

# Global smoothness for a 1D supercritical transport model with nonlocal velocity

Lucas C. F. Ferreira<sup>1\*</sup>, Valter V. C. Moitinho<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup> State University of Campinas (Unicamp), IMECC-Department of Mathematics,  
Rua Sérgio Buarque de Holanda, 651, CEP 13083-859, Campinas, SP, Brazil.

## Abstract

We are concerned with a nonlocal transport 1D-model with supercritical dissipation  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  in which the velocity is coupled via the Hilbert transform, namely the so-called CCF model. This model arises as a lower dimensional model for the famous 2D dissipative quasi-geostrophic equation and in connection with vortex-sheet problems. It is known that its solutions can blow up in finite time when  $\gamma \in (0, 1/2)$ . On the other hand, as stated by Kiselev (2010), in the supercritical subrange  $\gamma \in [1/2, 1)$  it is an open problem to know whether its solutions are globally regular. We show global existence of non-negative  $H^{3/2}$ -strong solutions in a supercritical subrange (close to 1) that depends on the initial data norm. Then, for each arbitrary smooth non-negative initial data, the model has a unique global smooth solution provided that  $\gamma \in [\gamma_1, 1)$  where  $\gamma_1$  depends on the  $H^{3/2}$ -initial data norm. Our approach is inspired on that of Coti Zelati and Vicol (IUMJ, 2016).

**AMS MSC:** 35Q35; 35B65; 76D03

**Keywords:** 1D transport model; Nonlocal velocity; Hilbert transform; Global regularity; Supercritical dissipation

## 1 Introduction

We consider the initial value problem for the 1D transport equation with nonlocal velocity

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \theta - \mathcal{H} \theta \theta_x + \Lambda^\gamma \theta = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{T} \times (0, \infty) \\ \theta(x, 0) = \theta_0(x) & \text{in } \mathbb{T}, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where  $0 < \gamma \leq 2$ ,  $\mathbb{T}$  is the 1D torus,  $\Lambda = (-\Delta)^{1/2}$  and  $\mathcal{H}$  denotes the Hilbert transform.

In the literature, the equation (1.1) arises as an one-dimensional model for the famous 2D dissipative quasi-geostrophic equation (2DQG) and in connection with vortex sheet evolution (see e.g. [1, 7]). For more details and results about the 2DQG see [5, 8, 9, 13] and references therein.

---

\*Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: lcff@ime.unicamp.br (L.C.F. Ferreira), valtermoitinho@live.com (V.V.C. Moitinho)  
LCF Ferreira was supported by FAPESP and CNPq, Brazil.  
V.V.C. Moitinho was supported by CAPES and CNPq, Brazil.

In view of the transport structure of (1.1), any sufficiently regular solution satisfies the following maximum principle

$$\|\theta(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|\theta_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})}.$$

For non-negative initial data  $\theta_0$ , one can show that the solution  $\theta$  is also non-negative. Moreover, the condition  $\theta_0 \geq 0$  is required to obtain

$$\|\theta(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})} \leq \|\theta_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})} \quad (1.2)$$

for all  $t \geq 0$ , by means of energy methods (see [7]).

The IVP (1.1) has three basic cases: subcritical  $1 < \gamma \leq 2$ , critical  $\gamma = 1$  and supercritical  $0 < \gamma < 1$ . The global smoothness problem in the critical and subcritical cases have already been solved. In [7], Córdoba, Córdoba and Fontelos proved global regularity for non-negative initial data  $\theta_0 \in H^2$  for  $1 < \gamma \leq 2$ . In the critical case, they obtained global  $H^1$ -solutions by assuming smallness condition on  $L^\infty$ -norm of the non-negative initial data. Also, in the inviscid case of (1.1), i.e., without the viscous term  $\Lambda^\gamma \theta$ , they showed blow-up of solutions for compactly supported, even and non-negative  $C^{1+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{R})$ -initial data such that  $\max_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \theta_0(x) = \theta_0(0) = 1$ . In [11], Dong showed global well-posedness of (1.1) for arbitrary initial data in  $H^{s_0}$  where  $s_0 = \max\{\frac{3}{2} - \gamma, 0\}$  and  $1 \leq \gamma \leq 2$  (critical and subcritical cases). In the supercritical case, he assumed a smallness condition on the initial data.

The global regularity problem for solutions of (1.1) in the supercritical case remains an open problem. In the part  $0 < \gamma < \frac{1}{2}$  of the supercritical range, Li and Rodrigo [15] proved blow-up of solutions in finite time for non-positive, smooth, even and compactly supported initial data satisfying  $\theta_0(0) = 0$  and a suitable weighted integrability condition. In [14], still in the same range, Kiselev showed blow-up of solutions in finite time for even, positive, bounded and smooth initial data  $\theta_0$  satisfying  $\max_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \theta_0(x) = \theta_0(0)$  and suitable integrability conditions.

In the range  $\frac{1}{2} \leq \gamma < 1$ , to the best of our knowledge, the formation of singularity in finite time or global smoothness is an open problem (stated by [14, p. 251]), even for sign restriction on the initial data, i.e.,  $\theta_0 \geq 0$  or  $\theta_0 \leq 0$ . In [10], Do obtained eventual regularization of solutions for non-negative initial data. He also obtained global regularity for a modified 1D model with  $\Lambda^\gamma \theta$  replaced by

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = -\frac{\Lambda}{\log(1 - \Delta)}\theta,$$

which can be understood as supercritical dissipation in a log-sense. In [16], Silvestre and Vicol provided four essentially different proofs of blow-up of solutions in the inviscid case. Moreover, they conjectured that solutions obtained as vanishing viscosity approximations could be bounded in  $C^{1/2}$ , for all  $t > 0$ , which would possibly yield Hölder regularization effects for the case  $1/2 \leq \gamma < 1$  and then would solve the global regularity conjecture in [14, p. 251] (see Conjectures 7.1 and 7.2 in [16]). In [2], Bae, Granero-Belinchón and Lazar considered the inviscid case and developed a theory of global weak super solutions for (1.1) with non-negative data  $\theta_0 \in L^1 \cap L^2$ .

