

VIRIAL ESTIMATES FOR HARD SPHERES

RYAN DENLINGER

ABSTRACT. We review a virial-type estimate which bounds the strength of interaction for a gas of N hard spheres (billiard balls) dispersing into Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^d . This type of estimate has been known for decades in the context of (semi-)dispersing billiards, and is essentially trivial in that context. Our goal, however, is to write virial estimates in a way which may lend insight into the problem of rigorously deriving Boltzmann's equation (cf. Lanford's theorem). Using virial estimates, we provide a short proof of lower bounds (sharp up to powers of logarithms) on the convergence rate of the first marginal in Lanford's theorem. Such lower bounds will often, but not always, follow trivially from energy conservation; the proof we present holds assuming only that the limiting dynamics is regular enough and does not reduce to free transport.

1. INTRODUCTION

The problem of interest to us is that of deriving various nonlinear partial differential equations (PDEs) starting from the Newtonian gas of N hard spheres. Depending on the chosen scalings, the relevant PDE could be the Navier-Stokes-Fourier equations, Boltzmann's equation, etc. (though fully nonlinear Navier-Stokes-Fourier is far out of reach by current methods). The existence and uniqueness of solutions to nonlinear PDEs is generally an open problem, except in the presence of very special conservation principles or perturbative assumptions. Even when solutions are known, the analysis tends to be quite complicated, depending on the strength of available *a priori* estimates for a hypothetical solution. For this reason, we are naturally led to the problem of deriving analogous *a priori* bounds on the particle model.

1.1. Hydrodynamic Limits of Interacting Particle Systems. There is not one unique way to approach the derivation of hydrodynamic equations starting from mechanical laws. One possible strategy to attack this problem would be to set up a hydrodynamic scaling at the particle level and let $N \rightarrow \infty$ (with the hope that local Gibbs states will possess some ergodicity). This is sometimes a useful approach in

the presence of *stochasticity* (e.g. see [20]) but has not been particularly fruitful in the deterministic case due to the limited understanding of dynamical systems in many dimensions. (Note however that some one-dimensional models are tractable, e.g. identical hard rods. [5]) A second possible strategy for hydrodynamic limits is to look for an intermediate (kinetic) description, retaining some of the microscopic information but not all of it. Kinetic descriptions operate on much smaller timescales than hydrodynamic descriptions because time averaging always washes some microscopic information away. Therefore, in order to pass from a kinetic description to a hydrodynamic description *at the particle level*, we need *quantitative bounds on long time intervals* (compactness is not enough!).

Despite striking advances in the passage from Boltzmann's equation to hydrodynamic equations in various low-density regimes (see [23] for an overview), the derivation of Boltzmann's equation from Newton's laws is still in its infancy. A classical theorem due to O. E. Lanford establishes the validity of Boltzmann's equation for a hard sphere gas, but only up to a fraction of the mean free time for a particle of gas. [13, 17, 21] Obviously Lanford's theorem is completely unsatisfactory because we need *many* collisions even to progress past $t = 0$ in a hydrodynamic description. R. Illner and M. Pulvirenti were able to obtain convergence globally in time, but only when the gas is so diffuse that particles mostly do not collide at all. [15, 16] H. van Beijeren, O. E. Lanford, J. L. Lebowitz and H. Spohn were able to derive the (non-conservative) *linear* Boltzmann equation for a tagged particle in an equilibrium background, as well as the linearized Boltzmann equation which is formally associated to the response of the background itself. [18, 26]

Much more recently, T. Bodineau, I. Gallagher, and L. Saint-Raymond were able to quantify the convergence from [26] on time scales T_N diverging like a power of $\log \log N$, thereby deriving Brownian motion in a suitable hydrodynamic scaling. [3] (Note that the $\log \log N$ timescale is still troublesome from a physical point of view but it is hard to avoid mathematically using the series-based methods of [3, 17, 26].) In a follow-up work, the same authors considered a symmetrized perturbation of size $1/N$ (this simulates the response of an equilibrium background to the influence of a tagged particle). [4] This leads to a rigorous derivation of the *linearized* Boltzmann equation on long timescales, and subsequently a derivation of linear hydrodynamic models (in two dimensions only).

1.2. Monotonicity, convexity, Morawetz, Bony. One of the classical problems for billiard systems (such as the hard sphere gas) is to estimate the number of collisions in a finite time interval. It is known that this number is finite for N hard spheres in \mathbb{R}^d (see [14, 27] for two different proofs) but *a priori* it might depend on the initial condition. Actually it turns out that the number of collisions is bounded *uniformly* with respect to initial conditions, but might grow like N^N or worse. [6] Note that *even if we ignore high-order correlations* and simply consider clusters of $\mathcal{O}(\log N)$ particles, the function $(\log N)^{\log N}$ *still* grows faster than any power of N . On the other hand, with respect to the Lanford theorem, one does not *really* care about the total number of collisions. We care about *estimates* in *good function spaces*; we do not need to count all collisions the same way.

Workers in billiards theory have known for decades that *some* collisions can be estimated very efficiently by constructing monotonic or convex functions of phase space coordinates. (Monotonicity or convexity is here measured along a fixed trajectory.) This idea was stated explicitly in [6] and was used implicitly in both [27] and [14]. It turns out that these (monotonic or convex) functions are of the same type as the functions appearing in proofs of virial and Morawetz type estimates for dispersive PDEs and Vlasov-type equations. (In fact T. Tao points out the connection explicitly in his book [25]; his §1.5 Example 1.34 may be viewed as a caricature of our Corollary 3.4, whereas our Corollary 3.4 is all but written already by R. Illner in [14].)

There is no known analogue of virial or Morawetz identities for the Boltzmann equation in general (without assuming extra estimates above the energy level). The closest known results are set in one space dimension; technically, the physical setting is \mathbb{R}^3 with spatial variation along just one axis. In that case, for certain collision kernels, it is possible to write down an integral which effectively tracks the accumulation of collisions as the solution $f(t)$ interacts with itself. One can prove monotonicity in time, as well as uniform boundedness in large time, using conservation laws. [2, 7–9] This technique is known as *Bony's functional* or *Glimm's functional*, by analogy with similar techniques for hyperbolic conservation laws in one space dimension. The point of this technique is that, in one dimension, two disturbances will perhaps pass through each other a few times and interact, but each time some part of the *potential for interaction* is expended and cannot be used again. This potential for interaction can only be measured directly due to the one-dimensional geometry. In higher dimensions, one would

have to consider potentials along many possible trajectories of the system and this is just too difficult to quantify (compare the difficulty of tracking shocks in higher dimensions).

