

# Stability of the Inviscid Power-Law Vortex in Self-Similar Coordinates

Matei P. Coiculescu

December 17, 2024

## Abstract

We prove that the stationary power-law vortex  $\bar{\omega}(x) = \beta|x|^{-\alpha}$ , which explicitly solves the unforced incompressible Euler equations in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , is linearly stable (for a class of sufficiently symmetric functions) in self-similar coordinates with the natural scaling.

## 1 Introduction

Consider the Cauchy problem of the two-dimensional Euler equations in vorticity form:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \omega + (v \cdot \nabla) \omega &= f \\ K_{BS} * \omega(\cdot, t) &= v(\cdot, t) \\ \omega(\cdot, t = 0) &= \omega_0(\cdot) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Here,  $f(x, t)$  is a real-valued forcing term and the vorticity  $\omega(x, t)$  is a real-valued function defined on  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times [0, T)$ . We consider solutions in the sense of distribution. In particular, we say  $\omega$  is a solution of Equation (1) if the following integral identity holds for every  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2 \times [0, T))$ :

$$\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (\omega(\partial_t \phi + (K_{BS} * \omega) \cdot \nabla \phi) + f \phi) dx dt = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \phi(x, 0) \omega_0(x) dx. \quad (2)$$

Here and in the sequel we denote the standard two-dimensional Biot-Savart kernel by  $K_{BS}$ . Although the operator  $\omega \rightarrow K_{BS} * \omega$  defined on Schwartz functions cannot be continuously extended to  $L^2$ , as shown in [2], it is well behaved on some closed linear subspaces of  $L^2$ . More generally, we shall show that for every  $1 < q < \infty$

there exist some closed linear subspaces of  $L^q$ , which we denote  $L_m^q$ , to which the operator can be continuously extended. Here  $m \geq 2$  is an integer and  $L_m^q$  are the  $m$ -fold rotationally symmetric functions lying in  $L^q$ . In other words, if  $R_\theta : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  is the counterclockwise rotation of angle  $\theta$  around the origin, then a function  $f \in L_m^q$  satisfies

$$f = f \circ R_{2\pi/m}.$$

We shall restrict ourselves to solutions of Equation (1) in a particular class of integrability. First, for any  $1 < q \leq \infty$  and  $2 < p \leq \infty$ , we define:

**Definition 1.** *The function  $\omega(x, t)$  is in the class  $\Upsilon_{q,p}^T$  if and only if*

$$\omega \in L_t^q([0, T], (L^1 \cap L^p)_x)$$

$$K_{BS} * \omega \in L_t^q([0, T], L_x^2)$$

**Definition 2.** *The function  $\omega(x)$  is in the class  $\Upsilon_p^0$  if and only if*

$$\omega \in (L^1 \cap L^p)_x$$

$$K_{BS} * \omega \in L_x^2$$

**Definition 3.** *The function  $\omega(x, t)$  is in the class  $\Upsilon_{q,p}^\infty$  if  $\omega \in \Upsilon_{q,p}^T$  for all  $T \geq 0$ .*

We also use a slightly different notation if the domain of times does not include the time  $t = 0$ :

**Definition 4.** *Let  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ . The function  $\omega(x, t)$  is in the class  $\Upsilon_{q,p}^{[a,b]}$  if and only if*

$$\omega \in L_t^q([a, b], (L^1 \cap L^p)_x)$$

$$K_{BS} * \omega \in L_t^q([a, b], L_x^2).$$

*We also say that  $\omega \in \Upsilon_{q,p}^{[a,\infty)}$  if and only if  $\omega \in \Upsilon_{q,p}^{[a,b]}$  for every  $b > a$ .*

One generally searches for solutions in  $\Upsilon_{\infty,p}^\infty$  with initial data in  $\Upsilon_p^0$ . The famous theorem of Yudovich, proven in [12], is:

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $\omega_0(x) \in \Upsilon_\infty^0$  and let  $f$  be some forcing term such that  $f \in \Upsilon_{1,\infty}^\infty$ . Then there exists a unique solution  $\omega(x, t)$  to Equation (1) in the class  $\Upsilon_{\infty,\infty}^\infty$  with initial data  $\omega_0$ .*

In a remarkable couplet of papers [9] and [10], Vishik provides the first evidence that the so-called ‘‘Yudovich Class’’  $L^1 \cap L^\infty$  is sharp, proving:

**Theorem 1.2.** *For every  $2 < p < \infty$ , there exists  $\omega_0(x) \in \Upsilon_p^0$  and a force  $f \in \Upsilon_{1,p}^\infty$  with the property that there are uncountably many solutions  $\omega(x, t) \in \Upsilon_{\infty,p}^\infty$  to Equation (1) with initial data  $\omega_0$ .*

The monograph [2] provides an alternative proof of Vishik’s theorem while following a similar approach, and we shall generally use the notation and terminology from [2]. Succinctly, one may describe Vishik’s general strategy as constructing an unstable radial vortex in self-similar coordinates that generates non-uniqueness while breaking radial symmetry. We now discuss the interpretation of Vishik’s proof in terms of dynamical systems proposed by the authors of the monograph [2].

We first observe that Equation (1) admits many stationary solutions in the form of “radial vortices” or vortex profiles of the form:

$$\bar{\omega}(x) = g(|x|), \quad \bar{v}(x) = \zeta(|x|)x^\perp,$$

where  $x^\perp = (-x_2, x_1)$  and  $K_{BS} * \bar{\omega} = \bar{v}$ . Suppose one could find a vortex profile  $\bar{\omega}$  that is linearly unstable, for instance that one finds a real and strictly positive eigenvalue  $\lambda$  of the linearized Euler equations and a trajectory on the unstable manifold associated to  $\lambda$  and  $\bar{\omega}$  of the form

$$\omega = \bar{\omega} + \omega_{lin} + o(e^{\lambda t}).$$

Here  $\omega_{lin} = e^{\lambda t} \eta(x)$  is a solution of the linearized Euler equations. We would then expect “non-uniqueness at time  $t = -\infty$ ” because of the instability of the vortex. The outline proposed in [2] is to instead consider a choice of self-similar coordinates for which self-similar solutions are sufficiently integrable and to find an unstable stationary vortex profile in the self-similar coordinates. Given a positive parameter  $\alpha > 0$ , one such choice of coordinates is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \xi &= xt^{-1/\alpha}, \quad \tau = \log(t) \\ v(x, t) &= t^{1/\alpha-1} V(\xi, \tau), \quad \omega(x, t) = t^{-1} \Omega(\xi, \tau). \end{aligned}$$

The Euler equations in these similarity variables, without force, are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\tau \Omega - \left(1 + \frac{\xi}{\alpha} \cdot \nabla_\xi\right) \Omega + V \cdot \nabla_\xi \Omega &= 0 \\ V &= K_{BS} * \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

If a self-similar profile  $\Omega$  satisfies  $\|\Omega\|_{L^p} = O(1)$  as  $\tau \rightarrow -\infty$ , then we also have that  $\|\omega\|_{L^p} = O(t^{-1+\frac{2}{p\alpha}})$  as  $t \rightarrow 0^+$ . In particular, choosing  $p = 2/\alpha$  ensures that the Lebesgue norms are  $O(1)$  in both coordinate systems, which is one reason why

we consider this a “natural” choice of self-similar coordinates. To prove Vishik’s theorem, one should take  $0 < \alpha \leq 2/p$ , which ensures the desired integrability. If one can find an unstable stationary solution  $\bar{\Omega}$  of the self-similar equations, then one can hope to prove non-uniqueness at time  $\tau = -\infty$ , which corresponds to non-uniqueness at physical time  $t = 0$ .

