TWO-POINT BOUNDARY VALUE PROBLEMS ON DIFFEOMORPHISM GROUPS

PATRICK HESLIN

Abstract. We consider a variety of geodesic equations on Sobolev diffeomorphism groups, including the equations of ideal hydrodynamics. We prove that solutions of the corresponding two-point boundary value problems are precisely as smooth as their boundary conditions. We further utilise this regularity property to construct continuously differentiable exponential maps in the Frechét setting.
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1. Introduction

The modern formulation of hydrodynamics goes all the way back to Euler in 1757 from whom we acquire the following equations describing the motion of an ideal (incompressible & inviscid) fluid in a closed $n$-dimensional Riemannian manifold $M$:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \nabla u & = -\nabla p \\
\text{div}(u) & = 0
\end{align*}
\]

If we further impose the condition that $u(0) = u_0$ we obtain the Cauchy problem for (1.1) whose rigorous studies date back to the 1920s with Günther and Lichtenstein, the 1930s with Wolibner and the 1960s with Yudovich and Kato. The list goes on. Many of these references can be found in the monographs of Majda and Bertozzi [22], Arnold and Khesin [2] and Bahouri, Chemin and Danchin [3].

In Arnold’s seminal paper [1] he observed that solutions of (1.1) can be viewed as geodesics of a right-invariant $L^2$ metric on the group $\mathcal{D}_\mu(M)$ of volume-preserving diffeomorphisms (sometimes referred to as volumorphisms). In essence, this approach showcases the natural framework in which to tackle (1.1) from the Lagrangian viewpoint. In their celebrated paper Ebin and Marsden [11] provided the formulation of the above in the $H^s$ Sobolev setting. Among other things they proved that for $s > \frac{n}{2} + 1$ the space of volumorphisms can be given the structure of a smooth, infinite dimensional Hilbert manifold. They showed that when equipped with Arnold’s $L^2$ metric the geodesic equation on this manifold is a smooth ordinary differential equation. They then applied the classic iteration method of Picard to obtain existence, uniqueness and smooth dependence on initial conditions. In particular, the last property allows one to define a smooth exponential map on $\mathcal{D}_\mu(M)$ in analogy with the classical construction in finite dimensional geometry. Hence, the work of Arnold, Ebin and Marsden enables us to explore the Riemannian geometry of fluid motion.

One of the central results in [11] says: Let $\gamma(t) \in \mathcal{D}_\mu(M)$ be an $L^2$ geodesic. If $\gamma(0) \in \mathcal{D}_\mu^{s+1}(M)$ and $\dot{\gamma}(0) \in T_\gamma \mathcal{D}_\mu^{s+1}(M)$, then $\gamma(t) \in \mathcal{D}_\mu^{s+1}(M)$ for all $t$ for which it was defined in $\mathcal{D}_\mu^s(M)$ cf. [11] Theorem 12.1 i.e., roughly speaking, if one considers [11] in Lagrangian coordinates as a second order ODE in $\mathcal{D}_\mu^s(M)$, any solution of the corresponding Cauchy problem (an $L^2$ geodesic) is as smooth as its initial conditions. A natural question is if a similar regularity result holds when the geodesic equation is framed as a two-point boundary value problem. More precisely: Given an $L^2$ geodesic $\gamma(t)$ emanating from the identity in $\mathcal{D}_\mu^s(M)$ and, at some later time $t_0 > 0$, passing through $\eta \in \mathcal{D}_\mu^{s+k}(M)$, can it be shown that $\gamma(t)$ evolves entirely in $\mathcal{D}_\mu^{s+k}(M)$, i.e., is an $L^2$ geodesic as smooth as its boundary conditions? We provide an affirmative answer to this question in the setting of 2D ideal fluids, 3D axisymmetric fluids with zero swirl, 1D equations such as the $\mu$CH and Hunter-Saxton equations, as well as the Euler-$\alpha$ equations, the symplectic Euler equations and other higher order Euler-Arnold equations arising from $H^r$ metrics with $r > 0$.

The earliest results of this nature, to the best of the author’s knowledge, are due to Constantin and Kolev in [9] and [8]. Here they used the above property to show the existence of a continuously Frechet differentiable exponential map for right-invariant $H^r$ metrics, $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, on the group of $C^\infty$ diffeomorphisms of the
circle. This result was improved upon by Kappeler, Loubet and Topalov [17] who showed that these exponential maps are in fact Fréchet bianalytic near zero.

This regularity property was further explored and used as a key ingredient by the latter authors in their study [18] of the group of orientation-preserving diffeomorphisms of the 2-torus, equipped with various right-invariant $H^r$ metrics, again for $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. As in [9] and [8], their goal was to show the existence of a continuously Fréchet differentiable exponential map on the group of $C^\infty$ diffeomorphisms of the 2-torus.

More recent work includes that of Bruveris [7], who obtained a similar result to the above on the full diffeomorphism group of an arbitrary closed manifold, utilising the group structure in his arguments.

As an example of the type of results proved in this paper, here are some of our central results pertaining to the Euler equations:

**Theorem 1.1.** Let $s > \frac{6}{2}$ and consider the group of volume-preserving diffeomorphisms of $\mathbb{T}^2$ equipped with a right-invariant $L^2$ metric. Given $u_0 \in T_e \mathcal{D}^s_\mu$, let $\gamma(t)$ denote the corresponding $L^2$ geodesic. If at time $t = 1$, $\gamma$ passes through a point $\eta \in \mathcal{D}^{s+1}_\mu$, then we have $u_0 \in T_e \mathcal{D}^{s+1}_\mu$ and consequently $\gamma(t)$ evolves entirely in $\mathcal{D}^{s+1}_\mu$.

**Theorem 1.2.** Let $s > \frac{13}{2}$ and consider the group of axisymmetric diffeomorphisms of $\mathbb{T}^3$ with respect to any of the Killing fields $K = \partial_i$, equipped with a right invariant $L^2$ metric. Given $u_0 \in T_e \mathcal{A}^s_{\mu,0}$ let $\gamma(t)$ denote the corresponding $L^2$ geodesic. If at time $t = 1$, $\gamma$ passes through a point $\eta \in \mathcal{A}^{s+1}_{\mu,0}$, then we have $u_0 \in T_e \mathcal{A}^{s+1}_{\mu,0}$ and consequently $\gamma(t)$ evolves entirely in $\mathcal{A}^{s+1}_{\mu,0}$.

We further use these regularity properties to construct continuously Fréchet differentiable exponential maps in the smooth setting.

**Theorem 1.3.** The Fréchet manifold $\mathcal{D}_\mu(\mathbb{T}^2)$ of smooth diffeomorphisms of $\mathbb{T}^2$ equipped with the $L^2$ metric admits a well-defined exponential map which is a local $C^1_F$-diffeomorphism at the identity.

**Theorem 1.4.** The Fréchet manifold $\mathcal{A}_{\mu,0}(\mathbb{T}^3)$ of smooth axisymmetric swirl-free diffeomorphisms of $\mathbb{T}^3$ with respect to any of the Killing Fields $K = \partial_i$, equipped with the $L^2$ metric admits a well-defined exponential map which is a local $C^1_F$-diffeomorphism at the identity.

Later sections will provide more precise statements of these results and notations. Theorem 1.4 improves upon a similar result of Omori [26] which is infinitesimal in character. His method involves constructing a connection on the full diffeomorphism group which turns the volume-preserving diffeomorphisms into a totally geodesic submanifold. In the proof of Theorem 1.2 we make use of the recent work of Lichtenfelz, Misiolek and Preston [21] on the Euler equations in 3 dimensions with axisymmetric swirl-free initial data.

Throughout the arguments we will consider multiple configuration spaces: the full diffeomorphism group, the space of volumorphisms and its subspace of axisymmetric diffeomorphisms and the space of symplectomorphisms, all equipped with various right-invariant metrics. In each setting we will consider Sobolev diffeomorphisms of class $H^s$ with varying requirements on the value of $s$ and we may write $\mathcal{G}^s(M)$ to refer to any of the aforementioned spaces. Similarly, we use $\mathcal{G}(M)$ to refer to the corresponding smooth settings.
The paper is organised as follows: Sections 2 & 3 contain the necessary background information for the spaces we will be considering. Section 4 contains the main results. We begin in Section 4.1 with the setting of compressible fluids on $\mathbb{T}^n$, covering the cases solved in [9], [8] and [18]. We then proceed to the Euler equations on $\mathbb{T}^2$ in Section 4.2, where we also cover the cases of the Euler-$\alpha$ and higher order Euler-Arnold equations mentioned above. This is followed by the axisymmetric results for 3D fluids in Sections 4.3.1 & 4.3.2. The final case of the Symplectic Euler equations on $\mathbb{T}^{2k}$ is covered in Section 4.4. In Section 5 we use our results from the Section 4 to construct continuously differentiable exponential maps in the Fréchet settings. Section 6 contains some concluding remarks and a mandate for further related research.

2. Manifold Structure of Sobolev Diffeomorphisms

Here we gather some basic facts about diffeomorphism groups. Further details concerning these spaces can be found in Ebin and Marsden [11], Arnold and Khesin [2], Ebin [10], Omori [27], Misiołek and Preston [25] and Inci, Kappeler and Topalov [16].

2.1. Sobolev Diffeomorphisms. Let $M$ be a compact, $n$-dimensional Riemannian manifold without boundary, with metric $g$ and volume form $\mu$. Let $g^\flat$ and $g^\#$ denote the usual “musical isomorphisms”. We define the Hodge Laplacian on $k$-forms by $\Delta = d\delta + \delta d$, where $d$ is the exterior derivative, $\delta = (-1)^{(n+1)/2} d^* \,* d*$ is its $L^2$ dual, and $*$ is the Hodge Star operator.

We define $H^s(TM)$ to be the space of vector fields on $M$ with $L^2$ derivatives up to order $s$. We equip $H^s(TM)$ with a $H^s$ inner product via:

$$\langle u, v \rangle_s = \sum_{k \leq s} \langle u, (1 - \Delta)^s v \rangle_{L^2}$$

In this paper we will concern ourselves with the case $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, but many of the constructions can be extended to the fractional case.

Recall that if $s > \frac{n}{2}$, then $H^s(M, M)$ is a Hilbert manifold modeled on $H^s(TM)$ equipped with $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_s$. If we further require $s > \frac{n}{2} + 1$, then $\mathcal{D}^s(M)$ inherits a smooth submanifold structure as an open subset of $H^s(M, M)$. Its tangent space at the identity is $T_e \mathcal{D}^s(M) = H^s(TM)$ whose dual enjoys an $L^2$-orthogonal decomposition by the Hodge theorem:

$$H^s(TM) = \mathcal{H} \oplus d\delta H^{s+2}(TM) \oplus \delta d H^{s+2}(TM)$$

where $\mathcal{H}$ denotes the finite dimensional subspace of harmonic one-forms on $M$.

