

Convergence of the Method of Reflections for Particle Suspensions in Stokes Flows

Richard M. Höfer

December 12, 2019

We study the convergence of the method of reflections for the Stokes equations in domains perforated by countably many spherical particles with boundary conditions typical for the suspension of rigid particles. We prove that a relaxed version of the method is always convergent in \dot{H}^1 under a mild separation condition on the particles. Moreover, we prove optimal convergence rates of the method in $\dot{W}^{1,q}$, $1 < q < \infty$ and in L^∞ (for finite clouds of particles) in terms of the particle volume fraction under a stronger separation condition of the particles.

1 Introduction

We consider a perforation of \mathbb{R}^3 by disjoint spherical particles with radii R_i located at positions X_i , $i \in I$, where I is a finite or countable index set. We write $B_i := B_{R_i}(X_i)$ and

$$K := \bigcup_i \overline{B_i}$$

for the set occupied by the particles.

We are interested in solving the Stokes problem

$$-\mu\Delta v + \nabla p = f \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus K, \quad (1.1)$$

$$ev = 0 \quad \text{in } K \quad (1.2)$$

$$\int_{\partial B_i} \sigma[v, p]n = \int_{B_i} f \quad \text{for all } i \in I. \quad (1.3)$$

$$\int_{\partial B_i} (x - X_i) \times \sigma[v, p]n = \int_{B_i} (x - X_i) \times f \quad \text{for all } i \in I. \quad (1.4)$$

Here, $ev = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla v + \nabla v^T)$ is the symmetric gradient. By a standard rigidity result, (1.2) means that the fluid velocity v (extended to the interior of the particles) is a rigid body motion inside of each particle. This condition is complemented by (1.3) and (1.4) where $\sigma[u] = 2\mu eu - p \text{Id}$ is the fluid stress. These two constraints prescribe the total force and torque acting on each particle.

We remark, that all the results presented in this paper continue to hold for the system corresponding to (1.1) - (1.4) when the Stokes equations are replaced by the Poisson equation.

The method of reflection yields a formal series expansion of the solution to certain (linear) PDEs like (1.1) - (1.4) in domains like $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus K$, where the boundary of the domain is decomposed into several (possibly infinitely many) disjoint boundaries. This series representation is of the form

$$v = u - \sum_{i_1 \in I} Q_{i_1} u + \sum_{i_2 \in I} \sum_{\substack{i_1 \in I \\ i_1 \neq i_2}} Q_{i_2} Q_{i_1} u - \sum_{i_3 \in I} \sum_{\substack{i_2 \in I \\ i_2 \neq i_3}} \sum_{\substack{i_1 \in I \\ i_1 \neq i_2}} Q_{i_3} Q_{i_2} Q_{i_1} u + \dots, \quad (1.5)$$

where u is the solution to the PDE in the whole space and the operators Q_i are certain solution operators which take into account only the i -th part of the boundary. This method has been systematically studied by Velázquez and the author in [HV18] for the Poisson and Stokes equations with Dirichlet boundary conditions. We showed in [HV18] how the method of reflections for Dirichlet boundary can be used to re-obtain classical homogenization results for the Poisson and Stokes equations in perforated domains. The method has been used in [FOT85; Rub86] to determine the fluctuations in related problems, where the particles are randomly distributed. We refer to [CGHS18] and [HV18] for a more general introduction, historical remarks and more references on the method of reflections and its applications.

1.1 Applications of the method in sedimentation and the effective viscosity problem

In several recent works, the method of reflections has been applied to system (1.1) - (1.4) which is a typical model for the study of particle suspensions. In particular, the method of reflections has been used for effective viscosity problem and the problem of (inertialless) particle sedimentation.

The effective viscosity problem aims at describing the phenomenon that the presence of the particles give rise to an effective viscosity μ_{eff} in the homogenization limit of many small particles. It is believed that an expansion of μ_{eff} in terms of the particle volume fraction ϕ of the form

$$\mu_{\text{eff}} = \mu + \frac{5}{2}\phi + \mu_2\phi^2 + \dots \quad (1.6)$$

holds, where $\frac{5}{2}\phi$ is known as the Einstein correction [Ein06].

In the effective viscosity problem, the method of reflections has turned out to be a very useful tool since, at least formally, it allows to determine the coefficients in the expansion for the effective viscosity in (1.6) by comparison with the expansion (1.5). More precisely, one expects the method of reflection to yield an approximation of the solution up to an error of order $o(\phi^k)$ by keeping the first $k + 1$ terms in (1.5), i.e. by cutting the expansion after the term involving k sums.

If the fluid equations (1.1) - (1.4) is complemented by the equations of motion for the particles, the problem becomes dynamical. A particularly physically relevant case is the dynamics of particle sedimentation, where the driving force is gravity acting on the particles. We emphasize that this case is included into the above system of equations (1.1) - (1.4) through a choice of f such that $f = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus K$ and $\int_{B_i} f = F_i$ where F_i is the gravity acting on particle B_i .

In typical dynamical suspension problems such as the sedimentation of inertialess particles, the particle positions change according to $\dot{X}_i = v(X_i)$. The method of reflections appears to

be very helpful in this context since it provides the necessary pointwise information on the solution in contrast to classical energy methods.

We give a brief summary about the results regarding the effective viscosity and sedimentation where the method of reflections has been used. In [JO04], Jabin and Otto used a variant of the method of reflections to identify the dilute regime of inertialess particle sedimentation where the dynamics is close to the dynamics of isolated particles. Later, the author studied the corresponding (strong) interacting regime in [Höf18], and proved convergence of the microscopic dynamics for inertialess particle sedimentation to the transport-Stokes system

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \rho + (u + \gamma^{-1}g) \cdot \nabla \rho &= 0 \\ -\Delta u + \nabla p &= \rho g, \quad \operatorname{div} u = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{1.7}$$

where $\rho(t, x)$ is the particle density, $g \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is the constant gravity and γ is a parameter accounting for the particle interaction strength. Using a related reflection method, quantitative convergence to (1.7) in terms of Wasserstein distances has been proved by Mecherbet in [Mec18]. In [Mec19], Mecherbet used similar methods for studying the sedimentation of close pairs of particles.

In [NS19], Niethammer and Schubert used the method of reflections to rigorously establish the Einstein law, i.e. the expansion in (1.6) up to order $o(\phi)$, for a suspension of spherical particles. Later, Hillairet and Wu [HW19] proved a corresponding result for more general shapes of particles. Moreover, Gerard-Varet and Hillairet [GVH19] were able to get insights on the second order correction in ϕ to the effective viscosity. For more results on the effective viscosity problem (not relying on the method of reflections), we refer the reader to [HM12; GV19; DG19].

1.2 Expected convergence rates and results of previous works

In [HV18], the method of reflections for the Dirichlet problem has been formulated in terms of orthogonal projections on the homogeneous Sobolev space $\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$. More precisely, using that the operators Q_i in (1.5) are orthogonal projections, the k -th order approximation of the method of reflections can be written as

$$v_k = (1 - \sum_{i \in I} Q_i)^k u.$$

The analysis of the convergence thus boils down to the study of the operator $L = \sum_{i \in I} Q_i$. For the Poisson equations with Dirichlet boundary conditions, the function $Q_i u$ is approximately given by

$$Q_i u(x) = \frac{(u)_i R_i}{|x - X_i|}, \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_i$$

where $(u)_i$ is the average of u over ∂B_i . A similar formula holds for the Stokes equations. In particular, the operator L is in general not well-defined if the particles are distributed everywhere in \mathbb{R}^3 . In [HV18], convergence of the method is therefore first shown for the screened Poisson equation (i.e. the operator $-\Delta + \lambda$, $\lambda > 0$), if the particles are sufficiently well separated and the capacity density of the particles is sufficiently small. For the Poisson and Stokes equation, the same result holds under the additional condition that the particles

only occupy a bounded set in \mathbb{R}^3 . In [HV18], a relaxed version of the method of reflections is then studied which also converges when the particles are distributed everywhere and the capacity density is only bounded. This relaxed version reads

$$\tilde{v}_k = (1 - \sum_{i \in I} \gamma_i Q_i)^k u,$$

where the parameters γ_i have to be chosen sufficiently small (e.g. $\gamma_i = \gamma e^{-|X_i|}$, γ small).

A corresponding formulation in terms of orthogonal reflections has been used in [Höf18] and [NS19] for the system (1.1) - (1.4).¹ Due to the different boundary conditions, the function $Q_i u$ decays much faster, namely roughly like

$$|(Q_i u)|(x) \sim \frac{R_i^3 |eu(X_i)|}{|x - X_i|^2} \quad \text{as } |x| \rightarrow \infty.$$

Moreover, the gradient $\nabla Q_i u$, which is the relevant quantity for analyzing the convergence of the method of reflections for the system (1.1) - (1.4), decays like $|x - X_i|^{-3}$. As a consequence, the convergence properties of the method of reflections for system (1.1) - (1.4) are much better than for the problem with Dirichlet boundary conditions. In particular, one expects the convergence to be related to the volume fraction ϕ of the particles instead of the capacity density. Indeed, formally, one obtains

$$\sum_{i \in I} Q_i u(x) \sim \sum \frac{R_i^3 eu(X_i)}{|x - X_i|^3} \sim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \phi(y) \frac{eu(y)}{|x - y|^3} dy,$$

where $\phi(y)$ denotes the local particle volume fraction. Hence, if one assumes that the local particle volume fraction is bounded by some constant ϕ_0 , one expects the first order correction in the method of reflections to scale like ϕ_0 . Similarly, the k -th order correction given by the $(k + 1)$ -st term on the right-hand side of (1.5) should scale like ϕ_0^k .

