BOUNDARY VORTICITY ESTIMATES FOR NAVIER–STOKES AND APPLICATION TO THE INVISCID LIMIT[*]

ALEXIS F. VASSEUR[†] AND JINCHENG YANG[†]

Abstract. Consider the steady solution to the incompressible Euler equation $\bar{u} = Ae_1$ in the periodic tunnel $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^{d-1} \times (0,1)$ in dimension $d = 2, 3$. Consider now the family of solutions u^ν to the associated Navier–Stokes equation with the no-slip condition on the flat boundaries, for small viscosities $\nu = A/\mathrm{Re}$, and initial values in L^2. We are interested in the weak inviscid limits up to subsequences $u^\nu \rightharpoonup u^\infty$ when both the viscosity ν converges to 0, and the initial value u_0^ν converges to Ae_1 in L^2. Under a conditional assumption on the energy dissipation close to the boundary, Kato showed in 1984 that u^ν converges to Ae_1 strongly in L^2 uniformly in time under this double limit. It is still unknown whether this inviscid limit is unconditionally true. The convex integration method produces solutions u_E to the Euler equation with the same initial values Ae_1 which verify at time $0 < T < T_0$: $\|u_E(T) - Ae_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \approx A^3 T$. This predicts the possibility of a layer separation with an energy of order $A^3 T$. We show in this paper that the energy of layer separation associated with any asymptotic u^∞ obtained via double limits cannot be more than $\|u^\infty(T) - Ae_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \lesssim A^3 T$. This result holds unconditionally for any weak limit of Leray–Hopf solutions of the Navier–Stokes equation. Especially, it shows that, even if the limit is not unique, the shear flow pattern is observable up to time $1/A$. This provides a notion of stability despite the possible nonuniqueness of the limit predicted by the convex integration theory. The result relies on a new boundary vorticity estimate for the Navier–Stokes equation. This new estimate, inspired by previous work on higher regularity estimates for Navier–Stokes, provides a nonlinear control scalable through the inviscid limit.

Key words. Navier-Stokes equation, inviscid limit, boundary regularity, blowup technique, layer separation

MSC codes. 76D05, 35B65

DOI. 10.1137/22M1503567

1. Introduction. For dimension $d = 2, 3$, we consider the periodic channel with physical boundary at $x_d = 0$ and $x_d = 1$: $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^{d-1} \times (0,1)$, where $\mathbb{T} = [0,1]_{\mathrm{per}}$ denotes the unit periodic domain. For any kinematic viscosity $\nu > 0$, we denote $u^\nu : (0,T) \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^d$ as the velocity field of an incompressible fluid confined in Ω, subject to no-slip boundary conditions, and $P^\nu : (0,T) \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ the associated pressure field. The dynamics of the flow is described by the following Navier–Stokes equation:

$$(\mathrm{NSE}_\nu) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t u^\nu + u^\nu \cdot \nabla u^\nu + \nabla P^\nu = \nu \Delta u^\nu & \text{in } (0,T) \times \Omega, \\ \mathrm{div}\, u^\nu = 0 & \text{in } (0,T) \times \Omega, \\ u^\nu = 0 & \text{for } x_d = 0, \text{ and } x_d = 1. \end{cases}$$

For any $A > 0$, we investigate the inviscid asymptotic behavior of u^ν when ν converges to 0, under the condition that the initial values converge to a plug flow of strength A:

[†]Department of Mathematics, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712, USA (vasseur@math.utexas.edu, https://ma.utexas.edu/~vasseur, jcyang@math.utexas.edu, https://ma.utexas.edu/~jcyang).

FIG. 1. *Two-dimensional periodic channel.*

$$\lim_{\nu \to 0} \|u^\nu(0) - Ae_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = 0. \tag{1.1}$$

Note that the steady plug flow $\bar{u}(t,x) = Ae_1$ is a solution to the Euler equation with impermeability boundary condition:

$$\text{(EE)} \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t \bar{u} + \bar{u} \cdot \nabla \bar{u} + \nabla \bar{P} = 0 & \text{in } (0,T) \times \Omega, \\ \operatorname{div} \bar{u} = 0 & \text{in } (0,T) \times \Omega, \\ \bar{u} \cdot n = 0 & \text{for } x_d = 0, \text{ and } x_d = 1, \end{cases}$$

where n is the outer normal as shown in Figure 1. However, it is an outstanding open question (even in dimension 2) whether, in the double limit (1.1) and $\nu \to 0$, the solution u^ν of (NSE_ν) converges to this plug flow Ae_1. The difficulty of this problem stems from the discrepancy between the no-slip boundary condition for the Navier–Stokes equation and the impermeable boundary condition of the Euler equation. Kato [20] showed in 1984 a conditional result ensuring this convergence under the a priori assumption that the energy dissipation rate in a very thin boundary layer Γ_ν of width proportional to ν vanishes:

$$\lim_{\nu \to 0} \int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_\nu} \nu \left| \nabla u^\nu \right|^2 \mathrm{d}x \, \mathrm{d}t = 0.$$

This condition has been sharpened in a variety of ways (see, for instance, [34, 37, 21, 22] and Kelliher [23] for a general review), and similar other conditional results have been derived (see, for instance, [2, 8, 7, 9]). Unconditional results of strong inviscid limits have been obtained only for real analytic initial data [30], vanishing vorticity near the boundary [25, 13], or symmetries [24, 27]. Since [29], it is expected that in favorable cases, the Prandtl boundary layer describes the behavior of the solution u^ν up to a distance proportional to $\sqrt{\nu}$. However, even in the simple shear flow case, it is possible to engineer families of initial values $u^\nu(0)$ converging to the shear flow, but associated with Prandtl boundary layers which are either strongly unstable [16], blow up in finite time [12], or even ill-posed in the Sobolev framework [14, 15].

It is actually believed that the inviscid asymptotic limit may fail due to turbulence (See Bardos and Titi [1]). This scenario is consistent with the nonuniqueness pathology of the shear flow solution for the Euler system (EE). Indeed, an adaptation to the boundary value problem (EE) of the construction based on convex integration

of Székelyhidi in [33] provides infinitely many solutions to (EE) with initial value Ae_1 (see also Bardos, Titi, Wiedemann [2] for a different boundary geometry). More precisely, the following estimate can be proved on this construction (see Appendix A).

PROPOSITION 1.1. *For any $0 < C < 2$, there exists a solution v to* (EE) *with initial value Ae_1 such that for any time $T < 1/(2A)$*

$$\|v(T) - Ae_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 = CA^3 T.$$

The convex integration is a powerful tool introduced by De Lellis and Székelyhidi [10] to construct weak solutions to the Euler equation. It proved itself to be a powerful tool to model turbulence. For instance, the technique was successfully applied by Isett [17] to prove the Onsager theorem (see also [3] for the construction of admissible solutions, and [6] for the proof of the other direction). It shows that turbulent flows can have regularity C^α for any α up to $1/3$, a property conjectured by Onsager [28]. Proposition 1.1 predicts the possible deviation from the initial plug flow Ae_1 due to turbulence, a phenomenon called layer separation. Moreover, it provides an explicit value for the L^2 norm of this layer separation.

This article aims to provide an upper bound on the L^2 norm of possible layer separations through the double limit inviscid asymptotics. In our channel framework, the Reynolds number is given by $\mathsf{Re} = A/\nu$. Our main theorem is the following.

THEOREM 1.2. *Let Ω be a unit periodic channel in $\mathbb{R}^d$ of dimension $d = 2,3$. There exists $C > 0$ depending on d only, such that the following is true. Let Ae_1 be a plug flow for some $A > 0$, and let u^ν be a Leray–Hopf solution to* (NSE$_\nu$) *with kinematic viscosity $\nu > 0$. For any $T > 0$, we have*

$$\|u^\nu(T) - Ae_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\nu}{2}\|\nabla u^\nu\|_{L^2((0,T)\times\Omega)}^2$$
$$\leq 4\|u^\nu(0) - Ae_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + CA^3 T + CA^2 \mathsf{Re}^{-1}\log(2 + \mathsf{Re}).$$

This theorem is the special case of a more general result given in Theorem 1.5 at the end of this section. By the Leray–Hopf solution, we mean any weak solution to (NSE$_\nu$) which in addition verifies the energy inequality:

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\|u^\nu\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq -\nu\|\nabla u^\nu\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.$$

We have the following corollary on any weak inviscid limit, which corresponds to the layer separation predicted by Proposition 1.1.

COROLLARY 1.3. *There exists a universal constant $C > 0$ such that the following is true. Consider any family u^ν of a Leray–Hopf solution to* (NSE$_\nu$) *such that u_0^ν converges strongly in $L^2(\Omega)$ to Ae_1. Then, for any weak limit u^∞ of weakly convergent subsequences of u^ν, we have for almost every $T > 0$ that*

$$\|u^\infty(T) - Ae_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq CA^3 T.$$

Note that the solutions u^ν are uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+, L^2(\Omega))$. Therefore they converge weakly up to a subsequence in $L_{t,x}^2$.

The result is built upon the conjecture that the double limit to Ae_1 in the inviscid asymptotic may fail, which is related to the physical relevance of the solutions constructed by convex integration. An interesting question is whether such solutions can

be themselves obtained via a double limit in the inviscid asymptotic. A first result in this direction was provided by Buckmaster and Vicol [4] where they constructed via convex integration, in the case without boundary, weak solutions at the level of Navier–Stokes. They show that the inviscid limit of this family of Navier–Stokes solutions can converge to weak solutions of Euler. However, these weak solutions constructed at the level of Navier–Stokes do not have enough regularity to be Leray–Hopf solutions, and therefore do not fit into the framework of Corollary 1.3.

Nonuniqueness and pattern predictability. The nonuniqueness of solutions to the Euler equation, as proved by convex integration, puts under question the ability of the model itself to predict the future. Theorem 1.2 provides a first example of how nonuniqueness and pattern predictability can be reconciled. The energy of the plug flow is A^2, while the maximum energy of the layer separation is bounded above by CA^3T. This predicts pattern visibility on a lapse of time $1/A$. On this lapse of time, the layer separation stays negligible compared to the plug flow pattern. Especially, the smaller the pattern is (small A), the longer the prediction stays accurate.

Inviscid limit and boundary vorticity. It is well known that the possible growth of the layer separation is closely related to the creation of boundary vorticity (see Kelliher [21], for instance). To see this, we formally compute the evolution of the L^2 distance between u^ν and $\bar{u}$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\left\|u^\nu - \bar{u}\right\|_{L^2}^2 &= (u^\nu - \bar{u}, \partial_t u^\nu) \\
&= -(u^\nu - \bar{u}, u^\nu \cdot \nabla u^\nu) - (u^\nu - \bar{u}, \nabla P^\nu) + \nu(u^\nu - \bar{u}, \Delta u^\nu) \\
&= \nu(u^\nu, \Delta u^\nu) - \nu(\bar{u}, \Delta u^\nu) \\
&= -\nu\left\|\nabla u^\nu\right\|_{L^2}^2 - \int_{\partial\Omega} J[\bar{u}] \cdot (\nu\omega^\nu)\mathrm{d}x',
\end{aligned}
$$

(1.2)

where $J[\bar{u}] = n^\perp \cdot \bar{u}$ when $d = 2$ and $J[\bar{u}] = n \times \bar{u}$ when $d = 3$, and ω^ν is the vorticity of u^ν. Since $\bar{u}$ is a constant on the boundaries, it is crucial to estimate the mean boundary vorticity. If the convergence $\nu\omega^\nu|_{\partial\Omega} \to 0$ holds in the average sense, then the inviscid limit would be valid. For a general static smooth solution to Euler's equation $\bar{u}$ in a general domain Ω, we only need $\nu\omega^\nu|_{\partial\Omega} \to 0$ in distribution. This convergence may fail and we could lose uniqueness, but we can still control the size of the impact from this boundary vorticity using Theorem 1.4 below.

