

Mean field limit of interacting filaments and vector valued non linear PDEs

Hakima Bessaih*, Michele Coghi†, Franco Flandoli‡

Abstract

Families of N interacting curves are considered, with long range, mean field type, interaction. A family of curves defines a 1-current, concentrated on the curves, analog of the empirical measure of interacting point particles. This current is proved to converge, as N goes to infinity, to a mean field current, solution of a nonlinear, vector valued, partial differential equation. In the limit, each curve interacts with the mean field current and two different curves have an independence property if they are independent at time zero. This set-up is inspired from vortex filaments in turbulent fluids, although for technical reasons we have to restrict to smooth interaction, instead of the singular Biot-Savart kernel. All these results are based on a careful analysis of a nonlinear flow equation for 1-currents, its relation with the vector valued PDE and the continuous dependence on the initial conditions.

1 Introduction

Classical mean field theory deals with pointwise particles in \mathbb{R}^d , described by their position $X_t^{i,N}$, that satisfy dynamics of the form

$$\frac{dX_t^{i,N}}{dt} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N k \left(X_t^{i,N} - X_t^{j,N} \right) \quad (1)$$

governed by the interaction kernel $k : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ (often a stochastic analog is considered but here we deal with the deterministic case). Denoting by $S_t^N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{X_t^{i,N}}$ the empirical measure, if k is bounded Lipschitz continuous and S_0^N weakly converges to a probability

*University of Wyoming, Department of Mathematics, Dept. 3036, 1000 East University Avenue, Laramie WY 82071, United States, bessaih@uwyo.edu

†Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa, P.zza dei Cavalieri 7, 56127, Pisa, michele.coghi@gmail.com

‡Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Pisa, Largo Bruno Pontecorvo 5, 56127, Pisa, Italy, flandoli@dma.unipi.it

measure μ_0 , one can prove that S_t^N weakly converges to a measure-valued solution μ_t of the mean field equation

$$\frac{\partial \mu_t}{\partial t} + \operatorname{div}((k * \mu_t) \mu_t) = 0$$

with initial condition μ_0 , where $k * \mu_t$ is the vector field in \mathbb{R}^d with i -component given by the convolution $k_i * \mu_t$; see [11].

Our aim is to develop an analogous result in the case when interacting points are replaced by interacting curves, that we call "filaments" by inspiration from the theory of vortex filaments in 3D fluids. The limit nonlinear PDE is vector valued or, more precisely, *current*-valued, as explained below.

The filament structures are curves in \mathbb{R}^d , $\gamma_t^{i,N}(\sigma)$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, parametrized by $\sigma \in [0, 1]$, and their interaction is described by the differential equation

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \gamma_t^{i,N}(\sigma) = \sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_j^N \int_0^1 K \left(\gamma_t^{i,N}(\sigma) - \gamma_t^{j,N}(\sigma') \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma'} \gamma_t^{j,N}(\sigma') d\sigma'$$

where α_j^N play the role of the factors $\frac{1}{N}$ in (1) and where now $K : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is a smooth matrix-valued function (precisely, we need K of class $\mathcal{UC}_b^3(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^m)$, see Section 2 for the definition). To the family of curves we associate a vector valued distribution (a "current") $\xi_t : C_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ formally given by

$$\xi_t^N = \sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_j^N \int_0^1 \delta_{\gamma_t^{j,N}(\sigma)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \gamma_t^{j,N}(\sigma) d\sigma$$

which plays the role of the empirical measure S_t^N . The mean field result will be that, under suitable assumptions on the initial conditions, ξ_t^N converges weakly to a current-valued solution ξ_t of the vector-valued equation

$$\frac{\partial \xi_t}{\partial t} + \operatorname{div}((K * \xi_t) \xi_t) = \xi_t \cdot \nabla (K * \xi_t) \quad (2)$$

where $K * \xi_t$ is the vector field in \mathbb{R}^d defined by (4) below and the meaning of the equation is given by Definition 10. Moreover, in the limit, each filament is coupled only with the *mean field* ξ_t :

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \gamma_t^i(\sigma) = (K * \xi_t) \left(\gamma_t^i(\sigma) \right) \quad (3)$$

and any two filaments in the limit have a suitable independence property, if the initial conditions are also independent (all these limit results require precise statements, given in section 6.2).

The investigation made here of interacting curves and the associated mean field PDE is motivated by the theory of vortex filaments in turbulent fluids. Starting from the simulations of [27], a new vision of a three dimensional turbulent fluid appeared as a system

composed of a large number of lower dimensional structures, in particular thin vortex structures. The idea is well described for instance by A. Chorin in his book [10]. For the purpose of turbulence, the investigation of large families of filaments was related to statistical properties, as we shall recall below. But, in parallel to statistical investigations, one of the natural questions is the relation between these families of filaments and the equations of fluid dynamics, the Euler or Navier-Stokes equations. In dimension 2, it is known that a proper mean field limit of point vortices leads to the 2D Euler equation. In dimension 3 this is an open problem, see for instance [22]. Our mean field result here is a contribution in this direction. We do not solve the true fluid dynamic problem, since we cannot consider Biot-Savart kernel K yet, but at least for relatively smooth kernels we show that the expected result holds true.

Having mentioned the link with fluid dynamics and works on vortex filaments, let us give more details and some references. As we have already said, the importance of thin vortex structures in 3D turbulence has been discussed intensively, especially after the striking simulations of [27]. While the situation in the two-dimensional case is pretty understood, this is not the case in the three-dimensional case. Chorin [10] has emphasized both the similarities and differences between statistical theories for heuristic models for ensembles of three-dimensional vortex filaments and the earlier two-dimensional statistical theories for point vortices. Some probabilistic models of vortex filaments based on the paths of stochastic processes have been proposed in [19], [22], [12], [13], [18], [25]. The importance of these models for the statistics of turbulence or for the understanding of 3D Euler equations is of high importance. Let us mention that the existence and uniqueness of solutions for the dynamics of vortex filaments has been investigated in [2] and for a random vortex filament [3], [8] and in [9] in the case of fractional Brownian motion. Of course, all the previous references mentioned deals with a smoothed version of the dynamics which is related to a mollified version of the Biot-Savart formula.

Statistical ensembles of vortex filaments arise many questions. One of them, approached with success by Onsager and subsequent authors in dimension 2, is the mean field limit of a dense collection of many interacting vortices. In dimension 3 this question has been investigated successfully by P. L. Lions and A. Majda. In [22], they develop the first mathematically rigorous equilibrium statistical theory for three-dimensional vortex filaments in the context of a model involving simplified asymptotic equations for nearly parallel vortex filaments. Their equilibrium Gibbs ensemble is written down exactly through function space integrals; then a suitably scaled mean field statistical theory is developed in the limit of infinitely many interacting filaments. The mean field equations involved a novel Hartree-like problem. A similar approach has been used for stochastic vortex filaments in [4], [5] where the Gibbs measure was based on a previous rigorous definition introduced in [13]. The mean field was proved to be solution of a variational formulation but given in an implicit form.

As far as the content of the paper, section 2 is devoted to the introduction of the space of currents (1-forms) provided with its strong and weak topologies. The push forward

of 1-currents is defined with some properties. In section 3, Lagrangian current dynamics are introduced. A flow equation for the current is defined by taking the push forward of an initial current under the flow of diffeomorphisms generated by a general differential equation. The existence and uniqueness of maximal solutions for the flow are proved under some assumptions by means of a fixed point argument. Section 4 is devoted to the Eulerian current dynamics. In particular, we prove that the two formulations are equivalent. In particular, the well posedness of the Lagrangian formulation translates into the well posedness of the Eulerian formulation and viceversa. In section 5, a result about continuous dependence on initial conditions is proved, that will be used later for proving a mean field result. A sequence of interacting curves (filaments) are defined in section 6. These curves are solutions of a system of differential equations (with a scaling α_j^N), that describe our flow of diffeomorphism. Here we are using a smooth kernel which could be a mollified version of the Biot-Savart formula. To this family of curves, we associate a current defined in the vein of empirical measures. We prove a mean field result when the number of filament $N \rightarrow \infty$. A similar result is also proved when the filaments are random in section 6.3.

2 Preliminaries on 1-currents

Given $k, d, m \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by $C_b^k(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^m)$ the space of all functions $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ that are of class C^k , bounded with all derivatives of orders up to k . By $\mathcal{UC}_b^3(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^m)$ we denote the subset of $C_b^3(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^m)$ of those functions f such that f, Df and D^2f are also uniformly continuous.

2.1 Generalities

Currents of dimension 1 (called 1-currents here) are linear continuous mappings on the space $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ of smooth compact support vector fields of \mathbb{R}^d . In the sequel we shall only consider 1-currents which are continuous in the $C_b(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ topology.

Moreover, consider the space $C_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ of continuous and bounded vector fields on \mathbb{R}^d , denote the uniform topology by $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ and consider the following Banach space of 1-currents:

$$\mathcal{M} := C_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)'$$

The topology induced by the duality will be denoted by $|\cdot|_{\mathcal{M}}$:

$$|\xi|_{\mathcal{M}} := \sup_{\|\theta\|_\infty \leq 1} |\xi(\theta)|.$$

We are interested in the weak topology too, essential to deal with approximation by “filaments”. We define

$$\|\xi\| = \sup\{\xi(\theta) \mid \|\theta\|_\infty + \text{Lip}(\theta) \leq 1\}$$

where $\text{Lip}(\theta)$ is the Lipschitz constant of θ . We set

$$d(\xi, \xi') = \|\xi - \xi'\|$$

for all $\xi, \xi' \in \mathcal{M}$. The number $\|\xi\|$ is well defined and

$$\|\xi\| \leq |\xi|_{\mathcal{M}}$$

and $d(\xi, \xi')$ satisfies the conditions of a distance. Convergence in the metric space (\mathcal{M}, d) corresponds to weak convergence in \mathcal{M} as dual to $C_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$. Recall the following fact:

Lemma 1 *If B is a closed ball in $(\mathcal{M}, |\cdot|_{\mathcal{M}})$, then (B, d) is a complete metric space.*

Proof. Let $\{\xi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be a Cauchy sequence in (B, d) . This is also a Cauchy sequence in the dual space $\text{Lip}_b(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)'$ with the dual operator norm. Hence it converges to some $\xi \in \text{Lip}_b(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)'$. Indeed $\text{Lip}_b(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ is a Banach space and $\|\cdot\|$ is the operator norm on his dual, which is complete.

Now we have an operator ξ defined on $\text{Lip}_b(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$, we want to extend it to the bigger space $C_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and to show that this extension is a limit to the sequence ξ_n in the norm $\|\cdot\|$.

Given $\theta \in \text{Lip}_b(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$, it holds, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$|\xi(\theta)| \leq |(\xi - \xi_n)(\theta)| + |\xi_n(\theta)| \leq \|\xi - \xi_n\|(\|\theta\|_{\infty} + \text{Lip}(\theta)) + R\|\theta\|_{\infty}$$

where R denotes the radius of B . Hence, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, it holds $|\xi(\theta)| \leq R\|\theta\|_{\infty}$. We can thus apply Hahn-Banach theorem to obtain a linear functional $\bar{\xi}$ defined on $C_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\|\bar{\xi}\| \leq R$ and $\bar{\xi} \equiv \xi$ on $\text{Lip}_b(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)'$.

