\sum_{j=1}^{r+1} C_e^{(5),j} \right) M_v L_n^{r+\frac{5}{2}} \mu^{r+1} \zeta_{n+1}^{(r+1)(\alpha-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\stackrel{C_e^{(5),j} \text{ monotone}}{\leq} C C_e^{(5),r+1} M_v L_n^{r+\frac{5}{2}} \mu^{r+1} \zeta_{n+1}^{(r+1)(\alpha-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

6.6.1 The principal part

We define the principal part of the perturbation using the functions defined in the previous section:

$$w_o(t, x) := W(t, x, \lambda t, \lambda \phi_{n+1}(t, x)).$$

By choice of $\gamma_k^{(j)}, \psi_k^{(j)}$, one can immediately see that for $t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_L]$

$$|w_o(t, x)| \leq C \sum_k |a_k(t, x, \lambda t)| \leq C \sqrt{|\rho_\ell(t, x)|} \leq C L_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\bar{e}} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (6.32)$$

From [23, Corollary 4.2], we obtain

Proposition 6.4. *Let $W = W(y, s, \xi, \tau)$ be defined by (6.21). Then we have*

$$W \otimes W(y, s, \xi, \tau) = R_\ell(y, s) + \sum_{1 \leq |k| \leq 2\lambda_0} U_k(y, s, \tau) e^{ik \cdot \xi}, \quad (6.33)$$

where $U_k \in C_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2, \mathcal{S}^{3 \times 3})$, $k \in \Lambda$, satisfies $U_k k = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(U_k) k$. Moreover, for any fixed $s \leq \mathfrak{t}_L, \tau \leq \lambda \mathfrak{t}_L, L \geq 1$, and for every $\delta \in (0, 1], r \in \mathbb{N}, 2 \leq r \leq r_* + 5$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|U_k(\cdot, s, \tau)\|_{C_x^\delta} &\leq C L_n^3 \sqrt{\bar{e}} C_e^{(1),\delta} \mu^\delta \zeta_{n+1}^{\delta(\alpha-1)} \delta_n, \\
\|U_k(\cdot, s, \tau)\|_{C_x^r} &\leq C L_n^{2r+3} C_e^{(7),r} \mu^r \zeta_{n+1}^{r(\alpha-1)} \delta_n.
\end{aligned}$$

For the proof, see Section 8.2. Moreover, we have the following estimates for w_o .

Lemma 6.5. *Fix $r \geq r_* + 2$. Then for $\delta \in (0, 1)$ sufficiently small it holds*

$$\begin{aligned}
\|w_o\|_{C_{\leq \mathfrak{t}_L} C_x^\delta} &\leq C L^{2\delta} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}} C_e^{(1),\delta} \lambda^\delta \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\
\|w_o\|_{C_{\leq \mathfrak{t}_L} C_x^{1+\delta}} &\leq C L^{2(1+\delta)} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}+2\delta} (C_e^{(1),1} + (C_e^{(5),2})^\delta (C_e^{(1),1})^{1-\delta}) \lambda^{1+\delta} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\
\|\partial_t w_o\|_{C_{\leq \mathfrak{t}_L} C_x^0} &\leq C_e^{\partial_t w_o} L^{3(1+\delta)} L_n^{\frac{9}{2}} \lambda^{1+\delta} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

with $C_e^{\partial_t w_o}$ specified in the proof.

The proof can also be found in Section 8.2.

6.6.2 The corrector terms

Let $\mathcal{P} := I - \mathcal{Q}$ be the classical Leray–Helmholtz projector on zero-mean, divergence-free vector fields. As before, define the corresponding flowed operators

$$\mathcal{P}_{\phi_{n+1}} v := [\mathcal{P}(v \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})] \circ \phi_{n+1}, \quad \mathcal{Q}_{\phi_{n+1}} v := [\mathcal{Q}(v \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})] \circ \phi_{n+1}.$$

Then using the definitions we can see that

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} \mathcal{P}_{\phi_{n+1}} v &= [\operatorname{div}(\mathcal{P}(v \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}))] \circ \phi_{n+1} = 0, \\ \operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} \mathcal{Q}_{\phi_{n+1}} v &= [\operatorname{div}(\mathcal{Q}(v \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}))] \circ \phi_{n+1} = \operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} v. \end{aligned}$$

Further, denoting by ψ the zero-mean solution of the Poisson equation $\Delta_{\phi_{n+1}} \psi = \operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} v$, where $\Delta_{\phi_{n+1}} v := [\Delta(v \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})] \circ \phi_{n+1}$, we have the alternative representation

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\phi_{n+1}} v = \nabla_{\phi_{n+1}} \psi + \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v dx,$$

if $v \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3; \mathbb{R}^3)$. As in [23], the strategy to control $\operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} v_{n+1}$, is to recall $v_{n+1} = v_\ell + w_o + w_c$ for an as yet undetermined w_c , and think of the flowed divergences of the two terms known so far. For the first term it is

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} v_\ell &= \operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} v_\ell - (\operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} v_n) * \chi_\ell + (\operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} v_n) * \chi_\ell - (\operatorname{div}_{\phi_n} v_n) * \chi_\ell \\ &\quad + (\operatorname{div}_{\phi_n} v_n) * \chi_\ell. \end{aligned}$$

The terms of the first line look like they might be controllable via mollification estimates and closeness of the flow maps ϕ_{n+1}, ϕ_n , so only the last term creates problems. We want to compensate for this term while still having a manageable time derivative. This led in [23] to the choice

$$w_c^1 := -(\mathcal{Q}^{\phi_n} v_\ell) * \chi_\ell,$$

which turns out to be what is needed¹. The other term to be controlled is the principal part, and we do this in the “easy” way by requiring

$$\operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} (w_o + w_c^2) = 0,$$

i.e.

$$w_c^2 := -\mathcal{Q}^{\phi_{n+1}} w_o.$$

We then define the total corrector term as

$$w_c := w_c^1 + w_c^2.$$

The main estimates for the corrector terms are summarised in the following lemma.

Lemma 6.6. *For $\delta \in (0, 1)$ sufficiently small, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_c^1\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^\delta} &\leq CL^7 L_n (1 + M_v^{2\delta}) \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}}, \\ \|w_c^1\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^{1+\delta}} &\leq CL^7 L_n (1 + M_v^{2\delta}) \ell^{-1} \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}}, \\ \|w_c^2\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^\delta} &\leq CL^{1+2\delta} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}+\delta} (C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta}) \lambda^{\delta-1} \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{\gamma-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ \|w_c^2\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^{1+\delta}} &\leq CL^{3+2\delta} L_n^{\frac{7}{2}+\delta} (C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta}) \lambda^\delta \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{\gamma-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

The definitions of the energy-dependent constants can be found in Proposition 6.3.

The proof will be presented in Section 8.3.

¹Since we want to control the divergence here, it is enough to project the divergence-free part of v_ℓ away and hence use \mathcal{Q}_{ϕ_n} !

6.6.3 The total perturbation

Finally, we define the new velocity field by

$$v_{n+1} := v_\ell + w_{n+1} := v_\ell + w_o + w_c, \quad (6.34)$$

where $w_{n+1} := w_o + w_c^1 + w_c^2$ is the total perturbation. The estimates for these are given in the following lemma.

Lemma 6.7. *We have for $\delta \in (0, 1)$ sufficiently small,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_{n+1}\|_{C_{\leq t_L}^0 C_x^\delta} &\leq C \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta}\right) L^{1+2\delta} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}+\delta} \lambda^\delta \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ \|w_{n+1}\|_{C_{\leq t_L}^0 C_x^{1+\delta}} &\leq C \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + (C_e^{(5),2})^\delta (C_e^{(1),1})^{1-\delta} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta}\right) L^{3+2\delta} L_n^{7/2+\delta} \delta_n^{1/2} \lambda^{1+\delta}, \\ \|v_{n+1}\|_{C_{\leq t_L}^0 C_x^{1+\delta}} &\leq C \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v + C_e^{(1),1} + (C_e^{(5),2})^\delta (C_e^{(1),1})^{1-\delta} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta}\right) L^{3+2\delta} L_n^{7/2+\delta} \delta_n^{1/2} \lambda^{1+\delta}, \\ \|v_{n+1} - v_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L}^0 C_x^0} &\leq C \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} + \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + \eta + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta}\right) \delta_{n+1}^{1/2}\right) L^{1+2\delta} L_n^{5/2+3\delta} \delta_n^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof can be found in Section 8.4.

6.7 The Reynolds stress and the new pressure

Let us recall the definition of the right-inverse operator for $\operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}}$ from [23, Lemma 3.4].

Lemma 6.8. *Let $v \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)$ and $\mathcal{R}v$ be the matrix-valued function defined in [14, Definition 4.2], so that $\mathcal{R}v$ takes values in the space $\mathcal{S}_0^{3 \times 3}$ of symmetric trace-free matrices and $\operatorname{div} \mathcal{R}v = v - \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v$. Then the operator $\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}}$ defined as*

$$\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} v := [\mathcal{R}(v \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})] \circ \phi_{n+1}$$

satisfies $\operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}}(\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} v) = v - \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v$.

Let us recall the equation at stage n :

$$\partial_t v_n + \operatorname{div}_{\phi_n}(v_n \otimes v_n) + \nabla_{\phi_n} q_n + (-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha v_n = \operatorname{div}_{\phi_n} \mathring{R}_n.$$

Given that we have constructed all the terms on the left-hand side of the above equation at stage $n+1$ in the previous sections, we can simply define

$$\mathring{R}_{n+1} := \mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} \left(\partial_t v_{n+1} + \operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}}(v_{n+1} \otimes v_{n+1}) + \nabla_{\phi_{n+1}} q_{n+1} + (-\Delta)_{\phi_{n+1}}^\alpha v_{n+1} \right).$$

To investigate the structure of this new stress term, recall that $v_{n+1} = v_\ell + w_o + w_c = v_\ell + w_{n+1}$. Moreover, recall the equation for $v_\ell = v_n * \chi_\ell$:

$$\partial_t v_\ell + \chi_\ell * \operatorname{div}_{\phi_n}(v_n \otimes v_n) + \chi_\ell * \nabla_{\phi_n} q_n + \chi_\ell * (-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha v_n = \chi_\ell * \operatorname{div}_{\phi_n} \mathring{R}_n. \quad (6.35)$$

Now, conceptually speaking, there are three sources of errors in the equation at stage $n+1$:

1. **Perturbation errors**, i.e. errors having to do with w_{n+1} , i.e. R^{tra} , R^{osc} , R^{compr} and R^{diss} .
2. **Flow errors** from the mismatch between having all operators flowed along ϕ_n at stage n and wanting to have all operators flowed along ϕ_{n+1} at stage $n+1$ while still wanting to use the equation at stage n to cancel lower-order terms. There is one further error coming from the transport error because there we really want to have a transport-type term $(v_\ell \cdot \nabla_{\phi_{n+1}})w_o$ and not $\operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}}(v_\ell \otimes w_o)$. The difference between the two terms is non-zero because of the flow.

3. **Mollification errors** from using v_ℓ in v_{n+1} instead of v_n . They basically arise from Equ. (6.35).

Compared with the case of the Euler equations in [23], all three types of error need to be modified when we introduce a dissipative term $(-\Delta)^\alpha u$ to the equation. We will now proceed to derive the stress decomposition at stage $n+1$. As usual, we do so by plugging in our ansatz $v_{n+1} = v_\ell + w_o + w_c$ and attempt to use our knowledge about the previous stage via v_ℓ . We write terms arising from the fractional Laplacian in blue color.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \partial_t v_{n+1} + \operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}}(v_{n+1} \otimes v_{n+1}) + \nabla_{\phi_{n+1}} q_\ell - \nabla_{\phi_{n+1}} \frac{1}{2} [|w_o|^2 - \tilde{p}_\ell] + (-\Delta)_{\phi_{n+1}}^\alpha v_{n+1} \\
& \stackrel{\text{Equ. (6.35)}}{=} \underbrace{[\partial_t w_o + \operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}}(v_\ell \otimes w_o) - w_o \operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} v_\ell]}_{\text{transport error}} + \underbrace{(-\Delta)_{\phi_{n+1}}^\alpha w_{n+1}}_{\text{dissipative error}} \\
& + \underbrace{\operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} \left(w_o \otimes w_o - \frac{1}{2} (|w_o|^2 - \tilde{p}_\ell) \operatorname{Id} - \mathring{R}_\ell \right)}_{\text{oscillation error}} \\
& + \underbrace{(\operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} - \operatorname{div}_{\phi_n}) \mathring{R}_\ell + (\operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} - \operatorname{div}_{\phi_n})(v_\ell \otimes v_\ell)}_{\text{flow error, I}} \\
& + \underbrace{\left((-\Delta)_{\phi_{n+1}}^\alpha - (-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha \right) v_\ell + (\nabla_{\phi_{n+1}} - \nabla_{\phi_n}) q_\ell + w_o \operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} v_\ell}_{\text{flow error, II}} \\
& + \underbrace{\left(\operatorname{div}_{\phi_n} \mathring{R}_\ell - (\operatorname{div}_{\phi_n} \mathring{R}_n) * \chi_\ell \right) + (\operatorname{div}_{\phi_n}(v_\ell \otimes v_\ell) - \operatorname{div}_{\phi_n}(v_n \otimes v_n) * \chi_\ell)}_{\text{mollification error, I}} \\
& + \underbrace{\left((-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha v_\ell - ((-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha v_n) * \chi_\ell \right) + (\nabla_{\phi_n} q_\ell - (\nabla_{\phi_n} q_n) * \chi_\ell)}_{\text{mollification error, II}} \\
& + \underbrace{\partial_t w_c + \operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}}(v_\ell \otimes w_c + w_o \otimes v_\ell + w_o \otimes w_c + w_c \otimes v_{n+1})}_{\text{compressibility error}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that, strictly speaking, the terms dubbed “error” in the above equation are the $\operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}}$ of the respective stress term, see the next section.

Compared with [23], three new error terms appear: the dissipative error and the first terms in the flow error, II and mollification error, II, respectively. Except for the terms involving α , all the other terms still satisfy the same bounds as in [23]. We will have to be careful to track the exact energy dependence of all terms, but apart from that we will mostly have to deal with the “new” terms.

With this definition we see that

$$\partial_t v_{n+1} + \operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}}(v_{n+1} \otimes v_{n+1}) + \nabla_{\phi_{n+1}} q_{n+1} + (-\Delta)_{\phi_{n+1}}^\alpha v_{n+1} = \operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} \mathring{R}_{n+1},$$

i.e. $(v_{n+1}, q_{n+1}, \phi_{n+1}, \mathring{R}_{n+1})$ is a solution to (4.6) at stage $n+1$ if we set

$$q_{n+1} := q_\ell - \frac{1}{2} (|w_o|^2 - \tilde{p}_\ell),$$

recalling that $\tilde{\rho}_\ell := \frac{2}{r_0} \sqrt{\eta^2 \delta_{n+1}^2 + |\mathring{R}_\ell|^2}$. Note that in the definition Equ. (6.22) of ρ_ℓ , there is an x -independent part γ_n . As the pressure appears inside a derivative, we do not need this part here and hence only have $\tilde{\rho}_\ell$, not the full ρ_ℓ .

6.7.1 Transport error

Proposition 6.9. *Let us denote $\mathring{R}^{\text{tra}} := \mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}}(\partial_t w_o + (v_\ell \cdot \nabla_{\phi_{n+1}})w_o)$. Then for every $r \geq r_\star + 2$ and $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small, it holds that almost surely for every $L \in \mathbb{N}$, $L \geq 1$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathring{R}^{\text{tra}}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x} &\leq C \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} + C_e^{(7),r} + C_e^{(7),r+\delta} + \left(C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),r+1} + C_e^{(5),r+\delta+1} \right) M_v + C_e^{(4),0} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + C_e^{(8),r} + C_e^{(8),r+\delta} \right) L^{r+2\delta} L_n^{2(r+\delta)+\frac{5}{2}} \lambda^\delta \mu^{-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ \|\mathring{R}^{\text{tra}}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^1} &\leq C \left(C_e^{(3),0} + \left(C_e^{(3),1} \right)^\delta \left(C_e^{(3),0} \right)^{1-\delta} + \left(C_e^{(1),1} + \left(C_e^{(5),2} \right)^\delta \left(C_e^{(1),1} \right)^{1-\delta} \right) M_v \right. \\ &\quad \left. + C_e^{(4),0} + \left(C_e^{(8),1} \right)^\delta \left(C_e^{(4),0} \right)^{1-\delta} \right) L^{3(1+\delta)} L_n^{\frac{7}{2}} \lambda^{1+\delta} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

For the proof, see Section 8.5.

6.7.2 Oscillation error

Proposition 6.10. *Let us denote $\mathring{R}^{\text{osc}} := \mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} \text{div}_{\phi_{n+1}}(w_o \otimes w_o - \frac{1}{2}(|w_o|^2 - \tilde{\rho}_\ell) Id + \mathring{R}_\ell)$. Then for every $r \geq r_\star + 1$ and $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small, it holds that almost surely for every $L \in \mathbb{N}$, $L \geq 1$*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathring{R}^{\text{osc}}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x} &\leq C \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(7),r+1} + C_e^{(7),r+\delta+1} \right) L^{r+2\delta+1} L_n^{2(r+\delta)+5} \lambda^{\delta-1} \mu \zeta_{n+1}^{\gamma-1} \delta_n, \\ \|\mathring{R}^{\text{osc}}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^1} &\leq C \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} C_e^{(1),1} + \left(C_e^{(7),2} \right)^\delta \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} C_e^{(1),1} \right)^{1-\delta} \right) L^{4(1+\delta)} L_n^{3+4\delta} \lambda^{1+\delta} \delta_n. \end{aligned}$$

For the proof see Section 8.6.

6.7.3 Flow error

Let us define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathring{R}_1^{\text{flow}} &:= \mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} \left[\left(\text{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} - \text{div}_{\phi_n} \right) \mathring{R}_\ell + \left(\text{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} - \text{div}_{\phi_n} \right) (v_\ell \otimes v_\ell) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\nabla_{\phi_{n+1}} - \nabla_{\phi_n} \right) q_\ell + w_o \text{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} v_\ell \right], \\ \mathring{R}_2^{\text{flow}} &:= \mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} \left[\left((-\Delta)_{\phi_{n+1}}^\alpha - (-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha \right) v_\ell \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 6.11. *For $r \geq r^\star + 2$, $\delta \in (0, 1)$ sufficiently small and $\gamma' \in (\gamma_\star, \gamma)$ it holds that almost surely for every $L \in \mathbb{N}$, $L \geq 1$*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathring{R}_1^{\text{flow}}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x} &\leq C \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} + M_v^2 + M_q + C_e^{(5),r+1} \right) L^{r+2+\delta} L_n^{r+\frac{7}{2}} \ell^{-\delta} (n+1) \zeta_n^{\gamma'}, \\ \|\mathring{R}_1^{\text{flow}}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^1} &\leq C \left(\eta + M_v^2 + M_q + C_e^{(1),\delta} \right) L^{4(1+\delta)} L_n^4 \ell^{-1-\delta} (n+1) \zeta_n^{\gamma'}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof can be found in Section 8.7.1.

Proposition 6.12. *For $\delta \in (0, 1)$ sufficiently small and $\gamma' \in (\gamma_\star, \gamma)$ it holds that almost surely for every $L \in \mathbb{N}$, $L \geq 1$*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathring{R}_2^{\text{flow}}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x} &\leq C L^{26} M_v D_n^{\delta+2\alpha} (n+1) \zeta_n^{\frac{1}{48}\gamma'}, \\ \|\mathring{R}_2^{\text{flow}}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^1} &\leq C M_v L_n^5 \ell^{-1-\delta-2\alpha} (n+1) \zeta_n^{\gamma'}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof can be found in Section 8.7.2. Combining these estimates, we finally arrive at

Proposition 6.13. Let $\mathring{R}^{\text{flow}} := \mathring{R}_1^{\text{flow}} + \mathring{R}_2^{\text{flow}}$. For $\delta \in (0, 1)$ sufficiently small and $\gamma' \in (\gamma_*, \gamma)$, it holds that almost surely for every $L \in \mathbb{N}$, $L \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathring{R}^{\text{flow}}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x} &\leq C \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} + C_e^{(5), r+1} + M_v + M_v^2 + M_q \right) L^{r+2+\delta} L_n^{r+7/2} \ell^{-\delta-2\alpha} (n+1) \zeta_n^{\frac{1}{48}\gamma'}, \\ \|\mathring{R}^{\text{flow}}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^1} &\leq C \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} + C_e^{(1), 1} + M_v + M_v^2 + M_q \right) L^2 L_n^5 \ell^{-1-\delta-2\alpha} (n+1) \zeta_n^{\gamma'}. \end{aligned}$$

6.7.4 Mollification error

Let us define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathring{R}_1^{\text{moll}} &:= \mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} \text{div}_{\phi_n} [((v_\ell \otimes v_\ell) - (v_n \otimes v_n) * \chi_\ell)], \\ \mathring{R}_2^{\text{moll}} &:= \mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} \left[\left(\text{div}_{\phi_n} \mathring{R}_\ell - (\text{div}_{\phi_n} \mathring{R}_n) * \chi_\ell \right) + (\nabla_{\phi_n} q_\ell - (\nabla_{\phi_n} q_n) * \chi_\ell) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \text{div}_{\phi_n} ((v_n \otimes v_n) * \chi_\ell) - (\text{div}_{\phi_n} (v_n \otimes v_n)) * \chi_\ell \right], \\ \mathring{R}_3^{\text{moll}} &:= \mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} [((-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha v_\ell - ((-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha v_n) * \chi_\ell)]. \end{aligned}$$

Recall from [23] the following estimates for the first two terms:

Proposition 6.14. For $\delta \in (0, 1)$ sufficiently small, almost surely for every $L \in \mathbb{N}$, $L \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathring{R}_1^{\text{moll}}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x} + \|\mathring{R}_2^{\text{moll}}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x} &\leq C(1 + M_v) L^{7+4\delta} L_n^2 D_n \ell^\gamma, \\ \|\mathring{R}_1^{\text{moll}}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^1} + \|\mathring{R}_2^{\text{moll}}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^1} &\leq C(1 + M_v) L^{3+2\delta} L_n^2 D_n \ell^{-\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof follows easily from a brief inspection of the proof of [23, Proposition 4.5].
For the new error term, we get the following.

Proposition 6.15. Let $\beta = \frac{\gamma}{48}$. For $\delta \in (0, 1)$ sufficiently small, almost surely for every $L \in \mathbb{N}$, $L \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathring{R}_3^{\text{moll}}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x} &\leq C(1 + M_v^{1-\beta} + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} + M_v) L^{16} L_n (D_n \ell^\gamma + \ell^\beta D_n^\beta), \\ \|\mathring{R}_3^{\text{moll}}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^1} &\leq C(1 + M_v^{1-\beta} + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} + M_v) L^{1+4\delta+2\alpha} L_n \ell^{-2\delta-4\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof will be given in Section 8.8. Finally, combining the previous propositions, we get the following statement for the total mollification error.

Proposition 6.16. For $\delta \in (0, 1)$ sufficiently small, almost surely for every $L \in \mathbb{N}$, $L \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathring{R}^{\text{moll}}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x} &\leq C(1 + M_v^{1-\beta} + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} + M_v) L^{7+4\delta} L_n^2 (\ell^\gamma D_n + \ell^\beta D_n^\beta), \\ \|\mathring{R}^{\text{moll}}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^1} &\leq C(1 + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} + M_v) L^{3+2\delta} L_n^2 D_n \ell^{-2\delta-4\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

6.7.5 Compressibility error

Proposition 6.17. Let us denote

$$\mathring{R}^{\text{comp}} := \mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} \left[\partial_t w_c + \text{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} (v_\ell \otimes w_c + w_o \otimes v_\ell + w_o \otimes w_c + w_c \otimes v_{n+1}) \right].$$

Then for every $r \geq r_* + 1$, $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small, almost surely for every $L \in \mathbb{N}$, $L \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathring{R}^{\text{comp}}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x} &\leq C \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{\text{comp}, 2, \delta} + C_e^{\text{comp}, 3, \delta} + C_e^{\text{comp}, 4, \delta} \right) L^{12+6\delta} L_n^{2(r+\delta)+\frac{9}{2}} \lambda^\delta \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}}, \\ \|\mathring{R}^{\text{comp}}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^1} &\leq C \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{\text{comp}, 2, 1+\delta} + C_e^{\text{comp}, 3, 1+\delta} + C_e^{\text{comp}, 4, 1+\delta} \right) L^{8+5\delta} L_n^{\frac{13}{2}+4\delta} \lambda^{1+\delta} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}}, \end{aligned}$$

with constants $C_e^{\text{comp}, 2, \delta}$, $C_e^{\text{comp}, 3, \delta}$, $C_e^{\text{comp}, 4, \delta}$, $C_e^{\text{comp}, 2, 1+\delta}$, $C_e^{\text{comp}, 3, 1+\delta}$, $C_e^{\text{comp}, 4, 1+\delta}$ specified in the proof.

The proof will be presented in Section 8.9.

6.7.6 Dissipative error

Let us denote the dissipative error by

$$R^{\text{diss}} := \mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} \left((-\Delta)_{\phi_{n+1}}^\alpha w_{n+1} \right).$$

Proposition 6.18. *For $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small, we have almost surely for every $L \in \mathbb{N}$, $L \geq 1$*

$$\begin{aligned} \|R^{\text{diss}}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^0} &\leq C \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),0} + C_e^{(5),r} + C_e^{(5),r+\delta} \right)^{1-2\alpha-\delta} \\ &\quad \cdot \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right)^{2\alpha+\delta} \\ &\quad \cdot L^{r+1+3\delta} L_n^{r+3/2+\delta} \ell^{(1+d(1/p-1)-2\delta)(1-2\alpha-\delta)} \lambda^{\delta(2\alpha+\delta)} \delta_{n+2}^{6/5(1-2\alpha-\delta)}, \\ \|R^{\text{diss}}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^1} &\leq C \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right)^{1-2\alpha-\delta} \\ &\quad \cdot \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + (C_e^{(5),2})^\delta (C_e^{(1),1})^{1-\delta} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta} \right)^{2\alpha+\delta} \\ &\quad \cdot L^{9+4\delta} L_n^{7/2+\delta} \delta_n^{1/2} \lambda^{2\alpha+3\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof will be given in Section 8.10.

6.8 The divergence

Proposition 6.19. *For every δ sufficiently small and $\gamma' \in (0, \gamma)$, for all $L \in \mathbb{N}$, $L \geq 1$ the following holds almost surely*

$$\|\text{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} v_{n+1}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} B_{\infty,\infty}^{-1}} \leq C(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v^{1-\delta} + M_v)L^{10}L_n(D_n^{1+2\delta}\ell^\gamma + D_n^\delta(n+1)\zeta_n^{\gamma'}).$$

The proof will be given in Section 8.11

6.9 The pressure

Recall the definition of the new pressure q_{n+1} and the energy pumping term $\tilde{\rho}_\ell$

$$q_{n+1} = q_\ell - \frac{1}{2} (|w_o|^2 - \tilde{\rho}_\ell), \quad \tilde{\rho}_\ell(x, t) = \frac{2}{r_0} \sqrt{\eta^2 \delta_{n+1}^2 + |\mathring{R}_\ell(x, t)|^2}.$$

Proposition 6.20. *Let*

$$M_q := C(1 + \eta + \bar{e}). \tag{6.36}$$

Then for every $L \in \mathbb{N}$, $L \geq 1$ it holds almost surely

$$\|q_{n+1} - q_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x} \leq M_q L_n \delta_n.$$

Moreover, for every $\delta \in (0, 1)$ sufficiently small and for every $L \in \mathbb{N}$, $L \geq 1$, it holds almost surely

$$\|q_{n+1} - q_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L, x}^1} \leq CL^{3(1+\delta)} L_n^5 \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(C_e^{\partial_t w_o} + C_e^{(1),\delta} + (C_e^{(5),2})^\delta (C_e^{(1),1})^{1-\delta} \right) + \eta + 1 \right) \lambda^{1+\delta} \delta_n.$$

The proof can be found in Section 8.12.

6.10 The kinetic energy

Proposition 6.21. *Recall the definition of r_0 from Section 6.6.1. Up to choosing C_ς, C_μ large enough, the following holds true almost surely:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| e(t)(1 - \delta_{n+1}) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |v_{n+1}(t, x)|^2 dx \right| \\ & \leq C \left(\left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta}\right)^2 + M_v C_e^{(1),1} + \sqrt{\bar{e}}(1 + C_e^{(1),1}) \right) \lambda^{2\delta} \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}} + \frac{9\eta}{r_0} \delta_{n+1}. \end{aligned}$$

We will give the proof in Section 8.13 below.

7 Proof of the main iterative proposition

In this section, simply speaking, we have to achieve three objectives:

1. Choosing m and r such that all of the expressions of powers of L and L_n can be bounded by L_{n+1} . This will be done in Section 7.3.
2. Choosing the *exponential parameters* m, b, c, \dots such that the various products of parameters in the estimates can be bounded by the desired simple powers such as δ_{n+2} in each iterative estimate. This will also be done in Section 7.3.
3. Choosing the *base parameter* a such that we can absorb all energy-dependent constants for any n , and choose the constant M_v of Equ. (4.12). We will do this in Sections 7.4, 7.5, respectively.

In order to derive all conditions on these parameters, we employ the estimates of the previous sections, which will be done in Sections 7.1 and 7.2.

7.1 C^0 estimates

The progressive measurability of v_{n+1}, q_{n+1} and \mathring{R}_{n+1} follows directly from their definitions.

Estimate for $q_{n+1} - q_n$: Iterative inequality Equ. (4.13) follows directly from Proposition 6.20.

Estimate for q_{n+1} : With the previous estimate, the choice $q_0 = 0$ and the iterative inequality of the n -th stage, we get:

$$\|q_{n+1}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^0} \leq \|q_{n+1} - q_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^0} + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \|q_{k+1} - q_k\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^0} \leq M_q L_n \sum_{k=0}^n \delta_k.$$

v_{n+1} **is mean-free:** Recall the definition of v_{n+1} from Equ. (6.34). The operation of mollification preserves the mean-freeness since, for f mean-free and g smooth,

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (f * g)(x) dx = \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} f(x-y) g(y) dy dx \stackrel{z=x-y}{=} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} f(z) g(y) dy dz = \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} f(z) dz \cdot \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} g(y) dy = 0.$$

Similarly, the flowed projector \mathcal{Q}_{ϕ_n} preserves mean-freeness, as for f mean-free,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (\mathcal{Q}_{\phi_n} f)(x) dx & \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (\mathcal{Q}(f \circ \phi_n^{-1})) \circ \phi_n(x) dx \stackrel{y=\phi_n(x)}{=} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \mathcal{Q}(f \circ \phi_n^{-1}) \cdot 1 dy \\ & = \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (I - \mathcal{P}) f(\phi_n^{-1}(y)) dy \stackrel{z=\phi_n^{-1}(y)}{=} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} f(z) dz = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that \mathcal{P} projects onto vector fields of zero mean [14, Definition 4.1].

Therefore, we see that v_ℓ and w_c^1 are mean-free. Moreover, since $w_o + w_c^2 = \mathcal{P}_{\phi_n} w_o$, the other terms of v_{n+1} are mean-free as well which in turn implies that $\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v_{n+1} dx = 0$.

The remaining inequalities will translate into conditions on the size of a in terms of the energy, as we will see. We will collect the requirements on a in the form of lower bounds $a \geq a_i$, $i = 1, \dots, 5$ and in Section 7.4, we will show that we can choose a suitable a satisfying all the requirements.

Estimate for the energy: For Equ. (4.7), we use Proposition 6.21 to find

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| e(t)(1 - \delta_{n+1}) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |v_{n+1}(t, x)|^2 dx \right| \\ & \leq C \left(\left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta}\right)^2 + M_v C_e^{(1),1} + \sqrt{\bar{e}}(1 + C_e^{(1),1}) \right) \lambda^{2\delta} \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}} + \frac{9\eta}{r_0} \delta_{n+1}. \end{aligned}$$

We will need $a \geq a_1$, where a_1 will be determined such that

$$C \left(\left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta}\right)^2 + M_v C_e^{(1),1} + \sqrt{\bar{e}}(1 + C_e^{(1),1}) \right) \lambda^{2\delta} \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}} \leq \frac{\eta}{r_0} \delta_{n+1}. \quad (7.1)$$

This will be done in Section 7.4. Once this is done, Equ. (4.7) follows immediately.

Estimate for $\operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} v_{n+1}$:

$$\|\operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} v_{n+1}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} B_{\infty, \infty}^{-1}} \stackrel{\text{Prop. 6.19}}{\leq} C(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v^{1-\delta} + M_v) L^{10} L_n (D_n^{1+2\delta} \ell^\gamma + D_n^\delta (n+1) \zeta_n^{\gamma'}).$$

In order to achieve iterative estimate Equ. (4.10), we will need both

$$L^{10} L_n \leq L_{n+1} \quad (7.2)$$

as well as $a \geq a_2$, where a_2 is determined such that

$$C(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v^{1-\delta} + M_v) (D_n^{1+2\delta} \ell^\gamma + D_n^\delta (n+1) \zeta_n^{\gamma'}) \leq \delta_{n+3}^{5/4}. \quad (7.3)$$

Estimate for \mathring{R}_{n+1} : We have collected the C^0 estimates for all the stress terms in the following table.

Term	Proposition	Estimate
$\ \mathring{R}^{\text{tra}}\ _{C_{\leq t_L} C_x}$	6.9	$C_e^{\text{tra},0} L^{r+2\delta} L_n^{2(r+\delta)+\frac{5}{2}} \lambda^\delta \mu^{-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}$
$\ \mathring{R}^{\text{osc}}\ _{C_{\leq t_L} C_x}$	6.10	$C_e^{\text{osc},0} L^{r+2\delta+1} L_n^{2(r+\delta)+5} \lambda^{\delta-1} \mu \zeta_{n+1}^{\gamma-1} \delta_n$
$\ \mathring{R}^{\text{flow}}\ _{C_{\leq t_L} C_x}$	6.13	$C_e^{\text{flow},0} L^{r+2+\delta} L_n^{r+7/2} \ell^{-\delta-2\alpha} (n+1) \zeta_n^{\frac{1}{48}\gamma'}$
$\ \mathring{R}^{\text{moll}}\ _{C_{\leq t_L} C_x}$	6.16	$C_e^{\text{moll},0} L^{7+4\delta} L_n^2 (\ell^\gamma D_n + \ell^\beta D_n^\beta)$
$\ \mathring{R}^{\text{comp}}\ _{C_{\leq t_L} C_x}$	6.17	$C_e^{\text{comp},0} L^{12+6\delta} L_n^{2(r+\delta)+\frac{9}{2}} \lambda^\delta \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}}$
$\ \mathring{R}^{\text{diss}}\ _{C_{\leq t_L} C_x}$	6.18	$C_e^{\text{diss},0} L^{r+1+3\delta} L_n^{r+3/2+\delta} \delta_{n+2}^{6/5(1-2\alpha-\delta)}$ $\cdot \ell^{(1+d(1/p-1)-2\delta)(1-2\alpha-\delta)} \lambda^{\delta(2\alpha+\delta)}$

Table 1: Summary of estimates for the $C_{\leq t_L} C_x^0$ -norms of the stress terms. The precise expression for each named constant (e.g. $C_e^{\text{tra},0}$) can be found in their respective propositions.