This argument is completely formal. In particular, in order to make it rigorous, one needs to deal with the fact that the decay $|x - X_i|^{-3}$ is critical for summability. Therefore, in [Höf18] and [NS19] finite clouds of particles are considered which avoids the summability issue at infinity. Moreover, since the decay is also critical at zero, instead of the expected convergence for small particle volume fraction ϕ_0 , the critical exponent caused a smallness assumption for $\phi_0 \log N$, where N is the total number of particles.

In [HW19; GVH19], a related method of reflections is studied. The problem of the critical exponent is overcome by approximating the sum $\sum \nabla Q_i u$ by an integral which takes the form of a Calderon-Zygmund operator. The method of reflections studied in [HW19; GVH19] replaces the operators Q_i by more explicit operators. This yields a modified method of reflections which produces a sequence \bar{v}_k which is not convergent to v . However, it is shown in [HW19; GVH19], that the error $v - \bar{v}_k$ is sufficiently small in terms of the particle volume fraction for the purpose of analyzing the first and second order correction for the effective viscosity of a suspension.

1.3 Outline of the main results

In the present paper, we follow the approach in [HV18] for the analysis of the method through studying the operator $L = \sum Q_i$. In contrast to the corresponding system with Dirichlet

¹To be precise, in [Höf18], a system is studied where particle rotations are neglected but this does not matter a lot for the analysis of the method.

boundary conditions studied in [HV18], we show that L is always a bounded self-adjoint operator on $\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ under the mere condition that the particles are non-overlapping, with a bound on $\|L\|$ which does not depend on the particle configuration (see Theorem 2.1). In particular, $\tilde{v}_k := (1 - \gamma L)^k u$ converges to v in $\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ for $\gamma < 2\|L\|$ (see 2.3). Moreover, we show that L has a spectral gap if there exists $\theta > 1$ such that the balls $B_{\theta R_i}(X_i)$ are disjoint, leading to a quantitative convergence result, Theorem 2.4.

This convergence results bears the advantage that it holds for a very general class of particle configurations. However, in many applications, stronger estimates on the rate of convergence are needed, in particular in terms of the particle volume fraction. Such a result can only be expected to hold under additional separation conditions on the particles, since clusters of close particles slow down the convergence of the method. We prove quantitative convergence results for the method of reflections in terms of $\phi_0 = \frac{R_{\max}^3}{d_{\min}^3}$, where R_{\max} is the maximal particle radius and d_{\min} is the minimal particle distance. We prove that for ϕ_0 sufficiently small, the method of reflections converges in $\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with rate ϕ_0 for any $1 < q < \infty$.

The quantity ϕ_0 is an upper bound for the particle volume fraction. The (quite restrictive) assumption that ϕ_0 scales like the particle volume fraction has been imposed in many related papers (see for instance [DGR08; HMS17; Höf18; NS19; GVH19]). It remains an important open problem to weaken this assumption in order to treat more general (and in particular random) configurations of particles using the method of reflections or an appropriately modified version of it. We refer to [Hil18; Mec18] for partial results in this direction.

Our combines the techniques from [HV18; Höf18; NS19; HW19; GVH19]. In particular, since the use of estimates for Calderon-Zygmund operators makes it possible to remove the logarithmic divergence in [Höf18; NS19], we are able to treat the case of infinitely many particles. The Calderon-Zygmund estimates are used in a slightly different way than in [HW19; GVH19], which yields better convergence rates in ϕ_0 . More precisely, we show that the $(k + 1)$ -st term on the right-hand side of (1.5) in general scales like ϕ_0^{k-1} in the homogeneous Sobolev space $\dot{W}^{1,q}$ for any $1 < q < \infty$. As we will discuss after stating this result, Theorem 2.5, these convergence rates seem to be optimal.

To our knowledge, this is the first time that the method of reflections is studied in more general homogeneous Sobolev spaces. By Sobolev embedding, this allows to obtain estimates in $C^{0,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Moreover, for bounded clouds of particles, we prove convergence results in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ where we gain a factor in ϕ_0 compared to $\dot{W}^{1,q}$ yielding best possible rates discussed in the previous subsection (see Corollary 2.7).

These results which are expected to be very useful for dynamical problems such as particle sedimentation. In particular, we hope that our results allow to obtain rigorous results for the effective dynamics of particle suspensions at small volume fractions ϕ instead of $\phi \rightarrow 0$ as in [Höf18; Mec18; Mec19]. It is this regime where the dynamics of particle suspensions becomes entangled with the effective viscosity problem.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give precise definition of the method of reflections and the statements of the main results. In Section 3, we prove the main results for the relaxed method of reflections. In Section 4, we prove the main result for the unrelaxed method, Theorem 2.5, in the Hilbert space $\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Relying on this result, we then generalize this result to $\dot{W}^{1,q}$ for any $1 < q < \infty$ in Section 5. Finally, in Section 6, we prove the convergence result in L^∞ , Corollary 2.7.

2 Setting and main results

2.1 Weak formulation of the problem

Without loss of generality, we set the viscosity $\mu = 1$ in the rest of the paper.

In order to write problem (1.1) - (1.4) in a weak formulation, we consider homogeneous Sobolev spaces of divergence free functions which are rigid body motions inside the particles. More precisely, we denote by $\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, $1 \leq q < \infty$ the homogeneous Sobolev space defined as the closure of $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with respect to the semi-norm $\|\nabla \cdot\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)}$. By the Sobolev embedding for $q < 3$, we can identify elements in $\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with functions in L^{q^*} , q^* being the Sobolev conjugate $q^* = (3q)/(3-q)$. On the other hand, if $q \geq 3$, elements in $\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ are equivalence classes of functions which differ by a constant almost everywhere. We also define

$$\dot{W}_\sigma^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3) = \{w \in \dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3) : \operatorname{div} w = 0\}.$$

Then, we introduce the space

$$W_q := \left\{ w \in \dot{W}_\sigma^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3) : ew = 0 \text{ in } K \right\}. \quad (2.1)$$

Then, if $f \in \dot{W}^{-1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3) := (\dot{W}^{1,q'}(\mathbb{R}^3))^*$ (q' denoting the Hölder conjugate of q), the weak formulation of (1.1) - (1.4) reads

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla v : \nabla \varphi &= \langle f, \varphi \rangle \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in W_{q'}, \\ \operatorname{div} v &= 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3, \\ ev &= 0 \quad \text{in } K. \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

This means that we seek a solution $v \in W_q$ which satisfies the first equation in (2.2).

2.2 The method of reflections in terms of orthogonal projections

For $q = 2$ we denote for simplicity $W := W_2$. In this case, the existence and uniqueness of a weak solution to (2.2) for any $f \in \dot{H}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ is immediate. Moreover, we can characterize this solution as follows. Let P denote the orthogonal projection in $\dot{H}_\sigma^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ to W . Then, the solution to (2.2) is given by $v = Pu$, where $u \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ is the solution to²

$$\Delta u + \nabla p = f, \quad \operatorname{div} u = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3. \quad (2.3)$$

For the setup of the method of reflections (following [HV18; Höf18; NS19]), we define

$$W_i = \left\{ w \in \dot{H}_\sigma^1(\mathbb{R}^3) : ew = 0 \text{ in } B_i \right\}.$$

Clearly,

$$W = \bigcap_i W_i.$$

²Note that here and in the following we denote by the same letter p different pressure terms. Since the pressure itself is not of interest for our analysis, there will arise no confusion from this slight abuse of notation.

Let P_i be the orthogonal projection from $\dot{H}_\sigma^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ to W_i and $Q_i = 1 - P_i$. We observe (see [NS19, Lemma 4.1])

$$W_i^\perp = \left\{ w \in \dot{H}_\sigma^1(\mathbb{R}^3) : \begin{aligned} & -\Delta w + \nabla p = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{B_i}, \\ & \int_{\partial B_i} \sigma[w, p]n = \int_{\partial B_i} (x - X_i) \times (\sigma[w, p]n) = 0 \end{aligned} \right\}. \quad (2.4)$$

The method of reflections can now be stated as follows. As a zero order approximation for the solution v to (2.2), one takes the solution u to (2.3). Recall from (2.2) that v is a rigid body motion inside of the particles, i.e. $ev = 0$ in $\cup_i B_i$. Thus, the idea behind the method of reflections is to add functions w_i to u in such a way that $u + w_i$ is a rigid body motion inside of the particle i , and still satisfies the Stokes equations. Thus, $w_i = -Q_i u$, and we define

$$v_1 = \left(1 - \sum_i Q_i\right)u.$$

Clearly, since generally $ew_i \neq 0$ in B_j for $j \neq i$, the function v_1 is still not a rigid body motion inside the particles. Therefore, higher order approximations for v are obtained by repeating this process.

$$v_k = \left(1 - \sum_i Q_i\right)^k u. \quad (2.5)$$

This defines the k -th order approximation of v through the method of reflections. It is not difficult to see that v_k coincides with the series expansion (1.5) cut after the $(k+1)$ -st term (see [HV18]).

