

# A Slightly Supercritical Condition of Regularity of Axisymmetric Solutions to the Navier-Stokes Equations

G. Seregin\*

September 21, 2021

Dedicated to Yoshihiro Shibata

## Abstract

In the note, a new regularity condition for axisymmetric solutions to the non-stationary 3D Navier-Stokes equations is proven. It is slightly supercritical.

**Keywords** Navier-Stokes equations, axisymmetric solutions, local regularity

**Data availability statement** Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

**Acknowledgement** The work is supported by the grant RFBR 20-01-00397.

---

\*University of Oxford, Mathematical Institute, OxpDE, Oxford, UK and St Petersburg Department of Steklov Mathematical Institute, RAS, Russia, email address: [seregin@maths.ox.ac.uk](mailto:seregin@maths.ox.ac.uk)

# 1 Introduction

In this note, we continue to analyse potential singularities of axisymmetric solutions to the non-stationary Navier-Stokes equations. In the previous paper [23], it has been shown that an axially symmetric solution is smooth provided a certain scale-invariant energy quantity of the velocity field is bounded. By definition, a potential singularity with bounded scale-invariant energy quantities is called the Type I blowup. It is important to notice that the above result does not follow from the so-called  $\varepsilon$ -regularity theory developed in [2], [15], and [10], where regularity is coming out due to smallness of those scale-invariant energy quantities.

We consider the 3D Navier-Stokes system

$$\partial_t v + v \cdot \nabla v - \Delta v = -\nabla q, \quad \operatorname{div} v = 0 \quad (1.1)$$

in the parabolic cylinder  $Q = \mathcal{C} \times ]-1, 0[$ , where  $\mathcal{C} = \{x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) : x_1^2 + x_2^2 < 1, -1 < x_3 < 1\}$ . A solution  $v$  and  $q$  is supposed to be a suitable weak one, which means the following:

**Definition 1.1.** *Let  $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  and  $T_2 > T_1$ . The pair  $w$  and  $r$  is a suitable weak solution to the Navier-Stokes system in  $Q_* = \omega \times ]T_1, T_2[$  if:*

1.  $w \in L_{2,\infty}(Q_*)$ ,  $\nabla w \in L_2(Q_*)$ ,  $r \in L_{\frac{3}{2}}(Q_*)$ ;
2.  $w$  and  $r$  satisfy the Navier-Stokes equations in  $Q_*$  in the sense of distributions;
3. for a.a.  $t \in [T_1, T_2]$ , the local energy inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\omega} \varphi(x, t) |w(x, t)|^2 dx + 2 \int_{T_1}^t \int_{\omega} \varphi |\nabla w|^2 dx dt' \leq \int_{T_1}^t \int_{\omega} [ |w|^2 (\partial_t \varphi + \Delta \varphi) + \\ + w \cdot \nabla \varphi (|w|^2 + 2r) ] dx dt' \end{aligned}$$

holds for all non-negative  $\varphi \in C_0^1(\omega \times ]T_1, T_2 + (T_2 - T_1)/2[)$ .

In our standing assumption, it is supposed that a suitable weak solution  $v$  and  $q$  to the Navier-Stokes equations in  $Q = \mathcal{C} \times ]-1, 0[$  is axially symmetric with respect to the axis  $x_3$ . The latter means the following: if we introduce the corresponding cylindrical coordinates  $(\varrho, \varphi, x_3)$  and use the corresponding representation  $v = v_{\varrho} e_{\varrho} + v_{\varphi} e_{\varphi} + v_3 e_3$ , then  $v_{\varrho, \varphi} = v_{\varphi, \varphi} = v_{3, \varphi} = q_{, \varphi} = 0$ .

There are many papers on regularity of axially symmetric solutions. We cannot pretend to cite all good works in this direction. For example, let us

mention papers: [9], [28], [13], [18], [20], [3], [26], [5], [25], [11], [19],[12] [4], [27], and [29].

Actually, our note is inspired by the paper [19], where the regularity of solutions has been proved under a slightly supercritical assumption. We would like to consider a different supercritical assumption, to give a different proof and to get a better result.

To state our supercritical assumption, additional notation is needed. Given  $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ , denote  $x' = (x_1, x_2, 0)$ . Next, different types of cylinders will be denoted as  $\mathcal{C}(r) = \{x : |x'| < r, |x_3| < r\}$ ,  $\mathcal{C}(x_0, r) = \mathcal{C}(r) + x_0$ ,  $Q^{\lambda, \mu}(r) = \mathcal{C}(\lambda r) \times ]-\mu R^2, 0[$ ,  $Q^{1,1}(r) = Q(r)$ ,  $Q^{\lambda, \mu}(z_0, r) = \mathcal{C}(x_0, \lambda r) \times ]t_0 - \mu R^2, t_0[$ . And, finally, we let

$$f(R) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{R}} \left( \int_{-R^2}^0 \left( \int_{\mathcal{C}(R)} |v|^3 dx \right)^{\frac{4}{3}} dt \right)^{\frac{3}{4}}$$

and

$$M(R) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{R}} \left( \int_{Q(R)} |v|^{\frac{10}{3}} dz \right)^{\frac{3}{10}}$$

for any  $0 < R \leq 1$  and assume that:

$$f(R) + M(R) \leq g(R) := c_* \ln^\alpha \ln^{\frac{1}{2}}(1/R) \quad (1.2)$$

for all  $0 < R \leq 2/3$ , where  $c_*$  and  $\alpha$  are positive constants and  $\alpha$  obeys the condition:

$$0 < \alpha \leq \frac{1}{224}. \quad (1.3)$$

Without loss of generality, one may assume that  $g(R) \geq 1$  for  $0 < R \leq \frac{2}{3}$ . To ensure the above condition, it is enough to increase the constant  $c_*$  if necessary.

Our aim could be the following completely local statement.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Assume that a pair  $v$  and  $q$  is axially symmetric suitable weak solution to the Navier-Stokes equations in  $Q$  and conditions (1.2) and (1.3) hold. Then the origin  $z = 0$  is a regular point of  $v$ .*

However, in this paper, we shall prove a weaker result leaving Theorem 1.2 as a plausible conjecture. We shall return to a proof of Theorem 1.2 elsewhere. In the present paper, the following fact is going to be justified.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $v$  be an axially symmetric solution to the Cauchy problem for the Xavier-Stokes equations (1.1) in  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times ]0, T[$  with initial divergence free field  $v_0$  from the Sobolev space  $H^2 = W_2^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$  such that*

$$\sup_{0 < t < T - \delta} \|\nabla v(\cdot, t)\|_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C(\delta) < \infty$$

for all  $0 < \delta < T$ . Assume further that

$$\Sigma_0 = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^3} |v_{02}(x)x_1 - v_{01}(x)x_2| < \infty \quad (1.4)$$

and

$$\sup_{0 < R \leq 2/3} \sup_{-\infty < h < \infty} f(R; (0, h, T)) + M(R; (0, h, T)) \leq g(R) \quad (1.5)$$

with some positive constants  $c_*$  and  $\alpha$ , satisfying (1.3), where

$$f(R; z_0) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{R}} \left( \int_{t_0 - R^2}^{t_0} \left( \int_{\mathcal{C}(x_0, R)} |v|^3 dx \right)^{\frac{4}{3}} dt \right)^{\frac{3}{4}}$$

and

$$M(R; z_0) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{R}} \left( \int_{Q(z_0, R)} |v|^{\frac{10}{3}} dz \right)^{\frac{3}{10}}.$$

Then  $v$  is a strong solution to the above Cauchy problem in  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times ]0, T[$ , i.e.,

$$\sup_{0 < t < T} \|\nabla v(\cdot, t)\|_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^3)} < \infty.$$

Our proof is based on the analysis of the following scalar equation

$$\partial_t \sigma + \left( v + 2 \frac{x'}{|x'|^2} \right) \cdot \nabla \sigma - \Delta \sigma = 0 \quad (1.6)$$

in  $Q \setminus (\{x' = 0\} \times ]-1, 0])$ , where  $\sigma := \rho v_\varphi = v_2 x_1 - v_1 x_2$ .