Recall that our goal is to prove that

$$\|\mathring{R}_{n+1}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^0} \leq \eta L_{n+1} \delta_{n+2}. \quad (7.4)$$

We see from the table that the most restrictive constraints on m come from the requirements

$$L^{7+4\delta} L_n^2 \leq L_{n+1}, \quad (7.5)$$

$$L^{12+6\delta} L_n^{2(r+\delta)+9/2} \leq L_{n+1}. \quad (7.6)$$

Let us define

$$C_e^{\dot{R},0} := C_e^{\text{tra},0} + C_e^{\text{osc},0} + C_e^{\text{flow},0} + C_e^{\text{moll},0} + C_e^{\text{comp},0} + C_e^{\text{diss},0}.$$

Lemma 7.1. *We have*

$$\|\dot{R}_{n+1}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^0} \leq C_e^{\dot{R},0} L_{n+1} \left(\lambda^\delta \delta_n^{1/2} \delta_{n+2}^{6/5} + \ell^{-\delta-2\alpha} (n+1) \delta_{n+3}^{8/3\cdot\beta} \right).$$

Furthermore, the energy-dependent constant $C_e^{\dot{R},0}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} C_e^{\dot{R},0} &\leq \left(\frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^{2r+3} \\ &\cdot C \left(1 + M_v^{1-\beta} + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \frac{|e|C^1}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1+\underline{e}}{\underline{e}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right) \cdot \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

The proof can be found in Section 8.14. To further simplify the expressions, let $\delta > 0$ be small enough such that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &< \alpha, \\ \lambda^\delta \delta_n^{1/2} &\leq 1. \end{aligned} \tag{7.7}$$

We can thus achieve (7.4) if we can ensure that $a \geq \max(a_3, a_4)$ is large enough such that

$$C_e^{\dot{R},0} \delta_{n+2}^{1/5} \leq \frac{\eta}{2}, \tag{7.8}$$

$$C_e^{\dot{R},0} \ell^{-3\alpha} (n+1) \delta_{n+3}^{8/3\cdot\beta} \delta_{n+2}^{-1} \leq \frac{\eta}{2}. \tag{7.9}$$

That this can indeed be done will be shown in Section 7.4.

Estimate for $v_{n+1} - v_n$: We will tend to this estimate in Section 7.5. The reason for this is that, as we will see, the constant M_v depends on a , so we will have to define a first.

7.2 C^1 estimates

Recall that A is chosen such that

$$\max \left\{ \|v_{n+1}\|_{C_{\leq t_L, x}^1}, \|q_{n+1}\|_{C_{\leq t_L, x}^1}, \|\dot{R}_{n+1}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^1} \right\} \leq A L_{n+1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{D_n}{\delta_{n+4}} \right)^{1+\epsilon}.$$

Estimate for \dot{R}_{n+1} : We have collected the C^1 estimates for all the stress terms in Table 7.2.

Let

$$C_e^{\dot{R},1} := C_e^{\text{tra},1} + C_e^{\text{osc},1} + C_e^{\text{flow},1} + C_e^{\text{moll},1} + C_e^{\text{comp},1} + C_e^{\text{diss},1}.$$

We will defer the long calculations to Section 8.14 and summarize the result in the following

Lemma 7.2. *The energy-dependent constant $C_e^{\dot{R},1}$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} C_e^{\dot{R},1} &\leq C \left(\frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^2 \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \cdot \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \frac{|e|C^1}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right)^2 + M_v^{1-\beta} + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}}^{1-\delta} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (M_v^{2\delta} + M_v) \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Term	Proposition	Estimate
$\ \mathring{R}^{\text{tra}}\ _{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^1}$	6.9	$C_e^{\text{tra},1} L^{3(1+\delta)} L_n^{7/2} \lambda^{1+\delta} \delta_n^{1/2}$
$\ \mathring{R}^{\text{osc}}\ _{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^1}$	6.10	$C_e^{\text{osc},1} L^{4(1+\delta)} L_n^{3+4\delta} \lambda^{1+\delta} \delta_n$
$\ \mathring{R}^{\text{flow}}\ _{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^1}$	6.13	$C_e^{\text{flow},1} L^2 L_n^5 \ell^{-1-\delta-2\alpha} (n+1) \varsigma_n^{\gamma'}$
$\ \mathring{R}^{\text{moll}}\ _{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^1}$	6.16	$C_e^{\text{moll},1} L^{3+2\delta} L_n^2 D_n \ell^{-2\delta-4\alpha}$
$\ \mathring{R}^{\text{comp}}\ _{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^1}$	6.17	$C_e^{\text{comp},1} L^{8+5\delta} L_n^{\frac{13}{2}+4\delta} \lambda^{1+\delta} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}}$
$\ \mathring{R}^{\text{diss}}\ _{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^1}$	6.18	$C_e^{\text{diss},1} L^{9+4\delta} L_n^{7/2+\delta} \delta_n^{1/2} \lambda^{2\alpha+3\delta}$

Table 2: Summary of estimates for the $C_{\leq t_L} C_x^1$ -norms of the stress terms. The precise expression for each named constant (e.g. $C_e^{\text{tra},1}$) can be found in their respective propositions.

We claim that

$$\lambda^{1+\delta} \leq \tilde{C} \delta_n^{1/2} \left(\frac{D_n}{\delta_{n+4}} \right)^{1+\epsilon} \quad (7.10)$$

as well as

$$L^{16+2\delta} L_n^{\frac{13}{2}+4\delta} \leq L_{n+1}. \quad (7.11)$$

Both claims will be checked in Section 7.3 below. Next,

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_{n+1}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^1} &\leq \|v_\ell\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^1} + \|w_o\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^1} + \|w_c\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^1} \\ &\leq L_n D_n + CL^{2(1+\delta)} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}+2\delta} (C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta}) \lambda^{1+\delta} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + CL^7 L_n (1 + M_v^{2\delta}) \ell^{-1} \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}} + CL^{3+2\delta} L_n^{\frac{7}{2}+\delta} (C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta}) \lambda^\delta \mu_{\varsigma_{n+1}}^{\alpha-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\stackrel{C_e^{(5),r} \text{ monotone}}{\leq} C_e^{v,1} L^7 L_n^{\frac{7}{2}+2\delta} \lambda^{1+\delta} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$C_e^{v,1} := C \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta} \right),$$

and which leads to the condition

$$L^7 L_n^{\frac{7}{2}+2\delta} \leq L_{n+1}. \quad (7.12)$$

Furthermore, for $\|v_{n+1}\|_{C_t^1 C_x}$, we use that

$$\partial_t v_{n+1} = \text{div}^{\phi_{n+1}} \left(\mathring{R}_{n+1} - v_{n+1} \otimes v_{n+1} - q_{n+1} \text{Id} \right).$$

Hence the $C_t^1 C_x$ -norm of v_{n+1} is determined by the $C_t C_x^1$ -norm of v_{n+1} estimated above, as well as the estimates of the $C_t C_x^1$ -norms of q_{n+1} and \mathring{R}_{n+1} .

Lemma 7.3. *The energy-dependent constant $C_e^{v,1}$ satisfies*

$$C_e^{v,1} \leq C \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right).$$

The proof will also be given in Section 8.14.

Finally, considering the pressure term, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \|q_{n+1}\|_{C_{\leq t_L, x}^1} &\leq \|q_{n+1} - q_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L, x}^1} + \|q_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L, x}^1} \\ &\leq CL^{3(1+\delta)} L_n^5 \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(C_e^{\partial_t w_o} + C_e^{(1),\delta} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right) + \eta + 1 \right) \lambda^{1+\delta} \delta_n + L_n D_n \\ &\leq C_e^q L_{n+1} \lambda^{1+\delta} \delta_n, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used another claim to be proven in Section 7.3:

$$L^{3(1+\delta)}L_n^5 \leq L_{n+1}. \quad (7.13)$$

Lemma 7.4. *The energy-dependent constant $C_e^{q,1}$ satisfies*

$$C_e^{q,1} \leq C \left(1 + \bar{e} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \left(1 + M_v + \left(1 + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right) \right) \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}}.$$

With these estimates in hand, we will determine A via

$$\max \left(C_e^{\tilde{R},1}, C_e^{v,1}, C_e^{q,1} \right).$$

As the calculation is again rather tedious, we defer it to the end of Section 8.14.

Lemma 7.5. *The energy-dependent constant A satisfies*

$$A = \tilde{A}_e \left(\frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^3, \quad (7.14)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{A}_e = C \left\{ 1 + (\bar{e} + \sqrt{\bar{e}}) \left(1 + \sqrt{\underline{e}} + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right)^2 + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} + M_v^{1-\beta} \right. \\ \left. + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}^{1-\delta} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + M_v + \bar{e} + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right) \right. \\ \left. + (1 + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v^{1-\delta} + M_v + \sqrt{\bar{e}}) \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that (replacing C with $\max(C, 1)$ if $C < 1$) we have

$$\tilde{A}_e > 1. \quad (7.15)$$

And furthermore, comparing $C_e^{\tilde{R},0}$ with A , we see that

$$C_e^{\tilde{R},0} \leq \tilde{A}_e \left(\frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^{2r+3} = A \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^{2r}. \quad (7.16)$$

7.3 Choice of the exponential parameters

In this section, assuming that the ‘‘base parameter’’ a satisfies $a > 1$, we check that all relations between the parameters $\delta_n, D_n, \varsigma_n, \ell, \mu, \lambda$ we assumed in Section 6.1 hold, i.e. we will derive relations between the ‘‘exponential parameters’’ b, c, m, ϵ that need to hold. Let us recall that $b = m + \epsilon$.

We will first investigate the conditions on m for $L_n = L^{m^{n+1}}$. The idea here is that if we have a condition of the form $L^x L_n^y \leq L_{n+1}$, this leads to the two conditions $m \geq x$ (for $n = 0$) as well as $m \geq y$. The most important conditions are Equ. (7.2), (7.5), (7.6), (7.11), (7.12) and (7.13). From these we get the two conditions

$$\begin{aligned} m &\geq 10, \\ m &\geq 2(r + \delta) + 9/2 \geq 2(r_* + 2 + \delta) + 9/2. \end{aligned}$$

Let us choose $r_* = 7$, $r = 9$, which means that we have to choose

$$m \geq 23.$$

Hence, let us choose $m = 23$. Now, to go from $n \rightarrow n + 1$ in the C^1 estimates Equ. (4.14) and (4.11), we need to have the condition

$$\begin{aligned} A\delta_n^{1/2} \left(\frac{D_n}{\delta_{n+4}} \right)^{1+\epsilon} &= Aa^{1/2-(1+\epsilon)} a^{(-1/2+c(1+\epsilon)+b^4(1+\epsilon))b^n} \\ &= Aa^{1/2-(1+\epsilon)} a^{cb^{n+1}} \leq D_{n+1}, \end{aligned} \quad (7.17)$$

as by definition $-1/2 + c(1 + \epsilon) + b^4(1 + \epsilon) = cb$, which gives the following additional condition on a :

$$a \geq A^{\frac{1}{\epsilon+1/2}}. \quad (7.18)$$

Now, to determine ϵ , we need to ensure that Equ. (7.10) holds, i.e.

$$\lambda^{1+\delta} \leq \tilde{C}\delta_n^{1/2} \left(\frac{D_n}{\delta_{n+4}} \right)^{1+\epsilon}.$$

By the definitions of the parameters involved, this translates to

$$b^n \left(-(1+\epsilon)(b^4+c) + \frac{4}{3}(1+\delta) \left[\frac{2r_*}{\gamma} + \frac{2-\gamma}{\gamma_*} \right] + \frac{2r_*}{\gamma}c + \frac{1}{2} \right) \leq 0.$$

Using the definition $m = 23$, $\gamma, \gamma_* \approx 1/2$, $\delta \approx 0$, $r_* = 7$ as well as the definitions of c, b , we see that this inequality holds for $\epsilon \geq 6$. To make sure that $b = m + \epsilon > 36$ (which we will need below), and in keeping with [23], let us choose $\epsilon = 15$, which implies $b = 38$.

With these choices, one easily verifies that the inequalities of Section 6.1 hold, except for Equ. (6.4) which requires a condition on a , see the next section.

7.4 Choice of a

Let us go through all conditions on a from the previous sections.

First, from Equ. (7.1), we deduce the condition

$$\begin{aligned} & \underbrace{C \left(\left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right)^2 + M_v C_e^{(1),1} + \sqrt{\bar{e}}(1 + C_e^{(1),1}) \right)}_{=: \tilde{C}_e} \lambda^{2\delta} \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}} \\ & \stackrel{\text{Equ. (7.7)}}{\leq} \tilde{C}_e \delta_n^{-1} \delta_{n+2}^{6/5} \stackrel{!}{\leq} \frac{\eta}{r_0} \delta_{n+1}, \end{aligned}$$

which holds if (note that $\frac{6}{5}b^2 - b - 1 > 0$ for $b > 2$)

$$\frac{r_0}{\eta} \tilde{C}_e \delta_n^{-1} \delta_{n+2}^{6/5} \delta_{n+1}^{-1} = \frac{r_0}{\eta} \tilde{C}_e a^{-\frac{4}{5}-b^n(\frac{6}{5}b^2-b-1)} \stackrel{n \geq 0}{\leq} \frac{r_0}{\eta} \tilde{C}_e a^{-\frac{6}{5}b^2+b+\frac{9}{5}} \stackrel{!}{\leq} 1.$$

Let us simplify the constants a bit more: since $\eta = C \frac{\underline{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{\eta} \leq C \frac{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}}{\underline{e}} \leq C \frac{(1+\sqrt{\bar{e}})^2}{\underline{e}} \leq C \frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}}. \quad (7.19)$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{C}_e &\leq C \left(\left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right)^2 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1+\underline{e}}{\underline{e}} (\sqrt{\bar{e}} + M_v) + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(1 + M_v^{4\delta} + \bar{e} \frac{(1+\bar{e})^4}{\underline{e}^2} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1+\underline{e}}{\underline{e}} (\sqrt{\bar{e}} + M_v) + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(1 + M_v^{4\delta} + \underline{e}(1+\bar{e})^2 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}(\sqrt{\bar{e}} + M_v) + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \right) \left(\frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^2 \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}}, \end{aligned}$$

and by a simple comparison, we see that

$$\frac{r_0}{\eta} \tilde{C}_e \leq \tilde{A}_e \left(\frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^3 \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}}.$$

As we have $-\frac{6}{5}b^2 + b + \frac{9}{5} < 0$ for $b > 2$, we see that the appropriate bound can easily be ensured if

$$a \geq \left(\tilde{A}_e \left(\frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^3 \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^{\frac{5}{6b^2 - 5b - 9}} =: a_1.$$

Second, from the estimate on the divergence we got our requirement Equ. (7.3). Using Equ. (7.7), (6.4) and (6.7), we find

$$\begin{aligned} & C(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v^{1-\delta} + M_v)(D_n^{1+2\delta} \ell^\gamma + D_n^\delta (n+1) \varsigma_n^{\gamma'}) \\ & \leq C(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v^{1-\delta} + M_v)(D_n \delta_n^{-1} \ell^\gamma + \delta_n^{-1/2} (n+1) \varsigma_n^{\gamma'}) \\ & \leq C(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v^{1-\delta} + M_v)(1 + \eta) \delta_{n+3}^{9/7} \\ & = C(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v^{1-\delta} + M_v)(1 + \eta) \delta_{n+3}^{1/28} \delta_{n+3}^{5/4}. \end{aligned}$$

As $\eta \leq C\sqrt{\bar{e}}$, we see that $C(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v^{1-\delta} + M_v)(1 + \eta) \leq A$, and hence the divergence estimate holds if we can ensure $A\delta_{n+3}^{1/28}$, i.e.

$$a \geq A^{\frac{28}{b^3-1}} =: a_2.$$

Third, we got Equ. (7.8), which, using Equ. (7.16) easily follows if

$$a \geq \left(A \left(\frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^{2r} \right)^{\frac{5}{b^2-1}} =: a_3.$$

Fourth, the other error terms led to Equ. (7.9). We want to show that

$$\ell^{-3\alpha} (n+1) \delta_{n+3}^{\frac{8}{3}\beta} \delta_{n+2}^{-37/36} \leq 1. \quad (7.20)$$

Once this has been done, we have

$$C_e^{\dot{R},0} \ell^{-3\alpha} (n+1) \delta_{n+3}^{\frac{8}{3}\beta} \leq C_e^{\dot{R},0} \delta_{n+2}^{1/36} \delta_{n+2},$$

which is bounded above by $\frac{\eta}{2} \delta_{n+2}$ if

$$C_e^{\dot{R},0} \delta_{n+2}^{1/36} \leq \frac{\eta}{2},$$

which, similarly as in the previous step, follows if

$$a \geq \left(A \left(\frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^{2r} \right)^{\frac{36}{b^2-1}} =: a_4.$$

Therefore, let us show Equ. (7.20). Using the definitions, the left-hand side is bounded by

$$(n+1) a^{-37/36 + \frac{4}{3}(2\beta - \frac{3\alpha}{\gamma})} a^{b^{n+3}(-\frac{8}{3}\beta + \frac{\alpha}{\gamma}(4 + 3\frac{c}{b^3}) + \frac{37}{36}\frac{1}{b})},$$

which is bounded by 1 as soon as

$$-\frac{8}{3}\beta + \frac{\alpha}{\gamma} \left(4 + 3\frac{c}{b^3}\right) + \frac{37}{36} \frac{1}{b} < 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \frac{\alpha}{\gamma} \left(4 + 3\frac{c}{b^3}\right) < \frac{8}{3}\beta - \frac{37}{36} \frac{1}{b}. \quad (7.21)$$

For this to be well-defined, we first need

$$\frac{8}{3}\beta - \frac{37}{36} \frac{1}{b} > 0,$$

which, using $\beta = \frac{\gamma}{48}$ translates into a condition on γ :

$$2\gamma > \frac{37}{b} = \frac{37}{38},$$

which holds for $\gamma \in (\frac{37}{76}, 1/2)$. Having established this, we translate Equ. (7.21) into a condition for α :

$$\alpha < \tilde{\alpha}_0 := \gamma \cdot \frac{\frac{8}{3}\beta - \frac{37}{36} \frac{1}{b}}{4 + 3\frac{c}{b^3}} \sim 1.7 \cdot 10^{-4}. \quad (7.22)$$

As $\alpha < \alpha_0$ and

$$\alpha_0 = \frac{1}{2cb + 1} \sim 8.7 \cdot 10^{-9} < \tilde{\alpha}_0,$$

this condition is clearly satisfied. Therefore, (7.20) holds.

Fifth, in order to make sure that the estimate for the C^1 -norms work, we needed Equ. (7.18), i.e.

$$a \geq A^{\frac{1}{\epsilon+1/2}} =: a_5.$$

Sixth, to guarantee parameter assumption Equ. (6.4), we need

$$D_n \ell^\gamma \leq \eta \delta_{n+3}^{9/7},$$

which by the definitions of the terms involved holds true if

$$\delta_{n+3}^{4/3-9/7} = \delta_{n+3}^{1/21} \leq \frac{\eta}{2},$$

which, using Equ. (7.19) as well as $\tilde{A}_e \geq 1$, leads to

$$a \geq A^{\frac{21}{b^3-1}} =: a_6.$$

Now we need to satisfy

$$a \geq \max(a_1, \dots, a_6).$$

By the particular structure of the bounds a_i , $i = 1, \dots, 6$, this amounts to finding the largest constant in the definitions of the a_i and taking it to the largest exponent. Hence we define

$$a := \left(A \left(\frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^{2r} \right)^{\frac{1}{\epsilon+1/2}}. \quad (7.23)$$

Remark 7.6. *Note that the least trivial conditions on the coefficients from the estimates on the stress terms originate from the new terms $\mathring{R}^{\text{flow},2}$ and $\mathring{R}^{\text{moll},3}$. It is to be expected that the method used in this paper for bounding the flow and mollification error might break down as one tries to achieve higher regularity of the convex integration solutions, where we hope that in the end $b = 1 + \epsilon$ for a small $\epsilon > 0$ is possible.*

7.5 Choice of M_v

Having defined a , we can finally choose the remaining constant M_v and conclude the proof.

Estimate for $v_{n+1} - v_n$: Note that

$$a = \left(\tilde{A}_e \left(\frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^3 \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^{2r+3} \right)^{\frac{1}{\epsilon+1/2}} \stackrel{\text{Equ. (7.15)}}{\geq} \left(\frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^{\frac{3}{16}} \geq \frac{1}{\underline{e}^{\frac{3}{16}}}.$$

From Lemma 6.7 it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} L_n^{-4} \delta_n^{-1/2} \|v_{n+1} - v_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x} &\leq C \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} + \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + \eta + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right) \delta_{n+1}^{1/2} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} + \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{(1 + \bar{e})^2}{\underline{e}} \right) a^{\frac{1}{2}(1-b^{n+1})} \right) (1 + M_v^{2\delta}) \\ &\stackrel{n \geq 0}{\leq} C \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} + \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{(1 + \bar{e})^2}{\underline{e}} \right) a^{\frac{1}{2}(1-b)} \right) (1 + M_v^{2\delta}) \\ &\leq C \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} + \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{(1 + \bar{e})^2}{\underline{e}} \right) \underline{e}^{\frac{3}{32}(b-1)} \right) (1 + M_v^{2\delta}) \\ &\leq C \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} + \underline{e}^{\frac{3}{32}(b-1)} + \frac{\sqrt{\bar{e}}}{\underline{e}} \underline{e}^{\frac{3}{32}(b-1)} + \frac{\sqrt{\bar{e}} \bar{e}^2}{\underline{e}} \underline{e}^{\frac{3}{32}(b-1)} \right) (1 + M_v^{2\delta}) \\ &\leq C \max \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}}, \bar{e}^{\frac{3}{32}(b-1)}, \bar{e}^{\frac{3}{32}(b-1)-1/2}, \bar{e}^{\frac{3}{32}(b-1)-3/2} \right) (1 + M_v^{2\delta}) \\ &= C \max \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}}, \bar{e}^{\frac{3}{32}(b-1)}, \bar{e}^{\frac{3}{32}(b-1)-3/2} \right) (1 + M_v^{2\delta}) \\ &=: E(1 + M_v^{2\delta}) \stackrel{!}{\leq} M_v. \end{aligned}$$

Consider $f(x) := \frac{x}{1+x^{2\delta}}$. It is obviously continuous and strictly monotone increasing and satisfies $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} f(x) = 0$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f(x) = \infty$. Thus, as $E \in (0, \infty)$, there is a unique $x = M_v$ such that

$$f(M_v) = E, \quad \text{i.e. } E = \frac{M_v}{1 + M_v^{2\delta}}. \quad (7.24)$$

The previous equality cannot be solved explicitly for M_v , but it will be sufficient to work with the following bounds for M_v

$$M_v \in \left[E, \max \left(2E, (2E)^{\frac{1}{1-2\delta}} \right) \right]. \quad (7.25)$$

With this choice of M_v , we have defined all parameters of the convex integration scheme.

7.6 Estimate of the regularity

With the choices for the parameters of Section 7.3, we find that the Hölder exponent θ of the solution is less than

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\theta} = \alpha_0 &= \frac{1}{2bc+1} = \frac{m-1}{2(1+\epsilon)(m+\epsilon)^5 + m-2-\epsilon} \\ &= \frac{23-1}{2(1+15)(23+15)^5 + 23-2-15} \sim 8.68 \cdot 10^{-9}, \end{aligned}$$

which, as in [23], is extremely low and far from the deterministic Onsager threshold of $1/3$. Because of the restrictions due to the new mollification error terms, we do not expect that this exponent could be improved substantially without finding a better way than Besov interpolation to deal with these error terms.

8 Proofs

8.1 Core estimates

In this section we provide proofs for all necessary estimates of the amplitude coefficients a_k and its derivatives in various norms.

Proof of Lemma 6.2. We estimate, using the definition,

$$\|\tilde{\rho}_\ell\|_{C_{\leq \iota_L} C_x} \leq \frac{2}{r_0} \left(\eta \delta_{n+1} + \|\mathring{R}_\ell\|_{C_{\leq \iota_L} C_x} \right) \leq \frac{4}{r_0} L_n \eta \delta_{n+1}.$$

Observe that for $\Phi(z) := \frac{2}{r_0} \sqrt{\eta^2 \delta_{n+1}^2 + z^2}$, it holds on $[0, L_n \eta \delta_{n+1}]$ that

$$|D^j \Phi(z)| \leq C (L_n \eta \delta_{n+1})^{1-j}.$$

Therefore, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\rho}_\ell\|_{C_{\leq \iota_L, x}^1} &= \|\tilde{\rho}_\ell\|_{C_{\leq \iota_L} C_x^1} + \|\tilde{\rho}_\ell\|_{C_{\leq \iota_L} C_x}, \\ \|\tilde{\rho}_\ell\|_{C_{\leq \iota_L} C_x^1} &\leq C \|\mathring{R}_\ell\|_{C_{\leq \iota_L} C_x^1} \leq C \ell^{-1} \|\mathring{R}_n\|_{C_{\leq \iota_L} C_x} \stackrel{\text{Equ. (4.8)}}{\leq} C L_n \eta \ell^{-1} \delta_{n+1}, \\ \|\tilde{\rho}_\ell\|_{C_{\leq \iota_L} C_x} &\leq C \|\mathring{R}_\ell\|_{C_{\leq \iota_L} C_x} \leq C L_n \ell^{-1} \eta \delta_{n+1}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Proof of Proposition 6.3. Throughout the proof, we let $t \in [0, \iota_L]$. In the following we often suppress the (uniform) time dependence and also write $\|\cdot\|_C$ for $\|\cdot\|_{C_x}$ to simplify the notation. We begin by applying the product rule to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|a_k\|_{C_x^\delta} &\leq \|\sqrt{\rho_\ell}\|_{C_x^\delta} \|\Gamma\|_C \|\Psi\|_C + \|\sqrt{\rho_\ell}\|_C \|\Gamma\|_{C_x^\delta} \|\Psi\|_C + \|\sqrt{\rho_\ell}\|_C \|\Gamma\|_C \|\Psi\|_{C_x^\delta}, \\ \|a_k\|_{C_x^r} &\leq C \sum_{r_1+r_2+r_3=r} \|\sqrt{\rho_\ell}\|_{C_x^{r_1}} \|\Gamma\|_{C_x^{r_2}} \|\Psi\|_{C_x^{r_3}}, \\ \|\partial_\tau a_k\|_{C_x^\delta} &\leq \|\sqrt{\rho_\ell}\|_{C_x^\delta} \|\Gamma\|_C \|\partial_\tau \Psi\|_C + \|\sqrt{\rho_\ell}\|_C \|\Gamma\|_{C_x^\delta} \|\partial_\tau \Psi\|_C + \|\sqrt{\rho_\ell}\|_C \|\Gamma\|_C \|\partial_\tau \Psi\|_{C_x^\delta}, \\ \|\partial_\tau a_k\|_{C_x^r} &\leq C \sum_{r_1+r_2+r_3=r} \|\sqrt{\rho_\ell}\|_{C_x^{r_1}} \|\Gamma\|_{C_x^{r_2}} \|\partial_\tau \Psi\|_{C_x^{r_3}}, \\ \|\partial_\tau a_k + i(k \cdot \tilde{v}) a_k\|_{C_x^\delta} &\leq \|\sqrt{\rho_\ell}\|_{C_x^\delta} \|\Gamma\|_C \|\partial_\tau \Psi + i(k \cdot \tilde{v}) \Psi\|_C + \|\sqrt{\rho_\ell}\|_C \|\Gamma\|_{C_x^\delta} \|\partial_\tau \Psi + i(k \cdot \tilde{v}) \Psi\|_C \\ &\quad + \|\sqrt{\rho_\ell}\|_C \|\Gamma\|_C \|\partial_\tau \Psi + i(k \cdot \tilde{v}) \Psi\|_{C_x^\delta}, \\ \|\partial_\tau a_k + i(k \cdot \tilde{v}) a_k\|_{C_x^r} &\leq C \sum_{r_1+r_2+r_3=r} \|\sqrt{\rho_\ell}\|_{C_x^{r_1}} \|\Gamma\|_{C_x^{r_2}} \|\partial_\tau \Psi + i(k \cdot \tilde{v}) \Psi\|_{C_x^{r_3}}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of (6.24): Let us consider the individual factors: since $C \underline{e} \delta_n \leq |\rho_\ell| \leq C L_n \bar{e} \delta_n$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sqrt{\rho_\ell}\|_{C_x^\delta} &= \|\sqrt{\rho_\ell}\|_C + [\sqrt{\rho_\ell}]_{C_x^\delta} \leq \|\sqrt{\rho_\ell}\|_C + C (\underline{e} \delta_n)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\rho_\ell\|_{C_x^\delta}, \\ &\leq C L_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\bar{e}} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} + C (\underline{e} \delta_n)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\mathring{R}_\ell\|_{C_x^\delta} \leq C L_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\bar{e}} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} + C L_n \underline{e}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \eta^{1-\delta} \delta_n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{n+1}^{1-\delta} D_n^\delta \\ &\leq C L_n (\sqrt{\bar{e}} + \underline{e}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \eta^{1-\delta}) \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} D_n^\delta. \end{aligned}$$

Next, it holds by definition that $\|\Gamma\|_{C_{t,x}^0}, \|\Psi\|_{C_{t,x}^0} \leq C$. Turning to the Hölder norm of Γ , we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Gamma\|_{C_x^\delta} &= \|\Gamma\|_C + [\Gamma]_{C_x^\delta} \leq C + C \left[\frac{\mathring{R}_\ell}{\rho_\ell} \right]_{C_x^\delta} \leq C + C \|\mathring{R}_\ell\|_C [\rho_\ell^{-1}]_{C_x^\delta} + C [\mathring{R}_\ell]_{C_x^\delta} \|\rho_\ell^{-1}\|_C \\
&\leq C + C \|\mathring{R}_\ell\|_C (\underline{e}\delta_n)^{-2} [\mathring{R}_\ell]_{C_x^\delta} + C [\mathring{R}_\ell]_{C_x^\delta} (\underline{e}\delta_n)^{-1} \\
&\leq C + CL_n \eta \delta_{n+1} (\underline{e}\delta_n)^{-2} L_n (\eta \delta_{n+1})^{1-\delta} D_n^\delta + CL_n (\eta \delta_{n+1})^{1-\delta} D_n^\delta (\underline{e}\delta_n)^{-1} \\
&\leq C + CL_n \eta^{1-\delta} \underline{e}^{-1} (1 + L_n \eta \delta_{n+1} (\underline{e}\delta_n)^{-1}) \delta_n^{-1} \delta_{n+1}^{1-\delta} D_n^\delta \\
&\leq CL_n^2 (1 + \eta^{1-\delta} \underline{e}^{-1}) \delta_n^{-1} \delta_{n+1}^{1-\delta} D_n^\delta.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally,

$$\|\Psi\|_{C_x^\delta} \leq C \mu^\delta \|\tilde{v}\|_{C_x^1}^\delta \leq CL_n^\delta \mu^\delta \varsigma_{n+1}^{\delta(\alpha-1)}.$$

Hence we can estimate the Hölder norm of a_k

$$\|a_k\|_{C_x^\delta} \leq C_e L_n^{\frac{5}{2}} \mu^\delta \varsigma_{n+1}^{\delta(\alpha-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where

$$C_e = C \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} + \underline{e}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \eta^{1-\delta} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \eta^{1-\delta} \underline{e}^{-1} \right).$$

Proof of (6.28): For $\|a_k\|_{C_x^r}$ we proceed as before, estimating each factor. Let us start with $\|\sqrt{\rho_\ell}\|_{C_x^r}$. First, observe that on the interval $[C\underline{e}\delta_n, CL_n\bar{e}\delta_n]$, the function $x \mapsto \sqrt{x}$ satisfies for $j \geq 1$

$$[\sqrt{\cdot}]_j \leq C(\underline{e}\delta_n)^{\frac{1}{2}-j}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\sqrt{\rho_\ell}\|_{C_x^r} &\leq C(L_n\bar{e}\delta_n)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C \sum_{j=1}^r (\underline{e}\delta_n)^{\frac{1}{2}-j} \|\rho_\ell\|_{C_x^{j-1}} \|\rho_\ell\|_{C_x} \\
&\leq C(L_n\bar{e}\delta_n)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C\delta_n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^r (\underline{e})^{\frac{1}{2}-j} (L_n\bar{e})^{j-1} \|\rho_\ell\|_{C_x^r}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\rho_\ell\|_{C_x^r} &\leq \|\rho_\ell\|_C + \sum_{j=1}^r [\tilde{\rho}_\ell]_j \leq CL_n\bar{e}\delta_n + C \sum_{j=1}^r (L_n\eta\delta_{n+1})^{1-j} \|\mathring{R}_\ell\|_{C_x^{j-1}} \|\mathring{R}_\ell\|_{C_x} \\
&\leq CL_n\bar{e}\delta_n + C \sum_{j=1}^r (L_n\eta\delta_{n+1})^{1-j} (L_n\eta\delta_{n+1})^{j-1} \ell^{1-r} L_n D_n \\
&\leq CL_n(1+\bar{e})\ell^{1-r} D_n.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, combining the two previous calculations, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\sqrt{\rho_\ell}\|_{C_x^r} &\leq (CL_n\bar{e}\delta_n)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C \frac{\sqrt{\bar{e}}(1+\bar{e})}{\bar{e}} \delta_n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \ell^{1-r} D_n L_n^r \sum_{j=1}^r \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^j \\
&\leq CL_n^r \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{\bar{e}} \sum_{j=1}^r \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^j \right) \delta_n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \ell^{1-r} D_n \\
&=: CL_n^r \sqrt{\bar{e}} C_e^{(r)} \delta_n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \ell^{1-r} D_n.
\end{aligned}$$

For $\|\Gamma\|_{C_x^r}$, using the boundedness of $\gamma_l^{(j)}$, we immediately see that

$$\|\Gamma\|_{C_x^r} \leq C + C \sum_{r_1+r_2=r} \|\mathring{R}_\ell\|_{C_x^{r_1}} \|\rho_\ell^{-1}\|_{C_x^{r_2}}.$$

Note that on $[C\underline{\rho}_n, \infty)$, the function $x \mapsto x^{-1}$ satisfies for $j \geq 1$

$$[(\cdot)^{-1}]_j \leq C(\underline{\rho}_n)^{-(j+1)}.$$

Hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho_\ell^{-1}\|_{C_x^{r_2}} &\leq C(\underline{\rho}_n)^{-1} + C \sum_{j=1}^{r_2} (\underline{\rho}_n)^{-j-1} \|\rho_\ell\|_{C_x^{j-1}}^j \|\rho_\ell\|_{C_x^{r_2}} \\ &\leq C \left(\underline{\rho}_n^{-1} + \frac{1+\bar{\rho}_n}{\underline{\rho}_n} L_n^{r_2} \sum_{j=1}^{r_2} \left(\frac{\bar{\rho}_n}{\underline{\rho}_n}\right)^j \right) \delta_n^{-2} \ell^{1-r_2} D_n \\ &\leq C L_n^{r_2} \underline{\rho}_n^{-1} C_e^{(r_2)} \delta_n^{-2} \ell^{1-r_2} D_n =: C_e^{\rho^{-1}, r_2} L_n^{r_2} \delta_n^{-2} D_n \ell^{1-r_2}. \end{aligned}$$

We combine the above estimates to find

$$\|\Gamma\|_{C_x^r} \leq C L_n^{r+1} \left(1 + \underline{\rho}_n^{-1} + \eta \sum_{j=1}^r C_e^{\rho^{-1}, j} \right) \delta_n^{-1} \ell^{1-r} D_n \leq C L_n^{r+1} C_e^{(r)} \delta_n^{-1} \ell^{1-r} D_n.$$

For $\|\Psi\|_{C_x^r}$, we use the boundedness of $\|\Psi\|_C$ and the interpolation inequality [32, Equ. (4.5)] to find

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Psi\|_{C_x^r} &\leq C \left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^r [\psi_k^{(i)}]_j [\tilde{v}]_r^{\frac{r-j}{r-1}} [\tilde{v}]_1^{(j-1)\frac{r}{r-1}} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^r \mu^j (L_n D_n \ell^{1-r} + L \varsigma_{n+1}^{\alpha-1})^{\frac{r-j}{r-1}} (L_n \varsigma_{n+1}^{\alpha-1})^{(j-1)\frac{r}{r-1}} \right) \\ &\leq C L_n^r \sum_{j=1}^r \mu^j \left(\max(D_n \ell^{1-r}, \varsigma_{n+1}^{\alpha-1}) \right)^{\frac{r-j}{r-1}} (\varsigma_{n+1}^{\alpha-1})^{(j-1)\frac{r}{r-1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.1)$$

Note that for $\max(D_n \ell^{1-r}, \varsigma_{n+1}^{\alpha-1}) = \varsigma_{n+1}^{\alpha-1}$, it holds that

$$\mu^j \left(\max(D_n \ell^{1-r}, \varsigma_{n+1}^{\alpha-1}) \right)^{\frac{r-j}{r-1}} (\varsigma_{n+1}^{\alpha-1})^{(j-1)\frac{r}{r-1}} = \mu^j \varsigma_{n+1}^{j(\alpha-1)}$$

and in the other case $\max(D_n \ell^{1-r}, \varsigma_{n+1}^{\alpha-1}) = D_n \ell^{1-r}$, using $D_n \leq \varsigma_{n+1}^{\alpha-1}$ and $\ell^{-1} \leq \mu$, we see that also

$$\mu^j \left(\max(D_n \ell^{1-r}, \varsigma_{n+1}^{\alpha-1}) \right)^{\frac{r-j}{r-1}} (\varsigma_{n+1}^{\alpha-1})^{(j-1)\frac{r}{r-1}} = \mu^j (D_n \ell^{1-r})^{\frac{r-j}{r-1}} (\varsigma_{n+1}^{\alpha-1})^{(j-1)\frac{r}{r-1}} \leq \mu^r \varsigma_{n+1}^{j(\alpha-1)}.$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\|\Psi\|_{C_x^r} \leq C L_n^r \mu^r \varsigma_{n+1}^{r(\alpha-1)},$$

with a constant which maximizes both the above cases.

