

Statistical solutions of the incompressible Euler equations

Raphael Wagner* Emil Wiedemann†

May 18, 2022

Abstract: We study statistical solutions of the incompressible Euler equations in two dimensions with vorticity in L^p , $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, and in the class of vortex-sheets with a distinguished sign. Our notion of statistical solution is based on the framework due to Bronzi, Mondaini and Rosa in [3]. Existence in this setting is shown by approximation with discrete measures, concentrated on deterministic solutions of the Euler equations. Additionally, we provide arguments to show that the statistical solutions of the Euler equations may be obtained in the inviscid limit of statistical solutions of the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations. Uniqueness of trajectory statistical solutions is shown in the Yudovich class.

1 Introduction and main results

We consider the *incompressible Euler equations* in two dimensions

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t u + \operatorname{div}(u \otimes u) + \nabla p &= 0 \\ \operatorname{div} u &= 0\end{aligned}$$

for a time-parametrized velocity field $u = (u^1(x, t), u^2(x, t))^t : \mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ and the scalar pressure $p : \mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where $T > 0$ is fixed.

In the classic literature, assumptions on the initial vorticity $\omega(u) := \operatorname{curl} u = \partial_1 u^2 - \partial_2 u^1$ yielded some of the first existence and uniqueness results for the corresponding Cauchy problem. The result of existence and uniqueness for weak solutions with vorticity in L^∞ is due to Yudovich (see [35]). Existence of weak solutions with vorticity in L^p , $1 < p < \infty$, was first proved by DiPerna and Majda in [14]. Weak solutions in the class of vortex-sheets with a distinguished sign, i.e. bounded and positive Radon measures in

*Institute of Applied Analysis, Ulm University, Helmholtzstraße 18, 89081 Ulm, Germany.
raphael.wagner@uni-ulm.de

†Institute of Applied Analysis, Ulm University, Helmholtzstraße 18, 89081 Ulm, Germany.
emil.wiedemann@uni-ulm.de

the negative Sobolev space H^{-1} were constructed by Delort in [12]. Delort's arguments were later used by Vecchi and Wu in [31] to also show existence of weak solutions with vorticity in the class $L^1 \cap H^{-1}$. While there are many more classes that one could consider, these are the ones that we will restrict ourselves to in this article.

The problem of uniqueness has still not been resolved in the aforementioned cases, with exception of the case of uniformly bounded vorticity, considered by Yudovich. Let us also point here towards the recent preprints by Vishik ([32], [33]), where non-uniqueness of the forced Euler equations with vorticity in some L^p space has been shown, or the work of Albritton, Brué and Colombo in [1], in which non-uniqueness of Leray-Hopf solutions of the forced Navier-Stokes equations has been proved. A lack of well-posedness and in some way uncertainty of the evolution of an initial state may lead one to the approach of considering a whole ensemble of weak solutions which may display desired properties in a statistical sense. This concept of considering ensembles and ensemble averages is common in the theory of turbulence, where individual flows may exhibit wild behaviour, while quantities, averaged in space and time, appear to be sort of universal over an ensemble of flows (see e.g. [20]).

A mathematically rigorous concept of statistical solutions in the context of the two and three-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations has been introduced in the seventies by Foias in [16] and [17] based on discussions with Prodi. Another concept of statistical solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations is due to Fursikov and Vishik (see [34]). The two notions differ in the way that Foias considered time parametrized probability measures on the phase space, while Vishik and Fursikov constructed single probability measures on an appropriate space of trajectories.

A connection between the two approaches was drawn not too long ago by Foias, Rosa and Temam in [19], where they consider probability measures on the space of weak (Leray-Hopf) solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations in the spirit of Vishik and Fursikov and show that the projections in time of these measures are statistical solutions, as originally considered by Foias. The former measures were then called Vishik-Fursikov measures by the authors and the resulting statistical solutions, obtained by projecting these in time, Vishik-Fursikov statistical solutions. The proof of existence of Vishik-Fursikov statistical solutions in [19] also differed significantly from the one given in [16], in which approximating sequences of probability measures were used, based on Galerkin approximations of the deterministic equations. The new proof, originally presented in [18], uses approximations by discrete measures, constructed using the Krein-Milman theorem. This latter proof has the flexibility of being generalized and applied to other equations. The theory of statistical solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations has in fact served as motivation for Bronzi, Mondaini and Rosa to develop an abstract concept of statistical solution in [3], in which, to some extent, not even an underlying partial differential equation is required. In their work, they label the analogue of the Vishik-Fursikov measures *trajectory statistical solutions* and the analogue of the aforementioned statistical solutions is labelled more specifically *phase space statistical solution*.

Though we will not require the same generality kept in [3], we will use their framework as a unifying concept for each class of weak solutions of the Euler equations mentioned earlier in this introduction.

The main results we prove in this work are essentially the following three: For each of the aforementioned classes of weak solutions of the Euler equations in the phase space X and every $T > 0$, given a distribution μ_0 on an appropriate space of initial data $X_0 \subset X$,

- I) there exists a trajectory statistical solution ρ satisfying $\Pi_0 \rho = \mu_0$, where Π_t is the time evaluation map at time t for every $0 \leq t \leq T$.

We also have energy type inequalities for the velocity and vorticity:

$$\int_{C([0,T];X)} \|u_{kin}(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} d\rho(u) \leq \int_X a^{|m(u_0)|} \|u_{0,kin}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} d\mu_0(u_0)$$

for almost every $0 \leq t \leq T$, a constant $a > 1$ and

$$\int_{C([0,T];X)} \|\omega(u(t))\|_{X_{vort}} d\rho(u) \leq \int_X \|\omega(u_0)\|_{X_{vort}} d\mu_0(u_0) \quad (1.1)$$

for every $0 \leq t \leq T$. In case that $X_{vort} = L^p$, $1 < p \leq \infty$, equality holds in (1.1). In the Yudovich class, this trajectory statistical solution is unique.

- II) If $\int_{X_0} \gamma(u_0)^2 d\mu_0(u_0) < \infty$, where $\gamma(u_0) := a^{|m(u_0)|}(1 + \|u_{0,kin}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)})$, then the projections $\{\rho_t := \Pi_t \rho\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ form a phase space statistical solution with $\rho_0 = \mu_0$, so that

$$\int_X \Phi(u) d\rho_t(u) = \int_X \Phi(u) d\rho_{t'}(u) + \int_{t'}^t \int_X \langle (u(s) \otimes u(s)), \nabla \Phi'(u) \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} d\rho_s(u) ds \quad (1.2)$$

for every $0 \leq t' \leq t \leq T$ and every appropriate test functional Φ . Moreover

$$\int_X \|u_{kin}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} d\rho_t(u) \leq \int_X a^{|m(u_0)|} \|u_{0,kin}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} d\mu_0(u_0)$$

for almost every $0 \leq t \leq T$ and

$$\int_X \|\omega(u)\|_{X_{vort}} d\rho_t(u) \leq \int_X \|\omega(u_0)\|_{X_{vort}} d\mu_0(u_0) \quad (1.3)$$

for every $0 \leq t \leq T$. In case that $X_{vort} = L^p$, $1 < p \leq \infty$, equality holds in (1.3)

- III) the statistical solutions may be constructed in a weak sense as the inviscid limit of a sequence of statistical solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations, which attain the initial distribution μ_0 in the same sense.

For I), we remark that the case of weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations and of the Euler equations with uniformly bounded vorticity is special due to uniqueness of the weak solutions and we will treat their construction separately.

The idea of the abstract proof of existence of trajectory statistical solutions in [3] will then, purely for didactic purposes, be displayed in the particularly simple situation of the vorticity being in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $1 < p < \infty$, where one may utilize strong compactness properties. We could, however, as we will do in all other cases, directly refer to the

existence results in [3] and only check the required conditions.

Likewise, for existence of phase space statistical solutions as just stated in II), we will demonstrate the abstract arguments in [3] for the specific case of vorticity being in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and note that all other cases may be treated similarly.

Since trajectory statistical solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations are essentially probability measures having support in the set of weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations, the discussion of the inviscid limit of those trajectory statistical solutions will be reduced to the study of the behaviour of the support and in essence, the deterministic inviscid limit. The inviscid limit results for phase space statistical solutions that we are going to state are then going to be the direct consequences of the results for trajectory statistical solutions.

We mention here that statistical solutions of the Euler equations have been considered in similar ways before by D. Chae in [4] and [5], P. Constantin and J. Wu in [9] and J. Kelliher in [22]. Chae constructs (phase space) statistical solutions of the Euler equations on the two-dimensional torus in [4] under an assumption on the mean enstrophy with respect to the initial distribution, which corresponds to the situation of solutions of the Euler equations with vorticity in L^p for $p = 2$. Our work here can be thought of as a generalization as we allow for any $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. A lesser difference lies in our article using \mathbb{R}^2 as the underlying domain. More fundamentally, our work differs in the used constructions. Chae uses the rather sophisticated compactness arguments that were used in Foias' original article in [16] to obtain statistical solutions of the Euler equations by means of a vanishing viscosity argument. These arguments include the Banach-Alaoglu theorem, applied to a family of functionals which are related to the statistical solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations, in combination with results from the theory of the Daniell integral and the theory of lifting to recover a suitable family of measures.

While we have also included an inviscid limit argument, our focus lies on the results and ideas from [3], in which discrete approximations are used, given by the Krein-Milman theorem.

Constantin and Wu consider statistical solutions of the Navier-Stokes and of the Euler equations with uniformly bounded vorticity on \mathbb{R}^2 , i.e. the case $p = \infty$. In contrast to this and the other articles previously mentioned, they work with the vorticity equation opposed to the velocity formulation. Also, they consider both phase space as well as trajectory statistical solutions for both the Euler and Navier-Stokes equations. Their proof of existence for trajectory statistical solutions of the Euler equations is in close proximity to the work of Vishik and Fursikov who also relied on Prokhorov's theorem to construct trajectory statistical solutions by an inviscid limit argument. For phase space statistical solutions, they used similar arguments as Chae to obtain these by an inviscid limit argument.

Kelliher also considers phase space statistical solutions of the Navier-Stokes and of the Euler equations in the Yudovich class but in their velocity formulation. The phase space statistical solution of the Euler equations is also obtained by an inviscid limit argument. However, while Constantin and Wu immediately employ the solution operator for the two-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations to construct corresponding statistical solutions, Kelliher first considers phase space statistical solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations

on balls of finite radius as constructed by Foias and then constructs statistical solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations on \mathbb{R}^2 by employing the theory of the expanding domain limit for the deterministic Navier-Stokes equations.

