

Hölder continuity of solutions to Vlasov-Fokker-Planck type equations with rough coefficients

Joint work with Cyril Imbert, François Golse and Alexis Vasseur

Clément Mouhot

U. Cambridge

Septembre 8, 2015

A motivation in nonlinear analysis of kinetic equations

- Oldest kinetic equation (Maxwell 1867, Boltzmann 1972):
$$\partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f = Q(f, f)$$
- Nonlinear (quadratic) PDE on $f = f(t, x, v) \geq 0$ with Q bilinear integral operator acting only on v
- For long-distance interactions Q has fractional ellipticity in v
- Global well-posedness major open problem for mathematicians
- Toy (much simpler) model: $\partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f = \rho[f] \nabla_v \cdot (\nabla_v f + v f)$
(where $\rho[f] := \int_v f$) with quadratic nonlinearity and preserving mass
- Surprisingly it seems (to my knowledge) that global well-posedness and propagation of regularity still unknown for this model
- Follow De Giorgi and Nash's strategy when solving Hilbert's 19th problem: **consider $\rho[f]$ as a given rough coefficient and try to derive some regularity on the solution**

The De Giorgi - Nash - Moser theory (1)

- Hilbert's 19th problem: whether minimizers f of an energy functional

$$\int_U L(\nabla f) \, dx \quad \text{are analytic where } L \text{ Lagrangian}$$

- Euler-Lagrange equations for the minimizers take the form

$$\nabla_i (a^{ij}(x) \nabla_j f) = 0$$

where $a^{ij} := \partial_{ij} L(\nabla f)$ and conditions on L ensures that the symmetric positive matrix $A = (a^{ij})$ is uniformly bounded above and below

- De Giorgi 1956 and Nash (1958): prove that the above conditions and $f \in L^2$ imply that the solution is L^∞ and Hölder (Nash considered the parabolic case) even when the coefficients are merely measurable
- It solves the problem of Hilbert by bootstrap

The De Giorgi - Nash - Moser theory (2)

- Proof of Nash relies on what is called now "Nash inequality" with an $L \log L$ estimate, and intricate estimates on the fundamental solution (not used here)
- Proof of De Giorgi relies on an iterative gain of integrability and an "isoperimetric lemma" to control oscillations
- Proof of Moser relies on a similar iterative gain of integrability for positive and then "negative" Lebesgue spaces and a clever control of oscillation for relating positive and negative Lebesgue norms by studying the equation on $\ln f$
- We use the iteration in the Moser form and the control of oscillation in the De Giorgi form (but the hypoelliptic nature creates new difficulties)
- Remark that there is a non-divergence form of the theory by Krylov-Safonov (not considered here)

The Hörmander theory of hypoellipticity (1)

- Starting point: 3 pages note of Kolmogorov in Annals of Math. 1934 "*Zufällige Bewegungen (Zur Theorie der Brownschen Bewegung)*"
- Kolmogorov considered $d = 1$ and A constant and with a possible constant drift (thus sometimes called "Kolmogorov equation")

$\partial_t f + v \cdot \partial_x f + b \partial_v f = a \partial_v^2 f$ and compute fundamental solutions

$$G(t, x, v, t', x', v') = \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{\pi a^2 (t' - t)^2} \times \exp \left\{ -\frac{[v' - v - b(t' - t)]^2}{4a(t' - t)} - \frac{3 \left[x' - x - \frac{v' + v}{2}(t' - t) \right]^2}{a^3 (t' - t)^3} \right\}$$

The Hörmander theory of hypoellipticity (2)

- Hörmander 1967's seminal paper starts from observing the regularisation of this fundamental solution and builds a general theory based on commutator estimates
- Related to Malliavin calculus in probability
- Regularisation **Gevrey** instead of analytic for parabolic equations
- Simpler case when no first order part and missing directions of diffusion recovered by commutator ("Hörmander type I"): NDGM theory already extended in this case
- Hörmander theory **local**: global estimates derived under the impulsion of **hypoocoercivity**
- Commutator estimates: $\partial_t f + Bf + A^*Af = 0$, $B = v \cdot \partial_x$, $A = \partial_v$
 $[A, B] = C = \partial_x$ missing direction: $\frac{d}{dt} \langle Af, Bf \rangle = -\|Cf\|^2 + \dots$

