arXiv:2106.02231v1 [math.AP] 4 Jun 2021

DETERMINING MAP, DATA ASSIMILATION AND AN OBSERVABLE REGULARITY CRITERION FOR THE THREE-DIMENSIONAL BOUSSINESQ SYSTEM

ABHISHEK BALAKRISHNA AND ANIMIKH BISWAS

Abstract. In this paper, we provide conditions, *based solely on the observed velocity data*, for the global well-posedness, regularity and convergence of the Azouni-Olson-Titi data assimilation algorithm (AOT algorithm) for a Leray-Hopf weak solutions of the three dimensional Boussinesq system. This condition also guarantees the construction of the *determining map*. The aforementioned conditions on the (finite-dimensional) velocity observations, which in this case comprise either of a finite-dimensional *modal* projection or finitely many *volume element observations*, are automatically satisfied for solutions that are globally regular and are uniformly bounded in the H^1-norm. However, neither regularity nor uniqueness is *a priori* assumed on the solutions. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first such rigorous analysis of the AOT data assimilation algorithm for the three-dimensional Boussinesq system. As a corollary, we obtain that the condition that we imposed in order to obtain well-posedness and tracking property for the AOT system is in fact *a new observable regularity criterion on the weak global attractor*. The proof of this fact proceeds through the construction of the determining map.

1. Introduction

For a given dynamical system, which is believed to accurately describe some aspect(s) of an underlying physical reality, the problem of forecasting is often hindered by inadequate knowledge of the initial state and/or model parameters describing the system. However, in many cases, this is compensated by the fact that one has access to data from (possibly noisy) measurements of the system, collected on a *much coarser spatial grid than the desired resolution of the forecast.* The objective of data assimilation and signal synchronization is to use this coarse scale observational measurements to fine tune our knowledge of the state and/or model to improve the accuracy of the forecasts [27, 47].

Due to its ubiquity in scientific applications, data assimilation has been the subject of a very large body of work. Classically, these techniques are based on linear quadratic estimation, also known as the Kalman Filter. The Kalman Filter has the drawback of assuming that the underlying system and any corresponding observation models are linear. It also assumes that measurement noise is Gaussian distributed. This has been mitigated by practitioners via modifications, such as the Ensemble Kalman Filter, Extended Kalman Filter and the Unscented Kalman Filter and consequently, there has been a recent surge of interest in developing a rigorous mathematical framework for these approaches; see, for instance, [13, 42, 47, 48, 50, 58] and the references therein. These works provide a Bayesian and variational framework for the problem, with emphasis on analyzing variational and Kalman filter based methods. It should be noted however that the problems of stability, accuracy and *catastrophic filter divergence*, particularly for *infinite dimensional chaotic dynamical systems governed by PDE's,* continue to pose serious challenges to rigorous analysis, and are far from being resolved [19, 20, 42, 64, 65].

An alternative approach to data assimilation, henceforth referred to as the *AOT algorithm,* has recently been proposed in [1, 14], which employs a feedback control paradigm via a *Newtonian*

relaxation scheme (*nudging*). This was in turn predicated on the notion of finite determining functionals (modes, nodes, volume elements) for dissipative systems, the rigorous existence of which was first established in [38–40,45]. Assuming that the observations are generated from a continuous dynamical system given by

$$\frac{d}{dt}u = F(u), u(0) = u_0,$$

the AOT algorithm entails solving an associated system

$$\frac{d}{dt}w = F(w) - \mu(I_h w - I_h u), w(0) = w_0 \text{ (arbitrary)}, \tag{1.1}$$

where I_h is a finite rank linear operator acting on the phase space, called *interpolant operator*, constructed *solely from observations* on u (e.g. low (Fourier) modes of u or values of u measured in a coarse spatial grid). Here h refers to the size of the spatial grid or, in case of the *modal interpolant*, the reciprocal of h stands for the number of observed modes. Moreover, $\mu > 0$ is the *relaxation/nudging parameter* an appropriate choice of which needs to be made for the algorithm to work. It can then be established that the AOT system (1.1) is well-posed and its solution *tracks* the solution of the original system asymptotically, i.e. $\|w - u\| \longrightarrow 0$ as $t \to \infty$ in a suitable norm.

Although initially introduced in the context of the two-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations, this was later generalized to include various other models and convergence in stronger norms (e.g. the analytic Gevrey class) [11,18,31,33–36,53,56], as well as to more general situations such as discrete in time and error-contaminated measurements and to statistical solutions [3,16,37]. This method has been shown to perform remarkably well in numerical simulations [12,32,41,43,44,49] and has recently been successfully implemented for the first time for efficient dynamical downscaling of a global atmospheric reanalysis [28]. Recent applications include its implementation in *reduced order modeling (ROM)* of turbulent flows to mitigate inaccuracies in ROM [66], and in inferring flow parameters and turbulence configurations [22,29].

In this paper, we consider the well-posedness, stability and convergence/tracking property of solutions of the AOT system for Leray-Hopf weak solutions of the three dimensional Boussinesq system, under adequate conditions on the *observations of the velocity field, and without assuming regularity*. This extends our previous work on the Navier-Stokes equations in [2]. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first such rigorous result for the 3D Boussinesq equations. In all the cases mentioned before except [2] where rigorous analysis is available, including the Navier-Stokes-α models [10,11,36], one crucially uses the fact that these models are well-posed and regular, i.e. uniform-in-time bound in a higher Sobolev norm (e.g. the $\mathbb{H}^1$-norm) is available. *These bounds are used in providing an upper bound on the spatial resolution h* of the observations (or lower bound on the number of observed low modes) necessary for the algorithm to be well-posed, stable and convergent. Additionally, the value of the nudging parameter μ guaranteeing convergence/tracking property also explicitly depends on this uniform bound. By contrast, our condition is formulated purely in terms of the observed, finite dimensional part of the data. For (u, θ), the solution to the Boussinesq system given in (2.12)-(2.14), the observations on the velocity component u are used to define the quantity

$$M_{h,u}^2 = 32 \sup_{0\le t\le T} \begin{cases} \|P_N(u)\|^2 \sim \sum\limits_{|k|\le N} |\lambda_k|^2 |\hat{u}(k)|^2, \ N \sim \dfrac{1}{h} & \text{(Modal)} \\ Ch \sum\limits_{\alpha} |\bar{u}_\alpha|^2, \ \bar{u}_\alpha = \dfrac{1}{|Q_\alpha|}\displaystyle\int_{Q_\alpha} u & (Volume) \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

where, λ_k are eigenvalues of the Stokes operator such that $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots$ with P_N being the associated spectral projections. Also, in the above definition, $\{Q_\alpha\}$ denotes partition of the domain into finitely many cubes of side length h. M_h so defined is a finite quantity (as shown in Remark 2.4). Then, if for $h_0 > 0$ (depending on fluid viscosity, thermal diffusivity and the size of the domain) there exists $0 < h \leq h_0$ such that

$$\frac{16cM_{h,u}^4}{\nu^3} \leq \frac{\nu}{4ch^2}, \quad (\nu \text{ is the fluid viscosity}) \tag{1.3}$$

then a choice of μ exists such that the data assimilated solution (w, η) is *regular* (given in Definition 2) and converges to the actual solution u.

1.1. **A New Observanle Regularity Criterion.** Condition (1.3) always holds when the velocity component u is *regular* (i.e. $\sup_{t\in[0,T)} \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} < \infty$). So one wonders about the relationship between (1.3) and the regularity of the solution. This is explored in Section 4 (and section 5) to obtain a *new observable regularity criteria* for the 3D Navier-Stokes on the weak attractor; similar result can be obtained for the three dimensional Boussinesq system as well. To describe our result, let $h_0 > 0$ be defined as

$$h_0^{-2} = \max\left\{\frac{1}{4c\lambda_1}, \frac{32c|f|^4}{\nu^8\lambda_1^2}\right\} \quad (f \text{ is the body force}).$$

Let $u(t), t \in \mathbb{R}$ be a Leray-Hopf weak solution of the 3D Navier-Stokes on the weak global attractor $\mathcal{A}$. Let M_h be defined as in (1.2), except that the supremum is taken on the interval $(-\infty, T]$. Assume there exists $0 < h \leq h_0$ for which

$$\frac{2cM_h^4}{\nu^3} \leq \frac{\nu}{16ch^2}.$$

Then $u(t)$ is regular on $(-\infty, T]$. We refer to this as *an observable regularity criterion* because it is purely based on the finitely many observations (modes or volume elements).

2. 3-D Boussinesq Equation

2.1. **Model.** The Bénard convection problem is a model of the Boussinesq convection system of an incompressible fluid layer, confined between two solid walls, which is heated from below in such a way that the lower wall maintains a temperature T_0, while the upper one maintains a temperature $T_1 < T_0$. In this case, after some change of variables and proper scaling (by normalizing the distance between the walls and the temperature difference), the three-dimensional Boussinesq equations that govern the perturbation of the velocity(u) and temperature about the pure conduction steady state(θ) are

$$\frac{du}{dt} + \nu\Delta u + (u\cdot\nabla)u = \theta \boldsymbol{e}_3 \tag{2.1}$$

$$\frac{d\theta}{dt} + \kappa\Delta\theta + (u\cdot\nabla)\theta - u\cdot\boldsymbol{e}_3 = 0 \tag{2.2}$$

$$\nabla\cdot u = 0 \tag{2.3}$$

$$u(0,x) = u_0, \quad \theta(0,x) = \theta_0 \tag{2.4}$$

For boundary conditions, in the x_3 direction we have

$$u, \theta = 0, \text{ at } x_3 = 0 \text{ and } x_3 = 1$$

and in the x_1 and x_2 directions, for simplicity, we have the periodic boundary condition

$$u, \theta \text{ are periodic, of period } L \text{ in the } x_1 \text{ and } x_2 \text{ directions.}$$

Here, $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ is a point in the domain, $u(t;x) = (u_1(t,x), u_2(t,x), u_3(t,x))$ is the fluid velocity and $\theta = \theta(t,x)$ is the scaled fluctuation of the temperature around the pure scaled conduction steady-state background temperature profile $1 - x_3$. It is given by $\theta = T - (1 - x_3)$, where $T = T(t,x)$ is the scaled temperature of the fluid inside the domain Ω. κ and ν are the thermal diffusivity and kinematic viscosity, respectively.

2.2. **Notation.** We briefly introduce the functional setting for (2.1)-(2.4). For $\alpha > 0$, $H^\alpha(\Omega)$ is the usual Sobolev space. We denote the inner product and norm of $L^2(\Omega)$ by $(\cdot,\cdot)$ and $|\cdot|$ respectively and the inner product and norm of $H^1(\Omega)$ by $((\cdot,\cdot))$ and $||\cdot||$ respectively. We define $\mathcal{F}$ to be the set of $C^\infty(\Omega)$ functions defined in Ω, which are trigonometric polynomials in x_1 and x_2 with period L, and compactly supported in the x_3-direction. We denote the space of vector valued functions on Ω that incorporates the divergence free condition by $\mathcal{V} = \{\phi \in \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F} | \nabla.\phi = 0\}$. H_0 and H_1 are closures of $\mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{F}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ respectively and V_0 and V_1 are closures of $\mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{F}$ in $H^1(\Omega)$ respectively.
H_0 and H_1 are endowed with the inner products

$$(u,v)_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{3} \int_\Omega u_i(x) v_i(x) dx$$

and

$$(\phi,\psi)_1 = \int_\Omega \phi(x)\psi(x)dx$$

respectively, and the norms $|u|_0 = (u,u)_0^{1/2}$ and $|\phi|_1 = (\phi,\phi)_1^{1/2}$ respectively. V_0 and V_1 are endowed with the inner products

$$((u,v))_0 = \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} \int_\Omega \partial_j u_i(x) \partial_j v_i(x) dx,$$

$$((\phi,\psi))_1 = \sum_{j=1}^{3} \int_\Omega \partial_j \phi(x) \partial_j \psi(x) dx$$

respectively, and the associated norms $\|u\|_0 = ((u,u))_0^{1/2}$ and $\|\phi\|_1 = ((\phi,\phi))_1^{1/2}$ respectively. We also denote by P_σ the Leray-Hopf orthogonal projection operator from $L^2(\Omega)$ to H_0.

Let $D(A_0) = V_0 \cap \left(H^2(\Omega)\right)^3$, $D(A_1) = V_1 \cap H^2(\Omega)$ and $A_i : D(A_i) \to H_i$ be the unbounded linear operator defined by

$$(A_i u, v)_i = ((u,v))_i, \quad \text{for } i = 0, 1. \tag{2.5}$$

We recall that A_i, for $i = 0, 1$, is a positive self adjoint operator with a compact inverse. Moreover, there exists a complete orthonormal set of eigenfunctions $\phi_{j,i} \in H_i$, such that $A_i \phi_{j,i} = \lambda_{j,i} \phi_{j,i}$, where $0 < \lambda_{1,i} \leq \lambda_{2,i} \leq \lambda_{3,i} \leq \dots$ are the eigenvalues of A_i repeated according to multiplicity.

For $i = 0, 1$, we denote by H_n^i the space spanned by the first n eigenvectors of A_i and the orthogonal projection from H_i onto H_n^i is denoted by P_n^i. We also have the Poincare inequality

$$\lambda_1^{1/2} |v|_i \leq \|v\|_i, v \in V_i. \tag{2.6}$$

where $\lambda_1 = \min\{\lambda_{1,0}, \lambda_{1,1}\}$.

Let V_i' be the dual of V_i for $i = 0, 1$. We define the bilinear term $B_0 : V_0 \times V_0 \to V_0'$ by

$$\langle B_0(u, v), w\rangle_{V_0', V_0} = (((u \cdot \nabla)v), w)_0$$

and $B_1 : V_0 \times V_1 \to V_1'$ by

$$\langle B_1(u, v), w\rangle_{V_1', V_1} = (((u \cdot \nabla)v), w)_1.$$

The bilinear term B_i, for $i = 0, 1$, satisfies the orthogonality property

$$B_i(u, w, w) = 0 \ \forall \ u \in V_0, \ w \in V_i. \tag{2.7}$$

We define the solution space $H = H_0 \times H_1$ equipped with the inner product

$$\langle s_1, s_2\rangle = (u_1, u_2)_0 + (\theta_1, \theta_2)_1,$$

where $s_1 = (u_1, \theta_1)$ and $s_2 = (u_2, \theta_2)$.
We recall some well-known bounds on the bilinear term for velocity in the 3D case.

Proposition 2.1. *If $u, v \in V_0$ and $w \in H_0$, then*

$$|(B_0(u, v), w)_0| \le c\|u\|_{L^6}\|\nabla v\|_{L^3}\|w\|_{L^2} \le c\|u\|\|v\||Av|^{1/2}|w| \tag{2.8}$$

Moreover if $u, v, w \in V_0$, then

$$|(B_0(u, v), w)_0| \le c\|u\|_{L^4}\|\nabla v\|_{L^2}\|w\|_{L^4} \le c|u|^{1/4}\|u\|^{3/4}\|v\||w|^{1/4}\|w\|^{3/4} \tag{2.9}$$

We also recall the Ladyzhenskaya's inequality for three dimensions :

$$\|w\|_{L^4} \le C|w|_0^{\frac{1}{4}}\|w\|_0^{\frac{3}{4}} \tag{2.10}$$

Remark 2.1. From [7], we know that the weak solution is uniformly bounded in time in $H = H_0 \times H_1$. Hence, for u and θ as in (2.1)-(2.2), there exists $M_0(u_0, \theta_0)$, $M_1(u_0, \theta_0) \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$|u|_0 \le M_0, \text{ and } |\theta|_1 \le M_1. \tag{2.11}$$

We denote by P_σ the Leray-Hopf orthogonal projection operator from $L^2(\Omega)$ to H_0. With above notation, by applying P_σ to (2.1), we may express the 3-D Boussinesqu equation in the following functional form:

$$\frac{du}{dt} + \nu A_0(u) + B_0(u, u) = P_\sigma(\theta \boldsymbol{e}_3) \tag{2.12}$$

$$\frac{d\theta}{dt} + \kappa A_1(\theta) + B_1(u, \theta) - u \cdot \boldsymbol{e}_3 = 0 \tag{2.13}$$

$$u(0, x) = u_0, \quad \theta(0, x) = \theta_0. \tag{2.14}$$

Definition 1. *(u, θ) is said to be a weak solution to (2.12)-(2.14) if for all $T > 0$,*

- *$u \in L^\infty(0, T; H_0) \cap L^2(0, T; V_0)$*
- *$\theta \in L^\infty(0, T; H_1) \cap L^2(0, T; V_1)$*
- *u, θ satisfy, $\forall v \in V_0$ and $\forall \zeta \in V_1$, a.e.t*

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt}(u, v)_0 + \nu((u, v))_0 + (B_0(u, u), v) = (\theta \boldsymbol{e}_3, v)_0 \\ &\frac{d}{dt}(\theta, \zeta)_1 + \kappa((\theta, \zeta))_1 + (B_1(u, \theta), \zeta)_1 - (u.\boldsymbol{e}_3, \zeta)_1 = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

A Leray-Hopf weak solution additionally satisfies, a.e. s, and for all $t \geq s$, the energy inequality

$$|u(t)|^2 + \int_s^t \nu \|u(\sigma)\|^2 d\sigma \leq |u(s)|^2 + \int_s^t (\theta \boldsymbol{e}_3(\sigma), u(\sigma)) d\sigma. \tag{2.16}$$

$$|\theta(t)|^2 + \int_s^t \kappa \|\theta(\sigma)\|^2 d\sigma \leq |\theta(s)|^2 + \int_s^t (u \cdot \boldsymbol{e}_3(\sigma), \theta(\sigma)) d\sigma. \tag{2.17}$$

2.3. **Interpolant Operators.** A finite rank, bounded linear operator $I_h : L^2(\Omega) \to L^2(\Omega)$ is said to be a type-I interpolant observable if there exists a dimensionless constant $c > 0$ such that

$$|I_h(v)| \leq c|v| \ \ \forall v \in L^2(\Omega) \text{ and } |I_h(v) - v| \leq ch\|v\| \ \ \forall v \in H^1(\Omega). \tag{2.18}$$

We look at two major examples of type-I interpolants.