Before showing the theorem, we first illustrate which estimates we may expect and how they prove Theorem 1.2. Denote the energy dissipation by

$$
D := \nu\left\|\nabla u^\nu\right\|_{L^2((0,T)\times\Omega)}^2.
$$

If we take the curl of (NSE_ν), we have the vorticity equation,

$$
\partial_t\omega + u \cdot \nabla\omega = \nu\Delta\omega + \omega \cdot \nabla u.
$$

The main difficulties are due to the transport term $u \cdot \nabla\omega$, and the boundary. Let us put aside those two difficulties for now, and focus on the other terms. Then the regularity we could expect for ω is at best

$$
\nu^2\left\|\nabla^2\omega\right\|_{L^1((0,T)\times\Omega)} \lesssim_d \nu\left\|\omega \cdot \nabla u\right\|_{L^1((0,T)\times\Omega)} \leq D.
$$

Here $A \lesssim_d B$ means $A \leq C(d)B$ for some constant $C(d)$ depending in dimension d only. This is not rigorous because the parabolic regularization is false in L^1, but let us also ignore this issue for the moment. By interpolation, we have

$$\nu^{\frac{3}{2}} \left\| \nabla^{\frac{2}{3}} \omega \right\|_{L^{\frac{3}{2}}((0,T)\times\Omega)}^{\frac{3}{2}} \lesssim_d \left(\nu^2 \left\| \nabla^2 \omega \right\|_{L^1((0,T)\times\Omega)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\nu \left\| \omega \right\|_{L^2((0,T)\times\Omega)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim_d D.$$

Finally the trace theorem suggests that (again, this is the borderline case for the trace theorem, so in no way a rigorous proof)

$$(1.3) \qquad \qquad \|\nu\omega\|_{L^{\frac{3}{2}}((0,T)\times\partial\Omega)}^{\frac{3}{2}} \lesssim_d D.$$

Using this $L^{\frac{3}{2}}$ estimate, if we integrate (1.2) from 0 to T, we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \|u^\nu - \bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 (T) + D$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2} \|u^\nu - \bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 (0) + \|J[\bar{u}] \cdot \nu\omega^\nu\|_{L^1((0,T)\times\partial\Omega)}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2} \|u^\nu - \bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 (0) + \|\nu\omega^\nu\|_{L^{\frac{3}{2}}((0,T)\times\partial\Omega)} \|\bar{u}\|_{L^3((0,T)\times\partial\Omega)}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2} \|u^\nu - \bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 (0) + \frac{1}{2}D + CA^3 T |\partial\Omega|$$

for some constant C depending on d only. By absorbing $\frac{1}{2}D$ to the left we finish the proof of Theorem 1.2. Note, however, that this direct proof collapses due to the transport term. In dimension three, u can be controlled at best in $L_{t,x}^{10/3}$ while the best control of $\nabla\omega$ is in the Lorentz spaces $L_{t,x}^{4/3,q}$ for any $q > 4/3$ (see [36]). But this is far from enough to bound the transport term $u\nabla\omega$ in $L_{t,x}^1$. In dimension 2, the transport term can almost be controlled in L^1. But the bound is in a negative power of ν and so is useless for the asymptotic limit. However, we can use blowup techniques inspired by [35] (see also [5, 36]) which naturally deplete the strength of the transport term.

Boundary vorticity control for the unscaled Navier–Stokes equation. In the review paper [26], Maekawa and Mazzucato summarized the difficulties of considering the inviscid limit with boundary:

> Mathematically, the main difficulty in the case of the no-slip boundary condition is the lack of a priori estimates on strong enough norms to pass to the limit, which in turn is due to the lack of a useful boundary condition for vorticity or pressure.

Following this remark, our proof relies on a new boundary vorticity control. This is a regularization result for the unscaled Navier–Stokes equation. However, it is remarkable that this estimate is rescalable through the inviscid limit $\nu \to 0$. The strategy of looking for uniform estimates with respect to the inviscid scaling was first introduced for one-dimensional (1D) conservation laws in [18]. It was successfully applied to obtain the unconditional double limit inviscid asymptotic in the case of a single shock [19]. Note that if (u^ν, P^ν) is a solution to (NSE$_\nu$), then $u(t,x) = u^\nu(\nu t, \nu x)$, $P(t,x) = P^\nu(\nu t, \nu x)$ solves the Navier–Stokes equation with unit viscosity coefficient in $(0, T/\nu) \times (\Omega/\nu)$:

$$(\text{NSE}) \qquad \qquad \partial_t u + u \cdot \nabla u + \nabla P = \Delta u, \qquad \text{div } u = 0.$$

The regularization result on the vorticity at the boundary is as follows.

THEOREM 1.4 (boundary regularity). *There exists a universal constant $C > 0$ such that the following holds. Let Ω be a periodic channel of period W and height H*

of dimension $d = 2$ or 3. For any Leray–Hopf solution u to (NSE_1) in $(0,T) \times \Omega$, there exists a parabolic dyadic decomposition[1]

$$\text{closure } \big\{(0,T) \times \partial\Omega\big\} = \text{closure } \big\{ \bigcup_i (s^i, t^i) \times \bar{B}_{r_i}(x^i) \big\},$$

where $0 \le s^i < t^i \le T$, $0 < r^i < \frac{W}{2}$, $x^i \in \partial\Omega$, and

$$\bar{B}_r(y) = \{(x', x_d) \in \partial\Omega : \|x' - y'\|_{\ell^\infty} < r, x_d = y_d\}$$

is a box of dimension $d - 1$ in $\partial\Omega$, such that the following is true. Define a piecewise constant function $\tilde{\omega} : (0,T) \times \partial\Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ by taking averages

$$\tilde{\omega}(t,x) = \frac{1}{|\bar{B}_{r^i}|} \int_{\bar{B}_{r^i}(x^i)} \left| \frac{1}{t^i - s^i} \int_{s^i}^{t^i} \omega \, \mathrm{d}t \right| \mathrm{d}x' \qquad for \ t \in (s^i, t^i), x \in \bar{B}_{r^i}(x^i).$$

Then

$$\left\| \tilde{\omega} \mathbf{1}_{\left\{ \tilde{\omega} > \max\left\{ \frac{1}{t}, \frac{1}{W^2}, \frac{1}{H^2} \right\} \right\}} \right\|_{L^{\frac{3}{2}, \infty}((0,T) \times \partial\Omega)}^{\frac{3}{2}} \le C \left\| \nabla u \right\|_{L^2((0,T) \times \Omega)}^2.$$

This theorem provides a "scaling invariant" nonlinear estimate, that is, both sides of the estimate have the same scaling under the canonical scaling of the Navier–Stokes equation $(t,x) \mapsto \varepsilon u(\varepsilon^2 t, \varepsilon x)$. The bounds in the theorem do not depend on the size of Ω or the terminal time T, and we do not require any smallness for the initial energy.

The conclusion of this theorem is slightly different from what we hope in (1.3), due to some difficulties that we overlooked in the formal argument. To begin with, the higher regularity $\nabla^2 \omega \in L^1$ is not known. As mentioned before, one reason is the transport term $u \cdot \nabla \omega$ is indeed hard to control. Using blowup techniques along the trajectories of the flow first introduced in [35], it was proved in [36] that without a boundary in $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3$, $\nabla^2 \omega \in L^{1,q}$ locally for $q > 1$ but misses the endpoint L^1. The bounded domain is even more complicated because of the lack of convenient global control on the pressure. In turn, it means that no control on the pressure can be brought locally through the blowup process. This poses problems when applying the boundary regularity theory for the linear evolutionary Stokes equation. Indeed, a counterexample constructed in [31] shows that we cannot control oscillations in time that way. The idea which remedies this problem consists in smoothing locally in time to gain some integrability. We can then apply the boundary Stokes estimate for $\int u \, \mathrm{d}t$ instead of u. This justifies the construction of $\tilde{\omega}$ via local smoothing in Theorem 1.4. Last, because the maximal function is not a bounded operator in L^1, we only obtained a weak $L^{\frac{3}{2}}$ norm instead of an $L^{\frac{3}{2}}$ norm.

Note that because $J[\bar{u}]$ is constant on the boundary $\partial\Omega$, and because $\tilde{\omega}$ is constructed via local smoothing on disjoint domains, we have

$$\left| \int_0^T \int_{\partial\Omega} J[\bar{u}] \cdot \omega^\nu \, \mathrm{d}x' \mathrm{d}t \right| \le \left| \int_0^T \int_{\partial\Omega} J[\bar{u}] \cdot \tilde{\omega}^\nu \, \mathrm{d}x' \mathrm{d}t \right|.$$

We can then apply Theorem 1.4, and proceed as in the formal computation. One last difficulty is that Theorem 1.4 is a regularization result, and so the estimate weakens when t goes to 0. Indeed, it controls only $\tilde{\omega} > \max \left\{ \frac{1}{t}, \frac{1}{W^2}, \frac{1}{H^2} \right\}$. If we integrate the

---

[1]A dyadic decomposition into cubes of parabolic scaling. See Definition 3.2.

remainder, there will be a logarithmic singularity at $t = 0$. To avoid this, we apply the vorticity bound only in the time interval $t \in (T_\nu, T)$ for some small time $T_\nu \approx \nu^3$, and for $t \in (0, T_\nu)$ we use a very short time stability of a stable Prandtl layer to bridge the gap.

General case. We actually do the proof in a slightly more general setting. We will consider a periodic channel with width W and height H, where the physical boundaries are localized at $x_d = 0$ and $x_d = H$ (see Figure 1):

$$\Omega = \left\{ (x', x_d) : 0 \leq x_d \leq H, x' \in [0, W]_{\text{per}}^{d-1} \right\}.$$

The following theorem estimates the layer separation for a more general shear flow $\bar{u}$ of the following form:

$$\bar{u}(x) = \begin{cases} \bar{U}(x_2)e_1, & d = 2, \\ \bar{U}_1(x_3)e_1 + \bar{U}_2(x_3)e_2, & d = 3. \end{cases}$$

In this configuration, we define the Reynolds number as

$$\mathsf{Re} = \frac{AH}{\nu},$$

where $A = \|\bar{u}\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)}$ is the boundary shear.

THEOREM 1.5 (general shear flow). *There exists a universal constant $C > 0$ such that the following holds. Let Ω be a bounded periodic channel with period W and height H in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with $d = 2$ or 3. Let $\bar{u}$ be a static shear flow in Ω with bounded vorticity, and let u^ν be a Leray–Hopf solution to* (NSE_ν). *For a given $\bar{u}$ defined as above, denote the maximum shear, boundary velocity, and kinetic energy of $\bar{u}$ by*

$$G := \|\nabla\bar{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, \qquad A := \|\bar{u}\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)}, \qquad E := \|\bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.$$

For any $T > 0$, we have

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left\{ \|u^\nu - \bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2(t) + \frac{\nu}{2}\|\nabla u^\nu\|_{L^2((0,t)\times\Omega)}^2 \right\}$$

$$\leq \exp(2GT)\bigg\{ 4\|u^\nu(0) - \bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + 2\nu G^2 T |\Omega| + CA^2 |\Omega| \, \mathsf{Re}^{-1} \log(2 + \mathsf{Re})$$

$$+ 2\mathsf{Re}^{-1}E + CA^3 T |\partial\Omega| \max\{H/W, 1\}^2 \bigg\}.$$

Note that Theorem 1.2 is a direct consequence of Theorem 1.5 with $H = W = 1$, $\bar{U} = A$ for $d = 2$, and $\bar{U}_1 = A, \bar{U}_2 = 0$ for $d = 3$.

We remark here to what extent could the constant shear flow configuration of $\bar{u}$ be generalized to other Euler solutions. The constancy of $\bar{u}$ is indeed very important to the local estimate, where we need to take the time average of the Navier–Stokes solution. As a consequence, constancy in time seems indispensable to our technique but constancy in space can be relaxed. As for the choice of shear structure, it allows us to facilitate short-time estimates on the Prandtl layer solution. If the steady Euler solution $\bar{u}$ is not a shear solution, we would need to make a finer estimate on the short-time stability of the Prandtl layer solution.

This paper is organized as follows. We first introduce necessary tools in section 2. The boundary vorticity estimate and the proof of Theorem 1.4 are shown in section 3. In section 4 we finish the proof of the main results, which are Theorems 1.2 and 1.5. Finally, we prove Proposition 1.1 in the appendix.