We collect

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|a_k\|_{C_x} \\
& \lesssim \|\sqrt{\rho_\ell}\|_0 \left(\|\Psi\|_r + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} \|\Gamma\|_i \|\Psi\|_{r-i} + \|\Gamma\|_r \right) \\
& + \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \|\sqrt{\rho_\ell}\|_j \left(\|\Psi\|_{r-j} + \sum_{i=1}^{r-j-1} \|\Gamma\|_i \|\Psi\|_{r-j-i} + \|\Gamma\|_{r-j} \right) \\
& + \|\sqrt{\rho_\ell}\|_r \\
& \lesssim L_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\bar{\rho}} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(L_n^r \mu^r \zeta_{n+1}^{r(\alpha-1)} + L_n^{r+1} \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} C_e^{(i)} \delta_n^{-1} \ell^{1-i} D_n \mu^{r-i} \zeta_{n+1}^{(r-i)(\alpha-1)} + L_n^{r+1} C_e^{(r)} \delta_n^{-1} \ell^{1-r} D_n \right) \\
& + \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} L_n^j \sqrt{\bar{\rho}} C_e^{(j)} \delta_n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \ell^{1-j} D_n \\
& \cdot \left(L_n^{r-j} \mu^{r-j} \zeta_{n+1}^{(r-j)(\alpha-1)} + L_n^{r-j+1} \sum_{i=1}^{r-j-1} C_e^{(i)} \delta_n^{-1} \ell^{1-i} D_n \mu^{r-j-i} \zeta_{n+1}^{(r-j-i)(\alpha-1)} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + L_n^{r-j+1} C_e^{(r-j)} \delta_n^{-1} \ell^{1-(r-j)} D_n \right) \\
& + L_n^r \sqrt{\bar{\rho}} C_e^{(r)} \delta_n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \ell^{1-r} D_n \\
& \lesssim L_n^{r+\frac{3}{2}} \sqrt{\bar{\rho}} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\mu^r \zeta_{n+1}^{r(\alpha-1)} + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} \eta C_e^{(i)} \mu^{r-i} \zeta_{n+1}^{(r-i)(\alpha-1)} + C_e^{(r)} \eta \right) \\
& + \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} L_n^{r+1} \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \sqrt{\bar{\rho}} C_e^{(j)} \eta \left(\mu^{r-j} \zeta_{n+1}^{(r-j)(\alpha-1)} + \sum_{i=1}^{r-j-1} C_e^{(i)} \eta \ell^{-i} \mu^{r-j-i} \zeta_{n+1}^{(r-j-i)(\alpha-1)} + C_e^{(r-j)} \eta \ell^{-(r-j)} \right) \\
& + L_n^r \sqrt{\bar{\rho}} C_e^{(r)} \eta \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \ell^{-r},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used $\ell D_n \leq \eta \delta_n$. The above hence finally yields

$$\|a_k\|_{C_x} \leq C_e^{[r]} L_n^{r+\frac{3}{2}} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu^r \zeta_{n+1}^{r(\alpha-1)},$$

where collecting the energy-dependent constants in the above yields the definition

$$C_e^{[r]} := C \sqrt{\bar{\rho}} \left(1 + C_e^{(r)} \eta + \eta^2 \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} C_e^{(j)} C_e^{(r-j)} \right).$$

Proof of (6.26): First, let us note that by the above observation

$$(\partial_\tau + (ik \cdot \tilde{v})) a_k = \sqrt{\rho_\ell} \Gamma (\partial_\tau + (ik \cdot \tilde{v})) \Psi.$$

Therefore, we estimate

$$\|\partial_\tau \Psi + i(k \cdot \tilde{v}) \Psi\|_{C_x^\delta} \leq C \mu^{\delta-1} \|\tilde{v}\|_{C_x^1}^\delta \leq C L_n^\delta \mu^{\delta-1} \zeta_{n+1}^{\delta(\gamma-1)},$$

and use this to conclude that

$$\|\partial_\tau a_k + i(k \cdot \tilde{v}) a_k\|_{C_x^\delta} \leq C_e L_n^{\frac{5}{2}} \mu^{\delta-1} \zeta_{n+1}^{\delta(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Proof of (6.29): For $r \in \mathbb{N}$, we estimate analogously to [23, p. 34], using (8.1), to obtain

$$\|\partial_\tau a_k + i(k \cdot \tilde{v}) a_k\|_{C_x^r} \leq C_e^{[r]} L_n^{r+1} \mu^{r-1} \zeta_{n+1}^{r(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Proof of (6.27) and (6.31): By the product rule we find

$$\partial_s a_k = (\partial_s \sqrt{\rho_\ell}) \Gamma \Psi + \sqrt{\rho_\ell} (\partial_s \Gamma) \Psi + \sqrt{\rho_\ell} \Gamma (\partial_s \Psi).$$

Let us treat each term in turn. First of all observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_s \sqrt{\rho_\ell}\|_{C_x} &\leq C(\underline{e}\delta_n)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_s \rho_\ell\|_{C_x}, \\ \|\partial_s \sqrt{\rho_\ell}\|_{C_x^r} &\leq C \sum_{r_1+r_2=r} \left\| \rho_\ell^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{C_x^{r_1}} \|\partial_s \rho_\ell\|_{C_x^{r_2}}. \end{aligned}$$

On $[C\underline{e}\delta_n, \infty)$, the function $x \mapsto \frac{1}{\sqrt{x}}$ satisfies for $j \geq 1$

$$\left[(\cdot)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right]_j \leq C(\underline{e}\delta_n)^{-(j+\frac{1}{2})}.$$

Hence we can easily see that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \rho_\ell^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{C_x} &\leq C(\underline{e}\delta_n)^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \\ \left\| \rho_\ell^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{C_x^r} &\leq C(\underline{e}\delta_n)^{-\frac{1}{2}} + C \sum_{j=1}^r (\underline{e}\delta_n)^{-(j+\frac{1}{2})} \|\rho_\ell\|_{C_x}^{j-1} \|\rho_\ell\|_{C_x} \\ &\leq (\underline{e}\delta_n)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(C + CL_n^r \delta_n^{-1} \ell^{1-r} D_n \frac{1+\bar{e}}{\bar{e}} \sum_{j=1}^r \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^j \right) \\ &\leq C(\underline{e}\delta_n)^{-\frac{1}{2}} C_e^{(r)} L_n^r \delta_n^{-1} \ell^{1-r} D_n. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,

$$\partial_s \rho_\ell = \partial_s \tilde{\rho}_\ell + \partial_s \gamma_n.$$

Since $|\partial_s \gamma_n| \leq C \|\tilde{e}\|_{C_{\leq 1}^1}$, we find

$$|\partial_s \gamma_n| \leq C(|e|_{C^1} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} D_n).$$

On the other hand, standard mollification estimates imply that

$$\|\partial_s \mathring{R}_\ell\|_r \leq CL_n \eta \delta_{n+1} \ell^{-1-r},$$

as well as

$$\left\| \left(\sqrt{\eta^2 \delta_{n+1}^2 + |\cdot|^2} \right)' (\mathring{R}_\ell) \right\|_r \leq C(L_n \eta \delta_{n+1})^{-1} \|\mathring{R}_\ell\|_r + C(L_n \eta \delta_{n+1})^{-r} \|\mathring{R}_\ell\|_1^r \leq C\ell^{-r}.$$

Hence we can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_s \tilde{\rho}_\ell\|_{C_x} &\leq C \|\partial_s \mathring{R}_\ell\|_{C_x} \leq CL_n \eta \delta_{n+1} \ell^{-1}, \\ \|\partial_s \tilde{\rho}_\ell\|_{C_x^r} &\leq C \sum_{j=0}^r \left\| \left(\sqrt{\eta^2 \delta_{n+1}^2 + |\cdot|^2} \right)' (\mathring{R}_\ell) \right\|_j \|\partial_s \mathring{R}_\ell\|_{r-j} \leq CL_n \eta \delta_{n+1} \ell^{-1-r}, \end{aligned}$$

which in turn implies (by $D_n \leq \eta \delta_{n+1} \ell^{-1}$)

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_s \rho_\ell\|_{C_x} &\leq C(L_n \eta \delta_{n+1} \ell^{-1} + |e|_{C^1} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} D_n) \leq C(L_n \eta (1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}) + |e|_{C^1}) \delta_{n+1} \ell^{-1}, \\ \|\partial_s \rho_\ell\|_{C_x^r} &\leq CL_n \eta \delta_{n+1} \ell^{-1-r}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\partial_s \sqrt{\rho_\ell}\|_{C_x} &\leq C \frac{L_n \eta (1 + \sqrt{\underline{e}}) + |e|_{C^1}}{\sqrt{\underline{e}}} \delta_n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{n+1} \ell^{-1}, \\
\|\partial_s \sqrt{\rho_\ell}\|_{C_x^r} &\leq C \left(\left\| \rho_\ell^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{C_x} \|\partial_s \rho_\ell\|_{C_x^r} + \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \left\| \rho_\ell^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{C_x^j} \|\partial_s \rho_\ell\|_{C_x^{r-j}} + \left\| \rho_\ell^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{C_x^r} \|\partial_s \rho_\ell\|_{C_x} \right) \\
&\leq C \left((\underline{e} \delta_n)^{-\frac{1}{2}} L_n \eta \delta_{n+1} \ell^{-1-r} + \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} (\underline{e} \delta_n)^{-\frac{1}{2}} L_n^j C_e^{(j)} \delta_n^{-1} \ell^{1-j} D_n L_n \eta \delta_{n+1} \ell^{-1-(r-j)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (\underline{e} \delta_n)^{-\frac{1}{2}} L_n^r C_e^{(r)} \delta_n^{-1} \ell^{1-r} D_n (L_n \eta (1 + \sqrt{\underline{e}}) + |e|_{C^1}) \delta_{n+1} \ell^{-1} \right) \\
&\leq C L_n^{r+1} \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{\underline{e}}} \left(1 + C_e^{(r)} (\eta (1 + \sqrt{\underline{e}}) + |e|_{C^1}) \right) \delta_n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{n+1} \ell^{-1-r} =: L_n^{r+1} C_e^{\partial_s \sqrt{\rho}, r} \delta_n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{n+1} \ell^{-1-r}.
\end{aligned}$$

Next we estimate

$$\|\partial_s \Gamma\|_{C_x^r} \leq C \sum_{i=0}^r \left\| (D \gamma_k^{(j)}) \left(\frac{R_\ell}{\rho_\ell} \right) \right\|_{C_x^i} \left(\|(\partial_s \dot{R}_\ell) \rho_\ell^{-1}\|_{C_x^{r-i}} + \|\dot{R}_\ell \partial_s \rho_\ell^{-1}\|_{C_x^{r-i}} \right).$$

By the chain rule, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| (D \gamma_k^{(j)}) \left(\frac{R_\ell}{\rho_\ell} \right) \right\|_{C_x^r} &\leq C \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^r \left\| \gamma_k^{(j)} \right\|_{C_x^{i+1}} \left\| \frac{R_\ell}{\rho_\ell} \right\|_{C_x}^{i-1} \left\| \frac{\dot{R}_\ell}{\rho_\ell} \right\|_{C_x} \right) \\
&\leq C \sum_{i=1}^r \left(1 + \frac{L_n \eta \delta_{n+1}}{\underline{e} \delta_n} \right)^{i-1} L_n^{r+1} C_e^{(r)} \delta_n^{-1} \ell^{1-r} D_n \\
&\leq C L_n^{2r} C_e^{(r)} \ell^{1-r} \delta_n^{-1} D_n.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, for any $r \in \mathbb{N}$ we find

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|(\partial_s \dot{R}_\ell) \rho_\ell^{-1}\|_{C_x^r} \\
&\leq C \sum_{j=0}^r \|\partial_s \dot{R}_\ell\|_{C_x^j} \|\rho_\ell^{-1}\|_{C_x^{r-j}} \\
&\leq C L_n \eta \delta_{n+1} \ell^{-1-r} (\underline{e} \delta_n)^{-1} + C \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} L_n \eta \delta_{n+1} \ell^{-1-j} \underline{e}^{-1} L_n^{r-j} C_e^{(r-j)} \delta_n^{-2} \ell^{1-(r-j)} D_n \\
&\quad + C L_n \eta \delta_{n+1} \ell^{-1} \underline{e}^{-1} L_n^r C_e^{(r)} \delta_n^{-2} \ell^{1-r} D_n \\
&= C L_n \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} \delta_{n+1} \delta_n^{-1} \ell^{-1-r} + C \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} \delta_{n+1} \delta_n^{-2} D_n \ell^{-r} \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} L_n^{r-j+1} C_e^{(j)} + C L_n^{r+1} \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} \delta_{n+1} \delta_n^{-2} D_n \ell^{-r} C_e^{(r)} \\
&\leq C L_n^{r+1} \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \eta C_e^{(r)} \right) \delta_{n+1} \delta_n^{-1} \ell^{-1-r},
\end{aligned}$$

as well as

$$\|(\partial_s \dot{R}_\ell(s, \cdot)) \rho_\ell^{-1}(s, \cdot)\|_{C_x} \leq C L_n \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} \ell^{-1} \delta_{n+1} \delta_n^{-1},$$

and

$$\|\dot{R}_\ell \partial_s \rho_\ell^{-1}\|_{C_x^r} \leq C \sum_{j=0}^r \|\dot{R}_\ell\|_j \|\partial_s \rho_\ell^{-1}\|_{r-j}.$$

Note that

$$\|\rho_\ell^{-2}\|_{C_x^r} \leq C(\underline{e}\delta_n)^{-2} + C \sum_{j=1}^r \sum_{i=1}^j (\underline{e}\delta_n)^{-(i+2)} (L_n \bar{e} \delta_n)^{i-1} L_n (1 + \bar{e}) \ell^{1-r} D_n \leq CL_n^r \underline{e}^{-2} C_e^{(r)} \delta_n^{-2} \ell^{-r},$$

and so we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_s \rho_\ell^{-1}\|_{C_x^r} &\leq C \sum_{j=0}^r \|\rho_\ell^{-2}\|_{C_x^j} \|\partial_s \rho_\ell\|_{C_x^{r-j}} \\ &\leq C(\underline{e}\delta_n)^{-2} L_n \eta \delta_{n+1} \ell^{-1-r} + C \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} L_n^j \underline{e}^{-2} C_e^{(j)} \delta_n^{-2} \ell^{-j} L_n \eta \delta_{n+1} \ell^{-1-(r-j)} \\ &\quad + CL_n^r \underline{e}^{-2} C_e^{(r)} \delta_n^{-2} \ell^{-r} (\eta L_n (1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}) + |e|_{C^1}) \delta_{n+1} \ell^{-1} \\ &\leq CL_n^{r+1} \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}^2} \left(1 + (1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \eta^{-1} |e|_{C^1}) \sum_{j=1}^r C_e^{(j)} \right) \delta_n^{-2} \delta_{n+1} \ell^{-1-r} \\ &\leq CL_n^{r+1} \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}^2} (1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \eta^{-1} |e|_{C^1}) C_e^{(r)} \delta_n^{-2} \delta_{n+1} \ell^{-1-r}, \\ \|\partial_s \rho_\ell^{-1}\|_{C_x} &\leq CL_n \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}^2} (1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \eta^{-1} |e|_{C^1}) \delta_n^{-2} \delta_{n+1} \ell^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we can estimate the other factor as

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathring{R}_\ell \partial_s \rho_\ell^{-1}\|_{C_x^r} &\leq C \|\mathring{R}_\ell\|_{C_x} \|\partial_s \rho_\ell^{-1}\|_{C_x^r} + C \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \|\mathring{R}_\ell\|_{C_x^j} \|\partial_s \rho_\ell^{-1}\|_{C_x^{r-j}} + C \|\mathring{R}_\ell\|_{C_x^r} \|\partial_s \rho_\ell^{-1}\|_{C_x} \\ &\leq CL_n^{r+2} \left(\frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} \right)^2 (1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \eta^{-1} |e|_{C^1}) C_e^{(r)} \delta_n^{-2} \delta_{n+1}^2 \ell^{-1-r}, \\ \|\mathring{R}_\ell \partial_s \rho_\ell^{-1}\|_{C_x} &\leq CL_n^2 \left(\frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} \right)^2 (1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \eta^{-1} |e|_{C^1}) \delta_n^{-2} \delta_{n+1}^2 \ell^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we can combine the above estimates to find

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\partial_s \Gamma\|_{C_x^r} \\
& \leq C \left\| \left(D\gamma_k^{(j)} \right) \left(\frac{R_\ell}{\rho_\ell} \right) \right\|_{C_x} \left(\|(\partial_s \dot{R}_\ell) \rho_\ell^{-1}\|_{C_x^r} + \|\dot{R}_\ell \partial_s \rho_\ell^{-1}\|_{C_x^r} \right) \\
& \quad + C \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} \left\| \left(D\gamma_k^{(j)} \right) \left(\frac{R_\ell}{\rho_\ell} \right) \right\|_{C_x^i} \left(\|(\partial_s \dot{R}_\ell) \rho_\ell^{-1}\|_{C_x^{r-i}} + \|\dot{R}_\ell \partial_s \rho_\ell^{-1}\|_{C_x^{r-i}} \right) \\
& \quad + C \left\| \left(D\gamma_k^{(j)} \right) \left(\frac{R_\ell}{\rho_\ell} \right) \right\|_{C_x^r} \left(\|(\partial_s \dot{R}_\ell) \rho_\ell^{-1}\|_{C_x} + \|\dot{R}_\ell \partial_s \rho_\ell^{-1}\|_{C_x} \right) \\
& \leq C \left(L_n^{r+1} \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \eta C_e^{(r)} \right) \delta_{n+1} \delta_n^{-1} \ell^{-1-r} + L_n^{r+2} \left(\frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} \right)^2 (1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \eta^{-1} |e|_{C^1}) C_e^{(r)} \delta_n^{-2} \delta_{n+1}^2 \ell^{-1-r} \right) \\
& \quad + C \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} C L_n^{2i} C_e^{(i)} \ell^{1-i} \delta_n^{-1} D_n \ell^{-1-(r-i)} \\
& \quad \cdot \left(L_n^{r-i+1} \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \eta C_e^{(r-i)} \right) \delta_{n+1} \delta_n^{-1} + L_n^{r-i+2} \left(\frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} \right)^2 (1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \eta^{-1} |e|_{C^1}) C_e^{(r-i)} \delta_n^{-2} \delta_{n+1}^2 \right) \\
& \quad + C L_n^{2r} C_e^{(r)} \ell^{1-r} \delta_n^{-1} D_n \left(C L_n \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} \ell^{-1} \delta_{n+1} \delta_n^{-1} + L_n^2 \left(\frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} \right)^2 (1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \eta^{-1} |e|_{C^1}) \delta_n^{-2} \delta_{n+1}^2 \ell^{-1} \right) \\
& \leq L_n^{2(r+1)} C_e^{\partial_s \Gamma, r} \delta_{n+1} \delta_n^{-1} \ell^{-1-r}, \\
& \|\partial_s \Gamma(s, \cdot)\|_0 \leq C L_n^2 \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} (1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \eta^{-1} |e|_{C^1}) \right) \ell^{-1} \delta_{n+1} \delta_n^{-1},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
C_e^{\partial_s \Gamma, r} &= C \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + (1 + \eta) C_e^{(r)} + \eta^2 \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} C_e^{(i)} C_e^{(r-i)} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} (1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \eta^{-1} |e|_{C^1}) \left((1 + \eta) C_e^{(r)} + \eta \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} C_e^{(i)} C_e^{(r-i)} \right) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

From [23, p.64] we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\partial_s \Psi\|_{C_x} &\leq C L_n \mu \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-2}, \\
\|\partial_s \Psi\|_{C_x^r} &\leq C L_n^{r+1} \mu^{r+1} \varsigma_{n+1}^{r(\gamma-1)-1} (D_n \ell^{1-r} + \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Let us put all terms together: recall

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_s a_k^{(j)}(s, y, \tau) &= \left(\partial_s \sqrt{\rho_\ell(s, y)} \right) \Gamma(s, y) \Psi(s, y, \tau) + \sqrt{\rho_\ell(s, y)} (\partial_s \Gamma(s, y)) \Psi(s, y, \tau) \\
& \quad + \sqrt{\rho_\ell(s, y)} \Gamma(s, y) (\partial_s \Psi(s, y, \tau)).
\end{aligned}$$

For the first term, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|(\partial_s \sqrt{\rho \ell}) \Gamma \Psi\|_{C_x^r} \\
& \leq C \|\partial_s \sqrt{\rho \ell}\|_{C_x} \left(\|\Psi\|_{C_x^r} + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} \|\Gamma\|_{C_x^i} \|\Psi\|_{C_x^{r-i}} + \|\Gamma\|_{C_x^r} \right) \\
& \quad + \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \|\partial_s \sqrt{\rho \ell}\|_{C_x^j} \left(\|\Psi\|_{C_x^{r-j}} + \sum_{i=1}^{r-j-1} \|\Gamma\|_{C_x^i} \|\Psi\|_{C_x^{r-j-i}} + \|\Gamma\|_{C_x^{r-j}} \right) \\
& \quad + \|\partial_s \sqrt{\rho \ell}\|_{C_x^r} \\
& \leq C \frac{L_n \eta (1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}) + |e|_{C^1}}{\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \delta_n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{n+1} \ell^{-1} \\
& \quad \cdot \left(L_n \mu^r \zeta_{n+1}^{r(\gamma-1)} + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} L_n^{i+1} C_e^{(i)} \delta_n^{-1} \ell^{1-i} D_n L_n^{r-i} \mu^{r-i} \zeta_{n+1}^{(r-i)(\gamma-1)} \right. \\
& \quad \quad \left. + L_n^{r+1} C_e^{(r)} \delta_n^{-1} \ell^{1-r} D_n \right) \\
& \quad + C \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} L_n^{j+1} C_e^{\partial_s \sqrt{\rho}, j} \delta_n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{n+1} \ell^{-1-j} \\
& \quad \cdot \left(L_n^{r-j+1} \mu^{r-j} \zeta_{n+1}^{(r-j)(\gamma-1)} + \sum_{i=1}^{r-j-1} L_n^{i+1} C_e^{(i)} \delta_n^{-1} \ell^{1-i} D_n L_n^{r-j-i} \mu^{r-j-i} \zeta_{n+1}^{(r-j-i)(\gamma-1)} \right. \\
& \quad \quad \left. + L_n^{r-j+1} C_e^{(r-j)} \delta_n^{-1} \ell^{1-(r-j)} D_n \right) \\
& \quad + L_n^{r+1} C C_e^{\partial_s \sqrt{\rho}, r} \delta_n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{n+1} \ell^{-1-r} \\
& \leq L_n^{r+2} C_e^{\partial_s(1), r} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu^{r+1} \zeta_{n+1}^{r(\gamma-1)},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$C_e^{\partial_s(1), r} := C \left(\left(\frac{\eta(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}) + |e|_{C^1}}{\sqrt{\bar{e}}} + C_e^{\partial_s \sqrt{\rho}, r} \right) (1 + \eta C_e^{(r)}) \right),$$

using $\delta_n^{-1}\delta_{n+1}\ell^{-1} \leq \mu$ as well as $\ell^{-j} \leq (\mu\varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1})^j$. The second term can be estimated similarly by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\sqrt{\rho\ell}(\partial_s\Gamma)\Psi\|_{C_x^r} \\
& \leq C\|\sqrt{\rho\ell}\|_{C_x} \left(\|\partial_s\Gamma\|_{C_x} \|\Psi\|_{C_x^r} + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} \|\partial_s\Gamma\|_{C_x^i} \|\Psi\|_{C_x^{r-i}} + \|\partial_s\Gamma\|_{C_x^r} \right) \\
& \quad + C \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \|\sqrt{\rho\ell}\|_{C_x^j} \left(\|\partial_s\Gamma\|_{C_x} \|\Psi\|_{C_x^{r-j}} + \sum_{i=1}^{r-j-1} \|\partial_s\Gamma\|_{C_x^i} \|\Psi\|_{C_x^{r-j-i}} + \|\partial_s\Gamma\|_{C_x^{r-j}} \right) \\
& \quad + C\|\sqrt{\rho\ell}\|_{C_x^r} \|\partial_s\Gamma\|_{C_x} \\
& \leq CL_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\sqrt{\bar{e}}\delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(L_n^2 \left(1 + \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}}(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \eta^{-1}|e|_{C^1})\delta_n^{-1}\delta_{n+1} \right) \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}}\ell^{-1}\delta_{n+1}\delta_n^{-1}L_n^r\mu^r\varsigma_{n+1}^{r(\gamma-1)} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} L_n^{2(i+1)}C_e^{\partial_s\Gamma,i}\delta_{n+1}\delta_n^{-1}\ell^{-1-i}L_n^{r-i}\mu^{r-i}\varsigma_{n+1}^{(r-i)(\gamma-1)} + L_n^{2(r+1)}C_e^{\partial_s\Gamma,r}\delta_{n+1}\delta_n^{-1}\ell^{-1-r} \right) \\
& \quad + C \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} L_n^j\sqrt{\bar{e}}C_e^{(j)}\delta_n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\ell^{1-j}D_n \\
& \quad \left(L_n^2 \left(1 + \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}}(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \eta^{-1}|e|_{C^1})\delta_n^{-1}\delta_{n+1} \right) \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}}\ell^{-1}\delta_{n+1}\delta_n^{-1}L_n^{r-j}\mu^{r-j}\varsigma_{n+1}^{(r-j)(\gamma-1)} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \sum_{i=1}^{r-j-1} L_n^{2(i+1)}C_e^{\partial_s\Gamma,i}\delta_{n+1}\delta_n^{-1}\ell^{-1-i}L_n^{r-j-i}\mu^{r-j-i}\varsigma_{n+1}^{(r-j-i)(\gamma-1)} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + L_n^{2(r-j+1)}C_e^{\partial_s\Gamma,r-j}\delta_{n+1}\delta_n^{-1}\ell^{-1-(r-j)} \right) \\
& \quad + CL_n^r\sqrt{\bar{e}}C_e^{(r)}\delta_n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\ell^{1-r}D_nL_n^2 \left(1 + \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}}(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \eta^{-1}|e|_{C^1})\delta_n^{-1}\delta_{n+1} \right) \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}}\ell^{-1}\delta_{n+1}\delta_n^{-1} \\
& \leq L_n^{2r+\frac{5}{2}}C_e^{\partial_s(2),r}\delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\mu^{r+1}\varsigma_{n+1}^{r(\gamma-1)-1}(D_n\ell^{1-r} + \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1}),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$C_e^{\partial_s(2),r} := C\sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \eta C_e^{(r)} \right) \left(\left(1 + \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}}(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \eta^{-1}|e|_{C^1}) \right) \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} + C_e^{\partial_s\Gamma,r} \right).$$

Finally, we estimate the third term:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\sqrt{\rho\ell}\Gamma\partial_s\Psi\|_{C_x^r} \\
& \leq C\|\sqrt{\rho\ell}\|_{C_x} \left(\|\partial_s\Psi\|_{C_x^r} + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} \|\Gamma\|_{C_x^i} \|\partial_s\Psi\|_{C_x^{r-i}} + \|\Gamma\|_{C_x^r} \|\partial_s\Psi\|_{C_x} \right) \\
& \quad + C \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \|\sqrt{\rho\ell}\|_{C_x^j} \left(\|\partial_s\Psi\|_{C_x^{r-j}} + \sum_{i=1}^{r-j-1} \|\Gamma\|_{C_x^i} \|\partial_s\Psi\|_{C_x^{r-j-i}} + \|\Gamma\|_{C_x^{r-j}} \|\partial_s\Psi\|_{C_x} \right) \\
& \quad + C\|\sqrt{\rho\ell}\|_{C_x^r} \|\partial_s\Psi\|_{C_x} \\
& \leq CL_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\sqrt{\bar{e}}\delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(L_n^{r+1}\mu^{r+1}\varsigma_{n+1}^{r(\gamma-1)-1}(D_n\ell^{1-r} + \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1}) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} L_n^{i+1}C_e^{(i)}\delta_n^{-1}\ell^{1-i}D_nL_n^{r-i+1}\mu^{r-i+1}\varsigma_{n+1}^{(r-i)(\gamma-1)-1}(D_n\ell^{1-(r-i)} + \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1}) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + L_n^{r+1}C_e^{(r)}\delta_n^{-1}\ell^{1-r}D_nL_n\mu\varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-2} \right) \\
& \quad + C \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} L_n^j\sqrt{\bar{e}}C_e^{(j)}\delta_n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\ell^{1-j}D_n \\
& \quad \left(L_n^{r-j+1}\mu^{r-j+1}\varsigma_{n+1}^{(r-j)(\gamma-1)-1}(D_n\ell^{1-(r-j)} + \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1}) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \sum_{i=1}^{r-j-1} L_n^{i+1}C_e^{(i)}\delta_n^{-1}\ell^{1-i}D_nL_n^{r-j-i+1}\mu^{r-j-i+1}\varsigma_{n+1}^{(r-j-i)(\gamma-1)-1}(D_n\ell^{1-(r-j-i)} + \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1}) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + L_n^{r-j+1}C_e^{(r-j)}\delta_n^{-1}\ell^{1-(r-j)}D_nL_n\mu\varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-2} \right) \\
& \quad + CL_n^r\sqrt{\bar{e}}C_e^{(r)}\delta_n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\ell^{1-r}D_nL_n\mu\varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-2} \\
& \leq L_n^{r+\frac{3}{2}}C_e^{\partial_s(3),r}\delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\mu^{r+1}\varsigma_{n+1}^{r(\gamma-1)-1}(D_n\ell^{1-r} + \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1}),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$C_e^{\partial_s(3),r} := C\sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \eta C_e^{(r)} + \eta^2 \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} C_e^{(j)} C_e^{(r-j)} \right).$$

Thus in total

$$\|\partial_s a_k\|_{C_x^r} \leq L_n^{2r+\frac{5}{2}} \left(C_e^{\partial_s(1),r} + C_e^{\partial_s(2),r} + C_e^{\partial_s(3),r} \right) \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu^{r+1} \varsigma_{n+1}^{r(\gamma-1)-1} (D_n \ell^{1-r} + \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1}).$$

Furthermore

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\partial_s a_k\|_{C_x} & \leq C \left(\|\partial_s \sqrt{\rho\ell}\|_{C_x} + \|\sqrt{\rho\ell}\|_{C_x} (\|\partial_s \Gamma\|_{C_x} + \|\partial_s \Psi\|_{C_x}) \right) \\
& \leq C \left(\frac{L_n \eta (1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}) + |e|_{C^1} \delta_n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{n+1} \ell^{-1}}{\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + L_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\bar{e}} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(L_n^2 \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} (1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \eta^{-1} |e|_{C^1}) \right) \ell^{-1} \delta_{n+1} \delta_n^{-1} + L_n \mu \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-2} \right) \right) \\
& \leq CL_n^{\frac{5}{2}} \left(\frac{\eta(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}) + |e|_{C^1}}{\sqrt{\bar{e}}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} (1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \eta^{-1} |e|_{C^1}) \right) \right) \right) \mu \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-2} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

This finally concludes the proof of Proposition 6.3. \square

8.2 The principal part

In this section, we show the main estimates for the principal part of the perturbation, namely those of Proposition 6.4 and Lemma 6.5.