It only remains to prove that ξ_n converges to $\bar{\xi}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{\xi} - \xi_n\| &= \sup\{\bar{\xi}(\theta) - \xi_n(\theta) \mid \|\theta\|_{\infty} + \text{Lip}(\theta) \leq 1\} \\ &= \sup\{\xi(\theta) - \xi_n(\theta) \mid \|\theta\|_{\infty} + \text{Lip}(\theta) \leq 1\} = \|\xi - \xi_n\| \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

■

We shall denote by \mathcal{M}_w the space \mathcal{M} endowed by the metric d .

If $\xi \in \mathcal{M}$ and $K : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is a continuous bounded matrix-valued function, then $K * \xi$ is the vector field in \mathbb{R}^d with i -component given by

$$(K * \xi)_i(x) = (K_i * \xi)(x) := \xi(K_i(x - \cdot)) \quad (4)$$

where $K_i(z)$ is the vector $(K_{ij}(z))_{j=1, \dots, d}$. We have

$$|(K * \xi)(x)| \leq |\xi|_{\mathcal{M}} \|K\|_{\infty}.$$

If K , in addition, is also of class $C_b^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^m)$, then

$$|(K * \xi)(x)| \leq \|\xi\| (\|K\|_{\infty} + \|DK\|_{\infty}). \quad (5)$$

2.2 Push-forward

Let $\theta \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ be a vector field (test function) and $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be a map. When defined, the *push-forward* of θ is

$$(\varphi_{\#}\theta)(x) = D\varphi(x)^T \theta(\varphi(x)).$$

If φ is of class $C^1(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$, then $\varphi_{\#}$ is a well defined bounded linear map from $C_b(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ to itself.

Given a curve $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ of class C^1 ($W^{1,1}$ is sufficient), consider the current

$$\xi = \int_0^1 \delta(\cdot - \gamma(\sigma)) \frac{d\gamma}{d\sigma}(\sigma) d\sigma$$

namely the linear functional $\xi : C_b(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as

$$\xi(\theta) = \int_0^1 \left\langle \theta(\gamma(\sigma)), \frac{d\gamma}{d\sigma}(\sigma) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^d} d\sigma.$$

If $\varphi \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$, we define

$$\varphi_{\#}\xi := \int_0^1 \delta(\cdot - \varphi(\gamma(\sigma))) D\varphi(\gamma(\sigma)) \frac{d\gamma}{d\sigma}(\sigma) d\sigma.$$

Remark 2 Given γ and φ , define the curve $\eta : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ as $\eta(\sigma) = \varphi(\gamma(\sigma))$. Notice that $\frac{d\eta}{d\sigma}(\sigma) = D\varphi(\gamma(\sigma)) \frac{d\gamma}{d\sigma}(\sigma)$. Hence $\varphi_{\#}\xi$ is the current associated to the curve η .

For this example of push-forward, we have the following relation:

$$(\varphi_{\#}\xi)(\theta) = \xi(\varphi_{\#}\theta).$$

Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} (\varphi_{\#}\xi)(\theta) &= \int_0^1 \left\langle \theta(\varphi(\gamma(\sigma))), D\varphi(\gamma(\sigma)) \frac{d\gamma}{d\sigma}(\sigma) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^d} d\sigma \\ &= \int_0^1 \left\langle D\varphi(\gamma(\sigma))^T \theta(\varphi(\gamma(\sigma))), \frac{d\gamma}{d\sigma}(\sigma) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^d} d\sigma \\ &= \int_0^1 \left\langle (\varphi_{\#}\theta)(\gamma(\sigma)), \frac{d\gamma}{d\sigma}(\sigma) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^d} d\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Motivated by the previous computation (which is relevant by itself because ultimately we want to deal with vortex filaments), given a 1-current $\xi \in \mathcal{M}$ and a smooth map $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ we define the push-forward $\varphi_{\#}\xi$ as the current

$$(\varphi_{\#}\xi)(\theta) := \xi(\varphi_{\#}\theta), \quad \theta \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d).$$

We have seen above that $\varphi_{\#}\xi$ has a nice reformulation when ξ is associated to a smooth curve. Let us find a reformulation when ξ is associated to a vector field. Thus, with little abuse of notations, let $\xi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be an integrable vector field and denote by ξ the associated current defined as

$$\xi(\theta) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \theta(x), \xi(x) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^d} dx.$$

Proposition 3 *Assume that φ is a diffeomorphism of \mathbb{R}^d and ξ is a vector field on \mathbb{R}^d in \mathbb{R}^d of class L^1 . Then $\varphi_{\#}\xi$ is the following vector field in \mathbb{R}^d , of class L^1 :*

$$(\varphi_{\#}\xi)(x) = D\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(x)) \xi(\varphi^{-1}(x)) |\det D\varphi^{-1}(x)|.$$

Proof. By definition we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\varphi_{\#}\xi)(\theta) &= \xi(\varphi_{\#}\theta) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left\langle D\varphi(x)^T \theta(\varphi(x)), \xi(x) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^d} dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \theta(\varphi(x)), D\varphi(x) \xi(x) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^d} dx \\ &\stackrel{y=\varphi(x)}{=} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \theta(y), D\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(y)) \xi(\varphi^{-1}(y)) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\det D\varphi^{-1}(y)| dy. \end{aligned}$$

■

3 Lagrangian current dynamics

In order to prove that the nonlinear vector-valued PDE (2) with initial condition $\xi_0 \in \mathcal{M}$, has unique local solutions in the space of currents, we adopt a Lagrangian point of view: we examine the ordinary differential equation

$$\frac{dx_t}{dt} = (K * \xi_t)(x_t), \quad (6)$$

consider the flow of diffeomorphisms $\varphi^{t, K*\xi}$ generated by it and take the push forward of ξ_0 under this flow:

$$\xi_t = \varphi_{\#}^{t, K*\xi} \xi_0, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (7)$$

The pair of equations (6)-(7) defines a closed system for $(\xi_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ which, for small T , has a unique solution. We shall prove then that current-valued solutions of the PDE (2) are in one-to-one correspondence with current-valued solutions of the flow system (6)-(7) and thus we get local existence and uniqueness for (2).

Since the specific linear form $K * \xi_t$ for the drift of equation (6) is irrelevant, we replace it with a more general, possibly non-linear, map. Thus we investigate a "flow equation" of the form

$$\xi_t = \varphi_{\#}^{t, B(\xi)} \xi_0, \quad t \in [0, T]$$

where $B(\xi_t)$ is a time-dependent vector field in \mathbb{R}^d , associated to the time-dependent current ξ_t , and $\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}$ is the flow associated to $B(\xi)$ by the equation

$$\frac{dx_t}{dt} = B(\xi_t)(x_t). \quad (8)$$

3.1 Assumptions on the drift

Let us discuss the general assumptions that we impose on the drift B of equation (8). We assume

$$B : \mathcal{M}_w \rightarrow C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d) \quad (9)$$

to be a continuous map such that for every $\xi, \xi' \in \mathcal{M}$

$$\|B(\xi)\|_{C_b^2} \leq C_B (\|\xi\| + 1) \quad (10)$$

$$\|B(\xi) - B(\xi')\|_\infty \leq C_B \|\xi - \xi'\| \quad (11)$$

$$\|DB(\xi) - DB(\xi')\|_\infty \leq C_B \|\xi - \xi'\| \quad (12)$$

We denote by DB and D^2B the derivatives of B in the $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ variable.

Our main example of B is the linear function

$$B(\xi) = K * \xi$$

where $K : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ (see (4)). The necessary regularity of K is specified by next lemma.

Lemma 4 *Let $K \in \mathcal{UC}_b^3(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^{d \times d})$. Then $B(\xi) = K * \xi$ maps continuously \mathcal{M} in to $C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ and satisfies assumptions (10)-(12).*

Proof. Since $K \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^{d \times d})$, $K * \xi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is a well defined function, for every $\xi \in \mathcal{M}$. From (4) and the uniform continuity of K it follows that $K * \xi$ is a continuous function: if $x_n \rightarrow x$, then $K_i \cdot (x_n - \cdot) \rightarrow K_i \cdot (x - \cdot)$ uniformly, for every $i = 1, \dots, d$. It is bounded, since

$$|(K * \xi)_i(x)| \leq \|\xi\| (\|K\|_\infty + \|DK\|_\infty) \quad (13)$$

Moreover, the linear map $B : \mathcal{M}_w \rightarrow C_b(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$, just defined is continuous in the weak topology of \mathcal{M} : from the previous inequality it follows

$$\|(K * \xi)_i - (K * \xi')_i\|_\infty \leq \|\xi - \xi'\| (\|K\|_\infty + \|DK\|_\infty).$$

Let us show that all the same facts extend to the first derivatives of $K * \xi$. Since DK is uniformly continuous and bounded, from

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{K_{ij}(x + \epsilon h) - K_{ij}(x)}{\epsilon} - DK_{ij}(x) \cdot h \right| \\ &= \left| \int_0^1 \frac{1}{\epsilon} DK_{ij}((1 - \alpha)x + \alpha(x + \epsilon h)) \cdot \epsilon h \, d\alpha - \int_0^1 DK_{ij}(x) \cdot h \, d\alpha \right| \\ &\leq \int_0^1 |DK_{ij}((1 - \alpha)x + \alpha(x + \epsilon h)) - DK_{ij}(x)| \, d\alpha \end{aligned}$$

it follows that the incremental ratio of K_{ij} in a direction h converges uniformly to $DK_{ij} \cdot h$. From

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon} \xi(K_{i \cdot}(x + \epsilon h - \cdot)) - \xi(K_{i \cdot}(x - \cdot)) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \xi \left(\frac{K_{i \cdot}(x + \epsilon h - \cdot) - K_{i \cdot}(x - \cdot)}{\epsilon} \right)$$

it follows that $K * \xi$ is differentiable at every point and

$$D(K * \xi)_i(x) \cdot h = \xi(DK_{i \cdot}(x) \cdot h).$$

The arguments now are similar to those already exposed above and iterate: this first derivatives are continuous bounded functions and $B : \mathcal{M}_w \rightarrow C_b^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ is continuous.

