

Streamfunction-vorticity formulation for incompressible viscous and inviscid flows on general surfaces

TIM BRÜERS¹
CHRISTOPH LEHRENFELD²
MAX WARDETZKY³

¹ Georg August University of Göttingen, Germany
Email address: t.brueers@math.uni-goettingen.de

² Georg August University of Göttingen, Germany
Email address: lehrenfeld@math.uni-goettingen.de

³ Georg August University of Göttingen, Germany
Email address: wardetzky@math.uni-goettingen.de.

ABSTRACT. This paper presents a streamfunction-vorticity formulation for the Navier–Stokes and Euler equations on general surfaces. Notably, this includes non-simply connected surfaces, on which the harmonic components of the velocity field play a fundamental role in the dynamics. By relying only on scalar and finite-dimensional quantities, our formulation ensures that the resulting methods give exactly tangential and incompressible velocity fields, while also being pressure robust. Compared to traditional methods based on velocity-pressure formulations, where one can only guarantee these structural properties by increasing the computational costs, this is a key advantage. We rigorously validate our formulation by proving its equivalence to the well understood velocity-pressure formulation under reasonable regularity assumptions. Furthermore, we demonstrate the applicability of the approach with numerical examples.

1. Introduction

The incompressible Navier–Stokes and Euler equations on surfaces model viscous and inviscid flows, usually expressed in a velocity–pressure formulation, henceforth called *velocity formulation*:

$$\partial_t V + \nabla_V V = F - \text{grad}(p) - \nu \text{rot}(\text{curl}(V)) + 2\nu\kappa V, \quad \text{div}(V) = 0. \quad (1.1)$$

Here, V denotes the velocity field, p the static pressure, F external forces, ν the kinematic viscosity, and κ the Gaussian curvature, while ∇ , grad , div , rot , curl are the corresponding surface differential operators. Both p and F are normalized by the constant fluid density. The terms involving ν represent the viscous forces, which vanish for the inviscid Euler equations ($\nu = 0$), and the divergence constraint expresses incompressibility (or inextensibility) of the surface flow.

Numerical methods for (1.1) on flat domains and surfaces are well established, see e.g. [23, 29, 30, 53, 18, 46, 45, 44]. However, the velocity formulation comes with structural challenges: (i) it requires vector-valued unknowns, (ii) tangentiality and incompressibility of discrete velocities can only be enforced weakly in many discretizations, and (iii) pressure robustness is lost unless special care is taken, leading to velocity errors that scale with pressure errors [34]. Moreover, all methods in this class lead to saddle-point problems coupling velocity and pressure, which are computationally demanding and require delicate compatibility conditions for stability.

An alternative is the *vorticity formulation*, obtained from (1.1) by introducing the scalar vorticity $\omega = \text{curl}(V)$ and employing the Hodge decomposition

$$V = \text{rot}(\psi) + H, \quad (1.2)$$

with a scalar streamfunction ψ and a harmonic vector field H . Although the harmonic component H is vector-valued, its corresponding space H_N is finite-dimensional, with a dimension equal to the first Betti number b_1 of the surface. This makes it possible to numerically pre-compute a basis for this space that is exactly tangential and divergence-free.

This change of variables recasts the system into scalar equations for ψ and ω , complemented by an b_1 -dimensional equation for H :

$$\omega = \Delta_{\text{dR}}(\psi), \quad (1.3a)$$

$$\partial_t \omega = \text{curl}(F) - \langle V, \text{grad}(\omega) \rangle - \nu \Delta_{\text{dR}}(\omega) + 2\nu \text{curl}(\kappa V), \quad (1.3b)$$

$$\partial_t H = P_{H_N}(F - \omega JV - \nu \text{rot}(\omega) + 2\nu \kappa V). \quad (1.3c)$$

In this system, $\Delta_{\text{dR}} = -\text{div}(\text{grad}(\cdot))$ denotes the de Rham Laplacian, P_{H_N} is the projection onto the space of harmonic fields, and the velocity V is always given by the decomposition (1.2). Together, these equations form a coupled problem consisting of two evolution equations for ω and H , and an elliptic (reconstruction) equation for ψ .

The formulation is therefore algorithmically attractive: it avoids saddle-point problems, involves primarily scalar unknowns, and yields exactly divergence-free, tangential discrete velocities. In this formulation, the pressure decouples and is recovered *a posteriori* from a Poisson problem. This decoupling, combined with the geometric properties of the Hodge decomposition, ensures that tangentiality, incompressibility, and pressure robustness are all satisfied by construction.

Despite its advantages, a comprehensive theory for the vorticity formulation on general surfaces has remained elusive, both in the differential geometry community (which has provided deep insights into the geometric structure of the Euler equations, see, e.g., [5]) and the computational community. The existing literature has largely sidestepped the full dynamics of the harmonic component by relying on highly restrictive assumptions of either a geometric or dynamic nature.

Geometric restrictions confined research to planar domains [13, 14, 1, 38, 37, 65, 22, 64, 63, 25, 41, 35, 8, 3, 2] or simply connected surfaces [43, 52, 51, 11, 10, 28], special cases that allow the velocity to be expressed simply as $V = \text{rot}(\psi)$. The widely employed dynamics restriction, in contrast, is to assume situations in which H is constant in time [17, 7, 4]. On general surfaces with evolving flows, however, neither type of assumption is justified, and the full dynamics of H must be accounted for.

Recent advances [66, 67], drawing on the spectral approach of [36], provided a versatile key to lifting these limitations by deriving the evolution of H as in (1.3c). Similarly, we lift these topological restrictions by carefully incorporating the harmonic fields into the system.

The main contribution of the present work is to establish the rigorous mathematical foundation of the vorticity formulation for both the Navier–Stokes and Euler scenarios. We derive the requisite weak forms of the vorticity formulation for both scenarios and prove their respective equivalence to the classical velocity formulations – thereby validating the vorticity approach in full generality.

As a consequence, the vorticity formulation yields a computationally attractive alternative to velocity–pressure methods. It combines exact incompressibility, tangentiality, and pressure robustness with a reduced scalar structure, opening the door for efficient algorithms that exploit the full potential of this formulation. We demonstrate this potential for a set of interesting examples.

Structure and main contributions

The presentation of our central theoretical results starts in Section 2 with a symbolic derivation that motivates the weak vorticity formulation and illustrates its equivalence to the standard weak velocity formulation, see in particular Theorem 2.6 and 2.10. The requisite rigorous mathematical framework is then established across Sections 3 to 5.

This framework is built in several stages. First, in Section 3, we establish the necessary groundwork by generalizing key identities and regularity statements from the flat case to handle difficult terms in the Navier–Stokes and Euler equations. Then, one of our main analytical contributions is the generalization of classical Navier–Stokes regularity results by Heywood and Rannacher [29] to general surfaces (Theorem 4.1) – a result that to our knowledge is not available in the literature. We achieve this by extending the Stokes regularity theorem to surfaces (Theorem 4.8). Finally, these analytical tools

STREAMFUNCTION-VORTICITY FORMULATION FOR FLOWS

from Sections 3 and 4 culminate in our main theoretical result: the rigorous proof of the equivalence between the weak vorticity and velocity formulations (Theorem 2.6 and 2.10).

We conclude by showcasing the practical power of our framework by presenting numerical simulations based on the vorticity formulation for general surfaces (see Section 6). Readers only interested in implementation details can directly skip to this section.

2. Overview of main results

Our main objective is to develop a framework for the weak vorticity formulation of the incompressible Navier–Stokes and Euler equations, with the goal of enabling rigorous analysis and numerical methods based on it. At present, no such comprehensive theory exists for general surfaces. This stands in contrast to the weak velocity formulations, for which existence, uniqueness, and regularity results are well established in various settings (see, e.g., Section 4). Our contribution is to establish a precise equivalence between the weak velocity and vorticity formulations, which enables the transfer of analytical results between them and paves the way for new developments in analysis and numerical methods. In this section, we state our main results and outline our approach, with detailed proofs and auxiliary statements deferred to the following sections.

2.1. Velocity formulation for Navier–Stokes and Euler

We begin by briefly establishing the setting and notation. Let M be a surface with a $C^{0,1}$ boundary. We introduce the key spaces of divergence-free velocity fields as:

$$\begin{aligned} J_{L^2} &:= \{V \in H(\text{div}) \mid \text{div}(V) = 0 \text{ and } \langle V, N \rangle|_{\partial M} = 0\}, \\ J_{H_0^1} &:= \{V \in H_0^1(\Gamma) \mid \text{div}(V) = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

We use standard notation for Sobolev spaces and denote the Bochner spaces by $L_T^p(B)$ for functions $f : (0, T) \rightarrow B$ (see Section A for details).

To motivate and develop the weak vorticity formulations rigorously, our strategy is to construct them to be equivalent to the well-understood weak velocity formulations. As a necessary first step, we must state the latter with precision. Both are posed on divergence-free spaces, which obviates the need for an explicit pressure term. The Navier–Stokes formulation is distinguished by its viscous term – absent in the Euler equations – which requires the symmetrized covariant derivative of the velocity field V , defined as $D_V := \frac{1}{2}(\nabla V + (\nabla V)^T)$, where ∇V is the covariant derivative of V .

Definition 2.1 (Velocity formulation [23, p.158], [60, p.533]).

Let $T \in (0, \infty)$, $V_0 \in J_{L^2}$ and $F \in L_T^2(H^{-1}(\Gamma))$ be given. Then:

- i.) $V \in L_T^2(J_{H_0^1}) \cap L_T^\infty(J_{L^2})$ is a solution of the *nonstationary Navier–Stokes equations in divergence-free formulation* if, for $\nu > 0$, the equation

$$\partial_t(V, W) = \langle F, W \rangle - (\nabla_V V, W) - 2\nu(D_V, \nabla W), \quad \forall W \in J_{H_0^1} \quad (\text{NS}_V)$$

holds in $(C_0^\infty((0, T)))'$ and V satisfies the initial condition $V_t|_{t=0} = V_0$.

- ii.) $V \in L_T^\infty(H^1(\Gamma) \cap J_{L^2})$ is a solution of the *nonstationary Euler equations in divergence-free formulation* if, for $\nu = 0$, the equation

$$\partial_t(V, W) = \langle F, W \rangle - (\nabla_V V, W), \quad \forall W \in H^1(\Gamma) \cap J_{L^2} \quad (\text{E}_V)$$

holds in $(C_0^\infty((0, T)))'$ and V satisfies the initial condition $V_t|_{t=0} = V_0$.

The solutions exhibit sufficient time regularity, specifically $V \in C([0, T]; J_{L^2})$ (Lemma 5.1), ensuring that the initial conditions in the preceding definition are well-posed. For the Navier–Stokes equations, the existence of unique weak solutions in the (no-slip) space $L_T^2(J_{H_0^1}) \cap L_T^\infty(J_{L^2})$ is a classical result for flat domains [62, 23], which can be extended to general surfaces with the techniques we develop in Section 4.

In contrast, a corresponding well-posedness result does not hold in general for the Euler equations in the (no-penetration) space $L_T^\infty(H^1(\Gamma) \cap J_{L^2})$; existence and uniqueness typically require stronger regularity assumptions (cf. Theorem 4.10). We adopt this particular weak definition for the Euler equations to allow for a unified treatment of both cases in our subsequent analysis.

Since the formulations above determine the velocity field, the corresponding pressure p can be recovered *a posteriori*, as detailed in the following proposition. The pressure reconstruction requires two definitions: (i) the space of functions with zero mean $L_0^2 := \{f \in L^2 \mid (f, 1) = 0\}$, and (ii) the formal L^2 -adjoint of ∇ , denoted by δ . This operator is defined by the relation $(\delta A, B) = (A, \nabla B)$ for all $A \in \Gamma_0^{(r, s+1)}$ and $B \in \Gamma_0^{(r, s)}$.

Proposition 2.2 (Pressure (Navier–Stokes and Euler)).

Let V be a weak solution to Equation (NS_V) or (E_V), $\nu > 0$ or $\nu = 0$ respectively. Then there exists a unique (distributional) pressure $p \in (C_0^\infty(M \times (0, T)))'$ solving

$$\text{grad}(p) = F - \partial_t V - \nabla_V V - 2\nu \cdot \delta(D_V). \quad (P')$$

Furthermore, if $\partial_t V \in L_T^2(H^{-1}(\Gamma))$, then $p \in L_T^2(L_0^2)$ and satisfies for a.e. $t \in (0, T)$

$$-(p_t, \text{div}(W)) = \langle F_t - \partial_t V_t, W \rangle - (\nabla_{V_t} V_t, W) - 2\nu(D_{V_t}, \nabla W), \quad (P)$$

for all $W \in H_0^1(\Gamma)$. These are the nonstationary Navier–Stokes/Euler equations in velocity-pressure formulation.

The pressure is unique in L_0^2 for a.e. $t \in (0, T)$; in other words, it is unique up to a function of time. The proof of Proposition 2.2 is given in Section 5.

2.2. Vorticity formulation for Navier–Stokes

Having precisely defined the weak velocity formulation, the next step is to motivate the corresponding weak vorticity formulation of the Navier–Stokes equations. The central tool for this derivation is the Hodge decomposition of $H^1(\Gamma)$ (see Theorem 3.10), which provides a unique and L^2 -orthogonal decomposition of a vector field into gradient, rotational, and harmonic components

$$H^1(\Gamma) = \text{grad}(H^2 \cap L_0^2) \oplus \text{rot}(H^2 \cap H_0^1) \oplus H^1(\Gamma) \cap H_N. \quad (\text{As}_H)$$

In this decomposition, the rotational components are generated by the operator $\text{rot}(\cdot) := -J\text{grad}(\cdot)$, where J is the Hodge star operator, i.e., a rotation by 90° . The final component, H_N , is the space of harmonic fields tangential to the boundary, defined as $H_N := \{X \in J_{L^2} \cap H(\text{curl}) \mid \text{curl}(X) = 0\}$.

A direct consequence of the Hodge decomposition (As_H) is its simplification for the velocity space $H^1(\Gamma) \cap J_{L^2}$ (which contains the no-slip space $J_{H_0^1}$). In this subspace, the gradient component vanishes due to orthogonality, leaving the decomposition

$$H^1(\Gamma) \cap J_{L^2} = \text{rot}(H^2 \cap H_0^1) \oplus H^1(\Gamma) \cap H_N.$$

Consequently, any velocity field $V \in H^1(\Gamma) \cap J_{L^2}$ can be expressed as $V = \text{rot}(\psi) + H$ for a streamfunction $\psi \in H^2 \cap H_0^1$ and a harmonic field $H \in H^1(\Gamma) \cap H_N$.

However, a key motivation for our weak vorticity formulation is to enable low-order numerical methods, specifically Galerkin approximations with piecewise constant velocity fields. This requires moving beyond the classical Hilbert space setting to a more general formulation posed in the larger

STREAMFUNCTION-VORTICITY FORMULATION FOR FLOWS

velocity spaces of the form $L^s(\Gamma) \cap J_{L^2}$. For the sake of a clear presentation, the precise range of possible exponents s is deferred to the discussion below Definition 2.3. To obtain such velocity fields, ψ and H must accordingly be sought in the spaces $W^{1,s} \cap H_0^1$ and $L^s(\Gamma) \cap H_N$, respectively.

To derive a formulation that is well-posed in these general $L^s(\Gamma)$ spaces, we now symbolically derive the weak vorticity formulation of the Navier–Stokes equations, inspired by ideas from [24] and [66, 67] for vorticity formulations.

We start from the momentum balance equation for the velocity-pressure formulation (P) and rewrite both the convective and viscous terms using two key vector calculus identities on surfaces:

$$\nabla_V V = \omega JV + \frac{1}{2} \text{grad}(|V|^2), \quad 2\delta D_V = \text{rot}(\text{curl}(V)) - 2\kappa V.$$

We refer to Lemma 3.5 (Nonl. term) and Theorem 3.7 (δD_V) for a detailed discussion of these identities. After substituting these identities into the momentum balance, we introduce the vorticity $\omega_t := \text{curl}(V_t)$. This yields the following weak form for a.e. $t \in (0, T)$

$$(\partial_t V_t, W) = (F_t - \text{grad}(p_t) - \omega_t JV_t - \frac{1}{2} \text{grad}(|V_t|^2) - \nu \text{rot}(\omega_t) + 2\nu \kappa V_t, W), \quad (2.1)$$

for all $W \in L^s(\Gamma)$. This form of the equation highlights three important aspects: (i) the diffusion term explicitly introduces the Gaussian curvature κ , revealing how viscosity behaves differently on curved surfaces, (ii) the presence of the $\text{rot}(\omega_t)$ term indicates that for the formulation to be well-defined against L^s test functions, the vorticity ω_t must possess at least $W^{1,r}$ regularity (where r is the dual exponent of s), which in turn imposes a regularity requirement on the velocity V , and (iii) establishing the existence of a pressure gradient $\text{grad}(p_t)$ in the appropriate dual space – which is not guaranteed a priori for a pressure merely in $L_T^2(L^2)$ – requires that all other terms in the equation are properly controlled. The latter requirement necessitates, making realistic regularity assumptions for terms like $\partial_t V$ and F , and carefully controlling the remaining terms in the equation.

Next, we symbolically derive the weak forms of equations (1.3a)-(1.3c) by testing (2.1) with specific subsets of $L^s(\Gamma)$.

To eliminate the pressure, we first choose a divergence-free test function $W = \text{rot}(\phi) + Z$, where $\phi \in W^{1,s} \cap H_0^1$ and $Z \in L^s(\Gamma) \cap H_N$. By construction, this function is orthogonal to all gradient fields. The momentum balance thus simplifies for a.e. $t \in (0, T)$ to

$$(\partial_t V_t, W) = (F_t - \omega_t JV_t - \nu \text{rot}(\omega_t) + 2\nu \kappa V_t, W).$$

Rewriting the time-derivative term using the identities $(\partial_t V, \text{rot}(\phi)) = \partial_t(\omega, \phi)$ and $(\partial_t V, Z) = \partial_t(H, Z)$ yields the dynamic evolution equations for the vorticity ω and the harmonic field H , which are the weak forms of Equations (1.3b) and (1.3c).

Second, to recover the pressure, we test (2.1) with a gradient field, $W = \text{grad}(q)$, for $q \in W^{1,s}$. Since the velocity field V is orthogonal to this test function, so is $\partial_t V$. This reduces the balance to an equation for the gradient terms, for a.e. $t \in (0, T)$

$$0 = (F_t - \text{grad}(p_t) - \omega_t JV_t - \frac{1}{2} \text{grad}(|V_t|^2) - \nu \text{rot}(\omega_t) + 2\nu \kappa V_t, \text{grad}(q)).$$

This yields a recovery equation for the total pressure $p^* := p + \frac{|V|^2}{2} - \frac{\|V\|_{L^2}^2}{2\text{Vol}(M)}$, where the final term, which is constant in space (but generally depends on time), ensures that p^* has zero mean, i.e., $p_t^* \in L_0^2$.