1.3. Main results and organization of this paper. The main focus of this work is Proposition 4.1, which is a virial-type spacetime estimate for hard spheres. As noted above, virial-type estimates are essentially classical in the billiards literature, and they play a prominent role in the derivation of Boltzmann's equation. (See [15, 16], particularly the first lemma of [16], which is Lemma 3.2 in the present manuscript.) The main difference with Proposition 4.1 is that the classical virial bound is re-formulated to control a quantity closely associated with the hard sphere BBGKY hierarchy, for a wide class of initial data. Unfortunately, while these estimates are quite general, they do not lead directly to coercive estimates at the limit for any nontrivial scaling of which we are aware. We will show, however, that virial estimates can be used to place *lower* bounds on the convergence rate in Lanford's theorem. Such lower bounds may, but do not always, follow trivially from energy conservation; our result holds under essentially minimal assumptions on the initial data. The types of data which are newly covered by our result have a product structure at the initial time, $f_0(x, v) = \rho(x)m(v)$, or are convex combinations $f_0(x, v) = \int d\alpha \rho_\alpha(x)m_\alpha(v)$ where each m_α has the same conserved moments. (See Example 6.1.)

Section 2 introduces the basic notation of this work, which mostly follows the presentation of [13]. Section 3 gives an elementary derivation of an identity due to Illner [14]. In Section 4, we apply this identity in a heuristic manner to derive the virial-type spacetime estimate; a rigorous proof may be found in [12]. Section 5 gives a very concise overview of Lanford's theorem, [13, 17], and some recent developments. Finally in Section 6 we use virial identities to prove a bound from below on the convergence rate in Lanford's theorem (including cases where such lower bounds would not follow directly from energy conservation).

2. NOTATION

Consider N non-overlapping hard spheres centered at positions $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with velocities $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$. The spheres are considered to have identical mass and radius, and are in all other ways physically indistinguishable. For convenience, we will assume without loss that all particles have unit diameter. The collection of all positions is a tuple X_N ,

$$\begin{aligned} X_N &= (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{dN} \\ V_N &= (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{dN} \end{aligned}$$

The classical phase-space coordinates of i th particle are given by $z_i = (x_i, v_i)$, and the phase-space coordinates of the whole gas are denoted

$$Z_N = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{2dN}$$

We may also write $Z_N = (X_N, V_N)$. The following function will play a central role in our analysis: for $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $Z_N \in \mathbb{R}^{2dN}$, we define

$$r_N(t, Z_N) = \sum_{i=1}^N (x_i \cdot v_i - |v_i|^2 t) \quad (1)$$

Following [13], we may introduce the N -particle phase space \mathcal{D}_N , which is defined by

$$\mathcal{D}_N = \{ Z_N \in \mathbb{R}^{2dN} \mid \forall 1 \leq i < j \leq N, |x_i - x_j| > 1 \} \quad (2)$$

The choice of \mathcal{D}_N is motivated by requirement that the spheres be mutually disjoint at all times. The closure of \mathcal{D}_N in \mathbb{R}^{2dN} in the standard topology is denoted $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_N$, and we will also write $\partial\mathcal{D}_N = \overline{\mathcal{D}}_N \setminus \mathcal{D}_N$. We will use the notation a.e. $Z_N \in \mathcal{D}_N$ to refer to a typical point for the Lebesgue measure on \mathcal{D}_N . The notation a.e. $Z_N \in \partial\mathcal{D}_N$ will refer to a typical point for the induced surface measure arising from the natural embedding $\partial\mathcal{D}_N \subset \mathbb{R}^{2dN}$.

Formally speaking, we wish to solve Newton's laws with a hard core interaction. This means if $Z_N(t_0) = (X_N(t_0), V_N(t_0)) \in \mathcal{D}_N$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{d}{dt} X_N(t) \right|_{t=t_0} &= V_N(t_0) \\ \left. \frac{d}{dt} V_N(t) \right|_{t=t_0} &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Hence the particles move freely between collisions. At each collision (that is, $Z_N(t_0) \in \partial\mathcal{D}_N$), the particles are required to interact elastically, thereby conserving momentum, energy, and angular momentum. The set of possible interactions for two-body elastic collisions is easy to parametrize explicitly. Suppose that there exists $i < j$ such that $x_j(t_0) = x_i(t_0) + \omega$ for some $\omega \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$; and, further suppose that $|x_{j'}(t_0) - x_{i'}(t_0)| > 1$ for any $i' < j'$ such that $(i', j') \neq (i, j)$. Let us denote

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow t_0^-} V_N(t) &= (v_1, \dots, v_i, \dots, v_j, \dots, v_N) \\ \lim_{t \rightarrow t_0^+} V_N(t) &= (v_1, \dots, v_i^*, \dots, v_j^*, \dots, v_N) \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} v_i^* &= v_i + \omega \omega \cdot (v_j - v_i) \\ v_j^* &= v_j - \omega \omega \cdot (v_j - v_i) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly for a.e. $Z_N \in \partial\mathcal{D}_N$ we will use the notation Z_N^* to refer to the image of the point Z_N through the collision transformation. The map $Z_N \mapsto Z_N^*$ is a measurable involution.

In the above “definition,” we have neglected to specify uniquely what happens when more than two particles collide at the same time. Multiple particle interactions occur with zero probability, though this statement requires justification which we will not discuss. (See [1] or [13].) The hard sphere flow at time t defines a measurable map

$$\psi_N^t : \mathcal{D}_N \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_N$$

For each $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the map ψ_N^t preserves the Lebesgue measure on $\mathcal{D}_N \subset \mathbb{R}^{2dN}$. Complete proofs of the existence of the hard sphere flow ψ_N^t may be found in the literature. [1, 13]

Following Boltzmann’s great insight, we realize that it is not very interesting to discuss any *particular* trajectory $\{\psi_N^t Z_N\}_{t \geq 0}$, because it is physically infeasible (or impossible) to measure the positions and velocities of all the particles at a given instant. Therefore, the initial value problem for Newton’s laws is *not* the correct problem for us to solve. The correct approach is to place a probability density $f_N(0, Z_N)$ on the set of possible initial states $Z_N \in \mathcal{D}_N$. The function $f_N(0, Z_N)$ represents our uncertainty about the actual state of the system. Since we have no physical means to distinguish between two particles in our model, the function $f_N(0, Z_N)$ must be *symmetric* with respect to interchange of particle indices.

We will denote by \mathcal{S}_N the symmetric group on N letters. Any permutation $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N$ acts on the phase-space coordinates $Z_N = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_N) \in \mathcal{D}_N$ as follows:

$$\sigma Z_N = (z_{\sigma(1)}, z_{\sigma(2)}, \dots, z_{\sigma(N)}) \in \mathcal{D}_N$$

Similarly, if $f_N(Z_N)$ is any function on \mathcal{D}_N , then σ acts on f_N by composition: $\sigma f_N = f_N \circ \sigma$. Let $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{D}_N)$ denote the set of probability measures on \mathcal{D}_N , and furthermore let $\mathcal{P}_{\text{a.c.}}(\mathcal{D}_N)$ denote the set of probability measures which are absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on \mathcal{D}_N . Any element of $\mathcal{P}_{\text{a.c.}}(\mathcal{D}_N)$ may be represented uniquely (a.e. $Z_N \in \mathcal{D}_N$) by a non-negative function $f_N(Z_N)$ such that $\int_{\mathcal{D}_N} f_N(Z_N) dZ_N = 1$. Finally let $\mathcal{P}_{\text{a.c.}}^{\text{sym}}(\mathcal{D}_N)$ be the set of absolutely continuous measures on \mathcal{D}_N such that the associated function f_N is invariant under the action of \mathcal{S}_N . Henceforth, when we write f_N , we will always mean an element of $\mathcal{P}_{\text{a.c.}}^{\text{sym}}(\mathcal{D}_N)$.

