

Dissipation in Turbulent Solutions of 2-D Euler

Gregory L. Eyink

Department of Mathematics

University of Arizona

Tucson, AZ 85721

Abstract

We establish local balance equations for smooth functions of the vorticity in the DiPerna-Majda weak solutions of 2D incompressible Euler, analogous to the balance proved by Duchon and Robert for kinetic energy in 3D. The anomalous term or defect distribution therein corresponds to the “enstrophy cascade” of 2D turbulence. It is used to define an appropriate notion of “dissipative Euler solution” in 2D. However, we show that the DiPerna-Majda solutions with vorticity in L^p are conservative and have zero defect. We formulate a notion of weak Euler solution for distributional vorticities with zero Hölder exponent in space for which we conjecture dissipation in the strict sense may occur.

1 Statement of Results

In 2-dimensional turbulence it is the *enstrophy* $\Omega(t) := \frac{1}{2}\|\omega(t)\|_2^2$ that is expected to cascade to small length-scales, not the energy as in three space dimensions [1]-[3]. In a view that goes back to Onsager [4], such turbulent cascades are conjectured to be described, in the limit of infinite Reynolds number, by singular (or weak) solutions of the incompressible Euler equations. More recently, Duchon and Robert [5] have shown how Onsager's idea of a dissipative Euler solution may be formalized in the three-dimensional case via a local energy balance relation. It is our purpose here to similarly formalize the notion of a 2-dimensional dissipative Euler solution, corresponding to the enstrophy cascade. Namely, we shall show for appropriate weak solutions in the vorticity-velocity formulation:

$$\partial_t \omega + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla) \omega = 0, \quad (1.1)$$

with $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{K} * \omega$ for the Biot-Savart kernel \mathbf{K} , that a local balance is satisfied in the sense of distributions

$$\partial_t h(\omega) + \nabla \cdot [\mathbf{u} h(\omega)] = -Z_h(\omega). \quad (1.2)$$

for nonnegative, convex functions $h(\omega)$. Dissipative solutions are those for which the distribution on the right is nonnegative: $Z_h(\omega) \geq 0$. We give here conditions under which $Z_h(\omega) = 0$, refining those in our earlier work [6]. It may be remarked that the balance equation (1.2) also makes more precise Polyakov's analogy of the enstrophy cascade with conservation law anomalies in quantum field-theory (such as the axial anomaly in QED) [8]. The distribution appearing as a sink term on the right side of (1.2) corresponds closely to such an anomaly.

Before stating precisely our theorems, it may help to motivate the statements (and the proofs) to give a brief, heuristic argument for the existence of the enstrophy cascade. In [6] (see also [7]) we considered a "filtered" form of the 2-D Euler equations

$$\partial_t \omega_\varepsilon + \nabla \cdot [\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \omega_\varepsilon + \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\varepsilon] = 0, \quad (1.3)$$

where $\omega_\varepsilon = \varphi_\varepsilon * \omega$ for a smooth mollifier φ , $\varphi_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}) = \varepsilon^{-2}\varphi(\varepsilon^{-1}\mathbf{x})$, and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_\varepsilon = (\mathbf{u}\omega)_\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\omega_\varepsilon$. The new term $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_\varepsilon$ represents a turbulent spatial transport of vorticity due to the eliminated small-scales. It is straightforward to show that the balance holds that

$$\partial_t h(\omega_\varepsilon) + \nabla \cdot [\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon h(\omega_\varepsilon) + h'(\omega_\varepsilon) \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\varepsilon] = h''(\omega_\varepsilon) \nabla \omega_\varepsilon \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\varepsilon. \quad (1.4)$$

The term $Z_{h,\varepsilon}(\omega) := -h''(\omega_\varepsilon) \nabla \omega_\varepsilon \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\varepsilon$ represents a transfer of h -stuff from length-scales $> \varepsilon$ to smaller scales. Based upon the notion of “UV-locality of interactions”, a natural approximation is to take $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_\varepsilon \approx (\text{const.})[(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \omega_\varepsilon)_\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \omega_\varepsilon]$ and then to Taylor expand to leading non-vanishing order to obtain

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}_\varepsilon \approx C\varepsilon^2 \mathbf{D}_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla \omega_\varepsilon. \quad (1.5)$$

Here \mathbf{D}_ε is the filtered velocity-gradient tensor $D_{ij} = \partial u_i / \partial x_j$; also, a spherically symmetric mollifier has been assumed. The first of our approximations is analogous to the “similarity model” employed by engineers in large-eddy simulation of three-dimensional turbulence and the second to its further simplification, the “nonlinear model” [9]. The matrix \mathbf{D}_ε is traceless and has, in vortical regions of the flow, a pair of imaginary eigenvalues and, in strain-dominated regions, two real eigenvalues of equal magnitude S_ε but opposite signs. It stands to reason that, in the latter straining regions, the compression of vorticity level sets will tend to align the direction of the vorticity gradient $\nabla \omega_\varepsilon$ with the eigendirection of \mathbf{D}_ε corresponding to the negative eigenvalue. Indeed, such alignment has been observed in simulations to hold (for the unfiltered quantities) with a high probability [10]. Assuming it to hold exactly, we find that

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}_\varepsilon \approx -C\varepsilon^2 S_\varepsilon \nabla \omega_\varepsilon. \quad (1.6)$$

This is precisely an eddy-viscosity model, with effective viscosity $\nu_\varepsilon = C\varepsilon^2 S_\varepsilon$ at scale ε . It leads to an effective dissipation $Z_\varepsilon(\omega) \approx -\nu_\varepsilon |\nabla \omega_\varepsilon|^2$. If the vorticity field is Hölder continuous with exponent s , $\omega \in C^s$, then $\nabla \omega_\varepsilon \sim \varepsilon^{s-1}$ for small ε and $S_\varepsilon \sim S$ independent of ε . In that case, $Z_\varepsilon(\omega) \sim \varepsilon^{2s}$ for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, so that we expect an asymptotic enstrophy cascade only when $s = 0$. This is precisely the “mean-field” scaling exponent in the Batchelor-Kraichnan theory [1]-[3].