Finally, the system is closed by the kinematic equation relating vorticity to velocity, which holds for a.e. $t \in (0, T)$

$$(\omega_t, \chi) = (V_t, \text{rot}(\chi)), \quad \forall \chi \in W^{1,r}.$$

This equation, the weak form of Equation (1.3a), follows from the definition $\omega := \text{curl}(V)$ due to the no-slip condition on V . Having derived all the component equations, we are now in a position to formally define the weak vorticity formulation.

Definition 2.3 (Harmonic streamfunction-vorticity formulation (Navier–Stokes)).

Let $s \in (2, \infty)$ with dual exponent $r \in (1, 2)$, i.e., $\frac{1}{s} + \frac{1}{r} = 1$ and $T \in (0, \infty)$. Further, let $\psi_0 \in H_0^1$, $H_0 \in H_N$ and $F \in L_T^2(L^r(\Gamma))$ be given. We introduce the quantities:

$$\begin{aligned} (\psi, H) &\in L_T^2(W^{1,s} \cap H_0^1) \times L_T^2(L^s(\Gamma) \cap H_N), \\ \omega &\in L_T^2(W^{1,r}) \cap L_T^\infty(L^r), \quad p^* \in L_T^2(W^{1,r} \cap L_0^2), \end{aligned}$$

such that $V := \text{rot}(\psi) + H$ satisfies $\partial_t V \in L_T^2(L^r(\Gamma))$ and the relation

$$(\omega, \cdot) = (V, \text{rot}(\cdot)) \in L_T^2((W^{1,r})'). \quad (\text{NS}_\omega^1)$$

The tuple (ψ, H, ω, p^*) solves the *harmonic streamfunction-vorticity formulation* if:

$$\partial_t(\omega, \cdot) + \partial_t(H, *) = (F - \omega JV - \nu \text{rot}(\omega) + 2\nu\kappa V, \text{rot}(\cdot) + *) \quad (\text{NS}_\omega^2)$$

$$\in L_T^2\left((W^{1,s} \cap H_0^1)' \times (L^s(\Gamma) \cap H_N)'\right),$$

$$(\text{grad}(p^*), \text{grad}(\cdot)) = (F - \omega JV - \nu \text{rot}(\omega) + 2\nu\kappa V, \text{grad}(\cdot)) \quad (\text{NS}_{p^*})$$

$$\in L_T^2((W^{1,s})'),$$

holds with $\nu > 0$ and initial conditions $(\psi_0, H_0) = (\psi_t, H_t)|_{t=0}$. We denote the weak Bochner derivative of $(\omega, \cdot) \in L_T^2((W^{1,s} \cap H_{0,c}^1)')$ and $(H, *) \in L_T^2((L^s(\Gamma) \cap H_N)')$ by $\partial_t(\omega, \cdot)$ and $\partial_t(H, *)$, respectively.

Remark 2.4. We make two remarks on this definition:

(i) First, on the well-definedness of the formulation. Similar to the velocity formulations defined previously, the temporal regularity is defined exclusively in terms of the L_T^2 and L_T^∞ Bochner spaces, as this choice simplifies the subsequent proof of equivalence. The fact that the equations are well-defined and that the initial conditions are attained under these assumptions is formally proven in Lemma 5.4. This lemma also justifies the condition $2 < s < \infty$, which is required to control the convective term within the assumed L_T^2 space. The spatial well-definedness of all terms is a consequence of the chosen exponents and follows from Lemma 3.1.

(ii) Second, on the initial data. While the formulation is stated for given initial data (ψ_0, H_0) , in practice these are computed from a given initial velocity field $V_0 \in J_{L^2}$ by solving the Hodge decomposition.

Remark 2.5. We highlight two special cases where the equations simplify notably. Let $\varphi \in W^{1,s} \cap H_0^1$ and $Z \in L^s(\Gamma) \cap H_N$ be arbitrary test functions.

- If the Gaussian curvature κ is constant, the L^2 -orthogonality $\text{rot}(H_0^1) \perp H_N$ allows us to decouple the curvature term

$$2\nu(\kappa V, \text{rot}(\varphi) + Z) = 2\nu\kappa(\text{rot}(\psi), \text{rot}(\varphi)) + 2\nu\kappa(H, Z).$$

- If the surface is closed ($\partial M = \emptyset$), the term $(\text{rot}(\omega), Z)$ vanishes. This simplifies the viscous term to

$$(\text{rot}(\omega), \text{rot}(\varphi) + Z) = (\text{rot}(\omega), \text{rot}(\varphi)).$$

The preceding symbolic derivation is reversible, meaning a solution of the vorticity formulation can be used to construct a corresponding solution for the velocity formulation. This reversibility is the core idea behind our main equivalence theorem, which is one of the central results of this work.

STREAMFUNCTION-VORTICITY FORMULATION FOR FLOWS

Theorem 2.6 (Equivalence of Navier–Stokes formulations).

Let $s \in (2, \infty)$ with dual exponent $r \in (1, 2)$, i.e., $\frac{1}{s} + \frac{1}{r} = 1$ and $T \in (0, \infty)$. Further assume that the L^2 -orthogonal and unique decomposition from Equation (As_H) holds.

- 1.) Let (V, p) solve the Navier–Stokes equations in velocity formulation. Further assume $F, \partial_t V \in L_T^2(L^r(\Gamma))$ and $\text{curl}(V) \in L_T^2(W^{1,r}) \cap L_T^\infty(L^r)$. Define $(\omega, p^*) := \left(\text{curl}(V), p + \frac{|V|^2}{2} - \frac{\|V\|_{L^2}^2}{2\text{Vol}(M)} \right)$, and choose ψ and H uniquely such that $V = \text{rot}(\psi) + H$. Then the tuple (ψ, H, ω, p^*) solves the Navier–Stokes equations in vorticity formulation.
- 2.) Let (ψ, H, ω, p^*) solve the Navier–Stokes equations in vorticity formulation, then the tuple $(V, p) := \left(\text{rot}(\psi) + H, p^* - \frac{|V|^2}{2} + \frac{\|V\|_{L^2}^2}{2\text{Vol}(M)} \right)$ solves the Navier–Stokes equations in velocity formulation.

Remark 2.7. The additional regularity assumed for $F, \partial_t V$, and $\text{curl}(V)$ in 1.) is necessary for the preceding symbolic derivation to hold. We note that these requirements are naturally satisfied by the solutions whose regularity is established in Theorem 4.1 below, provided the external force F possesses sufficient regularity.

While the symbolic derivation provides the blueprint for the proof, a rigorous argument requires careful handling of all regularity details. For instance, precisely controlling the term $\text{grad}(|V|^2)$ to show it possesses the required time regularity is a non-trivial step under the given assumptions. This control is fundamentally important for establishing the appropriate regularity of the pressure. For this reason, we provide a full, detailed proof of Theorem 2.6 in Section 5, where all such technical subtleties are addressed.

2.3. Vorticity formulation for Euler

We now turn our attention to the Euler equations ($\nu = 0$). As in the viscous case, we motivate the corresponding weak vorticity formulation by symbolically deriving it. The Hodge decomposition (As_H) remains the backbone of this approach. Consequently, the variables (ψ, H, ω, p^*) are defined analogously to the Navier–Stokes setting.

Before deriving the corresponding weak equations, we highlight a crucial difference between the Navier–Stokes and Euler cases: the boundary conditions for the velocity field. Navier–Stokes solutions satisfy a no-slip condition ($V|_{\partial M} = 0$), while Euler solutions satisfy only a no-penetration condition ($\langle V, N \rangle|_{\partial M} = 0$).

This difference directly impacts the weak kinematic equation relating vorticity to velocity. For the Euler case, deriving the weak form of $\omega := \text{curl}(V)$ generates a $\langle V, T \rangle|_{\partial M}$ term. Since this term is not constrained by the no-penetration condition, we must restrict the test functions to $W_0^{1,r}$ to ensure the boundary term vanishes. Therefore, the kinematic equation takes for a.e. $t \in (0, T)$ the form

$$(\omega_t, \varphi) = (V_t, \text{rot}(\varphi)) = (\text{rot}(\psi_t), \text{rot}(\varphi)), \quad \forall \varphi \in W_0^{1,r}.$$

This is the weak form of Equation (1.3a). Note that the required test space $W_0^{1,r}$ is a proper subspace of the space $W^{1,r}$ used in the Navier–Stokes case (NS _{ω}). Furthermore, unlike the Navier–Stokes case (unless $\partial M = \emptyset$), we can no longer guarantee that the vorticity has zero mean ($\omega_t \notin L_0^1$ in general).

A key motivation for developing weak vorticity formulations is their suitability for simple Galerkin approximations, particularly using low-order elements. However, the fact that the Euler kinematic equation uses a test space ($W_0^{1,r}$) which is a proper subspace of its Navier–Stokes counterpart ($W^{1,r}$) creates a challenge. For a well-posed Galerkin formulation, reducing the dimension associated with one equation can lead to an ill-posed system (an observation also made from different analytical viewpoints,

see, e.g., [13, Ch 1.3]). Therefore, for our unified framework to be stable, the test space for another equation must be correspondingly larger. Since the dimension of the harmonic space H_N is fixed by topology ($\dim(H_N) = b_1$) and the pressure p^* is recovered a posteriori, the necessary change must occur within the weak form of the vorticity evolution equation (1.3b).

We now derive the weak forms of the evolution equations (1.3b), (1.3c) and the pressure recovery equation for the Euler case ($\nu = 0$). The process largely mirrors the Navier–Stokes derivation, testing (2.1) (with $\nu = 0$) against specific subspaces of $L^s(\Gamma)$.

The derivations for the harmonic field H and the pressure p^* proceed exactly as in the Navier–Stokes case. This yields the Euler analogs to the pressure equation Equation (NS $_{p^*}$) and the harmonic component of Equation (NS $_{\omega}^2$).

However, the derivation for the vorticity evolution – the remaining component of Equation (NS $_{\omega}^2$) – requires adjustment. Testing with $W = \text{rot}(\phi)$ for $\phi \in W^{1,s} \cap H_0^1$ and applying Green’s formula leads, after rearrangement, for a.e. $t \in (0, T)$ to

$$\partial_t(\omega_t, \phi) = (\text{curl}(F_t) - V_t(\omega_t), \phi),$$

where $V(\omega) := \langle V, \text{grad}(\omega) \rangle$. As anticipated, to ensure a well-posed Galerkin system, we must extend the test space for this vorticity evolution equation. Assuming sufficient regularity for $\text{curl}(F)$ and $\partial_t \text{curl}(V)$, the final, larger test space is determined by the term with the lowest regularity: the convective transport $V(\omega)$. This term belongs only to $L^{\bar{r}}$ for some $\bar{r} \in (1, r)$ (as shown in the regularity proof for Theorem 2.10 below). The extension is justified by a density argument, relying on the fact that $W^{1,s} \cap H_0^1$ is dense in $L^{\bar{s}}$, where \bar{s} denotes the dual exponent of \bar{r} , i.e., $\frac{1}{\bar{r}} + \frac{1}{\bar{s}} = 1$.

Having established the structure of the component equations, we can now formally define the weak vorticity formulation for the Euler equations.

Definition 2.8 (Harmonic streamfunction-vorticity formulation (Euler)).

Let $s \in (2, \infty)$ with dual exponent $r \in (1, 2)$, i.e., $\frac{1}{s} + \frac{1}{r} = 1$ and $T \in (0, \infty)$. Further assume that M satisfies the embedding

$$H_0(\text{div}) \cap H(\text{curl}) \hookrightarrow H^1(\Gamma) \quad (\text{As}_E)$$

and let $H_0 \in H_N$, $\omega_0 \in L^r$ and $F \in L_T^2(L^r(\Gamma))$, such that $\text{curl}(F) \in L_T^2(L^r)$, be given. We introduce the quantities:

$$\begin{aligned} (\psi, H) &\in L_T^2(W^{1,s} \cap H_0^1) \times L_T^2(L^s(\Gamma) \cap H_N), \\ \omega &\in L_T^2(W^{1,r}) \cap L_T^\infty(L^2), \quad p^* \in L_T^2(W^{1,r} \cap L_0^2), \end{aligned}$$

such that $V := \text{rot}(\psi) + H$ satisfies $\partial_t V, \partial_t \omega \in L_T^2(L^r(\Gamma))$ and

$$(\omega, \cdot) = (\text{rot}(\psi), \text{rot}(\cdot)) \in L_T^2(W^{-1,s}). \quad (\text{E}_{\omega}^1)$$

The tuple (ψ, H, ω, p^*) solves the *harmonic streamfunction-vorticity formulation* if:

$$\partial_t \omega = \text{curl}(F) - V(\omega) \in L_T^2(L^{\bar{r}}), \quad (\text{E}_{\omega}^2)$$

$$\partial_t(H, \cdot) = (F - \omega JV, \cdot) \in L_T^2((L^s(\Gamma) \cap H_N)'), \quad (\text{E}_{\omega}^3)$$

$$(\text{grad}(p^*), \text{grad}(\cdot)) = (F - \omega JV, \text{grad}(\cdot)) \in L_T^2((W^{1,s})'), \quad (\text{E}_{p^*})$$

holds for some $\bar{r} \in (1, r)$ and initial conditions $(H_0, \omega_0) = (H_t, \omega_t)|_{t=0}$. We denote the weak Bochner derivative of $(H, \cdot) \in L_T^2((L^s(\Gamma) \cap H_N)'),$ by $\partial_t(H, \cdot)$. For closed surfaces ($\partial M = \emptyset$), we also require the additional condition $\omega \in L_T^2(L_0^1)$.

Remark 2.9. We make two remarks on this definition:

(i) First, on the well-definedness of the formulation. Similar to the velocity formulations defined previously, the temporal regularity is defined exclusively in terms of the L_T^2 and L_T^∞ Bochner spaces, as

STREAMFUNCTION-VORTICITY FORMULATION FOR FLOWS

this choice simplifies the subsequent proof of equivalence. The fact that the equations are well-defined and that the initial conditions are attained under these assumptions is formally proven in Lemma 5.6. Crucially, due to the weaker no-penetration boundary condition (compared to the no-slip condition in Navier–Stokes), the additional assumption (As_E) (see Theorem 3.8) is necessary to ensure the initial conditions are well-defined. The spatial well-definedness of all terms is a consequence of the chosen exponents and follows from Lemma 3.1 and the Sobolev embedding theorem.

(ii) Second, on the initial data. Unlike the Navier–Stokes case, where (ψ, H) are specified, the initial conditions here are prescribed for the pair (H, ω) . While the formulation is stated for given initial data (H_0, ω_0) , in practice these are computed from a given initial velocity field $V_0 \in J_{L^2}$ with $\text{curl}(V_0) \in L^r$ by solving the Hodge decomposition and computing the curl.

Similar to the Navier–Stokes case, the preceding symbolic derivation is reversible. This reversibility underpins our main equivalence theorem, a central result of this work.

Theorem 2.10 (Equivalence of Euler formulations).

Let $s \in (2, \infty)$ with dual exponent $r \in (1, 2)$, i.e., $\frac{1}{s} + \frac{1}{r} = 1$ and $T \in (0, \infty)$. Further assume that the L^2 -orthogonal and unique decomposition from Equation (As_H) holds.

- 1.) Let (V, p) solve the Euler equations in velocity formulation. Further assume $F, \partial_t V \in L_T^2(L^r(\Gamma))$, $\text{curl}(F), \partial_t \text{curl}(V) \in L_T^2(L^r)$ and $\text{curl}(V) \in L_T^2(W^{1,r})$. Define $(\omega, p^*) := \left(\text{curl}(V), p + \frac{|V|^2}{2} - \frac{\|V\|_{L^2(M)}^2}{2\text{Vol}(M)} \right)$, and choose ψ and H uniquely such that $V = \text{rot}(\psi) + H$. Then the tuple (ψ, H, ω, p^*) solves the Euler equations in vorticity formulation.
- 2.) Let (ψ, H, ω, p^*) solve the Euler equations in vorticity formulation, then the tuple $(V, p) := \left(\text{rot}(\psi) + H, p^* - \frac{|V|^2}{2} + \frac{\|V\|_{L^2(M)}^2}{2\text{Vol}(M)} \right)$ solves the Euler equations in velocity formulation.

Remark 2.11. Theorem 2.10 closely parallels Theorem 2.6, differing only in the additional regularity assumptions for $\partial_t \text{curl}(V)$ and $\text{curl}(F)$. These assumptions are strictly necessary to justify the extended test spaces identified in the preceding symbolic derivation. We note that these additional requirements are naturally satisfied by the solutions whose regularity is established in Theorem 4.10 below, provided the external force F possesses sufficient regularity.

While the symbolic derivation provides the blueprint for this proof, a rigorous argument requires careful handling of all regularity details. The Euler formulation shares generic analytical challenges already noted for the Navier–Stokes case, but faces additional hurdles due to the specific boundary-related adjustments discussed above. For this reason, we provide a full, detailed proof of Theorem 2.10 in Section 5, where all such technical subtleties are addressed.

3. Preliminaries

Before proceeding to the rigorous proofs of the equivalence theorems, we must first collect and generalize the necessary technical tools. Although to our knowledge some of these results have not previously been shown for surfaces in this generality, we defer most of the proofs to the supplementary material to maintain the flow of the main argument.

We begin by focusing on the functional-analytic framework, establishing Sobolev embeddings, interpolation inequalities, and crucial estimates for the convective and diffusive terms (see Section 3.1). Following this, we review the Hodge decomposition on general surfaces (Section 3.2). This decomposition underpins the entire vorticity formulation by decomposing any tangential, divergence-free vector field into a streamfunction and a harmonic component.

3.1. Key Estimates and Identities

General Principle. Throughout this section and the following, we rely on the standard principle that many results for bounded domains in \mathbb{R}^2 carry over to compact surfaces via a partition of unity argument. We do not repeat this justification for subsequent theorems where it applies.

We begin with a key estimate that is a specific consequence of the general Sobolev embedding theorem. For any $A \in H^1(\Gamma^{(k,l)})$, we have

$$\|A\|_{L^p} \leq C(p, M) \|A\|_{H^1}, \quad 1 \leq p < \infty, \quad (L_{\leq}^p)$$

where $C(p, M)$ is a positive constant. This inequality is essential for our formulation, both for handling general Sobolev scales and for controlling nonlinear terms like convection.

Next, we apply the Sobolev embedding and Hölder's inequality to analyze the vorticity space $W^{1,r}$. This analysis is necessary, for example, to justify the spatial well-definedness of the equations in the vorticity formulations.

Lemma 3.1 (Embedding of $W^{1,r}$).

Let $s \in (2, \infty)$ with dual exponent $r \in (1, 2)$, i.e., $\frac{1}{s} + \frac{1}{r} = 1$. Then the embeddings $W^{1,r} \hookrightarrow L^q \hookrightarrow L^2$ hold for $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{s}$. Consequently, for any $w \in W^{1,r}$, $X \in L^2(\Gamma)$, and $Y \in L^s(\Gamma)$, the product $w \cdot \langle X, Y \rangle$ belongs to $L^1(\Gamma)$.

Another important inequality is the Gagliardo–Nirenberg interpolation inequality, which we need in the upcoming Theorem 3.6 to derive regularity results for $|V|^2$. It follows from the corresponding results for bounded domains in \mathbb{R}^2 [20, 42] combined with the Poincaré inequality. For completeness, the proof can be found in the supplementary material.