In this paper we focus on supercritical values of  $\gamma$  contained in the range  $\frac{1}{2} \leq \gamma < 1$  (in fact, close to 1) and prove existence of global classical solutions for (1.1). More precisely, we show existence of  $H^{\frac{3}{2}}$ -strong solution for arbitrary non-negative initial data  $\theta_0 \in H^{\frac{3}{2}}$  and  $\gamma_1 \leq \gamma < 1$ , where  $\gamma_1$  depends on the  $H^{\frac{3}{2}}$ -norm of  $\theta_0$ . Indeed, due to standard regularization of  $H^{\frac{3}{2}}$ -strong solutions, our solutions are  $C^\infty$ -smooth for  $t > 0$ . For that matter, first we obtain an eventual regularization result with an explicit control on the regularization time  $T^*$ , namely

$$T^* = C\alpha^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \|\theta_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})}^{\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}}.$$

Afterwards, we provide an explicit estimate for the local existence time  $T_1$  of  $H^{\frac{3}{2}}$ -solutions and then compare it with  $T^*$ . More precisely, we obtain the explicit control

$$T_1 = C \left( \|\theta_0\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2\gamma(9+2\gamma)}{3(9+4\gamma)}} \|\theta_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}}^{2 - \frac{4\gamma(6+\gamma)}{3(9+4\gamma)}} \right)^{-1}.$$

Let us remark that in view of (1.2) the non-negative condition is relatively common for (1.1) and have been assumed in several works (see, e.g., [2, 3, 7, 11, 14]). Also, it is worth mentioning that, in consonance with the conjectures in [16], we obtain boundedness of solutions in  $C^\alpha$  for  $\alpha > 1 - \gamma$ .

Coti Zelati and Vicol [9] showed existence and uniqueness of global  $H^2$ -strong solutions (classical) for the 2DQG with supercritical values of  $\gamma$ . Our approach follows the spirit of [9], mainly with respect to the control on the regularization time of our  $H^{\frac{3}{2}}$ -solutions. However, for the control on the local existence time  $T_1$  we need to proceed in a different way by employing commutator estimates and suitable energy estimates for the  $H^{\frac{3}{2}}$ -solutions (see estimates (4.1) to (4.5)).

Our main result reads as follows.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $\theta_0 \in H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{T})$  be an arbitrary non-negative initial data. Then, there exists  $\gamma_1 = \gamma_1(\|\theta_0\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}}) \in (1/2, 1)$  such that for each  $\gamma \in [\gamma_1, 1)$  the IVP (1.1) has a unique global (classical)  $H^{\frac{3}{2}}$ -solution.*

**Remark 1.2.** *For each  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ , let  $R_\gamma$  be the supremum of all  $R > 0$  such that, for any  $\theta_0 \in H^2$  with  $\|\theta_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{T})}^{1 - \frac{2\gamma}{3}} \|\theta_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}^{\frac{2\gamma}{3}} \leq R$ , the unique  $H^{\frac{3}{2}}$ -solution of (1.1) with initial data  $\theta_0$  does not blow up in finite time. In view of arguments in the proof of Theorem 1.1, we have that  $R_\gamma \rightarrow \infty$  as  $\gamma \rightarrow 1^-$ . Moreover, in view of (4.8), we could choose  $\gamma_1$  depending on the quantity  $\|\theta_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{T})}^{1 - \frac{2\gamma}{3}} \|\theta_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}^{\frac{2\gamma}{3}}$  (instead of  $\|\theta_0\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}}$ ) which is invariant by the scaling of (1.1).*

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we recall some definitions, notations and properties for Hilbert transform and fractional Laplacian operator. Section 3 is devoted to the eventual regularity property. Finally, in Section 4 we prove Theorem 1.1.

## 2 Preliminaries

Let  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$  and denote the norm of  $L^p(\mathbb{T})$  by  $\|\cdot\|_{L^p}$ . For  $s \in \mathbb{R}$  the norms of the homogeneous Sobolev space  $\dot{H}^s(\mathbb{T})$  and its nonhomogeneous counterpart  $H^s(\mathbb{T})$  are denoted by  $\|\cdot\|_{\dot{H}^s} = \|\Lambda^s \cdot\|_{L^2}$  and  $\|\cdot\|_{H^s} = \|\Lambda^s \cdot\|_{L^2} + \|\cdot\|_{L^2}$ , respectively. In turn, for each  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , the Hölder space  $C^\alpha(\mathbb{T})$  is endowed with the norm  $\|\phi\|_{C^\alpha(\mathbb{T})} = [\phi]_{C^\alpha(\mathbb{T})} + \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})}$ , where the seminorm  $[\phi]$  is given by

$$[\phi]_{C^\alpha(\mathbb{T})} = \sup_{x, y \in \mathbb{T}, x \neq y} \frac{|\phi(x) - \phi(y)|}{|x - y|^\alpha}. \quad (2.1)$$

We recall that the periodic Hilbert transform  $\mathcal{H}$  is defined by means of Fourier transform as

$$\widehat{\mathcal{H}\phi}(m) = -i \operatorname{sign}(m) \widehat{\phi}(m)$$

for all  $m \in \mathbb{Z}_*$  and  $\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ . Alternatively, in original variables we have the expression

$$\mathcal{H}\phi(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} P.V. \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{\phi(y)}{\tan(\frac{x-y}{2})} dy,$$

which can be equivalently written as (see [4])

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}\phi(x) &= \frac{1}{\pi}P.V. \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{\phi(y)}{x-y} dy + \frac{1}{\pi} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_*} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \phi(y) \left( \frac{1}{x-y-2k\pi} + \frac{1}{2k\pi} \right) dy \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi}P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\phi(y)}{x-y} dy.\end{aligned}\tag{2.2}$$

In the last integral in (2.2), recall that  $P.V.$  is defined by

$$P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\phi(y)}{x-y} dy = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\epsilon < |x-y| < \frac{1}{\epsilon}} \frac{\phi(y)}{x-y} dy.$$

Hilbert transform commutes with derivatives and in particular we have that

$$\partial_x \mathcal{H}(\phi)(x) = \mathcal{H}(\partial_x \phi)(x).$$

For  $0 < \gamma < 2$  and  $\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ , the fractional Laplacian  $\Lambda^\gamma$  is defined by the following singular integral (see [8] for more details)

$$\Lambda^\gamma \phi(x) = c_\gamma \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{\phi(x) - \phi(x+y)}{|y - 2\pi k|^{1+\gamma}} dy = c_\gamma P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\phi(x) - \phi(x+y)}{|y|^{1+\gamma}} dy$$

where  $c_\gamma$  is a normalization constant. For  $\gamma \in (\gamma_0, 1]$ , the constant  $c_\gamma$  can be bounded from below and above by using  $\gamma_0$  and some universal constants  $C$ . The exact expression of the constant  $c_\gamma$  is not necessary for our ends.

We recall the following commutator estimate for the fractional Laplacian (for more details, see [12] and references therein).

**Lemma 2.1.** *Suppose that  $s > 0$  and  $1 < p < \infty$ . If  $f, g \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T})$  then*

$$\|\Lambda^s(fg) - f\Lambda^s g\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T})} \leq C \left( \|\partial_x f\|_{L^{p_1}(\mathbb{T})} \|\Lambda^{s-1} g\|_{L^{p_2}(\mathbb{T})} + \|\Lambda^s f\|_{L^{p_3}(\mathbb{T})} \|g\|_{L^{p_4}(\mathbb{T})} \right)$$

where  $p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4 \in (1, \infty)$  are such that

$$\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} = \frac{1}{p_3} + \frac{1}{p_4}$$

and  $C > 0$  is a constant depending on  $s, p, p_2$  and  $p_3$ .

