

# ASYMPTOTIC STABILITY FOR THE 3D NAVIER-STOKES EQUATIONS IN $L^3$ AND NEARBY SPACES

ZACHARY BRADSHAW AND WEINAN WANG

ABSTRACT. We provide a short proof of  $L^3$ -asymptotic stability around vector fields that are small in weak- $L^3$ , including small Landau solutions. We show that asymptotic stability also holds for vector fields in the range of Lorentz spaces strictly between  $L^3$  and weak- $L^3$ , as well as in the closure of the test functions in weak- $L^3$ . To provide a comprehensive perspective on the matter, we observe that asymptotic stability of Landau solutions does not generally extend to weak- $L^3$  via a counterexample.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

We consider the following perturbed version of the Navier-Stokes equations:

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t u - \Delta u + u \cdot \nabla u + u \cdot \nabla U + U \cdot \nabla u + \nabla p = 0 \\ \nabla \cdot u = 0 \\ u(x, 0) = u_0. \end{cases}$$

where  $U(x, t) \in L^\infty(0, \infty; L^{3, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^3))$  is divergence free with

$$\|U\|_{L^\infty(0, \infty; L^{3, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^3))} \leq A < \infty,$$

for some  $A$ . We will also assume that  $U \in C([0, \infty); L^{3, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^3))$ . Note that  $L^{3, \infty}$  denotes the weak- $L^3$  space. It is the endpoint space in the nested scale of Lorentz spaces  $L^{3, q}$  in which  $L^{3, 3} = L^3$ . The Navier-Stokes equations, which model the motion of viscous incompressible fluids, are obtained from (1.1) by setting  $U = 0$ . If  $U$  and  $V$  are themselves solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations, possibly supplemented with a common forcing term, then their difference  $u = U - V$  solves (1.1). It is therefore the correct context to study asymptotic stability which asks:

If  $U$  is a given solution to the stationary Navier-Stokes equations which is perturbed by  $u_0$  to obtain a solution  $V$  to the evolutionary Navier-Stokes equations, does the solution  $u = U - V$  to (1.1) go to zero in some sense as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ ?

This problem has been studied in a number of contexts. If  $U$  is a Landau solution—i.e. a  $-1$ -homogeneous jet-entrained solution to the stationary Navier-Stokes equations satisfying an exact formula—then  $L^2$ -asymptotic stability was shown in [6] provided the Landau solution is small. Note that in this application, while the Landau solution  $U$  as well as the perturbed solution are forced, their difference, which solves (1.1), is not forced as the forces cancel. This was later extended to general vector fields like  $U$  [7]. The  $L^3$ -asymptotic stability of Landau solutions was introduced by Li, Zhang and Zhang in [10] where it is shown that, if  $u_0$  is small enough in  $L^3$  and the background Landau solution is also sufficiently small, then there exists a unique global strong solution to (1.1) for which  $\|u\|_{L^3} \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . This has been generalized in [16, 15].

We will provide a new perspective on the  $L^3$ -asymptotic stability in [10]. The most visible difference in our work will be that  $U$  is not restricted to the class of Landau solutions. Indeed, it can be any prescribed divergence free vector field satisfying the conditions below (1.1) and does not need to satisfy any PDE. This relaxation is not merely academic as it will simplify the argument

for asymptotic stability. Relaxing the conditions on  $U$  will necessitate a new treatment of the term  $u \cdot \nabla U + U \cdot \nabla u$  because we cannot use Morrey's inequality as is done in [10]. A benefit of our approach is its flexibility which allows us to explore asymptotic stability beyond  $L^3$  by formulating our results for data in the Lorentz spaces  $L^{3,q}$  where  $3 < q < \infty$  and data in the closure of the test functions under the  $L^{3,\infty}$  quasinorm. These spaces include progressively rougher data as evidenced by the chain of embeddings,

$$L^3 \subsetneq L^{3,3 < q < \infty} \subsetneq \overline{C_c^\infty}^{L^{3,\infty}} \subsetneq L^{3,\infty}.$$

To round things out, we show that there exist initial perturbations  $u_0$  of Landau solutions in  $L^{3,\infty}$  which do not converge to the Landau solution in  $L^{3,\infty}$ , regardless of how small the initial perturbation is.

Our first theorem concerns the well-posedness of (1.1).

**Theorem 1.1** (Global well-posedness). *Let  $u_0 \in L^{3,q}$  with  $3 \leq q \leq \infty$  be divergence free. Let  $U$  be given, also divergence free with  $U \in C([0, \infty); L^{3,\infty})^1$  with*

$$\sup_{0 \leq t < \infty} \|U\|_{L^{3,\infty}} < A < \infty.$$

*There exist  $\epsilon_1$  and  $\epsilon_2$  so that, if  $A < \epsilon_1$  and  $\|u_0\|_{L^{3,q}} < \epsilon_2$ , then there exists a unique  $u \in C([0, \infty); L^{3,q})$  which solves (3.6) and satisfies*

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(0, \infty; L^{3,q})} \leq C \|u_0\|_{L^{3,q}},$$

*for a universal constant  $C$ .*

We prove this using a modification of Kato's algorithm. To do this we first formulate a fixed point theorem tailored to the structure of (1.1). We then establish integral estimates for the terms containing  $U$  by splitting  $U$  into a large-scale and small-scale part. Ultimately, this leads to a mild solution of the form

$$u(x, t) = e^{t\Delta} u_0 - \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\Delta} \mathbb{P} \nabla \cdot (u \otimes u) ds - \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\Delta} \mathbb{P} (u \cdot \nabla U + U \cdot \nabla u) ds.$$

In essence, we are extending Kato's result and approach, which is for  $U = 0$ , to a generalized version of the Navier-Stokes equations, (1.1), where  $U \neq 0$  is small. As will be visible in our proof, when  $q < \infty$  it suffices to have  $U \in L^\infty([0, \infty); L^{3,\infty})$ ; in particular, continuity is not needed. We include the continuity assumption as it allows us to outsource the proof of the  $q = \infty$  case to [12].

When  $q = 3$  and  $U$  is a small Landau solution, this result was proven in [10]. Let us briefly compare our approach to that of [10]. In [10] the linear operator  $\mathcal{L}v = -\Delta v + \mathbb{P}(v \cdot \nabla U + U \cdot \nabla v)$  is studied independently and a semigroup theory is developed for  $e^{t\mathcal{L}}$ . Then, (1.1) is formulated as an integral equation via the formula

$$u(x, t) = e^{t\mathcal{L}} u_0 - \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\mathcal{L}} \mathbb{P} \nabla \cdot (u \otimes u) ds.$$

This is essentially viewing the nonlinear problem (1.1) as a perturbation of  $\partial_t v + \mathcal{L}v = 0$ . Our approach avoids the semigroup theory for  $e^{t\mathcal{L}}$  by viewing (1.1) as a perturbation of the heat equation.

