

Nonlinear stability for active suspensions

Michele Coti Zelati, Helge Dietert, and David Gérard-Varet

Abstract. This paper is devoted to the nonlinear analysis of a kinetic model introduced by Saintillan and Shelley for rodlike particles in viscous flows. We investigate the stability of the constant state $\Psi(t, x, p) = \frac{1}{4\pi}$ corresponding to a distribution of particles that is homogeneous in space (variable $x \in \mathbb{T}^3$) and uniform in orientation (variable $p \in \mathbb{S}^2$). We prove its nonlinear stability under the optimal condition of linearized spectral stability. The main achievement in this work is that the smallness condition on the initial perturbation is independent of the translational diffusion and only depends on the rotational diffusion, which is particularly relevant for dilute suspensions. Upgrading our previous linear study [Ann. PDE 9 (2023), no. 2, article no. 20] to such a nonlinear stability result requires new mathematical ideas, due to the presence of a quasilinear term in x associated with nonlinear convection. This term cannot be treated as a source, because it is not controllable by the rotational diffusion in p . Also, it prevents the decoupling of x -Fourier modes crucially used in Coti Zelati, Dietert, and Gérard-Varet [Ann. PDE 9 (2023), no. 2, article no. 20]. A key feature of our work is an analysis of enhanced dissipation and mixing properties of the advection diffusion operator $\partial_t + (p + u(t, x)) \cdot \nabla_x - \nu \Delta_p$ on $\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2$ for a given appropriately small vector field u . We hope this linear analysis is of independent interest, and useful in other contexts with partial or anisotropic diffusions.

1. The model and main results

Microswimmers are organisms (e.g. bacteria) or objects operating in a fluid at the micro-scale. They exhibit inherent self-propulsion driven by mechanisms such as flagellar motion, cilia beating, or synthetic fluid flow inducers. Beyond understanding the individual behaviour of microswimmers [15], special attention was paid recently to their collective motion, with impact on fluid mixing, rheological properties, or self-organization of biological active matter [10, 12, 18, 20, 22].

We focus in this paper on one popular model, due to Saintillan and Shelley [21], describing dilute suspensions of self-propelled rodlike particles. This model, relevant to the dynamical behavior of bacteria, is a coupled fluid-kinetic model, detailing the interaction of the particles with the surrounding fluid medium and encapsulating the propulsion

mechanisms governing their motion. It reads

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \Psi + (U_0 p + u) \cdot \nabla_x \Psi + \nabla_p \cdot (\mathbb{P}_{p^\perp}[(\gamma E(u) + W(u))p] \Psi) &= \nu \Delta_p \Psi + \kappa \Delta_x \Psi, \\ -\Delta_x u + \nabla_x q &= \iota \nabla_x \cdot \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \Psi(t, x, p) p \otimes p \, dp, \\ \nabla_x \cdot u &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (1.1)$$

where

$$E(u) = \frac{1}{2}[\nabla_x u + (\nabla_x u)^\top] \quad \text{and} \quad W(u) = \frac{1}{2}[\nabla_x u - (\nabla_x u)^\top]$$

are the symmetric and skew-symmetric parts of $\nabla_x u$, respectively. The unknowns of the model are $\Psi = \Psi(t, x, p)$, the distribution of rodlike particles in space and orientation, and $u = u(t, x)$, $q = q(t, x)$ the fluid velocity and pressure. The space variable x is taken in a periodic box $\mathbb{T}_L := (\mathbb{R}/L\mathbb{Z})^3$ of size $L > 0$, while the orientation of the particles is given by $p \in \mathbb{S}^2$. The first equation in (1.1) describes the evolution of Ψ under three effects:

- transport by the fluid velocity $u(t, x)$ and by the self-propulsion $U_0 p$ with velocity $U_0 > 0$.
- rotation by angular velocity $\mathbb{P}_{p^\perp}[(\gamma E(u) + W(u))p]$, where $\mathbb{P}_{p^\perp}$ denotes projection tangentially to the sphere. This expression for the angular velocity is due to Jeffery [14] and corresponds to the angular velocity of a slender particle in a Stokes flow: interactions are neglected as the suspension is assumed to be dilute. The constant $\gamma \in [-1, 1]$ is related to the geometric properties of the particle.
- rotational and translational diffusion, with respective coefficients $\nu > 0$ and $\kappa > 0$.

Finally, the last two equations in (1.1) are Stokes equations for the fluid flow. They incorporate an additional stress Σ , where

$$\Sigma = \iota \nabla_x \cdot \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \Psi(t, x, p) p \otimes p \, dp$$

reflects the constraint exerted by the particles on the flow. It is obtained by a continuous approximation of the sum of all single particle contributions, modeled as dipoles of opposite forces along p . The parameter $\iota \neq 0$ distinguishes between two types of swimmers: pullers (resp. pushers) correspond to $\iota > 0$ (resp. $\iota < 0$). We refer to [21] or to the introduction in [9] for more on the derivation of the model.

Of special interest is the stability of the constant state equilibrium $\Psi^{\text{iso}} = 1/4\pi$, which corresponds to a distribution of particles homogeneous in space and uniform in orientation. In particular, physicists are interested in loss of stability, with possible emergence of collective patterns and rheological changes. It is therefore natural to work with

$$\psi = \Psi - \Psi^{\text{iso}} = \Psi - \frac{1}{4\pi}.$$

Moreover, one can put the system in dimensionless form, introducing

$$t := \frac{U_0 t}{L}, \quad x := \frac{x}{L}, \quad u := \frac{u}{U_0}, \quad q := \frac{qL}{U_0}, \quad v := \frac{vL}{U_0}, \quad \kappa := \frac{\kappa}{U_0 L}, \quad \iota := \frac{\iota L}{U_0}.$$

At this stage, it is worth noticing that the dimensionless *ratio* $\frac{\kappa}{v}$ is expected to be very small. Indeed, we recall that in the simplified setting of a single spherical passive particle of radius r , at temperature T , inside a Stokes flow of viscosity μ , Einstein–Stokes laws

$$D_t = \frac{k_B T}{6\pi\eta r}, \quad D_r = \frac{k_B T}{8\pi\eta r^3}$$

yield $\frac{\kappa}{v} = \frac{4}{3}(\frac{r}{L})^2 \ll 1$. It is likely that such smallness persists in the case of a dilute suspension of ellipsoidal particles. Moreover, in the case of self-propelled bacteria, it is acknowledged that propulsion strongly dominates over translational diffusion, so that the latter is often neglected; see [19, 23]. Therefore, it is important to obtain stability results that are uniform in small κ . This is the target of this work and for simplicity we take $\kappa = 0$ from now on. This is no loss of generality; see the discussion after Theorem 1. We end up with the following dimensionless system, for $x \in \mathbb{T}$, $p \in \mathbb{S}^2$:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \psi + (p + u) \cdot \nabla_x \psi - \frac{3\gamma}{4\pi} (p \otimes p) : E(u) + \nabla_p \cdot (\mathbb{P}_{p^\perp}[(\gamma E(u) + W(u))p] \psi) \\ = v \Delta_p \psi, \end{aligned} \quad (1.2a)$$

$$-\Delta_x u + \nabla_x q = \iota \nabla_x \cdot \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \psi(t, x, p) p \otimes p \, dp, \quad (1.2b)$$

$$\nabla_x \cdot u = 0. \quad (1.2c)$$

Since the seminal paper [21], system (1.2) has been the matter of several numerical and theoretical studies. In particular, simulations align well with experimental observations of suspensions of bacteria.

- For $\iota > 0$ (pullers), no coherent behaviour is observed, which can be interpreted as stability of Ψ^{iso} .
- For $\iota < 0$ (pushers), one observes formation of patterns when hydrodynamic interactions are increased.

Such observations are valid for small rotational diffusion. They were confirmed analytically in [21], *in the special case* $v = 0$, for the linearization of (1.2) around $\psi = 0$ (that is the linearization of (1.1) around $\Psi = \Psi^{\text{iso}}$). Spectral stability was studied, through a mode by mode Fourier analysis in variable x and refined in subsequent works [13, 17]. Specifically, all perturbations located at mode $k \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}_*^3$ decay if and only if

$$\frac{\gamma|\iota|}{|k|} < \Gamma_c$$

where the threshold Γ_c is given by

- if $\iota > 0$, $\Gamma_c = +\infty$ (unconditional stability),
- if $\iota < 0$, $\Gamma_c = \frac{4}{3\pi b_c^2(1-b_c^2)}$ with $b_c \approx 0.623$ the unique positive root of the function

$$s(b) = 2b^3 - \frac{4}{3}b + (b^4 - b^2) \ln \frac{1-b}{1+b}.$$

In particular, all modes decay under the condition

$$\frac{\gamma|\iota|}{2\pi} < \Gamma_c. \quad (1.3)$$

In the recent work [1], such linear stability for $\Gamma < \Gamma_c$ in the nondiffusive case $\nu = 0$ was revisited and linked to a mixing phenomenon, that is, a transfer from low to high frequencies in p . This phenomenon is related to the free-transport operator $\partial_t + p \cdot \nabla_x$, itself related to the self-propulsion of the particles. It leads to the decay of integral quantities in p , notably to the decay of the right-hand side of the Stokes equation in (1.1) and from there to the decay of the velocity field u . As $\nu = 0$, explicit computations are possible, and the stability analysis comes down to the decay of Fourier transforms *on the sphere* (as the orientation $p \in \mathbb{S}^2$ substitutes to the usual velocity variable $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ in other kinetic models). One key feature is that the decay of such Fourier transforms is limited, leading to a weaker mixing than in classical kinetic models, where the orientation variable $p \in \mathbb{S}^2$ is replaced by the usual velocity variable $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

In our recent paper [9], we carried out a sharp stability study of the linearized version of (1.2) for both $\nu = 0$ and $0 < \nu \ll 1$. We provided slightly more accurate stability results in the case $\nu = 0$, but more importantly, were able to show that the linear stability criterion (1.3) is still the right one for small $\nu > 0$. The introduction of rotational diffusion makes the analysis much harder, as all explicit expressions are lost. We will recall elements of this analysis below.

The purpose of this paper is to extend the linear stability result of [9] to the full nonlinear model (1.2). We present in the next section our main result, explain the main difficulties, notably in comparison to previous linear results. We also provide the general strategy of the proof.

1.1. Statement and sketch of proof

Our main result can be stated as follows.

Theorem 1. *Let $s \in \mathbb{N}$ with $s > \frac{7}{2}$ and assume (1.3). There exist constants $C_0, \nu_0, \delta_0 > 0$ depending on γ and ι such that for all $\nu \leq \nu_0$, and for all initial data ψ^{in} satisfying*

$$\|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{H_x^s L_p^2} \leq \delta_0 \nu^{\frac{3}{2}}, \quad (1.4)$$

system (1.2) has a unique global-in-time solution ψ that satisfies

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \|\psi(t)\|_{H_x^s L_p^2}^2 + \nu \int_0^\infty \|\nabla_p \psi(t)\|_{H_x^s L_p^2}^2 dt \leq C_0 \nu^{-1} \|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{H_x^s L_p^2}^2.$$

This theorem shows nonlinear stability of the solution Ψ^{iso} of (1.1) (or equivalently of the trivial solution $\psi = 0$ of (1.2)) under a smallness condition on the initial datum that is explicit in terms of ν . In other words, the nonlinear stability threshold (1.4) provides an estimate of the basin of attraction of the uniform equilibrium Ψ^{iso} , depending on the strength of rotational diffusion. Determining the optimal threshold is an interesting open problem, recently resolved in other contexts, such as the stability of Couette flow in the Navier–Stokes equations (see [4, 16, 26] and references therein), or the stability of global Maxwellians in the Vlasov–Poisson–Landau system [5] and the Boltzmann equation [3]. See also [25] for an optimal stability criterion for nematic suspensions via an entropy method. We explain just before Section 1.2 why addressing the question of the optimal threshold is still out of our reach.

Theorem 1 has two main features. First, it shows stability under condition (1.3), which is optimal in view of the linear analysis in [1, 9, 21]. Second, it does not require any spatial diffusion term $\kappa \Delta_x \psi$ in the evolution equation (1.2). One could add such a term and still prove stability under the same threshold (1.4), *independently of κ* . From this perspective, our result contrasts with [1], where such translational diffusion is added to the right-hand side of (1.2a).

In the case of pullers ($\iota > 0$), the authors of [1] prove nonlinear stability of the incoherent state Ψ^{iso} both for $x \in \mathbb{T}^d$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, under the condition

$$\|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{H_x^2 L_p^2} \ll \min(\nu, \kappa).$$

In the case of pushers ($\iota < 0$), they prove nonlinear stability of the incoherent state under the stringent assumption $\Gamma = o(\nu^{1/2})$ instead of $\Gamma < \Gamma_c$, and the initial constraint

$$\|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{H_x^2 L_p^2} \ll \nu^{1/4} \min(\nu^{1/2}, \kappa^{1/2}).$$

These restrictions allow the terms $u \cdot \nabla_x \psi$ and $\frac{3\gamma}{4\pi}(p \otimes p) : E(u)$ to be placed on the right-hand side of (1.2a) and the model to be treated as a perturbation of the advection-diffusion equation

$$\partial_t \psi + p \cdot \nabla_x \psi - \nu \Delta \psi = 0.$$

Relaxing these smallness requirements compels us to adopt a different strategy, described below.

Our general approach relies on a classical bootstrap argument. We introduce the maximal time T on which various smallness assumptions on u and ψ hold (see in particular (BA0)–(BA1)–(BA2) in Section 4.1), and we show that improved smallness conditions hold up to time T (see Section 4.3). This implies that $T = \infty$, and the stability estimate follows.

To show improvement of these bootstrap assumptions, we derive from (1.2) a Volterra equation in u :

$$u(t) + \int_0^t K(t, \tau) u(\tau) \, d\tau = f(t), \quad (1.5)$$

where the kernel $K(t, \tau) \in L(H_x^s, H_x^s)$ and the source term $f(t) \in H_x^s$ are defined via integral quantities over p , involving the solution operator $S_u(t, \tau)$ associated to the operator

$$\partial_t + (p + u) \cdot \nabla_x - \nu \Delta_p$$

on $\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2$. This reformulation and expressions for K and f are detailed in Section 4.2. We proceed in four main steps:

- The first key step, discussed further in Section 1.2, establishes enhanced dissipation and mixing decay estimates for the solution of the advection-diffusion equation

$$\partial_t g + (v + p) \cdot \nabla_x g = \nu \Delta_p g, \quad g|_{t=0} = g^{\text{in}}$$

under a suitable smallness assumption on v (to later be replaced by u). These mixing estimates rely on the vector field method.

- Using these estimates, we obtain decay in time for the kernel K and the source term f in the Volterra equation (see Proposition 4.2).
- We then analyze the Volterra equation (1.5) under the bootstrap assumptions to improve smallness of u and show integrable decay.
- Finally, with decay and smallness of u in hand, we return to the equation for ψ to improve the smallness conditions on ψ .

We emphasize that this strategy, combining a Volterra formulation for u with sharp analysis of the advection-diffusion operator, has already been used in our linear analysis [9]. However, in the linear case, we only considered $u = 0$, enabling mode-by-mode Fourier analysis in x . The introduction of the advection term $u \cdot \nabla_x$ couples all modes, introducing significant analytical difficulties.

This affects the mixing estimates via the vector field method. These estimates are based on a family of vector fields indexed by Fourier modes k , of the form $\chi_k(p) J_k(t, \nabla_p)$, where χ_k is supported away from $p = -k/|k|$. This localization is not preserved under mode coupling, adding complexity compared to [9]. More generally, achieving good commutation properties of our vector fields with the advection-diffusion operator (and a fortiori with the full nonlinear operator) is challenging. These vector fields are tailored to address critical points of the advection field $V(p) = p$ on the sphere, but are much less flexible than in Euclidean settings. This accounts for the relatively strong stability threshold $O(\nu^{3/2})$ in Theorem 1. We are currently unable to adapt the sharp stability techniques of [5] to propagate nonlinearly the full suite of linear enhanced dissipation and mixing estimates.

The estimates for the advection-diffusion problem are independent of the active suspension model, and are explained in more detail in the next section. They are likely of independent interest and are proved separately in Sections 2 and 3. The remaining steps in the proof of Theorem 1 for the active suspension model are carried out in Section 4.

1.2. Advection-diffusion equations on the sphere

An important part of our analysis is the description of mixing and enhanced dissipation properties on the sphere. These are the properties of solutions $g = g(t, x, p)$ for $x \in \mathbb{T}^3$ and $p \in \mathbb{S}^2$ solving the advection-diffusion equation

$$\partial_t g + (v + p) \cdot \nabla_x g = \nu \Delta_p g, \quad g|_{t=0} = g^{\text{in}}, \quad (1.6)$$

where g^{in} is the assigned initial datum, $\nu \in (0, 1)$ is a diffusivity parameter, and $v = v(t, x)$ is a divergence-free vector field satisfying adequate smallness and decay assumptions. We are interested in semigroup-type estimates for (1.6) that describe enhanced dissipation, as well as mixing estimates for integrated quantities.

To state our results, we expand g and v in Fourier series in x , calling $k \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ the corresponding Fourier variable. For $k \neq 0$, (1.6) becomes

$$\partial_t g_k + i p \cdot k g_k = \nu \Delta_p g_k + |k| V g_k, \quad V g_k := -i \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \hat{k} \cdot v_{k-\ell} g_\ell, \quad (1.7)$$

where $\hat{k} := k/|k|$. Without loss of generality, we will assume $g_0 = 0$ initially, as this mode simply satisfies the standard heat equation

$$\partial_t g_0 = \nu \Delta_p g_0$$

and hence such a condition is preserved by the evolution. Besides providing estimates on g , we are interested in integrals of the form

$$\mathbb{V}_k[g] := \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} g_k(p) Z_k(p) \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) \, dp, \quad (1.8)$$

for an arbitrary family $\{Z_k\}_{k \neq 0}$ of smooth, possibly vector-valued, functions. Our main result is based on the assumption that

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \|v(t)\|_{H^s} + \left(\int_0^\infty \|v(t)\|_{H^s}^2 \, dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \varepsilon \nu^{\frac{5}{4}}, \quad (\text{H})$$

for some $s > \frac{5}{2}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ small enough.

Theorem 2. *Let $s > \frac{5}{2}$, $0 < s' < s + \frac{1}{4}$. There exist constants $C_0, \varepsilon, \nu_0, \eta_1 > 0$ with the following properties. For all $\nu \leq \nu_0$, if (H) holds, then the solution to (1.6) satisfies the enhanced dissipation estimate*

$$\|g(t)\|_{H_x^s L_p^2} \leq C_0 e^{-\eta_1 \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} t} \|g^{\text{in}}\|_{H_x^s L_p^2}, \quad (1.9)$$

and the mixing estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \neq 0} |k|^{2s'} |\mathbb{V}_k[g_k(t)]|^2 &\leq C_0 \left(\frac{\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\min\{1, \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} t\}} \right)^3 \\ &\quad \times \sup_k (\|Z_k\|_{W_p^{1,\infty}}^2 + \|Z_k\|_{H_p^2}^2) \|g^{\text{in}}, \nabla_p g^{\text{in}}, \nabla_p^2 g^{\text{in}}\|_{H_x^s L_p^2}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (1.10)$$

for all $t \geq 0$.

Remark 1.1. Only the weaker condition

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \|v(t)\|_{H^s} + \left(\int_0^\infty \|v(t)\|_{H^s}^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \varepsilon v^{1/2} \quad (1.11)$$

is required to establish the enhanced dissipation estimate (1.9); see Proposition 3.15.

Recall that the term *enhanced dissipation* refers to the phenomenon where the time-scale of exponential decay (in our case, of order $v^{-1/2}$) is much shorter than the usual diffusive timescale v^{-1} associated with the heat equation (see [6, 8]). This effect is linked to mixing, which transfers energy to higher frequencies in the p -variable, where the viscous dissipation operator $-v\Delta_p$ acts more effectively. We do not know if condition (1.11) is optimal for proving enhanced dissipation estimates.

The proof of Theorem 2 is rather involved and does not rely on any special properties of the sphere $\mathbb{S}^2$. It is based on two key ingredients: the derivation of hypocoercive estimates, inspired by [2, 24], and the use of the vector field method, following ideas from [5, 7].

The central hypocoercivity estimate, given in (1.9), concerns the advection-diffusion operator

$$L_v = \partial_t + p \cdot \nabla_x - v\Delta_p,$$

i.e. the case with $u = 0$. This estimate is established in Section 2. Compared to the linear analysis in [9], we present a more general version in Proposition 3.15, where

- the function g is replaced by a general tensor Y (which will later be taken as g , Jg , or J^2g for some suitable vector field J);
- a source term, such as the one in (1.7), is included. This term will later originate either from the convection term (e.g. $-v \cdot \nabla_x g$, $-J(v \cdot \nabla_x g)$, or $-J^2(v \cdot \nabla_x g)$), or from commutators between J and L_v .

The estimate reveals improved decay properties for the quantity $\nabla(p \cdot k)Y$, which vanishes at $p = \pm \hat{k}$.

Although setting $Y = g$ and taking the source term to be $-v \cdot \nabla_x g$ is already sufficient to obtain the exponential decay in (1.9), *obtaining polynomial decay estimates for integral quantities*, uniformly in v , requires the use of adapted vector fields.