It is not difficult to see that the only stationary radial vortices solving the **unforced** self-similar Euler equations are precisely the power-law vortices of the form

$$\bar{\Omega}(\xi) = \beta(2 - \alpha)|\xi|^{-\alpha},$$

and we note that these correspond exactly to radial power-law vortices solving the unforced stationary Euler equations in the original coordinates. The exponent  $\alpha$  of the stationary profile is exactly determined by the choice of scaling for the self-similar coordinates, and the prefactor  $\beta$  is an arbitrary real number. The natural question arises: are the power-law vortices unstable in the self-similar coordinates? This question was also posed by the authors of [2]. An affirmative answer would suggest that non-uniqueness can arise from the (simple and explicit) power-law vortex, while a negative answer shows that a more complex stationary profile that necessarily depends on the angular variable would have to be found if there is any hope to complete the program proposed in [2]. We prove that the power-law vortex is linearly stable (for a class of sufficiently symmetric functions), in a way we shall now make more precise.

We can write the linearization of (3) around  $\bar{\Omega}$  as

$$(\partial_\tau - L_{ss})\Omega = 0.$$

The domain of  $L_{ss}$  as an operator into a Banach space  $\mathbf{B}$  is denoted

$$D_{\mathbf{B}}(L_{ss}) = \{\Omega \in \mathbf{B} : L_{ss}(\Omega) \in \mathbf{B}\}.$$

For the spaces  $\mathbf{B}$  under our consideration,  $L_{ss}$  will always be a closed, densely defined operator. We define the resolvent set of an operator  $\mathbf{L}$  on  $\mathbf{B}$  to be the open set of  $z \in \mathbb{C}$  for which  $\mathbf{L} - z$  has a bounded inverse from  $\mathbf{B} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}$ . We define the spectrum of  $\mathbf{L}$ , which we denote by  $\text{spec}(\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{B})$ , to be the closed set which is the complement of the resolvent set. Whenever the operator  $\mathbf{L}$  depends on the parameter  $\alpha$ , as is the case for  $L_{ss}$ , we denote the spectrum by  $\text{spec}_\alpha(\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{B})$ . The **spectral bound** of an operator  $\mathbf{L}$  densely defined on a Banach space  $\mathbf{B}$  is defined to be

$$s(\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{B}) := \inf_{\lambda \in \text{spec}(\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{B})} \text{Re}(\lambda).$$

Whenever the operator  $L$  depends on the parameter  $\alpha$ , as is the case for  $L_{ss}$ , we denote the spectral bound by  $s_\alpha(L, B)$ .

In the case when  $q \neq 2$ , we are able to prove an upper bound on the spectral bound for certain closed, proper subspaces  $U_{k,q}$  of  $L^q$ , which are defined to be:

$$U_{k,q} := \{f(r)e^{ik\theta} : f \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^+, r dr)\}.$$

In the case when  $q = 2$ , we use the additional Hilbert space structure and are able to prove an upper bound on the spectral bound for the whole of  $L_m^2$ . Together, we have the following theorem:

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Let  $q$  be such that  $1 < q \leq 2/\alpha$  and let  $m > 2$  and  $|k| > 2$  be any integers. If  $\bar{\Omega}(\xi) = \beta(2 - \alpha)|\xi|^{-\alpha}$  is the radial power-law vortex that solves the unforced Euler equations in self-similar coordinates and  $L_{ss}$  is the linearization of the Euler equations around  $\bar{\Omega}$ , then*

$$1 - \frac{1}{\alpha} \leq s_\alpha(L_{ss}, L_m^2) \leq 1 - \frac{1}{\alpha} + \frac{4}{\alpha(m - 2)}$$

and

$$s_\alpha(L_{ss}, U_{k,q}) \leq 1 - \frac{2}{\alpha q} + \frac{8}{\alpha q(|k| - 2)}.$$

Before continuing, we offer a few remarks. First, we have linear stability (a spectral bound less than zero) on  $U_{k,q}$  if

$$2 + \frac{8}{2 - \alpha q} < k.$$

Likewise, we have linear stability on  $L_m^2$  if

$$2 + \frac{4}{1 - \alpha} < m.$$

Second, it is not obvious from the resolvent bound we find that  $L_{ss}$  is an operator satisfying the hypotheses of the Hille-Yosida generation theorem. Thus, we cannot immediately conclude that  $L_{ss}$  generates a continuous semigroup; however, we plan to investigate whether  $L_{ss}$  generates a continuous semigroup on  $L_m^2$  and what its growth bound may be (note that the growth bound is **not** a priori equal to the spectral bound). Third, our upper bound for the spectral bound is independent of the “size” of the background vortex, which is controlled by the parameter  $\beta$ .

The choice of Lebesgue space  $L^q$  for  $1 < q \leq 2/\alpha$  is justified since one expects non-uniqueness to emerge from an (integrable) singularity at the spatial origin, and

the power-law vortex  $\overline{\Omega}$  is in  $L^q_{loc}$  if and only if  $q < 2/\alpha$ . We would also like to remark that our result, and indeed all work done on the non-uniqueness of the incompressible Euler equations with vorticity in the class  $\Upsilon_{\infty,p}^\infty$ , has implications for potential non-uniqueness of Leray-Hopf solutions of the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations. As shown by the authors of [1] in the case with a force, if one can construct an unstable vortex for the Euler equations in self-similar coordinates, one has essentially proven that Leray solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations admit non-unique solutions. Our result confirms the statement in [1] that finding such an unstable vortex is “far from elementary”.

In addition, we may view our result in the context of classical results on hydrodynamics stability. In the comprehensive work [4] by Chandrasekhar, various stability and instability results for fluid motion are described, including the well-known Rayleigh’s criterion for stability of steady inviscid flow between two co-axial cylinders. Rayleigh’s criterion would suggest, but not rigorously prove in the case of our infinite energy power-law vortices on the whole plane, that a vorticity profile  $|x|^{-\alpha}$  is stable in physical coordinates whenever  $\alpha < 2$ . We consider our Theorem 1.3 as mathematical proof of the (perhaps expected) stability in the case when  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  in the self-similar coordinates. In fact, the numerology of our theorem (we get linear stability and local integrability if  $\alpha q \leq 2$  and we need  $q \geq 1$  to get a complete Lebesgue norm), suggests that Rayleigh’s criterion holds for at least some choices of the parameters  $q, \alpha$  in the full range. We also mention the recent work [14] of Zelati and Zillinger, in which the authors consider the linear stability of vorticity profiles with singularities of power-law type in physical coordinates. The work in [14], however, does not provide quantitative information on the spectrum and does not consider the stability in self-similar coordinates.

We now remark the relationship our work has with the stability theorems proven by Arnold in [3] and the related questions proposed by Yudovich in [13]. Let  $\psi$  be the stream function of a stationary solution of the incompressible Euler equations. Arnold proves in [3] that the stationary flow is stable if the velocity profile is convex, or  $\nabla\psi/\nabla\Delta\psi > 0$ . When the velocity profile is concave, or  $\nabla\psi/\nabla\Delta\psi < 0$ , then there are finitely many unstable eigenvalues of the corresponding linear problem. The velocity profile corresponding to the power-law vortex  $\overline{\Omega}$  is concave, so we expect finitely many unstable eigenvalues. Our work improves this to a statement that there are no unstable eigenvalues for the linearization around  $\overline{\Omega}$ . Yudovich in [13] proposes that understanding the stability (or instability) of ideal fluid flows is an important problem in mathematical hydrodynamics, and we consider our work as some progress in that direction.

Besides the application to fluid dynamics, we consider an intriguing aspect of

our work to be the novel techniques we use in our analysis of the Euler equations linearized around the singular power-law vortex. The singularity of the background vortex leads to an unbounded operator  $L_{ss}$  with unbounded coefficients, which, to our knowledge, cannot be handled easily by any previously known method. For example,  $L_{ss}$  cannot be thought of as the compact perturbation of a skew-adjoint operator, which would be case if the background vortex were smooth.