In what follows it will be convenient to define the projections:

$$\pi_0 : T_e \mathcal{D}^s \to d\delta H^{s+2} \oplus \delta d H^{s+2} \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_\mathcal{H} : T_e \mathcal{D}^s \to \mathcal{H}$$

2.2. Volume-Preserving Diffeomorphisms. The volumorphism group is defined in terms of the Riemannian volume form $\mathcal{D}^s(M) = \{ \eta \in \mathcal{D}^s(M) \mid \eta^* \mu = \mu \}$. It is a smooth Hilbert submanifold of $\mathcal{D}^s(M)$ and the tangent space at the identity consists of all divergence-free $H^s$ vector fields $T_e \mathcal{D}^s(M) = \{ u \in T_e \mathcal{D}^s(M) \mid \text{div } u = 0 \} = g^\sharp(\mathcal{H} \oplus d\delta H^{s+2}(TM))$, i.e the first and third summand of the Hodge Decomposition above.
2.3. Axisymmetric Diffeomorphisms. Let $M$ be a 3-dimensional manifold equipped with a smooth Killing field $K$. Following [21] we define a divergence-free vector field $u$ on $M$ to be axisymmetric if it commutes with the Killing field: $[K, u] = 0$. We denote the set of $H^s$ axisymmetric vector fields by $T_e\mathcal{A}^s_u(M)$.

A volume-preserving diffeomorphism of $M$ is said to be axisymmetric if it commutes with the flow of the Killing field $K$. The set of all such $H^s$ volumorphisms, $\mathcal{A}^s_u(M)$ is a topological group as well as a smooth totally geodesic Hilbert submanifold of $\mathcal{D}^s_u(M)$, cf. [21], Section 3.

Axisymmetric fluid flows are of great interest and their behaviour might be informally described as 2\frac{1}{2}-dimensional fluids.

2.4. Symplectomorphisms. Let $M$ be a symplectic manifold of dimension $2k$ and let $\omega^s$ and $\omega^d$ denote the standard “$\omega$-musical isomorphisms”. Analogously to volumorphisms, the symplectomorphism group $\mathcal{D}^s(M)$ is a closed Hilbert submanifold of $\mathcal{D}(M)$ consisting of those diffeomorphisms which preserve the symplectic form $\omega$ under pullback. The tangent space at the identity is $T_e\mathcal{D}^s_u(M) = \{u \in T_e\mathcal{D}^s_u(M) \mid d\omega^s u = 0\} = \omega^d(\mathcal{H} \oplus d\delta H^{s+2}(T^*M))$, cf. [21].

For our purposes we will further require that $g$ and $\omega$ are compatible, that is, the map $J := g^*\omega^d : TM \to TM$ satisfies $J^2 = -Id$. In this case $J$ is said to give $M$ an almost complex structure, cf. [11], [10], [5], [28].

3. Lie Group Structure and Geodesics on Diffeomorphism Groups

Here we develop a Lie group framework for $\mathcal{D}^s(M)$ and its submanifolds of interest. We use this to present geodesic equations on diffeomorphism groups in a general formulation for a variety of metrics. The construction follows closely that of [11] and [25].

Throughout the various arguments in Section 4 we will deal with products of $H^s$ Sobolev functions and compositions with elements of $\mathcal{D}^s(M)$, so it is crucial that we have some control over the regularity of these objects. For this reason we recall the following lemma from [10].

**Lemma 3.1.** For any $s > k + 1$, $|m| \leq s$ and $k \geq 0$ we have:

1. $H^s(M, \mathbb{R}) \times H^m(M, \mathbb{R}) \to H^m(M, \mathbb{R}) ; (u, v) \mapsto uv$ is continuous.

2. $H^{s+k}(M, \mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathcal{D}^s(M) \to H^s(M, \mathbb{R}^d) ; (v, \phi) \mapsto v \circ \phi$ is $C^k$-smooth.

3. $\mathcal{D}^{s+k}(M) \to \mathcal{D}^s(M) ; \phi \mapsto \phi^{-1}$ is $C^k$-smooth.

In particular this gives us that $\mathcal{D}^s(M)$ is a topological group (one can readily show that $\mathcal{A}^s_u(M)$, $\mathcal{A}^s_u(M)$ and $\mathcal{D}^s_u(M)$ are all subgroups), where right translation $R_\eta$ is smooth and left translation $L_\eta$ is continuous (although not even Lipschitz continuous) in the $H^s$ topology.

Again, using $\mathcal{G}^s(M)$ to refer to any of the aforementioned manifolds, we denote the (almost) Lie algebra by $g^s = T_e\mathcal{G}^s(M)$, we recall the group adjoint:

$$\text{Ad}_\eta v = d_{\eta^{-1}}L_{\eta}d_{\eta}R_{\eta^{-1}}v = (D\eta \cdot v) \circ \eta^{-1}$$
and the Lie algebra adjoint:
\[ \text{ad}_u v = \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \text{Ad}_{\eta(t)} v = [u, v] \]
where \( \eta(t) \) is any curve in \( \mathcal{G}^*(M) \) with \( \eta(0) = e \) and \( \dot{\eta}(0) = u \). Observe that if \( u, v \in T_e \mathcal{G}^* \), their commutator is a priori only of Sobolev class \( H^{s-1} \).

**Remark 3.2.** The derivative loss coming from left translation and the Lie bracket are examples of why these diffeomorphism groups are sometimes referred to as “almost” Lie groups.

We now equip \( \mathcal{G}^*(M) \) with a (weak\(^1\)) right-invariant, Riemannian metric \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \). Note that the definitions of \( \text{Ad}_u \) and \( \text{ad}_u \) depend only on the group structure, and not on the choice of the metric. Hence, the geometry is, in some sense, encoded in the coadjoint operators defined as follows:
\[ \langle \text{Ad}_u^* u, v \rangle = \langle u, \text{Ad}_u v \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \text{ad}_u^* v, w \rangle = \langle v, \text{ad}_u w \rangle \]
for all \( u, v, w \in \mathfrak{g}^* \). Throughout this paper \( * \) will always refer to the adjoint of an operator with respect to the relevant metric and configuration space; which should be clear from the context.

We are specifically interested in the case where we equip \( \mathcal{G}^*(M) \) with a right-invariant \( H^r \) metric with \( r \geq 0 \) defined at the identity by:
\[ (u, v)_{H^r} := \langle A^r u, v \rangle_{L^2} \quad u, v \in T_e \mathcal{G}^* \]
where \( A^r \) denotes an invertible elliptic pseudo-differential operator of order \( 2r \); e.g. \( A^r = (1 + g^2 \Delta)^r \), cf. Taylor [33]. We refer to such an \( A^r \) as an *inertia operator*. We will always assume that \( A^r \) commutes with both \( d \) and \( \delta \) and that we have at least \( s > \frac{3}{2} + 2r + 1 \) to guarantee a baseline level of control over the regularity of the vector fields involved in the later calculations. We will use \( *_r \) to denote the adjoint of an operator with respect to such a \( H^r \) metric.

We define a geodesic on \( \langle \mathcal{G}^*(M), \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \rangle \) to be a critical path for the energy functional induced by the metric \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \) and recall two important lemmas pertaining to geodesics on Lie groups with right-invariant metrics:

**Lemma 3.3** (cf. [25] Theorem 3.2). If \( \mathcal{G} \) is a Lie group equipped with a (possibly weak) right-invariant metric \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \), then a curve \( \sigma(t) \) is a geodesic if and only if the curve \( u(t) \) in the Lie algebra given by the flow equation:
\[ \dot{\sigma}(t) = d_e R_{\sigma(t)} u(t) \]
solves the Euler-Arnold equation:
\[ \partial_t u(t) = -\text{ad}_{\sigma(t)}^* u(t) \tag{3.2} \]

and

**Lemma 3.4** (cf. [25] Corollary 3.3). If \( \sigma(t) \) is a curve in \( \mathcal{G} \) with \( u(t) = d_{\sigma(t)} R_{\sigma(t)}^{-1} (\dot{\sigma}(t)) \) satisfying (3.2) with initial conditions \( \sigma(0) = e \) and \( u(0) = u_0 \), then we have the following conservation law:
\[ \text{Ad}_{\sigma(t)}^* u(t) = u_0 \tag{3.3} \]
and hence we can rewrite the flow equation as:
\[ \dot{\sigma}(t) = d_e R_{\sigma(t)} \text{Ad}_{\sigma(t)^{-1}}^* u_0 = d_e L_{\sigma(t)^{-1}}^* u_0 \]

\(^1\)We say a metric on \( \mathcal{G}^* \) is weak if it induces a weaker topology than the inherent \( H^s \) topology.
Remark 3.5. It is important to note at this point that Lemmas 3.3 & 3.4 do not apply seamlessly to our setting of $H^s$ Sobolev diffeomorphism groups. As mentioned earlier, $\mathcal{G}^s(M)$ and its subgroups of interest are not Lie groups, on account of left translation only being continuous, etc. However, in any of the settings we consider in this paper, analogues of (3.2) and (3.3) will hold.

Notable examples of Euler-Arnold equations (3.2) in the setting of diffeomorphism groups include the incompressible Euler equations in two and three dimensions, Burgers’ equation, the Hunter-Saxton equation, the Camassa-Holm equation, the $\mu$CH equation as well as the Euler-$\alpha$ equations and the symplectic Euler equations. The associated Riemannian geometry of these equations as well as the existence of a $C^\infty$ exponential map and its properties has been studied extensively in the literature cf. [11], [27], [30], [12], [29], [25], [9], [8], [18], [10], [20] and many others.

4. Main Results

Let $\mathcal{G}^s$ be a group of diffeomorphisms of $M$ equipped with a (weak) Riemannian metric $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and an associated exponential map where we assume that the results stated in Lemmas 3.3 & 3.4 hold. Our main focus is the following question: if a geodesic $\gamma(t)$ emanating from the identity in $\mathcal{G}^s$ at some later time $t_0 > 0$ passes through $\eta \in \mathcal{G}^{s+k}$, can it be shown that $\gamma(t)$ evolves entirely in $\mathcal{G}^{s+k}$? For our purposes, it will be sufficient to assume that both $t_0 = 1$ and $k = 1$. References for the various commutator estimates involved in the calculations include Kato-Ponce [19] and Taylor [33].

As mentioned in the introduction, previous results in this vein are due to Constantin and Kolev [9], [8] and Kappeler, Loubet and Topalov [18], who worked with compressible equations on the circle and the 2-torus respectively and Bruveris [7]. At the heart of our method lie the various conservation laws motivated by Lemma 3.4.

