

# Existence and convergence of the length-preserving elastic flow of clamped curves

Fabian Rupp\*, Adrian Spener†

March 17, 2024

**Abstract:** We study the evolution of curves with fixed length and clamped boundary conditions moving by the negative  $L^2$ -gradient flow of the elastic energy. For any initial curve lying merely in the energy space we show existence and parabolic smoothing of the solution. Applying previous results on long time existence and proving a constrained Łojasiewicz–Simon gradient inequality we furthermore show convergence to a critical point as time tends to infinity.

**Keywords:** Nonlocal geometric evolution equation, clamped boundary conditions, elastic energy, Willmore functional, Łojasiewicz–Simon gradient inequality.

**MSC(2020)** 53E40 (primary), 35K52, 35K55(secondary).

## 1. Introduction and main results

For an immersed curve  $f: I := [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $d \geq 2$ , its *Euler–Bernoulli energy* or simply *elastic energy* is defined by

$$\mathcal{E}(f) := \frac{1}{2} \int_I |\vec{\kappa}|^2 \, ds.$$

Here  $ds := \gamma \, dx$ , where  $\gamma := |\partial_x f|$  denotes the *arc-length element*, and  $\vec{\kappa} := \partial_s^2 f$  is the *curvature vector field*, where  $\partial_s := \gamma^{-1} \partial_x$  is the *arc-length derivative*.

---

\*Institute of Analysis, Ulm University, Helmholtzstraße 18, 89081 Ulm, Germany.  
fabian.rupp@uni-ulm.de

†Institute of Applied Analysis, Ulm University, Helmholtzstraße 18, 89081 Ulm, Germany.  
adrian.spener@alumni.uni-ulm.de

In this article, we will deform an initial curve  $f_0$  in such a way that its elastic energy decreases as fast as possible, while keeping the *(total) length*  $\mathcal{L}(f) := \int_I ds$  fixed. This yields the geometric evolution equation

$$\partial_t^\perp f = -\nabla_s^2 \vec{\kappa} - \frac{1}{2} |\vec{\kappa}|^2 \vec{\kappa} + \lambda \vec{\kappa}. \quad (1.1)$$

Here  $\nabla_s$  denotes the connection on the normal bundle along  $f$ , given by  $\nabla_s := P^\perp \partial_s$ , where  $P^\perp X := X^\perp := X - \langle X, \partial_s f \rangle \partial_s f$  denotes the orthogonal projection along  $f$  of any vector field  $X$  along  $f$ . The *Lagrange multiplier*  $\lambda$  depends on the solution  $f$  and is given by

$$\lambda(f) = \lambda(f)(t) = \frac{\int_I \langle \nabla_s^2 \vec{\kappa} + \frac{1}{2} |\vec{\kappa}|^2 \vec{\kappa}, \vec{\kappa} \rangle ds}{\int_I |\vec{\kappa}|^2 ds}. \quad (1.2)$$

Here  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  denotes the Euclidean inner product. Note that the evolution (1.1) is *geometric*, i.e. if a smooth  $f$  satisfies (1.1), then so does  $\hat{f}(t, x) := (f \circ \Phi)(t, x) := f(t, \Phi(t, x))$  for any smooth family of reparametrizations  $\Phi: [0, T) \times I \rightarrow I$ . In addition to the evolution (1.1), we will prescribe *clamped boundary conditions*, fixing position and the unit tangent of the curve at the endpoints of  $I$ . For an immersed curve  $f_0$  we hence study the following initial boundary value problem.

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t f &= -\nabla_s^2 \vec{\kappa} - \frac{1}{2} |\vec{\kappa}|^2 \vec{\kappa} + \lambda \vec{\kappa} + \theta \partial_s f & \text{on } (0, T) \times I \\ f(0, x) &= f_0(x) & \text{for } x \in I \\ f(t, y) &= p_y & \text{for } 0 \leq t < T, y \in \partial I \\ \partial_s f(t, y) &= \tau_y & \text{for } 0 \leq t < T, y \in \partial I, \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

where the unknown  $\theta: [0, T) \times I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\theta = \langle \partial_t f, \partial_s f \rangle$  is the *tangential velocity*. By the integral representation of  $\lambda$ , (1.3) becomes a *nonlocal quasilinear system* which is also *degenerate* parabolic by its geometric nature. We assume that the boundary data  $p_y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \tau_y \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  satisfy the *compatibility conditions*

$$f_0(y) = p_y \text{ and } \partial_s f_0(y) = \tau_y \quad \text{for } y \in \partial I. \quad (1.4)$$

Note that (1.3) is preserved under a smooth family of reparametrizations  $\Phi$  which keeps the boundary  $\partial I$  fixed, where the tangential velocity might change.

It is not difficult to see that  $\lambda$  is chosen exactly in such a way that the length remains fixed during the flow, since along any sufficiently smooth solution of (1.3) we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{L}(f) = - \int_I \langle \vec{\kappa}, \partial_t f \rangle ds = \int_I \langle \nabla_s^2 \vec{\kappa} + \frac{1}{2} |\vec{\kappa}|^2 \vec{\kappa}, \vec{\kappa} \rangle ds - \lambda \int_I |\vec{\kappa}|^2 ds = 0, \quad (1.5)$$

whereas the energy indeed decreases since by (1.5)

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{E}(f) = \int_I \langle \nabla \mathcal{E}(f), \partial_t f \rangle ds = \int_I \langle \nabla \mathcal{E}(f) - \lambda \vec{\kappa}, \partial_t^\perp f \rangle ds = - \int_I |\partial_t^\perp f|^2 ds, \quad (1.6)$$

using that the  $L^2(ds_f)$ -gradient of  $\mathcal{E}$  is given by  $\nabla \mathcal{E}(f) = \nabla_s^2 \vec{\kappa} + \frac{1}{2} |\vec{\kappa}|^2 \vec{\kappa}$ . In the above calculations, we also used the fact that all boundary terms vanish due to the boundary

conditions. In order for  $\lambda$  to be well-defined, we need to ensure that  $f(t) := f(t, \cdot)$  is not a piece of a straight line. This can be guaranteed with no restrictions on  $\tau_0, \tau_1$  by requiring

$$|p_0 - p_1| < \ell := \mathcal{L}(f_0), \quad (1.7)$$

so  $\mathcal{E}(f_0) > 0$ , see Section 2.1 for a more detailed analysis of  $\lambda$ .

In [9], long time existence for smooth solutions of (1.3) with tangential velocity  $\theta \equiv 0$  under assumption (1.7) was shown with the help of interpolation inequalities. For the short time existence the authors of [9] refer to the beginning of Section 3 in [14], where the short time existence in the setting of Hölder spaces is only sketched for the case of closed curves. Moreover, the uniform bounds in [9, Theorem 1.1] imply subconvergence after reparametrization as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . However, different sequences could still have different limits.

The contribution of this paper is twofold: First, we show short time existence and parabolic smoothing for the elastic flow (1.3), filling the missing part in the long time existence. Note that we allow rough initial values, lying merely in the natural *energy space*, see Remark 2.19 for a detailed discussion.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $f_0 \in W^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$  be an immersed curve and suppose  $p_0, p_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\tau_0, \tau_1 \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$  satisfy (1.4) and (1.7). Then, there exists  $T > 0$  and a solution  $f \in W^{1,2}(0, T; L^2(I, \mathbb{R}^d)) \cap L^2(0, T; W^{4,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$  of (1.3).*

Moreover, we show that under the assumptions (1.4) and (1.7), the solution in Theorem 1.1 instantaneously becomes smooth, both in space and time, cf. Theorem 3.1.

Secondly we prove and apply a *constrained Łojasiewicz–Simon gradient inequality* (cf. [33]) to deduce convergence of the flow, where a new estimate (see Lemma 4.10) substantially simplifies the argument for the convergence result compared to previous works, cf. [6, 12].

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $f_0 \in W^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$  be an immersed curve and suppose  $p_0, p_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\tau_0, \tau_1 \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$  satisfy (1.4) and (1.7). Then, there exists a smooth family of curves  $f: (0, \infty) \times I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  solving (1.3), such that*

- (i)  $f(t) \rightarrow f_0$  in  $W^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$  as  $t \rightarrow 0$ ;
- (ii)  $f(t) \rightarrow f_\infty$  smoothly after reparametrization as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $f_\infty$  is a constrained clamped elastica, i.e. to a solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\nabla_s^2 \vec{\kappa} - \frac{1}{2} |\vec{\kappa}|^2 \vec{\kappa} + \lambda \vec{\kappa} = 0 & \text{on } I \\ f(y) = p_y & \text{for } y \in \partial I \\ \partial_s f(y) = \tau_y & \text{for } y \in \partial I \end{cases} \quad (1.8)$$

for some  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ .

Together with the previously mentioned work [9] this paper completes the study of the existence and convergence of the elastic flow of clamped curves with fixed length.

Unfortunately, due to the low regularity of the initial curves considered here, we are not able to show uniqueness for the solution of the geometric evolution equation (1.3).

In the smooth category, one can show uniqueness “up to reparametrization” by a PDE argument similar to [18]. However, due to our low regularity we were not able to prove sufficient contraction estimates. The reason for that is the rigid characterization of Lipschitz properties of Nemytskii operators, see for instance [4, Theorem 3.10, Theorem 7.9].

The elastic energy of curves has already been studied by Bernoulli. The analysis of the elastic flow, i.e. the one-dimensional analogue of the Willmore flow started with [31] and [14]. The boundary value problem for the elastic flow was considered in [22] for clamped curves and in [8] for natural second-order boundary conditions, see also [38, 23] for a related second order evolution of the *indicatrix*. In [29], the elastic flow of curves with infinite length was studied. Short time existence for the *length-penalized* elastic flow of clamped curves with initial data in  $\mathcal{C}^{2+\varepsilon}$  was established in [36]. Note that in [20], short time existence for the Willmore flow with small rough initial data was shown.

Recently the geometric evolution of networks gained more attention and previously achieved results were applied to the elastic flow of networks, see e.g. [17] and [10]. The elastic flow with different ambient geometries also gained attention, cf. [7, 28, 32]. In the hyperbolic plane, the elastic energy has a close relationship to the Willmore energy of rotational tori, see [21] and, for instance, [11].

The Łojasiewicz–Simon gradient inequality is a remarkable result on (*real*) *analytic* functions which was first proven in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  [24], and later generalized to infinite dimensions [34], see also [5]. Nowadays, it is the fundamental tool for investigating the asymptotic properties of gradient flows with analytic energies, which has been used for many geometric evolution equations, see for instance [6, 12, 16, 26]. The fixed-length constraint in (1.3) and (1.5) obstructs the use of [5] to deduce the gradient inequality, which is why we apply a recent extension to constrained energies [33]. A different approach to prove convergence for gradient flows of planar curves has been studied in [30].

This article is structured as follows. In Section 2, we pick a specific tangential velocity such that (1.3) becomes a parabolic system, which we reduce to a fixed point equation. The existence of a fixed point is then established on a small time interval, using the concept of maximal  $L^p$ -regularity together with appropriate contraction estimates. Section 3 is devoted to proving instantaneous smoothing of our solution, both in space and time. After that, we show long-time existence and a refined Łojasiewicz–Simon gradient inequality to finally prove Theorem 1.2 in Section 4.

## 2. Short time existence

The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 1.1. As in [17], we prescribe an explicit tangential motion to transform (1.3) into quasilinear parabolic PDE system. We then perform a linearization and use the theory of maximal  $L^p$ -regularity and suitable contraction estimates to prove Theorem 1.1 using a fixed point argument. We consider

an initial datum merely lying in  $W_{Imm}^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ , the space of  $W^{2,2}$ -immersions. This is a natural space for the elastic energy, since it is the roughest Sobolev space where  $\mathcal{E}$  remains finite.

## 2.1. On the Lagrange multiplier

To ensure that the Lagrange multiplier is well-defined, one needs to prevent the denominator from vanishing. We write  $\lambda(f) =: \frac{N(f)}{2\mathcal{E}(f)}$ , where  $N(f)$  denotes the numerator in (1.2) and observe that for a solution of (1.3) we have

$$|f(t, 0) - f(t, 1)| = |p_0 - p_1| < \ell = \mathcal{L}(f(t)) \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T],$$

using the boundary conditions, (1.7) and (1.5). In particular,  $f(t)$  cannot be part of a straight line, so  $\mathcal{E}(f(t)) > 0$  for all  $t \in [0, T]$ .

Moreover, we observe that after integration by parts we have

$$N(f) = \int_I \langle \nabla \mathcal{E}(f), \vec{\kappa} \rangle ds = \langle \nabla_s \vec{\kappa}, \vec{\kappa} \rangle|_{\partial I} - \int_I |\nabla_s \vec{\kappa}|^2 ds + \frac{1}{2} \int_I |\vec{\kappa}|^4 ds. \quad (2.1)$$

Note that in (2.1), no derivatives of second order of the curvature appear, which means that the Lagrange multiplier is formally of lower order compared to  $\nabla \mathcal{E}(f)$ . This will be extremely useful later on, since we can rely on the well-studied property of maximal  $L^p$ -regularity for a local operator in the linearization and treat the Lagrange multiplier as a nonlinearity in the fixed point argument.

## 2.2. From the geometric problem to a quasilinear PDE

As a next step, we explicitly compute the right hand side of (1.1). By Proposition A.1, it holds

$$\nabla \mathcal{E}(f) = \nabla_s^2 \vec{\kappa} + \frac{1}{2} |\vec{\kappa}|^2 \vec{\kappa} = \mathcal{A}(f)^\perp,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}(f) &:= \frac{\partial_x^4 f}{\gamma^4} - 6 \frac{\langle \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x f \rangle}{\gamma^6} \partial_x^3 f - 4 \frac{\langle \partial_x^3 f, \partial_x f \rangle}{\gamma^6} \partial_x^2 f - \frac{5}{2} \frac{|\partial_x^2 f|^2}{\gamma^6} \partial_x^2 f + \frac{35}{2} \frac{\langle \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x f \rangle^2}{\gamma^8} \partial_x^2 f \\ &=: \frac{\partial_x^4 f}{\gamma^4} + \tilde{F}(\gamma^{-1}, \partial_x f, \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x^3 f). \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

In order to solve (1.3), we study the following evolution problem, prescribing an explicit tangential motion  $\theta = \mu$  to make the problem parabolic. We want to find a family of immersions  $f: [0, T) \times I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t f &= -\nabla_s^2 \vec{\kappa} - \frac{1}{2} |\vec{\kappa}|^2 \vec{\kappa} + \mu \partial_s f + \lambda \vec{\kappa} & \text{on } (0, T) \times I \\ f(0, x) &= f_0(x) & \text{for } x \in I \\ f(t, y) &= p_y & \text{for } 0 \leq t < T, y \in \partial I \\ \partial_x f(t, y) &= \tau_y \gamma_0(y) & \text{for } 0 \leq t < T, y \in \partial I. \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

with  $\lambda$  as in (1.2) and  $\mu = \mu(f) : [0, T] \times I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  given by  $\mu := -\langle \mathcal{A}(f), \partial_s f \rangle$ . Note that the first order boundary conditions are a linear version of the general boundary conditions in (1.3), and thus easier to handle. The system (2.3) is often referred to as the *analytic problem*.

For  $1 < p < \infty$  and  $T > 0$ , we consider the space of solutions

$$\mathbb{X}_{T,p} := W^{1,p} \left( 0, T; L^p(I; \mathbb{R}^d) \right) \cap L^p \left( 0, T; W^{4,p}(I; \mathbb{R}^d) \right)$$

and the space of data

$$\mathbb{Y}_{T,p}^1 := L^p \left( 0, T; L^p(I; \mathbb{R}^d) \right).$$

The space of initial data is given by the *Besov space*

$$\mathbb{Y}_p^2 := \{f(0) \mid f \in \mathbb{X}_{T,p}\} = B_{p,p}^{4(1-\frac{1}{p})}(I; \mathbb{R}^d),$$

see for instance [13, Section 2]. We also consider the solution space with vanishing trace at time  $t = 0$  given by

$${}_0\mathbb{X}_{T,p} := \{f \in \mathbb{X}_{T,p} \mid f(0) = 0\}.$$

For convenience, we also set  $\mathbb{Y}_{T,p} := \mathbb{Y}_{T,p}^1 \times \mathbb{Y}_p^2$ .

### 2.3. Linearization of the analytic problem

If we linearize (2.3) for  $\lambda \equiv 0$ , we obtain a linear parabolic system. This system is a local PDE which we can apply maximal regularity theory to. First, assuming  $\lambda \equiv 0$  and using (2.2), the evolution in (2.3) has the form

$$\partial_t f = -\mathcal{A}(f) =: -\frac{\partial_x^4 f}{\gamma^4} - \tilde{F}(\gamma^{-1}, \partial_x f, \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x^3 f)$$

with  $\mathcal{A}$  as in (2.2). If we freeze coefficients for the highest order term at the initial datum  $f_0$  we get

$$\partial_t f + \frac{\partial_x^4 f}{\gamma_0^4} = \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_0^4} - \frac{1}{\gamma^4} \right) \partial_x^4 f - \tilde{F}(\gamma^{-1}, \partial_x f, \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x^3 f) =: F(\gamma^{-1}, \partial_x f, \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x^3 f, \partial_x^4 f), \quad (2.4)$$

where  $\gamma_0 := \gamma(0, \cdot) = |\partial_x f_0|$  and  $\tilde{F}$  as in (2.2). The linearized system we associate to (2.3) with  $\lambda \equiv 0$  is

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t f + \frac{1}{\gamma_0^4} \partial_x^4 f &= F & \text{on } (0, T) \times I \\ f(0, x) &= f_0(x) & \text{for } x \in I \\ f(t, y) &= p_y & \text{for } 0 \leq t < T, y \in \partial I \\ \partial_x f(t, y) &= \tau_y \gamma_0(y) & \text{for } 0 \leq t < T, y \in \partial I. \end{cases} \quad (2.5)$$

We can now apply the general  $L^p$ -theory for parabolic systems to obtain the following maximal regularity result. For the definition of the spaces for the boundary data  $\mathcal{D}_{T,p}^i$  with  $i = 0, 1$ , see (B.2).

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $p \in (1, \infty)$ ,  $0 < T \leq T_0$ . Suppose  $a \in \mathcal{C}([0, T_0] \times I; \mathbb{R})$  such that  $a(t, x) \geq \alpha$  for some  $\alpha > 0$  and all  $t \in [0, T_0], x \in I$ . Let  $(\psi, f_0) \in \mathbb{Y}_{T,p}$ ,  $b^0 \in \mathcal{D}_{T,p}^0$  and  $b^1 \in \mathcal{D}_{T,p}^1$  such that the following compatibility conditions are satisfied:*

$$\begin{aligned} b^0(0, y) &= f_0(y) & \text{for } y \in \partial I, \\ b^1(0, y) &= \partial_x f_0(y) & \text{for } y \in \partial I. \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

*Then, there exists a unique  $f \in \mathbb{X}_{T,p}$  such that*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t f + a \partial_x^4 f &= \psi & \text{on } (0, T) \times I \\ f(0, x) &= f_0(x) & \text{for } x \in I \\ f(t, y) &= b^0(t, y) & \text{for } 0 \leq t < T, y \in \partial I \\ \partial_x f(t, y) &= b^1(t, y) & \text{for } 0 \leq t < T, y \in \partial I, \end{cases} \quad (2.7)$$

*and there exists  $C = C(p, T, a) > 0$  such that*

$$\|f\|_{\mathbb{X}_{T,p}} \leq C \left( \|\psi\|_{\mathbb{Y}_{T,p}^1} + \|f_0\|_{\mathbb{Y}_p^2} + \|b^0\|_{\mathcal{D}_{T,p}^0} + \|b^1\|_{\mathcal{D}_{T,p}^1} \right). \quad (2.8)$$

*Moreover, if  $b^0 = 0$  and  $b^1 = 0$ , then we may choose  $C = C(p, T_0, a)$  independent of  $T \leq T_0$ .*

*Proof.* This follows from the maximal  $L^p$ -regularity of the elliptic operator  $a \partial_x^4$ , cf. [13, Theorem 2.1]. As in [36, p. 19] one can check that the boundary values satisfy the Lopatinskiĭ—Shapiro condition. In order to prove that one might choose  $C$  independent of  $T \leq T_0$  in the case of zero boundary data let  $b^0 = b^1 = 0$ . For  $\psi \in \mathbb{Y}_{T,p}^1$  we let  $\bar{\psi} \in \mathbb{Y}_{T_0,p}^1$  be its extension by zero. Let  $\bar{f}$  be the unique solution to (2.7) with right hand side  $\bar{\psi}$ ,  $\bar{f}_0 = f_0$  and boundary data  $\bar{b}^0 = \bar{b}^1 = 0$ . Then, by (2.8) we have for  $C(p, T_0, a) > 0$

$$\|\bar{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_{T_0,p}} \leq C \left( \|\bar{\psi}\|_{\mathbb{Y}_{T_0,p}^1} + \|\bar{f}_0\|_{\mathbb{Y}_p^2} \right) = C \left( \|\psi\|_{\mathbb{Y}_{T,p}^1} + \|f_0\|_{\mathbb{Y}_p^2} \right).$$

Note that by uniqueness, the solution  $f$  to (2.7) with right hand side  $\psi$ ,  $f_0$  and boundary data  $b^0 = b^1 = 0$  equals the restriction  $\bar{f}|_{[0,T]}$ , and hence

$$\|f\|_{\mathbb{X}_{T,p}} \leq \|\bar{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_{T_0,p}} \leq C \left( \|\psi\|_{\mathbb{Y}_{T,p}^1} + \|f_0\|_{\mathbb{Y}_p^2} \right). \quad \square$$

Now, we want to solve (2.3) for initial data  $f_0 \in W^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$  using a fixed point argument. Note that  $B_{2,2}^2(I; \mathbb{R}^d) = W^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$  by (B.1), so  $p = 2$  is a fine setup to deal with the desired initial data, see Remark 2.19 for a more detailed discussion.

We observe that the linearized system (2.5) can be viewed as a special case of Theorem 2.1 with  $a = \frac{1}{\gamma_0^4}$ ,  $b^0 = (p_0, p_1)$ ,  $b^1 = (\tau_0, \tau_1)$  and  $\psi = F$ .

Throughout the rest of this section, we will exclusively work with  $p = 2$ . To simplify notation the spaces  $\mathbb{X}_T, \mathbb{Y}_T, \mathcal{D}^0, \mathcal{D}^1$  will denote the respective spaces with  $p = 2$ .

## 2.4. Contraction estimates

The key ingredient in the proof of the short time existence is a contraction estimate for the nonlinearity in (2.3). We fix an initial datum  $f_0 \in W_{Imm}^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$  and boundary conditions  $p_0, p_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\tau_0, \tau_1 \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$  satisfying (1.4) and (1.7). For a *reference flow*  $\bar{f} \in \mathbb{X}_{T_0}$  with  $\bar{f}(0) = f_0$ , and  $M, T > 0$  we define

$$\bar{B}_M := \{f \in \mathbb{X}_T \mid f(0) = f_0 \text{ and } \|f - \bar{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} \leq M\}. \quad (2.9)$$

We will denote by  $T$  the *existence time* and by  $M$  the *contraction radius*. Although they shall be specified later on, we will always assume the a priori bounds  $M \in (0, M_0]$  and  $T \in (0, T_0]$  for finite  $0 < M_0, T_0 < \infty$ . Later we will choose a specific reference flow  $\bar{f}$ , see Definition 2.13.

### 2.4.1. Controlling the arc-length element and the energy

First, the following lemma yields uniform bounds from below on the arc-length element for small times, using that  $f_0$  is an immersion.