Unlike Chae or Constantin and Wu, who make assumptions on the L^2 or H^1 norm of the mean vorticity with respect to the initial distribution, we will, similarly to Kelliher, consider infinite energy solutions and require a bound on the mean total mass of vorticity and the L^2 norm of the finite kinetic energy parts with respect to the initial distribution. This is necessary for the Foias-Liouville equation (1.2) of phase space statistical solutions to be well-defined due to the connection between the (local) L^2 norm and the total mass of vorticity.

We will begin by giving an overview of the well-known results of existence and uniqueness of weak solutions in each of the aforementioned classes and highlight certain properties. In the second part of the introduction, we briefly review the abstract framework of statistical solutions given in [3].

In the main part, we construct statistical solutions in each class using the properties of weak solutions and by applying the ideas and results for abstract statistical solutions, both of which are described in the two preliminary sections.

1.1 Preliminaries on the Euler and Navier-Stokes equations

We denote by $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, the standard Lebesgue spaces on \mathbb{R}^2 with values in \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{R}^2 respectively. The associated standard L^p Sobolev spaces of order s on \mathbb{R}^2 will be denoted by $W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$ for all $s \in \mathbb{N}$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. For the specific case of $p = 2$, we let $H^s(\mathbb{R}^2) := W^{s,2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $H^s(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2) := W^{s,2}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$ for all $s \in \mathbb{N}$. The dual of $H^s(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $H^s(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$ will be denoted by $H^{-s}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $H^{-s}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$ respectively.

Related spaces of local integrability or compact support will generally be denoted by the addition of the subscript *loc* or *c* respectively.

We say that a vector field $v \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$ is weakly divergence-free if for every φ in the class of smooth and compactly supported functions $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$, we have $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} v \cdot \nabla \varphi \, dx = 0$. The subset of weakly divergence-free vector fields of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$ will be denoted by H .

In our notation for the standard norms on these spaces, we will not differ between spaces of functions with values in \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{R}^2 , e.g. $\|\cdot\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}$ will denote the norm on both $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$.

Let us also point out here that $T > 0$ will be a fixed final time for all equations considered throughout this article.

Definition 1.1. *A weakly divergence-free vector field $u \in L^\infty(0, T; H_{loc})$ is called a weak solution of the Euler equations with initial data $u_0 \in H_{loc}$ if for any $v = (v^1, v^2)^t \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2) \cap H$, we have*

i)

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} v \cdot u \, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla v : (u \otimes u) \, dx$$

in the sense of distributions on $(0, T)$, where $(u \otimes u) = (u_i u_j)_{i,j=1,2}$, $\nabla v = \left(\frac{\partial v^i}{\partial_j} \right)_{i,j=1,2} \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ and $:$ denotes the Frobenius inner product between two matrices;

ii) $u \in C([0, T]; H_{loc}^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2))$ for some $L > 1$ and $u(0) = u_0$ in $H_{loc}^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$.

If u only satisfies i), then we simply say that u is a weak solution of the Euler equations.

Definition 1.2. A weakly divergence-free vector field $u \in L^\infty(0, T; H_{loc})$, for which $\nabla u \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}))$, is called a weak solution of the Navier-Stokes equations with viscosity $\nu > 0$ and initial data $u_0 \in H_{loc}$ if for any $v = (v^1, v^2)^t \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2) \cap H$, we have

i)

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} v \cdot u \, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla v : (u \otimes u) \, dx + \nu \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \Delta v \cdot u \, dx$$

in the sense of distributions on $(0, T)$;

ii) $u \in C([0, T]; H_{loc})$ and $u(0) = u_0$ in H_{loc} .

If u only satisfies i), then we simply say that u is a weak solution of the Navier-Stokes equations (with viscosity ν).

As indicated here, throughout this article we will use \mathbb{R}^2 as the underlying domain. This is oftentimes convenient for two reasons. First, one may ignore boundary conditions and effects. Second, the Biot-Savart law, which constitutes how to recover velocity from vorticity, has an explicit form. In general, for a vector field $u = (u^1, u^2)^t \in L_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$, we define the (distributional) vorticity $\omega(u) = \partial_1 u^2 - \partial_2 u^1$.

The downside is that for a velocity field with compactly supported vorticity and given by the Biot-Savart law to have finite kinetic energy, its total mass of vorticity necessarily needs to vanish. We take care of this by only considering those vector fields which have a *radial-energy decomposition*. Now following [7][Chapter 1], for any $m \in \mathbb{R}$, let E_m be the set of weakly divergence-free vector fields $u \in H_{loc}$ such that there exists a *stationary vector field* $\sigma \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$, whose total mass of vorticity $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \omega(\sigma)$ is equal to m , for which

$$u - \sigma \in H.$$

Here, a vector field $\sigma \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$ is called stationary if there exists $g \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that

$$\sigma(x) = \frac{x^\perp}{|x|^2} \int_0^{|x|} s g(s) \, ds = \frac{1}{|x|^2} \begin{pmatrix} -x^2 \\ x^1 \end{pmatrix} \int_0^{|x|} s g(s) \, ds, x = \begin{pmatrix} x^1 \\ x^2 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

The stationary vector fields are smooth exact solutions of the Euler equations and in the situation above, $\omega(\sigma)(x) = g(|x|)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. A stationary vector field σ also satisfies the decay properties $\sigma \in \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{|x|}\right)$ and $\nabla \sigma \in \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{|x|^2}\right)$. While this implies $\nabla \sigma \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})$, it is not enough for σ to be square integrable. However, σ is at least bounded and vanishes at infinity.

Consequently, $u = \sigma + (u - \sigma)$ as above is the sum of a smooth exact solution of the Euler equations with radially symmetric vorticity and a vector field of finite kinetic energy. As indicated before, $\sigma \in H$ if and only if $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \omega(\sigma) = 0$ so that $E_m = \sigma + H$ is an affine space.

Throughout this article, we fix one stationary vector field Σ satisfying

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \omega(\Sigma) dx = 1 \quad (1.4)$$

so that $E_m = (m\Sigma) + H$. By fixing Σ , the decomposition

$$u = m\Sigma + (u - m\Sigma)$$

is now unique for any $u \in \mathbb{E}$ and we will occasionally write $u_{kin} := u - m\Sigma$ for the finite kinetic energy part of this decomposition and $m(u) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \omega(u - u_{kin})$ for the total mass of vorticity of the stationary field. Moreover, if $\omega(u)$ is a finite Borel measure in $H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ so that $(1 + |x|)\omega(u)$ is also a finite Borel measure, then as a consequence of the proof of [7][Lemma 1.3.1], we may even tell $m(u) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \omega(u)$. We then also introduce the space

$$\mathbb{E} := \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{R}} E_m.$$

We note that \mathbb{E} is in fact a separable Banach space with norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{E}}$ given by $\|u\|_{\mathbb{E}} = |m(u)| + \|u_{kin}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}$ for all $u \in \mathbb{E}$. By having fixed Σ , the radial energy decomposition is unique and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{E}}$ well-defined.

Let us also briefly recall that for a weak solution $u \in L^\infty(0, T; H_{loc})$ of the Euler equations and $v \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2) \cap H$, the function $t \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} v \cdot u(t) dx$ is absolutely continuous on $[0, T]$ with

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} v \cdot u(t) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla v : (u(t) \otimes u(t)) dx$$

for almost every $0 \leq t \leq T$.

The following theorem contains the classic results of all four classes of functions in which we consider weak solutions of the Euler equations. By $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, we mean the spaces of finite (non-negative) Borel measures on \mathbb{R}^2 . Oftentimes, we will also identify the latter space with the dual of the separable Banach space $C_0(\mathbb{R}^2)$ of continuous functions, vanishing at infinity.

In the following, for two Banach spaces $(X_1, \|\cdot\|_{X_1})$ and $(X_2, \|\cdot\|_{X_2})$, we define the norm $\|\cdot\|_{X_1 \cap X_2} := \|\cdot\|_{X_1} + \|\cdot\|_{X_2}$ on $X_1 \cap X_2$.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $u_0 \in E_m$ for some $m \in \mathbb{R}$ and fix $1 < p < \infty$.*

A) *Yudovich [35]: If $\omega(u_0) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$, then there exists a unique weak solution $u \in C([0, T]; E_m)$ with vorticity $\omega(u) \in L^\infty(0, T; L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2))$ and initial data u_0 .*

- B) DiPerna and Majda [14]: If $\omega(u_0) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$, then there exists a weak solution $u \in C([0, T]; H_{loc}) \cap L^\infty(0, T; W_{loc}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap E_m)$ with vorticity $\omega(u) \in L^\infty(0, T; L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^2))$ and initial data u_0 .
- C) Delort [12]: If $\omega(u_0) \in \mathcal{M}_c^+(\mathbb{R}^2)$, then there exists $L > 1$ and a weak solution $u \in C([0, T]; H_{loc}^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)) \cap L^\infty(0, T; E_m)$ with vorticity $\omega(u) \in L^\infty(0, T; \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^2))$ and initial data u_0 .
- D) Vecchi and Wu [31]: If $\omega(u_0) \in L_c^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$, then there exists $L > 1$ and a weak solution $u \in C([0, T]; H_{loc}^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)) \cap L^\infty(0, T; E_m)$ with vorticity $\omega(u) \in L^\infty(0, T; L^1(\mathbb{R}^2))$ and initial data u_0 .

Remark 1.4. Sometimes the condition of $\omega(u_0)$ being in $H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ or $H_{loc}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is imposed. This is already included in our assumption $u_0 = m\Sigma + u_{0,kin} \in E_m$ in Theorem 1.3: Indeed, $\omega(\Sigma)$ is an element of $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2) \subset H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ due to the very definition of stationary vector fields. Moreover, from $u_{0,kin} \in H \subset L^2(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$, it follows immediately that $\omega(u_{0,kin}) \in H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

In case of the Navier-Stokes equations, no assumptions on the vorticity are required to obtain unique weak solutions.

Theorem 1.5. Let $u_0 \in E_m$ for some $m \in \mathbb{R}$. Then there exists a unique weak solution $u \in C([0, T]; E_m)$ of the Navier-Stokes equations with initial data u_0 and viscosity $\nu > 0$ so that $\nabla u \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}))$. Moreover, u_{kin} satisfies the energy inequality

$$\|u_{kin}\|_{C([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^2))} + \nu \|\nabla u_{kin}\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^2))} \leq C \|u_{kin}(0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}, \quad (1.5)$$

where C is a constant depending exponentially on T and m (see also (1.9)).