We thank our advisor, Professor Camillo De Lellis, for his constant encouragement and support during our graduate studies. We would also like to thank him for sharing his deep insight into this and many other problems in mathematics. We thank Tim Binz for carefully reading our manuscript and pointing out many points in previous iterations of our work that required correction and improvement. We acknowledge the support of the National Science Foundation in the form of an NSF Graduate Research Fellowship.

## 2 Exponential Self-Similar Coordinates

We now more precisely discuss the change of coordinates used by Vishik in [9] and [10] as well as by the authors of [2]. Given a solution  $\omega(x, t)$  of Equation (1) on  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times [T_0, T_1]$ , we introduce a function  $\Omega$  on  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times [\log T_0, \log T_1]$  given by the following transformation. We set  $\tau = \log t$ ,  $\xi = xt^{-1/\alpha}$ , and let

$$\Omega(\xi, \tau) = e^\tau \omega(e^{\tau/\alpha} \xi, e^\tau).$$

The reverse transformation is given by:

$$\omega(x, t) = t^{-1} \Omega(t^{-1/\alpha} x, \log t).$$

If the vector field  $v(x, t)$  is given by  $(K_{BS} * \omega)(x, t)$  and the vector field  $V(\xi, \tau)$  is given by  $(K_{BS} * \Omega)(\xi, \tau)$ , then we have the following transformation rules:

$$V(\xi, \tau) = e^{\tau(1-1/\alpha)} v(e^{\tau/\alpha} \xi, e^\tau),$$

$$v(x, t) = t^{-1+1/\alpha} V(t^{-1/\alpha} x, \log t).$$

Vishik in [9] and [10] as well as the authors of [2] show that if  $\omega(x, t)$  satisfies Equation (1), then the function  $\Omega(\xi, \tau)$  satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\tau \Omega - \left(1 + \frac{\xi}{\alpha} \cdot \nabla\right) \Omega + (V \cdot \nabla) \Omega &= 0 \\ K_{BS} * \Omega(\cdot, \tau) &= V(\cdot, \tau). \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

We usually refer to this system of coordinates as the exponential self-similar coordinates or simply the self-similar coordinates. We refer to the system (3) as the vorticity form of the Euler equations in self-similar coordinates.

Now we introduce exponential self-similar polar coordinates. In particular, if  $(r, \theta, t)$  are the usual polar coordinates on  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times [T_1, T_2]$ , we let  $\rho = rt^{-1/\alpha}$ ,  $\theta$  unchanged, and  $\tau = \log t$  to get a new  $(\rho, \theta, \tau)$  system of coordinates. We consider the velocity form of the Euler Equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t v + (v \cdot \nabla)v &= -\nabla p \\ \operatorname{div} v &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

which we write in terms of exponential self-similar polar coordinates as:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\tau V_\rho + \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} - 1\right)V_\rho - \frac{\rho}{\alpha}\partial_\rho V_\rho + V_\rho\partial_\rho V_\rho + \frac{V_\theta}{\rho}\partial_\theta V_\rho - \frac{V_\theta^2}{\rho} &= -\partial_\rho P \\ \partial_\tau V_\theta + \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} - 1\right)V_\theta - \frac{\rho}{\alpha}\partial_\rho V_\theta + V_\rho\partial_\rho V_\theta + \frac{V_\theta}{\rho}\partial_\theta V_\theta + \frac{V_\rho V_\theta}{\rho} &= -\frac{1}{\rho}\partial_\theta P \\ \partial_\rho(\rho V_\rho) + \partial_\theta V_\theta &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

One can see that, up to a constant prefactor, the only stationary radial vortex  $V = V_\theta(\rho)e_\theta$  satisfying the exponential self-similar equations is precisely the power-law vortex with  $V_\theta(\rho) = \beta\rho^{1-\alpha}$ , where  $\beta$  is any real number.

**Proposition 2.1.** *The unique solution of Equation (5) of the form  $V = V_\theta(\rho)e_\theta$  is given by the profile  $V_\theta(\rho) = \beta\rho^{1-\alpha}$ , where  $\beta$  is any real number.*

*Proof.* The divergence-free condition is clearly satisfied. The second listed equation in Equation (5) simplifies to  $(1/\alpha - 1)V_\theta(\rho) - (\rho/\alpha)V_\theta'(\rho) = 0$ , a first-order differential equation whose unique solution is  $V_\theta(\rho) = \beta\rho^{1-\alpha}$ . For an appropriate choice of the pressure  $P$ , the equation listed first in Equation (5) will also be satisfied.  $\square$

We are thus led to define the velocity profile:

$$\bar{V}(\rho) = \beta\rho^{1-\alpha}e_\theta \tag{6}$$

and its associated vorticity profile:

$$\bar{\Omega}(\rho) = \beta(2 - \alpha)\rho^{-\alpha}. \tag{7}$$

Note that  $\bar{\Omega}$  corresponds exactly by the transformation back to physical coordinates to the stationary radial vortex with vorticity profile  $\beta(2 - \alpha)r^{-\alpha}$ .

### 3 Stability of the Power-Law Vortex

The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 1.3, which is the final result of a highly technical analysis of the linearization of the Euler equations around a singular power-law vortex. We write the linearization as

$$(\partial_\tau - L_{ss})\Omega = 0.$$

The main technical issue, for which no standard method can be used, is the highly singular behavior of the coefficients of  $L_{ss}$ . For example, we cannot simply say that  $L_{ss}$  is the compact perturbation of a skew-adjoint operator, which, on the contrary, would be the case if the background vortex profile  $\bar{\Omega}$  were smooth.

We now introduce some useful notation. We denote  $L_m^q$  to be the closed linear subspace of  $L^q$  of elements that are  $m$ -fold symmetric. In other words, if  $R_\theta : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  is the counterclockwise rotation of angle  $\theta$  around the origin, then a function  $f \in L_m^q$  satisfies

$$f = f \circ R_{2\pi/m}.$$

It will be convenient to define the following closed linear subspaces of  $L_m^q$ :

$$U_{km,q} := \{f(r)e^{imk\theta} : f \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^+, r dr)\}.$$

In the case when  $q = 2$ , the subspaces  $U_{km,2}$  are mutually orthogonal, so we have the direct sum:

$$L_m^2 = \bigoplus_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} U_{km,2}.$$

The topology of the space on the right is given by the  $\ell^2$  direct sum of the spaces  $U_{km,2}$  with the norm of an element in the direct sum  $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} f_k$  given by

$$\left( \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \|f_k\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

By the Theorem of Plancherel, the direct sum with this topology is exactly the space  $L_m^2$  with the subspace topology inherited from  $L^2$ . In the case when  $q \neq 2$ , we no longer have the benefit of the Hilbert space structure. Indeed, it is not difficult to see that  $L_m^q$  cannot be written as the  $\ell^p$  direct sum of the spaces  $U_{km,q}$  for any  $p \in [1, \infty]$ , see [5] and Section 13.5 on the Hausdorff-Young inequality in [6]. Instead, we shall work in each closed proper subspace  $U_{k,q}$  of  $L_m^q$  separately. We denote the Schwartz space by  $\mathcal{S}$  and its dual by  $\mathcal{S}^*$ . We begin by stating a slight improvement of a lemma from [2]. The improvement allows for a continuous extension of  $K_{BS}^*$  to  $L_m^q$  whenever  $1 < q < \infty$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** *For every  $m \geq 2$  there exists a unique continuous operator  $T : L_m^q \rightarrow S^*$  satisfying:*

1. *If  $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}$ , then  $T\varphi = K_{BS} * \varphi$  in the sense of distribution.*
2. *There exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that for every  $\varphi \in L_m^q$  there exists  $v(\varphi) := v \in W_{loc}^{1,q}$  such that*
  - $R^{-1}\|v\|_{L^q(B_R)} + \|Dv\|_{L^q(B_R)} \leq C\|\varphi\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^2)}$  for all  $R > 0$
  - $\operatorname{div} v = 0$  and  $T(\varphi) = v(\varphi)$  in the sense of distribution.