These vector fields are introduced in Section 3, where they are used to establish the mixing estimates (1.10). As in [9], after Fourier transform in x , the vector field takes the form

$$J_k = \alpha_k \nabla_p + i \left(\frac{|k|}{v} \right)^{1/2} \beta_k \nabla_p (p \cdot \hat{k}),$$

where

$$(\alpha_k, \beta_k) = (\alpha_{k,v}, \beta_{k,v})(t) = (\alpha, \beta)(v^{1/2}|k|^{1/2}t)$$

with α, β carefully chosen (slightly differently and with slight improvements over [9]). The evolution of α_k and β_k is tailored so that their commutator with L_v has better structure. In particular, a critical term in the commutator vanishes near $p = \hat{k}$, which aligns

with the hypocoercive estimate's improved decay for quantities vanishing at $p = \pm\hat{k}$. However, this requires introducing an additional cut-off function $\chi_k(p)$, supported away from $p = -\hat{k}$.

A complication arises because the convection term is nonlocal in Fourier space and tends to disrupt this localization. This necessitates two layers of estimates: nonlocalized estimates leading to suboptimal decay and localized ones leading to optimal decay. This two-pronged analysis is carried out in Sections 3.1 and 3.2. The usage of the nonlocalized estimates is the main restriction on the threshold condition in (H).

Once this framework is in place, the abstract source term F is replaced with the actual convection term $-u \cdot \nabla_x g$. Due to mode coupling in Fourier space, only summing over all modes allows for closing the estimates, as shown in Section 3.3. Finally, the mixing estimates for integral quantities are presented in Section 3.4.

1.3. Notation

We write $a \lesssim b$ to indicate that $a \leq Cb$, where the constant C depends only on the fixed parameters γ and ι . Similarly, we write $a \sim b$ if both $a \lesssim b$ and $b \lesssim a$ hold.

In Sections 2 and 3, which focus on equation (1.6) and its variations, the notation $a \lesssim b$ will instead refer to an inequality with an *absolute constant* C , independent of any parameters.

For any real number s , we use the following Sobolev space notation:

- $H^s = H^s_x(\mathbb{T}^3)$ denotes the standard Sobolev space in the spatial variable $x \in \mathbb{T}^3$ equipped with the norm

$$\|u\|_{H^s}^2 = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} [\max(1, |k|)]^{2s} |\hat{u}_k|^2$$

defined over the Fourier modes $u_k, k \in \mathbb{Z}^3$,

- $\mathcal{H}^s = H^s_x(\mathbb{T}^3; L^2_p(\mathbb{S}^2))$ denotes the corresponding space of L^2 -functions in $p \in \mathbb{S}^2$ with Sobolev regularity in x ,
- $\mathbb{Z}^3_* = \mathbb{Z}^3 \setminus \{0\}$.

2. Advection-diffusion with forcing: Hypocoercivity

Equation (1.7) can be seen as a forced advection-diffusion equation, as long as we impose mild assumptions on the right-hand side. In this section we derive energy estimates for a slight generalization of (1.7).

2.1. A general hypocoercivity setup and enhanced dissipation

The basic starting block is to find the hypocoercive dissipation functional for a tensor Y solving the advection-diffusion equation (1.7) on the sphere. We will then first apply

this estimate with $Y = g$ and then later with some vector fields $Y = Jg$, $Y = JJg$, for a suitable J . As a small generalization of (1.7), we study a family of $(0, n)$ -tensors $(Y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^3}$ evolving as

$$(\partial_t + \mathbf{i}p \cdot k - \nu \Delta_p)Y_k = |k|F_k, \quad (2.1)$$

for some forcing term F_k . Here we take as the Laplacian the connection Laplacian defined as $\nabla_p \cdot \nabla_p$ with the covariant derivative and the inner product from the metric.

From the analysis in [9] we expect enhanced dissipation on the timescale $O(\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ so that we set the rescaled time

$$h := \nu^{\frac{1}{2}}|k|^{\frac{1}{2}}t$$

and define the time-dependent weights

$$(a_k, b_k, c_k) := (a, b, c)(h), \quad (a'_k, b'_k, c'_k) := (a', b', c')(h)$$

for nonnegative functions a, b, c to be specified below. Denoting by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and $\| \cdot \|$ the L^2 inner product and norm, for any smooth nonnegative function $\chi = \chi(p)$, we define the sesquilinear form

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\chi, k}(Y_k, \tilde{Y}_k) &:= \langle Y_k \chi, \tilde{Y}_k \chi \rangle + \left(\frac{\nu}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} a_k \langle \nabla_p Y_k \chi, \nabla_p \tilde{Y}_k \chi \rangle \\ &\quad + b_k \langle \mathbf{i} \nabla_p(p \cdot \hat{k}) Y_k \chi, \nabla_p \tilde{Y}_k \chi \rangle + b_k \langle \nabla_p Y_k \chi, \mathbf{i} \nabla_p(p \cdot \hat{k}) \tilde{Y}_k \chi \rangle \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{\nu}{|k|} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} c_k \langle \nabla_p(p \cdot \hat{k}) Y_k \chi, \nabla_p(p \cdot \hat{k}) \tilde{Y}_k \chi \rangle \end{aligned}$$

and the corresponding energy functional

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\chi, k}(Y_k) &:= E_{\chi, k}(Y_k, Y_k) = \|Y_k \chi\|^2 + \left(\frac{\nu}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} a_k \|\nabla_p Y_k \chi\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2b_k \operatorname{Re} \langle \mathbf{i} \nabla_p(p \cdot \hat{k}) Y_k \chi, \nabla_p Y_k \chi \rangle + \left(\frac{\nu}{|k|} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} c_k \|\nabla_p(p \cdot \hat{k}) Y_k \chi\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

We also define the dissipation functional

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\chi, k}(Y_k) &:= \frac{\nu}{|k|} \|\nabla_p Y_k \chi\|^2 + \frac{\nu}{|k|} a_k \left(\frac{\nu}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla_p^2 Y_k \chi\|^2 \\ &\quad + b_k \|\nabla_p(p \cdot \hat{k}) Y_k \chi\|^2 + \frac{\nu}{|k|} c_k \left(\frac{\nu}{|k|} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla_p(\nabla_p(p \cdot \hat{k}) Y_k) \chi\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

The first lemma shows that for a good choice of a, b, c , these functionals provide a good estimate.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\chi = \chi(p)$ be a smooth cut-off and set*

$$a(h) = A \min(h, 1), \quad b(h) = B \min(h^2, 1), \quad c = C \min(h^3, 1) \quad (2.3)$$

for positive constants A, B, C . There exist constants $v_0, B_0, M > 0$ such that for $v \leq v_0$, $B < B_0$, and

$$A = B^{2/3}, \quad C = \frac{100B^2}{A},$$

any $(0, n)$ -tensor solution Y_k of (2.1) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} E_{\chi, k}(Y_k) + \frac{3}{4} |k| D_{\chi, k}(Y_k) - |k| \operatorname{Re} E_{\chi, k}(Y_k, F_k) \\ & \leq |k| M c_k \left(\frac{v}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|Y_k \chi\|^2 \\ & \quad + |k| M \left[\frac{v}{|k|} \|Y_k \nabla \chi\|^2 + \left(\frac{v}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}} a_k \|\nabla Y_k \nabla \chi\|^2 + \left(\frac{v}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} c_k \|\nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) Y_k \nabla \chi\|^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 2.2. As we will see, a, b, c satisfy the condition that $b_k^2 < \frac{1}{2} a_k c_k$. This makes the quadratic form $E_{\chi, k}$ coercive, in the sense that

$$\|Y_k \chi\|^2 + \left(\frac{v}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} a_k \|\nabla_p Y_k \chi\|^2 + \left(\frac{v}{|k|} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} c_k \|\nabla_p(p \cdot \hat{k}) Y_k \chi\|^2 \lesssim E_{\chi, k}(Y_k).$$

Remark 2.3. The statement of the lemma would still be true on any Riemannian manifold for which $(0, n)$ -tensors Z satisfy $|[\nabla, \Delta]Z| \lesssim |\nabla Z|$. To illustrate this, we will not use the fact that on $\mathbb{S}^2$ the commutator $[\nabla_p, \Delta_p]Z = -\nabla_p Z$ gives some extra coercivity property.

Proof of Lemma 2.1. Through the change of variables

$$v' := \frac{v}{|k|}, \quad t' := |k|t, \quad k' := \frac{k}{|k|}, \quad (2.4)$$

we can restrict to the case $|k| = 1$, so that $k = \hat{k}$. To lighten notation, we drop the subscript k , writing Y instead of Y_k , F instead of F_k , and so on, as well as the subscript p on the various differential operators. We find through standard estimates that

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|Y \chi\|^2 + v \|\nabla Y \chi\|^2 \leq \operatorname{Re} \langle Y \chi, F \chi \rangle + 2v \|\nabla Y \chi\| \|Y \nabla \chi\|.$$

Similarly, as

$$\partial_t \nabla Y + i p \cdot k \nabla Y - v \Delta \nabla Y = \nabla F - i \nabla(p \cdot k) Y + v [\nabla, \Delta] Y,$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla Y \chi\|^2 + v \|\nabla \nabla Y \chi\|^2 & \leq \operatorname{Re} \langle \nabla Y \chi, \nabla F \chi \rangle + 2v \|\nabla \nabla Y \chi\| \|\nabla Y \nabla \chi\| \\ & \quad + \|\nabla Y \chi\| \|\nabla(p \cdot k) Y \chi\| + v \|[\nabla, \Delta] Y \chi\| \|\nabla Y \chi\|. \end{aligned}$$

Also, using

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t(i\nabla(p \cdot k)Y) + ip \cdot k(i\nabla(p \cdot k)Y) - v i\nabla(p \cdot k)\Delta Y &= i\nabla(p \cdot k)F, \\ \partial_t \nabla Y + ip \cdot k \nabla Y - v \nabla \Delta Y &= \nabla F - i\nabla(p \cdot k)Y,\end{aligned}$$

we find

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt} \operatorname{Re}(i\nabla(p \cdot k)Y\chi, \nabla Y\chi) + \|\nabla(p \cdot k)Y\chi\|^2 \\ \leq v\langle i\nabla(p \cdot k)\Delta Y\chi, \nabla Y\chi \rangle + v\langle i\nabla(p \cdot k)Y\chi, \nabla \Delta Y\chi \rangle \\ + \operatorname{Re}(i\nabla(p \cdot k)F\chi, \nabla Y\chi) + \operatorname{Re}(i\nabla(p \cdot k)Y\chi, \nabla F\chi) \\ \leq v\|\nabla \nabla Y\chi\| [2\|\nabla(p \cdot k)Y\chi\| + \|Y\chi\| + 2\|\nabla(p \cdot k)Y\chi\|] \\ + \operatorname{Re}(i\nabla(p \cdot k)F\chi, \nabla Y\chi) + \operatorname{Re}(i\nabla(p \cdot k)Y\chi, \nabla F\chi).\end{aligned}$$

Finally, using

$$\partial_t(i\nabla(p \cdot k)Y) + ip \cdot k(i\nabla(p \cdot k)Y) - v\Delta(i\nabla(p \cdot k)Y) = i\nabla(p \cdot k)F + v[i\nabla(p \cdot k), \Delta]Y$$

together with the commutator formula (see [9, Lemma A.1])

$$\Delta(\nabla(p \cdot k) \otimes Y) = -\nabla(p \cdot k) \otimes Y - 2(p \cdot k)\nabla Y + \nabla(p \cdot k) \otimes \Delta Y,$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla(p \cdot k)Y\chi\|^2 + v\|\nabla(\nabla(p \cdot k)Y)\chi\|^2 + v\|\nabla(p \cdot k)Y\chi\|^2 \\ \leq 2v\|\nabla(\nabla(p \cdot k)Y)\chi\| \|\nabla(p \cdot k)Y\chi\| + \operatorname{Re}(\nabla(p \cdot k)Y\chi, \nabla(p \cdot k)F\chi) \\ + 2v\|\nabla(p \cdot k)Y\chi\| \|\nabla Y\chi\|.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, gathering these estimates leads to

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} E_\chi(Y) + D_\chi(Y) - \operatorname{Re} E_\chi(Y, F) \\ \leq va' \|\nabla Y\chi\|^2 + v^{\frac{1}{2}}a \|\nabla Y\chi\| \|\nabla(p \cdot k)Y\chi\| + v^{\frac{3}{2}}a \|[\nabla, \Delta]Y\chi\| \|\nabla Y\chi\| \\ + v^{\frac{1}{2}}b' \operatorname{Re}(i\nabla(p \cdot k)Y\chi, \nabla Y\chi) \\ + 2vb \|\nabla \nabla Y\chi\| (\|\nabla(\nabla(p \cdot k)Y)\chi\| + \|Y\chi\| + \|\nabla(p \cdot k)Y\chi\|) \\ + c' \|\nabla(p \cdot k)Y\chi\|^2 + 2v^{\frac{1}{2}}c \|\nabla(p \cdot k)Y\chi\| \|\nabla Y\chi\| \\ + 2v \|\nabla Y\chi\| \|Y\chi\| + 2v^{\frac{3}{2}}a \|\nabla \nabla Y\chi\| \|\nabla Y\chi\| \\ + 2v^{\frac{1}{2}}c \|\nabla(\nabla(p \cdot k)Y)\chi\| \|\nabla(p \cdot k)Y\chi\|.\end{aligned}$$

We are now ready to list the constraints on the coefficients a, b, c in order to absorb most of the terms of the right-hand side. It suffices that

- $a' \leq \frac{1}{100}$ to absorb the first term on the right-hand side by the term $\nu \|\nabla Y\chi\|^2$ in the dissipation functional $D_\chi(Y)$ on the left-hand side,
- $a^2 \leq \frac{b}{100}$ to absorb the second term by the term $\nu \|\nabla Y\chi\|^2 + b \|\nabla(p \cdot k)Y\chi\|^2$,
- $a \leq 1$ and ν small to absorb the third term by $\nu \|\nabla Y\chi\|^2$,
- $(b')^2 \leq \frac{b}{100}$ to absorb the fourth term by $\nu \|\nabla Y\chi\|^2 + b \|\nabla(p \cdot k)Y\chi\|^2$,
- $b^2 \frac{\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}}{a} \leq \frac{\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}c}{100}$ to bound the fifth term by

$$\frac{1}{10} \left(\nu^{\frac{3}{2}} a \|\nabla^2 Y\chi\|^2 + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} c \|\nabla(\nabla(p \cdot k)Y\chi)\|^2 + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} c \|Y\chi\|^2 + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} c \|\nabla(p \cdot k)Y\chi\|^2 \right),$$

the first two terms being absorbed by $D_\chi(Y)$ on the left-hand side,

- $c' \leq \frac{b}{100}$ to absorb the sixth term by $b \|\nabla(p \cdot k)Y\chi\|^2$,
- $c^2 \leq \frac{b}{100}$ to absorb the seventh term by $\nu \|\nabla Y\chi\|^2 + b \|\nabla(p \cdot k)Y\chi\|^2$.

These conditions are satisfied with our choice of a, b, c in (2.3). The last three terms involving $\nabla\chi$ can be treated classically using Young's inequality, without further constraints on a, b, c . ■

2.2. The energy inequality for g

As a first application of Lemma 2.1, we deduce an energy inequality for the solution g to (2.1). For the trivial cut-off $\chi \equiv 1$, we use the shorthand notation $E_k = E_{\chi,k}$ and $D_k = D_{\chi,k}$. By the previous lemma, taking $Y_k = g_k$, we get the following lemma.

Lemma 2.4. *Assume that the scalar function g satisfies (2.1). Then with the same functions as in Lemma 2.1 we find (for possibly smaller ν_0 and B_0) that*

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} E_k(g_k) + |k| a_k \left(\frac{\nu}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|g_k\|^2 + \frac{5}{8} |k| D_k(g_k) - |k| \operatorname{Re} E_k(g_k, F_k) \leq 0.$$

For the proof, we first recall the following interpolation result; see [9, Lemma 4.2].

Lemma 2.5. *For all $\sigma \in (0, 1]$, all vectors $e \in \mathbb{S}^2$, and all complex-valued $g \in H^1(\mathbb{S}^2)$, the following inequality holds:*

$$\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \|g\|^2 \leq \frac{\sigma}{2} \|\nabla g\|^2 + 2 \|\nabla(p \cdot e)g\|^2. \quad (2.5)$$

We now can perform the proof.

Proof of Lemma 2.4. Applying Lemma 2.1 yields

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} E_k(g_k) + \frac{3}{4} |k| D_k(g_k) - |k| \operatorname{Re} E_k(g_k, F_k) \leq |k| M c_k \left(\frac{\nu}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|g_k\|^2. \quad (2.6)$$

By the change of variables (2.4), we can again restrict to $|k| = 1$. We distinguish between long times and short times. For long times t such that $\nu \leq b_k = b(\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}t)$, we apply the

interpolation result with $\sigma = \frac{\nu}{b_k}$. It gives

$$D_k(g_k) \geq \nu \|\nabla g_k\|^2 + b_k \|\nabla(p \cdot k)g_k\|^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} b_k^{\frac{1}{2}} \|g_k\|^2.$$

As $b_k^{\frac{1}{2}} \gg a_k \gg c_k$ this gives the claimed control and allows the absorption of the right-hand side in (2.6).

For the smaller times t such that $\nu \geq b_k$, we find by Poincaré inequality that

$$c_k \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|g_k\|^2 \lesssim c_k \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla g_k\|^2 + c_k \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla(p \cdot k)g_k\|^2.$$

As for such times as $c_k \ll \nu^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $c_k \ll b_k$, we can also absorb them in the dissipation and control the right-hand side of (2.6). ■

3. Advection-diffusion with forcing: Vector fields

Adapting the strategy in [9], we use vector fields to deduce mixing estimates for (1.6) that are uniform in the diffusivity parameter ν . Proving enhanced dissipation for g essentially relies on the energy inequality of Lemma 2.4 together with a suitable treatment of the forcing term given by advection (see Section 3.3), as done in Section 3.3.2. However, the proof of uniform-in- ν mixing estimates is more involved: the use of vector fields requires cut-offs to localize and improve basic L^2 estimates near the south pole $p = -\hat{k}$; see Remark 3.2 and Lemma 3.4.

To treat the convection term in a sharp way, we need to introduce two hypocoercivity schemes in Section 3.3.3: a nonlocalized version (Lemma 3.5), without losses with respect to the convection term, and a localized one (Lemma 3.6), allowing the derivation of a sharp energy inequality. These results are then applied in Section 3.4 to obtain mixing estimates that are uniform in ν .

Our goal is to construct vector fields that have good commutation properties with the advection-diffusion equation (1.6). We look for vector fields of the form

$$J_k = \alpha_k \nabla_p + i \left(\frac{|k|}{\nu} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \beta_k \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}), \quad (3.1)$$

where we again introduce the good timescale $h = \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} t$ and set

$$\alpha_k(t) = \alpha(h), \quad \beta_k(t) = \beta(h)$$

for functions α, β to be specified. The factor in front of β_k is inspired by the fact that as $\nu \rightarrow 0$, we want to recover $\alpha_k \equiv 1$ and $(\frac{|k|}{\nu})^{\frac{1}{2}} \beta_k \equiv |k|t$. The reason is that the vector field $\nabla_p + i|k|t \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k})$ commutes to the free transport part. For the full operator in (1.6) we find the commutators

$$[\partial_t + i p \cdot k - \nu \Delta_p, \alpha_k \nabla_p] = \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \alpha' \nabla_p - i |k| \alpha \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) - \alpha \nu [\Delta_p, \nabla_p]$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\partial_t + \mathbf{i} p \cdot k - \nu \Delta_p, \mathbf{i} \left(\frac{|k|}{\nu} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \beta_k \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) \right] \\ &= \mathbf{i} |k| \beta' \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) - \mathbf{i} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \beta \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) + 2 \mathbf{i} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \beta \nabla[(p \cdot \hat{k}) \cdot] \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_t + \mathbf{i} p \cdot k - \nu \Delta_p) J_k Y_k &= -\mathbf{i} |k| (\alpha - \beta') \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) Y_k + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} (\alpha' + 2 \mathbf{i} \beta p \cdot \hat{k}) \nabla_p Y_k \\ &\quad - \alpha \nu [\Delta_p, \nabla_p] Y_k + \mathbf{i} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \beta \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) Y_k. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, for the $O(1)$ term on the right-hand side to disappear, the condition $\alpha = \beta'$ is necessary. A key idea from [9] is to complete this condition in such a way that the second term on the right-hand side vanishes at the *north pole* $p = \hat{k}$. The goal is to benefit from estimates for quantities $\nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) Y_k$ or $\nabla(\nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) Y_k)$ better than those for Y_k or ∇Y_k alone. In [9], we achieve this by imposing

$$\beta'(h) = \alpha(h), \quad \alpha'(h) = -2 \mathbf{i} \beta(h).$$

Together with the initial data $\alpha(0) = 1$, $\beta(0) = 0$, this provides

$$\alpha(h) = \cosh((1 - \mathbf{i})h), \quad \beta(h) = \frac{1 + \mathbf{i}}{2} \sinh((1 - \mathbf{i})h).$$

This is a good choice up to the critical time $\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. However, afterwards both terms behave asymptotically with the factor $e^{(1-\mathbf{i})h}$, which is growing fast. Hence, here we prefer to consider

$$\alpha(h) = e^{-(1-\mathbf{i})h} \cosh((1 - \mathbf{i})h) = \frac{1}{2} (1 + e^{-2h} e^{2\mathbf{i}h}) \quad (3.2)$$

and

$$\beta(h) = e^{-(1-\mathbf{i})h} \frac{1 + \mathbf{i}}{2} \sinh((1 - \mathbf{i})h) = \frac{(1 + \mathbf{i})}{4} (1 - e^{-2h} e^{2\mathbf{i}h}). \quad (3.3)$$

Remark 3.1. With this new choice of α and β , we have the important property that

$$\alpha \sim 1, \quad \beta^2 \sim b,$$

where b is the function appearing in Lemma 2.1 (now fixed).