Let $f_N(0)$ be any element of $\mathcal{P}_{\text{a.c.}}^{\text{sym}}(\mathcal{D}_N)$, which we regard as the initial state of the N particle gas. For any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ we will let $f_N(t)$ be the pushforward of $f_N(0)$ under the hard sphere flow ψ_N^t ; then, $f_N(t)$

is likewise an element of $\mathcal{P}_{\text{a.c.}}^{\text{sym}}(\mathcal{D}_N)$. Since ψ_N^t preserves the Lebesgue measure on \mathcal{D}_N , we may write the following expression for $f_N(t)$:

$$f_N(t, Z_N) = f_N(0, \psi_N^{-t} Z_N) \quad (3)$$

The functions $f_N(0)$ and $f_N(t)$ may be extended by zero so as to be defined on \mathbb{R}^{2dN} .

For any $1 \leq s \leq N$, we define the marginal $f_N^{(s)}(t)$ by partial integration:

$$f_N^{(s)}(t, Z_s) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d(N-s)}} f_N(t, Z_N) dz_{s+1} \dots dz_N \quad (4)$$

The evolution of the marginals $f_N^{(s)}(t)$ may be described explicitly via the so-called BBGKY hierarchy (Bogoliubov-Born-Green-Kirkwood-Yvon) [13], though we will *not* be making any use of the BBGKY hierarchy except in Section 6. The marginals $f_N^{(s)}(t)$ are non-negative symmetric functions on \mathbb{R}^{2ds} with unit mass.

The main result we will show, Proposition 4.1, will control the trace of the marginals $f_N^{(s)}(t, Z_s)$ along a certain hypersurface in $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{2ds}$, with polynomial dependence on N for large values of N . This is slightly problematic because the trace of an L^1 function is simply not defined; moreover, even if the data $f_N(0)$ is *smooth*, the function $f_N(t)$ typically develops singularities. Nevertheless, due to technical arguments which we will not discuss, it is possible to show that if $f_N(0)$ is smooth and compactly supported in \mathcal{D}_N then the required traces of $f_N^{(s)}(t)$ do, in fact, exist (at least for almost every $t \in \mathbb{R}$). See [10, 13, 22, 24] for more information on regularity issues for hard spheres. Our estimates do not depend on the choice of regularization, except insofar as the regularized marginals must be a sequence of symmetric non-negative functions which are indeed marginals in the sense of (4). Therefore, similar to the proof of the classical trace theorem in partial differential equations ($W^{1,p}(U) \subseteq L^p(\partial U)$ for sufficiently smooth bounded regions $U \subset \mathbb{R}^k$), the traces are actually meaningful *for solutions of Liouville's equation* even if the initial data is only L^1 . We will not discuss further the issues of regularity.

3. A MONOTONICITY FORMULA

Let us fix an initial point $Z_N \in \mathcal{D}_N$ in the microscopic phase-space, and consider the trajectory $\{\psi_N^t Z_N\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$. Our analysis begins with a simple observation: with $r_N(t, Z_N)$ as in (1), if we define

$$r_{Z_N}(t) = r_N(t, \psi_N^t Z_N) \quad (5)$$

then for any t_0 such that $\psi_N^{t_0} Z_N \in \mathcal{D}_N$ we have

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} r_{Z_N}(t) \right|_{t=t_0} = 0 \quad (6)$$

Indeed, we see that if $\dot{x}_i = v_i$ and $\dot{v}_i = 0$ then

$$\frac{d}{dt} (x_i \cdot v_i - |v_i|^2 t) = 0$$

Therefore, the difference $r_{Z_N}(t) - r_{Z_N}(0)$ is simply equal to a sum along *collisions* of incremental jumps in $r_{Z_N}(t)$. It will turn out that all of these jumps have the *same sign*, and we can compute the jumps explicitly in terms of collision parameters.

Let us compute the jump in $r_{Z_N}(t)$ across a collision taking place at time $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. We may assume that the interacting particles are simply those labelled $i = 1, 2$, since collisions are binary and particles are indistinguishable. The position coordinates are continuous in time, so we write them x_1, x_2 , with $x_2 = x_1 + \omega$ for some $\omega \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. The pre-collisional velocities will be denoted $v_1 \equiv v_1(t_0^-), v_2 \equiv v_2(t_0^-)$ and the post-collisional velocities will be denoted $v_1^* \equiv v_1(t_0^+), v_2^* \equiv v_2(t_0^+)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} r_{Z_N}(t_0^+) - r_{Z_N}(t_0^-) &= \{ (x_1 \cdot v_1^* - |v_1^*|^2 t_0) + (x_2 \cdot v_2^* - |v_2^*|^2 t_0) \} + \\ &\quad + \{ - (x_1 \cdot v_1 - |v_1|^2 t_0) - (x_2 \cdot v_2 - |v_2|^2 t_0) \} \end{aligned}$$

Due to energy conservation,

$$|v_1^*|^2 + |v_2^*|^2 = |v_1|^2 + |v_2|^2$$

so we may eliminate the explicit dependence on t_0 .

$$r_{Z_N}(t_0^+) - r_{Z_N}(t_0^-) = x_1 \cdot v_1^* + x_2 \cdot v_2^* - x_1 \cdot v_1 - x_2 \cdot v_2$$

Since $x_2 = x_1 + \omega$, this gives us

$$r_{Z_N}(t_0^+) - r_{Z_N}(t_0^-) = x_1 \cdot (v_1^* + v_2^* - v_1 - v_2) + \omega \cdot (v_2^* - v_2)$$

Due to momentum conservation,

$$v_1^* + v_2^* = v_1 + v_2$$

so we may eliminate the explicit dependence on the position coordinates. Hence

$$r_{Z_N}(t_0^+) - r_{Z_N}(t_0^-) = \omega \cdot (v_2^* - v_2)$$

This is the same as

$$r_{Z_N}(t_0^+) - r_{Z_N}(t_0^-) = -\omega \cdot (v_2 - v_1)$$

by the collisional change of variables from Section 2. But v_1, v_2 are the velocities of the two particles *coming into* a collision, so we must have

$$(x_2 - x_1) \cdot (v_2 - v_1) \leq 0$$

and therefore $\omega \cdot (v_2 - v_1) \leq 0$. Hence,

$$r_{Z_N}(t_0^+) - r_{Z_N}(t_0^-) = |\omega \cdot (v_2 - v_1)| \geq 0$$

Adding up all collisions along the trajectory we obtain the following identity, which was observed by Illner: [14]

Proposition 3.1. (*Illner*) For a.e. $Z_N \in \mathcal{D}_N$ and a.e. $t \geq 0$ there holds

$$r_{Z_N}(t) - r_{Z_N}(0) = \sum_k |\omega_k \cdot (v_{j_k}(t_k^-) - v_{i_k}(t_k^-))| \quad (7)$$

where the sum \sum_k is over all collisions along the trajectory $\{\psi_N^\tau Z_N\}_\tau$ for $0 \leq \tau \leq t$.

