

On the weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations: a possible gap related to the energy equality

PAOLO MAREMONTI *

to Senjo Shimizu on her 60th birthday

Abstract - It is well known that a Leray-Hopf weak solution enjoys an energy inequality. Here, we investigate the energy equality related to a suitable weak solution to the Navier-Stokes initial boundary value problem. The term suitable is meant in the sense that for our goals we achieve a weak solution whose existence is based as limit of solutions to the mollified Navier-Stokes system. In the case of a weak regularity of the solution, our results justify the possible gap for the energy equality in terms of “kinetic energy”. However, if there is a sufficient regularity, *e.g.*, like the continuity of the L^2 -norm of the weak solution, then the energy equality holds.

Keywords: Navier-Stokes equations, weak solutions, energy equality.

AMS Subject Classifications: 35Q30, 35B65, 76D05.

1 Introduction

We consider the Navier-Stokes initial boundary value problem:

$$\begin{aligned} v_t + v \cdot \nabla v + \nabla \pi &= \Delta v, \quad \nabla \cdot v = 0, \quad \text{in } (0, T) \times \Omega, \\ v &= 0 \text{ on } (0, T) \times \partial\Omega, \quad v = v_0 \text{ on } \{0\} \times \Omega, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ can be a bounded or an exterior domain, whose boundary $\partial\Omega$ for simplicity is assumed smooth, a half-space or the whole space. We set $w_t := \frac{\partial}{\partial t} w$ and $w \cdot \nabla w := (w \cdot \nabla)w$.

We investigate the existence of a weak solution v , in the sense of Leray-Hopf, to problem (1) enjoying the energy equality in the following form:

$$\|v(t)\|_2^2 + 2 \int_0^t \|\nabla v(\tau)\|_2^2 d\tau = \|v_0\|_2^2, \quad t > 0. \tag{2}$$

*Dipartimento di Matematica e Fisica, Università degli Studi della Campania “L. Vanvitelli”, via Vivaldi 43, 81100 Caserta, Italy. paolo.maremonti@unicampania.it

The research activity is performed under the auspices of GNFM-INdAM.

In 2D the result is true for all $t > 0$. Instead, the validity of the (2) is an open problem in nD , $n \geq 3$. Actually, limiting ourselves to the three-dimensional case, a weak solution *a priori* satisfies an energy inequality. The following one is in the strong form¹ and is due to Leray (1934) [26]:

$$\|v(t)\|_2^2 + 2 \int_s^t \|\nabla v(\tau)\|_2^2 d\tau \leq \|v(s)\|_2^2, \text{ for all } t > s \text{ and a.e. in } s > 0 \text{ and for } s = 0. \quad (3)$$

A priori there is no reason for the validity of a strong inequality in (3). To date, it appears as a consequence of the weakness of the weak solution v .

In Leary's paper [26], the possible instants of singularity are heuristically interpreted as possible phenomenas of turbulence in a fluid motion, that are expected in 3D.

We know, in part also thanks to inequality (3), that the set S of the possible instants of singularity of a Leray weak solution has at least $\mathcal{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(S) = 0$, \mathcal{H}^a is the a -dimensional Hausdorff measure, [5, 35].

In order to state our results and to attempt a comparison with the ones on the topic already known in literature, we introduce some notation and the definition of weak solution.

By the symbol $\mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$ we mean the set of functions divergence free and belonging to $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$. We indicate by $J^2(\Omega)$ and by $J^{1,2}(\Omega)$ the completion of $\mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ and in $W^{1,2}(\Omega)$, respectively.

We denote by $|D|$ the finite measure of a Lebesgue measurable set D . Moreover, for any family $\mathcal{F} := \{X_i : X_i \subset \mathbb{R} \text{ with } i \in \mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathbb{N}\}$ by $|\mathcal{F}|$ we mean the Lebesgue measure of the set $\bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} X_i$.

We use the symbol \rightharpoonup and the symbol \rightarrow to mean the weak and the strong convergence, respectively.

Definition 1. For all $v_0 \in J^2(\Omega)$, a field $v : (0, \infty) \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ is said a weak solution corresponding to datum v_0 if

1) for all $T > 0$, $v \in L^\infty(0, T; J^2(\Omega)) \cap L^2(0, T; J^{1,2}(\Omega))$,

2) for all $T > 0$ and $t, s \in (0, T)$, the field v satisfies the integral equation:

$$\int_s^t \left[(v, \varphi_\tau) - (\nabla v, \nabla \varphi) + (v \cdot \nabla \varphi, v) \right] d\tau + (v(s), \varphi(s)) = (v(t), \varphi(t)),$$

for all $\varphi(t, x) \in C_0^1([0, T) \times \Omega)$ with $\nabla \cdot \varphi(t, x) = 0$,

3) $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} (v(t), \varphi) = (v_0, \varphi)$, for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$.

The following theorem is well known in literature, and for the Cauchy problem it was proved by Leray in [26].

¹ The energy inequality (3) is said in strong form in contraposition to the one satisfied *a priori* only for $s = 0$, called in weak form. This is the case nD of a Hopf's weak solution to the IBVP in unbounded domains, where no energy inequality is known in the strong form.

Theorem 1. *For all $v_0 \in J^2(\Omega)$ there exists a weak solution v to problem (1) that enjoys the properties:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|v(t)\|_2^2 + 2 \int_s^t \|\nabla v(\tau)\|_2^2 d\tau \leq \|v(s)\|_2^2, \\ & \text{for all } t > s, \text{ and for all } s \in [0, \infty) - I, I \subset (0, \theta), \theta \leq c\|v_0\|_2^4, |I| = 0, c \text{ independent of } v_0; \\ & \text{for all } s \notin I, \lim_{t \rightarrow s^+} \|v(t) - v(s)\|_2 = 0; \\ & \text{for all } \varphi \in J^2(\Omega), (v(t), \varphi) \text{ is a continuous function of } t. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Definition 2. *A solution of Theorem 1 is said a Leray weak solution.*

Proposition 1. *Let v be a Leray weak solution. Then we get*

$$\|v(t)\|_2^2 + 2 \int_0^t \|\nabla v(\tau)\|_2^2 d\tau = \|v_0\|_2^2, \text{ a.e. in } t > 0, \quad (5)$$

if, and only if,

$$\|v(t)\|_2^2 + 2 \int_s^t \|\nabla v(\tau)\|_2^2 d\tau = \|v(s)\|_2^2, \text{ a.e. in } t > s. \quad (6)$$

Although the proof of Proposition 1 is immediate, we develop one in sect. 4.4.

In the following by the symbol $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ we mean the integer part of a real number.

The following theorem is related to our chief results:

Theorem 2. *For all $v_0 \in J^2(\Omega)$ there exists a Leray weak solution v that admits one and only one of the following two alternatives: almost everywhere in $t > 0$ the energy equality (5) holds, or, almost everywhere in $t, s \geq 0$, there exists an one-parameter family of non-negative integers $\{\mathbf{n}(\alpha)\}$ such that*

- if $\mathbf{n}(\alpha) \in \mathbb{N}$ the following special energy equality holds:

$$\|v(t)\|_2^2 + 2 \int_s^t \|\nabla v(\tau)\|_2^2 d\tau + \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \sum_{h=1}^{\mathbf{n}(\alpha)} \left[\|v(s_h(\alpha))\|_2^2 - \|v(t_h(\alpha))\|_2^2 \right] = \|v(s)\|_2^2, \quad (7)$$

where $\mathbf{n}(\alpha) \leq \lfloor 2c \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2} \rfloor$, for all $\alpha \in (\alpha'_0, 1)$, $\alpha'_0 > 0$, c is a constant independent of v_0, s, t , and $\{(s_h(\alpha), t_h(\alpha))\}_{h=1, \dots, \mathbf{n}(\alpha)} =: \tilde{J}(\alpha) \subset (s, t)$ is a family of pairwise disjoint open intervals enjoying the limit properties

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} (1 - \alpha)^{-1} |\tilde{J}(\alpha)| = 0 \text{ and } \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} (1 - \alpha) \mathbf{n}(\alpha) = 0,$$

- if $\mathbf{n}(\alpha) = 0$ for all $\alpha \in (\alpha'_0, 1)$, $\alpha'_0 > 0$, then on (s, t) the energy equality (6) holds.

Corollary 1. *The energy equality (5) holds if, and only if, almost everywhere in s and t there exists a $\alpha'_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that $\mathbf{n}(\alpha) = 0$ for all $\alpha \in (\alpha'_0, 1)$.*

REMARK 1.

- Our result is an existence result, so that we suitably construct our weak solution v of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2. The starting point is a sequence $\{v^m\}$, whose m th element is a smooth solution to the *mollified* Navier-Stokes IBVP (see (21)), this is the Leray approach to the existence of a weak solution. In our proof we prove that, for all $q \in [1, 2)$, the sequence $\{\nabla v^m\}$ converges strong in $L^q(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$. This result was proved for the first time in [8] (see also Lemma 5 of this note) and it is crucial for our aims.
- In connection with a Leray's weak solution the following elucidation is due. If for Leray's weak solution we mean the one given in Definition 2, whose set of solutions, by virtue of Theorem 1, is certainly not empty, then, being not known a uniqueness theorem, *a priori* we cannot say that a Leray's weak solution enjoys the properties of Theorem 2. Instead, if for Leray's weak solution we mean the one that is constructed as limit of the sequence $\{v^m\}$, where v^m is a solution to the mollified Navier-Stokes system (21), then, by virtue of the uniqueness of weak limit, then we can say that it enjoys the properties of Theorem 2.
- By virtue of Proposition 1, if, and only if, there exists an interval (s, t) for which the integer $\mathbf{n}(\alpha)$ belongs to \mathbb{N} , for all $\alpha \in (\alpha'_0, 1)$, then the energy equality fails to hold. However, we are not able to detect a such interval.
- It is natural to inquire about the claim $t > s \geq 0$ a.e. for the energy equalities (7), that does not exclude that for $s = 0$ equality (7) does not hold. The instants $s < t$ that ensure (7), indicated by \mathcal{T} their set, are the ones for which $\|\nabla v^m(t)\|_2$, related to the sequence $\{v^m\}$ of solutions to (21), admits a bound uniform with respect to m (see (46)). Being $\mathcal{T} \subseteq I^c$ (I is stated in Theorem 1), the instants $s \in I^c - \mathcal{T}$ appear lacking. However, recalling that our weak solution is continuous in L^2 -norm on the right of $s \in I^c$, one achieves the result for $s \in I^c$, in particular if $v_0 \in J^2(\Omega) - J^{1,2}(\Omega)$, by means of a suitable sequence of instant $\{s_p\} \rightarrow s$ and by considering the limit on p of the related terms in (7).
- The special bound $\lfloor 2c \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2} \rfloor$ for the integers $\mathbf{n}(\alpha)$ is due to the special auxiliary function that we employ to achieve the result. However, one can consider other auxiliary functions for the goal. In this regard it is worth to stress that they lead to the same result. In our proof, we employ the auxiliary function that seems to be simplest to us for the computations.

However, we do not consider it useful to state our result looking for a function enjoying suitable qualitative properties to achieve the result. Because here we want and we, coherently, need to quantify the possible gap for the energy equality. So that for us it is more interesting any particular function that is better at quantify the gap.

- In Theorem 2 the energy equality holds if $\mathbf{n}(\alpha) = 0$ for all $\alpha \in (\alpha'_0, 1)$. However, $\mathbf{n}(\alpha) \neq 0$ is a possible integer. Actually, we can also achieve another integer: $\mathbf{N}(\alpha) \in [\mathbf{n}(\alpha), \lfloor 2c \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2} \rfloor]$. The integer $\mathbf{n}(\alpha)$ is deduced as min-limit on m of a suitable sequence $\{\mathbf{n}(\alpha, m)\}$, Lemma 12, instead $\mathbf{N}(\alpha, m)$ is deduced as max-limit of the same sequence. Considering the subsequence that achieves the max-limit $\mathbf{N}(\alpha)$ and developing the same argument lines employed for the subsequence related to the min-limit $\mathbf{n}(\alpha)$ (see Lemma 14), one formally obtains the same result of Theorem 1, that is

$$\|v(t)\|_2^2 + 2 \int_s^t \|\nabla v(\tau)\|_2^2 d\tau + \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \sum_{h=1}^{\mathbf{N}(\alpha)} [\|v(\sigma_h(\alpha))\|_2^2 - \|v(\tau_h(\alpha))\|_2^2] = \|v(s)\|_2^2,$$

where, for all $\alpha \in (\alpha'_0, 1)$, $\{(\sigma_h(\alpha), \tau_h(\alpha))\}_{h=1, \dots, \mathbf{N}(\alpha)}$ is a family of pairwise disjoint open intervals. Finally, set $\widehat{J}(\alpha) := \{(\sigma_h(\alpha), \tau_h(\alpha)) \text{ for } h = 1, \dots, \mathbf{N}(\alpha)\}$, one gets the limit properties

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} (1 - \alpha)^{-1} |\widehat{J}(\alpha)| = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} (1 - \alpha) \mathbf{N}(\alpha) = 0.$$

We are not able to compare $\widehat{J}(\alpha)$ and $\widetilde{J}(\alpha)$ of Theorem 2.

- In Theorem 2 the possible gap is given in terms of the “kinetic energy” $\|v(t)\|_2^2$. Via (7), letting $\alpha \rightarrow 1^-$, we have $|t_h(\alpha) - s_h(\alpha)| \rightarrow 0$, then in the case of $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \|v(s_h(\alpha))\|_2^2 - \|v(t_h(\alpha))\|_2^2 > 0$ we read into a discontinuity in time of the L^2 -norm of the solution v .
- For a Leray weak solution formula (7) is a possible gap for the energy equality. However, we can achieve another, that is the one given in (79) that we point out in Remark 8. This formula furnishes the possible gap by means of the “internal energy”.
- If for some $s, t \in \mathcal{T}$ the energy equality (6) does not hold, then for all the extracts $\{\nabla v^{m_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ the strong convergence in $L^2(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$ does not hold. Then one easily gets that there exists an extract such that

$$\lim_{m_k} \int_s^t \|\nabla v^{m_k} - \nabla v\|_2^2 d\tau = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \sum_{h=1}^{\mathbf{n}(\alpha)} [\|v(s_h(\alpha))\|_2^2 - \|v(t_h(\alpha))\|_2^2],$$

or equivalently

$$\lim_{m_k} \int_s^t \|\nabla v^{m_k}\|_2^2 d\tau = \int_s^t \|\nabla v\|_2^2 d\tau + \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \sum_{h=1}^{\mathbf{n}(\alpha)} [\|v(s_h(\alpha))\|_2^2 - \|v(t_h(\alpha))\|_2^2].$$

REMARK 2.

- We set the viscosity $\nu = 1$, not being interested to the questions connected with the vanishing viscosity. Hence, in our results, for the constants we do not explicit the dependence on the viscosity ν of the fluid. However, if $\nu \rightarrow 0$ some results fail to hold.

- We stress that in Theorem 2 the claim related to the validity of (3) has not to be considered pleonastic. Actually, assuming $s = 0$, estimate (3) holds for all $t > 0$, in contrast to the validity *a priori* almost everywhere of the special energy equalities (7).
- We think that having clarified in (7) the possible gap in the energy equality, it is now possible to better delimit the ambit of the question of an extra-dissipation. In particular, if some motive of weakness of the solution or of turbulence phenomena of the fluid makes happen an “extra energy” that is not equivalent to the one exhibits in (7), then we have a case of non-uniqueness for weak solutions.
- Related to the last remark, that is connection between energy relation and uniqueness question, we would like to point out the following. In [4] the authors furnish an example of non uniqueness for very weak solutions u that are continuous in L^2 -norm. The example does not work provided that the very weak solution u belongs to $L^2(0, T; J^{1,2}(\Omega))$. Hence, the energy relation can be discriminant for the uniqueness question. This is the case for very weak u solutions enjoying the integrability property $L^4(0, T; L^4(\Omega))$. Actually, in [18] the author proves that any very weak solution $u \in L^4(0, T; L^4(\Omega))$ satisfies an energy equality.