Let us list some differentiability properties of  $\sigma$ . Some of them follows from partial regularity theory developed by Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg.

Indeed, since  $v$  and  $q$  are an axially symmetric suitable weak solution, there exists a closed set  $S^\sigma$  in  $Q$ , whose 1D-parabolic measure in  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}$  is equal to zero and  $x' = 0$  for any  $z = (x, t) \in S^\sigma$ , such that any spatial derivative of  $v$  (and thus of  $\sigma$ ) is Hölder continuous in  $Q \setminus S^\sigma$ .

Next, we observe that

$$|\partial_t \sigma(z) - \Delta \sigma(z)| \leq \left( \sup_{z=(x,t) \in P(\delta, R; R) \times ]-R^2, 0[} |v(z)| + 2/\delta \right) |\nabla \sigma(z)|$$

for any  $0 < \delta < R < 1$ , where  $P(a, b; h) = \{x : a < |x'| < b, |x_3| < h\}$ . Since  $v$  is axially symmetric, the first factor on the right hand side is finite. This fact, by iteration, yields

$$\sigma \in W_p^{2,1}(P(\delta, R; R) \times ]-R^2, 0[)$$

for any  $0 < \delta < R < 1$  and for any finite  $p \geq 2$ .

It follows from the above partial regularity theory that, for any  $-1 < t < 0$ ,

$$\sigma(x', x_3, t) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad |x'| \rightarrow 0 \quad (1.7)$$

for all  $x_3 \in ]-1, 1[ \setminus S_t^\sigma$ .

In the same way, as it has been done in [25] and [23], one can show that  $\sigma \in L_\infty(Q(R))$  for any  $0 < R < 1$ .

The main part of the proof of Theorem 1.3 is the following fact.

**Proposition 1.4.** *Let  $\sigma = \rho v_\varphi$ , then*

$$\text{osc}_{z \in Q(r)} \sigma \leq C_1(c_*) \left( \frac{r}{2R} \right)^{C_2(c_*)} \text{osc}_{z \in Q(2R)} \sigma(z), \quad (1.8)$$

where  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are positive constants and  $0 < r < R \leq R_*(c_*, \alpha) \leq 1/6$ . Here,  $\text{osc}_{z \in Q(r)} \sigma(z) = M_r - m_r$  and

$$M_r = \sup_{z \in Q(r)} \sigma(z), \quad m_r = \inf_{z \in Q(r)} \sigma(z).$$

The above statement is an improvement of the result in [19], where the bound for oscillations of  $\sigma$  contains a logarithmic factor only.

The proof of Proposition 1.4 is based on a technique developed in [17], see also references there. We also would like to mention interesting results for the heat equation with a divergence free drift, see [6], [7], [24], and [1].

## 2 Auxiliary Facts

Define the class  $\mathcal{V}$  of functions  $\pi : Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  possessing the properties:

(i) there exists a closed set  $S^\pi$  in  $Q$ , whose 1D-parabolic measure  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}$  is equal to zero and  $x' = 0$  for any  $z = (x', x_3, t) \in S^\pi$ , such that any spatial derivative is Hölder continuous in  $Q \setminus S^\pi$ ;

(ii)

$$\pi \in W_2^{2,1}(P(\delta, R; R) \times ] - R^2, 0]) \cap L_\infty(Q(R))$$

for any  $0 < \delta < R < 1$ .

We are going to use the following subclass  $\mathcal{V}_0$  of the class  $\mathcal{V}$ , saying that  $\pi \in \mathcal{V}_0$  if and only if  $\pi \in \mathcal{V}$  and

$$\partial_t \pi + \left( u + 2 \frac{x'}{|x'|^2} \right) \cdot \nabla \pi - \Delta \pi = 0 \quad (2.1)$$

in  $\mathcal{C} \setminus \{x' = 0\} \times ] - 1, 0[$ .

We shall also say that  $\pi \in \mathcal{V}_0$  has the property  $(\mathcal{B}_R)$  in  $Q(2R)$  if there exists a number  $k_R > 0$  such that  $\pi(0, x_3, t) \geq k_R$  for  $-(2R)^2 \leq t \leq 0$ ,  $x_3 \in ] - 2R, 2R[ \setminus S_t^\pi$ , where  $S_t^\pi = \{x \in \mathcal{C} : (x, t) \in S^\pi\}$ .

**Remark 2.1.** *Let  $0 < r \leq R$  and  $\pi \in \mathcal{V}_0$  have the property  $(\mathcal{B}_R)$  in  $Q(2R)$ . Then  $\pi$  has the property  $(\mathcal{B}_r)$  in  $Q(2r)$  with any constant less or equal to  $k_R$ .*

In what follows, we always suppose that  $0 < R \leq 1/6$ .

**Proposition 2.2.** *Let  $\pi \in \mathcal{V}_0$  have the property  $(\mathcal{B}_R)$ . Then, for any  $0 < k \leq k_R$ , for any  $0 < \tau_1 < \tau < 2$ , and for any  $0 < \gamma_1 < \gamma < 4$ , the following inequality holds:*

$$\sup_{z \in Q^{\tau_1, \gamma_1}(R)} \sigma(z) \leq c_1(\tau_1, \tau, \gamma_1, \gamma, M(2R)) \left( \frac{1}{|Q^{\tau, \gamma}(R)|} \int_{Q^{\tau, \gamma}(R)} \sigma^{\frac{10}{3}}(R) dz \right)^{\frac{3}{10}}, \quad (2.2)$$

where  $\sigma = (k - \pi)_+$ ,

$$c_1(\tau_1, \tau, \gamma_1, \gamma, M(2R)) = \frac{c}{(\tau - \tau_1)^{\frac{16}{3}}} \left( 1 + \frac{\tau - \tau_1}{\sqrt{\gamma - \gamma_1}} + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_1 \tau_1^3} \right)^{\frac{1}{10}} M(2R) \right)^3,$$

and  $Q^{\tau, \gamma}(R) = \mathcal{C}(\tau R) \times ] - \gamma R^2, 0[$ .

*Proof.* Repeating arguments in [23], we can get the following estimate of  $h = \sigma^m$ :

$$\left( \int_{t_2}^0 \int_{\mathcal{C}(r_2)} |h|^{\frac{10}{3}} dz \right)^{\frac{3}{10}} \leq$$

$$\leq c \left( \int_{t_1}^0 \int_{\mathcal{C}(r_1)} |h|^{\frac{5}{2}} dz \right)^{\frac{2}{5}} \frac{(r_1^3 |t_1|)^{\frac{1}{10}}}{r_1 - r_2} \left( 1 + \frac{r_1 - r_2}{\sqrt{t_2 - t_1}} + \overline{M}(r_1, t_1) + \frac{r_1^{\frac{13}{8}} |t_1|^{\frac{1}{36}}}{(r_1 - r_2)^{\frac{7}{9}}} \right) \quad (2.3)$$

for any  $0 < r_2 < r_1 < 2R$  and  $-4R^2 < t_1 < t_2 < 0$ , where

$$\overline{M}(r_1, t_1) = \left( \frac{1}{|t_1| r_1^3} \right)^{\frac{1}{10}} \left( \int_{t_1}^0 \int_{\mathcal{C}(r_1)} |v|^{\frac{10}{3}} dz \right)^{\frac{3}{10}}.$$

