

THE OBUKHOV–CORRSIN SPECTRUM OF PASSIVE SCALAR TURBULENCE THROUGH ANOMALOUS REGULARIZATION

KEEFER ROWAN

ABSTRACT. The Obukhov–Corrsin spectrum predicts the distribution of Fourier mass for a passive scalar field advected by a “turbulent” velocity field with spatial regularity C_x^α for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and subject to a time-stationary forcing. We prove the Obukhov–Corrsin spectrum holds after summing over geometric annuli in Fourier space—up to logarithmic corrections—as a consequence of a sharp anomalous regularization result. We then prove this anomalous regularization for a broad class of Kraichnan-type models. The proof of anomalous regularization relies on a Fourier space ℓ^p energy equality and a weighted lattice Poincaré inequality.

1. INTRODUCTION

Nearly a century ago, it became apparent that an exact description of a turbulent fluid was impossible and attention turned to understanding *generic* and *statistical* features of fluids [Tay35, Fri95]. A pioneering and highly successful theory capturing the generic statistics of a turbulent fluid is Kolmogorov’s K41 theory [Kol41b, Kol41c, Kol41a]. A central prediction of K41 theory is the equilibrium distribution of Fourier mass of a three-dimensional fluid velocity u in statistical equilibrium under a steady forcing and vanishing diffusivity

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu |\hat{u}(k)|^2 \approx |k|^{-11/3}, \quad (1.1)$$

$k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $|k| \gg 1$, $\hat{u}(k)$ is the k th Fourier coefficient of $u : \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, and μ is the “vanishing-viscosity equilibrium measure”.

Some aspects of the phenomenology of turbulent fluids have been given a rigorous mathematical foundation. Notably, the Onsager conjecture [Ons49] has seen an essentially complete resolution [CET94, BDLIS15, Ise18, NV23]. Additionally, the more robust Kolmogorov 4/5 law—also a central prediction of K41 theory—has been shown to necessarily arise in the equilibrium measure of fluid velocity given the physically well-motivated (but unproven) hypothesis of weak anomalous dissipation [BCZPSW19]. There are, however, numerous obstacles to giving rigorous proof to the prediction (1.1). There are physical obstacles: (1.1) is, in fact, believed to be *false*, due to the presence of *intermittency corrections*—slightly increasing the exponent beyond 11/3—further, there is not even a predicted universal value for this correction [Fri95, Chapter 6]. There are also profound mathematical obstacles: the three-dimensional viscous fluid equation is possibly not even globally well-posed and,

Date: December 3, 2025.

École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne. keeferr.rowan@epfl.ch.

beyond that, understanding the development of a turbulent cascade such as (1.1) would require an extremely precise, uniform-in-viscosity control on the non-linear fluid equation which has essentially no precedent in the mathematical literature.

As such, we turn to a more tractable problem: *passive scalar turbulence*. Passive scalars are scalar fields $\theta_t^\kappa : \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that are advected by a “fluid-like” velocity $v_t : \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ but do not act on the velocity field. The scalar $\theta_t^\kappa : \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ thus solves a linear advection-diffusion equation, and the velocity field is prescribed extrinsically. Ideally, we would take the velocity field v_t to itself be a solution to a (stochastically forced) fluid equation, but that essentially returns us to the difficulty of the original problem. We therefore take *synthetic velocity fields*, which are given explicit definition and for which we seek to retain various “fluid-like” properties. The simplest such property, which we always take in this work, is that the velocity field is incompressible: $\nabla \cdot v_t = 0$. Since we are trying to capture turbulent phenomena, we also take v_t to have the regularity of a turbulent velocity field, which is (around) $C_x^{1/3}$; we in fact consider regularities C_x^α for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ as the phenomenology is similar in this parameter range.

In this setting of passive scalar turbulence with spatially rough advecting flow, there is analogous phenomenological theory to K41, known as Obukhov–Corrsin theory [Obu49, Cor51], which makes the prediction that for a d -dimensional passive scalar θ advected by a C_x^α “turbulent” velocity field and subject to a statistically steady forcing, we have in statistical equilibrium

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu |\hat{\theta}(k)|^2 \approx |k|^{-d-(1-\alpha)}. \quad (1.2)$$

We note that—unlike in the fluid setting—we actually expect (1.2) to hold; intermittency corrections are only expected to appear for moments greater than 2 [GK95, FMV98, BGK98, DRDII25].

It is the goal of this work to show (a slightly weaker version of) (1.2) holds for the invariant measure associated to any velocity field $v_t \in C_x^\alpha$ provided the properties of *anomalous dissipation* and *anomalous regularization* (up to the appropriate regularity index) hold. We then show that the desired anomalous dissipation and regularization hold for the stochastic version of the advection-diffusion equation given by taking the advecting flow to be a transport noise—known in the physics literature as the Kraichnan model [Kra68]. We thus give the first complete proof of a turbulent statistical scaling law like (1.1) or (1.2) in the “rough” regime—in which the fluid velocity has less than one derivative, corresponding to the limit of vanishing fluid viscosity. The “smooth” regime, also known as the Batchelor regime and corresponding to a fixed positive fluid viscosity, is by now well understood; see the discussion in Section 2.4 for an overview and connections with the problem under study.

1.1. Results for two Kraichnan models. We now specify two interesting velocity fields for which we have complete results leading to a version of (1.2). As will be clear in Section 1.2, we can prove some form of anomalous regularization for a broad variety of different transport noises, and we can show that anomalous dissipation and regularization imply a form of (1.2) for a very general class of correlated-in-time

velocity fields as well as transport noises. We provide these two specific cases first in order to give a clear statement of results free from the technical assumptions needed in the general setting.

In this section, we focus on the transport noise (or Kraichnan) setting; that is, we consider

$$\dot{\theta}_t^\kappa - \kappa \Delta \theta_t^\kappa + \circ du_t \cdot \nabla \theta_t^\kappa = F(x) dW_t, \quad (1.3)$$

where $\theta_t^\kappa : \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $F \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with $\int F(x) dx = 0$, $W_t \in \mathbb{R}$ a standard Brownian motion, and du_t is a white-in-time, correlated-in-space, incompressible Gaussian vector field independent of W_t , defined by

$$du_t(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} w_k e^{2\pi i k \cdot x} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} e_{k,j} dW_t^{k,j}, \quad (1.4)$$

where $e_{k,j}$ is an orthonormal basis for $\{a \in \mathbb{R}^d : a \cdot k = 0\}$, $w_k = w_{-k}$, $v_{-k,j} = v_{k,j}$, the $W^{k,j}$ are standard \mathbb{C} -valued Brownian motions, $W^{-k,j} = \overline{W^{k,j}}$, and $W^{k,j}$ independent from $W^{\ell,m}$ unless $k = \pm \ell$ and $m = j$. Since $k \cdot e_{k,j} = 0$, we have that $\nabla \cdot du_t = 0$. The $\circ du_t$ in the above equations signifies that we are taking the Stratonovich convention for stochastic integration, which is the physically relevant choice in this setting (see Section 2.2 for further discussion). We will also want to consider the freely-decaying version of (1.3):

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\varphi}_t^\kappa - \kappa \Delta \varphi_t^\kappa + \circ du_t \cdot \nabla \varphi_t^\kappa = 0, \\ \varphi_0^\kappa(x) = F(x). \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

Throughout the paper, we will always be in the case that for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} |k|^{2\alpha} w_k^2 \leq 1. \quad (1.6)$$

This assumption then gives that du_t is (essentially) spatially C^α . In this setting, since $\kappa > 0$, (1.3) and (1.5) are straightforwardly well defined (see, e.g., the discussion of [Row24, Section 2.2]).

We now specify the two choices of w_k we will consider in this section. The first is (essentially) the usual choice of coefficients for the Kraichnan model on \mathbb{T}^d .

Definition 1.1 (Isotropic Kraichnan model on \mathbb{T}^d). We let $d \geq 2$, fix $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, and let $w_0 = 0$. For $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$, we define

$$w_k := Z^{-1} |k|^{-d/2-\alpha} (\log |k| + 1)^{-1},$$

where Z is chosen so that (1.6) holds with equality.

We note that in the above definition we have an additional factor of $\log |k|$ compared to the more usual definitions [Kra68, FGV01, GGM24, Row24]. This is to make it so that (1.6) actually holds (as opposed to being log divergent). This is essentially a choice made for purely technical convenience.

We also define the following much sparser coefficient set.

Definition 1.2 (Shear Kraichnan model on \mathbb{T}^d). We let $d \geq 2$, fix $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, and let $w_0 = 0$. For $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$, we define

$$w_k := \begin{cases} Z^{-1}|k|^{-1/2-\alpha}(\log |k| + 1)^{-1} & k_3 = k_4 = \dots = k_d = 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where Z is chosen so that (1.6) holds with equality.

We note that the velocity field given by Definition 1.2 is very anisotropic. It is a sum of a pure x shear and a pure y shear, so constant in every direction except x and y , thus having a fairly degenerate structure. We emphasize that the velocity field du_t with coefficients given by Definition 1.2 still *points in all directions*—its range is \mathbb{R}^d —it just has a very restricted Fourier support: the k_x and k_y axes.

With the above specifications of the coefficients w_k , we are ready to state our first main result, giving anomalous dissipation and anomalous regularization for passive scalars advected by the “Kraichnan models” specified above.

Theorem 1.3 (Anomalous dissipation and regularization). *Let $d \geq 2$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, and let du_t have its coefficients defined by either Definition 1.1 or Definition 1.2. Then there exists $C(d, \alpha) > 0$ such that for all $F \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with $\int F(x) dx = 0$ and all $\kappa > 0$, if we let φ_t^κ be the solution to (1.5), then we have the following estimates:*

$$\text{for all } t \geq 0, \quad \mathbb{E} \|\varphi_t^\kappa\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2 \leq C e^{-C^{-1}t} \|\varphi_0^\kappa\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2, \quad (1.7)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^1 \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} \frac{|k|^{2(1-\alpha)}}{(\log |k| + 1)^4} |\hat{\varphi}_t^\kappa(k)|^2 dt \leq C \|\varphi_0^\kappa\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2, \quad (1.8)$$

where $\hat{\varphi}_t^\kappa(k)$ is the k th Fourier coefficient of φ_t^κ .

We emphasize that the constants in the above estimates are *uniform in $\kappa > 0$* . As such, (1.7) is a statement of anomalous dissipation: (1.5) is dissipating L^2 energy uniformly in $\kappa > 0$ despite the $\kappa = 0$ equation being formally L^2 conserving (see Section 2.1 for further discussion of this phenomenon). (1.8) is a statement of anomalous regularization: (1.5) is gaining regularity (since $1 - \alpha > 0$) on its initial data uniformly in $\kappa > 0$ despite the $\kappa = 0$ equation being regularity preserving—at least for smooth velocity fields (see Section 2.3 for further discussion of this phenomenon).

Remark 1.4. In (1.8), we see we are getting (essentially) $H_x^{1-\alpha}$ regularity on φ_t^κ (uniformly in $\kappa > 0$). This is however in conflict with (1.2), which predicts (essentially) $H_x^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}}$ regularity in equilibrium. This discrepancy is due to (1.2) only being the correct scaling prediction when the advecting velocity field is time-regular (say at least $C_{t,x}^0$). In the case we are considering, du_t is white in time, so (essentially) $C_t^{-1/2} C_x^\alpha$. This roughness in time [GK95, FGV01, GGM24] changes the scaling of (1.2) to

$$\mathbb{E} |\hat{\theta}(k)|^2 \approx |k|^{-d-2(1-\alpha)}. \quad (1.9)$$

That is we expect (essentially) $H_x^{1-\alpha}$ regularity in equilibrium, in exact correspondence with (1.8) (up to logarithmic corrections).

Remark 1.5. Our anomalous regularization statement (1.8) is integrated in time. One might wonder if a pointwise-in-time anomalous regularization statement also holds. Such a pointwise-in-time statement is proven in [DGP25, Theorem 1.3]. Following the same argument of [DGP25, Proposition 4.11], we too could upgrade (1.8) to a pointwise-in-time statement but at the cost of strictly decreasing the regularity exponent to $1 - \alpha - \delta$ for any $\delta > 0$. It seems likely that one could get a pointwise-in-time version of (1.8) at the endpoint regularity of $1 - \alpha$ with additional log corrections by keeping careful quantitative track of the constants appearing in the proof of [DGP25, Proposition 4.11]. This would require estimates on the constants appearing in (infinitely many) interpolation theorems, which likely would require reproving these theorems. Since the pointwise-in-time estimate on the free-decay problem doesn't gain us any better estimates on the invariant measure, which is the primary object of interest in this work, we leave such considerations to future studies.

These anomalous dissipation and regularization estimates then give rise to the following version of the statistical scaling law (1.9).

Theorem 1.6 (Obukhov–Corrsin spectrum on annuli). *Let $d \geq 2$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, and let du_t have its coefficients defined by either Definition 1.1 or Definition 1.2. Then there exists $C(d, \alpha) > 0$ such that for all $F \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with $\int F(x) dx = 0$ and all $\kappa > 0$, we have the following results. The Markov process θ_t^κ given by (1.3) has a unique invariant probability measure μ^κ on the zero-mean subspace of $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$, and μ^κ has the global moment regularity upper bound*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} \frac{|k|^{2(1-\alpha)}}{(\log |k| + 1)^4} |\hat{\theta}^\kappa|^2 \leq C \|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2, \quad (1.10)$$

where $\hat{\theta}^\kappa(k)$ is the k th Fourier coefficient of $\theta^\kappa \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$. We also have the following upper and lower bounds on the Fourier mass on annuli: there exists $r_0(F) > 0$ such that for all $r \in (\kappa^{\frac{1}{2\alpha}}, r_0)$,

$$\begin{aligned} C^{-1} r^{2(1-\alpha)} \|F\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq \sum_{C^{-1} r^{-1} (\log r^{-1})^{-\frac{2}{\alpha}} \leq |k| \leq C r^{-1} (\log r^{-1})^{\frac{2}{1-\alpha}}} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} |\hat{\theta}^\kappa(k)|^2 \\ &\leq C (\log r^{-1})^{\frac{4}{\alpha}} r^{2(1-\alpha)} \|F\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

We note that the final display of Theorem 1.6 is precisely the predicted statistical scaling law (1.9) summed over a geometrically sized annulus on the Fourier lattice, $\{C^{-1} r^{-1} \leq |k| \leq C r^{-1}\}$, at the length scale r (so wavenumber magnitude r^{-1})—up to logarithmic corrections. There are multiple logarithmic corrections. First, the annulus is not quite of geometric size: it instead grows very slightly faster than geometrically. Then since the annulus is “too large”, we expect a bit more mass on the annulus by summing (1.9), so the lower bound is very slightly too small (by logarithmic factors). Finally the upper and lower bounds are mismatched by a logarithmic factor. These logarithmic corrections however are essentially physically unobservable; it is not even clear they should be able to be completely removed.

Nonetheless, we do not claim that the logarithmic factors are optimal, and in particular we would expect a matching upper and lower bound to hold in at least some cases. There is also the (natural) restriction that $r > \kappa^{1/2\alpha}$, which is further discussed in Remark 1.14 below.

The fact that we have to sum the original pointwise prediction (1.9) over annuli in order to get the lower bound (a pointwise upper bound clearly holds as a consequence of (1.10)) is not too surprising; a similar summing is needed to get bounds on the Batchelor spectrum (see Section 2.4 for further discussion and comparison). While a pointwise lower bound may hold, its proof would likely require much finer control on the Fourier evolution of (1.5).

The final result we record before stating our results in their general formulation is the following infinite-order smoothing estimate in the case of the velocity field du_t defined by Definition 1.2. In that case, we note for $d \geq 3$ and any $3 \leq j \leq d$, we have that $\partial_j du_t = 0$. Thus, fixing $3 \leq j \leq d$ and letting $|\partial_j| := (-\partial_j \partial_j)^{1/2}$, for any $s \in [0, \infty)$, if φ_t^κ solves (1.5), so does $|\partial_j|^s \varphi_t^\kappa$ (with different initial data). This allows us to iterate the smoothing estimate (1.8) to prove the following.