The next lemma contains a property of the fractional Laplacian (see [8] for more details and a proof in the two-dimensional case).

**Lemma 2.2.** *Assume that  $0 < \gamma < 2$  and  $\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ . Then, we have the pointwise equality*

$$2\phi(x)\Lambda^\gamma \phi(x) = \Lambda^\gamma(\phi)^2(x) + D_\gamma(\phi)(x) \text{ in } \mathbb{T},$$

where

$$D_\gamma(\phi)(x) = c_\gamma \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{(\phi(x) - \phi(x+y))^2}{|y - 2\pi k|^{1+\gamma}} dy = c_\gamma P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{(\phi(x) - \phi(x+y))^2}{|y|^{1+\gamma}} dy.$$

We finish this section with a technical lemma that will be useful for our purposes (see [5, Lemma B.1]).

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be compact and  $T > 0$ . Consider a function*

$$f : \mathcal{K} \times (0, T) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$$

and assume that the functions

$$f_\lambda(\cdot) = f(\lambda, \cdot) : (0, T) \rightarrow [0, \infty) \quad \text{and} \quad f'_\lambda(\cdot) = (\partial_t f)(\lambda, \cdot) : (0, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

are continuous, for each  $\lambda \in \mathcal{K}$ . Additionally, assume that the following properties hold true:

- (i) The families  $\{f_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \mathcal{K}}$  and  $\{f'_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \mathcal{K}}$  are uniformly equicontinuous with respect to  $t$ ;
- (ii) For every  $t \in (0, T)$ , the functions

$$f(\cdot, t) : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow [0, \infty) \quad \text{and} \quad (\partial_t f)(\cdot, t) : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

are continuous. Moreover, define

$$F(t) = \sup_{\lambda \in \mathcal{K}} f_\lambda(t).$$

Then, for almost every  $t \in (0, T)$  the function  $F$  is differentiable at  $t$  and there exists  $\lambda_* = \lambda_*(t) \in \mathcal{K}$  such that the following equalities hold simultaneously:

$$F(t) = f_{\lambda_*}(t) \quad \text{and} \quad F'(t) = f'_{\lambda_*}(t).$$

### 3 Eventual regularization

In this section, we show a **new** “eventual regularization” result for solutions of (1.1) in which we provide an explicit control on the eventual regularity time  $T^*$ .

Firstly, in [11], we can find the following local existence result for (1.1): let  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  and  $\theta_0 \in H^{\frac{3}{2}-\gamma}(\mathbb{T})$ . Then, there exists  $T > 0$  such that the IVP (1.1) has a unique strong solution

$$\theta \in C([0, T]; H^{\frac{3}{2}-\gamma}(\mathbb{T})) \cap L^2((0, T); H^{\frac{3-\gamma}{2}}(\mathbb{T})).$$

Using regularity techniques for the solution obtained in [11] (see Section 4 and estimates (4.1)-(4.5)), we can show that there exists  $0 < T_1 \leq T$  such that

$$\theta \in C([0, T_1]; H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{T})) \tag{3.1}$$

provided that  $\theta_0 \in H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{T})$ . Moreover,

$$\theta \in C^1((0, T_1); H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{T})), \quad \partial_t \theta \in L^\infty((0, \tilde{T}); H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{T})) \quad \text{and} \quad \theta \in L^2((0, \tilde{T}); H^{\frac{3+\gamma}{2}}(\mathbb{T})),$$

for all  $0 < \tilde{T} < T_1$ .

In what follows, we state our “eventual regularization” result.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Suppose that  $\gamma \in [1/2, 1)$  and  $\theta_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T})$  is non-negative. Let  $\alpha \in (1 - \gamma, 1)$  and define*

$$T^* = C\alpha^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \|\theta_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})}^{\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}}, \quad (3.2)$$

where  $C = \gamma^{-1}k_1k_2^{\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}} > 0$  with  $k_1$  and  $k_2$  being independent of  $\alpha, \gamma$  and  $\theta_0$ . Let  $\theta$  be a solution of (1.1) in  $C([0, T_1]; H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{T}))$  with existence time  $0 < T_1 < \infty$ . If  $T^* < T_1$ , then  $\theta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T} \times (T^*, T_1])$ .

**Remark 3.2.** *Let us observe that the expression ‘‘eventual regularization’’ is used in the literature in the context of weak solutions and  $T_1 = \infty$ . Nevertheless, in our range of  $\gamma$ , it is not known whether (1.1) has global weak solution and then we need to adapt this kind of result to our context but borrowing the same expression.*

In next lemma we recall a well-known result that assures that the control of high-order Holder norms is sufficient to obtain smoothness. This result essentially follows from [10, Theorem 2.1] which extended the results of [6] about 2DQG to (1.1).

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $\theta$  be a solution of (1.1) in the class (3.1) with non-negative initial data  $\theta_0$ . If  $0 < t_0 < t_1 \leq T_1$  and*

$$\theta \in L^\infty((t_0, t_1); C^\alpha(\mathbb{T}))$$

with  $0 < \gamma < 1$  and  $1 - \gamma < \alpha$ , then

$$\theta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T} \times (t_0, t_1]).$$

### 3.1 Proof of Theorem 3.1

In view of Lemma 3.3, we need to show that

$$\theta \in L^\infty((T^*, T_1); C^\alpha(\mathbb{T})),$$

where  $\alpha > 1 - \gamma$  and  $T^*$  is as in (3.2). For that, we denote  $\delta_h\theta(x, t) = \theta(x + h, t) - \theta(x, t)$  and define

$$v(x, t, h) = \frac{\delta_h\theta(x, t)}{(\xi^2(t) + |h|^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}, \quad (3.3)$$

where  $\xi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is a bounded decreasing differentiable function which will be determined later. Notice that it is sufficient to estimate  $\|v(t)\|_{L^\infty}$  when  $\xi(t) = 0$  in order to control the seminorm (2.1) of  $\theta$  in  $C^\alpha(\mathbb{T})$ .

We start by providing estimates for  $Lv^2$  where  $L$  is the operator of the corresponding equation satisfied by  $\delta_h\theta$ . We split the proof into a sequence of lemmas. Taking the differences in (1.1) evaluated in  $x + h$  and  $x$ , it follows that

$$\partial_t\delta_h\theta - \mathcal{H}\theta\partial_x\delta_h\theta - \delta_h\mathcal{H}\theta\partial_h\delta_h\theta + \Lambda^\gamma\delta_h\theta = 0, \quad (3.4)$$

which gives  $L = \partial_t - u\partial_x - \delta_hu\partial_h + \Lambda^\gamma$  with  $u = \mathcal{H}\theta$ . Combining (3.4) and Lemma 2.2 we obtain that  $v^2$  satisfies

$$Lv^2 + \frac{1}{(\xi^2(t) + |h|^2)^\alpha} D_\gamma(\delta_h\theta) = -2\alpha\xi' \frac{\xi}{\xi^2 + |h|^2} v^2 + 2\alpha \frac{h}{\xi^2 + |h|^2} \delta_h\mathcal{H}\theta v^2. \quad (3.5)$$

Next we estimate the term  $D_\gamma(\delta_h\theta)$ .