Theorem 3.2 (Gagliardo–Nirenberg interpolation inequality).

Let $a \in [1, \infty]$, $p \in [1, \infty)$ and $\theta \in [0, 1]$ satisfy the relation $\frac{2}{p} = \frac{2}{a} - \theta$. Then there exists a positive constant $C(p, \theta, M)$ such that for any $T \in W^{1,a}(\Gamma^{(r,s)})$, the following estimate holds

$$\|T\|_{L^p} \leq C(p, \theta, M) \left(\|\nabla T\|_{L^a}^\theta \|T\|_{L^a}^{1-\theta} + \|T\|_{L^a} \right). \quad (\text{GN}_{\leq})$$

Furthermore, if $T \in W_0^{1,a}$, this estimate tightens to

$$\|T\|_{L^p} \leq C(p, \theta, M) \|\nabla T\|_{L^a}^\theta \|T\|_{L^a}^{1-\theta}, \quad (\text{GN}_{\leq}^0)$$

provided that either (i) $\partial M \neq \emptyset$ and $a \in (1, \infty)$ or (ii) $\partial M = \emptyset$, $a \in [1, \infty)$ and $r = 0 = s$.

Next, we present a generalization of Gaffney's inequality [19]. For vector fields $X \in H_0(\text{div}) \cap H_0(\text{curl})$, this result explicitly bounds the L^2 norm of ∇X by the norms of $\text{div}(X)$ and $\text{curl}(X)$. The proof employs the de Rham Laplacian, defined as $\Delta_{\text{dR}}(V) := \text{rot}(\text{curl}(V)) - \text{grad}(\text{div}(V))$.

This inequality is of fundamental importance for the Navier–Stokes equations. Due to the no-slip boundary condition, the velocity field V naturally belongs to this function space. Since V is also divergence-free, this estimate allows us to derive regularity based solely on its vorticity – a crucial step in proving the equivalence of the formulations.

Lemma 3.3 (Gaffney's inequality).

There exists a positive constant $C(M)$ such that for all $X \in H_0(\text{div}) \cap H_0(\text{curl})$, the following estimates hold. If $\partial M \neq \emptyset$, then

$$\|\nabla X\|_{L^2} \leq C(M) \left(\|\text{div}(X)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\text{curl}(X)\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (\text{G}_{\leq}^0)$$

If $\partial M = \emptyset$, an additional L^2 -term is required to control $\ker(\text{div}) \cap \ker(\text{curl})$, leading to

$$\|\nabla X\|_{L^2} \leq C(M) \left(\|X\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\text{div}(X)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\text{curl}(X)\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (\text{G}_{\leq})$$

STREAMFUNCTION-VORTICITY FORMULATION FOR FLOWS

In particular, these estimates imply the equality $H_0^1(\Gamma) = H_0(\text{div}) \cap H_0(\text{curl})$.

Proof. We first prove the general estimate (G_{\leq}) . By standard density results, it suffices to show the inequality for smooth vector fields $V \in \Gamma_0$. Using integration by parts – noting that boundary terms vanish since $V \in \Gamma_0$ – followed by the Weitzenböck formula on surfaces, $\delta \nabla V = \Delta_{\text{dR}} V - \kappa V$ (see, e.g., [57, p.26]), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla V\|_{L^2}^2 &= (\delta \nabla V, V)_{L^2} = (\Delta_{\text{dR}} V, V)_{L^2} - (\kappa V, V)_{L^2} \\ &= \|\text{div}(V)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\text{curl}(V)\|_{L^2}^2 - (\kappa V, V)_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since M is compact, the negative Gaussian curvature $-\kappa$ is bounded from above. This implies $-(\kappa V, V) \leq K(M)\|V\|^2$, proving Equation (G_{\leq}) and consequently the equality $H_0^1(\Gamma) = H_0(\text{div}) \cap H_0(\text{curl})$.

To prove the boundary estimate (G_{\leq}^0) when $\partial M \neq \emptyset$, we argue by contradiction. Assume the inequality does not hold. Then there exists a sequence $Y_n \in H_0^1(\Gamma)$ such that $\|\nabla Y_n\|_{L^2} = 1$ and $\|\text{div}(Y_n)\|_{L^2} + \|\text{curl}(Y_n)\|_{L^2} < \frac{1}{n}$. By Rellich's lemma and the general estimate (G_{\leq}) , we extract a subsequence that is Cauchy in $\|\cdot\|_{H^1}$. Its limit $Y \in H_0^1(\Gamma)$ must satisfy $\text{div}(Y) = 0 = \text{curl}(Y)$, but $\|\nabla Y\|_{L^2} = 1$. If $\partial M \in C^\infty$, this immediately contradicts [57, Thm 3.4.4], which states that the only harmonic field vanishing on the boundary is zero. For the general case $\partial M \in C^{0,1}$, we utilize the ambient manifold W from our definition of such a surface (cf. Definition A.1). We choose a larger surface \tilde{M} with smooth boundary such that $M \subset \tilde{M} \subset W$. Extending Y by zero yields a field \tilde{Y} on \tilde{M} that retains all key properties: $\tilde{Y} \in H_0^1(\Gamma, \tilde{M})$, $\text{div}(\tilde{Y}) = 0$, $\text{curl}(\tilde{Y}) = 0$, and $\|\nabla \tilde{Y}\|_{L^2} = 1$. Applying [57, Thm 3.4.4] to \tilde{M} yields $\tilde{Y} = 0$, again a contradiction. Thus, the estimate Equation (G_{\leq}^0) must hold. ■

A very practical consequence of Gaffney's inequality is the following corollary, which is of great importance for the Navier–Stokes case in proving the equivalence of the formulations. It allows us to relate velocity fields in $J_{H_0^1}$ to those with less regularity in $L^s(\Gamma) \cap J_{L^2}$. In particular, the ability to recover higher regularity from lower regularity assumptions is a key feature.

Corollary 3.4 (Connection between $J_{H_0^1}$ and $L^s(\Gamma) \cap J_{L^2}$).

Let $s \in (2, \infty)$ with dual exponent $r \in (1, 2)$, i.e., $\frac{1}{s} + \frac{1}{r} = 1$. Then the following equality of sets holds

$$\begin{aligned} \{(V, \omega) \in J_{H_0^1} \times L^2 \mid (\text{curl}(V), \chi) = (\omega, \chi), \forall \chi \in L^2\} \\ = \{(V, \omega) \in (L^s(\Gamma) \cap J_{L^2}) \times L^2 \mid (V, \text{rot}(\chi)) = (\omega, \chi), \forall \chi \in W^{1,r}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. This proof follows the same steps as [24, Lem III.2.1] and is provided in the supplementary material for completeness. ■

We next present a lemma and theorem crucial for analyzing the regularity of the nonlinear term $\nabla_V V$. We begin with the decomposition that is central to our earlier symbolic derivation, as it introduces the vorticity while isolating a gradient component.

Lemma 3.5 (Nonlinear term).

Let $V \in W^{1,p}(\Gamma)$ for $p \in [\frac{4}{3}, \infty]$, then

$$\nabla_V V = \text{curl}(V)JV + \frac{1}{2}\text{grad}(|V|^2) \in L^1(\Gamma).$$

Proof. For smooth vector fields $V, X \in \Gamma$, we compute

$$\frac{1}{2}\langle \text{grad}(|V|^2), X \rangle = \frac{1}{2}X(|V|^2) = \langle \nabla_X V, V \rangle = \langle X, \nabla_V V + [(\nabla V)^T - (\nabla V)](V) \rangle.$$

A short computation in normal coordinates shows that $[(\nabla V)^T - (\nabla V)](V) = -\text{curl}(V)JV$, which proves the desired equation for $V \in \Gamma$. Using a density argument combined with the Sobolev embedding for $p = \frac{4}{3}$ we conclude that the equality holds at least in $L^1(\Gamma)$. All remaining cases of p follow from Hölder's inequality due to the compactness of M . ■

In the previous lemma, the condition $V \in W^{1,p}(\Gamma)$ guarantes that $|V|^2$ is at least in $W^{1,1}$. More precisely, for $V \in H^1(\Gamma)$, a simple application of Hölder's inequality and the Sobolev embedding (L^p_{\leq}) yields

$$\|\text{grad}(|V|^2)\|_{L^r} \leq 2\|\nabla V\|_{L^2}\|V\|_{L^q} \leq C(M)\|V\|_{H^1}^2,$$

for any $r \in (1, 2)$ and $q \in (2, \infty]$ such that $\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{q}$. This implies $|V|^2 \in W^{1,r}$.

However, the situation is more involved when $V \in L_T^2(J_{H_0^1}) \cap L_T^\infty(J_{L^2})$ and we aim to prove that $\nabla_V V \in L_T^2(L^r(\Gamma))$. In this Bochner space setting, the spatial estimates from before are insufficient. To resolve this, we need to assume additional regularity for $\text{curl}(V)$. The core idea is that via the Gagliardo–Nirenberg interpolation inequality (Theorem 3.2) we can control the problematic term $\|V\|_{L^q}$ using $\|\nabla V\|_{L^2}$. Then, since $\text{div}(V) = 0$, Gaffney's inequality (Lemma 3.3) allows the additional vorticity regularity to control this resulting term. We rigorously establish this result in the next theorem.

Theorem 3.6 ($|V|^2$ regularity).

Let $r \in (1, 2)$, $T \in (0, \infty)$, $V \in L_T^2(J_{H_0^1}) \cap L_T^\infty(J_{L^2})$ and $\text{curl}(V) \in L_T^2(W^{1,r}) \cap L_T^\infty(L^r)$. Then $|V|^2 \in L_T^2(W^{1,r})$. In particular this implies that $\nabla_V V \in L_T^2(L^r(\Gamma))$.

Proof. The proof follows the strategy outlined above; full details are provided in the supplementary material. ■

Lastly, we present the theorem used to express the viscosity term $2\nu(D_V, \nabla W)$ in terms of vorticity and curvature.

Theorem 3.7 (δD_V).

For any $V, W \in H^1(\Gamma)$, the equality $(D_V, D_W) = (D_V, \nabla W)$ holds. Furthermore, if $V \in J_{H_0^1}$ and $\text{curl}(V) \in W^{1,r}$ for some $r \in (1, 2)$, we have

$$2(D_V, \nabla W) = (\text{rot}(\text{curl}(V)) - 2\kappa V, W), \quad (3.1)$$

for all $W \in H_0^1(\Gamma)$.

Proof. First, for any $V, W \in \Gamma$ the identity $(D_V, D_W) = (D_V, \nabla W)$ follows from the fact that D_V is symmetric. This is easily seen for smooth fields and extends to $H^1(\Gamma)$ by density.

Next, we prove (3.1) following an idea from [24, p.89]. Let $W \in \Gamma_0$. Using the first part of the proof and Green's formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2(D_V, \nabla W) &= 2(\delta(D_W), V) = (\Delta_{\text{dR}} W, V) - 2(\kappa W, V) \\ &= (\text{rot}(\text{curl}(V)), W) - 2(\kappa V, W). \end{aligned}$$

The second equality uses the identity $2\delta(D_W) = \Delta_{\text{dR}} W - 2\kappa W$, which follows from combining $2\delta(D_W) = \delta(\nabla W) - \kappa W - \text{grad}(\text{div}(W))$ (see [54, 6, Lem 2.1; II.E]) with the Weitzenböck formula $\delta(\nabla W) = \Delta_{\text{dR}} W - \kappa W$ [57, p.26] and the fact that $\text{div}(V) = 0$. Finally, a density argument combined with the Sobolev embedding (L^p_{\leq}) extends this result to all $W \in H_0^1(\Gamma)$. ■

3.2. Hodge decomposition

We now turn to the Hodge decomposition, which forms the geometric backbone of all vorticity equations discussed in this work. As the earlier symbolic derivation demonstrates, this decomposition is essential for splitting the velocity field into a scalar streamfunction and a harmonic component. While this fundamental geometric tool is well-known, precise statements for general $H^k(\Gamma)$ spaces on surfaces with a $C^{k,1}$ boundary can be surprisingly difficult to locate in the literature.

To properly set the stage for this theorem, we first need a deeper understanding of the space of harmonic fields H_N . We therefore begin by deriving a stronger version of Gaffney's inequality (Lemma 3.3) that relies on relaxed boundary conditions.

Theorem 3.8 (Embedding of $H_0(\text{div}) \cap H(\text{curl})$).

Let M be a surface with $\partial M \in C^{k,1}$ for $k \geq 1$. Then the following continuous embedding holds

$$\{V \in H_0(\text{div}) \cap H(\text{curl}) \mid \text{div}(V), \text{curl}(V) \in H^{k-1}\} \hookrightarrow H^k(\Gamma).$$

Define the space of harmonic fields as $H_N := \{X \in J_{L^2} \cap H(\text{curl}) \mid \text{curl}(X) = 0\}$. Then H_N is a finite-dimensional subspace of $H^k(\Gamma)$.

Proof. For the base case $k = 1$, the result for bounded domains in \mathbb{R}^2 is established in [24, Prop I.3.1]. Crucially, this result also holds for general Riemannian metrics, which allows the extension to surfaces via a standard partition of unity argument. For $k \geq 2$, the result is obtained by combining the base case with higher regularity results for the Dirichlet and Neumann Laplace equations (see [24, Thm I.1.8, I.1.10] and [57, Lem 3.4.7, Cor 3.4.8]).

To prove the finite dimensionality of H_N , we apply this theorem (with $k = 1$) to any $H \in H_N$. Since $\text{div}(H) = 0$ and $\text{curl}(H) = 0$, we obtain the norm equivalence $\|H\|_{H^1} \leq C(M)\|H\|_{L^2}$. This estimate, combined with Rellich's lemma, implies that the unit ball of H_N in $L^2(\Gamma)$ is compact. Therefore, H_N must be finite-dimensional. ■

Remark 3.9. The dimension of the harmonic fields is determined solely by a topological invariant of the surface: $\dim(H_N) = b_1(M)$, where $b_1(M)$ is the first Betti number. Even for surfaces with only $C^{0,1}$ boundary, one can show that H_N remains finite-dimensional and satisfies this property, though the arguments are more involved (see, e.g., [40, Thm 11.1]).

Theorem 3.10 (Hodge decomposition).

Let M be a surface with a $C^{k,1}$ boundary for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then the following unique L^2 -orthogonal decomposition holds

$$H^k(\Gamma) = \text{grad}(H^{k+1} \cap L_0^2) \oplus \text{rot}(H^{k+1} \cap H_0^1) \oplus H^k(\Gamma) \cap H_N.$$

In particular, for $k = 0$ this intersection is H_N , while for $k \geq 1$, Theorem 3.8 implies that $H^k(\Gamma) \cap H_N = H_N$.

Proof. For surfaces with $C^{0,1}$ boundary, the base case ($k = 0$) is a consequence of [39, Thm 8.2], obtained by dualizing their results for differential forms to vector fields. When $k \geq 1$ and $V \in H^k(\Gamma)$ we use this base case to write $V = \text{grad}(q) + \text{rot}(\psi) + H$ for $q \in H^1 \cap L_0^2$, $\psi \in H_0^1$ and $H \in H_N$. The regularity of the harmonic component, $H \in H^k(\Gamma)$, follows immediately from Theorem 3.8. For the potentials q and ψ , applying div and curl to V reveals that they solve Neumann and Dirichlet Laplace problems, respectively, with source terms in H^{k-1} . Consequently, standard elliptic regularity results for surfaces (see [24, Thm I.1.8, I.1.10] and [57, Lem 3.4.7, Cor 3.4.8]) imply that $q \in H^{k+1}$ and $\psi \in H^{k+1}$. ■

Remark 3.11. We conclude with three important notes on the scope of the Hodge decomposition. First, the standard $H^1(\Gamma)$ decomposition used in our main theorems (e.g., Theorem 2.6 and Theorem 2.10) generally requires a $C^{1,1}$ boundary and does not hold for $C^{0,1}$ boundaries. Second, this requirement can be relaxed in specific cases. For $s \in (2, 4]$, stronger regularity results for the Laplace problem on $C^{0,1}$ surfaces exist [21, 59]. By arguments similar to those used above, these results imply a corresponding $L^s(\Gamma)$ Hodge decomposition, which would allow proving Theorem 2.6 for this range of s without assuming a $C^{1,1}$ boundary. We do not pursue this generalization here, but mention it for completeness. Finally, if M is topologically a disc with a finite number of disjoint subdiscs removed, the harmonic space H_N can be parameterized by potentials in $\text{rot}(H^{k+1})$. In this special case, the entire Hodge decomposition can be expressed using purely scalar functions (see [24, Thm I.3.2] and [66, Prop 5]).

4. Regularity of the velocity formulation

The equivalence theorems (Theorem 2.6 and 2.10) constitute a central result of this work, yet they rely on specific regularity assumptions for the velocity field. This section is dedicated to providing the rigorous justification for these conditions.

We achieve this by establishing regularity results for the velocity formulation on surfaces, generalizing classical theorems from bounded domains in \mathbb{R}^2 . This extension necessitates the development of specific analytic tools, such as a generalized Stokes regularity theorem and a Poincaré–Morrey inequality, which are essential for handling the viscous term on general surfaces. Beyond verifying the equivalence, these results also provide the necessary functional-analytic basis for subsequent convergence analysis of the equivalent vorticity formulations.

4.1. Regularity results for the Navier–Stokes equation

In this section, we extend a regularity result for the Navier–Stokes equations by Heywood and Rannacher [29, p.7–14], which they proved for bounded domains in \mathbb{R}^2 . However, the original proof relies on the specific characterization of the viscosity term ($2\nu(D_V, \nabla W) = \nu(\nabla V, \nabla W)$) that holds only due to the flatness, meaning it cannot be applied directly to general surfaces.

Thus, our aim is to investigate the general structure of the viscosity term and prove that the underlying techniques can be carried over to surfaces. We begin by stating the corresponding theorem and subsequently discuss the required adjustments for the proof. In preparation for this, we define the finite-dimensional space of Killing fields – fields whose flows are isometries – as $\mathcal{K} := \{K \in H^1(\Gamma) \mid D_K = 0, \langle K, N \rangle|_{\partial M} = 0\}$. Note that for closed surfaces ($\partial M = \emptyset$), this space plays a fundamental role in establishing the regularity results. We denote by $P_{\mathcal{K}} : L^2(\Gamma) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ the L^2 -orthogonal projection onto this space.

Theorem 4.1 (Navier–Stokes regularity).