Next, we wish to iterate (2.3). To this end, let  $m = m_i = \left(4/3\right)^i$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} r_1 &= r_i = \tau_1 R + (\tau - \tau_1) R 2^{-i+1}, & r_2 &= r_{i+1}, \\ t_1 &= t_i = -\gamma_1 R^2 - (\gamma - \gamma_1) R^2 4^{-i+1}, & t_2 &= t_{i+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $i = 1, 2, \dots$ . Then, we can derive from (2.3) the following inequality

$$G_{i+1} \leq \left( \frac{c 2^{i+1}}{\tau - \tau_1} \right)^{\frac{1}{m_i}} \left( 1 + \frac{\tau - \tau_1}{\sqrt{\gamma - \gamma_1}} + \overline{M}(r_i, t_i) + \frac{2^{(i+1)\frac{7}{9}}}{(\tau - \tau_1)^{\frac{7}{9}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{m_i}} G_i, \quad (2.4)$$

where

$$G_i = \left( \frac{1}{|t_i| r_i^3} \int_{t_i}^0 \int_{\mathcal{C}(r_i)} \sigma^{\frac{5m_i}{2}} dz \right)^{\frac{2}{5m_i}}.$$

Noticing that

$$\overline{M}(r_i, t_i) \leq c \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_1 \tau_1^3} \right)^{\frac{1}{10}} M(2R),$$

let us make use of (2.4) to obtain the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} &G_{i+1} \leq \\ &\leq \left( \frac{c 2^{i+1}}{\tau - \tau_1} \right)^{\frac{1}{m_i}} \left( 1 + \frac{\tau - \tau_1}{\sqrt{\gamma - \gamma_1}} + \frac{2^{(i+1)\frac{7}{9}}}{(\tau - \tau_1)^{\frac{7}{9}}} + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_1 \tau_1^3} \right)^{\frac{1}{10}} M(2R) \right)^{\frac{1}{m_i}} G_i, \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

which, after iterations, gives the following

$$G_{i+1} \leq \xi_i G_1, \quad (2.6)$$

where

$$\xi_i = \prod_{k=1}^i \left( \frac{c2^{k+1}}{\tau - \tau_1} \right)^{\frac{1}{m_k}} \left( 1 + \frac{\tau - \tau_1}{\sqrt{\gamma - \gamma_1}} + \frac{2^{(k+1)\frac{7}{9}}}{(\tau - \tau_1)^{\frac{7}{9}}} + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_1 \tau_1^3} \right)^{\frac{1}{10}} M(2R) \right)^{\frac{1}{m_k}}.$$

Obviously,

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_i &\leq \prod_{k=1}^i \left( \frac{c2^{k+1}}{\tau - \tau_1} \right)^{\frac{1}{m_k}} \left( 1 + \frac{2^{(k+1)\frac{7}{9}}}{(\tau - \tau_1)^{\frac{7}{9}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{m_k}} \left( 1 + \frac{\tau - \tau_1}{\sqrt{\gamma - \gamma_1}} + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_1 \tau_1^3} \right)^{\frac{1}{10}} M(2R) \right)^{\frac{1}{m_k}}. \end{aligned}$$

Next,

$$\ln \xi_i \leq A_1 + A_2 + A_3,$$

where

$$A_1 = \sum_{k=1}^i \frac{1}{m_k} (\ln c + (k+1) \ln 2 - \ln(\tau - \tau_1)) \leq \ln c - 3 \ln(\tau - \tau_1),$$

$$\begin{aligned} A_2 &= \sum_{k=1}^i \frac{1}{m_k} \ln \left( 1 + \frac{2^{(k+1)\frac{7}{9}}}{(\tau - \tau_1)^{\frac{7}{9}}} \right) = \sum_{k=1}^i \frac{1}{m_k} \ln \left( \frac{2^{(k+1)\frac{7}{9}}}{(\tau - \tau_1)^{\frac{7}{9}}} \right) + \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{m_k} \ln \left( 1 + \frac{(\tau - \tau_1)^{\frac{7}{9}}}{2^{(k+1)\frac{7}{9}}} \right) \leq \ln \frac{c}{(\tau - \tau_1)^{\frac{7}{3}}} + \\ &\quad + (\tau - \tau_1)^{\frac{7}{9}} \sum_{k=1}^i \frac{1}{m_k} \frac{1}{2^{(k+1)\frac{7}{9}}} \leq \ln \frac{c}{(\tau - \tau_1)^{\frac{7}{3}}}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} A_3 &= \ln \left( 1 + \frac{\tau - \tau_1}{\sqrt{\gamma - \gamma_1}} + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_1 \tau_1^3} \right)^{\frac{1}{10}} M(2R) \right) \sum_{k=1}^i \frac{1}{m_k} \leq \\ &\leq \ln \left( 1 + \frac{\tau - \tau_1}{\sqrt{\gamma - \gamma_1}} + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_1 \tau_1^3} \right)^{\frac{1}{10}} M(2R) \right)^3. \end{aligned}$$

So,

$$\xi_i \leq \frac{c}{(\tau - \tau_1)^{\frac{16}{3}}} \left( 1 + \frac{\tau - \tau_1}{\sqrt{\gamma - \gamma_1}} + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_1 \tau_1^3} \right)^{\frac{1}{10}} M(2R) \right)^3.$$

Passing to the limit as  $i \rightarrow \infty$  in (2.6), we complete the proof the Proposition.  $\square$



**Remark 2.3.** *If we additionally assume that  $\pi(\cdot, -\theta R^2) \geq k$  in  $B$  for some  $0 < \theta \leq 1$ , then we do not need to use a cut-off in  $t$ . So, for  $0 < \lambda < 1$ , we have*

$$\sup_{Q^{\lambda R, \theta}(R)} \sigma \leq c'_1(\lambda, M(2R)) \left( \frac{1}{|Q^{1, \theta}(R)|} \int_{Q^{1, \theta}(R)} \sigma^{\frac{10}{3}} dz \right)^{\frac{3}{10}},$$

where

$$c'_1(\lambda, M(2R)) = \frac{c}{(1-\lambda)^{\frac{16}{3}}} \left( 1 + \left( \frac{1}{\theta \lambda^3} \right)^{\frac{1}{10}} M(2R) \right)^3.$$

**Corollary 2.4.** *Let a non-negative function  $\pi \in \mathcal{V}_0$  have the property  $(\mathcal{B}_R)$  in  $Q(2R)$  and let  $0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda < 2$  and  $0 < \theta \leq 1$ . Suppose that*

$$|\{\pi < k\} \cap Q^{\lambda, \theta}((0, t_0), R)| < \mu |Q^{\lambda, \theta}(R)| \quad (2.7)$$

for some  $t_0 > -4R^2$ , for some  $0 < k \leq k_R$ , and for some

$$0 < \mu \leq \mu_* = \left( \frac{1}{2c_1(\lambda_1, \lambda, \theta/2, \theta, M(2R))} \right)^{\frac{10}{3}}.$$

Then  $\pi \geq \frac{k}{2}$  in  $Q^{\lambda_1, \theta/2}((0, t_0), R)$ .

If, in addition,  $\pi(\cdot, t_0 - \theta R^2) > k$  in  $\mathcal{C}(\lambda R)$ , then  $\pi \geq \frac{k}{2}$  in  $Q^{\lambda_1, \theta}((0, t_0), R)$ .

*Proof.* The first statement can be proved ad absurdum with the help of inequality (2.2) and a suitable choice of the number  $\mu_*$ . The second statement is proved in the same way but with the help of the inequality of Remark 2.3. Number  $\mu_*$  is defined by the constant  $c'_1$  instead of  $c_1$ .  $\square$

The two lemmas below are obvious modifications of the corresponding statements in the paper [17].

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $0 \leq \pi \in \mathcal{V}_0$  have the property  $(\mathcal{B}_R)$  in  $Q(2R)$ . Given  $\delta_0 \in ]0, 1]$ , there exists a positive number  $\theta_0(\delta_0, f(2R)) \leq 1$  such that if, for  $0 < \theta \leq \theta_0$ ,  $0 < k_0 \leq k_R$ , there holds*

$$|\{\pi(\cdot, t_0 - \theta R^2) \geq k_0\} \cap \mathcal{C}(R)| > \delta_0 |\mathcal{C}(R)|,$$

then

$$|\{\pi(\cdot, t) \geq \frac{\delta_0}{3} k_0\} \cap \mathcal{C}(R)| > \frac{\delta_0}{3} |\mathcal{C}(R)|$$

for all  $t \in [t_0 - \theta R^2, t_0]$ .

