

NEW REGULARITY CRITERIA FOR WEAK SOLUTIONS TO THE MHD EQUATIONS IN TERMS OF AN ASSOCIATED PRESSURE

JIŘÍ NEUSTUPA AND MINSUK YANG

ABSTRACT. We prove that if $0 < T_0 < T \leq \infty$, $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}, p)$ is a suitable weak solution of the MHD equations in $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, T)$ and either $\mathcal{F}_\gamma(p_-) \in L^\infty(0, T_0; L^{3/2}(\mathbb{R}^3))$ or $\mathcal{F}_\gamma(|\mathbf{u}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}|^2 + 2p)_+ \in L^\infty(0, T_0; L^{3/2}(\mathbb{R}^3))$ for some $\gamma > 0$, where $\mathcal{F}_\gamma(s) = s[\ln(1+s)]^{1+\gamma}$ and the subscripts “−” and “+” denote the negative and the nonnegative part, respectively, then the solution $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}, p)$ has no singular points in $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, T_0]$. The results are also valid, as a special case, for the Navier–Stokes equations.

1. INTRODUCTION AND FORMULATION OF THE MAIN RESULTS

1.1. The system of MHD equations. The motion of a viscous incompressible electrically conductive fluid in \mathbb{R}^3 in the time interval $(0, T)$ (where $0 < T \leq \infty$), at the absence of an external specific body force and an external magnetic induction, is described by the system of *magneto-hydro-dynamical equations* (which is abbreviated to *MHD equations*)

$$\rho \partial_t \mathbf{u} + \rho \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} - \mu \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{b} \times \mathbf{b} = -\nabla p + \rho \nu \Delta \mathbf{u}, \quad (1)$$

$$\partial_t \mathbf{b} - \operatorname{curl}(\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{b}) = -\xi \operatorname{curl}(\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{b}), \quad (2)$$

$$\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = \operatorname{div} \mathbf{b} = 0. \quad (3)$$

The system is completed by the initial conditions

$$\mathbf{u}|_{t=0} = \mathbf{u}_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{b}|_{t=0} = \mathbf{b}_0. \quad (4)$$

The unknowns are the velocity field \mathbf{u} of the fluid, the magnetic field \mathbf{b} and the pressure p . The coefficients ρ , μ , ν and ξ , which are all supposed to be positive constants, represent the density of the fluid, the magnetic permeability, the kinematic viscosity and the magnetic diffusivity, respectively. We may further assume, without loss of generality, that $\rho = 1$ and $\mu = 1$. Then the equations (1) and (2) can also be written in the form

$$\partial_t \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{b} + \nabla(p + \tfrac{1}{2}|\mathbf{b}|^2) = \nu \Delta \mathbf{u}, \quad (1)$$

$$\partial_t \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} = \xi \Delta \mathbf{b}. \quad (2)$$

1.2. Notation. We denote vector functions and spaces of vector functions by boldface letters. We denote by $\mathbf{C}_{0,\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ the linear space of all infinitely differentiable divergence-free vector functions in \mathbb{R}^3 with a compact support and by $\mathbf{L}_\sigma^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ the closure of $\mathbf{C}_{0,\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ in $\mathbf{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$. We define $\mathbf{W}_\sigma^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3) := \mathbf{W}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3) \cap \mathbf{L}_\sigma^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Finally, we will denote by c a general constant, which may change its value in the same proof.

1.3. Weak solutions, suitable weak solutions, and associated pressure. Given $\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{b}_0 \in \mathbf{L}_\sigma^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$, a pair $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}) \in [L^\infty(0, T; \mathbf{L}_\sigma^2(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^2(0, T; \mathbf{W}_\sigma^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3))]^2$ is said to be a *weak solution* to the system (1)–(3) with the initial conditions (4) if the integral identities

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} [-\mathbf{u} \cdot \partial_t \phi + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} \cdot \phi - \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{b} \cdot \phi + \nu \nabla \mathbf{u} : \nabla \phi] \, dx \, dt &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \phi(\cdot, 0) \, dx \\ \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} [-\mathbf{b} \cdot \partial_t \phi + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{b} \cdot \phi - \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} \cdot \phi + \xi \nabla \mathbf{b} : \nabla \phi] \, dx \, dt &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \mathbf{b}_0 \cdot \phi(\cdot, 0) \, dx \end{aligned}$$

hold for all $\phi \in C_0^\infty([0, T]; \mathbf{C}_{0,\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3))$.

A distribution p in $Q_T := \mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, T)$ is said to be an *associated pressure* if \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b} and p satisfy equations (1)–(3) in the sense of distributions in Q_T .

If (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}) is a weak solution, an associated pressure p is a locally integrable function in Q_T such that the product $p\mathbf{u}$ is also locally integrable in Q_T , and $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}, p$ satisfy the so called *localized energy inequality*

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{Q_T} 2(\nu |\nabla \mathbf{u}|^2 + \xi |\nabla \mathbf{b}|^2) \psi \, dx \, dt \\ &\leq \int_{Q_T} [|\mathbf{u}|^2 (\partial_t \psi + \nu \Delta \psi) + |\mathbf{b}|^2 (\partial_t \psi + \xi \Delta \psi) \\ &\quad + (|\mathbf{u}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}|^2 + 2p)(\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \psi) - 2\mu(\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{b})(\mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla \psi)] \, dx \, dt \end{aligned}$$

for every nonnegative infinitely differentiable scalar function ψ compactly supported in Q_T , then we call $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}, p)$ a *suitable weak solution* to the system (1)–(3).

Note that the existence of a weak solution can be proven by the same method as for the Navier–Stokes equations. The existence of an associated pressure and its smoothness are studied in the paper [18] by J. Neustupa and M. Yang. The sketch of the construction of a suitable weak solution (which is also analogous to the Navier–Stokes equations) can be found in the paper [10] by Ch. He and Z. Xin.

1.4. Regular points and singular points. Throughout the paper we assume that $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}, p)$ is a suitable weak solution to the MHD initial-value problem (1)–(4) in Q_T . A space-time point $(\mathbf{x}_0, t_0) \in Q_T$ is said to be a *regular point* of the solution $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}, p)$ if there exists a neighborhood $U(\mathbf{x}_0, t_0) \subset Q_T$ of this point such that both \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{b} are essentially bounded in $U(\mathbf{x}_0, t_0)$. Other points of Q_T are called singular points. It follows from the paper [14] by A. Mahalov, B. Nicolaenko and T. Shilkin that if (\mathbf{x}_0, t_0) is a regular point of the solution $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}, p)$ then there exists a neighborhood $U(\mathbf{x}_0, t_0)$, such that \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{b} together with all their spatial derivatives (of all orders) are Hölder–continuous in $U(\mathbf{x}_0, t_0)$. Moreover, J. Neustupa and M. Yang [18] showed that the neighborhood $U(\mathbf{x}_0, t_0)$ can be chosen so that $\partial_t \mathbf{u}$ and p together with all their spatial derivatives (of all orders) are essentially bounded in $U(\mathbf{x}_0, t_0)$.

Suppose that $M \subset (0, T)$ and let us denote by \mathcal{S}_M the set of all singular points of the solution $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}, p)$ in $\mathbb{R}^3 \times M$ and by $\mathcal{S}(t_0)$ (for $t_0 \in (0, T)$) the set of all points $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that $(\mathbf{x}, t_0) \in \mathcal{S}_{(0,T)}$. (It should be noted that the question whether $\mathcal{S}_{(0,T)}$ is nonempty is open.) Obviously, the set $\mathcal{S}_{(0,T)}$ is closed in

$\mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, T)$ and the set $\mathcal{S}(t_0)$ is closed in \mathbb{R}^3 . Ch. He and Z. Xin [10] derived a series of criteria for regularity of the solution $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}, p)$ at a given point $(\mathbf{x}_0, t_0) \in Q_T$, from which one can deduce that the 1-dimensional Hausdorff measure of $\mathcal{S}_{(0, T)}$ is zero.

1.5. The choice of the pressure. As the pressure p can be modified by an additive function of t , we fix p so that

$$p(\mathbf{x}, t) + \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2 = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|} \operatorname{div} \operatorname{div} [\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{y}, t) \otimes \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{y}, t) - \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{y}, t) \otimes \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{y}, t)] d\mathbf{y}. \quad (5)$$

This formula comes from the equation

$$\Delta(p + \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{b}|^2) = \operatorname{div} \operatorname{div} [\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{b} \otimes \mathbf{b}] \equiv \partial_i \partial_j (u_i u_j - b_i b_j),$$

which we obtain if we apply the operator div to equation (1). We explain in subsection 2.1 that formula (5) has a sense for all $(\mathbf{x}, t) \in Q_T \setminus \mathcal{S}_{(0, T)}$. The pressure given by (5) satisfies $\nabla p \in L^r(\delta, T; \mathbf{L}^s(\mathbb{R}^3))$ for all $0 < \delta < T$, $1 < r < 2$, and $1 < s < 3/2$ satisfying $2/r + 3/s = 4$ (see Theorem 3 in [18]). The functions \mathbf{u} , \mathbf{b} are supposed to have been modified on a set of measure zero so that both \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{b} are weakly continuous from $(0, T)$ to $\mathbf{L}_\sigma^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$.

1.6. The results of this paper. To neatly formulate our main theorem and write its proof, we introduce the following function. Let γ be a positive parameter and define for $s \geq 0$ the function

$$\mathcal{F}_\gamma(s) := s [\ln(1+s)]^{1+\gamma}. \quad (6)$$

We note that \mathcal{F}_γ is increasing and strictly convex on $[0, \infty)$.

