

# ON THE SUITABLE WEAK SOLUTIONS TO THE NAVIER-STOKES EQUATIONS IN THE WHOLE SPACE

By H. BEIRÃO DA VEIGA

## Introduction

In the absence of an uniqueness theorem for the Navier-Stokes equations, the properties proved for solutions obtained by different methods could not coincide. Hence, it is interesting to construct solutions with useful "additional" properties, solutions which are (very likely) those having a physical meaning.

A classical property proved for the solutions of Navier-Stokes equations is the energy inequality (0.4). Recently Scheffer ([7] to [10]) and Caffarelli, Kohn and Nirenberg [3] proved very interesting results on the Hausdorff dimension of the singular set for *suitable* weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations. In [3] the authors proved that the singular set of a suitable weak solution has Hausdorff 1-dimensional measure (in space-time) zero. After this result it becomes natural to require this additional property for the weak solutions. It is not clear if "suitability" holds for solutions constructed by Faedo-Galerkin's method. In fact, suitable weak solutions must verify the local energy inequality (0.5), which is difficult to be proved if a well defined pressure doesn't exist for the approximating problem.

Scheffer [8] constructed suitable weak solutions in the case  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3$ ,  $f=0$ ,  $u_0 \in H$ . Caffarelli, Kohn and Nirenberg [3] constructed suitable weak solutions also when  $f \in L^2(0, T; H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3))$ . These last authors also considered the case of a bounded domain  $\Omega$ .

We will present a quite natural and easy construction of suitable weak solution in the case:

$$\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3, \quad u_0 \in H, \quad f \in L^2(0, T; H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)).$$

The method utilize only  $L^2$  theory for the space variables. (see also [5], Chap. I, Remarque 6.11, and [1]). The corresponding problem for a bounded open set  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  is studied in [2], by introducing a new approximation theorem for non-linear problems.

Let now  $u_0 \in H$ ,  $f \in L^2(0, T; H^{-1})$ , and consider sequences  $u_{0,\epsilon} \in W$ ,  $f_\epsilon \in L^2(0, T; L^2)$  such that:

$$(0.9) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} u_{0,\epsilon} = u_0 \text{ in } H, \\ \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} f_\epsilon = f \text{ in } L^2(0, T; H^{-1}). \end{array} \right.$$

One has the following result:

**THEOREM B.** — Let  $u_0, f, u_{0,\epsilon}$  and  $f_\epsilon$  be as in (0.2), (0.9) and consider the solution  $u_\epsilon$  of problem (0.6) $_\epsilon$ . When  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  there exists a subsequence, still denoted by  $u_\epsilon$ ,  $\nabla p_\epsilon$  converging (see below) to a solution  $u$ ,  $\nabla p$  of the Navier-Stokes equations (0.1), verifying (0.3) and (0.4). Moreover, the local energy inequality (0.5) holds.

Convergence, and regularity of  $u, p$  are as follows:

- (i)  $u_\epsilon$  converges to  $u$  in  $L^2(0, T; V)$  weak; in  $L^\infty(0, T; H)$  weak-\*, almost everywhere in  $Q_T$  and in  $L^2(0, T; B_R)$ ,  $\forall R > 0$ .
- (ii)  $u'_\epsilon$  converges weakly to  $u'$  in  $L^2(0, T; W)$  and in  $L^{4/3}(0, T; H^{-1}) + L^2(0, T; H^{-2})$ . Moreover  $u' \in L^{4/3}(0, T; H^{-1})$ .
- (iii)  $u'_\epsilon u'_\epsilon$  converges weakly to  $u' u'$  in  $L^{4/3}(0, T; L^2)$ , and  $(u_\epsilon \cdot \nabla) u_\epsilon$  converges weakly to  $(u \cdot \nabla) u$  in  $L^{4/3}(0, T; H^{-1})$ .
- (iv)  $p_\epsilon$  converges weakly to  $p$  in  $L^{4/3}(0, T; L^2 + L^6)$  and  $\nabla p_\epsilon$  converges weakly to  $\nabla p$  in  $L^{4/3}(0, T; H^{-1})$ . If  $\nabla \cdot f = 0$  then  $p_\epsilon$  converges to  $p$  in  $L^{4/3}(0, T; L^2)$ .

Note that by using equation (2.9) other regularity results on  $p$  and  $\nabla p$  follow.

*1. Proof of Theorem A.* — Let  $f \in H$ ,  $\text{Re } \lambda > 0$  and consider the problem:

$$(1.1) \quad \lambda u + \epsilon \Delta^2 u - \Delta u = f$$

By Fourier transform the unique solution  $u \in H$  of (1.1) is given by:

$$(1.2) \quad \hat{u}(\xi) = (\lambda + \epsilon |\xi|^4 + |\xi|^2)^{-1} f(\xi).$$

It follows that  $(\text{Re } \lambda + \epsilon |\xi|^4 + |\xi|^2)^{-1} |\hat{u}(\xi)| \leq |f(\xi)|$ , hence  $u \in H^4$ . On the other hand:

$$|\lambda| |\hat{u}(\xi)| \leq |\lambda + \epsilon |\xi|^4 + |\xi|^2| \cdot |\hat{u}(\xi)| \leq |f(\xi)|,$$

consequently:

$$(1.3) \quad |u| \leq |\lambda|^{-1} |f|, \quad \forall f \in H.$$

Define  $D(A) = H^4 \cap W$  and  $Au = \epsilon \Delta^2 u - \Delta u$ . It easily follows that  $A$  is a closed operator,  $D(A)$  is dense in  $H$ , the resolvent set  $\rho(A)$  contains  $\{\lambda : \text{Re } \lambda > 0\}$  and:

$$\|(\lambda + A)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(H; H)} \leq |\lambda|^{-1},$$

(<sup>1</sup>) Here we consider the complex valued case.

for every  $\lambda$  such that  $\text{Re } \lambda > 0$ . By using well known results on linear evolution equations [see [6], Vol. II, Chap. 4, Thm. 3.2] one gets the following statement:

**THEOREM 1.1.** — Let  $u_0 \in W(2)$  and  $g \in L^2(0, T; H)$ . There exists a unique solution  $u$

of problem:

$$(1.4) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} u' + \varepsilon \Delta^2 u - \Delta u = g, \\ \Delta \cdot u = 0, \\ u|_{t=0} = u_0. \end{array} \right.$$

Moreover:

$$(1.5) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} u \in L^2(0, T; H^4) \cap C(0, T; W), \\ u' \in L^2(0, T; H). \end{array} \right.$$

Let  $P$  be the orthogonal projection of  $L^2$  onto the closed subspace  $H$ . It is well known that  $H^\perp = \{p \in L^2_{loc} : \Delta p \in L^2\}$ . In terms of Fourier transform, for every  $n \in L^2$  one has  $n = v + \Delta q$ , where  $v \in H$  and  $\Delta q \in H^\perp$  are given by:

$$(1.6) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \hat{v} = \hat{n} - |\xi|^{-2} (\hat{\xi} \cdot \hat{n}) \hat{\xi}, \\ \hat{q} = |\xi|^{-2} \hat{\xi} \cdot \hat{n}. \end{array} \right.$$

Consider now the non linear problem:

$$(1.7) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} u' + \varepsilon \Delta^2 u + P[(u \cdot \nabla)u] - \Delta u = g, \\ \Delta \cdot u = 0, \\ u|_{t=0} = u_0. \end{array} \right.$$

The following result holds:

**THEOREM 1.2.** — Let  $g \in L^2(0, T; H)$ ,  $u_0 \in W$ . There exists a unique solution of problem

(1.7), which verifies (1.5).