Let M have a $C^{2,1}$ boundary. Assume $V_0 \in H^2(\Gamma) \cap J_{H_0^1}$ and $F, \partial_t F \in L^\infty(L^2(\Gamma))$ with $\partial_t F \in C([0, \infty); L^2(\Gamma))$. Further let $P_{\mathcal{K}}(F) \in L_\infty^1(L^2(\Gamma))$ if $\partial M = \emptyset$ and define $\tau_t := \min\{1, t\}$. Then there exists a unique solution (V, p) of Equation (P) for $\nu > 0$, such that the tuple $(V, \partial_t V, p, \sqrt{\tau} \partial_t V) \in C([0, \infty); H^2(\Gamma) \cap J_{H_0^1} \times J_{L^2} \times H^1 \cap L_0^2 \times J_{H_0^1})$ and

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \infty)} \{ \|V_t\|_{H^2} + \|\partial_t V_t\|_{L^2} + \|p_t\|_{H^1} + \sqrt{\tau_t} \|\partial_t V_t\|_{H^1} \} \leq C(M), \quad (\text{NS}_R^1)$$

where $C(M)$ is a positive constant. In addition, $\|V_t - V_0\|_{H^2} \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0$ and it holds that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \infty)} \left\{ e^{-t} \int_0^t e^s (\|\partial_s V_s\|_{H^1}^2 + \tau_s (\|\partial_s V_s\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\partial_s^2 V_s\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_s p_s\|_{H^1}^2)) ds \right\} \leq C(M). \quad (\text{NS}_R^2)$$

STREAMFUNCTION-VORTICITY FORMULATION FOR FLOWS

Remark 4.2. The time weighting factors in the estimates serve two distinct purposes. First, the factor $\tau_t := \min\{1, t\}$ is introduced to damp potentially diverging contributions near $t = 0$, as uniform bounds cannot be guaranteed for general initial data. Conversely, the exponential factor e^{-t} in Equation (NS_R²) guarantees that the expression $\sup_{t \in [0, \infty)} e^{-t} \int_0^t e^s(\dots) ds$ stays bounded as long as the integrand is bounded. If one is only interested in estimates for finite time $T > 0$, the exponential factors may be replaced by 1. Under these conditions, the integral estimate (NS_R²) implies the following weak time regularity: $\partial_t V \in L_T^2(J_{H_0^1})$, $\sqrt{\tau} \partial_t V \in L_T^2(H^2(\Gamma) \cap J_{H_0^1})$, $\sqrt{\tau} \partial_t^2 V \in L_T^2(J_{L^2})$, and $\sqrt{\tau} \partial_t p \in L_T^2(H^1 \cap L_0^2)$. Finally, we note that while Heywood and Rannacher [29, Thm 2.3] proved this theorem for bounded domains in \mathbb{R}^2 with C^2 boundaries, the slightly stronger assumption of $C^{2,1}$ boundary regularity used here is required by the generalized Stokes regularity theorem (Theorem 4.8), below.

Next we briefly discuss some adaptations that have to be made to the proof of Heywood and Rannacher in order to extend it to surfaces. We begin by detailing the necessary steps for surfaces with a boundary, i.e. $\partial M \neq \emptyset$. Afterwards, we address the case $\partial M = \emptyset$.

- (1) **Poincaré Inequality Adaptation:** The original proof frequently relies on the standard Poincaré inequality, i.e., $\|\cdot\|_{H^1} \leq C(M) \|\nabla \cdot\|_{L^2}$, which often leads to simplifications in combination with the Euclidean viscosity term $\nu(\nabla V, \nabla \cdot)$. Since on surfaces the viscosity term is $2\nu(D_V, D_\cdot)$ (see Theorem 3.7), we must replace the classical Poincaré inequality with a Poincaré–Morrey inequality (derived in Corollary 4.6 below), which establishes the analogous bound $\|\cdot\|_{H^1} \leq C(M) \|D_\cdot\|_{L^2}$.
- (2) **Stokes Regularity Adaptation:** For second-order estimates, the original proof relies on controlling the H^2 -norm by the L^2 -norm of $P(\Delta_{\text{dR}} \cdot)$, where $P : L^2(\Gamma) \rightarrow J_{L^2}$ is the orthogonal projection into J_{L^2} . This statement is a consequence of the Euclidean Stokes regularity theorem. The operator $P(\Delta_{\text{dR}} \cdot)$ arises naturally because the Euclidean viscosity term takes the strong form $\delta \nabla = \Delta_{\text{dR}}$. However, since the strong form of the viscosity term on surfaces is $2\delta D$, we require a generalized Stokes regularity theorem (derived in Theorem 4.8 below). This allows us to control the H^2 -norm by the L^2 -norm of $P(\delta D_\cdot)$.

With these two adapted estimates, the exact norm estimates and bounds from the original proof can be carried over directly, which concludes the derivation for surfaces with nonempty boundaries.

Finally, we address the case of closed surfaces, i.e. $\partial M = \emptyset$. The primary distinction here is that the solution space $J_{H_0^1}$ allows nontrivial elements of the finite-dimensional space of Killing fields \mathcal{K} . The presence of such fields prevents the direct application of the Poincaré–Morrey inequality and the generalized Stokes regularity theorem (established below in Corollary 4.6 and Theorem 4.8). Note that this issue does not arise when $\partial M \neq \emptyset$, as the boundary conditions inherent to $J_{H_0^1}$ force all Killing fields to vanish (see Theorem B.5 below).

To control the contributions from Killing fields, we decompose the space as $J_{H_0^1} = \mathcal{K} \oplus J_{\mathcal{K}}^\perp$, where $J_{\mathcal{K}}^\perp := \{V \in J_{H_0^1} \mid V \in \ker(P_{\mathcal{K}})\}$ forms the L^2 -orthogonal complement to \mathcal{K} . Accordingly, we uniquely split the velocity field into $V = V_{\mathcal{K}} + V_\perp$.

By exploiting the identities $0 = (\nabla_W W, K) = (D_W, \nabla K) = (\nabla_K K, W)$, which hold for any $W \in J_{H_0^1}$ and $K \in \mathcal{K}$, we can split the Navier–Stokes equations (NS_V) for a.e. $t \in (0, T)$ into:

$$\langle \partial_t V_{\mathcal{K}, t}, K \rangle = (F_t, K), \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{K}, \quad (\mathcal{K})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \partial_t V_{\perp, t}, W \rangle = & (F_t, W) - (\nabla_{V_{\perp, t}} V_{\perp, t}, W) - (\nabla_{V_{\mathcal{K}, t}} V_{\perp, t}, W) \\ & - (\nabla_{V_{\perp, t}} V_{\mathcal{K}, t}, W) - 2\nu(D_{V_{\perp, t}}, \nabla W), \quad \forall W \in J_{\mathcal{K}}^\perp. \end{aligned} \quad (\mathcal{K}^\perp)$$

The initial conditions for $V_{\mathcal{K}}$ and V_\perp are determined by the projection of $V_0 = V_{\mathcal{K}, 0} + V_{\perp, 0}$. Thus, it remains to show that this system for $V_{\mathcal{K}}$ and V_\perp has a unique solution with the required regularity.

First, we observe that the equation for the Killing component (\mathcal{K}) admits the explicit unique solution $V_{\mathcal{K},t} = V_{\mathcal{K},0} + \int_0^t P_{\mathcal{K}}(F_s)ds$. Given the assumptions on the force F and the properties of Killing fields (see Theorem B.5 below), it follows that $V_{\mathcal{K}}, \partial_t V_{\mathcal{K}}, \partial_t^2 V_{\mathcal{K}} \in C([0, \infty); \mathcal{K}) \cap L^\infty(\mathcal{K})$, satisfying all necessary regularity conditions.

Next, we address the equation for the orthogonal component (\mathcal{K}^\perp). Since the space $J_{\mathcal{K}}^\perp$ admits both the Poincaré–Morrey inequality and the Stokes regularity theorem, we can proceed with the same norm estimates as in the case with boundary ($\partial M \neq \emptyset$). The only potential difference arises from the convective terms involving $V_{\mathcal{K}}$. However, using the identity $(\nabla_K K, W) = 0$, these terms can always be rewritten in the form $(\nabla_V V, W)$. This structural property, combined with the established regularity of $V_{\mathcal{K}}$, allows us to close the required estimates for V_\perp .

The remainder of this section is dedicated to establishing the Poincaré–Morrey inequality and the Stokes regularity theorem, thereby providing the rigorous justification for the adaptations discussed above. We begin with Korn’s inequality on $J_{H_0^1}$, which serves as a fundamental prerequisite for the Poincaré–Morrey estimate.

Theorem 4.3 (Korn inequality).

There exists a positive constant $C(M)$ such that $\|\nabla V\|_{L^2} \leq C(M) (\|V\|_{L^2}^2 + \|D_V\|_{L^2}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ holds for all $V \in J_{H_0^1}$. In particular, for closed surfaces ($\partial M = \emptyset$), this estimate implies that the space $\mathcal{K} \subset J_{H_0^1}$ is finite-dimensional.

Proof. Let $V \in \mathcal{V} := \{X \in \Gamma_0 \mid \operatorname{div}(X) = 0\}$. We compute

$$2\|D_V\|_{L^2}^2 = 2(D_V, \nabla V) = \|\nabla V\|_{L^2}^2 - (\kappa V, V) \geq \|\nabla V\|_{L^2}^2 - C(M)\|V\|_{L^2}^2.$$

We obtain the first equality via Theorem 3.7, while the second follows from Green’s formula and the identity $2\delta(D_V) = \delta(\nabla V) - \kappa V - \operatorname{grad}(\operatorname{div}(V))$ (see [54, Lem 2.1] or [6, II.E]). For the final inequality, we rely on the compactness of M , which implies that the Gaussian curvature κ is bounded from above by some positive constant $C(M)$. The result extends to $J_{H_0^1}$ by density (see Theorem 5.3 below).

For closed surfaces ($\partial M = \emptyset$), combining this Korn inequality with Rellich’s lemma proves that the unit ball of the Killing field space \mathcal{K} is compact in $L^2(\Gamma)$. Consequently, \mathcal{K} is finite-dimensional. ■

Remark 4.4. As one would expect, the space \mathcal{K} remains finite-dimensional even for surfaces with non-empty boundary (see, e.g., [50, Lemma 6]). However, in this case, Killing fields do not contribute to the solution space: as shown in Theorem B.5 3.) below, the intersection $J_{H_0^1} \cap \mathcal{K}$ is trivial.

Using Korn’s inequality, we next establish the Poincaré–Morrey inequality on appropriate subspaces of $J_{H_0^1}$.

Theorem 4.5 (Poincaré–Morrey inequality on subspaces of $J_{H_0^1}$).

Let $\mathcal{V} \subset J_{H_0^1}$ be a closed subspace such that $\mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{K} = \{0\}$. Then there exists a positive constant $C(M)$ such that the Poincaré–Morrey inequality

$$\|V\|_{H^1} \leq C(M)\|D_V\|_{L^2} \tag{PM}_{\leq}$$

holds for all $V \in \mathcal{V}$.

Proof. We prove Equation (PM_{\leq}) by contradiction. Assume the inequality does not hold. Then there exists a sequence $Y_n \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $\|Y_n\|_{H^1} = 1$ and $\|D_{Y_n}\|_{L^2} < \frac{1}{n}$. By Rellich’s lemma and Korn’s inequality (Theorem 4.3), we can extract a subsequence that is Cauchy in $\|\cdot\|_{H^1}$. Since \mathcal{V} is closed, the limit Y belongs to \mathcal{V} and must satisfy $D_Y = 0$ and $\|Y\|_{H^1} = 1$. The condition $D_Y = 0$ implies $Y \in \mathcal{K}$. However, since $\mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{K} = \{0\}$, we must have $Y = 0$, which contradicts the normalization $\|Y\|_{H^1} = 1$. Thus, the estimate holds. ■

STREAMFUNCTION-VORTICITY FORMULATION FOR FLOWS

Finally, we apply the general result to the specific solution spaces of the Navier–Stokes equations.

Corollary 4.6 (Poincaré–Morrey inequality).

The Poincaré–Morrey inequality (PM_≤) holds on $J_{H_0^1}$ if $\partial M \neq \emptyset$, and on $J_{\mathcal{K}}^\perp$ if $\partial M = \emptyset$.

Proof. In both cases, the spaces $J_{H_0^1}$ and $J_{\mathcal{K}}^\perp$ are closed subspaces of $H^1(\Gamma)$. Furthermore, the requirement that the intersection with \mathcal{K} is trivial is satisfied: for $J_{H_0^1}$ (when $\partial M \neq \emptyset$), this follows from Theorem B.5 3.) below, while for $J_{\mathcal{K}}^\perp$, it holds by construction. Thus, the result follows directly from Theorem 4.5. \blacksquare

Remark 4.7. For closed surfaces ($\partial M = \emptyset$), Theorem 4.3 ensures that \mathcal{K} is finite-dimensional. This property guarantees the unique L^2 -orthogonal decomposition $J_{H_0^1} = \mathcal{K} \oplus J_{\mathcal{K}}^\perp$.

With the Poincaré–Morrey inequality established, we prove the following Stokes regularity theorem. We observe that for closed surfaces, the variational formulation is only solvable if the force vanishes on the Killing fields, as D and div vanish on this subspace.

Theorem 4.8 (Stokes regularity theorem).

Let $F \in H^{-1}(\Gamma)$. In the case of closed surfaces ($\partial M = \emptyset$), we additionally assume the compatibility condition $\langle F, K \rangle = 0$ for all $K \in \mathcal{K}$. Then the problem

$$(D_V, D_W) - (p, \text{div}(W)) = \langle F, W \rangle, \quad \forall W \in H_0^1(\Gamma) \quad (4.1)$$

admits a unique solution $V \in \begin{cases} J_{H_0^1}, & \text{if } \partial M \neq \emptyset \\ J_{\mathcal{K}}^\perp, & \text{if } \partial M = \emptyset \end{cases}$ and $p \in L_0^2$ satisfying

$$\|V\|_{H^1} + \|p\|_{L^2} \leq C(M)\|F\|_{H^{-1}},$$

for a positive constant $C(M)$. Furthermore, if M has a $C^{2,1}$ boundary and $F \in L^2(\Gamma)$, then $V \in H^2(\Gamma)$, $p \in H^1(\Gamma)$ and

$$\|V\|_{H^2} + \|p\|_{H^1} \leq C(M)\|F\|_{L^2}.$$

Proof. The existence and uniqueness of the solution pair (V, p) follow from Brezzi’s splitting theorem [9, Thm III.4.3], which applies here due to the Poincaré–Morrey inequality (Corollary 4.6) and the upcoming Theorem 5.2, which we postpone to Section 5.

Next, we establish the higher regularity results assuming $F \in L^2(\Gamma)$. Our approach is inspired by [27, Ch 7.3.3] and [24, Thm I.5.5], relating the Stokes solution to the biharmonic equation. Let $W \in \Gamma_0$. Using the identity (3.1) and Green’s formula, we obtain the relation

$$(\text{curl}(V), \text{curl}(W)) = (2F + 2\kappa V, W) + (2p, \text{div}(W)).$$

By density, this identity extends to all $W \in H_0^1(\Gamma)$.

We now employ the Hodge decomposition (Theorem 3.10) to write $V = \text{rot}(\psi) + H$, with $\psi \in H^2 \cap H_0^1$ and $H \in H_N$. Crucially, due to the $C^{2,1}$ boundary, Theorem 3.8 establishes $H_N \hookrightarrow H^2(\Gamma)$. This yields the bound $\|H\|_{H^2} \leq C(M)\|H\|_{L^2} \leq C(M)\|V\|_{L^2}$, where the last step uses the L^2 -orthogonality of the decomposition.

It remains to prove that $\psi \in H^3$. To do this, we choose a test function of the form $W = \text{rot}(\varphi)$ with $\varphi \in H_0^2$. Substituting this into the previous identity yields

$$(\Delta_{\text{dR}}\psi, \Delta_{\text{dR}}\varphi) = (2F + 2\kappa V, \text{rot}(\varphi)), \quad \forall \varphi \in H_0^2.$$

In other words, ψ is a weak solution to the biharmonic equation with a source term $2F + 2\kappa V$ in L^2 (since $F \in L^2$ and $\kappa \in L^\infty$). Relying on standard regularity estimates for the biharmonic equation (see,

e.g., [24, Thm I.1.11]; the generalization to surfaces with $C^{2,1}$ boundary is straightforward but tedious), we conclude that $\psi \in H^3$ and satisfies the bound $\|\psi\|_{H^3} \leq C(M)\|F\|_{L^2}$. This establishes the desired regularity for V .

Finally, the regularity of the pressure follows from its construction and the established regularity of F and V , implying $p \in H^1$ with $\|p\|_{H^1} \leq C(M)\|F\|_{L^2}$. ■

Remark 4.9. To establish the regularity result, we reduced the Stokes problem to the biharmonic equation. This approach, known from [27, Ch 7.3.3] and [24, Thm I.5.5], allows for a very elementary proof but has the drawback of requiring a $C^{2,1}$ boundary. For bounded domains in \mathbb{R}^2 , it is established that these regularity results hold for C^2 boundaries (see [12]). Thus, we expect that the present result could be extended to C^2 surfaces by different techniques.

4.2. Regularity results for the Euler equation

For the Euler equations, a substantial body of regularity theory already exists in the literature (see, e.g., [62, Appendix III] for an overview). Unlike the Navier–Stokes case, where we had to generalize planar results to surfaces, regularity results for the Euler equations on surfaces with smooth boundaries are well-established.

Therefore, we state the following theorem. The specific formulation presented here – including the functional setting and the treatment of the time-dependent external force – follows the work of Temam [61, Thm 2.1], who established the result for bounded planar domains with a C^5 boundary. To justify the validity of this result on general surfaces, we refer to the geometric framework developed by Ebin and Marsden [16]. In their seminal work, they transfer the problem from the classical equations to the task of finding geodesics on the group of volume-preserving diffeomorphisms, a reformulation that allows them to apply methods from global analysis and infinite-dimensional geometry. Although their main exposition focuses on time-independent forces for simplicity, they explicitly remark that the external force may depend on time. We expect that their geometric techniques can be adapted to the functional setting of Temam, thereby yielding the following result for surfaces.

Theorem 4.10 (Euler regularity).

Let M have a C^∞ boundary. Assume $V_0 \in H^3(\Gamma) \cap J_{L^2}$ and $F \in L_\infty^1(H^3(\Gamma))$. Then there exists a unique solution $(V, p) \in L_\infty^\infty(H^3(\Gamma) \cap J_{L^2} \times H^2 \cap L_0^2)$ to Equation (P) (with $\nu = 0$) such that $V \in C([0, \infty); H^3(\Gamma) \cap J_{L^2})$ and $\|V_t - V_0\|_{H^3} \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0$. Furthermore, if $F \in C([0, \infty); H^2(\Gamma))$, then the solution satisfies $(\partial_t V, p) \in C([0, \infty); H^2(\Gamma) \cap J_{L^2} \times H^3 \cap L_0^2)$.

5. Equivalence of velocity and vorticity formulations

Having justified the necessary regularity assumptions in the previous section, our main goal here is to provide the rigorous justification for the symbolic equivalence proofs presented in Section 2.2 and Section 2.3. This involves two main tasks: verifying that the vorticity formulations (including their initial conditions) are well-defined, and proving the equivalence theorems for both the Navier–Stokes and Euler equations.

We begin, however, by addressing foundational aspects of the velocity formulation that were previously deferred to maintain the narrative flow. Specifically, we establish the continuity of the initial conditions and outline the rigorous construction of the pressure (Proposition 2.2). Note that for the latter, the full technical proof is provided only in the supplementary material to ensure readability.

Lemma 5.1 (Well-defined initial condition of Definition 2.1 (Velocity formulation)).