Certainly, since  $T$  is a continuous linear operator on  $L_m^q$ ,  $T$  is a continuous linear operator when restricted to the closed invariant subspace  $U_{k,q} \subset L_m^q$ . We shall denote  $T$  interchangeably with  $\nabla^\perp \Delta^{-1}$  or  $K_{BS}*$ , although we shall mostly use the latter notation. Recall that we wrote the linearization of (3) around  $\bar{\Omega}$  as

$$(\partial_\tau - L_{ss})\Omega = 0$$

where the linear operator  $L_{ss}$  is given by:

$$L_{ss}\Omega = \Omega + \left(\frac{\xi}{\alpha} - \bar{V}\right) \cdot \nabla \Omega - \nabla^\perp \Delta^{-1} \Omega \cdot \nabla \bar{\Omega}.$$

The domain of  $L_{ss}$  as an operator into a Banach space  $\mathbf{B}$  is denoted

$$D_{\mathbf{B}}(L_{ss}) = \{\Omega \in L_m^q : L_{ss}(\Omega) \in \mathbf{B}\}.$$

For us  $\mathbf{B} = L_m^2$  or  $\mathbf{B} = U_{k,q}$ , so  $L_{ss}$  will always be a closed, densely defined operator. We define the resolvent set of an operator  $L$  on  $\mathbf{B}$  to be the open set of  $z \in \mathbb{C}$  for which  $L - z$  has a bounded inverse from  $\mathbf{B} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}$ . We define the spectrum of  $L$ , which we denote by  $\operatorname{spec}(L, \mathbf{B})$ , to be the closed set which is the complement of the resolvent set. Whenever the operator  $L$  depends on the parameter  $\alpha$ , as is the case for  $L_{ss}$ , we denote the spectrum by  $\operatorname{spec}_\alpha(L, \mathbf{B})$ . The spectral bound is denoted  $s_\alpha(L, \mathbf{B})$ .

We take the opportunity to restate the theorem that we shall prove.

**Theorem 3.2.** *Let  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Let  $q$  be such that  $1 < q \leq 2/\alpha$  and let  $m > 2$  be an integer. If  $\bar{\Omega}(\xi) = \beta(2 - \alpha)|\xi|^{-\alpha}$  is the radial power-law vortex that solves the unforced Euler equations in self-similar coordinates, then*

$$1 - \frac{1}{\alpha} \leq s_\alpha(L_{ss}, L_m^2) \leq 1 - \frac{1}{\alpha} + \frac{4}{\alpha(m-2)}$$

and

$$s_\alpha(L_{ss}, U_{k,q}) \leq 1 - \frac{2}{\alpha q} + \frac{8}{\alpha q(m-2)}.$$

The lower bound on the spectral bound is proven in the penultimate section of the appendix.

### 3.1 Proof of Lemma 3.1

Let  $f \in L_m^q \cap \mathcal{S}$  and let  $v = K_{BS} * f$ . We first claim that

$$\int_{B_R} v = 0 \quad \text{for every } R > 0. \quad (8)$$

Indeed, we have  $v = \nabla^\perp h$ , where  $h$  is the unique classical solution of  $\Delta h = f$  given by  $K * f$  where  $K(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \log|x|$ . Since the kernel  $K$  is invariant under all rotations  $R_\theta$  and since  $f$  is  $m$ -fold symmetric, we conclude that  $h$  is  $m$ -fold symmetric. Therefore,

$$R_{-2\pi/m} \nabla h(R_{2\pi/m} x) = \nabla h(x).$$

Thus, integrating in  $x$  we conclude

$$\int_{B_R} \nabla h = R_{2\pi/m} \int_{B_R} \nabla h,$$

so

$$\int_{B_R} \nabla h = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} R_{2k\pi/m} \int_{B_R} \nabla h.$$

However, since  $m \geq 2$ , the sum is zero, which shows that  $\int_{B_R} \nabla h = 0$ . Finally, with the property just shown, we may use the Poincaré inequality to conclude:

$$R^{-1} \|v\|_{L^q(B_R)} + \|Dv\|_{L^q(B_R)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^q(B_R)}$$

since  $\|Dv\|_{L^q} \leq \|f\|_{L^q}$  by the Calderón-Zygmund theorem.

### 3.2 Fourier Expansion of the Linearized Equations

In what follows, we shall abuse notation and denote the (exponential self-similar) radial coordinate by  $r$  instead of  $\rho$ .

We recall that the inverse Laplacian  $\Delta^{-1}$  preserves rotational symmetries. Thus, for any  $\Omega \in L_m^2 \cap \mathcal{S}$ ,  $\Delta^{-1}\Omega \in L_m^2 \cap C^\infty$  and likewise for any  $\Omega \in U_{k,q} \cap \mathcal{S}$ ,  $\Delta^{-1}\Omega \in U_{k,q} \cap C^\infty$ . We formally decompose:

$$\Delta^{-1}\Omega = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} f_k(r) e^{mik\theta} \quad (9)$$

where  $f_k(r) \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^+, r dr)$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Let  $\lambda = \lambda_1 + i\lambda_2$  be our putative element of the spectrum, where  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\lambda_1 > 1 - \frac{2}{q\alpha}$ . We consider the eigenvalue equation  $L_{ss}\Omega - \lambda\Omega = 0$ , or equivalently

$$(1 - (\lambda_1 + i\lambda_2))\Omega + \left(\frac{\xi}{\alpha} - \bar{V}\right) \cdot \nabla \Omega - \nabla^\perp \Delta^{-1}\Omega \cdot \nabla \bar{\Omega} = 0.$$

Using the decomposition (9), the above linear partial differential equation becomes equivalent to an infinite family of ordinary differential equations. The ordinary differential equation corresponding to the parameter  $k$  is:

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 - (\lambda_1 + i\lambda_2))(\partial_r^2 + \frac{\partial_r}{r} + \frac{\partial_\theta^2}{r^2})(f_k(r)e^{mik\theta}) + \\ & + (\frac{r}{\alpha}e_r - \beta r^{1-\alpha}e_\theta) \cdot (\partial_r((\partial_r^2 + \frac{\partial_r}{r} + \frac{\partial_\theta^2}{r^2})(f_k(r)e^{mik\theta}))e_r + \frac{\partial_\theta}{r}((\partial_r^2 + \frac{\partial_r}{r} + \frac{\partial_\theta^2}{r^2})(f_k(r)e^{mik\theta}))e_\theta) + \\ & + (\frac{\partial_\theta}{r}(f_k(r)e^{mik\theta})e_r - \partial_r(f_k(r)e^{mik\theta})e_\theta) \cdot (-\alpha(2-\alpha)\beta r^{-1-\alpha}e_r) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Simplifying, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{\alpha}(f_k''(r) + \frac{f_k'(r)}{r} - \frac{(mk)^2 f_k(r)}{r^2})' + (1 - (\lambda_1 + i\lambda_2))(f_k''(r) + \frac{f_k'(r)}{r} - \frac{(mk)^2 f_k(r)}{r^2}) \\ & - mik\beta r^{-\alpha}(f_k''(r) + \frac{f_k'(r)}{r} - \frac{(mk)^2 f_k(r)}{r^2}) - mikr^{-2-\alpha}\alpha(2-\alpha)\beta f_k(r) = 0. \quad (10) \end{aligned}$$

### 3.3 Characterization of the Spectrum

Henceforth we let  $g$  be an arbitrary function in  $L_m^2$  when  $q = 2$  or  $U_{k,q}$  when  $q \neq 2$ . Proving that  $L_{ss} - \lambda I$  is surjective with bounded resolvent is equivalent to proving that the operator  $R_\lambda(g) := (L_{ss} - \lambda I)^{-1}(g)$  exists and is bounded as an operator into  $D(L_{ss})$ . We shall succeed in demonstrating surjectivity for  $\lambda$  sufficiently large by using a fixed point argument in a class of sufficiently symmetry functions. Proving that  $L_{ss} - \lambda I$  is injective amounts to proving that  $L_{ss} - \lambda I = g$  has at most one solution. The uniqueness of the solution (or the injectivity of  $L_{ss} - \lambda I$ ) follows from the uniqueness of the fixed point. We shall now reduce our problem to showing that the unique solution of an integral equation is in some Lebesgue space with quantified  $L^q$  bound.