REMARK 3.

- It is well known the following result proved in [5]:

Assume $v_0 \in J^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Then there exists a $R(v_0) > 0$ such that the corresponding suitable weak solution² (v, π) is smooth in $(0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^3 - B_R$, and the pressure $\pi \in L^{\frac{4}{3}}(0, \infty; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$.

Starting from the weak formulation, by means of the Prodi’s arguments, it is not difficult to prove that for a such weak solution the following localized energy equality holds:

$$\|h^{\frac{1}{2}}v(t)\|_2^2 + 2 \int_0^t \|h^{\frac{1}{2}}\nabla v(\tau)\|_2^2 d\tau = \|h^{\frac{1}{2}}v_0\|_2^2 + \int_0^t [(\Delta h, |v|^2) + (v \otimes v, \nabla h \otimes v) + 2(\pi, \nabla h \cdot v)] d\tau,$$

for all $t > 0$, and for all smooth non-negative function $h : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ with support enclosed in $\mathbb{R}^3 - B_R$.

- To date, with regard to the question of the validity of the energy equality (2), we detect two different ways of thinking. One looks for sufficient conditions in order to obtain the energy equality. Another tries to justify the inequality by means of turbulence arguments.
- The former is based on a wide literature originated³ by Prodi (1959) in [34], that required the integrability property $L^4(0, T; L^4(\Omega))$ to a weak solution v (more properly an extra condition) in order to obtain the energy equality for v .

² Here suitable weak solution is meant in the sense of Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg

³ Prodi’s result on the energy equality is in Lemma 2 of the quoted paper, which is devoted to the uniqueness of weak solutions enjoying an extra condition. The extra condition for the uniqueness is the same used by Serrin in [37], that is $L^{\frac{2p}{p-3}}(0, T; L^p(\Omega))$, $p > 3$.

In the setting of extra conditions (Prodi's kind), we find some that concern the derivatives of the weak solution. The goal is to weaken "Prodi's condition".

Actually, in [6] the authors assume $v \in L^3(0, T; D(A_2^{\frac{5}{12}}))$ and in [15] the authors assume $v \in L^3(0, T; D(A_{\frac{18}{7}}^{\frac{1}{4}}))$.

In papers [1, 2] and in Theorem 1.3 Ch. I of [31] (PhD thesis), the authors assume $\nabla v \in L^r(0, T; L^s(\Omega))$ with $\frac{2n}{s} + \frac{n+2}{r} = n + 2$ ($n \geq 3$ is the Euclidean dimension of Ω)⁴.

However, the extra conditions, as a matter of course, force the initial datum to be suitably more regular than the assumption $v_0 \in J^2(\Omega)$. Therefore, these results can only concern the weak solutions corresponding to a subset of initial data in $J^2(\Omega)$. In this setting interesting results are obtained in [22, 23].

Conversely, more recent than the former, some papers have been devoted to study the compatibility between the initial datum only in L^2 and the validity of the energy equality of a weak solution, see [8, 9, 10, 28]. In particular, the result found in [28] suggests that there is no incompatibility⁵ between the extra condition $L^4(\varepsilon, T; L^4(\Omega))$, $\varepsilon > 0$, which is enough to ensure the energy equality, and the assumption $v_0 \in J^2(\Omega)$.

- Instead, the authors of [11, 12] support the following ideas. In the case of "less regularity", the idea is that the presence of turbulences in fluid motions causes an extra dissipation, the one that balances the gap in the energy inequality (3). Actually, they consider as possible an analogy between the gap in (3) and the "anomalous dissipation" conjectured by Onsager⁶ (1949) in [33] for weak solutions to the Euler equations. In [11, 12], the anomalous dissipation $\varepsilon[u^\nu](t, x)$, for all $\nu > 0$ (viscosity coefficient), proposed in the energy relation is defined as

$$\varepsilon[u^\nu](t, x) := \nu |\nabla u^\nu(t, x)|^2 + D[u^\nu(t, x)], \quad (8)$$

with $D[u^\nu] \geq 0$. So that, in place of (3) the energy relation becomes

$$\|u^\nu(t)\|_2^2 + 2\nu \int_0^t \|\nabla u^\nu(\tau)\|_2^2 d\tau + 2 \int_0^t \|D[u^\nu](\tau)\|_1 d\tau = \|u_0\|_2^2, \quad \text{a. e. in } t > 0. \quad (9)$$

In section 3. of [12], the validity of (8) is supported by considering a Leray's approximation (see problem (21) of this note). In particular, denoted by $\{u^m\}$ the sequence of solutions

⁴ For $\beta \in (0, 1)$, A_q^β is the fractional power of the Stokes operator $A_q := -P_q \Delta$. If $n = 3$, due to variability of the exponents r, s , the extra assumptions in the papers [1, 2, 31] are not in all comparable with the ones of [6, 15].

⁵ In [28] it is proved that also the extra conditions for the regularity can be relaxed in such a way to be compatible with the assumption v_0 just in $J^2(\Omega)$. This fact points out that the characterization between the initial data and some extra-conditions of Serrin's kind, investigated by some authors, see *e.g.* [22, 23], concerns the only conditions and cannot be regarded as a characterization of the regularity properties of a Leray-Hopf weak solution.

In [14], from a different point of view, the extra condition $L^4(\varepsilon, T; L^4(\Omega))$ is deduced and applied for a special weak solution. Consequently, a local energy equality holds too.

⁶ The Onsager conjecture is not part of the goals of this note. We refer to the fundamental results obtained in [3, 7, 36].

to problem (21), by virtue of the properties of the functional convex and semicontinuous associated to the dissipation, the authors achieve the following limit property (in the following u is the weak solution, weak limit of $\{u^m\}$, the symbol ν is omitted):

$$\lim_m |\nabla u^m(t, x)|^2 - |\nabla u(t, x)|^2 = D[u] \geq 0. \quad (10)$$

Hence, if $D[u^\nu(t, x)] > 0$ on a set of non-zero measure, the extra energy is achieved. But, employing the strong convergence stated in Lemma 6, that holds for all the Leray sequences $\{u^m\}$, the limit property (10) can be only satisfied like equal to zero a.e. in (t, x) . So that, by means of (10) one cannot justify formula (8). Hence, (9) is not justified.

Outline of the proof.

Our result is an existence result, so that we suitably construct our weak solution v . For this aim we need to recall some well known results, that we partially reproduce in order to make the note self-contained.

The starting point is a sequence $\{v^m\}$, whose m th element is a smooth solution to the *mollified* Navier-Stokes IBVP (see (21), this is the Leray approach).

The first step is to prove that, for all $q \in [1, 2)$, the sequence $\{\nabla v^m\}$ is strongly convergent in $L^q(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$ (Lemma 6). Subsequently, by means of an auxiliary function, and making use of the energy relation for the smooth solutions $\{v^m\}$, we are able to prove a first result of convergence that leads to the following relation (formula (44)):

$$\frac{2}{\pi} \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \lim_m \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \frac{\|v^m\|_2^2}{1+\|\nabla v^m\|_2^4} \frac{d}{d\tau} \|\nabla v^m\|_2^2 d\tau = \|v(s)\|_2^2 - \|v(t)\|_2^2 - 2 \int_s^t \|\nabla v\|_2^2 d\tau,$$

($J(\alpha, m) \subset (s, t)$, see (41), for all (α, m) the set $J(\alpha, m)$ is at most the union of a countable family of pairwise disjoint intervals). Thanks always to special properties of our auxiliary function and to the energy relation valid for the sequence $\{v^m\}$, we prove that the term of on the left-hand side is equal (formula (50)) to

$$\frac{2}{\pi} \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \lim_m \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \frac{\|v^m\|_2^2}{1+\|\nabla v^m\|_2^4} \frac{d}{d\tau} \|\nabla v^m\|_2^2 d\tau = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \overline{\lim}_m \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \|\nabla v^m\|_2^2 d\tau = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \lim_m \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \|\nabla v^m\|_2^2 d\tau.$$

Subsequently, we prove that the previous limits initially considered on $J(\alpha, m)$ (*a priori*, for all (α, m) , countable set of disjoint open intervals) can be relaxed to a subset $J'(\alpha, m)$ of disjoint open intervals whose cardinality is finite ($\text{card} J'(\alpha, m) = \mathbf{n}(\alpha) < \lfloor c \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2} \rfloor$, for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$). This property of finite cardinality allows us by means of further arguments to prove (7). \square

The plan of the paper is the following. After recalling and proving some preliminary results in sect. 2, in sect. 3 we introduce the Navier-Stokes initial boundary value problem with a mollified non-linear term, in order to work with a sequence $\{(v^m, \pi^m)\}$ of smooth approximating solutions,

whose limit in “metric of the energy” gives our weak solution. Finally, in sect. 4 we furnish the proof of Theorem 2.

Acknowledgement - The author would like to thank F. Crispo and C.R. Grisanti with whom, in the joint works [8, 9, 10], he shared and discussed with interest the same question.

Moreover, the author would like to thank a referee who, by bringing to the attention of the author several misprints, improved the reading of the paper.

2 Some preliminary lemmas

We start by recalling the L^q -Helmholtz decomposition, that is

$$L^q(\Omega) \equiv J^q(\Omega) \oplus G^q(\Omega),$$

where $J^q(\Omega)$ is the completion of $\mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$ in $L^q(\Omega)$ and $G^q(\Omega) := \{w \in L^q(\Omega) : w \equiv \nabla h \text{ with } h \in W_{loc}^{1,q}(\Omega)\}$. By the symbol P_q we denote the projection from $L^q(\Omega)$ onto $J^q(\Omega)$. In the case of $q = 2$, we just write P . For details on the Helmholtz decomposition see the monograph [17], and see also [38, 30] for a different approach to the problem that is due to Solonnikov.

By the symbol $-P_q \Delta$ we mean the Stokes operator defined on $J^{1,q}(\Omega) \cap W^{2,q}(\Omega)$ with range $J^q(\Omega)$. Here the symbol $J^{1,q}(\Omega)$ denotes the completion of $\mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$ in $W^{1,q}(\Omega)$. For further results on the Stokes operator we refer to the monograph [17].

Lemma 1. *There exists a constant $c > 0$ such that*

$$\|w\|_\infty \leq c \|P \Delta w\|_2^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla w\|_2^{\frac{1}{2}}, \text{ for all } w \in J^{1,2}(\Omega) \cap W^{2,2}(\Omega). \quad (11)$$

Proof. Estimate (11) is an inequality of the Gagliardo-Nirenberg kind, whose right-hand side has the Stokes operator as max order of derivatives. For the proof see [27, 29]. \square

Lemma 2 (Friedrichs’s lemma). *Let Ω be a bounded domain, and $\{a_p\}$ an orthogonal basis in $L^2(\Omega)$. For all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$\|u\|_2 \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \left[\sum_{k=1}^N (u, a^k)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon \|\nabla u\|_q, \text{ for all } u \in W^{1,q}(\Omega),$$

provided that $q > \frac{6}{5}$.

Proof. This lemma is a generalization of the well known Friedrichs’s lemma stated for $q = 2$. The proof is given in [25] Ch.II Lemma 2.4. \square

Lemma 3. *Let $\{h_m(t)\} \subset L^1(0, T)$ be a sequence of non-negative functions such that $\|h_m\|_1 \leq M < \infty$, for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Also, assume that $h_m(t) \rightarrow h(t)$ a.e. in $t \in (0, T)$ with $h(t) \in L^1(0, T)$. Then we get,*

$$\text{for all } \alpha \in (0, \alpha_0), \quad \lim_m \int_0^T h_m(t) p(\alpha, h_m(t)) dt = \int_0^T h(t) p(\alpha, h(t)) dt, \quad (12)$$

and

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \widehat{\alpha}^-} \lim_m \int_0^T h_m(t) p(\alpha, h_m(t)) dt = \int_0^T h(t) dt, \quad (13)$$

provided that, for all $\alpha \in (0, \widehat{\alpha})$, the function $p(\alpha, r)$ is continuous in $r > 0$ and

$$p(\alpha, r) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } r \in [0, g(\alpha)], \\ \text{is decreasing, with } \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} p(\alpha, r) = 0, & \text{if } r > g(\alpha), \end{cases}$$

where $g(\alpha)$ denotes a strictly increasing and continuous function with $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \widehat{\alpha}^-} g(\alpha) = \infty$.

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T h_m(t) p(\alpha, h_m(t)) dt &= \int_0^T (h_m(t) - h(t)) p(\alpha, h_m(t)) dt + \int_0^T h(t) p(\alpha, h_m(t)) dt \\ &=: I_1(\alpha, m) + I_2(\alpha, m). \end{aligned}$$

Since $h_m(t) \rightarrow h(t)$ a.e. in $t \in (0, T)$, then, for all $\alpha \in (0, \widehat{\alpha})$, $p(\alpha, h_m(t)) \rightarrow p(\alpha, h(t))$ a.e. in $t \in (0, T)$. Since $p(\alpha, h_m(t)) \leq 1$ for all $t \in (0, T)$, recalling that $h(t) \in L^1(0, T)$, then the following limit holds:

$$\lim_m I_2(\alpha, m) = \int_0^T h(t) p(\alpha, h(t)) dt, \text{ for all } \alpha \in (0, \widehat{\alpha}). \quad (14)$$

Now, we consider I_1 that, in our assumptions, is bounded with a constant independent of $\alpha \in (0, \widehat{\alpha})$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Our goal is to prove that $\lim_m I_1(\alpha, m) = 0$, for all $\alpha \in (0, \widehat{\alpha})$. We point out that, for $\varepsilon \in (0, \widehat{\alpha} - \alpha)$ and for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(0, T) = \{t : h_m(t) \leq g(\widehat{\alpha} - \varepsilon)\} \cup \{t : g(\widehat{\alpha} - \varepsilon) < h_m(t)\} =: J_m^1(\varepsilon) \cup J_m^2(\varepsilon).$$

Hence, for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we write

$$\begin{aligned} I_1(\alpha, m) &= \int_0^T \chi_{J_m^1}(\varepsilon)(h_m(t) - h(t)) p(\alpha, h_m(t)) dt + \int_0^T \chi_{J_m^2}(\varepsilon)(h_m(t) - h(t)) p(\alpha, h_m(t)) dt \\ &= I_1^1(\alpha, m, \varepsilon) + I_1^2(\alpha, m, \varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Letting $m \rightarrow \infty$ we get $\chi_{J_m^1}(\varepsilon) |h_m(t) - h(t)| p(\alpha, h_m(t)) \leq |h_m(t) - h(t)| \rightarrow 0$ a.e. in $t \in (0, T)$. Recalling that $p(\alpha, h_m(t)) \leq 1$, we have $|\chi_{J_m^1}(\varepsilon)(h_m(t) - h(t)) p(\alpha, h_m(t))| \leq g(\widehat{\alpha} - \varepsilon) + h(t)$ for all $t \in (0, T)$. Hence, by virtue of Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, for all $\alpha \in (0, \widehat{\alpha})$ and for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \widehat{\alpha} - \alpha)$, we arrive at

$$\lim_m I_1^1(\alpha, m, \varepsilon) = 0. \quad (15)$$

For the second integral we point out that $\chi_{J_m^2(t)} p(\alpha, h_m(t)) \leq p(\alpha, g(\hat{\alpha} - \varepsilon))$ for all $t \in (0, T)$. Recalling that the sequence $\{h_m\}$ is bounded in $L^1(0, T)$ and that $h \in L^1(0, T)$, we deduce

$$\left| I_1^2(\alpha, m, \varepsilon) \right| \leq cp(\alpha, g(\hat{\alpha} - \varepsilon)), \quad (16)$$

with c independent of $\alpha \in (0, \hat{\alpha})$, $\varepsilon \in (0, \hat{\alpha} - \alpha)$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, via (15) and (16), for all $\alpha \in (0, \hat{\alpha})$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \hat{\alpha} - \alpha)$, we arrive at

$$\overline{\lim}_m |I_1(\alpha, m)| \leq cp(\alpha, g(\hat{\alpha} - \varepsilon)).$$

By the assumptions, $p(\alpha, r)$ tends to zero for $r \rightarrow \infty$, for all $\alpha \in (0, \hat{\alpha})$, and since $\varepsilon \in (0, \hat{\alpha} - \alpha)$ is arbitrary, we arrive at

$$\lim_m I_1(\alpha, m) = 0.$$

The last one and the limit property (14) prove (12).