**Lemma 2.2.** *For  $T = T(T_0, M_0, \bar{f}) > 0$  small enough and  $M \in (0, M_0]$ , any  $f \in \bar{B}_M$  satisfies  $\gamma(t, x) \geq \inf_I \frac{\gamma_0}{2}$  for all  $(t, x) \in [0, T) \times I$ . In particular, all curves  $f(t, \cdot)$  are immersed.*

*Proof.* By assumption,  $f_0$  is an immersed curve. Using Proposition B.1 (ii), we have  $f \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha([0, T]; \mathcal{C}^1(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$ , for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Moreover, there exists  $C = C(T_0) > 0$  such that for  $t \in [0, T]$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|f(t) - f(0)\|_{\mathcal{C}^1(I; \mathbb{R}^d)} &\leq \|f\|_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha(0, T; \mathcal{C}^1(I; \mathbb{R}^d))} T^\alpha \\ &\leq \left( \|f - \bar{f}\|_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha(0, T; \mathcal{C}^1(I; \mathbb{R}^d))} + \|\bar{f}\|_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha(0, T; \mathcal{C}^1(I; \mathbb{R}^d))} \right) T^\alpha \\ &\leq \left( C(T_0)M_0 + \|\bar{f}\|_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha(0, T; \mathcal{C}^1(I; \mathbb{R}^d))} \right) T^\alpha, \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

where  $C(T_0)$  is the constant in the embedding in Proposition B.1 (ii), using that  $f - \bar{f}$  has trace zero at  $t = 0$ . In particular, for  $T = T(T_0, M_0, \bar{f}, \alpha) > 0$  small enough and  $(t, x) \in [0, T) \times I$ , we have

$$|\partial_x f(t, x)| \geq \inf_I |\partial_x f_0(x)| - |\partial_x f(t, x) - \partial_x f(0, x)| \geq \frac{\inf_I \gamma_0}{2}. \quad \square$$

Moreover, in order to control the Lagrange multiplier, we will need a uniform lower bound on the elastic energy.

**Lemma 2.3.** *There exist  $T = T(\bar{f})$  and  $M = M(T_0) > 0$  such that  $\mathcal{E}(f(t)) \geq \frac{\mathcal{E}(f_0)}{3} > 0$  (cf. (1.7)) for all  $t \in [0, T)$ ,  $f \in \bar{B}_M$ .*

*Proof.* First, we have the following estimate

$$\mathcal{E}(f(t)) \geq \mathcal{E}(f_0) - |\mathcal{E}(f_0) - \mathcal{E}(\bar{f}(t))| - |\mathcal{E}(\bar{f}(t)) - \mathcal{E}(f(t))|.$$



By Proposition B.1 (i) and (B.1),  $\bar{f} \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; W^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$ . Consequently, the map  $t \mapsto \bar{f}(t) \in W^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$  is continuous and so is  $t \mapsto \mathcal{E}(\bar{f}(t))$  since the elastic energy is analytic and whence continuous on the space of  $W^{2,2}$ -immersions, cf. Proposition 4.4. Consequently, for  $T = T(f) > 0$  small enough, we have

$$|\mathcal{E}(f_0) - \mathcal{E}(\bar{f}(t))| \leq \frac{\mathcal{E}(f_0)}{3} \text{ for all } 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

On the other hand, by continuity of  $\mathcal{E}$  on  $W^{2,2}$  we find  $\delta = \delta(f_0) > 0$  such that

$$|\mathcal{E}(g) - \mathcal{E}(f_0)| \leq \frac{\mathcal{E}(f_0)}{3} \text{ for all } \|g - f_0\|_{W^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \delta.$$

Therefore, using Proposition B.1 (i) and (B.1), there exists  $C = C(T_0)$  such that for all  $t \in [0, T]$  we have

$$\|f(t) - \bar{f}(t)\|_{W^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C(T_0)\|f - \bar{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} \leq \delta$$

if we take  $M = M(T_0)$  small enough. Again we used that  $f - \bar{f}$  has trace zero at  $t = 0$ . The claim follows.  $\square$

#### 2.4.2. Estimates for the nonlinearities

First, the following definition describes the structure of the nonlinearities in (2.3) which guarantees the desired contraction properties.

**Definition 2.4.** Let  $(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2$ . We denote by  $A^{(a,b)}$  the set of bounded multilinear maps

$$\varphi: (\mathbb{R}^d)^m \times (\mathbb{R}^d)^a \times (\mathbb{R}^d)^b \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^w \quad (2.11)$$

for some  $w \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . Then, we define the set  $\mathcal{A}^{(a,b)}$  of multilinear maps of type  $(a, b)$  as the set of all maps  $f \mapsto \Phi(f)$  acting via

$$\begin{aligned} & \Phi(f)(t, x) \\ &= \varphi\left(\underbrace{\partial_x f(t, x), \dots, \partial_x f(t, x)}_{m\text{-times}}, \underbrace{\partial_x^2 f(t, x), \dots, \partial_x^2 f(t, x)}_{a\text{-times}}, \underbrace{\partial_x^3 f(t, x), \dots, \partial_x^3 f(t, x)}_{b\text{-times}}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^w, \end{aligned}$$

for almost every  $(t, x) \in (0, T) \times I$  where  $\varphi \in A^{(a,b)}$ .

**Remark 2.5.** Note that we do not keep track of  $m$ , the number of first order derivatives appearing in  $\Phi \in \mathcal{A}^{(a,b)}$ . This is justified since by Proposition B.1 (ii), the derivatives of first order of  $f \in \mathbb{X}_T$  are in  $\mathcal{C}([0, T] \times I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ , and hence do not affect the integrability of  $\Phi(f)$ .

**Example 2.6.** The map  $f \mapsto \Phi(f) = \langle \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x f \rangle \partial_x^3 f$  is in  $\mathcal{A}^{(1,1)}$ , since the derivatives of second and third order only appear linearly.

The following proposition yields for which parameters  $(a, b)$  we get a contraction. Note that nonlinearities with these structure appear in  $\tilde{F}$  in (2.2) and  $\lambda$  in (2.1).

**Proposition 2.7.** *Let  $q \in (0, 1)$  and let  $\Phi \in \mathcal{A}^{(a,b)}$ . Then, for  $T, M > 0$  small enough, each of the following nonlinear maps is a well-defined,  $q$ -contraction, i.e. Lipschitz with Lipschitz constant  $q$ .*

- (i)  $\bar{B}_M \rightarrow L^2(0, T; L^2), f \mapsto \Phi(f)$ , if  $(a, b) = (1, 1)$  or  $(a, b) = (3, 0)$ .
- (ii)  $\bar{B}_M \rightarrow L^2(0, T), f \mapsto \int_I \Phi(f) dx$ , if  $(a, b) = (0, 2), (a, b) = (2, 1)$  or  $(a, b) = (4, 0)$ .
- (iii)  $\bar{B}_M \rightarrow L^2(0, T(\mathbb{R}^d)^2), f \mapsto \text{tr}_{\partial I} \Phi(f)$ , if  $(a, b) = (1, 1)$  or  $(a, b) = (3, 0)$ .
- (iv)  $\bar{B}_M \rightarrow L^2(0, T; L^2), f \mapsto (\gamma_0^{-4} - \gamma^{-4}) \partial_x^4 f$ .

The following general contraction result for multilinear maps will be the key ingredient in the proof of Proposition 2.7.

**Lemma 2.8.** *Let  $1 \leq q_1 \leq \infty$  and suppose  $(f_1, \dots, f_r) \mapsto \mu(f_1, \dots, f_r)$  is a multilinear map such that for all  $f_1, \dots, f_r \in \mathbb{X}_{T,2}$  we have*

$$\|\mu(f_1, \dots, f_r)\|_{L^{q_1}(0, T; Z)} \leq C \prod_{j=1}^r \|S \partial_x^{d_j} f_j\|_{X_j}. \quad (2.12)$$

Here, we have  $d_1, \dots, d_r \in \{0, \dots, 3\}$ ,  $S \in \{\text{Id}, \text{tr}_{\partial I}\}$  and  $Z, X_1, \dots, X_r$  are Banach spaces such that

(i)  $\partial_x^{d_i}: \mathbb{X}_T \rightarrow X_i$  and for  $f \in {}_0\mathbb{X}_T$  we have the estimate  $\|S \partial_x^{d_i} f\|_{X_i} \leq C(T_0) \|f\|_{\mathbb{X}_T}$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, r$ .

(ii) for all  $j = 1, \dots, r$  one of the following conditions is satisfied.

a) There exists  $\alpha > 0$  such that  $\|S \partial_x^{d_j} f\|_{X_j} \leq C(T_0) T^\alpha \|f\|_{\mathbb{X}_T}$  for all  $f \in {}_0\mathbb{X}_T$ .

b) There exists  $k \neq j$  such that  $\|S \partial_x^{d_k} f\|_{X_k} \rightarrow 0$  as  $T \rightarrow 0$  for all  $f \in \mathbb{X}_T$ .

Then, setting  $\mu(f) = \mu(f, \dots, f)$ , we have  $\mu(f) \in L^{q_1}(0, T; Z)$  for all  $f \in \mathbb{X}_T$  and for any  $q \in (0, 1)$ , there exist  $M = M(q, r, T_0, M_0, \bar{f}), T = T(q, r, T_0, M_0, \bar{f}) > 0$  small enough, such that for all  $f, \tilde{f} \in \bar{B}_M$  we have

$$\|\mu(f) - \mu(\tilde{f})\|_{L^{q_1}(0, T; Z)} \leq q \|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T}.$$

**Remark 2.9.** When applying Lemma 2.8, we will always work with Banach spaces of the type  $X_j = L^{p_j}(0, T; L^{q_j})$  and  $Z = L^{p_0}$ , for some  $p_0, p_j, q_j \in [1, \infty]$ . Note that (ii) b) is always satisfied if there exist  $k \neq j$  with  $p_k < \infty$ , since then  $\lim_{T \rightarrow 0} \|f\|_{L^{p_k}(0, T; L^{q_k})} \rightarrow 0$  by dominated convergence.

*Proof of Lemma 2.8.* Let  $f, \tilde{f} \in \bar{B}_M$ . Adding and subtracting zeroes and using the multilinearity, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(f) - \mu(\tilde{f}) &= \mu(f - \tilde{f}, f, \dots, f) + \mu(\tilde{f}, f - \tilde{f}, f, \dots, f) \\ &\quad + \dots + \mu(\tilde{f}, \dots, f - \tilde{f}, f) + \mu(\tilde{f}, \dots, \tilde{f}, f - \tilde{f}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, using (2.12), we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\mu(f) - \mu(\tilde{f})\|_{L^{q_1}(0,T;Z)} \\ &\leq C \sum_{j=1}^r \|S\partial_x^{d_1} \tilde{f}\|_{X_1} \dots \|S\partial_x^{d_{j-1}} \tilde{f}\|_{X_{j-1}} \|S\partial_x^{d_j} (f - \tilde{f})\|_{X_j} \|S\partial_x^{d_{j+1}} f\|_{X_{j+1}} \dots \|S\partial_x^{d_r} f\|_{X_r}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

We now show that the contraction property is valid for each summand in (2.13). Note that for all  $k \in \{1, \dots, r\}$  by (i) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|S\partial_x^{d_k} f\|_{X_k} &\leq \|S\partial_x^{d_k} (f - \bar{f})\|_{X_k} + \|S\partial_x^{d_k} \bar{f}\|_{X_k} \\ &\leq C(T_0) \|f - \bar{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} + \|S\partial_x^{d_k} \bar{f}\|_{X_k} \leq C(T_0) \left( M + \|S\partial_x^{d_k} \bar{f}\|_{X_k} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

In particular, for  $M \leq M_0, T \leq T_0$  we find

$$\|S\partial_x^{d_k} f\|_{X_k}, \|S\partial_x^{d_k} \tilde{f}\|_{X_k} \leq C(T_0, M_0, \bar{f}). \quad (2.15)$$

Now, let  $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ . If (ii) a) is satisfied, using  $f(0) = \tilde{f}(0) = f_0$ , we find

$$\begin{aligned} &\|S\partial_x^{d_1} \tilde{f}\|_{X_1} \dots \|S\partial_x^{d_{j-1}} \tilde{f}\|_{X_{j-1}} \|S\partial_x^{d_j} (f - \tilde{f})\|_{X_j} \|S\partial_x^{d_{j+1}} f\|_{X_{j+1}} \dots \|S\partial_x^{d_r} f\|_{X_r} \\ &\leq C(T_0, M_0, \bar{f}) T^\alpha \|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} \leq \frac{q}{C_r} \|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T}, \end{aligned}$$

for  $T = T(\alpha, T_0, M_0, \bar{f}) > 0$  small enough. Otherwise, if (ii) b) is satisfied, we estimate using (i) for the  $j$ -th factor, (2.14) for the  $k$ -th factor and (2.15) for the remaining factors, to get

$$\begin{aligned} &\|S\partial_x^{d_1} \tilde{f}\|_{X_1} \dots \|S\partial_x^{d_{j-1}} \tilde{f}\|_{X_{j-1}} \|S\partial_x^{d_j} (f - \tilde{f})\|_{X_j} \|S\partial_x^{d_{j+1}} f\|_{X_{j+1}} \dots \|S\partial_x^{d_r} f\|_{X_r} \\ &\leq C(T_0, M_0, \bar{f}) \left( M + \|S\partial_x^{d_k} \bar{f}\|_{X_k} \right) \|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T}. \end{aligned}$$

By (ii) b),  $\lim_{T \rightarrow 0} \|S\partial_x^{d_k} \bar{f}\|_{X_k} = 0$ . Consequently, taking  $M = M(q, r, T_0, M_0, \bar{f}) > 0$  and  $T = T(q, r, T_0, M_0, \bar{f}) > 0$  small enough we find

$$\begin{aligned} &\|S\partial_x^{d_1} \tilde{f}\|_{X_1} \dots \|S\partial_x^{d_{j-1}} \tilde{f}\|_{X_{j-1}} \|S\partial_x^{d_j} (f - \tilde{f})\|_{X_j} \|S\partial_x^{d_{j+1}} f\|_{X_{j+1}} \dots \|S\partial_x^{d_r} f\|_{X_r} \\ &\leq \frac{q}{C_r} \|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T}. \end{aligned}$$

All in all, we have proven

$$\|\mu(f) - \mu(\tilde{f})\|_{L^{q_1}(0,T;Z)} \leq q \|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} \quad \text{for } f, \tilde{f} \in \bar{B}_M. \quad \square$$

Similarly, one obtains the following result which we will use in the proof of the smoothing property later on.

**Corollary 2.10.** *Under the assumptions of Lemma 2.8, for any  $q \in (0, 1)$  there exists  $T = T(q, r, T_0, M_0, \bar{f}) > 0$  such that for all  $u \in {}_0\mathbb{X}_T$  we have*

$$\|\mu(\bar{f}, \dots, \bar{f}, u, \bar{f}, \dots, \bar{f})\|_{L^{q_1}(0, T; Z)} \leq q \|u\|_{\mathbb{X}_T},$$

where exactly one argument of  $\mu$  is  $u$ , and all other arguments are  $\bar{f}$ .

Together with the embedding results in Proposition B.1 and Proposition B.3, we can now prove Proposition 2.7.

*Proof of Proposition 2.7.* Let  $f, \tilde{f} \in \bar{B}_M \subset \mathbb{X}_T$  with  $M, T > 0$  small enough such that Lemma 2.2 is satisfied. The strategy for the proof of cases (i)-(iii) is to apply Lemma 2.8. To that end, we use Hölder's inequality in time and space, and then verify the assumptions of Lemma 2.8 using Proposition B.3. In the following, we denote by  $f_1, \dots, f_m, g, g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4, h, h_1, h_2$  general functions in  $\bar{B}_M$ .

Case (i): If  $(a, b) = (1, 1)$ , by Hölder's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\varphi(\partial_x f_1, \dots, \partial_x f_m, \partial_x^2 g, \partial_x^3 h)\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2)} \\ & \leq C(\varphi) \prod_{j=1}^m \|\partial_x f_j\|_{\infty} \|\partial_x^2 g\|_{L^4(0, T; L^8)} \|\partial_x^3 h\|_{L^4(0, T; L^{\frac{8}{3}})}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

Using Proposition B.1 (ii) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_x : \mathbb{X}_T \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^\alpha([0, T]; \mathcal{C}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)), \\ & \text{with the estimate } \|\partial_x f\|_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha([0, T]; \mathcal{C}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))} \leq C(T_0) \|f\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} \text{ for } f \in {}_0\mathbb{X}_T. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, with the same argument as in (2.10), we find

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_x : \mathbb{X}_T \rightarrow \mathcal{C}([0, T] \times I; \mathbb{R}^d), \\ & \text{with the estimate } \|\partial_x f\|_{\infty} \leq C(T_0) T^\alpha \|f\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} \text{ for } f \in {}_0\mathbb{X}_T, \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

such that (ii) a) in Lemma 2.8 is satisfied. Next, using Proposition B.3 (i) with  $k = 2$  and  $\theta = \frac{3}{4}$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_x^2 : \mathbb{X}_T \rightarrow L^8(0, T; L^4), \\ & \text{with the estimate } \|\partial_x^2 f\|_{L^8(0, T; L^4)} \leq C(T_0) \|f\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} \text{ for all } f \in {}_0\mathbb{X}_T, \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

since  $\frac{4-2}{4} \cdot \frac{3}{4} - \frac{1}{2} \geq -\frac{1}{8}$  and  $(4-2)(1 - \frac{3}{4}) - \frac{1}{2} \geq -\frac{1}{4}$ . Similarly for the third derivative with  $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_x^3 : \mathbb{X}_T \rightarrow L^{\frac{8}{3}}(0, T; L^4), \\ & \text{with the estimate } \|\partial_x^3 f\|_{L^{\frac{8}{3}}(0, T; L^4)} \leq C(T_0) \|f\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} \text{ for all } f \in {}_0\mathbb{X}_T. \end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

Thus, condition (ii) a) in Lemma 2.8 is satisfied for the first  $m$  factors in (2.16) by (2.17), whereas for the remaining factors condition (ii) b) holds. More precisely, for  $j = m + 1$  choosing  $k = m + 2$  works and conversely  $j = m + 2, k = m + 1$ , using Remark 2.9. The case  $(a, b) = (3, 0)$  can be treated similarly, using Hölder to obtain

$$\|\varphi(\partial_x f_1, \dots, \partial_x f_m, \partial_x^2 g_1, \partial_x^2 g_2, \partial_x^2 g_3)\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2)} \leq C \prod_{j=1}^m \|\partial_x f_j\|_{\infty} \prod_{j=1}^3 \|\partial_x^2 g_j\|_{L^6(0, T; L^6)},$$

and then Proposition B.3 (i) with  $k = 2, \theta = \frac{2}{3}$  to get

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_x^2: \mathbb{X}_T &\rightarrow L^6(0, T; L^6), \\ \text{with the estimate } \|\partial_x^2 f\|_{L^6(0, T; L^6)} &\leq C(T_0) \|f\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} \quad \text{for all } f \in {}_0\mathbb{X}_T. \end{aligned} \quad (2.20)$$

Case (ii): First, we have the following basic estimate

$$\left\| \int_I \Phi(f) dx - \int_I \Phi(\tilde{f}) dx \right\|_{L^2(0, T)} \leq \|\Phi(f) - \Phi(\tilde{f})\|_{L^2(0, T; L^1)}.$$

It hence suffices to show that  $\mathbb{X}_T \rightarrow L^2(0, T; L^1), f \mapsto \Phi(f)$  is a  $q$ -contraction. To that end, we will use Lemma 2.8 with  $Z = L^1, S = \text{Id}$ .

If  $(a, b) = (0, 2)$ , we have by Hölder's inequality

$$\|\varphi(\partial_x f_1, \dots, \partial_x f_m, \partial_x^3 h_1, \partial_x^3 h_2)\|_{L^2(0, T; L^1)} \leq C \prod_{j=1}^m \|\partial_x f_j\|_{\infty} \prod_{j=1}^2 \|\partial_x^3 h_j\|_{L^4(0, T; L^2)}. \quad (2.21)$$

Now, using Proposition B.3 (i) with  $k = 3$  and  $\theta = 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_x^3: \mathbb{X}_T &\rightarrow L^4(0, T; L^2(I; \mathbb{R}^d)) \\ \text{with the estimate } \|\partial_x^3 f\|_{L^4(0, T; L^2)} &\leq C(T_0) \|f\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} \quad \text{for all } f \in {}_0\mathbb{X}_T. \end{aligned} \quad (2.22)$$

Consequently, the last two factors in (2.21) satisfy condition (i) and (ii) b) in Lemma 2.8, cf. Remark 2.9. For the first  $m$  factors, we may once again use (2.17) to deduce that conditions (i) and (ii) a) in Lemma 2.8 are satisfied.

If  $(a, b) = (2, 1)$ , we proceed similarly, first using Hölder to get

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\varphi(\partial_x f_1, \dots, \partial_x f_m, \partial_x^2 g_1, \partial_x^2 g_2, \partial_x^3 h)\|_{L^2(0, T; L^1)} \\ &\leq C \prod_{j=1}^m \|\partial_x f_j\|_{\infty} \prod_{j=1}^2 \|\partial_x^2 g_j\|_{L^8(0, T; L^4)} \|\partial_x^3 h\|_{L^4(0, T; L^2)}, \end{aligned}$$

and then applying (2.17), (2.18) and (2.22). For  $(a, b) = (4, 0)$ , we may apply Hölder's inequality to obtain

$$\|\varphi(\partial_x f_1, \dots, \partial_x f_m, \partial_x^2 g_1, \partial_x^2 g_2, \partial_x^2 g_3, \partial_x^2 g_4)\|_{L^2(0, T; L^1)} \leq C \prod_{j=1}^m \|\partial_x f_j\|_{\infty} \prod_{j=1}^4 \|\partial_x^2 g_j\|_{L^8(0, T; L^4)},$$

and then use (2.17) and (2.18).

Case (iii): Again, we use Lemma 2.8, now with  $Z = (\mathbb{R}^d)^2$  and  $S = \text{tr}_{\partial I}$ . If  $(a, b) = (1, 1)$  we obtain by Hölder's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\text{tr}_{\partial I} \varphi(\partial_x f_1, \dots, \partial_x f_m, \partial_x^2 g, \partial_x^3 h)\|_{L^2(0, T; (\mathbb{R}^d)^2)} \\ & \leq C \prod_{j=1}^m \|\text{tr}_{\partial I} \partial_x f_j\|_{\infty} \|\text{tr}_{\partial I} \partial_x^2 g\|_{L^8(0, T; (\mathbb{R}^d)^2)} \|\text{tr}_{\partial I} \partial_x^3 h\|_{L^{\frac{8}{3}}(0, T; (\mathbb{R}^d)^2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.23)$$

Note that by Proposition B.3 (ii), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{tr}_{\partial I} \partial_x^2: \mathbb{X}_T \rightarrow L^8(0, T; (\mathbb{R}^d)^2), \\ & \text{with the estimate } \|\text{tr}_{\partial I} \partial_x^2 f\|_{L^8(0, T; (\mathbb{R}^d)^2)} \leq C(T_0) \|f\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} \quad \text{for all } f \in {}_0\mathbb{X}_T, \end{aligned} \quad (2.24)$$

whereas for the third derivative, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{tr}_{\partial I} \partial_x^3: \mathbb{X}_T \rightarrow L^{\frac{8}{3}}(0, T; (\mathbb{R}^d)^2), \\ & \text{with the estimate } \|\text{tr}_{\partial I} \partial_x^3 f\|_{L^{\frac{8}{3}}(0, T; (\mathbb{R}^d)^2)} \leq C(T_0) \|f\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} \quad \text{for all } f \in {}_0\mathbb{X}_T. \end{aligned} \quad (2.25)$$

As in cases (i) and (ii), we then use the mapping properties and the estimates in (2.17), (2.24) and (2.25) together with Remark 2.9 to verify that the assumptions of Lemma 2.8 are satisfied.