In [10], data in either  $L^p$  for some  $3 < p < \infty$  or in  $L^3$  with large norm are also considered and local well-posedness established. Since our primary interest is asymptotic stability, which is not meaningful for time-local solutions, we do not pursue these results but note they can be derived from our fixed-point theorem following Kato's argument.

Our main asymptotic stability result is as follows.

---

<sup>1</sup>Note that inclusion in  $C([0, \infty); L^{3,\infty})$  is understood to mean strong continuity for  $t > 0$  and continuity in terms of  $L^{3/2,1}$ - $L^{3,\infty}$  duality at  $t = 0$ .

**Theorem 1.2** (Asymptotic stability). *Suppose  $3 \leq q \leq \infty$ . For  $U$ ,  $u_0$  and  $u$  as in Theorem 1.1 but with  $A \leq \epsilon_1/2$  and  $\|u_0\|_{L^{3,q}} \leq \epsilon_2/2$  and with the extra assumption that  $u_0 \in \overline{C_{c,\sigma}^\infty}^{L^{3,\infty}}$  when  $q = \infty$ , we have*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|u\|_{L^{3,q}}(t) = 0.$$

Our proof of asymptotic stability re-formulates  $L^3$ -asymptotic stability in terms of  $L^2$ -asymptotic stability as studied by Karch et. al. [7]. In that paper, it is shown that  $L^2$ -perturbations around vector fields like  $U$ , e.g., uniformly small in  $L^{3,\infty}$ , are asymptotically stable. Our observation is that, if we start with  $U$  and perturb it by something small in  $L^3$ , call it  $v$ , then the perturbation  $U + v$  can be written as  $(U + V) + u$  where  $u$  is still small in  $L^3$  but *is also in an energy class* while  $U + V$  is still small in  $L^{3,\infty}$ —this has the form of the solutions for which  $L^2$ -asymptotic stability is proven in [7]. It follows that  $\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}(t_k) \rightarrow 0$  for some sequence  $t_k \rightarrow \infty$ . By a Sobolev embedding, we have that the  $L^6$  norm of  $u$  is small at some time and, by interpolation, so is the  $L^3$  norm. This means we can make the  $L^3$  norm of  $V + u$  as small as we like at a particular large time which depends on how small we want  $V + u$  to be. Applying Theorem 1.1 at this time implies that the solution remains small at all later times. This leads to asymptotic stability. A splitting argument also appears in the proof of convergence in [10] (which is reminiscent of Calderon’s [4]; see also [9, p. 259]) but we note that our result is streamlined by the relaxation of Theorem 1.1 to velocities other than Landau solutions. In particular, when we split  $U + v$  into  $(U + V) + u$ , we can use Theorem 1.1 to solve for  $u$  instead of having to construct it by hand as in [10].

This argument can be extended to the Lorentz spaces  $L^{3,q}$  when  $q < \infty$  because the closure of  $C_c^\infty$  under the  $L^{3,q}$  norm is all of  $L^{3,q}$ . By definition, this property also holds in  $\overline{C_c^\infty}^{L^{3,\infty}}$ . This however fails in general when  $q = \infty$  meaning that we cannot decompose  $v$  into  $V + u$  as in the above picture. As justified in the following theorem, this failure cannot be avoided.

**Theorem 1.3** (Asymptotic stability fails in  $L^{3,\infty}$ ). *Let  $U = u_L(x)$  be a Landau solution which satisfies the size requirement in Theorem 1.1, i.e.  $\|u_L\|_{L^{3,\infty}} < \epsilon_1$ . For any  $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_2)$ , there exists  $u_0 \in L^{3,\infty}$  for which  $\|u_0\|_{L^{3,\infty}} < \epsilon$  so that*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|u\|_{L^{3,\infty}} > 0,$$

where  $u$  is the solution to (1.1) referenced in Theorem 1.1.

In other words, asymptotic stability around Landau solutions fails for some initial perturbations in  $L^{3,\infty}$  regardless of how small the Landau solution or the initial perturbation are in  $L^{3,\infty}$  and, therefore, Theorem 1.2 cannot be generalized to  $L^{3,\infty}$ . Of course, Theorem 1.1 implies the perturbed solution is stable in that it remains within a finite distance in  $L^{3,\infty}$  of the Landau solution, provided the initial difference is small. The initial perturbations we use in the theorem are scaling invariant. Classically, for the Navier-Stokes equations, if small-data global well-posedness holds in a class admitting self-similar initial data, e.g. in  $L^{3,\infty}$ , then the global solution associated with a sufficiently small self-similar initial datum is itself self-similar. Since the  $L^{3,\infty}$  norm of a self-similar solution is independent of time, it cannot go to zero. Because Landau solutions are self-similar, the same argument applies to the *perturbed* Navier-Stokes equations (1.1) around a Landau solution  $U$ .

**Organization:** Section 2 contains definitions and preliminary ideas. Section 3 contains the fixed point argument and the proof of Theorem 1.1. Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 are proven in Section 4.

## 2. DEFINITIONS AND PRELIMINARIES

First, we define Lorentz spaces.

**Definition 2.1.** *For a measurable function  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we define:*

$$d_{f,\Omega}(\alpha) := |\{x \in \Omega : |f(x)| > \alpha\}|.$$

Then, the Lorentz spaces  $L^{p,q}(\Omega)$  with  $1 \leq p < \infty$ ,  $1 \leq q \leq \infty$  is the set of all functions  $f$  on  $\Omega$  such that the quasi-norm  $\|f\|_{L^{p,q}(\Omega)}$  is finite and

$$\|f\|_{L^{p,q}(\Omega)} := \left( p \int_0^\infty \alpha^q d_{f,\Omega}(\alpha)^{\frac{q}{p}} \frac{d\alpha}{\alpha} \right)^{1/q}$$

$$\|f\|_{L^{p,\infty}(\Omega)} := \sup_{\alpha>0} \alpha d_{f,\Omega}(\alpha)^{1/p}.$$

The space  $L^{p,\infty}$  coincides with weak- $L^p$ . We also have  $\|f\|_{L^{p,p}(\Omega)} = \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)}$  and  $L^{p,q_1}(\Omega) \subset L^{p,q_2}(\Omega)$  whenever  $1 \leq q_1 \leq q_2 \leq \infty$ , with the embedding being continuous.

The following is a standard heat semigroup estimate [5, Proposition 3.2].

**Proposition 2.2** (Heat estimate). *Let  $1 < p \leq r < \infty$  and  $1 < q \leq \infty$ , then*

$$\|e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^{p_1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim t^{-\frac{n}{2}(\frac{1}{p_2} - \frac{1}{p_1})} \|f\|_{L^{p_2,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

The next lemma is Young's convolution inequality in Lorentz spaces. It is also known as "O'Neil's convolution inequality" and a variation on what originally appeared as [13, Theorem 2.6]. We use the version in Blozinski [1, Theorem 2.12] which characterizes the constants more precisely than in [13].