Lemma 1.6. Let $u \in \mathbb{E}$ be a vector field having a radial-energy decomposition with vorticity $\omega(u) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Then u is given by the Biot-Savart law, that is

$$u = K * \omega(u),$$

where $K(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{x^\perp}{|x|^2}$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. In particular, vector fields in \mathbb{E} are uniquely determined by their vorticity.

This can be proved based on the observation that a vector field whose coefficients are tempered distributions is uniquely determined by its divergence and vorticity, up to a vector field whose coefficients are harmonic polynomials (see [7][Proposition 1.3.1]).

Let us also recall the following theorem on classical solutions (see e.g. [7][Theorem 4.2.4] in case of the Euler equations):

Theorem 1.7. Let $m \in \mathbb{R}$ and $r \geq 2$ be a natural number. For every $u_0 \in E_m \cap C^r(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$ there exist unique solutions in $C([0, T]; E_m) \cap L^\infty(0, T; C^r(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2))$ of the Euler or Navier-Stokes equations with initial data u_0 .

One can even show that the weak solution of the Navier-Stokes equations becomes instantaneously smooth.

In general, for two smooth solutions u_1, u_2 of the Euler or Navier-Stokes equations with radial-energy decompositions

$$u_1 = \sigma_1 + v_1, u_2 = \sigma_2 + v_2,$$

where σ_1, σ_2 are stationary solutions and $v_1 := u_1 - \sigma_1, v_2 := u_2 - \sigma_2 \in H$ are vector fields of finite kinetic energy, we have a relative energy inequality for the finite kinetic energy parts (see [25][Proposition 3.4])

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|v_1 - v_2\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} \\ & \leq \exp \left(\int_0^T \|\nabla v_2\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} + \|\nabla \sigma_1\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} dt \right) \left(\|v_1(0) - v_2(0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \int_0^T \|\sigma_1 - \sigma_2\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} \|\nabla v_2(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} + \|\nabla \sigma_1 - \nabla \sigma_2\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} \|v_2(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} dt \right), \end{aligned} \tag{1.6}$$

which can be proved using the Gronwall inequality. For this, in [25], the estimate

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} ((v_1 - v_2) \cdot \nabla v_2) \cdot (v_1 - v_2) dx \leq \|v_1 - v_2\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \|\nabla v_2\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)}$$

was used. In the Navier-Stokes case, one can use Ladyzhenskaya's inequality to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} ((v_1 - v_2) \cdot \nabla v_2) \cdot (v_1 - v_2) dx \tag{1.7} \\ & \leq \|v_1 - v_2\|_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \|\nabla v_2\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} \\ & \leq C \|v_1 - v_2\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} \|\nabla(v_1 - v_2)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} \|\nabla v_2\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} \\ & \leq C \|v_1 - v_2\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \|\nabla v_2\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + \frac{\nu}{2} \|\nabla(v_1 - v_2)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \end{aligned}$$

for a constant C depending on ν , which we altered between the last and second last inequality, so that the term $\exp \left(\int_0^T \|\nabla v_2\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} + \|\nabla \sigma_1\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} dt \right)$ on the right-hand side (1.6) can be replaced by $\exp \left(C \int_0^T \|\nabla v_2\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + \|\nabla \sigma_1\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} dt \right)$. In case of the Navier-Stokes equations, one also obtains the gradient control

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu \int_0^T \|\nabla(v_1 - v_2)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 dt \tag{1.8} \\ & \leq C \int_0^T \|v_1 - v_2\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 (\|\nabla v_2\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + \|\nabla \sigma_1\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)}) \\ & \quad + \|\nabla(\sigma_1 - \sigma_2)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} \|v_2\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} + \|\sigma_1 - \sigma_2\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} \|\nabla v_2\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} dt. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, letting $u_2 = 0$ yields in (1.6) for both equations the energy inequality

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|v_1\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq \exp(T \|\nabla \sigma_1\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)}) \|v_1(0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} \quad (1.9)$$

for the finite kinetic energy part and, in combination with (1.8), specifically for the Navier-Stokes equations, the energy inequality (1.5).

We also see from (1.6), using the variation (1.7), whenever a sequence of weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations in $C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})$ has bounded gradients in $L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}))$ and whose initial data is Cauchy in \mathbb{E} , then that sequence is Cauchy in $C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})$. We are going to use this fact later on to prove closedness in $C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})$ of the set of weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations with fixed viscosity.

We now fix $u_0 \in \mathbb{E}$ and suppose that $\omega(u_0)$ is in one of the classes described in Theorem 1.3. Then a weak solution u of the Euler or Navier-Stokes equations may be constructed by smoothing of the initial data and using the corresponding smooth solutions of the Euler or Navier-Stokes equations as approximating sequences. The weak solution u inherits several properties and a priori estimates from the smooth approximations, which we will list now and assume in the following sections. These are by no means granted. For instance in [29], weak solutions with vortex-sheet initial data (case C) in Theorem 1.3) are constructed, using convex integration methods, whose vorticity will in general no longer be a bounded measure in positive time.

From (1.9), we derive

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|u_{kin}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq \exp(T |m(u_0)| \|\nabla \Sigma\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)}) \|u_{0,kin}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}. \quad (1.10)$$

We introduce the constant

$$a := \exp(T \|\nabla \Sigma\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)}), \quad (1.11)$$

whose dependency on T and Σ we omit in our notation as both are fixed throughout. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|u(t)\|_{L^2(B_r(x_0))} &\leq \|m(u_0)\Sigma\|_{L^2(B_r(x_0))} + \|u_{kin}(t)\|_{L^2(B_r(x_0))} & (1.12) \\ &\leq |m(u_0)| (\|\Sigma\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} \sqrt{\pi} r) + a^{|m(u_0)|} \|u_{0,kin}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{\|\Sigma\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} \sqrt{\pi} r}{T \|\nabla \Sigma\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)}} + \|u_{0,kin}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} \right) a^{|m(u_0)|} \\ &\leq C \max\{1, r\} (1 + \|u_{0,kin}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}) a^{|m(u_0)|} \\ &= C \max\{1, r\} \gamma(u_0) \end{aligned}$$

for any $r > 0, x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and almost every $0 \leq t \leq T$, where C is a constant depending on T and Σ and $\gamma(u_0) := (1 + \|u_{0,kin}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}) a^{|m(u_0)|}$. We remark here that γ is continuous with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{E}}$, depends exponentially on $m(u_0)$ and, in a sense, linearly on $u_{0,kin}$. There exists $L \in \mathbb{N}$ and a constant $C = C(L)$ such that

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\partial_t u\|_{H^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\omega(u_0)|, \quad (1.13)$$

where the term on the right-hand side denotes the total variation norm of $\omega(u_0)$. The proof of this in [21][Theorem 2.1] works for both equations. This will usually guarantee equicontinuity of the velocity in $H^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$.

We may also infer continuity of the vorticity $\omega(u)$ for both equations depending on the class of initial vorticity that is considered. If

$$\begin{cases} \omega(u_0) \in (L^1 \cap L^\infty)(\mathbb{R}^2), \text{ then } \omega(u) \in C([0, T]; L^q(\mathbb{R}^2)) \text{ for every } 1 \leq q < \infty \\ \omega(u_0) \in (L^1 \cap L^p)(\mathbb{R}^2) \text{ for some } 1 < p < \infty, \text{ then } \omega(u) \in C([0, T]; L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)) \\ \omega(u_0) \in L_c^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \text{ or } \omega(u_0) \in \mathcal{M}_c^+(\mathbb{R}^2), \text{ then } \omega(u) \in C_w([0, T]; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2)). \end{cases}$$

The last condition means that for any $\psi \in C_0(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $t \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \psi d\omega(u)(t)$ is continuous. We are also interested in conservation of the $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$ norm of the vorticity for the Euler equations. For this, we consider weak solutions whose vorticity $\omega(u)$ is a *renormalized solution* of the vorticity equation of the Euler equations, i.e. in the sense of distributions

$$\partial_t \beta(\omega) + u \cdot \nabla \beta(\omega) = 0$$

is satisfied for all $\beta \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ that are bounded and vanishing near 0 with $u = K * \omega$ given by the Biot-Savart law (see for instance [13] and [15] for more details).

At least for vorticity in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $p > 1$, we may smoothly implement this into the presented work here. We remark though that [10] suggests that this also works in the $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ case with some adaptations.

For $p \geq 2$, the vorticity of every weak solution is already renormalized [15]. For $1 < p < 2$, the vorticities of weak solutions obtained by (smooth) approximations of the Euler or Navier-Stokes equations in the inviscid limit are also renormalized ([15],[11]) and convergence holds in the strong sense ([8], [23]).

Lemma 1.8. *Suppose that $(\omega^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset C([0, T]; L^p(\mathbb{R}^2))$, $1 < p < \infty$, is a sequence of renormalized solutions of the vorticity formulation of the Euler equations or a sequence of vorticities of solutions $(u^n = K * \omega^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of the Navier-Stokes equations with viscosity $\nu^n \rightarrow 0$ ($n \rightarrow \infty$). If $\omega^n(0) \rightarrow \omega_0$ in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$, then a subsequence of $(\omega^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges in $C([0, T]; L^p(\mathbb{R}^2))$ to a renormalized solution of the Euler equations with initial data ω_0 .*

Renormalized solutions conserve all $L^q(\mathbb{R}^2)$ norms, $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, of the vorticity, i.e.

$$\|\omega(u)(t)\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^2)} = \|\omega(u_0)\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^2)} \quad (1.14)$$

for every $0 \leq t \leq T$ (with both sides possibly being ∞). In case of the Navier-Stokes equations, these quantities may at least not increase, i.e. (1.14) holds by replacing $=$ with \leq . Moreover, for solutions with initial vorticity in $L_c^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ or $\mathcal{M}_c^+(\mathbb{R}^2)$, i.e cases C) and D) in Theorem 1.3, we have

$$\begin{cases} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \omega(u)(t) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \omega(u_0) & : C) \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\omega(u)(t)| dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\omega(u_0)| dx & : D) \end{cases} \quad (1.15)$$

for all $0 \leq t \leq T$ in case of both equations.