If  $(a, b) = (3, 0)$ , we proceed similarly, first using Hölder to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\text{tr}_{\partial I} \varphi(\partial_x f_1, \dots, \partial_x f_m, \partial_x^2 g_1, \partial_x^2 g_2, \partial_x^2 g_3)\|_{L^2(0, T; (\mathbb{R}^d)^2)} \\ & \leq C \prod_{j=1}^m \|\partial_x f_j\|_{\infty} \prod_{j=1}^3 \|\partial_x^2 g_j\|_{L^6(0, T; (\mathbb{R}^d)^2)}, \end{aligned}$$

and then (2.17) for the first order terms and Proposition B.3 (ii) with  $k = 2$ , yielding

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{tr}_{\partial I} \partial_x^2: \mathbb{X}_T \rightarrow L^6(0, T; (\mathbb{R}^d)^2), \\ & \text{with the estimate } \|\text{tr}_{\partial I} \partial_x^2 f\|_{L^6(0, T; (\mathbb{R}^d)^2)} \leq C(T_0) \|f\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} \quad \text{for all } f \in {}_0\mathbb{X}_T. \end{aligned}$$

Case (iv): Let  $q \in (0, 1)$ . For  $f, \tilde{f} \in \bar{B}_M$ , we have

$$|(\gamma_0^{-4} - \gamma^{-4})\partial_x^4 f - (\gamma_0^{-4} - \tilde{\gamma}^{-4})\partial_x^4 \tilde{f}| \leq |\gamma_0^{-4} - \gamma^{-4}| |\partial_x^4 f - \partial_x^4 \tilde{f}| + |\tilde{\gamma}^{-4} - \gamma^{-4}| |\partial_x^4 \tilde{f}|.$$

Thus, we may estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\gamma_0^{-4} - \gamma^{-4})\partial_x^4 f - (\gamma_0^{-4} - \tilde{\gamma}^{-4})\partial_x^4 \tilde{f}\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2)} \\ & \leq \|\gamma_0^{-4} - \gamma^{-4}\|_{\infty} \|\partial_x^4 f - \partial_x^4 \tilde{f}\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2)} + \|\tilde{\gamma}^{-4} - \gamma^{-4}\|_{\infty} \|\partial_x^4 \tilde{f}\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.26)$$

For the first term, we use the mean value theorem and Lemma 2.2 to conclude

$$|\gamma_0(x)^{-4} - \gamma(t, x)^{-4}| \leq 4 \left( \frac{\inf_I \gamma_0}{2} \right)^{-5} |\partial_x f_0(x) - \partial_x f(t, x)|. \quad (2.27)$$

Consequently, using Proposition B.1 (ii) we may estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\gamma_0^{-4} - \gamma^{-4}\|_\infty &\leq C(\gamma_0) \sup_{(t,x) \in [0,T] \times I} |\partial_x f(0,x) - \partial_x f(t,x)| \\
&\leq C(\gamma_0) \sup_{(t,x) \in [0,T] \times I} \|f(0) - f(t)\|_{\mathcal{C}^{1+\alpha}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)} \\
&\leq C(\gamma_0) \sup_{(t,x) \in [0,T] \times I} t^\alpha \|f\|_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha([0,T]; \mathcal{C}^{1+\alpha}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))} \\
&\leq C(\gamma_0) T^\alpha \left( \|f - \bar{f}\|_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha([0,T]; \mathcal{C}^{1+\alpha}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))} + \|\bar{f}\|_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha([0,T]; \mathcal{C}^{1+\alpha}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))} \right) \\
&\leq C(\gamma_0, T_0) T^\alpha \left( \|f - \bar{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} + \|\bar{f}\|_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha([0,T]; \mathcal{C}^{1+\alpha}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))} \right) \\
&\leq C(T_0, M_0, \bar{f}) T^\alpha.
\end{aligned}$$

Combined with the simple estimate  $\|\partial_x^4 f - \partial_x^4 \tilde{f}\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2)} \leq \|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T}$  this yields a  $\frac{q}{2}$ -contraction estimate for the first part of (2.26), taking  $T = T(q, T_0, M_0, \bar{f}) > 0$  small enough. For the remaining part, we use (2.27) with  $\gamma_0$  replaced by  $\tilde{\gamma}$  to conclude

$$\|\tilde{\gamma}^{-4} - \gamma^{-4}\|_\infty \leq 4 \left( \inf_I \frac{\gamma_0}{2} \right)^{-5} \|\partial_x f - \partial_x \tilde{f}\|_\infty \leq C(T_0, \bar{f}) T^\alpha \|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T},$$

and  $\|\partial_x^4 f\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2)} \leq \|f - \bar{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} + \|\partial_x^4 \bar{f}\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2)} \leq C(M_0, \bar{f})$ . Consequently, if we take  $T = T(q, T_0, M_0, \bar{f}) > 0$  small enough, the second part of (2.26) is a  $\frac{q}{2}$ -contraction.  $\square$

It is not difficult to see that the statement of Proposition 2.7 remains true if one allows multiplication by powers of the arc-length element.

**Corollary 2.11.** *Let  $q \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\Phi \in \mathcal{A}^{(a,b)}$ . Then, choosing  $T = T(q, \ell, T_0, M_0)$ ,  $M = M(q, \ell, T_0, M_0) > 0$  small enough, each of the following maps is a well-defined  $q$ -contraction.*

- (i)  $\bar{B}_M \rightarrow L^2(0, T; L^2)$ ,  $f \mapsto \gamma^{-\ell} \Phi(f)$ , if  $(a, b) = (1, 1)$  or  $(a, b) = (3, 0)$ .
- (ii)  $\bar{B}_M \rightarrow L^2(0, T)$ ,  $f \mapsto \int_I \gamma^{-\ell} \Phi(f) dx$ , if  $(a, b) = (0, 2)$ ,  $(a, b) = (2, 1)$  or  $(a, b) = (4, 0)$ .
- (iii)  $\bar{B}_M \rightarrow L^2(0, T(\mathbb{R}^d)^2)$ ,  $f \mapsto \text{tr}_{\partial I} \gamma^{-\ell} \Phi(f)$ , if  $(a, b) = (1, 1)$  or  $(a, b) = (3, 0)$ .

*Proof. Well-definedness:* By Lemma 2.2 we can estimate  $|\gamma^{-\ell} \Phi(f)| \leq \frac{\inf \gamma_0}{2} |\Phi(f)|$  for all  $T, M > 0$  small enough. Thus  $f \mapsto \gamma^{-\ell} \Phi(f)$  maps into the correct space by Lemma 2.8. *Contraction:* Let  $q \in (0, 1)$  and let  $f, \tilde{f} \in \bar{B}_M$ . For the first case, taking  $T, M > 0$  small enough, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\gamma^{-\ell} \Phi(f) - \tilde{\gamma}^{-\ell} \Phi(\tilde{f})\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2)} \\
&\leq \|\gamma^{-\ell} - \tilde{\gamma}^{-\ell}\|_\infty \|\Phi(f)\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2)} + \|\tilde{\gamma}^{-\ell}\|_\infty \|\Phi(f) - \Phi(\tilde{f})\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2)} \\
&\leq \|\gamma^{-\ell} - \tilde{\gamma}^{-\ell}\|_\infty (\|\Phi(f) - \Phi(\tilde{f})\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2)} + \|\Phi(\tilde{f})\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2)})
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \left( \|\tilde{\gamma}^{-\ell} - \bar{\gamma}^{-\ell}\|_{\infty} + \|\bar{\gamma}^{-\ell}\|_{\infty} \right) \|\Phi(f) - \Phi(\tilde{f})\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2)} \\
& \leq C(T_0, M_0, \bar{f}) \|\gamma^{-\ell} - \tilde{\gamma}^{-\ell}\|_{\infty} + \left( \|\tilde{\gamma}^{-\ell} - \bar{\gamma}^{-\ell}\|_{\infty} + \|\bar{\gamma}^{-\ell}\|_{\infty} \right) q_2 \|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T}
\end{aligned}$$

using Proposition 2.7 for  $q_2 \in (0, 1)$  to be chosen. With similar estimates one finds

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \int_I \gamma^{-\ell} \Phi(f) \, dx - \int_I \tilde{\gamma}^{-\ell} \Phi(\tilde{f}) \, dx \right\|_{L^2(0,T)} \\
& \leq C(T_0, M_0, \bar{f}) \|\gamma^{-\ell} - \tilde{\gamma}^{-\ell}\|_{\infty} + \left( \|\tilde{\gamma}^{-\ell} - \bar{\gamma}^{-\ell}\|_{\infty} + \|\bar{\gamma}^{-\ell}\|_{\infty} \right) q_2 \|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\operatorname{tr}_{\partial I} \gamma^{-\ell} \Phi(f) - \operatorname{tr}_{\partial I} \tilde{\gamma}^{-\ell} \Phi(\tilde{f})\|_{L^2(0,T;(\mathbb{R}^d)^2)} \\
& \leq C(T_0, M_0, \bar{f}) \|\gamma^{-\ell} - \tilde{\gamma}^{-\ell}\|_{\infty} + \left( \|\tilde{\gamma}^{-\ell} - \bar{\gamma}^{-\ell}\|_{\infty} + \|\bar{\gamma}^{-\ell}\|_{\infty} \right) q_2 \|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T}.
\end{aligned}$$

We will now prove that for any  $q \in (0, 1)$  the map  $\bar{B}_M \rightarrow L^\infty((0, T) \times I)$ ,  $f \mapsto \gamma^{-\ell}$  is a  $q$ -contraction for  $T, M > 0$  small enough. We find as in (2.27)

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\gamma^{-\ell} - \tilde{\gamma}^{-\ell}\|_{\infty} & \leq C(\ell, T_0, M_0, \bar{f}) \|f - \tilde{f}\|_{C^0([0,T];C^1(I;\mathbb{R}^d))} \leq C(\ell, T_0, M_0, \bar{f}) T^\alpha \|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} \\
& \leq \frac{q}{2} \|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T},
\end{aligned}$$

for  $T = T(q, \ell, T_0, M_0, \bar{f}) > 0$  small enough using Proposition B.1 (ii) and the fact that  $f(0) = \tilde{f}(0) = f_0$ . Thus, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
& C(T_0, M_0, \bar{f}) \|\gamma^{-\ell} - \tilde{\gamma}^{-\ell}\|_{\infty} + \left( \|\tilde{\gamma}^{-\ell} - \bar{\gamma}^{-\ell}\|_{\infty} + \|\bar{\gamma}^{-\ell}\|_{\infty} \right) q_2 \|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} \\
& \leq \frac{q}{2} \|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} + \left( M_0 + \|\bar{\gamma}^{-\ell}\|_{\infty} \right) q_2 \|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} \leq q \|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T},
\end{aligned}$$

choosing first  $q_2 = q_2(q, \ell, T_0, M_0, \bar{f}) \in (0, 1)$  sufficiently small and passing to a smaller  $T = T(q, \ell, T_0, M_0, \bar{f})$  and  $M = M(q, \ell, T_0, M_0, \bar{f}) > 0$  if necessary.  $\square$

### 2.4.3. Proof of the contraction property

In order to reduce our problem to a fixed point equation, we define the following nonlinearities.

**Lemma 2.12.** *Let  $q \in (0, 1)$ . Then the following maps*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}: \bar{B}_M & \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}_T^1, & \mathcal{F}(f) &:= F(\gamma^{-1}, \partial_x f, \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x^3 f, \partial_x^4 f) \\
\Lambda: \bar{B}_M & \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}_T^1, & \Lambda(f) &:= \lambda(f) \vec{\kappa}_f \\
\mathcal{N}: \bar{B}_M & \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}_T^1, & \mathcal{N}(f) &:= \mathcal{F}(f) + \Lambda(f),
\end{aligned}$$

*are well-defined and  $q$ -contractions for  $T = T(q, T_0, M_0, \bar{f}), M = M(q, T_0, M_0, \bar{f}) > 0$  small enough, with  $F$  as in (2.4) and  $\lambda$  as in (1.2).*



*Proof.* First, taking  $T = T(T_0, M_0, \bar{f})$ ,  $M = M(T_0) > 0$  small enough such that Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3 hold, all terms are defined almost everywhere. We observe that  $\mathcal{F}(f)$  is a sum of terms as in Corollary 2.11 (i) and Proposition 2.7 (iv) by (2.2), hence well-defined and a  $q$ -contraction for all  $q \in (0, 1)$ , taking  $T = T(q, T_0, M_0, \bar{f})$ ,  $M = M(q, T_0, M_0, \bar{f}) > 0$  small enough.

For  $\Lambda$  we need to do one additional estimate. For  $f \in \bar{B}_M$  and  $T, M > 0$  the scalar valued function  $\lambda$  is in  $L^2(0, T)$ , since by Lemma 2.3 the energy  $\mathcal{E}(f)$  in the denominator of  $\lambda$  (cf. Section 2.1) is bounded from below uniformly in  $t$ , whereas the nominator  $N(f)$  is in  $L^2(0, T)$  by Corollary 2.11 (ii) and (iii) and by the explicit formulas in Lemma A.2 and (2.1). The term  $\vec{\kappa}_f$  is in  $L^\infty(0, T)$  by the embedding  $\mathbb{X}_T \hookrightarrow BUC([0, T]; W^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$ , cf. Proposition B.1 (i), (B.1) and Proposition A.1.

Now, the crucial step is the proof of the contraction estimate for  $\Lambda$ . To that end, let  $f, \tilde{f} \in \bar{B}_M$ . Then, writing  $\lambda(f) = \frac{N(f)}{2\mathcal{E}(f)}$  as in Section 2.1, we find for almost every  $(t, x)$

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\lambda(f)(t)\vec{\kappa}_f(t, x) - \lambda(\tilde{f})(t)\vec{\kappa}_{\tilde{f}}(t, x)| \\
& \leq |\lambda(f)(t) - \lambda(\tilde{f})(t)| |\vec{\kappa}_f(t, x)| + |\lambda(\tilde{f})(t)| |\vec{\kappa}_f(t, x) - \vec{\kappa}_{\tilde{f}}(t, x)| \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2\mathcal{E}(f(t))\mathcal{E}(\tilde{f}(t))} |N(f)(t)| |\mathcal{E}(f(t)) - \mathcal{E}(\tilde{f}(t))| |\vec{\kappa}_f(t, x)| \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{2\mathcal{E}(f(t))} |N(f)(t) - N(\tilde{f})(t)| |\vec{\kappa}_f(t, x)| + |\lambda(f)(t)| |\vec{\kappa}_f(t, x) - \vec{\kappa}_{\tilde{f}}(t, x)| \\
& \leq C(f_0) |N(f)(t)| |\mathcal{E}(f(t)) - \mathcal{E}(\tilde{f}(t))| |\vec{\kappa}_f(t, x)| \\
& \quad + C(f_0) |N(f)(t) - N(\tilde{f})(t)| |\vec{\kappa}_f(t, x)| + |\lambda(f)(t)| |\vec{\kappa}_f(t, x) - \vec{\kappa}_{\tilde{f}}(t, x)|, \tag{2.28}
\end{aligned}$$

using that by Lemma 2.3 the elastic energy is bounded from below. Taking the  $L^2L^2$ -norm in (2.28), we are left with three terms. The first one is

$$\begin{aligned}
& \| |N(f)| |\mathcal{E}(f) - \mathcal{E}(\tilde{f})| |\vec{\kappa}_f| \|_{L^2(0, T; L^2)} \\
& \leq \|N(f)\|_{L^2(0, T)} \|\mathcal{E}(f) - \mathcal{E}(\tilde{f})\|_{L^\infty(0, T)} \|\vec{\kappa}_f\|_{L^\infty(0, T; L^2)}. \tag{2.29}
\end{aligned}$$

Now, note that  $N(f)$  is a sum of terms as in Corollary 2.11 (ii) and (iii) by (2.1) and the explicit formulas in Lemma A.2. Therefore, for any  $q \in (0, 1)$ , we have

$$\|N(f) - N(\tilde{f})\|_{L^2(0, T)} \leq q \|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T}, \tag{2.30}$$

if we take  $T = T(q, T_0, M_0, \bar{f})$ ,  $M = M(q, T_0, M_0, \bar{f}) > 0$  small enough. In particular, we can assume that  $f \mapsto N(f)$  is 1-Lipschitz.

For the elastic energy term, note that  $\mathcal{E}$  is analytic, hence  $\mathcal{C}^1$  on the space of  $W^{2,2}$ -immersions, cf. Proposition 4.4, in particular it is locally Lipschitz near  $f_0 \in W_{Imm}^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ . Hence, there exists  $C(f_0) > 0$  such that  $|\mathcal{E}(h) - \mathcal{E}(\tilde{h})| \leq C(f_0) \|h - \tilde{h}\|_{W^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)}$  for all  $h$  and  $\tilde{h}$  satisfying  $\|h - f_0\|_{W^{2,2}} < \delta$  and  $\|\tilde{h} - f_0\|_{W^{2,2}} \leq \delta$ .

By Proposition B.1(i), we have  ${}_0\mathbb{X}_T \hookrightarrow BUC(0, T; W^{2,2})$ . Consequently, we have

$$\|f(t) - f_0\|_{W^{2,2}} \leq \|f(t) - \bar{f}(t)\|_{W^{2,2}} + \|\bar{f}(t) - f_0\|_{W^{2,2}}$$

$$\leq C(T_0)M + \|\tilde{f}(t) - \tilde{f}(0)\|_{W^{2,2}} \leq \delta$$

for  $M = M(T_0), T = T(\tilde{f}) > 0$  small enough, and similarly  $\|\tilde{f}(t) - \tilde{f}(0)\|_{W^{2,2}} \leq \delta$ . But then, using Proposition B.1(i), we have the estimate

$$\|\mathcal{E}(f) - \mathcal{E}(\tilde{f})\|_{L^\infty(0,T)} \leq C(f_0)\|f - \tilde{f}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;W^{2,2})} \leq C(T_0, \tilde{f})\|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T}. \quad (2.31)$$

For the curvature term  $\vec{\kappa}_f$ , note that the map  $W_{Imm}^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow L^2(I; \mathbb{R}^d), f \mapsto \vec{\kappa}_f = \partial_{s_f}^2 f$  is analytic (cf. Proposition 4.4), in particular Lipschitz near  $f_0$ . The same argument as above yields

$$\|\vec{\kappa}_f - \vec{\kappa}_{\tilde{f}}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)} \leq C(f_0)\|f - \tilde{f}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;W^{2,2})} \leq C(T_0, \tilde{f})\|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T}. \quad (2.32)$$

Now, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|\vec{\kappa}_f\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)} &\leq \|\vec{\kappa}_f - \vec{\kappa}_{\tilde{f}}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)} + \|\vec{\kappa}_{\tilde{f}}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)} \\ &\leq C(T_0, \tilde{f})\|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} + \|\vec{\kappa}_{\tilde{f}}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)} \leq C(T_0, M_0, \tilde{f}) \end{aligned} \quad (2.33)$$

and using (2.30), we obtain the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \|N(f)\|_{L^2(0,T)} &\leq \|N(f) - N(\tilde{f})\|_{L^2(0,T)} + \|N(\tilde{f})\|_{L^2(0,T)} \\ &\leq \|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} + \|N(\tilde{f})\|_{L^2(0,T)} \leq M + \|N(\tilde{f})\|_{L^2(0,T)}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.34)$$

If we now combine (2.31), (2.33) and (2.34), we obtain from (2.29)

$$\begin{aligned} C(f_0)\|N(f)\|\|\mathcal{E}(f) - \mathcal{E}(\tilde{f})\|\|\vec{\kappa}_f\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2)} \\ \leq (M + \|N(\tilde{f})\|_{L^2(0,T)}) C(T_0, M_0, \tilde{f})\|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} \leq \frac{q}{4}\|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} \end{aligned}$$

if we take  $T = T(q, T_0, M_0, \tilde{f}), M = M(q, T_0, M_0, \tilde{f}) > 0$  small enough.

For the second term in (2.28), using (2.30) and (2.33) we have

$$\begin{aligned} C(f_0)\|N(f)(t) - N(\tilde{f})(t)\|_{L^2(0,T)}\|\vec{\kappa}_f(t, x)\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)} &\leq C(T_0, M_0, \tilde{f})q_2\|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} \\ &\leq \frac{q}{4}\|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T}, \end{aligned}$$

after taking  $q_2 = q_2(q, T_0, M_0, \tilde{f}) \in (0, 1)$  small enough and reducing  $T = T(q, T_0, M_0, \tilde{f}), M = M(q, T_0, M_0, \tilde{f}) > 0$  if necessary.

For the last term in (2.28), using Lemma 2.3, (2.34) and (2.32), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{N(f)}{\mathcal{E}(f)} \right\|_{L^2(0,T)} \|\vec{\kappa}_f - \vec{\kappa}_{\tilde{f}}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)} &\leq \frac{3}{\mathcal{E}(f_0)} (M + \|N(\tilde{f})\|_{L^2(0,T)}) C(T_0, \tilde{f})\|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} \\ &\leq \frac{q}{4}\|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T}. \end{aligned}$$

taking  $M = M(q, T_0, M_0, \tilde{f}), T = T(q, T_0, M_0, \tilde{f}) > 0$  small enough. All in all, we have now shown that for  $T = T(q, T_0, M_0, \tilde{f}), M = M(q, T_0, M_0, \tilde{f}) > 0$  small enough, we have

$$\|\Lambda(f) - \Lambda(\tilde{f})\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2)} = \|\lambda(f)\vec{\kappa}_f - \lambda(\tilde{f})\vec{\kappa}_{\tilde{f}}\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2)} \leq \frac{3q}{4}\|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T},$$

which proves, that  $\Lambda: \bar{B}_M \rightarrow L^2(0,T;L^2)$  is a  $\frac{3q}{4}$ -contraction. Reducing  $T, M > 0$  if necessary, we may assume that  $\mathcal{F}$  is a  $\frac{q}{4}$ -contraction, hence  $\mathcal{N}: \bar{B}_M \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}_T^1$  is a  $q$ -contraction for  $T = T(q, T_0, M_0, \tilde{f}), M = M(q, T_0, M_0, \tilde{f}) > 0$  small enough.  $\square$

## 2.5. The fixed point argument

We will now reduce the analytic problem (2.3) to a fixed point equation and show local existence and uniqueness via the contraction principle. To that end, we first choose a specific reference solution  $\bar{f}$  in (2.9) on the time interval  $[0, T_0)$ .

**Definition 2.13.** *We define the reference solution  $\bar{f}$  to be the unique solution of the following initial boundary value problem.*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \bar{f} + \frac{\partial_x^4 \bar{f}}{\gamma_0^4} = 0 & \text{on } [0, T_0) \times I \\ \bar{f}(0, x) = f_0(x) & \text{for } x \in I \\ \bar{f}(t, y) = p_y & \text{for } 0 \leq t < T_0, y \in \partial I \\ \partial_x \bar{f}(t, y) = \tau_y \gamma_0(y) & \text{for } 0 \leq t < T_0, y \in \partial I. \end{cases}$$

*Existence and uniqueness in the class*

$$\mathbb{X}_{T_0} = W^{1,2} \left( 0, T_0; L^2(I; \mathbb{R}^d) \right) \cap L^2 \left( 0, T_0; W^{4,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d) \right)$$

*follows from Theorem 2.1. Note that the restriction of the solution is the unique solution in the class  $\mathbb{X}_T$  for all  $0 < T \leq T_0$ .*

Now, let  $q \in (0, 1)$ ,  $T = T(T_0, M_0, \bar{f})$ ,  $M = M(T_0, M_0, \bar{f}) > 0$ , be small enough such that Lemmas 2.2, 2.3 and 2.12 hold. Let  $f \in \bar{B}_M$ . Then, we have  $\mathcal{N}(f) \in \mathbb{Y}_T^1$ , cf. Lemma 2.12. For  $\psi := \mathcal{N}(f)$ ,  $b^0 := (p_0, p_1)$ ,  $b^1 := (\tau_0, \tau_1)$  and  $a := \gamma_0^{-4} \in \mathcal{C}([0, T_0] \times I)$  the compatibility conditions (2.6) are satisfied, since by (1.4) we have

$$\begin{aligned} b^0(0, y) &= f_0(y) & \text{for } y \in \partial I, \\ b^1(0, y) &= \tau_y \gamma_0(y) = \partial_x f_0(y) & \text{for } y \in \partial I. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by Theorem 2.1, there exists a unique solution  $g \in \mathbb{X}_T$  of the linear initial boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t g + \frac{\partial_x^4 g}{\gamma_0^4} = \mathcal{N}(f) & \text{on } (0, T) \times I \\ g(0, x) = f_0(x) & \text{for } x \in I \\ g(t, y) = p_y & \text{for } 0 \leq t < T, y \in \partial I \\ \partial_x g(t, y) = \tau_y \gamma_0(y) & \text{for } 0 \leq t < T, y \in \partial I. \end{cases} \quad (2.35)$$

**Definition 2.14.** *We define the map  $\Phi: \bar{B}_M \rightarrow \mathbb{X}_T$ ,  $\Phi(f) := g$ , where  $g \in \mathbb{X}_T$  is the unique solution to (2.35).*

**Remark 2.15.** *Finding a solution of (2.3) in the ball  $\bar{B}_M \subset \mathbb{X}_T$  is equivalent to finding a fixed point of the map  $\Phi$  in Definition 2.14.*

We will now show that  $\Phi$  is a contraction on  $\bar{B}_M$  for  $M, T > 0$  small enough.

**Proposition 2.16.** *Let  $q \in (0, 1)$ . Then there exist  $M = M(q, T_0, M_0, \bar{f})$  and  $T = T(q, T_0, M, M_0, \bar{f}) > 0$  such that  $\Phi: \bar{B}_M \rightarrow \bar{B}_M$  is well-defined and a  $q$ -contraction, i.e.*

$$\|\Phi(f) - \Phi(\tilde{f})\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} \leq q \|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} \quad (2.36)$$

for all  $f, \tilde{f} \in \bar{B}_M$ .