We now state our main theorems:

Our first theorem establishes the local vorticity balance equations for the weak Euler solutions constructed by DiPerna and Majda for initial data $\omega_0 \in L^p, p > 1$ [11]. Although they considered solutions in the whole plane \mathbb{R}^2 , we shall restrict attention for simplicity to solutions on the 2-D torus \mathbb{T}^2 . DiPerna and Majda also established existence of weak solutions in the velocity-pressure formulation, but it is not hard to show that, for $p > 4/3$, the associated vorticity field in their solution also satisfies the weak vorticity-velocity equations (see below). In fact, the only property of the DiPerna-Majda solution that we will employ in our proof is that $\omega \in L^\infty([0, T], L^p(\mathbb{T}^2))$ and our theorem would apply to any other such solutions as well. To state our theorem, we must introduce an appropriate class of differentiable functions

$$\mathcal{H}_p := \{h \mid h \in C^1(\mathbb{R}), \quad |h'(\omega)| \leq C(1 + |\omega|^{p-1}) \text{ for some } C > 0\} \quad (1.7)$$

which have at most L^p -growth. We then have the following:

Theorem 1 *If $\omega \in L^\infty([0, T], L^p(\mathbb{T}^2))$ and the associated $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{K} * \omega$ for $p > 4/3$ are a weak solution of 2-D incompressible Euler in the vorticity-velocity formulation, then for $h \in \mathcal{H}_r \cap C^2$, with $r = \frac{3}{2}p - 1$ for $\frac{4}{3} < p < 2$, $r < p$ for $p = 2$, and $r = p$ for $p > 2$, the balance (1.2) holds*

$$\partial_t h(\omega) + \nabla \cdot [\mathbf{u} h(\omega)] = -Z_h(\omega)$$

in the sense of distributions. The righthand side is given by the distributional limit

$$Z_h(\omega) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} -h''(\omega_\varepsilon) \nabla \omega_\varepsilon \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\varepsilon \quad (1.8)$$

which exists for any choice of mollifier φ which is C^∞ , nonnegative, and compactly supported, with unit integral, and it is independent of that choice. For the special case of the enstrophy integral, $h(\omega) = \frac{1}{2}|\omega|^2$, when $p > 2$, we write simply $Z(\omega) = Z_h(\omega)$. In that case, there is the alternative expression:

$$Z(\omega) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{4} \int d^2 \ell \nabla \varphi_\varepsilon(\ell) \cdot \Delta_\ell \mathbf{u} |\Delta_\ell \omega|^2 \quad (1.9)$$

where $\Delta_\ell \omega(\mathbf{x}, t) = \omega(\mathbf{x} + \ell, t) - \omega(\mathbf{x}, t)$, likewise for $\Delta_\ell \mathbf{u}$, and φ is further restricted to be an even function of its argument.

Note that, formally, $Z_h(\omega) = h''(\omega)Z(\omega)$, so the fluxes of general convex functions are, in some sense, proportional to the enstrophy flux with a nonnegative factor. The last expression (1.9) for the enstrophy flux has a nice interpretation as a local, non-ensemble-averaged form of the “-2 law” for the direct cascade, in its form applicable without isotropy (see [6], Appendix B). Thus, the defect distribution in the vorticity balance equations has an exact connection with the enstrophy cascade in 2D turbulence theory.

However, we next show that this distribution is, in fact, zero for the DiPerna-Majda weak solutions, which therefore conserve the integral

$$I_h(t) = \int d^2\mathbf{x} \, h(\omega(\mathbf{x}, t)) \quad (1.10)$$

for all h of suitable growth:

Theorem 2 *If $\omega \in L^\infty(0, T; L^p(\mathbb{T}^2))$ is a DiPerna-Majda weak Euler solution for $p \geq 2$, then*

$$\partial_t h(\omega) + \nabla \cdot [\mathbf{u}h(\omega)] = 0 \quad (1.11)$$

in distribution sense for all $h \in \mathcal{H}_r$ with $r = p$ when $p > 2$ and for any $r < p$ when $p = 2$.

In [6] it was proved that such a conservation statement holds for $\omega \in L^p(0, T; B_p^{s, \infty}(\mathbb{T}^2))$ for $s > 0, p \geq 3$ where $B_p^{s, \infty}(\mathbb{T}^2)$ is the standard Besov space of functions in $L^p(\mathbb{T}^2)$ which are Hölder of index s in the L^p -mean sense [12]. That theorem was thus analogous to the Besov-space improvement of Onsager’s original conservation result for 3D, which was proved by Constantin, E, and Titi [13]. We now see that the smoothness assumed in [6] was unnecessary and that simple L^p bounds alone are sufficient for conservation. Thus, we conclude that the DiPerna-Majda weak solutions are not relevant to the problem of constructing dissipative Euler solutions. In the language of turbulence theory, they do not support enstrophy cascades over infinitely-long ranges of wavenumber.