For the initial data considered in case B), i.e. when $\omega(u_0) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for some $1 < p < \infty$, we have

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq C(p) \|\omega(u_0)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)},$$

which comes from a Calderón-Zygmund argument. Splitting the Biot-Savart kernel into a sum in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) + L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$, Young's convolution inequality shows that $u = K * \omega(u) \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^2) + L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2) \hookrightarrow L^p_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Hence, for any ball $B_r(x_0) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ of radius $r > 0$, there exists a constant $C = C(r, p)$ so that

$$\|u\|_{L^p(B_r(x_0))} \leq C(r, p) \|\omega(u_0)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)}$$

and consequently also

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(B_r(x_0))} \leq C(r, p) \|\omega(u_0)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)}. \quad (1.16)$$

For the case of $\omega(u_0)$ just being an element of $\mathcal{M}_c^+(\mathbb{R}^2)$ or $L_c^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$, we will later use the following theorem, which may be derived from Theorem 6.3.1 in [7]. A measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is called continuous if it has no atoms, i.e. $\mu(\{x\}) = 0$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. By Lemma 6.3.2 in [7], μ being an element of $H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is a sufficient condition for μ to be continuous. Compare this to Remark 1.4.

We also recall the Hahn decomposition $\mu = \mu^+ - \mu^-$, where μ^+ and μ^- are positive, finite measures in $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Then $|\mu| := \mu^+ + \mu^-$ denotes the associated total variation measure.

Theorem 1.9. *Let $(u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{E})$ be a sequence of weak solutions of the Euler or Navier-Stokes equations, converging weakly- $*$ to some $u \in L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{E})$ and suppose that the vorticities $(\omega(u^n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converge weakly- $*$ to $\omega(u)$ in $L^\infty(0, T; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2))$. If $(|\omega(u^n)|)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly- $*$ to some ω^+ in $L^\infty(0, T; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2))$, where $\omega^+(t)$ is continuous for almost every $0 \leq t \leq T$, then u is a weak solution of the Euler equations.*

Later on, when we consider case C) in Theorem 1.3 of the initial vorticity being in $\mathcal{M}_c^+(\mathbb{R}^2)$, this will be very easy to check since for any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $|\mu| = \mu$.

In case D) in Theorem 1.7, some more care is required. The following property that we may demand for the weak solution u of the Euler or Navier-Stokes equations, which has also been the key in the original arguments by Vecchi and Wu in [31], will be of great help showing the non-concentration assumptions of Theorem 1.9:

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int_{B_r(x_0)} |\omega(u)| \, dx \leq \sup_{|E| = \pi r^2} \int_E |\omega(u_0)| \, dx, \quad (1.17)$$

for all $r > 0$ and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$, where on the right-hand side, we consider the supremum over the set of all Borel measurable sets E in \mathbb{R}^2 whose Lebesgue measure $|E|$ is equal to πr^2 . For smooth solutions of the Euler equations, this follows from the fact that the

vorticity is being transported by the velocity. As pointed out in the proof of Theorem 3.5 in [28], in case of the Navier-Stokes equations, one may derive this by constructing the Navier-Stokes solution via viscous-splitting, i.e. approximation of iteratively solving the Euler and heat equation over time scales of vanishing size (see the discussion on p. 1089 in [28] and [24][Section 3.4] for an introduction to viscous splitting), both of which leave the estimate (1.17) intact.

1.2 Preliminaries on the abstract framework of statistical solutions

The Borel- σ -algebra on a topological space X will be denoted by $\mathcal{B}(X)$. For an interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$, the Lebesgue- σ -algebra on I will be denoted by $\mathcal{L}(I)$. Then the space of continuous functions between I and X , endowed with the compact-open topology, will be denoted by $C_{loc}(I; X)$.

Definition 1.10. *Let X be a Hausdorff space, $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ some arbitrary interval and let $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{X} := C_{loc}(I; X)$. A Borel probability measure ρ on \mathcal{X} is called a \mathcal{U} -trajectory statistical solution (over I) if*

i) ρ is inner regular, i.e.

$$\rho(A) = \sup_{\substack{K \subset A \\ K \text{ compact in } \mathcal{X}}} \rho(K)$$

for every Borel measurable subset A of \mathcal{X} ;

ii) there exists $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{U}$ which is Borel measurable in \mathcal{X} such that $\rho(\mathcal{V}) = 1$. In this case, we say that ρ is carried by \mathcal{U} .

Remark 1.11. i) *The set \mathcal{U} can be thought of as the set of solutions of a partial differential equation with phase space X . Also, the carrier \mathcal{U} does not necessarily have to be Borel measurable.*

ii) *The assumption of inner regularity is owed to the generality in which statistical solutions are discussed in [3]. There, a special topology on the space of finite Borel measures $\mathcal{M}(X)$ is used, introduced by F. Topsøe in [30], which the authors label weak- $*$ semicontinuity topology. This topology turns the subspace of inner regular measures in $\mathcal{M}(X)$ into a Hausdorff space. For a completely regular Hausdorff space X , this topology coincides with the standard weak- $*$ topology on $\mathcal{M}(X)$.*

Moreover, on Polish spaces, i.e. completely metrizable spaces, every finite Borel measure is already inner regular ([26][Theorem 3.2]). Most of the spaces considered here are Polish spaces and consequently, we will usually ignore condition i) in Definition 1.10.

Let us also recall here the precise definition of the support of a Borel measure. Let X be a topological space and for every $x \in X$, we denote by \mathcal{O}_x the set of all open neighbourhoods of x . For a measure μ on the Borel- σ -algebra of X , the support of μ is defined as

$$\text{supp } \mu = \{x \in X : \forall O \in \mathcal{O}_x : \mu(O) > 0\}.$$

The support of a measure is closed. Indeed, its complement is the union of all open sets of measure 0.

One can also consider time parametrized measures. The notations used in the following definition are explained below.

Definition 1.12. *Let X, Z be Hausdorff spaces and let Y be a topological vector space such that $Z \subset X \subset Y'_{w*}$ with continuous injections. Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an arbitrary interval and consider a function $F : I \times Z \rightarrow Y'$.*

A family $\{\rho_t\}_{t \in I}$ of Borel probability measures on X is called a statistical solution (in phase space) of the evolution equation $u_t = F(t, u)$, over the interval I , if

i) *the mapping*

$$t \mapsto \int_X \varphi(u) d\rho_t(u)$$

belongs to $C_b(I)$, the space of bounded continuous functions on I , for every $\varphi \in C_b(X)$;

ii) *for almost every $t \in I$, ρ_t is carried by Z and $u \mapsto \langle F(t, u), v \rangle_{Y', Y}$ is ρ_t -integrable for every $v \in Y$;*

iii) *the mapping*

$$t \mapsto \int_X \langle F(t, u), v \rangle_{Y', Y} d\rho_t(u)$$

belongs to $L^1_{loc}(I)$ for every $v \in Y$;

iv) *for any cylindrical test function $\Phi \in Y'$, we have*

$$\int_X \Phi(u) d\rho_t(u) = \int_X \Phi(u) d\rho_{t'}(u) + \int_{t'}^t \int_X \langle F(s, u), \Phi'(u) \rangle_{Y', Y} d\rho_s(u) ds \quad (1.18)$$

for all $t, t' \in I$.

Here, $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{Y', Y}$ denotes the duality product between Y and its topological dual Y' . Moreover, Y'_{w*} specifically denotes Y' endowed with the weak-* topology.

A function $\Phi : Y' \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called cylindrical test function in Y' if there exists $\phi \in C^1_c(\mathbb{R}^k)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $v_1, \dots, v_k \in Y$ such that

$$\Phi(u) = \phi(\langle u, v_1 \rangle_{Y', Y}, \dots, \langle u, v_k \rangle_{Y', Y})$$

for all $u \in Y'$.

For such a cylindrical test function Φ and $w \in Y'$, one may compute the Gâteaux derivative $\Phi'(u)$ of Φ at $u \in Y'$ in direction of $w \in Y'$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \langle w, \Phi'(u) \rangle_{Y', Y''} &= \sum_{j=1}^k \partial_j \phi(\langle u, v_1 \rangle_{Y', Y}, \dots, \langle u, v_k \rangle_{Y', Y}) \langle w, v_j \rangle_{Y', Y} \\ &= \langle w, \sum_{j=1}^k \partial_j \phi(\langle u, v_1 \rangle_{Y', Y}, \dots, \langle u, v_k \rangle_{Y', Y}) v_j \rangle_{Y', Y}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we identify $\Phi'(u)$ with $\sum_{j=1}^k \partial_j \phi(\langle u, v_1 \rangle_{Y', Y}, \dots, \langle u, v_k \rangle_{Y', Y}) v_j$ as an element in Y . Moreover, we see from this representation that Φ' is continuous on Y'_{w^*} .

In [3], we are provided with existence results for both trajectory statistical solutions and statistical solutions in phase space.

Theorem 1.13. *Let X be a Hausdorff space and let I be some arbitrary interval, which is closed and bounded on the left with endpoint t_0 . Let $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{X} := C_{loc}(I; X)$ and suppose*

(H1) $\Pi_{t_0} \mathcal{U} = X$, where $\Pi_{t_0} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow X, u \mapsto u(t_0)$ is the time evaluation mapping at the initial time t_0 ;

there exists a family $\mathcal{K}'(X)$ of compact subsets of X such that

(H2) every inner regular Borel probability measure μ_0 on X (see Definition 1.10) is inner regular with respect to $\mathcal{K}'(X)$, i.e. $\sup_{K \in \mathcal{K}'(X)} \mu_0(K) = \mu_0(A)$ for every Borel measurable set A in X ;

(H3) for every $K \in \mathcal{K}'(X)$, the set $\Pi_{t_0}^{-1}(K) \cap \mathcal{U}$ is compact in \mathcal{X} .

Then, for any inner regular Borel probability measure μ_0 on X , there exists a \mathcal{U} -trajectory statistical solution ρ over I such that $\Pi_{t_0} \rho = \mu_0$, i.e. $\rho(\Pi_{t_0}^{-1}(A)) = \mu_0(A)$ for every Borel measurable subset A of X .

Remark 1.14. *i) (H1) means that for each initial value in X , we may find a trajectory in \mathcal{U} to the corresponding initial value problem on I .*

ii) (H2) allows one to pull back to the case of inner regular initial distributions of compact support as arbitrary inner regular initial distributions may be approximated through exhaustion of their support by sets in $\mathcal{K}'(X)$.

iii) (H3) states that the set of solution trajectories with initial data in $K \in \mathcal{K}'(X)$ is compact. This can usually be shown by adapting the compactness proofs that yield existence of solutions in the first place and will also be our strategy later.