Iterating again, based on the uniform continuity of D^2K and the property $K \in C_b^3$, we get that $B : \mathcal{M}_w \rightarrow C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ is well defined and continuous. Property (10) comes from (13) and the similar inequalities for first and second derivatives; the last one requires K of class C_b^3 . Property (11) follows from (13). Finally, property (12) is proved similarly, using the analogous bound on the second derivative. ■

3.2 Properties of the flow

For any $b \in C([0, T]; C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d))$, consider the ODE in \mathbb{R}^d

$$X'_t = b(t, X_t) \tag{14}$$

and denote by $\varphi^{t,b}(x)$ the associated flow. It is differentiable and

$$\frac{d}{dt} D\varphi^{t,b}(x) = Db\left(t, \varphi^{t,b}(x)\right) D\varphi^{t,b}(x), \quad D\varphi^{0,b}(x) = Id. \tag{15}$$

In the sequel we shall denote by $B(\xi)$ also the function $t \mapsto B(\xi_t)$. Moreover, we write

$$\|\xi\|_T := \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\xi_t\|.$$

The computations in the proof of the following lemma are classical; however, it is important for Theorem 9 below that we carefully make the estimates (17) and (18) depend only on one of the two current-valued processes, say ξ ; this asymmetric dependence is less obvious, although common to other problems like the theorems of weak-strong uniqueness.

Lemma 5 *If $\xi \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{M}_w)$, then the flow $\varphi^{t, B(\xi)} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is twice differentiable and satisfies, for all $t \in [0, T]$,*

$$\left\| D\varphi^{t, B(\xi)} \right\|_{\infty} \leq e^{C_B T (\|\xi\|_T + 1)} \quad (16)$$

$$\left\| \varphi^{t, B(\xi)} - \varphi^{t, B(\xi')} \right\|_{\infty} \leq C_B T e^{C_B T (\|\xi\|_T + 1)} \|\xi - \xi'\|_T \quad (17)$$

and for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| D\varphi^{t, B(\xi)} - D\varphi^{t, B(\xi')} \right\|_{\infty} \\ & \leq C_B T e^{C_B (T+1) (\|\xi\|_T + \|\xi'\|_T + 2)} \left(1 + C_B T (\|\xi\|_T + 1) e^{C_B T (\|\xi\|_T + 1)} \right) \|\xi - \xi'\|_T. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Moreover, for every $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$|D\varphi^{t, B(\xi)}(x) - D\varphi^{t, B(\xi)}(y)| \leq C_B T (\|\xi\|_T + 1) e^{C_B (2T+1) (\|\xi\|_T + 1)} |x - y|. \quad (19)$$

Proof. We have, from $\frac{d}{dt} D\varphi^{t, B(\xi)}(x) = DB(\xi_t)(\varphi^{t, B(\xi)}(x)) D\varphi^{t, B(\xi)}(x)$,

$$\left| D\varphi^{t, B(\xi)}(x) \right| \leq e^{\int_0^t |DB(\xi_s)(\varphi^{s, B(\xi)}(x))| ds}$$

$$\left\| D\varphi^{t, B(\xi)} \right\|_{\infty} \leq e^{\int_0^t \|DB(\xi_s)\|_{\infty} ds}.$$

Now, using the assumption (10) on B we get (16).

For the estimate (17), notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\varphi^{t, B(\xi)}(x) - \varphi^{t, B(\xi')}(x) \right) &= B(\xi_t) \left(\varphi^{t, B(\xi)}(x) \right) - B(\xi'_t) \left(\varphi^{t, B(\xi')}(x) \right) \\ &= B(\xi_t) \left(\varphi^{t, B(\xi)}(x) \right) - B(\xi_t) \left(\varphi^{t, B(\xi')}(x) \right) \\ &\quad + B(\xi_t) \left(\varphi^{t, B(\xi')}(x) \right) - B(\xi'_t) \left(\varphi^{t, B(\xi')}(x) \right) \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \varphi^{t, B(\xi)}(x) - \varphi^{t, B(\xi')}(x) \right| &\leq \int_0^t \|DB(\xi_s)\|_{\infty} \left| \varphi^{s, B(\xi)}(x) - \varphi^{s, B(\xi')}(x) \right| ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \|B(\xi_s) - B(\xi'_s)\|_{\infty} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, using Gronwall's lemma we get that

$$\left| \varphi^{t, B(\xi)}(x) - \varphi^{t, B(\xi')}(x) \right| \leq \int_0^t \|B(\xi_s) - B(\xi'_s)\|_{\infty} e^{\int_s^t \|DB(\xi_r)\|_{\infty} dr} ds.$$

Now, using again assumptions (10) and (11), we deduce (17).

Now, let us prove (18). Let us notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{dt} \left(D\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}(x) - D\varphi^{t,B(\xi')}(x) \right) \\
&= DB(\xi_t) \left(\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}(x) \right) D\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}(x) - DB(\xi'_t) \left(\varphi^{t,B(\xi')}(x) \right) D\varphi^{t,B(\xi')}(x) \\
&= DB(\xi_t) \left(\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}(x) \right) D\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}(x) - DB(\xi_t) \left(\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}(x) \right) D\varphi^{t,B(\xi')}(x) \\
&+ DB(\xi_t) \left(\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}(x) \right) D\varphi^{t,B(\xi')}(x) - DB(\xi'_t) \left(\varphi^{t,B(\xi')}(x) \right) D\varphi^{t,B(\xi')}(x).
\end{aligned}$$

For the first term,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| DB(\xi_t) \left(\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}(x) \right) D\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}(x) - DB(\xi_t) \left(\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}(x) \right) D\varphi^{t,B(\xi')}(x) \right| \\
&\leq \|DB(\xi_t)\|_\infty \left| D\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}(x) - D\varphi^{t,B(\xi')}(x) \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

For the second term,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| DB(\xi_t) \left(\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}(x) \right) D\varphi^{t,B(\xi')}(x) - DB(\xi'_t) \left(\varphi^{t,B(\xi')}(x) \right) D\varphi^{t,B(\xi')}(x) \right| \\
&\leq \left| DB(\xi_t) \left(\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}(x) \right) - DB(\xi'_t) \left(\varphi^{t,B(\xi')}(x) \right) \right| \left| D\varphi^{t,B(\xi')}(x) \right| \\
&\leq \left| DB(\xi_t) \left(\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}(x) \right) - DB(\xi_t) \left(\varphi^{t,B(\xi')}(x) \right) \right| \left| D\varphi^{t,B(\xi')}(x) \right| \\
&+ \left| DB(\xi_t) \left(\varphi^{t,B(\xi')}(x) \right) - DB(\xi'_t) \left(\varphi^{t,B(\xi')}(x) \right) \right| \left| D\varphi^{t,B(\xi')}(x) \right| \\
&\leq \|D^2B(\xi_t)\|_\infty \left| \varphi^{t,B(\xi)}(x) - \varphi^{t,B(\xi')}(x) \right| \left| D\varphi^{t,B(\xi')}(x) \right| \\
&+ \|DB(\xi_t) - DB(\xi'_t)\|_\infty \left| D\varphi^{t,B(\xi')}(x) \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, using assumption (10), (12) and the estimates (16) and (17), we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| D\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}(x) - D\varphi^{t,B(\xi')}(x) \right| &\leq C_B(\|\xi\|_T + 1) \int_0^t \left| D\varphi^{s,B(\xi)}(x) - D\varphi^{s,B(\xi')}(x) \right| ds \\
&+ C_B T e^{C_B T(\|\xi'\|_T + 1)} \left(1 + C_B T(\|\xi\|_T + 1) e^{C_B T(\|\xi\|_T + 1)} \right) \|\xi - \xi'\|_T
\end{aligned}$$

which implies, by Gronwall's lemma,

$$\left| D\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}(x) - D\varphi^{t,B(\xi')}(x) \right| \leq e^{TC_B(\|\xi\|_T + 1)} C_B T e^{C_B T(\|\xi'\|_T + 1)} \left(1 + C_B T(\|\xi\|_T + 1) e^{C_B T(\|\xi\|_T + 1)} \right) \|\xi - \xi'\|_T.$$

It is left to prove (19).

$$\begin{aligned}
& |D\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}(x) - D\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}(y)| \\
& \leq \int_0^t \left| DB(\xi_s)(\varphi^{s,B(\xi)}(x))D\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}(x) - DB(\xi_s)(\varphi^{s,B(\xi)}(y))D\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}(y) \right| ds \\
& \leq \int_0^t \left| DB(\xi_s)(\varphi^{s,B(\xi)}(x))D\varphi^{s,B(\xi)}(x) - DB(\xi_s)(\varphi^{s,B(\xi)}(x))D\varphi^{s,B(\xi)}(y) \right| \\
& \quad + \left| DB(\xi_s)(\varphi^{s,B(\xi)}(x))D\varphi^{s,B(\xi)}(y) - DB(\xi_s)(\varphi^{s,B(\xi)}(y))D\varphi^{s,B(\xi)}(y) \right| ds \\
& \leq \sup_{s \in [0,t]} \|DB(\xi_s)\|_\infty \int_0^t \left| D\varphi^{s,B(\xi)}(x) - D\varphi^{s,B(\xi)}(y) \right| ds \\
& \quad + t \sup_{s \in [0,t]} \left(\left\| D\varphi^{s,B(\xi)} \right\|_\infty^2 \|D^2B(\xi_s)\|_\infty \right) |x - y|.
\end{aligned}$$

We now apply Gronwall's Lemma and we get

$$|D\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}(x) - D\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}(y)| \leq T \sup_{s \in [0,T]} \left(\left\| D\varphi^{s,B(\xi)} \right\|_\infty^2 \|D^2B(\xi_s)\|_\infty \right) e^{T \sup_{s \in [0,T]} \|DB(\xi_s)\|_\infty} |x - y|.$$

Now, using (5) and (10) we get (19). ■

3.3 Well posedness of the flow equation

We are now ready to consider the closed loop $\xi \mapsto \varphi^{\cdot,B(\xi)} \mapsto \xi_t := \varphi_{\#}^{t,B(\xi)} \xi_0$, namely the equation:

$$\xi_t = \varphi_{\#}^{t,B(\xi)} \xi_0, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (20)$$

Let us prove it has a unique solution in the space $C([0, T]; \mathcal{M})$ by using a fixed point argument. Indeed, let $\xi_0 \in \mathcal{M}$ be the initial current, at time $t = 0$. Given $\xi = (\xi_t)_{t \in [0, T]} \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{M}_w)$, let $\Gamma(\xi) = \eta = (\eta_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ be the time-dependent current defined as

$$\eta_t = \varphi_{\#}^{t,B(\xi)} \xi_0, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (21)$$

Lemma 6 *Given $\xi_0 \in \mathcal{M}$, set $R = 2 \|\xi_0\|_{\mathcal{M}}$. Then there exists $T_R^0 > 0$, depending only on R , such that $\Gamma(B_R) \subset B_R$, where B_R is the set of all $\xi = (\xi_t)_{t \in [0, T]} \in C(0, T; \mathcal{M})$ such that $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\xi_t\|_{\mathcal{M}} \leq R$. Similarly if B_R is defined by the norm $C([0, T]; \mathcal{M}_w)$, where \mathcal{M}_w is endowed with the norm $\|\cdot\|$.*

Proof. First we prove the first statement. To do it, we must estimate the strong norm of $\eta = \Gamma(\xi)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \varphi_{\#}^{t,B(\xi)} \xi_0(\theta) \right| &= \left| \xi_0 \left(\varphi_{\#}^{t,B(\xi)} \theta \right) \right| \leq \|\xi_0\|_{\mathcal{M}} \left\| \varphi_{\#}^{t,B(\xi)} \theta \right\|_\infty = \|\xi_0\|_{\mathcal{M}} \left\| D\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}(\cdot)^T \theta \left(\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}(\cdot) \right) \right\|_\infty \\
&\leq \|\xi_0\|_{\mathcal{M}} \left\| D\varphi^{t,B(\xi)} \right\|_\infty \left\| \theta \left(\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}(\cdot) \right) \right\|_\infty \leq \|\xi_0\|_{\mathcal{M}} \left\| D\varphi^{t,B(\xi)} \right\|_\infty \|\theta\|_\infty
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\eta_t|_{\mathcal{M}} \leq |\xi_0|_{\mathcal{M}} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| D\varphi^{t, B(\xi)} \right\|_{\infty}. \quad (22)$$

Using (16) and $\|\xi\| \leq |\xi|_{\mathcal{M}} \leq R$, we get that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\eta_t|_{\mathcal{M}} \leq \frac{R}{2} e^{C_B(R+1)T}.$$

If T satisfies $e^{C_B(R+1)T} \leq 2$, we get $\Gamma(B_R) \subset B_R$ and the proof is complete.