Being $h(t) \in L^1(0, T)$ and $p(\alpha, \rho) \leq 1$, and, letting $\alpha \rightarrow \hat{\alpha}$, $p(\alpha, \rho) \rightarrow 1$, via Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, then from (12) we get

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \hat{\alpha}} \int_0^T h(t) p(\alpha, h(t)) dt = \int_0^T h(t) dt,$$

that proves (13). □

REMARK 4. We stress the peculiarity of the lemma whose thesis is connected to the auxiliary function p . Actually, for $p \equiv 1$ the result fails to hold. We have the example of sequence $\{u_m\}$ with $u_m = m$ for $t \in (0, \frac{1}{m})$ and $u_m = 0$ for $t \in (\frac{1}{m}, 1)$. Then $\|u_m\|_1 = 1$, for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $u_m \rightarrow 0 = u$ on $(0, 1)$, but $\|u_m\|_1$ does not converge to 0.

Lemma 4. Let $\{\rho_m\}$ be a sequence of measurable functions. Assume that, a.e. on (s, t) , $\{\rho_m\}$ converges to $\rho \in L^1(s, t)$. Let $J(\alpha, m) := \{\tau \in (s, t) : \rho_m(\tau) > \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}\}$. Assume that for a constant c , independent of $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, the following holds:

$$|J(\alpha, m)| \leq \frac{c}{\tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}}, \quad \text{for all } m \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (17)$$

Then, we get

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \overline{\lim}_m \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \frac{\rho_m^2}{1+\rho_m^2} d\tau = 0. \quad (18)$$

Proof. We initially remark that the left-hand side of (18) is well posed for all $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Actually, $\rho_m^2/(1+\rho_m^2) \in (0, 1)$ and, by virtue of assumption (17), $\overline{\lim}_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{|J(\alpha, m)|}{1-\alpha} \leq$

$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{c}{(1-\alpha) \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}} \leq c \frac{\pi}{2}$. By means of a simple computation, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\lim}_m \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \frac{\rho_m^2}{1+\rho_m^2} d\tau &= \overline{\lim}_m \left[\int_{J(\alpha, m)} \left[\frac{\rho_m^2}{1+\rho_m^2} - \frac{\rho^2}{(1+\rho_m^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}(1+\rho^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right] d\tau \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \frac{\rho^2}{(1+\rho_m^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}(1+\rho^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} d\tau \right] \\ &=: \overline{\lim}_m \left[I_1(\alpha, m) + I_2(\alpha, m) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

For I_1 we have

$$\frac{\rho_m^2}{1+\rho_m^2} - \frac{\rho^2}{(1+\rho_m^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}(1+\rho^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{a.e. in } \tau \in (s, t),$$

and

$$\left| \frac{\rho_m^2}{1+\rho_m^2} - \frac{\rho^2}{(1+\rho_m^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}(1+\rho^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right| \leq (1+\rho), \quad \text{a.e. in } \tau \in (s, t).$$

Hence, applying Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, we obtain

$$\lim_m I_1(\alpha, m) = \int_s^t \left[\frac{\rho_m^2}{1+\rho_m^2} - \frac{\rho^2}{(1+\rho_m^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}(1+\rho^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right] d\tau = 0, \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in (0, 1).$$

Since $\rho_m > \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}$ for all $t \in J(\alpha, m)$, for the second integral we have

$$I_2(\alpha, m) \leq \frac{1}{\tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}} \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \rho d\tau.$$

We set

$$X(\alpha) := \{Y \subset (s, t) : |Y| \leq \frac{c}{\tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}}\}.$$

Since in (17) we assumed $|J(\alpha, m)| \leq \frac{c}{\tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}}$, then $J(\alpha, m) \in X(\alpha)$ and

$$I_2(\alpha, m) \leq \frac{1}{\tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}} \sup_{Y \in X(\alpha)} \int_Y \rho d\tau.$$

So that we get

$$\overline{\lim}_m \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \frac{\rho_m^2}{1+\rho_m^2} d\tau \leq \frac{1}{\tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}} \sup_{Y \in X(\alpha)} \int_Y \rho d\tau.$$

Hence, we arrive at

$$\frac{1}{1-\alpha} \overline{\lim}_m \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \frac{\rho_m^2}{1+\rho_m^2} d\tau \leq \frac{1}{(1-\alpha) \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}} \sup_{Y \in X(\alpha)} \int_Y \rho d\tau.$$

Being $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} (1 - \alpha) \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2} = \frac{2}{\pi}$, we are going to prove that

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \sup_{Y \in X(\alpha)} \int_Y \rho d\tau = 0. \quad (19)$$

In this way, the thesis of the lemma holds. By virtue of the theorem on the absolute continuity of the integral, for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\bar{\alpha} \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_1(Y) < \frac{c}{\tan \bar{\alpha} \frac{\pi}{2}} &\Rightarrow \int_Y \rho d\tau < \varepsilon, \\ \text{in particular, for all } \alpha \in (\bar{\alpha}, 1) : \mu_1(Y) &\leq \frac{c}{\tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}} < \frac{c}{\tan \bar{\alpha} \frac{\pi}{2}} \Rightarrow \int_Y \rho d\tau < \varepsilon \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

For the same ε , by virtue of the *sup*-property, we get the existence of $\bar{Y} \in X(\alpha)$ such that

$$\sup_{Y \in X(\alpha)} \int_Y \rho d\tau < \int_{\bar{Y}} \rho d\tau + \varepsilon < 2\varepsilon,$$

where in the last step we taken (20)₂ into account. Since ε is arbitrary, we have proved (19). \square

3 The IBVP for the mollified Navier-Stokes equations

We introduce an auxiliary Navier-Stokes initial boundary value problem:

$$\begin{aligned} v_t^m + \mathbb{J}_m[v^m] \cdot \nabla v^m + \nabla \pi^m &= \Delta v^m, \quad \nabla \cdot v^m = 0, \quad \text{on } (0, T) \times \Omega, \\ v^m &= 0 \text{ on } (0, T) \times \partial\Omega, \quad v^m = v_0^m \text{ on } \{0\} \times \Omega, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where $\mathbb{J}_m[\cdot] \equiv J_{\frac{1}{m}}[\cdot]$ and $J_{\frac{1}{m}}[\cdot]$ is the Friedrichs (space) mollifier, and $\{v_0^m\} \subset \mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$ converges to v_0 in L^2 -norm.

Theorem 3. *For all $v_0^m \in \mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$ there exists a unique smooth solution, for $t > 0$, to problem (21) defined for all $T > 0$. In particular, for all $T > 0$, we get*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{for all } \varphi \in J^2(\Omega), \{(v^m(t), \varphi)\} &\subset C((0, T)) \text{ is uniformly equicontinuous and bounded sequence} \\ v^m &\in C^1((0, T); J^{1,2}(\Omega)) \cap L^2(0, T; W^{2,2}(\Omega)), \quad v_t^m \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\Omega)), \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

and, for all $t > s \geq 0$,

$$\|v^m(t)\|_2^2 + 2 \int_s^t \|\nabla v^m\|_2^2 d\tau = \|v^m(s)\|_2^2 \leq \|v_0\|_2^2. \quad (23)$$

Moreover, the following estimate holds:

$$\|\nabla v^m(t)\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\theta}^t \left[\|P\Delta v^m\|_2^2 + \|v_t^m\|_2^2 \right] d\tau \leq (2c\|v_0\|_2^2)^{-1}, \text{ for all } t \geq \theta \text{ and } m \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (24)$$

where we have $\theta = c\|v_0\|_2^4$ with a constant c independent of t, m and v_0 .

Proof. For the existence and the regularity of a solution (v^m, π^m) we can employ the well known Faedo-Galerkin method as proposed in [21, 39] (e.g., one founds developed this idea in Appendix of [5] or in sect. 2 of [19]). In particular one arrives at proving (22)-(23).

We prove estimate⁷ (24). We apply the projection operator P to equation (21)₁, then, we consider the L^2 -norm of both sides:

$$\|v_t^m - P\Delta v^m\|_2^2 = \|P(J_m[v^m] \cdot \nabla v^m)\|_2^2.$$

Since $(v_t^m, P\Delta v^m) = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla v^m\|_2^2$, we get the following

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla v^m\|_2^2 + \|P\Delta v^m\|_2^2 + \|v_t^m\|_2^2 = \|P(J_m[v^m] \cdot \nabla v^m)\|_2^2. \quad (25)$$

We estimate the right-hand side by means of (11):

$$\|P(J_m[v^m] \cdot \nabla v^m)\|_2^2 \leq \|J_m[v^m] \cdot \nabla v^m\|_2^2 \leq \|v^m\|_\infty^2 \|\nabla v^m\|_2^2 \leq c \|\nabla v^m\|_2^3 \|P\Delta v^m\|_2. \quad (26)$$

Hence, we deduce

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla v^m\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|P\Delta v^m\|_2^2 + \|v_t^m\|_2^2 \leq c \|\nabla v^m\|_2^6. \quad (27)$$

From energy estimate (23), for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we deduce the existence of a $\theta_m \leq c\|v_0\|_2^4$ such that $\|\nabla v^m(\theta_m)\|_2^2 \leq (2c\|v_0\|_2^2)^{-1}$. Actually, if the estimate does not hold, we get

$$\frac{1}{2} \|v_0\|_2^2 = (2c\|v_0\|_2^2)^{-1} c\|v_0\|_2^4 < \int_0^{c\|v_0\|_2^4} \|\nabla v^m(\tau)\|_2^2 d\tau \leq \frac{1}{2} \|v_0^m\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \|v_0\|_2^2,$$

which is an *absurdum*. Since the differential energy relation furnishes $\|\nabla v^m\|_2^2 \leq \|v^m\|_2 \|v_t^m\|_2 \leq \|v_0\|_2 \|v_t^m\|_2$, from (27) we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla v^m\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left[\|P\Delta v^m\|_2^2 + \|v_t^m\|_2^2 \right] < \|\nabla v^m\|_2^4 \|v_0\|_2^{-2} (2c\|v_0\|_2^2 \|\nabla v^m\|_2^2 - 1) \Big|_{t=\theta_m} \leq 0.$$

This last, the bound for θ_m and $\|\nabla v^m(\theta_m)\|_2^2 \leq (2c\|v_0\|_2^2)^{-1}$ easily lead to (24). \square

⁷ Estimate (24) is generally given on the weak solution v , it furnishes the regularity of v for $t \geq c\|v_0\|_2^4$. This is a result related to the Leray's partial regularity, called structure theorem of a Leray's weak solution. Here we furnish the proof on $\{v^m\}$. One gets the same regularity for the weak solution v with the instant θ as endpoint of the regularity interval.

REMARK 5. In place of $\mathbb{J}[\cdot]$ mollifier one can construct an approximating system by means of the Yosida Approximation. Then one arrives at the same result, that is, estimates (22)-(23) hold. For this result we quote [20, 32].

Lemma 5. *For all $T > 0$, the sequence $\{v^m\}$ furnished by Theorem 3 weakly converges to $v \in L^2(0, T; J^{1,2}(\Omega))$. Moreover, there exists an extract, denoted again by $\{v^m\}$, such that, for all $\varphi \in J^2(\Omega)$, the sequence $\{(v^m(t), \varphi)\}$ converges, uniformly on $(0, T)$, to $(v(t), \varphi) \in C((0, T))$ and converges strongly to v in $L^2(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$*

Proof. The result is well known, it is a part of existence theorem of a weak solution enjoying the energy inequality in strong form. Thus, we omit the details and we limit ourselves to sketch the idea of the proof. The weak convergence to v is a consequence of the energy relation (23). Moreover, for all $\varphi \in J^2(\Omega)$, by virtue of (22)₁, any extract $\{(v^m(t), \varphi)\}$ converges uniformly on $(0, T)$, and, since by virtue of (23), for all $t > 0$, any extract $\{v^m\}$ admits v as weak limit in $J^2(\Omega)$, then $(v(t), \varphi)$ is a continuous function, *e.g.* see [24]. This is enough to apply, the Friedrichs Lemma 2 for the sequence $\{v^m\} \subset L^2(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$ in the way suggested in [24], that is, for all $R > 0$,

$$\int_0^T \|v^m - v\|_{L^2(\Omega \cap B_R)}^2 d\tau \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \sum_{p=1}^N \int_0^T (v^m - v, a^p)^2 d\tau + \varepsilon \int_0^T \|\nabla v^m - \nabla v\|_2^2 d\tau. \quad (28)$$

Hence, the result of convergence is immediate in the case of Ω bounded. In the case of Ω unbounded, in accord with our assumptions, the result can be proved in the way proposed by Leray in [26]. The idea of the proof is to achieve for the sequence $\{v^m\}$ the conditions of the compactness theorem in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for all $t > 0$. Assume that the following holds:

$$\|v^m(t)\|_{L^2(|x|>R)}^2 \leq \|v_0^m\|_{L^2(|x|>\frac{R}{2})}^2 + c(t)\psi(R) \text{ for any } t > 0, R > 2\bar{R} \text{ and } m \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (29)$$

with $c(t) \in L^\infty(0, T)$ and $\psi(R, v_0) = o(1)$. Set

$$H(R, T) := T\|v_0\|_{L^2(|x|>R)}^2 + \psi(R) \int_0^T c(t) dt + \int_0^T \|v(t)\|_{L^2(|x|>R)}^2 dt \equiv o(1),$$

then, for all $T > 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \|v^m(t) - v(t)\|_2^2 dt &= \int_0^T \|v^m(t) - v(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega \cap B_R)}^2 dt + \int_0^T \|v^m(t) - v(t)\|_{L^2(|x|>R)}^2 dt \\ &\leq 2 \int_0^T \|v^m(t) - v(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega \cap B_R)}^2 dt + 2\|v_0^m - v_0\|_{L^2(|x|>\frac{R}{2})}^2 + 2H(R, T). \end{aligned}$$

Employing (28) for the first term on the right-hand side, and recalling that $\{v_0^m\}$ converges to v_0 in the L^2 -norm, letting $m \rightarrow \infty$, the first two terms on the right-hand side tend to zero. Secondary, being $H(R, T) = o(1)$, letting $R \rightarrow \infty$, we get that the right-hand side approaches zero.