In this paper we will concern ourselves primarily with the flat case $M = \mathbb{T}^n$. However, many of the constructions can be extended to the setting of curved spaces by collecting any lower order terms arising in the various calculations due to derivatives of the components of the metric and its Christoffel symbols on $M$ into a single term which will be negligible for our purposes.

We begin the groundwork for the main results. We aim to establish an explicit relationship between the regularity of the end configuration $\eta$ and the regularity of the initial velocity $u_0$. To do this we will make use of (3.3), suitably modified to each case considered below.

Lemma 4.1. Let $s > \frac{n}{2} + 3$ and let $\gamma(t)$ be a smooth curve in $\mathcal{G}^s(\mathbb{T}^n)$ with $v(t) = d_{\gamma(t)}R_{\gamma(t)^{-1}}(\dot{\gamma}(t))$, $\gamma(0) = e$ and $\gamma(1) = \eta$. We have the following identity

$$\Delta \eta = D\eta \int_0^1 D\gamma(t)^{-1}(P_\lambda v) \circ \gamma(t) \, dt + G$$

where $G = G(\gamma)$ is of class $H^{s-1}$ and $P_\lambda$ is a differential operator acting component-wise given by:

$$P_\lambda(t) = \lambda - \sum_{i,j=1}^n p_{ij}(t) \partial_i \partial_j \quad \text{with} \quad p_{ij}(t) = (D\gamma D\gamma^{-1})_{ij} \circ \gamma^{-1}(t)$$
with $D\gamma^\top$ denoting the pointwise adjoint of $D\gamma$.

**Proof.** Applying the Laplacian $\Delta$ to the tangent vector to the curve $\gamma(t)$, we get:

$$\Delta \left( \frac{d\gamma}{dt} \right) = \Delta (v \circ \gamma) = (Dv \circ \gamma) \Delta \gamma - \lambda v \circ \gamma + (P_\lambda v) \circ \gamma$$

Rearranging, we get:

\[
\begin{cases}
\frac{d}{dt} (\Delta \gamma) - (Dv \circ \gamma)(\Delta \gamma) = (P_\lambda v) \circ \gamma - \lambda v \circ \gamma \\
\Delta \gamma(0) = 0.
\end{cases}
\] (4.3)

On the other hand, differentiating the flow equation $d\gamma/dt = v \circ \gamma$ in the spatial variables gives:

\[
\begin{cases}
\frac{d}{dt} (D\gamma) - Dv \circ \gamma D\gamma = 0 \\
D\gamma(0) = \text{Id}.
\end{cases}
\] (4.4)

Using (4.4) and the Duhamel formula, we can now rewrite (4.3) as an integral equation in the form:

\[
\Delta \gamma(t) = D\gamma(t) \int_0^t D\gamma(\tau)^{-1} (P_\lambda v) \circ \gamma(\tau) \ d\tau + G(t)
\]

where

$$G(t) = -\lambda D\gamma(t) \int_0^t D\gamma(\tau)^{-1} (v \circ \gamma)(\tau) \ d\tau$$

is a curve in $H^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$. Evaluating at $t = 1$ and denoting $G(1)$ by $G$ we arrive at (4.1). \(\Box\)

Suppose now that $\gamma(t)$ is a geodesic of the metric $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ in $G^s$ with $\gamma(0) = e$ and $\dot{\gamma}(0) = u_0 \in T_e G^s$. Suppose further that at time $t_0 = 1$, $\gamma$ passes through $\eta$. Since $\text{Ad}_{\gamma(t)}^{-1} = D\gamma(t)^{-1}R_{\gamma(t)}$, using the conservation law (3.3) and Lemma 4.1, we may rewrite (4.1) as:

\[
\Delta \eta = D\eta \int_0^1 \text{Ad}_{\gamma(t)}^{-1} P_\lambda(t) \left( \text{Ad}_{\gamma(t)}^{-1} \right)^* u_0 \ dt + G
\]

where $* \text{ denotes the metric adjoint as before.}$

We can see from (4.5) that $P_\lambda$ will play a central role in establishing a relationship between the regularity of $\eta$ and our initial data $u_0$. To this end we establish that it defines a norm equivalent to the $H^1$ norm for sufficiently large $\lambda > 0$.

**Lemma 4.2.** There exists a $\lambda > 0$ such that, for any $t \in [0, 1]$ and $v \in H^1$, the operator $P_\lambda$ satisfies the estimate:

$$\langle P_\lambda(t)v, v \rangle_{L^2} \simeq \|v\|_{H^1}^2.$$  

**Proof.** We first derive an estimate for the coefficients $p_{ij}$. For any $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $t \in [0, 1]$ and $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, we have

\[
\sum_{i,j=1}^n p_{ij}(t)w_i w_j = w^T [D\gamma(t)] [D\gamma(t)^\top] \circ \gamma^{-1}(t) w = |D\gamma(t)^\top \circ \gamma^{-1} w|^2.
\]
As \( s > \frac{n}{2} + 3 \), it follows from a compactness argument and the fact that \( D_\gamma \circ \gamma^{-1} \) is a linear isomorphism of \( \mathbb{R}^n \) for all \( t \in [0, 1] \) that:

\[
(4.6) \quad \sum_{i,j=1}^n p_{ij}(t)w_iw_j \simeq |w|^2
\]

Integrating by parts and using estimate (4.6), we have:

\[
\langle P_\lambda(t)v, v \rangle_{L^2} = \lambda \langle v, v \rangle_{L^2} - \sum_{i,j} \langle p_{ij}(t)\partial_i\partial_j v, v \rangle_{L^2}
\]

\[
= \lambda \|v\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^n} \sum_{i,j} \partial_ip_{ij}(t)\partial_j|v|^2 \, dx + \int_{\mathbb{T}^n} \sum_{i,j} p_{ij}(t)\partial_jv\partial_iv \, dx
\]

\[
= \lambda \|v\|_{L^2}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} \langle \partial_i\partial_j p_{ij}(t)v, v \rangle_{L^2} + \int_{\mathbb{T}^n} \sum_{i,j} p_{ij}(t)\partial_jv\partial_iv \, dx
\]

\[
\geq \lambda \|v\|_{L^2}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} \|\partial_j\partial_ip_{ij}(t)v\|_{L^2} \|v\|_{L^2} + \int_{\mathbb{T}^n} \sum_i |\partial_iv_1|^2 + |\partial_tv_2|^2 \, dx
\]

\[
\geq \|v\|_{H^1}^2,
\]

where the penultimate and last inequalities follow from the uniform boundedness in \( t \in [0, 1] \) of the coefficients \( \partial_i\partial_j p_{ij} \) and taking \( \lambda \) sufficiently large.

On the other hand using (4.6) again we have

\[
\langle P_\lambda(t)v, v \rangle_{L^2} \preceq \lambda \|v\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} \|\partial_j\partial_ip_{ij}(t)v\|_{L^2} \|v\|_{L^2} + \int_{\mathbb{T}^n} \sum_i |\partial_iv_1|^2 + |\partial_tv_2|^2 \, dx
\]

\[
\preceq \|v\|_{H^1}^2.
\]

4.1. Diffeomorphisms of the Flat \( n \)-Torus \( \mathbb{T}^n \). We are now ready to present our first theorem, which generalises to \( n \) dimensions the corresponding results proved in [9], [8] and [18]. Our method follows along the lines of the aforementioned. The main difference is the explicit use of the coadjoint operators and the conservation law \([3,3]\) which shortens the argument.

**Theorem 4.3.** Let \( r \geq 1 \) be an integer, \( s > \frac{n}{2} + 2r + 5 \) and consider the space of orientation preserving diffeomorphisms of \( \mathbb{T}^n \) equipped with a right-invariant \( H^r \) metric \([3,1]\). Given \( u_0 \in T_e\mathcal{D}^s \) let \( \gamma(t) \) denote the corresponding \( H^r \) geodesic. If at time \( t = 1 \), \( \gamma \) passes through a point \( \eta \in \mathcal{D}^{s+1} \), then we have \( u_0 \in T_e\mathcal{D}^{s+1} \) and consequently \( \gamma(t) \) evolves entirely in \( \mathcal{D}^{s+1} \).

Recall from [29], Section 3, that the group coadjoint on \( \mathcal{D}^s(\mathbb{T}^n) \) equipped with a \( H^r \) metric has the form:

\[
\text{Ad}^*_\eta v = A^{-r}\left( \det(D\eta)D\eta^\top(A^rv \circ \eta) \right)
\]

Hence we have the following version of \([3,3]\):

\[
u(t) = (\text{Ad}^{-1}_{\gamma(t)})^* u_0 = A^{-r}R^{-1}_{\gamma(t)}(\det(D\gamma(t))D\gamma(t)^\top)^{-1}A^r u_0 \]

**Remark 4.4.** Later in our argument we will require that, for each \( t \in [0, 1] \), \( (\text{Ad}^{-1}_{\gamma(t)})^* : T_e\mathcal{D}^{s+1} \rightarrow T_e\mathcal{D}^{s+1} \) be a bounded invertible linear operator, so it is at this point that we can explicitly see the necessity of \( r \geq 1 \). A simple derivative count shows...
that $A^r$ must be at least of order 2 to prevent a loss of derivatives coming from the multiplication by the coefficients of the matrix $D\gamma(t)$ which are a priori only of class $H^{s-1}$.

**Proof of Theorem 4.3.** Using (4.5) we have

$$\Delta \eta = D\eta \int_0^1 \text{Ad}_{\gamma(t)}^{-1} P_{\lambda}(t) (\text{Ad}_{\gamma(t)}^{-1})^{*r} u_0 \, dt + G$$

$$= D\eta \int_0^1 \text{Ad}_{\gamma(t)}^{-1} A^{-\hat{z}} P_{\lambda}(t) A\hat{z} (\text{Ad}_{\gamma(t)}^{-1})^{*r} u_0 \, dt$$

$$+ D\eta \int_0^1 \text{Ad}_{\gamma(t)}^{-1} A^{-\hat{z}} [A\hat{z}, P_{\lambda}(t)] (\text{Ad}_{\gamma(t)}^{-1})^{*r} u_0 \, dt + G$$

where again $G$ is of class $H^{s-1}$. Notice now that $[A\hat{z}, P_{\lambda}(t)] = [A\hat{z}, p^{ij}] \partial_i \partial_j$ and, as $p^{ij}$ are of class $H^{s-1}$, we have that $[A\hat{z}, P_{\lambda}(t)] : H^s \to H^{s-r-1}$ by the following Kato-Ponce commutator estimate:

$$\|A\hat{z}(fg) - fA\hat{z}g\|_{H^{s-r-1}} \lesssim \|\nabla f\|_\infty \|g\|_{H^{s-2}} + \|f\|_{H^{s-1}} \|g\|_\infty$$

Hence, the second term belongs to $H^{s-1}$ and we rewrite:

$$\Delta \eta = D\eta \int_0^1 \text{Ad}_{\gamma(t)}^{-1} A^{-\hat{z}} P_{\lambda}(t) A\hat{z} (\text{Ad}_{\gamma(t)}^{-1})^{*r} u_0 \, dt + \tilde{G}$$

where $\tilde{G} := D\eta \int_0^1 \text{Ad}_{\gamma(t)}^{-1} A^{-\hat{z}} [A\hat{z}, P_{\lambda}(t)] (\text{Ad}_{\gamma(t)}^{-1})^{*r} u_0 \, dt + G$ is of class $H^{s-1}$.