Proof of Proposition 6.4. Recall that

$$U_k(s, y, \tau, \xi) = \sum_{k \neq k'} a_k(s, y, \tau) a_{k'}(s, y, \tau) E_k \otimes E_{k'} e^{-ik' \cdot \xi}.$$

From this, we immediately find, for $t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_L]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|U_k\|_{C_y^\delta} &\leq C \sum_{k \neq k'} \|a_k\|_{C_x^\delta} \|a_{k'}\|_{C_x} + \|a_k\|_{C_x} \|a_{k'}\|_{C_x^\delta} \leq CL_n^3 \sqrt{\bar{e}} C_e^{(1), \delta} \mu^\delta \varsigma_{n+1}^{\delta(\alpha-1)} \delta_n, \\ \|U_k\|_{C_y^r} &\leq C \sum_{k \neq k'} \sum_{j=0}^r \|a_k\|_{C_x^j} \|a_{k'}\|_{C_x^{r-j}} \leq CL_n^{2r+3} \left(C_e^{(5), r} \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor} C_e^{(5), j} C_e^{(5), r-j} \right) \delta_n \mu^r \varsigma_{n+1}^{r(\alpha-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 6.5. Recall that since $\lambda = C\mu^2\varsigma_{n+1}^{\alpha-2}$ and hence $\lambda \geq \mu(D_n\ell^{-1} + \varsigma_{n+1}^{\alpha-1})$, similar to the proof of [23, Lemma 4.10] and the above estimates we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_o\|_{C_{\leq \mathfrak{t}_L} C_x^\delta} &\leq CL^{2\delta} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}} C_e^{(1), \delta} \lambda^\delta \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ \|w_o\|_{C_{\leq \mathfrak{t}_L} C_x^{1+\delta}} &\leq CL^{2(1+\delta)} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}+2\delta} (C_e^{(1), 1} + (C_e^{(5), 2})^\delta (C_e^{(1), 1})^{1-\delta}) \lambda^{1+\delta} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

For $\partial_t w_o$ we take the same approach as in [23, Lemma 4.10]: below we will show

$$\|\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{trans}}\|_{C_{\leq \mathfrak{t}_L} C_x^1} \leq C_e^{\text{trans}, 1} L^{3(1+\delta)} L_n^{\frac{7}{2}} \lambda^{1+\delta} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

By the stationary phase lemma (Equ. (B.6) to be precise), we furthermore deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \partial_t w_o \right\|_{C_{\leq \mathfrak{t}_L} C_x} &\leq CL\lambda^{-1} ([\partial_s a_k]_{C_t C_x^1} + \lambda[\partial_\tau a_k + ik \cdot \bar{v} a_k]_{C_t C_x^1} + \lambda[k \cdot v_\ell a_k]_{C_t C_x^1}) \\ &\leq CLL_n^{\frac{9}{2}} \left(C_e^{(8), 1} + C_e^{(3), 1} + M_v C_e^{(1), 1} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \right) \mu \varsigma_{n+1}^{\alpha-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we summarize

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t w_o\|_{C_{\leq \mathfrak{t}_L} C_x} &\leq C \left(\|\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{trans}}\|_{C_t C_x^1} + \|v_\ell\|_{C_t C_x} \|w_o\|_{C_t C_x^1} + \left\| \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \partial_t w_o \right\|_{C_t C_x} \right) \\ &\leq C_e^{\text{trans}, 1} L^{3(1+\delta)} L_n^{\frac{7}{2}} \lambda^{1+\delta} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} + CLL_n^{\frac{7}{2}} C_e^{(1), 1} M_v \lambda \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + CLL_n^{\frac{9}{2}} \left(C_e^{(8), 1} + C_e^{(3), 1} + M_v C_e^{(1), 1} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \right) \mu \varsigma_{n+1}^{\alpha-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq CL^{3(1+\delta)} L_n^{\frac{9}{2}} \left(C_e^{\text{trans}, 1} + C_e^{(8), 1} + C_e^{(3), 1} + M_v C_e^{(1), 1} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \right) \lambda^{1+\delta} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &=: C_e^{\partial_t w_o} L^{3(1+\delta)} L_n^{\frac{9}{2}} \lambda^{1+\delta} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof. \square

8.3 The corrector w_c

Proof of Lemma 6.6. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\|w_c^1\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^\delta} &\leq \|\mathcal{Q}_{\phi_n} v_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^\delta}, \\ \|w_c^1\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^{1+\delta}} &\leq \ell^{-1} \|\mathcal{Q}_{\phi_n} v_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^\delta}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus we just have to estimate as in [23, Equ. (4.13)]:

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathcal{Q}_{\phi_n} v_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^\delta} &\leq CL^{6+2\delta} \|\operatorname{div}_{\phi_n} v_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L} B_{\infty, \infty}^{\delta-1}} \\ &\leq CL^{6+2\delta} \|\operatorname{div}_{\phi_n} v_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L} B_{\infty, \infty}^{-1}}^{1-2\delta} \|\operatorname{div}_{\phi_n} v_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L} B_{\infty, \infty}^{-1/2}}^{2\delta},\end{aligned}$$

and, using Lemma B.9, Lemma B.2 and Lemma B.8,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\operatorname{div}_{\phi_n} v_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L} B_{\infty, \infty}^{-1/2}} &= \|\operatorname{div}[v_n \circ \phi_n^{-1}] \circ \phi_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L} B_{\infty, \infty}^{-1/2}} \leq CL^{7/2} \|\operatorname{div}[v_n \circ \phi_n^{-1}]\|_{C_{\leq t_L} B_{\infty, \infty}^{-1/2}} \\ &\leq CL^4 \|v_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^{1/2}} \leq CL^4 L_n (1 + M_v) D_n.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we conclude

$$\|\mathcal{Q}_{\phi_n} v_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^\delta} \leq C(1 + M_v^{2\delta}) L^{6+10\delta} L_n \delta_{n+2}^{5(1-2\delta)/4} D_n^{2\delta} \leq C(1 + M_v^{2\delta}) L^7 L_n \delta_{n+2}^{6/5},$$

which in turn completes the proof of the estimates for w_c^1 . For the other corrector term, we find

$$\begin{aligned}\|w_c^2\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^\delta} &\leq CL^{1+\delta} \lambda^{-1} \sum_k \lambda^\delta [a_k]_{C_x^1} + L^\delta \|a_k\|_{C_x^{1+\delta}} \\ &\leq CL^{1+\delta} \lambda^{-1} \sum_k \lambda^\delta C_e^{(1),1} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}} \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{\gamma-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} + L^\delta C_e^{(5),1+\delta} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}+\delta} \mu^{1+\delta} \zeta_{n+1}^{(1+\delta)(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq CL^{1+2\delta} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}+\delta} (C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta}) \lambda^{\delta-1} \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{\gamma-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ \|w_c^2\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^{1+\delta}} &\leq CL^{2+\delta} \lambda^{-1} \sum_k \lambda^{1+\delta} [a_k]_{C_x^1} + L^{1+\delta} \|a_k\|_{C_x^{2+\delta}} \\ &\leq CL^{2+\delta} \lambda^{-1} \sum_k \lambda^{1+\delta} C_e^{(1),1} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}} \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{\gamma-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} + L^{1+\delta} C_e^{(5),2+\delta} L_n^{\frac{7}{2}+\delta} \mu^{2+\delta} \zeta_{n+1}^{(2+\delta)(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq CL^{3+2\delta} L_n^{\frac{7}{2}+\delta} (C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta}) \lambda^\delta \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{\gamma-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}.\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. \square

8.4 The total perturbation

Proof of Lemma 6.7. As $w_{n+1} = w_o + w_c^1 + w_c^2$, we find, using Lemmas 6.5 and 6.6

$$\begin{aligned}\|w_{n+1}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^\delta} &\leq \|w_o\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^\delta} + \|w_c^1\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^\delta} + \|w_c^2\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^\delta} \\ &\leq C \left(L^{2\delta} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}} C_e^{(1),\delta} \lambda^\delta \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} + L^7 L_n (1 + M_v^{2\delta}) \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}} + L^{1+2\delta} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}+\delta} (C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta}) \lambda^{\delta-1} \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{\gamma-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(C_e^{(1),\delta} + 1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right) \left(1 + \frac{\delta_{n+2}^{6/5}}{\lambda^\delta \delta_n^{1/2}} + \frac{\mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{\gamma-1}}{\lambda} \right) L^{1+2\delta} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}+\delta} \lambda^\delta \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \stackrel{\text{Equ. (6.6), (6.1)}}{\leq} & C \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right) L^{1+2\delta} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}+\delta} \lambda^\delta \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|w_{n+1}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^{1+\delta}} \leq \|w_o\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^{1+\delta}} + \|w_c^1\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^{1+\delta}} + \|w_c^2\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^{1+\delta}} \\
& \stackrel{\text{Lemmas 6.5, 6.6}}{\leq} C(C_e^{(1),1} + (C_e^{(5),2})^\delta (C_e^{(1),1})^{1-\delta}) L^{2+2\delta} L_n^{5/2+\delta} \lambda^{1+\delta} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \quad + C(1 + M_v^{2\delta}) L^7 L_n \ell^{-1} \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}} + C(C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta}) L^{3+2\delta} L_n^{7/2+\delta} \lambda^{1+\delta} \\
& \leq C \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + (C_e^{(5),2})^\delta (C_e^{(1),1})^{1-\delta} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta} \right) \left(1 + \frac{\delta_{n+2}^{6/5} \ell^{-1}}{\delta_n^{1/2} \lambda^{1+\delta}} \right) L^{3+2\delta} L_n^{7/2+\delta} \delta_n^{1/2} \lambda^{1+\delta} \\
& \stackrel{\text{Equ. (6.1)}}{\leq} C \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + (C_e^{(5),2})^\delta (C_e^{(1),1})^{1-\delta} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta} \right) L^{3+2\delta} L_n^{7/2+\delta} \delta_n^{1/2} \lambda^{1+\delta}.
\end{aligned}$$

The third estimate follows as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|v_{n+1}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^{1+\delta}} \leq \|v_\ell\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^\delta} + \|w_{n+1}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^\delta} \\
& \stackrel{\text{Equ. (6.17)}}{\leq} C \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v + C_e^{(1),1} + (C_e^{(5),2})^\delta (C_e^{(1),1})^{1-\delta} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta} \right) L^{3+2\delta} L_n^{7/2+\delta} \delta_n^{1/2} \lambda^{1+\delta}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the last estimate, by the previous lemmas as well as Equ. (6.32), (6.12), (6.4) (6.1), (6.3), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|w_{n+1} - v_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x} = \|v_\ell - v_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x} + \|w_{n+1}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x} \\
& \leq C \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} + \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + \eta + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right) \delta_{n+1}^{1/2} \right) L^{1+2\delta} L_n^{5/2+3\delta} \delta_n^{1/2}. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

8.5 Transport error

In the next sections, we control all stress terms from Section 6.7. We start with the transport error.

Proof of Proposition 6.9. As in [23, Proof of Proposition 4.3], we let $b_k := (\partial_\tau a_k + i(k \cdot \tilde{v})a_k) \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}$ and $\Omega_k^\lambda(\cdot) := \Omega_k(\lambda \cdot)$ (recalling that $\Omega_k(\xi) := E_k e^{ik \cdot \xi}$), and use the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{R}_{n+1}^{\text{trans}} &= \hat{R}_{n+1}^{\text{trans},1} + \hat{R}_{n+1}^{\text{trans},2} + \hat{R}_{n+1}^{\text{trans},3}, \\
\hat{R}_{n+1}^{\text{trans},1} &:= \lambda \mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} \left(\sum_{k \in \Lambda} (b_k \Omega_k^\lambda) \circ \phi_{n+1} \right), \\
\hat{R}_{n+1}^{\text{trans},2} &:= \mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} \left(\sum_{k \in \Lambda} (v_\ell \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1} \cdot \nabla_y (a_k \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}) \Omega_k^\lambda) \circ \phi_{n+1} \right), \\
\hat{R}_{n+1}^{\text{trans},3} &:= \mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} \left(\sum_{k \in \Lambda} (\partial_s a_k \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1} \Omega_k^\lambda) \circ \phi_{n+1} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

We estimate, for $r \geq r_* + 2$ and $t \in [0, t_L]$, using the stationary phase lemma B.12,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\hat{R}_{n+1}^{\text{trans},1}\|_{C_x^\delta} \leq CL^\delta \sum_k \lambda^\delta \|\partial_\tau a_k + ik \cdot \tilde{v} a_k\|_{C_x} + L^r \lambda^{1+\delta-r} \|\partial_\tau a_k + ik \cdot \tilde{v} a_k\|_{C_x^r} \\
& \quad + L^{r+\delta} \lambda^{1-r} \|\partial_\tau a_k + ik \cdot \tilde{v} a_k\|_{C_x^{r+\delta}} \\
& \leq CL^\delta \sum_k \lambda^\delta L_n^{\frac{5}{2}} \sqrt{\bar{e}} \mu^{-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} + L^r \lambda^{1+\delta-r} C_e^{(7),r} L_n^{r+1} \mu^{r-1} \zeta_{n+1}^{r(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \quad + L^{r+\delta} \lambda^{1-r} C_e^{(7),r+\delta} L_n^{r+\delta+1} \mu^{r+\delta-1} \zeta_{n+1}^{(r+\delta)(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq CL^{r+2\delta} L_n^{r+\delta+1} \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} + C_e^{(7),r} + C_e^{(7),r+\delta} \right) \lambda^\delta \mu^{-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{trans},2}\|_{C_x^\delta} &\leq CL^\delta \sum_k \lambda^{\delta-1} \|(v_\ell \cdot \nabla) a_k\|_{C_x} + L^r \lambda^{\delta-r} [(v_\ell \cdot \nabla) a_k]_{C_x^r} + L^{r+\delta} \lambda^{-r} [(v_\ell \cdot \nabla) a_k]_{C_x^{r+\delta}} \\
&\leq CL^\delta \sum_k \lambda^{\delta-1} C_e^{(1),1} M_v L_n^{\frac{7}{2}} \mu \zeta_{n+1}^{\gamma-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} + L^r \lambda^{\delta-r} C_e^{(5),r+1} M_v L_n^{r+\frac{5}{2}} \mu^{r+1} \zeta_{n+1}^{(r+1)(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad + L^{r+\delta} \lambda^{-r} C_e^{(5),r+\delta+1} M_v L_n^{r+\delta+\frac{5}{2}} \mu^{r+\delta+1} \zeta_{n+1}^{(r+\delta+1)(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C \left(C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),r+1} + C_e^{(5),r+\delta+1} \right) M_v L_n^{r+\delta+\frac{5}{2}} L^{r+2\delta} \lambda^{\delta-1} \mu \zeta_{n+1}^{\gamma-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{trans},3}\|_{C_x^\delta} &\leq CL^\delta \sum_k \lambda^{\delta-1} \|\partial_s a_k\|_{C_x} + L^r \lambda^{\delta-r} [\partial_s a_k]_{C_x^r} + L^{r+\delta} \lambda^{-r} [\partial_s a_k]_{C_x^{r+\delta}} \\
&\leq CL^\delta \sum_k \lambda^{\delta-1} C_e^{(4),0} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}} \mu \zeta_{n+1}^{\gamma-2} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} + L^r \lambda^{\delta-r} C_e^{(8),r} L_n^{2r+\frac{5}{2}} \mu^{r+1} \zeta_{n+1}^{r(\gamma-1)-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(D_n \ell^{1-r} + \zeta_{n+1}^{\gamma-1} \right) \\
&\quad + L^{r+\delta} \lambda^{-r} C_e^{(8),r+\delta} L_n^{2(r+\delta)+\frac{5}{2}} \mu^{r+\delta+1} \zeta_{n+1}^{(r+\delta)(\gamma-1)-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(D_n \ell^{1-(r+\delta)} + \zeta_{n+1}^{\gamma-1} \right) \\
&\leq C \left(C_e^{(4),0} + C_e^{(8),r} + C_e^{(8),r+\delta} \right) L^{r+2\delta} L_n^{2(r+\delta)+\frac{5}{2}} \lambda^{\delta-1} \mu \zeta_{n+1}^{\gamma-2} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

In total this gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{trans}}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x} &\leq C \left(\sqrt{\bar{\epsilon}} + C_e^{(7),r} + C_e^{(7),r+\delta} + \left(C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),r+1} + C_e^{(5),r+\delta+1} \right) M_v + C_e^{(4),0} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + C_e^{(8),r} + C_e^{(8),r+\delta} \right) L^{r+2\delta} L_n^{2(r+\delta)+\frac{5}{2}} \lambda^\delta \mu^{-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, using Equ. (B.5), we find for $t \in [0, t_L]$

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{trans},1}\|_{C_x^1} &\leq \|\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{trans},1}\|_{C_x^{1+\delta}} \\
&\leq C \lambda L^{3+2\delta} \sum_k \|(\partial_\tau a_k + \mathbf{i}k \cdot \tilde{v} a_k)(\Omega_k^\lambda \circ \phi_{n+1})\|_{C_x^\delta} \\
&\leq C \lambda L^{3+2\delta} \sum_k L^\delta \|\partial_\tau a_k + \mathbf{i}k \cdot \tilde{v} a_k\|_{C_x} \|\Omega_k^\lambda\|_{C_x^\delta} + \|\partial_\tau a_k + \mathbf{i}k \cdot \tilde{v} a_k\|_{C_x^\delta} \\
&\leq CL^{3(1+\delta)} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}} \left(C_e^{(3),0} + C_e^{(3),\delta} \right) \lambda^{1+\delta} \mu^{-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{trans},2}\|_{C_x^1} &\leq \|\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{trans},2}\|_{C_x^{1+\delta}} \\
&\leq CL^{3+2\delta} \sum_k \|((v_\ell \cdot \nabla_y) a_k)(\Omega_k^\lambda \circ \phi_{n+1})\|_{C_x^\delta} \\
&\leq CL^{3+2\delta} \sum_k L^\delta \|(v_\ell \cdot \nabla_y) a_k\|_{C_x} \|\Omega_k^\lambda\|_{C_x^\delta} + \|(v_\ell \cdot \nabla_y) a_k\|_{C_x^\delta} \\
&\leq CL^{3(1+\delta)} L_n^{\frac{7}{2}} M_v \left(C_e^{(1),1} + \left(C_e^{(5),2} \right)^\delta \left(C_e^{(1),1} \right)^{1-\delta} \right) \lambda^{1+\delta} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

since by interpolation

$$\|(v_\ell \cdot \nabla_y) a_k\|_{C_x^\delta} \leq C \left(C_e^{(5),2} \right)^\delta \left(C_e^{(1),1} \right)^{1-\delta} L_n^{\frac{7}{2}} M_v \left(\mu \zeta_{n+1}^{\gamma-1} \right)^{1+\delta} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Finally, the third term can be estimated in the same way by

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{trans},3}\|_{C_x^1} &\leq \|\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{trans},3}\|_{C_x^{1+\delta}} \\
&\leq CL^{3+2\delta} \sum_k \|(\partial_s a_k)(\Omega_k^\lambda \circ \phi_{n+1})\|_{C_x^\delta} \\
&\leq CL^{3+2\delta} \sum_k L^\delta \|\partial_s a_k\|_{C_x} \|\Omega_k^\lambda\|_{C_x^\delta} + \|\partial_s a_k\|_{C_x^\delta} \\
&\leq CL^{3(1+\delta)} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}+\delta} \left(C_e^{(4),0} + \left(C_e^{(8),1} \right)^\delta \left(C_e^{(4),0} \right)^{1-\delta} \right) \lambda^{1+\delta} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

where again by interpolation we found

$$\|\partial_s a_k\|_{C^\delta} \leq C \left(C_e^{(8),1} \right)^\delta \left(C_e^{(4),0} \right)^{1-\delta} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}+2\delta} \left(D_n + \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1} \right)^\delta \mu \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-2} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

In total, this gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{trans}}\|_{C_{\leq \iota_L} C_x^1} &\leq C_e^{\text{trans},1} L^{3(1+\delta)} L_n^{\frac{7}{2}} \lambda^{1+\delta} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\
C_e^{\text{trans},1} &:= C \left(C_e^{(3),0} + \left(C_e^{(3),1} \right)^\delta \left(C_e^{(3),0} \right)^{1-\delta} + \left(C_e^{(1),1} + \left(C_e^{(5),2} \right)^\delta \left(C_e^{(1),1} \right)^{1-\delta} \right) M_v \right. \\
&\quad \left. + C_e^{(4),0} + \left(C_e^{(8),1} \right)^\delta \left(C_e^{(4),0} \right)^{1-\delta} \right). \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

8.6 Oscillation error

Proof of Proposition 6.10. Following [23, Section 4.3], we use the definition of $\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{osc}}$ and w_o , the representation (6.33) and the stationary phase lemma B.12 to deduce, for $r \geq r_* + 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{osc}}\|_{C_{\leq \iota_L} C_x^\delta} &\leq CL^\delta \sum_k L \lambda^{\delta-1} [U_k]_{C_{\leq \iota_L} C_x^1} + L^{r+1} \lambda^{\delta-r} [U_k]_{C_{\leq \iota_L} C_x^{r+1}} + L^{r+\delta+1} \lambda^{-r} [U_k]_{C_{\leq \iota_L} C_x^{r+1+\delta}} \\
&\leq CL^{r+2\delta+1} \sum_k \lambda^{\delta-1} L_n^3 \sqrt{\bar{e}} C_e^{(1),1} \mu \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1} \delta_n + \lambda^{\delta-r} L_n^{2r+5} C_e^{(7),r+1} \mu^{r+1} \varsigma_{n+1}^{(r+1)(\gamma-1)} \delta_n \\
&\quad + \lambda^{-r} L_n^{2(r+\delta)+5} C_e^{(7),r+\delta+1} \mu^{r+\delta+1} \varsigma_{n+1}^{(r+\delta+1)(\gamma-1)} \delta_n \\
&\leq CL^{r+2\delta+1} L_n^{2(r+\delta)+5} \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(7),r+1} + C_e^{(7),r+\delta+1} \right) \lambda^{\delta-1} \mu \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1} \delta_n.
\end{aligned}$$

For the first order norm, an application of Equ. (B.5) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{osc}}\|_{C_{\leq \iota_L} C_x^1} \\
&\leq CL^{3+2\delta} \sum_k \left\| \text{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} \left(U_k - \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(U_k) \text{Id} \right) \Omega_k^\lambda \circ \phi_{n+1} \right\|_{C_{\leq \iota_L} C_x^\delta} \\
&\leq CL^{3+2\delta} \sum_k L^\delta \lambda^\delta \left\| \text{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} \left(U_k - \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(U_k) \text{Id} \right) \right\|_{C_{\leq \iota_L} C_x^0} + \left\| \text{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} \left(U_k - \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(U_k) \text{Id} \right) \right\|_{C_{\leq \iota_L} C_x^\delta} \\
&\leq CL^{3+2\delta} \sum_k L^{1+\delta} \lambda^\delta \|U_k\|_{C_x^1} + L^{1+2\delta} \|U_k\|_{C_x^{1+\delta}} \\
&\leq CL^{3+2\delta} \sum_k L^{1+\delta} L_n^3 \lambda^\delta \sqrt{\bar{e}} C_e^{(1),1} \mu \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1} \delta_n + L^{1+2\delta} L_n^{3+4\delta} \left(C_e^{(7),2} \right)^\delta \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} C_e^{(1),1} \right)^{1-\delta} \mu^{1+\delta} \varsigma_{n+1}^{(1+\delta)(\gamma-1)} \delta_n \\
&\leq CL^{4(1+\delta)} L_n^{3+4\delta} \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} C_e^{(1),1} + \left(C_e^{(7),2} \right)^\delta \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} C_e^{(1),1} \right)^{1-\delta} \right) \lambda^{1+\delta} \delta_n. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

8.7 Flow error

8.7.1 First term

Here we rederive the estimates for the first part of the flow error, carefully tracking all energy dependencies of the constants.

Proof of Proposition 6.11. As in [23, Section 4.4], we further decompose the first part of the flow error into

$$\begin{aligned}\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{flow},1} &= \mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{flow},1,1} + \mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{flow},1,2}, \\ \mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{flow},1,1} &:= \mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} G_\ell, \\ \mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{flow},1,2} &:= \mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} (w_o \operatorname{div} \phi_{n+1} v_\ell),\end{aligned}$$

where $G_\ell := (\operatorname{div} \phi_{n+1} - \operatorname{div} \phi_n) F_\ell$, $F_\ell := F_n * \chi_\ell$, and $F_n := v_n \otimes v_n - \mathring{R}_n + q_n \operatorname{Id}$.

Now we estimate separately: First we estimate F_n via

$$\|F_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x} \leq CM_v^2 L_n^2 + CL_n \eta \delta_{n+1} + CM_q L_n \leq C(\eta + M_v^2 + M_q) L_n^2.$$

Thus, we deduce from mollification estimates and Equ. (B.3) as in [23, Proof of Proposition 4.8] that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{flow},1,1}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^\delta} &\leq C(\eta + M_v^2 + M_q) L^{8+4\delta} L_n^2 \ell^{-\delta} (n+1) \varsigma_n^{\gamma'}, \\ \|\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{flow},1,1}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^{1+\delta}} &\leq C(\eta + M_v^2 + M_q) L^{9+3\delta} L_n^2 \ell^{-1-\delta} (n+1) \varsigma_n^{\gamma'}.\end{aligned}$$

For the second part, we use again the stationary phase lemma B.12 to find, for $r \geq r_* + 2$, and $t \leq t_L$

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{flow},1,2}\|_{C_x^\delta} &\leq CL^\delta \sum_k L \lambda^{\delta-1} \|a_k\|_{C_x} \|v_\ell\|_{C_x^1} \\ &\quad + L^{r+1} \sum_{r_1+r_2=r} \lambda^{\delta-r} \|a_k\|_{C_x^{r_1}} \|v_\ell\|_{C_x^{r_2+1}} + L^{r+2} \sum_{r_1+r_2=r+1} \lambda^{-r} \|a_k\|_{C_x^{r_1}} \|v_\ell\|_{C_x^{r_2+1}} \\ &\leq CL^\delta \sum_k L \lambda^{\delta-1} L_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\bar{e}} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} L_n D_n \\ &\quad + L^{r+1} \lambda^{\delta-r} \left(L_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\bar{e}} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \ell^{-r} L_n D_n + C_e^{(5),r} L_n^{r+\frac{3}{2}} \mu^r \varsigma_{n+1}^{r(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} L_n D_n \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} C_e^{(5),j} L_n^{j+\frac{3}{2}} \mu^j \varsigma_{n+1}^{j(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} L_n D_n \ell^{-(r-j)} \right) \\ &\quad + L^{r+2} \lambda^{-r} \left(L_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\bar{e}} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \ell^{-(r+1)} L_n D_n + C_e^{(5),r+1} L_n^{r+\frac{5}{2}} \mu^{r+1} \varsigma_{n+1}^{(r+1)(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} L_n D_n \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{j=1}^r C_e^{(5),j} L_n^{j+\frac{3}{2}} \mu^j \varsigma_{n+1}^{j(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} L_n D_n \ell^{-(r+1-j)} \right) \\ &\leq CL^{r+2+\delta} L_n^{r+\frac{7}{2}} C_e^{(5),r+1} \lambda^{\delta-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} D_n.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, applying Equ (B.5), we find for $t \leq t_L$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{flow},1,2}\|_{C_x^{1+\delta}} \\
& \leq CL^{3+2\delta} \sum_k \|a_k(\Omega_k^\lambda \circ \phi_{n+1}) \text{div}^{\phi_{n+1}} v_\ell\|_{C_x^\delta} \\
& \leq CL^{3+2\delta} \sum_k \|a_k\|_{C_x^\delta} \|\text{div}^{\phi_{n+1}} v_\ell\|_{C_x} + L^\delta \lambda^\delta \|a_k\|_{C_x} \|\text{div}^{\phi_{n+1}} v_\ell\|_{C_x} + \|a_k\|_0 \|\text{div}^{\phi_{n+1}} v_\ell\|_{C^\delta} \\
& \leq CL^{3+2\delta} \sum_k C_e^{(1),\delta} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}} \mu_n^\delta \varsigma_{n+1}^{\delta(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} D_n + L^{1+\delta} L_n^{\frac{3}{2}} \sqrt{\bar{e}} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} D_n + L^{1+2\delta} L_n^{\frac{3}{2}} \sqrt{\bar{e}} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} D_n \ell^{-\delta} \\
& \leq CL^{4(1+\delta)} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}} C_e^{(1),\delta} \lambda^\delta \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} D_n. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

8.7.2 Second term

In this section, we consider the new term of the flow error, $\mathring{R}_2^{\text{flow}}$. We will handle it using a Besov interpolation argument. Let us first explain why a simpler approach did not work.

Remark 8.1. (a) For $\mathring{R}_2^{\text{flow}}$, the “naïve” approach of using the Fourier definition of the fractional Laplacian does not work here, or at least it is very difficult. The problem is that if we use the definition of $\mathring{R}_2^{\text{flow}}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left((-\Delta)_{\phi_{n+1}}^\alpha v_\ell - (-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha v_\ell \right) (t, x) \\
& = \sum_k |k|^{2\alpha} \left[\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v_\ell(t, z) e^{ik \cdot \phi_{n+1}(t, z)} dz e^{-ik \cdot \phi_{n+1}(t, x)} - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v_\ell(t, z) e^{ik \cdot \phi_n(t, z)} dz e^{-ik \cdot \phi_n(t, x)} \right] \\
& = \sum_k |k|^{2\alpha} \left[\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v_\ell(t, z) \left[e^{ik \cdot \phi_{n+1}(t, z)} - e^{ik \cdot \phi_n(t, z)} \right] dz e^{-ik \cdot \phi_{n+1}(t, x)} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v_\ell(t, z) e^{ik \cdot \phi_n(t, z)} dz \left[e^{-ik \cdot \phi_{n+1}(t, x)} - e^{-ik \cdot \phi_n(t, x)} \right] \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Can we make this small enough? At first sight, yes, however, there is a trade-off here. We need to achieve at the same time smallness with respect to n , i.e. smallness in terms of the parameters of the convex integration scheme and smallness with respect to k , i.e. summability due to the nonlocal nature of the fractional Laplacian.

It is not clear how to balance these two constraints in a way that makes the convex integration scheme work. This seems to be due to the lack of “explicit” damping factors $|k|^{-N}$ in the expressions above. The usual way to create them is to introduce derivatives on the exponential factor and use integration by parts, but this means we will have more derivatives on v_ℓ , and hence factors of ℓ^{-1} , but we cannot afford much more than $\ell^{-\delta-\alpha}$, and definitely not ℓ^{-N} for some integer $N \geq 1$. So it seems like one needs to avoid using this definition of the fractional Laplacian.

(b) Another in principle plausible approach would be to use the “paralinearisation lemma” of [4, Corollary 2.91]. We first tried a similar approach as in [23, Lemma C.2], using continuity of the Bessel potential operators $(\mathbb{I} - \Delta)^{-1}$ and the explicit, local nature of $(\mathbb{I} - \Delta)$ as well as duality to get a more manageable form of the resulting expressions and then apply the paralinearisation lemma in a Besov space of “sufficiently high” regularity. However, a more careful inspection of the lemma’s proof reveals that the constant in the lemma depends on higher derivatives than the second if s is large. We could not find a way to employ this tool in a way that circumvents this issue. Hence we needed a different argument.

We first apply that $\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}}$ is an order (-1) operator: for $t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_L]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} \left(\left[(-\Delta)_{\phi_{n+1}}^\alpha - (-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha \right] v_\ell \right) \right\|_{C_x^\delta} &= \left\| \mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} \left(\left[(-\Delta)_{\phi_{n+1}}^\alpha - (-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha \right] v_\ell \right) \right\|_{B_{\infty, \infty}^\delta} \\ &\stackrel{\text{Equ. (B.3)}}{\leq} CL^{5+4\delta} \left\| \left[(-\Delta)_{\phi_{n+1}}^\alpha - (-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha \right] v_\ell \right\|_{B_{\infty, \infty}^{\delta-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\left[(-\Delta)_{\phi_{n+1}}^\alpha - (-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha \right] v_\ell \\ &= (-\Delta)^\alpha (v_\ell \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}) \circ \phi_{n+1} - (-\Delta)^\alpha (v_\ell \circ \phi_n^{-1}) \circ \phi_n \\ &= (-\Delta)^\alpha (v_\ell \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1} - v_\ell \circ \phi_n^{-1}) \circ \phi_{n+1} + \left[(-\Delta)^\alpha (v_\ell \circ \phi_n^{-1}) \circ \phi_{n+1} - (-\Delta)^\alpha (v_\ell \circ \phi_n^{-1}) \circ \phi_n \right] \\ &=: I + II. \end{aligned}$$

Note that both terms have a similar form. In particular, the following holds:

Lemma 8.2. *We have for $t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_L]$*

$$\begin{aligned} \|I\|_{B_{\infty, \infty}^{\delta-1}} &\leq 2CL^7 \|f_I \circ \psi_I - f_I\|_{B_{\infty, \infty}^{\delta+2\alpha-1}}, \quad \text{for } \psi_I := \phi_{n+1}^{-1} \circ \phi_n, \quad f_I := v_\ell, \\ \|II\|_{B_{\infty, \infty}^{\delta-1}} &\leq 2CL^4 \|f_{II} \circ \psi_{II} - f_{II}\|_{B_{\infty, \infty}^{\delta+2\alpha-1}}, \quad \text{for } \psi_{II} := \phi_{n+1} \circ \phi_n^{-1}, \quad f_{II} := (-\Delta)^\alpha (v_\ell \circ \phi_n^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since we will be using different dualisations

$$(B_{\infty, \infty}^s, B_{1,1}^{-s})$$

for several values of s , we will denote which one we use by writing “ $B_{\infty, \infty}^s$ -dualisation” whenever we use it. We will first treat the term I . We will explain this term in full technical detail and shorten the analogous computations for subsequent terms. For $t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_L]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|I\|_{B_{\infty, \infty}^{\delta-1}} &= \left\| (-\Delta)^\alpha (v_\ell \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1} - v_\ell \circ \phi_n^{-1}) \circ \phi_{n+1} \right\|_{B_{\infty, \infty}^{\delta-1}} \\ &\stackrel{B_{\infty, \infty}^{\delta-1}\text{-dualisation}}{=} \sup_{\substack{g \in B_{1,1}^{1-\delta} \\ \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta}} = 1}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} [(-\Delta)^\alpha (v_\ell \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1} - v_\ell \circ \phi_n^{-1}) \circ \phi_{n+1}] \cdot g \, dx \\ &\leq \sup_{\substack{g \in C^\infty \\ \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta}} \leq 2}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} [(-\Delta)^\alpha (v_\ell \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1} - v_\ell \circ \phi_n^{-1}) \circ \phi_{n+1}] \cdot g \, dx \\ &= \sup_{\substack{g \in C^\infty \\ \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta}} \leq 2}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} [(-\Delta)^\alpha (v_\ell \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1} - v_\ell \circ \phi_n^{-1})] \cdot (g \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}) \, dx \\ &= \sup_{\substack{g \in C^\infty \\ \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta}} \leq 2}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} [v_\ell \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1} - v_\ell \circ \phi_n^{-1}] \cdot (-\Delta)^\alpha (g \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}) \, dx \\ &= \sup_{\substack{g \in C^\infty \\ \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta}} \leq 2}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} [v_\ell \circ (\phi_{n+1}^{-1} \circ \phi_n) - v_\ell] \cdot [(-\Delta)^\alpha (g \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})] \circ \phi_n^{-1} \, dx, \end{aligned}$$

and using a $B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta+2\alpha-1}$ -dualisation, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\|I\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta-1}} &\leq C \sup_{\substack{g \in C^\infty \\ \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta}} \leq 2}} \|v_\ell \circ (\phi_{n+1}^{-1} \circ \phi_n) - v_\ell\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta+2\alpha-1}} \cdot \|(-\Delta)^\alpha (g \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}) \circ \phi_n^{-1}\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta-2\alpha}} \\
&\stackrel{\text{Lemma B.10}}{\leq} CL^{4-(1-\delta-2\alpha)} \|v_\ell \circ (\phi_{n+1}^{-1} \circ \phi_n) - v_\ell\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta+2\alpha-1}} \sup_{\substack{g \in C^\infty \\ \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta}} \leq 2}} \|(-\Delta)^\alpha (g \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta-2\alpha}} \\
&\stackrel{\text{Lemma B.2}}{\leq} CL^{3+\delta+2\alpha} \|v_\ell \circ (\phi_{n+1}^{-1} \circ \phi_n) - v_\ell\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta+2\alpha-1}} \cdot C \sup_{\substack{g \in C^\infty \\ \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta}} \leq 2}} \|g \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta}} \\
&\stackrel{\text{Lemma B.10}}{\leq} CL^{3+\delta+2\alpha} \|v_\ell \circ (\phi_{n+1}^{-1} \circ \phi_n) - v_\ell\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta+2\alpha-1}} \cdot CL^{4-(1-\delta)} \sup_{\substack{g \in C^\infty \\ \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta}} \leq 2}} \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta}} \\
&\leq 2CL^{6+2\delta+2\alpha} \|v_\ell \circ (\phi_{n+1}^{-1} \circ \phi_n) - v_\ell\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta+2\alpha-1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the second term satisfies (letting $f_{II} := (-\Delta)^\alpha (v_\ell \circ \phi_n^{-1})$) for $t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_L]$

$$\begin{aligned}
\|II\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta-1}} &\leq \sup_{\substack{g \in C^\infty \\ \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta}} \leq 2}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} [f_{II} \circ (\phi_{n+1} \circ \phi_n^{-1}) - f_{II}] \cdot (g \circ \phi_n^{-1}) \, dx \\
&\stackrel{B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta-1}\text{-dualisation}}{\leq} C \sup_{\substack{g \in C^\infty \\ \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta}} \leq 2}} \|f_{II} \circ (\phi_{n+1} \circ \phi_n^{-1}) - f_{II}\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta-1}} \cdot \|g \circ \phi_n^{-1}\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta}} \\
&\stackrel{\text{Lemma B.10}}{\leq} 2CL^{3+\delta} \|f_{II} \circ (\phi_{n+1} \circ \phi_n^{-1}) - f_{II}\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta-1}}. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Now we set $s = \delta - 1 < 0$ and estimate, using duality:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f \circ \psi - f\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^s} &\leq \sup_{\substack{g \in C^\infty \\ \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{-s}} \leq 2}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} f \cdot [g \circ \psi^{-1} - g] \, dx \\
&\stackrel{B_{\infty,\infty}^{s+\varepsilon}\text{-dualisation}}{\leq} C \sup_{\substack{g \in C^\infty \\ \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{-s}} \leq 2}} \|f\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{s+\varepsilon}} \|g \circ \psi^{-1} - g\|_{B_{1,1}^{-s-\varepsilon}},
\end{aligned}$$

for some $\varepsilon > 0$ to be determined below.

Lemma 8.3. *Let $L \in \mathbb{N}$, $L \geq 1$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $s < 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ be such that $-s - \varepsilon/2 \in (0, 1)$.*

Then for every $g \in B_{1,1}^{-s}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and $\psi = \phi_1 \circ \phi_2$, if either $\phi_i \in \{\phi_{n+1}^{-1} \circ \phi_n, \phi_{n+1} \circ \phi_n^{-1}\}$ or $\phi_i \in \{\phi_n(t, \cdot), \phi_n(r, \cdot)\}$ for some fixed $t \leq \mathfrak{t}_L, r$, we have

$$\|g \circ \psi^{-1} - g\|_{B_{1,1}^{-s-\varepsilon}} \leq C_d(L, s, \varepsilon) \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{-s}} \|\psi - \text{Id}\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{48}}. \quad (8.2)$$

Furthermore, we have $C_3(L, s, 1) \leq CL^8$.

Proof. We want to prove this equality using interpolation because the L^1 -type Besov norms are more difficult to handle than the L^∞ -type Besov norms are. Using L^p -interpolation, we can “split” our problem into a bounded term of L^1 -type and a small term of L^∞ -type, each raised to a power $\vartheta, 1 - \vartheta$,

respectively. We need the resulting powers of the “small” term to be sufficiently small for the scheme to work.