**Remark 2.6.** *There is a formula for  $\theta_0$ :*

$$\theta_0 = \left( \frac{c\delta_0^6}{1 + \delta_0^2 f(2R)} \right)^{\frac{4}{3}}.$$

**Lemma 2.7.** *Let  $0 \leq \pi \in \mathcal{V}_0$  have the property  $(\mathcal{B}_R)$  in  $Q(2R)$ . Let, for any  $t \in [t_0 - \theta_1 R^2, t_0]$ ,*

$$|\{\pi(\cdot, t) \geq k_1\} \cap \mathcal{C}(R)| \geq \delta_1 |\mathcal{C}(R)|$$

*for some  $0 < k_1 \leq k_R$  and for some  $0 < \delta_1 \leq 1$  and  $0 < \theta_1 \leq 1$ .*

*Then, for any  $\mu_1 \in ]0, 1[$ , the following inequality is valid:*

$$|\{\pi < 2^{-s} k_1\} \cap Q^{1, \theta_1}((0, t_0), R)| \leq \mu_1 |Q^{1, \theta_1}(R)|$$

*with the integer number  $s$  defined as*

$$s = \text{entier} \left( \frac{c}{\delta_1^2 \mu_1^2 \theta_1} (1 + f(2R)) \right) + 1.$$

.

Given  $\theta \in ]0, 1]$ , we can find an number  $0 < R_{*1}(c_*, \alpha, \theta) \leq 1$  so that  $\left( \frac{1}{cg(2r)} \right)^{\frac{4}{3}} \leq \theta$  for all  $0 < r \leq R_{*1}$ .

**Corollary 2.8.** *Let  $0 \leq \pi \in \mathcal{V}_0$  have the property  $(\mathcal{B}_R)$  in  $Q(2R)$ . If  $\pi(\cdot, \bar{t}) \geq k_2$  in  $\mathcal{C}(R)$ , then, for any  $\sigma \in ]0, 1[$ , the inequality  $\pi \geq \beta_2 k_2$  holds in  $Q^{\sigma, \theta_0}((0, t_0), R)$ , where*

$$\beta_2 = \frac{1}{6} 2^{-c(1-\sigma)^{-40} \sigma^{-6} g^{25}(2R)}$$

*provided  $R \leq R_{*1}$ .*

*Proof.* We apply Lemma 2.5 with  $\delta_0 = \delta_2 = 1$  and  $k_0 = k_2$ . Then, for  $\sigma = 4/(27c)$ , we calculate

$$\theta_0 = \left( \frac{\frac{4}{27}\sigma}{\frac{1}{\sigma} + f(2R)} \right)^{\frac{4}{3}} \geq \left( \frac{c}{g(2R)} \right)^{\frac{4}{3}}$$

and state that the following inequality holds:

$$|\{\pi(\cdot, t) > \frac{k_0}{3}\} \cap \mathcal{C}(R)| \geq \frac{1}{3} |\mathcal{C}(R)|$$

for any  $t \in [t_0 - \theta_0 R^2, t_0]$ , where  $t_0 = \bar{t} + \theta_0 R^2$ . In what follows, we are going to use the quantity  $(c/(g(2R)))^{\frac{4}{3}}$  as a new number  $\theta_0$  instead of  $\theta_0(1, f(2R))$ .

Now, we are going to apply Lemma 2.7 with another set of parameters  $k_1 = \frac{1}{3}k_2$ ,  $\theta_1 = \theta_0$ ,  $\delta_1 = \frac{1}{3}$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_1 = \mu_* &= \left(\frac{1}{2c'_1}\right)^{\frac{10}{3}}, & c'_1 &= \frac{c}{(1-\sigma)^{\frac{16}{3}}} \left(1 + \left(\frac{1}{\theta_0 \sigma^3}\right)^{\frac{1}{10}} M(2R)\right)^3 \leq \\ & \leq \frac{c}{(1-\sigma)^{\frac{16}{3}}} \left(\frac{1}{\theta_0 \sigma^3}\right)^{\frac{3}{10}} g^3(2R). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma (2.7) gives us:

$$|\{\pi < 2^{-s}k_1\} \cap Q^{1,\theta_1}((0, t_0), R)| < \mu_1 |Q^{1,\theta_1}(R)|,$$

where

$$s = \text{entier}\left(\frac{c}{\delta_1^2 \mu_1^2 \theta_1}(1 + f(2R))\right) + 1.$$

But we know that

$$\pi(\cdot, t_0 - \theta_0 R^2) \geq k_2 > 2^{-s}k_1 = 2^{-s}\frac{k_2}{3}.$$

Then, from Corollary 2.4, it follows that  $\pi > \frac{1}{2}2^{-s}k_1 = \beta_2 k_2$  with  $\beta_2 = \frac{1}{2}2^{-s}\frac{1}{3}$  in  $Q^{\sigma, \theta_0}((0, t_0), R)$ . □

**Lemma 2.9.** *Let  $0 \leq \pi \in \mathcal{V}_0$  have the property  $(\mathcal{B}_R)$  in  $Q(2R)$ , assuming that  $R \leq R_{*1}(c_*, \alpha, \theta)$  for some  $0 < \theta \leq 1$ . Suppose further that, for some  $0 < k \leq k_R$  and for some  $-R^2 \leq \bar{t} \leq -\theta R^2$ , there holds  $\pi(\cdot, \bar{t}) \geq k$  in  $\mathcal{C}(R)$ . Then  $\pi \geq \beta_0 k$  in  $\widehat{Q} := \mathcal{C}(\frac{2}{3}R) \times [\bar{t}, 0]$ , where*

$$\beta_0 \geq \ln^{-\frac{1}{2}}(1/R)$$

for  $R \leq R_{*2}(c_*, \alpha, \theta)$ .

*Proof.* Let

$$N = \text{entier}\left(\frac{9}{8} \frac{|\bar{t}|}{\theta_0 R^2}\right) + 1,$$

where  $\tilde{\theta}_0 = (c/g(\frac{2}{3}2R))^{\frac{4}{3}} \leq \theta$ . Next, we introduce

$$\hat{\theta}_0 = \frac{|\bar{t}|}{(\frac{8N}{9} + \frac{1}{2N})R^2} \leq \tilde{\theta}_0.$$

*Step 1.* By Corollary 2.8, the inequality  $\pi \geq \beta_2^{(1)}k$  holds at least in  $\mathcal{C}((1 - \frac{1}{3N})R) \times [\bar{t}_1, \bar{t}_1 + \hat{\theta}_0 R^2]$ , where  $\bar{t}_1 = \bar{t}$ ,  $\bar{t}_2 = \bar{t}_1 + \hat{\theta}_0 R^2$ ,  $\sigma = 1 - 1/(3N) \geq 2/3$ ,  $1 - \sigma = 1/(3N)$ , and

$$\ln \beta_2^{(1)} = -\ln 6 - cN^{40}g^{25}(2R)$$

*Step 2.* Here, we are going to use Corollary 2.8 with  $R(1 - 1/(3N))$  instead of  $R$  and with  $\sigma = (1 - 2/(3N))/(1 - 1/(3N))$ . As a result, we have the estimate  $\pi \geq \beta_2^{(2)}\beta_2^{(1)}k$  at least in  $\mathcal{C}((1 - 2/(3N))R) \times [\bar{t}_2, \bar{t}_2 + \hat{\theta}_0(1 - 1/(3N))^2 R^2]$ ,  $\bar{t}_3 = \bar{t}_2 + \hat{\theta}_0(1 - 1/(3N))^2 R^2$ , and

$$\ln \beta_2^{(2)} = -\ln 6 - cN^{40}g^{25}(2(1 - 1/(3N))R).$$

So,  $\pi \geq \beta_2^{(2)}\beta_2^{(1)}k$  in  $\mathcal{C}((1 - 2/(3N))R) \times [\bar{t}, \bar{t}_3]$ .