Here is our main theorem:

Theorem 1. *Let $\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{b}_0 \in \mathbf{W}_\sigma^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and let $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}, p)$ be a suitable weak solution of the MHD initial-value problem (1)–(4) in Q_T . Let $0 < T_0 < T$ and suppose that there exists $\gamma > 0$ so that at least one of the conditions*

- a) $\mathcal{F}_\gamma(p_-) \in L^\infty(0, T_0; L^{3/2}(\mathbb{R}^3))$,
- b) $\mathcal{F}_\gamma(\mathcal{B}_+) \in L^\infty(0, T_0; L^{3/2}(\mathbb{R}^3))$, where $\mathcal{B} := \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}|^2 + \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{b}|^2 + p$

holds. Then the set $\mathcal{S}_{(0, T_0]}$ of singular points of the solution $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}, p)$ in $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, T_0]$ is empty. Consequently, the functions \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{b} are Hölder continuous in $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, T_0]$.

Note that the subscripts “−” and “+” denote the negative and nonnegative part, respectively. As the negative part is taken “positively”, e.g. p satisfies $p = p_+ - p_-$. The function \mathcal{B} is the so called *Bernoulli pressure*. Obviously, condition a), respectively b), is satisfied if there exists $q > \frac{3}{2}$ such that p_- , respectively \mathcal{B}_+ , is in $L^\infty(0, T_0; L^q(\mathbb{R}^3))$. It follows from Theorem 1 that if $\mathcal{F}_\gamma(p_-)$ or $\mathcal{F}_\gamma(\mathcal{B}_+)$ lies in $L^\infty(0, T; L^{3/2}(\mathbb{R}^3))$ then $\mathcal{S}_{(0, T)} = \emptyset$.

1.7. Comparison with previous results. In many papers, various authors have formulated sufficient conditions for regularity of a weak solution to the Navier–Stokes equations in terms of an associated pressure. In this context, we quote the papers [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [8], [7], [11], [12], [15], [16], [19], [20] and [21]. A typical idea used in most of the papers is to multiply the Navier–Stokes equation by the function $\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{u}|^\alpha$ with an appropriate $\alpha > 0$ and then to integrate over the spatial domain where the equations are considered. Then the integral of $(\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}) \cdot \mathbf{u}|\mathbf{u}|^\alpha$ is equal to zero whenever \mathbf{u} satisfies the no-slip boundary condition. This method, however, fails in the case of the MHD equations. The reason is that the momentum equation (1) contains, in addition to $\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}$, also the nonlinear term $\mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{b}$, and this term multiplied by $\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{u}|^\alpha$ does not lead to zero. This cannot be compensated by equation (2) multiplied e.g. by $\mathbf{b}|\mathbf{b}|^\alpha$ or anything else. Of papers, based on another method than is the sketched idea, we quote [15], [16] and [19]. In the last cited paper, G. Seregin and V. Šverák consider a suitable weak solution \mathbf{u}, p to the Navier–Stokes equations in $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, \infty)$. The authors say that a scalar function $g : \mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ satisfies condition (C) if to any $t_0 > 0$ there exists $R_0 > 0$ such that

$$A(t_0) := \sup_{\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3} \sup_{t_0 - R_0^2 \leq t \leq t_0} \int_{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0| < R_0} \frac{g(\mathbf{x}, t)}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} d\mathbf{x} < \infty$$

and for each fixed $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and each fixed $R \in (0, R_0]$, the function

$$t \mapsto \int_{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0| < R} \frac{g(\mathbf{x}, t)}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} d\mathbf{x}$$

is left continuous at t_0 . The main result of [19] says that if there exists g satisfying condition (C) so that the normalized pressure

$$p(\mathbf{x}, t) := \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|} [\partial_i u_j \partial_j u_i](\mathbf{y}, t) d\mathbf{y}$$

satisfies

$$|\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2 + 2p(\mathbf{x}, t) \leq g(\mathbf{x}, t) \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3, 0 < t < \infty \quad (7)$$

or

$$p(\mathbf{x}, t) \geq -g(\mathbf{x}, t) \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3, 0 < t < \infty \quad (8)$$

then \mathbf{u} is Hölder-continuous in $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, \infty)$, i.e. \mathbf{u} is regular. The method has been extended by K. Kang and J. Lee to the MHD equations (1)–(3). (See Theorem 1.3 in [13].) The first sufficient condition for regularity of a suitable weak solution $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}, p$ of the MHD system (1)–(3) formulated in [13] coincides with (8). The second condition is similar to (7): it requires

$$|\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2 + |\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2 + 2p(\mathbf{x}, t) \leq g(\mathbf{x}, t) \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3, 0 < t < \infty. \quad (9)$$

Our conditions a) and b), used in Theorem 1, are weaker than conditions (8) and (9) from paper [13], respectively. Thus, our Theorem 1 generalizes Theorem 1.3 from paper [13]. Obviously, if one considers $\mathbf{b} \equiv \mathbf{0}$ then our Theorem 1 also represents a generalization of the results from [19].

1.8. Two auxiliary results. We finish this section by giving two lemmas, which will later clarify the reasons for the use of function \mathcal{F}_γ in conditions a) and b) of Theorem 1.

Lemma 2. *Let $\gamma > 0$ and f a nonnegative measurable function in \mathbb{R}^3 . If $\mathcal{F}_\gamma(f) \in L^{3/2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, then there exists $R_\gamma \in (0, 1]$ such that*

$$\sup_{0 < r < R_\gamma} \sup_{\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3} \left(\frac{(\ln r^{-1})^{1+\gamma}}{r} \int_{B_r(\mathbf{x}_0)} f(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} \right) < \infty. \quad (10)$$

Proof. Let $M_1 := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3; f(\mathbf{x}) \leq 1\}$ and $M_2 := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3; f(\mathbf{x}) > 1\}$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} J_1(\mathbf{x}_0, r) &:= \frac{(\ln r^{-1})^{1+\gamma}}{r} \int_{B_r(\mathbf{x}_0) \cap M_1} f(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x}, \\ J_2(\mathbf{x}_0, r) &:= \frac{(\ln r^{-1})^{1+\gamma}}{r} \int_{B_r(\mathbf{x}_0) \cap M_2} f(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x}. \end{aligned}$$

We clearly have

$$J_1(\mathbf{x}_0, r) \leq \frac{(\ln r^{-1})^{1+\gamma}}{r} \int_{B_r(\mathbf{x}_0)} d\mathbf{x} = \frac{4\pi}{3} r^2 (\ln r^{-1})^{1+\gamma},$$

and $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0+} r^2 (\ln r^{-1})^{1+\gamma} = 0$ after a simple computation. Thus, there exists $\rho_\gamma \in (0, 1]$ such that

$$\sup_{0 < r < \rho_\gamma} \sup_{\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3} J_1(\mathbf{x}_0, r) < 1. \quad (11)$$

Now, we focus on estimating the main term $J_2(\mathbf{x}_0, r)$. We put $g(\mathbf{x}) := f(\mathbf{x}) \chi_{M_2}(\mathbf{x})$ and χ_{M_2} to denote the characteristic function of the set M_2 so that

$$J_2(\mathbf{x}_0, r) = \frac{(\ln r^{-1})^{1+\gamma}}{r} \int_{B_r(\mathbf{x}_0)} g(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x}. \quad (12)$$

We define for $s \geq 0$

$$\Phi_\gamma(s) := \mathcal{F}_\gamma^{3/2}(s) = s^{\frac{3}{2}} [\ln(1+s)]^{\frac{3(1+\gamma)}{2}}. \quad (13)$$

Notice that Φ_γ is increasing and strictly convex on $[0, \infty)$ since \mathcal{F}_γ has the same properties. By Jensen's inequality we have

$$\Phi_\gamma\left(\frac{3}{4\pi r^3} \int_{B_r(\mathbf{x}_0)} g(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x}\right) \leq \frac{3}{4\pi r^3} \int_{B_r(\mathbf{x}_0)} \Phi_\gamma(g)(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x}.$$

Since $\mathcal{F}_\gamma(f) \in L^{3/2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, if we denote

$$c_1 := \frac{3}{4\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_\gamma(g)(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} < \infty, \quad (14)$$

then

$$\Phi_\gamma\left(\frac{3}{4\pi r^3} \int_{B_r(\mathbf{x}_0)} g(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x}\right) \leq r^{-3} c_1.$$

Since Φ_γ is bijective and its inverse function Φ_γ^{-1} is increasing, we have

$$\int_{B_r(\mathbf{x}_0)} g(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} \leq \frac{4\pi r^3}{3} \Phi_\gamma^{-1}(r^{-3} c_1). \quad (15)$$

If we denote

$$A_\gamma(r) := \Phi_\gamma^{-1}(r^{-3}c_1), \quad (16)$$

then combining (12), (15), and (16) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} J_2(\mathbf{x}_0, r) &\leq \frac{4\pi}{3} (\ln r^{-1})^{1+\gamma} r^2 A_\gamma(r) \\ &= \frac{4\pi}{3} \left(\frac{\ln r^{-1}}{\ln(1+A_\gamma(r))} \right)^{1+\gamma} r^2 A_\gamma(r) [\ln(1+A_\gamma(r))]^{1+\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition (13) we have

$$\mathcal{F}_\gamma^{3/2}(A_\gamma(r)) = \Phi_\gamma(A_\gamma(r)) = r^{-3}c_1.$$