Estimate (29) is proved in several papers concerning the question of the energy inequality (3). For this reason we do not give the proof, but, for the interested reader, we quote the proof furnished in sect. 6.4.1 of the paper [8]. \square

The following lemma was proved for the first time in [8]

Lemma 6. *Let $\{v^m\}$ be the sequence furnished by Theorem 3 and let v be the limit ensured by Lemma 5. Then, for all $q \in [1, 2)$, the sequence $\{v^m\}$ strongly converges to v in $L^q(0, T; J^{1,2}(\Omega))$.*

Proof. In order to prove the strong convergence, we initially prove that $\{P\Delta v^m\}$ is bounded in $L^{\frac{2}{3}}(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$ ⁸. We consider (27) again. Hence, we trivially deduce

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla v^m\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|P\Delta v^m\|_2^2 + \|v_t^m\|_2^2 \leq c \|\nabla v^m\|_2^6 \leq c(1 + \|\nabla v^m\|_2^2)^2 \|\nabla v^m\|_2^2.$$

This last is integrated in the following way:

$$\frac{1}{1 + \|\nabla v^m(0)\|_2^2} + \int_0^t \left[\frac{1}{2} \frac{\|P\Delta v^m\|_2^2 + \|v_t^m\|_2^2}{(1 + \|\nabla v^m\|_2^2)^2} \right] d\tau \leq \frac{1}{1 + \|\nabla v^m(t)\|_2^2} + c \int_0^t \|\nabla v^m\|_2^2 d\tau. \quad (30)$$

Applying Hölder's reverse inequality with “complementary” exponents $q = -\frac{1}{2}$ and $q' = \frac{1}{3}$, uniformly in $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\int_0^t (\|P\Delta v^m\|_2^{\frac{2}{3}} + \|v_t^m\|_2^{\frac{2}{3}}) d\tau \right]^3 &\leq \left[\int_0^t (1 + \|\nabla v^m\|_2^2) d\tau \right]^2 \left[1 + c \int_0^t \|\nabla v^m\|_2^2 d\tau \right] \\ &\leq \left[t + \|v_0\|_2^2 \right]^2 \left[1 + c \|v_0\|_2^2 \right] =: \mathfrak{A}(t, \|v_0\|_2), \text{ for all } t > 0. \end{aligned}$$

For any pair (m, p) and for all $t > 0$, by means of an integration by parts and Holder's inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t \|\nabla v^m - \nabla v^p\|_2 d\tau &\leq \int_0^t \|P\Delta(v^m - v^p)\|_2^{\frac{1}{2}} \|v^m - v^p\|_2^{\frac{1}{2}} d\tau \leq \left[\int_0^t \|P\Delta(v^m - v^p)\|_2^{\frac{2}{3}} d\tau \right]^{\frac{3}{4}} \left[\int_0^t \|v^m - v^p\|_2^2 d\tau \right]^{\frac{1}{4}} \\ &\leq 2^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathfrak{A}(t, \|v_0\|_2)^{\frac{1}{4}} \left[\int_0^t \|v^m - v^p\|_2^2 d\tau \right]^{\frac{1}{4}}. \end{aligned}$$

By virtue of Lemma 5, we obtain the Cauchy condition for $\{v^m\}$ in $L^1(0, T; J^{1,2}(\Omega))$. Via (23), the sequence $\{v^m\}$ is bounded in $L^2(0, T; J^{1,2}(\Omega))$. Hence, by interpolation we realize the Cauchy condition in $L^q(0, T; J^{1,2}(\Omega))$, for all $q \in [1, 2)$. So that, the sequence admits the strong limit in $L^q(0, T; J^{1,2}(\Omega))$, for all $q \in [1, 2)$, which coincides with $v \in L^2(0, T; J^{1,2}(\Omega))$. The lemma is proved. \square

⁸ An analogous integrability property for weak solutions has been obtained both in [13] and in [16]. But our proof, very short, is original with regards to the ones of the quoted papers and is furnished on the sequence $\{v^m\}$, we are not interested to the property on the weak solution.

Corollary 2. *The sequence $\{v^m\}$ of solutions to problem (21) converges to v in $J^{1,2}(\Omega)$ uniformly on $t \geq \theta$.*

Proof. By virtue of Lemma 5 and Lemma 6 we have that $\{v^m\}$ strongly converges to v in $J^{1,2}$ a.e. in $t > 0$. Without invalidating the thesis, we can assume that the strong convergence holds for $t = \theta$. We can state the following estimates with a bound \mathfrak{D} independent of m , t and v , and whose value is inessential for our aims;

employing estimates (11), (23) and (24) we get

$$\int_{\theta}^t \|v^m(\tau)\|_{\infty}^2 d\tau \leq c \left[\int_{\theta}^t \|P\Delta v^m(\tau)\|_2^2 d\tau \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\int_{\theta}^t \|\nabla v^m(\tau)\|_2^2 d\tau \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} =: \mathfrak{D}_1, \quad (31)$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t > \theta$;

employing estimates (23) and (24), we get

$$\int_{\theta}^t \|\nabla v^m(\tau)\|_2^4 d\tau \leq \max_{[\theta, t]} \|\nabla v^m(\tau)\|_2^2 \int_{\theta}^t \|\nabla v^m(\tau)\|_2^2 d\tau =: \mathfrak{D}_2, \quad (32)$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t > \theta$.

We denote by $\mathfrak{D} := \max\{\mathfrak{D}_1, \mathfrak{D}_2\}$. Set $w := v^m - v^p$, from system (21) by difference, we deduce

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla w\|_2^2 + \|P\Delta w\|_2^2 + \|w_t\|_2^2 = \|P(v^m \cdot \nabla w) + P(w \cdot \nabla v^p)\|_2^2 \quad \text{for all } t > \theta. \quad (33)$$

Applying Hölder's inequality to the term of the right-hand side, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|P(v^m \cdot \nabla w) + P(w \cdot \nabla v^p)\|_2^2 &\leq 2(\|v^m\|_{\infty}^2 \|\nabla w\|_2^2 + \|w\|_{\infty}^2 \|\nabla v^p\|_2^2) \\ &\leq c(\|v^m\|_{\infty}^2 \|\nabla w\|_2^2 + \|\nabla w\|_2 \|P\Delta w\|_2 \|\nabla v^p\|_2^2), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last estimate we employed (11) again. Increasing the right-hand side of (33) via the last estimate, and employing the Young inequality, we deduce the differential equation

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla w\|_2^2 \leq c \|\nabla w\|_2^2 (\|v^m\|_{\infty}^2 + \|\nabla v^p\|_2^4), \quad \text{for all } t > \theta.$$

Hence, by means of estimates (31) and (32), via an integration, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla v^m(t) - \nabla v^p(t)\|_2 &= \|\nabla w(t)\|_2 \leq \exp[\mathfrak{D}] \|\nabla w(\theta)\|_2 \\ &\leq \exp[\mathfrak{D}] \|\nabla v^m(\theta) - \nabla v^p(\theta)\|_2, \quad \text{for all } m, p \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } t \geq \theta. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

In the case of the L^2 -norm, for all $t > \theta$, we consider the energy relation related to w :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \|w(t)\|_2^2 + 2\|\nabla w(t)\|_2^2 &= (w \cdot \nabla w, v^m) \leq \|w\|_6 \|\nabla w\|_2 \|v^m\|_3 \leq \|w\|_6 \|\nabla w\|_2 \|v^m\|_2^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla v^m\|_2^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq c \|v_0\|_2^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla w\|_2^2 \|\nabla v^m\|_2^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq c \|v_0\|_2^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla w\|_2^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\|\nabla v^m\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v^p\|_2^{\frac{3}{2}} \|\nabla v^m\|_2^{\frac{1}{2}} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where we have increased by means of Hölder's inequality, Sobolev inequality and the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality. Taking estimate (23) into account, an integration on $t > \theta$, furnishes

$$\begin{aligned} \|v^m(t) - v^p(t)\|_2^2 &= \|w(t)\|_2^2 \leq \|w(\theta)\|_2^2 + c \exp[\mathfrak{D}] \|v_0\|_2^{\frac{5}{2}} \|\nabla v^m(\theta) - \nabla v^p(\theta)\|_2^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \|v^m(\theta) - v^p(\theta)\|_2^2 + c \exp[\mathfrak{D}] \|v_0\|_2^{\frac{5}{2}} \|\nabla v^m(\theta) - \nabla v^p(\theta)\|_2^{\frac{1}{2}}, \text{ for all } m, p \in \mathbb{N}. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Now, from our assumption of strong convergence of $\{v^m(\theta)\}$ in $J^{1,2}(\Omega)$, via estimates (34) and (35), the thesis of the corollary holds. \square

Lemma 7. *The sequence $\{v^m\}$ furnished by Theorem 3 enjoys the following estimate:*

$$\int_0^t \frac{1}{(1+\|\nabla v^m\|_2^2)^2} \left| \frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla v^m\|_2^2 \right| d\tau \leq 1 + c \|v_0\|_2^2, t > 0. \quad (36)$$

Proof. From (25) we are able to get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{(1+\|\nabla v^m\|_2^2)^2} \left| \frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla v^m\|_2^2 \right| &= \left| \frac{\|P(J_m[v^m] \cdot \nabla v^m)\|_2^2}{(1+\|\nabla v^m\|_2^2)^2} - \frac{\|P\Delta v^m\|_2^2 + \|v_t^m\|_2^2}{(1+\|\nabla v^m\|_2^2)^2} \right| \\ &\leq c \frac{\|\nabla v^m\|_2^3 \|P\Delta v^m\|_2}{(1+\|\nabla v^m\|_2^2)^2} + \frac{\|P\Delta v^m\|_2^2 + \|v_t^m\|_2^2}{(1+\|\nabla v^m\|_2^2)^2} \\ &\leq \|\nabla v^m\|_2^2 + c \frac{\|P\Delta v^m\|_2^2 + \|v_t^m\|_2^2}{(1+\|\nabla v^m\|_2^2)^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

where estimating the right hand-side we have taken (26) into account and applied the Young inequality. Integrating (37) on $(0, t)$, via estimate (30) and via energy relation (23), we arrive at (36). \square

4 Proof of Theorem 2 and Corollary 1

4.1 Existence of a weak solution v to problem (1), Theorem 1

We start by proving the existence of a weak solution.

Lemma 8. *For all $v_0 \in J^2(\Omega)$ there exists a sequence $\{v^m\}$, enjoying the following limit properties:*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{for all } T > 0, \quad \{v^m\} &\rightharpoonup v \text{ in } L^2(0, T; J^{1,2}(\Omega)), \\ \{v^m\} &\rightarrow v \text{ in } L^2(0, T; L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^q(0, T; J^{1,2}(\Omega)), \quad q \in [1, 2), \\ \{v^m\} &\rightarrow v \text{ in } J^{1,2}(\Omega), \text{ a.e. in } t \in [0, \theta) \text{ and for all } t \geq \theta, \text{ with } \theta \leq c \|v_0\|_2^4, \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

where the constant c is independent of v_0 , and the limit v is a weak solution to problem (1) that enjoys the properties:

$$\begin{aligned} \|v(t)\|_2^2 + 2 \int_s^t \|\nabla v\|_2^2 d\tau &\leq \|v(s)\|_2^2, \text{ for all } t > s, \text{ and for all } s \in [0, \infty) - I, I \subset (0, \theta), \mu_1(I) = 0, \\ &\text{for all } s \in I^C, \lim_{t \rightarrow s^+} \|v(s) - v(t)\|_2 = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

for all $\varphi \in J^2(\Omega)$, $(v(t), \varphi)$ is a continuous function of t .

Proof. The existence result of v is achieved following the approach furnished by Leray in [26]. Actually, we consider the sequence stated in Theorem 3 and its limit v stated in Lemma 5, Lemma 6. Then the existence of θ and the related estimate are deduced from Theorem 3. For all $t \in [0, T]$, v is also a weak limit in $J^2(\Omega)$ with $(v(t), \varphi) \in C([0, T])$, for all $\varphi \in J^2(\Omega)$, that is (39)₃.

One easily verifies that the limit v is a weak solution.

Property (38)₃ is deduced from the strong convergence stated in Lemma 6 and the regularity of v achieved for $t > \theta$ in Corollary 2.

Estimate (39)₁ is the so called energy inequality in strong form introduced by Leray. In order to deduce (39)₁, we consider an instant $s \geq 0$ in which $\lim_m \|v^m(s)\|_2 = \|v(s)\|_2$. In the case of $s \neq 0$, the existence is ensured, almost everywhere in $s \in (0, \theta)$, by Lemma 5, and for all $s \geq \theta$ by Corollary 2. We denote by I the set of the possible instants s for which the strong convergence fails to hold. By our arguments, $I \subset (0, \theta)$ and $\mu_1(I) = 0$. Then, for all $s \in I^C$, we consider (23), and we perform the lower limit of the left-hand side and the limit of the right-hand side of (23). Then one easily achieves the energy inequality for the weak limit v as stated in (39).

Properties (39)₂ are an immediate consequence of the weak limit properties and of (39)₁. \square

4.2 A first “partial energy equality” for the weak solution

The first our goal is to prove that the weak solution v furnished in Lemma 8 enjoys the energy equality

$$\begin{aligned} \|v(t)\|_2^2 + 2 \int_0^t \|\nabla v(\tau)\|_2^2 d\tau - \|v(s)\|_2^2 &= 2 \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \lim_{m''} \int_{\tilde{J}(\alpha, m'')} \rho_{m''} d\tau = 2 \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \lim_{m''} \sum_{k=1}^{n(\alpha, m'')} \int_{s_k}^{t_k} \rho_{m''} d\tau \\ \|v(t)\|_2^2 + 2 \int_0^t \|\nabla v(\tau)\|_2^2 d\tau - \|v(s)\|_2^2 &= 2 \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \lim_{m'} \int_{\tilde{J}(\alpha, m')} \rho_{m'} d\tau = 2 \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \lim_{m'} \sum_{k=1}^{n(\alpha, m')} \int_{s_k}^{t_k} \rho_{m'} d\tau, \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where $\{\rho_{m''}\}$ and $\{\rho_{m'}\}$ are two suitable subsequences of $\{\rho_m\}$ and $n(\alpha, m'')$ and $n(\alpha, m')$ sequences of integers with upper bound $\lfloor 2c \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2} \rfloor$.

For this aim, we are going to prove that some strong convergences hold. These convergences are a consequence of the strong convergences furnished in sect. 2 and in sect. 3, of some auxiliary functions and of the differential energy equality (23) deduced for the elements of the sequence $\{v^m\}$.