After  $N$  steps, we shall have  $\bar{t}_N = 0$  and

$$\pi \geq \beta_2^{(N)} \dots \beta_2^{(1)}k = \beta_0(R)k$$

in  $\mathcal{C}(\frac{2}{3}R) \times [\bar{t}, 0]$ , where

$$\ln \beta_2^{(i+1)} = -\ln 6 - cN^{40}g^{25}(2(1 - i/(3N))R)$$

for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, N - 1$ .

Next, according to assumption (1.2), we can have

$$\ln \beta_0 \geq -N \ln 6 - cN^{40} \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} c_*^{25} \ln^\gamma \ln^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \frac{1}{2(1 - i/(3N))R} \right),$$

where  $25\alpha < 1$ . Since

$$\ln \frac{1}{1-x} \leq 2x$$

provided  $0 \leq x \leq 1/2$ , we find, assuming that  $R \leq 1/6$ , the following:

$$\ln^\gamma \ln^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \frac{1}{2(1 - i/(3N))R} \right) \leq \ln^\gamma \left( \ln \frac{1}{2R} + \frac{i}{N} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \ln^\gamma \left( \ln^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{2R} + \left( \frac{i}{N} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) = \ln^\gamma \left( \ln^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{2R} \left( 1 + \left( \frac{i}{N \ln \frac{1}{2R}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \right) \leq \\
&\leq \ln^\gamma \left( \ln^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{2R} \left( 1 + \left( \frac{i}{N} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \right) = \left( \ln \left( \ln^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{2R} \right) + \ln \left( 1 + \left( \frac{i}{N} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \right)^\gamma \leq \\
&\leq \left( \ln \left( \ln^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{2R} \right) + \left( \frac{i}{N} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)^\gamma \leq \ln^\gamma \left( \ln^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{2R} \right) + \left( \frac{i}{N} \right)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

From the latter inequality, one can deduce the bound

$$\begin{aligned}
\ln \beta_0 &\geq -N \ln 6 - cc_*^{25} N^{40} \left( N \ln^\gamma \ln^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{2R} + \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \left( \frac{i}{N} \right)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \right) \geq \\
&\geq -N \ln 6 - cc_*^{25} N^{41} \ln^\gamma \ln^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{2R},
\end{aligned}$$

which is valid for  $0 < R \leq R_{*3}(\alpha) \leq 1/6$ . Taking into account that  $N \leq c(g(2R))^{\frac{4}{3}}$ , we conclude

$$\ln \beta_0 \geq -c_1(c_*) \ln^{\frac{239\alpha}{3}} \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{R}}.$$

It remains to find  $R_{*4}(c_*, \alpha) \leq 1$  such that

$$c_1(c_*) \ln^{\frac{239\alpha}{3}-1} \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{R}} \leq 1$$

for all  $0 < R \leq R_{*4}$ . So, we have the required inequality provided  $0 < R \leq R_{*2} = \min\{R_{*1}, R_{*3}, R_{*4}\}$ .  $\square$

### 3 Proof of Proposition 1.4

Now, we can state an analog of Lemma 4.2 of [17] for the class  $\mathcal{V}$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $0 \leq \pi \in \mathcal{V}_0$  possess the property  $(\mathcal{B}_R)$  in  $Q(2R)$ .*

*Suppose further that*

$$\pi \leq M_0 k_R \tag{3.1}$$

*in  $Q(2R)$  for some  $M_0 \geq 1$ . Then, there exists  $\bar{t} \in [-R^2, -\frac{3}{4}R^2]$  such that*

$$|e_{\kappa_0}(\bar{t})| \geq \delta_0 |B(R)| \tag{3.2}$$

Here,  $\kappa_0 = \kappa_0(f(2R)) = c/(1 + f(2R))$ ,  $e_\kappa(t) := \{x \in \mathcal{C}(R) : \pi(x, t) \geq \kappa k_R\}$ , and

$$\delta_0(M_0, f(2R)) = \left( \frac{c}{M_0(1 + f(2R))} \right)^{\frac{9}{4}}.$$

*Proof.* Here, we follow arguments of the paper [17]. They are based on the identity:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_Q (-\pi \partial_t \eta - \pi \Delta \eta - (v + 2x'/|x'|^2) \cdot \nabla \eta \pi) dx dt = \\ & = 4\pi_0 \int_{-1}^0 \int_{-1}^1 \pi(0, x_3, t) \eta(0, x_3, t) dx_3 dt, \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

which is valid for any non-negative test function  $\eta$  supported in  $Q$ . Here,  $\pi_0 = 3.14\dots$ . Although a similar statement has been proven in [17] under the assumption that  $\pi$  is Lipschitz, it remains to be true for functions  $\pi$  from the class  $\mathcal{V}_0$  as well. Indeed, take a smooth cut-off function  $\psi = \psi(x')$  so that  $\psi(x') = \Psi(|x'|)$ ,  $0 \leq \psi \leq 1$ ,  $\psi(x') = 0$  if  $|x'| \leq \varepsilon/2$ ,  $\psi(x') = 1$  if  $|x'| \geq \varepsilon$ ,  $\Psi'(\varrho) \leq c/\varrho$  and  $\Psi''(\varrho) \leq c/\varrho^2$  for some positive constant  $c$ . Then, it follows from (2.1) that:

$$\int_Q \left( \pi \partial_t (\eta \psi) + \pi (u + b) \cdot \nabla (\eta \psi) + \pi \Delta (\eta \psi) \right) dz = 0.$$

There are two difficult terms for passing to the limit as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . The first one is as follows:

$$I_1 := \int_Q \pi \eta \Delta \psi dx dt = J_1 + J_2,$$

where

$$J_1 := \int_Q (\pi \eta - (\pi \eta)|_{x'=0}) \Delta \psi dx dt,$$

For  $J_2$ , we find

$$J_2 := \int_Q (\pi \eta)|_{x'=0} \Delta \psi dx dt = \int_{-1}^0 \int_{-1}^1 (\pi \eta)|_{x'=0} dx_3 dt \int_{|x'| < 1} \Delta \psi(x') dx'$$

and

$$\int_{|x'| < 1} \Delta \psi(x') dx' = 2\pi_0 \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{\varepsilon} \frac{1}{\varrho} \frac{\partial}{\partial \varrho} \left( \varrho \Psi'(\varrho) \right) \varrho d\varrho = 2\pi_0 \varrho \Psi'(\varrho) \Big|_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{\varepsilon} = 0.$$

Now, we wish to show that

$$J_1 := \int_Q \xi \Delta \psi dx dt \rightarrow 0$$

as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , where,  $\xi := \pi \eta - (\pi \eta)|_{x'=0}$ . To this end, let us introduce the function

$$H_\varepsilon(x_3, t) := \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2} < \varrho < \varepsilon} \xi \Delta \psi dx'.$$

It can be bounded from above and from below

$$|H_\varepsilon(x_3, t)| \leq c \sup_{\text{spt} \eta} \pi \sup_{|x'| < 1} \eta(x', x_3, t) \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{\varepsilon} \varrho d\varrho =: h(x_3, t)$$

provided  $\varepsilon < 1$ . The function  $h$  is supported in  $] -1, 1[ \times ] -1, 0[$  and thus

$$\int_{-1}^1 \int_{-1}^0 h(x_3, t) dx_3 dt < \infty.$$

Now, let  $(0, x_3, t)$  be a regular point of  $\pi$ , i.e.,  $(0, x_3, t) \notin S^\pi$ . Then,  $\xi(x', x_3, t) \rightarrow 0$  as  $|x'| \rightarrow 0$  and thus for any  $\delta > 0$  there exists a number  $\tau(x_3, t) > 0$  such that  $|\xi(x', x_3, t)| < \delta$  provided  $|x'| < \tau$ . So,

$$|H_\varepsilon(x_3, t)| < c \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon^2} \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{\varepsilon} \varrho d\varrho = c \frac{\delta}{2}$$

provided  $\varepsilon < \tau$ . Therefore,  $H_\varepsilon(x_3, t) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  and by the Lebesgue theorem on dominated convergence, we find that

$$J_1 = \int_{-1}^1 \int_{-1}^0 H_\varepsilon(x_3, t) dx_3 dt \rightarrow 0$$

as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ .

Similar arguments work for the second difficult term:

$$I := \int_Q \pi \eta b \cdot \nabla \psi dz = J_1 + J_2,$$

where

$$J_1 = \int_Q \xi b \cdot \nabla \psi dz$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} J_2 &:= \int_Q (\pi \eta)|_{x'=0} b \cdot \nabla \psi dx dt = \int_{-1}^0 \int_{-1}^1 (\pi \eta)|_{x'=0} dx_3 dt 2\pi_0 \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{\varepsilon} \frac{2}{\varrho} \Psi'(\varrho) \varrho d\varrho = \\ &= 4\pi_0 \int_{-1}^0 \int_{-1}^1 (\pi \eta)|_{x'=0} dx_3 dt. \end{aligned}$$

The fact that  $J_1 \rightarrow 0$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  can be justified in the same way as above, replacing  $H_\varepsilon$  with the function

$$G_\varepsilon(x_3, t) := \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2} < |x'| < \varepsilon} \xi b \cdot \nabla \psi dx'.$$

Other terms can be treated in a similar way and even easier. So, the required identity (3.3) has been proven.

Now, let us select the test function  $\eta$  in (3.3), using the following notation

$$Q^{\lambda, \theta}(z_0, R) := \mathcal{C}(x_0, \lambda R) \times ]t_0 - \theta R^2, t_0[,$$

so that  $\eta = 1$  in  $Q^{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{8}}((0, -\frac{13}{16}R^2), R)$ ,  $\eta = 0$  out of  $Q^{1, \frac{1}{4}}((0, -\frac{3}{4}R^2), R)$  and  $|\partial_t \eta| + |\nabla \eta|^2 + |\nabla^2 \eta| \leq c/R^2$ . Taking into account that  $\pi$  has the property  $(\mathcal{B}_R)$ , we find

$$\frac{\pi_0}{2} k_R R^2 \leq \frac{c}{R^2} \int_{Q^{1, \frac{1}{4}}(z_R, R)} \pi dz + \frac{c}{R} \int_{Q^{1, \frac{1}{4}}(z_R, R)} \pi |v| dz + \frac{c}{R} \int_{Q^{1, \frac{1}{4}}(z_R, R)} \frac{\pi}{|x'|} dz,$$



where  $z_R = (0, -\frac{3}{4}R^2)$ .

Setting  $E_\kappa = \{(x, t) : t \in ] - R^2, -\frac{3}{4}R^2[, x \in e_\kappa(t)\}$ , we can deduce from the latter inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\pi_0}{2} k_R R^3 \leq \\ & \leq \frac{c}{R^2} \int_{Q^{1, \frac{1}{4}}(z_R, R) \setminus E_\kappa} \pi dz + \frac{c}{R} \int_{Q^{1, \frac{1}{4}}(z_R, R) \setminus E_\kappa} \pi |v| dz + \frac{c}{R} \int_{Q^{1, \frac{1}{4}}(z_R, R) \setminus E_\kappa} \frac{\pi}{|x'|} dz + \\ & + \frac{c}{R^2} \int_{Q^{1, \frac{1}{4}}(z_R, R) \cap E_\kappa} \pi dz + \frac{c}{R} \int_{Q^{1, \frac{1}{4}}(z_R, R) \cap E_\kappa} \pi |v| dz + \frac{c}{R} \int_{Q^{1, \frac{1}{4}}(z_R, R) \cap E_\kappa} \frac{\pi}{|x'|} dz. \end{aligned}$$

Applying (3.1) and recalling definitions of the sets  $e_\kappa(t)$  and  $E_\kappa$ , we can get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\pi_0}{2} k_R R^3 \leq \\ & \leq \frac{c\kappa k_R}{R^2} \left\{ |Q^{1, \frac{1}{4}}(R)| + R \int_{Q^{1, \frac{1}{4}}(z_R, R) \setminus E_\kappa} |v| dz + R \int_{Q^{1, \frac{1}{4}}(z_R, R) \setminus E_\kappa} \frac{1}{|x'|} dz \right\} + \\ & + \frac{cM_0 k_R}{R^2} \left\{ |E_\kappa| + R \int_{Q^{1, \frac{1}{4}}(z_R, R) \cap E_\kappa} |v| dz + R \int_{Q^{1, \frac{1}{4}}(z_R, R) \cap E_\kappa} \frac{1}{|x'|} dz \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We need to estimate integrals in the above inequality. First, for integrals containing  $v$ , Holder inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{Q^{1, \frac{1}{4}}(z_R, R) \setminus E_\kappa} |v| dx & \leq \|\mathbb{I}\|_{\frac{3}{2}, \frac{4}{3}, Q^{1, \frac{1}{4}}(R)} \left( \int_{-R^2}^{-\frac{3}{4}R^2} \left( \int_{\mathcal{C}(R)} |v|^3 dx \right)^{\frac{4}{3}} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \leq \\ & \leq f(2R) R^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\mathbb{I}\|_{\frac{3}{2}, \frac{4}{3}, Q^{1, \frac{1}{4}}(R)} \leq f(2R) R^4 \end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$\int_{Q^{1, \frac{1}{4}}(z_R, R) \cap E_\kappa} |v| dz \leq f(2R) R^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\mathbb{I}\|_{\frac{3}{2}, \frac{4}{3}, E_\kappa}.$$

To evaluate the last two integrals, let us take into account the fact:

$$\frac{1}{|x'|} \in L^{\frac{9}{5}, \infty}(Q^{1, \frac{1}{4}}(z_R, R)).$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{Q^{1, \frac{1}{4}}(z_R, R) \setminus E_\kappa} \frac{1}{|x'|} dz &\leq \left\| \frac{1}{|x'|} \right\|_{\frac{9}{5}, \infty, Q^{1, \frac{1}{4}}(z_R, R)} \|\mathbb{I}\|_{\frac{9}{4}, 1, Q^{1, \frac{1}{4}}(R)} \leq \\ &\leq cR^{\frac{2}{3}} R^{\frac{10}{3}} = cR^4 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\int_{Q^{1, \frac{1}{4}}(z_R, R) \cap E_\kappa} \frac{1}{|x|} dz \leq cR^{\frac{2}{3}} \|\mathbb{I}\|_{\frac{9}{4}, 1, E_\kappa}.$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\pi_0}{2} k_R R^3 &\leq c\kappa k_R R^3 (1 + f(2R)) + \\ &+ \frac{cM_0 k_R}{R^2} \left[ |E_\kappa| + f(2R) R^{\frac{3}{2}} \|\mathbb{I}\|_{\frac{3}{2}, \frac{4}{3}, E_\kappa} + R^{\frac{5}{3}} \|\mathbb{I}\|_{\frac{9}{4}, 1, E_\kappa} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

So,

$$\frac{\pi_0}{2} \leq c\kappa (1 + f(2R)) + \frac{cM_0}{R^5} \left[ |E_\kappa| + f(2R) R^{\frac{3}{2}} \|\mathbb{I}\|_{\frac{3}{2}, \frac{4}{3}, E_\kappa} + R^{\frac{5}{3}} \|\mathbb{I}\|_{\frac{9}{4}, 1, E_\kappa} \right].$$

Now, one can find  $\kappa = \kappa_0(f(2R)) = c/(1 + f(2R))$  such that

$$\frac{cM_0}{R^5} \left[ |E_{\kappa_0}| + f(2R) R^{\frac{3}{2}} \|\mathbb{I}\|_{\frac{3}{2}, \frac{4}{3}, E_{\kappa_0}} + R^{\frac{5}{3}} \|\mathbb{I}\|_{\frac{9}{4}, 1, E_{\kappa_0}} \right] \geq 1.$$