Corollary 1.7 (Infinite order smoothing in constant directions). *Let $d \geq 3$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, and let du_t have its coefficients defined by Definition 1.2. Then for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $C(d, n, \alpha) > 0$ such that for all $F \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with $\int F(x) dx = 0$ and all $\kappa > 0$, if we let φ_t^κ be the solution to (1.5), then for all $3 \leq j \leq d$, we have the following estimate*

$$\mathbb{E} \|\partial_j^n \varphi_1^\kappa\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2 \leq C \|\varphi_0^\kappa\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2. \quad (1.11)$$

This result yields anomalous infinite order smoothing in some directions. This is somewhat surprising but not in conflict with other known theory, such as the Constantin–E–Titi-type commutator estimates [CET94], since φ_t^κ will still be rough (only $C_x^{(1-\alpha)-}$) in the x_1, x_2 directions. This curious result is a consequence of having anomalous regularization estimates even for somewhat “degenerate” velocity fields—such as that given by Definition 1.2—that have an a.s. exact symmetry (here being invariant under x_j translations for $3 \leq j \leq d$). Since this corollary does not appear to be of significant physical interest and, as such, we do not discuss it further.

1.2. Notation and general results. We now state our general results which will give Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.6 as essentially direct consequences (see Section 3.4 for the relevant arguments). We first clarify and define some notation.

1.2.1. Notation, definitions, and assumptions. Throughout, we work on the torus \mathbb{T}^d for $d \geq 2$, which we identify with $[0, 1]^d / \sim$. For $j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$, we denote by $j^\perp \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ the orthogonal complement of the subspace of \mathbb{R}^d spanned by j . Then Π_{j^\perp} denotes orthogonal projection onto this subspace. For a vector $a \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$, we let $\langle a \rangle$ denote its span in \mathbb{Z}^d :

$$\langle a \rangle := \{ra : r \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

In addition to the stochastic equations (1.3) and (1.5), we will also consider the usual advection-diffusion equation, both with a stochastic forcing and in free decay:

$$\dot{\theta}_t^\kappa - \kappa \Delta \theta_t^\kappa + v_t \cdot \nabla \theta_t^\kappa = F(x) dW_t, \quad (1.12)$$

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\varphi}_t^\kappa - \kappa \Delta \varphi_t^\kappa + v_t \cdot \nabla \varphi_t^\kappa = 0, \\ \varphi_0^\kappa(x) = F(x), \end{cases} \quad (1.13)$$

where $\kappa > 0$ and as with du_t , we always take v_t to be divergence-free: $\nabla \cdot v_t = 0$. $(v_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ will be taken to be random and independent of the forcing noise W_t . We assume throughout that $(v_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ is *time-stationary* in law: for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $(v_{t+s})_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \stackrel{d}{=} (v_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$. We will always assume that for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|v_t\|_{C_x^\alpha} \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad v \in C^0(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d). \quad (1.14)$$

We note then that (1.12) and (1.13) are well-posed as $\kappa > 0$, even though the $\kappa = 0$ equations may not be well-posed.

Throughout we will assume that

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \theta_t^\kappa(x) dx = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \varphi_t^\kappa(x) dx = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} du_t(x) dx = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} v_t(x) dx = 0.$$

Since the advecting flows are divergence-free, this condition will hold for θ_t^κ and φ_t^κ provided $\int F(x) dx = 0$. Since averages are conserved by the advection-diffusion equation, anomalous dissipation estimates such as (1.7) cannot hold (without modification) unless we assume that $\int F(x) dx = 0$. We thus take this zero-mean condition as a global assumption for notational simplicity. Similarly, averages in the advecting flows induce trivial transformations on the solutions that we are not interested in, so we also take them to be zero-mean.

For a function $f : \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we denote the Fourier transform $\hat{f} : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ so that

$$f(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \hat{f}(k) e^{2\pi i k \cdot x}.$$

Because we assume all of our functions to be zero-mean throughout, we variously view the Fourier transform as a function $\mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ and a function $\mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$.

We define $\sigma(H)$ regularity spaces which generalize H^s spaces.

Definition 1.8 ($\sigma(H)$ -spaces). For a function $\sigma : [1, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$, we define the $\sigma(H)$ norm on zero-mean functions,

$$\|f\|_{\sigma(H)} := \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} \sigma(|k|)^2 |\hat{f}(k)|^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

We note that $\sigma(H) = H^s$ for $\sigma(r) = r^s$. We now give a general definition of what we mean for the velocity fields du_t or v_t to exhibit anomalous dissipation or regularization. We emphasize that here and throughout the paper, all constants are *independent of* $\kappa > 0$.

Definition 1.9 (Anomalous regularization and dissipation). We say that the velocity field du_t *exhibits anomalous dissipation* if there exists $C > 0$ such that for all $F \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with $\int F(x) dx = 0$ and all $\kappa \in (0, 1]$, letting φ_t^κ be the solution to (1.5), then for all $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E} \|\varphi_t^\kappa\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2 \leq C e^{-C^{-1}t} \|\varphi_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2.$$

For a function $\sigma : [1, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$, we say that du_t *exhibits anomalous regularization up to $\sigma(H)$* if there exists $C > 0$ such that for all $F \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with $\int F(x) dx = 0$ and all $\kappa \in (0, 1]$, letting φ_t^κ be the solution to (1.5), then

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^1 \|\varphi_t^\kappa\|_{\sigma(H)}^2 dt \leq C \|\varphi_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2.$$

We take the analogous definitions for a time-correlated velocity field v_t , with (1.13) in place of (1.5).

1.2.2. Bounds on the energy spectrum of the invariant measure. We next want to state bounds on the invariant measures associated to (1.3) and (1.12). As such, we first need a result guaranteeing these objects exist uniquely. This is rather straightforward as we always have $\kappa > 0$, giving a global geometric contractivity under the natural coupling of different initial conditions (giving them the same noise). There is however one minor complication, which is that while we can consider θ_t^κ to be the Markov process on its own in the case of a white-in-time noise (1.3), it is no longer (necessarily) a Markov process for (1.12). For (1.12), we must instead keep track of the entire velocity field trajectory in order to ensure the Markov condition. That is the Markov process we consider is $((v_{s+t})_{s \in \mathbb{R}}, \theta_t^\kappa) \in C^0(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d) \times L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$. It is then straightforward to verify this is indeed a Markov process.

Proposition 1.10 (Invariant measures). *For any $\kappa > 0$, $F \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ such that $\int F(x) dx = 0$, and w_k satisfying (1.6) for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, the Markov process θ_t^κ given by (1.3) has a unique invariant probability measure μ^κ on the subspace of $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ given by zero-mean functions. Further, letting φ_t^κ be the solution to (1.5), then for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$, we have that*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} |\hat{\theta}^\kappa(k)|^2 = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{E} |\hat{\varphi}_t^\kappa(k)|^2 dt. \quad (1.15)$$

Similarly, for any $\kappa > 0$, $F \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with $\int F(x) dx = 0$, and $(v_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ having time-stationary law ν on $C^0(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d)$ almost surely satisfying (1.14) for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, the Markov process $((v_{s+t})_{s \in \mathbb{R}}, \theta_t^\kappa)$ where θ_t^κ solves (1.12) has a unique invariant probability measure μ^κ on the subspace of $C^0(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d) \times L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ given by $((v_s)_{s \in \mathbb{R}}, \theta^\kappa)$ where $\int \theta^\kappa(x) dx = 0$ such that $\mu^\kappa(d(v_s)_{s \in \mathbb{R}}, L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)) = \nu(d(v_s)_{s \in \mathbb{R}})$.¹ Further, letting φ_t^κ be the solution to (1.13), for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} |\hat{\theta}^\kappa(k)|^2 = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{E} |\hat{\varphi}_t^\kappa(k)|^2 dt.$$

¹That is, for $((v_s)_{s \in \mathbb{R}}, \theta^\kappa)$ distributed according to μ^κ , v has the marginal law given by ν .

We now state the straightforward proposition that, if we have anomalous dissipation and anomalous regularization up to some regularity, then we get moment bounds in that regularity for the invariant measure.

Proposition 1.11 (Upper bounds on the invariant measure). *Suppose that du_t has coefficients w_k satisfying (1.6) for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and exhibits anomalous dissipation and anomalous regularization up to $\sigma(H)$ for some $\sigma : [1, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$. Fix $F \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with $\int F(x) dx = 0$ and $\kappa \in (0, 1]$, then let μ^κ be unique invariant measure for (1.3) from Proposition 1.10. Then there exists a $C > 0$, depending on the constants in Definition 1.9, such that*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} \|\theta^\kappa\|_{\sigma(H)}^2 \leq C \|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2.$$

The same result holds with v_t satisfying (1.14) for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ in place of du_t and (1.12) in place of (1.3).

We now state our general result for correlated-in-time advecting flows giving bounds on the energy spectrum of the invariant measure under the assumption of anomalous dissipation and regularization up to some general regularity index.

Theorem 1.12 (Lower bounds on the invariant measure for correlated-in-time models). *Let v_t almost surely satisfy (1.14) for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Suppose that v_t exhibits anomalous dissipation and anomalous regularization up to $\sigma(H)$ for some $\sigma : [1, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ with*

$$\sigma(r) \geq \frac{r^\beta}{(\log r + 1)^m}. \quad (1.16)$$

Then for any $F \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with $\int F(x) dx = 0$, there exists $r_0(F) > 0$ and a constant $C > 0$, depending on β, m , and the constants appearing in the anomalous dissipation and regularization estimates for v_t , such that for all $r \in (\kappa^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}, r_0)$,

$$\sum_{C^{-1}r^{-\frac{1+\alpha}{2(1-\beta)}}(\log r^{-1})^{-\frac{m}{1-\beta}} \leq |k| \leq Cr^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{2\beta}}(\log r^{-1})^{\frac{m}{\beta}}} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} |\hat{\theta}^\kappa(k)|^2 \geq C^{-1} r^{1-\alpha} \|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2, \quad (1.17)$$

where μ^κ is the unique invariant measure from Proposition 1.10. In particular when $\beta = \frac{1-\alpha}{2}$, for all $r \in (\kappa^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}, r_0)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} C^{-1} r^{1-\alpha} \|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2 &\leq \sum_{C^{-1}r^{-1}(\log r^{-1})^{-\frac{2m}{\alpha+1}} \leq |k| \leq Cr^{-1}(\log r^{-1})^{\frac{2m}{1-\alpha}}} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} |\hat{\theta}^\kappa(k)|^2 \\ &\leq C (\log r^{-1})^{\frac{4m}{1+\alpha}} r^{1-\alpha} \|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (1.18)$$

Next we give our general result for white-in-time advecting flows giving bounds on the energy spectrum of the invariant measure. It is this result that will imply Theorem 1.6.

Theorem 1.13 (Lower bounds on the invariant measure for white-in-time models). *Let du_t have coefficients w_k satisfying (1.6) for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Suppose that du_t*

exhibits anomalous dissipation and anomalous regularization up to $\sigma(H)$ for some $\sigma : [1, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ with

$$\sigma(r) \geq \frac{r^\beta}{(\log r + 1)^m}. \quad (1.19)$$

Then for any $F \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with $\int F(x) dx = 0$, there exists $r_0(F) > 0$ and a constant $C > 0$, depending on β, m , and the constants appearing in the anomalous dissipation and regularization estimates for du_t , such that for all $r \in (\kappa^{\frac{1}{2\alpha}}, r_0)$,

$$\sum_{C^{-1}r^{-\frac{\alpha}{1-\beta}}(\log r^{-1})^{-\frac{m}{1-\beta}} \leq |k| \leq Cr^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{\beta}}(\log r^{-1})^{\frac{m}{\beta}}} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} |\hat{\theta}^\kappa(k)|^2 \geq C^{-1} r^{2(1-\alpha)} \|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2, \quad (1.20)$$

where μ^κ is the unique invariant measure from Proposition 1.10. In particular when $\beta = 1 - \alpha$, for all $r \in (\kappa^{\frac{1}{2\alpha}}, r_0)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} C^{-1} r^{2(1-\alpha)} \|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2 &\leq \sum_{C^{-1}r^{-1}(\log r^{-1})^{-\frac{m}{\alpha}} \leq |k| \leq Cr^{-1}(\log r^{-1})^{\frac{m}{1-\alpha}}} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} |\hat{\theta}^\kappa(k)|^2 \\ &\leq C(\log r^{-1})^{\frac{2m}{\alpha}} r^{2(1-\alpha)} \|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (1.21)$$

Remark 1.14. The above results, as well as Theorem 1.6, include the restriction that $r > \kappa^{\frac{1}{2\alpha}}$ in the white-in-time case and $r > \kappa^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}$ in the time correlated case. It is clear there must be some κ dependent lower bound on r , since the presence of the diffusion $\kappa\Delta$ ensures that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} \|\theta^\kappa\|_{H^1}^2 \leq \kappa^{-1} \|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2.$$

Thus on very small scales (dependent on κ), we must have the Fourier coefficients of θ^κ must decay faster than (1.2) or (1.9) predict. The interval on which the Fourier coefficients decay more quickly due to the dissipation is known as the *dissipation range*. The values we get for the transition to the dissipation range are in agreement with the values predicted by dimensional analysis, as is suggested by the agreement of $\frac{1}{1+\alpha} = \frac{3}{4}$ when $\alpha = 1/3$, agreeing with the Kolmogorov lengthscale of K41 theory.

The above results are of substantially less interest when $\beta < \frac{1-\alpha}{2}$ and $\beta < 1-\alpha$ for Theorem 1.12 and Theorem 1.13 respectively, since in that case we are really making algebraic-in- r errors compared to summing the predictions (1.2) and (1.9) respectively. However, they still provide nontrivial lower bounds that become increasingly good as β increases to $\frac{1-\alpha}{2}$ or $1-\alpha$ respectively. In the $\beta = \frac{1-\alpha}{2}$ (or $\beta = 1-\alpha$) case we get matching upper and lower bounds on geometrically sized annuli as predicted by (1.2) (or (1.9))—where each of those claims is true up to logarithmic errors, just as in Theorem 1.6. These results thus show that (a version of) the Obukhov–Corrsin spectrum must hold whenever the advecting flow exhibits anomalous dissipation and anomalous regularization up to the sharp regularity space, modulo to logarithmic corrections. We note that while in Theorem 1.3 and more generally in Theorem 1.16, we exhibit stochastic velocity fields du_t that have the requisite anomalous dissipation and regularization properties, for the correlated-in-time case (to the best of

our knowledge) proving that some velocity field v_t satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1.12 for some $\beta > 0$ remains an interesting open problem; see Section 2 for further discussion.

1.2.3. Anomalous regularization and dissipation for white-in-time models. We now turn our attention to stating general conditions on the coefficients w_k defining the stochastic advecting flow du_t in (1.4) that give anomalous dissipation and regularization. It is by verifying these conditions (and bounding the function S defined in (1.23)) for the special cases of Definition 1.1 and Definition 1.2 that we will get Theorem 1.3. Let us now give our hypotheses on the coefficients.

