

# $L^r$ -HELMHOLTZ-WEYL DECOMPOSITION FOR THREE DIMENSIONAL EXTERIOR DOMAINS

MATTHIAS HIEBER, HIDEO KOZONO, ANTON SEYFERT, SENJO SHIMIZU, AND TAKU YANAGISAWA

**ABSTRACT.** In this article the Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition in three dimensional exterior domains is established within the  $L^r$ -setting for  $1 < r < \infty$ . In fact, given an  $L^r$ -vector field  $\mathbf{u}$ , there exist  $\mathbf{h} \in X_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$ ,  $\mathbf{w} \in \dot{H}^{1,r}(\Omega)^3$  with  $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{w} = 0$  and  $p \in \dot{H}^{1,r}(\Omega)$  such that  $\mathbf{u}$  may be decomposed uniquely as

$$\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{h} + \operatorname{rot} \mathbf{w} + \nabla p.$$

If for the given  $L^r$ -vector field  $\mathbf{u}$ , its harmonic part  $\mathbf{h}$  is chosen from  $V_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$ , then a decomposition similar to the above one is established, too. However, its uniqueness holds in this case only for the case  $1 < r < 3$ . The proof given relies on an  $L^r$ -variational inequality allowing to construct  $\mathbf{w} \in \dot{H}^{1,r}(\Omega)^3$  and  $p \in \dot{H}^{1,r}(\Omega)$  for given  $\mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega)^3$  as weak solutions to certain elliptic boundary value problems.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition plays an important role in differential geometry and partial differential equations. Historically speaking, such a decomposition was initiated by the work of Rham, Hodge and Kodaira within the setting of general  $p$ -forms on compact Riemannian manifolds and within the  $L^2$ -setting. The case of Riemannian manifolds with boundaries was treated first by Morrey [21] and Abraham, Marsden and Ratiu [1]. Whereas the classical theory of the Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition is mainly concerned with the  $L^2$ -setting, it is nowadays well understood that the existence of such a decomposition within the  $L^r$ -framework for  $1 < r < \infty$  is of essential importance in many problems of analysis, and in particular in the analysis of the Navier-Stokes equations.

Consider in particular the famous Leray problem of finding a solution to the stationary Navier-Stokes equation with inhomogeneous Dirichlet boundary data  $g$  on  $\partial D$  in a multiply connected bounded domain  $D$ . The total flux condition on  $g$  meaning  $\int_{\partial D} g \cdot \nu \, d\sigma = 0$  is a necessary condition for the solvability of Leray's problem, and Leray [19] himself showed that under the restricted flux condition on  $g$ , i.e.,  $\int_{S_j} g \cdot \nu \, d\sigma = 0$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, L$ , where  $\partial D = \cup_{j=1}^L S_j$  with  $S_j$  denoting disjoint closed smooth surfaces, there exists a solution to this problem. He, however, left open the general case, where only the total flux condition is being assumed. For details see e.g. the monograph by Galdi [6]. This problem was recently solved by Korobkov, Pileckas and Russo [14] for bounded domains in the two-dimensional setting and for axially symmetric domains in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , hereby making use of arguments very much related to the Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition for *bounded* domains. The relationship between the solvability of Leray's problem and harmonic vector fields on  $D$  has been clarified in [17]: the restricted flux condition on  $g$  yields a solenoidal extension  $\tilde{g}$  to  $D$  with a trivial harmonic part, while the total flux condition yields such an extension with a non-trivial harmonic part.

Solonnikov [29] and Fujiawara-Morimoto [5] were the first to prove an  $L^r$ -Helmholtz decomposition in  $n$ -dimensional *bounded* domains with smooth boundaries. More precisely, they proved that every  $\mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega)^n$  can be uniquely decomposed as

$$(1.1) \quad \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v} + \nabla p,$$

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35J57, 35Q35.

*Key words and phrases.* Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition, exterior domains, harmonic vector fields, vector and scalar potentials .

where  $\mathbf{v} \in L^r_\sigma(\Omega)$ , i.e.,  $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v} = 0$ ,  $\mathbf{v} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$  and  $p \in H^{1,r}(\Omega)$  ( $\boldsymbol{\nu}$  denotes the unit outer normal to  $\partial\Omega$ ). For a survey of results known in this direction, see [13]. For the case  $n = 3$ , the second and the fifth author proved in [16] the Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition of  $\mathbf{v}$  satisfying (1.1) stating that  $\mathbf{u}$  can be decomposed as

$$(1.2) \quad \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{h} + \operatorname{rot} \mathbf{w} + \nabla p,$$

where  $\mathbf{h} \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})^3$  with

$$\operatorname{div} \mathbf{h} = 0, \operatorname{rot} \mathbf{h} = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{h} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0,$$

and  $\mathbf{w} \in H^{1,r}(\Omega)^3$  with

$$\operatorname{div} \mathbf{w} = 0 \text{ and } \mathbf{w} \times \boldsymbol{\nu}|_{\partial\Omega} = \mathbf{0}.$$

They also proved a similar decomposition to (1.2) with the harmonic part  $\mathbf{h}$  satisfying another boundary condition  $\mathbf{h} \times \boldsymbol{\nu}|_{\partial\Omega} = \mathbf{0}$ .

Considering the situation of *unbounded* domains  $\Omega$ , Miyakawa [20] was the first to prove a decomposition of the form (1.1) in three dimensional exterior domains with smooth boundaries. Later on, Simader-Sohr [27] extended Miyakawa's result to the  $n$ -dimensional setting. Indeed, they showed that for any domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  with smooth boundary, a decomposition of the form (1.1) holds true if and only if the *weak Neumann* problem for the Poisson equation is uniquely solvable in the sense that for every  $\mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega)^n$  there exists a unique  $p \in L^r_{\text{loc}}(\bar{\Omega})$  with  $\nabla p \in L^r(\Omega)^n$  such that

$$(1.3) \quad \int_{\Omega} \nabla p \cdot \nabla \varphi dx = \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \varphi dx \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\bar{\Omega}).$$

Based on (1.3), it was shown by Farwig-Sohr [3], Heywood [10], Thun-Miyakawa [30] and Geissert-Heck-Hieber-Sawada [7] that a decomposition of the form (1.1) holds true for various types of unbounded domains. However, it seems that a Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition of the form (1.2) is not known for unbounded domains.

It is the aim of this article to establish a Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition to the form (1.2) for three dimensional *exterior* domains. Due to the results in [12], it is known that  $X^r_{\text{har}}(\Omega)$  as well as  $V^r_{\text{har}}(\Omega)$  are of finite dimension, where

$$(1.4) \quad X^r_{\text{har}}(\Omega) \equiv \{\mathbf{h} \in L^r(\Omega)^3; \operatorname{div} \mathbf{h} = 0, \operatorname{rot} \mathbf{h} = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{h} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\},$$

$$(1.5) \quad V^r_{\text{har}}(\Omega) \equiv \{\mathbf{h} \in L^r(\Omega)^3; \operatorname{div} \mathbf{h} = 0, \operatorname{rot} \mathbf{h} = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{h} \times \boldsymbol{\nu}|_{\partial\Omega} = \mathbf{0}\}.$$

In contrast to the situation of bounded domains, it is not obvious to determine whether  $X^r_{\text{har}}(\Omega)$  and  $V^r_{\text{har}}(\Omega)$  are finite dimensional. The reason for this is that Rellich's compact imbedding result  $H^{1,r}(\Omega) \subset L^r(\Omega)$  does not hold for exterior domains  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ . Showing that the behavior of  $\mathbf{h}$  as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$  for  $\mathbf{h} \in X^r_{\text{har}}(\Omega)$  and for  $\mathbf{h} \in V^r_{\text{har}}(\Omega)$  can be controlled in terms of local  $L^r$ -bounds of  $\mathbf{h}$  in  $\Omega$  replaces Rellich's compactness argument in the proof of the fact that the above spaces are finite dimensional. For details, see [12]. Another aspect of the decomposition (1.2) with the fact that  $\dim X^r_{\text{har}}(\Omega) < \infty$  and  $\dim V^r_{\text{har}}(\Omega) < \infty$  is the Hodge theorem in exterior domains which states that the cohomology group on  $L^r(\Omega)^3$  is isomorphic to  $X^r_{\text{har}}(\Omega)$  and  $V^r_{\text{har}}(\Omega)$  in accordance with the boundary conditions.

In order to obtain an  $L^r$ -decomposition of the (1.2) in exterior domains, we search for vector potentials  $\mathbf{w} \in L^r_{\text{loc}}(\bar{\Omega})^3$  with  $\nabla \mathbf{w} \in L^r(\Omega)^{3^2}$  as weak solutions to elliptic boundary value problems of the form

$$(1.6) \quad \begin{cases} \operatorname{rot} \operatorname{rot} \mathbf{w} &= \operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{w} &= 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathbf{w} \times \boldsymbol{\nu} &= \mathbf{0} & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

To this end, we consider the  $L^r$ -variational inequality

$$(1.7) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{L^r(\Omega)} \\ & \leq C \sup \left\{ \frac{\left| \int_{\Omega} (\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{w} \cdot \operatorname{rot} \boldsymbol{\psi} + \operatorname{div} \mathbf{w} \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\psi}) dx \right|}{\|\nabla \boldsymbol{\psi}\|_{L^{r'}(\Omega)}}; \boldsymbol{\psi} \in C_0^\infty(\bar{\Omega})^3, \boldsymbol{\psi} \times \boldsymbol{\nu}|_{\partial\Omega} = \mathbf{0} \right\} + C \|\mathbf{w}\|_{L^r(D)} \end{aligned}$$

with  $1/r + 1/r' = 1$ , where  $D$  is a *compact* subdomain of  $\Omega$ . An inequality of the form (1.7) enables us to apply the generalized Lax-Milgram theorem in  $L^r(\Omega)$ , see [18], in order to construct a weak solution  $\mathbf{w}$  to (1.6) in the homogeneous Sobolev space  $\dot{H}^{1,r}(\Omega)^3$ . Note that the form  $\text{rot } \mathbf{u}$  on the right hand side of (1.6) is necessarily orthogonal to the null space associated with the adjoint equation to (1.6) so that for every  $\mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega)^3$  with  $1 < r < \infty$  there exists a unique weak solution  $\mathbf{w} \in \dot{H}^{1,r}(\Omega)^3$ .

On the other hand, suppose we choose the harmonic part  $\mathbf{h}$  from  $V_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$  in (1.2). Then the scalar potential  $p$  has to be chosen subject to homogeneous boundary condition  $p|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$ . This implies that we need to solve the *weak Dirichlet* problem, i.e., (1.3) with  $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$  replaced by  $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ . It was shown by Simader-Sohr [26] (see also Kozono-Sohr [15]) that a weak Dirichlet problem of this form is uniquely solvable if and only if  $r$  satisfies  $3/2 < r < 3$ . Note that there is a crucial difference between Dirichlet and Neumann problems in exterior domains. The latter is uniquely solvable for all  $1 < r < \infty$  in both bounded and exterior domains. Observe that the functional  $\varphi \mapsto \int_\Omega \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \varphi dx$  does not need not to vanish for harmonic function  $\varphi$  in  $\Omega$  with  $\varphi|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ . In order to circumvent this difficulty, we modify the boundary condition for  $p$  on  $\partial\Omega$  in accordance with  $\mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega)^3$  in the case  $1 < r \leq 3/2$ , which enables us to obtain a satisfactory direct decomposition even for the choice of  $\mathbf{h} \in V_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$ . Here we should remark that another approach using  $\dot{H}^{1,r}(\Omega)$  was investigated by Simader-Sohr [28], Prüss-Simonnet [23] and Shibata [25]. In the case where  $3 \leq r < \infty$ , we obtain a decomposition as in (1.2) with  $\mathbf{h} \in V_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$ , while the unique expression holds only up to a modulo one dimensional subspace.

This paper is organized as follows. In the following section, we shall state our main results. Section 3 is devoted to various estimates in the homogeneous Sobolev space  $\dot{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$ . In particular, the  $L^r$ -variational inequality (1.7) estimating  $\nabla \mathbf{w}$  in terms of  $\text{div } \mathbf{w}$  and  $\text{rot } \mathbf{w}$  is investigated there in detail. In Section 4, based on the above  $L^r$ -variational inequality, we prove the existence of a weak solution  $\mathbf{w}$  to (1.6), which determines then the vector potential in (1.2). In Section 5, the solvability of the weak Dirichlet problem (1.3) with  $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$  replaced by  $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$  is investigated. Finally, in Section 6 we shall prove our main theorems.

## 2. RESULTS

Throughout this paper, we impose the following assumption on the domain  $\Omega$ .

**Assumption.**  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  is an exterior domain in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  with the smooth boundary  $\partial\Omega$ .

We start by introducing some notations and various function spaces. For  $1 \leq r \leq \infty$ , the function space  $L^r(\Omega)$  stands for all scalar- and vector-valued functions on  $\Omega$  with the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{L^r}$ . We denote by  $(\cdot, \cdot)$  the duality pairing between  $L^r(\Omega)$  and  $L^{r'}(\Omega)$ , where  $1/r + 1/r' = 1$  and  $1 < r < \infty$ . The spaces  $\dot{H}^{1,r}(\Omega)$  and  $\dot{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  are defined by

$$(2.1) \quad \dot{H}^{1,r}(\Omega) \equiv \{[p]; p \in L_{\text{loc}}^r(\bar{\Omega}), \nabla p \in L^r(\Omega)\}, \quad \dot{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega) \equiv \{p \in \dot{H}^{1,r}(\Omega); p|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\},$$

where  $[p]$  denotes the equivalent class consisting of all  $p$  such that  $q \in [p]$  implies that  $p - q = \text{const.}$  in  $\Omega$ . Equipped with the norm  $\|p\|_{\dot{H}^{1,r}} \equiv \|\nabla p\|_{L^r}$ , both  $\dot{H}^{1,r}(\Omega)$  and  $\dot{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  are Banach spaces.

Let  $\widehat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  be the completion of  $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$  with respect to the norm  $\|\nabla p\|_{L^r}$ . Obviously,  $\widehat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega) \subset \dot{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  for all  $1 < r < \infty$ . However, we shall see in Proposition 3.1 below that  $r = 3$  is a threshold exponent pointing out a crucial difference between  $\dot{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  and  $\widehat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$ .

Furthermore, we introduce the space  $\dot{X}^r(\Omega)$ ,  $\dot{V}^r(\Omega)$ ,  $\dot{X}_\sigma^r(\Omega)$  and  $\dot{V}_\sigma^r(\Omega)$  by

$$(2.2) \quad \dot{X}^r(\Omega) \equiv \{\mathbf{u} \in \dot{H}^{1,r}(\Omega); \mathbf{u} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\}, \quad \dot{V}^r(\Omega) \equiv \{\mathbf{u} \in \dot{H}^{1,r}(\Omega); \mathbf{u} \times \boldsymbol{\nu}|_{\partial\Omega} = \mathbf{0}\},$$

$$(2.3) \quad \dot{X}_\sigma^r(\Omega) \equiv \{\mathbf{u} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega); \text{div } \mathbf{u} = 0\}, \quad \dot{V}_\sigma^r(\Omega) \equiv \{\mathbf{u} \in \dot{V}^r(\Omega); \text{div } \mathbf{u} = 0\},$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\nu}$  denotes the unit outer normal to  $\partial\Omega$ . Finally, let us recall that the  $L^r$ -harmonic vector fields  $X_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$  and  $V_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$  are defined by

$$(2.4) \quad X_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega) \equiv \{\mathbf{h} \in L^r(\Omega); \text{div } \mathbf{h} = 0, \text{rot } \mathbf{h} = 0, \mathbf{h} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\},$$

$$(2.5) \quad V_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega) \equiv \{\mathbf{h} \in L^r(\Omega); \text{div } \mathbf{h} = 0, \text{rot } \mathbf{h} = 0, \mathbf{h} \times \boldsymbol{\nu}|_{\partial\Omega} = \mathbf{0}\}.$$

The following proposition was proved in [12].

**Proposition 2.1.** [12, Theorem 2.1] *Let  $\Omega$  be as in the Assumption. Then  $X_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$  and  $V_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$  are both finite dimensional for all  $1 < r < \infty$ .*

**Remark.** The dimensions of the spaces  $\dim X_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$  and  $\dim V_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$  are more precisely determined in [12, Theorem 2.2] in terms of the topological structure of the boundary of  $\partial\Omega$ , and in particular by the corresponding *Betti numbers*. It should be noted that  $\dim V_{\text{har}}^{r_1}(\Omega) < \dim V_{\text{har}}^{r_2}(\Omega)$  provided  $1 < r_1 \leq 3/2 < r_2 < \infty$ . See also [11, Theorems 2.1, 2.2] in two-dimensional exterior domains.

The two main results of this article read as follows.

**Theorem 2.2.** *Let  $\Omega$  satisfy the Assumption, and let  $1 < r < \infty$ .*

(i) *For every  $\mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega)$  there exist  $\mathbf{h} \in X_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$ ,  $\mathbf{w} \in \dot{V}_\sigma^r(\Omega)$  and  $p \in \dot{H}^{1,r}(\Omega)$  such that*

$$(2.6) \quad \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{h} + \text{rot } \mathbf{w} + \nabla p$$

*and there exists a constant  $C = C(\Omega, r)$  such that*

$$(2.7) \quad \|\mathbf{h}\|_{L^r} + \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{L^r} + \|\nabla p\|_{L^r} \leq C \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^r},$$

(ii) *The above decomposition (2.6) is unique in the sense that if  $\mathbf{u}$  is decomposed as*

$$(2.8) \quad \mathbf{u} = \tilde{\mathbf{h}} + \text{rot } \tilde{\mathbf{w}} + \nabla \tilde{p}$$

*for some  $\tilde{\mathbf{h}} \in X_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{w}} \in \dot{V}_\sigma^r(\Omega)$  and  $\tilde{p} \in \dot{H}^{1,r}(\Omega)$ , then*

$$(2.9) \quad \mathbf{h} = \tilde{\mathbf{h}}, \quad \text{rot } \mathbf{w} = \text{rot } \tilde{\mathbf{w}}, \quad \nabla p = \nabla \tilde{p}.$$

Note that in the above theorem, the harmonic part  $\mathbf{h}$  of  $\mathbf{u}$  is an element of  $X_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$  and the assertion for exterior domains parallels the one for bounded domains; see [16, Theorem 2.1]. On the other hand, if the harmonic part is chosen from  $V_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$ , then the situation is quite different from the one of bounded domains.

**Theorem 2.3.** *Let  $\Omega$  satisfy the Assumption.*

(i) *Let  $1 < r \leq 3/2$ . Then, for every  $\mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega)$ , there exist  $\mathbf{h} \in V_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$ ,  $\mathbf{w} \in \dot{X}_\sigma^r(\Omega)$  and  $p \in \dot{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  such that*

$$(2.10) \quad \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{h} + \text{rot } \mathbf{w} + \nabla p$$

*and there exists a constant  $C = C(\Omega, r)$  such that*

$$(2.11) \quad \|\mathbf{h}\|_{L^r} + \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{L^r} + \|\nabla p\|_{L^r} \leq C \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^r}.$$

*The above decomposition (2.10) is unique in the sense that if  $\mathbf{u}$  is decomposed as*

$$(2.12) \quad \mathbf{u} = \tilde{\mathbf{h}} + \text{rot } \tilde{\mathbf{w}} + \nabla \tilde{p}$$

*for some  $\tilde{\mathbf{h}} \in V_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{w}} \in \dot{X}_\sigma^r(\Omega)$  and  $\tilde{p} \in \dot{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$ , then*

$$(2.13) \quad \mathbf{h} = \tilde{\mathbf{h}}, \quad \text{rot } \mathbf{w} = \text{rot } \tilde{\mathbf{w}}, \quad \nabla p = \nabla \tilde{p}.$$

(ii) *Let  $3/2 < r < 3$ . Then, for every  $\mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega)$  there exist  $\mathbf{h} \in V_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$ ,  $\mathbf{w} \in \dot{X}_\sigma^r(\Omega)$  and  $p \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  such that  $\mathbf{u}$  may be decomposed as (2.10) including an estimate of the form (2.11). The above decomposition (2.10) is unique in the sense that if  $\mathbf{u}$  is decomposed as in (2.12) for some  $\tilde{\mathbf{h}} \in V_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{w}} \in \dot{X}_\sigma^r(\Omega)$  and  $\tilde{p} \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$ , then (2.13) holds.*

(iii) *Let  $3 \leq r < \infty$ . Then, for every  $\mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega)$ , there exist  $\mathbf{h} \in V_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$ ,  $\mathbf{w} \in \dot{X}_\sigma^r(\Omega)$  and  $p \in \dot{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  such that  $\mathbf{u}$  can be decomposed as in (2.10) including an estimate of the form (2.11). If  $\mathbf{u}$  is decomposed as in (2.12) for some  $\tilde{\mathbf{h}} \in V_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{w}} \in \dot{X}_\sigma^r(\Omega)$  and  $\tilde{p} \in \dot{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$ , then*

$$(2.14) \quad \mathbf{h} - \tilde{\mathbf{h}} = \lambda \nabla q_0, \quad \text{rot } \mathbf{w} = \text{rot } \tilde{\mathbf{w}}, \quad p - \tilde{p} = \lambda q_0$$

*for some  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ , where  $q_0$  is the harmonic function in  $\dot{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  such that  $q_0(x) \rightarrow 1$  as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ .*

**Remarks.** (i) For every  $1 < r < \infty$  we define  $\mathbf{H}^r(\Omega) \equiv L_\sigma^r(\Omega)/\{\text{rot } \mathbf{w}; \mathbf{w} \in \dot{V}_\sigma^r(\Omega)\}$  which may be regarded as the first de Rham cohomology group on  $L^r(\Omega)$ . It follows from Theorem 2.2 that  $\mathbf{H}^r(\Omega)$  is isomorphic to  $X_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$  for all  $1 < r < \infty$ . Hence, Theorem 2.2 has an aspect of the Hodge theorem (see, e.g, Warner [31, Theorem 6.11]) in exterior domains.

(ii) Let  $1 < r \leq 3/2$  and consider Theorem 2.3. In order to obtain a decomposition as in Theorem 2.3 it is necessary to choose the space  $\dot{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  for the scalar potential  $p$ . Indeed, we shall show that there is a vector field  $\mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega)$  such that for every  $p \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  the decomposition (2.10) is not valid. On the other hand, in the case  $3/2 < r < 3$ , we may choose the smaller space  $\hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  for  $p$  in (2.10). Notice that  $\hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega) \subset \dot{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  for  $1 < r < 3$ , which is essential to the unique decomposition as in (2.13). This difference may be regarded as an effect of the harmonic vector space  $V_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$  for the threshold value  $r = 3/2$ . More precisely, it was proved in [12, Theorem 2.2] that  $\dim V_{\text{har}}^{r_1}(\Omega) = \dim V_{\text{har}}^{r_2}(\Omega) - 1$  provided  $1 < r_1 \leq 3/2 < r_2 < \infty$ .

(iii) In the case  $3 \leq r < \infty$ , the unique expression for the harmonic part  $\mathbf{h}$  and the scalar potential  $p$  holds true, of course, modulo the harmonic function  $q_0$  in  $\Omega$ , which may be regarded as a crucial difference between bounded and exterior domains.

(iv) Let  $L_\tau^r(\Omega) \equiv \{\mathbf{v} \in L^r(\Omega); \text{rot } \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{v} \times \boldsymbol{\nu}|_{\partial\Omega} = \mathbf{0}\}$ . In contrast to the above (i), we define another cohomology group  $\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}^r(\Omega)$  by

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}^r(\Omega) \equiv \begin{cases} L_\tau^r(\Omega)/\{\nabla p; p \in \dot{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)\} & \text{for } 1 < r \leq 3/2, \\ L_\tau^r(\Omega)/\{\nabla p; p \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)\} & \text{for } 3/2 < r < 3. \end{cases}$$

Then, it follows from Theorem 2.3 (i) and (ii) that  $\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}^r(\Omega)$  is isomorphic to  $V_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$  for  $1 < r < 3$ . This may be regarded as a unique harmonic representative of the cohomology group in exterior domains.

(v) It seems an interesting question to ask whether  $\mathbf{w}$  and  $p$  have additional regularity properties as  $\mathbf{w} \in H^{m+1,r}(\Omega)$  and  $p \in H^{m+1,r}(\Omega)$  in (2.6) and (2.10) provided  $\mathbf{u} \in H^{m,r}(\Omega)$  for  $m = 1, 2, \dots$ . An affirmative answer to this question for bounded domains  $\Omega$  was given in [16, Theorem 2.4].