*Proof.* — By using Hölder's inequality and Sobolev embedding theorem one easily obtains:

$$(1.8) \quad |P(v \cdot \nabla)v|_2 \leq |v \cdot \nabla|_2 |v|_2 \leq |v|_2^2 |\Delta v|_2 \leq c \|v\|_3^3 \|v\|_2, \quad \forall v \in H^2.$$

Consider now the problem (1.7), with  $P(v \cdot \nabla)v$  in the place of  $P(u \cdot \nabla)u$ . By Theorem

1.1 there exists a unique solution  $u$ , verifying (1.5). Define a map  $S$  by  $Sv = u$ , and let

$K$  be the set:

$$K = \{v \in C(0, T; V) \cap L^2(0, T; W) : v|_{t=0} = u_0, \|v\|_{C(0, T; V)} \leq B, \|v\|_{L^2(0, T; W)} \leq B\},$$

(7)  $W = [D(A), H]_{1/2}$ , in the notation of [6].

where  $B$  and  $\tau$  will be fixed later.  $\mathbb{K}$  is a closed subset of  $C(0, \tau; V) \cap L^2(0, \tau; W)$ . From (1.8) it follows that:

$$(1.9) \quad \|P(v, \Delta)v\|_{L^2(0, \tau; H)} \leq cB^4\tau^{1/2}, \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{K}.$$

We want to show that  $S$  is a contraction in  $\mathbb{K}$ , if  $\tau$  is sufficiently small. By taking the scalar product in  $L^2$  of equation (1.7)<sub>ε</sub> with  $P(v, \Delta)v$  in the place of  $P(u, \Delta)u$  with  $u$  and  $\Delta u$  one easily obtains:

$$(1.10) \quad \|u\|_{C(0, \tau; V)}^2 + \|u\|_{L^2(0, \tau; W)}^2 \leq c_0^2 \{ \|u_0\|_V^2 + \|g\|_{L^2(0, \tau; H)}^2 + B^4\tau^{1/2} \},$$

where  $c_0$  is a numerical constant (3). By fixing  $B = 2c_0\|u_0\|_V$ , and by choosing  $\tau$  sufficiently small, one shows that  $S(\mathbb{K}) \subset \mathbb{K}$ . Let  $u = Su$ ,  $w = u - u$ . Clearly:

$$(1.11) \quad w' + \varepsilon \Delta^2 w - \Delta w = P[(v, \Delta)v - (v, \Delta)v],$$

$$w|_{t=0} = 0.$$

On the other hand, as in (1.8),

$$\|(v, \Delta)v - (v, \Delta)v\|_2 \leq c\|v\|_2 \|v\|_2 + c\|v\|_2 \|v - \bar{v}\|_2 + c\|v - \bar{v}\|_2 \|v - \bar{v}\|_2.$$

Hence:

$$(1.12) \quad \|P(v, \Delta)v - (v, \Delta)v\|_{L^2(0, \tau; H)} \leq c\tau^{1/2} B^2 \{ \|v - \bar{v}\|_{C(0, \tau; V)} + \|v - \bar{v}\|_{L^2(0, \tau; W)} \}.$$

From (1.11) and (1.12) it follows that  $S$  is a contraction on  $\mathbb{K}$  if  $\tau$  is sufficiently small. Hence there exists a unique local solution of (1.7)<sub>ε</sub>. Finally, by taking the scalar product of (1.7)<sub>ε</sub> with  $u$  and  $\Delta^2 u$  it follows a global *a priori* bound for  $\|u(t)\|_2^2$ .  $\square$

We now prove Theorem A. Let  $u_\varepsilon$  be the solution of (1.7)<sub>ε</sub> with  $g = Pf_\varepsilon$ . Define  $w_\varepsilon = u_\varepsilon' + \varepsilon \Delta^2 u_\varepsilon - \Delta u_\varepsilon + (u_\varepsilon, \Delta)u_\varepsilon - f_\varepsilon$ . Clearly  $w_\varepsilon \in L^2(0, T; L^2)$  and  $Pw_\varepsilon = 0$ . Hence there exists a unique  $\Delta p_\varepsilon$  such that  $w_\varepsilon = -\Delta p_\varepsilon$  and (0.6)<sub>ε</sub> and (0.7) hold. Estimate (0.8) is obvious.

Finally, let  $\phi(t, x)$  be a non-negative  $C^\infty$  function with compact support in the space variables. By taking the scalar product of (0.6)<sub>ε</sub> with  $\phi u_\varepsilon$  and by integrating on  $\mathbb{Q}$  one obtains:

$$(1.15) \quad \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{Q}} |u_\varepsilon(t)|^2 \phi + 2 \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{Q}} |\Delta u_\varepsilon|^2 \phi + 2\varepsilon \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{Q}} |\Delta u_\varepsilon|^2 \phi \leq \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{Q}} |u_0, \varepsilon|^2 \phi + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{Q}} |u_\varepsilon|^2 \left( \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} + \Delta \phi \right) + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{Q}} (|u_\varepsilon|^2 + 2d) u_\varepsilon \cdot \Delta \phi + 2 \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{Q}} f_\varepsilon \cdot u_\varepsilon \phi + 4\varepsilon \|\Delta \phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{Q})} \| \Delta u_\varepsilon \|_{L^2(\mathbb{Q})} \| \Delta u_\varepsilon \|_{L^2(\mathbb{Q})} + 2\varepsilon \|\Delta \phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{Q})} \| u_\varepsilon \|_{L^2(\mathbb{Q})} \| \Delta u_\varepsilon \|_{L^2(\mathbb{Q})}.$$

(3) Assume  $\tau < 1$ , in order to get  $\|v\|_{L^2(0, \tau; H)} \leq \|v\|_{C(0, \tau; H)}$ .

2. Proof of Theorem B. — Let  $u_0, u_0^\varepsilon, f, f_\varepsilon$  be as in Theorem B and let  $u_\varepsilon, \Delta p_\varepsilon$  be the solution of (0.6) $_\varepsilon$ . From (0.8) it follows that

$$(2.1) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon \|\Delta u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2)} = 0,$$

hence  $\varepsilon \Delta u_\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  in  $L^2(0, T; H^{-2})$ . On the other hand it is not difficult to verify that (since  $H^2 \hookrightarrow L^\infty$ ):

$$\|P(u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla) u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(0, T; W)} \leq c \|u_\varepsilon\|_{C(0, T; H)} \|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(0, T; V)}$$

and by utilizing (0.8) one gets:

$$(2.2) \quad \|P(u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla) u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(0, T; W)} \leq c_T (\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_2 + \|f_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(0, T; H^{-1})}).$$

Consequently:

$$(2.3) \quad \|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(0, T; W)} \leq c_T (1 + \sqrt{\varepsilon}) (\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_2 + \|f_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(0, T; H^{-1})})$$

For the sake of convenience we denote by "constant", quantities that remain bounded when  $\varepsilon$  goes to zero, as for instance the right hand side of (2.3).

Using notations of [6], one has  $L^2 = [H^1, H^{-2}]_{1/3}$  (see [6], Vol. I, Chap. I, Thm 12.3) and similarly:

$$H = [V, W]_{1/3}.$$

Since  $u_\varepsilon$  is bounded in  $L^2(0, T; V)$  and in  $H^1(0, T; W)$  it follows that

$$(2.4) \quad \|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^{1/3}(0, T; H)} \leq \text{Const.} \quad (4)$$

by the theorem of intermediate derivatives ([6], Vol. I, Chap. I, Thms 4.1 and 2.3). Let  $B_R = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |x| < R\}$ . The sequence  $u_\varepsilon$  is bounded in  $L^2(0, T; H^1(B_R)) \cap H^{1/3}(0, T; L^2(B_R))$ , and by a compactness argument there exists a subsequence converging in  $L^2(0, T; L^2(B_R))$ , see [5], Chap. I, Thm 5.2. At this stage of the proof, all the statements in (i) and the first statement in (ii) follow easily. On the other hand,

$$L^2(0, T; L^6) \cap L^\infty(0, T; L^2) \hookrightarrow L^{8/3}(0, T; L^4);$$

$$(2.5) \quad \|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^{8/3}(0, T; L^4)} \leq \text{Const.}$$

and a well known argument (use Lemma 1.3 in [5] or argue as in p. 76) leads to the first statement in (iii). The second statement follows from the first one, since

$$\sum_1^t D_t^i u^i = \sum_1^t D_t^i (u^i u^i).$$

Now we prove statement (iv). From (0.6) $_\varepsilon$  it follows that

$$(2.6) \quad -\Delta p_\varepsilon = \nabla \cdot [u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla] u_\varepsilon - \nabla \cdot f_\varepsilon.$$

(\*)  $u \in H^s(0, T; X)$ , means that  $u$  and the fractional derivative  $d^s u/dt^s, s \in \mathbb{R}^+$ , belong to  $L^2(0, T; X)$ . See [6], for details.