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $0 < \gamma_0 \leq \gamma < 1$  and  $\alpha \in (1 - \gamma, 1)$ . Then, there exists a positive constant  $c_0 = c_0(\gamma_0)$  such that*

$$D_\gamma(\delta_h\theta)(x) \geq \frac{1}{c_0|h|^\gamma} \left( \frac{|v(x, h)|}{\|v\|_{L^\infty}} \right)^{\frac{\gamma}{1-\alpha}} |\delta_h\theta(x)|^2,$$

for all  $x, h \in \mathbb{T}$ .

**Proof.** Let  $\chi$  be a smooth radially non-decreasing cutoff function such that  $\chi$  vanishes for  $|x| \leq 1$ ,  $\chi$  is identically 1 for  $|x| \geq 2$  and its derivative verifies  $|\chi'| \leq 2$ . For  $R \geq 4|h|$ , we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} D_\gamma(\delta_h\theta)(x) &\geq c_\gamma \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{(\delta_h\theta(x) - \delta_h\theta(x+y))^2}{|y|^{1+\gamma}} \chi\left(\frac{|y|}{R}\right) dy \\ &\geq c_\gamma |\delta_h\theta(x)|^2 \int_{|y| \geq 2R} \frac{1}{|y|^{1+\gamma}} dy - 2c_\gamma |\delta_h\theta(x)| \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\delta_h\theta(x+y)}{|y|^{1+\gamma}} \chi\left(\frac{|y|}{R}\right) dy \right| \\ &\geq c_\gamma \frac{|\delta_h\theta(x)|^2}{R^\gamma} - 2c_\gamma |\delta_h\theta(x)| \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\theta(x+y) - \theta(x)) \delta_{-h} \left( \frac{\chi\left(\frac{|y|}{R}\right)}{|y|^{1+\gamma}} \right) dy \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Denoting  $g(y) = \chi\left(\frac{|y|}{R}\right) |y|^{-(1+\gamma)}$  and using mean value theorem, we obtain

$$|\delta_{-h}g(y)| \leq |h| \max_{0 \leq \lambda \leq 1} |g'(y - \lambda h)| \leq c_1 \frac{|h|}{|y|^{2+\gamma}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\frac{3R}{4} \leq |y|\}},$$

for some constant  $c_1 \geq 1$ . Hence the integral in (3.6) can be estimated as

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\theta(x+y) - \theta(x)) \delta_{-h} \left( \frac{\chi\left(\frac{|y|}{R}\right)}{|y|^{1+\gamma}} \right) dy \right| &\leq c_1 |h| \int_{|y| \geq \frac{3R}{4}} \frac{|\delta_y\theta(x)|}{(\xi^2 + |y|^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \frac{(\xi^2 + |y|^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}{|y|^{2+\gamma}} dy \\ &\leq c_1 |h| \|v\|_{L^\infty} \int_{|y| \geq \frac{3R}{4}} \frac{(\xi^2 + |y|^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}{|y|^{2+\gamma}} dy \\ &\leq c_1 c_2 \frac{|h| \|v\|_{L^\infty}}{R^\gamma} \left( \frac{\xi^\alpha}{R} + \frac{1}{R^{1-\alpha}} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

for some constant  $c_2 \geq 1$ .

Now choose  $R > 0$  defined by

$$R = \left[ \frac{8c_1 c_2 \|v\|_{L^\infty}}{|v(x, t)|} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} |h|. \quad (3.8)$$

Since  $c_1 c_2 \geq 1$  and  $|v(x, t)| \leq \|v\|_{L^\infty}$ , it follows that  $R \geq 8^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} |h| \geq 4|h|$ .

Using (3.8), we can rewrite estimate (3.7) as

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\theta(x+y) - \theta(x)) \delta_{-h} \left( \frac{\chi\left(\frac{|y|}{R}\right)}{|y|^{1+\gamma}} \right) dy \right| &\leq \frac{1}{R^\gamma} \left[ \frac{c_1 c_2 \xi^\alpha \|v\|_{L^\infty}}{(8c_1 c_2)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}} \left[ \frac{|v(x, t)|}{\|v\|_{L^\infty}} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} + \frac{|v(x, t)| |h|^\alpha}{8} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{|\xi|^\alpha + |h|^\alpha}{8R^\gamma} |v(x, t)| \\ &\leq \frac{|\delta_h\theta(x)|}{4R^\gamma}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

because  $a^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \leq a$  for all  $a \leq 1$ .

Combining estimates (3.6) and (3.9) and using the definition of  $R$ , we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} D_\gamma(\delta_h\theta)(x) &\geq c_\gamma \frac{|\delta_h\theta(x)|^2}{2R^\gamma} \\ &\geq c_\gamma \frac{1}{2(8c_1c_2)^{\frac{\gamma}{1-\alpha}}|h|^\gamma} \left[ \frac{|v(x,t)|}{\|v\|_{L^\infty}} \right]^{\frac{\gamma}{1-\alpha}} |\delta_h\theta(x)|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

as required. ■

**Remark 3.5.** Notice that the condition  $0 < \gamma_0 \leq \gamma < 1$  arises from the need of controlling terms with the power  $\frac{\gamma}{1-\alpha}$  in (3.8) and (3.10).

In the next lemma, we define  $\xi$  by an ordinary differential equation and obtain an estimate for the first term on the right hand side of (3.5).

**Lemma 3.6.** Let  $\gamma_0 > 0$ ,  $\gamma \in [\gamma_0, 1)$  and  $\alpha \in (1 - \gamma, 1)$ . There exists a positive constant  $k_1 = k_1(\gamma_0)$  such that if

$$\xi' = -\frac{1}{\alpha k_1} \xi^{1-\gamma}, \quad (3.11)$$

then

$$-2\alpha\xi' \frac{\xi}{\xi^2 + |h|^2} v^2 \leq \frac{1}{8c_0|h|^\gamma} v^2, \text{ for all } x, h \in \mathbb{T}, \quad (3.12)$$

where  $c_0$  is the same constant appearing in Lemma 3.4.

