The localized characterization for the singularity formation in the Navier-Stokes equations
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Abstract: This paper is concerned with the localized behaviors of the solution $u$ to the Navier-Stokes equations near the potential singular points. We establish the concentration rate for the $L^{p,\infty}$ norm of $u$ with $3 \leq p \leq \infty$. Namely, we show that if $z_0 = (t_0, x_0)$ is a singular point, then for any $r > 0$, it holds

$$\limsup_{t \to t_0^-} ||u(t, x) - u(t)_{x_0, r}||_{L^{3,\infty}(B_r(x_0))} > \delta^*,$$
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for $3 < p \leq \infty$, $\frac{1}{\mu} + \frac{1}{\nu} = \frac{1}{2}$ and $2 \leq \nu \leq \frac{2}{3}p$,

where $\delta^*$ is a positive constant independent of $p$ and $\nu$. Our main tools are some $\varepsilon$-regularity criteria in $L^{p,\infty}$ spaces and an embedding theorem from $L^{p,\infty}$ space into a Morrey type space. These are of independent interests.
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1 Introduction

We consider the concentration phenomenon near the potential singularity for the three dimensional incompressible Navier-Stokes equations

\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{cases}
\partial_t u - \Delta u + u \cdot \nabla u + \nabla P &= 0, \\
\nabla \cdot u &= 0,
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

where the unknowns \( u, P \) denote the velocity vector field, pressure respectively.

It is well-known that if \( u_0 \) is smooth enough, then problems (1.1) have a unique regular solution on \([0, T)\) for some \( T > 0 \); see, for example, \([9,13,14,22,32,36]\) and the references therein. The global existence and regularity problem of the Navier-Stokes equations is one of the most significant open questions in the field of partial differential equations. The case of \( \mathbb{R}^2 \) was known to Leray \([21]\) in 1933. Later, the case of 2D domains with boundary was settled by Ladyzhenskaya \([19]\) in 1959. In the case \( n = 3 \), some remarkable progress has been made since the pioneering work by Leray in the 1930s. The fundamental papers of Leray \([22]\) and Hopf \([12]\) showed the global existence of weak solutions in the whole space and on bounded open domain with smooth boundary respectively. The weak solutions, called Leray-Hopf weak solutions, satisfy (1.1) in the distributional sense and belong to \( L^\infty L^2 \cap L^2 H^1 \). Moreover, the following strong global energy inequality holds

\[
||u(t)||^2_{L^2} + 2 \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |
abla u|^2 \, dx \, dt \leq ||u(t_0)||^2_{L^2},
\]

for all \( t \in (0, \infty) \) and a.e. \( t_0 \in [0, t] \) including 0. The regularity or uniqueness of Leray-Hopf weak solutions is one of the most significant open questions in the field of partial differential equations.

To understand the weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations in dimension \( n = 3 \), there are various sufficient conditions to ensure the regularity of weak solutions.

Leray \([22]\) shown that for \( 3 < p \leq \infty \), there exists \( c_p \) such that the conditions

\[
||u(t)||_{L^p} < \frac{c_p}{(T - t)^{\frac{p-3}{3p}}}
\]

imply the regularity of weak solutions on \([0, T)\). The well-known Ladyzhenskaya-Prodi-Serrin criteria \([20,27,33]\) showed that if \( u \in L^q([0, T], L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)) \) for \( \frac{2}{q} + \frac{3}{p} \leq 1, p > 3 \) then \( u \) is regular on \([0, T]\). The endpoint case \( p = 3 \) is more subtle. In a breakthrough paper, Escauríaza, Serengi and Sverak \([8]\) proved that the \( L^\infty L^3 \) solutions are smooth. This result was improved by Tao \([35]\) showed that as the solution \( u \) approaches a finite blowup time \( T \), the critical norm \( ||u(t)||_{L^3} \) must blow up at a rate \((\log \log \log \frac{1}{T-t})^c \) with some absolute constant \( c > 0 \). The other endpoint case \( p = \infty \) was generalized by Kozono and Taniuchi. In \([16]\), they proved that \( u \in L^2([0, T]; BMO(\mathbb{R}^3)) \) implies the regularity of the solution
Since the condition $||u(t)||_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq \frac{cp}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{2p}}}$ merely implies $u \in L^{q,\infty}(L^p)$ for \( \frac{3}{p} + \frac{2}{q} = 1, p > 3 \), it is natural to generalize the classical Ladyzhenskaya-Prodi-Serrin type criterion in Lorentz spaces. In [17], Kim and Kozono proved the local boundedness of a weak solution $u$ under the assumption that $||u||_{L^r,\infty([0,T];L^s,\infty(\mathbb{R}^3))}$ is sufficiently small for some $(r,s)$ with $\frac{2}{r} + \frac{3}{s} = 1$ and $3 \leq s < \infty$. The limiting case of the regularity criteria derived by Kim and Kozono was proved by He and Wang [11] i.e. any weak solution $u$ to the Navier-Stokes equations is regular under the assumption that $||u||_{L^2,\infty([0,T];L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3))}$ is sufficiently small. This results of He and Wang were improved by Wang and Zhang [38] which showed that $||u_3||_{L^r,\infty([0,T];L^s,\infty(\mathbb{R}^3))} \leq M$ and $||u_h||_{L^r,\infty([0,T];L^s,\infty(\mathbb{R}^3))} \leq c_M$ with $\frac{2}{r} + \frac{3}{s} = 1$ and $3 < s \leq \infty$ imply the regularity of the suitable weak solution $u$ to Navier-Stokes equations, where $c_M$ is a small constant depending on $M$.

Another important step towards a better understanding of the Navier-Stokes equations is the partial regularity theory. This theory was initiated by Scheffer [28–30] and improved by Caffarelli, Kohn and Nirenberg [4]. In [30], Scheffer pioneered the partial regularity theory by introducing the definition of suitable weak solutions and proving their existence in dimension $n = 3$. Moreover, he showed that the singular sets of the suitable weak solutions have finite $\frac{5}{3}$-dimensional Hausdorff measure in space-time. Caffarelli, Kohn and Nirenberg [4] made remarkable improvements in dimension $n = 3$ by proving that the 1-dimensional parabolic Hausdorff measure of singular sets of suitable weak solutions is zero. For more results about partial regularity theory of the Navier-Stokes equations, we refer the reader to [7, 10, 18, 24, 37, 39] and the references therein.