In light of (3.2)–(3.3), we compute the commutator between J_k and the advection-diffusion equation as

$$\begin{aligned} & [\partial_t + \mathbf{i} p \cdot k - \nu \Delta_p, J_k] + |k| (1 - \mathbf{i}) \left(\frac{\nu}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= |k| 2 \mathbf{i} \beta \left(\frac{\nu}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla_p [(p \cdot \hat{k} - 1) \cdot] + |k| \left[-\frac{\nu}{|k|} \alpha [\Delta_p, \nabla_p] - \mathbf{i} \left(\frac{\nu}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \beta \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we find for a tensor Y_k solution of (2.1) that $J_k Y_k$ satisfies

$$(\partial_t + i p \cdot k - \Delta_p) J_k Y_k + |k|(1 - i) \left(\frac{\nu}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} J_k Y_k = |k| J_k F_k + |k| R_k Y_k, \quad (3.4)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} R_k Y_k &= 2i\beta_k \left(\frac{\nu}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla_p [(p \cdot \hat{k} - 1) Y_k] - \frac{\nu}{|k|} \alpha_k [\Delta_p, \nabla_p] Y_k \\ &\quad - i \left(\frac{\nu}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \beta_k \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) Y_k \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

is a remainder term.

Remark 3.2. We insist that through our choice of vector field J_k , the worst term on the right-hand side of (3.5), namely $2i\beta_k \left(\frac{\nu}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla_p [(p \cdot \hat{k} - 1) Y_k]$, vanishes at $p = \hat{k}$. This will allow us to benefit from the better controls that we have on $\nabla(p \cdot k) Y_k$ or $\nabla(\nabla(p \cdot k) Y_k)$; see the dissipation functional (2.2). Still, this better control will only be achieved away from the *south pole* $p = -\hat{k}$. Indeed, near the south pole, $\nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) Y_k$ vanishes while our term on the right-hand side does not, so that the former cannot control the latter. Namely, we will achieve optimal estimates only for $J_k g_k \chi_k$, where χ_k is zero near the south pole $p = -\hat{k}$. To obtain control near this south pole, we need to define another vector field H_k , replacing the relation $\alpha' = -2i\beta$ which was our starting point for J_k by $\alpha' = +2i\beta$. All the estimates we obtain for $J_k Y_k \chi_k$, with $\chi_k = 0$ near the south pole, extend readily to $H_k Y_k g_k$, with $g_k = 0$ near the north pole.

3.1. L^2 estimates

We start with a basic estimate for $J_k Y_k$ without localization.

Lemma 3.3. *There exists $M > 0$ such that for all $k \neq 0$ it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|J_k Y_k\|^2 + |k| \frac{3}{4} \frac{\nu}{|k|} \|\nabla J_k Y_k\|^2 + |k| \frac{3}{4} \left(\frac{\nu}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|J_k Y_k\|^2 - |k| \operatorname{Re} \langle J_k Y_k, J_k F_k \rangle \\ \leq |k| M [b_k \|Y_k\|^2 + D_k(Y_k)]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Proof. As before, we can take the time rescaling from (2.4) and assume $|k| = 1$. We also get rid of the subscript k in the notation when no confusion arises. Performing an L^2 estimate on (3.4), we find

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|JY\|^2 + \nu \|\nabla JY\|^2 + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|JY\|^2 - \operatorname{Re} \langle JY, JF \rangle \leq \operatorname{Re} \langle JY, RY \rangle.$$

To bound the right-hand side, we integrate by parts the first term in the definition (3.5) of R , and get

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re} \langle JY, RY \rangle &\lesssim |\beta| \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla JY\| \|(p \cdot k - 1)Y\| + \nu |\alpha| \|JY\| \|\nabla Y\| \\ &\quad + |\beta| \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|JY\| \|\nabla(p \cdot k)Y\| \\ &\lesssim \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} |b|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla JY\| \|Y\| + \nu \|JY\| \|\nabla Y\| + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} |b|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|JY\| \|\nabla(p \cdot k)Y\|, \end{aligned}$$

where we used Remark 3.1 for the last bound. The result then follows classically from Young's inequality. ■

We now show an improved L^2 bound, when localized away from the *south pole* $p = -\hat{k}$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $k \neq 0$, and let $\chi_k = \chi_k(p)$, $\tilde{\chi}_k = \tilde{\chi}_k(p)$ be two smooth functions, which are zero near $p = -\hat{k}$, and such that $|\chi_k| + |\nabla \chi_k| \lesssim \tilde{\chi}_k$. Then, for some $M > 0$ independent of k , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|J_k Y_k \chi_k\|^2 + |k| \frac{3}{4} \frac{v}{|k|} \|\nabla J_k Y_k \chi_k\|^2 + |k| \frac{3}{4} \left(\frac{v}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|J_k Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \\ & \quad - |k| \langle J_k Y_k \chi_k, J_k F_k \chi_k \rangle \\ & \leq |k| M \left[\frac{v}{|k|} \|Y \tilde{\chi}_k\|^2 + D_{\tilde{\chi}_k, k}(Y_k) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. As before, we can through (2.4) assume that $|k| = 1$. We further omit the subscript k from our notation. The localized L^2 estimate yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|J Y \chi\|^2 + v \|\nabla J Y \chi\|^2 + v^{\frac{1}{2}} \|J Y \chi\|^2 - \langle J Y \chi, J F \chi \rangle \\ & \leq 2v \|\nabla J Y \chi\| \|J Y \nabla \chi\| + \text{Re} \langle J Y \chi, R Y \chi \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to the definition of J and Remark 3.1, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \|J Y \nabla \chi\|^2 & \lesssim |\alpha|^2 \|\nabla Y \nabla \chi\|^2 + v^{-1} |\beta|^2 \|\nabla(p \cdot k) Y \nabla \chi\|^2 \\ & \lesssim \|\nabla Y \tilde{\chi}\|^2 + v^{-1} b \|\nabla(p \cdot k) Y \tilde{\chi}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that the first term on the right-hand side satisfies for some $M > 0$,

$$2v \|\nabla J Y \chi\| \|J Y \nabla \chi\| \leq \frac{1}{8} v \|\nabla J Y \chi\|^2 + M(v \|\nabla Y \tilde{\chi}\|^2 + b \|\nabla(p \cdot k) Y \tilde{\chi}\|^2).$$

For the second term, we integrate by parts the first term on the right-hand side of (3.5), and find

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Re} \langle J Y \chi, R Y \chi \rangle & \lesssim |\beta| v^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla J Y \chi\| \|(p \cdot k - 1) Y \chi\| + |\beta| v^{\frac{1}{2}} \|J Y \chi\| \|(p \cdot k - 1) Y \nabla \chi\| \\ & \quad + v |\alpha| \|J Y \chi\| \|\nabla Y \chi\| + |\beta| v^{\frac{1}{2}} \|J Y \chi\| \|\nabla(p \cdot k) Y \chi\| \\ & \lesssim (\|\nabla J Y \chi\| + \|J Y \chi\|) (b^{\frac{1}{2}} v^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla(p \cdot k) Y \tilde{\chi}\| + v \|\nabla Y \chi\|). \end{aligned}$$

Note that besides Remark 3.1, crucially we have used that $|(p \cdot k - 1)| \lesssim |\nabla(p \cdot k)|$ on the support of $\tilde{\chi}$, a property that was missing in the proof of Lemma 3.3. One can conclude using Young's inequality that for some $M > 0$,

$$\text{Re} \langle J Y \chi, R Y \chi \rangle \lesssim \frac{1}{8} v \|\nabla J Y \chi\|^2 + \frac{1}{8} v \|J Y \chi\|^2 + M(v \|\nabla Y \tilde{\chi}\|^2 + b \|\nabla(p \cdot k) Y \tilde{\chi}\|^2).$$

The lemma follows. ■

3.2. Hypocoercive estimates

To control JY in the hypocoercivity functional, we first show a nonlocalized bound, where we do not benefit from the localization and thus lose in terms of scaling in v .

Lemma 3.5. *Assume the setup of Lemma 2.1. For possibly smaller v_0 , B_0 and a new constant M we find that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} E_k(J_k Y_k) + \frac{5}{8} |k| D_k(J_k Y_k) + \frac{3}{4} |k| \left(\frac{v}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} E_k(J_k Y_k) - |k| \operatorname{Re} E_k(J_k Y_k, J F_k) \\ & \leq |k| M \left(\frac{v}{|k|} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left[D_k(Y_k) + \left(\frac{v}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{c_k^2}{b_k} \|Y_k\|^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By the change of variables (2.4), we can restrict to $|k| = 1$. As before we omit the subscript k . Then (3.4) and Lemma 2.1 imply (taking into account the extra term $(1-i)v^{\frac{1}{2}}JY$)

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} E(JY) + \frac{3}{4} D(JY) + v^{\frac{1}{2}} E(JY) - \operatorname{Re} E(JY, JF) \\ & \leq \operatorname{Re} E(RY, JY) + M c v^{\frac{1}{2}} \|JY\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

The last term on the right-hand side can be directly absorbed by the third term on the left-hand side, as $c \ll 1$. For $\operatorname{Re} E(RY, JY)$, first note that

$$\begin{aligned} |RY|^2 & \lesssim (v|\beta|^2 + v^2|\alpha|^2)|\nabla Y|^2 + v|\beta|^2 |\nabla(p \cdot k)Y|^2 \\ & \lesssim v|\nabla Y|^2 + vb|\nabla(p \cdot k)Y|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we used Remark 3.1 for the last bound. Then split $\operatorname{Re} E_k(RY, JY)$ as

$$\operatorname{Re} E_k(RY, JY) = I^0 + I^a + I^b + I^c,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I^0 & = \operatorname{Re} \langle RY, JY \rangle, \\ I^a & = a v^{\frac{1}{2}} \operatorname{Re} \langle \nabla RY, \nabla JY \rangle, \\ I^b & = b \operatorname{Re} \langle i \nabla(p \cdot k)RY, \nabla JY \rangle + b \operatorname{Re} \langle i \nabla(p \cdot k)JY, \nabla RY \rangle, \\ I^c & = c v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \operatorname{Re} \langle \nabla(p \cdot k)RY, \nabla(p \cdot k)JY \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly,

$$I^0 \leq \|RY\| \|JY\|,$$

so that for a constant $\delta > 0$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} I^0 - \delta v^{\frac{1}{2}} \|JY\|^2 & \lesssim \delta^{-1} v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|RY\|^2 \lesssim \delta^{-1} v^{-\frac{1}{2}} (v \|\nabla Y\|^2 + vb \|\nabla(p \cdot k)Y\|^2) \\ & \lesssim \delta^{-1} v^{-\frac{1}{2}} D(Y). \end{aligned}$$

For I^a we find after an integration by parts that

$$I^a - \delta a v^{\frac{3}{2}} \|\nabla^2 JY\|^2 \lesssim \delta^{-1} a v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|RY\|^2 \lesssim \delta^{-1} v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|RY\|^2 \lesssim \delta^{-1} v^{-\frac{1}{2}} D(Y).$$

Recalling the choice (2.3) of the weights, we get for I^b that

$$\begin{aligned} I^b - \delta v^{\frac{1}{2}} c [\|\nabla(\nabla(p \cdot k)JY)\|^2 + \|JY\|^2] &\lesssim \delta^{-1} \frac{b^2}{c} v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|RY\|^2 \\ &\lesssim \delta^{-1} v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|RY\|^2 \lesssim \delta^{-1} v^{-\frac{1}{2}} D(Y). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we need to bound I^c . We find that

$$\begin{aligned} I^c - \delta b \|\nabla(p \cdot k)JY\|^2 &\lesssim \delta^{-1} v^{-1} \frac{c^2}{b} \|\nabla(p \cdot k)RY\|^2 \\ &\lesssim \delta^{-1} \frac{c^2}{b} (\|\nabla(p \cdot k)\nabla Y\|^2 + b \|\nabla(p \cdot k)Y\|^2) \\ &\lesssim \delta^{-1} v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{c^2}{b} v^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla(\nabla(p \cdot k)Y)\|^2 + \frac{c^2}{b} v^{\frac{1}{2}} \|Y\|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + b \|\nabla(p \cdot k)Y\|^2 \right) \\ &\lesssim \delta^{-1} v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{c^2}{b} v^{\frac{1}{2}} \|Y\|^2 + D(Y) \right). \end{aligned}$$

The lemma follows. ■

Using a cut-off, we can obtain a sharp estimate.

Lemma 3.6. *Assume the setup of Lemma 2.1 and $\chi_k, \tilde{\chi}_k$ as in Lemma 3.4. For possibly smaller v_0, B_0 and a new constant M we find that*

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} E_{\chi_k, k}(J_k Y_k) + \frac{5}{8} |k| D_{\chi_k, k}(J_k Y_k) \\ &\quad + \frac{3}{4} |k| \left(\frac{v}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} E_{\chi_k, k}(J_k Y_k) - |k| \operatorname{Re} E_{\chi_k, k}(J_k Y_k, JF_k) \\ &\leq |k| M \left[\left(\frac{v}{|k|} \right) \frac{c_k^2}{b_k} \|Y_k \tilde{\chi}\|^2 + D_{\tilde{\chi}_k, k}(Y_k) + \left(\frac{v}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} c_k \|\nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) J_k Y_k \nabla \chi\|^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Again, we can make the change of variables (2.4) as in the proof of Lemma 2.1, and assume that $|k| = 1$. Starting from Lemma 2.1, we find that (omitting the subscript k as before)

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} E_\chi(JY) + \frac{3}{4} D_\chi(JY) + v^{\frac{1}{2}} E_\chi(JY) - \operatorname{Re} E_\chi(JY, JF) \\ &\leq \operatorname{Re} E_\chi(RY, JY) + M c v^{\frac{1}{2}} \|JY \chi\|^2 \\ &\quad + M [v \|JY \nabla \chi\|^2 + v^{\frac{3}{2}} a \|\nabla JY \nabla \chi\|^2 + v^{\frac{1}{2}} c \|\nabla(p \cdot k) JY \nabla \chi\|^2]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

We first treat the term $\operatorname{Re} E_\chi(RY, JY)$. A preliminary remark is that $|p \cdot k - 1| \sim |\nabla(p \cdot k)|^2$ on the support of $\tilde{\chi}$, from where it is easily deduced that, pointwise in the support of $\tilde{\chi}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |RY|^2 &\lesssim v|\beta|^2[|\nabla(\nabla(p \cdot k)Y)|^2 + |\nabla(p \cdot k)Y|^2] + v^2|\alpha|^2|\nabla Y|^2 \\ &\lesssim vb[|\nabla(\nabla(p \cdot k)Y)|^2 + |\nabla(p \cdot k)Y|^2] + v^2|\nabla Y|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

The first term splits as

$$\operatorname{Re} E_\chi(RY, JY) = I^0 + I^a + I^b + I^c,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I^0 &= \operatorname{Re}\langle RY_\chi, JY_\chi \rangle, \\ I^a &= av^{\frac{1}{2}} \operatorname{Re}\langle \nabla RY_\chi, \nabla JY_\chi \rangle, \\ I^b &= b \operatorname{Re}\langle i\nabla(p \cdot k)RY_\chi, \nabla JY_\chi \rangle + b \operatorname{Re}\langle i\nabla(p \cdot k)JY_\chi, \nabla RY_\chi \rangle, \\ I^c &= cv^{-\frac{1}{2}} \operatorname{Re}\langle \nabla(p \cdot k)RY_\chi, \nabla(p \cdot k)JY_\chi \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

For I^0 , after integration by parts of the first term in the definition (3.5) of RY , we get

$$\begin{aligned} |I^0| &\leq 2|\beta|v^{\frac{1}{2}}\{\|\nabla JY_\chi\| \|(p \cdot k - 1)Y_\chi\| + 2\|JY_\chi\| \|(p \cdot k - 1)Y_\chi\|\} \\ &\quad + v|\alpha| \|JY_\chi\| [\Delta, \nabla]Y_\chi + v^{\frac{1}{2}}|\beta| \|JY_\chi\| \|\nabla(p \cdot k)Y_\chi\|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we find for a constant $\delta > 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} |I^0| - \delta v \|\nabla JY_\chi\|^2 - \delta v^{\frac{1}{2}} \|JY_\chi\|^2 \\ \lesssim \delta^{-1} \{|\beta|^2 \|\nabla(p \cdot k)Y_\chi\|^2 + |\beta|^2 v^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla(p \cdot k)Y_\chi\|^2 + v^{\frac{3}{2}} \|\nabla Y_\chi\|^2\} \\ \lesssim \delta^{-1} D_{\tilde{\chi}}(Y), \end{aligned}$$

taking into account that $|\beta|^2 \sim b$ from the definition (3.3) of β and the choice (2.3) for b .

For I^a note that

$$|I^a| \leq av^{\frac{1}{2}} [\|\nabla \nabla JY_\chi\| \|RY_\chi\| + 2\|\nabla JY_\chi\| \|RY_\chi\|]$$

so that

$$|I^a| - \delta v^{\frac{3}{2}} a \|\nabla \nabla JY_\chi\|^2 - \delta v \|\nabla JY_\chi\|^2 \lesssim \delta^{-1} v^{-\frac{1}{2}} a \|RY_\chi\|^2 + \delta^{-1} a^2 \|RY_\chi\|^2.$$

Hence, from (3.8), we find (using that the choice (2.3) implies $ab \sim c$)

$$|I^a| - \delta v^{\frac{3}{2}} a \|\nabla \nabla JY_\chi\|^2 - \delta v \|\nabla JY_\chi\|^2 \lesssim \delta^{-1} D_{\tilde{\chi}}(Y).$$

For I^b note that

$$|I^b| \leq b \|RY_\chi\| [2\|\nabla(\nabla(p \cdot k)JY)_\chi\| + \|JY_\chi\|] + 2b \|RY_\chi\| \|\nabla(p \cdot k)JY_\chi\|,$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} |I^b| - \delta v^{\frac{1}{2}} c \|\nabla(\nabla(p \cdot k) J Y) \chi\|^2 - \delta v^{\frac{1}{2}} \|J Y \chi\|^2 - \delta b \|\nabla(p \cdot k) J Y \chi\|^2 \\ \lesssim \delta^{-1} v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{b^2}{c} \|R Y \chi\|^2 + \delta^{-1} b \|R Y \nabla \chi\|^2 \lesssim \delta^{-1} D_{\tilde{\chi}}(Y), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality comes again from (3.8) (note that $\frac{b^2}{c} \sim a$, $b \sim a^2$, so that the right-hand side is similar to the one for I_a). For I^c , the treatment is more involved. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla(p \cdot k) R = 2v \nabla_p [(p \cdot k - 1)(J Y - \alpha \nabla Y)] - 2i\beta v^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla \nabla(p \cdot k)(p \cdot k - 1) Y \\ - v\alpha \nabla(p \cdot k) [\Delta, \nabla] Y - i v^{\frac{1}{2}} \beta \nabla(p \cdot k) \nabla(p \cdot k) Y. \end{aligned}$$

We recall that on the support of $\tilde{\chi}$, $|p \cdot k - 1| \sim |\nabla(p \cdot k)|^2$ so that

$$|(p \cdot k - 1) \nabla Y| \lesssim |\nabla(\nabla(p \cdot k) Y)| + |\nabla(p \cdot k) Y|.$$

Hence we find that

$$\begin{aligned} |I^c| \lesssim v^{\frac{1}{2}} c \|\nabla(\nabla(p \cdot k) J Y) \chi\| \{ \|\nabla(p \cdot k) J Y \chi\| + \|\nabla(\nabla(p \cdot k) Y) \chi\| + \|\nabla(p \cdot k) Y \chi\| \} \\ + v^{\frac{1}{2}} c \|\nabla(p \cdot k) J Y \chi\| \{ \|\nabla(p \cdot k) J Y \nabla \chi\| + \|\nabla(\nabla(p \cdot k) Y) \nabla \chi\| \\ + \|\nabla(p \cdot k) Y \nabla \chi\| \} \\ + v^{-\frac{1}{2}} c \|\nabla(p \cdot k) J Y \chi\| \{ \beta v^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla(p \cdot k) Y \chi\| + v \|\nabla(\nabla(p \cdot k) Y) \chi\| + v \|Y \chi\| \}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we can bound I^c as

$$\begin{aligned} |I^c| - \delta v^{\frac{1}{2}} c \|\nabla(\nabla(p \cdot k) J Y) \chi\|^2 - \delta b \|\nabla(p \cdot k) J Y \chi\|^2 \\ \lesssim \delta^{-1} v^{\frac{1}{2}} c \{ \|\nabla(p \cdot k) J Y \chi\|^2 + \|\nabla(\nabla(p \cdot k) Y) \chi\|^2 + \|\nabla(p \cdot k) Y \chi\|^2 \} \\ + \delta^{-1} v \frac{c^2}{b} \{ \|\nabla(p \cdot k) J Y \nabla \chi\|^2 + \|\nabla(\nabla(p \cdot k) Y) \nabla \chi\|^2 + \|\nabla(p \cdot k) Y \nabla \chi\|^2 \} \\ + \delta^{-1} \frac{c^2 |\beta|^2}{b} \|\nabla(p \cdot k) Y \chi\|^2 + \delta^{-1} v \frac{c^2}{b} \{ \|\nabla(\nabla(p \cdot k) Y) \chi\|^2 + \|Y \chi\|^2 \} \\ \lesssim \delta^{-1} v^{\frac{1}{2}} c \|\nabla(p \cdot k) J Y \chi\|^2 + \delta^{-1} D_{\tilde{\chi}}(Y) + \delta^{-1} v \frac{c^2}{b} \|\nabla(p \cdot k) J Y \nabla \chi\|^2 \\ + \delta^{-1} v \frac{c^2}{b} \|Y \chi\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