In particular, that  $L_{ss} - \lambda I$  is surjective is equivalent to stating that the inhomogeneous ordinary differential equation

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{\alpha}(f_k''(r) + \frac{f_k'(r)}{r} - \frac{(mk)^2 f_k(r)}{r^2})' + (1 - (\lambda_1 + i\lambda_2))(f_k''(r) + \frac{f_k'(r)}{r} - \frac{(mk)^2 f_k(r)}{r^2}) \\ & - mik\beta r^{-\alpha}(f_k''(r) + \frac{f_k'(r)}{r} - \frac{(mk)^2 f_k(r)}{r^2}) - mikr^{-2-\alpha}\alpha(2-\alpha)\beta f_k(r) = g_k(r) \quad (11) \end{aligned}$$

has a solution  $f_k(r)$  with  $f_k''(r) + \frac{f_k'(r)}{r} - \frac{(mk)^2 f_k(r)}{r^2} \in L^q(\mathbb{R}, r dr)$  for any given function  $g_k(r) \in L^q(\mathbb{R}, r dr)$ . That  $L_{ss} - \lambda I$  is injective is equivalent to stating that the

homogeneous ordinary differential equation Equation (10) has no non-trivial solution or, equivalently, that  $L_{ss} - \lambda I = g$  has a unique solution for every choice of the function  $g$ .

Henceforth, we drop the subscript notation showing dependence on  $k$  and simply write  $f(r)$  and  $g(r)$ . Moreover, we define:

$$u(r) := f''(r) + \frac{f'(r)}{r} - \frac{(mk)^2 f(r)}{r^2},$$

which is the quantity we wish to control in  $L^q(rdr)$ . We now perform the change of variables  $e^t = r$  and define:

$$\psi(t) := f(e^t)e^{(2/q-2)t} \quad G(t) := g(e^t)e^{2t/q} \quad U(t) := u(e^t)e^{2t/q}.$$

These functions are chosen so that

$$\begin{aligned} g(r) \in L^q(rdr) &\iff G(t) \in L^q(dt) \\ u(r) \in L^q(rdr) &\iff U(t) \in L^q(dt) \\ f(r)/r^2 \in L^q(rdr) &\iff \psi(t) \in L^q(dt). \end{aligned}$$

Given  $G(t) \in L^q(dt)$ , our new goal is to solve for  $U(t) \in L^q(dt)$  (or alternatively  $\psi(t) \in W^{2,q}(dt)$ ). The ordinary differential equations in terms of the new variable and functions are

$$U(t) = \psi''(t) + \left(4 - \frac{4}{q}\right)\psi'(t) + \left(4 - (km)^2 + \frac{4}{q^2} - \frac{8}{q}\right)\psi(t)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{\alpha}U'(t) + \left(1 - \frac{2}{\alpha q} - \lambda_1 - i\lambda_2\right)U(t) - mik\beta e^{-\alpha t}U(t) - mik\alpha(2 - \alpha)\beta e^{-\alpha t}\psi(t) = G(t).$$

In the case when  $k = 0$ , we can integrate the equation of first order and get:

$$U(t) = ce^{t(2/q+\alpha(\lambda-1))} + \alpha e^{t(2/q+\alpha(\lambda-1))} \int_0^t e^{-s(2/q+\alpha(\lambda-1))} G(s) ds.$$

The unique choice of constant that will make  $U$  integrable is precisely

$$c = -\alpha \int_0^\infty e^{-s(2/q+\alpha(\lambda-1))} G(s) ds,$$

with which we have

$$U(t) = -\alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi_{(-\infty,0)}(t-s) e^{(t-s)(2/q+\alpha(\lambda-1))} G(s) ds.$$

By Young's convolution inequality, it follows that  $U(t) \in L^q(dt)$  is a solution of the ordinary differential equation with

$$\|U\|_q \leq \frac{\alpha \|G\|_q}{2/q + \alpha(\lambda_1 - 1)}.$$

This is the unique solution, since in the case when  $k = 0$ , the homogeneous problem reduces to :

$$\frac{1}{\alpha} U'(t) + \left(1 - \frac{2}{\alpha q} - \lambda_1 - i\lambda_2\right) U(t) = 0,$$

whose only solution is given by  $U(t) = c_1 e^{t(2/q+\alpha(\lambda-1))}$ , which is not in any  $L^q$  space, unless identically zero.

We may henceforth without loss of generality assume that  $k \geq 1$ . The case when  $k \leq -1$  is "symmetric" to the case when  $k \geq 1$ . Now, integrating the differential equation of first order yields

$$\begin{aligned} U(t) &= c_1 \exp\left(-mik\beta e^{-\alpha t} + t(2/q + \alpha(\lambda - 1))\right) + \\ &+ \alpha \exp\left(-mik\beta e^{-\alpha t} + t(2/q + \alpha(\lambda - 1))\right) \int_0^t \exp\left(mik\beta e^{-\alpha s} - s(2/q + \alpha(\lambda - 1))\right) G(s) ds + \\ &+ mik\beta \alpha^2 (2 - \alpha) \exp\left(-mik\beta e^{-\alpha t} + t(2/q + \alpha(\lambda - 1))\right) \times \\ &\times \int_0^t \exp\left(mik\beta e^{-\alpha s} - s(2/q + \alpha\lambda)\right) \psi(s) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

The constant  $c_1$  depends on the choice of initial condition. Also, integrating the differential equation of second order gets us:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(t) &= c_2 e^{-(km+2-2/q)t} - \frac{e^{-(km+2-2/q)t}}{2km} \int_0^t e^{(km+2-2/q)s} U(s) ds + \\ &+ c_3 e^{(km-2+2/q)t} + \frac{e^{(km-2+2/q)t}}{2km} \int_0^t e^{-(km-2+2/q)s} U(s) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Finally to have  $\psi(t) \in L^q(dt)$  we use Equation (13), with the unique choice of constants:

$$c_2 = -\frac{1}{2km} \int_{-\infty}^0 e^{(km+2-2/q)s} U(s) ds$$

and

$$c_3 = -\frac{1}{2km} \int_0^\infty e^{-(km-2+2/q)s} U(s) ds.$$

These bounded linear functionals of  $U$  are uniquely chosen so that  $\psi \in L^q(dt)$  if  $U \in L^q(dt)$ . In addition, for smooth functions  $u, f$ , Equation (13) implies that  $\Delta^{-1}u = f$  in the classical sense, while the unique choice of  $c_2, c_3$  above guarantee the desired integrability of  $f$ . We may thus write  $\psi$  in terms of the convolution operator:

$$\psi(t) = -\frac{1}{2km} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( e^{-(km+2-2/q)(t-s)} \chi_{(0,\infty)}(t-s) + e^{(km-2+2/q)(t-s)} \chi_{(-\infty,0)}(t-s) \right) U(s) ds$$

We can denote the kernel above by

$$K_1(t, s) := \left( e^{-(km+2-2/q)(t-s)} \chi_{(0,\infty)}(t-s) + e^{(km-2+2/q)(t-s)} \chi_{(-\infty,0)}(t-s) \right).$$