On the other hand, the idea of investigating the potential singularity of solutions goes back as far as [22]. In [22], Leray showed that if a weak solution $u$ first develops singularity at time $T$ then for $3 < p \leq \infty$ and $t < T$, it follows

$$||u(t)||_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)} \geq \frac{cp}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{2p}}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.4)

Moreover, Leray raised the question of the existence of self-similar singularity with the form

$$u(x,t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2a(T-t)}} U\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{2a(T-t)}}\right).$$

This question was completely solved by a negative answer due to Nečas, Ružička and Šverák [26], also see [34] for a more general case. In general, if $u$ satisfies

$$||u(t)||_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq \frac{C}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{2p}}},$$

The singularity or regularity of solution $u$ at time $T$ remains unknown. The potential singularity satisfying

$$||u(t)||_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq \frac{C}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$
is called Type I singularity in time. For the axisymmetric Navier-Stokes equations, Chen-Strain-Yau-Tsai \cite{5,6} and Koch-Nadirashvili-Seregin-Sverák \cite{15} proved that the solution $u$ does not develop Type I singularity respectively. For the behavior of the critical $L^3$ norm, Escauriaza, Seregin and Sverák \cite{8} proved that if $(x,T)$ is a singular point then

$$\limsup_{t \to T^-} ||u(t)||_{L^3(B_r(x))} = \infty \text{ for any fixed } r > 0.$$ \hspace{1cm} (1.5)

Later, Seregin \cite{31} improved (1.5):

$$\lim_{t \to T^-} ||u(t)||_{L^3(\mathbb{R}^3)} = \infty.$$ \hspace{1cm} (1.6)

Albritton and Barker \cite{1} refined (1.5) and (1.6) to show that if $\Omega$ is a bounded domain with $C^2$ boundary one has

$$\lim_{t \to T^-} ||u(t)||_{L^3(B_\delta(x) \cap \Omega)} = \infty \text{ for any fixed } \delta > 0.$$ \hspace{1cm} (1.7)

In \cite{23}, Li, Ozawa and Wang proved that if $u$ first blows up at $T$, there exists $t_n \to T^-$ and $x_n \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that

$$||u(t_n)||_{L^m(B_{\sqrt{C(m)(T-t)}(x_n)})} \geq \frac{C(m)}{(T-t)^{\frac{m-3}{2m}}} \text{ for } 3 \leq m \leq \infty.$$ \hspace{1cm} (1.8)

This result was improved by Maekawa, Miura and Prange. They \cite{25} proved that for every $t \in (0,T)$ there exists $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that

$$||u(t)||_{L^m(B_{\sqrt{C(m)(T-t)}(x(t))})} \geq \frac{C(m)}{(T-t)^{\frac{m-3}{2m}}} \text{ for } 3 \leq m \leq \infty.$$ \hspace{1cm} (1.9)

It is worth pointing out that in (1.8) and (1.9), there is no information about $x_n$ and $x(t)$. It is natural to ask whether the concentration phenomenon occurs on balls $B(x,R)$ with $R = O(\sqrt{T-t})$ and with $(x,T)$ being a singular point. Recently, this question was affirmatively answered by Barker and Prange for the critical $L^3$ norm for Leray-Hopf solutions which experiences the first singular time at $T$. In \cite{2}, they proved that if $u$ satisfy the Type I bound:

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^3} \sup_{0 < r < r_0} \sup_{T - r^2 < t < T} \frac{1}{r} \int_{B_r(x)} |u(y,t)|^2 dy \frac{1}{r} \leq M$$ \hspace{1cm} (1.10) for a given $r_0 \in (0, \infty]$ and $M, T \in (0, \infty)$

then it holds

$$||u(\cdot, t)||_{L^3(B_R(x))} \geq \gamma_{\text{univ}}, \quad R = O(\sqrt{T-t}).$$ \hspace{1cm} (1.11)
Recently, Barker and Prange [3] show under the assumption \(\|u\|_{L^\infty L^3} \leq M\), the optimal blow-up rate at the potential singular point \((T^*, 0)\) is
\[
\|u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^3(B_R(0))} \geq C(M) \log \left( \frac{1}{T^* - t} \right), \quad R = O \left( \left( T^* - t \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right). \tag{1.12}
\]

In conclusion, if one characterizes the local behaviors of solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations near a potential singularity by critical norm \(L^3\), the optimal blow-up rate was obtained by Barker and Prange [3]. But, if we consider the local characterization of singularity by \(L^3\) norm, there is an unpleasant problem. On the one hand, It is well-known that if \(|u(T, x)| \leq c|x|\) with small enough \(c\) then \((T, 0)\) can not be a singular point. One the other hand, it is clear that \(\|u(T, \cdot)\|_{L^3(B_r)} = \infty\) for any \(r > 0\). This means that one can not exclude such point from the singular set by using \(L^3\) norm. Noticing that \(\|u(T, \cdot)\|_{L^3, \infty} = (\frac{4\pi}{3})^{\frac{1}{3}} c\), it is more natural to characterize the singularity formation for the Navier-Stokes equations by \(L^3, \infty\) norm. The main purpose of this paper is to characterize the singularity formation in the Navier-Stokes equations by the critical norm \(L^3, \infty\).

### 1.1 Main result

We first show some \(\varepsilon\)-regularity criteria. It is worth pointing out that our criteria are established in \(L^q, \infty\) space and the constant \(\delta\) in our \(\varepsilon\)-regularity criteria does not depend on the value of \(p\).

**Theorem 1.1** Let \(\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{2}\) with \(2 \leq p \leq \infty\). Assume \((u, P)\) be a suitable weak solution to the Navier-Stokes equations (1.1) on \(Q_1(z_0)\). There exists an absolute constant \(\delta > 0\) such that if
\[
\|\sup_{\eta \leq 1} \left( \frac{1}{\eta} \int_{B_\eta(x_0)} |u(x, t) - u_{x_0, \eta}|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \|_{L^{q, \infty}[t_0 - 1, t_0]} \leq \delta \tag{1.13}
\]
or
\[
\|\sup_{\eta \leq 1} \left( \frac{1}{\eta} \int_{B_\eta(x_0)} |u(x, t)|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \|_{L^{q, \infty}[t_0 - 1, t_0]} \leq \delta, \tag{1.14}
\]
then \(z_0\) is a regular point.

**Remark 1.1** It is worth pointing out that the quantities
\[
\|\sup_{\eta \leq 1} \left( \frac{1}{\eta} \int_{B_\eta(x_0)} |u(x, t) - u_{x_0, \eta}|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \|_{L^{q, \infty}[t_0 - 1, t_0]}
\]
and
\[
\|\sup_{\eta \leq 1} \left( \frac{1}{\eta} \int_{B_\eta(x_0)} |u(x, t)|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \|_{L^{q, \infty}[t_0 - 1, t_0]}
\]
with \(\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{2}\) and \(2 \leq p \leq \infty\) are invariant under the scaling (1.18), we can replace 1 by any \(r > 0\) in Theorem 1.1.
By using Theorem 1.1 and the embedding theorem established in Lemma 2.4, we obtain the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.2** Let \((u, P)\) be a suitable weak solution in \(Q_1(z_0)\). Assume \(z_0\) be a singular point. Then for any given \(r \in (0, 1)\), it holds

\[
\limsup_{t \to t_0^-} \|u(t, x) - u(t_{x_0, r})\|_{L^3, \infty(B_r(x_0))} > \delta^*
\]

(1.15) and

\[
\limsup_{t \to t_0^-} (t_0 - t)^{\frac{1}{2}} r^{\frac{2}{2} - \frac{3}{p}} \|u(t)\|_{L^p, \infty(B_r(x_0))} > \delta^*
\]

(1.16) for \(3 < p \leq \infty\), \(\frac{1}{\mu} + \frac{1}{\nu} = \frac{1}{2}\) and \(2 \leq \nu \leq \frac{2}{3} p\),

where \(u_{x_0, r}(t) = \frac{1}{|B_r(x_0)|} \int_{B_r(x_0)} u(t, y) dy\) and \(\delta^* > 0\) is independent on \(\mu, \nu, p\) and \(r\).