An hypoelliptic extension of the NDGM theory

Theorem (Imbert-Golse-CM-Vasseur)

We consider the following Vlasov-Fokker-Planck type equation

$$\partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f = \nabla_v \cdot (A(t, x, v) \nabla_v f)$$

where the $d \times d$ symmetric matrix A satisfies the ellipticity condition $0 < \lambda Id \leq A \leq \Lambda Id$ but is, besides that, merely measurable.

We define for $z = (t, x, v)$ the cube $Q_r(z) = B_{r^3}(x) \times B_r(v) \times (t - r^2, t]$. Then for $0 < r_1 < r_0$, if f is a solution in $Q_{r_0}(z_0)$ then

$$\|f\|_{L^\infty(Q_{r_1}(z_0))} + \|f\|_{C^\alpha(Q_{r_1}(z_0))} \leq C \|f\|_{L^2(Q_{r_0}(z_0))}$$

where C depends on $z_0, r_0, r_1, \lambda, \Lambda, d$ and α only depends on λ, Λ, d .

Gain of L^∞ done before in [Pascucci-Polidoro 2004]

C^α claimed in [Wang-Zhang 2011] (I don't understand their proof)

Gain of integrability - The elliptic case (following Moser)

- We consider, with $f = f(t, v)$ and g source term nicely behaved:

$$\nabla_v (A(t, v) \nabla_v f) = g$$

- Central energy estimate:

$$\|f\|_{H^1(Q_{r_1})} \lesssim \frac{1}{(r_0 - r_1)^2} \|f\|_{L^2(Q_{r_0})}$$

- Sobolev embedding translates the gain H^1 into L^p , $p > 2$
- Iteration by applying the argument to any subsolution $f^{p/2}$, $p \geq 2$, for a sequence of radii $r_n \rightarrow r_\infty > 0$, to get finally L^∞ in Q_{r_∞}
- It relies crucially on the ellipticity of the operator in all variables

The parabolic case (following Moser)

- We now consider the parabolic case of the classical theory as it closer to the hypoelliptic we want to treat, with $f = f(t, v)$:

$$\partial_t f = \nabla_x (A(t, v) \nabla_v f)$$

- Central energy estimate:

$$\left(\int_{v \in B_{r_1}} f^2 dv \right)_{t=T} + \int_{T-r_1^2}^T |\nabla_v f|^2 dv dt \lesssim \frac{1}{(r_0 - r_1)^2} \int_{T-r_0^2}^T \int_{v \in B_{r_0}} f^2 dv dt$$

- Similar iteration argument in both variables t, v
- Again it relies crucially on the ellipticity of the operator in all variables

Difficulties here

- Coming to our equation $\partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f = \nabla_v \cdot (A \nabla_v f)$ we can derive the central energy estimate as above:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_{x \in B_{r_1^3}, v \in B_{r_1}} f^2 dx dv \right)_{t=T} + \int_{T-r_1^2}^T |\nabla_v f|^2 dx dv dt \\ \lesssim \frac{1}{(r_0 - r_1)^2} \int_{T-r_0^2}^T \int_{x \in B_{r_0^3}, v \in B_{r_0}} f^2 dx dv dt \end{aligned}$$

- Problem: control only on v -gradients, not x -gradients
- Key tool in kinetic theory to remedy this: **averaging lemma** [Golse-Perthame-Sentis 1985]
- Second problem: for the iteration we need to work on **subsolutions** (cf. $f^{p/2}$) for which averaging lemma do not hold

Strategy

- **Averaging lemma:** solutions to

$$\partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f = \nabla_v^k g, \quad f, g \in L^2, \quad k \geq 0$$

have more regularity on the partial v -averages: $\int_v f \, dv \in H_{t,x}^s$, s small