First, we can increase the integrability/summability indices $(1,1) \rightarrow (p,p)$ for $p > 1$ to be determined below at the cost of slightly worse regularity. To be precise, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \|g \circ \psi^{-1} - g\|_{B_{1,1}^{-s-\varepsilon}} &\stackrel{\text{Lemma B.6}}{\leq} C(p) \|g \circ \psi^{-1} - g\|_{B_{p,1}^{-s-\varepsilon}} \stackrel{\text{Lemma B.5}}{\leq} C(p)C(\varepsilon, p) \|g \circ \psi^{-1} - g\|_{B_{p,p}^{-s-\varepsilon+\varepsilon/2}} \\ &= C(\varepsilon, p) \|g \circ \psi^{-1} - g\|_{B_{p,p}^{-s-\varepsilon/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, the trick consists in understanding $g \circ \psi^{-1} - g$ as the application of a linear operator

$$Th := h \circ \psi^{-1} - h$$

and to apply interpolation theory to this operator.

To this end, let us show that for the endpoints $p \in \{1, \infty\}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} T: B_{1,1}^{-s-\varepsilon/4} &\rightarrow B_{1,1}^{-s-\varepsilon/2} \quad \text{with norm bounded by } CL^{8+2s+\varepsilon}, \\ T: B_{\infty,\infty}^{-s-\varepsilon/4} &\rightarrow B_{\infty,\infty}^{-s-\varepsilon/2} \quad \text{with norm bounded by } CL^{-2s-\varepsilon/2} \|\psi - \text{Id}\|_{L^\infty}^{(1-\theta)(-s-\varepsilon/4)}. \end{aligned}$$

Case 1: $p = 1$. Here we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|g \circ \psi^{-1} - g\|_{B_{1,1}^{-s-\varepsilon/2}} &\leq \|g \circ \psi^{-1}\|_{B_{1,1}^{-s-\varepsilon/2}} + \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{-s-\varepsilon/2}} \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma B.10}}{\leq} 2L^{4-(-s-\varepsilon/2)} L^{4-(-s-\varepsilon/2)} \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{-s-\varepsilon/2}} \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma B.4}}{\leq} C(\varepsilon/4) L^{8+2s+\varepsilon} \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{-s-\varepsilon/4}}. \end{aligned}$$

Case 2: $p = \infty$. Recall that $0 < -s - \varepsilon/2 < 1$ and let $\theta \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\theta^{-1}(-s - \varepsilon/2) = -s - \varepsilon/4, \quad \text{i.e. } \theta = \frac{-s - \varepsilon/2}{-s - \varepsilon/4}.$$

We now have²

$$\|g \circ \psi^{-1} - g\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{-s-\varepsilon/2}} \stackrel{\text{Equ. (1.4)}}{\leq} C \|g \circ \psi^{-1} - g\|_{C^{-s-\varepsilon/2}} = C(\|g \circ \psi^{-1} - g\|_{L^\infty} + [g \circ \psi^{-1} - g]_{C^{-s-\varepsilon/2}}).$$

The second term can be estimated as

$$\begin{aligned} [g \circ \psi^{-1} - g]_{C^{-s-\varepsilon/2}} &\stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \sup_{x \neq y} \frac{|g \circ \psi^{-1}(x) - g(x) - g \circ \psi^{-1}(y) - g(y)|}{|x - y|^{-s-\varepsilon/2}} =: \sup_{x \neq y} \frac{I_{g,\psi}(x, y)}{|x - y|^{-s-\varepsilon/2}} \\ &\leq \left(\sup_{x \neq y} \frac{I_{g,\psi}(x, y)}{|x - y|^{\theta^{-1}(-s-\varepsilon/2)}} \right)^\theta \left(\sup_{x \neq y} I_{g,\psi}(x, y) \right)^{1-\theta} \\ &\leq [g \circ \psi^{-1} - g]_{C^{-s-\varepsilon/4}}^\theta \left(\sup_{x \neq y} I_{g,\psi}(x, y) \right)^{1-\theta} \\ &\leq C(\theta) \|g \circ \psi^{-1} - g\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{-s-\varepsilon/4}}^\theta \left(\sup_{x \neq y} I_{g,\psi}(x, y) \right)^{1-\theta} \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma B.8}}{\leq} C(\theta) \left(L^{-s-\varepsilon/4} \right)^2 \|g\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{-s-\varepsilon/4}}^\theta \left(\sup_{x \neq y} I_{g,\psi}(x, y) \right)^{1-\theta}. \end{aligned}$$

²Here, C^α denote the classical Hölder spaces; note that the embedding of the Zygmund spaces C^α into the Hölder spaces works because in this case, $0 < \alpha < 1$.

The last factor can now be estimated readily as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{g,\psi}(x, y) &\leq |g \circ \psi^{-1}(x) - g(x)| + |g \circ \psi^{-1}(y) - g(y)| \\
&\leq [g]_{\mathcal{L}^{-s-\varepsilon/4}} \left(|\psi^{-1}(x) - x|^{-s-\varepsilon/4} + |\psi^{-1}(y) - y|^{-s-\varepsilon/4} \right) \\
&\leq C \|g\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{-s-\varepsilon/4}} \|\psi - \text{Id}\|_{L^\infty}^{-s-\varepsilon/4}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we find

$$\|g \circ \psi^{-1} - g\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{-s-\varepsilon/2}} \leq CL^{-2s-\varepsilon/2} \|g\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{-s-\varepsilon/4}} \|\psi - \text{Id}\|_{L^\infty}^{(1-\theta)(-s-\varepsilon/4)}.$$

Then, using complex interpolation theory (cf. [35, Theorem 2.6, p. 51]), we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\|T\|_{\mathcal{L}([B_{1,1}^{-s-\varepsilon/4}, B_{\infty,\infty}^{-s-\varepsilon/4}]_\vartheta, [B_{1,1}^{-s-\varepsilon/2}, B_{\infty,\infty}^{-s-\varepsilon/2}]_\vartheta)} &\leq \|T\|_{\mathcal{L}(B_{1,1}^{-s-\varepsilon/4}, B_{1,1}^{-s-\varepsilon/2})}^{1-\vartheta} \|T\|_{\mathcal{L}(B_{\infty,\infty}^{-s-\varepsilon/4}, B_{\infty,\infty}^{-s-\varepsilon/2})}^\vartheta \\
&\leq CL^{(1-\vartheta)(8+2s+\varepsilon)} L^{\vartheta(-2s-\varepsilon/2)} \|\psi - \text{Id}\|_{L^\infty}^{\vartheta(1-\theta)(-s-\varepsilon/4)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, applying [29, Theorem 14.4.30, p. 345 f.] allows us to identify the interpolation spaces

$$\begin{aligned}
[B_{1,1}^{-s-\varepsilon/4}, B_{\infty,\infty}^{-s-\varepsilon/4}]_\vartheta &= B_{p,p}^{-s-\varepsilon/4}, \\
[B_{1,1}^{-s-\varepsilon/2}, B_{\infty,\infty}^{-s-\varepsilon/2}]_\vartheta &= B_{p,p}^{-s-\varepsilon/2}
\end{aligned}$$

for

$$\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1-\vartheta}{1} + \frac{\vartheta}{\infty}, \quad \text{i.e. } \vartheta = 1 - \frac{1}{p} \in (0, 1) \quad \text{since } p \in (1, \infty).$$

Thus we find that

$$\|T\|_{\mathcal{L}(B_{p,p}^{-s-\varepsilon/4}, B_{p,p}^{-s-\varepsilon/2})} \leq CL^{(1-\vartheta)(8+2s+\varepsilon)} L^{\vartheta(-2s-\varepsilon/2)} \|\psi - \text{Id}\|_{L^\infty}^{\vartheta(1-\theta)(-s-\varepsilon/4)}.$$

In summary, this implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|g \circ \psi^{-1} - g\|_{B_{p,p}^{-s-\varepsilon/2}} &= \|Tg\|_{B_{p,p}^{-s-\varepsilon/2}} \leq \|T\|_{\mathcal{L}(B_{p,p}^{-s-\varepsilon/4}, B_{p,p}^{-s-\varepsilon/2})} \|g\|_{B_{p,p}^{-s-\varepsilon/4}} \\
&\leq CL^{(1-\vartheta)(8+2s+\varepsilon)} L^{\vartheta(-2s-\varepsilon/2)} \|\psi - \text{Id}\|_{L^\infty}^{\vartheta(1-\theta)(-s-\varepsilon/4)} \|g\|_{B_{p,p}^{-s-\varepsilon/4}} \\
&\leq CL^{(1-\vartheta)(8+2s+\varepsilon)} L^{\vartheta(-2s-\varepsilon/2)} \|\psi - \text{Id}\|_{L^\infty}^{\vartheta(1-\theta)(-s-\varepsilon/4)} \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{-s}},
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the Sobolev-type embedding theorem Lemma B.7 in the case

$$\begin{aligned}
p_1 &= q_1 = 1, \\
p_2 &= q_2 = p,
\end{aligned}$$

and we finally choose p such that

$$d \left(1 - \frac{1}{p} \right) = \varepsilon/4, \quad \text{i.e. } p = \frac{1}{1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4d}} \in (1, \infty), \quad \text{which works for } 0 < \varepsilon < 4d.$$

The exponent of the norm of $\psi - \text{Id}$ can be calculated since

$$\begin{aligned}
\vartheta &= 1 - \frac{1}{p} = \frac{\varepsilon}{4d} \in (0, 1), \\
1 - \theta &= \frac{\varepsilon/4}{-s - \varepsilon/4} \in (0, 1).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\vartheta(1-\theta)(-s-\varepsilon/4) = \frac{\varepsilon}{4d} \cdot \frac{\varepsilon/4}{-s-\varepsilon/4} \cdot (-s-\varepsilon/4) = \frac{\varepsilon^2}{16d}.$$

Finally, using the above choices, we find that the constant has the form

$$C_d(L, s, \varepsilon) := CL^{(1-\vartheta)(8+2s+\varepsilon)} L^{\vartheta(-2s-\varepsilon/2)} = CL^{8(1-\frac{\varepsilon}{4d})+2s(1-\frac{\varepsilon}{2d})+\varepsilon(1-\frac{3\varepsilon}{8d})}.$$

As $\varepsilon > 0$ and $s < 0$, we immediately infer that $C_3(L, s, 1) \leq CL^8$. This concludes the proof. \square

With the preparations of the previous section, we are now ready to prove Proposition 6.12.

Proof of Proposition 6.12. The restrictions on ε from the previous section are

1. $\varepsilon > 0$;
2. $\varepsilon < 4d = 12$;
- 3.

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < -s - \varepsilon/2 < 1 &\Leftrightarrow 0 < -2s - \varepsilon < 2 &\Leftrightarrow 2s < -\varepsilon < 2(1+s) \\ &\Leftrightarrow -2s > \varepsilon > -2(1+s) &\stackrel{s=\frac{\delta}{2}-1}{\Leftrightarrow} 2(1-\delta) > \varepsilon > -2\delta. \end{aligned}$$

The intersection of the three conditions gives

$$\varepsilon \in (0, 2(1-\delta)).$$

We obviously have that for $\psi \in \{\psi_I, \psi_{II}\}$

$$\|\psi - \text{Id}\|_{L^\infty} \leq \max(\|\phi_{n+1} - \phi_n\|_{L^\infty}, \|\phi_{n+1}^{-1} - \phi_n^{-1}\|_{L^\infty}) \leq C(n+1)\zeta_n^{\gamma'}, \quad (8.3)$$

and hence we find

$$\begin{aligned} \|I + II\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta-1}} &\stackrel{\text{Lemma 8.3}}{\leq} CL^7 L^8 \sup_{\substack{g \in C^\infty \\ \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta}} \leq 2}} \left(\|f_I\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{s+\varepsilon}} + \|f_{II}\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{s+\varepsilon}} \right) \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta}} \|\psi - \text{Id}\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{2}{48}} \\ &\leq 2CL^{15} \left(\|v_\ell\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta-1+\varepsilon}} + \|(-\Delta)^\alpha(v_\ell \circ \phi_n^{-1})\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta-1+\varepsilon}} \right) \|\psi - \text{Id}\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{2}{48}} \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma B.2, Lemma B.8}}{\leq} CL^{4-(\delta+2\alpha-1+\varepsilon)} L^{15} \|v_\ell\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta+2\alpha-1+\varepsilon}} \|\psi - \text{Id}\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{2}{48}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, there is a **trade-off**:

1. For the terms with v_ℓ , we want $\varepsilon > 0$ to be **as small as possible**, because each derivative of v_ℓ costs a factor ℓ^{-1} .
2. On the other hand, for the $\psi - \text{Id}$ term, we want ε to be **as large as possible**, since this determines how small the resulting term will be.

Since the term -1 appears in the regularity exponent of v_ℓ , $1 \leq \varepsilon \ll 2$ is admissible. So, let us fix

$$\varepsilon = 1.$$

This implies

$$\|I + II\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta-1}} \leq CL^{20} \|v_\ell\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta+2\alpha}} \|\psi - \text{Id}\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{1}{48}} \stackrel{\text{Equ. (6.17), (8.3)}}{\leq} CL^{20} M_v \ell^{-\delta-2\alpha} (n+1) \zeta_n^{\frac{1}{48}\gamma'}.$$

Therefore,

$$\|\mathring{R}_2^{\text{flow}}\|_{C_t^0 C_x^0} \leq CL^{26} M_v \ell^{-\delta-2\alpha} (n+1) \varsigma_n^{\frac{1}{48}\gamma'},$$

as we wanted to show. Regarding the C^1 -norm, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathring{R}_2^{\text{flow}}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^1} &\leq C \left\| \mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} \left[\left((-\Delta)_{\phi_{n+1}}^\alpha - (-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha \right) v_\ell \right] \right\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^{1+\delta}} \\ &\stackrel{\text{Equ. (B.5)}}{\leq} CL^{1+2\delta} \left(\|(-\Delta)_{\phi_{n+1}}^\alpha v_\ell\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^\delta} + \|(-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha v_\ell\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^\delta} \right) \\ &= CL^{1+2\delta} \left(\|(-\Delta)^\alpha (v_\ell \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}) \circ \phi_{n+1}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^\delta} + \|(-\Delta)^\alpha (v_\ell \circ \phi_n^{-1}) \circ \phi_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^\delta} \right) \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma B.8, Lemma B.2}}{\leq} CL^{1+4\delta+2\alpha} \|v_\ell\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^{\delta+2\alpha}} \\ &\stackrel{\text{Equ. (6.17)}}{\leq} CL^2 \ell^{-1-\delta-2\alpha} M_v L_n \ell \\ &\stackrel{\text{Equ. (6.3)}}{\leq} CM_v L^2 L_n \ell^{-1-\delta-2\alpha} (n+1) \varsigma_n^{\gamma'}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

8.8 Mollification error

Proof of Proposition 6.15. Throughout this proof, let $t \in [0, t_L]$. The idea here is similar to the one for the flow error, except that instead of a difference $\phi_{n+1} - \phi_n$, in the most difficult terms, we will have differences of the form $\phi_n(t) - \phi_n(s)$.

We start in a similar way as for $\mathring{R}_2^{\text{flow}}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathring{R}_3^{\text{moll}}(t) \right\|_{C_x^\delta} &:= \left\| \mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} \left[\left((-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha v_\ell - \left((-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha v_n \right) * \chi_\ell \right) \right] \right\|_{C_x^\delta} \\ &\stackrel{\text{Equ. (B.3)}}{\leq} CL^{5+4\delta} \left\| \left((-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha v_\ell - \left((-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha v_n \right) * \chi_\ell \right) \right\|_{B_{\infty, \infty}^{\delta-1}} \\ &\leq CL^{5+4\delta} \left(\left\| \left((-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha (v_\ell - v_n) \right) \right\|_{B_{\infty, \infty}^{\delta-1}} + \left\| \left((-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha v_n - \left((-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha v_n \right) * \chi_\ell \right) \right\|_{B_{\infty, \infty}^{\delta-1}} \right) \\ &=: CL^{5+4\delta} (I + II). \end{aligned}$$

Let us consider I first:

$$\begin{aligned} I &\stackrel{\text{Lemma B.9}}{\leq} CL^{4-(\delta-1)} \left\| \left((-\Delta)^\alpha \left((v_\ell - v_n) \circ \phi_n^{-1} \right) \right) \right\|_{B_{\infty, \infty}^{\delta-1}} \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma B.2}}{\leq} CL^{5-\delta} \left\| (v_\ell - v_n) \circ \phi_n^{-1} \right\|_{B_{\infty, \infty}^{\delta+2\alpha-1}} \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma B.9}}{\leq} CL^{10-2\delta-2\alpha} \|v_\ell - v_n\|_{B_{\infty, \infty}^{\delta+2\alpha-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

If we only had a spatial mollification, we would be done now using standard mollification estimates. However, we have a mollification in both space and time. So we need to work a bit more and employ Lemma B.15 for $s = \delta + 2\alpha - 1$, $f = v_n$, $\kappa = 1$ and $\beta = \gamma \in (0, 1/2)$:

$$\begin{aligned} I(t) &\leq CL^{10-2\delta-2\alpha} \|v_\ell - v_n\|_{B_{\infty, \infty}^{\delta+2\alpha-1}}(t) \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma B.15}}{\leq} CL^{10} \left(\ell \|v_n\|_{C_t^0 B_{\infty, \infty}^{\delta+2\alpha}} + \ell^\gamma \|v_n\|_{C_t^\gamma B_{\infty, \infty}^{\delta+2\alpha-1}} \right) \\ &\leq CL^{10} \ell^\gamma \left(\|v_n\|_{C_t^0 C_x^1} + \|v_n\|_{C_t^\gamma C_x^0} \right) \\ &\stackrel{\text{Equ. (4.11)}}{\leq} CL^{10} L_n D_n \ell^\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Now we estimate the term II . We again apply Lemma B.15, this time with $f = (-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha v_n$, $s = \delta - 1$, $\kappa = 1$ and $\beta = \frac{\gamma}{48} \in (0, 1/2)$. The significance of this latter choice will become clear in Equ. (8.4).

$$\begin{aligned} II(t) &= \|(-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha v_n - ((-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha v_n) * \chi_\ell\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta-1}}(t) \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma B.15}}{\leq} C\ell \|(-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha v_n\|_{C_t^0 B_{\infty,\infty}^\delta} + \ell^\beta \|(-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha v_n\|_{C_t^\beta B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta-1}} \\ &\stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} C\ell \|(-\Delta)^\alpha (v_n \circ \phi_n^{-1}) \circ \phi_n\|_{C_t^0 B_{\infty,\infty}^\delta} + \ell^\beta \|(-\Delta)^\alpha (v_n \circ \phi_n^{-1}) \circ \phi_n\|_{C_t^\beta B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

The first term is simple: Using $B_{\infty,\infty}^\delta = C_x^\delta$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \|(-\Delta)^\alpha (v_n \circ \phi_n^{-1}) \circ \phi_n\|_{C_t^0 B_{\infty,\infty}^\delta} &\stackrel{\text{Lemmas B.8, B.2}}{\leq} CL^{2\delta+2\alpha} \|v_n\|_{C_t^0 B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta+2\alpha}} \leq CL^{2\delta+2\alpha} \|v_n\|_{C_t^0 C_x^1} \\ &\leq CLL_n D_n. \end{aligned}$$

The main difficulty lies in estimating the second term. We want to ‘‘peel away’’ all the operations to get to a norm of v_n only. An obvious strategy would be to attempt to use [23, Lemma C.3], however, as we would have to use it once, then increase the regularity, and then use it again, this latter use is not covered by that lemma as it concerns the $C_t^\beta C_x^0$ -norm, not the $C_t^\beta C_x^{2\alpha}$ -norm. Here, we will transfer some of the flow operations onto a test function. This has the added benefit of simplifying the time-dependence of the terms we need to estimate, as the test function is independent of time, whereas v_n and ϕ_n are time dependent. More precisely, setting $F(t, x) := (-\Delta)^\alpha (v_n \circ \phi_n^{-1})(t, x)$

$$\begin{aligned} [F \circ \phi_n]_{C_t^\beta B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta-1}} &= \sup_{\substack{s,r \in [0,t], \\ s \neq r}} \frac{\|F(s, \phi_n(s)) - F(r, \phi_n(r))\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta-1}}}{|s-r|^\beta} \\ &= \sup_{\substack{s,r \in [0,t], \\ s \neq r}} \frac{1}{|s-r|^\beta} \sup_{\substack{g \in B_{1,1}^{1-\delta} \\ \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta}} \leq 1}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (F(s, \phi_n(s, x)) - F(r, \phi_n(r, x))) g(x) dx \\ &\leq \sup_{\substack{s,r \in [0,t], \\ s \neq r}} \frac{1}{|s-r|^\beta} \sup_{\substack{g \in C^\infty \\ \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta}} \leq 2}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} F(s, y) (g \circ \phi_n^{-1})(s, y) dy - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} F(r, y) (g \circ \phi_n^{-1})(r, y) dy \\ &\leq \sup_{\substack{s,r \in [0,t], \\ s \neq r}} \frac{1}{|s-r|^\beta} \sup_{\substack{g \in C^\infty \\ \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta}} \leq 2}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (F(s, y) - F(r, y)) (g \circ \phi_n^{-1})(s, y) dy \\ &\quad + \sup_{\substack{s,r \in [0,t], \\ s \neq r}} \frac{1}{|s-r|^\beta} \sup_{\substack{g \in C^\infty \\ \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta}} \leq 2}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} F(r, y) ((g \circ \phi_n^{-1})(s) - (g \circ \phi_n^{-1})(r)) dy \\ &=: D + E. \end{aligned}$$

This is similar to the terms we had to deal with in the flow error, except for differences of ϕ_{n+1}, ϕ_n , here we have differences of $\phi_n(t)$ and $\phi_n(s)$. We apply the same method we used for the flow error.

Let us consider the easier term, D , first:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{\substack{s,r \in [0,t], \\ s \neq r}} \frac{1}{|s-r|^\beta} \sup_{\substack{g \in C^\infty \\ \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta}} \leq 2}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (F(s,y) - F(r,y))(g \circ \phi_n^{-1})(s,y) dy \\
& \stackrel{\text{Lemma B.10}}{\leq} C \sup_{\substack{s,r \in [0,t], \\ s \neq r}} \sup_{\substack{g \in C^\infty \\ \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta}} \leq 2}} \frac{\|F(s) - F(r)\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta-1}}}{|s-r|^\beta} CL^{4-(1-\delta)} \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta}} \\
& \leq CL^{3+\delta} \sup_{\substack{s,r \in [0,t], \\ s \neq r}} \frac{\|(-\Delta)^\alpha [(v_n \circ \phi_n^{-1})(s) - (v_n \circ \phi_n^{-1})(r)]\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta-1}}}{|s-r|^\beta} \\
& \stackrel{\text{Lemma B.2}}{\leq} CL^{3+\delta} \sup_{\substack{s,r \in [0,t], \\ s \neq r}} \frac{\|(v_n \circ \phi_n^{-1})(s) - (v_n \circ \phi_n^{-1})(r)\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta+2\alpha-1}}}{|s-r|^\beta}.
\end{aligned}$$

We need to be careful here, since outside of D , we only have a “weak” factor of $\ell^\beta \approx \ell^{1/100}$ as opposed to the $\ell^\gamma \approx \ell^{1/2}$ in [23], so we cannot afford “full” terms of D_n as we could there. We thus analyze the term inside the supremum:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{|s-r|^\beta} \|(v_n \circ \phi_n^{-1})(t) - (v_n \circ \phi_n^{-1})(s)\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta+2\alpha-1}} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{|s-r|^\beta} \sup_{\substack{g \in C^\infty \\ \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta-2\alpha}} \leq 2}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v_n(s,y) \cdot (g \circ \phi_n(s)) dy - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v_n(r,y) \cdot (g \circ \phi_n(r)) dy \\
& \stackrel{\text{duality}}{\leq} C \sup_{\substack{g \in C^\infty \\ \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta-2\alpha}} \leq 2}} \frac{\|v_n(s) - v_n(r)\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta+2\alpha-1}}}{|s-r|^\beta} \|g \circ \phi_n(s)\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta-2\alpha}} \\
& \quad + C \sup_{\substack{g \in C^\infty \\ \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta-2\alpha}} \leq 2}} \|v_n(r)\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta+2\alpha}} \frac{\|g \circ \phi_n(s) - g \circ \phi_n(r)\|_{B_{1,1}^{-\delta-2\alpha}}}{|s-r|^\beta} \\
& =: D_a + D_b.
\end{aligned}$$

For the term D_a , we find

$$\begin{aligned}
D_a & \stackrel{\text{Lemma B.10}}{\leq} \frac{\|v_n(s) - v_n(r)\|_{C_x^0}}{|s-r|^\beta} CL^{4-(1-\delta-2\alpha)} \sup_{\substack{g \in C^\infty \\ \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta-2\alpha}} \leq 2}} \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta-2\alpha}} \\
& \leq 4CL^{3+\delta+2\alpha} \left(\frac{\|v_n(s) - v_n(r)\|_{C_x^0}}{|s-r|} \right)^\beta \|v_n\|_{C_t^0 C_x^0}^{1-\beta} \\
& \leq CL^4 \|v_n\|_{C_t^1 C_x^0}^\beta \|v_n\|_{C_t^0 C_x^0}^{1-\beta} \\
& \stackrel{\text{Equ. (4.11), (4.12)}}{\leq} CL^4 (L_n D_n)^\beta (2M_v L_n)^{1-\beta} \\
& \leq CL^4 L_n M_v^{1-\beta} D_n^\beta.
\end{aligned}$$

The term D_b is treated as follows: setting $\psi := \phi_n(s) \circ \phi_n^{-1}(r)$, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
D_b & \stackrel{\text{Lem. B.8}}{\leq} CL^{\delta+2\alpha} \|v_n\|_{C_t^0 C_x^{\delta+2\alpha}} \frac{1}{|s-r|^\beta} \sup_{\substack{g \in C^\infty \\ \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta-2\alpha}} \leq 2}} \sup_{\substack{h \in C^\infty \\ \|h\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta+2\alpha}} \leq 2}} \|g \circ \psi - g\|_{B_{1,1}^{-\delta-2\alpha}} \|h\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta+2\alpha}} \\
& \stackrel{\text{Equ. (6.18), Lem. 8.3}}{\leq} CL^{9+\delta+2\alpha} (M_v + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha}) L_n D_n^{\delta+2\alpha} \frac{1}{|s-r|^\beta} \sup_{\substack{g \in C^\infty \\ \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta-2\alpha}} \leq 2}} \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta-2\alpha}} \|\psi - \text{Id}\|_{L^\infty}^{1/48} \\
& \leq CL^{9+\delta+2\alpha} (M_v + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha}) L_n D_n^{\delta+2\alpha} \frac{\|\phi_n(r) - \phi_n(s)\|_{L^\infty}^{1/48}}{|s-r|^\beta}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the penultimate step, we applied Lemma 8.3 with $s = \delta + 2\alpha - 1$. Now, with $\beta = \frac{\gamma}{48}$, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
D_b & \leq CL^{9+\delta+2\alpha} (M_v + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha}) L_n D_n^{\delta+2\alpha} \left(\frac{\|\phi_n(r) - \phi_n(s)\|_{L^\infty}}{|s-r|^\alpha} \right)^{1/48} \\
& \leq CL^{9+\delta+2\alpha} (M_v + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha}) L_n D_n^{\delta+2\alpha} (CL)^{1/48} \\
& \leq CL^{10} L_n (M_v + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha}) D_n^{\delta+2\alpha}.
\end{aligned} \tag{8.4}$$

Finally, we need to estimate the term

$$E := \sup_{\substack{s,r \in [0,t], \\ s \neq r}} \frac{1}{|s-r|^\beta} \sup_{\substack{g \in C^\infty \\ \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta}} \leq 2}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} F(r,y) ((g \circ \phi_n^{-1})(s) - (g \circ \phi_n^{-1})(r)) dy.$$

First, we consider

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} F(r,y) ((g \circ \phi_n^{-1})(s) - (g \circ \phi_n^{-1})(r)) dy \\
& \stackrel{\text{Lemma B.2}}{\leq} C \|v_n \circ \phi_n^{-1}\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta+2\alpha}} \|(g \circ \phi_n^{-1})(s) - (g \circ \phi_n^{-1})(r)\|_{B_{1,1}^{-\delta}} \\
& \stackrel{\text{Lemma B.8, Equ. (6.18)}}{\leq} CL^{\delta+2\alpha} L_n D_n^{\delta+2\alpha} (M_v + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha}) \|(g \circ \phi_n^{-1})(s) - (g \circ \phi_n^{-1})(r)\|_{B_{1,1}^{-\delta}}.
\end{aligned}$$

We consider the last factor separately:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(g \circ \phi_n^{-1})(s) - (g \circ \phi_n^{-1})(r)\|_{B_{1,1}^{-\delta}} & \leq \sup_{\substack{h \in C^\infty \\ \|h\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^\delta} \leq 2}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} [g \circ \phi_n^{-1}(s) - g \circ \phi_n^{-1}(r)] \cdot h dx \\
& \leq C \sup_{\substack{h \in C^\infty \\ \|h\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^\delta} \leq 2}} \|g \circ (\phi_n^{-1}(s) \circ \phi_n(r)) - g\|_{B_{1,1}^{-\delta}} \|h \circ \phi_n(r)\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^\delta} \\
& \stackrel{\text{Lemma B.8}}{\leq} CL^\delta \|g \circ \psi - g\|_{B_{1,1}^{-\delta}},
\end{aligned}$$

with $\psi := \phi_n^{-1}(s) \circ \phi_n(r)$. We apply Lemma 8.3 with $s = \delta - 1 < 0$ and $\varepsilon = 1$ to find (recall that $\beta = \gamma/48$)

$$\begin{aligned}
\|g \circ \psi - g\|_{B_{1,1}^{-\delta}} & \leq L^\delta \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta}} \|\psi - \text{Id}\|_{L^\infty}^{1/48} \leq CL^\delta \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta}} \left(\frac{\|\phi_n^{-1}(s) - \phi_n^{-1}(r)\|_{C_x^0}}{|s-r|^\gamma} \right)^{1/48} |s-r|^{\frac{\gamma}{48}} \\
& \leq CL^9 \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta}} |s-r|^\beta.
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging our above results into the definition of E yields:

$$E \leq CL^{9+2\delta+2\alpha} L_n D_n^{\delta+2\alpha} (M_v + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha}) \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta}}.$$

This finally gives (as $\delta + 2\alpha < \beta$)

$$\begin{aligned} II(t) &\leq C\ell L L_n D_n + \ell^\beta \left(CL^4 L_n M_v^{1-\beta} D_n^\beta + CL^{10} L_n (M_v + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha}) D_n^{\delta+2\alpha} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + CL^{9+2\delta+2\alpha} L_n D_n^{\delta+2\alpha} (M_v + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha}) \sup_{\substack{g \in C^\infty \\ \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta}} \leq 2}} \|g\|_{B_{1,1}^{1-\delta}} \right) \\ &\leq CL^{10} L_n (1 + M_v^{1-\beta} + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} + M_v) (\ell D_n + \ell^\beta D_n^\beta + \ell^\beta D_n^{\delta+2\alpha}) \\ &\leq CL^{10} L_n (1 + M_v^{1-\beta} + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} + M_v) (\ell D_n + \ell^\beta D_n^\beta). \end{aligned}$$

Now we combine all estimates to find

$$\left\| \mathring{R}_3^{\text{moll}}(t) \right\|_{C_x^\delta} \leq CL^{5+4\delta} (I + II) \leq CL^{16} L_n (1 + M_v^{1-\beta} + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} + M_v) (\ell^\gamma D_n + \ell^\beta D_n^\beta).$$

To estimate the C^1 -norm of $\mathring{R}_3^{\text{moll}}$, let us calculate

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \mathring{R}_3^{\text{moll}} \right\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^1} \\ &\stackrel{\text{Equ. (B.5)}}{\leq} CL^{1+2\delta} \left\| ((-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha v_\ell - ((-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha v_n) * \chi_\ell) \right\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^\delta} \\ &\leq CL^{1+2\delta} \left\| (-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha (v_\ell - v_n) \right\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^\delta} + CL^{1+2\delta} \left\| (-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha v_n - [(-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha v_n] * \chi_\ell \right\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^\delta} \\ &=: I + II. \end{aligned}$$

We have for $t \leq t_L$

$$\begin{aligned} I &\stackrel{\text{Lemmas B.8, B.2}}{\leq} CL^{1+4\delta+2\alpha} \left(\|v_\ell\|_{C_x^{\delta+2\alpha}} + \|v_n\|_{C_x^{\delta+2\alpha}} \right) \\ &\stackrel{\text{Equ. (6.17) (6.18)}}{\leq} CL^{1+4\delta+2\alpha} (M_v L_n \ell^{-\delta-2\alpha} + (M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} + M_v) L_n D_n^{\delta+2\alpha}) \\ &\leq C(M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} + M_v) L^{1+4\delta+2\alpha} L_n \ell^{-\delta-2\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we consider the other term: Using interpolation, we find

$$\begin{aligned} II &\leq CL^{1+2\delta} \left(\|(-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha v_n\|_{C_x^\delta} + \|(-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha v_n\|_{C_x^0}^{1-\delta} \left\| \{(-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha v_n\} * D\chi_\ell \right\|_{C_x^0}^\delta \right) \\ &\leq CL^{1+2\delta} \ell^{-\delta} \|(-\Delta)_{\phi_n}^\alpha v_n\|_{C_x^\delta} \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma B.8}}{\leq} CL^{1+2\delta} \ell^{-\delta} L^{2\delta+2\alpha} \|v_n\|_{C_x^{\delta+2\alpha}} \\ &\leq C(M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} + M_v) L^{1+4\delta+2\alpha} L_n \ell^{-\delta} D_n^{\delta+2\alpha} \\ &\leq C(M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} + M_v) L^{1+4\delta+2\alpha} L_n \ell^{-2\delta-4\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\left\| \mathring{R}_3^{\text{moll}} \right\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^1} \leq C(M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} + M_v) L^{1+4\delta+2\alpha} L_n \ell^{-2\delta-4\alpha} \square$$

8.9 Compressibility error

Proof of Proposition 6.17. Throughout this proof, let $t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_L]$. We use the decomposition of [23, Proof of Proposition 4.11]:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{comp}} &= \mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{comp},1} + \mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{comp},2} + \mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{comp},3} + \mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{comp},4} \\ \mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{comp},1} &:= \mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} \partial_t w_c^1, \\ \mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{comp},2} &:= \mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} \partial_t w_c^2, \\ \mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{comp},3} &:= \mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} \text{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} (v_{n+1} \otimes w_c + w_c \otimes v_{n+1} - w_c \otimes w_c), \\ \mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{comp},4} &:= \mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} \text{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} (v_\ell \otimes w_c).\end{aligned}$$

Following [23], it is easy to see that the constants in

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{comp},1}\|_{C_{\leq \mathfrak{t}_L} C_x^\delta} &\leq C(1 + M_v^{2\delta}) L^{12+5\delta} L_n \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}} \ell^{-3\delta}, \\ \|\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{comp},1}\|_{C_{\leq \mathfrak{t}_L} C_x^{1+\delta}} &\leq C(1 + M_v^{2\delta}) L^7 L_n \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}} \ell^{-1-3\delta},\end{aligned}$$

are independent of the energy. Next, for $r \geq r_* + 1$ and $t \leq \mathfrak{t}_L$, by the stationary phase lemma B.12