However, even in this degenerate form, the balance (1.11) may be useful for another important problem: the uniqueness of the DiPerna-Majda solutions. So far, uniqueness of weak Euler solutions in 2D is established only for the solutions in $L^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^2)$ constructed by

Yudovich [14] and for DiPerna-Majda solutions in $L^p, p \in (1, \infty)$ if also $\omega \in BMO$ [15]. Yet, if we define a “dissipative Euler solution” to be any with $\omega \in L^p([0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^2)$ for $p > 2$ such that

$$\partial_t h(\omega) + \nabla \cdot [\mathbf{u}h(\omega)] \leq 0 \quad (1.12)$$

for all convex $h \in \mathcal{H}_p$, then we see that the DiPerna-Majda solutions are dissipative, with equality in (1.12). It is very tempting to speculate, as do Duchon and Robert [5], that dissipative Euler solutions are unique. In fact, there is even more reason in the 2D case, because there is then an infinity of convex “entropies” h . For the problem of scalar conservation laws, such entropies play a crucial role in establishing uniqueness (e.g. see [16]). However, unlike the scalar case, it is not necessarily true even for smooth classical solutions of 2D Euler that the dynamics is L^1 -contractive. In fact, for two such solutions ω_1, ω_2 , $\frac{d}{dt} \|\omega_1(t) - \omega_2(t)\|_1 = -2 \int_{\omega_1=\omega_2} \mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot (\mathbf{u}_1 - \mathbf{u}_2) \omega \, ds$ where \mathbf{n}_{12} is the unit vector normal to the curve $\omega_1 = \omega_2$ from the region $\omega_1 > \omega_2$ to $\omega_2 > \omega_1$, and $\omega = \omega_1 = \omega_2$. It is precisely the nonlocal relation between \mathbf{u} and ω which allows $\mathbf{u}_1 \neq \mathbf{u}_2$ where $\omega_1 = \omega_2$. Instead, we believe that the quite different methods of DiPerna and Lions [17] may apply to show that Euler solutions with $\omega_0 \in L^p(\mathbb{T}^2)$, $p > 4/3$, are unique.¹ In fact, Theorem 2 above implies that DiPerna-Majda solutions for $p > 2$ are “renormalized solutions” as considered by DiPerna-Lions for the linear advection equation.

The most remarkable part of Onsager’s conjecture is not the conservation statement, but, rather, the claim that there are solutions of the inviscid equation which do in fact dissipate, with a strict decrease. Little progress has been made in constructing such solutions. It has been noted recently that breakdown of uniqueness of Lagrangian particle trajectories in Hölder but non-Lipschitz flows can be a mechanism for the anomalous dissipation of the analogous integrals as (1.10) for passive scalars [18]-[20]. For the 3D problem, Shnirelman has found a weak solution which dissipates energy globally, by constructing a generalized flow with random Lagrangian trajectories [21]. In the case of the Yudovich solutions, it is known that they are conservative precisely because the corresponding velocity field is log-Lipschitz and the Lagrangian flow maps

¹ I am indebted to E. Vanden-Eijnden and C. D. Levermore for pointing out to me this paper.

X_t are unique, volume-preserving homeomorphisms. Therefore, the Yudovich solution is given simply by $\omega(\mathbf{x}, t) = \omega_0(X_{-t}(\mathbf{x}))$ in terms of the inverse-Lagrangian map. All of the integrals $I_h(t)$ in (1.10) are then trivially time-invariant. DiPerna and Lions in their paper [17] show that there are likewise unique Lagrangian flow maps $X_t(x)$ with $X \in C(0, T; L^p(\mathbb{T}^2))$ whenever $\mathbf{u} \in L^1(0, T; W^{1,p}(\mathbb{T}^2))$ for $p \geq 1$ and that these maps preserve Lebesgue measure when $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0$. The “renormalized” solutions of the linear advection equation constructed by DiPerna-Lions are shown to have precisely the form $\omega(\mathbf{x}, t) = \omega_0(X_{-t}(\mathbf{x}))$. While it is not true in general that the distributional solutions in the sense considered here are renormalized solutions, Theorem 2, as we have observed above, shows that this is so for the DiPerna-Majda solutions of Euler when $p > 2$. Hence, the conservation properties of these solutions are again connected with the uniqueness of Lagrangian particle trajectories.

Our Theorem 2 corroborates the heuristic argument in the Introduction that, $s = 0$, in some sense, is required for a strictly dissipative solution of the sort conjectured by Onsager. It is well-known that if one starts with $\omega_0 \in B_p^{s,\infty}(\mathbb{T}^2)$ for $s > 0$ at time $t = 0$, then the exponent may (and generally will) deteriorate exponentially in time: for example, $s(t) = e^{-C\|\omega_0\|_\infty t} s$ if $\omega_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^2) \cap B_p^{s,\infty}(\mathbb{T}^2)$ [22]. Thus, there will be no dissipation at any finite time, as is known already for Yudovich solutions. On the other hand, deterioration is consistent with the expectation from 2D turbulence theory that there will be an exponentially growing range of scales ε with $\int d^2\mathbf{x} Z_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}, t) \approx \eta(t)$, independent of ε [23, 24]. To see dissipation at finite (or zero) time, one must begin with initial data which is sufficiently rough. We conjecture that $\omega_0 \in B_p^{0,\infty}(\mathbb{T}^2)$, $p > 1$ is sufficient to obtain dissipation. To make more specific the conjecture, we state the following proposition and definition:

Theorem 3 *If $\omega \in L^\infty(0, T; B_p^{0,\infty}(\mathbb{T}^2))$ and $\mathbf{u}(t) = \mathbf{K} * \omega(t)$ for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$ for some $p > \frac{4}{3}$, then for any $\psi \in C_0^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^2)$ it follows that $(\partial_t + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla)\psi \in L^1(0, T; B_q^{0,1}(\mathbb{T}^2))$ with $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$. Hence, the expression $\langle (\partial_t + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla)\psi, \omega \rangle$ is well-defined as the evaluation of a continuous linear functional on the element ω of the Banach space $L^\infty(0, T; B_p^{0,\infty}(\mathbb{T}^2))$.*

This leads to the following

Definition 1 *We say that $\omega \in L^\infty(0, T; B_p^{0, \infty}(\mathbb{T}^2))$ and $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{K} * \omega$ for $p > 4/3$ are a weak solution of the 2D incompressible Euler equations in the vorticity-velocity formulation, if*

$$\langle (\partial_t + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla) \psi, \omega \rangle = 0 \quad (1.13)$$

for all $\psi \in C_0^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^2)$.

Unlike the DiPerna-Majda construction of solutions $\omega \in L^\infty(0, T; L^p(\mathbb{T}^2))$, we know of no existence proof for solutions in the above space. Nevertheless, 2D turbulence theory makes it natural to conjecture that they exist. For example, if the kinetic energy spectrum of a 2D solution is bounded by the Kraichnan-Batchelor spectrum, as $E(k, t) \leq C(t)k^{-3}$ for $\|C\|_{L^\infty[0, T]} < \infty$, then it is easy to check that $\omega \in L^\infty(0, T; B_p^{0, \infty}(\mathbb{T}^2))$ for $p = 2$. See also [25]. Therefore, it is such solutions which may be expected to appear as realizations of invariant measures for forced steady-states in the zero-viscosity limit. Any solutions with the Kraichnan-Batchelor spectrum have infinite total enstrophy and are not measurable functions in general but only distributions. We expect that solutions in this class may be dissipative in the sense that the righthand side $Z_{h, \varepsilon}(\omega)$ of the balance (1.4)—which still makes sense for $\varepsilon > 0$ —will tend to a positive limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ for all convex $h \in \mathcal{H}_p$. Put another way, although the integral $I_h(t)$ may itself be infinite, it still makes sense to talk about a finite *dissipation rate* for it, defined as $Z_h := \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} -\frac{dI_h^\varepsilon}{dt}(t)$, where $I_h^\varepsilon(t)$ is the value of the integral for ω_ε . The results of DiPerna and Lions [17] do not rule out such a possibility, because they require $\mathbf{u} \in L^1(0, T; W^{1, p}(\mathbb{T}^2))$ for some $p \geq 1$, whereas $W^{1, p}(\mathbb{T}^2) = B_p^{1, p}(\mathbb{T}^2) \subsetneq B_p^{1, \infty}(\mathbb{T}^2)$. If $\mathbf{u}(t) \in B_p^{1, \infty}(\mathbb{T}^2)$ only, then examples like that in section IV.2 of [17] show that uniqueness of the Lagrangian trajectories breaks down and dissipation (in the sense of non-vanishing enstrophy flux) is possible.

Note: After this work was finished, we received a preprint from E and Vanden-Eijnden [26] which uses a similar argument as our Theorem 2 to prove global enstrophy conservation when $\omega \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)$. Local conservation for $p = 2$ seems still to be open.

2 Proofs

2.1. Proof of Theorem 1

We comment first on the validity of the weak vorticity-velocity equation for the DiPerna-Majda solutions. The condition $p > 4/3$ arises from the requirement that the nonlinear advection term $\mathbf{u}\omega \in L^1(\mathbb{T}^2)$. Since $\mathbf{u} \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{T}^2) \subset L^{p'}(\mathbb{T}^2)$ for $\frac{1}{p'} = \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2}$ by Sobolev imbedding, one finds that $p' > q$, with q defined by $\frac{1}{q} = 1 - \frac{1}{p}$, when $p > 4/3$. Then $\mathbf{u}\omega \in L^1(\mathbb{T}^2)$ follows by Hölder inequality. The weak velocity-pressure form of the Euler equation is that

$$\int d^2\mathbf{x} \int dt [\partial_t \phi \cdot \mathbf{u} + \nabla \otimes \phi : \mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u}] = 0 \quad (2.1)$$

for any smooth, divergence-free test function $\phi(\mathbf{x}, t)$. In particular, $\phi = \nabla^T \psi$ satisfies these conditions for any smooth ψ , where ∇^T is the skew-gradient, $\partial_i^T = \varepsilon_{ij} \partial_j$ with ε_{ij} the Levi-Civita tensor in 2D. (In fact, by Hodge theory, any divergence-free vector field ϕ in 2D can be written in this way.) Substituting $\phi = \nabla^T \psi$ into (2.1) it is easy, using the L^1 property of $\mathbf{u}\omega$ and $\omega = -\nabla^T \cdot \mathbf{u}$, to derive the vorticity-velocity equation.

The main condition of Theorem 1 on the index r can be similarly understood from the following lemma:

Lemma 1 *If $\omega \in L^p(\mathbb{T}^2)$ for $p > 4/3$ and $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{K} * \omega$, then for any $h \in \mathcal{H}_r$ it holds that $\mathbf{u}h(\omega) \in L^1(\mathbb{T}^2)$ when $r = \frac{3}{2}p - 1$ for $\frac{4}{3} < p < 2$, $r < p$ for $p = 2$, and $r = p$ for $p > 2$.*

Remark: For convenience in the proof below, and in all later proofs, we employ an equivalent definition of the class of functions

$$\mathcal{H}_p := \{h \mid h \in C^1(\mathbb{R}), |h'(\omega)| \leq C|\omega|^{p-1} \text{ for } |\omega| \geq R \text{ for some } C, R > 0\} \quad (2.2)$$

We will make the argument then assuming that $R = 0$ so that the bound in (2.2) above holds globally. In fact, when $R > 0$ it is easy to bound the contributions from the small- ω regions of integration over space and time by terms proportional to $\|h'\|_{L^\infty[-R,R]}, \|h''\|_{L^\infty[-R,R]}$, assuming that the latter are finite. So we lose no generality and simplify the arguments by taking $R = 0$.