*Proof.* The contraction property: Let  $q \in (0, 1)$  and  $f, \tilde{f} \in \bar{B}_M$  and let  $g = \Phi(f), \tilde{g} = \Phi(\tilde{f})$ . We observe that  $g - \tilde{g}$  vanishes at the boundary  $\partial I$  up to first order. By Definition 2.14 and (2.8), we have for some  $C = C(T_0, f_0) > 0$

$$\|g - \tilde{g}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} \leq C \|\mathcal{N}(f) - \mathcal{N}(\tilde{f})\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2)} \leq C \frac{q}{2C} \|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T}, \quad (2.37)$$

reducing  $T = T(q, T_0, M_0, \bar{f})$ ,  $M = M(q, T_0, M_0, \bar{f}) > 0$  so that Lemma 2.12 can be applied. This proves the estimate (2.36).

Well-definedness: Let  $f \in \bar{B}_M$  and apply (2.37) with  $\tilde{g} = \bar{f}$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|g - \bar{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} &= \|\Phi(f) - \Phi(0)\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} \leq C \|\mathcal{N}(f) - 0\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2)} \\ &\leq C (\|\mathcal{N}(f) - \mathcal{N}(\bar{f})\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2)} + \|\mathcal{N}(\bar{f})\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2)}) \\ &\leq \frac{q}{2} \|f - \bar{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} + C \|\mathcal{N}(\bar{f})\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2)} \\ &\leq \frac{q}{2} M + C \|\mathcal{N}(\bar{f})\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2)}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.38)$$

using that  $g - \bar{f}$  vanishes at the boundary up to first order. Now, by dominated convergence we have  $\|\mathcal{N}(\bar{f})\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2)} \leq \frac{M}{2C}$  reducing  $T = T(q, T_0, M, M_0, \bar{f})$  if necessary. Then, from (2.38) we conclude  $\|\Phi(f) - \bar{f}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} \leq M$  for  $M, T > 0$  small enough.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.17.** *Let  $f_0 \in W_{Imm}^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $p_0, p_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\tau_0, \tau_1 \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$  satisfying (1.4) and (1.7). Then there exists  $M > 0$  and  $T > 0$  such that (2.3) has a unique solution  $f \in \bar{B}_M \subset W^{1,2}(0, T; L^2(I; \mathbb{R}^d)) \cap L^2(0, T; W^{4,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$ .*

*Proof.* For  $T, M > 0$  as in Proposition 2.16 with  $q = \frac{1}{2}$ , the map  $\Phi: \bar{B}_M \rightarrow \bar{B}_M$  is a contraction in the complete metric space  $\bar{B}_M$  and hence has a unique fixed point  $f \in \bar{B}_M$  by the contraction principle. Since any fixed point of  $\Phi$  is a solution of (2.3) in  $\bar{B}_M$  and vice versa, the claim follows.  $\square$

**Remark 2.18.** *By the construction of our solution and Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.3, the arc-length element  $|\partial_x f|$  and the elastic energy of the solution  $f$  in Theorem 2.17 are bounded from below and above, uniformly in  $t \in [0, T)$ .*

This immediately implies Theorem 1.1.

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* By Theorem 2.17, there exists  $T > 0$  and a solution  $f$  of (2.3) such that  $f \in W^{1,2}(0, T; L^2(I; \mathbb{R}^d)) \cap L^2(0, T; W^{4,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$ . Consequently,  $f$  solves (1.3), since at the boundary we have

$$\partial_{s_f} f(t, y) = \frac{\partial_x f(t, y)}{|\partial_x f(t, y)|} = \frac{\gamma_0(y) \tau_y}{|\gamma_0(y) \tau_y|} = \tau_y \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T), y \in \partial I. \quad \square$$

**Remark 2.19.** Our assumption on the regularity of the initial datum is very natural. On the one hand, the space  $W_{Imm}^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$  is the correct energy space associated to the elastic energy, so we would like to obtain short time existence for an initial datum in  $W_{Imm}^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ . In view of the linear problem in Theorem 2.1, working in the Sobolev scale one would hence need to pick  $p \in (1, \infty)$  such that  $W^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow B^{4(1-\frac{1}{p})p,p}(I; \mathbb{R}^d) = \mathbb{Y}_p^2$ . However, in order to estimate the denominator of the Lagrange multiplier  $\lambda$ , we want continuity of our solution with values in  $W^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ . Using Proposition B.1 (i), this can be achieved if  $B^{4(1-\frac{1}{p})p,p}(I; \mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow W^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ . Clearly, this can only work for  $p = 2$ . Moreover, for the same reason as above, even the introduction of time-weighted Sobolev spaces would not provide solutions with lower initial regularity.

**Theorem 2.20.** The solution  $f \in \bar{B}_M \subset W^{1,2}(0, T; L^2(I; \mathbb{R}^d)) \cap L^2(0, T; W^{4,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$  in Theorem 2.17 is the unique solution of (2.3) in the whole space  $W^{1,2}(0, T; L^2(I; \mathbb{R}^d)) \cap L^2(0, T; W^{4,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$ .

*Proof.* First we note that any restriction of the solution  $f \in \bar{B}_M$  to a smaller time interval  $[0, \tilde{T}]$  is again the unique solution of (2.3) in  $\bar{B}_M$  on  $[0, \tilde{T}]$  by Theorem 2.17. Now, we let  $T_1, T_2 > 0$  and assume that  $f_i \in W^{1,2}(0, T_i; L^2(I; \mathbb{R}^d)) \cap L^2(0, T_i; W^{4,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  are two families of immersions satisfying (2.3) with  $f_0 \in W_{Imm}^{2,2}(I)$ . Without loss of generality we may assume that  $T_1 \leq T_2$ . We claim that  $f_2|_{[0, T_1]} = f_1$ .

To show the claim we define  $\bar{t} = \sup\{t \in [0, T_1] : f_1(s) = f_2(s) \forall 0 \leq s \leq t\}$ . Note that  $\bar{t}$  is well-defined by Proposition B.1 (i). We need to show that  $\bar{t} = T_1$ . To do so we first prove that  $\bar{t} > 0$ . Indeed, for  $T \searrow 0$ , we have  $\|f_i|_{[0, T]}\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} \rightarrow 0$  by the dominated convergence theorem, and the same holds for the reference flow  $\bar{f}$  from Definition 2.13. Thus, for  $T > 0$  small enough,  $f_i|_{[0, T]} \in \bar{B}_M$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Further decreasing  $T > 0$  if necessary we obtain from Theorem 2.17 that  $f_1|_{[0, T]} = f_2|_{[0, T]}$  is the unique solution  $f \in \bar{B}_M$ . Thus,  $f_1(s) = f(s) = f_2(s)$  for all  $0 \leq s \leq T$ , showing that  $\bar{t} \geq T > 0$ .

We now assume that  $\bar{t} < T_1$ . Since  $f_i \in \mathbb{X}_{T_1} \hookrightarrow BUC([0, T_1], W^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$  and both solutions are immersed for all times, we find that  $f_0 := f_1(\bar{t}) \in W_{Imm}^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ . Whence, by Theorem 2.17, there exist  $M > 0$ ,  $T > 0$  such that (2.3) has a unique solution  $f \in \bar{B}_M$ . Observing that  $f_i(\bar{t} + t, \cdot)|_{0 \leq t \leq T_1 - \bar{t}}$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  are both solutions to (2.3) with the same initial value  $f_0$ , we find by similar arguments as above that  $f_1(\bar{t} + \cdot) = f = f_2(\bar{t} + \cdot)$  on  $[0, T)$ , contradicting the definition of  $\bar{t}$ .  $\square$

### 3. Parabolic smoothing

The goal of this section is to show that our solution  $f$  from Theorem 2.17 instantaneously becomes smooth.

**Theorem 3.1.** Let  $f_0 \in W_{Imm}^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$  satisfying (1.4) and (1.7). Then, there exists  $0 < T_1 \leq T$  such that the solution  $f$  in Theorem 1.1 satisfies  $f \in C^\infty((0, T_1) \times I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ .

Note that since we had to work with the critical embeddings in the contraction estimates in Section 2.4, more precisely in (2.22), (2.24) and (2.25), higher integrability of the

nonlinearity cannot be obtained by standard estimates relying on Hölder's inequality. Therefore, we cannot directly start the usual bootstrap argument (cf. Section 3.3) to show smoothness. Instead, we show an instantaneous gain of regularity in the time variable.

### 3.1. Time regularity

We will use Angenent's parameter trick [2, 3], but only in the time variable. To that end, we follow [15]. As before, throughout this subsection, we use  $\mathbb{X}_T, \mathbb{Y}_T, \mathcal{D}_T^0, \mathcal{D}_T^1$  for the corresponding spaces introduced in Section 2.2 with  $p = 2$  to simplify notation.

**Theorem 3.2.** *Let  $f \in W^{1,2}(0, T; L^2(I; \mathbb{R}^d)) \cap L^2(0, T; W^{4,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$  be the unique solution of (2.3), given by Theorem 2.17. Then there exists  $0 < T_1 < T$  such that  $f \in C^\omega((0, T_1); W^{2,2}(I, \mathbb{R}^d))$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $t_0 \in (0, T_1)$  with  $0 < T_1 \leq T$  to be determined. Moreover, let  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  be small enough, such that  $[t_0 - 3\varepsilon_0, t_0 + 3\varepsilon_0] \subset (0, T_1)$  and let  $\xi \in C_0^\infty((0, T); \mathbb{R})$  be a cutoff function such that  $\text{supp } \xi \subset [t_0 - 2\varepsilon_0, t_0 + 2\varepsilon_0]$ ,  $0 \leq \xi \leq 1$  and  $\xi \equiv 1$  on  $[t_0 - \varepsilon_0, t_0 + \varepsilon_0]$ . There exists  $r_0 > 0$  such that for  $|r| < r_0$ , the map  $t \mapsto t + \xi(t)r: [0, T] \rightarrow [0, T]$  is a diffeomorphism. Thus, so is

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_r: [0, T] \times I &\rightarrow [0, T] \times I, \\ \Psi_r(t, x) &:= (t + \xi(t)r, x). \end{aligned}$$

This induces a pullback map on functions: For any  $g: [0, T] \times I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  we define

$$(\Psi_r^* g)(t, x) := g(t + \xi(t)r, x).$$

Note that we have  $(\Psi_r^* g)(0, x) = g(0, x)$ . Using [15, Proposition 5.3 (b)] (with  $\mathcal{F} = W_2$ ,  $l = 4$  and  $s = 0$ ) it can be shown that  $\Psi_r^*: L^2(0, T; L^2(I; \mathbb{R}^d)) \rightarrow L^2(0, T; L^2(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$  is a linear isomorphism with  $\Psi_r^*(\mathbb{X}_T) \subset \mathbb{X}_T$ . Moreover, we observe

$$(\partial_t \Psi_r^* g)(t, x) = \partial_t g(t + \xi(t)r, x)(1 + \xi'(t)r) = (\Psi_r^* \partial_t g)(t, x) \cdot (1 + \xi'(t)r). \quad (3.1)$$

As in Section 2.4 (with  $\bar{f} = f$  as our reference solution), we consider

$$B_M := \{g \in \mathbb{X}_T \mid g(0) = f_0 \text{ and } \|g - f\|_{\mathbb{X}_T} < M\},$$

which is an open set in the affine space  $\{g \in \mathbb{X}_T \mid g(0) = f_0\}$ . Furthermore we define

$$W_T := \{(\psi, b^0, b^1) \in \mathbb{Y}_T^1 \times \mathcal{D}_T^0 \times \mathcal{D}_T^1 \mid b^0(0) = 0, b^1(0) = 0\}. \quad (3.2)$$

Note that  $W_T$  is a closed linear subspace of  $\mathbb{Y}_T^1 \times \mathcal{D}_T^0 \times \mathcal{D}_T^1$ . Choosing  $M, T > 0$  small enough, by Lemma 2.12 the map

$$\Theta: B_M \times (-r_0, r_0) \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}_T^1 \times \mathcal{D}_T^0 \times \mathcal{D}_T^1$$

$$\Theta(g, r) := \begin{pmatrix} \partial_t g + (1 + \xi' r)(\mathcal{A}(g) - \Lambda(g)) \\ \text{tr}_{\partial I}(g - f_0) \\ \text{tr}_{\partial I}(\partial_x g - (\tau_0, \tau_1)|\partial_x f_0|) \end{pmatrix}$$

is well-defined. Moreover, it's easy to see that its image is contained in  $W_T$ . We now claim that  $\Theta$  is analytic. First, we note that the map

$$B_M \ni g \mapsto |\partial_x g|^{-1} \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathcal{C}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$$

is analytic. This follows from Remark 2.18 and the fact that for any  $c > 0$  the map

$$\{u \in \mathcal{C}^0([0, T] \times I; \mathbb{R}^d) \mid |u| > c \text{ on } [0, T] \times I\} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^0([0, T] \times I; \mathbb{R}), u \mapsto |u|$$

is analytic by [4, Theorem 6.8]. Furthermore, as the careful analysis in Proposition 2.7 and Corollary 2.11 shows, all components of  $\Theta(g, r)$  are sums of bounded multilinear maps on appropriate Banach spaces in  $\gamma^{-1} = |\partial_x g|^{-1}$ ,  $\{\partial_x^k g\}_{k=1}^4$  and  $r$  and thus analytic. Moreover, using (3.1) and (2.3) we find

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_t \Psi_r^* f)(t, x) &= \partial_t f(t + \xi(t)r, x)(1 + \xi'(t)r) \\ &= (-\mathcal{A}(f) + \Lambda(f))(t + \xi(t)r, x) \cdot (1 + \xi'(t)r) \\ &= (-\mathcal{A}(\Psi_r^* f) + \Lambda(\Psi_r^* f))(t, x) \cdot (1 + \xi'(t)r), \end{aligned}$$

since  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\Lambda$  only act on the spatial variables. Therefore, we have  $\Theta(\Psi_r^* f, r) = 0$  for all  $r \in (-r_0, r_0)$ .

As a next step, we will show that  $\Theta(g, r) = 0$  implies  $g = \Psi_r^* f$ , for  $g \in B_M$  and  $r \in (-r_0, r_0)$ . To that end, we compute using that  $\Psi_r^*$  is an isomorphism and (3.1)

$$\partial_t g = \partial_t (\Psi_r^* (\Psi_r^*)^{-1} g) = \Psi_r^* \partial_t ((\Psi_r^*)^{-1} g) \cdot (1 + \xi' r).$$

Now, let  $g \in B_M, r \in (-r_0, r_0)$  such that  $\Theta(g, r) = 0$ . Defining  $h := (\Psi_r^*)^{-1} g \in \mathbb{X}_T$ , we then have  $\partial_t h = (\Psi_r^*)^{-1} \left( \frac{\partial_t g}{1 + \xi' r} \right)$ . Furthermore, using  $\Theta(g, r) = 0$ , we find

- (i)  $h(0, x) = (\Psi_r^* h)(0, x) = f_0(x), \quad x \in I;$
- (ii)  $h(t + \xi(t)r, y) = g(t, y) = p_y, \quad t \in [0, T], y \in \partial I;$
- (iii)  $\partial_x h(t + \xi(t)r, y) = \partial_x g(t, y) = \tau_y |\partial_x f_0(y)|, \quad t \in [0, T], y \in \partial I.$

Since  $[0, T] \rightarrow [0, T], t \mapsto t + \xi(t)r$  is a diffeomorphism, we conclude  $h(t, y) = f_0(y)$  and  $\partial_x h(t, y) = \tau_y |\partial_x f_0(y)|$  for  $t \in [0, T], y \in \partial I$ . Consequently, we find

$$\begin{aligned} &\begin{pmatrix} \partial_t (\Psi_r^*)^{-1} g + (\mathcal{A}((\Psi_r^*)^{-1} g) - \Lambda((\Psi_r^*)^{-1} g)) \\ \text{tr}_{\partial I}((\Psi_r^*)^{-1} g - f_0) \\ \text{tr}_{\partial I}(\partial_x (\Psi_r^*)^{-1} g - (\tau_0, \tau_1)|\partial_x f_0|) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} (\Psi_r^*)^{-1} \left( \frac{\partial_t g}{1 + \xi' r} \right) + (\Psi_r^*)^{-1} \mathcal{A}(g) - (\Psi_r^*)^{-1} \Lambda(g) \\ \text{tr}_{\partial I}((\Psi_r^*)^{-1} g - f_0) \\ \text{tr}_{\partial I}(\partial_x (\Psi_r^*)^{-1} g - (\tau_0, \tau_1)|\partial_x f_0|) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

using that  $(\Psi_r^*)^{-1}$  commutes with differentiation, integration and taking the trace with respect to the spatial variable, since it only acts on the temporal variable.

Now, by (3.3)  $h = (\Psi_r^*)^{-1}g \in \mathbb{X}_T$  is a solution to the PDE system (2.3) and thus by the global uniqueness result in Theorem 2.20, we conclude  $h = f$ , hence  $g = \Psi_r^*f$ .

In the following Lemma 3.3, we will see that  $D^1\Theta(f, 0) := \Theta'(f, 0)|_{0\mathbb{X}_{T_1}} : 0\mathbb{X}_{T_1} \rightarrow W_{T_1}$  is an isomorphism of Banach spaces for  $T_1 > 0$  small enough.

Hence, by the analytic form of the implicit function theorem, there exists  $0 < \varepsilon < r_0$  and  $h \in C^\omega((-\varepsilon, \varepsilon), \mathbb{X}_{T_1})$  such that for all  $(g, r) \in B_M \times (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$  we have  $\Theta(g, r) = 0$  if and only if  $g = h(r)$ . However, by the previous results this yields  $h(r) = \Psi_r^*f$  for all  $|r| < \varepsilon$ . In particular, we get that  $(-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \mathbb{X}_{T_1}, r \mapsto \Psi_r^*f$  is analytic, and thus so is the map  $(-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \rightarrow W^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d), r \mapsto (\Psi_r^*f)(t_0, \cdot) = f(t_0 + \xi(t_0)r, \cdot) = f(t_0 + r, \cdot)$  by Proposition B.1 (i). Consequently, the map  $(t_0 - \varepsilon, t_0 + \varepsilon) \rightarrow W^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d), t \mapsto f(t, \cdot)$  is analytic and the claim follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.3.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.1, there exists  $T_1 = T_1(T, M, f)$  such that  $D^1\Theta(f, 0) : 0\mathbb{X}_{T_1} \rightarrow W_{T_1}$  given by*

$$D^1\Theta(f, 0) = \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \Theta(f + \varepsilon u, 0) = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_t u + \mathcal{A}'(f)u - \Lambda'(f)u \\ \text{tr}_{\partial I} u \\ \text{tr}_{\partial I} \partial_x u \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.4)$$

is an isomorphism of Banach spaces. Here  $\mathcal{A}'(f), \Lambda'(f) : 0\mathbb{X}_{T_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}_{T_1}^1$  denote the Fréchet-derivatives of the analytic maps  $\mathcal{A}, \Lambda$  at  $f$  and  $W_{T_1}$  is as in (3.2).

*Proof.* Let  $0 < T_1 \leq T$  to be chosen. Using the definition of  $\Theta$ , (3.4) follows from a direct computation. We write  $D^1\Theta(f, 0)u = Lu + Ju$ , where

$$Lu = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_t u + \frac{\partial_x^4 u}{|\partial_x f|^4} \\ \text{tr}_{\partial I} u \\ \text{tr}_{\partial I} \partial_x u \end{pmatrix}, \quad Ju = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{A}'(f)u - \frac{\partial_x^4 u}{|\partial_x f|^4} - \Lambda'(f)u \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.5)$$

It is a consequence of Theorem 2.1 that  $L : 0\mathbb{X}_{T_1} \rightarrow W_{T_1}$  is an isomorphism of Banach spaces, where the required compatibility conditions in (2.6) are satisfied by definition of  $W_{T_1}$ . The assumption  $a = |\partial_x f|^{-4} \geq \alpha > 0$  is a consequence of Remark 2.18. We will now show that the operator norm of  $J : 0\mathbb{X}_{T_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}_{T_1}^1$  tends to zero as  $T_1$  goes to zero. This will follow from the contraction estimates in Section 2.4 and the multilinear structure of the nonlinearities. For any  $\Phi \in \mathcal{A}^{(a,b)}$  with corresponding  $\varphi \in A^{(a,b)}$ , cf. Definition 2.4, we have the following variation.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \Phi(f + \varepsilon u) &= \sum_{i=1}^m \varphi(\partial_x f, \dots, \partial_x u, \dots, \partial_x f, \partial_x^2 f, \dots, \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x^3 f, \dots, \partial_x^3 f) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^a \varphi(\partial_x f, \dots, \partial_x f, \partial_x^2 f, \dots, \partial_x^2 u, \dots, \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x^3 f, \dots, \partial_x^3 f) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^b \varphi(\partial_x f, \dots, \partial_x f, \partial_x^2 f, \dots, \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x^3 f, \dots, \partial_x^3 u, \dots, \partial_x^3 f). \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$



In particular, the derivative is again the same multilinear map, applied to derivatives of  $f$  and  $u$ . Since our nonlinearities also involve integer powers of the arc-length element, we compute the variation

$$\left. \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \right|_{\varepsilon=0} |\partial_x(f + \varepsilon u)|^{-\ell} = -\ell |\partial_x f|^{-(\ell+2)} \langle \partial_x f, \partial_x u \rangle. \quad (3.7)$$

Note that the derivatives  $\mathcal{A}'(f)u$  and  $\Lambda'(f)u$  consist of terms of the following form, cf. (2.1), (2.2), Lemma A.2, with  $\Phi \in \mathcal{A}^{(a,b)}$  and  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$ :

- (i)  $\left. \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \right|_{\varepsilon=0} |\partial_x(f + \varepsilon u)|^{-\ell} \Phi(f + \varepsilon u)$  with  $(a, b) = (1, 1)$  or  $(a, b) = (3, 0)$ ;
- (ii)  $\left. \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \right|_{\varepsilon=0} \int_I |\partial_x(f + \varepsilon u)|^{-\ell} \Phi(f + \varepsilon u) dx$  with  $(a, b) = (0, 2)$ ,  $(a, b) = (2, 1)$  or  $(a, b) = (4, 0)$ ;
- (iii)  $\left. \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \right|_{\varepsilon=0} \text{tr}_{\partial I} |\partial_x(f + \varepsilon u)|^{-\ell} \Phi(f + \varepsilon u)$  with  $(a, b) = (1, 1)$  or  $(a, b) = (3, 0)$ ;
- (iv)  $\left. \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \right|_{\varepsilon=0} |\partial_x(f + \varepsilon u)|^{-4} \partial_x^4(f + \varepsilon u)$ .

In the first case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left. \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \right|_{\varepsilon=0} |\partial_x(f + \varepsilon u)|^{-\ell} \Phi(f + \varepsilon u) \\ &= -\ell |\partial_x f|^{-(\ell+2)} \langle \partial_x f, \partial_x u \rangle \Phi(f) + |\partial_x f|^{-\ell} \left. \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \right|_{\varepsilon=0} \Phi(f + \varepsilon u). \end{aligned}$$

Note that by Remark 2.18, the arc-length element is bounded from below, uniformly in  $t \in [0, T]$ . For the second term above, we may use Corollary 2.10. The assumptions are satisfied by the mapping properties and estimates which we showed in the proof of Proposition 2.7, case (i), more precisely (2.17), (2.18) and (2.19) for  $(a, b) = (1, 1)$  and (2.17) and (2.20) for  $(a, b) = (3, 0)$ . Thus, using (3.6) and Corollary 2.10 we obtain for  $T_1 = T_1(q, T, M, f) > 0$  small enough

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \left. \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \right|_{\varepsilon=0} |\partial_x(f + \varepsilon u)|^{-\ell} \Phi(f + \varepsilon u) \right\|_{L^2(0, T_1; L^2)} \\ & \leq C(\ell, f) \left( \|\partial_x u\|_{C^0([0, T_1] \times I; \mathbb{R}^d)} + q \|u\|_{\mathbb{X}_{T_1}} \right) \leq C(\ell, T, f) (T_1^\alpha + q) \|u\|_{\mathbb{X}_{T_1}}, \quad (3.8) \end{aligned}$$

using (2.17), where now  $T$  plays the role of  $T_0$  earlier. Clearly first choosing  $q \in (0, 1)$  and then  $T_1 > 0$  the operator norm of this map  ${}_0\mathbb{X}_{T_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}_{T_1}^1 = L^2(0, T_1; L^2)$  can be made arbitrarily small. For the other cases we will proceed similarly.