Hence $r^2 \mathcal{F}_\gamma(A_\gamma) = c_1^{2/3}$, which is the same as

$$r^2 A_\gamma(r) [\ln(1+A_\gamma(r))]^{1+\gamma} = c_1^{2/3}$$

due to the definition (6). Thus, we get

$$J_2(\mathbf{x}_0, r) \leq \frac{4\pi}{3} c_1^{2/3} \left(\frac{\ln r^{-1}}{\ln(1+A_\gamma(r))} \right)^{1+\gamma}. \quad (17)$$

Notice that

$$\frac{\ln r^{-1}}{\ln(1+A_\gamma(r))} < 1$$

is equivalent to $r^{-1} - 1 < A_\gamma(r)$, which is also equivalent to

$$r^3 \Phi_\gamma(r^{-1} - 1) < r^3 \Phi_\gamma(A_\gamma(r)) = c_1$$

where we have used the fact that Φ_γ is increasing and (16). By definition we have

$$r^3 \Phi_\gamma(r^{-1} - 1) = (r^2 \mathcal{F}_\gamma(r^{-1} - 1))^{3/2}.$$

After some simple computations, we see that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0+} r^2 \mathcal{F}_\gamma(r^{-1} - 1) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0+} r(1-r) (\ln r^{-1})^{1+\gamma} = 0.$$

Thus, there exists a positive number $R_\gamma < \rho_\gamma$ such that

$$\sup_{0 < r < R_\gamma} r^3 \Phi_\gamma(r^{-1} - 1) < c_1.$$

Equivalently, we have

$$\sup_{0 < r < R_\gamma} \frac{\ln r^{-1}}{\ln(1+A_\gamma(r))} < 1. \quad (18)$$

Therefore combining (17) and (18) we get

$$\sup_{0 < r < R_\gamma} \sup_{\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3} J_2(\mathbf{x}_0, r) < \frac{4\pi}{3} c_1^{2/3}. \quad (19)$$

From (11) and (19) we get the desired result (10). \square

Remark 3. An upper bound of (10) can be taken as the sum of the bounds in (11) and (19), which depends only on the $L^{3/2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ norm of $\mathcal{F}_\gamma(f)$.

Lemma 4. Let $\gamma > 0$ and f a nonnegative measurable function in \mathbb{R}^3 . If there exists $R \in (0, 1]$ such that

$$\sup_{0 < r < R} \sup_{\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3} \left(\frac{(\ln r^{-1})^{1+\gamma}}{r} \int_{B_r(\mathbf{x}_0)} f(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} \right) < \infty, \quad (20)$$

then

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \sup_{\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3} \int_{B_r(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{f(\mathbf{x})}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} \, d\mathbf{x} = 0.$$

Proof. Define the measure $d\mu = f(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x}$ on \mathbb{R}^3 . Applying Fubini's theorem we get

$$\int_{B_r(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{f(\mathbf{x})}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_{B_r(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{d\mu}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} = \int_0^\infty \mu\{\mathbf{x} \in B_r(\mathbf{x}_0); |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^{-1} > \xi\} \, d\xi.$$

Replacing $\xi = \zeta^{-1}$ and changing variables we have

$$\int_0^\infty \mu\{\mathbf{x} \in B_r(\mathbf{x}_0); |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^{-1} > \xi\} \, d\xi = \int_0^\infty \mu\{\mathbf{x} \in B_r(\mathbf{x}_0); |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0| < \zeta\} \frac{d\zeta}{\zeta^2}.$$

Splitting the last integral into two parts we define

$$\begin{aligned} D_1(\mathbf{x}_0, r) &:= \int_0^r \mu\{\mathbf{x} \in B_r(\mathbf{x}_0); |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0| < \zeta\} \frac{d\zeta}{\zeta^2}, \\ D_2(\mathbf{x}_0, r) &:= \int_r^\infty \mu\{\mathbf{x} \in B_r(\mathbf{x}_0); |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0| < \zeta\} \frac{d\zeta}{\zeta^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Let c denote the supremum in (20). Then we use the condition (20) to obtain

$$D_1(\mathbf{x}_0, r) = \int_0^r \mu(B_\zeta(\mathbf{x}_0)) \frac{d\zeta}{\zeta^2} = \int_0^r \left(\int_{B_\zeta(\mathbf{x}_0)} f(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} \right) \frac{d\zeta}{\zeta^2} \leq c \int_0^r \frac{\zeta}{(\ln \zeta^{-1})^{1+\gamma}} \frac{d\zeta}{\zeta^2}.$$

Changing variables we have

$$\int_0^r \frac{\zeta}{(\ln \zeta^{-1})^{1+\gamma}} \frac{d\zeta}{\zeta^2} = \int_0^r \frac{1}{\zeta (-\ln \zeta)^{1+\gamma}} \, d\zeta = \int_{-\ln r}^\infty \frac{d\eta}{\eta^{1+\gamma}} = \frac{1}{\gamma (\ln r^{-1})^\gamma}.$$

Thus, we get

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \sup_{\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3} D_1(\mathbf{x}_0, r) \leq c \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\gamma (\ln r^{-1})^\gamma} = 0. \quad (21)$$

Similarly, we use the condition (20) to obtain

$$D_2(\mathbf{x}_0, r) = \int_r^\infty \mu(B_\zeta(\mathbf{x}_0)) \frac{d\zeta}{\zeta^2} = \frac{1}{r} \int_{B_r(\mathbf{x}_0)} f(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} \leq c \frac{1}{(\ln r^{-1})^{1+\gamma}}.$$

Thus, we get

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \sup_{\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3} D_2(\mathbf{x}_0, r) \leq c \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{(\ln r^{-1})^{1+\gamma}} = 0. \quad (22)$$

From (21) and (22) we get the desired result. \square

Corollary 5. Let $\gamma > 0$ and f a nonnegative measurable function in $\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathcal{T}$, where $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathbb{R}$. If

$$\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \|\mathcal{F}_\gamma(f(\cdot, t))\|_{3/2} < \infty,$$

then

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \sup_{\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3} \int_{B_r(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{f(\mathbf{x}, t)}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} \, d\mathbf{x} = 0.$$

Proof. As Remark 3 an upper bound in (10) may depends only on the norm $\|\mathcal{F}_\gamma(f(\cdot, t))\|_{3/2}$, which is uniformly bounded in $t \in \mathcal{T}$. Thus, we conclude the desired result from Lemma 2 and Lemma 4. \square

2. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1 UNDER CONDITION A).

In this section, we suppose that $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}, p)$ is a suitable weak solution to the MHD initial-value problem (1)–(4) in Q_T , satisfying condition a) of Theorem 1. We will prove that $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}, p)$ has no singular points in $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, T_0]$. Assume, by contradiction, that $\mathcal{S}_{(0, T_0]} \neq \emptyset$. Due to the assumption that $\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{b}_0 \in \mathbf{W}_\sigma^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, there exists $T_1 \in (0, T_0)$ such that $\mathcal{S}_{(0, T_1)} = \emptyset$. Thus, the first time instant, when a singular point appears is a point from $[T_1, T_0]$. Let us denote this time instant by t_0 . In accordance with the terminology from [9], we may call it *epoch of irregularity*. (Recall that, generally, $t_0 \in (0, T)$ is said to be an epoch of irregularity of the solution $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}, p)$ if there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\mathcal{S}(t) = \emptyset$ for all $t \in (t_0 - \delta, t_0)$ and $\mathcal{S}(t_0) \neq \emptyset$.)

2.1. More on formula (5). Obviously, the right hand side of formula (5) has a sense at every point $(\mathbf{x}, t) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, T)$ such that $\mathcal{S}(t) = \emptyset$. Let us show that it also has a sense at all regular points (\mathbf{x}, t) of the solution $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}, p)$ which lie on the time level t such that $\mathcal{S}(t) \neq \emptyset$. Thus, let $d > 0$ and \mathbf{x} be a point in \mathbb{R}^3 whose distance from $\mathcal{S}(t)$ is greater than or equal to $2d$. Splitting the integral on the right hand side of (5) to the sum of the integral over $B_d(\mathbf{x})$ and the integral over $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_d(\mathbf{x})$ and applying twice the integration by parts to the integral over $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_d(\mathbf{x})$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|} \operatorname{div} \operatorname{div} [\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{y}, t) \otimes \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{y}, t) - \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{y}, t) \otimes \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{y}, t)] \, d\mathbf{y} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_i \partial y_j} [u_i(\mathbf{y}, t) u_j(\mathbf{y}, t) - b_i(\mathbf{y}, t) b_j(\mathbf{y}, t)] \, d\mathbf{y} \\ &= I_d^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}, t) + I_d^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}, t), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_d^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}, t) &= \int_{B_d(\mathbf{x})} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_i \partial y_j} [u_i(\mathbf{y}, t) u_j(\mathbf{y}, t) - b_i(\mathbf{y}, t) b_j(\mathbf{y}, t)] \, d\mathbf{y} \\ &\quad + \int_{S_d(\mathbf{x})} \frac{n_i^{\mathbf{x}}}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} [u_i(\mathbf{y}, t) u_j(\mathbf{y}, t) - b_i(\mathbf{y}, t) b_j(\mathbf{y}, t)] \, d_y S \\ &\quad - \int_{S_d(\mathbf{x})} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} \left(\frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|} \right) n_j^{\mathbf{x}} [u_i(\mathbf{y}, t) u_j(\mathbf{y}, t) - b_i(\mathbf{y}, t) b_j(\mathbf{y}, t)] \, d_y S, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} I_d^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}, t) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_d(\mathbf{x})} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_i \partial y_j} \left(\frac{1}{|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}|} \right) [u_i(\mathbf{y}, t) u_j(\mathbf{y}, t) - b_i(\mathbf{y}, t) b_j(\mathbf{y}, t)] \, d\mathbf{y} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_d(\mathbf{x})} \mathbb{K}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) : [\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{y}, t) \otimes \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{y}, t) - \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{y}, t) \otimes \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{y}, t)] \, d\mathbf{y}. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Here, $S_d(\mathbf{x})$ is the sphere with center \mathbf{x} and radius d ,