Next, we claim that the operator defined by:

$$Mv = \int_0^1 Mv \, dt := \int_0^1 \text{Ad}_{\gamma(t)}^{-1} A^{-\hat{z}} P_{\lambda}(t) A\hat{z} (\text{Ad}_{\gamma(t)}^{-1})^{*r} v \, dt$$

is a linear isomorphism from $H^{s+1}$ to $H^{s-1}$. We can see that, for $r + 1 \leq k \leq s + 1$, $M : H^k \to H^{k-2}$ is a bounded linear operator, as the integrand is a composition of bounded linear operators. Consider the case $k = r + 1$, and define the bilinear form:

$$\Lambda : H^{r+1} \times H^{r+1} \to \mathbb{R}; \quad \Lambda(v, w) = \langle Mv, w \rangle_{H^r}$$

It follows from the boundedness of $M$ that $\Lambda$ is bounded. Furthermore, by Lemma 4.2 we have:

$$\Lambda(v, v) = \int_0^1 \left\langle A^{-\hat{z}} P_{\lambda}(t) A\hat{z} (\text{Ad}_{\gamma(t)}^{-1})^{*r} v , (\text{Ad}_{\gamma(t)}^{-1})^{*r} v \right\rangle_{H^r} \, dt$$

$$= \int_0^1 \left\langle P_{\lambda}(t) A\hat{z} (\text{Ad}_{\gamma(t)}^{-1})^{*r} v , A\hat{z} (\text{Ad}_{\gamma(t)}^{-1})^{*r} v \right\rangle_{L^2} \, dt$$

$$\gtrsim \int_0^1 \left\| A\hat{z} (\text{Ad}_{\gamma(t)}^{-1})^{*r} v \right\|^2_{H^r} \, dt$$

$$\gtrsim \left\| (\text{Ad}_{\gamma(t)}^{-1})^{*r} v \right\|^2_{H^{r+1}}$$

$$\gtrsim \|v\|^2_{H^{r+1}}$$

Hence, by the Lax-Milgram theorem, we have that $M : H^{r+1} \to H^{r-1}$ is a linear isomorphism. We now proceed by induction. Assume $M : H^k \to H^{k-2}$ is a linear
isomorphism for some \( r+1 \leq k \leq s \), and let \( g \in H^{k-1} \). By the induction hypothesis, there exists \( f \in H^k \) such that \( Mf = g \). For \( j = 1, \ldots, n \) consider:
\[
\partial_j f = \partial_j M^{-1} g \\
= M^{-1} \partial_j g + [\partial_j, M^{-1}]g \\
= M^{-1} \partial_j g + M^{-1}[M, \partial_j]M^{-1}g \\
= M^{-1} \partial_j g + M^{-1}[M, \partial_j]f.
\]

By assumption, the first term on the RHS is in \( H^k \). As for the commutator term we have:

**Lemma 4.5.** For \( j = 1, \ldots, n \) and \( r+1 \leq k \leq s \), \( [M, \partial_j] : H^k \to H^{k-2} \).

**Proof.** From (4.9) is suffices to show \([M_\ell, \partial_j] : H^k \to H^{k-2} \), and the lemma follows. First, for an operator \( B \), define \( \tilde{C}_\gamma(B) = R_\gamma BR^{-1}_\gamma \), and its inverse \( \tilde{C}_\gamma(B) = R\gamma_1 BR_\gamma \). Then, using (4.7), the fact that \([A^r, \partial_j] = 0 \) and some standard commutator algebra, we have:
\[
[M_\ell, \partial_j] = [D_\gamma R_\gamma, A^{-\tilde{\gamma}}P_\lambda A^{-\tilde{\gamma}}] (\det (D_\gamma D_\gamma^\top))^{-1} A^r, \partial_j] \\
= [D_\gamma C_\gamma(A^{-\tilde{\gamma}}P_\lambda A^{-\tilde{\gamma}})] (\det (D_\gamma D_\gamma^\top))^{-1} A^r \\
= [D_\gamma C_\gamma(A^{-\tilde{\gamma}}P_\lambda A^{-\tilde{\gamma}})] (\det (D_\gamma D_\gamma^\top))^{-1} A^r \\
+ D_\gamma C_\gamma(A^{-\tilde{\gamma}}P_\lambda A^{-\tilde{\gamma}}) [\det (D_\gamma D_\gamma^\top)] A^r \\
+ D_\gamma C_\gamma(A^{-\tilde{\gamma}}P_\lambda A^{-\tilde{\gamma}}) [\det (D_\gamma D_\gamma^\top)] A^r.
\]

The first and second term mapping to the correct space follows from the fact that, for \( f \in H^{s-1} \), we have \([f, \partial_j] : H^{s-2} \to H^{s-2} \), which is clear. All that remains is to show that \([C_\gamma(A^{-\tilde{\gamma}}P_\lambda A^{-\tilde{\gamma}}), \partial_j] : H^{k-2r} \to H^{k-2} \), which is equivalent to showing \([A^{-\tilde{\gamma}}P_\lambda A^{-\tilde{\gamma}}, C_\gamma(\partial_j)] = [A^{-\tilde{\gamma}}P_\lambda A^{-\tilde{\gamma}}, \partial_j \gamma^k \circ \gamma^{-1} \partial_j] : H^{k-2r} \to H^{k-2} \). Let \( f^k_j = \partial_j \gamma^k \circ \gamma^{-1} \in H^{s-1} \). Now we have:
\[
[A^{-\tilde{\gamma}}P_\lambda A^{-\tilde{\gamma}}, f^k_j \partial_j] = A^{-\tilde{\gamma}} [f^k_j, A^{\tilde{\gamma}}] \partial_j A^{-\tilde{\gamma}} A^{-\tilde{\gamma}} P_\lambda A^{-\tilde{\gamma}} + A^{-\tilde{\gamma}} [P_\lambda, f^k_j \partial_j] A^{-\tilde{\gamma}} \\
+ A^{-\tilde{\gamma}} P_\lambda A^{-\tilde{\gamma}} [f^k_j, A^{\tilde{\gamma}}] \partial_j A^{-\tilde{\gamma}}
\]

and the result follows by observing that:
- \([P_\lambda, f^k_j \partial_j] \) is a 2nd order differential operator with coefficients in \( H^{s-3} \)
- \([f^k_j, A^{\tilde{\gamma}}] : H^{k-3} \to H^{k-r-2} \)
- \([f^k_j, A^{\tilde{\gamma}}] : H^{k-r-1} \to H^{k-2r} \)

where the latter two follow commutator estimates analogous to (4.18).

Hence \( \partial_j f \in H^k \) and by the induction argument \( M : H^{s+1} \to H^{s+1} \) is a linear isomorphism and we have:
\[
\Delta \eta = D_\eta M(u_0) + \tilde{G},
\]
which implies
\[
u_0 = M^{-1}(D_\eta^{-1}(\Delta \eta - \tilde{G})) \in H^{s+1}
\]
and the proof of Theorem (4.3) is complete.
4.2. Volume-Preserving Diffeomorphisms of the Flat 2-Torus $\mathbb{T}^2$. The main result presented in this section is as follows:

**Theorem 4.6.** Let $s > 6$ and consider the group of volume-preserving diffeomorphisms of $\mathbb{T}^2$ equipped with a right-invariant $L^2$ metric. Given $u_0 \in T_e \mathcal{D}^s_\mu$, let $\gamma(t)$ denote the corresponding $L^2$ geodesic. If at time $t = 1$, $\gamma$ passes through a point $\eta \in \mathcal{D}^{s+1} \mu+1$, then we have $u_0 \in T_e \mathcal{D}^{s+1} \mu$ and consequently $\gamma(t)$ evolves entirely in $\mathcal{D}^{s+1} \mu$.

For the proof we make use of the conservation of vorticity in 2D, which takes the form:

$$\text{(4.10)} \quad \text{rot}(u) \circ \gamma = \text{rot}(u_0),$$

where $u$ is the Eulerian velocity of the flow $\gamma$, cf. (3.3). Applying the symplectic gradient $\nabla^\perp := (-\partial_2, \partial_1)$ to both sides of (4.10) we obtain the following conservation law.

$$\text{(4.11)} \quad \Delta u = \text{Ad}_\gamma (\Delta u_0)$$

Now, recall by the Hodge Decomposition Theorem (2.1) that we may decompose the tangent space $T_e \mathcal{D}^s_\mu$ into an $L^2$-orthogonal sum:

$$T_e \mathcal{D}^s_\mu = T_e \mathcal{D}^s_{\mu,ex} \oplus \mathcal{H}$$

where $T_e \mathcal{D}^s_{\mu,ex} = g^t (d\delta H^{s+2}(T^*\mathbb{T}^2))$ is known as the space of exact volume-preserving vector fields and again $\mathcal{H}$ denotes the space of harmonic vector fields. Hence, we can rewrite $u_0 = \nabla^\perp f_0 + h_0$, where $f_0 \in H^{s+1}_0(T^2, \mathbb{R}) := \{ g \in H^{s+1}(T^2, \mathbb{R}) \mid \hat{g}(0) = 0 \}$ and $h_0 \in \mathcal{H}$. So we may reformulate (4.11) as:

**Lemma 4.7.** For $u_0 = \nabla^\perp f_0 + h$, $\gamma$ and $u$ as above, we have:

$$u(t) = \nabla^\perp (\Delta^{-1} R_{\gamma(t)}^{-1} \Delta f_0) + h(t)$$

where $h(t)$ evolves in $\mathcal{H}$ and $\Delta^{-1} : H^{s-1}_0(T^2, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow H^{s+1}_0(T^2, \mathbb{R})$, defined in frequency space by:

$$\Delta^{-1} f(\xi) := \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } \xi = (0,0) \\
\hat{f}(\xi) & \text{if } \xi \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus (0,0) 
\end{cases}$$

is a linear isomorphism.