Since  $f_{\epsilon, j} \in H^{-1}$ , there exist (non unique)  $f_{\epsilon, j} \in L^2, j=0, 1, 2, 3$ , such that:

$$(2.7) \quad f_{\epsilon} = f_{\epsilon, 0} + \sum_{j=1}^3 \frac{\partial f_{\epsilon, j}}{\partial x_j}$$

The norms of  $f_{\epsilon, j}, j=0, 1, 2, 3$ , in the space  $L^2(0, T; L^2)$  remain bounded when  $\epsilon$  tends to zero, since the same holds for the  $L^2(0, T; H^{-1})$  norm of  $f_{\epsilon}$ . From (2.6) and (2.7) it follows that:

$$(2.8) \quad p_{\epsilon} = p_{\epsilon}^{(1)} + p_{\epsilon}^{(2)} + p_{\epsilon}^{(3)},$$

where:

$$(2.9) \quad \left\{ \begin{aligned} -\Delta p_{\epsilon}^{(1)} &= \sum_{j=1}^3 \frac{\partial x_j \partial x_j}{\partial^2} (u_{\epsilon}^j n_{\epsilon}^j), \\ -\Delta p_{\epsilon}^{(2)} &= - \sum_{j=1}^3 \frac{\partial x_j \partial x_j}{\partial^2} f_{\epsilon, j}, \\ -\Delta p_{\epsilon}^{(3)} &= - \sum_{j=1}^3 \frac{\partial x_j}{\partial} f_{\epsilon, 0}. \end{aligned} \right.$$

By Fourier transform  $|\xi|^2 p_{\epsilon}^{(1)} = - \sum_{j=1}^3 \xi_j u_{\epsilon}^j n_{\epsilon}^j$ . Taking in account the estimate (2.5)

one obtains:

$$(2.10) \quad \left\{ \begin{aligned} \|p_{\epsilon}^{(1)}\|_{L^{4/3}(0, T; L^2)} &\leq \text{Const}, \\ \|\Delta p_{\epsilon}^{(1)}\|_{L^{4/3}(0, T; H^{-1})} &\leq \text{Const}. \end{aligned} \right.$$

Analogously,

$$(2.11) \quad \left\{ \begin{aligned} \|p_{\epsilon}^{(2)}\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2)} &\leq \text{Const}, \\ \|\Delta p_{\epsilon}^{(2)}\|_{L^2(0, T; H^{-1})} &\leq \text{Const}. \end{aligned} \right.$$

Finally,  $|\xi| p_{\epsilon}^{(3)} = -i \sum_{j=0}^3 \xi_j f_{\epsilon, j}$ , consequently:

$$(2.12) \quad \left\{ \begin{aligned} \|p_{\epsilon}^{(3)}\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2)} &\leq \text{Const}, \\ \|\Delta p_{\epsilon}^{(3)}\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2)} &\leq \text{Const}. \end{aligned} \right.$$

The first statement in (2.12) follows from a well known theorem on Riesz potentials [11], Chap. 5, Thm 1, (b)].

From (2.8), (2.10), (2.11), (2.12) it follows that:

$$(2.13) \quad \left\{ \begin{aligned} \|p_{\epsilon}\|_{L^{4/3}(0, T; L^2+L^6)} &\leq \text{Const}, \\ \|\Delta p_{\epsilon}\|_{L^{4/3}(0, T; H^{-1})} &\leq \text{Const}. \end{aligned} \right.$$

This proves statement (iv). If  $\nabla \cdot f = 0$  one choose  $f_{\epsilon}$  verifying  $\nabla \cdot f_{\epsilon} = 0$ . Hence  $p_{\epsilon} \equiv p_{\epsilon}^{(1)}$ , and  $p_{\epsilon}$  verifies (2.10).

The properties proved until now allow us to pass to the limit in (0.6)<sub>ε</sub> in order to obtain (0.1) and the remaining properties in (ii). Weak continuity of  $u(t)$ , (0.1)<sub>ε</sub> and (0.4) are proved in the usual way.

*Proof of the local energy inequality.* — We start by proving (0.5) for almost all  $t \in [0, T]$ . Since  $u_\varepsilon \rightarrow u$  strongly in  $L^2(0, T; L^2(B_R))$ , for every  $R > 0$ , it follows that (a subsequent)  $u_\varepsilon$  converges strongly to  $u$  in  $L^2(B_R)$ , for every  $R > 0$ , and for almost all  $t \in [0, T]$ . For this values of  $t$  the first term on the left hand side of (1.15) converges to the corresponding term in (0.5). The limit of the second term is less or equal to the corresponding term in (0.5), and the third one is non-negative. From the inclusion  $L^\infty(0, T; L^2) \cup L^2(0, T; L^6) \subset L^{10/3}(\Omega_T)$ , and from the convergence of  $u_\varepsilon$  to  $u$  almost everywhere in  $\Omega_T$  it follows that  $|u_\varepsilon|^2 u_\varepsilon - |u|^2 u$  weakly in  $L^{10/9}(\Omega_T)$ .

Hence:

$$\iint_{\Omega_T} |u_\varepsilon|^2 u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla \phi \rightarrow \iint_{\Omega_T} |u|^2 u \cdot \nabla \phi.$$

On the other hand from:

$$\|u_\varepsilon - u\|_{L^4(0, T; L^2(B_R))} \leq \|u_\varepsilon - u\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(B_R))} \times \|u_\varepsilon - u\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(B_R))}$$

it follows that  $u_\varepsilon \rightarrow u$  strongly in  $L^4(0, T; L^2(B_R))$ ,  $R > 0$ . This is sufficient to pass to the limit on the pressure term. Finally the two last terms on the right hand side of (1.15) tend to zero, as a consequence of (2.1).

To finish the proof it remains to show that (0.5) holds for every  $t \in [0, T]$ . Let  $t_n \rightarrow t$  be a sequence of values for which (0.5) holds. Write (0.5) for  $t_n$  and take the limit inf when  $t_n \rightarrow t$ . This yields (0.5) with the first integral on the left hand side replaced by the right hand side of (2.14) below.

However,

$$(2.14) \quad \int_{\Omega_{t_n}} |u|^2 \phi \, dx \leq \liminf_{t_n \rightarrow t} \int_{\Omega_{t_n}} |u|^2 \phi \, dx,$$

since  $u(t) \sqrt{\phi(t)}$  is weakly continuous in  $[0, T]$  with values in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}_x^3)$ .  $\square$

#### REFERENCES

- [1] H. BEIRÃO DA VEIGA, Sulla Approssimazione Delle Soluzioni Deboli Globali Della Equazione di Navier-Stokes, preprint U.T.M. n° 155 (1984) Dipart. Matematica-Univ. di Trento.  
 [2] H. BEIRÃO DA VEIGA, On the suitable weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations in a bounded domain (J. Math. Pures et Appl., to appear).  
 [3] L. CAFFARELLI, R. KOHN and L. NIRENBERG, Partial Regularity of Suitable weak Solutions of the Navier-Stokes Equations (Comm. Pure Appl. Math., Vol. 35, 1982, pp. 771-831).  
 [4] O. A. LADYZENSKAYA, The Mathematical Theory of Viscous Incompressible Flow, Gordon and Breach, New York, 1969.

- [5] J. L. LIONS, *Quelques méthodes de résolution de problèmes aux limites non-linéaires*, Dunod, Paris, 1969.
- [6] J. L. LIONS and E. MAGENES, *Problèmes aux limites non homogènes et applications*, Vol. I and II, Dunod, Paris, 1968.
- [7] V. SCHEFFER, *Partial Regularity of Solutions to the Navier-Stokes Equations* (*Pacific J. of Math.*, Vol. 66, 1976, pp. 535-552).
- [8] V. SCHEFFER, *Hausdorff Measure and the Navier-Stokes Equations* (*Comm. Math. Phys.*, Vol. 55, 1977, pp. 97-112).
- [9] V. SCHEFFER, *The Navier-Stokes Equations on a Bounded Domain* (*Comm. Math. Phys.*, Vol. 73, 1980, pp. 1-42).
- [10] V. SCHEFFER, *Boundary Regularity for the Navier-Stokes Equations in a Half-space* (*Comm. Math. Phys.*, Vol. 85, 1982, pp. 275-299).
- [11] E. M. STEIN, *Singular Integrals and Differentiability Properties of Functions*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1970.

(Manuscrit reçu en mars 1984.)

H. BEIRÃO DA VEIGA  
 Dipartimento di Matematica,  
 Facoltà Scienze,  
 Università di Trento,  
 38050 Povo (Trento),  
 Italy.