Let V be a solution to the velocity formulation of the Navier–Stokes (NS_V) or Euler (E_V) equations. Then $V \in C([0, T], J_{L^2})$.

Proof. For the Navier–Stokes case, applying the Gagliardo–Nirenberg interpolation inequality (GN_≤) (with $p = 4$ and $a = 2$) shows that the right-hand side of Equation (NS_V) lies in $L_T^2((J_{H_0^1})')$ (cf. [23, p.157-159] for bounded domains in \mathbb{R}^2). Thus, identifying $\partial_t V$ with this expression in the sense of the weak Bochner derivative for Gelfand triples, we obtain

$$\partial_t V = F - (\nabla_V V, \cdot) - 2\nu(D_V, \nabla \cdot) \in L_T^2((J_{H_0^1})'). \quad (\text{NS}_{\partial_t V})$$

This regularity implies that $V \in C([0, T], J_{L^2})$, ensuring that the evaluation at $t = 0$ is well-defined. The same argument applies to the Euler equation (E_V), with the modification that the derivative lies in a different dual space

$$\partial_t V = F - (\nabla_V V, \cdot) \in L_T^2((H^1(\Gamma) \cap J_{L^2})'). \quad (\text{E}_{\partial_t V})$$

This yields the corresponding continuity result for the inviscid case. ■

We now turn to the proof of Proposition 2.2 (Pressure), which asserts the existence and regularity of the pressure p . Establishing this requires two fundamental results regarding the divergence operator. The first shows that div is an isomorphism on an appropriate subspace, while the second characterizes functionals that vanish on divergence-free fields. Since the proofs of these statements for bounded domains in \mathbb{R}^2 rely on standard Banach space arguments, they generalize directly to surfaces.

Theorem 5.2 (Divergence is an isomorphism).

Let $H_0^1(\Gamma) = J_{H_0^1} \oplus (J_{H_0^1})^\perp$ be the orthogonal decomposition with respect to the inner product $(\nabla \cdot, \nabla \cdot)$. Then the divergence operator induces an isomorphism $\text{div} : (J_{H_0^1})^\perp \rightarrow L_0^2$.

Proof. For bounded domains in \mathbb{R}^2 , this is proven in [24, Cor I.2.4]. ■

Theorem 5.3 (Density results and Pressure).

Let $\mathcal{V} := \{V \in \Gamma_0 \mid \text{div}(V) = 0\}$. If $F \in H^{-1}(\Gamma)$ satisfies $\langle F, W \rangle = 0$ for all $W \in \mathcal{V}$, then there exists a unique $p \in L_0^2$ such that $\langle F, \cdot \rangle = -(p, \text{div}(\cdot))$. In particular, this implies the density results $J_{L^2} = \overline{\mathcal{V}}^{\|\cdot\|_{L^2}}$ and $J_{H_0^1} = \overline{\mathcal{V}}^{\|\cdot\|_{H^1}}$.

Proof. For bounded domains in \mathbb{R}^2 , the existence of the pressure is established in [24, Thm I.2.3], while the density results are proven in [24, Cor I.2.5, Thm I.2.8]. ■

We are now in a position to rigorously construct the pressure as stated in Proposition 2.2. We note that while this procedure is standard for the Navier–Stokes equations, its application to the Euler equations is less common in this functional setting. However, consistent with our unified definition, this construction remains valid and applies analogously.

Proof. [Proof of Proposition 2.2] The proof strategy corresponds to the standard Navier–Stokes approach found in [23, p.160] and relies fundamentally on Theorem 5.2 and Theorem 5.3 established above. For completeness, the full detailed proof is provided in the supplementary material. ■

5.1. Vorticity formulation (Navier–Stokes)

In this subsection, we complete the proof of the equivalence between the velocity and vorticity formulations for the Navier–Stokes equations. We begin by establishing the well-definedness of the vorticity formulation in the following lemma, which serves as a necessary prerequisite for the main equivalence proof.

Lemma 5.4 (Well-definedness of Definition 2.3 (vorticity formulation NS)).

Let $s \in (2, \infty)$ with dual exponent $r \in (1, 2)$, i.e., $\frac{1}{s} + \frac{1}{r} = 1$ and $T \in (0, \infty)$. For any tuple (ψ, H, ω, p^*) satisfying the regularity assumptions of Definition 2.3, the following holds:

i.) $(\psi, H) \in C([0, T]; H_0^1 \times H_N)$, ensuring that the initial conditions are well-defined.

ii.) The equations Equations (NS_ω^2) and (NS_{p^*}) are well-defined.

Proof.

i.) We first establish the time continuity of the resulting velocity field $V = \text{rot}(\psi) + H$. By construction, $V \in L_T^2(L^s(\Gamma) \cap J_{L^2})$. The kinematic equation (NS_ω^1) implies that $\text{curl}(V) = \omega \in L_T^2(W^{1,r})$. Applying Lemma 3.1, we find that $\omega \in L_T^2(L^2)$. Consequently, Corollary 3.4 applies, yielding the enhanced regularity $V \in L_T^2(J_{H_0^1})$. To conclude the continuity of V , we examine its time derivative. Since $\partial_t V \in L_T^2(L^r(\Gamma))$, the Sobolev Embedding Theorem (Equation (L_{\leq}^p)) implies $\partial_t V \in L_T^2((J_{H_0^1})')$ within the context of the Gelfand triple $J_{H_0^1} \subset J_{L^2} \subset (J_{H_0^1})'$. This regularity implies that $V \in C([0, T]; J_{L^2})$.

Since the decomposition $V = \text{rot}(\psi) + H$ is L^2 -orthogonal, the continuity of V directly implies $(\psi, H) \in C([0, T]; H_0^1 \times H_N)$, ensuring the initial conditions are well-defined. We also note that this continuity of V extends to the vorticity viewed as a functional, implying $(\omega, \cdot) \in C([0, T]; (H^1)')$.

ii.) Equations Equation (NS_ω^2) and Equation (NS_{p^*}) are required to hold in L_T^2 with values in the appropriate spatial dual spaces. For most linear terms, this follows immediately from Hölder's inequality. We therefore focus on the three critical terms: the nonlinear convection ωJV , the time derivatives, and the curvature term κV .

Nonlinear Term: Since $V \in C([0, T]; J_{L^2}) \subset L_T^\infty(J_{L^2})$ and $\omega \in L_T^2(W^{1,r})$, we can estimate the term ωJV against a test function $X \in L^s(\Gamma)$ following the reasoning in Lemma 3.1: $\|(\omega JV, X)\|_{L_T^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq \|\omega\|_{L_T^2(W^{1,r})} \|V\|_{L_T^\infty(J_{L^2})} \|X\|_{L^s}$. Thus, the nonlinear term lies in the required dual spaces. Crucially, note that this estimate requires $s \in (2, \infty)$ and would fail for smaller s .

Time Derivatives: We need to show that $\partial_t(\omega, \cdot) \in L_T^2((W^{1,s} \cap H_0^1)')$ and $\partial_t(H, \cdot) \in L_T^2((L^s(\Gamma) \cap H_N)')$. Let $\phi \in C_0^\infty(0, T)$. Using Equation (NS_ω^1) and the fact that $\partial_t V \in L_T^2(L^r(\Gamma))$, we compute for any $\chi \in W^{1,s}$

$$\int_0^T (\omega_t, \chi)(-\partial_t \phi_t) dt = \int_0^T (V_t, \text{rot}(\chi))(-\partial_t \phi_t) dt = \int_0^T \langle \partial_t V, \text{rot}(\chi) \rangle \phi_t dt.$$

STREAMFUNCTION-VORTICITY FORMULATION FOR FLOWS

Similarly, utilizing the orthogonality $\text{rot}(H_0^1) \perp^{L^2} H_N$, we find for any $Z \in L^s(\Gamma) \cap H_N$

$$\int_0^T (H_t, Z)(-\partial_t \phi_t) dt = \int_0^T (V_t, Z)(-\partial_t \phi_t) dt = \int_0^T \langle \partial_t V, Z \rangle \phi_t dt.$$

Since the spaces $W^{1,s}$ and $L^s(\Gamma) \cap H_N$ are reflexive, these identities imply the existence of weak Bochner derivatives, denoted by $\partial_t(\omega, \cdot) \in L_T^2((W^{1,s})')$ and $\partial_t(H, \cdot) \in L_T^2((L^s(\Gamma) \cap H_N)')$. The embedding $(W^{1,s})' \hookrightarrow (W^{1,s} \cap H_0^1)'$ ensures the vorticity derivative has the required regularity.

Curvature Term: Finally, since $\kappa \in L^2(\Gamma)$, the Sobolev Embedding Theorem (Equation (L_{\leq}^p)) allows us to bound the curvature term

$$\|(\kappa V, X)\|_{L_T^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq \|\kappa\|_{L^2} \|V\|_{L_T^2(J_{H_0^1})} \|X\|_{L^s}, \quad \forall X \in L^s(\Gamma).$$

■

With the well-definedness of the formulation established, we are now in a position to conclude the proof of the equivalence between the velocity and vorticity formulations by deriving the required regularity statements.

Proof. [Regularity proof of Theorem 2.6 (Equivalence of Navier–Stokes formulations)] In this proof, we provide the rigorous justification for the symbolic derivation in Section 2.2 by establishing the missing regularity statements.

- 1.) We proceed in two steps. First, in 1a.), we establish the pressure regularity $p \in L_T^2(W^{1,r} \cap L_0^2)$. Then, in 1b.), we define the quantities (ψ, H, ω, p^*) and verify they possess the regularity required by Definition 2.3 (vorticity formulation NS).
 - a.) Let $V \in L_T^2(J_{H_0^1}) \cap L_T^\infty(J_{L^2})$ be a solution to (NS_V) . We impose the additional regularity assumptions: $F, \partial_t V \in L_T^2(L^r(\Gamma)) \subset L_T^2(H^{-1}(\Gamma))$ and $\text{curl}(V) \in L_T^2(W^{1,r}) \cap L_T^\infty(L^r)$. The pressure p is defined via Proposition 2.2 (Pressure), and thus (P) holds. Utilizing the vector calculus identities established in the symbolic derivation (specifically Lemma 3.5 (Nonl. term) and Theorem 3.7 (δD_V)), we can rewrite the momentum equation in the form of (2.1). Crucially, the regularity required for this step is provided by Theorem 3.6, which ensures that the nonlinear term satisfies $|V|^2 \in L_T^2(W^{1,r})$. Since every other term in this equation belongs to $L_T^2(L^r(\Gamma))$, it follows that the pressure gradient $\text{grad}(p)$ also belongs to this space. Consequently, we conclude that $p \in L_T^2(W^{1,r} \cap L_0^2)$.
 - b.) **Streamfunction and Harmonic Field:** Since $V \in L_T^2(J_{H_0^1}) \cap L_T^\infty(J_{L^2})$, we invoke the Hodge decomposition (As_H) . We rely on the fact that this decomposition on $H^1(\Gamma)$ implies the existence of a corresponding unique L^2 -orthogonal decomposition on $L^2(\Gamma)$. Consequently, there exist unique potentials $\psi \in L_T^2(H^2 \cap H_0^1) \cap L_T^\infty(H_0^1)$ and $H \in L_T^2(H^1 \cap H_N) \cap L_T^\infty(H_N)$ such that $V = \text{rot}(\psi) + H$. The Sobolev Embedding Theorem (Equation (L_{\leq}^p)) then ensures that $(\psi, H) \in L_T^2(W^{1,s} \cap H_0^1) \times L_T^2(L^s(\Gamma) \cap H_N)$ for $s \in (2, \infty)$. Furthermore, since $V \in C([0, T]; J_{L^2})$ (see Lemma 5.1), we conclude – analogously to Lemma 5.4 i.) – that $(\psi, H) \in C([0, T]; H_0^1 \times H_N)$. This allows us to define the initial conditions $(\psi_0, H_0) = (\psi_t, H_t)|_{t=0}$. Finally, the regularity $\partial_t V \in L_T^2(L^r(\Gamma))$ implies that the time derivatives of the components satisfy $\partial_t(\text{rot}(\psi) + H) \in L_T^2(L^r(\Gamma))$.
- Vorticity:** We define $\omega := \text{curl}(V)$. By assumption, $\omega \in L_T^2(W^{1,r}) \cap L_T^\infty(L^r)$. Using the fact that $V \in L_T^2(J_{H_0^1})$ and the embedding $W^{1,r} \subset L^2$ (Lemma 3.1 (Embedding of $W^{1,r}$)), we confirm that (NS_ω^1) holds in $L_T^2((W^{1,r})')$, as derived in the symbolic proof. Regarding the time derivative, we proceed exactly as in Lemma 5.4 ii.). The regularity of $\partial_t V$ implies that the functionals satisfy $\partial_t(\omega, \cdot) \in L_T^2((W^{1,s} \cap H_0^1)')$ and $\partial_t(H, \cdot) \in L_T^2((L^s(\Gamma) \cap H_N)')$. This rigorously justifies the derivation of (NS_ω^2) .

Total Pressure: Finally, we define the total pressure $p^* := p + \frac{|V|^2}{2} - \frac{\|V\|_{L^2}^2}{2\text{Vol}(M)}$. Recall from step 1a.) that $p \in L_T^2(W^{1,r} \cap L_0^2)$. By applying Theorem 3.6 to control $|V|^2$, using Lemma 3.1 (Embedding of $W^{1,r}$), and noting that $V \in L_T^\infty(J_{L^2})$, we deduce that $p^* \in L_T^2(W^{1,r} \cap L_0^2)$.

- 2.) Let (ψ, H, ω, p^*) be a solution to (NS_ω^1) to (NS_{p^*}) , and define $V := \text{rot}(\psi) + H$. According to Lemma 5.4, we have $V \in L_T^2(J_{H_0^1}) \cap C([0, T]; J_{L^2})$. This ensures that $V \in L_T^\infty(J_{L^2})$ and that the initial condition $V_0 := V|_{t=0} \in J_{L^2}$ is well-defined. Furthermore, the regularity $\partial_t V \in L_T^2(L^r(\Gamma))$ is satisfied by definition (see Definition 2.3). Additionally, Equation (NS_ω^1) implies $\text{curl}(V) = \omega$. Since the solution space for ω is $L_T^2(W^{1,r}) \cap L_T^\infty(L^r)$, we conclude that $\text{curl}(V)$ shares this regularity.

■

Remark 5.5. If only the restricted decomposition $J_{H_0^1} = \text{rot}(H^2 \cap H_0^1) \oplus (H^1(\Gamma) \cap H_N)$ is available (rather than the full $H^1(\Gamma)$ decomposition), the previous proof still establishes the equivalence between the velocity V solving (NS_V) and the triple (ψ, H, ω) solving the kinematic and dynamic eqs. (NS_ω^1) and (NS_ω^2) .

5.2. Vorticity formulation (Euler)

In this subsection, we complete the proof of the equivalence between the velocity and vorticity formulations of the Euler equations. Many steps in this analysis are analogous to the Navier–Stokes case discussed previously. We therefore begin by establishing the following lemma, which guarantees the well-definedness of the vorticity formulation and serves as a prerequisite for the main equivalence result.

Lemma 5.6 (Well-definedness of Definition 2.8 (vorticity formulation (E))).

Let $s \in (2, \infty)$ with dual exponent $r \in (1, 2)$, i.e., $\frac{1}{s} + \frac{1}{r} = 1$ and $T \in (0, \infty)$. For any tuple (ψ, H, ω, p^*) satisfying the regularity assumptions of Definition 2.8, the following holds:

- i.) $(H, \omega) \in C([0, T]; H_N \times L^r)$, ensuring that the initial conditions are well-defined.
- ii.) Equations (E_ω^2) and (E_{p^*}) are well-defined.

Proof.

- i.) Analogously to Lemma 5.4, we derive from Equation (E_ω^1) that $V \in L_T^2(L^s(\Gamma) \cap J_{L^2})$ and $\text{curl}(V) = \omega \in L_T^2(W^{1,r}) \subset L_T^2(L^2)$. Invoking Assumption Equation (A_{SE}) , it follows that $V \in L_T^2(H^1(\Gamma) \cap J_{L^2})$. By the Sobolev Embedding Theorem (Equation (L_\leq^p)), we have $\partial_t V \in L_T^2((H^1(\Gamma) \cap J_{L^2})')$ within the context of the Gelfand triple $H^1(\Gamma) \cap J_{L^2} \subset J_{L^2} \subset (H^1(\Gamma) \cap J_{L^2})'$. This regularity implies that $V \in C([0, T]; J_{L^2})$.

As in Lemma 5.4, the orthogonality of the decomposition implies that $(\psi, H) \in C([0, T]; H_0^1) \times C([0, T]; H_N)$. Furthermore, the condition $\partial_t \omega \in L_T^2(L^r)$ implies $\omega \in C([0, T]; L^r)$, ensuring that the initial conditions are well-defined. Finally, we note that Equation (E_ω^1) uniquely determines the initial streamfunction $\psi_0 := \psi|_{t=0}$ as the solution to $(\text{rot}(\psi_0), \text{rot}(\varphi)) = (\omega_0, \varphi) \quad \forall \varphi \in H_0^1$.

- ii.) For Equation (E_ω^3) and (E_{p^*}) , the arguments from Lemma 5.4 apply directly, ensuring these equations are well-defined. We therefore focus our investigation on the vorticity transport equation

STREAMFUNCTION-VORTICITY FORMULATION FOR FLOWS

(E_ω²). The regularity assumptions on $\partial_t \omega$ and $\text{curl}(F)$ guarantee that both terms reside in $L_T^2(L^{\bar{r}})$ for any $\bar{r} \in (1, r)$.

Finally, we address the advection term $V(\omega)$. Since $V \in L_T^\infty(J_{L^2})$ and $\text{curl}(V) \in L_T^\infty(L^2)$ (as implied by the regularity of ω), Assumption Equation (A_E) allows us to conclude that $V \in L_T^\infty(H^1(\Gamma) \cap J_{L^2})$. Combining this spatial regularity with $\omega \in L_T^2(W^{1,r})$ and invoking the Sobolev Embedding Theorem (Equation (L_≤^p)), we obtain $V(\omega) \in L_T^2(L^{\bar{r}})$ for any $\bar{r} \in (1, r)$. ■

With the well-definedness of the formulation established, we are now in a position to conclude the proof of the equivalence between the velocity and vorticity formulations by deriving the missing regularity statements. The proof proceeds analogously to that of Theorem 2.6.

Proof. [Regularity proof of Theorem 2.10] In this proof, we provide the rigorous justification for the symbolic derivation in Section 2.3 by establishing the missing regularity statements. The structure of the proof mirrors exactly the regularity proof of the equivalence theorem (Theorem 2.6) for the Navier–Stokes equations. To streamline the presentation, we refer to the corresponding steps in the proof of Theorem 2.6 using the subscript NS.

1.) We proceed with the same two steps as in Step 1_{NS}.