$$\mathbf{n}^{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{y}) \equiv (n_1^{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{y}), n_2^{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{y}), n_3^{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{y})) := \frac{\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|} = \frac{\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}}{d}$$

and $\mathbb{K}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) := \nabla_{\mathbf{y}}^2 |\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}|^{-1}$ is the second order tensor with the entries

$$k_{ij}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_i \partial y_j} \left(\frac{1}{|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}|} \right) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} \frac{y_j - x_j}{|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}|^3} = 3 \frac{(y_i - x_i)(y_j - x_j)}{|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}|^5} - \frac{\delta_{ij}}{|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}|^3}$$

for $i, j = 1, 2, 3$. As all integrals in $I_d^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ and $I_d^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ converge, (5) makes sense. Thus, since $d > 0$ can be chosen arbitrarily small, the pressure is defined by formula (5) at every regular point of $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}, p)$.

2.2. An estimate of \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{b} in the neighborhood of infinity. If a suitable weak solution $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}, p)$ is regular in $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (t_0 - \delta, t_0)$, where $0 \leq t_0 - \delta < t_0 \leq T$, then

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t_0 - \delta \leq t \leq t_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_R(0)} (|\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2 + |\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2) d\mathbf{x} = 0. \quad (25)$$

The same formula is proven in [19] just for a suitable weak solution \mathbf{u} of the Navier–Stokes equations. (See formula (4.6) in [19].) The derivation uses the subtraction of the generalized (i.e. localized) energy equality from the energy equality for solution \mathbf{u} , and on appropriate estimates of the difference. The presence of function \mathbf{b} , as an additional component of the solution, affects the whole procedure only technically. The formula, in the complete form (25) (i.e. for a suitable weak solution $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}, p)$ for the MHD equations), is also used in the proof of Theorem 1.3 in [13].

2.3. Important identities. Let $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $t \in (0, T)$, $R > 0$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. By (5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} |\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{y}|^{-\alpha} \left[p(\mathbf{y}, t) + \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{y}, t)|^2 \right] d\mathbf{y} \\ &= \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \operatorname{div} \operatorname{div} [\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t) \otimes \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t) - \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, t) \otimes \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, t)] \left(\int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{y}|^{-\alpha}}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|} d\mathbf{y} \right) d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} [\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t) \otimes \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t) - \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, t) \otimes \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, t)] \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \left(\int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{y}|^{-\alpha}}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|} d\mathbf{y} \right) d\mathbf{x} \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

One can compute the integral to see that

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{y}|^{-\alpha}}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|} d\mathbf{y} = \frac{4\pi |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^{-\alpha}}{3 - \alpha} \left(-\mathbb{I} + \alpha \frac{(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0) \otimes (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0)}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^2} \right) \quad (27)$$

for $|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0| \leq R$ and

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{y}|^{-\alpha}}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|} d\mathbf{y} = \frac{4\pi R^{3-\alpha}}{3 - \alpha} |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^{-3} \left(-\mathbb{I} + 3 \frac{(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0) \otimes (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0)}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^2} \right) \quad (28)$$

for $|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0| > R$. As the derivation of (27) and (28) is quite technical, we provide its details in Appendix. Substituting formulas (27) and (28) to (26), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^\alpha} \left(p + \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{b}|^2 \right) d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \frac{1}{3 - \alpha} \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^\alpha} \left(-|\mathbf{u}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}|^2 + \alpha |\mathbf{u}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 - \alpha |\mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 \right) d\mathbf{x} \\ &+ \frac{1}{3 - \alpha} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{R^{3-\alpha}}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^3} \left(2|\mathbf{u}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 - |\mathbf{u}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 - 2|\mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 \right) d\mathbf{x}, \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{x}, t) &:= \left(\frac{\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t) \cdot (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0)}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} \right) \frac{\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|}, & \mathbf{u}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{x}, t) &:= \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t) - \mathbf{u}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{x}, t), \\ \mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{x}, t) &:= \left(\frac{\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, t) \cdot (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0)}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} \right) \frac{\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|}, & \mathbf{b}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{x}, t) &:= \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, t) - \mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{x}, t). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mathbf{u}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is the orthogonal projection of $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ to the “radial” direction $\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0$ (radial in the coordinate system centered at the point \mathbf{x}_0) and $\mathbf{u}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is the orthogonal projection of $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ to the plane perpendicular to $\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0$. The same explanation also holds for $\mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ and $\mathbf{b}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{x}, t)$. Equality (29) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{R} \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{R^\alpha}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^\alpha} \left[(3 - \alpha)p + |\mathbf{u}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + (1 - \alpha)|\mathbf{u}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + \frac{1 - \alpha}{2} |\mathbf{b}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + \frac{1 + \alpha}{2} |\mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 \right] d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{R^2}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^3} \left(2|\mathbf{u}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 - |\mathbf{u}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 - 2|\mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 \right) d\mathbf{x}. \end{aligned}$$

Particularly, choosing $\alpha = 1$ and $\alpha = 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} \left(2p + |\mathbf{u}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 \right) d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{1}{R} \left(3p + |\mathbf{u}|^2 + \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{b}|^2 \right) d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{R^2}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^3} \left[2|\mathbf{u}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 - |\mathbf{u}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 - 2|\mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 \right] d\mathbf{x}. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

2.4. The continuity of \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{b} from $(0, t_0]$ to $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$. As the solution $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}, p)$ has no singular points in $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, t_0)$, the norms $\|\mathbf{u}(\cdot, t)\|_2$ and $\|\mathbf{b}(\cdot, t)\|_2$ depend continuously on t for $t \in (0, t_0)$. Our next aim in this subsection is to prove that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow t_0^-} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (|\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t) - \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t_0)|^2 + |\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, t) - \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, t_0)|^2) d\mathbf{x} = 0. \quad (31)$$

We shall use the next lemma:

Lemma 6. *If $\Omega_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is a bounded domain and $0 < \delta < t_0 < T$, then the following implications hold:*

$$\sup_{R>0, \mathbf{x}_0 \in \Omega_0} \frac{1}{R} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t_0-\delta < t < t_0} \|\mathbf{u}(\cdot, t)\|_{2; B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)}^2 < \infty \implies \lim_{t \rightarrow t_0^-} \|\mathbf{u}(\cdot, t) - \mathbf{u}(\cdot, t_0)\|_{2; \Omega_0} = 0, \quad (32)$$

$$\sup_{R>0, \mathbf{x}_0 \in \Omega_0} \frac{1}{R} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t_0-\delta < t < t_0} \|\mathbf{b}(\cdot, t)\|_{2; B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)}^2 < \infty \implies \lim_{t \rightarrow t_0^-} \|\mathbf{b}(\cdot, t) - \mathbf{b}(\cdot, t_0)\|_{2; \Omega_0} = 0. \quad (33)$$

Proof. As the function \mathbf{u} is weakly continuous from $(t_0 - \delta, t_0]$ to $\mathbf{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$, it is also weakly continuous from $(t_0 - \delta, t_0]$ to $\mathbf{L}^2(B_R(\mathbf{x}_0))$. Hence, due to the lower semi-continuity of the norm in $\mathbf{L}^2(B_R(\mathbf{x}_0))$, we have

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t_0-\delta < t < t_0} \|\mathbf{u}(\cdot, t)\|_{2; B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)}^2 = \sup_{t_0-\delta < t \leq t_0} \|\mathbf{u}(\cdot, t)\|_{2; B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)}^2. \quad (34)$$

Then the implication (32) follows from Lemma 3.2 in [19]. Note that the authors of [19] prove an analogous implication in their Lemma 3.2, considering the supremum over $R > 0$, $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \Omega_0$ and $t \in (0, t_0]$ in the premise. However, due to (34), the suprema on the left hand side of (32) are equal to just one supremum over $R > 0$, $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \Omega_0$ and $t \in (0, t_0]$, which means that Lemma 3.2 from [19] can be applied.

The validity of the implication (33) can be confirmed in the same way.

Note that an analogue of Lemma 3.2 from paper [19], which deals just with the Navier–Stokes equations, can also be found in paper [13], which concerns the MHD equations. \square

In order to prove (31), let us at first show that the premises in the implications (32) and (33) in Lemma 6 are satisfied.