We remark that given a function  $g$ , there is also at most one unique choice of the parameter  $c_1$  such that the function  $U(t)$  lies in  $L^q(dt)$  and satisfies Equation (12). In fact, the bounded functional  $c_1(U)$  will be given by

$$c_1 = -\alpha \int_0^\infty \exp(mik\beta e^{-\alpha s} - s(2/q + \alpha(\lambda - 1))) G(s) ds - \\ mik\beta\alpha^2(2 - \alpha) \int_0^\infty \exp(mik\beta e^{-\alpha s} - s(2/q + \alpha\lambda)) \psi(s) ds$$

and Equation (12) becomes

$$U(t) = -\alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp(-mik\beta e^{-\alpha t} + mik\beta e^{-\alpha s} + (t-s)(2/q + \alpha(\lambda - 1))) \chi_{(-\infty,0)}(t-s) G(s) ds - \\ mik\beta\alpha^2(2 - \alpha) \times \\ \times \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\alpha s} \exp(-mik\beta e^{-\alpha t} + mik\beta e^{-\alpha s} + (t-s)(2/q + \alpha(\lambda - 1))) \chi_{(-\infty,0)}(t-s) \psi(s) ds.$$

We denote the kernel:

$$K_2(t, s) := \exp(-mik\beta e^{-\alpha t} + mik\beta e^{-\alpha s} + (t-s)(2/q + \alpha(\lambda - 1))) \chi_{(-\infty,0)}(t-s).$$

We thus have the following Fredholm integral equation for  $U$ :

$$U(t) = -\alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}} K_2(t, s) G(s) ds + \frac{i\alpha^2(2 - \alpha)\beta}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} K_2(t, s) e^{-\alpha s} K_1(s, r) U(r) dr ds.$$

We proceed to simplify the integral equation by integrating the kernels in the  $s$  variable first:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}} K_2(t, s) e^{-\alpha s} K_1(s, r) ds = \\ &= F_1(t, r) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp \left( mik\beta e^{-\alpha s} - \alpha s - (2/q + \alpha(\lambda - 1) + mk + 2 - 2/q)s \right) \chi_{(\max(t, r), \infty)}(s) ds + \\ &+ F_2(t, r) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp \left( mik\beta e^{-\alpha s} - \alpha s - (2/q + \alpha(\lambda - 1) - (mk - 2 + 2/q))s \right) \chi_{(t, r)}(s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Where

$$F_1(t, r) = \exp \left( - mik\beta e^{-\alpha t} + (2/q + \alpha(\lambda - 1))t + r(mk + 2 - 2/q) \right)$$

and

$$F_2(t, r) = \exp \left( - mik\beta e^{-\alpha t} + (2/q + \alpha(\lambda - 1))t - r(mk - 2 + 2/q) \right).$$

We remark that

$$\frac{d}{ds} \left( \frac{i}{m\alpha k\beta} e^{mik\beta e^{-\alpha s}} \right) = e^{mik\beta e^{-\alpha s} - \alpha s}.$$

Thus integrating by parts and simplifying we get (for  $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $Re(\mu) > 0$ ):

$$\int_t^\infty e^{mik\beta e^{-\alpha s} - \alpha s} e^{-\mu s} ds = \frac{-i}{m\alpha k\beta} e^{mik\beta e^{-\alpha t}} e^{-\mu t} + \frac{\mu i}{m\alpha k\beta} \int_t^\infty e^{mik\beta e^{-\alpha s}} e^{-\mu s} ds. \quad (14)$$

Likewise, integrating by parts yields (for some generic  $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$ ):

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_t^r e^{mik\beta e^{-\alpha s} - \alpha s} e^{-\mu s} ds = \\ &= \frac{-i}{m\alpha k\beta} \left( e^{mik\beta e^{-\alpha t}} e^{-\mu t} - e^{mik\beta e^{-\alpha r}} e^{-\mu r} \right) + \frac{\mu i}{m\alpha k\beta} \int_t^r e^{mik\beta e^{-\alpha s}} e^{-\mu s} ds. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Henceforth we denote

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_1 &:= 2/q + \alpha(\lambda - 1) + mk + 2 - 2/q \\ \mu_2 &:= 2/q + \alpha(\lambda - 1) - (mk - 2 + 2/q). \end{aligned}$$

Applying Equation (14) and Equation (15) to the original integral under consideration (and using that  $\lambda > 1 - \frac{2}{q\alpha}$ ) gets us

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}} K_2(t, s) e^{-\alpha s} K_1(s, r) ds = \\ & F_1(t, r) \chi_{(0, \infty)}(t - r) \left( \frac{-i}{m\alpha k\beta} e^{mik\beta e^{-\alpha t}} e^{-\mu_1 t} + \frac{\mu_1 i}{m\alpha k\beta} \int_t^{\infty} e^{mik\beta e^{-\alpha s}} e^{-\mu_1 s} ds \right) + \\ & + F_1(t, r) \chi_{(-\infty, 0)}(t - r) \left( \frac{-i}{m\alpha k\beta} e^{mik\beta e^{-\alpha r}} e^{-\mu_1 r} + \frac{\mu_1 i}{m\alpha k\beta} \int_r^{\infty} e^{mik\beta e^{-\alpha s}} e^{-\mu_1 s} ds \right) + \\ & + F_2(t, r) \chi_{(-\infty, 0)}(t - r) \left( \frac{-i}{m\alpha k\beta} \left( e^{mik\beta e^{-\alpha t}} e^{-\mu_2 t} - e^{mik\beta e^{-\alpha r}} e^{-\mu_2 r} \right) + \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{\mu_2 i}{m\alpha k\beta} \int_t^r e^{mik\beta e^{-\alpha s}} e^{-\mu_2 s} ds \right). \end{aligned}$$

Simplifying further (there is a remarkable cancellation that occurs) we achieve:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}} K_2(t, s) e^{-\alpha s} K_1(s, r) ds = \\ & = \frac{-i}{m\alpha k\beta} K_1(t, r) + \frac{\mu_1 i}{m\alpha k\beta} \int_{\mathbb{R}} K_2(t, s) e^{-(s-r)(mk+2-2/q)} \chi_{(0, \infty)}(s - r) ds + \\ & \quad + \frac{\mu_2 i}{m\alpha k\beta} \int_{\mathbb{R}} K_2(t, s) e^{(s-r)(mk-2+2/q)} \chi_{(-\infty, 0)}(s - r) ds. \end{aligned}$$

We rearrange the terms and get:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}} K_2(t, s) e^{-\alpha s} K_1(s, r) ds = \\ & = \frac{-i}{m\alpha k\beta} K_1(t, r) + \frac{\mu_1 i}{m\alpha k\beta} \int_{\mathbb{R}} K_2(t, s) K_1(s, r) ds + \\ & \quad + \frac{-2i}{\beta\alpha} \int_{\mathbb{R}} K_2(t, s) e^{(s-r)(mk-2+2/q)} \chi_{(-\infty, 0)}(s - r) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Henceforth we denote

$$K_3(s, r) := e^{(s-r)(mk-2+2/q)} \chi_{(-\infty, 0)}(s - r).$$

We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
U(t) &= -\alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}} K_2(t, s)G(s)ds + \frac{\alpha(2-\alpha)}{2km} \int_{\mathbb{R}} K_1(t, r)U(r)dr + \\
&+ \frac{-\mu_1\alpha(2-\alpha)}{2km} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} K_2(t, s)K_1(s, r)U(r)dsdr + \\
&+ \alpha(2-\alpha) \iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} K_2(t, s)K_3(s, r)U(r)dsdr.
\end{aligned}$$

### 3.3.1 The Integral Transforms

We have a convolution operator:

$$\Phi_1(U)(t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} K_1(t, s)U(s)ds.$$