To prove the second statement we first see, from the definition of the norm $\|\cdot\|$, that it holds

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\eta_t\| \leq \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| \varphi_{\#}^{t, B(\xi)} \xi_0 \right\| = \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \sup \{ |\xi_0(\varphi_{\#}^{t, B(\xi)} \theta)| \mid \|\theta\|_{\infty} + \text{Lip}(\theta) \leq 1 \}$$

Now, proceeding as in the previous part, we estimate $|\xi_0(\varphi_{\#}^{t, B(\xi)} \theta)|$ and the prove follows in the same way. ■

Theorem 7 *For every $\xi_0 \in \mathcal{M}$, there is $T_R > 0$, depending only on $|\xi_0|_{\mathcal{M}}$, such that there exists a unique solution ξ of the flow equation (20) in $C([0, T_R]; \mathcal{M})$.*

Proof. Step 1. Let $R = 2|\xi_0|_{\mathcal{M}}$ and T_R^0 be given by the previous lemma; let $T \in [0, T_R^0]$ to be chosen below. Let $\xi, \xi' \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{M}_w)$, $\eta = \Gamma(\xi)$, $\eta' = \Gamma(\xi')$. We have, for every Lipschitz function θ ,

$$|(\eta_t - \eta'_t)(\theta)| \leq |\xi_0|_{\mathcal{M}} \|\varphi_{\#}^{t, B(\xi)} \theta - \varphi_{\#}^{t, B(\xi')} \theta\|_{\infty} \quad (23)$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \varphi_{\#}^{t, B(\xi)} \theta - \varphi_{\#}^{t, B(\xi')} \theta \right\|_{\infty} &= \left\| D\varphi^{t, B(\xi)}(\cdot)^T \theta \left(\varphi^{t, B(\xi)}(\cdot) \right) - D\varphi^{t, B(\xi')}(\cdot)^T \theta \left(\varphi^{t, B(\xi')}(\cdot) \right) \right\|_{\infty} \\ &\leq \left\| D\varphi^{t, B(\xi)}(\cdot)^T \theta \left(\varphi^{t, B(\xi)}(\cdot) \right) - D\varphi^{t, B(\xi)}(\cdot)^T \theta \left(\varphi^{t, B(\xi')}(\cdot) \right) \right\|_{\infty} \\ &\quad + \left\| D\varphi^{t, B(\xi)}(\cdot)^T \theta \left(\varphi^{t, B(\xi')}(\cdot) \right) - D\varphi^{t, B(\xi')}(\cdot)^T \theta \left(\varphi^{t, B(\xi')}(\cdot) \right) \right\|_{\infty} \\ &\leq \left\| D\varphi^{t, B(\xi)} \right\|_{\infty} \|D\theta\|_{\infty} \left\| \varphi^{t, B(\xi)} - \varphi^{t, B(\xi')} \right\|_{\infty} \\ &\quad + \|\theta\|_{\infty} \left\| D\varphi^{t, B(\xi)} - D\varphi^{t, B(\xi')} \right\|_{\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

By definition, $\|\eta_t - \eta'_t\|$ is less than or equal to the supremum of (23), taken over the Lipschitz functions θ such that $\|\theta\|_{\infty} + \text{Lip}(\theta) \leq 1$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\eta_t - \eta'_t\| \\ &\leq |\xi_0|_{\mathcal{M}} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| D\varphi^{t, B(\xi)} \right\|_{\infty} \left\| \varphi^{t, B(\xi)} - \varphi^{t, B(\xi')} \right\|_{\infty} \\ &\quad + |\xi_0|_{\mathcal{M}} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| D\varphi^{t, B(\xi)} - D\varphi^{t, B(\xi')} \right\|_{\infty} \end{aligned}$$

Hence, using (16)

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\eta_t - \eta'_t\| \\ & \leq e^{C_B T(R+1)} |\xi_0|_{\mathcal{M}} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| \varphi^{t, B(\xi)} - \varphi^{t, B(\xi')} \right\|_{\infty} + |\xi_0|_{\mathcal{M}} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| D\varphi^{t, B(\xi)} - D\varphi^{t, B(\xi')} \right\|_{\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

Step 2. Using the estimates given in lemma (5) and summarizing

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\eta_t - \eta'_t\| \\ & \leq C_B T e^{2C_B T(R+1)} |\xi_0|_{\mathcal{M}} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\xi_t - \xi'_t\| \\ & \quad + |\xi_0|_{\mathcal{M}} C_B T e^{C_B(3T+2)(R+1)} (1 + C_B T(R+1)) \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\xi_t - \xi'_t\| \\ & \leq C_B T |\xi_0|_{\mathcal{M}} \left(e^{C_B(3T+2)(R+1)} (2 + C_B T(R+1)) \right) \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\xi_t - \xi'_t\|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for T small enough, Γ is a contraction in $C([0, T]; \mathcal{M}_w)$.

Recall now lemma 1. The space of currents of class $C([0, T]; \mathcal{M}_w)$ with $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\xi_t|_{\mathcal{M}} \leq R$ is a complete metric space, and Γ is a contraction in this space, for T small enough. It follows that there exists a unique fixed point of Γ in this space. Finally, the fixed point is also in $C([0, T]; \mathcal{M})$ since the output of the push forward is in this space. ■

3.4 Maximal solutions

Given $\xi_0 \in \mathcal{M}$, let Υ_{ξ_0} be the set of all $T > 0$ such that there exists a unique current-valued solution on $[0, T]$ for the flow equation (20) with initial condition ξ_0 . Let $T_{\xi_0} = \sup \Upsilon_{\xi_0}$; on $[0, T_{\xi_0})$ a unique solution ξ is well defined; it is called the maximal solution. We have $\xi \in C([0, T_{\xi_0}); \mathcal{M})$. An easy fact is:

Lemma 8 *If $T_{\xi_0} < \infty$, then*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow T_{\xi_0}^-} |\xi_t|_{\mathcal{M}} = +\infty.$$

Proof. We prove the claim by contradiction. Assume there is a sequence $t_n \rightarrow T_{\xi_0}^-$ and a constant $C > 0$ such that $|\xi_{t_n}|_{\mathcal{M}} \leq C$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We may apply the existence and uniqueness theorem on the time interval $[t_n, t_n + T]$ where T depends only on C . Hence a unique solution exists up to time $t_n + T$. For large n this contradicts the definition of T_{ξ_0} , if it is finite. ■

Taking into account that we only have $\|\xi\| \leq |\xi|_{\mathcal{M}}$, we have the following interesting criterion.

Theorem 9 *If $T_{\xi_0} < \infty$, then*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow T_{\xi_0}^-} \|\xi_t\| = +\infty.$$

Proof. For $t \in [0, T_{\xi_0})$ we have (the proof is the same as estimate (22) in Lemma 6)

$$|\xi_t|_{\mathcal{M}} \leq |\xi_0|_{\mathcal{M}} \left\| D\varphi^{t, B(\xi)} \right\|_{\infty} \leq |\xi_0|_{\mathcal{M}} e^{C_B t (\|\xi_t\| + 1)} \quad (24)$$

having used (16) in the last step. Hence ($\xi_0 \neq 0$, otherwise $T_{\xi_0} = +\infty$), for $t \in (0, T_{\xi_0})$

$$\|\xi\|_t \geq \frac{1}{C_B t} \log \frac{|\xi_t|_{\mathcal{M}}}{|\xi_0|_{\mathcal{M}}} - 1.$$

From $\lim_{t \rightarrow T_{\xi_0}^-} |\xi_t|_{\mathcal{M}} = +\infty$ it follows $\lim_{t \rightarrow T_{\xi_0}^-} \|\xi_t\| = +\infty$. ■

4 Eulerian current dynamics

Given an operator B with the assumptions exposed at the beginning of Section 3.2, and taking values in the set of divergence free vector fields, consider the non-linear PDE

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial t} + \operatorname{div}(B(\xi)\xi) = (\xi \cdot \nabla)B(\xi) \\ \xi(0) = \xi_0. \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

Definition 10 *We say that $\xi \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{M})$ is a current-valued solution for the PDE (25) if for every $\theta \in C_b^1(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and every $t \in [0, T]$, it satisfies*

$$\xi_t(\theta) - \int_0^t \xi_s(D\theta \cdot B(\xi_s)) ds = \xi_0(\theta) + \int_0^t \xi_s(DB(\xi_s)^T \cdot \theta) ds. \quad (26)$$

The definition on an open interval $[0, T)$ (possibly infinite) is similar. The aim of this section is to prove the following result.

Theorem 11 *Given $\xi_0 \in \mathcal{M}$, on a sufficiently small time interval $[0, T]$, there exists a unique current-valued solution for the PDE (25), defined on a maximal interval $[0, T_{\xi_0})$. It is given by the unique maximal current-valued solution of the flow equation (20).*

The proof consists in proving that $\xi \in C([0, T_{\xi_0}); \mathcal{M})$ is a current-valued solution for the PDE (25) if and only if it is a solution of the flow equation (20); when this is done, all statements of the theorem are proved, because we already know that equation (20) has a unique local solution in the space of currents.

In order to prove the previous claim of equivalence between (25) and (20) consider, for given $T > 0$ and $b \in C([0, T]; C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d))$, the auxiliary *linear* PDE

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial t} + \operatorname{div}(b\xi) = (\xi \cdot \nabla)b \\ \xi(0) = \xi_0 \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

The definition of solution is analogous to the nonlinear case, just replacing $B(\xi)$ by b . For this equation we shall prove:

Lemma 12 *A function $\xi \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{M})$ is a current-valued solution for the PDE (27) if and only if it is given by*

$$\xi_t = \varphi_{\#}^{t,b} \xi_0.$$

The proof of this lemma occupies the next two subsections. When this result is reached, we can prove Theorem 11 with the following simple argument: if $\xi \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{M})$ is a current-valued solution for the PDE (25), then it is a current-valued solution for the PDE (27) with $b := B(\xi)$, hence $\xi_t = \varphi_{\#}^{t,b} \xi_0 = \varphi_{\#}^{t,B(\xi)} \xi_0$, namely ξ solves the flow equation (20). Conversely, if ξ solves the flow equation (20), namely $\xi_t = \varphi_{\#}^{t,B(\xi)} \xi_0$, setting $b := B(\xi)$ we have that $\xi_t = \varphi_{\#}^{t,b} \xi_0$, hence by the lemma it solves the PDE (27) with $b = B(\xi)$, hence it solves (25).