### 3. PRELIMINARIES

#### 3.1. Weak Dirichlet Problem for the Poisson Equation.

We first consider weak solutions to the Poisson equations in the space  $\hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$ . To this end, the following characterization of the spaces  $\hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  and  $\dot{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  plays an important role.

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $\Omega$  be as in the Assumption.*

(i) *Let  $1 < r < 3$ . Then*

$$(3.1) \quad \hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega) = \{p \in \dot{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega); p \in L^{r_*}(\Omega)\}$$

for  $1/r_* = 1/r - 1/3$ .

(ii) *Let  $3 \leq r < \infty$ . Then  $\hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega) = \dot{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$ . Moreover, there is a closed subspace  $\tilde{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  of  $\dot{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  such that*

$$(3.2) \quad \dot{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega) = \tilde{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega) \oplus \{\lambda q_0; \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\} \quad (\text{direct sum}),$$

where  $q_0$  is the harmonic function in  $\dot{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  such that  $q_0(x) \rightarrow 1$  as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ .

For a proof of proposition 3.1 we refer to the articles [26, (7.6)] by Simader-Sohr and [15, Lemma 2.2] by Kozono-Sohr.

**Remark.** For  $3/2 < r < 3$ , we have similarly to (3.2) that

$$\dot{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega) = \hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega) \oplus \{\lambda q_0; \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

We next introduce for  $1 < r < \infty$  the generalized Laplacian  $-\Delta_r : \hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega) \rightarrow \hat{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)^*$  defined by

$$(3.3) \quad \langle -\Delta_r p, \phi \rangle \equiv (\nabla p, \nabla \phi) \quad \text{for } p \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega) \text{ and } \phi \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega).$$

Here  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  denotes the duality pairing between  $\hat{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)^*$  and  $\phi \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)$ .

Following [26, Theorem 7.2] and [15, Corollary 3.4], the kernel  $\text{Ker}(-\Delta_r)$  and the range  $\text{R}(-\Delta_r)$  of the generalized Laplacian  $-\Delta_r$  enjoy the following properties.

**Proposition 3.2.**

- (i)  $\text{Ker}(-\Delta_r)$  is of finite dimension and  $\text{R}(-\Delta_r)$  is a closed subspace of  $\hat{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)^*$  for all  $1 < r < \infty$ .
- (ii) If  $1 < r < 3$ , then  $\text{Ker}(-\Delta_r) = \{0\}$ .
- (iii) If  $3/2 < r < \infty$ , then  $\text{R}(-\Delta_r) = \dot{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)^*$ .
- (iv) If  $3 \leq r < \infty$ , then  $\text{Ker}(-\Delta_r) = \{\lambda q_0; \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\}$ .

It follows from Proposition 3.2 and the closed range theorem that in the case  $1 < r \leq 3/2$ , for given  $f \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)^*$  there exists a unique  $p \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  satisfying

$$(3.4) \quad (\nabla p, \nabla \phi) = \langle f, \phi \rangle \quad \text{for all } \phi \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)$$

if and only if  $f$  satisfies that  $\langle f, q_0 \rangle = 0$ . On the other hand, in the case  $3/2 < r < \infty$  such a restriction is redundant so that the existence of  $p \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  is shown for arbitrary  $f \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)^*$ , while the uniqueness property holds only for  $3/2 < r < 3$ . However, even in the case  $1 < r \leq 3/2$ , although  $f$  does not necessarily satisfy such an orthogonal condition, replacing  $\hat{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)$  by  $\tilde{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)$  in (3.4), we obtain the following result.

**Lemma 3.3.** (Simader-Sohr [26, Theorem 7.3]). *Let  $\Omega$  be as in the Assumption and let  $1 < r \leq 3/2$ . Let  $\tilde{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)$  be as in (3.2) with  $r$  replaced by  $3 \leq r' < \infty$ . Then for every  $g \in \tilde{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)^*$  there exists a unique  $q \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  such that*

$$(3.5) \quad (\nabla q, \nabla \psi) = \langle g, \psi \rangle \quad \text{for all } \psi \in \tilde{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega),$$

where  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  denotes the duality pairing between  $\tilde{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)^*$  and  $\tilde{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)$ . Moreover, there exists a constant  $C = C(\Omega, r)$  such that

$$(3.6) \quad \|\nabla q\|_{L^r} \leq C \|g\|_{\tilde{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)^*}.$$

It follows from Proposition 3.2 that the generalized Laplacian  $-\Delta_r : \hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega) \rightarrow \hat{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)^* = \dot{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)^*$  is not surjective for  $1 < r \leq 3/2$ , which means that the target space  $\dot{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)^*$  is too large to make  $-\Delta_r$  surjective. To recover its surjectivity, we need to restrict the range of  $-\Delta_r$  onto  $\tilde{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)^*$ , which causes necessarily the smaller space  $\tilde{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)$  for the test function  $\psi$  in (3.5).

*Proof of Lemma 3.3.* For the readers convenience, we give here a simplified proof of Lemma 3.3. Let us consider the map  $-\tilde{\Delta}_r : \hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega) \rightarrow \tilde{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)^*$  defined by

$$\langle -\tilde{\Delta}_r p, \psi \rangle \equiv (\nabla p, \nabla \psi) \quad \text{for } p \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega) \text{ and } \psi \in \tilde{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega).$$

For the proof of the assertion it suffices to show that  $-\tilde{\Delta}_r$  is bijective, i.e., that  $\text{Ker}(-\tilde{\Delta}_r) = \{0\}$  and  $\text{R}(-\tilde{\Delta}_r) = \tilde{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)^*$ .

We first show that  $\text{Ker}(-\tilde{\Delta}_r) = \{0\}$ . Let  $p \in \text{Ker}(-\tilde{\Delta}_r)$ . Then  $p \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  satisfies

$$(\nabla p, \nabla \psi) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \psi \in \tilde{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega).$$

Since  $q_0 \in \text{Ker}(-\Delta_r)$ , we have  $(\nabla p, \nabla q_0) = 0$ . Hence, by (3.2)

$$(\nabla p, \nabla \varphi) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in \dot{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega).$$

Since  $1 < r \leq 3/2$  and since  $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$  is dense in  $\dot{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)$  for such  $r$ , it follows from [15, Theorem A] that  $p \equiv 0$  in  $\Omega$ , which yields that  $\text{Ker}(-\tilde{\Delta}_r) = \{0\}$ .

We next prove that  $\text{R}(-\tilde{\Delta}_r) = \tilde{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)^*$ . To this end, we first show that the range  $\text{R}(-\tilde{\Delta}_r)$  is closed in  $\tilde{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)^*$ . Suppose that  $\{p_m\}_{m=1}^\infty \subset \hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  satisfies

$$-\tilde{\Delta}_r p_m \rightarrow g \quad \text{in } \tilde{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)^* \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty$$



for some  $g \in \tilde{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)^*$ . Then there exists  $f \in \dot{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)^*$  such that

$$-\Delta_r p_m \rightarrow f \quad \text{in } \dot{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)^* \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty.$$

Indeed, it follows from (3.2) that for every  $\varphi \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)$  there exist  $\psi \in \tilde{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)$  and  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\varphi = \psi + \lambda q_0$  with  $\|\nabla \psi\|_{L^{r'}} \leq C \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^{r'}}$  for some  $C = C(\Omega, r)$ . Since  $q_0 \in \text{Ker}(-\Delta_{r'})$ , we have  $(\nabla p_m, \nabla q_0) = 0$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|\langle -\Delta_r(p_m - p_l), \varphi \rangle|}{\|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^{r'}}} &= \frac{|(\nabla p_m - \nabla p_l, \nabla \psi)|}{\|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^{r'}}} \\ &\leq C^{-1} \frac{|(\nabla p_m - \nabla p_l, \nabla \psi)|}{\|\nabla \psi\|_{L^{r'}}} \\ &\leq C^{-1} \|-\tilde{\Delta}_r(p_m - p_l)\|_{\tilde{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)^*} \end{aligned}$$

for all  $m, l \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since  $\varphi \in \dot{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)$  is arbitrary and since  $-\tilde{\Delta}_r p_m \rightarrow g$  in  $\tilde{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)^*$ , it follows from the above estimate that  $-\Delta_r p_m \rightarrow f$  in  $\dot{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)^*$  with some  $f \in \dot{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)^*$ . Since  $\text{R}(-\Delta_r)$  is closed in  $\hat{H}^{1,r'}(\Omega)^* = \dot{H}^{1,r'}(\Omega)^*$ , implied by Propositions 3.1 (ii) and 3.2 (i), there exists  $p \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  such that  $f = -\Delta_r p$ . It is easy to see that  $\langle f, \psi \rangle = \langle g, \psi \rangle$  for all  $\psi \in \tilde{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)$ , from which we obtain that  $-\tilde{\Delta}_r p = g$ . This means that the range  $\text{R}(-\tilde{\Delta}_r)$  is closed in  $\tilde{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)^*$ .

Now, it follows from the closed range theorem that  $\text{R}(-\tilde{\Delta}_r) = \text{Ker}((-\tilde{\Delta}_r)^*)^\perp$ , and hence we may show that  $\text{Ker}((-\tilde{\Delta}_r)^*) = \{0\}$ . Let  $\psi \in \text{Ker}((-\tilde{\Delta}_r)^*)$ . Then  $\psi \in \tilde{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)$  satisfies

$$0 = \langle p, (-\tilde{\Delta}_r)^* \psi \rangle = \langle -\tilde{\Delta}_r p, \psi \rangle = (\nabla p, \nabla \psi) = \langle -\Delta_{r'} p, \psi \rangle \quad \text{for all } p \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega).$$

This means that  $\psi \in \text{Ker}(-\Delta_{r'})$ , whence  $\psi \in \tilde{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega) \cap \{\lambda q_0; \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\}$ . By (3.2),  $\psi = 0$ , which yields that  $\text{Ker}((-\tilde{\Delta}_r)^*) = \{0\}$ . This proves Lemma 3.3.  $\square$

### 3.2. Characterization of $X^r(D)$ and $V^r(D)$ .

Let us take  $R > 0$  so large that

$$\partial\Omega \subset B_R \equiv \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3; |x| < R\},$$

and define  $D \equiv \Omega \cap B_{R+2}$ . We introduce a cut-off procedure decomposing the vector field  $\mathbf{u}$  on  $\Omega$  into  $\mathbf{u} = \eta \mathbf{u} + (1 - \eta) \mathbf{u} \equiv \mathbf{u}_1 + \mathbf{u}_2$  for a cut-off function  $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$  satisfying  $0 \leq \eta(x) \leq 1$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ ,  $\eta(x) = 1$  for  $|x| \leq R + 1$  and  $\eta(x) = 0$  for  $|x| \geq R + 2$ . We may regard  $\mathbf{u}_2$  as the vector field on  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , while  $\mathbf{u}_1$  should be considered as a compact perturbation of  $\mathbf{u}$  on  $D$ . Notice that  $D$  is a bounded domain in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  with boundary  $\partial D = \partial\Omega \cup \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3; |x| = R + 2\}$ . Similarly to (2.2), we define  $X^r(D)$  and  $V^r(D)$  by

$$(3.7) \quad X^r(D) = \{\mathbf{u} \in H^{1,r}(D); \mathbf{u} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}|_{\partial D} = 0\}, \quad V^r(D) = \{\mathbf{u} \in H^{1,r}(D); \mathbf{u} \times \boldsymbol{\nu}|_{\partial D} = \mathbf{0}\},$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\nu}$  is the unit outer normal to  $\partial D$ .

The following estimates may be regarded as the Poincaré and the Sobolev inequalities for functions belonging to  $X^r(D)$  and  $V^r(D)$ .

**Proposition 3.4.** *Let  $X^r(D)$  and  $V^r(D)$  be as in (3.7).*

i) *For every  $1 < r < \infty$  there exists a constant  $C = C(r, R)$  such that*

$$(3.8) \quad \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^r(D)} \leq C \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r(D)}$$

*holds for all  $\mathbf{u} \in X^r(D)$  and all  $\mathbf{u} \in V^r(D)$ .*

ii) *For every  $1 < r < 3$  there exists a constant  $C = C(r, R)$  such that*

$$(3.9) \quad \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^{r^*}(D)} \leq C \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r(D)} \quad \text{with } \frac{1}{r^*} \equiv \frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{3}$$

*holds for all  $\mathbf{u} \in X^r(D)$  and all  $\mathbf{u} \in V^r(D)$ .*

Note that in (3.8) and (3.9) we do not impose on  $\mathbf{u}$  the homogeneous boundary condition  $\mathbf{u}|_{\partial D} = 0$ . It suffices to assume either  $\mathbf{u} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}|_{\partial D} = 0$  or  $\mathbf{u} \times \boldsymbol{\nu}|_{\partial D} = \mathbf{0}$ .

*Proof of Proposition 3.4.* i) Let us first prove (3.8) for  $\mathbf{u} \in X^r(D)$  by a contradiction argument. Assume that (3.8) fails. Then there is a sequence  $\{\mathbf{u}_m\}_{m=1}^\infty \subset X^r(D)$  such that  $\|\mathbf{u}_m\|_{L^r(D)} \equiv 1$  for all  $m = 1, 2, \dots$  and such that  $\nabla \mathbf{u}_m \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$  in  $L^r(D)$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . Since  $D$  is a bounded domain, Rellich compactness theorem implies that there is a subsequence of  $\{\mathbf{u}_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ , denoted again by  $\{\mathbf{u}_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$  for simplicity, and a function  $\mathbf{u} \in X^r(D)$  such that

$$(3.10) \quad \nabla \mathbf{u}_m \rightharpoonup \nabla \mathbf{u} \text{ weakly in } L^r(D), \quad \mathbf{u}_m \rightarrow \mathbf{u} \text{ strongly in } L^r(D)$$

as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . Since  $\nabla \mathbf{u}_m \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$  in  $L^r(D)$ , we have  $\nabla \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$  in  $L^r(D)$ , which yields  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{c}$  in  $D$  for some constant vector  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ . On the other hand, there exists some  $x_j \in \partial\Omega$  such that  $\boldsymbol{\nu}_{x_j} = \mathbf{e}_j$  for  $j = 1, 2, 3$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\nu}_{x_j}$  denotes the unit outer normal to  $\partial\Omega$  at  $x_j$  and where  $\{\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \mathbf{e}_3\}$  is the canonical basis in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Since  $\mathbf{u} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}|_{\partial D} = 0$ , we have that  $\mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{e}_j = 0$  for  $j = 1, 2, 3$ , which implies  $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{0}$ . This contradicts  $\|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^r(D)} = 1$ .

Concerning  $\mathbf{u} \in V^r(D)$ , we may argue in the same way as above since the constant vector satisfying  $\mathbf{c} \times \mathbf{e}_j = \mathbf{0}$  for  $j = 1, 2, 3$  also yields that  $\mathbf{u} \equiv \mathbf{0}$  in  $\Omega$ .

ii) The proof is quite similar to the one of i). Assume that (3.9) fails. Then there is a sequence  $\{\mathbf{u}_m\}_{m=1}^\infty \subset X^r(D)$  such that  $\|\mathbf{u}_m\|_{L^{r^*}(D)} \equiv 1$  for all  $m = 1, 2, \dots$  and such that  $\nabla \mathbf{u}_m \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$  in  $L^r(D)$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . Since  $D$  is bounded and since  $r < r_*$ ,  $\{\mathbf{u}_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$  is a bounded sequence in  $H^{1,r}(D)$ . Hence, again by the Rellich compactness theorem, there is a subsequence of  $\{\mathbf{u}_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ , which we denote again by  $\{\mathbf{u}_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ , and a function  $\mathbf{u} \in X^r(D)$  fulfilling (3.10). Since  $\nabla \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$  in  $\Omega$  and since  $\mathbf{u} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}|_{\partial D} = 0$ , we conclude similarly as above that  $\mathbf{u} \equiv \mathbf{0}$ . On the other hand, by Sobolev's inequality

$$\|\mathbf{u}_m\|_{L^{r^*}(D)} \leq C(\|\mathbf{u}_m\|_{L^r(D)} + \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_m\|_{L^r(D)}),$$

for some constant  $C = C(r, D)$  independent of  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Assertion (3.10) thus implies

$$\mathbf{u}_m \rightarrow \mathbf{0} \text{ strongly in } L^{r^*}(D) \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty.$$

contradicting the fact that  $\|\mathbf{u}_m\|_{L^{r^*}(D)} \equiv 1$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ .

The proof of (3.9) for  $\mathbf{u} \in V^r(D)$  is parallel to the one of  $\mathbf{u} \in X^r(D)$  and hence omitted. This completes the proof of Proposition 3.4.  $\square$

Our next aim is to investigate variational inequalities on  $X^r(D)$  and  $V^r(D)$  by  $\text{div}$  and  $\text{rot}$  operations. Let us define  $\mathcal{X}(D)$  and  $\mathcal{V}(D)$  by

$$\mathcal{X}(D) \equiv \{\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in C^\infty(\bar{D}); \boldsymbol{\varphi} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}|_{\partial D} = 0\}, \quad \mathcal{V}(D) \equiv \{\boldsymbol{\psi} \in C^\infty(\bar{D}); \boldsymbol{\psi} \times \boldsymbol{\nu}|_{\partial D} = \mathbf{0}\}.$$

Furthermore, we introduce harmonic vector fields  $X_{\text{har}}(D)$  and  $V_{\text{har}}(D)$  by

$$X_{\text{har}}(D) \equiv \{\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{X}(D); \text{div } \mathbf{h} = 0, \text{rot } \mathbf{h} = \mathbf{0}\}, \quad V_{\text{har}}(D) \equiv \{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{V}(D); \text{div } \mathbf{k} = 0, \text{rot } \mathbf{k} = \mathbf{0}\}.$$

It is known (see [16, Theorem 2.1]) that both  $X_{\text{har}}(D)$  and  $V_{\text{har}}(D)$  are finite dimensional vector spaces. We thus may write  $\dim X_{\text{har}}(D) = N$  and  $\dim V_{\text{har}}(D) = L$  as

$$X_{\text{har}}(D) = \text{Span}\{\mathbf{h}_1, \dots, \mathbf{h}_N\}, \quad V_{\text{har}}(D) = \text{Span}\{\mathbf{k}_1, \dots, \mathbf{k}_L\}.$$

**Proposition 3.5.** (i) For every  $1 < r < \infty$  there exists a constant  $C = C(r, D)$  such that

$$(3.11) \quad \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r(D)} \leq C \left( \sup_{\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in \mathcal{X}(D)} \frac{|(\text{rot } \mathbf{u}, \text{rot } \boldsymbol{\varphi})_D + (\text{div } \mathbf{u}, \text{div } \boldsymbol{\varphi})_D|}{\|\nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}\|_{L^{r'}(D)}} + \sum_{j=1}^N |(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{h}_j)_D| \right)$$

holds for all  $\mathbf{u} \in X^r(D)$ , where  $(\cdot, \cdot)_D$  denotes the inner product between  $L^r(D)$  and  $L^{r'}(D)$ .

(ii) Let  $\mathbf{u} \in X^q(D)$  for some  $1 < q < \infty$ . If

$$(3.12) \quad \sup_{\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in \mathcal{X}(D)} \frac{|(\text{rot } \mathbf{u}, \text{rot } \boldsymbol{\varphi})_D + (\text{div } \mathbf{u}, \text{div } \boldsymbol{\varphi})_D|}{\|\nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}\|_{L^{r'}(D)}} < \infty$$

for some  $1 < r < \infty$ , then  $\mathbf{u} \in X^r(D)$  and satisfies (3.11).



(iii) For every  $1 < r < \infty$  there exists a constant  $C = C(r, D)$  such that

$$(3.13) \quad \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r(D)} \leq C \left( \sup_{\boldsymbol{\psi} \in \mathcal{V}(D)} \frac{|(\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u}, \operatorname{rot} \boldsymbol{\psi})_D + (\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}, \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\psi})_D|}{\|\nabla \boldsymbol{\psi}\|_{L^{r'}(D)}} + \sum_{j=1}^L |(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{k}_j)_D| \right)$$

for all  $\mathbf{u} \in V^r(D)$ .

(iv) Let  $\mathbf{u} \in V^q(D)$  for some  $1 < q < \infty$ . If

$$(3.14) \quad \sup_{\boldsymbol{\psi} \in \mathcal{V}(D)} \frac{|(\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u}, \operatorname{rot} \boldsymbol{\psi})_D + (\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}, \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\psi})_D|}{\|\nabla \boldsymbol{\psi}\|_{L^{r'}(D)}} < \infty$$

for some  $1 < r < \infty$ , then  $\mathbf{u} \in V^r(D)$  and satisfies (3.13).

*Proof.* The estimates (3.11) and (3.13) are proved in [16, Lemma 4.1]. Indeed, the authors of [16] showed (3.11) and (3.13) for  $\mathbf{u} \in X^r(D)$  and for  $\mathbf{u} \in V^r(D)$  under the condition that  $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0$ . It is straightforward easy to generalize their result to (3.11) and (3.13) provided  $(\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}, \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\varphi})_D$  and  $(\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}, \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\psi})_D$  are added. It hence suffices to prove assertions (ii), (iii) and (iv). Let us first prove (ii). Our proof is based on the one of [16, Lemma 3.1] by making use of the identity

$$(3.15) \quad (\nabla \mathbf{u}, \nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi})_D = (\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u}, \operatorname{rot} \boldsymbol{\varphi})_D + (\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}, \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\varphi})_D - \int_{\partial D} \mathbf{u} \cdot (\boldsymbol{\varphi} \cdot \nabla \boldsymbol{\nu} + \boldsymbol{\varphi} \times \operatorname{rot} \boldsymbol{\nu}) dS$$

for  $\mathbf{u} \in X^q(D)$  and  $\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in \mathcal{X}(D)$ , and where the unit outer normal  $\boldsymbol{\nu}$  can be extended continuously in the neighborhood of  $\partial D$ . Since  $D$  is bounded, we may assume that  $1 < q < 3/2$  and  $q < r$ . Let us first consider the case  $1/q - 1/3 \leq 1/r < 1/q$ . Define  $1 < q_1 < \infty$  so that  $1/q_1 \equiv 1/q - 1/3$ . Then  $\frac{1}{q_1} = 1 - \left(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{3}\right) \geq \frac{1}{r} > \frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{3}$ . Hence, by Sobolev's embeddings

$$H^{1,r'}(D) \subset L^{q_1'}(D), \quad H^{1,q}(D) \subset L^{q_1}(D).$$

By (3.9) we obtain

$$(3.16) \quad |(\mathbf{u}, \boldsymbol{\varphi})_D| \leq \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^{q_1}(D)} \|\boldsymbol{\varphi}\|_{L^{q_1'}(D)} \leq C \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^q(D)} \|\nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}\|_{L^{r'}(D)}.$$

Defining  $p \in (1, \infty)$  by  $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{3}{2} \frac{1}{q_1} = \frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right)$  we have  $\frac{1}{p'} = \frac{1}{q_1'} - \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{q_1'}\right)$ . Hence, by (3.8), Sobolev's inequality and by the trace theorem

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^p(\partial D)} &\leq C \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^{1-\frac{1}{q},q}(\partial D)} \leq C \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^{1,q}(D)} \leq \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^q(D)} \\ C \|\boldsymbol{\varphi}\|_{L^{p'}(\partial D)} &\leq C \|\boldsymbol{\varphi}\|_{H^{1-\frac{1}{q_1'},q_1'}(\partial D)} \leq C \|\boldsymbol{\varphi}\|_{H^{1,q_1'}(D)} \leq C \|\boldsymbol{\varphi}\|_{H^{1,r'}(D)} \leq C \|\nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}\|_{L^{r'}(D)}. \end{aligned}$$

The above inequalities yield

$$(3.17) \quad \left| \int_{\partial D} \mathbf{u} \cdot (\boldsymbol{\varphi} \cdot \nabla \boldsymbol{\nu} + \boldsymbol{\varphi} \times \operatorname{rot} \boldsymbol{\nu}) dS \right| \leq C \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^q(D)} \|\nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}\|_{L^{r'}(D)}$$

for all  $\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in \mathcal{X}(D)$ . By (3.12) and (3.15)–(3.17) we obtain

$$(3.18) \quad \begin{aligned} &\sup_{\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in \mathcal{X}(D)} \frac{|(\nabla \mathbf{u}, \nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi})_D + (\mathbf{u}, \boldsymbol{\varphi})_D|}{\|\nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}\|_{L^{r'}(D)} + \|\boldsymbol{\varphi}\|_{L^{r'}(D)}} \\ &\leq \sup_{\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in \mathcal{X}(D)} \frac{|(\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u}, \operatorname{rot} \boldsymbol{\varphi})_D + (\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}, \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\varphi})_D|}{\|\nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}\|_{L^{r'}(D)}} + C \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^q(D)} < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, it follows from [16, Lemma 3.1 (2)] that  $\mathbf{u} \in X^r(D)$ .