Now, by Young's convolution inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Phi_1(U)(t)\|_q &\leq \|U\|_q \left( \int_0^\infty e^{-(mk+2-2/q)y} dy + \int_{-\infty}^0 e^{(mk-2+2/q)y} dy \right) \leq \\
&\leq \left( \frac{1}{mk-2+2/q} + \frac{1}{mk+2-2/q} \right) \|U\|_q.
\end{aligned}$$

In a similar manner, we denote

$$\Phi_2(U) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} K_2(t, s)U(s)ds$$

and observe that

$$|\Phi_2(U)| \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \hat{K}_2(t, s)|U(s)|ds$$

where

$$\hat{K}_2(t, s) := e^{(t-s)(2/q+\alpha(\lambda-1))} \chi_{(-\infty, 0)}(t-s)$$

is the kernel of a convolution operator. Thus, arguing as before, we apply the Young convolution inequality and get

$$\|\Phi_2(U)(t)\|_q \leq \|U\|_q \left( \int_0^\infty e^{-(2/q+\alpha(\lambda-1))y} dy \right) \leq \frac{1}{2/q+\alpha(\lambda-1)} \|U\|_q.$$

Lastly, we have the convolution operator:

$$\Phi_3(U)(t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} K_3(t, s)U(s)ds.$$

whose operator norm we once again estimate using Young's convolution inequality:

$$\|\Phi_3(U)(t)\|_q \leq \|U\|_q \left( \int_{-\infty}^0 e^{y(mk-2+2/q)} dy \right) \leq \frac{1}{(mk-2+2/q)} \|U\|_q.$$

### 3.3.2 Conclusion

We recall what we have heretofore shown. We found three bounded integral transforms from  $L^q \rightarrow L^q$ , given by  $\Phi_1$ ,  $\Phi_2$  and  $\Phi_3$ . Showing that the operator we are working on is surjective (and injective) then becomes equivalent to showing (for every  $G \in L^q$ ) the existence of a (unique) fixed point of the map

$$U \rightarrow -\alpha\Phi_2(G) + \frac{\alpha(2-\alpha)}{2km}\Phi_1(U) - \frac{\mu_1\alpha(2-\alpha)}{2km}\Phi_2(\Phi_1(U)) + \alpha(2-\alpha)\Phi_2(\Phi_3(U)).$$

This, by the Banach fixed point theorem, is equivalent to showing that the map

$$\hat{\Phi}(U) := \frac{\alpha(2-\alpha)}{2km}\Phi_1(U) - \frac{\mu_1\alpha(2-\alpha)}{2km}\Phi_2(\Phi_1(U)) + \alpha(2-\alpha)\Phi_2(\Phi_3(U))$$

is contractive. However, by our work in the previous subsection, we can estimate the operator norm of  $\hat{\Phi}$  by:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\Phi}\| &\leq \frac{\alpha(2-\alpha)}{2km} \cdot \left( \frac{1}{mk-2+2/q} + \frac{1}{mk+2-2/q} \right) + \\ &+ \frac{(2/q + a(\lambda_1 - 1) + mk + 2 - 2/q)\alpha(2-\alpha)}{2km(2/q + \alpha(\lambda_1 - 1))} \cdot \left( \frac{1}{mk-2+2/q} + \frac{1}{mk+2-2/q} \right) + \\ &+ \frac{\alpha(2-\alpha)}{2/q + \alpha(\lambda_1 - 1)} \left( \frac{1}{mk-2+2/q} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that the complex number  $\lambda$  was chosen so that  $\text{Re}(\lambda) = \lambda_1 > 1 - \frac{2}{q\alpha}$ . Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be such that

$$\lambda_1 = 1 - \frac{2}{q\alpha} + \epsilon = 1 - \frac{2 - \epsilon q\alpha}{q\alpha}.$$

Using Mathematica, we can verify that if

$$mk \geq 2 + \frac{8}{\epsilon\alpha q},$$

then  $\|\hat{\Phi}\| < 1$  for all choices of  $1 < q \leq 2/\alpha$  and  $0 < \alpha < 1$ . For the code that verifies this inequality, see the last subsection of the appendix. Thus the unique solubility of the ordinary differential equation, hence the surjectivity of the map, is proven for the spaces  $L_m^2$  or  $U_{k,q}$  whenever  $m \geq 2 + \frac{8}{\epsilon\alpha q}$  or  $k \geq 2 + \frac{8}{\epsilon\alpha q}$  and  $1 < q \leq 2/\alpha$ ,  $0 < \alpha < 1$ . Note that, since the fixed point is unique, we have provided a proof of the injectivity of the map  $L_{ss} - \lambda I$  for  $m, \lambda, k$  satisfying the conditions above.

We now conclude our main theorem. Observe that  $\epsilon = \lambda_1 - (1 - \frac{2}{q\alpha})$ , then we have proven that  $\lambda$  is in the resolvent if

$$\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) \geq 1 - \frac{2}{\alpha q} + \frac{8}{\alpha q(m-2)},$$

which directly implies the upper estimate on the spectral bound.

## A Appendix

### A.1 Explicit Solutions of Equation (10)

In this section we solve the eigenvalue equation in terms of the stream function. For simplicity of notation, we assume  $\beta = 1$  and  $m = 2$ , but the proof is entirely the same in the general case. We recall Equation (10) :

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{\alpha} \left( f_k''(r) + \frac{f_k'(r)}{r} - \frac{4k^2 f_k(r)}{r^2} \right)' + (1 - (\lambda_1 + i\lambda_2)) \left( f_k''(r) + \frac{f_k'(r)}{r} - \frac{4k^2 f_k(r)}{r^2} \right) \\ & - 2ikr^{-\alpha} \left( f_k''(r) + \frac{f_k'(r)}{r} - \frac{4k^2 f_k(r)}{r^2} \right) - 2ikr^{-2-\alpha} \alpha (2 - \alpha) f_k(r) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

We consider the above homogeneous ordinary differential equation and perform a change of variables  $z = -2ikr^{-\alpha}$ , since this will put the ordinary differential equation in a form that is already well studied. More precisely, we define a new function  $w_k(z)$  that is given by

$$w_k(z) = f_k((-2ik)^{1/\alpha} z^{-1/\alpha}) \cdot (-2ik)^{-2k/\alpha} z^{2k/\alpha}.$$

The function is defined so that if  $f_k(r) = w(-2ikr^{-\alpha})r^{2k}$  satisfies the homogeneous ordinary differential equation, we get that  $w$  satisfies the following ordinary differential equation:

$$0 = 2kr^{-3\alpha+2k-2} \left( i(\alpha - 4k)r^\alpha (r^\alpha(\alpha\lambda - 2k + 2) + 2i\alpha k) w'(-2ikr^{-\alpha}) + \right.$$

$$+2\alpha k((r^\alpha(\alpha(\lambda+2)-6k+2)+2i\alpha k)w''(-2ikr^{-\alpha})-2i\alpha k w^{(3)}(-2ikr^{-\alpha}))+ \\ +i(\alpha-2)\alpha r^{2\alpha}w(-2ikr^{-\alpha}))$$

Letting  $r = (-2ik)^{1/\alpha}z^{-1/\alpha}$  and simplifying we finally have:

$$0 = z^2 w^{(3)}(z) + z(1-z+\lambda+1+\frac{2-6k}{\alpha})w''(z) + \\ +((\lambda+\frac{2-2k}{\alpha})\alpha^{-1}(\alpha-4k)-z(-1+\alpha^{-1}(\alpha-4k)+1))w'(z) + \alpha^{-1}(\alpha-2)w(z). \quad (16)$$

We put the equation in this form because Equation 07.25.13.0004.01 from [11] states that the general solution of the ordinary differential equation:

$$z^2 w^{(3)}(z) + z(1-z+b_1+b_2)w''(z) + (b_1b_2-z(a_1+a_2+1))w'(z) - a_1a_2w(z) = 0$$

is given exactly by

$$w(z) = c_1 \cdot {}_2\tilde{F}_2(a_1, a_2; b_1, b_2; z) + \\ + c_2 \left( G_{2,3}^{2,2}(z|1-a_1, 1-a_2; 0, 1-b_1, 1-b_2) + G_{2,3}^{2,2}(z|1-a_1, 1-a_2; 0, 1-b_2, 1-b_1) \right) + \\ + c_3 G_{2,3}^{3,2}(-z|1-a_1, 1-a_2; 0, 1-b_1, 1-b_2).$$

Here  ${}_2\tilde{F}_2$  denotes the regularized hypergeometric function and  $G_{m,n}^{p,q}$  denotes the Meijer-G function. The definition of both of these classes of special functions can be found in [8] or [11].