The elements of W_i^\perp can be interpreted as force dipoles leading to a decay like $|x - X_i|^{-3}$. As discussed in Section 1.2, it is this decay that determines the convergence rate of the method of reflections.

2.3 Main results for the relaxed method

We want to study the convergence $v_k \rightarrow v$. Clearly, convergence cannot be expected in general, since the sequence v_k might be unbounded. We therefore need to study the operator L defined by

$$L := \sum_i Q_i.$$

Since the sum is infinite, it is a priori not even clear whether L is a bounded operator on $\dot{H}_\sigma^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Indeed, in [HV18], we studied the corresponding operator when boundary condition in (1.1) - (1.4) are replaced by Dirichlet boundary condition. In that case, L generally does not define a bounded operator if the particles are distributed everywhere in the whole space. Indeed, in that case, the corresponding functions $Q_i u$ decay like $|x - X_i|^{-1}$ which is not fast enough to make the sum $\sum Q_i u$ converge. On the other hand, for the boundary conditions studied here, the functions $Q_i u$ decay faster (like $|x - X_i|^{-2}$) since they are ‘‘dipole potentials’’ meaning

$$\int_{\partial B_i} \sigma[Q_i u, p]n = 0,$$

because $Q_i u \in W_i^\perp$.

We prove that L is a bounded operator on the mere condition that the particles are pairwise disjoint.

Theorem 2.1. *Assume that $B_i \cap B_j = \emptyset$ for all $i \neq j \in I$. Then, the operator $L = \sum_i Q_i$ is a well defined, bounded, nonnegative and self-adjoint operator on $\dot{H}_\sigma^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $\|L\| \leq C$ for a universal constant C .*

Remark 2.2. Following the proof of this theorem in Section 3, it is possible to relax the non-overlapping condition. More precisely, the theorem remains true, if there exists an $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|\{i \in I: x \in B_i\}| \leq N_0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$. The norm of $\|L\|$ is then bounded by $C N_0^{1/2}$.

Even though L is a well-defined bounded operator on $\dot{H}_\sigma^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$, the sequence v_k might be unbounded. Analogously to [HV18] we therefore also study the convergence of the so called relaxed method of reflections which consists in replacing the sequence v_k by

$$\tilde{v}_k := (1 - \gamma L)^k u, \quad (2.6)$$

for some small parameter $\gamma > 0$.

As a direct consequence from the spectral theorem for bounded self-adjoint operators, the relaxed method of reflections is always convergent, if γ is chosen small enough in (2.6), independently of the particle configuration. More precisely, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 2.3. *Assume that $B_i \cap B_j = \emptyset$. There exists a universal constant $\gamma_0 > 0$ such that for all $0 < \gamma < \gamma_0$*

$$(1 - \gamma L)^k \rightarrow P,$$

pointwise as operators on $\dot{H}_\sigma^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$, where P is the orthogonal projection from $\dot{H}_\sigma^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ to W . In particular, for all $f \in \dot{H}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, the sequence \tilde{v}_k defined in (2.6) converges to the unique weak solution $v \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ of problem (2.2).

For a quantitative convergence result, we impose the following additional assumption on the particle configuration: which is equivalent to

$$\text{there exists } \theta > 1 \text{ such that } B_{\theta R_i}(X_i) \cap B_{\theta R_j}(X_j) = \emptyset \quad \text{for all } i \neq j. \quad (2.7)$$

Under this constraint, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 2.4. *Assume that (2.7) holds for some $\theta > 1$. Then, there exist constants $0 < c < C < \infty$ depending only on θ such that for all $\gamma > 0$*

$$\|(1 - \gamma L)^k - P\| \leq \max\{1 - c\gamma, |1 - C\gamma|\}^k$$

This theorem implies that we may choose γ (depending only on θ) such that the convergence $\tilde{v}_k \rightarrow v$ is exponential with a rate that depends only on θ .

2.4 Main results for the unrelaxed method

For convergence of the unrelaxed method of reflections, we need an additional smallness condition. We introduce

$$d_{\min} := \inf_{i \neq j} |X_i - X_j|, \quad R_{\max} := \sup_{i \in I} R_i.$$

The smallness needed for the results stated in this subsection is in terms of

$$\phi_0 := \frac{R_{\max}^3}{d_{\min}^3}. \quad (2.8)$$

In particular, we assume $R_{\max} < \infty$ and $d_{\min} > 0$. We emphasize that smallness of ϕ_0 is a stronger condition than the assumption that θ in (2.7) can be chosen large. In the case that the particle radii are identical, these conditions are equivalent, though.

We consider the convergence of the method of reflections in the spaces $\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ for $1 < q < \infty$. Since the operators Q_i are orthogonal projections in $\dot{H}_\sigma^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$, we first have to obtain a meaningful definition of the method in $\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ by extending these operators and thus L from the dense set $\dot{H}_\sigma^1(\mathbb{R}^3) \cap \dot{W}_\sigma^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ to $\dot{W}_\sigma^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$.

Theorem 2.5. *Let $1 < q < \infty$. Then, there exists $\bar{\phi}_0 > 0$ depending only on θ and q such that for all $\phi_0 < \bar{\phi}_0$ the operator L can be extended to a well-defined operator on $\dot{W}_\sigma^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and for all $f \in \dot{W}^{-1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ there exists a unique weak solution $v \in \dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ to (2.2). Moreover, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$\|(1 - L)^k u - v\|_{\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C \|e(1 - L)^k u\|_{L^q(\cup_i B_i)} \leq C(C\phi_0)^k \|eu\|_{L^q(\cup_i B_i)},$$

where $u \in \dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ is the unique weak solution to (2.3).

Remark 2.6. By Morrey's inequality, we see that the above theorem applied with $q > 3$ in particular implies convergence for the Hölder seminorm $[\cdot]_{C^{0,\alpha}}$, $\alpha = 1 - 3/q$. Moreover, if in addition $f \in \dot{W}^{-1,r}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, $r < 3$ we can deduce convergence in $C^{0,\alpha}$.

Theorem 2.5 says that we gain a factor ϕ_0 each time we apply the method of reflections. However, it should be emphasized that the estimate only implies that the k -th order corrector $L(1 - L)^{k-1}$ is of order ϕ_0^{k-1} . This k -th order corrector coincides with the $(k + 1)$ -st term on the right hand side of (1.5) and we have argued in Section 1.2 that this term is expected to be of order ϕ_0^k . In particular, the above theorem does not imply any smallness on $u - v$.

Such a smallness cannot hold in general in the space $\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ since

$$\|u - v\|_{\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)}^q \geq \|e(u - v)\|_{L^q(\cup_i B_i)}^q = \|eu\|_{L^q(\cup_i B_i)}^q.$$

For a sufficiently regular function f , one might exploit the term $\|eu\|_{L^q(\cup_i B_i)}$ for some smallness in ϕ_0 . At best, though one can hope for a factor $\phi_0^{1/q}$.

However, the heuristics that the k -th order approximation gives an accuracy ϕ_0^{k+1} holds if we look at the function itself instead of the gradient. For this result we need to make the additional assumption that there exists a bounded set $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ with

$$X_i \in U \quad \text{for all } i \in I. \quad (\text{H2})$$

In particular, this implies the restriction that the number of particles is finite. The reason for this additional assumption is that we need to control the sum

$$\sum_{j \neq i} |Q_i w(X_i)| \sim \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{R^3 |eu(X_j)|}{|X_i - X_j|^2}.$$

Corollary 2.7. *Let $1 < r < 3 < q < \infty$ and assume (H2). Then, there exists $\bar{\phi}_0 > 0$ depending only on q such that for all $\phi_0 < \bar{\phi}_0$ and for all $f \in \dot{W}^{-1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3) \cap \dot{W}^{-1,r}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and all $k \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$\|(1-L)^k u - v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C(R_{\max}^\alpha + \phi_0^{1/q'}) (C\phi_0)^k \|eu\|_{L^q(\cup_i B_i)}, \quad (2.9)$$

where $\alpha = 1 - 3/q$ and C depends only on q and U from (H2). Moreover,

$$\sup_{i \in I} \left| \int_{\partial B_i} (1-L)^k u - v \right| \leq C \phi_0^{1/q'} (C\phi_0)^k \|eu\|_{L^q(\cup_i B_i)}. \quad (2.10)$$

Remark 2.8. (i) To see that the term R_{\max}^α on the right-hand side of (2.9) is needed, we consider the case $k = 0$ and look at the difference $u - v$ in B_i for any i . The function v is restricted to a rigid body motion inside B_i , whereas u is more or less arbitrary. Since $u \in C^{0,\alpha}$, the best possible approximation for u in $L^\infty(B_i)$ by a rigid body motion will therefore in general be afflicted with an error R_{\max}^α .

(ii) If one assumes additional regularity on f , namely $f \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)$, we find $\nabla u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and therefore $\|eu\|_{L^q(\cup_i B_i)} \leq \phi_0^{1/q}$. Inserting this into (2.10) yields the optimal convergence rate ϕ_0^{k+1} .

(iii) The assumption $f \in \dot{W}^{-1,r}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ in the above corollary is only needed to fix the problem that functions in $\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ are only defined up to a constant.

3 Proof of the main results on the relaxed method of reflections

In this section we prove that the operator L always defines a bounded operator under the mere condition that the particles are disjoint. Being a sum of orthogonal projections, L is also self-adjoint. Therefore, the convergence of the relaxed method of reflections is a direct consequence of spectral theory. Moreover, we get quantitative convergence results in the case that the separation condition (2.7) holds.

