

ONE SIDED HÖLDER REGULARITY OF GLOBAL WEAK SOLUTIONS OF NEGATIVE ORDER DISPERSIVE EQUATIONS

OLA I.H. MAEHLÉN AND JUN XUE

ABSTRACT. We prove global existence, uniqueness and stability of entropy solutions with $L^2 \cap L^\infty$ initial data for a general family of negative order dispersive equations. It is further demonstrated that this solution concept extends in a unique continuous manner to all L^2 initial data. These weak solutions are found to satisfy one sided Hölder conditions whose coefficients decay in time. The latter result controls the height of solutions and further provides a way to bound the maximal lifespan of classical solutions from their initial data.

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider the initial value problem

$$\begin{cases} u_t + \frac{1}{2}(u^2)_x = (G * u)_x, & (t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}, \\ u(0, x) = u_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

for initial data $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and an even convolution kernel $G \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ admitting an integrable weak derivative $G' =: K \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$. A classical family of examples for (1.1) is attained when we for G or $-G$ insert a Bessel kernel G_α with $\alpha > 1$, as defined by its Fourier transform

$$\widehat{G}_\alpha(\xi) = \frac{1}{(1 + 4\pi^2\xi^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}, \quad (1.2)$$

using the normalization $\mathcal{F}(f) = \hat{f}(\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x)e^{-2\pi i\xi x} dx$. In particular, setting $G = -G_2$ yields the Burgers–Poisson equation, which in [24] is derived as a model for shallow water waves. Central questions in the study of water wave model equations include well-posedness, persistence and non-persistence of solutions, the latter two in particular exemplified by solitary and breaking waves. The answers depend intricately on the type of nonlinearity and dispersive term featured in the equation. In the case of a quadratic nonlinearity, the fractional Korteweg–de Vries equation (fKdV)

$$u_t + \frac{1}{2}(u^2)_x = (|D|^\beta u)_x \quad (1.3)$$

where $\mathcal{F}(|D|^\beta u) = |\xi|^\beta \hat{u}$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, has been suggested [19] as a scale for studying how the strength of the dispersion affects the questions of well-posedness and water-wave features. To connect (1.1) to the fKdV setting, observe that our assumption on G implies that $\widehat{G}(\xi) = o(|\xi|^{-1})$ as $|\xi| \rightarrow \infty$ and so in this sense one may place (1.1) in the region $\beta < -1$ for fKdV. However, \widehat{G} will in our case be bounded, while $|\xi|^\beta \rightarrow \infty$ as $\xi \rightarrow 0$ for $\beta < 0$, and thus (1.1) can not match the low-frequency effect

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35L03; 35Q53; 35B30.

Key words and phrases. negative order dispersion; weak entropy solutions; existence and uniqueness; Oleinik estimate.

of negative order fKdV which assigns (very) high velocities to (very) low frequencies. This qualitative difference disappears in a periodic setting; the dispersion of fKdV on the torus is for $\beta < -1$ precisely of the form assumed in (1.1). It should be noted that the methods in this paper can, after a few modifications, be carried out on the torus, and thus our results can be extended to *periodic* solutions of fKdV for $\beta < -1$. With the relation between (1.1) and (1.3) accounted for, we now summarize a few results for the latter to sketch what one may expect of well-posedness and water-wave features in our case.

The fractional KdV equation of order $\beta \in (\frac{6}{7}, 2]$ is globally well-posed in appropriate function spaces; the regions $\beta \in (\frac{6}{7}, 1)$ and $\beta \in (1, 2)$ are treated in [23] and [12] respectively, and there are numerous works on the well posedness for $\beta = 1$ (Benjamin–Ono equation) and $\beta = 2$ (KdV equation), see for example [15] and [16] and the references therein. For values $\beta \leq \frac{6}{7}$ only local well-posedness results have been established [10, 23]. Still, numerical investigation [17] suggests that fKdV is globally well-posed for dispersion as weak as $\beta > \frac{1}{2}$, but not for $\beta \leq \frac{1}{2}$; this is also conjectured in [19]. One might expect the culprit of this loss of global well-posedness for weak dispersion, to be the appearance of breaking waves (shock formation), i.e. bounded solutions that develop infinite slope in finite time. In the negative order regime $\beta < 0$ this might be true: the occurrence of breaking waves have been proved for the case $\beta = -2$ (Ostrovsky–Hunter equation) by [20], for the case $\beta = -1$ (Burgers–Hilbert) by [25] and for the region $\beta \in (-1, -\frac{1}{3})$ by [14]. However, no such results exists in the positive order regime $\beta > 0$, and it is believed that instead other blowup phenomena occur in the range $\beta \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ inhibiting global well-posedness; see the discussion in [17, 19] or [22] where an example of L^∞ blowup in finite time is constructed for the modified Benjamin–Ono equation. In the absence of classical global solutions, several authors have for the $\beta < 0$ regime turned to the concept of *entropy* solutions. Adapted from the study of hyperbolic conservation laws, entropy solutions are weak solutions that satisfy extra conditions – the entropy inequalities – automatically satisfied by classical solutions when the latter exist. This solution concept allows for continuation past wave breaking and so global well-posedness may again be achieved. In [6] existence and uniqueness of global entropy solutions for the Ostrovsky–Hunter equation ($\beta = -2$) is established for appropriate initial data. Similarly, [4] provides global entropy solutions for the Burgers–Hilbert equation ($\beta = -1$) and a partial uniqueness result. Finally, the Burgers–Poisson equation mentioned above is in [11] shown to admit unique global entropy solutions for integrable initial data. The authors also provide sufficient conditions on the initial data leading to wave breaking. This equation is not an isolated instance of (1.1) featuring wave breaking; [7] shows that the phenomena is present whenever $G \in C \cap L^1(\mathbb{R})$ is symmetric and monotone on \mathbb{R}^+ . More generally Corollary 2.7, which provides maximal lifespans for classical solutions, hints that every instance of (1.1) features wave breaking as is explained in more detail below.

We now give a brief discussion of our results presented in Section 2. Theorem 2.1 provides existence, uniqueness and L^2 stability of entropy solutions of (1.1) – as defined by Def. 1.1 – for initial data in $L^2 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$. The result is proved in Section 3. Here, existence follows from an operator splitting argument as done in [11], while uniqueness follows from a variation of the Kruřkov’s doubling of variables device [18] yielding a weighted L^1 -contraction. The L^2 stability follows from a variation of the L^1 -contraction combined with an L^2 tightness estimate of these solutions. The

stability result is strong enough to allow the solution concept to be extended – in a unique continuous manner – to all L^2 initial data; this is Corollary 2.2.

Theorem 2.3 infers one sided Hölder regularity for weak solutions of (1.1) with L^2 initial data, and it is a generalization of the Oleïnik estimate (4.1) for Burgers' equation. The result is proved in Section 4. Here, the idea is to introduce for a solution u an object $\omega(t, h) \geq \sup_x [u(t, x + h) - u(t, x)]$ bounding the one sided growth rate of u , and through an operator splitting argument the evolution of ω can be controlled. As Lemma 4.3 shows, the nonlinearity has a smoothing effect on ω . The dispersion on the other hand, is treated as perturbative source term (Lemma 4.4) that we are able to limit – and this is the key – through Lemma 4.2 using ω itself and the non-increasing L^2 norm of u . Letting then the iterative steps of the operator splitting go to zero, one attains an autonomous equation (4.14) for ω , which can be replaced by a coarser but simpler equation (4.16) resulting in Theorem 2.3. This result has two interesting consequences. Corollary 2.6 bounds the height of the entropy solutions by an expression dependent only on $K = G'$, the L^2 norm of the initial data and the time t . Said expression is decreasing in t , but does not tend to zero; this would generally be impossible due to the existence of solitary waves [9] for several instances of (1.1). Corollary 2.7 bounds the lifespan of classical solutions of (1.1) provided the initial data satisfies a skewness condition (2.8). The idea is to exploit the time-reversibility for classical solutions of (1.1): as Theorem 2.3 is valid also for reversed solutions this poses one sided Hölder conditions on the original solution's initial data. The implication is that a classical solution will break down before any contradiction is reached. One may ask 'how' these classical solutions break down, and wave breaking rise as the natural candidate, but proving this rigorously, is beyond the scope of this paper. That said, one can expect a classical solution of (1.1) to break down at $t = T$ only if $\inf_x u(t, x) \rightarrow -\infty$ as $t \nearrow T$, which is the case for Burgers' equation with a C^1 source. We also point out that our skewness condition (2.8) differ from that of both [11] and [7]; neither imply the other.

1.1. The entropy formulation. We shall restrict the concept of entropy solutions to the function class $L_{\text{loc}}^\infty([0, \infty), L^\infty(\mathbb{R}))$, which we here define as the subspace of $L_{\text{loc}}^\infty([0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R})$ of functions $u = u(t, x)$ that are essentially bounded on $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$ for each $T > 0$. Necessary is the notion of an entropy pair (η, q) of (1.1), which is to say that

$$\eta: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ is smooth and convex, while } q'(u) = \eta'(u)u.$$

Definition 1.1. For bounded initial data $u_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, we say that a function $u \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty([0, \infty), L^\infty(\mathbb{R}))$ is an entropy solution of (1.1) if:

- (1) it satisfies for all non-negative $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R})$ and all entropy pairs (η, q) of (1.1) the entropy inequality

$$\int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta(u)\varphi_t + q(u)\varphi_x + \eta'(u)(K * u)\varphi \, dxdt \geq 0, \quad (1.4)$$

- (2) it assumes the initial data in L_{loc}^1 sense, that is

$$\text{ess lim}_{t \searrow 0} \int_{-r}^r |u(t, x) - u_0(x)| dx = 0,$$

for all $r > 0$.

The concept of entropy solutions lies between that of strong and weak solutions. If $u \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty([0, \infty), L^\infty(\mathbb{R})) \cap C^1(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R})$ is a classical solution of (1.1) then it is necessarily an entropy solution as multiplying (1.1) with $\eta'(u)\varphi$ and integrating by parts yields (1.4) as an equality. And if u is an entropy solution of (1.1) then it is necessarily a weak solution as follows from considering the two entropy pairs $(\eta(u), q(u)) = (u, \frac{1}{2}u^2)$ and $(\eta(u), q(u)) = (-u, -\frac{1}{2}u^2)$ respectively.

1.2. A fractional variation. The exponents of the one sided Hölder conditions provided by Theorem 2.3 depend on the regularity of $K = G'$; the smoother K is, the higher the exponent. More precisely, we attain the Hölder exponent $\frac{1+s}{2}$ if $|K|_{TV^s} < \infty$ where the latter seminorm is for $s \in [0, 1]$ defined by

$$|K|_{TV^s} = \sup_{h>0} \frac{\|K(\cdot + h) - K\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}}{h^s}. \quad (1.5)$$

When $s = 1$ this seminorm coincides with the classical total variation of K , while $s = 0$ gives twice the L^1 norm of K , and thus we necessarily have $|K|_{TV^0} < \infty$ as we assume $K \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$. For $s \in (0, 1)$ the seminorm is a measure of intermediate regularity between $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ and $BV(\mathbb{R})$; in particular Lemma A.3 bounds this seminorm by the one associated with $W^{s,1}(\mathbb{R})$. The seminorm also satisfies the scaling property $|K(\lambda \cdot)|_{TV^s} = |\lambda|^{s-1}|K|_{TV^s}$ and so does not coincide with the scaling invariant fractional variation from [21] used in [3] to attain maximal smoothing effects for one-dimensional scalar conservation laws.

2. MAIN RESULTS

We here present the two main results, Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.3 and corresponding corollaries. For a general discussion of the content given here, see the end of the above introduction. We start with Theorem 2.1, which provides a global well-posedness theory for entropy solutions of (1.1) with initial data in $L^2 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$. The theorem is established in Section 3.

Theorem 2.1. *For every initial data $u_0 \in L^2 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ there exists a unique entropy solution u of (1.1). The mapping $t \mapsto u(t)$ is continuous from $[0, \infty)$ to $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and $u(t)$ satisfies for all $t \geq 0$ the bounds*

$$\|u(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}, \quad \|u(t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq e^{t\kappa} \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}, \quad (2.1)$$

where $\kappa := \|K\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}$. Moreover, we have the following stability result: if two sequences $(t_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset [0, \infty)$ and $(u_{0,k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset L^2 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ admit the limits

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} t_k = t, \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} u_{0,k} = u_0 \quad \text{in } L^2(\mathbb{R}),$$

where $u_0 \in L^2 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, then the corresponding entropy solutions satisfy

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} u_k(t_k) = u(t) \quad \text{in } L^2(\mathbb{R}).$$

It is worth mentioning that this theorem is also valid on a time-bounded domain $(0, T) \times \mathbb{R}$; see the discussion following the proof of Proposition 3.1. The tools used to prove the stability result of the theorem do not depend on the height of the initial data, thus allowing for the following corollary which is proved at the end of Subsection 3.3.

Corollary 2.2 (Global L^2 well-posedness). *Equation (1.1) is globally well-posed for $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ initial data in the following sense: The solution map $S: (t, u_0) \mapsto u(t)$ mapping $L^2 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ initial data to the corresponding entropy solution at time $t \geq 0$, extends uniquely to a jointly continuous mapping $S: [0, \infty) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R})$. In particular, the L^2 -bound, -continuity and -stability of Theorem 2.1 carries over to all weak solutions provided by S . Moreover, for any $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$, the corresponding weak solution $u(t, x) := S(t, u_0)(x)$ is locally bounded in $(0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ and satisfies the entropy inequalities (1.4).*

The second theorem infers one sided Hölder regularity for the weak solutions provided by Corollary 2.2. The result depends on the regularity of $K = G'$ which is measured using the fractional variation $|K|_{TV^s}$ defined in (1.5). The theorem is proved in Section 4.

Theorem 2.3. *For initial data $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$, let u be the corresponding weak solution of (1.1) provided by Corollary 2.2, and let $s \in [0, 1]$ be such that $|K|_{TV^s} < \infty$. Then for all $t > 0$, $x \mapsto u(t, x)$ coincides a.e. with a left-continuous function satisfying for all $x \geq y$ the one sided Hölder condition*

$$u(t, x) - u(t, y) \leq a(t)(x - y)^{\frac{1+s}{2}}, \quad (2.2)$$

for a Hölder coefficient $a(t) > 0$ strictly decreasing in t .

As we assume $K \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$, the case $s = 0$ of Theorem 2.3 is valid for all instances of (1.1). Also, when either G or $-G$ coincides with a Bessel kernel G_α , as introduced in (1.2), and $\alpha \in (1, 2]$ the one sided Hölder regularity from Theorem 2.3 takes the form

$$u(t, x) - u(t, y) \leq a(t)(x - y)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, \quad x \geq y,$$

as follows from Lemma A.4 when setting $s = \alpha - 1$. In particular, for the Burgers–Poisson equation (where $G = -G_2$) L^2 data results in weak solutions that are one sided Lipschitz continuous with a Lipschitz constant that can be read off from the second part of Corollary 2.5 when using $|(G_2)'|_{TV} = 2$. We conclude this section with a few corollaries of Theorem 2.3 including a decaying height bound for entropy solutions and a maximal lifespan estimate for classical solutions of (1.1).

Remark 2.4. As Corollary 4.10 states, the Hölder coefficient in (2.2) can be set to

$$a(t) = C_1(s)|K|_{TV^s}^{\frac{2+s}{3+2s}} \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^{\frac{1+s}{3+2s}} + C_2(s) \frac{\|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^{\frac{1-s}{3}}}{t^{\frac{2+s}{3}}}, \quad (2.3)$$

where the two coefficients $C_1(s)$ and $C_2(s)$ are given by

$$C_1(s) = \frac{2^{\frac{3+s}{6+4s}} [(2+s)(3+s)]^{\frac{1+s}{6+4s}}}{1+s}, \quad C_2(s) = \frac{2^{\frac{4+2s}{3+3s}} (2+s)^{\frac{5+s}{6}} (3+s)^{\frac{1-s}{6}}}{2^{\frac{1-s}{6}} 3^{\frac{2+s}{3}} (1+s)}. \quad (2.4)$$

Alternatively, one may use the sharper expression for $a(t)$ provided by Lemma 4.9 where the shorthand notation $\mu = \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}$ and $\kappa_s = |K|_{TV^s}$ is used.

For clarity, we now use the explicit expressions from this remark to write out the content of Theorem 2.3 for the special case $s = 0$ where we may use the identity $|K|_{TV^0} = 2\|K\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}$, and the case $s = 1$ where we may use $|K|_{TV^1} = |K|_{TV}$.

Corollary 2.5 (Explicit regularity when $s = 0$ and $s = 1$).

- *The $s = 0$ case: For initial data $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$, let u be the corresponding weak solution of (1.1) provided by Corollary 2.2. Then for all $t > 0$, $x \mapsto u(t, x)$ coincides a.e. with a left-continuous function satisfying for all $x \geq y$ the one sided Hölder condition*

$$\frac{u(t, x) - u(t, y)}{(x - y)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq 2^{\frac{4}{3}} 3^{\frac{1}{6}} \|K\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}^{\frac{2}{3}} \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^{\frac{1}{3}} + \frac{4 \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^{\frac{1}{3}}}{3^{\frac{1}{2}} t^{\frac{2}{3}}}.$$

- *The $s = 1$ case: If $|K|_{TV} < \infty$, then the above u further satisfies for all $t > 0$ and $x \geq y$ the one sided Lipschitz condition*

$$\frac{u(t, x) - u(t, y)}{x - y} \leq \frac{3^{\frac{1}{5}}}{2^{\frac{1}{5}}} |K|_{TV}^{\frac{3}{5}} \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^{\frac{2}{5}} + \frac{1}{t}.$$

Note that the second part of the corollary generalizes the classical Oleĭnik estimate $u(t, x) - u(t, y) \leq \frac{x-y}{t}$ for Burgers' equation (where $K = 0$). Next, we introduce an L^∞ for the weak solutions provided by Corollary 2.2 which, in contrast to the one from (2.1), is decreasing in time.

Corollary 2.6 (Height bound). *For initial data $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$, let u be the corresponding weak solution of (1.1) provided by Corollary 2.2. Then for all $t > 0$ we have the height bound*

$$\|u(t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq \left[2^{\frac{11}{12}} 3^{\frac{1}{3}} \|K\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}^{\frac{1}{3}} + \frac{2^{\frac{5}{4}}}{t^{\frac{1}{3}}} \right] \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^{\frac{2}{3}}. \quad (2.5)$$

More generally, for any $s \in [0, 1]$ such that $|K|_{TV^s} < \infty$, we have for the above u and all $t > 0$ the height bound

$$\|u(t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq \tilde{C}_1(s) |K|_{TV^s}^{\frac{1}{3+2s}} \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^{\frac{2+2s}{3+2s}} + \tilde{C}_2(s) \frac{\|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^{\frac{2}{3}}}{t^{\frac{1}{3}}}, \quad (2.6)$$

where the coefficients $\tilde{C}_1(s)$ and $\tilde{C}_2(s)$ are expressions similar to $C_1(s)$ and $C_2(s)$ from Remark 2.4, and they are both written out in (A.2) in the appendix.

Proof. See Appendix B.

Observe that together, the two height bounds (2.1) and (2.5) imply that when $u_0 \in L^2 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ the corresponding weak solution of (1.1) is globally bounded. The next and final result of this section establishes a maximal lifespan for classical solutions of (1.1). For brevity we introduce the following seminorm

$$[u_0]_s := \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{R} \\ h > 0}} \left[\frac{u_0(x-h) - u_0(x)}{h^{\frac{1+s}{2}}} \right], \quad (2.7)$$

which is a (left) one sided Hölder seminorm of exponent $\frac{1+s}{2}$.

Corollary 2.7 (Maximal lifespan). *There are universal constants $C, c > 0$ such that: if initial data $u_0 \in L^2 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies the skewness condition*

$$[u_0]_s^{3+2s} > c |K|_{TV^s}^{2+s} \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^{1+s}, \quad (2.8)$$

for some $s \in [0, 1]$ such that $|K|_{TV^s} < \infty$, then the lifespan T of a classical solution $u \in L^\infty \cap C^1((0, T) \times \mathbb{R})$ of (1.1) admitting u_0 as initial data must satisfy

$$T < C \left[\frac{\|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^{1-s}}{[u_0]_s^3} \right]^{\frac{1}{2+s}}. \quad (2.9)$$

Proof. See Appendix B.

3. WELL POSEDNESS OF ENTROPY SOLUTIONS

In this section, we provide for (1.1) a global well-posedness theory of entropy solutions as defined by Def. 1.1. In particular, the content of Theorem 2.1 follows from Proposition 3.1, Corollary 3.6 and Proposition 3.9; see the summary at the beginning of Subsection 3.3. Corollary 2.2 is also proved here at the end of Subsection 3.3. For entropy solutions of (1.1), the proofs of existence and uniqueness is the same for $L^2 \cap L^\infty$ data as for L^∞ data; only the L^1 setting allows for ‘shortcuts’. Thus for generality, many results in the two coming subsections will be presented for initial data $u_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$. We also note that in these two subsections only Lemma 3.3 exploits the dispersive nature of (1.1), that is, that $K = G'$ is odd.