**Lemma 2.3** (Young's convolution inequality in Lorentz spaces, [1]). *Suppose  $f \in L^{p_1,q_1}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ ,  $g \in L^{p_2,q_2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  with  $1 < p_1, p_2, r < \infty$  and  $0 < q_1, q_2, s \leq \infty$ ,*

$$1/r + 1 = 1/p_1 + 1/p_2 \quad \text{and} \quad 1/s \leq 1/q_1 + 1/q_2$$

*Then  $f * g \in L^{r,s}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  and*

$$\|f * g\|_{L^{r,s}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C(r, q_1, q_2, s) \|f\|_{L^{p_1,q_1}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \|g\|_{L^{p_2,q_2}(\mathbb{R}^3)},$$

where

$$(2.1) \quad C(r, q_1, q_2, s) \begin{cases} = O(r(\alpha^{\frac{1}{\alpha} - \frac{1}{s}})), & \text{if } 1/\alpha = 1/q_1 + 1/q_2, s \geq 1 \\ \leq O(2^{s/r} - 1)^{-1/s} (\alpha^{\frac{1}{\alpha} - \frac{1}{s}}), & \text{if } 1/\alpha = 1/q_1 + 1/q_2, 0 < s < 1. \end{cases}$$

*Remark 2.4.* By the preceding inequality it is easy to see that, letting  $K$  be the kernel of the Oseen tensor we have for  $3 < p < \infty$  and  $C = C(p, \infty) = O(p(p^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{p}})) = O(p)$  (in other words, we use the first case of (2.1) with  $r = s = q_1 = \alpha = p \geq 1$ ),

$$\|D^\alpha \mathbb{P} e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^p} \leq Cp \|D^\alpha K(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{3p/(3+2p),p}} \|f\|_{L^{3,\infty}} \leq Cp \|D^\alpha K(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{3p/(3+2p)}} \|f\|_{L^{3,q}},$$

where  $\alpha$  is a multi-index in  $\mathbb{N}_0^n$  and we have used the embeddings  $L^{r,s} \subset L^{r,s'}$  for  $s' > s$  twice, noting that  $3p/(3+2p) < p$  for all  $p$ . It follows that

$$\|D^\alpha \mathbb{P} e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^p} \leq C p t^{-|\alpha|/2 - 3(1/3 - 1/p)/2} \|f\|_{L^{3,q}},$$

where the constant depends on  $|\alpha|$ .

**2.1. The weak solutions of Karch et. al.** [7]. In a series of papers [6, 7], Karch and Pilarczyk, along with Schonbek in [7], establish asymptotic stability for a class of weak solutions generalizing the Leray-Hopf weak solutions for Navier-Stokes to the perturbed Navier-Stokes equations. We recall the following definition from [7].

**Definition 2.5.** *Let  $u_0 \in L^2$  and  $T \in (0, \infty]$ . A vector field  $u$  is a weak solution to (1.1) on  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times [0, T]$  if it satisfies (1.1) in a weak sense (see [7, Def. 2.6] for the precise definition of this) and belongs to the space*

$$C_w^\infty([0, T]; L_\sigma^2(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^2((0, T]; \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)),$$

where  $L_\sigma^2$  is the closure of divergence free test functions in  $L^2$ .

We will use the following theorem of Karch et. al., which is [7, Theorem 2.7].

**Theorem 2.6** ( $L^2$ -asymptotic stability). *For every  $u_0 \in L^2_\sigma$ ,  $U$  as given below (1.1) and each  $T > 0$ , the problem (1.1) has a weak solution  $u$  for which the strong energy inequality*

$$\|u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + 2(1 - AK) \int_s^t \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 ds \leq \|u(s)\|_{L^2}^2,$$

*holds for almost every  $s \geq 0$  (including  $s = 0$ ) and every  $t \geq s$ , where  $K$  is a universal constant and we are assuming  $1 - AK > 0$  (this amounts to a smallness condition on  $A$ ). Furthermore we have*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 = 0.$$

We will also need a weak-strong uniqueness result which connects the solutions we construct in Theorem 1.1 to those in Theorem 2.6.

**Theorem 2.7** (Weak-strong uniqueness). *Suppose  $u_0 \in L^{3,q} \cap L^2_\sigma$  and is small in  $L^{3,q}$  as required by Theorem 1.1. Let  $u$  denote the global weak solution in Theorem 2.6. Let  $v$  denote the global strong solution in Theorem 1.1. Then  $u = v$ .*

*Proof sketch.* The details of this sort of proof are well known when  $q = 3$ —see, e.g., [14, Theorem 4.4]. The only modification here is the use of the estimate<sup>2</sup>

$$\int f \cdot \nabla U g \, dx \leq K \|U\|_{L^{3,\infty}} \|\nabla f\|_{L^2} \|\nabla g\|_{L^2}.$$

In the context of a typical weak-strong uniqueness proof, this shows up when bounding

$$\int w \cdot \nabla v w \, dx \leq K \|v\|_{L^{3,\infty}} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^2,$$

where  $w = u - v$ . By taking  $\|v\|_{L^{3,\infty}} \lesssim K^{-1}$ , which amounts to a smallness condition in Theorem 1.1, formal energy estimates can be closed. When  $3 \leq q < \infty$ , this argument still applies because  $L^{3,q}$  embeds continuously in  $L^{3,\infty}$ .  $\square$

### 3. A FIXED POINT ARGUMENT

Recall the following fixed point theorem: If  $E$  is a Banach space and  $B : E \times E \rightarrow E$  is a bounded bilinear transform satisfying

$$(3.1) \quad \|B(e, f)\|_E \leq C_B \|e\|_E \|f\|_E,$$

and if  $\|e_0\|_E \leq \varepsilon \leq (4C_B)^{-1}$ , then the equation  $e = e_0 - B(e, e)$  has a solution with  $\|e\|_E \leq 2\varepsilon$  and this solution is unique in  $\overline{B}(0, 2\varepsilon)$ . We make use of the following linear perturbation of this.

**Proposition 3.1.** *If  $E$  is a Banach space and  $B : E \times E \rightarrow E$  is a bounded bilinear transform satisfying*

$$(3.2) \quad \|B(e, f)\|_E \leq C_B \|e\|_E \|f\|_E,$$

*and if  $\|e_0\|_E \leq \varepsilon \leq (4C_B)^{-1}$ , and  $U$  is given and satisfies,*

$$(3.3) \quad \|B(e, U)\|_E + \|B(U, e)\|_E \leq \frac{1}{8} \|e\|_E,$$

*then the equation  $e = e_0 - B(e, e) - B(U, e) - B(e, U)$  has a solution with  $\|e\|_E \leq 3\varepsilon/2$  and this solution is unique in  $\overline{B}(0, 3\varepsilon/2)$ .*

<sup>2</sup>Note that this is the genesis of the constant  $K$  appearing in Theorem 2.6.

