

Sharp non-uniqueness for the Boussinesq equation with fractional dissipation

Zipeng Chen¹ * and Zhaoyang Yin^{1†}

¹School of Science,

Shenzhen Campus of Sun Yat-sen University, Shenzhen 518107, China

Abstract

This paper focuses on the d -dimensional ($d \geq 2$) Boussinesq equation with fractional dissipation $(-\Delta)^\alpha$ on the torus. We show that the uniqueness property breaks down within the function space $L_t^p L_x^\infty$ for any $p < \frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}$ when $1 \leq \alpha < \frac{d+1}{2}$ and the function space $L_t^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}} L_x^q$ for any $q < \infty$ when $1 < \alpha < \frac{d+1}{2}$. Moreover, the weak solutions we construct are smooth outside a set of singular times with Hausdorff dimension arbitrarily small. This result is sharp, as weak-strong uniqueness holds in the space $L_T^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}} L_x^\infty$.

Keywords: Boussinesq equation, Convex integration, Non-uniqueness

AMS Subject Classification: 35Q30, 76D03

1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider the following d -dimensional ($d \geq 2$) Boussinesq equation:

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t v + \operatorname{div}(v \otimes v) + \nabla p + (-\Delta)^\alpha v = \theta e_d, \\ \operatorname{div} v = 0, \\ \partial_t \theta + \operatorname{div}(v\theta) + (-\Delta)^\alpha \theta = 0, \quad \forall (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d, \end{cases}$$

where $T > 0$, \mathbb{T}^d is the d -dimensional torus and $e_d = (0, 0, \dots, 1)$. Here, v, p, θ represent velocity, pressure, and temperature, respectively. The Boussinesq equation serves to model large-scale atmospheric and oceanic circulations underlying cold front formations and jet stream behaviors (see [34]). Moreover, the Boussinesq equation is indispensable for investigating the Rayleigh–Bénard convection, which is one of the most widely studied convection phenomena (see [9, 10, 18]). Let us first present the notion of weak solutions in the distributional sense to (1.1).

Definition 1.1. *Let $(u_0, \theta_0) \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$. A pair $(u, \theta) \in L_{t,x}^2$ is a weak solution of (1.1) with initial data (u_0, θ_0) if the following hold:*

*Email: chenzp26@mail2.sysu.edu.cn

†E-mail: mcsyzy@mail.sysu.edu.cn

- For a.e. $t \in [0, T]$, $u(t)$ is weakly divergence-free.
- For any $\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\operatorname{div} \phi = 0$ and $\phi(t) = 0$ if $t \geq T$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} u_0(x) \cdot \phi(0, x) dx = - \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} u \cdot (\partial_t \phi - (-\Delta)^\alpha \phi + u \cdot \nabla \phi) + \theta e_d \cdot \phi dx dt.$$

- For any $\psi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})$ with $\psi(t) = 0$ if $t \geq T$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \theta_0(x) \cdot \psi(0, x) dx = - \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \theta \cdot (\partial_t \psi - (-\Delta)^\alpha \psi + u \cdot \nabla \psi) dx dt.$$

Moreover, we call the weak solution (u, θ) is generalized Leray-Hopf weak solution if (u, θ) belongs to $L_T^\infty L_x^2 \cap L_T^2 \dot{H}_x^\alpha$ and satisfies

$$(1.2) \quad \|u(t)\|_{L_x^2}^2 + 2 \int_0^t \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u(s)\|_{L_x^2}^2 ds \leq \|u_0\|_{L_x^2}^2 + 2 \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \theta e_d \cdot u dx ds,$$

$$(1.3) \quad \|\theta(t)\|_{L_x^2}^2 + 2 \int_0^t \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \theta(s)\|_{L_x^2}^2 ds \leq \|\theta_0\|_{L_x^2}^2.$$

Consider the famous Navier-Stokes equation:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v + \operatorname{div}(v \otimes v) + \nabla p - \nu \Delta v = 0, \\ \operatorname{div} v = 0, \\ v(0) = v_0, \end{cases}$$

Leray [28] first proved that there exists a weak solution in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d))$ for any L^2 solenoidal initial data, which satisfies the energy inequality

$$\|v(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\nu \int_0^t \|\nabla v(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \leq \|v_0\|_{L^2}^2, \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

In the case of smooth bounded domain with Dirichlet boundary conditions, Hopf [20] derived an analogous result. This category of weak solutions is nowadays known as Leray-Hopf weak solutions. In the present time, the uniqueness problem for Leray-Hopf weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations remains an open question. However, significant breakthroughs have been made in the uniqueness, regularity, and global existence of solutions to NS equation within broader function spaces. The most relevant result to this article is the Ladyzhenskaya-Prodi-Serrin criteria [25, 26, 37, 38]. It states that if a Leray-Hopf weak solution belongs to the critical or subcritical regime:

$$L_t^p L_x^q \quad \text{with} \quad \frac{2}{p} + \frac{d}{q} \leq 1,$$

then uniqueness is guaranteed for Leray-Hopf solutions with the same initial data (more precisely, we need $C_t L^q$ rather than $L_t^\infty L_x^q$ when $p = \infty$). Moreover, belonging to such functional spaces also implies the regularity of Leray-Hopf solutions [17, 24, 39]. For the 3D hyperdissipative NS equation, [42] proves that uniqueness holds in the critical or subcritical regime

$$L_t^p L_x^q \quad \text{with} \quad \frac{2\alpha}{p} + \frac{3}{q} \leq 2\alpha - 1.$$

It's known that weak solution of NS equation will stay unique in the critical or subcritical regime due to LPS criteria. But in the supercritical, uniqueness may break down and there have been many non-uniqueness results. Buckmaster-Vicol [5] first proved the non-uniqueness of finite energy weak solutions to 3D NS equation, which is based on the convex integration scheme and the L_x^2 -based intermittent spatial building block. Using the same method, Luo-Titi [33] extended the above result to 3D hyperviscous NS equation with fractional hyperviscosity exponent less than the Lion exponent $\frac{5}{4}$. Luo-Pu [30] showed the non-uniqueness of $C_t^0 L_x^2$ weak solutions to 2D hypoviscous NS equation. In [6], Cheskidov-Luo used the temporal intermittency method and proved the sharp non-uniqueness of NS equation on the class $L_t^p L_x^\infty$ when $p < 2$. This is the first sharp non-uniqueness counterexample near the endpoint of LPS criteria. In [7], Cheskidov-Luo established sharp non-uniqueness on the class $L_t^\infty L_x^q$ when $q < 2$ for the 2D NS equation, which is another endpoint of LPS criteria. For the 3D hyperdissipative NS equation with fractional hyperviscosity exponent beyond Lion exponent, Li-Qu-Zeng-Zhang [29] showed the sharp non-uniqueness in the supercritical space in view of the generalized LPS criteria.

In these papers of proving non-uniqueness results as well this one, the convex integration method stands as the most crucial tool. De Lellis-Székelyhidi [13, 14] first introduced the convex integration scheme into the incompressible Euler equation. The convex integration scheme has been fully developed in recent years, for instance [1, 2, 3, 8, 11, 12, 16, 21, 23]. The resolution of Onsager's conjecture marks a major milestone—specifically, Isett [22] resolved the conjecture for the 3D case (see also [4]), and Giri-Radu [19] achieved the same for the 2D case.

Driven by research on Onsager's conjecture regarding the Euler equation and the non-uniqueness of weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equation, a natural question arises: do analogous results hold for the Boussinesq system? For the 3D inviscid Boussinesq equation without thermal diffusion, Tao-Zhang [40] showed the existence of C^β periodic weak solutions with the prescribed kinetic energy where $\beta \in (0, \frac{1}{5})$. Miao-Nie-Ye [35] proved the Hölder threshold regularity exponent for L^p -norm conservation of temperature of this system is $\frac{1}{3}$. The existence of periodic weak solutions belonging to C^β with $\beta \in (0, \frac{1}{3})$ and possessing the prescribed kinetic energy was demonstrated by Xu-Tan [41]. For the 2D Boussinesq equation with thermal diffusion, Luo-Tao-zhang [31, 32] constructed the Hölder continuous dissipative weak solutions with the prescribed kinetic energy and showed the non-uniqueness of finite energy weak solutions.

2 Main result and outline of the paper

The main theorems of this paper is formulated in Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2, which shows non-uniqueness of weak solutions for the Boussinesq equation (1.1).

Theorem 2.1. *Let $d \geq 2$ be the dimension and $1 \leq \alpha < \frac{d+1}{2}$. For any $1 \leq p < \frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}$, if $(u, \theta) \in L_T^p L_x^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ is a weak solution of (1.1) and has at least one interval of regularity, then there exist infinitely many non-generalized-Leray-Hopf weak solutions in $L_T^p L_x^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ of (1.1) with the same initial data.*

Theorem 2.2. *Let $d \geq 2$ be the dimension and $1 < \alpha < \frac{d+1}{2}$. For any $q < \infty$, if $(u, \theta) \in L_t^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}} L_x^q$ is a weak solution of (1.1) and has at least one interval of regularity, then there exist infinitely many non-generalized-Leray-Hopf weak solutions in $L_t^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}} L_x^q$ of (1.1) with the same initial data.*

Remark 2.3. *Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2 represent the first results establishing the sharp nonuniqueness of the Boussinesq system, and the proof can also be adopted for the NS equation. However, the proof of Theorem 2.1 or Theorem 2.2 is not valid in the case $\alpha \geq \frac{d+1}{2}$. More precisely, we can not balance the oscillation error which comes from convection term and the linear error (see Section 5.3), which is the same obstacle encountered in [29].*

Due to the similar structure of NS equation, the Boussinesq system (1.1) may possess the same weak-strong uniqueness properties in the critical or subcritical regime. More precisely, we have the following theorem, which corresponds to an end point $(\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}, \infty)$ of generalized LPS criteria and reflect that non-uniqueness results of Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2 are sharp.

Theorem 2.4. *Let (u, θ) be a weak solution of (1.1) and $1 \leq \alpha < \frac{d+2}{2}$ such that $(u, \theta) \in L_T^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}} L_x^\infty$. Then (u, θ) is a generalized Leray-Hopf weak solution and unique in the class of generalized Leray-Hopf weak solutions.*

We introduce the Boussinesq-Reynolds equation:

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t v + \operatorname{div}(v \otimes v) + \nabla p + (-\Delta)^\alpha v = \theta e_d + \operatorname{div} R, \\ \operatorname{div} v = 0, \\ \partial_t \theta + \operatorname{div}(v \theta) + (-\Delta)^\alpha \theta = \operatorname{div} S, \end{cases}$$

where R is a symmetric matrix function and S is a vector function.

The following proposition serves as the basis for the proof of Theorem 2.1 or Theorem 2.2.

Proposition 2.5. *Let $d \geq 2$ be the dimension, $1 \leq \alpha < \frac{d+1}{2}$, $1 \leq p < \frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}$, $q < \infty$ and $\epsilon > 0$. For any smooth vector field $v \in C^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and smooth function $\rho \in C^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})$ with*

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} v(t, x) dx = 0, \operatorname{div} v = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho(t, x) dx = 0,$$

there exist weak solutions (u, θ) of (1.1) and a set

$$I = \cup_{i=1}^\infty (a_i, b_i) \subset [0, T]$$

such that the following holds.

- *The weak solution (u, θ) belongs to $L_T^p L_x^\infty$ and satisfies*

$$\|u - v\|_{L_T^p L_x^\infty} + \|\theta - \rho\|_{L_T^p L_x^\infty} \leq \epsilon.$$

Moreover, if $1 < \alpha < \frac{d+1}{2}$, we have

$$\|u - v\|_{L_T^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}} L_x^q} + \|\theta - \rho\|_{L_T^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}} L_x^q} \leq \epsilon.$$

- *(u, θ) is smooth on $I \times \mathbb{T}^d$. Moreover, (u, θ) coincides with the unique smooth solution with the initial data $(v(0, x), \rho(0, x))$ and is also regular near $t = T$.*
- *The Hausdorff dimension of the residue set $S = [0, T] \setminus I$ satisfies*

$$d_{\mathcal{H}}(S) \leq \epsilon.$$

The rest of the paper focuses on the proof of Proposition 2.5. We will use the iteration scheme and there are two steps of construction. In Section 3, we use the gluing procedure introduced by Isett in [22], to concentrate the stress errors into many smaller sub-intervals. This step will make the singular set of the limit have a small Hausdorff dimension. In Section 4 and 5, we add the suitable perturbation using the space-time convex integration method to reduce the size of the Reynolds stress error (R, S) . Finally, in Section 6, we conclude the proof of Proposition 2.5, Theorem 2.1, Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 2.4.