4.1 From the flow to the PDE

In this subsection we prove one half of Lemma 12, precisely that ξ_t defined by $\xi_t = \varphi_{\#}^{t,b} \xi_0$ is a current-valued solution of the PDE (27). Let θ be a test function, so that

$$\xi_t(\theta) = \varphi_{\#}^{t,b} \xi_0(\theta) = \xi_0 \left(\varphi_{\#}^{t,b} \theta \right) = \xi_0 \left(D\varphi^{t,b}(\cdot)^T \theta \left(\varphi^{t,b}(\cdot) \right) \right).$$

Hence (the time derivative commutes with ξ_0 since ξ_0 is linear continuous)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \xi_t(\theta) &= \frac{d}{dt} \xi_0 \left(D\varphi^{t,b}(\cdot)^T \theta \left(\varphi^{t,b}(\cdot) \right) \right) \\ &= \xi_0 \left(\frac{d}{dt} \left(D\varphi^{t,b}(\cdot)^T \right) \theta \left(\varphi^{t,b}(\cdot) \right) \right) + \xi_0 \left(D\varphi^{t,b}(\cdot)^T \frac{d}{dt} \left(\theta \left(\varphi^{t,b}(\cdot) \right) \right) \right) \\ &= \xi_0 \left(D\varphi^{t,b}(\cdot)^T D b_t(\varphi^{t,b}(\cdot))^T \theta \left(\varphi^{t,b}(\cdot) \right) \right) + \xi_0 \left(D\varphi^{t,b}(\cdot)^T D\theta(\varphi^{t,b}(\cdot)) \frac{d}{dt} \left(\varphi^{t,b}(\cdot) \right) \right) \\ &= \xi_0 \left(D\varphi^{t,b}(\cdot)^T D b_t(\varphi^{t,b}(\cdot))^T \theta \left(\varphi^{t,b}(\cdot) \right) \right) + \xi_0 \left(D\varphi^{t,b}(\cdot)^T D\theta(\varphi^{t,b}(\cdot)) b_t(\varphi^{t,b}(\cdot)) \right) \\ &= I_1 + I_2 \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$I_1 = \xi_0 \left(\varphi_{\#}^{t,b} (D b^T \theta) \right) = \varphi_{\#}^{t,b} \xi_0 (D b^T \theta) = \xi_t (D b^T \theta).$$

And

$$I_2 = \xi_0 \left(\varphi_{\#}^{t,b} D\theta b \right) = \varphi_{\#}^{t,b} \xi_0 (D\theta b) = \xi_t (D\theta b).$$

Hence

$$\frac{d}{dt} \xi_t(\theta) = \xi_t (D b^T \theta) + \xi_t (D\theta b).$$

This is equation (26) (with b in place of $B(\xi)$), which completes the proof.

4.2 From the PDE to the flow

In this subsection we prove the other half of Lemma 12: if ξ is a current-valued solution of the PDE (27), then $\xi_t = \varphi_{\#}^{t,b} \xi_0$.

Since the computation, by means of regularizations and commutator lemma, may obscure the underlying argument, let us first provide the proof in the case smooth fields. In such a case, from Proposition 3 we have (we denote $\varphi^{t,b}$ by φ_t for simplicity)

$$\xi_t(x) = D\varphi_t(\varphi_t^{-1}(x))\xi_0(\varphi_t^{-1}(x))$$

which is equivalent to

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} [(D\varphi_t)^{-1}(x)\xi_t(\varphi_t(x))] = 0. \quad (28)$$

To compute this derivative we will make use of the following rule

$$d(D\varphi_t)^{-1} = -(D\varphi_t)^{-1}Db(\varphi_t).$$

Here and in the following we assume that $D\varphi_t$ is a unitary matrix and b is divergence free regular vector field.

Let us compute the derivative (28),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} [(D\varphi_t)^{-1}(x)\xi_t(\varphi_t(x))] &= (D\varphi_t)^{-1} [-Db_t(\varphi_t)\xi_t(\varphi_t) + \partial_t\xi_t(\varphi_t) + D\xi_t(\varphi_t)b_t(\varphi_t)] \quad (29) \\ &= (D\varphi_t)^{-1} [-(\xi_t \cdot \nabla)b_t + \partial_t\xi_t + (b_t \cdot \nabla)\xi_t](\varphi_t) \end{aligned}$$

and the term in the brackets is equal to zero when ξ_t solves equation (27). In the previous computations and also below it is convenient to keep in mind that, given a vector field $\theta : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, its Jacobian matrix is given by

$$D\theta := \begin{pmatrix} \nabla\theta_1^T \\ \nabla\theta_2^T \\ \nabla\theta_3^T \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let us now go back to currents. Given a current-valued solution ξ of the PDE (27), we regularize it as

$$v_i^\epsilon(t, x) := (\xi_t * \theta^\epsilon e_i)(x) = \xi_t(\theta^\epsilon(x - \cdot)e_i), \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq 3$$

Here $\theta^\epsilon(x) = \epsilon^{-3}\theta(\epsilon^{-1}x)$ is a mollifier, and $\{e_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq 3}$ is the canonical base of \mathbb{R}^3 .

Using equation (26) (with b in place of $B(\xi)$), we see that v_ϵ solves

$$v_i^\epsilon(t, x) = v_i^\epsilon(0, x) + \int_0^t \{ \xi_s(\nabla(\theta^\epsilon(x - \cdot)) \cdot b_s e_i) + [(\xi_s \cdot \nabla)b_s](\theta^\epsilon(x - \cdot)) \} ds$$

Define now

$$(\mathcal{R}_1^\epsilon[b_t, \xi_t](x))_i := \xi_t(\nabla(\theta^\epsilon(x - \cdot)) \cdot b_t e_i) + (b_t(x) \cdot \nabla)\xi_t(\theta^\epsilon(x - \cdot)e_i) \quad 1 \leq i \leq 3 \quad (30)$$

$$\mathcal{R}_2^\epsilon[\xi_t, b_t](x) := \begin{pmatrix} [(\xi_t \cdot \nabla)b_t](\theta^\epsilon(x - \cdot)e_1) \\ \dots \\ \dots \end{pmatrix} - \left[\begin{pmatrix} \xi_t(\theta^\epsilon(x - \cdot)e_1) \\ \dots \end{pmatrix} \cdot \nabla \right] b_t(x)$$

so that

$$v_i^\epsilon(t, x) = v^\epsilon(0, x) + \int_0^t \{ \mathcal{R}_1^\epsilon[b_s, \xi_s](x) + \mathcal{R}_2^\epsilon[\xi_s, b_s](x) - (b_s \cdot \nabla)v_i^\epsilon(s, x) + (v_i^\epsilon(s, x) \cdot \nabla)b_s \} ds$$

which means (provided continuity in t of the integrand),

$$\partial_t v_i^\epsilon(t, x) + (b_t \cdot \nabla)v_i^\epsilon(t, x) - (v_i^\epsilon(t, x) \cdot \nabla)b_t = \mathcal{R}_1^\epsilon[b_t, \xi_t](x) + \mathcal{R}_2^\epsilon[\xi_t, b_t](x)$$

Plugging this last equation into equation (29), we obtain

$$[(D\varphi_t)^{-1}(x)v_i^\epsilon(t, \varphi_t(x))] = \int_0^t (D\varphi_s)^{-1}(x) (\mathcal{R}_1^\epsilon[b_s, \xi_s] + \mathcal{R}_2^\epsilon[\xi_s, b_s]) (\varphi_s(x)) ds \quad (31)$$

If we want (28) to hold, we must verify that the left-hand side goes to the left hand side of (28) and the right-hand side goes to 0, as $\epsilon \rightarrow \infty$. It suffices to obtain this convergence weakly, thus we test (31) against a test function $\rho \in C_b^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)$ (we need ρ to be differentiable because of Lemma 13 and (32)).

$$\int [(D\varphi_t)^{-1}(x)v_i^\epsilon(t, \varphi_t(x))] \cdot \rho(x) dx = \int \int_0^t (D\varphi_s)^{-1}(x) (\mathcal{R}_1^\epsilon[b_s, \xi_s] + \mathcal{R}_2^\epsilon[\xi_s, b_s]) (\varphi_s(x)) ds \cdot \rho(x) dx$$

If we have a closer look at the right-hand side, we see that we need that the commutator goes to zero when tested against the function

$$\bar{\rho}_s(x) = (D\varphi_s)^{-1}(\varphi_s^{-1}(x))\rho(\varphi_s^{-1}(x)) \quad (32)$$

If this test function satisfies the assumptions on Lemma 13 and 14, we can conclude. In particular, we ask that it is bounded together with his first derivative,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{\rho}_s\|_\infty &\leq \|(D\varphi_s)^{-1}\|_\infty \|\rho_s\|_\infty \\ \|D\bar{\rho}_s\|_\infty &\leq \|D^2(\varphi_s^{-1})\|_\infty \|\rho\|_\infty + \|(D\varphi_s)^{-1}\|_\infty^2 \|D\rho\|_\infty \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 13 *Let $\rho, b \in C_b^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)$, there exists a constant C independent of ϵ such that,*

$$\left| \int \mathcal{R}_1^\epsilon[b, \xi](x) \cdot \rho(x) dx \right| \leq \epsilon C |\xi|_{\mathcal{M}} \|D\rho\|_\infty \|b\|_\infty$$

Proof. By (30), we have

$$\int \mathcal{R}_1^\epsilon[b, \xi](x) \cdot \rho(x) dx = \sum_{i=1}^3 \int [\xi_t(\nabla(\theta^\epsilon(x - \cdot)) \cdot b e_i) + (b(x) \cdot \nabla) \xi_t(\theta^\epsilon(x - \cdot) e_i)] \cdot \rho(x) dx$$

If we consider ξ to be a 3-dimensional measure $(d\xi_1, d\xi_2, d\xi_3)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int \mathcal{R}_1^\epsilon[b, \xi](x) \cdot \rho(x) dx &= \sum_{i=1}^3 \iint \nabla \theta^\epsilon(x - y) \cdot (b(x) - b(y)) \rho_i(x) d\xi_i(y) dx \\ &= - \sum_{i=1}^3 \iint \theta^\epsilon(b(x) - b(y)) \nabla \rho_i(x) d\xi_i(y) dx \end{aligned}$$

If we assume that the current can be swapped with (1) the integration, (2) the derivative in x , and (3) the scalar product by $b(x)$ we can repeat the same reasoning to obtain

$$\int \mathcal{R}_1^\epsilon[b, \xi](x) \cdot \rho(x) dx = - \sum_{i=1}^3 \xi \left(\int \theta^\epsilon(x - y) (b(x) - b(y)) \nabla \rho_i(x) dx \right)$$