**Proof.** Using (4.11) we have:

$$\Delta u = \text{Ad}_\gamma (\Delta u_0)$$

$$= \text{Ad}_\gamma (\Delta (\nabla^\perp f_0 + h))$$

$$= \text{Ad}_\gamma (\nabla^\perp \Delta f_0)$$

$$= \nabla^\perp (R_{\gamma}^{-1} \Delta f_0)$$

which, as $\Delta$ acts component-wise on vector fields, immediately yields (4.12). $\square$

Formula (4.12) will be more convenient for our purposes than (4.10).
**Proof of Theorem 4.6.** Using Lemma 4.1 and (4.12) we have:
\[
\Delta \eta = D\eta \int_0^1 D\gamma(t)^{-1} R_{\gamma(t)} \Delta^{-1} \gamma^{-1}(\Delta^{-1} R_{\gamma(t)} \Delta f_0) \, dt + G
\]
\[
= D\eta \int_0^1 D\gamma(t)^{-1} R_{\gamma(t)} \Delta^{-1} \gamma^{-1} D\gamma(t) \nabla^\perp \Delta f_0 \, dt + G
\]
\[
= D\eta \int_0^1 R_{\gamma(t)} \Gamma^{-1}(t) P_{\lambda}(t) \Delta^{-1} \Gamma(t) R_{\gamma(t)}^{-1} \Delta^\perp \Delta f_0 \, dt + G
\]
where \(G\) has absorbed the term \(D\eta \int_0^1 D\gamma(t)^{-1} R_{\gamma(t)} \Delta^{-1} \gamma^{-1} \Omega(\Delta f_0) \, dt\) and is still of class \(H^{s-1}\) and we denote \(\Gamma := D\gamma \circ \gamma^{-1}\) for notational simplicity.

Next, we introduce commutator terms in order to achieve a more advantageous symmetry in the formulas. We recall the Hodge projections:
\[\pi_0 : T_e \mathcal{D}^s \rightarrow T_e \mathcal{D}^s_{\mu,ex} \oplus \nabla H^{s+1}\] and \(\pi_H : T_e \mathcal{D}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{H}\), cf. (2.2) and rewrite:
\[
\Delta \eta = D\eta \int_0^1 R_{\gamma(t)} \Gamma^{-1}(t) P_{\lambda}(t) \Delta^{-1} \Gamma(t) R_{\gamma(t)}^{-1} \nabla^\perp \Delta f_0 \, dt + G
\]
\[
= D\eta \int_0^1 R_{\gamma(t)} \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 P_{\lambda}(t) \Delta^{-1/2} \Gamma(t) R_{\gamma(t)}^{-1} \nabla^\perp \Delta f_0 \, dt + G
\]
\[
= D\eta \int_0^1 R_{\gamma(t)} \Omega(t) R_{\gamma(t)}^{-1} \nabla^\perp \Delta f_0 \, dt + G
\]
where
\[
\Omega(t) = \Gamma^{-1}(t) P_{\lambda}(t) \Delta^{-1} \Gamma(t) - \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 P_{\lambda}(t) \Delta^{-1/2}.
\]
We claim the second integral is of class \(H^{s-1}\) and hence can be absorbed into \(G\).

**Lemma 4.8.** We have \(\Omega : [0, 1] \times H^s_0 \rightarrow H^{s-1}\).

**Proof.** Observe that \(\Gamma(t)\) and its inverse have entries in \(H^{s-1}\). We suppress \(t\) and continue
\[
\Omega = \Gamma^{-1} P_{\lambda} \Delta^{-1} \Gamma - \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 P_{\lambda} \Delta^{-1/2}
\]
\[
= \Gamma^{-1} P_{\lambda} \Delta^{-1} \Gamma - P_{\lambda} \Delta^{-1} + P_{\lambda} \Delta^{-1} - \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 P_{\lambda} \Delta^{-1/2}
\]
\[
= \Gamma^{-1} \left[ P_{\lambda} \Delta^{-1}, \Gamma \right] + \pi_0 P_{\lambda} \Delta^{-1} + \pi_H P_{\lambda} \Delta^{-1} - \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 P_{\lambda} \Delta^{-1/2}
\]
As \(\pi_0 = \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 \Delta^{1/2}\), we have:
\[
\Omega = \Gamma^{-1} \left[ P_{\lambda} \Delta^{-1}, \Gamma \right] + \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 \Delta^{1/2} P_{\lambda} \Delta^{-1} - \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 P_{\lambda} \Delta^{-1/2} + \pi_H P_{\lambda} \Delta^{-1}
\]
\[
= \Gamma^{-1} \left[ P_{\lambda} \Delta^{-1}, \Gamma \right] + \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 \left[ \Delta^{1/2}, P_{\lambda} \Delta^{-1} \right] + \pi_H P_{\lambda} \Delta^{-1}
\]
Examining the terms separately we have:
\[
\left[ P_{\lambda} \Delta^{-1}, \Gamma \right] = \lambda \left[ \Delta^{-1}, \Gamma \right] - [p^{ij} \partial_i \partial_j \Delta^{-1}, \Gamma]
\]
\[
= \lambda \left[ \Delta^{-1}, \Gamma \right] - [p^{ij} \Delta^{-1} \partial_i \partial_j, \Gamma]
\]
\[
= \lambda \left[ \Delta^{-1}, \Gamma \right] - p^{ij} \Delta^{-1} \partial_i \partial_j \Gamma + \Gamma p^{ij} \Delta^{-1} \partial_i \partial_j
\]
Commuting \( p^{ij} \) with \( \Gamma \) and introducing commutator terms, we have:

\[
[P_{\lambda} \Delta^{-1}, \Gamma] = \lambda [\Delta^{-1}, \Gamma] - p^{ij} \Delta^{-1} \partial_i \partial_j \Gamma + p^{ij} \Gamma \Delta^{-1} \partial_i \partial_j
\]

\[
= \lambda [\Delta^{-1}, \Gamma] - p^{ij} \Delta^{-1} \partial_i \partial_j \Gamma + p^{ij} \Delta^{-1} \Gamma \partial_i \partial_j - p^{ij} \Delta^{-1} \Gamma \partial_i \partial_j + p^{ij} \Gamma \Delta^{-1} \partial_i \partial_j
\]

\[
= \lambda \Delta^{-1} \Gamma \Delta^{-1} - p^{ij} \Delta^{-1} \partial_i \partial_j \Gamma - p^{ij} \Delta^{-1} \Gamma \partial_i \partial_j
\]

We can see by direct calculation of \([\Gamma, \Delta]\) and \([\partial_i \partial_j, \Gamma]\) that these terms map \( H^{s-2} \) to \( H^{s-3} \). As for the second term we have

\[
[\Delta^{\frac{1}{2}}, P_{\lambda}] = [\Delta^{\frac{1}{2}}, p^{ij}] \partial_i \partial_j
\]

and, as \( p^{ij} \) are of class \( H^{s-1} \), the fact that this maps \( H^{s} \) to \( H^{s-2} \) is a consequence of the following Kato-Ponce [19] commutator estimate:

\[
(4.13) \quad \left\| \frac{1}{2} \Delta f g - f \Delta \frac{1}{2} g \right\|_{H^{s-2}} \lesssim \left\| \nabla f \right\|_{\infty} \left\| g \right\|_{H^{s-1}} + \left\| f \right\|_{H^{s-1}} \left\| g \right\|_{\infty}
\]

Lastly, observe that the term \( \pi_{\mathcal{H}} P_{\lambda} \Delta^{-1} \) maps \( H^{s-2} \to C^{\infty} \).

Returning to the proof of Theorem 4.6 we have

\[
(4.14) \quad \Delta \eta = D \eta \int_{0}^{1} R_{\gamma(t)} \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_{0} P_{\lambda}(t) \Delta^{-1/2} R_{\gamma(t)}^{-1} \left( \nabla^{\perp} \Delta f_{0} \right) dt + \tilde{G}
\]

where now \( \tilde{G} = G + D \eta \int_{0}^{1} R_{\gamma(t)} \Omega(t) R_{\gamma(t)}^{-1} \left( \nabla^{\perp} \Delta f_{0} \right) dt \) evolves in \( H^{s-1} \).

Next, as before, we consider the linear operator defined by:

\[
(4.15) \quad Mv = \int_{0}^{1} M_{t} v \ dt := \int_{0}^{1} R_{\gamma(t)} \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_{0} P_{\lambda}(t) \Delta^{-1/2} R_{\gamma(t)}^{-1} v \ dt
\]

The boundedness of \( M \) on \( H_{0}^{k} \) for \( 0 \leq k \leq s-1 \) follows from the uniform boundedness in \( t \in [0,1] \) of the operators comprising the integrand \( M_{t} \).

**Remark 4.9.** Equation (4.14) says:

\[
(4.16) \quad M(\nabla^{\perp} \Delta f_{0}) = D \eta^{-1} (\Delta \eta - \tilde{G}) \in H^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}^{2}, \mathbb{R}^{2})
\]

Our next lemma follows from deriving an elliptic estimate for \( M \).

**Lemma 4.10.** For \( 0 \leq k \leq s-1 \), if \( Mv \in H^{k} \), then \( v \in H_{0}^{k} \).

**Proof.** For \( k = 0 \) we have from Lemma 3.1 and the \( L^{2} \)-orthogonality in the Hodge decomposition (2.1) that:

\[
\| Mv \|_{L^{2}} \| v \|_{L^{2}} \geq \left| \langle Mv, v \rangle_{L^{2}} \right|
\]

\[
= \left| \int_{0}^{1} \langle \pi_{0} P_{\lambda}(t) \Delta^{-1/2} R_{\gamma(t)}^{-1} v, \Delta^{-1/2} R_{\gamma(t)}^{-1} v \rangle_{L^{2}} dt \right|
\]

\[
\geq \left| \int_{0}^{1} \left\| \Delta^{-1/2} R_{\gamma(t)}^{-1} v \right\|_{H^{1}}^{2} dt \right|
\]

\[
\simeq \| v \|^{2}_{L^{2}}
\]

From which it follows that if \( Mv \in L^{2} \), then \( v \in L^{2} \).

Now assume the lemma holds for some \( k \) with \( 0 \leq k \leq s-2 \) and \( Mv \in H^{k+1} \).