We will require an auxiliary lemma due to Illner and Pulvirenti which follows easily from Proposition 3.1. [15, 16] In order to state the lemma, we introduce a new function on \mathcal{D}_N ,

$$I_N(Z_N) = \sum_{i=1}^N |x_i|^2 \quad (8)$$

The proof is a computation, which we include for completeness.

Lemma 3.2. For a.e. $Z_N = (X_N, V_N) \in \mathcal{D}_N$ and all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$I_N(\psi_N^t Z_N) \geq I_N((X_N + V_N t, V_N)) \quad (9)$$

Proof. By time-reversibility we may assume $t \geq 0$. The function $I_N(\psi_N^t Z_N)$ is globally continuous in t for a.e. $Z_N \in \mathcal{D}_N$. With this in mind, it suffices to point out that the desired inequality is true for $t = 0$, and between collisions (using energy conservation) we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \{I_N(\psi_N^t Z_N) - I_N((X_N + V_N t, V_N))\} = 2 \{r_{Z_N}(t) - r_{Z_N}(0)\}$$

We conclude by Proposition 3.1. \square

Remark. Lemma 3.2 was the key estimate which Illner and Pulvirenti [15, 16] relied upon to rigorously derive Boltzmann's equation, globally in time, for a rarefied gas in \mathbb{R}^d . The theorem of Illner and Pulvirenti is analogous to "small data" results for nonlinear PDE, and therefore does not resolve the problem of deriving Boltzmann's equation near global Maxwellians. Note however that Proposition 3.1 is more general than Lemma 3.2 and generally contains more detailed information about the dynamics, including possible cancellations. Another important point is

that Illner and Pulvirenti actually applied Lemma 3.2 to isolated clusters of particles, controlling separately the interactions between clusters. In the same way Proposition 3.1 is applicable to isolated clusters of particles, just as it is applicable to the gas as a whole.

The next lemma is technical, and again follows from Proposition 3.1.

Lemma 3.3. *For a.e. $Z_N = (X_N, V_N) \in \mathcal{D}_N$, all $t \geq 0$, and all $\lambda > 0$, there holds*

$$|r_{Z_N}(t)| \leq \frac{1}{2} \lambda^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (\lambda^2 |x_i|^2 + |v_i|^2) \quad (10)$$

Proof. Recall that $r_{Z_N}(t) \equiv r_N(t, \psi_N^t Z_N)$. On the other hand, by (1),

$$\begin{aligned} |r_N(t, Z_N)| &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N |x_i \cdot v_i - |v_i|^2 t| \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N |(x_i - v_i t) \cdot v_i| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N (\lambda |x_i - v_i t|^2 + \lambda^{-1} |v_i|^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \lambda I_N((X_N - V_N t, V_N)) + \frac{1}{2} \lambda^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N |v_i|^2 \end{aligned}$$

We can bound the first term on the last line using Lemma 3.2. Hence,

$$|r_N(t, Z_N)| \leq \frac{1}{2} \lambda I_N(\psi_N^{-t} Z_N) + \frac{1}{2} \lambda^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N |v_i|^2$$

Replace Z_N by $\psi_N^t Z_N$ on both sides and use the conservation of energy to conclude. \square

Combining Proposition 3.1 and Lemma 3.3, we obtain:

Corollary 3.4. *For a.e. $Z_N = (X_N, V_N) \in \mathcal{D}_N$ and all $\lambda > 0$, we have*

$$\sum_k |\omega_k \cdot (v_{j_k}(t_k^-) - v_{i_k}(t_k^-))| \leq 2\lambda^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (\lambda^2 |x_i|^2 + |v_i|^2) \quad (11)$$

where the sum \sum_k is over all collisions along the trajectory $\{\psi_N^t Z_N\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$.

Remark. *It is interesting to compare Corollary 3.4 against the case where we count all collisions equally, without the weighting factor $|\omega \cdot (v_j - v_i)|$. In that case the best one can do with current technology is bound the*

number of collisions by super-exponential functions of the number of particles, e.g. growing faster than N^N ; we refer to [6] for estimates of this type. Indeed, the authors of [6] rightly note that much better estimates can be proven if not all collisions are counted. Note that unweighted collision estimates are of direct interest for dynamical systems theory, whereas kinetic theory is more interested in finding good function spaces whose associated norms may well contain weights.

Remark. Clearly, Corollary 3.4 represents the “worst case” behavior for a system of hard spheres. If the initial conditions Z_N are chosen “randomly” (with suitable scalings of x, v ; cf. low-density limit, [11]) then the left-hand side should typically be much smaller than the right-hand side, at least when collisions are counted on finite time intervals. This statement can be formalized and proved (in an average sense for suitable f_0) on a small time interval in the Boltzmann-Grad scaling, using the bounds from the proof of Lanford’s theorem. An interesting open question, which should be addressed, is whether improvements can be obtained (on average) for Corollary 3.4, locally in time and away from local equilibria, while assuming less than what is required to prove Lanford’s theorem. Such a result by itself cannot be expected to allow improvement of the time of convergence in Lanford’s theorem, but may provide relevant insights in that direction.

4. AN AVERAGING TRICK

The previous section was primarily concerned with weighted sums over collisions which occur along a single trajectory $\{\psi_N^t Z_N\}_t$. However, as has been explained in Section 2, we are really interested in ensemble averages over many trajectories. This is due to the physical fact that we cannot say with any precision what the initial state Z_N “really” is. We will “prove” a spacetime estimate by averaging both sides of (11) with respect to the *same* measure $f_N(0, Z_N) dZ_N$ and applying a change of variables on the left-hand side. The change of variables as presented here is not entirely rigorous, though we are confident that this approach can be converted into a rigorous proof. An alternative, completely rigorous, proof of the virial-type estimate (Proposition 4.1) has already been given. [12]

Remark. We emphasize that the results of this section are not new, nor are they especially novel except perhaps in the style of presentation; indeed, estimates of the type shown here go back many decades. In particular, in this section we will prove a virial-type estimate for the second marginal which holds under finiteness of second moments, but this estimate is not uniform in the Boltzmann-Grad scaling. The

novelty of our contribution is precisely the fact that virial estimates can sometimes provide nontrivial information in the Boltzmann-Grad scaling (not easily accessible by other means), but that discussion is deferred to Section 6.

We will find it helpful to define an auxiliary function,

$$W_N^{(i,j)}(Z_N) = |(x_j - x_i) \cdot (v_j - v_i)| \quad (12)$$

Observe that $W_N^{(i,j)}(Z_N) = |\omega \cdot (v_j - v_i)|$ if $Z_N \in \partial\mathcal{D}_N$ represents a collision between particles i and j with $x_j = x_i + \omega$. For any $Z_N \in \mathcal{D}_N$ let $\tilde{i}_N(Z_N), \tilde{j}_N(Z_N)$ be chosen such that $0 < |x_{\tilde{i}_N} - x_{\tilde{j}_N}| \leq |x_i - x_j|$ for all $i \neq j$. This uniquely defines \tilde{i}_N, \tilde{j}_N (up to switching the two indices) for a.e. $Z_N \in \mathcal{D}_N$ and also for a.e. $Z_N \in \partial\mathcal{D}_N$. Let us finally define

$$W_N(Z_N) = W_N^{(\tilde{i}_N(Z_N), \tilde{j}_N(Z_N))}(Z_N) \quad (13)$$

so that $W_N(Z_N)$ is always equal to the correct collision parameter $|\omega \cdot (v_j - v_i)|$ (when binary collisions are well-defined) globally along $\partial\mathcal{D}_N$.