We next consider the case  $1/q_1 - 1/3 \leq 1/r < 1/q_1 = 1/q - 1/3$ . Since  $q_1 < r$ , we obtain  $\|\nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}\|_{L^{r'}(D)} \leq C \|\nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}\|_{L^{q_1'}(D)}$  for all  $\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in \mathcal{X}(D)$ . Hence, by (3.12)

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in \mathcal{X}(D)} \frac{|(\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u}, \operatorname{rot} \boldsymbol{\varphi})_D + (\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}, \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\varphi})_D|}{\|\nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}\|_{L^{q_1'}(D)}} < \infty.$$

Applying the above argument, yields  $\mathbf{u} \in X^{q_1}(D)$ . Replacing  $q$  by  $q_1$  we see that  $\mathbf{u} \in X^r(D)$ .

Finally, it remains to consider with the case  $0 < 1/r < 1/q_1 - 1/3 = 1/q - 2/3 \equiv 1/q_2$ . By the second case, we have that  $\mathbf{u} \in X^{q_2}(D)$ . Pick now  $q_3$  with  $1 < q_3 < q_2 < r$  such that  $1/q_3 = 1/r + 1/3$ . Since  $\mathbf{u} \in X^{q_3}(D)$ , we see that  $\mathbf{u} \in X^r(D)$ .

We next prove (iv). The proof is quite similar to the one of (ii). Instead of (3.15) we make use of the identity

$$(3.19) \quad (\nabla \mathbf{u}, \nabla \psi)_D = (\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u}, \operatorname{rot} \psi)_D + (\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}, \operatorname{div} \psi)_D + \int_{\partial D} \mathbf{u} \cdot (\psi \cdot \nabla \boldsymbol{\nu} - \psi \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\nu}) dS$$

for all  $\psi \in \mathcal{V}(D)$ . Similar arguments as to derive (3.17) yield

$$\left| \int_{\partial D} \mathbf{u} \cdot (\psi \cdot \nabla \boldsymbol{\nu} - \psi \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\nu}) dS \right| \leq C \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^q(D)} \|\nabla \psi\|_{L^{r'}(D)}$$

Assertions (3.14), (3.8) and (3.19) imply

$$\sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{V}(D)} \frac{|(\nabla \mathbf{u}, \nabla \psi)_D + (\mathbf{u}, \psi)_D|}{\|\nabla \psi\|_{L^{r'}(D)} + \|\psi\|_{L^{r'}(D)}} < \infty.$$

Hence, it follows from [16, Lemma 3.1 (1)] that  $\mathbf{u} \in V^r(D)$ , provided  $1/q - 1/3 \leq 1/r < 1/q$ . The case  $1/r < 1/q - 1/3$  can be handled in the same way as (ii). We omit the details. The proof of Proposition 3.5 is complete.  $\square$

We next consider the div-rot estimates in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . To this end, let us define  $\dot{H}^{1,r}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  by

$$\dot{H}^{1,r}(\mathbb{R}^3) \equiv \{[\mathbf{u}]; \mathbf{u} \in L^r_{\operatorname{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^3); \nabla \mathbf{u} \in L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)\}, \quad 1 < r < \infty.$$

Equipped with the norm  $\|[\mathbf{u}]\|_{\dot{H}^{1,r}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \equiv \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)}$ , the space  $\dot{H}^{1,r}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  becomes a Banach space. The following proposition is a variant of Proposition 3.5. Denote by  $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\mathbb{R}^3}$  the canonical duality pairing between  $L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)$  and  $L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ .

**Proposition 3.6.** (i) *For every  $1 < r < \infty$  there exists a constant  $C = C(r)$  such that*

$$(3.20) \quad \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C \sup_{\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \frac{|(\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u}, \operatorname{rot} \boldsymbol{\varphi})_{\mathbb{R}^3} + (\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}, \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\varphi})_{\mathbb{R}^3}|}{\|\nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)}}$$

for all  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{H}^{1,r}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ .

(ii) *Let  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{H}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  for some  $1 < q < \infty$ . If  $\mathbf{u}$  satisfies*

$$(3.21) \quad \sup_{\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \frac{|(\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u}, \operatorname{rot} \boldsymbol{\varphi})_{\mathbb{R}^3} + (\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}, \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\varphi})_{\mathbb{R}^3}|}{\|\nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)}} < \infty$$

for some  $1 < r < \infty$ , then  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{H}^{1,r}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  and estimate (3.20) holds true.

*Proof.* (i) The Calderón-Zygmund inequality yields

$$(3.22) \quad \|\nabla \partial_j \psi\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C \|-\Delta \psi\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)}, \quad j = 1, 2, 3$$

for all  $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$  and for a constant  $C = C(r)$ . Since  $H \equiv \{-\Delta \psi; \psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)\}$  is dense in  $L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ ,

(3.22) and integration by parts yield

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \frac{|(\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u}, \operatorname{rot} \boldsymbol{\varphi})_{\mathbb{R}^3} + (\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}, \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\varphi})_{\mathbb{R}^3}|}{\|\nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)}} = \sup_{\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \frac{|(\mathbf{u}, -\Delta \boldsymbol{\varphi})_{\mathbb{R}^3}|}{\|\nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)}} \\ & \geq \sup_{\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \frac{|(\mathbf{u}, -\Delta \partial_j \psi)_{\mathbb{R}^3}|}{\|\nabla \partial_j \psi\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)}} \geq C \sup_{\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \frac{|(\partial_j \mathbf{u}, -\Delta \psi)_{\mathbb{R}^3}|}{\|-\Delta \psi\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)}} \\ & = C \sup_{\mathbf{f} \in L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \frac{|(\partial_j \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{f})_{\mathbb{R}^3}|}{\|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)}} = C \|\partial_j \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)}, \quad j = 1, 2, 3, \end{aligned}$$

with the constant  $C = C(r)$ . This implies (3.20).

(ii) Suppose that  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{H}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  satisfies (3.21). Then we obtain from (3.22) and the above estimate that

$$(3.23) \quad \sup_{\boldsymbol{\psi} \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \frac{|(\partial_j \mathbf{u}, -\Delta \boldsymbol{\psi})_{\mathbb{R}^3}|}{\|-\Delta \boldsymbol{\psi}\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)}} < \infty, \quad j = 1, 2, 3.$$

Since  $H = \{-\Delta \boldsymbol{\psi}; \boldsymbol{\psi} \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)\}$  is dense in  $L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , it follows from (3.23) that the functional  $H \ni \boldsymbol{\psi} \mapsto (\partial_j \mathbf{u}, -\Delta \boldsymbol{\psi})_{\mathbb{R}^3} \in \mathbb{R}$  can be extended uniquely to a continuous functional on  $L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . Hence, there exists a unique  $\mathbf{v}_j \in L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)$  such that

$$(3.24) \quad (\mathbf{v}_j, -\Delta \boldsymbol{\psi})_{\mathbb{R}^3} = (\partial_j \mathbf{u}, -\Delta \boldsymbol{\psi})_{\mathbb{R}^3} \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{\psi} \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3), j = 1, 2, 3.$$

Since  $\mathbf{h}_j \equiv \mathbf{v}_j - \partial_j \mathbf{u} \in L^r(\mathbb{R}^3) + L^q(\mathbb{R}^3) \subset L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , it follows from (3.24) and Weyl's lemma that  $\mathbf{h}_j \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$  and that  $\mathbf{h}_j$  is harmonic in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  in the classical sense. Moreover, since  $\mathbf{h}_j \in L^r(\mathbb{R}^3) + L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , Liouville's theorem implies  $\mathbf{h}_j \equiv \mathbf{0}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , which yields  $\partial_j \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v}_j \in L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)$  for  $j = 1, 2, 3$ . Hence,  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{H}^{1,r}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  and satisfies estimate (3.20).  $\square$

### 3.3. Characterization of $\dot{X}^r(\Omega)$ and $\dot{V}^r(\Omega)$ .

Let us recall the spaces  $\dot{X}^r(\Omega)$  and  $\dot{V}^r(\Omega)$  defined by (2.2). Denoting  $\mathcal{X}(\Omega) \equiv \{\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in C_0^\infty(\bar{\Omega}); \boldsymbol{\varphi} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\}$  and  $\mathcal{V}(\Omega) \equiv \{\boldsymbol{\psi} \in C_0^\infty(\bar{\Omega}); \boldsymbol{\psi} \times \boldsymbol{\nu}|_{\partial\Omega} = \mathbf{0}\}$ , similarly to the space  $\hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  in (2.1), we define  $\hat{X}^r(\Omega)$  and  $\hat{V}^r(\Omega)$  to be the closure of  $\mathcal{X}(\Omega)$  and  $\mathcal{V}(\Omega)$  in  $\dot{H}^{1,r}(\Omega)$ , respectively. The following proposition may be regarded as the characterization of  $\hat{X}^r(\Omega)$  and  $\hat{V}^r(\Omega)$  corresponding to that of  $\hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  as in Proposition 3.1.

**Proposition 3.7.** *Let  $\Omega$  be as in the Assumption.*

(i) *If  $1 < r < 3$ , then*

$$(3.25) \quad \hat{X}^r(\Omega) = \{\mathbf{u} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega); \mathbf{u} \in L^{r*}(\Omega)\}, \quad \hat{V}^r(\Omega) = \{\mathbf{u} \in \dot{V}^r(\Omega); \mathbf{u} \in L^{r*}(\Omega)\}$$

for  $\frac{1}{r_*} = \frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{3}$ . Moreover,

$$(3.26) \quad \dot{X}^r(\Omega) = \hat{X}^r(\Omega) \oplus \text{Span}\{\mathbf{h}_1, \mathbf{h}_2, \mathbf{h}_3\},$$

where  $\{\mathbf{h}_1, \mathbf{h}_2, \mathbf{h}_3\} \subset \bigcap_{1 < p < \infty} \dot{X}^p(\Omega)$  satisfies that  $\text{div } \mathbf{h}_j = 0$ ,  $\text{rot } \mathbf{h}_j = \mathbf{0}$ ,  $\mathbf{h}_j(x) \rightarrow \mathbf{e}_j$  as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$  for  $j = 1, 2, 3$ , and where  $\{\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \mathbf{e}_3\}$  denotes the canonical basis of  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Similarly,

$$(3.27) \quad \dot{V}^r(\Omega) = \hat{V}^r(\Omega) \oplus \text{Span}\{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2, \mathbf{k}_3\},$$

where  $\{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2, \mathbf{k}_3\} \subset \bigcap_{1 < p < \infty} \dot{V}^p(\Omega)$  satisfies that  $\text{div } \mathbf{k}_j = 0$ ,  $\text{rot } \mathbf{k}_j = \mathbf{0}$ ,  $\mathbf{k}_j(x) \rightarrow \mathbf{e}_j$  as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$  for  $j = 1, 2, 3$ .

(ii) *If  $3 \leq r < \infty$ , then*

$$(3.28) \quad \dot{X}^r(\Omega) = \hat{X}^r(\Omega), \quad \dot{V}^r(\Omega) = \hat{V}^r(\Omega).$$

*Proof.* Since the proof of (3.25) and (3.28) is parallel to that of Proposition 3.1, we only prove (3.26) and (3.27). Let us first show (3.26). Take arbitrary  $\{\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \mathbf{w}_3\} \subset \bigcap_{1 < p < \infty} \dot{X}^p(\Omega)$  such that  $\mathbf{w}_j(x) \rightarrow \mathbf{e}_j$  as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$  and such that  $\mathbf{w}_j(\cdot) - \mathbf{e}_j \in L^{r*}(\Omega)$  for  $j = 1, 2, 3$ . Note that such a triple  $\{\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \mathbf{w}_3\}$  can be constructed for instance as  $\mathbf{w}_j(x) = (1 - \eta(x))\mathbf{e}_j$  for  $j = 1, 2, 3$  with the cut-off function  $\eta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$  satisfying  $\eta(x) = 1$  for  $|x| \leq R + 1$  and  $\eta(x) = 0$  for  $|x| \geq R + 2$ . Recall that  $R$  is chosen so large that  $\partial\Omega \subset B_R = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3; |x| < R\}$ . We shall first show that

$$(3.29) \quad \dot{X}^r(\Omega) = \hat{X}^r(\Omega) \oplus \text{Span}\{\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \mathbf{w}_3\}.$$

Indeed, let  $\mathbf{w} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega)$ . Since  $1 < r < 3$ , by [8, Corollary 2.2] that exists a constant vector  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^3$  such that  $\mathbf{w}(\cdot) - \mathbf{c} \in L^{r*}(\Omega)$ . Since  $\mathbf{c} = \sum_{j=1}^3 \lambda_j \mathbf{e}_j$  with  $\lambda_j = \mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{e}_j$  for  $j = 1, 2, 3$ , we may set  $\hat{\mathbf{w}}(x) := \mathbf{w}(x) - \sum_{j=1}^3 \lambda_j \mathbf{w}_j(x)$ . Since  $\hat{\mathbf{w}}(x) = \mathbf{w}(x) - \mathbf{c} - \sum_{j=1}^3 \lambda_j (\mathbf{w}_j(x) - \mathbf{e}_j)$ , we see that  $\hat{\mathbf{w}} \in L^{r*}(\Omega)$ . Hence, it follows from (3.25) that  $\hat{\mathbf{w}} \in \hat{X}^r(\Omega)$ . Since  $\mathbf{w} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega)$  is arbitrary and since  $\hat{X}^r(\Omega) \cap \text{Span}\{\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \mathbf{w}_3\} = \{\mathbf{0}\}$ , we obtain (3.29).

Next, we show that the triple  $\{\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \mathbf{w}_3\}$  may be replaced by the triplet  $\{\mathbf{h}_1, \mathbf{h}_2, \mathbf{h}_3\}$  of harmonic vector fields as in (3.26). To this end, consider the following Neumann problem

$$(3.30) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta q_j = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial q_j}{\partial \boldsymbol{\nu}} = \mathbf{e}_j \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu} & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ \nabla q_j(x) \rightarrow 0 & \text{as } |x| \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, 3. \end{cases}$$

Since  $\int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbf{e}_j \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu} dS = 0$  for  $j = 1, 2, 3$ , there is a smooth solution  $q_j$  of (3.30) satisfying  $\nabla q_j, \nabla^2 q_j \in L^p(\Omega)$  for all  $1 < p < \infty$ , see, e.g., [28, Theorem 4.1]. Defining  $\mathbf{h}_j(x) = \mathbf{e}_j - \nabla q_j(x)$ , we see that  $\mathbf{h}_j \in \bigcap_{1 < p < \infty} \dot{X}^p(\Omega)$  with  $\mathbf{h}_j(\cdot) - \mathbf{e}_j \in \bigcap_{1 < p < \infty} L^p(\Omega)$  satisfying  $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{h}_j = 0$ ,  $\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{h}_j = \mathbf{0}$  and  $\mathbf{h}_j(x) \rightarrow \mathbf{e}_j$  as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$  for  $j = 1, 2, 3$ . This means that the harmonic triple  $\{\mathbf{h}_1, \mathbf{h}_2, \mathbf{h}_3\}$  has the same properties as the one of  $\{\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \mathbf{w}_3\}$  in (3.29), and hence the proof of (3.26) is complete.

We next show (3.27). Considering the triplet  $\{\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{v}_3\} \subset \bigcap_{1 < p < \infty} \dot{V}^r(\Omega)$  with  $\mathbf{v}_j(\cdot) - \mathbf{e}_j \in L^{r^*}(\Omega)$  such that  $\mathbf{v}_j(x) \rightarrow \mathbf{e}_j$  as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$  for  $j = 1, 2, 3$ , similarly to (3.29), we obtain the decomposition

$$(3.31) \quad \dot{V}^r(\Omega) = \widehat{V}^r(\Omega) \oplus \operatorname{Span}\{\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{v}_3\}.$$

Hence, for the proof of (3.27) we may construct the harmonic triplet  $\{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2, \mathbf{k}_3\} \subset \bigcap_{1 < p < \infty} \dot{V}^p(\Omega)$  with the same properties as those of  $\{\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{v}_3\}$ . For that purpose, similarly to (3.30), we consider the following Dirichlet problem

$$(3.32) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta \pi_j = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \pi_j = x \cdot \mathbf{e}_j & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ \pi_j(x) \rightarrow 0 & \text{as } |x| \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, 3. \end{cases}$$

Let  $\pi$  the solution of (3.32) satisfying  $\nabla \pi \in L^s(\Omega)$  for all  $3/2 < s \leq \infty$  and  $\nabla^2 \pi \in L^p(\Omega)$  for all  $1 < p < \infty$ ; see, e.g., [27, Theorem 4.2]. Defining  $\mathbf{k}_j(x) = \nabla(x \cdot \mathbf{e}_j - \pi_j(x))$ , we see that  $\{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2, \mathbf{k}_3\} \subset \bigcap_{1 < p < \infty} \dot{V}^p(\Omega)$  with  $\mathbf{k}_j(\cdot) - \mathbf{e}_j = \nabla \pi_j(\cdot) \in \bigcap_{3/2 < s < \infty} L^s(\Omega)$  are satisfying  $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{k}_j = 0$ ,  $\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{k}_j = \mathbf{0}$  and  $\mathbf{k}_j(x) \rightarrow \mathbf{e}_j$  as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$  for  $j = 1, 2, 3$ . Since  $3/2 < r_*$ , the harmonic triplet  $\{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2, \mathbf{k}_3\}$  has the required properties of  $\{\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{v}_3\}$  in (3.31), and hence we obtain the desired decomposition (3.27). This proves Proposition 3.7.  $\square$

We next consider fundamental inequalities on  $\dot{X}^r(\Omega)$  and  $\dot{V}^r(\Omega)$ .

**Proposition 3.8.** *Let  $\Omega$  be as in the Assumption and  $D = \Omega \cap B_{R+2}$  for  $R > 0$  sufficiently large. If  $1 < r < \infty$ , then there exists  $C = C(\Omega, r, R)$  such that*

$$(3.33) \quad \|\mathbf{w}\|_{L^r(D)} \leq C \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{L^r}$$

for all  $\mathbf{w} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega)$  and all  $\mathbf{w} \in \dot{V}^r(\Omega)$ .

*Proof.* We prove the assertion for  $\mathbf{w} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega)$ , only. The proof for  $\mathbf{w} \in \dot{V}^r(\Omega)$  is similar. We make use of contradiction argument. Assume that the estimate (3.33) fails. Then there exists a sequence  $\{\mathbf{w}_m\}_{m=1}^\infty \subset \dot{X}^r(\Omega)$  such that  $\|\mathbf{w}_m\|_{L^r(D)} \equiv 1$  for all  $m = 1, 2, \dots$  and such that  $\nabla \mathbf{w}_m \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$  in  $L^r(\Omega)$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . It follows from Rellich's theorem for  $H^{1,r}(D)$  and the weak compactness of  $\dot{X}^r(\Omega)$  that there exists a subsequence of  $\{\mathbf{w}_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ , denote again by  $\{\mathbf{w}_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ , and a function  $\mathbf{w} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega)$  such that

$$\nabla \mathbf{w}_m \rightharpoonup \nabla \mathbf{w} \quad \text{weakly in } L^r(\Omega) \text{ and } \mathbf{w}_m \rightarrow \mathbf{w} \text{ strongly in } L^r(D)$$

as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . Then  $\nabla \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{0}$  in  $\Omega$ , which implies that  $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{c}$  in  $\Omega$  for a constant vector  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ . On the other hand, there exists some  $x_j \in \partial\Omega$  such that  $\boldsymbol{\nu}_{x_j} = \mathbf{e}_j$  for  $j = 1, 2, 3$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\nu}_{x_j}$  denotes the unit outer normal to  $\partial\Omega$  at  $x_j$  and where  $\{\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \mathbf{e}_3\}$  is the same as in Proposition 3.7. Since  $\mathbf{w} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ , it follows that  $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{0}$ , which, however, contradicts  $\|\mathbf{w}\|_{L^r(D)} = 1$ . This proves Proposition 3.8.  $\square$

We consider next  $\operatorname{div}$ - $\operatorname{rot}$  estimate in  $\dot{X}(\Omega)$  and  $\dot{V}(\Omega)$  corresponding to Propositions 3.5 and 3.6.

**Lemma 3.9.** *Let  $\Omega$  be as in the Assumption, and let  $D$  and  $R$  be as above.*

(i) *For  $1 < r < \infty$ , there exists a constant  $C = C(\Omega, r, R)$  such that*

$$(3.34) \quad \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} \leq C(\|\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} + \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} + \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^r(D)})$$

*holds for all  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega)$  and all  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{V}^r(\Omega)$ .*

(ii) *Let  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{X}^q(\Omega)$  (resp.  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{V}^q(\Omega)$ ) for some  $1 < q < \infty$ . If  $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega)$  and  $\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega)$  for some  $1 < r < \infty$ , then  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega)$  (resp.  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{V}^r(\Omega)$ ) satisfying (3.34).*

*Proof.* (i) Let  $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$  be a cut-off function satisfying  $0 \leq \eta(x) \leq 1$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ ,  $\eta(x) = 1$  for  $|x| \leq R+1$  and  $\eta(x) = 0$  for  $|x| \geq R+2$ . Decompose  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega)$  in such a way that

$$(3.35) \quad \mathbf{u}(x) = \eta(x)\mathbf{u}(x) + (1 - \eta(x))\mathbf{u}(x) \equiv \mathbf{u}_1(x) + \mathbf{u}_2(x), \quad x \in \Omega.$$

We may regard  $\mathbf{u}_1$  and  $\mathbf{u}_2$  as functions defined on  $D$  and on  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , respectively. We first handle  $\mathbf{u}_1 \in X^r(D)$ . Since

$$(3.36) \quad \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_1 = \eta \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} + \nabla \eta \cdot \mathbf{u}, \quad \operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u}_1 = \eta \operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u} + \nabla \eta \times \mathbf{u}$$

and since  $\operatorname{supp} \eta \subset D$ ,  $\operatorname{supp} \nabla \eta \subset B_{R+2} \setminus B_{R+1}$ , it follows from (3.11) that

$$(3.37) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_1\|_{L^r(D)} &\leq C(\|\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u}_1\|_{L^r(D)} + \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_1\|_{L^r(D)} + \|\mathbf{u}_1\|_{L^r(D)}) \\ &\leq C(\|\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} + \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} + \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^r(D)}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $C = C(\Omega, r, R)$ .

We next consider  $\mathbf{u}_2 \in \dot{H}^{1,r}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . Since

$$\begin{aligned} &|(\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u}_2, \operatorname{rot} \boldsymbol{\varphi})_{\mathbb{R}^3} + (\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_2, \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\varphi})_{\mathbb{R}^3}| \\ &= |((1 - \eta)\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u} - \nabla \eta \times \mathbf{u}, \operatorname{rot} \boldsymbol{\varphi})_{\mathbb{R}^3} + ((1 - \eta)\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} - \nabla \eta \cdot \mathbf{u}, \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\varphi})_{\mathbb{R}^3}| \\ &\leq C(\|\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} + \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^r(D)})\|\operatorname{rot} \boldsymbol{\varphi}\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)} + C(\|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} + \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^r(D)})\|\operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\varphi}\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\ &\leq C(\|\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} + \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} + \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^r(D)})\|\nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , it follows from (3.20) that

$$(3.38) \quad \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_2\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C(\|\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} + \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} + \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^r(D)}).$$

Since  $\operatorname{supp} \mathbf{u}_1 \subset D \subset \Omega$ ,  $\operatorname{supp} \mathbf{u}_2 \subset \Omega$ , it follows from (3.35), (3.37) and (3.38) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} &\leq \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_1\|_{L^r(D)} + \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_2\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\ &\leq C(\|\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} + \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} + \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^r(D)}) \end{aligned}$$

with  $C = C(\Omega, r, R)$ , which yields (3.34) for  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega)$ . The proof of (3.34) for  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{V}^r(\Omega)$  is quite similar and hence omitted.