Before the proofs of main results, we first recall some definitions and notations of the suitable weak solutions to (1.1), Lorenz space, and some invariant quantities. Setting

\[
B_r(x_0) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |x - x_0| < r\}, \quad B_r = B_r(0), \quad B = B_1,
\]

\[
Q_r(z_0) = B_r(x_0) \times (t_0 - r^2, t_0), \quad Q_r = Q_r(0), \quad Q = Q_1.
\]

**Definition 1.1** The function pair \((u, P)\) is called a suitable weak solution of (1.1) in \(Q_1(z_0)\) if

1. \(u \in L^\infty((t_0, 1); L^2_{\text{loc}}(B_1(x_0)) \cap L^2((t_0, 1), t_0); H^1_{\text{loc}}(B_1(x_0)))\),

2. There exists a distribution \(P \in L^3_{\text{loc}}(Q_1(z_0))\) such that \((u, P)\) satisfies (1.1) in the sense of distributions.

3. The function pair \((u, P)\) satisfies the following local energy inequality:

\[
\int_{B_1(x_0)} |u(t, x)|^2 \phi dx + 2 \int_{t_0}^t \int_{B_1(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 \phi dx ds
\]

\[
\leq \int_{t_0}^t \int_{B_1(x_0)} |u|^2 (\partial_t \phi + \nu \Delta \phi) + (|u|^2 + 2P) u \cdot \nabla \phi dx ds.
\]

(1.17) for every nonnegative \(\phi \in C_0^\infty(Q_1(z_0))\).

We say a point \(z_0\) is a regular point of a solution \(u\) to (1.1) if there exists a non-empty neighborhood \(\mathcal{O}_{z_0}\) of \(z_0\) such that \(u \in L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_{z_0})\). The complement of the set of regular points will be called the singular set.

Assume \(\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3\). We use \(L^q((0, T]; L^p(\Omega))\) to denote the space of measurable functions with the following norm

\[
\|f\|_{L^q((0, T]; L^p(\Omega))} = \begin{cases} (\int_0^T (\int_\Omega |f(t, x)|^p dx)^{\frac{q}{p}} dt)^{\frac{1}{q}}, & 1 \leq q < \infty, \\ \text{ess sup}_{t \in (0, T]} \|f(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p(\Omega)}, & q = \infty. \end{cases}
\]
The Lorentz space $L^{r,s}([0, T])$ is the space of measurable functions with the following norm:

$$
||f||_{L^{r,s}([0, T])} = \left\{ \begin{array}{cl}
\int_0^\infty \sigma^{s-1} \{ \{ x \in [0, T] : |f(x)| > \sigma \} \} \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma}, & 1 \leq s < \infty, \\
\sup_{\sigma > 0} \sigma \{ \{ x \in [0, T] : |f(x)| > \sigma \} \}^{\frac{1}{s}}, & s = \infty.
\end{array} \right.
$$

Let $(u, P)$ be a solution of (1.1). Introduce the scaling

$$
u = \lambda u(\lambda^2 t, \lambda x); \quad P = \lambda^2 P(\lambda^2 t, \lambda x),
$$

(1.18) for arbitrary $\lambda > 0$. Then the function pair $(u_\lambda, P_\lambda)$ is also a solution of (1.1).

We introduce the following invariant quantities, which are invariant under the natural scaling (1.18):

$$
A(u, r, z) = \sup_{t-r^2 \leq s \leq t} \frac{1}{r} \int_{B_r(z)} |u|^2 dx; \quad B(u, r, z) = \frac{1}{r} \int \int_{Q_r(z)} |\nabla u|^2 dx dt,
$$

$$
C(u, r, z) = \frac{1}{r^2} \int \int_{Q_r(z)} |v|^3 dx dt; \quad D(P, r, z) = \frac{1}{r^2} \int \int_{Q_r(z)} |P|^2 dx dt.
$$

For simplicity, we introduce the notations

$$
A(u, r) = A(u, r, 0); \quad B(u, r) = B(u, r, 0); \quad C(u, r) = C(u, r, 0); \quad D(P, r) = D(P, r, 0).
$$

Throughout this paper, $u_{x_0, \rho} = \frac{1}{|B_{\rho}|} \int_{B_{\rho}(x_0)} u dx$ and $C$ denotes an absolute and often large positive number which can change from line to line.

## 2 The proofs of Main results

We first show some crucial lemmas.

**Lemma 2.1** Let $z_0 = (x_0, t_0)$ and $\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{2}$, $2 \leq p \leq \infty$. Assume $(u, P)$ be a suitable weak solution to (1.1) on $Q_1(z_0)$ satisfying

$$
||\sup_{\rho \leq 1} \left( \frac{1}{\rho} \int_{B_{\rho}(x_0)} |u(t, x) - u(t, x_0, \rho)|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} ||_{L^{q, \infty}([t_0-1, t_0])} = M < \infty \quad (2.1)
$$

or

$$
||\sup_{\rho \leq 1} \left( \frac{1}{\rho} \int_{B_{\rho}(x_0)} |u(t, x)|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} ||_{L^{q, \infty}([t_0-1, t_0])} = M < \infty. \quad (2.2)
$$

Then,

if $2 \leq p < 3$, it holds

$$
C(u, r, z_0) \leq C^r \rho C(u, \rho, z_0) + C(\rho^2 B(u, \rho, z_0))^{\frac{2-3p}{2-p}} M^{\frac{2p}{3p}}. \quad (2.3)
$$
if $3 \leq p \leq 6$, it holds
\[ C(u, r, z_0) \leq C \frac{r}{\rho} C(u, \rho, z_0) + C(\frac{\rho}{r}) A(u, \rho, z_0)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} M^{\frac{p}{2}}, \] (2.4)

if $6 < p \leq \infty$, it holds
\[ C(u, r, z_0) \leq C \frac{r}{\rho} C(u, \rho, z_0) + C(\frac{\rho}{r}) A(u, \rho, z_0)^{\frac{3}{2}} M^{\frac{3}{2}} \] (2.5)

where $C$ is a positive absolute constant independent on $p$.

