

CARLEMAN ESTIMATE FOR THE NAVIER-STOKES EQUATIONS AND APPLICATIONS

¹ OLEG Y. IMANUVILOV, ² LUCA LORENZI, ^{3,4,5,6} M. YAMAMOTO

ABSTRACT. For linearized Navier-Stokes equations, we first derive a Carleman estimate with a regular weight function. Then we apply it to establish conditional stability for the lateral Cauchy problem and finally we prove conditional stability estimates for inverse source problem of determining a spatially varying divergence-free factor of a source term.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $T > 0$, and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be a bounded domain with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$ and A, B be sufficiently smooth. By a^T we denote the transpose of a vector a under consideration. We set

$$\partial_j = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}, \quad j = 1, 2, 3, \quad \partial_t = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \quad \nabla = (\partial_1, \partial_2, \partial_3), \quad \nabla_{x,t} = (\nabla, \partial_t)$$

and

$$\operatorname{div} v = \sum_{j=1}^3 \partial_j v_j \quad \text{for } v = (v_1, v_2, v_3)^T.$$

¹ Department of Mathematics, Colorado State University

101 Weber Building, Fort Collins, CO 80523-1874, USA

e-mail: oleg@math.colostate.edu

² Department of Mathematical, Physical and Computer Sciences, University of Parma, Parco Area delle Scienze 53/A, I-43124 Parma Italy

e-mail: luca.lorenzi@unipr.it

³ Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, The University of Tokyo, Komaba, Meguro, Tokyo 153-8914, Japan

⁴ Honorary Member of Academy of Romanian Scientists, Ilfov, nr. 3, Bucuresti, Romania

⁵ Correspondence member of Accademia Peloritana dei Pericolanti,

Palazzo Università, Piazza S. Pugliatti 1 98122 Messina Italy

⁶ Peoples' Friendship University of Russia (RUDN University) 6 Miklukho-Maklaya St, Moscow, 117198, Russian Federation e-mail: myama@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp .

We consider

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v(x, t) - \Delta v + (A(x, t) \cdot \nabla)v + (v \cdot \nabla)B(x, t) + \nabla p = F(x, t), \\ \operatorname{div} v(x, t) = 0, \quad x \in \Omega, 0 < t < T. \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

Let $\Gamma \subset \partial\Omega$ and $\Omega_0 \subset \Omega$ be given subboundary and subdomain.

In this article, we consider the following two problems.

Continuation of solution by Cauchy data on $\Gamma \times (0, T)$. *Let (v, p) satisfy (1.1) with $F = 0$ and let $I \subset (0, T)$. Then determine (v, p) in $\Omega_0 \times I$ by v and its derivatives on $\Gamma \times (0, T)$.*

Inverse source problem. *Let $t_0 \in (0, T)$ be given and let (v, p) satisfy (1.1). Then determine F by v and its derivatives on $\Gamma \times (0, T)$ and $v(\cdot, t_0)$.*

A method based on Carleman estimate by Bukhgeim and Klibanov [5] is applicable for proving stability estimates for these problems. Since [5], there have been many works for parabolic, hyperbolic and other types of equations. We refer only to Beilina and Klibanov [1], Bellassoued and Yamamoto [3], Imanuvilov and Yamamoto [14], [16], [17], Klibanov [19], Klibanov and Timonov [20], Yamamoto [22]. Here the references are very limited and see also the references in the above works.

On the other hand, there are not sufficient works on inverse problems by the same methodology for the Navier-Stokes equations in spite of the importance. We refer only to Imanuvilov and Yamamoto [15], Bellassoued, Imanuvilov and Yamamoto [2], Boulakia [4], Choulli, Imanuvilov, Puel and Yamamoto [6], Fabre [7], Fan, Di Cristo, Jiang and Nakamura [8], Fan, Jiang and Nakamura [9]. See also Imanuvilov and Yamamoto [17], [18] as for inverse problems for the fluid equations.

Huang, Imanuvilov and Yamamoto [11] recently simplified the method by [5] and here we apply it. We remark that we use the same type of Carleman estimate for the Navier-Stokes equations as [2] but the derivation of a Carleman estimate is simpler than [2].

Thus, in this article, we aim at improving the results in [2], and the main achievements are:

- a more feasible Carleman estimate (Theorem 1) for the applications.

- an improvement of the conditional stability estimates for the continuation of solutions by Cauchy data.
- novel conditional stability estimates in determining force term $F(x, t)$ in view of the divergence-free component.

Now we show the key Carleman estimate, and to this end, we need some notations. Let $t_0 \in (0, T)$ be arbitrarily taken. We choose $\delta > 0$ such that $0 < t_0 - \delta < t_0 + \delta < T$ and we set

$$I = (t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta), \quad Q := \Omega \times I.$$

Let $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^3$ and $|\gamma| = \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + \gamma_3$. For $k, \ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $s > 0$, we set

$$H^{k, \ell}(Q) = \{v \in L^2(Q); \partial_x^\gamma v \in L^2(Q), |\gamma| \leq k, \partial_t^j v \in L^2(Q) \quad 0 \leq j \leq \ell\}.$$

Let $d \in C^2(\overline{\Omega})$ satisfy

$$|\nabla d| \neq 0 \quad \text{on } \overline{\Omega}. \quad (1.2)$$

Henceforth we fix a large constant $\lambda > 0$, and throughout the article, we omit the λ -dependency of the constants. For arbitrarily chosen constant $\beta > 0$, we set

$$\varphi(x, t) = e^{\lambda(d(x) - \beta(t - t_0)^2)}, \quad (x, t) \in Q.$$

Henceforth by $[u]_k$ with $k = 1, 2, 3$, we denote the k -th component of a vector u , and $\nabla(\text{rot } v)$ means the matrix with the elements $\partial_j[\text{rot } v]_k$, $1 \leq j, k \leq 3$.

Then

Theorem 1 (Carleman estimate for the Navier-Stokes equations).

There exist constants $s_0 > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_Q \left\{ \frac{1}{s} (|\partial_t \text{rot } v|^2 + |\partial_t v|^2 + |\Delta(\text{rot } v)|^2 + |\Delta v|^2) \right. \\ & \left. + s (|\nabla(\text{rot } v)|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) + s^3 (|\text{rot } v|^2 + |v|^2) \right\} e^{2s\varphi} dx dt \\ & \leq C \int_Q |\text{rot } F|^2 e^{2s\varphi} dx dt + C s^3 \int_{\partial\Omega \times I} \sum_{j=0}^1 (|\nabla_{x,t}^j(\text{rot } v)|^2 + |\nabla^j v|^2) e^{2s\varphi} dS dt \\ & + C s^3 \sum_{\kappa=0}^1 \int_{\Omega} \sum_{j=0}^1 |\nabla^j(\text{rot } v(x, t_0 + (-1)^\kappa \delta))|^2 e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0 + \delta)} dx \end{aligned}$$

for all $s > s_0$, $p \in L^2(I; H^1(\Omega))$ and $v, \text{rot} v \in H^{2,1}(Q)$.

We note that $\varphi(x, t_0 + \delta) = \varphi(x, t_0 - \delta)$, $x \in \Omega$.

Remark 1.

We can estimate also $\frac{1}{s} |\nabla p|^2 e^{2s\varphi}$ on the left-hand side if we replace the term $\int_Q |\text{rot} F|^2 dx dt$ by $\int_Q (|F|^2 + |\text{rot} F|^2) dx dt$.

Here we choose a regular weight function $e^{\lambda(d(x) - \beta(t-t_0)^2)}$. A similar Carleman estimate with the same type of weight function for the Navier-Stokes equations is derived in [2], but the derivation here is simpler. On the other hand, we can choose other type of weight function with singularity at $t = 0, T$, which was created by Imanuvilov [12] for a single parabolic equation. For linearized Navier-Stokes equations, we refer to Choulli, Imanuvilov, Puel and Yamamoto [6], Fan, Di Cristo, Jiang and Nakamura [8], Fan, Jiang and Nakamura [9], Fernández-Cara, Guerrero, Imanuvilov and Puel [10].

Next we formulate the main result for the continuation of solution. For small $\delta > 0$ satisfying $0 < t_0 - \delta < t_0 + \delta$, we choose $0 < \delta_0 < \delta < T$. We consider

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v(x, t) - \Delta v + (A(x, t) \cdot \nabla) v + (v \cdot \nabla) B + \nabla p = 0, \\ \text{div} v = 0, \quad (x, t) \in Q := \Omega \times I. \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

Then we are requested to estimate (v, p) in some subdomain by data of v on $\Gamma \times (0, T)$, where Γ is an arbitrary subboundary of $\partial\Omega$.

For an arbitrarily chosen subboundary $\Gamma \subset \partial\Omega$, we choose an arbitrary subdomain $\Omega_0 \subset \Omega$ such that

$$\overline{\Omega_0} \subset \Omega \cup \Gamma, \quad \overline{\Omega_0} \cap \partial\Omega \text{ is included in Int}(\Gamma): \text{ the interior of } \Gamma.$$

We are ready to state the main result for the continuation.

Theorem 2 (continuation of solution).

Let $(v, p) \in H^{2,1}(Q) \times L^2(0, T; H^2(\Omega))$ satisfy (1.3) with $\text{rot} v \in H^{2,1}(Q)$ and

$$\sum_{j=0}^1 (\|\nabla_{x,t}^j(\text{rot} v)\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega \times (0,T))} + \|\nabla^j v\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega \times (0,T))}) + \|\text{rot} v\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^1(\Omega))} \leq M \quad (1.4)$$

with arbitrarily fixed constant $M > 0$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist constants $C > 0$ and $\theta \in (0, 1)$, which depend on $M, \varepsilon, \Gamma, \Omega_0$ such that

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^1 \|\text{rot}^\ell v\|_{H^{1,1}(\Omega_0 \times (\varepsilon, T-\varepsilon))} + \|\Delta(\text{rot}^\ell v)\|_{L^2(\Omega_0 \times (\varepsilon, T-\varepsilon))} + \|\nabla p\|_{L^2(\Omega_0 \times (\varepsilon, T-\varepsilon))} \leq C(D + D^\theta),$$

where

$$D := \sum_{j=0}^1 (\|\nabla_{x,t}^j(\text{rot} v)\|_{L^2(\Gamma \times (0, T))} + \|\nabla^j v\|_{L^2(\Gamma \times (0, T))}).$$

This theorem asserts stability in determining a solution (v, p) in some subdomain by boundary data of v on $\Gamma \times (0, T)$ under a priori bound (1.4).