ON THE CONSTRUCTION  
OF SUITABLE WEAK SOLUTIONS  
TO THE NAVIER-STOKES  
EQUATIONS VIA  
A GENERAL APPROXIMATION THEOREM

By H. BEIRÃO DA VEIGA (\*)

Introduction

In this paper we continue the study (initiated in [2]) of methods of construction of suitable weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations.

Basically, a *suitable weak solution* is a weak solution  $u \in L^2(0, T; V) \cap C^{0, \alpha}(0, T; H)$  which verifies the local energy inequality (0.3); other properties requested in the definition (see [3]) follow directly from the equations if the data are smooth enough.

Caffarelli, Kohn and Nirenberg proved in [3] that the one dimensional Hausdorff measure of the set of the interior singularities of a suitable weak solution is zero. Weaker results were proved previously by Scheffer; see [7], [8], [9]. At the light of that result it seems quite natural to require the local energy inequality as an additional property to be verified for the weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations. In fact, on deducing the various differential equations of Mathematical Physics from physical principles it is generally assumed that the functions describing the physical quantities are "sufficiently smooth". Under this assumption, physical principles and differential equations are more or less equivalent. On considering weak solutions this equivalence could disappear. In that case, in order to maintain the physical meaning of the description, one has to complement the differential equations with the lost physical principles.

There is no evidence that solutions obtained by Faedo-Galerkin method verifies the local energy estimate. Scheffer [7] constructed suitable weak solutions in the whole space. Caffarelli, Kohn and Nirenberg [3] constructed them also in bounded domains. For the whole space case, we proved in [2] that by adding  $\varepsilon \Delta^2 u_\varepsilon$  ( $\varepsilon > 0$ ) to the main equation and by letting  $\varepsilon$  go to zero one obtains a suitable weak solution as limit of the  $u_\varepsilon$ . In the case of a bounded domain the same approach gives a weak

(\*) Facoltà di Scienze, Univ. di Trento, 38050 POVO (TN) Italy.

solution to the Navier-Stokes system (see [1]). We are convinced that (as for the whole space) the same approach gives a suitable weak solution. However, the proof would require long calculations in order to obtain for the linearized equation with the term  $\Delta^2 u$  results similar to those of Solonnikov [10] for the linearized equation with  $-\Delta u$ . The aim of this paper is to introduce a different approach, which seems us particularly simple and elegant, based on an abstract approximation result (see theorem A). It allows us to prove the local energy estimates up to the boundary, i. e., without assuming the text functions in equation (0.3) with compact support in  $\Omega$  (see Theorem B).

We give a complete proof of Theorem B below, without assuming the reader familiar with the Navier-Stokes equations. A certain length of this paper is due to these facts.

NOTATIONS AND RESULTS. — One has the following approximation theorem:

**THEOREM A.** — Let  $\mathbb{K}$  be a non-empty, convex and compact subset of a Banach space  $X$ , and let  $\mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{K}$  be a dense convex subset in  $\mathbb{K}$ . Assume that  $S: \mathbb{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$  is a map such that its restriction to the convex hull of every finite number of elements of  $\mathbb{Q}$  is continuous. Then, given  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a couple of elements  $v_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Q}$ ,  $u_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{K}$  such that  $u_\varepsilon = S v_\varepsilon$  and  $\|u_\varepsilon - v_\varepsilon\| < \varepsilon$ .

Let us briefly illustrate this result. In general we want to solve a non-linear equation, say  $\phi(u, n) = f$ , where  $\phi(u, n) = f$  is solvable in  $u$  for each fixed smooth  $v$  (e. g., for the construction of weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations, replace in (0.1) the term  $(u \cdot \nabla) u$  by  $(v \cdot \nabla) u$ ). Let  $Y$  be a Banach space in which an *a priori* estimate is known (e. g., for the Navier-Stokes equations set:

$$Y = \{u: u \in L^\infty(0, T; H) \cap L^2(0, T; V), u' \in L^{4/3}(0, T; V)\} \quad (2)';$$

let  $\mathbb{K}$  be the corresponding ball, and let  $\mathbb{Q}$  be the set of smooth elements of  $\mathbb{K}$ . Let  $X$  be a larger space, with respect to which  $\mathbb{K}$  is a compact subset [e. g., for N.S. equations set  $X = L^2(\Omega_T)$  (2)]. Denote by  $u = S v$  the solution of  $\phi(u, n) = f$ , for each fixed  $v \in \mathbb{Q}$ .

For the Navier-Stokes equation the map  $S$  is not continuous, except for quite strong topologies. In this last case, however, we loose the inclusion  $S \mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{K}$ , unless small values of  $T$  are chosen (local solutions in time). A similar situation appears very often, for non-linear problems. However,  $S$  is continuous on finite dimensional subspaces, since all norms are then equivalent. Hence theorem A applies. Hence, from  $v_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{K}$ ,  $\|u_\varepsilon - v_\varepsilon\| < \varepsilon$  it follows the existence of suitable subsequences  $u_\varepsilon \rightarrow u$ ,  $v_\varepsilon \rightarrow v$ , weakly in  $Y$ . Moreover  $\phi(v_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon) = f$ , since  $S v_\varepsilon = u_\varepsilon$ . By going to the limit as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , and under natural assumptions on  $\phi$ , one gets  $\phi(u, v) = f$ .

The proof of Theorem A will be given in section 1.

We present now the main notations:

$\Omega$ , an open, bounded subset of  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , locally situated on one side of his boundary  $\Gamma$ , a differentiable manifold of class  $C^2$ .

$$\Omega_T \equiv ]t\} \times \Omega; \quad \Omega_T \equiv ]0, T[ \times \Omega; \quad \Sigma_T \equiv ]0, T[ \times \Gamma, \quad \text{for } T \in ]0, +\infty[.$$

(2) In the next section a different choice will be taken, since we want to construct weak solutions verifying the additional properties (0.3) and  $u, \Delta p \in L^{5/4}(\Omega_T)$ .

$$\|u\|_{g, p, T} \equiv \|u\|_{L^p(0, T; L^2(\Omega))}; \quad \|u\|_{g, T} \equiv \|u\|_{g, q, T}.$$

For convenience we adopt the notation:

$L^p_{loc}(0, +\infty; \mathcal{X})$ , space of functions defined in  $[0, +\infty[$  with values in  $\mathcal{X}$ , whose restrictions to  $]0, T[$  belong to  $L^p(0, T; \mathcal{X})$ , for every  $T > 0$ .  
 $C(0, T; \mathcal{X})$ ;  $C^{ab}(0, T; \mathcal{X})$ , space of continuous [resp. weakly continuous] functions in  $]0, T[$  with values in  $\mathcal{X}$ .  
 with the usual modification if  $p = +\infty$ .

$$\|u\|_{L^p(0, T; \mathcal{X})} \equiv \int_0^T \|u(\tau)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^p d\tau < +\infty,$$

$L^p(0, T; \mathcal{X})$ , Banach space of strongly measurable functions in  $]0, T[$  with values in the Banach space  $\mathcal{X}$ , for which:

$H$  is the closure of  $\mathcal{V}$  in  $L^2$  and  $V$  is the closure of  $\mathcal{V}$  in  $W_1^2$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V} &\equiv \{v \in W_1^2; \Delta \cdot v = 0 \text{ in } \Omega\}, \\ H &\equiv \{v \in L^2; \Delta \cdot v = 0 \text{ in } \Omega, v, n = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma\}, \\ \mathcal{V} &\equiv \{v \in [C_0^\infty(\Omega)]_3; \Delta \cdot v = 0 \text{ in } \Omega\}, \end{aligned}$$

As usual we define:

$$(w, \Delta)v = \sum_3 \frac{\partial v_j}{\partial x_i} w_i \frac{\partial v_j}{\partial x_i}$$

and:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta v\|_2 &= \left( \sum_3 \left( \frac{\partial v_j}{\partial x_i} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2}, \\ \|v\|_V &= \|\Delta v\|_2 = \left( \int_\Omega |\Delta v|^2 dx \right)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

For vector functions we also define:

As done for scalar functions, we define for vector functions  $v = (v_1, v_2, v_3)$  the spaces  $W_s^p, W_k^p, W_s^p, W_k^p$ , and so on. Norms will be denoted by the same symbol in both cases.

$$\|f\|_{k, p} = \left( \sum_k \sum_{|\alpha|=l} |D^\alpha f|_p^p \right)^{1/p}.$$

The norm in  $W_k^p(\Omega)$ ,  $k$  non-negative integer, is:

$W_k^p$  Closure of  $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$  in  $W_k^p$ ,  $k$  positive integer.