3.1. Uniqueness of entropy solutions. It is natural to start with the proof of uniqueness, as this equips us with a weighted L^1 -contraction that can further be used in the existence proof. The involved weight $w_M^r(t, x)$ can be interpreted as a bound on the propagation of information for solutions of (1.1). Its technical role in the coming proof is to serve as a subsolution of a dual equation, namely the one obtained from setting the square bracket in (3.17) to zero. A similar method can be found in [1] where nonlocal conservation laws are treated. The weight is constructed as follows. Writing $|K|$ to denote the function $x \mapsto |K(x)|$, we introduce for a parameter $t \geq 0$ the operator $e^{t|K|*}$ mapping $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ to itself for any $p \in [1, \infty]$, defined by

$$\left(e^{t|K|*} f \right)(x) = f(x) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left((|K|*)^n f \right)(x) \frac{t^n}{n!}, \quad (3.1)$$

where $(|K|*)^n$ represents the operation of convolving with $|K|$ repeatedly n times. Observe that by repeated use of Young’s convolution inequality we have for any $p \in [1, \infty]$ and $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R})$

$$\|e^{t|K|*} f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})} \leq e^{t\kappa} \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})}, \quad (3.2)$$

where $\kappa := \|K\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}$. For parameters $r, M \geq 0$, we further introduce

$$\chi_M^r(t, x) = \begin{cases} 1, & |x| < r + Mt, \\ 0, & \text{else,} \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

and set

$$w_M^r(t, x) = \left(e^{t|K|*} \chi_M^r(t, \cdot) \right)(x). \quad (3.4)$$

By (3.2), this weight satisfies for $p \in [1, \infty]$ the bound

$$\|w_M^r(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})} \leq e^{t\kappa} (2r + 2Mt)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad (3.5)$$

where the case $p = \infty$ is evaluated in a limit sense. Thus, $w_M^r(t, \cdot) \in L^1 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ for all $t, r, M \geq 0$. With w_M^r defined, we are ready to state Proposition 3.1 establishing the uniqueness of entropy solutions. It should be noted that although the following result is stated to hold for a.e. $t \geq 0$, it can be extended to all $t \geq 0$, as we shall later prove that entropy solutions of (1.1) are continuous when viewed as $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$ -valued time-dependent functions.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $u, v \in L^\infty_{\text{loc}}([0, \infty), L^\infty(\mathbb{R}))$ be entropy solutions of (1.1) with $u_0, v_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ as initial data. Then, for any $r > 0$ and a.e. $t \geq 0$ we have the weighted L^1 -contraction*

$$\int_{-r}^r |u(t, x) - v(t, x)| dx \leq \int_{-r}^r |u_0(x) - v_0(x)| w_M^r(t, x) dx, \quad (3.6)$$

where w_M^r is given by (3.4), and M is any parameter satisfying

$$M \geq \frac{\|u\|_{L^\infty([0, t] \times \mathbb{R})} + \|v\|_{L^\infty([0, t] \times \mathbb{R})}}{2}. \quad (3.7)$$

Thus, there is at most one entropy solution of (1.1) for each $u_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$.

Proof. We begin by reformulating (1.4) in terms of the Kruřkov entropies; parameterized over $k \in \mathbb{R}$, they are given by $(\eta_k(u), q_k(u)) = (|u - k|, F(u, k))$ where

$$F(u, k) := \frac{1}{2} \text{sgn}(u - k)(u^2 - k^2).$$

These entropy pairs lack the required smoothness, but are still applicable in (1.4) as they can be smoothly approximated. Indeed, consider for $\delta > 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{R}$ the entropy pairs $\eta_k^\delta(u) = \sqrt{(u - k)^2 + \delta^2}$ and $q_k^\delta(u) = \int_k^u (\eta_k^\delta)'(y) y dy$. As we have the pointwise limits

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \eta_k^\delta(u) = |u - k|, \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} q_k^\delta(u) = F(u, k), \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} (\eta_k^\delta)'(u) = \text{sgn}(u - k),$$

we can substitute $(\eta, q) \mapsto (\eta_k^\delta, q_k^\delta)$ in (1.4) and let $\delta \rightarrow 0$ to conclude through dominated convergence that u satisfies

$$0 \leq \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}} |u - k| \varphi_t + F(u, k) \varphi_x + \text{sgn}(u - k)(K * u) \varphi dx dt, \quad (3.8)$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{R}$ and all non-negative $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R})$. For brevity, we set $U = \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}$ for use throughout the proof. Let $\psi \in C_c^\infty(U \times U)$ be non-negative, and consider u and v as functions in (t, x) and (s, y) respectively. For fixed $(s, y) \in U$, we can in (3.8) insert the test-function $\varphi: (t, x) \mapsto \psi(t, x, s, y)$ and the constant $k = v(s, y)$ so to obtain

$$0 \leq \int_U |u - v| \psi_t + F(u, v) \psi_x + \text{sgn}(u - v)(K *_x u) \psi dx dt, \quad (3.9)$$

where we write $K *_x u$ to stress that the operator $K*$ is applied with respect to the x -variable. As (3.9) holds for all $(s, y) \in U$ we can integrate (3.9) over $(s, y) \in U$ to further attain

$$0 \leq \int_U \int_U |u - v| \psi_t + F(u, v) \psi_x + \text{sgn}(u - v)(K *_x u) \psi dx dt dy ds. \quad (3.10)$$

Next we swap the role of $u(t, x)$ and $v(s, y)$: rewriting (3.8) in terms of the variables (s, y) and replacing u by v , we can fix $(t, x) \in U$ and insert the test-function

$\varphi: (s, y) \mapsto \psi(t, x, s, y)$ and the constant $k = u(t, x)$ so to obtain

$$0 \leq \int_U \int_U |u - v| \psi_s + F(v, u) \psi_y + \operatorname{sgn}(v - u) (K *_y v) \psi dx dt dy ds, \quad (3.11)$$

where we also integrated over $(t, x) \in U$. As $F(u, v) = F(v, u)$ and $\operatorname{sgn}(v - u) = -\operatorname{sgn}(u - v)$ we can add (3.10) to (3.11) so to further obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq & \int_U \int_U |u - v| (\psi_t + \psi_s) + F(u, v) (\psi_x + \psi_y) dx dt dy ds \\ & + \int_U \int_U \operatorname{sgn}(u - v) (K *_x u - K *_y v) \psi dx dt dy ds. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Next, let $\rho \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be non-negative and satisfy $\|\rho\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} = 1$, and let ρ_ε denote the expression

$$\rho_\varepsilon = \rho_\varepsilon(t - s, x - y) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \rho\left(\frac{t - s}{\varepsilon}, \frac{x - y}{\varepsilon}\right),$$

for $\varepsilon > 0$. For a fixed $T \in (0, \infty)$, we further let φ denote a non-negative element of $C_c^\infty((0, T) \times \mathbb{R})$ and set

$$\psi(t, x, s, y) = \varphi(t, x) \rho_\varepsilon(t - s, x - y),$$

or simply $\psi = \varphi \rho_\varepsilon$ for short. Note that, for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, this ψ is non-negative, smooth and of compact support in $U \times U$; in particular, it satisfies the prior assumptions posed on it. From the observation that $(\partial_t + \partial_s) \rho_\varepsilon = 0 = (\partial_x + \partial_y) \rho_\varepsilon$, we conclude that

$$(\psi_t + \psi_s) = \varphi_t \rho_\varepsilon, \quad (\psi_x + \psi_y) = \varphi_x \rho_\varepsilon,$$

and so inserting for ψ in (3.12) we attain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq & \int_U \int_U \left[|u - v| \varphi_t + F(u, v) \varphi_x \right] \rho_\varepsilon dx dt dy ds \\ & + \int_U \int_U \operatorname{sgn}(u - v) (K *_x u - K *_y v) \varphi \rho_\varepsilon dx dt dy ds. \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Next, we wish to ‘go to the diagonal’ by taking $\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}$ of (3.13); for simplicity we study each line separately. For the first one we pick $M \in (0, \infty)$ satisfying the inequality (3.7) with T replacing t , and use $(u^2 - v^2) = (u + v)(u - v)$ to calculate

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_U \int_U \left[|u - v| \varphi_t + F(u, v) \varphi_x \right] \rho_\varepsilon dx dt dy ds \\ & \leq \int_U \int_U |u - v| \left[\varphi_t + M |\varphi_x| \right] \rho_\varepsilon dx dt dy ds \\ & \leq \int_U |u(t, x) - v(t, x)| \left[\varphi_t + M |\varphi_x| \right] dx dt \\ & \quad + \int_U \int_U |v(t, x) - v(s, y)| \left[\varphi_t + M |\varphi_x| \right] \rho_\varepsilon dx dt dy ds, \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

where we in the last step added and subtracted $v(t, x)$ followed by the triangle inequality. As $\rho_\varepsilon(t - s, x - y)$ is supported in the region $|(t - s, x - y)| \leq \varepsilon$ and

satisfies $\|\rho_\varepsilon\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} = 1$, the very last integral in (3.14) is bounded by

$$\sup_{|(\varepsilon, \delta)| \leq \varepsilon} \int_U |v(t, x) - v(t + \varepsilon, x + \delta)| \left[\varphi_t + M|\varphi_x| \right] dx dt \rightarrow 0, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow 0,$$

where the limit holds as translation is a continuous operation on $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$ and $\varphi \in C_c^\infty((0, T) \times \mathbb{R})$. Thus we have established

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_U \int_U \left[|u - v| \varphi_t + F(u, v) \varphi_x \right] \rho_\varepsilon dx dt dy ds \\ & \leq \int_U |u - v| \left[\varphi_t + M|\varphi_x| \right] dx dt, \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

where the v on the right-hand side of (3.15) is a function in (t, x) . Turning our attention to the second line of (3.13), we start by observing

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_U \int_U \text{sgn}(u - v) (K *_x u - K *_y v) \varphi \rho_\varepsilon dx dt dy ds \\ & \leq \int_U \int_U \int_{\mathbb{R}} |K(z)| |u(t, x - z) - v(s, y - z)| \varphi(t, x) \rho_\varepsilon(t - s, x - y) dz dx dt dy ds \\ & = \int_U \int_U \int_{\mathbb{R}} |K(z)| |u(t, x) - v(s, y)| \varphi(t, x + z) \rho_\varepsilon(t - s, x - y) dz dx dt dy ds \\ & = \int_U \int_U |u - v| \left[|K| *_x \varphi \right] \rho_\varepsilon dx dt dy ds, \end{aligned}$$

where the third line holds by the substitution $(x, y) \mapsto (x + z, y + z)$ and the last by the symmetry of $z \mapsto |K(z)|$. By similar reasoning used to attain (3.14), we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_U \int_U \text{sgn}(u - v) (K *_x u - K *_y v) \rho_\varepsilon \varphi dx dt dy ds \\ & \leq \int_U |u - v| (|K| * \varphi) dx dt, \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

where the v on the right-hand side of (3.16) is a function in (t, x) . Combining (3.13) with (3.15) and (3.16), yields the inequality

$$0 \leq \int_U |u - v| \left[\varphi_t + M|\varphi_x| + |K| * \varphi \right] dx dt, \quad (3.17)$$

where again, both u and v are now functions in (t, x) . By density, we may extend (3.17) to hold for all non-negative $\varphi \in W_0^{1,1}((0, T) \times \mathbb{R})$. Thus, we can set $\varphi(t, x) = \theta(t)\phi(t, x)$ for two non-negative functions $\theta \in W_0^{1,1}((0, T))$ and $\phi \in W^{1,1}((0, T) \times \mathbb{R})$ where we note that ϕ need not vanish at $t = 0$ and $t = T$. In doing so, (3.17) yields

$$0 \leq \int_U |u - v| \theta' \phi dx dt + \int_U |u - v| \theta \left[\phi_t + M|\phi_x| + |K| * \phi \right] dx dt, \quad (3.18)$$

To rid ourselves of the second integral, we now construct a particular ϕ such that the square bracket in (3.18) is non-positive in $(0, T) \times \mathbb{R}$. Let $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be smooth, non-increasing and satisfy $f(x) = 1$ for $x \leq 0$ and $f(x) = 0$ for sufficiently large x , and define

$$g(t, x) = f(|x| + M(t - T)). \quad (3.19)$$

By the properties of f , it is readily checked that $g \in C_c^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{R})$. We now define the function ϕ to be

$$\phi(t, x) = \left(e^{(T-t)|K|*} g(t, \cdot) \right)(x), \quad (3.20)$$

where we used the operator defined in (3.1). Observe that ϕ is non-negative and smooth on $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$ with integrable derivatives; this last part follows when using (3.2). That the square bracket in (3.18) is non-positive, can be seen as follows: note first from (3.19) that

$$\begin{aligned} g_t(t, x) &= M f'(|x| + M(t - T)), \\ g_x(t, x) &= \operatorname{sgn}(x) f'(|x| + M(t - T)). \end{aligned}$$

As f' is non-positive, we find $g_t = -M|g_x|$. Thus, using (3.20) we calculate for $t \in (0, T)$

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_t + |K| * \phi &= e^{(T-t)|K|*} g_t, \\ &= -M \left(e^{(T-t)|K|*} |g_x| \right), \\ &\leq -M \left| e^{(T-t)|K|*} g_x \right| \\ &= -M |\phi_x|, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds as differentiation commutes with convolution. In conclusion, the second integral in (3.18) is non-positive. Next, for a small parameter $\epsilon > 0$ we set $\theta = \theta_\epsilon$ where θ_ϵ is given by

$$\theta_\epsilon(t) = \begin{cases} t/\epsilon, & t \in (0, \epsilon), \\ 1, & t \in (\epsilon, T - \epsilon), \\ (T - t)/\epsilon, & t \in (T - \epsilon, T). \end{cases} \quad (3.21)$$

Inserting this in (3.18), removing the non-positive integral and letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} &\liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{T-\epsilon}^T \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |u(t, x) - v(t, x)| \phi(t, x) dx \right) \frac{dt}{\epsilon} \\ &\leq \limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_0^\epsilon \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |u(t, x) - v(t, x)| \phi(t, x) dx \right) \frac{dt}{\epsilon} \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

where we moved the negative term over to the left-hand side. As u and v are bounded on $(0, T) \times \mathbb{R}$ and continuous at $t = 0$ in L^1_{loc} sense, it is easy to see that $|u(t, \cdot) - v(t, \cdot)| \phi(t, \cdot) \rightarrow |u_0(\cdot) - v_0(\cdot)| \phi(0, \cdot)$ in $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ when $t \rightarrow 0$ since the same is true for $\phi(t, x)$ and $\phi(0, x)$. Thus the right-hand side of (3.22) is given by

$$\limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_0^\epsilon \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |u(t, x) - v(t, x)| \phi(t, x) dx \right) \frac{dt}{\epsilon} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} |u_0 - v_0| \phi(0, x) dx.$$

As for the left-hand side, we wish to apply the Lebesgue differentiation theorem so to get convergence for a.e. $T > 0$, but this can not be directly done due to the implicit T -dependence of ϕ . Instead, we observe from (3.19) and (3.20) that $\phi(T, x) = g(T, x) = f(|x|)$ where the latter function is independent of T . Since

$\varphi(t, \cdot) \rightarrow f(|\cdot|)$ in $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ as $t \rightarrow T$, the boundness of u and v means that $|u(t, \cdot) - v(t, \cdot)|(\varphi(t, \cdot) - f(|\cdot|)) \rightarrow 0$ in $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ as $t \rightarrow T$ and so we may estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{T-\epsilon}^T \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |u(t, x) - v(t, x)| \phi(t, x) dx \right) \frac{dt}{\epsilon} \\ &= \limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{T-\epsilon}^T \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |u(t, x) - v(t, x)| f(|x|) dx \right) \frac{dt}{\epsilon} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} |u(T, x) - v(T, x)| f(|x|) dx, \quad \text{a.e. } T \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality used the Lebesgue differentiation theorem. Thus we conclude from (3.22) that we for a.e. $T \geq 0$ have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}} |u(T, x) - v(T, x)| f(|x|) dx \\ & \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} |u_0(x) - v_0(x)| \left(e^{TK} f(|\cdot| - MT) \right) (x) dx, \end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

where we inserted for $\phi(0, x)$ using (3.19) and (3.20). As f was any smooth, non-negative, non-increasing function satisfying $f(x) = 1$ for $x \leq 0$ and $f(x) = 0$ for sufficiently large x , we may in (3.23) set $f = \mathbb{1}_{(-\infty, r)}$ through a standard approximation argument. Doing this, we observe that $f(|x| - MT) = \chi_M^r(T, x)$ where the latter is defined in (3.3), and so we obtain from (3.23) exactly (3.6), with T substituting for t . This concludes the proof. \square

While we in this paper are concerned with global entropy solutions, one may wish to study entropy solutions on a time-bounded domain $(0, T) \times \mathbb{R}$. Such solutions would be defined as in Def. 1.1, but with the test-functions in (1.4) restricted to $C_c^\infty((0, T) \times \mathbb{R})$. Still, no new solutions are attained this way: the uniqueness of entropy solutions on a time-bounded domain follows from the same argument as above, and thus an entropy solution on $(0, T) \times \mathbb{R}$ is the restriction of a global one which the following section establishes the existence of.

3.2. Existence of entropy solutions. In this subsection, we prove the existence of an entropy solution of (1.1) for arbitrary initial data $u_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$. The strategy goes as follows: we first introduce for a parameter $\epsilon > 0$ an approximate solution map $S_{\epsilon, t}: L^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ whose key properties are collected in Proposition 3.2. Next, we show in Lemma 3.4 that when $S_{\epsilon, t}$ is applied to sufficiently regular initial data u_0 , we attain approximate entropy solutions. Further, in Proposition 3.5 we establish the convergence (as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$) of these approximations to an entropy solution, and the result is extended to general L^∞ data in Corollary 3.6. Throughout the section, we occasionally refer to the space $C([0, \infty), L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}))$ of functions $u \in L_{\text{loc}}^1([0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R})$ such that $t \mapsto u(t, \cdot)$ is a continuous mapping from $[0, \infty)$ to $L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R})$. By an operator splitting argument, we aim to build entropy solutions of (1.1) from those of Burgers' equation, $u_t + \frac{1}{2}(u^2)_x = 0$, and the linear convolution equation, $u_t = K * u$. On that note, we introduce two families of operators $(S_t^B)_{t \geq 0}$ and $(S_t^K)_{t \geq 0}$ parameterized over $t \geq 0$. The operator $S_t^B: L^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is the solution map for Burgers' equation restricted to L^∞ data at time t ; that is,

$$S_t^B: f \mapsto u^f(t, \cdot), \tag{3.24}$$

where $(t, x) \mapsto u^f(t, x)$ is the unique entropy solution in $L_{\text{loc}}^\infty([0, \infty), L^\infty(\mathbb{R})) \cap C([0, \infty), L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}))$ (see [18]) for the problem

$$\begin{cases} u_t + \frac{1}{2}(u^2)_x = 0, & (t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}, \\ u(0, x) = f(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}. \end{cases}$$

Note that S_t^B is a flow map in the sense that $S_{t_1}^B \circ S_{t_2}^B = S_{t_1+t_2}^B$ for all $t_1, t_2 \geq 0$. The second map $S_t^K : L^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is for $t \geq 0$ defined by

$$S_t^K : f \mapsto f + tK * f. \quad (3.25)$$

The actual solution map for the equation $u_t = K * u$ is the operator e^{tK*} defined as (3.1) with K replacing $|K|$; the reason we have instead chosen S_t^K as (3.25) (which can be seen as a first order approximation of e^{tK*}) is for our calculations to be slightly tidier. Note however, S_t^K is not a flow mapping. With these two families of operators, we build a third family of operators $S_{\varepsilon,t}$: for fixed parameters $\varepsilon > 0$ and $t \geq 0$, pick $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $s \in [0, \varepsilon)$ such that $t = s + n\varepsilon$, and define

$$S_{\varepsilon,t} = S_s^B \circ \left[S_\varepsilon^K \circ S_\varepsilon^B \right]^{on}, \quad (3.26)$$

where the notation on implies that the square bracket is composed with itself $(n-1)$ times; if $n = 0$, then the square bracket should be replaced by the identity. We shall demonstrate that as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ the map $S_{\varepsilon,t}$ converges in an appropriate sense to the solution map for entropy solutions of (1.1). We begin by collecting a few properties of $S_{\varepsilon,t}$ when applied to the space $BV(\mathbb{R})$; this subspace of $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ is equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{BV(\mathbb{R})} = \|\cdot\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} + |\cdot|_{TV}$, where the total variation seminorm $|\cdot|_{TV}$ coincides with $|\cdot|_{TV^1}$ as defined in (1.5). A short and effective discussion of $BV(\mathbb{R})$ can be found in either [8] or [13]; we note that functions in $BV(\mathbb{R})$ have essential right and left limits at each point, and their height is bounded by their total variation, thus $BV(\mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow L^1 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$.

