

The localized characterization for the singularity formation in the Navier-Stokes equations

Wenke Tan*

Key Laboratory of Computing and Stochastic Mathematics (Ministry of Education),
School of Mathematics and Statistics, Hunan Normal University,
Changsha, Hunan 410081, China

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

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

and

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow t_0^-} (t_0 - t)^{\frac{1}{\mu}} r^{\frac{2}{\nu} - \frac{3}{p}} \|u(t)\|_{L^{p,\infty}(B_r(x_0))} > \delta^*$$

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

where δ^* is a positive constant independent of p and ν . Our main tools are some ε -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.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2020): 76D05, 76D03, 35Q30.

Keywords: Navier-Stokes equations; Suitable weak solutions; Singular point; Concentration rate

*tanwenkeybfq@163.com

1 Introduction

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

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u - \Delta u + u \cdot \nabla u + \nabla P = 0, \\ \nabla \cdot u = 0, \\ u(0, x) = u_0(x) \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

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

$$\|u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + 2 \int_{t_0}^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u|^2 dx dt \leq \|u(t_0)\|_{L^2}^2, \quad (1.2)$$

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

$$\|u(t)\|_{L^p} < \frac{c_p}{(T-t)^{\frac{p-3}{2p}}} \quad (1.3)$$

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, Escauriaza, Serenjin 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

u to (1.1). Since the condition $\|u(t)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq \frac{c_p}{|T-t|^{\frac{p-3}{2p}}}$ 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

$$\|u(t)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)} \geq \frac{c_p}{(T-t)^{\frac{p-3}{2p}}}. \quad (1.4)$$

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

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

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 [5, 6] and Koch-Nadirashvili-Seregin-Šverák [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 [8] proved that if (x, T) is a singular point then

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

Later, Seregin [31] improved (1.5):

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow T^-} \|u(t)\|_{L^3(\mathbb{R}^3)} = \infty. \quad (1.6)$$

Albritton and Barker [1] refined (1.5) and (1.6) to show that if Ω is a bounded domain with C^2 boundary one has

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

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

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

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

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

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 [2], they proved that if u satisfy the Type I bound:

$$\sup_{\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3} \sup_{0 < r < r_0} \sup_{T-r^2 < t < T} \left(\frac{1}{r} \int_{B_r(\bar{x})} |u(y, t)|^2 dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq M \quad (1.10)$$

for a given $r_0 \in (0, \infty]$ and $M, T \in (0, \infty)$

then it holds

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^3(B_R(x))} \geq \gamma_{univ}, \quad R = O(\sqrt{T-t}). \quad (1.11)$$

Recently, Barker and Prange [3] show under the assumption $\|u\|_{L_t^\infty L^{3,\infty}} \leq M$, the optimal blow-up rate at the potential singular point $(T^*, 0)$ is

$$\|u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^3(B_R(0))} \geq C(M) \log\left(\frac{1}{T^* - t}\right), \quad R = O((T^* - t)^{\frac{1}{2}-}). \quad (1.12)$$

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 $|u(T, x)| \leq \frac{c}{|x|}$ with small enough c then $(T, 0)$ can not be a singular point. On 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 $\|u(T, \cdot)\|_{L^{3,\infty}(B_r)} = \left(\frac{4\pi}{3}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}c$, 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 ε -regularity criteria. It is worth pointing out that our criteria are established in $L^{q,\infty}$ space and the constant δ in our ε -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*

$$\left\| \sup_{\eta \leq 1} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \int_{B_\eta(x_0)} |u(x, t) - u_{x_0, \eta}|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\|_{L^{q,\infty}[t_0-1, t_0]} \leq \delta \quad (1.13)$$

$$\text{or} \quad \left\| \sup_{\eta \leq 1} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \int_{B_\eta(x_0)} |u(x, t)|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\|_{L^{q,\infty}[t_0-1, t_0]} \leq \delta, \quad (1.14)$$

then z_0 is a regular point.

Remark 1.1 *It is worth pointing out that the quantities*

$$\left\| \left(\sup_{\eta \leq 1} \frac{1}{\eta} \int_{B_\eta(x_0)} |u(x, t) - u_{x_0, \eta}|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\|_{L^{q,\infty}[t_0-1, t_0]}$$

and

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

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*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow t_0^-} \|u(t, x) - u(t)_{x_0, r}\|_{L^{3, \infty}(B_r(x_0))} > \delta^* \quad (1.15)$$

and

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow t_0^-} (t_0 - t)^{\frac{1}{\mu}} r^{\frac{2}{\nu} - \frac{3}{p}} \|u(t)\|_{L^{p, \infty}(B_r(x_0))} > \delta^* \quad (1.16)$$

$$\text{for } 3 < p \leq \infty, \frac{1}{\mu} + \frac{1}{\nu} = \frac{1}{2} \text{ and } 2 \leq \nu \leq \frac{2}{3}p,$$

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 μ, ν, 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

$$\begin{aligned} B_r(x_0) &= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |x - x_0| < r\}, B_r = B_r(0), B = B_1, \\ Q_r(z_0) &= B_r(x_0) \times (t_0 - r^2, t_0), Q_r = Q_r(0), Q = Q_1. \end{aligned}$$