- Averages "transversal" to cancellations of symbol of the hyperbolic transport operator (gain of regularity limited by order 1 of operator)
- It degenerates if RHS g not controlled \Rightarrow problem for subsolutions

$$\partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f \leq \nabla_v (A \nabla_v f) + \dots = \nabla_v \cdot H_0 + H_1 \text{ with } H_0, H_1 \in L^2$$

- **Comparison principle:** $0 \leq f \leq F$ with a true solution F of previous equation on which energy estimate $L_{t,x}^2 H_v^1$ plus averaging lemma $H_{t,x}^s L_v^1$ imply some $H_{t,x,v}^{s'}$ ($0 < s' < s$) and thus some gain of integrability on F by Sobolev embedding that is inherited by f

The iteration

- The previous argument ends up with the following: there is $\kappa > 1$ such that for all $q > 1$:

$$\|(f^q)^\kappa\|_{L^2(Q_{r_1})}^2 \lesssim \left(\frac{1}{(r_0 - r_1)^2} + \frac{1}{r_0(r_1 - r_0)} \right) \|f^q\|_{L^2(Q_{r_0})}^{2\kappa}$$

- Choose $q = q_n = 2\kappa^n$ and $R_{n+1} = R_n - \frac{1}{a(n+1)^2}$ (a small)
- The constant at step n is $C_n \sim c(a^2 n^4 + bn^2)^\kappa$ and

$$\prod_{n=0}^{+\infty} C_n^{\frac{1}{2\kappa^n}} < +\infty, \quad R_n \rightarrow R_\infty > 0$$

which implies the convergence of the iteration

Regularity of non-negative subsolutions revisited (1)

- With the $L^2 - L^\infty$ gain at hand we can now revisit the question of the regularity of subsolutions to $\partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f \leq \nabla_v \cdot H_0 + H_1$, which we write

$$\partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f = \nabla_v \cdot H_0 + H_1 - \mu$$

with a measure $\mu \geq 0$ and $H_0, H_1 \in L^2$ and $0 \leq f \in L_{t,x,v}^\infty \cap L_{t,x}^2 H_v^1$

- The estimate on the mass $\int_{t,x,v} f \phi$ (for a cutoff function ϕ) yields

$$\|\mu\|_{M^1(Q_{r_1})} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(Q_{r_0})} + \|H_0\|_{L^2(Q_{r_0})} + \|H_1\|_{L^2(Q_{r_0})}$$

which is a surprisingly strong control on the unknown error μ

Regularity of non-negative subsolutions revisited (2)

- We then write $-\mu = (1 - \Delta_x)^{1/4}g$ with $g \in L^p$, $p \in (1, 2)$ by ellipticity of the fractional Laplacian, and apply refined averaging lemma on

$$\partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f = \nabla_v \cdot H_0 + H_1 + (1 - \Delta_x)^{1/4}g$$

in L^p to get some $W_{t,x}^{s,p} L_v^1$ regularity for a small s

- We then interpolate with the L^∞ regularity to deduce some $H_{t,x}^{s'} L_v^1$ regularity
- Finally we combine it with the energy estimate $L_{t,x}^2 H_v^1$ to get $f \in H_{t,x,v}^{s''}$ for some (possibly very small) $s'' > 0$
- Note that because of the interpolation with L^∞ to "bring back" the regularity obtained in L^2 this argument does not supersede the previous comparison principle in the $L^2 - L^\infty$ iteration, which is still needed

Gain of integrability of $\nabla_v f$ (1)

- Another property on **subsolutions** $\partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f \leq \nabla_v (A \nabla_v f)$ which is (surprisingly) as strong as in the parabolic case

Theorem

There is $\varepsilon > 0$ universal so that

$$\int_{Q_{r_1}} |\nabla_v f|^{2+\varepsilon} dt dx dv \lesssim_{r_0, r_1, \lambda, \Lambda, d} \left(\int_{Q_{r_0}} |\nabla_v f|^2 dt dx dv \right)^{\frac{2+\varepsilon}{2}}$$