*Proof.* One just sets up a Picard scheme with

$$e_n = e_0 - B(e_{n-1}, e_{n-1}) - B(U, e_{n-1}) - B(e_{n-1}, U).$$

We have

$$\|e_1\|_E \leq \varepsilon + \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon + \frac{1}{8}\varepsilon \leq \frac{3}{2}\varepsilon.$$

In principle,  $C_B$  is large and, in particular, we assume  $C_B \geq 1$ . By induction, if  $e_{n-1}$  satisfies the bound written above for  $e_1$  then

$$(3.4) \quad \|e_n\|_E \leq \frac{3}{2}\varepsilon$$

and, therefore, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\|e_n\|_E \leq \frac{3}{2}\varepsilon.$$

We have also that

$$e_{n+1} - e_n = -B(e_n, e_n) - B(U, e_n) - B(e_n, U) + B(e_{n-1}, e_{n-1}) + B(U, e_{n-1}) + B(e_{n-1}, U).$$

It follows that

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \|e_{n+1} - e_n\|_E &\leq C_B \|e_{n+1}\|_E \|e_n - e_{n-1}\|_E + C_B \|e_n\|_E \|e_n - e_{n-1}\|_E + \frac{1}{4} \|e_n - e_{n-1}\|_E \\ &\leq \left(\frac{3}{4} + \frac{1}{8}\right) \|e_n - e_{n-1}\|_E. \end{aligned}$$

This implies the sequence is Cauchy and therefore has a limit  $e$  in  $E$  and  $\|e\|_E \leq 3\varepsilon/2$ . The uniform bounds and continuity of the bilinear operator guarantee that  $e = e_0 - B(e, e) - B(U, e) - B(e, U)$ . If  $f$  satisfies  $f = e_0 - B(f, f) - B(U, f) - B(f, U)$  and  $\|f\|_E \leq 7/(16C_B)$ , then

$$\|e - f\|_E \leq \frac{7}{8} \|e - f\|_E,$$

implying  $e$  is unique. □

In what follows we will apply this to the operator

$$B(u, v) = - \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\Delta} \mathbb{P} \nabla \cdot (u \otimes v) ds.$$

where  $\mathbb{P}$  is the Leray projector. Applying the Leray projection to (1.1) as well as Duhamel's principle results in the following mild formulation of (1.1),

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} u(x, t) &= e^{t\Delta} u_0 - \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\Delta} \mathbb{P} \nabla \cdot (u \otimes u) ds - \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\Delta} \mathbb{P} (u \cdot \nabla U + U \cdot \nabla u) ds \\ &= e^{t\Delta} u_0 + B(u, u) + B(u, U) + B(U, u). \end{aligned}$$

We are now ready to prove our global well-posedness result.

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* We first prove the case when  $3 \leq q < \infty$ . The case  $q = \infty$  will be given at the end of the proof. We define a Kato-type space:

$$\|\cdot\|_K = \sup_{3 < p < \infty} \|\cdot\|_{K_p},$$

where

$$\|u\|_{K_p} = \sup_{0 < t < \infty} \frac{1}{t^{1/2-3/(2p)}} \|u\|_{L^p(t)}.$$

The appearance of  $p^{-1}$  reflects the appearance of  $p$  in the constants on the right-hand side of the final display in Remark 2.4. Note that to get estimates for (1.1) with  $U = 0$  it suffices to only consider several of the Kato spaces  $K_p$ . It seems to treat the generalized case they must all be included as we will eventually need to estimate  $\|u\|_{K_p}$  in terms of  $\|u\|_{K_{2p}}$ .

Let  $\|\cdot\|_X = \sup\{\|\cdot\|_K, \|\cdot\|_Y\}$ , where  $Y = L^\infty((0, \infty); L^{3,q})$ . Our strategy is to apply the fixed point theorem with  $E = X$ .

**3.1. Bilinear estimates.** For a value  $\delta > 0$  which we will eventually specify, we write  $U(x, t) = U_{low} + U_{high}$  where

$$U_{high} = U\chi_{\{|U| \geq \delta\sqrt{t}^{-1}\}}.$$

Let

$$S_t = \{|U| \geq \delta\sqrt{t}^{-1}\}.$$

Note that  $\|U_{high}\|_{L^{3,\infty}} \leq \|U\|_{L^{3,\infty}}$  and  $|S_t| \leq \left(\frac{\sqrt{t}}{\delta}\right)^3 \|U_{high}\|_{L^{3,\infty}}^3$ . On the other hand,  $\|U_{low}\|_{L^\infty}(t) \leq \delta\sqrt{t}^{-1}$ . Using this and Remark 2.4 we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|B(u, U_{low})\|_{L^p}(t) &\lesssim p\delta \int_0^t \frac{1}{(t-s)^{1/2+3(1/3-1/p)/2} s^{1/2}} \|u\|_{L^{3,q}}(s) ds \\ &\lesssim p\delta \int_0^t \frac{1}{(t-s)^{1-3/(2p)} s^{1/2}} \|u\|_{L^{3,q}}(s) ds \\ &\lesssim p\delta t^{3/(2p)-1/2} \|u\|_Y. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$(3.7) \quad \sup_{0 < t < \infty} t^{1/2-3/(2p)} \frac{1}{p} \|B(u, U_{low})\|_{L^p}(t) \lesssim \delta \|u\|_X,$$

which means

$$\|B(u, U_{low})\|_K \lesssim \delta \|u\|_X,$$

To estimate  $\|B(u, U_{low})\|_Y$ , we have

$$(3.8) \quad \|B(u, U_{low})\|_{L^{3,q}} \lesssim \delta \int_0^t \frac{1}{(t-s)^{1/2}} \|uU_{low}\|_{L^{3,q}} ds \lesssim \delta \int_0^t \frac{1}{(t-s)^1 s^{1/2}} \|u\|_{L^{3,q}} ds.$$

Thus, we see

$$\|B(u, U_{low})\|_Y \lesssim \delta \|u\|_X.$$

We now turn our attention to the singular part of  $U$ . Observe that for  $q \geq 3$ ,

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \|B(u, U_{high})\|_{L^{3,q}} &\lesssim \|B(u, U_{high})\|_{L^3} \lesssim \int_0^t \frac{1}{(t-s)^{3/4}} \|u \otimes U_{high}\|_{L^2}(s) ds \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{10} \int_0^t \frac{1}{(t-s)^{3/4}} \|u\|_{L^{10}}(s) \|U_{high}\|_{L^{5/2}}(s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Note that by [3, Lemma 6.1],

$$\|U_{high}\|_{L^{5/2}}^{5/2}(s) \lesssim (\sqrt{s})^{1/2} \delta^{-1/2} \|U\|_{L^{3,\infty}}^{5/2}.$$