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

1. $u \in L^\infty((t_0 - 1, t_0); L^2_{loc}(B_1(x_0)) \cap L^2((t_0 - 1, t_0); H^1_{loc}(B_1(x_0))),$
2. *There exists a distribution $P \in L^{\frac{3}{2}}_{loc}(Q_1(z_0))$ such that (u, P) satisfies (1.1) in the sense of distributions.*
3. *The function pair (u, P) satisfies the following local energy inequality:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_1(x_0)} |u(t, x)|^2 \phi dx + 2 \int_{t_0-1}^t \int_{B_1(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 \phi dx ds \\ & \leq \int_{t_0-1}^t \int_{B_1(x_0)} |u|^2 (\partial_t \phi + \nu \Delta \phi) + (|u|^2 + 2P)u \cdot \nabla \phi dx ds. \end{aligned} \quad (1.17)$$

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:

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

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

$$u_\lambda(t, x) = \lambda u(\lambda^2 t, \lambda x); \quad P_\lambda(t, x) = \lambda^2 P(\lambda^2 t, \lambda x), \quad (1.18)$$

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

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

$$\begin{aligned} A(u, r, z) &= \sup_{t-r^2 \leq s \leq t} \frac{1}{r} \int_{B_r(x) \times \{s\}} |u|^2 dx; & B(u, r, z) &= \frac{1}{r} \int \int_{Q_r(z)} |\nabla u|^2 dx dt, \\ C(u, r, z) &= \frac{1}{r^2} \int \int_{Q_r(z)} |v|^3 dx dt; & D(P, r, z) &= \frac{1}{r^2} \int \int_{Q_r(z)} |P|^{\frac{3}{2}} dx dt. \end{aligned}$$

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, $u_{x_0, \rho} \doteq \frac{1}{|B_\rho|} \int_{B_\rho(x_0)} u dx$ 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*

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

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

Then,

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

$$C(u, r, z_0) \leq C \frac{r}{\rho} C(u, \rho, z_0) + C \left(\frac{\rho}{r} \right)^2 B(u, \rho, z_0)^{\frac{9-3p}{6-p}} M^{\frac{3p}{6-p}}. \quad (2.3)$$

if $3 \leq p \leq 6$, it holds

$$C(u, r, z_0) \leq C \frac{r}{\rho} C(u, \rho, z_0) + C \left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right) A(u, \rho, z_0)^{\frac{p-3}{p-2}} M^{\frac{p}{p-2}}, \quad (2.4)$$

if $6 < p \leq \infty$, it holds

$$C(u, r, z_0) \leq C \frac{r}{\rho} C(u, \rho, z_0) + C \left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}} A(u, \rho, z_0)^{\frac{3}{4}} M^{\frac{3}{2}} \quad (2.5)$$

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 $f_p(t) = (\sup_{\rho \leq 1} \frac{1}{\rho} \int_{B_\rho(x_0)} |u(t, x) - u_{x_0, \rho}|^p dx)^{\frac{1}{p}}$. At almost every time $t \in (t_0 - \rho^2, t_0]$ we estimate

$$\int_{B_r(x_0)} |u|^3 dx \leq C |B_r| |u_{x_0, \rho}|^3 + C \int_{B_r(x)} |u - u_{x_0, \rho}|^3 dx = I_1 + I_2. \quad (2.6)$$

For I_1 , we have

$$I_1 = C |B_r(x_0)| \left| \frac{1}{|B_\rho(x_0)|} \int_{B_\rho(x_0)} u dy \right|^3 \leq C \left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^3 \int_{B_\rho(x_0)} |u|^3 dx. \quad (2.7)$$

We now estimate I_2 .

If $2 < p < 3$, we estimate I_2 as follows

$$I_2 \leq C \|u - u_{x_0, \rho}\|_{L^p}^{\frac{3p}{6-p}} \|u - u_{x_0, \rho}\|_{L^6}^{\frac{6(3-p)}{6-p}}.$$

Integrating with respect to time from $t_0 - r^2$ to t_0 and using Hölder's inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{t_0 - r^2}^{t_0} \int_{B_r(x_0)} |u - u_{x_0, \rho}|^3 dx ds \\ & \leq \left(\int_{t_0 - r^2}^{t_0} \|u - u_{x_0, \rho}\|_{L^6(B_\rho(x_0))}^2 ds \right)^{\frac{9-3p}{6-p}} \left(\int_{t_0 - r^2}^{t_0} \|u - u_{x_0, \rho}\|_{L^p(B_\rho(x_0))}^{\frac{3p}{2p-3}} ds \right)^{\frac{2p-3}{6-p}} \\ & \leq \left(\int_{t_0 - r^2}^{t_0} \int_{B_\rho(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 dx ds \right)^{\frac{9-3p}{6-p}} \rho^{\frac{3}{6-p}} \left(\int_{t_0 - r^2}^{t_0} f_p^{\frac{3p}{2p-3}}(s) ds \right)^{\frac{2p-3}{6-p}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