A similar conditional stability for the continuation was proved in [2], but our proof is simplified by adapting the proof of Proposition 2 in Huang, Imanuvilov and Yamamoto [11] which is concerned with a single parabolic equation. In [11], differently from the conventional arguments by Carleman estimates, we do not use any cut-off functions $\chi(x, t)$ which is compactly supported, and do not need to consider $\chi(x, t)v(x, t)$, but directly $v(x, t)$. In the case of the Navier-Stokes equations, the cut-off destroys the original structure of the equations, that is, $\text{div } \chi v = 0$ does not hold. Consequently, if we apply the cut-off, then we have to prove a Carleman estimate for the Navier-Stokes equations without $\text{div } v = 0$, which causes a complexity (see [2]). Since we do not here require any cut-off at all, the proofs of Theorems 1 - 3 are simplified.

Finally we state the main result for the inverse source problem. In (1.1), we assume

$$\text{div } F(x, t_0) = 0, \quad x \in \Omega. \tag{1.5}$$

We introduce two kinds of conditions:

$$|\partial_t^k \text{rot } F(x, t)| \leq C |\text{rot } F(x, t_0)|, \quad (x, t) \in Q, \quad k = 0, 1. \tag{1.6}$$

$$|\partial_t^k \text{rot } F(x, t)| \leq C (|\nabla F(x, t_0)| + |F(x, t_0)|), \quad (x, t) \in Q, \quad k = 0, 1, 2. \tag{1.7}$$

We notice that (1.6) implies (1.7), that is, condition (1.7) is more generous than (1.6).

We are ready to state different conditional stability estimates according to (1.6) and (1.7).

Theorem 3 (inverse source problem).

Let $\Gamma \subset \partial\Omega$ be arbitrary and $\Omega_0 \subset \Omega$ be a subdomain satisfying $\overline{\Omega_0} \subset \Omega \cup \Gamma$ and $\overline{\Omega_0} \cap \partial\Omega \subset \text{Int}(\Gamma)$.

(i) We set

$$\mathcal{F}_1 := \{F \in L^2(Q); \text{rot} F, \text{div} F \in H^1(I; L^2(\Omega)), (1.6) \text{ is satisfied}\}.$$

We set

$$D_1 := \sum_{j,k=0}^1 (\|\nabla_{x,t}^j \partial_t^k(\text{rot} v)\|_{L^2(\Gamma \times I)} + \|\nabla^j \partial_t^k v\|_{L^2(\Gamma \times I)}) + \|v(\cdot, t_0)\|_{H^3(\Omega)}. \quad (1.8)$$

We assume that a solution $(v, p) \in H^{2,1}(Q) \times H^{1,0}(Q)$ to (1.1) satisfies $\partial_t \text{rot} v \in H^{2,1}(Q)$, $\partial_t p \in H^{1,0}(Q)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j,k=0}^1 (\|\nabla_{x,t}^j \partial_t^k(\text{rot} v)\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega \times I)} + \|\nabla^j \partial_t^k v\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega \times I)}) \\ & + \sum_{\kappa=0}^1 \sum_{k=0}^1 \|\partial_t^\kappa \text{rot}(\cdot, t_0 + (-1)^\kappa \delta)\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq M_1 \end{aligned} \quad (1.9)$$

with arbitrarily given constant $M_1 > 0$. Then there exist constants $C > 0$ and $\theta \in (0, 1)$, dependent on Ω_0, Γ, M_1 , such that

$$\|\text{rot} F(\cdot, t_0)\|_{L^2(\Omega_0)} \leq C(D_1^\theta + D_1)$$

for each $F \in \mathcal{F}_1$.

(ii) We set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_2 := \{F \in H^2(I; H^2(\Omega)); \|F(\cdot, t_0)\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \leq m_1, \quad F(\cdot, t_0) = |\nabla F(\cdot, t_0)| = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma, \\ (1.5) \text{ and } (1.7) \text{ are satisfied}\} \end{aligned}$$

with arbitrarily chosen constant $m_1 > 0$. We further set

$$D_2 := \sum_{j=0}^1 \sum_{k=0}^2 (\|\nabla_{x,t}^j \partial_t^k(\text{rot} v)\|_{L^2(\Gamma \times I)} + \|\nabla^j \partial_t^k v\|_{L^2(\Gamma \times I)}) + \|v(\cdot, t_0)\|_{H^4(\Omega)}.$$

We assume that a solution $(v, p) \in H^{2,1}(Q) \times H^{1,0}(Q)$ to (1.1) satisfies $\partial_t^k \text{rot} v \in H^{2,1}(Q)$, $\partial_t^k p \in H^{1,0}(Q)$ with $k = 0, 1, 2$ and

$$\sum_{j=0}^1 \sum_{k=0}^2 (\|\nabla_{x,t}^j \partial_t^k \text{rot} v\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega \times I)} + \|\nabla^j \partial_t^k v\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega \times I)})$$

$$+ \sum_{\kappa=0}^1 \sum_{k=0}^2 \|\partial_t^k \operatorname{rot} v(\cdot, t_0 + (-1)^\kappa \delta)\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq M_2$$

with arbitrarily given constant $M_2 > 0$. Then there exist constants $C > 0$ and $\theta \in (0, 1)$, dependent on $\Omega_0, \Gamma, m_2, M_2$, such that

$$\|F(\cdot, t_0)\|_{H^1(\Omega_0)} \leq C(D_2^\theta + D_2)$$

for each $F \in \mathcal{F}_2$.

In Theorem 3 (i) we aim at the determination of $\operatorname{rot} F(x, t_0)$ for $x \in \Omega$, not F itself, and we do not need to assume (1.5). Theorem 3 asserts two kinds of conditional stability according to the admissible sets \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 . Theorem 3 (i) determines only the rotation component of $F(x, t_0)$ and so it is not necessary to assume (1.5).

In Theorem 3, not assuming the boundary condition on the whole boundary of Ω , we establish stability in determining F in a subdomain of Ω . On the other hand, the stability over Ω is proved with the boundary condition on the whole $\partial\Omega \times (0, T)$ in Choulli, Imanuvilov, Puel and Yamamoto [6] for the Navier-Stokes equations, and Fan, Jiang and Nakamura [9] for the Boussinesq equations.

We will test conditions (1.5) - (1.7). First, as the following example shows, the condition (1.5) is essential for the uniqueness in determining $F(x, t_0)$ in Theorem 3 (ii), where no data of p are observed.

Obstruction to the uniqueness in determining F :

We consider a simple case

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v(x, t) - \Delta v + \nabla p = f(x), \\ \operatorname{div} v = 0, \quad (x, t) \in Q := \Omega \times I, \\ v(x, t_0) = 0 \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega, \quad \operatorname{supp} v \subset \Omega \times (0, T). \end{cases} \quad (1.10)$$

Here f is an \mathbb{R}^3 -valued smooth function. It is trivial that $(v, p) = (0, 0)$ satisfies (1.10) with $f = 0$. Let $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$. Then $(v, p) := (0, \psi)$ satisfies (1.10) with $f := \nabla\psi$. In other words, by the appearance of the pressure field p in the Navier-Stokes equations, there is no possibility for the uniqueness in determining the component of f given by a scalar potential.

Next we examine the conditions (1.5) - (1.7) by considering examples.

Example 1. We see that (1.5) is replaced in terms of a vector potential:

$$F(x, t) := \operatorname{rot} q(x, t), \quad (x, t) \in Q,$$

where $q = q(x, t)$ is smooth. Then (1.5) is automatically satisfied. Moreover, we see that (1.7) is equivalent to

$$|\operatorname{rot} \operatorname{rot} (\partial_t^k q(x, t))| \leq C(|\nabla \operatorname{rot} q(x, t_0)| + |\operatorname{rot} q(x, t)|), \quad (x, t) \in Q, \quad k = 0, 1, 2.$$

Example 2.

Let

$$F(x, t) = r(t)f(x), \quad x \in \Omega, \quad 0 < t < T, \quad r(t_0) \neq 0, \quad \operatorname{div} f = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

where real-valued $r \in C^2[0, T]$ and $f = (f_1, f_2, f_3)^T$ are smooth. Then (1.5) and (1.6) are satisfied. Indeed we can directly verify $\operatorname{div} F(x, t_0) = r(t_0)\operatorname{div} f(x) = 0$ for $x \in \Omega$, which is (1.5). Moreover, we have

$$|\partial_t^k \operatorname{rot} F(x, t)| = \left| \frac{d^k r}{dt^k}(t) \operatorname{rot} f(x) \right| \leq C |\operatorname{rot} f(x)|, \quad k = 0, 1$$

and

$$|\operatorname{rot} F(x, t_0)| = |r(t_0)| |\operatorname{rot} f(x)|, \quad (x, t) \in Q,$$

which is (1.6).

Example 3.

For more general F unlike Example 2, it is not always easy to verify (1.6), but in the following case the condition (1.7) can be readily verified. Let

$$F(x, t) = R(x, t)f(x),$$

where $R(x, t) = (r_{jk}(x, t))_{1 \leq j, k \leq 3}$ and each component r_{jk} is smooth in (x, t) , and $f(x) = (f_1(x), f_2(x), f_3(x))^T$. Then (1.7) is satisfied if

$$|\det R(x, t_0)| > 0 \quad \text{for } x \in \overline{\Omega}.$$

Indeed, we have

$$|\partial_t^k \operatorname{rot} F(x, t)| \leq C(|\nabla f(x)| + |f(x)|), \quad (x, t) \in \overline{Q}, \quad k = 0, 1, 2.$$

Therefore it is sufficient to verify

$$|\nabla f(x)| + |f(x)| \leq C(|\nabla F(x, t_0)| + |F(x, t_0)|), \quad x \in \Omega. \quad (1.11)$$

Verification of (1.11). By $|\det R(x, t_0)| \neq 0$ for $x \in \bar{\Omega}$, we have

$$|f(x)| \leq C|F(x, t_0)|, \quad x \in \bar{\Omega}.$$

Next, setting $F = (F_1, F_2, F_3)^T$, we have

$$\partial_\ell F_k(x, t_0) = \sum_{j=1}^3 r_{kj}(x, t_0) \partial_\ell f_j(x) + \sum_{j=1}^3 (\partial_\ell r_{kj})(x, t_0) f_j(x),$$

and so

$$\sum_{j=1}^3 r_{kj}(x, t_0) \partial_\ell f_j(x) = \partial_\ell F_k(x, t_0) - \sum_{j=1}^3 (\partial_\ell r_{kj}(x, t_0)) f_j(x),$$

that is,

$$R(x, t_0) \partial_\ell f(x) = \partial_\ell F(x, t_0) - (\partial_\ell R(x, t_0)) f(x).$$

Therefore, by $|\det R(x, t_0)| \neq 0$ for $x \in \bar{\Omega}$, we see

$$|\partial_\ell f(x)| \leq C(|\partial_\ell F(x, t_0)| + |F(x, t_0)|), \quad x \in \bar{\Omega}, \quad 1 \leq \ell \leq 3.$$

Thus (1.11) is verified.