2. Notations and preliminary. We begin with some notations. We will be working with boxes more often than balls. For this reason, let us denote the spatial box and the space-time cube of radius r by

$$B_r := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x\|_{\ell^\infty} < r \right\}, \qquad Q_r := (-r^2, 0) \times B_r.$$

We denote the same box and cube centered at x and (t, x) by $B_r(x)$ and $Q_r(t, x)$, respectively. Near the boundary $\{x_d = 0\}$, we denote the half-box and its boundary part by

$$B_r^+ := \{(x', x_d) : \|x'\|_{\ell^\infty} < r, 0 < x_d < r\}, \qquad \bar{B}_r := \{(x', 0) : \|x'\|_{\ell^\infty} < r\},$$

and denote their space-time version by

$$Q_r^+ = (-r^2, 0) \times B_r^+, \qquad \bar{Q}_r = (-r^2, 0) \times \bar{B}_r.$$

Finally, for a bounded set Ω and $f \in L^2(\Omega)$, we denote the average of f in Ω as

$$\fint_\Omega f \mathrm{d}x = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_\Omega f \mathrm{d}x.$$

In this section, we provide some useful preliminary results and some corollaries, which will be used later in the paper. Most are widely known, and we do not claim any originality in the proof, but we include them here for completeness.

2.1. Evolutionary Stokes equation. Let (u, P) be the solution to the following Stokes equation:

$$\text{(SE)} \qquad \begin{cases} \partial_t u + \nabla P = \Delta u + f & \text{in } (0, T) \times \Omega, \\ \operatorname{div} u = 0 & \text{in } (0, T) \times \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Recall the following estimates on Stokes equations, which can be found in the book of Seregin [31].

THEOREM 2.1 (Cauchy problem, [31, section 4.4, Theorem 4.5]). *Let Ω be a bounded domain with smooth boundary. Let $1 < p, q < \infty$, and $f \in L^p(0, T; L^q(\Omega))$. There exists a unique solution (u, P) to* (SE) *such that*
  (1) *u satisfies the zero initial-boundary condition:*

$$u = 0 \text{ at } t = 0,$$
$$u = 0 \text{ on } (0, T) \times \partial\Omega.$$

  (2) *P satisfies the zero mean condition:*

$$\int_\Omega P(t, x) \mathrm{d}x = 0 \text{ at any } t \in (0, T).$$

Moreover, we have the coercive estimate

$$\left\| |\partial_t u| + |\nabla^2 u| + |\nabla P| \right\|_{L^p(0, T; L^q(\Omega))} \leq C(\Omega, p, q) \|f\|_{L^p(0, T; L^q(\Omega))}.$$

THEOREM 2.2 (Local boundary regularity, [31, section 4.7 Proposition 7.10]). *Let* $1 < p < \infty$, $1 < q \leq q' < \infty$. *Assume* $u, \nabla u, P \in L_t^p L_x^q(Q_2^+)$, $f \in L_t^p L_x^{q'}(Q_2^+)$, *and* (u, P) *satisfy* (SE) *in* $\Omega = Q_2^+$. *Moreover, assume*

(2.1)
$$u = 0 \text{ on } \{x_d = 0\}.$$

Then we have the local boundary estimate

$$\big\| |\partial_t u| + |\nabla^2 u| + |\nabla P| \big\|_{L_t^p L_x^{q'}(Q_1^+)}$$
$$\leq C(p, q, q') \left(\big\| |u| + |\nabla u| + |P| \big\|_{L_t^p L_x^q(Q_2^+)} + \|f\|_{L_t^p L_x^{q'}(Q_1^+)} \right).$$

Combining these two estimates, we derive the following mixed case.

COROLLARY 2.3. *Let* $1 < p_2 < p_1 < \infty$, $1 < q_1, q_2 < \infty$, $f \in L_t^{p_1} L_x^{q_1}(Q_2^+)$, $u, \nabla u, P \in L_t^{p_2} L_x^{q_2}(Q_2^+)$. *If* (u, P) *satisfies* (SE) *in* Q_2^+ *and* u *satisfies* (2.1), *then* $u = u_1 + u_2$ *satisfying for any* $q' < \infty$, *there exists a constant* $C = C(p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2, q')$ *such that*

$$\big\| |\partial_t u_1| + |\nabla^2 u_1| \big\|_{L_t^{p_1} L_x^{q_1}(Q_1^+)} + \big\| |\partial_t u_2| + |\nabla^2 u_2| \big\|_{L_t^{p_2} L_x^{q'}(Q_1^+)}$$
$$\leq C \left(\|f\|_{L_t^{p_1} L_x^{q_1}(Q_2^+)} + \big\| |u| + |\nabla u| + |P| \big\|_{L_t^{p_2} L_x^{q_2}(Q_2^+)} \right).$$

Proof. Let Ω' be a smooth domain such that $B_{\frac{3}{2}}^+ \subset \Omega' \subset B_2^+$. Define u_1 to be the solution to the Cauchy problem in Ω' with force f. By Theorem 2.1, we obtain

$$\big\| |\partial_t u_1| + |\nabla^2 u_1| + |\nabla P_1| \big\|_{L^{p_1}(-4,0; L^{q_1}(\Omega'))} \leq C \|f\|_{L_t^{p_1} L_x^{q_1}(Q_2^+)}.$$

Since u_1 has trace zero, P_1 has mean zero, we have

$$\big\| |u_1| + |\nabla u_1| + |P_1| \big\|_{L^{p_1}(-4,0; L^{q_1}(\Omega'))} \leq C \|f\|_{L_t^{p_1} L_x^{q_1}(Q_2^+)}.$$

Now we define $u_2 = u - u_1, P_2 = P - P_1$. Since $p_1 > p_2$, we have

$$\big\| |u_2| + |\nabla u_2| + |P_2| \big\|_{L_t^{p_2} L_x^{\min\{q_1, q_2\}}(Q_{3/2}^+)}$$
$$\leq C \left(\|f\|_{L_t^{p_1} L_x^{q_1}(Q_2^+)} + \big\| |u| + |\nabla u| + |P| \big\|_{L_t^{p_2} L_x^{q_2}(Q_2^+)} \right).$$

Note that u_2 solves (SE) with zero force term in $Q_{\frac{3}{2}}^+$, so the desired result follows by applying Theorem 2.2. □

2.2. Inhomogeneous Sobolev embedding. We show that given partial derivatives bounded in inhomogeneous Lebesgue spaces, a binary function is bounded in L^∞.

LEMMA 2.4 (inhomogeneous supercritical Sobolev embedding). *Let* $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, *and* $\Omega = \{(t, z) : t \in [-1, 0], z \in [0, 1]\}$. *Let* $u \in L^1(\Omega)$ *with weak partial derivatives bounded in inhomogeneous spaces*

$$\partial_t u \in L_t^1 L_z^\infty(\Omega) + L_t^q L_z^1(\Omega), \qquad \partial_z u \in L_t^p L_z^\infty(\Omega) + L_t^\infty L_z^r(\Omega)$$

with $p > \frac{1}{\alpha}, q > \frac{1}{1-\alpha}, r > 1$, *then* $u \in C(\Omega)$ *is continuous with oscillations bounded by*

$$\sup_\Omega u - \inf_\Omega u = \|u\|_{\operatorname{osc}(\Omega)} \leq C \left(\|\partial_t u\|_{L_t^1 L_z^\infty + L_t^q L_z^1} + \|\partial_z u\|_{L_t^p L_z^\infty + L_t^\infty L_z^r} \right),$$

where $C = C(p, q, r)$ *depends on* p, q, r.

FIG. 2. *Inhomogeneous Sobolev embedding.*

Proof. Up to cutoff and mollification, we may assume $u \in C^\infty((-\infty, 0] \times [0, \infty))$ with compact support in $2\Omega = (-2, 0] \times [0, 2)$. Up to translation, we show $u(0,0)$ is bounded. By the fundamental theorem of calculus, for any $\lambda > 0$, we have

$$0 = u(0,0) + \int_0^\infty \frac{\partial}{\partial s} u(-s, \lambda s^\alpha) \mathrm{d}s.$$

Taking the average for $\lambda \in \left(\frac{1}{2}, 2\right)$ yields

$$|u(0,0)| \leq \int_{\frac{1}{2}}^2 \int_0^\infty |\partial_t u| + \lambda \alpha s^{\alpha-1} |\partial_z u| \, \mathrm{d}s \, \mathrm{d}\lambda.$$

The Jacobian of $(t, z) = (s, \lambda s^\alpha)$ is

$$\frac{D(t, z)}{D(s, \lambda)} = \det \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ \lambda \alpha s^{\alpha-1} & s^\alpha \end{bmatrix} = s^\alpha = |t|^\alpha \sim z,$$

thus we can bound $u(0,0)$ via a change of variable by

$$|u(0,0)| \leq \int_{\mathscr{C}} \left(|\partial_t u| + \alpha z |t|^{-1} |\partial_z u| \right) |t|^{-\alpha} \, \mathrm{d}z \, \mathrm{d}t$$

$$= \int_{\mathscr{C}} |t|^{-\alpha} |\partial_t u| + \alpha \lambda |t|^{-1} |\partial_z u| \, \mathrm{d}z \, \mathrm{d}t,$$

where $\mathscr{C}$ is the region illustrated in Figure 2.

Now we compute inhomogeneous norms of $|t|^{-1}$ and $|t|^{-\alpha}$ in $\mathscr{C}$:

$$\int_{\frac{1}{2}|t|^\alpha}^{2|t|^\alpha} |t|^{-\alpha} \, \mathrm{d}z = \frac{3}{2} \in L_t^\infty(-2, 0),$$

$$\left\| |t|^{-\alpha} \right\|_{L_z^\infty(\frac{1}{2}|t|^\alpha, 2|t|^\alpha)} = |t|^{-\alpha} \in L_t^{q'}(-2, 0),$$

$$\int_{\frac{1}{2}|t|^\alpha}^{2|t|^\alpha} |t|^{-1} \, \mathrm{d}z = \frac{3}{2} |t|^{\alpha-1} \in L_t^{p'}(-2, 0),$$

$$\|1/t\|_{L_z^{r'}(\frac{1}{2}|t|^\alpha, 2|t|^\alpha)} = |t|^{-1} \left(\frac{3}{2} |t|^\alpha \right)^{\frac{1}{r'}} \lesssim |t|^{\frac{\alpha}{r'} - 1} \in L_t^1(-2, 0).$$

Here $p' < \frac{1}{\alpha}, q' < \frac{1}{1-\alpha}, r' < \infty$ are the Hölder conjugates of p, q, r, respectively. In conclusion, $|t|^{-1}$ and $|t|^{-\alpha}$ are bounded in spaces

$$|t|^{-\alpha} \in L_t^\infty L_z^1 \cap L_t^{q'} L_z^\infty, \qquad\qquad |t|^{-1} \in L_t^{p'} L_z^1 \cap L_t^1 L_z^{r'},$$

which completes the proof of this lemma by the Hölder inequality. $\qquad\square$

2.3. Parabolic maximal function. Let us introduce the following notion of maximal function adapted to the parabolic scaling.

DEFINITION 2.5 (parabolic maximal function). *For $f \in L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, we define the parabolic maximal function by taking the greatest mean values*

$$\mathcal{M}f(t,x) := \sup_{r>0} \fint_{t-r^2}^{t+r^2} \fint_{B_r(x)} |f(s,y)| \mathrm{d}y \, \mathrm{d}s.$$

For $f \in L^1((0,T) \times \Omega)$, where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a bounded set, we can define $\mathcal{M}f$ by applying the previous definition on the zero extension of f in $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$.

Recall the classical weak type $(1,1)$ bound on the maximal function $\mathcal{M}$:

$$\|\mathcal{M}f\|_{L^{1,\infty}} \leq C_d \|f\|_{L^1}.$$

2.4. Lipschitz decay of 1D heat equation. We end this section by reminding the readers that solutions to the 1D heat equation have a decay rate of $t^{-\frac{3}{4}}$ in the Lipschitz norm. It will be useful to control the Prandtl layer in a small initial time of order $O(\nu^3)$. This result is very elementary. We give the proof for the sake of completeness.

LEMMA 2.6. *For $z > 0$ we have*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^2 e^{-n^2 z} < z^{-\frac{3}{2}}.$$

Proof. We can approximate this infinite series by

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^2 e^{-n^2 z} = z^{-\frac{3}{2}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\sqrt{z}n)^2 e^{-(\sqrt{z}n)^2} \sqrt{z}$$

$$= z^{-\frac{3}{2}} \left(\int_0^{\infty} x^2 e^{-x^2} \mathrm{d}x + O(\sqrt{z}) \right)$$

$$= \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{4} z^{-\frac{3}{2}} + O(z^{-1}),$$

when $z \to 0$ is small, and

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^2 e^{-n^2 z} \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^2 e^{-nz} = \frac{\mathrm{d}^2}{\mathrm{d}z^2} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-nz} \right) = \frac{\mathrm{d}^2}{\mathrm{d}z^2} \left(\frac{1}{e^z - 1} \right) = \frac{(e^z + 1)e^z}{(e^z - 1)^3} \approx e^{-z}$$

when $z \to \infty$ is large. This proves that the left-hand side is bounded by $Cz^{-\frac{3}{2}}$ for some constant C, which can be easily determined by carefully examining the estimates. $\square$

Using this lemma, we can compute the decay rate.