- **Modal interpolation**: In this case $I_h u = P_K^0(u)$ with $h \sim 1/K$, where P_K^0 denotes the orthogonal projection onto the space spanned by the first K eigenvectors of the Stokes operatorA_0. Indeed, one can easily check that it satisfies (2.18):

$$|P_K(v)| \leq |v| \ \ \forall v \in L^2(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad |P_K(v) - v| \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_K^{1/2}} \|v\| \ \ \forall v \in H^1(\Omega). \tag{2.19}$$

  where $\lambda_K = \min\{\lambda_K^0, \lambda_K^1\}$.

- **Volume interpolation**: In this case, Ω is partitioned into N smaller cuboids Q_α, where $\alpha \in \mathcal{J} = \left\{(j,k,l) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} : 1 \leq j,k,l \leq \sqrt[3]{N}\right\}$. Each cuboid is of diameter $h = \sqrt{2L^2+1}/\sqrt[3]{N}$. The interpolation operator is defined as follows:

$$I_h(v) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{J}} \bar{v}_\alpha \chi_{Q_\alpha}(x), \quad v \in L^2(\Omega) \tag{2.20}$$

  where

$$\bar{v}_\alpha = \frac{1}{|Q_\alpha|} \int_{Q_\alpha} v(x) dx, \tag{2.21}$$

  and $|Q_\alpha|$ is the volume of Q_α. For $v \in V_0$, we define $I_h(v) = (I_h(v_1), I_h(v_2), I_h(v_3))$, where $v = (v_1, v_2, v_3)$.

2.4. **Well-Posedness.**

Definition 2. *(u, θ) is said to be a weak solution to* (2.12)-(2.14) *if for all $T > 0$,*

- $u \in L^\infty(0,T; H_0) \cap L^2(0,T; V_0)$
- $\theta \in L^\infty(0,T; H_1) \cap L^2(0,T; V_1)$
- *u, θ satisfy, $\forall v \in V_0$ and $\forall \zeta \in V_1$, a.e.t*

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt}(u,v)_0 + \nu((u,v))_0 + (B_0(u,u),v) = (\theta \boldsymbol{e}_3, v)_0 \\ &\frac{d}{dt}(\theta,\zeta)_1 + \kappa((\theta,\zeta))_1 + (B_1(u,\theta),\zeta)_1 - (u.\boldsymbol{e}_3,\zeta)_1 = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

A weak solution is said to be a strong/regular solution if it also belongs to

$$\left[L^\infty(0,T;V) \cap L^2(0,T;D(A))\right] \times \left[L^\infty(0,T;V_1) \cap L^2(0,T;D(A_1))\right].$$

Remark 2.2. Similar to the case of 3-D Navier-Stokes, we have existence but not uniqueness of weak solution. Also, given initial data in $V_0 \times V_1$, a unique strong solution exists for some $[0,T]$ and a strong solution is unique in the larger class of Leray-Hopf weak solutions.

2.5. **Existence Of Weak Solution.** In this section, we prove the existence of a weak solution to the data assimilated Boussinesq equation. Our data assimilated algorithm is given by the solution (w,η) of

$$\frac{dw}{dt} + \nu A_0(w) + B_0(w,w) = P_\sigma(\eta \boldsymbol{e}_3) + \mu(P_\sigma(I_h(u) - I_h(w))) \tag{2.23}$$

$$\frac{d\eta}{dt} + \kappa A_1(\eta) + B_1(w,\eta) - w.\boldsymbol{e}_3 = 0 \tag{2.24}$$

$$w(x,0) = 0, \eta(x,0) = 0. \tag{2.25}$$

The Galerkin approximation (w_n, η_n) of (w,η) satisfies

$$\frac{dw_n}{dt} + \nu A_0(w_n) + P_n B_0(w_n,w_n) = (\eta_n \boldsymbol{e}_3) + \mu(P_n(I_h(u) - I_h(w_n))) \tag{2.26}$$

$$\frac{d\eta_n}{dt} + \kappa A_1(\eta_n) + P_n B_1(w_n,\eta_n) - w_n \cdot \boldsymbol{e}_3 = 0 \tag{2.27}$$

$$w_n(x,0) = 0, \eta_n(x,0) = 0 \tag{2.28}$$

where, by abuse of notation, P_n denotes the projection onto the space spanned by the first n eigenvectors of A_i for $i = 0, 1$.

Theorem 2.2. *Let (u,θ) be a Leray-Hopf weak solution to (2.12)-(2.14) for all $t \geq 0$ and I_h be any type 1 interpolant. Let $h_0 > 0$ be such that*

$$h_0^2 = \frac{\nu\kappa\lambda_1}{16c}.$$

Then, provided $h \leq h_0$ and μ is chosen satisfying

$$\frac{\nu}{2ch_0^2} \leq \mu \leq \frac{\nu}{2ch^2} \quad \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_1} \sim L^2\right), \tag{2.29}$$

there exists a weak solution (w,η) of (2.23) such that for any $T > 0$,

$$w \in L^\infty(0,T;H_0) \cap L^2(0,T;V_0), \text{ and } \eta \in L^\infty(0,T;H_1) \cap L^2(0,T;V_1).$$

Proof. Taking the inner product of (2.26) with w_n and (2.27) with η_n and adding, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\left(|w_n|_0^2 + |\eta_n|_1^2\right) + \nu\|w_n\|_0^2 + \kappa\|\eta_n\|_1^2 &\leq 2|\eta_n|_1|w_n|_0 + \mu(I_h(u) - I_h(w_n), w_n) \\ &\leq 2|\eta_n|_1|w_n|_0 + \mu(w_n - I_h(w_n), w_n) \\ &\quad - \mu|w_n|_0^2 + \mu(I_h(u), w_n) \end{aligned} \tag{2.30}$$

We bound each of the terms on the RHS below.
First, using Young's inequality, (2.29) and (2.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2|\eta_n|_1|w_n|_0 &\leq \frac{2|w_n|_0^2}{\kappa\lambda_1} + \frac{\kappa\lambda_1|\eta_n|_1^2}{2} \\ &\leq \frac{\mu|w_n|_0^2}{4} + \frac{\kappa\|\eta_n\|_1^2}{2}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.31}$$

Next, using (2.18), Cauchy-Schwartz, Young's inequality and the second inequality in (2.29), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mu|(w_n - I_h(w_n), w_n)|_0 &\leq \mu|w_n - I_h(w_n)|_0|w_n|_0 \\ &\leq \mu c h^2 \|w_n\|_0^2 + \frac{\mu}{4}|w_n|_0^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\nu}{2}\|w_n\|_0^2 + \frac{\mu}{4}|w_n|_0^2,\end{aligned} \tag{2.32}$$

Lastly, using Cauchy-Schwartz and Young's inequality, we have

$$\mu|(I_h(u), w_n)|_0 \leq \mu|I_h(u)|_0^2 + \frac{\mu}{4}|w_n|_0^2. \tag{2.33}$$

Combining all the estimates, we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left(|w_n|_0^2 + |\eta_n|_1^2\right) + \nu\|w_n\|_0^2 + \kappa\|\eta_n\|_1^2 + \frac{\mu}{2}|w_n|_0^2 \leq 2\mu|I_h(u)|_0^2. \tag{2.34}$$

Splitting the above inequality and using (2.6), we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}|w_n|_0^2 + \frac{\mu}{2}|w_n|_0^2 \leq 2\mu|I_h(u)|_0^2$$

and

$$\frac{d}{dt}|\eta_n|_1^2 + \kappa\lambda_1|\eta_n|_1^2 \leq 2\mu|I_h(u)|_0^2.$$

Applying Gronwall, (2.11), (2.18) and (2.28), we obtain

$$|w_n|_0^2 \leq 4M_0^2, \text{ and } |\eta_n|_1^2 \leq \frac{2\mu M_0^2}{\kappa\lambda_1}. \tag{2.35}$$

Dropping the first and the last term on LHS of (2.34) and integrating on the interval $[s, s+1]$, we obtain

$$\int_s^{s+1} \left(\nu\|w_n\|_0^2 + \kappa\|\eta_n\|_1^2\right) \leq 2\mu M_0^2. \tag{2.36}$$

The remainder of the proof is similar to the proof of existence of weak solutions of the 3D NSE. □

Remark 2.3. The data assimilated solution we have obtained is also unique. Later, from Theorem 3.1, we obtain uniqueness of solution on the time interval $[0.\infty)$. The same argument can be used to show uniqueness here on the time interval $[0, T]$.

2.6. **Time Independent Bound On Data Assimilated Temperature.** The following theorem will establish a time independent bound on $\|\eta\|_{L^{2p}}$, which will be a stepping stone in proving convergence of the data assimilated solution to the actual solution.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$ and η and η_n be as in* (2.24) *and* (2.28) *respectively. Assume that the hypotheses of Theorem 2.2 hold. Then $\|\eta\|_{L^{2p}}$ is uniformly bounded in time.*

Proof. Taking the inner product of (2.27) with η_n^{2p-1}, we obtain

$$\left(\frac{d\eta_n}{dt}, \eta_n^{2p-1}\right)_1 - \kappa\left(\Delta\eta_n, \eta_n^{2p-1}\right)_1 + \left((w_n \cdot \nabla)\eta_n, \eta_n^{2p-1}\right)_1 = (w_n \cdot \boldsymbol{e}_3, \eta_n^{2p-1})_1 \tag{2.37}$$

We estimate each term below.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2p}\frac{d\eta_n^{2p}}{dt} &= \eta_n^{2p-1}\frac{d\eta_n}{dt} \\ \Rightarrow \left(\frac{d\eta_n}{dt}, \eta_n^{2p-1}\right)_1 &= \frac{1}{2p}\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega \eta_n^{2p} dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2p}\frac{d}{dt}\|\eta_n\|_{L^{2p}}^{2p} \end{aligned} \tag{2.38}$$

Integrating by part, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} -\kappa(\Delta\eta_n, \eta_n^{2p-1})_1 &= (2p-1)\kappa\left(\nabla\eta_n, \eta_n^{2p-2}\nabla\eta_n\right)_1 \\ &= (2p-1)\kappa\left(\eta_n^{p-1}\nabla\eta, \eta_n^{p-1}\nabla\eta_n\right)_1 \\ &= \frac{2p-1}{p^2}|\nabla\left(\eta_n^p\right)|_1^2 \end{aligned} \tag{2.39}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left((w_n\cdot\nabla)\eta_n, \eta_n^{2p-1}\right)_1 &= -\left((w_n\cdot\nabla)\,\eta_n^{2p-1}, \eta_n\right)_1 \\ &= -(2p-1)\left(\eta_n^{2p-2}\,(w_n\cdot\nabla)\,\eta_n, \eta_n\right)_1 \\ &= -\frac{2p-1}{p^2}\left((w_n\cdot\nabla\eta_n)\,, \eta_n^{2p-1}\right)_1 \end{aligned} \tag{2.40}$$

Therefore, $\left(\left(w\cdot\nabla\eta_n, \eta_n^{2p-1}\right)\right)_1 = 0$.
From Holder's inequality, we have

$$|(w_n\cdot\boldsymbol{e}_3, \eta_n^{2p-1})_1| \le \|w_n\|_{L^{q_1}}\cdot\left\|(\eta_n^p)^{2-\frac{1}{p}}\right\|_{L^{q_2}} \tag{2.41}$$

where $q_1 = \frac{6p}{4p+1}$ and $q_2 = \frac{6p}{2p-1}$. Note that $q_1 \le 2\ \forall p\in\mathbb{N}$ and since Ω is a bounded domain of finite measure, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |(w_n\cdot\boldsymbol{e}_3, \eta_n^{2p-1})_1| &\le C|w_n|_0\cdot\left\|(\eta_n^p)^{2-\frac{1}{p}}\right\|_{L^{q_2}} \\ &\le C|w_n|_0\cdot\left(\int_\Omega(\eta_n^p)^6\right)^{1/q_2} \\ &\le C|w_n|_0\cdot\left(\,\|\eta_n^p\|_{L^6}\,\right)^{\frac{2p-1}{p}} \end{aligned} \tag{2.42}$$

Applying the Sobolev embedding $L^6(\Omega)\hookrightarrow H^1$,Young's inequality and (2.35), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |(w_n\cdot\boldsymbol{e}_3, \eta_n^{2p-1})_1| &\le C|w_n|_0\cdot\left(\,|\nabla\left(\eta_n^p\right)|_1\,\right)^{\frac{2p-1}{p}} \\ &\le Cp^{2p-2}|w_n|_0^{2p} + \left(\frac{2p-1}{2p^2}\right)|\nabla\left(\eta_n^p\right)|_1^2 \\ &\le Cp^{2p-2}M_0^{2p} + \left(\frac{2p-1}{2p^2}\right)|\nabla\left(\eta_n^p\right)|_1^2 \end{aligned} \tag{2.43}$$

Combining all the estimates we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2p}\frac{d}{dt}\|\eta_n\|_{L^{2p}}^{2p} + \left(\frac{2p-1}{2p^2}\right)|\nabla\left(\eta_n^p\right)|_1^2 \le Cp^{2p-2}M_0^{2p} \tag{2.44}$$

Substituting $\zeta_n = \eta_n^p$, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2p}\frac{d}{dt}|\zeta_n|_1^2 + \left(\frac{2p-1}{2p^2}\right)|\nabla\zeta_n|_1^2 \le Cp^{2p-2}M_0^{2p} \tag{2.45}$$

Since $\zeta_n = \eta_n^p$, it shares the same boundary conditions as η_n, and hence (2.6) is applicable to the above equation, giving us

$$\frac{d}{dt}|\zeta_n|_1^2 + \left(\frac{(2p-1)\lambda_1}{p}\right)|\zeta_n|_1^2 \leq Cp^{2p-1}M_0^{2p} \tag{2.46}$$

Now, applying Gronwall, we obtain

$$\|\eta_n\|_{L^{2p}}^{2p} = |\zeta_n|_1^2 \leq C\left(\frac{p^{2p}}{(2p-1)\lambda_1}\right)M_0^{2p} \tag{2.47}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\|\eta_n\|_{L^{2p}} \leq \frac{CpM_0}{((2p-1)\lambda_1)^{\frac{1}{2p}}} \coloneqq S_{p,u} = S_p \tag{2.48}$$

Hence η_n is a bounded sequence in $L^\infty(0,T;L^{2p}(\Omega))$ and there exists a subsequence η_{n_k} that converges to η^* in $L^\infty(0,T;L^{2p}(\Omega))$ in the weak star topology. In other words

$$\langle \eta_{n_k}, \xi\rangle_{X',X} \to \langle \eta^*, \xi\rangle_{X',X} \quad \forall \xi \in X = L^1(0,T;L^q(\Omega)), \tag{2.49}$$

where $2p$ and q are Holder conjugates. We also know that η_n, and hence $\eta_{n,k}$, converges to η in $L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$ in the weak star topology. In other words

$$\langle \eta_{n_k}, \xi\rangle_{X_1',X_1} \to \langle \eta, \xi\rangle_{X_1',X_1} \quad \forall \xi \in X_1 = L^1(0,T;L^2(\Omega)). \tag{2.50}$$

Now since $p \geq 1$ and Ω is bounded, $L^{2p}(\Omega) \subset L^2(\Omega)$ and $L^2(\Omega) \subset L^q(\Omega)$. This would mean that

$$L^\infty(0,T;L^{2p}(\Omega)) \quad \text{is a subspace of} \quad L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega)) \tag{2.51}$$

and the convergence in (2.49) will also hold in the weaker topology, giving us

$$\langle \eta_{n_k}, \xi\rangle_{X_1',X_1} \to \langle \eta^*, \xi\rangle_{X_1',X_1} \quad \forall \xi \in X_1 = L^1(0,T;L^2(\Omega)). \tag{2.52}$$

This would mean the sequence η_{n_k} has two weak star limits in $L^1(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$. Hence $\eta^* = \eta$ and

$$\|\eta\|_{L^{2p}} \leq \frac{CpM_0}{((2p-1)\lambda_1)^{\frac{1}{2p}}} \coloneqq S_{p,u} = S_p \tag{2.53}$$

□

2.7. **Global Existence Of Strong Solution.** Another key result we will need in order to show convergence of the data assimilated solution to the actual solution is the regularity of the data assimilated velocity w. In order to do so, we will have to impose conditions on our data and look at the term $\|I_h(u)\|_0$. For the case of modal interpolation, in addition to satisfying (2.18), I_h also satisfies

$$\|I_h(v)\| \leq \|P_N(u)\| \leq c\|v\| \quad \forall v \in H^1(\Omega),\ N \sim \frac{1}{h} \tag{2.54}$$

The piece-wise constant volume interpolant as defined in (2.20) may not satisfy (2.54) due to the lack of regularity of the characteristic function. In order to establish an inequality similar to (2.54) and also an inequality explicitly in terms of the data for volume interpolation, we define a smoothed volume interpolant operator $\tilde{I}_h$ that satisfies

$$\|\tilde{I}_h(v)\|_0^2 \leq Ch\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}}|\bar{v}_\alpha|^2 \leq C\|v\|_0^2 \quad \forall v \in V_0, \tag{2.55}$$

where $\bar{v}_\alpha$ is as in (2.21). The proof of (2.55) and the justification as to why $\tilde{I}_h$ is a type-I interpolant is provided in the appendix.

Hence, we can now define a modified type-I interpolant which encompasses the usual modal interpolant and the smoothed volume interpolant.

Next, for a general Leray-Hopf weak solution u of (2.12)-(2.14), we define the quantity $M_{h,u}(= M_{h,u,T})$ as

$$M_{h,u}^2 = 32 \sup_{0\le t\le T} \begin{cases} \|P_N(u)\|^2 \sim \sum\limits_{|k|\le N} |\lambda_{k,0}|^2 |\hat{u}(k)|^2,\ N \sim \dfrac{1}{h} & \text{(Modal)} \\ Ch \sum\limits_{\alpha} |\bar{u}_\alpha|^2,\ \bar{u}_\alpha = \dfrac{1}{|Q_\alpha|}\displaystyle\int_{Q_\alpha} u & (Volume) \end{cases} \tag{2.56}$$

where, $\lambda_{k,0}$ is the k^{th} smallest eigenvalue of A_0 corresponding to the eigenvector $\phi_{k,0}$ and $P_N(u) = \sum\limits_{k=1}^{N} \hat{u}(k)\phi_{k,0}$.