Assumption 1.15. *We fix $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Then we suppose that $(w_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ is*

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} |k|^{2\alpha} w_k^2 \leq 1. \quad (1.22)$$

We then let

$$S(r) := \sum_{|k| \leq r} |k|^{1+\alpha} w_k^2. \quad (1.23)$$

We suppose the following structural conditions on S : there exists $r_0 \geq 4$, $\delta, \beta \in (0, 1)$, and for all $K \geq 1$, $\Psi(K) > 0$ such that for all $r \geq r_0$, we have the bounds

$$S(r) \geq \delta |r|^\beta, \quad (1.24)$$

$$\inf_{v \in \mathbb{R}^d, |v|=1} \sum_{|k| \leq r} |k|^{1+\alpha} w_k^2 |\Pi_{k^\perp} v| \geq \delta S(r), \quad (1.25)$$

$$S(Kr) \leq \Psi(K) S(r). \quad (1.26)$$

The first condition (1.22) is (essentially) asking that $du_t \in C_x^\alpha$. We then define S in (1.23), which we will want to be as large as possible to get the maximal amount of regularization in (1.28) below. As such, we are motivated to take α to be as large as possible so that (1.22) holds (of course the relevant condition is that the sum is finite; if the sum is finite, we can rescale time in order to make that constant 1).

The final conditions (1.24), (1.25), and (1.26) are of a rather more technical nature. (1.24) is almost necessary in order to get the anomalous dissipation. The condition is essentially requiring that du_t doesn't have a full derivative, since if du_t had a full spatial derivative, we'd have that for all $r > 0$, $S(r) \leq \sum_k |k|^{1+\alpha} w_k^2 < \infty$, and so we couldn't possibly have the growth (1.24) as $r \rightarrow \infty$. A condition of this form is clearly necessary, as we couldn't possibly have an anomalous dissipation estimate like (4.5) for spatially smooth advecting flows. The condition (1.26) is purely technical and likely could be loosened in many different ways. However, it is a rather soft condition that is straightforwardly satisfied by all examples we are interested in.

The condition (1.25) is more natural (and important) than (1.26). This condition essentially requires that all of the w_k mass isn't concentrated on a single line in Fourier space. A condition like this is necessary, as the “pure shear” case—where e.g. $w_k = |k|^{-1/2-\alpha} \mathbb{1}_{k_2=k_3=\dots=k_n=0}$ so that all of the mass of w_k is purely concentrated on a line—does not exhibit anomalous dissipation or regularization (as can

be shown by computing the solution explicitly). The condition (1.25) quantitative non-degeneracy condition that excludes this case.

We now state our general result on anomalous dissipation and regularization.

Theorem 1.16 (Anomalous regularization and dissipation for suitable white-in-time models). *Suppose $(w_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}}$ satisfies Assumption 1.15 for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Fix $F \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with $\int F(x) dx = 0$ and let φ_t^κ solve (1.5). Then for all $R \geq r_0$, there exists $C(\beta, \delta, R, \Psi) > 0$ such that for all $\kappa \in (0, 1]$, we have the bounds for all $t \geq 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \|\varphi_t^\kappa\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2 \leq e^{-C^{-1}t} \|\varphi_0^\kappa\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2, \quad (1.27)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^1 \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} \left(\frac{S(R|k|)}{\log |k| + 1} \right)^2 |\widehat{\varphi}_t^\kappa(k)|^2 \leq C \|\varphi_0^\kappa\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2, \quad (1.28)$$

where S is given by (1.23). Therefore, under Definition 1.9, du_t exhibits anomalous dissipation and anomalous regularization up to $\sigma_R(H)$ with

$$\sigma_R(r) := \frac{S(Rr)}{\log r + 1}.$$

Acknowledgments. We would like to thank Lucio Galeati, Sotirios Kotitsas, and Mario Maurelli for a stimulating discussion, as well Elias Hess-Childs for helpful feedback on an early draft.

2. DISCUSSION AND PREVIOUS RESULTS

We now provide further discussion of the results and give additional connections with the extensive mathematical literature.

2.1. Anomalous dissipation, the Obukhov–Corrsin spectrum, and the importance of anomalous regularization. The mathematical problem of anomalous dissipation of passive scalars—in which the solution to the advection-diffusion equation dissipates L^2 energy uniform in diffusivity despite the zero-diffusivity equation being formally energy-conserving—has seen substantial attention in recent years. While the results of the current work do include statements of anomalous dissipation in (1.7) and (1.27), they are not the primary interest of the paper. (1.27) is a proper generalization of the previously known results, but the two most interesting cases covered in (1.7) were already treated in [Row24].

Anomalous dissipation is an important physical phenomenon underpinning the equilibrium (and non-equilibrium) theory of passive scalar turbulence and is a central ingredient to our arguments. Despite having a long history in the physics literature, appearing prominently in both the K41 theory of fluid turbulence and the Obukhov–Corrsin theory of passive scalar turbulence, the rigorous mathematical treatment of this phenomenon is quite a bit more recent. The first proof of anomalous dissipation for an advection-diffusion equation appeared in [DELJ22] and following that there have been many additional constructions, each focusing on a different aspect of the problem: see [CCS23, AV25, BSJW23, EL24, HPZZ25, JS24, HCR25b] among others.

Some of these results, [CCS23, EL24], prove Obukhov–Corrsin-type upper bounds, proving that the scalar solution has uniform bounds in C_x^β for all $\beta < \frac{1-\alpha}{2}$ for an advecting velocity field $u \in L_t^\infty C_x^\alpha$. Additionally, a qualitative form of the Obukhov–Corrsin lower bound [DEIJ22, Section 5] based on the argument of [CET94] is well known: if φ^κ exhibits anomalous dissipation, it cannot be uniformly bounded in $L_t^2 C_x^\beta$ for any $\beta > \frac{1-\alpha}{2}$.

However, these Obukhov–Corrsin-type bounds are of a rather different form than the ones considered here in Theorem 1.6, Theorem 1.12, and Theorem 1.13. The most obvious refinement is obtaining essentially sharp bounds on (almost) geometric annuli in Fourier space, providing a more precise localization of the Fourier mass, but there are also other substantial differences. We are working with the equilibrium measure for the stochastically forced equation (1.3) while the previous references are considering the free-decay problem (1.12). It is in this distinction that the importance of anomalous regularization becomes clear. In the free-decay problem, one starts with smooth initial data and seeks to show that the solution to (1.13) doesn’t become too singular in finite time. However, this proof technique straightforwardly fails in trying to prove the regularity of the equilibrium measure. From (1.15), in order to have positive regularity of the equilibrium measure, we need not just that the free decay problem doesn’t become too large in a positive regularity norm, we actually need positive regularity norms to decay in a time integrable way, uniformly in diffusivity.

The only way we know how to get uniform-in-diffusivity decay of the solution is through anomalous dissipation, which gives decay in a zero-regularity norm. We then can use anomalous regularization, which bounds positive regularity norms by zero-regularity norms, to upgrade this decay to decay of positive regularity norms, giving the desired bound of a positive regularity norm in equilibrium. This suggests that to get Obukhov–Corrsin-type bounds in equilibrium, one typically needs the stronger phenomenon of anomalous regularization as opposed to the free-decay case, for which one only needs that the solutions don’t become too rough.

We note additionally that the previously constructed deterministic examples exhibiting anomalous dissipation that have Obukhov–Corrsin-type regularity bounds are not “time-uniform”. They all require one to start the advection-diffusion equation at specific times in order to have the correct behavior; this prevents the constructions from fitting into the framework considered here.

2.2. The Kraichnan model/transport noise. The anomalous dissipation examples discussed above were all for the advection-diffusion equation (1.13), in which the velocity field is at least bounded in time. The case of a stochastic advecting flow (1.5) also has a long history, originating in the physics literature [Kra68] as the “Kraichnan model” of a turbulent velocity field. Following its initial introduction, it has been widely utilized as a testing ground for ideas such as intermittency [GK95] and spontaneous stochasticity [BGK98]. The model also saw mathematical treatment in [JR02, JR04, LR04, LR06].

We note that the presence of a multiplicative white (in time) noise in the equation (1.5) necessitates the choice of a stochastic integration convention, the two most

common being Itô and Stratonovich. In this setting though, the Stratonovich convention is certainly the right choice. The transport noise model should be thought of as the limiting case of a very fast fluctuating random velocity field. By the Wong-Zakai theorem [WZ65, WZ69], this limiting procedure gives rise to a Stratonovich noise. See also [FP22] for another perspective on the appearance of Stratonovich transport noise in fluid models.

More recently, there has been renewed mathematical interest in rough transport noise and the Kraichnan model [Gal20, FGL21, FL21, CM24, Row24, GGM24, DGP25]. Of particular relevance for us here are [GGM24, DGP25], but let us defer further discussion of these works to Section 2.3. In the author’s previous work [Row24], anomalous dissipation was proven for a wide variety of Kraichnan noises using techniques related to those of the current work (for further discussion, see Section 3).

2.3. Anomalous regularization. Anomalous regularization, in which the passive scalar gains regularity over the initial data uniformly in diffusivity despite the zero-diffusivity equation being regularity preserving for spatially smooth flows (and generically causing growth of positive regularity norms), is a phenomenon that has only just started to be understood. While it is possible for C_x^α velocity fields to cause initial data to lose all Sobolev regularity [ACM19b], anomalous regularization demonstrates that for certain fluid-like velocity fields, we actually see the opposite phenomenon: substantial regularity gain. The connection between anomalous regularization and the appearance of the statistical scaling laws like (1.1) and (1.2) has previously been discussed in [Dri22].

Mathematical demonstrations of anomalous regularization are rather recent: following [CM24], which used an anomalous regularization estimate to prove well-posedness for the 2D vorticity-form Euler equations with rough transport noise, anomalous regularization has been demonstrated for a variety of equations subject to transport noise [JL25, BGM24, BGM25]. Of particular relevance to the current work are [GGM24] and [DGP25], which consider the same equation (1.5) studied here, but on \mathbb{R}^d instead of \mathbb{T}^d . We note that [DGP25] also considers a variety of interesting cases where $\nabla \cdot du_t \neq 0$, which we do not cover at all.

The arguments of [GGM24] and [DGP25] do not directly transfer from \mathbb{R}^d to \mathbb{T}^d . The behavior of equilibrium measures is much better on \mathbb{T}^d due to its compactness and, as such, for estimates like the Obukhov–Corrsin spectrum we prefer to work on \mathbb{T}^d . The proof techniques of [GGM24] and [DGP25] exploit the rotational symmetry of \mathbb{R}^d and use exact asymptotic expansions in order to prove the anomalous regularization. Since there is no (global) rotational symmetry on the torus, this proof method runs into difficulties on \mathbb{T}^d . We also note that due to the exact asymptotic expansions present in their arguments, they cannot handle the case where $du_t = du_t^1 + du_t^2$ for independent noises where du_t^1 is well-behaved (satisfying their assumptions) and du_t^2 is some arbitrary noise (with enough regularity so that the equation is still well-posed). In contrast, due to the “energy estimate” structure of our proof, we can treat a very broad class of highly anisotropic noises and more noise is always “helpful”: adding an additional negative term that could always be

disregarded. This allows us to cover the case that $du_t = du_t^1 + du_t^2$, as can be seen by inspecting the proof (we choose not to make statements along these lines so as not to further complicate the already quite technical theorem statements).

We note that [DGP25, Theorem 1.3, (1.11)] provides a sharp endpoint regularity bound in a Besov space with regularity exactly $1 - \alpha$, strictly better than our result (1.8) which is off the endpoint by some logarithmic correction. However, one can verify that even if we were to attain an anomalous regularization result in the same Besov space, there would still be logarithmic corrections present in the Obukhov–Corrsin bounds of Theorem 1.6. In this work, we generally won’t be concerned with optimality of logarithmic errors; the sharp endpoint regularization for the Kraichnan model on the torus is left for future studies.

Finally, we note the recent work [HCR25a] gives an anomalous regularization result for a deterministic (and positive time regularity) flow. However, this result is both non-sharp—not getting close to the endpoint regularity of $\frac{1-\alpha}{2}$ for the scalar—and non-time-uniform—only giving anomalous regularization when started from specific times. As such, this construction doesn’t satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 1.12.

2.4. Batchelor regime passive scalars. We now divert our discussion to a different regime of the advection-diffusion equation: the Batchelor regime. In the Batchelor regime, we take the advecting flow to be spatially smooth, heuristically corresponding to a fluid at a fixed positive viscosity. In the Batchelor regime, there is a different prediction for the scaling behavior of passive scalars at statistical equilibrium analogous to (1.2), known as Batchelor’s law:

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu |\hat{\theta}(k)|^2 \approx |k|^{-d}. \quad (2.1)$$

We note this formally corresponds to (1.2) (or (1.9)) with $\alpha = 1$, but this is the correct prediction even for velocity fields with C_x^∞ regularity; the statistics of the passive scalar become independent of the regularity of the advecting flow for regularities above one. We note also that this prediction is now independent of whether one considers the advection-diffusion case (1.12) or the transport noise case (1.3).

In the Batchelor regime, the primary phenomena of interest (in place of anomalous dissipation and anomalous regularization) are (exponential) mixing [ACM19a, EZ19, BBPS22, MHSW22, BZG23, LTZ24, NFS25, CR25a] and enhanced dissipation [FI19, CZDE20, BBPS21a, CIS25, ELM25]. In [BBPS21b], it is shown how the competition of exponential mixing (which sends Fourier mass to infinity at an exponential rate) and the regularity of the advecting flow (which prevents Fourier mass from going to infinity faster than exponentially) necessarily leads to a cumulative version of the Batchelor spectrum (2.1), given by summing over balls in Fourier space:

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{|k| \leq r} |\hat{\theta}(k)|^2 \approx \log r.$$

In [CR25b], a refined argument gives upper and lower bounds on annuli of constant width. The argument of this work giving Obukhov–Corrsin bounds on annuli in Fourier space draws inspiration from [CR25b], as is further discussed in Section 3.

2.5. Uniform-in-diffusivity vs. at zero diffusivity. The final topic we discuss is the issue of uniform-in-diffusivity estimates compared to estimates for the zero-diffusivity equation. The zero-diffusivity equation—in contrast to the positive diffusivity equation—is not straightforwardly well-posed, and in the case of correlated-in-time advection-diffusion equation (1.13) with a C_x^α advecting flow, it is generically ill-posed, admitting many solutions even under various selection principles [CCS23]. However, for the white-in-time equation (1.5), the zero-diffusivity equation is well-posed [JR02, JR04, DGP25], so one could seek to make statements directly about this zero-diffusivity equation. We choose not to pursue this path for a few reasons. Dealing with the positive diffusivity case is technically more straightforward as the well-posedness theory is standard and well-behaved in both the advection-diffusion case and the white-in-time case. One can hope to transform uniform-in-diffusivity results to the zero-diffusivity equation under some weak convergence results. Finally, the physics literature often phrases its investigation in terms of uniform in (small enough) diffusivity estimates, so this setting fits well within the literature.

3. OVERVIEW OF THE ARGUMENT

We now discuss the argument, which breaks into two independent main pieces:

- The proof of the general result of anomalous dissipation and regularization for white-in-time velocity fields given by Theorem 1.16: discussed in Section 3.1 and given in Section 4, relying on a lattice inequality proved in Section 6.
- The proof of the Obukhov–Corrsin bounds of Theorem 1.12 and Theorem 1.13 under the assumption of anomalous dissipation and regularization: discussed in Section 3.2 and given in Section 5.

In addition to these two main steps, we need to conclude Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.6 as special cases of the Theorem 1.16 and Theorem 1.13 respectively, as well as provide the short arguments for Corollary 1.7, Proposition 1.10, and Proposition 1.11. These straightforward arguments are provided at the end of this section and won't be further discussed.

3.1. Overview of the proof of anomalous regularization and anomalous dissipation in white-in-time models. The proof of Theorem 1.16 is strongly inspired by the argument of [LTZ24] as well as [Row24]. Let us fix $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ in this discussion and consider the velocity field du_t with Fourier coefficients defined by Definition 1.1. We then let φ_t^κ solve (1.5).