LEMMA 2.7. *Let $\nu > 0$, $H > 0$, and suppose $v(t, x_d)$ solves the following 1D heat equation in $[0, H]$:*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v = \nu v_{xx} & \text{in } (0, \infty) \times (0, H), \\ v = 0 & \text{on } (0, \infty) \times \{0, H\}, \\ v = v_0 & \text{at } t = 0 \end{cases}$$

with $v_0 \in L^2(0, H)$. Then

$$\|\nabla v(t)\|_{L^{\infty}} \leq \frac{1}{2} (\nu t)^{-\frac{3}{4}} \|v_0\|_{L^2}.$$

Proof. We can write the solutions explicitly in terms of Fourier series. We expand v_0 by a sine series as

$$v_0(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n \sin\left(\frac{n\pi x}{H}\right)$$

with

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n^2 = \frac{2}{H} \|v_0\|_{L^2}^2 < \infty.$$

The solution can be explicitly written as

$$v(t,x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n \sin\left(\frac{n\pi x}{H}\right) e^{-\nu \frac{n^2 \pi^2}{H^2} t},$$

so the derivative is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
|\partial_x v(t,x)| &\le \left| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n \cos\left(\frac{n\pi x}{H}\right) \left(\frac{n\pi}{H}\right) e^{-\nu \frac{n^2 \pi^2}{H^2} t} \right| \\
&\le \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{n\pi}{H}\right)^2 e^{-2\nu \frac{n^2 \pi^2}{H^2} t}, \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\le \left(\frac{2}{H} \|v_0\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{\pi}{H}\right) \left(\frac{2\nu \pi^2 t}{H^2}\right)^{-\frac{3}{4}} \\
&\le \frac{1}{2} (\nu t)^{-\frac{3}{4}} \|v_0\|_{L^2}
\end{aligned}$$

using the previous lemma. □

3. Boundary regularity for the Navier–Stokes equation. The goal of this section is to prove the boundary regularity for the Navier–Stokes equation with a unit viscosity constant: Theorem 1.4. This relies on the following local estimate.

PROPOSITION 3.1. *Suppose (u, P) is a weak solution to* (NSE) *with forcing term $f \in L^1(-4, 0; L^2(B_2^+))$ such that $u \in L^\infty(-4, 0; L^2(B_2^+))$, $\nabla u \in L^2(Q_2^+)$, and in distribution they satisfy*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u + u \cdot \nabla u + \nabla P = \Delta u + f & \text{in } Q_2^+, \\ \text{div}\, u = 0 & \text{in } Q_2^+, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \bar{Q}_2. \end{cases}$$

If we denote

$$c_0 := \int_{-4}^{0} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2(B_2^+)}^2 + \|f\|_{L^2(B_2^+)} \, \mathrm{d}t,$$

then we can bound the average-in-time vorticity on the boundary by

$$\int_{\bar{B}_1} \left| \int_{-1}^{0} \omega(t, x', 0) \mathrm{d}t \right| \mathrm{d}x' \le C(c_0 + c_0^{\frac{1}{2}}).$$

Proof. For $t \in (-3, 0)$, we define

$$U(t, x) = \int_{t-1}^{t} u(s, x) \mathrm{d}s.$$

As explained in the introduction, this is needed to tame the time oscillation of the local pressure, which comes from $\partial_t u$. This allows us to apply the local Stokes estimate at the boundary. Denote $\rho(t) = \mathbf{1}_{[0,1]}(t)$, then $U = u *_t \rho$, where $*_t$ stands for convolution in the t variable only. If we denote $Q = P *_t \rho$, and $F = (f - u \cdot \nabla u) *_t \rho$, then U satisfies the following system:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t U + \nabla Q = \Delta U + F & \text{in } (-3, 0) \times B_2^+, \\ U = 0 & \text{on } \{x_d = 0\}. \end{cases}$$

The proof of this theorem can be divided into three steps: the first two estimate terms in this system, and the last step uses the Stokes estimate and the Sobolev embedding.

Step 1: Estimates on $u, U, \partial_t U, \Delta U$. We have via Sobolev embedding and using that $u = 0$ on $\bar{Q}_2$ that

(3.1) $$\|u\|_{L_t^2 L_x^6(Q_2^+)} \leq C c_0^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

for both dimensions 2 and 3. Since $\partial_t U(t, x) = u(t, x) - u(t - 1, x)$, we have

$$\|\partial_t U\|_{L_t^2 L_x^6((-3,0) \times B_2^+)} \leq C c_0^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

On the other hand, the Laplacian of U is bounded by

$$\|\Delta U\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{-1}((-3,0) \times B_2^+)} \leq C \|\Delta u\|_{L_t^2 H_x^{-1}(Q_2^+)} \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(Q_2^+)} \leq C c_0^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Step 2: Estimates on F and Q. Applying Hölder's inequality, by (3.1) we have

$$\|u \cdot \nabla u\|_{L_t^1 L_x^{\frac{3}{2}}(Q_2^+)} \leq C c_0.$$

Also by (3.1) we have by embedding that

$$\|\operatorname{div}(u \otimes u)\|_{L_t^1 W_x^{-1,3}(Q_2^+)} \leq C c_0$$

for both dimensions 2 and 3. By convolution, we bound F by

$$\|F\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^{\frac{3}{2}}((-3,0) \times B_2^+)}, \|F\|_{L_t^\infty W_x^{-1,3}((-3,0) \times B_2^+)} \leq C c_0.$$

Next we estimate Q. Using $\nabla Q = \Delta U + F - \partial_t U$ we have

$$\|\nabla Q\|_{L_t^2 H_x^{-1}} \leq C c_0 + C c_0 + C c_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C(c_0 + c_0^{\frac{1}{2}}).$$

Without loss of generality we assume that the average of Q is zero at every t. Then by the Nečas theorem (see [31, section 1.4]),

$$\|Q\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \leq C(c_0 + c_0^{\frac{1}{2}}).$$

Step 3: Stokes estimates and trace theorem. By Corollary 2.3, we can split U into $U_1 + U_2$, where for any $p < \infty$, we have

$$\left\| |\partial_t U_1| + |\nabla^2 U_1| \right\|_{L_t^p L_x^{\frac{3}{2}}(Q_1^+)} + \left\| |\partial_t U_2| + |\nabla^2 U_2| \right\|_{L_t^2 L_x^p(Q_1^+)} \leq C(c_0 + c_0^{\frac{1}{2}}).$$

Denote $\Omega(t, x_d) := \int_{\bar{B}_1} |\nabla U(t, x', x_d)| dx'$, then $\partial_{x_d}\Omega$ is bounded in

$$\partial_{x_d}\Omega \in L_t^2 L_{x_d}^p + L_t^p L_{x_d}^{\frac{3}{2}}((-1,0) \times (0,1))$$

for any $p < \infty$. Note that

$$\partial_t \Omega = \int |\nabla u| \, dx' \in L_{t,x_d}^2((-1,0) \times (0,1)).$$

Since by interpolation, $L_t^1 L_{x_d}^\infty \cap L_t^\infty L_{x_d}^1 \subset L_{t,x_d}^2$, by duality $\partial_t \Omega$ is bounded in $L_{t,x_d}^2 \subset L_t^1 L_{x_d}^\infty + L_t^\infty L_{x_d}^1$. Similarly, $\partial_{x_d}\Omega$ is bounded in

$$\partial_{x_d}\Omega \in L_t^2 L_{x_d}^p + L_t^p L_{x_d}^{\frac{3}{2}}((-1,0) \times (0,1)) \subset L_t^r L_{x_d}^\infty + L_t^\infty L_{x_d}^r((-1,0) \times (0,1))$$

for any $p > 3$ and $r > 1$ sufficiently small. Now we can use Lemma 2.4 to show Ω is continuous up to the boundary with oscillation bounded by

$$\|\Omega\|_{\mathrm{osc}((-1,0)\times(0,1))} \le C(c_0 + c_0^{\frac{1}{2}}).$$

Since the average of Ω is also bounded as

$$\int \Omega dx_d dt = \int_{Q_1^+} |\nabla u| \, dx \, dt \le C c_0^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

we have Ω is bounded in L^∞, in particular,

$$\int_{\bar{B}_1} \left| \int_{-1}^0 \nabla u(t, x', 0) dt \right| dx' = \Omega(0,0) \le C_0(c_0 + c_0^{\frac{1}{2}}).$$

This concludes the proof of this proposition. $\qquad\square$

The proof of Theorem 1.4 relies on a domain decomposition inspired by the Calderón–Zygmund decomposition introduced for the study of singular integrals (see [32]). We first define the parabolic dyadic decomposition.

DEFINITION 3.2 (parabolic dyadic decomposition). *Let $L > 0$, and let Ω be a periodic channel of period W and height H. We define the parabolic dyadic decomposition of $(0, L) \times \Omega$ as below. Denote*

(3.2) $$R_0 = \min\left\{ \sqrt{L}, \frac{W}{2}, \frac{H}{2} \right\}.$$

Then we can find positive integers k_L, k_W, k_H, such that

$$L = 4^{k_L} L_0, \qquad W = 2 \cdot 2^{k_W} W_0, \qquad H = 2 \cdot 2^{k_H} H_0,$$

where L_0, W_0, H_0 satisfy

$$R_0 \le \sqrt{L_0}, W_0, H_0 \le 2R_0.$$

First, we evenly divide $(0, L) \times \Omega$ into $4^{k_L} \cdot 2^{k_W+1} \cdot 2^{k_H+1}$ cubes of length L_0, width W_0, and height H_0, and denote $\mathcal{Q}_0$ to be this set of cubes. For each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_0$, we can divide Q into 4×2^d subcubes with length $L_0/4$, width $W_0/2$, and height $H_0/2$. This set is denoted by $\mathcal{Q}_1$. For each cube in $\mathcal{Q}_1$, we can continue to dissect it into 4×2^d smaller cubes with a quarter the length, half the width, and half the height. We denote

FIG. 3. *Initial partition $\mathcal{Q}^\circ$ of a long channel $(0, L) \times \Omega$.*

the resulted family by $\mathcal{Q}_2$. We proceed indefinitely and define $\mathcal{Q} = \cup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{Q}_k$ to be the parabolic dyadic decomposition of $(0, L) \times \Omega$.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. The partition of $(0, T) \times \Omega$ is now constructed as follows. During the parabolic dyadic decomposition of $(0, T) \times \Omega$, we first select a family of disjoint cubes, denoted by $\mathcal{Q}^\circ$, according to the following rule:

(a) For any integer $k \geq 1$ in $\{4^{-k} L_0 \leq t \leq 4^{-k+1} L_0\}$, we pick every parabolic cube in $\mathcal{Q}_k$, which are cubes of size $4^{-k} L_0 \times 2^{-k} W_0 \times 2^{-k} H_0$.

(b) In $\{t \geq L_0\}$, we pick every parabolic cube in $\mathcal{Q}_0$.

The selection of these cubes ensures enough gap from the initial time $t = 0$, which allows the local parabolic regularization to apply around these cubes.

As shown in Figures 3 and 4, they form a partition of $(0, T) \times \Omega$. Figure 3 corresponds to when $R_0 = \min\left\{\frac{W}{2}, \frac{H}{2}\right\} < \sqrt{L_0}$, and Figure 4 corresponds to when $R_0 = \sqrt{L_0} = \sqrt{T}$, in which case (b) does not happen.