Proposition 3.2. *With $S_{\varepsilon,t}$ as defined in (3.26), we have for all $\varepsilon > 0$, $t \geq \tilde{t} \geq 0$, $f \in BV(\mathbb{R})$ and $p \in [1, \infty]$*

$$\|S_{\varepsilon,t}(f)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})} \leq e^{t\kappa} \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})}, \quad (L^p \text{ bound}),$$

$$\|S_{\varepsilon,t}(f)\|_{TV} \leq e^{t\kappa} \|f\|_{TV}, \quad (TV \text{ bound}),$$

$$\|S_{\varepsilon,t}(f) - S_{\varepsilon,\tilde{t}}(f)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} \leq (t - \tilde{t} + \varepsilon)C_f(t), \quad (\text{Approximate time continuity}),$$

where $\kappa := \|K\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}$ and where the factor $C_f(t)$ only depends on f and t .

Proof. Consider $\varepsilon > 0$ fixed. We will be using the following properties of the mappings S_t^B and S_t^K

$$\|S_t^B(f)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})} \leq \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})}, \quad \|S_t^K(f)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})} \leq e^{t\kappa} \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})}, \quad (3.27)$$

$$|S_t^B(f)|_{TV} \leq |f|_{TV}, \quad |S_t^K(f)|_{TV} \leq e^{t\kappa} |f|_{TV}, \quad (3.28)$$

$$\|S_t^B(f) - f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} \leq t|f|_{TV}^2, \quad \|S_t^K(f) - f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} \leq t\kappa \|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}, \quad (3.29)$$

valid for all $t \geq 0$, $p \in [1, \infty]$ and $f \in BV(\mathbb{R})$. The inequalities involving S_t^B are well known and can be found for example in [13]. As for the inequalities involving S_t^K , these estimates follow directly from the definition of S_t^K (3.25) together with Young's convolution inequality and $1 + t\kappa \leq e^{t\kappa}$. We start by proving the L^p and TV bound of the proposition. For this we fix $t \geq 0$ and pick $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $s \in [0, \varepsilon)$

such that $t = s + n\varepsilon$, and pick an arbitrary $f \in BV(\mathbb{R})$. By iteration of the two inequalities in (3.27) we attain

$$\|S_{\varepsilon,t}(f)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})} = \|S_s^B \circ [S_\varepsilon^K \circ S_\varepsilon^B]^{on}(f)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})} \leq e^{n\varepsilon\kappa} \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})}, \quad (3.30)$$

for all $p \in [1, \infty]$, and by iteration of the inequalities in (3.28) we similarly get

$$|S_{\varepsilon,t}(f)|_{TV} = |S_s^B \circ [S_\varepsilon^K \circ S_\varepsilon^B]^{on}(f)|_{TV} \leq e^{n\varepsilon\kappa} |f|_{TV}. \quad (3.31)$$

This gives the first two bounds of the proposition. For the time continuity, we pick $\tilde{t} \in [0, t]$ and $\tilde{n} \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\tilde{s} \in [0, \varepsilon)$ such that $\tilde{t} = \tilde{s} + \tilde{n}\varepsilon$. Suppose first that $t - \tilde{t} \leq \varepsilon$, and set $\tilde{f} = S_{\varepsilon,\tilde{n}\varepsilon}(f)$. Then either $S_{\varepsilon,t}(f) = S_{s-\tilde{s}}^B(\tilde{f})$ or $S_{\varepsilon,t}(f) = S_s^B \circ S_\varepsilon^K \circ S_{\varepsilon-\tilde{s}}^B(\tilde{f})$ corresponding to the two situations $n = \tilde{n}$ and $n = \tilde{n} + 1$; we will only deal with the latter as the other case is dealt with similarly. By the triangle inequality we then have

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_{\varepsilon,t}(f) - S_{\varepsilon,\tilde{t}}(f)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} &\leq \|S_s^B \circ S_\varepsilon^K \circ S_{\varepsilon-\tilde{s}}^B(\tilde{f}) - S_\varepsilon^K \circ S_{\varepsilon-\tilde{s}}^B(\tilde{f})\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} \\ &\quad + \|S_\varepsilon^K \circ S_{\varepsilon-\tilde{s}}^B(\tilde{f}) - S_{\varepsilon-\tilde{s}}^B(\tilde{f})\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} + \|S_{\varepsilon-\tilde{s}}^B(\tilde{f}) - \tilde{f}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}. \end{aligned}$$

The three terms on the right-hand side can be directly dealt with using the two inequalities (3.29) followed by the estimates (3.30) and (3.31). Doing so in a straight forward manner results in the bound

$$se^{2n\varepsilon\kappa} |f|_{TV}^2 + \varepsilon\kappa e^{\tilde{n}\varepsilon\kappa} \|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} + (\varepsilon - \tilde{s})e^{2\tilde{n}\varepsilon\kappa} |f|_{TV}^2 \leq \varepsilon e^{2t\kappa} (2|f|_{TV}^2 + \kappa \|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}).$$

Thus, setting for example $C_f(t) = e^{2t\kappa} (2|f|_{TV}^2 + \kappa \|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})})$ the time continuity estimate holds whenever $t - \tilde{t} \leq \varepsilon$. By breaking any large time step into steps of size no larger than ε , the general case follows by the triangle inequality. \square

The L^p bound provided by the previous proposition was attained by applying Young's convolution inequality on the operator $K*$; in doing so, we miss possible cancellations that might take place as K , after all, is an odd function. While efficient L^p bounds might not be feasible for general $p \geq 1$, these cancellations are easily exploited for the L^2 norm as seen from the following lemma. This L^2 control is crucial for the analysis of Section 4.

Lemma 3.3. *With $S_{\varepsilon,t}$ as defined in (3.26), we have for all $\varepsilon > 0$, $t \geq 0$ and $f \in L^2 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$*

$$\|S_{\varepsilon,t}(f)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq e^{\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon t\kappa^2} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})},$$

where $\kappa := \|K\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}$.

Proof. Consider $\varepsilon > 0$ and $t \geq 0$ fixed. As K is odd, real valued and in $L^1(\mathbb{R})$, it is readily checked that $K*$ is a skew-symmetric operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$, that is

$$\langle f, K * g \rangle = -\langle K * f, g \rangle,$$

for all $f, g \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$, and consequently $\langle f, K * f \rangle = 0$ for all $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$. In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_\varepsilon^K(f)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 &= \langle f + \varepsilon K * f, f + \varepsilon K * f \rangle \\ &= \langle f, f \rangle + \varepsilon^2 \langle K * f, K * f \rangle \\ &\leq (1 + \varepsilon^2 \kappa^2) \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combined with $1 + \varepsilon^2 \kappa^2 \leq e^{\varepsilon^2 \kappa^2}$ and the fact that S_ε^B is non-expansive on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ (left-most inequality in (3.27)), the result follows by iteration. \square

When $u_0 \in BV(\mathbb{R})$, we can use $S_{\varepsilon,t}$ to construct a family of approximate entropy solutions of (1.1) as follows. For an arbitrary, but fixed, $u_0 \in BV(\mathbb{R})$, let the family $(u^\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon>0} \subset L^\infty_{\text{loc}}([0, \infty), L^\infty(\mathbb{R}))$ be defined by

$$u^\varepsilon(t) = S_{\varepsilon,t}(u_0), \quad (3.32)$$

where $u^\varepsilon(t)$ is compact notation for $x \mapsto u^\varepsilon(t, x)$ and $S_{\varepsilon,t}$ is as defined in (3.26). Although $(u^\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon>0}$ is considered a family in $L^\infty_{\text{loc}}([0, \infty), L^\infty(\mathbb{R}))$, we stress that each member is for all $t \geq 0$ well defined in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$. For small $\varepsilon > 0$ these functions are not far off from satisfying the entropy inequality (1.4), as we now show.

Lemma 3.4. *With $(u^\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon>0}$ as defined in (3.32) for some $u_0 \in BV(\mathbb{R})$, we have for every entropy pair (η, q) of (1.1) and non-negative $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R})$ the approximate entropy inequality*

$$\int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta(u^\varepsilon) \varphi_t + q(u^\varepsilon) \varphi_x + \eta'(u^\varepsilon)(K * u^\varepsilon) \varphi dx dt \geq O(\varepsilon).$$

Proof. Fixing $\varepsilon > 0$, we observe from the definition of $S_{\varepsilon,t}$ (3.26) that u^ε is an entropy solution of Burgers' equation on the open sets $(t_{n-1}^\varepsilon, t_n^\varepsilon) \times \mathbb{R}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where $t_n^\varepsilon = n\varepsilon$; thus

$$\int_{t_{n-1}^\varepsilon}^{t_n^\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta(u^\varepsilon) \varphi_t + q(u^\varepsilon) \varphi_x dx dt \geq 0, \quad (3.33)$$

for every non-negative $\varphi \in C_c^\infty((t_{n-1}^\varepsilon, t_n^\varepsilon) \times \mathbb{R})$ and every entropy pair (η, q) of Burgers' equation, which coincides with the entropy pairs of (1.1) as the convection term of the two equations agree. Moreover, by the time continuity of S_t^B (3.28) and the TV bound from Proposition 3.2, we see that $u^\varepsilon \in C([t_{n-1}^\varepsilon, t_n^\varepsilon], L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}))$; at $t = t_n^\varepsilon$ it is discontinuous from the left, as the left limit is given by $u^\varepsilon(t_n^\varepsilon -) = S_\varepsilon^B(u^\varepsilon(t_{n-1}^\varepsilon))$, while we have defined

$$u^\varepsilon(t_n^\varepsilon) = u^\varepsilon(t_n^\varepsilon -) + \varepsilon K * u^\varepsilon(t_n^\varepsilon -). \quad (3.34)$$

The continuity in time allows us, by a similar trick used to attain (3.22), to extend (3.33) to

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{t_{n-1}^\varepsilon}^{t_n^\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta(u^\varepsilon) \varphi_t + q(u^\varepsilon) \varphi_x dx dt &\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta(u^\varepsilon(t_n^\varepsilon -)) \varphi(t_n^\varepsilon, x) dx \\ &\quad - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta(u^\varepsilon(t_{n-1}^\varepsilon)) \varphi(t_{n-1}^\varepsilon, x) dx, \end{aligned} \quad (3.35)$$

for all non-negative $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R})$. For the remainder of the proof, consider the entropy pair (η, q) and $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R})$ fixed. Summing (3.35) over $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and using $\varphi(0, x) = 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}} \eta(u^\varepsilon) \varphi_t + q(u^\varepsilon) \varphi_x dx dt \\ &\geq \sum_{n=1}^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[\eta(u^\varepsilon(t_n^\varepsilon -)) - \eta(u^\varepsilon(t_n^\varepsilon)) \right] \varphi(t_n^\varepsilon, x) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (3.36)$$

By Proposition 3.2, the family $(u^\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon>0}$ is uniformly bounded on the support of φ , and so we can assume without loss of generality that $|\eta'|, |\eta''| < C_1$ for some large

C_1 . Using the relation (3.34), the square bracket from (3.36) can thus be estimated

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta(u^\varepsilon(t_n^\varepsilon -)) - \eta(u^\varepsilon(t_n^\varepsilon)) \\ & \geq -\varepsilon \eta'(u^\varepsilon(t_n^\varepsilon -)) \left[K * u^\varepsilon(t_n^\varepsilon -) \right] - \frac{C_1 \varepsilon^2}{2} |K * u^\varepsilon(t_n^\varepsilon -)|^2, \end{aligned}$$

which, again by the uniform bound of u^ε on the compact support of φ , further implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[\eta(u^\varepsilon(t_n^\varepsilon -)) - \eta(u^\varepsilon(t_n^\varepsilon)) \right] \varphi(t_n^\varepsilon, x) dx \\ & \geq -\varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta'(u^\varepsilon(t_n^\varepsilon -)) \left[K * u^\varepsilon(t_n^\varepsilon -) \right] \varphi(t_n, x) dx - C_2 \varepsilon^2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.37)$$

for some $C_2 > 0$ independent of n and ε . Combining the uniform time regularity of Proposition 3.2 and the compact support of φ , we see that the function

$$g_\varepsilon(t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta'(u^\varepsilon(t)) \left[K * u^\varepsilon(t) \right] \varphi(t, x) dx, \quad (3.38)$$

satisfies for all $t \geq \tilde{t} \geq 0$ an inequality $|g_\varepsilon(t) - g_\varepsilon(\tilde{t})| \leq C_3(t - \tilde{t} + \varepsilon)$ for some sufficiently large C_3 independent of ε . Thus, the integral on the right-hand side of (3.37) can be bounded from below as such

$$\begin{aligned} & -\varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta'(u^\varepsilon(t_n^\varepsilon -)) \left[K * u^\varepsilon(t_n^\varepsilon -) \right] \varphi(t_n, x) dx \\ & = -\int_{t_{n-1}^\varepsilon}^{t_n^\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta'(u^\varepsilon(t_n^\varepsilon -)) \left[K * u^\varepsilon(t_n^\varepsilon -) \right] \varphi(t_n, x) dx dt \\ & \geq -\int_{t_{n-1}^\varepsilon}^{t_n^\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta'(u^\varepsilon(t)) \left[K * u^\varepsilon(t) \right] \varphi(t, x) dx dt - 2C_3 \varepsilon^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.39)$$

Picking the smallest $N(\varepsilon) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\text{supp } \varphi \cap (\varepsilon N(\varepsilon), \infty) \times \mathbb{R} = \emptyset$, we combine (3.36), (3.37) and (3.39) to deduce

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}} \eta(u^\varepsilon) \varphi_t + q(u^\varepsilon) \varphi_x + \eta'(u^\varepsilon) (K * u^\varepsilon) \varphi dx dt \geq CN(\varepsilon) \varepsilon^2,$$

for some sufficiently large $C > 0$. And as $N(\varepsilon) \varepsilon^2 \sim \varepsilon$ the proof is complete. \square

With the previous result at hand, it is natural to look for a limit function of $(u^\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon > 0}$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$; this would be a suitable candidate for an entropy solution of (1.1) with initial data $u_0 \in BV(\mathbb{R})$. In the next proposition, we do exactly this and collect a few properties about the resulting solution.

Proposition 3.5. *For any initial data $u_0 \in BV(\mathbb{R})$, let $(u^\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon > 0}$ be as defined in (3.32). Then, for all $t \geq 0$ the following limit holds in $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$*

$$u^\varepsilon(t) \rightarrow u(t), \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow 0, \quad (3.40)$$

where u is an entropy solution of (1.1) with initial data u_0 . Moreover, u is an element of $C([0, \infty), L^1(\mathbb{R})) \cap L^\infty_{\text{loc}}([0, \infty), L^\infty(\mathbb{R}))$ and satisfies for all $t \geq 0$

$$\|u(t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq e^{t\kappa} \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}, \quad (3.41)$$

$$\|u(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}, \quad (3.42)$$

where $\kappa := \|K\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}$.

Proof. We first prove the limit (3.40) for a special subsequence of $(u^\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon>0}$ and then generalize afterwards. Fixing $t \geq 0$, we see from Proposition 3.2 that the functions $(u^\varepsilon(t))_{\varepsilon>0}$ satisfy for any $p \in [1, \infty]$

$$\|u^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})} \leq e^{t\kappa} \|u_0\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})}, \quad (3.43)$$

and in particular, they are uniformly bounded in $L^1(\mathbb{R})$. Moreover, they are equicontinuous with respect to translation

$$\|u^\varepsilon(t, \cdot + h) - u^\varepsilon(t, \cdot)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} \leq h e^{t\kappa} |u_0|_{TV},$$

for all $h > 0$, and so by the Kolmogorov–Riesz compactness Theorem, any infinite subset of $(u^\varepsilon(t))_{\varepsilon>0}$ is relatively compact in $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$; as we have skipped developing a tightness estimate for $(u^\varepsilon(t))_{\varepsilon>0}$, we can not claim the family to be relatively compact in $L^1(\mathbb{R})$. The family $(u^\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon>0}$ is not equicontinuous in time and so we can not directly apply the Arzelà–Ascoli theorem, however, the family is for small ε arbitrary close to be equicontinuous and so the proof of the theorem is still applicable; for clarity we perform the steps. By a standard diagonalization argument, we can select a subsequence $(u^{\varepsilon_j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset (u^\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon>0}$ such that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_j = 0$ and $u^{\varepsilon_j}(t)$ converges in $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$ for every $t \in E$ with E being a countable dense subset of \mathbb{R}^+ . Next, we claim that $u^{\varepsilon_j}(t)$ converges in $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$ for every $t \geq 0$. Indeed, fix $r > 0$ for locality and pick $s \in E$ such that $|s - t| < \varepsilon$ for some arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$. By the time regularity estimate of Proposition 3.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{j, i \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-r}^r |u^{\varepsilon_j}(t) - u^{\varepsilon_i}(t)| dx \\ & \leq \limsup_{j, i \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-r}^r |u^{\varepsilon_j}(t) - u^{\varepsilon_j}(s)| + |u^{\varepsilon_j}(s) - u^{\varepsilon_i}(s)| + |u^{\varepsilon_i}(s) - u^{\varepsilon_i}(t)| dx \\ & \leq \limsup_{j, i \rightarrow \infty} (2\varepsilon + \varepsilon_j + \varepsilon_i) C_{u_0}(t + \varepsilon) + \limsup_{j, i \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-r}^r |u^{\varepsilon_j}(s) - u^{\varepsilon_i}(s)| dx \\ & = 2\varepsilon C_{u_0}(t + \varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

and since r and ε were arbitrary, we conclude that $u^{\varepsilon_j}(t)$ converges in $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$ to some $u(t)$. Moreover, as $u^{\varepsilon_j}(t)$ converges locally to $u(t)$, the bound (3.43) necessarily carries over to $u(t)$, and so in particular

$$\|u(t)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})} \leq e^{t\kappa} \|u_0\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})},$$

and further by Fatou’s lemma we infer for all $t \geq \tilde{t} \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \|u(t) - u(\tilde{t})\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} & \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|u^{\varepsilon_j}(t) - u^{\varepsilon_j}(\tilde{t})\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} \\ & \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} (t - \tilde{t} + \varepsilon_j) C_{u_0}(t) \\ & = (t - \tilde{t}) C_{u_0}(t). \end{aligned} \quad (3.44)$$

Thus $u \in C([0, \infty), L^1(\mathbb{R})) \cap L^\infty_{\text{loc}}([0, \infty), L^\infty(\mathbb{R}))$. Next, we prove that u is, in accordance with Def. 1.1, an entropy solution of (1.1) with initial data u_0 ; the latter part follows from $u(0) = u_0$ and (3.44). To see that u satisfies the entropy inequalities (1.4), we pick an arbitrary entropy pair (η, q) of (1.1) and a non-negative

$\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R})$ and recall Lemma 3.4 to calculate

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta(u) \varphi_t + q(u) \varphi_x + \eta'(u)(K * u) \varphi dx dt \\ &= \lim_{j \rightarrow 0} \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta(u^{\varepsilon_j}) \varphi_t + q(u^{\varepsilon_j}) \varphi_x + \eta'(u^{\varepsilon_j})(K * u^{\varepsilon_j}) \varphi dx dt \\ &\geq \lim_{j \rightarrow 0} O(\varepsilon_j) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.45)$$

where the second line holds as the integrand converges in $L^1(\mathbb{R})$; after all, $(u^{\varepsilon_j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded on the compact support of φ . By Proposition 3.1 we conclude that u is the unique entropy solution of (1.1) with u_0 as initial data. What remains to show, is the general limit (3.40) and the L^2 bound of u (3.42); the latter follow by Lemma 3.3 and Fatou's lemma. We prove (3.40) by contradiction; if this limit does not exist, then there is a subsequence $(u^{\varepsilon_j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset (u^\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon > 0}$, a $t > 0$ and an $r > 0$ such that

$$\liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-r}^r |u(t) - u^{\varepsilon_j}(t)| dx > 0.$$

But as argued above, the infinite set $(u^{\varepsilon_j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ must be precompact in $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$ for every $t \geq 0$, and thus we can pick a subsequence converging for every $t \geq 0$ in $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$ to the unique (Proposition 3.1) entropy solution u which contradicts the above limit inferior. \square

The existence of entropy solutions for general L^∞ data now follows from the previous proposition together with the weighted L^1 -contraction provided by Proposition 3.1. It is useful to observe that the weight w_M^r (3.4) is increasing in t . In particular, with u, v, t, r and M as in (3.6), we have the contraction

$$\int_{-r}^r |u(t, x) - v(t, x)| dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} |u_0(x) - v_0(x)| w_M^r(T, x) dx, \quad (3.46)$$

where $T \in (0, \infty)$ is any parameter satisfying $T > t$. We note that while Proposition 3.1 only implies the validity of (3.46) for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$, we will in the following corollary apply it on entropy solutions with BV data; as the previous proposition guaranteed that these functions are continuous from $[0, \infty)$ to $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$, the above contraction holds for all $t \in [0, T]$.