**Proof** We first consider that the assumption (2.1) is holding. Let $r < \rho \leq 1$ and define $f_p(t) = (\sup_{\rho \leq 1} \frac{1}{p} \int_{B_\rho(x_0)} |u(t, x) - u_{x_0, \rho}|^p dx)^{\frac{1}{p}}$. At almost every time $t \in (t_0 - \rho^2, t_0]$ we estimate
\[ \int_{B_r(x_0)} |u|^3 dx \leq C |B_r||u_{x_0, \rho}|^3 + C \int_{B_r(x)} |u - u_{x_0, \rho}|^3 dx = I_1 + I_2. \] (2.6)

For $I_1$, we have
\[ I_1 = C |B_r(x_0)||\frac{1}{|B_\rho(x_0)|} \int_{B_\rho(x_0)} u dy|^3 \leq C(\frac{r}{\rho})^3 \int_{B_r(x_0)} |u|^3 dx. \] (2.7)

We now estimate $I_2$.
If $2 < p < 3$, we estimate $I_2$ as follows
\[ I_2 \leq C \|u - u_{x_0, \rho}\|_{L^p}^{\frac{3p}{2}} \|u - u_{x_0, \rho}\|_{L^\frac{3p}{2 - p}}. \]
Integrating with respect to time from $t_0 - r^2$ to $t_0$ and using Hölder’s inequality, we obtain
\[ \int_{t_0 - r^2}^{t_0} \int_{B_r(x_0)} |u - u_{x_0, \rho}|^3 dx ds \leq (\int_{t_0 - r^2}^{t_0} \|u - u_{x_0, \rho}\|_{L^p(B_\rho(x_0))}^{\frac{3p}{2 - p}} ds)^{\frac{2p}{3p - 2}} \int_{t_0 - r^2}^{t_0} \|u - u_{x_0, \rho}\|_{L^\frac{3p}{2 - p}(B_\rho(x_0))} ds^{\frac{2p - 3}{2 - p}} \]
\[ \leq (\int_{t_0 - r^2}^{t_0} \int_{B_\rho(x_0)} \|\nabla u\|^2 dx ds)^{\frac{9 - 3p}{2p - 3}} \rho^{\frac{3}{2p - 3}} (\int_{t_0 - r^2}^{t_0} f_p^{\frac{3p}{2p - 3}}(s) ds)^{\frac{2p - 3}{6 - p}}. \]
By using the assumption $\|f_p\|_{L^{q,\infty}(t_0-1, t_0)} = M$ and $\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{2}$, we have

$$\int_{t_0-r^2}^{t_0} f_p(s) \frac{3p}{2p-3} ds = \frac{3p}{2p-3} \int_0^\infty \sigma^{\frac{3+p}{2p-3}} \{s \in [t-r^2, t]; f_p(s) > \sigma\} d\sigma$$

$$\leq \frac{3p}{2p-3} \int_0^R \sigma^{\frac{3+p}{2p-3}} r^2 d\sigma + M^{\frac{2p}{p-2}} \int_0^\infty \sigma^{\frac{3+p}{2p-3} - \frac{2p}{p-2}} d\sigma$$

$$\leq R^{\frac{2p}{p-3}} r^2 + (3 - \frac{6}{p}) R^{\frac{2p}{p-3}} - \frac{2p}{p-2} M^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}$$

$$\leq (4 - \frac{6}{p}) r^{\frac{p}{p-3}} M^{\frac{3p}{p-3}},$$

where we take $R = r^{\frac{p-2}{p}} M$.

When $p = 2$, in the estimate (2.9), we choose $R = M$ and obtain

$$\int_{t_0-r^2}^{t_0} f_p(s) \frac{2p}{2p-3} ds = 6 \int_0^M \sigma^5 r^2 d\sigma = r^2 M^6.$$

This means that the conclusion in (2.9) is still holding for $p = 2$.

Substituting (2.9) into (2.8) implies

$$\int_{t_0-r^2}^{t_0} \int_{B_r(x_0)} |u - u_{x_0,\rho}|^3 dx ds$$

$$\leq (4 - \frac{6}{p})^{\frac{2p-3}{6p-7}} \rho^{\frac{3}{6p-7}} r^{\frac{6p-7}{6p-7}} \left( \int_0^{t_0-r^2} \int_{B_r(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 dx ds \right)^{\frac{9-3p}{6p}} M^{\frac{3p}{6p}}.$$

Combining (2.10) with (2.6)-(2.7), we get

$$\int_{Q_{r}(z_0)} |u|^3 dx dt$$

$$\leq C \left( \frac{r}{\rho} \right)^3 \int_{Q_{r}(z_0)} |u|^3 dx ds + C \rho^{\frac{3}{6-p} r^{\frac{p}{6-p}}} \left( \int_{Q_{r}(z_0)} |\nabla u|^2 dx ds \right)^{\frac{9-3p}{6-p}} M^{\frac{3p}{6-p}}$$

$$\leq \left( \frac{r}{\rho} \right)^3 \int_{Q_{r}(z_0)} |u|^3 dx ds + C \rho^{2 \frac{2}{6-p} r^{\frac{p}{6-p}}} B(u, \rho, z_0)^{\frac{9-3p}{6-p}} M^{\frac{3p}{6-p}},$$

where we have used the fact $(4 - \frac{6}{p})^{\frac{2p-3}{6p-7}} \leq 4$ for $2 \leq p < 3$. Multiplying this estimate by $\frac{1}{r^2}$, we obtain (2.3).
If \( 3 \leq p \leq 6 \), we deduce, using interpolation inequality

\[
I_2 \leq C \left( \int_{B_{\rho}(x_0)} |u - u_{x_0, \rho}|^2 \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \left( \int_{B_{\rho}(x_0)} |u - u_{x_0, \rho}|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq C \rho A(u, \rho, z_0)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \left( \frac{1}{\rho} \int_{B_{\rho}(x_0)} |u - u_{x_0, \rho}|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \tag{2.11}
\]

Summing up the estimates for \( I_1 \) and \( I_2 \) and integrating with respect to time from \( t_0 - r^2 \) to \( t_0 \), we obtain

\[
\int_{t_0-r^2}^{t_0} \int_{B_r(x_0)} |u|^3 \, dx \, ds \leq C \rho^3 \int_{t_0-r^2}^{t_0} \int_{B_{\rho}(x_0)} |u|^3 \, dx \, ds + C \rho A(u, \rho, z_0)^{\frac{p-3}{2}} \int_{t_0-r^2}^{t_0} \int_{B_{\rho}(x_0)} f_{\rho}^{\frac{p}{p-2}}(s) \, ds. \tag{2.12}
\]