In [Row24], we consider

$$g_t^\kappa(x) := \int \mathbb{E} \varphi_t^\kappa(y) \varphi_t^\kappa(y+x) dy,$$

which satisfies the equation

$$\dot{g}_t^\kappa = 2\kappa \Delta g + \nabla \cdot a \nabla g_t^\kappa \tag{3.1}$$

for a matrix a satisfying

$$v \cdot a(x)v \geq |x|^{2\alpha} |v|^2,$$

hence (3.1) becomes a degenerate parabolic equation as $\kappa \rightarrow 0$. We note we also consider g^κ defined this way in Section 5.2. A direct computation then verifies that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \frac{1}{2} \|g^\kappa\|_{L^2}^2 \leq -\| |x|^\alpha \nabla g^\kappa \|_{L^2}^2 \leq -C^{-1} \|g^\kappa\|_{H^{1-\alpha}}^2,$$

where for the second inequality we use weighted Sobolev inequality [CKN84]. Integrating in time, we thus get that

$$\int_0^1 \|g_t^\kappa\|_{H^{1-\alpha}}^2 dt \leq \|g_0^\kappa\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (3.2)$$

This looks a lot like our desired anomalous regularization estimate (1.8), except that the bound is on g_t^κ instead of φ_t^κ . This estimate is much weaker, as g^κ is already integrated in x compared to φ^κ ; in fact, L^∞ -type estimates on g^κ are equivalent to L^2 -type estimates on φ^κ . Thus we want the inequality (3.2) in L_x^∞ instead of L_x^2 . However, it is not particularly clear how to get an L^∞ -type smoothing estimate for the degenerate parabolic equation (3.1), and the general theory of degenerate parabolic equations is not very well developed (see [DGP25, Remark 1.4] for a discussion of the relevant literature on degenerate PDE regularity theory).

Following the lead of [LTZ24], we can look at the problem in Fourier space, which allows one to compute—using the Fourier transform of (3.1)—that for any $p \geq 1$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \sum_k a_k^p \leq -2\pi^2 p \sum_{k,j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} w_j^2 |\Pi_{j^\perp} k|^2 (a_{k+j}^{p-1} - a_k^{p-1})(a_{k+j} - a_k), \quad (3.3)$$

where $a_k(t) := \mathbb{E}|\widehat{\varphi}_t^\kappa(k)|^2$. Taking $p \downarrow 1$ in Fourier space is analogous to taking $p \uparrow \infty$ in real space, thus if we can get a good “weighted Poincaré-type” inequality for all $p > 1$ (in place of a real-space weighted Sobolev inequality), we can hope to get an (almost) $L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ version of (3.2). We note that we cannot work directly with $p = 1$ as in that case the term on the right hand side of (3.3) vanishes, which is the Fourier space version of the fact that the velocity field du_t doesn’t appear directly in the time derivative of $\|\varphi_t\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2$. This formulation of the problem has the advantage of utilizing additional structure of the problem, since the appearance of positive weight w_j^2 on the right hand side is related to the fact that covariance functions are positive definite, hence have positive Fourier transforms. In the real space formulation of the problem (3.1), we have that $a(x)$ has a negative Fourier transform, but it is not clear how to use this information.

The requisite Poincaré inequality is provided by the following proposition, which is a direct corollary of Lemma 6.3 proved in Section 6.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $(w_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}}$ satisfying Assumption 1.15 for α , and $(a_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}}$ such that $a_k \geq 0$ and*

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} |k|^{2(1-\alpha)} a_k^p < \infty.$$

Then for all $R \geq r_0$, there exists $C(\delta, R, \Psi) > 0$ so that for S defined by (1.23), for all $p \in (1, 2]$, we have the bound

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} S(R|k|)^2 a_k^p \leq \frac{C}{p-1} \sum_{k, j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} w_j^2 |\Pi_{j^\perp} k|^2 (a_{k+j}^{p-1} - a_k^{p-1})(a_{k+j} - a_k).$$

The proof of this inequality is further discussed in Section 6. Combining Proposition 3.1 with (3.3) and integrating in time, we get that for $p > 1$

$$\int_0^1 \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} S(R|k|)^2 a_k^p dt \leq \frac{C}{p-1} \|a_k(0)\|_{\ell^1}^p = \frac{C}{p-1} \|\varphi_0^\kappa\|_{L^2}^{2p}.$$

If we had the above inequality with $p = 1$ (and a finite constant on the right hand side), by recalling the definition of $a_k(t)$, we could directly conclude the smoothing estimate of Theorem 1.16 (or an even stronger version, without the logarithmic corrections). However, it turns out that by a careful application of Hölder's inequality with appropriately chosen exponents on doubly exponential annuli, the above inequalities for $p > 1$ actually imply the desired smoothing estimate for $p = 1$, after introducing additional logarithmic weights.

We have thus covered the smoothing estimate aspect of Theorem 1.16, but we also need the anomalous dissipation aspect. That is now straightforward, since using that $S(R|k|) \geq S(R) \geq 1$, we can combine Proposition 3.1 and (3.3) to give that for all $p > 1$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \sum_k a_k^p \leq -C^{-1}(p-1) \sum_k a_k^p.$$

Applying then Grönwall's inequality, we have exponential decay of all ℓ^p norms of a_k for $p > 1$. Again we want the decay for $p = 1$, but this then follows using the regularization estimate, Hölder's inequality, and the lower bound on S given by (1.24) in order to bound the ℓ^1 norm by the ℓ^p norm for some $p > 1$, thus concluding the proof of Theorem 1.16.

3.2. Overview of the proof of the Obukhov–Corrsin lower bounds. Let us only discuss here the proof of Theorem 1.12. The proof of Theorem 1.13 follows similarly, working the equation for g^κ (3.1) for the commutator bounds instead of directly with (1.13).

The proof of Theorem 1.12 is inspired by the proof of the Batchelor spectrum bounds [BBPS21b], the refinement of this argument in [CR25b], and the commutator argument of [CET94] (appearing in the advection-diffusion setting first in [DELJ22]). The idea is to perform the commutator bound of [CET94] on φ_t^κ solving (1.13), which yields for all $r \in (0, 1)$,

$$-\frac{d}{dt} \|\eta_r * \varphi_t^\kappa\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(\kappa r^{-2} + \|v_t\|_{C_x^\alpha} r^{-(1-\alpha)}) \frac{1}{|B_r|} \int_{B_r} \|\varphi_t^\kappa(x-y) - \varphi_t^\kappa(x)\|_{L_x^2}^2 dy.$$

where η_r is a standard family of mollifiers. Using that $\varphi_t^\kappa \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, we can integrate the left hand side over $[0, \infty)$ to get an $O(1)$ constant. Restricting the

range of r so that $\kappa r^{-2} \leq r^{-(1-\alpha)}$ and bounding the right hand side in Fourier space, we then get

$$Cr^{1-\alpha} \leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} \min(|k|^2 r^2, 1) \mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} |\hat{\theta}^\kappa(k)|^2,$$

where we Proposition 1.10 to relate time integrals of φ_t^κ to expectations over the invariant measure μ^κ of (1.12). We then note that this would give us exactly the desired lower bound on the energy spectrum if we could show that the dominant contribution to the sum on the right hand side was given by a geometrically annulus centered at r^{-1} , $\{C^{-1}r^{-1} \leq |k| \leq Cr^{-1}\}$.

This same problem, of having to localize the contribution of the sum in Fourier space, appeared in [CR25b]. The idea there is to utilize any available the upper bounds on $\mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} |\hat{\theta}^\kappa(k)|^2$ —in that case provided by exponential mixing, here provided by the regularity of the invariant measure given by Proposition 1.11—to localize the sum. To that end, we split the sum into sums over $|k| < a$, $a \leq |k| \leq b$, and $|k| > b$ for $1 \leq a < r^{-1} < b < \infty$. We then use upper bounds provided by Proposition 1.11 to control the contributions of the $|k| < a$ and $|k| > b$ parts, then choosing a small enough and b large enough to reabsorb these errors on the left hand side.

The result is a lower bound on the mass on the annulus $\{a \leq |k| \leq b\}$. Ideally, we want $a = C^{-1}r^{-1}$, $b = Cr^{-1}$. However, this would only be attainable if we had regularity estimates on the invariant measure all the way up to the endpoint of $H_x^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}}$, without any logarithmic corrections. Due to the logarithmic corrections even in the best case, a is logarithmically in r^{-1} smaller than $C^{-1}r^{-1}$ and b logarithmically bigger than Cr^{-1} . Thus we only get the bounds on (at best) slightly super-geometrically large annuli in Fourier space. In general, if we have even worse smoothing estimates, algebraically below $H_x^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}}$ —that is only H_x^β for some $\beta < \frac{1-\alpha}{2}$ —we have even larger annuli and our estimates are substantially worse.

3.3. Proofs of Propositions 1.10 and 1.11.

Proof of Proposition 1.10. We consider only the case of (1.12); the case of (1.3) follows even more straightforwardly as in that case we don't need to track $(v_{s+t})_{s \in \mathbb{R}}$. We fix $\kappa > 0$ throughout this argument. Let θ_t^κ solve (1.12) with arbitrary initial data $\theta_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with $\int \theta_0(x) dx = 0$. For some trajectory $(v_r)_{r \in \mathbb{R}} \in C^0(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d)$ and $-\infty < s \leq t < \infty$, let $\mathcal{T}_{s,t}^v$ be the solution operator to the unforced advection-diffusion equation (1.13) from time s to time t . Then by Duhamel's principle, we have that for any $t > 0$

$$\theta_t^\kappa = \mathcal{T}_{0,t}^v \theta_0 + \int_0^t \mathcal{T}_{s,t}^v F dW_s = \mathcal{T}_{-t,0}^{(v_{s+t})_{s \in \mathbb{R}}} \theta_0 + \int_0^t \mathcal{T}_{-(t-s),0}^{(v_{s+t})_{s \in \mathbb{R}}} F dW_s.$$

We then note that by the standard energy estimate for an advection-diffusion equation and the Poincaré inequality, $\|\mathcal{T}_{-t,0}^{(v_{s+t})_{s \in \mathbb{R}}} \theta_0\| \leq e^{-C^{-1}\kappa t} \|\theta_0\|_{L^2}$. We also have by the time-stationarity in law of v ,

$$\int_0^t \mathcal{T}_{-(t-s),0}^{(v_{s+t})_{s \in \mathbb{R}}} F dW_s \stackrel{d}{=} \int_0^t \mathcal{T}_{-s,0}^v F dW_s,$$

where $\stackrel{d}{=}$ means equality in distribution (or law). Thus sending $t \rightarrow \infty$, we have that, in law,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \theta_t^\kappa \stackrel{d}{=} \int_0^\infty \mathcal{T}_{-s,0}^v F dW_s,$$

where the integral on the right hand side makes sense again using the basic decay estimate of the advection-diffusion equation to give that surely, $\|\mathcal{T}_{-s,0}^v F\|_{L^2} \leq e^{-C^{-1}\kappa s} \|F\|_{L^2}$.

This above argument essentially immediately implies that the random variable

$$(v, \int_0^\infty \mathcal{T}_{-s,0}^v F dW_s)$$

has a law μ^κ that is invariant for the Markov process $((v_{s+t})_{s \in \mathbb{R}}, \theta_t^\kappa)$ for θ_t^κ solving (1.12), and further that it is the unique invariant measure for the process also satisfying $\mu^\kappa(dv, L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)) = \nu(dv)$ (since the dependency on the data θ_0 vanishes as $t \rightarrow \infty$). An application of Itô's isometry immediately implies (1.15), allowing us to conclude. \square

Proof of Proposition 1.11. By Proposition 1.10, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} \|\theta^\kappa\|_{\sigma(H)}^2 = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{E} \|\varphi_t^\kappa\|_{\sigma(H)}^2 dt. \quad (3.4)$$

By the definition of anomalous dissipation and anomalous regularization, we have for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\int_n^{n+1} \|\varphi_t^\kappa\|_{\sigma(H)}^2 dt \leq C \|\varphi_n^\kappa\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C e^{-C^{-1}n} \|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2.$$

Summing this inequality over $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and using (3.4), we conclude. \square

3.4. Proofs of Theorem 1.3, Theorem 1.6, and Corollary 1.7.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. We want to apply Theorem 1.16. As such, we need to compute $S(r)$ associated to the $(w_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}}$ as defined by Definition 1.1 and Definition 1.2 and verify Assumption 1.15. We note first that (1.22) is satisfied by construction.

First for the case of Definition 1.1, we compute that for $r \geq r_0(\alpha)$

$$\begin{aligned}
 S(r) &= Z^{-1} \sum_{1 \leq |j| \leq r} |j|^{1+\alpha} \frac{|j|^{-d-2\alpha}}{(\log |j| + 1)^2} \\
 &\approx \int_{r_0/2}^r \frac{s^{-\alpha}}{(\log s)^2} ds \\
 &\approx \int_{r_0/2}^r (1-\alpha) \frac{s^{1-\alpha}}{(\log s)^2} - 2 \frac{s^{1-\alpha}}{(\log s)^3} ds \\
 &= \frac{r^{1-\alpha}}{(\log r)^2} - \frac{(r_0/2)^{1-\alpha}}{(\log(r_0/2))^2} \\
 &\approx \frac{r^{1-\alpha}}{(\log r)^2},
 \end{aligned}$$

where by $A \approx B$ we mean that there exists $C(d, \alpha) > 0$ such that $C^{-1}A \leq B \leq CA$. Similarly, for the case of Definition 1.2, we compute for $r \geq r_0(\alpha)$:

$$S(r) = 4Z^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^r j^{1+\alpha} \frac{j^{-1-2\alpha}}{(\log j + 1)^2} \approx \int_{r_0/2}^r \frac{s^{-\alpha}}{(\log s)^2} ds \approx \frac{r^{1-\alpha}}{(\log r)^2}.$$

Condition (1.24) and (1.26) of Assumption 1.15 follow then directly for both cases of Definition 1.1 and Definition 1.2. The final condition (1.25) also follows from the straightforward computation that for each case there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and any $r \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\sum_{|j|=r} w_j^2 |\Pi_{j^\perp} v| \geq \delta \sum_{|j|=r} w_j^2.$$

Thus we can apply Theorem 1.16 which directly gives the result, after using our bounds on $S(r)$. \square

Theorem 1.6 is a direct consequence of Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.13 with $\beta = 1 - \alpha$ and $m = 2$.

Proof of Corollary 1.7. Fix $3 \leq j \leq d$ and let $|\partial_j| := (-\partial_j \partial_j)^{1/2}$, where throughout we are using the functional calculus of self-adjoint operators on $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Then, since du_t is invariant under x_j translations, we have that for any $s > 0$, $|\partial_j|^s \varphi_t^\kappa$ solves (1.5). Thus by (1.7) there exists $C > 0$ such that for any $t \geq 0$

$$\mathbb{E} \| |\partial_j|^s \varphi_t^\kappa \|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \| |\partial_j|^s \varphi_0^\kappa \|_{L^2}^2$$

and by (1.8),

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^1 \| |\partial_j|^{s+\frac{1-\alpha}{2}} \widehat{\varphi}_t^\kappa(k) \|^2 dt \leq C \mathbb{E} \int_0^1 \frac{|k|^{2(1-\alpha)}}{(\log |k| + 1)^4} |\widehat{|\partial_j|^s \varphi_t^\kappa}(k)|^2 dt \leq C \| |\partial_j|^s \varphi_0^\kappa \|_{L^2}^2.$$

Combining the above two displays, we get that for all $t > 0$

$$\mathbb{E} \| |\partial_j|^{s+\frac{1-\alpha}{2}} \varphi_t^\kappa \|_{L^2}^2 \leq C t^{-1} \| |\partial_j|^s \varphi_0^\kappa \|_{L^2}^2.$$

Iterating this inequality, we conclude the result. \square

4. ANOMALOUS REGULARIZATION AND DISSIPATION FOR WHITE-IN-TIME MODELS

We fix $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and Fourier coefficients w_k for du_t as given in (1.4) such that w_k satisfy Assumption 1.15 for α .