The first term on the right-hand side can be absorbed by $D_{\chi}(J Y)$ on the left-hand side. Regarding the third term, note that by the definition (3.1) we can directly estimate

$$\begin{aligned} v \frac{c^2}{b} \|\nabla(p \cdot k) J Y \nabla \chi\|^2 &\lesssim v \frac{c^2}{b} (\|\nabla(\nabla(p \cdot k) Y) \nabla \chi\|^2 + \|Y \nabla \chi\|^2) \\ &\quad + \frac{c^2}{b} |\beta|^2 \|\nabla(p \cdot k) Y \nabla \chi\|^2 \\ &\lesssim D_{\tilde{\chi}}(Y) + v \frac{c^2}{b} \|Y \nabla \chi\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

The last step of the proof is to control the second to fourth terms on the right-hand side of (3.7). The second one can be absorbed by the term $\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} E_{\chi}(JY)$ on the left-hand side, as $c \ll 1$. For the next one, we note that by definition (3.1),

$$\nu \|JY \nabla \chi\|^2 \lesssim \nu \|\nabla Y \nabla \chi\|^2 + b_k \|\nabla(p \cdot k)Y \nabla \chi\|^2 \lesssim D_{\tilde{\chi}}(Y).$$

For the fourth term, again by (3.1),

$$\nu^{\frac{3}{2}} a \|\nabla JY \nabla \chi\|^2 \lesssim \nu^{\frac{3}{2}} a \|\nabla \nabla Y \nabla \chi\|^2 + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} ab \|\nabla(\nabla(p \cdot k)Y) \nabla \chi\|^2 \lesssim D_{\tilde{\chi}}(Y).$$

Putting all the above estimates together, we conclude the proof. $\blacksquare$

3.3. The role of convection

In this section we now specialize the discussion to the case in which the forcing term F_k is of the form

$$VY_k = -i\hat{k} \sum_{\ell} v_{k-\ell} Y_{\ell}, \quad (3.9)$$

for a divergence-free velocity field v . This is precisely the setting in (1.7). As we do not have a strong enough gain of regularization in x , we cannot neglect the gains arising from the divergence-free property. This translates into losing the possibility of working mode-by-mode in k , as all the x -modes are coupled, and instead we work with energy functionals that include all the nonzero x -modes.

Therefore, we look at

$$E_{\chi,s}(Y) = \sum_k |k|^{2s} E_{\chi_k,k}(Y_k)$$

for a family of cut-offs $(\chi_k)_{k \neq 0}$ (that we can think of as $\chi_k = \chi(p \cdot \hat{k})$). The divergence-free cancellations can be seen through the following lemma.

Lemma 3.7. *Consider a divergence-free velocity field v , so that $\sum_k k \cdot v_k = 0$, and weights $W: \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\tilde{W}: \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow X$ for some normed space X satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} \forall x, y, \quad |y| \geq \frac{|x|}{2} &\Rightarrow W(x) \lesssim W(y), \quad \|\tilde{W}(x)\|_X \lesssim \|\tilde{W}(y)\|_X, \\ \forall x, y, \quad \|\tilde{W}(x) - \tilde{W}(y)\|_X &\lesssim \left(\frac{\|\tilde{W}(x)\|_X}{|x|} + \frac{\|\tilde{W}(y)\|_X}{|y|} \right) |x - y|. \end{aligned}$$

Then for any nonnegative sequences $\{H_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3}$, $\{G_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k, \ell} W(k) \|\tilde{W}(k) - \tilde{W}(\ell)\|_X |v_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell| H_{\ell} G_k \\ &\lesssim \left(\sum_k |k| H_k \right) \left(\sum_k W(k) \|\tilde{W}(k)\|_X |v_k|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_k W(k) \|\tilde{W}(k)\|_X G_k^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \left(\sum_k |k| G_k \right) \left(\sum_k W(k) \|\tilde{W}(k)\|_X |v_k|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_k W(k) \|\tilde{W}(k)\|_X H_k^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& + \left(\sum_k |k| |v_k| \right) \left(\sum_k W(k) \|\tilde{W}(k)\|_X H_k^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_k W(k) \|\tilde{W}(k)\|_X G_k^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We split the sum into three:

$$\sum_{k, \ell} = \sum_{|k| \geq 2|\ell|} + \sum_{|\ell| \geq 2|k|} + \sum_{|\ell|/2 \leq |k| \leq 2|\ell|}.$$

We find

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{|k| \geq 2|\ell|} W(k) \|\tilde{W}(k) - \tilde{W}(\ell)\|_X |v_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell| H_\ell G_k \\
& \lesssim \sum_{|k| \geq 2|\ell|} \left(\sqrt{W(k-\ell) \|\tilde{W}(k-\ell)\|_X} |v_{k-\ell}| \right) \left(\sqrt{W(k) \|\tilde{W}(k)\|_X} G_k \right) |\ell| H_\ell \\
& \lesssim \left(\sum_k |k| H_k \right) \left(\sum_k W(k) \|\tilde{W}(k)\|_X |v_k|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_k W(k) \|\tilde{W}(k)\|_X G_k^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, as $v_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell = v_{k-\ell} \cdot k$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{|\ell| \geq 2|k|} W(k) \|\tilde{W}(k) - \tilde{W}(\ell)\|_X |v_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell| H_\ell G_k \\
& \lesssim \sum_{|\ell| \geq 2|k|} W(\ell) \|\tilde{W}(k) - \tilde{W}(\ell)\|_X |v_{k-\ell} \cdot k| H_\ell G_k \\
& \lesssim \left(\sum_k |k| G_k \right) \left(\sum_k W(k) \|\tilde{W}(k)\|_X |v_k|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_k W(k) \|\tilde{W}(k)\|_X H_k^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{|\ell|/2 \leq |k| \leq 2|\ell|} W(k) \|\tilde{W}(k) - \tilde{W}(\ell)\|_X |v_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell| H_k G_\ell \\
& \lesssim \sum_{|\ell|/2 \leq |k| \leq 2|\ell|} W(k) \left(\frac{\|\tilde{W}(k)\|_X}{|k|} + \frac{\|\tilde{W}(\ell)\|_X}{|\ell|} \right) |k - \ell| |v_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell| H_k G_\ell \\
& \lesssim \sum_{|\ell|/2 \leq |k| \leq 2|\ell|} \sqrt{|W(k)| \|\tilde{W}(k)\|_X} \sqrt{|W(\ell)| \|\tilde{W}(\ell)\|_X} |k - \ell| |v_{k-\ell}| H_k G_\ell \\
& \lesssim \left(\sum_k |k| |v_k| \right) \left(\sum_k W(k) \|\tilde{W}(k)\|_X H_k^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_k W(k) \|\tilde{W}(k)\|_X G_k^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is over. ■

Using the cancellation from the divergence-free condition, we control the error in the hypoelliptic estimate by the following bound.

Lemma 3.8. *Assume the setup of Lemma 2.1, and let $(\chi_k)_{k \neq 0}$ be a family of smooth functions. Then the convection operator defined in (3.9) obeys the following estimate, for all $s > \frac{5}{2}$, for all $\delta > 0$:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_k |k|^{2s+1} \operatorname{Re} E_{\chi_k, k}(V Y_k, Y_k) - \delta v^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_k |k|^{2s} \|Y_k \chi_k\|^2 - \delta v \sum_k |k|^{2s} \|\nabla Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \\ & - \delta v^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_k |k|^{2s} b_k^2 \|\nabla(\nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) Y_k) \chi_k\|^2 \\ & - (\delta + \|v\|_{H^s} v^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \sum_k |k|^{2s+1} c_k \|\nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \\ & \lesssim \delta^{-1} v^{-1} \|v\|_{H^s}^2 \sum_k |k|^{2s} \|Y_k\|^2 + \delta^{-1} \|v\|_{H^s}^2 \sum_k |k|^{2s} \|\nabla Y_k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.9. Note that the localization through a cut-off is lost in the last two terms. This will be the main constraint on the size of v . Note also that the requirement $s > \frac{5}{2}$ ensures that $\sum_{k \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}^3} |k| |v_k| \lesssim \|v\|_{H^s}$, an inequality that will be used implicitly each time we apply Lemma 3.7.

Proof of Lemma 3.8. We use for short notation V_k instead of $V Y_k$. We decompose

$$\sum_k |k|^{2s+1} \operatorname{Re} E_{\chi_k, k}(V_k, Y_k) = I^0 + I^a + I^b + I^c,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I^0 &= \sum_k |k|^{2s+1} \operatorname{Re} \langle V_k \chi_k, Y_k \chi_k \rangle, \\ I^a &= v^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} a_k \operatorname{Re} \langle \nabla_p V_k \chi_k, \nabla_p Y_k \chi_k \rangle, \\ I^b &= \sum_k |k|^{2s+1} b_k [\operatorname{Re} \langle i \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) V_k \chi_k, \nabla Y_k \chi_k \rangle + \operatorname{Re} \langle i \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) Y_k \chi_k, \nabla V_k \chi_k \rangle], \\ I^c &= v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_k |k|^{2s+\frac{3}{2}} c_k \operatorname{Re} \langle \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) V_k \chi_k, \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) Y_k \chi_k \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Using that v is real, we find from the definition that

$$\begin{aligned} I^0 &= \sum_{k, \ell} |k|^{2s} \operatorname{Re} \langle i k v_{k-\ell} Y_\ell \chi_k, Y_k \chi_k \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k, \ell} \operatorname{Re} \langle i (|k|^{2s} k \chi_k^2 - |\ell|^{2s} \ell \chi_\ell^2) \cdot v_{k-\ell} Y_\ell, Y_k \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k, \ell} \operatorname{Re} \langle i (|k|^{2s} \chi_k^2 - |\ell|^{2s} \chi_\ell^2) v_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell Y_\ell, Y_k \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality comes from the divergence-free property: $v_{k-\ell} \cdot k = v_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell$. We can split the difference as

$$|k|^{2s} \chi_k^2 - |\ell|^{2s} \chi_\ell^2 = |k|^{2s} \chi_k (\chi_k - \chi_\ell) + (|k|^{2s} - |\ell|^{2s}) \chi_k \chi_\ell + |\ell|^{2s} \chi_\ell (\chi_k - \chi_\ell).$$

Hence, using the symmetry in k and ℓ ,

$$\begin{aligned} I^0 &\leq \sum |k|^{2s} \|\chi_k - \chi_\ell\|_\infty |v_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell| \|Y_\ell\| \|Y_k \chi_k\| \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum [|k|^{2s} - |\ell|^{2s}] |v_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell| \|Y_\ell \chi_\ell\| \|Y_k \chi_k\|. \end{aligned}$$

We apply Lemma 3.7, taking $W = |k|^{2s}$ and $\tilde{W}(k) = \chi_k$ for the first sum, and $W = 1$, $\tilde{W}(k) = |k|^{2s}$ for the second sum. We get

$$I^0 \lesssim \|v\|_{H^s} \left(\sum |k|^{2s} \|Y_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum |k|^{2s} \|Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

For I^a we find similarly (that is, replacing $\chi_k(p)$, function of p , by $\chi_k(p)a(v^1|k|^{\frac{1}{2}}t)$, function of p and t) that

$$\begin{aligned} I^a &= \frac{\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2} \sum \operatorname{Re} \langle i[|k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} a_k \chi_k^2 - |\ell|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} a_\ell \chi_\ell^2] v_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell \nabla Y_\ell, \nabla Y_k \rangle \\ &\leq \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \|a_k^{\frac{1}{2}} \chi_k - a_\ell^{\frac{1}{2}} \chi_\ell\|_\infty |v_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell| \|\nabla Y_\ell\| a_k^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla Y \chi_k\| \\ &\quad + \frac{\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2} \sum ||k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} - |\ell|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}}| |v_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell| a_\ell^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla Y_\ell \chi_\ell\| a_k^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla Y \chi_k\|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we find that

$$I^a \lesssim \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_{H^s} \left(\sum |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla Y_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} a_k \|\nabla Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

For I^b , we find by the definition

$$I^b = \sum \operatorname{Re} \langle i[b_k |k|^{2s} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) \chi_k^2 - b_\ell |\ell|^{2s} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{\ell}) \chi_\ell^2] v_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell Y_\ell, \nabla Y_k \rangle,$$

where we split the bracket as

$$\begin{aligned} &b_k |k|^{2s} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) \chi_k^2 - b_\ell |\ell|^{2s} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{\ell}) \chi_\ell^2 \\ &= |k|^{2s} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) b_k \chi_k (\chi_k - \chi_\ell) + [|k|^{2s} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) b_k - |\ell|^{2s} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{\ell}) b_\ell] \chi_k \chi_\ell \\ &\quad + |\ell|^{2s} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{\ell}) b_\ell \chi_\ell (\chi_k - \chi_\ell). \end{aligned}$$

Hence we find that

$$\begin{aligned} I^b &\leq \sum |k|^{2s} \|\chi_k - \chi_\ell\|_\infty |v_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell| \|Y_\ell\| b_k \|\nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) \nabla Y_k \chi_k\| \\ &\quad + \sum \||k|^{2s} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) b_k - |\ell|^{2s} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{\ell}) b_\ell\|_\infty |v_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell| \|Y_\ell \chi_\ell\| \|\nabla Y_k \chi_k\| \\ &\quad + \sum |k|^{2s} \|\chi_k - \chi_\ell\|_\infty |v_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell| \|\nabla Y_\ell\| b_k \|\nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) Y_k \chi_k\|. \end{aligned}$$

This yields that

$$\begin{aligned} I^b &\lesssim \|v\|_{H^s} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s} \|Y_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s} b_k^2 \|\nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) \nabla Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + \|v\|_{H^s} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s} \|Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s} \|\nabla Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + \|v\|_{H^s} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s} \|\nabla Y_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s} b_k^2 \|\nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

For I^c we find

$$\begin{aligned} I^c &= \frac{v^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{2} \sum \operatorname{Re} \{ i [|k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} c_k \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) \chi_k^2 \\ &\quad - |\ell|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} c_\ell \nabla(p \cdot \hat{\ell}) \nabla(p \cdot \hat{\ell}) \chi_\ell^2] v_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell Y_\ell, Y_k \}. \end{aligned}$$

We split the difference as

$$\begin{aligned} &|k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} c_k \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) \chi_k^2 - |\ell|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} c_\ell \nabla(p \cdot \hat{\ell}) \nabla(p \cdot \hat{\ell}) \chi_\ell^2 \\ &= |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} c_k^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) [c_k^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) \chi_k - c_\ell^{\frac{1}{2}} |\ell|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{\ell}) \chi_\ell] \chi_k \\ &\quad + [|k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} - |\ell|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}}] c_k^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) \chi_k c_\ell^{\frac{1}{2}} |\ell|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{\ell}) \chi_\ell \\ &\quad + |\ell|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} c_\ell^{\frac{1}{2}} |\ell|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{\ell}) [c_k^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) \chi_k - c_\ell^{\frac{1}{2}} |\ell|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{\ell}) \chi_\ell] \chi_\ell. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we find that

$$\begin{aligned} I^c &\leq v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \|c_k^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) - c_\ell^{\frac{1}{2}} |\ell|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{\ell})\|_\infty |v_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell| \|Y_\ell\| c_k^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad \times \|\nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) Y_k \chi_k\| \\ &\quad + \frac{v^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{2} \sum ||k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} - |\ell|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}}| |v_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell| c_\ell^{\frac{1}{2}} |\ell|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla(p \cdot \hat{\ell}) Y_\ell \chi_\ell\| c_k^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad \times \|\nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) Y_k \chi_k\|. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 3.7, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} I^c &\lesssim v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_{H^s} \left(\sum |k|^{2s} \|Y_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum |k|^{2s+1} c_k \|\nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_{H^s} \left(\sum |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} c_k \|\nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Collecting the estimates, we therefore find

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_k |k|^{2s+1} \operatorname{Re} E_{\chi_k, k}(V_k, Y_k) \\
& \lesssim \|v\|_{H^s} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s} \|Y_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s} \|Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \quad + v^{\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_{H^s} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla Y_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} a_k \|\nabla Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \quad + \|v\|_{H^s} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s} \|Y_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s} b_k^2 \|\nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) \nabla Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \quad + \|v\|_{H^s} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s} \|Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s} \|\nabla Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \quad + \|v\|_{H^s} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s} \|\nabla Y_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s} b_k^2 \|\nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \quad + v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_{H^s} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s} \|Y_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s+1} c_k \|\nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \quad + v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_{H^s} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} c_k \|\nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Splitting the right-hand side with Young's inequality then gives the claimed control. $\blacksquare$

Using the cancellation from the divergence-free condition, we control the error for the energy by the following estimate.

Lemma 3.10. *Let $(\chi_k = \chi_k(p))_{k \neq 0}$ be a family of smooth functions. Then the convection operator defined in (3.9) obeys the following estimate, for all $s > \frac{5}{2}$:*

$$\sum_k |k|^{2s+1} \operatorname{Re} \langle V Y \chi_k, Y \chi_k \rangle \lesssim \|v\|_{H^s} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s} \|Y_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s} \|Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Proof. See the computation for I^0 in the previous lemma. $\blacksquare$

3.3.1. Commutator with the vector fields. In order to control Jg and JJg , we need to understand the commutator with the convection term, that is we need to understand the influence of

$$SY_k = \sum_{\ell} J_k(-i\hat{k}v_{k-\ell})Y_{\ell} - \sum_{\ell} (-i\hat{k}v_{k-\ell})J_{\ell}Y_{\ell}.$$

To control Jg in L^2 , we prove a first commutator estimate.

Lemma 3.11. *Let $(\chi_k)_{k \neq 0}$ be a family of smooth functions. We find*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_k |k|^{2s+1} \operatorname{Re} \langle SY_k \chi_k, J_k Y_k \chi_k \rangle - \delta v^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_k |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} \|J_k Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \\ & \lesssim \|v\|_{H^s} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s} \|\nabla Y_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s} \|J_k Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \quad + \delta^{-1} v^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|v\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{4}}}^2 \sum_k |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} \|Y_k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We estimate the α term in SY as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum |k|^{2s} \operatorname{Re} \langle (\alpha_k - \alpha_\ell)(-iv_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell) \nabla Y_\ell \chi_k, J_k Y_k \chi_k \rangle \\ & \lesssim \sum |k|^{2s} \|\alpha_k - \alpha_\ell\|_\infty |v_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell| \|\nabla Y_\ell\| \|J_k Y_k \chi_k\| \\ & \lesssim \|v\|_{H^s} \left(\sum |k|^{2s} \|\nabla Y_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum |k|^{2s} \|J_k Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

For the β term we find

$$\begin{aligned} & v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum |k|^{2s} \langle (\beta_k |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) - \beta_\ell |\ell|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{\ell})) iv_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell Y_\ell \chi_k, J_k Y_k \chi_k \rangle \\ & \lesssim v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum |k|^{2s} \|\beta_k |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) - \beta_\ell |\ell|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{\ell})\|_\infty |v_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell| \|Y_\ell\| \|J_k Y_k \chi_k\| \\ & \lesssim v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{4}}} (|k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} \|Y_k\|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} (|k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} \|J_k Y_k \chi_k\|)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Splitting gives the required estimate. ■

Remark 3.12. By a slight modification, the β term can also be bounded by

$$v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} (|k|^{2s+1} \|Y_k\|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} (|k|^{2s} \|J_k Y_k \chi_k\|)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

For the hypoelliptic functional, we control the commutator by the following estimate.