We first recall from [NS19] some properties of the subspaces W_i and W_i^\perp (see equation (2.1)) and the corresponding orthogonal projections P_i and Q_i .

Lemma 3.1 ([NS19, Lemma 4.2]). *Let $w \in W_i^\perp$. Then*

$$\int_{\partial B_i} w = \int_{B_i} \frac{\nabla w - (\nabla w)^T}{2} = 0.$$

In particular, for all $w \in \dot{H}_\sigma^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ we have

$$P_i w = V + \omega \times (x - X_i), \quad V = \int_{\partial B_i} w, \quad \omega = \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_i} \text{curl } w$$

Lemma 3.2 ([NS19, Corollary 4.3]). *There exists a universal constant $C > 0$ such that all $w \in W_i^\perp$,*

$$\|w\|_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C \|ew\|_{L^2(B_i)}$$

Remark 3.3. In particular, this Lemma implies that for all $w_1, w_2 \in H_\sigma^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$

$$\|Q_i w_1\|_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C \|ew_1\|_{L^2(B_i)}, \quad (3.1)$$

$$(w_1, Q_i w_2)_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C \|ew_1\|_{L^2(B_i)} \|ew_2\|_{L^2(B_i)}, \quad (3.2)$$

Theorem 2.1 easily follows from Lemma 3.2.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Since L is self-adjoint, we have³

$$\|L\|_{\dot{H}_\sigma^1 \rightarrow \dot{H}_\sigma^1} = \sup_{\substack{w \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3) \\ \|w\|_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} = 1}} (Lw, w)_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)}.$$

By (3.2), we have

$$(Lw, w)_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} = \sum_i (Q_i w, w)_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C \sum_i \|w\|_{L^2(B_i)}^2 \leq C.$$

This finishes the proof. \square

Corollary 2.3 is a direct consequence of Theorem 2.1 and the spectral theorem for bounded self-adjoint operators. We refer to [HV18, Proposition 2.13] for the details.

In order to quantify the convergence rate, we need to prove that L has a spectral gap, i.e., that L is strictly positive on W^\perp . This is proved in the following Lemma under the additional condition (2.7). Theorem 2.4 is a direct consequence of Theorem 2.1 and Lemma 3.4 below. For the details of the proof we refer again to [HV18, Proposition 2.13].

Lemma 3.4. *Assume that (2.7) holds. Then, there exists a constant $c > 0$ depending only on θ from (2.7) such that*

$$(Lw, w)_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} \geq c \|w\|_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \quad \text{for all } w \in W^\perp$$

Proof. Let $w \in W^\perp$. We observe that u is the function of minimal norm in

$$X_w := \{\varphi \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3) : e\varphi = ew \text{ in } B_i \text{ for all } i \in I\}.$$

Indeed, let $\varphi \in X_w$, then $e(w - \varphi) = 0$ in all the particles. Therefore, $w - \varphi \in W$. Thus $w = Q\varphi$, where Q is the orthogonal projection to W^\perp . In particular

$$\|\varphi\|_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 = \|w\|_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 + \|\varphi - w\|_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2.$$

We apply Lemma 3.6 below to $Q_i u$ (restricted to B_i) to obtain functions $\varphi_i \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that $\text{supp } \varphi_i \subseteq B_{\theta R_i}(X_i)$, $\varphi_i = Q_i w$ in B_i , and $\|\varphi_i\|_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C \|eQ_i w\|_{L^2(B_i)} \leq C \|Q_i w\|_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)}$.

³To be precise, we do not know a priori that L is well-defined on $\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$. However, it is straightforward to resolve this issue by approximating L through taking into account only finitely many particles. We refer to the proof of [HV18, Proposition 2.7] for the details.

Since the balls $B_{\theta R_i}(X_i)$ are disjoint by assumption and $e\varphi_i = eQw_i = ew_i$ in B_i , we deduce that the function $\varphi := \sum \varphi_i$ is an element of X_w . Hence, we may estimate

$$\begin{aligned} (Lw, w)_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} &= \sum_i (Q_i w, w) = \sum_i \|Q_i w\|_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \\ &\geq c \sum_i \|\varphi_i\|_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 = c \|\varphi\|_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \geq c \|w\|_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Remark 3.5. The proof of the Lemma shows that on W^\perp an equivalent norm is given by $\|e \cdot\|_{L^2(\cup_i B_i)}$ with

$$\|ew\|_{L^2(\cup_i B_i)} \leq \|w\|_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C \|ew\|_{L^2(\cup_i B_i)},$$

where the constant C depends only on θ . Indeed, the second inequality follows immediately from (3.3) and (3.1).

For the proof of Lemma 3.4, we used the following lemma.

Lemma 3.6 ([NS19, Lemma 4.6]). *Let $1 < q < \infty$, $\theta > 1$, $r > 0$, and $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$, and assume $w \in W_\sigma^{1,q}(B_r(x))$ satisfies*

$$\oint_{\partial B_r(x)} w = \oint_{B_r(x)} \operatorname{curl} w = 0.$$

Then, there exists an extension $Ew = E_{\theta,r,x,q}w \in W_\sigma^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $\operatorname{supp} Ew \subseteq B_{\theta r}(x)$ such that $Ew = w$ in $B_r(x)$ and

$$\|\nabla Ew\|_{L^q(B_{\theta r}(x))} \leq C \|ew\|_{L^q(B_r(x))}, \quad (3.4)$$

where the constant C depends only on θ and q .

Remark 3.7. (i) Lemma 4.6 in [NS19] only covers the case $q = 2$. The general case is analogous, though.

(ii) If the condition $\oint_{\partial B_r(x)} \operatorname{curl} w = 0$ is dropped, one gets the same assertion with ∇w instead of ew on the right-hand side of (3.4).

4 Proof of Theorem 2.5 for $q = 2$

For the sake of a simpler presentation, we will assume in the following that all the radii are identical, i.e., $R_i = R_{\max}$ for all $i \in I$. It is not difficult to check that all the estimates that we prove are monotone in the particle radii. Therefore, the general case of different particle radii is proved in the same way. We emphasize that this argument is only valid, since the quantity ϕ_0 from (2.8) only depends on R_{\max} , whereas the optimal factor θ in (2.7) is sensitive to the individual particle radii.

Since we assume that all the particles have the same radius R_{\max} , it follows from a scaling argument that it suffices to consider the case $R = 1$ for the proof of Theorem 2.5. We will therefore assume $R_i = 1$ for all $i \in I$ in Sections 4 and 5.

The convergence results proved in the previous section are based on bounds derived from variational principles, that hold for general particle distributions and the application of the

abstract spectral theorem. In this section, we prove convergence results in $\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ for the unrelaxed method of reflections for sufficiently dilute particle configurations. For obtaining such convergence results, and to quantify them for small particle volume fraction ϕ_0 , a more detailed study of the operator L is needed that goes beyond the bounds and the spectral gap found in the previous section. More precisely, we will prove that the operator L has the following structure.

Proposition 4.1. *There exists an operator $T: W^\perp \rightarrow W^\perp$ such that $\|T\| \leq C$, where C depends only on θ and*

$$L = (1 + \phi_0 T)P_{W^\perp}. \quad (4.1)$$

Theorem 2.5 in the case $q = 2$ is a direct consequence of this proposition. For future reference, we give the statement of this result.

Corollary 4.2. *There exists a constant C which depends only on θ such that for all $u \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$*

$$\|(1 - L)^k u - P_W u\|_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq (C\phi_0)^k \|P_{W^\perp} u\|_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)}$$

As we will see in the next section, for the proof of Theorem 2.5 in the general case $1 < q < \infty$, we will show an analogous version of Proposition 4.1. However, the analogue of the decomposition $\dot{H}_\sigma^1(\mathbb{R}^3) = W \oplus W^\perp$ for $\dot{W}_\sigma^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ is more subtle. Indeed, as we will see in the next section, to obtain such an analogue decomposition, we will rely on Corollary 4.2.

In order to prove Proposition 4.1, it is crucial to understand the interactions between the particles in the method. Recall the setup of the method of reflections from (2.5) as

$$v_k = \left(1 - \sum_i Q_i\right)^k u$$

and that the iteration of the operator $(1 - \sum_i Q_i)$ is necessary, since $eQ_i w$ generally does not vanish in B_j for $j \neq i$. In order to quantify this error, we will study $\nabla Q_i w$ in B_j . The following decay estimate has been shown in [NS19, Corollary 4.4]

$$|\nabla Q_i w(x)| \leq C \|ew\|_{L^2(B_i)} \frac{1}{|x - X_i|^3} \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_\theta(X_i).$$

Although this estimate is optimal, it is not sufficient in the case when the particles are distributed everywhere in the whole space due to the critical exponent on the right-hand side. Therefore, it is not possible to derive the desired estimate by adding the absolute values of all the errors coming from all other particles, but it can only be achieved by taking into account possible cancellations between these errors. To be able to exploit such cancellation phenomena, we split the operator Q_i into two parts Q_i^d and Q_i^q , which we call the simple dipole part and the quadrupole part. As explained in the introduction, Q_i maps to functions that are dipole potentials meaning $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} -\Delta Q_i u + \nabla p = 0$. As we will see below, the simple dipoles are explicit, which enables us to study the cancellations using Calderon-Zygmund theory. The remainder Q_i^d maps to functions with vanishing monopole and dipole moment. Therefore, they decay faster (their gradient like $|x|^{-4}$) yielding summability. We remark that simple dipoles have also been considered in [NS19; HW19; GVH19] and that the approximation of the method of reflections studied in [HW19; GVH19] is similar to neglecting the quadrupole parts Q_i^q .