Remark 2.4. Observe that $M_{h,u}$, as defined in (2.56), depends only on the data and is always finite. In the volume interpolation case, from (2.20), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} |\bar{u}_\alpha|^2 \le \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} \left(\left| \frac{1}{|Q_\alpha|} \int_{Q_\alpha} u(x)dx \right| \right)^2 &\le \frac{N^2}{|\Omega|^2} \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} \|u\|^2_{L^1(Q_\alpha)} \\ &\le \frac{N}{|\Omega|} \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} \|u\|^2_{L^2(Q_\alpha)} \\ &\le \frac{N}{|\Omega|} |u|_0^2 \\ &\le \frac{N}{|\Omega|} M_0^2 \quad \text{(which is finite).} \end{aligned} \tag{2.57}$$

For the modal case, from (2.56),we may write

$$\|P_N(u)\|^2 \le \lambda_N |u|_0 \le \lambda_N M_0 \text{ (which is finite).} \tag{2.58}$$

Next, we have the following theorem that establishes the regularity of w.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $\tilde{I}_h$ be a modified general type-I interpolant, $M_{h,u}$ be as in* (2.56) *and $0 < T \le \infty$. Let $h_0 > 0$ be be given by*

$$h_0^{-2} = \frac{4c}{\nu} \max\left\{ \frac{8}{\kappa\lambda_1}, \frac{2}{\kappa}\left(1 + \frac{2}{\lambda_1^2}\right) \right\}. \tag{2.59}$$

Assume that for some $0 < h \le h_0$

$$\frac{16cM_{h,u}^4}{\nu^3} \le \frac{\nu}{4ch^2}. \tag{2.60}$$

Let μ be chosen such that

$$\max\left\{ \frac{\nu}{4ch_0^2}, \frac{16cM_{h,u}^4}{\nu^3} \right\} \le \mu \le \frac{\nu}{4ch^2}. \tag{2.61}$$

Then, the data assimilated fluid velocity is regular and satisfies

$$\|w\|_0 \le M_{h,u}.$$

Proof. Taking the inner product of (2.26) with $A_0(w_n)$ and (2.27) with η_n and adding, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\left(\|w_n\|_0^2+|\eta_n|_1^2\right)+\nu|A_0w_n|_0^2+\kappa\|\eta_n\|_1^2 &= -(B_0(w_n,w_n),A_0w_n)_0+\mu(w_n-\tilde{I}_hw_n,A_0w_n)_0\\ &\quad-\mu\|w_n\|_0^2+\mu(\tilde{I}_hu,A_0w_n)_0\\ &\quad+(\eta_n,A_0(w_n)\cdot\boldsymbol{e}_3)_1+(\eta_n,w_n\cdot\boldsymbol{e}_3)_1\end{aligned}$$

First, applying (2.8) and Young's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|(B_0(w_n,w_n),A_0w_n)_0| &\le c\|w_n\|_0^{3/2}|A_0(w_n)|_0^{3/2}\\ &\le \frac{c}{\nu^3}\|w_n\|_0^6+\frac{\nu}{4}|A_0w_n|_0^2.\end{aligned}$$

Next, from (2.19), Cauchy-Schwartz, Young's inequality and the second inequality in (2.61), we have

$$\begin{aligned}|\mu(w_n-\tilde{I}_hw_n,A_0w_n)|_0 &\le \mu ch\|w_n\|_0|A_0w_n|_0\\ &\le \frac{\mu^2ch^2}{\nu}\|w_n\|_0^2+\frac{\nu}{4}|A_0w_n|_0^2\\ &\le \frac{\mu}{4}\|w_n\|_0^2+\frac{\nu}{4}|A_0w_n|_0^2,\end{aligned}$$

Also, from (2.54), (2.55) and (2.56), we see that, for a modified type-I interpolant $\tilde{I}_h$, we may write

$$32\|\tilde{I}_hu(t)\|_0 \le M_{h,u},\ t\in[0,T]. \tag{2.62}$$

For the remaining terms, we apply Cauchy-Schwarz, Young's inequality and (2.6) to obtain

$$\mu(\tilde{I}_h(u),A_0w_n)_0 \le \mu\|\tilde{I}_hu(t)\|_0^2+\frac{\mu}{4}\|w_n\|_0^2,$$

$$\|\eta_n\|_1\|w_n\|_0 \le \frac{\|\eta_n\|_1^2}{\mu}+\frac{\mu\|w_n\|_0^2}{4},$$

$$\begin{aligned}|\eta_n|_1|w_n|_0 &\le \frac{2|\eta_n|_1^2}{\mu\lambda_1}+\frac{\mu\lambda_1|w_n|_0^2}{8}\\ &\le \frac{2\|\eta_n\|_1^2}{\mu\lambda_1^2}+\frac{\mu\|w_n\|_0^2}{8}\end{aligned}$$

Combining estimates we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\left(\|w_n\|_0^2+|\eta_n|_1^2\right)+\frac{\nu}{2}|A_0w_n|_0^2+\left(\kappa-\frac{1}{\mu}-\frac{2}{\mu\lambda_1^2}\right)\|\eta_n\|_1^2+\left(\frac{\mu}{8}-\frac{c}{\nu^3}\|w_n\|_0^4\right)\|w_n\|_0^2\\ \le \mu\sup_{[0,T]}\|\tilde{I}_hu(t)\|_0^2.\end{aligned}$$

Let $[0,T_1]$ be the maximal interval on which $\|w_n(t)\|\le M_{h,u}$ for $t\in[0,T_1]$, where $M_{h,u}$ as in (2.55). Note that $T_1>0$ exists because we have $w_n(0)=0$. Assume that $T_1<T$. Then by continuity, we must have $\|w_n(T_1)\|=M_{h,u}$. Applying (2.11),(2.35), the first inequality in (2.61) and dropping all terms except the first and the last term on the LHS, we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|w_n\|_0^2+\frac{\mu}{8}\|w_n\|_0^2 \le 2\mu\sup_{[0,T]}\|\tilde{I}_hu(t)\|_0^2.$$

Applying Gronwall's inequality and (2.62), we obtain

$$\|w_n(t)\|_0^2 \leq 16 \sup_{[0,T]} \|\tilde{I}_h u(t)\|_0^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} M_{h,u}^2 \quad \forall t \in [0, T_1].$$

This contradicts the fact that $\|w_n(T_1)\| = M_{h,u}$. Therefore $T_1 \geq T$ and consequently, $\|w_n(t)\| \leq M_{h,u}$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. Passing to the limit as $n \to \infty$, we obtain the desired conclusion for w. □

2.8. **Synchronization For General Type-I Interpolant.** We will now show that the data assimilated solution approaches the actual solution(synchronization) for the general type-I interpolant. To show synchronization, in addition to (2.16) and (2.17), we will need an energy equality for the data assimilation equation. Taking the inner product of (2.23) and (2.24) with w and η respectively, we obtain

$$|w(t)|_0^2 + 2\nu \int_0^t \|w(s)\|_0^2 ds = |w(0)|_0^2 + 2\mu \int_0^t (I_h(u(s) - w(s)), w(s))_0 ds + 2 \int_0^t (w \cdot \boldsymbol{e}_3(s), \eta(s))_1 ds. \tag{2.63}$$

$$|\eta(t)|_1^2 + 2\kappa \int_0^t \|\eta(s)\|_1^2 ds = |\eta(0)|_1^2 + 2 \int_0^t (w \cdot \boldsymbol{e}_3(s), \eta(s))_1 ds. \tag{2.64}$$

We now state the following lemma.

Lemma 2.5. *Let (u, θ) be the general Leray-Hopf weak solution of (2.12)-(2.14) and (w, η) be the weak solution to (2.23)-(2.25). Let $\tilde{w} = w - u$, $\tilde{\eta} = \eta - \theta$ and $0 < T \leq \infty$. Then,*

$$|\tilde{w}(t)|_0^2 + 2\nu \int_0^t \|\tilde{w}(s)\|_0^2 ds \leq |\tilde{w}(0)|_0^2 + 2 \int_0^t B_0(\tilde{w}(s), \tilde{w}(s)), w(s))_0 ds - 2\mu \int_0^t (I_h(\tilde{w}(s)), \tilde{w}(s))_0 \, ds + 2 \int_0^t (\tilde{w}(s) \cdot \boldsymbol{e}_3, \tilde{\eta}(s))_1 ds. \tag{2.65}$$

$$|\tilde{\eta}(t)|_1^2 + 2\kappa \int_0^t \|\tilde{\eta}(s)\|_1^2 ds \leq |\tilde{\eta}(0)|_1^2 + 2 \int_0^t B_1(\tilde{w}(s), \tilde{\eta}(s)), \eta(s))_1 ds + 2 \int_0^t (\tilde{w}(s) \cdot \boldsymbol{e}_3, \tilde{\eta}(s))_1 ds \tag{2.66}$$

Proof. Recall that we denote by ϕ_j^0 the eigenfunction corresponding to λ_j^0, $j = 1, 2, \ldots$, with $\lambda_1^0 \leq \lambda_2^0 \ldots$ being the eigenvalues of A_0. Let H_n^0 denote the span of $\phi_1^0, \phi_2^0, \ldots \phi_n^0$ and P_n^0 denote the projection onto the space H_n^0. Also, let $P_n^0(u) = u_n$ and $P_n^0(w) = w_n$. It is important to note that u_n and w_n in this lemma are projections of u and w onto a finite dimensional subspace and must not be confused with the Galerkin projections of u and w. We observe that since u_n finite dimensional, $\dfrac{\partial u_n}{dt}$ exists in the classical sense. We hence have

$$\frac{d}{dt}(w_n, u_n)_0 = \left(\frac{\partial w_n}{dt}, u_n\right)_0 + \left(w_n, \frac{\partial u_n}{dt}\right)_0 = (-B_0(w, w) - \nu A_0(w) + \mu(I_h(u - w) + \eta \boldsymbol{e}_3), u_n)_0 + (w_n, f - B_0(u, u) - \nu A_0(u) + \theta \boldsymbol{e}_3)_0 \,. \tag{2.67}$$

Using the fact that P_n^0 commutes with A_0, we obtain

$$(A_0(u), w_n)_0 = (A_0(u), P_n(w))_0 = (P_n(u), A_0(w)_0) = (u_n, A_0(w))_0. \tag{2.68}$$

Integrating on the interval $[s,t]$, $0 \le s < t \le T$ and applying (2.68), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}(w_n(t),u_n(t))_0 - (w_n(s),u_n(s))_0 &= \int_s^t \left((\eta(\sigma)\boldsymbol{e}_3,u_n(\sigma))_0 + (\theta(\sigma)\boldsymbol{e}_3,w_n(\sigma))_0\right)d\sigma \\ &- 2\nu\int_s^t (A_0(w)(\sigma),u_n(\sigma))_0 d\sigma + 2\mu\int_s^t (I_h(u(\sigma)-w(\sigma))),u_n(\sigma))_0 d\sigma \\ &- \int_s^t \left\{(B_0(w(\sigma),w(\sigma)),u_n(\sigma))_0 + (B_0(u(\sigma),u(\sigma)),w_n(\sigma))_0\right\}d\sigma.\end{aligned} \tag{2.69}$$

$u_n(\tau) \to u(\tau)$ in H_0 for each $\tau \in [0,T]$. Letting $n \to \infty$ and passing through the limit, we see that for almost all s and t, $0 < s < t < T$:

$$\begin{aligned}(w(t),u(t)) - (w(s),u(s)) &= \int_s^t \left((\eta(\sigma)\boldsymbol{e}_3,u(\sigma))_0 + (\theta(\sigma)\boldsymbol{e}_3,w(\sigma))_0\right)d\sigma \\ &- 2\nu\int_s^t (A_0(w)(\sigma),u(\sigma))_0 d\sigma + 2\mu\int_s^t (I_h(u(\sigma)-w(\sigma))),u(\sigma))_0 d\sigma \\ &- \int_s^t \left\{(B_0(w(\sigma),w(\sigma)),u(\sigma))_0 + (B_0(u(\sigma),u(\sigma)),w(\sigma))_0\right\}d\sigma\end{aligned} \tag{2.70}$$

Since u is weakly continuous in H_0 and w is strongly continuous in H_0, the function

$$t \to (u(t),w(t))$$

is continuous and the relation (2.70) holds for all s and t, $0 \le s < t \le T$. Moreover, we observe that

$$(B_0(w,w),u)_0 + (B_0(u,u),w)_0 = (B_0(w-u,w),u)_0 = (B_0(w-u,w-u),u)_0\,.$$

Incorporating this in (2.70) and letting $s = 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}(w(t),u(t)) + 2\nu\int_0^t ((w,u))_0 &= (w(0),u(0))_0 + \int_s^t \left((\eta(\sigma)\boldsymbol{e}_3,u(\sigma))_0 + (\theta(\sigma)\boldsymbol{e}_3,w(\sigma))_0\right)d\sigma \\ &- \int_0^t (B_0(\tilde{w}(s),\tilde{w}(s)),w(s))ds - 2\mu\int_0^t I_h(\tilde{w}(s),u)ds\end{aligned} \tag{2.71}$$

Adding (2.16) and (2.63) and subtracting two times (2.71), we obtain (2.65). Repeating the same arguments for

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\eta_n,\theta_n)_1 = \left(\frac{\partial\eta_n}{dt},\theta_n\right)_1 + \left(\eta_n,\frac{\partial\theta_n}{dt}\right)_1,$$

we obtain (2.64). □

With the above lemma in place, we will now prove synchronization in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.6. *Let I_h be the general type-I interpolant, $0 < T \le \infty$ and $M_{h,u}$ as in* (2.56)*. Also, let $h_0 > 0$ be defined as*

$$h_0^{-2} = \max\left\{\frac{32c}{\nu\kappa\lambda_1}, \frac{8c}{\nu\kappa}\left(1+\frac{2}{\lambda_1^2}\right), \frac{64CS_2^8}{\nu^4\kappa^4}\right\}, \tag{2.72}$$

where S_2 is as in (2.53) *with $p = 2$. We define $\tilde{w} = w - u$ and $\tilde{\eta} = \eta - \theta$. Assume that for some $h \le h_0$,*

$$\frac{16cM_{h,u}^4}{\nu^3} \le \frac{\nu}{4ch^2}. \tag{2.73}$$

Let μ be chosen such that

$$\max\left\{\frac{\nu}{4ch_0^2}, \frac{16cM_{h,u}^4}{\nu^3}\right\} \leq \mu \leq \frac{\nu}{4ch^2}. \tag{2.74}$$

Then,

$$\left(|\tilde{w}(t)|_0^2 + |\tilde{\eta}(t)|_1^2\right) \leq \left(|\tilde{w}(0)|_0^2 + |\tilde{\eta}(0)|_1^2\right) e^{-\alpha t} \quad \forall t \in [0,T] \tag{2.75}$$

where $\alpha = \min\left\{\frac{\mu}{4}, \frac{\kappa\lambda_1}{2}\right\}$. *In particular, if in the statement of Theorem 2.4,* $T = \infty$, *then*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\left(|\tilde{w}(t)|_0^2 + |\tilde{\eta}(t)|_1^2\right) = 0. \tag{2.76}$$

Proof. Adding equations (2.63) and (2.64), we obtain

(2.77)

$$\begin{aligned}|\tilde{w}(t)|_0^2 + |\tilde{\eta}(t)|_1^2 + 2\nu\int_0^t \|\tilde{w}(s)\|_0^2 ds + 2\kappa\int_0^t \|\tilde{\eta}(s)\|_1^2 ds \leq |\tilde{w}(0)|_0^2 + |\tilde{\eta}(0)|_1^2 - 2\mu|\tilde{w}|^2 \\ + 2\int_0^t (B_0(\tilde{w}(s),\tilde{w}(s)),w(s))_0 ds + 2\int_0^t (B_1(\tilde{w}(s),\tilde{\eta}(s)),\eta(s))_1 ds \\ + 2\mu\int_0^t \left(\tilde{w} - I_h(\tilde{w}(s),\tilde{w}(s))\right)_0 ds + 4\int_0^t (\tilde{w}(s)\cdot \boldsymbol{e}_3, \tilde{\eta}(s))_1 ds\end{aligned}$$

We bound each term on the RHS.
First, applying (2.9), Cauchy-Schwartz and Young's inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}|B_0(\tilde{w},\tilde{w}),w)_0| &\leq |(B_0(\tilde{w},w),\tilde{w}|)|_0 \\ &\leq c|\tilde{w}|_0^{1/2}\|\tilde{w}\|_0^{3/2}\|w\|_0 \\ &\leq \frac{c}{\nu^3}\|w\|_0^4|\tilde{w}|_0^2 + \frac{\nu}{2}\|\tilde{w}\|_0^2.\end{aligned} \tag{2.78}$$

Next, using Holder's inequality, (2.10), Young's inequality and (2.53), we have

$$\begin{aligned}|(B_1(\tilde{w},\tilde{\eta}),\eta)|_1 &\leq \|\tilde{w}\|_{L^4}\|\nabla\tilde{\eta}_n\|_{L^2}\|\eta\|_{L^4} \\ &\leq |\tilde{w}|_0^{1/4}\|\tilde{w}\|_0^{3/4}\|\tilde{\eta}\|_1\|\eta\|_{L^4} \\ &\leq \frac{\nu}{4}\|\tilde{w}\|_0^2 + \frac{\kappa}{2}\|\tilde{\eta}\|_1^2 + \frac{C}{\nu^3\kappa^4}|\tilde{w}|_0^2\|\eta\|_{L^4}^8 \\ &\leq \frac{\nu}{4}\|\tilde{w}\|_0^2 + \frac{\kappa}{2}\|\tilde{\eta}\|_1^2 + \frac{C}{\nu^3\kappa^4}S_2^8|\tilde{w}|_0^2\end{aligned} \tag{2.79}$$