In the second case, we have as in case (ii) of the proof of Proposition 2.7

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \left. \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \right|_{\varepsilon=0} \int_I |\partial_x(f + \varepsilon u)|^{-\ell} \Phi(f + \varepsilon u) dx \right\|_{L^2(0, T_1)} \\ & \leq \left\| \left. \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \right|_{\varepsilon=0} |\partial_x(f + \varepsilon u)|^{-\ell} \Phi(f + \varepsilon u) \right\|_{L^2(0, T_1; L^1)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq C(\ell, f) \left( \|\partial_x u\|_{C^0([0, T_1] \times I; \mathbb{R}^d)} + q \|u\|_{\mathbb{X}_{T_1}} \right) \leq C(\ell, T, f) (T_1^\alpha + q) \|u\|_{\mathbb{X}_{T_1}}, \quad (3.9)$$

where we used (2.17) in the last step. The third case is as in case (iii) in the proof of Proposition 2.7, hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \operatorname{tr}_{\partial I} |\partial_x(f + \varepsilon u)|^{-\ell} \Phi(f + \varepsilon u) \right\|_{L^2(0, T_1; (\mathbb{R}^d)^2)} \\ & \leq \left\| \operatorname{tr}_{\partial I} \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} |\partial_x(f + \varepsilon u)|^{-\ell} \Phi(f + \varepsilon u) \right\|_{L^2(0, T_1; (\mathbb{R}^d)^2)} \\ & \leq C(\ell, f) \left( \|\partial_x u\|_{C^0([0, T_1] \times I; \mathbb{R}^d)} + q \|u\|_{\mathbb{X}_{T_1}} \right) \leq C(\ell, T, f) (T_1^\alpha + q) \|u\|_{\mathbb{X}_{T_1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

Now, we are going to prove that  $J$  has arbitrarily small operator norm for  $T_1 > 0$  small. First, using (2.2), the 4<sup>th</sup> order term in  $u$  in  $\mathcal{A}'(f)u - \frac{\partial_x^4 u}{|\partial_x f|^4}$  cancels since

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \frac{\partial_x^4(f + \varepsilon u)}{|\partial_x(f + \varepsilon u)|} - \frac{\partial_x^4 u}{|\partial_x f|^4} \right\|_{L^2(0, T_1; L^2)} &= \left\| -4 \frac{\partial_x^4 f}{|\partial_x f|^6} \langle \partial_x f, \partial_x u \rangle \right\|_{L^2(0, T_1; L^2)} \\ &\leq C(f) \|\partial_x u\|_{C^0([0, T_1] \times I; \mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &\leq C(T, f) T_1^\alpha \|u\|_{\mathbb{X}_{T_1}}, \end{aligned}$$

using (2.17). In particular, this has arbitrarily small operator norm for  $T_1 > 0$  small enough. The lower order terms in  $\mathcal{A}'(f)u$  are as in case (i) above by (2.2) and hence have arbitrarily small operator norm by (3.8) choosing  $T_1 > 0$  small enough.

For the  $\Lambda'(f)u$  term, we proceed as in the proof of Lemma 2.12 and write  $\lambda(f) = \frac{N(f)}{2\mathcal{E}(f)}$ . Consequently, we have

$$\Lambda'(f)u = \frac{N'(f)u}{2\mathcal{E}(f)} \vec{\kappa}(f) - \frac{N(f)\mathcal{E}'(f)u}{2\mathcal{E}(f)^2} \vec{\kappa}(f) + \lambda(f) \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \vec{\kappa}(f + \varepsilon u), \quad (3.11)$$

where  $\mathcal{E}'(f)(t) := \mathcal{E}'(f(t, \cdot)): W^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  denotes the Fréchet derivative of  $\mathcal{E}$  at  $f(t, \cdot) \in W_{Imm}^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ . For the first term in (3.11), we use Remark 2.18 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{N'(f)u}{\mathcal{E}(f)} \vec{\kappa}(f) \right\|_{L^2(0, T_1; L^2)} &\leq C(f) \|\vec{\kappa}(f)\|_{L^\infty(0, T_1; L^2)} \|N'(f)u\|_{L^2(0, T_1)} \\ &\leq C(T, f) (T_1^\alpha + q) \|u\|_{\mathbb{X}_{T_1}}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

using (3.9) and (3.10) since  $N'(f)u$  consists of terms as in Cases (ii) and (iii) above. Again, this can be made arbitrarily small in operator norm for  $q \in (0, 1)$  and  $T_1 > 0$  small enough.

The second term can be estimated by

$$\left\| \frac{N(f)\mathcal{E}'(f)u}{\mathcal{E}(f)^2} \vec{\kappa}(f) \right\|_{L^2(0, T_1; L^2)}$$

$$\leq C(f) \|\vec{\kappa}(f)\|_{L^\infty(0,T_1;L^2)} \|N(f)\|_{L^2(0,T_1)} \sup_{t \in [0,T_1]} (\|\mathcal{E}'(f(t))\|_{(W^{2,2})^*} \|u(t)\|_{W^{2,2}}). \quad (3.13)$$

Since  $\mathcal{E}$  is analytic on the space of  $W^{2,2}$ -immersions, there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that if  $\|f(t, \cdot) - f_0\|_{W^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)} < \delta$ , we have

$$\|\mathcal{E}'(f(t, \cdot)) - \mathcal{E}'(f_0)\|_{(W^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))^*} \leq 1.$$

Like in the proof of Lemma 2.3, taking  $T_1 = T_1(f_0) > 0$  small enough, we may conclude that  $\|\mathcal{E}'(f(t))\|_{(W^{2,2})^*} \leq C(f_0)$  for all  $0 \leq t \leq T_1$ . Moreover, by Proposition B.1 (i), we have  $\|u(t)\|_{W^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C(T) \|u\|_{\mathbb{X}_{T_1}}$  for all  $0 \leq t \leq T_1 \leq T$ . Therefore, since  $\|N(f)\|_{L^2(0,T_1)} \rightarrow 0$  as  $T_1 \rightarrow 0$  by dominated convergence, (3.13) yields

$$\left\| \frac{N(f) \mathcal{E}'(f) u}{\mathcal{E}(f)^2} \vec{\kappa}(f) \right\|_{L^2(0,T_1;L^2)} \leq q \|u\|_{\mathbb{X}_{T_1}}, \quad (3.14)$$

for any given  $q \in (0, 1)$ , taking  $T_1 = T_1(q, T, f) > 0$  small enough.

For the last term in (3.11), we compute using Proposition A.1 (i)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \vec{\kappa}(f + \varepsilon u) &= \frac{\partial_x^2 u}{|\partial_x f|^2} - \frac{\langle \partial_x f, \partial_x u \rangle}{|\partial_x f|^4} \partial_x^2 f - \frac{\langle \partial_x^2 u, \partial_x f \rangle}{|\partial_x f|^4} \partial_x f - \frac{\langle \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x u \rangle}{|\partial_x f|^4} \partial_x f \\ &\quad - \frac{\langle \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x f \rangle}{|\partial_x f|^4} \partial_x u + 4 \frac{\langle \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x f \rangle \langle \partial_x f, \partial_x u \rangle}{|\partial_x f|^6} \partial_x f. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \vec{\kappa}(f + \varepsilon u) \right\|_{L^\infty(0,T_1;L^2)} &\leq C(T, f) (\|\partial_x^2 u\|_{L^\infty(0,T_1;L^2)} + \|\partial_x u\|_{L^\infty(0,T_1;L^2)}) \\ &\leq C(T, f) \|u\|_{\mathbb{X}_{T_1}} \end{aligned}$$

by Proposition B.1 (i), and consequently

$$\left\| \lambda(f) \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \vec{\kappa}(f + \varepsilon u) \right\|_{L^2(0,T_1;L^2)} \leq \|\lambda(f)\|_{L^2(0,T_1)} C(T, f) \|u\|_{\mathbb{X}_{T_1}}, \quad (3.15)$$

which has arbitrarily small operator norm if  $0 < T_1 = T_1(f) \leq T$  is small enough, using  $\|\lambda(f)\|_{L^2(0,T_1)} \rightarrow 0$  as  $T_1 \rightarrow 0$  by dominated convergence.

Consequently, from (3.11), (3.12), (3.14) and (3.15) we conclude that

$${}_0\mathbb{X}_{T_1} \rightarrow L^2(0, T_1; L^2), u \mapsto \Lambda'(f)u$$

has arbitrarily small operator norm if  $T_1 > 0$  is small enough. Consequently, we have shown that  $\lim_{T_1 \rightarrow 0} \|J\|_{\mathcal{L}({}_0\mathbb{X}_{T_1}, W_{T_1})} \rightarrow 0$ .

To finish the proof, we will use the Neumann series. By Theorem 2.1 we have the estimate  $\|L^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(W_{T_1,0}, \mathbb{X}_{T_1})} \leq C(T, f) =: \hat{c}$  for all  $0 < T_1 \leq T$ . Note that now  $f$  corresponds to the data in the linear problem, not to the variable. By the above estimates, for  $0 < T_1 \leq T$  small enough, we have  $\|J\|_{\mathcal{L}({}_0\mathbb{X}_{T_1}, W_{T_1})} < q := \frac{1}{\hat{c}}$ . Therefore, the map  $D^1\Theta(f, 0) = L + J \in \mathcal{L}({}_0\mathbb{X}_{T_1}, W_{T_1})$  is an isomorphism by the Neumann series theorem, [39, II.1 Theorem 2].  $\square$

### 3.2. Higher integrability for the Lagrange multiplier

In this section, we will use the higher time regularity to improve the integrability of  $\lambda$ , which will allow us to start a bootstrap argument. First, we recall the following modification of [9, Lemma 4.3].

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $f \in \mathbb{X}_{T,2}$  be a solution of (1.3). Then, we have*

$$|\lambda|(\ell - |p_1 - p_0|) \leq 2\ell \|\partial_t^\perp f\|_{L^1(ds)} + \int_I |\vec{\kappa}|^2 ds + \int_I |\nabla_s \vec{\kappa}| ds.$$

*Proof.* We proceed as in [9, Lemma 4.3]. Let  $l: [0, T) \times I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  be the parametrization of the line segment from  $p_0$  to  $p_1$  given by

$$l(t, x) := p_0 + \frac{\varphi(t, x)}{\ell}(p_1 - p_0),$$

with  $\varphi(t, \xi) := \int_0^\xi |\partial_x f| dx$  for  $(t, \xi) \in [0, T) \times I$ . We then have  $l(t, 0) = p_0, l(t, 1) = p_1$  and  $\partial_s l(t, \cdot) = \frac{1}{\ell}(p_1 - p_0)$ . Therefore, using the identity  $\nabla_s^2 \vec{\kappa} + \frac{1}{2}|\vec{\kappa}|^2 \vec{\kappa} = \nabla_s (\nabla_s \vec{\kappa} + \frac{1}{2}|\vec{\kappa}|^2 \partial_s f)$  (cf. [9, p. 1048]), we find after integrating by parts

$$\begin{aligned} \int_I \langle \partial_t^\perp f, f - l \rangle ds &= \left\langle \left( \lambda - \frac{1}{2}|\vec{\kappa}|^2 \right) \partial_s f - \nabla_s \vec{\kappa}, f - l \right\rangle \Big|_{\partial I} + \frac{1}{2} \int_I |\vec{\kappa}|^2 ds - \lambda \int_I ds \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{\ell} \int_I \langle \nabla_s \vec{\kappa} + \frac{1}{2}|\vec{\kappa}|^2 \partial_s f - \lambda \partial_s f, p_1 - p_0 \rangle ds. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, since  $f = l$  on the boundary, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\lambda|(\ell - |p_1 - p_0|) &= \left( 1 - \frac{|p_1 - p_0|}{\ell} \right) |\lambda| \int_I ds \\ &\leq \int_I |\partial_t^\perp f| ds \|f - l\|_\infty + \frac{1}{2} \int_I |\vec{\kappa}|^2 ds + \frac{|p_1 - p_0|}{2\ell} \int_I |\vec{\kappa}|^2 ds + \frac{|p_1 - p_0|}{\ell} \int_I |\nabla_s \vec{\kappa}| ds. \end{aligned}$$

Using (1.7) and the simple estimate  $\|f - l\|_\infty \leq 2\ell$  yields the claim.  $\square$

Note that a priori, the Lagrange multiplier  $\lambda$  will be only  $L^2(0, T)$  for  $f \in \mathbb{X}_{T,2}$ . The next proposition improves this integrability, at least on a small timescale bounded away from zero.

**Proposition 3.5.** *Let  $f$  be the solution of (2.3) from Theorem 2.17 and let  $T_1 > 0$  as in Theorem 3.2. Then, for any  $0 < \varepsilon < T_1$  we have  $\lambda(f) \in L^4(\varepsilon, T_1)$ .*

*Proof.* As a consequence of Theorem 3.2, we have  $\partial_t f \in \mathcal{C}^\omega((0, T_1; W^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)))$  and thus we get  $\partial_t f \in \mathcal{C}^0([\varepsilon, T_1] \times I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ . Hence, Lemma 3.4 and (1.7) yield that  $\lambda$  has the same integrability on  $(\varepsilon, T_1)$  as  $\int_I |\nabla_s \vec{\kappa}| ds$ . By Proposition A.1 (ii) and the uniform bounds on the arc-length element, cf. Remark 2.18, it suffices to show  $\partial_x^3 f \in L^4(\varepsilon, T_1; L^1(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$ , since  $\partial_x^2 f \in \mathcal{C}^0([\varepsilon, T_1]; L^2(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$ . In fact using Proposition B.3 (i) as in (2.22), we even get  $\partial_x^3 f \in L^4(\varepsilon, T_1; L^2(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$ .  $\square$

### 3.3. The bootstrap argument in the Sobolev scale

The improved integrability of  $\lambda$  in Proposition 3.5 enables us to start a bootstrap argument to increase the Sobolev regularity of our solution in Theorem 2.17. Note that by Sobolev embeddings, in order to prove smoothness of our solution it suffices to reach  $\mathbb{X}_{T,p}$  with  $p > 5$ , see Lemma 3.7.

**Proposition 3.6.** *Let  $f$  be as in Theorem 2.17, let  $T_1 > 0$  be as in Theorem 3.2 and let  $0 < \varepsilon < T_1$ . Then  $f \in W^{1,20}(\varepsilon, T_1; L^{20}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)) \cap L^{20}(\varepsilon, T_1; W^{4,20}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$ .*

*Proof.* For any  $0 < \delta < T_1$  let  $\eta \in C^\infty([0, T]; \mathbb{R})$  be a smooth cutoff function with  $\eta \equiv 0$  on  $[0, \frac{\delta}{2}]$  and  $\eta \equiv 1$  on  $[\delta, T_1)$ . Since  $f$  solves (2.3), the function  $u := f\eta$  solves the equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u + \frac{\partial_x^4 u}{|\partial_x f|^4} = \hat{F} & \text{on } (0, T_1) \times I \\ u(0, x) = 0 & \text{for } x \in I \\ u(t, y) = p_y \eta(t) & \text{for } 0 \leq t < T_1 \\ \partial_x u(t, y) = \tau_y \eta(t) |\partial_x f_0(y)| & \text{for } 0 \leq t < T_1. \end{cases} \quad (3.16)$$

with  $\hat{F} := [\tilde{F}(|\partial_x f|^{-1}, \partial_x f, \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x^3 f) + \lambda(f)\tilde{\kappa}_f] \eta + f \partial_t \eta$ , where  $\tilde{F}$  is as in (2.2).

Then, up to the regularity of  $\hat{F}$ , the system (3.16) satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 2.1 for any  $p \in [2, \infty)$ . The coefficient  $|\partial_x f|^{-1}$  is Hölder continuous by Proposition B.1 (iii) and the initial datum is smooth. Moreover, the zeroth and first order boundary data are smooth in time since  $\eta$  is smooth. Furthermore, the compatibility conditions (2.6) are trivially satisfied since  $\eta$  vanishes near  $t = 0$ .

The strategy of the proof is a *bootstrap argument* which works as follows: If for any  $p > 2$  we are able to show  $\hat{F} \in \mathbb{Y}_{T_1,p} = L^p(0, T_1; L^p(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$ , we may then conclude the existence of a unique solution  $v \in \mathbb{X}_{T_1,p} = W^{1,p}(0, T_1; L^p(I; \mathbb{R}^d)) \cap L^p(0, T_1; W^{4,p}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$ . However,  $v$  then also is a solution in the class  $\mathbb{X}_{T_1,2}$  and so is  $u = f\eta$ . By the uniqueness part of Theorem 2.1 we may then conclude  $v = u \in \mathbb{X}_{T_1,p}$ . Thus, the Sobolev regularity of  $u$  has improved from 2 to  $p > 2$ . On  $[\delta, T_1)$  this yields an improved regularity for  $f$ . In the next iteration we will repeat this argument with  $p' > p$  while increasing  $\delta > 0$ . In particular, note that  $\delta$  and hence  $\eta$  and  $u$  changes between each step. Note that since we only wish to accomplish  $u \in \mathbb{X}_{T_1,p}$  for some  $p > 5$ , we will not necessarily use the optimal regularity gain in each step.

Step 1:  $f \in W^{1,\frac{5}{2}}(\frac{\varepsilon}{4}, T_1; L^{\frac{5}{2}}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)) \cap L^{\frac{5}{2}}(\frac{\varepsilon}{4}, T_1; W^{4,\frac{5}{2}}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$ . Let  $\delta := \frac{\varepsilon}{4}$ . By the above remark, the claim follows from  $\hat{F} \in \mathbb{Y}_{T_1,\frac{5}{2}} = L^{\frac{5}{2}}(0, T_1; L^{\frac{5}{2}}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$  which we will now show.

We start with the term  $\tilde{F}$ . By Remark 2.18 the arc-length element is uniformly bounded from above and below on  $(0, T)$  and hence the zeroth and first order terms and factors do not affect integrability. By (2.2),  $\tilde{F}$  consists of multilinearities of the type  $\Phi \in \mathcal{A}^{(a,b)}$  with  $(a, b) = (1, 1)$  and  $(a, b) = (3, 0)$  and as in the proof of Proposition 2.7, we will use Hölder's inequality to prove the integrability.

Note that Proposition B.1 (iii) with  $k = 2, \theta = \frac{4}{5}$  yields  $\partial_x^2 f \in L^{10}(0, T; L^{10}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$ , thus in particular  $|\partial_x^2 f|^3 \in L^{\frac{5}{2}}(0, T; L^{\frac{5}{2}}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$ . Moreover, by Proposition B.3 (i) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_x^2 f &\in L^{\frac{40}{3}}(0, T; L^5(I; \mathbb{R}^d)) \text{ using } k = 2, \theta = \frac{17}{20}, \\ \partial_x^3 f &\in L^{\frac{40}{13}}(0, T; L^5(I; \mathbb{R}^d)) \text{ using } k = 3, \theta = \frac{7}{10}.\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, by Hölder's inequality we find  $|\partial_x^2 f| |\partial_x^3 f| \in L^{\frac{5}{2}}(0, T; L^{\frac{5}{2}}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$ .

The term  $f \partial_t \eta$  is even in  $\mathcal{C}^\alpha([0, T] \times I; \mathbb{R}^d)$  by Proposition B.1 (ii), using  $f \in \mathbb{X}_{T_1, 2}$ , and hence does not affect the integrability.

For the remaining term, we observe that clearly  $\lambda(f) \vec{\kappa}_f \eta|_{(0, \frac{\varepsilon}{8})} \equiv 0$  has the correct integrability, whereas for the remaining interval  $(\frac{\varepsilon}{8}, T_1)$  we may use the improved time regularity. Using Proposition A.1, and the bounds on the arc-length element we get  $\vec{\kappa}_f \in L^{10}(0, T; L^{10}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$ . Moreover, by Proposition 3.5 we have  $\lambda \in L^4(\frac{\varepsilon}{8}, T_1)$  and hence by Hölder's inequality we find  $\lambda(f) \vec{\kappa}_f \eta \in L^{\frac{5}{2}}(0, T; L^{\frac{5}{2}}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$ . Consequently, have  $u \in \mathbb{X}_{T_1, \frac{5}{2}}$ .

Step 2:  $f \in W^{1,4}(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, T_1; L^4(I; \mathbb{R}^d)) \cap L^4(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, T_1; W^{4,4}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$ . We now take  $\delta := \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$  and a corresponding cutoff function  $\eta$ . As in step 1, we will show  $\hat{F} \in L^4(0, T_1; L^4(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$ . Again, all terms which are of zeroth or first order in  $f$  are in  $L^\infty((0, T) \times I)$  and hence do not affect the integrability. Moreover, since  $\eta \equiv 0$  on  $[0, \frac{\varepsilon}{4}]$ , we immediately have  $\hat{F} \in L^4(0, \frac{\varepsilon}{4}; L^4(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$ . It hence remains to consider the interval  $(\frac{\varepsilon}{4}, T_1)$ , where we can use the previous step. By step 1,  $u \in \mathbb{X}_{T_1, \frac{5}{2}}$  and thus by Proposition B.1 (i), we have

$$u \in BUC\left([0, T_1]; B_{\frac{5}{2}, \frac{5}{2}}^{4(1-\frac{2}{5})}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)\right) = BUC\left([0, T_1]; W^{\frac{12}{5}, \frac{5}{2}}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)\right),$$

using [37, Theorem 4.3.3 (a)] and  $\frac{12}{5} \notin \mathbb{Z}$ . Consequently

$$\partial_x^2 f \in \mathcal{C}^0\left([\frac{\varepsilon}{4}, T_1]; L^q(I; \mathbb{R}^d)\right), \quad \text{for any } q \in [1, \infty). \quad (3.17)$$

Moreover, using Proposition B.1 (iii) with  $k = 3, p = \frac{5}{2}$  and  $\theta = \frac{29}{40}$  we get  $\partial_x^3 u \in L^{\frac{32}{7}}(0, T_1; L^8(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$ , and hence  $\partial_x^3 f \in L^{\frac{32}{7}}(\frac{\varepsilon}{4}, T_1; L^8(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$ . In particular, choosing  $q$  in (3.17) large enough we find

$$|\partial_x^2 f| |\partial_x^3 f| \in L^4\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{4}, T_1; L^4(I; \mathbb{R}^d)\right).$$

Moreover, we have  $\partial_x^2 u \in L^{15}(0, T_1; L^{15}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$ , using Proposition B.1 (iii) with  $k = 2, p = \frac{5}{2}$  and  $\theta = \frac{2}{3}$ , so in particular  $|\partial_x^2 f|^3 \in L^4(\frac{\varepsilon}{4}, T_1; L^4(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$ . For the  $\lambda$ -term we have  $\lambda \in L^4(\frac{\varepsilon}{4}, T_1)$  by Proposition 3.5 and  $\partial_x^2 f \in \mathcal{C}^0([\frac{\varepsilon}{4}, T_1]; L^4(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$  by (3.17), so  $\lambda(f) \vec{\kappa}_f \in L^4(\frac{\varepsilon}{4}, T_1; L^4(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$  which finishes the proof of step 2.

Step 3:  $f \in W^{1,20}(\varepsilon, T_1; L^{20}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)) \cap L^{20}(\varepsilon, T_1; W^{4,20}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$ . We finally take  $\delta := \varepsilon$  with corresponding  $\eta$ . We will show  $\hat{F} \in L^{20}(0, T_1; L^{20}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$ . On the interval  $[0, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}]$

there is nothing to show, whereas on  $(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, T_1)$  we use the previous step. We have  $u \in \mathbb{X}_{T_1,4}$  and thus

$$u \in BUC([0, T_1]; B_{4,4}^{4(1-\frac{1}{4})}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}^0([0, T_1]; B_{4,4}^{\frac{5}{2}}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)) = \mathcal{C}^0([0, T_1]; W^{\frac{5}{2},4}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)),$$

using [37, Theorem 4.3.3 (a) and Theorem 4.6.1 (c)] for instance.

Consequently, we find  $\partial_x^2 f \in \mathcal{C}^0([\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, T_1]; \mathcal{C}^2(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$ , in particular, also second order terms in  $f$  do no longer affect integrability. By Proposition B.1 (iii) we have

$$\partial_x^3 f \in L^{20}(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, T_1; L^{20}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)), \quad \text{using } k=3, p=4 \text{ and } \theta = \frac{4}{5}. \quad (3.18)$$

For the term involving  $\lambda$ , we recall that using Theorem 3.2 and Lemma 3.4,  $\lambda$  has the same integrability as  $\int_I |\nabla_s \kappa| ds$  on  $(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, T_1)$ . Thus  $\lambda(f) \in L^{20}(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, T_1)$  using (3.18) and consequently  $\lambda(f) \vec{\kappa}_f \in L^{20}(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, T_1; L^{20}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$ . Thus, step 3 and hence the proposition is proven.  $\square$

### 3.4. Smoothing in the Hölder scale

In this section, we use parabolic Schauder theory to finally show Theorem 3.1, i.e. that our solution is smooth.