By the assumptions, we obtain \( ||f_p||_{L^\infty[t_0-1,t_0]} = M \) with \( \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{2} \). It follows

\[
\int_{t_0-r^2}^{t_0} \int_{B_{\rho}(x_0)} |u|^3 \, dx \, ds = \frac{p}{p-2} \int_0^\infty \sigma^{\frac{2p}{p-2}} |\{ s \in [t_0 - r^2, t_0] : f_p(s) > \sigma \}| \, d\sigma
\]

\[
= \frac{p}{p-2} \left( \int_0^R \sigma^{\frac{2p}{p-2}} |\{ s \in [t_0 - r^2, t_0] : f_p(s) > \sigma \}| \, d\sigma + \int_R^\infty \sigma^{\frac{2p}{p-2}} |\{ s \in [t_0 - r^2, t_0] : f_p(s) > \sigma \}| \, d\sigma \right)
\]

\[
\leq \frac{p}{p-2} \left( \int_0^R \sigma^{\frac{2p}{p-2}} r^2 \, d\sigma + \int_R^\infty \sigma^{\frac{2p}{p-2}} - \frac{2p}{p-2} \sigma^{\frac{2p}{p-2}} r^2 \, d\sigma \right)
\]

\[
= r^2 R^{\frac{p}{p-2}} + R^{\frac{p}{p-2}} M^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}
\]

\[
= 2r M^{\frac{p}{p-2}}
\]

where we choose \( R = r^{-\frac{p-2}{p}} M \). Substituting (2.13) into (2.12), it follows

\[
\int_{t_0-r^2}^{t_0} \int_{B_r(x_0)} |u|^3 \, dx \, dt \leq C \rho^3 \int_{t_0-r^2}^{t_0} \int_{B_{\rho}(x_0)} |u|^3 \, dx \, ds + C \rho A(u, \rho, z_0)^{\frac{p-3}{2}} M^{\frac{p}{p-2}}. \tag{2.14}
\]

Multiplying (2.14) by \( \frac{1}{r^2} \), we get

\[
\frac{1}{r^2} \int_{Q_r(\cdot)} |u|^3 \, dx \, dt \leq C \rho \frac{\frac{1}{r^2}}{\frac{1}{p^2}} \int_{Q_{\rho}(\cdot)} |u|^3 \, dx \, ds + C \rho A(u, \rho, z_0)^{\frac{p-3}{2}} M^{\frac{p}{p-2}}.
\]
This means (2.4).

If $6 < p \leq \infty$, we estimate $I_2$ by using Hölder’s inequality as follows

$$I_2 \leq \int_{B_p(x_0)} |u - u_{x_0, \rho}|^\frac{3}{2} |u - u_{x_0, \rho}|^{\frac{3}{2}} dx$$

(2.15)

\[ \leq C\left( \int_{B_p(x_0)} |u - u_{x_0, \rho}|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \left( \int_{B_p(x_0)} |u - u_{x_0, \rho}|^p dx \right)^{\frac{3}{4p}} \rho^{\frac{3(p - 6)}{4p}} \]

\[ \leq Cr^3 \frac{3}{p^2} A(u, \rho, z_0)^{\frac{3}{2}} \int_0^{t_0} f_p(s) ds. \]

Summing up the estimates for $I_1$ and $I_2$ and integrating with respect to time from $t_0 - r^2$ to $t_0$, we obtain

\[ \int_{t_0 - r^2}^{t_0} \int_{B_r(x_0)} |u|^3 dx \, ds \]

(2.16)

\[ \leq C \rho \frac{3}{p^2} \int_{t_0 - r^2}^{t_0} \int_{B_p(x_0)} |u|^3 dx \, ds + C \rho \frac{3(p - 6)}{2p} A(u, \rho, z_0)^{\frac{3}{2}} \int_{t_0 - r^2}^{t_0} \int_{B_r(x_0)} f_p(s) ds. \]

Using the similar estimates for (2.9) or (2.13), we obtain

\[ \int_{t_0 - r^2}^{t_0} f_p(s) ds \leq (1 + \frac{3}{p - 2})r^{3 - \frac{3(p - 6)}{2p}} M^{\frac{3}{2}}. \]

(2.17)

Substituting (2.17) into (2.16) implies

\[ \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{t_0 - r^2}^{t_0} \int_{B_r(x_0)} |u|^3 dx \, ds \]

(2.18)

\[ \leq C \rho \frac{3}{p^2} \int_{t_0 - r^2}^{t_0} \int_{B_p(x_0)} |u|^3 dx \, ds + C \rho \frac{3(p - 6)}{2p} A(u, \rho, z_0)^{\frac{3}{2}} M^{\frac{3}{2}} \]

\[ \leq C \rho \frac{3}{p^2} A(u, \rho, z_0)^{\frac{3}{2}} M^{\frac{3}{2}} \]

where we have used the facts $1 + \frac{3p - 6}{2p} \leq 4$ and $(\frac{3}{p})^{\frac{3(p - 6)}{2p}} \leq (\frac{3}{p})^{\frac{3}{2}}$. We thus show (2.5) and complete the proof of Lemma 2.1 under the assumption (2.1).

If the assumption (2.2) is holding, we denote $f_p(t) = \sup_{\rho \leq 1} (\frac{1}{\rho} \int_{B_p(x_0)} |u(t, x)|^p dx)^{\frac{3}{p}}$ and modify the processes of proofs as follows.

In the case $2 \leq p < 3$, we can replace $\|u - u_\rho\|_{L^p(B_p)}$ by $C_p\|u\|_{L^p(B_p)}$ in (2.8) and repeat the processes of proofs for (2.9)-(2.10) to get (2.3). The difference is that in this case, the constant $C_p$ is depended on $p$. Noticing $2 \leq p < 3$, we can choose a large enough constant $C$ to get rid of the dependence on $p$.

If $3 \leq p \leq 6$ or $6 < p \leq \infty$, we just need to replace $I_2 = \int_{B_r(x_0)} |u - u_{x_0, \rho}|^3 dx$ by $C \int_{B_r(x_0)} |u|^3 dx$ and repeat the processes of proofs step by step to get (2.4) and (2.5).
Lemma 2.2 Let \( z_0 = (x_0, t_0) \) and \( \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{2}, \) \( 2 \leq p \leq \infty. \) Assume \((u, P)\) be a suitable weak solution to (1.1) on \( Q_1(z_0) \) satisfying

\[
|| \sup_{\rho \leq 1} \left( \frac{1}{\rho} \int_{B_{\rho}(z_0)} |u(t, x) - u(t, x_0, \rho)|^p \, dx \right)^\frac{1}{p} ||_{L^{\infty}((t_0 - 1, t_0))} = M < \infty, \tag{2.19}
\]

or

\[
|| \sup_{\rho \leq 1} \left( \frac{1}{\rho} \int_{B_{\rho}(z_0)} |u(t, x)|^p \, dx \right)^\frac{1}{p} ||_{L^{\infty}((t_0 - 1, t_0))} = M < \infty, \tag{2.20}
\]

then there exists a constant \( \rho_0 > 0 \) only depended on \( A(u, 1, z_0), B(u, 1, z_0), C(u, 1, z_0) \) and \( D(P, 1, z_0), \) such that for \( r \leq \rho_0, \) it follows

\[
A(u, r, z) + B(u, r, z) + C(u, r, z) + D(P, r, z) \leq C(M). \tag{2.21}
\]