$W_s^p$  and usual norm in  $W_s^p$ .  
 $W_s^p$  Sobolev space  $W_s^p(\Omega)$ ,  $1 \leq p < +\infty, s \in \mathbb{R}$  (see [6] for definition and properties), and usual norm in  $L^p$ .  
 $L^p$  usual  $L^p(\Omega)$  space ( $1 \leq p \leq +\infty$ ), and usual norm in  $L^p$ .

We denote by  $c$  positive constants depending at most on  $\Omega$  and on the fixed parameter  $p$ . For convenience we denote different constants by the same symbol  $c$ . Otherwise, we will write  $c_0, c_1, c_2, \dots$

The Navier-Stokes equations describing the motion of a viscous incompressible fluid are ( $0 < T \leq +\infty$ ):

$$(0.1) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} n' + (n, \nabla)n - \Delta n = f - \nabla p \quad \text{in } Q_T, \\ \Delta \cdot n = 0 \quad \text{in } Q_T, \\ n = 0 \quad \text{on } \Sigma_T, \\ n|_{t=0} = n_0(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega, \end{array} \right.$$

where  $n' = \partial n / \partial t$ . We assume, without losing generality, that the density  $\rho$  and the viscosity  $\mu$  are equal to one. The initial data  $n_0(x)$  and the external force field  $f(t, x)$  are given. The velocity  $n(t, x)$  and the pressure  $p(t, x)$  are unknowns. In this paper we prove the following result:

**THEOREM B.** — Let  $n_0 \in H^1 \cap W^{2-2/p}$  and  $f \in L^1_{loc}(0, +\infty; L^2) \cap L^p_{loc}(0, +\infty; L^p)$ , with  $10/9 < p \leq 5/4$ . Then there exists a weak solution  $n, p$  of system (0.1) in  $Q_{+\infty}$ , such that:

$$(0.2) \quad \begin{array}{l} n \in L^2_{loc}(0, +\infty; V) \cap C^{2,p}_{loc}(0, +\infty; H) \cap L^p_{loc}(0, +\infty; W^2_p), \\ n' \in L^{4/3}_{loc}(0, +\infty; W^2_T) \cap L^p_{loc}(0, +\infty; L^p), \\ p \in L^p_{loc}(0, +\infty; W^1_p). \end{array}$$

Moreover,  $n, p$  verifies the local energy estimate up to the boundary:

$$(0.3) \quad \int_{\Omega_t} |n|^2 \phi + 2 \iint_{Q_t} |\nabla n|^2 \phi \leq \int_{\Omega_0} |n_0|^2 \phi + \iint_{Q_t} |n|^2 (\phi' + \Delta \phi) + \iint_{Q_t} (|n|^2 + 2p)n \cdot \nabla \phi + 2 \iint_{Q_t} f \cdot n \phi,$$

for every  $t > 0$  and for every  $\phi \in C^2(\overline{Q_{+\infty}})$ ,  $\phi \geq 0$  on  $\overline{Q_{+\infty}}$ .

Finally, for every  $T > 0$  one has:

$$\begin{array}{l} \|n\|_{\infty, 2, T} \leq \|n_0\|_2 + \|f\|_{1, 2, T}, \\ \|\Delta n\|_{2, T} \leq \|n_0\|_2 + 2\|f\|_{1, 2, T}, \\ \|n'\|_{p, T} + \|n\|_{L^p(0, T; W^2_p)} + \|\Delta p\|_{p, T} \\ \leq c_0 \|n_0\|_{2-(2/p), p} + c_1 \|f\|_{p, T} + c_2 \|n_0\|_2 + \|f\|_{1, 2, T}. \end{array}$$

*Remark 0.1.* — As in [10] equation (17), we assume the pressure  $p(t, x)$  determined by the supplementary condition:

$$(0.5) \quad \int_{\Gamma} p(t, x) d\Gamma = 0, \quad \text{for almost all } t > 0.$$

Alternatively, we could utilize the condition:

$$(0.6) \quad \int_{\Omega} p(t, x) dx = 0, \text{ for almost all } t > 0.$$

1. The approximating problem

We begin by defining the set of vectors:

$$V \equiv \{v \in C^\infty(\bar{Q}_T) : v(t) \in \mathcal{V}, \text{ for all } t \in [0, T]\},$$

where  $T$  is an arbitrary positive real number, and by considering the linear system:

$$(1.2) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} n' + (v \cdot \nabla)n - \Delta n + \nabla p = f \text{ in } Q_T, \\ \nabla \cdot n = 0 \text{ in } Q_T, \\ n = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma_T, \\ n|_{t=0} = u_0 \text{ in } \Omega, \end{array} \right.$$

for  $v \in V$ . For convenience we define:

$$(1.3) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} A(u_0, f) \equiv \|u_0\|_2 + \|f\|_{1, 2, T}, \\ A_2^1(u_0, f) \equiv \|u_0\|_2^2 + 2\|f\|_{1, 2, T}^2, \\ B(u_0, f) \equiv c_0 \|u_0\|_{2-(2/d)p} + c_1 \|f\|_{p, T} \end{array} \right.$$

where the constants  $c_0$  and  $c_1$  will be defined in the proof of Theorem 1.2. One has the following result:

**THEOREM 1.1.** — Let  $v \in V$ ,  $u_0 \in V$  and  $f \in L^2(Q_T)$ . Then there exists a unique solution  $u, \nabla p$  of problem (1.2), which verifies:

$$(1.4) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} u \in L^2(0, T; W_2^2) \cap C(0, T; V), \\ n \in L^2(Q_T), \\ \nabla p \in L^2(Q_T), \end{array} \right.$$

and:

$$(1.5) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \|u\|_{\infty, 2, T} \leq A(u_0, f), \\ \|\Delta u\|_{2, T} \leq A_1(u_0, f). \end{array} \right.$$

*Proof.* — Existence, uniqueness and regularity follows as for the usual linearized Navier-Stokes equation; alternatively, one can use Theorem 4.2 in [1], page 487. Estimates (1.5) follow easily by multiplying equation (1.2)<sub>1</sub> by  $u$ , by integrating over  $\Omega$  and by doing some well known devices.  $\square$

Let now  $1 < p \leq 5/4$  and define  $q = q(d)$  and  $r = r(d)$  as follows:

$$\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{1} - \frac{d}{2}, \quad \frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{1 - (2/q)} + \frac{6}{2/q} = \frac{1}{1} - \frac{3}{q}.$$

Since  $0 < 2/q < 1$  it follows that:

$$|v|_p \leq |v_2|^{1-2/q} |v|_2^{2/q} \leq c |v|_2^{1-2/q} |\Delta v|_2^{2/q}, \tag{1.6}$$

where we used a well known Sobolev's theorem (see for instance [4], Chap. I, Lemma 3). Consequently:

$$\|v\|_{q, p, T} \leq c (\|v\|_{\infty, 2, T} + \|\Delta v\|_{2, T}). \tag{1.7}$$

We now prove the following result:

**THEOREM 1.2.** — Under the hypothesis of Theorem 1.1 the solution  $u, \Delta v$  of problem

(1.2) verifies the estimate:

$$\|u\|_{p, T} + \|u\|_{L^p(0, T; W_2^q)} + \|\Delta v\|_{p, T} \leq B(u_0, f) + c_2 (\|v\|_{\infty, 2, T} + \|\Delta v\|_{2, T}). \tag{1.8}$$

*Proof.* — Note that  $L^2(Q_T) \hookrightarrow L^p(Q_T)$  and  $V \hookrightarrow H \hookrightarrow W_2^{2-2/p}$ . Estimate (1.8) follows from Theorem 15, paragraph 17, p. 102 of [10], by taking in account the estimates:

$$\|(v, \Delta v)\|_{p, T} \leq \|v\|_{q, T} \|\Delta v\|_{2, T},$$

and (1.7). Note that  $\|v\|_{q, T}$  is bounded by  $c$  times the left hand side of (1.7), since  $q \leq 10/3 \leq r$ .

Now we prove the approximation theorem stated in the introduction.