Lemma 3.13. *Let $(\chi_k)_{k \neq 0}$ a family of smooth functions. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum |k|^{2s+1} \operatorname{Re} E_{\chi_k, k}(SY_k, J_k Y_k) \\ & \quad - \delta \left[\sum |k|^{2s+1} D_{\chi_k, k}(J_k Y_k) + v^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} \|J_k Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \right] \\ & \lesssim \delta^{-1} \|v\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \left[v^{-1} \sum |k|^{2s+1} \|\nabla Y_k\|^2 + v^{-2} \sum |k|^{2s+1} \|Y_k\|^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. From the definition we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum |k|^{2s+1} \operatorname{Re} E_{\chi_k, k}(SY_k, J_k Y_k) \\ & = \sum |k|^{2s} \operatorname{Re} E_{\chi_k, k}((\alpha_k - \alpha_\ell)(-iv_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell) \nabla Y_\ell, J_k Y_k) \\ & \quad + v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum |k|^{2s} \operatorname{Re} E_{\chi_k, k}(i(\beta_k |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) - \beta_\ell |\ell|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{\ell}))(-iv_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell) Y_\ell, J_k Y_k). \end{aligned}$$

As before, we split the contributions in I^0 , I^a , I^b , and I^c . For I^0 we find

$$I^0 = \sum |k|^{2s} \operatorname{Re} \langle (\alpha_k - \alpha_\ell)(-iv_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell) \nabla Y_\ell \chi_k, J_k Y_k \chi_k \rangle \\ + v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum |k|^{2s} \operatorname{Re} \langle (\beta_k |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) - \beta_\ell |\ell|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{\ell}))(v_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell) Y_\ell \chi_k, J_k Y_k \chi_k \rangle.$$

The first sum can be directly estimated by Lemma 3.7 as

$$\sum |k|^{2s} \operatorname{Re} \langle (\alpha_k - \alpha_\ell)(-iv_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell) \nabla Y_\ell \chi_k, J_k Y_k \chi_k \rangle \\ \lesssim \|v\|_{H^s} \left(\sum |k|^{2s} \|\nabla Y_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum |k|^{2s} \|J_k Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

For the second sum, we find by Lemma 3.7 that

$$v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum |k|^{2s} \operatorname{Re} \langle (\beta_k |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) - \beta_\ell |\ell|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{\ell}))(v_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell) Y_\ell \chi_k, J_k Y_k \chi_k \rangle \\ \lesssim v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{4}}} \left(\sum |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} \|Y_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} \|J_k Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

For I^a , we find

$$I^a = v^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \operatorname{Re} a_k \langle (\alpha_k - \alpha_\ell)(-iv_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell) \nabla \nabla Y_\ell \chi_k, \nabla J_k Y_k \chi_k \rangle \\ + \sum |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \operatorname{Re} a_k \langle \nabla(i\beta_k |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) \\ - i\beta_\ell |\ell|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{\ell}))(-iv_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell) Y_\ell \chi_k, \nabla J_k Y_k \chi_k \rangle.$$

In the first term, we integrate by parts and then find by Lemma 3.7 that

$$I^a \lesssim v^{\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_{H^{s-\frac{1}{4}}} \left(\sum |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla Y_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} a_k^2 \|\nabla \nabla J_k Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ + \|v\|_{H^s} \left(\sum |k|^{2s} (\|\nabla Y_k\|^2 + \|Y_k\|^2) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum |k|^{2s} \|\nabla J_k Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

For I^b we find

$$I^b = \sum |k|^{2s} \operatorname{Re} \langle i(\alpha_k - \alpha_\ell)(-iv_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell) \nabla Y_\ell \chi_k, b_k \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) \nabla J_k Y_k \chi_k \rangle \\ + \sum |k|^{2s} \operatorname{Re} \langle \nabla(\alpha_k - \alpha_\ell)(-iv_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell) \nabla Y_\ell \chi_k, i b_k \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) J_k Y_k \chi_k \rangle \\ + v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} \operatorname{Re} \langle i(i\beta_k |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) - i\beta_\ell |\ell|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{\ell}))(-iv_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell) Y_\ell \chi_k, \\ b_k |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) \nabla J_k Y_k \chi_k \rangle \\ + v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} \operatorname{Re} \langle \nabla(i\beta_k |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) - i\beta_\ell |\ell|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{\ell}))(-iv_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell) Y_\ell \chi_k, \\ i \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) b_k |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} J_k Y_k \chi_k \rangle.$$

so that we find (after integration by parts of the second and fourth terms)

$$\begin{aligned} I^b &\lesssim \|v\|_{H^s} \left(\sum |k|^{2s} \|\nabla Y_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum |k|^{2s} b_k^2 (\|\nabla(\nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) J_k Y_k) \chi_k\|^2 + \|J Y_k \chi_k\|^2) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \left(\sum |k|^{2s+1} \|Y_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad \times \left(\sum |k|^{2s} b_k^2 (\|\nabla(\nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) J Y_k) \chi_k\|^2 + \|J_k Y_k \chi_k\|^2) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

For I^c we find

$$\begin{aligned} I^c &= v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum |k|^{2s} \operatorname{Re} \langle \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k})(\alpha_k - \alpha_\ell)(-iv_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell) \nabla Y_\ell \chi_k, c_k |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) J_k Y_k \chi_k \rangle \\ &\quad + v^{-1} \sum |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} \operatorname{Re} \langle \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k})(\beta_k |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) - \beta_\ell |\ell|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{\ell}))(-iv_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell) Y_\ell \chi_k, \\ &\quad c_k \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) J_k Y_k \chi_k \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we find that

$$\begin{aligned} I^c &\lesssim v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_{H^s} \left(\sum |k|^{2s} \|\nabla Y_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum |k|^{2s+1} c_k^2 \|\nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) J_k Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + v^{-1} \|v\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \left(\sum |k|^{2s+1} \|Y_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum |k|^{2s+1} c_k^2 \|\nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) J_k Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first term comes from the α -term and the second from the β -term.

The inequality of the lemma can then be established as in the proof of Lemma 3.8, through splitting and Young's inequality. ■

To control $J_k J_k g$, we need the following estimate.

Lemma 3.14. *Let $(\chi_k)_{k \neq 0}$ a family of smooth functions. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_k |k|^{2s+1} \operatorname{Re} \langle J_k S Y_k \chi_k, J_k J_k Y_k \chi_k \rangle - \delta v^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_k |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} \|J_k J_k Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \\ &\quad - \delta v \sum_k |k|^{2s} \|\nabla J_k J_k Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \\ &\lesssim v^{-\frac{5}{2}} \|v\|_{H^{s+\frac{3}{4}}}^2 \sum_k |k|^{2s+\frac{3}{2}} \|Y_k\|^2 + v^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|v\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{4}}}^2 \sum_k |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla Y_k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Expanding the definition of $J_k S Y_k$ we find

$$\begin{aligned} |k| J_k S Y_k &= \sum_\ell \alpha_k (\alpha_k - \alpha_\ell) (-iv_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell) \nabla \nabla Y_\ell \\ &\quad + v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_\ell \alpha_k \nabla ((i\beta_k |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) - i\beta_\ell |\ell|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{\ell})) (-iv_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell) Y_\ell) \\ &\quad + v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_\ell i\beta_k |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) (\alpha_k - \alpha_\ell) (-iv_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell) \nabla Y_\ell \\ &\quad + v^{-1} \sum_\ell i\beta_k |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) (i\beta_k |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) - i\beta_\ell |\ell|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{\ell})) \\ &\quad \times (-iv_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell) Y_\ell. \end{aligned}$$

The contribution of the first term can be bounded, after integration by parts, by

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum |k|^{2s} \|\alpha_k - \alpha_\ell\|_\infty |v_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell| \|\nabla Y_\ell\| (\|\nabla J_k J_k Y_k \chi_k^2\| + 2\|J_k J_k Y_k \chi_k |\nabla \chi_k|\|) \\ & \lesssim \|v\|_{H^s} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s} \|\nabla Y_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s} (\|\nabla J_k J_k Y_k \chi_k\|^2 + \|J_k J_k Y_k \chi_k\|^2) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

The contribution of the second term can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum |k|^{2s} v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\beta_k |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) - \beta_\ell |\ell|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{\ell})\|_\infty |v_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell| \|\nabla Y_\ell\| \|J_k J_k Y_k \chi_k^2\| \\ & + \sum |k|^{2s} v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\beta_k |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla^2(p \cdot \hat{k}) - \beta_\ell |\ell|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla^2(p \cdot \hat{\ell})\|_\infty |v_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell| \|Y_\ell\| \|J_k J_k Y_k \chi_k^2\| \\ & \lesssim v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{4}}} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} (\|\nabla Y_k\|^2 + \|Y_k\|^2) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s+\frac{3}{2}} \|J_k J_k Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

The contribution of the third term can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\alpha_k - \alpha_\ell\|_\infty |v_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell| \|\nabla Y_\ell\| \|J_k J_k Y_k \chi_k^2\| \\ & \lesssim v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{4}}} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla Y_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} \|J_k J_k Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

The last term can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum |k|^{2s+1} v^{-1} \|\beta_k |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) - \beta_\ell |\ell|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{\ell})\|_\infty |v_{k-\ell} \cdot \ell| \|Y_\ell\| |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|J_k J_k Y_k \chi_k\| \\ & \lesssim v^{-1} \|v\|_{H^{s+\frac{3}{4}}} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s+\frac{3}{2}} \|Y_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} \|J_k J_k Y_k \chi_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

The result follows from all these bounds and Young's inequality. $\blacksquare$

3.3.2. Application to the density g . Under suitable assumptions on the velocity field v , we can now obtain controls on g and its vector fields. Notice that we request something less stringent than (H). We begin from g .

Proposition 3.15. *There exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ with the following property: if $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ and*

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \|v(t)\|_{H^s} + \left(\int_0^{+\infty} \|v(t)\|_{H^s}^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \varepsilon v^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

then for any $T > 0$ there holds

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \sum_k |k|^{2s} E_k(g_k) + v^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^T \sum_k |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} a_k \|g_k\|^2 \\ & + \int_0^T \sum_k |k|^{2s+1} D_k(g_k) \lesssim \|g^{\text{in}}\|_{H_x^s L_p^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, (1.9) holds.

Proof. We start from the inequality in Lemma 2.4: we take $F_k = Vg_k$, multiply by $|k|^{2s}$, and sum over k . To bound the term $\sum |k|^{2s} \operatorname{Re} E_k(g_k, Vg_k)$, we apply Lemma 3.8 with $Y_k = g_k$, $\chi = 1$. We find

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \sum_k |k|^{2s} E_k(g_k) + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_k |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} a_k \|g_k\|^2 + \sum_k |k|^{2s+1} D_k(g_k) \\ \lesssim (\delta \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} + \delta^{-1} \nu^{-1} \|v\|_{H^s}^2) \sum_k |k|^{2s} \|g_k\|^2 + (\delta \nu + \delta^{-1} \|v\|_{H^s}^2) \sum_k |k|^{2s} \|\nabla g_k\|^2 \\ + \delta \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_k |k|^{2s} b_k^2 \|\nabla(\nabla(p \cdot \hat{k})g_k)\|^2 \\ + (\delta + \|v\|_{H^s} \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \sum_k |k|^{2s+1} c_k \|\nabla(p \cdot \hat{k})g_k\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

for any $\delta > 0$. We take $\delta = \varepsilon$. If $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$ is small enough, most terms on the right-hand side can be absorbed into the dissipation functional, and we end up with

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \sum_k |k|^{2s} E_k(g_k) + \sum_k |k|^{2s+1} a_k \left(\frac{\nu}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|g_k\|^2 + \sum_k |k|^{2s+1} D_k(g_k) \\ \lesssim (\varepsilon \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon^{-1} \nu^{-1} \|v\|_{H^s}^2) \|g\|_{H_x^s L_p^2}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

In particular,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|g\|_{H_x^s L_p^2} \lesssim (\varepsilon \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon^{-1} \nu^{-1} \|v\|_{H^s}^2) \|g\|_{H_x^s L_p^2}$$

so that our assumptions and the Gronwall lemma yield

$$\|g(t)\|_{H_x^s L_p^2} \leq M e^{M \varepsilon \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} t} \|g^{\text{in}}\|_{H_x^s L_p^2}, \quad \forall t \geq 0$$

for an absolute constant $M > 0$. If $t \leq \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, injecting this bound into the right-hand side of (3.10) and integrating on $(0, T)$ proves the lemma. If $t \geq \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, we first integrate (3.10) on $(0, \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}})$, resulting in

$$\sum_k |k|^{2s} E_k(g_k)|_{t=\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \leq e^{M \varepsilon} \|g^{\text{in}}\|_{H_x^s L_p^2}^2.$$

Using the interpolation inequality (2.5) again with $\sigma = \frac{4\nu a_k}{|k|c_k}$, we deduce that at time $t = \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ (time for which $\sigma \leq 1$ if ν is small enough),

$$\begin{aligned} E_k(g_k) &\geq \|g_k\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} a_k \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla_p g_k\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} c_k \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla_p(p \cdot \hat{k})g_k\|^2 \\ &\geq \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} (a_k c_k)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \|g_k\|^2 = \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} (AC)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \|g_k\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

and eventually

$$\|g(\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}})\|_{H_x^s L_p^2} \leq \lambda \|g^{\text{in}}\|_{H_x^s L_p^2}^2, \quad \lambda := \frac{e^{M \varepsilon_0}}{1 + \frac{1}{2} (AC)^{\frac{1}{2}}} < 1$$

taking $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ small enough. Iterating this bound gives exactly (1.9) and concludes the proof. $\blacksquare$

3.3.3. Application to the vector fields. The analogous version of Proposition 3.15 for vector fields is contained in Lemma 3.17 (estimate without cut-off) and Lemma 3.18 (estimate with cut-off) below. We start with an L^2 estimate.

Lemma 3.16. *Let $(\chi_k)_{k \neq 0}$ be a family of smooth functions with $\chi_k = 0$ near $p = -\hat{k}$. There exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ with the following property: if $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ and*

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \|v(t)\|_{H^s} + \left(\int_0^\infty \|v(t)\|_{H^s}^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \varepsilon v^{\frac{3}{4}},$$

then for any $T > 0$ there holds

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \|J_k g_k \chi_k\|^2 + \int_0^T v \sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla J_k g_k \chi_k\|^2 \\ & + v^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_k |k|^{2s} \|J_k g_k \chi_k\|^2 \lesssim \|g^{\text{in}}\|_{H_x^s L_p^2}^2 + \|\nabla g^{\text{in}}\|_{H_x^s L_p^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We first establish an estimate without cut-off, starting from Lemma 3.3. We take $Y_k = g_k$, $F_k = V Y_k = V J_k g_k$, multiply by $|k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}}$, and sum over k . We find

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \|J_k g_k\|^2 + v \sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla J_k g_k\|^2 + v^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_k |k|^{2s} \|J_k g_k\|^2 \\ & \lesssim \sum_k |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} \langle J_k g_k, V J_k g_k \rangle + \sum_k |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} \langle J_k g_k, S g_k \rangle \\ & + \sum_k |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} b_k \|g_k\|^2 + \sum_k |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} D_k(g_k). \end{aligned}$$

The first term on the right-hand side is bounded thanks to Lemma 3.10 (applied with $Y = Jg$, $\chi = 1$):

$$\sum_k |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} \operatorname{Re} \langle V J_k g_k, J_k g_k \rangle \lesssim \|v\|_{H^s} \sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \|J_k g_k\|^2.$$

It can be absorbed by the left-hand side, as $\|v\|_{H^s} \ll v^{\frac{1}{2}}$. The second term on the right-hand side is estimated thanks to Lemma 3.11 (applied with $Y = g$, $\chi = 1$):

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_k |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} \operatorname{Re} \langle S J_k g_k, J_k g_k \rangle - \delta v^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_k |k|^{2s} \|J_k g_k\|^2 \\ & \lesssim \|v\|_{H^{s-\frac{1}{4}}} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla g_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \|J_k g_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & + \delta^{-1} v^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|v\|_{H^s}^2 \sum_k |k|^{2s} \|g_k\|^2 \\ & \lesssim \delta v^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \|J_k g_k\|^2 + \delta^{-1} \|v\|_{H^{s-\frac{1}{4}}}^2 v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla g_k\|^2 \\ & + \delta^{-1} v^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|v\|_{H^s}^2 \sum_k |k|^{2s} \|g_k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

We take $\delta = \varepsilon$. For $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ small enough, the first term can be absorbed into the left-hand side, while the second term can be included in $\sum_k |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} D_k(g_k)$. We end up with

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \sum |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \|J_k g_k\|^2 + \nu \sum |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla J_k g_k\|^2 + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum |k|^{2s} \|J_k g_k\|^2 \\ & \lesssim \sum_k |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} b_k \|g_k\|^2 + \sum_k |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} D_k(g_k) + \varepsilon^{-1} \nu^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|v\|_{H^s}^2 \|g\|_{H_x^s L_p^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The time integral of the second term on the right-hand side could be controlled directly thanks to Proposition 3.15. Similarly, the time integral of the last term could be controlled thanks to the assumption on v and (1.9). But the limiting term, due to the absence of cut-off, is $\sum_k |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} b_k \|g_k\|^2 \lesssim \sum_k |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} a_k \|g_k\|^2$, where we could not squeeze a factor $\nabla(p \cdot k)$. This forces us to multiply the previous inequality by $\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}$. We get, with Proposition 3.15, that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \|J_k g_k\|^2 + \int_0^T \nu^{\frac{3}{2}} \sum |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla J_k g_k\|^2 \\ & + \int_0^T \nu \sum |k|^{2s} \|J_k g_k\|^2 \lesssim \|g^{\text{in}}\|_{H_x^s L_p^2}^2 + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla_p g^{\text{in}}\|_{H_x^s L_p^2}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

We can then obtain a better bound using the cut-off χ , replacing our starting point (3.6) by the improved Lemma 3.4. After similar manipulations, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \sum |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \|J_k g_k \chi_k\|^2 + \nu \sum |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla J_k g_k \chi_k\|^2 + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum |k|^{2s} \|J_k g_k \chi_k\|^2 \\ & \lesssim \|v\|_{H^{s-\frac{1}{4}}} \left(\sum |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \|J_k g_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \|J_k g_k \chi_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & + \|v\|_{H^{s-\frac{1}{4}}} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla g_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \|J_k g_k \chi_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & + \sum_k |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} D_k(g_k) + \nu \sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \|g_k \tilde{\chi}_k\|^2 + \varepsilon^{-1} \nu^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|v\|_{H^s}^2 \|g\|_{H_x^s L_p^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

which implies, using the smallness assumption on v ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \sum |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \|J_k g_k \chi_k\|^2 + \nu \sum |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla J_k g_k \chi_k\|^2 + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum |k|^{2s} \|J_k g_k \chi_k\|^2 \\ & \lesssim \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_{H^{s-\frac{1}{4}}}^2 \sum |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \|J_k g_k\|^2 + \sum_k |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} D_k(g_k) \\ & + (\nu + \varepsilon^{-1} \nu^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|v\|_{H^s}^2) \|g\|_{H_x^s L_p^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using Proposition 3.15, (3.11), and (1.9) concludes the proof of the lemma. $\blacksquare$

For the control of the hypocoercive functional of $J_k Y$, we first show an estimate with a loss in ν , but without localization.

Lemma 3.17. *There exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ with the following property: if $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ and*

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \|v(t)\|_{H^s} + \left(\int_0^{+\infty} \|v(t)\|_{H^s}^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \varepsilon v^{\frac{3}{4}},$$

then for any $T > 0$ there holds

$$\begin{aligned} & v^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \sum_k |k|^{2s-1} E_k(J_k g_k) + \int_0^T \sum_k |k|^{2s} D_k(J_k g_k) + v^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} E_k(J_k g_k) \right] \\ & \lesssim \|g^{\text{in}}, \nabla_p g^{\text{in}}\|_{H_x^s L_p^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof is very close to the proof of (3.11). One starts from Lemma 3.5, which is applied with $Y_k = g_k$, $F_k = Vg_k$. One multiplies by $|k|^{2s-1}$, and sums over k . The nonlinear term

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum |k|^{2s-1} \operatorname{Re} E_k(J_k g_k, J_k Vg_k) \\ & = \sum |k|^{2s-1} \operatorname{Re} E_k(J_k g_k, VJ_k g_k) + \sum |k|^{2s-1} \operatorname{Re} E_k(J_k g_k, Sg_k) \end{aligned}$$

is then treated with Lemmas 3.8 and 3.13. We leave the details to the reader. $\blacksquare$

We then get an improved estimate with cut-off.

Lemma 3.18. *Let $(\chi_k)_{k \neq 0}$ as in Lemma 3.16. There exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ with the following property: if $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ and*

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \|v(t)\|_{H^s} + \left(\int_0^{+\infty} \|v(t)\|_{H^s}^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \varepsilon v,$$

then for any $T > 0$ there holds

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \sum_k |k|^{2s-1} E_{\chi_k, k}(J_k g_k) + \int_0^T \sum_k |k|^{2s} D_{\chi_k, k}(J_k g_k) \\ & + v^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^T \sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} E_{\chi_k, k}(J_k g_k) \lesssim \|g^{\text{in}}, \nabla_p g^{\text{in}}\|_{H_x^s L_p^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof is again very close to that of Lemma 3.16, once the estimate without cut-off has been established. One needs to combine Lemmas 3.6 and 3.17, as well as Lemmas 3.8 and 3.13 to control the convection term. $\blacksquare$

The last control that we will need to prove mixing estimates is an $H^{s-\frac{3}{4}}$ estimate on JJg .