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

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{t_0-r^2}^{t_0} f_p(s)^{\frac{3p}{2p-3}} ds \\
&= \frac{3p}{2p-3} \int_0^\infty \sigma^{\frac{3+p}{2p-3}} |\{s \in [t-r^2, t]; f_p(s) > \sigma\}| d\sigma \\
&\leq \frac{3p}{2p-3} \left\{ \int_0^R \sigma^{\frac{3+p}{2p-3}} r^2 d\sigma + M^{\frac{2p}{p-2}} \int_R^\infty \sigma^{\frac{3+p}{2p-3} - \frac{2p}{p-2}} d\sigma \right\} \\
&\leq R^{\frac{3p}{2p-3}} r^2 + \left(3 - \frac{6}{p}\right) R^{\frac{3p}{2p-3} - \frac{2p}{p-2}} M^{\frac{2p}{p-2}} \\
&\leq \left(4 - \frac{6}{p}\right) r^{\frac{p}{2p-3}} M^{\frac{3p}{2p-3}},
\end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

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

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

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

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

Substituting (2.9) into (2.8) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{t_0-r^2}^{t_0} \int_{B_r(x_0)} |u - u_{x_0,\rho}|^3 dx ds \\
&\leq \left(4 - \frac{6}{p}\right)^{\frac{2p-3}{6-p}} \rho^{\frac{3}{6-p}} r^{\frac{p}{6-p}} \left(\int_{t_0-\rho^2}^{t_0} \int_{B_\rho(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 dx ds \right)^{\frac{9-3p}{6-p}} M^{\frac{3p}{6-p}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

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

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

where we have used the fact $\left(4 - \frac{6}{p}\right)^{\frac{2p-3}{6-p}} \leq 4$ 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

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\leq C \left(\int_{B_\rho(x_0)} |u - u_{x_0, \rho}|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{p-3}{p-2}} \left(\int_{B_\rho(x_0)} |u - u_{x_0, \rho}|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p-2}} \\ &\leq C \rho A(u, \rho, z_0)^{\frac{p-3}{p-2}} \left(\frac{1}{\rho} \int_{B_\rho(x_0)} |u - u_{x_0, \rho}|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p-2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{t_0 - r^2}^{t_0} \int_{B_r(x_0)} |u|^3 dx ds \\ &\leq C \left(\frac{r}{\rho} \right)^3 \int_{t_0 - \rho^2}^{t_0} \int_{B_\rho(x_0)} |u|^3 dx ds + C \rho A(u, \rho, z_0)^{\frac{p-3}{p-2}} \int_{t_0 - r^2}^{t_0} f_p^{\frac{p}{p-2}}(s) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{t_0 - r^2}^{t_0} f_p^{\frac{p}{p-2}}(s) ds \\ &= \frac{p}{p-2} \int_0^\infty \sigma^{\frac{2}{p-2}} |\{s \in [t_0 - r^2, t_0] : f_p(s) > \sigma\}| d\sigma \\ &= \frac{p}{p-2} \left\{ \int_0^R \sigma^{\frac{2}{p-2}} |\{s \in [t_0 - r^2, t_0] : f_p(s) > \sigma\}| d\sigma \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_R^\infty \sigma^{\frac{2}{p-2}} |\{s \in [t_0 - r^2, t_0] : f_p(s) > \sigma\}| d\sigma \right\} \\ &\leq \frac{p}{p-2} \int_0^R \sigma^{\frac{2}{p-2}} r^2 d\sigma + \frac{p}{p-2} \int_R^\infty \sigma^{\frac{2}{p-2} - \frac{2p}{p-2}} d\sigma M^{\frac{2p}{p-2}} \\ &= r^2 R^{\frac{p}{p-2}} + R^{\frac{-p}{p-2}} M^{\frac{2p}{p-2}} \\ &= 2r M^{\frac{p}{p-2}} \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{t_0 - r^2}^{t_0} \int_{B_r(x_0)} |u|^3 dx dt \\ &\leq C \left(\frac{r}{\rho} \right)^3 \int_{t_0 - \rho^2}^{t_0} \int_{B_\rho(x_0)} |u|^3 dx dt + C r \rho A(u, \rho, z_0)^{\frac{p-3}{p-2}} M^{\frac{p}{p-2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

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

$$\frac{1}{r^2} \int_{Q_r(z)} |u|^3 dx dt \leq C \left(\frac{r}{\rho} \right) \frac{1}{\rho^2} \int_{Q_\rho(z)} |u|^3 dx dt + C \left(\frac{\rho}{r} \right) A(u, \rho, z_0)^{\frac{p-3}{p-2}} M^{\frac{p}{p-2}}.$$

This means (2.4).

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

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &\leq \int_{B_\rho(x_0)} |u - u_{x_0, \rho}|^{\frac{3}{2}} |u - u_{x_0, \rho}|^{\frac{3}{2}} dx & (2.15) \\
&\leq C \left(\int_{B_\rho(x_0)} |u - u_{x_0, \rho}|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \left(\int_{B_\rho(x_0)} |u - u_{x_0, \rho}|^p dx \right)^{\frac{3}{2p}} \rho^{\frac{3(p-6)}{4p}} \\
&\leq C \rho^{\frac{3}{4} + \frac{3}{2p} + \frac{3(p-6)}{4p}} A(u, \rho, z_0)^{\frac{3}{4}} f_p^{\frac{3}{2}}(s) ds.
\end{aligned}$$

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

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{t_0 - r^2}^{t_0} \int_{B_r(x_0)} |u|^3 dx ds & (2.16) \\
&\leq C \left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^3 \int_{t_0 - \rho^2}^{t_0} \int_{B_\rho(x_0)} |u|^3 dx ds + C \rho^{\frac{3p-6}{2p}} A(u, \rho, z_0)^{\frac{3}{4}} \int_{t_0 - r^2}^{t_0} f_p^{\frac{3}{2}}(s) ds.
\end{aligned}$$