Since $\mathcal{F}_\gamma(p_-) \in L^\infty(0, T; L^{3/2}(\mathbb{R}^3))$, there exists set $\mathcal{T} \subset (0, t_0)$ of 1D Lebesgue measure zero such that the norm $\|\mathcal{F}_\gamma(p_-(\cdot, t))\|_{3/2}$ is uniformly bounded for $t \in (0, t_0) \setminus \mathcal{T}$. Then, due to Corollary 5, there exists $R_0 > 0$ such that for all $t \in (0, t_0) \setminus \mathcal{T}$,

$$\sup_{R \in (0, R_0)} \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{p_-(\mathbf{x}, t)}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} \leq 1.$$

Let $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $R \in (0, R_0)$. It follows from the second identity in (30) that at each time $t \in (0, t_0) \setminus \mathcal{T}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{R} \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \left(|\mathbf{u}|^2 + \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{b}|^2 \right) d\mathbf{x} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{R} \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \left(|\mathbf{u}|^2 + \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{b}|^2 + 3[p_+ + p_-] \right) d\mathbf{x} \\ & = \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} \left(2p_+ + |\mathbf{u}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 \right) d\mathbf{x} + \frac{3}{R} \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} p_- d\mathbf{x} \\ & = \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} \left(2p_+ + |\mathbf{u}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 \right) d\mathbf{x} + \frac{3}{R} \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} p_- d\mathbf{x} - \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{2p_-}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} d\mathbf{x}, \end{aligned}$$

which is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B_{R_0}(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} (2p + |\mathbf{u}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2) d\mathbf{x} + \frac{3}{R} \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} p_- d\mathbf{x} + \int_{B_{R_0}(\mathbf{x}_0) \setminus B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{2p_-}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} d\mathbf{x} \\
& \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_{R_0}(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{R^2}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^3} [2|\mathbf{u}_r|^2 - |\mathbf{u}_p|^2 - 2|\mathbf{b}_r|^2 - |\mathbf{b}_p|^2] d\mathbf{x} \\
& \quad + \frac{3}{R} \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} p_- d\mathbf{x} + \int_{B_{R_0}(\mathbf{x}_0) \setminus B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{2p_-}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} d\mathbf{x} \\
& \leq \frac{c}{R_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_{R_0}(\mathbf{x}_0)} (|\mathbf{u}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}|^2) d\mathbf{x} + \int_{B_{R_0}(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{3p_-}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} d\mathbf{x} \\
& \leq \frac{c}{R_0} (\|\mathbf{u}(\cdot, t)\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{b}(\cdot, t)\|_2^2) + 3,
\end{aligned}$$

where the constant c is independent of \mathbf{x}_0 , t , R and R_0 .

We have shown that the terms $R^{-1} \|\mathbf{u}(\cdot, t)\|_{2; B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)}$ and $R^{-1} \|\mathbf{b}(\cdot, t)\|_{2; B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)}$ are bounded above and the bound is independent of \mathbf{x}_0 , t and R for $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $t \in (0, t_0) \setminus \mathcal{T}$ and $R \in (0, R_0)$. If $R > R_0$ then, obviously, $R^{-1} \|\mathbf{u}(\cdot, t)\|_{2; B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \leq R_0^{-1} \|\mathbf{u}(\cdot, t)\|_{2; \mathbb{R}^3} \leq c/R_0$, where the constant c is independent of \mathbf{x}_0 , t , R and R_0 . (The same estimates also hold for function \mathbf{b} .) This shows that the premises in the implications (32) and (33) are true, and the suprema on the left hand sides of (32) and (33) can be even considered over all $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and not only over \mathbf{x}_0 from a bounded domain Ω_0 . Thus, the statements of the implications are also true for any bounded domain Ω_0 in \mathbb{R}^3 . Combining this result with (25), we obtain (31).

2.5. The continuity of $I_d^{(2)}$ in $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, t_0]$. Let $d > 0$. Recall that the function $I_d^{(2)}$ is defined in (24). Assume that a sequence of points $\{(\mathbf{x}_n, t_n)\}$ in $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, t_0]$ converges to a point $(\mathbf{x}_*, t_*) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, t_0]$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Obviously,

$$|I_d^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}_n, t_n) - I_d^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}_*, t_*)| \leq |I_d^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}_n, t_n) - I_d^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}_n, t_*)| + |I_d^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}_n, t_*) - I_d^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}_*, t_*)|. \quad (35)$$

For simplicity, we denote by $\mathbb{U}(\mathbf{y}, t)$ and $\mathbb{B}(\mathbf{y}, t)$ the expressions $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{y}, t) \otimes \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{y}, t)$ and $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{y}, t) \otimes \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{y}, t)$, respectively. Then the first term on the right hand side can be estimated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& |I_d^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}_n, t_n) - I_d^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}_n, t_*)| \\
& = \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_d(\mathbf{x}_n)} \mathbb{K}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_n) : [\mathbb{U}(\mathbf{y}, t_n) - \mathbb{U}(\mathbf{y}, t_*) - \mathbb{B}(\mathbf{y}, t_n) - \mathbb{B}(\mathbf{y}, t_*)] d\mathbf{y} \right| \\
& \leq \frac{c}{d^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (|\mathbb{U}(\mathbf{y}, t_n) - \mathbb{U}(\mathbf{y}, t_*)| + |\mathbb{B}(\mathbf{y}, t_n) - \mathbb{B}(\mathbf{y}, t_*)|) d\mathbf{y}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $t_* \in (0, t_0]$, the right hand side tends to zero for $n \rightarrow \infty$ due to the continuity of $\|\mathbf{u}(\cdot, t)\|_2$ and $\|\mathbf{b}(\cdot, t)\|_2$ for $t \in (0, t_0]$. The second term on the right hand side of (35) can be estimated in the following

way:

$$\begin{aligned}
& |I_d^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}_n, t_*) - I_d^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}_*, t_*)| \\
&= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_d(\mathbf{x}_n)} \mathbb{K}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_n) : [\mathbb{U}(\mathbf{y}, t_*) - \mathbb{B}(\mathbf{y}, t_*)] d\mathbf{y} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_d(\mathbf{x}_*)} \mathbb{K}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_*) : [\mathbb{U}(\mathbf{y}, t_*) - \mathbb{B}(\mathbf{y}, t_*)] d\mathbf{y} \right| \\
&\leq \left| \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_d(\mathbf{x}_n)} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_d(\mathbf{x}_*)} \right) \mathbb{K}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_n) : [\mathbb{U}(\mathbf{y}, t_*) - \mathbb{B}(\mathbf{y}, t_*)] d\mathbf{y} \right| \\
&\quad + \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_d(\mathbf{x}_*)} [\mathbb{K}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_n) - \mathbb{K}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_*)] : [\mathbb{U}(\mathbf{y}, t_*) - \mathbb{B}(\mathbf{y}, t_*)] d\mathbf{y} \right| \\
&= \left| \left(\int_{B_d(\mathbf{x}_*) \setminus B_d(\mathbf{x}_n)} - \int_{B_d(\mathbf{x}_n) \setminus B_d(\mathbf{x}_*)} \right) \mathbb{K}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_n) : [\mathbb{U}(\mathbf{y}, t_*) - \mathbb{B}(\mathbf{y}, t_*)] d\mathbf{y} \right| \\
&\quad + \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_d(\mathbf{x}_*)} [\mathbb{K}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_n) - \mathbb{K}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_*)] : [\mathbb{U}(\mathbf{y}, t_*) - \mathbb{B}(\mathbf{y}, t_*)] d\mathbf{y} \right|. \tag{36}
\end{aligned}$$

If n is so large that $|\mathbf{x}_n - \mathbf{x}_*| < d$ then the first modulus on the right hand side is less than or equal to

$$\frac{c}{d^3} \left(\int_{B_d(\mathbf{x}_*) \setminus B_d(\mathbf{x}_n)} + \int_{B_d(\mathbf{x}_n) \setminus B_d(\mathbf{x}_*)} \right) |\mathbb{U}(\mathbf{y}, t_*) - \mathbb{B}(\mathbf{y}, t_*)| d\mathbf{y},$$

where the constant c is independent of n . This tends to zero for $n \rightarrow \infty$ because both $\mathbb{U}(\cdot, t_*)$ and $\mathbb{B}(\cdot, t_*)$ are in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)^{3 \times 3}$ and the measures of $B_d(\mathbf{x}_*) \setminus B_d(\mathbf{x}_n)$ and $B_d(\mathbf{x}_n) \setminus B_d(\mathbf{x}_*)$ tend to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$. In order to show that the second modulus on the right hand side of (36) also tends to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$, consider n so large that $|\mathbf{x}_n - \mathbf{x}_*| < \frac{1}{2}d$. Then $|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_n| \geq \frac{1}{2}d$ for $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_d(\mathbf{x}_*)$. Obviously, for these \mathbf{y} , the inequality $|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_*| \geq d$ also holds true. Hence

$$|k_{ij}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_n) - k_{ij}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_*)| = \left| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_i \partial y_j} \left(\frac{1}{|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_n|} - \frac{1}{|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_*|} \right) \right| \leq c \frac{|\mathbf{x}_n - \mathbf{x}_*|}{d^4},$$

where the constant c is independent of d , \mathbf{x}_n and \mathbf{x}_* . Thus, the second modulus on the right hand side of (36) is bounded above by

$$c \frac{|\mathbf{x}_n - \mathbf{x}_*|}{d^4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\mathbb{U}(\mathbf{y}, t_*) - \mathbb{B}(\mathbf{y}, t_*)| d\mathbf{y},$$

which tends to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, we have shown that for each $d > 0$, the function $I_d^{(2)}$ is continuous on $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, t_0]$.