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{comp},2}\|_{C_x^\delta} &\leq CL^{r+3+2\delta} \sum_k \lambda^{\delta-2} [\partial_s a_k]_{C_x^1} + \lambda^{\delta-r-1} [\partial_s a_k]_{C_x^{r+1}} + \lambda^{-r-1} [\partial_s a_k]_{C_x^{r+1+\delta}} \\ &\quad + \lambda^{\delta-1} [\partial_\tau a_k]_{C_x^1} + \lambda^{\delta-r} [\partial_\tau a_k]_{C_x^{r+1}} + \lambda^{-r} [\partial_\tau a_k]_{C_x^{r+1+\delta}} \\ &\quad + \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1} \left(\lambda^{\delta-1} [a_k]_{C_x^2} + \lambda^{\delta-r} [a_k]_{C_x^{r+2}} + \lambda^{-r} [a_k]_{C_x^{r+2+\delta}} \right) \\ &\quad + CL^{11+4\delta} \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1} \|w_c^2\|_{C_x^\delta} \\ &\leq CL^{r+3+2\delta} \sum_k \lambda^{\delta-2} C_e^{(8),1} L_n^{\frac{9}{2}} \mu^2 \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-2} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} (D_n + \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1}) \\ &\quad + \lambda^{\delta-r-1} C_e^{(8),r+1} L_n^{2r+\frac{5}{2}} \mu^{r+2} \varsigma_{n+1}^{(r+1)(\gamma-1)-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} (D_n \ell^{-r} + \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1}) \\ &\quad + \lambda^{-r-1} C_e^{(8),r+1+\delta} L_n^{2(r+\delta)+\frac{5}{2}} \mu^{r+2+\delta} \varsigma_{n+1}^{(r+\delta+1)(\gamma-1)-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} (D_n \ell^{-(r+\delta)} + \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1}) \\ &\quad + \lambda^{\delta-1} C_e^{(2),1} (1 + M_v) L_n^3 \mu \varsigma_{n+1}^{2(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + \lambda^{\delta-r} C_e^{(6),r+1} (1 + M_v) L_n^{r+3} \mu^{r+1} \varsigma_{n+1}^{(r+2)(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + \lambda^{-r} C_e^{(6),r+1+\delta} (1 + M_v) L_n^{r+\delta+3} \mu^{r+1+\delta} \varsigma_{n+1}^{(r+2+\delta)(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1} \left(\lambda^{\delta-1} C_e^{(5),2} L_n^{\frac{7}{2}} \mu^2 \varsigma_{n+1}^{2(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \right. \\ &\quad \quad \left. + \lambda^{\delta-r} C_e^{(5),r+2} L_n^{r+\frac{7}{2}} \mu^{r+2} \varsigma_{n+1}^{(r+2)(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \right. \\ &\quad \quad \left. + \lambda^{-r} C_e^{(5),r+2+\delta} L_n^{r+\delta+\frac{7}{2}} \mu^r \varsigma_{n+1}^{(r+\delta+2)(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \\ &\quad + CL^{12+6\delta} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}+\delta} \left(C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right) \lambda^{\delta-1} \mu \varsigma_{n+1}^{2\gamma-2} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C_e^{\text{comp},2,\delta} L^{12+6\delta} L_n^{2(r+\delta)+\frac{5}{2}} \lambda^{\delta-1} \mu \varsigma_{n+1}^{2\gamma-2} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}},\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}C_e^{\text{comp},2,\delta} &:= C \left(C_e^{(8),1} + C_e^{(8),r+1} + C_e^{(8),r+\delta+1} + \left(C_e^{(2),1} + C_e^{(6),r+1} + C_e^{(6),r+\delta+1} \right) (1 + M_v) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + C_e^{(5),2} + C_e^{(5),r+2} + C_e^{(5),r+\delta+2} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right).\end{aligned}$$

Further (recalling the notation $u_c(t, x) := i \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \nabla_{\phi_{n+1}} a_k(t, x, \lambda t) \times \frac{k}{|k|^2} \times \Omega_k(\lambda \phi_{n+1})$ and the identity $w_c^2 = \frac{1}{\lambda} \mathcal{Q}(u_c \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}) \circ \phi_{n+1}$ from [23, p.45]), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{comp},2}\|_{C_x^{1+\delta}} &\leq \lambda^{-1} \|(\mathcal{R}\mathcal{Q}\partial_t(u_c \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})) \circ \phi_{n+1}\|_{C_x^{1+\delta}} + \|\mathcal{R}^{\phi_{n+1}}(\dot{\phi}_{n+1} \cdot \nabla^{\phi_{n+1}} w_c^2)\|_{C_x^{1+\delta}} \\
&\leq CL^{3+2\delta} \left(\lambda^{-1} L^\delta \|\partial_t(u_c \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})\|_{C_x^\delta} + \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1} (L \|w_c^2\|_{C_x^1} + L^{2+\delta} \|w_c^2\|_{C_x^{1+\delta}}) \right) \\
&\leq CL^{3+2\delta} \left(\lambda^{-1} L^\delta \left(\sum_k \|(\nabla \partial_t)(a_k \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})\|_{C_x^\delta} + \|(\nabla \partial_t)(a_k \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})\|_{C_x} \lambda^\delta \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + L^{5+3\delta} L_n^{\frac{7}{2}+\delta} (C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta}) \lambda^\delta \mu \varsigma_{n+1}^{2\gamma-2} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \\
&\leq CL^{3(1+\delta)} \left(\lambda^{-1} L^\delta \left(\sum_k L^\delta \left(\|\partial_s a_k\|_{C_x^{1+\delta}} + \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1} \left(\|a_k\|_{C_x^{1+\delta}} + \|a_k\|_{C_x^{2+\delta}} \right) \right) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \|\partial_s a_k\|_{C_x^1} + \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1} \left(\|a_k\|_{C_x^1} + \|a_k\|_{C_x^2} \right) + \|(\nabla \partial_t)(a_k \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})\|_{C_x} \lambda^\delta \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + L^{5+2\delta} L_n^{\frac{7}{2}+\delta} (C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta}) \lambda^\delta \mu \varsigma_{n+1}^{2\gamma-2} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \\
&\leq CL^{3(1+\delta)} \\
&\quad \left(\lambda^{-1} L^\delta \left(\sum_k L^\delta \left(C_e^{(8),1+\delta} L_n^{\frac{13}{2}+2\delta} \mu^{2+\delta} \varsigma_{n+1}^{(1+\delta)(\gamma-1)-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} (D_n \ell^{-\delta} + \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1}) \right. \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1} C_e^{(5),2+\delta} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}+\delta} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu^{2+\delta} \varsigma_{n+1}^{(2+\delta)(\gamma-1)} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (1 + \lambda^\delta) C_e^{(8),1} L_n^{\frac{13}{2}} \mu^2 \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-2} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} (D_n + \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1}) + \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1} C_e^{(5),2} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu^2 \varsigma_{n+1}^{2(\gamma-1)} \right) \\
&\quad \left. + L^{5+2\delta} L_n^{\frac{7}{2}+\delta} (C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta}) \lambda^\delta \mu \varsigma_{n+1}^{2\gamma-2} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \\
&\leq C_e^{\text{comp},2,1+\delta} L^{8+5\delta} L_n^{\frac{13}{2}+2\delta} \lambda^\delta \mu \varsigma_{n+1}^{2\gamma-2} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

where the constant is given by

$$C_e^{\text{comp},2,1+\delta} := C \left(C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta} + C_e^{(8),1+\delta} \right).$$

Next we apply Equ. (B.4) which yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{comp},3}\|_{C_x^\delta} &\leq CL^{2\delta} \left((\|v_\ell\|_{C_x^\delta} + \|w_o\|_{C_x^\delta} + \|w_c\|_{C_x^\delta}) \|w_c\|_{C_x} + (\|v_\ell\|_{C_x} + \|w_o\|_{C_x} + \|w_c\|_{C_x}) \|w_c\|_{C_x^\delta} \right) \\
&\leq CL^{2\delta} \left(\ell^{-\delta} M_v L_n + L^{2\delta} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}} C_e^{(1),\delta} \lambda^\delta \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} + (1 + M_v^{2\delta}) L^7 L_n \delta_{n+1}^{\frac{6}{5}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + L^{1+2\delta} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}+\delta} \left(C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right) \lambda^{\delta-1} \mu \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \\
&\quad \times \left((1 + M_v^{2\delta}) L^7 L_n \delta_{n+1}^{\frac{6}{5}} + L^{1+2\delta} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}+\delta} \left(C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right) \lambda^{\delta-1} \mu \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \\
&=: C_e^{\text{comp},3,\delta} L^{2+6\delta} L_n^{5+2\delta} \lambda^\delta \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$C_e^{\text{comp},3,\delta} := C \left(1 + M_v + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right) \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right).$$

Moreover, using Equ. (B.5)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{comp},3}\|_{C_x^{1+\delta}} \\
& \leq CL^{2(1+\delta)} \left((\|v_\ell\|_{C_x^\delta} + \|w_o\|_{C_x^\delta} + \|w_c\|_{C_x^\delta}) \|w_c\|_{C_x^{1+\delta}} + (\|v_\ell\|_{C_x^{1+\delta}} + \|w_o\|_{C_x^{1+\delta}}) \|w_c\|_{C_x^\delta} \right) \\
& \leq CL^{2(1+\delta)} \left(\ell^{-\delta} M_v L_n + C_e^{(1),\delta} L^{2\delta} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}} \lambda^\delta \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} + (1 + M_v^{2\delta}) L^7 L_n \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + (C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta}) L^{1+2\delta} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}+2\delta} \lambda^{\delta-1} \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{\gamma-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \\
& \quad \times \left((1 + M_v^{2\delta}) L^7 L_n \ell^{-1} \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}} + (C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta}) L^{3+2\delta} L_n^{\frac{7}{2}+2\delta} \lambda^\delta \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{\gamma-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \\
& \quad + CL^{2(1+\delta)} \left(\ell^{-\delta} L_n D_n + (C_e^{(1),\delta} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta}) L^{2+2\delta} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}+2\delta} \lambda^{1+\delta} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \\
& \quad \times \left((1 + M_v^{2\delta}) L^7 L_n \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}} + (C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta}) L^{1+2\delta} L_n^{\frac{5}{2}+2\delta} \lambda^\delta \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{\gamma-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \\
& \leq C_e^{\text{comp},3,1+\delta} L^{16+2\delta} L_n^{6+4\delta} \lambda^{1+\delta} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}},
\end{aligned}$$

where we have set

$$\begin{aligned}
C_e^{\text{comp},3,1+\delta} & := C \left((1 + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta}) (1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta}) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + (1 + C_e^{(1),\delta} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta}) (1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta}) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally we decompose

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{comp},4} & = \mathcal{R}^{\phi_{n+1}} \left(v_\ell \text{div}^{\phi_{n+1}}(w_o) \right) + \mathcal{R}^{\phi_{n+1}} \left((w_o \cdot \nabla^{\phi_{n+1}}) v_\ell \right) \\
& = \sum_k \mathcal{R}^{\phi_{n+1}} \left(\left[(v_\ell \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}) (\text{div}(a_k \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}) + \lambda(a_k \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})) E_k e^{i\lambda k \cdot x} \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + (a_k \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}) E_k \cdot \nabla(v_\ell \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}) e^{i\lambda k \cdot x} \right] \circ \phi_{n+1} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

We then obtain by the stationary phase lemma, Lemma B.12, for $r \geq r_* + 2$ and $t \leq t_L$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{comp},4}\|_{C_x^\delta} \\
& \leq CL^\delta \sum_k \lambda^{\delta-1} (\|v_\ell\|_{C_x} (L\|a_k\|_{C_x^1} + \lambda\|a_k\|_{C_x}) + L\|a_k\|_{C_x} \|v_\ell\|_{C_x^1}) \\
& \quad + \lambda^{\delta-r} (\|(v_\ell \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}) \text{div}(a_k \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})\|_{C_x^r} + \lambda\|(v_\ell \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})(a_k \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})\|_{C_x^r} \\
& \quad \quad + \|(a_k \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})E_k \cdot \nabla(v_\ell \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})\|_{C_x^r}) \\
& \quad + \lambda^{-r} (\|(v_\ell \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}) \text{div}(a_k \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})\|_{C_x^{r+\delta}} + \lambda\|(v_\ell \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})(a_k \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})\|_{C_x^{r+\delta}} \\
& \quad \quad + \|(a_k \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})E_k \cdot \nabla(v_\ell \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})\|_{C_x^{r+\delta}}) \\
& \leq CL^\delta \sum_k \lambda^{\delta-1} (\|v_\ell\|_{C_x} (L\|a_k\|_{C_x^1} + \lambda\|a_k\|_{C_x}) + L\|a_k\|_{C_x} \|v_\ell\|_{C_x^1}) \\
& \quad + \lambda^{\delta-r} \left(\|v_\ell\|_{C_x} L^{r+1} \|a_k\|_{C_x^{r+1}} + L^r \|v_\ell\|_{C_x^r} \|a_k\|_{C_x^1} + \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} L^j \|v_\ell\|_{C_x^j} L^{r+1-j} \|a_k\|_{C_x^{r+1-j}} \right. \\
& \quad \quad \left. + \lambda \left(\|v_\ell\|_{C_x} L^r \|a_k\|_{C_x^r} + L^r \|v_\ell\|_{C_x^r} \|a_k\|_{C_x} + \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} L^j \|v_\ell\|_{C_x^j} L^{r-j} \|a_k\|_{C_x^{r-j}} \right) \right. \\
& \quad \quad \left. + L \|v_\ell\|_{C_x^1} L^r \|a_k\|_{C_x^r} + L^{r+1} \|v_\ell\|_{C_x^{r+1}} \|a_k\|_{C_x} + \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} L^{j+1} \|v_\ell\|_{C_x^{j+1}} L^{r-j} \|a_k\|_{C_x^{r-j}} \right) \\
& \quad + \lambda^{-r} \left(\|v_\ell\|_{C_x} L^{r+2} \|a_k\|_{C_x^{r+2}} + L^{r+1} \|v_\ell\|_{C_x^{r+1}} \|a_k\|_{C_x^1} + \sum_{j=1}^r L^j \|v_\ell\|_{C_x^j} L^{r+2-j} \|a_k\|_{C_x^{r+2-j}} \right. \\
& \quad \quad \left. + \lambda \left(\|v_\ell\|_{C_x} L^{r+1} \|a_k\|_{C_x^{r+1}} + L^{r+1} \|v_\ell\|_{C_x^{r+1}} \|a_k\|_{C_x} + \sum_{j=1}^r L^j \|v_\ell\|_{C_x^j} L^{r+1-j} \|a_k\|_{C_x^{r+1-j}} \right) \right. \\
& \quad \quad \left. + L \|v_\ell\|_{C_x^1} L^{r+1} \|a_k\|_{C_x^{r+1}} + L^{r+2} \|v_\ell\|_{C_x^{r+2}} \|a_k\|_{C_x} + \sum_{j=1}^r L^{j+1} \|v_\ell\|_{C_x^{j+1}} L^{r+1-j} \|a_k\|_{C_x^{r+1-j}} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

which we estimate further by using Proposition 6.3

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{comp},4}\|_{C_x^\delta} \\
& \leq CL^\delta \sum_k LL_n^{\frac{7}{2}} \lambda^{\delta-1} \left(M_v \left(C_e^{(1),1} \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{\gamma-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} + \lambda \sqrt{\bar{e}} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} D_n \right) \\
& \quad + \lambda^{\delta-r} L^{r+1} L_n^{r+\frac{7}{2}} \left(M_v C_e^{(5),r+1} \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{r+1} \zeta_{n+1}^{(r+1)(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} + D_n \ell^{1-r} C_e^{(1),1} \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{\gamma-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \right. \\
& \quad + \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} D_n \ell^{1-j} C_e^{(5),r+1-j} \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{r+1-j} \zeta_{n+1}^{(r+1-j)(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \quad + \lambda \left(M_v C_e^{(5),r} \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^r \zeta_{n+1}^{r(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} + D_n \ell^{1-r} \sqrt{\bar{e}} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \right. \\
& \quad \quad \left. + \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} D_n \ell^{1-j} C_e^{(5),r-j} \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{r-j} \zeta_{n+1}^{(r-j)(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \\
& \quad + D_n C_e^{(5),r} \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^r \zeta_{n+1}^{r(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} + D_n \ell^{-r} \sqrt{\bar{e}} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \quad \left. + \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} D_n \ell^{-j} C_e^{(5),r-j} \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{r-j} \zeta_{n+1}^{(r-j)(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \\
& \quad + \lambda^{-r} L^{r+2} L_n^{r+\frac{9}{2}} \left(M_v C_e^{(5),r+2} \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{r+2} \zeta_{n+1}^{(r+2)(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} + D_n \ell^{-r} C_e^{(1),1} \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{\gamma-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \right. \\
& \quad + \sum_{j=1}^r D_n \ell^{1-j} C_e^{(5),r+2-j} \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{r+2-j} \zeta_{n+1}^{(r+2-j)(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \quad + \lambda \left(M_v C_e^{(5),r+1} \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{r+1} \zeta_{n+1}^{(r+1)(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} + D_n \ell^{-r} \sqrt{\bar{e}} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \right. \\
& \quad \quad \left. + \sum_{j=1}^r D_n \ell^{1-j} C_e^{(5),r+1-j} \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{r+1-j} \zeta_{n+1}^{(r+1-j)(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \\
& \quad + D_n C_e^{(5),r+1} \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{r+1} \zeta_{n+1}^{(r+1)(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} + D_n \ell^{-(r+1)} \sqrt{\bar{e}} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \quad \left. + \sum_{j=1}^r D_n \ell^{-j} C_e^{(5),r+1-j} \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{r+1-j} \zeta_{n+1}^{(r+1-j)(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \\
& \leq CL^\delta \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_k LL_n^{\frac{7}{2}} \lambda^{\delta-1} \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{\gamma-1} \left(M_v \left(C_e^{(1),1} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \right) + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \right) \\
& \quad + \lambda^{\delta-r} \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{r+1} \zeta_{n+1}^{(r+1)(\gamma-1)} L^{r+1} L_n^{r+\frac{7}{2}} \\
& \quad \times \left((1 + M_v) C_e^{(5),r+1} + C_e^{(1),1} + \lambda \left((1 + M_v) C_e^{(5),r} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \right) + C_e^{(5),r} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \right) \\
& \quad + \lambda^{-r} \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{r+2} \zeta_{n+1}^{(r+2)(\gamma-1)} L^{r+2} L_n^{r+\frac{9}{2}} \\
& \quad \times \left((1 + M_v) C_e^{(5),r+2} + C_e^{(1),1} + \lambda \left((1 + M_v) C_e^{(5),r+1} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \right) + C_e^{(5),r+1} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \right) \\
& \leq C_e^{\text{comp},4,\delta} L^{r+\delta+2} L_n^{r+\frac{9}{2}} \lambda^{\delta-1} \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{\gamma-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}
\end{aligned}$$

where we used $D_n \ell^{-j} \leq \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^j \zeta_{n+1}^{j(\gamma-1)}$, and where

$$C_e^{\text{comp},4,\delta} := C(1 + M_v) \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),r+2} \right).$$

Further

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{comp},4}\|_{C_x^{1+\delta}} \\
& \leq CL^{3+2\delta} \left(\|(v_\ell \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}) \operatorname{div}(a_k \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})\|_{C_x^\delta} + \lambda \|(v_\ell \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})(a_k \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})\|_{C_x^\delta} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \|(a_k \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}) E_k \cdot \nabla(v_\ell \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})\|_{C_x^\delta} \right) \\
& \leq CL^{3+2\delta} \left(L^{1+\delta} \left(\|v_\ell\|_{C_x} \|a_k\|_{C_x^{1+\delta}} + \|v_\ell\|_{C_x^\delta} \|a_k\|_{C_x^1} \right) + \lambda L^\delta \left(\|v_\ell\|_{C_x} \|a_k\|_{C_x^\delta} + \|v_\ell\|_{C_x^\delta} \|a_k\|_{C_x} \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + L^{1+\delta} \left(\|a_k\|_{C_x} \|v_\ell\|_{C_x^{1+\delta}} + \|a_k\|_{C_x^\delta} \|v_\ell\|_{C_x^1} \right) \right) \\
& \leq CL^{3+2\delta} \left(L^{1+\delta} L_n^{\frac{7}{2}+\delta} \left(M_v C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \mu^{1+\delta} \varsigma_{n+1}^{(1+\delta)(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} + M_v \ell^{-\delta} C_e^{(1),1} \mu \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \lambda L^\delta L_n^{\frac{7}{2}} \left(M_v C_e^{(1),\delta} \mu^\delta \varsigma_{n+1}^{\delta(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} + M_v \ell^{-\delta} \sqrt{\bar{e}} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + L^{1+\delta} L_n^{\frac{7}{2}} \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} D_n \ell^{-\delta} + C_e^{(1),\delta} \mu^\delta \varsigma_{n+1}^{\delta(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} D_n \right) \right) \\
& \leq CL^{4+3\delta} L_n^{\frac{7}{2}+\delta} \left(M_v C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \mu^{1+\delta} \varsigma_{n+1}^{(1+\delta)(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} + M_v \ell^{-\delta} C_e^{(1),1} \mu \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \lambda \left(M_v C_e^{(1),\delta} \mu^\delta \varsigma_{n+1}^{\delta(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} + M_v \ell^{-\delta} \sqrt{\bar{e}} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} D_n \ell^{-\delta} + C_e^{(1),\delta} \mu^\delta \varsigma_{n+1}^{\delta(\gamma-1)} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} D_n \right) \\
& \leq C_e^{\text{comp},4,1+\delta} L^{4+3\delta} L_n^{\frac{7}{2}+\delta} (\lambda^\delta \mu \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1} + \lambda \mu^\delta \varsigma_{n+1}^{\delta(\gamma-1)}) \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$C_e^{\text{comp},4,1+\delta} := C \left(M_v \left(C_e^{(5),1+\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \right) + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + C_e^{(1),\delta} \right).$$

Thus for the total compressibility error, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{comp}}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x} & \leq C(1 + M_v^{2\delta}) L^7 L_n \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}} \ell^{-3\delta} \\
& \quad + C_e^{\text{comp},2,\delta} L^{12+6\delta} L_n^{2(r+\delta)+\frac{9}{2}} \lambda^{\delta-1} \mu \varsigma_{n+1}^{2\gamma-2} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \quad + C_e^{\text{comp},3,\delta} L^{2+6\delta} L_n^{5+2\delta} \lambda^\delta \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}} \\
& \quad + C_e^{\text{comp},4,\delta} L^{r+\delta+2} L_n^{r+\frac{9}{2}} \lambda^{\delta-1} \mu \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq C \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{\text{comp},2,\delta} + C_e^{\text{comp},3,\delta} + C_e^{\text{comp},4,\delta} \right) L^{12+6\delta} L_n^{2(r+\delta)+\frac{9}{2}} \lambda^\delta \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}},
\end{aligned}$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathring{R}_{n+1}^{\text{comp}}\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^1} & \leq C(1 + M_v^{2\delta}) L^7 L_n \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}} \ell^{-1-3\delta} \\
& \quad + C \left(C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta} + C_e^{(8),1+\delta} \right) L^{8+5\delta} L_n^{\frac{13}{2}+2\delta} \lambda^\delta \mu \varsigma_{n+1}^{2\gamma-2} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \quad + C_e^{\text{comp},3,1+\delta} L^{16+2\delta} L_n^{6+4\delta} \lambda^{1+\delta} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}} \\
& \quad + C_e^{\text{comp},4,1+\delta} L^{4+3\delta} L_n^{\frac{7}{2}+\delta} (\lambda^\delta \mu \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1} + \lambda \mu^\delta \varsigma_{n+1}^{\delta(\gamma-1)}) \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq C \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{\text{comp},2,1+\delta} + C_e^{\text{comp},3,1+\delta} + C_e^{\text{comp},4,1+\delta} \right) L^{8+5\delta} L_n^{\frac{13}{2}+4\delta} \lambda^{1+\delta} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}}. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

8.10 Dissipative error

Throughout this proof, let $t \in [0, t_L]$. We will employ similar arguments as [12, 15]. The trick here consists in applying commutativity of the operators \mathcal{R} and $(-\Delta)^\alpha$, both of which are Fourier

multipliers, bijectivity of ϕ_{n+1} as well as interpolation to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} \left((-\Delta)_{\phi_{n+1}}^\alpha w_{n+1} \right)\|_{C^0} &= \|\mathcal{R} \{ (-\Delta)^\alpha [w_{n+1} \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}] \} \circ \phi_{n+1}\|_{C^0} \\
&\leq C \|\mathcal{R} \{ (-\Delta)^\alpha [w_{n+1} \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}] \} \circ \phi_{n+1}\|_{C^{\delta/2}} \\
&\stackrel{\text{Lemma B.8}}{\leq} CL^{\delta/2} \|(-\Delta)^\alpha \{ \mathcal{R}[w_{n+1} \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}] \}\|_{C^{\delta/2}} \\
&\stackrel{\text{Theorem A.1}}{\leq} CL^{\delta/2} [\mathcal{R}(w_{n+1} \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})]_{2\alpha+\delta} \\
&\leq CL^{\delta/2} \|\mathcal{R}(w_{n+1} \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})\|_{C^0}^{1-2\alpha-\delta} \|D\mathcal{R}(w_{n+1} \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})\|_{C^0}^{2\alpha+\delta} \\
&= CL^{\delta/2} \|\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} w_{n+1}\|_{C^0}^{1-2\alpha-\delta} \|D[\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} w_{n+1} \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}]\|_{C^0}^{2\alpha+\delta}.
\end{aligned}$$

To calculate the first term, we need to calculate the three perturbative terms.

Lemma 8.4. *For $t \in [0, t_L]$, we have*

$$\|\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} w_{n+1}\|_{C_x^0} \leq CL^{r+2\delta} L_n^{r+3/2+\delta} \left(1 + C_e^{(1),0} + C_e^{(5),r} + C_e^{(5),r+\delta} \right) \ell^{1+d(1/p-1)-2\delta} \delta_{n+2}^{6/5}.$$

Proof. Recall that

$$w_o = \sum_{k \in \Lambda} a_k E_k e^{i\lambda k \cdot \phi_{n+1}(x)} = \left(\sum_k (a_k \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}) E_k e^{i\lambda k \cdot} \right) \circ \phi_{n+1} =: \left(\sum_k \bar{a}_k E_k e^{i\lambda k \cdot} \right) \circ \phi_{n+1}$$

Therefore, applying the stationary phase lemma, Lemma B.12, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} w_o\|_{C_x^0} &\leq C \|\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} w_o\|_{C_x^\delta} \leq CL^\delta \sum_k \left(\lambda^{\delta-1} \|\bar{a}_k\|_{C_x^0} + \lambda^{\delta-r} \|\bar{a}_k\|_{C_x^r} + \lambda^{-r} \|\bar{a}_k\|_{C_x^{r+\delta}} \right) \\
&\leq CL^{r+2\delta} \lambda^{\delta-1} \sum_k \left(\|a_k\|_{C_x^0} + \lambda^{-(r-1)} \|a_k\|_{C_x^r} + \lambda^{-(r+\delta-1)} \|a_k\|_{C_x^{r+\delta}} \right) \\
&\leq L^{r+2\delta} L_n^{r+3/2+\delta} \delta_n^{1/2} \lambda^{\delta-1} \left(C_e^{(1),0} + C_e^{(5),r} \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{\gamma-1} \left(\frac{\mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{\gamma-1}}{\lambda} \right)^{r-1} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + C_e^{(5),r+\delta} \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{\gamma-1} \left(\frac{\mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{\gamma-1}}{\lambda} \right)^{r+\delta-1} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda^{-(r-1)} \left(\mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{\gamma-1} \right)^r &\leq 1, \\
\lambda^{-(r-2)} \left(\mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{\gamma-1} \right)^{r+1} &\leq 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we find that we have simplified the original estimates to

$$\|\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} w_o\|_{C_x^0} \leq CL^{r+2\delta} L_n^{r+3/2+\delta} \delta_n^{1/2} \lambda^{\delta-1} \left(C_e^{(1),0} + C_e^{(5),r} + C_e^{(5),r+\delta} \right).$$

In a similar way we find that

$$\|\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} w_c^2\|_{C_x^0} = \|\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} \mathcal{Q}^{\phi_{n+1}} w_o\|_{C_x^0} \leq CL^{r+2\delta} L_n^{r+3/2+\delta} \delta_n^{1/2} \lambda^{\delta-1} \left(C_e^{(1),0} + C_e^{(5),r} + C_e^{(5),r+\delta} \right).$$

The remaining corrector term is handled differently. Recall that

$$w_c^1 := -\mathcal{Q}_{\phi_n} v_n * \chi_\ell = -\mathcal{Q}_{\phi_n} v_n * \chi_\ell^0,$$

where \mathcal{Q} is $I - \mathcal{P}$. Recall further the following estimate from [23, Equ. (4.13)]:

$$\|\mathcal{Q}_{\phi_n} v_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x^\delta} \leq C(1 + M_v^{2\delta}) L^7 L_n \delta_{n+2}^{6/5}. \quad (8.5)$$

Following [23], we find

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} w_c^1\|_{C_x^0} &\leq C \|\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} w_c^1\|_{C_x^\delta} \stackrel{\text{Equ. (B.3)}}{\leq} C L^{5+4\delta} \|\mathcal{Q}_{\phi_n} v_n * \chi_\ell^0\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta-1}} \\ &\stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} C L^{5+4\delta} \left\| \int_0^\ell \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (\mathcal{Q}_{\phi_n} v_n)(x-y, t-s) \chi_\ell^0(y, s) dy ds \right\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta-1}} \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma B.13}}{\leq} C L^{5+4\delta} \ell \|\mathcal{Q}_{\phi_n} v_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L} L_x^\infty} \|\chi_\ell^0\|_{C_{\leq t_L} B_{p,\infty}^{2\delta-1}} \\ &\stackrel{\text{Equ. (8.5)}}{\leq} C(1 + M_v^{2\delta}) \ell L^{12+4\delta} L_n \delta_{n+2}^{6/5} \|\chi_\ell^0\|_{C_{\leq t_L} B_{p,\infty}^{2\delta-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, $p = p(\delta) \in (1, \infty)$ is a number very close to 1 to be determined in Section 7, and χ_ℓ^0 denotes the (spatially) mean-free part of χ_ℓ , and we have the following estimate for its Besov norm:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\chi_\ell^0\|_{B_{p,\infty}^{2\delta-1}} &= \|\ell^{-4} \chi^0(\ell^{-1}x, \ell^{-1}t)\|_{B_{p,\infty}^{2\delta-1}} = \ell^{-1} \left\| \ell^{-3} \chi(\ell^{-1}x, \ell^{-1}t) - \int \chi(y, \ell^{-1}t) dy \right\|_{B_{p,\infty}^{2\delta-1}} \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma B.14}}{\leq} \ell^{-1} \ell^{d/p-d-(2\delta-1)} \|\chi\|_{B_{p,\infty}^{2\delta-1}} \leq C \ell^{d(1/p-1)-2\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\|\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} w_c^1\|_{C_x^0} \leq C(1 + M_v^{2\delta}) L^{12+\delta} L_n \delta_{n+2}^{6/5} \ell^{1+d(1/p-1)-2\delta}.$$

Putting it together we find

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} w_{n+1}\|_{C_x^0} \\ &\leq C L^{r+2\delta} L_n^{r+3/2+\delta} \delta_n^{1/2} \lambda^{\delta-1} \left(C_e^{(1),0} + C_e^{(5),r} + C_e^{(5),r+\delta} \right) + C(1 + M_v^{2\delta}) L^{12+4\delta} L_n \delta_{n+2}^{6/5} \ell^{1+d(1/p-1)-2\delta} \\ &\leq C L^{r+2\delta} L_n^{r+3/2+\delta} \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),0} + C_e^{(5),r} + C_e^{(5),r+\delta} \right) \ell^{1+d(1/p-1)-2\delta} \delta_{n+2}^{6/5}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Now we need to consider the term

$$\|D[\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} w_{n+1} \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}]\|_{C_x^0} = \|D[\mathcal{R}(w_{n+1} \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})]\|_{C_x^0}.$$

Lemma 8.5. For any $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, $t \in [0, t_L]$,

$$\|\partial_j \mathcal{R}(w_{n+1} \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})\|_{C_x^0} \leq C(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta}) L^{3+4\delta} L_n^{5/2+\delta} \delta_n^{1/2} \lambda^\delta. \quad (8.6)$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_j \mathcal{R}(w_{n+1} \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})\|_{C_x^0} &= \|\partial_j (\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} w_{n+1} \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})\|_{C_x^0} \\ &= \left\| \sum_l \partial_l (\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} w_{n+1}) \cdot \partial_l (\phi_{n+1,j}^{-1}) \right\|_{C_x^0} \\ &\leq C L \|\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} w_{n+1}\|_{C_x^{1+\delta}} \\ &\stackrel{\text{Equ. (B.5)}}{\leq} C L^{2+2\delta} \|w_{n+1}\|_{C_x^\delta} \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma 6.7}}{\leq} C L^{2+2\delta} L^{1+2\delta} L_n^{5/2+\delta} \lambda^\delta \delta_n^{1/2} \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Proposition 6.18. We apply the two previous lemmas to find

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} \left((-\Delta)_{\phi_{n+1}}^\alpha w_{n+1} \right) \|_{C^0} \leq CL^{\delta/2} \|\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} w_{n+1}\|_{C^0}^{1-2\alpha-\delta} \|D [\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} w_{n+1} \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}] \|_{C^0}^{2\alpha+\delta} \\
& \stackrel{\text{Lemmas 8.4, 8.5}}{\leq} CL^{\delta/2} \\
& \quad \cdot \left(L^{r+2\delta} L_n^{r+3/2+\delta} \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),0} + C_e^{(5),r} + C_e^{(5),r+\delta} \right) \ell^{1+d(1/p-1)-2\delta} \delta_{n+2}^{6/5} \right)^{1-2\alpha-\delta} \\
& \quad \cdot \left(L^{3+4\delta} L_n^{5/2+\delta} \delta_n^{1/2} \lambda^\delta \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right) \right)^{2\alpha+\delta} \\
& \leq CL^{r+1+3\delta} L_n^{r+3/2+\delta} \ell^{(1+d(1/p-1)-2\delta)(1-2\alpha-\delta)} \lambda^{\delta(2\alpha+\delta)} \delta_{n+2}^{6/5(1-2\alpha-\delta)} \\
& \quad \cdot \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),0} + C_e^{(5),r} + C_e^{(5),r+\delta} \right)^{1-2\alpha-\delta} \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right)^{2\alpha+\delta}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now let us turn to the C^1 -norm. We estimate, for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\partial_i \mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} \left((-\Delta)_{\phi_{n+1}}^\alpha w_{n+1} \right) \|_{C_x^0} = \|\partial_i \{ \mathcal{R} [(-\Delta)^\alpha (w_{n+1} \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})] \circ \phi_{n+1} \} \|_{C_x^0} \\
& = \left\| \sum_j \partial_j \mathcal{R} [(-\Delta)^\alpha (w_{n+1} \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})] \circ \phi_{n+1} \cdot \partial_j \phi_{n+1}^i \right\|_{C_x^0} \\
& \leq CL \sum_j \|\partial_j \mathcal{R} (-\Delta)^\alpha (w_{n+1} \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}) \|_{C_x^0} \\
& = CL \sum_j \| (-\Delta)^\alpha \partial_j \mathcal{R} (w_{n+1} \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}) \|_{C_x^0} \\
& \stackrel{\text{Theorem A.1}}{\leq} CL \sum_j [\partial_j \mathcal{R} (w_{n+1} \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1})]_{2\alpha+\delta} \\
& \stackrel{\text{interpolation}}{\leq} CL \sum_j \|\partial_j \mathcal{R} (w_{n+1} \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}) \|_{C_x^0}^{1-(2\alpha+\delta)} \|D \partial_j \mathcal{R} (w_{n+1} \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}) \|_{C^0}^{2\alpha+\delta}.
\end{aligned}$$

The first term (to a different power) has already been estimated above in Lemma 8.5. For the second term, we proceed as follows: For $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ we find, using the chain and product rule,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\partial_i \partial_j \mathcal{R} (w_{n+1} \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}) \|_{C_x^0} = \|\partial_i \partial_j [(\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} w_{n+1}) \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}] \|_{C_x^0} \\
& = \left\| \partial_i \sum_l \partial_l (\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} w_{n+1}) \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1} \cdot \partial_l \phi_{n+1,j}^{-1} \right\|_{C_x^0} \\
& = \left\| \sum_{k,l} \partial_k \partial_l (\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} w_{n+1}) \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1} \cdot \partial_k \phi_{n+1,i}^{-1} \partial_l \phi_{n+1,j}^{-1} + \sum_l \partial_l (\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} w_{n+1}) \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1} \cdot \partial_i \partial_l \phi_{n+1,j}^{-1} \right\|_{C_x^0} \\
& \leq \left(CL^2 \sum_{k,l} \|\partial_k \partial_l \mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} w_{n+1}\|_{C_x^0} + \sum_l CL \|\partial_l \mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} w_{n+1}\|_{C_x^0} \right) \\
& \leq CL^2 \|\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}} w_{n+1}\|_{C_x^{2+\delta}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, an application of Equ. (B.5) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \partial_i \partial_j \mathcal{R}(w_{n+1} \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}) \right\|_{C_x^0} \\
& \leq CL^{5+2\delta} \|w_{n+1}\|_{C_x^{1+\delta}} \\
& \stackrel{\text{Lemma 6.7}}{\leq} CL^{5+2\delta} L^{3+2\delta} L_n^{7/2+\delta} \delta_n^{1/2} \lambda^{1+2\delta} \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + (C_e^{(5),2})^\delta (C_e^{(1),1})^{1-\delta} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta} \right) \\
& \leq CL^{8+4\delta} L_n^{7/2+\delta} \delta_n^{1/2} \lambda^{1+2\delta} \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + (C_e^{(5),2})^\delta (C_e^{(1),1})^{1-\delta} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The above estimates are then combined to give