3 Concentration of the Reynolds stress error

In this part, we employ gluing technique to concentrate the Reynolds stress errors. The support of the new Reynolds stress errors will be scaled down to our needed degree. At the same time, the new Reynolds stress errors will almost keep its $L_T^1 L_x^r$ norm and the perturbation in velocity or in temperature will be arbitrary small in $L_T^\infty H_x^d$.

We introduce the notion of well-preparedness of solutions to (2.1) from [6], aiming at ensuring that the singular set in time has a small Hausdorff dimension.

Definition 3.1. *Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. We call smooth solution (v, θ, R, S) of (2.1) are well prepared if there exist a set I and a length scale $\tau > 0$ such that I is a union of at most $\tau^{-\epsilon}$ many closed intervals of length 5τ and*

$$R(t, x) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad S(t, x) = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad \text{dist}(t, I^c) \leq \tau.$$

Proposition 3.2. *Let $0 < \epsilon < 1$ and (u, θ, R, S) be a well-prepared smooth solution of (2.1) of some set I and length scale τ . For any $1 < r < \infty$ and $\delta > 0$, there exists a universal constant $C(r, \epsilon, d) > 0$ and a well-prepared smooth solution $(\bar{u}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{S})$ of some set \bar{I} and length scale $\bar{\tau}$ such that the following holds.*

(1) *The set \bar{I} and the length scale $\bar{\tau}$ satisfy*

$$(3.1) \quad \bar{I} \subset I, \{0, 1\} \notin \bar{I} \text{ and } \bar{\tau} < \frac{\tau}{2}.$$

(2) *The new Reynolds stress error \bar{R} and \bar{S} satisfy*

$$(3.2) \quad \bar{R}(t, x) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{S}(t, x) = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad \text{dist}(t, \bar{I}^c) \leq \frac{3\tau}{2},$$

$$(3.3) \quad \|\bar{R}\|_{L_T^1 L_x^r} \leq C \|R\|_{L_T^1 L_x^r}, \quad \|\bar{S}\|_{L_T^1 L_x^r} \leq C \|S\|_{L_T^1 L_x^r}.$$

(3) *The velocity perturbation $\bar{u} - u$ and the temperature perturbation $\bar{\theta} - \theta$ satisfy*

$$(3.4) \quad \text{supp}(\bar{u} - u) \subset I \times \mathbb{T}^d, \quad \text{supp}(\bar{\theta} - \theta) \subset I \times \mathbb{T}^d,$$

$$(3.5) \quad \|\bar{u} - u\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^d} \leq \delta, \quad \|\bar{\theta} - \theta\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^d} \leq \delta.$$

3.1. Gluing procedure

Firstly, we construct $(\bar{u}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{S})$. Let $\bar{\tau} > 0$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, we define

$$t_i = i\bar{\tau}^\epsilon, \quad \forall i \in [0, \frac{T}{\bar{\tau}^\epsilon}].$$

Here we assume $\frac{T}{\bar{\tau}^\epsilon}$ is always an integer without loss of generality. For any $i \in [0, \frac{T}{\bar{\tau}^\epsilon} - 1]$, let $v_i : [t_i, t_{i+1}] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^d$ and $\phi_i : [t_i, t_{i+1}] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$ be the smooth solutions of the following Boussinesq system

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t v_i + \operatorname{div}(v_i \otimes u) + \operatorname{div}(u \otimes v_i) + \operatorname{div}(v_i \otimes v_i) + \nabla p_i + (-\Delta)^\alpha v_i = \phi_i e_d - \operatorname{div} R, \\ \operatorname{div} v_i = 0, \\ \partial_t \phi_i + \operatorname{div}(u \phi_i) + \operatorname{div}(v_i \theta) + \operatorname{div}(v_i \phi_i) + (-\Delta)^\alpha \phi_i = -\operatorname{div} S, \\ v_i(t_i, x) = \phi_i(t_i, x) = 0. \end{cases}$$

The next step involves gluing $\{v_i\}$ or $\{\phi_i\}$ together to form a new solution: this new solution is the exact solution of the Boussinesq equation on the majority of $[0, T]$, with the error being supported on multiple disjoint small subintervals. We define smooth cutoff functions $\{\chi_i : [0, T] \rightarrow [0, 1]\}$ as follows.

For any $i \in [1, \frac{T}{\bar{\tau}^\epsilon} - 2]$,

$$\chi_i(t) \triangleq \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t_i + \bar{\tau} \leq t \leq t_{i+1} - \bar{\tau}, \\ 0 & \text{if } t \leq t_i + \frac{\bar{\tau}}{2} \text{ or } t \geq t_{i+1} - \frac{\bar{\tau}}{2}, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\chi_0(t) \triangleq \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq t_1 - \bar{\tau}, \\ 0 & \text{if } t \geq t_1 - \frac{\bar{\tau}}{2}, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\chi_{\frac{T}{\bar{\tau}^\epsilon}-1}(t) \triangleq \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t_{\frac{T}{\bar{\tau}^\epsilon}-1} + \bar{\tau} \leq t \leq 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } t \leq t_{\frac{T}{\bar{\tau}^\epsilon}-1} + \frac{\bar{\tau}}{2}. \end{cases}$$

We define the new velocity

$$\bar{u} \triangleq u + \sum_i \chi_i v_i,$$

and the new temperature

$$\bar{\theta} \triangleq \theta + \sum_i \chi_i \phi_i.$$

Using (3.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \bar{u} - \Delta^\alpha \bar{u} + \operatorname{div}(\bar{u} \otimes \bar{u}) + \nabla p &= \theta e_d + \operatorname{div} R + (\partial_t - \Delta^\alpha) \left(\sum_i \chi_i v_i \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_i \chi_i (\operatorname{div}(u \otimes v_i) + \operatorname{div}(v_i \otimes u)) + \sum_i \chi_i^2 \operatorname{div}(v_i \otimes v_i) \\ &= \theta e_d + \operatorname{div} R + \sum_i \partial_t \chi_i \cdot v_i \\ &\quad + \sum_i (\chi_i^2 - \chi_i) \operatorname{div}(v_i \otimes v_i) + \sum_i \chi_i (-\operatorname{div} R + \theta_i e_d) - \sum_i \chi_i \nabla q_i. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we introduce new concentrated Reynolds stress and new pressure as

$$\bar{R} \triangleq (1 - \sum_i \chi_i) R + \mathcal{R} \left(\sum_i \partial_t \chi_i \cdot v_i \right) + \sum_i (\chi_i^2 - \chi_i) v_i \otimes v_i,$$

$$\bar{p} \triangleq p + \sum_i \chi_i q_i.$$

Here $\mathcal{R} : C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d; S^{d \times d})$ is an antidivergence operator (see B.1). Therefore, we have

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \bar{u} + (-\Delta)^\alpha \bar{u} + \operatorname{div}(\bar{u} \otimes \bar{u}) + \nabla \bar{p} = \bar{\theta} e_d + \operatorname{div} \bar{R}, \\ \operatorname{div} \bar{u} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Following the same procedure, we define

$$\bar{S} \triangleq (1 - \sum_i \chi_i) S + \mathcal{G}(\sum_i \partial_t \chi_i \cdot \theta_i) + \sum_i (\chi_i^2 - \chi_i) v_i \cdot \theta_i.$$

Here $\mathcal{G} : C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ is another type of antidivergence operator (see B.1). Finally, $(\bar{u}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{S})$ satisfy the Boussinesq-Renolds equation:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \bar{u} + \operatorname{div}(\bar{u} \otimes \bar{u}) + \nabla \bar{p} + (-\Delta)^\alpha \bar{u} = \bar{\theta} e_d + \operatorname{div} \bar{R}, \\ \operatorname{div} \bar{u} = 0, \\ \partial_t \bar{\theta} + \operatorname{div}(\bar{u} \bar{\theta}) + (-\Delta)^\alpha \bar{\theta} = \operatorname{div} \bar{S}. \end{cases}$$

3.2. Proof of Proposition 3.2

In the above subsection, we define $(\bar{u}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{S})$. In this part, we prove the proposition 3.2. First, we present an additional proposition that quantifies the corrector v_i and ϕ_i with respect to the time scale $\bar{\tau}$ as well as the forcings $-\operatorname{div} R$ and $-\operatorname{div} S$.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $d \geq 2$, (u, θ, R, S) be smooth functions, $1 < r < \infty$ and $\delta > 0$. There exists a universal constant C_r depending only on r and dimension d such that the following holds.*

If $\bar{\tau}$ is sufficiently small, then the smooth solutions (v_i, ϕ_i) to (3.6) on $[t_i, t_{i+1}]$ satisfy

$$(3.7) \quad \|(v_i, \phi_i)\|_{L^\infty(t_i, t_{i+1}; H_x^d(\mathbb{T}^d))} \leq \delta,$$

$$(3.8) \quad \|\mathcal{R} v_i\|_{L^\infty(t_i, t_{i+1}; L^r(\mathbb{T}^d))} \leq C_r \|R\|_{L^1(t_i, t_{i+1}; L^r(\mathbb{T}^d))} + C_{r, u, \theta} \delta \bar{\tau}^\epsilon,$$

$$(3.9) \quad \|\mathcal{G} \phi_i\|_{L^\infty(t_i, t_{i+1}; L^r(\mathbb{T}^d))} \leq C_r \|S\|_{L^1(t_i, t_{i+1}; L^r(\mathbb{T}^d))} + C_{r, u, \theta} \delta \bar{\tau}^\epsilon,$$

here the constant $C_{r, u, \theta}$ depends only on r , u and θ .

Proof. Since $\bar{\tau}$ is sufficiently small, (3.7) is obtained directly by using the standard energy estimate and continuity method. In the following, we focus on the demonstration of (3.8).

Denote by \mathbb{P}_H the Leray projection operator. Applying antidivergence operator \mathcal{R} to both sides of the first equation in (3.6), we have

$$(\partial_t + (-\Delta)^\alpha) \mathcal{R} v_i = -\mathcal{R} \mathbb{P}_H \operatorname{div}(v_i \otimes u + u \otimes v_i + v_i \otimes v_i) - \mathcal{R} \mathbb{P}_H \operatorname{div} R + \mathcal{R} \mathbb{P}_H(\phi_i e_d)$$

By (3.7) and the fact that $\mathcal{R} \mathbb{P}_H \operatorname{div}$ is a Calderon-Zygmund operator on $L^r(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and $t_{i+1} - t_i = \bar{\tau}^\epsilon$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathcal{R} \mathbb{P}_H \operatorname{div}(v_i \otimes u + u \otimes v_i + v_i \otimes v_i) + \mathcal{R} \mathbb{P}_H \operatorname{div} R\|_{L^1(t_i, t_{i+1}; L^r(\mathbb{T}^d))} \\ & \leq C_r (\|v_i u\|_{L^1(t_i, t_{i+1}; L^r(\mathbb{T}^d))} + \|v_i^2\|_{L^1(t_i, t_{i+1}; L^r(\mathbb{T}^d))} + \|R\|_{L^1(t_i, t_{i+1}; L^r(\mathbb{T}^d))}) \end{aligned}$$

$$(3.10) \quad \leq C_r(\bar{\tau}^\epsilon \|u\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \|v_i\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} + \bar{\tau}^\epsilon \|v_i\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty}^2 + \|R\|_{L^1(t_i, t_{i+1}; L^r(\mathbb{T}^d))})$$

$$(3.11) \quad \leq C_r \|R\|_{L^1(t_i, t_{i+1}; L^r(\mathbb{T}^d))} + C_{r,u,\theta} \delta \bar{\tau}^\epsilon.$$

Due to Theorem B.2 and the fact that ϕ_i has zero mean, we obtain

$$(3.12) \quad \|\mathcal{R}\mathbb{P}_H(\phi_i e_d)\|_{L^1(t_i, t_{i+1}; L^r(\mathbb{T}^d))} \leq C_r \|\phi_i\|_{L^1(t_i, t_{i+1}; L^r(\mathbb{T}^d))} \leq C_{r,u,\theta} \delta \bar{\tau}^\epsilon.$$

Combining (3.10), (3.12) and property of the Heat equation, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathcal{R}v_i\|_{L^\infty(t_i, t_{i+1}; L^r(\mathbb{T}^d))} \\ & \leq C_r \|\mathcal{R}\mathbb{P}_H \operatorname{div}(v_i \otimes u + u \otimes v_i + v_i \otimes v_i) - \mathcal{R}\mathbb{P}_H \operatorname{div} R + \mathcal{R}\mathbb{P}_H(\phi_i e_d)\|_{L^1(t_i, t_{i+1}; L^r(\mathbb{T}^d))} \\ & \leq C_r \|R\|_{L^1(t_i, t_{i+1}; L^r(\mathbb{T}^d))} + C_{r,u,\theta} \delta \bar{\tau}^\epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

which gives (3.8). The proof of (3.9) is similar, here we omit the detail. \square

Finally, we complete the proof of Proposition 3.2.