Corollary 3.6. *For any initial data $u_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, there exists a corresponding entropy solution $u \in C([0, \infty), L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}))$ of (1.1) satisfying for all $t \geq 0$*

$$\|u(t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq e^{t\kappa} \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}, \quad (3.47)$$

where $\kappa := \|K\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}$. If $u_0 \in L^2 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, it also satisfies for all $t \geq 0$

$$\|u(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}. \quad (3.48)$$

Proof. For $u_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, let $(u^j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of entropy solutions of (1.1) whose corresponding initial data $(u_0^j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset BV(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies $\sup_j \|u_0^j\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}$ and $u_0^j \rightarrow u_0$ in $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. For a fixed $T > 0$, set

$$M = e^{T\kappa} \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})},$$

and observe from (3.41) that $\sup_j \|u^j(t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq M$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. In particular, (3.46) is valid for all substitutions $(u, v) \mapsto (u^j, u^i)$ and all parameters $r > 0$, $t \in [0, T]$ and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Using this contraction, we may estimate for any $r > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{j,i \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int_{-r}^r |u^j(t, x) - u^i(t, x)| dx \\ & \leq \limsup_{j,i \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |u_0^j(x) - u_0^i(x)| w_M^r(T, x) dx = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last limit holds by the dominated convergence theorem. This shows that $(u^j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is Cauchy in the Fréchet space $C([0, \infty), L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}))$ and so the sequence converge to some $u \in C([0, \infty), L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}))$. Moreover,

$$\|u(t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|u^j(t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq e^{t\kappa} \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})},$$

by (3.41), and so $u \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty([0, \infty), L^\infty(\mathbb{R}))$ too. That u takes u_0 as initial data in L_{loc}^1 -sense follows from the time-continuity of u and $u(0) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} u_0^j = u_0$ where the limit is taken in $L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R})$. Moreover, as each member $(u^j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the entropy inequalities (1.4), the same can be said for u by a similar calculation as (3.45). Thus the corollary is proved, save for the L^2 estimate; this is attained through Fatou's lemma and (3.42) as we may assume $\sup_j \|u_0^j\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}$. \square

3.3. L^2 continuity and stability of entropy solutions. For clarity, we summarize what of Theorem 2.1 has been proved so far and what remains to be proved. Combining Proposition 3.1 and Corollary 3.6, we conclude that there exists a unique entropy solution of (1.1) in accordance with Def. 1.1 for every initial data $u_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and thus also for $u_0 \in L^2 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$. Furthermore, Corollary 3.6 guarantees that these solutions are continuous from $[0, \infty)$ to $L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R})$ so that the restriction $u(t) := u(t, \cdot) \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R})$ makes sense for all $t \geq 0$. The same corollary also provides the bounds (2.1) of Theorem 2.1. It remains to prove that entropy solutions with $L^2 \cap L^\infty$ data are continuous from $[0, \infty)$ to $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and that they satisfy the stability result of Theorem 2.1. To do so, we shall exploit the height bound of Corollary 2.6. As explained at the beginning of Section 4, Corollary 2.6 can be proved for the case $u_0 \in L^2 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ independently of this subsection; thus we may here use the height bound (2.5) for entropy solutions of (1.1) without risking a circular argument. From here til the end of the section, we take the above properties of entropy solutions for granted. We begin with a variant of Proposition 3.1 which makes use of the above discussed height bound.

Lemma 3.7. *There is a function $\Psi: [0, \infty)^3 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, increasing in all arguments, such that for any pair of entropy solutions u, v of (1.1) with respective initial data $u_0, v_0 \in L^2 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ one has for any $t, r \geq 0$ and $N \geq \max\{\|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}, \|v_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}\}$ the inequality*

$$\|u(t) - v(t)\|_{L^1([-r, r])} \leq \Psi(t, N, r) \|u_0 - v_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}. \quad (3.49)$$

Proof. Let u, v, u_0, v_0 and N be as described in the lemma. By (2.5) from Corollary 2.6, and the property of N , we have for all $t > 0$

$$\frac{\|u(t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} + \|v(t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}}{2} \leq CN^{\frac{2}{3}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{\frac{1}{3}}}\right) =: m(t), \quad (3.50)$$

where $C := \max\{2^{\frac{11}{12}}3^{\frac{1}{3}}\|K\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}^{\frac{1}{3}}, 2^{\frac{5}{4}}\}$. With $F(u, v) := \frac{1}{2}\text{sgn}(u-v)(u^2-v^2)$, we have for any non-negative $\varphi \in C_c^\infty((0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R})$ the inequality

$$0 \leq \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}} |u-v|\varphi_t + F(u, v)\varphi_x + |u-v|(|K| * \varphi) dx dt. \quad (3.51)$$

This is attained by following the first half of the proof of Proposition 3.1 without using the bound $|F(u, v)| \leq M|u-v|$ as done in the first inequality of (3.14); one may instead, when ‘going to the diagonal’, subtract $F(u(t, x), v(t, x))$ from $F(u(t, x), v(s, y))$ and use

$$|F(u(t, x), v(s, y)) - F(u(t, x), v(x, y))| \lesssim |v(s, y) - v(t, x)|,$$

which follows from local Lipschitz continuity of F and the fact that u and v are globally bounded (as pointed out after Corollary 2.6). With (3.51) established, we may now filter out $(u+v)/2$ from F using the more precise bound (3.50), that is

$$|F(u(t, x), v(t, x))| \leq m(t)|u(t, x) - v(t, x)|.$$

Doing so, and additionally setting $\varphi(t, x) = \theta(t)\phi(t, x)$ for two arbitrary non-negative functions $\theta \in C_c^\infty((0, T))$ and $\phi \in C_c^\infty((0, T) \times \mathbb{R})$, with $T > 0$ also arbitrary, we conclude from (3.51) that

$$0 \leq \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}} |u-v|\theta'\phi dx dt + \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}} |u-v|\theta[\phi_t + m(t)|\phi_x| + |K| * \phi] dx dt. \quad (3.52)$$

Observe that (3.52) resembles (3.18); for brevity, we skip minor details in the following steps due to their similarity of those following (3.18). Let $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a smooth and non-increasing function satisfying $f(x) = 1$ for $x \leq 0$ and $f(x) = 0$ for sufficiently large x , and set

$$g(t, x) := f(|x| + M(t) - M(T)),$$

where we have here defined $M(t)$ by

$$M(t) := \int_0^t m(s) ds = CN^{\frac{2}{3}}\left(t + \frac{3}{2}t^{\frac{2}{3}}\right),$$

not to be confused with the constant M from the proof of Proposition 3.1. Analogous to (3.20), we then set

$$\phi(t, x) = \left(e^{(T-t)|K| * g(t, \cdot)}\right)(x), \quad (3.53)$$

and while this ϕ is not of compact support, both it, and its derivatives, are integrable on $(0, T) \times \mathbb{R}$ and so by an approximation argument it can be used in (3.52) (the compact support of θ means the singularity of $m(t)$ at $t = 0$ is not seen). By similar arguments as those following (3.20) we find also here that the second integral in (3.52) is non-positive, and so we may remove it. Letting then θ approximate $\mathbb{1}_{(0, T)}$ in a similar (smooth) manner as done by the sequence (3.21), we may from (3.52) conclude

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |u(T, x) - v(T, x)|\phi(T, x) dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} |u_0(x) - v_0(x)|\phi(0, x) dx, \quad (3.54)$$

where we used that $t \mapsto |u(t, \cdot) - v(t, \cdot)|\phi(t, \cdot)$ is continuous from $[0, T]$ to $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ which holds as the same is true for $t \mapsto \phi(t, \cdot)$ while u and v are both globally bounded and continuous from $[0, T]$ to $L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R})$. Note that $\phi(0, x) = f(|x|)$, and so

letting $f \rightarrow \mathbb{1}_{(-\infty, r)}$ in L^1 sense, the left-hand side of (3.54) becomes the left-hand side of (3.49). When $f \rightarrow \mathbb{1}_{(-\infty, r)}$ we also get from (3.53) that

$$\phi(0, x) \rightarrow \left(e^{T|K|*} \mathbb{1}_{(-\infty, r)}(|\cdot| - M(T)) \right)(x), \quad (3.55)$$

in L^1 sense. Denoting the right-hand side of (3.55) also by $\phi(0, x)$, it follows by Young's convolution inequality that

$$\|\phi(0, x)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq e^{T\kappa} [2r + 2M(T)]^{\frac{1}{2}} = e^{T\kappa} \left[2r + 2CN^{\frac{2}{3}} \left(t + \frac{3}{2}t^{\frac{2}{3}} \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (3.56)$$

where $\kappa := \|K\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}$. Applying then the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality to the right-hand side of (3.54), and using the above L^2 bound for $\phi(0, x)$, we attain (3.49) (with T substituting for t) for $\Psi(T, N, r)$ given by the right-hand side of (3.56). \square

We follow up with a tightness bound for entropy solutions with $L^2 \cap L^\infty$ data.

Lemma 3.8. *There is a function $\Phi: [0, \infty)^2 \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, increasing in all arguments, such that if u is an entropy solution of (1.1) with initial data $u_0 \in L^2 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, then for any $t, r \geq 0$ and $N \geq \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}$*

$$\int_{|x|>r} u^2(t, x) dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} u_0^2(x) \Phi(t, N, |x| - r) dx. \quad (3.57)$$

Moreover,

$$\lim_{\xi \rightarrow -\infty} \Phi(t, N, \xi) = 0, \quad \Phi(t, N, \xi) = e^{2t\kappa}, \quad \xi > 0,$$

where $\kappa := \|K\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}$, and in particular, $\xi \mapsto \Phi(t, M, \xi)$ is a bounded function.

Proof. Pick arbitrary initial data $u_0 \in L^2 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and let u denote the corresponding entropy solution of (1.1). Writing out the entropy inequality (1.4) for u using the entropy pair $(\eta(u), q(u)) = (u^2, \frac{2}{3}u^3)$ and a non-negative test function $\varphi \in C_c^\infty((0, T) \times \mathbb{R})$, with $T \in (0, \infty)$ fixed, we get

$$0 \leq \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}} u^2 \varphi_t + \frac{2}{3} u^3 \varphi_x + 2u(K * u) \varphi \, dx dt. \quad (3.58)$$

By the height bound (2.5) of Corollary 2.5, we have $\|u(t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq m(t)$ where $m(t)$ is as defined in (3.50), and so the second term of the above integrand satisfies

$$\frac{2}{3} u^3 \varphi_x \leq u^2 \left[\frac{2}{3} m(t) |\varphi_x| \right].$$

Additionally, the third part of the integrand satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} 2u(K * u) \varphi \, dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} 2u(t, x) u(t, y) K(x - y) \varphi(t, x) \, dy dx \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[|u(t, x)|^2 + |u(t, y)|^2 \right] |K(x - y)| \varphi(t, x) \, dy dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} u^2 \left[\kappa \varphi + |K| * \varphi \right] \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Inserting these two bounds in (3.58) we get for any non-negative $\varphi \in C_c^\infty((0, T) \times \mathbb{R})$

$$0 \leq \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}} u^2 \left[\varphi_t + \frac{2}{3} m(t) |\varphi_x| + \mathcal{K} * \varphi \right] \, dx dt, \quad (3.59)$$

where we introduced the measure $\mathcal{K} := \kappa\delta + |K|$, where δ is the Dirac measure. We also here, like the previous proof, proceed in a manner similar to the second half of the proof of Proposition 3.1, though some necessary changes are made. We set $\varphi(t, x) = \theta(t)\rho(x)\phi(t, x)$ for three smooth non-negative functions on $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$ with θ and ρ having compact support in $(0, T)$ and \mathbb{R} respectively. Additionally, while ϕ need not be compactly supported, we require ϕ and its derivatives to be bounded. Inserting this in (3.59) we get

$$0 \leq \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}} u^2 \theta' \rho \phi dx dt + \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}} u^2 \theta \left[\rho \phi_t + \frac{2}{3} m(t) |(\rho \phi)_x| + \mathcal{K} * (\rho \phi) \right] dx dt. \quad (3.60)$$

By approximation, (3.60) is still valid for a non-negative $\theta \in W_0^{1,1}((0, T))$ and so we may set $\theta = \theta_\epsilon$ where the latter given by (3.21), followed by letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ to conclude from (3.60) that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} u^2(T, x) \rho(x) \phi(T, x) dx &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} u_0^2(x) \rho(x) \phi(0, x) dx \\ &\quad + \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}} u^2 \left[\rho \phi_t + \frac{2}{3} m(t) |(\rho \phi)_x| + \mathcal{K} * (\rho \phi) \right] dx dt, \end{aligned} \quad (3.61)$$

where we used that $t \mapsto u^2(t, \cdot) \rho(\cdot) \phi(t, \cdot)$ is continuous in L^1 sense as follows from the L_{loc}^1 continuity and boundness of u , the smoothness of ϕ and the compact support of ρ . Next, we set $\rho(x) = \tilde{\rho}(x/N)$ where $\tilde{\rho} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is non-negative and satisfies $\tilde{\rho}(0) = 1$. Letting $N \rightarrow \infty$, (3.61) yields through the dominated convergence theorem

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} u^2(T, x) \phi(T, x) dx &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} u_0^2(x) \phi(0, x) dx \\ &\quad + \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}} u^2 \left[\phi_t + \frac{2}{3} m(t) |\phi_x| + \mathcal{K} * \phi \right] dx dt, \end{aligned} \quad (3.62)$$

where the convergence of the integrals follows from the boundness of ϕ (and its derivatives) combined with $\|u(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. To rid ourselves of the last integral in (3.62), we perform a similar trick as done for (3.18) and (3.52), but with a different f ; we here let $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a *non-decreasing* function with bounded derivatives. Define further g by

$$g(t, x) := f(|x| + M(T) - M(t)),$$

where $M(t)$ denotes

$$M(t) := \int_0^t \frac{2}{3} m(s) ds = CN^{\frac{2}{3}} \left(\frac{2}{3} t + t^{\frac{2}{3}} \right), \quad (3.63)$$

and analogues to (3.20), we set ϕ to be

$$\phi(t, x) = \left(e^{(T-t)\mathcal{K}*} g(t, \cdot) \right)(x).$$

As $t \mapsto g(t, x)$ is still a non-increasing function, we conclude by similar arguments as those following (3.20) that the square bracket in (3.62) is non-positive. Thus, removing the non-positive integral in (3.62) we conclude

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} u^2(T, x) f(|x|) dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} u_0^2(x) \left(e^{T\mathcal{K}*} f(|\cdot| + M(T)) \right)(x) dx, \quad (3.64)$$

where we used the explicit expressions for $\phi(T, x)$ and $\phi(0, x)$. Letting $f \rightarrow \mathbb{1}_{(r, \infty)}$ pointwise a.e. it is clear that the left-hand side of (3.64) converges to $\int_{|x|>r} u^2(T) dx$. As for the right-hand side, we get the cumbersome term $e^{TK^*} \mathbb{1}_{(r, \infty)}(|\cdot| + MT)$ which we now simplify. Let the Borel measure ν_T be defined by the relation $\nu_T^* = e^{TK^*}$ and observe that we for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ have

$$\left(\nu * \mathbb{1}_{(r, \infty)}(|\cdot| + M(T)) \right)(x) = \int_{|x-y|+M(T)>r} d\nu_T(y) \leq \int_{|x|-r+M(T)>-|y|} d\nu_T(y). \quad (3.65)$$

We thus define $\Phi(T, N, |x|-r)$ to be the latter expression after substituting for $M(T)$ using (3.63). Inserting this in (3.64) we get exactly (3.57) with T substituting for t . The properties of Φ stated in the lemma can be read directly from (3.65) when setting $\xi = |x| - r$ together with the fact that $T \mapsto \nu_T$ is increasing (in the appropriate sense) and $\int_{\mathbb{R}} d\nu_T = e^{TK^*} = e^{2TK}$. \square

We may now prove the remaining part of Theorem 2.1.

Proposition 3.9. *Let two sequences $(t_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset [0, \infty)$ and $(u_{0,k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset L^2 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ admit limits*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |t_k - t| = 0, \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|u_{0,k} - u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = 0,$$

with $t \in [0, \infty)$ and $u_0 \in L^2 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$. Letting $(u_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and u denote the entropy solutions of (1.1) corresponding to the initial data $(u_{0,k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and u_0 respectively, we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|u_k(t_k) - u(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = 0.$$

In particular, entropy solutions of (1.1) with $L^2 \cap L^\infty$ data are continuous from $[0, \infty)$ to $L^2(\mathbb{R})$.

Proof. Suppose first that $t > 0$. As $t_k \rightarrow t$ there is a $T \in (0, \infty)$ such that $(t_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset [0, T]$. Similarly, there is an N such that $N \geq \|v_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}$ for every $v_0 \in \{u_{0,1}, u_{0,2}, \dots, u_0\}$; observe that such an N satisfies $N \geq \|v(t)\|_{L^2}$ for all $t \in [0, T]$ and v ranging over the corresponding entropy solutions. As the function Φ from Lemma 3.8 was increasing in its arguments, we infer for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $r > 0$ that

$$\int_{|x|>r} u_k^2(t_k, x) dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} u_{0,k}^2(x) \Phi(T, N, |x| - r).$$

Furthermore, as $\xi \mapsto \Phi(T, M, \xi)$ is bounded while $u_{0,k}^2 \rightarrow u_0^2$ in $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, it follows that

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{|x|>r} u_k^2(t_k, x) dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} u_0^2(x) \Phi(T, M, |x| - r), \quad (3.66)$$

for any $r > 0$. Since u_0^2 is integrable and $\lim_{\xi \rightarrow -\infty} \Phi(T, M, \xi) = 0$, we may for any $\varepsilon > 0$ pick a sufficiently large $r > 0$ such that the right-hand side of (3.66) is smaller than ε^2 . For such a couple of constants $\varepsilon, r > 0$ we find

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|u_k(t_k) - u(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq 2\varepsilon + \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|u_k(t_k) - u(t)\|_{L^2([-r, r])}. \quad (3.67)$$

To deal with the rightmost term in (3.67), we yet again let m be the function defined in (3.50) using the above N . As $t > 0$, there are only a finite number of elements in

$(t_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ smaller than $t/2$; without loss of generality, we shall assume there are none. By the height bound (2.5) from Corollary 2.6 and m being decreasing in t , it then follows that $\|v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq m(t/2)$ for every $v \in \{u_1(t_1), u_2(t_2), \dots, u(t)\}$. Thus,

$$\|u_k(t_k) - u(t)\|_{L^2([-r,r])}^2 \leq 2m(t/2)\|u_k(t_k) - u(t)\|_{L^1([-r,r])},$$

and by the triangle inequality, we further have

$$\|u_k(t_k) - u(t)\|_{L^1([-r,r])} \leq \|u_k(t_k) - u(t_k)\|_{L^1([-r,r])} + \|u(t_k) - u(t)\|_{L^1([-r,r])}.$$

As $t \mapsto u(t)$ is continuous in L^1_{loc} sense, we have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|u(t_k) - u(t)\|_{L^1([-r,r])} = 0$, while Lemma 3.7 gives us

$$\|u_k(t_k) - u(t_k)\|_{L^1([-r,r])} \leq \Psi(T, N, r)\|u_{0,k} - u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \rightarrow 0, \quad k \rightarrow \infty.$$

The last term of (3.67) is thus zero, and as $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, we conclude $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|u_k(t_k) - u(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = 0$. Suppose next $t = 0$. We have the two immediate properties

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|u_k(t_k) - u_0\|_{L^1([-r,r])} &= 0, \quad \forall r > 0, \\ \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left[\|u_k(t_k)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} - \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \right] &\leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

the first following by the triangle inequality, Lemma 3.7 and the fact that $t \mapsto u(t)$ is continuous in L^1_{loc} sense, while the second follows from using $\|u_k(t_k)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq \|u_{0,k}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}$. Moreover, for any $w \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u_k(t_k) - u_0, u_0 \rangle &= \langle u_k(t_k) - u_0, w \rangle + \langle u_k(t_k) - u_0, u_0 - w \rangle \\ &\leq \|u_0 - u_k(t_k)\|_{L^1(\text{supp}(w))} \|w\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \\ &\quad + \left[\|u_k(t_k)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} + \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \right] \|u_0 - w\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}, \end{aligned}$$

and so, together with the above properties, we see from approximating u_0 (in L^2 sense) by elements in $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ that

$$\langle u_k(t_k) - u_0, u_0 \rangle \rightarrow 0, \quad k \rightarrow \infty.$$

This last limit, and the above limit superior, then give us

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|u_k(t_k) - u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left[\langle u_k(t_k), u_k(t_k) \rangle - \langle u_0, u_0 \rangle \right] - 2 \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \langle u_k(t_k) - u_0, u_0 \rangle \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the stability result of the proposition has been demonstrated. That this implies the continuity of $t \mapsto u(t)$ in L^2 sense follows by considering the sequence of initial data where $u_{0,k} = u_0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. \square

We end the section by proving Corollary 2.2.