- It follows (iteration) from "Gehring lemma": given $q > 1$ if there is θ small enough s.t. for all $z \in \Omega$

$$\int_{Q_r(z)} g^q \leq C_\theta \left(\int_{Q_{8r}(z)} g dz \right)^q + \theta \int_{Q_{8r}(z)} g^q dz$$

$$\text{then } \left(\int_{Q_r} g^{q+\varepsilon} dz \right)^{1/(q+\varepsilon)} \lesssim \left(\int_{Q_{4r}} g^q dz \right)^{1/q}$$

Gain of integrability of $\nabla_v f$ (2)

- Proof of Gehring lemma is based on the following inequalities

$$(1) \quad \int_{Q_r} |\nabla_v f|^2 dz \leq \frac{C}{r^2} \int |f - \tilde{f}_{2r}|^2 dz$$

$$(2) \quad \sup_{t \in (T-r^2, T]} \int_{Q_r^t} |f - \tilde{f}_r|^2 dz \leq Cr^2 \int_{Q_{3r}} |\nabla_v f|^2 dz$$

$$(3) \quad \left(\int |f - \tilde{f}|^{q+\varepsilon} \right)^{1/(2+\varepsilon)} dz \lesssim \left(\int |\nabla_v f|^2 dz \right)^{1/2}$$

proved by the energy estimate (written removing the x, v -average \tilde{f}_{2r}), fractional Poincaré in x, v , Sobolev embedding and the $H_{x,v}^s$ regularity for subsolutions (averages \tilde{f}_{\dots} and cubes Q_{\dots} along free flow)

- Then bootstrap the estimate on $\nabla_v f$ using $\int |f - \tilde{f}|^2$ as pivot

Control of oscillation: the classical theory (1)

- Clear observation: bad idea to differentiate the PDE
- Best to relate local suprema and infima (oscillation), i.e. control the modulus of continuity
- In view of the previous gain of integrability it is natural to continue in " L^∞ " setting, i.e. Hölder regularity
- In the parabolic case, it takes time for the diffusive effect to manifest, and time delays must be taken into when comparing suprema and infima
- Moser's strategy: gains $L^\varepsilon - L^\infty$ and $L^{-\infty} - L^{-\varepsilon}$ and then compare L^ε and $L^{-\varepsilon}$ by studying the equation for $\ln f$ and using Poincaré inequality \Rightarrow not clear how to follow this approach by lack of Poincaré inequality
- Moser arrives at comparing suprema and infima which is an independent property called Harnack inequality (see later)
- Harnack inequality implies Hölder regularity but not the opposite

Control of oscillation: the classical theory (2)

- De Giorgi's strategy: always consider oscillation as a whole without separating controls suprema and infima, and control decrease of oscillation when reducing the size of the cube considered
- Again time delays must be taken into account for the decrease to take place when considering our time-evolution case
- Main Lemma of decrease of oscillations: for f solution in Q_2 with $|f| \leq 1$ then $\text{osc}_{Q_{1/2}} f \leq 2 - \delta$ for some $\delta > 0$
- It implies Hölder regularity at the point at which cubes shrink
- It is implied by the following Lemma of decrease of supremum bound: for f solution in Q_2 with $|f| \leq 1$ and $|\{f \leq 0\} \cap Q_1| \geq (1/2)|Q_1|$ then $\sup_{Q_{1/2}} f \leq 1 - \delta$
- This decrease of the supremum bound follows from the *isoperimetric De Giorgi argument*

De Giorgi isoperimetric argument (1)

- Original statement is proved by constructive isoperimetric calculation:

Theorem

Consider $f \in H^1$ on Q_2 with $f \leq 1$ and

$$\left| \left\{ f \geq \frac{1}{2} \right\} \cap Q_1 \right| \geq \delta_1 \quad \text{and} \quad |\{f \leq 0\} \cap Q_1| \geq \delta_2$$

then there is $\alpha > 0$ depending on δ_1 , δ_2 and the H^1 norm so that

$$\left| \left\{ 0 < f < \frac{1}{2} \right\} \cap Q_1 \right| \geq \alpha$$

- Here we don't have H^1 in all variables which seems critical in the calculation
- We argue by contradiction and compactness

De Giorgi isoperimetric argument (2)

- We want to prove (a source term could also be included. . .)