Hence,

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \|B(u, U_{high})\|_{L^{3,q}} &\lesssim \int_0^t \frac{\|u\|_{K_{10}}}{(t-s)^{3/4} s^{1/2-3/(20)}} ((\sqrt{s})^{1/2} \delta^{-1/2} \|U\|_{L^{3,\infty}}^{5/2})^{2/5} ds \\ &\lesssim \delta^{-1/5} \|U\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^{3,\infty}} \|u\|_{K_{10}} \int_0^t \frac{1}{(t-s)^{3/4} s^{1/4}} ds \\ &\lesssim \delta^{-1/5} \|U\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^{3,\infty}} \|u\|_X. \end{aligned}$$

Regarding estimates in  $K$ , observe that for  $3 < p < \infty$ ,<sup>3</sup>

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{p} \|B(u, U_{high})\|_{L^p}(t) &\lesssim \frac{1}{p} \int_0^t \frac{1}{(t-s)^{1/2+3(1/r-1/p)/2}} \|u \otimes U_{high}\|_{L^r}(s) ds \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{2p} \int_0^t \frac{1}{(t-s)^{1/2+3(1/r-1/p)/2}} \|U_{high}\|_{L^{\bar{r}}}(s) \|u\|_{L^{2p}} ds \end{aligned}$$

where we will need  $r < 3$ ,  $3(1/r - 1/p)/2 < 1/2$  and

$$\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{\bar{r}} + \frac{1}{2p}.$$

Provided  $\bar{r} < 3$  we have

$$\int_{S_s} |U_{high}|^{\bar{r}} \lesssim \|U_{high}\|_{L^{3,\infty}}^{\bar{r}} |S_s|^{1-\bar{r}/3} = \|U_{high}\|_{L^{3,\infty}}^{\bar{r}} (\sqrt{s}/\delta)^{3-\bar{r}}.$$

Hence,

$$(3.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{p} \|B(u, U_{high})\|_{L^p}(t) &\lesssim \frac{1}{2p} \int_0^t \frac{1}{(t-s)^{1/2+3(1/r-1/p)/2}} \|U_{high}\|_{L^{3,\infty}} (\sqrt{s}/\delta)^{3/\bar{r}-1} \|u\|_{L^{2p}}(s) ds \\ &\lesssim \delta^{1-3/\bar{r}} \|u\|_{K_{2p}} \|U\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^{3,\infty}} \int_0^t \frac{s^{-1/2+3(1/r-1/(2p))/2}}{(t-s)^{1/2+3(1/r-1/p)/2} s^{1/2-3/(4p)}} ds \\ &\lesssim \delta^{1-3/\bar{r}} \|u\|_X \|U\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^{3,\infty}} t^{3/(2p)-1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

implying

$$(3.13) \quad \|B(u, U_{high})\|_{K_p} \lesssim \delta^{1-3/\bar{r}} \|u\|_X \|U\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^{3,\infty}}.$$

For the preceding argument to make sense we needed to have

$$r < 3; \quad 3(1/r - 1/p) < 1/2; \quad \bar{r} < 3.$$

The middle condition and last condition are met provided

$$\frac{3p}{p+3} < r < \frac{6p}{2p+3}.$$

As  $\frac{3p}{p+3} < \frac{6p}{2p+3} < 3$  for all  $3 < p < \infty$ , we can always choose an appropriate  $r \in (3/2, 3)$ . At this stage we have confirmed that

$$\|B(u, U_{high})\|_X \lesssim (\delta^{1-3/\bar{r}} + \delta^{-1/5}) \|u\|_X \|U\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^{3,\infty}}.$$

Note that since  $\bar{r} \in (3/2, 3)$ , assuming  $\delta < 1$ , the dependence on  $\bar{r}$  can be eliminated above and we obtain

$$\|B(u, U_{high})\|_X \lesssim \delta^{-1} \|u\|_X \|U\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^{3,\infty}}.$$

So, by first taking  $\delta$  small and basing a smallness condition on  $\|U\|_{L^\infty L^{3,\infty}}$  in terms of  $\delta$  and universal constants, we can ensure that

$$\|B(u, U)\|_X \leq \frac{1}{16} \|u\|_X.$$

By a symmetric argument we have the same bound for  $\|B(U, u)\|_X$ .

We have explicitly worked out the bilinear estimates for the terms involving  $U$  but have not mentioned  $B(u, u)$ . Inspecting the estimates above, we may replace  $B(u, U)$  with  $B(u, u)$  and set  $\delta = 1$  to obtain

$$\|B(u, u)\|_X \lesssim \|u\|_X \|u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^{3,\infty}} \lesssim \|u\|_X^2,$$

---

<sup>3</sup>Compared to Kato's original paper [8], we need to include the full range of  $K_p$  norms  $3 < p < \infty$  as we are only able to bound  $K_p$  using  $K_{2p}$ .



where we have used the continuous embedding  $L^{3,q} \subset L^{3,\infty}$ . The suppressed constant in the preceding estimate becomes  $C_B$  in Proposition 3.1. At this stage, we have confirmed that by requiring  $A \geq \|U\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^{3,\infty}}$  to be small, we can apply Proposition 3.1 to obtain a unique solution  $u$  to (1.1) which is in  $X$ .

**3.2. Time continuity.** We now show continuity in time of the  $L^{3,q}$  norms of  $u$  for  $t > 0$ . Continuity at  $t = 0$ —i.e. convergence to the initial data—will be addressed after this. We follow the approach in [14], which is based on [8].

We begin by establishing continuity of the caloric extension of  $u_0$ . Taking  $t, t_1 > 0$ , we want to control  $e^{t\Delta}u_0 - e^{t_1\Delta}u_0$  in  $L^{3,q}$ . We have as  $t \rightarrow 0$

$$(e^{t\Delta}f - f)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-|z|^2/4} g(x, z, t) dz, \quad g(x, z, t) = f(x - \sqrt{t}z) - f(x).$$

By Proposition 2.2 and Minkowski's integral inequality in [11],

$$\|e^{t\Delta}f - f\|_{L^{p,q}} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-|z|^2/4} \|g(\cdot, z, t)\|_{L^{p,q}} dz \rightarrow 0,$$

where we emphasize that  $p, q < \infty$ —this fails when  $p < \infty$  and  $q = \infty$ . Next, we see by Young's convolution inequality in Lemma 2.3,

$$(3.14) \quad \left\| e^{(t+h)\Delta}f - e^{t\Delta}f \right\|_{L^{3,q}} \leq \|(4\pi(t+h))^{-3/2} e^{-x^2/4(t+h)} - (4\pi t)^{-3/2} e^{-x^2/4t}\|_{L^1} \|f\|_{L^{3,q}} \rightarrow 0,$$

as  $h \rightarrow 0$ .