We are interested in cubes that touch the boundary, i.e., having zero distance from $\partial\Omega$. We call these cubes the "boundary cubes." Given a boundary cube $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_k$ that meets the boundary $\{x_d = 0\}$, we denote its length as $l = 4^{-k} L_0$, width as $w = 2^{-k} W_0$, and height as $h = 2^{-k} H_0$. Thus for some $(t, x', 0) \in (0, T) \times \partial\Omega$, Q can be expressed as

$$Q = (t - l, t) \times \bar{B}_{w/2}(x') \times (0, h), \qquad \bar{B}_{w/2}(x') = \{y' : \|x' - y'\|_{\ell^\infty} < w/2\}.$$

Let us denote

$$2Q = (t - 2l, t) \times \bar{B}_w(x') \times (0, 2h).$$

A similar definition applies to boundary cubes that touch $\{x_d = H\}$. A boundary cube $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_k$ is said to be suitable if it satisfies

$$\text{(S)} \qquad \qquad \int_{2Q} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx \, dt \leq c_0 (2^{-k} R_0)^{-4}$$

for some c_0 to be determined.

Starting from $\mathcal{Q}^\circ$, we decompose the boundary cubes based on the following rules. For each boundary cube in the initial partition $\mathcal{Q}^\circ$ that is not suitable, we dyadically dissect it into 4×2^d smaller parabolic cubes. For each smaller boundary cube, we continue to dissect it until the suitability condition (S) is satisfied. This process will

FIG. 4. *Initial partition $\mathcal{Q}^\circ$ of a wide channel $(0, L) \times \Omega$.*

finish in finitely many steps almost everywhere because ∇u is bounded in L^2 for any Leray–Hopf solutions, so all sufficiently small cubes are suitable.

The final partition consists of a subcollection of dyadic boundary cubes $\{Q^i\}_{i\in\Lambda} \subset \mathcal{Q}$ that are suitable, mutually disjoint, and closure $\{(0,T) \times \partial\Omega\} = $ closure $\{\bigcup_i \bar{Q}_i\}$. For each boundary cube $Q^i \in \mathcal{Q}_k$ centered at $(t^{(i)}, x^{(i)})$, we denote its length as $l_i = 4^{-k}L_0$, width as $w_i = 2^{-k}W_0$, and height as $h_i = 2^{-k}H_0$. Thus Q^i can be expressed as

$$Q^i = (t^{(i)} - l_i, t^{(i)}) \times \bar{B}^i \times (0, h_i), \qquad\qquad \bar{B}^i = \bar{B}_{w_i/2}(x^{(i)}).$$

It is easy to see from our construction that $2Q^i \subset (0,T) \times \Omega$. Denote $r_i = 2^{-k}R_0$, then from Definition 3.2 we have

$$r_i \leq \sqrt{l_i}, w_i, h_i \leq 2r_i.$$

Suitability (S) of Q^i implies

$$\int_{2Q^i} |\nabla u|^2 \, \mathrm{d}x \, \mathrm{d}t \leq c_0 r_i^{-4}.$$

Using the canonical scaling of the Navier–Stokes equation $u_r(t, x) := ru(r^2 t, rx)$, Proposition 3.1 implies that

$$\tilde{\omega}|_{\bar{Q}^i} = \int_{\bar{B}^i} \left| \int_{t^{(i)} - l_i}^{t^{(i)}} \omega(t, x', 0) \mathrm{d}x' \right| \mathrm{d}t \leq C(c_0 + c_0^{\frac{1}{2}})r_i^{-2} =: c_1 r_i^{-2}.$$

We can use this proposition because Q^i is comparable to a parabolic cube.

Now we separate into three cases:

1. If $Q^i \in \mathcal{Q}^\circ \cap \mathcal{Q}_k$ with $k \geq 1$, then by condition (a), any $(t,x) \in Q^i$ satisfies $t < 4l_i \leq 16r_i^2$, thus in $\bar{Q}^i$ we have

$$\tilde{\omega} \leq \frac{16c_1}{t}.$$

We can select c_0 small enough such that $16c_1 = 1$.

2. If $Q^i \in \mathcal{Q}^\circ \cap \mathcal{Q}_0$, then by condition (b), any $(t,x) \in Q^i$ satisfies $L_0 = l_i < t < T$, $r_i = R_0$, thus in $\bar{Q}^i$ we have

$$\tilde{\omega} \leq c_1 R_0^{-2} = \frac{1}{16} R_0^{-2}.$$

Note that this case only happens when $T > L_0 \geq R_0^2$, so in fact we know $R_0 = \min\{W, H\}/2$, thus $\tilde{\omega} \leq \min\{W, H\}^{-2}$.

3. If $Q^i \notin \mathcal{Q}^\circ$ is not one of the initial cubes in the grid, then its antecedent cube $\tilde{Q}^i$ is also a boundary cube and is not suitable, so

$$\int_{2\tilde{Q}^i} |\nabla u|^2 \, \mathrm{d}x \, \mathrm{d}t > c_0 (2r_i)^{-4}.$$

By the definition of the maximal function $\mathcal{M}$ (recall Definition 2.5), this implies

$$\min_{Q^i} \mathcal{M}(|\nabla u|^2) \geq c_2 r_i^{-4}$$

for some c_2 comparable to c_0.

Combining these three cases, for any $r_\star = 2^l R_0$ with $l \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$\left\{ (t, x') \in (0, T) \times \partial\Omega : \tilde{\omega} > \max\left\{ c_1 r_\star^{-2}, t^{-1}, W^{-2}, H^{-2} \right\} \right\}$$
$$\subset \bigcup_i \left\{ \bar{Q}^i : r_i < r_\star \right\} \subset \bigcup_i \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \left\{ \bar{Q}^i : r_i = 2^{-k} r_\star \right\}.$$

Therefore the measure of the upper level set is controlled by the total measure of these suitable boundary cubes, that is,

$$\left| \left\{ \tilde{\omega} > \max\left\{ c_1 r_\star^{-2}, t^{-1}, W^{-2}, H^{-2} \right\} \right\} \right| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{r_i = 2^{-k} r_\star} \left| \bar{Q}^i \right|$$
$$\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{2^k}{r_\star} \sum_{r_i = 2^{-k} r_\star} \left| Q^i \right|.$$

Note that

$$\bigcup_i \left\{ Q^i : r_i = 2^{-k} r_\star \right\} \subset \left\{ \mathcal{M}(|\nabla u|^2) \geq c_2 (2^{-k} r_\star)^{-4} \right\},$$

which implies that

$$\left| \left\{ \tilde{\omega} > \max\left\{ c_1 r_\star^{-2}, t^{-1}, W^{-2}, H^{-2} \right\} \right\} \right|$$
$$\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{2^k}{r_\star} \left| \left\{ \mathcal{M}(|\nabla u|^2) \geq c_2 (2^{-k} r_\star)^{-4} \right\} \right|$$

$$\lesssim \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{2^k}{r_\star} \left\| \mathcal{M}(|\nabla u|^2) \right\|_{L^{1,\infty}_{\mathrm{loc}}((0,T)\times\Omega)} (2^{-k} r_\star)^4$$

$$\lesssim \left\| |\nabla u|^2 \right\|_{L^1((0,T)\times\Omega)} r_\star^3.$$

By the definition of Lorentz space, this shows

$$\left\| \tilde{\omega} \mathbf{1}_{\left\{ \tilde{\omega} > \max\left\{ \frac{1}{t}, \frac{1}{W^2}, \frac{1}{H^2} \right\} \right\}} \right\|_{L^{\frac{3}{2},\infty}((0,T)\times\partial\Omega)}^{\frac{3}{2}} \lesssim \|\nabla u\|_{L^2((0,T)\times\Omega)}^2.$$

This completes the proof of the theorem. □

4. Proof of the main result. This section is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 1.5. Theorem 1.4 provides a control on the large part of $\tilde{\omega}$, but it leaves a remainder in the region $\tilde{\omega} < \frac{1}{t}$, whose integral has a logarithmic singularity at $t = 0$. To avoid this singularity, we should apply Theorem 1.4, only away from $t = 0$, and near $t = 0$ we should adopt a different strategy.

Let u_{Pr}^ν be a shear solution to (NSE_ν) with initial value $u_{\mathrm{Pr}}^\nu|_{t=0} = \bar{u}$ (the pressure term is 0). Then u_{Pr}^ν can be written as

$$u_{\mathrm{Pr}}^\nu(t,x) = \begin{cases} U_{\mathrm{Pr}}^\nu(t,x_2) e_1, & d = 2, \\ U_{\mathrm{Pr}1}^\nu(t,x_3) e_1 + U_{\mathrm{Pr}2}^\nu(t,x_3) e_2, & d = 3, \end{cases}$$

where U_{Pr}^ν solves the Prandtl layer equation,

$$(\mathrm{Pr}_\nu) \qquad \begin{cases} \partial_t U_{\mathrm{Pr}}^\nu = \nu \partial_{x_d x_d} U^\nu & \text{in } (0,T) \times (0,H), \\ U_{\mathrm{Pr}}^\nu = 0 & \text{on } (0,T) \times \{0,H\}, \\ U_{\mathrm{Pr}}^\nu = \bar{U} & \text{at } t = 0. \end{cases}$$

We choose a small positive number $T_\nu < T$ to be determined later, and separate the evolution into two parts: in a short period $(0, T_\nu)$, we compare u^ν and $\bar{u}$ with the Prandtl layer u_{Pr}^ν, while in the remaining time (T_ν, T), we compare u^ν and $\bar{u}$ using the boundary vorticity.

Before we proceed, let us remark on a few useful computations and estimates that will be used repeatedly in this section. If v, w are two divergence-free vector fields in $(0,T) \times \Omega$ satisfying the no-slip boundary condition $v = 0$ and the no-flux boundary condition $w \cdot n = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, respectively, then we have the following three estimates:

$$(4.1) \qquad (v - w, v \cdot \nabla v - w \cdot \nabla w) = (v - w, v \cdot \nabla(v - w)) + (v - w, (v - w) \cdot \nabla w)$$

$$\leq \|\nabla w\|_{L^\infty} \|v - w\|_{L^2}^2,$$

$$(4.2) \qquad (v - w, \nabla P) = \int_{\partial\Omega} P(v - w) \cdot n \, \mathrm{d}S = 0,$$

$$(4.3) \qquad (v - w, \Delta v) = -\|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + (\nabla w, \nabla v) - \int_{\partial\Omega} w \cdot \partial_n v \, \mathrm{d}S$$

$$\leq -\frac{1}{2} \|\nabla v\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2} - \int_{\partial\Omega} J[w] \cdot \mathrm{curl}\, v \, \mathrm{d}S.$$

Here $J[w]$ is a rotation of w and $\mathrm{curl}\, v$ is the vorticity of v defined by

$$J[w] := \begin{cases} n^\perp \cdot w, & d = 2, \\ n \times w, & d = 3, \end{cases} \qquad \mathrm{curl}\, v := \begin{cases} \nabla^\perp \cdot v, & d = 2, \\ \nabla \times v & d = 3, \end{cases}$$

where $n^\perp$ is the rotation of the normal vector counterclockwise by a right angle, and $\nabla^\perp = (-\partial_{x_2}, \partial_{x_1})$. Moreover, note that $w \cdot \nabla w = 0$ in (4.1) when w is a shear flow.