(ii) The proof uses again the cut-off method. Given  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{X}^q(\Omega)$ , the essential point is to derive estimate  $\|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^r(D)} \leq C\|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^{1,q}(D)}$ . To this end, we consider three cases for  $q$ , namely for  $3 \leq q < \infty$ ,  $3/2 \leq q < 3$  and  $1 < q < 3/2$ .

*Case 1.* Let  $3 \leq q < \infty$ . Proposition 3.8 and Sobolev's inequality imply  $\mathbf{u} \in L^r(D)$  and

$$(3.39) \quad \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^r(D)} \leq C\|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^{1,q}(D)} \leq C\|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^q}$$

for some  $C = C(\Omega, r, R)$ . We write  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_1 + \mathbf{u}_2$  as in (3.35). Since  $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega)$  and  $\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega)$ , and since  $\operatorname{supp} \eta \subset D$  and  $\operatorname{supp} \nabla \eta \subset B_{R+2} \setminus B_{R+1}$ , we obtain by (3.36) and (3.39) that  $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_1 \in L^r(D)$  and  $\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u}_1 \in L^r(D)$ . Hence, by Proposition 3.5 (ii)

$$(3.40) \quad \mathbf{u}_1 \in X^r(D).$$

Since

$$(3.41) \quad \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_2 = (1 - \eta)\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} - \nabla \eta \cdot \mathbf{u}, \quad \operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u}_2 = (1 - \eta)\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u} - \nabla \eta \times \mathbf{u},$$

we obtain by (3.39) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_2\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)} &\leq \|(1-\eta)\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \|\nabla\eta \cdot \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C(\|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} + \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^r(D)}) \\ &\leq C(\|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} + \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^q}) \\ \|\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u}_2\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)} &\leq \|(1-\eta)\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \|\nabla\eta \times \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C(\|\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} + \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^r(D)}) \\ &\leq C(\|\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} + \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^q}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by Proposition 3.6 (ii)

$$(3.42) \quad \mathbf{u}_2 \in \dot{H}^{1,r}(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

Combining (3.40) with (3.42) we conclude that  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega)$ .

*Case 2.* Let  $3/2 \leq q < 3$ . If  $r \leq q$ , then  $\mathbf{u} \in L^r(D)$  with estimate (3.39), and hence the argument given in Case 1 is valid to derive  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega)$ . We hence consider the case  $q < r$ . Assume first that  $1/q_1 \equiv 1/q - 1/3 \leq 1/r < 1/q$ . Sobolev's inequality implies (3.39) and hence  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega)$ .

We next deal with the case  $1/r < 1/q_1$ . Since  $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} \in L^q(\Omega) \cap L^r(\Omega)$  and  $\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u} \in L^q(\Omega) \cap L^r(\Omega)$ , and since  $q < q_1 < r$  we see that  $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} \in L^{q_1}(\Omega)$  and  $\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u} \in L^{q_1}(\Omega)$ . Hence, by the above argument,  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{X}^{q_1}(\Omega)$ . Since  $q_1 \geq 3$  we obtain (3.39) with  $q$  replaced by  $q_1$  so that we may reduce our case to Case 1 to obtain  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega)$ .

*Case 3.* Let  $1 < q < 3/2$ . If  $r \leq q$ , then (3.39) holds and  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega)$ . If  $q < r \leq q_1$ , Sobolev's inequality implies (3.39) and hence  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega)$ . It remains to consider the case  $q_1 < r < \infty$ . The same argument as in the Case 2 is valid and yields  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{X}^{q_1}(\Omega)$ . If  $r \leq q_2$  with  $1/q_2 \equiv 1/q_1 - 1/3 = 1/q - 2/3$ , then (3.39) holds with  $q$  replaced by  $q_1$ , which yields  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega)$ . Finally, consider the case  $q_2 < r < \infty$ . Since  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{X}^{q_1}(\Omega)$ ,  $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} \in L^{q_2}(\Omega)$  and  $\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u} \in L^{q_2}(\Omega)$ , (3.39) with  $r$  and  $q$  replaced by  $q_2$  and  $q_1$ , implies  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{X}^{q_2}(\Omega)$ . Defining  $1 < q_3 < q_2$  by  $1/q_3 \equiv 1/r + 1/3$  we have  $\mathbf{u} \in H^{1,q_3}(D)$ . Hence by (3.33) and by Sobolev's inequality  $\mathbf{u} \in L^r(D)$  satisfying

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^r(D)} \leq C\|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^{1,q_3}(D)} \leq C\|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^{1,q_2}(D)} \leq C\|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^{q_2}}.$$

The same argument as in the Case 1 is valid now, because (3.39) holds with  $q$  replaced by  $q_2$ . Hence,  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega)$  and the proof of ii) for  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{X}^q(\Omega)$  is complete. The proof for  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{V}^q(\Omega)$  is similar and hence omitted.  $\square$

We now define the harmonic vector spaces  $\dot{X}^r(\Omega)$  and  $\dot{V}^r(\Omega)$  for  $1 < r < \infty$  by

$$(3.43) \quad \dot{X}_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega) \equiv \{\mathbf{h} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega); \operatorname{div} \mathbf{h} = 0, \operatorname{rot} \mathbf{h} = 0\},$$

$$(3.44) \quad \dot{V}_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega) \equiv \{\mathbf{h} \in \dot{V}^r(\Omega); \operatorname{div} \mathbf{h} = 0, \operatorname{rot} \mathbf{h} = 0\}.$$

The following lemma is a consequence of Lemma 3.9.

**Lemma 3.10.** *Let  $\Omega$  be as in the Assumption. If  $1 < r < \infty$ , then*

$$\dot{X}_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega) = \dot{X}_{\text{har}}^2(\Omega) \equiv \dot{X}_{\text{har}}(\Omega) \quad \text{as well as} \quad \dot{V}_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega) = \dot{V}_{\text{har}}^2(\Omega) \equiv \dot{V}_{\text{har}}(\Omega)$$

*and  $\dot{X}_{\text{har}}(\Omega)$  and  $\dot{V}_{\text{har}}(\Omega)$  are finite dimensional vector spaces.*

*Proof.* The first two assertions follow from Lemma 3.9 (ii). In order to prove that  $\dim \dot{X}_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega) < \infty$  note that since  $\dot{X}_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$  is a closed subspace in  $\dot{X}^r(\Omega)$ , it suffices to show that the unit sphere of  $\dot{X}_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$  is compact in the norm of  $\dot{X}^r(\Omega)$ . To this end, suppose that  $\{\mathbf{u}_m\}_{m=1}^\infty \subset \dot{X}_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$  satisfies  $\|\nabla \mathbf{u}_m\|_{L^2} \equiv 1$  for all  $m = 1, 2, \dots$ . By the weak compactness, there exist a subsequence of  $\{\mathbf{u}_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ , denoted again by  $\{\mathbf{u}_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ , and a function  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{X}_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$  such that

$$(3.45) \quad \nabla \mathbf{u}_m \rightharpoonup \nabla \mathbf{u} \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(\Omega) \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty.$$

On the other hand, we see by Proposition 3.8 that  $\{\mathbf{u}_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$  is bounded in  $H^{1,2}(D)$ . Since  $D$  is a bounded domain in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , by Rellich's theorem we may assume that

$$\mathbf{u}_m \rightarrow \mathbf{u} \quad \text{strongly in } L^r(D) \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty.$$



Since  $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_m = 0$  and  $\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u}_m = 0$  for all  $m = 1, 2, \dots$ , Lemma 3.9 (i) implies that  $\{\nabla \mathbf{u}_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $L^2(\Omega)$  and by (3.45) it follows that

$$\nabla \mathbf{u}_m \rightarrow \nabla \mathbf{u} \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\Omega) \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty.$$

Since  $\{\mathbf{u}_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$  is an arbitrary sequence of the unit sphere in  $\dot{X}_{\text{har}}(\Omega)$ , we conclude that the dimension of  $\dot{X}_{\text{har}}(\Omega)$  is finite. The proof of  $\dim \dot{V}_{\text{har}}(\Omega) < \infty$  is parallel to the one given above and hence omitted.  $\square$

Following Lemma 3.10, we may assume that  $\dim \dot{X}_{\text{har}}(\Omega) = N$  and  $\dim \dot{V}_{\text{har}}(\Omega) = L$ . Hence, there are a basis  $\{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N\}$  of  $\dot{X}_{\text{har}}(\Omega)$  and a basis  $\{\psi_1, \dots, \psi_L\}$  of  $\dot{V}_{\text{har}}(\Omega)$  such that

$$(3.46) \quad (\nabla \varphi_j, \nabla \varphi_k) = \delta_{jk}, \quad j, k = 1, \dots, N, \quad (\nabla \psi_l, \nabla \psi_m) = \delta_{lm}, \quad l, m = 1, \dots, L,$$

where  $\{\delta_{jk}\}_{1 \leq j, k \leq N}$  and  $\{\delta_{lm}\}_{1 \leq l, m \leq L}$  denote Kronecker's symbols. Then for every  $1 < r < \infty$ , there exist closed subspaces  $\tilde{X}^r(\Omega)$  and  $\tilde{V}^r(\Omega)$  of  $\dot{X}^r(\Omega)$  and  $\dot{V}^r(\Omega)$ , respectively, such that

$$(3.47) \quad \dot{X}^r(\Omega) = \dot{X}_{\text{har}}(\Omega) \oplus \tilde{X}^r(\Omega), \quad \dot{V}^r(\Omega) = \dot{V}_{\text{har}}(\Omega) \oplus \tilde{V}^r(\Omega) \quad (\text{direct sum}).$$

The following lemma corresponds to Lemma 3.9 (i).

**Lemma 3.11.** *Let  $\Omega$  be as in the Assumption and let  $1 < r < \infty$ .*

(i) *There exists a constant  $C = C(\Omega, r)$  such that*

$$(3.48) \quad \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} \leq C(\|\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} + \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} + \sum_{j=1}^N |(\nabla \mathbf{u}, \nabla \varphi_j)|) \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{u} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega),$$

$$(3.49) \quad \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} \leq C(\|\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} + \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} + \sum_{l=1}^L |(\nabla \mathbf{u}, \nabla \psi_l)|) \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{u} \in \dot{V}^r(\Omega).$$

(ii) *There exists a constant  $C = C(\Omega, r)$  such that*

$$(3.50) \quad \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} \leq C(\|\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} + \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r}) \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{u} \in \tilde{X}^r(\Omega) \text{ and for all } \mathbf{u} \in \tilde{V}^r(\Omega).$$

*Proof.* (i) In order to prove (3.48), we make use of a contradiction argument. Assume that the estimate (3.48) fails. Then there is a sequence  $\{\mathbf{u}_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$  in  $\dot{X}^r(\Omega)$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_m\|_{L^r} &\equiv 1 \quad \text{for all } m \in \mathbb{N}, \\ \|\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u}_m\|_{L^r} + \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_m\|_{L^r} + \sum_{j=1}^N |(\nabla \mathbf{u}_m, \nabla \varphi_j)| &\rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

By the weak compactness, there exists a subsequence of  $\{\mathbf{u}_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ , denoted again by  $\{\mathbf{u}_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ , and a function  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega)$  such that

$$\nabla \mathbf{u}_m \rightharpoonup \nabla \mathbf{u} \quad \text{weakly in } L^r(\Omega).$$

By Proposition 3.8,  $\{\mathbf{u}_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$  is bounded in  $H^{1,r}(D)$ . By Rellich's theorem we may assume that

$$\mathbf{u}_m \rightarrow \mathbf{u} \quad \text{strongly in } L^r(D) \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty.$$

By Lemma 3.9 (i),  $\{\nabla \mathbf{u}_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $L^r(\Omega)$ , which implies that  $\nabla \mathbf{u}_m \rightarrow \nabla \mathbf{u}$  strongly in  $L^r(\Omega)$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence,  $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0$  and  $\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$ , and Lemma 3.10 implies  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{X}_{\text{har}}(\Omega)$ . Moreover, since  $(\nabla \mathbf{u}, \nabla \varphi_j) = 0$  for  $j = 1, \dots, N$ ,  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$ , which contradicts  $\|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} = 1$ . The proof of (3.49) is similar to that of (3.48) and hence omitted.

(ii) Assume that (3.50) fails. Then there is a sequence  $\{\mathbf{u}_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$  in  $\tilde{X}^r(\Omega)$  such that

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{u}_m\|_{L^r} \equiv 1 \quad \text{for all } m \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (\|\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u}_m\|_{L^r} + \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_m\|_{L^r}) = 0.$$

Then by the same compactness argument as in the above, we may assume that there is a function  $\mathbf{u} \in \tilde{X}^r(\Omega)$  such that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_m - \nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} = 0.$$

Since  $\tilde{X}^r(\Omega)$  is closed in  $\dot{X}^r(\Omega)$ , we obtain  $\mathbf{u} \in \tilde{X}^r(\Omega)$ . On the other hand,  $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0$  and  $\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$ , which means that  $\mathbf{u} \in \dot{X}_{\text{har}}(\Omega)$ . Since  $\tilde{X}^r(\Omega) \cap \dot{X}_{\text{har}}(\Omega) = \{\mathbf{0}\}$ , we see that  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$ , which contradicts

$\|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} = 1$ . The proof of (3.50) for  $\mathbf{u} \in \tilde{V}^r(\Omega)$  follows similarly from the above lines, and hence details may be omitted.  $\square$

### 3.4. Functionals on $\mathbb{R}^3$ supported in $\Omega$ .

Assume that  $\Omega_0$  is a subdomain of  $\Omega$  satisfying  $\overline{\Omega_0} \subset \Omega$ . Consider a further subdomain  $\Omega_1 \subset \Omega$  in such a way that  $\overline{\Omega_0} \subset \Omega_1$  and that  $K \equiv \Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega_1}$  is a bounded domain in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Take a cut-off function  $\zeta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$  with  $0 \leq \zeta(x) \leq 1$  such that

$$(3.51) \quad \zeta(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } x \in \Omega_1, \\ 0 & \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Omega. \end{cases}$$

We show that the space of linear functionals on  $\dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)$  and  $\dot{V}^{r'}(\Omega)$  supported on  $\overline{\Omega_0} \subset \Omega$  are continuously embedded into those on  $\hat{H}^{1,r}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  which is the closure of  $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$  with respect to the homogeneous norm  $\|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)}$ . Similarly to Proposition 3.1, we have the following concrete characterization of  $\hat{H}^{1,r}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  as

$$\hat{H}^{1,r}(\mathbb{R}^3) = \begin{cases} \{[\mathbf{u}]; \mathbf{u} \in L^{r^*}(\mathbb{R}^3); \nabla \mathbf{u} \in L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)\} & \text{for } 1 < r < 3, \\ \{[\mathbf{u}]; \mathbf{u} \in L_{\text{loc}}^r(\mathbb{R}^3), \nabla \mathbf{u} \in L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)\} & \text{for } 3 \leq r < \infty, \end{cases}$$

where  $[\mathbf{u}]$  denotes the set of equivalent class of  $\mathbf{u}$  such that  $\mathbf{v} \in [\mathbf{u}]$  implies that  $\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v} \equiv \text{const}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Hence,

$$(3.52) \quad \dot{H}^{1,r}(\mathbb{R}^3) = \hat{H}^{1,r}(\mathbb{R}^3) \quad \text{for all } 1 < r < \infty.$$

Indeed, by [8, Corollary 2.2 (ii)] if  $1 < r < 3$ , for  $\mathbf{u} \in L_{\text{loc}}^r(\mathbb{R}^3)$  with  $\nabla \mathbf{u} \in L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)$  there is a constant vector  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{c} \in L^{r^*}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , which yields (3.52).

**Proposition 3.12.** *Let  $\Omega$  be as in the Assumption. Suppose that  $\Omega_0$  is a subdomain satisfying  $\overline{\Omega_0} \subset \Omega$  and that  $\zeta$  is a function as in (3.51). Let  $f \in \dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*$  or  $f \in \dot{V}^{r'}(\Omega)^*$  for  $1 < r < \infty$ . Then the functional  $\tilde{f}$  defined by*

$$(3.53) \quad \langle \tilde{f}, \Phi \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} \equiv \langle f, \zeta \Phi \rangle \quad \text{for } \Phi \in \hat{H}^{1,r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)$$

may be regarded as an element of  $\hat{H}^{1,r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)^*$  satisfying

$$(3.54) \quad \|\tilde{f}\|_{\hat{H}^{1,r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)^*} \leq \begin{cases} C\|f\|_{\dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*} & \text{for } f \in \dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*, \\ C\|f\|_{\dot{V}^{r'}(\Omega)^*} & \text{for } f \in \dot{V}^{r'}(\Omega)^*, \end{cases}$$

for some constant  $C = C(\Omega, \Omega_0, r)$  independent of  $f$ .

To be precise let us note that in (3.53) the bracket  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3}$  on the left hand side denotes the duality pairing between  $\hat{H}^{1,r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)^*$  and  $\hat{H}^{1,r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , while the bracket  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  on the right hand side denotes the one between  $\dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*$  (resp.  $\dot{V}^{r'}(\Omega)^*$ ) and  $\dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)$  (resp.  $\dot{V}^{r'}(\Omega)$ ).

*Proof of Proposition 3.12.* We give here only a detailed proof for  $f \in \dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*$ ; the proof for  $f \in \dot{V}^{r'}(\Omega)^*$  is similar. Note that  $\zeta \Phi \in \dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega) \cap \dot{V}^{r'}(\Omega)$  for all  $\Phi \in \hat{H}^{1,r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ .

Consider first the case when  $3/2 < r < \infty$ . It follows from (3.52) and Sobolev's inequality that

$$(3.55) \quad \|\Phi\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C\|\nabla \Phi\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \quad \text{for all } \Phi \in \hat{H}^{1,r'}(\mathbb{R}^3),$$

where  $1/q \equiv 1/r' - 1/3$ . Since  $\text{supp} \nabla \zeta \subset K$  and since  $K$  is a bounded domain in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , it follows from (3.53) and (3.55) that

$$(3.56) \quad \begin{aligned} |\langle \tilde{f}, \Phi \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3}| &\leq \|f\|_{\dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*} \|\zeta \Phi\|_{\dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)} \\ &= \|f\|_{\dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*} \|\nabla(\zeta \Phi)\|_{L^{r'}} \\ &\leq \|f\|_{\dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*} (\|\nabla \zeta \cdot \Phi\|_{L^{r'}(K)} + \|\nabla \Phi\|_{L^{r'}}) \\ &\leq C\|f\|_{\dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*} (\|\Phi\|_{L^q(K)} + \|\nabla \Phi\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)}) \\ &\leq C\|f\|_{\dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*} \|\nabla \Phi\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\Phi \in \hat{H}^{1,r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . This implies  $\tilde{f} \in \hat{H}^{1,r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)^*$  as well as (3.54).

We consider next the case when  $1 < r \leq 3/2$ . It follows from [15, Lemma 2.5] that the space  $S_K$  defined by  $S_K \equiv \{\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3); \int_K \varphi(x)dx = 0\}$  is *dense* in  $\hat{H}^{1,r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . Poincaré's inequality implies

$$\|\varphi\|_{L^{r'}(K)} \leq C\|\nabla\varphi\|_{L^{r'}(K)} \leq C\|\nabla\varphi\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in S_K,$$

for some  $C = C(r, K)$ . Hence, similarly to (3.56) we obtain

$$|\langle \tilde{f}, \varphi \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3}| \leq C\|f\|_{\dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*} (\|\varphi\|_{L^{r'}(K)} + \|\nabla\varphi\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)}) \leq C\|f\|_{\dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*} \|\nabla\varphi\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)}$$

for all  $\varphi \in S_K$ . Since  $S_K$  is dense in  $\hat{H}^{1,r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , we obtain  $\tilde{f} \in \hat{H}^{1,r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)^*$  as well as (3.54).  $\square$

#### 4. CONSTRUCTION OF THE VECTOR POTENTIAL

In this section to prove the existence of the vector potential  $\mathbf{w}$  in (2.6) and (2.10).

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $\Omega$  be as in the Assumption and let  $1 < r < \infty$ .*

(i) *For every  $\mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega)$  there exists  $\mathbf{w} \in \dot{X}_\sigma^r(\Omega)$  such that*

$$(4.1) \quad (\text{rot } \mathbf{w}, \text{rot } \Phi) = (\mathbf{u}, \text{rot } \Phi)$$

*holds for all  $\Phi \in \dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)$ . Moreover, there exists a constant  $C = C(\Omega, r)$  such that*

$$(4.2) \quad \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{L^r} \leq C\|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^r}.$$

(ii) *For every  $\mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega)$  there exists  $\mathbf{w} \in \dot{V}_\sigma^r(\Omega)$  such that*

$$(4.3) \quad (\text{rot } \mathbf{w}, \text{rot } \Psi) = (\mathbf{u}, \text{rot } \Psi)$$

*holds for all  $\Psi \in \dot{V}^{r'}(\Omega)$ . Moreover, there exists a constant  $C = C(\Omega, r)$  such that*

$$(4.4) \quad \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{L^r} \leq C\|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^r}.$$

The proof of Theorem 4.1 is subdivided into several steps.

##### 4.1. Bilinear forms on $\dot{X}^r(\Omega)$ and $\dot{V}^r(\Omega)$ .

In order to prove Theorem 4.1, we first solve (4.1) and (4.3) for general  $\mathbf{w} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega)$  and  $\mathbf{w} \in \dot{V}^r(\Omega)$ , respectively. Then, in the next step, we show that such  $\mathbf{w}$  necessarily satisfies  $\text{div } \mathbf{w} = 0$ . For the validity of  $\mathbf{w} \in \dot{X}_\sigma^r(\Omega)$  in (4.1) it is essential that the right hand side is written in the form  $(\mathbf{u}, \text{rot } \Phi)$ . Consider the bilinear forms  $a_X(\cdot, \cdot)$  and  $a_V(\cdot, \cdot)$  defined by

$$(4.5) \quad a_X(\mathbf{v}, \Phi) = (\text{rot } \mathbf{v}, \text{rot } \Phi) + (\text{div } \mathbf{v}, \text{div } \Phi) \quad \text{for } \mathbf{v} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega) \text{ and } \Phi \in \dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega),$$

$$(4.6) \quad a_V(\mathbf{w}, \Psi) = (\text{rot } \mathbf{w}, \text{rot } \Psi) + (\text{div } \mathbf{w}, \text{div } \Psi) \quad \text{for } \mathbf{w} \in \dot{V}^r(\Omega) \text{ and } \Psi \in \dot{V}^{r'}(\Omega).$$

The following proposition gives regularity properties for solutions associated to the bilinear forms (4.5) and (4.6).