Applying (2.18), Cauchy-Schwartz, Young's inequality and (2.61), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}|\mu(\tilde{w} - I_h(\tilde{w}))|_0|\tilde{w}|_0 &\leq \mu ch\|\tilde{w}\|_0|\tilde{w}|_0 \\ &\leq \mu ch^2\|\tilde{w}\|_0^2 + \frac{\mu}{4}|\tilde{w}|_0^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\nu}{4}\|\tilde{w}\|_0^2 + \frac{\mu}{4}|\tilde{w}|_0^2.\end{aligned} \tag{2.80}$$

Using Cauchy-Schwartz, Young's inequality and (2.6) , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}4|\tilde{\eta}|_1|\tilde{w}|_0 &\leq \frac{16|\tilde{\eta}|_1^2}{\mu} + \frac{\mu|\tilde{w}|_0^2}{4} \\ &\leq \frac{16\|\tilde{\eta}\|_1^2}{\lambda_1\mu} + \frac{\mu|\tilde{w}|_0^2}{4}\end{aligned} \tag{2.81}$$

Combining the above estimates and applying (2.6), (2.72),(2.74) and the fact that $\|w\|_0 \leq M_{h,u}$, we obtain

$$|\tilde{w}(t)|_0^2 + |\tilde{\eta}(t)|_1^2 + \frac{\mu}{4}\int_0^t |\tilde{w}(s)|_0^2 ds + \frac{\kappa\lambda_1}{2}\int_0^t |\tilde{\eta}(s)|_1^2 ds \leq |\tilde{w}(0)|_0^2 + |\tilde{\eta}(0)|_1^2. \tag{2.82}$$

From (2.82) we observe that

$$|\tilde{w}(t)|_0^2 + |\tilde{\eta}(t)|_1^2 \leq |\tilde{w}(0)|_0^2 + |\tilde{\eta}(0)|_1^2. \tag{2.83}$$

Let

$$\alpha = \min\left\{\frac{\mu}{4}, \frac{\kappa\lambda_1}{2}\right\}.$$

Changing the interval of integration from $[0,t]$ to $[t-1/\alpha, t]$, applying Lemma 6.6 with $y = |\tilde{w}(t)|^2 + |\tilde{\eta}(t)|^2$ and using (2.83), we obtain

$$\left(|\tilde{w}(t)|^2 + |\tilde{\eta}(t)|^2\right) \leq \left(|\tilde{w}(0)|_0^2 + |\tilde{\eta}(0)|_1^2\right) e^{-\alpha\left(t-\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)} \quad \forall t \in [0,T]. \tag{2.84}$$

□

3. Forward Determining map

We now describe the lifting map introduced in [9], which played a crucial role in obtaining the determining form for evolution equations. In some sense, this map is proposed as a substitute, or alternative, for the notion of inertial manifold. Using the ideas in [3], we construct a similar map for the 3-D Boussinesqu(and later for the 3-D Navier-Stokes) equation. Notably, the conditions we require for the construction of this map here(like in [3]) are weaker than the ones considered in [6]. In particular, we do not require any condition on the time derivative of the input function $v = v(t)$ in (3.7), below. This may be useful within the context of data assimilation, where $v(t)$ represents the observed spatial coarse-mesh data, which is usually noisy.

We begin by introducing spaces that contain the domain and ranges of the map W^+ and by introducing the evolution equation which yields the definition of W^+.
We denote by $L_b^2(\mathbb{R}^+; D(A_0))$ the functions in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; D(A_0))$ which are translation bounded, i.e.,

$$\sup_{s\geq 0}\int_s^{s+1} |A_0(u(r))|_0^2 dr < \infty. \tag{3.1}$$

Similarly, $L_b^2(\mathbb{R}^+; V)$ denotes the functions in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; V)$ which satisfy

$$\sup_{s\geq 0}\int_s^{s+1} \|u(r)\|_0^2 dr < \infty.$$

Let

$$Y_+ = \left(C_b(\mathbb{R}_+; V_0) \cap L_b^2(\mathbb{R}_+; D(A_0))\right) \times C_b(\mathbb{R}_+; H_1)$$

and

$$Z_+ = \left(C_b(\mathbb{R}_+; H_0) \cap L_b^2(\mathbb{R}_+; V_0)\right) \times C_b(\mathbb{R}_+; H_1)$$

where, $C_b(I; B)$ denotes the space of all bounded and continuous functions over the interval I with values in the Banach space B. Y_+ and Z_+ are Banach spaces with norms

$$\|u\|_{Y_+} = \left\{\|u\|_0^2 + \sup_{s\geq 0}\int_s^{s+1} |A_0(u(r))|_0^2 dr\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{3.2}$$

and

$$\|u\|_{Z_+} = \left\{ |u|_0^2 + \sup_{s\geq 0} \int_s^{s+1} \|u(r)\|_0^2 dr \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{3.3}$$

respectively. Moreover, let X be the Banach space

$$X_+ = C_b(\mathbb{R}^+; (H^1(\Omega))^3)$$

equipped with the norm

$$\|v\|_{X_+} = \sup_{s\geq 0} \|v(s)\|_0. \tag{3.4}$$

The observed spatial coarse-mesh data is denoted by $v(t)$. For the purpose of data assimilation, we consider the case $v \in X_+$ with $\|v\|_{X_+} \leq \rho \sim h^{-1/2}$ for some $\rho > 0$. We use $B_{X_+}(\rho)$ to denote the closed ball in X_+ of radius ρ centered at 0. We also define the Banach space

$$P_+ = C_b(\mathbb{R}_+; H_0) \times C_b(\mathbb{R}_+; H_1)$$

with the norm

$$\|(u,\theta)\|_{P_+} = \left\{ |u|_0^2 + |\theta|_1^2 \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{3.5}$$

For $\tau \in I \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ and a Banach space B, we define the time translation $\tau_\sigma : C(I;B) \to C(I;B)$ as

$$\tau_\sigma(u(t)) = u(t+\sigma). \tag{3.6}$$

Now given $v \in B_{X_+}(\rho)$, we consider the following initial-value problem:

$$\frac{dw}{dt} + \nu A_0(w) + B_0(w,w) = P_\sigma(\eta \boldsymbol{e}_3) + \mu(P_\sigma(v - I_h(w))) \tag{3.7}$$

$$\frac{d\eta}{dt} + \kappa A_1(\eta) + B_1(w,\eta) - w.\boldsymbol{e}_3 = 0 \tag{3.8}$$

$$w(x,0) = 0, \eta(x,0) = 0. \tag{3.9}$$

The corresponding Galerkin approximation is given by

$$\frac{dw_n}{dt} + \nu A_0(w) + B_0(w_n,w_n) = P_n(\eta_n \boldsymbol{e}_3) + \mu(P_n(v - I_h(w))) \tag{3.10}$$

$$\frac{d\eta_n}{dt} + \kappa A_1(\eta_n) + B_1(w,\eta_n) - w_n.\boldsymbol{e}_3 = 0 \tag{3.11}$$

$$w_n(x,0) = 0, \eta_n(x,0) = 0. \tag{3.12}$$

We can now define the map W_+.

Definition 3. *Let $\rho > 0$. We define the forward determining map $W_+ : B_{X_+}(\rho) \to Y_+$ as*

$$W_+(v) = (w,\eta). \tag{3.13}$$

Theorem 3.1. *Let I_h be a general type-I interpolant, $v \in B_{X_+}(\rho)$ for some $\rho > 0$ $\left(\rho \sim 1/\sqrt{h}\right)$, $0 < T \leq \infty$ and*

$$M_{h,u}^2 = 32 \sup_{[0,T]} \|v\|_0^2. \tag{3.14}$$

Also, let $h_0 > 0$ be defined as

$$h_0^{-2} = \max\left\{ \frac{32c}{\nu\kappa\lambda_1}, \frac{8c}{\nu\kappa}\left(1 + \frac{2}{\lambda_1^2}\right), \frac{64CS_2^8}{\nu^4\kappa^4} \right\}, \tag{3.15}$$

where c, h are as in (2.18) *and S_2 is as in* (2.53) *with $p = 2$. Assume that for some $h \leq h_0$,*

$$\frac{16cM_{h,u}^4}{\nu^3} \leq \frac{\nu}{4ch^2}. \tag{3.16}$$

Let μ be chosen such that

$$\max\left\{\frac{\nu}{4ch_0^2}, \frac{16cM_{h,u}^4}{\nu^3}\right\} \leq \mu \leq \frac{\nu}{4ch^2}. \tag{3.17}$$

Then, there exists a weak solution (w, η) to (3.7)-(3.9)*. Moreover, the following statements hold true*

(a) $\|w\|_0 \leq M_{h,u}$

(b) $W_+ : B_{X_+}(\rho) \to Z_+$ *is Lipschitz continuous.*

(c) Let (u, θ) be a weak solution (2.12)-(2.14)*. Assume that $|I_h(u)(s) - v(s)|_0 \to 0$ as $s \to \infty$. Then $\|W_+(v)(s) - (u(s), \theta(s))\|_{P_+} \to 0$ as $s \to \infty$*

(d) Let $v_1, v_2 \in B_{X_+}(\rho)$, Then, $W_+(v_1) = W_+(v_2)$ iff $P_\sigma(v_1 - v_2) = P_\sigma(\bar{v}) = 0$, where $\bar{v} = v_1 - v_2$.

(e) For every $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^+$,

$$W_+ \circ \tau_\sigma(v) = \tau_\sigma \circ W_+(v). \tag{3.18}$$

Proof. The existence of a weak solution (w, η) and the proof of (a) is obtained by repeating the proof of Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 2.4, after replacing $I_h(u)$ with v.

To prove (b), we define $\bar{w}_n = w_n^1 - w_n^2$, $\bar{\eta}_n = \eta_n^1 - \eta_n^2$ and $\bar{v}_n = P_n(\bar{v}_1 - \bar{v}_2)$, where (w_n^1, η_n^1) and (w_n^2, η_n^2) are Galerkin approximations of (w^1, η^1) and (w^2, η^2) respectively and $(w^1, \eta^1) = W_+(v_1)$ and $(w^2, \eta^2) = W_+(v_2)$.
$\bar{w}_n$ and $\bar{\eta}_n$ satisfy the equations

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d\bar{w}_n}{dt} + \nu A_0(\bar{w}_n) + B_0(\bar{w}_n, w_n) + B_0(u_n, \bar{w}_n) - \bar{\eta}_n \boldsymbol{e}_3 &= \mu P_n(\bar{v}_n - I_h(\bar{w}_n)) \\ &= \mu \bar{v}_n + \mu P_n(\bar{w}_n - I_h(\tilde{w}_n)) \\ &\quad - \mu \bar{w}_n\end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

$$\frac{d\bar{\eta}_n}{dt} + \kappa A_1(\bar{\eta}_n) + B_1(\bar{w}_n, \eta_n) + B_1(u, \bar{\eta}_n) - \bar{w}_n \cdot \boldsymbol{e}_3 = 0 \tag{3.20}$$

Taking the inner product of $\bar{w}_n$ and $\bar{\eta}_n$ with (3.19) and (3.20) respectively, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\left(|\bar{w}_n|_0^2 + |\bar{\eta}_n|_1^2\right) + \nu\|\bar{w}_n\|_0^2 + \kappa\|\bar{\eta}_n\|_1^2 + \mu|\bar{w}_n|_0^2 &\leq |(B_0(\bar{w}_n, w_n), \bar{w}_n|)_0 + |(B_1(\bar{w}_n, \eta_n), \bar{\eta}_n)|_1 \\ &\quad + 2|\bar{w}_n|_0|\bar{\eta}_n|_1 + |\mu(\bar{w}_n - I_h(\bar{w}_n))|_0|\bar{w}_n|_0 \\ &\quad + \mu|\bar{v}_n|_0|\bar{w}_n|_0.\end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

Applying Young's inequality, we obtain

$$\mu|\bar{v}_n|_0|\bar{w}_n|_0 \leq \mu|\bar{v}_n|_0^2 + \frac{\mu}{4}|\bar{w}_n|_0^2, \tag{3.22}$$

Bounding the other terms on the RHS of (3.21) exactly as in Theorem 2.6, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\left(|\bar{w}_n|_0^2+\bar{\eta}_n|_1^2\right)+\nu\|\bar{w}_n\|_0+\left(\frac{\mu}{4}-\frac{c}{\nu^3}\|w_n\|_0^4-\frac{CS_2^8}{\nu^3\kappa^4}\right)|\bar{w}_n|_0^2+\left(\frac{\kappa\lambda_1}{2}-\frac{4}{\mu}\right)|\bar{\eta}|_1^2\leq\mu|\bar{v}_n|_0^2. \tag{3.23}$$

We already have $\|w\|_0\leq M_{h,u}$. Now applying (3.17) and (3.15), we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left(|\bar{w}_n|^2|_0+|\bar{\eta}_n|_1^2\right)+\frac{\mu}{4}|\bar{w}_n|_0^2+\frac{\kappa\lambda_1}{2}|\bar{\eta}_n|_1^2\leq 2\mu|\bar{v}_n|_0^2. \tag{3.24}$$

Next, applying Gronwall (for $t,\sigma\in[0,T]$ with $t>\sigma$) separately to $|\bar{w}_n|^2$ and $|\bar{\eta}_n|^2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}|\bar{w}_n(t)|_0^2&\leq|\bar{w}_n(\sigma)|_0^2e^{-(\mu/4)(t-\sigma)}+8\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|\bar{v}_n|_0^2,\\ |\bar{\eta}_n(t)|_1^2&\leq|\bar{\eta}_n(\sigma)|_1^2e^{-\left(\frac{\kappa\lambda_1}{2}\right)(t-\sigma)}+\frac{4\mu}{\kappa\lambda_1}\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}_+}|\bar{v}_n|_0^2.\end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

$\bar{w}_n$ and $\bar{\eta}_n$ converge respectively to $\bar{w}$ and $\bar{\eta}$ weakly. Also $\bar{v_n}\to\bar{v_n}$ in $B_{x_+}(\rho)$. Therefore, letting $n\to\infty$, setting $\sigma=0$ and noting that $\bar{w}(0)=\bar{\eta}(0)=0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}|\bar{w}(t)|^2|_0&\leq 8\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}_+}|\bar{v}|_0^2\\ |\bar{\eta}(t)|_1^2&\leq\frac{4\mu}{\kappa\lambda_1}\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}_+}|\bar{v}|_0^2.\end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

Using (3.23), we may write

$$\nu\|\bar{w}_n\|_0\leq\mu\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}_+}|\bar{v}_n(t)|_0^2. \tag{3.27}$$

Letting $n\to\infty$ and integrating both sides on the interval $[t,t+1]$, we obtain

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}_+}\int_t^{t+1}\nu\|\bar{w}(s)\|_0ds\leq\mu\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}_+}|\bar{v}(t)|_0^2. \tag{3.28}$$

(3.26) and (3.28) together prove (b).

To prove (c), we define $\tilde{w}=w-u$ and $\tilde{\eta}=\eta-\theta$, where $(w,\eta)=W_+(v)$. Replacing $I_h(u)$ with v in (2.63) and repeating the arguments of Lemma (2.5), we obtain a modified version of (2.65), given by

(3.29)

$$\begin{aligned}|\tilde{w}(t)|_0^2+2\nu\int_\sigma^t\|\tilde{w}(s)\|_0^2ds\leq&|\tilde{w}(0)|_0^2+2\int_\sigma^t B_0(\tilde{w}(s),\tilde{w}(s)),w(s))_0ds\\ &+2\mu\int_\sigma^t\left(v(s)-I_hw(s),\tilde{w}(s)\right)_0ds+2\int_\sigma^t(\tilde{w}(s)\cdot\boldsymbol{e}_3,\tilde{\eta}(s))_1ds.\\ \leq&|\tilde{w}(0)|_0^2+2\int_\sigma^t B_0(\tilde{w}(s),\tilde{w}(s)),w(s))_0ds\\ &+2\mu\int_\sigma^t\left(v(s)-I_hu(s),\tilde{w}(s)\right)_0ds+2\mu\int_\sigma^t\left(\tilde{w}-I_h\tilde{w}(s),\tilde{w}(s)\right)_0ds\\ &-\mu\int_\sigma^t\|\tilde{w}\|_0ds+2\int_\sigma^t(\tilde{w}(s)\cdot\boldsymbol{e}_3,\tilde{\eta}(s))_1ds..\end{aligned}$$

Applying Cauchy-Schwarz and Young's inequality, we obtain

$$2\mu\,|(v(s)-I_hu(s),\tilde{w}(s))_0| \le 2\mu|v(s)-I_hu(s)|_0^2+\frac{\mu}{2}|\tilde{w}(s)|_0^2. \tag{3.30}$$

Also,

$$|v|_0^2 \le \frac{1}{\lambda_1}\|v\|_0^2 \le \frac{1}{\lambda_1}\rho^2. \tag{3.31}$$

and $|I_hu|_0 \le |u|_0 \le M_0$. Hence it makes sense to talk about the term

$$\sup_{0\le s\le\infty}|I_h(u)(s)-v(s)|_0.$$

Proceeding exactly as in Theorem 2.6, we obtain

$$|\tilde{w}(t)|_0^2+|\tilde{\eta}(t)|_1^2+\frac{\mu}{4}\int_\sigma^t|\tilde{w}(s)|_0^2ds+\frac{\kappa\lambda_1}{2}|\tilde{\eta}|_1^2 \le |\tilde{w}(\sigma)|_0^2+|\tilde{\eta}(\sigma)|_1^2+2\mu\sup_{\sigma\le s\le t}|I_h(u)(s)-v(s)|_0. \tag{3.32}$$

Next, letting

$$\alpha=\min\left\{\frac{\mu}{4},\frac{\kappa\lambda_1}{2}\right\}$$

and applying Corollary 6.7, (2.35) and (2.11), we obtain

$$\left(|\tilde{w}(t)|_0^2+|\tilde{\eta}(t)|_1^2\right) \le 16Me^{-\alpha(t/2)}+\frac{2\mu}{\alpha}\sup_{t/2\le s\le t}|I_h(u)(s)-v(s)|_0. \tag{3.33}$$

Taking the lim sup as $t\to\infty$ and using the hypothesis that $|I_h(u)(s)-v(s)|_0\to 0$ as $s\to\infty$, we see that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\left(|\tilde{w}(t)|_0^2+|\tilde{\eta}(t)|_1^2\right)=0, \tag{3.34}$$

proving (c).