The following computations for Proposition 4.1 and Proposition 4.2 essentially appear in [LTZ24, Sections 2-3]; we repeat them here for the reader's convenience.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\kappa > 0$, $F \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with $\int F(x) dx = 0$, and φ_t^κ solve (1.5). The for $(a_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}}$ with $a_k \geq 0$ defined by*

$$a_k(t) := \mathbb{E}|\hat{\varphi}_t^\kappa(k)|^2,$$

the a_k solve the equation

$$\dot{a}_k = -8\pi^2\kappa|k|^2a_k - 4\pi^2 \sum_j w_j^2 |\Pi_{j^\perp} k|^2 (a_k - a_{k-j}). \quad (4.1)$$

Proof. Taking the Fourier transform of (1.5), we have that

$$\dot{\hat{\varphi}}_t^\kappa(k) = -4\pi^2\kappa|k|^2\hat{\varphi}_t^\kappa(k) - 2\pi i k \cdot \sum_j w_j \hat{\varphi}_t^\kappa(k-j) \sum_{n=1}^{d-1} v_{j,n} \circ dW_t^{j,n}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E}|\hat{\varphi}_t^\kappa(k)|^2 &= -8\pi^2\kappa|k|^2 \mathbb{E}|\hat{\varphi}_t^\kappa(k)|^2 \\ &\quad - 2\pi i k \cdot \sum_j \sum_{n=1}^{d-1} v_{j,n} w_j \mathbb{E} \hat{\varphi}_t^\kappa(k-j) \overline{\hat{\varphi}_t^\kappa(k)} \circ dW_t^{j,n} \\ &\quad + 2\pi i k \cdot \sum_j \sum_{n=1}^{d-1} v_{j,n} w_j \mathbb{E} \overline{\hat{\varphi}_t^\kappa(k-j)} \hat{\varphi}_t^\kappa(k) \circ \overline{dW_t^{j,n}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

We then note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \hat{\varphi}_t^\kappa(k-j) \overline{\hat{\varphi}_t^\kappa(k)} \circ dW_t^{j,n} &= \frac{1}{2} [d(\hat{\varphi}_t^\kappa(k-j) \overline{\hat{\varphi}_t^\kappa(k)}), dW_t^{j,n}] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \pi i \hat{\varphi}_t^\kappa(k-j) k \cdot \sum_\ell w_\ell \overline{\hat{\varphi}_t^\kappa(k-\ell)} \sum_{m=1}^{d-1} v_{\ell,m} [\overline{dW_t^{\ell,m}}, dW_t^{j,n}] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E} \pi i \overline{\hat{\varphi}_t^\kappa(k)} (k-j) \cdot \sum_\ell w_\ell \hat{\varphi}_t^\kappa(k-j-\ell) \sum_{m=1}^{d-1} v_{\ell,m} [dW_t^{\ell,m}, dW_t^{j,n}] \\ &= \pi i \mathbb{E} |\hat{\varphi}_t^\kappa|^2(k-j) w_j k \cdot v_{j,n} - \pi i \mathbb{E} |\hat{\varphi}_t^\kappa|^2(k) w_j k \cdot v_{j,n}, \end{aligned}$$

where we use $w_j = w_{-j}$, $v_{j,n} = v_{-j,n}$, $[dW_t^{\ell,m}, dW_t^{j,n}] = \delta_{\ell,-j}\delta_{m,n}$, $[\overline{dW_t^{\ell,m}}, dW_t^{j,n}] = \delta_{\ell,j}\delta_{m,n}$, and $j \cdot v_{j,m} = 0$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
 & -2\pi i k \cdot \sum_j \sum_{n=1}^{d-1} v_{j,n} w_j \mathbb{E} \left(\widehat{\varphi}_t^\kappa(k-j) \overline{\widehat{\varphi}_t^\kappa(k)} \circ dW_t^{j,n} - \overline{\widehat{\varphi}_t^\kappa(k-j) \widehat{\varphi}_t^\kappa(k)} \circ dW_t^{j,n} \right) \\
 & = -2\pi i k \cdot \sum_j \sum_{n=1}^{d-1} v_{j,n} w_j \left(\pi i \mathbb{E} |\widehat{\varphi}_t^\kappa|^2(k-j) w_j k \cdot v_{j,n} - \pi i \mathbb{E} |\widehat{\varphi}_t^\kappa|^2(k) w_j k \cdot v_{j,n} \right. \\
 & \quad \left. - \overline{\pi i \mathbb{E} |\widehat{\varphi}_t^\kappa|^2(k-j) w_j k \cdot v_{j,n} - \pi i \mathbb{E} |\widehat{\varphi}_t^\kappa|^2(k) w_j k \cdot v_{j,n}} \right) \\
 & = -4\pi^2 \sum_j w_j^2 \left(\mathbb{E} |\widehat{\varphi}_t^\kappa|^2(k) - \mathbb{E} |\widehat{\varphi}_t^\kappa|^2(k-j) \right) \sum_{n=1}^{d-1} (k \cdot v_{j,n})^2 \\
 & = -4\pi^2 \sum_j w_j^2 |\Pi_{j^\perp} k|^2 \left(\mathbb{E} |\widehat{\varphi}_t^\kappa|^2(k) - \mathbb{E} |\widehat{\varphi}_t^\kappa|^2(k-j) \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

Plugging this into (4.2)—and recalling the definition of a_k, f_k —we conclude. \square

The following computation is a bit formal but can easily be verified to hold due to the presence of the diffusion $\kappa > 0$, ensuring that for any $t \geq 0$

$$\int_0^t \sum_k |k|^2 |a_k(s)| ds = \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \|\varphi_s^\kappa\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2 ds \leq \kappa^{-1} \|\varphi_0^\kappa\|_{L^2}^2 < \infty.$$

This (together with Hölder's inequality) ensures all of our sums are absolutely convergent, hence the below manipulations are valid.

Proposition 4.2. *For all $p \geq 1$, letting $(a_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}}$ with $a_k \geq 0$ and $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} a_k(0) < \infty$ such that a_k solves (4.1). Then*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \sum_k a_k^p = -8\pi^2 \kappa p \sum_k |k|^2 a_k^p - 2\pi^2 p \sum_{k,j} w_j^2 |\Pi_{j^\perp} k|^2 (a_k - a_{k-j}) (a_k^{p-1} - a_{k-j}^{p-1}). \quad (4.3)$$

Proof. Computing directly with (4.1), we have that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \sum_k a_k^p = p \sum_k a_k^{p-1} \dot{a}_k = -8\pi^2 \kappa p \sum_k |k|^2 a_k^p - 4\pi^2 p \sum_{k,j} w_j^2 |\Pi_{j^\perp} k|^2 (a_k - a_{k-j}) a_k^{p-1}. \quad (4.4)$$

Then we note that, using that $w_j = w_{-j}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{k,j} w_j^2 |\Pi_{j^\perp} k|^2 (a_k - a_{k-j}) a_k^{p-1} &= \sum_{k,j} w_j^2 |\Pi_{j^\perp} (k+j)|^2 (a_{k+j} - a_k) a_{k+j}^{p-1} \\
 &= \sum_{k,j} w_{-j}^2 |\Pi_{j^\perp} k|^2 (a_{k-j} - a_k) a_{k-j}^{p-1} \\
 &= - \sum_{k,j} w_j^2 |\Pi_{j^\perp} k|^2 (a_k - a_{k-j}) a_{k-j}^{p-1}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Together with (4.4), this gives the result. \square

We now want to apply Proposition 3.1 together with Proposition 4.2 to deduce the anomalous dissipation and anomalous regularization estimates of Theorem 1.16 (in the language of the a_k). We recall that we are assuming the coefficients w_k of du_t satisfy Assumption 1.15 for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. We emphasize the constants in the result and proof below are uniform in κ . Theorem 1.16 is directly implied by the result below, after recalling the definition of a_k .

Proposition 4.3. *Let $(a_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}}$ with $a_k \geq 0$ and $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} a_k(0) < \infty$ such that a_k solves (4.1). Then for all $R \geq r_0$, there exists $C(\beta, \delta, R, \Psi) > 0$ such that for all $\kappa \in (0, 1]$, we have the bounds*

$$\|a_k(t)\|_{\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)} \leq e^{-C^{-1}t} \|a_k(0)\|_{\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)}, \quad (4.5)$$

$$\int_0^1 \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} \left(\frac{S(R|k|)}{\log |k| + 1} \right)^2 a_k(s) ds \leq C \|a_k(0)\|_{\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)}. \quad (4.6)$$

Proof. As noted above, since $\kappa > 0$, we have that for all $t \geq 0$

$$\int_0^t \sum_k |k|^2 |a_k(s)| ds < \infty.$$

Thus we can apply (4.3) and Proposition 3.1 to give that for $p \in (1, 2]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \sum_k a_k^p &\leq -2\pi^2 p \sum_{k,j} w_j^2 |\Pi_{j^\perp} k|^2 (a_k - a_{k-j}) (a_k^{p-1} - a_{k-j}^{p-1}) \\ &\leq -C^{-1}(p-1) \sum_k S(R|k|)^2 a_k^p. \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

For (4.6), we integrate (4.7) over $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$\int_0^1 \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} S(R|k|)^2 a_k^p(s) ds \leq \frac{C}{p-1} \sum_k a_k^p(0) \leq \frac{C}{p-1} \|a_k(0)\|_{\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)}^p. \quad (4.8)$$

We however want the bound in ℓ^1 on the left hand side, which we can get from (4.8) by the following argument. By Hölder's inequality, for any sequence $p_n \in (1, 2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^1 \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} (\log |k| + 1)^{-2} S(R|k|)^2 a_k(s) ds \\ &= \int_0^1 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{2^{2n-1} \leq |k| < 2^{2n+1-1}} (\log |k| + 1)^{-2} S(R|k|)^2 a_k(s) ds \\ &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{-2n} 2^{p_n^{-1}(p_n-1)2^{n+1}} \left(\int_0^1 \sum_{2^{2n-1} \leq |k| < 2^{2n+1-1}} S(R|k|)^{2p_n} a_k^{p_n}(s) ds \right)^{1/p_n}. \end{aligned}$$

We then use that S is increasing to bound the final term in the above display by

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{(p_n-1)2^{n+1}-2n} S(R2^{2^{n+1}})^{2(p_n-1)} \left(\int_0^1 \sum_{2^{2n-1} \leq |k| < 2^{2n+1}} S(R|k|)^2 a_k^{p_n}(s) ds \right)^{1/p_n} \\ & \leq \|a_k(0)\|_{\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{(p_n-1)2^{n+1}-2n} (R2^{2^{n+1}})^{2(1-\alpha)(p_n-1)} \left(\frac{C}{p_n-1} \right)^{1/p_n}, \end{aligned}$$

where for the final inequality, we use (4.8) to bound the ds integral and (6.1) to bound $S(R2^{2^n})$. Since $p_n \in (1, 2)$, we have that $\left(\frac{C}{p_n-1}\right)^{1/p_n} \leq \frac{C}{p_n-1}$. Using also that $\alpha \geq 0, p_n \leq 2$, putting everything together, we see

$$\int_0^1 \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} \frac{S(R|k|)^2}{(\log |k| + 1)^2} a_k(s) ds \leq C \|a_k(0)\|_{\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{3(p_n-1)2^{n+1}-2n} (p_n-1)^{-1}.$$

We choose then $p_n = 2^{-n} + 1$, giving

$$\int_0^1 \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} \frac{S(R|k|)^2}{(\log |k| + 1)^2} a_k(s) ds \leq C \|a_k(0)\|_{\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{-n} \leq C \|a_k(0)\|_{\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)},$$

which is (4.6).

We now consider (4.5). By (4.7) and (1.24), we have that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \sum_k a_k^p \leq -C^{-1}(p-1) \sum_k a_k^p,$$

so we can apply Grönwall's inequality to give for any $t \geq 0$

$$\|a_k(t)\|_{\ell^p} \leq e^{-C^{-1}(p-1)t} \|a_k(0)\|_{\ell^p} \leq e^{-C^{-1}(p-1)t} \|a_k(0)\|_{\ell^1}. \quad (4.9)$$

Then letting β as in Assumption 1.15, by Hölder's inequality we have,

$$\|a_k\|_{\ell^1} \leq \| |k|^\beta a_k \|_{\ell^1}^{1/2} \| |k|^{-\beta} a_k \|_{\ell^1}^{1/2} \leq \| |k|^\beta a_k \|_{\ell^1}^{1/2} \|a_k\|_{\ell^p}^{1/2} \| |k|^{-\beta} \|_{\ell^q}^{1/2},$$

for p, q Hölder conjugates. Then we can choose $p(\beta) \in (1, 2]$ so that $\| |k|^{-\beta} \|_{\ell^q} \leq C(\beta) < \infty$, thus

$$\|a_k\|_{\ell^1} \leq C \| |k|^\beta a_k \|_{\ell^1}^{1/2} \|a_k\|_{\ell^p}^{1/2}.$$

Then by (4.9), there exists $C(\beta, \delta, R, \Psi) > 0$ so that for any $t \geq 0$

$$\|a_k(t)\|_{\ell^1} \leq C e^{-C^{-1}t} \| |k|^\beta a_k(t) \|_{\ell^1}^{1/2} \|a_k(0)\|_{\ell^1}^{1/2}.$$

Integrating this bound over $s \in [t, t+1]$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_t^{t+1} \|a_k(s)\|_{\ell^1} ds &\leq C e^{-C^{-1}t} \|a_k(0)\|_{\ell^1}^{1/2} \int_t^{t+1} \| |k|^\beta a_k(s) \|_{\ell^1}^{1/2} ds \\ &\leq C e^{-C^{-1}t} \|a_k(0)\|_{\ell^1}^{1/2} \left(\int_t^{t+1} \sum_k |k|^\beta a_k(s) ds \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq C e^{-C^{-1}t} \|a_k(0)\|_{\ell^1}^{1/2} \left(\int_t^{t+1} \sum_k \left(\frac{S(R|k|)}{\log |k| + 1} \right)^2 a_k(s) ds \right)^{1/2}, \quad (4.10) \end{aligned}$$

where we use (1.24) of Assumption 1.15. Note that by (4.3) with $p = 1$, we have that $\|a_k(t)\|_{\ell^1}$ is decreasing in t . Combining this fact with (4.10) and (4.6), we have that

$$\|a_k(t+1)\|_{\ell^1} \leq \int_t^{t+1} \|a_k(s)\|_{\ell^1} ds \leq C e^{-C^{-1}t} \|a_k(0)\|_{\ell^1}^{1/2} \|a_k(t)\|_{\ell^1}^{1/2} \leq C e^{-C^{-1}t} \|a_k(0)\|_{\ell^1}.$$

This then gives (4.5), after perhaps increasing the constant C to cover $t \in [0, 1]$. \square

5. OBUKHOV–CORRSIN LOWER BOUNDS

We let $\eta \in C_c^\infty(B_1)$ be such that $\eta \geq 0$ and $\int \eta(x) dx = 1$. We let $\eta_r(x) := r^{-d} \eta(x/r)$. For $r \in (0, 1)$, we view η_r as a function $\mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ under the identification $\mathbb{T}^d \cong [0, 1]^d / \sim$.

5.1. Obukhov–Corrsin lower bounds for correlated-in-time models. The following is essentially the argument of [CET94], which appeared first in the passive scalar case in [DEIJ22, Theorem 4].