Proof of Lemma: We first note the definition $\mathbf{K} := \nabla^T G$ where G is the Greens function of $-\Delta$ on \mathbb{T}^2 . Then $\mathbf{u} \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{T}^2)$ because $\|\mathbf{u}\|_p \leq \|\mathbf{K}\|_1 \|\omega\|_p$ by Young's inequality and $\|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_p \leq C \|\omega\|_p$ by the Calderón-Zygmund inequality. Hence, by the same Sobolev imbedding as before, $\mathbf{u} \in L^{p'}(\mathbb{T}^2)$ for $\frac{1}{p'} = \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2}$ when $\frac{4}{3} < p < 2$ and for any finite $p' \geq 1$ when $p = 2$, and for $p' = \infty$ when $p > 2$. Then, by definition of \mathcal{H}_r ,

$$\|\mathbf{u}h(\omega)\|_1 \leq (\text{const.}) \|\mathbf{u}|\omega|^r\|_1 \leq (\text{const.}) \|\mathbf{u}\|_{p'} \|\omega\|_{rq'}^r \quad (2.3)$$

with $\frac{1}{q'} = 1 - \frac{1}{p'}$. When $\frac{4}{3} < p < 2$, then $\frac{1}{q'} = \frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{p}$ and $rq' = p$ for $r = \frac{3}{2}p - 1$. On the other hand, when $p > 2$, then $q' = 1$, and $rq' = p$ for $r = p$. Lastly, in the critical case $p = 2$, the only requirement is that $q' > 1$. Then $rq' \leq p$ can be satisfied for any $r < p$ by an appropriate choice of $q' > 1$. Thus, for the given definitions of r ,

$$\|\mathbf{u}h(\omega)\|_1 \leq (\text{const.}) \|\omega\|_p^{r+1} \quad (2.4)$$

because $\|\mathbf{u}\|_{p'} \leq C \|\mathbf{u}\|_{W^{1,p}} \leq C' \|\omega\|_p$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1: We consider the filtered balance equation (1.4):

$$\partial_t h(\omega_\varepsilon) + \nabla \cdot [\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon h(\omega_\varepsilon) + h'(\omega_\varepsilon) \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\varepsilon] = h''(\omega_\varepsilon) \nabla \omega_\varepsilon \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\varepsilon.$$

and, just as in [5], we show that every term on the lefthand side has a limit in the sense of distributions for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. We show first that $h(\omega_\varepsilon) \rightarrow h(\omega)$. In fact, by the mean-value theorem, $h(\omega_\varepsilon) - h(\omega) = h'(\bar{\omega}_\varepsilon)(\omega_\varepsilon - \omega)$ for $\bar{\omega}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}, t) = \lambda(\mathbf{x}, t)\omega(\mathbf{x}, t) + (1 - \lambda(\mathbf{x}, t))\omega_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}, t)$ with some $0 \leq \lambda(\mathbf{x}, t) \leq 1$. Then, in the notations of Lemma 1, we have

$$|h(\omega_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}, t)) - h(\omega(\mathbf{x}, t))| \leq (\text{const.}) |\bar{\omega}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}, t)|^{r-1} |\omega_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}, t) - \omega(\mathbf{x}, t)|$$

and thus by Hölder inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \|h(\omega_\varepsilon(t)) - h(\omega(t))\|_{q'} &\leq (\text{const.}) \|\bar{\omega}_\varepsilon(t)\|_{rq'}^{r-1} \|\omega_\varepsilon(t) - \omega(t)\|_{rq'} \\ &\leq (\text{const.}) \|\omega(t)\|_p^{r-1} \|\omega_\varepsilon(t) - \omega(t)\|_p. \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

By the properties of the mollifier, $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|\omega_\varepsilon(t) - \omega(t)\|_p = 0$ for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$, and thus $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|h(\omega_\varepsilon(t)) - h(\omega(t))\|_{q'} = 0$. To complete the argument, we use the uniform bound

$$\|h(\omega_\varepsilon(t)) - h(\omega(t))\|_{q'} \leq (\text{const.}) \|\omega\|_{L^\infty(0, T; L^p(\mathbb{T}^2))}^r \quad (2.6)$$

to conclude by dominated convergence that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|h(\omega_\varepsilon) - h(\omega)\|_{L^{q'}([0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^2)} = 0$, which implies convergence $h(\omega_\varepsilon) \rightarrow h(\omega)$ in sense of distributions.