4.1 Simple dipoles

We denote by $\text{Sym}_0(3)$ the set of all symmetric traceless 3×3 matrices, We call a function $w \in W_i^\perp$ a simple dipole (potential), if w is affine in B_i . By the characterization of W_i^\perp in Lemma 4.3, this means that there exists $S \in \text{Sym}_0(3)$ such that $w(x) = S(x - X_i)$ in B_i . We denote

$$\begin{aligned} V_i^d &:= \{w \in W_i^\perp : \nabla^2 w = 0 \text{ in } B_i\}, \\ V_i^q &:= \{w \in W_i^\perp : (w, \varphi)_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} = 0 \text{ for all } \varphi \in V_i^d\}. \end{aligned}$$

We call functions in V_i^q quadrupole (potentials). The functions in V_i^d are solutions to the Stokes system

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta w + \nabla p &= 0, \quad \text{div } w = 0 && \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_i, \\ w &= S(x - X_i) && \text{in } B_i. \end{aligned}$$

They can be computed explicitly (see e.g. [GM12]) to find $w(x) = w_S(x - X_i)$ with

$$w_S(x) := \begin{cases} Sx & \text{in } B_i \\ \frac{5}{2} \frac{x(x \cdot Sx)}{|x|^5} + \frac{Sx}{|x|^5} - \frac{5}{2} \frac{x(Sx \cdot x)}{|x|^7} & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{B_i}. \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

We now define the operators

$$Q_i^d := P_{V_i^d} Q_i, \quad Q_i^q := Q_i - Q_i^d, \quad (4.3)$$

where $P_{V_i^d}$ denotes the orthogonal projections to the subspace V_i^d .

We can give the following characterization of Q_i^d .

Lemma 4.3. *Let $w \in \dot{H}_\sigma^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Then, $Q_i^d w(x) = w_S(x - X_i)$, where w_S is defined by (4.2) and*

$$S = \int_{B_i} ew.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume $X_i = 0$. Let $S \in \text{Sym}_0(3)$ and such that $Q_i^d w(x) = w_S$. Let $T \in \text{Sym}_0(3)$. A direct computation yields

$$-\Delta w_T + \nabla p = 5Tx\mathcal{H}^2|_{\partial B_1} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3.$$

Thus, using that $\nu = x$ on ∂B_i , we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= (Q_i w - Q_i^d w, w_T) = \langle Q_i w - Q_i^d w, -\Delta w_T + \nabla p \rangle = 5 \int_{\partial B_i} (Q_i w - Q_i^d w) \cdot T\nu \\ &= 5T : \int_{B_i} \nabla(Q_i w(y) - w_S(y)) \, dy = 5T : \int_{B_i} \nabla Q_i w(y) - S \, dy \end{aligned}$$

Since $T \in \text{Sym}_0(3)$ was arbitrary, we deduce

$$S = \int_{B_i} eQ_i w = \int_{B_i} ew,$$

where the last identity is immediate from the definition of W_i . \square

The following straightforward decay estimates extend Lemma [NS19, Lemma 4.7].

Lemma 4.4. *Let $w \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Then, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_\theta(X_i)$*

$$\begin{aligned} |Q_i w(x)| &\leq C \frac{1}{|x - X_i|^2} \|ew\|_{L^2(B_i)}, & |\nabla Q_i w(x)| &\leq C \frac{1}{|x - X_i|^3} \|ew\|_{L^2(B_i)}, \\ |Q_i^q w(x)| &\leq C \frac{1}{|x - X_i|^3} \|ew\|_{L^2(B_i)}, & |\nabla Q_i^q w(x)| &\leq C \frac{1}{|x - X_i|^4} \|ew\|_{L^2(B_i)}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

where C depends only on θ .

Proof. We prove the first estimate in (4.4). The other estimates are analogous.

Assume without loss of generality $X_i = 0$. Since $Q_i^q w \in W_i^\perp$ we know that $f := -\Delta Q_i^q w \in \dot{H}_\sigma^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $\text{supp } f \subseteq \overline{B_i}$ such that $Sf = Q_i^q w$, where S is the solution operator for the Stokes equations in \mathbb{R}^3 . Here, $\dot{H}_\sigma^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ denotes the dual of $\dot{H}_\sigma^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $\text{supp } f \subseteq \overline{B_i}$ means $\langle f, \varphi \rangle = 0$ for all $\varphi \in \dot{H}_\sigma^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $\varphi = 0$ in B_i . We have

$$\|f\|_{\dot{H}_\sigma^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)} = \|Q_i^q w\|_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq \|Q_i w\|_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C \|ew\|_{L^2(B_i)},$$

where we used Lemma 3.2 in the last estimate. We denote by Φ the fundamental solution of the Stokes equations. Then, we claim

$$|Q_i^q w(x)| = |(\Phi * f)(x)| = \langle f, E(\Phi - (\Phi)_{x,1} - (\nabla\Phi)_{x,1} \cdot (y - x)) \rangle.$$

Here

$$(\Phi)_{x,1} = \int_{B_1(x)} \Phi(y) \, dy,$$

and similarly for $(\nabla\Phi)_{x,1}$. Moreover, $E(\Phi - (\Phi)_{x,1} - (\nabla\Phi)_{x,1} \cdot (y - x)) \in H_{\sigma,0}^1(B_\theta(x))$ is an extension of the restriction of $\Phi - (\Phi)_{x-X_i,\theta} - (\nabla\Phi)_{x,1} \cdot (y - x)$ to $B_1(x)$.

Indeed, since $\text{supp } f \subseteq \overline{B_i}$ the extension does not affect the convolution. Moreover, since $Q_i^q w \in V_i^q$, subtracting the affine function $(\Phi)_{x-X_i,\theta} - (\nabla\Phi)_{x,1} \cdot (y - x)$ has no effect.

By Lemma 3.6 and Remark 3.7 we can choose the extension such that

$$\|E(\Phi - (\Phi)_{x,1} - (\nabla\Phi)_{x,1} \cdot (y - x))\|_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C \|\nabla\Phi - (\nabla\Phi)_{x,1}\|_{L^2(B_i)} \leq C \frac{1}{|x|^3},$$

where the last estimate follows from a direct computation for $|x| \geq \theta$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} |Q_i^q w(x)| &\leq \|f\|_{\dot{H}_\sigma^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \|E(\Phi - (\Phi)_{x,1} - (\nabla\Phi)_{x,1} \cdot (y - x))\|_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\ &\leq C \frac{1}{|x - X_i|^3} \|ew\|_{L^2(B_i)}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

4.2 Proof of Proposition 4.1

Proof of Proposition 4.1. Since L is self-adjoint and $\ker L = W$, we have $\text{range } L = W^\perp$. Thus there exists a unique $T: W^\perp \rightarrow W^\perp$ such that (4.1) holds. It remains to prove $\|T\| \leq C$, where C depends only on θ . By Remark 3.5, we can equip W^\perp with the equivalent norm

$$\|e \cdot\|_{L^2(\cup_i B_i)}.$$

Thus, we need to prove

$$\|e(1-L)v\|_{L^2(\cup_i B_i)} \leq C\phi_0 \|ev\|_{L^2(\cup_i B_i)} \quad \text{for all } v \in W^\perp.$$

Let $v \in W^\perp$. We observe that

$$e(1-L)v = ev - \sum_j eQ_j v = - \sum_{j \neq i} eQ_j v = - \sum_{j \neq i} (eQ_j^d v + eQ_j^q v) \quad \text{in } B_i.$$

where Q_j^d and $Q_j^q v$ are the simple dipole and the quadrupole part of $Q_j v$, respectively, defined in (4.3). Thus, it remains to prove that

$$\sum_i \left\| \sum_{j \neq i} eQ_j^d v \right\|_{L^2(B_i)}^2 \leq C\phi_0^2 \|ev\|_{L^2(\cup_i B_i)}^2, \quad (4.5)$$

$$\sum_i \left\| \sum_{j \neq i} eQ_j^q v \right\|_{L^2(B_i)}^2 \leq C\phi_0^2 \|ev\|_{L^2(\cup_i B_i)}^2. \quad (4.6)$$

We begin with the term (4.6). By Lemma 4.4, we have

$$|eQ_j^q v| \leq \frac{C}{|X_i - X_j|^4} \|ev\|_{L^2(B_j)} \quad \text{in } B_i \quad \text{for all } j \neq i.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i \left\| \sum_{j \neq i} eQ_j^q v \right\|_{L^2(B_i)}^2 &\leq C \sum_i \left(\sum_{j \neq i} \frac{1}{|X_i - X_j|^4} \|ev\|_{L^2(B_j)} \right)^2 \\ &\leq C \sum_i \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{1}{|X_i - X_j|^4} \|ev\|_{L^2(B_j)}^2 \sum_{k \neq i} \frac{1}{|X_i - X_k|^4} \end{aligned}$$

We can estimate the sum in k by an integral to find

$$\sum_{k \neq i} \frac{1}{|X_i - X_k|^4} \leq Cd_{\min}^{-3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_{d_{\min}}(0)} \frac{1}{|x|^4} dx \leq Cd_{\min}^{-4}$$

After exchanging the sums in i and j , we can use the same estimate again, yielding

$$\sum_i \left\| \sum_{j \neq i} \nabla Q_j^q v \right\|_{L^2(B_i)}^2 \leq CCd_{\min}^{-8} \sum_j \|ev\|_{L^2(B_j)}^2.$$

Recalling $\phi_0 = d_{\min}^{-3}$, this finishes the proof of (4.6).