It remains to estimate two integrals on the left hand side of the latter inequality:

$$\|\mathbb{I}\|_{\frac{3}{2}, \frac{4}{3}, E_{\kappa_0}} = \left( \int_{-R^2}^{-\frac{3}{4}R^2} |e_\kappa(t)|^{\frac{8}{9}} dt \right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \leq c|E_{\kappa_0}|^{\frac{2}{3}} R^{\frac{1}{6}}$$

and

$$\|\mathbb{I}\|_{\frac{9}{4}, 1, E_\kappa} \leq c|E_{\kappa_0}|^{\frac{4}{9}} R^{\frac{10}{9}}.$$

Letting  $A = |E_{\kappa_0}|/R^5$ , we arrive at the following inequality

$$f(A) := A + A^{\frac{4}{9}} + f(2R)A^{\frac{2}{3}} \geq \frac{1}{cM_0}.$$

Since  $f'(A) > 0$  for  $A > 0$ , we can state that the last inequality implies

$$\frac{|E_{\kappa_0}|}{|\mathcal{C}(R)|^{\frac{1}{4}}R^2} \geq \delta_0 = \left( \frac{c}{M_0(1+f(2R))} \right)^{\frac{9}{4}}.$$

It is not so difficult to show the existence of  $\bar{t} \in [-R^2, -\frac{3}{4}R^2]$  with the property:

$$|e_{\kappa_0}(\bar{t})|^{\frac{1}{4}}R^2 \geq |E_{\kappa_0}|.$$

So, it is proven that there exists  $\bar{t} \in [-R^2, -3R^2/4]$  such that

$$|\{x \in \mathcal{C}(R) : \pi(x, \bar{t}) > \kappa_0 k_R\}| \geq \delta_0 |\mathcal{C}(R)|, \quad (3.4)$$

which completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

Now, we are able to prove Proposition 1.4.

Assume that the function  $\pi$  meets all the conditions of Lemma 3.1 and according to it, we can claim that:

$$|e_{\kappa_0}(\bar{t})| = |\{x \in \mathcal{C}(R) : \pi(x, \bar{t}) \geq \kappa_0 k_R\}| \geq \delta_0 |\mathcal{C}(R)|$$

for some  $\bar{t} \in [-R^2, -\frac{3}{4}R^2]$ ,  $\kappa_0 = c/g(2R)$ , and  $\delta_0 = c(M_0)/g^{\frac{9}{4}}(2R)$ . Now, we can calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(\delta_0(M_0, f(2R)), f(2R)) &\geq c \left( \frac{\delta_0^6}{1 + \delta_0^2 f(2R)} \right)^{\frac{4}{3}} \geq \\ &\geq c(M_0) \left( \frac{1}{g(2R)} \right)^{18}, \end{aligned}$$

apply Lemma 2.5, and find

$$|\{\pi(\cdot, t) \geq \delta_0 \kappa_0 k_R / 3\} \cap \mathcal{C}(R)| > \delta_0 / 3 |\mathcal{C}(R)|$$

for all  $t \in [\bar{t}, t_0]$  with  $t_0 = \bar{t} + \theta_0 R^2$  and  $\theta_0 = c(M_0)(g(2R))^{-18}$ .

Next, it follows from Lemma 2.7 that:

$$|\{\pi < 2^{-s} \delta_0 \kappa_0 k_R / 3\} \cap Q^{1, \theta_0}((0, t_0), R)| \leq \mu_* |Q^{1, \theta_0}(R)|,$$

where

$$s = \text{entier} \left( \frac{c}{\delta_0^2 \mu_*^2 \theta_0} (1 + f(2R)) \right) + 1$$

and  $\mu_*$  is the number that appears in Corollary 2.4, see also Proposition 2.2. In our case,

$$\mu_* = \left( \frac{1}{2c_1(3/4, 1, \theta_0/2, \theta_0, M(2R))} \right)^{\frac{10}{3}}$$

and, moreover

$$c_1(3/4, 1, \theta_0/2, \theta_0, M(2R)) \leq c\theta_0^{-\frac{3}{2}}g^3(2R) \leq c(M_0)(g(2R))^{30}.$$

Then, Corollary 2.4 implies the bound

$$\pi \geq 2^{-s}\delta_0\kappa_0k_R/6 = \hat{\beta}_2\kappa_0k_R$$

in  $Q^{\frac{3}{4}, \frac{1}{2}\theta_0}((0, t_0), R)$ . So, combining previous estimates, we find the following:

$$\hat{\beta}_2 = \frac{1}{6}2^{-s}\delta_0 \geq e^{-sln2-\ln 6}\delta_0 \geq e^{-cs}\delta_0,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} s &\leq \frac{2g(2R)}{\delta_0^2\mu_*^2\theta_0} \leq c(M_0)g(2R)(g(2R))^{\frac{9}{2}}(g(2R))^{18}c_1^{\frac{20}{3}} \leq \\ &\leq c(M_0)(g(2R))^{\frac{47}{2}}(g(2R))^{30\frac{20}{3}} \leq c(M_0)(g(2R))^{224}. \end{aligned}$$

So,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\beta}_2 &\geq e^{-c(M_0)(g(2R))^{224}} c(M_0)(g(2R))^{-\frac{9}{4}} \geq e^{-2c(M_0)(g(2R))^{224}} \geq \\ &\geq e^{-c(M_0, c_*) \ln^{224\alpha} \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{R}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, there exists a number  $0 < R_{*5}(M_0, c_*, \alpha) \leq \min\{1/6, R_{*2}\}$  such that

$$2c(M_0, c_*) \ln^{224\alpha-1} \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{R}} \leq 1$$

and

$$c(M_0, c_*) \ln^{224\alpha} \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{R}} \geq \ln \ln^\alpha \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{R}}$$

for  $0 < R \leq R_{*5}(M_0, c_*, \alpha)$  and thus

$$\begin{aligned} -c(M_0, c_*) \ln^{224\alpha} \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{R}} &= -2c(M_0, c_*) \ln^{224\alpha} \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{R}} + \\ + c(M_0, c_*) \ln^{224\alpha} \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{R}} &\geq -\ln \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{R}} + \ln \ln^\alpha \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{R}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, the number  $\hat{\beta}_2$  is estimated as follows:

$$\hat{\beta}_2 \geq \left( \ln \frac{1}{R} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \ln \ln^\alpha \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{R}} \quad (3.5)$$

for  $0 < R \leq R_{*5}(M_0, c_*, \alpha)$ .

Since

$$-R^2 \leq \bar{t} + \theta_0/2R^2 = t_0 - \theta_0/2R^2 < t_0 = \bar{t} + \theta_0R^2 \leq -\frac{3}{4}R^2 + \frac{1}{4}R^2 = -\frac{1}{2}R^2,$$

there is  $\bar{t}_1 \in [-R^2, -\frac{1}{2}R^2]$  such that

$$\pi(\cdot, \bar{t}_1) > \hat{\beta}_2 \kappa_0 k_R$$

in  $\mathcal{C}(\frac{3}{4}R)$ . It allows us to apply Lemma 2.9 with  $\theta = 1/2$ , with  $\frac{3}{4}R$  instead of  $R$ , with  $\bar{t}_1$  instead of  $\bar{t}$ , and with  $\hat{\beta}_2 \kappa_0 k_R$  instead of  $k$ . According to Lemma 2.9, the inequality

$$\pi \geq \beta_0 \hat{\beta}_2 \kappa_0 k_R$$

holds in  $Q(R/2)$ . It follows from Lemma 2.9 and from (3.5) that

$$\pi \geq \frac{c(c_*)k_R}{\ln(\frac{1}{R})} = \beta(2R)k_R$$

in  $Q(R/2)$ .