Here for the form $F(x, t) = R(x, t)f(x)$ with 3×3 matrix $R(x, t)$, we do not know a convenient sufficient condition for (1.6), but condition (1.7) can be more directly verified. Therefore, Theorem 3 (ii) is more feasible in applications.

Remark 2.

A special case $F(x, t) = f(x)r(x, t)$, where f is real-valued and r is \mathbb{R}^3 -valued, is trivial by (1.5). Because (1.5) means that f satisfies a first-order transport equation $r(x, t_0) \cdot \nabla f(x) + f(x) \operatorname{div} r(x, t_0) = 0$ for $x \in \Omega$, and so f can be uniquely determined by boundary data of f under a certain condition on $r(x, t_0)$.

Remark 3.

Theorem 3 (i) estimates only $\operatorname{rot} F(x, t_0)$. However, since $\operatorname{div} F(x, t_0) = 0$ for $x \in \Omega$, we have

$$-\Delta F(x, t_0) = \operatorname{rot} \operatorname{rot} F(x, t_0) - \nabla \operatorname{div} F(x, t_0) = \operatorname{rot} \operatorname{rot} F(x, t_0), \quad x \in \Omega.$$

If we are given boundary data $F(x, t_0)$ with $x \in \partial\Omega$ in a suitable space, then we can further estimate by means of H^{-1} -estimate of the solution to $-\Delta F(x, t_0) = h$ under condition (1.6). Here we do not pursue more. In Section 5.4, we will discuss this issue by means of a Carleman estimate in H^{-1} -space under a weaker assumption than (1.7).

This article is composed of six sections. In Sections 2-4, we prove Theorems 1 -3 respectively. Section 5 is devoted to concluding remarks and in Section 6, we derive Lemma 2 which is used for the proof of Theorem 1.

2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Thanks to the large parameter $s > 0$, it suffices to prove Theorem 1 for $B = 0$.

We set

$$z := \operatorname{rot} v.$$

Then

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t z(x, t) - \Delta z + (A(x, t) \cdot \nabla)z = \operatorname{rot} F - \sum_{j=1}^3 \nabla A_j \times \partial_j v, \\ \Delta v = -\operatorname{rot} z, \quad x \in \Omega, 0 < t < T. \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

The system (2.1) provides a decomposition of the Navier-Stokes equations into a parabolic equation in $z := \operatorname{rot} v$ and an elliptic equation in v , where p is eliminated.

First we show a Carleman estimate for a simple parabolic equation with constant coefficients:

$$\partial_t u - \Delta u = G \quad \text{in } Q.$$

Henceforth $C > 0$ denotes generic constants which are independent of $s > 0$.

Lemma 1.

There exist constants $C > 0$ and $s_0 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_Q \left\{ \frac{1}{s} (|\partial_t u|^2 + |\Delta u|^2) + s |\nabla u|^2 + s^3 |u|^2 \right\} e^{2s\varphi} dx dt \\ & \leq C \int_Q |G|^2 e^{2s\varphi} dx dt + C s^3 \int_{\partial\Omega \times I} (|\nabla_{x,t} u|^2 + |u|^2) e^{2s\varphi} dS dt \\ & \quad + C s^3 \sum_{\kappa=0}^1 \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u(x, t_0 + (-1)^\kappa \delta)|^2 + |u(x, t_0 + (-1)^\kappa \delta)|^2) e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0 + \delta)} dx \end{aligned}$$

for all $s > s_0$ and all $u \in H^{2,1}(Q)$.

Lemma 1 is a standard Carleman estimate for a single parabolic equation, and a direct proof is found for example in Bellassoued and Yamamoto [3] (Lemma 7.1), Yamamoto [22] (Theorems 3.1 and 3.2).

Next we show two Carleman estimates for the Laplace operator.

Lemma 2.

Let $r \in L^2(I; H^2(\Omega))$ satisfy

$$-\Delta r(x, t) = g(x, t) \quad \text{in } Q.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_Q (s|\nabla r(x, t)|^2 + s^3|r(x, t)|^2)e^{2s\varphi(x, t)} dxdt \\ & \leq C \int_Q |g(x, t)|^2 e^{2s\varphi(x, t)} dxdt + Cs^3 \int_{\partial\Omega \times I} (|\nabla r|^2 + |r|^2)e^{2s\varphi(x, t)} dSdt \end{aligned}$$

for all $s > s_0$.

Lemma 3.

Let $w \in H^2(\Omega)$ satisfy

$$-\Delta w(x) = h(x), \quad x \in \Omega.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} (s|\nabla w(x)|^2 + s^3|w(x)|^2)e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0)} dx \\ & \leq C \int_{\Omega} |h(x)|^2 e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0)} dx + Cs^3 \int_{\partial\Omega} (|\nabla w(x)|^2 + |w(x)|^2)e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0)} dS \end{aligned}$$

for all $s > s_1$.

The proof of Lemma 3 is standard and we can prove directly by integration by parts (e.g., Lemma 7.1 in [3]), and Lemma 3 is used also for the proof of Theorem 3 in Section 4.

The proof of Lemma 2 is done by integrating the standard elliptic Carleman estimate in Lemma 3 for $-\Delta$ over the time interval I . For completeness, the derivation of Lemma 2 from Lemma 3 is provided in Appendix.

Now we complete the proof of Theorem 1. We apply Lemmata 1 and 2 to (2.1):

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_Q \left\{ \frac{1}{s} (|\partial_t z|^2 + |\Delta z|^2) + s |\nabla z|^2 + s^3 |z|^2 \right\} e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \\
& \leq C \int_Q \left| \operatorname{rot} F - \sum_{j=1}^3 A_j \times (\partial_j v) \right|^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt + C J_1 \\
& \leq C \int_Q |\operatorname{rot} F|^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt + C \int_Q (|\nabla v|^2 + |v|^2) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt + C J_1
\end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

and

$$\int_Q (s |\nabla v|^2 + s^3 |v|^2) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \leq C \int_Q |\operatorname{rot} z|^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt + C J_2. \tag{2.3}$$

Here and henceforth we set

$$\begin{aligned}
J_1 & := s^3 \int_{\partial\Omega \times I} (|\nabla_{x,t}(\operatorname{rot} v)|^2 + |\operatorname{rot} v|^2) e^{2s\varphi} dSdt \\
& + s^3 \sum_{\kappa=0}^1 \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla(\operatorname{rot} v(x, t_0 + (-1)^\kappa \delta))|^2 + |\operatorname{rot} v(x, t_0 + (-1)^\kappa \delta)|^2) e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0 + \delta)} dx
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$J_2 := s^3 \int_{\partial\Omega \times I} (|\nabla v|^2 + |v|^2) e^{2s\varphi} dSdt.$$

Hence, substituting (2.3) into the second term on the right-hand side of (2.1):

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_Q \left\{ \frac{1}{s} (|\partial_t z|^2 + |\Delta z|^2) + s |\nabla z|^2 + s^3 |z|^2 \right\} e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \\
& \leq C \int_Q |\operatorname{rot} F|^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt + C \int_Q |\operatorname{rot} z|^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt + C(J_1 + J_2).
\end{aligned}$$

Absorbing the second term on the right-hand side into the left-hand side, we complete the proof of Theorem 1.

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 2

Theorem 1 holds with general $d(x)$ satisfying only (1.2) in the weight function, but in order to apply for the proof of Theorems 2 and 3, we have to choose $d(x)$ closely related to the geometry of Γ as follows. First we construct some domain Ω_1 . For $\Gamma \subset \partial\Omega$, we choose a bounded domain Ω_1 with smooth boundary such that

$$\Omega \subsetneq \Omega_1, \quad \bar{\Gamma} = \overline{\partial\Omega \cap \Omega_1}, \quad \partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma \subset \partial\Omega_1.$$

In particular, $\Omega_1 \setminus \overline{\Omega}$ contains some non-empty open subset. We note that Ω_1 can be constructed as the interior of a union of $\overline{\Omega}$ and the closure of a non-empty domain $\widehat{\Omega}$ satisfying $\widehat{\Omega} \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{\Omega}$ and $\partial\widehat{\Omega} \cap \partial\Omega = \Gamma$.

We choose a domain ω such that $\overline{\omega} \subset \Omega_1 \setminus \overline{\Omega}$. Then, by Imanuvilov [12], we can find $d \in C^2(\overline{\Omega_1})$ such that

$$d > 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_1, \quad |\nabla d| > 0 \quad \text{on } \overline{\Omega_1 \setminus \omega}, \quad d = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_1. \quad (3.1)$$

In particular, by $\overline{\Omega_0} \subset \Omega_1$, we see

$$d > 0 \quad \text{on } \overline{\Omega_0}, \quad d = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma. \quad (3.2)$$

We recall that we choose a domain $\Omega_0 \subset \Omega$ satisfying $\overline{\partial\Omega_0 \cap \partial\Omega} \subset \text{Int}(\Gamma)$ and $\overline{\Omega_0} \subset \Omega \cup \Gamma$.

Henceforth we use this d and a sufficiently large constants $\lambda > 0$. Later by (3.10), we choose a constant $\beta > 0$.