For the time continuity of the Duhamel terms, we have

$$(3.15) \quad \begin{aligned} B(u, U)(t) - B(u, U)(t_1) &= \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\Delta} \mathbb{P}\nabla \cdot (u \otimes U) ds - \int_0^{t_1} e^{(t_1-s)\Delta} \mathbb{P}\nabla \cdot (u \otimes U) ds \\ &= \int_0^{\rho t_1} \left( e^{(t-\rho t_1)\Delta} - e^{(t_1-\rho t_1)\Delta} \right) e^{(\rho t_1-s)\Delta} \mathbb{P}\nabla \cdot (u \otimes U) ds \\ &\quad + \int_{\rho t_1}^t e^{(t-s)\Delta} \mathbb{P}\nabla \cdot (u \otimes U) ds - \int_{\rho t_1}^{t_1} e^{(t_1-s)\Delta} \mathbb{P}\nabla \cdot (u \otimes U) ds \\ &= I_1 + I_2 + I_3, \end{aligned}$$

where we take  $\rho \in (0, 1)$  so that  $\rho t_1 < t$  and let  $t_1$  be fixed, and will let  $t$  approach  $t_1$  from either side. Introducing  $\rho$  allows us to prove left and right continuity simultaneously.

To estimate  $I_1$ , we again use our decomposition of  $U = U_{high} + U_{low}$ , this time taking  $\delta = 1$ . For  $I_1$ , we have

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{aligned} \|I_1\|_{L^{3,q}} &\leq \int_0^{\rho t_1} \left\| \left( e^{(t-\rho t_1)\Delta} - e^{(t_1-\rho t_1)\Delta} \right) e^{(\rho t_1-s)\Delta} \mathbb{P}\nabla \cdot (u \otimes U_{high}) \right\|_{L^{3,q}} ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^{\rho t_1} \left\| \left( e^{(t-\rho t_1)\Delta} - e^{(t_1-\rho t_1)\Delta} \right) e^{(\rho t_1-s)\Delta} \mathbb{P}\nabla \cdot (u \otimes U_{low}) \right\|_{L^{3,q}} ds \\ &= I_{11} + I_{12}. \end{aligned}$$

For  $I_{12}$ , observe that for  $s, \rho$  and  $t_1$  fixed, we have  $(u \otimes U_{low})(s) \in L^{3,q}$  and so, by (2.4),

$$e^{(\rho t_1-s)\Delta} \mathbb{P}\nabla \cdot [(u \otimes U_{low})(\tau)] \in L^{3,q}.$$

Upon sending  $t \rightarrow t_1$ , this fact and (3.14) imply that

$$(3.17) \quad \left\| \left( e^{(t-\rho t_1)\Delta} - e^{(t_1-\rho t_1)\Delta} \right) e^{(\rho t_1-s)\Delta} \mathbb{P}\nabla \cdot (u \otimes U_{low}) \right\|_{L^{3,q}} \rightarrow 0.$$

This amounts to pointwise convergence as  $t \rightarrow t_1$  for  $s \in (0, \rho t_1)$ . We further have

$$(3.18) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left\| \left( e^{(t-\rho t_1)\Delta} - e^{(t_1-\rho t_1)\Delta} \right) e^{(\rho t_1-s)\Delta} \mathbb{P} \nabla \cdot (u \otimes U_{low})(s) \right\|_{L^{3,q}} \\ & \lesssim \left( \frac{1}{(t-s)^{1/2}} + \frac{1}{(t_1-s)^{1/2}} \right) s^{-1/2} \|u\|_{L^\infty(0,\infty;L^{3,q})} \in L^1(0, \rho t_1). \end{aligned}$$

Applying the dominated convergence theorem now implies that  $I_{12} \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow t_1$ . The argument for  $I_{11}$  is identical once we observe that  $L^{3,q}$  embeds continuously in  $L^3$  and

$$\|e^{(\rho t_1-s)\Delta} \mathbb{P} \nabla \cdot [(u \otimes U_{high})(s)]\|_{L^3} \lesssim \frac{1}{(\rho t_1-s)^{3/4} s^{1/2}} \|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_\infty} \|U_{high}\|_{L^2}(s) < \infty.$$

Hence,  $e^{(\rho t_1-s)\Delta} \mathbb{P} \nabla \cdot [(u \otimes U_{high})(\tau)] \in L^{3,q}$ .

For  $I_2$ , we again use our decomposition of  $U = U_{high} + U_{low}$ , beginning with

$$(3.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \|I_2\|_{L^{3,q}} & \leq \int_{\rho t_1}^t \|\nabla e^{(t_1-s)\Delta} \mathbb{P}(u \otimes U_{high})\|_{L^{3,q}} ds + \int_{\rho t_1}^t \|\nabla e^{(t_1-s)\Delta} \mathbb{P}(u \otimes U_{low})\|_{L^{3,q}} ds \\ & = I_{21} + I_{22}. \end{aligned}$$

For  $I_{22}$ , we use the fact that  $\|U_{low}\|_{L^\infty}(s) = \sqrt{s}^{-1}$  and get

$$(3.20) \quad \begin{aligned} I_{22} & \leq \int_{\rho t_1}^t s^{-1/2} (t-s)^{-1/2} \|u\|_{L^{3,q}} ds \\ & \leq \|u\|_{L^\infty(0,\infty;L^{3,q})} \int_{\rho t_1}^t s^{-1/2} (t-s)^{-1/2} ds \\ & \lesssim (\rho t_1)^{-1/2} (t - \rho t_1)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

which can be made small by taking  $\rho$  close to 1 and  $t$  close to  $t_1$ . For  $I_{21}$  we have

$$(3.21) \quad \begin{aligned} I_{21} & \leq \int_{\rho t_1}^t \|\nabla e^{(t_1-s)\Delta} \mathbb{P}(u \otimes U_{high})\|_{L^3} ds \\ & \lesssim \int_{\rho t_1}^t (t-s)^{-3/4} \|u\|_{L^{10}} \|U_{high}\|_{L^{5/2}} ds \\ & \lesssim \|u\|_{K_{10}} (\rho t_1)^{-7/20} \|U\|_{L^{3,\infty}} \int_{\rho t_1}^t (t-s)^{-3/4} s^{1/5} ds, \end{aligned}$$

which can also be made small by taking  $\rho$  close to 1 and  $t$  close to  $t_1$ . The estimates for  $I_3$  are essentially the same as those for  $I_2$  and we omit them. The estimates for  $B(u, u)(t) - B(u, u)(t_1)$  and  $B(U, u)(t) - B(U, u)(t_1)$  are also similar and are omitted. Taken together, these bounds imply time-continuity in  $L^{3,q}$  by first taking  $\rho$  close to 1 and then taking  $t$  close to  $t_1$ .