Lemma 3.19. *Let χ , χ_k as in Lemma 3.16. There exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ with the following property: if $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ and*

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \|v(t)\|_{H^s} + \left(\int_0^{+\infty} \|v(t)\|_{H^s}^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \varepsilon v^{\frac{5}{4}},$$

then for any $T > 0$ there holds

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{3}{2}} \|J_k J_k g_k \chi_k\|^2 + \int_0^T \nu \sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{3}{2}} \|\nabla J_k J_k g_k \chi_k\|^2 \\ & + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_k |k|^{2s-1} \|J_k J_k g_k \chi_k\|^2 \lesssim \|g^{\text{in}}, \nabla_p g^{\text{in}}, \nabla_p^2 g^{\text{in}}\|_{H_x^s L_p^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The starting point is Lemma 3.4 applied with $Y = Jg$, $F = JVG$. We find

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{3}{2}} \|J_k J_k g_k \chi_k\|^2 + \frac{3}{4} \nu \sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{3}{2}} \|\nabla J_k J_k g_k \chi_k\|^2 \\ & + \frac{3}{4} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_k |k|^{2s-1} \|J_k J_k g_k \chi_k\|^2 \\ & \lesssim \sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} |\langle J_k Y_k \chi, J_k J_k Vg_k \chi \rangle| + \nu \sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{3}{2}} \|J_k g_k \tilde{\chi}_k\|^2 \\ & + \sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} D_{\tilde{\chi}_k, k}(J_k g_k). \end{aligned}$$

The last two terms are controlled thanks to Lemma 3.18, replacing χ by $\tilde{\chi}$, after integration in time. The convection term is decomposed into

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \langle J_k J_k g_k \chi, J_k J_k Vg_k \chi \rangle &= \sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \langle J_k J_k g_k \chi_k, J_k Sg_k \chi_k \rangle \\ &+ \sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \langle J_k J_k g_k \chi_k, SJ_k g_k \chi \rangle \\ &+ \sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \langle J_k J_k g_k \chi_k, VJ_k J_k g_k \chi_k \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

We use Lemma 3.10 to write

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \operatorname{Re} \langle J_k J_k g_k \chi_k, VJ_k J_k g_k \chi_k \rangle \\ & \lesssim \|v\|_{H^{s-\frac{3}{4}}} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{3}{2}} \|J_k J_k g_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{3}{2}} \|J_k J_k g_k \chi_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \lesssim \delta \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{3}{2}} \|J_k J_k g_k \chi_k\|^2 + \delta^{-1} \|v\|_{H^{s-\frac{3}{4}}}^2 \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{3}{2}} \|J_k J_k g_k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Replacing the first operator J_k by its definition, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \|v\|_{H^{s-\frac{3}{4}}}^2 \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{3}{2}} \|J_k J_k g_k\|^2 \\ & \lesssim \|v\|_{H^{s-\frac{3}{4}}}^2 \nu^{-\frac{3}{2}} \left(\nu \sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{3}{2}} \|\nabla_p J_k g_k\|^2 + \sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} b_k \|\nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) J_k g_k\|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

The right-hand side can be controlled thanks to Lemma 3.17, after integration in time. The term

$$\sum |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \langle J_k J_k g_k \chi_k, S J_k g_k \chi_k \rangle$$

can be controlled in an easier way with Lemmas 3.11 and 3.17. Finally, the term

$$\sum |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \langle J_k J_k g_k \chi_k, J_k S g_k \chi_k \rangle$$

can be controlled thanks to Lemma 3.14. This concludes the proof. $\blacksquare$

3.4. Mixing estimates

We now consider integral quantities of the form (1.8), namely

$$v_k[g] = \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} g_k(p) Z_k(p) \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) dp,$$

and establish decay estimates as a consequence of orientation mixing.

Proposition 3.20. *Let $k \neq 0$, $Z_k = Z_k(p)$ a smooth function, and $\chi_k = \chi_k(p)$ a smooth function which is 1 on the support of Z_k . Then, for any $g \in H^1$, we have*

$$|v_k[g]| \lesssim \frac{v^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \beta_k} [\|J_k g_k \chi_k\| + \|g_k \chi_k\|] \|Z_k\|_{H^1}.$$

Proof. We use the identity $\nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) g_k = \frac{1}{i} \frac{v^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \beta_k} (J_k g_k - \alpha_k \nabla g_k)$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} |v_k[g]| &\leq \frac{v^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \beta_k} \left(\left| \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} J_k g_k Z_k(p) \right| + \left| \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \alpha_k \nabla g_k Z_k(p) \right| \right) \\ &\leq \frac{v^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \beta_k} \left(\left| \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} J_k g_k Z_k(p) \right| + \left| \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \alpha_k g_k \nabla \cdot Z_k(p) \right| \right) \\ &\lesssim \frac{v^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \beta_k} \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |J_k g_k \chi_k Z_k(p)| + \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |g_k \chi_k \nabla \cdot Z_k(p)| \right). \end{aligned}$$

The result follows from the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality. $\blacksquare$

When g is the solution of the advection-diffusion equation (1.6), suitable norms of the functions $\{v_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ can be estimated in terms of the vector field J as follows.

Proposition 3.21. *Assume*

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \|v(t)\|_{H^s} + \left(\int_0^\infty \|v(t)\|_{H^s}^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \varepsilon v^{\frac{3}{4}}.$$

Then, for $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ small enough, we find

$$\sum_k |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} |v_k[g(t)]|^2 \lesssim \frac{v}{|\beta(v^{\frac{1}{2}} t)|^2} \sum_k |k|^{2s} (\|g_k^{\text{in}}\|^2 + \|\nabla g_k^{\text{in}}\|^2) \left(\sup_\ell \|Z_\ell\|_{H^1}^2 \right).$$

Proof. For all $k \neq 0$, we introduce χ_k, ψ_k a smooth partition of unity on the sphere ($\chi_k + \psi_k \equiv 1$) such that $\chi_k = 0$ near $p = -\hat{k}$ and $\psi_k = 0$ near $p = \hat{k}$. We can decompose

$$\mathbb{V}_k[g(t)] = \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} g_k(t)(Z_k \chi_k)(p) \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) + \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} g_k(t)(Z_k \psi_k)(p) \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}).$$

It is enough to prove that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_k |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} g_k(t)(Z_k \chi_k)(p) \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) \right|^2 \\ & \lesssim \frac{\nu}{\beta(\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} t)^2} \sum_k |k|^{2s} (\|g_k^{\text{in}}\|^2 + \|\nabla g_k^{\text{in}}\|^2) \left(\sup_{\ell} \|Z_{\ell}\|_{H^1}^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

as the other integral could be treated similarly, by exchanging the roles of the north and south poles; see Remark 3.2. We then introduce another family $(\tilde{\chi}_k)_{k \neq 0}$ which is still zero near $p = -\hat{k}$, with $\tilde{\chi}_k = 1$ on the support of χ_k . It follows from Proposition 3.20 that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_k |k|^{2s+\frac{1}{2}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} g_k(t)(Z_k \chi_k)(p) \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) \right|^2 \\ & \lesssim \sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\nu}{|\beta_k|^2} [\|J_k g_k(t) \tilde{\chi}_k\|^2 + \|g_k(t) \tilde{\chi}_k\|^2] \|Z_k\|_{H^1}^2 \\ & \lesssim \frac{\nu}{|\beta(\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} t)|^2} \sum_k |k|^{2s-\frac{1}{2}} [\|J_k g_k(t) \chi_k\|^2 + \|g_k(t) \chi_k\|^2] \left(\sup_{\ell} \|Z_{\ell}\|_{H^1}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

The result then follows from Proposition 3.15 and Lemma 3.16. $\blacksquare$

When dealing with JJg , we follow the same spirit as in [9, Proposition 1.7] and obtain the following bound.

Proposition 3.22. *Let $k \neq 0$, $Z_k = Z_k(p)$ a smooth function, and $\chi_k = \chi_k(p)$ a smooth function which is 1 on the support of Z_k . Then, for all $r = r_k(t)$, the following bound holds:*

$$|\mathbb{V}_k[g]| \lesssim (A_{r,k} \|g_k \chi_k\| + B_{r,k} \|J_k g_k \chi_k\| + C_{r,k} \|J_k J_k g_k \chi_k\|) (\|Z_k\|_{H^2} + \|Z_k\|_{W^{1,\infty}}),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_{r,k} &:= \frac{\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|k|^{\frac{1}{2}} |\beta_k|} \left(r + r^{-1} \frac{\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|k|^{\frac{1}{2}} |\beta_k|} \right), \\ B_{r,k} &:= \frac{\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|k|^{\frac{1}{2}} |\beta_k|} \left(r + (r^{-1} + |\ln r|^{\frac{1}{2}}) \frac{\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|k|^{\frac{1}{2}} |\beta_k|} \right), \\ C_{r,k} &:= \frac{\nu}{|k| |\beta_k|^2} |\ln(r)|^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. As a preliminary step, we introduce $\chi_r = \chi_r(p)$ a smooth function with $\chi_r = 1$ on an r -neighborhood of $\hat{k}$, and $\chi_r = 0$ outside a $2r$ -neighborhood of $\hat{k}$. We then consider, for any smooth G with $G = 0$ near $p = -\hat{k}$ and $\chi_k = 1$ on the support of G , and for any tensor Y_k ,

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} Y_k G \right| \leq \left| \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} Y_k \chi_r G \right| + \left| \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} Y_k (1 - \chi_r) G \right| =: I_1 + I_2.$$

We find directly by Cauchy–Schwarz,

$$I_1 \lesssim \|Y_k \chi_k\| r \|G\|_{L^\infty}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= \frac{1}{i\beta_k} \left(\frac{\nu}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) \cdot J_k Y_k \frac{G}{|\nabla_p(p \cdot \hat{k})|^2} (1 - \chi_r) \\ &\quad + \frac{\alpha_k}{i\beta_k} \left(\frac{\nu}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} Y_k \nabla_p \cdot \left(\nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) \frac{G}{|\nabla_p(p \cdot \hat{k})|^2} (1 - \chi_r) \right), \end{aligned}$$

from where

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\lesssim \frac{1}{|\beta_k|} \left(\frac{\nu}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|G\|_{L^\infty} \|J_k Y_k \chi_k\| |\ln(r)|^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + \frac{|\alpha_k|}{|\beta_k|} \left(\frac{\nu}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|Y_k \chi_k\| \frac{1}{r} (\|G\|_{L^\infty} + \|G\|_{H^1}). \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} Y_k G \right| &\lesssim \left(\left(\frac{1}{|\beta_k|} \left(\frac{\nu}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{r} + r \right) \|Y_k \chi_k\| + \frac{1}{|\beta_k|} \left(\frac{\nu}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} |\ln(r)|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|J_k Y_k \chi_k\| \right) \\ &\quad \times (\|G\|_{L^\infty} + \|G\|_{H^1}). \end{aligned}$$

We then turn to

$$|\mathcal{V}[g_k(t)]| \leq \left| \frac{1}{i\beta_k} \left(\frac{\nu}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} Z_k J_k g_k \right| + \left| \frac{\alpha_k}{i\beta_k} \left(\frac{\nu}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} (\nabla_p \cdot Z_k) g_k \right|.$$

Applying the previous formula, we end up with

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{V}[g_k(t)]| &\lesssim \frac{1}{|\beta_k|} \left(\frac{\nu}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\left(\frac{1}{|\beta_k|} \left(\frac{\nu}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{r} + r \right) \|J_k g_k \chi_k\| \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{|\beta_k|} \left(\frac{\nu}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} |\ln(r)|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|J_k J_k g_k \chi_k\| \right) (\|Z_k\|_{L^\infty} + \|Z_k\|_{H^1}) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{|\beta_k|} \left(\frac{\nu}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\left(\frac{1}{|\beta_k|} \left(\frac{\nu}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{r} + r \right) \|g_k \chi_k\| \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{|\beta_k|} \left(\frac{\nu}{|k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} |\ln(r)|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|J_k g_k \chi_k\| \right) (\|\nabla Z_k\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla Z_k\|_{H^1}). \end{aligned}$$

The result follows. ■

We can now conclude this linear analysis, proving Theorem 2.

Proof of Theorem 2. For $t \leq 1$, Proposition 3.21 implies

$$\sum_{k \neq 0} |k|^{2s'} |V_k[g_k(t)]|^2 \lesssim t^{-2} \sup_k (\|Z_k\|_{W_p^{1,\infty}}^2 + \|Z_k\|_{H_p^2}^2) \|g^{\text{in}}, \nabla_p g^{\text{in}}, \nabla_p^2 g^{\text{in}}\|_{H_x^s L_p^2}^2,$$

so that the claimed conclusion follows as in this time range $t^{-2} \leq t^{-3}$.

In the range $t \geq 1$, we apply Proposition 3.22 with the choice

$$r = r_k(t) = \left(\frac{v^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|k|^{\frac{1}{2}} |\beta_k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim 1.$$

Then the bounds satisfy

$$A_{r,k}, B_{r,k}, |k|^{\frac{1}{4}} C_{r,k} \lesssim \left(\frac{v^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|k|^{\frac{1}{2}} |\beta_k|} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}},$$

which implies the claimed result. $\blacksquare$

4. Nonlinear stability

The proof of the nonlinear stability Theorem 1 relies on two main ingredients: the analysis of a Volterra equation that allows the computation of u from ψ through the relations specified in (1.2), and the use of the linear estimates of Theorem 2, via a proper bootstrapping scheme. These two points will be carried out in Sections 4.2 and 4.3, respectively.

For notational convenience, we will prove Theorem 1 with shifted index $s - 1$ instead of s . As u has one more degree of regularity than ψ in x , u will then have H^s regularity in x .

Let $s > \frac{9}{2}$, $T \in (0, \infty]$, and a field v be defined on $[0, T)$ and satisfy

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|v(t)\|_{H^s} + \left(\int_0^T \|v(t)\|_{H^s}^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \varepsilon v^{\frac{5}{4}}. \quad (\text{H}')$$

We introduce

$$S_v(t, \tau): L^2 \rightarrow L^2, \quad 0 \leq \tau \leq t < T,$$

the linear two-parameter process arising as the solution operator of the (nonautonomous) advection-diffusion equation in (1.6), considered on $(0, T)$. Namely, for $0 \leq \tau \leq t < T$ we set $S_v(t, \tau)g^{\text{in}} = g_\tau(t)$, where g_τ is the solution on $[\tau, T)$ of

$$\partial_t g_\tau + (v + p) \cdot \nabla_x g_\tau - \nu \Delta_p g_\tau = 0, \quad g_\tau|_{t=\tau} = g^{\text{in}}.$$

The results in Theorem 2 were stated under (H) for the time interval $(0, \infty)$ but extend straightforwardly under (H') to an arbitrary interval (τ, T) . In particular, given $s > \frac{5}{2}$,

$0 < s' < s + \frac{1}{4}$, there exist constants $C_0, \varepsilon, \nu_0, \eta_1 > 0$ such that for all $\nu \leq \nu_0$ the condition (H') implies

$$\|(S_\nu(t, \tau)g^{\text{in}})_{\neq 0}\|_{H_x^s L_p^2} \leq C_0 e^{-\eta_1 \nu^{\frac{1}{2}}(t-\tau)} \|g_{\neq 0}^{\text{in}}\|_{H_x^s L_p^2} \quad (4.1)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k \neq 0} |k|^{2s'} |V_k[S_\nu(t, \tau)g^{\text{in}}]|^2 \\ & \leq C_0 \left(\frac{\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\min\{1, \nu^{\frac{1}{2}}(t-\tau)\}} \right)^3 \sup_k (\|Z_k\|_{W_p^{1,\infty}}^2 + \|Z_k\|_{H_p^2}^2) \|g_{\neq 0}^{\text{in}}\|_{H_x^s L_p^2}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

for all $t \in [0, T)$. We will now focus on the analysis of the full system (1.2).

4.1. Bootstrap assumptions

Let $\psi^{\text{in}} \in \mathcal{H}^{s-1}$. Existence and uniqueness of a local-in-time solution to (1.2) satisfying

$$\psi \in C_{\text{loc}}([0, T_*), \mathcal{H}^{s-1}), \quad \nabla_p \psi \in L_{\text{loc}}^2([0, T_*), \mathcal{H}^{s-1})$$

is standard; see e.g. [1, Theorem B.2] for $s = 2$. Moreover, if T_* is the maximal time of existence, one has

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow T_*} \|u(t)\|_{H^s} = \infty.$$

Let $\eta_0 = \frac{\eta_1}{10}$, with η_1 the absolute constant in (4.1). Let $\delta, \delta', \delta''$ be positive constants to be specified later, only depending on γ and ι . For each ν , let $T = T(\nu, \gamma, \iota) > 0$ be the maximal time upon which the following three bootstrap assumptions hold:

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} e^{\eta_0 \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} t} \|u(t)\|_{H^s} \leq \delta \nu^{\frac{3}{2}}, \quad (\text{BA0})$$

$$\int_0^T \|\nabla_p \psi(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}}^2 dt \leq \delta'^2 \nu^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (\text{BA1})$$

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\psi(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} \leq \delta'' \nu^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (\text{BA2})$$

For any $\delta, \delta', \delta''$, the existence of a positive T is guaranteed by the smallness assumption on ψ^{in} , taking δ_0 small enough compared to $\delta, \delta', \delta''$. Note also that (BA0) implies (H'), for $\delta \leq \min(\frac{\varepsilon}{\eta_0^{1/4}}, 1)$. The point is to show that there exists ν_0 such that for all $\nu \leq \nu_0$, all three bounds are satisfied with improved constants $\delta/2, \delta'/2, \delta''/2$ instead of $\delta, \delta', \delta''$, and that moreover, on $(0, T)$,

$$\sup_{0 \leq t < T} \|\psi\|_{H_x^s L_p^2}^2 + \nu \int_0^T \|\nabla_p \psi\|_{H_x^s L_p^2}^2 dt \lesssim \nu^{-1} \|\psi^{\text{in}}\|^2. \quad (4.3)$$

Improvement of the constants will imply that $T = T_* = \infty$, which combined with (4.3) will conclude the proof of Theorem 1.

Remark 4.1. Condition (BA0) is of enhanced dissipation type, and holds on the velocity field u solving the nonlinear system. If we were instead able to propagate some mixing estimate of the form

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} (1+t)^\alpha \|u(t)\|_{H^s} \leq \delta \nu^{\frac{5}{4}}$$

for some $\alpha > 1$, we could lower the stability threshold (1.4) from $\nu^{\frac{3}{2}}$ down to $\nu^{\frac{5}{4}}$, because it would be enough to ensure that u satisfies (H'). However, deriving such nonlinear mixing estimates, in the spirit of [5], seems out of reach in our context.

4.2. Analysis of the Volterra equation

From (1.2), we can deduce a Volterra-like equation for u . On one hand, from the second relation in (1.2), u is obtained from ψ through application of the linear operator U defined by

$$U\psi = \iota \operatorname{St}^{-1} \nabla_x \cdot \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} p \otimes p \psi,$$

where St is the Stokes operator $-\mathbb{P}\Delta$ on $\mathbb{T}$ (with $\mathbb{P}$ the Leray projector). On the other hand, the solution ψ to the first relation in (1.2) obeys the Duhamel formula

$$\psi(t) = S_u(t, 0)\psi^{\text{in}} + \int_0^t S_u(t, \tau) F(\tau) d\tau,$$

with

$$F(t) = \frac{3\gamma}{4\pi} (p \otimes p) : E(u) - \nabla_p \cdot (\mathbb{P}_{p^\perp}[(\gamma E(u) + W(u))p]\psi).$$

Applying the operator U to both sides of this Duhamel formula, we get

$$u(t) + \int_0^t K(t, \tau) u(\tau) d\tau = f(t),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} K(t, \tau) u_0 &= -\frac{3\gamma\iota}{4\pi} \operatorname{St}^{-1} \nabla_x \cdot \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} p \otimes p S_u(t, \tau) (p \otimes p : E(u_0)), \\ f(t) &= \iota \operatorname{St}^{-1} \nabla_x \cdot \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} p \otimes p S_u(t, 0) \psi^{\text{in}} \\ &\quad - \iota \operatorname{St}^{-1} \nabla_x \cdot \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} p \otimes p \\ &\quad \times \int_0^t S_u(t, \tau) \nabla_p \cdot (\mathbb{P}_{p^\perp}[(\gamma E(u(\tau)) + W(u(\tau)))p]\psi(\tau)) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Our first result concerns the integrability properties of the kernel K and only requires the bootstrap assumption (H').

Proposition 4.2. *There exists an absolute constant ν_0 such that for $\nu \leq \nu_0$, condition (H') implies that kernel K satisfies the following estimates:*

- (a) $\|K(t, \tau)\|_{L(H^s, H^s)} \lesssim 1$ for all $\tau \leq t$ with $t - \tau \leq 1$.
- (b) $\|K(t, \tau)\|_{L(H^s, H^s)} \lesssim e^{-\eta_1 v^{\frac{1}{2}}(t-\tau)}$, for all $\tau \leq t$, with η_1 the rate given in the hypocoercive estimate (4.1).
- (c) $\|K(t, \tau)\|_{L(H^s, H^r)} \lesssim \frac{1}{(t-\tau)^{\frac{3}{2}}} + v^{\frac{3}{4}}$, for all $\tau < t$, for any $r < s + \frac{1}{4}$.