**Proposition 4.2.** *Let  $\Omega$  be as in the Assumption and let  $1 < q < \infty$  and  $3/2 < r < \infty$ .*

(i) *Suppose that  $f \in \dot{X}^{q'}(\Omega)^* \cap \dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*$ . If  $\mathbf{v} \in \dot{X}^q(\Omega)$  satisfies*

$$(4.7) \quad a_X(\mathbf{v}, \varphi) = \langle f, \varphi \rangle \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in \mathcal{X}(\Omega),$$

*then  $\mathbf{v} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega)$ . Here the bracket  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  denotes the duality pairing between  $\dot{X}^{q'}(\Omega)^*$  and  $\dot{X}^{q'}(\Omega)$ .*

(ii) *Suppose that  $f \in \dot{V}^{q'}(\Omega)^* \cap \dot{V}^{r'}(\Omega)^*$ . If  $\mathbf{w} \in \dot{V}^q(\Omega)$  satisfies*

$$(4.8) \quad a_V(\mathbf{w}, \psi) = \langle f, \psi \rangle \quad \text{for all } \psi \in \mathcal{V}(\Omega),$$

*then  $\mathbf{w} \in \dot{V}^r(\Omega)$ . Here the bracket  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  denotes the duality pairing between  $\dot{V}^{q'}(\Omega)^*$  and  $\dot{V}^{q'}(\Omega)$ .*

*Proof.* Again we only prove (i). Define two domains  $\Omega_1$  and  $\Omega_2$  by  $\Omega_1 \equiv D$  and  $\Omega_2 \equiv \mathbb{R}^3$ , respectively and define further two cut-off functions  $\zeta_1$  and  $\zeta_2$  by  $\zeta_1(x) \equiv \eta(x)$  and  $\zeta_2(x) \equiv 1 - \eta(x)$ , respectively, where  $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$  is the same cut-off function as in (3.35). Since

$$(4.9) \quad \mathbf{v}(x) = \zeta_1(x)\mathbf{v}(x) + \zeta_2(x)\mathbf{v}(x) \equiv \mathbf{v}_1(x) + \mathbf{v}_2(x), \quad x \in \Omega,$$

we may regard  $\mathbf{v}_1 \in X^q(D)$  and  $\mathbf{v}_2 \in \dot{H}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . By (4.7) we obtain

$$(4.10) \quad \int_{\Omega_i} (\text{rot } \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \text{rot } \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i + \text{div } \mathbf{v}_i \text{div } \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i) dx = \langle f, \zeta_i \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i \rangle - \int_D (2\nabla \zeta_i \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v} + \Delta \zeta_i \mathbf{v}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i dx, \quad i = 1, 2$$

for all  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_1 \in \mathcal{X}(D)$  and for all  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_2 \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . Notice that  $\text{supp } \zeta_1 \subset D$  and that  $\text{supp } \nabla \zeta_i, \text{supp } \Delta \zeta_i \subset B_{R+2} \setminus B_{R+1} \subset D$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Since  $f \in \dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*$ , it follows from (3.8) that

$$(4.11) \quad \begin{aligned} |\langle f, \zeta_1 \boldsymbol{\varphi}_1 \rangle| &\leq \|f\|_{\dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*} \|\nabla(\zeta_1 \boldsymbol{\varphi}_1)\|_{L^{r'}} \\ &\leq \|f\|_{\dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*} (\|\zeta_1 \nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}_1\|_{L^{r'}} + \|\nabla \zeta_1 \cdot \boldsymbol{\varphi}_1\|_{L^{r'}}) \\ &\leq C \|f\|_{\dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*} (\|\nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}_1\|_{L^{r'}(D)} + \|\nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}_1\|_{L^{r'}(D)}) \\ &\leq C \|f\|_{\dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*} \|\nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}_1\|_{L^{r'}(D)} \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_1 \in \mathcal{X}(D)$ . By Proposition 3.12

$$(4.12) \quad |\langle f, \zeta_2 \boldsymbol{\varphi}_2 \rangle| \leq C \|f\|_{\dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*} \|\nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}_2\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)}$$

for all  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_2 \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . In order to treat the second term in the integral on  $D$  on the right hand side of (4.10), we use a technique similar to the one given in the proof of Lemma 3.9 (ii) and consider the following three cases.

*Case 1.* Let  $1/q - 1/3 \leq 1/r < 2/3$ . Take  $1 < s < \infty$  satisfying  $1/s \equiv 1/r + 1/3$  and hence  $q' \leq s'$ . Since  $D$  is a bounded domain, it follows from (3.9) and (3.33) that

$$(4.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \left| \int_D (2\nabla \zeta_1 \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v} + \Delta \zeta_1 \mathbf{v}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\varphi}_1 dx \right| &\leq C (\|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{L^q(D)} + \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^q(D)}) \|\boldsymbol{\varphi}_1\|_{L^{q'}(D)} \\ &\leq C (\|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{L^q} + \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^q(D)}) \|\boldsymbol{\varphi}_1\|_{L^{s'}(D)} \\ &\leq C \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{L^q} \|\nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}_1\|_{L^{r'}(D)} \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_1 \in \mathcal{X}(D)$  and for some  $C = C(\Omega, r, q, R)$ . Similarly, the Sobolev embedding  $\dot{H}^{1,r'}(\mathbb{R}^3) \subset L^{s'}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  implies

$$(4.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \left| \int_D (2\nabla \zeta_2 \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v} + \Delta \zeta_2 \mathbf{v}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\varphi}_2 dx \right| &\leq C (\|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{L^q(D)} + \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^q(D)}) \|\boldsymbol{\varphi}_2\|_{L^{s'}(D)} \\ &\leq C \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{L^q} \|\nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}_2\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_2 \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$  for some  $C = C(\Omega, r, q, R)$ . It follows from (4.10), (4.11), (4.13) and Proposition 3.5 (ii) that

$$(4.15) \quad \mathbf{v}_1 \in X^r(D).$$

Similarly, it follows from (4.10), (4.12), (4.14) and Proposition 3.6 (ii) that

$$(4.16) \quad \mathbf{v}_2 \in \dot{H}^{1,r}(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

We now deduce from (4.9), (4.15) and (4.16) that  $\mathbf{v} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega)$  provided  $1/q - 1/3 \leq 1/r < 2/3$ .

*Case 2.* Let  $1/q - 2/3 \leq 1/r < 1/q - 1/3 \equiv 1/q_1$ . Since  $f \in \dot{X}^{q'}(\Omega)^* \cap \dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*$  and since  $q < q_1 < r$ , we obtain  $f \in \dot{X}^{q'}(\Omega)^* \cap \dot{X}^{q_1'}(\Omega)^*$ . Hence, the argument of case 1 with  $r$  replaced by  $q_1$  implies  $\mathbf{v} \in \dot{X}^{q_1}(\Omega)$ . Since  $f \in \dot{X}^{q_1'}(\Omega)^* \cap \dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*$ , the argument of case 1 with  $q$  replaced by  $q_1$ , implies  $\mathbf{v} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega)$ .

*Case 3.* Let  $0 < 1/r < 1/q - 2/3 \equiv 1/q_2$ . Take  $q_1 < q_3 < q_2$  so that  $1/q_3 \equiv 1/r + 1/3$ . The arguments of case 1 and case 2 imply  $\mathbf{v} \in \dot{X}^{q_3}(\Omega)$ . Since  $f \in \dot{X}^{q_3'}(\Omega)^* \cap \dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*$  we conclude that  $\mathbf{v} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega)$ .  $\square$

Based on the bilinear forms  $a_X(\cdot, \cdot)$  in (4.5) and  $a_V(\cdot, \cdot)$  in (4.6), we define now  $S_r : \dot{X}^r(\Omega) \rightarrow \dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*$  and  $T_r : \dot{V}^r(\Omega) \rightarrow \dot{V}^{r'}(\Omega)^*$  by

$$(4.17) \quad \langle S_r \mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\Phi} \rangle \equiv a_X(\mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\Phi}) \quad \text{for } \mathbf{v} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega) \text{ and } \boldsymbol{\Phi} \in \dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega),$$

$$(4.18) \quad \langle T_r \mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\Psi} \rangle \equiv a_V(\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\Psi}) \quad \text{for } \mathbf{w} \in \dot{V}^r(\Omega) \text{ and } \boldsymbol{\Psi} \in \dot{V}^{r'}(\Omega).$$

Here the bracket  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  denotes the duality pairing of  $\dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*$  and  $\dot{X}^r(\Omega)$  in (4.17), and that of  $\dot{V}^{r'}(\Omega)^*$  and  $\dot{V}^r(\Omega)$  in (4.18), respectively. Obviously,  $S_r \in \mathcal{L}(\dot{X}^r(\Omega), \dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*)$  and  $T_r \in \mathcal{L}(\dot{V}^r(\Omega), \dot{V}^{r'}(\Omega)^*)$ .

Here  $\mathcal{L}(Y, Z)$  denotes the set of bounded linear operators from  $Y$  to  $Z$ . The following proposition gives estimates of  $\nabla \mathbf{v}$  by means of  $\text{rot } \mathbf{v}$  and  $\text{div } \mathbf{v}$  in  $L^r(\Omega)$ .

**Proposition 4.3.** *Let  $\Omega$  be as in the Assumption and let  $1 < r < \infty$ . There exists a constant  $C = C(\Omega, r, R)$  such that*

$$(4.19) \quad \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{L^r} \leq C(\|S_r \mathbf{v}\|_{\dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*} + \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^r(D)}) \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{v} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega),$$

$$(4.20) \quad \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{L^r} \leq C(\|T_r \mathbf{w}\|_{\dot{V}^{r'}(\Omega)^*} + \|\mathbf{w}\|_{L^r(D)}) \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{w} \in \dot{V}^r(\Omega).$$

*Proof.* We first prove (4.19). For  $\mathbf{v} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega)$  set  $S_r \mathbf{v} = f$ . By (4.17)

$$(4.21) \quad a_X(\mathbf{v}, \Phi) = (\text{rot } \mathbf{v}, \text{rot } \Phi) + (\text{div } \mathbf{v}, \text{div } \Phi) = \langle f, \Phi \rangle \quad \text{for all } \Phi \in \dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega).$$

Decomposing  $\mathbf{v}$  as  $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbf{v}_2$  as in (4.9), we obtain by (4.10) and integration by parts

$$(4.22) \quad \int_{\Omega_i} (\text{rot } \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \text{rot } \varphi_i + \text{div } \mathbf{v}_i \text{div } \varphi_i) dx = \langle f, \zeta_i \varphi_i \rangle + \int_D (2\nabla \zeta_i \cdot \nabla \varphi_i + \Delta \zeta_i \varphi_i) \cdot \mathbf{v} dx, \quad i = 1, 2$$

for all  $\varphi_1 \in \mathcal{X}(D)$  and for all  $\varphi_2 \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . Recall that  $\Omega_1 = D$  and  $\Omega_2 = \mathbb{R}^3$ . By (3.8)

$$(4.23) \quad \left| \int_D (2\nabla \zeta_1 \cdot \nabla \varphi_1 + \Delta \zeta_1 \varphi_1) \cdot \mathbf{v} dx \right| \leq C(\|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^r(D)} (\|\nabla \varphi_1\|_{L^{r'}(D)} + \|\varphi_1\|_{L^{r'}(D)}) \\ \leq C\|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^r(D)} \|\nabla \varphi_1\|_{L^{r'}(D)}$$

for all  $\varphi_1 \in \mathcal{X}(D)$ . It follows from (4.22), (4.11), (4.23) and Proposition 3.5 that  $\nabla \mathbf{v}_1 \in L^r(D)$  as well as

$$(4.24) \quad \|\nabla \mathbf{v}_1\|_{L^r(D)} \leq C \sup_{\varphi_1 \in \mathcal{X}(D)} \frac{|(\text{rot } \mathbf{v}_1, \text{rot } \varphi_1)_D + (\text{div } \mathbf{v}_1, \text{div } \varphi_1)_D|}{\|\nabla \varphi_1\|_{L^{r'}(D)}} + C \sum_{j=1}^N |(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{h}_j)_D| \\ \leq C(\|f\|_{\dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*} + \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^r(D)}).$$

Next, in order to treat  $\mathbf{v}_2 \in \dot{H}^{1,r}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , consider the functional  $g_{\mathbf{v}}$  defined by

$$g_{\mathbf{v}} : \dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega) \ni \Phi \mapsto \int_D (2\nabla \zeta_2 \cdot \nabla \Phi + \Delta \zeta_2 \Phi) \cdot \mathbf{v} dx \in \mathbb{R}.$$

By Proposition 3.8

$$\left| \int_D (2\nabla \zeta_2 \cdot \nabla \Phi + \Delta \zeta_2 \Phi) \cdot \mathbf{v} dx \right| \leq C\|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^r(D)} (\|\nabla \Phi\|_{L^{r'}(D)} + \|\Phi\|_{L^{r'}(D)}) \\ \leq C\|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^r(D)} \|\nabla \Phi\|_{L^{r'}}$$

for all  $\Phi \in \dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)$  and for some  $C = C(\Omega, r, R)$ . This means

$$(4.25) \quad g_{\mathbf{v}} \in \dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^* \quad \text{and} \quad \|g_{\mathbf{v}}\|_{\dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*} \leq C\|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^r(D)}.$$

Taking  $\zeta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$  in such a way that  $\zeta(x) = 1$  for  $|x| \geq R+1$  and that  $\zeta(x) = 0$  for  $|x| \leq R+1/2$ , we obtain by (4.25) and Proposition 3.12

$$\left| \int_D (2\nabla \zeta_2 \cdot \nabla \varphi_2 + \Delta \zeta_2 \varphi_2) \cdot \mathbf{v} dx \right| = |\langle g_{\mathbf{v}}, \zeta \varphi_2 \rangle| = |\langle \tilde{g}_{\mathbf{v}}, \varphi_2 \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3}| \leq \|\tilde{g}_{\mathbf{v}}\|_{\hat{H}^{1,r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)^*} \|\nabla \varphi_2\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\ \leq C\|g_{\mathbf{v}}\|_{\dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*} \|\nabla \varphi_2\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C\|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^r(D)} \|\nabla \varphi_2\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)}$$

for all  $\varphi_2 \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . This implies together with (4.12), (4.22) and Proposition 3.6 that  $\mathbf{v}_2 \in \dot{H}^{1,r}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  as well as

$$(4.26) \quad \|\nabla \mathbf{v}_2\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C \sup_{\varphi_2 \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \frac{|(\text{rot } \mathbf{v}_2, \text{rot } \varphi_2)_{\mathbb{R}^3} + (\text{div } \mathbf{v}_2, \text{div } \varphi_2)_{\mathbb{R}^3}|}{\|\nabla \varphi_2\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^3)}} \\ \leq C(\|f\|_{\dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*} + \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^r(D)}).$$

Finally, the desired estimate (4.19) is a consequence of (4.9), (4.24) and (4.26). The proof of (4.20) is similar to that of (4.19) and hence omitted.  $\square$

The following is an immediate consequence of Proposition 4.3.

**Proposition 4.4.** *Let  $\Omega$  be as in the Assumption and let  $1 < r < \infty$ .*

- (i) *The kernel  $\text{Ker}(S_r)$  is a finite dimensional subspace in  $\dot{X}^r(\Omega)$  and the range  $\text{R}(S_r)$  is a closed subspace in  $\dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*$ .*
- (ii) *The kernel  $\text{Ker}(T_r)$  is a finite dimensional subspace in  $\dot{V}^r(\Omega)$  and the range  $\text{R}(T_r)$  is a closed subspace in  $\dot{V}^{r'}(\Omega)^*$ .*

*Proof.* By Proposition 3.8 and Rellich's theorem, both  $\dot{X}^r(\Omega)$  and  $\dot{V}^r(\Omega)$  are compactly embedded into  $L^r(D)$ . Hence, the assertion follows from (4.19), (4.20) and [22, Lemma 3].  $\square$

Concerning the kernels  $\text{Ker}(S_r)$  and  $\text{Ker}(T_r)$ , we have the following precise characterization.

**Proposition 4.5.** *Let  $\Omega$  be as in the Assumption and let  $1 < r < \infty$ . Then  $\text{Ker}(S_r) = \dot{X}_{\text{har}}(\Omega)$  and  $\text{Ker}(T_r) = \dot{V}_{\text{har}}(\Omega)$ .*

*Proof.* Obviously  $\dot{X}_{\text{har}}(\Omega) \subset \text{Ker}(S_r)$  and hence we only prove that  $\text{Ker}(S_r) \subset \dot{X}_{\text{har}}(\Omega)$ . Let  $\mathbf{v} \in \text{Ker}(S_r)$ . By (4.17)

$$(4.27) \quad a_X(\mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\varphi}) = (\text{rot } \mathbf{v}, \text{rot } \boldsymbol{\varphi}) + (\text{div } \mathbf{v}, \text{div } \boldsymbol{\varphi}) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{\varphi} \in \mathcal{X}(\Omega).$$

Hence, it follows from Proposition 4.2 that  $\mathbf{v} \in \dot{X}^2(\Omega)$ . Since  $\mathcal{X}(\Omega)$  is dense in  $\widehat{X}^2(\Omega)$ , we see that (4.27) remains valid for all  $\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in \widehat{X}^2(\Omega)$ . Moreover, we may choose  $\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in \dot{X}^2(\Omega)$  in (4.27). Indeed, by Proposition 3.7 (i), every  $\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in \dot{X}^2(\Omega)$  may be expressed as

$$\boldsymbol{\varphi} = \boldsymbol{\psi} + \sum_{j=1}^3 \lambda_j \mathbf{h}_j \quad \text{with some } \boldsymbol{\psi} \in \widehat{X}^2(\Omega) \text{ and } \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3 \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Since  $\text{div } \mathbf{h}_j = 0$ ,  $\text{rot } \mathbf{h}_j = \mathbf{0}$ ,  $j = 1, 2, 3$  and since (4.27) holds for  $\boldsymbol{\varphi} = \boldsymbol{\psi} \in \widehat{X}^2(\Omega)$ , we obtain

$$a_X(\mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\varphi}) = a_X(\mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\psi}) + \sum_{j=1}^3 \lambda_j a_X(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{h}_j) = 0.$$

Choosing  $\boldsymbol{\varphi} = \mathbf{v}$  yields  $\text{div } \mathbf{v} = 0$  and  $\text{rot } \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}$ . This means that  $\mathbf{v} \in \dot{X}_{\text{har}}(\Omega)$ . Since  $\mathbf{v} \in \text{Ker}(S_r)$  is arbitrary, we obtain  $\text{Ker}(S_r) \subset \dot{X}_{\text{har}}(\Omega)$ . Taking into account assertion (3.27), the proof of the second assertion parallels the first one.  $\square$

The following lemma plays an essential role for the proof of Theorem 4.1. We recall that the spaces  $\widetilde{X}^r(\Omega)$  in  $\dot{X}^r(\Omega)$  and  $\widetilde{V}^r(\Omega)$  in  $\dot{V}^r(\Omega)$  were introduced in (3.47).

**Lemma 4.6.** *Let  $\Omega$  be as in the Assumption and let  $1 < r < \infty$ .*

- (i) *For given  $f \in \dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*$ , there exists  $\mathbf{v} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega)$  such that*

$$(4.28) \quad S_r \mathbf{v} = f$$

*if and only if  $f$  satisfies that*

$$(4.29) \quad \langle f, \boldsymbol{\varphi} \rangle = 0 \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{\varphi} \in \dot{X}_{\text{har}}(\Omega),$$

*where  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  denotes the duality pairing of  $\dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*$  and  $\dot{X}^r(\Omega)$ .*

- (ii) *For every  $f \in \dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*$  satisfying the condition (4.29) there exists a unique  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}} \in \widetilde{X}^r(\Omega)$  satisfying*

$$(4.30) \quad S_r \tilde{\mathbf{v}} = f.$$

*Moreover, there exists a constant  $C = C(\Omega, r, R)$  such that*

$$(4.31) \quad \|\nabla \tilde{\mathbf{v}}\|_{L^r} \leq C \|f\|_{\dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*}.$$

- (iii) *For given  $g \in \dot{V}^{r'}(\Omega)^*$  there exists  $\mathbf{w} \in \dot{V}^r(\Omega)$  such that*

$$(4.32) \quad T_r \mathbf{w} = g$$



if and only if  $g$  satisfies that

$$(4.33) \quad \langle g, \psi \rangle = 0 \quad \text{for all } \psi \in \dot{V}_{\text{har}}(\Omega),$$

where  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  denotes the duality pairing of  $\dot{V}^{r'}(\Omega)^*$  and  $\dot{V}^{r'}(\Omega)$ .

(iv) For every  $g \in \dot{V}^{r'}(\Omega)^*$  satisfying the condition (4.33) there exists a unique  $\tilde{\mathbf{w}} \in \tilde{V}^r(\Omega)$  such that

$$(4.34) \quad T_r \tilde{\mathbf{w}} = g.$$

Moreover, there exists a constant  $C = C(\Omega, r, R)$  such that

$$(4.35) \quad \|\nabla \tilde{\mathbf{w}}\|_{L^r} \leq C \|g\|_{\dot{V}^{r'}(\Omega)^*}.$$

*Proof.* (i) By Propositions 4.4 (i) and 4.5 (i), and the closed range theorem

$$(4.36) \quad R(S_r) = {}^\perp \text{Ker}(S_r^*) = {}^\perp \text{Ker}(S_{r'}) = {}^\perp \dot{X}_{\text{har}}(\Omega) = \{f \in \dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*; \langle f, \varphi \rangle = 0, \forall \varphi \in \dot{X}_{\text{har}}(\Omega)\},$$

which implies assertion (i).

(ii) Suppose that  $f \in \dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*$  satisfies the condition (4.29). By (i), there exists a solution  $\mathbf{v} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega)$  of (4.28). By (3.47)  $\mathbf{v}$  may be decomposed as  $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_0 + \tilde{\mathbf{v}}$ , where  $\mathbf{v}_0 \in \dot{X}_{\text{har}}(\Omega)$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}} \in \tilde{X}^r(\Omega)$ . Proposition 4.5 implies  $S_r \mathbf{v}_0 = 0$  and hence  $S_r \tilde{\mathbf{v}} = f$ . This yields (4.30). For the proof of the estimate (4.31), it suffices to show that

$$(4.37) \quad \|\nabla \tilde{\mathbf{v}}\|_{L^r} \leq C \|S_r \tilde{\mathbf{v}}\|_{\dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*} \quad \text{for all } \tilde{\mathbf{v}} \in \tilde{X}^r(\Omega)$$

with some  $C = C(\Omega, r, R)$ . Assume that (4.37) fails. Then there is a sequence  $\{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_m\}_{m=1}^\infty \subset \tilde{X}^r(\Omega)$  such that  $\|\nabla \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_m\|_{L^r} \equiv 1$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|S_r \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_m\|_{\dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*} = 0$ . Since  $\tilde{X}^r(\Omega)$  is a closed subspace of  $\dot{X}^r(\Omega)$ , there is a subsequence of  $\{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ , denoted again by  $\{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$  itself, and a function  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}} \in \tilde{X}^r(\Omega)$  such that

$$\nabla \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_m \rightharpoonup \nabla \tilde{\mathbf{v}} \quad \text{weakly in } L^r(\Omega) \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty.$$

Since the injection  $\dot{X}^r(\Omega) \subset L^r(D)$  is compact, the above weak convergence yields

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_m - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}\|_{L^r(D)} = 0.$$

Hence, by (4.19)  $\{\nabla \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $L^r(\Omega)$ , which yields

$$\nabla \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_m \rightarrow \nabla \tilde{\mathbf{v}} \quad \text{strongly in } L^r(\Omega) \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty.$$

Since  $S_r \in \mathcal{L}(\dot{X}^r(\Omega), \dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*)$ , we obtain  $S_r \tilde{\mathbf{v}} = 0$ , which implies  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}} \in \text{Ker}(S_r) = \dot{X}_{\text{har}}(\Omega)$ . Finally, since  $\dot{X}_{\text{har}}(\Omega) \cap \tilde{X}^r(\Omega) = \{\mathbf{0}\}$ , we obtain  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}} = 0$ , which contradicts  $\|\nabla \tilde{\mathbf{v}}\|_{L^r} = 1$ .

(iii) and (iv) Making use of Propositions 4.4 (ii) and 4.5, the proof of assertions (iii) and (iv) parallels the one of the above (i) and (ii), respectively. Details are hence omitted.  $\square$

The following lemma is a consequence of Lemma 4.6

**Lemma 4.7.** *Let  $\Omega$  be as in the Assumption and let  $1 < r < \infty$ .*

(i) *For every  $\mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega)$  there exists a unique  $\mathbf{v} \in \tilde{X}^r(\Omega)$  such that*

$$(4.38) \quad a_X(\mathbf{v}, \Phi) = (\mathbf{u}, \text{rot } \Phi) \quad \text{for all } \Phi \in \dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega).$$

*Moreover,  $\mathbf{v}$  satisfies the estimate*

$$(4.39) \quad \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{L^r} \leq C \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^r},$$

*for some constant  $C = C(\Omega, r, R)$ .*

(ii) *For every  $\mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega)$  there exists a unique  $\mathbf{w} \in \tilde{V}^r(\Omega)$  such that*

$$(4.40) \quad a_V(\mathbf{w}, \Psi) = (\mathbf{u}, \text{rot } \Psi) \quad \text{for all } \Psi \in \dot{V}^{r'}(\Omega).$$

*Moreover,  $\mathbf{w}$  satisfies the estimate*

$$(4.41) \quad \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{L^r} \leq C \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^r},$$

*for some  $C = C(\Omega, r, R)$ .*

*Proof.* (i) Given  $\mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega)$ , we define the functional  $f_{\mathbf{u}}$  by

$$(4.42) \quad \langle f_{\mathbf{u}}, \Phi \rangle \equiv (\mathbf{u}, \operatorname{rot} \Phi) \quad \text{for } \Phi \in \dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega).$$

Obviously,  $f_{\mathbf{u}} \in \dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*$  and

$$(4.43) \quad \|f_{\mathbf{u}}\|_{\dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*} \leq \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^r}.$$

By (4.42),  $\langle f_{\mathbf{u}}, \varphi \rangle = 0$  for all  $\varphi \in \dot{X}_{\text{har}}(\Omega)$ . This means that condition (4.29) is fulfilled for  $f_{\mathbf{u}}$ . Hence, it follows from Lemma 4.6 and (4.43) that there exists a unique  $\mathbf{v} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega)$  such that

$$(4.44) \quad S_r \mathbf{v} = f_{\mathbf{u}}$$

satisfying

$$(4.45) \quad \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{L^r} \leq C \|f\|_{\dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)^*} \leq C \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^r}.$$

By (4.42), (4.44) and (4.45) we see that  $\mathbf{v}$  solves (4.38) and satisfies (4.39).