*Proof of Theorem A.* — Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  be fixed. The compactness of  $\mathbb{K}$  guarantees the existence of a finite number of elements  $\tilde{v}_1, \dots, \tilde{v}_N \in \mathbb{K}$ , such that:

$$\mathbb{K} \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^N B(\tilde{v}_i, \varepsilon/4),$$

where  $B(x, \delta)$  denotes the ball with center in  $x$  and radius  $\delta$  in the space  $X$ . Since  $\mathbb{Q}$  is dense in  $\mathbb{K}$  there exists elements  $v_i \in \mathbb{Q}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , such that:

$$\mathbb{K} \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^N B(v_i, \varepsilon/2).$$

Let now  $\mathbb{Q}_0$  be the convex hull generated by the elements  $v_1, \dots, v_N$  and let  $P: \mathbb{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_0$  be a continuous map on  $\mathbb{K}$ , such that:

$$\|Pu - u\| < \varepsilon, \quad \forall u \in \mathbb{K}. \tag{1.9}$$

If  $X$  is an Hilbert space [in the sequel we will utilize Theorem A with  $X = L^2(Q_T)$ ] it suffices to define  $P$  as the projection on to  $\mathbb{Q}_0$ . In this case  $P$  is continuous, moreover:

$$\|Pu - u\| = \inf_{v \in \mathbb{Q}_0} \|v - u\| < \varepsilon/2.$$

In the general case it is not difficult to prove the existence of a continuous  $P$  verifying (1.9), and we leave the construction to the reader.

Consider now the restriction of the map  $PS$  to  $\mathbb{Q}_0$ ,  $PS: \mathbb{Q}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_0$ . This map is continuous from a finite dimensional bounded, closed and convex set on itself. By Brower's fixed point theorem there exists  $v_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Q}_0$  such that  $PS v_\varepsilon = v_\varepsilon$ . Defining  $u_\varepsilon = S v_\varepsilon$  it follows from (1.9) that:

$$\|v_\varepsilon - u_\varepsilon\| = \|P u_\varepsilon - u_\varepsilon\| < \varepsilon. \quad \square$$

For brevity we will use the notation  $L^p(\mathcal{X}) = L^p(0, T; \mathcal{X})$ , where  $\mathcal{X}$  is a Banach space and:

$$W_1^p(\mathcal{X}) = \{v \in L^p(\mathcal{X}) : v' \in L^p(\mathcal{X})\}.$$

We define the Banach space:

$$Y \equiv L^\infty(H) \cup L^2(V) \cup W_1^p(L^p).$$

normalized according to the definition. Let  $A, A_1$  and  $B$  be non-negative real numbers and define  $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{K}(A, A_1, B)$  as:

$$(1.10) \quad \mathbb{K} \equiv \{v \in Y : \|v\|_{\infty, 2}, \tau \leq A, \|\Delta v\|_2, \tau \leq A_1, \|v'\|_{p, \tau} \leq B\}.$$

$\mathbb{K}$  is a convex compact subset of  $X \equiv L^2(\mathbb{Q}_T)$  (see [5], Chap. I, Theorem 5.1). One has the following result:

LEMMA 1.3. — The convex set:

$$\mathbb{Q} \equiv A \cup \mathbb{K},$$

is dense in  $\mathbb{K}$  in the  $X$  topology.

*Proof.* — Let  $v \in \mathbb{K}$ . We assume, without loose of generality, that  $v$  verifies strictly the inequalities appearing in definition (1.10). Extend  $v$  by reflexion to  $[-T, 0]$  and to  $[T, 2T]$ , and define in the usual way the mollifiers:

$$(1.11) \quad v_n(t) = \int_0^1 j_n(t - \tau) v(\tau) d\tau, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

Since  $v_n \in \mathbb{K}$  and  $v_n \rightarrow v$  in  $X$  when  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ , we don't loose generality by also assuming that  $v \in C^1(0, T; V)$ .

Let now  $\varepsilon > 0$  be fixed and choose  $\omega = \omega(\varepsilon)$  such that:

$$|v(t) - v(s)| > \varepsilon, \|v(t) - v(s)\| > \varepsilon, \quad |v'(t) - v'(s)|^p > \varepsilon,$$

whenever  $s, t \in [0, T], |s - t| > \omega$ . Fix points  $t_i$  in  $[0, T]$  verifying:

$$0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_n = T,$$

and:

$$|t_{i+1} - t_i| > \omega \quad \text{for } i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1.$$

Finally fix  $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_1(\epsilon)$  such that:

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \epsilon_i^p (t_{i+1} - t_i)^{1-p} \leq \epsilon^p.$$

Define  $v_i = v(t_i) \in V, i = 0, \dots, n$ , and fix elements  $w_i \in \mathcal{W}$  such that:

$$\|w_i - v_i\|_Z < \epsilon, \quad \|w_i - v_i\|_Y < \epsilon, \quad |w_i - v_i|^p < \epsilon_1, \quad \text{for } i = 0, 1, \dots, n.$$

Consider the function  $w(t)$ , which is linear on each interval  $[t_i, t_{i+1}]$  and verifies:

$$w(t_i) = w_i \quad \text{for } i = 0, 1, \dots, n.$$

Arguing separately in each interval  $[t_i, t_{i+1}]$  one easily shows that:

$$\|w(t) - v(t)\|_Z < 4\epsilon, \quad \|w(t) - v(t)\|_Y < 4\epsilon,$$

hence:

$$(1.12) \quad \|w - v\|_Z^2 \leq 16\epsilon^2 T, \quad \|w - v\|_{\infty, Z} \leq 4\epsilon.$$

On the other hand, for  $t \in [t_i, t_{i+1}]$ ,

$$w(t) = \frac{v_{i+1} - v_i}{w_{i+1} - w_i} + \frac{v_{i+1} - v_i}{w_i - v_i},$$

consequently:

$$\|w(t) - v(t)\|_Z^2 \leq \left| \frac{v_{i+1} - v_i}{w_{i+1} - w_i} - \frac{v_{i+1} - v_i}{w_i - v_i} \right|^2 + \frac{2\epsilon_1}{2\epsilon_1} + \frac{2\epsilon_1}{2\epsilon_1}.$$

By using the mean value theorem for functions with values in a Banach space, it follows that:

$$\|w(t) - v(t)\|_Z^2 \leq \epsilon + \frac{2\epsilon_1}{2\epsilon_1}.$$

for every  $t \in [t_i, t_{i+1}]$ . Taking in account the definition of  $\epsilon_1$ , one easily shows that:

$$(1.13) \quad \|w - v\|_Z^2 \leq (2^{p-1}T + 2^{2p-1})\epsilon^p.$$

From (1.12), (1.13) it follows that  $w \in K_\epsilon$ , for  $\epsilon$  sufficiently small. Moreover,  $w \rightarrow v$  in  $Y$ , hence in  $X$ , when  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ .

The proof of lemma 1.3 is accomplished by approximating  $w$  by mollifiers  $w_n$ , as in (1.11). Recall that  $w(t)$  is piecewise linear in  $[0, T]$ , with values in  $\mathcal{W}$ .  $\square$

Let now  $(u_0, f) \in V \times L^2(Q_T)$  be fixed and define a map:

$$S : V \rightarrow X,$$

by  $Sv = u$ , where  $u$  is the solution of problem (1.2) corresponding to  $v \in V$ . We claim the following result:



LEMMA 1.4. — The restriction of  $S$  to every finite dimensional subspace of  $\Lambda$  is continuous, with respect to the  $X$ -topology. In particular, the restriction of  $S$  to the convex hull of a finite number of elements of  $\mathbb{Q}$  is continuous with respect to the  $X$ -topology.