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

$$\int_{t_0 - r^2}^{t_0} f_p^{\frac{3}{2}}(s) ds \leq \left(1 + 3\frac{p-2}{p+6}\right) r^{2 - \frac{3p-6}{2p}} M^{\frac{3}{2}}. \quad (2.17)$$

Substituting (2.17) into (2.16) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{r^2} \int_{t_0 - r^2}^{t_0} \int_{B_r(x_0)} |u|^3 dx ds & (2.18) \\
&\leq C \frac{r}{\rho} \frac{1}{\rho^2} \int_{t_0 - \rho^2}^{t_0} \int_{B_\rho(x_0)} |u|^3 dx ds + C \left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^{\frac{3p-6}{2p}} A(u, \rho, z_0)^{\frac{3}{4}} M^{\frac{3}{2}} \\
&\leq C \frac{r}{\rho} C(u, \rho, z_0) + C \left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}} A(u, \rho, z_0)^{\frac{3}{4}} M^{\frac{3}{2}}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the facts $1 + 3\frac{p-2}{p+6} \leq 4$ and $\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^{\frac{3p-6}{2p}} \leq \left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}$. 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 $f_p(t) = \sup_{\rho \leq 1} \left(\frac{1}{\rho} \int_{B_\rho(x_0)} |u(t, x)|^p dx\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$ and modify the processes of proofs as follows.

In the case $2 \leq p < 3$, we can replace $\|u - u_\rho\|_{L^p(B_\rho)}$ by $C_p \|u\|_{L^p(B_\rho)}$ 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 $C \int_{B_\rho(x_0)} |u|^3 dx$ 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

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

$$\text{or} \quad \left\| \sup_{\rho \leq 1} \left(\frac{1}{\rho} \int_{B_\rho(x_0)} |u(t, x)|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\|_{L^{q, \infty}([t_0-1, t_0])} = M < \infty, \quad (2.20)$$

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

$$A(u, r, z) + B(u, r, z) + C(u, r, z) + D(P, r, z) \leq C(M). \quad (2.21)$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \phi + \Delta \phi &= 0 \text{ in } Q_{\frac{1}{2}\rho}, \\ |\partial_t \phi + \Delta \phi| &\leq C\rho^{-5} \text{ in } Q_\rho, \\ C^{-1}r^3 \leq \phi &\leq Cr^{-3}; \quad |\nabla \phi| \leq Cr^{-4} \text{ in } Q_r, \\ \phi &\leq C\rho^{-3}; \quad |\nabla \phi| \leq C\rho^{-4} \text{ in } Q_\rho - Q_{\frac{3}{4}\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} A(u, r) + B(u, r) &\leq C\left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^2 A(u, \rho) + C\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^2 C(u, \rho) + C\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^2 C^{\frac{1}{3}}(u, \rho) D^{\frac{2}{3}}(P, \rho) \\ &\leq C\left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^2 A(u, \rho) + C\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^2 C(u, \rho) + C\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^2 D(P, \rho). \end{aligned} \quad (2.22)$$

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

$$\int_{B_\rho} |P_1|^{\frac{3}{2}} dx \leq C \left(\int_{B_\rho} |u|^3 dx \right).$$

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

$$\int_{B_r} |P_2|^{\frac{3}{2}} dx \leq Cr^3 \sup_{x \in B_r} |P_2(x)|^{\frac{3}{2}} \leq C\left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^3 \int_{B_\rho} |P_2|^{\frac{3}{2}} dx.$$

It then follows that for $0 < r \leq \frac{\rho}{2}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_r} |P|^{\frac{3}{2}} dx \\ & \leq C \left(\int_{B_\rho} |u|^3 dx \right) + C \left(\frac{r}{\rho} \right)^3 \int_{B_\rho} |P - P_1|^{\frac{3}{2}} dx \\ & \leq C \left(\int_{B_\rho} |u|^3 dx \right) + C \left(\frac{r}{\rho} \right)^3 \int_{B_\rho} |P|^{\frac{3}{2}} dx. \end{aligned}$$

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

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

This implies

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

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

$$\begin{aligned} C^{\frac{7}{6}}(u, r) & \leq C \left(\frac{r}{\rho} \right)^{\frac{6}{7}} C^{\frac{7}{6}}(u, \rho) + C \left(\frac{\rho}{r} \right)^{\frac{7}{3}} B^{\frac{7(3-p)}{2(6-p)}}(u, \rho) M^{\frac{7p}{2(6-p)}} \\ & \leq C \left(\frac{r}{\rho} \right)^{\frac{6}{7}} C^{\frac{7}{6}}(u, \rho) + C \left(\frac{\rho}{r} \right)^{\frac{7}{3} + \frac{7}{6} \frac{7(3-p)}{2(6-p)}} \left(\left(\frac{r}{\rho} \right)^{\frac{7}{6}} B(u, \rho) \right)^{\frac{7(3-p)}{2(6-p)}} M^{\frac{7p}{2(6-p)}} \\ & \leq C \left(\frac{r}{\rho} \right)^{\frac{6}{7}} C^{\frac{7}{6}}(u, \rho) + C \left(\frac{\rho}{r} \right)^5 \left(\left(\frac{r}{\rho} \right)^{\frac{7}{6}} B(u, \rho) \right)^{\frac{7(3-p)}{2(6-p)}} M^{\frac{7p}{2(6-p)}}, \\ & \leq C \left(\frac{r}{\rho} \right)^{\frac{6}{7}} C^{\frac{7}{6}}(u, \rho) + C \left(\frac{r}{\rho} \right)^{\frac{7}{6}} B(u, \rho) + C \left(\frac{\rho}{r} \right)^{40} M^{\frac{7p}{5p-9}}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.24)$$