To prove (d), we note that $\bar{w}=w_1-w_2=0$ and $\bar{\eta}=\eta_1-\eta_2=0$, where $(w_1,\eta_1)=W_+(v_1)$ and $(w_2,\eta_2)=W_+(v_2)$. Since w_1 and w_2 are regular, the term $\bar{w}$ is differentiable a.e on $\mathbb{R}^+$. From (3.7), we may write

$$\frac{d\bar{w}}{dt}+\nu A_0(\bar{w})+B_0(\bar{w},w_1)+B_0(w_2,\bar{w})-\bar{\eta}\boldsymbol{e}_3=\mu P_\sigma(\bar{v}-I_h(\bar{w})) \tag{3.35}$$

Letting $\bar{w}=0$ and $\bar{\eta}=0$, we obtain $P_\sigma(\bar{v})=0$. If $P_\sigma(\bar{v})=0$, We obtain $W_+(v_1)=W_+(v_2)$ from the Lipschitz continuity of W_+.

To show (e), we observe that $\tau_\sigma\circ W_+(v)$ is a solution of (3.7)-(3.9) corresponding to $\tau_\sigma(v)$. From the Lipschitz property of the map W_+, we have uniqueness of solution. Hence

$$W_+\circ\tau_\sigma(v)=\tau_\sigma\circ W_+(v).$$

□

Corollary 3.2. *Let I_h be a general type-I interpolant and u be a weak solution* (2.12)-(2.14). *Let the hypothesis of Theorem 3.1 hold. Then $\|W_+(I_h(u))(s)-(u(s),\theta(s))\|_{P_+}\to 0$ as $s\to\infty$*

Proof. Applying part (c) of Theorem 3.1 with $v=I_h(u)$, we obtain the statement of the corollary. □

Remark 3.1. The fact that W^+ is Lipschitz continuous means that the way we reconstruct our solution from the data is "stable". Lipschitz continuity in turn implies uniqueness of solutions as well. Also, Corollary 3.2 says that the solution obtained from type-I interpolation data(for appropriate h) asymptotically approaches the actual solution.

Theorem 3.3. *Let (u_1, θ_1) and (u_2, θ_2) be two restricted Leray-Hopf weak solutions and M_{h,u_i} (for $i = 1, 2$) be as in (2.56). Also, let $h_0 > 0$ be defined as*

$$h_0^{-2} = \max\left\{\frac{32c}{\nu\kappa\lambda_1}, \frac{8c}{\nu\kappa}\left(1 + \frac{2}{\lambda_1^2}\right), \frac{64CS_2^8}{\nu^4\kappa^4}\right\}, \tag{3.36}$$

where c, h are as in (2.18) and S_2 is as in (2.53) with $p = 2$. Assume that on $[0, \infty)$, for $i = 1, 2$, for some $h \leq h_0$,

$$\frac{16cM_{h,u_i}^4}{\nu^3} \leq \frac{\nu}{4ch^2}. \tag{3.37}$$

Let μ be chosen such that

$$\max\left\{\frac{\nu}{4ch_0^2}, \frac{16cM_{h,u_i}^4}{\nu^3}\right\} \leq \mu \leq \frac{\nu}{4ch^2}. \tag{3.38}$$

Then, if

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} |I_h(u_1)(t) - I_h(u_2)(t)|_0 = 0$$

then

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} |u_1(t) - u_2(t)| = 0 \text{ and } \lim_{t\to\infty} |\theta_1(t) - \theta_2(t)| = 0.$$

Proof. Repeating the proof of part (c) with $(u, \theta) = (u_1, \theta_1)$, $(w, \eta) = (u_2, \theta_2)$ and $v = I_h u_2$, we obtain the statement of the theorem. □

Remark 3.2. The above theorem shows that $h \leq h_0$ satisfying (3.37) is *asymptotically determining*.

4. An observable regularity criterion on the Weak attractor of the three-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations

In this section we will be looking at solutions to the data assimilated 3-D Navier-Stokes equation on the weak attractor. We discuss well-posedness of the data assimilated equation for time ranging over all real numbers as well as the question of uniqueness and regularity for 3-D Navier-Stokes equation on the weak attractor when the "low modes" are known.

The 3-D incompressible Navier-Stokes equations (3D NSE) on a domain with time independent forcing (assumed for simplicity) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + (u \cdot \nabla)u - \Delta u + \nabla p &= f \\ \nabla \cdot u &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

Applying P_σ to (4.1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + B_0(u, u) + A_0(u) &= f. \\ \nabla \cdot u &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

where, by abuse of notation, we denote $P_\sigma(f)$ by f. Applying P_n^0 to (4.2), we obtain the Galerkin approximation to the system, given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial t} + B_0(u_n, u_n) + A_0(u_n) &= P_n^0 f \\ \nabla \cdot u_n &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

4.1. **Well-Posedness.** We begin by providing definitions of weak and strong solutions.

Definition 4. *A (Leray-Hopf) weak solution on a time interval $I = [0, T] \subset \mathbb{R}$ is defined as a function $u = u(t)$ on I with values in H_0 and satisfying the following properties:*

- $u \in L^\infty(0, T; H_0) \cap L^2(0, T; V_0) \cap C(0, T : V_0')$
- $\dfrac{du}{dt} \in L^{4/3}(0, T; V_0')$
- *u satisfies the functional equation (4.2) in the distribution sense on I, with values in V_0';*
- *For almost all $t' \in I$, u satisfies the following energy inequality*

$$|u(t)|_0^2 + 2\nu \int_{t'}^{t} \|u(s)\|_0^2 ds \leq |u(t')|_0^2 + 2\int_{t'}^{t} (f(s), u(s))_0 ds. \tag{4.4}$$

for all $t \in I$, with $t' > t$.

Definition 5. *A weak solution is said to be a strong/regular solution if it also belongs to $L^\infty(0, T; V_0) \cap L^2(0, T; D(A_0))$.*

We have the following previously established results on existence and uniqueness.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $f \in L^2(0, T; V_0')$. Then, there exists a weak solution u of (4.2), satisfying all the properties given in Definition 4.*

Theorem 4.2. *Let v be a strong solution to (4.2). Then, there doesn't exist any other weak solution u of (4.2).*

Remark 4.1. For 3-D Navier-Stokes equation, we have existence of weak solution(Theorem 4.1), but not uniqueness. Moreover, we have uniqueness of strong solutions(Theorem 4.2), but not existence.

4.2. **Weak Attractor.** Despite the lack of a well-posedness result for the three-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations, it is still a natural question to ask what the dynamics and the asymptotic behaviors of their weak solutions are, despite the possibility that they are not unique with respect to the initial condition. In particular, it is natural to ask whether there exists some sort of global attractor in this case. Due to the lack of a well-defined semigroup associated with the solutions of the system, the classical theory of dynamical system does not apply directly. Nevertheless, it is still possible to adapt a number of results from the classical theory to this situation.
One of the first and main results in this direction was given in [8], in which an object called the weak global attractor was defined as follows.

Definition 6. *The Weak attractor for the Navier-Stokes equation, $\mathbb{A}$, denotes the set of $u_0 \in H_0$ for which there exists a weak solution $u(t)$ of (4.2), for $t \in \mathbb{R}$, such that*

- $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}; H_0)$
- $u(0) = u_0$.

Remark 4.2. The weak global attractor for the 3-D Navier-Stokes operator has the following properties:

- For every weak solution u of (4.2) on the time interval $(0, \infty)$, we have
$$u(t) \to \mathbb{A} \text{ weakly in } H_0, \text{ as } t \to \infty.$$
- $\mathbb{A}$ is weakly compact in H_0.
- $\mathbb{A}$ is invariant in the sense that if $u_0 \in \mathbb{A}$ and u is a global weak solution uniformly bounded in H_0 with $u(0) = u_0$ then $u(t) \in \mathbb{A}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

4.3. **Determining Map.** We begin by introducing spaces that contain the domain and ranges of the determining map W and by introducing the evolution equation which yields the definition of W.

We denote by $L^2_b(\mathbb{R}; D(A_0))$ the functions in $L^2(\mathbb{R}; D(A_0))$ which are translation bounded, i.e.,

$$\sup_{s\in\mathbb{R}} \int_s^{s+1} |A_0(u(r))|_0^2 dr < \infty. \tag{4.5}$$

Similarly, $L^2_b(\mathbb{R}; V)$ denotes the functions in $L^2(\mathbb{R}; V)$ which satisfy

$$\sup_{s\in\mathbb{R}} \int_s^{s+1} \|u(r)\|_0^2 dr < \infty.$$

Let

$$Y = C_b(\mathbb{R}; V_0) \cap L^2_b(\mathbb{R}; D(A_0)) \text{ and } Z = C_b(\mathbb{R}; H_0) \cap L^2_b(\mathbb{R}; V_0).$$

where, $C_b(I; B)$ denotes the space of all bounded and continuous functions over the interval I with values in the Banach space B. Y and Z are Banach spaces with norms

$$\|u\|_Y = \left\{ \|u\|_0^2 + \sup_{s\in\mathbb{R}} \int_s^{s+1} |A_0(u(r))|_0^2 dr \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{4.6}$$

and

$$\|u\|_Z = \left\{ |u|_0^2 + \sup_{s\in\mathbb{R}} \int_s^{s+1} \|u(r)\|_0^2 dr \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{4.7}$$

respectively.

For $\tau \in I \subset \mathbb{R}$ and a Banach space B, we define the time translation $\tau_\sigma : C(I; B) \to C(I; B)$ as

$$\tau_\sigma(u(t)) = u(t + \sigma). \tag{4.8}$$

Moreover, let X be the Banach space

$$X = C_b(\mathbb{R}; (\dot{H}^1(\Omega))^3) \cap V_0$$

equipped with the norm

$$\|v\|_X = \sup_{s\in\mathbb{R}} \|v(s)\|_0. \tag{4.9}$$

The observed spatial coarse-mesh data is denoted by $v(t)$. For the purpose of data assimilation, we consider the case $v \in X$ with $\|v\|_X \le \rho$ for some $\rho > 0$. We use $B_X(\rho)$ to denote the closed ball in X of radius ρ centered at 0.

The data assimilation algorithm is given by the solution w of the equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial w}{\partial t} + B_0(w, w) + \nu A_0(w) &= f + \mu(v - I_h(w)) \\ \nabla \cdot w &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

Observe that the above system is not an initial value problem but an evolution equation for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. The Galerkin approximation of (4.10) is obtained by applying P_n and is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial w_n}{\partial t} + B_0(w_n, w_n) + \nu A_0(w_n) &= P_n f + \mu(P_n(v) - I_h(w_n)) \\ \nabla \cdot w_n &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

where u_n is as in (4.3).

Theorem 4.3. *Let u be the solution to (2.12)-(2.13) on the weak attractor for $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $v \in B_X(\rho)$ for some $\rho > 0$ and I_h be any type 1 interpolant. Define*

$$M_h^2 = 8\left(\frac{|f|^2}{\nu^2\lambda_1} + \rho^2\right). \tag{4.12}$$

Also, let $h_0 > 0$ be defined as

$$h_0^2 = \frac{1}{4c\lambda_1}. \tag{4.13}$$

Assume that for some $h \leq h_0$,

$$\frac{2cM_h^4}{\nu^3} \leq \frac{\nu}{4ch^2}. \tag{4.14}$$

Let μ be chosen such that

$$\max\left\{\frac{2cM_h^4}{\nu^3}, \frac{\nu}{4ch_0^2}\right\} \leq \mu \leq \frac{\nu}{4ch^2}. \tag{4.15}$$

Then there exists a unique global solution (w, η) of (2.23)-(2.24) such that

$$w \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}; V_0) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}; D(A_0)). \tag{4.16}$$

Moreover, the following bounds hold

(1) $\|w\|_0 \leq M_h$.

(2) $\displaystyle\int_t^{t+1} |A_0 w(t)|_0^2 dt \leq \frac{4}{\nu}\left(\frac{1}{\nu}|f|_0^2 + \mu\rho^2\right)$

Also, consider $v_1, v_2 \in B_X(\rho)$ and let w_1 and w_2 be solutions to (4.10) corresponding to inputs v_1 and v_2 respectively. Denote $\tilde{w} = w_1 - w_2$ and $\tilde{v} = v_1 - v_2$. Then

(3) $|\tilde{w}(t)|_0^2 \leq 4\|\tilde{v}\|_X^2$

(4) $\displaystyle\int_s^{s+1} \|\tilde{w}(t)\|_0^2 dt \leq \frac{4\mu}{\nu}\|\tilde{v}\|_X^2$

Proof. The proof existence of global solution satisfying (4.16) is obtained by showing that the solution, w_n to the Galerkin system (4.11) with $w(-N) = 0$ satisfies (1) and (2) on the time interval $[-N, \infty)$(the proof for which follows exactly that of Theorem 2.4) and extracting a subsequence via the diagonal process and then passing to the limit. We proceed as in Theorem 2.4. We will first look at equation (4.11) on the time interval $[-N, \infty]$ with the initial condition $w_n(-N) = 0$.

Taking the inner product of (4.11) with $A_0 w_n$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|w_n\|_0^2 + \nu|A_0 w_n|_0^2 =& -(B_0(w_n, w_n), A_0(w_n))_0 + \mu(w_n - I_h(w_n), A_0(w_n))_0 \\ &- \mu\|w_n\|_0^2 + \mu(P_n(v), A_0(w_n))_0 + (f, A_0(w_n))\end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

We bound each term below. First, applying (2.8) and Young's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|(B_0(w_n, w_n), A_0(w_n))|_0 &\leq c\|w\|_0^{3/2}|A_0(w_n)|_0^{3/2} \\ &\leq \frac{c}{\nu^3}\|w_n\|_0^6 + \frac{\nu}{4}|A_0(w_n)|_0^2.\end{aligned}$$

Next, from (2.19), Cauchy-Schwartz, Young's inequality and the second inequality in (2.61), we have

$$\begin{aligned}|\mu(w_n - I_h(w_n), A_0(w_n))|_0 &\leq \mu ch\|w_n\|_0|A_0(w_n)|_0 \\ &\leq \frac{\mu^2 ch^2}{\nu}\|w_n\|_0^2 + \frac{\nu}{4}|A_0(w_n)|_0^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\mu}{4}\|w_n\|_0^2 + \frac{\nu}{4}|A_0(w_n)|_0^2,\end{aligned}$$

Applying (2.5) and Cauchy-Schwarz, we obtain

$$\mu(P_n(v), A_0(w_n))_0 \leq \mu\|P_n(v)\|_0^2 + \frac{\mu}{4}\|w_n\|_0^2.$$

Lastly, applying Cauchy-Schwartz and Young's inequality, we obtain

$$|(f, A_0 w_n)_0| \leq |f|_0|A_0 w_n|_0 \leq \frac{1}{\nu}|f|_0^2 + \frac{\nu}{4}|A_0 w_n|^2$$

Inserting the above estimate into (4.17), we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|w_n\|_0^2 + \left(\mu - \frac{c}{\nu^3}\|w_n\|_0^4\right)\|w_n\|_0^2 + \frac{\nu}{2}|A_0 w_n|_0^2 \leq \frac{2}{\nu}|f|_0^2 + 2\mu\|P_n(v)\|_0^2 \tag{4.18}$$

Let $[-N, T_1]$ be the maximal interval on which $\|w_n(t)\| \leq M_h$ for $t \in [-N, T_1]$, where M_h as in (4.15). Note that $T_1 > -N$ exists because we have $w_n(-N) = 0$. Assume that $T_1 < \infty$. Then by continuity, we must have $\|w_n(T_1)\| = M_h$. Applying (2.11),(2.35), the first inequality in (2.61) and dropping all terms except the first and the last term on the LHS of (4.18), we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|w_n\|_0^2 + \frac{\mu}{2}\|w_n\|_0^2 \leq \frac{2}{\nu}|f|_0^2 + 2\mu\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}}\|P_n(v)\|_0^2. \tag{4.19}$$

Applying Gronwall, we obtain, for all $t \in [-N, T_1]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|w_n\|_0^2 \leq 4\left(\frac{|f|^2}{\nu^2\lambda_1} + \|(v)\|_X^2\right)\left(1 - e^{-\frac{\mu}{8}(n+t)}\right) &\leq 4\left(\frac{|f|^2}{\nu^2\lambda_1} + \rho^2\right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}M_h^2.\end{aligned}$$

This contradicts the fact that $\|w_n(T_1)\| = M_h$. Therefore $\|w_n(t)\| \leq M_h$ for all $t \in [-n, \infty)$. Dropping all terms except the last term on the LHS of (4.18) and integrating both sides over the interval $[t, t+1]$, it follows that

$$\int_t^{t+1} |A_0 w_n|_0^2 \leq \frac{4}{\nu}\left(\frac{1}{\nu}|f|_0^2 + \mu\rho^2\right) \tag{4.20}$$

Therefore, we have a sequence of solutions w_n that satisfy (1) and (2) on the interval $[-N, \infty)$. One can now extract a convergent subsequence via the diagonal process and pass through the limit to show that the limit w is a solution to (4.10) and satisfies (4.16), (1) and (2).