Proof of Proposition 3.2. Let $\bar{\tau}$ be sufficiently small such that $10\bar{\tau}^\epsilon < \tau$ and $\bar{\tau} < \frac{\tau}{2}$. We define the set on time axis \bar{I} in Proposition 3.2 as follows,

$$\bar{I} \triangleq \bigcup_{i \in \Sigma} \left[t_i - \frac{5\bar{\tau}}{2}, t_i + \frac{5\bar{\tau}}{2} \right].$$

where $\Sigma = \{i \in \mathbb{Z} : 1 \leq i \leq \frac{T}{\bar{\tau}^\epsilon} \text{ and } (R, S) \neq 0 \text{ on } [t_{i-1}, t_i + \frac{5\bar{\tau}}{2}] \cap [0, T]\}$. Thus the temporal support and the well-preparedness of $(\bar{u}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{S})$ follow easily from the definition of $\{\chi_i\}$ and (\bar{R}, \bar{S}) . We only need to verify $\bar{I} \subset I$ and we argue by contradiction.

If there exists $a \in \bar{I} \cap I^c$, then there exists $i \in \Sigma$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} a & \in [t_i - \frac{5\bar{\tau}}{2}, t_i + \frac{5\bar{\tau}}{2}] \subset [t_{i-1}, t_i + \frac{5\bar{\tau}}{2}], \\ (R, S)|_{[t_{i-1}, t_i + \frac{5\bar{\tau}}{2}]} & \neq 0, \\ (R, S)|_{(a-\tau, a+\tau)} & = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts the fact that $[t_{i-1}, t_i + \frac{5\bar{\tau}}{2}] \subset (a - \tau, a + \tau)$ due to $10\bar{\tau}^\epsilon < \tau$.

In the following, we focus on the estimates of $(\bar{u}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{S})$. Due to the definition of \bar{R} and the triangle inequality, we get

$$\|\bar{R}\|_{L_T^1 L_x^\infty} \leq \|1 - \sum_i \chi_i\|_{L_T^\infty} \|R\|_{L_T^1 L_x^\infty} + \sum_i \|\partial_t \chi_i\|_{L_T^1} \|\mathcal{R}v_i\|_{L_T^\infty L_x^\infty} + \sum_i \|\chi_i - \chi_i^2\|_{L_T^1} \|v_i \otimes v_i\|_{L_T^\infty L_x^\infty}.$$

By the definition of $\{\chi_i\}$, we have the following trivial bounds in time:

$$(3.13) \quad \|1 - \sum_i \chi_i\|_{L_T^\infty} \leq 1,$$

and for any $i \in [0, \frac{T}{\bar{\tau}^\epsilon} - 1]$,

$$(3.14) \quad \|\partial_t \chi_i\|_{L_T^1} \lesssim 1,$$

$$(3.15) \quad \|\chi_i - \chi_i^2\|_{L_T^1} \lesssim \bar{\tau}.$$

Combing (3.13), (3.14), (3.15) and Proposition 3.3, we obtain

$$\|\bar{R}\|_{L_T^1 L_x^r} \lesssim \|R\|_{L_T^1 L_x^r} + \sum_i (C_r \|R\|_{L^1(t_i, t_{i+1}; L^r(\mathbb{T}^d))} + C_{r,u,\theta} \delta \bar{\tau}^\epsilon) + \sum_i \delta^2 \bar{\tau}.$$

Using the fact that $\sum_i \bar{\tau} \leq \sum_i \bar{\tau}^\epsilon \leq T$ and choosing $\bar{\tau}$ sufficiently small, we get

$$\|\bar{R}\|_{L_T^1 L_x^r} \leq C \|R\|_{L_T^1 L_x^r}.$$

By the definition of $\{\chi_i\}$, (3.1) and Proposition 3.3, we have

$$\|\bar{u} - u\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^d} \leq \left\| \sum_i \chi_i v_i \right\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^d} \leq \delta.$$

Using the same method, we can obtain the estimate of $(\bar{\theta}, \bar{S})$, the proof is omitted herein for brevity. \square

4 Convex integration in space-time

This section concentrates on reducing the size of the Reynolds stress by using the convex integration method. The main step is to construct a suitable velocity perturbation ω and a suitable temperature perturbation κ such that

$$\tilde{u} = \bar{u} + \omega, \quad \tilde{\theta} = \bar{\theta} + \kappa$$

solve the Boussinesq-Reynolds equation with smaller Reynolds stress \tilde{R} and \tilde{S} . Here we present the main proposition of this section.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $d \geq 2$ be the dimension, $1 \leq \alpha < \frac{d+1}{2}$, $1 \leq p < \frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}$ and $q < \infty$, there exists $r > 1$ such that we have the following.*

Let $\delta > 0$ and $(\bar{u}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{S})$ be a well-prepared smooth solution of (2.1) for the set \bar{I} and the length scale $\bar{\tau}$, there exists another well-prepared smooth solution $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{R}, \tilde{\theta}, \tilde{S})$ of (2.1) for the same set \bar{I} and the same length scale $\bar{\tau}$ such that the following holds.

(1) *The new Reynolds stress error \tilde{R} and \tilde{S} satisfies*

$$\|(\tilde{R}, \tilde{S})\|_{L_T^1 L_x^r} \leq \delta.$$

(2) *The velocity perturbation $\omega \triangleq \tilde{u} - \bar{u}$ and the temperature perturbation $\kappa \triangleq \tilde{\theta} - \bar{\theta}$ satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{supp}_t(\omega, \kappa) &\subset \bar{I}, \\ \|(\omega, \kappa)\|_{L^2([0,T] \times \mathbb{T})} &\leq M \|(\bar{R}, \bar{S})\|_{L^1([0,T] \times \mathbb{T})}, \\ \|(\omega, \kappa)\|_{L_T^p L_x^\infty} &\leq \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, if $1 < \alpha < \frac{d+1}{2}$, we have

$$\|(\omega, \kappa)\|_{L_T^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}} L_x^q} \leq \delta.$$

4.1. Concentrated Mikado flows

Firstly, we recall the stationary Mikado flows that are introduced in [12]. They serve as the key spatial building blocks in the convex integration method. What we use are called concentrated Mikado flows that can be found in [6, Theorem 4.3] or [29, Section 4.1]. Here we recall $e_k = \frac{k}{|k|}$ for any $k \in \Lambda$.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $d \geq 2$ be the dimension and $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ be the finite set given by Lemma A.1. For any $k \in \Lambda$ and $\mu > 0$, there exist two smooth functions $\Psi_k^\mu : \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\Phi_k^\mu : \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that the following hold.*

(1) *For any $k \in \Lambda$, Ψ_k^μ and Φ_k^μ satisfy*

$$\Psi_k^\mu = \Delta \Phi_k^\mu.$$

(2) *For any $k \in \Lambda$, $\Psi_k^\mu e_k$ is divergence-free, solves the stationary Euler equations without pressure*

$$(4.1) \quad \operatorname{div}(\Psi_k^\mu e_k \otimes \Psi_k^\mu e_k) = 0,$$

and can be written as a divergence of a skew-symmetric tensor

$$(4.2) \quad \Psi_k^\mu e_k = \operatorname{div} \Omega_k^\mu,$$

which Ω_k^μ is defined as follows,

$$\Omega_k^\mu \triangleq e_k \otimes \nabla \Phi_k^\mu - \nabla \Phi_k^\mu \otimes e_k$$

(3) *For any $k \in \Lambda$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and $m \geq 0$, there holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^{-m} \|\nabla^m \Psi_k^\mu\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} &\lesssim_m \mu^{\frac{d-1}{2} - \frac{d-1}{p}}, \\ \mu^{-m} \|\nabla^m \Phi_k^\mu\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} &\lesssim_m \mu^{-2 + \frac{d-1}{2} - \frac{d-1}{p}}, \\ \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (\Psi_k^\mu)^2 &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

(4) *For any $k \neq k' \in \Lambda$ and $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, there holds*

$$\|\Psi_k^\mu \Psi_{k'}^\mu\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} \lesssim \mu^{d-1 - \frac{d}{p}}.$$

In the above estimates, the implicit constants are uniform with respect to μ .

Denote

$$W_k^\mu \triangleq \Psi_k^\mu e_k.$$

$\{W_k^\mu\}_k$ are called the concentrated Mikado flows and μ is spatial concentration parameter.

4.2. Temporal intermittency and space-time cutoffs

For obtaining estimates in $L_T^p L_x^\infty$ or $L_T^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}} L_x^q$ estimates, implementing temporal concentration during the construction of perturbation is a necessary step.

Let $g \in C_c^\infty((0, T))$ and $l > 0$ be a large constant which will be determined later. We define a T -periodic function $g_l : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that satisfies

$$g_l(t) = l^{\frac{1}{2}} g(lt), \quad \forall t \in [0, T].$$

In order to cancel the high temporal frequency due to the temporal concentration, we define the following temporal corrector.

$$h_l(t) \triangleq \int_0^t g_l^2(s) - 1 \, ds, \quad \forall t \in [0, T].$$

From the above definition, we can easily obtain the following estimate.

Proposition 4.3. *For any $p \in [1, \infty]$ and $\nu, m \in \mathbb{N}$, we have*

$$(4.3) \quad \|\partial_t^m (g_l(\nu \cdot))\|_{L_T^p} \lesssim (\nu l)^m l^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}},$$

$$(4.4) \quad \|g_l(\nu \cdot)\|_{L_T^2} = 1,$$

$$(4.5) \quad \|h_l\|_{L_T^\infty} \leq 1.$$

Here the implicit constants in above estimates hold uniformly in temporal concentration parameter l and temporal oscillation parameter ν .

In the following, we define two cutoff functions. The first is to meet the hypotheses in Lemma A.1 and the second is to ensure the well-preparedness of $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{R}, \tilde{\theta}, \tilde{S})$.

We define a smooth, monotonically increasing function $\xi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ that satisfies

$$\xi(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{2\|(\bar{R}, \bar{S})\|_{L^1([0, T] \times \mathbb{T})}}{r_0} & \text{if } 0 \leq |x| \leq \|(\bar{R}, \bar{S})\|_{L^1([0, T] \times \mathbb{T})}, \\ \frac{2|x|}{r_0} & \text{if } |x| \geq 2\|(\bar{R}, \bar{S})\|_{L^1([0, T] \times \mathbb{T})}. \end{cases}$$

Here r_0 is the constant given in Lemma A.1. We denote

$$\rho(t, x) \triangleq \xi(|(\bar{R}, \bar{S})(t, x)|), \quad \forall (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d.$$

Then we immediately obtain

$$\text{Id} - \frac{\bar{R}(t, x)}{\rho(t, x)} \in B_{r_0}(\text{Id}), \quad \forall (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d,$$

and according to Lemma A.1,

$$\Gamma_k(\text{Id} - \frac{\bar{R}(t, x)}{\rho(t, x)})$$

is well defined.

To guarantee that $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{R}, \tilde{\theta}, \tilde{S})$ is well-prepared for the set \bar{I} and the length scale $\bar{\tau}$, we define a smooth temporal function $f : [0, T] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ that satisfies

$$f(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \text{dist}(t, \bar{I}^c) \geq \frac{3\bar{\tau}}{2}, \\ 0 & \text{if } \text{dist}(t, \bar{I}^c) \leq \bar{\tau}. \end{cases}$$

4.3. Construction of the new perturbation and the new Reynolds stress error

We recall four parameters for the perturbation:

- (1) Temporal oscillation $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ and temporal concentration $\kappa > 0$.
- (2) Spatial oscillation $\sigma \in \mathbb{N}$ and spatial concentration $\mu \in \mathbb{N}$.