2.6. The continuity of p and p_- in $(\mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, t_0]) \setminus \mathcal{S}_{(0, t_0]}$. Recall that points of $\mathcal{S}_{(0, t_0]}$ may appear in $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, t_0]$ only on the time level $t = t_0$, which means $\mathcal{S}_{(0, t_0]} = \mathcal{S}_{\{t_0\}}$. Function p satisfies

$$p(\mathbf{x}, t) = \frac{1}{4\pi} [I_d^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}, t) + I_d^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}, t)],$$

where $I_d^{(1)}$ and $I_d^{(2)}$ are the functions, defined by (23) and (24). Also recall that we have already proven the continuity of $I_d^{(2)}$ in $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, t_0]$ for any $d > 0$ in subsection 2.5. We still need to show that $I_d^{(1)}$ is continuous in $(\mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, t_0]) \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\{t_0\}}$.

Function $I_d^{(1)}$ is continuous at each point $(\mathbf{x}, t) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, t_0]$, whose distance from $\mathcal{S}_{\{t_0\}}$ is greater than or equal to $2d$, due to the Hölder continuity of \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{b} in $B_{2d}((\mathbf{x}, t))$ (the ball in \mathbb{R}^4). Hence the same statement on continuity can also be made on $I_d^{(1)} + I_d^{(2)}$. However, as the sum $I_d^{(1)} + I_d^{(2)}$ is independent of d , because it equals $4\pi p$, it is a continuous function on the whole set $(\mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, t_0]) \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\{t_0\}}$.

Consequently, both p and p_- are continuous functions in $(\mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, t_0]) \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\{t_0\}}$.

2.7. The boundedness of $\|\mathcal{F}_\gamma(p_-(\cdot, t))\|_{3/2}$ up to the epoch of irregularity t_0 . Let Ω_0 be a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^3 and $d > 0$. Since $\mathcal{S}(t_0)$ is a closed subset of \mathbb{R}^3 of 1-dimensional Hausdorff measure zero, we have

$$\int_{\Omega_0} \mathcal{F}_\gamma^{3/2}(p_-(\mathbf{y}, t_0)) \, d\mathbf{y} = \lim_{d \rightarrow 0+} \int_{\Omega_0 \setminus U_d(\mathcal{S}(t_0))} \mathcal{F}_\gamma^{3/2}(p_-(\mathbf{y}, t_0)) \, d\mathbf{y}, \quad (37)$$

which does not exclude that both sides are infinity. (Here, we denote by $U_d(\mathcal{S}(t_0))$ the d -neighborhood of set $\mathcal{S}(t_0)$ in \mathbb{R}^3 .) As $p_-(\cdot, t_0)$ is continuous on $\mathcal{M}_1 := (\mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, t_0]) \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\{t_0\}}$ and $\mathcal{M}_2 := (\overline{\Omega_0} \setminus U_d(\mathcal{S}(t_0))) \times [t_0/2, t_0]$ is a bounded closed subset of \mathcal{M}_1 , the function $\mathcal{F}_\gamma(p_-)$ is uniformly continuous on \mathcal{M}_2 . Hence if we put

$$c_2 := \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{0 < t < t_0} \|\mathcal{F}_\gamma(p_-(\cdot, t))\|_{3/2}^{3/2},$$

then

$$\int_{\Omega_0 \setminus U_d(\mathcal{S}(t_0))} \mathcal{F}_\gamma^{3/2}(p_-(\mathbf{y}, t_0)) \, d\mathbf{y} = \lim_{t \rightarrow t_0-} \int_{\Omega_0 \setminus U_d(\mathcal{S}(t_0))} \mathcal{F}_\gamma^{3/2}(p_-(\mathbf{y}, t_0)) \, d\mathbf{y} \leq c_2.$$

This shows that the integral in the limit on the right hand side of (37) is finite and bounded by c_2 . Since c_2 is independent of d , the integral on the left hand side of (37) is also bounded by c_2 . Since this holds for any bounded domain Ω_0 , the integral $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \mathcal{F}_\gamma^{3/2}(p_-(\mathbf{y}, t_0)) \, d\mathbf{y}$ is bounded by c_2 as well.

2.8. Completion of the proof of Theorem 1 under condition a). In order to deny the existence of a singular point of the suitable weak solution $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}, p)$ on the time level $t = t_0$, we will use the next lemma, which is a special case of Theorem 1.1 in [13].

Lemma 7. *Let $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}, p)$ be a suitable weak solution to the MHD initial-value problem (1)–(4) in Q_T and $(\mathbf{x}_0, t_0) \in Q_T$. There exists $\epsilon_* > 0$ (independent of the solution $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}, p)$ and the point (\mathbf{x}_0, t_0)) such that if $B_{R_*}(\mathbf{x}_0) \times (t_0 - R_*^2, t_0) \subset Q_T$ for some $R_* > 0$ and*

$$\sup_{0 < R < R_*} \sup_{t_0 - R^2 \leq t \leq t_0} \frac{1}{R} (\|\mathbf{u}(\cdot, t)\|_{2; B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)}^2) < \epsilon_*, \quad (38)$$

$$\sup_{0 < R < R_*} \sup_{t_0 - R^2 \leq t \leq t_0} \frac{1}{R} \|\mathbf{b}(\cdot, t)\|_{2; B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)}^2 < \infty \quad (39)$$

then (\mathbf{x}_0, t_0) is a regular point of the solution $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}, p)$.

The proof of Theorem 1 under condition a) can now be completed in this way. Recall that, by assumption, the epoch of irregularity $t_0 \in (0, T_0]$ is the first instant of time when a singular point of the solution $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}, p)$ appears. Let $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Our aim is to show that there exists $R_* > 0$ such that (38) and (39) hold.

Note that due to Corollary 5 and the results of subsection 2.7, we have for all $t \in (0, t_0]$,

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{B_r(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{p_-(\mathbf{x}, t)}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} d\mathbf{x} = 0. \quad (40)$$

Since the norm $\|\mathcal{F}_\gamma(p_-(\cdot, t))\|_{3/2}$ is bounded as a function of t on $(0, t_0]$, the limit in (40) is uniform with respect to $t \in (0, t_0]$. Moreover, at time t_0 , we also have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} \left[|\mathbf{u}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{x}, t_0)|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{x}, t_0)|^2 + 2p_+(\mathbf{x}, t_0) \right] d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} \left[|\mathbf{u}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{x}, t_0)|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{x}, t_0)|^2 + 2p(\mathbf{x}, t_0) \right] d\mathbf{x} + \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{2p_-(\mathbf{x}, t_0)}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} d\mathbf{y} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{R^2}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^3} \left[2|\mathbf{u}_r(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2 - |\mathbf{u}_p(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2 - 2|\mathbf{b}_r(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_p(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2 \right] d\mathbf{y} \\ &\quad + \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{2p_-(\mathbf{x}, t_0)}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} d\mathbf{x} \leq \frac{c}{R} + \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{2p_-(\mathbf{x}, t_0)}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} d\mathbf{x} < \infty \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

due to (30) and (40). Let ϵ_* be the number in Lemma 7. Now, we choose $R_* > 0$ so small that

$$\int_{B_{R_*}(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{2p_-(\mathbf{x}, t)}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} d\mathbf{x} < \frac{\epsilon_*}{4} \quad (42)$$

for all $t \in (0, t_0]$ and

$$\int_{B_{R_*}(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} \left[|\mathbf{u}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{x}, t_0)|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{x}, t_0)|^2 + 2p_+(\mathbf{x}, t_0) \right] d\mathbf{x} < \frac{\epsilon_*}{4}.$$

The latter is possible because the integral on the left hand side of (41) is finite and the integrand is nonnegative. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_{R_*}(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{R_*^2}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^3} \left[2|\mathbf{u}_r(\mathbf{x}, t_0)|^2 - |\mathbf{u}_p(\mathbf{x}, t_0)|^2 - 2|\mathbf{b}_r(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_p(\mathbf{x}, t_0)|^2 \right] d\mathbf{x} \\ &\equiv \int_{B_{R_*}(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} \left[|\mathbf{u}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{x}, t_0)|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{x}, t_0)|^2 + 2p(\mathbf{x}, t_0) \right] d\mathbf{x} \quad (\text{by (30)}) \\ &\leq \int_{B_{R_*}(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} \left[|\mathbf{u}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{x}, t_0)|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{x}, t_0)|^2 + 2p_+(\mathbf{x}, t_0) \right] d\mathbf{x} < \frac{\epsilon_*}{4}. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Applying (31), we deduce that there exists a small positive number δ such that for $t \in (t_0 - \delta, t_0]$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_{R_*}(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{R_*^2}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^3} \left[2|\mathbf{u}_r(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2 - |\mathbf{u}_p(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2 - 2|\mathbf{b}_r(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_p(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2 \right] d\mathbf{x} < \frac{\epsilon_*}{2}.$$

Then, due to (30) and (42), we also have for all $R \in (0, R_*)$ and on each time level $t \in (t_0 - \delta, t_0]$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{R} \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \left(|\mathbf{u}|^2 + \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{b}|^2 \right) d\mathbf{x} \leq \frac{1}{R} \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \left(|\mathbf{u}|^2 + \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{b}|^2 + 3p_+ \right) d\mathbf{x} \\
& = \frac{1}{R} \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \left(|\mathbf{u}|^2 + \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{b}|^2 + 3p \right) d\mathbf{x} + \frac{3}{R} \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} p_- d\mathbf{x} \\
& = \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} \left[|\mathbf{u}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + 2p \right] d\mathbf{x} + \frac{3}{R} \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} p_- d\mathbf{x} \\
& = \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} \left[|\mathbf{u}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + 2p_+ \right] d\mathbf{x} - \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{2p_-}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} d\mathbf{x} + \frac{3}{R} \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} p_- d\mathbf{x},
\end{aligned}$$

which is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B_{R_*}(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} \left[|\mathbf{u}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + 2p \right] d\mathbf{x} \\
& + \int_{B_{R_*}(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{2p_-}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} d\mathbf{x} - \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{2p_-}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} d\mathbf{x} + \frac{3}{R} \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} p_- d\mathbf{x} \\
& = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_{R_*}(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{R_*^2}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^3} \left[2|\mathbf{u}_r|^2 - |\mathbf{u}_p|^2 - 2|\mathbf{b}_r|^2 - |\mathbf{b}_p|^2 \right] d\mathbf{x} \\
& + \int_{B_{R_*}(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{2p_-}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} d\mathbf{x} - \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{2p_-}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} d\mathbf{x} + \frac{3}{R} \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} p_- d\mathbf{x} \\
& \leq \frac{\epsilon_*}{2} + \int_{B_{R_*}(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{3p_-}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} d\mathbf{x} \leq \frac{\epsilon_*}{2} + \frac{3\epsilon_*}{8} < \epsilon_*.
\end{aligned}$$