For given $t_0 > 0$ and $\delta_2 > 0$ satisfying $0 < t_0 - \delta_2 < t_0 + \delta_2 < T$. We apply the Carleman estimate Theorem 1 in $\Omega \times (t_0 - \delta_2, t_0 + \delta_2)$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega \times (t_0 - \delta_2, t_0 + \delta_2)} \left(\sum_{j,\ell=0}^1 |\nabla_{x,t}^j(\text{rot}^\ell v)|^2 + \sum_{\ell=0}^1 |\Delta(\text{rot}^\ell v)|^2 \right) e^{2s\varphi} dx dt \\ & \leq C s^4 \int_{\partial\Omega \times (t_0 - \delta_2, t_0 + \delta_2)} \sum_{j=0}^1 (|\nabla_{x,t}^j(\text{rot} v)|^2 + |\nabla^j v|^2) e^{2s\varphi} dS dt \\ & \quad + C s^4 \sum_{\kappa=0}^1 \int_{\Omega} \sum_{j=0}^1 |\nabla^j(\text{rot} v(x, t_0 + (-1)^\kappa \delta_2))|^2 e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0 + \delta_2)} dx \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

for all $s > s_0$.

Here we note that the constants $C > 0$ and $s_0 > 0$ are independent of t_0 because the Carleman estimate is invariant by the translation in time provided that the translated time interval is included in $(0, T)$.

We set

$$d_0 = \min_{x \in \overline{\Omega_0}} d(x), \quad d_1 = \max_{x \in \overline{\Omega}} d(x).$$

Let $\tilde{\varepsilon} > 0$ be given such that $0 < \tilde{\varepsilon} < \delta_2$. Then, by (3.2), we have

$$\max_{x \in \overline{\partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma}, t_0 - \delta_2 \leq t \leq t_0 + \delta_2} \varphi(x, t) \leq 1, \quad \max_{x \in \overline{\Omega}} \varphi(x, t_0 - \delta_2) = \max_{x \in \overline{\Omega}} \varphi(x, t_0 + \delta_2) \leq e^{\lambda(d_1^2 - \beta\delta_2^2)} \quad (3.4)$$

and

$$\min_{x \in \overline{\Omega_0}, t_0 - \tilde{\varepsilon} \leq t \leq t_0 + \tilde{\varepsilon}} \varphi(x, t) \geq e^{\lambda(d_0^2 - \beta \tilde{\varepsilon}^2)}. \quad (3.5)$$

For concise descriptions, we set

$$N(v; t_0 - \tilde{\varepsilon}, t_0 + \tilde{\varepsilon}) := \sum_{\ell=0}^1 (\|\text{rot}^\ell v\|_{H^{1,1}(\Omega_0 \times (t_0 - \tilde{\varepsilon}, t_0 + \tilde{\varepsilon}))}^2 + \|\Delta(\text{rot}^\ell v)\|_{L^2(\Omega_0 \times (t_0 - \tilde{\varepsilon}, t_0 + \tilde{\varepsilon}))}^2).$$

Therefore, shrinking the integral domain $\Omega \times (t_0 - \delta_2, t_0 + \delta_2)$ to $\Omega_0 \times (t_0 - \tilde{\varepsilon}, t_0 + \tilde{\varepsilon})$ on the left-hand side of (3.3), applying the trace theorem and the embedding $H^1(0, T; H^1(\Omega)) \subset C([0, T]; H^1(\Omega))$, in terms of (1.4), (3.4) and (3.5), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \exp(2se^{\lambda(d_0^2 - \beta \tilde{\varepsilon}^2)}) N(v; t_0 - \tilde{\varepsilon}, t_0 + \tilde{\varepsilon}) \\ & \leq Cs^4 \left(\int_{\Gamma \times (t_0 - \delta_2, t_0 + \delta_2)} + \int_{(\partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma) \times (t_0 - \delta_2, t_0 + \delta_2)} \right) \sum_{j=0}^1 (|\nabla_{x,t}^j(\text{rot} v)|^2 + |\nabla^j v|^2) e^{2s\varphi} dS dt \\ & + Cs^4 \sum_{\kappa=0}^1 \int_{\Omega} \sum_{j=0}^1 |\nabla^j \text{rot}(x, t_0 + (-1)^\kappa \delta_2)|^2 e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0 + \delta_2)} dx \\ & \leq Cs^4 e^{Cs} D^2 + Cs^4 e^{2s} M^2 + Cs^4 M^2 \exp(2se^{\lambda(d_1^2 - \beta \delta_2^2)}) \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

for all $s \geq s_0$.

Now we will make a specific choice of $\beta > 0$, $\tilde{\varepsilon} > 0$ and $\delta_2 > 0$ such that $0 < \tilde{\varepsilon} < \delta_2$. First fix sufficiently large $N > 1$ such that

$$N - 1 > \frac{d_1^2 - d_0^2}{d_0^2}, \quad \text{that is,} \quad \frac{d_1^2}{d_0^2} < N. \quad (3.7)$$

For given $\varepsilon > 0$ in the statement of the theorem, we set

$$\tilde{\varepsilon} := \frac{\varepsilon}{N - 1}, \quad \delta_2 := N\tilde{\varepsilon} = \frac{N\varepsilon}{N - 1} > \tilde{\varepsilon}. \quad (3.8)$$

Since it suffices to consider the case where $\varepsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small, we can assume that $\delta_2 > 0$ is small, in particular, $0 < \delta_2 < T - \delta_2 < T$. Then, we can prove

$$\frac{d_1^2 - d_0^2}{\delta_2^2 - \tilde{\varepsilon}^2} < \frac{d_0^2}{\tilde{\varepsilon}^2}. \quad (3.9)$$

Indeed, by (3.8) and $N > 1$ we see

$$\frac{\delta_2^2}{\tilde{\varepsilon}^2} = N^2 > N.$$

Using (3.7), we have

$$\frac{d_1^2}{d_0^2} < N < \frac{\delta_2^2}{\tilde{\varepsilon}^2}, \quad \text{that is,} \quad \frac{d_1^2 - d_0^2}{d_0^2} < \frac{\delta_2^2 - \tilde{\varepsilon}^2}{\tilde{\varepsilon}^2},$$

which yields (3.9) by multiplying with $\frac{d_0^2}{\delta_2^2 - \tilde{\varepsilon}^2} > 0$.

Therefore, we can choose $\beta > 0$ such that

$$\frac{d_1^2 - d_0^2}{\delta_2^2 - \tilde{\varepsilon}^2} < \beta < \frac{d_0^2}{\tilde{\varepsilon}^2}, \quad (3.10)$$

which implies

$$d_0^2 - \beta\tilde{\varepsilon}^2 > 0, \quad d_0^2 - \beta\tilde{\varepsilon}^2 > d_1^2 - \beta\delta_2^2,$$

that is,

$$\mu_1 := e^{\lambda(d_0^2 - \beta\tilde{\varepsilon}^2)} > \mu_2 := \max\{1, e^{\lambda(d_1^2 - \beta\delta_2^2)}\}.$$

We arbitrarily choose $t_0 \in (\delta_2, T - \delta_2)$. We notice that $(t_0 - \delta_2, t_0 + \delta_2) \subset (0, T)$. Hence (3.6) yields

$$N(v; t_0 - \tilde{\varepsilon}, t_0 + \tilde{\varepsilon}) \leq Cs^4 M^2 e^{-2s\mu_0} + Cs^4 e^{Cs} D^2$$

for all $s \geq s_0$. Here we note

$$\mu_0 := \mu_1 - \mu_2 > 0.$$

Replacing s and C by $s + s_0$ and e^{Cs_0} respectively, we see

$$N(v; t_0 - \tilde{\varepsilon}, t_0 + \tilde{\varepsilon}) \leq Cs^4 M^2 e^{-2s\mu_0} + Cs^4 e^{Cs} D^2$$

for all $s \geq 0$. By $\mu_0 > 0$, we easily verify $\sup_{s>0} s^4 e^{-s\mu_0} < \infty$ and $s^4 e^{Cs} \leq C_1 e^{C_1 s}$ with large $C_1 > 0$, we obtain

$$N(v; t_0 - \tilde{\varepsilon}, t_0 + \tilde{\varepsilon}) \leq CM^2 e^{-s\mu_0} + Ce^{Cs} D^2$$

for all $s \geq 0$. Here we note that $C > 0$ is a generic constant which is independent of $s > 0$.

We make the right-hand side small by choosing $s \geq 0$ suitably.

Case 1: $D < M$.

We choose $s > 0$ such that

$$M^2 e^{-s\mu_0} = D^2 e^{Cs},$$

that is,

$$s = \frac{2}{C + \mu_0} \log \frac{M}{D} > 0.$$

Then

$$N(v; t_0 - \tilde{\varepsilon}, t_0 + \tilde{\varepsilon}) \leq 2CM^{\frac{2C}{C+\mu_0}} D^{\frac{2\mu_0}{C+\mu_0}}.$$

Case 2: $D \geq M$.

Then we can directly

$$N(v; t_0 - \tilde{\varepsilon}, t_0 + \tilde{\varepsilon}) \leq CD^2(e^{-s\mu_0} + e^{Cs}).$$

Hence setting $s = 1$ for example, we see $N(v; t_0 - \tilde{\varepsilon}, t_0 + \tilde{\varepsilon}) \leq CD^2e^C$. Thus in both cases, we obtain

$$N(v; t_0 - \tilde{\varepsilon}, t_0 + \tilde{\varepsilon}) \leq C(M)(D^2 + D^{2\theta}), \quad (3.11)$$

where $\theta = \frac{\mu_0}{C+\mu_0} \in (0, 1)$. Here the constants C and θ are dependent on $\tilde{\varepsilon}, \delta_2 > 0$, but independent of t_0 . Varying t_0 over $(\delta_2, T - \delta_2)$, we reach

$$N(v; \delta_2 - \tilde{\varepsilon}, T - \delta_2 + \tilde{\varepsilon}) \leq C(M)(D^2 + D^{2\theta}).$$

Since $\delta_2 - \tilde{\varepsilon} = (N - 1)\tilde{\varepsilon} = \varepsilon$ and $T - \delta_2 + \tilde{\varepsilon} = T - \varepsilon$, by (3.8), we can complete the proof of Theorem 2. ■

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 3

Section 4.1. Proof of Theorem 3 (i).

First Step.