It remains to prove (4.5). We use the explicit form of the $Q_j^d v$ provided by (4.2). We introduce

$$\mathcal{K}(x)S := e \left(\frac{5(Sx \cdot x)x}{2|x|^5} \right) \quad \text{for all } S \in \text{Sym}_0(3).$$

Then, by Lemma 4.3 and equation (4.2)

$$eQ_j^d v(x) =: \mathcal{K}(x - X_j)(ev)_j + R(x - X_j).$$

where $(ev)_j = \int_{B_j} ev$ and with an explicit remainder term R . We note that R decays sufficiently fast (like $|x|^{-5}$) such that we can apply the same strategy as above for the quadrupole terms Q_i^q .

It remains to prove

$$\sum_i \left\| \sum_{j \neq i} \mathcal{K}(x - X_j)(ev)_j \right\|_{L^2(B_i)}^2 \leq C \phi_0^2 \|ev\|_{L^2(\cup_i B_i)}^2,$$

We introduce the function

$$g := \sum_j (ev)_j |B_{d_{\min}/4}|^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{B_{d_{\min}/4}(X_j)}.$$

Then, for all $x \in B_i$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \neq i} \mathcal{K}(x - X_j)(ev)_j &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_{d_{\min}/2}(X_i)} (\mathcal{K}(x - X_j) - \mathcal{K}(x - y)) g(y) dy \\ &+ \int_{B_{d_{\min}/4}(X_i)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_{d_{\min}/2}(X_i)} (\mathcal{K}(x - y) - \mathcal{K}(z - y)) g(y) dy dz \\ &+ \int_{B_{d_{\min}/4}(X_i)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_{d_{\min}/2}(X_i)} \mathcal{K}(z - y) g(y) dy dz \\ &=: A_1^i(x) + A_2^i(x) + A_3^i. \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

Since for all $x \in B_i$ and $y \in B_{d_{\min}/2}(X_j)$

$$|\mathcal{K}(x - X_j) - \mathcal{K}(x - y)| \leq \frac{C d_{\min}}{|X_i - X_j|^4},$$

the first term on the right-hand side of (4.7) is estimated analogously to (4.6) above, leading to

$$\sum_i \|A_1^i\|_{L^2(B_i)}^2 \leq C \phi_0^2 \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\cup_i B_i)}^2$$

Similarly, A_2^i is controlled by

$$\sum_i \|A_2^i\|_{L^2(B_i)}^2 \leq C \phi_0^2 \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\cup_i B_i)}^2$$

In order to estimate A_3^i in (4.7) (which are constant functions) we notice that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_{d_{\min}/2}(X_i)} \mathcal{K}(z - y) g(y) dy = (\mathcal{K} * (g - g_i))(z),$$

where

$$g_i := (\nabla v)_{B_i} |B_{d_{\min}/4}|^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{B_{d_{\min}/4}(X_i)}.$$

Since \mathcal{K} is a Calderon-Zygmund operator, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_i \|A_3^i\|_{L^2(B_i)}^2 &= C \sum_i (A_3^i)^2 \\
&\leq C d_{\min}^{-3} \sum_i \|\mathcal{K} * (g - g_i)\|_{L^2(B_{d_{\min}/4}(X_i))}^2 \\
&\leq C d_{\min}^{-3} \sum_i \|\mathcal{K} * g\|_{L^2(B_{d_{\min}/4}(X_i))}^2 + C d_{\min}^{-3} \sum_i \|\mathcal{K} * g_i\|_{L^2(B_{d_{\min}/4}(X_i))}^2 \\
&\leq C d_{\min}^{-3} \|\mathcal{K} * g\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 + C d_{\min}^{-3} \sum_i \|\mathcal{K} * g_i\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \\
&\leq C d_{\min}^{-3} \|g\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 + C d_{\min}^{-3} \sum_i \|g_i\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \\
&\leq C d_{\min}^{-3} \|g\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \\
&\leq C \phi_0^2 \|ev\|_{L^2(\cup_i B_i)}^2
\end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of (4.5). The proof of the proposition is complete. \square

5 Proof of Theorem 2.5 in the general case

To prove Theorem 2.5 for general $1 < q < \infty$, we follow the proof in the case $q = 2$. More precisely, we aim for a characterization of the operator L acting on $\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ analogous to Proposition 4.1. Clearly, for such a characterization, we first of all need to extend $L = \sum_i Q_i$ to a bounded linear operator on $\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and we need to find a suitable replacement of W^\perp .

In view of the characterization of W_i^\perp in (2.4), we define for $1 < q < \infty$ the function spaces

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{i,q} &:= \left\{ w \in \dot{W}_\sigma^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3) : -\Delta w + \nabla p = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{B_i}, \right. \\
&\quad \left. \int_{\partial B_i} \sigma[w, p]n = 0 = \int_{\partial B_i} (x - X_i) \times (\sigma[w, p]n) \right\}, \\
V_q &:= \left\{ w \in \dot{W}_\sigma^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3) : -\Delta w + \nabla p = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{B_i}, \right. \\
&\quad \left. \int_{\partial B_i} \sigma[w, p]n = 0 = \int_{\partial B_i} (x - X_i) \times (\sigma[w, p]n) \text{ for all } i \in I \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the proof of the analogous version of Proposition 4.1, we need the following ingredients, which we will make precise below:

- The extension of the operators Q_i and L to $\dot{W}_\sigma^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with corresponding estimates.
- The decomposition $\dot{W}_\sigma^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3) = W_q \oplus V_q$, that $\|e \cdot\|_{L^q(\cup_i B_i)}$ is an equivalent norm on V_q and that the solution $v \in \dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ to (2.2) is given by $P_{W_q} u$ where u is defined as in (2.3).
- The decomposition $Q_i = Q_i^q + Q_i^d$ with decay estimates.

The main difficulty is the second point, the decomposition $\dot{W}_\sigma^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3) = W_q \oplus V_q$ with uniform estimates in the particle configurations. This is directly related to a well-posedness result for

(2.2) and one could try to obtain such a result using a classical approach for boundary value problems of elliptic equations. However, it seems at least very technical to prove such a result with a uniform bound for all particle configurations with ϕ_0 sufficiently small.

We therefore take a different approach relying on the the method of reflections. This is the reason why we first studied the convergence in $\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ in the previous section. Interpolating the convergence rate in $\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ provided by Corollary 2.3 with the uniform estimates on L in $\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ that we are going to show, we can prove that the method of reflections converges in $\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ to a solution of (2.2) provided ϕ_0 is sufficiently small. Although we do not obtain optimal convergence rates due to the interpolation, this is enough to deduce uniform bounds on the solution.

Proposition 5.1. *Let $1 < q < \infty$. Then the operators Q_i extend to bounded linear operators on $\dot{W}_\sigma^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that for all $w \in \dot{W}_\sigma^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$*

$$\|Q_i w\|_{\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C \|ew\|_{L^q(B_i)}. \quad (5.1)$$

where C depends only on q . Moreover, $L = \sum_i Q_i$ is a well-defined bounded operator on $\dot{W}_\sigma^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $W_q \subseteq \ker L$, $\text{range } L \subseteq V_q$ and

$$\|Lw\|_{\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C \|ew\|_{L^q(\cup_i B_i)}. \quad (5.2)$$

Proposition 5.2. *Let $1 < q < \infty$. Then, there exists $\bar{\phi}_0 > 0$ depending only on q such that for all $\phi_0 < \bar{\phi}_0$ and for all $w \in \dot{W}_\sigma^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ there exists a unique decomposition $w = w_1 + w_2$ with $w_1 \in W_q$, $w_2 \in V_q$. Moreover,*

$$\|w_1\|_{\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C \|u\|_{\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)}, \quad (5.3)$$

$$\|w_2\|_{\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C \|eu\|_{L^q(\cup_i B_i)} = C \|ew\|_{L^q(\cup_i B_i)}, \quad (5.4)$$

where C depends only on θ and q . Furthermore, for all $f \in \dot{W}^{-1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ there exists a unique weak solution $v \in \dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ to (2.2) which is given by $v = P_{W_q} u$ where u is the unique solution to (2.3) and P_{W_q} denotes the projection in $\dot{W}_\sigma^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ to W_q .

Remark 5.3. For $q \geq 3$, elements $u \in \dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ are only determined up to a constant. The uniqueness statement in the theorem above has to be understood in this context.