Taking the absolute value on both sides we get

$$\left| \int \mathcal{R}_1^\epsilon[b, \xi](x) \cdot \rho(x) dx \right| \leq 3 |\xi|_{\mathcal{M}} \|D\rho\|_\infty \|\nabla b\|_\infty \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^3} \left(\int \theta^\epsilon(x - y) |x - y| dx \right)$$

Now, a change of variables in the integral does the trick and we obtain the desired estimation with the constant equal to

$$C := 3 \int \theta(x) |x| dx$$

■

Lemma 14 *Let $\rho \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)$, $b \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)$. There exists a constant C independent of ϵ such that*

$$\left| \int \mathcal{R}_2^\epsilon[\xi, b](x) \cdot \rho(x) dx \right| \leq \epsilon C |\xi|_{\mathcal{M}} \|\rho\|_\infty \|D^2 b\|_\infty$$

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 13, we obtain

$$\int \mathcal{R}_2^\epsilon[\xi, b](x) \cdot \rho(x) dx = \sum_{i=1}^3 \xi \left(\int \theta^\epsilon(x - \cdot) (\partial_i b(\cdot) - \partial_i b(x)) \cdot \rho(x) dx \right)$$

The proof follows as in Lemma 13 and the final constant C is the same. ■

5 Continuous dependence on initial conditions

Recall that a local time of existence and uniqueness for the flow equation (20) exists for every $\xi_0 \in \mathcal{M}$ and its size, in the proof based on contraction principle, depends only on $|\xi_0|_{\mathcal{M}}$. Therefore, if we have a sequence $\xi_0^n \xrightarrow{d} \xi_0$, since weakly convergent sequences are bounded, there exists a common time interval $[0, T]$ of existence and uniqueness, with $T > 0$.

Theorem 15 *Given $\xi_0, \xi_0^n \in \mathcal{M}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi_0^n - \xi_0\| = 0$, let $[0, T]$ be a common time interval of existence and uniqueness for the flow equation (20) and denote by $\xi, \xi^n \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{M})$ the corresponding solutions. Then $\xi^n \rightarrow \xi$ in $C([0, T]; \mathcal{M}_w)$ and more precisely there exists a constant $C > 0$ (depending on the $\|\cdot\|$ -norms of ξ_0, ξ_0^n and on T) such that*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\xi_t^n - \xi_t\| \leq C \|\xi_0^n - \xi_0\|.$$

Proof. Step 1. There exists a constant $C_0 > 0$ such that

$$\|\xi\|_T \leq C_0, \quad \|\xi^n\|_T \leq C_0 \quad (33)$$

uniformly in $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Indeed, the time T can be reached in a finite number of small steps T_R related to the contraction principle, namely the application of Theorem 7. On each small interval the uniform-in-time $\|\cdot\|$ -norm is controlled by the $\|\cdot\|$ -norm of the initial condition of that time interval. The inequalities (33) readily follow. Finally, from (24) it follows also

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\xi_t|_{\mathcal{M}} \leq C'_0, \quad \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\xi_t^n|_{\mathcal{M}} \leq C'_0 \quad (34)$$

for some $C'_0 > 0$.

Step 2.

We have

$$\begin{aligned} |\xi_t(\theta) - \xi_t^n(\theta)| &= \left| \varphi_{\#}^{t, B(\xi)} \xi_0(\theta) - \varphi_{\#}^{t, B(\xi^n)} \xi_0^n(\theta) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \varphi_{\#}^{t, B(\xi)} \xi_0(\theta) - \varphi_{\#}^{t, B(\xi)} \xi_0^n(\theta) \right| + \left| \varphi_{\#}^{t, B(\xi)} \xi_0^n(\theta) - \varphi_{\#}^{t, B(\xi^n)} \xi_0^n(\theta) \right| \\ &= \left| (\xi_0 - \xi_0^n) \left(\varphi_{\#}^{t, B(\xi)} \theta \right) \right| + \left| \xi_0^n \left(\varphi_{\#}^{t, B(\xi)} \theta - \varphi_{\#}^{t, B(\xi^n)} \theta \right) \right| \\ &\leq \|\xi_0 - \xi_0^n\| \left(\|\varphi_{\#}^{t, B(\xi)} \theta\|_{\infty} + \text{Lip}(\varphi_{\#}^{t, B(\xi)} \theta) \right) + |\xi_0^n|_{\mathcal{M}} \|\varphi_{\#}^{t, B(\xi)} \theta - \varphi_{\#}^{t, B(\xi^n)} \theta\|_{\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, from (33), (16) and (19) there exist $C_{11}, C_{12} > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi_{\#}^{t, B(\xi)} \theta\|_{\infty} &= \|D\varphi^{t, B(\xi)}(\cdot)^T \theta(\varphi^{t, B(\xi)}(\cdot))\|_{\infty} \leq \|D\varphi^{t, B(\xi)}\|_{\infty} \|\theta\|_{\infty} \leq C_{11} \\ \text{Lip}(\varphi_{\#}^{t, B(\xi)} \theta) &\leq \|D^2\varphi^{t, B(\xi)}(\cdot)\|_{\infty} \|\theta\|_{\infty} + \|D\varphi^{t, B(\xi)}\|_{\infty} \text{Lip}(\theta) \leq C_{12}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\varphi_{\sharp}^{t,B(\xi)}\theta - \varphi_{\sharp}^{t,B(\xi^n)}\theta\|_{\infty} &= \|D\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}(\cdot)^T\theta(\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}(\cdot)) - D\varphi^{t,B(\xi^n)}(\cdot)^T\theta(\varphi^{t,B(\xi^n)}(\cdot))\|_{\infty} \\
&\leq \|D\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}(\cdot)^T\theta(\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}(\cdot)) - D\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}(\cdot)^T\theta(\varphi^{t,B(\xi^n)}(\cdot))\|_{\infty} \\
&\quad + \|D\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}(\cdot)^T\theta(\varphi^{t,B(\xi^n)}(\cdot)) - D\varphi^{t,B(\xi^n)}(\cdot)^T\theta(\varphi^{t,B(\xi^n)}(\cdot))\|_{\infty} \\
&\leq \|D\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}\|_{\infty}\text{Lip}(\theta)\|\varphi^{t,B(\xi)} - \varphi^{t,B(\xi^n)}\|_{\infty} + \|D\varphi^{t,B(\xi)} - D\varphi^{t,B(\xi^n)}\|_{\infty}\|\theta\|_{\infty} \\
&\leq \|D\varphi^{t,B(\xi)}\|_{\infty}\|\varphi^{t,B(\xi)} - \varphi^{t,B(\xi^n)}\|_{\infty} + \|D\varphi^{t,B(\xi)} - D\varphi^{t,B(\xi^n)}\|_{\infty} \\
&\leq te^{C_B T(\|\xi\|_T+1)}C_B e^{C_B T(\|\xi\|_T+1)}\|\xi - \xi^n\|_t \\
&\quad + tC_B e^{C_B(T+1)(\|\xi\|_T+\|\xi^n\|_T+2)}\left(1 + C_B T(\|\xi\|_T + 1)e^{C_B T(\|\xi\|_T+1)}\right)\|\xi - \xi^n\|_t.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus there exists $C_{13} > 0$ such that

$$\|\varphi_{\sharp}^{t,B(\xi)}\theta - \varphi_{\sharp}^{t,B(\xi^n)}\theta\|_{\infty} \leq tC_{13}\|\xi - \xi^n\|_t.$$

Collecting these bounds, for every $T_0 \in [0, T]$ we get

$$\|\xi - \xi^n\|_{T_0} \leq \|\xi_0 - \xi_0^n\| (C_{11} + C_{12}) + T_0 C_{13} |\xi_0^n|_{\mathcal{M}} \|\xi - \xi^n\|_{T_0}.$$

This proves the theorem if T_0 is small enough, say $T_0 \leq \frac{1}{2C_{13}C'_0}$; but the constant $2C_{13}C'_0$ does not vary when we repeat the argument on the interval $[T_0, 2T_0]$ and so on (until we cover $[0, T]$) and thus in a finite number of steps we get the result on $[0, T]$. ■

6 Interacting filaments and their mean field limit

6.1 Interacting filaments as current dynamics

Let $K \in \mathcal{UC}_b^3(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^{d \times d})$ be given. An example of K which heuristically motivates the investigation of filaments done here can be, in $d = 3$, a smooth approximation of Biot-Savart kernel. Consider a set of N curves in \mathbb{R}^d , $\gamma_t^{i,N}(\sigma)$, parametrized by $\sigma \in [0, 1]$, time dependent, which satisfy the equations

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\gamma_t^{i,N}(\sigma) = \sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_j^N \int_0^1 K\left(\gamma_t^{i,N}(\sigma) - \gamma_t^{j,N}(\sigma')\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma'}\gamma_t^{j,N}(\sigma') d\sigma' \quad (35)$$

$$\gamma_0^{i,N} \text{ given, } i = 1, \dots, N$$

for some sequence of weights $\{\alpha_j^N\}$. This dynamics of curves can be reformulated as a dynamics of currents of the form

$$\xi_t = \varphi_{\sharp}^{t,K*\xi}\xi_0 \quad (36)$$

for a suitable ξ_0 . Let us explain this reformulation.

To the family of curves we associate the current $\xi_t : C_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as

$$\xi_t(\theta) := \sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_j^N \int_0^1 \theta(\gamma_t^{j,N}(\sigma)) \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \gamma_t^{j,N}(\sigma) d\sigma \quad (37)$$

or more formally, in the vein of empirical measures,

$$\xi_t = \sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_j^N \int_0^1 \delta_{\gamma_t^{j,N}(\sigma)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \gamma_t^{j,N}(\sigma) d\sigma. \quad (38)$$

Theorem 16 *If $\{\gamma_t^{i,N}(\sigma), i = 1, \dots, N, t \in [0, T], \sigma \in [0, 1]\}$ is a family of $C^1([0, T] \times [0, 1]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ functions which satisfies the identities (35), then the current $\xi_t : C_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $t \in [0, T]$, defined by (37) satisfies equation (36). Conversely, if $\xi \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{M}_w)$ is the unique current-valued solution of equation (36) with ξ_0 defined by (37) (for $t = 0$) with respect to a given family of C^1 initial curves $\{\gamma_0^{i,N}(\sigma), i = 1, \dots, N, \sigma \in [0, 1]\}$, then the representation (37) holds where $\gamma_t^{i,N}(\sigma)$ is defined as*

$$\gamma_t^{i,N}(\sigma) = \varphi^{t, K*\xi}(\gamma_0^{i,N}(\sigma)) \quad (39)$$

and the curves $\gamma_t^{i,N}(\sigma)$ satisfy the identities (35).