The “proof” of the spacetime estimate is based on the following observation: the collision sum \sum_k on the left-hand side of (11) may be re-cast as an integral in time:

$$\sum_k W_N(\psi_N^{t_k} Z_N) \equiv \int_{\mathbb{R}} \delta_{\psi_N^t Z_N \in \partial\mathcal{D}_N} W_N(\psi_N^t Z_N) dt$$

Average both sides with respect to $f_N(0, Z_N) dZ_N$.

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{D}_N} \left\{ \sum_k W_N(\psi_N^{t_k} Z_N) \right\} f_N(0, Z_N) dZ_N &= \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{D}_N} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \delta_{\psi_N^t Z_N \in \partial\mathcal{D}_N} W_N(\psi_N^t Z_N) f_N(0, Z_N) dt dZ_N \end{aligned}$$

The double integral on the right-hand side reduces (by Fubini) to an integral of “something” over $\partial\mathcal{D}_N$, due to the delta-function and the identity $f_N(t, Z_N) = f_N(0, \psi_N^{-t} Z_N)$. Unfortunately, making the change of variables precise requires a technical application of the divergence theorem and careful manipulation of delta functions. (The proof of [12] avoids any mention of delta functions.) Here we record the result of

correct manipulations:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{D}_N} \left\{ \sum_k W_N(\psi_N^{t_k} Z_N) \right\} f_N(0, Z_N) dZ_N &= \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\partial \mathcal{D}_N} [W_N(Z_N)]^2 f_N(t, Z_N) d\sigma_N dV_N dt \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where $d\sigma_N dV_N$ represents the surface measure on $\partial \mathcal{D}_N$.

To conclude, we bound the left hand side of (14) using Corollary 3.4, then reduce both sides using the symmetry of $f_N(t)$ and the definition of the marginals of $f_N(t)$. We have also simplified the estimate by optimal choice of the parameter $\lambda > 0$.

Proposition 4.1. *For each $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let $f_N(0)$ be an initial probability density on \mathcal{D}_N , which we assume to be symmetric under particle interchange, and let $f_N(t, Z_N) = f_N(0, \psi_N^{-t} Z_N)$. Let $f_N^{(s)}(t)$, $1 \leq s \leq N$, denote the s -marginal of $f_N(t)$. Further assume that $f_N(0)$ is smooth and compactly supported in the interior of \mathcal{D}_N . Then for all $2 \leq s \leq N$ there holds*

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq s} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{ds} \times \mathbb{R}^{d(s-1)} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |\omega \cdot (v_j - v_i)|^2 \times \\ &\quad \times f_N^{(s)}(t, \dots, x_i, v_i, \dots, x_i + \omega, v_j, \dots) d\omega dX_s^{(j)} dV_s dt \leq \\ &\leq C_d \frac{s(s-1)}{N} \left(\int |x|^2 f_N^{(1)}(0, x, v) dx dv \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int |v|^2 f_N^{(1)}(0, x, v) dx dv \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where $dX_s^{(j)} = dx_1 \dots dx_{j-1} dx_{j+1} \dots dx_s$ and C_d is a constant depending only on the dimension d .

Remark. *It is possible to compare Proposition 4.1 with Lemma 1 of [16]; several other related formulas may also be found in [14].*

Remark. *Note that, up to constants, Proposition 4.1 is formally equivalent to Corollary 3.4 because we can always fix a point $Z_N^0 \in \mathcal{D}_N$ (such that the trajectory $\{\psi_N^t Z_N^0\}_t$ is globally defined) and let*

$$f_N(0, Z_N) = \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \delta_{Z_N = \sigma Z_N^0} \quad (16)$$

Therefore, just as Corollary 3.4 is suboptimal for “many” choices of initial condition Z_N (under suitable scalings), Proposition 4.1 is suboptimal for most physically relevant densities $f_N(0)$. Again this is not a theorem but an empirical observation, rooted in the apparent success of kinetic theory in describing physical reality.

5. FACTORIZED DATA

In this section, and for the remainder of the work, we will assume that spheres are re-scaled to have diameter $\varepsilon > 0$ instead of diameter 1. Thus the proper condition defining \mathcal{D}_N is $|x_i - x_j| > \varepsilon$ instead of $|x_i - x_j| > 1$.

$$\mathcal{D}_N = \{Z_N = (X_N, V_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{dN} \times \mathbb{R}^{dN} \mid \forall 1 \leq i < j \leq N, |x_i - x_j| > \varepsilon\} \quad (17)$$

Moreover, we assume the Boltzmann-Grad scaling $N\varepsilon^{d-1} = 1$; physically, this means that the mean free path for a typical particle is of order one. Note that the total volume occupied by all N particles is of order ε ; hence, the Boltzmann-Grad limit describes a state of low density.

Suppose $f_0(x, v)$ is a measurable function on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ with

$$0 \leq f_0(x, v) \in (L^1_{x,v} \cap L^\infty_x L^1_v)(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d) \quad (18)$$

Furthermore let us suppose, for convenience, that f_0 is a normalized probability distribution:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f_0(x, v) dx dv = 1 \quad (19)$$

Then it is natural to define “factorized” states on \mathcal{D}_N in the following way:

$$f_N(0, Z_N) = \mathcal{Z}_N^{-1} f_0^{\otimes N}(Z_N) \mathbf{1}_{Z_N \in \mathcal{D}_N} \quad (20)$$

Here \mathcal{Z}_N is the partition function,

$$\mathcal{Z}_N = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2dN}} f_0^{\otimes N}(Z_N) \mathbf{1}_{Z_N \in \mathcal{D}_N} dZ_N \quad (21)$$

We will use the imprecise shorthand $f_N(0) \sim f_0^{\otimes N}$ for such “factorized” initial data. Then it is possible to prove the following *pointwise* estimate for the first marginal at $t = 0$, valid for almost every $(x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ under the Boltzmann-Grad scaling $N\varepsilon^{d-1} = 1$, for all small enough $\varepsilon > 0$ depending only on f_0 and d :

$$\left| f_N^{(1)}(0, x, v) - f_0(x, v) \right| \leq C_d \|f_0\|_{L^\infty_x L^1_v} f_0(x, v) \varepsilon \quad (22)$$

Similar pointwise convergence estimates (also of order ε) are available for higher order marginals $f_N^{(s)}(0)$ as well, as long as s is fixed as $N \rightarrow \infty$. We refer to [13] or [12] for detailed proofs.