Proof. We can restrict to the case $\tau = 0$, as all the arguments that we will use are translation invariant. Given $u_0 \in H^s$, we denote by ψ_0 the solution of

$$\partial_t \psi_0 + (u + p) \cdot \nabla_x \psi_0 - \nu \Delta_p \psi_0 = 0, \quad \psi_0|_{t=0} = -\frac{3\gamma\iota}{4\pi} p \otimes p : E(u_0).$$

Note that the initial data is mean-free in x , a property that is propagated through time: $\psi_0 = \psi_{0, \neq 0}$. From the definition of ψ_0 ,

$$K(t, 0)u_0 = \text{St}^{-1} \nabla_x \cdot \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} p \otimes p \psi_0.$$

By a standard energy estimate on ψ_0 in $\mathcal{H}^{s-1}$, under (H') for u we find

$$\|\psi_0(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} \lesssim \|\psi_0(0)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{H^s}, \quad \forall t \leq 1.$$

Hence,

$$\|K(t, 0)u_0\|_{H^s} \lesssim \|\psi_0(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{H^s}, \quad \forall t \leq 1$$

and estimate (a) follows. Also, the hypocoercive estimate (4.1), which is valid under (H'), implies for δ small enough that

$$\|\psi_0(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} \lesssim e^{-\eta_1 v^{\frac{1}{2}} t} \|\psi_0(0)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} \lesssim e^{-\eta_1 v^{\frac{1}{2}} t} \|u_0\|_{H^s}, \quad \forall t \geq 0,$$

which implies estimate (b). It remains to prove estimate (c). Expressing the operator $\text{St}^{-1} \nabla_x \cdot$ in Fourier, one checks that

$$\|K(t, 0)u_0\|_{H^r}^2 = \sum_{k \neq 0} |k|^{2r-2} \left| \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} (p \cdot \hat{k}) P_{\hat{k}^\perp} p \psi_{0,k} \right|^2.$$

To a given k , we can associate a cartesian frame $(e_x, e_y, e_z := \hat{k})$ and spherical coordinates (θ, φ) with θ the colatitude and φ the longitude. In particular, $p = \sin \theta \cos \varphi e_x + \sin \theta \sin \varphi e_y + \cos \theta \hat{k}$. We compute

$$p \cdot \hat{k} = \cos \theta,$$

$$\nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) = -\sin \theta e_\theta = -\sin \theta (\cos \theta \cos \varphi e_x + \cos \theta \sin \varphi e_y - \sin \theta \hat{k}),$$

$$P_{\hat{k}^\perp} p = p - (p \cdot \hat{k}) \hat{k} = \sin \theta \cos \varphi e_x + \sin \theta \sin \varphi e_y,$$

so that

$$(p \cdot \hat{k}) P_{\hat{k}^\perp} p = -P_{\hat{k}^\perp} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}).$$

Hence,

$$\|K(t, 0)u_0\|_{H^r}^2 = \sum_{k \neq 0} |k|^{2r-2} \left| \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} P_{\hat{k}^\perp} \nabla(p \cdot \hat{k}) \psi_{0,k} \right|^2.$$

From there, we apply inequality (4.2) (see (1.8) for the definition of V_k), with $Z = Z_k = P_{\hat{k}^\perp}$ and $s = r - \frac{5}{4} +$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} \|K(t, 0)u_0\|_{H^r}^2 &\lesssim \left(\frac{v^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\min(1, v^{\frac{1}{2}}t)} \right)^3 (\|\psi_0(0)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{r-\frac{5}{4}+}}^2 + \|\nabla_p \psi_0(0)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{r-\frac{5}{4}+}}^2 \\ &\quad + \|\nabla_p^2 \psi_0(0)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{r-\frac{5}{4}+}}^2) \\ &\lesssim \left(\frac{1}{t^3} + v^{\frac{3}{2}} \right) \|u_0\|_{H^{r-\frac{1}{4}+}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The result follows. $\blacksquare$

We can now state a stability estimate for u .

Proposition 4.3. Assume (1.3). Let $\eta_0 = \frac{\eta_1}{10}$, with η_1 the absolute constant given in (4.1). There exists $v_0 > 0$ depending on γ and ι such that for $v \leq v_0$ the condition (H') implies

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} e^{\eta_0 v^{\frac{1}{2}} t} \|u(t)\|_{H^s} \lesssim \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} e^{\eta_0 v^{\frac{1}{2}} t} \|f(t)\|_{H^s}.$$

Proof. The proof is an adaptation of the reasoning in [9, Section 5.2]. We first extend $K(t, \tau)$ by zero for $t \geq T$ or $\tau > t$, and extend $u(t)$ and $f(t)$ by zero for $t \geq T$. Setting

$$k(t, \tau) = e^{\eta_0 v^{\frac{1}{2}}(t-\tau)} K(t, \tau), \quad \tilde{u}(t) = e^{\eta_0 v^{\frac{1}{2}} t} u(t), \quad \tilde{f}(t) = e^{\eta_0 v^{\frac{1}{2}} t} f(t),$$

the Volterra equation is equivalent to

$$\tilde{u}(t) + \int_0^\infty k(t, \tau) \tilde{u}(\tau) d\tau = \tilde{f}(t) \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathbb{R}_+, \quad (4.4)$$

and the point is to show that $\sup_{t \geq 0} \|\tilde{u}(t)\|_{H^s} \lesssim \sup_{t \geq 0} \|\tilde{f}(t)\|_{H^s}$. We introduce

$$\mathcal{K}_s := \left\{ k : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow L(H^s, H^s), \quad k(t, \tau) = 0 \text{ for } \tau \leq t, \right. \\ \left. \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \int_0^\infty |k(t, \tau)| d\tau < +\infty \right\},$$

equipped with $\|k\|_{\mathcal{K}_s} := \sup_t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} |k(t, \tau)| d\tau$. This space is an analogue of the space of *Volterra kernels of bounded type* introduced in [11], replacing kernels with values in $\mathbb{C}^n$ by kernels with values in $L(H^s, H^s)$. One can show exactly as in [11] that $\mathcal{K}_s$ is a Banach algebra for the product

$$(k_1 \star k_2)(t, \tau) := \int_0^\infty k_1(t, \tau') k_2(\tau', \tau) d\tau'.$$

Moreover, as in any Banach algebra, there is a notion of resolvent: we say that $k \in \mathcal{K}_s$ has resolvent $r \in \mathcal{K}_s$ if

$$r + k \star r = r + r \star k = k.$$

One can show the following lemma.

Lemma 4.4 (Direct adaptation of [11, Chapter 9, Lemma 3.4]). *If $k \in \mathcal{K}_s$ has a resolvent $r \in \mathcal{K}_s$ then, for any $\tilde{f} \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+, H^s)$, equation (4.4) has a unique solution $\tilde{u} \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+, H^s)$, given by*

$$\tilde{u}(t) = \tilde{v}(t) - \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} r(t, \tau) \tilde{v}(\tau) d\tau.$$

In particular, $\|\tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+, H^s)} \leq (1 + \|r\|_{\mathcal{K}_s}) \|\tilde{v}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+, H^s)}$.

Moreover, the set of kernels having a resolvent is open, which can be proved through a von Neumann series argument. Namely, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 4.5 (Direct adaptation of [11, Chapter 9, Theorem 3.9]). *If $k = k_1 + k_2$ is the sum of two elements of $\mathcal{K}_s$, if k_1 has a resolvent r_1 , and if*

$$\|k_2\|_{\mathcal{K}_s} < \frac{1}{1 + \|r_1\|_{\mathcal{K}_s}},$$

then k has a resolvent r , given by $r = \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} (-1)^n ((k_2 - r_1 \star k_2) \star)^n (k - r_1 \star k)$.

Following [9], we decompose

$$k(t, \tau) = K(t, \tau) + (e^{\eta_0 v^{\frac{1}{2}}(t-\tau)} - 1)K(t, \tau) =: k_1(t, \tau) + k_2(t, \tau).$$

It is easily seen that $k \in \mathcal{K}_s$. Moreover, we will prove the following lemma below.

Lemma 4.6. *Assume (1.3). There exists $v_0 > 0$ depending on γ and ι such that, for all $v \leq v_0$, if (H') holds, then the kernel $(t, \tau) \mapsto K(t, \tau)$ has a resolvent $R = R(t, \tau)$, and*

$$\|K(t, \tau)\|_{\mathcal{K}_s} \lesssim 1, \quad \|R(t, \tau)\|_{\mathcal{K}_s} \lesssim 1.$$

Assuming for the moment that this lemma is satisfied, we now prove that $\|k_2\|_{\mathcal{K}_s} \rightarrow 0$ as $v \rightarrow 0$. Let $a \in (0, 1)$ be specified, $b := \frac{1}{8\eta_0}$, and decompose:

$$\begin{aligned} \|k_2\|_{\mathcal{K}_s} &\leq \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \int_0^\infty (e^{\eta_0 v^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau} - 1) \|K(t, t - \tau)\|_{L(H^s, H^s)} d\tau \\ &\leq \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \left(\int_0^{av^{-\frac{1}{2}}} + \int_{av^{-\frac{1}{2}}}^{b|\ln v|v^{-\frac{1}{2}}} + \int_{b|\ln v|v^{-\frac{1}{2}}}^\infty \right) (e^{\eta_0 v^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau} - 1) \\ &\quad \times \|K(t, t - \tau)\|_{L(H^s, H^s)} d\tau \\ &=: \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} I_1(t) + I_2(t) + I_3(t). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\kappa > 0$. Using the bound $\|K(t, t - \tau)\|_{L(H^s, H^s)} \lesssim \langle \tau \rangle^{-\frac{3}{2}}$ for $\tau \leq a\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, see Proposition 4.2, we find

$$I_1(t) \lesssim (e^{\eta_0 a} - 1) \leq \kappa \quad \text{for } a \text{ small enough.}$$

This a being fixed, using the bound $\|K(t, t - \tau)\|_{L(H^s, H^s)} \lesssim \nu^{\frac{3}{4}}$ for $\tau \in [a\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}, b\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\ln \nu|]$, cf. again Proposition 4.2, we get

$$I_2(t) \lesssim \nu^{-\eta_0 b} \nu^{1/4} \lesssim \nu^{1/4-1/8} \leq \kappa,$$

for ν small enough. Finally, using the second inequality in Proposition 4.2, we get

$$I_3(t) \lesssim \int_{b|\ln \nu| \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}}^{+\infty} e^{(\eta_0 - \eta_1) \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau} d\tau \lesssim \nu^{-\frac{1}{2} + (\eta_1 - \eta_0)b} = \nu^{\frac{1}{8}(\frac{\eta_1}{\eta_0} - 5)} \leq \kappa,$$

for ν small enough. Hence, $\|k_2\|_{\mathcal{K}_S}$ goes to zero with ν . By Lemmas 4.5 and 4.6 (still to be proved), we deduce that the kernel k has a resolvent r , with $\|r\|_{\mathcal{K}_S} \lesssim 1$. Proposition 4.3 is then a direct consequence of Lemma 4.4. The only missing step is the proof of Lemma 4.6, which is done below. ■

Proof of Lemma 4.6. We recall, for $0 \leq \tau \leq t < T$, the formula

$$K(t, \tau)u_0 := \text{St}^{-1} \nabla_x \cdot \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} p \otimes p \psi_\tau,$$

where $\psi_0 = \psi_0(t)$ is the solution of

$$\partial_t \psi_\tau + (u + p) \cdot \nabla_x \psi_\tau - \nu \Delta_p \psi_\tau = 0, \quad t \geq \tau, \quad \psi_\tau|_{t=\tau} = -\frac{3\gamma\iota}{4\pi} p \otimes p : E(u_0).$$

The first estimate of the lemma follows from the estimates of Proposition 4.2 (see the treatment of the kernel k_2 for very close computations). To show that K has a resolvent with norm $O(1)$, we will again rely on Lemma 4.5, seeing K as a perturbation of the kernel $\bar{K}(t, \tau) = \bar{K}_0(t, \tau)1_{t < T}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{for all } \tau > t, \quad \bar{K}_0(t, \tau) = 0, \\ &\text{while for } \tau \leq t, \quad \bar{K}_0(t, \tau)u_0 := \text{St}^{-1} \nabla_x \cdot \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} p \otimes p \bar{\psi}_\tau(t), \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

where this time $\bar{\psi}_\tau$ is the solution (mean-free in x) of

$$\partial_t \bar{\psi}_\tau + p \cdot \nabla_x \bar{\psi}_\tau - \nu \Delta_p \bar{\psi}_\tau = 0, \quad t \geq \tau, \quad \bar{\psi}_\tau|_{t=\tau} = -\frac{3\gamma\iota}{4\pi} p \otimes p : E(u_0). \quad (4.6)$$

The kernel $\bar{K}_0$, corresponding to the case $u = 0$, was analyzed Fourier mode by Fourier mode in [9]. We recall some elements of this analysis in Appendix A. This analysis shows in particular that there exists $\nu_0 > 0$ depending on γ and ι such that for $\nu \leq \nu_0$ the kernel $\bar{K}_0$ has a resolvent $\bar{R}_0$ satisfying

$$\|\bar{R}_0(t, \tau)\|_{\mathcal{K}_S} \lesssim 1.$$

It implies directly that $\bar{K}(t, \tau) = \bar{K}_0(t, \tau)1_{t < T}$ has for resolvent $\bar{R}(t, \tau) = \bar{R}_0(t, \tau)1_{t < T}$ whose norm in $\mathcal{K}_s$ satisfies the same bound. By Lemma 4.5, it is then enough to show that under (H'),

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow 0} \|(K - \bar{K})\|_{\mathcal{K}^s} = 0. \quad (4.7)$$

Let $\varkappa > 0$. For some large $\tilde{T}$ we decompose the difference as

$$\begin{aligned} \|(K - \bar{K})\|_{\mathcal{K}^s} &\leq \int_0^{\tilde{T}} \|(K - \bar{K})(t, t - \tau)\|_{L(H^s, H^s)} d\tau \\ &\quad + \int_{\tilde{T}}^\infty (\|K(t, t - \tau)\|_{L(H^s, H^s)} + \|\bar{K}(t, t - \tau)\|_{L(H^s, H^s)}) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

For the second part, we use the estimates of Proposition 4.2, which are also valid for $\bar{K}$, as $u = 0$ satisfies (H'): introducing $c = \frac{1}{\eta_1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\tilde{T}}^\infty (\|K(t, t - \tau)\|_{L(H^s, H^s)} + \|\bar{K}(t, t - \tau)\|_{L(H^s, H^s)}) d\tau \\ &= \left(\int_{\tilde{T}}^{\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}} + \int_{\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}}^{c\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}|\nu|} + \int_{c\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}|\nu|}^{+\infty} \right) (\|K(t, t - \tau)\|_{L(H^s, H^s)} + \|\bar{K}(t, t - \tau)\|_{L(H^s, H^s)}) d\tau \\ &\lesssim \int_{\tilde{T}}^{\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{1}{\langle \tau \rangle^{\frac{3}{2}}} d\tau + \int_{\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}}^{c\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}|\nu|} \nu^{\frac{3}{4}} d\tau + \int_{c\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}|\nu|}^{+\infty} e^{-\eta_1 \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau} d\tau \\ &\lesssim \int_{\tilde{T}}^\infty \frac{1}{\langle \tau \rangle^{\frac{3}{2}}} d\tau + \nu^{1/4}|\nu| + \nu^{-\frac{1}{2} + \eta_1 c} \leq \varkappa, \end{aligned}$$

for $\tilde{T}$ large enough (depending on γ and ι) and ν small enough. This time, $\tilde{T}$ being fixed, we turn to the first term. We claim that for ν small enough, if (H') holds, for all $\tau \leq \tilde{T}$,

$$\|(K - \bar{K})(t, t - \tau)\|_{L(H^s, H^{s-1})} \lesssim \nu^{\frac{5}{4}}. \quad (4.8)$$

Let us assume temporarily that (4.8) holds. We also have, by the third inequality in Proposition 4.2,

$$\|K(t, t - \tau)\|_{L(H^s, H^{s+s'})} + \|\bar{K}(t, t - \tau)\|_{L(H^s, H^{s+s'})} \lesssim \frac{1}{\tau^{\frac{3}{2}}} \quad (4.9)$$

for $s' = \frac{1}{8}$ (any $s' \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$ would do). By interpolation of (4.8) and (4.9), we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(K - \bar{K})(t, t - \tau)\|_{L(H^s, H^s)} \\ &\leq \|(K - \bar{K})(t, t - \tau)\|_{L(H^s, H^{s-1})}^{1-\theta} \\ &\quad \times (\|K(t, t - \tau)\|_{L(H^s, H^{s+s'})} + \|\bar{K}(t, t - \tau)\|_{L(H^s, H^{s+s'})})^\theta \\ &\lesssim \nu^{\frac{5}{4}(1-\theta)} \tau^{-\frac{3}{2}\theta}, \end{aligned}$$

with θ such that $\theta s' - (1 - \theta) = 0$, that is, $\theta = \frac{1}{1+s'} = \frac{8}{9}$. We deduce from this estimate and the estimate

$$\|(K - \bar{K})(t, t - \tau)\|_{L(H^s, H^s)} \leq \|K(t, t - \tau)\|_{L(H^s, H^s)} + \|\bar{K}(t, t - \tau)\|_{L(H^s, H^s)} \lesssim 1$$

that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{\tilde{T}} \|(K - \bar{K})(t, t - \tau)\|_{L(H^s, H^s)} d\tau \\ &= \int_0^{\mathcal{K}} \|(K - \bar{K})(t, t - \tau)\|_{L(H^s, H^s)} d\tau + \int_{\mathcal{K}}^{\tilde{T}} \|(K - \bar{K})(t, t - \tau)\|_{L(H^s, H^s)} d\tau \\ &\leq C\mathcal{K} + C'v^{\frac{5}{4}(1-\theta)} \int_{\mathcal{K}}^{+\infty} \tau^{-\frac{3}{2}\theta} \leq C\mathcal{K} + C''v^{\frac{5}{4}(1-\theta)}\mathcal{K}^{-\frac{1}{3}} \leq (C+1)\mathcal{K}, \end{aligned}$$

for v small enough. As $\mathcal{K}$ is arbitrary, this proves (4.7). The final step is to establish (4.8). From the definition of the kernel, we find for $t \leq T$ (otherwise all quantities are zero),

$$\|(K - \bar{K})(t, \tau)u_0\|_{H^{s-1}} \leq \|(\psi_0 - \bar{\psi}_0)(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-2}}.$$

The function $\psi := \psi_\tau - \bar{\psi}_\tau$ satisfies

$$\partial_t \psi + (u + p) \cdot \nabla_x \psi - v \Delta_p \psi = -u \cdot \nabla_x \bar{\psi}_\tau, \quad t \geq \tau, \quad \psi|_{t=\tau} = 0.$$

A standard estimate yields (for $s - 2 > \frac{5}{2}$)

$$\partial_t \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-2}}^2 \lesssim \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-2}} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-2}}^2 + \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-2}} \|\nabla_x \bar{\psi}_\tau\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-2}} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-2}}.$$

For $\tau \leq t$ with $t - \tau \leq \tilde{T}$ (where we recall that $\tilde{T}$ is fixed) this implies

$$\|\psi(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-2}} \lesssim \int_\tau^t \|\bar{\psi}_\tau(t')\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} \|u(t')\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-2}} dt' \lesssim \sup_{\tau \leq t' \leq t} \|\bar{\psi}_\tau(t')\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} v^{\frac{5}{4}} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{H^s} v^{\frac{5}{4}},$$

where the second inequality is coming from (H') and from the standard Sobolev estimate $\sup_{\tau \leq t' \leq t} \|\bar{\psi}_\tau(t')\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} \lesssim \|\bar{\psi}_\tau(\tau)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} = \|\frac{3\gamma\iota}{4\pi} p \otimes p : E(u_0)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}}$. Estimate (4.8) follows, and the proof of the lemma is concluded. ■

4.3. Improvement of the bootstrap assumptions

The goal of this section is to prove the following proposition.

Proposition 4.7. *Assume (1.3). Let $\eta_0 = \frac{\eta_1}{10}$, with η_1 the absolute constant given in (4.1). There exist $\delta, \delta', \delta'', v_0 > 0$ depending on γ and ι such that for $v \leq v_0$ the assumptions (BA0)–(BA1)–(BA2) imply*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|u(t)\|_{H^s} \lesssim \|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} e^{-\eta_0 v^{\frac{1}{2}} t}, \\ & v \int_0^T \|\nabla_p \psi(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}}^2 dt \lesssim \|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}}^2 v^{-1} + \|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}}^3 v^{-\frac{3}{2}} + \|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}}^4 v^{-\frac{5}{2}}, \\ & \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\psi(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} \lesssim \|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} v^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

In particular, there exists δ_0 , depending on γ and ι , such that for

$$\|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} \leq \delta_0 \nu^{\frac{3}{2}},$$

(BA0)–(BA1)–(BA2) can be improved, with $\delta/2$, $\delta'/2$, $\delta''/2$ replacing δ , δ' , δ'' , and also such that (4.3) holds.

As explained in Section 4.1, the last part of the proposition implies Theorem 1.