Proof. Let us prove the first direction: from the general definition of push-forward, we get

$$\begin{aligned} (\varphi_{\#}^{t, K*\xi} \xi_0)(\theta) &= \xi_0(\varphi_{\#}^{t, K*\xi} \theta) = \xi_0\left(\left(D\varphi^{t, K*\xi}\right)^T \theta \circ \varphi^{t, K*\xi}\right) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_j^N \int_0^1 \tilde{\theta}(\gamma_0^{j,N}(\sigma)) \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \gamma_0^{j,N}(\sigma) d\sigma \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{\theta} = \left(D\varphi^{t, K*\xi}\right)^T \theta \circ \varphi^{t, K*\xi}$$

and we want to prove that this is equal to

$$\xi_t(\theta) = \sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_j^N \int_0^1 \theta(\gamma_t^{j,N}(\sigma)) \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \gamma_t^{j,N}(\sigma) d\sigma.$$

Thus it is sufficient to prove

$$\int_0^1 \theta(\gamma_t^{j,N}(\sigma)) \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \gamma_t^{j,N}(\sigma) d\sigma = \int_0^1 \tilde{\theta}(\gamma_0^{j,N}(\sigma)) \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \gamma_0^{j,N}(\sigma) d\sigma.$$

To prove this, notice that

$$(K * \xi_t)(x) = \sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_j^N \int_0^1 K(x - \gamma_t^{j,N}(\sigma)) \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \gamma_t^{j,N}(\sigma) d\sigma.$$

Therefore the equations (35) for the interaction of curves can be rewritten as

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \gamma_t^{i,N}(\sigma) = (K * \xi_t) \left(\gamma_t^{i,N}(\sigma) \right).$$

This means that

$$\gamma_t^{i,N}(\sigma) = \varphi^{t,K*\xi} \left(\gamma_0^{i,N}(\sigma) \right).$$

Now, from this fact, we can deduce the identity above. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 \theta \left(\gamma_t^{j,N}(\sigma) \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \gamma_t^{j,N}(\sigma) d\sigma &= \int_0^1 \theta \left(\varphi^{t,K*\xi} \left(\gamma_0^{j,N}(\sigma) \right) \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \varphi^{t,K*\xi} \left(\gamma_0^{j,N}(\sigma) \right) d\sigma \\ &= \int_0^1 \left(D\varphi^{t,K*\xi} \right)^T \left(\gamma_0^{j,N}(\sigma) \right) \left(\theta \circ \varphi^{t,K*\xi} \right) \left(\gamma_0^{j,N}(\sigma) \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \gamma_0^{j,N}(\sigma) d\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Let us now prove the opposite direction. Let us assume that ξ_t satisfies equation (36) with ξ_0 defined by (37) for $t = 0$, with respect to a given family of C^1 initial curves $\left\{ \gamma_0^{i,N}(\sigma), i = 1, \dots, N, \sigma \in [0, 1] \right\}$. Then we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_t(\theta) &= \left(\varphi^{t,K*\xi} \xi_0 \right) (\theta) = \xi_0 \left(\varphi_{\#}^{t,K*\xi} \theta \right) = \xi_0 \left(\left(D\varphi^{t,K*\xi} \right)^T \theta \circ \varphi^{t,K*\xi} \right) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_j^N \int_0^1 \left(D\varphi^{t,K*\xi} \right)^T \left(\gamma_0^{j,N}(\sigma) \right) \theta \left(\varphi^{t,K*\xi} \left(\gamma_0^{j,N}(\sigma) \right) \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \gamma_0^{j,N}(\sigma) d\sigma \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_j^N \int_0^1 \theta \left(\varphi^{t,K*\xi} \left(\gamma_0^{j,N}(\sigma) \right) \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \left(\varphi^{t,K*\xi} \left(\gamma_0^{j,N}(\sigma) \right) \right) d\sigma \end{aligned}$$

Let us define $\gamma_t^{j,N}(\sigma)$ by (39). Then the representation (37) holds. Moreover, from (39) we have, for each σ ,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \gamma_t^{i,N}(\sigma) = (K * \xi_t) \left(\gamma_t^{i,N}(\sigma) \right)$$

which is precisely (35) due to the already established form of ξ_t . ■

The reformulation above provides first of all an existence and uniqueness result:

Corollary 17 *Assume $K \in \mathcal{UC}_b^3(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^{d \times d})$. For every $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and every family of C^1 curves $\left\{ \gamma_0^{i,N}(\sigma), i = 1, \dots, N, \sigma \in [0, 1] \right\}$, there exists a unique maximal solution $\left\{ \gamma_t^{i,N}(\sigma), i = 1, \dots, N, t \in [0, T_f], \sigma \in [0, 1] \right\}$ of equations (35) in the class of $C^1([0, T_f] \times [0, 1]; \mathbb{R}^d)^N$ functions.*

6.2 Mean field result

The next theorem proves two important results: first, if a family of initial curves approximates a current at time $t = 0$, then the solutions of the filament equations converge to the solution of the vector valued PDE. The second, related result is that each curve of the family becomes, in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$, closer and closer to the solutions $\bar{\gamma}_t^{i,N}(\sigma)$ of equation (3), precisely

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \bar{\gamma}_t^{i,N}(\sigma) &= (K * \xi_t) \left(\bar{\gamma}_t^{i,N}(\sigma) \right) \\ \bar{\gamma}_0^{i,N} &= \gamma_0^{i,N}. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

This equation describes the interaction of a filament with the mean field ξ_t . This is the core of the concept of mean field theory. Notice that, without further assumptions on the convergence of $\gamma_0^{i,N}$ (that we do not assume, since a typical example is the case of random independent initial conditions), it is not true that $\bar{\gamma}_t^{i,N}$ converges. The second part of the next theorem only claims that $\gamma_t^{i,N}$ and $\bar{\gamma}_t^{i,N}$ are close to each other.

As a technical remark, notice that if ξ_t exists on a time interval $[0, T]$, then $K * \xi_t$ satisfies the regularity conditions of Lemma 4 and therefore there exists a unique time-dependent C^1 -curve $\bar{\gamma}_t^{i,N}$ (for each i, N), solution of equation (40).

Theorem 18 *Let, for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $\{\gamma_0^{i,N}(\sigma), i = 1, \dots, N, \sigma \in [0, 1]\}$ be a family of C^1 curves. Assume that the associated currents at time zero*

$$\xi_0^N = \sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_j^N \int_0^1 \delta_{\gamma_0^{j,N}(\sigma)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \gamma_0^{j,N}(\sigma) d\sigma \quad (41)$$

converge weakly to a current $\xi_0 \in \mathcal{M}$. Let $T > 0$ be any time such that on $[0, T]$ there are unique current-valued solutions ξ_t^N and ξ_t to equation (36) with respect to the initial conditions ξ_0^N or ξ_0 ; notice that such a time exists because the initial currents ξ_0^N and ξ_0 are equibounded (since they converge weakly); moreover, notice that ξ_t^N has the form

$$\xi_t^N = \sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_j^N \int_0^1 \delta_{\gamma_t^{j,N}(\sigma)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \gamma_t^{j,N}(\sigma) d\sigma$$

corresponding to curve-solutions to equation (35) and that ξ_t is the unique solution to the vector-valued PDE (27). Let $\bar{\gamma}_t^{i,N}$ be the solution to the mean field equation (40).

Then:

- i) the currents ξ^N converge in $C([0, T]; \mathcal{M}_w)$ to the current ξ .*
- ii) $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(t, \sigma) \in [0, T] \times [0, 1]} \left| \gamma_t^{i,N}(\sigma) - \bar{\gamma}_t^{i,N}(\sigma) \right| = 0$.*

Proof. Part (i) is a straightforward consequence of Theorem 15 on the continuous dependence on initial conditions.

As to part (ii), denoting as above by $\xi_t^N, \bar{\xi}_t^N$ respectively the currents associated to the families $\gamma_t^{i,N}, \bar{\gamma}_t^{i,N}$ (see (37)), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \gamma_t^{i,N}(\sigma) - \bar{\gamma}_t^{i,N}(\sigma) \right| &\leq \int_0^t |(K * \xi_s^N)(\gamma_s^{i,N}(\sigma)) - (K * \xi_s)(\bar{\gamma}_s^{i,N}(\sigma))| ds \\ &\leq \int_0^t |(K * \xi_s^N)(\gamma_s^{i,N}(\sigma)) - (K * \xi_s^N)(\bar{\gamma}_s^{i,N}(\sigma))| ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t |(K * \xi_s^N)(\bar{\gamma}_s^{i,N}(\sigma)) - (K * \xi_s)(\bar{\gamma}_s^{i,N}(\sigma))| ds. \end{aligned}$$

From two of the properties of " $K * \xi$ " proved in Lemma 4, we have (taking also the supremum in $\sigma \in [0, 1]$)

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \gamma_t^{i,N}(\sigma) - \bar{\gamma}_t^{i,N}(\sigma) \right| &\leq C \int_0^t \|DK * \xi_s^N\|_\infty |\gamma_s^{i,N}(\sigma) - \bar{\gamma}_s^{i,N}(\sigma)| ds + C \int_0^t \|\xi_s^N - \xi_s\| ds \\ &\leq C \int_0^t |\gamma_s^{i,N}(\sigma) - \bar{\gamma}_s^{i,N}(\sigma)| ds + C \int_0^t \|\xi_s^N - \xi_s\| ds \end{aligned}$$

where we have denoted a generic constant by C and we have used that $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\xi_s^N\| < \infty$, as we know from the first part of the proof (e.g. since they converge in $C([0, T]; \mathcal{M}_w)$). We also know, from the first part, that $\bar{\xi}^N \rightarrow \xi$ in $C([0, T]; \mathcal{M}_w)$. Then it is sufficient to apply Gronwall's Lemma to obtain the claim of part (ii). ■

Sometimes one has a probabilistic framework of the following kind. We have a filtered probability space $(\Omega, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ and the separable Banach space $\mathcal{C} = C([0, 1]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ with the Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{C})$; we call *random curve* in \mathbb{R}^d any measurable map from $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ to $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{C}))$. We use the notation γ also for a random curve. The image measure μ of such map is the *law of the random curve*. It is a probability measure on $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{C}))$.

Then consider, for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$, a family $\{\gamma_0^{i,N}, i = 1, \dots, N\}$ of random curves and consider the associated currents ξ_0^N defined as in (41), which now are random currents, namely measurable mappings from $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ to the space \mathcal{M} endowed with its Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{M})$. Let ξ_0 be a random current. For all $\omega \in \Omega$, solve uniquely the flow equation (36) with the initial conditions $\xi_0^N(\omega)$ and $\xi_0(\omega)$ and call $\xi_t^N(\omega)$ and $\xi_t(\omega)$ the corresponding solutions. Assume that all the the whole family of currents $\xi_0^N(\omega), \xi_0(\omega)$ when N and ω vary, are equibounded. Then take some $T > 0$ such that unique solutions $\xi_t^N(\omega)$ and $\xi_t(\omega)$ exist. For every $t \in [0, T]$, ξ_t^N and ξ_t are random currents (namely they are measurable), by the continuous dependence on initial conditions, Theorem 15. Assume that ξ_0^N converges in probability to ξ_0 . Then it is easy to show that, for every $t \in [0, T]$, ξ_t^N converges in probability to ξ_t , and also that $\|\xi_t^N - \xi_t\|_T$ converges in probability to zero.