The $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ convergence rate for the first marginal at $t = 0$ arises from careful partition function estimates, and is intuitively due to the fact that the total volume occupied by all particles is roughly $N\varepsilon^d$, that is, $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ in the Boltzmann-Grad scaling $N\varepsilon^{d-1} = 1$. It is not hard to

derive *worse* convergence rates under weaker regularity assumptions, e.g. $f_0 \in L_x^p L_v^1$ with $d < p < \infty$. However, as far as we are aware, one does not obtain an error which is *smaller* than $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ even if f_0 is in the Schwartz class, or jointly Gaussian in x and v .

Let us now assume that f_0 is in the Schwartz class and let $f(t)$ be the solution of Boltzmann's equation (on a small time interval) with hard sphere interaction and $f(0) = f_0$:

$$(\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x) f(t, x, v) = Q^+(f, f)(t, x, v) - Q^-(f, f)(t, x, v) \quad (23)$$

$$Q^+(f, f) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}} d\omega dv_2 |\omega \cdot (v - v_2)| f(t, x, v^*) f(t, x, v_2^*) \quad (24)$$

$$Q^-(f, f) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}} d\omega dv_2 |\omega \cdot (v - v_2)| f(t, x, v) f(t, x, v_2) \quad (25)$$

Here we define the collisional change of variables, for a unit vector $\omega \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ and any $v, v_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} v^* &= v + \omega \omega \cdot (v_2 - v) \\ v_2^* &= v_2 - \omega \omega \cdot (v_2 - v) \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

In the mid 1970s, Oscar Lanford showed that if $f_0(x, v)$ is nice enough (say smooth with compact support on \mathbb{R}^{2d}) then the function $f_N(t, Z_N) = f_N(0, \psi_N^{-t} Z_N)$ with initial data $f_N(0) \sim f_0^{\otimes N}$ has first marginal converging to the solution of Boltzmann's equation on a small time interval in the Boltzmann-Grad scaling $N\varepsilon^{d-1} = 1$. [17] Namely, for some small $T > 0$ depending on f_0 , any $t \in [0, T]$, and almost every $x, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} f_N^{(1)}(t, x, v) = f(t, x, v) \quad (27)$$

Moreover it follows from Lanford's proof that the higher order marginals, say $f_N^{(s)}(t)$, converge to the tensor products $f(t)^{\otimes s}$. Lanford's theorem was the first rigorous justification of kinetic theory from deterministic Newtonian mechanics, and his proof remains the basis of most of the more recent developments in first principles derivations of collisional kinetic equations.

Remark. *We must point out that a completely different point of view, pioneered by Kac and McKean, is to start with a stochastic model in which the microscopic position coordinates are essentially hidden variables. In these models, the impact parameter is automatically random even in the N particle system, and much more detailed results are available. Most notably, unlike the Lanford theorem, the convergence to Boltzmann is often proven globally in time. We refer to [19] and references therein for more details.*

Within the past few years, a number of authors have worked to make Lanford's theorem into a more quantitative result. Arguably the most notable contribution along these lines is [13], in which convergence rates of order $\mathcal{O}\left(\varepsilon^{\frac{d-1}{d+1}-}\right)$ were obtained. (The convergence can be proven in $L_{x,v}^\infty$ for the first marginal, but not for higher marginals, due to issues of irreversibility which we do not discuss here.) It is not established in [13] whether the convergence rate obtained therein is optimal (nor does there seem to be a particularly compelling reason that it should be optimal). Intuitively it should not be possible to obtain an error that is much smaller than $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$, since such small errors cannot even be proven at $t = 0$. We are not aware of any proof in the literature that the convergence rate in Lanford's theorem can be $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{1-})$; however, what we will prove here is that the $L_{x,v}^\infty$ error (of the first marginal) certainly cannot be much *smaller* than $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$. The proof is based on a virial-type inequality similar to (15).

6. ON CONVERGENCE RATES IN LANFORD'S THEOREM

In this section we will establish a lower bound on the convergence rate in Lanford's theorem; throughout our discussion, we will actually assume Maxwellian tails jointly in x and v , as in [15, 16]. Before stating our main result, a few comments are in order. The first is that conservation laws may automatically imply bounds from below: after all, we certainly have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |v|^2 f_N^{(1)}(t, x, v) dx dv = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |v|^2 f_N^{(1)}(0, x, v) dx dv \quad (28)$$

Therefore, in the event that $f_N(0)$ is chosen to satisfy the following inequality:

$$\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon^{-1} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |v|^2 f_N^{(1)}(0, x, v) dx dv - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |v|^2 f_0(x, v) dx dv \right| > 0 \quad (29)$$

then $f_N^{(1)}(t)$ cannot be within $o(\varepsilon)$ of $f(t)$, since the kinetic energy witnesses a slower convergence rate. On the other hand, by the example below, it is not hard to construct factorized densities $f_N(0)$ which satisfy both

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |v|^2 f_N^{(1)}(0, x, v) dx dv = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |v|^2 f_0(x, v) dx dv \quad (30)$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} v f_N^{(1)}(0, x, v) dx dv = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} v f_0(x, v) dx dv \quad (31)$$

Therefore the conserved moments do not *always* place a lower bound on the convergence rate in Lanford's theorem.

Example 6.1. Fix a large number K . Let \mathcal{J} be a (possibly uncountable) index set and let μ be a probability measure on \mathcal{J} . For μ -a.e. $\alpha \in \mathcal{J}$, measurably with respect to α , we pick a non-negative measurable function $\rho_\alpha(x)$ with $\int \rho_\alpha(x) dx = 1$ and $\|\rho_\alpha\|_\infty \leq K$, and a non-negative measurable function $m_\alpha(v)$ with $\int m_\alpha(v) dv = 1$, $\int v m_\alpha(v) dv = 0$ and $\int |v|^2 m_\alpha(v) dv = 1$. Then if we write

$$f_0(x, v) = \int_{\mathcal{J}} d\mu(\alpha) \rho_\alpha(x) m_\alpha(v) \quad (32)$$

and let $f_N(0) \sim f_0^{\otimes N}$ as in Section 5, then we have both (30) and (31).

The second observation is that (under natural decay assumptions) we can place lower bounds on the L^∞ error, up to powers of $\log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$, by placing lower bounds on a weighted L^1 error. To see why, observe that if both $f_N^{(1)}(t)$ and $f(t)$ have Maxwellian tails jointly in x and v (as in the work of [15, 16]) then there exists a number $k = k(t) > 0$ (depending on f) such that the following estimate holds for all $C > 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} (|x|^2 + |v|^2) \left| f_N^{(1)}(t) - f(t) \right| dx dv &\lesssim \\ &\lesssim \left(C \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right)^{d+1} \left\| f_N^{(1)}(t, x, v) - f(t, x, v) \right\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} + \varepsilon^{kC} \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Hence we will not actually mention the $L_{x,v}^\infty$ norm in stating our main result.

Finally, we remark that for any solution $f(t)$ of Boltzmann's equation having enough regularity and decay in x and v , there holds

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} (x \cdot v - |v|^2 t) f(t, x, v) dx dv = 0 \quad (34)$$

We will not actually use any regularity properties of Boltzmann's equation aside from (34). Therefore, instead of trying to find optimal conditions which guarantee (34), we will simply include (34) as a hypothesis in the theorem.