We define two amplitude functions:

$$\begin{aligned} a_k(t, x) &\triangleq g_l(\nu t) f(t) \rho(t, x)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Gamma_k \left(\text{Id} - \frac{\bar{R}(t, x)}{\rho(t, x)} \right), \\ b_k(t, x) &\triangleq g_l(\nu t) f(t) \rho(t, x)^{\frac{1}{2}} \gamma_k \left(-\frac{\bar{S}(t, x)}{\rho(t, x)} \right) \left[\Gamma_k \left(\text{Id} - \frac{\bar{R}(t, x)}{\rho(t, x)} \right) \right]^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where Γ_k and γ_k are given in Lemma A.1. Since Γ is bounded below by a positive constant $c_0 > 0$ from Lemma A.1, b_k is well defined.

The principle part of the new velocity perturbation $\omega^{(p)}$ and the new temperature perturbation $\kappa^{(p)}$ are composed of the amplitude function and the concentrated Mikado flow with oscillation:

$$(4.6) \quad \omega^{(p)}(t, x) \triangleq \sum_{k \in \Lambda} a_k(t, x) \Psi_k^\mu(\sigma x) e_k,$$

$$(4.7) \quad \kappa^{(p)}(t, x) \triangleq \sum_{k \in \Lambda} b_k(t, x) \Psi_k^\mu(\sigma x).$$

Note also that $\omega^{(p)}$ is not divergence-free. To rectify this, we introduce the divergence-free corrector:

$$(4.8) \quad \omega^{(c)}(t, x) \triangleq \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \sigma^{-1} \nabla a_k(t, x) : \Omega_k^\mu(\sigma x).$$

Thus, by (4.2),

$$\begin{aligned} \omega^{(p)} + \omega^{(c)} &= \sigma^{-1} \sum_{k \in \Lambda} a_k(t, x) \text{div} \Omega_k^\mu(\sigma x) + \sigma^{-1} \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \nabla a_k(t, x) : \Omega_k^\mu(\sigma x) \\ &= \sigma^{-1} \text{div} \left(\sum_{k \in \Lambda} a_k(t, x) \Omega_k^\mu(\sigma x) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $a_k(t, x) \Omega_k^\mu$ is skew-symmetric, $\omega^{(p)} + \omega^{(c)}$ is manifestly divergence-free.

To achieve a balance for the high temporal frequency component in the interaction, temporal correctors are introduced herein.

$$(4.9) \quad \omega^{(t)}(t, x) \triangleq \nu^{-1} h_l(\nu t) \mathbb{P}_H \text{div} \bar{R},$$

$$(4.10) \quad \kappa^{(t)}(t, x) \triangleq \nu^{-1} h_l(\nu t) \text{div} \bar{S},$$

$\omega^{(t)}$ is obviously divergence-free.

In summary, by the above definition, we define the total velocity perturbation and the total temperature perturbation:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega &\triangleq \omega^{(p)} + \omega^{(c)} + \omega^{(t)}, \\ \kappa &\triangleq \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \kappa^{(p)} + \kappa^{(t)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}$ denotes the projection onto non-zero Fourier modes. Here we note that ω is divergence-free and κ has zero mean.

Having defined the perturbation in the prior part, we focus on the construction of the new Reynolds stress. First, we carry out the computation of the interactions associated with the principal part:

$$(4.11) \quad \text{div}(\omega^{(p)} \otimes \omega^{(p)} + \bar{R}) = \text{div} \left[\sum_{k \in \Lambda} (a_k)^2 (\Psi_k^\mu)^2 e_k \otimes e_k + \bar{R} \right] + \text{div} R_{far},$$

$$(4.12) \quad \operatorname{div}(\omega^{(p)}\kappa^{(p)} + \bar{S}) = \operatorname{div} \left[\sum_{k \in \Lambda} a_k b_k (\Psi_k^\mu)^2 e_k + \bar{S} \right] + \operatorname{div} S_{far},$$

where R_{far} and S_{far} denote the nonlocal interactions between Mikado flows with different directions and are given by

$$(4.13) \quad R_{far} \triangleq \sum_{k \neq k'} \mathcal{R} \operatorname{div} (a_k a_{k'} \Psi_k^\mu(\sigma x) \Psi_{k'}^\mu(\sigma x) e_k \otimes e_{k'}),$$

$$(4.14) \quad S_{far} \triangleq \sum_{k \neq k'} a_k b_{k'} \Psi_k^\mu(\sigma x) \Psi_{k'}^\mu(\sigma x) e_k.$$

By a direct computation and Lemma A.1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div} \left(\sum_{k \in \Lambda} a_k^2 e_k \otimes e_k + \bar{R} \right) &= \operatorname{div} \left[f^2 g_l^2(\nu t) \rho \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \Gamma_k^2 (\operatorname{Id} - \frac{\bar{R}}{\rho}) e_k \otimes e_k + \bar{R} \right] \\ &= \operatorname{div} [f^2 g_l^2(\nu t) \rho \operatorname{Id} - f^2 g_l^2 \bar{R} + \bar{R}] \\ &= \nabla(f^2 g_l^2(\nu t) \rho) + \operatorname{div} [(1 - g_l^2(\nu t)) \bar{R}], \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div} \left(\sum_{k \in \Lambda} a_k b_k e_k \otimes e_k + \bar{S} \right) &= \operatorname{div} \left[f^2 g_l^2(\nu t) \rho \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \gamma_k \left(-\frac{\bar{S}}{\rho} \right) e_k + \bar{S} \right] \\ &= \operatorname{div} [(1 - f^2 g_l^2(\nu t)) \bar{S}] \\ &= \operatorname{div} [(1 - g_l^2(\nu t)) \bar{S}], \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality in both is valid due to (3.2) and the definition of f . Using the definition of $\omega^{(t)}$ and $\kappa^{(t)}$, we have

$$(4.15) \quad \operatorname{div} \left(\sum_{k \in \Lambda} a_k^2 e_k \otimes e_k + \bar{R} \right) = \nabla(f^2 g_l^2(\nu t) \rho) - \partial_t \omega^{(t)} + \operatorname{div} R_{osc,t} - \nu^{-1} \nabla \Delta^{-1} \operatorname{div} \operatorname{div} (\partial_t \bar{R} h_l(\nu t)),$$

$$(4.16) \quad \operatorname{div} \left(\sum_{k \in \Lambda} a_k b_k e_k \otimes e_k + \bar{S} \right) = -\partial_t \kappa^{(t)} + \operatorname{div} S_{osc,t},$$

where $R_{osc,t}$ and $S_{osc,t}$ denote temporal oscillation error and are given by

$$(4.17) \quad R_{osc,t} \triangleq \nu^{-1} h_l(\nu t) \partial_t \bar{R},$$

$$(4.18) \quad S_{osc,t} \triangleq \nu^{-1} h_l(\nu t) \partial_t \bar{S}.$$

Applying (4.1) and the two bilinear operators introduced in Proposition B.3, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} (4.19) \quad \operatorname{div} \sum_{k \in \Lambda} a_k^2 ((\Psi_k^\mu)^2 - 1) e_k \otimes e_k &= \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \nabla(a_k^2) \cdot ((\Psi_k^\mu)^2 - 1) e_k \otimes e_k \\ &= \operatorname{div} \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \mathcal{B}(\nabla(a_k^2), \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}(\Psi_k^\mu(\sigma x) e_k \otimes \Psi_k^\mu(\sigma x) e_k)) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(4.20) \quad \operatorname{div} \sum_{k \in \Lambda} a_k b_k ((\Psi_k^\mu)^2 - 1) e_k = \sum_{k \in \Lambda} e_k \cdot \nabla(a_k b_k) (\Psi_k^\mu(\sigma x)^2 - 1)$$

$$= \operatorname{div} \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \tilde{\mathcal{B}}(e_k \nabla(a_k b_k), \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \Psi_k^\mu(\sigma x)^2).$$

Here we note that (4.19) and (4.20) have zero spatial mean. Thus, we define two spatial oscillation errors

$$(4.21) \quad R_{osc,x} \triangleq \mathcal{B}(\nabla(a_k^2), \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}(\Psi_k^\mu(\sigma x)^2 e_k \otimes e_k)),$$

$$(4.22) \quad S_{osc,x} \triangleq \tilde{\mathcal{B}}(e_k \nabla(a_k b_k), \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \Psi_k^\mu(\sigma x)^2).$$

Combining (4.11), (4.12), (4.15), (4.16), (4.19) and (4.20), we obtain

$$(4.23) \quad \operatorname{div}(\omega^{(p)} \otimes \omega^{(p)} + \bar{R}) + \partial_t \omega^{(t)} = \nabla(f^2 g_l^2(\nu t) \rho) - \nu^{-1} \nabla \Delta^{-1} \operatorname{div} \operatorname{div}(\partial_t \bar{R} h_l(\nu t)) \\ + \operatorname{div} R_{far} + \operatorname{div} R_{osc,t} + \operatorname{div} R_{osc,x},$$

$$(4.24) \quad \operatorname{div}(\omega^{(p)} \kappa^{(p)} + \bar{S}) + \partial_t \kappa^{(t)} = \operatorname{div} S_{far} + \operatorname{div} S_{osc,t} + \operatorname{div} S_{osc,x}.$$

As usual, we define the correction error and the linear error:

$$(4.25) \quad R_{cor} \triangleq \mathcal{R} \operatorname{div}((\omega^c + \omega^{(t)}) \otimes \omega + \omega^{(p)} \otimes (\omega^c + \omega^{(t)})),$$

$$(4.26) \quad R_{lin} \triangleq \mathcal{R}(\partial_t(\omega^p + \omega^{(c)}) + (-\Delta)^\alpha \omega + \operatorname{div}(\bar{u} \otimes \omega + \omega \otimes \bar{u}) - \kappa e_d),$$

$$(4.27) \quad S_{cor} \triangleq \mathcal{G} \operatorname{div}(\omega \kappa^{(t)} + (\omega^{(c)} + \omega^{(t)}) \kappa^{(p)}),$$

$$(4.28) \quad S_{lin} \triangleq \mathcal{G}(\partial_t \kappa^{(p)} + (-\Delta)^\alpha \kappa + \operatorname{div}(\bar{u} \kappa + \omega \bar{\theta})).$$

Finally, we let the velocity \tilde{u} and $\tilde{\theta}$ of Proposition 4.1 be

$$\tilde{u} = \bar{u} + \omega, \quad \tilde{\theta} = \bar{\theta} + \kappa$$

which leads to the Boussinesq-Reynolds system

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \tilde{u} + \operatorname{div}(\tilde{u} \otimes \tilde{u}) + \nabla \tilde{p} + (-\Delta)^\alpha \tilde{u} = \tilde{\theta} e_d + \operatorname{div} \tilde{R}, \\ \operatorname{div} \tilde{u} = 0, \\ \partial_t \tilde{\theta} + \operatorname{div}(\tilde{u} \tilde{\theta}) + (-\Delta)^\alpha \tilde{\theta} = \operatorname{div} \tilde{S}, \end{cases}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{p} &= \bar{p} - f^2 g_l^2(\nu t) \rho + \nu^{-1} \Delta^{-1} \operatorname{div} \operatorname{div}(\partial_t \bar{R} h_l(\nu t)), \\ \tilde{R} &= R_{far} + R_{osc,t} + R_{osc,x} + R_{cor} + R_{lin}, \\ \tilde{S} &= S_{far} + S_{osc,t} + S_{osc,x} + S_{cor} + S_{lin}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we briefly check the equation with temperature in the Boussinesq-Reynolds system. By (4.24) and the definition of \tilde{S} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \tilde{\theta} + \operatorname{div}(\tilde{u} \tilde{\theta}) + (-\Delta)^\alpha \tilde{\theta} &= \partial_t \bar{\theta} + \operatorname{div}(\bar{u} \bar{\theta}) + (-\Delta)^\alpha \bar{\theta} + \partial_t \kappa + \operatorname{div}(\bar{u} \kappa + \omega \bar{\theta} + \omega \kappa) + (-\Delta)^\alpha \kappa \\ &= \operatorname{div} \bar{S} + \partial_t \kappa^{(t)} + \operatorname{div}(\omega^{(p)} \kappa^{(p)}) + \operatorname{div}(\bar{u} \kappa + \omega \bar{\theta}) + \partial_t \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \kappa^{(p)} + (-\Delta)^\alpha \kappa \\ &\quad + \operatorname{div} \left[\omega \kappa^{(t)} - \omega \oint_{\mathbb{T}^d} k^{(p)} + (\omega^{(c)} + \omega^{(t)}) \kappa^{(p)} \right] \\ &= \operatorname{div} \tilde{S}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\operatorname{div}(\omega \oint_{\mathbb{T}^d} k^{(p)}) = 0$ is due to the fact that ω is divergence-free.