Lemma 5.4. *For $w \in \dot{W}_\sigma^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ let $S := \int_{B_i} ew$ and define*

$$Q_i^d w(x) := w_S(x - X_i),$$

where w_S is given by (4.2). Moreover, let

$$Q_i^q = Q_i - Q_i^d.$$

Then

$$\|Q_i^q w\|_{\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \|Q_i^d w\|_{\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C \|ew\|_{L^q(B_i)}. \quad (5.5)$$

Moreover, for all $\theta > 1$ and for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_\theta(X_i)$,

$$|Q_i w(x)| \leq C \frac{1}{|x - X_i|^2} \|ew\|_{L^q(B_i)}, \quad |\nabla Q_i w(x)| \leq C \frac{1}{|x - X_i|^3} \|ew\|_{L^q(B_i)}, \quad (5.6)$$

$$|Q_i^q w(x)| \leq C \frac{1}{|x - X_i|^3} \|ew\|_{L^q(B_i)}, \quad |\nabla Q_i^q w(x)| \leq C \frac{1}{|x - X_i|^4} \|ew\|_{L^q(B_i)}, \quad (5.7)$$

where C depends only on θ and q .

Corresponding to Proposition 4.1, we deduce the following statement.

Proposition 5.5. *Let $1 < q < \infty$. Then, there exists $\bar{\phi}_0 > 0$ depending only on q such that for all $\phi_0 < \bar{\phi}_0$ there exists an operator $T: V_q \rightarrow V_q$ such that $\|T\| \leq C$, where C depends only on q and*

$$L = (1 + \phi_0 T)P_{V_q}.$$

Since the proof of Proposition 5.5 is completely analogous to the proof of Proposition 4.1, we refrain from repeating the details. Moreover, Theorem 2.5 follows directly by combining Proposition 5.5 with Proposition 5.2.

In the following subsections, we proof Proposition 5.1, Proposition 5.2 and Lemma 5.4.

5.1 Proof of Proposition 5.1 and Lemma 5.4

We use the following result taken from [Gal11, Exercise V.5.1]

Theorem 5.6. *Let $1 < q < 3$ and let $g \in W^{1-1/q, q}(\partial B)$. Consider the problem*

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta w + \nabla p &= 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B, \\ w &= g & \text{on } \partial B. \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

If

$$\int_{\partial B} g = 0,$$

then, (5.8) has a unique weak solution $w \in \dot{W}_\sigma^{1, q}(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B)$ which satisfies

$$\|\nabla w\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B)} \leq C \|g\|_{W^{1-1/q, q}(\partial B)}.$$

Proof of Proposition 5.1. Using the above theorem, we extend the operators Q_i to $\dot{W}_\sigma^{1, q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, $q < 3$, by solving for $w \in \dot{W}_\sigma^{1, q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ the problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta Q_i w + \nabla p &= 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_i, \\ Q_i w &= w - \int_{\partial B_i} w \, dx - \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_i} \operatorname{curl} w \, dx \times (\cdot - X_i) & \text{in } B_i. \end{aligned}$$

For $q = 2$, this definition coincides with the original definition of Q_i as an orthogonal projection due to Lemma 3.1. Moreover, by the above theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q_i w\|_{\dot{W}^{1, q}(\mathbb{R}^3)} &\leq C_q \left\| w - \int_{\partial B_i} w \, dx - \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_i} \operatorname{curl} w \, dx \times (\cdot - X_i) \right\|_{W^{1, q}(B_i)} \\ &\leq C_q \|e w\|_{L^q(B_i)}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

where the last inequality follows from a Korn-Poincaré inequality (see e.g. [NS19, Lemma 4.4]) for functions with

$$\int_{\partial B_i} w = \int_{B_i} \operatorname{curl} w = 0.$$

For $q > 3$, we notice that $w \in \dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ implies $w|_{B_i} \in H^1(B_i)$. Hence $Q_i w$ is well-defined in $\dot{H}_\sigma^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Moreover, using the decay estimates from Lemma 4.4, we have for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_2(X_i)$

$$|(Q_i w)(x)| \leq C \frac{1}{|x - X_i|^2} \|ew\|_{L^q(B_i)}, \quad |(\nabla Q_i w)(x)| \leq C \frac{1}{|x - X_i|^3} \|ew\|_{L^q(B_i)}$$

Combining this estimate with standard regularity theory for the Stokes equations in the annulus $B_2(X_i) \setminus B_1(X_i)$, we deduce that (5.1) also holds in this case.

It remains to show that the operator $L = \sum_i Q_i$ is also bounded on $\dot{W}_\sigma^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $W_q \subseteq \ker L$ and $\text{range } L \subseteq V_q$ and that (5.2) holds. Clearly, if $ew = 0$, in $\cup_i B_i$, then $Lw = 0$. Let $w \in \dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $\|ew\|_{L^q(\cup_i B_i)} = 1$. Then, we claim

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla(Q_i w) \cdot \nabla \varphi = 0 \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in W_{i,q'}, \quad (5.10)$$

where q' is the dual Hölder exponent. For $q = 2$, this is immediate from the original definition of Q_i as the orthogonal projection to W_i^\perp . For $q \neq 2$, (5.10) thus follows by density and continuity of Q_i due to (5.1). In the same way as one obtains the characterization $W^\perp = V_2$ (see [NS19, Lemma 4.1]), equation (5.10) implies $Q_i w \in V_{i,q}$. Since $V_{i,q} \subseteq V_q$ this shows $Lw \subseteq V_q$ once we have proved that L is well defined.

Let $\varphi \in \dot{W}_\sigma^{1,q'}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $\|\varphi\|_{\dot{W}^{1,q'}(\mathbb{R}^3)} = 1$. From (5.10), we deduce

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla(Q_i w) \cdot \nabla \varphi = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla(Q_i w) \cdot \nabla(Q_i \varphi).$$

Therefore, using (5.1)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla(Lw) \cdot \nabla \varphi &= \sum_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla(Q_i w) \cdot \nabla(Q_i \varphi) \leq \sum_i \|Q_i w\|_{\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \|Q_i \varphi\|_{\dot{W}^{1,q'}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\ &\leq C_q \sum_i \left(\frac{1}{q} \|ew\|_{L^q(B_i)}^q + \frac{1}{q'} \|e\varphi\|_{L^{q'}(B_i)}^{q'} \right) \\ &\leq C_q \left(\frac{1}{q} \|ew\|_{L^q(\cup_i B_i)}^q + \frac{1}{q'} \|\varphi\|_{\dot{W}^{1,q'}(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{q'} \right) \leq C_q, \end{aligned}$$

where C_q depends only on q .

This establishes (5.2) since for all $\psi \in W_\sigma^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$

$$\|\psi\|_{\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C_q \sup_{\substack{\varphi \in \dot{W}_\sigma^{1,q'}(\mathbb{R}^3) \\ \|\varphi\|_{\dot{W}^{1,q'}(\mathbb{R}^3)} = 1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla \psi.$$

This finishes the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 5.4. The estimate

$$\|Q_i^d w\|_{\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C \|ew\|_{L^q(B_i)} \quad (5.11)$$

follows directly from the explicit form of Q_i^d . Then, (5.5) follows from (5.1) and (5.11). The decay estimates (5.6) and (5.7) are proved in the same way as in Lemma 4.4. \square

5.2 Proof of Proposition 5.2

Proof of Proposition 5.2. We begin by proving the existence and uniqueness of solutions to (2.2). Assume $q > 2$ (the case $q < 2$ is treated analogously). Let $r > q$ and $f \in \dot{W}^{-1,r}(\mathbb{R}^3) \cap \dot{H}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. As before, we denote by $u \in \dot{W}^{1,r}(\mathbb{R}^3) \cap \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ the unique weak solution to (2.3). Employing the method of reflections, we define $v_k := (1-L)^k u$. By Corollary 4.2 $v_k \rightarrow v \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and v solves (2.2). Moreover, by Corollary 4.2 and Proposition 5.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_k - v_{k+1}\|_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} &= \|L(1-L)^k u\|_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq (C\phi_0)^k \|u\|_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)}, \\ \|v_k - v_{k+1}\|_{\dot{W}^{1,r}(\mathbb{R}^3)} &= \|L(1-L)^k u\|_{\dot{W}^{1,r}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C_r^{k+1} \|u\|_{\dot{W}^{1,r}(\mathbb{R}^3)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by interpolation (Riesz-Thorin or Marcinkiewicz)

$$\|L(1-L)^k\|_{\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3) \rightarrow \dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C_r^{(k+1)\lambda} (C\phi_0)^{k(1-\lambda)},$$

where λ satisfies $1/q = \lambda/r + (1-\lambda)/2$. Choosing $r = 2q$, we thus find

$$\|L(1-L)^k\|_{\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3) \rightarrow \dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C_q (C_q \phi_0^{\lambda q})^k.$$

In particular, for ϕ_0 small enough (depending only on q) v_k is a Cauchy sequence in $\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, implying $v_k \rightarrow v$ in $\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and

$$\|v\|_{\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C_q \|u\|_{\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C_q \|f\|_{\dot{W}^{-1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)}.$$

By density, the same result holds for any $f \in \dot{W}^{-1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$.

It remains to prove uniqueness. By linearity it is enough to show that if $v \in \dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ satisfies (2.2) with $f = 0$, then $v = 0$. Let $g \in \dot{W}^{-1,q'}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and let $w \in \dot{W}^{1,q'}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ be a solution to (2.2) with right-hand side g . Then,

$$\langle g, v \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla w : \nabla v = \langle 0, w \rangle = 0.$$

Since $g \in \dot{W}^{-1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ was arbitrary, this implies $v = 0$.