In case that the conditions of Theorem 1.13 only hold for a subset of inner regular Borel probability measures or, in a related way, continuity of the solutions only holds in a coarser topology, there is another version of this existence theorem available, which is going to be the content of the following theorem.

Theorem 1.15. *Let X be a Hausdorff space and let I be some arbitrary interval, which is closed and bounded on the left with endpoint t_0 . Let $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{X} := C_{loc}(I; X)$ and let X_0 be a Borel subset of X . Suppose that*

(H1') $\Pi_{t_0} \mathcal{U} \supset X_0$;

there exists a family $\mathcal{K}'(X_0)$ of compact subsets of X_0 such that

(H2') every inner regular Borel probability measure μ_0 on X (see Definition 1.10), which is carried by X_0 , is inner regular with respect to $\mathcal{K}'(X_0)$, i.e. $\mu_0(A) = \sup_{\substack{K \subset A \\ K \in \mathcal{K}'(X_0)}} \mu_0(K)$ for every Borel measurable $A \subset X$;

(H3') for every $K \in \mathcal{K}'(X_0)$, the set $\Pi_{t_0}^{-1}(K) \cap \mathcal{U}$ is compact in \mathcal{X} .

Then, for any inner regular Borel probability measure μ_0 on X , which is carried by X_0 , there exists a \mathcal{U} -trajectory statistical solution ρ over I such that $\Pi_{t_0}\rho = \mu_0$,

We are going to use this theorem later in the first way described right before Theorem 1.15. X will be a very general space, whose natural topology is the one in which we have continuity of our solutions, e.g. $H_{loc}^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$ (see Definition 1.1), whereas X_0 incorporates the assumptions on the initial velocity and vorticity that are required to obtain solutions in each specific class, so that (H1') is satisfied.

Different choices of X or X_0 are absolutely possible though. Let us also point here towards Remark 3.7 in [3]: In case of the Navier-Stokes equations on a bounded domain, one could use Theorem 1.13 with the choice of $X = H_w$, i.e. H endowed with the weak topology, as weak Leray-Hopf solutions are continuous with respect to this topology. Alternatively, one could apply Theorem 1.15 with the choice of $X_0 = H_w$ and $X = D(A^{-1/2})$, i.e. viewing Leray-Hopf solutions as continuous functions with values in the domain of sufficiently large negative powers of the Stokes operator.

For the existence result of statistical solutions in phase space, let us give some explanation beforehand in which sense the evolution equation $u_t = F(t, u)$ is to be understood. As before, let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be some arbitrary interval, Y a topological vector space and X, Z Hausdorff spaces such that $Z \subset X \subset Y'_{w*}$ with continuous injections. As in [3], we say that $u : I \rightarrow Y'$ has a certain property P weak-* scalarwise if for every $v \in Y$, the function $I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, t \mapsto \langle u(t), v \rangle_{Y', Y}$, has the property P . Then we define \mathcal{Z} to be the space of functions $u : I \rightarrow X$ such that $u(t) \in Z$ for almost every $t \in I$. Let \mathcal{Y}_1 be the space of functions $u \in \mathcal{X} := C_{loc}(I; X)$ that are weak-* scalarwise absolutely continuous such that there exists $w : I \rightarrow X$ which is weak-* scalarwise locally integrable and satisfies $\frac{d}{dt} \langle u(t), v \rangle_{Y', Y} = \langle w(t), v \rangle_{Y', Y}$ for almost every $t \in I$ and for all $v \in Y$.

Theorem 1.16. *Let X, Z be Hausdorff spaces and Y be a topological vector space such that $Z \subset X \subset Y'_{w*}$ with continuous injections. Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an arbitrary interval and consider a function $F : I \times Z \rightarrow Y'$ as well as $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{X} := C_{loc}(I; X)$. Suppose that ρ is a \mathcal{U} -statistical solution with $\rho(\mathcal{V}) = 1$ for some $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{U}$, which is Borel measurable in \mathcal{X} . We assume*

- i) $\mathcal{B}(Z) \subset \mathcal{B}(X)$;
- ii) $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{X}_1 := \mathcal{Z} \cap \mathcal{Y}_1$;
- iii) $F : I \times Z \rightarrow Y'$ is $(\mathcal{L}(I) \otimes \mathcal{B}(Z))$ - $\mathcal{B}(Y')$ measurable such that
 - $t \mapsto F(t, u(t))$ is weak-* scalarwise locally integrable on I for $u \in \mathcal{X}_1$;

- $u_t = F(t, u)$ in the weak sense for every $u \in \mathcal{U}$, i.e.

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle u(t), v \rangle_{Y', Y} = \langle F(t, u(t)), v \rangle_{Y', Y}$$

in the sense of distributions on I , for all $v \in Y$;

iv) the mapping

$$t \mapsto \int_{\mathcal{V}} |\langle F(t, u(t)), v \rangle_{Y', Y}| d\rho(u)$$

belongs to $L^1_{loc}(I)$ for every $v \in Y$.

Then

$$t \mapsto \int_{\mathcal{V}} \varphi(u(t)) d\rho(u) \in C_b(I)$$

for every $\varphi \in C_b(X)$ and for every cylinder functional Φ in Y' and $t', t \in I$, we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{V}} \Phi(u(t)) d\rho(u) = \int_{\mathcal{V}} \Phi(u(t')) d\rho(u) + \int_{t'}^t \int_{\mathcal{V}} \langle F(s, u(s)), \Phi'(u(s)) \rangle_{Y', Y} d\rho(u).$$

In particular, the family of projections $\{\rho_t\}_{t \in I}$, $\rho_t = \Pi_t \rho$, is a statistical solution in phase space of the equation $u_t = F(t, u)$ over I .

The statistical solutions in phase space as constructed in Theorem 1.16 by projecting trajectory statistical solutions in time will also be called *projected statistical solutions in phase space*. It may not always be clear whether every statistical solution in phase space is already a projected statistical solution in phase space.

In combination with Theorem 1.13 and Theorem 1.15, we obtain the following results.

Theorem 1.17. *Let X and Z be Hausdorff spaces and Y be a topological vector space such that $Z \subset X \subset Y'_{w*}$ with continuous injections. Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an arbitrary interval, which is closed and bounded on the left with left endpoint t_0 , and let $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{X} := C_{loc}(I; X)$ satisfy the hypotheses (H1), (H2) and (H3) of Theorem 1.13. We assume*

(H4) $\mathcal{B}(Z) \subset \mathcal{B}(X)$;

(H5) $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{X}_1 := \mathcal{Z} \cap \mathcal{Y}_1$ (see the explanation above Theorem 1.16) and $F : I \times Z \rightarrow Y'$ is $(\mathcal{L}(I) \otimes \mathcal{B}(Z))$ - $\mathcal{B}(Y')$ measurable such that

- $t \mapsto F(t, u(t))$ is weak-* scalarwise locally integrable on I for $u \in \mathcal{X}_1$;
- $u_t = F(t, u)$ in the weak sense for every $u \in \mathcal{U}$, i.e.

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle u(t), v \rangle_{Y', Y} = \langle F(t, u(t)), v \rangle_{Y', Y}$$

in the sense of distributions on I , for all $v \in Y$;

(H6) there exists a function $\gamma : I \times X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that for every $v \in Y$ the mapping $(t, u) \mapsto \gamma(t, u, v)$ is $\mathcal{L}(I) \otimes \mathcal{B}(X)$ measurable and

$$\int_{t_0}^t |\langle F(s, u(s)), v \rangle_{Y', Y}| ds \leq \gamma(t, u(t_0), v)$$

for all $t \in I, u \in \mathcal{U}$.

Then, for any inner regular Borel probability measure μ_0 on X , satisfying

$$\int_X \gamma(t, u_0, v) d\mu_0(u_0) < \infty \tag{1.19}$$

for almost every $t \in I$ and all $v \in Y$, there exists a projected statistical solution $\{\rho_t\}_{t \in I}$ such that $\rho_{t_0} = \mu_0$.

Theorem 1.18. Consider the framework of Theorem 1.17 and let X_0 be a Borel subset of X . Suppose, however, that \mathcal{U} satisfies the conditions (H1'), (H2') and (H3') in Theorem 1.15 instead of (H1), (H2) and (H3). If also (H4), (H5) and (H6) from Theorem 1.17 hold, then for any inner regular Borel probability measure μ_0 on X which is carried by X_0 and satisfies (1.19), there exists a projected statistical solution $\{\rho_t\}_{t \in I}$ such that $\rho_{t_0} = \mu_0$.

We remark that γ , as defined by us in (1.12), has a slightly different form compared to γ in (1.19), but it will play the same role.

2 Trajectory statistical solutions of the Euler equations

In this section, we are going to construct trajectory statistical solutions of the Euler equations in each of the discussed classes of Section 1.1 and of the Navier-Stokes equations. We will begin by discussing trajectory statistical solutions in the class of weak solutions as in A) in Theorem 1.3, i.e. weak solutions of the Euler equations with uniformly bounded vorticity and in the class of weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations. These two cases are somewhat similar as we do have unique solutions. Moreover, we will not need the existence results from Section 1.2 but instead construct the trajectory statistical solutions in a more straightforward way as pushforward measures of the initial distribution under the corresponding solution operator. Our only task here is to check the required measurability properties.

In the second part of this section, we consider the remaining classes of solutions B) - D) in Theorem 1.3. Even though each case there has its own intricacies, all of them may be handled similarly by making use of the existence result Theorem 1.15. We will in fact demonstrate the idea behind Theorem 1.13 and Theorem 1.15 in the particular case of B), when the vorticity is in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $1 < p < \infty$.

2.1 Vorticity in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and the Navier-Stokes class

We consider the spaces

- $X^\infty = X_{NS}^\nu = \mathbb{E}$;
- $X_0^\infty = \{u_0 \in \mathbb{E} : \omega(u_0) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)\}$;
- \mathcal{U}^∞ , the space of weak solutions of the Euler equations $u \in C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})$ with vorticity $\omega(u) \in C([0, T]; L^q(\mathbb{R}^2)) \cap L^\infty(0, T; L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2))$, $1 \leq q < \infty$, and initial data in X_0^∞ ;
- \mathcal{U}_{NS}^ν , the space of weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations $u \in C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})$ such that $\nabla u \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}))$ with initial data in \mathbb{E} and viscosity ν ,

where $\nu > 0$ will be a fixed constant in the following, unless stated otherwise.