6.3 Propagation of chaos

In this section we assume that the vorticity is the same for each vortex, namely $\alpha_j^N = \frac{1}{N}$ for every $j \leq N$, to ensure that independence is maintained as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

To every curve $\gamma \in C^1([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^d)$, we can associate a current, which will also be called γ with a slight abuse of notation, in this way

$$\gamma(\theta) := \int_0^1 \theta(\gamma(\sigma)) \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \gamma(\sigma) d\sigma$$

for $\theta \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$. The definition of the tensor product $\gamma \otimes \gamma'$ is

$$(\gamma \otimes \gamma')(\theta, \theta') = \gamma(\theta) \gamma'(\theta').$$

We fix a filtered probability space $(\Omega, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ and, following the notion given in the previous subsection, we consider random curves. We say that a family $(\gamma_i)_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ of random curves is symmetric or exchangeable if its law is independent of permutations of the indexes. We start with the following general result, for random currents independent of time.

Theorem 19 *Let ξ be a current and, for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\gamma^N := (\gamma^{i,N})_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ be a symmetric family of random- $C^1([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^d)$ curves. We call ξ^N the empirical measure associated with the family γ^N . Suppose that, for every $\theta \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)$,*

$$|\xi|_{\mathcal{M}} < \infty, \quad |\gamma^{i,N}(\theta)| \leq C \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s. \quad (42)$$

uniformly in i, N and that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} [|\xi^N(\theta) - \xi(\theta)|] = 0. \quad (43)$$

Then, for every fixed $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and for every family of test functions $(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r) \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)^r$, it holds

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} [(\gamma^{1,N} \otimes \dots \otimes \gamma^{ir,N})(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r)] = \prod_{i=1}^r \xi(\theta_i).$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we prove the theorem in the case $k = 2$. For every θ_1, θ_2 bounded Lipschitz continuous functions in \mathbb{R}^d we have

$$|\mathbb{E} [\gamma^{1,N}(\theta_1) \gamma^{2,N}(\theta_2)] - \xi(\theta_1) \xi(\theta_2)| \leq |\mathbb{E} [\gamma^{1,N}(\theta_1) \gamma^{2,N}(\theta_2)] - \mathbb{E} [\xi^N(\theta_1) \xi^N(\theta_2)]| \quad (44)$$

$$+ |\mathbb{E} [\xi^N(\theta_1) \xi^N(\theta_2)] - \xi(\theta_1) \xi(\theta_2)| \quad (45)$$

The second term, (45), goes to zero because of (42)-(43):

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbb{E} [\xi^N(\theta_1) \xi^N(\theta_2)] - \xi(\theta_1) \xi(\theta_2)| \\ & \leq |\mathbb{E} [(\xi^N(\theta_1) - \xi(\theta_1)) \xi^N(\theta_2)]| + |\mathbb{E} [(\xi^N(\theta_2) - \xi(\theta_2)) \xi(\theta_1)]| \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} [|\xi^N(\theta_1) - \xi(\theta_1)|] \mathbb{E} [|\xi^N(\theta_2)|] + |\xi|_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbb{E} [|\xi^N(\theta_2) - \xi(\theta_2)|] \end{aligned}$$

To study (44) we use the symmetry of γ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E} [\gamma_1(\theta_1)\gamma_2(\theta_2)] - \mathbb{E} [\xi^N(\theta_1)\xi^N(\theta_2)]| &= |\mathbb{E} [\gamma_1(\theta_1)\gamma_2(\theta_2)] \\ &\quad - \frac{N^2 - N}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [\gamma_1(\theta_1)\gamma_2(\theta_2)] - \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} [\gamma_1(\theta_1)^2]| \\ &= \frac{1}{N} (\mathbb{E} [|\gamma_1(\theta_1)\gamma_2(\theta_2)|] + \mathbb{E} [\gamma_1(\theta_1)^2]) \end{aligned}$$

The expectations are bounded because of (42), hence the last term goes to zero. ■

Now we want to apply the previous theorem to our filaments. We verify in the following Lemma that the dynamic of filaments satisfies Theorem 19, under suitable assumptions on the initial condition.

Lemma 20 *Given a family $\gamma_0 := \{\gamma_0^{i,N}\}_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ of random variables on $C^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)$, and a current ξ_0 , we assume*

1. $(\gamma_0^{1,N}, \dots, \gamma_0^{N,N})$ are exchangeable.
2. $|\gamma_0^{i,N}(\theta)| \leq C$, for a.e. ω , uniformly in i and N .
3. $|\xi_0|_{\mathcal{M}} < \infty$
4. $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} [\|\xi_0^N - \xi_0\|] = 0$

There exists a time $T > 0$ such that the solutions $\gamma_t := \{\gamma_t^{i,N}\}_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ and ξ_t of equations (35) and (36) starting respectively from γ_0 and ξ_0 satisfy conditions 1) - 4) at every time $t \in [0, T]$.

Proof. Exchangeability is clearly preserved by the system of filaments, because there is no other randomness and the dynamics of each filament is perfectly equal to the one of the others.

To prove that $\gamma_t^{i,N}(\theta)$ is bounded, we use (39) and its derivative and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_t^{i,N}(\theta) &= \int_0^1 \theta(\gamma_t^{i,N}) \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \gamma_t^{i,N} d\sigma \\ &= \int_0^1 \theta(\varphi^{K*\xi_t}(\gamma_0^{i,N})) (K * \xi_t)(\gamma_0^{i,N}) \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \gamma_0^{i,N} d\sigma = \gamma_0^{i,N}(\bar{\theta}) \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\theta}(x) := \theta(\varphi^{K*\xi_t}(x))(K * \xi_t)(x)$ is bounded continuous because of Lemma 4.

The third property follows immediately from Theorem 7.

The last property, 4), is a direct consequence of Theorem 15. ■

Corollary 21 *Under the assumptions of Lemma 20, for every fixed $r \in \mathbb{N}$, every family of test functions $(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r) \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)^r$ and every $t \in [0, T]$, it holds*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\gamma_t^{1,N} \otimes \dots \otimes \gamma_t^{ir,N} \right) (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r) \right] = \prod_{i=1}^r \xi_t(\theta_i).$$

Acknowledgements: Hakima Bessaih's research is partially supported by the NSF grant DMS-1418838.

References

- [1] J. Beale, A. Majda, Vortex methods. I. Convergence in three dimensions, *Math. Comp.* **39** (1982), no. 159, 1–27.
- [2] L. C. Berselli, H. Bessaih, Some results for the line vortex equation, *Nonlinearity* **15** (2002), no. 6, 1729–1746.
- [3] H. Bessaih, M. Gubinelli, F. Russo, The evolution of a random vortex filament, *Ann. Probab.* **33** (2005), no. 5, 1825–1855.
- [4] H. Bessaih, F. Flandoli, A mean field result for 3D vortex filaments, *Probabilistic methods in fluids*, 22–34, World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 2003.
- [5] H. Bessaih, F. Flandoli, Limit behaviour of a dense collection of vortex filaments, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* **14** (2004), no. 2, 189–215.
- [6] J. P. Bourguignon, H. Brezis: Remarks on the Euler equations, *J. Funct. Analysis* **15** (1974), 341–363.
- [7] H. Brezis: *Functional Analysis, Sobolev spaces and Partial differential equations*, Universitext, Springer, New York 2011.
- [8] Z. Brzezniak, M. Gubinelli, M. Neklyudov, Global solutions of the random vortex filament equation, *Nonlinearity* **26** (2013), no. 9, 2499–2514.
- [9] Chandana, Wijeratne, Hakima, Bessaih, Fractional Brownian Motion and an Application to Fluids, *Stochastic Equations for Complex Systems: Theoretical and Computational Topics*, Springer-Verlag, (2015) 37–52.
- [10] A. J. Chorin, The evolution of a turbulent vortex, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **83** (1982), no. 4, 517–535.

- [11] R. L. Dobrushin, Vlasov equation, *Funct. Anal. Appl.* **13** (1979), 115–123.
- [12] F. Flandoli, A probabilistic description of small scale structures in 3D fluids, *Annales Inst. Henri Poincaré, Probab. & Stat.* **38**, no. 2, (2002) 207–228.
- [13] F. Flandoli and M. Gubinelli, The Gibbs ensembles of vortex filaments, *Prob. Theory and Related Fields* **122** (2002), no. 3, 317–340.
- [14] F. Flandoli, M. Gubinelli, Random currents and probabilistic models of vortex filaments. Seminar on Stochastic Analysis, Random Fields and Applications IV, 129–139, *Progr. Probab.*, 58, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2004.
- [15] F. Flandoli, M. Gubinelli, Statistics of a vortex filament model, *Electron. J. Probab.* **10** (2005), no. 25, 865–900.
- [16] F. Flandoli, M. Gubinelli, M. Giaquinta, V. M. Tortorelli, Stochastic currents, *Stoch. Process. Appl.* **115** (2005), no. 9, 1583–1601.
- [17] F. Flandoli, M. Gubinelli, F. Russo, On the regularity of stochastic currents, fractional Brownian motion and applications to a turbulence model, *Annales Inst. Henri Poincaré, Probab. & Stat.* **45** (2009), no. 2, 545–576.
- [18] F. Flandoli and I. Minelli, Probabilistic models of vortex filaments, *Czech. Math. Journal* **51** (126), no. 4, (2001) 713–731.
- [19] G. Gallavotti, *Foundations of fluid dynamics*, Translated from the Italian. Texts and Monographs in Physics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2002.
- [20] T. Kato, G. Ponce: Commutator estimates and the Euler and Navier-Stokes equations, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **41** (1988), no. 7, 891–907.
- [21] P.L. Lions, *On Euler equations and statistical physics*, Cattedra Galileiana [Galileo Chair], Scuola Normale Superiore, Classe di Scienze, Pisa, 1998.
- [22] P.L. Lions and A. Majda, Equilibrium Statistical Theory for Nearly Parallel Vortex Filaments, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **53**, (2000), 76–142.
- [23] A. J. Majda, A. Bertozzi, *Vorticity and incompressible flow*, Cambridge Texts in Applied Mathematics, **27**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.
- [24] C. Marchioro and M. Pulvirenti, *Mathematical Theory of Incompressible Nonviscous Fluids*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1994).
- [25] D. Nualart, C. Rovira and S. Tindel, Probabilistic models for vortex filaments based on fractional Brownian motion, *Ann. Probab.* **31** (2003), no. 4, 1862–1899.

- [26] S. Schochet, The point-vortex method for periodic weak solutions of the 2-D Euler equations, *Comm Pure Appl. Math.* **49** (1996), n. 9, 911–965.
- [27] A. Vincent and M. Meneguzzi, The dynamics of vorticity tubes in homogeneous turbulence, *J. Fluid Mech.* **258** (1994), 245– 254.