**Proof.** Substituting (3.11) on the left hand side of (3.12), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} -2\alpha\xi' \frac{\xi}{\xi^2 + |h|^2} v^2 &\leq \frac{2(k_1)^{-1}\xi^{2-\gamma}}{\xi^2 + |h|^2} v^2 \\ &\leq \frac{2(k_1)^{-1}(\xi^2 + |h|^2)^{1-\frac{\gamma}{2}}}{\xi^2 + |h|^2} v^2 \\ &\leq \frac{2(k_1)^{-1}}{(\xi^2 + |h|^2)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}} v^2 \leq \frac{2(k_1)^{-1}}{|h|^\gamma} v^2. \end{aligned}$$

Just choosing  $k_1 = 16c_0$ , we are done. ■

Now we need to estimate the term in (3.5) that depends on the Hilbert transform. We do that in the next two lemmas. First, we work with the factor  $\delta_h\mathcal{H}\theta(x)$  in the second term of the right hand side of (3.5).

**Lemma 3.7.** Let  $\gamma \in [\gamma_0, 1)$  and  $\alpha \in (1 - \gamma, 1)$ . If  $\rho \geq 4|h|$ , then

$$|\delta_h\mathcal{H}\theta(x)| \leq C \left[ \rho^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} (D_\gamma(\delta_h\theta)(x))^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|v\|_{L^\infty} \left( \frac{|h|\xi^\alpha}{\rho} + \frac{|h|}{\rho^{1-\alpha}} \right) \right], \quad (3.13)$$

for all  $x, h \in \mathbb{T}$ .

**Proof.** Let  $\chi$  be a smooth radially non-decreasing cutoff function that vanishes for  $|x| \leq 1$  and is equal 1 for  $|x| \geq 2$ , and such that the derivative satisfies  $|\chi'| \leq 2$ . From (2.2), we obtain

$$\delta_h(\mathcal{H}\theta)(x) = \mathcal{H}(\delta_h\theta)(x) = -\frac{1}{\pi} P.V \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\delta_h\theta(x+y)}{y} dy.$$

For  $\epsilon > 0$ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\epsilon \leq |y| \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon}} \frac{\delta_h\theta(x+y)}{y} dy &= \int_{\epsilon \leq |y| \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon}} \frac{\delta_h\theta(x+y) - \delta_h\theta(x)}{y} dy \\ &:= I + J, \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

where

$$I = \int_{\epsilon \leq |y| \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon}} \left[ 1 - \chi\left(\frac{|y|}{\rho}\right) \right] \frac{\delta_h\theta(x+y) - \delta_h\theta(x)}{y} dy$$

and

$$J = \int_{\epsilon \leq |y| \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon}} \chi\left(\frac{|y|}{\rho}\right) \frac{\delta_h\theta(x+y) - \delta_h\theta(x)}{y} dy.$$

Applying Hölder inequality and taking  $\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{2\rho}$ , we can estimate  $I$  as follows

$$\begin{aligned} |I| &\leq \int_{\epsilon \leq |y| \leq 2\rho} \frac{|\delta_h\theta(x+y) - \delta_h\theta(x)|}{|y|} dy \\ &\leq \left( \int_{|y| \leq 2\rho} \frac{1}{|y|^{1-\gamma}} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{\epsilon \leq |y| \leq 2\rho} \frac{|\delta_h\theta(x+y) - \delta_h\theta(x)|^2}{|y|^{1+\gamma}} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C\rho^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \left( \int_{\epsilon \leq |y|} \frac{|\delta_h\theta(x+y) - \delta_h\theta(x)|^2}{|y|^{1+\gamma}} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

For  $J$ , we have that

$$|J| \leq \int_{\epsilon \leq |y| \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon}} \left| \delta_{-h} \left( \frac{\chi\left(\frac{|y|}{\rho}\right)}{y} \right) \right| |(\theta(x+y) - \theta(x))| dy. \tag{3.16}$$

Taking  $g(y) = \chi\left(\frac{|y|}{\rho}\right) y^{-1}$  and applying mean value theorem, we arrive at

$$|\delta_{-h}g(y)| \leq |h| \max_{0 \leq \lambda \leq 1} |g'(y - \lambda h)| \leq C|h| \frac{\mathbf{1}_{\{\frac{3\rho}{4} \leq |y|\}}}{|y|^2}. \tag{3.17}$$

Substituting (3.17) into (3.16) and taking  $\epsilon \leq \frac{3\rho}{4}$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} J &\leq C|h| \int_{\frac{3\rho}{4} \leq |y| \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon}} \frac{|(\theta(x+y) - \theta(x))|}{|y|^2} dy \\ &\leq C|h| \|v\|_{L^\infty} \int_{\frac{3\rho}{4} \leq |y|} \frac{(\xi^2 + |y|^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}{|y|^2} dy \\ &\leq C|h| \|v\|_{L^\infty} \left( \frac{\xi^\alpha}{\rho} + \frac{1}{\rho^{1-\alpha}} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

The estimate (3.13) follows by inserting (3.15) and (3.18) in (3.14) and making  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . ■

Next we provide a condition on the initial data of  $\xi$  to relate (3.13) to the estimates of the other terms.

**Lemma 3.8.** *Let  $\gamma \in [\gamma_0, 1)$  and  $\alpha \in (1 - \gamma, 1)$ , and assume that*

$$\|v\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{4\|\theta_0\|_{L^\infty}}{\xi_0^\alpha}. \quad (3.19)$$

There exists a constant  $k_2 = k_2(\gamma_0) \geq 1$  such that if

$$\xi_0 = (k_2\alpha\|\theta_0\|_{L^\infty})^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}},$$

then

$$2\alpha\frac{|h|}{\xi^2 + |h|^2}|\delta_h\mathcal{H}\theta|v^2 \leq \frac{1}{2(\xi^2 + |h|^2)^\alpha}D_\gamma(\delta_h\theta)(x) + \frac{1}{8c_0|h|^\gamma}v^2,$$

for all  $x, h \in \mathbb{T}$  with  $|h| \leq \xi_0$ .

**Proof.** From (3.13) and Young's inequality for products it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 2\alpha\frac{|h|}{\xi^2 + |h|^2}|\delta_h\mathcal{H}\theta|v^2 &\leq \frac{|h|}{2(\xi^2 + |h|^2)^\alpha}D_\gamma(\delta_h\theta)(x) \\ &\quad + C\alpha\frac{|h|^2}{\xi^2 + |h|^2}\left[\frac{\alpha\rho^\gamma v^2}{(\xi^2 + |h|^2)^{1-\alpha}} + \|v\|_{L^\infty}\left(\frac{\xi^\alpha}{\rho} + \frac{1}{\rho^{1-\alpha}}\right)\right]v^2. \end{aligned}$$

It is sufficient to show that

$$C\alpha\left[\frac{\alpha\rho^\gamma v^2}{(\xi^2 + |h|^2)^{1-\alpha}} + \|v\|_{L^\infty}\left(\frac{\xi^\alpha}{\rho} + \frac{1}{\rho^{1-\alpha}}\right)\right] \leq \frac{1}{8c_0|h|^\gamma}. \quad (3.20)$$