Proof of Corollary 2.2. The solution mapping S is by Proposition 3.9 jointly continuous from $[0, \infty) \times (L^2 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}))^*$ to $L^2(\mathbb{R})$, where $(L^2 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}))^*$ denotes the set $L^2 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ equipped with its L^2 subspace-topology. Seeking to extend S to all of $[0, \infty) \times L^2(\mathbb{R})$ in a continuous manner, we note that we have only one choice: whenever a sequence $(u_{0,k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in L^2 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ converges in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$, it follows from Lemma 3.7 that the corresponding entropy solutions $(u_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ form a Cauchy sequence in the Fréchet space $C([0, \infty), L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}))$, and thus they converge to a unique element $u \in C([0, \infty), L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}))$ in the appropriate topology. We now argue that u inherits

all the nice properties of entropy solutions of (1.1) established so far, apart from being bounded at $t = 0$. Denoting $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ for the L^2 limit of $(u_{0,k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, we have by Fatou's lemma

$$\|u(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|u_k(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|u_{0,k}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}.$$

Moreover, as each u_k satisfy the height bound (2.5) this bound also carries over to u , and thus u is locally bounded in $(0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}$. Similarly, as each u_k satisfy the entropy inequalities (1.4), the same is true for u by a limit argument exploiting the uniform bound of $(u_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ on the support of φ and the fact that η and q are smooth; in particular, u is a weak solution of (1.1). Even Lemma 3.7 and Lemma 3.8 carries over to u by approximation. In conclusion, u – and all other weak solutions obtained this way – satisfy every property used for entropy solutions in the proof of Proposition 3.9, and so the proposition extends to these weak solutions. Consequently, S is continuous on the larger set $[0, \infty) \times L^2(\mathbb{R})$, and the proof is complete. \square

4. ONE SIDED HÖLDER REGULARITY FOR ENTROPY SOLUTIONS

In this section we show that entropy solutions of (1.1) with $L^2 \cap L^\infty$ data satisfy one sided Hölder conditions with time-decreasing coefficients. As Subsection 3.3 exploits Corollary 2.6, which is proved using the results established here, we stress that the coming analysis will only depend on the results of Subsection 3.1 and 3.2, thus avoiding a circular argument. In Subsection 4.1 we introduce the necessary building blocks and provide an informal discussion of the idea behind the analysis of Subsection 4.2 where the Hölder conditions are constructed; Theorem 2.3 is proved in the summary following Corollary 4.8. Central in this section is the following object, which in classical terms can be described as a modulus of right upper semi-continuity.

Definition 4.1. We say that a smooth and strictly increasing function $\omega: (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is a *modulus of growth* for $v: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ if for all $h > 0$

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{x \in \mathbb{R}} [v(x+h) - v(x)] \leq \omega(h).$$

The requirement that ω be smooth and strictly increasing is for technical convenience. Note also that we did not require $\omega(0+) = 0$; this is to include the expression (4.10) when $s = 0$.

4.1. Preliminary results. The classical Oleĭnik estimate [8] for entropy solutions of Burgers' equation is for $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}$ and $h \geq 0$ given by

$$u(t, x+h) - u(t, x) \leq \frac{h}{t}. \quad (4.1)$$

For a fixed $t > 0$, this one sided Lipschitz condition (or modulus of growth) restricts how fast $x \mapsto u(t, x)$ can grow, but not how fast it can decrease, thus allowing for jump discontinuities (shocks) whose left limit is above the right. Interestingly, when the initial data of Burgers' equation satisfies $u_0 \in L^p(\mathbb{R})$ for some $p \in [1, \infty)$, one can for the corresponding entropy solution u use (4.1) to attain

$$\|u(t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}^{p+1} \leq \frac{p+1}{t} \|u(t)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})}^p \leq \frac{p+1}{t} \|u_0\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})}^p, \quad (4.2)$$

where the rightmost inequality is just the classical L^p bound for Burgers' equation, and thus, the height of $u(t) = u(t, \cdot)$ tends to zero as $t \rightarrow \infty$. We omit the proof of (4.2), which is similar to that of the next lemma where we provide a general method for bounding the height of a function $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ admitting a modulus of growth ω . Our focus on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ is because the other L^p norms might fail to be non-increasing for entropy solutions of (1.1); the generalization of (4.1) will (surprisingly) require a generalization of (4.2), so $p = 2$ is the natural choice as $\|u(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}$ for entropy solutions of (1.1). In the coming lemma we also provide for later convenience a bound on the following seminorm defined for $v \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ by

$$|v|_\infty := \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{x,y \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{v(x) - v(y)}{2}. \quad (4.3)$$

As $|v|_\infty \leq \|v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}$, any bound on $\|v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}$ obviously carries over to $|v|_\infty$. Note however, that the next lemma bounds $|v|_\infty$ sharper than it does $\|v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}$. Finally, we mention that the extra assumptions posed on ω in the lemma are only for technical simplicity, as the lemma holds more generally.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $v \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ admit a modulus of growth ω that satisfies $\omega(0+) = 0$ and $\omega(\infty) = \infty$. Then $v \in L^2 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and moreover*

$$\|v\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 \geq F\left(\|v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}\right), \quad (4.4)$$

$$\frac{1}{2}\|v\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 \geq F\left(|v|_\infty\right), \quad (4.5)$$

where F is the strictly increasing and convex function

$$F(y) := 2 \int_0^y \int_0^{y_1} \omega^{-1}(y_2) dy_2 dy_1. \quad (4.6)$$

Proof. By Lemma A.1 from the appendix we may assume v to be left-continuous, and in particular, well defined at every point. Then, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $v(x) \geq 0$ we have for $h \in (0, \omega^{-1}(v(x))]$

$$v(x-h) \geq v(x) - \omega(h) \geq 0,$$

and similarly, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $v(x) < 0$ we have for $h \in (0, \omega^{-1}(-v(x))]$

$$v(x+h) \leq v(x) + \omega(h) \leq 0.$$

Squaring each of these inequalities (the bottom one would flip direction) and integrating over $h \in (0, \omega^{-1}(|v(x)|)]$, yields in both cases

$$\|v\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 \geq \int_0^{\omega^{-1}(|v(x)|)} (|v(x)| - \omega(h))^2 dh, \quad (4.7)$$

where the left-hand side has been replaced by the upper bound $\|v\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2$. Performing the change of variables $h = \omega^{-1}(y)$ the right-hand side of (4.7) can further be written

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{|v(x)|} (|v(x)| - y)^2 d\omega^{-1}(y) &= 2 \int_0^{|v(x)|} (|v(x)| - y) \omega^{-1}(y) dy \\ &= 2 \int_0^{|v(x)|} \int_0^y \omega^{-1}(z) dz dy, \end{aligned}$$

where we integrated by parts twice. This last expression is exactly $F(|v(x)|)$, and so letting this replace the right-hand side of (4.7) followed by taking the supremum

with respect to $x \in \mathbb{R}$ yields (4.4). For (4.5), we write v_+ and v_- for the positive and negative part of v respectively, and observe that $v \in L^2 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ implies $|v|_\infty = \frac{1}{2}(\|v_+\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} + \|v_-\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})})$ and $\|v\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 = \|v_+\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 + \|v_-\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2$. Furthermore, as both v_+ and $-v_-$ admit ω as a modulus of growth, we can use (4.4) followed by Jensen's inequality to calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\|v\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 &= \frac{1}{2}\left[\|v_+\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 + \|v_-\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2\right] \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}\left[F\left(\|v_+\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}\right) + F\left(\|v_-\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}\right)\right] \\ &\geq F\left(\frac{1}{2}\left[\|v_+\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} + \|v_-\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}\right]\right) \\ &= F\left(|v|_\infty\right). \end{aligned}$$

□

The calculations of the next subsection, where Theorem 2.3 is proved, can be boiled down to the three lemmas of this subsection (Lemma 4.2 being the first). The remaining Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.4, induce a natural evolution of a modulus of growth from the mappings S_t^B and S_t^K , introduced in (3.24) and (3.25). The relevance of these results should come as no surprise; the previous section showed that entropy solutions could be approximated by repeated compositions of said mappings.

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose $v \in BV(\mathbb{R})$ admits a concave modulus of growth ω . Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, the function $w = S_\varepsilon^B(v)$, admits the modulus of growth*

$$h \mapsto \frac{\omega(h)}{1 + \varepsilon\omega'(h)}. \quad (4.8)$$

Proof. As $v \in BV(\mathbb{R})$ it admits for each $x \in \mathbb{R}$ an essential left limit $v(x-)$ and right limit $v(x+)$, and since S_t^B is non-expansive on $BV(\mathbb{R})$, the same can be said for w . Thus we assume without loss of generality that v and w are left continuous. For $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $h > 0$ and $t \in [0, \varepsilon]$, introduce the two (minimal) backward characteristics of $S_t^B(v)$ emanating from (ε, x) and $(\varepsilon, x+h)$ respectively

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_1(t) &= x + (t - \varepsilon)w(x), \\ \xi_2(t) &= x + h + (t - \varepsilon)w(x+h). \end{aligned}$$

As v and w are left continuous, it follows from Theorem 11.1.3. in [8] that

$$v(\xi_1(0)) \leq w(x), \quad w(x+h) \leq v(\xi_2(0)).$$

Moreover, by the Oleřnik estimate of w (4.1), we find

$$\xi_2(0) - \xi_1(0) = h - \varepsilon[w(x+h) - w(x)] \geq 0,$$

and so exploiting ω we can calculate

$$\begin{aligned} w(x+h) - w(x) &\leq v(\xi_2(0)) - v(\xi_1(0)) \\ &\leq \omega(h - \varepsilon[w(x+h) - w(x)]) \\ &\leq \omega(h) - \varepsilon\omega'(h)(w(x+h) - w(x)), \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

where the last inequality holds as ω is concave. We conclude that

$$w(x+h) - w(x) \leq \frac{\omega(h)}{1 + \varepsilon\omega'(h)},$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $h > 0$. That (4.8) is positive, smooth and strictly increasing follows from ω being positive, smooth, strictly increasing and concave. \square

We follow immediately with a similar result for the operator S_t^K , which will depend on the fractional variation $|K|_{TV^s}$ as defined in (1.5) and the seminorm $|\cdot|_\infty$ defined in (4.3).

Lemma 4.4. *Let $s \in [0, 1]$ and assume $|K|_{TV^s} < \infty$. Suppose $v \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ admits a modulus of growth ω . Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, the function $w = S_\varepsilon^K(v)$ admits the modulus of growth*

$$h \mapsto \omega(h) + \varepsilon |K|_{TV^s} |v|_\infty h^s. \quad (4.10)$$

Proof. For simple notation, we introduce the shift operator $T_h: f \mapsto f(\cdot + h)$. As shifts commute with convolution, and since $\int_{\mathbb{R}} T_h K - K dx = 0$, we start by noting that for any $k \in \mathbb{R}$

$$(T_h - 1)(K * v) = [(T_h - 1)K] * (v - k).$$

Next, we introduce $\bar{v} = \text{ess sup}_x v(x)$ and $\underline{v} = \text{ess inf}_x v(x)$, and observe that

$$\|v - k\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} = \max\{\bar{v} - k, k - \underline{v}\},$$

and so setting $k = \frac{1}{2}(\bar{v} + \underline{v})$, we get $\|v - k\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} = \frac{1}{2}(\bar{v} - \underline{v}) = |v|_\infty$. By Young's convolution inequality and the above calculations we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \|(T_h - 1)(K * v)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} &\leq \|K(\cdot + h) - K\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} \|v - k\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \\ &\leq |K|_{TV^s} |v|_\infty h^s. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for any $h > 0$ we have

$$(T_h - 1)w = (T_h - 1)v + \varepsilon(T_h - 1)(K * v) \leq \omega(h) + \varepsilon |K|_{TV^s} |v|_\infty h^s,$$

where the last inequality holds pointwise for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}$. \square

We conclude this subsection with an informal discussion to motivate the technicalities of Subsection 4.2. For initial data $u_0 \in L^2 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ let u denote the corresponding entropy solution of (1.1). For a fixed $t > 0$, suppose the function $\omega: [0, t] \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is such that for every $\tau \in [0, t]$ the function $\omega(\tau, \cdot)$ serves as a concave modulus of growth for $u(\tau) = u(\tau, \cdot)$. Seeking to extend the time domain of ω , we let $\Delta t > 0$ denote an infinitesimal time step, and write $u(t + \Delta t) = S_{\Delta t}^K \circ S_{\Delta t}^B(u(t))$ which is informally justified by the previous section. Lemma 4.3 and 4.4 now suggests how to extend ω to $\omega(t + \Delta t, h)$, and combining the two lemmas we conclude for some fixed $s \in [0, 1]$ that

$$\omega(t + \Delta t, h) = \frac{\omega(t, h)}{1 + \Delta t \omega_h(t, h)} + \Delta t |K|_{TV^s} |u(t)|_\infty h^s, \quad (4.11)$$

serves as a modulus of growth for $u(t + \Delta t)$. Using (4.11) to extend ω has the disadvantage of requiring one to calculate $|u(t)|_\infty$. To overcome this difficulty, we replace $|u(t)|_\infty$ with the upper bound $m[\omega]$, dependent only on $\omega(t, \cdot)$ and $\|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}$, defined by

$$\frac{1}{2} \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 = \int_0^{m[\omega]} \int_0^y \omega^{-1}(t, z) dz dy, \quad (4.12)$$

where $\omega^{-1}(t, \cdot)$ is the inverse of $\omega(t, \cdot)$. By (4.5) and $\|u(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}$ we indeed get $|u(t)|_\infty \leq m[\omega]$. Additionally, by Taylor expansion we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\omega}{1 + \Delta t \omega_h} &= \omega - \Delta t \omega_h \omega + O((\Delta t)^2) \\ &= \omega - \frac{\Delta t}{2} (\omega^2)_h + O((\Delta t)^2), \end{aligned}$$

and so subtracting $\omega(t, h)$ on each side of (4.11), dividing by Δt and replacing $|u(t)|_\infty$ with $m[\omega]$, we get

$$\frac{\Delta \omega}{\Delta t} = -\frac{1}{2} (\omega^2)_h + \kappa_s m[\omega] h^s + O(\Delta t), \quad (4.13)$$

where $\Delta \omega := \omega(t + \Delta t, h) - \omega(t, h)$ and $\kappa_s := |K|_{TV^s}$. In summary, equation (4.13) describes for an infinitesimal time step Δt a sufficiently large change $\Delta \omega$ such that $\omega + \Delta \omega$ serves as a modulus of growth for $u(t + \Delta t)$ whenever the same can be said for ω and $u(t)$. As t was general, one can expect from this discussion that if ω satisfies the partial differential equation

$$\begin{cases} \omega_t + \frac{1}{2} (\omega^2)_h = \kappa_s m[\omega] h^s, \\ \omega(0, h) = \omega_0(h), \end{cases} \quad (4.14)$$

where ω_0 is a modulus of growth for u_0 , then $h \mapsto \omega(t, h)$ serves as a modulus of growth for $u(t)$ for all $t > 0$. Unfortunately, working directly with (4.14) is cumbersome due to the term $m[\omega]$, which can be viewed as a nonlinear and nonlocal operator in space applied to ω . Nevertheless, we can make the following observation: assume that a solution ω of (4.14) admits a limit $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \omega(t, h) = \bar{\omega}(h)$, which in turn yields a limit $m[\omega] \rightarrow m[\bar{\omega}] =: \bar{m}$. Then (4.14) reduces to

$$\frac{1}{2} (\bar{\omega}^2)_h = \kappa_s \bar{m} h^s, \quad \implies \quad \bar{\omega}(h) = \sqrt{\frac{2\kappa_s \bar{m}}{1+s}} h^{\frac{1+s}{2}},$$

where we assume $\bar{\omega}(0) = 0$. If one wanted, this expression for $\bar{\omega}$ could be used in (4.12) to calculate \bar{m} , thus also calculating the coefficient of $\bar{\omega}$ explicitly; the resulting expression would coincide with the limit of (2.3). As the ‘limit modulus of growth’ is of the form $h \mapsto ah^{\frac{1+s}{2}}$, one may hope that a solution of (4.14) is of the similar form $\omega(t, h) = a(t)h^{\frac{1+s}{2}}$. In Lemma 4.5 we show that $m[\omega] = c_0 a(t)^{\frac{1}{2+s}}$, for an appropriate $c_0 > 0$, whenever $\omega(t, h) = a(t)h^{\frac{1+s}{2}}$, and so seeking a solution of (4.14) of this special form, we insert for ω and $m[\omega]$ in (4.14) and get

$$\dot{a} h^{\frac{1+s}{2}} + \frac{(1+s)}{2} a^2 h^s = \kappa_s c_0 a^{\frac{1}{2+s}} h^s.$$

Setting $c_1 := \kappa_s c_0$ and $c_2 := \frac{1+s}{2}$, we further divide each side by $h^{\frac{1+s}{2}}$ and rearrange to get

$$\dot{a} = \left[c_1 a^{\frac{1}{2+s}} - c_2 a^2 \right] h^{\frac{s-1}{2}}. \quad (4.15)$$

Apart from the special case $s = 1$, the h -dependence on the right-hand side of (4.15) means that the only non-trivial solution $a(t)$ of this form is the constant one where the square bracket is zero. As we do not wish to impose regularity constraints on the initial data, this constant solution is not of value to us. Instead we make a second observation: for $a \gg 1$ the right-hand side of (4.15) is negative and thus increasing in h . This roughly suggests that if we relax our search to instead find a

function $h \mapsto a(t)h^{\frac{1+s}{2}}$ serving as a modulus of growth for $u(t)$ when $h < H$, for some finite H , then H can replace h in (4.15) and we can solve thereafter. Conveniently, Lemma 4.5 demonstrates that there is an $H > 0$ such that if $h \mapsto a(t)h^{\frac{1+s}{2}}$ serves as a modulus of growth for $u(t)$ when $h \in (0, H)$ then the same holds for all $h > 0$. This H depends on $a(t)$ and is given by $H(a) = c_3 a^{-\frac{2}{2+s}}$ for an appropriate $c_3 > 0$. Replacing h with $H(a)$ in (4.15) gives

$$\dot{a} = \left[c_1 a^{\frac{1}{2+s}} - c_2 a^2 \right] c_3^{\frac{s-1}{2}} a^{\frac{1-s}{2+s}}, \quad (4.16)$$

which indeed is the equation (4.37) that the Hölder coefficients constructed in the next subsection solve. In conclusion, this informal argument suggests that if u_0 admits the modulus of growth $h \mapsto a(0)h^{\frac{1+s}{2}}$, then the same can be said for $u(t)$ and $h \mapsto a(t)h^{\frac{1+s}{2}}$ where $a(t)$ solves (4.16) for $t > 0$. We stress that this discussion is only meant to coarsely summarize the idea behind the steps in the following subsection.

4.2. Deriving a modulus of growth for entropy solutions. Throughout this subsection we shall let $\mu > 0$ denote an arbitrary but fixed value, essentially serving as a placeholder for the L^2 norm of the initial data. We also assume $s \in [0, 1]$ fixed and that $\kappa_s := |K|_{TV^s} < \infty$, where $|K|_{TV^s}$ is defined in (1.5). Motivated by the previous discussion, we shall for an arbitrary entropy solution u of (1.1) with $L^2 \cap L^\infty$ data, seek an expression $a(t)$ such that $h \mapsto a(t)h^{\frac{1+s}{2}}$ serves as a modulus of growth (Def. 4.1) for $x \mapsto u(t, x)$. We begin with an important result, which among other things rephrases Lemma 4.2 for the more explicit case $\omega(h) = ah^{\frac{1+s}{2}}$. For this purpose, we introduce the constant

$$c_s = \left[\frac{(2+s)(3+s)}{2(1+s)^2} \right]^{\frac{1+s}{4+2s}}, \quad (4.17)$$

and the function

$$H(a) = \frac{(2c_s)^{\frac{2}{1+s}} \mu^{\frac{2}{2+s}}}{a^{\frac{2}{2+s}}}, \quad (4.18)$$

defined for all $a > 0$. We recall for the following lemma definition (4.3) of the seminorm $|\cdot|_\infty$.