4.1. Prandtl timespan. To compute the evolution of $u^\nu - u^\nu_{\mathrm{Pr}}$, first we subtract their equations and obtain

$$\partial_t(u^\nu - u^\nu_{\mathrm{Pr}}) + u^\nu \cdot \nabla u^\nu + \nabla P^\nu = \nu\Delta(u^\nu - u^\nu_{\mathrm{Pr}}).$$

The evolution of $u^\nu - u^\nu_{\mathrm{Pr}}$ can be computed using (4.1)–(4.3) as

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\|u^\nu - u^\nu_{\mathrm{Pr}}\|^2_{L^2} + \nu\|\nabla(u^\nu - u^\nu_{\mathrm{Pr}})\|^2_{L^2} \le -(u^\nu - u^\nu_{\mathrm{Pr}}, u^\nu \cdot \nabla u^\nu)$$
$$\le \|\nabla u^\nu_{\mathrm{Pr}}\|_{L^\infty}\|u^\nu - u^\nu_{\mathrm{Pr}}\|^2_{L^2}.$$

By Lemma 2.7, the Lipschitz norm of the Prandtl layer at time t is

$$\|\nabla u^\nu_{\mathrm{Pr}}\|_{L^\infty}(t) = \|\nabla U^\nu_{\mathrm{Pr}}\|_{L^\infty} \le \frac{1}{2}(\nu t)^{-\frac{3}{4}}\left(\frac{E}{|\partial\Omega|}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Integrating in time, we have

$$(4.4) \qquad 2\|\nabla u^\nu_{\mathrm{Pr}}\|_{L^1(0,T_\nu;L^\infty(\Omega))} \le \int_0^{T_\nu}(\nu t)^{-\frac{3}{4}}\left(\frac{E}{|\partial\Omega|}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathrm{d}t \le \log 2$$

if we choose T_ν small enough such that

$$(4.5) \qquad T_\nu \le T_* := \left(\frac{\log 2}{4}\right)^4 E^{-2}|\partial\Omega|^2\nu^3.$$

By Grönwall's inequality, we have for any $0 < t < T_\nu$,

$$(4.6) \qquad \frac{1}{2}\|u^\nu - u^\nu_{\mathrm{Pr}}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}(t) + \nu\|\nabla(u^\nu - u^\nu_{\mathrm{Pr}})\|^2_{L^2((0,t)\times\Omega)} \le \|u^\nu - \bar{u}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}(0).$$

The evolution of $u^\nu_{\mathrm{Pr}} - \bar{u}$ can be computed using (4.3) as

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\|u^\nu_{\mathrm{Pr}} - \bar{u}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} = (u^\nu_{\mathrm{Pr}} - \bar{u}, \partial_t u^\nu_{\mathrm{Pr}}) = (u^\nu_{\mathrm{Pr}} - \bar{u}, \nu\Delta u^\nu_{\mathrm{Pr}})$$
$$\le -\frac{\nu}{2}\|\nabla u^\nu_{\mathrm{Pr}}\|^2_{L^2} + \frac{\nu}{2}\|\nabla\bar{u}\|^2_{L^2} - \nu\int_{\partial\Omega}\bar{u}\cdot\partial_n u^\nu_{\mathrm{Pr}}\mathrm{d}x',$$

where $\|\nabla\bar{u}\|^2_{L^2} \le G^2|\Omega|$ and

$$\left|\int_{\partial\Omega}\bar{u}\cdot\partial_n u^\nu_{\mathrm{Pr}}\mathrm{d}x'\right| \le \|\nabla u^\nu_{\mathrm{Pr}}\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)}\|\bar{u}\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)}|\partial\Omega|.$$

Integration in time gives that for any $0 < t < T_\nu$, we have

$$\frac{1}{2}\|u^\nu_{\mathrm{Pr}} - \bar{u}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}(t) + \frac{\nu}{2}\|\nabla u^\nu_{\mathrm{Pr}}\|^2_{L^2((0,t)\times\Omega)}$$
$$\le \frac{\nu}{2}G^2|\Omega|t + A\nu|\partial\Omega|\|\nabla u^\nu_{\mathrm{Pr}}\|_{L^1(0,T_\nu;L^\infty(\Omega))}$$
$$\le \frac{\nu}{2}G^2|\Omega|t + \frac{1}{2}A^2|\Omega|\,\mathsf{Re}^{-1},$$

where the last inequality used (4.4).

Combined with (4.6), we have for any $0 < t \le T_\nu$,

$$(4.7) \qquad \frac{1}{2}\|u^\nu - \bar{u}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}(t) + \frac{\nu}{2}\|\nabla u^\nu\|^2_{L^2((0,t)\times\Omega)}$$
$$\le 2\|u^\nu - \bar{u}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}(0) + \nu G^2|\Omega|t + A^2|\Omega|\,\mathsf{Re}^{-1}.$$

4.2. Main timespan. The evolution of $u^\nu - \bar{u}$ can be computed using (4.1)–(4.3) as

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\|u^\nu - \bar{u}\|_{L^2}^2 = (u^\nu - \bar{u}, \partial_t u^\nu)$$

$$\leq -(u^\nu - \bar{u}, u^\nu \cdot \nabla u^\nu) - (u^\nu - \bar{u}, \nabla P^\nu) + \nu(u^\nu - \bar{u}, \Delta u^\nu)$$

$$\leq \|\nabla \bar{u}\|_{L^\infty}\|u^\nu - \bar{u}\|_{L^2}^2 - \frac{1}{2}\nu\|\nabla u^\nu\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\nu\|\nabla \bar{u}\|_{L^2}^2$$

$$- \int_{\partial\Omega} J[\bar{u}] \cdot (\nu\omega^\nu)\mathrm{d}x'.$$

Since $\bar{u}$ is a constant on each connecting component of $\partial\Omega$, by integrating from T_ν to T, we have

$$\frac{1}{2}\|u^\nu - \bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2(T) + \frac{\nu}{2}\|\nabla u^\nu\|_{L^2((T_\nu,T)\times\Omega)}^2$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2}\|u^\nu - \bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2(T_\nu) + G\int_{T_\nu}^T \|u^\nu - \bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2(t)\mathrm{d}t + \frac{\nu}{2}G^2(T - T_\nu)|\Omega|$$

$$+ A\left(\left|\int_{T_\nu}^T\int_{\{x_d=0\}}\nu\omega^\nu\mathrm{d}x'\mathrm{d}t\right| + \left|\int_{T_\nu}^T\int_{\{x_d=H\}}\nu\omega^\nu\mathrm{d}x'\mathrm{d}t\right|\right).$$

Adding (4.7) at $t = T_\nu$, we have for any $T > T_\nu$ that

$$\frac{1}{2}\|u^\nu - \bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2(T) + \frac{\nu}{2}\|\nabla u^\nu\|_{L^2((0,T)\times\Omega)}^2$$

$$(4.8) \quad \leq 2\|u^\nu - \bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2(0) + G\int_{T_\nu}^T \|u^\nu - \bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2(t)\mathrm{d}t + \nu G^2 T|\Omega| + A^2|\Omega|\,\mathsf{Re}^{-1}$$

$$+ A\left(\left|\int_{T_\nu}^T\int_{\{x_d=0\}}\nu\omega^\nu\mathrm{d}x'\mathrm{d}t\right| + \left|\int_{T_\nu}^T\int_{\{x_d=H\}}\nu\omega^\nu\mathrm{d}x'\mathrm{d}t\right|\right).$$

4.3. Proof of Theorem 1.5. We first note that Theorem 1.5 is only interesting when the initial kinetic energies $\|u^\nu(0)\|_{L^2}$ and $\|\bar{u}\|_{L^2}$ are comparable.

LEMMA 4.1. *Let $\bar{u} \in L^2(\Omega)$, and let u^ν be a Leray–Hopf solution to (NSE_ν), so the energy inequality holds:*

$$\frac{1}{2}\|u^\nu(T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \nu\|\nabla u^\nu\|_{L^2((0,T)\times\Omega)}^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\|u^\nu(0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.$$

For any $C' > 1$, there exists $C > 0$ such that if $\|u^\nu(0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} > C\|\bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ or $\|\bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} > C\|u^\nu(0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$, then

$$\|u^\nu(T) - \bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + 2\nu\|\nabla u^\nu\|_{L^2((0,T)\times\Omega)}^2 \leq C'\|u^\nu(0) - \bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.$$

Proof. If $\|u^\nu(0)\|_{L^2} > C\|\bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$, by energy inequality we can bound

$$\|u^\nu(T) - \bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{C}\right)\left(\|u^\nu(T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + C\|\bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2\right)$$

$$= \left(1 + \frac{1}{C}\right)\|u^\nu(0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - 2\left(1 + \frac{1}{C}\right)\nu\|\nabla u^\nu\|_{L^2((0,T)\times\Omega)}^2$$

$$+ (C + 1)\|\bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2$$

$$\leq \left(1+\frac{1}{C}\right)^2 \left(\|u^\nu(0) - \bar{u}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + C \|\bar{u}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \right)$$
$$- 2\nu \|\nabla u^\nu\|^2_{L^2((0,T)\times\Omega)} + (C+1) \|\bar{u}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Since $\|u^\nu(0)\|_{L^2} > C\|\bar{u}\|_{L^2}$ implies $\|\bar{u}\|_{L^2} < \frac{1}{C-1} \|u^\nu(0) - \bar{u}\|_{L^2}$, we conclude

$$\|u^\nu(T) - \bar{u}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + 2\nu \|\nabla u^\nu\|^2_{L^2((0,T)\times\Omega)} \leq C' \|u^\nu(0) - \bar{u}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

for some $C' \to 1^+$ as $C \to \infty$. If $\|u^\nu(0)\|_{L^2} < \frac{1}{4} \|\bar{u}\|_{L^2}$, then by the energy inequality we can estimate

$$\|u^\nu(T) - \bar{u}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \left(1+\frac{1}{C}\right) \left(C \|u^\nu(T)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\bar{u}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \right)$$
$$\leq (1+C) \|u^\nu(0)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} - 2(1+C)\nu \|\nabla u^\nu\|^2_{L^2((0,T)\times\Omega)}$$
$$+ \left(1+\frac{1}{C}\right) \|\bar{u}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}$$
$$\leq \left(1+\frac{1}{C}\right)^2 \left(\|u^\nu(0) - \bar{u}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + C \|u^\nu(0)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \right)$$
$$- 2\nu \|\nabla u^\nu\|^2_{L^2((0,T)\times\Omega)} + (1+C) \|u^\nu(0)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Since $\|\bar{u}\|_{L^2} > C\|u^\nu(0)\|_{L^2}$ implies $\|u^\nu(0)\|_{L^2} < \frac{1}{C-1} \|u^\nu(0) - \bar{u}\|_{L^2}$, we again have

$$\|u^\nu(T) - \bar{u}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + 2\nu \|\nabla u^\nu\|^2_{L^2((0,T)\times\Omega)} \leq C' \|u^\nu(0) - \bar{u}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

and the result also follows. □

Because of this lemma, from here we assume

$$\frac{E}{C} \leq \|u^\nu(0)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq CE$$

for some universal constant C. Under this assumption, we see there is a trivial upper bound on layer separation as

$$(4.9) \qquad \frac{1}{2} \|u^\nu(T) - \bar{u}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \nu \|\nabla u^\nu\|^2_{L^2((0,T)\times\Omega)} \leq CE$$

again using the energy inequality.

Next we study the rescaled boundary vorticity. Since u^ν solve (NSE_ν) in $(0,T)\times\Omega$, its rescale $u(t,x) = u^\nu(\nu t, \nu x)$ solves (NSE) in $(0, T/\nu) \times (\Omega/\nu)$. Moreover,

$$\nabla u(t,x) = \nu \nabla u^\nu(\nu t, \nu x), \qquad \omega(t,x) = \nu \omega^\nu(\nu t, \nu x).$$

Now we apply Theorem 1.4 on u, and we have a rescaled estimate on u^ν as

$$(4.10) \qquad \left\| \nu \tilde{\omega}^\nu \mathbf{1}_{\left\{ \nu \tilde{\omega}^\nu > \max\left\{ \frac{\nu}{t}, \frac{\nu^2}{W^2}, \frac{\nu^2}{H^2} \right\} \right\}} \right\|^{\frac{3}{2}}_{L^{\frac{3}{2},\infty}((0,T)\times\partial\Omega)} \leq C\nu \|\nabla u^\nu\|^2_{L^2((0,T)\times\Omega)}.$$

Proof of Theorem 1.5. We choose $T_\nu = 4^{-K}T$ for some integer K such that

$$\frac{1}{4}T_* \leq T_\nu \leq T_*,$$

where T_* is defined in (4.5). The average of ω^ν in (T_ν, T) is thus bounded by the average of $\tilde{\omega}^\nu$. To estimate the boundary vorticity in (4.8), we split it as

$$
(4.11) \quad
\begin{aligned}
\left| \int_{T_\nu}^{T} \int_{\{x_d=0\}} \nu \omega^\nu \mathrm{d}x' \mathrm{d}t \right| &\leq \int_{T_\nu}^{T} \int_{\{x_d=0\}} \nu \tilde{\omega}^\nu \mathrm{d}x' \mathrm{d}t \\
&\leq \int_{T_\nu}^{T} \int_{\{x_d=0\}} \nu \tilde{\omega}^\nu \mathbf{1}_{\left\{ \nu \tilde{\omega}^\nu > \max\left\{ \frac{\nu}{t}, \frac{\nu^2}{W^2}, \frac{\nu^2}{H^2} \right\} \right\}} \mathrm{d}x' \mathrm{d}t \\
&\quad + \int_{T_\nu}^{T} \int_{\{x_d=0\}} \max\left\{ \frac{\nu}{t}, \frac{\nu^2}{W^2}, \frac{\nu^2}{H^2} \right\} \mathrm{d}x' \mathrm{d}t.
\end{aligned}
$$