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

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

$$\begin{aligned} & A(u, r) + B(u, r) \\ & \leq C \left(\frac{r}{\rho} \right)^2 A(u, \rho) + \left(\frac{r}{\rho} \right)^{\frac{7}{6}} C^{\frac{7}{6}}(u, \rho) + \left(\frac{r}{\rho} \right)^{\frac{8}{7}} D^{\frac{8}{7}}(P, \rho) + C \left(\left(\frac{\rho}{r} \right)^{21} + \left(\frac{\rho}{r} \right)^{24} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.25)$$

Similarly, we obtain by using (2.23)

$$\begin{aligned} D(P, r)^{\frac{8}{7}} & \leq C \left(\frac{r}{\rho} \right)^{\frac{8}{7}} D^{\frac{8}{7}}(P, \rho) + C \left(\frac{\rho}{r} \right)^{\frac{16}{7}} C(u, \rho)^{\frac{8}{7}} \\ & \leq C \left(\frac{r}{\rho} \right)^{\frac{8}{7}} D^{\frac{8}{7}}(P, \rho) + \left(\frac{r}{\rho} \right)^{\frac{7}{6}} C(u, \rho)^{\frac{7}{6}} + C \left(\frac{\rho}{r} \right)^{168}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.26)$$

Define $G(r) \equiv A(u, r) + B(u, r) + C^{\frac{7}{6}}(u, r) + D^{\frac{8}{7}}(P, r)$. Summing up the estimates (2.24)-(2.26) implies

$$G(r) \leq C\left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^{\frac{8}{7}}G(\rho) + C(1 + M^{\frac{7p}{5p-9}})\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^{168} \quad (2.27)$$

where we have used the fact $\frac{r}{\rho} < 1$.

Fix $\theta = \min\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{C^{\frac{7}{6}}}\}$ and set $r = \theta^k \rho$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. (2.27) yields

$$G(\theta^k \rho) \leq \theta G(\theta^{k-1} \rho) + C(1 + M^{\frac{7p}{5p-9}})\theta^{-168}. \quad (2.28)$$

By a standard iterative argument, we deduce that

$$G(r) \leq \frac{r}{\rho}G(\rho) + C(1 + M^{\frac{7p}{5p-9}}) \text{ for } r \leq \rho \leq 1. \quad (2.29)$$

We now first take $\rho = 1$ then choose ρ_{01} satisfying $\frac{\rho_{01}}{1}G(1) \leq 1$, it follows

$$G(r) \leq C(M^{\frac{7p}{5p-9}}) \text{ for } r \leq \rho_{01}. \quad (2.30)$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} & C(u, r)^{\frac{7}{6}} \quad (2.31) \\ & \leq C\left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^{\frac{7}{6}}C(u, \rho)^{\frac{7}{6}} + C\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^{\frac{7}{6}}A(u, \rho)^{\frac{7}{6}\frac{p-3}{p-2}}M^{\frac{7}{6}\frac{p}{p-2}} \\ & \leq C\left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^{\frac{7}{6}}C(u, \rho)^{\frac{7}{6}} + C\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^{\frac{7}{6}+(\frac{7}{6})^2\frac{p-3}{p-2}}\left(\left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^{\frac{7}{6}}A(u, \rho)\right)^{\frac{7}{6}\frac{p-3}{p-2}}M^{\frac{7}{6}\frac{p}{p-2}} \\ & \leq C\left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^{\frac{7}{6}}C(u, \rho)^{\frac{7}{6}} + \left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^{\frac{7}{6}}A(u, \rho) + C\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^{\frac{6(p-2)}{9-p}\left(\frac{7}{6} + \frac{49}{36}\frac{p-3}{p-2}\right)}M^{\frac{7p}{9-p}} \\ & \leq C\left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^{\frac{7}{6}}C(u, \rho)^{\frac{7}{6}} + \left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^{\frac{7}{6}}A(u, \rho) + C\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^{24}M^{\frac{7p}{9-p}} \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact $\frac{6(p-2)}{9-p}\left(\frac{7}{6} + \frac{49}{36}\frac{p-3}{p-2}\right) \leq 24$ for $3 \leq p \leq 6$. Collecting (2.25)-(2.26) and (2.31) implies

$$G(r) \leq C\left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^{\frac{8}{7}}G(\rho) + C(1 + M^{\frac{7p}{9-p}})\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^{168}. \quad (2.32)$$

By using the similar computations in the estimates for (2.27)-(2.30), we show that there exists a constant ρ_{02} such that for $r \leq \rho_{02}$ it follows

$$G(r) \leq C(M^{\frac{7p}{9-p}}). \quad (2.33)$$

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

$$C(u, r)^{\frac{7}{6}} \leq C\left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^{\frac{7}{6}}C(u, \rho)^{\frac{7}{6}} + \left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^{\frac{7}{6}}A(u, \rho) + C\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^{23}M^{14}. \quad (2.34)$$