**Lemma 3.7.** *Let  $f$  be the solution of (2.3) constructed in Theorem 2.17. If there exists  $p > 5$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $f \in W^{1,p}(\varepsilon, T_1; L^p(I; \mathbb{R}^d)) \cap L^p(\varepsilon, T_1; W^{4,p}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$  then  $f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty((\varepsilon, T_1) \times I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ .*

*Proof.* We first show that  $f$  is in a parabolic Hölder space and subsequently use a bootstrapping argument to show the desired smoothness.

For simplification we assume that  $\varepsilon = 0$  in the first part of the proof. Let  $\delta > 0$  and  $\eta \in \mathcal{C}^\infty([0, T_1]; \mathbb{R})$  be a smooth cutoff satisfying  $\eta(t) = 0$  for all  $0 \leq t \leq \frac{\delta}{2}$ ,  $\eta(t) = 1$  for all  $\delta \leq t \leq T_1$ . Similar to (3.16) we find that  $u = \eta f$  satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u + a(t, x) \partial_x^4 u &= \hat{F} & \text{on } (0, T_1) \times I \\ u(0, x) &= 0 & \text{for } x \in I \\ u(t, y) &= p_y \eta(t) & \text{for } 0 \leq t < T_1 \\ \partial_x u(t, y) &= \tau_y \eta(t) |\partial_x f_0(y)| & \text{for } 0 \leq t < T_1. \end{cases} \quad (3.19)$$

with  $a(t, x) = |\partial_x f|^{-4}$  and  $\hat{F} = [\tilde{F}(\partial_x f, \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x^3 f, |\partial_x f|^{-1}) + \lambda_f \vec{\kappa}_f] \eta + \partial_t \eta f$ , cf. (3.16).

By Remark 2.18, there exists some  $c > 0$  such that  $c^{-1} \geq |\partial_x f| \geq c$  on  $[0, T_1] \times I$ . Similar to Proposition B.1 (ii), we find that  $f \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha([0, T_1]; \mathcal{C}^{3+\alpha}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$  for some  $\alpha > 0$ . From this we can show that  $\hat{F} \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha([0, T_1] \times I; \mathbb{R}^d)$  as follows: Using that Hölder spaces are algebras it is clear that  $\tilde{F}(|\partial_x f|^{-1}, \partial_x f, \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x^3 f) \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha([0, T_1] \times I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ , since  $\tilde{F}$  is a polynomial and  $x \mapsto \frac{1}{x}$  is smooth and Lipschitz on  $[c, \infty)$ . Similarly,  $\vec{\kappa}_f \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha([0, T_1] \times I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ , and since  $\eta$  is smooth, it only remains to check that  $\lambda_f \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha([0, T_1] \times I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ . For some polynomial  $P$  we have

$$2\mathcal{E}(f) = \int_I |\vec{\kappa}_f|^2 ds = \int_0^1 P(|\partial_x f|^{-1}, \partial_x f, \partial_x^2 f) dx \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha([0, T_1]) \subset \mathcal{C}^\alpha([0, T_1] \times I)$$

since  $P(|\partial_x f|^{-1}, \partial_x f, \partial_x^2 f) \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha([0, T_1] \times I)$ . By (2.1), for the numerator  $N(f)$  we have

$$N(f) = \langle \nabla_s \vec{\kappa}_f, \vec{\kappa}_f \rangle|_{\partial_I} - \int |\nabla_s \vec{\kappa}_f|^2 ds + \frac{1}{2} \int |\vec{\kappa}_f|^4 ds.$$

Being the spatial trace of a  $\mathcal{C}^\alpha([0, T_1] \times I)$ -function, the first term is in  $\mathcal{C}^\alpha([0, T_1]) \subset \mathcal{C}^\alpha([0, T_1] \times I)$ . Similarly, the first integrand is in  $\mathcal{C}^\alpha([0, T_1] \times I)$ , and the second in  $\mathcal{C}^\alpha([0, T_1]; \mathcal{C}^{1+\alpha}(I))$ , from which we obtain the desired smoothness of  $\lambda_f$ . Whence we have  $\hat{F} \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha([0, T_1] \times I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ , thus  $\hat{F} \in H^{\frac{\alpha}{4}, \alpha}([0, T_1] \times I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ , where we denote with the latter the parabolic Hölder space (see [35, §11, §13]). Since  $\eta$  vanishes near zero we find that the compatibility conditions are satisfied. Using  $a(t, x) \in H^{\frac{\alpha}{4}, \alpha}([0, T_1] \times I; \mathbb{R}^d)$  with  $a(t, x) \geq c^4 > 0$  we obtain from [35, Theorem 4.9] (see also [17, 3.3]) the maximal regularity of the problem (3.19) in the Hölder space  $H^{\frac{\alpha}{4}, \alpha}([0, T_1] \times I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ , since one can check similar to [36, p. 19] that the boundary values satisfy the Lopatinskii—Shapiro condition. Thus  $u \in H^{\frac{4+\alpha}{4}, 4+\alpha}([0, T_1] \times I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ , and by definition of  $\eta$  we have  $f \in H^{\frac{4+\alpha}{4}, 4+\alpha}([\delta, T_1] \times I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ .

To apply the bootstrapping procedure we first claim that if  $f \in H^{\frac{4+\beta}{4}, 4+\beta}([\tilde{\delta}, T_1] \times I; \mathbb{R}^d)$  for some  $\beta \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\beta > 0$  and  $\tilde{\delta} \geq 0$ , then  $f \in H^{\frac{5+\beta}{4}, 5+\beta}([\tilde{\delta} + \delta, T_1] \times I; \mathbb{R}^d)$  for any  $\delta > 0$ . From this claim and the first part of the proof it follows that

$$f \in \bigcap_{\delta > 0, \tilde{\delta} > 0, \beta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \setminus \mathbb{Z}} H^{\frac{4+\beta}{4}, 4+\beta}([\varepsilon + \tilde{\delta} + \delta, T_1] \times I; \mathbb{R}^d) \subset \mathcal{C}^\infty((\varepsilon, T_1) \times I; \mathbb{R}^d).$$

To finish the proof it hence remains to show the claim. To do so, we proceed as before by assuming that  $\tilde{\delta} = 0$  and choosing  $\eta$  and  $u$  as before. It only remains to check that if we have  $f \in H^{\frac{4+\beta}{4}, 4+\beta}([0, T_1] \times I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ , the functions  $a$  and  $\hat{F}$  are in the space  $H^{\frac{1+\beta}{4}, 1+\beta}([0, T_1] \times I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ , since then we have  $u \in H^{\frac{5+\beta}{4}, 5+\beta}([0, T_1] \times I; \mathbb{R}^d)$  by the maximal Hölder regularity and consequently  $f \in H^{\frac{5+\beta}{4}, 5+\beta}([\delta, T_1] \times I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ . Firstly, we have  $|\partial_x f|^{-1}, \partial_x f, \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x^3 f \in H^{\frac{1+\beta}{4}, 1+\beta}([0, T_1] \times I)$  by assumption and the definition of parabolic Hölder spaces. Thus we obtain that  $a, \hat{F}(|\partial_x f|^{-1}, \partial_x f, \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x^3 f)$  and  $\vec{\kappa}_f$  are in  $H^{\frac{1+\beta}{4}, 1+\beta}([0, T_1] \times I)$ , where we used that the Hölder spaces form an algebra. To show that  $\hat{F} \in H^{\frac{1+\beta}{4}, 1+\beta}([0, T_1] \times I)$  it suffices to prove this regularity for  $\lambda(f)$ . Similarly to the reasoning above we obtain

$$2\mathcal{E}(f) = \int_I |\vec{\kappa}_f|^2 ds = \int_0^1 P(|\partial_x f|^{-1}, \partial_x f, \partial_x^2 f) dx \in \mathcal{C}^{\frac{2+\beta}{4}}([0, T_1]) \subset H^{\frac{1+\beta}{4}, 1+\beta}([0, T_1] \times I)$$

and we can finish the proof by observing

$$\langle \nabla_s \vec{\kappa}_f, \vec{\kappa}_f \rangle|_{\partial_I} - \int |\nabla_s \vec{\kappa}_f|^2 ds + \frac{1}{2} \int |\vec{\kappa}_f|^4 ds \in \mathcal{C}^{\frac{1+\beta}{4}}([0, T_1]) \subset H^{\frac{1+\beta}{4}, 1+\beta}([0, T_1] \times I). \quad \square$$

Now, the proof of Theorem 3.1 is almost immediate.

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* The solution  $f$  in Theorem 1.1 is exactly the solution  $f$  in Theorem 2.17. By Proposition 3.6 we have  $f \in W^{1,20}(\varepsilon, T_1; L^{20}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)) \cap L^{20}(\varepsilon, T_1; L^{20}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$  for any  $0 < \varepsilon < T_1$ . Hence, by Lemma 3.7, we find  $f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty((\varepsilon, T_1) \times I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ .  $\square$



## 4. Long time behavior and the proof of Theorem 1.2

In this section, we will use the long time existence result in [9] to show the existence of a global solution of (1.3). Moreover, we will prove and use a *refined Łojasiewicz–Simon gradient inequality* to conclude convergence after reparametrization.

### 4.1. Long-time existence after reparametrization

As a first step towards proving Theorem 1.2, we will establish long-time existence and subconvergence after reparametrization for our solution. The key ingredient is the smoothness of our solution and [9, Theorem 1.1].

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $f \in W^{1,2}(0, T; L^2(I; \mathbb{R}^d)) \cap L^2(0, T; W^{4,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$  be as in Theorem 2.17 and let  $0 < \varepsilon < T$ . Then, there exists  $\bar{\varepsilon} \in (\varepsilon, T)$  and  $\hat{f} \in C^\infty((0, \infty) \times I; \mathbb{R}^d)$  satisfying (1.3) such that*

- (i)  $\hat{f}(t, x) = f(t, x)$  for all  $0 \leq t \leq \varepsilon, x \in I$ ;
- (ii)  $\hat{f}(t, \cdot)$  has zero tangential velocity for all  $t \geq \bar{\varepsilon}$ ;
- (iii)  $\hat{f}$  subconverges smoothly as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , after reparametrization with constant speed, to a constrained elastica, i.e. a solution (1.8).

*Proof.* By Theorem 3.1, the solution  $f$  in Theorem 2.17 is instantaneously smooth. Thus, to simplify notation we may assume  $f \in C^\infty([\varepsilon, T] \times I; \mathbb{R}^d)$  for some  $\varepsilon > 0$  after possibly reducing  $T > 0$ . Moreover, we may also assume a uniform bound from below on the arc-length element using Remark 2.18.

Let  $\theta := \langle \partial_t f, \partial_{s_f} f \rangle$  be the tangential velocity of  $f$ . By the smoothness of  $f$  and the bound on the arc-length element, the function  $(t, r) \mapsto \frac{\theta(t, r)}{|\partial_x f(t, r)|}$  is globally Lipschitz on  $[\varepsilon, T] \times I$ . For each  $x \in I$ , we consider the initial value problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \Phi(t, x) &= -\frac{\theta(t, \Phi(t, x))}{|\partial_x f(t, \Phi(t, x))|} \\ \Phi(\varepsilon, x) &= x. \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

By classical ODE theory, there exists  $\varepsilon < \hat{T} \leq T$  and a smooth family of reparametrizations  $\Phi: [\varepsilon, \hat{T}] \times I \rightarrow I$  satisfying (4.1) and

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(t, y) &= y \quad \text{for } t \in [\varepsilon, \hat{T}], y \in \partial I \\ \partial_x \Phi(t, x) &> 0 \quad \text{for all } (t, x) \in [\varepsilon, \hat{T}] \times I. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

Therefore,  $\Phi(t, \cdot)$  is strictly increasing and a diffeomorphism of  $I$  for each  $t \in [\varepsilon, \hat{T}]$ . A direct computation yields that the reparametrization  $f_1(t, x) := f(t, \Phi(t, x))$  satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t f_1(t, x) &= \partial_t f(t, \Phi(t, x)) + \partial_x f(t, \Phi(t, x)) \partial_t \Phi(t, x) \\ &= \partial_t^\perp f(t, \Phi(t, x)) + \theta(t, \Phi(t, x)) \partial_{s_f} f(t, \Phi(t, x)) + \partial_x f(t, \Phi(t, x)) \partial_t \Phi(t, x) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \partial_t^\perp f(t, \Phi(t, x)) \\
&= -\nabla_{s_{f_1}}^2 \vec{\kappa}_{f_1}(t, x) - \frac{1}{2} |\vec{\kappa}_{f_1}(t, x)|^2 \vec{\kappa}_{f_1}(t, x) + \lambda(f_1)(t) \vec{\kappa}_{f_1}(t, x),
\end{aligned}$$

using that  $f$  solves (1.3) and the transformation of the geometric quantities. For the boundary conditions, let  $t \in [\varepsilon, \hat{T}]$ ,  $y \in \partial I$  and note that  $f_1(t, y) = f(t, y) = p_y$  and  $\partial_{s_{f_1}} f_1(t, y) = \partial_{s_f} f(t, y) = \tau_y$  by (4.2). Consequently,  $f_1$  is a smooth solution of (1.3) on  $[\varepsilon, \hat{T}]$  with tangential velocity zero and smooth initial datum  $f(\varepsilon)$ . By [9, Theorem 1.1],  $f_1$  can be extended to a global smooth solution  $\bar{f}$  on  $[\varepsilon, \infty)$  which subconverges, after reparametrization with constant speed, to a constrained elastica as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

In particular, we have the identity

$$\bar{f}(t, x) = f(t, \Phi(t, x)) \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon \leq t \leq \hat{T}. \quad (4.3)$$

Now, let  $\varepsilon < \bar{\varepsilon} < \hat{T}$  and  $\Psi: [0, \hat{T}] \times I \rightarrow I$  be a smooth family of reparametrizations with

$$\Psi(t, x) = x \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq t \leq \varepsilon; \quad \Psi(t, x) = \Phi(t, x) \quad \text{for all } \bar{\varepsilon} \leq t \leq \hat{T}. \quad (4.4)$$

The existence of such a  $\Psi$  is proven in Lemma C.1. We now define

$$\hat{f}(t, x) := \begin{cases} f(t, \Psi(t, x)) & \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq \hat{T}, x \in I \\ \bar{f}(t, x) & \text{for } t \geq \bar{\varepsilon}, x \in I. \end{cases}$$

Note that  $\hat{f}$  is clearly smooth in  $x$  for every  $t \geq 0$  fixed. It is also smooth in  $t$  for fixed  $x \in I$ , by (4.3) and (4.4). Property (i) follows from (4.4). Furthermore, by definition of  $\hat{f}$  on  $[\bar{\varepsilon}, \infty) \times I$  we find that  $\hat{f} = \bar{f}$  has zero tangential velocity and hence (ii) is satisfied. The last property follows since the asymptotic behavior of  $\hat{f}$  is inherited from  $\bar{f}$ .  $\square$

## 4.2. The length-preserving elastic flow as a gradient flow on a Hilbert manifold

In this section, we will show that the flow (1.3) is in fact a gradient flow on a suitable submanifold of curves.

**Proposition 4.2.** *Let  $p_0, p_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\tau_0, \tau_1 \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$  and  $\ell \in \mathbb{R}$  such that (1.7) holds. Then*

$$\mathcal{X} := \left\{ f \in W_{Imm}^{4,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d) \mid f(y) = p_y \text{ and } \partial_s f(y) = \tau_y \text{ for } y \in \partial I, \mathcal{L}(f) = \ell \right\}.$$

*is a weak Riemannian splitting analytic submanifold of  $W^{4,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$  with codimension  $4d - 1$ .*

*Proof.* By the Sobolev embedding  $W^{4,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}^1(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ , the set  $W_{Imm}^{4,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$  of  $W^{4,2}$ -immersions is open in  $W^{4,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ . The function

$$\mathcal{G}: W_{Imm}^{4,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times (\mathbb{R}^d)^2 \times (\mathbb{S}^{d-1})^2, \mathcal{G}(f) := \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{L}(f) \\ f(0) \\ f(1) \\ \partial_{s_f} f(0) \\ \partial_{s_f} f(1) \end{pmatrix}$$

is an analytic map. Moreover, its differential is given by

$$d\mathcal{G}_f: W^{4,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times (\mathbb{R}^d)^2 \times \mathcal{T}_{\partial_s f(0)} \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \times \mathcal{T}_{\partial_s f(1)} \mathbb{S}^{d-1},$$

$$d\mathcal{G}_f(u) = \begin{pmatrix} -\int_I \langle \vec{\kappa}_f, u \rangle ds_f \\ u(0) \\ u(1) \\ \frac{\partial_x u(0)}{|\partial_x f(0)|} - \frac{\langle \partial_x u(0), \partial_x f(0) \rangle \partial_x f(0)}{|\partial_x f(0)|^3} \\ \frac{\partial_x u(1)}{|\partial_x f(1)|} - \frac{\langle \partial_x u(1), \partial_x f(1) \rangle \partial_x f(1)}{|\partial_x f(1)|^3} \end{pmatrix}$$

for  $f \in W_{Imm}^{4,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $u \in W^{4,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ . It is not difficult to see, that  $d\mathcal{G}_f$  is surjective if  $f \in \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{G}^{-1}(\{(\ell, p_0, p_1, \tau_0, \tau_1)^T\})$ . Indeed, let  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  and let  $q_y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $z_y \in T_{\partial_s f(y)} \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$  for  $y = 0, 1$ . Note that  $\mathcal{T}_{\partial_s f(y)} \mathbb{S}^{d-1} = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \langle z, \partial_x f(y) \rangle = 0\}$ . Clearly, we can find an immersed curve  $u \in W^{4,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$  with  $u(y) = q_y$  and  $\frac{\partial_x u(y)}{|\partial_x f(y)|} = z_y$  for  $y = 0, 1$ . Now, using the characterization of the tangent space, for  $v \in C_0^\infty(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$  we find

$$d\mathcal{G}_f(u+v) = \begin{pmatrix} -\int_I \langle \vec{\kappa}_f, u+v \rangle ds_f \\ q_0 \\ q_1 \\ z_0 \\ z_1 \end{pmatrix},$$

since adding  $v$  does not change the boundary behavior. Moreover, as  $\vec{\kappa}_f \not\equiv 0$  using  $f \in \mathcal{X}$  and (1.7), we can choose  $v$  such that  $\int_I \langle \vec{\kappa}_f, v \rangle ds_f = \varepsilon \neq 0$ . Setting  $\beta := \int_I \langle \vec{\kappa}_f, u \rangle ds_f$  and  $w := u - \frac{\alpha+\beta}{\delta} v$ , we find  $\int_I \langle \vec{\kappa}_f, w \rangle ds_f = \beta - (\alpha + \beta) = -\alpha$ , hence we have shown  $d\mathcal{G}_f(w) = (\alpha, q_0, q_1, z_0, z_1)$ , so  $d\mathcal{G}_f$  is surjective.

Consequently,  $\mathcal{X} \subset W^{4,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$  is a splitting submanifold by [1, Theorem 3.5.4] with codimension  $1 + 2d + 2(d-1) = 4d - 1$ . Like in [33], the analytic form of the implicit function theorem can be used to show that  $\mathcal{X}$  is in fact analytic. The tangent space is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_f \mathcal{X} &= \ker d\mathcal{G}_f \\ &= \{u \in W^{4,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d) \mid u = 0 \text{ on } \partial I, \partial_x^\perp u = 0 \text{ on } \partial I, \int_I \langle \vec{\kappa}_f, u \rangle ds_f = 0\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

Since (1.3) is a  $L^2(ds_f)$  gradient flow, it is natural to endow  $\mathcal{X}$  with the Riemannian metric  $\langle u, v \rangle_{L^2(ds_f)} = \int_I \langle u, v \rangle ds_f$  for  $u, v \in \mathcal{T}_f \mathcal{X}$ . Note that since  $\mathcal{T}_f \mathcal{X}$  is certainly not complete with respect to the induced norm, the metric is only *weakly Riemannian* (cf. [1, Definition 5.2.12]).  $\square$

It is not difficult to see that by (4.5) the right hand side of the evolution (1.1) is the projection of the full  $L^2(ds_f)$ -gradient  $\nabla \mathcal{E}(f)$  onto the  $L^2(ds_f)$ -closure of the tangent space  $\mathcal{T}_f \mathcal{X}$ . This implies that (1.1) is the gradient flow of  $\mathcal{E}$  on the manifold  $\mathcal{X}$ .

### 4.3. The constrained Łojasiewicz–Simon gradient inequality

In this subsection, we establish a Łojasiewicz–Simon inequality for  $\mathcal{E}$  on  $\mathcal{X}$ . To do so, we have to deal with the invariance of both energies, which unfortunately creates large kernels for their first and second variations. Like in [6, 12], we work around this issue by restricting the energy to normal directions and using the implicit function theorem. In the following, we will always assume that the assumptions (1.4) and (1.7) are satisfied.

**Definition 4.3.** Fix  $\bar{f} \in \mathcal{X}$  and define  $V_c := W^{4,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d) \cap W_0^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ . We define the space of normal vector fields along  $\bar{f}$  by

$$W^{4,2,\perp}(I; \mathbb{R}^d) := \{f \in W^{4,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d) \mid \langle f, \partial_x \bar{f} \rangle = 0 \text{ on } I\}.$$

Moreover, we define  $H^\perp := L^{2,\perp}(I; \mathbb{R}^d) := \{u \in L^2(I; \mathbb{R}^d) \mid \langle u, \partial_x \bar{f} \rangle = 0 \text{ a.e.}\}$  and  $V_c^\perp := V_c \cap W^{4,2,\perp}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ . Both are Hilbert spaces and the  $L^2$ -orthogonal projection onto  $H^\perp$  is given by the pointwise projection  $P^\perp(f) := f - \langle f, \partial_s \bar{f} \rangle \partial_s \bar{f}$ .

Moreover, by the embedding  $W^{4,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}^1(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$  there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough such that for all  $u \in W^{4,2,\perp}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$  with  $\|u\|_{W^{4,2}} < \varepsilon$ , the curve  $f = \bar{f} + u$  is immersed. Defining  $U_\varepsilon := \{u \in V_c^\perp \mid \|u\|_{W^{4,2}} < \varepsilon\}$  we consider the energies

$$\begin{aligned} L: U_\varepsilon &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, & L(u) &= \mathcal{L}(\bar{f} + u) \text{ and} \\ E: U_\varepsilon &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, & E(u) &= \mathcal{E}(\bar{f} + u). \end{aligned}$$

We have the following result.

**Proposition 4.4** (cf. [12, Proof of Theorem 3.1, Remark 3.3]). *The energy  $E$  satisfies the following properties.*

1.  $E: U_\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is analytic;
2. its gradient  $\nabla E: U_\varepsilon \rightarrow H^\perp$  is analytic;
3. the derivative  $(\nabla E)'(0): V_c^\perp \rightarrow H^\perp$  is Fredholm with index zero.

It is well known that this is sufficient to prove a Łojasiewicz–Simon gradient inequality for  $E$  (cf. [5, Corollary 3.11], [12, Theorem 3.1], [33, Theorem 1.2], [32, Corollary 2.6]). However, in order to conclude a *constrained* or *refined* Łojasiewicz–Simon gradient inequality, cf. (16) in [33], we also need to analyze the length functional.

**Proposition 4.5.** *The energy  $L$  satisfies the following properties.*

1.  $L: U_\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is analytic.
2. The gradient map  $\nabla L: U_\varepsilon \rightarrow H^\perp$  is analytic.
3. The derivative  $(\nabla L)'(0): V_c^\perp \rightarrow H^\perp$  is compact.
4.  $L(0) = \ell$  and  $\nabla L(0) \neq 0$ .

*Proof.* 1. The map  $U_\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $u \mapsto |\partial_x(\bar{f} + u)|$  is analytic by [12, Lemma 3.4, 1.], and hence so is  $L$ .

2. The  $H^\perp$ -gradient of  $L$  is given by  $\nabla L(u) = -P^\perp(\bar{\kappa}_{\bar{f}+u}|\partial_x(\bar{f} + u)|)$ . Note that the map  $U_\varepsilon \rightarrow L^2(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $u \mapsto \bar{\kappa}_{\bar{f}+u}$  is analytic by [12, Lemma 3.4, 3.]. Since the multiplication  $L^2(I; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^\infty(I; \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L^2(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $(f, \phi) \mapsto f\phi$  is analytic, so is the map  $U_\varepsilon \rightarrow L^2(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $u \mapsto \bar{\kappa}_{\bar{f}+u}|\partial_x(\bar{f} + u)|$ . The continuity and linearity of  $P^\perp: L^2(I; \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow H^\perp$  yields the claim.