Choose

$$\rho = 4(\xi^2 + |h|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (3.21)$$

and note that  $\rho \geq 4|h|$ . Combining (3.19) and (3.21), we obtain

$$\frac{\alpha\rho^\gamma v^2}{(\xi^2 + |h|^2)^{1-\alpha}} \leq C\frac{\alpha\|\theta_0\|_{L^\infty}^2(\xi^2 + |h|^2)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}}{\xi_0^{2\alpha}(\xi^2 + |h|^2)^{1-\alpha}}. \quad (3.22)$$

For  $|h| \leq \xi_0$ ,  $1 - \gamma < \alpha < 1$  and  $\xi \leq \xi_0$ , we deduce that

$$\frac{(\xi^2 + |h|^2)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}}{\xi_0^{2\alpha}(\xi^2 + |h|^2)^{1-\alpha}} \leq C\frac{(\xi^2 + |h|^2)^{\gamma+\alpha-1}}{\xi_0^{2\alpha}(\xi^2 + |h|^2)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}} \leq C\frac{1}{\xi_0^{2(1-\gamma)}|h|^\gamma}. \quad (3.23)$$

Estimates (3.22) and (3.23) yield

$$\frac{\alpha\rho^\gamma v^2}{(\xi^2 + |h|^2)^{1-\alpha}} \leq C\frac{\alpha\|\theta_0\|_{L^\infty}^2}{\xi_0^{2(1-\gamma)}|h|^\gamma}. \quad (3.24)$$

Proceeding similarly, one also can show that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\|v\|_{L^\infty} \xi^\alpha}{\rho} + \frac{\|v\|_{L^\infty}}{\rho^{1-\alpha}} &\leq C \frac{\|\theta_0\|_{L^\infty}}{\xi_0^\alpha} \left( \frac{\xi^\alpha}{(\xi^2 + |h|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \frac{1}{(\xi^2 + |h|^2)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}}} \right) \\
&\leq C \frac{\|\theta_0\|_{L^\infty}}{\xi_0^\alpha} \frac{(\xi^2 + |h|^2)^{\frac{\gamma+\alpha-1}{2}}}{|h|^\gamma} \\
&\leq C \frac{\|\theta_0\|_{L^\infty}}{\xi_0^{1-\gamma} |h|^\gamma}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

Adding (3.24) and (3.25), we get

$$\frac{\alpha \rho^\gamma v^2}{(\xi^2 + |h|^2)^{1-\alpha}} + \|v\|_{L^\infty} \left( \frac{\xi^\alpha}{\rho} + \frac{1}{\rho^{1-\alpha}} \right) \leq C \left( \frac{\alpha \|\theta_0\|_{L^\infty}^2}{\xi_0^{2(1-\gamma)}} + \frac{\|\theta_0\|_{L^\infty}}{\xi_0^{1-\gamma}} \right) \frac{1}{|h|^\gamma}. \tag{3.26}$$

In view of (3.26), notice that we only need to show that

$$C \alpha \left( \frac{\alpha \|\theta_0\|_{L^\infty}^2}{\xi_0^{2(1-\gamma)}} + \frac{\|\theta_0\|_{L^\infty}}{\xi_0^{1-\gamma}} \right) \leq \frac{1}{8c_0}. \tag{3.27}$$

For that, we simply choose  $\xi_0$  satisfying

$$\frac{\|\theta_0\|_{L^\infty}}{\xi_0^{1-\gamma}} \leq \frac{1}{16\tilde{C}c_0\alpha},$$

for some constant  $\tilde{C}$  such that  $\tilde{C} \geq C$  and  $\tilde{C}c_0 \geq 1$ . Combining (3.26) and (3.27), we conclude (3.20). ■

Finally, we are ready to conclude the proof of Theorem 3.1. For  $1 - \gamma < \alpha \leq 1/2$ , let

$$M = \frac{4 \|\theta_0\|_{L^\infty}}{\xi_0^\alpha}$$

and define

$$t_* = \sup\{0 \leq t < T_1 : \|v(\tau)\|_{L^\infty} < M \text{ for all } \tau \in [0, t]\}. \tag{3.28}$$

Note that  $t_*$  is well-defined since (3.3) provides

$$\|v(0)\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{M}{2}.$$

We are going to show that  $t_* = T_1$ . Suppose by contradiction that  $t_* < T_1$ . Since  $v$  is continuous and periodic in  $x$  and  $h$  there exists  $(x_0, h_0) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}$  such that  $|v(x_0, t_*, h_0)| = M$ . We claim that  $|h_0| \leq \xi_0$ . Indeed, if  $|h_0| \geq \xi_0$ , then

$$|v(x_0, t_*, h_0)| \leq \frac{2 \|\theta\|_{L^\infty}}{|h_0|^\alpha} \leq \frac{2 \|\theta_0\|_{L^\infty}}{\xi_0^\alpha} \leq \frac{M}{2}.$$

Applying Lemmas 3.6 and 3.8 in (3.5) for  $t \in (0, t_*]$ , we obtain the estimate

$$Lv^2 + \frac{1}{(\xi^2 + |h|^2)^\alpha} D_\gamma(\delta_h \theta) \leq \frac{1}{2(\xi^2 + |h|^2)^\alpha} D_\gamma(\delta_h \theta) + \frac{1}{4c_0|h|^\gamma} v^2, \quad (3.29)$$

for all  $x, h \in \mathbb{T}$  with  $|h| \leq \xi_0$ . Using Lemma 3.4 we can rewrite (3.29) as follows

$$Lv^2 + \frac{1}{4c_0|h|^\gamma} \left[ \left( \frac{|v(x, h)|}{\|v\|_{L^\infty}} \right)^{\frac{\gamma}{1-\alpha}} - 1 \right] v^2 + \frac{1}{4c_0|h|^\gamma} \left( \frac{|v(x, h)|}{\|v\|_{L^\infty}} \right)^{\frac{\gamma}{1-\alpha}} v^2 \leq 0. \quad (3.30)$$

Now consider  $\epsilon > 0$  such that

$$\|v(t)\|_{L^\infty} \geq \frac{7M}{8}, \text{ for all } t \in [t_* - \epsilon, t_*]. \quad (3.31)$$

Given  $t \in [t_* - \epsilon, t_*)$ , consider  $(x_t, h_t) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}$  such that the function  $(x, h) \rightarrow v^2(x, t, h)$  reaches its maximum. At this point, we have that  $\partial_x v^2 = \partial_h v^2 = 0$ ,  $\Lambda^\gamma v^2 \geq 0$  and  $|h_t| \leq \xi_0$ , which leads us to

$$(\partial_t v^2)(x_t, t, h_t) \leq Lv^2(x_t, t, h_t). \quad (3.32)$$

Using (3.31) and  $|h_t| \leq \xi_0$ , we deduce that

$$\frac{49M}{256c_0\xi_0^\gamma} \leq \frac{v^2(x_t, t, h_t)}{4c_0|h_t|^\gamma}. \quad (3.33)$$

Next, adding (3.32) and (3.33), we conclude

$$(\partial_t v^2)(x_t, t, h_t) + \frac{49M}{256c_0\xi_0^\gamma} \leq Lv^2(x_t, t, h_t) + \frac{v^2(x_t, t, h_t)}{4c_0|h_t|^\gamma}. \quad (3.34)$$

Combining estimate (3.30) at the point  $(x_t, t, h_t)$  with (3.34) and using that  $|v(x_t, t, h_t)| = \|v(t)\|_{L^\infty}$ , it follows that

$$(\partial_t v^2)(x_t, t, h_t) \leq -\frac{49M}{256c_0\xi_0^\gamma},$$

for all  $t \in [t_* - \epsilon, t_*)$ .