By our assumption imposed on function  $\sigma$ , we can put  $k_R = \frac{1}{2} \text{osc}_{z \in Q(2R)} \sigma(z)$ . Then, either  $\pi = \sigma - m_{2R}$  or  $\pi = M_{2R} - \sigma(z)$  satisfies all the conditions of the proposition with  $M_0 = 2$ . Simple arguments show that

$$\text{osc}_{z \in Q(R/2)} \sigma(z) \leq \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2} \beta(2R) \right) \text{osc}_{z \in Q(2R)} \sigma(z).$$

Now, after iterations of the latter inequality, we arrive at the following bound

$$\begin{aligned} \text{osc}_{z \in Q(R/2^{2k+1})} &\leq \prod_{i=0}^k \left( \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2} \beta(R/2^{2k+1}) \right) \text{osc}_{z \in Q(2R)} \sigma(z) \right) = \\ &= \eta_k \text{osc}_{z \in Q(2R)} \sigma(z) \end{aligned}$$

being valid for any natural number  $k$ .

In order to evaluate  $\eta_k$ , take  $\ln$  of it. As a result,

$$\begin{aligned}
\ln \eta_k &= \sum_{i=0}^k \ln \left( \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \beta(R/2^{2k+1})\right) \right) \leq - \sum_{i=0}^k \frac{1}{2} \beta(R/2^{2k+1}) = \\
&= -c(c_*) \sum_{i=0}^k (\ln(2^k/R))^{-1} = -c(c_*) \sum_{i=0}^k \frac{1}{k \ln 2 + \ln 1/R} \leq \\
&\leq -c(c_*) \int_0^{k+1} \frac{dx}{x \ln 2 + \ln 1/R} = \\
&= -c(c_*) \left( \ln(2^{k+1}/R) - \ln(1/R) \right) = -c(c_*) \left( \ln(2^{k+1}) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

So, (1.8) follows. The proof of Proposition 1.4 is complete.

## 4 Proof of Theorem 1.3

By the maximum principle, we have  $|\sigma| = |\varrho v_\varphi| \leq \Sigma_0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times ]0, T[$ . From Proposition 1.4, it follows that

$$|\sigma(\varrho, x_3, t)| \leq C_1(c_*) \left( \frac{\varrho}{2R_*} \right)^{C_2(c_*)} 2\Sigma_0$$

for all  $0 < \varrho \leq R_*(c_*, \alpha)$ , for all  $x_3 \in \mathbb{R}$ , and for  $t \in ]T - R_*^2, T[$ . For  $\varrho > R_*$ , we simply have

$$|\sigma(\varrho, x_3, t)| \leq \Sigma_0 \left( \frac{\varrho}{R_*} \right)^{C_2(c_*)}.$$

It remains to notice that  $v(\cdot, T - R_*^2) \in H^2$ . Therefore, one can use the main result of the paper [4], see also [16] and [12], for the Cauchy problem for the Navier-Stokes system (1.1) in  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times ]T - R_*^2, T[$  and conclude that  $v$  is a strong solution in the interval  $]0, T[$ .

## References

- [1] Albritton, D., Dong, H., Regularity properties of passive scalars with rough divergence-free drifts, arXiv:2107.12511.

- [2] Caffarelli, L., Kohn, R.-V., Nirenberg, L., *Partial regularity of suitable weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., Vol. XXXV (1982), pp. 771–831.
- [3] Chae D., Lee, J., On the regularity of the axisymmetric solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations, Math. Z., 239(2002), 645-671.
- [4] C. Chen, D. Fang and T. Zhang, Regularity of 3D axisymmetric Navier-Stokes equations, Discrete Continuous Dynamical Systems - A, 2017, 37 (4) : 1923-1939.
- [5] C. Chen, R. M. Strain, H. Yau and T. Tsai, Lower bounds on the blow-up rate of the axisymmetric Navier-Stokes equations II, Comm. Part. Diff. Equa., 34(2009), 203–232.
- [6] Ignatova, M., On the continuity of solutions to advection-diffusion equations with slightly super- critical divergence-free drifts. Adv. Nonlinear Anal., 3(2):81-86, 2014.
- [7] Ignatova, M., Kukavica, I., and Ryzhik, L., The Harnack inequality for second-order parabolic equations with divergence-free drifts of low regularity. Comm. Partial Differential Equations, 41(2):208–226, 2016.
- [8] Kang, K., Regularity of axially symmetric flows in half-space in three dimensions, SIAM J. Math. Anal. Vol. 35(2004), No. 6, pp. 1636–1643.
- [9] Ladyzhenskaya, O. A., On unique solvability of the three-dimensional Cauchy problem for the Navier-Stokes equations under the axial symmetry, Zap. Nauchn. Sem. LOMI 7(1968), 155-177.
- [10] Ladyzhenskaya, O. A., Seregin, G. A., On partial regularity of suitable weak solutions to the three-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations, J. math. fluid mech., 1(1999), pp. 356-387.
- [11] Z. Lei and Q. Zhang, A Liouville theorem for the axially symmetric Navier-Stokes equations, J. Funct. Anal., 261(2011), 2323–2345.
- [12] Z. Lei and Q. Zhang. Criticality of the axially symmetric Navier-Stokes equations. Pacific Journal of Mathematics, 289(1):169–187, 2017.
- [13] Leonardi, S., Malek, Necas, J., & Pokorný, M., On axially symmetric flows in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , ZAA, 18(1999), 639-649.

- [14] Leray, J., *Sur le mouvement d'un liquide visqueux emplissant l'espace*, Acta Math. **63** (1934), 193–248.
- [15] Lin, F.-H., A new proof of the Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg theorem, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 51 (1998), 241–257.
- [16] C. Miao and X. Zheng, On the global well-posedness for the Boussinesq system with horizontal dissipation. Comm. Math. Phys. 321 (2013), no. 1, 33–67.
- [17] Nazarov, A.I., Uraltseva, N.N., The Harnack inequality and related properties for solutions to elliptic and parabolic equations with divergence-free lower-order coefficients, St. Petersburg Math. J., 23:1. (2012), 93–115
- [18] Neustupa, J., Pokorný, M., Axisymmetric flow of Navier-Stokes fluid in the whole space with non-zero angular velocity components, Math. Bohemica, 126(2001), 469–481.
- [19] Pan, X., Regularity of solutions to axisymmetric Navier-Stokes equations with a slightly supercritical condition, Journal of Differential Equations Volume 260, Issue 12, 15 June 2016, 8485–8529.
- [20] Pokorný, M., A regularity criterion for the angular velocity component in the case of axisymmetric Navier-Stokes equations, 2001.
- [21] Scheffer, V., Partial regularity of solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations, Pacific J. Math., 66(1976), 535–552.
- [22] Scheffer, V., Hausdorff measure and the Navier-Stokes equations, Commun. Math. Phys., 55(1977), pp. 97–112 .
- [23] Seregin, G. Local regularity of axisymmetric solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations. Anal. Math. Phys. 10 (2020), no. 4, Paper No. 46, 20 pp.
- [24] Seregin, G., Silvestre, L., Sverak, V., and Zlatoš, A. On divergence-free drifts. J. Differential Equations, 252(1):505–540, 2012.
- [25] Seregin, G., Sverak, V., On Type I singularities of the local axisymmetric solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations, Communications in PDE's, 34(2009), pp. 171–201.



- [26] Seregin, G., Zajaczkowski, W., A sufficient condition of regularity for axially symmetric solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 39(2007), pp. 669-685.
- [27] Seregin, G., Zhou, D., Regularity of solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations in  $\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^{-1}$ , *Zapiski POMI*, Vol. 407, 2018, pp.119–128.
- [28] Ukhovskij, M. R., Yudovich, V. L., Axially symmetric motions of ideal and viscous fluids filling all space, *Prikl. Mat. Mech.* 32 (1968), 59-69.
- [29] P. Zhang and T. Zhang, Global axisymmetric solutions to the three-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations system, *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, 2014(2014), 610–642.