We denote by

$$\mathcal{T} := \{s \geq 0 : \{v^m(s, x)\} \text{ is strongly convergent to } v \text{ in } J^{1,2}(\Omega)\}.$$

By virtue of (38)₃, the set \mathcal{T} is not empty, and

$$\mu_1([0, \infty) - \mathcal{T}) = \mu_1([0, \theta) - \{\mathcal{T} \cap [0, \theta)\}) = 0.$$

Lemma 9. *Let $\{v^m\}$ be the sequence of solutions to (21) and v the weak solution to (1) furnished in Lemma 8. Let $t, s \in \mathcal{T}$. Then there exists a family $\{J(\alpha, m)\}$ of sets, where, for all $\alpha \in (\alpha_1, 1)$, $\alpha_1 > 0$, and $m \geq m_0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} J(\alpha, m) &:= \bigcup_{h \in \mathbb{N}(\alpha, m)} (s_h, t_h), \mathbb{N}(\alpha, m) \text{ at most countable set, and } |J(\alpha, m)| \leq \|v_0\|_2^2 [\tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}]^{-1}, \\ \text{for all } h \in \mathbb{N}(\alpha, m), (s_h, t_h) &:= \{\tau : \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2} < \|\nabla v^m(\tau)\|_2^2 \leq A_m\}, A_m := \max_{[s, t]} \|\nabla v^m\|_2^2, \\ \text{with } \|\nabla v^m(s_h)\|_2^2 &= \|\nabla v^m(t_h)\|_2^2 = \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}, \text{ and, for } h \neq k, (s_h, t_h) \cap (s_k, t_k) = \emptyset. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Set

$$h(\alpha, m) := \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \frac{\|v^m\|_2^2}{1 + \|\nabla v^m\|_2^4} \frac{d}{d\tau} \|\nabla v^m\|_2^2 d\tau, \quad (42)$$

for all $\alpha \in (\alpha_1, 1)$ there exists

$$\lim_m h(\alpha, m) \in [0, \frac{1}{2} \|v_0\|_2^2], \quad (43)$$

and the weak solution v enjoys the following special “energy relation”:

$$\frac{2}{\pi} \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} \lim_m h(\alpha, m) = \|v(s)\|_2^2 - \|v(t)\|_2^2 - 2 \int_s^t \|\nabla v\|_2^2 d\tau. \quad (44)$$

Proof. We prove the claims (41)-(44) by means of a suitable construction. We set

$$\alpha \in (0, 1), \rho > 0, \quad A(\rho) := \frac{\frac{\pi}{2} - \arctan \rho}{(1 - \alpha) \frac{\pi}{2}}.$$

We define the function

$$p(\alpha, \rho) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \rho \in [0, \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}], \\ A(\rho), & \text{if } \rho \in (\tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}, \infty). \end{cases}$$

Setting $g(\alpha) = \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}$, the function $p(\alpha, \rho)$ enjoys the same properties of the function introduced in Lemma 3 with $\hat{\alpha} := 1$. We consider the sequence $\{v^m\}$ of solutions. For all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, the energy equation (23), that for the convenience of the reader we reproduce, holds:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|v^m(t)\|_2^2 + 2 \|\nabla v^m(t)\|_2^2 = 0 \iff \|v^m(t)\|_2^2 + 2 \int_s^t \|\nabla v^m\|_2^2 d\tau = \|v^m(s)\|_2^2. \quad (45)$$

We set $\rho_m(t) := \|\nabla v^m(t)\|_2^2$, and we consider $p(\alpha, \rho_m(t))$.

Since $s, t \in \mathcal{T}$, there exists α_1 such that

$$\max\{\|\nabla v(s)\|_2^2, \|\nabla v(t)\|_2^2\} < \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}, \text{ for all } \alpha \in (\alpha_1, 1),$$

where v is the weak solution stated in Lemma 8. Hence, by virtue of the convergence in $J^{1,2}(\Omega)$ -norm stated in (38)₃, we state the existence of m_0 such that

$$\max\{\|\nabla v^m(s)\|_2^2, \|\nabla v^m(t)\|_2^2\} < \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}, \text{ for all } m \geq m_0 \text{ and } \alpha \in (\alpha_1, 1). \quad (46)$$

We denote by $J(\alpha, m) := \{\tau \in (s, t) : \rho_m(\tau) \in (\tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}, A^m]\}$.

If $A_m \leq \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}$, then $J(\alpha, m)$ is an empty set.

If $A_m > \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}$ holds, since $\max\{\rho_m(s), \rho_m(t)\} < \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}$, then one gets $(s, t) - J(\alpha, m) \neq \emptyset$. For $\tau \in (s, t)$, the intersection between the straight line $(\tau, \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2})$ and the curve $(\tau, \rho_m(\tau))$, by the continuity of ρ_m , detects the endpoints of open non empty intervals. Actually, since $\rho_m(s) < \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $\rho_m(\tau)$ is continuous, there exists $\bar{\tau}$ such that $\rho_m(\bar{\tau}) = \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $\rho_m(\tau) > \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}$ for some right-neighborhood $U^+(\bar{\tau})$. Analogously, being $\rho_m(t) < \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}$, by the continuity there exists $\bar{\bar{\tau}}$ such that $\rho_m(\bar{\bar{\tau}}) = \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $\rho_m(\bar{\bar{\tau}}) > \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}$ in some left-neighborhood $U^-(\bar{\bar{\tau}})$. A pair of distinct and successive points $\bar{\tau}$ and $\bar{\bar{\tau}}$ are the endpoints of an open not empty interval $U \subseteq J(\alpha, m)$. Being $U \neq \emptyset$ and open, $J(\alpha, m)$ is at most the union of a countable family of pairwise disjoint intervals (s_h, t_h) with $\rho(s_h) = \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $\rho(t_h) = \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}$. We denote by $\mathbb{N}(\alpha, m)$ the set of indexes h whose cardinality is less than or equal \aleph_0 .

For the measure of $J(\alpha, m) \subset (s, t)$, we get

$$\sum_{h \in \mathbb{N}(\alpha, m)} (t_h - s_h) \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2} = |J(\alpha, m)| \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2} \leq \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \rho_m(\tau) d\tau \leq \int_s^t \rho_m(\tau) d\tau \leq \frac{1}{2} \|v_0\|_2^2, \quad (47)$$

where we taken the energy relation (45) into account. Estimate (47) completes (41). Recalling the definition of $p(\alpha, \rho_m(t))$, we have

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} p(\alpha, \rho_m(\tau)) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{a.e. in } \tau \in (s, t) - \overline{J(\alpha, m)}, \\ -\frac{2}{\pi} \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \frac{\dot{\rho}_m(\tau)}{1+\rho_m^2(\tau)} & \text{for all } \tau \in J(\alpha, m), \end{cases}$$

where taken into account that, for all $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, the function p is a Lipschitz's function in ρ_m , and $\rho_m(t) \in C^1([s, t])$. Hence, $p(\alpha, \rho_m(t))$ is a Lipschitz's function in t . We multiply equation (45) by $p(\alpha, \rho_m(t))$ and we integrate by parts on (s, t) :

$$\frac{2}{\pi} \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \frac{e_m}{1+\rho_m^2} \dot{\rho}_m(\tau) d\tau = e_m(s) - e_m(t) - 2 \int_s^t \rho_m p(\alpha, \rho_m) d\tau, \quad (48)$$

where we set $e_m := \|v^m\|_2^2$. Since the hypotheses of Lemma 3 are satisfied, and since $s, t \in \mathcal{T}$, by virtue of (12), letting $m \rightarrow \infty$, each term on the right-hand side of (48) admits limit. So that we arrive at

$$\frac{2}{\pi} \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \lim_m \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \frac{e_m}{1+\rho_m^2(\tau)} \dot{\rho}_m(\tau) d\tau = e(s) - e(t) - 2 \int_s^t \rho p(\alpha, \rho) d\tau, \quad (49)$$

where we set $e := \|v\|_2$ and $\rho := \|\nabla v\|_2^2$ (v weak solution). The relation (49) proves the limit property (43). Hence, letting $\alpha \rightarrow 1^-$, via (13), we arrive at

$$\frac{2}{\pi} \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \lim_m \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \frac{e_m}{1+\rho_m^2} \dot{\rho}_m d\tau = e(s) - e(t) - 2 \int_s^t \rho d\tau,$$

that, via the position (42), is equivalent to (44). \square

Lemma 10. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 9, we get*

$$\frac{2}{\pi} \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \lim_m \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \frac{e_m}{1+\rho_m^2} \dot{\rho}_m d\tau = 2 \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \overline{\lim}_m \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \rho_m d\tau = 2 \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \lim_m \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \rho_m d\tau. \quad (50)$$

Proof. Recalling (41) related to $J(\alpha, m)$ given in Lemma 9, by means of an integration by parts, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \frac{e_m}{1+\rho_m^2} \dot{\rho}_m d\tau &= \sum_{h \in \mathbb{N}(\alpha, m)} \int_{s_h}^{t_h} \frac{e_m}{1+\rho_m^2} \dot{\rho}_m d\tau \\ &= \frac{\tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}}{1+\tan^2 \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}} \sum_{h \in \mathbb{N}(\alpha, m)} [e_m(t_h) - e_m(s_h)] - \sum_{h \in \mathbb{N}(\alpha, m)} \int_{s_h}^{t_h} \frac{\dot{e}_m \rho_m}{1+\rho_m^2} d\tau \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_{h \in \mathbb{N}(\alpha, m)} \int_{s_h}^{t_h} \frac{e_m \rho_m^2}{(1+\rho_m^2)^2} \dot{\rho}_m d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, via the energy relation (45), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} - \sum_{h \in \mathbb{N}(\alpha, m)} \int_{s_h}^{t_h} \frac{e_m}{1+\rho_m^2} \dot{\rho}_m d\tau + 2 \sum_{h \in \mathbb{N}(\alpha, m)} \int_{s_h}^{t_h} \frac{e_m \rho_m^2}{(1+\rho_m^2)^2} \dot{\rho}_m d\tau \\ = \frac{2 \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}}{1+\tan^2 \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}} \sum_{h \in \mathbb{N}(\alpha, m)} \int_{s_h}^{t_h} \rho_m d\tau - 2 \sum_{h \in \mathbb{N}(\alpha, m)} \int_{s_h}^{t_h} \frac{\rho_m^2}{1+\rho_m^2} d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Since $-\frac{1}{1+\xi^2} + \frac{2\xi^2}{(1+\xi^2)^2} = -\frac{2}{(1+\xi^2)^2} + \frac{1}{1+\xi^2}$ holds, then, for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, the last formula is equivalent to the following

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1+\tan^2\alpha\frac{\pi}{2}}{\tan\alpha\frac{\pi}{2}} \int_{J(\alpha,m)} \frac{e_m}{1+\rho_m^2} \dot{\rho}_m d\tau + 2 \frac{1+\tan^2\alpha\frac{\pi}{2}}{\tan\alpha\frac{\pi}{2}} \int_{J(\alpha,m)} \frac{\rho_m^2}{1+\rho_m^2} d\tau - 2 \frac{1+\tan^2\alpha\frac{\pi}{2}}{\tan\alpha\frac{\pi}{2}} \int_{J(\alpha,m)} \frac{e_m}{(1+\rho_m^2)^2} \dot{\rho}_m d\tau \\ & = 2 \int_{J(\alpha,m)} \rho_m d\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

Since the right-hand side is bounded uniformly in $m \in \mathbb{N}$, for all α , we get

$$2 \overline{\lim}_m \int_{J(\alpha,m)} \rho_m d\tau = A(\alpha) + B(\alpha), \quad (52)$$

where we set

$$A(\alpha) := \frac{1+\tan^2\alpha\frac{\pi}{2}}{\tan\alpha\frac{\pi}{2}} \lim_m \int_{J(\alpha,m)} \frac{e_m}{1+\rho_m^2} \dot{\rho}_m d\tau,$$

and

$$B(\alpha) := 2 \overline{\lim}_m \left[\frac{1+\tan^2\alpha\frac{\pi}{2}}{\tan\alpha\frac{\pi}{2}} \int_{J(\alpha,m)} \frac{\rho_m^2}{1+\rho_m^2} d\tau - \frac{1+\tan^2\alpha\frac{\pi}{2}}{\tan\alpha\frac{\pi}{2}} \int_{J(\alpha,m)} \frac{e_m}{(1+\rho_m^2)^2} \dot{\rho}_m d\tau \right]. \quad (53)$$

The terms $A(\alpha)$ and $B(\alpha)$ are both well posed. For $A(\alpha)$, via (49), we have the existence of the limit on m . For $B(\alpha)$ both the terms on the right-hand side of (53) are bounded with a constant independent of $m \in \mathbb{N}$ (the former being $J(\alpha, m) \subset (s, t)$, the latter via (36)). We recall the following elementary limit property:

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} (1 - \alpha) \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2} = \frac{2}{\pi}.$$

Hence, we get

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} A(\alpha) = \frac{2}{\pi} \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \lim_m \int_{J(\alpha,m)} \frac{e_m}{1+\rho_m^2} \dot{\rho}_m d\tau. \quad (54)$$

This limit is well posed by virtue of (44). Moreover, the lower bound of ρ_m , implicit in (41)₂, and estimate (36) allow us to deduce that

$$\frac{1+\tan^2\alpha\frac{\pi}{2}}{\tan\alpha\frac{\pi}{2}} \overline{\lim}_m \left| \int_{J(\alpha,m)} \frac{e_m}{(1+\rho_m^2)^2} \dot{\rho}_m d\tau \right| \leq \frac{1}{\tan\alpha\frac{\pi}{2}} \overline{\lim}_m \left| \int_{J(\alpha,m)} \frac{e_m}{1+\rho_m^2} \dot{\rho}_m d\tau \right| \leq \frac{1+c\|v_0\|_2^2}{\tan\alpha\frac{\pi}{2}}.$$

Hence, one deduces that

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1+\tan^2\alpha\frac{\pi}{2}}{\tan\alpha\frac{\pi}{2}} \overline{\lim}_m \left| \int_{J(\alpha,m)} \frac{e_m}{(1+\rho_m^2)^2} \dot{\rho}_m d\tau \right| = 0.$$

These last and the limit property (18) lead to

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} B(\alpha) = 0. \quad (55)$$

The limits achieved in (54) and (55), via (52), ensure (50) for the upper limit. In analogous way one deduces the lower limit property in (50). \square

REMARK 6. Under the assumptions of Lemma 9, for all $\alpha \in (\alpha_0, 1)$, Lemma 10 leads to the existence of the upper limit $L(\alpha)$ and lower limit $l(\alpha)$ with respect to $m \in \mathbb{N}$. However, letting $\alpha \rightarrow 1^-$, their limits are equal, see (50).

Thus, we detect two different subsequences indexed by m'' and by m' , extracted by the sequence in m , one achieving the upper limit $L(\alpha)$ and the other achieving lower limit $l(\alpha)$, respectively.

In the following, we consider indifferently the two subsequences, and, abusing in the use of the notation, we use for both the subsequences the same index m . Sure that no confusion arises.