**Proof** Without loss of generality, we set \( z_0 = 0. \) Let \( \phi(t, x) = \chi(t, x)\psi(t, x) \) where \( \chi \) is cut-off function which equals 1 in \( Q_{\frac{2}{3}} \) and vanishes outside of \( Q_{\frac{1}{3}}. \) Then let \( \psi = (4\pi(r^2 - t))^{-\frac{3}{2}} e^{-\frac{|y|^2}{4(r^2 - t)}}. \) Direct computations show that \( \phi \geq 0 \) and

\[
\partial_t \phi + \Delta \phi = 0 \text{ in } Q_{\frac{2}{3}},
\]

\[
|\partial_t \phi + \Delta \phi| \leq C\rho^5 \text{ in } Q_{\rho},
\]

\[
C^{-1}r^3 \leq \phi \leq Cr^{-3}; \quad |\nabla \phi| \leq Cr^{-4} \text{ in } Q_r,
\]

\[
\phi \leq C\rho^{-4} \text{ in } Q_{\rho} - Q_{\frac{4}{3}}.
\]

Using \( \phi \) as a test function in the local energy inequality (1.17), we obtain

\[
A(u, r) + B(u, r) \leq C\left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^2 A(u, \rho) + C\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^2 C(u, \rho) + C\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^2 C^\frac{1}{2}(u, \rho)D^\frac{1}{2}(P, \rho)
\]

\[
\leq C\left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^2 A(u, \rho) + C\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^2 C(u, \rho) + C\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^2 D(P, \rho).
\tag{2.22}
\]

We now show some bounds on \( D(u, r). \) Let \( \eta(x) \) be a cut-off function which equals 1 in \( B_{\frac{2}{3}} \) and vanishes outside of \( B_{\frac{4}{3}}. \) Let \( P_1 \) satisfy \( -\Delta P_1 = \partial_i \partial_j (u_{ij} \eta) \) and \( P_2 = P - P_1. \) Then, it is clear that \( \Delta P_2 = 0 \) in \( B_{\frac{4}{3}}. \) By using the Calderón-Zygmund inequality, we have

\[
\int_{B_{\rho}} |P_1|^\frac{3}{2} \, dx \leq C(\int_{B_{\rho}} |u|^3 \, dx).
\]

By the properties of the harmonic functions, we infer that for \( r \leq \frac{\rho}{2}, \)

\[
\int_{B_{r}} |P_2|^\frac{3}{2} \, dx \leq Cr^3 \sup_{x \in B_{r}} |P_2(x)|^\frac{3}{2} \leq C\left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^3 \int_{B_{\rho}} |P_2|^\frac{3}{2} \, dx.
\]
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It then follows that for \(0 < r \leq \frac{\rho}{2}\)

\[
\int_{B_r} |P|^\frac{\rho}{2} dx \\
\leq C(\int_{B_\rho} |u|^3 dx) + C\left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^3 \int_{B_\rho} |P - P_1|^\frac{\rho}{2} dx \\
\leq C(\int_{B_\rho} |u|^3 dx) + C\left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^3 \int_{B_\rho} |P|^\frac{\rho}{2} dx.
\]

Integrating with respect to \(t\) from \(-r^2\) to 0, we obtain, using Hölder inequality,

\[
\int_{Q_r} |P|^\frac{\rho}{2} dx dt \leq C(\int_{Q_\rho} |u|^3 dx dt) + C\left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^3 \int_{Q_\rho} |P|^\frac{\rho}{2} dx dt.
\]

This implies

\[
D(P, r) \leq C\left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^2 D(P, \rho) + C\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^2 C(u, \rho). \tag{2.23}
\]

We now show some crucial bounds for \(C(u, r)\).

**In the case** \(2 \leq p < 3\)  
Noticing (2.3), we have by using Young’s inequality

\[
C^\frac{\rho}{2}(u, r) \leq C\left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^\frac{\rho}{2} C^\frac{\rho}{2}(u, \rho) + C\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^\frac{\rho}{2} B(u, \rho) M^\frac{\rho}{2(6-p)} (\int_{Q_\rho} |u|^3 dx dt)
\]

\[
\leq C\left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^\frac{\rho}{2} C^\frac{\rho}{2}(u, \rho) + C\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^\frac{\rho}{2} \left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^\frac{\rho}{2} \left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^\frac{\rho}{2} B(u, \rho) M^\frac{\rho}{2(6-p)} M^\frac{\rho}{2(6-p)}
\]

\[
\leq C\left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^\frac{\rho}{2} C^\frac{\rho}{2}(u, \rho) + C\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^\frac{\rho}{2} \left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^\frac{\rho}{2} B(u, \rho) + C\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^\frac{\rho}{2} B(u, \rho) + C\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^\frac{\rho}{2} B(u, \rho) + C\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^\frac{\rho}{2} B(u, \rho)
\]

where we have used the facts \(\frac{\rho}{2} > 1\) and \(2 \leq p < 3\).

By using Young’s inequality, we deduce from (2.22)

\[
A(u, r) + B(u, r) \leq C\left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^2 A(u, \rho) + \left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^\frac{\rho}{2} C^\frac{\rho}{2}(u, \rho) + \left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^\frac{\rho}{2} D^\frac{\rho}{2}(P, \rho) + C\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^{21} + \left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^{24}. \tag{2.25}
\]

Similarly, we obtain by using (2.23)

\[
D(P, r)^\frac{\rho}{2} \leq C\left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^\frac{\rho}{2} D^\frac{\rho}{2}(P, \rho) + C\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^\frac{\rho}{2} C(u, \rho)^\frac{\rho}{2} \tag{2.26}
\]

\[
\leq C\left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^\frac{\rho}{2} D^\frac{\rho}{2}(P, \rho) + \left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^\frac{\rho}{2} C(u, \rho)^\frac{\rho}{2} + C\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^{168}.
\]
Define \( G(r) \equiv A(u,r) + B(u,r) + C^\tilde{r}(u,r) + D^\tilde{r}(P,r) \). Summing up the estimates (2.24)-(2.26) implies

\[
G(r) \leq C\left(\frac{r}{p}\right)^{\frac{7}{p}} G(\rho) + C\left(1 + M^{\frac{2p}{p-r}}\right)\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^{168} \tag{2.27}
\]

where we have used the fact \( \frac{r}{p} < 1 \).