Lemma 4.5. *With fixed $a > 0$, let $\omega(h) = ah^{\frac{1+s}{2}}$ for $h \in (0, \infty)$. Suppose $v \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies $\|v\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq \mu$ and admits ω as a modulus of growth for the restricted values $h \in (0, H(a))$. Then v admits ω as a modulus of growth for all $h \in (0, \infty)$ and moreover*

$$\|v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq 2^{\frac{1+s}{4+2s}} c_s \mu^{\frac{1+s}{2+s}} a^{\frac{1}{2+s}}, \quad (4.19)$$

$$|v|_\infty \leq c_s \mu^{\frac{1+s}{2+s}} a^{\frac{1}{2+s}}. \quad (4.20)$$

Proof. We begin by proving the two inequalities, so let us assume for now that v admits ω as a modulus of growth for all $h \in (0, \infty)$. Since $\omega^{-1}(y) = a^{-\frac{2}{1+s}} y^{\frac{2}{1+s}}$ the function F from (4.6) can here be written

$$F(y) = \left[\frac{2(1+s)^2}{(3+s)(4+2s)} \right] \frac{y^{\frac{4+2s}{1+s}}}{a^{\frac{2}{1+s}}} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{y}{c_s a^{\frac{1}{2+s}}} \right)^{\frac{4+2s}{1+s}},$$

with inverse

$$F^{-1}(y) = 2^{\frac{1+s}{4+2s}} c_s a^{\frac{1}{2+s}} y^{\frac{1+s}{4+2s}}.$$

Combined with $\|v\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq \mu$, (4.4) and (4.5) give $\|v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq F^{-1}(\mu^2)$ and $|v|_\infty \leq F^{-1}(\frac{1}{2}\mu^2)$, which coincides with (4.19) and (4.20) respectively. Next, assume we only know that v admits ω as a modulus of growth for $h \in (0, H(a))$. The steps in the proof of Lemma 4.2 can still be carried out if one lets the role of $\omega^{-1}(y) = a^{-\frac{2}{1+s}} y^{\frac{2}{1+s}}$ be taken by the truncated version

$$y \mapsto \min \left\{ a^{-\frac{2}{1+s}} y^{\frac{2}{1+s}}, H(a) \right\},$$

to yield the inequalities $\|v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq \tilde{F}^{-1}(\mu^2)$ and $|v|_\infty \leq \tilde{F}^{-1}(\frac{1}{2}\mu^2)$ with

$$\tilde{F}(y) := 2 \int_0^y \int_0^{y_1} \min \left\{ a^{-\frac{2}{1+s}} y_2^{\frac{2}{1+s}}, H(a) \right\} dy_2 dy_1.$$

As \tilde{F} is strictly increasing and agrees with F on $(0, aH(a)^{\frac{1+s}{2}})$, we necessarily have both $\tilde{F}^{-1}(\mu^2) = F^{-1}(\mu^2)$ and $\tilde{F}^{-1}(\frac{1}{2}\mu^2) = F^{-1}(\frac{1}{2}\mu^2)$ provided $F^{-1}(\mu^2) < aH(a)^{\frac{1+s}{2}}$. As $F^{-1}(\mu^2)$ is exactly the right-hand side of (4.19), we see that the latter inequality holds since

$$F^{-1}(\mu^2) = 2^{\frac{1+s}{4+2s}} c_s \mu^{\frac{1+s}{2+s}} a^{\frac{1}{2+s}} < 2c_s \mu^{\frac{1+s}{2+s}} a^{\frac{1}{2+s}} = aH(a)^{\frac{1+s}{2}}.$$

Thus, the bounds for $\|v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}$ and $|v|_\infty$ attained now coincides again with (4.19) and (4.20). It then follows that v admits ω as a modulus of growth for all $h \in (0, \infty)$. Indeed, for any $h \in [H(a), \infty)$ we have the two trivial inequalities

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left[v(x+h) - v(x) \right] \leq 2|v|_\infty, \quad aH(a)^{\frac{1+s}{2}} \leq ah^{\frac{1+s}{2}},$$

and so we would be done if $2|v|_\infty \leq aH(a)^{\frac{1+s}{2}}$, which is precisely the already established inequality (4.20) multiplied by two. \square

The most essential part of the previous lemma, is in allowing us to extend the domain for which a homogeneous modulus of growth is valid. Its utility will become apparent in the proof of the next proposition which in short combines Lemma 4.8 and 4.10 to attain a corresponding result for the operator $S_\varepsilon^B \circ S_\varepsilon^K$. While it in Section 3 was natural to work with iterations of $S_\varepsilon^K \circ S_\varepsilon^B$, it will here be easier to work with its counterpart $S_\varepsilon^B \circ S_\varepsilon^K$. We now introduce the useful limit value \underline{a} defined by

$$\underline{a} = \left(\frac{2c_s \kappa_s}{1+s} \right)^{\frac{2+s}{3+2s}} \mu^{\frac{1+s}{3+2s}}. \quad (4.21)$$

This quantity will naturally occur in our calculations to come and relate to the expression $a(t)$ we seek by $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} a(t) = \underline{a}$. In particular, it coincides with the first term on the right-hand side of (2.3) from Remark 2.4, though it is here expressed in different notation.

Proposition 4.6. *For every $A \in (\underline{a}, \infty)$, there are constants $C_A, \varepsilon_A > 0$ such that: if $v \in BV(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies $\|v\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq \mu$ and admits the modulus of growth $h \mapsto ah^{\frac{1+s}{2}}$*

for some $a \in [\underline{a}, A]$, then for every $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_A]$ the function $w = S_\varepsilon^B \circ S_\varepsilon^K(v)$ admits the modulus of growth

$$h \mapsto \left(a - \varepsilon f(a) + \varepsilon^2 C_A \right) h^{\frac{1+s}{2}}, \quad (4.22)$$

where $f(a) \geq 0$ is given by

$$f(a) = \left[\frac{(1+s)a^{\frac{2-s}{2+s}}}{2^{\frac{2}{1+s}} c_s^{\frac{1-s}{1+s}} \mu^{\frac{1-s}{2+s}}} \right] \left[a^{\frac{3+2s}{2+s}} - \underline{a}^{\frac{3+2s}{2+s}} \right]. \quad (4.23)$$

Proof. For fixed $A > \underline{a}$, let $v \in BV(\mathbb{R})$ and $a \in [\underline{a}, A]$ be as described in the lemma. We fix the pair v and a for convenience, but it should be clear from the proof that the construction of C_A and ε_A do not in fact depend on said pair. Introduce for $\varepsilon > 0$ the auxiliary function $\tilde{v} = S_\varepsilon^K(v)$. Combining Lemma 4.4 and (4.20), \tilde{v} admits the concave modulus of growth

$$\tilde{\omega}(h) = ah^{\frac{1+s}{2}} + \varepsilon c_s \kappa_s a^{\frac{1}{2+s}} \mu^{\frac{1+s}{2+s}} h^s.$$

And since $\tilde{v} \in BV(\mathbb{R})$, as follows from (3.27) and (3.28), we can further apply Lemma 4.3 to $w = S_\varepsilon^B(\tilde{v})$, which combined with $\tilde{\omega}'(h) > (\frac{1+s}{2})ah^{\frac{s-1}{2}}$, allows us to conclude that w admits the modulus of growth

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(h) &= \frac{ah^{\frac{1+s}{2}} + \varepsilon c_s \kappa_s a^{\frac{1}{2+s}} \mu^{\frac{1+s}{2+s}} h^s}{1 + \varepsilon (\frac{1+s}{2}) ah^{\frac{s-1}{2}}} \\ &= ah^{\frac{1+s}{2}} + \frac{-\varepsilon (\frac{1+s}{2}) a^2 h^s + \varepsilon c_s \kappa_s a^{\frac{1}{2+s}} \mu^{\frac{1+s}{2+s}} h^s}{1 + \varepsilon (\frac{1+s}{2}) ah^{\frac{s-1}{2}}} \\ &= ah^{\frac{1+s}{2}} - \varepsilon \underbrace{\left[\frac{(1+s)a^2 - 2c_s \kappa_s a^{\frac{1}{2+s}} \mu^{\frac{1+s}{2+s}}}{2h^{\frac{1-s}{2}} + \varepsilon(1+s)a} \right]}_{B(a,h,\varepsilon)} h^{\frac{1+s}{2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

where $B(a, h, \varepsilon)$ denotes the square bracket. With \underline{a} as given by (4.21), this square bracket can further be factored

$$B(a, h, \varepsilon) = \left[\frac{(1+s)a^{\frac{1}{2+s}}}{2h^{\frac{1-s}{2}} + \varepsilon(1+s)a} \right] \left[a^{\frac{3+2s}{2+s}} - \underline{a}^{\frac{3+2s}{2+s}} \right]. \quad (4.25)$$

Since $a \geq \underline{a}$ it follows that $B(a, h, \varepsilon)$ is non-negative and thus non-increasing in $h > 0$. Consequently, we read from (4.24) the inequality

$$\omega(h) \leq \left(a - \varepsilon B(a, \bar{h}, \varepsilon) \right) h^{\frac{1+s}{2}}, \quad 0 < h < \bar{h}. \quad (4.26)$$

Since (4.26) can be viewed as implying that w admits a homogeneous modulus of growth on bounded intervals, we would like to make use of Lemma 4.5; however, we do not necessarily have $\|w\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq \mu$ (as is assumed by said lemma). We deal with this small inconvenience as follows: define \tilde{w} by

$$\tilde{w} := \rho^{-1} w, \quad \rho := \max \left\{ 1, \mu^{-1} \|w\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \right\}, \quad (4.27)$$

that is, \tilde{w} is the renormalized version of w if the L^2 norm of w exceeds μ . We proceed by proving the proposition for \tilde{w} and then extend the result to w . Observe

that ω must serve as a modulus of growth also for \tilde{w} since $\rho \geq 1$, and consequently by (4.26), \tilde{w} further admits for any fixed $\bar{h} > 0$ the modulus of growth

$$h \mapsto \left(a - \varepsilon B(a, \bar{h}, \varepsilon) \right) h^{\frac{1+s}{2}}, \quad (4.28)$$

for the restricted values $h \in (0, \bar{h})$. Lemma 4.5 then tells us that \tilde{w} must additionally admit (4.28) as a modulus of growth for all $h > 0$ provided

$$H\left(a - \varepsilon B(a, \bar{h}, \varepsilon) \right) \leq \bar{h}, \quad (4.29)$$

where the function H is as defined by (4.18). As H is a decreasing function while B is non-negative, all \bar{h} satisfying (4.29) necessarily also satisfy $\bar{h} \geq H(a)$; we now show that we for small ε can pick such a \bar{h} close to $H(a)$. To do so, we start by introducing the closed set of points (a, h, ε) defined by

$$S_A = [\underline{a}, A] \times [H(A), \infty) \times [0, \infty),$$

where we abuse notation slightly by reusing a as a dummy variable for referring to elements in $[\underline{a}, A]$ (although the original $a \in [\underline{a}, A]$ is fixed). From (4.25) we see that both $(a, h, \varepsilon) \mapsto B(a, h, \varepsilon)$ and its partial derivatives are bounded on the set S_A . We exploit the additional smoothness of B later; for now we need only $\|B\|_{L^\infty(S_A)} < \infty$. Pick $\varepsilon_A > 0$ such that

$$\varepsilon_A \|B\|_{L^\infty(S_A)} \leq \frac{1}{2} \underline{a},$$

and observe that the argument of H in (4.29) must then lie in $[\frac{1}{2}\underline{a}, A]$ for all $(a, \bar{h}, \varepsilon) \in [\underline{a}, A] \times [H(a), \infty) \times [0, \varepsilon_A] \subset S_A$. Moreover, as H is smooth on $[\frac{1}{2}\underline{a}, A]$ we conclude for any such triplet $(a, \bar{h}, \varepsilon)$ that

$$H\left(a - \varepsilon B(a, \bar{h}, \varepsilon) \right) \leq H(a) + \varepsilon \|H'\|_{L^\infty([\frac{1}{2}\underline{a}, A])} \|B\|_{L^\infty(S_A)} =: H(a) + \varepsilon D_A.$$

Thus, this calculation guarantees that the choice $\bar{h} = H(a) + \varepsilon D_A$ satisfies (4.29) for every $a \in [\underline{a}, A]$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_A]$, and so substituting for \bar{h} in (4.28), we conclude that \tilde{w} admits the modulus of growth

$$h \mapsto \left(a - \varepsilon B(a, H(a) + \varepsilon D_A, \varepsilon) \right) h^{\frac{1+s}{2}}, \quad (4.30)$$

for all $h > 0$, provided $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_A]$ (we already assume $a \in [\underline{a}, A]$). Recalling that the partial derivatives of B are bounded on S_A , we can write

$$B(a, H(a) + \varepsilon D_A, \varepsilon) \geq B(a, H(a), 0) - \varepsilon \left[D_A \left\| \frac{\partial B}{\partial h} \right\|_{L^\infty(S_A)} + \left\| \frac{\partial B}{\partial \varepsilon} \right\|_{L^\infty(S_A)} \right], \quad (4.31)$$

and so letting C_A denote a constant no smaller than the square bracket in (4.31), we combine this inequality with (4.30) to further conclude that

$$h \mapsto \left(a - \varepsilon B(a, H(a), 0) + \varepsilon^2 C_A \right) h^{\frac{1+s}{2}}, \quad (4.32)$$

also serves as a modulus of growth for \tilde{w} , provided $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_A]$. Using the explicit expressions (4.25) and (4.18) one attains the identity $B(a, H(a), 0) = f(a)$, where f is as defined in (4.23), and so the proposition has been proved for the renormalized function \tilde{w} . It remains to extend the result to w ; assume from here on out that $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_A]$. Introducing $\tilde{a} = (a - \varepsilon f(a) + \varepsilon^2 C_A)$ for brevity, it is clear from the relation $w = \rho \tilde{w}$, where ρ is as defined in (4.27), that w admits $h \mapsto \rho \tilde{a} h^{\frac{1+s}{2}}$ as a modulus of growth, as the same can be said for \tilde{w} and $h \mapsto \tilde{a} h^{\frac{1+s}{2}}$. Moreover, by a

similar and coarser calculation as in the proof of Lemma 3.3, we have $\|w\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq (1 + \varepsilon^2 \kappa^2) \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}$ where $\kappa = \|K\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}$, and so $\rho \leq 1 + \varepsilon^2 \kappa^2$. Thus

$$\rho \tilde{a} \leq (1 + \varepsilon^2 \kappa^2) \tilde{a} = a - \varepsilon f(a) + \varepsilon^2 [C_A + \kappa^2 \tilde{a}] \leq a - \varepsilon f(a) + \varepsilon^2 \tilde{C}_A,$$

where $\tilde{C}_A := [C_A + \kappa^2 (A + \varepsilon_A^2 C_A)]$, and so this calculation shows that the proposition also holds for w after choosing a larger constant C_A . \square

Together with a few results from Section 3, the previous proposition equips us with all we need to construct moduli of growth for entropy solutions of (1.1). Roughly speaking, we can for small $\varepsilon > 0$ iterate Proposition 4.6 repeatedly to construct a modulus of growth for an approximate entropy solution (3.32), and further letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ this construction carries over to the entropy solution itself. To formalize, we shall introduce some notation and assume from here on that a pair of constants ε_A, C_A , as described by Proposition 4.6, has been chosen for each $A > \underline{a}$. Define the function

$$g_A^\varepsilon(a) := a - \varepsilon f(a) + \varepsilon^2 C_A, \quad (4.33)$$

which is parameterized over $A > \underline{a}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_A]$ and where

$$f(a) = \gamma a^{\frac{2-s}{2+s}} \left(a^{\frac{3+2s}{2+s}} - \underline{a}^{\frac{3+2s}{2+s}} \right), \quad \gamma = \frac{1+s}{2^{\frac{2}{1+s}} c_s^{\frac{1-s}{1+s}} \mu^{\frac{1-s}{2+s}}}. \quad (4.34)$$

The function f in (4.34) is indeed the same as in (4.23), and so $g_A^\varepsilon(a)$ is the new Hölder coefficient provided by Proposition 4.6. In the coming proposition, we carry out the above sketched argument consisting in part of repeated iterations of Proposition 4.6, and consequently, we will encounter repeated compositions of g_A^ε . We point out two relevant facts about g_A^ε . First off, for any $A > \underline{a}$ and sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, the function g_A^ε maps $[\underline{a}, A]$ to itself. To see this, note from (4.33) that $(g_A^\varepsilon)'$ is strictly positive on $[\underline{a}, A]$ for small $\varepsilon > 0$. Moreover, we have

$$g_A^\varepsilon(\underline{a}) = \underline{a}, \quad g_A^\varepsilon(A) = A - \varepsilon f(A) + \varepsilon^2 C_A,$$

and since $f(A) > 0$, it is clear that $\varepsilon > 0$ can be made sufficiently small such that

$$\underline{a} = g_A^\varepsilon(\underline{a}) \leq g_A^\varepsilon(a) \leq g_A^\varepsilon(A) \leq A, \quad (4.35)$$

for all $a \in [\underline{a}, A]$. Our second fact, rigorously justified in the coming proposition, is that repeated compositions of g_A^ε applied to the starting value $a = A$ will, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, result in a smooth function $a_A: [0, \infty) \rightarrow (\underline{a}, A]$, implicitly defined by

$$t = \int_{a_A(t)}^A \frac{da}{f(a)}. \quad (4.36)$$

That (4.36) yields a unique value $a_A(t) \in (\underline{a}, A]$ for each $t \in [0, \infty)$ follows as the positive integrand has a non-integrable singularity at $a = \underline{a}$. Alternatively, the function a_A can be viewed as the solution of the differential equation

$$\begin{cases} a'(t) = -f(a(t)), & t > 0, \\ a(0) = A, \end{cases} \quad (4.37)$$

which coincides with the equation (4.16) from the discussion of the previous subsection. For the next proposition, we shall exploit the two constants

$$M_A = \max_{a \in [\underline{a}, A]} |f'(a)|, \quad \tilde{M}_A = \max_{a \in [\underline{a}, A]} |f(a)f'(a)|, \quad (4.38)$$

both well defined as f is smooth on \mathbb{R}^+ . Note that the latter serves as a bound on $(a_A)'' = f(a_A)f'(a_A)$, and so by Taylor expansion, we infer

$$|a_A(t + \varepsilon) - a_A(t) + \varepsilon f(a_A(t))| \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \tilde{M}_A, \quad (4.39)$$

for all $t \geq 0$ and $\varepsilon \geq 0$.

Proposition 4.7. *Let u be an entropy solution of (1.1), whose initial data $u_0 \in BV(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies $\|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq \mu$ and admits a modulus of growth $h \mapsto Ah^{\frac{1+s}{2}}$ for some $A > \underline{a}$. Then for all $t > 0$, the function $x \mapsto u(t, x)$ admits the modulus of growth*

$$h \mapsto a_A(t)h^{\frac{1+s}{2}},$$

with a_A given by (4.36).

Proof. Consider $t > 0$ fixed, and assume without loss of generality that $\|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} < \mu$; if the proposition holds in this case, it necessarily also holds in the case $\|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq \mu$ as the implicit μ -dependence of $a_A(t)$ is a continuous one. Pick a large $n \in \mathbb{N}$, set $\varepsilon = \frac{t}{n}$ and consider the family of functions $u_n^k \in BV(\mathbb{R})$ defined inductively by

$$\begin{cases} u_n^0 = S_\varepsilon^B(u_0), \\ u_n^k = S_\varepsilon^B \circ S_\varepsilon^K(u_n^{k-1}), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, n, \end{cases}$$

As u_0 admits $h \mapsto Ah^{\frac{1+s}{2}}$ as a modulus of growth, so does u_n^0 by Lemma 4.3. Observe also that each $u_n^k \in BV(\mathbb{R})$ as follows by induction and the properties of S_ε^B and S_ε^K listed at the very beginning in the proof of Proposition 3.2. Moreover, by similar reasoning as in the proof of Lemma 3.3, we have

$$\|u_n^k\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq e^{\frac{k}{2}\varepsilon^2\kappa^2} \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq e^{\frac{t}{2n}\kappa^2} \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, n,$$

where $\kappa = \|K\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}$. Since we have a strict inequality $\|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} < \mu$, we can assume n large enough such that $\|u_n^k\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq \mu$ for every k . We define further the coefficients a_n^k inductively by

$$\begin{cases} a_n^0 = A, \\ a_n^k = g_A^\varepsilon(a_n^{k-1}), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, n, \end{cases}$$

where g_A^ε is given by (4.33). We assume n large enough such that $\varepsilon = \frac{t}{n}$ is both less than $\varepsilon_A > 0$ and small enough such that g_A^ε maps $[\underline{a}, A]$ to itself (see the discussion leading up to (4.35)). In particular, each a_n^k is in $[\underline{a}, A]$. We may now apply Proposition 4.6 inductively to each pair (u_n^k, a_n^k) , starting with (u_n^0, a_n^0) . As u_n^0 admits $h \mapsto a_n^0 h^{\frac{1+s}{2}}$ as a modulus of growth, Proposition 4.6 infers the same relationship for the pair (u_n^1, a_n^1) , and by repeating the argument, the same can be said for all pairs (u_n^k, a_n^k) . Most importantly, u_n^n admits $h \mapsto a_n^n h^{\frac{1+s}{2}}$ as a modulus of growth. The proposition will now follow if we can, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, establish the limits

$$a_n^n \rightarrow a_A(t), \quad (4.40)$$

$$u_n^n \rightarrow u(t), \quad (4.41)$$

where $u(t) = u(t, \cdot)$ and the latter limit is taken in $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$. Indeed, in this scenario we can let φ denote any non-negative smooth function of compact support that

satisfies $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi dx = 1$ so to calculate for $h > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left[u(t, x+h) - u(t, x) \right] &= \sup_{\varphi} \langle u(t, \cdot + h) - u(t, \cdot), \varphi \rangle \\
&= \sup_{\varphi} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle u_n^n(\cdot + h) - u_n^n, \varphi \rangle \\
&\leq \sup_{\varphi} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n^n h^{\frac{1+s}{2}} \\
&= a_A(t) h^{\frac{1+s}{2}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.42}$$