We set

$$\tilde{D}_1 := \sum_{j,k=0}^1 (\|\nabla_{x,t}^j \partial_t^k (\text{rot } v)\|_{L^2(\Gamma \times I)} + \|\nabla^j \partial_t^k v\|_{L^2(\Gamma \times I)})$$

and we see

$$D_1 = \tilde{D}_1 + \|v(\cdot, t_0)\|_{H^3(\Omega)}.$$

We choose $d \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})$ satisfying (3.1) and (3.2), and we set

$$\varphi(x, t) = e^{\lambda(d(x) - \beta(t-t_0)^2)}$$

with sufficiently large $\lambda > 0$ and some $\beta > 0$. Later we will specify $\beta > 0$. By (3.2) we can choose small $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ such that $d = 0$ on $\partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma$, that is,

$$\varphi(x, t) \leq 1 \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in (\partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma) \times I, \quad d(x) \geq \varepsilon_1 \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega_0.$$

We set

$$\mu_1 := e^{\lambda\varepsilon_1}, \quad \mu_2 := \max\{1, e^{\lambda(\|d\|_{C(\bar{\Omega})} - \beta\delta^2)}\}. \quad (4.1)$$

For $\varepsilon_1 > 0$, we choose $\beta > 0$ large such that

$$\varepsilon_1 > \|d\|_{C(\bar{\Omega})} - \beta\delta^2. \quad (4.2)$$

Therefore, (4.1) yields

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \int_{(\partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma) \times I} \sum_{j,k=0}^1 (|\nabla_{x,t}^j \partial_t^k (\text{rot } v)|^2 + |\nabla^j \partial_t^k v|^2) e^{2s\varphi} dSdt \leq CM_1^2 e^{2s\mu_2}, \\ \int_{\Gamma \times I} \sum_{j,k=0}^1 (|\nabla_{x,t}^j \partial_t^k (\text{rot } v)|^2 + |\nabla^j \partial_t^k v|^2) e^{2s\varphi} dSdt \leq Ce^{Cs} \tilde{D}_1^2. \end{array} \right. \quad (4.3)$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} C \sum_{\kappa=0}^1 \int_{\Omega} \sum_{k=0}^1 (|\nabla(\text{rot } \partial_t^k v)(x, t_0 + (-1)^\kappa \delta)|^2 + |\text{rot } \partial_t^k v(x, t_0 + (-1)^\kappa \delta)|^2) e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0 + \delta)} dx \\ \leq CM_1^2 e^{2se^{\lambda(\|d\|_{C(\bar{\Omega})} - \beta\delta^2)}} \leq CM_1^2 e^{2s\mu_2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

We apply Theorem 1 to v to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_Q (s|\nabla v|^2 + s|\nabla(\text{rot } v)|^2 + s^3|v|^2) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \leq C \int_Q |\text{rot } F|^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \\ + Cs^3 M_1^2 e^{2s\mu_2} + Cs^3 e^{Cs} \tilde{D}_1^2 \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

by (4.2) - (4.4).

Setting $v_1 := \partial_t v$, we have

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \partial_t v_1(x, t) - \Delta v_1 + (A(x, t) \cdot \nabla) v_1 + (v_1 \cdot \nabla) B(x, t) \\ + (\partial_t A \cdot \nabla) v + (v \cdot \nabla) \partial_t B + \nabla \partial_t p = \partial_t F(x, t), \\ \text{div } v_1(x, t) = 0, \quad x \in \Omega, \quad 0 < t < T. \end{array} \right.$$

Noting that

$$\text{rot}((\partial_t A \cdot \nabla)v) = (\partial_t A \cdot \nabla)\text{rot } v \quad (4.6)$$

$$+ \left(\sum_{j=1}^3 (\partial_2 a_j) \partial_j v_3 - (\partial_3 a_j) \partial_j v_2, \sum_{j=1}^3 (\partial_3 a_j) \partial_j v_1 - (\partial_1 a_j) \partial_j v_3, \sum_{j=1}^3 (\partial_1 a_j) \partial_j v_2 - (\partial_2 a_j) \partial_j v_1 \right)^T,$$

where we set $\partial_t A := (a_1, a_2, a_3)^T$, by (4.5) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_Q (|\operatorname{rot}((\partial_t A \cdot \nabla)v)|^2 + |\operatorname{rot}((v \cdot \nabla)\partial_t B)|^2) e^{2s\varphi} dx dt \\ & \leq C \int_Q (|\nabla(\operatorname{rot} v)|^2 + |\nabla v|^2 + |v|^2) e^{2s\varphi} dx dt \\ & \leq \frac{C}{s} \int_Q |\operatorname{rot} F|^2 e^{2s\varphi} dx dt + C s^2 M_1^2 e^{2s\mu_2} + C s^2 e^{Cs} \tilde{D}_1^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

Therefore, we apply Theorem 1 to v_1 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_Q \left(\frac{1}{s} |\partial_t^2 \operatorname{rot} v|^2 + s^3 |\partial_t \operatorname{rot} v|^2 + s (|\nabla(\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v)|^2 + |\nabla \partial_t v|^2) + s^3 |\partial_t v|^2 \right) e^{2s\varphi} dx dt \\ & \leq C \int_Q \sum_{k=0}^1 |\partial_t^k \operatorname{rot} F|^2 e^{2s\varphi} dx dt + C s^3 M_1^2 e^{2s\mu_2} + C s^3 e^{Cs} \tilde{D}_1^2 \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

for all large $s > 0$.

Second Step.

We start to estimate $\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v(x, t_0)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v(x, t_0)|^2 e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0)} dx = \int_{t_0-\delta}^{t_0} \left(\partial_t \int_{\Omega} |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v(x, t)|^2 e^{2s\varphi(x, t)} dx \right) dt \\ & + \int_{\Omega} |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v(x, t_0 - \delta)|^2 e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0 - \delta)} dx \\ & = \int_{t_0-\delta}^{t_0} \int_{\Omega} (2((\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v) \cdot (\operatorname{rot} \partial_t^2 v)) + 2s \partial_t \varphi |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v|^2) e^{2s\varphi(x, t)} dx dt \\ & + \int_{\Omega} |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v(x, t_0 - \delta)|^2 e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0 - \delta)} dx \\ & \leq C \int_Q (s |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v|^2 + |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v| |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t^2 v|) e^{2s\varphi(x, t)} dx dt + C M_1^2 e^{2s\mu_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we applied also (4.1) and the bound M_1 . We have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v| |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t^2 v| = \left(\frac{1}{s} |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t^2 v| \right) (s |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v|) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{s^2} |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t^2 v|^2 + s^2 |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v|^2 \right) = \frac{1}{2s} \left(\frac{1}{s} |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t^2 v|^2 + s^3 |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v|^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

and so (4.8) implies

$$\int_Q |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v| |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t^2 v| e^{2s\varphi} dx dt \leq \frac{C}{s} \int_Q \sum_{k=0}^1 |\partial_t^k \operatorname{rot} F|^2 e^{2s\varphi} dx dt + Cs^2 M_1^2 e^{2s\mu_2} + Cs^2 e^{Cs} \tilde{D}_1^2$$

and

$$\int_Q s |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v|^2 e^{2s\varphi} dx dt \leq \frac{C}{s^2} \int_Q \sum_{k=0}^1 |\partial_t^k \operatorname{rot} F|^2 e^{2s\varphi} dx dt + Cs M_1^2 e^{2s\mu_2} + Cse^{Cs} \tilde{D}_1^2.$$

Hence,

$$\int_\Omega |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v(x, t_0)|^2 e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0)} dx \leq \frac{C}{s} \int_Q \sum_{k=0}^1 |\partial_t^k \operatorname{rot} F|^2 e^{2s\varphi} dx dt + Cs^2 M_1^2 e^{2s\mu_2} + Cs^2 e^{Cs} D_1^2. \quad (4.9)$$

By (1.1) and $\partial_t \operatorname{rot} v \in H^1(I; L^2(\Omega)) \subset C(\bar{I}; L^2(\Omega))$, we have

$$F(x, t_0) = \partial_t v(x, t_0) - \Delta v(x, t_0) + (A \cdot \nabla)v(x, t_0) + (v(x, t_0) \cdot \nabla)B(x, t_0) + \nabla p(x, t_0),$$

and

$$\operatorname{rot} F(x, t_0) = \operatorname{rot} \partial_t v(x, t_0) + a(x), \quad (4.10)$$

where

$$a(x) := \operatorname{rot} (-\Delta v(x, t_0) + (A \cdot \nabla)v(x, t_0) + (v(x, t_0) \cdot \nabla)B(x, t_0)). \quad (4.11)$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_\Omega |\operatorname{rot} F(x, t_0)|^2 e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0)} dx \\ & \leq \frac{C}{s} \int_Q \sum_{k=0}^1 |\partial_t^k \operatorname{rot} F|^2 e^{2s\varphi} dx dt + Cs^2 M_1^2 e^{2s\mu_2} + Cs^2 e^{Cs} D_1^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

By (1.6) and $\varphi(x, t) \leq \varphi(x, t_0)$ for $(x, t) \in Q$, we have

$$\frac{C}{s} \int_Q \sum_{k=0}^1 |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t^k F(x, t)|^2 e^{2s\varphi(x, t)} dx dt \leq \frac{C}{s} \int_\Omega |\operatorname{rot} F(x, t_0)|^2 e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0)} dx.$$

Therefore,

$$\int_\Omega |\operatorname{rot} F(x, t_0)|^2 e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0)} dx \leq \frac{C}{s} \int_\Omega |\operatorname{rot} F(x, t_0)|^2 e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0)} dx + Cs^2 M_1^2 e^{2s\mu_2} + Cs^2 e^{Cs} D_1^2$$

for all large $s > 0$.

Choosing $s > 0$ large, we can absorb the first term on the right-hand side into the left-hand side, we obtain

$$\int_\Omega |\operatorname{rot} F(x, t_0)|^2 e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0)} dx \leq Cs^2 M_1^2 e^{2s\mu_2} + Cs^2 e^{Cs} D_1^2$$

for all large $s > s_0$. By $d(x) \geq \varepsilon_1$ for $x \in \Omega_0$ and $\Omega_0 \subset \Omega$, noting $\varphi(x, t_0) = e^{\lambda d(x)}$, we see

$$e^{2se^{\lambda\varepsilon_1}} \int_{\Omega_0} |\operatorname{rot} F(x, t_0)|^2 dx \leq \int_{\Omega} |\operatorname{rot} F(x, t_0)|^2 e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0)} dx.$$

Therefore,

$$\int_{\Omega_0} |\operatorname{rot} F(x, t_0)|^2 dx \leq Cs^2 M_1^2 e^{2s\mu_2} e^{-2s\mu_1} + Cs^2 e^{Cs} D_1^2.$$

By (4.2), we see

$$\mu_0 := e^{\lambda\varepsilon_1} - \mu_2 = \mu_1 - \mu_2 > 0,$$

and so

$$\int_{\Omega_0} |\operatorname{rot} F(x, t_0)|^2 dx \leq Cs^2 M_1^2 e^{-2s\mu_0} + Cs^2 e^{Cs} D_1^2$$

for all $s > s_0$. By the same argument in obtaining (3.11), we complete the proof of Theorem 3 (i).