4.3.1. Bound on u . In all that follows, we take $\delta \leq \min(\frac{\varepsilon}{\eta_0^{1/4}}, 1)$, so that (BA0) implies (H'), and the results of Section 4.2 can be applied. The starting point is Proposition 4.3, which says that

$$\sup_{0 \leq t < T} e^{\eta_0 \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} t} \|u(t)\|_{H^s} \lesssim \sup_{0 \leq t < T} e^{\eta_0 \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} t} \|f(t)\|_{H^s},$$

with the source term

$$\begin{aligned} f(t) &= \iota \text{St}^{-1} \nabla_x \cdot \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} p \otimes p S_u(t, 0) \psi^{\text{in}} \\ &\quad - \iota \text{St}^{-1} \nabla_x \cdot \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} p \otimes p \\ &\quad \quad \times \int_0^t S_u(t, \tau) \nabla_p \cdot (\mathbb{P}_{p^\perp}[(\gamma E(u(\tau)) + W(u(\tau)))p] \psi(\tau)) d\tau \\ &=: f^{\text{in}}(t) + f_{\text{NL}}(t). \end{aligned}$$

We recall that $S_u(t, \tau)$ is the solution operator of $L = -(u + p) \cdot \nabla_x u + \nu \Delta_p$. The first term is estimated as

$$\|f^{\text{in}}(t)\|_{H^s} \lesssim \|(S_u(t, 0) \psi^{\text{in}})_{\neq 0}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} \lesssim e^{-\eta_1 \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} t} \|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}},$$

where the last inequality comes from (4.1). Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_{\text{NL}}(t)\|_{H^s} &\lesssim \int_0^t \|(S(t, \tau) \nabla_p \cdot (\mathbb{P}_{p^\perp}[(\gamma E(u(\tau)) + W(u(\tau)))p] \psi(\tau)))_{\neq 0}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} d\tau \\ &\lesssim \int_0^t e^{-\eta_1 \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} (t-\tau)} (\|\nabla_x u(\tau) \otimes \nabla_p \psi(\tau)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} + \|\nabla_x u(\tau) \otimes \psi(\tau)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}}) d\tau \\ &\lesssim \int_0^t e^{-\eta_1 \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} (t-\tau)} \|u(\tau)\|_{H^s} (\|\nabla_p \psi(\tau)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} + \|\psi(\tau)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}}) d\tau \\ &\lesssim \left(\sup_{0 \leq \tau < T} e^{\eta_0 \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau} \|u(\tau)\|_{H^s} \right) \\ &\quad \times \int_0^t e^{-\eta_1 \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} (t-\tau)} e^{-\eta_0 \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau} (\|\nabla_p \psi(\tau)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} + \|\psi(\tau)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}}) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\eta_0 \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} t} \|f_{\text{NL}}(t)\|_{H^s} &\lesssim \left(\sup_{0 \leq \tau < T} e^{\eta_0 \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau} \|u(\tau)\|_{H^s} \right) \int_0^t e^{-(\eta_1 - \eta_0) \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} (t-\tau)} (\|\nabla_p \psi(\tau)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} + \|\psi(\tau)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}}) d\tau, \end{aligned}$$

where the second factor on the right-hand side is a convolution, resulting in

$$\begin{aligned}
 & e^{\eta_0 \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} t} \|f_{NL}(t)\|_{H^s} \\
 & \lesssim \left(\sup_{0 \leq \tau < T} e^{\eta_0 \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau} \|u(\tau)\|_{H^s} \right) \left(\|e^{-(\eta_1 - \eta_0) \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot} \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+)} \| \nabla_p \psi(\cdot) \|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} \|_{L^2(0,T)} \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \|e^{-(\eta_1 - \eta_0) \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot} \|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)} \| \psi(\cdot) \|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} \|_{L^\infty(0,T)} \right) \\
 & \lesssim \left(\sup_{0 \leq \tau < T} e^{\eta_0 \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau} \|u(\tau)\|_{H^s} \right) \left(\nu^{-1/4} \| \nabla_p \psi(\cdot) \|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} \|_{L^2(0,T)} \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \| \psi(\cdot) \|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} \|_{L^\infty(0,T)} \right) \\
 & \lesssim \left(\sup_{0 \leq \tau < T} e^{\eta_0 \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau} \|u(\tau)\|_{H^s} \right) (\delta' + \delta''),
 \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality comes from (BA1)–(BA2). Hence,

$$\sup_{0 \leq \tau < T} e^{\eta_0 \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau} \|u(\tau)\|_{H^s} \lesssim \sup_{t \geq 0} e^{(\eta_0 - \eta_1) \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} t} \|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} + (\delta' + \delta'') \left(\sup_{\tau \geq 0} e^{\eta_0 \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau} \|u(\tau)\|_{H^s} \right).$$

For δ', δ'' small enough (with a threshold depending on γ and ι), we can absorb the second term on the right-hand side, which implies the first bound of the proposition.

4.3.2. Bound on ψ . We come back to equation (1.2). Performing standard $\mathcal{H}^{s-1}$ Sobolev estimates on the equation, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}}^2 + \nu \|\nabla_p \psi\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}}^2 & \lesssim \|u\|_{H^s} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} + \|u\|_{H^{s-1}} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}}^2 \\
 & \quad + \|u\|_{H^s} (\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} + \|\nabla_p \psi\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}}) \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

On the right-hand side, the first term corresponds to the contribution of the linear term $-\frac{3\Gamma}{4\pi}(p \otimes p) : E(u)$. The second term corresponds to the contribution of the transport term $(u + p) \cdot \nabla_x \psi$, while the third one corresponds to the contribution of

$$\nabla_p \cdot (\mathbb{P}_{p^\perp}[(\gamma E(u) + W(u))p]\psi).$$

It implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}}^2 + \frac{\nu}{2} \|\nabla_p \psi\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}}^2 & \lesssim \|u\|_{H^s} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} + \|u\|_{H^s} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}}^2 \\
 & \quad + \nu^{-1} \|u\|_{H^s}^2 \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}}^2
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

so that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} \lesssim \|u\|_{H^s} + (\|u\|_{H^s} + \nu^{-1} \|u\|_{H^s}^2) \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}}.$$

The Gronwall lemma together with the bound (4.10) that we have just established yields

$$\begin{aligned}\|\psi(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} &\lesssim \|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left(\int_0^t (\|u\|_{H^s} + v^{-1}\|u\|_{H^s}^2) d\tau\right) \\ &\lesssim \|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left(\int_0^t (\delta v^{\frac{3}{2}} e^{-\eta_0 v^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau} + \delta^2 v^2 e^{-2\eta_0 v^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau}) d\tau\right) \\ &\lesssim \|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} v^{-\frac{1}{2}},\end{aligned}$$

for v small enough. Back to (4.11), integrating from 0 to t and using (4.10), we find

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{v}{2} \int_0^t \|\nabla_p \psi\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}}^2 &\lesssim \|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}}^2 + \int_0^t (\|u\|_{H^s} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}} + \|u\|_{H^s} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}}^2 + v^{-1}\|u\|_{H^s}^2 \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}}^2) d\tau \\ &\lesssim \|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}}^2 + \|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}}^2 v^{-1} + \|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}}^3 v^{-\frac{3}{2}} + \|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}}^4 v^{-\frac{5}{2}} \\ &\lesssim \|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}}^2 v^{-1} + \|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}}^3 v^{-\frac{3}{2}} + \|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}}^4 v^{-\frac{5}{2}}.\end{aligned}$$

A. Resolvent estimates in the linear setting

The goal of this appendix is to show that the kernel $\bar{K}_0$ defined in (4.5) has a resolvent $\bar{R}_0$ satisfying $\|\bar{R}_0\|_{\mathcal{K}_s} \lesssim 1$. As the equation in (4.6) is autonomous in time, we have $\bar{K}_0(t, \tau) = K_0(t - \tau)1_{\tau \leq t}$, with

$$K_0(t)u_0 := \text{St}^{-1} \nabla_x \cdot \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} p \otimes p \bar{\psi}_0(t).$$

Accordingly, we look for a resolvent of the form $\bar{R}_0(t, \tau) = R_0(t - \tau)1_{\tau \leq t}$, where R_0 is the resolvent of K_0 for the usual convolution product

$$R_0 + K_0 \star R_0 = R_0 + R_0 \star K_0 = K_0, \quad f \star g(t) = \int_0^t f(\tau)g(t - \tau) d\tau.$$

In this case, $\|\bar{R}_0\|_{\mathcal{K}_s} = \|R_0\|_{L_t^1(\mathbb{R}_+, L(H^s, H^s))}$. Hence we want to show

$$\|R_0\|_{L_t^1(\mathbb{R}_+, L(H^s, H^s))} \lesssim 1. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

The properties of K_0 have been studied in [9]. More precisely, we performed a mode-by-mode Fourier analysis in x , with the study for an arbitrary $k \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}_*^3$ of

$$\partial_t \hat{\psi}_k + \text{i} p \cdot k \hat{\psi}_k - v \Delta_p \hat{\psi}_k = 0, \quad t \geq 0, \quad \hat{\psi}_k|_{t=0} = -\frac{3\gamma l}{4\pi} p \otimes p : \frac{k \otimes u_0 + u_0 \otimes k}{2}$$

and

$$\hat{K}_k(t) = \frac{\text{i}}{|k|^2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} p \cdot k P_{k^\perp} p \hat{\psi}_k(t) \in L(\mathbb{C}^3, \mathbb{C}^3).$$

The analysis in [9] showed in particular that under the spectral condition $\frac{\gamma|\iota|}{|k|} < \Gamma_c$, the $\hat{K}_k$ has a unique resolvent $\hat{R}_k$, satisfying $\|\hat{R}_k\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)} \leq C_k$ where C_k is independent of ν , depends on γ, ι , and possibly on k (the dependence with respect to k was not examined in detail in [9]; see below). Note that for $u = \sum_{k \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}_*^3} \hat{u}_k e^{ik \cdot x}$, one has

$$K_0(t)u = \sum_{k \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}_*^3} \hat{K}_k(t) \hat{u}_k e^{ik \cdot x}$$

and, at least formally,

$$R_0(t)u = \sum_{k \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}_*^3} \hat{R}_k(t) \hat{u}_k e^{ik \cdot x}.$$

The remaining step is to show convergence of the series defining R_0 , and to get a bound independent of ν . This requires more accurate bounds on the $\hat{R}_k$ for $k \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}_*^3$. We will distinguish between low and high frequencies: for some cut-off frequency N to be fixed later, we write

$$R_0^b(t)u = \sum_{|k| \leq N} \hat{R}_k(t) \hat{u}_k e^{ik \cdot x}, \quad R_0^\sharp(t)u = \sum_{|k| > N} \hat{R}_k(t) \hat{u}_k e^{ik \cdot x}.$$

We will prove that there exists N , depending only on γ and ι , such that

$$\sup_{|k| > N} |\hat{R}_k(t)| \lesssim \frac{1}{(1+t)^{\frac{3}{2}}}, \quad \forall t \geq 0. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

As $\|R_0^\sharp(t)u\|_{H^s} \leq \sup_{|k| > N} |\hat{R}_k(t)| \|u\|_{H^s}$, one has easily $\|R_0^\sharp\|_{L_t^1(\mathbb{R}_+, L(H^s, H^s))} \lesssim 1$. This N being fixed, R_0^b is made of a finite number of terms, for which the bound $\|\hat{R}_k\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)} \leq C_k$ allows us to conclude that $\|R_0^b\|_{L_t^1(\mathbb{R}_+, L(H^s, H^s))} \lesssim 1$, which in turn yields (A.1).

To prove (A.2), let

$$t' = |k|t, \quad k' = \frac{k}{|k|}, \quad \nu' = \frac{\nu}{|k|}, \quad \hat{\psi}'_{k'}(t') = \frac{1}{|k|} \hat{\psi}_k(t)$$

so that

$$\partial_{t'} \hat{\psi}'_{k'} + i p \cdot k' \hat{\psi}'_{k'} - \nu' \Delta_p \hat{\psi}'_{k'} = 0, \quad t \geq 0, \quad \hat{\psi}'_{k'} = -\frac{3\gamma\iota}{4\pi} p \otimes p : \frac{k' \otimes u_0 + u_0 \otimes k'}{2}.$$

We further introduce

$$\hat{K}_{k'}(t')u_0 = i \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} p \cdot k' P_{(k')^\perp} \hat{\psi}'_{k'}(t').$$

It is an easy verification that

$$\hat{K}_k(t) = \hat{K}_{k'}(|k|t).$$

The analysis of [9] was actually focused on the normalized kernels $\hat{K}_{k'}$ (normalized because $|k'| = 1$). There, it was shown that there exist ν_0 , C_0 , η_1 , m depending on γ , ι such that for $\nu' \leq \nu_0$ following inequalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{K}_{k'}(t')| &\leq C_0 \frac{\ln(2+t')}{(1+t')^2} \quad \forall t' \leq (\nu')^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \\ |\hat{K}_{k'}(t')| &\leq C_0 \nu' |\ln(\nu')|^m \quad \forall t' \in [\nu'^{-\frac{1}{2}}, c|\ln(\nu')|(\nu')^{-\frac{1}{2}}], \\ |\hat{K}_{k'}(t')| &\leq C_0 e^{-\eta_1(\nu')^{\frac{1}{2}}t'} \quad \forall t' \geq c|\ln(\nu')|(\nu')^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking c large enough compared to η_1 , these estimates imply

$$|\hat{K}_{k'}(t')| \lesssim \frac{1}{(1+t')^{\frac{3}{2}}}$$

(any power less than 2 would do). Hence,

$$|\hat{K}_k(t)| \lesssim \frac{1}{(1+|k|t)^{\frac{3}{2}}}.$$

This implies

$$\|\hat{K}_k\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)} \lesssim \frac{1}{|k|} \lesssim \frac{1}{N}.$$

For N large enough, we have in particular that $\|\hat{K}_k\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)} < 1$, and we know in this case that the resolvent is given explicitly by the Neumann series

$$\hat{R}_k = \sum_{j \geq 0} (-1)^j (\hat{K}_k \star)^j \hat{K}_k.$$

It is moreover straightforward to show that if

$$|f(t)| \lesssim \frac{C_f}{(1+|k|t)^{\frac{3}{2}}}, \quad |\hat{K}_k(t)| \leq \frac{C_K}{(1+|k|t)^{\frac{3}{2}}},$$

then for some absolute constant C_0 ,

$$|\hat{K}_k \star f(t)| \leq \frac{C_0 C_f C_K}{|k|(1+|k|t)^{\frac{3}{2}}}.$$

By induction we get

$$|(\hat{K}_k \star)^j \hat{K}_k(t)| \leq \left(\frac{C_0 C_K}{|k|} \right)^j \frac{C_K}{(1+|k|t)^{\frac{3}{2}}}.$$

Finally, for N large enough so that $\frac{C_0 C_K}{N} < 1$, we find

$$|R_k(t)| \lesssim \sum_{j \geq 0} \left(\frac{C_0 C_K}{|k|} \right)^j \frac{1}{(1+|k|t)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \lesssim \frac{1}{(1+|k|t)^{\frac{3}{2}}}.$$

The result (A.2) follows.

Funding. MCZ acknowledges support of the Royal Society through grant URF/R1\191492 and the ERC/EPSC through grant Horizon Europe Guarantee EP/X020886/1. The work of DGV was supported by project Singflows grant ANR-18-CE-40-0027 and project Bourgeons grant ANR-23-CE40-0014-01 of the French National Research Agency (ANR).

References

- [1] D. Albritton and L. Ohm, [On the stabilizing effect of swimming in an active suspension](#). *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **55** (2023), no. 6, 6093–6132 Zbl 1527.35256 MR 4661714
- [2] J. Bedrossian and M. Coti Zelati, [Enhanced dissipation, hypoellipticity, and anomalous small noise inviscid limits in shear flows](#). *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **224** (2017), no. 3, 1161–1204 Zbl 1371.35213 MR 3621820
- [3] J. Bedrossian, M. Coti Zelati, and M. Dolce, [Taylor dispersion and phase mixing in the non-cutoff Boltzmann equation on the whole space](#). *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)* **129** (2024), no. 1, article no. e12616 Zbl 1545.35076 MR 4766985
- [4] J. Bedrossian, P. Germain, and N. Masmoudi, [Dynamics near the subcritical transition of the 3D Couette flow I: Below threshold case](#). *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **266** (2020), no. 1294 Zbl 1444.35002 MR 4126259
- [5] S. Chaturvedi, J. Luk, and T. Nguyen, [The Vlasov–Poisson–Landau system in the weakly collisional regime](#). *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **36** (2023), no. 4, 1103–1189 Zbl 1522.35505 MR 4618956
- [6] P. Constantin, A. Kiselev, L. Ryzhik, and A. Zlatoš, [Diffusion and mixing in fluid flow](#). *Ann. of Math. (2)* **168** (2008), no. 2, 643–674 Zbl 1180.35084 MR 2434887
- [7] M. Coti Zelati, [Stable mixing estimates in the infinite Péclet number limit](#). *J. Funct. Anal.* **279** (2020), no. 4, article no. 108562 Zbl 1445.35056 MR 4095800
- [8] M. Coti Zelati, M. G. Delgadino, and T. M. Elgindi, [On the relation between enhanced dissipation timescales and mixing rates](#). *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **73** (2020), no. 6, 1205–1244 Zbl 1444.76098 MR 4156602
- [9] M. Coti Zelati, H. Dietert, and D. Gérard-Varet, [Orientation mixing in active suspensions](#). *Ann. PDE* **9** (2023), no. 2, article no. 20 Zbl 1529.35372 MR 4658583
- [10] P. Degond, S. Merino-Aceituno, F. Vergnet, and H. Yu, [Coupled self-organized hydrodynamics and Stokes models for suspensions of active particles](#). *J. Math. Fluid Mech.* **21** (2019), no. 1, article no. 6 Zbl 1420.35232 MR 3905352
- [11] G. Gripenberg, S.-O. Londen, and O. Staffans, [Volterra integral and functional equations](#). *Encyclopedia Math. Appl.* 34, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990 Zbl 0695.45002 MR 1050319
- [12] V. Gyrya, K. Lipnikov, I. S. Aranson, and L. Berlyand, [Effective shear viscosity and dynamics of suspensions of micro-swimmers from small to moderate concentrations](#). *J. Math. Biol.* **62** (2011), no. 5, 707–740 Zbl 1232.92032 MR 2786723
- [13] C. Hohenegger and M. J. Shelley, [Stability of active suspensions](#). *Phys. Rev. E (3)* **81** (2010), no. 4, article no. 046311 MR 2736227
- [14] G. B. Jeffery, [The motion of ellipsoidal particles immersed in a viscous fluid](#). *Proc. R. Soc. Lond., Ser. A* **102** (1922), 161–179 Zbl 49.0748.02

- [15] E. Lauga and T. R. Powers, [The hydrodynamics of swimming microorganisms](#). *Rep. Progr. Phys.* **72** (2009), no. 9, article no. 096601 MR 2539632
- [16] N. Masmoudi and W. Zhao, [Stability threshold of two-dimensional Couette flow in Sobolev spaces](#). *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire* **39** (2022), no. 2, 245–325 Zbl 1510.35212 MR 4412070
- [17] L. Ohm and M. J. Shelley, [Weakly nonlinear analysis of pattern formation in active suspensions](#). *J. Fluid Mech.* **942** (2022), article no. A53 Zbl 1494.76133 MR 4434542
- [18] S. Rafai, L. Jibuti, and P. Peyla, [Effective viscosity of microswimmer suspensions](#). *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104** (2010), article no. 098102
- [19] G. Rosser, R. E. Baker, J. P. Armitage, and A. G. Fletcher, [Modelling and analysis of bacterial tracks suggest an active reorientation mechanism in *Rhodobacter sphaeroides*](#). *J. R. Soc. Interface* **11** (2014), no. 97, article no. 20140320
- [20] D. Saintillan, [Rheology of active fluids](#). In *Annual review of fluid mechanics. Vol. 50*, pp. 563–592, Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech. 50, Annual Reviews, Palo Alto, CA, 2018 Zbl 1384.76057 MR 3753222
- [21] D. Saintillan and M. J. Shelley, [Instabilities, pattern formation, and mixing in active suspensions](#). *Phys. Fluids* **20** (2008), no. 12, article no. 123304 Zbl 1182.76654
- [22] A. Sokolov, I. S. Aranson, J. O. Kessler, and R. E. Goldstein, [Concentration dependence of the collective dynamics of swimming bacteria](#). *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98** (2007), article no. 158102
- [23] B. ten Hagen, S. van Teeffelen, and H. Löwen, [Brownian motion of a self-propelled particle](#). *J. Phys. Condens. Matter*, **23** (2011), article no. 194119
- [24] C. Villani, [Hypocoercivity](#). *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **202** (2009), no. 950 Zbl 1197.35004 MR 2562709
- [25] S. Weady, [Variational bounds and nonlinear stability of an active nematic suspension](#). *J. Fluid Mech.* **988** (2024), article no. A5 Zbl 07862183 MR 4752131
- [26] D. Wei and Z. Zhang, [Transition threshold for the 3D Couette flow in Sobolev space](#). *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **74** (2021), no. 11, 2398–2479 Zbl 1513.35438 MR 4373161

Received 13 September 2024; revised 1 July 2025; accepted 6 August 2025.

Michele Coti Zelati

Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London, London SW7 2AZ, UK;
m.coti-zelati@imperial.ac.uk

Helge Dietert

Institut de Mathématiques de Jussieu-Paris Rive Gauche (IMJ-PRG), Université Paris Cité and Sorbonne Université, CNRS, 75013 Paris, France; helge.dietert@imj-prg.fr

David Gérard-Varet

Institut de Mathématiques de Jussieu-Paris Rive Gauche (IMJ-PRG), Université Paris Cité and Sorbonne Université, CNRS, 75013 Paris, France; david.gerard-varet@u-paris.fr