- a.) Repeating the arguments given in 1a.)_{NS} shows that Equation (P) (with $\nu = 0$) can be cast in the form of Equation (2.1), implying that $p \in L_T^2(W^{1,r} \cap L_0^2)$. The only difference stems from the fact that we cannot directly apply Theorem 3.6 due to the different boundary conditions. However, this poses no difficulty: we can instead utilize the estimate preceding Theorem 3.6, which, in combination with the regularity $V \in L_T^\infty(H^1(\Gamma))$, yields $|V|^2 \in L_T^2(W^{1,r})$.
- b.) We repeat the arguments from Step 1b.)_{NS} to verify the regularity of (ψ, H, ω, p^*) . Invoking the Hodge decomposition for $V \in L_T^\infty(H^1(\Gamma) \cap J_{L^2})$ and using the Sobolev embeddings, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi &\in L_T^2(W^{1,s} \cap H_0^1) \cap C([0, T]; H_0^1), \\ H &\in L_T^2(L^s(\Gamma) \cap H_N) \cap C([0, T]; H_N), \\ \partial_t(\text{curl}(\psi) + H) &\in L_T^2(L^r(\Gamma)), \\ \omega &\in L_T^2(W^{1,r}) \cap L_T^\infty(L^2) \cap C([0, T]; L^r). \end{aligned}$$

This ensures the initial conditions $H_0 := H_t|_{t=0} \in H_N$ and $\omega_0 := \omega_t|_{t=0} \in L^r$ are well-defined. Using the regularity $V \in L_T^\infty(H^1(\Gamma))$ and the embedding $W^{1,r} \subset L^2$ (Lemma 3.1 (Embedding of $W^{1,r}$)), we conclude that Equation (E_ω¹) holds in $L_T^2(W^{-1,s})$. Furthermore, noting that $\partial_t \text{curl}(V) = \partial_t \omega \in L_T^2(L^r)$, we apply the arguments from Lemma 5.6 ii.) to show that $(\partial_t V, \cdot) = \partial_t(H, \cdot)$ in $L_T^2((L^s(\Gamma) \cap H_N)')$ and that $V(\omega) \in L^{\bar{r}}$ for any $\bar{r} \in (1, r)$. This justifies the derivation of Equations (E_ω²) and (E_ω³).

Finally, we define $p^* := p + \frac{|V|^2}{2} - \frac{\|V\|_{L^2}^2}{2\text{Vol}(M)}$. Since $p \in L_T^2(W^{1,r} \cap L_0^2)$ and $|V|^2 \in L_T^2(W^{1,r})$, it follows that $p^* \in L_T^2(W^{1,r} \cap L_0^2)$.

- 2.) We repeat the arguments from Step 2.)_{NS}. Additionally, we utilize the property $\omega \in L_T^\infty(L^2)$ in conjunction with Assumption Equation (A_E) to prove that $V \in L_T^\infty(H^1(\Gamma) \cap J_{L^2}) \cap C([0, T]; J_{L^2})$. Finally, in order to conclude that $\omega = \text{curl}(V)$, we must explicitly use the condition $\omega \in L_T^2(L_0^1)$ in the case where $\partial M = \emptyset$. ■

Remark 5.5 holds for the Euler case with respect to the corresponding equations.

6. Discretization and numerical examples

In this section, we translate the streamfunction-vorticity framework developed in the previous sections into a computable numerical algorithm for general surfaces. The method mirrors the non-discrete theory by relying on a discrete representation of the Hodge decomposition to decouple the flow components. As established previously, this structural approach ensures that the resulting discrete velocity fields are exactly tangential and divergence-free. Moreover, as the pressure decouples, the method is pressure-robust.

We proceed by first establishing an abstract discrete setting based on this underlying discrete Hodge decomposition. We then formulate the semi-discrete (spatially discrete) equations for both the Navier–Stokes and Euler cases. Subsequently, we present the fully discrete algorithms using an explicit time-stepping scheme. Following this, we introduce the concrete low-order finite element realization (using \mathbb{P}^1 -based streamfunction and \mathbb{P}^0 -velocity) employed in our implementation. Finally, we conclude with numerical examples that demonstrate the scheme’s ability to correctly deal with surfaces with non-trivial topology, thereby validating our vorticity formulation.

6.1. Abstract semi-discrete setting

The core of our numerical strategy relies on a discrete realization of the Hodge decomposition. Let M_h be a triangulated approximation of the surface M with a corresponding set of triangles \mathcal{T}_h , and let \mathbb{X}_h be a finite-dimensional (Hilbert) space approximating the space of tangential vector fields $L^2(\Gamma)$. Our formulation requires the existence of three auxiliary finite element (Hilbert) spaces – a potential space \mathbb{Q}_h , a streamfunction space \mathbb{S}_h , and a space of harmonic vector fields $\mathbb{H}_{h,N} \subset \mathbb{X}_h$ – which, together with discrete gradient and rotated gradient operators $\text{grad}_h : \mathbb{Q}_h \rightarrow \mathbb{X}_h$ and $\text{rot}_h : \mathbb{S}_h \rightarrow \mathbb{X}_h$, satisfy the unique orthogonal decomposition

$$\mathbb{X}_h = \text{grad}_h(\mathbb{Q}_h) \oplus \text{rot}_h(\mathbb{S}_h) \oplus \mathbb{H}_{h,N}.$$

A crucial topological requirement is that the dimension of the discrete harmonic space $\mathbb{H}_{h,N}$ matches the first Betti number of the (non-discrete) surface M , which is the dimension of H_N .

Finally, for the discretization of velocity fields in J_{L^2} , we restrict our attention to the subspace $\mathbb{V}_h \subset \mathbb{X}_h$ characterized by the reduced decomposition $\mathbb{V}_h = \text{rot}_h(\mathbb{S}_h) \oplus \mathbb{H}_{h,N}$. This corresponds to the kernel of div_h , which we define via duality as $\text{div}_h := \text{grad}_h^* : \mathbb{X}_h \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_h$. We denote the discrete space for the approximation of the vorticity ω by \mathbb{W}_h . We require that $\mathbb{S}_h \subset \mathbb{W}_h$, that $1 \in \mathbb{W}_h$, and that rot_h extends to a mapping $\mathbb{W}_h \rightarrow \mathbb{X}_h$. Note that we will denote all discrete inner products by $(\cdot, \cdot)_h$, and we assume that the inner products properly extends to terms of the form fX , where f is a discrete scalar function and $X \in \mathbb{X}_h$.

Based on the abstract spaces defined above, we now present the semi-discrete (spatially discrete) streamfunction-vorticity formulations. Throughout this formulation, the discrete velocity field is defined by $V_h = \text{rot}_h(\psi_h) + H_h$.

Navier–Stokes equations. The semi-discrete solution (ψ_h, H_h, ω_h) is defined as a Bochner function taking values in $\mathbb{S}_h \times \mathbb{H}_{h,N} \times \mathbb{W}_h$. This solution satisfies the following system, which is the discrete counterpart to (NS_ω^1) and (NS_ω^2) :

$$(\omega_h, \chi_h)_h = (V_h, \text{rot}_h(\chi_h))_h, \quad (\text{NS}_{\omega_h}^1)$$

$$(\partial_t \omega_h, \varphi_h)_h + (\partial_t H_h, Z_h)_h = (F_h - \omega_h J_h V_h - \nu \text{rot}_h(\omega_h) + 2\nu \kappa_h V_h, \text{rot}_h(\varphi_h) + Z_h)_h, \quad (\text{NS}_{\omega_h}^2)$$

for all test functions $(\varphi_h, Z_h, \chi_h) \in \mathbb{S}_h \times \mathbb{H}_{h,N} \times \mathbb{W}_h$. Here, F_h is the external force represented by a Bochner function with values in \mathbb{X}_h , κ_h is the discrete Gaussian curvature (assumed given) and $J_h : \mathbb{X}_h \rightarrow \mathbb{X}_h$ denotes the discrete rotation operator. The system is supplemented with initial conditions

STREAMFUNCTION-VORTICITY FORMULATION FOR FLOWS

$(\psi_{h,0}, H_{h,0})$ obtained by decomposing the discrete initial velocity $V_{h,0} \in \mathbb{V}_h$, which is defined as the projection of the non-discrete initial velocity V_0 onto \mathbb{V}_h .

Euler equations. For the Euler equations, the spatially discrete system takes the form, mirroring the non-discrete formulation (E_ω^1) to (E_ω^3) :

$$(\omega_h, \varphi_h)_h = (\text{rot}_h(\psi_h), \text{rot}_h(\varphi_h))_h, \quad (E_{\omega_h}^1)$$

$$(\partial_t \omega_h, \chi_h)_h = (\text{curl}(F)_h - V_h(\omega_h), \chi_h)_h, \quad (E_{\omega_h}^2)$$

$$(\partial_t H_h, Z_h)_h = (F_h - \omega_h J_h V_h, Z_h)_h, \quad (E_{\omega_h}^3)$$

for all test functions $(\varphi_h, Z_h, \chi_h) \in \mathbb{S}_h \times \mathbb{H}_{h,N} \times \mathbb{W}_h$. Here, $\text{curl}(F)_h$ denotes the curl of the external force represented by a Bochner function with values in \mathbb{W}_h and $V_h(\omega_h) := \langle V_h, \text{grad}_h(\omega_h) \rangle$ denotes the discrete advection term. Note that due to the exchanged roles of the test functions φ_h and χ_h compared to $(NS_{\omega_h}^1)$ and $(NS_{\omega_h}^2)$, we can exploit the orthogonality $\mathbb{H}_{h,N} \perp \text{rot}_h(\mathbb{S}_h)$ to simplify $(E_{\omega_h}^1)$. Similar to before, the system requires initial conditions $(H_{h,0}, \omega_{h,0})$. We obtain $H_{h,0}$ by extracting the harmonic component of $V_{h,0} \in \mathbb{V}_h$, while $\omega_{h,0}$ is defined as the projection of the initial vorticity $\omega_0 := \text{curl}(V_0)$ onto \mathbb{W}_h . In the case of a closed surface ($\partial M_h = \emptyset$), we impose the additional requirement that ω_h has a vanishing spatial mean, i.e. $(\omega_h, 1)_h = 0$. This ensures consistency with the non-discrete framework, where the zero-mean property is a necessary condition for ω to be the curl of V .

Pressure. For both the Navier–Stokes and Euler ($\nu = 0$) equations, the discrete total pressure $p_h^* \in \mathbb{Q}_h$ is recovered a posteriori from (ψ_h, H_h, ω_h) via the discrete Laplace problem

$$(\text{grad}_h(p_h^*), \text{grad}_h(q_h))_h = (F_h - \omega_h J_h V_h - \nu \text{rot}_h(\omega_h) + 2\nu \kappa_h V_h, \text{grad}_h(q_h))_h, \quad (P_h)$$

for all test functions $q_h \in \mathbb{Q}_h$.

6.2. Algorithms and low-order finite element realization

In this subsection, we discretize the semi-discrete Navier–Stokes and Euler equations in time. For this purpose, we employ a standard first-order explicit Euler scheme. We note that a similar fully discrete scheme was implemented in [37] for the Navier–Stokes equations, though restricted to the special case of simply connected domains in \mathbb{R}^2 (which implies $\mathbb{H}_{h,N} = \{0\}$). Furthermore, our spatial procedure coincides with the one described in [66, Algo 2] for the Euler equations, with the distinction that they employ a higher-order Runge–Kutta scheme in time. After stating the algorithms, we conclude the subsection by detailing the concrete low-order finite element realization used in our experiments.

Navier–Stokes algorithm. Let $\Delta t > 0$ be the time step size. We denote the approximation of a variable X at time $t_n = n\Delta t$ by X^n .

Given the initial data $\psi_h^0 \in \mathbb{S}_h$ and $H_h^0 \in \mathbb{H}_{h,N}$, we use $V_h^0 = \text{rot}_h(\psi_h^0) + H_h^0$ to compute ω_h^0 via $(NS_{\omega_h}^1)$. Thus, assuming we are given the solution $(\psi_h^n, H_h^n, \omega_h^n)$ at time t_n , we use $V_h^n = \text{rot}_h(\psi_h^n) + H_h^n$ to define the functional

$$R^n(W) := (F_h^n - \omega_h^n J_h V_h^n - \nu \text{rot}_h(\omega_h^n) + 2\nu \kappa_h V_h^n, W)_h,$$

for $W \in \mathbb{V}_h$. With this definition, we perform the step $t_n \rightarrow t_{n+1}$ as follows:

1.) Compute $\psi_h^{n+1} \in \mathbb{S}_h$ by solving the Laplace problem

$$(\text{rot}_h(\psi_h^{n+1}), \text{rot}_h(\varphi_h))_h = (\omega_h^n, \varphi_h)_h + \Delta t R^n(\text{rot}_h(\varphi_h))_h, \quad \forall \varphi_h \in \mathbb{S}_h.$$

2.) Compute $H_h^{n+1} \in \mathbb{H}_{h,N}$ by solving

$$(H_h^{n+1}, Z_h)_h = (H_h^n, Z_h)_h + \Delta t R^n(Z_h), \quad \forall Z_h \in \mathbb{H}_{h,N}.$$

3.) Using $V_h^{n+1} = \text{rot}_h(\psi_h^{n+1}) + H_h^{n+1}$, we compute $\omega_h^{n+1} \in \mathbb{W}_h$ by solving

$$(\omega_h^{n+1}, \chi_h)_h = (V_h^{n+1}, \text{rot}_h(\chi_h))_h, \quad \forall \chi_h \in \mathbb{W}_h.$$

Remark 6.1. Similar to Remark 2.5, the algorithm simplifies in specific geometric settings:

- If the discrete Gaussian curvature κ_h is globally constant, the curvature terms decouple due to orthogonality:

$$\begin{aligned} (\kappa_h V_h^n, \text{rot}_h(\varphi_h))_h &= \kappa_h (\text{rot}_h(\psi_h^n), \text{rot}_h(\varphi_h))_h, \\ (\kappa_h V_h^n, Z_h)_h &= \kappa_h (H_h^n, Z_h)_h. \end{aligned}$$

- If the surface is closed ($\partial M_h = \emptyset$), then part of the viscous term vanishes from the harmonic update

$$(\text{rot}_h(\omega_h^n), Z_h)_h = 0.$$

Euler algorithm. Given the initial data $H_h^0 \in \mathbb{H}_{h,N}$ and $\omega_h^0 \in \mathbb{W}_h$, where we impose a zero-mean condition on ω_h^0 if $\partial M_h = \emptyset$, we solve (E $_{\omega_h}^1$) to find ψ_h^0 , which implies $V_h^0 = \text{rot}_h(\psi_h^0) + H_h^0$. Assuming we are given the solution $(\psi_h^n, H_h^n, \omega_h^n)$ at time t_n , we use $V_h^n = \text{rot}_h(\psi_h^n) + H_h^n$ and perform the step $t_n \rightarrow t_{n+1}$ as follows:

1.) Update $\omega_h^{n+1} \in \mathbb{W}_h$ by solving

$$(\omega_h^{n+1}, \chi_h)_h = (\omega_h^n, \chi_h)_h + \Delta t (\text{curl}_h(F_h^n) - V_h^n(\omega_h^n), \chi_h)_h, \quad \forall \chi_h \in \mathbb{W}_h.$$

2.) Update $H_h^{n+1} \in \mathbb{H}_{h,N}$ by solving

$$(H_h^{n+1}, Z_h)_h = (H_h^n, Z_h)_h + \Delta t (F_h^n - \omega_h^n J_h V_h^n, Z_h)_h, \quad \forall Z_h \in \mathbb{H}_{h,N}.$$

3.) Recover $\psi_h^{n+1} \in \mathbb{S}_h$ by solving the Laplace problem

$$(\text{rot}_h(\psi_h^{n+1}), \text{rot}_h(\varphi_h))_h = (\omega_h^{n+1}, \varphi_h)_h, \quad \forall \varphi_h \in \mathbb{S}_h.$$

Finally, we note that if $\partial M_h = \emptyset$, the update in step 1.) preserves the vanishing mean of ω_h^{n+1} by construction. A key distinction from the Navier–Stokes algorithm lies in the solution order: here, we explicitly update ω_h^{n+1} and H_h^{n+1} before recovering ψ_h^{n+1} . In the Navier–Stokes case, the computational roles of ω_h^{n+1} and ψ_h^{n+1} are effectively interchanged.

Low-order finite element realization. To implement the fully discrete scheme, we select concrete finite element spaces that fulfill the structural requirements of the abstract Hodge decomposition on a given triangulation \mathcal{T}_h of the polyhedral surface M_h . We adopt the following low-order setting:

- $\mathbb{X}_h := [\mathbb{P}^0(\mathcal{T}_h)]^2$: piecewise constant vector fields.
- $\mathbb{W}_h := S^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$: continuous \mathbb{P}^1 -Lagrange elements.
- $\mathbb{S}_h := S_0^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$: $S^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$ elements φ with $\varphi|_{\partial M_h} = 0$ or zero mean if $\partial M_h = \emptyset$.

STREAMFUNCTION-VORTICITY FORMULATION FOR FLOWS

- $\mathbb{Q}_h := \text{CR}^1(\mathcal{T}_h) \cap L_0^2(\mathcal{T}_h)$: Crouzeix–Raviart elements with zero mean.

Throughout this realization, $(\cdot, \cdot)_h$ denotes the standard L^2 -inner product on M_h . We employ the standard element-wise gradient for grad_h and define the discrete rotation via $\text{rot}_h(\cdot) := -J_h \text{grad}_h(\cdot)$. Here, J_h represents the element-wise rotation by 90° in the tangent plane. Since $M_h \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, this operation is realized as $J_h(X_h) = N_{M_h} \times X_h$ for any $X_h \in \mathbb{X}_h$, where N_{M_h} denotes the element-wise unit normal field.

Crucially, it holds that $\text{grad}_h(\text{CR}^1(\mathcal{T}_h)) \perp \text{rot}_h(S_0^1(\mathcal{T}_h))$. We therefore define the discrete harmonic space as the orthogonal complement within \mathbb{X}_h

$$\mathbb{H}_{h,N} := (\text{grad}_h(\mathbb{Q}_h) \oplus \text{rot}_h(\mathbb{S}_h))^\perp \subset \mathbb{X}_h.$$

It can be shown that the elements of $\mathbb{H}_{h,N}$ have continuous normal components across edges and are exactly tangential to the boundary ∂M_h [49, Lem 3.1]. Moreover, since M_h is homeomorphic to M , the dimension of this space satisfies $\dim(\mathbb{H}_{h,N}) = \dim(H_N)$ (see [49, Thm 3.2]), ensuring that the discrete cohomology matches the non-discrete one. Consequently, this choice of spaces satisfies all requirements of the abstract discrete setting.