Fix \( \theta = \min\left\{ \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2p}\right\} \) and set \( r = \theta^k \rho \) for \( k \in \mathbb{N} \). (2.27) yields

\[
G(\theta^k \rho) \leq \theta G(\theta^{k-1} \rho) + C\left(1 + M^{\frac{7p}{p-r}}\right)\theta^{-168}. \tag{2.28}
\]

By a standard iterative argument, we deduce that

\[
G(r) \leq C\left(1 + M^{\frac{7p}{p-r}}\right) for r < \rho \leq 1. \tag{2.29}
\]

We now first take \( \rho = 1 \) then choose \( \rho_0 \) satisfying \( \frac{m_a}{p} G(1) \leq 1 \), it follows

\[
G(r) \leq C\left(M^{\frac{7p}{p-r}}\right) for r \leq \rho_0. \tag{2.30}
\]

In the case \( 3 \leq p \leq 6 \) From (2.4), it is clear that

\[
C(\rho) \leq C\left(\frac{r}{p}\right)^{\frac{7}{p}} C(\rho)^{\tilde{r}} + C\left(\frac{r}{p}\right)^{\tilde{r}} A(u,\rho)^{\frac{p-3}{p-2}} M^{\frac{p-3}{p-2}} \tag{2.31}
\]

\[
\leq C\left(\frac{r}{p}\right)^{\tilde{r}} C(\rho)^{\tilde{r}} + C\left(\frac{r}{p}\right)^{\tilde{r}} A(u,\rho)^{\frac{p-3}{p-2}} ((\rho)\frac{\tilde{r}}{p} A(u,\rho))^\frac{p-3}{p} M^{\frac{p}{p-2}} \tag{2.32}
\]

\[
\leq C\left(\frac{r}{p}\right)^{\tilde{r}} C(\rho)^{\tilde{r}} + C\left(\frac{r}{p}\right)^{\tilde{r}} A(u,\rho) + C\left(\frac{r}{p}\right)^{\frac{6(p-2)}{9-p}} M^{\frac{2p}{p-2}} \tag{2.33}
\]

where we have used the fact \( \frac{6(p-2)}{9-p} \left(\frac{7}{6} + \frac{48}{36(p-2)}\right) \leq 24 \) for \( 3 \leq p \leq 6 \). Collecting (2.25)-(2.26) and (2.31) implies

\[
G(r) \leq C\left(\frac{r}{p}\right)^{\tilde{r}} G(\rho) + C\left(1 + M^{\frac{2p}{p-r}}\right)\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^{168}. \tag{2.32}
\]

By using the similar computations in the estimates for (2.27)-(2.30), we show that there exists a constant \( \rho_0 \) such that for \( r \leq \rho_0 \) it follows

\[
G(r) \leq C\left(M^{\frac{7p}{p-r}}\right). \tag{2.33}
\]

In the case \( 6 < p \leq \infty \): From (2.5) and Young’s inequality, it is clear that

\[
C(\rho) \leq C\left(\frac{r}{p}\right)^{\tilde{r}} C(\rho)^{\tilde{r}} + C\left(\frac{r}{p}\right)^{\tilde{r}} A(u,\rho) + C\left(\frac{r}{p}\right)^{24} M^{14}. \tag{2.34}
\]
Collecting (2.25)-(2.26) and (2.34) yields
\[
G(r) \leq C \left( \frac{r}{\rho} \right)^{\frac{q}{p}} G(\rho) + C \left( \frac{\rho}{r} \right)^{168} (M^{14} + 1). \tag{2.35}
\]
By using similar computations in the estimates for (2.27)-(2.30), we get that there exists a constant \( \rho_0 \) such that for \( r \leq \rho_0 \), it follows
\[
G(r) \leq C M^{14}. \tag{2.36}
\]
Collecting (2.30), (2.33) and (2.36) and taking \( \rho_0 = \min \{ \rho_0_1, \rho_0_2, \rho_0_3 \} \), we thus obtain (2.21).

**Lemma 2.3** Let \( z_0 = (x_0, t_0) \) and \( \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{2} \) with \( 2 \leq p \leq \infty \). Assume \( (u, P) \) be a suitable weak solution of (1.1) in \( Q_1(z_0) \). For any fixed \( \varepsilon > 0 \), there exists two constants \( \delta \) and \( r^* \) depended on \( \varepsilon \) such that if
\[
\left\| \left( \sup_{\rho \leq 1} \frac{1}{\rho} \int_{B_\rho(x_0)} |u(t, x) - u(t, x_{0, \rho})|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\|_{L^q([t_0-1, t_0])} \leq \delta
\tag{2.37}
\]
or
\[
\left\| \left( \sup_{\rho \leq 1} \frac{1}{\rho} \int_{B_\rho(x_0)} |u(t, x)|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\|_{L^q([t_0-1, t_0])} \leq \delta
\tag{2.38}
\]
then it is holding
\[
C(u, r^*, z_0) \leq \varepsilon. \tag{2.39}
\]

**Proof** Without loss of generality, we assume \( z_0 = 0 \) and \( \delta \leq 1 \). In view of Lemma 2.2, we have that for \( \rho \leq \rho_0 \), it is holding
\[
C(u, \rho, z) + D(P, \rho, z) + A(u, \rho, z) + B(u, \rho, z) \leq C \tag{2.40}
\]
where \( C \) is an absolute constant.

If \( 2 \leq p < 3 \), we deduce by choosing \( \rho = \rho_0 \) in (2.3) and using (2.40)
\[
C(u, r) \leq \frac{r}{\rho_0} C + C(\frac{\rho_0}{r})^2 C \frac{3p}{4-p} \delta \frac{3p}{6-p} \tag{2.41}
\]
where we have used \( \frac{3p}{6-p} \leq 1 \) and \( \frac{3p}{4-p} \geq \frac{3}{2} \). In (2.41), we first choose \( r^* = \frac{\rho_0}{2r} \) then take \( \delta_1 \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4C^2} \), it follows that
\[
C(u, r^*) \leq \varepsilon. \tag{2.42}
\]
If $3 \leq p \leq 6$, by choosing $\rho = \rho_0$ in (2.4) and using (2.40), we obtain also that
\[
C(u, r) \leq C \frac{r}{\rho_0} C(u, \rho_0) + C(\frac{\rho_0}{r}) A(u, \rho) \frac{r^p - 3}{p - 3} \delta^{\frac{3}{p}}
\] (2.43)
where we have used $\frac{r^p - 3}{p - 3} \leq 1$ and $\frac{r^p}{p - 2} \geq \frac{3}{2}$ for $3 \leq p \leq 6$. We now first choose $r^* = \frac{\rho_0}{2C}$ then take $\delta_2 \leq \frac{1}{4^*C^2}$, it follows (2.42) again.