Section 4.2. Proof of Theorem 3 (ii).

First Step.

We set

$$\tilde{D}_2 := \sum_{j=0}^1 \sum_{k=0}^2 (\|\nabla_{x,t}^j \partial_t^k (\operatorname{rot} v)\|_{L^2(\Gamma \times I)} + \|\nabla^j \partial_t^k v\|_{L^2(\Gamma \times I)})$$

and

$$D_2 := \tilde{D}_2 + \|v(\cdot, t_0)\|_{H^4(\Omega)}, \quad \tilde{M}_2 := M_2 + m_1.$$

Now we choose $\varphi(x, t) = e^{\lambda(d(x) - \beta(t-t_0)^2)}$, where $d \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})$ satisfies (3.1) and (3.2), and $\lambda > 0$ is sufficiently large, and the constant $\beta > 0$ satisfies (4.2). Then (3.4) and (3.5) hold.

Therefore,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \int_{(\partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma) \times I} \sum_{j=0}^1 \sum_{k=0}^2 (|\nabla_{x,t}^j \partial_t^k (\operatorname{rot} v)|^2 + |\nabla^j \partial_t^k v|^2) e^{2s\varphi} dS dt \leq CM_2^2 e^{2s\mu_2}, \\ \int_{\Gamma \times I} \sum_{j=0}^1 \sum_{k=0}^2 (|\nabla_{x,t}^j \partial_t^k (\operatorname{rot} v)|^2 + |\nabla^j \partial_t^k v|^2) e^{2s\varphi} dS dt \leq Ce^{Cs} \tilde{D}_2^2. \end{array} \right. \quad (4.13)$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} C \sum_{\kappa=0}^1 \int_{\Omega} \sum_{j=0}^1 \sum_{k=0}^2 (|\nabla(\operatorname{rot} \partial_t^k v)(x, t_0 + (-1)^\kappa \delta)|^2 + |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t^k v(x, t_0 + (-1)^\kappa \delta)|^2) e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0 + \delta)} dx \\ \leq CM_2^2 e^{2se^{\lambda(\|d\|_{C(\bar{\Omega})} - \beta\delta^2)}} \leq CM_2^2 e^{2s\mu_2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

Moreover, setting $v_2 := \partial_t^2 v$, we have

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \partial_t v_2(x, t) - \Delta v_2 + (A(x, t) \cdot \nabla) v_2 + (v_2 \cdot \nabla) B(x, t) \\ + 2(\partial_t A \cdot \nabla) v_1 + 2(v_1 \cdot \nabla) \partial_t B + (\partial_t^2 A \cdot \nabla) v + (v \cdot \nabla) \partial_t^2 B + \nabla \partial_t^2 p = \partial_t^2 F(x, t), \\ \operatorname{div} v_2(x, t) = 0, \quad x \in \Omega, 0 < t < T. \end{array} \right.$$

By (4.13) and (4.14), we apply Theorem 1 to v_2 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_Q s |\nabla(\operatorname{rot} \partial_t^2 v)|^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \leq C \int_Q |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t^2 F|^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \\ & + C \int_Q |\operatorname{rot} \{2(\partial_t A \cdot \nabla) v_1 + 2(v_1 \cdot \nabla) \partial_t B + (\partial_t^2 A \cdot \nabla) v + (v \cdot \nabla) \partial_t^2 B\}|^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \\ & + Cs^3 M_2^2 e^{2s\mu_2} + Cs^3 e^{Cs} \tilde{D}_2^2 \\ & \leq C \int_Q |\partial_t^2 \operatorname{rot} F|^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt + Cs^3 M_2^2 e^{2s\mu_2} + Cs^3 e^{Cs} \tilde{D}_2^2 \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

for all large $s > 0$.

Similarly to (4.6) and (4.7), in terms of (4.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_Q |\operatorname{rot} (2(\partial_t A \cdot \nabla) v_1 + 2(v_1 \cdot \nabla) \partial_t B)|^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \\ & \leq C \int_Q (|\nabla(\operatorname{rot} v_1)|^2 + |\nabla v_1|^2 + |v_1|^2) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \\ & = C \int_Q (|\nabla(\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v)|^2 + |\nabla \partial_t v|^2 + |\partial_t v|^2) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \\ & \leq \frac{C}{s} \int_Q \sum_{k=0}^1 |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t^k F|^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt + Cs^2 M_2^2 e^{2s\mu_2} + Cs^2 e^{Cs} \tilde{D}_2^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

Here we used also $M_1 \leq M_2$ and $D_1 \leq D_2$. Similarly we can verify

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_Q |\operatorname{rot} ((\partial_t^2 A \cdot \nabla) v + (v \cdot \nabla) \partial_t^2 B)|^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \\ & \leq \frac{C}{s} \int_Q |\operatorname{rot} F|^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt + Cs^2 M_2^2 e^{2s\mu_2} + Cs^2 e^{Cs} \tilde{D}_2^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

Substituting (4.16) and (4.17) into (4.15), we obtain

$$\int_Q s |\nabla(\operatorname{rot} \partial_t^2 v)|^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt$$

$$\leq C \int_Q \sum_{k=0}^2 |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t^k F|^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt + Cs^3 M_2^2 e^{2s\mu_2} + Cs^3 e^{Cs} \tilde{D}_2^2.$$

With (4.8), we see

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_Q (s|\nabla(\operatorname{rot} \partial_t^2 v)|^2 + s|\nabla(\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v)|^2) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \\ & \leq C \int_Q \sum_{k=0}^2 |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t^k F|^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt + Cs^3 M_2^2 e^{2s\mu_2} + Cs^3 e^{Cs} \tilde{D}_2^2 \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

for all large $s > 0$.

Second Step.

Now, similarly to Second Step of the proof of Theorem 3 (i), using (4.18) and (4.14), we see

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v(x, t_0))|^2 e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0)} dx = \int_{t_0-\delta}^{t_0} \left(\partial_t \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v(x, t))|^2 e^{2s\varphi(x, t)} dx \right) dt \\ & + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v)(x, t_0 - \delta)|^2 e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0 - \delta)} dx \\ & = \int_{t_0-\delta}^{t_0} \int_{\Omega} (2(\nabla(\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v) \cdot \nabla(\operatorname{rot} \partial_t^2 v)) + 2s\partial_t \varphi |\nabla(\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v)|^2) e^{2s\varphi(x, t)} dxdt \\ & + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v)(x, t_0 - \delta)|^2 e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0 - \delta)} dx \\ & \leq C \int_Q (s|\nabla(\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v)|^2 + |\nabla(\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v)| |\nabla(\operatorname{rot} \partial_t^2 v)|) e^{2s\varphi(x, t)} dxdt + CM_2^2 e^{2s\mu_2} \\ & \leq C \sum_{k=0}^2 \int_Q |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t^k F|^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt + Cs^3 M_2^2 e^{2s\mu_2} + Cs^3 e^{Cs} \tilde{D}_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Here $(\nabla(\operatorname{rot} A) \cdot \nabla(\operatorname{rot} B))$ means that the sum of the products of all the corresponding elements of the two matrices $\nabla(\operatorname{rot} A)$ and $\nabla(\operatorname{rot} B)$.

Applying (1.7) to the first term on the right-hand side, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v(x, t_0))|^2 e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0)} dx & \leq C \int_Q (|F(x, t_0)|^2 + |\nabla F(x, t_0)|^2) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \\ & + Cs^3 M_2^2 e^{2s\mu_2} + Cs^3 e^{Cs} \tilde{D}_2^2 \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

for all large $s > 0$.

By (1.5), we have

$$\operatorname{rot} \operatorname{rot} F(x, t_0) = -\Delta F(x, t_0) + \nabla(\operatorname{div} F(x, t_0)) = -\Delta F(x, t_0), \quad x \in \Omega$$

and (4.10) yields

$$\operatorname{rot} \operatorname{rot} F(x, t_0) = \operatorname{rot} \operatorname{rot} \partial_t v(x, t_0) + \operatorname{rot} a(x),$$

where a is defined by (4.11). Hence,

$$-\Delta F(x, t_0) = \operatorname{rot} \operatorname{rot} (\partial_t v(x, t_0)) + \operatorname{rot} a(x), \quad x \in \Omega.$$

Therefore,

$$|\Delta F(x, t_0)| \leq C(|\nabla(\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v(x, t_0))| + |\operatorname{rot} a(x)|), \quad x \in \Omega$$

and so (4.19) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |\Delta F(x, t_0)|^2 e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0)} dx &\leq C \int_Q (|F(x, t_0)|^2 + |\nabla F(x, t_0)|^2) e^{2s\varphi(x, t)} dx dt \\ &+ C e^{Cs} (s^3 \tilde{D}_2^2 + \|v(\cdot, t_0)\|_{H^4(\Omega)}^2) + C s^3 M_2^2 e^{2s\mu_2} \end{aligned}$$

for all large $s > 0$. Since $\varphi(x, t) \leq \varphi(x, t_0)$ for $(x, t) \in Q$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |\Delta F(x, t_0)|^2 e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0)} dx &\leq C \int_{\Omega} (|F(x, t_0)|^2 + |\nabla F(x, t_0)|^2) e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0)} dx \\ &+ C e^{Cs} s^3 D_2^2 + C s^3 M_2^2 e^{2s\mu_2} \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

for all large $s > 0$

Third Step.

Next we apply Lemma 3 shown already in Section 2, which is an elliptic Carleman estimate.