Basis for discrete harmonic fields. For completeness, we briefly outline the construction of a basis for $\mathbb{H}_{h,N}$, following the procedure described in [66, Algo 4] (see e.g. [49, Sec 4.1] for alternative methods). We first determine the dimension $l := \dim(\mathbb{H}_{h,N})$ using the Euler characteristic relation

$$l = |\mathcal{E}_h| - |\mathcal{V}_h| - |\mathcal{T}_h| + 1 + \begin{cases} 1, & \partial M = \emptyset \\ 0, & \partial M \neq \emptyset \end{cases},$$

where $|\mathcal{V}_h|$, $|\mathcal{E}_h|$, and $|\mathcal{T}_h|$ denote the number of vertices, edges, and triangles in the mesh, respectively. With l determined, we generate l random vector fields $X_1, \dots, X_l \in \mathbb{X}_h$. To extract the harmonic component of each field, we compute its discrete Hodge decomposition by projecting out the rotational and gradient parts. This is achieved by solving the following Poisson problems for $(\xi_k, \zeta_k) \in \mathbb{S}_h \times \mathbb{Q}_h$:

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{rot}_h(\xi_k), \text{rot}_h(\varphi_h))_h &= (X_k, \text{rot}_h(\varphi_h))_h, \quad \forall \varphi_h \in \mathbb{S}_h, \\ (\text{grad}_h(\zeta_k), \text{grad}_h(q_h))_h &= (X_k, \text{grad}_h(q_h))_h, \quad \forall q_h \in \mathbb{Q}_h, \end{aligned}$$

and subsequently setting $Y_k := X_k - \text{rot}_h(\xi_k) - \text{grad}_h(\zeta_k) \in \mathbb{H}_{h,N}$. Since the initial fields are chosen randomly, the resulting projections $\{Y_k\}_{k=1}^l$ are almost surely linearly independent. Finally, we apply the Gram–Schmidt process to $\{Y_k\}_{k=1}^l$ to obtain an orthonormal basis for $\mathbb{H}_{h,N}$.

6.3. Numerical examples

To validate our approach, we consider three test cases that highlight the method’s performance on domains with non-trivial topology – i.e., domains where harmonic fields play a fundamental role – and varying boundary conditions.

First, we address the planar Schäfer Turek benchmark. This example serves to quantitatively assess our discrete schemes by computing relevant quantities of interest and comparing them to established values from the literature. It further poses the challenge of mixed boundary conditions that differ from the standard Dirichlet settings. For a detailed discussion on a more general discrete Hodge decomposition capable of incorporating this wider class of boundary conditions, we refer the reader to the supplementary material.

Next, we extend our validation to curved manifolds by simulating the Schäfer Turek benchmark on a pierced ring and the Kelvin–Helmholtz instability on a torus. These examples serve to verify that our discrete schemes exhibit the correct qualitative behavior on curved surfaces.




FIGURE 1. Schäfer–Turek benchmark. The streamfunction ψ , vorticity ω , and velocity field $|V|$ are displayed, visualizing the shedding of vortices behind the hole.

Schäfer–Turek benchmark. In this section, we analyze the Schäfer–Turek benchmark problem 2D-2 from [55] in the vorticity formulation. This benchmark models laminar flow ($Re = 100$) through a rectangular channel containing a slightly off-center circular obstacle, leading to a *Kármán vortex street*; see Figure 1 for a visualization. For the precise setup, we refer the reader to the supplementary material.

This benchmark poses a significant challenge for vorticity-based formulations for two reasons. First, the domain is not simply connected, necessitating the correct handling of harmonic fields to capture the physics. Second, the model requires mixed boundary conditions (Dirichlet on inlet, walls, and obstacle; vanishing tangential velocity and pressure on the outlet) that differ from the pure Dirichlet settings analyzed previously. These can be incorporated by utilizing a generalized Hodge decomposition from [26, Thm 1.1] that accommodates mixed boundary conditions. For more details on the class of admissible boundary conditions and their relation to the stress tensor, we refer the reader to the supplementary material.

Note that the implementation of this mixed Hodge decomposition and the discretization process follows the strategy outlined previously. However, the enforcement of the boundary condition $\langle V, T \rangle = 0$ at the outlet requires careful treatment, particularly on coarser meshes, as it creates a jump in the tangential velocity across the boundary elements; this in turn induces spurious oscillations in the vorticity near the outlet. To suppress these artifacts and stabilize the solution, we introduce a local coupling term of order $\mathcal{O}(h^2)$ in the vicinity of the outlet.

To evaluate the simulation quantitatively, we compute the total hydrodynamic force acting on the obstacle boundary ∂M_o , which simplifies under the no-slip condition to $F_o = \int_{\partial M_o} (-pN + \nu\omega T) ds$. From the x - and y -components of F_o , we compute the dimensionless drag (C_D) and lift (C_L) coefficients. Additionally, we compute the Strouhal number (St), which characterizes the frequency of the periodic vortex shedding. For the precise definitions of these dimensionless quantities and the flow parameters used, we refer the reader to the supplementary material.

Numerical values for these quantities are reported in Table 1 for various mesh resolutions. While the drag coefficients C_D^{\min} and C_D^{\max} converge closely to the reference values, the lift coefficients C_L^{\min} and C_L^{\max} converge to values slightly distinct from the literature. This discrepancy likely stems from the outlet boundary conditions. Our formulation imposes $\langle V, T \rangle = 0$ and $\langle \sigma(V, p)N, N \rangle = 0$ at ∂M_{out} , whereas the reference values were computed using the standard “do-nothing” condition ($\sigma(V, p)N = 0$) common in velocity-pressure formulations.

STREAMFUNCTION-VORTICITY FORMULATION FOR FLOWS

| Δt | h | C_D^{\min} | C_D^{\max} | C_L^{\min} | C_L^{\max} | St |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------|
| $6.4 \cdot 10^{-4}$ | $4 \cdot 10^{-3}$ | 3.02488 | 3.09034 | -1.02589 | 1.01468 | 0.30390 |
| $3.2 \cdot 10^{-4}$ | $2\sqrt{2} \cdot 10^{-3}$ | 3.11382 | 3.17828 | -1.01779 | 1.00241 | 0.30283 |
| $1.6 \cdot 10^{-4}$ | $2 \cdot 10^{-3}$ | 3.14485 | 3.20881 | -1.01494 | 0.99732 | 0.30234 |
| $0.8 \cdot 10^{-4}$ | $\sqrt{2} \cdot 10^{-3}$ | 3.15727 | 3.22098 | -1.01429 | 0.99501 | 0.30208 |
| Ref. values [33] and [15] | | 3.16430 | 3.22757 | -1.02053 | 0.98580 | 0.30188 |

TABLE 1. Schäfer Turek benchmark 2D-2 results for different resolutions.

Schäfer Turek benchmark on a pierced ring. In this section, we analyze the classical Schäfer Turek benchmark on a pierced ring. Specifically, we define our surface M as the lateral area of a cylinder aligned with the z -axis, having unit diameter and unit height. This domain is pierced slightly above the equator ($z = 0.025$) by a circular hole of diameter $d = 1/8$, located on the negative y -axis.

To drive the flow, we apply a constant external force with magnitude $|F| = 0.1$ in the clockwise azimuthal direction (tangential to the cylinder surface). We simulate the dynamics governed by the Navier–Stokes equations with a viscosity of $\nu = 0.001$. The resulting flow accelerates until the driving force is balanced by viscous dissipation, establishing a mean velocity V_{mean} . Using the hole diameter d as the characteristic length scale and V_{mean} as the velocity scale, we obtain a Reynolds number of $Re \approx 100$. Consistent with expectations from the flat case discussed above, we observe the formation of a characteristic *Kármán vortex street*, as illustrated in Figure 2.

Kelvin–Helmholtz instability on a torus. In this section, we analyze the Kelvin–Helmholtz instability on a torus governed by the Navier–Stokes equations with viscosity $\nu = 0.001$ and vanishing external force ($F = 0$). It is important to emphasize that for the torus, the first Betti number is $b_1 = 2$, implying that the dimension of the harmonic space is $\dim(\mathbb{H}_{h,N}) = 2$. Consequently, harmonic fields play a significant role in the flow dynamics.

We utilize a setup adapted from the classical square periodic domain (see e.g. [56, Ch 2]) to the toroidal geometry. The flow is driven by an initial velocity field V_0 designed to generate a shear layer with a Reynolds number of $Re = 200$. Physically, V_0 creates a counter-rotating flow between the upper and lower halves of the torus, superimposed with a perturbation that breaks the rotational symmetry. This destabilizes the shear layer, leading to the characteristic roll-up of vortices and their subsequent interaction shown in Figure 3. For the precise parameterization and the explicit construction of V_0 , we refer the reader to the supplementary material.




FIGURE 2. Schäfer Turek benchmark on a pierced ring. The streamfunction ψ , vorticity ω , and velocity field $|V|$ are displayed, visualizing the shedding of vortices behind the hole.




FIGURE 3. Kelvin–Helmholtz instability on a torus. Time evolution of vorticity ω and velocity V (white arrows) governed by the Navier–Stokes equations. A mirror below reveals the rear dynamics.

In the flat planar case with periodic boundary conditions in one direction (topologically representing a ring or annulus), it is well-established that the instability evolves into four distinct vortices, which subsequently merge into two and finally into a single vortex structure, with the long-time behavior being extremely sensitive to small perturbations [56, Sec 4]. Theoretically, this aligns with the fact that for the Euler equations, the dynamics of four interacting vortices are known to be chaotic, whereas configurations with 1, 2, or 3 vortices are integrable [5, Sec 11.B].

We observe a qualitatively similar evolution on the torus. In particular, the chaotic nature of the four-vortex configuration makes the long-time behavior extremely sensitive to small perturbations. In our simulation, the lack of perfect symmetry in the unstructured mesh acts as such an additional perturbation. Consequently, while the flow maintains symmetry initially, there exists a time t^* after which the solution becomes visibly asymmetric. This is particularly evident during the first merging phase, where the two vortex pairs do not merge at diametrically opposite locations. This axial asymmetry grows with increasing time. We note that similar symmetry breaking behavior was observed in [47, Sec 4.2] during the process of four vortices merging into two.

Bibliography

- [1] Yves Achdou, Roland Glowinski, and Olivier Pironneau. Tuning the mesh of a mixed method for the stream function vorticity formulation of the navier-stokes equations. *Numerische Mathematik*, 63:145–163, 1992.

STREAMFUNCTION-VORTICITY FORMULATION FOR FLOWS

- [2] D. Adak, D. Mora, and A. Silgado. The morley-type virtual element method for the navier–stokes equations in stream-function form. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, 419:116573, 2024.
- [3] Adak, Dibyendu, Mora, David, Natarajan, Sundararajan, and Silgado, Alberth. A virtual element discretization for the time dependent navier–stokes equations in stream-function formulation. *ESAIM: M2AN*, 55(5):2535–2566, 2021.
- [4] Ryoichi Ando, Nils Thuerey, and Chris Wojtan. A stream function solver for liquid simulations. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)*, 34(4):1–9, 2015.
- [5] Vladimir I. Arnold and Boris A. Khesin. *Topological methods in hydrodynamics*. Springer, 1998.
- [6] Marino Arroyo and Antonio Desimone. Relaxation dynamics of fluid membranes. *Physical review. E, Statistical, nonlinear, and soft matter physics*, 79:031915, 04 2009.
- [7] Omri Azencot, Steffen Weißmann, Maks Ovsjanikov, Max Wardetzky, and Mirela Ben-Chen. Functional fluids on surfaces. *Computer Graphics Forum*, 33(5):237–246, 2014.
- [8] L. Beirão da Veiga, D. Mora, and A. Silgado. A fully-discrete virtual element method for the non-stationary boussinesq equations in stream-function form. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, 408:115947, 2023.
- [9] Dietrich Braess. *Finite Elements: Theory, Fast Solvers, and Applications in Solid Mechanics*. Cambridge University Press, 3 edition, 2007.
- [10] Philip Brandner, Thomas Jankuhn, Simon Praetorius, Arnold Reusken, and Axel Voigt. Finite element discretization methods for velocity-pressure and stream function formulations of surface stokes equations. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 2021.
- [11] Brandner, Philip and Reusken, Arnold. Finite element error analysis of surface stokes equations in stream function formulation. *ESAIM: M2AN*, 54(6):2069–2097, 2020.
- [12] Lamberto Cattabriga. Su un problema al contorno relativo al sistema di equazioni di stokes. *Rendiconti del Seminario Matematico della Universita di Padova*, 31:308–340, 1961.
- [13] Alexandre Joel Chorin and Jerrold E Marsden. *A mathematical introduction to fluid mechanics*, volume 168. Springer, 1992.
- [14] EJ Dean, R Glowinski, and O Pironneau. Iterative solution of the stream function-vorticity formulation of the stokes problem, applications to the numerical simulation of incompressible viscous flow. *Computer methods in applied mechanics and engineering*, 87(2-3):117–155, 1991.
- [15] TU Dortmund. DFG flow around cylinder benchmark 2D-2. https://wwwold.mathematik.tu-dortmund.de/~featflow/en/benchmarks/cfdbenchmarking/flow/dfg_benchmark2_re100.html, 2025.
- [16] David G. Ebin and Jerrold Marsden. Groups of diffeomorphisms and the motion of an incompressible fluid. *Annals of Mathematics*, 92(1):102–163, 1970.
- [17] Sharif Elcott, Yiyong Tong, Eva Kanso, Peter Schröder, and Mathieu Desbrun. Stable, circulation-preserving, simplicial fluids. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)*, 26(1):4–es, 2007.

- [18] Thomas-Peter Fries. Higher-order surface fem for incompressible navier-stokes flows on manifolds. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Fluids*, 88(2):55–78, 2018.
- [19] Matthew P Gaffney. The harmonic operator for exterior differential forms. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 37(1):48–50, 1951.
- [20] Emilio Gagliardo. Ulteriori proprietà di alcune classi di funzioni in più variabili. *Ricerche di Matematica*, 8:24–51, 1959.
- [21] Jun Geng. $W_{1,p}$ estimates for elliptic problems with neumann boundary conditions in lipschitz domains. *Advances in Mathematics*, 229(4):2427–2448, 2012.
- [22] Fattehallah Ghadi. Finite element solution of a stream function-vorticity system and its application to the navier stokes equations. *Applied Mathematics*, 04:257–262, 01 2013.
- [23] Vivette Girault and Pierre-Arnaud Raviart. *Finite Element Approximation of the Navier-Stokes Equations*. Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, 1979.
- [24] Vivette Girault and Pierre-Arnaud Raviart. *Finite Element Methods for Navier-Stokes Equations, Theory and Algorithms*. Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, 1986.
- [25] R. Glowinski and O. Pironneau. Numerical methods for the first biharmonic equation and for the two-dimensional stokes problem. *SIAM Review*, 21(2):167–212, 1979.
- [26] Vladimir Gol’dshstein, Irina Mitrea, and Marius Mitrea. Hodge decompositions with mixed boundary conditions and applications to partial differential equations on lipschitz manifolds. *Journal of Mathematical Sciences*, 172(3), 2011.
- [27] P. Grisvard. *Elliptic Problems in Nonsmooth Domains*. Classics in Applied Mathematics. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2011.
- [28] B.J. Gross and P.J. Atzberger. Hydrodynamic flows on curved surfaces: Spectral numerical methods for radial manifold shapes. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 371:663–689, 2018.
- [29] John G. Heywood and Rolf Rannacher. Finite element approximation of the nonstationary navier–stokes problem. i: Regularity of solutions and second-order error estimates for spatial discretization. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 19(2):275–311, 1982.
- [30] Volker John. *Finite Element Methods for Incompressible Flow Problems*. Springer Cham, 2016.
- [31] Jürgen Jost. *Riemannian Geometry and Geometric Analysis*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.
- [32] John M Lee. *Introduction to Riemannian manifolds*, volume 2. Springer, 2019.
- [33] Christoph Lehrenfeld and Joachim Schöberl. High order exactly divergence-free hybrid discontinuous Galerkin methods for unsteady incompressible flows. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, 307:339 – 361, 2016.
- [34] Alexander Linke. On the role of the helmholtz decomposition in mixed methods for incompressible flows and a new variational crime. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, 268:782–800, 2014.

STREAMFUNCTION-VORTICITY FORMULATION FOR FLOWS

- [35] Andreas Lippke and Helmut Wagner. Numerical solution of the navier-stokes equations in multiply connected domains. *Computers & Fluids*, 20(1):19–28, 1991.
- [36] Beibei Liu, Gemma Mason, Julian Hodgson, Yiyong Tong, and Mathieu Desbrun. Model-reduced variational fluid simulation. *ACM Trans. Graph.*, 34(6), November 2015.
- [37] Jian-Guo Liu and Weinan E. Simple finite element method in vorticity formulation for incompressible flows. *Mathematics of Computation*, 70(234):579–593, 2001.
- [38] Jian-Guo Liu and Chi-Wang Shu. A High-Order Discontinuous Galerkin Method for 2D Incompressible Flows. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 160(2):577–596, 2000.
- [39] Dorina Mitrea, Marius Mitrea, and Mei-Chi Shaw. Traces of differential forms on lipschitz domains, the boundary de rham complex, and hodge decompositions. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal*, 57(5):2061–2095, 2008.
- [40] Dorina Mitrea, Marius Mitrea, and Michael Taylor. Layer potentials, the hodge laplacian, and global boundary problems in nonsmooth riemannian manifolds. *Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society*, 150(713):1–120, 2001.
- [41] Akira Mizukami. A stream function-vorticity finite element formulation for navier-stokes equations in multi-connected domain. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering*, 19(9):1403–1409, 1983.
- [42] L. Nirenberg. On elliptic partial differential equations. *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa - Scienze Fisiche e Matematiche*, Ser. 3, 13(2):115–162, 1959.
- [43] I. Nitschke, A. Voigt, and J. Wensch. A finite element approach to incompressible two-phase flow on manifolds. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 708:418–438, 2012.
- [44] Ingo Nitschke, Sebastian Reuther, and Axel Voigt. *Discrete Exterior Calculus (DEC) for the Surface Navier-Stokes Equation*. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2017.
- [45] Maxim Olshanskii, Arnold Reusken, and Alexander Zhiliakov. Inf-sup stability of the trace p_2 – p_1 Taylor–Hood elements for surface PDEs. *Mathematics of Computation*, 90(330):1527–1555, 2021.
- [46] Maxim Olshanskii and Vladimir Yushutin. A penalty finite element method for a fluid system posed on embedded surface. *Journal of Mathematical Fluid Mechanics*, 21, 02 2019.
- [47] Maxim A. Olshanskii and Alexander Zhiliakov. Recycling augmented lagrangian preconditioner in an incompressible fluid solver. *Numerical Linear Algebra with Applications*, 29(2):e2415, 2022.
- [48] Peter Petersen. *Riemannian Geometry*, volume 171. Springer, 2016.
- [49] Konstantin Poelke and Konrad Polthier. Boundary-aware hodge decompositions for piecewise constant vector fields. *Computer-Aided Design*, 78:126–136, 2016. SPM 2016.
- [50] Volker Priebe. Solvability of the navier-stokes equations on manifolds with boundary. *manuscripta mathematica*, 83:145–159, 1994.
- [51] Arnold Reusken. Stream function formulation of surface Stokes equations. *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis*, 40(1):109–139, 10 2018.