We now proceed to prove (3) and (4). Let $w_{1,n}$ and $w_{2,n}$ satisfy (4.11) with $v = v_1$ and $v = v_2$ respectively. Then $\tilde{w}_n = w_{1,n} - w_{2,n}$ and $\tilde{v}_n = P_n(\tilde{v})$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d\tilde{w}_n}{dt} + \nu A_0(\tilde{w}_n) + B_0(\tilde{w}_n, w_{1,n}) + B_0(w_{2,n}, \tilde{w}_n) &= \mu P_n(\tilde{v} - I_h(\tilde{w})) \\ &= \mu\tilde{v}_n + \mu(\tilde{w}_n - I_h(\tilde{w}_n)) \\ &\quad - \mu\tilde{w}_n\end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

Taking the inner product of (4.21) with $\tilde{w}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}|\tilde{w}_n|_0^2 + \nu\|\tilde{w}_n\|_0^2 + \mu|\tilde{w}_n|_0^2 &\leq |(B_0(\tilde{w}_n, w_{1,n}), \bar{w}_n|)|_0 \\ &\quad + |\mu(\tilde{w}_n - I_h(\tilde{w}_n))|_0|\bar{w}_n|_0 \\ &\quad + \mu|\tilde{v}_n|_0|\bar{w}_n|_0.\end{aligned} \tag{4.22}$$

We bound each term on the RHS.
First, applying (2.9), Cauchy-Schwartz and Young's inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}|(B_0(\tilde{w}_n, w_{1,n}), \tilde{w}_n|)|_0 &\leq c|\tilde{w}_n|_0^{1/2}\|\tilde{w}_n\|_0^{3/2}\|w_{1,n}\|_0 \\ &\leq \frac{c}{\nu^3}\|w_{1,n}\|_0^4|\tilde{w}_n|_0^2 + \frac{\nu}{2}\|\tilde{w}_n\|_0^2.\end{aligned} \tag{4.23}$$

Applying (2.18), Cauchy-Schwartz, Young's inequality and (4.15), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}|\mu(\tilde{w}_n - I_h(\tilde{w}_n))|_0|\tilde{w}_n|_0 &\leq \mu ch\|\tilde{w}_n\|_0|\tilde{w}_n|_0 \\ &\leq \mu ch^2\|\tilde{w}_n\|_0^2 + \frac{\mu}{4}|\tilde{w}_n|_0^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\nu}{4}\|\tilde{w}_n\|_0^2 + \frac{\mu}{4}|\tilde{w}_n|_0^2.\end{aligned} \tag{4.24}$$

Lastly, applying Young's inequality we have

$$\mu|\tilde{v}_n|_0|\bar{w}_n|_0 \leq \mu|\tilde{v}_n|_0^2 + \frac{\mu}{4}|\bar{w}_n|_0^2, \tag{4.25}$$

Inserting the above estimates into(4.22), we obtain,

$$\frac{d}{dt}|\tilde{w}_n|_0^2 + \frac{\nu}{2}\|\tilde{w}_n\|_0^2 + \left(\mu - \frac{c}{\nu^3}\|w_{1,n}\|_0^4|\right)|\tilde{w}_n|_0^2 \leq 2\mu|\tilde{v}_n|_0. \tag{4.26}$$

From proof of (1), we know that $\|w_{1,n}(t)\|_0 \leq M_h \ \ \forall t \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence, applying (4.15) and integrating on the interval $[\sigma, t]$, we obtain

$$|\tilde{w}_n(t)|_0^2 \leq |\tilde{w}_n(\sigma)|^2 e^{\frac{\mu}{2}(\sigma - t)} + 4\|\tilde{v}_n\|_X^2\left(1 - e^{\frac{\mu}{2}(\sigma - t)}\right). \tag{4.27}$$

Letting $\sigma \to -\infty$, we obtain

$$|\tilde{w}_n(t)|_0^2 \leq 4\|\tilde{v}_n\|_X^2 \tag{4.28}$$

Keeping only the second term on the LHS of (4.26) and integrating on the interval$[s, s+1]$, we obtain

$$\int_s^{s+1} \|\tilde{w}_n(t)\|_0^2 dt \leq \frac{4\mu}{\nu}\|\tilde{v}_n\|_X^2 \tag{4.29}$$

Taking the limit $n \to \infty$ in (4.28) and (4.29), we obtain (3) and (4). □

Definition 7. *Consider $\rho > 0$, $\mu > 0$ and $h > 0$ satisfying the hypothesis of Theorem 4.3. Then, the determining map $W : B_X(\rho) \to Y$ is given by $W(v) = w$.*

Remark 4.3. Observe that $Y \subset Z$. Hence, from (3) and (4) in Theorem 4.3, we may conclude that $W : B_X(\rho) \to Z$ is Lipschitz continuous. Lipschitz continuity in turn implies uniqueness of solutions.

Corollary 4.4. *The determining map W defined in Definition 7, in addition to being Lipschitz continuous has the following properties*

(1) Let $v_1, v_2 \in B_X(\rho)$, Then, $W(v_1) = W(v_2)$ iff $P_\sigma(v_1 - v_2) = P_\sigma(\bar{v}) = 0$.

(2) For every $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$W \circ \tau_\sigma(v) = \tau_\sigma \circ W(v). \tag{4.30}$$

Proof. To prove (1), we note that $\bar{w} = w_1 - w_2 = 0$, where $w_1 = W(v_1)$ and $w_2 = W(v_2)$. Since w_1 and w_2 are regular, the term $\bar{w}$ is differentiable a.e on $\mathbb{R}$. From (4.10), we may write

$$\frac{\partial \bar{w}}{\partial t} + \nu A_0(\bar{w}) + B_0(\bar{w}, w_1) + B_0(w_2, \bar{w}) = \mu P_\sigma(\bar{v} - I_h(\bar{w})) \tag{4.31}$$

Letting $\bar{w} = 0$, we obtain $P_\sigma(\bar{v}) = 0$. If $P_\sigma(\bar{v}) = 0$, We obtain $W(v_1) = W(v_2)$ from the Lipschitz continuity of W.
To show (2), we observe that $\tau_\sigma \circ W(v)$ is a solution of (4.10) corresponding to $\tau_\sigma(v)$. From the Lipschitz property of the map W, we have uniqueness of solution. Hence

$$W \circ \tau_\sigma(v) = \tau_\sigma \circ W(v).$$

□

4.4. **New Regularity Criterion On The Weak Attractor.** In this section we establishes that the Leray-Hopf weak solution u to (4.2) on weak attractor is in fact a strong solution. We will use the following four lemmas to prove Theorem 4.8, which will help us obtain our regularity criterion(given by Theorem 4.9).
The first lemma is obtained by repeating the arguments of Lemma 2.5.

Lemma 4.5. *Let u be the general Leray-Hopf weak solution of* (4.1) *and w be the strong solution to* (4.10) *as given in [2]. Let $\tilde{w} = w - u$. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{w}(t)|_0^2 + 2\nu \int_0^t \|\tilde{w}(s)\|_0^2 ds \leq |\tilde{w}(0)|_0^2 + 2\int_0^t b(\tilde{w}(s), \tilde{w}(s), w(s)) ds \\ - 2\mu \int_0^t \left(I_h(\tilde{w}(s), \tilde{w}(s))\right)_0 ds \end{aligned} \tag{4.32}$$

Lemma 4.6. *Let u be a general Leray-Hopf weak solution of* (4.1) *and w be a strong solution to* (4.10) *as given in [2]. Also, let $\tilde{w} = w - u$. Then,*

$$|\tilde{w}(t)|_0^2 \leq 4M^2 e^{-\mu\left(t - \frac{1}{\mu}\right)}. \tag{4.33}$$

where

$$M = \max\left\{ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{\mu}} |w(t)|_0, \sup_{0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{\mu}} |u(t)|_0 \right\} \tag{4.34}$$

.

Proof. Repeating the arguments of Lemma 2.5, we have

(4.35)

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{w}(t)|_0^2 + 2\nu \int_0^t \|\tilde{w}(s)\|_0^2 ds &\leq |\tilde{w}(0)|_0^2 + 2\int_0^t (B_0(\tilde{w}(s), \tilde{w}(s)), w(s))_0 ds - 2\mu \int_0^t \left(I_h(\tilde{w}(s), \tilde{w}(s))\right)_0 ds \\ &\leq |\tilde{w}(0)|_0^2 + 2\int_0^t (B_0(\tilde{w}(s), \tilde{w}(s)), w(s))_0 ds \\ &\quad + 2\mu \left(\int_0^t \left(\tilde{w} - I_h(\tilde{w}(s), \tilde{w}(s))\right)_0 ds \right) - 2\mu \int_0^t |\tilde{w}|_0^2 ds \end{aligned}$$

We bound each term on the RHS. First, applying (2.9), Cauchy-Schwartz and Young's inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |(B_0(\tilde{w},\tilde{w}),w)_0| = (B_0(\tilde{w},w),\tilde{w}|)_0| &\leq c|\tilde{w}|_0^{1/2}\|\tilde{w}\|_0^{3/2}\|w\|_0 \\ &\leq \frac{c}{\nu^3}\|w\|_0^4|\tilde{w}|_0^2 + \frac{\nu}{2}\|\tilde{w}\|_0^2 \\ &\leq \frac{c}{\nu^3}M_{h,u}^4|\tilde{w}|_0^2 + \frac{\nu}{2}\|\tilde{w}\|_0^2 \end{aligned} \tag{4.36}$$

Applying (2.18), Cauchy-Schwartz, Young's inequality and (2.61), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 2|\mu(\tilde{w} - I_h(\tilde{w}))|_0|\tilde{w}|_0 &\leq 2\mu ch\|\tilde{w}\|_0|\tilde{w}|_0 \\ &\leq 2\mu ch^2\|\tilde{w}\|_0^2 + \frac{\mu}{2}|\tilde{w}|_0^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\nu}{2}\|\tilde{w}\|_0^2 + \frac{\mu}{2}|\tilde{w}|_0^2. \end{aligned} \tag{4.37}$$

w, as shown in [2] satisfies the hypothesis of Theorem 4.3. Inserting the estimates into (4.35) and applying (4.15), we see that

$$|\tilde{w}(t)|_0^2 + \nu\int_0^t \|\tilde{w}(s)\|_0^2 ds + \mu\int_0^t |\tilde{w}|_0^2 ds \leq |\tilde{w}(0)|_0^2 \tag{4.38}$$

Dropping the second term on the LHS and changing the interval of integration from $[0,t]$ to $[t - 1/\mu, t]$, we have

$$|\tilde{w}(t)|_0^2 + \mu\int_{t-\frac{1}{\mu}}^t |\tilde{w}|_0^2 ds \leq |\tilde{w}(t-1/\mu)|_0^2 \tag{4.39}$$

Now, applying Lemma 6.6, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{w}(t)|_0^2 &\leq \mu e^{-\mu\left(t-\frac{1}{\mu}\right)}\int_0^{\frac{1}{\mu}} |\tilde{w}(\tau)|_0^2 d\tau \\ &\leq 4M^2 e^{-\mu\left(t-\frac{1}{\mu}\right)} \end{aligned} \tag{4.40}$$

□

Lemma 4.7. *Let u be a Leray-Hopf weak solution of (4.1) on the weak attractor and w be the strong solution of (4.10) as given in the Theorem 4.3. Let $\tilde{w} = w - u$ and $\tilde{w}_\tau(t) = \tilde{w}(t - \tau - 1/\mu)$. Then*

$$|\tilde{w}_\tau(t)|_0^2 \leq 4M^2 e^{-\mu\left(t-\frac{1}{\mu}\right)}. \tag{4.41}$$

where M is as in (4.34).

Proof. Dropping the middle term on the LHS of (4.38), we obtain

$$|\tilde{w}(t)|_0^2 + \mu\int_0^t |\tilde{w}(s)|_0^2 ds \leq |\tilde{w}(0)|_0^2 \tag{4.42}$$

Changing the interval of integration from $[0,t]$ to $[t - \tau - 2/\mu, t - \tau - 1/\mu]$, we obtain

$$|\tilde{w}(t-\tau-1/\mu)|_0^2 + \mu\int_{t-\tau-2/\mu}^{t-\tau-1/\mu} |\tilde{w}(s)|_0^2 ds \leq |\tilde{w}(t-\tau-2/\mu)|_0^2 \tag{4.43}$$

Applying the definition of $\tilde{w}_\tau$, (4.43) can be rewritten as

$$|\tilde{w}_\tau(t)|_0^2 + \mu\int_{t-1/\mu}^t |\tilde{w}_\tau(s)|_0^2 ds \leq |\tilde{w}_\tau(t-1/\mu)|_0^2. \tag{4.44}$$

Proceeding exactly as in Lemma 4.6, we obtain the statement of the lemma. □

Theorem 4.8. *Let u be a general Leray-Hopf weak solution of (4.1) and w be a strong solution to (4.10) as given in Theorem 4.3. Also, let $\tilde{w} = w - u$ and $\tilde{w}_\tau(t) = \tilde{w}(t - \tau - 1/\mu)$. Then, $|\tilde{w}(t)|_0 = 0\ \forall t \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. It is enough to show that for any $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $|\tilde{w}(t_0)|_0^2 \leq \epsilon$. Given $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, let $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that

$$\left(4M^2 e^{-\mu\tau}\right) e^{-\mu(t_0)} \leq \epsilon, \tag{4.45}$$

where M is as in (4.34). Then, from Lemma 4.7, we have

$$|\tilde{w}_\tau(t_0 + \tau + 1/\mu)|_0^2 \leq \left(4M^2 e^{-\mu\tau}\right) e^{-\mu(t_0)}. \tag{4.46}$$

Applying (4.45) and the definition of $\tilde{w}_\tau$, we obtain

$$|\tilde{w}(t_0)|_0^2 \leq \epsilon. \tag{4.47}$$

□

Remark 4.4. From the above theorem we see that on the weak attractor, $u = w$, where u is a general Leray-Hopf weak solution to (4.1) and w be a strong solution to (4.10). This would in turn mean that u on the weak attractor can be shown to be regular whenever we can can construct such a w, giving us a regularity criterion summarized in the thorem below.

Theorem 4.9. *Let u be a Leray-Hopf weak solution of (4.2) on the weak attractor. Let $h_0 > 0$ be defined as*

$$h_0^{-2} = \max\left\{\frac{1}{4c\lambda_1}, \frac{32c|f|^4}{\nu^8\lambda_1^2}\right\} \quad \textit{(f is the body force).}$$

Assume there exists $0 < h \leq h_0$ for which

$$\frac{2cM_h^4}{\nu^3} \leq \frac{\nu}{16ch^2}.$$

Then $u(t)$ is regular for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

5. Weakened Regularity Condition

In Theorem 4.3, the condition we imposed on the data to show regularity of w can be weakened. In this section, we will show that the weakened condition on the data is sufficient to obtain the same regularity result as that in Theorem 4.3(1).
We define $K_h := K_{h,\tau_0}$, for $\tau_0 > 0$ and Holder conjugates $p \geq 3$ and $q \geq 1$, as

$$K_h = \sup_{t\in[-\infty,T]} \left(\int_t^{t+\tau_0} \|I_h u\|^{2p} ds\right)^{1/2p}. \tag{5.1}$$

The weakened condition is obtained in terms of K_h instead of ρ.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\tilde{I}_h$ be a modified general type-I interpolant, K_h be defined as in (5.1) and $0 \leq T \leq \infty$. Let $h_0 > 0$ be given by*

$$h_0^{-2} = \max\left\{4c\lambda_1, \frac{1024c|f|^4}{\nu^8\lambda^2}\right\} \tag{5.2}$$

Assume there exists $\tau_0 > 0$ and $0 < h \leq h_0$ such that $K_h < \infty$ and

$$\left(\frac{32CK_h^4}{q^{\frac{2}{q}}}\right)^{\frac{p}{p-2}} \leq \frac{\nu}{4ch^2}. \tag{5.3}$$

Let μ be chosen such that

$$\max\left\{\frac{\nu}{4ch_0^2}, \left(\frac{32CK_h^4}{q^{\frac{2}{q}}}\right)^{\frac{p}{p-2}}\right\} \leq \mu \leq \frac{\nu}{4ch^2}. \tag{5.4}$$

Then, the data assimilated fluid velocity is regular and satisfies

$$\|w\|_0 \leq M_h, \tag{5.5}$$

where

$$M_h^2 = \frac{8|f|^2}{\lambda_1\nu^2} + \frac{2CK_h^2\mu^{1/p}}{q^{1/q}}\left(\frac{2}{1-e^{-\frac{\nu\lambda_1 p}{4}\tau_0}}\right)^{1/p}. \tag{5.6}$$

Proof. Taking the inner product of the 3-D Navier-Stokes equation with $A_0 w_n$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|w_n\|_0^2 + \nu|A_0 w_n|_0^2 =& -(B_0(w_n,w_n),A_0(w_n))_0 + \mu(w_n - I_h(w_n), A_0(w_n))_0 \\ &- \mu\|w_n\|_0^2 + \mu(I_h u, A_0(w_n))_0 + (f, A_0(w_n))\end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

We bound each term below.

$$\begin{aligned}|(B_0(w_n,w_n),A_0(w_n))|_0 &\leq c\|w\|_0^{3/2}|A_0(w_n)|_0^{3/2} \\ &\leq \frac{c}{\nu^3}\|w_n\|_0^6 + \frac{\nu}{4}|A_0(w_n)|_0^2.\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}|\mu(w_n - I_h w_n, A_0(w_n))|_0 &\leq \mu ch\|w_n\|_0|A_0(w_n)|_0 \\ &\leq \frac{\mu^2 ch^2}{\nu}\|w_n\|_0^2 + \frac{\nu}{4}|A_0(w_n)|_0^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\mu}{4}\|w_n\|_0^2 + \frac{\nu}{4}|A_0(w_n)|_0^2,\end{aligned}$$

$$\mu(I_h u, A_0(w_n))_0 \leq \mu\|I_h u\|_0^2 + \frac{\mu}{4}\|w_n\|_0^2.$$

Lastly, applying Cauchy-Schwartz and Young's inequality, we obtain

$$|(f, A_0 w_n)_0| \leq |f|_0|A_0 w_n|_0 \leq \frac{1}{\nu}|f|_0^2 + \frac{\nu}{4}|A_0 w_n|^2$$

Inserting the above estimate into (5.7), we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|w_n\|_0^2 + \left(\mu - \frac{c}{\nu^3}\|w_n\|_0^4\right)\|w_n\|_0^2 + \frac{\nu}{2}|A_0 w_n|_0^2 \leq \frac{2}{\nu}|f|_0^2 + 2\mu\|I_h u\|_0^2 \tag{5.8}$$

Let $[0, T_1]$ be the maximal interval on which $\|w_n(t)\| \leq M_h$ for $t \in [0, T_1]$. Note that $T_1 > 0$ exists because we have $w_n(0) = 0$. Assume that $T_1 < T$. Then by continuity, we must have $\|w_n(T_1)\| = M_h$. Applying (5.4)and (5.6) to (5.8) and dropping the last term on the LHS of (5.8), we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|w_n\|_0^2 + \frac{\mu}{2}\|w_n\|_0^2 \leq \frac{2}{\nu}|f|_0^2 + 2\mu\|P_n(v)\|_0^2. \tag{5.9}$$

Applying Gronwall's and Holder's inequalities, for any $t \in [0, T_1]$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_n(t)\|^2 &\leq \frac{4|f|^2}{\mu\nu} + 2\mu \int_0^t e^{-\frac{\mu}{2}(t-s)} \|I_h u\|^2 ds \\ &\leq \frac{4|f|^2}{\mu\nu} + 2\mu \left(\int_0^t e^{-\frac{\mu q}{4}(t-s)} ds \right)^{1/q} \left(\int_0^t e^{-\frac{\mu p}{4}(t-s)} \|I_h u\|^{2p} ds \right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq \frac{4|f|^2}{\mu\nu} + \frac{C\mu^{1/p}}{q^{1/q}} \left(\int_0^t e^{-\frac{\mu p}{4}(t-s)} \|I_h u\|^{2p} ds \right)^{1/p} \end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

Where $1 \leq p, q \leq \infty$ are Holder conjugates. We now try to bound the second term on the RHS of the above inequality.