5 Proof of Proposition 4.1

In this section, we complete the proof of Proposition 4.1. Since the claim that $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{R}, \tilde{\theta}, \tilde{S})$ of (2.1) are well-prepared for the set \bar{I} and the same length scale $\bar{\tau}$ and $\text{supp}_t(\omega, \kappa) \subset \bar{I}$ follows easily from the definition, we omit the proof. We only need to choose suitable parameters and prove that the new perturbations and the Reynolds stress constructed in Section 4 satisfy estimates of Proposition 4.1. We denote \bar{C} are those constants independent of the parameters (ν, σ, l, μ) but depending on $(\bar{u}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{S})$. We recall the exponents p and q are the ones given by Proposition 4.1.

5.1. Choice of parameters

We fix two parameters $\beta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $r \in (1, 2)$ as follows:

Case A: $1 < \alpha < \frac{d+1}{2}$

Firstly, the first parameter $\beta > 0$ satisfies

$$(5.1) \quad \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}\right) \frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-2} (d-1) + \frac{d-1}{2} - \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}\right) \left(6 + \frac{5}{\alpha-1}\right) \beta < -\beta,$$

$$(5.2) \quad -\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2\alpha-1}{2\alpha}\right) \left(6 + \frac{5}{\alpha-1}\right) \beta - \frac{d-1}{q} < -\beta,$$

$$(5.3) \quad \frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-2} (d-1) - \left(6 + \frac{5}{\alpha-1}\right) \beta > 2\beta,$$

$$(5.4) \quad \frac{d-1}{2\alpha-2} - 1 - \frac{5\beta}{2\alpha-2} > 2\beta.$$

Then, fixing β as above, we choose $r \in (1, 2)$ such that

$$(5.5) \quad d - \frac{d}{r} < \beta.$$

Since $p < \frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}$ and $1 < \alpha < \frac{d+1}{2}$, we easily deduce

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}\right) \frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-2} (d-1) + \frac{d-1}{2} < 0, \quad \frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-2} (d-1) > 0, \quad \frac{d-1}{2\alpha-2} - 1 > 0.$$

Hence, we can choose $\beta > 0$ sufficiently small to satisfy the above.

In case A, We choose the parameter l, ν, σ, μ as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \nu &\triangleq \lambda^\beta, \\ l &\triangleq \lambda^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-2}(d-1) - (6 + \frac{5}{\alpha-1})\beta}, \\ \sigma &\triangleq \lambda^{\frac{d-1}{2\alpha-2} - 1 - \frac{5\beta}{2\alpha-2}}, \\ \mu &\triangleq \lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Case B: $\alpha = 1$

We choose $\beta > 0$ and r which satisfy

$$10\beta < d-1 \quad \text{and} \quad d - \frac{d}{r} < \beta.$$

In case B, We choose the parameter l, ν, σ, μ as follows.

$$\nu \triangleq \lambda^\beta,$$

$$\begin{aligned}
l &\triangleq \lambda^{\max\{2, \frac{d-1+2\beta}{2(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2})}\}}, \\
\sigma &\triangleq l^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu^{-1+2\beta} = \lambda^{\frac{1}{2} \max\{2, \frac{d-1+2\beta}{2(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2})}\} - 1 + 2\beta}, \\
\mu &\triangleq \lambda.
\end{aligned}$$

In both cases, we choose $\lambda > 0$ is large enough so that $\nu, \sigma \in \mathbb{N}$ and the value of λ will be fixed in the end. The parameter β we choose above immediately implies $l, \nu, \sigma, \mu \gg 1$.

Lemma 5.1. *Let l, ν, σ, μ be chosen above, for any $1 \leq \alpha < \frac{d+1}{2}$, there holds*

$$(5.6) \quad l^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}} \mu^{\frac{d-1}{2}} \leq \lambda^{-\beta},$$

$$(5.7) \quad \sigma^{-1}(\nu l) l^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mu^{-1 + \frac{d-1}{2} - \frac{d-1}{r}} \leq \lambda^{-\beta},$$

$$(5.8) \quad l^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\sigma \mu)^{2\alpha-1} \mu^{\frac{d-1}{2} - \frac{d-1}{r}} \leq \lambda^{-\beta}.$$

$$(5.9) \quad \sigma^{-1} \mu^{d-1 - \frac{d-1}{r}} \leq \lambda^{-\beta},$$

$$(5.10) \quad l^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq \lambda^{-\beta}.$$

Moreover, if $1 < \alpha < \frac{d+1}{2}$, we have

$$l^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2\alpha-1}{2\alpha}} \mu^{\frac{d-1}{2} - \frac{d-1}{q}} \leq \lambda^{-\beta}.$$

Proof. We only prove the inequalities in Case A (i.e. $1 < \alpha < \frac{d+1}{2}$) and the proof in Case B is similar. For the first inequality (5.6), it suffices to show that

$$\left(\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-2} (d-1) - \left(6 + \frac{5}{\alpha-1}\right) \beta \right) \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p} \right) + \frac{d-1}{2} \leq -\beta,$$

which is exactly identical to (5.1).

The second inequality (5.7) is equivalent to

$$-\left(\frac{d-1}{2\alpha-2} - 1 - \frac{5\beta}{2\alpha-2} \right) + \beta + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-2} (d-1) - \left(6 + \frac{5}{\alpha-1}\right) \beta \right) - 1 + \frac{d-1}{2} - \frac{d-1}{r} \leq -\beta.$$

Thus, direct computation

$$-\left(\frac{d-1}{2\alpha-2} - 1 - \frac{5\beta}{2\alpha-2} \right) + \beta + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-2} (d-1) - \left(6 + \frac{5}{\alpha-1}\right) \beta \right) - 1 - \frac{d-1}{2} = -2\beta$$

and (5.5) immediately imply (5.7).

Similarly, the third inequality (5.8) is equivalent to

$$-\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-2} (d-1) - \left(6 + \frac{5}{\alpha-1}\right) \beta \right) + \left(\frac{d-1}{2\alpha-2} - \frac{5\beta}{2\alpha-2} \right) (2\alpha-1) + \frac{d-1}{2} - \frac{d-1}{r} \leq -\beta.$$

Thus, (5.5) and the fact that

$$-\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-2} (d-1) - \left(6 + \frac{5}{\alpha-1}\right) \beta \right) + \left(\frac{d-1}{2\alpha-2} - \frac{5\beta}{2\alpha-2} \right) (2\alpha-1) - \frac{d-1}{2} = -2\beta$$

give (5.8).

Moreover, (5.3), (5.4) and (5.5) imply directly (5.9) and (5.10).

In the case $1 < \alpha < \frac{d+1}{2}$, by (5.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2\alpha-1}{2\alpha} \right) \left(\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-2} (d-1) - \left(6 + \frac{5}{\alpha-1} \right) \beta \right) + \frac{d-1}{2} - \frac{d-1}{q} \\ &= - \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2\alpha-1}{2\alpha} \right) \left(6 + \frac{5}{\alpha-1} \right) \beta - \frac{d-1}{q} \\ &< -\beta, \end{aligned}$$

which immediately implies (5.1). \square

5.2. Estimates on perturbation

We first show the estimate on amplitude functions a_k and b_k , their definitions and Proposition 4.3 immediately give the following results.

Lemma 5.2. *For any $r \in [1, \infty]$ and $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\|(\partial_t^n \nabla^m a_k, \partial_t^n \nabla^m b_k)\|_{L_T^r L_x^\infty} \leq \bar{C}(\nu l)^n l^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{r}}.$$

Moreover, we have

$$\|(a_k(t), b_k(t))\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)} \lesssim g_l(\nu t) \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho(t, x) dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Using Proposition 4.2 and lemma 5.2, we obtain the following estimate on the principal part of the perturbation.

Proposition 5.3. *Let $\delta > 0$. If λ is sufficiently large, then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\omega^{(p)}, \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \kappa^{(p)})\|_{L_T^p L_x^\infty} \leq \delta, \\ & \|(\omega^{(p)}, \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \kappa^{(p)})\|_{L_T^2 L_x^2} \lesssim \|(\bar{R}, \bar{S})\|_{L_{t,x}^1}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, if $1 < \alpha < \frac{d+1}{2}$, then we have

$$\|(\omega^{(p)}, \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \kappa^{(p)})\|_{L_T^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}} L_x^q} \leq \delta,$$

Proof. We first focus on the estimate of $\kappa^{(p)}$. By the definition of $\kappa^{(p)}$, Proposition 4.2 and Lemma 5.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \kappa^{(p)}\|_{L_T^p L_x^\infty} &\leq \|\kappa^{(p)}\|_{L_T^p L_x^\infty} + \|\mathbb{P}_{=0} \kappa^{(p)}\|_{L_T^p L_x^\infty} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \|b_k\|_{L_T^p L_x^\infty} \|\Psi_k^\mu\|_{L_x^\infty} + \|b_k\|_{L_T^p L_x^\infty} \|\Psi_k^\mu\|_{L_x^1} \\ &\leq \bar{C} \mu^{\frac{d-1}{2}} l^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}} + \bar{C} \mu^{-\frac{d-1}{2}} l^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}}, \end{aligned}$$

which by Lemma 5.1 implies that

$$(5.11) \quad \|\mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \kappa^{(p)}\|_{L_T^p L_x^\infty} \leq \bar{C} \lambda^{-\beta}.$$

Similarly, if $1 < \alpha < \frac{d+1}{2}$, we have

$$\|\mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \kappa^{(p)}\|_{L_T^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}} L_x^q} \leq \|\kappa^{(p)}\|_{L_T^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}} L_x^q} + \|\mathbb{P}_{=0} \kappa^{(p)}\|_{L_T^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}} L_x^q}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lesssim \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \|b_k\|_{L_T^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}} L_x^\infty} \|\Psi_k^\mu\|_{L_x^q} + \|b_k\|_{L_T^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}} L_x^\infty} \|\Psi_k^\mu\|_{L_x^1} \\
& \leq \bar{C} \mu^{\frac{d-1}{2} - \frac{d-1}{q}} l^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2\alpha-1}{2\alpha}} + \bar{C} \mu^{-\frac{d-1}{2}} l^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2\alpha-1}{2\alpha}}, \\
(5.12) \quad & \leq \bar{C} \lambda^{-\beta}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the view of Proposition 4.2, Lemma 5.2 and Lemma C.1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\kappa^{(p)}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)} & \lesssim \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \|b_k(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)} \|\Psi_k^\mu\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)} + \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \bar{C} \\
(5.13) \quad & \lesssim g_l(\nu t) \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho(t, x) dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \bar{C}.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma C.1 once again, we infer that

$$(5.14) \quad \int_0^T g_l^2(\nu t) \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho(t, x) dx dt \lesssim \|(\bar{R}, \bar{S})\|_{L_{t,x}^1} + \bar{C} \nu^{-1},$$

where we use the fact that $\int g_l^2 = 1$ and thanks to the definition of ρ .

Thus, combining (5.13) and (5.14), we have

$$\|\kappa^{(p)}\|_{L_T^2 L_x^2} \lesssim \|(\bar{R}, \bar{S})\|_{L_{t,x}^1}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \bar{C}(\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}).$$

Moreover, since

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbb{P}_{=0} \kappa^{(p)}\|_{L_T^2 L_x^2} & \lesssim \|\kappa^{(p)}\|_{L_T^2 L_x^1} \\
& \lesssim \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \|b_k\|_{L_T^2 L_x^\infty} \|\Psi_k^\mu\|_{L_x^1} \\
& \leq \bar{C} \mu^{-\frac{d-1}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$(5.15) \quad \|\mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \kappa^{(p)}\|_{L_T^2 L_x^2} \lesssim \|(\bar{R}, \bar{S})\|_{L_{t,x}^1}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \bar{C}(\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \mu^{-\frac{d-1}{2}}).$$

Finally, if λ is sufficiently large, (5.11), (5.12) and (5.15) give the desired results. The estimation procedure for $\omega^{(p)}$ is analogous to that employed for $\kappa^{(p)}$, so we omit the proof. \square

Compared to the principal perturbation $\omega^{(p)}$ and $\kappa^{(p)}$, the divergence-free corrector $\omega^{(c)}$ and the temporal corrector $(\omega^{(t)}, \kappa^{(t)})$ are much smaller.