Collecting (2.25)-(2.26) and (2.34) yields

$$G(r) \leq C\left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^{\frac{8}{7}}G(\rho) + C\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^{168}(M^{14} + 1). \quad (2.35)$$

By using similar computations in the estimates for (2.27)-(2.30), we get that there exists a constant ρ_{03} such that for $r \leq \rho_{03}$, it follows

$$G(r) \leq C(M^{14}). \quad (2.36)$$

Collecting (2.30), (2.33) and (2.36) and taking $\rho_0 = \min\{\rho_{01}, \rho_{02}, \rho_{03}\}$, 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 δ and r^* depended on ε such that if*

$$\left\| \left(\sup_{\rho \leq 1} \frac{1}{\rho} \int_{B_\rho(x_0)} |u(t, x) - u(t)_{x_0, \rho}|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\|_{L^{q, \infty}([t_0-1, t_0])} \leq \delta \quad (2.37)$$

$$\text{or} \quad \left\| \left(\sup_{\rho \leq 1} \frac{1}{\rho} \int_{B_\rho(x_0)} |u(t, x)|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\|_{L^{q, \infty}([t_0-1, t_0])} \leq \delta \quad (2.38)$$

then it is holding

$$C(u, r^*, z_0) \leq \varepsilon, \quad (2.39)$$

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

$$C(u, \rho, z) + D(P, \rho, z) + A(u, \rho, z) + B(u, \rho, z) \leq C \quad (2.40)$$

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)

$$\begin{aligned} C(u, r) &\leq \frac{r}{\rho_0} C + C\left(\frac{\rho_0}{r}\right)^2 C^{\frac{9-3p}{6-p}} \delta^{\frac{3p}{6-p}} \\ &\leq \frac{r}{\rho_0} C + C^2 \left(\frac{\rho_0}{r}\right)^2 \delta^{\frac{3}{2}} \end{aligned} \quad (2.41)$$

where we have used $\frac{9-3p}{6-p} \leq 1$ and $\frac{3p}{6-p} \geq \frac{3}{2}$. In (2.41), we first choose $r^* = \frac{\varepsilon \rho_0}{2C}$ then take $\delta_1 \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4C^{\frac{2}{3}}}$, it follows that

$$C(u, r^*) \leq \varepsilon. \quad (2.42)$$

If $3 \leq p \leq 6$, by choosing $\rho = \rho_0$ in (2.4) and using (2.40), we obtain also that

$$\begin{aligned} C(u, r) &\leq C \frac{r}{\rho_0} C(u, \rho_0) + C \left(\frac{\rho_0}{r} \right) A(u, \rho)^{\frac{p-3}{p-2}} \delta^{\frac{p}{p-2}} \\ &\leq \frac{r}{\rho_0} C + C \left(\frac{\rho_0}{r} \right) C \delta^{\frac{3}{2}} \end{aligned} \quad (2.43)$$

where we have used $\frac{p-3}{p-2} \leq 1$ and $\frac{p}{p-2} \geq \frac{3}{2}$ for $3 \leq p \leq 6$. We now first choose $r^* = \frac{\varepsilon \rho_0}{2C}$ then take $\delta_2 \leq \frac{\varepsilon^{\frac{4}{3}}}{4^{\frac{3}{3}} C^2}$, 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

$$C(u, r) \leq C \frac{r}{\rho_0} + C^2 \left(\frac{\rho_0}{r} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \delta^{\frac{3}{2}}. \quad (2.44)$$

We now first choose $r^* = \frac{\varepsilon \rho_0}{2C}$ then take $\delta_3 \leq \frac{\varepsilon^{\frac{5}{3}}}{2^{\frac{3}{3}} C^{\frac{3}{3}}}$, 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*

$$\left(\sup_{\eta \leq r} \frac{1}{\eta} \int_{B_\eta} |u|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq C \|u\|_{L^{\frac{3p}{2}, \infty}(B_r)} \quad (2.45)$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant independent on p .

Proof This conclusion is a direct computation as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_\eta} |u|^p dx &= p \int_0^\infty \sigma^{p-1} |\{x \in B_\eta : |u(x)| > \sigma\}| d\sigma \\ &\leq Cp \left[\int_0^R \sigma^{p-1} \eta^3 d\sigma + \int_R^\infty \sigma^{p-1-\frac{3p}{2}} d\sigma \|u\|_{L^{\frac{3p}{2}, \infty}(B_\eta)}^{\frac{3p}{2}} \right] \\ &\leq C [R^p \eta^3 + 2R^{-\frac{p}{2}} \|u\|_{L^{\frac{3p}{2}, \infty}(B_\eta)}^{\frac{3p}{2}}] \\ &\leq C \eta \|u\|_{L^{\frac{3p}{2}, \infty}(B_\eta)}^p \end{aligned} \quad (2.46)$$

where we take $R = \eta^{-\frac{2}{p}} \|u\|_{L^{\frac{3p}{2}, \infty}(B_\eta)}$. 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*

$$\|u\|_{L^q((t-r^2, t); L^p(B_r(x)))} \leq r^{\frac{2}{q} + \frac{3}{p} - 1} \varepsilon^*,$$