Case 1: $t \geq \tau_0$.

Let $k = \left\lfloor \frac{t}{\tau_0} \right\rfloor$ be the largest integer such that $k\tau_0 \leq t$. Therefore,

$$t = k\tau_0 + \epsilon, \quad \text{where} \quad 0 \leq \epsilon \leq \tau_0. \tag{5.11}$$

Let $\alpha = \frac{p\mu}{4}$. Then, from (5.1) and (5.11), we may write

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t e^{-\frac{\mu p}{4}(t-s)} \|I_h u\|^{2p} ds &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{k} \int_{(j-1)\tau_0}^{j\tau_0} e^{-\alpha(t-s)} \|I_h(u)\|^{2p} ds + \int_{n\tau_0}^{t} e^{-\alpha(t-s)} \|I_h(u)\|^{2p} ds \\ &\leq e^{-\alpha\epsilon} \sum_{j=1}^{k} e^{-\alpha(n-j)\tau} \int_{(j-1)\tau_0}^{j\tau_0} \|I_h(u)\|^{2p} ds + \int_{n\tau_0}^{n\tau_0+\epsilon} \|I_h(u)\|^{2p} ds \\ &\leq e^{-\alpha\epsilon} K_h^{2p} \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} e^{m\alpha\tau_0} + K_h^{2p}. \\ &\leq \frac{2K_h^{2p}}{1 - e^{\alpha\tau_0}} \end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

Case 2: $t \leq \tau_0$.

From(5.1), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t e^{-\alpha(t-s)} \|I_h u\|^2 ds &\leq \int_0^t \|I_h u\|^2 ds \\ &\leq \int_0^{\tau_0} \|I_h u\|^2 ds \\ &\leq K_h^{2p} \\ &\leq \frac{2K_h^{2p}}{1 - e^{\alpha\tau_0}} \end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

Applying (5.12), (5.13) and (5.6) to (5.10), we obtain that for any $t \in [0, T_1]$

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_n(t)\|^2 &\leq \frac{4|f|^2}{\mu\nu} + \frac{CK_h^2\mu^{1/p}}{q^{1/q}} \left(\frac{2}{1-e^{-\frac{\mu p}{4}\tau_0}}\right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq \frac{4|f|^2}{\lambda_1\nu^2} + \frac{CK_h^2\mu^{1/p}}{q^{1/q}} \left(\frac{2}{1-e^{-\frac{\nu\lambda_1 p}{4}\tau_0}}\right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}M_h^2. \end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

This contradicts the fact that $\|w_n(T_1)\| = M_h$. Therefore $T_1 \geq T$ and consequently, $\|w_n(t)\| \leq M_h$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. Passing to the limit as $n \to \infty$, we obtain the desired conclusion for w. □

Hence, similar to Theorem 4.9, using Lemma 4.5 - Lemma 4.7, we obtain the following regularity criterion:

Theorem 5.2. *Let u be a Leray-Hopf weak solution of (4.2) on the weak attractor and K_h be defined as in (5.1). Let $h_0 > 0$ be defined as*

$$h_0^{-2} = \max\left\{4c\lambda_1, \frac{1024c|f|^4}{\nu^5\lambda^2}\right\}.$$

Assume there exists $0 < h \leq h_0$ for which

$$\max\left\{\frac{\nu}{4ch_0^2}, \left(\frac{32CK_h^4}{q^{\frac{2}{q}}}\right)^{\frac{p}{p-2}}\right\} \leq \mu \leq \frac{\nu}{4ch^2}.$$

Then $u(t)$ is regular for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Remark 5.1. Note that in Theorem 5.2, the definition of M_h is given by (5.6), which is not the same as (2.56). Also, the regularity criterion given by Theorem 5.2 is in the spirit of the criterion given by Corollary 5.2 in [5]. However, our condition solely depends on the observed data.

6. Appendix

Recall that for volume interpolation, we divided our domain into smaller sub domains(cuboids Q_α) of diameter h and indexed by the set $\mathcal{J}$. Let us define the set $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{J}$ as

$$\mathcal{E} = \left\{\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) \in \mathcal{J} : \alpha_3 = 1 \text{ or } \alpha_3 = \sqrt[3]{N}\right\}. \tag{6.1}$$

$\mathcal{E}$ represents the collection of sub domains touching the top and bottom boundaries($x_3 = 0$ and $x_3 = 1$). For sub domains Q_α with $\alpha \in \mathcal{E}$, we introduce a modification $Q_{\epsilon,\alpha}$ for $0 < \epsilon < h$, given by

$$Q_{\epsilon,\alpha} = \begin{cases} ((\alpha_1 - 1) * h_L, \alpha_1 * h_L) \times ((\alpha_2 - 1) * h_L, \alpha_2 * h_L) \times (\epsilon, h_1) & , \text{ for } \alpha_3 = 1 \\ ((\alpha_1 - 1) * h_L, \alpha_1 * h_L) \times ((\alpha_2 - 1) * h_L, \alpha_2 * h_L) \times (1 - h_1, 1 - \epsilon) & , \text{ for } \alpha_3 = \sqrt[3]{N}, \end{cases} \tag{6.2}$$

where $h_x = x/\sqrt[3]{N}$. We now define the $\tilde{I}_h$ as

$$\tilde{I}_h(v)(x) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{J}} \bar{v}_\alpha \phi_\alpha(x), \quad v \in H^1(\Omega) \tag{6.3}$$

where

$$\phi_\alpha = \rho_\epsilon * \psi_{Q_\alpha}, \ \rho_\epsilon(x) = \epsilon^{-3}\rho\left(x/\epsilon\right), \ \bar{v}_\alpha = \frac{1}{|Q_\alpha|}\int_{Q_\alpha} v(x)dx. \tag{6.4}$$

$$\psi_{Q_\alpha}(x) = \begin{cases} \chi_{Q_\alpha} & , \text{ for } \alpha \notin \mathcal{E} \\ \chi_{Q_{\epsilon,\alpha}} & , \text{ for } \alpha \in \mathcal{E} \end{cases} \tag{6.5}$$

$$\rho(x) = \begin{cases} K_0 \exp\left(\frac{-1}{1-x^2}\right) & , \text{ for } |x| < 1 \\ 0 & , \text{ otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{6.6}$$

and

$$(K_0)^{-1} = \int_{|x|<1} \exp\left(\frac{-1}{1-x^2}\right) dx.$$

We set $\epsilon = h/10$.

Remark 6.1. $\|\tilde{I}_h\|_0$ is well defined since the characteristic function of each sub domain has been mollified. The characteristic function of sub domains touching the top and bottom boundaries have been modified($Q_{\epsilon,\alpha}$) so that it's support is an "ϵ distance" away from the top and the bottom boundaries. This is done so that after mollification, the modified characteristic function respects the Dirichlet boundary condition at $x_3 = 0, 1$.

Lemma 6.1. *Let ϕ_α and ρ be defined as in* (6.4) *and* (6.6) *respectively. Then, for $i = 1$, 2 and* 3

$$|\partial_{x_i}\phi_\alpha|^2 \le Ch\|\partial_{x_i}\rho\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$$

Proof. Recall that $\phi_\alpha = \rho_\epsilon * \psi_{Q_\alpha}$. Applying Young's inequality for convolutions, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_{x_i}\left(\rho_\epsilon * \psi_{Q_\alpha}\right)|^2 &= |\left(\partial_{x_i}\rho_\epsilon\right) * \psi_{Q_\alpha}|^2 \\ &\le \|\partial_{x_i}\rho_\epsilon\|^2_{L^1(\Omega)} |\psi_{Q_\alpha}|^2 \end{aligned} \tag{6.7}$$

Now, we look at each term on the RHS of (6.7). Differentiating the second equation in (6.4) with x_i and using the fact that $\epsilon = h/10$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_{x_i}\rho_\epsilon\|^2_{L^1(\Omega)} &= \left(\int_{|x|\le\epsilon} \left|\epsilon^{-4}\partial_{x_i}\rho(x/\epsilon)\right| dx\right)^2 \\ &\le C\epsilon^{-2}\|\partial_{x_i}\rho\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \\ &\le Ch^{-2}\|\partial_{x_i}\rho\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega)}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.8}$$

From the definition of χ_{Q_α}, we readily obtain

$$|\psi_{Q_\alpha}|^2 \le \int_{Q_\alpha} 1^2 dx = \frac{|\Omega|}{N} \le h^3 \tag{6.9}$$

Combining (6.7), (6.8) and (6.9) and noting that $|\Omega|/N \le h^3$, we obtain

$$|\partial_{x_i}\phi_\alpha|^2 \le \frac{C|\Omega|h^{-2}}{N}\|\partial_{x_i}\rho\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \le Ch\|\partial_{x_i}\rho\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \tag{6.10}$$

□

We now prove the following theorem. The proof technique was borrowed from [1], where it was used to prove a similar statement for the two dimensional case.

Theorem 6.2. *Let $\mathcal{K} = \{-1, 0, 1\}^3$ and $\tilde{I}_h$ be as in (6.3) and $K_\rho = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{3} \|\partial_{x_i}\rho\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\right)^{1/2}$. Then ,*

$$|\tilde{I}_h(v)|^2_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq ChK_\rho^2 \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} |\bar{v}_\alpha|^2 \quad \forall v \in H^1(\Omega). \tag{6.11}$$

Proof. We set $\epsilon = h/10$. Hence, it follows immediately that $|\phi_\alpha \phi_\beta| = 0$ for $\alpha - \beta \notin \mathcal{K}$, where $\mathcal{K} = \{-1, 0, 1\}^3$. Differentiating (6.3) and applying Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|\partial_{x_i}\tilde{I}_h(v)|^2 &\leq \int_\Omega \sum_{\gamma\in\mathcal{K}} \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} |\bar{v}_\alpha \partial_{x_i}\phi_\alpha(x)|\, |\bar{v}_{\alpha+\gamma}\partial_{x_i}\phi_{\alpha+\gamma}(x)|\, dx \\
&\leq \int_\Omega \sum_{\gamma\in\mathcal{K}} \left(\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} |\bar{v}_\alpha|^2 \, |\partial_{x_i}\phi_\alpha(x)|^2\right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} |\bar{v}_{\alpha+\gamma}|^2 \, |\partial_{x_i}\phi_{\alpha+\gamma}(x)|^2\right)^{1/2} dx \\
&\leq \int_\Omega \sum_{\gamma\in\mathcal{K}} \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} |\bar{v}_\alpha|^2 \, |\partial_{x_i}\phi_\alpha(x)|^2 \, dx \\
&\leq 27 \int_\Omega \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} |\bar{v}_\alpha|^2 \, |\partial_{x_i}\phi_\alpha(x)|^2 \, dx \\
&\leq 27 \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} |\bar{v}_\alpha|^2 |\partial_{x_i}\phi_\alpha|^2
\end{aligned} \tag{6.12}$$

Applying (6.10) to (6.12), we may write

$$|\partial_{x_i}\tilde{I}_h(v)|^2 \leq \frac{C|\Omega|h^{-2}}{N} \|\partial_{x_i}\rho\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} |\bar{v}_\alpha|^2 \leq Ch\|\partial_{x_i}\rho\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} |\bar{v}_\alpha|^2 \tag{6.13}$$

Now, summing over i, we obtain

$$|\tilde{I}_h(v)|^2_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq \frac{C|\Omega|h^{-2}}{N} K_\rho^2 \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} |\bar{v}_\alpha|^2 \leq ChK_\rho^2 \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} |\bar{v}_\alpha|^2 \quad \forall v \in H^1(\Omega). \tag{6.14}$$

□

Corollary 6.3. *Let $\tilde{I}_h$ be as in (6.3) and $K_\rho = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{3} \|\partial_{x_i}\rho\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\right)^{1/2}$. Then*

$$\|\tilde{I}_h(v)\| \leq CK_\rho \|v\| \quad \forall v \in H^1(\Omega). \tag{6.15}$$

Proof. We first look at the term $\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} |\bar{v}_\alpha|^2$ in (6.13). Using the definition of $\bar{v}_\alpha$ given in (2.21), Holder's inequality and Gagliardo-Nirenberg-Sobolev inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} |\bar{v}_\alpha|^2 \leq \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} \left(\left|\frac{1}{|Q_\alpha|}\int_{Q_\alpha} v(x)dx\right|\right)^2 &\leq \frac{N^2}{|\Omega|^2}\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} \|v\|^2_{L^1(Q_\alpha)} \\ &\leq \frac{N^2}{|\Omega|^2}\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} |Q_\alpha|^{5/3}\|v\|^2_{L^6(Q_\alpha)} \\ &\leq \frac{CN^{1/3}}{|\Omega|^{1/3}}\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} \|v\|^2_{H^1(Q_\alpha)} \\ &\leq \frac{CN^{1/3}}{|\Omega|^{1/3}}\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}}\sum_{i=1}^{3} \|(\partial_{x_i} v)\,\chi_{Q_\alpha}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \frac{CN^{1/3}}{|\Omega|^{1/3}}\sum_{i=1}^{3}\left(\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} (\partial_{x_i} v)\,\chi_{Q_\alpha}, \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} (\partial_{x_i} v)\,\chi_{Q_\alpha}\right)\end{aligned} \tag{6.16}$$

Next, using the fact that for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{J}$,

$$\chi_{Q_\alpha}\chi_{Q_\beta} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \alpha \neq \beta \\ \chi_{Q_\alpha} & \text{if } \alpha = \beta, \end{cases} \tag{6.17}$$

we can simplify the expression on the RHS of (6.16) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} |\bar{v}_\alpha|^2 &\leq \frac{CN^{1/3}}{|\Omega|^{1/3}}\sum_{i=1}^{3} \|\partial_{x_i} v\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \frac{CN^{1/3}}{|\Omega|^{1/3}}\|v\|^2\end{aligned} \tag{6.18}$$

Applying (6.18) to the the first inequality in (6.14) and summing over i, we obtain

$$\|\tilde{I}_h(v)\| \leq CK_\rho\|v\| \quad \forall v \in H^1(\Omega). \tag{6.19}$$

□

Next, we briefly try to see why $\tilde{I}_h$ is a type-I interpolant. We first look at a lemma, which is a modified version of a similar result in [4].

Lemma 6.4. *Let $U = \{(p,q,r) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |p-a| < 0.5h, |q-b| < 0.5h, |r-c| < 0.5h,$ for $a,b,c \in \mathbb{R}\}$ be a cube of side length $h > 0$ and center $m = (a,b,c)$ and $u \in W^{1,p}(U)$. Assume $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. Then there exists a C, depending on only on p, such that*

$$\|u - (u)_U\|_p \leq Ch\|\nabla u\|_p,$$

where

$$(u)_U = \frac{1}{|U|}\int_U u(x)dx$$

Proof. From Theorem2.6, it follows that the statement is true for a cube V of side length one given by $V = \{(p,q,r) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |p| < 0.5, |q| < 0.5, |r| < 0.5\}$. For $y \in V$, we define $v \in W^{1,p}(V)$ by

$$v(y) = u(hy + m).$$

From Theorem 2.6 we obtain

$$\|v - (v)_V\|_p \leq C\|\nabla v\|_p.$$

Changing variables, we obtain the statement of the theorem. □

Theorem 6.5. *Let $\tilde{I}_h$ be the smoothed volume interpolant as defined in* (6.3)*. Then $\tilde{I}_h$ is a type-I interpolant.*

Proof.

$$|\tilde{I}_h(v)|^2 \leq \left|\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} \bar{v}_\alpha \phi_\alpha\right|^2 \tag{6.20}$$

Recall that $|\phi_\alpha \phi_\beta| = 0$ for $\alpha - \beta \notin \mathcal{K}$, where $\mathcal{K} = \{-1, 0, 1\}^3$. Repeating the arguments in (6.12) and applying Young's inequality for convolutions, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{I}_h(v)|^2 &\leq 27 \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} |\bar{v}_\alpha|^2 |\phi_\alpha|^2 \\ &\leq 27 \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} |\bar{v}_\alpha|^2 \|\rho_\epsilon\|^2_{L^1(\Omega)} |\psi_{Q_\alpha}|^2 \end{aligned} \tag{6.21}$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho_\epsilon\|_{L^1(\Omega)}|^2 &= \left(\int_{|x|\leq\epsilon} \left|\epsilon^{-3}\rho(x/\epsilon)\right| dx\right)^2 \\ &\leq C\|\rho\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \end{aligned} \tag{6.22}$$

Applying (6.22) and the middle inequality of (6.9) to (6.21), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{I}_h(v)|^2 &\leq C\|\rho\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \frac{|\Omega|}{N} \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} |\bar{v}_\alpha|^2 \\ &\leq C\|\rho\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \frac{|\Omega|}{N} \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} \left(\left|\frac{1}{|Q_\alpha|}\int_{Q_\alpha} v(x)dx\right|\right)^2 \\ &\leq C\|\rho\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \frac{N}{|\Omega|} \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} \|v\|^2_{L^1(Q_\alpha)} \\ &\leq C\|\rho\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} \|v\|^2_{L^2(Q_\alpha)} \\ &\leq C\|\rho\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega)} |v|^2 \end{aligned} \tag{6.23}$$

We now look at $|v - \tilde{I}_h(v)|$.

$$|v - \tilde{I}_h(v)|^2 \leq \left|\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} (v - \bar{v}_\alpha)\phi_\alpha\right|^2 \tag{6.24}$$

After repeating the arguments in (6.21) and (6.22), we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
|v-\tilde{I}_h(v)|^2 &\leq C\|\rho\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} |(v-\bar{v}_\alpha)\phi_\alpha|^2 \\
&\leq C\|\rho\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \frac{|\Omega|}{N} \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} |(v-\bar{v}_\alpha)|^2 \|\phi_\alpha\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \\
&\leq C\|\rho\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \frac{N}{|\Omega|} \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} |(v-\bar{v}_\alpha)|^2 \|\rho_\epsilon\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega)} |\psi|^2_{L^1(\Omega)} \\
&\leq Ch^{-6} \frac{|\Omega|^2}{N^2} \|\rho\|^4_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} |(v-\bar{v}_\alpha)|^2
\end{aligned} \tag{6.25}
$$

Lastly, applying Lemma 6.4 and noting that $|\Omega|/N \leq h^3$, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
|v-\tilde{I}_h(v)|^2 &\leq Ch^2 \|\rho\|^4_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}} \|v\|^2_{H^1(Q_\alpha)} \\
&\leq Ch^2 \|\rho\|^4_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|v\|^2_{H^1(\Omega)}
\end{aligned} \tag{6.26}
$$

Therefore, from (6.23) and (6.26), we see that $\tilde{I}_h$ is a type-I interpolant. □

We now state and prove the following lemma due to E.S Titi (via private communication).