As this holds independently of R (for $R \in (0, R_*)$) and t (for $t \in (t_0 - \delta, t_0]$), we observe that (38) and (39) hold. Thus, due to Lemma 7, (\mathbf{x}_0, t_0) is a regular point of the solution $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}, p)$. Since \mathbf{x}_0 was chosen arbitrarily in \mathbb{R}^3 , the solution has no singular points on the time level t_0 . This is a contradiction with the assumption that t_0 is an epoch of irregularity. Consequently, the solution $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}, p)$ has no singular points in Q_T . Using the results of [14], we can state that \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{b} are Hölder-continuous in Q_T . The proof of Theorem 1 (under condition a)) is completed.

3. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1 UNDER CONDITION B)

The subsections 2.1–2.5 can be repeated without any changes. In subsection 2.4 (on the left continuity of \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{b} as functions of time in $(0, t_0]$), we used condition a) of Theorem 1. We show in the next subsection 3.1 that the same conclusion (formulated by means of (31)) can also be proven if we consider condition b) instead of condition a).

3.1. The left continuity of \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{b} in the L^2 -norm at an epoch of irregularity. First we recall that $\mathcal{B} = \frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{u}|^2 + \frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{b}|^2 + p$. As in subsection 2.4, we deduce that there exists a set $\mathcal{T} \subset (0, t_0)$ of the 1-dimensional Lebesgue measure zero and $R_0 > 0$ such that for all $t \in (0, t_0) \setminus \mathcal{T}$,

$$\sup_{R \in (0, R_0)} \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{\mathcal{B}_+(\mathbf{x}, t)}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} \leq 1.$$

Let $t \in (0, t_0) \setminus \mathcal{T}$, $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $R_0 > 0$. We will use the identities (30) in the form

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} (2p + |\mathbf{u}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2) d\mathbf{y} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2R} \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} (|\mathbf{u}|^2 + 2|\mathbf{b}|^2) d\mathbf{x} + \frac{3}{2R} \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} (2p + |\mathbf{u}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}|^2) d\mathbf{y} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{R^2}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^3} [2|\mathbf{u}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 - |\mathbf{u}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 - 2|\mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2] d\mathbf{x}. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Then, for $0 < R \leq R_0$ and each time $t \in (0, t_0)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2R} \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} (|\mathbf{u}|^2 + 2|\mathbf{b}|^2) d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \frac{3}{2R} \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} (|\mathbf{u}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}|^2 + 2p) d\mathbf{x} - \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} (|\mathbf{u}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + 2p) d\mathbf{x} \\ &\leq \frac{3}{R} \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \mathcal{B}_+ d\mathbf{x} + \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} [2\mathcal{B}_+ - (|\mathbf{u}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + 2p)] d\mathbf{x} - \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{2\mathcal{B}_+}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} d\mathbf{x} \\ &\leq \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{\mathcal{B}_+}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} d\mathbf{x} + \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} [2\mathcal{B}_+ - (|\mathbf{u}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + 2p)] d\mathbf{x}, \\ &= 3 \int_{B_{R_0}(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{2\mathcal{B}_+}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} d\mathbf{x} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_{R_0}(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{R_0^2}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^3} [2|\mathbf{u}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 - |\mathbf{u}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 - 2|\mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2] d\mathbf{x}. \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

Obviously,

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_{R_0}(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{R_0^2}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^3} [2|\mathbf{u}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 - |\mathbf{u}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 - 2|\mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2] d\mathbf{x} \right| \leq \frac{c}{R_0},$$

where the constant c is independent of \mathbf{x}_0 , t , R and R_0 . The boundedness of the first term on the right hand side of (45), independent of t for $t \in (0, t_0) \setminus \mathcal{T}$, can now be justified by means of the same arguments as the boundedness of the analogous integral in subsection 2.5. The validity of the premises in the implications (32) and (33) can now be also confirmed in the same way as at the end of subsection 2.4. The statements of these implications and (25) imply that (31) holds.

The contents of subsections 2.6 and 2.7 can be copied with the only change that we replace p_- by \mathcal{B}_+ and we also use the Hölder-continuity of \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{b} in the neighborhood of regular points. Instead of subsection 2.8, where the proof of Theorem 1 was completed under condition a), now we have the following subsection 3.2.

3.2. Completion of the proof of Theorem 1 under condition b). Assume the condition b) of Theorem 1 holds. Let t_0 be an epoch of irregularity of the solution $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}, p$. Let $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3$. We will show that there exists $R_* > 0$ such that (38) holds.

Let $R > 0$ and $t \in (t_0 - \delta, t_0]$. Using the identity between the first two lines in (44), and at the end also the identity between the first and the third lines, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2R} \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} (|\mathbf{u}|^2 + 2|\mathbf{b}|^2) \, d\mathbf{x} \\
&= \frac{3}{2R} \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} (|\mathbf{u}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}|^2 + 2p) \, d\mathbf{x} - \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} (|\mathbf{u}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + 2p) \, d\mathbf{x} \\
&\leq \frac{3}{R} \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \mathcal{B}_+ \, d\mathbf{x} - \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{2\mathcal{B}_+}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} \, d\mathbf{x} \\
&\quad + \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} [2\mathcal{B}_+ - (|\mathbf{u}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + 2p)] \, d\mathbf{x} \\
&\leq \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{\mathcal{B}_+}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} \, d\mathbf{x} + \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} (|\mathbf{u}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2) \, d\mathbf{x} \\
&\quad + \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} [2\mathcal{B}_+ - (|\mathbf{u}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}|^2 + 2p)] \, d\mathbf{x}, \tag{46}
\end{aligned}$$

which is finite, because it is the same as

$$\begin{aligned}
& 3 \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{\mathcal{B}_+}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} \, d\mathbf{x} + \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} (|\mathbf{u}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2) \, d\mathbf{x} \\
&\quad - \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} (|\mathbf{u}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}|^2 + 2p) \, d\mathbf{x} \\
&= 3 \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{\mathcal{B}}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} \, d\mathbf{x} - \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} (|\mathbf{u}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + 2p) \, d\mathbf{x} \\
&= 3 \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{\mathcal{B}_+}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} \, d\mathbf{x} \\
&\quad - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{R^2}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^3} [2|\mathbf{u}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 - |\mathbf{u}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 - 2|\mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2] \, d\mathbf{x} \tag{47} \\
&\leq 3 \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{\mathcal{B}_+}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} \, d\mathbf{x} + \frac{c}{R},
\end{aligned}$$

where the constant c is independent of \mathbf{x}_0 , t and R .

Let ϵ_* be the number in Lemma 7. By analogy with (40), we have

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{B_r(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{\mathcal{B}_+(\mathbf{x}, t)}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} \, d\mathbf{x} = 0 \tag{48}$$

uniformly with respect to $t \in (0, t_0]$. Choose $R_* > 0$ so small that

$$3 \int_{B_{R_*}(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{\mathcal{B}_+(\mathbf{x}, t)}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} \, d\mathbf{x} < \frac{\epsilon_*}{4} \tag{49}$$

for all $t \in (0, t_0]$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_{R_*}(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} (|\mathbf{u}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{x}, t_0)|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2) d\mathbf{x} \\ & + \int_{B_{R_*}(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} \left[(|\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t_0)|^2 + |\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, t_0)|^2 + 2p(\mathbf{x}, t_0))_- \right] d\mathbf{x} < \frac{\epsilon_*}{4}. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

This choice of ϵ_* is possible, because of (48) and due to the fact that the second integral in (50) equals the right hand side of (46) (with $R = R_*$ and $t = t_0$), which is finite and consists of three integrals over $B_{R_*}(\mathbf{x}_0)$ with nonnegative integrands. Then, by analogy with (43) and from the comparison of (46) with (47), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{R^2}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^3} [2|\mathbf{u}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 - |\mathbf{u}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 - 2|\mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2] d\mathbf{x} \Big|_{t=t_0} \\ & = - \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{\mathcal{B}_+}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} d\mathbf{x} + \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} (|\mathbf{u}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2) d\mathbf{x} \Big|_{t=t_0} \\ & + \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} (|\mathbf{u}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}|^2 + 2p)_- d\mathbf{x} \Big|_{t=t_0} \leq \frac{\epsilon_*}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

Due to (31), there exists $\delta > 0$ so small that

$$- \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{R^2}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^3} [2|\mathbf{u}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 - |\mathbf{u}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 - 2|\mathbf{b}_r^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_p^{\mathbf{x}_0}|^2] d\mathbf{x} < \frac{\epsilon_*}{2}$$

at all times $t \in (t_0 - \delta, t_0]$. Applying this inequality with (49) and using the fact that the term on the left hand side of (46), which is $(2R)^{-1} \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} (|\mathbf{u}|^2 + 2|\mathbf{b}|^2) d\mathbf{x}$, is equal to the expression in (48), we observe that the inequality

$$\frac{1}{2R} \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} (|\mathbf{u}|^2 + 2|\mathbf{b}|^2) d\mathbf{x} < \frac{\epsilon_*}{4} + \frac{\epsilon_*}{2} = \frac{3\epsilon_*}{4}.$$

holds for all $t \in (t_0 - \delta, t_0]$ and $R \in (0, R_*]$. The proof can now be completed in the same way as in the case of condition a) in Section 2.