*Proof.* — Let  $\Lambda_0$  be a finite dimensional subspace of  $\Lambda$ , and let  $v, v_n \in \Lambda_0, \|v_n - v\| \rightarrow 0$  when  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ . Since in a finite dimensional vector space all norms are equivalent, one has in particular:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \|v_n - v\|_{C^1(\mathbb{Q}^T)} = 0.$$

Let  $u_n = S v_n, u = S v$  and consider the difference (side by side) between equation (1.2)<sub>1</sub> written for the couple  $u, v$  and written for the couple  $u_n, v_n$ . By taking the scalar product in  $L^2$  of  $u_n - u$  with both sides of the equation just obtained, the thesis follows (without difficulty) by using well known devices.  $\square$

Finally, we prove the following lemma:

LEMMA 1.5. — Let  $u_0, f \in V \times L^2(\mathbb{Q}^T)$  be given and fix  $\mathbb{K}$  by choosing in definition (1.10) the values:

$$(1.14) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} A = A(u_0, f), \\ A_1 = A_1(u_0, f), \\ B = B(u_0, f) + c_2(A + A_1)A_1. \end{array} \right.$$

Then the map  $S$ , defined via the system (1.2), verifies:

$$(1.15) \quad S(\mathbb{Q}) \subset \mathbb{K}.$$

*Proof.* — The result follows from the estimates (1.5) and (1.8), since  $v \in \mathbb{K}$ .  $\square$   
With the definitions given above, all the hypotheses of theorem A are verified. As a consequence, one obtains the following approximation theorem:

THEOREM 1.6. — Let  $u_0 \in V$  and  $f \in L^2(\mathbb{Q}^T)$  be given, and let  $1 < p \leq 5/4$ . Then, in correspondence to every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exist  $v_\varepsilon \in \Lambda, u_\varepsilon \in Y, p_\varepsilon \in L^p(0, T, W^1_p)$  verifying the system:

$$(1.16) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} u_\varepsilon + (v_\varepsilon, \Delta) u_\varepsilon - \Delta u_\varepsilon + \Delta p_\varepsilon = f \text{ in } \mathbb{Q}^T, \\ \Delta u_\varepsilon = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{Q}^T, \\ u_\varepsilon = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma^T, \\ (u_\varepsilon)|_{t=0} = u_0 \text{ in } \Omega, \end{array} \right.$$

and for which:

$$(1.17) \quad \|u_\varepsilon - v_\varepsilon\|_2, \tau < \varepsilon.$$

Moreover, the following estimates hold:

$$(1.18) \left\{ \begin{aligned} & \|u_\varepsilon\|_{\infty, 2, T} \leq A(n_0, f), \\ & \|\Delta u_\varepsilon\|_{2, T} \leq A_2^1(n_0, f), \\ & \|u_\varepsilon\|_{p, T} + \|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^p(\mathbb{W}_2^2)} + \|\Delta P_\varepsilon\|_{p, T} \leq B(n_0, f) + c_3 A_2^1(n_0, f). \end{aligned} \right.$$

Estimates (1.18)<sub>1</sub> and (1.18)<sub>2</sub> hold also for  $v_\varepsilon$  and  $\Delta v_\varepsilon$  respectively, and estimate (1.18)<sub>3</sub> holds for  $v_\varepsilon$ .

Remark. — If in definition (1.10) one add the condition  $\|v\|_{L^p(\Omega, T; \mathbb{W}_2^2)} \leq B$ , then (1.18)<sub>3</sub> holds also for  $\|v_\varepsilon\|_{L^p(\Omega, T; \mathbb{W}_2^2)}$ . However, this would not be useful.

### 2. The limit problem

Let  $u_0 \in H \cap \mathbb{W}_2^{2/p}$  and  $f \in L^1(0, T; L^2(\Omega_T)) \cap L^p(\Omega_T)$  be given, (3) and consider sequences  $u_0^{(n)} \in V$  and  $f_n \in L^2(\Omega_T)$  such that:

$$(2.1) \left\{ \begin{aligned} & \|u_0^{(n)} - u_0\|_{2, T} < n^{-1}, \quad \|u_0^{(n)} - u_0\|_{2-2/p, T} < n^{-1}, \\ & \|f_n - f\|_{1, 2, T} < n^{-1}, \quad \|f_n - f\|_{p, T} < n^{-1}. \end{aligned} \right.$$

Let now  $(u_n, v_n, p_n)$  be the solution of problem (1.16)<sub>ε</sub> for  $\varepsilon = 1/n$  and with data  $u_0 = u_0^{(n)}, f = f_n$ . For the reader's convenience we rewrite theorem 1.6 for this case. One has:

THEOREM 2.1. — Let  $u_0, f, u_0^{(n)}, f_n, v_n, p_n$  and  $p_n$  be as above.

Then:

$$(2.2) \left\{ \begin{aligned} & u_n + (v_n, \Delta) u_n - \Delta u_n + \Delta p_n = f_n \quad \text{in } \Omega_T, \\ & \Delta \cdot u_n = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_T, \\ & u_n = 0 \quad \text{on } \Sigma_T, \\ & (u_n)^{|\cdot|=0} = u_0^{(n)} \quad \text{in } \Omega, \end{aligned} \right.$$

and:

$$(2.3) \quad \|u_n - v_n\|_{2, T} \leq n^{-1}.$$

(3) We put  $u_0$  and  $f$  directly in equation (2.2) and we drop  $1/n$  in equation (2.4), if  $u_0 \in V$  and  $f \in L^2(\Omega_T)$ .

(2.7)  $(v_n)_i (u_n)_j \rightarrow u_i u_j$  weakly in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3/2})$ .  
 In particular  $(v_n, \Delta) u_n \rightarrow (u, \Delta) u$  weakly in  $L^2(W^2_2)$ . The convergence of the other terms in equation (2.2)<sub>1</sub> to the corresponding terms in equation (0.1)<sub>1</sub> is clear. Hence  $u, p$  is a solution of system (0.1). Finally, the estimates (0.4) follow from the corresponding estimates (2.4), by taking in account the lower semi-continuity of the norms with respect to the weak convergences.

(2.6)  $u_n \rightarrow u, v_n \rightarrow v$  strongly in  $L^2(\Omega)$ ; strongly in  $L^2(\Omega_T)$  for almost all  $t \in ]0, T[$ ; and almost everywhere in  $\Omega_T$ .  
 On the other hand, from the embedding  $L^\infty(L^2) \cap L^2(L^6) \subset L^4(L^3)$ , it follows that the sequences  $(v_n)_i (u_n)_j$  for which  $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , are bounded in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3/2})$ . A well known device (see [5], p. 76) gives:

(2.5)  $p_n \rightarrow p$  weakly in  $L^p(W^1_p)$ ,  
 $v_n \rightarrow v$  weakly in  $L^2(V)$ , weakly in  $L^p(W^1_p)$ , and weak-\* in  $L^\infty(H)$ .  
 Moreover, a well known compactness theorem ([5], Chap. 1, Theorem 5.1) guarantees that we can select subsequences (denoted by the same index  $v$ ) verifying:

By using the estimates stated in Theorem 2.1 and the property (2.3), it follows the existence of subsequences  $u_n, v_n$  and functions  $u, p$  such that:  
 From the sequences  $u_n$  and  $v_n$  we can select subsequences converging both to a solution  $u$  of problem (0.1). This is done by using well known devices, which we recall for the sake of completeness; see for instance [4], [5], [12], [1]. Note that the "usual" non-linear term  $(u_n, \Delta) u_n$  is replaced by  $(v_n, \Delta) u_n$ . However, (2.3) guarantees that the sequences  $u_n$  and  $v_n$  have the same limit.  
 On the right hand sides of (2.4), the term  $1/n$  is assumed to be added to the norms of  $u_0$  and  $f$ , appearing in definition (1.3).

Finally, estimates (2.4)<sub>1</sub> and (2.4)<sub>2</sub> hold for  $v_n$  and  $\Delta v_n$ , respectively, and (2.4)<sub>3</sub> holds for  $v_n$ .

$$(2.4) \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \|u_n\|_{\infty, 2, T} \leq A \left( n_0 + \frac{n}{1}, f + \frac{n}{1} \right) \\ \|\Delta u_n\|_{2, T} \leq A_2 \left( n_0 + \frac{n}{1}, f + \frac{n}{1} \right) \\ \|u_n\|_{p, T} + \|u_n\|_{L^p(W^1_p)} + \|\Delta p_n\|_{p, T} \leq B \left( n_0 + \frac{n}{1}, f + \frac{n}{1} \right) + c_3 A_2 \left( n_0 + \frac{n}{1}, f + \frac{n}{1} \right) \end{array} \right.$$

Moreover:

Now we want to prove the local energy estimate (0.3), for every  $\phi \in C^2(\mathbb{Q}^T)$ ,  $\phi \geq 0$  on  $\mathbb{Q}^T$ . By multiplying both sides of equation (2.2)<sub>1</sub> by  $\phi u_\nu$  and by integrating over  $\mathbb{Q}_\nu$  one easily shows that:

$$(2.8) \quad \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{Q}_\nu} |\Delta u_\nu|_2^2 \phi + \int_{\mathbb{Q}_\nu} |\nabla u_\nu|_2^2 \phi = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{Q}_\nu} |u_\nu^0|_2^2 \phi + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{Q}_\nu} |\nabla u_\nu|_2^2 (\phi' + \Delta \phi) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{Q}_\nu} |\Delta u_\nu|_2^2 \phi + \int_{\mathbb{Q}_\nu} |\nabla u_\nu|_2^2 \phi + \int_{\mathbb{Q}_\nu} \Delta \phi + \int_{\mathbb{Q}_\nu} f_\nu \cdot u_\nu \phi.$$

Note that the limit functions  $u$  and  $p$  are not smooth enough to justify a similar calculation starting from equation (0.1).