Theorem 6.1. Let $f_N(t, Z_N)$ be a non-negative solution of the Liouville equation for N identical hard spheres of diameter $\varepsilon > 0$, for each N in the Boltzmann-Grad scaling $N\varepsilon^{d-1} = 1$. We suppose that f_N is symmetric under particle interchange, that f_N is a probability density,

and that the following moment estimate holds:

$$\sup_N \frac{1}{N} \int_{\mathcal{D}_N} \sum_{i=1}^N (|x_i|^2 + |v_i|^2) f_N(0, Z_N) dZ_N < \infty \quad (35)$$

Additionally, assume that $f(t)$ is a solution of the Boltzmann equation which satisfies

$$\forall t \in [0, T], \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} (x \cdot v - |v|^2 t) f(t, x, v) dx dv = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} x \cdot v f(0, x, v) dx dv \quad (36)$$

Assume, moreover, that $f(t)$ does not satisfy the free transport equation on any open subinterval of $[0, T]$. Finally, assume that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} f_N^{(1)}(t) = f(t) \quad (37)$$

holds in the sense of distributions for each $t \in [0, T]$. Then for any T_1, T_2 with $0 \leq T_1 < T_2 \leq T$ we have

$$\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon^{-1} \sup_{t \in [T_1, T_2]} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} (|x|^2 + |v|^2) \left| f_N^{(1)}(t) - f(t) \right| dx dv > 0 \quad (38)$$

Remark. The requirement that f is not a solution of free transport is a technical condition; it excludes local Maxwellian functions, e.g. $f(t) = ce^{-|x-vt|^2} e^{-|v|^2}$. It is expected that optimal $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ convergence rates hold for such solutions, but this is not a part of the theorem.

Remark. The conditions of Theorem 6.1 are satisfied if $f_0 : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth, compactly supported, non-negative probability density function, with associated solution $f(t)$ of Boltzmann's equation; and, $f_N(0) \sim f_0^{\otimes N}$ as in Section 5, and T is the small time appearing in the original theorem of Lanford. [17]

Remark. The supremum over $[T_1, T_2]$ in (38) can actually be replaced by a supremum over the two-point set $\{T_1, T_2\}$ (the proof is the same).

Proof. We will assume that (38) fails for some T_1, T_2 in order to reach a contradiction. We have the following virial identity (see the proof of Proposition 1.3.5 in [12], or average out (7) in the manner of Section 4):

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} (x \cdot v - |v|^2 T_2) f_N^{(1)}(T_2) dx dv - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} (x \cdot v - |v|^2 T_1) f_N^{(1)}(T_1) dx dv \\ &= C_d \frac{N-1}{2} \varepsilon^d \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |\omega \cdot (v_2 - v_1)|^2 \times \\ & \quad \times f_N^{(2)}(t, x_1, v_1, x_1 + \varepsilon \omega, v_2) d\omega dx_1 dv_1 dv_2 dt \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Therefore, using the Boltzmann-Grad scaling $N\varepsilon^{d-1} = 1$ and (36), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |\omega \cdot (v_2 - v_1)|^2 f_N^{(2)}(t, x_1, v_1, x_1 + \varepsilon\omega, v_2) d\omega dx_1 dv_1 dv_2 dt \\ & \leq C_{d,T} \varepsilon^{-1} \sup_{t \in [T_1, T_2]} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} (|x|^2 + |v|^2) \left| f_N^{(1)}(t, x, v) - f(t, x, v) \right| dx dv \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Here we have used the triangle inequality and the fact that (36) holds with $t = T_1$ and $t = T_2$.

Hence if (38) is not true then there exists a subsequence N' (depending on T_1, T_2) such that

$$\lim_{N'} \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \int |\omega \cdot (v_2 - v_1)|^2 f_{N'}^{(2)}(t, x_1, v_1, x_1 + \varepsilon\omega, v_2) d\omega dx_1 dv_1 dv_2 dt = 0 \quad (41)$$

The remainder of the proof consists in showing that (41) combined with (37) implies that $f(t)$ satisfies the free transport equation on $[T_1, T_2]$.

Define the transport semigroup, which acts on a function $g(x, v)$, by the formula

$$[\mathcal{T}(\tau)g](x, v) = g(x - \tau v, v) \quad (42)$$

Also define the (lowest order) BBGKY collision operator

$$C_2 f_N^{(2)}(t, x_1, v_1) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \omega \cdot (v_2 - v_1) f_N^{(2)}(t, x_1, v_1, x_1 + \varepsilon\omega, v_2) d\omega dv_2 \quad (43)$$

Then we have (see [13], note that there is a factor of $(N-1)\varepsilon^{d-1}$ which we ignore in view of the Boltzmann-Grad scaling):

$$(\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x) f_N^{(1)}(t) = C_2 f_N^{(2)}(t) \quad (44)$$

Therefore for $t \in [T_1, T_2]$ we have the Duhamel representation

$$f_N^{(1)}(t) = \mathcal{T}(t - T_1) f_N^{(1)}(T_1) + \int_{T_1}^t \mathcal{T}(t - \tau) C_2 f_N^{(2)}(\tau) d\tau \quad (45)$$

Let us employ the usual L^2 inner product

$$\langle \varphi, f \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \varphi(x, v) f(x, v) dx dv \quad (46)$$

Then for any smooth compactly supported function φ and any $t \in [T_1, T_2]$ we have

$$\left\langle \varphi, f_N^{(1)}(t) - \mathcal{T}(t - T_1) f_N^{(1)}(T_1) \right\rangle = \int_{T_1}^t \left\langle \varphi, \mathcal{T}(t - \tau) C_2 f_N^{(2)}(\tau) \right\rangle d\tau \quad (47)$$

Now by (37) and the assumption that $f(t)$ does not solve the free transport equation on $[T_1, T_2]$, in order to reach a contradiction it suffices to show:

$$\lim_{N'} \int_{T_1}^t \left\langle \varphi, \mathcal{T}(t - \tau) C_2 f_N^{(2)}(\tau) \right\rangle d\tau = 0 \quad (48)$$

Using duality we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{T_1}^t \left\langle \varphi, \mathcal{T}(t - \tau) C_2 f_N^{(2)}(\tau) \right\rangle d\tau &= \int_{T_1}^t \left\langle \mathcal{T}(-(t - \tau))\varphi, C_2 f_N^{(2)}(\tau) \right\rangle d\tau \\ &= \int_{T_1}^t \left\langle \Phi(\tau), C_2 f_N^{(2)}(\tau) \right\rangle d\tau \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Here we have defined (considering t fixed)

$$\Phi(\tau) = \mathcal{T}(-(t - \tau))\varphi \quad (50)$$

Using the definition of the BBGKY collision operator, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{T_1}^t \left\langle \Phi(\tau), C_2 f_N^{(2)}(\tau) \right\rangle d\tau &= \\ \int_{T_1}^t \int d\tau d\omega dx_1 dv_1 dv_2 \omega \cdot (v_2 - v_1) \Phi(\tau, x_1, v_1) f_N^{(2)}(\tau, x_1, v_1, x_1 + \varepsilon\omega, v_2) \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