Lemma 2.3 with  $f(t, \lambda) = v(x, t, h)^2$  and  $\lambda = (x, h) \in \mathcal{K} = \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}$  yields

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|v(t)\|_{L^\infty}^2 \leq (\partial_t v^2)(x_t, t, h_t) \leq -\frac{49M}{256c_0\xi_0^\gamma}, \quad (3.35)$$

for all  $t \in [t_* - \epsilon, t_*)$ . Integrating (3.35), we arrive at

$$\|v(t_*)\|_{L^\infty} < M,$$

which contradicts (3.28). Consequently  $t_* = T_1$  and  $v \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T} \times (0, T_1))$ .

Next, taking  $\xi_0 = (k_2 \alpha \|\theta_0\|_{L^\infty})^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}}$  as in Lemma 3.8, then the solution of (3.11) is given by

$$\xi(t) = \begin{cases} [\xi_0^\gamma - \frac{\gamma}{\alpha k_1} t]^\frac{1}{\gamma}, & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq T_* \\ 0, & \text{if } T_* < t < T_1 \end{cases},$$

where

$$T_* = C \alpha^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \|\theta_0\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}} \text{ with } C = \gamma^{-1} k_1 k_2^{\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}}.$$

Since  $\xi(t) = 0$  for  $T_* < t < T_1$ , it follows that

$$[\theta(\cdot, t)]_{C^\alpha} \leq C \|v(t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq M, \text{ for all } T_* < t < T_1,$$

and we are done. ■

## 4 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Firstly we obtain an explicit lower bound of the local existence time with  $H^{\frac{3}{2}}$ -initial data. For that, we need an *a priori* estimate of  $H^{\frac{3}{2}}$ -norm of the solution and after compare with the eventual regularization time  $T^*$  (3.2).

Formally applying  $\Lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}$  in (1.1) and then multiply by  $\Lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}\theta$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left\| \Lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}\theta(t) \right\|_{L^2}^2 + \left\| \Lambda^{\frac{3+\gamma}{2}}\theta(t) \right\|_{L^2}^2 &= \int \Lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}\theta \Lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathcal{H}\theta\theta_x)(t, x) dx \\ &= I_1 + I_2, \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

where

$$I_1 = \int \Lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}\theta \left[ \Lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathcal{H}\theta\theta_x) - \mathcal{H}\theta\Lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}\theta_x \right](t, x) dx$$

and

$$I_2 = \int \Lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}\theta \mathcal{H}\theta\Lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}\theta_x(t, x) dx.$$

Using Hölder inequality and Lemma 2.1 with  $p = 2$ ,  $p_1 = p_4 = \frac{3}{\gamma}$  and  $p_2 = p_3 = \frac{6}{3-2\gamma}$ , we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &\leq \left\| \Lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}\theta(t) \right\|_{L^2} \left\| \Lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathcal{H}\theta\theta_x)(t) - \mathcal{H}\theta\Lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}\theta_x(t) \right\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \left\| \Lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}\theta(t) \right\|_{L^2} \left\| \Lambda\theta(t) \right\|_{L^{\frac{3}{\gamma}}} \left\| \Lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}\theta(t) \right\|_{L^{\frac{6}{3-2\gamma}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

An integration by parts and Hölder inequality lead us to

$$I_2 \leq \left\| \Lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}\theta(t) \right\|_{L^2} \left\| \Lambda\theta(t) \right\|_{L^{\frac{3}{\gamma}}} \left\| \Lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}\theta(t) \right\|_{L^{\frac{6}{3-2\gamma}}}.$$

Applying Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality and (1.2), we conclude that

$$\left\| \Lambda\theta(t) \right\|_{L^{\frac{3}{\gamma}}} \leq C \left\| \Lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}\theta(t) \right\|_{L^2}^{1-\frac{2\gamma}{9}} \left\| \theta_0 \right\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2\gamma}{9}}$$

and

$$\left\| \Lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}\theta(t) \right\|_{L^{\frac{6}{3-2\gamma}}} \leq C \left\| \Lambda^{\frac{3+\gamma}{2}}\theta(t) \right\|_{L^2}^{\frac{9+2\gamma}{3(3+\gamma)}} \left\| \theta_0 \right\|_{L^2}^{\frac{\gamma}{3(3+\gamma)}}. \quad (4.3)$$

Thus, using (4.2)-(4.3), we can estimate the right hand side of (4.1) as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left\| \Lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}\theta(t) \right\|_{L^2}^2 + \left\| \Lambda^{\frac{3+\gamma}{2}}\theta(t) \right\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq C \left\| \Lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}\theta(t) \right\|_{L^2}^{2-\frac{2\gamma}{9}} \left\| \theta_0 \right\|_{L^2}^{\frac{\gamma(9+2\gamma)}{9(3+\gamma)}} \left\| \Lambda^{\frac{3+\gamma}{2}}\theta(t) \right\|_{L^2}^{\frac{9+2\gamma}{3(3+\gamma)}} \\ &\leq C \left\| \Lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}\theta(t) \right\|_{L^2}^{4-\frac{4\gamma(6+\gamma)}{3(9+4\gamma)}} \left\| \theta_0 \right\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2\gamma(9+2\gamma)}{3(9+4\gamma)}} + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \Lambda^{\frac{3+\gamma}{2}}\theta(t) \right\|_{L^2}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

which, in particular, gives

$$\left\| \theta(t) \right\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}} \leq \frac{\left\| \theta_0 \right\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}}}{\left[ 1 - C \left( 2 - \frac{4\gamma(6+\gamma)}{3(9+4\gamma)} \right) \left\| \theta_0 \right\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2\gamma(9+2\gamma)}{3(9+4\gamma)}} \left\| \theta_0 \right\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}}^{2-\frac{4\gamma(6+\gamma)}{3(9+4\gamma)}} t \right]^{\frac{1}{2-\frac{4\gamma(6+\gamma)}{3(9+4\gamma)}}}}, \quad (4.5)$$