Noting that $F(x, t_0) = |\nabla F(x, t_0)| = 0$ for $x \in \Gamma$, application of Lemma 3 to (4.20) yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Omega} (s|\nabla F(x, t_0)|^2 + s^3|F(x, t_0)|^2) e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0)} dx \\ &\leq C \int_{\Omega} (|F(x, t_0)|^2 + |\nabla F(x, t_0)|^2) e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0)} dx + C e^{Cs} s^3 D_2^2 + C s^3 M_2^2 e^{2s\mu_2} \\ &\quad + C s^3 \int_{\partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma} (|\nabla F(x, t_0)|^2 + |F(x, t_0)|^2) e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0)} dS \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

for all large $s > 0$. Recalling that $\varphi(x, t) \leq 1$ for $(x, t) \in (\partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma) \times I$, by $\|F(\cdot, t_0)\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \leq m_1$

and (4.1), we apply the trace theorem to obtain

$$\int_{\partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma} (|\nabla F(x, t_0)|^2 + |F(x, t_0)|^2) e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0)} dS \leq m_1^2 \int_{\partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma} e^{2s} dS \leq C m_1^2 e^{2s} \leq C m_1^2 e^{2s\mu_2}.$$

Choosing $s > 0$ large, we can absorb the first term on the right-hand side of (4.21) into the left-hand side, and so

$$\int_{\Omega} s(|\nabla F(x, t_0)|^2 + |F(x, t_0)|^2) e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0)} dx \leq C e^{Cs} s^3 D_2^2 + C s^3 \widetilde{M}_2^2 e^{2s\mu_2}$$

for all large $s > 0$. Shrinking the integral domain Ω on the left-hand side to Ω_0 and using (4.1) and $e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0)} \geq e^{2se^{\lambda\varepsilon_1}} = e^{2s\mu_1}$ for $x \in \Omega_0$,

$$e^{2s\mu_1} \|F(\cdot, t_0)\|_{H^1(\Omega_0)}^2 \leq C e^{Cs} s^3 D_2^2 + C s^3 \widetilde{M}_2^2 e^{2s\mu_2}$$

for all large $s > 0$. By (4.2), we have $\mu_1 > \mu_2$ and so

$$\|F(\cdot, t_0)\|_{H^1(\Omega_0)}^2 \leq C e^{Cs} s^3 D_2^2 + C s^3 \widetilde{M}_2^2 e^{-2s\mu_0}$$

for all large $s > 0$. Here we set $\mu_0 := \mu_1 - \mu_2 > 0$. Therefore, by the same argument as in reaching (3.10), we can complete the proof of Theorem 3 (ii). ■

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

5.1. Original Navier-Stokes equations

We mainly consider linearized Navier-Stokes equations. The original Navier-Stokes equations reads as

$$\partial_t v(x, t) - \Delta v(x, t) + (v \cdot \nabla) v(x, t) + \nabla p = F(x, t), \quad x \in \Omega, 0 < t < T. \quad (5.1)$$

Let v_1 and v_2 satisfy (5.1) with F_1 and F_2 respectively. Then, setting $v := v_1 - v_2$, we have

$$\partial_t v(x, t) - \Delta v(x, t) + (v_1 \cdot \nabla) v(x, t) + (v \cdot \nabla) v_2(x, t) + \nabla p = (F_1 - F_2)(x, t), \quad x \in \Omega, 0 < t < T,$$

which corresponds to (1.1). Although the existence of v_1, v_2 to the initial boundary value problems for the Navier-Stokes equations, is in general, not completely solved with our assumed regularity, for our inverse problems we assume the existence of v_1, v_2 with such regularity. Moreover, we see by the proof that $T > 0$ can be arbitrarily small, and our inverse problem requires the existence of the solution (v, p) local in time. Moreover, we notice that for the inverse problems, we consider the solutions only for positive time interval $t > t_0 - \delta > 0$, so that there is a possibility that we rely on the smoothing property in time of solution to the Navier-Stokes equations, in order to gain the necessary regularity of solution for the inverse problem.

On the other hand, in our inverse source problems, we cannot choose $t_0 = 0$, in other words, our problem is not an inverse problem for any initial boundary value problem. In particular, we remark that we do not assume any initial conditions, but we need $v(\cdot, t_0)$ in Ω with some $t_0 > 0$. In general, the inverse problem with our formulation for parabolic equations as well as the Navier-Stokes equations has been a long-standing open problem for the case of $t_0 = 0$.

5.2. Data of pressure field p

In this article, we do not use any data of p . Therefore, in Theorem 3 (ii), we have to assume (1.5): $\operatorname{div} F(\cdot, t_0) = 0$ in Ω . With information of p , we need not such assumption for unknown sources, but here we do not pursue this direction.

5.3. Available Carleman estimates

As Carleman estimates for parabolic equations including the Navier-Stokes equations, we can have two types according to the choices of weight functions in the following forms.

- Regular weight function:

$$\varphi(x, t) := e^{\lambda(d(x) - \beta(t - t_0)^2)}. \tag{5.2}$$

- Singular weight function:

$$\varphi(x, t) = \frac{e^{\lambda\eta(x)} - e^{2\lambda\|\eta\|_{C(\bar{\Omega})}}}{h(t)}, \tag{5.3}$$

where $\lim_{t \rightarrow t_0 \pm \delta} h(t) = 0$.

Here $d, \eta \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})$ are chosen suitably.

The Carleman estimate with the weight (5.3) was proved firstly by Imanuvilov [12] for a parabolic equation.

As for related inverse problems for the Navier-Stokes equations, Choulli, Imanuvilov, Puel and Yamamoto [6], Fan, Di Cristo, Jiang and Nakamura [8], Fan, Jiang and Nakamura [9] used Carleman estimates with (5.3), while Bellassoued, Imanuvilov and Yamamoto [2] and the current article rely on (5.2).

Moreover, in order to derive Carleman estimates for the Navier-Stokes equations with (5.2) or (5.3), we have two options:

- (1) First take rot to obtain a parabolic equation in $\operatorname{rot} v$ and then a Poisson equation in v . See [6], [8], [9] with the weight in form of (5.3).

(2) First take div to obtain a Poisson equation in p and then a parabolic equation in v .
See also [2] with the weight in form of (5.2).

The present article is based on Option (1) with the weight function (5.2), which is a different combination of the weight function and the option.

5.4. Improvement of Theorem 3 (ii)

So far, we prefer to a use of Carleman estimates of a limited category. Here we apply an H^{-1} -Carleman estimate for Δ and improve Theorem 3 (ii).

Indeed we can relax condition (1.7) as

$$|\partial_t^k \operatorname{rot} F(x, t)| \leq C(|\nabla F(x, t_0)| + |F(x, t_0)|), \quad (x, t) \in Q, \quad k = 0, 1. \quad (5.4)$$

Compared with (1.7), we need not the second derivative in t on the left-hand side. Then reducing the time regularity by 1 in data and a priori bound, we can improve the conclusion in Theorem 3 (ii) as follows. We recall that D_1 is defined by (1.8).

Proposition 1.

There exist constants $C > 0$ and $\theta \in (0, 1)$, which are dependent on Ω_0, M_1, Γ , such that

$$\|F\|_{H^1(\Omega_0)} \leq C(D_1 + D_1^\theta) \quad (5.5)$$

for each

$$F \in \mathcal{F}_3 := \{F \in H^1(I; H^2(\Omega)); \operatorname{supp} F(\cdot, t_0) \subset \Omega, (1.5) \text{ and } (5.4) \text{ are satisfied}\},$$

provided that (1.9) holds with arbitrarily chosen constant $M_1 > 0$.

We can relax also the condition $\operatorname{supp} F(\cdot, t_0) \subset \Omega$, but for simplicity we keep this condition in \mathcal{F}_3 and here give

Sketch of the proof of (5.5).

Under the assumption, we can follow the argument in the proof of Theorem 3 (i) and reach (4.12). Application of (5.4) to the first term on the right-hand side of (4.12) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |\operatorname{rot} F(x, t_0)|^2 e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0)} dx &\leq \frac{C}{s} \int_Q (|F(x, t_0)|^2 + |\nabla F(x, t_0)|^2) e^{2s\varphi(x, t)} dx dt \\ &+ Cs^2 M_1^2 e^{2s\mu_2} + Ce^{Cs} s^2 D_1^2 \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

for all large $s > 0$. We estimate the first term on the right-hand side of (5.6) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_Q (|F(x, t_0)|^2 + |\nabla F(x, t_0)|^2) e^{2s\varphi(x, t)} dx dt \\ &= \int_{\Omega} (|F(x, t_0)|^2 + |\nabla F(x, t_0)|^2) e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0)} \left(\int_{t_0-\delta}^{t_0+\delta} e^{2s(\varphi(x, t) - \varphi(x, t_0))} dt \right) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since $d \geq 0$ on $\bar{\Omega}$, we see

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{t_0-\delta}^{t_0+\delta} e^{2s(\varphi(x, t) - \varphi(x, t_0))} dt = \int_{t_0-\delta}^{t_0+\delta} e^{-2se^{\lambda d(x)}(1 - e^{-\lambda\beta(t-t_0)^2})} dt \\ & \leq \int_{t_0-\delta}^{t_0+\delta} e^{-2s(1 - e^{-\lambda\beta(t-t_0)^2})} dt = o(1) \end{aligned}$$

as $s \rightarrow \infty$ by the Lebesgue theorem. Therefore,

$$\int_Q (|F(x, t_0)|^2 + |\nabla F(x, t_0)|^2) e^{2s\varphi(x, t)} dx dt = o(1) \int_{\Omega} (|F(x, t_0)|^2 + |\nabla F(x, t_0)|^2) e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0)} dx$$

and so (5.6) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & s \int_{\Omega} |\operatorname{rot} F(x, t_0)|^2 e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0)} dx \\ & \leq o(1) \int_{\Omega} (|F(x, t_0)|^2 + |\nabla F(x, t_0)|^2) e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0)} dx + Cs^3 M_1^2 e^{2s\mu_2} + Ce^{Cs} s^3 D_1^2 \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

for all large $s > 0$.

Now by (1.5), we have

$$-\Delta F(x, t_0) = \operatorname{rot} \operatorname{rot} F(x, t_0), \quad x \in \Omega, \quad (5.8)$$

and $\operatorname{supp} F(\cdot, t_0) \subset \Omega$. We show an H^{-1} -Carleman estimate for Δ as follows. Let $E, \tilde{E} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be bounded domains with smooth boundaries ∂E and $\partial \tilde{E}$ such that $\bar{E} \subset \tilde{E}$, and $\omega \subset \tilde{E} \setminus \bar{E}$ be an arbitrary non-empty open set. Then in Imanuvilov [12] it is proved that there exists $\eta \in C^2(\bar{E})$ satisfying

$$\eta = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial \tilde{E}, \quad \eta > 0 \quad \text{in } \tilde{E}, \quad |\nabla \eta| > 0 \quad \text{on } \overline{\tilde{E} \setminus \omega}. \quad (5.9)$$

We set $\varphi_0(x) := e^{\lambda\eta(x)}$ with sufficiently large constant $\lambda > 0$. Then

Lemma 4.