Lemma 11. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 9, for the subsequences, related to the upper limit and lower limit, respectively, the following limit properties hold:*

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} (1 - \alpha)^{-1} \overline{\lim}_{m''} |J(\alpha, m'')| = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} (1 - \alpha)^{-1} \overline{\lim}_{m'} |J(\alpha, m')| = 0. \quad (56)$$

Proof. For all $h \in \mathbb{N}(\alpha, m)$, we evaluate the energy relation (45) on the interval (s_h, t_h) :

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} e_m(t) + \rho_m(t) = 0, \quad t \in (s_h, t_h), \implies e_m(t_h) + 2 \int_{s_h}^{t_h} \rho_m d\tau = e_m(s_h). \quad (57)$$

After multiplying this last by $\arctan \rho_m$, we integrate by parts on (s_h, t_h) . In virtue of the values of ρ_m in the endpoints of intervals (s_h, t_h) , stated in (41)₃, we get

$$\alpha \frac{\pi}{2} \frac{1}{2} [e_m(t_h) - e_m(s_h)] + \int_{s_h}^{t_h} \arctan \rho_m \rho_m d\tau = \frac{1}{2} \int_{s_h}^{t_h} \frac{e_m \dot{\rho}_m}{1 + \rho_m^2} d\tau,$$

that, via (57), is equivalent to

$$\int_{s_h}^{t_h} [\arctan \rho_m - \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}] \rho_m d\tau = \frac{1}{2} \int_{s_h}^{t_h} \frac{e_m \dot{\rho}_m}{1 + \rho_m^2} d\tau, \quad (58)$$

that has the left-hand side non-negative, for all $h \in \mathbb{N}(\alpha, m)$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. We sum (58) on index $h \in \mathbb{N}(\alpha, m)$. Hence, the following holds:

$$\int_{J(\alpha, m)} [\arctan \rho_m - \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}] \rho_m d\tau = \frac{1}{2} \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \frac{e_m \dot{\rho}_m}{1 + \rho_m^2} d\tau.$$

We consider the following decomposition:

$$\int_{J(\alpha, m)} \left[\frac{\pi}{2} - \arctan \rho_m \right] \rho_m d\tau - (1 - \alpha) \frac{\pi}{2} \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \rho_m d\tau = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \frac{e_m \dot{\rho}_m}{1 + \rho_m^2} d\tau.$$

By virtue of (49), the right-hand side admits limit on m , and the same limit property holds for any subsequence. Hence, we get

$$\lim_m \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \left[\frac{\pi}{2} - \arctan \rho_m \right] \rho_m d\tau = (1 - \alpha) \frac{\pi}{2} \lim_m \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \rho_m d\tau - \frac{1}{2} \lim_m \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \frac{e_m \dot{\rho}_m}{1 + \rho_m^2} d\tau.$$

That we write equivalently as

$$\frac{1}{1 - \alpha} \lim_m \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \left[\frac{\pi}{2} - \arctan \rho_m \right] \rho_m d\tau = \frac{\pi}{2} \lim_m \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \rho_m d\tau - \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} \lim_m \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \frac{e_m \dot{\rho}_m}{1 + \rho_m^2} d\tau. \quad (59)$$

Since both the terms on the right-hand side admit limit on $\alpha \rightarrow 1^-$ and, by virtue of (50), are equal, we arrive at

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} \lim_m \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \left[\frac{\pi}{2} - \arctan \rho_m \right] \rho_m d\tau = \frac{\pi}{2} \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \lim_m \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \rho_m d\tau - \frac{1}{2} \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} \lim_m \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \frac{e_m \dot{\rho}_m}{1 + \rho_m^2} d\tau = 0.$$

Since for $x > 0$ the function $\left[\frac{\pi}{2} - \arctan x \right] x$ is positive and concave with limit 1 at ∞ , via (59), for some positive constant $c(\alpha_1)$, we get

$$0 = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} \lim_m \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \left[\frac{\pi}{2} - \arctan \rho_m \right] \rho_m d\tau \geq c \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} (1 - \alpha)^{-1} \overline{\lim}_m |J(\alpha, m)|,$$

which proves the lemma. \square

REMARK 7. In the next lemma we are going to state formula (60)₁ with max-limit on the right-hand side. By the same arguments formula (60)₂ holds with the min-limit on the right-hand side. For two different reasons, the nature of the limits is not interesting for our aims. The former is due to the fact that in any case the subsequent limit on α furnishes the same value. The latter is due to the fact that in the sequel (see Lemma 14) we look for a family on one-parameter α , say $\mathbf{n}''(\alpha)$ and $\mathbf{n}'(\alpha)$, in place of the possible $\mathbf{n}(\alpha, m'')$ and $\mathbf{n}(\alpha, m')$, respectively. So that the nature of the limit in (60) becomes inessential.

Lemma 12. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 9, the limit value (50), initially stated by considering the family $\{J(\alpha, m)\}$ for $\alpha \in (\alpha_1, 1)$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, holds by considering a subfamily $\{\tilde{J}(\alpha, m'')\}$ (resp. $\{\tilde{J}(\alpha, m')\}$), for $\alpha \in (\alpha'_0, 1)$, $\alpha'_0 > \alpha_1$, where $\tilde{J}(\alpha, m'')$ (resp. $\tilde{J}(\alpha, m')$) is a set of pairwise disjoint open intervals with $\text{card}(\tilde{J}(\alpha, m'')) = \mathbf{n}(\alpha, m'') < \lfloor 2c \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2} \rfloor$ for all m'' (resp. $\text{card}(\tilde{J}(\alpha, m')) = \mathbf{n}(\alpha, m') < \lfloor 2c \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2} \rfloor$, for all m') with $t_k - s_k > (\sqrt{2c \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}})^{-2}$, for all $k = 0, \dots, \mathbf{n}(\alpha, m'')$,*

(resp. $k = 0, \dots, \mathbf{n}(\alpha, m')$), where c is a constant independent of m'' (resp. m'), v_0 and α . That is, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2}{\pi} \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \lim_m \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \frac{e_m}{1+\rho_m^2} \dot{\rho}_m d\tau &= 2 \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \lim_{m''} \int_{\tilde{J}(\alpha, m'')} \rho_{m''} d\tau = 2 \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \lim_{m''} \sum_{k=1}^{\mathbf{n}(\alpha, m'')} \int_{s_k}^{t_k} \rho_{m''} d\tau, \\ \frac{2}{\pi} \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \lim_m \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \frac{e_m}{1+\rho_m^2} \dot{\rho}_m d\tau &= 2 \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \lim_{m'} \int_{\tilde{J}(\alpha, m')} \rho_{m'} d\tau = 2 \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \lim_{m'} \sum_{k=1}^{\mathbf{n}(\alpha, m')} \int_{s_k}^{t_k} \rho_{m'} d\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

Moreover, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} (1-\alpha)^{-1} \overline{\lim}_{m''} |\tilde{J}(\alpha, m'')| &= 0 \text{ and } \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} (1-\alpha) \overline{\lim}_{m''} \mathbf{n}(\alpha, m'') = 0, \\ \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} (1-\alpha)^{-1} \overline{\lim}_{m'} |\tilde{J}(\alpha, m')| &= 0 \text{ and } \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} (1-\alpha) \overline{\lim}_{m'} \mathbf{n}(\alpha, m') = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

Proof. We consider an $\alpha_0 \in (\alpha_1, 1)$ in such a way that

$$(1-\alpha) \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2} < \frac{2}{\pi}, \text{ for all } \alpha \in (\alpha_0, 1). \quad (62)$$

From now on we restrict our arguments to the parameter $\alpha \in (\alpha_0, 1)$. We denote by $J(\alpha, m'')$ the subset of $J(\alpha, m)$ related to the index $m \equiv m''$ of the subsequence $\{\rho_{m''}\}$. In the following of the present proof, by the symbol c we denote the absolute constant that appears in estimate (27). For an arbitrary $\mu > c$, we define

$$\mathbb{N}''(\alpha, m'') := \left\{ k \in \mathbb{N}(\alpha, m'') : t_k - s_k \geq \frac{1}{2\mu \tan^2 \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}} \text{ holds for } (s_k, t_k) \in J(\alpha, m'') \right\}. \quad (63)$$

Considering the set of indexes $\mathbb{N}''(\alpha, m'')$, we trivially find a lower bound for $|J(\alpha, m'')|$:

$$|J(\alpha, m'')| = \sum_{h \in \mathbb{N}(\alpha, m'')} (t_h - s_h) \geq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}''(\alpha, m'')} (t_k - s_k).$$

Assume that $\text{card}(\mathbb{N}''(\alpha, m'')) \geq \lfloor 2c \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2} \rfloor$ for all $\alpha \in (\alpha_0, 1)$. Then we also obtain

$$|J(\alpha, m'')| \geq \frac{\lfloor 2c \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2} \rfloor}{2\mu \tan^2 \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}}.$$

Recalling that in (62) the inequality $(1-\alpha) \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2} < \frac{2}{\pi}$ holds for all $\alpha \in (\alpha_0, 1)$, the last estimate leads to

$$\frac{2}{\pi} (1-\alpha)^{-1} |J(\alpha, m'')| > \frac{\lfloor 2c \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2} \rfloor}{2\mu \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}}. \quad (64)$$

For some $\alpha'_0 \in (\alpha_0, 1)$, via (56), estimate (64) is an absurd for all $\alpha \in (\alpha'_0, 1)$. This proves that, for some $\alpha'_0 \in (\alpha_0, 1)$,

$$\text{card}(\mathbb{N}''(\alpha, m'')) = \mathbf{n}''(\alpha, m'') < \lfloor 2c \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2} \rfloor, \text{ for all } m'' \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } \alpha \in (\alpha'_0, 1). \quad (65)$$

Now, we consider $h \in \mathbb{N}(\alpha, m'') - \mathbb{N}''(\alpha, m'')$. For such indexes h we have $t_h(\alpha, m'') - s_h(\alpha, m'') < \frac{1}{2\mu \tan^2 \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}}$. Integrating the differential inequality (27), we get

$$\rho_{m''}(\tau) \leq \frac{\tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}}{\left[1 - 2c(\tau - s_h) \tan^2 \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \text{ for all } \tau \in (s_h(\alpha, m''), s_h(\alpha, m'') + \frac{1}{2c \tan^2 \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}}), \text{ for all } m'',$$

where we taken into account that, for all $h \in \mathbb{N}(\alpha, m'')$ and $m'' \in \mathbb{N}$, $\rho_{m''}(s_h(\alpha, m'')) = \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}$ holds. Thus, being $\mu > c$ and $t_k - s_k < (2\mu \tan^2 \alpha \frac{\pi}{2})^{-1}$, we get $\rho_{m''}(\tau) \leq \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2} [1 - \frac{c}{\mu}]^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ for all $\tau \in (s_h, t_h)$, that allows us the estimate

$$\overline{\lim}_{m''} \sum_{h \in \mathbb{N}(\alpha, m'') - \mathbb{N}''(\alpha, m'')} \int_{s_h}^{t_h} \rho_{m''} d\tau \leq \frac{\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}}{(\mu - c)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \overline{\lim}_{m''} |J(\alpha, m'')|.$$

Hence, via (56), for some constant $\eta > 0$, the following holds:

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \overline{\lim}_{m''} \sum_{h \in \mathbb{N}(\alpha, m'') - \mathbb{N}''(\alpha, m'')} \int_{s_h}^{t_h} \rho_{m''} d\tau \leq \eta \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2} \overline{\lim}_{m''} |J(\alpha, m'')| = 0. \quad (66)$$

We consider formula (51) restricted to the sequence indexed in $\{m''\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1 + \tan^2 \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}}{\tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}} \int_{J(\alpha, m'')} \frac{e_{m''}}{1 + \rho_{m''}^2} \dot{\rho}_{m''} d\tau + 2 \frac{1 + \tan^2 \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}}{\tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}} \int_{J(\alpha, m'')} \frac{\rho_{m''}^2}{1 + \rho_{m''}^2} d\tau - 2 \frac{1 + \tan^2 \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}}{\tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}} \int_{J(\alpha, m'')} \frac{e_{m''}}{(1 + \rho_{m''}^2)^2} \dot{\rho}_{m''} d\tau \\ = 2 \int_{J(\alpha, m'')} \rho_{m''} d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling the definition set in (63), via (65), the last is modified in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1 + \tan^2 \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}}{\tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}} \int_{J(\alpha, m'')} \frac{e_{m''}}{1 + \rho_{m''}^2} \dot{\rho}_{m''} d\tau + 2 \frac{1 + \tan^2 \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}}{\tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}} \int_{J(\alpha, m'')} \frac{\rho_{m''}^2}{1 + \rho_{m''}^2} d\tau - 2 \frac{1 + \tan^2 \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}}{\tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}} \int_{J(\alpha, m'')} \frac{e_{m''}}{(1 + \rho_{m''}^2)^2} \dot{\rho}_{m''} d\tau \\ = 2 \sum_{k=1}^{n(\alpha, m'')} \int_{s_k}^{t_k} \rho_{m''} d\tau + 2 \sum_{h \in \mathbb{N}(\alpha, m'') - \mathbb{N}''(\alpha, m'')} \int_{s_h}^{t_h} \rho_{m''} d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $m'' \rightarrow \infty$, we arrive at

$$2 \overline{\lim}_{m''} \sum_{k=1}^{n(\alpha, m'')} \int_{s_k}^{t_k} \rho_{m''} d\tau = A(\alpha) + C(\alpha), \quad (67)$$

where we set⁹

$$A(\alpha) := \frac{1 + \tan^2 \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}}{\tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}} \lim_{m''} \int_{J(\alpha, m'')} \frac{e_{m''}}{1 + \rho_{m''}^2} \dot{\rho}_{m''} d\tau,$$

⁹ Since the sequence $\{h(\alpha, m)\}$ admits limit, see (43), its value $A(\alpha)$ holds also on any extract. Instead, a finite number of addends alters the term $B(\alpha)$ of formula (52). Thus, its expression in (53) is changed. *A priori* we need to distinguish it by considering the limit value of a new term that we denote by $C(\alpha)$. This justifies the formula (67).

and

$$C(\alpha) := 2 \lim_{m''} \left[\frac{1+\tan^2 \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}}{\tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}} \int_{J(\alpha, m'')} \frac{\rho_{m''}^2}{1+\rho_{m''}^2} d\tau - \frac{1+\tan^2 \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}}{\tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}} \int_{J(\alpha, m'')} \frac{e_{m''}}{(1+\rho_{m''}^2)^2} \dot{\rho}_{m''} d\tau - \sum_{h \in \mathbb{N}(\alpha, m'') - \mathbb{N}''(\alpha, m'')} \int_{s_h}^{t_h} \rho_{m''} d\tau \right].$$

The analogous of the limit property (55) holds, that is

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \lim_{m''} \left| \frac{1+\tan^2 \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}}{\tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}} \int_{J(\alpha, m'')} \frac{\rho_{m''}^2}{1+\rho_{m''}^2} d\tau - \frac{1+\tan^2 \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}}{\tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}} \int_{J(\alpha, m'')} \frac{e_{m''}}{(1+\rho_{m''}^2)^2} \dot{\rho}_{m''} d\tau \right| = 0.$$

Hence, by virtue (66), then we also prove that

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} C(\alpha) = 0.$$

Hence, set

$$\tilde{J}(\alpha, m'') := \{(s_h, t_h) : t_h - s_h > (\sqrt{2c} \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2})^{-2}, h = 1, \dots, n''(\alpha, m'')\}, \quad (68)$$

we arrive at

$$\frac{2}{\pi} \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \lim_{m''} \int_{J(\alpha, m'')} \frac{e_{m''}}{1+\rho_{m''}^2} \dot{\rho}_{m''} d\tau = 2 \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \lim_{m''} \int_{\tilde{J}(\alpha, m'')} \rho_{m''} d\tau = 2 \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \lim_{m''} \sum_{k=1}^{n(\alpha, m'')} \int_{s_k}^{t_k} \rho_{m''} d\tau.$$

Hence, we arrive at (60)₁.

Being $\tilde{J}(\alpha, m'') \subseteq J(\alpha, m'')$, by virtue of (56), the first statement of (61)₁ is immediate.

Finally, considering again (64), in the light of (62) and (65), we also get

$$\frac{2}{\pi} (1-\alpha)^{-1} |J(\alpha, m)| > \frac{\lfloor 2c \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2} \rfloor}{2\mu \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}} \geq c(\alpha_1) (1-\alpha) \frac{n(\alpha, m)}{2\mu}, \text{ for all } \alpha \in (\alpha_1, 1). \quad (69)$$

Letting $m \rightarrow \infty$ and then $\alpha \rightarrow 1^-$, via (56), we arrive at the second statement of (61)₁.

In the case of the sequence indexed in $\{m'\}$ the proof of (60)₂ and (61)₂ are the same. \square

4.3 The “special energy equality” (7) for the weak solutions of Theorem 1

We start with the following.