By the inductive hypothesis, \( v \in H_{0}^{k} \). Furthermore, for \( j = 1, 2 \) we have:

\[
M \partial_{j} v = \partial_{j} M v + [M, \partial_{j}] v
\]
By assumption, \( \partial_j M v \in H^k \). As for the other term:

**Lemma 4.11.** For \( 0 \leq k \leq s - 2 \), we have \( [M, \partial_j] : H^k_0 \to H^k_0 \)

*Proof.* We show the statement holds for the commutator \([M, \partial_j]\) involving the integrand and the lemma follows. We have:

\[
[M, \partial_j] = C_\gamma \left( \left[ \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 P_\lambda \Delta^{-1/2}, \tilde{C}_\gamma (\partial_j) \right] \right)
\]

where again \( C_\gamma (B) := R_\gamma BR_\gamma^{-1} \) and \( \tilde{C}_\gamma (B) := R_\gamma^{-1} BR_\gamma \). Examining the term inside the conjugation above, we have:

\[
\left[ \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 P_\lambda \Delta^{-1/2}, \tilde{C}_\gamma (\partial_j) \right] = \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 P_\lambda \Delta^{-1/2} \tilde{C}_\gamma (\partial_j) - \bar{C}_\gamma (\partial_j) \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 P_\lambda \Delta^{-1/2} \\
= \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 P_\lambda \Delta^{-1/2} \bar{C}_\gamma (\partial_j) - \bar{C}_\gamma (\partial_j) \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 P_\lambda \Delta^{-1/2} \\
+ \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 P_\lambda \tilde{C}_\gamma (\partial_j) \Delta^{-1/2} - \bar{C}_\gamma (\partial_j) \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 P_\lambda \Delta^{-1/2} \\
= \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 P_\lambda \left[ \Delta^{-1/2}, \bar{C}_\gamma (\partial_j) \right] + \left[ \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 P_\lambda, \tilde{C}_\gamma (\partial_j) \right] \Delta^{-1/2} \\
= \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 P_\lambda \Delta^{-1/2} \left[ \bar{C}_\gamma (\partial_j), \Delta^{-1/2} \right] + \left[ \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 P_\lambda, \tilde{C}_\gamma (\partial_j) \right] \Delta^{-1/2}
\]

Notice that the term

\[
\left[ \bar{C}_\gamma (\partial_j), \Delta^{-1/2} \right] = [\partial_j \gamma^k, \gamma^k, \Delta^{-1/2} ] = [\partial_j \gamma^k, \Delta^{-1/2} ] \partial_k
\]

maps \( H^{s-1}_0 \to H^{s-2}_0 \). As for the second term:

\[
\left[ \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 P_\lambda, \tilde{C}_\gamma (\partial_j) \right] = \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 P_\lambda \Delta^{-1/2} \bar{C}_\gamma (\partial_j) - \bar{C}_\gamma (\partial_j) \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 P_\lambda \\
= \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 P_\lambda \Delta^{-1/2} \bar{C}_\gamma (\partial_j) - \bar{C}_\gamma (\partial_j) \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 P_\lambda \\
+ \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 \bar{C}_\gamma (\partial_j) P_\lambda - \bar{C}_\gamma (\partial_j) \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 P_\lambda \\
= \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 \left[ P_\lambda, \bar{C}_\gamma (\partial_j) \right] + \left[ \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0, \tilde{C}_\gamma (\partial_j) \right] P_\lambda
\]

The commutator term \( \left[ P_\lambda, \tilde{C}_\gamma (\partial_j) \right] \) can be explicitly calculated to be a second order operator with \( H^{s-3} \) coefficients. As for the second term we compute:

\[
\left[ \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0, \bar{C}_\gamma (\partial_j) \right] = \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 \bar{C}_\gamma (\partial_j) - \bar{C}_\gamma (\partial_j) \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 \\
= \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 \bar{C}_\gamma (\partial_j) (\pi_0 + \pi_\mathcal{H}) - \bar{C}_\gamma (\partial_j) \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0
\]

To proceed we introduce the identity on \( H^k_0 \) as \( \Delta^{1/2} \Delta^{-1/2} \) into the term involving the projection \( \pi_0 \). So we have:

\[
\left[ \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0, \tilde{C}_\gamma (\partial_j) \right] = \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 \bar{C}_\gamma (\partial_j) \Delta^{1/2} \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 - \bar{C}_\gamma (\partial_j) \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 \\
+ \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 \bar{C}_\gamma (\partial_j) \pi_\mathcal{H} \\
= \Delta^{-1/2} \left[ \bar{C}_\gamma (\partial_j), \Delta^{1/2} \right] \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 + \Delta^{-1/2} \pi_0 \bar{C}_\gamma (\partial_j) \pi_\mathcal{H}
\]

As before \( \left[ \bar{C}_\gamma (\partial_j), \Delta^{1/2} \right] : H^{s-2}_0 \to H^{s-3}_0 \), and we have \([M, \partial_j] : H^k_0 \to H^k_0\) for \( 0 \leq k \leq s - 2 \).

Hence, \( M \partial_j v \in H^k \). So by the inductive hypothesis we have \( \partial_j v \in H^k_0 \) which gives us \( v \in H^{k+1}_0 \). Therefore, we have that, for \( 0 \leq k \leq s - 1 \), if \( M v \in H^k \), then \( v \in H^k_0 \).
Returning to the proof of Theorem 4.6, since (4.16) says \(M(\nabla \perp \Delta f_0) \in H^{s-1}\) we have
\[
\nabla \perp \Delta f_0 \in H^{s-1}
\]
which implies that
\[
\nabla \perp f_0 \in H^{s+1}
\]
which finally gives us that \(u_0 \in H^{s+1}\).

4.2.1. Higher Order Euler-Arnold Equations. In this section we equip the group of volumorphisms with a right-invariant \(H^r\) metric (3.1) induced by the interia operator \(A^r\), for integer \(r \geq 1\), then (3.2) becomes:

\[
(4.17) \quad \begin{cases}
\partial_t A^r u + \nabla_u A^r u + (\nabla u)^\top A^r u = -\nabla p \\
\text{div}(u) = 0
\end{cases}
\]

The main result in this section is as follows:

**Theorem 4.12.** Let \(r \geq 1\) be an integer, \(s > 2r + 6\) and consider the group of volume-preserving diffeomorphisms of \(T^2\) equipped with a right-invariant \(H^r\) metric (3.1). Given \(u_0 \in T_e D_s\) let \(\gamma(t)\) denote the corresponding \(H^r\) geodesic. If at time \(t = 1\), \(\gamma\) passes through a point \(\eta \in D_s^{s+1}\), then we have \(u_0 \in T_e D_s^{s+1}\) and consequently \(\gamma(t)\) evolves entirely in \(D_s^{s+1}\).

Taking the curl of both sides of (4.17), we acquire a “conservation of vorticity”-type equation in this context.

\[
(4.18) \quad \text{rot}(A^r u) \circ \gamma = \text{rot}(A^r u_0)
\]

This allows us to derive an analogous conservation law to (4.12).

**Lemma 4.13.** For \(u_0 = \nabla \perp f_0 + h\), \(\gamma\) and \(u\) as above, we have:

\[
(4.19) \quad u(t) = \nabla \perp (\Delta^{-1} A^{-r} R_{\gamma(t)}^{-1} A^r \Delta f_0) + h(t)
\]

where \(h(t)\) evolves in \(\mathcal{H}\).

**Proof.** Again, as in the \(L^2\) setting, applying the symplectic gradient \(\nabla \perp := (-\partial_2, \partial_1)\) to both sides of (4.18) gives us:

\[
A^r \Delta u = \text{Ad}_\gamma A^r u_0
\]

Which immediately yields (4.19).

**Proof of Theorem 4.12** Using Lemma 4.1 and (4.19), this follows from a completely analogous argument as in Theorem 4.6.

**Remark 4.14.** If we define \(A = 1 - \alpha^2 \Delta\), the above theorem covers the case of the Euler-\(\alpha\) equations studied in [15] and [29].
4.3. Swirl-Free Axisymmetric Diffeomorphisms.

4.3.1. The Case of the Flat 3-Torus $T^3$. In this section we consider the group of axisymmetric diffeomorphisms of the flat periodic box $T^3$, equipped with any of the Killing fields $K = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^0}$ and a certain subclass of swirl-free initial data.

Given an axisymmetric vector field $v$, we define its swirl to be the function $g(v, K)$ on $T^3$. A vector field is called swirl-free if this function identically vanishes. In our argument for this section, the swirl-free condition will deliver a conservation law which will play the same role that conservation of vorticity did in the previous section. It is shown in [21] that the swirl of an axisymmetric velocity field is transported by its flow. More precisely, if $u_0 \in T_e \mathcal{A}^s_{\mu,0}$ and $\gamma(t)$ is the corresponding geodesic in $\mathcal{A}^s_{\mu}$ then $g(u, K) \circ \gamma(t) = g(u_0, K)$ as long as it is defined. We denote the space of swirl-free axisymmetric vector fields by $T_e \mathcal{A}^s_{\mu,0}$. The proof of the following lemma can be found in [21].

**Lemma 4.15.** Let $K$ be any of the Killing fields $\partial_3$. Then:

1. If $v \in T_e \mathcal{A}^{s+1}_{\mu,0}$, then $\text{curl} v = \phi K$, where $\phi$ is a function of class $H^s$.
2. If $u_0 \in T_e \mathcal{A}^s_{\mu,0}$ and $u(t)$ is the corresponding solution of the Euler equations \[1.1\], then, by (i), we can write $\text{curl} u_0 = \phi_0 K$ and $\text{curl} u(t, x) = \phi(t, x) K(x)$. The function $\phi$ is transported along the flow lines: $\phi(t, \gamma(t)) = \phi_0(x)$.
3. If $u_0 \in T_e \mathcal{A}^s_{\mu,0}$ then the corresponding solution $u(t)$ of the Euler equations \[1.1\] can be extended globally in time.
4. If $u_0$ and $u(t)$ are as above, and $\gamma(t) \in \mathcal{A}^s_{\mu,0}$ is the flow of $u(t)$, then $K$ is preserved by the adjoint: $\text{Ad}_{\gamma(t)} K = K$.
5. For $v \in T_p T^3$ with $g(v, K(p)) = 0$, we have $g(D\gamma(t) v, K(\gamma(t, p))) = 0$

We now proceed to the main result for this section:

**Theorem 4.16.** Let $s > \frac{15}{2}$ and consider the group of axisymmetric diffeomorphisms of $T^3$ with respect to any of the Killing fields $K = \partial_3$, equipped with a right invariant $L^2$ metric. Given $u_0 \in T_e \mathcal{A}^s_{\mu,0}$ let $\gamma(t)$ denote the corresponding $L^2$ geodesic. If at time $t = 1$, $\gamma$ passes through a point $\eta \in \mathcal{A}^{s+1}_{\mu}$, then we have $u_0 \in T_e \mathcal{A}^{s+1}_{\mu,0}$ and consequently $\gamma(t)$ evolves entirely in $\mathcal{A}^{s+1}_{\mu,0}$.

Without loss of generality, we will assume, for the duration of the section, that $K = \partial_3$. So, if we assume a vector field is axisymmetric and swirl-free, this is now equivalent to saying $v = v_1 \partial_1 + v_2 \partial_2$, where $\partial_3 v_1 = \partial_3 v_2 = 0$. Proceeding as before we establish a conservation law:

**Lemma 4.17.** Let $u(t)$ be the Eulerian velocity of the flow $\gamma(t)$. Then we have:

\[\Delta u(t) = \text{Ad}_{\gamma(t)} \Delta u_0.\]

**Proof.** As $u(t)$ evolves in $T_e \mathcal{A}^s_{\mu,0}$, we may write $u(t) = u_1(t) \partial_1 + u_2(t) \partial_2$, where $\partial_3 u_1(t) = \partial_3 u_2(t) = 0$. Hence by taking the curl we have:

$\text{curl} u(t) = (- \partial_2 u_1(t) + \partial_1 u_2(t)) \partial_3$.