APPENDIX

Here, we return to the validity of formulas (27) and (28). Recall that $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $R > 0$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. We have

$$\int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{y}|^{-\alpha}}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|} d\mathbf{y} = \int_0^R r^{-\alpha} \left(\int_{S_r(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{d\mathbf{y} S}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|} \right) dr. \quad (A1)$$

The inside integral over $S_r(\mathbf{x}_0)$ depends on \mathbf{x} only through $|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{x}|$. Thus, we may assume, without loss of generality, that $\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{x} = (0, 0, ra)$, where $a = |\mathbf{x}|/r$. We use the transformation to the spherical coordinates: $\mathbf{y} = (r \cos \varphi \sin \vartheta, r \sin \varphi \sin \vartheta, r \cos \vartheta)$. The Jacobian is equal to $r^2 \sin \vartheta$. Then

$$|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|^2 = |(r \cos \varphi \sin \vartheta, r \sin \varphi \sin \vartheta, r \cos \vartheta - ra)|^2 = r^2 [1 + a^2 - 2a \cos \vartheta],$$

and therefore, using also the change of variables $1 + a^2 - 2a \cos \vartheta = z$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{S_r(\mathbf{0})} \frac{d_y S}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|} &= 2\pi \int_0^\pi \frac{r^2 \sin \vartheta}{r \sqrt{1 + a^2 - 2a \cos \vartheta}} d\vartheta = \frac{\pi r^2}{|\mathbf{x}|} \int_{1+a^2-2a}^{1+a^2+2a} \frac{dz}{\sqrt{z}} \\ &= \frac{2\pi r^2}{|\mathbf{x}|} [\sqrt{z}]_{(1-a)^2}^{(1+a)^2} = \frac{2\pi r^2}{|\mathbf{x}|} [(1+a) \mp (1-a)], \end{aligned}$$

where the sign “ $-$ ” holds if $1 - a \geq 0$, which means $|\mathbf{x}| \leq r$ and “ $+$ ” holds if $1 - a < 0$, which means $|\mathbf{x}| > r$. Thus, returning to a general point \mathbf{x}_0 instead of the special case $\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{0}$, we get

$$\int_{S_r(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{d_y S}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|} = \begin{cases} 4\pi r & \text{if } |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0| \leq r, \\ 4\pi r^2 |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^{-1} & \text{if } |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0| > r. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A2})$$

Let us at first assume that $|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0| < R$. Then, by (A1),

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{y}|}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|} d\mathbf{y} &= \int_0^R r^{-\alpha} \int_{S_r(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{d_y S}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|} dr \\ &= \int_0^{|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{x}|} \frac{4\pi r^{2-\alpha}}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} dr + \int_{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|}^R 4\pi r^{1-\alpha} dr \\ &= \frac{4\pi |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^{2-\alpha}}{3-\alpha} + \frac{4\pi R^{2-\alpha}}{2-\alpha} - \frac{4\pi |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^{2-\alpha}}{2-\alpha} \\ &= \frac{4\pi R^{2-\alpha}}{2-\alpha} - \frac{4\pi |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^{2-\alpha}}{(3-\alpha)(2-\alpha)}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{y}|}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|} d\mathbf{y} = -\frac{4\pi}{(3-\alpha)(2-\alpha)} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}^2 |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^{2-\alpha}. \quad (\text{A3})$$

Since

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}^2 |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^\beta = \beta(\beta - 2) |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^{\beta-4} (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0) \otimes (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0) + \beta |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^{\beta-2}, \quad (\text{A4})$$

equality (A3) (where we use (A4) with $\beta = \alpha - 2$) yields (27).

Suppose now that $|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0| > R$. Then (A1) and (A2) imply that

$$\int_{B_R(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{y}|}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|} d\mathbf{y} = \int_0^R r^{-\alpha} \int_{S_r(\mathbf{x}_0)} \frac{d_y S}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|} dr = \int_0^R \frac{4\pi r^{2-\alpha}}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|} dr = \frac{4\pi R^{3-\alpha}}{3-\alpha} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|}.$$

This together with (A4) (which we use with $\beta = -1$) yields (28).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

J. Neustupa has been supported by the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic (RVO 67985840) and by the Grant Agency of the Czech Republic, grant No. GA19-042435. M. Yang has been supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea No. 2016R1C1B2015731 and No. 2015R1A5A1009350.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Beirão da Veiga: A sufficient condition on the pressure for the regularity of weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations. *J. Math. Fluid Mech.* **2** (2000), 96–106.
- [2] L. Berselli, G. P. Galdi: Regularity criterions involving the pressure for the weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **130** (2002), no. 12, 3585–3595.

- [3] S. Bosia, M. Conti, V. Pata: A regularity criterion for the Navier-Stokes equations in terms of the pressure gradient. *Cent. Eur. J. Math.* **12** (2014), 1015–1025.
- [4] Z. Cai, J. Fan, J. Zhai: Regularity criteria in weak spaces for 3-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations in terms of the pressure. *Differential Integral Equations* **23** (2010), no. 11-12, 1023–1033.
- [5] D. Chae, J. Lee: Regularity criterion in terms of pressure for the Navier-Stokes equations. *Nonlinear Analysis* **46** (2001), 727–735.
- [6] Q. Chen, Z. Zhang: Regularity criterion via the pressure on weak solutions to the 3D Navier-Stokes equations. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **136** (2007), no. 6, 1829–1837.
- [7] J. Fan, S. Jiang, G. Ni: On regularity criteria for the n -dimensional Navier–Stokes equations in terms of the pressure. *J. Differential Equations* **244** (2008), 2963–2979.
- [8] J. Fan, T. Ozawa: Regularity criterion for weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations in terms of pressure. *J. Inequal. Appl.* 2008, article ID 412678, 6 pages, DOI: 10.1155/2008/412678.
- [9] G. P. Galdi: An Introduction to the Navier-Stokes initial-boundary value problem. In *Fundamental Directions in Mathematical Fluid Mechanics*, ed. G. P. Galdi, J. Heywood, R. Rannacher, series “Advances in Mathematical Fluid Mechanics”. Birkhäuser, Basel 2000, pp. 1–98.
- [10] Ch. He, Z. Xin: Partial regularity of suitable weak solutions to the incompressible magnetohydrodynamic equations. *J. Func. Analysis* **227** (2005), 113–152.
- [11] K. Kang, J. Lee: On regularity criteria in conjunction with the pressure of the Navier–Stokes equations. *Internat. Math. Res. Notes* Vol. 2006, Issue 9, Article ID 80762, 25 pp.
- [12] K. Kang, J. Lee: Erratum: On regularity criteria in conjunction with the pressure of the Navier–Stokes equations. *Internat. Math. Res. Notes* Vol. 2010, Issue 9, 1772–1774.
- [13] K. Kang, J. Lee: Interior regularity criteria for suitable weak solutions of the magnetohydrodynamics equations. *J. Diff. Equations* **247** (2009), 2310–2330.
- [14] A. Mahalov, B. Nicolaenko, T. Shilkin: $L_{3,\infty}$ solutions to the MHD equations. *J. of Math. Sci.* **143**, no. 2, 2007, 2911–2923.
- [15] J. Nečas, J. Neustupa: New conditions for local regularity of a suitable weak solution to the Navier-Stokes equations. *J. Math. Fluid Mech.* **4** (2002), 237–256.
- [16] J. Neustupa: A contribution to the theory of regularity of a weak solution to the Navier-Stokes equations via one component of velocity and other related quantities. *J. Math. Fluid Mech.* **20** (2018), no. 3, 1249–1267.
- [17] J. Neustupa: The role of pressure in the theory of weak solutions of the Navier–Stokes equations. In *Fluids under Pressure*, eds. T. Bodnár, G. P. Galdi and Š. Nečasová, to be published by Birkhäuser.
- [18] J. Neustupa, M. Yang: On the pressure in the theory of MHD equations. *Submitted*.
- [19] G. Seregin, V. Šverák: Navier-Stokes equations with lower bounds on the pressure. *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.* **163** (2002), 65–86.
- [20] M. Struwe: On a Serrin-type regularity criterion for the Navier-Stokes equations in terms of the pressure. *J. Math. Fluid Mech.* **9** (2007), 235–242.
- [21] T. Suzuki: Regularity criteria of weak solutions in terms of pressure in Lorentz spaces to the Navier-Stokes equations. *J. Math. Fluid Mech.* **14** (2012), no. 4, 653–660.

J. NEUSTUPA: CZECH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, PRAHA, CZECH REPUBLIC
 E-mail address: neustupa@math.cas.cz

M. YANG: YONSEI UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SEOUL, REPUBLIC OF KOREA
 E-mail address: m.yang@yonsei.ac.kr