Proposition 5.4. *Let $\delta > 0$. If λ is sufficiently large, then we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\omega^{(c)}\|_{L_T^p L_x^\infty} & \leq \delta, \\
\|\omega^{(c)}\|_{L_T^2 L_x^2} & \leq \|(\bar{R}, \bar{S})\|_{L_{t,x}^1}^{\frac{1}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|(\omega^{(t)}, \kappa^{(t)})\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \leq \delta.$$

Moreover, if $1 < \alpha < \frac{d+1}{2}$, we have

$$\|\omega^{(c)}\|_{L_T^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}} L_x^q} \leq \delta.$$

Proof. By the definition of $\omega^{(c)}$, Proposition 4.2 and Lemma 5.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|\omega^{(c)}\|_{L_T^p L_x^\infty} &\lesssim \sigma^{-1} \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \|\nabla a_k\|_{L_T^p L_x^\infty} \|\Omega_k^\mu(\sigma \cdot)\|_{L_x^\infty} \\
 &\leq \bar{C} \sigma^{-1} l^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}} \mu^{-1 + \frac{d-1}{2}} \\
 (5.16) \quad &\leq \bar{C} \sigma^{-1} \mu^{-1},
 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|\omega^{(c)}\|_{L_{t,x}^2} &\lesssim \sigma^{-1} \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \|\nabla a_k\|_{L_T^2 L_x^\infty} \|\Omega_k^\mu(\sigma \cdot)\|_{L_x^2} \\
 (5.17) \quad &\leq \bar{C} \sigma^{-1} \mu^{-1}.
 \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of $(\omega^{(t)}, \kappa^{(t)})$, Proposition 4.3 and Proposition 4.2, we deduce

$$(5.18) \quad \|(\omega^{(t)}, \kappa^{(t)})\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \leq \bar{C} \nu^{-1} \|h\|_{L_T^\infty} \leq \bar{C} \nu^{-1}.$$

Similarly, if $1 < \alpha < \frac{d+1}{2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|\omega^{(c)}\|_{L_T^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}} L_x^q} &\lesssim \sigma^{-1} \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \|\nabla a_k\|_{L_T^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}} L_x^\infty} \|\Omega_k^\mu(\sigma \cdot)\|_{L_x^q} \\
 &\leq \bar{C} \sigma^{-1} \mu^{-1 + \frac{d-1}{2} - \frac{d-1}{q}} l^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2\alpha-1}{2\alpha}} \\
 (5.19) \quad &\leq \bar{C} \sigma^{-1} \mu^{-1}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if λ is sufficiently large, (5.16), (5.17), (5.18) and (5.19) give the desired results. \square

Combining Proposition (5.3) and Proposition (5.4), we easily derive the following proposition.

Proposition 5.5. *Let $\delta > 0$. If λ is sufficiently large, then we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|(\omega, \kappa)\|_{L_T^p L_x^\infty} &\leq \delta, \\
 \|(\omega, \kappa)\|_{L_T^2 L_x^2} &\lesssim \|(\bar{R}, \bar{S})\|_{L_{t,x}^1}^{\frac{1}{2}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, if $1 < \alpha < \frac{d+1}{2}$, we have

$$\|(\omega, \kappa)\|_{L_T^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}} L_x^q} \leq \delta.$$

5.3. Estimate on Reynolds stress error

Having completed the estimates for the perturbation, we now turn our attention to estimating the Reynolds errors \tilde{R} and \tilde{S} in this part.

Proposition 5.6. *Let $\delta > 0$. If λ is sufficiently large, then we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|(R_{osc,t}, S_{osc,t})\|_{L_T^1 L_x^r} &\leq \delta, \\
 \|(R_{osc,x}, S_{osc,x})\|_{L_T^1 L_x^r} &\leq \delta, \\
 \|(R_{far}, S_{far})\|_{L_T^1 L_x^r} &\leq \delta.
 \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The first estimate follows easily from the definition of $R_{osc,t}$ and $S_{osc,t}$ and Proposition 4.3, so we omit the proof.

In the view of (4.22), Proposition 4.2, Lemma 5.2, Lemma B.3 and Lemma B.2, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|S_{osc,x}\|_{L_T^1 L_x^r} &= \left\| \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \tilde{\mathcal{B}}(e_k \nabla(a_k b_k), \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \Psi_k^\mu(\sigma x)^2) \right\|_{L_T^1 L_x^r} \\
 &\lesssim \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \|\nabla(a_k b_k)\|_{L_T^1 C_x^1} \|\mathcal{G} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \Psi_k^\mu(\sigma x)^2\|_{L_x^r} \\
 &\lesssim \sigma^{-1} \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \|\nabla(a_k b_k)\|_{L_T^1 C_x^1} \|\Psi_k^\mu\|_{L_x^{2r}}^2 \\
 &\leq \bar{C} \sigma^{-1} \mu^{d-1-\frac{d-1}{r}} \\
 &\leq \bar{C} \lambda^{-\beta}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Since the estimate of $R_{osc,x}$ is similar, for λ sufficiently large, there holds

$$\|(R_{osc,x}, S_{osc,x})\|_{L_T^1 L_x^r} \leq \delta.$$

By (4.14), Proposition 4.2 and Lemma 5.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|S_{far}\|_{L_T^1 L_x^r} &\lesssim \sum_{k \neq k'} \|a_k\|_{L_T^2 L_x^\infty} \|b_{k'}\|_{L_T^2 L_x^\infty} \|\Psi_k^\mu \Psi_{k'}^\mu\|_{L_x^r} \\
 &\leq \bar{C} \mu^{d-1-\frac{d}{r}} \\
 &\leq \bar{C} \lambda^{\beta-1},
 \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from (5.5) and estimate of R_{far} is similar. Taking λ sufficiently large, there holds

$$\|(R_{far}, S_{far})\|_{L_T^1 L_x^r} \leq \delta.$$

□

Proposition 5.7. *Let $\delta > 0$. If λ is sufficiently large, then we have*

$$\|(R_{lin}, S_{lin})\|_{L_T^1 L_x^r} \leq \delta.$$

Proof. We first divide the linear error S_{lin} into three parts:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|S_{lin}\|_{L_T^1 L_x^r} &\leq \|\mathcal{G} \partial_t \kappa^{(p)}\|_{L_T^1 L_x^r} + \|\mathcal{G}(-\Delta)^\alpha \kappa\|_{L_T^1 L_x^r} + \|\mathcal{G} \operatorname{div}(\bar{u} \kappa + \omega \bar{\theta})\|_{L_T^1 L_x^r} \\
 &\triangleq L_1 + L_2 + L_3.
 \end{aligned}$$

Estimate of L_1 :

Using (4.7), Proposition 4.2, Lemma 5.2, Lemma B.2 and L_x^r boundedness of $\mathcal{G} \operatorname{div}$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
 L_1 &= \left\| \mathcal{G} \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \partial_t b_k \Psi_k^\mu(\sigma \cdot) \right\|_{L_T^1 L_x^r} \\
 &= \sigma^{-1} \left\| \mathcal{G} \left(\sum_{k \in \Lambda} \operatorname{div}(\partial_t b_k \cdot \nabla \Phi_k^\mu(\sigma \cdot)) - \nabla \partial_t b_k \cdot \nabla \Phi_k^\mu(\sigma \cdot) \right) \right\|_{L_T^1 L_x^r}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lesssim \sigma^{-1} \left(\sum_{k \in \Lambda} \|\partial_t b_k\|_{L_T^1 L_x^\infty} \|\nabla \Phi_k^\mu(\sigma \cdot)\|_{L_x^r} + \|\nabla \partial_t b_k\|_{L_T^1 L_x^\infty} \|\nabla \Phi_k^\mu(\sigma \cdot)\|_{L_x^r} \right) \\
& \leq \bar{C} \sigma^{-1} (\nu l) l^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mu^{-1 + \frac{d-1}{2} - \frac{d-1}{r}} \\
(5.20) \quad & \leq \bar{C} \lambda^{-\beta},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma 5.1.

Estimate of L_2 :

By L_x^r boundedness of $\mathcal{G} \nabla$, we deduce

$$L_2 \lesssim \| |\nabla|^{2\alpha-1} \kappa^{(p)} \|_{L_T^1 L_x^r} + \| |\nabla|^{2\alpha-1} \kappa^{(t)} \|_{L_T^1 L_x^r}.$$

Thanks to the interpolation estimate, Proposition 4.2, Lemma 5.1, Lemma 5.2, we have

$$(5.21) \quad L_2 \lesssim \bar{C} l^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\sigma \mu)^{2\alpha-1} \mu^{\frac{d-1}{2} - \frac{d-1}{r}} + \bar{C} l^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq \bar{C} \lambda^{-\beta}.$$

Estimate of L_3 :

By L_x^r boundedness of $\mathcal{G} \operatorname{div}$, we have

$$(5.22) \quad L_3 \lesssim \|\bar{u} \kappa + \omega \bar{\theta}\|_{L_T^1 L_x^r} \lesssim \bar{C} \|(\omega, \kappa)\|_{L_T^p L_x^\infty}.$$

Finally, combining (5.20), (5.21), (5.22) and Proposition 5.5 implies the desired result of S_{lin} if λ is sufficiently large. Since the estimate of R_{lin} follows a similar logic, we omit the corresponding proof. \square

Proposition 5.8. *Let $\delta > 0$. If λ is sufficiently large, then we have*

$$\|(R_{cor}, S_{cor})\|_{L_T^1 L_x^r} \leq \delta.$$

Proof. By (4.27), L_x^r boundedness of $\mathcal{G} \operatorname{div}$ and Hölder's inequality, we deduce

$$\|S_{cor}\|_{L_T^1 L_x^r} \lesssim (\|\omega\|_{L_{t,x}^2} + \|\kappa^{(p)}\|_{L_{t,x}^2}) (\|\omega^{(c)}\|_{L_T^2 L_x^m} + \|\omega^{(t)}\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} + \|\kappa^{(t)}\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty}),$$

where q satisfies

$$\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{m}.$$

Therefore, due to Proposition 5.3, Proposition 5.4 and Proposition 5.5, we have

$$(5.23) \quad \|S_{cor}\|_{L_T^1 L_x^r} \leq \bar{C} (\sigma^{-1} \mu^{-1+d-1-\frac{d-1}{r}} + \nu^{-1}) \leq \bar{C} \lambda^{-\beta},$$

Thanks to the estimate of $\omega^{(c)}$:

$$\|\omega^{(c)}\|_{L_T^2 L_x^m} \lesssim \sigma^{-1} \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \|\nabla a_k\|_{L_T^2 L_x^\infty} \|\Omega_k^\mu(\sigma \cdot)\|_{L_x^m} \leq \bar{C} \sigma^{-1} \mu^{-1+d-1-\frac{d-1}{r}}.$$

Hence, the desired result of S_{cor} follows from (5.23) if λ is sufficiently large. As usual, the estimate of R_{cor} is similar, so we omit the proof. \square

Combining Proposition 5.6-5.8, we can easily get the following result.

Proposition 5.9. *Let $\delta > 0$. If λ is sufficiently large, then we have*

$$\|(\tilde{R}, \tilde{S})\|_{L_{t,x}^1} \leq \delta.$$

6 Proof of main results

In this section, we give a detailed proof of Proposition 2.5, Theorem 2.1, Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 2.4.

Proof of Proposition 2.5. Let v and ρ be the smooth functions given in Proposition 2.5. We define $(u_0, \theta_0, R_0, S_0)$ as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} u_0 &= v, \\ \theta_0 &= \rho, \\ R_0 &= \mathcal{R}(\partial_t u_0 + (-\Delta)^\alpha u_0 + \operatorname{div}(u_0 \otimes u_0) - \theta_0 e_d), \\ S_0 &= \mathcal{G}(\partial_t \theta_0 + (-\Delta)^\alpha \theta_0 + \operatorname{div}(u_0 \theta_0)), \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{G} are inverse divergence operator on \mathbb{T}^d defined in Lemma B.1.