Comparing this with Lemma 4.15 we see $\phi = -\partial_2 u_1(t) + \partial_1 u_2(t)$ and thus, as $\phi$ is preserved along the flow lines ($\phi \circ \gamma = \phi_0$), we have as in 2D:

\[(- \partial_2 u_1(t) + \partial_1 u_2(t)) \circ \gamma = -\partial_2 u_{0,1}(t) + \partial_1 u_{0,2}(t).\]
Since
\[ \Delta u_0 = \Delta u_{0,1} \partial_1 + \Delta u_{0,2} \partial_2, \]
\[ \Delta u(t) = \Delta u_1(t) \partial_1 + \Delta u_2(t) \partial_2, \]
and
\[ D\gamma(t) = \begin{bmatrix} \partial_1 \gamma_1 & \partial_2 \gamma_1 & 0 \\ \partial_1 \gamma_2 & \partial_2 \gamma_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \]
the lemma follows in an identical fashion to the computation for (4.11).

We proceed with the proof of Theorem 4.16.

**Proof of Theorem 4.16** Using (4.11) and (4.20), this follows from a completely analogous argument as in Theorem 4.6.

### 4.3.2. The Case of the Round 3-Sphere \( S^3 \)

In this section we consider the group of axisymmetric diffeomorphisms of the three sphere \( S^3 \) equipped with the round metric. We begin by describing some basic aspects of the structure of Killing fields on \( S^3 \). The space of Quaternions \( \mathbb{H} = \{ p = p_1 + p_2 i + p_3 j + p_4 k \mid p_i \in \mathbb{R} \} \) identified with \( \mathbb{R}^4 \) when equipped with Quaternion multiplication:

\[ p \ast q = (p_1 q_1 - p_2 q_2 - p_3 q_3 - p_4 q_4) + (p_1 q_2 + p_2 q_1 + p_3 q_4 - p_4 q_3)i \]
\[ + (p_1 q_3 - p_2 q_4 + p_3 q_1 + p_4 q_2)j + (p_1 q_4 + p_2 q_3 - p_3 q_2 + p_4 q_1)k \]

and the standard Euclidean metric is a Lie group with identity element 1.

We compute the derivatives of right and left translations to be:

\[ d_p R_q(v) = (v_1 q_1 - v_2 q_2 - v_3 q_3 - v_4 q_4) + (v_1 q_2 + v_2 q_1 + v_3 q_4 - v_4 q_3)i \]
\[ + (v_1 q_3 - v_2 q_4 + v_3 q_1 + v_4 q_2)j + (v_1 q_4 + v_2 q_3 - v_3 q_2 + v_4 q_1)k \]

and

\[ d_p L_q(w) = (q_1 w_1 - q_2 w_2 - q_3 w_3 - q_4 w_4) + (q_1 w_2 + q_2 w_1 + q_3 w_4 - q_4 w_3)i \]
\[ + (q_1 w_3 - q_2 w_4 + q_3 w_1 + q_4 w_2)j + (q_1 w_4 + q_2 w_3 - q_3 w_2 + q_4 w_1)k \]

Letting \( \overline{q} = q_1 - q_2 i - q_3 j - q_4 k \), denoting by \( \pi_1 : \mathbb{H} \to \mathbb{R} \) the projection \( \pi_1(q) = q_1 \) and identifying \( \mathbb{H} \) with its tangent space, we have the following readily verifiable facts:

1. \( \langle p, q \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^4} = \pi_1(p \ast \overline{q}) = \pi_1(\overline{p} \ast q) \)
2. \( p \ast \overline{p} = p_1^2 + p_2^2 + p_3^2 + p_4^2 \)
3. \( p^{-1} = \frac{\overline{p}}{|p|^2} \)
4. \( \overline{p} \ast q = \overline{q} \ast p \)
5. \( |p \ast q|^2 = |p \ast q \ast \overline{p} \ast \overline{q}| = |p \ast q \ast \overline{w} \ast \overline{q}| = |p|^2 |q|^2 \)
6. \( \langle d_p R_q(v), d_p R_q(w) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^4} = \pi_1(v \ast q \ast \overline{w} \ast \overline{q}) = |q|^2 \pi_1(v \ast \overline{w}) = |q|^2 \langle v, w \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^4} \)
7. \( \langle d_p L_q(v), d_p L_q(w) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^4} = \pi_1(\overline{q} \ast \overline{v} \ast q \ast w) = |q|^2 \pi_1(\overline{v} \ast w) = |q|^2 \langle v, w \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^4} \)
Thinking of $S^3$ as the submanifold of unit Quaternions, we see from the above that $S^3$ with the round metric is a Lie group whose metric is bi-invariant w.r.t. the group action. Hence, we may use the group structure to generate Killing fields from the canonical basis for the Lie algebra:

1. $d_1R_s(i) = -x_2 + x_1i - x_4j + x_3k$
2. $d_1R_s(j) = -x_3 + x_4i + x_1j - x_2k$
3. $d_1R_s(k) = -x_4 - x_3i + x_2j + x_1k$
4. $d_1L_x(i) = -x_2 + x_1i + x_4j - x_3k$
5. $d_1L_x(j) = -x_3 - x_4i + x_1j + x_2k$
6. $d_1L_x(k) = -x_4 + x_3i - x_2j + x_1k$

It is clear that these are linearly independent as vector fields on $S^3$. Recall now that the dimension of the space of Killing fields on a Riemannian manifold of dimension $n$ is at most $\frac{n(n+1)}{2}$. Hence the space of Killing fields on $S^3$ is a 6 dimensional vector space and the above fields form a basis. We now proceed to the main result for this section:

**Theorem 4.18.** Let $s > \frac{12}{7}$ and consider the group of axisymmetric diffeomorphisms of $S^3$ with respect to any of the Killing fields above, equipped with a right invariant $L^2$ metric. Given $u_0 \in T_e\mathcal{A}_{\mu,0}^s$ let $\gamma(t)$ denote the corresponding $L^2$ geodesic. If at time $t = 1$, $\gamma$ passes through a point $\eta \in \mathcal{A}_{\mu,0}^{s+1}$, then we have $u_0 \in T_e\mathcal{A}_{\mu,0}^{s+1}$ and consequently $\gamma(t)$ evolves entirely in $\mathcal{A}_{\mu,0}^{s+1}$.

Without loss of generality, we will assume for the remainder of the section that $K = d_1R_x(i)$. Letting $E_1 = d_1R_x(j)$ and $E_2 = d_1R_x(k)$. It is easily verifiable that these form a global orthonormal frame for vector fields on $S^3$ such that:

1. $[E_1, E_2] = [E_1, K] = [E_2, K] = 0$
2. $E_1 \times E_2 = K$  \hspace{1cm} $E_1 \times K = -E_2$  \hspace{1cm} $E_2 \times K = E_1$ (up to a sign)

So, if we assume a vector field is axisymmetric and swirl-free, this is now equivalent to saying $v = v_1E_1 + v_2E_2$, where $Kv_1 = Kv_2 = 0$. Armed with this basis frame we can, in an analogous fashion to what was done for Section 4.2, establish the following lemmas:

**Lemma 4.19.** Let $s > \frac{2}{7}$ and let $\gamma(t)$ be a smooth curve in $\mathcal{A}_{\mu,0}^s$ with $v(t) = d_\gamma(t)R_{\gamma(t)}^{-1}(\dot{\gamma}(t))$, $\gamma(0) = e$ and $\gamma(1) = \eta$. We have the following identity

$$\Delta \eta = D\eta \int_0^1 D\gamma(t)^{-1}(P_\lambda) \circ \gamma(t) \, dt + G$$

where $G = G(\gamma)$ is of class $H^{s-1}$ and $P_\lambda$ is a differential operator acting, in our global frame, component wise given by:

$$P_\lambda(t) = \lambda - \sum_{i,j=1}^n p_{ij}(t)E_iE_j \hspace{1cm} with \hspace{1cm} p_{ij}(t) = (D\gamma D\gamma^\top)_{ij} \circ \gamma^{-1}(t)$$

with $D\gamma^\top$ denoting the pointwise adjoint of $D\gamma$. 


Lemma 4.20. There exists a $\lambda > 0$ such that, for any $t \in [0, 1]$ and $v \in H^1$ such that the operator $P_{\lambda}$ satisfies the estimate:

$$\langle P_{\lambda}(t)v, v \rangle_{L^2} \simeq \|v\|^2_{H^1}$$

and

Lemma 4.21. Let $u(t)$ be the Eulerian velocity of the flow $\gamma(t)$. Then we have:

$$(4.24) \quad \Delta u(t) = \text{Ad}_{\gamma(t)} \Delta u_0.$$  

For more details on the proofs of these lemmas, cf. [14].

We proceed with the proof of Theorem 4.18:

Proof of Theorem 4.18. Using (4.22) and (4.24), this follows from an analogous argument as in Theorem 4.6. $\Box$

4.4. Symplectomorphisms of the Flat Torus $T^2_k$. In this section we consider the group of symplectomorphisms of the torus $T^2_k$, equipped with the standard symplectic form $\omega$. The main result presented in this section is

Theorem 4.22. Let $s > k + 5$ and consider the group of symplectomorphisms of $T^2_k$ equipped with a right-invariant $L^2$ metric. Given $u_0 \in T_\epsilon \mathcal{G}_s^*$ let $\gamma(t)$ denote the corresponding $L^2$ geodesic. If at time $t = 1$, $\gamma$ passes through a point $\eta \in \mathcal{G}_s^{s+1}$, then we have $u_0 \in T_\epsilon \mathcal{G}_s^{s+1}$ and consequently $\gamma(t)$ evolves entirely in $\mathcal{G}_s^{s+1}$.