We recall the collisional change of variables

$$\begin{aligned} v_1^* &= v_1 + \omega\omega \cdot (v_2 - v_1) \\ v_2^* &= v_2 - \omega\omega \cdot (v_2 - v_1) \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

as well as the boundary condition

$$f_N^{(2)}(\tau, x_1, v_1^*, x_1 + \varepsilon\omega, v_2^*) = f_N^{(2)}(\tau, x_1, v_1, x_1 + \varepsilon\omega, v_2) \quad (53)$$

hence what we need to control is the *difference*

$$\Phi(\tau, x_1, v_1) - \Phi(\tau, x_1, v_1^*) \quad (54)$$

Of course for $T_1 \leq \tau \leq t$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi(\tau, x_1, v_1) - \Phi(\tau, x_1, v_1^*)| &\leq \|\nabla_v \Phi(\tau)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} |v_1 - v_1^*| \\ &= \|\nabla_v \Phi(\tau)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} |\omega \cdot (v_2 - v_1)| \\ &\leq C_T \|\nabla_{x,v} \varphi\|_\infty |\omega \cdot (v_2 - v_1)| \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

(This trick is inspired by related work due to Cercignani using the Bony functional. [7–9])

Hence the right hand side of (51) is controlled by the following quantity:

$$C_T \|\nabla_{x,v}\varphi\|_\infty \int_{T_1}^t \int d\tau d\omega dx_1 dv_1 dv_2 |\omega \cdot (v_2 - v_1)|^2 f_N^{(2)}(\tau, x_1, v_1, x_1 + \varepsilon\omega, v_2) \quad (56)$$

which is going to zero (along the subsequence N') due to (41). \square

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper is largely based on work completed for the author's dissertation at New York University. The partial manuscript was completed under a postdoctoral fellowship at the University of Texas at Austin, for which I am most appreciative. I would like to thank my PhD advisor, Nader Masmoudi, as well as Pierre Germain, for their advice and comments. I would also like to thank Nataša Pavlović for reading an early version of this manuscript and providing insightful feedback. Additionally, I wish to indicate my appreciation to the anonymous referee(s) for helpful comments following careful reading of the present version. Finally I would like to thank the organizers of this special session of JMM 2017 for the invitation, without which this manuscript would most likely never have reached its current state of completion.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. K. Alexander, *The infinite hard-sphere system*, Ph.D. Thesis, 1975.
- [2] A. Biryuk, W. Craig, and V. Panferov, *Strong solutions of the Boltzmann equation in one spatial dimension*, *Comptes Rendus Mathematique* **342** (2006), no. 11, 843–848.
- [3] T. Bodineau, I. Gallagher, and L. Saint-Raymond, *The Brownian motion as the limit of a deterministic system of hard spheres*, *Invent. math.* (2015).
- [4] ———, *From hard spheres dynamics to the Stokes-Fourier equations: an L^2 analysis of the Boltzmann-Grad limit*, *Annals of PDE* **3** (2017), no. 1, 2.
- [5] C. Boldrighini, R. L. Dobrushin, and Yu. M. Sukhov, *One-dimensional hard rod caricature of hydrodynamics*, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **31** (1983), no. 3, 577–616.
- [6] D. Burago, S. Ferleger, and A. Kononenko, *Uniform estimates on the number of collisions in semi-dispersing billiards*, *Ann. Math.* **147** (1998), no. 3, 695–708.
- [7] C. Cercignani, *A remarkable estimate for the solutions of the Boltzmann equation*, *Applied Mathematics Letters* **5** (1992), no. 5, 59–62.
- [8] ———, *Weak solutions of the Boltzmann equation and energy conservation*, *Applied Mathematics Letters* **8** (1995), no. 2, 53–59.
- [9] ———, *Global weak solutions of the Boltzmann equation*, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **118** (2005), no. 1-2, 333–342.
- [10] C. Cercignani, V. I. Gerasimenko, and D. Ya. Petrina, *Many-particle dynamics and kinetic equations*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997.

- [11] C. Cercignani, R. Illner, and M. Pulvirenti, *The mathematical theory of dilute gases*, Springer Verlag, 1994.
- [12] R. Denlinger, *The propagation of chaos for a rarefied gas of hard spheres in vacuum*, Ph.D. Thesis, 2016.
- [13] I. Gallagher, L. Saint-Raymond, and B. Texier, *From Newton to Boltzmann: Hard spheres and short-range potentials*, Zurich Lec. Adv. Math. (2014).
- [14] R. Illner, *On the number of collisions in a hard sphere particle system in all space*, Transport Theory and Stat. Phys. **18** (1989), no. 1, 71–86.
- [15] R. Illner and M. Pulvirenti, *Global validity of the Boltzmann equation for a two-dimensional rare gas in vacuum*, Comm. Math. Phys. **105** (1986), no. 2, 189–203.
- [16] ———, *Global validity of the Boltzmann equation for two- and three-dimensional rare gas in vacuum: Erratum and improved result*, Comm. Math. Phys. **121** (1989), no. 1, 143–146.
- [17] O. E. Lanford, *Time evolution of large classical systems*, Dynamical systems, theory and applications, 1975, pp. 1–111.
- [18] J. L. Lebowitz and H. Spohn, *Steady state self-diffusion at low density*, J. Stat. Phys. **29** (1982), no. 1, 39–55.
- [19] S. Mischler and C. Mouhot, *Kac’s program in kinetic theory*, Invent. math. **193** (2013), no. 1, 1–147.
- [20] S. Olla, S.R.S. Varadhan, and H.-T. Yau, *Hydrodynamical limits for a Hamiltonian system with weak noise*, Comm. Math. Phys. **155** (1993), no. 3, 523–560.
- [21] M. Pulvirenti, C. Saffirio, and S. Simonella, *On the validity of the Boltzmann equation for short range potentials*, Rev. Math. Phys. **26** (2014), no. 2, 1450001.
- [22] M. Pulvirenti and S. Simonella, *On the evolution of the empirical measures for the hard-sphere dynamics*, Bull. Inst. Math. Acad. Sinica **10** (2015), 171–204.
- [23] L. Saint-Raymond, *Hydrodynamic limits of the Boltzmann equation*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1971, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2009.
- [24] S. Simonella, *Evolution of correlation functions in the hard sphere dynamics*, Journal of Statistical Physics **155** (2014), no. 6, 1191–1221.
- [25] T. Tao, *Nonlinear dispersive equations: local and global analysis*, CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics, vol. 106, AMS, 2006.
- [26] H. van Beijeren, O. E. Lanford, J. L. Lebowitz, and H. Spohn, *Equilibrium time correlation functions in the low-density limit*, Journal of Statistical Physics **22** (1980), no. 2, 237–257.
- [27] L. N. Vaserstein, *On systems of particles with finite-range and/or repulsive interactions*, Comm. Math. Phys. **69** (1979), no. 1, 31–56.