Lemma 6.6. *Let $y : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a real valued function, with $y(t) \geq 0\ \forall t \in \mathbb{R}$. If y satisfies, for $0 \leq s \leq t$ and a constant $\mu > 0$, the inequality*

$$y(t) + \mu \int_s^t y(\tau) d\tau \leq y(s), \tag{6.27}$$

then

$$y(t) \leq \mu e^{-\mu\left(t-\frac{1}{\mu}\right)} \int_0^{\frac{1}{\mu}} y(\tau) d\tau, \quad \forall t \geq 1/\mu. \tag{6.28}$$

Proof. Let

$$\psi(t) = \int_{t-\frac{1}{\mu}}^t y(\tau) d\tau. \tag{6.29}$$

Choosing $s = (t - 1/\mu)$,we can then rewrite (6.27) as

$$\frac{\partial \psi(t)}{dt} + \mu\psi(t) \leq 0. \tag{6.30}$$

Thus, from standard Gronwall over the interval $[\sigma, t]$ inequality, we obtain

$$\psi(t) \leq \psi(\sigma)\, e^{-\mu(t-\sigma)}. \tag{6.31}$$

Choosing $\sigma = 1/\mu$, we obtain

$$\psi(t) \leq \psi(1/\mu)\, e^{-\mu\left(t-\frac{1}{\mu}\right)}. \tag{6.32}$$

Now, keeping only the first term on the LHS of (6.27), integrating with respect to s over the interval $\left[t-\frac{1}{\mu},t\right]$ and applying (6.32), we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\frac{1}{\mu}\right)y(t) &\leq \int_{t-\frac{1}{\mu}}^{t} y(\tau)d\tau \\ &\leq \psi\left(1/\mu\right)e^{-\mu\left(t-\frac{1}{\mu}\right)} \\ &\leq e^{-\mu\left(t-\frac{1}{\mu}\right)}\int_{0}^{\frac{1}{\mu}} y(\tau)d\tau.\end{aligned} \tag{6.33}$$

Multiplying (6.33) by a factor of μ, we obtain (6.28). □

If, in (6.31), we choose $\sigma = t/2$, we obtain the following Corollary

Corollary 6.7. *Let $y:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ be a real valued function, with $y(t)\geq 0\ \forall t\in\mathbb{R}$. If y satisfies, for $0\leq s\leq t$ and a constant $\mu>0$, the inequality*

$$y(t)+\mu\int_{s}^{t} y(\tau)d\tau \leq y(s), \tag{6.34}$$

then

$$y(t)\leq \mu e^{-\mu(t/2)}\int_{t/2-1/\mu}^{t/2} y(\tau)d\tau, \quad \forall t\geq 1/\mu. \tag{6.35}$$

References

[1] Azouani, Abderrahim and Olson, Eric and Titi, Edriss S.: Continuous data assimilation using general interpolant observables *Journal of Nonlinear Science* **24**, no. 2, 277–304(2014). 1, 6

[2] Biswas, Animikh and Price, Randy: Continuous Data Assimilation for the Three Dimensional Navier-Stokes Equations *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.01329*(2020). 1, 4.5, 4.6, 4.4

[3] Biswas, Animikh and Foias, Ciprian and Mondaini, Cecilia F. and Titi, Edriss S.: Downscaling data assimilation algorithm with applications to statistical solutions of the Navier–Stokes equations *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré C, Analyse non linéaire* **36**, no. 2, 295–326(2019). 1, 3

[4] Evans, Lawrence C.: Partial differential equations *American Mathematical Society*(2010). 6

[5] Holst, MJ and Titi, Edriss S.: Determining projections and functionals for weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations *Contemporary mathematics* **204**, 125–138(1997). 5.1

[6] Foias, Ciprian and Jolly, Michael S and Kravchenko, Rostyslav and Titi, Edriss S.: A unified approach to determining forms for the 2D Navier-Stokes equations–the general interpolants case *Russian Mathematical Surveys* **69**, no. 2, 369(2014). 3

[7] Foias, C. and Manley, O. and Temam, R.: Attractors for the Bénard problem: existence and physical bounds on their fractal dimension *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications* **11**, no. 8, 939–967(1987).

[8] Foias, Ciprian and Temam, Roger: The connection between the Navier-Stokes equations, dynamical systems, and turbulence theory, *Directions in partial differential equations*, 55–73(1987).

[9] Foias, Ciprian and Jolly, Michael S and Kravchenko, Rostyslav and Titi, Edriss S.: A determining form for the two-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations: The Fourier modes case, *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, **53**, no. 11, 115623(2012). 2.1

[10] Albanez, Débora A. F.; Benvenutti, Maicon J. Continuous data assimilation algorithm for simplified Bardina model. *Evol. Equ. Control Theory* **7** (2018), no. 1, 33–52. 4.2

[11] Albanez, Débora A. F.; Nussenzveig Lopes, Helena J.; Titi, Edriss S. Continuous data assimilation for the three-dimensional Navier–Stokes-α model. *Asymptot. Anal.* **97** (2016), no. 1-2, 139–164. 3

[12] M.U. Altaf, E.S. Titi, T. Gebrael, O. Knio, L. Zhao, M.F. McCabe and I. Hoteit, Downscaling the 2D Bénard convection equations using continuous data assimilation, *Comput. Geosci.* bf 21 (2017), no. 3, 393-410. 1

1

1

[13] M. Asch, M. Bocquet and M. Nodet, *Data Assimilation: Methods, Algorithms, and Applications*, Fundamentals of Algorithms, 11. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 2016. 1

[14] A. Azouani and E.S. Titi, *Feedback control of nonlinear dissipative systems by finite determining parameters – a reaction diffusion paradigm*, Evol. Equ. Control Theory, 3 (2014), no. 4, pp. 579–594. 1

[15] A. Balakrishna and A. Biswas, Data assimilation for the three dimensional Navier-Stokes equations with observational error, *in preparation.*

[16] H. Bessaih, E. Olson and E. S. Titi, *Continuous data assimilation with stochastically noisy data*, Nonlinearity 28 (2015), pp. 729–753. 1

[17] A. Biswas and M. Branicki, Accuracy and stability of 3D Var filters for the Navier-Stokes equations for general interpolant observables, *in preparation.*

[18] A. Biswas and V.R. Martinez, *Higher-order synchronization for a data assimilation algorithm for the 2D Navier-Stokes equations*, Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl., 35 (2017), pp. 132–157. 1

[19] D. Blömker, K. Law, A.M. Stuart and K.C. Zygalakis, *Accuracy and stability of the continuous-time 3DVAR filter for the Navier-Stokes equation*, Nonlinearity 26 (2013), no. 8, pp. 2193–2219. 1

[20] C.E.A. Brett, K.F. Lam, K.J.H. Law, D.S. McCormick, M.R. Scott and A.M. Stuart, *Accuracy and stability of filters for dissipative PDEs*, Phys. D 245 (2013), pp. 34–45. 1

[21] T. Buckmaster and V. Vicol. Nonuniqueness of weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equation. *Ann. of Math. (2)* **189** (2019), no. 1, 101–144.

[22] E. Carlson, J. Hudson and A. Larios. Parameter recovery for the 2 dimensional Navier-Stokes equations via continuous data assimilation. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* **42** (2020), no. 1, A250–A270. 1

[23] A. Cheskidov, M. Dai and L. Kavli. Determining modes for the 3D Navier-Stokes equation. *Phys. D* **374-375** (2018), 1–9.

[24] A. Cheskidov and M. Dai. Kolmogorov's dissipation number and the number of degrees of freedom for the 3D Navier–Stokes equations. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh* **149** (2019), 429-446.

[25] J.-Y. Chemin, *Fluides parfaites incomressibles,* Astérisque, **230**, 1995.

[26] P. Constantin and C. Foias, *Navier-Stokes Equations*, Chicago Lectures in Mathematics, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 1988.

[27] R. Daley, *Atmospheric Data Analysis*, Cambridge Atmospheric and Space Science Series, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1991). 1

[28] Srinivas Desamsetti; Hari Prasad Dasari; Sabique Langodan; Edriss S. Titi; Omar Knio and Ibrahim Hoteit, Dynamical downscaling of general circulation models using continuous data assimilation, *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, (2019), *https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.3612*. 1

[29] Di Leoni, Patricio Clark; Mazzino, Andrea and Biferale, Luca; Inferring flow parameters and turbulent configuration with physics-informed data assimilation and spectral nudging, *Phys. Rev. Fluids* **3**, no. 10 (2018),104604. *DOI:https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevFluids.3.104604* 1

[30] Di Leoni, Patricio Clark; Mazzino, Andrea and Biferale, Luca. Synchronization to big-data: Nudging the Navier-Stokes equations for data assimilation of turbulent flows. *Physical Review X* **10**, 011023 (2020), 011023-1–011023-15.

[31] Farhat, A.; Glatt-Holtz, N. E.; Martinez, V. R.; McQuarrie, S. A.; Whitehead, J. P.; Data Assimilation in Large Prandtl Rayleigh–Bénard Convection from Thermal Measurements. *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.* **19** (2020), no. 1, 510–540. 1

[32] Farhat, Aseel; Johnston, Hans; Jolly, Michael; Titi, Edriss S. Assimilation of nearly turbulent Rayleigh-Bénard flow through vorticity or local circulation measurements: a computational study. *J. Sci. Comput.* **77** (2018), no. 3, 1519–1533. 1

[33] A. Farhat, M.S. Jolly, and E.S. Titi, *Continuous data assimilation for the 2D Bénard convection through velocity measurements alone*, Phys. D, 303 (2015), pp. 59–66. 1

[34] A. Farhat, E. Lunasin and E.S. Titi, *On the Charney conjecture of data assimilation employing temperature measurements alone: the paradigm of 3D planetary geostrophic model*, Mathematics of Climate and Weather Forecasting, 2(1) (2016), pp. 61–74. 1

[35] Farhat, Aseel; Lunasin, Evelyn; Titi, Edriss S. Data assimilation algorithm for 3D Bénard convection in porous media employing only temperature measurements. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **438** (2016), no. 1, 492–506. 1

[36] Farhat, Aseel; Lunasin, Evelyn; Titi, Edriss S. A data assimilation algorithm: the paradigm of the 3D Leray-α model of turbulence. *Partial differential equations arising from physics and geometry,* 253–273, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., 450, *Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge,* 2019. 1

[37] C. Foias, C. F. Mondaini and E. S. Titi, *A discrete data assimilation scheme for the solutions of the two-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations and their statistics*, SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst., 15 (2016), no. 4, pp. 2109–2142. 1

[38] C. Foias and G. Prodi, *Sur le comportement global des solutions non-stationnaires des équations de Navier-Stokes en dimension 2*, Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova, 39 (1967), pp. 1–34. 1

[39] C. Foias and R. Temam, *Determination of the solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations by a set of nodal values*, Math. Comp., 43 (1984), pp. 117–133. 1

[40] C. Foias and E. S. Titi, Determining nodes, finite difference schemes and inertial manifolds. *Nonlinearity* **4** (1991), no. 1, 135–153. 1

[41] M. Gesho, E. Olson and E. Titi, *A computational study of a data assimilation algorithm for the two dimensional Navier-Stokes equations*, Commun. Comput. Phys., 19 (2016), no. 4, pp. 1094–1110. 1

[42] J. Harlim and A. Majda, *Filtering Complex Turbulent Systems*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012. 1

[43] K. Hayden, E. Olson and E.S. Titi, *Discrete data assimilation in the Lorenz and 2D Navier-Stokes equations,* Phys. D, 240 (2011), 1416-1425. 1

[44] Joshua Hudson and Michael Jolly, Numerical efficacy study for data assimilation for the 2D magnetohydrodynamic equations, *Journal of Computational Dynamics,* **6** no. 1 (2019), 131-145. 1

[45] D. A. Jones and E. S. Titi, Determining finite volume elements for the 2D Navier-Stokes equations. Experimental mathematics: computational issues in nonlinear science (Los Alamos, NM, 1991). *Physica D* (1992), no. 1-4, 165–174. 1

[46] D. A. Jones and E. S. Titi, Upper bounds on the number of determining modes, nodes, and volume elements for the Navier-Stokes equations. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **42** (1993), no. 3, 875–887.

[47] Kalnay, E. *Atmospheric Modeling, Data Assimilation and Predictability.* Cambridge University Press, 2003. 1

[48] D. T. B. Kelly, K.J. H. Law and A. M. Stuart, Well-posedness and accuracy of the ensemble Kalman filter in discrete and continuous time. *Nonlinearity* (2014), 2579-2603. 1

[49] Larios, Adam; Rebholz, Leo G.; Zerfas, Camille. Global in time stability and accuracy of IMEX-FEM data assimilation schemes for Navier-Stokes equations, *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.* **345** (2019), 1077–1093. 1

[50] K. Law, A.M. Stuart and K.C. Zygalakis, *Data Assimilation, A Mathematical Introduction*, Springer, 2015. 1

[51] P.G. Lemarié-Rieusset, *Recent developments in the Navier-Stokes problem*, Chapman & Hall/CRC Research Notes in Mathematics. **431** (2002).

[52] T. Luo and E. S. Titi, Non-uniqueness of weak solutions to hyperviscous Navier-Stokes equations: on sharpness of J.-L. Lions exponent. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* **59**, no. 3 (2020), Paper No. 92, 15 pp.

[53] P.A. Markowich, E.S. Titi, and S. Trabelsi, *Continuous data assimilation for the three-dimensional Brinkman-Forchheimer-extended Darcy model*, Nonlinearity, 29 (2016), pp. 1292–1328. 1

[54] I. Moise, R. Temam and M. Ziane, Asymptotic analysis of the Navier-Stokes equations in thin domains, *Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal* **10**, (1997), 249-282.

[55] S. Montgomery-Smith, Global regularity of the Navier-Stokes equation on thin three-dimensional domains with periodic boundary conditions, *Electron. J. Differential Equations* (1999), No. 11, pp. 1-19.

[56] Y. Pei. Continuous data assimilation for the 3D primitive equations of the ocean. *Commun. Pure Appl. Anal.* **18** (2019), no. 2, 643–661. 1

[57] G. Raugel and G. Sell, Navier-Stokes equations on thin 3D domains. I. Global attractors and global regularity of solutions, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **6** (1993), 503-568.

[58] S. Reich and C. Cotter, *Probabilistic Forecasting and Bayesian Data Assimilation*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2015. 1

[59] J. C. Robinson, *Infinite-Dimensional Dynamical Systems*, Cambridge Texts in Applied Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2001. An introduction to dissipative parabolic PDEs and the theory of global attractors.

[60] G. Seregin, G. (2012). A certain necessary condition of potential blow up for Navier-Stokes equations, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **312** (3, (2012), 833–845. DOI: 10.1007/s00220-011-1391-x.

[61] J. Serrin, On the interior regularity of weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **9** (1962) 187–195.

[62] J. Serrin, The initial value problem for the Navier-Stokes equations, *Nonlinear Problems (R. E. Langer, ed.)*, University of Wisconsin Press, 1963, pp. 69-98.

[63] R. Temam, *Navier-Stokes Equations. Theory and Numerical Analysis*, Studies in Mathematics and its Applications, 3rd edition, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York, 1984. Reedition in the AMS Chealsea Series, AMS, Providence, 2001.

[64] Xin T. Tong; Andrew J. Majda; David Kelly, Nonlinear stability of the ensemble Kalman filter with adaptive covariance inflation, *Commun. Math. Sci.* **14** (2016), no. 5, 1283Đ1313. 1

[65] Xin T. Tong; Andrew J. Majda; David Kelly, Nonlinear stability and ergodicity of ensemble based Kalman filters, *Nonlinearity* **29** (2016), no. 2, 657Đ691. 1

[66] Zerfas, Camille, Rebholz, Leo G., Schneier, Michael, Iliescu, Traian; Continuous data assimilation reduced order models of fluid flow, *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.* **357** (2019), 112596, 18 pp. 1