We now prove continuity at  $t = 0$ . For this we use an inductive argument involving the Picard iterates  $e_n$  in the proof of Proposition 3.1. We first observe that if  $u_0 \in L^{3,q}$  where  $q < \infty$ , then  $e_0 = e^{t\Delta} u_0 \rightarrow u_0$  in  $L^{3,q}$  as  $t \rightarrow 0^+$  and  $t^{1/2-3/(2p)} \|e_0\|_{L^p} \rightarrow 0$  for  $p \in (3, \infty)$  as  $t \rightarrow 0^+$ —these properties fail when  $q = \infty$ . Next, suppose these properties hold for  $e_n$ . We will show they also hold for  $e_{n+1}$ . Inspecting (3.7), (3.8), (3.10) and (3.13), we can see that

$$\|B(U, e_n)\chi_{(0,T]}\|_X \lesssim_{u_0, U} \|e_n\chi_{(0,T]}\|_X \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } T \rightarrow 0^+,$$

by assumption. Recalling that  $E$  in Proposition 3.1 is what we are have presently labeled  $X$ , we have that  $e_n \rightarrow u$  in  $X$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . This implies  $e_n\chi_{(0,T]} \rightarrow u\chi_{(0,T]}$  in  $X$ . We therefore have that

$$\|(u - e_0)\chi_{(0,T]}\|_X \leq \|(u - e_n)\chi_{(0,T]}\|_X + \|(e_n - e_0)\chi_{(0,T]}\|_X.$$

For any  $\epsilon > 0$ , we can make the right-hand side of the above small by first choosing  $n$  large and then choosing  $T$  small. Since  $e_0 \rightarrow u_0$  in  $L^{3,q}$  as  $t \rightarrow 0^+$ , it follows from the above display that  $u \rightarrow u_0$  in  $L^{3,q}$ .

**3.3. Modifications when  $q = \infty$ .** We now modify this argument for the case of  $L^{3,\infty}$  data. The fixed point argument is actually easier than in the case of  $L^{3,q < \infty}$  data as we do not need to involve the Kato classes (although we could if we wanted to). Indeed, in [12, Lemma 23], Meyer shows that if  $Z = L^{3,\infty}$  and  $E = L^\infty([0, \infty); Z) \cap C([0, \infty); Z)$ , then  $B(\cdot, \cdot)$  is continuous from  $E \times E$  into  $E$ . Since  $U$  is in  $Z = L^{3,\infty}$  uniformly in time, there is no work to be done to conclude that

$$\|B(e, U)\|_E + \|B(U, e)\|_E \leq C_B \|e\|_E \|U\|_E,$$

and so we can apply Proposition 3.1 to obtain the solution  $u$  provided  $\|U\|_E$  and  $\|u_0\|_{L^{3,\infty}}$  are small. □

#### 4. ASYMPTOTIC STABILITY, OR NOT

In this section we first prove Theorem 1.2 and then prove Theorem 1.3.

Our proof of asymptotic stability, i.e. Theorem 1.2, is based on re-framing the  $L^3$ -asymptotic stability problem in terms of the  $L^2$ -asymptotic stability theory of Karch et. al. Essentially, we will view a small element of  $L^{3,q}$  as something that can be decomposed into an  $L^{3,q}$  part—the tail—and an  $L^2$  part—the head. We can make the tail as small as we like and, applying Theorem 1.1 to it, we end up with a solution to the  $U$ -perturbed Navier-Stokes equations that is as small as we like. The  $L^2$  part, evolving from the head, is now accounted for by the  $L^2$ -asymptotic stability of [7].

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be given. Suppose that  $\|U\| \leq \epsilon_1/2$  and  $\|u_0\|_{L^{3,q}} \leq \epsilon_2/2$ . Rewrite  $u_0$  as  $\tilde{u}_0 + \bar{u}_0$  and assume  $\|\bar{u}_0\|_{L^{3,q}} < \min\{\epsilon_1/(2C), \epsilon/(2C), \epsilon_2/2\}$  while  $\tilde{u}_0 \in L^2$  and both are divergence free. This is done using the fact that  $C_{c,\sigma}^\infty$  is dense in  $L_\sigma^{3,q}$  and, by definition, also in  $\overline{C_{c,\sigma}^\infty}^{L^{3,\infty}}$ . In particular, in our splitting  $\tilde{u}_0 \in C_{c,\sigma}^\infty$ . Let  $\bar{u}$  solve (1.1) with data  $\bar{u}_0$  and perturbation term  $U$ ; this comes from Theorem 1.1. In particular we have

$$\|\bar{u}\|_{L^\infty(0,\infty;L^{3,q})} < \min\{\epsilon_1/2, \epsilon/2\}.$$

Then, consider  $\tilde{u}$  as a solution to (1.1) with initial data  $\tilde{u}_0 = u_0 - \bar{u}_0$  with  $U$  in (1.1) replaced by  $(U + \bar{u})$ . Noting that

$$\|U + \bar{u}\|_{L^\infty(0,\infty;L^{3,\infty})} \leq \|U\|_{L^\infty(0,\infty;L^{3,\infty})} + \|\bar{u}\|_{L^\infty(0,\infty;L^{3,q})} \leq \epsilon_1,$$

and

$$\|\tilde{u}_0\|_{L^{3,q}} \leq \|u_0\|_{L^{3,q}} + \|\bar{u}_0\|_{L^{3,q}} \leq \epsilon_2,$$

we can still use Theorem 1.1 to solve for  $\tilde{u}$ . But  $\tilde{u}_0$  is also chosen so that  $\tilde{u}_0 \in L^2$ . Hence, the Karch et. al. theory [7] applies and generates a time-global Leray solution which must equal  $\tilde{u}$  by weak-strong uniqueness, Theorem 2.7. By Theorem 2.6, we see that

$$\int_s^{s+1} \|\nabla \tilde{u}\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \rightarrow 0$$

as  $s \rightarrow \infty$ , at least for almost every  $s$ . Noting that  $\dot{H}^1$  embeds continuously into  $L^6$ , and since we can interpolate  $L^3$  between  $L^6$  and  $L^2$ , there must exist a time  $t_0$  at which  $\|\tilde{u}\|_{L^{3,q}}(t_0) \leq \|\tilde{u}\|_{L^3}(t_0) \leq \min\{\epsilon_2/C, \epsilon/(2C)\}$ , where we have also used the continuity of the embedding  $L^3 \subset L^{3,q}$ . We may now apply Theorem 1.1 a third time to conclude that  $\sup_{t_0 < t < \infty} \|\tilde{u}\|_{L^{3,q}} < \epsilon/2$ . Consequently

$$\sup_{t_0 < t < \infty} \|u\|_{L^{3,q}} < \epsilon.$$

Since  $\epsilon$  was arbitrary we conclude that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|u\|_{L^{3,q}} = 0.$$

□

We now prove that Theorem 1.2 is not true if  $L^{3,q}$  is replaced by  $L^{3,\infty}$  with no further stipulations. Note that a solution  $u$  is self-similar if it satisfies  $u(x, t) = \lambda u(\lambda x, \lambda^2 t)$  for every  $\lambda > 0$  and it is discretely self-similar if this possibly only holds for some  $\lambda$ . The initial data is self-similar or discretely self-similar if the preceding scaling relation holds with the time variable omitted. If we do not care that we are perturbing around a Landau solution, then the proof of Theorem 1.2 is simple: We just take  $u_0$  and  $v_0$  to be self-similar, divergence free with small difference in  $L^{3,\infty}$ . The ensuing self-similar solutions  $u$  and  $v$  then confirm Theorem 1.2 because the  $L^{3,\infty}$ -norm of their difference is scaling invariant and hence does not decay as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . The same basic idea applies when the background flow is a Landau solution because it is also scaling invariant. Note that we cannot merely take the second solution to be another Landau solution because, if two Landau solutions differ in  $L^{3,\infty}$  seminorm, then they have different forces and therefore the equation for their difference also has a forcing term.