We show next for the middle term that $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon h(\omega_\varepsilon) \rightarrow \mathbf{u}h(\omega)$. In fact, with notations again as in Lemma 1,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(t)h(\omega_\varepsilon(t)) - \mathbf{u}(t)h(\omega(t))\|_1 &\leq \|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(t) - \mathbf{u}(t)\|_{p'} \|h(\omega_\varepsilon(t))\|_{q'} + \|\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{p'} \|h(\omega_\varepsilon(t)) - h(\omega(t))\|_{q'} \\ &\leq (\text{const.}) \|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(t) - \mathbf{u}(t)\|_{p'} \|\omega(t)\|_p^r + \|\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{p'} \|h(\omega_\varepsilon(t)) - h(\omega(t))\|_{q'}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

Thus, we see that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon h(\omega_\varepsilon(t)) - \mathbf{u}h(\omega(t))\|_1 = 0$ for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$. In this case we have the uniform bound

$$\|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon h(\omega_\varepsilon(t)) - \mathbf{u}h(\omega(t))\|_1 \leq (\text{const.}) \|\omega\|_{L^\infty(0, T; L^p(\mathbb{T}^2))}^{r+1} \quad (2.8)$$

so that we can use Lebesgue's theorem again to infer $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon h(\omega_\varepsilon) - \mathbf{u}h(\omega)\|_{L^1([0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^2)} = 0$, which gives the result.

Finally, for the third term we show that $h'(\omega_\varepsilon)\sigma_\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$ as a distribution. We use the definition $\sigma_\varepsilon = (\mathbf{u}\omega)_\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\omega_\varepsilon$ and the Hölder inequality

$$\|h'(\omega_\varepsilon(t))\sigma_\varepsilon(t)\|_1 \leq \|h'(\omega_\varepsilon(t))\|_{p/(r-1)} \|(\mathbf{u}(t)\omega(t))_\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(t)\omega_\varepsilon(t)\|_{p/(p-r+1)} \quad (2.9)$$

along with $\|h'(\omega_\varepsilon(t))\|_{p/(r-1)} \leq (\text{const.}) \|\omega_\varepsilon(t)\|_p^{r-1}$ and the triangle inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\mathbf{u}(t)\omega(t))_\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(t)\omega_\varepsilon(t)\|_{p/(p-r+1)} &\leq \|(\mathbf{u}(t)\omega(t))_\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}(t)\omega(t)\|_{p/(p-r+1)} \\ &\quad + \|\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{p'} \|\omega(t) - \omega_\varepsilon(t)\|_p + \|\mathbf{u}(t) - \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(t)\|_{p'} \|\omega_\varepsilon(t)\|_p \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

to infer that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|(\mathbf{u}(t)\omega(t))_\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(t)\omega_\varepsilon(t)\|_{p/(p-r+1)} = 0$ for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$. Note that we have used $\|\mathbf{u}(t)\omega(t)\|_{p/(p-r+1)} \leq \|\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{p/(p-r)} \|\omega(t)\|_p$ and $(p-r)/p < p'$. Again a uniform

bound on $\|h'(\omega_\varepsilon(t))\boldsymbol{\sigma}_\varepsilon(t)\|_1$ like that in (2.8) completes the argument. Gathering these results, we see that the entire lefthand side of (1.4) approaches $\partial_t h(\omega) + \nabla \cdot [\mathbf{u}h(\omega)]$ in the sense of distributions as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Obviously this limit is independent of the mollifier φ and the righthand side $-Z_{h,\varepsilon}(\omega) = h''(\omega_\varepsilon)\nabla\omega_\varepsilon \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\varepsilon$ has the same limit. This gives the first half of Theorem 1.

The second half of the theorem for the particular choice $h(\omega) = \frac{1}{2}|\omega|^2$ follows by the same argument as in [5]. In this proof, the balance (1.4) is replaced by

$$\partial_t\left(\frac{1}{2}\omega\omega_\varepsilon\right) + \nabla \cdot \left[\left(\frac{1}{2}\omega\omega_\varepsilon\right)\mathbf{u}\right] = -\tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega) \quad (2.11)$$

where an easy calculation gives

$$\tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega) := \frac{1}{2}\omega\nabla \cdot [(\omega\mathbf{u})_\varepsilon] - \frac{1}{2}\omega(\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla)\omega_\varepsilon. \quad (2.12)$$

An argument exactly like the previous one shows that, when $p > 2$, the distributional limit $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega)$ exists and equals $-\partial_t(\frac{1}{2}|\omega|^2) - \nabla \cdot [(\frac{1}{2}|\omega|^2)\mathbf{u}] = Z(\omega)$. In addition, a simple calculation using the incompressibility of the velocity field shows that the expression appearing in (1.9) in Theorem 1 can be written

$$\int d^2\ell \nabla\varphi_\varepsilon(\ell) \cdot \Delta_\ell \mathbf{u} |\Delta_\ell \omega|^2 = \nabla \cdot [\mathbf{u}(\omega^2)_\varepsilon - (\mathbf{u}\omega^2)_\varepsilon] + 4\tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega). \quad (2.13)$$

As before, it is easy to show for $p > 2$ that $\mathbf{u}(\omega^2)_\varepsilon - (\mathbf{u}\omega^2)_\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$ as a distribution when $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Hence, it follows that the limits of $\frac{1}{4} \int d^2\ell \nabla\varphi_\varepsilon(\ell) \cdot \Delta_\ell \mathbf{u} |\Delta_\ell \omega|^2$ and $\tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega)$ are also the same. That proves the second half of Theorem 1. \square

2.2. Proof of Theorem 2

A result on global conservation corresponding to the local result in Theorem 2 was already proved in [6] but with an additional smoothness assumption that $\omega \in L^p(0, T; B_p^{s,\infty}(\mathbb{T}^2))$. Here we show that conservation holds without any such a smoothness assumption. Let $\tau_\varepsilon(f, g) := (fg)_\varepsilon - f_\varepsilon g_\varepsilon$ where $f_\varepsilon = \varphi_\varepsilon * f$. Then, we make use of the following key estimate:

Lemma 2 *Let $\omega \in L^p(\mathbb{T}^2)$ and $\mathbf{u} \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{T}^2)$ for $p \geq 2$, and let $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0$. Then*

$$\|\nabla \cdot \tau_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}, \omega)\|_{L^{p/2}} \leq C \|\mathbf{u}\|_{W^{1,p}} \|\omega\|_{L^p} \quad (2.14)$$

with a constant C independent of ε .