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 δ such that if

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sup_{\eta \leq 1} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \int_{B_\eta(x_0)} |u(x, t) - u_{x_0, \eta}|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\|_{L^{q, \infty}[t_0-1, t_0]} \leq \delta \\ \text{or} \quad & \left\| \sup_{\eta \leq 1} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \int_{B_\eta(x_0)} |u(x, t)|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\|_{L^{q, \infty}[t_0-1, t_0]} \leq \delta \end{aligned}$$

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 $\frac{1}{\mu_0} + \frac{1}{\nu_0} = \frac{1}{2}$, it holds

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow t_0} (t_0 - t)^{\frac{1}{\mu_0}} r_0^{\frac{2}{\nu_0} - \frac{3}{p_0}} \|u(t)\|_{L^{p_0, \infty}(B_{r_0}(x_0))} \leq \delta^*. \quad (2.47)$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{t \rightarrow t_0} (t_0 - t)^{\frac{1}{\mu_0}} \sup_{\eta < r_0} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \int_{B_\eta(x_0)} |u|^{\nu_0} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{\nu_0}} \quad (2.48) \\ & \leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow t_0} (t_0 - t)^{\frac{1}{\mu_0}} \sup_{\eta < r_0} \left(\eta^{2 - \frac{9\nu_0}{2p_0} + \frac{3\nu_0}{2p}} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \int_{B_\eta(x_0)} |u|^{\frac{2p_0}{3}} dx \right)^{\frac{3\nu_0}{2p_0}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\nu_0}} \\ & \leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow t_0} (t_0 - t)^{\frac{1}{\mu_0}} \sup_{\eta < r_0} \left(\eta^{\frac{2}{\nu_0} - \frac{3}{p_0}} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \int_{B_\eta(x_0)} |u|^{\frac{2p_0}{3}} dx \right)^{\frac{3}{2p_0}} \right) \\ & \leq C \limsup_{t \rightarrow t_0} (t_0 - t)^{\frac{1}{\mu_0}} \sup_{\eta < r_0} \left(\eta^{\frac{2}{\nu_0} - \frac{3}{p_0}} \|u(t)\|_{L^{p_0, \infty}(B_\eta(x_0))} \right) \\ & \leq C \limsup_{t \rightarrow t_0} (t_0 - t)^{\frac{1}{\mu_0}} r_0^{\frac{2}{\nu_0} - \frac{3}{p}} \|u(t)\|_{L^{p_0, \infty}(B_{r_0}(x_0))} \leq C\delta^* \\ & = \delta, \end{aligned}$$

where δ is the same constant in Theorem 1.1 and we choose $\delta^* = \frac{\delta}{C}$. This yields $\|\sup_{\eta \leq r_0^*} (\frac{1}{\eta} \int_{B_\eta(x_0)} |u(t)|^{\nu_0} dx)^{\frac{1}{\nu_0}}\|_{L^{\mu_0, \infty}[t_0 - (r_0^*)^2, t_0]} \leq \delta$ 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

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow t_0^-} \|u(t, x) - u_{r, x_0}(t)\|_{L^{3, \infty}(B_r(x_0))} \leq \delta^*. \quad (2.49)$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{t \rightarrow t_0} \sup_{\eta < r_0} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \int_{B_\eta(x_0)} |u - u_{x_0, \eta}|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq C \limsup_{t \rightarrow t_0} \sup_{\eta < r_0} \left(\eta^{-1} \int_{B_\eta(x_0)} |u - u_{x_0, r}|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & = C \limsup_{t \rightarrow t_0} \|u(t) - u(t)_{x_0, r}\|_{L^{3, \infty}(B_{r_0}(x_0))} \\ & \leq C \delta^* = \delta. \end{aligned} \quad (2.50)$$

This yields $\|\sup_{\eta \leq r_0^*} (\frac{1}{\eta} \int_{B_\eta(x_0)} |u(t) - u_{x_0, \eta}|^2 dx)^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{L^\infty[t_0 - (r_0^*)^2, t_0]} \leq \delta$. 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.

Acknowledgments

The authors are supported by the Construct Program of the Key Discipline in Hunan Province and NSFC Grant No. 11871209.

References

- [1] D. Albritton, T. Barker, Localized necessary conditions for singularity formation in the Navier-Stokes equations with curved boundary, *J. Differential Equations* **269(9)** (2020) 7529-7573.
- [2] T. Barker and C. Prange, Localized smoothing for the Navier-Stokes equations and concentration of critical norm near singularities, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **236** (2020) 1487-1541.
- [3] T. Barker and C. Prange, Quantitative regularity for the Navier-Stokes equations via spatial concentration, *arXiv: 2003.06717v3*