As before we begin with a consequence of (4.3) and establish a new conservation law from it. The following can be found in [10].

$$(4.25) \quad \gamma^* \delta \omega^\flat u = \delta \omega^\flat u_0$$

Using this we obtain:

Proposition 4.23.

$$(4.26) \quad \Delta u = \text{Ad}_\eta \Delta u_0$$

Proof. Applying $g^d$ to both sides of (4.25):

$$g^d \eta^* (\Delta \omega^\flat u) = g^d \Delta \omega^\flat u_0$$

$$\Rightarrow D\eta^\top g^d \omega^\flat (\Delta u \circ \eta) = g^d \omega^\flat \Delta u_0$$

$$\Rightarrow D\eta^\top J(\Delta u \circ \eta) = J\Delta u_0$$

$$\Rightarrow \Delta u = R_\eta^{-1} J^{-1} (D\eta^\top)^{-1} J\Delta u_0$$

$$= R_\eta^{-1} D\eta \Delta u_0$$

$$= \text{Ad}_\eta \Delta u_0$$

Where, in the penultimate line, we have used the fact that $D_\eta$ is a symplectic matrix. $\Box$

Proof of Theorem 4.22. This follows in a completely analogous fashion to the proof of Theorem 4.6, using the above conservation law (4.25). $\Box$
5. The Frechét Setting

As mentioned in the introduction, to the best of the author’s knowledge, the earliest investigations into the kind of regularity property considered in this paper are due to Constantin & Kolev [9, 8] and Kappeler, Loubet & Topalov [17, 18]. In each instance, the authors used this property to construct exponential maps which were local \( C^1 \)-diffeomorphisms in the Frechét category. We obtain analogous results here for the settings we have considered. As in the above, we make use of a Nash-Moser-type inverse function theorem for Frechét spaces admitting Hilbert approximations cf. [13 & 18, Theorem A.5]. First we recall some basic definitions.

Let \( X \) and \( Y \) be Frechét spaces with \( U \subseteq X \) and \( V \subseteq Y \) open subsets. We say \( f : U \to Y \) is differentiable at \( u \in U \) in the direction \( x \in X \) if the limit
\[
\delta_u f(x) := \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{f(u + \varepsilon x) - f(u)}{\varepsilon}
\]
converges in \( Y \) with respect to the Frechét topology. If \( \delta_u f(x) \) exists for all \((u, x) \in U \times X\) and the map given by
\[
\delta f : U \times X \to Y,
\]
\[
\delta f(u, x) = \delta_u f(x)
\]
is continuous with respect to the Frechét topologies on \( U \times X \) and \( Y \), then \( f \) is said to be continuously differentiable or \( C^1 \). A map \( f : U \to V \) is called a \( C^1 \)-diffeomorphism if it is a homeomorphism where both \( f \) and \( f^{-1} \) are \( C^1 \). We now state our version of the inverse function theorem:

**Lemma 5.1.** Let \( s_0 > \frac{n}{2} + 1 \) and assume we have a well-defined exponential map on \( (\mathcal{G}^{s_0}, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle) \):
\[
\exp^{s_0} : U^0 \to V^0
\]
which is a \( C^1 \)-diffeomorphism, where \( U^0 \) is a neighbourhood of \( 0 \in T_e \mathcal{G}^{s_0} \) and \( V^0 \) is a neighbourhood of \( e \in \mathcal{G}^{s_0} \), lying in the image of one of our chart maps for \( \mathcal{G}^{s_0} \). Define, for any \( k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, s_k := s_0 + k \), \( U^k := U^0 \cap T_e \mathcal{G}^{s_0+k}, U := U^0 \cap T_e \mathcal{G}, V^k := V^0 \cap \mathcal{G}^{s_0+k}, V := V^0 \cap \mathcal{G} \) and \( \exp^k := \exp^{s_0} |_{U^k} \). If, for all \( k \), the following properties hold:

1. \( \exp^k : U^k \to V^k \) is a bijective \( C^1 \)-map;
2. For any \( u \in U \), \( d_u \exp^s : T_u \mathcal{G}^{s_0} \to \exp^0(u) \mathcal{G}^{s_0} \) is a linear isomorphism with the property that
\[
d_u \exp^s(T_e \mathcal{G}^{s_k} \setminus T_e \mathcal{G}^{s_{k+1}}) \subseteq \exp^0(u) \mathcal{G}^{s_k} \setminus \exp^0(u) \mathcal{G}^{s_{k+1}}.
\]

Then \( \exp := \exp^{s_0} |_U : U \to V \) is a \( C^1 \)-diffeomorphism.

**Proof.** By (1), \( \exp : U \to V \) is a well-defined bijection. Examining the derivatives, we note that, for any \( u \in U \), \( d_u \exp^s = d_u \exp^{s_0} \big|_{T_u \mathcal{G}^{s_k}} \). Hence, by our assumptions, the map \( d_u \exp^k : T_e \mathcal{G}^{s_k} \to \exp^0(u) \mathcal{G}^{s_k} \) is a bounded linear bijection in the \( H^{s_k} \) topologies and hence, by the open mapping theorem, is a linear isomorphism. Now, as \( U \) is a dense subset of each \( U^k \) in the \( H^{s_k} \) topology, by applying the inverse function theorem at each point \( u \in U \), we have \( \exp^{s_k-1} : V^k \to U^k \) is a \( C^1 \) map in the \( H^{s_k} \) topologies.

\[\text{It is important to note that this notion of continuously differentiable is weaker than the standard definition, cf. [13, Page 73]}\]
Hence, Theorem 5.2.

Proof of Theorem 5.3. This case is not a new result, cf. [26], however we have used a different method.

Next, from [12], we know that \( \exp : T_e G \to T V \) is continuous in the Frechet topology.

Hence, \( \exp : U \to V \) is a \( C^1 \) diffeomorphism.

**Theorem 5.2.** For each of the settings we have considered in Section 4, we can construct an exponential map on a neighbourhood of \( 0 \in T_e G \) which is a \( C^1 \) diffeomorphism onto its image.

We will prove the case for \( \mathcal{D}_v(T^2) \) equipped with the \( L^2 \) metric. We note that this case is not a new result, cf. [26], however we have used a different method of proof. The result for the other settings considered in Section 4 follows from analogous arguments. We will use the notation defined in Lemma 5.3.

**Theorem 5.3.** The Frechet manifold \( \mathcal{D}_v(T^2) \) equipped with the \( L^2 \) metric admits a well-defined exponential map which is a local \( C^1 \)-diffeomorphism at the identity.

**Proof of Theorem 5.3.** Let \( s_0 > 6 \). From [11], we have that \( \mathcal{D}^{s_0}(T^2) \) equipped with the \( L^2 \) metric admits a well-defined exponential map which is a local \( C^\infty \) diffeomorphism at the identity \( \exp^{s_0} : U^{s_0} \to V^{s_0} \). We may shrink \( U^{s_0} \) if necessary so that \( V^{s_0} \) lies in the image of a chart map for \( \mathcal{D}^{s_0}(T^2) \).

We know from [11] Theorem 12.1 that, for all \( k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \), \( \exp^{s_0}(U_k) \subseteq V^k \).

Furthermore, uniqueness and smooth dependence of Lagrangian solutions on initial data in each \( H^{s_k} \) topology gives us that \( \exp^{s_k} := \exp^{s_0}|_{U_k} : U_k \to V^k \) is a well-defined \( C^\infty \) injection. Theorem 4.0 now guarantees that, for all \( k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \), \( \exp^{s_k} : U^k \to V^k \) is in fact a \( C^\infty \) bijection.

Next, from [12], we know that \( \exp^{s_0} \) is a non-linear Fredholm map of index zero.

Hence, we can further restrict \( U^{s_0} \) if necessary to guarantee that, for all \( u \in U \), \( d_u \exp^{s_0} : T_e \mathcal{D}^{s_0}_v(T^2) \to T_{\exp^{s_0}(u)} \mathcal{D}^{s_0}_v(T^2) \) is a linear isomorphism. Furthermore, defining \( \eta := \exp^{s_0}(u) \in \mathcal{D}_v(T^2) \) we in fact have:

\[
d_u \exp^{s_0} = D\eta(\Omega_u - \Gamma_u)
\]

where, for any \( k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \), \( D\eta : T_e \mathcal{D}^{s_k}_v(T^2) \to T_{\eta} \mathcal{D}^{s_k}_v(T^2) \) and \( \Omega_u : T_e \mathcal{D}^{s_k}_v(T^2) \to T_e \mathcal{D}^{s_{k+1}}_v(T^2) \) are linear isomorphisms and \( \Gamma_u : T_e \mathcal{D}^{s_k}_v(T^2) \to T_e \mathcal{D}^{s_{k+1}}_v(T^2) \) is a compact operator. So, if for \( w \in T_e \mathcal{D}^{s_k}_v(T^2) \), \( d_u \exp^{s_0}(w) = T_{\eta} \mathcal{D}^{s_{k+1}}_v(T^2), \)

we have that \( w = \Omega_u^{-1} \left( D\eta^{-1}(d_u \exp^{s_0}(w)) + \Gamma_u(w) \right) \in T_e \mathcal{D}^{s_{k+1}}_v(T^2). \)

Hence, \( d_u \exp^{s_0}(T_e \mathcal{D}^{s_k}_v(T^2) \setminus T_e \mathcal{D}^{s_{k+1}}_v(T^2)) \subseteq T_{\eta} \mathcal{D}^{s_k}_v(T^2) \setminus T_{\eta} \mathcal{D}^{s_{k+1}}_v(T^2) \) and we may apply Lemma 5.3.

**Remark 5.4.** It is important to note that Theorem 5.3 does not follow immediately from the work of Ebin and Marsden in [11]. While they define an exponential map for each Sobolev index \( s > \frac{n}{2} + 1 \), \( \exp^s : U^s \to V^s \) and, indeed, their Theorem 12.1 ensures that each \( \exp^s \) will map smooth initial data to a geodesic in \( \mathcal{D}_v(T^2) \), they
do so by applying the inverse function theorem in separately for each index. Hence, there is no apriori relationship between $\tilde{U}^s$ which guarantees that their intersection is not a single point, cf. [26, page 87].

**Remark 5.5.** To establish the analogous results to Theorem 5.3 in the other settings considered in Section 4 we make use of the literature pertaining to Fredholmness of exponential maps on groups of diffeomorphisms cf. [5], [6], [4], [21] and [25].

### 6. Concluding Remarks

There are a variety of natural continuations to this work:

Firstly, the author expects that these results are not sharp. For example, it is expected that the $s > 6$ requirement in Theorem 4.6 can be relaxed to $s > \frac{7}{2}$, etc.

Next, it would be interesting to develop these arguments in the case of an arbitrary compact manifold, possibly with boundary. As mentioned in Section 4, many of the estimates presented carry through for the setting of curved spaces. This is done by collecting any lower order terms arising in the various calculations due to derivatives of the components of the metric and its Christoffel symbols on the manifold into a single term which would be negligible for our purposes.

In the case of a manifold with non-trivial boundary, however, the methods would have to be modified. For example, the estimates in Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2 need to be reproved, due to the presence of boundary terms when integrating by parts. The calculations involving non-local operators $\Delta^{-1}$, etc. will have to be readdressed, along the lines of [6].

Lastly, it would be interesting to investigate the connection, if any, between the type of regularity property we have considered here and Fredholmness of the exponential map, which has been a focal point of study for the past 20 years or so cf. [23], [24], [12], [32], [31], [5], [6], [4], [21] and [25].
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