We first prove (4.40). Using the explicit form (4.33) of g_A^ε with $\varepsilon = \frac{t}{n}$, the constants (4.38) and the inequality (4.39) we can calculate for $k \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| a_n^k - a_A\left(\frac{kt}{n}\right) \right| \\
&= \left| g_A^\varepsilon\left(a_n^{k-1}\right) - a_A\left(\frac{(k-1)t}{n} + \frac{t}{n}\right) \right| \\
&\leq \left| a_n^{k-1} - a_A\left(\frac{(k-1)t}{n}\right) \right| + \left(\frac{t}{n}\right) \left| f\left(a_n^{k-1}\right) - f\left(a_A\left(\frac{(k-1)t}{n}\right)\right) \right| \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{t}{n}\right)^2 \left(C_A + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{M}_A\right) \\
&\leq \left[1 + \left(\frac{t}{n}\right)M_A\right] \left| a_n^{k-1} - a_A\left(\frac{(k-1)t}{n}\right) \right| + \left(\frac{t}{n}\right)^2 D_A,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.43}$$

with $D_A := C_A + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{M}_A$. By repeated use of (4.43), and the fact that $a_n^0 = a_A(0) = A$, we conclude

$$|a_n^n - a_A(t)| \leq \left(\frac{t}{n}\right)^2 D_A \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left[1 + \left(\frac{t}{n}\right)M_A\right]^k \leq \frac{1}{n} \left[t^2 D_A e^{tM_A}\right],$$

and thus (4.40) is established. To prove (4.41), we recall definition (3.26) of the approximate solution map $S_{\varepsilon, t}$ and observe the relation

$$u_n^n = S_\varepsilon^B \circ S_{\varepsilon, t}(u_0) =: S_\varepsilon^B(u^\varepsilon(t)), \tag{4.44}$$

where the definition of u^ε coincides with (3.32), although we now work with a particular u_0 and $\varepsilon = \frac{t}{n}$. As Proposition 3.5 ensures that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} u^\varepsilon(t) = u(t)$ in $L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R})$, the same limit then carries over to u_n^n (as $n \rightarrow \infty$) by (4.44) and the time continuity of the map S_ε^B (3.29) together with the TV bound of u^ε provided by Proposition 3.2. With the two limits (4.40) and (4.41) established, the proof is complete. \square

For a fixed $t > 0$, it is not hard to see from (4.36) that $A \mapsto a_A(t)$ is strictly increasing. In particular, each $a_A(t)$ is bounded above by the pointwise limit $b(t) := \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} a_A(t)$. This function $b: (0, \infty) \rightarrow (\underline{a}, \infty)$ is implicitly given by

$$t = \frac{1}{\gamma \underline{a}^{\frac{3}{2+s}}} \int_{\frac{b(t)}{\underline{a}}}^{\infty} \frac{d\xi}{\xi^{\frac{2-s}{2+s}} \left(\xi^{\frac{3+2s}{2+s}} - 1\right)}, \tag{4.45}$$

which can be read from (4.36) by letting $A \rightarrow \infty$ and performing the change of variables $a = \underline{a}\xi$. That $b(t) \in (\underline{a}, \infty)$ is well defined for $t > 0$ follows as the integrand in (4.45) is positive with an integrable tail at $\xi = \infty$ and a non-integrable singularity at $\xi = 1$. The utility of b is that it allows us to generalize the previous proposition to initial data $u_0 \in L^2 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$.

Corollary 4.8. *Let u be an entropy solution of (1.1), whose initial data $u_0 \in L^2 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies $\|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq \mu$. Then for all $t > 0$, the function $x \mapsto u(t, x)$ admits the modulus of growth*

$$h \mapsto b(t)h^{\frac{1+s}{2}},$$

where $b(t)$ is defined by (4.45).

Proof. Consider $t > 0$ fixed. Let $(u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of entropy solutions of (1.1) whose corresponding initial data $(u_0^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies

$$\|u_0^n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}, \quad \|u_0^n\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})},$$

and yields, in L^1_{loc} sense, the limit

$$u_0^n \rightarrow u_0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

For a fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we can apply Proposition 4.7 to conclude for a sufficiently large $A > 0$ that $u^n(t) = u^n(t, \cdot)$ admits the modulus of growth $h \mapsto a_A(t)h^{\frac{1+s}{2}}$, which in turn can be replaced by the upper bound $h \mapsto b(t)h^{\frac{1+s}{2}}$. This modulus of growth carries over to $u(t)$ by a calculation similar to (4.42), if we can show that $u^n(t) \rightarrow u(t)$ in $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$. By the weighted L^1 -contraction of Proposition 3.1 and the uniform L^∞ bound of $(u_0^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, this latter limit follows from the corresponding limit of the initial data. \square

We pause here to note that Theorem 2.3 follows.

Proof of Theorem 2.3. We start by proving the theorem for $u_0 \in L^2 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ in which case the corresponding weak solution u provided by Corollary 2.2 is the entropy solution provided by Theorem 2.1. For $s \in [0, 1]$ such that $|K|_{TV^s} =: \kappa_s < \infty$, all calculations of this subsection go through. In particular, they go through for the case $\mu = \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}$ (μ was arbitrary), and by Corollary 4.8 we may then conclude for all $t > 0$ that $x \mapsto u(t, x)$ admits $h \mapsto b(t)h^{\frac{1+s}{2}}$ as a modulus of growth. By Lemma A.1, $x \mapsto u(t, x)$ then coincides a.e. with both a left-continuous function and a right-continuous function whenever $t > 0$; associating $u(t, \cdot)$ with either, the inequality $u(t, x+h) - u(t, x) \leq b(t)h^{\frac{1+s}{2}}$ holds for all $t, h > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Finally, the fact that $t \mapsto b(t)$ is strictly decreasing can be read directly from (4.45), and so Theorem 2.3 has been proved for the case $u_0 \in L^2 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$. The height bound from Corollary 2.6 may now be proved for entropy solutions of (1.1) with $L^2 \cap L^\infty$ data, and so the calculations of Section 3.3 can be carried out resulting in the jointly continuous solution map $S: [0, \infty) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R})$. Exploiting the continuity of S , Theorem 2.3 holds for every $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ by a density argument. \square

Next, we shall establish the content of Remark 2.4. The implicit description (4.45) of $b(t)$ makes its dependence on t somewhat convoluted; whether or not there exists a simple and explicit representation of $b(t)$, for general $s \in [0, 1]$, will not be pursued here. Instead, we provide an explicit bound $b(t) \leq a(t)$, which in the case $s = 0$ turns out to be an equality. The trick is to exploit the identity

$$-\frac{d}{d\xi} \left[c_1 \log \left(1 + \frac{c_2}{\xi^{c_3} - 1} \right) \right] = \frac{c_1 c_2 c_3 \xi^{c_3 - 1}}{(\xi^{c_3} - 1)^2 + c_2 (\xi^{c_3} - 1)}, \quad (4.46)$$

and that the right-hand side can approximate the integrand in (4.45) from above, for the particular choice of parameters

$$c_1 = \frac{2+s}{3+2s}, \quad c_2 = \frac{3+2s}{3}, \quad c_3 = \frac{3}{2+s}. \quad (4.47)$$

It is worth mentioning that these parameters are chosen such that (4.46) preserves the tail and singularity of the integrand in (4.45). This is to make $a(t)$ and $b(t)$ behave qualitatively the same; see Subsection 4.3 for a more precise discussion.

Lemma 4.9. *We have for all $t > 0$ the pointwise bound $b(t) \leq a(t)$, where $b(t)$ is as in (4.45), while $a(t)$ is the quantity defined by*

$$a(t) = \underline{a} \left[1 + \frac{1 + \frac{2}{3}s}{e^{\tau t} - 1} \right]^{\frac{2+s}{3}}, \quad (4.48)$$

where the limit value \underline{a} and the exponent τ are given by

$$\underline{a} = C_1(s) \kappa_s^{\frac{2+s}{3+2s}} \mu^{\frac{1+s}{3+2s}}, \quad \tau = C_0(s) \kappa_s^{\frac{3}{3+2s}} \mu^{\frac{2s}{3+2s}}, \quad (4.49)$$

and where $C_1(s)$ is as it appears in (2.4) while $C_0(s)$ is given by (A.1) in the appendix. Moreover, for all $t > 0$, if $s = 0$ then the two expressions coincide $b(t) = a(t)$, while if $s \in (0, 1]$ we have a strict inequality $b(t) < a(t)$.

Proof. Note first that the above \underline{a} is the same as the one used throughout this section; Lemma A.2 shows the equivalence between how it is originally defined (4.21) and (4.49). Next, the integral in (4.45) can be bounded by first observing that the integrand satisfies for all $\xi > 1$ the pointwise inequality

$$\frac{1}{\xi^{\frac{2-s}{2+s}} \left(\xi^{\frac{3+2s}{2+s}} - 1 \right)} \leq \frac{\xi^{\frac{1-s}{2+s}}}{\left(\xi^{\frac{3}{2+s}} - 1 \right)^2 + \left(1 + \frac{2}{3}s \right) \left(\xi^{\frac{3}{2+s}} - 1 \right)}. \quad (4.50)$$

To see this, one can multiply each side of (4.50) with the two denominators followed by some cleaning up to find that (4.50) is for $\xi > 1$ equivalent to

$$\xi^{\frac{3-2s}{2+s}} \leq \frac{2s}{3} + \left(\frac{3-2s}{3} \right) \xi^{\frac{3}{2+s}}. \quad (4.51)$$

Setting $x = 1$, $y = \xi^{\frac{3-2s}{2+s}}$, $p = \frac{3}{2s}$ and $q = \frac{3}{3-2s}$, Young's inequality $xy \leq \frac{1}{p}x^p + \frac{1}{q}y^q$ guarantees the validity of (4.51). Moreover, we observe for all $\xi > 1$ that (4.51) is an equality if $s = 0$ and a strict inequality otherwise; this, together with the calculations to come, justifies the last assertion of the lemma. Combining (4.45) with (4.50) we find

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma \underline{a}^{\frac{3}{2+s}} t &\leq \int_{\frac{b(t)}{\underline{a}}}^{\infty} \frac{\xi^{\frac{1-s}{2+s}}}{\left(\xi^{\frac{3}{2+s}} - 1 \right)^2 + \left(1 + \frac{2}{3}s \right) \left(\xi^{\frac{3}{2+s}} - 1 \right)} d\xi \\ &= \left(\frac{2+s}{3+2s} \right) \log \left(1 + \frac{1 + \frac{2}{3}s}{(b(t)/\underline{a})^{\frac{3}{2+s}} - 1} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the integral was solved by the formula (4.46) with the specific parameters (4.47). Rearranging this inequality, we get (4.48), but with $\tau = \frac{3+2s}{2+s} \gamma \underline{a}^{\frac{3}{2+s}}$. Lemma A.2 shows that this expression for τ is equivalent with (4.49). \square

The expression (4.48) is the sharpest explicit Hölder coefficient – appropriate for use in Theorem 2.3 – that we give here, and it is a close approximation of $b(t)$ as pointed out in Subsection 4.3. The much simpler expression (2.3) follows directly from (4.48) if one use the following inequalities

$$\left(1 + \frac{c_1}{e^{c_2} - 1}\right)^{\frac{2+s}{3}} < \left(1 + \frac{c_1}{c_2}\right)^{\frac{2+s}{3}} < 1 + \left(\frac{c_2}{c_3}\right)^{\frac{2+s}{3}}, \quad (4.52)$$

valid for all $c_1, c_2 > 0$.

Corollary 4.10. *With u and $s \in [0, 1]$ as in Theorem 2.3, one may set the Hölder coefficient in (2.2) to*

$$C_1(s) |K|_{TV^s}^{\frac{2+s}{3+2s}} \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^{\frac{1+s}{3+2s}} + C_2(s) \frac{\|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^{\frac{1-s}{3}}}{t^{\frac{2+s}{3}}}, \quad (4.53)$$

where $C_1(s)$ and $C_2(s)$ are as they appear in (2.4).

Proof. By the above given proof of Theorem 2.3, one can after the substitution $\mu = \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}$ and $\kappa_s = |K|_{TV^s}$ use $b(t)$, defined in (4.45), as a valid Hölder coefficient in (2.2). By Lemma 4.9 one may then also use the larger coefficient $a(t)$, here defined by (4.48), and so we are done if we can show that $a(t)$ is bounded above by (4.53). Combining (4.48) with (4.52) we get

$$a(t) \leq \underline{a} + \underline{a} \left(\frac{1 + \frac{2}{3}s}{\tau t}\right)^{\frac{2+s}{3}} = C_1(s) \kappa_s^{\frac{2+s}{3+2s}} \mu^{\frac{1+s}{3+2s}} + C_2(s) \frac{\mu^{\frac{1-s}{3}}}{t^{\frac{2+s}{3}}}$$

where the first term on the right hand side is the expression for \underline{a} as given by (4.49) while the second term follows from the identity (A.5) of Lemma A.2. As μ and κ_s represent $\|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}$ and $|K|_{TV^s}$ respectively, we are done. \square

4.3. The error of the approximation. We conclude the section with a short discussion regarding the approximation $a(t)$ of $b(t)$ from Lemma 4.9. One can think of $a(t)$ as a delayed version of $b(t)$; defining the delay $\varepsilon(t)$ through the relation $a(t + \varepsilon(t)) = b(t)$ it follows that $\varepsilon(t)$ satisfies

$$\varepsilon(t) = \frac{1}{\gamma \underline{a}^{\frac{3}{2+s}}} \int_{\frac{b(t)}{\underline{a}}}^{\infty} \frac{\frac{2s}{3} + \left(\frac{3-2s}{3}\right) \xi^{\frac{3}{2+s}} - \xi^{\frac{3-2s}{2+s}}}{\xi^{\frac{2-s}{2+s}} \left(\xi^{\frac{3+2s}{2+s}} - 1\right) \left(\xi^{\frac{3}{2+s}} - 1\right) \left(\xi^{\frac{3}{2+s}} + \frac{2}{3}\right)} d\xi. \quad (4.54)$$

This identity is attained by subtracting the implicit representation of $b(t)$ from that of $a(t + \varepsilon(t))$, that is, the integrand is exactly the difference between the right- and left-hand side of (3.37). From (4.54) we observe that $\varepsilon(t)$ is strictly increasing and bounded above by

$$\bar{\varepsilon} := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon(t) = \frac{1}{\gamma \underline{a}^{\frac{3}{2+s}}} \int_1^{\infty} \frac{\frac{2s}{3} + \left(\frac{3-2s}{3}\right) \xi^{\frac{3}{2+s}} - \xi^{\frac{3-2s}{2+s}}}{\xi^{\frac{2-s}{2+s}} \left(\xi^{\frac{3+2s}{2+s}} - 1\right) \left(\xi^{\frac{3}{2+s}} - 1\right) \left(\xi^{\frac{3}{2+s}} + \frac{2}{3}\right)} d\xi,$$

where the integral is finite as the integrand is bounded (the numerator has a second order zero at $\xi = 1$) and decays sufficiently fast. Moreover, as $b(t) \simeq t^{-\frac{2+s}{3}}$ for small t while the integrand satisfies $\simeq \xi^{-\frac{8+s}{2+s}}$ for large ξ , we infer from (4.54) that $\varepsilon(t) \lesssim t^2$, and so combining this with the boundness of $\varepsilon(t)$ we get

$$\varepsilon(t) \lesssim \min\{t^2, 1\}.$$

In conclusion $a(t)$ and $b(t)$ behaves very similar for small t , and approach the same limit – at the same exponential rate – as $t \rightarrow \infty$ with $b(t)$ being at most a time-step $\bar{\varepsilon}$ ahead of $a(t)$, that is, $b(t) \in [a(t + \bar{\varepsilon}), a(t)]$.

APPENDIX A. AUXILIARY RESULTS

In the coming lemma we work with the concept of a modulus of growth as defined by Def. 4.1.

Lemma A.1. *Let $f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$ admit a modulus of growth ω that satisfies $\omega(0+) = 0$. Then f admits essential left and right limits at each point $x \in \mathbb{R}$. In particular, there are functions f^- and f^+ , respectively left- and right-continuous, that coincides a.e. with f .*

Proof. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}$ the existence of an essential left limit $f(x-)$ of f at x , follows from the calculation

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{ess lim sup}_{\substack{y < 0 \\ y \rightarrow 0}} f(x + y) - \text{ess lim inf}_{\substack{y < 0 \\ y \rightarrow 0}} f(x + y) \\ &= \text{ess lim sup}_{\substack{y_2 < y_1 < 0 \\ y_2, y_1 \rightarrow 0}} \left[f(x + y_1) - f(x + y_2) \right] \\ &\leq \limsup_{\substack{y_2 < y_1 < 0 \\ y_2, y_1 \rightarrow 0}} \omega(y_1 - y_2) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

By the Lebesgue differentiation theorem, the function $f^-(x) := f(x-)$ can only differ from f on a null set, and moreover, must be left continuous as the above calculation could be repeated for f^- with essential limits replaced by limits. A similar argument yields the existence of an essential right limit $f(x+)$ of f at each $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and further that $f^+(x) := f(x+)$ is a right-continuous function agreeing a.e. with f . \square

The next lemma deals with quantities appearing throughout the paper and the relations between them. For convenience, we here list the definition of each relevant quantity; some of them given for the first time. The quantities c_s and γ were in (4.17) and (4.34) defined to be

$$c_s = \left[\frac{(2+s)(3+s)}{2(1+s)^2} \right]^{\frac{1+s}{2(2+s)}}, \quad \gamma = \frac{1+s}{2^{\frac{2}{1+s}} c_s^{\frac{1-s}{1+s}} \mu^{\frac{1-s}{2+s}}}.$$

The coefficient $C_0(s)$ from Lemma 4.9 is defined here by

$$C_0(s) := \frac{2^{\frac{3-s}{3+2s}} (3+s)^{\frac{s}{3+2s}} (3+2s)}{2^{\frac{2}{1+s}} (2+s)^{\frac{3+s}{3+2s}}}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

The two coefficients $C_1(s)$ and $C_2(s)$ were in Remark (2.4) defined to be

$$C_1(s) = \frac{2^{\frac{3+s}{6+4s}} [(2+s)(3+s)]^{\frac{1+s}{6+4s}}}{1+s}, \quad C_2(s) = \frac{2^{\frac{4+2s}{3+3s}} (2+s)^{\frac{5+s}{6}} (3+s)^{\frac{1-s}{6}}}{2^{\frac{1-s}{6}} 3^{\frac{2+s}{3}} (1+s)}.$$

Finally, the two coefficients $\tilde{C}_1(s)$ and $\tilde{C}_2(s)$ from Corollary 2.6 are defined here by

$$\tilde{C}_1(s) := \frac{2^{\frac{3+s}{(3+2s)(4+2s)}} [(2+s)(3+s)]^{\frac{1+s}{3+2s}}}{1+s}, \quad \tilde{C}_2(s) := \frac{2^{\frac{2}{3+3s}} (2+s)^{\frac{2}{3}} (3+s)^{\frac{1}{3}}}{2^{\frac{1-s}{12+6s}} 3^{\frac{1}{3}} (1+s)}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

In the coming lemma, we will also see the quantities μ and κ_s ; these are simply placeholders for the expressions $\|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}$ and $|K|_{TV^s}$ respectively and will not affect the algebra in any non-trivial way.