Now we pass to the limit in equation (2.8), when  $\nu \rightarrow +\infty$ . We start by proving (0.3) for the values  $t$  for which  $u_\nu(t) \rightarrow u(t)$  strongly in  $L^2$ . Later, we extend (0.3) to every  $t \in [0, T]$ .

It's clear that the integrals over  $\Omega_0$  and  $\Omega_t$  in equation (2.8) converge to the corresponding integrals in (0.3). On the other hand,  $D_t(u_\nu)^j \rightarrow D_t u_j$  weakly in  $L^2(\mathbb{Q}^T)$ . Consequently  $\sqrt{\phi} D_t(u_\nu)^j \rightarrow \sqrt{\phi} D_t u_j$  weakly in  $L^2(\mathbb{Q}^T)$ , hence:

$$\int_{\mathbb{Q}_\nu} |\Delta u_\nu|_2^2 \phi \leq \liminf \int_{\mathbb{Q}_\nu} |\Delta u_\nu|_2^2 \phi.$$

The convergence of the second and of the last term on the right hand side of (2.8) to the corresponding terms in (0.3) is obvious. Let us consider the two remaining terms.

From the embedding  $L^\infty(L^2) \cap L^2(L^6) \subset L^{10/3}(\mathbb{Q}^T)$ , one gets  $\| |u_\nu|_2^{10/9} \|_{10/9} \leq \text{Const}$ . Taking in account the pointwise convergence in  $\mathbb{Q}^T$ , one shows that  $|u_\nu|_2^{10/9} v_\nu$  converges weakly to  $|u|_2^{10/9} v$  in  $L^{10/9}(\mathbb{Q}^T)$ ; see [5], Chap. I, Lemma 1.3.

In particular:

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\mathbb{Q}_\nu} |u_\nu|_2^{10/9} v_\nu \cdot \Delta \phi = \int_{\mathbb{Q}} |u|_2^{10/9} v \cdot \Delta \phi.$$

Finally we consider the pressure term. From (2.5)<sub>2</sub> and from a well known Sobolev's embedding theorem it follows that:

$$(2.8) \quad p_\nu \rightarrow p \text{ weakly in } L^p(0, T; L^p),$$

where  $1/p^* = (1/d) - (1/3)$ ; we assume now that  $10/9 < p \leq 5/4$ . Consequently the relation:

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\mathbb{Q}_\nu} p_\nu \cdot \Delta \phi = \int_{\mathbb{Q}} p \cdot \Delta \phi$$

is proved if we show that:

$$(2.9) \quad u_\nu \rightarrow u \text{ strongly in } L^p(\mathbb{Q}^T),$$

where in general  $1/\alpha = 1 - (1/d)$ . There are not loose of generality on assuming that

$10/9 \equiv p_0 < p < 6/5$ , since  $p'$  and  $(p^*)'$  are decreasing functions of  $p$ . Estimate (1.7) for the value  $q = 10$  show that:

$$(2.10) \quad \|u_v\|_{p_0, (p_0)'; T} \leq \text{Const.},$$

since  $p_0 = 10$  and  $(p_0^*)' = 30/13$ . On the other hand, for  $p \in ]10/9, 6/5[$  one has  $p' \in ]2, 10[$ ,  $(p^*)' \in ]2, 30/13[$ . Hence, by fixing a value  $\theta \in ]0, 1[$  for which:

$$\frac{1}{1-\theta} \geq \frac{p'}{\theta} + \frac{p_0'}{2}, \quad \frac{1}{1-\theta} \geq \frac{(p^*)'}{\theta} + \frac{(p_0^*)'}{2}$$

one obtains:

$$(2.11) \quad \|u_v - u\|_{p, (p^*)'; T} \leq c \|u_v - u\|_{\theta, (p_0^*)'; T} \|u_v - u\|_{2, T}.$$

Statement (2.9) follows from (2.10) and (2.11), by recalling that  $u_v \rightarrow u$  strongly in  $L^2(Q_T)$ .

To accomplish the proof of Theorem A it remains to show that (0.3) holds for every  $t \in ]0, T[$ . Let  $t_n$  be a sequence of values for which (0.3) holds, and such that  $t_n \rightarrow t$ . Consider equation (0.3) for the values  $t_n$ , and take the  $\lim \inf$  when  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ . The function  $u(t) \sqrt{\phi(t)}$  is weakly continuous in  $[0, T]$  with values in  $L^2$ , since the same property holds for  $u(t)$ . Consequently,

$$\int_{\Omega_{t_n}} |u|^2 \phi \leq \lim \inf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega_{t_n}} |u|^2 \phi.$$

The convergence of the integrals over  $\Omega_{t_n}$  to the corresponding integrals over  $\Omega_t$  is obvious.  $\square$

In order to prove theorem A in the time interval  $[0, +\infty[$ , we proceed as follows. We start by fixing an increasing sequence of positive values  $T_n$  converging to  $+\infty$  [replace also in (2.1) the value  $T$  by  $T_n$ ].

Then we apply our approximation argument to each fixed interval  $[0, T_{n_0}]$ , by starting each time from a subsequence of indices for which the convergence to  $(u, n, p)$  holds in  $[0, T_{n_0-1}]$ . We obtain a solution  $u, p$  in  $\mathbb{Q}^{+\infty}$ , verifying all the requested properties, by selecting a diagonal subsequence.

RFFRRRNCES

[1] H. BEIRÃO DA VEIGA, *sulla approssimazione delle soluzioni deboli globali della equazione di Navier-Stokes*, preprint U.T.M. 155, Agosto 1984, Dipartimento di Matematica, Univ. di Trento.  
 [2] H. BEIRÃO DA VEIGA, *On the suitable weak Solutions to the Navier-Stokes Equations in the Whole Space* [*J. Math. Pures et Appliquées* (to appear)].

- [3] L. CAPPARELLI, R. KOHN and L. NIRENBERG, *Partial Regularity of Suitable weak Solutions of the Navier-Stokes Equations* (Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 35, 1982, pp. 771-831).
- [4] O. A. LADYZENSKAYA, *The Mathematical Theory of Viscous Incompressible Flow*, Gordon and Breach, New York, 1969.
- [5] J. L. LIONS, *Quelques méthodes de résolution des problèmes aux limites non linéaires*, Dunod, Paris, 1969.
- [6] J. NEČAS, *Les méthodes directes en théorie des équations elliptiques*, Masson, Paris, 1967.
- [7] V. SCHEFFER, *Hausdorff Measure and the Navier-Stokes Equations* (Comm. Math. Phys., Vol. 55, 1977, pp. 97-112).
- [8] V. SCHEFFER, *The Navier-Stokes Equations on a Bounded Domain* (Comm. Math. Phys., Vol. 73, 1980, pp. 1-42).
- [9] V. SCHEFFER, *Boundary Regularity for the Navier-Stokes Equations in a Half-space* (Comm. Math. Phys., Vol. 85, 1982, pp. 275-299).
- [10] V. A. SOLOMONIKOV, *Estimates of the Solutions of a Nonstationary Linearized System of Navier-Stokes Equations* (American Math. Soc. Transl., Vol. 75, 1968, pp. 1-116).
- [11] V. A. SOLOMONIKOV, *Estimates for the Solutions of Nonstationary Navier-Stokes Equations* (J. Soviet Math. Vol. 8, 1977, pp. 467-529).
- [12] R. TEMAM, *Navier-Stokes Equations*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1977.

(Manuscrit reçu en septembre 1984.)

H. BEIRÃO DA VEIGA,  
 Facoltà di Scienze,  
 Univ. di Trento,  
 38050 Povo (TN), Italy.