(ii) By Proposition 4.5 and Lemma 4.6(iv), the above argument of (i) is also applicable to the proof of assertion ii). Again we omit the details.  $\square$

#### 4.2. Proof of Theorem 4.1.

We base the proof of Theorem 4.1 on Lemma 4.7. Indeed, we only need to show that the two solutions  $\mathbf{v} \in \dot{X}^r(\Omega)$  of (4.38) and  $\mathbf{w} \in \hat{V}^r(\Omega)$  of (4.40) necessarily satisfy  $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v} = \operatorname{div} \mathbf{w} = 0$ . To this end, we investigate the bilinear forms  $a_X(\cdot, \cdot)$  on  $\dot{X}_\sigma^2(\Omega) \times \dot{X}_\sigma^2(\Omega)$  and  $a_V(\cdot, \cdot)$  on  $\dot{V}_\sigma^2(\Omega) \times \dot{V}_\sigma^2(\Omega)$ , respectively. Similarly to (2.3), we introduce the spaces  $\hat{X}_\sigma^r(\Omega)$  and  $\hat{V}_\sigma^r(\Omega)$  defined by

$$(4.46) \quad \hat{X}_\sigma^r(\Omega) \equiv \{\mathbf{u} \in \hat{X}^r(\Omega); \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0\}, \quad \hat{V}_\sigma^r(\Omega) \equiv \{\mathbf{u} \in \hat{V}^r(\Omega); \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0\}.$$

**Proposition 4.8.** *Let  $\Omega$  be as in the Assumption.*

(i) *For every  $\phi \in \dot{X}^2(\Omega)$  there exist  $\phi_\sigma \in \hat{X}_\sigma^2(\Omega)$  and  $\phi_c \in \dot{X}^2(\Omega)$  with  $\operatorname{rot} \phi_c = \mathbf{0}$  such that  $\phi$  can be decomposed as*

$$(4.47) \quad \phi = \phi_\sigma + \phi_c.$$

(ii) *For every  $\psi \in \dot{V}^2(\Omega)$  there exist  $\psi_\sigma \in \hat{V}_\sigma^2(\Omega)$  and  $\psi_c \in \dot{V}^2(\Omega)$  with  $\operatorname{rot} \psi_c = \mathbf{0}$  such that  $\psi$  can be decomposed as*

$$(4.48) \quad \psi = \psi_\sigma + \psi_c.$$

*Proof.* (i) We consider first the case when  $\phi \in \hat{X}^2(\Omega)$ . Then there exists  $p \in \dot{H}^{1,6}(\Omega)$  with  $D^2 p \in L^2(\Omega)$  such that

$$(4.49) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta p = \operatorname{div} \phi & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial p}{\partial \nu} = \phi \cdot \nu = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

For the time being, assume the existence of such  $p$ . Then, setting  $\phi_\sigma \equiv \phi - \nabla p$  and  $\phi_c \equiv \nabla p$ , we obtain by Proposition 3.7 that  $\phi_\sigma \in \hat{X}_\sigma^2(\Omega)$  and  $\phi_c \in \dot{X}^2(\Omega)$  with  $\operatorname{rot} \phi_c = \mathbf{0}$ . Hence, the desired decomposition (4.47) follows. For general  $\phi \in \dot{X}^2(\Omega)$ , (3.26) implies

$$\phi = \hat{\phi} + \sum_{j=1}^3 \lambda_j \mathbf{h}_j,$$

where  $\hat{\phi} \in \hat{X}^2(\Omega)$  and  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3 \in \mathbb{R}$ . Since  $\hat{\phi} \in \hat{X}^2(\Omega)$ , the above observation yields that  $\hat{\phi}$  may be expressed as

$$\hat{\phi} = \hat{\phi}_\sigma + \hat{\phi}_c,$$

where  $\hat{\phi}_\sigma \in \hat{X}_\sigma^2(\Omega)$  and  $\hat{\phi}_c \in \dot{X}^2(\Omega)$  with  $\operatorname{rot} \hat{\phi} = \mathbf{0}$ . Now defining  $\phi_\sigma \equiv \hat{\phi}_\sigma$  and  $\phi_c \equiv \hat{\phi}_c + \sum_{j=1}^3 \lambda_j \mathbf{h}_j$ , we see that  $\phi_\sigma \in \hat{X}_\sigma^2(\Omega)$  and  $\phi_c \in \dot{X}^2(\Omega)$  with  $\operatorname{rot} \phi_c = \mathbf{0}$ , and the desired decomposition (4.47) follows again.

It remains to show the existence of a solution  $p$  of (4.49) for  $\phi \in \widehat{X}^2(\Omega)$  within the class  $p \in \dot{H}^{1,6}(\Omega)$  with  $D^2p \in L^2(\Omega)$ . Since  $\mathcal{X}(\Omega)$  is dense in  $\widehat{X}^2(\Omega)$ , there is a sequence  $\{\phi_m\}_{m=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{X}(\Omega)$  such that

$$(4.50) \quad \nabla \phi_m \rightarrow \nabla \phi \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega), \quad \phi_m \rightarrow \phi \quad \text{in } L^6(\Omega) \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty.$$

The solvability of the weak Neumann problem (see, e.g., [27, Theorem 1.3] and [28, Theorem 4.1]) implies that for each  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists a function  $p_m \in \dot{H}^{1,r}(\Omega)$  for all  $1 < r < \infty$  satisfying

$$(4.51) \quad (\nabla p_m, \nabla \varphi) = (\phi_m, \nabla \varphi) \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\bar{\Omega}).$$

Hence, by (4.50), (4.51) and the variational inequality we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla p_m - \nabla p_l\|_{L^6} &\leq C \sup_{\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\bar{\Omega})} \frac{|(\nabla p_m - \nabla p_l, \nabla \varphi)|}{\|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^{\frac{6}{5}}}} \\ &\leq C \sup_{\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\bar{\Omega})} \frac{|(\phi_m - \phi_l, \nabla \varphi)|}{\|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^{\frac{6}{5}}}} \\ &\leq C \|\phi_m - \phi_l\|_{L^6} \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as  $m, l \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence, there exists  $p \in \dot{H}^{1,6}(\Omega)$  such that

$$(4.52) \quad \nabla p_m \rightarrow \nabla p \quad \text{in } L^6(\Omega) \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty.$$

Now, letting  $m \rightarrow \infty$  in both sides of (4.51), we obtain by (4.50) and (4.52) that

$$(\nabla p, \nabla \varphi) = (\phi, \nabla \varphi) \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\bar{\Omega}).$$

This means that  $p$  is the unique weak solution of (4.49).

We next show that  $D^2p \in L^2(\Omega)$ . Let  $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$  be the cut-off function in the proof of Lemma 3.9. Similarly to (3.35), we set

$$p_m^{(2)}(x) \equiv (1 - \eta(x))(p_m(x) - p_m^D) \quad \text{with } p_m^D \equiv \frac{1}{|D|} \int_D p_m(y) dy, \quad m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Notice that  $p_m^{(2)} \in \dot{H}^{1,r}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  for all  $1 < r < \infty$  and that  $p_m^{(2)}(x) = p_m(x) - p_m^D$  for  $|x| \geq R + 2$ . By (4.51)

$$\Delta p_m^{(2)} = (1 - \eta) \operatorname{div} \phi_m - 2 \nabla \eta \cdot \nabla p_m - \Delta \eta (p_m - p_m^D) \equiv f_m, \quad m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Set  $\tilde{p}_m^{(2)} \equiv \Gamma * f_m$ , where  $\Gamma(x) = -(4\pi|x|)^{-1}$  denotes the Newton kernel. Since  $\nabla p_m^{(2)} - \nabla \tilde{p}_m^{(2)} \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)$  for all  $3/2 < q < \infty$  and since  $p_m^{(2)} - \tilde{p}_m^{(2)}$  is harmonic in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , it follows from Liouville's theorem that for each  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists a constant  $c_m \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $p_m^{(2)}(x) - \tilde{p}_m^{(2)}(x) = c_m$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ . The Calderón-Zygmund estimate and Poincaré's inequality on  $D$  yield

$$\begin{aligned} &\|D^2 p_m^{(2)} - D^2 \tilde{p}_m^{(2)}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\ &= \|D^2 p_m^{(2)} - D^2 \tilde{p}_m^{(2)}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\ &\leq C \|\Delta(\tilde{p}_m^{(2)} - p_m^{(2)})\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\ &\leq C \|f_m - \tilde{f}_m\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\ &\leq C (\|\operatorname{div}(\phi_m - \phi_l)\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla(p_m - p_l)\|_{L^2(D)} + \|p_m - p_l - (p_m^D - p_l^D)\|_{L^2(D)}) \\ &\leq C (\|\nabla(\phi_m - \phi_l)\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla(p_m - p_l)\|_{L^2(D)}) \\ (4.53) \quad &\leq C (\|\nabla(\phi_m - \phi_l)\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla(p_m - p_l)\|_{L^6}) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $m, l \in \mathbb{N}$ . It follows from (4.50) and (4.52) that there exists  $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$  such that  $D^2 p_m^{(2)} \rightarrow g$  in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . Since  $p_m(x) = p_m^{(2)}(x)$  for all  $|x| \geq R + 2$  and all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , we see by (4.52) that  $D^2 p(x) = g(x)$  for all  $|x| \geq R + 2$ . Thus  $D^2 p \in L^2(\Omega)$ .

(ii) We first consider the case where  $\psi \in \widehat{V}^2(\Omega)$ . Similarly to (4.49) we consider the Dirichlet problem

$$(4.54) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta p &= \operatorname{div} \psi \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ p &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

in the class  $p \in \dot{H}_0^{1,6}(\Omega)$  with  $D^2p \in L^2(\Omega)$ . Setting  $\psi_\sigma \equiv \psi - \nabla p$  and  $\psi_c \equiv \nabla p$ , we see that  $\psi_\sigma \in \hat{V}^2(\Omega)$ ,  $\psi_c \in \dot{V}^2(\Omega)$  and that the decomposition (4.48) holds. For general  $\psi \in \dot{V}^2(\Omega)$ , in the same way as above, we make use of (3.27) to reduce the general case to  $\psi \in \hat{V}^2(\Omega)$ .

It remains to show the existence of a solution  $p \in \dot{H}_0^{1,6}(\Omega)$  to (4.54) with  $D^2p \in L^2(\Omega)$ . Since  $\mathcal{V}(\Omega)$  is dense in  $\dot{V}^2(\Omega)$  there is a sequence  $\{\psi_m\}_{m=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{V}(\Omega)$  such that

$$(4.55) \quad \nabla \psi_m \rightarrow \nabla \psi \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega), \quad \psi_m \rightarrow \psi \quad \text{in } L^6(\Omega) \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty.$$

By (3.2) and Proposition 3.2(iii) we know that  $-\Delta_6$  is bijective as a mapping from  $\tilde{H}_0^{1,6}(\Omega)$  onto  $\hat{H}_0^{1,\frac{6}{5}}(\Omega)^*$ , and hence for each  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists a unique  $p_m \in \tilde{H}_0^{1,6}(\Omega)$  such that

$$(4.56) \quad (\nabla p_m, \nabla \Phi) = (\psi_m, \Phi) \quad \text{for all } \Phi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega).$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla p_m - \nabla p_l\|_{L^6} &\leq C \sup_{\Phi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)} \frac{|(\nabla p_m - \nabla p_l, \nabla \Phi)|}{\|\nabla \Phi\|_{L^{\frac{6}{5}}}} \leq C \sup_{\Phi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)} \frac{|(\psi_m - \psi_l, \nabla \Phi)|}{\|\nabla \Phi\|_{L^{\frac{6}{5}}}} \leq C \|\psi_m - \psi_l\|_{L^6} \\ &\rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as  $m, l \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence, there exists  $p \in \tilde{H}_0^{1,6}(\Omega)$  such that

$$(4.57) \quad \nabla p_m \rightarrow \nabla p \quad \text{in } L^6(\Omega) \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty.$$

Letting  $m \rightarrow \infty$  on both sides of (4.56), we obtain by (4.55) and (4.57) that

$$(4.58) \quad (\nabla p, \nabla \Phi) = (\psi, \nabla \Phi) \quad \text{for all } \Phi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega).$$

This means that  $p$  is the weak solution of (4.54).

We finally show that  $D^2p \in L^2(\Omega)$ . The argument is similar to the one given above (i). Indeed, setting  $p_m^{(2)}(x) \equiv (1 - \eta(x))p_m(x)$ , we see that

$$(4.59) \quad \|D^2p_m^{(2)} - D^2p_l^{(2)}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C(\|\nabla(\psi_m - \psi_l)\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla(p_m - p_l)\|_{L^6}), \quad m, l \in \mathbb{N}.$$

In comparison with (i), it is here unnecessary to subtract the mean value  $p_m^D$  on  $D$  since  $p_m|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ , so that we may make use of Poincaré's inequality. In fact,  $\|p_m - p_l\|_{L^2(D)} \leq C\|\nabla(p_m - p_l)\|_{L^2(D)}$  for all  $m, l \in \mathbb{N}$ . By (4.59) there is  $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$  such that  $p_m^{(2)} \rightarrow g$  in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . It follows from (4.57) that  $D^2p(x) = g(x)$  for  $|x| \geq R + 2$ . Hence,  $D^2p \in L^2(\Omega)$ .  $\square$

We recall that  $\dot{X}_\sigma^r(\Omega)$  and  $\dot{V}_\sigma^r(\Omega)$  are defined by (2.3). Since  $\dot{X}_{\text{har}}(\Omega)$  is a finite dimensional subspace of  $\dot{X}_\sigma^2(\Omega)$ , there is a closed subspace  $\tilde{X}_\sigma^2(\Omega)$  of  $\dot{X}_\sigma^2(\Omega)$  such that

$$(4.60) \quad \dot{X}_\sigma^2(\Omega) = \tilde{X}_\sigma^2(\Omega) \oplus \dot{X}_{\text{har}}(\Omega), \quad (\text{direct sum}).$$

Similarly, there is a closed subspace  $\tilde{V}_\sigma^2(\Omega)$  of  $\dot{V}_\sigma^2(\Omega)$  such that

$$(4.61) \quad \dot{V}_\sigma^2(\Omega) = \tilde{V}_\sigma^2(\Omega) \oplus \dot{V}_{\text{har}}(\Omega), \quad (\text{direct sum}).$$

**Lemma 4.9.** *For every  $\mathbf{u} \in L^2(\Omega)$  there exists a unique  $\mathbf{v} \in \tilde{X}_\sigma^2(\Omega)$  such that*

$$(4.62) \quad a_X(\mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\varphi}) = (\mathbf{u}, \text{rot } \boldsymbol{\varphi}) \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{\varphi} \in \dot{X}^2(\Omega).$$

*For every  $\mathbf{u} \in L^2(\Omega)$  there is a unique  $\mathbf{w} \in \tilde{V}_\sigma^2(\Omega)$  such that*

$$(4.63) \quad a_V(\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\psi}) = (\mathbf{u}, \text{rot } \boldsymbol{\psi}) \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{\psi} \in \dot{V}^2(\Omega).$$

*Proof.* Again, we only prove the first assertion. We show first that for every  $\mathbf{u} \in L^2(\Omega)$  there exists a unique  $\mathbf{v} \in \tilde{X}_\sigma^2(\Omega)$  such that

$$(4.64) \quad (\text{rot } \mathbf{v}, \text{rot } \boldsymbol{\phi}) = (\mathbf{u}, \text{rot } \boldsymbol{\phi}) \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{\phi} \in \tilde{X}_\sigma^2(\Omega).$$

Indeed, by (3.50),  $(\mathbf{v}, \phi)_{\tilde{X}_\sigma^2} \equiv (\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{v}, \operatorname{rot} \phi)$  defines an inner product on the Hilbert space  $\tilde{X}_\sigma^2(\Omega)$ . Then, for  $\mathbf{u} \in L^2(\Omega)$  consider the functional  $f_{\mathbf{u}}$  on  $\tilde{X}_\sigma^2(\Omega)$  defined by  $\langle f_{\mathbf{u}}, \phi \rangle = (\mathbf{u}, \operatorname{rot} \phi)$  for  $\phi \in \tilde{X}_\sigma^2(\Omega)$ . Since

$$|\langle f_{\mathbf{u}}, \phi \rangle| \leq \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2} \|\operatorname{rot} \phi\|_{L^2} \leq \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2} \|\phi\|_{\tilde{X}_\sigma^2}$$

for all  $\phi \in \tilde{X}_\sigma^2(\Omega)$ , we see that  $f_{\mathbf{u}} \in \tilde{X}_\sigma^2(\Omega)^*$ . Hence, by the Riesz representation theorem, there exists a unique  $\mathbf{v} \in \tilde{X}_\sigma^2(\Omega)$  such that  $(\mathbf{v}, \phi)_{\tilde{X}_\sigma^2} = \langle f_{\mathbf{u}}, \phi \rangle$  for all  $\phi \in \tilde{X}_\sigma^2(\Omega)$ . This implies (4.64).

We next show that  $\mathbf{v} \in \tilde{X}_\sigma^2(\Omega)$  satisfies also (4.62). By Proposition 4.8 (i), for  $\varphi \in \dot{X}^2(\Omega)$  there exist  $\varphi_\sigma \in \hat{X}_\sigma^2(\Omega)$  and  $\varphi_c \in \dot{X}^2(\Omega)$  with  $\operatorname{rot} \varphi_c = \mathbf{0}$  such that  $\varphi = \varphi_\sigma + \varphi_c$ . Moreover, since  $\varphi_\sigma \in \hat{X}_\sigma^2(\Omega) \subset \dot{X}_\sigma^2(\Omega)$ , (4.60) implies  $\varphi_\sigma = \tilde{\varphi}_\sigma + \varphi_{\text{har}}$  for some  $\tilde{\varphi}_\sigma \in \tilde{X}_\sigma^2(\Omega)$  and  $\varphi_{\text{har}} \in \dot{X}_{\text{har}}$ . Since  $\operatorname{rot} \varphi = \operatorname{rot} \varphi_\sigma = \operatorname{rot} \tilde{\varphi}_\sigma$ , we deduce from (4.64) that

$$a_X(\mathbf{v}, \varphi) = (\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{v}, \operatorname{rot} \varphi) = (\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{v}, \operatorname{rot} \tilde{\varphi}_\sigma) = (\mathbf{u}, \operatorname{rot} \tilde{\varphi}_\sigma) = (\mathbf{u}, \operatorname{rot} \varphi).$$

Since  $\varphi \in \dot{X}^2(\Omega)$  is arbitrary, the above identity implies (4.62).  $\square$

**Lemma 4.10.** *Let  $\Omega$  be as in the Assumption and let  $\mathbf{u} \in L^2(\Omega)$ .*

(i) *Suppose that  $\mathbf{v} \in \tilde{X}^2(\Omega)$  satisfies*

$$(4.65) \quad a_X(\mathbf{v}, \varphi) = (\mathbf{u}, \operatorname{rot} \varphi) \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in \tilde{X}^2(\Omega).$$

*Then  $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v} = 0$ .*

(ii) *Suppose that  $\mathbf{w} \in \tilde{V}^2(\Omega)$  satisfies*

$$(4.66) \quad a_V(\mathbf{w}, \psi) = (\mathbf{u}, \operatorname{rot} \psi) \quad \text{for all } \psi \in \tilde{V}^2(\Omega).$$

*Then  $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{w} = 0$ .*

*Proof.* Observe that (4.65) and (4.66) yield (4.62) and (4.63), respectively. Indeed,  $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v} = \operatorname{div} \mathbf{w} = 0$  follows from Lemma 4.9 with the aid of the unique solvability of (4.38) and (4.40) in Lemma 4.7.  $\square$

We are finally in the position to prove Theorem 4.1.

**Theorem 4.11.** *Let  $\Omega$  be as in the Assumption and let  $1 < r < \infty$ .*

(i) *For every  $\mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega)$  there exists a unique  $\mathbf{v} \in \tilde{X}^r(\Omega)$  satisfying (4.38) and  $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v} = 0$ . In particular,*

$$(4.67) \quad (\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{v}, \operatorname{rot} \Phi) = (\mathbf{u}, \operatorname{rot} \Phi) \quad \text{for all } \Phi \in \dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega).$$

*Moreover,  $\mathbf{v}$  is subject to the estimate (4.39).*

(ii) *For every  $\mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega)$  there exists a unique  $\mathbf{w} \in \tilde{V}^r(\Omega)$  satisfying (4.40) and  $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{w} = 0$ . In particular,*

$$(4.68) \quad (\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{w}, \operatorname{rot} \Psi) = (\mathbf{u}, \operatorname{rot} \Psi) \quad \text{for all } \Psi \in \dot{V}^{r'}(\Omega).$$

*Moreover,  $\mathbf{w}$  is subject to the estimate (4.41).*

*Proof.* (i) Due to Lemma 4.7 it suffices to prove that  $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v} = 0$ . Since  $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$  is dense in  $L^r(\Omega)$ , there is a sequence  $\{\mathbf{u}_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$  with  $\mathbf{u}_m \rightarrow \mathbf{u}$  in  $L^r(\Omega)$ . Lemma 4.7 (i) yields that for each  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists a unique  $\mathbf{v}_m \in \tilde{X}^r(\Omega)$  with

$$(4.69) \quad a_X(\mathbf{v}_m, \Phi) = (\mathbf{u}_m, \operatorname{rot} \Phi) \quad \text{for all } \Phi \in \dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega).$$

Moreover,

$$(4.70) \quad \|\nabla \mathbf{v}_m\|_{L^r} \leq C \|\mathbf{u}_m\|_{L^r}, \quad m = 1, 2, \dots,$$

for some  $C = C(\Omega, r, R)$ . By (4.69)

$$(4.71) \quad a_X(\mathbf{v}_m, \varphi) = (\mathbf{u}_m, \operatorname{rot} \varphi) \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in \mathcal{X}(\Omega).$$

Since  $\dot{X}^2(\Omega) \ni \phi \mapsto (\mathbf{u}_m, \operatorname{rot} \phi) \in \mathbb{R}$  is a continuous functional, it follows from (4.71) and Proposition 4.2(i) that  $\mathbf{v}_m \in \dot{X}^2(\Omega)$ . Furthermore, by (4.71)

$$(4.72) \quad a_X(\mathbf{v}_m, \phi) = (\mathbf{u}_m, \operatorname{rot} \phi) \quad \text{for all } \phi \in \dot{X}^2(\Omega).$$

Indeed, since  $\mathcal{X}(\Omega)$  is dense in  $\widehat{X}^2(\Omega)$ , we observe that (4.72) remains true for  $\phi \in \widehat{X}^2(\Omega)$ . For general  $\phi \in \dot{X}^2(\Omega)$ , we see by (3.26) that  $\phi = \hat{\phi} + \sum_{j=1}^3 \lambda_j \mathbf{h}_j$  with  $\hat{\phi} \in \widehat{X}^2(\Omega)$  and  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3 \in \mathbb{R}$ . Since  $\text{rot } \phi = \text{rot } \hat{\phi}$  and since (4.72) holds for  $\phi = \hat{\phi}$ , we verify that (4.72) holds for all  $\phi \in \dot{X}^2(\Omega)$ .