*Proof of Theorem 1.3.* Let  $U$  be a Landau solution with small enough norm for Theorem 1.1 to apply. We will understand this as a function of  $x$  and  $t$  where  $U(x, t) = U(x)$ .

We recall a general fact about discretely self-similar vector fields:  $u_0 \in L^{3,\infty} \cap DSS$  if and only if  $u_0 \in L^3_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\}) \cap DSS$  [2]. To be more precise, in [2] Tsai and Bradshaw showed that, if  $u_0$  is  $\lambda$ -DSS then

$$\int_{1 \leq |x| \leq \lambda} |u_0|^3 dx \leq 3(\lambda - 1)^2 \|u_0\|_{L^{3,\infty}}^3,$$

and

$$\|u_0\|_{L^{3,\infty}}^3 \leq \frac{\lambda^3}{3(\lambda - 1)} \int_{1 \leq |x| \leq \lambda} |u_0|^3 dx,$$

see [2, (3.5) and (3.7)]. Let  $\tilde{u}_0 \in L^3$  satisfy  $u_0 \in C^\infty_{c,\sigma}(\{x : 1 \leq |x| \leq \lambda\})$  and  $\|\tilde{u}_0\|_{L^3} = M > 0$ . Let  $u_0$  be the  $\lambda$ -DSS extension of  $\tilde{u}_0$  to  $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\}$ . Then,  $u_0$  is divergence free in a distributional sense and  $\|u_0\|_{L^{3,\infty}} \sim_\lambda M$ . In this way we can construct discretely self-similar initial data of arbitrarily small size.

Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be given. Without loss of generality we take this less than  $\epsilon_2$  in Theorem 1.1 and less than  $\frac{\|U\|_{L^{3,\infty}}}{2}$ . Let  $u_0$  be chosen so that  $\|u_0\|_{L^{3,\infty}} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{C}$  where  $C$  is as in Theorem 1.1. By Theorem 1.1, there exists a unique solution  $u$  to (1.1) with perturbation term  $U$  and data  $u_0$ . Note that  $u_0$  is discretely self-similar, as is  $U$ . Since  $u$  is unique, by re-scaling we must have that  $u$  is also discretely self-similar. Since we know that  $u$  converges in a weak sense to  $u_0$ , we cannot have  $u = 0$  in  $L^{3,\infty}$  for all positive times. In particular, there exists  $t$  so that  $u(\cdot, t) \neq 0$  in  $L^{3,\infty}$ . But then by discretely self-similar scaling,  $\|u(\cdot, \lambda^{2k} t)\|_{L^{3,\infty}} = \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{3,\infty}} \neq 0$  in  $L^{3,\infty}$  for any  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . In particular,

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|u\|_{L^{3,\infty}} \geq \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{3,\infty}}.$$

□

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research of Z. Bradshaw was supported in part by the NSF via grant DMS-2307097 and the Simons Foundation via a TSM grant.

W. Wang was supported in part by the Simons Foundation via a TSM grant (No. 00007730), and he would like to thank Xukai Yan for discussions on Landau solutions.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. P. BLOZINSKI, *On a convolution theorem for  $L(p, q)$  spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 164 (1972), pp. 255–265.
- [2] Z. BRADSHAW AND T.-P. TSAI, *Forward discretely self-similar solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations II*, Ann. Henri Poincaré, 18 (2017), pp. 1095–1119.
- [3] ———, *Global existence, regularity, and uniqueness of infinite energy solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, 45 (2020), pp. 1168–1201.
- [4] C. P. CALDERÓN, *Existence of weak solutions for the Navier-Stokes equations with initial data in  $L^p$* , Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 318 (1990), pp. 179–200.
- [5] M. HIEBER AND T. H. NGUYEN, *Periodic solutions and their stability to the Navier-Stokes equations on a half space*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. S, 17 (2024), pp. 1899–1910.
- [6] G. KARCH AND D. PILARCZYK, *Asymptotic stability of Landau solutions to Navier-Stokes system*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 202 (2011), pp. 115–131.
- [7] G. KARCH, D. PILARCZYK, AND M. E. SCHONBEK,  *$L^2$ -asymptotic stability of singular solutions to the Navier-Stokes system of equations in  $\mathbb{R}^3$* , J. Math. Pures Appl. (9), 108 (2017), pp. 14–40.
- [8] T. KATO, *Strong  $L^p$ -solutions of the Navier-Stokes equation in  $\mathbf{R}^m$ , with applications to weak solutions*, Math. Z., 187 (1984), pp. 471–480.
- [9] P. G. LEMARIÉ-RIEUSSET, *Recent developments in the Navier-Stokes problem*, vol. 431 of Chapman & Hall/CRC Research Notes in Mathematics, Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 2002.
- [10] Y. LI, J. ZHANG, AND T. ZHANG, *Asymptotic stability of Landau solutions to Navier-Stokes system under  $L^p$ -perturbations*, J. Math. Fluid Mech., 25 (2023), pp. Paper No. 5, 30.
- [11] R. MANDEL, *Real interpolation for mixed Lorentz spaces and Minkowski’s inequality*, Z. Anal. Anwend., 42 (2023), pp. 457–469.
- [12] Y. MEYER, *Wavelets, paraproducts, and Navier-Stokes equations*, in Current developments in mathematics, 1996 (Cambridge, MA), Int. Press, Boston, MA, 1997, pp. 105–212.
- [13] R. O’NEIL, *Convolution operators and  $L^{p,q}$  spaces*, Duke Mathematical Journal, 30 (1963), pp. 129–142.
- [14] T.-P. TSAI, *Lectures on Navier-Stokes equations*, vol. 192 of Graduate Studies in Mathematics, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2018.
- [15] J. ZHANG AND T. ZHANG, *Global well-posedness of perturbed Navier-Stokes system around Landau solutions*, J. Math. Phys., 64 (2023), pp. Paper No. 011516, 7.
- [16] Z. ZHAO AND X. ZHENG, *Asymptotic stability of homogeneous solutions to Navier-Stokes equations under  $L^p$ -perturbations*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.00840, (2023).

Zachary Bradshaw, Department of Mathematics, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR, USA;  
e-mail: [zb002@uark.edu](mailto:zb002@uark.edu)

Weinan Wang, Department of Mathematics, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK, USA; e-mail:  
[ww@ou.edu](mailto:ww@ou.edu)