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \partial_i \mathcal{R}_{\phi_{n+1}}(-\Delta)_{\phi_{n+1}}^\alpha w_{n+1} \right\|_{C_x^0} \leq CL \sum_j \left\| \partial_j \mathcal{R}(w_{n+1} \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}) \right\|_{C_x^0}^{1-(2\alpha+\delta)} \left\| D \partial_j \mathcal{R}(w_{n+1} \circ \phi_{n+1}^{-1}) \right\|_{C_x^0}^{2\alpha+\delta} \\
& \leq CL \left(L^{3+4\delta} L_n^{5/2+\delta} \delta_n^{1/2} \lambda^\delta \right)^{1-2\alpha-\delta} \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right)^{1-2\alpha-\delta} \\
& \quad \cdot \left(L^{8+4\delta} L_n^{7/2+\delta} \delta_n^{1/2} \lambda^{1+\delta} \right)^{2\alpha+\delta} \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + (C_e^{(5),2})^\delta (C_e^{(1),1})^{1-\delta} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta} \right)^{2\alpha+\delta} \\
& \leq CL^{9+4\delta} L_n^{7/2+\delta} \delta_n^{1/2} \lambda^{2\alpha+3\delta} \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right)^{1-2\alpha-\delta} \\
& \quad \cdot \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + (C_e^{(5),2})^\delta (C_e^{(1),1})^{1-\delta} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta} \right)^{2\alpha+\delta}. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

8.11 Estimating the divergence

Proof of Proposition 6.19. We proceed as in [23, Section 4.6] and decompose

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} v_{n+1} &= \operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} v_\ell - (\operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} v_n) * \chi_\ell \\
& \quad + (\operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} v_n) * \chi_\ell - (\operatorname{div}_{\phi_n} v_n) * \chi_\ell \\
& \quad + (\operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} \mathcal{Q}_{\phi_n} v_n) * \chi_\ell - \operatorname{div}_{\phi_n} ((\mathcal{Q}_{\phi_n} v_n) * \chi_\ell) \\
& \quad + \operatorname{div}_{\phi_n} ((\mathcal{Q}_{\phi_n} v_n) * \chi_\ell) - \operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} ((\mathcal{Q}_{\phi_n} v_n) * \chi_\ell).
\end{aligned}$$

The first and third line are easily estimated using mollification estimates: applying [23, Lemma 4.4] and Equ. (B.2), we find³

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} v_\ell - (\operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} v_n) * \chi_\ell \right\|_{C_{\leq \iota_L} C_x} \leq CL^2 \|v_n\|_{C_{\leq \iota_L} C_x^1} \ell^\gamma \leq CL^2 L_n D_n \ell^\gamma, \\
& \left\| (\operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} \mathcal{Q}_{\phi_n} v_n) * \chi_\ell - \operatorname{div}_{\phi_n} ((\mathcal{Q}_{\phi_n} v_n) * \chi_\ell) \right\|_{C_{\leq \iota_L} C_x} \leq CL^2 \left\| \mathcal{Q}_{\phi_n} v_n \right\|_{C_{\leq \iota_L} C_x^\delta} \ell^\gamma \\
& \leq CL^{4+2\delta} \|v_n\|_{C_{\leq \iota_L} C_x^{1+\delta}} \ell^\gamma \\
& \leq CL^{4+2\delta} L_n D_n^{1+2\delta} \ell^\gamma.
\end{aligned}$$

The second line is estimated using [23, Lemma 4.7] and Lemma B.13 and Equ. (6.18)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| (\operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} v_n) * \chi_\ell - (\operatorname{div}_{\phi_n} v_n) * \chi_\ell \right\|_{C_{\leq \iota_L} B_{\infty,\infty}^{-1}} \leq CL^3 \|v_n\|_{C_{\leq \iota_L} C_x^\delta} (n+1) \varsigma_n^{\gamma'} \\
& \leq C(M_v + M_v^{1-\delta}) L^3 L_n D_n^\delta.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, the fourth line follows in a similar way to give

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \operatorname{div}_{\phi_n} ((\mathcal{Q}_{\phi_n} v_n) * \chi_\ell) - \operatorname{div}_{\phi_{n+1}} ((\mathcal{Q}_{\phi_n} v_n) * \chi_\ell) \right\|_{C_{\leq \iota_L} B_{\infty,\infty}^{-1}} \\
& \leq CL^3 \left\| (\mathcal{Q}_{\phi_n} v_n) * \chi_\ell \right\|_{C_{\leq \iota_L} C_x^\delta} (n+1) \varsigma_n^{\gamma'} \\
& \leq C(1 + M_v^{2\delta}) L^{10} L_n \delta_{n+2}^{6/5} (n+1) \varsigma_n^{\gamma'}.
\end{aligned}$$

³Note that for $n = 0$, $v_n = 0$, and for $n > 0$, we know that $v_n = v_{n-1} * \chi_\ell + w_{o,n-1} + w_{c,n-1}$, and we can apply mollification estimates for the first term and our estimates for the $C_x^{1+\delta}$ norms for the second and third term to get the estimate $\|v_n\|_{C_{\leq \iota_L} C_x^{1+\delta}} \leq CL_n D_n^{1+2\delta}$.

Combining the four estimates yields the desired result. \square

8.12 Estimating the pressure

Proof of Proposition 6.20. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|q_{n+1} - q_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x} &\leq \|q_{n+1} - q_\ell\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x} + \|q_\ell - q_n\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x} \\ &\leq C(L_n \bar{e} \delta_n + L_n \delta_{n+1}) + \ell L_n D_n \\ &\leq C(1 + \eta + \bar{e}) L_n \delta_n =: M_q L_n \delta_n. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, using

$$\|\partial_t |w_o|^2\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x} \leq C \|w_o\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x} \|\partial_t w_o\|_{C_{\leq t_L} C_x} \leq C \sqrt{\bar{e}} C_e^{\partial_t w_o} L^{3(1+\delta)} L_n^5 \lambda^{1+\delta} \delta_n,$$

we obtain for $t \leq t_L$

$$\begin{aligned} \|q_{n+1} - q_n\|_{C_{t,x}^1} &\leq \|q_{n+1} - q_\ell\|_{C_{t,x}^1} + \|q_\ell - q_n\|_{C_{t,x}^1} \\ &\leq C \left(\| |w_o|^2 \|_{C_t^1 C_x} + \| |w_o|^2 \|_{C_t C_x^1} + \|\tilde{\rho}\|_{C_{t,x}^1} \right) + \|q_\ell - q_n\|_{C_{t,x}^1} \\ &\leq C \left(C_e^{\partial_t w_o} L^{3(1+\delta)} L_n^5 \sqrt{\bar{e}} \lambda^{1+\delta} \delta_n \right. \\ &\quad \left. + L^{2(1+\delta)} L_n^{3+2\delta} \sqrt{\bar{e}} (C_e^{(1),\delta} + (C_e^{(5),2})^\delta (C_e^{(1),1})^{1-\delta}) \lambda^{1+\delta} \delta_n + L_n \eta \delta_{n+1} \ell^{-1} \right) + L_n D_n \\ &\leq C L^{3(1+\delta)} L_n^5 \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(C_e^{\partial_t w_o} + C_e^{(1),\delta} + (C_e^{(5),2})^\delta (C_e^{(1),1})^{1-\delta} \right) + \eta + 1 \right) \lambda^{1+\delta} \delta_n. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

8.13 Estimating the kinetic energy

Proof of Proposition 6.21. Recall that in this section $L = 1$. We first observe that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| e(t)(1 - \delta_{n+1}) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |v_{n+1}(t, x)|^2 dx \right| \\ &\leq \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (|v_{n+1}|^2 - |v_\ell|^2 - |w_o|^2)(t, x) dx \right| + 3 \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \tilde{\rho}_\ell(t, x) dx \right| \\ &\quad + \sum_{1 \leq |k| \leq 2\lambda_0} \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \text{tr}(U_k(t, x)) e^{i\lambda k \cdot \phi_{n+1}(t, x)} dx \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Let us start with the first term. Using

$$|v_{n+1}|^2 - |v_\ell|^2 - |w_o|^2 = |w_c|^2 + 2v_\ell \cdot w_o + 2v_\ell \cdot w_c + 2w_o \cdot w_c,$$

we find

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (|v_{n+1}|^2 - |v_\ell|^2 - |w_o|^2)(t, x) dx \right| &\leq \|w_c\|_0 (\|w_c\|_0 + 2\|w_o\|_0) + 2 \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v_\ell \cdot w_o dx \right| \\ &\quad + 2 \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v_\ell \cdot w_c dx \right|. \end{aligned}$$

We use the parameter relation Equ. (6.10) to simplify

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_c\|_{C_{\leq t} C_x} &\leq C(1 + M_v^{2\delta}) \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}} + C(C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta}) \lambda^{\delta-1} \mu_{\zeta_{n+1}}^{\gamma-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\stackrel{\text{Equ. (6.10)}}{\leq} C \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right) \lambda^\delta \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, using Equ. (B.6) we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v_\ell \cdot w_o dx \right| &\leq C\lambda^{-1} \sum [v_\ell \cdot a_k]_1 \leq C\lambda^{-1} \sum \|v_\ell\|_0 [a_k]_1 + [v_\ell]_1 \|a_k\|_0 \\
&\leq C\lambda^{-1} \left(M_v C_e^{(1),1} \mu \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1} \delta_n^{1/2} + D_n \sqrt{\bar{e}} \right) \delta_n^{1/2} \\
&\leq C \left(M_v C_e^{(1),1} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \right) \left(\frac{\mu \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1}}{\lambda} + \frac{D_n}{\lambda} \right) \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\stackrel{\text{Equ. (6.5), (6.10)}}{\leq} C \left(M_v C_e^{(1),1} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \right) \delta_{n+2}^{6/5} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

We use the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality to find

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v_\ell \cdot w_c dx \right| \leq C\sqrt{\bar{e}} \|w_c\|_{C_{\leq t} C_x} \leq C\sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right) \lambda^\delta \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (|v_{n+1}|^2 - |v_\ell|^2 - |w_o|^2)(t, x) dx \right| \\
&\leq C \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right)^2 \lambda^{2\delta} \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{12}{5}} \\
&\quad + C \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right) C_e^{(1),\delta} \lambda^{2\delta} \delta_n \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}} \\
&\quad + C (M_v C_e^{(1),1} + \sqrt{\bar{e}}) \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad + C\sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right) \lambda^\delta \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}} \\
&\leq C \left(\left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right)^2 + M_v C_e^{(1),1} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \right) \lambda^{2\delta} \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, the second term can be estimated by

$$3 \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \tilde{\rho}_\ell(t, x) dx \right| \leq \frac{9\eta}{r_0} \delta_{n+1}.$$

The third term can be dealt with by another application of the stationary phase lemma, Equ. (B.6)

$$\sum_{1 \leq |k| \leq 2\lambda_0} \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \text{tr}(U_k(t, x)) e^{i\lambda k \cdot \phi_{n+1}(t, x)} dx \right| \leq C\sqrt{\bar{e}} C_e^{(1),1} \frac{\mu \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1}}{\lambda} \delta_n \stackrel{\text{Equ. (6.10)}}{\leq} C\sqrt{\bar{e}} C_e^{(1),1} \delta_{n+2}^{6/5} \delta_n.$$

Thus, in total we find

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| e(t)(1 - \delta_{n+1}) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |v_{n+1}(t, x)|^2 dx \right| \\
&\leq C \left(\left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right)^2 + M_v C_e^{(1),1} + \sqrt{\bar{e}}(1 + C_e^{(1),1}) \right) \lambda^{2\delta} \delta_{n+2}^{\frac{6}{5}} + \frac{9\eta}{r_0} \delta_{n+1}. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

8.14 Estimates for energy-dependent constants

Proof of Lemma 7.1. Let us study the first two and the last two lines of the table first. We see that by Equ. (6.9), (6.10)

$$\begin{aligned}
&C_e^{\text{tra},0} L^{r+2\delta} L_n^{2(r+\delta)+\frac{5}{2}} \lambda^\delta \mu^{-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} + C_e^{\text{osc},0} L^{r+2\delta+1} L_n^{2(r+\delta)+5} \lambda^{\delta-1} \mu \varsigma_{n+1}^{\gamma-1} \delta_n \\
&\leq (C_e^{\text{tra},0} + C_e^{\text{osc},0}) L^{r+2\delta+1} L_n^{2(r+\delta)+5} \lambda^\delta \delta_n^{1/2} \delta_{n+2}^{6/5}.
\end{aligned}$$

This yields immediately that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\hat{R}^{\text{tra}}\|_{C_{\leq \iota_L} C_x^0} + \|\hat{R}^{\text{osc}}\|_{C_{\leq \iota_L} C_x^0} + \|\hat{R}^{\text{comp}}\|_{C_{\leq \iota_L} C_x^0} + \|\hat{R}^{\text{diss}}\|_{C_{\leq \iota_L} C_x^0} \\ & \leq (C_e^{\text{tra},0} + C_e^{\text{osc},0} + C_e^{\text{comp},0} + C_e^{\text{diss},0}) L^{r+2\delta+1} L_n^{2(r+\delta)+5} \lambda^\delta \delta_n^{1/2} \delta_{n+2}^{6/5} \\ & \leq C_e^{\hat{R},0} L^{r+2\delta+1} L_n^{2(r+\delta)+5} \lambda^\delta \delta_n^{1/2} \delta_{n+2}^{6/5}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we analyse \hat{R}^{moll} . We immediately see that, by definition

$$\ell^\gamma D_n = \frac{c_{n,\ell}}{C_\ell} \delta_{n+3}^{4/3} \leq 2\delta_{n+3}^{4/3}.$$

The other term is much less small:

$$(\ell D_n)^\beta = (\ell^{1-\gamma} \ell^\gamma D_n)^\beta \stackrel{\gamma \in (0,1/2)}{\leq} \left(\ell^\gamma 2\delta_{n+3}^{4/3} \right)^\beta \leq 2\delta_{n+3}^{2\beta \cdot 4/3}.$$

Finally, for \hat{R}^{flow} , we see that, using $\gamma' \in (\gamma_*, \gamma)$ hence $\frac{\gamma'}{\gamma_*} > 1$, as well as $\beta = \frac{\gamma}{48}$,

$$\zeta_n^{\frac{1}{48}\gamma'} = (\zeta_n^{\gamma_*})^{\frac{1}{48} \frac{\gamma'}{\gamma_*}} \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \left(\frac{1}{C_\zeta} \frac{\delta_{n+3}^{4/3}}{n+1} \right)^{\frac{1}{48} \frac{\gamma'}{\gamma_*}} \leq \delta_{n+3}^{4/3 \cdot \frac{1}{48} \frac{\gamma'}{\gamma_*}} \leq \delta_{n+3}^{4/3 \cdot \frac{1}{48} \gamma \in (0,1/2)} \stackrel{\gamma \in (0,1/2)}{\leq} \delta_{n+3}^{4/3 \cdot 2\gamma \frac{1}{48}} = \delta_{n+3}^{2\beta \cdot 4/3}.$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{R}^{\text{flow}}\|_{C_{\leq \iota_L} C_x^0} + \|\hat{R}^{\text{moll}}\|_{C_{\leq \iota_L} C_x^0} & \leq (C_e^{\text{flow},0} + C_e^{\text{moll},0}) L^{r+2+\delta} L_n^{r+7/2} \ell^{-\delta-2\alpha} (n+1) \delta_{n+3}^{8/3 \cdot \beta} \\ & \leq C_e^{\hat{R},0} L^{r+2+\delta} L_n^{r+7/2} \ell^{-\delta-2\alpha} (n+1) \delta_{n+3}^{8/3 \cdot \beta}. \end{aligned}$$

Together with assumptions Equ. (7.5), Equ. (7.6), this implies the claim.

Now let us turn to estimating the constant $C_e^{\hat{R},0}$ itself.

We recall

$$\begin{aligned} C_e^{(1),1} & := C \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} + \underline{e}^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \underline{e}^{-1} \right), \\ C_e^{(4),0} & := C \left(\frac{\eta(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}) + |e|_{C^1}}{\sqrt{\bar{e}}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} (1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \eta^{-1} |e|_{C^1}) \right) \right) \right), \\ C_e^{(5),r} & := C \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \eta C_e^{(r)} + \eta^2 \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} C_e^{(j)} C_e^{(r-j)} \right), \\ C_e^{(8),r} & := C_e^{\partial_s(1),r} + C_e^{\partial_s(2),r} + C_e^{\partial_s(3),r}, \\ C_e^{\partial_s(1),r} & = C \left(\frac{\eta(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}) + |e|_{C^1}}{\sqrt{\bar{e}}} + C_e^{\partial_s \sqrt{\bar{p}},r} \right) \left(1 + \eta C_e^{(r)} \right), \\ C_e^{\partial_s(2),r} & = C \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \eta C_e^{(r)} \right) \left(\left(1 + \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} (1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \eta^{-1} |e|_{C^1}) \right) \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} + C_e^{\partial_s \Gamma,r} \right), \\ C_e^{\partial_s(3),r} & = C \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \eta C_e^{(r)} + \eta^2 \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} C_e^{(j)} C_e^{(r-j)} \right), \\ C_e^{\partial_s \sqrt{\bar{p}},r} & = C \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \left(1 + C_e^{(r)} (\eta(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}) + |e|_{C^1}) \right), \end{aligned}$$

as well as

$$C_e^{\partial_s \Gamma, r} = C \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + (1 + \eta) C_e^{(r)} + \eta^2 \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} C_e^{(i)} C_e^{(r-i)} + \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} (1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \eta^{-1} |e|_{C^1}) \left((1 + \eta) C_e^{(r)} + \eta \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} C_e^{(i)} C_e^{(r-i)} \right) \right)$$

and

$$C_e^{(r)} \leq C \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\bar{e}} \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^r,$$

and we recall that $M_q = C(1 + \eta + \bar{e})$. Next we will simplify the above constants. To this end, we obtain further upper bounds to be inserted back into the analysis. First of all

$$C_e^{(1),1} = C \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} + \underline{e}^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \underline{e}^{-1} \right) = C \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\bar{e}} \underline{e}} + \frac{1}{\underline{e}} \right) \leq C \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\underline{e}} \right) = C \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1 + \underline{e}}{\underline{e}}.$$

Further using $\eta \leq C \frac{\underline{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}}$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} C_e^{(4),0} &\leq C \left(\sqrt{\underline{e}} + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\sqrt{\underline{e}}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}) \underline{e}} \right) \right) \leq C \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\sqrt{\underline{e}}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \sqrt{\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}}} \right) \right) \\ &\leq C \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Next, due to the above representation of $C_e^{(r)}$ we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} C_e^{(5),r} &\leq C \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \eta \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\bar{e}} \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^r + \eta^2 \left(\frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\bar{e}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^r \right) \\ &\leq C \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^{r-1} + \left(\frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^{r-2} \right) \\ &\leq C \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^{r-1} + (1 + \bar{e}) \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^{r-2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} C_e^{(5),1+\delta} &:= \left(C_e^{(5),2} \right)^\delta \left(C_e^{(1),1} \right)^{1-\delta} \leq C \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} + (1 + \bar{e}) \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^\delta \left(\frac{1 + \underline{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^{1-\delta} \\ &\leq C \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{\bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\left(C_e^{(5),2} \right)^\delta \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} C_e^{(1),1} \right)^{1-\delta} \leq C \sqrt{\bar{e}}^{2-\delta} \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{\bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right).$$

Next,

$$\begin{aligned} C_e^{\partial_s \sqrt{\rho}, r} &\leq C \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \left(1 + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\bar{e}} \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^r (\underline{e} + |e|_{C^1}) \right) \leq C \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^r \left(1 + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right), \\ C_e^{\partial_s \sqrt{\rho}, 1} &\leq C \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now, in a similar way, for $r \geq 2$, using $(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}})^2 \geq 1 + \bar{e}$, we may estimate

$$\begin{aligned} C_e^{\partial_s \Gamma, r} &\leq C \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + (1 + \eta) \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\bar{e}} \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^r + \eta^2 \left(\frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\bar{e}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^r \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} (1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \eta^{-1} |e|_{C^1}) \left((1 + \eta) \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\bar{e}} \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^r + \eta \left(\frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\bar{e}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^r \right) \right) \\ &\leq C \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(\frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^{r-2}, \end{aligned}$$

whereas for $r = 1$

$$\begin{aligned} C_e^{\partial_s \Gamma, 1} &\leq C \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \left(1 + \eta + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right) C_e^{(1)} \right) \leq C \frac{\eta}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \left(1 + \eta + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right) \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(1 + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right) \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we conclude for $r \geq 2$

$$\begin{aligned} C_e^{\partial_s(1), r} &\leq C \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\sqrt{\underline{e}}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^r \left(1 + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right) \right) \left(1 + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^{r-1} \right) \\ &\leq C \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^{r-1} \right)^2 \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}}, \end{aligned}$$

as well as

$$C_e^{\partial_s(2), r} \leq C \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^{r-1} \right) \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(\frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^{r-2}.$$

On the other hand, for $r = 1$

$$\begin{aligned} C_e^{\partial_s(1), 1} &\leq C \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\sqrt{\underline{e}}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right) \right) \left(1 + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \\ &\leq C \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right)^2 \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}}, \\ C_e^{\partial_s(2), 1} &\leq C \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, for $r \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} C_e^{\partial_s(3), r} &\leq C \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^{r-1} + \left(\frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^{r-2} \right) \\ &\leq C \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^{r-2}, \end{aligned}$$

and for $r = 1$

$$C_e^{\partial_s(3), 1} \leq C \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right).$$

The previous calculations are then combined to yield (for $r \geq 2$)

$$\begin{aligned}
C_e^{(8),r} &= C_e^{\partial_s(1),r} + C_e^{\partial_s(2),r} + C_e^{\partial_s(3),r} \\
&\leq C\sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \sqrt{\underline{e}} + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}}\right) \left(\left(1 + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}}\right)^{r-1}\right)^2 \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left(1 + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}}\right)^{r-1}\right) \left(\frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}}\right)^2 \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}}\right)^{r-2} + \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}}\right) \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}}\right)^{r-2} \right) \\
&\leq C\sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \sqrt{\underline{e}} + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}}\right) \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}}\right)^2 \left(\frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}}\right)^2 \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}}\right)^{2r-1},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$C_e^{(8),1} := C_e^{\partial_s(1),1} + C_e^{\partial_s(2),1} + C_e^{\partial_s(3),1} \leq C\sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}}\right) \left(1 + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}}\right)^2 \frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}}.$$

Thus

$$C_e^{(8),\delta} := \left(C_e^{(8),1}\right)^\delta \left(C_e^{(4),0}\right)^{1-\delta} \leq C\sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}}\right) \left(1 + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}}\right)^2 \frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}}.$$

We are now in a position to estimate $C_e^{\hat{R},0}$. Note that by definition, using the monotonicity of the constants $C_e^{(j),r}$ for $j \geq 5$, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
&C_e^{\hat{R},0} \\
&\leq C \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + C_e^{(7),r} + C_e^{(7),r+\delta} + M_v \left(C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),r+1} + C_e^{(5),r+\delta+1}\right) + C_e^{(4),0} + C_e^{(8),r} + C_e^{(8),r+\delta} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sqrt{\bar{e}} C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(7),r+1} + C_e^{(7),r+1+\delta} + M_v + M_v^2 + M_q + M_v^{1-\beta} + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),0} + C_e^{(1),\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),r+\delta} + C_e^{\text{comp},2,\delta} + C_e^{\text{comp},3,\delta} + C_e^{\text{comp},4,\delta} \right) \\
&\stackrel{\text{monotonicity}}{\leq} C \left(1 + M_v^{1-\beta} + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} + M_q + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + C_e^{(1),1}\right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + C_e^{(1),0} + C_e^{(1),\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(4),0} + C_e^{(5),r+3} + C_e^{(8),r+2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (1 + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta}) \cdot (1 + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),r+2}) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that, by considering the two cases $\eta \leq 1$, $\eta > 1$, one finds that

$$C_e^{(1),0} + C_e^{(1),\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} \leq 2 \left(C_e^{(1),0} + C_e^{(1),1}\right).$$

Using this and the above estimates, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
& C_e^{\hat{R},0} \\
& \leq C \left(1 + M_v^{1-\beta} + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} + M_q + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1+\underline{e}}{\underline{e}} \right) + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1+\underline{e}}{\underline{e}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right) \right. \\
& \quad + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^{(r+3)-1} + (1+\bar{e}) \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^{(r+3)-2} \right) \\
& \quad + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^{2(r+2)-1} \\
& \quad + \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1+\underline{e}}{\underline{e}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right) \\
& \quad \cdot \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^{(r+2)-1} + (1+\bar{e}) \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^{(r+2)-2} \right) \right) \Bigg) \\
& \leq \left(\frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^{2r+3} \\
& \quad \cdot C \left(1 + M_v^{1-\beta} + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^2 \right. \\
& \quad + \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1+\underline{e}}{\underline{e}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right) \\
& \quad \cdot \left. \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \right) \right). \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 7.2. Plugging in the expressions for all constants and simplifying a bit, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
C_e^{\hat{R},1} & \leq C \left(1 + C_e^{(3),0} + C_e^{(3),\delta} + \left(1 + M_v + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right) M_v + C_e^{(4),0} + C_e^{(8),\delta} \right. \\
& \quad + \sqrt{\bar{e}} C_e^{(1),1} + \left(C_e^{(7),2} \right)^\delta \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} C_e^{(1),1} \right)^{1-\delta} \\
& \quad + \eta + M_v^{1-\beta} + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} + M_q + C_e^{(1),\delta} \\
& \quad + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{\text{comp},2,1+\delta} + C_e^{\text{comp},3,1+\delta} + C_e^{\text{comp},4,1+\delta} \\
& \quad + \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right)^{1-2\alpha-\delta} \\
& \quad \cdot \left. \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta} \right)^{2\alpha+\delta} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Now we recall that

$$\begin{aligned}
C_e^{\text{comp},2,1+\delta} & = C \left(C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta} + C_e^{(8),1+\delta} \right), \\
C_e^{\text{comp},3,1+\delta} & = C \left(\left(1 + M_v + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right) \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta} \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \left(1 + C_e^{(1),\delta} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right) \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right) \right), \\
C_e^{\text{comp},4,1+\delta} & = C \left(M_v \left(C_e^{(5),1+\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \right) + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + C_e^{(1),\delta} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

and we denote

$$C_e^{(5),1+\delta} := \left(C_e^{(5),2} \right)^\delta \left(C_e^{(1),1} \right)^{1-\delta}.$$

We will simplify these constants further. Using the monotonicity of $C_e^{(5),r}$, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
C_e^{\hat{R},1} &:= C \left(1 + C_e^{(3),0} + C_e^{(3),\delta} + \left(1 + M_v + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right) M_v + C_e^{(4),0} + C_e^{(8),\delta} \right. \\
&\quad + \sqrt{\bar{e}} C_e^{(1),1} + \left(C_e^{(7),2} \right)^\delta \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} C_e^{(1),1} \right)^{1-\delta} + \eta + M_v^{1-\beta} + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} + M_q + C_e^{(1),\delta} \\
&\quad + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{\text{comp},2,1+\delta} + C_e^{\text{comp},3,1+\delta} + C_e^{\text{comp},4,1+\delta} \\
&\quad + \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right)^{1-2\alpha-\delta} \\
&\quad \cdot \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta} \right)^{2\alpha+\delta} \\
&\leq C \left(1 + C_e^{(3),0} + C_e^{(3),\delta} + \left(1 + M_v + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right) M_v + C_e^{(4),0} + C_e^{(8),\delta} \right. \\
&\quad + \sqrt{\bar{e}} C_e^{(1),1} + \left(C_e^{(7),2} \right)^\delta \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} C_e^{(1),1} \right)^{1-\delta} + \eta + M_v^{1-\beta} + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} + M_q + C_e^{(1),\delta} + M_v^{2\delta} \\
&\quad + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta} + C_e^{(8),1+\delta} \\
&\quad + \left(1 + M_v + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right) \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta} \right) \\
&\quad + \left(1 + C_e^{(1),\delta} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right) \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right) \\
&\quad \left. + M_v \left(C_e^{(5),1+\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \right) + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned}
C_e^{\hat{R},1} &\leq C \left(1 + C_e^{(1),0} + C_e^{(1),\delta} + C_e^{(4),0} + C_e^{(8),\delta} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} C_e^{(1),1} + \left(C_e^{(7),2} \right)^\delta \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} C_e^{(1),1} \right)^{1-\delta} \right. \\
&\quad + \eta + M_v^{1-\beta} + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} + M_q + C_e^{(1),\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta} + C_e^{(8),1+\delta} \\
&\quad + \left(1 + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right) \left(1 + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta} \right) \\
&\quad + \left(1 + C_e^{(1),\delta} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right) \left(1 + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right) \\
&\quad + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + M_v^{2\delta} \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta} \right) \\
&\quad \left. + M_v \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v + C_e^{(1),\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta} \right) \right) \\
&\leq C \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + (1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}) C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(4),0} + \left(C_e^{(5),2} \right)^\delta \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} C_e^{(1),1} \right)^{1-\delta} + \eta + M_q \right. \\
&\quad + C_e^{(8),1+\delta} + M_v^{1-\beta} + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} \\
&\quad + \left(1 + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right) \left(1 + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta} \right) \\
&\quad + \left(1 + C_e^{(1),\delta} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right) \left(1 + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right) \\
&\quad + M_v^{2\delta} \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} \right) \\
&\quad \left. + M_v \left(1 + C_e^{(1),1} + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v + C_e^{(5),2+\delta} \right) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

We will need most of the estimates for the constants used in the proof of Lemma 7.1 above.

We further estimate

$$C_e^{(5),2+\delta} \leq C_e^{(5),3} \leq C \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{\bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right),$$

which leads us to

$$\max \left(C_e^{(5),1+\delta}, C_e^{(5),2+\delta} \right) \leq C \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right).$$

Collecting the above estimates, we find

$$\begin{aligned} C_e^{\dot{R},1} &\leq C \left(1 + (1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}) \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1+\underline{e}}{\underline{e}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right) + \sqrt{\bar{e}}^{2-\delta} \frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) + \eta + \bar{e} \right. \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right) + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^3 \\ &\quad + \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1+\underline{e}}{\underline{e}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right) \right)^2 + M_v^{1-\beta} + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} \\ &\quad + \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1+\underline{e}}{\underline{e}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right) \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1+\underline{e}}{\underline{e}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right) \\ &\quad + (M_v^{2\delta} + M_v) \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1+\underline{e}}{\underline{e}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right) \right) \Big) \\ &\leq C \left(1 + \bar{e} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + (1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}) \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1+\underline{e}}{\underline{e}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right) + \sqrt{\bar{e}}^{2-\delta} \frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right. \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right) + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^3 \\ &\quad + \bar{e} \left(\frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^2 \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^2 + M_v^{1-\beta} + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} \\ &\quad + \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right) \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \\ &\quad + (M_v^{2\delta} + M_v) \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1+\underline{e}}{\underline{e}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right) \right) \Big), \end{aligned}$$

which we simplify further to get

$$\begin{aligned}
C_e^{\hat{R},1} &\leq C \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \sqrt{\underline{e}} + \frac{|e|C^1}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^3 \right) + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} \right. \\
&\quad + M_v^{1-\beta} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}}^{1-\delta} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right) \right) \\
&\quad \left. + (M_v^{2\delta} + M_v) \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1 + \underline{e}}{\underline{e}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{\bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right) \right) \right) \\
&\leq C \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \sqrt{\underline{e}} + \frac{|e|C^1}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^3 + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} + M_v^{1-\beta} \right. \\
&\quad + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}}^{1-\delta} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right) \right) \\
&\quad \left. + (M_v^{2\delta} + M_v) \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1 + \underline{e}}{\underline{e}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{\bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right) \right) \right) \\
&\leq C \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \sqrt{\underline{e}} + \frac{|e|C^1}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^3 + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} + M_v^{1-\beta} \right. \\
&\quad + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(\frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^2 \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}}^{1-\delta} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right) \\
&\quad \left. + (M_v^{2\delta} + M_v) \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1 + \underline{e}}{\underline{e}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{\bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right) \right) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

and finally

$$\begin{aligned}
C_e^{\hat{R},1} &\leq C \left(\frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^2 \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \cdot \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \sqrt{\underline{e}} + \frac{|e|C^1}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right)^2 + M_v^{1-\beta} + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} \right. \\
&\quad + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}}^{1-\delta} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right) \\
&\quad \left. + (M_v^{2\delta} + M_v) \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right) \right). \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 7.3. We now turn to the constant for the velocity:

$$\begin{aligned}
C_e^{v,1} &:= C \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} + C_e^{(5),2+\delta} \right) \\
&\leq C \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1 + \underline{e}}{\underline{e}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right) \right) \\
&\leq C \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1 + \bar{e}}{1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right). \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 7.4. Recall that

$$\begin{aligned}
C_e^{q,1} &:= C \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(C_e^{\partial_t w_o} + C_e^{(1),\delta} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right) + \eta + 1 \right), \\
C_e^{\partial_t w_o} &:= C \left(C_e^{\text{trans},1} + C_e^{(8),1} + C_e^{(3),1} + M_v C_e^{(1),1} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \right), \\
C_e^{\text{trans},1} &:= C \left(C_e^{(3),0} + C_e^{(3),\delta} + \left(C_e^{(1),1} + C_e^{(5),1+\delta} \right) M_v + C_e^{(4),0} + C_e^{(8),\delta} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Using the estimates we have obtained thus far, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
C_e^{\text{trans},1} &\leq C \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1+\underline{e}}{\underline{e}} + \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1+\underline{e}}{\underline{e}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right) M_v \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right) + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right)^2 \frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right) \\
&\leq C \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \left(1 + M_v + \left(1 + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned}
C_e^{\partial_t w_o} &\leq C \left(\sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \left(1 + M_v + \left(1 + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right)^2 \frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} + (1 + M_v) \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1+\underline{e}}{\underline{e}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \right) \\
&\leq C \sqrt{\bar{e}} \frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \left(1 + M_v + \left(1 + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$C_e^{q,1} \leq C \left(1 + \bar{e} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \left(1 + M_v + \left(1 + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right) \right) \frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}}. \quad \square$$

Proof of Lemma 7.5. We estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max \left(C_e^{\dot{R},1}, C_e^{v,1}, C_e^{q,1} \right) \\
&\leq C \left(\frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^3 \max \left\{ 1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right)^2 + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + M_v^{1-\beta} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}}^{1-\delta} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (M_v^{2\delta} + M_v) \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right), \right. \\
&\quad \left. 1 + M_v^{2\delta} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right), \right. \\
&\quad \left. 1 + \bar{e} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \left(M_v + \left(1 + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right) \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

which we further simplify via

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max \left(C_e^{\tilde{R},1}, C_e^{v,1}, C_e^{q,1} \right) \\
& \leq C \left(\frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^3 \max \left\{ 1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \sqrt{\underline{e}} + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right)^2 + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} \right. \\
& \quad + M_v^{1-\beta} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}^{1-\delta}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right) \\
& \quad + (M_v^{2\delta} + M_v) \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right), \\
& \quad \left. 1 + \bar{e} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \left(M_v + \left(1 + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right) \right\} \\
& \leq \left(\frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^3 \\
& \quad \cdot C \left\{ 1 + (\bar{e} + \sqrt{\bar{e}}) \left(1 + \sqrt{\underline{e}} + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right)^2 + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} + M_v^{1-\beta} \right. \\
& \quad + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}^{1-\delta}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + M_v + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right) \\
& \quad \left. + (M_v^{2\delta} + M_v) \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right) \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

We slightly enlarge the latter factor to maximize other expressions later in the proof by defining

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{A}_e := C & \left\{ 1 + (\bar{e} + \sqrt{\bar{e}}) \left(1 + \sqrt{\underline{e}} + \frac{|e|_{C^1}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right)^2 + M_v^{1-\delta-2\alpha} + M_v^{1-\beta} \right. \\
& + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right) \left(1 + \sqrt{\bar{e}^{1-\delta}} + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + M_v + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right) \\
& \left. + (1 + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v^{1-\delta} + M_v + \sqrt{\bar{e}}) \left(1 + M_v^{2\delta} + M_v + \sqrt{\bar{e}} \left(1 + \bar{e} + \frac{1+\bar{e}}{1+\sqrt{\bar{e}}} \right) \right) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then we set $A := \tilde{A}_e \left(\frac{1+\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\bar{e}}{\underline{e}} \right)^3$. □

A An estimate for the fractional Laplacian

Recall that by \mathcal{C}^β we denote the classical Hölder spaces, whereas by C^β we denote the Hölder–Zygmund spaces. The following theorem provides estimates for the fractional Laplacian in \mathcal{C}^β .