Proposition 5.1. *Let φ_t^κ solve (1.13). Then there exists $C(d) > 0$ such that for all $r \in (0, 1)$, we have the bound*

$$-\frac{d}{dt} \|\eta_r * \varphi_t^\kappa\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(\kappa r^{-2} + \|v_t\|_{C_x^\alpha} r^{-(1-\alpha)}) \frac{1}{|B_r|} \int_{B_r} \|\varphi_t^\kappa(x-y) - \varphi_t^\kappa(x)\|_{L_x^2}^2 dy. \quad (5.1)$$

Thus in particular, for all $r \geq \kappa^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}$,

$$-\frac{d}{dt} \|\eta_r * \varphi_t^\kappa\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(1 + \|v_t\|_{C_x^\alpha}) r^{-(1-\alpha)} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} \min(|k|^2 r^2, 1) |\hat{\varphi}_t^\kappa(k)|^2. \quad (5.2)$$

Proof. Convolution with η_r , we see that

$$\partial_t(\eta_r * \varphi_t^\kappa) = \kappa \Delta(\eta_r * \varphi_t^\kappa) - (\eta_r * v_t) \cdot \nabla(\eta_r * \varphi_t^\kappa) + \nabla \cdot (\eta_r * v_t \eta_r * \varphi_t^\kappa - \eta_r * (v_t \varphi_t^\kappa)).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\eta_r * \varphi_t^\kappa\|_{L^2}^2 &= \kappa \|\nabla \eta_r * \varphi_t^\kappa\|_{L^2}^2 + \int \nabla \eta_r * \varphi_t^\kappa (\eta_r * v_t \eta_r * \varphi_t^\kappa - \eta_r * (v_t \varphi_t^\kappa)) \\ &\leq \kappa \|\nabla \eta_r * \varphi_t^\kappa\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \eta_r * \varphi_t^\kappa\|_{L^2} \|\eta_r * v_t \eta_r * \varphi_t^\kappa - \eta_r * (v_t \varphi_t^\kappa)\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

We then note that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|\nabla \eta_r * \varphi_t^\kappa\|_{L^2} &= \left\| \int \nabla \eta_r(y) \varphi_t^\kappa(x-y) dy \right\|_{L_x^2} \\
 &= \left\| \int \nabla \eta_r(y) (\varphi_t^\kappa(x-y) - \varphi_t^\kappa(x)) dy \right\|_{L_x^2} \\
 &\leq Cr^{-1} \frac{1}{|B_r|} \int_{B_r} \|\varphi_t^\kappa(x-y) - \varphi_t^\kappa(x)\|_{L_x^2} dy,
 \end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

where we use the definition of η and Minkowski's integral inequality for the final line.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\eta_r * v_t(x) \eta_r * \varphi_t^\kappa(x) - \eta_r * (v_t \varphi_t^\kappa)(x) \\
 &= (\eta_r * v_t(x) - v_t(x)) (\eta_r * \varphi_t^\kappa(x) - \varphi_t^\kappa(x)) \\
 &\quad - \int \eta_r(y) (v_t(x-y) - v_t(x)) (\varphi_t^\kappa(x-y) - \varphi_t^\kappa(x)) dy.
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, again using Minkowski's integral inequality, we can readily see

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\|\eta_r * v_t \eta_r * \varphi_t^\kappa - \eta_r * (v_t \varphi_t^\kappa)\|_{L^2} \\
 &\leq 2 \sup_{|y| \leq r, x \in \mathbb{T}^d} |v_t(x-y) - v_t(x)| \int \eta_r(y) \|\varphi_t^\kappa(x-y) - \varphi_t^\kappa(x)\|_{L_x^2} dy \\
 &\leq 2r^\alpha \|v_t\|_{C_x^\alpha} \frac{1}{|B_r|} \int_{B_r} \|\varphi_t^\kappa(x-y) - \varphi_t^\kappa(x)\|_{L_x^2} dy.
 \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

Then combining (5.3), (5.4), (5.5), and Jensen's inequality, we get (5.1). For (5.2), we use that $r \geq \kappa^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}$, the Plancherel isomorphism, and the behavior of Fourier coefficients under translation to give

$$-\frac{d}{dt} \|\eta_r * \varphi_t^\kappa\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(1 + \|v_t\|_{C_x^\alpha}) r^{-(1-\alpha)} \sum_k |\widehat{\varphi_t^\kappa}|^2(k) \frac{1}{|B_r|} \int_{B_r} |1 - e^{2\pi i k \cdot y}|^2 dy.$$

Bounding the integral on the right hand side, we conclude. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.12. Letting φ_t^κ solve (1.13), we have that (both by the anomalous dissipation and by the fact $\kappa > 0$),

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \|\varphi_t^\kappa\|_{L^2}^2 = 0.$$

Since $\eta_r * F$ converges to F in $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ as $r \rightarrow 0$, there exists some $r_0 > 0$ such that for all $r \in (0, r_0)$, $\|\eta_r * \varphi_0^\kappa\|_{L^2} = \|\eta_r * F\|_{L^2} \geq \frac{1}{2} \|F\|_{L^2}$. Thus, taking an expectation,

integrating (5.2) over $t \in [0, \infty)$, and using (1.14), for all $r \in (\kappa^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}, r_0)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{4} \|F\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \|\eta_r * \varphi_0^\kappa\|_{L^2}^2 - \mathbb{E} \|\eta_r * \varphi_t^\kappa\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq Cr^{-(1-\alpha)} \mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty \sum_k \min(|k|^2 r^2, 1) |\hat{\varphi}_t^\kappa(k)|^2 \\ &= Cr^{-(1-\alpha)} \sum_k \min(|k|^2 r^2, 1) \mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} |\hat{\theta}^\kappa(k)|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

where μ^κ is the unique invariant measure from Proposition 1.10 and we use the representation from Proposition 1.10 for the final equality. Then for $1 \leq a < r^{-1} < b < \infty$ to be chosen, we bound

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_k \min(|k|^2 r^2, 1) \mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} |\hat{\theta}^\kappa(k)|^2 \\ &\leq r^2 \sum_{|k| < a} |k|^2 |\hat{\theta}^\kappa(k)|^2 + \sum_{a \leq |k| \leq b} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} |\hat{\theta}^\kappa(k)|^2 + \sum_{|k| > b} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} |\hat{\theta}^\kappa(k)|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{a \leq |k| \leq b} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} |\hat{\theta}^\kappa(k)|^2 + r^2 a^{2(1-\beta)} (\log a + 1)^{2m} \sum_{|k| < a} \frac{|k|^{2\beta}}{(\log |k| + 1)^{2m}} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} |\hat{\theta}^\kappa(k)|^2 \\ &\quad + C \frac{(\log |b| + 1)^{2m}}{b^{2\beta}} \sum_{|k| > b} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} \frac{|k|^{2\beta}}{(\log |k| + 1)^{2m}} |\hat{\theta}^\kappa(k)|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{a \leq |k| \leq b} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} |\hat{\theta}^\kappa(k)|^2 + C \left(r^2 a^{2(1-\beta)} (\log a + 1)^{2m} + \frac{(\log |b| + 1)^{2m}}{b^{2\beta}} \right) \|F\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

where we use (1.16), the assumption of anomalous regularization up to $\sigma(H)$, and Proposition 1.11 for the final inequality.

Choosing

$$a = C^{-1} \frac{r^{-\frac{1+\alpha}{2(1-\beta)}}}{(\log r^{-1})^{\frac{m}{1-\beta}}} \quad \text{and} \quad b = Cr^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{2\beta}} (\log r^{-1})^{\frac{m}{\beta}}$$

for C sufficiently large, we have that

$$Cr^{-(1-\alpha)} \left(r^2 a^{2(1-\beta)} (\log a + 1)^{2m} + \frac{(\log |b| + 1)^{2m}}{b^{2\beta}} \right) \|F\|_{L^2} \leq \frac{1}{8} \|F\|_{L^2}^2,$$

so we can combine (5.6) and (5.7) to give (1.17). The first inequality of (1.18) then follows directly. For the second inequality of (1.18), we compute using Proposition 1.11 and (1.16):

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{C^{-1}r^{-1}(\log r^{-1})^{-\frac{2m}{\alpha+1}} \leq |k| \leq Cr^{-1}(\log r^{-1})^{\frac{2m}{1-\alpha}}} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} |\hat{\theta}^\kappa(k)|^2 \\
 & \leq C(\log r^{-1})^{\frac{4m}{1+\alpha}} r^{1-\alpha} \sum_k \frac{|k|^{1-\alpha}}{(\log |k| + 1)^{2m}} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} |\hat{\theta}^\kappa(k)|^2 \\
 & \leq C(\log r^{-1})^{\frac{4m}{1+\alpha}} r^{1-\alpha} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} \|\theta^\kappa\|_{\sigma(H)}^2 \\
 & \leq C(\log r^{-1})^{\frac{4m}{1+\alpha}} r^{1-\alpha} \|F\|_{L^2}^2,
 \end{aligned}$$

giving the claimed bound. \square

5.2. Obukhov–Corrsin lower bounds for white-in-time models.

Definition 5.2. We define the covariance matrix $D : \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ of du_t by

$$\mathbb{E} du_t^i(x) du_s^j(y) =: \delta(t-s) D_{ij}(x-y).$$

Lemma 5.3. *We have the representation*

$$D(x) = \sum_k |w_k|^2 \cos(2\pi k \cdot x) \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} e_{k,j} \otimes e_{k,j}.$$

We then have that there exist $C(d) > 0$ such that for all $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,

$$|D(0) - D(x)| \leq C|x|^{2\alpha} \sum_k |k|^{2\alpha} |w_k|^2. \quad (5.8)$$

Proof. The representation is a direct computation, using that the imaginary part cancels as the coefficients are purely real and even in k . Then we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
 |D(0) - D(x)| & \leq C \sum_k |w_k|^2 (1 - \cos(2\pi k \cdot x)) \\
 & \leq C \sum_k |w_k|^2 \min(|k|^2 |x|^2, 1) \\
 & \leq C \max_k \min(|k|^{2(1-\alpha)} |x|^2, |k|^{-2\alpha}) \sum_k |k|^{2\alpha} |w_k|^2 \\
 & \leq C|x|^{2\alpha} \sum_k |k|^{2\alpha} |w_k|^2,
 \end{aligned}$$

as claimed. \square

The following is a direct computation using stochastic calculus. See, e.g., [Row24, Section 2.2] for the derivation.

Proposition 5.4. *Let φ_t^κ solve (1.5). Define for $r \in \mathbb{T}^d$*

$$g_t^\kappa(x) := \int \mathbb{E} \varphi_t^\kappa(y) \varphi_t^\kappa(y+x) dy. \quad (5.9)$$

Then

$$\dot{g}_t^\kappa = 2\kappa\Delta g + (D(0) - D(x)) : \nabla^2 g_t^\kappa. \quad (5.10)$$

Proposition 5.5. *Suppose that the w_k satisfy (1.6), then there exists $C(d) > 0$ such that for all $r \in (0, 1)$, we have the bound*

$$-\frac{d}{dt}\eta_r * g_t^\kappa(0) \leq C(\kappa + r^{2\alpha})r^{-2}\frac{1}{|B_r|} \int_{B_r} \mathbb{E}\|\varphi_t^\kappa(x) - \varphi^\kappa(x-y)\|_{L_x^2}^2 dy. \quad (5.11)$$

Thus in particular, for all $r \in (\kappa^{\frac{1}{2\alpha}}, 1)$,

$$-\frac{d}{dt}\eta_r * g_t^\kappa(0) \leq Cr^{-2(1-\alpha)} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} \min(|k|^2 r^2, 1) |\hat{\varphi}_t^\kappa(k)|^2. \quad (5.12)$$

Proof. By (5.10) and (5.9),

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{d}{dt}\eta_r * g_t^\kappa(0) &= -\mathbb{E} \int \eta_r(x) \varphi_t^\kappa(y) ((2\kappa\Delta + (D(0) - D(x)) : \nabla^2) \varphi_t^\kappa)(y-x) dx dy \\ &= -\mathbb{E} \int (2\kappa I + (D(0) - D(x)) : \nabla^2 \eta_r(x) \varphi_t^\kappa(y) \varphi_t^\kappa(y-x) dx dy, \end{aligned}$$

where in order to move the derivatives in x , we use that $\sum_{i=1}^d \partial_i D_{ij} = \sum_{j=1}^d \partial_j D_{ij} = 0$ by construction (this is a version of the fact that $\nabla \cdot du_t = 0$ by construction). We then note that

$$\begin{aligned} &-\mathbb{E} \int (2\kappa I + (D(0) - D(x)) : \nabla^2 \eta_r(x) \varphi_t^\kappa(y) \varphi_t^\kappa(y-x) dx dy \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \int (2\kappa I + (D(0) - D(x)) : \nabla^2 \eta_r(x) (\varphi_t^\kappa(y) - \varphi_t^\kappa(y-x))^2 dx dy, \end{aligned}$$

since the $\varphi_t^\kappa(y)^2$ term is killed by integrating by parts the ∇_x on η_r and then $\varphi_t^\kappa(y-x)^2$ term is equal to $\varphi_t^\kappa(y)^2$ term by changing variables in y . Combining the two displays above, using the definition of η_r , (5.8), and (1.22), we get (5.11). (5.12) then follows as in Proposition 5.1. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.13. We note that for $x \in \mathbb{T}^d$, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$g_t^\kappa(x) = \mathbb{E} \int \varphi_t^\kappa(y) \varphi_t^\kappa(y+x) dy \leq \mathbb{E} \|\varphi_t^\kappa\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Then—both since $\kappa > 0$ and due to the anomalous dissipation—we have that as $t \rightarrow \infty$, $\mathbb{E} \|\varphi_t^\kappa\|_{L^2}^2 \rightarrow 0$. Thus for any $r \in (0, 1)$, as $t \rightarrow \infty$, $\eta_r * g_t^\kappa(0) \rightarrow 0$. Also, by the definition of g^κ , we have that $g_0^\kappa \in C^0(\mathbb{T}^d)$ since $\varphi_0^\kappa = F \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Thus $\eta_r * g_0^\kappa(0) \rightarrow g_0^\kappa(0) = \|F\|_{L^2}^2$ as $r \rightarrow 0$, so there exists some $r_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that for all $r \leq r_0$, $\eta_r * g_0^\kappa(0) \geq \frac{1}{2} \|F\|_{L^2}^2$.

Combining this with (5.12), by integrating over $t \in [0, \infty)$, we have for any $r \in (\kappa^{\frac{1}{2\alpha}}, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \|F\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq Cr^{-2(1-\alpha)} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} \min(|k|^2 r^2, 1) \int_0^\infty |\widehat{\varphi}_t^\kappa(k)|^2 dt \\ &= Cr^{-2(1-\alpha)} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} \min(|k|^2 r^2, 1) \mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} |\widehat{\theta}_t^\kappa(k)|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.13)$$

where for the equality we use the representation from Proposition 1.10 for μ^κ the unique invariant measure of (1.3). Then, for $1 \leq a < |k| < b < \infty$ to be chosen, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_k \min(|k|^2 r^2, 1) \mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} |\widehat{\theta}_t^\kappa(k)|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{a \leq |k| \leq b} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} |\widehat{\theta}_t^\kappa(k)|^2 + r^2 \sum_{|k| < a} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} |k|^2 |\widehat{\theta}_t^\kappa(k)|^2 + \sum_{|k| > b} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} |\widehat{\theta}_t^\kappa(k)|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{a \leq |k| \leq b} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} |\widehat{\theta}_t^\kappa(k)|^2 + r^2 a^{2(1-\beta)} (\log a + 1)^{2m} \sum_{|k| < a} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} \frac{|k|^{2\beta}}{(\log |k| + 1)^{2m}} |\widehat{\theta}_t^\kappa(k)|^2 \\ &\quad + C \frac{(\log b + 1)^{2m}}{b^{2\beta}} \sum_{|k| > b} \frac{|k|^{2\beta}}{(\log |k| + 1)^{2m}} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} |\widehat{\theta}_t^\kappa(k)|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{a \leq |k| \leq b} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} |\widehat{\theta}_t^\kappa(k)|^2 + C \left(r^2 a^{2(1-\beta)} (\log a + 1)^{2m} + \frac{(\log b + 1)^{2m}}{b^{2\beta}} \right) \|F\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.14)$$

where we use (1.19), the assumption of anomalous regularization up to $\sigma(H)$, and Proposition 1.11 for the final inequality.