Since (u_0, θ_0) are mean-free, $(u_0, \theta_0, R_0, S_0)$ solves (2.1). Combining Proposition 3.2 and Proposition 4.1, we can construct a sequence of well-preparedness weak solutions $\{(u_n, \theta_n, R_n, S_n)\}$ the set I_n and length scale τ_n as follows. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $\{(u_n, \theta_n, R_n, S_n)\}$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_n &\triangleq 2^{-n} \min\{\|(R_{n-1}, S_{n-1})\|_{L_T^1 L_x^r}, \epsilon\}, \\ \|(R_n, S_n)\|_{L_T^1 L_x^r} &\leq \delta_n, \\ \|(u_n - u_{n-1}, \theta_n - \theta_{n-1})\|_{L_{t,x}^2} &\leq M \|(R_{n-1}, S_{n-1})\|_{L_T^1 L_x^r} \leq M \delta_{n-1}, \\ \|(u_n - u_{n-1}, \theta_n - \theta_{n-1})\|_{L_T^p L_x^\infty} &\leq \delta_n, \\ (u_n(0, x), \theta_n(0, x)) &= (u(0, x), \theta(0, x)). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, if $1 < \alpha < \frac{d+1}{2}$, we have

$$\|(u_n - u_{n-1}, \theta_n - \theta_{n-1})\|_{L_T^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}} L_x^q} \leq \delta_n, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}^*.$$

Therefore, there exist $(u, \theta) \in L_T^p L_x^\infty \cap L_{t,x}^2$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} (u_n, \theta_n) &\rightarrow (u, \theta) \quad \text{in } L_T^p L_x^\infty \cap L_{t,x}^2, \\ \|(u, \theta) - (v, \rho)\|_{L_T^p L_x^\infty \cap L_{t,x}^2} &\leq \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

and (u, θ) is weak solution of (1.1). If $1 < \alpha < \frac{d+1}{2}$, (u, θ) will additionally belong to $L_T^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}} L_x^q$ and satisfy

$$\|(u, \theta) - (v, \rho)\|_{L_T^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}} L_x^q} \leq \epsilon.$$

For the structure of the intervals of regularity of (u, θ) , it is similar to [6, Theorem 1.11] and we give a brief proof. We denote I_n and τ_n the set and length scale of the well-preparedness of $(u_n, \theta_n, R_n, S_n)$. Note that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{supp}_t(u_{n+1} - u_n, \theta_{n+1} - \theta_n) &\subset I_n, \\ \tau_{n+1} &< \frac{\tau_n}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad I_n \subset I_{n+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$I \triangleq \bigcup_{n \geq 0} I_n^c \setminus \{0, 1\},$$

where the complement is considered with respect to $[0, T]$. Due to the fact that each I_n is a finite union of closed intervals, I can be expressed as a union of countably many open intervals:

$$I = \bigcup_{i \geq 0} (a_i, b_i).$$

Since for any $m \geq n$,

$$(I_n)^c \subset (I_m)^c \subset (\text{supp}_t(u_{m+1} - u_m, \theta_{m+1} - \theta_m))^c,$$

we have $(u, \theta) = (u_n, \theta_n)$ on I_n^c for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence we deduce that $(u, \theta) \in C^\infty(I \times \mathbb{T}^d)$.

As each I_n is a union of at most $\tau_n^{-\epsilon}$ many closed intervals of length $5\tau_n$, we have

$$d_{\mathcal{H}}([0, T] \setminus I) = d_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\bigcap_{n \geq 0} I_n\right) = d_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\overline{\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_n}\right) \leq \epsilon,$$

which gives the desired result for the Hausdorff dimension bound. \square

With the aid of Proposition 2.5, non-uniqueness of weak solutions for the Boussinesq system (1.1) can be derived.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Let $d \geq 2$ be the dimension, $1 \leq \alpha < \frac{d+1}{2}$, $1 \leq p < \frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}$. Without loss of generality, we suppose that $(u, \theta) \in L_T^p L_x^\infty$ is a smooth weak solution of (1.1). Let f be a smooth function on $[0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d$ with

$$\|f\|_{L^p([T/2, T]; L_x^2)} = 1.$$

For any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, We define

$$u_m = u, \theta_m = \theta + m(1 - \chi)f,$$

where χ is smooth function on $[0, T]$ satisfying

$$\chi(t) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq \frac{T}{4}, \\ 0, & \text{if } \frac{T}{2} \leq t \leq T. \end{cases}$$

Then by Proposition 2.5, there exist weak solutions $\{(\tilde{u}_m, \tilde{\theta}_m)\}$ of (1.1) satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u}_m(0) &= u_m(0) = u(0) \quad , \quad \|\tilde{u}_m - u_m\|_{L_T^p L_x^\infty} \leq \frac{1}{4}, \\ \tilde{\theta}_m(0) &= \theta_m(0) = \theta(0) \quad , \quad \|\tilde{\theta}_m - \theta_m\|_{L_T^p L_x^\infty} \leq \frac{1}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we have for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\theta}_m\|_{L_T^p L_x^2} &\geq \|\theta_m\|_{L_T^p L_x^2} - \|\tilde{\theta}_m - \theta_m\|_{L_T^p L_x^\infty} \\ &\geq m\|f\|_{L^p([T/2, T]; L_x^2)} - \|\theta\|_{L_T^p L_x^\infty} - \|\tilde{\theta}_m - \theta_m\|_{L_T^p L_x^\infty} \end{aligned}$$

$$\geq m - \|\theta\|_{L_T^p L_x^\infty} - \frac{1}{4},$$

and for any $m \neq m' \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\theta}_m - \tilde{\theta}_{m'}\|_{L_T^p L_x^2} &\geq \|\theta_m - \theta_{m'}\|_{L_T^p L_x^2} - \|\theta_m - \tilde{\theta}_m\|_{L_T^p L_x^2} - \|\theta_{m'} - \tilde{\theta}_{m'}\|_{L_T^p L_x^2} \\ &\geq |m - m'| \|f\|_{L^p([T/2, T]; L_x^2)} - \|\theta_m - \tilde{\theta}_m\|_{L_T^p L_x^\infty} - \|\theta_{m'} - \tilde{\theta}_{m'}\|_{L_T^p L_x^\infty} \\ &\geq |m - m'| - \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $(\tilde{u}_m, \tilde{\theta}_m)$ is not a generalized Leray-Hopf weak solution when m is large enough and $(\tilde{u}_m, \tilde{\theta}_m) \neq (\tilde{u}_{m'}, \tilde{\theta}_{m'})$ if $m \neq m'$. Therefore, there exist infinitely many non-generalized-Leray-Hopf weak solutions in $L_T^p L_x^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ of (1.1) with same initial data. \square

The proof of Theorem 2.2 is analogous, except that we replace $L_T^p L_x^\infty$ with $L_T^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}} L_x^q$ for $1 < \alpha < \frac{d+1}{2}$. Next, before proving Theorem 2.4, we show two Lemmas 6.1-6.2 which easily imply Theorem 2.4.

Lemma 6.1. *If $(u, \theta) \in L_T^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}} L_x^\infty$ is weak solution of (1.1), then (u, θ) is generalized Leray-Hopf weak solution.*

Proof. Using standard Galerkin method, we know there exists a weak solution $(\bar{u}, \bar{\theta})$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \bar{u} + u \cdot \nabla \bar{u} + \nabla p + (-\Delta)^\alpha \bar{u} = \bar{\theta} e_d, \\ \operatorname{div} \bar{u} = 0, \\ \partial_t \bar{\theta} + u \cdot \nabla \bar{\theta} + (-\Delta)^\alpha \bar{\theta} = 0, \quad \forall (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d, \\ \bar{u}(0) = u(0), \\ \bar{\theta}(0) = \theta(0), \end{cases}$$

and the energy inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{u}(t)\|_{L_x^2}^2 + 2 \int_0^t \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \bar{u}(s)\|_{L_x^2}^2 ds &\leq \|\bar{u}(0)\|_{L_x^2}^2 + 2 \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \bar{\theta} e_d \cdot \bar{u} dx ds, \quad \forall t \in [0, T], \\ \|\bar{\theta}(t)\|_{L_x^2}^2 + 2 \int_0^t \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \bar{\theta}(s)\|_{L_x^2}^2 ds &\leq \|\bar{\theta}(0)\|_{L_x^2}^2, \quad \forall t \in [0, T]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we only need to show

$$u \equiv \bar{u} \quad \text{and} \quad \theta \equiv \bar{\theta}.$$

We denote

$$\omega := \bar{u} - u \quad \text{and} \quad \rho := \bar{\theta} - \theta,$$

and (ω, ρ) satisfy

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \omega + u \cdot \nabla \omega + \nabla p + (-\Delta)^\alpha \omega = \rho e_d, \\ \operatorname{div} \omega = 0, \\ \partial_t \rho + u \cdot \nabla \rho + (-\Delta)^\alpha \rho = 0, \quad \forall (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d, \\ \omega(0) = 0, \\ \rho(0) = 0. \end{cases}$$

By the definition of weak solution, for any $\phi \in C_0^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\psi \in C_0^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})$, we have

$$(6.1) \quad - \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \omega \cdot (\partial_t \phi - \nu(-\Delta)^\alpha \phi + u \cdot \nabla \phi) + \rho e_d \cdot \phi \, dxdt = 0,$$

$$(6.2) \quad - \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho \cdot (\partial_t \psi - \kappa(-\Delta)^\alpha \psi + u \cdot \nabla \psi) \, dxdt = 0.$$

□

By [29, lemma B.4], we know for any $F \in C_0^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $f \in C_0^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})$, there exist $(\Phi, \Psi) \in L_T^\infty L_x^2 \cap L_T^2 \dot{H}^\alpha$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \Phi - (-\Delta)^\alpha \Phi + u \cdot \nabla \Phi = F, \\ \operatorname{div} \Phi = 0, \\ \Phi(T) = 0, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \Psi - (-\Delta)^\alpha \Psi + u \cdot \nabla \Psi = f, \\ \Psi(T) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, we can use $\phi = \Phi$ and $\psi = \Psi$ respectively in (6.1) and (6.2) as test functions, resulting in $\omega = 0$ and $\rho = 0$, which finishes the proof.

Lemma 6.2. *Let $d \geq 2$, $1 \leq \alpha < \frac{d+2}{2}$ and (u_1, θ_1) , (u_2, θ_2) be two generalized Leray-Hopf weak solutions of (1.1) with same initial data. If (u_1, θ_1) belongs to $L_T^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}} L_x^\infty$, then $(u_1, \theta_1) \equiv (u_2, \theta_2)$.*

Proof. Let $\omega := u_1 - u_2$ and $\rho := \theta_1 - \theta_2$, we derive that

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \omega + (-\Delta)^\alpha \omega + u_1 \cdot \nabla u_1 - u_2 \cdot \nabla u_2 + \nabla P = \rho e_d, \\ \operatorname{div} \omega = 0, \\ \omega(0) = 0. \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho + (-\Delta)^\alpha \rho + u_1 \cdot \nabla \theta_1 - u_2 \cdot \nabla \theta_2 = 0, \\ \rho(0) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Using the mollification argument and the fact that $(u_1, \theta_1) \in L_T^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}} L_x^\infty$ and (u_2, θ_2) is generalized Leray-Hopf weak solution (see [27, Chapter 12]), we have

$$(6.3) \quad \|\omega(t)\|_{L_x^2}^2 + 2 \int_0^t \|\nabla^\alpha \omega(s)\|_{L_x^2}^2 ds \leq 2 \left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} u_1 \cdot (\omega \cdot \nabla) \omega \, dxds \right| + 2 \left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho e_d \cdot \omega \, dxds \right|,$$

$$(6.4) \quad \|\rho(t)\|_{L_x^2}^2 + 2 \int_0^t \|\nabla^\alpha \rho(s)\|_{L_x^2}^2 ds \leq 2 \left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \theta_1 \cdot (\omega \cdot \nabla) \rho \, dxds \right|.$$

By Hölder's inequality and interpolation inequality, we obtain

$$\|u_1 \cdot (\omega \cdot \nabla) \omega\|_{L_{t,x}^1} \lesssim \|u_1\|_{L^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}}((0,t);L_x^\infty)} \|\omega\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \|\nabla \omega\|_{L_t^{2\alpha} L_x^2}$$

$$\lesssim \|u_1\|_{L^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}}((0,t);L_x^\infty)} \|\omega\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^{2-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \|\nabla^\alpha \omega\|_{L_{t,x}^2}^{\frac{1}{\alpha}},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\theta_1 \cdot (\omega \cdot \nabla) \rho\|_{L_{t,x}^1} &\lesssim \|\theta_1\|_{L^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}}((0,t);L_x^\infty)} \|\omega\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \|\nabla \rho\|_{L_t^{2\alpha} L_x^2} \\ &\lesssim \|\theta_1\|_{L^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}}((0,t);L_x^\infty)} \|\omega\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \|\rho\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^{1-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \|\nabla^\alpha \rho\|_{L_{t,x}^2}^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}. \end{aligned}$$