Lemma A.2. *With $c_s, \gamma, C_0(s), C_1(s), C_2(s), \tilde{C}_1(s), \tilde{C}_2(s), \mu$ and κ_s as they appear above, we have the relations*

$$\left(\frac{2c_s\kappa_s}{1+s}\right)^{\frac{2+s}{3+2s}} \mu^{\frac{1+s}{3+2s}} =: \underline{a} = C_1(s)\kappa_s^{\frac{2+s}{3+2s}} \mu^{\frac{1+s}{3+2s}}, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$\left(\frac{3+2s}{2+s}\right)\gamma\underline{a}^{\frac{3}{2+s}} =: \tau = C_0(s)\kappa_s^{\frac{3}{3+2s}} \mu^{\frac{2s}{3+2s}}, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$\underline{a}\left(\frac{3+2s}{3\tau}\right)^{\frac{2+s}{3}} = C_2(s)\mu^{\frac{1-s}{3}}, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$2^{\frac{1+s}{4+2s}}c_sC_1(s)^{\frac{1}{2+s}} = \tilde{C}_1(s), \quad (\text{A.6})$$

$$2^{\frac{1+s}{4+2s}}c_sC_2(s)^{\frac{1}{2+s}} = \tilde{C}_2(s). \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Proof. We start with (A.3): inserting for c_s on the left-hand side of (A.3) we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{2}{1+s}\right)^{\frac{2+s}{3+2s}} \left(\frac{(2+s)(3+s)}{2(1+s)^2}\right)^{\frac{1+s}{2(3+2s)}} \kappa_s^{\frac{2+s}{3+2s}} \mu^{\frac{1+s}{3+2s}} \\ &= \underbrace{\left[\frac{2^{\frac{3+s}{6+4s}}[(2+s)(3+s)]^{\frac{1+s}{6+4s}}}{1+s}\right]}_{C_1(s)} \kappa_s^{\frac{2+s}{3+2s}} \mu^{\frac{1+s}{3+2s}}, \end{aligned}$$

and so (A.3) is established. Next, we prove (A.4): on the left-hand side of (A.4) we substitute for \underline{a} the left-hand side of (A.3) and insert for γ to attain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{3+2s}{2+s}\right)\left(\frac{1+s}{2^{\frac{2}{1+s}}c_s^{\frac{1-s}{1+s}}\mu^{\frac{1-s}{2+s}}}\right)\left(\frac{2c_s\kappa_s}{1+s}\right)^{\frac{3}{3+2s}} \mu^{\frac{3+3s}{(2+s)(3+2s)}} \\ &= \left[\left(\frac{2^{\frac{3}{3+2s}}(1+s)^{\frac{2s}{3+2s}}(3+2s)}{2^{\frac{2}{1+s}}(2+s)}\right)c_s^{\frac{2s(2+s)}{(1+s)(3+2s)}}\right]\kappa_s^{\frac{3}{3+2s}} \mu^{\frac{2s}{3+2s}}. \end{aligned}$$

Inserting for c_s , this last square bracket can further be written

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{2^{\frac{3}{3+2s}}(1+s)^{\frac{2s}{3+2s}}(3+2s)}{2^{\frac{2}{1+s}}(2+s)}\right)\left(\frac{(2+s)(3+s)}{2(1+s)^2}\right)^{\frac{s}{3+2s}} \\ &= \underbrace{\left[\frac{2^{\frac{3-s}{3+2s}}(3+s)^{\frac{s}{3+2s}}(3+2s)}{2^{\frac{2}{1+s}}(2+s)^{\frac{3+s}{3+2s}}}\right]}_{C_0(s)}, \end{aligned}$$

and so (A.4) is established. Next, we prove (A.5): if we on the left-hand side of (A.5) replace τ with the left-hand side of (A.4) we attain

$$\underline{a}\left(\frac{3+2s}{3}\right)^{\frac{2+s}{3}} \left[\frac{2+s}{(3+2s)\gamma\underline{a}^{\frac{3}{2+s}}}\right]^{\frac{2+s}{3}} = \left(\frac{2+s}{3\gamma}\right)^{\frac{2+s}{3}}$$

$$= \left(\frac{2^{\frac{2}{1+s}}(2+s)}{3(1+s)} \right)^{\frac{2+s}{3}} c_s^{\frac{(1-s)(2+s)}{3(1+s)}} \mu^{\frac{1-s}{3}},$$

where the second equality follows from inserting for γ . Inserting for c_s in this last expression, we get

$$\left(\frac{2^{\frac{2}{1+s}}(2+s)}{3(1+s)} \right)^{\frac{2+s}{3}} \left[\frac{(2+s)(3+s)}{2(1+s)^2} \right]^{\frac{1-s}{6}} \mu^{\frac{1-s}{3}} = \underbrace{\left[\frac{2^{\frac{4+2s}{3+3s}}(2+s)^{\frac{5+s}{6}}(3+s)^{\frac{1-s}{6}}}{2^{\frac{1-s}{6}} 3^{\frac{2+s}{3}}(1+s)} \right]}_{C_2(s)} \mu^{\frac{1-s}{3}},$$

and so (A.5) is established. Next, we prove (A.6): inserting for c_s and $C_1(s)$ on the left-hand side of (A.6) we get

$$\begin{aligned} & 2^{\frac{1+s}{2(2+s)}} \left(\frac{(2+s)(3+s)}{2(1+s)^2} \right)^{\frac{1+s}{2(2+s)}} \left(\frac{2^{\frac{3+s}{2(3+2s)}} [(2+s)(3+s)]^{\frac{1+s}{2(3+2s)}}}{1+s} \right)^{\frac{1}{2+s}} \\ &= \underbrace{\left[\frac{2^{\frac{3+s}{(3+2s)(4+2s)}} [(2+s)(3+s)]^{\frac{1+s}{3+2s}}}{1+s} \right]}_{\tilde{C}_1(s)}, \end{aligned}$$

and so (A.6) is established. Finally, we prove (A.7): inserting for c_s and $C_2(s)$ on the left-hand side of (A.7) we get

$$\begin{aligned} & 2^{\frac{1+s}{2(2+s)}} \left(\frac{(2+s)(3+s)}{2(1+s)^2} \right)^{\frac{1+s}{2(2+s)}} \left(\frac{2^{\frac{2(2+s)}{3+3s}} (2+s)^{\frac{5+s}{6}} (3+s)^{\frac{1-s}{6}}}{2^{\frac{1-s}{6}} 3^{\frac{2+s}{3}}(1+s)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2+s}} \\ &= \underbrace{\left[\frac{2^{\frac{2}{3+3s}} (2+s)^{\frac{2}{3}} (3+s)^{\frac{1}{3}}}{2^{\frac{1-s}{12+6s}} 3^{\frac{1}{3}}(1+s)} \right]}_{\tilde{C}_2(s)}, \end{aligned}$$

demonstrating the last equation (A.7). \square

In the next lemma, we show that $W^{s,1}$ regularity is sufficient to bound the fractional variation (1.5). For this, we recall the Slobodeckij seminorm

$$[f]_{s,1} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{|f(x+y) - f(x)|}{|y|^{1+s}} dx dy,$$

associated with $W^{s,1}(\mathbb{R})$ for $s \in (0, 1)$. Note however, the two seminorms are not equivalent as setting $f(x) = |x|^{s-1}$ with $s \in (0, 1)$ yields $|f|_{TV^s} < \infty = [f]_{s,1}$.

Lemma A.3. *For $f \in W^{s,1}(\mathbb{R})$ with $s \in [0, 1]$, we have the relations*

$$\begin{aligned} |f|_{TV^0} &= 2\|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}, \\ |f|_{TV^s} &\leq C_s [f]_{s,1}, \quad s \in (0, 1), \\ |f|_{TV^1} &= |f|_{TV(\mathbb{R})}, \end{aligned}$$

where the constant C_s only depends on $s \in (0, 1)$.

Proof. The cases $s = 0$ and $s = 1$ are trivial and so we focus on $s \in (0, 1)$. Set $\tau(y) := \|f(\cdot + y) - f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}$ and observe that τ is sub-additive by the triangle inequality. For any $h > 0$ we find

$$\begin{aligned} 2[f]_{s,1} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\tau(y)}{|y|^{1+s}} dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\tau(h-y)}{|h-y|^{1+s}} dy \\ &\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\tau(y) + \tau(h-y)}{\max\{|y|, |h-y|\}^{1+s}} dt \\ &\geq \tau(h) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{\max\{|y|, |h-y|\}^{1+s}} dy \\ &= \frac{\tau(h)}{h^s} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{\max\{|y|, |1-y|\}^{1+s}} dy, \end{aligned}$$

and so taking the supremum over $h > 0$ gives the result. \square

The Bessel kernels $G_\alpha \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ are for general $\alpha > 0$ defined by the formula (1.2) if one evaluates the integral in a principle value sense. We list a few properties regarding these kernels that can be found in [2, Chap. 2.4.]; for all $\alpha, \beta > 0$ we have the two identities

$$\|G_\alpha\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} = 1, \quad G_{\alpha+\beta} = G_\alpha * G_\beta,$$

and for $\alpha > 1$, the distributional derivatives $K_\alpha := (G_\alpha)'$ satisfy

$$\|K_\alpha\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} < \infty, \quad |K_\alpha(x)| \lesssim_\alpha |x|^{\alpha-2}.$$

Additionally, G_α is symmetric and completely monotone on $(0, \infty)$ when $\alpha \in (0, 2]$ (see [5]). We use these properties in the coming lemma to bound the seminorm (1.5) when evaluated on K_α .

Lemma A.4. *For $\alpha > 1$ and $0 \leq s \leq \min\{\alpha - 1, 1\}$ we have*

$$|K_\alpha|_{TV^s} < \infty.$$

Proof. First let $\alpha \in (1, 2)$. As G_α is symmetric and completely monotone on $(0, \infty)$, K_α is positive on $(-\infty, 0)$, negative on $(0, \infty)$ and strictly increasing on both. Thus we may calculate for $h > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \|K_\alpha(\cdot + h) - K_\alpha\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} &= \int_{-\infty}^{-h} K_\alpha(x+h) - K_\alpha(x) dx + \int_{-h}^0 K_\alpha(x) - K_\alpha(x+h) dx \\ &\quad + \int_0^\infty K_\alpha(x+h) - K_\alpha(x) dx \\ &= 4 \int_{-h}^0 K_\alpha(x) dx \leq C_\alpha h^{\alpha-1}, \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C_\alpha < \infty$. For $s \in [0, \alpha - 1]$ we then have

$$\begin{aligned} |K_\alpha|_{TV^s} &= \sup_{h>0} \frac{\|K_\alpha(\cdot + h) - K_\alpha\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}}{h^s} \\ &\leq (2\|K_\alpha\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})})^{\frac{1-s}{\alpha-1}} \sup_{h>0} \left(\frac{\|K_\alpha(\cdot + h) - K_\alpha\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}}{h^{\alpha-1}} \right)^{\frac{s}{\alpha-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last quantity is bounded by the above calculation. For $\alpha = 2$, we have $G_\alpha(x) = \frac{1}{2}e^{-|x|}$ and thus $K_2(x) = -\frac{1}{2}\text{sgn}(x)e^{-|x|}$. This gives $|K_2|_{TV^1} = |K_2|_{TV} = 2$,

which together with a similar interpolation argument as above implies the lemma for the $\alpha = 2$ case. Finally, for $\alpha > 2$ we can use the identity

$$K_\alpha(\cdot + h) - K_\alpha = G_{\alpha-2} * (K_2(\cdot + h) - K_2),$$

to conclude by Young's convolution inequality that $|K_\alpha|_{TV^s} \leq |K_2|_{TV^s}$ for all $s \in [0, 1]$. \square

APPENDIX B. PROOF OF COROLLARY 2.6 AND COROLLARY 2.7

We prove Corollary 2.6 which provides a decaying L^∞ bound for the weak solutions of (1.1) provided by Corollary 2.2.

Proof of Corollary 2.6. We prove only (2.6) as (2.5) follows directly from the former when setting $s = 0$ and using $|K|_{TV^0} = 2\|K\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}$. With $s \in [0, 1]$ such that $|K|_{TV^s} < \infty$, we have by Theorem 2.3 that $u(t)$ admits the modulus of growth (Def. 4.1) $h \mapsto a(t)h^{\frac{1+s}{2}}$, where we set $a(t)$ to be the explicit expression (2.3) provided by Remark 2.4. The parameter $\mu > 0$ from Lemma 4.5 is arbitrary (see the beginning of Subsection 4.2) and so we may set it to $\mu = \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}$. Using $\|u(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}$, we infer from said lemma – more specifically (4.19) – that

$$\|u(t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq 2^{\frac{1+s}{2(2+s)}} c_s \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^{\frac{1+s}{2+s}} a(t)^{\frac{1}{2+s}},$$

for all $t > 0$. Using the sub-additivity of $y \mapsto |y|^{\frac{1}{2+s}}$ we infer that

$$a(t)^{\frac{1}{2+s}} \leq C_1(s)^{\frac{1}{2+s}} |K|_{TV^s}^{\frac{1}{3+2s}} \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^{\frac{1+s}{(2+s)(3+2s)}} + C_2(s)^{\frac{1}{2+s}} \frac{\|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^{\frac{1-s}{3(2+s)}}}{t^{\frac{1}{3}}},$$

and so inserting this in the above inequality we get

$$\|u(t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq \left[2^{\frac{1+s}{2(2+s)}} c_s C_1(s)^{\frac{1}{2+s}} \right] |K|_{TV^s}^{\frac{1}{3+2s}} \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^{\frac{2+2s}{3+2s}} + \left[2^{\frac{1+s}{2(2+s)}} c_s C_2(s)^{\frac{1}{2+s}} \right] \frac{\|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^{\frac{2}{3}}}{t^{\frac{1}{3}}},$$

for all $t > 0$. That these square brackets coincide with $\tilde{C}_1(s)$ and $\tilde{C}_2(s)$ is precisely the two identities (A.6) and (A.7) of Lemma A.2. \square

Next, we prove Corollary 2.7 which established a maximal lifespan for classical solutions of (1.1) with $L^2 \cap L^\infty$ data.

Proof of Corollary 2.7. Consider $s \in [0, 1]$ fixed for now, and assume $|K|_{TV^s} < \infty$. As (bounded) classical solutions are entropy solutions, we may associate $u \in L^\infty \cap C^1((0, T) \times \mathbb{R})$ with the global entropy solution admitting u_0 as initial data, provided by Theorem 2.1; the discussion following the proof of Proposition 3.1 justifies this viewpoint. Referring to this solution also as u , we have by (2.1) that $x \mapsto u(T, x)$ is a well defined element of $L^2 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ approximated in L^2 sense by $u(t)$ as $t \nearrow T$. Setting $v(t, x) := u(T - t, -x)$, we see through pointwise evaluation that v also is a classical solution of (1.1) (and thus an entropy solution) on $(0, T) \times \mathbb{R}$ with initial data $v_0(x) := u(T, -x)$. From (2.1) we then infer $\|v_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}$ since

$$\|v_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = \|u(T)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = \|v(T)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq \|v_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}.$$

Using the identity $u_0(x) = v(T, -x)$ for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and applying Theorem 2.3 to v we further find for all $h > 0$ and a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}$ that

$$u_0(x - h) - u_0(x) = v(T, -x + h) - v(T, -x) \leq a(T)h^{\frac{1+s}{2}}, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where we for $a(T)$ use the following explicit expression from Remark 2.4

$$a(T) = C_1(s) |K|_{TV^s}^{\frac{2+s}{3}} \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^{\frac{1+s}{3+2s}} + C_2(s) \frac{\|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^{\frac{1-s}{3}}}{T^{\frac{2+s}{3}}} =: \underline{a} + \frac{q}{T^{\frac{2+s}{3}}}, \quad (\text{B.2})$$

and where we have substituted $\|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}$ for $\|v_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}$ as the two quantities agree. Dividing each side of (B.1) by $h^{\frac{1+s}{2}}$ and taking the essential supremum with respect to $x \in \mathbb{R}$ we get

$$[u_0]_s := \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{R} \\ h > 0}} \left[\frac{u_0(x-h) - u_0(x)}{h^{\frac{1+s}{2}}} \right] \leq \underline{a} + \frac{q}{T^{\frac{2+s}{3}}}, \quad (\text{B.3})$$

and if $[u_0]_s > \underline{a}$ then (B.3) can be rewritten as

$$T \leq \left[\frac{q}{[u_0]_s - \underline{a}} \right]^{\frac{3}{2+s}} = \left(\frac{C_2(s)}{1 - \frac{\underline{a}}{[u_0]_s}} \right)^{\frac{3}{2+s}} \frac{\|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^{\frac{1-s}{2+s}}}{[u_0]_s^{\frac{3}{2+s}}} =: F\left(\frac{\underline{a}}{[u_0]_s}\right) \frac{\|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^{\frac{1-s}{2+s}}}{[u_0]_s^{\frac{3}{2+s}}}, \quad (\text{B.4})$$

where the first equality replaced q by its explicit expression as given by (B.2). We now show that this gives for any $\rho \in (0, 1)$ the following implication

$$[u_0]_s^{3+2s} > \left(\frac{C_1(s)}{\rho} \right)^{3+2s} |K|_{TV^s}^{2+s} \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^{1+s}, \quad \implies \quad T \leq F(\rho) \frac{\|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^{\frac{1-s}{2+s}}}{[u_0]_s^{\frac{3}{2+s}}}. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Indeed, using the explicit expression (B.2) for \underline{a} we see that the left-hand side of (B.5) is equivalent to $[u_0]_s > \underline{a}/\rho$ which, as $\rho \in (0, 1)$, implies that $[u_0]_s > \underline{a}$ and so (B.4) holds. By observing that $\rho \mapsto F(\rho)$ is strictly increasing on $(0, 1)$ and that $\rho > \underline{a}/[u_0]_s$ we see that the right-hand side of (B.5) then follows from (B.4). With (B.5) established, the corollary follows: for any $\rho \in (0, 1)$ we get such universal constants c and C by setting

$$c = \sup_{s \in [0,1]} \left(\frac{C_1(s)}{\rho} \right)^{3+2s}, \quad C = \sup_{s \in [0,1]} F(\rho) = \sup_{s \in [0,1]} \left(\frac{C_2(s)}{1 - \rho} \right)^{\frac{3}{2+s}}. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

The free parameter ρ allows us to shrink one of the two constants at the cost of enlarging the other; in particular, c is at its smallest for $\rho \rightarrow 1$ while C is at its smallest for $\rho \rightarrow 0$. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] N. ALIBAUD, *Entropy formulation for fractal conservation laws*, J. Evol. Equ., 7 (2007), pp. 145–175.
- [2] N. ARONSZAJN AND K. T. SMITH, *Theory of Bessel potentials. I*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble), 11 (1961), pp. 385–475.
- [3] C. BOURDARIAS, M. GISCLON, AND S. JUNCA, *Fractional BV spaces and applications to scalar conservation laws*, J. Hyperbolic Differ. Equ., 11 (2014), pp. 655–677.
- [4] A. BRESSAN AND K. T. NGUYEN, *Global existence of weak solutions for the Burgers-Hilbert equation*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 46 (2014), pp. 2884–2904.
- [5] G. BRUELL, M. EHRNSTÖM, M. A. JOHNSON, AND E. WAHLÉN, *Waves of greatest height for nonlocal dispersive equations*, work in progress.
- [6] G. M. COCLITE AND L. DI RUVO, *Oleinik type estimates for the Ostrovsky-Hunter equation*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 423 (2015), pp. 162–190.
- [7] A. CONSTANTIN AND J. ESCHER, *Wave breaking for nonlinear nonlocal shallow water equations*, Acta Math., 181 (1998), pp. 229–243.

- [8] C. M. DAFERMOS, *Hyperbolic Conservation Laws in Continuum Physics*, vol. 325 of Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, third ed., 2010.
- [9] M. EHRNSTRÖM, M. D. GROVES, AND E. WAHLÉN, *On the existence and stability of solitary-wave solutions to a class of evolution equations of Whitham type*, *Nonlinearity*, 25 (2012), pp. 2903–2936.
- [10] M. EHRNSTRÖM AND Y. WANG, *Enhanced existence time of solutions to the fractional Korteweg–de Vries equation*, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 51 (2019), pp. 3298–3323.
- [11] K. GRUNERT AND K. T. NGUYEN, *On the Burgers-Poisson equation*, *J. Differential Equations*, 261 (2016), pp. 3220–3246.
- [12] S. HERR, A. D. IONESCU, C. E. KENIG, AND H. KOCH, *A para-differential renormalization technique for nonlinear dispersive equations*, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 35 (2010), pp. 1827–1875.
- [13] H. HOLDEN AND H. RISEBRO, NILS, *Front Tracking for Hyperbolic Conservation Laws*, 2ed Springer, 2015.
- [14] V. M. HUR, *Wave breaking in the Whitham equation*, *Adv. Math.*, 317 (2017), pp. 410–437.
- [15] A. D. IONESCU AND C. E. KENIG, *Global well-posedness of the Benjamin-Ono equation in low-regularity spaces*, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 20 (2007), pp. 753–798.
- [16] R. KILLIP AND M. VIŞAN, *KdV is well-posed in H^{-1}* , *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 190 (2019), pp. 249–305.
- [17] C. KLEIN AND J.-C. SAUT, *A numerical approach to blow-up issues for dispersive perturbations of Burgers’ equation*, *Phys. D*, 295/296 (2015), pp. 46–65.
- [18] S. N. KRUŽKOV, *First Order Quasilinear Equations in Several Independent Variables*, *Sbornik: Mathematics*, 10 (1970), pp. 217–243.
- [19] F. LINARES, D. PILOD, AND J.-C. SAUT, *Dispersive perturbations of Burgers and hyperbolic equations I: Local theory*, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 46 (2014), pp. 1505–1537.
- [20] Y. LIU, D. PELINOVSKY, AND A. SAKOVICH, *Wave breaking in the Ostrovsky-Hunter equation*, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 42 (2010), pp. 1967–1985.
- [21] E. LOVE AND L. YOUNG, *Sur une classe de fonctionnelles linéaires*, *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 28 (1937), pp. 243–257.
- [22] Y. MARTEL AND D. PILOD, *Construction of a minimal mass blow up solution of the modified Benjamin-Ono equation*, *Math. Ann.*, 369 (2017), pp. 153–245.
- [23] L. MOLINET, D. PILOD, AND S. VENTO, *On well-posedness for some dispersive perturbations of Burgers’ equation*, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 35 (2018), pp. 1719–1756.
- [24] G. B. WHITHAM, *Linear and Nonlinear Waves*, Wiley-Interscience, John Wiley & Sons, New York-London-Sydney, 1974. Pure and Applied Mathematics.
- [25] R. YANG, *Shock formation for the Burgers-Hilbert equation*, arXiv:2006.05568v2, 2020.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, NORWEGIAN UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, 7491 TRONDHEIM, NORWAY

Email address: ola.mahlen@ntnu.no, jun.xue@ntnu.no