Choosing

$$a = C^{-1} \frac{r^{-\frac{\alpha}{1-\beta}}}{(\log r^{-1})^{\frac{m}{1-\beta}}} \quad \text{and} \quad b = Cr^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{\beta}} (\log r^{-1})^{\frac{m}{\beta}},$$

for C sufficiently large, we have that

$$Cr^{-2(1-\alpha)} \left(r^2 a^{2(1-\beta)} (\log a + 1)^{2m} + \frac{(\log |b| + 1)^{2m}}{b^{2\beta}} \right) \|F\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \frac{1}{4} \|F\|_{L^2}^2,$$

so we can combine (5.13) and (5.14) to give (1.20). The first inequality of (1.21) then follows directly. For the second inequality of (1.21), we compute using Proposition 1.11 and (1.19):

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{C^{-1}r^{-1}(\log r^{-1})^{-\frac{m}{\alpha}} \leq |k| \leq Cr^{-1}(\log r^{-1})^{\frac{m}{1-\alpha}}} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} |\widehat{\theta}^\kappa(k)|^2 \\ &\leq C(\log r^{-1})^{\frac{2m}{\alpha}} r^{2(1-\alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^\kappa} \|\theta^\kappa\|_{\sigma(H)}^2 \\ &\leq C(\log r^{-1})^{\frac{2m}{\alpha}} r^{2(1-\alpha)} \|F\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

giving the claimed bound. \square

6. WEIGHTED LATTICE POINCARÉ INEQUALITIES

In this section, we fix $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and coefficients $(w_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}}$ satisfying Assumption 1.15. We note that

$$S(r) \leq r^{1-\alpha} \sum_j |j|^{2\alpha} w_j^2 \leq r^{1-\alpha}. \quad (6.1)$$

The goal of this section is to prove Proposition 3.1, which will be a direct corollary of Lemma 6.3. We keep explicit track of constants since we will need to choose some constants sufficiently large compared to other constants, and the validity of this argument is made clearest by keeping constants explicit.

Our first step will be proving the following inequality of ℓ^1 -type. While we ultimately want the inequality of Proposition 3.1, which is an ℓ^p -type inequality, we will see this ℓ^1 -type inequality will imply the ℓ^p -type inequality. We can view this ℓ^1 -type inequality as a weighted Poincaré inequality on the lattice, since the right hand side involves only differences $|a_{k+j} - a_k|$ and there is weights on both sides (note however these weights are not matching: the weight on the left is generically much larger than the weight on the right, giving us a substantial “gain” in the weighting). The idea behind the argument is first to break up into geometric annuli, which is helpful since on a geometric annulus the weights are pointwise comparable up to a uniform constant. Then we want to use the “fundamental theorem of calculus” to write a_k in terms of differences $a_{k+mj+j} - a_{k+mj}$ and an endpoint a_{k+nj} . We will then utilize that $w_j > 0$ for infinitely many j , so on larger annuli, there are more and more differencing directions j we can take advantage of. This growth of differencing directions is what is ultimately responsible for the gain in the weight in the inequality.

Lemma 6.1. *Fix $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $(w_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}}$ satisfying Assumption 1.15 for α . Then, for all $R \geq r_0$, $(a_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}}$ such that $a_k \geq 0$ and*

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} |k|^{2(1-\alpha)} a_k < \infty, \quad (6.2)$$

for S defined by (1.23), we have the bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} S(R|k|)^2 a_k \\ & \leq 192R^2 \delta^{-2} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\} \\ |k+j| \geq (24R\delta^{-1})^{-2}|k|}} |j|^\alpha w_j^2 S(24\delta^{-1}R^2|k|) |\Pi_{j^\perp} k| |a_{k+j} - a_k|. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $\lambda = 24\delta^{-1}R$. Then for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $A_n := \{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \lambda^{n-1} < |k| \leq \lambda^n\}$.

We first note that for any $k, j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$ and $b \geq 1$, we have that

$$a_k = a_{k+bj} - \sum_{m=0}^{b-1} a_{k+mj+j} - a_{k+mj}.$$

We now fix $k \in A_n$. Then, applying the triangle inequality and summing $b \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k + bj \in A_{n+1}$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} |\{b \in \mathbb{N} : k + bj \in A_{n+1}\}| a_k &\leq \sum_{b \geq 0, k+bj \in A_{n+1}} \left(a_{k+bj} + \sum_{m=0}^{b-1} |a_{k+mj+j} - a_{k+mj}| \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{b \geq 0, k+bj \in A_{n+1}} a_{k+bj} + |\{b \in \mathbb{N} : k + bj \in A_{n+1}\}| \sum_{\substack{m \geq 0 \\ |k+mj+j| \leq \lambda^{n+1}}} |a_{k+mj+j} - a_{k+mj}|. \end{aligned}$$

Dividing, we thus get

$$a_k \leq \frac{1}{|\{b \in \mathbb{N} : k + bj \in A_{n+1}\}|} \sum_{b \geq 0, k+bj \in A_{n+1}} a_{k+bj} + \sum_{\substack{m \geq 0 \\ |k+mj+j| \leq \lambda^{n+1}}} |a_{k+mj+j} - a_{k+mj}|.$$

We only want the differences $|a_{k+mj+j} - a_{k+mj}|$ to appear when $k + mj$ is large, that is $|k + mj| > \lambda^{n-1}$. For an arbitrary j , $k + mj$ may get close to 0 for $m \geq 0$, but in that case we can consider $-j$ instead. That is, we note that either for all $m \geq 0$, $|k + mj| \geq |k|$ or for all $m \geq 0$, $|k - mj| \geq |k|$. Thus for $\tilde{j} = j$ in the first case or $\tilde{j} = -j$ in the second, applying the above inequality for \tilde{j} gives

$$\begin{aligned} a_k &\leq \frac{1}{|\{b \in \mathbb{N} : k + b\tilde{j} \in A_{n+1}\}|} \sum_{b \geq 0, k+b\tilde{j} \in A_{n+1}} a_{k+b\tilde{j}} + \sum_{\substack{m \geq 0 \\ |k+m\tilde{j}+\tilde{j}| \leq \lambda^{n+1}}} |a_{k+m\tilde{j}+\tilde{j}} - a_{k+m\tilde{j}}| \\ &\leq \frac{2}{|(k + \langle j \rangle) \cap A_{n+1}|} \sum_{\ell \in (k + \langle j \rangle) \cap A_{n+1}} a_\ell + \sum_{\ell, \ell+j \in (k + \langle j \rangle) \cap (A_n \cup A_{n+1})} |a_{\ell+j} - a_\ell|. \end{aligned}$$

We now sum this inequality over $k \in A_n$, $|j| \leq R\lambda^n$ —using that since $\lambda \geq 8R$ and $R \geq 2$, for any such k, j we have that $(k + \langle j \rangle) \cap A_{n+1} \neq \emptyset$. In the sum, we add the n, k, j dependent weight $\nu_j^n \frac{|\Pi_{j^\perp} k|}{|k|}$ —with $\nu_j^n \geq 0$ specified below—giving:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{|j| \leq R\lambda^n} \sum_{k \in A_n} \nu_j^n \frac{|\Pi_{j^\perp} k|}{|k|} a_k \\ &\leq \sum_{k \in A_n} \sum_{|j| \leq R\lambda^n} \frac{2\nu_j^n |\Pi_{j^\perp} k|}{|k| |(k + \langle j \rangle) \cap A_{n+1}|} \sum_{\ell \in (k + \langle j \rangle) \cap A_{n+1}} a_\ell \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \in A_n} \sum_{|j| \leq R\lambda^n} \nu_j^n \frac{|\Pi_{j^\perp} k|}{|k|} \sum_{\ell, \ell+j \in (k + \langle j \rangle) \cap (A_n \cup A_{n+1})} |a_{\ell+j} - a_\ell|. \end{aligned}$$

Using then that $\ell - k \in \langle j \rangle$, so $\ell + \langle j \rangle = k + \langle j \rangle$ and $\Pi_{j^\perp} k = \Pi_{j^\perp} \ell$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{|j| \leq R\lambda^n} \sum_{k \in A_n} \nu_j^n \frac{|\Pi_{j^\perp} k|}{|k|} a_k \\
& \leq 2 \sum_{|j| \leq R\lambda^n} \sum_{\ell \in A_{n+1}} \sum_{k \in (\ell + \langle j \rangle) \cap A_n} \frac{\nu_j^n}{|(\ell + \langle j \rangle) \cap A_{n+1}|} a_\ell \\
& \quad + \lambda^{1-n} \sum_{|j| \leq R\lambda^n} \sum_{\ell, \ell+j \in A_n \cup A_{n+1}} \sum_{k \in (\ell + \langle j \rangle) \cap A_n} \nu_j^n |\Pi_{j^\perp} \ell| |a_{\ell+j} - a_\ell| \\
& = 2 \sum_{j \leq R\lambda^n} \sum_{\ell \in A_{n+1}} \nu_j^n \frac{|(\ell + \langle j \rangle) \cap A_n|}{|(\ell + \langle j \rangle) \cap A_{n+1}|} a_\ell \\
& \quad + \lambda^{1-n} \sum_{|j| \leq R\lambda^n} \sum_{\ell, \ell+j \in A_n \cup A_{n+1}} \nu_j^n |(\ell + \langle j \rangle) \cap A_n| |\Pi_{j^\perp} \ell| |a_{\ell+j} - a_\ell|. \quad (6.3)
\end{aligned}$$

We now note that $|(\ell + \langle j \rangle) \cap A_m| \leq \frac{2\lambda^m}{|j|} + 1$ and for $\ell \in A_{n+1}$ such that $|(\ell + \langle j \rangle) \cap A_n| > 0$, we have that

$$|(\ell + \langle j \rangle) \cap A_{n+1}| \geq \frac{\lambda^{n+1} - \lambda^n}{|j|} - 1 \geq \frac{\lambda^{n+1}}{2|j|} - 1$$

Then, for $\ell \in A_{n+1}$, $|j| \leq R\lambda^n$, we have that

$$\frac{|(\ell + \langle j \rangle) \cap A_n|}{|(\ell + \langle j \rangle) \cap A_{n+1}|} \leq \frac{4\lambda^n + 2|j|}{\lambda^{n+1} - 2|j|} \leq \frac{4\lambda^n + 2R\lambda^n}{\lambda^{n+1} - 2R\lambda^n} \leq 6R\lambda^{-1}, \quad (6.4)$$

using that $R \geq 4$ and $\lambda \geq 4R$. We also have that for $|j| \leq R\lambda^n$,

$$|(\ell + \langle j \rangle) \cap A_n| \leq \frac{2\lambda^n}{|j|} + 1 \leq 2R \frac{\lambda^n}{|j|}. \quad (6.5)$$

Combining (6.3), (6.4), and (6.5) and summing over n , we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|j| \leq R\lambda^n} \sum_{k \in A_n} \nu_j^n \frac{|\Pi_{j^\perp} k|}{|k|} a_k \leq 12R\lambda^{-1} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|j| \leq R\lambda^n} \sum_{k \in A_{n+1}} \nu_j^n a_k \\
& \quad + 2R\lambda \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|j| \leq R\lambda^n} \sum_{k, k+j \in A_n \cup A_{n+1}} \frac{\nu_j^n}{|j|} |\Pi_{j^\perp} k| |a_{k+j} - a_k|. \quad (6.6)
\end{aligned}$$

We now choose $\nu_j^n := |j|^{1+\alpha} w_j^2 S(R\lambda^n)$, giving that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k \in A_n} S(R\lambda^n)^2 a_k \\
 & \leq \delta^{-1} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k \in A_n} S(R\lambda^n) a_k \sum_{|j| \leq R\lambda^n} |j|^{1+\alpha} w_j^2 \frac{|\Pi_{j^\perp} k|}{|k|} \\
 & \leq 12\delta^{-1} R\lambda^{-1} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|j| \leq R\lambda^n} \sum_{k \in A_{n+1}} |j|^{1+\alpha} w_j^2 S(R\lambda^n) a_k \\
 & \quad + 2R\lambda\delta^{-1} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|j| \leq R\lambda^n} \sum_{k, k+j \in A_n \cup A_{n+1}} |j|^\alpha w_j^2 S(R\lambda^n) |\Pi_{j^\perp} k| |a_{k+j} - a_k|,
 \end{aligned} \tag{6.7}$$

where we use the definition of S (1.23) as well as the assumption (1.25)—which applies as $R\lambda^n \geq R \geq r_0$ —for the first inequality and (6.6) for the second inequality. Then again using the definition of S together with $\lambda = 24R\delta^{-1}$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
 12\delta^{-1} R\lambda^{-1} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|j| \leq R\lambda^n} \sum_{k \in A_{n+1}} |j|^{1+\alpha} w_j^2 S(R\lambda^n) a_k & \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k \in A_{n+1}} S(R\lambda^n)^2 a_k \\
 & \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k \in A_n} S(R\lambda^n)^2 a_k.
 \end{aligned} \tag{6.8}$$

We also have from (6.2) and (6.1),

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k \in A_n} S(R\lambda^n)^2 a_k & \leq (\lambda R)^{2(1-\alpha)} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k \in A_n} (\lambda^{n-1})^{2(1-\alpha)} a_k \\
 & \leq (\lambda R)^{2(1-\alpha)} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k \in A_n} |k|^{2(1-\alpha)} a_k < \infty.
 \end{aligned}$$

Together with (6.8), this gives that we can reabsorb the first term on the right hand side of (6.7) and use the definition of λ to get

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k \in A_n} S(R\lambda^n)^2 a_k \\
 & \leq 96R^2\delta^{-2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|j| \leq R\lambda^n} \sum_{k, k+j \in A_n \cup A_{n+1}} |j|^\alpha w_j^2 S(R\lambda^n) |\Pi_{j^\perp} k| |a_{k+j} - a_k|.
 \end{aligned} \tag{6.9}$$

Using that S is increasing and that for $k \in A_n$, $|k| \leq \lambda^n$, we have that

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} S(R|k|)^2 a_k = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k \in A_n} S(R|k|)^2 a_k \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k \in A_n} S(R\lambda^n)^2 a_k. \tag{6.10}$$

Using that for $k, k+j \in A_n \cup A_{n+1}$, $\lambda^{n-1} \leq |k| \leq \lambda^{n+1}$ and $|k+j| \geq \lambda^{n-1}$, we also have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|j| \leq R\lambda^n} \sum_{k, k+j \in A_n \cup A_{n+1}} |j|^\alpha w_j^2 S(R\lambda^n) |\Pi_{j^\perp} k| |a_{k+j} - a_k| \\ \leq 2 \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\} \\ |k+j| \geq \lambda^{-2}|k|}} |j|^\alpha w_j^2 S(R\lambda|k|) |\Pi_{j^\perp} k| |a_{k+j} - a_k|. \end{aligned} \quad (6.11)$$

Finally, combining (6.9), (6.10), (6.11), and the definition of λ , we conclude. \square

The following inequality is used in a similar setting in [LTZ24, Proof of Lemma 2.6].