3. We compute the second derivative using standard formulas for the variation of geometric quantities (see for instance [14, Lemma 2.1]). We have

$$\begin{aligned} (\nabla L)'(0)u &= \frac{d}{dt}\bigg|_{t=0} \nabla L(tu) = -\frac{d}{dt}\bigg|_{t=0} P^\perp(\bar{\kappa}_{\bar{f}+u}|\partial_x(\bar{f} + u)|) \\ &= -P^\perp \frac{d}{dt}\bigg|_{t=0} \bar{\kappa}_{\bar{f}+tu}|\partial_x \bar{f}| - P^\perp \bar{\kappa}_{\bar{f}} \frac{d}{dt}\bigg|_{t=0} |\partial_x(\bar{f} + tu)| \\ &= -\left(\nabla_{s_{\bar{f}}}^2 u + \langle u, \bar{\kappa}_{\bar{f}} \rangle \bar{\kappa}_{\bar{f}}\right) |\partial_x \bar{f}| + \bar{\kappa}_{\bar{f}} \langle u, \bar{\kappa}_{\bar{f}} \rangle |\partial_x \bar{f}|. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, the operator  $(\nabla L)'(0): V_c^\perp \rightarrow H^\perp$  is only of second order in  $u$ , hence compact by the Rellich–Kondrachov Theorem [19, Theorem 7.26].

4.  $L(0) = \mathcal{L}(\bar{f}) = \ell$  since  $\bar{f} \in \mathcal{X}$ . Since we have  $|\bar{f}(1) - \bar{f}(0)| = |p_1 - p_0| > \ell$ ,  $\bar{f}$  cannot be part of a straight line, hence  $\bar{\kappa}_{\bar{f}} \not\equiv 0$  and also  $|\partial_x \bar{f}| \neq 0$  since  $\bar{f}$  is immersed.  $\square$

This enables us to conclude the inequality in normal directions.

**Theorem 4.6.** *Suppose  $\bar{f} \in \mathcal{X}$  is a constrained elastica. Then, there exist  $C, \sigma > 0$  and  $\theta \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$  such that for all  $f = \bar{f} + u \in \mathcal{X}$  with  $u \in V_c^\perp$  and  $\|u\|_{W^{4,2}} \leq \sigma$  we have*

$$|\mathcal{E}(f) - \mathcal{E}(\bar{f})|^{1-\theta} \leq C \|\nabla_{L^2(ds_f)} \mathcal{E}(f) + \lambda(f) \nabla_{L^2(ds_f)} \mathcal{L}(f)\|_{L^2(ds_f)}.$$

*Proof.* First, we verify the conditions of [33, Corollary 5.2] for the energy  $E$  and the constraint  $\mathcal{G}(u) = L(u) - \ell$  on the spaces  $V = V_c^\perp, H = H^\perp$ . Note that  $\nabla \mathcal{G} = \nabla L$ . Clearly,  $V_c^\perp \hookrightarrow H^\perp$  densely. Assumptions (ii) and (iii) follow from Proposition 4.4, whereas assumptions (iv)–(vi) are satisfied by Proposition 4.5. Note that  $u = 0$  is a constrained critical point of  $E$  on  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{G}^{-1}(\{0\})$  since  $\bar{f}$  is a constrained elastica.

Then, by [33, Corollary 5.2]  $E|_{\mathcal{M}}$  satisfies a constrained Łojasiewicz–Simon gradient inequality, i.e. there exist  $C, \sigma > 0$  and  $\theta \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$  such that for all  $u \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $\|u\|_{W^{4,2}} \leq \sigma$  we have

$$|E(u) - E(0)|^{1-\theta} \leq C \|P(u) \nabla E(u)\|_{L^2},$$

where  $P(u): H^\perp \rightarrow H^\perp$  denotes the orthogonal projection onto the closure of the tangent space  $\overline{T_u \mathcal{M}} = \{y \in H^\perp \mid \langle \nabla L(u), y \rangle_{L^2} = 0\}$  (cf. [33, Proposition 3.3]). Therefore, for

$$\lambda(f) = \frac{\langle \bar{\kappa}_f, \nabla \mathcal{E}(f) \rangle_{L^2(ds_f)}}{\|\bar{\kappa}_f\|_{L^2(ds_f)}^2}$$

as in (1.2) with  $f = \bar{f} + u$  we have the estimate

$$\|P(u)\nabla E(u)\|_{L^2} = \|P(u)(\nabla E(u) + \lambda\nabla L(u))\|_{L^2} \leq \|\nabla E(u) + \lambda\nabla L(u)\|_{L^2}.$$

Moreover, we have  $\nabla E(u) = \nabla_{L^2(ds_f)}\mathcal{E}(f)|\partial_x f|$  and  $\nabla L(u) = \nabla_{L^2(ds_f)}\mathcal{L}(f)|\partial_x f|$ . Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \|P(u)\nabla E(u)\|_{L^2} &\leq \|P(u)(\nabla E(u) + \lambda\nabla L(u))\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \|\nabla_{L^2(ds_f)}\mathcal{E}(f)|\partial_x f| + \lambda\nabla_{L^2(ds_f)}\mathcal{L}(f)|\partial_x f|\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \|\partial_x f\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla_{L^2(ds_f)}\mathcal{E}(f) + \lambda\nabla_{L^2(ds_f)}\mathcal{L}(f)\|_{L^2(ds_f)}. \end{aligned}$$

Reducing  $\sigma > 0$  if necessary, we may assume that  $\|\partial_x f\|_{L^\infty}$  is uniformly bounded for  $\|f - \bar{f}\|_{W^{4,2}} \leq \sigma$  by the Sobolev embedding theorem. This proves the claim.  $\square$

We will use this to prove the full constrained Łojasiewicz–Simon gradient inequality for not necessarily normal variations via the following reparametrization argument.

**Lemma 4.7** ([12, Lemma 4.1]). *Let  $\bar{f} \in W^{5,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$  be a regular curve. Then, there exists  $\sigma > 0$  such that for all  $\psi \in V_c$  with  $\|\psi\|_{W^{4,2}} \leq \sigma$ , there exists a  $W^{4,2}$ -diffeomorphism  $\Phi: I \rightarrow I$  such that*

$$(\bar{f} + \psi) \circ \Phi = \bar{f} + \eta \tag{4.6}$$

for some  $\eta \in V_c^\perp$ . Moreover, given  $\sigma > 0$  there exists  $\tilde{\sigma} = \tilde{\sigma}(\bar{f}, \sigma) > 0$  such that for all  $\psi \in V_c$  with  $\|\psi\|_{W^{4,2}} \leq \tilde{\sigma}$  we have the above representation with  $\|\eta\|_{W^{4,2}} \leq \sigma$ .

**Theorem 4.8.** *Let  $\bar{f} \in \mathcal{X} \cap W^{5,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$  be a constrained elastica. Then there exist  $C, \sigma > 0$  and  $\theta \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$  such that*

$$|\mathcal{E}(f) - \mathcal{E}(\bar{f})| \leq C \|\nabla_{L^2(ds_f)}\mathcal{E}(f) + \lambda(f)\nabla_{L^2(ds_f)}\mathcal{L}(f)\|_{L^2(ds_f)},$$

for all  $f \in \mathcal{X}$  such that  $\|f - \bar{f}\|_{W^{4,2}} \leq \sigma$ .

*Proof.* Let  $C, \sigma > 0, \theta \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$  as in Theorem 4.6,  $\bar{f} \in \mathcal{X}$  be a constrained critical point of  $\mathcal{E}$  on  $\mathcal{X}$ . By the regularity assumption on  $\bar{f}$ , we may use Lemma 4.7.

Thus, we find  $\tilde{\sigma} > 0$  such that (4.6) holds for all  $\psi \in V_c$  with  $\|\psi\|_{W^{4,2}} \leq \tilde{\sigma}$  for some  $\eta \in V_c^\perp$  with  $\|\eta\|_{W^{4,2}} \leq \sigma$ . Let  $f \in \mathcal{X}$  such that  $\|f - \bar{f}\|_{W^{4,2}} \leq \tilde{\sigma}$ . Then by Lemma 4.7, there exist a diffeomorphism  $\Phi: I \rightarrow I$  and  $\eta \in V_c^\perp$  such that  $f \circ \Phi = \bar{f} + \eta$ .

Note that with  $f, \bar{f} \in \mathcal{X}$  we also get  $f \circ \Phi = \bar{f} + \eta \in \mathcal{X}$ , since  $\mathcal{L}(f) = \mathcal{L}(f \circ \Phi) = \ell$ . Since the elastic energy is invariant under reparametrization, we hence get using Theorem 4.6

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{E}(f) - \mathcal{E}(\bar{f})|^{1-\theta} &= |\mathcal{E}(\bar{f} + \eta) - \mathcal{E}(\bar{f})|^{1-\theta} \\ &\leq C \|\nabla_{L^2(ds_{\bar{f}+\eta})}\mathcal{E}(\bar{f} + \eta) + \lambda(\bar{f} + \eta)\nabla_{L^2(ds_{\bar{f}+\eta})}\mathcal{L}(\bar{f} + \eta)\|_{L^2(ds_{\bar{f}+\eta})}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

Since  $\lambda$  and the gradients are geometric, i.e transform correctly under reparametrizations, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda(\bar{f} + \eta) &= \lambda(f \circ \Phi) = \lambda(f), \\ \nabla_{L^2(ds_{\bar{f}+\eta})} \mathcal{E}(\bar{f} + \eta) &= \nabla_{L^2(ds_f)} \mathcal{E}(f) \circ \Phi \\ \nabla_{L^2(ds_{\bar{f}+\eta})} \mathcal{L}(\bar{f} + \eta) &= \nabla_{L^2(ds_f)} \mathcal{L}(f) \circ \Phi.\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla_{L^2(ds_{\bar{f}+\eta})} \mathcal{E}(\bar{f} + \eta) + \lambda(\bar{f} + \eta) \nabla_{L^2(ds_{\bar{f}+\eta})} \mathcal{L}(\bar{f} + \eta)\|_{L^2(ds_{\bar{f}+\eta})} \\ = \|\nabla_{L^2(ds_f)} \mathcal{E}(f) \circ \Phi + \lambda(f) \nabla_{L^2(ds_f)} \mathcal{L}(f) \circ \Phi\|_{L^2(ds_{f \circ \Phi})} \\ = \|\nabla_{L^2(ds_f)} \mathcal{E}(f) + \lambda(f) \nabla_{L^2(ds_f)} \mathcal{L}(f)\|_{L^2(ds_f)}.\end{aligned}$$

Together with (4.7), this implies the Łojasiewicz–Simon gradient inequality for the elastic energy on  $\mathcal{X}$ .  $\square$

#### 4.4. Convergence

Usually (see e.g. [6, p. 358 – 359] and [12, p. 2188 – 2191]), a lot of PDE theory and a priori parabolic Schauder estimates are used when applying the Łojasiewicz–Simon gradient inequality to conclude convergence for geometric problems. In this section, we will present a lemma which will enable us to significantly shorten this lengthy argument in the proof of Theorem 1.2. We exploit the explicit structure of the constant speed reparametrization and the length bound to control the full velocity of the constant speed parametrization by the purely normal velocity of the original evolution. See also [26] for another approach to simplify the convergence proof.

**Definition 4.9.** *Let  $T \in (0, \infty]$  and let  $f: [0, T) \times I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  be a family of immersed curves in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . The constant speed  $\mathcal{L}(f(t))$  reparametrization  $\tilde{f}(t)$  of  $f(t)$  is given by  $\tilde{f}(t, x) := f(t, \psi(t, x))$  where  $\psi(t, \cdot): I \rightarrow I$  is the inverse of  $\varphi(t, \cdot): I \rightarrow I$  given by*

$$\varphi(t, x) := \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}(f(t))} \int_0^x |\partial_x f(t, z)| dz = \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}(f(t))} \int_0^x ds_{f(t)}.$$

**Lemma 4.10.** *Suppose  $T \in (0, \infty]$  and  $f: [0, T) \times I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  is a family of curves in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , such that  $f(t, 0) = p_0, f(t, 1) = p_1$  and  $\mathcal{L}(f(t)) > 0$  for all  $t \in (0, T]$ . Then, if  $\tilde{f}(t)$  is the constant speed  $\mathcal{L}(f(t))$  reparametrization of  $f(t)$ , for all  $t \in [0, T)$  we have*

$$\|\partial_t \tilde{f}(t)\|_{L^2(dx)} \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{\mathcal{L}(f(t))} + 16 \mathcal{E}(f(t))} \|\partial_t f\|_{L^2(ds_{f(t)})}.$$

In particular, if  $f$  evolves by the length preserving elastic flow (1.3), we have

$$\|\partial_t \tilde{f}(t)\|_{L^2(dx)} \leq C \|\partial_t f\|_{L^2(ds_{f(t)})},$$

for all  $t \in (0, T]$ , where  $C = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\ell} + 16\mathcal{E}(f_0)}$ .

*Proof.* Recall that by Definition 4.9 we have

$$\psi(t, \varphi(t, x)) = \varphi(t, \psi(t, x)) = x \text{ for all } t \in [0, T], x \in I.$$

For the derivatives of  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  we thus obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(i)} \quad \partial_t \varphi(t, x) &= -\frac{\partial_t \mathcal{L}(f(t))}{\mathcal{L}(f(t))^2} \int_0^x ds_{f(t)} - \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}(f(t))} \int_0^x \langle \partial_t f, \vec{\kappa}_{f(t)} \rangle ds_{f(t)}; \\ \text{(ii)} \quad \partial_x \varphi(t, x) &= \frac{|\partial_x f(t, x)|}{\mathcal{L}(f(t))}; \\ \text{(iii)} \quad \partial_x \psi(t, \varphi(t, x)) &= (\partial_x \varphi(t, x))^{-1} = \frac{\mathcal{L}(f(t))}{|\partial_x f(t, x)|}; \\ \text{(iv)} \quad \partial_t \psi(t, \varphi(t, x)) &= -\partial_x \psi(t, \varphi(t, x)) \partial_t \varphi(t, x) \\ &= \frac{\mathcal{L}(f(t))}{|\partial_x f(t, x)|} \left( \frac{\partial_t \mathcal{L}(f(t))}{\mathcal{L}(f(t))^2} \int_0^x ds_{f(t)} + \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}(f(t))} \int_0^x \langle \partial_t f, \vec{\kappa}_{f(t)} \rangle ds_{f(t)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now, we estimate

$$\|\partial_t \tilde{f}(t)\|_{L^2(dx)}^2 \leq 2 \left( \int_0^1 |(\partial_t f)(t, \psi(t, x))|^2 dx + \int_0^1 |(\partial_x f)(t, \psi(t, x))|^2 |\partial_t \psi(t, x)|^2 dx \right).$$

The change of coordinates  $y = \psi(t, x)$  together with  $\psi(t, 0) = 0$  and  $\psi(t, 1) = 1$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t \tilde{f}(t)\|_{L^2(dx)}^2 &\leq 2 \left( \int_0^1 |\partial_t f(t, y)|^2 \frac{1}{\partial_x \psi(t, \varphi(t, y))} dy \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |\partial_x f(t, y)|^2 |\partial_t \psi(t, \varphi(t, y))|^2 \frac{1}{\partial_x \psi(t, \varphi(t, y))} dy \right) =: 2(A + B). \end{aligned}$$

For the first integral, we clearly have

$$A = \int_0^1 |\partial_t f(t, y)|^2 \frac{|\partial_x f(t, y)|}{\mathcal{L}(f(t))} dy = \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}(f(t))} \|\partial_t f\|_{L^2(ds_{f(t)})}^2.$$

For the second part, note that by (iv), we have

$$B = \int_0^1 \left| \frac{\partial_t \mathcal{L}(f(t))}{\mathcal{L}(f(t))} \int_0^y ds_{f(t)} + \int_0^y \langle \partial_t f, \vec{\kappa}_{f(t)} \rangle ds_{f(t)} \right|^2 \frac{|\partial_x f(t, y)|}{\mathcal{L}(f(t))} dy.$$

Now, using the boundary conditions, we have  $\partial_t \mathcal{L}(f(t)) = -\int_I \langle \vec{\kappa}_{f(t)}, \partial_t f(t) \rangle ds_{f(t)}$  and the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} B &\leq 2 \int_0^1 \left( \left| \frac{\partial_t \mathcal{L}(f(t))}{\mathcal{L}(f(t))} \int_0^y ds_{f(t)} \right|^2 + \left| \int_0^y \langle \partial_t f(t), \vec{\kappa}_{f(t)} \rangle ds_{f(t)} \right|^2 \right) \frac{|\partial_x f(t, y)|}{\mathcal{L}(f(t))} dy \\ &\leq 2 \int_0^1 \left( \left( \int_0^1 |\langle \partial_t f(t), \vec{\kappa}_{f(t)} \rangle| ds_{f(t)} \right)^2 + \left( \int_0^1 |\langle \partial_t f(t), \vec{\kappa}_{f(t)} \rangle| ds_{f(t)} \right)^2 \right) \frac{|\partial_x f(t, y)|}{\mathcal{L}(f(t))} dy \\ &= 4 \left( \int_0^1 |\langle \partial_t f(t), \vec{\kappa}_{f(t)} \rangle| ds_{f(t)} \right)^2 \leq 4 \|\partial_t f(t)\|_{L^2(ds_{f(t)})}^2 \|\vec{\kappa}_{f(t)}\|_{L^2(ds_{f(t)})}^2 \\ &= 8 \mathcal{E}(f(t)) \|\partial_t f(t)\|_{L^2(ds_{f(t)})}^2. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$



**Remark 4.11.** Note that in the proof of Lemma 4.10, we only used the boundary conditions to conclude that no boundary terms appear when integrating by parts. In particular, Lemma 4.10 also holds in the case of closed curves.

Finally, we can prove our main convergence result.

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  and let  $\hat{f} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty((0, \infty) \times I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $\bar{\varepsilon} > \varepsilon$  be as in Theorem 4.1. The first statement of Theorem 1.2 follows from property (i) in Theorem 4.1, and the fact that the solution  $f$  in Theorem 2.17 lies in  $\mathbb{X}_{T,2} \hookrightarrow BUC([0, T]; W^{2,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$  by Proposition B.1 and (B.1).

For the convergence statement, let  $\tilde{f}$  be the constant speed  $\ell$  reparametrization of  $\hat{f}$ , cf. Definition 4.9, and note that  $\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty((0, \infty) \times I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ . By Theorem 4.1 (iii), there exists a sequence  $t_n \rightarrow \infty$  and a smooth regular curve  $f_\infty: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ , such that  $\tilde{f}(t_n) \rightarrow f_\infty$  in  $\mathcal{C}^k(I; \mathbb{R}^n)$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . Moreover, as a consequence of Theorem 4.1,  $f_\infty$  is a smooth constrained elastica, i.e. a smooth solution of (1.8).

Recall from Theorem 4.1 (ii) that  $\hat{f}$  has tangential velocity zero for  $t$  sufficiently large. Thus, we can without loss of generality assume  $\mathcal{E}(\hat{f}(t)) = \mathcal{E}(\tilde{f}(t)) > \mathcal{E}(f_\infty)$ , since otherwise  $\hat{f}(t)$  would be eventually constant by (1.6), and hence convergent. Moreover, since  $\mathcal{E}(\hat{f}(t))$  is non increasing, we have  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}(\hat{f}(t)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}(\tilde{f}(t_n)) = \mathcal{E}(f_\infty)$ .

Since  $f_\infty$  is smooth, by Theorem 4.8, there exists  $\sigma, C_{LS} > 0$  and  $\theta \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$  such that we have a refined Łojasiewicz–Simon inequality, i.e. for all  $g \in \mathcal{X}$  with  $\|g - f_\infty\|_{W^{4,2}} \leq \sigma$

$$|\mathcal{E}(g) - \mathcal{E}(f_\infty)|^{1-\theta} \leq C_{LS} \|\nabla_{L^2(ds_g)} \mathcal{E}(g) + \lambda(g) \nabla_{L^2(ds_g)} \mathcal{L}(g)\|_{L^2(ds_g)}. \quad (4.8)$$

Passing to a subsequence, we can assume  $\|\tilde{f}(t_n, \cdot) - f_\infty\|_{W^{4,2}} < \sigma$  for all  $n$ . Define

$$s_n := \sup \left\{ s \geq t_n \mid \|\tilde{f}(t, \cdot) - f_\infty\|_{W^{4,2}} < \sigma \text{ for all } t \in [t_n, s] \right\}$$

and note that  $s_n > t_n$  since  $\tilde{f}$  is smooth. Define  $G(t) := \left( \mathcal{E}(\tilde{f}(t)) - \mathcal{E}(f_\infty) \right)^\theta$ . By our assumption  $\mathcal{E}(\tilde{f}(t)) > \mathcal{E}(f_\infty)$ , so we can compute on  $[t_n, s_n)$  using that  $\hat{f}$  solves (1.3) with  $\theta \equiv 0$ , so  $\partial_t \hat{f} = -\nabla \mathcal{E}(\hat{f}) - \lambda \nabla \mathcal{L}(\hat{f})$  and the fact that  $\mathcal{E}$  is geometric, i.e. invariant under reparametrization

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{d}{dt} G &= \theta \left( \mathcal{E}(\tilde{f}) - \mathcal{E}(f_\infty) \right)^{\theta-1} \left( -\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{E}(\tilde{f}) \right) \\ &= \theta \left( \mathcal{E}(\tilde{f}) - \mathcal{E}(f_\infty) \right)^{\theta-1} \left( -\left\langle \nabla_{L^2(ds_{\tilde{f}})} \mathcal{E}(\tilde{f}), \partial_t \tilde{f} \right\rangle_{L^2(ds_{\tilde{f}})} \right) \\ &= \theta \left( \mathcal{E}(\tilde{f}) - \mathcal{E}(f_\infty) \right)^{\theta-1} \left\| \nabla_{L^2(ds_{\tilde{f}})} \mathcal{E}(\tilde{f}) + \lambda(\tilde{f}) \nabla_{L^2(ds_{\tilde{f}})} \mathcal{L}(\tilde{f}) \right\|_{L^2(ds_{\tilde{f}})} \|\partial_t \tilde{f}\|_{L^2(ds_{\tilde{f}})}. \end{aligned}$$

However, the quantity  $\|\nabla_{L^2(ds_{\tilde{f}})} \mathcal{E}(\tilde{f}) + \lambda(\tilde{f}) \nabla_{L^2(ds_{\tilde{f}})} \mathcal{L}(\tilde{f})\|_{L^2(ds_{\tilde{f}})}$  is geometric, too. Thus

$$-\frac{d}{dt} G = \theta \left( \mathcal{E}(\tilde{f}) - \mathcal{E}(f_\infty) \right)^{\theta-1} \left\| \nabla_{L^2(ds_{\tilde{f}})} \mathcal{E}(\tilde{f}) + \lambda(\tilde{f}) \nabla_{L^2(ds_{\tilde{f}})} \mathcal{L}(\tilde{f}) \right\|_{L^2(ds_{\tilde{f}})} \|\partial_t \tilde{f}\|_{L^2(ds_{\tilde{f}})}$$

$$\geq \frac{\theta}{C_{LS}} \|\partial_t \hat{f}\|_{L^2(ds_f)}.$$

on  $[t_n, s_n)$  by (4.8) and our choice of  $s_n$ . Therefore, by Lemma 4.10 we have

$$-\frac{d}{dt}G(t) \geq C\|\partial_t \tilde{f}\|_{L^2(dx)}, \quad (4.9)$$

for all  $t \in [t_n, s_n)$ , where  $C = C(\ell, \mathcal{E}(f_0), \theta, C_{LS}) > 0$ . Let  $t \in [t_n, s_n)$ . Then

$$\|\tilde{f}(t) - \tilde{f}(t_n)\|_{L^2(dx)} \leq \int_{t_n}^t \|\partial_t \tilde{f}(\tau)\|_{L^2(dx)} d\tau \leq \frac{1}{C}G(t_n) \rightarrow 0 \quad (4.10)$$

using (4.9) and  $\mathcal{E}(\tilde{f}(t_n)) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(f_\infty)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . We now assume that all of the  $s_n$  are finite. Then, by continuity (4.10) also holds for  $t = s_n$ . By the subconvergence result in Theorem 4.1, passing to a subsequence we have  $\tilde{f}(s_n) \rightarrow \psi$  smoothly as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Moreover, by continuity and the definition of  $s_n$ , we have  $\|\psi - f_\infty\|_{W^{4,2}} = \sigma$ , whereas on the other hand we have  $\|\psi - f_\infty\|_{L^2(dx)} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\tilde{f}(s_n) - \tilde{f}(t_n)\|_{L^2(dx)} = 0$  by (4.10), a contradiction.