On the other hand, by (3.47),  $\mathbf{v}_m \in \dot{X}^2(\Omega)$  may be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{v}_m = \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_m + \mathbf{g}_m \quad \text{with } \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_m \in \tilde{X}^2(\Omega) \text{ and } \mathbf{g}_m \in \dot{X}_{\text{har}}(\Omega), \quad m \in N.$$

Since  $a_X(\mathbf{g}_m, \phi) = 0$  for all  $\phi \in \dot{X}^2(\Omega)$ , we obtain from (4.72) that

$$a_X(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_m, \phi) = a_X(\mathbf{v}_m, \phi) = (\mathbf{u}_m, \text{rot } \phi) \quad \text{for all } \phi \in \dot{X}^2(\Omega).$$

Hence, by Lemma 4.10(i),  $\text{div } \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_m = 0$ , which yields that  $\text{div } \mathbf{v}_m = 0$ . Since the mapping  $L^r(\Omega) \ni \mathbf{u} \mapsto \mathbf{v} \in \tilde{X}^r(\Omega)$  with  $S_r \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{u}}$  is continuous, by (4.39) and since  $\mathbf{u}_m \rightarrow \mathbf{u}$  in  $L^r(\Omega)$ , it follows from (4.70) that  $\{\mathbf{v}_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $\tilde{X}^r(\Omega)$ . Thus there exists  $\mathbf{v} \in \tilde{X}^r(\Omega)$  such that

$$(4.73) \quad \nabla \mathbf{v}_m \rightarrow \nabla \mathbf{v} \quad \text{in } L^r(\Omega) \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty.$$

Obviously,  $\mathbf{v}$  is a unique solution of (4.38) with  $\text{div } \mathbf{v} = 0$  and satisfies the estimate (4.39).

(ii) The proof of (ii) is again parallel to the one of (i) and hence omitted.  $\square$

## 5. CONSTRUCTION OF THE SCALAR POTENTIAL

In this section we construct the scalar potential  $p$  for the given function  $\mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega)$  in (2.6) and (2.10) in Theorems 2.2 and 2.3, respectively. We start by describing the scalar potential  $p \in \dot{H}^{1,r}(\Omega)$  in (2.6), which is determined by the solution of the weak Neumann problem of the Poisson equation.

**Proposition 5.1.** (*Simader-Sohr* [27, Theorem 1.4]) *Let  $\Omega$  be as in the Assumption and let  $1 < r < \infty$ . For every  $\mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega)$  there is a unique  $p \in \dot{H}^{1,r}(\Omega)$  such that*

$$(5.1) \quad (\nabla p, \nabla \psi) = (\mathbf{u}, \nabla \psi) \quad \text{for all } \psi \in \dot{H}^{1,r'}(\Omega).$$

Moreover,  $p$  is subject to the estimate

$$(5.2) \quad \|\nabla p\|_{L^r} \leq C \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^r},$$

for some  $C = C(\Omega, r)$ .

We next investigate the scalar potential  $p$  in Theorem 2.3. In comparison with  $p$  in (5.1), we need to solve the weak Dirichlet problem for the Poisson equation. To this end, we make use of the Laplacian  $-\Delta_r : \hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega) \rightarrow \hat{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)^*$  given in (3.3). We start with the case where  $3/2 < r < \infty$ .

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $\Omega$  be as in the Assumption.*

(i) *Let  $3/2 < r < 3$ . For every  $\mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega)$  there is a unique  $p \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  satisfying*

$$(5.3) \quad (\nabla p, \nabla \phi) = (\mathbf{u}, \nabla \phi) \quad \text{for all } \phi \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega) \text{ and}$$

$$(5.4) \quad \|\nabla p\|_{L^r} \leq C \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^r},$$

for some  $C = C(\Omega, r)$ .

(ii) *Let  $3 \leq r < \infty$ . For every  $\mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega)$  there is a unique  $p \in \tilde{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  satisfying (5.3). Moreover,  $p$  is subject to the estimate (5.4).*

*Proof.* (i) For given  $\mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega)$  we define the functional  $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{u}}$  by  $\langle \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{u}}, \phi \rangle = (\mathbf{u}, \nabla \phi)$  for  $\phi \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)$ . Obviously,  $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{u}} \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)^*$  satisfies  $\|\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{u}}\|_{\hat{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)^*} \leq \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^r}$ . Hence, the assertion is a consequence of Proposition 3.2 (ii) and (iii).

(ii) By (3.2) and Proposition 3.2 (iv),  $-\Delta_r$  is a *bijective* operator from  $\tilde{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  onto  $\hat{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)^*$ . Hence, we obtain the assertion in the same way as above.  $\square$

We next consider the case where  $1 < r \leq 3/2$ . As stated in Proposition 3.2 (iii),  $-\Delta_r$  is not surjective in this case. Hence, we consider the larger space  $\dot{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  for the solvability of (5.3).



**Lemma 5.3.** (*Simader-Sohr* [28, Theorem 1.2], *Prüss-Simonett* [23, Theorem 7.4.3], *Shibata* [25, Theorem 3.2]) *Let  $\Omega$  be as in the Assumption and let  $1 < r \leq 3/2$ . For every  $\mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega)$ , there exists a unique  $p \in \dot{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  satisfying (5.3) and (5.4).*

*Proof.* We give here a different proof from [28], [23] and [25]. Let us first show first that there exists a scalar function  $\bar{p} \in \dot{H}^{1,r}(\Omega)$  with  $\bar{p}|_{\partial\Omega} = \text{const.}$  satisfying (5.3). To this end, we use the cut-off function  $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$  defined in the proof of Lemma 3.9. For given  $\mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega)$ , consider the functional  $g_{\mathbf{u}}$  defined by  $\langle g_{\mathbf{u}}, \psi \rangle \equiv (\mathbf{u}, \nabla \psi)$  for  $\psi \in \tilde{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)$ . Then  $g_{\mathbf{u}} \in \tilde{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)^*$  and  $\|g_{\mathbf{u}}\|_{\tilde{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)^*} \leq \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^r}$ . By Lemma 3.3, there exists a unique  $\pi \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  such that

$$(5.5) \quad (\nabla \pi, \nabla \psi) = (\mathbf{u}, \nabla \psi) \quad \text{for all } \psi \in \tilde{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega).$$

and satisfies

$$(5.6) \quad \|\nabla \pi\|_{L^r} \leq C \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^r},$$

for some  $C = C(\Omega, r)$ . Similarly, now  $\mathbf{u}$  being replaced by  $\nabla \eta$ , there is a unique  $\alpha \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  such that

$$(5.7) \quad (\nabla \alpha, \nabla \psi) = (\nabla \eta, \nabla \psi) \quad \text{for all } \psi \in \tilde{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega),$$

where  $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$  is as in the proof of Lemma 3.9. Defining  $q$  by  $q(x) \equiv \eta(x) - \alpha(x)$  for  $x \in \Omega$ , we see that

$$(5.8) \quad (\nabla q, \nabla q_0) \neq 0,$$

where  $q_0 \in \bigcap_{s>3/2} \dot{H}_0^{1,s}(\Omega)$  is a harmonic function given by (3.2) with  $q_0(x) \rightarrow 1$  as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ .

Assume (5.8) for the time being. Define

$$(5.9) \quad \bar{p}(x) \equiv \pi(x) + \lambda q(x), \quad x \in \Omega \quad \text{with } \lambda \equiv \frac{(\mathbf{u}, \nabla q_0)}{(\nabla q, \nabla q_0)}.$$

Then  $\nabla \bar{p} \in L^r(\Omega)$  and  $\bar{p}|_{\partial\Omega} = \lambda$ . Moreover,  $\bar{p}$  satisfies

$$(5.10) \quad (\nabla \bar{p}, \nabla \phi) = (\mathbf{u}, \nabla \phi) \quad \text{for all } \phi \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega).$$

Indeed, since  $1 < r \leq 3/2$ , by (3.2) every  $\phi \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)$  may be decomposed as  $\phi = \psi + \mu q_0$  for some  $\psi \in \tilde{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)$  and  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ . Since  $(\nabla \pi, \nabla q_0) = 0$ , we obtain from (5.5), (5.7) and (5.9)

$$\begin{aligned} (\nabla \bar{p}, \nabla \phi) &= (\nabla \pi + \lambda \nabla q, \nabla \psi + \mu \nabla q_0) \\ &= (\nabla \pi, \nabla \psi) + \mu (\nabla \pi, \nabla q_0) + \lambda (\nabla q, \nabla \psi) + \lambda \mu (\nabla q, \nabla q_0) \\ &= (\mathbf{u}, \nabla \psi) + \lambda (\nabla \eta - \nabla \alpha, \nabla \psi) + \mu (\mathbf{u}, \nabla q_0) \\ &= (\mathbf{u}, \nabla (\psi + \mu q_0)) \\ &= (\mathbf{u}, \nabla \phi), \end{aligned}$$

which implies (5.10). Setting  $p(x) \equiv \bar{p}(x) - \lambda$  implies  $p \in \dot{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$ . Since  $\nabla p = \nabla \bar{p}$ , (5.3) is implied by (5.10). Moreover, (5.6) and (5.9) yield

$$\|\nabla p\|_{L^r} = \|\nabla \bar{p}\|_{L^r} \leq C \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^r},$$

which implies (5.4).

Finally, concerning uniqueness, suppose that  $\hat{p} \in \dot{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  is another solution of (5.3). Then  $p_* \equiv p - \hat{p} \in \dot{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  satisfies  $(\nabla p_*, \nabla \phi) = 0$  for all  $\phi \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)$ . Since  $1 < r \leq 3/2$ , it follows from [15, Theorem A] that  $p_* \equiv 0$  on  $\Omega$ , which yields the desired uniqueness property.

It only remains to prove (5.8). Since  $q_0 \in \text{Ker}(-\Delta_{r'})$  and since  $\alpha \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$ , we see that  $(\nabla \alpha, \nabla q_0) = 0$ . Hence,

$$(\nabla q, \nabla q_0) = (\nabla \eta - \nabla \alpha, \nabla q_0) = (\nabla \eta, \nabla q_0) = \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{\partial q_0}{\partial \nu} dS.$$

Assume that (5.8) fails. The above identity yields

$$(5.11) \quad \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{\partial q_0}{\partial \nu} dS = 0.$$

Since  $q_0$  is harmonic in  $\Omega$  with  $q_0|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$  and  $q_0(x) \rightarrow 1$  as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ , the maximum principle yields  $0 \leq q_0(x) \leq 1$  for all  $x \in \Omega$  and thus  $\frac{\partial q_0}{\partial \nu} \leq 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$ . By (5.11)  $\frac{\partial q_0}{\partial \nu} \equiv 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$ , which yields  $(\nabla q_0, \nabla \Psi) = 0$  for all  $\Psi \in C_0^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ . Finally, since  $q_0 \in \dot{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)$ , the uniqueness property of the weak Neumann problem for the Poisson equation implies  $q_0(x) \equiv \text{const}$  on  $\Omega$ , which causes a contradiction.  $\square$

## 6. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREMS 2.2 AND 2.3

### 6.1. Generalized Stokes formula.

In this section, we finally prove our main results stated in Theorems 2.2 and 2.3. To this end, let us first consider the generalized Stokes formula in  $\Omega$  which holds on  $E_{\text{div}}^r(\Omega)$  and  $E_{\text{rot}}^r(\Omega)$  defined by

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\text{div}}^r(\Omega) &\equiv \{ \mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega); \text{div } \mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega) \} \quad \text{equipped the norm } \|\mathbf{u}\|_{E_{\text{div}}^r} = \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} + \|\text{div } \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} \\ E_{\text{rot}}^r(\Omega) &\equiv \{ \mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega); \text{rot } \mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega) \} \quad \text{equipped the norm } \|\mathbf{u}\|_{E_{\text{rot}}^r} = \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} + \|\text{rot } \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r}. \end{aligned}$$

We state the generalized Stokes formula in exterior domains. The following generalized Stokes formulae (6.1) and (6.2) are well-known in the case of bounded domains  $\Omega$ . There seems to be no proof in the literature for the situation of exterior domains  $\Omega$ .

**Lemma 6.1.** *Let  $\Omega$  be as in the Assumption and let  $1 < r < \infty$ . There exist bounded operators  $\gamma_\nu$  and  $\tau_\nu$  on  $E_{\text{div}}^r(\Omega)$  and on  $E_{\text{rot}}^r(\Omega)$  with the properties that*

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_\nu : E_{\text{div}}^r(\Omega) \ni \mathbf{u} &\mapsto \gamma_\nu \mathbf{u} \in H^{1-\frac{1}{r},r'}(\partial\Omega)^*, \quad \gamma_\nu \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u} \cdot \nu|_{\partial\Omega} \quad \text{for } \mathbf{u} \in C_0^1(\bar{\Omega}), \\ \tau_\nu : E_{\text{rot}}^r(\Omega) \ni \mathbf{u} &\mapsto \tau_\nu \mathbf{u} \in H^{1-\frac{1}{r},r'}(\partial\Omega)^*, \quad \tau_\nu \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u} \times \nu|_{\partial\Omega} \quad \text{for } \mathbf{u} \in C_0^1(\bar{\Omega}), \end{aligned}$$

respectively. Furthermore, the following generalized Stokes formulae hold true

$$(6.1) \quad (\mathbf{u}, \nabla q) + (\text{div } \mathbf{u}, q) = \langle \gamma_\nu \mathbf{u}, \gamma_0 q \rangle_{\partial\Omega} \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{u} \in E_{\text{div}}^r(\Omega) \text{ and all } q \in H^{1,r'}(\Omega),$$

$$(6.2) \quad (\mathbf{u}, \text{rot } \psi) = (\text{rot } \mathbf{u}, \psi) + \langle \tau_\nu \mathbf{u}, \gamma_0 \psi \rangle_{\partial\Omega} \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{u} \in E_{\text{rot}}^r(\Omega) \text{ and all } \psi \in H^{1,r'}(\Omega),$$

where  $\gamma_0$  denotes the usual trace operator from  $H^{1,r'}(\Omega)$  onto  $H^{1-\frac{1}{r},r'}(\partial\Omega)$ , and  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\partial\Omega}$  denotes the duality pairing between  $H^{1-\frac{1}{r},r'}(\partial\Omega)^*$  and  $H^{1-\frac{1}{r},r'}(\partial\Omega)$ .

*Proof of Lemma 6.1.* We start by showing that  $C_0^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$  is dense in both  $E_{\text{div}}^r(\Omega)$  and  $E_{\text{rot}}^r(\Omega)$  for all  $1 < r < \infty$ . Indeed, let  $\mathbf{u} \in E_{\text{div}}^r(\Omega)$ . Then there exists an extension  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \in L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)$  of  $\mathbf{u}$  satisfying  $\text{div } \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \in L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)$  and

$$(6.3) \quad \mathbf{u}(x) = \tilde{\mathbf{u}}(x) \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega, \quad \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C\|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^r}, \quad \|\text{div } \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C\|\text{div } \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r},$$

for some  $C = C(\Omega, r)$  independent of  $\mathbf{u}$ . For  $\delta > 0$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we set  $\mathbf{u}_{k,\delta}(x) \equiv \zeta_k(x)(\rho_\delta * \tilde{\mathbf{u}})(x)$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ , where the mollifier  $\rho_\delta$  is defined by  $\rho_\delta(x) \equiv \delta^{-3}\rho(x/\delta)$  for some  $\rho \in C_0^\infty(B_1)$  satisfying  $\rho(x) \geq 0$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$  and  $\int_{|x|<1} \rho(x)dx = 1$ . Let  $\{\zeta_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$  be a sequence of cut-off functions defined by  $\zeta_k(x) = \zeta(x/k)$  for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , where  $\zeta \in C_0^\infty(B_2)$  satisfies  $0 \leq \zeta(x) \leq 1$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$  and  $\zeta(x) = 1$  for  $x \in B_1$ . Notice that  $\zeta_k(x) = 1$  for  $x \in B_k$  and  $\zeta_k(x) = 0$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_{2k}$  with  $\|\nabla \zeta_k\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq Ck^{-1}$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , where  $C = \|\nabla \zeta\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)}$ . Obviously,  $\mathbf{u}_{k,\delta} \in C_0^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$  for all  $\delta > 0$  and all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . For every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is  $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\varepsilon) > 0$  such that  $\|\rho_{\delta_0} * \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)} < \varepsilon/4$ . For such a  $\delta_0$ , there exists  $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\|\zeta_{k_0}(\rho_{\delta_0} * \tilde{\mathbf{u}}) - \rho_{\delta_0} * \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)} < \varepsilon/4$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{u}_{k_0,\delta_0} - \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} &= \|\zeta_{k_0}(\rho_{\delta_0} * \tilde{\mathbf{u}}) - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^r} \\ (6.4) \quad &\leq \|\zeta_{k_0}(\rho_{\delta_0} * \tilde{\mathbf{u}}) - \rho_{\delta_0} * \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \|\rho_{\delta_0} * \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\ &< \varepsilon/2. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$(6.5) \quad \|\text{div } \rho_{\delta_0} * \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \text{div } \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)} = \|\rho_{\delta_0} * \text{div } \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \text{div } \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)} < \varepsilon/4.$$

Since  $\|\nabla \zeta_k \cdot (\rho_\delta * \tilde{\mathbf{u}})\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq \|\nabla \zeta_k\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \|\rho_\delta * \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq Ck^{-1} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^r}$  for all  $\delta > 0$  and all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $C = C(\Omega, r)$ , we may assume that

$$(6.6) \quad \|\zeta_{k_0} \operatorname{div} \rho_{\delta_0} * \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \operatorname{div} \rho_{\delta_0} * \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \|\nabla \zeta_{k_0} \cdot \rho_{\delta_0} * \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)} < \varepsilon/4$$

holds for  $k_0$ . Furthermore, since  $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_{k_0, \delta_0} = \zeta_{k_0} \operatorname{div} \rho_{\delta_0} * \tilde{\mathbf{u}} + \nabla \zeta_{k_0} \cdot \rho_{\delta_0} * \tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ , assertions (6.5) and (6.6) yield

$$(6.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_{k_0, \delta_0} - \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^r} &\leq \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_{k_0, \delta_0} - \operatorname{div} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\ &\leq \|\zeta_{k_0} \operatorname{div} \rho_{\delta_0} * \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \operatorname{div} \rho_{\delta_0} * \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \|\operatorname{div} \rho_{\delta_0} * \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \operatorname{div} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\ &\quad + \|\nabla \zeta_{k_0} \cdot (\rho_{\delta_0} * \tilde{\mathbf{u}})\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\ &< \varepsilon/2. \end{aligned}$$

By (6.4) and (6.7),  $\|\mathbf{u}_{k_0, \delta_0} - \mathbf{u}\|_{E_{\operatorname{div}}^r} < \varepsilon$ . Since  $\mathbf{u} \in E_{\operatorname{div}}^r(\Omega)$  was arbitrary,  $C_0^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$  is dense in  $E_{\operatorname{div}}^r(\Omega)$ . An approximating argument similar to the above one yields that  $C_0^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$  is dense in  $E_{\operatorname{rot}}^r(\Omega)$ .

In order to prove (6.1) note that for every  $\mathbf{u} \in E_{\operatorname{div}}^r(\Omega)$ , there exists a sequence  $\{\mathbf{u}_m\}_{m=1}^\infty \subset C_0^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$  with

$$(6.8) \quad \mathbf{u}_m \rightarrow \mathbf{u}, \quad \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_m \rightarrow \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} \quad \text{in } L^r(\Omega) \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty.$$

Since the trace operator  $\gamma_0 : H^{1, r'}(\Omega) \rightarrow H^{1-\frac{1}{r'}, r'}(\partial\Omega)$  is surjective, for every  $p \in H^{1-\frac{1}{r'}, r'}(\partial\Omega)$  there exists  $q \in H^{1, r'}(\Omega)$  satisfying  $\gamma_0 q = p$  and  $\|q\|_{H^{1, r'}(\Omega)} \leq C\|p\|_{H^{1-\frac{1}{r'}, r'}(\partial\Omega)}$  for some  $C = C(\Omega, r)$ . Considering the functional  $X_m(p)$  given by

$$X_m(p) \equiv (\nabla q, \mathbf{u}_m) + (q, \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_m), \quad m \in \mathbb{N}$$

we verify that the value of  $X_m(p)$  is independent of  $q$ , as long as  $q \in H^{1, r'}(\Omega)$  and  $\gamma_0 q = p$ . Indeed, assume that there are  $q_1, q_2 \in H^{1, r'}(\Omega)$  with  $\gamma_0 q_1 = \gamma_0 q_2 = p$ . We aim to show that

$$(6.9) \quad (\nabla q_1, \mathbf{u}_m) + (q_1, \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_m) = (\nabla q_2, \mathbf{u}_m) + (q_2, \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_m), \quad m \in \mathbb{N},$$

which for  $\tilde{q} \equiv q_1 - q_2$  is equivalent to

$$(\nabla \tilde{q}, \mathbf{u}_m) + (\tilde{q}, \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_m) = 0, \quad m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since  $\gamma_0 \tilde{q} = 0$  and since  $\operatorname{supp} \mathbf{u}_m$  is compact in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , we obtain

$$(\nabla \tilde{q}, \mathbf{u}_m) + (\tilde{q}, \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_m) = \int_\Omega \operatorname{div} (\tilde{q} \mathbf{u}_m) dx = \int_{\partial\Omega} \gamma_0 \tilde{q} \mathbf{u}_m \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu} dS = 0, \quad m \in \mathbb{N},$$

from which we obtain (6.9). The functional  $X_m(p)$  is hence well-defined for every  $p \in H^{1-\frac{1}{r'}, r'}(\partial\Omega)$ . Furthermore, by (6.8)

$$X_{\mathbf{u}}(p) \equiv \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} X_m(p) = (\nabla q, \mathbf{u}) + (q, \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u})$$

with  $|X_{\mathbf{u}}(p)| \leq C\|\mathbf{u}\|_{E_{\operatorname{div}}^r} \|p\|_{H^{1-\frac{1}{r'}, r'}(\partial\Omega)}$ . This means that for every  $\mathbf{u} \in E_{\operatorname{div}}^r(\Omega)$ ,  $X_{\mathbf{u}}$  is a continuous functional on  $H^{1-\frac{1}{r'}, r'}(\partial\Omega)$  satisfying  $\|X_{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H^{1-\frac{1}{r'}, r'}(\partial\Omega)^*} \leq C\|\mathbf{u}\|_{E_{\operatorname{div}}^r}$ . Finally, defining  $\gamma_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \mathbf{u}$  by  $\langle \gamma_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \mathbf{u}, p \rangle_{\partial\Omega} \equiv X_{\mathbf{u}}(p)$  for  $p \in H^{1-\frac{1}{r'}, r'}(\partial\Omega)$ , we see that  $\gamma_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \mathbf{u} \in H^{1-\frac{1}{r'}, r'}(\partial\Omega)^*$  enjoys the property (6.1). We also verify that  $\gamma_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}|_{\partial\Omega}$  provided  $\mathbf{u} \in C_0^1(\Omega)$ .

The validity of (6.2) is proved by similar argument as above.  $\square$

We note that Lemma 6.1 implies that

$$(6.10) \quad X_{\operatorname{har}}^r(\Omega) = \{\mathbf{h} \in E_{\operatorname{div}}^r(\Omega) \cap E_{\operatorname{rot}}^r(\Omega); \operatorname{div} \mathbf{h} = 0, \operatorname{rot} \mathbf{h} = \mathbf{0}, \gamma_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \mathbf{h} = 0\},$$

$$(6.11) \quad V_{\operatorname{har}}^r(\Omega) = \{\mathbf{h} \in E_{\operatorname{div}}^r(\Omega) \cap E_{\operatorname{rot}}^r(\Omega); \operatorname{div} \mathbf{h} = 0, \operatorname{rot} \mathbf{h} = \mathbf{0}, \tau_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \mathbf{h} = \mathbf{0}\}.$$

for all  $1 < r < \infty$ .

## 6.2. Proof of Theorem 2.2.

Let  $1 < r < \infty$ . For given  $\mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega)$  we take  $p \in \dot{H}^{1,r}(\Omega)$  and  $\mathbf{w} \in \dot{V}_\sigma^r(\Omega)$  given by Theorem 5.1 and Theorem 4.1 (ii) and define  $\mathbf{h}$  by

$$(6.12) \quad \mathbf{h} \equiv \mathbf{u} - \operatorname{rot} \mathbf{w} - \nabla p.$$

Let us first show that  $\mathbf{h} \in X_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$ . Obviously,  $\mathbf{h} \in L^r(\Omega)$ . Furthermore,  $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{h} = 0$  and  $\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{h} = \mathbf{0}$  in the sense of distribution in  $\Omega$ , i.e.,

$$(6.13) \quad (\mathbf{h}, \nabla \psi) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \psi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega),$$

$$(6.14) \quad (\mathbf{h}, \operatorname{rot} \Psi) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \Psi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega).$$

Indeed, by (5.1) and (6.2)

$$(\mathbf{h}, \nabla \psi) = (\mathbf{u} - \nabla p, \nabla \psi) - (\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{w}, \nabla \psi) = -(\mathbf{w}, \operatorname{rot} \nabla \psi) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \psi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega),$$

which implies (6.13). By (4.3) and (6.1)

$$(\mathbf{h}, \operatorname{rot} \Psi) = (\mathbf{u} - \operatorname{rot} \mathbf{w}, \operatorname{rot} \Psi) - (\nabla p, \operatorname{rot} \Psi) = (p, \operatorname{div} \operatorname{rot} \Psi) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \Psi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega),$$

which implies (6.14).