For the first term in (4.11), we apply (4.10) and obtain

$$
(4.12) \quad
\begin{aligned}
\int_{T_\nu}^{T} \int_{\{x_d=0\}} &A \nu \tilde{\omega}^\nu \mathbf{1}_{\left\{ \nu \tilde{\omega}^\nu > \max\left\{ \frac{\nu}{t}, \frac{\nu^2}{W^2}, \frac{\nu^2}{H^2} \right\} \right\}} \mathrm{d}x' \mathrm{d}t \\
&\leq \left\| \nu \tilde{\omega}^\nu \mathbf{1}_{\left\{ \nu \tilde{\omega}^\nu > \max\left\{ \frac{\nu}{t}, \frac{\nu^2}{W^2}, \frac{\nu^2}{H^2} \right\} \right\}} \right\|_{L^{\frac{3}{2},\infty}((0,T)\times\partial\Omega)} \|A\|_{L^{3,1}((0,T)\times\partial\Omega)} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{8} \nu \|\nabla u^\nu\|_{L^2((0,T)\times\Omega)}^2 + C A^3 T \left| \partial\Omega \right|.
\end{aligned}
$$

For the second term in (4.11), it is bounded by

$$
\begin{aligned}
A \int_{T_\nu}^{T} \int_{\{x_d=0\}} &\max\left\{ \frac{\nu}{t}, \frac{\nu^2}{W^2}, \frac{\nu^2}{H^2} \right\} \mathrm{d}x' \mathrm{d}t \\
&\leq A \int_{T_\nu}^{T} \int_{\{x_d=0\}} \frac{\nu}{t} \mathrm{d}x' \mathrm{d}t + A \int_{T_\nu}^{T} \int_{\{x_d=0\}} \max\left\{ \frac{\nu^2}{W^2}, \frac{\nu^2}{H^2} \right\} \mathrm{d}x' \mathrm{d}t \\
&\leq A \nu \log\left(\frac{T}{T_\nu} \right) |\partial\Omega| + A \nu^2 \min\{W, H\}^{-2} T |\partial\Omega| \\
&\leq A^2 |\Omega| \, \mathsf{Re}^{-1} \log\left(\frac{4T}{T_*} \right) + A^3 T |\partial\Omega| \, \mathsf{Re}^{-2} \max\left\{ H/W, 1 \right\}^2.
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $\frac{1}{T_*} = C E^2 |\partial\Omega|^{-2} \nu^{-3} = C \left(\frac{E}{A^2|\Omega|} \right)^2 \mathsf{Re}^3 \frac{A}{H}$, we separate the log as

$$
\log\left(\frac{4T}{T_*} \right) \leq 3 \log \mathsf{Re} + 2 \left(\frac{E}{A^2 |\Omega|} \right) + \frac{AT}{H} + C.
$$

Thus the second term in (4.11) is bounded by

$$
(4.13) \quad
\begin{aligned}
A \int_{T_\nu}^{T} \int_{\{x_d=0\}} &\max\left\{ \frac{\nu}{t}, \frac{\nu^2}{W^2}, \frac{\nu^2}{H^2} \right\} \mathrm{d}x' \mathrm{d}t \\
&\leq A^2 |\Omega| \, \mathsf{Re}^{-1} \log\left(\mathsf{Re} + C \right) + 2 \mathsf{Re}^{-1} E \\
&\quad + A^3 T |\partial\Omega| \left(\mathsf{Re}^{-1} + \mathsf{Re}^{-2} \max\left\{ H/W, 1 \right\}^2 \right).
\end{aligned}
$$

Plugging (4.12)–(4.13) into (4.11) and applying to (4.8) (naturally, for $\{x_d = H\}$ the same estimate), we conclude for every $T > T_\nu$ that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|u^\nu - \bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 (T) &+ \frac{\nu}{2} \|\nabla u^\nu\|_{L^2((T_\nu, T)\times\Omega)}^2 \\
&\leq 4 \|u^\nu - \bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 (0) + 2G \int_{T_\nu}^{T} \|u^\nu - \bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 (t) \mathrm{d}t
\end{aligned}
$$

$$+ \ 2\nu G^2 T |\Omega| + A^2 \, |\Omega| \, \mathsf{Re}^{-1} \log{(\mathsf{Re}+C)} + 2\mathsf{Re}^{-1} E$$
$$+ \ CA^3 T \, |\partial\Omega| \left(1 + \mathsf{Re}^{-2} \max\{H/W,1\}^2 \right).$$

Combined with (4.7) we see indeed that the above inequality is true for any $T > 0$, so applying Grönwall's inequality yields

$$\sup_{0 \le t \le T} \left\{ \|u^\nu - \bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 (t) + \frac{\nu}{2} \|\nabla u^\nu\|_{L^2((0,t)\times\Omega)}^2 \right\}$$

$$\le \exp(2GT) \left\{ 4 \|u^\nu(0) - \bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + CA^3 T \, |\partial\Omega| \left(1 + \mathsf{Re}^{-2} \max\{H/W,1\}^2 \right) + R_\nu \right\},$$

where the remainder terms R_ν is defined as

$$R_\nu = 2\nu G^2 T \, |\Omega| + A^2 \, |\Omega| \, \mathsf{Re}^{-1} \log{(\mathsf{Re}+C)} + 2\mathsf{Re}^{-1} E.$$

Finally, if Re is sufficiently small, then the estimate holds true automatically by the $\mathsf{Re}^{-1} E$ term according to the trivial bound (4.9). Otherwise, by $\mathsf{Re}^{-2} \le C$ and $\mathsf{Re}^{-1} \log(\mathsf{Re}+C) \le C \log(2 + \mathsf{Re})$ we complete the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. In this particular setting, $G = 0$, $E = A^2|\Omega|$, $W/H = 1$. Therefore we can bound

$$R_\nu \le CA^2 \, |\Omega| \, \mathsf{Re}^{-1} \log(2 + \mathsf{Re}) + 2\mathsf{Re}^{-1} E \le CA^2 \, |\Omega| \, \mathsf{Re}^{-1} \log(2 + \mathsf{Re})$$

which finishes the proof of the theorem. □

Appendix A. Construction of weak solutions to the Euler equation with layer separation. This appendix is dedicated to the proof of Proposition 1.1. In [33], Székelyhidi constructed weak solutions to (EE) with a strictly decreasing energy profile with vortex sheet initial data in a unit torus $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^d$, by means of convex integration introduced in [11].

We will first construct a weak (distributional) solution (v, P) to (EE) in a two-dimensional set $\mathbb{T} \times (0,1)$, such that $v = e_1$ at $t = 0$ and $\frac{1}{2} \|v\|_{L^2}^2 (t) = \frac{1}{2} - rt$ at a constant rate $r > 0$ for small t. To achieve this, we follow the ideas of [33]. However, we first construct a subsolution $\bar{v}$ on a bigger domain $\tilde{\Omega} = \mathbb{T} \times [-1, 2]$, that we will convex integrate only on $\mathbb{T} \times (0, 1)$. The result function v is a solution to (EE) only inside $\mathbb{T} \times (0, 1)$, but it keeps the global incompressibility div $v = 0$ in $\mathbb{T} \times [-1, 2]$, together with $v = 0$ on $\mathbb{T} \times (-1, 0) \cup (1, 2)$. This provides the impermeability condition needed at the boundary. More precisely, consider $(\bar{v}, \bar{u}, \bar{q}): (0, T) \times \tilde{\Omega} \to \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathcal{S}_0^{2\times2} \times \mathbb{R}$ with respect to some $\bar{e}: (0, T) \times \tilde{\Omega} \to [0, \infty)$, satisfying $\bar{v} \in L_{\mathrm{loc}}^2$, $\bar{u} \in L_{\mathrm{loc}}^1$, $\bar{q} \in \mathcal{D}'$, and in the distribution sense

(A.1)
$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \bar{v} + \ \mathrm{div} \, \bar{u} + \nabla \bar{q} = 0, \\ \mathrm{div} \, \bar{v} = 0, \end{cases}$$

and almost everywhere

$$\bar{v} \otimes \bar{v} - \bar{u} \le \bar{e} \, \mathrm{Id}.$$

Here $\mathcal{S}_0^{2\times2}$ is the space of trace-free two-by-two matrices.

To achieve this, we set

$$\bar{v} = (\alpha, 0), \qquad \bar{u} = \begin{pmatrix} \beta & \gamma \\ \gamma & -\beta \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \bar{q} = \beta$$

for some $\alpha(t, x_2), \beta(t, x_2), \gamma(t, x_2)$ to be fixed. With this choice, we need

$$\partial_t \alpha + \partial_{x_2} \gamma = 0, \qquad \begin{pmatrix} \bar{e} - \alpha^2 + \beta & \gamma \\ \gamma & \bar{e} - \beta \end{pmatrix} \geq 0.$$

The second constraint can be simplified to

$$2\bar{e} - \alpha^2 \geq 0, \qquad (\bar{e} - \alpha^2 + \beta)(\bar{e} - \beta) \geq \gamma^2.$$

Denote $\bar{f} = \bar{e} - \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2$, $\delta = \beta - \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2$, then

$$\begin{cases} \bar{f} \geq 0, \\ (\bar{f} + \delta)(\bar{f} - \delta) \geq \gamma^2 \end{cases} \Rightarrow \bar{f} \geq \sqrt{\gamma^2 + \delta^2} \Rightarrow \bar{e} \geq \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 + \sqrt{\gamma^2 + \delta^2} \geq \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 + |\gamma|,$$

which will be the only constraint by setting $\beta = \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2$ thus $\delta = 0$. It suffices to find (α, γ) that solves $\partial_t \alpha + \partial_{x_2} \gamma = 0$, i.e., we require the conservation of momentum and need

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \int \alpha \mathrm{d}x_2 = 0, \qquad \gamma = \int_{0.5}^{x_2} \partial_t \alpha \, \mathrm{d}x_2, \qquad \bar{e} \geq \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 + |\gamma|.$$

Let us mimic the strategy in [33] and work with different vortex-sheet initial data:

$$\alpha(0, x_2) = \begin{cases} 1, & 0 \leq x_2 \leq 1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$

and let $\alpha(t, x_2)$ be the piecewise linear function interpolating $(-1, 0)$, $(0, 0)$, $(\lambda t, 1)$, $(1 - \lambda t, 1)$, $(1, 0)$, $(2, 0)$ for some fixed $\lambda > 0$ to be determined as in Figure 5.

Under this setup, it is simple to see that

$$\partial_{x_2} \gamma = -\partial_t \alpha = \lambda \alpha |\partial_{x_2} \alpha|$$

from which we can recover

$$\gamma(t, x_2) = \begin{cases} -\frac{\lambda}{2}\left(1 - \alpha^2(t, x_2)\right), & -1 \leq x_2 \leq \frac{1}{2}, \\ \frac{\lambda}{2}\left(1 - \alpha^2(t, x_2)\right), & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$

and as a consequence, we need

$$\bar{e} \geq \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 + |\gamma| = \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2}(1 - \alpha^2) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}(1 - \lambda)(1 - \alpha^2).$$


FIG. 5. *The graph of $\alpha(t, x_2), \frac{1}{\lambda}\gamma(t, x_2)$ for a fixed $0 \leq t < T = \frac{1}{2\lambda}$.*

Let us fix $\lambda, \varepsilon \in (0,1)$, and set

(A.2)
$$\bar{e} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(1-\lambda)(1-\alpha^2).$$

Then $\bar{e} > \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 + |\gamma|$ in the space-time region $\mathcal{U} := (0,T) \times \mathbb{T} \times (0,1) \cap \{\alpha < 1\}$.