Theorem

For all $\delta_1, \delta_2 > 0$ and $f \leq 1$ solution of our equation on Q_2 and

$$\left| \left\{ f \geq \frac{1}{2} \right\} \cap Q_1 \right| \geq \delta_1 \quad \text{and} \quad |\{f \leq 0\} \cap Q_1| \geq \delta_2$$

there is $\alpha > 0$ depending on δ_1, δ_2

$$\left| \left\{ 0 < f < \frac{1}{2} \right\} \cap Q_1 \right| \geq \alpha$$

- We consider a contradiction sequence f_k, A_k (the diffusion matrix must be let depending on n , i.e. oscillating in order to prove something universal and independent of scaling-zooming)

De Giorgi isoperimetric argument (3)

- The sequence satisfies $\lambda \text{Id} \leq A_k \leq \Lambda \text{Id}$ and $f_k \leq 1$

$$\left| \left\{ f_k \geq \frac{1}{2} \right\} \cap Q_1 \right| \geq \delta_1 \quad \text{and} \quad |\{f_k \leq 0\} \cap Q_1| \geq \delta_2$$

$$\left| \left\{ 0 < f_k < \frac{1}{2} \right\} \cap Q_1 \right| \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} 0$$

- The positive part f_k^+ is a subsolution, it has a weak limit in $L^2_{t,x} H^1_v$ by the energy estimate and a strong limit in $L^2_{t,x,v}$ by the H^s regularity
- Consider $T = 1/2$ in $[1/2, 1]$ smooth, then the limit $g = T(f^+)$ satisfies $0 \leq g \leq 1$ and $|\{0 < g < \frac{1}{2}\} \cap Q_1| = 0$
- And since

$$\int T''(f_n^+) A_n \nabla_v f_n \cdot \nabla_v f_n \phi \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} 0$$

by the gain of integrability on $\nabla_v f_n$, g is still a subsolution

De Giorgi isoperimetric argument (4)

- Hence we have built a subsolution g that only the values 0 and $1/2$ but also inherits

$$\left| \left\{ g \geq \frac{1}{2} \right\} \cap Q_1 \right| \geq \delta_1 \quad \text{and} \quad |\{g \leq 0\} \cap Q_1| \geq \delta_2$$

- Observe that for almost every x , by the classical isoperimetric lemma in v (using the H_v^1 control) it is constant in v , and $\nabla_v g = 0$
- It remains to identify the limit (product of weak limits)

$$h_k = A_k \nabla_v g_k \rightharpoonup_{L^2(Q_1)} h$$

- Using the equation integrated against $g_k \phi$ we have

$$\int h_k \cdot \nabla_v (g_k \phi) \rightarrow \int h \nabla_v (g \phi)$$

which implies since $\nabla_v g = 0$ and $g_k \rightarrow g$ strongly in L^2 that

$$\int h_k \cdot (\nabla_v g_k) \phi \rightarrow 0$$

De Giorgi isoperimetric argument (5)

- We deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \int |h|^2 \phi &\leq \liminf \int |A_k \nabla_v g_k|^2 \phi \\ &\leq \Lambda \lim \int h_k \cdot \nabla_v g_k = 0 \end{aligned}$$

and therefore $h = 0$

- Finally we end up with $\partial_t g + v \cdot \nabla_x g \leq 0$ with some mass at 0 and $1/2$ which implies a contradiction by studying the trajectories of free transport
- Note that this proof is **not** quantitative and finding a quantitative proof would be very interesting

From the isoperimetric estimate to the supremum

- Use the $L^2 - L^\infty$ gain locally: if not enough L^2 mass then supremum is low
- Iterate $f_{k+1} = 2f_k - 1$ which preserves $f_k \leq 1$ and prove that for some k_0 large enough (finite) then $|\{f_{k_0} \geq 0\} \cap Q_1|$ is small enough to get $\|f_{k_0}\|_{L^\infty(Q_{1/2})} \leq 1/2$
- This means back on f : $f \leq 1 - 2^{-1-k_0}$
- k_0 has to exist since mass α necessary each time too much mass above...