Lemma 13. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 9 assume that for some $s, t \in \mathcal{T}$ the energy equality (6) does not hold for the weak limit v . Then for all $\alpha \in (\alpha'', 1)$, $\alpha'' \geq \alpha'_0$, the set $\tilde{J}(\alpha, \tilde{m})$, defined in (68), has $\text{card } \tilde{J}(\alpha, \tilde{m}) = n(\alpha, \tilde{m}) \in [1, \lfloor 2c \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2} \rfloor]$ for all subsequences of indexes $\{\tilde{m}\} \subseteq \{m\}$.*

Proof. Assume that the statement is false. Let $\nu_k \rightarrow 1^-$ be such that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists an extract $\{\tilde{m}\}$ enjoying the property $\text{card } \tilde{J}(\nu_k, \tilde{m}) = n(\nu_k, \tilde{m}) = 0$ for all \tilde{m} of the extract sequence. That is, for all k , along the subsequence $\{\tilde{m}\}$, we have, at least for a $\mu > c$, that $\mathbb{N}''(\nu_k, \tilde{m}) = \emptyset$ (see

(63) for the definition). Hence, being $\mathbf{n}(\nu_k, \tilde{m}) = 0$ for all \tilde{m} of the extract sequence $\{\tilde{m}\}$, along this sequence $\{\tilde{m}\}$ we arrive at (67) with the left-hand side null, and with

$$A(\nu_k) := \frac{1+\tan^2 \nu_k \frac{\pi}{2}}{\tan \nu_k \frac{\pi}{2}} \lim_{\tilde{m}} \int_{J(\nu_k, \tilde{m})} \frac{e_{\tilde{m}}}{1+\rho_{\tilde{m}}^2} \dot{\rho}_{\tilde{m}} d\tau = \frac{1+\tan^2 \nu_k \frac{\pi}{2}}{\tan \nu_k \frac{\pi}{2}} \lim_{\tilde{m}} h(\nu_k, \tilde{m}), \quad (70)$$

thanks to (43) this last holds because $\{\tilde{m}\}$ is extracted from $\{m\}$ and $\{h(\alpha, m)\}$ is convergent. Moreover, being $\mathbb{N}''(\nu_k, \tilde{m}) = \emptyset$, the function $C(\alpha)$ in (67) becomes

$$D(\nu_k) := 2 \lim_{\tilde{m}} \left[\frac{1+\tan^2 \nu_k \frac{\pi}{2}}{\tan \nu_k \frac{\pi}{2}} \int_{J(\nu_k, \tilde{m})} \frac{\rho_{\tilde{m}}^2}{1+\rho_{\tilde{m}}^2} d\tau - \frac{1+\tan^2 \nu_k \frac{\pi}{2}}{\tan \nu_k \frac{\pi}{2}} \int_{J(\nu_k, \tilde{m})} \frac{e_{\tilde{m}}}{(1+\rho_{\tilde{m}}^2)^2} \dot{\rho}_{\tilde{m}} d\tau - \sum_{h \in \mathbb{N}(\nu_k, \tilde{m})} \int_{s_h}^{t_h} \rho_{\tilde{m}} d\tau \right]. \quad (71)$$

Since the limit properties (66) and (55) hold for the whole sequence $\{m''\}$, we prove that for $D(\nu_k)$, defined by (71), the following limit holds

$$\lim_{\nu_k \rightarrow 1^-} D(\nu_k) = 0. \quad (72)$$

Hence, for the hypothesis of absurd we get relation (67) with the left-hand side null, and, via (72), for the right-hand side of (67) we prove that for the term (70) holds $\lim_{\nu_k \rightarrow 1^-} A(\nu_k) = 0$. So that, via (44), we arrive at

$$0 = \|v(s)\|_2^2 - \|v(t)\|_2^2 - 2 \int_s^t \|\nabla v\|_2^2 d\tau.$$

this last contradicts the assumption. \square

Lemma 14. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 9, if for some $t > s \in \mathcal{T}$ the weak solution v does not enjoy the energy equality, then there exists an one parameter family $\mathbf{n}(\alpha)$ of positive integers such that the weak solution v satisfies the following special energy equality:*

$$\|v(t)\|_2^2 + 2 \int_s^t \|\nabla v(\tau)\|_2^2 d\tau + \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \sum_{h=1}^{\mathbf{n}(\alpha)} \left[\|v(s_h(\alpha))\|_2^2 - \|v(t_h(\alpha))\|_2^2 \right] = \|v(s)\|_2^2, \quad (73)$$

where $\mathbf{n}(\alpha) \leq \lfloor 2c \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2} \rfloor$ c is a constant independent of v_0 , $s, t \in \mathcal{T}$ and of α . Moreover, set $\tilde{J}'(\alpha) := \{(s_h(\alpha), t_h(\alpha)) \text{ for } h = 1, \dots, \mathbf{n}(\alpha)\}$, then one gets

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} (1-\alpha)^{-1} |\tilde{J}'(\alpha)| = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} (1-\alpha) \mathbf{n}(\alpha) = 0. \quad (74)$$

Proof. We work on the sequence $\{v^{m''}\}$ of Lemma 12, the same argument works considering the sequence $\{v^{m'}\}$. Moreover, for the sake of the simplicity, since abusing in the notation there is no confusion, we denote $\{v^{m''}\}$ by $\{v^m\}$. The strategy is to construct an extract from $\{v^m\}$ which in the limit leads to (73).

We are going to prove that for all $\alpha \in (\alpha'_0, 1)$ there exists an extract $\{\tilde{m}\} \subseteq \{m''\}$ such that

$$\text{card}(J'(\alpha, \tilde{m})) = \mathbf{n}(\alpha) \text{ for all } \tilde{m},$$

with $J'(\alpha, m) \subseteq \tilde{J}(\alpha, m)$, where $\tilde{J}(\alpha, m)$ is the family of subsets stated in Lemma 12 in order to deduce (60).

By virtue of Lemma 12, the cardinality of the set $\tilde{J}(\alpha, m)$ is the sequence of nonnegative integers $\{\mathbf{n}(\alpha, m)\}$, which is bounded by $\lfloor 2c \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2} \rfloor$ for all $\alpha \in (\alpha'_0, 1)$. Then, for all $\alpha \in (\alpha'_0, 1)$, there exists $\mathbf{n}(\alpha) \leq \lfloor 2c \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2} \rfloor$ as min-limit with respect to m . We denote by $\{\tilde{m}\} \subseteq \{m\}$ the sequence that realizes the min-limit. Since $\{\mathbf{n}(\alpha, m)\}$ is a sequence of integers variable in the finite range of integers $\{0, \dots, \lfloor 2c \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2} \rfloor\}$, we also realize that the extract $\mathbf{n}(\alpha, \tilde{m}) = \mathbf{n}(\alpha) > 0$ for all \tilde{m} . We set $\mathbf{n}(\alpha) > 0$ since we denied the energy equality, that is, by virtue of Lemma 13, we denied, for all $\alpha \in (\alpha'', 1)$, $\alpha'' \geq \alpha'_0$, the existence of any subsequence for which $\mathbf{n}(\alpha, m) = 0$.

Now, we work on the subsequence \tilde{m} which realizes the min-limit $\mathbf{n}(\alpha)$. Moreover, we set $J'(\alpha, \tilde{m})$ the subset of $\tilde{J}(\alpha, \cdot)$, whose cardinality is $\mathbf{n}(\alpha)$ for all \tilde{m} .

Thus, starting from our sequence of index \tilde{m} , we are going to construct $2\mathbf{n}(\alpha)$ subsequences, one for each endpoint of the intervals, with the constrain that each subsequence is extracted from the previous one.

The first subsequence is the one related to $\{s_1(\alpha, \tilde{m})\}$ that admits an extract convergent to some $s_1(\alpha)$, and the subsequence $\{t_1(\alpha, \tilde{m})\}$, with indexes $\{\tilde{m}\}$ extracted from the last one, admits a limit $t_1(\alpha)$ and going on until to $h = \mathbf{n}(\alpha)$. With abuse of the notation, since there is no confusion, we again denote the last extract by $\{\tilde{m}\}$.

Of course, being along any extract $s_h(\alpha, \tilde{m}) < t_h(\alpha, \tilde{m}) < s_{h+1}(\alpha, \tilde{m})$ for all $h = 1, \dots, \mathbf{n}(\alpha) - 1$, we also get $s_h(\alpha) \leq t_h(\alpha) \leq s_{h+1}(\alpha)$. So that the last extract has a sequence of indexes in \tilde{m} for which, for each $h = 1, \dots, \mathbf{n}(\alpha)$, we get $\lim_{\tilde{m}} s_h(\alpha, \tilde{m}) = s_h(\alpha)$ and $\lim_{\tilde{m}} t_h(\alpha, \tilde{m}) = t_h(\alpha)$.

We call the generic endpoint $z_k(\alpha, \tilde{m})$, $k = 1, \dots, 2\mathbf{n}(\alpha)$. For the $2\mathbf{n}(\alpha)$ endpoints $z_k(\alpha, \tilde{m})$ we determine subsequences of the approximating $\{v^{\tilde{m}}\}$ with the same procedure used to establish the limits $s_h(\alpha)$ and $t_h(\alpha)$ for $h = 1, \dots, \mathbf{n}(\alpha)$.

To achieve this goal, we distinguish the case of Ω bounded domain from the case of Ω unbounded domain.

The case of Ω bounded – For $h = 1, \dots, \mathbf{n}(\alpha)$, recalling the values in $J^{1,2}$ -norm of $v^{\tilde{m}}(s_h(\alpha, \tilde{m}))$ and of $v^{\tilde{m}}(t_h(\alpha, \tilde{m}))$ stated in (41)₃, we have

$$\{v^{\tilde{m}}(z_1(\alpha, \tilde{m}))\}, \text{ with } \|v^{\tilde{m}}(z_1(\alpha, \tilde{m}))\|_2 \leq \|v_0\|_2 \text{ and } \|\nabla v^{\tilde{m}}(z_1(\alpha, \tilde{m}))\|_2 = \tan \frac{\pi}{2} \alpha. \quad (75)$$

Hence, this sequence is contained in a ball of $J^{1,2}(\Omega)$, so that, by virtue of the Rellich-Kondrachov theorem, admits an extract strongly convergent in $L^2(\Omega)$ and weakly in $J^{1,2}(\Omega)$, whose limits admit the same bounds given in (75). We evaluate the Rellich-Kondrachov extract with indexes $\{\tilde{m}\}$ in $z_2(\alpha, \tilde{m})$, that is

$$\{v^{\tilde{m}}(z_2(\alpha, \tilde{m}))\}, \text{ with } \|v^{\tilde{m}}(z_2(\alpha, \tilde{m}))\|_2 \leq \|v_0\|_2 \text{ and } \|\nabla v^{\tilde{m}}(z_2(\alpha, \tilde{m}))\|_2 = \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}.$$

This extract is contained in the same ball of $J^{1,2}(\Omega)$, so that admits an extract strongly convergent in $L^2(\Omega)$ and weakly in $J^{1,2}(\Omega)$. We iterate the procedure until to $k = 2\mathbf{n}(\alpha)$. With abuse of the notation, since there is no confusion, we again denote the last extract by $\{\tilde{m}\}$. In this way, by means of the last subsequence of $\{v^{m''}\}$, we state an extract $\{v^{\tilde{m}}(z_k(\alpha, \tilde{m}))\}$ that, for all $k = 1, \dots, 2\mathbf{n}(\alpha)$, is convergent in $L^2(\Omega)$.

For $k = 1, \dots, 2\mathbf{n}(\alpha)$, we denote by $w_k(\alpha, x)$ the limit in $L^2(\Omega)$. Now, our task is to prove that such limits coincide with the following values of the weak solution v :

$$\begin{aligned} w_1(\alpha, x) &= v(s_1(\alpha), x), & w_2(\alpha, x) &= v(t_1(\alpha)), \\ w_3(\alpha, x) &= v(s_2(\alpha), x), & w_4(\alpha, x) &= v(t_2(\alpha), x), \\ &\vdots & &\vdots \\ w_{2\mathbf{n}(\alpha)-3}(\alpha, x) &= v(s_{\mathbf{n}(\alpha)-1}(\alpha), x), & w_{2\mathbf{n}(\alpha)-2}(\alpha, x) &= v(t_{\mathbf{n}(\alpha)-1}(\alpha), x), \\ w_{2\mathbf{n}(\alpha)-1}(\alpha, x) &= v(s_{2\mathbf{n}(\alpha)}(\alpha), x), & w_{2\mathbf{n}(\alpha)}(\alpha, x) &= v(t_{\mathbf{n}(\alpha)}(\alpha), x). \end{aligned} \tag{76}$$

In the previous table is implicit the following application: to k odd $\rightarrow s_h(\alpha)$ (h suitable), and to k even $\rightarrow t_h(\alpha)$ (h suitable).

In order to prove (76), first of all we recall that, by virtue of (22)₁, the original sequence $\{v^m\}$ is such that, for all $\varphi \in J^2(\Omega)$ and $T > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \{(v^m, \varphi)\} &\subset C([0, T)) \text{ is an uniformly equicontinuous and bounded sequence,} \\ \text{whose limit } (v(t), \varphi) &\in C([0, T)), \text{ where } v \text{ is the weak solution.} \end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

Of course, the same property holds for any extract. Recalling that relatively to $\{z_k(\alpha, \tilde{m})\}$, if k is odd, for a suitable index h , we have the property $s_h(\alpha, \tilde{m}) \rightarrow s_h(\alpha)$, then we get

$$\begin{aligned} (w_k(\alpha), \varphi) &= \lim_m (v^{\tilde{m}}(z_k(\alpha, \tilde{m})), \varphi) \\ &= \lim_{\tilde{m}} [(v^{\tilde{m}}(s_h(\alpha, \tilde{m})) - v^{\tilde{m}}(s_h(\alpha)), \varphi)] + \lim_{\tilde{m}} (v^{\tilde{m}}(s_h(\alpha)), \varphi) \\ &= v(s_h(\alpha), \varphi), \end{aligned}$$

where we employ (77) for the former limit and the weak convergence for latter limit. Analogously, recalling that if k related to $\{z_k(\alpha, \tilde{m})\}$ is even, for a suitable index h , we have the property $t_h(\alpha, \tilde{m}) \rightarrow t_h(\alpha)$, then we get

$$\begin{aligned} (w_k(\alpha), \varphi) &= \lim_{\tilde{m}} (v^{\tilde{m}}(z_k(\alpha, \tilde{m})), \varphi) \\ &= \lim_{\tilde{m}} [(v^{\tilde{m}}(t_h(\alpha, \tilde{m})) - v^{\tilde{m}}(t_h(\alpha)), \varphi)] + \lim_{\tilde{m}} (v^{\tilde{m}}(t_h(\alpha)), \varphi) \\ &= v(t_h(\alpha), \varphi). \end{aligned}$$

Since in both the relations the test function φ is arbitrary, then we have proved (76).

The case of Ω unbounded – In this case we cannot employ the Rellich-Kondrakov theorem. So that, we recall the technique on the convergence in L^p . For this end, we employ the Rellich-Kondrakov theorem on the bounded domain $\Omega \cap B_R$, and for $\Omega \cap B_R^c$ we employ estimate (29), that is uniform with respect to \tilde{m} , being $\{\tilde{m}\}$ extract from $\{m\}$, and with respect to $t \in [0, \theta_0]$.