Remark 2.1. *i) We introduced $X^\infty = X_{NS}^\nu = \mathbb{E}$ here to indicate the connection to Definition 1.10. However, hoping to keep things clearer, we will usually not use this notation but rather write out \mathbb{E} , so it is particularly clear which norm or topology is considered.*

ii) Unlike in the next subsection, properties such as (1.14) need not be explicitly demanded in the definition of \mathcal{U}^∞ since all weak solutions in \mathcal{U}^∞ have vorticities that are renormalized solutions of the vorticity formulation of the Euler equations.

There exists a solution operator $S^\infty : X_0^\infty \rightarrow \mathcal{U}^\infty \subset C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})$ so that for any $u_0 \in X_0^\infty$, $S^\infty(u_0)$ is the unique weak solution of the Euler equations with initial data u_0 as given by Theorem 1.3. Likewise, there exists an operator $S_{NS}^\nu : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_{NS}^\nu \subset C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})$ so that $S_{NS}^\nu(u_0)$ is the unique weak solution of the Navier-Stokes equations with initial data u_0 and viscosity ν as given by Theorem 1.5.

For instance in the latter case, given an initial distribution μ_0 , the natural way to describe the distribution ρ_{NS}^ν of the solutions in \mathcal{U}_{NS}^ν with respect to μ_0 would be to define ρ_{NS}^ν as the pushforward measure $S_{NS}^\nu \mu_0$, that is $\rho_{NS}^\nu(A) = \mu_0((S_{NS}^\nu)^{-1}(A))$ for all Borel measurable sets A in $C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})$. This would immediately imply that ρ_{NS}^ν is carried by \mathcal{U}_{NS}^ν in the sense of Definition 1.10 if we could find a measurable subset of \mathcal{U}_{NS}^ν in $C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})$ with measure 1, or just show that \mathcal{U}_{NS}^ν is measurable itself. This definition, however, requires that S_{NS}^ν is Borel measurable.

We begin by proving the Borel measurability of X_0^∞ in \mathbb{E} .

Lemma 2.2. *The space X_0^∞ is Borel measurable in \mathbb{E} .*

Proof. Letting $A_k = \{u \in X_0^\infty : \|\omega(u)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)}, \|\omega(u)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq k\}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we may write

$$X_0^\infty = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} A_k.$$

Therefore, to prove the lemma, it suffices to prove that A_k is closed in \mathbb{E} . Let $(u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in A_k which converges in \mathbb{E} to some u . Due to the definition of A_k and weak-* compactness, we may also find subsequences for which

$$\begin{aligned}\omega(u^n) &\xrightarrow{*} \omega(u) \quad (n \rightarrow \infty) \text{ in } \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2), \\ \omega(u^n) &\xrightarrow{*} \omega(u) \quad (n \rightarrow \infty) \text{ in } L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2).\end{aligned}$$

The fact that on the right-hand side we could write $\omega(u)$ instead of some unspecific element in the according spaces follows from the convergence of $(u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in \mathbb{E} . Now with $\omega(u)$ being an element of $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2) \subset L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, we obtain from weak-* convergence in the sense of measures that for any $r > 0$

$$\|\omega(u)\|_{L^1(B_r(0))} \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\omega(u^n)\|_{L^1(B_r(0))} \leq k,$$

so that $\|\omega(u)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq k$. By also concluding from weak-* convergence in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ that $\|\omega(u)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq k$, we obtain $u \in A_k$. \square

Before proceeding with the following lemma, let us define the smoothing operators $(\mathcal{J}^\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon > 0}$: Fix a non-negative $\eta \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ having support in the closed unit ball $\overline{B}_1(0)$ and satisfying $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta \, dx = 1$. Then define $\eta^\varepsilon(x) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \eta\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, and finally let

$$\mathcal{J}^\varepsilon f := \eta^\varepsilon * f$$

for all $f \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

Lemma 2.3. *The operator S^∞ is $\mathcal{B}(X_0^\infty)$ - $\mathcal{B}(C([0, T]; \mathbb{E}))$ measurable, the operator S_{NS}^ν is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{E})$ - $\mathcal{B}(C([0, T]; \mathbb{E}))$ measurable.*

Proof. We prove the stated measurability of S^∞ , where we begin by introducing the following operators (for the definition of Σ , see (1.4)):

- $G : X_0^\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times H$, $u_0 \mapsto (m(u_0), u_{0,kin})$;
- $S^{\mathbb{R} \times H} : \mathbb{R} \times H \rightarrow \mathcal{U}^\infty$, $(m, v) \mapsto S^\infty(m\Sigma + v)$.

We are going to argue that S^∞ can be written as the pointwise limit ($\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$) of

$$S^{\varepsilon, \infty} : X_0^\infty \rightarrow \mathcal{U}^\infty, S^{\varepsilon, \infty} = (S^{\mathbb{R} \times H} \circ (\text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}}, \mathcal{J}^\varepsilon)) \circ G, \varepsilon > 0,$$

which we now prove to be measurable as a composition of measurable functions.

The definition of $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{E}}$ immediately implies that G is even continuous.

As for the measurability of $S^{\mathbb{R} \times H} \circ (\text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}}, \mathcal{J}^\varepsilon)$, we note that for any $(m, v) \in \mathbb{R} \times H$, the function $u = (S^{\mathbb{R} \times H} \circ (\text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}}, \mathcal{J}^\varepsilon))(m, v)$ is the smooth solution of the Euler equations in \mathcal{U}^∞ with smooth initial data $m\Sigma + \mathcal{J}^\varepsilon v \in E_m$ (see Theorem 1.7).

The stability estimate (1.6) for smooth solutions of the Euler equations yields the continuity of $S^{\mathbb{R} \times H} \circ (\text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}}, \mathcal{J}^\varepsilon)$ between the spaces $\mathbb{R} \times H$ and $C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})$.

The pointwise convergence of $S^{\varepsilon, \infty}$ to S^∞ is now a classic argument by which the weak

solutions in the Yudovich class may actually be constructed. See for instance [7][Chapter 5], where it is proved that for $m \in \mathbb{R}$ and any $u_0 \in E_m$, the solutions with smoothed initial data $(\mathcal{J}^\varepsilon u_0)_{\varepsilon>0}$ are Cauchy in $C([0, T]; E_m)$. The fact that in the definition of $S^{\varepsilon, \infty}$ we only smoothed the initial finite kinetic energy part does not make a difference because $\|\mathcal{J}^\varepsilon \Sigma - \Sigma\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} \rightarrow 0$ ($\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$) (see [7][Lemma 5.1.2]).

The measurability of S_{NS}^ν may be proved analogously as we chose $X_{NS}^\nu = X^\infty = \mathbb{E}$ and the important ingredient in the proof above being the stability estimate (1.6), which also holds in the Navier-Stokes case. \square

Lemma 2.4. *The space \mathcal{U}^∞ is Borel measurable in $C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})$, the space \mathcal{U}_{NS}^ν is closed in $C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})$.*

Proof. We may write $\mathcal{U}^\infty = \bigcup_{k=1}^\infty A_k$ with $A_k = \{u \in \mathcal{U}^\infty : \|\omega(u(0))\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq k\}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then we show that each set A_k , $k \in \mathbb{N}$, is closed in $C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})$. Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $(u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset A_k$ be a sequence converging to some u in $C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})$. This also implies convergence in $C([0, T]; H_{loc})$, which is strong enough to conclude that u is a weak solution of the Euler equations with initial data $u(0)$. From the definition of A_k , we may derive similarly to Lemma 2.2 that $u(0) \in X_0^\infty$ satisfies $\|\omega(u(0))\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq k$. Moreover, by (1.14), $\|\omega(u)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)}$ remains essentially bounded in time by k , so that $\omega(u) \in L^\infty(0, T; L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2))$ and we conclude $u \in A_k$.

Now we show the closedness of \mathcal{U}_{NS}^ν in $C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})$. Let $(u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{U}_{NS}^\nu$ be a sequence converging to some u in $C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})$. Due to (1.5), $(\nabla u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is also bounded in $L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}))$, from which we may derive weak-* convergence of $(\nabla u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ to ∇u in $L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}))$ so that u is in the desired space of functions. Both of these types of convergence suffice to pass to the limit in each term in the weak formulation of the Navier-Stokes equations so that u is once again a weak solution of the two-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations with viscosity ν . \square

As outlined at the beginning of this section, we now obtain an existence result for \mathcal{U}^∞ -trajectory statistical solutions, which we will state in a moment. Here, we would like to add that this trajectory statistical solution has a certain dissipation property of the vorticity as in (1.14). Proving this will require the following lemma.

Lemma 2.5. *The mappings $X_0^\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, u \mapsto \|\omega(u)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)}$ are Borel measurable for every $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. In particular, they are also Borel measurable when extended by ∞ to \mathbb{E} .*

Proof. Recall from Lemma 2.2 that X_0^∞ is Borel measurable in \mathbb{E} .

For every $1 \leq p < \infty$, $u \mapsto \|\omega(u)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)}$ can be written as the pointwise limit ($\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$) of the functions $u \mapsto \|\mathcal{J}^\varepsilon \omega(u)\|_{L^p(B_{1/\varepsilon}(0))}$. For each $\varepsilon > 0$, these functions can be seen to be continuous on X_0^∞ with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{E}}$. But then also $u \mapsto \|\omega(u)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)}$ is Borel measurable as the pointwise limit ($p \rightarrow \infty$) of the Borel measurable maps $u \mapsto \|\omega(u)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)}$. \square

In the following, $\Pi_0^\mathbb{E} : C([0, T]; \mathbb{E}) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}$ is the time evaluation mapping at time $t = 0$. We are also going to use the constant a as given in (1.11).

Theorem 2.6. Let μ_0 be a Borel probability measure on X_0^∞ . The Borel probability measure ρ^∞ on $C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})$, given by

$$\rho^\infty(A) = S^\infty \mu_0(A) := \mu_0((S^\infty)^{-1}(A))$$

for all Borel measurable sets A in $C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})$, is the well-defined and unique \mathcal{U}^∞ -trajectory statistical solution satisfying $\Pi_0^\mathbb{E} \rho^\infty = \mu_0$. If $\int_{\mathbb{E}} a^{|m(u_0)|} \|u_{0, kin}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} d\mu_0(u_0) < \infty$, then

$$\int_{C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})} \|u_{kin}(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} d\rho^\infty(u) \leq \int_{\mathbb{E}} a^{|m(u_0)|} \|u_{0, kin}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} d\mu_0(u_0) \quad (2.1)$$

for every $0 \leq t \leq T$.