Theorem A.1 (Interaction with Hölder spaces, Theorem B.1 of [42], Thm. 1.4 of [41]). *Let $\alpha, \delta > 0$ and $\beta \geq 0$ such that $2\alpha + \beta + \delta < 1$, and let $f: \mathbb{T}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$. If $f \in \mathcal{C}_x^{2\alpha+\beta+\delta}$, then $(-\Delta)^\alpha f \in \mathcal{C}_x^\beta$. Moreover, there exists a constant $C = C(\delta) > 0$ such that*

$$\|(-\Delta)^\alpha f\|_{\mathcal{C}_x^\beta} \leq C[f]_{2\alpha+\beta+\delta}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

B Besov Spaces

Let us collect some crucial lemmas regarding Besov spaces.

Lemma B.1 (Negative Regularity Paraproduct estimates, [38], Prop. A.7 (Fourth case)). *Let $\alpha < 0 < \beta$ and $\alpha + \beta > 0$. Let $p_1, p_2, p, q \in [1, \infty]$ such that*

$$\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$$

Then the mapping

$$(f, g) \mapsto f \cdot g$$

between continuous functions extends to a bilinear map from $B_{p_1, q}^\alpha \times B_{p_2, q}^\beta$ to $B_{p, q}^\alpha$, i.e.

$$\|f \cdot g\|_{B_{p, q}^\alpha} \leq C \|f\|_{B_{p_1, q}^\alpha} \|g\|_{B_{p_2, q}^\beta}.$$

Lemma B.2 ([4], Prop. 2.78). *Let $m \in \mathbb{R}$ and h be a Fourier multiplier of class S^m . Define $h(D)u := \mathcal{F}^{-1}[h\mathcal{F}u]$, where \mathcal{F} denotes the Fourier transform and \mathcal{F}^{-1} the inverse Fourier transform. Then, for every $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $1 \leq p, r \leq \infty$, $h(D)$ is continuous from $B_{p, r}^s \rightarrow B_{p, r}^{s-m}$.*

The next lemma is similar. We state and prove it because technically speaking, Lemma B.2 requires that the symbol of a Fourier multiplier be smooth everywhere, which is not true for $f(\xi) = |\xi|^\alpha$ in $\xi = 0$.

Lemma B.3 (Continuity of the fractional Laplacian). *Let $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $p, r \in [1, \infty]$. Then the fractional Laplacian is a continuous operator*

$$(-\Delta)^\alpha: B_{p, r}^s \rightarrow B_{p, r}^{s-2\alpha}.$$

Proof. We follow the proof of [4, Proposition 2.78]. Recall that Δ_j denotes the j -th Littlewood–Paley block. We need to show that

$$\forall j \geq -1: \quad 2^{j(s-2\alpha)} \|\Delta_j(-\Delta)^\alpha u\|_{L^p} \leq C 2^{js} \|\Delta_j u\|_{L^p}.$$

First, consider $j = -1$. Let $\theta \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$ and $\theta = 1$ on $\text{supp } \chi$. Note that

$$\Delta_{-1}(-\Delta)^\alpha u = (\chi |\cdot|^{2\alpha} \hat{u})^\vee = ((|\cdot|^{2\alpha} \theta) \chi \hat{u})^\vee = (|\cdot|^{2\alpha} \theta)(D)(\Delta_{-1} u) = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(|\cdot|^{2\alpha} \theta) * (\Delta_{-1} u).$$

Note that since $\text{supp } \theta \subset B_R(0)$, for some $R \geq 1$,

$$\mathcal{F}^{-1}(|\cdot|^{2\alpha} \theta)(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |k|^{2\alpha} \theta(k) e^{ik \cdot x} = \sum_{|k| \leq R} |k|^{2\alpha} \theta(k) e^{ik \cdot x},$$

and hence

$$\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(|\cdot|^{2\alpha} \theta)\|_{L^1} \leq |\mathbb{T}^d| \sum_{|k| \leq R} |k|^{2\alpha} \theta(k) \leq |\mathbb{T}^d| R^{d+2\alpha} \leq |\mathbb{T}^d| R^{d+2} < \infty.$$

Now, by Young's convolution inequality, we find

$$\|\Delta_{-1}(-\Delta)^\alpha u\|_{L^p} \leq \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(|\cdot|^{2\alpha} \theta)\|_{L^1} \|\Delta_{-1} u\|_{L^p} \leq C(d) \|\Delta_{-1} u\|_{L^p},$$

and we find that

$$2^{(-1)(s-2\alpha)} \|\Delta_{-1}(-\Delta)^\alpha u\|_{L^p} \leq 2^{(-1)s} 2^{2\alpha} C(d) \|\Delta_{-1} u\|_{L^p} \leq 2C(d) 2^{(-1)s} \|\Delta_{-1} u\|_{L^p}.$$

Now consider $j \geq 0$. Similarly as before, we have, with $f(\xi) = |\xi|^{2\alpha}$,

$$\Delta_j(-\Delta)^\alpha u = (\varphi_j |\cdot|^{2\alpha} \hat{u})^\vee = f(D) \Delta_j u.$$

Since the function $f(D)$ (recalling the notation for Fourier multipliers from Lemma B.2) is applied to the function $\Delta_j u$ which has Fourier support in an annulus $2^j \mathcal{C}$, we are in a position to apply [4, Lemma 2.2]. Let us quickly check that f satisfies the assumptions of the lemma with $m = 2\alpha$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_i f(\xi) &= 2\alpha|\xi|^{2\alpha-2}\xi_i \\ \partial_k \partial_i f(\xi) &= -4\alpha(1-\alpha)|\xi|^{2\alpha-4}\xi_i \xi_k + 2\alpha|\xi|^{2\alpha-2}\delta_{k,i},\end{aligned}$$

etc. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}|\partial_i f(\xi)| &\leq 2\alpha|\xi|^{2\alpha-2}(\xi_i^2)^{1/2} \leq 2\alpha|\xi|^{2\alpha-2}|\xi| = 2\alpha|\xi|^{2\alpha-1}, \\ |\partial_k \partial_i f(\xi)| &\leq 4\alpha(1-\alpha)|\xi|^{2\alpha-4}|\xi|^2 + 2\alpha|\xi|^{2\alpha-2} = (4\alpha(1-\alpha) + 2\alpha)|\xi|^{2\alpha-2}.\end{aligned}$$

Continuing inductively, we see that for any $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$,

$$|\partial^\beta f(\xi)| \leq C_\beta |\xi|^{2\alpha-|\beta|}.$$

Furthermore, $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\})$. Then by [4, Lemma 2.2], we get that

$$2^{j(s-2\alpha)} \|\Delta_j(-\Delta)^\alpha u\|_{L^p} = 2^{j(s-2\alpha)} \|f(D)\Delta_j u\|_{L^p} \leq C 2^{j(s-2\alpha)} 2^{j2\alpha} \|\Delta_j u\|_{L^p} = 2^{js} \|\Delta_j u\|_{L^p},$$

which completes the proof. \square

Lemma B.4 (Increasing the s -index). *Let $s' > s$, $p, r \in [1, \infty]$. Then there is a constant $C = C(|s' - s|)$ such that*

$$\|u\|_{B_{p,r}^s} \leq C \|u\|_{B_{p,r}^{s'}}. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Proof. Without loss of generality we only consider the case $r < \infty$. The case $r = \infty$ works the same way.

$$\begin{aligned}\|u\|_{B_{p,r}^s}^r &\stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \sum_{j=-1}^{\infty} 2^{jrs} \|\Delta_j u\|_{L^p}^r = \sum_{j=-1}^{\infty} 2^{jrs'} 2^{jr(s-s')} \|\Delta_j u\|_{L^p}^r \\ &= 2^{-rs'} 2^{-r(s-s')} \|\Delta_{-1} u\|_{L^p}^r + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{jrs'} \underbrace{2^{jr(s-s')}}_{\leq 1} \|\Delta_j u\|_{L^p}^r \\ &\leq 2^{r|s-s'|} 2^{-rs'} \|\Delta_{-1} u\|_{L^p}^r + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{jrs'} \|\Delta_j u\|_{L^p}^r \\ &\leq (\max(2^{|s-s'|}, 1))^r \left(\sum_{j=-1}^{\infty} 2^{jrs} \|\Delta_j u\|_{L^p}^r \right) \\ &= 2^{|s-s'|r} \left(\sum_{j=-1}^{\infty} 2^{jrs} \|\Delta_j u\|_{L^p}^r \right) \\ \Rightarrow \|u\|_{B_{p,r}^s} &\leq 2^{|s-s'|} \|u\|_{B_{p,r}^{s'}},\end{aligned}$$

which proves the claim with $C = 2^{|s-s'|}$. \square

Lemma B.5 (Increasing the q -index). *Let $p, q_0, q_1 \in [1, \infty]$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $q_0 < q_1$. Then we have the continuous embedding*

$$B_{p,q_1}^{s+\varepsilon} \hookrightarrow B_{p,q_0}^s,$$

i.e. there is a constant $C = C_{\varepsilon, q_0, q_1}$ such that $\|u\|_{B_{p,q_0}^s} \leq C \|u\|_{B_{p,q_1}^{s+\varepsilon}}$.

Proof. First, let $q_1 < \infty$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u\|_{B_{p,q_0}^s} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(\sum_{j \geq -1}^{\infty} 2^{jsq_0} \|\Delta_j u\|_{L^p}^{q_0} \right)^{1/q_0} = \left(\sum_{j \geq -1}^{\infty} 2^{-j\epsilon q_0} 2^{j(s+\epsilon)q_0} \|\Delta_j u\|_{L^p}^{q_0} \right)^{1/q_0} \\
&\stackrel{\text{Hölder}}{\leq} \left(\sum_{j \geq -1}^{\infty} 2^{j(s+\epsilon)q_0 \frac{q_1}{q_0}} \|\Delta_j u\|_{L^p}^{q_0 \frac{q_1}{q_0}} \right)^{\frac{q_0}{q_1} \cdot \frac{1}{q_0}} \left(\sum_{j \geq -1}^{\infty} 2^{-j\epsilon \frac{q_0 q_1}{q_1 - q_0}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_0} (1 - \frac{q_0}{q_1})} \\
&= \left(\sum_{j \geq -1}^{\infty} 2^{j(s+\epsilon)q_1} \|\Delta_j u\|_{L^p}^{q_1} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \left(\sum_{j \geq -1}^{\infty} 2^{-j\epsilon \frac{q_0 q_1}{q_1 - q_0}} \right)^{\frac{q_1 - q_0}{q_0 q_1}} \\
&= C_{\epsilon, q_0, q_1} \|u\|_{B_{p, q_1}^{s+\epsilon}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, let $q_1 = \infty$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u\|_{B_{p, q_0}^s} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(\sum_{j \geq -1}^{\infty} 2^{jsq_0} \|\Delta_j u\|_{L^p}^{q_0} \right)^{1/q_0} = \left(\sum_{j \geq -1}^{\infty} 2^{-j\epsilon q_0} 2^{j(s+\epsilon)q_0} \|\Delta_j u\|_{L^p}^{q_0} \right)^{1/q_0} \\
&\leq \left(\sum_{j \geq -1}^{\infty} 2^{-j\epsilon q_0} \left(\sup_j 2^{j(s+\epsilon)q_0} \|\Delta_j u\|_{L^p} \right)^{q_0} \right)^{1/q_0} \\
&= \left(\sum_{j \geq -1}^{\infty} 2^{-j\epsilon q_0} \right)^{1/q_0} \|u\|_{B_{p, \infty}^{s+\epsilon}} = C_{\epsilon, q_0} \|u\|_{B_{p, \infty}^{s+\epsilon}}. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma B.6 (Increasing the p -index). *Let $p_0, p_1, q \in [1, \infty]$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $p_0 < p_1$. Then there is a constant $C = C_{p_0, p_1}$ such that*

$$\|u\|_{B_{p_0, q}^s} \leq C \|u\|_{B_{p_1, q}^s},$$

i.e. we have the continuous embedding $B_{p_1, q}^s \hookrightarrow B_{p_0, q}^s$.

Proof. First let $p_1 < \infty$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u\|_{B_{p_0, q}^s} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(\sum_{j \geq -1} 2^{jsq} \|1 \cdot \Delta_j u\|_{L^{p_0}}^q \right)^{1/q} \\
&\stackrel{\text{Hölder}}{\leq} \left(\sum_{j \geq -1} 2^{jsq} \left(\int 1 dx \right)^{\frac{q}{p_0} (1 - \frac{p_0}{p_1})} \left(\int |\Delta_j u|^{p_0 \cdot \frac{p_1}{p_0}} dx \right)^{\frac{q}{p_0} \cdot \frac{p_0}{p_1}} \right)^{1/q} \\
&= \left(\sum_{j \geq -1} 2^{jsq} \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} 1 dx \right)^{\frac{q}{p_0} (1 - \frac{p_0}{p_1})} \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |\Delta_j u|^{p_0 \cdot \frac{p_1}{p_0}} dx \right)^{\frac{q}{p_0} \cdot \frac{p_0}{p_1}} \right)^{1/q} \\
&= |\mathbb{T}^3|^{\frac{p_1 - p_0}{p_0 p_1}} \left(\sum_{j \geq -1} 2^{jsq} \|\Delta_j u\|_{L^{p_1}}^q \right)^{1/q} = C_{p_0, p_1} \|u\|_{B_{p_1, q}^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now let $p_1 = \infty$. Then we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u\|_{B_{p_0,q}^s} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(\sum_{j \geq -1} 2^{jsq} \|1 \cdot \Delta_j u\|_{L^{p_0}}^q \right)^{1/q} \\
&\stackrel{\text{Hölder}}{\leq} \left(\sum_{j \geq -1} 2^{jsq} \left(\int 1 dx \right)^{\frac{q}{p_0}} \|\Delta_j u\|_{L^\infty}^q \right)^{1/q} \\
&= |\mathbb{T}^3|^{\frac{1}{p_0}} \left(\sum_{j \geq -1} 2^{jsq} \|\Delta_j u\|_{L^\infty}^q \right)^{1/q} = C_{p_0,\infty} \|u\|_{B_{\infty,q}^s}. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we shall need the following Sobolev-type embedding theorem for Besov spaces.

Lemma B.7 (Sobolev-type embedding, [4], Proposition 2.71). *Let $1 \leq p_1 \leq p_2 \leq \infty$ and $1 \leq q_1 \leq q_2 \leq \infty$. Then, for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$, we have the continuous embedding*

$$B_{p_1,q_1}^s \hookrightarrow B_{p_2,q_2}^{s-d\left(\frac{1}{p_1}-\frac{1}{p_2}\right)}, \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \|u\|_{B_{p_2,q_2}^{s-d\left(\frac{1}{p_1}-\frac{1}{p_2}\right)}} \leq C \|u\|_{B_{p_1,q_1}^s},$$

where C is independent of s, p_i and q_i , $i = 1, 2$.

Lemma B.8 (Lemma C.1 of [23]). *Let $\phi = \phi_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For any $\delta \in [0, 1)$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}$, $r \leq \kappa$ there exists a constant $C = C(\delta, r)$ such that the following holds almost surely for every $L \in \mathbb{N}$, $L \geq 1$. For every f on $(-\infty, \mathfrak{t}_L] \times \mathbb{T}^3$ of class $C_{\leq \mathfrak{t}_L}^{r+\delta}$ and every fixed $t \leq \mathfrak{t}_L$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f \circ \phi\|_{C_x^{r+\delta}} &\leq CL^{r+\delta} \|f\|_{C_x^{r+\delta}}, \\
\|f \circ \phi^{-1}\|_{C_x^{r+\delta}} &\leq CL^{r+\delta} \|f\|_{C_x^{r+\delta}},
\end{aligned}$$

where $f \circ \phi$ denotes the map $(-\infty, \mathfrak{t}_L] \times \mathbb{T}^3 \ni (t, x) \mapsto f(t, \phi(t, x))$, and similarly for $f \circ \phi^{-1}$.

Lemma B.9 (Lemma C.2 of [23]). *Let $\phi = \phi_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For every $s \in (0, 2)$, $s \neq 1$ there exists $C = C(s)$ such that for every $L \in \mathbb{N}$, $L \geq 1$ and every continuous function f on $\mathbb{T}^3 \times (-\infty, \mathfrak{t}_L]$ it holds that*

$$\|f \circ \phi^{\pm 1}\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{-s}} \leq CL^{4-s} \|f\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{-s}}.$$

Recall the following estimates from [23, Equ. (C.1)]:

Lemma B.10. *Let $\phi = \phi_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For every $s \in (0, 1)$, there exists a $C = C(s)$ such that for every $L \in \mathbb{N}$ and every continuous function f on $\mathbb{T}^3 \times (-\infty, \mathfrak{t}_L]$ the following hold:*

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f \circ \phi\|_{B_{1,1}^s} &\leq CL^{4-s} \|f\|_{B_{1,1}^s}, \\
\|f \circ \phi^{-1}\|_{B_{1,1}^s} &\leq CL^{4-s} \|f\|_{B_{1,1}^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma B.11 (Lemma C.4 of [23]). *Let $\phi = \phi_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For any $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and any $r \in \mathbb{N}$, $r + 2 \leq \kappa$, there exists a constant $C = C(\delta, r)$ such that for every $v: \mathbb{T}^3 \times (-\infty, \mathfrak{t}_L] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$, $A: \mathbb{T}^3 \times (-\infty, \mathfrak{t}_L] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ almost surely for every $L \in \mathbb{N}$, $L \geq 1$, $t \leq \mathfrak{t}_L$*

$$\|\mathcal{Q}_\phi v\|_{C_x^{r+\delta}} \leq CL^{2r+2\delta} \|v\|_{C_x^{r+\delta}}, \quad (\text{B.2})$$

$$\|\mathcal{R}_\phi v\|_{C_x^\delta} \leq CL^{5+4\delta} \|v\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{\delta-1}}, \quad (\text{B.3})$$

$$\|\mathcal{R}_\phi(\text{div}_\phi A)\|_{C_x^{r+\delta}} \leq CL^{2r+2\delta} \|A\|_{C_x^{r+\delta}}, \quad (\text{B.4})$$

$$\|\mathcal{R}_\phi v\|_{C_x^{r+1+\delta}} \leq CL^{2r+1+2\delta} \|v\|_{C_x^{r+\delta}}. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Lemma B.12 (Proposition C.5 of [23]). *Let $\phi = \phi_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $a \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)$ be a smooth function and let $k \in \mathbb{Z}^3 \setminus \{0\}$ and $\lambda \geq 1$ be fixed. Define $f(x) = a(x)e^{i\lambda k \cdot x}$.*

(i) *For any $r \in \mathbb{N}$, we have almost surely for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$*

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} f(\phi(t, x)) dx \right| \leq \frac{[a]_{C_x^r}}{\lambda^r}. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

(ii) *For any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $r + 1 \leq \kappa$, we have almost surely for every $L \in \mathbb{N}$, $L \geq 1$ and $t \in (-\infty, \tau_L]$*

$$\|\mathcal{R}^\phi(f \circ \phi)\|_{C_x^\delta} \leq CL^\delta \left(\lambda^{\delta-1} \|a\|_{C_x^0} + \lambda^{\delta-r} [a]_{C_x^r} + \lambda^{-r} [a]_{C_x^{r+\delta}} \right), \quad (\text{B.7})$$

$$\|\mathcal{R}^\phi Q^\phi(f \circ \phi)\|_{C_x^\delta} \leq CL^\delta \left(\lambda^{\delta-1} \|a\|_{C_x^0} + \lambda^{\delta-r} [a]_{C_x^r} + \lambda^{-r} [a]_{C_x^{r+\delta}} \right), \quad (\text{B.8})$$

where $C = C(\delta, r)$.

Lemma B.13 (Lemma C.6 of [23]). *Let $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$ such that $\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} = 1$. Then, for every $\delta \in (0, 1)$, there exists a C such that for every $f \in B_{p_1, \infty}^{s+\delta}(\mathbb{T}^3)$ with mean zero and $g \in L^{p_2}(\mathbb{T}^3)$, the spatial convolution on the torus $f *_{\mathbb{T}^3} g$ belongs to $B_{\infty, \infty}^s(\mathbb{T}^3)$ and*

$$\|f *_{\mathbb{T}^3} g\|_{B_{\infty, \infty}^s} \leq C \|f\|_{B_{p_1, \infty}^{s+\delta}} \|g\|_{L^{p_2}}.$$

Lemma B.14 (Lemma C.7 of [23]). *Let $\ell = 2^{-N}$ for some positive $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Let f be a smooth function on \mathbb{R}^d with $\text{supp } f \subset (0, 2\pi)^d$, and denote*

$$\begin{aligned} f^0 &:= f - \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int_{[0, 2\pi]^d} f, \\ f_\ell &:= \ell^{-d} f(\cdot/\ell), \\ f_\ell^0 &:= f_\ell - \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int_{[0, 2\pi]^d} f_\ell = f_\ell - \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int_{[0, 2\pi]^d} f. \end{aligned}$$

Extend f, f^0, f_ℓ and f_ℓ^0 periodically on \mathbb{T}^d . Then for every $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $p \in [1, \infty]$ it holds that

$$\|f_\ell^0\|_{B_{p, \infty}^s} = \ell^{d/p-d-s} \|f^0\|_{B_{p, \infty}^s} \leq \ell^{d/p-d-s} \|f\|_{B_{p, \infty}^s}.$$

Lemma B.15. *Let $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $\chi_\ell(t, x) = \psi_\ell(t)\varphi_\ell(x)$ be a space-time mollifier. Let $f: \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be a smooth function. Then for any $\kappa, \beta \in (0, 1]$ and $t \geq 0$*

$$\|f *_{t, x} \chi_\ell - f\|_{B_{\infty, \infty}^\theta}(t) \leq C\ell^\kappa \|f\|_{C_t^0 B_{\infty, \infty}^{\theta+\kappa}} + \ell^\beta \|f\|_{C_t^\beta B_{\infty, \infty}^\theta}.$$

Proof. We find that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(f * \chi_\ell)(t) - f(t)\|_{B_{\infty, \infty}^\theta} &= \left\| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} [f(t-s, \cdot - y) - f(t, \cdot)] \varphi_\ell(y) \psi_\ell(s) dy ds \right\|_{B_{\infty, \infty}^\theta} \\ &\stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \sup_{j \geq -1} 2^{j\theta} \left\| \Delta_j \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} [f(t-s, \cdot - y) - f(t, \cdot)] \varphi_\ell(y) \psi_\ell(s) dy ds \right\|_{L^\infty} \\ &= \sup_{j \geq -1} 2^{j\theta} \left\| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} [(\Delta_j f)(t-s, \cdot - y) - (\Delta_j f)(t, \cdot)] \varphi_\ell(y) \psi_\ell(s) dy ds \right\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leq \sup_{j \geq -1} 2^{j\theta} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^3} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} [(\Delta_j f)(t-s, x-y) - (\Delta_j f)(t-s, x)] \varphi_\ell(y) \psi_\ell(s) dy ds \right| \\ &\quad + \sup_{j \geq -1} 2^{j\theta} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^3} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} [(\Delta_j f)(t-s, x) - (\Delta_j f)(t, x)] \varphi_\ell(y) \psi_\ell(s) dy ds \right| \\ &=: A + B. \end{aligned}$$

We first estimate A :

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= \sup_{j \geq -1} 2^{j\theta} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^3} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} [(\Delta_j f)(t-s, x-y) - (\Delta_j f)(t-s, x)] \varphi_\ell(y) \psi_\ell(s) \, dy ds \right| \\
&\leq \sup_{j \geq -1} 2^{j\theta} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} [\Delta_j f(t-s, \cdot)]_{C_x^\kappa} |y|^\kappa \varphi_\ell(y) \psi_\ell(s) \, dy ds \\
&\leq \ell^\kappa \sup_{j \geq -1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \sup_{r \in (-\infty, t]} 2^{j\theta} [\Delta_j f(r, \cdot)]_{C_x^\kappa} \varphi_\ell(y) \psi_\ell(s) \, dy ds \\
&\leq \ell^\kappa \sup_{j \geq -1} \sup_{r \in (-\infty, t]} \underbrace{2^{j\theta} [\Delta_j f(r, \cdot)]_{C_x^\kappa}}_{\leq \sup_{j \geq -1} \dots} \\
&\leq \ell^\kappa \sup_{r \in (-\infty, t]} \sup_{j \geq -1} 2^{j\theta} [\Delta_j f(r, \cdot)]_{C_x^\kappa} \\
&\stackrel{\text{interpolation}}{\leq} 2\ell^\kappa \sup_{r \in (-\infty, t]} \sup_{j \geq -1} 2^{j\theta} (\|D_x \Delta_j f(r, \cdot)\|_{L_x^\infty})^\kappa \|\Delta_j f(r, \cdot)\|_{L_x^\infty}^{1-\kappa} \\
&\stackrel{[4, \text{Lemma 2.1}]}{\leq} 2\ell^\kappa \sup_{r \in (-\infty, t]} \sup_{j \geq -1} 2^{j\theta} (2^j C \|\Delta_j f(r, \cdot)\|_{L_x^\infty})^\kappa \|\Delta_j f(r, \cdot)\|_{L_x^\infty}^{1-\kappa} \\
&= C\ell^\kappa \sup_{r \in (-\infty, t]} \sup_{j \geq -1} 2^{j(\theta+\kappa)} \|\Delta_j f(r, \cdot)\|_{L_x^\infty} \\
&\stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} C\ell^\kappa \|f\|_{C_t^0 B_{\infty, \infty}^{\theta+\kappa}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now let us estimate B :

$$\begin{aligned}
B &= \sup_{j \geq -1} 2^{j\theta} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^3} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{(\Delta_j v_n)(t-s, x) - (\Delta_j v_n)(t, x)}{|s|^\beta} |s|^\beta \psi_\ell(s) \, ds \right| \\
&\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \sup_{j \geq -1} 2^{j\theta} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^3} \left| \frac{(\Delta_j v_n)(t-s, x) - (\Delta_j v_n)(t, x)}{|s|^\beta} \right| |s|^\beta \psi_\ell(s) \, ds \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{|s|^\beta} \sup_{j \geq -1} 2^{j\theta} \|(\Delta_j v_n)(t-s, x) - (\Delta_j v_n)(t, x)\|_{L^\infty} |s|^\beta \psi_\ell(s) \, ds \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{|s|^\beta} \|v_n(t-s, \cdot) - v_n(t, \cdot)\|_{B_{\infty, \infty}^\theta} |s|^\beta \psi_\ell(s) \, ds \\
&\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\sup_{\substack{u, r \in (-\infty, t] \\ u \neq r}} \frac{1}{|u-r|^\beta} \|v_n(u, \cdot) - v_n(r, \cdot)\|_{B_{\infty, \infty}^\theta} \right) |s|^\beta \psi_\ell(s) \, ds \\
&\stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|v_n\|_{C_t^\beta B_{\infty, \infty}^\theta} |s|^\beta \psi_\ell(s) \, ds \\
&\leq \ell^\beta \|v_n\|_{C_t^\beta B_{\infty, \infty}^\theta}. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Acknowledgements. T.L. has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the EU-HORIZON EUROPE ERC-2021-ADG research and innovation programme (project „Noise in Fluids“, grant agreement no. 101053472). A.S. gratefully acknowledges the support by the German Research Foundation (DFG) through the Walter Benjamin Programme, Project number 507913792.

References

- [1] D. Albritton, E. Brué, and M. Colombo. Non-uniqueness of Leray solutions of the forced Navier-Stokes equations. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 196(1):415–455, 2022.

- [2] D. Albritton, E. Brué, and M. Colombo. Gluing non-unique Navier-Stokes solutions. *Ann. PDE*, 9(2):Paper No. 17, 25, 2023.
- [3] D. Albritton and M. Colombo. Non-uniqueness of Leray Solutions to the hypodissipative Navier–Stokes equations in two dimensions. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 402(1):429–446, 2023.
- [4] H. Bahouri, J.-Y. Chemin, and R. Danchin. *Fourier Analysis and Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2011.
- [5] S. E. Berkemeier. Existence and non-uniqueness of ergodic Leray–Hopf solutions to the stochastic power-law flows. *arXiv preprint 2412.08622*, 2024.
- [6] E. Bruè and C. De Lellis. Anomalous dissipation for the forced 3D Navier-Stokes equations. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 400(3):1507–1533, 2023.
- [7] E. Brué, R. Jin, Y. Li, and D. Zhang. Non-uniqueness in law of Leray solutions to 3D forced stochastic Navier-Stokes equations. *arXiv preprint 2309.09753*, 2023.
- [8] T. Buckmaster, M. Colombo, and V. Vicol. Wild solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations whose singular sets in time have Hausdorff dimension strictly less than 1. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 24(9):3333–3378, 2022.
- [9] T. Buckmaster, C. De Lellis, P. Isett, and L. Székelyhidi, Jr. Anomalous dissipation for 1/5-Hölder Euler flows. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 182(1):127–172, 2015.
- [10] T. Buckmaster, C. de Lellis, L. Székelyhidi, Jr., and V. Vicol. Onsager’s conjecture for admissible weak solutions. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 72(2):229–274, 2019.
- [11] T. Buckmaster and V. Vicol. Nonuniqueness of weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equation. *Ann. of Math.*, 189(1):101–144, 2019.
- [12] M. Colombo, C. De Lellis, and L. De Rosa. Ill-posedness of Leray solutions for the hypodissipative Navier–Stokes equations. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 362(2):659–688, 2018.
- [13] M. Dai. Nonunique weak solutions in Leray–Hopf class for the three-dimensional Hall–MHD system. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 53(5):5979–6016, 2021.
- [14] C. De Lellis and L. Székelyhidi, Jr. Dissipative continuous Euler flows. *Invent. Math.*, 193(2):377–407, 2013.
- [15] L. De Rosa. Infinitely many Leray-Hopf solutions for the fractional Navier-Stokes equations. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 44(4):335–365, 2019.
- [16] A. Debussche, M. Hofmanová, and J. Vovelle. Degenerate parabolic stochastic partial differential equations: quasilinear case. *Ann. Probab.*, 44(3):1916–1955, 2016.
- [17] A. Debussche and U. Pappalettera. Second order perturbation theory of two-scale systems in fluid dynamics. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, published online first, 2024.
- [18] F. Flandoli, M. Hofmanová, D. Luo, and T. Nilssen. Global well-posedness of the 3D Navier-Stokes equations perturbed by a deterministic vector field. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 32(4):2568–2586, 2022.
- [19] F. Flandoli and D. Luo. High mode transport noise improves vorticity blow-up control in 3D Navier-Stokes equations. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 180(1-2):309–363, 2021.
- [20] F. Flandoli and U. Pappalettera. From additive to transport noise in 2D fluid dynamics. *Stoch. Partial Differ. Equ. Anal. Comput.*, 10(3):964–1004, 2022.

- [21] P. K. Friz and M. Hairer. *A Course on Rough Paths: With an Introduction to Regularity Structures*. Springer Nature, 2020.
- [22] M. Gorini. L^2 -density of wild initial data for the hypodissipative Navier-Stokes equations. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 284(6):109819, 2023.
- [23] M. Hofmanová, T. Lange, and U. Pappalettera. Global existence and non-uniqueness of 3D Euler equations perturbed by transport noise. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 2023.
- [24] M. Hofmanová, R. Zhu, and X. Zhu. Global existence and non-uniqueness for 3D Navier-Stokes equations with space-time white noise. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 247(3):Paper No. 46, 70, 2023.
- [25] M. Hofmanová, R. Zhu, and X. Zhu. Global-in-time probabilistically strong and Markov solutions to stochastic 3D Navier–Stokes equations: Existence and nonuniqueness. *The Annals of Probability*, 51(2):524 – 579, 2023.
- [26] M. Hofmanová, R. Zhu, and X. Zhu. Non-uniqueness in law of stochastic 3D Navier–Stokes equations. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, 2023.
- [27] M. Hofmanová, R. Zhu, and X. Zhu. Non-unique ergodicity for deterministic and stochastic 3D Navier–Stokes and Euler equations. *arXiv preprint 2208.08290*, 2022.
- [28] M. Hofmanová, R. Zhu, and X. Zhu. Non-uniqueness of Leray-Hopf solutions for stochastic forced Navier-Stokes equations. *arXiv preprint 2309.03668*, 2023.
- [29] T. Hytönen, J. van Neerven, M. Veraar, and L. Weis. *Analysis in Banach Spaces Volume III: Harmonic Analysis and Spectral Theory*. Springer Cham, 2011.
- [30] P. Isett. A proof of Onsager’s conjecture. *Annals of Mathematics*, 188(3):871–963, 2018.
- [31] H. Kunita. *Stochastic Flows and Stochastic Differential Equations*. Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- [32] C. Lellis and L. Székelyhidi. Dissipative Euler flows and Onsager’s conjecture. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 16(7):1467–1505, 2014.
- [33] J. Leray. Sur le mouvement d’un liquide visqueux emplissant l’espace. *Acta Mathematica*, 63(none):193 – 248, 1934.
- [34] J. L. Lions. *Quelques méthodes de résolution des problèmes aux limites non linéaires*. Dunod, 1969.
- [35] A. Lunardi. *Interpolation theory*, volume 16 of *Appunti. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa (Nuova Serie) [Lecture Notes. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa (New Series)]*. Edizioni della Normale, Pisa, 2018. Third edition [of MR2523200].
- [36] T. Luo and P. Qu. Non-uniqueness of weak solutions to 2D hypoviscous Navier-Stokes equations. *J. Differential Equations*, 269(4):2896–2919, 2020.
- [37] T. Luo and E. S. Titi. Non-uniqueness of weak solutions to hyperviscous Navier–Stokes equations: on sharpness of J.-L. Lions exponent. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 59(3):92, 2020.
- [38] J.-C. Mourrat and H. Weber. Global well-posedness of the dynamic Φ^4 model in the plane. *The Annals of Probability*, 45(4):2398 – 2476, 2017.
- [39] U. Pappalettera. Global existence and non-uniqueness for the Cauchy problem associated to 3D Navier–Stokes equations perturbed by transport noise. *Stochastics and Partial Differential Equations: Analysis and Computations*, 12(3):1769–1804, 2024.

- [40] M. Rehmeier and A. Schenke. Nonuniqueness in law for stochastic hypodissipative Navier–Stokes equations. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 227:113179, 2023.
- [41] L. Roncal and P. R. Stinga. Fractional Laplacian on the torus. *Commun. Contemp. Math.*, 18(3):1550033, 26, 2016.
- [42] L. De Rosa. Infinitely many Leray–Hopf solutions for the fractional Navier–Stokes equations. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 44(4):335–365, 2019.
- [43] H.-J. Schmeisser and H. Triebel. *Topics in Fourier Analysis and Function Spaces*. Wiley, 1987.
- [44] T. Tao. Global regularity for a logarithmically supercritical hyperdissipative Navier–Stokes equation. *Anal. PDE*, 2(3):361–366, 2009.
- [45] K. Yamazaki. Non-uniqueness in law of three-dimensional Navier–Stokes equations diffused via a fractional Laplacian with power less than one half. *arXiv preprint 2104.10294*, 2021.
- [46] K Yamazaki. Nonuniqueness in law for two-dimensional Navier–Stokes equations with diffusion weaker than a full Laplacian. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 54(4):3997–4042, 2022.
- [47] K. Yamazaki. Remarks on the non-uniqueness in law of the Navier–Stokes equations up to the J.-L. Lions’ exponent. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 147:226–269, 2022.