- [52] S. Reuther and A. Voigt. The interplay of curvature and vortices in flow on curved surfaces. *Multiscale Modeling & Simulation*, 13(2):632–643, 2015.
- [53] Sebastian Reuther and Axel Voigt. Solving the incompressible surface navier-stokes equation by surface finite elements. *Physics of Fluids*, 30(1):012107, 2018.
- [54] Maryam Samavaki and Jukka Tuomela. Navier–stokes equations on riemannian manifolds. *Journal of Geometry and Physics*, 148:103543, 2020.
- [55] Michael Schäfer, Stefan Turek, Franz Durst, Egon Krause, and Rolf Rannacher. Benchmark computations of laminar flow around a cylinder. In *Flow simulation with high-performance computers II: DFG priority research programme results 1993–1995*, pages 547–566. Springer, 1996.
- [56] Philipp W. Schroeder, Volker John, Philip L. Lederer, Christoph Lehrenfeld, Gert Lube, and Joachim Schöberl. On reference solutions and the sensitivity of the 2d kelvin–helmholtz instability problem. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, 77(4):1010–1028, 2019.
- [57] Günter Schwarz. *Hodge Decomposition-A method for solving boundary value problems*. Springer, 1995.
- [58] Yuanzhen Shao, Gieri Simonett, and Mathias Wilke. The navier-stokes equations on manifolds with boundary. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 416:1602–1659, 2025.
- [59] Zhongwei Shen. Bounds of riesz transforms on l^p spaces for second order elliptic operators. *Annales de l’Institut Fourier*, 55(1):173–197, 2005.
- [60] Michael Taylor. *Partial Differential Equations III: Nonlinear Equations*, volume 117. Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.
- [61] R Temam. Local existence of \mathcal{C}^∞ solutions of the euler equations of incompressible perfect fluids. *Turbulence and Navier Stokes Equations*, pages 184–194, 1976.
- [62] Roger Temam. *Navier-Stokes Equations: Theory and Numerical Analysis*. Studies in Mathematics and its Applications. AMS Chelsea Publishing, 1984.
- [63] Tayfun Tezduyar, James Liou, D. Ganjoo, and Marek Behr. Solution techniques for the vorticity-streamfunction formulation of two-dimensional unsteady incompressible flows. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Fluids*, 11:515–539, 10 1990.
- [64] Tayfun E Tezduyar, Roland Glowinski, and J Liou. Petrov-galerkin methods on multiply connected domains for the vorticity-stream function formulation of the incompressible navier-stokes equations. *International journal for numerical methods in fluids*, 8(10):1269–1290, 1988.
- [65] Zhenfu Tian and Yongbin Ge. A fourth-order compact finite difference scheme for the steady stream function–vorticity formulation of the navier–stokes/boussinesq equations. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Fluids*, 41(5):495–518, 2003.
- [66] Hang Yin, Mohammad Sina Nabizadeh, Baichuan Wu, Stephanie Wang, and Albert Chern. Fluid cohomology. *ACM Trans. Graph.*, 42(4), jul 2023.
- [67] Cuncheng Zhu, Hang Yin, and Albert Chern. Viscous vortex dynamics on surfaces. *ACM Trans. Graph.*, 44(6), December 2025.

Appendix A. Notation

In this section, we introduce the necessary background on Sobolev spaces, boundary traces, and Bochner spaces. The notation employed here extends standard conventions from the Euclidean setting.

Surfaces. We begin by specifying the class of surfaces considered in this work.

Definition A.1 (Surface with $C^{k,1}$ or C^{k+1} boundary).

Let W be a smooth, oriented, two-dimensional Riemannian manifold, possibly with smooth boundary. A subset $M \subset W$ is called a *surface with $C^{k,1}$ (or C^{k+1}) boundary*, for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, if M is the closure of an open, connected subset of W , M is compact and if for every $x \in \partial M$, there exists a neighborhood $U \subset W$ of x and a chart $\varphi : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ of W such that $\varphi(U \cap \partial M)$ is the graph of a $C^{k,1}$ (or C^{k+1}) function, with $\varphi(U \cap M^\circ)$ lying on one side of this graph.

It is worth noting that a surface M with a $C^{k,1}$ (or C^{k+1}) boundary constitutes a $C^{k,1}$ (or C^{k+1}) submanifold of W [27, Thm 1.2.1.5]. The converse, however, holds only if M is at least a C^1 submanifold. Prominent examples of surfaces with $C^{k,1}$ or C^{k+1} boundary include: (i) the closure of any open, bounded, and connected subset of \mathbb{R}^2 with a $C^{k,1}$ (or C^{k+1}) boundary (see, e.g., Figure 4 a)), (ii) any compact, connected, oriented two-dimensional smooth Riemannian manifold M , with or without smooth boundary (see, e.g., Figure 4 b) and c)).

Throughout the remainder of this work, we assume that M possesses at least a $C^{0,1}$ (Lipschitz) boundary. Any requirements for higher boundary regularity will be stated explicitly.

Function spaces. We now introduce the Sobolev spaces on M relevant to this work, extending standard definitions from bounded domains in \mathbb{R}^2 [24] to (r, s) -tensors on manifolds. We rely on the standard operators from Riemannian geometry defined in Section B.

Let $\Gamma^{(r,s)}(W)$ be the set of smooth sections of $T^{(r,s)}W$, $\Gamma^{(r,s)} := \Gamma^{(r,s)}(W)|_M$ and $\Gamma_0^{(r,s)}$ be the subset of $\Gamma^{(r,s)}$ consisting of sections with compact support in the interior of M . For the specific cases of smooth functions, vector fields, and 1-forms, we adopt the following notation:

$$C^\infty := \Gamma^{(0,0)}, \quad C_0^\infty := \Gamma_0^{(0,0)}, \quad \Gamma := \Gamma^{(1,0)}, \quad \Gamma_0 := \Gamma_0^{(1,0)}, \quad \Omega^1 := \Gamma^{(0,1)}, \quad \Omega_0^1 := \Gamma_0^{(0,1)}.$$

Further, we denote by $(L^p(\Gamma^{(r,s)}), \|\cdot\|_{L^p})$ the standard Lebesgue spaces for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. We define the dual pairing between $U \in L^p(\Gamma^{(r,s)})$ and $V \in L^q(\Gamma^{(r,s)})$ (where $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$) by $(U, V) := \int_M \langle U, V \rangle dV$.




FIGURE 4. Examples of surfaces M : a) A subset of \mathbb{R}^2 with a $C^{0,1}$ boundary (rectangle with an open disk removed); b) A smooth manifold with boundary (hemisphere); c) A smooth manifold without boundary (torus).

For $X, Y \in \Gamma$, $\nabla_Y X$ denotes the Levi-Civita connection. This extends to the covariant derivative $\nabla : \Gamma^{(r,s)} \rightarrow \Gamma^{(r,s+1)}$ for smooth tensor fields. Utilizing the formal L^2 -adjoint $\delta(A) := -\text{tr}_{12}(\nabla A)$ for $A \in \Gamma^{(r,s)}$ ($s \geq 1$), we generalize the concept of weak derivatives to $L^p(\Gamma^{(r,s)})$. This yields the Sobolev spaces $W^{m,p}(\Gamma^{(r,s)})$ for $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, equipped with the norm $\|A\|_{W^{m,p}} := (\sum_{k=0}^m \|\nabla^k A\|_{L^p}^p)^{\frac{1}{p}}$.

It is folklore that standard results for Sobolev spaces in \mathbb{R}^2 carry over to surfaces via a partition of unity argument. In particular, the density results $L^p(\Gamma^{(r,s)}) = \overline{\Gamma_0^{(r,s)} \|\cdot\|_{L^p}}$ and $W^{m,p}(\Gamma^{(r,s)}) = \overline{\Gamma^{(r,s)} \|\cdot\|_{W^{m,p}}}$ hold for $1 \leq p < \infty$ [24, Lem I.1.1, Thm I.1.2]. This motivates the definition of the following subspace

$$W_0^{m,p}(\Gamma^{(r,s)}) := \begin{cases} W^{m,p}(C^\infty \cap L_0^1(C^\infty)) & \text{if } \partial M = \emptyset \text{ and } r = 0 = s \\ \overline{\Gamma_0^{(r,s)} \|\cdot\|_{W^{m,p}}}, & \text{else} \end{cases}.$$

Here, $L_0^1(C^\infty) := \{f \in L^1(C^\infty) \mid \int_M f dV = 0\}$ ensures a vanishing mean value. The corresponding dual space is denoted by $W^{-m,q}(\Gamma^{(r,s)})$, where q is the dual exponent.

Since a surface with a $C^{k,1}$ boundary constitutes a $C^{k,1}$ submanifold of W , we define the boundary trace spaces $W^{m,p}(\Gamma^{(r,s)}|_{\partial M})$ for $\partial M \neq \emptyset$ and $m \leq k+1$, following the construction in [27, Def 1.3.3.2]. In particular, when $m \geq 1$ and $m - \frac{1}{p} \notin \mathbb{N}$, the boundary trace map $W^{m,p}(\Gamma^{(r,s)}) \rightarrow W^{m-1,p}(\Gamma^{(r,s)}|_{\partial M})$ is continuous and compact, with kernel $W^{m,p}(\Gamma^{(r,s)}) \cap W_0^{1,p}(\Gamma^{(r,s)})$.

Furthermore, for $W \in W^{1,q}(\Gamma^{(1,1)})$ and $V \in W^{1,p}(\Gamma)$ with $1 < p, q < \infty$ and $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$, the following Green's formula holds

$$(W, \nabla V) = (\delta W, V) + (W(N), V)_{\partial M}.$$

Here, $N \in L^\infty(\Gamma|_{\partial M})$ denotes the unique outward-pointing unit normal vector field on ∂M , and W is identified with a linear map $TM \rightarrow TM$.

Moreover, the boundary trace induces the fractional Sobolev spaces $W^{m-\frac{1}{p},p}(\Gamma^{(r,s)}|_{\partial M})$. These are defined as the image of $W^{m,p}(\Gamma^{(r,s)})$ under the trace operator, equipped with the natural quotient norm of $W^{m,p}(\Gamma^{(r,s)})/\ker(\gamma_0)$.

Finally, we adopt the following abbreviations for function spaces: $W^{m,p} := W^{m,p}(C^\infty)$, $W^{m,p}(\partial M) := W^{m,p}(C^\infty|_{\partial M})$. For the Hilbert space case ($p = 2$), we use the standard notation: $H^m(\Gamma^{(r,s)}) := W^{m,2}(\Gamma^{(r,s)})$, $H^{m-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma^{(r,s)}|_{\partial M}) := W^{m-\frac{1}{2},2}(\Gamma^{(r,s)}|_{\partial M})$. Analogous notation applies to the corresponding dual spaces.

Additional differential operators. We introduce the following differential operators: First, the gradient $\text{grad}(\cdot)$ and its formal L^2 -adjoint, the divergence $\text{div}(\cdot)$. Second, the rotated gradient operator $\text{rot}(\cdot) := -J\text{grad}(\cdot)$ and its formal L^2 -adjoint, the scalar curl $\text{curl}(\cdot) := -\text{div}(J\cdot)$, where J denotes the Hodge star operator, i.e., a rotation by 90° .

These definitions ensure that the weak divergence and curl operators are well-defined, giving rise to the Hilbert spaces $H(\text{div})$ and $H(\text{curl})$, equipped with their natural graph norms $\|\cdot\|_{H(\text{div})}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{H(\text{curl})}$. Analogous to the standard Sobolev spaces, density arguments yield $H(\text{div}) = \overline{\Gamma}^{\|\cdot\|_{H(\text{div})}}$ and $H(\text{curl}) = \overline{\Gamma}^{\|\cdot\|_{H(\text{curl})}}$ [62, Thm 1.1].

Furthermore, defining the tangential vector field $T := JN$, the standard trace construction [24, Thm 2.5, Thm I.2.11] provides the continuous trace operators: $\langle \cdot, N \rangle|_{\partial M} : H(\text{div}) \rightarrow H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\partial M)$ and $\langle \cdot, T \rangle|_{\partial M} : H(\text{curl}) \rightarrow H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\partial M)$. These traces satisfy the following Green's formulas for $V_1 \in H(\text{div})$, $V_2 \in H(\text{curl})$, and $f \in H^1$:

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{div}(V_1), f) &= -(V_1, \text{grad}(f)) + \langle \langle V_1, N \rangle, f \rangle_{\partial M}, \\ (\text{curl}(V_2), f) &= (V_2, \text{rot}(f)) + \langle \langle V_2, T \rangle, f \rangle_{\partial M}. \end{aligned}$$

STREAMFUNCTION-VORTICITY FORMULATION FOR FLOWS

We denote the kernels of these trace operators by $H_0(\text{div}) := \ker(\langle \cdot, N \rangle)$ and $H_0(\text{curl}) := \ker(\langle \cdot, T \rangle)$. It is well-known that these kernels coincide with the closures of Γ_0 , i.e., $H_0(\text{div}) = \overline{\Gamma_0}^{\|\cdot\|_{H(\text{div})}}$ and $H_0(\text{curl}) = \overline{\Gamma_0}^{\|\cdot\|_{H(\text{curl})}}$ [24, Thm I.2.6, Thm I.2.12].

Finally, we define the velocity spaces:

$$\begin{aligned} J_{L^2} &:= \{V \in H(\text{div}) \mid \text{div}(V) = 0 \text{ and } \langle V, N \rangle|_{\partial M} = 0\}, \\ J_{H_0^1} &:= \{V \in H_0^1(\Gamma) \mid \text{div}(V) = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

The notation for these spaces is motivated by the density results $J_{L^2} = \overline{\mathcal{V}}^{\|\cdot\|_{L^2}}$ and $J_{H_0^1} = \overline{\mathcal{V}}^{\|\cdot\|_{H^1}}$, where $\mathcal{V} := \{V \in \Gamma_0 \mid \text{div}(V) = 0\}$ (see Theorem 5.3).

Bochner spaces. Let $(L_T^p(B), \|\cdot\|_{L_T^p(B)})$ denote the Bochner space of functions $f : (0, T) \rightarrow B$, where $T \in (0, \infty]$ and B is a Banach space. We adopt the notation $f_t := f(t) \in B$ for $t \in (0, T)$. To interpret equations holding almost everywhere in time t , we recall the following equivalence

$$f = 0 \in L_T^p(B) \Leftrightarrow \text{for a.e. } t \in (0, T) : \langle b', f_t \rangle = 0, \quad \forall b' \in B'.$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the duality pairing between B' and B .

To handle initial conditions, we utilize the space $C([0, T]; B)$ of continuous functions $h : [0, T] \rightarrow B$. For $T < \infty$, this space is equipped with the standard maximum norm $\|h\|_{C([0, T]; B)} = \max_{t \in [0, T]} \|h_t\|$. A key criterion for time continuity arises in the context of Gelfand triples $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{V}'$, where \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{H} are Hilbert spaces. Specifically, if $V \in L_T^2(\mathcal{V})$ and its weak time derivative satisfies $\partial_t V \in L_T^2(\mathcal{V}')$, then it follows that $V \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{H})$ [23, p.150-151]. Furthermore, under these regularity assumptions, the following Green's formula holds for any V, W satisfying these conditions

$$\int_0^T (\langle \partial_t V_t, W_t \rangle + \langle V_t, \partial_t W_t \rangle) dt = (V_T, W_T)_{\mathcal{H}} - (V_0, W_0)_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

Appendix B. Riemannian geometry

Definition B.1 (Covariant derivative on $\Gamma^{(r,s)}$ [32, Lem 4.6]).

The Levi-Civita connection gives rise to the covariant derivative $\nabla : \Gamma^{(r,s)} \rightarrow \Gamma^{(r,s+1)}$, which is defined for $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r \in \Omega^1$ and $X, Y_1, \dots, Y_s \in \Gamma$ by:

$$(\nabla A)(\underbrace{\dots}_{r \text{ times}}, X, \underbrace{\dots}_{s \text{ times}}) := (\nabla_X A)(\dots),$$

$$(\nabla_X A)(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r, Y_1, \dots, Y_s) := X(A(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r, Y_1, \dots, Y_s)) - \sum_{i=1}^{r+s} A(\alpha_1, \dots, \nabla_X W_i, \dots, Y_s),$$

where $W_i = \alpha_i$ for $i \leq r$ and $W_i = Y_{i-r}$ for $i > r$.

Definition B.2 (Traces [32, p.13, p.28]).

The basis independent traces of $A \in T^{(1,1)}M$ and $B \in T^{(r,s)}M$ (for $s \geq 2$) are defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(A) &:= \sum_{k=1}^n dx^k(A(\partial_k)), \\ \text{tr}_{12}(B) &= \sum_{i,j=1}^n g^{ij} B(\underbrace{\dots}_{r \text{ times}}, \partial_i, \partial_j, \underbrace{\dots}_{s-2 \text{ times}}). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that tr_{12} explicitly depends on the Riemannian metric g , whereas tr does not.

Definition and Proposition B.3 (Curvature [32, Lem 8.7]).

The curvature endomorphism is defined by $R(X, Y) := \nabla_Y \nabla_X - \nabla_X \nabla_Y + \nabla_{[X, Y]}$ for $X, Y \in \Gamma$. This induces the curvature tensor $\text{Rm}(X, Y, Z, W) := \langle R(X, Y)Z, W \rangle$ for $Z, W \in \Gamma$. Moreover on 2

dimensional manifolds the Gaussian curvature may be characterized as $\kappa := Rm(E_1, E_2, E_1, E_2)$ for any local orthonormal frame E_1, E_2 .

Definition B.4 (Hodge operator on vector fields [31, p.105]).

Let $*_k$ denote the Hodge-* operator on differential k -forms. The Hodge operator J acting on a vector field $X \in \Gamma$ is defined by: $J(X) := \sharp(*_1(\flat X))$.

Theorem B.5 (Killing field).

The space of Killing fields $\mathcal{K} = \{K \in H^1(\Gamma) \mid D_K = 0, \langle K, N \rangle|_{\partial M} = 0\}$ satisfies the following properties:

- 1.) $\mathcal{K} \subset H^1(\Gamma) \cap J_{L^2}$.
- 2.) For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the embedding $\mathcal{K} \hookrightarrow H^k(\Gamma)$ holds. In particular, $\mathcal{K} \subset \Gamma$, i.e., every Killing field is smooth.
- 3.) If $\partial M \neq \emptyset$ and $K \in \mathcal{K}$ vanishes on the boundary (i.e., $K|_{\partial M} = 0$), then $K = 0$.

Proof.

- 1.) This is a direct consequence of $\operatorname{div}(K) = \operatorname{tr}(\nabla K) = \operatorname{tr}(D_K) = 0$.
- 2.) A detailed proof in local coordinates is provided in [50, Lem 3]. Combining this local result with a partition of unity yields the global statement for surfaces.
- 3.) The proof proceeds similarly to [58, Prop 6.2]. First, one establishes that $K|_{\partial M} = 0$ implies $\nabla K|_{\partial M} = 0$. Next, we choose a surface \tilde{M} with smooth boundary such that $M \subset \tilde{M} \subset W$. Extending K by zero to \tilde{M} , we obtain $K \in H^1(\Gamma(\tilde{M}))$. Thus, K remains a Killing field on \tilde{M} , and by property 2.), it follows that $K \in \Gamma(\tilde{M})$. Finally, [48, Prop 8.1.4] states that a Killing field is uniquely determined by its value $K(p)$ and its covariant derivative $(\nabla K)(p)$ at any single point $p \in \tilde{M}$. Choosing $p \in \partial M$, where both K and ∇K vanish, we conclude that $K = 0$ on \tilde{M} , and consequently on M .

■