for all  $0 \leq t \leq \left[ 2C \left( 2 - \frac{4\gamma(6+\gamma)}{3(9+4\gamma)} \right) \|\theta_0\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2\gamma(9+2\gamma)}{3(9+4\gamma)}} \|\theta_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}}^{2 - \frac{4\gamma(6+\gamma)}{3(9+4\gamma)}} \right]^{-1}$ . A priori estimate (4.5) together with (1.2) yield

$$\|\theta(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}} \leq 4 \|\theta_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}}, \text{ for all } 0 \leq t \leq \left[ 4C \|\theta_0\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2\gamma(9+2\gamma)}{3(9+4\gamma)}} \|\theta_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}}^{2 - \frac{4\gamma(6+\gamma)}{3(9+4\gamma)}} \right]^{-1},$$

and then  $\|\theta(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}}$  does not blow up until

$$T_1 = \frac{1}{C_1 \|\theta_0\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2\gamma(9+2\gamma)}{3(9+4\gamma)}} \|\theta_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}}^{2 - \frac{4\gamma(6+\gamma)}{3(9+4\gamma)}}}, \quad (4.6)$$

where  $C_1$  is a constant that can be bounded from below and above for all  $\gamma \in [\gamma_0, 1]$ . Thus, in (3.1) we can consider  $T_1$  as in (4.6).

On the other hand, using Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality, we can estimate  $T^*$  in (3.2) as

$$T^* = C\alpha^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \|\theta_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})}^{\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}} \leq t_\gamma,$$

where

$$t_\gamma = Ck_0^{\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}} \alpha^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \|\theta_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}}^{\frac{\gamma}{3(1-\gamma)}} \|\theta_0\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2\gamma}{3(1-\gamma)}}$$

with  $k_0$  independent of  $\gamma, \alpha$  and  $\theta_0$ .

We claim that for  $\gamma$  sufficiently close to 1 we can choose  $\alpha \in (1 - \gamma, 1/2]$  such that  $t_\gamma < T_1$ . Taking  $C_2 = C_1 k_0^{\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}}$ , this is equivalent to

$$C_0 C_2 \alpha^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \|\theta_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}}^{2 - \frac{4\gamma(6+\gamma)}{3(9+4\gamma)} + \frac{\gamma}{3(1-\gamma)}} \|\theta_0\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2\gamma(9+2\gamma)}{3(9+4\gamma)} + \frac{2\gamma}{3(1-\gamma)}} \leq 1. \quad (4.7)$$

Next, let us choose  $R > 0$  sufficiently large so that

$$\|\theta_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{T})}^{1 - \frac{2\gamma}{3}} \|\theta_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}^{\frac{2\gamma}{3}} \leq \|\theta_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{T})} \leq R. \quad (4.8)$$

In view of (4.7) and (4.8), taking  $C_3 = C_0 C_2$  it is sufficient to have that

$$C_3 \alpha^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} R^{\frac{18-3\gamma-2\gamma^2}{(1-\gamma)(9+4\gamma)}} \leq 1$$

or, equivalently,

$$\alpha \leq R^{-\frac{18-3\gamma-2\gamma^2}{9+4\gamma}} C_3^{-(1-\gamma)}. \quad (4.9)$$

Choosing  $\alpha = \min \left\{ 2(1 - \gamma), \frac{1}{2} \right\}$ , it follows from (4.9) that there exists  $\gamma_1 := \gamma_1(R) \in [\gamma_0, 1]$  such that  $T^* \leq t_\gamma < T_1$  for all  $\gamma \in [\gamma_1, 1]$ , which gives the claim.

Next, let  $T_{\max}$  be the maximal existence time for the solution (3.1) of (1.1). Assume by contradiction that  $T_{\max} < \infty$ . We have that  $\theta \in C([0, T_{\max}); \dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{T}))$  with  $T^* < T_1 \leq T_{\max}$ . Then, by Theorem 3.1,  $\theta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T} \times (T^*, T_{\max}])$  and, in particular,  $\theta(T_{\max}) \in \dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{T})$ . So, by using standard arguments and the local-existence of [11], we can extend  $\theta$  in the class (3.1) to a time-interval  $[0, T_2)$  with  $T_{\max} < T_2$ , which is a contradiction. It follows that  $T_{\max} = \infty$  and  $\theta$  is a global  $\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}$ -solution (which is classical) for (1.1). ■

## References

- [1] G. R. Baker, X. Li and A. C. Morlet, Analytic structure of 1D-transport equations with nonlocal fluxes, *Physica D* 91 (1996), 349–375.
- [2] H. Bae, R. Granero-Belinchón and O. Lazar, On the local and global existence of solutions to 1D transport equations with nonlocal velocity, arXiv:1806.01011, 2018.
- [3] H. Bae, R. Granero-Belinchón and Omar Lazar, Global existence of weak solutions to dissipative transport equations with nonlocal velocity, *Nonlinearity* 31 (2018), 1484–1515.
- [4] A. Calderón and A. Zygmund, Singular integrals and periodic functions, *Studia Math.* 14 (1954), 249–271.
- [5] P. Constantin, A. Tarfulea and V. Vicol, Long time dynamics of forced critical SQGV, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 335 (2015), 93–141.
- [6] P. Constantin and J. Wu, Regularity of Hölder continuous solutions of the supercritical quasi-geostrophic equation, *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré Non Linear Analysis* 25 (6) (2008), 1103–1110.
- [7] A. Córdoba, D. Córdoba and M. Fontelos, Formation of Singularities for a Transport Equation with Nonlocal Velocity, *Annals of Mathematics* 162 (3) (2005) 1377–1389.
- [8] A. Córdoba and D. Córdoba, A maximum principle applied to quasi-geostrophic equations, *Commun. Math. Phys.* (2004) (249) 511–528.
- [9] M. Coti Zelati and V. Vicol, On the global regularity for the supercritical SQG equation. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* 65 (2) (2016), 535–552.
- [10] T. Do, On a 1D transport equation with nonlocal velocity and supercritical dissipation, *Journal of Differential Equations*, 256 (9) (2014), 3166–3178.
- [11] H. Dong, Well-posedness for a transport equation with nonlocal velocity, *Journal of Functional Analysis* 255 (11) (2008), 3070–3097.
- [12] N. Ju, Dissipative 2D quasi-geostrophic equation: local well-posedness, global regularity and similarity solutions, *Indiana University mathematics journal*, (2007), 187–206.
- [13] A. Kiselev, Nonlocal maximum principles for active scalars, *Advances in Mathematics*, 227 (5) 2011, 1806–1826.
- [14] A. Kiselev, Regularity and blow up for active scalars. *Math. Model. Nat. Phenom.* 5 (4) (2010), 225–255.
- [15] D. Li and J. Rodrigo, Blow-up of solutions for a 1D transport equation with nonlocal velocity and supercritical dissipation, *Advances in Mathematics*, 217 (6) (2008), 2563–2568.
- [16] L. Silvestre and V. Vicol, On a transport equation with nonlocal drift, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 368 (2016), 6159–6188