Lemma 6.2. *For $a, b \geq 0$ and $p > 1$*

$$|a^p - b^p| \leq \frac{p}{\sqrt{p-1}} \sqrt{a^p + b^p} \sqrt{(a^{p-1} - b^{p-1})(a-b)}. \quad (6.12)$$

Proof. Recall that for convex functions $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have that for $x, y \in [0, \infty)$,

$$f(y) \geq f(x) + f'(x)(y-x).$$

Using that for $p > 1$, x^p and $x^{\frac{p}{p-1}}$ are convex, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} pb^{p-1}(a-b) &\leq a^p - b^p \leq pa^{p-1}(a-b), \\ \frac{p}{p-1}b(a^{p-1} - b^{p-1}) &\leq a^p - b^p \leq \frac{p}{p-1}a(a^{p-1} - b^{p-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the product of the two inequality and taking a square root, we get the desired result. \square

Lemma 6.3. *Fix $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $(w_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}}$ satisfying Assumption 1.15 for α . Then, for all $R \geq r_0$, $(a_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}}$ such that $a_k \geq 0$ and*

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} |k|^{2(1-\alpha)} a_k^p < \infty, \quad (6.13)$$

for S defined by (1.23), we have the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} S(R|k|)^2 a_k^p \\ \leq \frac{2^{17} R^2 p^2 \Psi((24\delta^{-1}R)^3)^2}{\delta^2(p-1)} \sum_{k, j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} w_j^2 |\Pi_{j^\perp} k|^2 (a_{k+j}^{p-1} - a_k^{p-1})(a_{k+j} - a_k). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Applying Lemma 6.1 to a_k^p , we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} S(R|k|)^2 a_k^p \\
 & \leq 192R^2 \delta^{-2} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\} \\ |k+j| \geq (24R\delta^{-1})^{-2}|k|}} |j|^\alpha w_j^2 S(24\delta^{-1}R^2|k|) |\Pi_{j^\perp} k| |a_{k+j}^p - a_k^p| \\
 & \leq \frac{192R^2 p}{\delta^2 \sqrt{p-1}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\} \\ |k+j| \geq (24R\delta^{-1})^{-2}|k|}} |j|^\alpha w_j^2 S(24\delta^{-1}R^2|k|) |\Pi_{j^\perp} k| \\
 & \quad \times \sqrt{a_{k+j}^p + a_k^p} \sqrt{(a_{k+j}^{p-1} - a_k^{p-1})(a_{k+j} - a_k)} \\
 & \leq \frac{192R^2 p}{\delta^2 \sqrt{p-1}} \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\} \\ |k+j| \geq (24R\delta^{-1})^{-2}|k|}} |j|^{2\alpha} w_j^2 S(24\delta^{-1}R^2|k|)^2 (a_{k+j}^p + a_k^p) \right)^{1/2} \\
 & \quad \times \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\} \\ |k+j| \geq (24R\delta^{-1})^{-2}|k|}} w_j^2 |\Pi_{j^\perp} k|^2 (a_{k+j}^{p-1} - a_k^{p-1})(a_{k+j} - a_k) \right)^{1/2}, \tag{6.14}
 \end{aligned}$$

where we use (6.12) for the second inequality and Cauchy-Schwarz for the third. We then use that S is increasing and (1.22) to bound

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\} \\ |k+j| \geq (24R\delta^{-1})^{-2}|k|}} |j|^{2\alpha} w_j^2 S(24\delta^{-1}R^2|k|)^2 (a_{k+j}^p + a_k^p) \\
 & \leq \sum_{k, j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} |j|^{2\alpha} w_j^2 \left(S((24\delta^{-1}R)^3 R|k+j|)^2 a_{k+j}^p + S(24\delta^{-1}R^2|k|) a_k^p \right) \\
 & \leq 2 \sum_k S((24\delta^{-1}R)^3 R|k|)^2 a_k^p \sum_j |j|^{2\alpha} w_j^2 \\
 & \leq 2 \sum_k S((24\delta^{-1}R)^3 R|k|)^2 a_k^p.
 \end{aligned}$$

We then use that $R \geq r_0$, allowing us apply (1.26) to give that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\} \\ |k+j| \geq (24R\delta^{-1})^{-2}|k|}} |j|^{2\alpha} w_j^2 S(24\delta^{-1}R^2|k|)^2 (a_{k+j}^p + a_k^p) \\
 & \leq 2\Psi((24\delta^{-1}R)^3)^2 \sum_k S(R|k|)^2 a_k^p. \tag{6.15}
 \end{aligned}$$

We then note that from (6.1) and (6.13), we have that

$$\sum_k S(R|k|)^2 a_k^p \leq R^{2(1-\alpha)} \sum_k |k|^{2(1-\alpha)} a_k^p < \infty.$$

Thus, using (6.15), we can factor out the first term on the right hand side of (6.14) and take the square to give the result. \square

REFERENCES

- [ACM19a] Giovanni Alberti, Gianluca Crippa, and Anna Mazzucato. Exponential self-similar mixing by incompressible flows. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 32(2):445–490, 2019.
- [ACM19b] Giovanni Alberti, Gianluca Crippa, and Anna L. Mazzucato. Loss of regularity for the continuity equation with non-Lipschitz velocity field. *Ann. PDE*, 5(1):Paper No. 9, 19, 2019.
- [AV25] Scott Armstrong and Vlad Vicol. Anomalous diffusion by fractal homogenization. *Annals of PDE*, 11(1):2, 2025.
- [BBPS21a] Jacob Bedrossian, Alex Blumenthal, and Sam Punshon-Smith. Almost-sure enhanced dissipation and uniform-in-diffusivity exponential mixing for advection–diffusion by stochastic Navier–Stokes. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 179(3):777–834, 2021.
- [BBPS21b] Jacob Bedrossian, Alex Blumenthal, and Sam Punshon-Smith. The Batchelor Spectrum of Passive Scalar Turbulence in Stochastic Fluid Mechanics at Fixed Reynolds Number. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 75, 2021.
- [BBPS22] Jacob Bedrossian, Alex Blumenthal, and Samuel Punshon-Smith. Almost-sure exponential mixing of passive scalars by the stochastic Navier–Stokes equations. *The Annals of Probability*, 50(1):241–303, 2022.
- [BCZPSW19] Jacob Bedrossian, Michele Coti Zelati, Samuel Punshon-Smith, and Franziska Weber. A sufficient condition for the Kolmogorov 4/5 law for stationary martingale solutions to the 3D Navier–Stokes equations. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 367(3):1045–1075, 2019.
- [BDLIS15] Tristan Buckmaster, Camillo De Lellis, Philip Isett, and László Székelyhidi, Jr. Anomalous dissipation for 1/5-Hölder Euler flows. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 182(1):127–172, 2015.
- [BGK98] Denis Bernard, Krzysztof Gawędzki, and Antti Kupiainen. Slow Modes in Passive Advection. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 90(3):519–569, 1998.
- [BGM24] Marco Bagnara, Francesco Grotto, and Mario Aureli. Anomalous Regularization in Kazantsev-Kraichnan Model, November 2024. arXiv:2411.09482 [math].
- [BGM25] Marco Bagnara, Lucio Galeati, and Mario Aureli. Regularization by rough Kraichnan noise for the generalised SQG equations. *Math. Ann.*, 392(4):4773–4830, 2025.
- [BSJW23] Jan Burczak, László Székelyhidi Jr., and Bian Wu. Anomalous dissipation and Euler flows, 2023. arXiv:2310.02934.
- [BZG23] Alex Blumenthal, Michele Coti Zelati, and Rishabh S. Gvalani. Exponential mixing for random dynamical systems and an example of Pierrehumbert. *The Annals of Probability*, 51(4):1559–1601, 2023.
- [CCS23] Maria Colombo, Gianluca Crippa, and Massimo Sorella. Anomalous dissipation and lack of selection in the Obukhov–Corrsin theory of scalar turbulence. *Annals of PDE*, 9(2):21, 2023.
- [CET94] Peter Constantin, Weinan E, and Edriss S. Titi. Onsager’s conjecture on the energy conservation for solutions of Euler’s equation. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 165(1):207–209, 1994.
- [CIS25] William Cooperman, Gautam Iyer, and Seungjae Son. A Harris theorem for enhanced dissipation, and an example of Pierrehumbert. *Nonlinearity*, 38(4):Paper No. 045027, 32, 2025.
- [CKN84] Luis Caffarelli, Robert Kohn, and Louis Nirenberg. First order interpolation inequalities with weights. *Compositio Mathematica*, 53(3):259–275, 1984.

- [CM24] Michele Coghi and Mario Maurelli. Existence and uniqueness by Kraichnan noise for 2D Euler equations with unbounded vorticity, July 2024. arXiv:2308.03216 [math].
- [Cor51] Stanley Corrsin. On the Spectrum of Isotropic Temperature Fluctuations in an Isotropic Turbulence. *Journal of Applied Physics*, 22(4):469–473, 1951.
- [CR25a] William Cooperman and Keefer Rowan. Exponential scalar mixing for the 2D Navier–Stokes equations with degenerate stochastic forcing. *Inventiones mathematicae*, October 2025.
- [CR25b] William Cooperman and Keefer Rowan. Fourier mass lower bounds for Batchelor-regime passive scalars, March 2025. arXiv:2503.05885 [math].
- [CZDE20] Michele Coti Zelati, Matias G. Delgadino, and Tarek M. Elgindi. On the relation between enhanced dissipation timescales and mixing rates. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 73:1205–1244, 2020.
- [DEIJ22] Theodore D. Drivas, Tarek M. Elgindi, Gautam Iyer, and In-Jee Jeong. Anomalous dissipation in passive scalar transport. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 243(3):1151–1180, 2022.
- [DGP25] Theodore D. Drivas, Lucio Galeati, and Umberto Pappalettera. Anomalous dissipation and regularization in isotropic Gaussian turbulence, September 2025. arXiv:2509.10211 [math].
- [DRDII25] Luigi De Rosa, Theodore D. Drivas, Marco Inversi, and Philip Isett. Intermittency and Dissipation Regularity in Turbulence, February 2025. arXiv:2502.10032 [math].
- [Dri22] Theodore D. Drivas. Self-regularization in turbulence from the Kolmogorov 4/5-law and alignment. *Philos. Trans. Roy. Soc. A*, 380(2226):Paper No. 20210033, 15, 2022.
- [EL24] Tarek M. Elgindi and Kyle Liss. Norm growth, non-uniqueness, and anomalous dissipation in passive scalars. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 248(6):120, 2024.
- [ELM25] Tarek M. Elgindi, Kyle Liss, and Jonathan C. Mattingly. Optimal enhanced dissipation and mixing for a time-periodic, Lipschitz velocity field on \mathbb{T}^2 . *Duke Math. J.*, 174(7):1209–1260, 2025.
- [EZ19] Tarek M. Elgindi and Andrej Zlatoš. Universal mixers in all dimensions. *Advances in Mathematics*, 356:106807, 2019.
- [FGL21] Franco Flandoli, Lucio Galeati, and Dejun Luo. Delayed blow-up by transport noise. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 46(9):1757–1788, 2021.
- [FGV01] Gregory Falkovich, Krzysztof Gawedzki, and Massimo Vergassola. Particles and fields in fluid turbulence. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 73(4):913–975, 2001. Publisher: American Physical Society.
- [FI19] Yuanyuan Feng and Gautam Iyer. Dissipation enhancement by mixing. *Nonlinearity*, 32(5):1810, 2019.
- [FL21] Franco Flandoli and Dejun Luo. High mode transport noise improves vorticity blow-up control in 3D Navier-Stokes equations. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 180(1-2):309–363, 2021.
- [FMV98] U. Frisch, A. Mazzino, and M. Vergassola. Intermittency in Passive Scalar Advection. *Physical Review Letters*, 80(25):5532–5535, 1998.
- [FP22] Franco Flandoli and Umberto Pappalettera. From additive to transport noise in 2D fluid dynamics. *Stoch. Partial Differ. Equ. Anal. Comput.*, 10(3):964–1004, 2022.
- [Fri95] Uriel Frisch. Turbulence: The Legacy of A. N. Kolmogorov, 1995.
- [Gal20] Lucio Galeati. On the convergence of stochastic transport equations to a deterministic parabolic one. *Stochastics and Partial Differential Equations: Analysis and Computations*, 8(4):833–868, 2020.
- [GGM24] Lucio Galeati, Francesco Grotto, and Mario Maurelli. Anomalous Regularization in Kraichnan’s Passive Scalar Model, 2024. arXiv:2407.16668.
- [GK95] Krzysztof Gawedzki and Antti Kupiainen. Anomalous Scaling of the Passive Scalar. *Physical Review Letters*, 75(21):3834–3837, 1995.

- [HCR25a] Elias Hess-Childs and Keefer Rowan. Turbulent and intermittent phenomena in a universal total anomalous dissipator, July 2025. arXiv:2508.00115 [math].
- [HCR25b] Elias Hess-Childs and Keefer Rowan. A universal total anomalous dissipator, 2025. arXiv:2501.18526.
- [HPZZ25] Martina Hofmanová, Umberto Pappalettera, Rongcahn Zhu, and Xiangchan Zhu. Anomalous and total dissipation due to advection by solutions of randomly forced Navier–Stokes equations. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 35(5):3119–3149, 2025.
- [Ise18] Philip Isett. A proof of Onsager’s conjecture. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 188(3):871–963, 2018.
- [JL25] Shuaijie Jiao and Dejun Luo. Well-posedness of stochastic mSQG equations with Kraichnan noise and L^p data. *J. Differential Equations*, 438:Paper No. 113362, 41, 2025.
- [JR02] Yves Le Jan and Olivier Raimond. Integration of Brownian vector fields. *The Annals of Probability*, 30(2):826–873, 2002.
- [JR04] Yves Le Jan and Olivier Raimond. Flows, coalescence and noise. *The Annals of Probability*, 32(2):1247–1315, 2004.
- [JS24] Carl Johan Peter Johansson and Massimo Sorella. Anomalous dissipation via spontaneous stochasticity with a two-dimensional autonomous velocity field, 2024. arXiv:2409.03599.
- [Kol41a] Andrei Nikolaevich Kolmogorov. Dissipation of energy in locally isotropic turbulence. *Akademiia Nauk SSSR Doklady*, 32:16, 1941.
- [Kol41b] Andrei Nikolaevich Kolmogorov. The local structure of turbulence in incompressible viscous fluid for very large Reynolds’ numbers. *Akademiia Nauk SSSR Doklady*, 30:301–305, 1941.
- [Kol41c] Andrej Nikolaevich Kolmogorov. On the degeneration of isotropic turbulence in an incompressible viscous fluid. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 31(6):319–323, 1941.
- [Kra68] Robert H. Kraichnan. Small-Scale Structure of a Scalar Field Convected by Turbulence. *The Physics of Fluids*, 11(5):945–953, 1968.
- [LR04] S. V. Lototskii and B. L. Rozovskii. The passive scalar equation in a turbulent incompressible Gaussian velocity field. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk*, 59(2(356)):105–120, 2004.
- [LR06] S. V. Lototsky and B. L. Rozovskii. Wiener chaos solutions of linear stochastic evolution equations. *Ann. Probab.*, 34(2):638–662, 2006.
- [LTZ24] Dejun Luo, Bin Tang, and Guohuan Zhao. An elementary approach to mixing and dissipation enhancement by transport noise, 2024. arXiv:2402.07484.
- [MHSW22] Joe Myers Hill, Rob Sturman, and Mark C. T. Wilson. Exponential mixing by orthogonal non-monotonic shears. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 434:133224, 2022.
- [NFS25] Víctor Navarro-Fernández and Christian Seis. Exponential mixing by random cellular flows, February 2025. arXiv:2502.17273 [math].
- [NV23] Matthew Novack and Vlad Vicol. An intermittent Onsager theorem. *Invent. Math.*, 233(1):223–323, 2023.
- [Obu49] Alexander M. Obukhov. Structure of Temperature Field in Turbulent Flow. *Izv. Akad. Nauk. SSSR, Ser. Geogr. i Geofiz.*, 13:58–69, 1949.
- [Ons49] Lars Onsager. Statistical hydrodynamics. *Il Nuovo Cimento (1943-1954)*, 6(2):279–287, 1949.
- [Row24] Keefer Rowan. On anomalous diffusion in the Kraichnan model and correlated-in-time variants. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 248(5):93, 2024.
- [Tay35] Geoffrey Ingram Taylor. Statistical theory of turbulence. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A - Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, 151(873):421–444, 1935.
- [WZ65] Eugene Wong and Moshe Zakai. On the Convergence of Ordinary Integrals to Stochastic Integrals. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 36(5):1560–1564, 1965.

- [WZ69] Eugene Wong and Moshe Zakai. Riemann-Stieltjes approximations of stochastic integrals. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete*, 12(2):87–97, 1969.