We now turn to the decomposition $\dot{W}_\sigma^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3) = W_q \oplus V_q$. Let $w \in \dot{W}_\sigma^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Then $w = w_1 + w_2$ with $w_1 \in W_q$ and $w_2 \in V_q$ if and only if w_1 solves (2.2) for $f = -\Delta w$. As we have just proved, this problem has a unique solution, which establishes $\dot{W}_\sigma^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3) = V_q \oplus W_q$ as well as the estimate (5.3). In particular, this shows the assertion $v = P_{W_q} u$ from the proposition.

It remains to prove (5.4). To this end, we observe that for the decomposition $w = w_1 + w_2$, the function w_2 only depends on $ew|_{\cup_i B_i}$. In particular,

$$\|w_2\|_{\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C_q \|\tilde{w}\|_{\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)}$$

for any function $\tilde{w} \in \dot{W}_\sigma^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that $e\tilde{w}|_{\cup_i B_i} = ew|_{\cup_i B_i}$. By Lemma 3.7, such a function \tilde{w} exists with

$$\|\tilde{w}\|_{\dot{W}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C_q \|ew\|_{L^q(\cup_i B_i)}.$$

This finishes the proof. \square

Remark 5.7. It is possible to rely on Theorem 2.4 instead of Corollary 4.2 for the interpolation in the method of reflections in the proof above to show the result of Proposition 5.2 for p close to 2 without the smallness condition on ϕ_0 .

More precisely, the following holds. For all $\theta > 2$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for all $q \in (2 - \delta, 2 + \delta)$ and all $w \in \dot{W}_\sigma^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ there exists a unique decomposition $w = w_1 + w_2$, with $w_1 \in W_q$ and $w_2 \in V_q$. Moreover, w_1 and w_2 satisfy (5.3) and (5.4), respectively, with a constant C which depends only on θ .

6 Proof of Corollary 2.7

Proof of Corollary 2.7. We claim that it suffices to prove that for all $w \in \dot{W}_\sigma^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$

$$\|(1 - L)w - w\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C(R^\alpha + \phi^{1/q'}) \|ew\|_{L^q(\cup_i B_i)}. \quad (6.1)$$

Indeed, assume that (6.1) holds. Then, by Theorem 2.5,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(1 - L)^k u - v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} &\leq \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} \|(1 - L)^n u - (1 - L)^{n+1} u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\ &\leq C(R^\alpha + \phi^{1/q'}) \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} \|e(1 - L)^n u\|_{L^q(\cup_i B_i)} \\ &\leq C(R^\alpha + \phi^{1/q'}) \|eu\|_{L^q(\cup_i B_i)} \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} (C\phi)^n \\ &\leq C(R^\alpha + \phi^{1/q'}) (C\phi)^k \|eu\|_{L^q(\cup_i B_i)} \end{aligned}$$

provided ϕ is sufficiently small.

It remains to prove (6.1). Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and let $i_x \in I$ be the minimizer of $|X_i - x|$. (We can disregard the set, where the minimizer is not unique because it is a nullset.) It is easy to generalize the proof of Lemma 5.4 for an arbitrary particle radius $R_j > 0$ to see that for all $j \neq i_x$

$$|Q_j w(x)| \leq \frac{R_{\max}^{3/q'}}{|X_i - X_j|^2} \|ew\|_{L^q(B_j)}, \quad (6.2)$$

Moreover, by the maximum modulus estimate for the Stokes equations, (see [MRS99, Theorem 6.1])

$$|Q_{i_x} w(x)| \leq C \|Q_{i_x} w\|_{L^\infty(B_{i_x})} \leq CR_{\max}^\alpha [Q_{i_x} w]_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{i_x})}.$$

where we used that $\int_{\partial B_{i_x}} Q_{i_x} w = 0$. From Sobolev embedding it follows

$$|Q_{i_x} w(x)| \leq CR_{\max}^\alpha \|Q_{i_x} w\|_{W^{1,q}(B_{i_x})} \leq CR_{\max}^\alpha \|ew\|_{L^q(B_{i_x})}, \quad (6.3)$$

where we used the Korn-Poincaré inequality in the last estimate in the same way as in (5.9).

Combining (6.2) and (6.3) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
|(1-L)w - w)(x)| &\leq |Q_{i_x}w(x)| + \sum_{j \neq i_x} |Q_jw(x)| \\
&\leq CR_{\max}^\alpha \|ew\|_{L^q(B_{i_x})} + \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{R_{\max}^{3/q'}}{|X_i - X_j|^2} \|ew\|_{L^q(B_j)} \\
&\leq CR_{\max}^\alpha \|ew\|_{L^q(B_{i_x})} + C\phi^{1/q'} \left(\sum_{j \neq i} \frac{d_{\min}^3}{|X_i - X_j|^{2q'}} \right)^{1/q'} \left(\sum_j \|ew\|_{L^q(B_j)}^q \right)^{1/q} \\
&\leq CR_{\max}^\alpha \|ew\|_{L^q(B_{i_x})} + C\phi^{1/q'} \left(\int_U \frac{1}{|x|^{2q'}} \right) \|ew\|_{L^q(\cup_j B_j)} \\
&\leq C(R_{\max}^\alpha + \phi^{1/q'}) \|ew\|_{L^q(\cup_j B_j)}
\end{aligned}$$

for $2q' < 3$, i.e. $q > 3$, where we used (H2). This finishes the proof of (2.9)

Estimate (2.10) is proven analogously. In this case, the term R_{\max}^α is not needed, because $\int_{\partial B_i} Q_i w = 0$. \square

Acknowledgement

The author wants to thank Richard Schubert for helpful discussions. The author has been supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) through the collaborative research center “The Mathematics of Emerging Effects” (CRC 1060, Projekt-ID 211504053) and the Hausdorff Center for Mathematics (GZ 2047/1, Projekt-ID 390685813).

References

- [CGHS18] G. Ciaramella, M. Gander, L. Halpern, and J. Salomon. “Methods of Reflections: relations with Schwarz methods and classical stationary iterations, scalability and preconditioning”. In: *HAL preprint hal-01930232* (2018).
- [DG19] M. Duerinckx and A. Gloria. “Corrector equations in fluid mechanics: Effective viscosity of colloidal suspensions”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.09625* (2019).
- [DGR08] L. Desvillettes, F. Golse, and V. Ricci. “The mean-field limit for solid particles in a Navier-Stokes flow”. In: *J. Stat. Phys.* 131.5 (2008), pp. 941–967.
- [Ein06] A. Einstein. “Eine neue Bestimmung der Moleküldimensionen”. In: *Ann. Physik* 19 (1906), pp. 289–306.
- [FOT85] R. Figari, E. Orlandi, and S. Teta. “The Laplacian in regions with many small obstacles: fluctuations around the limit operator”. In: *J. Stat. Phys.* 41.3-4 (1985), pp. 465–487.
- [Gal11] G. P. Galdi. *An introduction to the mathematical theory of the Navier-Stokes equations, steady-state problems*. 2nd ed. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, New York, 2011, pp. xiv+1018.

- [GM12] É. Guazzelli and J. F. Morris. *A physical introduction to suspension dynamics*. Cambridge Texts in Applied Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012, pp. xii+229.
- [GV19] D. Gerard-Varet. “A simple justification of effective models for conducting or fluid media with dilute spherical inclusions”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.11931* (2019).
- [GVH19] D. Gerard-Varet and M. Hillairet. “Analysis of the viscosity of dilute suspensions beyond Einstein’s formula”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.08208* (2019).
- [Hil18] M. Hillairet. “On the homogenization of the Stokes problem in a perforated domain”. In: *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 230.3 (2018), pp. 1179–1228.
- [HM12] B. M. Haines and A. L. Mazzucato. “A proof of Einstein’s effective viscosity for a dilute suspension of spheres”. In: *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 44.3 (2012), pp. 2120–2145.
- [HMS17] M. Hillairet, A. Moussa, and F. Sueur. “On the effect of polydispersity and rotation on the Brinkman force induced by a cloud of particles on a viscous incompressible flow”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.08628* (2017).
- [HV18] R. M. Höfer and J. J. L. Velázquez. “The method of reflections, homogenization and screening for Poisson and Stokes equations in perforated domains”. In: *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 227.3 (2018), pp. 1165–1221.
- [HW19] M. Hillairet and D. Wu. “Effective viscosity of a polydispersed suspension”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.12306* (2019).
- [Höf18] R. M. Höfer. “Sedimentation of inertialess particles in Stokes flows”. In: *Comm. Math. Phys.* 360.1 (2018), pp. 55–101.
- [JO04] P.-E. Jabin and F. Otto. “Identification of the dilute regime in particle sedimentation”. In: *Comm. Math. Phys.* 250.2 (2004), pp. 415–432.
- [Mec18] A. Mecherbet. “Sedimentation of particles in Stokes flow”. In: *arXiv:1806.07795 arXiv preprint* (2018).
- [Mec19] A. Mecherbet. “A model for suspension of clusters of particle pairs”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.02304* (2019).
- [MRS99] P. Maremonti, R. Russo, and G. Starita. “On the Stokes equations: the boundary value problem”. In: *Advances in Fluid Dynamics*. Vol. 4. Quad. Mat. Dept. Math., Seconda Univ. Napoli, Caserta, 1999, pp. 69–140.
- [NS19] B. Niethammer and R. Schubert. “A local version of Einstein’s formula for the effective viscosity of suspensions”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.08554* (2019).
- [Rub86] J. Rubinstein. “On the macroscopic description of slow viscous flow past a random array of spheres”. In: *J. Statist. Phys.* 44.5-6 (1986), pp. 849–863.