We next show that  $\gamma_\nu \mathbf{h} = 0$ . By (5.1) and (6.1)

$$0 = (\mathbf{u} - \nabla p, \nabla q) = \langle \gamma_\nu (\mathbf{u} - \nabla p), \gamma_0 q \rangle_{\partial\Omega} \quad \text{for all } q \in H^{1,r'}(\Omega).$$

Since  $\gamma_0 : H^{1,r'}(\Omega) \rightarrow H^{1-\frac{1}{r'}}(\partial\Omega)$  is surjective, the above identity implies that  $\gamma_\nu (\mathbf{u} - \nabla p) = 0$ . Moreover, since  $\mathbf{w} \in \dot{V}^r(\Omega)$ ,  $\mathbf{w} \times \nu|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$  and by (6.2) we deduce

$$(\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{w}, \nabla q) = (\mathbf{w}, \operatorname{rot} (\nabla q)) - \langle \mathbf{w} \times \nu, \nabla q \rangle_{\partial\Omega} = 0 \quad \text{for all } q \in H^{2,r'}(\Omega).$$

Since  $H^{2,r'}(\Omega)$  is dense in  $H^{1,r'}(\Omega)$ , from this identity we obtain

$$(\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{w}, \nabla q) = 0 \quad \text{for all } q \in H^{1,r'}(\Omega).$$

On the other hand, by (6.1) we obtain

$$0 = (\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{w}, \nabla q) = -(\operatorname{div} (\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{w}), p) + \langle \gamma_\nu \operatorname{rot} \mathbf{w}, \gamma_0 q \rangle_{\partial\Omega} = \langle \gamma_\nu \operatorname{rot} \mathbf{w}, \gamma_0 q \rangle_{\partial\Omega} \quad \text{for all } q \in H^{1,r'}(\Omega).$$

Again by surjectivity of  $\gamma_0$ , we obtain  $\gamma_\nu \operatorname{rot} \mathbf{w} = 0$  and hence  $\gamma_\nu \mathbf{h} = 0$ . It thus follows from (6.10), (6.13) and (6.14) that  $\mathbf{h} \in X_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$  satisfies (2.6). The estimate (2.7) is a consequence of (4.4), (5.2) and (6.12).

It remains to prove the uniqueness of the expression (2.6). Assume that  $\hat{\mathbf{h}} \in X_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{w}} \in \dot{V}_\sigma^r(\Omega)$  and  $\hat{p} \in \dot{H}^{1,r}(\Omega)$  fulfill (2.8). Set  $\hat{\mathbf{h}} \equiv \mathbf{h} - \hat{\mathbf{h}}$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{w}} \equiv \mathbf{w} - \hat{\mathbf{w}}$  and  $\hat{p} \equiv p - \hat{p}$ . Then

$$(6.15) \quad \hat{\mathbf{h}} + \operatorname{rot} \hat{\mathbf{w}} + \nabla \hat{p} = 0.$$

Since  $\gamma_\nu \hat{\mathbf{h}} = 0$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{w}} \times \nu|_{\partial\Omega} = \mathbf{0}$ , we obtain by (6.1) and (6.2)

$$\begin{aligned} & (\nabla \hat{p}, \nabla \psi) \\ &= -(\hat{\mathbf{h}}, \nabla \psi) - (\operatorname{rot} \hat{\mathbf{w}}, \nabla \psi) = (\operatorname{div} \hat{\mathbf{h}}, \psi) - \langle \gamma_\nu \hat{\mathbf{h}}, \gamma_0 \psi \rangle_{\partial\Omega} - (\hat{\mathbf{w}}, \operatorname{rot} (\nabla \psi)) + \langle \hat{\mathbf{w}} \times \nu, \nabla \psi \rangle_{\partial\Omega} \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ . By the uniqueness of the weak Neumann problem of the Poisson equation,  $\nabla \hat{p} \equiv 0$  in  $\Omega$ , which implies

$$(6.16) \quad \nabla p = \nabla \hat{p}.$$

Furthermore,  $\operatorname{rot} \hat{\mathbf{w}} = -\hat{\mathbf{h}}$ . Since  $\operatorname{rot} \hat{\mathbf{h}} = \mathbf{0}$  and  $\Psi \times \nu|_{\partial\Omega} = \mathbf{0}$  for  $\Psi \in \dot{V}^{r'}(\Omega)$ , assertion (6.2) implies

$$a_V(\hat{\mathbf{w}}, \Psi) = (\operatorname{rot} \hat{\mathbf{w}}, \operatorname{rot} \Psi) + (\operatorname{div} \hat{\mathbf{w}}, \operatorname{div} \Psi) = (-\hat{\mathbf{h}}, \operatorname{rot} \Psi) = (-\operatorname{rot} \hat{\mathbf{h}}, \Psi) + \langle \hat{\mathbf{h}}, \Psi \times \nu \rangle_{\partial\Omega} = 0$$

for all  $\Psi \in \dot{V}^{r'}(\Omega)$ . Hence,  $\hat{\mathbf{w}} \in \operatorname{Ker}(T_r)$ . Finally, by Proposition 4.5 (ii)  $\hat{\mathbf{w}} \in \dot{V}_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$  and  $\operatorname{rot} \hat{\mathbf{w}} = \mathbf{0}$ . i.e.,

$$(6.17) \quad \operatorname{rot} \mathbf{w} = \operatorname{rot} \hat{\mathbf{w}}.$$

Assertions (6.15), (6.16) and (6.17) imply  $\hat{\mathbf{h}} = \mathbf{0}$ , i.e.,

$$(6.18) \quad \mathbf{h} = \hat{\mathbf{h}}$$

and the desired unique decomposition (2.9) is a consequence of (6.16), (6.17) and (6.18). This completes the proof of Theorem 2.2.  $\square$

### 6.3. Proof of Theorem 2.3.

Let  $\mathbf{u} \in L^r(\Omega)$ . For  $1 < r \leq 3/2$  take  $p \in \dot{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  given in Lemma 5.3. For  $3/2 < r < 3$  and for  $3 \leq r < \infty$  take  $p \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  and  $p \in \tilde{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  given in Lemma 5.2 (i) and (ii), respectively. Define  $\mathbf{h}$  as in (6.12). Our first aim is to show that  $\mathbf{h} \in V_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$ . Obviously,  $\mathbf{h} \in L^r(\Omega)$ . In the same way as done in (6.13) and (6.14), we verify that  $\text{div } \mathbf{h} = 0$  and  $\text{rot } \mathbf{h} = \mathbf{0}$  in the sense of distributions in  $\Omega$ . Hence, we may show that  $\tau_\nu \mathbf{h} = 0$ . Since  $\gamma_0 p = 0$ , assertions (6.1) and (6.2) imply

$$\langle \tau_\nu(\nabla p), \gamma_0 \psi \rangle_{\partial\Omega} = \langle \nabla p, \text{rot } \psi \rangle = \langle \gamma_0 p, \gamma_\nu(\text{rot } \psi) \rangle_{\partial\Omega} = 0 \quad \text{for all } \psi \in H^{1,r'}(\Omega),$$

which yields

$$(6.19) \quad \tau_\nu(\nabla p) = 0.$$

For every  $\psi \in H^{1,r'}(\Omega)$  we consider the weak Neumann problem in  $\dot{H}^{1,r'}(\Omega)$  for the Poisson equation

$$\begin{cases} \Delta q = \text{div } \psi & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial q}{\partial \nu} = \psi \cdot \nu & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

It is known that there exists a unique  $q \in \dot{H}^{1,r'}(\Omega)$  satisfying  $(\nabla q, \nabla \varphi) = (\psi, \nabla \varphi)$  for all  $\varphi \in \dot{H}^{1,r}(\Omega)$ . Moreover, similarly as in (4.49) we deduce  $D^2 q \in L^{r'}(\Omega)$ . Setting  $\Phi \equiv \psi - \nabla q$  and we see that  $\Phi \in L^{r'}(\Omega)$  with  $\text{div } \Phi = 0$ ,  $\text{rot } \Phi \in L^{r'}(\Omega)$  and  $\Phi \cdot \nu|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ . Hence,  $\Phi \in \dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)$ . Since  $\text{rot } \psi = \text{rot } \Phi$  and since  $\text{rot } (\mathbf{u} - \text{rot } \mathbf{w}) = \text{rot } (\mathbf{h} + \nabla p) = \mathbf{0}$ , (6.2) and (4.1) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \tau_\nu(\mathbf{u} - \text{rot } \mathbf{w}), \gamma_0 \psi \rangle_{\partial\Omega} &= (\mathbf{u} - \text{rot } \mathbf{w}, \text{rot } \psi) - (\text{rot } (\mathbf{u} - \text{rot } \mathbf{w}), \psi) \\ &= (\mathbf{u} - \text{rot } \mathbf{w}, \text{rot } \psi) \\ &= (\mathbf{u} - \text{rot } \mathbf{w}, \text{rot } \Phi) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\psi \in H^{1,r'}(\Omega)$  is arbitrary, we obtain

$$(6.20) \quad \tau_\nu(\mathbf{u} - \text{rot } \mathbf{w}) = 0.$$

By (6.19) and (6.20),  $\tau_\nu \mathbf{h} = 0$  and  $\mathbf{h} \in V_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$  with the decomposition (2.10). The estimate (2.11) is then a consequence of (6.12), (4.2) and (5.4).

It remains to prove the uniqueness of the decomposition (2.10).

(i) Let  $1 < r \leq 3/2$  and suppose that  $\hat{\mathbf{h}} \in V_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{w}} \in \dot{X}_\sigma^r(\Omega)$  and  $\hat{p} \in \dot{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  satisfy (2.12). Setting  $\tilde{\mathbf{h}} \equiv \mathbf{h} - \hat{\mathbf{h}}$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{w}} \equiv \mathbf{w} - \hat{\mathbf{w}}$  and  $\hat{p} = p - \tilde{p}$ , we obtain (6.15). Moreover, For every  $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$  we obtain

$$(6.21) \quad (\nabla \hat{p}, \nabla \varphi) = -(\hat{\mathbf{h}}, \nabla \varphi) - (\text{rot } \hat{\mathbf{w}}, \nabla \varphi) = (\text{div } \hat{\mathbf{h}}, \varphi) - (\hat{\mathbf{w}}, \text{rot } (\nabla \varphi)) = 0.$$

Thus  $\hat{p}$  is harmonic in  $\Omega$ . Since  $\hat{p}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$  and since  $\nabla \hat{p} \in L^r(\Omega)$ , it follows from [15, Theorem A] that  $\hat{p} \equiv 0$  in  $\Omega$  and hence (6.16).

Furthermore  $\text{rot } \hat{\mathbf{w}} = -\hat{\mathbf{h}}$ . Since  $\hat{\mathbf{h}} \times \nu|_{\partial\Omega} = \mathbf{0}$ , (6.2) yields

$$\begin{aligned} a_X(\hat{\mathbf{w}}, \Phi) &= (\text{rot } \hat{\mathbf{w}}, \text{rot } \Phi) + (\text{div } \hat{\mathbf{w}}, \text{div } \Phi) \\ &= (-\hat{\mathbf{h}}, \text{rot } \Phi) \\ (6.22) \quad &= (-\text{rot } \hat{\mathbf{h}}, \Phi) - \langle \hat{\mathbf{h}} \times \nu, \Phi \rangle_{\partial\Omega} \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\Phi \in \dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)$ . Thus  $\hat{\mathbf{w}} \in \text{Ker}(S_r)$  and it follows from Proposition 4.5 that  $\hat{\mathbf{w}} \in \dot{X}_{\text{har}}(\Omega)$  yielding  $\text{rot } \hat{\mathbf{w}} = 0$ . Hence, we obtain (6.17). The desired unique decomposition (2.13) is a consequence of (6.16), (6.17) and (6.18).

(ii) Let  $3/2 < r < 3$ . Suppose that  $\tilde{\mathbf{h}} \in V_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{w}} \in \dot{X}_\sigma^r(\Omega)$  and  $\tilde{p} \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  satisfy (2.12). Note that the identity (6.21) remains true for  $\hat{p} \in H_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$ . Since  $3/2 < r < 3$ ,  $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$  is dense in  $\hat{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)$  it follows from (6.21) that

$$(6.23) \quad (\nabla \hat{p}, \nabla \varphi) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega),$$

yielding  $\hat{p} \in \text{Ker}(-\Delta_r)$ . Proposition 3.2 (ii) yields  $\hat{p} = 0$  and hence (6.16). Since (6.22) remains true even for  $3/2 < r < 3$ , we arrive at (6.17) and hence (6.18) and (2.13).

(iii) Let  $3 \leq r < \infty$  and suppose that  $\tilde{\mathbf{h}} \in V_{\text{har}}^r(\Omega)$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{w}} \in \dot{X}_\sigma^r(\Omega)$  and  $\tilde{p} \in \dot{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  satisfy (2.12). Since  $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$  is dense in  $\hat{H}_0^{1,r'}(\Omega)$ , (6.23) remains true and hence  $\hat{p} \in \text{Ker}(-\Delta_r)$ . By Proposition 3.2 (iv)

$$(6.24) \quad \hat{p} = \lambda q_0 \quad \text{for some } \lambda \in \mathbb{R}.$$

The assertions (6.15) and (6.24) imply  $\text{rot } \hat{\mathbf{w}} = -\hat{\mathbf{h}} - \lambda \nabla q_0$ . Since  $\hat{\mathbf{h}} \times \boldsymbol{\nu}|_{\partial\Omega} = \nabla q_0 \times \boldsymbol{\nu}|_{\partial\Omega} = \mathbf{0}$ , (6.2) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} a_X(\hat{\mathbf{w}}, \boldsymbol{\Phi}) &= (\text{rot } \hat{\mathbf{w}}, \text{rot } \boldsymbol{\Phi}) + (\text{div } \hat{\mathbf{w}}, \text{div } \boldsymbol{\Phi}) \\ &= (-\hat{\mathbf{h}} - \lambda \nabla q_0, \text{rot } \boldsymbol{\Phi}) \\ &= (-\text{rot } (\hat{\mathbf{h}} + \lambda \nabla q_0), \boldsymbol{\Phi}) - \langle (\hat{\mathbf{h}} + \lambda \nabla q_0) \times \boldsymbol{\nu}, \boldsymbol{\Phi} \rangle_{\partial\Omega} \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\boldsymbol{\Phi} \in \dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)$ . Hence,  $\hat{\mathbf{w}} \in \text{Ker}(S_r) = \dot{X}_{\text{har}}(\Omega)$  and thus (6.17). Finally, by (6.15), (6.17) and (6.24)

$$(6.25) \quad \hat{\mathbf{h}} = \lambda \nabla q_0$$

with the same  $\lambda$  as above. The desired uniqueness assertion in (2.14) is then a consequence of (6.17), (6.24) and (6.25). The proof of Theorem 2.3 is complete.  $\square$

Finally, some comments concerning the remark after Theorem 2.3 are in order. In fact, it is impossible to replace  $p \in \dot{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  by  $p \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  provided  $1 < r \leq 3/2$ . More precisely, let  $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$  be the cut-off function introduced in Lemma 3.9. Assume that there exist  $\mathbf{h} \in X_{\text{har}}(\Omega)$ ,  $\mathbf{w} \in \dot{X}_\sigma^r(\Omega)$  and  $p \in \hat{H}_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  such that

$$\nabla \eta = \mathbf{h} + \text{rot } \mathbf{w} + \nabla p.$$

Then, for every  $\boldsymbol{\Phi} \in \dot{X}^{r'}(\Omega)$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} a_X(\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\Phi}) &= (\text{rot } \mathbf{w}, \text{rot } \boldsymbol{\Phi}) + (\text{div } \mathbf{w}, \text{div } \boldsymbol{\Phi}) \\ &= (-\mathbf{h} + \nabla(\eta - p), \text{rot } \boldsymbol{\Phi}) \\ &= (\text{rot } (-\mathbf{h} + \nabla(\eta - p)), \boldsymbol{\Phi}) + \langle (-\mathbf{h} + \nabla(\eta - p)) \times \boldsymbol{\nu}, \boldsymbol{\Phi} \rangle_{\partial\Omega} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 4.5,  $\text{rot } \mathbf{w} = 0$  and hence  $\nabla \eta = \mathbf{h} + \nabla p$ . Set  $g(x) = \eta(x) - p(x)$  and we notice that  $g$  is harmonic in  $\Omega$ . Setting  $\tilde{g}(x) = g(x) - 1$ , we verify that

$$\begin{cases} \Delta \tilde{g} = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \tilde{g} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Since  $\nabla \tilde{g} \in L^r(\Omega)$  for  $1 < r \leq 3/2$ , it follows from [15, Theorem A] that  $\tilde{g} \equiv 0$  on  $\Omega$ , and hence  $g(x) \equiv 1$  for all  $x \in \Omega$ . Finally,  $\eta(x) = 0$  for  $|x| \geq R + 2$  and thus  $p(x) = -1$  for all  $|x| \geq R + 2$ . This contradicts the fact that  $p \in L^{r*}(\Omega)$ , where  $r_*$  is defined by (3.1).

**Acknowledgement.** The authors would like to express their thanks to Prof. Yoshihiro Shibata for valuable comments, in particular concerning Lemma 5.3.



## REFERENCES

- [1] Abraham, R., Marsden, J., Ratiu, T., *Manifolds, Tensor Analysis and Applications*. Appl. Math. Sciences, Springer, 1988
- [2] Fang, D., Hieber, M., Zi, R., *Global existence results for Oldroyd-B model fluids in exterior domains; the case of non-small computing parameters*. Math. Ann. **357**, 687–709 (2013).
- [3] Farwig, R., Sohr, H., *Helmholtz decomposition and Stokes resolvent system for aperture domains in  $L^q$ -spaces*. Analysis **16**, 1–26 (1996).
- [4] Foias, C., Temam, R., *Remarques sur les equations de Navier-Stokes stationnaires et les phenomenes successifs de bifurcations*. Ann. Scu. Norm. Super. Pisa **5**, 29–63 (1978).
- [5] Fujiwara, D., Morimoto, H., *An  $L^r$ -theorem of the Helmholtz decomposition of vector fields*. J. Fac.Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math. **24**, 685–700 (1977).
- [6] Galdi, G.P., *An Introduction to the Mathematical Theory of the Navier-Stokes Equations*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Second Edition, Springer, (2011).
- [7] Geissert, M., Heck, H., Hieber, M., Sawada, O., *Weak Neumann implies Stokes*. J. Reine Angew. Math. **669**, 75–100 (2012).
- [8] Giga, Y., Sohr, H., *On the Stokes operator in exterior domains*. J. Fac.Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math. **36**, 103–130 (1989).
- [9] Hanzawa, E., *Classical solutions of the Stefan problem*. Tohoku Math. J. **33**, 297–335 (1981).
- [10] Heywood, J.G., *On uniqueness questions in the theory of viscous flow*. Acta Math. **136**, 61–102 (1976).
- [11] Hieber, M., Kozono, H., Seyfert, A., Shimizu, S., Yanagisawa, T., *A Characterization of harmonic  $L^r$ -vector fields in two dimensional exterior domains*. to appear in J. Geom. Anal.
- [12] Hieber, M., Kozono, H., Seyfert, A., Shimizu, S., Yanagisawa, T., *A Characterization of harmonic  $L^r$ -vector fields in three dimensional exterior domains*. submitted
- [13] Hieber, M., Saal, J., *The Stokes equation in the  $L^p$ -setting: well-posedness and regularity properties*. Handbook of math. analysis in mech. of viscous fluids, 117–206. Springer, 2018.
- [14] Korobkov, M., Pileckas, K., Russo, R., *Solution of Leray’s problem for stationary Navier-Stokes equations in plane and axially symmetric domains*. Ann. of Math. **181**, 769–807 (2015).
- [15] Kozono, H., Sohr, H., *On a new class of generalized solutions for the Stokes equations in exterior domains*. Ann. Scu. Norm. Super. Pisa **19**, 155–181 (1992).
- [16] Kozono, H., Yanagisawa, T.,  *$L^r$ -variational inequality for vector fields and the Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition in bounded domains*. Indiana Univ. Math. J. **58**, 1853–1920 (2009).
- [17] Kozono, H., Yanagisawa, T., *Leray’s problem on the stationary Navier-Stokes equations with inhomogeneous boundary data*. Math. Z. **262**, 27–39 (2009).
- [18] Kozono, H., Yanagisawa, T., *Generalized Lax-Milgram theorem in Banach spaces and its application to the elliptic system of boundary value problems*. Manuscripta Math. **141**, 637–662 (2013).
- [19] Leray, J., *Etude de diverses équations intégrales non linéaires et de quelques problèmes que pose l’hydrodynamique*. J. Math. Pures Appl. **12**, 1–82 (1933).
- [20] Miyakawa, T., *On nonstationary solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations in exterior domains*. Hiroshima Math. J. **12**, 115–140 (1982).
- [21] Morrey, C.B., *Multiple Integrals in the Calculus of Variations*. Grundlehren der mathematische Wissenschaften **130**, Springer, 1966.
- [22] Peetre, J., *Another approach to elliptic boundary problems*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **14**, 711–731 (1961).
- [23] Prüss, J., Simonett, G., *Moving interfaces and quasilinear parabolic evolution equations*. Monographs in Mathematics, Vol. **105**, Birkhäuser, 2016.
- [24] Seyfert, A., *The Helmholtz-Hodge decomposition in Lebesgue spaces on exterior domains and evolution equations on the whole real time axis*. PhD Thesis, Technische Universität Darmstadt, 2018.
- [25] Shibata, Y., *On the local well-posedness of free boundary problem for the Navier-Stokes equations in an exterior domain*. Commu. Pure Appl. Anal. **17**, 1681–1721 (2018).
- [26] Simader, C.G., Sohr, H., *The weak Dirichlet and Neumann problem for the Laplacian in  $L^q$  for bounded and exterior domains*. Nonlinear Analysis, Function Spaces and Applications, Kubec, M., Kufner, A., Opic, B., Rákosník (ed.) Vol.4, Teubner-Text vol.199, 180–223 Teubner- Leibzig 1990.
- [27] Simader, C.G., Sohr, H., *A new approach to the Helmholtz decomposition and the Neumann problem in  $L^q$ -spaces for bounded and exterior domains*. In: Mathematical Problems relating to the Navier-Stokes Equations, Advances in Mathematics for Applied Sciences, G.P. Galdi (ed.), World Scientific, 1–35 (1992).
- [28] Simader, C.G., Sohr, H., *The Dirichlet problem for the Laplacian in bounded and unbounded domains*. Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 360, Longman, 1996.
- [29] Solonnikov, V.A., *Estimate for solutions of nonstationary Navier-Stokes equations*. J. Soviet Math. **8**, 467–529 (1977).
- [30] Tun, M.T., Miyakawa, T., *A proof of the Helmholtz decomposition of vector fields over the half-space*. Adv. Math. Sci. Appl. **18**, 199–217 (2008).
- [31] Warner, F.W., *Foundations of differentiable manifolds and Lie groups*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics **94**, New York-Berlin-Heidelberg-Tokyo, Springer-Verlag.1971.

FACHBEREICH MATHEMATIK, TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT DARMSTADT,, SCHLOSSGARTENSTR. 7, DARMSTADT 64289, GERMANY

*E-mail address:* `hieber@mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, WASEDA UNIVERSITY, 169-8555 TOKYO, JAPAN, RESEARCH ALLIANCE CENTER OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES,, TOHOKU UNIVERSITY, 980-8578 SENDAI, JAPAN

*E-mail address:* `kozono@waseda.jp`

FACHBEREICH MATHEMATIK, TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT DARMSTADT,, SCHLOSSGARTENSTR. 7, DARMSTADT 64289, GERMANY

*E-mail address:* `seyfert@mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de`

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF HUMAN AND ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES, KYOTO UNIVERSITY, 606-8501 KYOTO, JAPAN

*E-mail address:* `shimizu.senjo.5s@kyoto-u.ac.jp`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NARA WOMEN'S UNIVERSITY, NARA 630-8506, JAPAN

*E-mail address:* `taku@cc.nara-wu.ac.jp`