We choose

$$a_1 = \frac{-2k - \sqrt{\alpha^2 - 2\alpha + 4k^2}}{\alpha}, \quad a_2 = \frac{-2k + \sqrt{\alpha^2 - 2\alpha + 4k^2}}{\alpha} \\ b_1 = \frac{\alpha - 4k}{\alpha}, \quad b_2 = \frac{2 - 2k + \alpha\lambda}{\alpha}$$

and denote

$$\mathfrak{q}_{\alpha,k} := \frac{\sqrt{\alpha^2 - 2\alpha + 4k^2}}{\alpha}.$$

Then the solution of Equation (16) is exactly (for any choice of constants  $c_1, c_2, c_3$ ):

$$w(z) = c_1 \cdot {}_2\tilde{F}_2\left(-\frac{2k}{\alpha} - \mathfrak{q}_{\alpha,k}, -\frac{2k}{\alpha} + \mathfrak{q}_{\alpha,k}; 1 - \frac{4k}{\alpha}, \lambda + \frac{2-2k}{\alpha}; z\right) +$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& +c_2 \left( G_{2,3}^{2,2} \left( z \left| 1 + \frac{2k}{\alpha} + \mathfrak{q}_{\alpha,k}, 1 + \frac{2k}{\alpha} - \mathfrak{q}_{\alpha,k}; 0, \frac{4k}{\alpha}, 1 - \lambda + \frac{2k-2}{\alpha} \right) + \right. \\
& \left. + G_{2,3}^{2,2} \left( z \left| 1 + \frac{2k}{\alpha} + \mathfrak{q}_{\alpha,k}, 1 + \frac{2k}{\alpha} - \mathfrak{q}_{\alpha,k}; 0, 1 - \lambda + \frac{2k-2}{\alpha}, \frac{4k}{\alpha} \right) \right) + \\
& +c_3 G_{2,3}^{3,2} \left( -z \left| 1 + \frac{2k}{\alpha} + \mathfrak{q}_{\alpha,k}, 1 + \frac{2k}{\alpha} - \mathfrak{q}_{\alpha,k}; 0, \frac{4k}{\alpha}, 1 - \lambda + \frac{2k-2}{\alpha} \right) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Using the transformation back to  $f_k(r)$ , we see that we have found the solutions of the homogeneous differential equation (10). The asymptotic properties for the special functions  ${}_2\tilde{F}_2$  and  $G_{m,n}^{p,q}$  described in Chapter 5 of [8], suggest that no solution of the homogeneous equation is integrable. We shall attempt to prove this claim in subsequent work.

## A.2 Lower Bound for the Spectral Bound

The following proof of the lower bound on the spectral bound was suggested to us by Tim Binz. We want to prove that  $\lambda = 1 - \frac{1}{\alpha} \in \text{spec}_\alpha(L_{ss}, L_m^2)$  for all  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , and  $m \geq 2$ . Since we know

$$L_m^2 = \bigoplus_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}^{\ell^2} U_{km},$$

it suffices to show that  $1 - \frac{1}{\alpha} \in U_{km}$  for some  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . We do this for  $k = 0$ , in which case the resolvent equation for  $U(t)$ , as above, simplifies to:

$$U'(t) = \alpha G(t). \tag{17}$$

Integrating, Equation (17) becomes the integral equation

$$U(t) = c + \alpha \int_0^t G(s) ds,$$

where  $c$  is a constant that must be chosen so that  $U \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ . Consider the function

$$G(t) := \frac{1}{|t| + 1} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}).$$

It is not difficult to see that

$$c + \alpha \int_0^t G(s) ds = c + \alpha \cdot \text{sgn}(t) \log(1 + |t|),$$

is not in  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$  for any choice of constant  $c$ . This implies that  $1 - \frac{1}{\alpha} \in \text{spec}_\alpha(L_{ss}, U_0)$ .

### A.3 Mathematica Code

The following Mathematica code verifies that the previously discussed contraction property is satisfied for  $m \geq 2 + \frac{8}{\epsilon q \alpha}$ . We should interpret  $e$  in the code below as representing the number  $\epsilon q \alpha$  from our proof above.

```
Reduce[ForAll[{a, l, k, q},
  0 < a < 1 && k >= 1 && l >= 1 - (2 - e)/(q*a) &&
  1 <= q <=
  2/a, (a*(2 - a)/(2*k*m))*(1/(k*m + 2 - 2/q) +
  1/(k*m - 2 + 2/q)) + ((2/q + a*(1 - l) +
  m*k + 2 - 2/q)*
  a*(2 - a)/(2*k*m*(2/q + a*(1 - l))))*
  (1/(k*m + 2 - 2/q)
  +
  1/(k*m - 2 + 2/q)) +
  a*(2 - a)*(1/(2/q + a*(1 - l)))*
  (1/(m*k - 2 + 2/q)) < 1] &&
e > 0 && m >= (8 + 2 e)/e && Element[m, Integers]]
```

## References

- [1] Albritton, D., Brue, E., Colombo, M. *Non-Uniqueness of Leray Solutions of the Forced Navier-Stokes Equations*. Annals of Math. Vol. 196. pp. 415-455. (2022).
- [2] Albritton, D., Brue, E., Colombo, M., De Lellis, C., Giri, V., Janisch, M., Kwon, H. *Instability and Non-uniqueness for the 2D Euler Equations, after M. Vishik*. Annals of Mathematics Studies. 219. Princeton, N.J., (2023).
- [3] Arnold, V.I. *Conditions for Non-Linear Stability of Stationary Plane Curvilinear Flows of an Ideal Fluid*. Sov. Math. Dokl. 162, No. 5. pp. 773-777. (1965).
- [4] Chandrasekhar, S. *Hydrodynamic and Hydromagnetic Stability*. Oxford Press. (1961).
- [5] Edwards, R.E. *Fourier Series, a Modern Introduction, Volume 1* Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag. (1979).
- [6] Edwards, R.E. *Fourier Series, a Modern Introduction, Volume 2* Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag. (1979).
- [7] Engel, K-J., Nagel, R. *One-Parameter Semigroups for Linear Evolution Equations*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag. (2000).
- [8] Luke, Y.L. *Mathematical Functions and their Approximations*. Academic Press Inc. (1975).
- [9] Vishik, M. *Instability and non-uniqueness in the Cauchy problem for the Euler equations of an ideal incompressible fluid. Part I*. arXiv: 1805.09426 (2018).
- [10] Vishik, M. *Instability and non-uniqueness in the Cauchy problem for the Euler equations of an ideal incompressible fluid. Part II*. arXiv: 1805.09440 (2018).
- [11] Wolfram Research, Inc. <https://functions.wolfram.com>. Mathematical Functions Site. (2024).
- [12] Yudovich, V.I. *Non-stationary flow of an ideal incompressible liquid*. USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics. (1963).
- [13] Yudovich, V.I. *Eleven Great Problems of Mathematical Hydrodynamics*. Moscow Math. J. Vol 3. No. 2. pp. 711-737. (2003).
- [14] Zelati, M.C., Zillinger, C. *On degenerate circular and shear flows: the point vortex and power law circular flows*. Comm. PDE. Vol. 44. pp. 110-155. (2019).