Moreover, if μ_0 satisfies $\int_{\mathbb{E}} \|\omega(u_0)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} d\mu_0(u_0) < \infty$, then also

$$\int_{C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})} \|\omega(u(t))\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} d\rho^\infty(u) = \int_{\mathbb{E}} \|\omega(u_0)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} d\mu_0(u_0) \quad (2.2)$$

for every $0 \leq t \leq T$.

Proof. Due to the measurability of S^∞ , which was proved in Lemma 2.3, ρ^∞ is well-defined, clearly carried by \mathcal{U}^∞ , which is measurable due to Lemma 2.4 and satisfies

$$\Pi_0^\mathbb{E} \rho^\infty = (\Pi_0^\mathbb{E} \circ S^\infty) \mu_0 = \mu_0$$

since $\Pi_0^\mathbb{E} \circ S^\infty = \text{Id}_{X_0^\infty}$.

We now prove (2.2). The energy inequality (2.1) follows analogously based on (1.10). Let $U : [0, T] \times C([0, T]; \mathbb{E}) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}, (t, u) \mapsto u(t)$ be the evaluation mapping. As U is continuous, it is also $\mathcal{L}([0, T]) \otimes \mathcal{B}(C([0, T]; \mathbb{E}))$ - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{E})$ measurable. Using Lemma 2.3, $U \circ (\text{Id}_{[0, T]}, S^\infty)$ is $\mathcal{L}([0, T]) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{E})$ - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{E})$ measurable.

The fact that then also $(t, u_0) \mapsto \|\omega(S^\infty(u_0))(t)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)}$ is $\mathcal{L}([0, T]) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{E})$ measurable follows from Lemma 2.5.

Let $u_0 \in X_0^\infty$. Recall from (1.14) that for every $0 \leq t \leq T$, we have

$$\|\omega(S^\infty(u_0))(t)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} = \|\omega(u_0)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)}.$$

Integrating this equality with respect to μ_0 immediately yields (2.2).

To finish the proof, we show the claimed uniqueness. Let μ be any \mathcal{U}^∞ -trajectory statistical solution with initial distribution μ_0 in the sense that $\Pi_0^\mathbb{E} \mu = \mu_0$.

Let $Q \in \mathcal{B}(C([0, T]; \mathbb{E}))$. As μ is carried by the measurable set \mathcal{U}^∞ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(Q) &= \mu(Q \cap \mathcal{U}^\infty) = \mu((\Pi_0^\mathbb{E})^{-1}(\Pi_0^\mathbb{E}(Q \cap \mathcal{U}^\infty)) \cap \mathcal{U}^\infty) \\ &= \mu((\Pi_0^\mathbb{E})^{-1}(\Pi_0^\mathbb{E}(Q \cap \mathcal{U}^\infty))) = \mu_0(\Pi_0^\mathbb{E}(Q \cap \mathcal{U}^\infty)), \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\Pi_0^\mathbb{E}(Q \cap \mathcal{U}^\infty) = (S^\infty)^{-1}(Q \cap \mathcal{U}^\infty)$ is measurable in $X^\infty = \mathbb{E}$ by Lemma 2.3 and Lemma 2.4. This particularly shows that μ is equal to $S^\infty \mu_0 = \rho^\infty$. \square

We likewise obtain the following theorem on existence of \mathcal{U}_{NS}^ν -trajectory statistical solutions.

Theorem 2.7. *Let μ_0 be a Borel probability measure on \mathbb{E} . The Borel probability measure ρ_{NS}^ν on $C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})$, given by*

$$\rho_{NS}^\nu(A) = S_{NS}^\nu \mu_0(A) := \mu_0((S_{NS}^\nu)^{-1}(A))$$

for all Borel measurable sets A in $C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})$, is the well-defined and unique \mathcal{U}_{NS}^ν -trajectory statistical solution satisfying $\Pi_0 \rho_{NS}^\nu = \mu_0$.

Remark 2.8. *Similarly to (2.1), one can also obtain an energy inequality for trajectory statistical solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations as well as other properties, derived from the deterministic equations. We omit the discussion here as these properties are neither original nor do we need them in the following. Instead, we refer the reader for instance to Sections 6 and 7 in [22].*

To close this section, we briefly argue in what way the \mathcal{U}^∞ -trajectory statistical solution in Theorem 2.6 can also be obtained in the inviscid limit of the \mathcal{U}_{NS}^ν -trajectory statistical solution in Theorem 2.7 as $(\nu \rightarrow 0)$.

The following theorem due to Chemin (see [6]) in the deterministic case will make things quite convenient.

Theorem 2.9. *Let $u_0 \in X_0^\infty$. Then*

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow 0} S_{NS}^\nu(u_0) = S^\infty(u_0) \text{ in } C([0, T]; \mathbb{E}).$$

Then, by a simple application of the dominated convergence theorem, we obtain the following result from Theorem 2.9.

Theorem 2.10. *Let μ_0 be a Borel probability measure on X_0^∞ . Then $(S_{NS}^\nu \mu_0)_{\nu > 0}$ converges to $S^\infty \mu_0$ as $(\nu \rightarrow 0)$ in the sense that for every real-valued, bounded continuous function Φ on $C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})$,*

$$\int_{C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})} \Phi(u) dS_{NS}^\nu \mu_0(u) \rightarrow \int_{C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})} \Phi(u) dS^\infty \mu_0(u) \quad (\nu \rightarrow 0).$$

2.2 Vorticity in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, and in $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^2)$

In this subsection, we construct trajectory statistical solutions for the class of weak solutions of the Euler equations with vorticity in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, and in the space $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^2)$ of finite, non-negative Borel measures, considered by Delort.

We fix $1 < p < \infty$ and define the spaces

- $X^p = H_{loc}^p$, $X^{VS} = X^1 = H_{loc}^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$;
- $X_0^p = \{u_0 \in \mathbb{E} : \omega(u_0) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)\}$;

- $X_0^{VS} = \{u_0 \in \mathbb{E} : \omega(u_0) \in \mathcal{M}_c^+(\mathbb{R}^2)\};$
- $X_0^1 = \{u_0 \in \mathbb{E} : \omega(u_0) \in L_c^1(\mathbb{R}^2)\};$
- \mathcal{U}^p , the set of weak solutions of the Euler equations $u \in C([0, T]; X^p) \cap L^\infty(0, T; W_{loc}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2) \cap \mathbb{E})$ whose vorticity $\omega(u) \in C([0, T]; L^p(\mathbb{R}^2))$ is a renormalized solution of the vorticity formulation of the Euler equations having initial data in X_0^p and satisfying (1.10), (1.13) and (1.16);
- \mathcal{U}^{VS} , the set of weak solutions of the Euler equations $u \in C([0, T]; X^{VS}) \cap L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{E})$ with vorticity $\omega(u) \in C_w([0, T]; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2)) \cap L^\infty(0, T; \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^2))$ and initial data in X_0^{VS} satisfying (1.10), (1.13) and (1.15);
- \mathcal{U}^1 , the set of weak solutions of the Euler equations $u \in C([0, T]; X^1) \cap L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{E})$ with vorticity $\omega(u) \in C_w([0, T]; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2)) \cap L^\infty(0, T; L^1(\mathbb{R}^2))$ and initial data in X_0^1 satisfying (1.10), (1.13), (1.15) and (1.17).

As in the previous subsection, we will typically write out H_{loc} or $H_{loc}^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$ in the following instead of X^p, X^{VS} or X^1 in order to make it clearer which topology we consider.

We will treat these cases simultaneously whenever it is possible and seems reasonable. Should certain aspects vary too much though, then we will state and prove the results separate from one another. For the occasions where we consider all cases at once or formulate statements which hold in each case, we may write X, X_0 and \mathcal{U} as placeholders. Unlike the weak solutions considered in the previous subsection, the weak solutions considered here may no longer be unique and we will make use of the abstract existence result Theorem 1.15. Even though it would not be necessary, we will in fact demonstrate the nice arguments used in the proof of Theorem 1.15 in the particularly simple situation when the vorticity is in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

To begin with, let us prove a few measurability properties of these spaces.

Lemma 2.11. *The Borel- σ -algebras on \mathbb{E} generated by the topology induced by $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{E}}$ and the (subspace-) topologies of H_{loc} and $H_{loc}^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$ coincide. Moreover, the set \mathbb{E} is Borel measurable itself in H_{loc} and $H_{loc}^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$.*

Proof. We will only explicitly prove the case of H_{loc} . Showing measurability of \mathbb{E} in $H_{loc}^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$ and equality between the Borel- σ -algebras as stated in the lemma can be done in the exact same way by simply replacing H_{loc} with $H_{loc}^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$ in the following. Due to the continuous embedding $\mathbb{E} \hookrightarrow H_{loc}$, relatively open sets in \mathbb{E} with respect to the topology of H_{loc} are also $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{E}}$ open. This implies one inclusion between the two Borel- σ -algebras.

Next, we note that since \mathbb{E} is a separable Banach space, the Borel- σ -algebra on \mathbb{E} generated by the norm topology and the weak topology coincide. The latter is also generated by the weakly compact subsets, as $\mathbb{E} = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \overline{B}_k^{\mathbb{E}}(0)$ with the weak topology is σ -compact. Therefore, to prove the other inclusion stated in the lemma, we show that weakly compact subsets of \mathbb{E} are closed in H_{loc} . Both points just mentioned will then also yield the

measurability of \mathbb{E} in H_{loc} .

Let K be such a weakly compact subset in \mathbb{E} and consider a sequence $(u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in K which converges to some $u \in H_{loc}$ with respect to the metric of H_{loc} . By the Eberlein-Šmulian theorem, K is also weakly sequentially compact and, after passing to a subsequence of $(u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, there exists some $v \in K$ such that $u^n \rightharpoonup v$ ($n \rightarrow \infty$) in \mathbb{E} . Weak convergence of $(u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} = (m(u^n)\Sigma + u_{kin}^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in \mathbb{E} is equivalent to $(m(u^n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converging in \mathbb{R} and $(u_{kin}^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converging weakly in H . Consequently, $(u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly in $L^2(B)$ to v for every bounded measurable subset $B \subset \mathbb{R}^2$.

By testing with some $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$, the two types of convergence yield $u = v$, which particularly implies $u \in K$ and thereby the closedness of K . \square

Recall that in Theorem 1.15, a fundamental assumption was the measurability of X_0 in X , which we are going to check in the following lemmata.