Consequently, there has to exist some  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $s_{n_0} = \infty$ , and this yields  $\|\tilde{f}(t) - f_\infty\|_{W^{4,2}} < \sigma$  for all  $t \geq t_{n_0}$ . This means that (4.9) holds for any  $t \geq t_{n_0}$ , thus  $t \mapsto \|\partial_t \tilde{f}(t)\|_{L^2(dx)} \in L^1([0, \infty); \mathbb{R})$ . Hence, for all  $t_{n_0} \leq t \leq t'$  we have

$$\|\tilde{f}(t) - \tilde{f}(t')\|_{L^2(dx)} \leq \int_t^{t'} \|\partial_t \tilde{f}(\tau)\|_{L^2(dx)} d\tau \rightarrow 0,$$

as  $t, t' \rightarrow \infty$  by the dominated convergence theorem. Therefore, the limit  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{f}(t)$  exists in  $L^2(dx)$  and thus equals  $f_\infty$ . A subsequence argument shows that for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$  we have  $\|\tilde{f}(t) - f_\infty\|_{C^k(I; \mathbb{R}^d)} \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , i.e. the convergence is smooth.  $\square$

## Appendix A Explicit formulas in coordinates

In this section, we present the explicit representation of the geometric quantities appearing in this article. They can be obtained by a straight forward calculation, see e.g. [17, (2.3)].

**Proposition A.1.** *Suppose  $f: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  is a smooth immersion. With the arc-length element  $\gamma = |\partial_x f|$  we have*

$$\begin{aligned} (i) \quad \vec{\kappa}_f &= \partial_s^2 f = \frac{\partial_x^2 f}{\gamma^2} - \frac{\langle \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x f \rangle}{\gamma^4} \partial_x f = \frac{(\partial_x^2 f)^\perp}{\gamma^4}; \\ (ii) \quad \nabla_{s_f} \vec{\kappa}_f &= \frac{\partial_x^3 f}{\gamma^3} - \frac{\langle \partial_x^3 f, \partial_x f \rangle}{\gamma^5} \partial_x f - 3 \frac{\langle \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x f \rangle}{\gamma^5} \partial_x^2 f + 3 \frac{\langle \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x f \rangle^2}{\gamma^7} \partial_x f; \\ (iii) \quad \nabla_{s_f}^2 \vec{\kappa}_f &= \left[ \frac{\partial_x^4 f}{\gamma^4} - 6 \frac{\langle \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x f \rangle}{\gamma^6} \partial_x^3 f - 4 \frac{\langle \partial_x^3 f, \partial_x f \rangle}{\gamma^6} \partial_x^2 f - 3 \frac{|\partial_x^2 f|^2}{\gamma^6} \partial_x^2 f + 18 \frac{\langle \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x f \rangle^2}{\gamma^8} \partial_x^2 f \right]^\perp; \\ (iv) \quad \nabla \mathcal{E}(f) &= \left[ \frac{\partial_x^4 f}{\gamma^4} - 6 \frac{\langle \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x f \rangle}{\gamma^6} \partial_x^3 f - 4 \frac{\langle \partial_x^3 f, \partial_x f \rangle}{\gamma^6} \partial_x^2 f - \frac{5}{2} \frac{|\partial_x^2 f|^2}{\gamma^6} \partial_x^2 f + \frac{35}{2} \frac{\langle \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x f \rangle^2}{\gamma^8} \partial_x^2 f \right]^\perp. \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma A.2.** *Let  $f$  be a smooth immersed curve with arc-length element  $\gamma$ . Then it holds*

$$\begin{aligned}
(i) \quad |\vec{\kappa}_f|^4 &= \gamma^{-8} |\partial_x^2 f|^4 - 2\gamma^{-10} |\partial_x^2 f|^2 \langle \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x f \rangle^2 + \gamma^{-12} \langle \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x f \rangle^4; \\
(ii) \quad |\nabla_{s_f} \vec{\kappa}_f|^2 &= \gamma^{-6} |\partial_x^3 f|^2 - \gamma^{-8} \langle \partial_x^3 f, \partial_x f \rangle^2 - 6\gamma^{-8} \langle \partial_x^3 f, \partial_x^2 f \rangle \langle \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x f \rangle \\
&\quad + 6\gamma^{-10} \langle \partial_x^3 f, \partial_x f \rangle \langle \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x f \rangle^2 + 9\gamma^{-10} \langle \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x f \rangle^2 |\partial_x^2 f|^2 \\
&\quad - 9\gamma^{-12} \langle \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x f \rangle^4; \\
(iii) \quad \langle \nabla_{s_f} \vec{\kappa}_f, \vec{\kappa}_f \rangle &= \gamma^{-5} \langle \partial_x^3 f, \partial_x^2 f \rangle - \gamma^{-7} \langle \partial_x^3 f, \partial_x f \rangle \langle \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x f \rangle \\
&\quad - 3\gamma^{-7} \langle \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x f \rangle |\partial_x^2 f|^2 + 3\gamma^{-9} \langle \partial_x^2 f, \partial_x f \rangle^3.
\end{aligned}$$

## Appendix B Function spaces

In this section, we collect all relevant information on the function spaces for maximal  $L^p$ -regularity. Most of the embedding results are collected in [27], where even a polynomial weight  $t^{1-\mu}$  in time is allowed. As discussed in Remark 2.19, time weights do not allow to prove short-time existence with weaker initial data, and hence we restrict ourselves to the case  $\mu = 1$ .

Let  $J \subset \mathbb{R}$  be an interval,  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . For any  $s \in (0, \infty) \setminus \mathbb{N}$  and a Banach space  $E$ , the ( $E$ -valued) *Sobolev–Slobodetskii space* and the *Bessel potential space*, respectively, are given by real and complex interpolation

$$\begin{aligned}
W^{s,p}(J; E) &:= \left( W^{[s],p}(J; E), W^{[s]+1,p}(J; E) \right)_{s-[s],p}; \\
H^{s,p}(J; E) &:= \left( W^{[s],p}(J; E), W^{[s]+1,p}(J; E) \right)_{s-[s]};
\end{aligned}$$

where  $W^{k,p}(J; E)$  denotes the usual Bochner–Sobolev space for  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . Recall from [37, Theorem 2.4.1 (a), Definition 4.2.1] that the *Besov spaces* are given by

$$B_{p,q}^s(I; \mathbb{R}^d) := \left( W^{m_1,p}(I; \mathbb{R}^d), W^{m_2,p}(I; \mathbb{R}^d) \right)_{\theta,q},$$

where  $s = (1 - \theta)m_1 + \theta m_2$ ,  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ ,  $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ,  $m_1 < m_2$ ,  $p, q \in [1, \infty)$ . By [37, Definition 2.3.1 (d) and Theorem 2.3.2 (d)] we have the relation

$$\begin{aligned}
B_{p,p}^s(I; \mathbb{R}^d) &= W^{s,p}(I; \mathbb{R}^d) \quad \text{for } s \notin \mathbb{N}; \\
B_{2,2}^s(I; \mathbb{R}^d) &= W^{s,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d) \quad \text{for } s > 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{B.1}$$

Moreover, recall from [13, Section 2], that in the setting of the maximal regularity spaces  $\mathbb{X}_{T,p}$ , the spaces of zeroth and first order boundary data are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}_{T,p}^0 &:= W^{1-\frac{1}{4p},p}(0, T; L^p(\partial I; \mathbb{R}^d)) \cong W^{1-\frac{1}{4p},p}(0, T; (\mathbb{R}^d)^2); \\
\mathcal{D}_{T,p}^1 &:= W^{\frac{3}{4}-\frac{1}{4p},p}(0, T; L^p(\partial I; \mathbb{R}^d)) \cong W^{\frac{3}{4}-\frac{1}{4p},p}(0, T; (\mathbb{R}^d)^2).
\end{aligned} \tag{B.2}$$

**Proposition B.1.** *Let  $0 < T \leq T_0 < \infty$  and let  $p \geq 2$ .*

(i)  $\mathbb{X}_{T,p} \hookrightarrow BUC([0, T], B_{p,p}^{4(1-\frac{1}{p})}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$  with the estimate

$$\|f\|_{BUC([0,T]; B_{p,p}^{4(1-\frac{1}{p})}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))} \leq C(T_0, p) \|f\|_{\mathbb{X}_{T,p}} \quad \text{for } f \in {}_0\mathbb{X}_T.$$

(ii)  $\mathbb{X}_{T,p} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}^\alpha([0, T]; \mathcal{C}^{1,\alpha}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$  for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  with the estimate

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha([0,T]; \mathcal{C}^{1,\alpha}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))} \leq C(T_0, p) \|f\|_{\mathbb{X}_{T,p}} \quad \text{for } f \in {}_0\mathbb{X}_T.$$

(iii) *The  $k$ -th spatial derivative is continuous as a map*

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_x^k: \mathbb{X}_{T,p} &\rightarrow H^{\frac{4-k}{4}, p}(0, T; L^p(I; \mathbb{R}^d)) \cap L^p(0, T; H^{4-k, p}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)) \\ &\hookrightarrow W^{\frac{(4-k)\theta}{4}, p}(0, T; W^{(4-k)(1-\theta), p}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)) \quad \text{for all } \theta \in (0, 1), \end{aligned}$$

*with the estimate*

$$\|\partial_x^k f\|_{H^{\frac{4-k}{4}, p}(0, T; L^p(I; \mathbb{R}^d)) \cap L^p(0, T; H^{4-k, p}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))} \leq C(T_0, p) \|f\|_{\mathbb{X}_{T,p}} \quad \text{for } f \in {}_0\mathbb{X}_T.$$

(iv) *The spatial trace of the  $k$ -th spatial derivative is continuous as a map*

$$\text{tr}_{\partial I} \partial_x^k: \mathbb{X}_T \rightarrow W^{\frac{4-k}{4} - \frac{1}{8}, p}(0, T; L^p(\partial I; \mathbb{R}^d)) \cong W^{\frac{4-k}{4} - \frac{1}{8}, p}(0, T; (\mathbb{R}^d)^2),$$

*with the estimate*

$$\|\text{tr}_{\partial I} \partial_x^k f\|_{W^{\frac{4-k}{4} - \frac{1}{8}, p}(0, T; (\mathbb{R}^d)^2)} \leq C(T_0, p) \|f\|_{\mathbb{X}_{T,p}} \quad \text{for } f \in {}_0\mathbb{X}_T.$$

*Proof.* This follows for instance from the time-weighted case in [27], more precisely from [27, Lemma 3.4, Theorem 4.2 and Theorem 4.5].  $\square$

**Remark B.2.** *Note that for a Hilbert space  $E$  and  $s \in (0, \infty)$ ,  $p = 2$ , the Bessel potential spaces coincide with the Slobodetskii spaces, i.e.  $H^{s,2}(0, T; E) = W^{s,2}(0, T; E)$  with equivalence of norms, cf. [25, Corollary 4.37]. A particular consequence of this is that in the case  $p = 2$  we get from Proposition B.1 (iii) that*

$$\partial_x^k: \mathbb{X}_{T,2} \rightarrow W^{\frac{4-k}{4}, 2}(0, T; L^2(I; \mathbb{R}^d)) \cap L^2(0, T; W^{4-k, 2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$$

*is continuous, with the estimate*

$$\|\partial_x^k f\|_{W^{\frac{4-k}{4}, 2}(0, T; L^2(I; \mathbb{R}^d)) \cap L^2(0, T; W^{4-k, 2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))} \leq C(T_0) \|f\|_{\mathbb{X}_{T,2}} \quad \text{for } f \in {}_0\mathbb{X}_T.$$

A crucial tool in proving the contraction estimates in Section 2.4 was the precise control of the integrability of the spatial derivatives and their spatial trace, with operator norm bounded independent of  $T \leq T_0$ . As in Section 2.4, we restrict to the case  $p = 2$  here.

**Proposition B.3.** *Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in [1, \infty)$ .*

(i) *If there exists  $\theta \in [0, 1]$  such that  $\frac{4-k}{4}\theta - \frac{1}{2} \geq -\frac{1}{\rho_1}$  and  $(4-k)(1-\theta) - \frac{1}{2} \geq -\frac{1}{\rho_2}$  then  $\partial_x^k: \mathbb{X}_{T,2} \rightarrow L^{\rho_1}(0, T; L^{\rho_2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))$  with the estimate*

$$\|\partial_x^k f\|_{L^{\rho_1}(0, T; L^{\rho_2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))} \leq C(T_0, k, \theta, \rho_1, \rho_2) \|f\|_{\mathbb{X}_{T,2}} \quad \text{for all } f \in {}_0\mathbb{X}_{T,2}.$$

(ii) *If  $\frac{4-k}{4} - \frac{5}{8} \geq -\frac{1}{\rho_1}$ , then  $\text{tr}_{\partial I} \partial_x^k: \mathbb{X}_{T,2} \rightarrow L^{\rho_1}(0, T; (\mathbb{R}^d)^2)$  with the estimate*

$$\|\text{tr}_{\partial I} \partial_x^k f\|_{L^{\rho_1}(0, T; (\mathbb{R}^d)^2)} \leq C(T_0, k, \rho_1) \|f\|_{\mathbb{X}_{T,2}} \quad \text{for all } f \in {}_0\mathbb{X}_{T,2}.$$

*Proof.* We first prove the estimates.

(i) Using first Proposition B.1 (iii) with  $T = T_0$  and Remark B.2, then interpolation, and in the last line the usual Sobolev embedding both in the temporal and spatial variable, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_x^k: {}_0\mathbb{X}_{T_0,2} &\rightarrow W^{\frac{4-k}{4},2}(0, T_0; L^2(I; \mathbb{R}^d)) \cap L^2(0, T_0, W^{4-k,2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)) \\ &\hookrightarrow W^{\frac{4-k}{4}\theta,2}(0, T_0; W^{(4-k)(1-\theta),2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)) \\ &\hookrightarrow L^{\rho_1}(0, T_0; L^{\rho_2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d)). \end{aligned} \tag{B.3}$$

Now, as a consequence of [27, Lemma 2.5], there exists an extension operator  $E_T$  from  $(0, T)$  to  $(0, T_0)$  such that  $E_T: {}_0\mathbb{X}_{T,2} \rightarrow {}_0\mathbb{X}_{T_0,2}$  has operator norm bounded by  $C(T_0)$ . Then, for any  $f \in {}_0\mathbb{X}_{T,2}$  we have using (B.3)

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_x^k f\|_{L^{\rho_1}(0, T; L^{\rho_2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))} &\leq \|\partial_x^k (E_T f)\|_{L^{\rho_1}(0, T_0; L^{\rho_2}(I; \mathbb{R}^d))} \\ &\leq C(T_0, k, \theta, \rho_1, \rho_2) \|E_T f\|_{\mathbb{X}_{T_0,2}} \\ &\leq C(T_0, k, \theta, \rho_1, \rho_2) \|f\|_{\mathbb{X}_{T,2}}. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) Since  $\text{tr}_{\partial I} \partial_x^k f$  only depends on the temporal variable, we first use Proposition B.1 (iv) with  $T = T_0$  and Remark B.2 and then the Sobolev embedding to find

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}_{\partial I} \partial_x^k: {}_0\mathbb{X}_{T_0,2} &\rightarrow W^{\frac{4-k}{4}-\frac{1}{8},2}(0, T_0; (\mathbb{R}^d)^2) \\ &\hookrightarrow L^{\rho_1}(0, T_0; (\mathbb{R}^d)^2). \end{aligned} \tag{B.4}$$

Again, using the extension operator, we find for any  $f \in {}_0\mathbb{X}_{T,2}$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\text{tr}_{\partial I} \partial_x^k f\|_{L^{\rho_1}(0, T; (\mathbb{R}^d)^2)} &\leq \|\text{tr}_{\partial I} \partial_x^k (E_T f)\|_{L^{\rho_1}(0, T_0; (\mathbb{R}^d)^2)} \\ &\leq C(T_0, k, \rho_1) \|E_T f\|_{\mathbb{X}_{T_0,2}} \\ &\leq C(T_0, k, \rho_1) \|f\|_{\mathbb{X}_{T,2}}. \end{aligned}$$

The mapping properties follow from (B.3) and (B.4), replacing  $T_0$  by  $T$  and  ${}_0\mathbb{X}_{T_0,2}$  by  $\mathbb{X}_{T,2}$ .  $\square$

## Appendix C A gluing lemma for reparametrizations

In Theorem 4.1, we used the fact that two smooth reparametrizations can be interpolated by another smooth reparametrization. We state this gluing result here in a slightly more general form for possible future reference.

**Lemma C.1.** *Let  $0 < t_1 < t_2 < T$  and  $\Phi_1: [0, t_2] \times I \rightarrow I$ ,  $\Phi_2: [t_1, T] \times I \rightarrow I$  be smooth families of reparametrizations, such that  $\Phi_i(t, \cdot)$  is strictly increasing for all suitable  $t$  and  $i = 1, 2$ . Then, there exists a smooth family of strictly increasing reparametrizations  $\Psi: [0, T] \times I \rightarrow I$  satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(t, x) &= \Phi_1(t, x), & \text{for all } 0 \leq t \leq t_1, x \in I \\ \Psi(t, x) &= \Phi_2(t, x), & \text{for all } t_2 \leq t \leq T, x \in I.\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Let  $\delta > 0$  be sufficiently small and  $\eta: [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, 0 \leq \eta \leq 1$  be a smooth cutoff function, satisfying

$$\eta(t) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq t_1 + \delta \\ 0, & \text{for } t \geq t_2 - \delta. \end{cases}$$

Then it is not difficult to check that the function  $\Psi: [0, T] \times I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  given by

$$\Psi(t, x) := \begin{cases} \Phi_1(t, x) & \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq t_1, x \in I \\ \Phi_1(t, x)\eta(t) + \Phi_2(t, x)(1 - \eta(t)), & \text{for } t \in [t_1, t_2], x \in I \\ \Phi_2(t, x) & \text{for } t_2 \leq t \leq T, x \in I \end{cases}$$

is smooth and satisfies all the desired properties. □

## Acknowledgments

Fabian Rupp is supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation)-Projekt Nummer: 404870139. The authors would like to thank Anna Dall’Acqua, Marius Müller and Rico Zacher for helpful discussions and comments.

## References

- [1] R. Abraham, J. E. Marsden, and T. S. Ratiu. *Manifolds, tensor analysis, and applications*. Springer, New York, 2004.
- [2] S. Angenent. Parabolic equations for curves on surfaces. I. Curves with  $p$ -integrable curvature. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 132(3):451–483, 1990.
- [3] S. B. Angenent. Nonlinear analytic semiflows. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, 115(1-2):91–107, 1990.
- [4] J. Appell and P. P. Zabrejko. *Nonlinear superposition operators*, volume 95 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990.

- [5] R. Chill. On the Łojasiewicz-Simon gradient inequality. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 201(2):572–601, 2003.
- [6] R. Chill, E. Fařangová, and R. Schätzle. Willmore blowups are never compact. *Duke Math. J.*, 147(2):345–376, 2009.
- [7] A. Dall’Acqua, T. Laux, Lin, P. Pozzi, and A. Spener. The elastic flow of curves on the sphere. *Geom. Flows*, 3(1):1 – 13, 2018.
- [8] A. Dall’Acqua, C.-C. Lin, and P. Pozzi. Evolution of open elastic curves in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  subject to fixed length and natural boundary conditions. *Analysis (Berlin)*, 34(2):209–222, 2014.
- [9] A. Dall’Acqua, C.-C. Lin, and P. Pozzi. A gradient flow for open elastic curves with fixed length and clamped ends. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5)*, 17(3):1031–1066, 2017.
- [10] A. Dall’Acqua, C.-C. Lin, and P. Pozzi. Elastic flow of networks: long-time existence result. *Geom. Flows*, 4(1):83 – 136, 2019.
- [11] A. Dall’Acqua, M. Müller, R. Schätzle, and A. Spener. The Willmore flow of tori of revolution, 2020. arXiv:2005.13500.
- [12] A. Dall’Acqua, P. Pozzi, and A. Spener. The Łojasiewicz-Simon gradient inequality for open elastic curves. *J. Differential Equations*, 2016.
- [13] R. Denk, M. Hieber, and J. Prüss. Optimal  $L^p$ - $L^q$ -estimates for parabolic boundary value problems with inhomogeneous data. *Math. Z.*, 257(1):193–224, 2007.
- [14] G. Dziuk, E. Kuwert, and R. Schätzle. Evolution of elastic curves in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ : existence and computation. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 33(5):1228–1245, 2002.
- [15] J. Escher, J. Prüss, and G. Simonett. A new approach to the regularity of solutions for parabolic equations. In *Evolution equations*, volume 234 of *Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math.*, pages 167–190. Dekker, New York, 2003.
- [16] P. M. N. Feehan and M. Maridakis. Łojasiewicz–Simon gradient inequalities for analytic and Morse–Bott functions on Banach spaces. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 765:35–67, 2020.
- [17] H. Garcke, J. Menzel, and A. Pluda. Willmore flow of planar networks. *J. Differential Equations*, 266(4):2019–2051, 2019.
- [18] H. Garcke and A. Novick-Cohen. A singular limit for a system of degenerate Cahn-Hilliard equations. *Adv. Differential Equations*, 5(4-6):401–434, 2000.
- [19] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer, Berlin, 2001.

- [20] H. Koch and T. Lamm. Geometric flows with rough initial data. *Asian J. Math.*, 16(2):209–235, 2012.
- [21] J. Langer and D. Singer. Curves in the hyperbolic plane and mean curvature of tori in 3-space. *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 16(5):531–534, 1984.
- [22] C.-C. Lin.  $L^2$ -flow of elastic curves with clamped boundary conditions. *J. Differential Equations*, 252(12):6414 – 6428, 2012.
- [23] C.-C. Lin, Y.-K. Lue, and H. R. Schwetlick. The second-order  $L^2$ -flow of inextensible elastic curves with hinged ends in the plane. *J. Elasticity*, 119(1-2):263–291, 2015.
- [24] S. Łojasiewicz. Sur les ensembles semi-analytiques. I.H.E.S., Bures-sur-Yvette, 1965.
- [25] A. Lunardi. *Interpolation theory*, volume 16 of *Appunti. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa (Nuova Serie)*. Edizioni della Normale, Pisa, 2018.
- [26] C. Mantegazza and M. Pozzetta. The Łojasiewicz-Simon inequality for the elastic flow, 2020. arXiv:2007.16093.
- [27] M. Meyries and R. Schnaubelt. Interpolation, embeddings and traces of anisotropic fractional Sobolev spaces with temporal weights. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 262(3):1200–1229, 2012.
- [28] M. Müller and A. Spener. On the convergence of the elastic flow in the hyperbolic plane. *Geom. Flows*, 5(1):40–77, 2020.
- [29] M. Novaga and S. Okabe. Curve shortening-straightening flow for non-closed planar curves with infinite length. *J. Differential Equations*, 256(3):1093–1132, 2014.
- [30] M. Novaga and S. Okabe. Convergence to equilibrium of gradient flows defined on planar curves. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 733:87–119, 2017.
- [31] A. Polden. *Curves and Surfaces of Least Total Curvature and Fourth Order Flows*. PhD thesis, Universität Tübingen, 1996.
- [32] M. Pozzetta. Convergence of elastic flows of curves into manifolds, 2020. arXiv:2007.00582.
- [33] F. Rupp. On the Łojasiewicz–Simon gradient inequality on submanifolds. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 279(8):108708, 2020.
- [34] L. Simon. Asymptotics for a class of nonlinear evolution equations, with applications to geometric problems. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 118(3):525–571, 1983.
- [35] V. A. Solonnikov. On boundary value problems for linear parabolic systems of differential equations of general form. *Tr. Mat. Inst. Steklova*, 83:3–163, 1965.



- [36] A. Spener. Short time existence for the elastic flow of clamped curves. *Math. Nachr.*, 290(13):2052–2077, 2017.
- [37] H. Triebel. *Interpolation theory, function spaces, differential operators*. VEB Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, Berlin, 1978.
- [38] Y. Wen.  $L^2$  flow of curve straightening in the plane. *Duke Math. J.*, 70(3):683–698, 1993.
- [39] K. Yoshida. *Functional analysis*. Springer, Berlin; Heidelberg, 1995.