Hence, we estimate in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} \|v^{\tilde{m}}(z_1(\alpha, \tilde{m})) - v^p(z_1(\alpha, p))\|_2 &\leq \|v^{\tilde{m}}(z_1(\alpha, \tilde{m})) - v^{\tilde{p}}(z_1(\alpha, \tilde{p}))\|_{L^2(\Omega \cap B_R)} \\ &\quad + \|v^{\tilde{m}}(z_1(\alpha, \tilde{m})) - v^{\tilde{p}}(z_1(\alpha, \tilde{p}))\|_{L^2(\Omega \cap B_R^c)} \\ &\leq \|v^{\tilde{m}}(z_1(\alpha, \tilde{m})) - v^{\tilde{p}}(z_1(\alpha, \tilde{p}))\|_{L^2(\Omega \cap B_R)} + 2[\|v_0\|_{L^2(|x|>R)} + c(t)\psi(R)]. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling that $\|v_0\|_{L^2(|x|>R)} + \psi(R) = o(1)$, $c(t)$ is bounded, the last estimate ensures the Cauchy condition. Hence, the wanted convergence holds. Then one proceeds as in the case of Ω bounded. So that, we consider the case of Ω unbounded as achieved.

Now, the proof follows the same way for both the kinds of domains.

We consider formula (60) for the last subsequence extract from $\{m''\}$:

$$\frac{2}{\pi} \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \lim_{\tilde{m}} \int_{J(\alpha, \tilde{m})} \frac{e_{\tilde{m}}}{1+\rho_{\tilde{m}}^2} \dot{\rho}_{\tilde{m}} d\tau = 2 \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \lim_{\tilde{m}} \int_{\tilde{J}'(\alpha, \tilde{m})} \rho_{\tilde{m}} d\tau = 2 \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \lim_{\tilde{m}} \sum_{k=1}^{\mathbf{n}(\alpha)} \int_{s_k(\alpha, \tilde{m})}^{t_k(\alpha, \tilde{m})} \rho_{\tilde{m}} d\tau.$$

Employing for the last term the formula of energy (45), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2}{\pi} \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \lim_{\tilde{m}} \int_{J(\alpha, \tilde{m})} \frac{e_{\tilde{m}}}{1+\rho_{\tilde{m}}^2} \dot{\rho}_{\tilde{m}} d\tau &= \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \lim_{\tilde{m}} \sum_{k=1}^{\mathbf{n}(\alpha)} \left[\|v^{\tilde{m}}(s_k(\alpha, \tilde{m}))\|_2^2 - \|v^{\tilde{m}}(t_k(\alpha, \tilde{m}))\|_2^2 \right] \\ &= \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \sum_{k=1}^{\mathbf{n}(\alpha)} \left[\|v(s_k(\alpha))\|_2^2 - \|v(t_k(\alpha))\|_2^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{78}$$

Being $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} (1-\alpha) \frac{1+\tan^2 \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}}{\tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}} = \frac{2}{\pi}$, substituting (78) in (44), we achieve (73).

We set $\tilde{J}'(\alpha) := \{(s_h(\alpha), t_h(\alpha))\}$, for all indexes $h = 1, \dots, \mathbf{n}(\alpha)$ such that $[s_h(\alpha), t_h(\alpha)]$ is not a degenerate interval. The set $J'(\alpha)$ is not empty. Because if we get $s_h(\alpha) \equiv t_h(\alpha)$ for all indexes h , then by virtue of (76) we also get that the gap $\|v(s_h(\alpha))\|_2 - \|v(t_h(\alpha))\|_2 = 0$. This last would furnish the energy equality on (s, t) , which contradicts the assumption.

Therefore, we can define an application

$$\mathbf{n}': \alpha \in (\alpha'_0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{N} : \mathbf{n}'(\alpha) = \text{number of indexes } h \in \{1, \dots, \mathbf{n}(\alpha)\} \text{ such that } s_h(\alpha) \neq t_h(\alpha).$$

Since there is no confusion, we denote the application $\mathbf{n}'(\alpha)$ again by $\mathbf{n}(\alpha)$.

Recalling the definition of $\{(s_h(\alpha), t_h(\alpha))\}$ and the one related to $J(\alpha, m)$, we easily get

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{J}'(\alpha)| &= \left| \sum_{h=1}^{\mathbf{n}(\alpha)} (t_h(\alpha) - s_h(\alpha)) \right| = \left| \sum_{h=1}^{\mathbf{n}(\alpha)} (t_h(\alpha) - t_h(\alpha, \tilde{m}) + t_h(\alpha, \tilde{m}) - s_h(\alpha, \tilde{m}) + s_h(\alpha, \tilde{m}) - s_h(\alpha)) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \sum_{h=1}^{\mathbf{n}(\alpha)} (t_h(\alpha) - t_h(\alpha, \tilde{m})) \right| + \left| \sum_{h=1}^{\mathbf{n}(\alpha)} (t_h(\alpha, \tilde{m}) - s_h(\alpha, \tilde{m})) \right| + \left| \sum_{h=1}^{\mathbf{n}(\alpha)} (s_h(\alpha, \tilde{m}) - s_h(\alpha)) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \sum_{h=1}^{\mathbf{n}(\alpha)} (t_h(\alpha) - t_h(\alpha, \tilde{m})) \right| + |J(\alpha, \tilde{m})| + \left| \sum_{h=1}^{\mathbf{n}(\alpha)} (s_h(\alpha, \tilde{m}) - s_h(\alpha)) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\{s_h(\alpha, \tilde{m})\} \rightarrow s_h(\alpha)$ and $\{t_h(\alpha, \tilde{m})\} \rightarrow t_h(\alpha)$, letting $\tilde{m} \rightarrow \infty$, we arrive at

$$|\tilde{J}'(\alpha)| \leq \overline{\lim}_m |J(\alpha, m)|.$$

Multiplying by $(1 - \alpha)^{-1}$, by virtue of (56), we achieve the proof of the former claim in (74). In order to prove the latter claim of (74), one considers again (69) that along the sequence $\{\tilde{m}\}$ becomes

$$\frac{2}{\pi} \frac{|J(\alpha, \tilde{m})|}{1 - \alpha} > \frac{\lfloor 2c \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2} \rfloor}{2\mu \tan \alpha \frac{\pi}{2}} \geq c(\alpha_1)(1 - \alpha) \frac{\mathbf{n}(\alpha, \tilde{m})}{2\mu} = c(\alpha_1)(1 - \alpha) \frac{\mathbf{n}(\alpha)}{2\mu}, \text{ for all } \alpha \in (\max\{\alpha_1, \alpha'_0\}, 1).$$

Hence, by letting $\tilde{m} \rightarrow \infty$ and then letting $\alpha \rightarrow 1^-$, via (56), we achieve the latter claim of (74). \square

4.4 Proofs of Proposition 1, Theorem 2 and Corollary 1

Proof of Proposition 1. The necessary condition is immediate. Actually, given two instants $t > s$ both in \mathcal{T} , evaluating (6) in t and in s , respectively, then by the difference one deduces the energy equality on (s, t) . For the sufficient condition, if $0 \notin \mathcal{T}$, we consider any sequence $\{s_p\} \subset \mathcal{T}$ converging to 0. Hence, by the hypothesis (6) and property (4), letting $s_p \rightarrow 0$, we arrive at (6). \square

Proof of Theorem 2. The proof is a consequence of Lemma 8 and Lemma 13 - Lemma 14. \square

Proof of Corollary 1. The necessary condition is a consequence of formula (7) that implies $\mathbf{n}(\alpha) = 0$, that is $\tilde{J}'(\alpha) = \emptyset$. The converse is a consequence of Proposition 1 and of Lemma 14. \square

REMARK 8. A possible result consequence of Lemma 14 is the following. Actually, we can work on the subsequence in $\{m\}$ that leads to the definition of $\mathbf{n}(\alpha)$ in order to prove (40). Working in this way, formula (60) becomes:

$$\frac{2}{\pi} \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} \lim_m \int_{J(\alpha, m)} \frac{e_m}{1 + \rho_m^2} \dot{\rho}_m d\tau = 2 \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \sum_{k=1}^{\mathbf{n}(\alpha)} \lim_m \int_{s_k(\alpha, m)}^{t_k(\alpha, m)} \rho_m d\tau.$$

Hence, we can modify (40). That is, we get

$$\|v(t)\|_2^2 + 2 \int_s^t \|\nabla v(\tau)\|_2^2 d\tau - \|v(s)\|_2^2 = -2 \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} \sum_{k=1}^{n(\alpha)} \lim_m \int_{s_k(\alpha, m)}^{t_k(\alpha, m)} \rho_m d\tau, \quad (79)$$

where $n(\alpha)$ and the extract $\{\rho_m\}$ are deduced as in the proof of (73).

Declaration:

Conflict of interests The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] H. Beirão da Veiga and J. Yang, *On the energy equality for solutions to Newtonian and non-Newtonian fluids*, Nonlinear Anal. **185** (2019) 388-402.
- [2] L.C. Berselli and E. Chiodaroli, *Remarks on the energy equality for the 3D Navier-Stokes equations*, Waves in flows-the 2018 Prague-Sum Workshop lectures, 91-107, Adv. Math. Fluid Mech., Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, (2021).
- [3] T. Buckmaster, C. de Lellis, L. Székelyhidi and V. Vicol, *Onsager's conjecture for admissible weak solutions*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **72** (2019) 229-274.
- [4] T. Buckmaster and V. Vicol, *Nonuniqueness of weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equation*, Ann. of Math. **189** (2019) 101-144.
- [5] L. Caffarelli, R. Kohn, and L. Nirenberg, *Partial regularity of suitable weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **35** (1982), no.6, 771-831.
- [6] A. Cheskidov, S. Friedlander and R. Shvydkoy, *On the energy equality for weak solutions of the 3D Navier-Stokes equations*, In Rannacher, R., Sequeira, A. (eds.) Advances in Mathematical Fluid Mechanics, pp. 171-175. Springer, Berlin (2010)
- [7] P. Constantin, W. E and E.S. Titi, *Onsager's conjecture on the energy conservation for solutions of Euler's equation*, Comm. Math. Phys. **165** (1994) 207-209.
- [8] F. Crispo, C.R. Grisanti and P. Maremonti, *Some new properties of a suitable weak solution to the Navier-Stokes equations*, in Waves in Flows: The 2018 Prague-Sum Workshop Lectures, series: Lecture Notes in Mathematical Fluids Mechanics, editors: G.P.Galdi, T. Bodnar, S. Necasova, Birkhauser.
- [9] F. Crispo, C.R. Grisanti and P. Maremonti, *Navier-Stokes equations: an analysis of a possible gap to achieve the energy equality*, Ricerche di Matematica, **70** (2021) 235-249, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11587-020-00525-5>
- [10] F. Crispo, C.R. Grisanti and P. Maremonti, *Navier-Stokes equations: a new estimate of a possible gap related to the energy equality of a suitable weak solution*, Meccanica, **58** (2023) 1141-1149 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11012-023-01642-9>
- [11] T.D. Drivas and G.L. Eyink, *An Onsager singularity theorem for Leray solutions of incompressible Navier-Stokes*, Nonlinearity **32** (2019) 4465-4482.

- [12] J. Duchon and R. Robert, *Inertial energy dissipation for weak solutions of incompressible Euler and Navier-Stokes equations*, Nonlinearity **13** (2000) 249-255.
- [13] G.F.D. Duff, *Derivative estimates for the Navier-Stokes equations in a three-dimensional region*, Acta Math. **164** (1990) 145-210.
- [14] R. Farwig, Y. Giga, P-Y Hsu, *The Navier-Stokes equations with initial values in Besov spaces of type $B_{q,\infty}^{1+\frac{3}{q}}$* , J. Korean Math. Soc. **54** (2017) 1483-1504.
- [15] R. Farwig and Y. Taniuchi, *On the energy equality of Navier-Stokes equations in general unbounded domains*, Arch. Math. **95** (2010) 447-456.
- [16] C. Foias, C. Guillop, and R. Temam, *New a priori estimates for Navier-Stokes equations in dimension 3*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **6** (1981) 329-359.
- [17] G.P. Galdi, *An introduction to the mathematical theory of the Navier-Stokes equations*, (I) **38** Springer Tracts in N.P., (1994).
- [18] G.P. Galdi, *On the energy equality for distributional solutions to Navier-Stokes equations*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **147** (2019), 785-792.
- [19] G.P. Galdi and P. Maremonti, *Monotonic decreasing and asymptotic behavior of the kinetic energy for weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations in exterior domains*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **94** (1986) 253-266.
- [20] Y. Giga and H. Sohr, *Abstract L^p estimates for the Cauchy problem with applications to the Navier-Stokes equations in exterior domains*, J. Funct. Analysis, **102**(1991) 72-94.
- [21] J.G. Heywood, *The Navier-Stokes equations: existence, regularity and decay of solutions*, Indiana Univ. Mathem. J., **29** (1980) 639-681.
- [22] H. Kozono, A. Okada and S. Shimizu, *Characterization of initial data in the homogeneous Besov space for solutions in the Serrin class of the Navier-Stokes equations*, J. Funct. Analysis, **278** n.5 (2020), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfa.2019.108390>
- [23] H. Kozono, A. Okada and S. Shimizu, *Necessary and sufficient condition on initial data in the Besov space for solutions in the Serrin class of the Navier-Stokes equations*, **21** (2021), 3015-3033, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00028-020-00614-w>
- [24] O.A. Ladyžhenskaja, *The mathematical theory of viscous incompressible flow*, Gordon and Breach Sc. Publisher, (1969).
- [25] O.A. Ladyžhenskaja, V.A. Solonnikov and N.N. Ural'ceva, *Linear and quasi-linear equations of parabolic type*, AMS (1968).
- [26] J. Leray, *Sur le mouvement d'un liquide visqueux emplissant l'espace*, Acta Math. **63** (1934), no. 1, 193-248.
- [27] P. Maremonti, *Some interpolation inequalities involving Stokes operator and first order derivatives*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl., **175** (1998), 59-91.
- [28] P. Maremonti, *A note on Prodi-Serrin conditions for the regularity of a weak solution to the Navier-Stokes equations*, J. Math. Fluid Mech. **20** (2018), no. 2, 379-392.

- [29] P. Maremonti, *On an interpolation inequality involving the Stokes operator*, Mathematical analysis in fluid mechanics selected recent results, Contemp. Math., vol. 710, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2018, pp. 203–209.
- [30] P. Maremonti, *On the L^p Helmholtz decomposition: a review of a result due to Solonnikov*, Lith. Math. J. **58** (2018) 268–283. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10986-018-9403-6>
- [31] J.A. Mauro, *Some analytic questions in Mathematical Physics Problem*, (2010), <https://etd.adm.unipi.it/t/etd-12232009-161531/>
- [32] T. Miyakawa and H. Sohr, *On energy inequality, smoothness and large time behavior in L^2 for weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations*, Math. Z., **199** (1988) 455–478.
- [33] L. Onsager, *Statistical hydrodynamics*, Nuovo Cimento **6** (1949) 279–287.
- [34] G. Prodi, *Un teorema di unicità per le equazioni di Navier-Stokes*, Annali di Mat. Pura e Appl. **48**, (1959) 173–182.
- [35] V. Scheffer, *Turbulence and Hausdorff dimension*, in Turbulence and Navier-Stokes equations, L.N. in Mathematics **565** (1976), Springer.
- [36] V. Scheffer, *An inviscid flow with compact support in space-time*, J. Geom. Anal. **3** (1993) 343–401.
- [37] J. Serrin, *The Initial Boundary Value Problem for the Navier-Stokes Equations*, The University Wisconsin Press, Madison (1963).
- [38] V.A. Solonnikov, *Estimates of the solutions of the nonstationary Navier-Stokes system*, Zap. Nauchn. Sem. POMI, **38** (1973) 153–231.
- [39] R. Temam, *Navier-Stokes equations*, North-Holland, 1979.