- [4] L. Caffarelli, R. Kohn, and L. Nirenberg, Partial regularity of suitable weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **35** (1982) 771-831.
- [5] C. Chen, R. Strain, H. Yau and T. Tsai, Lower bound on the blow-up rate of the axisymmetric Navier-Stokes equations, *Int. Math. Res. Notices.* (2008) 1-31.
- [6] C. Chen, R. Strain, H. Yau and T. Tsai, Lower bound on the blow-up rate of the axisymmetric Navier-Stokes equations II, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **34** (2009) 203-232.
- [7] H. Choe and J. Lewis, On the singular set in the Navier-Stokes equations, *J. Funct. Anal.* **175** (2000) 348-369.
- [8] L. Escauriaza, G. Seregin, V. Šverák, $L^{3,\infty}$ solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations and backward uniqueness, *Russian Math. Surveys* **58** (2003) 186-212.
- [9] H. Fujita and T. Kato, On the nonstationary Navier-Stokes system, *Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova* **32** (1962) 243-260.
- [10] S. Gustafson, K. Kang and T. Tsai, Interior regularity criteria for suitable weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **273** (2007) 161-176.
- [11] C. He and Y. Wang, Limiting case for the regularity criterion of the Navier-Stokes equations and the magnetohydrodynamic equations, *Sci. China Math.* **53** (2010) 1767-1774.
- [12] E. Hopf, Über die Anfangswertaufgabe für die hydrodynamischen Grundgleichungen, *Math. Nachr.* **4** (1950-51) 213-231.
- [13] S. Kaniel and M. Shinbrot, Smoothness of weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **24** (1967) 302-324.
- [14] A.A. Kiselev and O.A. Ladyzhenskaya, On the existence and uniqueness of the solution of the nonstationary problem for a viscous incompressible fluid, *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.* **21** (1957) 655-680.
- [15] G. Koch, N. Nadirashvili, G. Seregin and V. Sverak, Liouville theorem for the Navier-Stokes equations and applications, *Acta Math.* **203** (2009) 83-105.
- [16] H. Kozono and Y. Taniuchi, Bilinear estimates in BMO and the Navier-Stokes equations, *Math.z.* **235** (2000) 173-194.
- [17] H. Kim and H. Kozono, Interior regularity criteria in weak spaces for the Navier-Stokes equations, *Manuscripta Math.* **115** (2004) 85-100.

- [18] O. A. Ladyzhenskaya and G. A. Seregin, On partial regularity of suitable weak solutions to the three-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations, *J. Math. Fluid Mech.* **1** (1999) 356-387.
- [19] O.A. Ladyzhenskaya, Solution "in the large" to the boundary-value problem for the Navier-Stokes equations in two space variables. *Doklady Akademii Nauk* **123(3)** (1958) 427-429.
- [20] O. A. Ladyzhenskaya , Uniqueness and smoothness of generalized solutions of Navier-Stokes equations, *Zap. Naučn. Sem. Leningrad. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (LOMI)* **5** (1967) 169-185.
- [21] J. Leray, Étude de diverses équations intégrales non linéaires et de quelques problèmes que pose l'hydrodynamique. *Gauthier-Villars* (1933).
- [22] J. Leray, Sur le mouvement d'un liquide visqueux emplissant l'espace, *Acta. Math.* **63** (1934) 183-248.
- [23] K. Li, T. Ozawa and B. Wang, Dynamical behavior for the solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations, *Commun. Pure Appl. Anal.* **17(4)** (2018) 1511-1560.
- [24] F. H. Lin, A new proof of the Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg theorem, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **51** (1998) 241-257.
- [25] Y. Maekawa, H. Miura and C. Prange, Estimates for the Navier-Stokes equations in the half-space for non-localized data, *Anal. PDE* **13(4)** (2020) 945-1010.
- [26] J. Necas, M. Ruzicka and V. Sverak, On Leray's self-similar solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations, *Acta Math.* **176** (1996) 283-294.
- [27] G. Prodi, Un teorema di unicità per le equazioni di Navier-Stokes, *Ann. Mat. Pure Appl.* **48(4)** (1959) 173-182.
- [28] V. Scheffer, Hausdorff measure and the Navier-Stokes equations, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **55(2)** (1977) 97-112.
- [29] V. Scheffer, The Navier-Stokes equations in space dimension four, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **61(1)** (1977) 41-68.
- [30] V. Scheffer, The Navier-Stokes equations on a bounded domain, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **73(1)** (1980) 1-42.
- [31] G. Seregin, A certain necessary condition of potential blow up for Navier-Stokes equations, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **312(3)** (2012) 833-845.

- [32] J. Serrin, The initial value problem for the Navier-Stokes equations, *Nonlinear Problems* (Proceedings of a Symposium, Madison, Wis.), R. T. Langer, ed., University of Wisconsin, Madison (1963) 69-98.
- [33] J. Serrin, On the interior regularity of weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations, *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.* **9** (1962) 187-195.
- [34] T. Tsai, On Leray's self-similar solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations satisfying local energy estimates, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **143** (1998) 29-51.
- [35] T. Tao, Quantitative bounds for critically bounded solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations, *arXiv:1908.04958v2*
- [36] W. von Wahl, The Equations of Navier-Stokes and Abstract Parabolic Equations, Aspects of Mathematics No. E8, *Vieweg, Braunschweig* 1985.
- [37] J. Wolf, A New Criterion for Partial Regularity of Suitable Weak Solutions to the Navier-Stokes Equations, *Advances in mathematical fluid mechanics Springer, Berlin* (2010) 613-630.
- [38] W. Wang, Z. Zhang, On the interior regularity criteria and the number of singular points to the Navier-Stokes equations, *J. Anal. Math.* **132** (2014) 139-170.
- [39] Y. Wang, G. Wu and D. Zhou, A regularity criterion at one scale without pressure for suitable weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations, *J. Differential Equations* **267** (2019) 4673-4704.