Proof: Note that

$$\nabla \cdot \tau_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}, \omega) = \nabla \cdot [(\mathbf{u}\omega)_\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}\omega_\varepsilon] + (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon) \cdot \nabla \omega_\varepsilon. \quad (2.15)$$

The first term is handled in exactly the same manner as in Lemma II.1 of [17]. However, it is easy to see that

$$\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L^p} \leq \varepsilon \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^p} \leq \varepsilon \|\mathbf{u}\|_{W^{1,p}} \quad (2.16)$$

and

$$\|\nabla \omega_\varepsilon\|_{L^p} \leq \varepsilon^{-1} \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^1} \|\omega\|_{L^p}. \quad (2.17)$$

These control the second term. \square

Corollary 1 *Under the same hypotheses, let $r_\varepsilon := -\nabla \cdot \tau_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}, \omega)$. Then $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} r_\varepsilon = 0$ strong in $L^{p/2}(\mathbb{T}^2)$ for $p \geq 2$.*

Proof: Since $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} r_\varepsilon = 0$ for smooth \mathbf{u}, ω , one can obtain the result for all $\omega \in L^p(\mathbb{T}^2), \mathbf{u} \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{T}^2)$ by an approximation argument using the estimate in Proposition 1. \square

If \mathbf{u} is related to ω by the Biot-Savart formula, $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{K} * \omega$, then $\tau_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}, \omega) = \sigma_\varepsilon$ in the earlier notation. In particular, we see that

$$\partial_t \omega_\varepsilon + (\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla) \omega_\varepsilon = r_\varepsilon \quad (2.18)$$

for a weak Euler solution.

Proof of Theorem 2: Using (2.18) we get

$$\partial_t h(\omega_\varepsilon) + (\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla) h(\omega_\varepsilon) = h'(\omega_\varepsilon) r_\varepsilon. \quad (2.19)$$

It was proved in Theorem 1 that

$$\partial_t h(\omega_\varepsilon) + (\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla) h(\omega_\varepsilon) \longrightarrow \partial_t h(\omega) + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla) h(\omega) \quad (2.20)$$

in the sense of distributions for all such h . Furthermore, for any $h \in C^1$ with $h' \in L^\infty$,

$$\|h'(\omega_\varepsilon) r_\varepsilon\|_{L^1} \rightarrow 0. \quad (2.21)$$

Having proved that (1.11) holds for h with $h' \in L^\infty$ we then extend it to the general h in the theorem statement by an approximation argument, as in Corollaries II.1-2 in [17]. \square

Remark: The smoothness assumed in the earlier proof of [6] is not necessary to obtain conservation, but only to provide an estimate of the rate of the vanishing of the flux. With the assumption that $\omega \in L^p(0, T; B_p^{s, \infty}(\mathbb{T}^2))$ the bounds above can be improved as follows. General estimates in Besov spaces give $\|\nabla \omega_\varepsilon(t)\|_p \leq C\varepsilon^{s-1}\|\omega(t)\|_{B_p^{s, \infty}}$ and $\sup_{|\ell| < \varepsilon} \|\Delta_\ell \omega(t)\|_p \leq \varepsilon^s \|\omega(t)\|_{B_p^{s, \infty}}$. See [12], or Appendix C of [6]. Just as in [6] this gives

$$\|Z_{h, \varepsilon}(\omega(t))\|_1 \leq (\text{const.})\varepsilon^{2s}\|\omega(t)\|_p^{r-1}\|\omega(t)\|_{B_p^{s, \infty}}^2 \leq (\text{const.})\varepsilon^{2s}\|\omega(t)\|_{B_p^{s, \infty}}^{r+1} \quad (2.22)$$

Because $r + 1 < p$, integrating over $t \in [0, T]$ gives

$$\|Z_{h, \varepsilon}(\omega)\|_{L^1([0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^2)} \leq (\text{const.})\varepsilon^{2s}\|\omega\|_{L^p(0, T; B_p^{s, \infty}(\mathbb{T}^2))}^{r+1}. \quad (2.23)$$

Thus, $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} Z_{h, \varepsilon}(\omega) = 0$ as before, but with an estimate of the rate. The bound $O(\varepsilon^{2s})$ is in agreement with the estimate given by the heuristic argument in the Introduction.