There exist constants $C > 0$ and $s_0 > 0$ such that

$$\int_E (|\nabla w(x)|^2 + s^2 |w(x)|^2) e^{2s\varphi_0(x)} dx \leq C \sum_{j=1}^n s \int_E |g_j(x)|^2 e^{2s\varphi_0(x)} dx$$

for all $s > s_0$ and $w \in H_0^2(E)$ satisfying

$$\Delta w = \sum_{j=1}^n \partial_j g_j(x), \quad x \in E.$$

This is a Carleman estimate where the right-hand side is estimated in H^{-1} -space, while Lemma 3 in Section 2 is a Carleman estimate whose right-hand side is estimated in the L^2 -space.

Lemma 4 is proved as follows: We make the zero extension of w in E to $\tilde{E} \supset E$. By $w \in H_0^2(E)$, we see that $w \in H_0^2(\tilde{E})$ and $w = 0$ in $\tilde{E} \setminus E$. Hence, applying Theorem 2.2 in Imanuvilov and Puel [13], we have

$$\int_{\tilde{E}} (|\nabla w(x)|^2 + s^2 |w(x)|^2) e^{2s\varphi_0(x)} dx \leq C \sum_{j=1}^n s \int_{\tilde{E}} |g_j(x)|^2 e^{2s\varphi_0(x)} dx$$

for all large $s > 0$, which is Lemma 4.

Here we fix sufficiently large $\lambda > 0$ and so in the Carleman estimate we can omit the dependence of the constants and the estimate on λ .

We apply Lemma 4 by setting $\tilde{E} = \Omega_1$ and $E = \Omega$ and $\eta(x) = d(x)$, where $\Omega_1 \not\subseteq \bar{\Omega}$ satisfies (3.1). Moreover $\text{rot rot } F(x, t_0)$ is given by a linear combination of $\partial_j [\text{rot } F(x, t_0)]_k$, $1 \leq j, k \leq 3$, where $[\cdot]_k$ denotes the k -th component of a vector under consideration. Application of Lemma 4 to (5.8) implies

$$\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla F(x, t_0)|^2 + s^2 |F(x, t_0)|^2) e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0)} dx \leq C s \int_{\Omega} |\text{rot } F(x, t_0)|^2 e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0)} dx$$

for all large $s > 0$. Substituting (5.7), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla F(x, t_0)|^2 + s^2 |F(x, t_0)|^2) e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0)} dx \\ & \leq o(1) \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla F(x, t_0)|^2 + |F(x, t_0)|^2) e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0)} dx + C s^3 M_1^2 e^{2s\mu_2} + C e^{Cs} s^3 D_1^2 \end{aligned}$$

for all large $s > 0$.

Choosing $s > 0$ sufficiently large, we can absorb the first term on the right-hand side into the left-hand side, we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla F(x, t_0)|^2 + |F(x, t_0)|^2) e^{2s\varphi(x, t_0)} dx \leq C s^3 M_1^2 e^{2s\mu_2} + C e^{Cs} s^3 D_1^2$$

for all large $s > 0$. Then, by the same argument as in the final part of the proof of Theorem 3 (i), we can complete the proof of (5.5). ■

In place of Lemma 4, one may apply a Carleman estimate (e.g., Vogelsang [21]) for a system $\operatorname{rot} w = g$ and $\operatorname{div} w = 0$, but we do not exploit here.

6. APPENDIX. DERIVATION OF LEMMA 2 FROM LEMMA 3

Let $t \in I$ be arbitrarily fixed. Then, applying Lemma 3 to $-\Delta r(x, t) = g(x, t)$ in Q , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} (s|\nabla r(x, t)|^2 + s^3|r(x, t)|^2) e^{2\tilde{s}\varphi(x, t_0)} dx \\ & \leq C \int_{\Omega} |g(x, t)|^2 e^{2\tilde{s}\varphi(x, t_0)} dx + C\tilde{s}^3 \int_{\partial\Omega} (|\nabla r(x, t)|^2 + |r(x, t)|^2) e^{2\tilde{s}\varphi(x, t_0)} dS \end{aligned} \quad (6.1)$$

for all $\tilde{s} > s_1$: some constant.

We set $s_* := s_1 e^{\lambda\beta\delta^2}$. Let $s > s_*$. Then

$$s e^{-\lambda\beta(t-t_0)^2} \geq s e^{-\lambda\beta\delta^2} > s_1$$

for all $t \in \bar{I}$. Then in (6.1), setting $\tilde{s} := s e^{-\lambda\beta(t-t_0)^2}$, we see

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} (s e^{-\lambda\beta(t-t_0)^2} |\nabla r(x, t)|^2 + s^3 e^{-3\lambda\beta(t-t_0)^2} |r(x, t)|^2) e^{2s e^{-\lambda\beta(t-t_0)^2} \varphi(x, t_0)} dx \\ & \leq C \int_{\Omega} |g(x, t)|^2 e^{2s e^{-\lambda\beta(t-t_0)^2} \varphi(x, t_0)} dx + C s^3 e^{-3\lambda\beta(t-t_0)^2} \int_{\partial\Omega} (|\nabla r|^2 + |r|^2) e^{2s e^{-\lambda\beta(t-t_0)^2} \varphi(x, t_0)} dS. \end{aligned}$$

Here, by $e^{-\lambda\beta(t-t_0)^2} \geq e^{-\lambda\beta\delta^2}$ for $t \in I$, we see

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} (s e^{-\lambda\beta\delta^2} |\nabla r(x, t)|^2 + s^3 e^{-3\lambda\beta\delta^2} |r(x, t)|^2) e^{2s\varphi(x, t)} dx \\ & \leq C \int_{\Omega} |g(x, t)|^2 e^{2s\varphi(x, t)} dx + C s^3 \int_{\partial\Omega} (|\nabla r|^2 + |r|^2) e^{2s\varphi(x, t)} dS. \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying with $e^{3\lambda\beta\delta^2}$ and integrating over $t \in I$, we complete the derivation of Lemma 2.

■

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The first author was supported partly by NSF grant DMS 1312900. The third author was supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (S) 15H05740 and Grant-in-Aid (A) 20H00117 of Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, The National Natural Science Foundation of China (no. 11771270, 91730303), and the RUDN University Strategic Academic Leadership Program. Most of the article was composed when the first author stayed at University of Parma as visiting professor and he thanks the university for offering an excellent occasion.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Beilina and M.V. Klibanov, *Approximate Global Convergence and Adaptivity for Coefficient Inverse Problems*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2012.
- [2] M. Bellassoued, O.Y. Imanuvilov and M. Yamamoto, Carleman estimate for the Navier-Stokes equations and an application to a lateral Cauchy problem, *Inverse Problems* **32** (2016) 025001.
- [3] M. Bellassoued and M. Yamamoto, Masahiro, *Carleman Estimates and Applications to Inverse Problems for Hyperbolic Systems*, Springer-Japan, Tokyo, 2017.
- [4] M. Boulakia, Quantification of the unique continuation property for the nonstationary Stokes problem, *Mathematical control & related fields* **6** (2016) 27-52.
- [5] A.L. Bukhgeim and M.V. Klibanov, Global uniqueness of a class of multidimensional inverse problems, *Soviet Math. Dokl.* **24** (1981) 244-247.
- [6] M. Choulli, O. Y. Imanuvilov, J.-P. Puel and M. Yamamoto, Inverse source problem for linearized Navier-Stokes equations with data in arbitrary sub-domain, *Appl. Anal.* **92** (2013) 2127-2143.
- [7] C. Fabre, Uniqueness results for stokes equations and their consequences in linear and nonlinear control problems, *ESAIM: COCV* **1** (1996) 267-302.
- [8] J. Fan, M. Di Cristo, Y. Jiang, and G. Nakamura, Inverse viscosity problem for the Navier-Stokes equation, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **365** (2010) 750-757.
- [9] J. Fan, Y. Jiang, and G. Nakamura, Inverse problems for the Boussinesq system, *Inverse Probl.* **25** (2009), 085007 (10pp).
- [10] E. Fernández-Cara, S. Guerrero, O.Y. Imanuvilov and J.-P. Puel, Local exact controllability of the Navier-Stokes system, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **83** (2004), 1501-1542.
- [11] X. Huang, O.Y. Imanuvilov, and M. Yamamoto, Stability for inverse source problems by Carleman estimates, *Inverse Problems* **36** (2020) 125006.
- [12] O.Y. Imanuvilov, Controllability of parabolic equations, *Sbornik Math.* **186** (1995), 879-900.

- [13] O.Y. Imanuvilov and J.-P. Puel, Global Carleman estimates for weak solutions of elliptic nonhomogeneous Dirichlet problems, *International Mathematics Research Notices* **16** (2003), 883-913.
- [14] O. Y. Imanuvilov and M. Yamamoto, Lipschitz stability in inverse parabolic problems by the Carleman estimate, *Inverse Problems* **14** (1998) 1229-1245.
- [15] O.Y. Imanuvilov and M. Yamamoto, Inverse source problem for the Stokes system, *Direct and inverse problems of mathematical physics* (Newark, DE, 1997), *Int. Soc. Anal. Appl. Comput.*, 5, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, pp. 441-451, 2000.
- [16] O. Y. Imanuvilov and M. Yamamoto, Global Lipschitz stability in an inverse hyperbolic problem by interior observations, *Inverse Problems* **17** (2001) 717-728.
- [17] O. Y. Imanuvilov and M. Yamamoto, Inverse problems for a compressible fluid system, *Inverse Problems and Related Topics*, Springer Proceedings in Mathematics & Statistics 310, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, pp. 101-148, 2020.
- [18] O.Y. Imanuvilov and M. Yamamoto, Global Lipschitz stability for an inverse source problem for the Navier-Stokes equations, preprint.
- [19] M.V. Klibanov, Inverse problems and Carleman estimates, *Inverse Problems* **8** (1992) 575-596.
- [20] M.V. Klibanov and A.A. Timonov, *Carleman Estimates for Coefficient Inverse Problems and Numerical Applications*, VSP, Utrecht, 2004.
- [21] V. Vogelsang, On the strong unique continuation principle for inequalities of Maxwell type, *Math. Ann.* **289** (1991) 285-295.
- [22] M. Yamamoto, Carleman estimates for parabolic equations and applications, *Inverse Problems* **25** (2009) 123013 (75pp).