We denote

$$f(t) := \max_{s \in [0,t]} \|\omega(s)\|_{L_x^2}^2 + 2 \int_0^t \|\nabla^\alpha \omega(s)\|_{L_x^2}^2 ds + \max_{s \in [0,t]} \|\rho(s)\|_{L_x^2}^2 + 2 \int_0^t \|\nabla^\alpha \rho(s)\|_{L_x^2}^2 ds.$$

Thus, using Young's inequality and combining (6.3) and (6.4), we obtain

$$f(t) \leq C \|(u_1, \theta_1)\|_{L^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}}((0,t);L_x^\infty)} f(t) + C \int_0^t f(s) ds.$$

Since $\|(u_1, \theta_1)\|_{L^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}}((0,t);L_x^\infty)}$ tend to 0 when t tend to 0, we obtain $(\omega, \rho) = 0$ when t is small by Gronwall's inequality. Finally, using continuity argument, we know $(\omega, \rho) = 0$ for any $t \in [0, T]$, which finish the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.4. Combing Lemma 6.1 and Lemma 6.2, we immediately obtain Theorem 2.4. \square

A Geometric lemma

The geometric lemma from [15] plays an important role in the convex integration method. Here we recall an extension version of the geometric lemma from [40], which is suitable for the Boussinesq equation. We denote that $S_0^{d \times d}$ is the set of symmetric $d \times d$ matrices, $B_r(\text{Id})$ is the ball in $S_0^{d \times d}$ with center Id and radius r , and $e_k = \frac{k}{|k|}$ for any $k \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Lemma A.1. *There exist $r_0 > 0$, $c_0 > 0$, a finite set $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, smooth functions $\{\Gamma_k \in C^\infty(B_{r_0}(\text{Id}); \mathbb{R})\}_{k \in \Lambda}$ and smooth functions $\{\gamma_k \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R})\}_{k \in \Lambda}$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_k(R) &\geq c_0, \quad \forall R \in B_{r_0}(\text{Id}), \\ R &= \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \Gamma_k^2(R) e_k \otimes e_k, \quad \forall R \in B_{r_0}(\text{Id}), \\ f &= \sum_{k \in \Lambda} \gamma_k(f) e_k, \quad \forall f \in \mathbb{R}^d. \end{aligned}$$

B Antidivergence operator

We recall two types of antidivergence operator \mathcal{R} introduced in [15] and \mathcal{G} introduced in [40].

Proposition B.1. *There exist two linear operators $\mathcal{R} : C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d; S_0^{d \times d})$ and $\mathcal{G} : C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div} \mathcal{R} v &= v - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} v, \quad \forall v \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^d), \\ \operatorname{div} \mathcal{G} f &= f - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} f, \quad \forall f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}). \end{aligned}$$

Actually, \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{G} act as the degree -1 operator and we have the following theorem (see detailed proof in [6, Theorem B.3]).

Proposition B.2. *Let $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. For any vector field $v \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and any function $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})$, it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{R} v\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} &\lesssim \|v\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)}, \\ \|\mathcal{G} f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} &\lesssim \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, if $v \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})$, then there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{R} v(\sigma \cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} &\lesssim \sigma^{-1} \|v\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)}, \quad \text{for any } \sigma \in \mathbb{N}, \\ \|\mathcal{G} f(\sigma \cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} &\lesssim \sigma^{-1} \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)}, \quad \text{for any } \sigma \in \mathbb{N}. \end{aligned}$$

We introduce two bilinear operators $\mathcal{B} : C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d, \mathbb{R}^d) \times C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d, \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}) \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d, S_0^{d \times d})$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{B}} : C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d, \mathbb{R}) \times C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$. The two operators share similar properties and permit us to obtain a derivative of the last argument. we define two operators as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}(v, A) &\triangleq v \mathcal{R} A - \mathcal{R}(\nabla v \mathcal{R} A), \quad \forall (v, A) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d, \mathbb{R}^d) \times C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d, \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}), \\ \tilde{\mathcal{B}}(f, g) &\triangleq f \mathcal{G} g - \mathcal{G}(\nabla f \mathcal{G} g), \quad \forall (f, g) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d, \mathbb{R}) \times C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d, \mathbb{R}). \end{aligned}$$

Proposition B.3. *Let $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. For any $(v, A) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d, \mathbb{R}^d) \times C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d, \mathbb{R}^{d \times d})$ and $(f, g) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d, \mathbb{R}) \times C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d, \mathbb{R})$. The following holds,*

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div} \mathcal{B}(v, A) &= v A - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} v A, \\ \operatorname{div} \tilde{\mathcal{B}}(f, g) &= f g - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} f g, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{B}(v, A)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} &\lesssim \|v\|_{C^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} \|\mathcal{R} A\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)}, \\ \|\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(f, g)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} &\lesssim \|f\|_{C^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} \|\mathcal{G} g\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. This follows immediately from the definition of \mathcal{B} and $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ and Proposition B.2. Here we omit the proof. \square

C Improved Hölder's inequality

We recall the improved Hölder's inequality from [36, Lemma 2.1] (see also [5, Lemma 3.7]).

Lemma C.1. *Let $p \in [1, \infty]$ and $f, g : \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be smooth functions. Then for any $\sigma \in \mathbb{N}$, we have*

$$\|g \cdot f(\sigma \cdot)\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|g\|_{L^p} \|f\|_{L^p} + \sigma^{-\frac{1}{p}} \|g\|_{C^1} \|f\|_{L^p}.$$

Acknowledgments This work was partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No.12171493).

References

- [1] T. Buckmaster. Onsager’s conjecture almost everywhere in time. *Comm.Math.Phys.*, 333(3):1175–1198, 2015.
- [2] T. Buckmaster, C. De Lellis, P. Isett, and L. Székelyhidi, Jr. Anomalous dissipation for 1/5-Hölder Euler flows. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 182(1):127–172, 2015.
- [3] T. Buckmaster, C. De Lellis, and L. Székelyhidi, Jr. Dissipative Euler flows with Onsager-critical spatial regularity. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 69(9):1613–1670, 2016.
- [4] T. Buckmaster, C. de Lellis, L. Székelyhidi, Jr., and V. Vicol. Onsager’s conjecture for admissible weak solutions. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 72(2):229–274, 2019.
- [5] T. Buckmaster and V. Vicol. Nonuniqueness of weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equation. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 189(1):101–144, 2019.
- [6] A. Cheskidov and X. Luo. Sharp nonuniqueness for the Navier-Stokes equations. *Invent. Math.*, 229(3):987–1054, 2022.
- [7] A. Cheskidov and X. Luo. L^2 -critical nonuniqueness for the 2D Navier-Stokes equations. *Ann. PDE*, 9(2):Paper No. 13, 56, 2023.
- [8] A. Choffrut. h -principles for the incompressible Euler equations. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 210(1):133–163, 2013.
- [9] P. Constantin and C. R. Doering. Variational bounds on energy dissipation in incompressible flows. II. Channel flow. *Phys. Rev. E (3)*, 51(4):3192–3198, 1995.
- [10] P. Constantin and C. R. Doering. Heat transfer in convective turbulence. *Nonlinearity*, 9(4):1049–1060, 1996.
- [11] S. Daneri. Cauchy problem for dissipative Hölder solutions to the incompressible Euler equations. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 329(2):745–786, 2014.
- [12] S. Daneri and L. Székelyhidi, Jr. Non-uniqueness and h -principle for Hölder-continuous weak solutions of the Euler equations. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 224(2):471–514, 2017.
- [13] C. De Lellis and L. Székelyhidi, Jr. The Euler equations as a differential inclusion. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 170(3):1417–1436, 2009.
- [14] C. De Lellis and L. Székelyhidi, Jr. On admissibility criteria for weak solutions of the Euler equations. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 195(1):225–260, 2010.

-
- [15] C. De Lellis and L. Székelyhidi, Jr. Dissipative continuous Euler flows. *Invent. Math.*, 193(2):377–407, 2013.
 - [16] C. De Lellis and L. Székelyhidi, Jr. Dissipative Euler flows and Onsager’s conjecture. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 16(7):1467–1505, 2014.
 - [17] I. Gallagher, G. S. Koch, and F. Planchon. Blow-up of critical Besov norms at a potential Navier-Stokes singularity. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 343(1):39–82, 2016.
 - [18] A. V. Getling. *Rayleigh-Bénard convection*, volume 11 of *Advanced Series in Nonlinear Dynamics*. World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., River Edge, NJ, 1998. Structures and dynamics.
 - [19] V. Giri and R. a.-O. Radu. The Onsager conjecture in 2D: a Newton-Nash iteration. *Invent. Math.*, 238(2):691–768, 2024.
 - [20] E. Hopf. über die Anfangswertaufgabe für die hydrodynamischen Grundgleichungen. *Math. Nachr.*, 4:213–231, 1951.
 - [21] P. Isett. *Hölder continuous Euler flows in three dimensions with compact support in time*, volume 196 of *Annals of Mathematics Studies*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2017.
 - [22] P. Isett. A proof of Onsager’s conjecture. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 188(3):871–963, 2018.
 - [23] P. Isett and S.-J. Oh. On nonperiodic Euler flows with Hölder regularity. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 221(2):725–804, 2016.
 - [24] L. Iskauriaza, G. A. Serëgin, and V. Shverak. $L_{3,\infty}$ -solutions of Navier-Stokes equations and backward uniqueness. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk*, 58(2(350)):3–44, 2003.
 - [25] H. Kozono and H. Sohr. Remark on uniqueness of weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations. *Analysis*, 16(3):255–271, 1996.
 - [26] O. A. Ladyženskaja. Uniqueness and smoothness of generalized solutions of Navier-Stokes equations. *Zap. Naučn. Sem. Leningrad. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (LOMI)*, 5:169–185, 1967.
 - [27] P. G. Lemarié-Rieusset. *The Navier-Stokes problem in the 21st century*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2016.
 - [28] J. Leray. Sur le mouvement d’un liquide visqueux emplissant l’espace. *Acta Math.*, 63(1):193–248, 1934.
 - [29] Y. Li, P. Qu, Z. Zeng, and D. Zhang. Sharp non-uniqueness for the 3D hyperdissipative Navier-Stokes equations: beyond the Lions exponent. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 190:Paper No. 103602, 64, 2024.
 - [30] T. Luo and P. Qu. Non-uniqueness of weak solutions to 2D hypoviscous Navier-Stokes equations. *J. Differential Equations*, 269(4):2896–2919, 2020.
 - [31] T. Luo, T. Tao, and L. Zhang. Finite energy weak solutions of 2D Boussinesq equations with diffusive temperature. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 40(6):3737–3765, 2020.

-
- [32] T. Luo, T. Tao, and L. Zhang. Hölder continuous weak solutions of the 2D Boussinesq equation with thermal diffusion. *Sci. China Math.*, 67(8):1777–1806, 2024.
 - [33] T. Luo and E. S. Titi. Non-uniqueness of weak solutions to hyperviscous Navier-Stokes equations: on sharpness of J.-L. Lions exponent. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 59(3):Paper No. 92, 15, 2020.
 - [34] A. Majda. *Introduction to PDEs and waves for the atmosphere and ocean*, volume 9 of *Courant Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. New York University, Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York; American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003.
 - [35] C. Miao, Y. Nie, and W. Ye. On Onsager’s type conjecture for the inviscid Boussinesq equations. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 287(7):Paper No. 110527, 52, 2024.
 - [36] S. Modena and L. Székelyhidi, Jr. Non-uniqueness for the transport equation with Sobolev vector fields. *Ann. PDE*, 4(2):Paper No. 18, 38, 2018.
 - [37] G. Prodi. Un teorema di unicità per le equazioni di Navier-Stokes. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)*, 48:173–182, 1959.
 - [38] J. Serrin. On the interior regularity of weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 9:187–195, 1962.
 - [39] J. Serrin. On the interior regularity of weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 9:187–195, 1962.
 - [40] T. Tao and L. Zhang. Hölder continuous solutions of Boussinesq equations. *Acta Math. Sci. Ser. B (Engl. Ed.)*, 38(5):1591–1616, 2018.
 - [41] S. Xu and Z. Tan. Hölder continuous solutions of Boussinesq equations with Onsager-critical spatial regularity. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 64(1):Paper No. 7, 44, 2025.
 - [42] Y. Zhou. Regularity criteria for the generalized viscous MHD equations. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire*, 24(3):491–505, 2007.