We are now ready to apply Theorem 1.3 of [33] when convex integrating in $(0,T) \times \mathbb{T} \times (0,1)$ only. This provides infinitely many $(\tilde{v}, \tilde{u}) \in L^\infty_{loc}((0,T) \times \tilde{\Omega})$ with $\tilde{v} \in C(0,T; L^2_{\text{weak}}(\tilde{\Omega}))$ such that $(\tilde{v}, \tilde{u}, 0)$ satisfies (A.1), $(\tilde{v}, \tilde{u}) = 0$ a.e. in $\mathcal{U}^c = (0,T) \times \mathbb{T} \times ((-1,0) \cup (1,2)) \cup \{\alpha = 1\}$, and $v := \bar{v} + \tilde{v}$, $u := \bar{u} + \tilde{u}$ satisfy

$$v \otimes v - u = \bar{e}\,\text{Id} \qquad \text{a.e. in } (0,T) \times \mathbb{T} \times (0,1).$$

From the second equation of (A.1), $\partial_{x_2} v_2 = -\partial_{x_1} v_1$, and $v_2 \in C_{x_2}(W^{-1,\infty}_{x_1})$. But since we didn't convex integrate on $(0,T) \times \mathbb{T} \times ((-1,0) \cup (0,1))$, we still have $v_2 = 0$ at $x_2 = 0$ and $x_2 = 1$. This provides the impermeability boundary conditions at these points.

Then (v,P) satisfies (EE) with the impermeability conditions in $(0,T) \times \mathbb{T} \times (0,1)$ in the distributional sense for $P = \bar{q} - \bar{e}$, and $\frac{1}{2}|v|^2 = \bar{e}$ matches the energy density profile given in (A.2) (note that the constructed solution is not a solution to (EE) in the domain $(0,T) \times \mathbb{T} \times (-1,2)$). Now, we have on $(0,T) \times \mathbb{T} \times (0,1)$,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int \frac{|v|^2}{2}dx = \varepsilon(1-\lambda)\int \alpha \partial_t \alpha\, dx_2 = -\varepsilon\lambda(1-\lambda)\int \alpha^2|\partial_{x_2}\alpha|\,dx_2 = -\frac{2}{3}\varepsilon\lambda(1-\lambda),$$

i.e., $\frac{1}{2}\|v\|^2_{L^2}$ decreases linearly at the rate $r := \frac{2}{3}\varepsilon\lambda(1-\lambda)$.

We consider the deviation from the initial value. Since $\tilde{v} = 0$ a.e. at $t = 0$, we know $v(0) = \bar{v}(0) = \pm e_1$, and

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int |v(t) - v(0)|^2 dx = \frac{d}{dt}\int \frac{|v(t)|^2}{2}dx - \frac{d}{dt}\int v(t)\cdot v(0)dx$$

$$= -r - \int \partial_t v(t) \cdot v(0)dx$$

$$= -r + \int \text{div}\, u(t) \cdot v(0)dx.$$

The quantity $\bar{e}$ and $\bar{q}$ depend only on t, x_2, so the equation on v_1 from (A.1) has no pressure and verifies

$$\partial_{x_2} u_{12} = -\partial_t v_1 - \partial_{x_1} u_{11}.$$

Especially, $u_{12} \in C_{x_2}(W^{-1,\infty}_{t,x_1})$. Therefore,

$$\int \text{div}\, u(t) \cdot v(0)dx = \int_{\mathbb{T}} -u_{12}(t,x_1,0) + u_{12}(t,x_1,1)dx_1$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{T}} -\bar{u}_{12}(t,x_1,0) + \bar{u}_{12}(t,x_1,1)dx_1$$

$$= -\gamma(t,0) + \gamma(t,1) = \lambda.$$

This gives

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int |v(t) - v(0)|^2 dx = \lambda - r = \lambda - \frac{2}{3}\varepsilon\lambda(1-\lambda).$$

This rate converges to 1 by setting $\lambda \to 1$ and $\varepsilon \to 0$, thus

$$\frac{1}{2} \left\| v(t) - e_1 \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T} \times [0,1])}^2 = Ct \qquad \forall t \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2\lambda} \right).$$

Moreover, $v = 0$ on $\{x_2 = 0, 1\}$.

Now for some $A > 0$, define $(v^*, P^*) : (0, \frac{1}{2\lambda A}) \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$ by time rescaling $v^*(t, x) = Av(At, x)$, $P^*(t, x) = A^2 P(At, x)$, where $\Omega = \mathbb{T} \times [0, 1]$ is the unit channel. Then $v^*(0) = Ae_1$ in Ω, $v^*(t) = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ and

$$\frac{1}{2} \left\| v(t) - Ae_1 \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T} \times [0,1])}^2 = CA^3 t \qquad \forall t \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2\lambda A} \right)$$

for some C, λ satisfying $0 < C < \lambda < 1$.

REFERENCES

[1] C. W. Bardos and E. S. Titi, *Mathematics and turbulence: Where do we stand?*, J. Turbul., 14 (2013), pp. 42–76, https://doi.org/10.1080/14685248.2013.771838.

[2] C. W. Bardos, E. S. Titi, and E. Wiedemann, *The vanishing viscosity as a selection principle for the Euler equations: The case of 3D shear flow*, C. R. Math., 350 (2012), pp. 757–760, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crma.2012.09.005.

[3] T. Buckmaster, C. De Lellis, L. Székelyhidi, and V. Vicol, *Onsager's conjecture for admissible weak solutions*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 72 (2019), pp. 229–274, https://doi.org/10.1002/cpa.21781.

[4] T. Buckmaster and V. Vicol, *Nonuniqueness of weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equation*, Ann. of Math. (2), 189 (2019), pp. 101–144, https://doi.org/10.4007/annals.2019.189.1.3.

[5] K. Choi and A. F. Vasseur, *Estimates on fractional higher derivatives of weak solutions for the Navier-Stokes equations*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire, 31 (2014), pp. 899–945, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anihpc.2013.08.001.

[6] P. Constantin, E. W., and E. S. Titi, *Onsager's conjecture on the energy conservation for solutions of Euler's equation*, Comm. Math. Phys., 165 (1994), pp. 207–209.

[7] P. Constantin, T. Elgindi, M. Ignatova, and V. Vicol, *Remarks on the inviscid limit for the Navier–Stokes equations for uniformly bounded velocity fields*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 49 (2017), pp. 1932–1946, https://doi.org/10.1137/15M1054572.

[8] P. Constantin, I. Kukavica, and V. Vicol, *On the inviscid limit of the Navier-Stokes equations*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 143 (2015), pp. 3075–3090, https://doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9939-2015-12638-X.

[9] P. Constantin and V. Vicol, *Remarks on high Reynolds numbers hydrodynamics and the inviscid limit*, J. Nonlinear Sci., 28 (2018), pp. 711–724, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00332-017-9424-z.

[10] C. De Lellis and L. Székelyhidi, *The Euler equations as a differential inclusion*, Ann. of Math. (2), 170 (2009), pp. 1417–1436, https://doi.org/10.4007/annals.2009.170.1417.

[11] C. De Lellis and L. Székelyhidi, *On admissibility criteria for weak solutions of the Euler equations*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 195 (2010), pp. 225–260, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00205-008-0201-x.

[12] E. W., *Boundary layer theory and the zero-viscosity limit of the Navier-Stokes equation*, Acta Math. Sin. (Engl. Ser.), 16 (2000), pp. 207–218, https://doi.org/10.1007/s101140000034.

[13] M. Fei, T. Tao, and Z. Zhang, *On the zero-viscosity limit of the Navier-Stokes equations in $\mathbb{R}_+^3$ without analyticity*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9), 112 (2018), pp. 170–229, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matpur.2017.09.007.

[14] D. Gérard-Varet and E. Dormy, *On the ill-posedness of the Prandtl equation*, J. Amer. Math. Soc., 23 (2010), pp. 591–609, https://doi.org/10.1090/S0894-0347-09-00652-3.

[15] D. Gérard-Varet and T. T. Nguyen, *Remarks on the ill-posedness of the Prandtl equation*, Asymptot. Anal., 77 (2012), pp. 71–88.

[16] E. Grenier, *On the nonlinear instability of Euler and Prandtl equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 53 (2000), pp. 1067–1091, https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0312(200009)53:9⟨1067::AID-CPA1⟩3.3.CO;2-H.

[17] P. Isett, *A proof of Onsager's conjecture*, Ann. of Math. (2), 188 (2018), pp. 871–963, https://doi.org/10.4007/annals.2018.188.3.4.

[18] M.-J. KANG AND A. F. VASSEUR, *Contraction property for large perturbations of shocks of the barotropic Navier-Stokes system*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS), 23 (2021), pp. 585–638, https://doi.org/10.4171/jems/1018.

[19] M.-J. KANG AND A. F. VASSEUR, *Uniqueness and stability of entropy shocks to the isentropic Euler system in a class of inviscid limits from a large family of Navier-Stokes systems*, Invent. Math., 224 (2021), pp. 55–146, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00222-020-01004-2.

[20] T. KATO, *Remarks on zero viscosity limit for nonstationary Navier-Stokes flows with boundary*, in Seminar on Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations, S. S. Chern, ed., Springer New York, 1984, pp. 85–98.

[21] J. P. KELLIHER, *On Kato's conditions for vanishing viscosity*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., 56 (2007), pp. 1711–1721, https://doi.org/10.1512/iumj.2007.56.3080.

[22] J. P. KELLIHER, *Vanishing viscosity and the accumulation of vorticity on the boundary*, Commun. Math. Sci., 6 (2008), pp. 869–880.

[23] J. P. KELLIHER, *Observations on the vanishing viscosity limit*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 369 (2017), pp. 2003–2027, https://doi.org/10.1090/tran/6700.

[24] M. C. LOPES FILHO, A. L. MAZZUCATO, H. J. NUSSENZVEIG LOPES, AND M. TAYLOR, *Vanishing viscosity limits and boundary layers for circularly symmetric 2D flows*, Bull. Braz. Math. Soc. (N.S.), 39 (2008), pp. 471–513, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00574-008-0001-9.

[25] Y. MAEKAWA, *On the inviscid limit problem of the vorticity equations for viscous incompressible flows in the half-plane*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 67 (2014), pp. 1045–1128, https://doi.org/10.1002/cpa.21516.

[26] Y. MAEKAWA AND A. L. MAZZUCATO, *The inviscid limit and boundary layers for Navier-Stokes flows*, in Handbook of Mathematical Analysis in Mechanics of Viscous Fluids, Springer, Cham, Switzerland, 2018, pp. 781–828, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-13344-7_15.

[27] A. MAZZUCATO AND M. TAYLOR, *Vanishing viscosity plane parallel channel flow and related singular perturbation problems*, Anal. PDE, 1 (2008), pp. 35–93, https://doi.org/10.2140/apde.2008.1.35.

[28] L. ONSAGER, *Statistical hydrodynamics*, Nuovo Cimento (9), 6 (1949), pp. 279–287.

[29] L. PRANDTL, *Über flussigkeitsbewegung bei sehr kleiner reibung*, Actes du 3me Congrès International des Mathématiciens, Heidelberg, Teubner, Leipzig, 1904, pp. 484–491.

[30] M. SAMMARTINO AND R. E. CAFLISCH, *Zero viscosity limit for analytic solutions, of the Navier-Stokes equation on a half-space. I. Existence for Euler and Prandtl equations*, Comm. Math. Phys., 192 (1998), pp. 433–461, https://doi.org/10.1007/s002200050304.

[31] G. SEREGIN, *Lecture Notes on Regularity Theory for the Navier-Stokes Equations*, World Scientific, Singapore, 2014, https://doi.org/10.1142/9314.

[32] E. M. STEIN AND T. S. MURPHY, *Harmonic Analysis (PMS-43): Real-Variable Methods, Orthogonality, and Oscillatory Integrals. (PMS-43)*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993, http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1bpmb3s.

[33] L. SZÉKELYHIDI, *Weak solutions to the incompressible Euler equations with vortex sheet initial data*, C. R. Math., 349 (2011), pp. 1063–1066, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crma.2011.09.009.

[34] R. TEMAM AND X. WANG, *On the behavior of the solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations at vanishing viscosity*, Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4), 25 (1997), pp. 807–828, http://www.numdam.org/item/ASNSP_1997_4_25_3-4_807_0.

[35] A. F. VASSEUR, *Higher derivatives estimate for the 3D Navier-Stokes equation*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire, 27 (2010), pp. 1189–1204, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anihpc.2010.05.002.

[36] A. F. VASSEUR AND J. YANG, *Second derivatives estimate of suitable solutions to the 3d Navier-Stokes equations*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 241 (2021), pp. 683–727, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00205-021-01661-4.

[37] X. WANG, *A Kato type theorem on zero viscosity limit of Navier-Stokes flows*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., 50 (2001), pp. 223–241, https://doi.org/10.1512/iumj.2001.50.2098.