If $6 < p \leq \infty$, by choosing $\rho = \rho_0$ in (2.5) and using (2.40), we obtain by similar computations that
\[
C(u, r) \leq C \frac{r}{\rho_0} + C^2(\frac{\rho_0}{r})^{\frac{3}{2}} \delta^{\frac{3}{p}}
\] (2.44)
We now first choose $r^* = \frac{\rho_0}{2C}$ then take $\delta_3 \leq \frac{1}{4^*C^2}$, it follows (2.42). Choosing $\delta = \min\{\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3\}$ yields Lemma 2.3.

To get the concentration rate including both time scale and space scale, we need an embedding theorem from the Lorentz space $L^{p,\infty}$ to a Morrey type space

**Lemma 2.4** For any given $r > 0$ and $2 \leq p \leq \infty$, it follows
\[
(\sup_{\eta \leq r} \eta \int_{B_\eta} |u|^p dx)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq C ||u||_{L^{\frac{p}{p-2}}(B_r)}
\] (2.45)
where $C > 0$ is a constant independent on $p$.

**Proof** This conclusion is a direct computation as follows
\[
\int_{B_\eta} |u|^p dx = p \int_0^\infty \sigma^{p-1} |\{x \in B_\eta : |u(x)| > \sigma\}| d\sigma
\] (2.46)
\[
\leq Cp \int_0^R \sigma^{p-1} \eta^3 d\sigma + \int_R^\infty \sigma^{p-1-\frac{3p}{2}} d\sigma ||u||_{L^{\frac{3p}{2}}(B_\eta)}
\] \[
\leq C[R^p \eta^3 + 2R^{\frac{3p}{2}} ||u||_{L^{\frac{3p}{2}}(B_\eta)}]
\] \[
\leq C \eta ||u||_{L^{\frac{3p}{2}}(B_\eta)}^p
\]
where we take $R = \eta^{\frac{2}{3p}} ||u||_{L^{\frac{3p}{2}}(B_\eta)}$. This yields (2.45).

To prove the local regularity for the suitable weak solution to (1.1), we need a criterion for partial regularity due to Wolf [37].
Lemma 2.5 [37] For every $3 \leq s, q \leq \infty$ there exists a constant $\varepsilon^* = \varepsilon(s, p) > 0$ with the following property: Let $u$ be a suitable weak solution to the Navier-Stokes equations (1.1) in $Q_r(z)$. If

$$||u||_{L^\infty((t-r^2, t); L^p(B_r(x)))} \leq r^{\frac{q}{q} + \frac{2}{p} - 1} \varepsilon^*,$$

Then $u$ is Hölder continuous on $Q_{\frac{r}{2}}(z)$.

We now start the proofs of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.1 By using Lemma 2.3, we obtain that for the given $\varepsilon^* = \varepsilon(3, 3)$ in Lemma 2.5, there exist two positive constants $r^*$ and $\delta$ such that if

$$||\sup_{\eta \leq 1} \frac{1}{\eta} \int_{B_{r}(x_0)} |u(x, t) - u_{x_0, \eta}|^p dx|^\frac{1}{p}||_{L^\infty[0, 1] \leq \delta}$$

or

$$||\sup_{\eta \leq 1} \frac{1}{\eta} \int_{B_{r}(x_0)} |u(x, t)|^p dx||_{L^\infty[0, 1] \leq \delta}$$

then it follows

$$C(u, r^*, z) \leq \varepsilon^*.$$

In view of Lemma 2.5 for $q = p = 3$, we deduce that $z_0$ is a regular point. This yields Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.2 Without loss of generality, we assume $0 < r < 1$. In the case $3 < p \leq \infty$, if Theorem 1.2 is false, then there exists some $0 < r_0 < 1$ such that for some $3 < p_0 \leq \infty$, $2 \leq \nu_0 \leq \frac{2p_0}{3}$ and $\frac{1}{\nu_0} + \frac{1}{v_0} = \frac{1}{2}$, it holds

$$\lim_{t \to t_0} \sup_{t_0 - t_0} \frac{1}{r_0^\frac{3}{3} - \frac{2}{p_0}} ||u(t)||_{L^{p_0, \infty}(B_{r_0}(x_0))} \leq \delta^*.$$  \hspace{2cm} (2.47)

By using Hölder’s inequality and Lemma 2.4, we get

$$\lim_{t \to t_0} \sup_{t_0 - t_0} \frac{1}{r_0^\frac{3}{3} - \frac{2}{p_0}} \sup_{\eta < r_0} \frac{1}{\eta} \int_{B_{r}(x_0)} |u|^{p_0} dx \frac{1}{r_0^\frac{3}{3} - \frac{2}{p_0}} \leq \frac{1}{r_0^\frac{3}{3} - \frac{2}{p_0}} \frac{1}{\eta} \int_{B_{r}(x_0)} |u|^{\frac{2p_0}{3}} dx \frac{1}{r_0^\frac{3}{3} - \frac{2}{p_0}} \leq C \lim_{t \to t_0} \sup_{t_0 - t_0} \frac{1}{r_0^\frac{3}{3} - \frac{2}{p_0}} ||u(t)||_{L^{p_0, \infty}(B_{r_0}(x_0))} \leq C \delta^*$$

= \delta,
where $\delta$ is the same constant in Theorem 1.1 and we choose $\delta^* = \frac{\delta}{C}$. This yields

$$\sup_{\eta \leq r_0^*} \left( \frac{1}{\eta} \int B_{\eta \, x_0} |u(t) - u_{r,x_0}(t)|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \delta$$

for some $r_0^* \leq r_0$. From (2.48) and Theorem 1.1, we deduce $z_0$ is a regular point. This is a contradiction.

In the case $p = 3$, if Theorem 1.2 is false, then there exists some $0 < r_0 < 1$ such that it holds that

$$\limsup_{t \to t_0^-} \sup_{\eta < r_0} \left( \frac{1}{\eta} \int B_{\eta \, x_0} |u(t) - u_{r,x_0}(t)|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \delta.$$  

By using the fact $\min_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \int |u - c|^2 dx = \int |u - u_{x_0}|^2 dx$ and Lemma 2.4, we deduce

$$\limsup_{t \to t_0^-} \sup_{\eta < r_0} \left( \frac{1}{\eta} \int B_{\eta \, x_0} |u(t) - u_{r,x_0}|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C \limsup_{t \to t_0^-} \sup_{\eta < r_0} \left( \int B_{\eta \, x_0} |u(t) - u_{x_0}|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

$$= C \limsup_{t \to t_0^-} \left( \int B_{\eta \, x_0} |u(t) - u(t)_{x_0,r}|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

$$\leq C \delta^* = \delta.$$

This yields $\sup_{\eta \leq r_0^*} \left( \frac{1}{\eta} \int B_{\eta \, x_0} |u(t) - u_{x_0,\eta}|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \delta$. From (2.50) and Theorem 1.1, we deduce $z_0$ is a regular point. This is also a contradiction. We thus complete the proof of Theorem 1.2.
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