2.3. Proof of Theorem 3

The proof uses arguments very similar to those above Lemma 1. Because of the regularity hypothesis on ω , $\mathbf{u} \in L^\infty(0, T; B_p^{1, \infty}(\mathbb{T}^2))$. Indeed, using the Calderón-Zygmund inequality it is easy to show that $\nabla \mathbf{u} \in L^\infty(0, T; B_p^{0, \infty}(\mathbb{T}^2))$, and this is equivalent to the first statement ([12], Theorem 2.3.8). Then, for any $p'' < p'$ with p' defined by $\frac{1}{p'} = \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2}$, one has the continuous embedding $B_p^{1, \infty}(\mathbb{T}^2) \subset B_{p''}^{0, 1}(\mathbb{T}^2)$. In fact, $B_p^{1, \infty}(\mathbb{T}^2) \subset B_{p''}^{\varepsilon, \infty}(\mathbb{T}^2)$ for $\frac{1}{p''} := \frac{1}{p} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ for any small $\varepsilon > 0$ ([12], Theorem 2.7.1), but then $B_{p''}^{\varepsilon, \infty}(\mathbb{T}^2) \subset B_{p''}^{0, 1}(\mathbb{T}^2)$ by an elementary imbedding ([12], Prop. 2.3.2/2). Now, precisely for $p > \frac{4}{3}$, one has $\frac{1}{p'} < \frac{1}{q}$ with $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$. Thus, it is possible to choose $p'' > q$ but still $p'' < p'$. In that case, $\mathbf{u} \in L^1(0, T; B_q^{0, 1}(\mathbb{T}^2))$, whereas $L^\infty(0, T; B_p^{0, \infty}(\mathbb{T}^2)) = [L^1(0, T; B_q^{0, 1}(\mathbb{T}^2))]^*$, the Banach dual ([12], Theorem 2.11.2). To conclude the proof, we just note that, if $\psi \in C_0^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^2)$, then also $(\partial_t + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla)\psi \in L^1(0, T; B_q^{0, 1}(\mathbb{T}^2))$ (see [12], Lemma 3.3.1). \square

Acknowledgements I would like to thank the Institute of Theoretical Physics at Santa Barbara for their kind hospitality in the spring of 2000. This work was begun there during my stay for the program on “Physics of Hydrodynamic Turbulence.” It was completed during my sabbatical at Johns Hopkins University in autumn 2000, and I would like to acknowledge my hosts there, Shiyi Chen and Charles Meneveau.

References

- [1] R. H. Kraichnan, “Inertial ranges in two-dimensional turbulence,” *Phys. Fluids* **10** 1417-1423 (1967)
- [2] C. E. Leith, “Diffusion approximation for two-dimensional turbulence,” *Phys. Fluids* **11** 671-672 (1968)
- [3] G. K. Batchelor, “Computation of the energy spectrum in homogeneous two-dimensional turbulence,” *Phys. Fluids Suppl. II* **12** 233-239 (1969)
- [4] L. Onsager, “Statistical hydrodynamics,” *Nuovo Cim. Suppl.* **6** 279-289 (1949)
- [5] J. Duchon and R. Robert, “Inertial energy dissipation for weak solutions of incompressible Euler and Navier-Stokes equations,” *Nonlinearity* **13** 249-255 (2000)
- [6] G. L. Eyink, “Exact results for stationary turbulence in 2D: consequences of vorticity conservation,” *Physica D* **91** 97-142 (1996)
- [7] P. Constantin and J. Wu, “The inviscid limit for nonsmooth vorticity,” *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **45** 67-81 (1996)
- [8] A. M. Polyakov, “The theory of turbulence in two dimensions,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **396** 367-385 (1993)
- [9] C. Meneveau and J. Katz, “Scale-invariance and turbulence models for large-eddy simulation,” *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.* **32** 1-32 (2000)

- [10] M. E. Brachet, M. Meneguzzi, H. Politano, and P. L. Sulem, “The dynamics of freely decaying two-dimensional turbulence,” *J. Fluid Mech.* **194** 333-49 (1988)
- [11] R. J. DiPerna and A. J. Majda, “Concentrations in regularizations for 2-D incompressible flow,” *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* **XL** 301-345 (1987)
- [12] H. Triebel, *Theory of Function Spaces* (Birkhäuser, Basel, 1983)
- [13] P. Constantin, W. E, and E. S. Titi, “Onsager’s conjecture on the energy conservation for solutions of Euler’s equation,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **165** 207-209 (1994)
- [14] V. I. Yudovich, “Non-stationary flow of an ideal incompressible liquid,” *Zh. Vych. Mat.* **3** 1032-1066 (1963)
- [15] M. Vishik, “Incompressible flows of an ideal fluid with vorticity in borderline spaces of Besov type,” *Ann. de l’Ecole Norm. Sup.* **32** 769-812 (1999)
- [16] P. D. Lax, “Shock waves and entropy,” in: *Contributions to Nonlinear Functional Analysis*. E. H. Zarantonello, Ed. (Academic Press, New York, 1971)
- [17] R. J. DiPerna and P. L. Lions, “Ordinary differential equations, transport theory, and Sobolev spaces,” *Invent. Math.* **98** 511-547 (1989).
- [18] D. Bernard, K. Gawędzki, and A. Kupiainen, “Slow modes in passive advection,” *J. Stat. Phys.* **90** 519-569 (1998)
- [19] Y. Le Jan and O. Raimond, “Integration of Brownian vector fields,” preprint *math.PR/9909147*
- [20] W. E and E. Vanden-Eijnden, “Generalized flows, intrinsic stochasticity, and turbulent transport,” preprint *nlin.CD/0003028*.
- [21] A. Shnirelman, “Weak solutions with decreasing energy of incompressible Euler equations,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **210** 541-603 (2000)

- [22] H. Bahouri and J.-Y. Chemin, “Equations de transport relatives à des champs de vecteurs non-lipschitziens et mécanique des fluides,” *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.* **127** 159-181 (1994)
- [23] R. H. Kraichnan, “Statistical dynamics of two-dimensional flow,” *J. Fluid Mech.* **67** 155-175 (1975)
- [24] R. H. Kraichnan, “Convection of a passive scalar by a quasi-uniform random straining field,” *J. Fluid Mech.* **64** 737-762 (1974)
- [25] P. Constantin, “The Littlewood-Paley spectrum in two-dimensional turbulence,” *Theor. Comp. Fluid Dyn.* **9** 183-9 (1997)
- [26] W. E and E. Vanden-Eijnden, “Remarks on 2D turbulence,” preprint.