Lemma 2.12. *The spaces X_0^p , $1 < p < \infty$, and X_0^{VS} are Borel measurable in \mathbb{E} . In particular, they are also Borel measurable subsets of H_{loc} and $H_{loc}^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$.*

Proof. Both cases may be proved similarly to Lemma 2.2 by writing

$$X_0^p = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \{u \in X_0^p : \|\omega(u)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)}, \|\omega(u)\|_{L^p} \leq k\}$$

and

$$X_0^{VS} = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \{u \in X_0^{VS} : \text{supp } \omega(u) \subset \overline{B}_k(0)\}.$$

The remaining part of measurability of X_0^p and X_0^{VS} in H_{loc} and $H_{loc}^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$ now follows from Lemma 2.11. \square

Showing the measurability of X_0^1 in \mathbb{E} or $H_{loc}^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$ is a bit more difficult and has to be treated differently, compared to the previous cases, due to the lack of reflexivity of $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$. We first prove the following lemma.

Lemma 2.13. *The spaces $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $L_c^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ are Borel measurable in $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ endowed with the weak-* topology.*

Proof. We first note that from the definition of the total variation norm via the duality $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2) \cong C_0(\mathbb{R}^2)'$, it follows that the total variation norm is weakly lower semicontinuous as a mapping from $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, endowed with the weak-* topology, into the real numbers. Consequently, open balls with respect to the total variation norm are measurable with respect to the Borel- σ -algebra generated by the weak-* topology.

Let $(f^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a dense subset of $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$. To conclude the proof of measurability of $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$, it now suffices to show

$$L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) = \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2) : \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |f^n - \mu| < \frac{1}{k} \right\}. \quad (2.3)$$

Indeed, a measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is an element of the set on the right-hand side if and only if there exists a strictly increasing sequence $(n_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that $f^{n_m} \rightarrow \mu$ ($m \rightarrow \infty$) with respect to the total variation norm. In particular, $(f^{n_m})_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with respect to the total variation norm. As the total variation norm and the $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ norm coincide on $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \subset \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $(f^{n_m})_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ is also a Cauchy-sequence in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Due to the completeness of $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$, necessarily $\mu \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$. The other inclusion in (2.3) follows from the density of $(f^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. As for $L_c^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$, we may write

$$L_c^1(\mathbb{R}^2) = L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \{\omega \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2) : \text{supp } \omega \subset \overline{B}_k(0)\},$$

where each set in the countable union is closed in $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with respect to the weak-* topology. \square

Lemma 2.14. *The space X_0^1 is Borel measurable in \mathbb{E} . In particular, it is also a Borel measurable subset of $H_{loc}^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$.*

Proof. In this proof, measurability in $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is always meant with respect to the Borel- σ -algebra generated by the weak-* topology as in the previous lemma.

We introduce the mapping $\Psi : \{u \in \mathbb{E} : \omega(u) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2)\} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $u \mapsto \omega(u)$.

Consider the closed and hence measurable subsets $\mathbb{E}_k = \{u \in \mathbb{E} : \omega(u) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2), \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\omega(u)| \leq k\}$ of \mathbb{E} for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and denote by Ψ_k the restrictions of Ψ to \mathbb{E}_k for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We argue that every mapping Ψ_k is continuous: Let $(u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in \mathbb{E}_k converging to some $u \in \mathbb{E}$. Then $(\omega(u^n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence in the closed total variation ball of radius k , centred at 0. By the Banach-Alaoglu theorem there exists a subsequence, again denoted by $(\omega(u^n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, converging weakly-* to some $\omega \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. From convergence in \mathbb{E} , it follows that necessarily $\omega = \omega(u)$ and the weak-* convergence already holds for the sequence itself, i.e. $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Psi_k(u^n) = \Psi_k(u)$ with respect to the weak-* topology.

Finally, $X_0^1 = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} X_0^1 \cap \mathbb{E}_k = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \Psi_k^{-1}(L_c^1(\mathbb{R}^2))$ is measurable by Lemma 2.13. \square

To meet the requirements of Theorem 1.13, we will need to construct families $\mathcal{K}'(X_0)$ of compact subsets of the space of initial data such that solutions having initial data in one of those compact sets are compact in the whole set of solutions. We remark here that this required closedness in particular includes that the limits need not only be weak solutions of the Euler equations, but also satisfy the a priori estimates that we impose in the definition of $\mathcal{U}^p, \mathcal{U}^{VS}$ and \mathcal{U}^1 . Estimating the left-hand side may usually be done by an argument of weak or weak-* lower semicontinuity. Estimating the right-hand side, which involves the initial data, is a different matter. In the construction of weak solutions, convergence of the right-hand side involving the initial data is usually obvious from the approximation scheme, e.g. smoothing of the initial data. For general sequences of solutions as considered here, it is not clear. In the case of the three-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations considered for instance in [19], the same problem arises as it is not clear whether weak limits of Leray-Hopf solutions satisfy the energy inequality.

Therefore, the sets in $\mathcal{K}'(X_0)$ particularly need to be compact in a compatible way with the a priori estimates demanded above.

Interestingly enough, no infinite dimensional Banach space may be exhausted by compact subsets, which can be seen by a Baire category argument. Yet in a measure theoretic way this is possible, if the space is Polish, in the sense that every Borel measure is inner regular (see Theorem 3.2 in [26]). This fact will be heavily exploited later on.

For the precise definition of those families of compact sets, we introduce the operator $\text{curl}^p : X_0^p \rightarrow L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^2), u_0 \mapsto \omega(u_0)$, as well as the operator $\text{curl}^1 : X_0^1 \rightarrow L^1(\mathbb{R}^2), u_0 \mapsto \omega(u_0)$.

Using the smoothing operator as in Lemma 2.5, it is not hard to see that curl^p and curl^1 are measurable as pointwise limits of continuous functions and may then also be seen as measurable maps on \mathbb{E} , extended by ∞ , due to Lemma 2.12 and Lemma 2.14. Now we define

- $\mathcal{K}'(X_0^p)$ to be the family consisting of all sets of the form $S \cap (\text{curl}^p)^{-1}(K)$, where $S \subset X_0^p$ is compact in \mathbb{E} and K is a compact set in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$;
- $\mathcal{K}'(X_0^{VS})$ to be the family consisting of all subsets of X_0^{VS} which are compact in \mathbb{E} ;
- $\mathcal{K}'(X_0^1)$ to be the family consisting of all sets of the form $S \cap (\text{curl}^1)^{-1}(K)$, where $S \subset X_0^1$ is compact in \mathbb{E} and K is a compact set in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

For a compact set K in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $(\text{curl}^p)^{-1}(K)$ is a subset of X_0^p , (relatively) closed in \mathbb{E} , which implies that with S as above, $S \cap (\text{curl}^p)^{-1}(K)$ is a subset of X_0^p which is compact in \mathbb{E} . Due to the continuous embedding $\mathbb{E} \hookrightarrow H_{loc}$, the sets in $\mathcal{K}'(X_0^p)$ are indeed compact in H_{loc} .

Likewise, one may argue that $\mathcal{K}'(X_0^1)$ consists of sets in X_0^1 which are compact in $\mathbb{E} \hookrightarrow H_{loc}^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$.

Compactness of the sets in $\mathcal{K}'(X_0^{VS})$ in $\mathbb{E} \hookrightarrow H_{loc}^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$ follows directly from the definition.

We now show that these families satisfy $(H2')$ in Theorem 1.15.

Lemma 2.15. *Let μ_0 be a Borel probability measure on X_0 . Then μ_0 is inner regular with respect to the family $\mathcal{K}'(X_0)$.*

Proof. We begin with the easiest case of μ_0 being a Borel probability measure on X_0^{VS} . By Lemma 2.11 and Lemma 2.12, μ_0 can be seen as a Borel probability measure on \mathbb{E} . Since \mathbb{E} is a Polish space, μ_0 is inner regular with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{E}}$ compact sets in X_0^{VS} , which form by definition $\mathcal{K}'(X_0^{VS})$.

Now we consider the case of μ_0 being a Borel probability measure on X_0^p . Let A be a Borel subset of X_0^p . Due to Lemma 2.11 and Lemma 2.12, we may also view μ_0 as a measure on \mathbb{E} , which is a Polish space. In this sense, μ_0 is already inner regular and we obtain

$$\mu_0(A) = \sup_{\substack{S \subset A \\ S \text{ compact in } \mathbb{E}}} \mu_0(S) = \sup_{\substack{S \subset A \\ S \text{ compact in } \mathbb{E}}} \mu_0((\text{curl}^p)^{-1}(\text{curl}^p(S)))$$

We would now like to argue that for any compact subset S in \mathbb{E} , $\text{curl}^p(S)$ is Borel measurable in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$. First of all, let $T : L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$ be the Biot-Savart operator (see Lemma 1.6). Note that T is continuous even considered as an operator on $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ as it is a convolution operator with a kernel that may be written as a sum in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) + L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$. By Lemma 1.6, we have

$$\text{curl}^p(S) = T^{-1}(S). \quad (2.4)$$

Since convergence in \mathbb{E} implies convergence in H_{loc} , which again implies convergence in $L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$, S is not only compact with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{E}}$ but also with respect to the topology of $L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$. Due to (2.4), $\text{curl}^p(S)$ is closed and hence Borel measurable in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

We may then introduce the pushforward measure $\mu_0^p := \text{curl}^p \mu_0$ on $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$. As a Borel probability measure on a Polish space, μ_0^p is also inner regular.

Continuing where we left of with our computation of $\mu_0(A)$, we now have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_0(A) &= \sup_{\substack{S \subset A \\ S \text{ compact in } \mathbb{E}}} \mu_0^p(\text{curl}^p(S)) \\ &= \sup_{\substack{S \subset A \\ S \text{ compact in } \mathbb{E}}} \sup_{\substack{K \subset \text{curl}^p(S) \\ K \text{ compact in } L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)}} \mu_0^p(K) \\ &= \sup_{\substack{S \subset A \\ S \text{ compact in } \mathbb{E}}} \sup_{\substack{(\text{curl}^p)^{-1}(K) \subset S \\ K \text{ compact in } L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)}} \mu_0((\text{curl}^p)^{-1}(K) \cap S) \\ &\leq \sup_{\substack{S \cap (\text{curl}^p)^{-1}(K) \subset A \\ S \subset X_0^p \text{ compact in } \mathbb{E} \\ K \text{ compact in } L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)}} \mu_0((\text{curl}^p)^{-1}(K) \cap S) \\ &\leq \mu_0(A), \end{aligned}$$

as desired. The remaining case of μ_0 being a Borel probability measure on X_0^1 may be proved analogously to the previous one due to the similarity between the definition of $\mathcal{K}'(X_0^p)$ and $\mathcal{K}'(X_0^1)$ and due to the fact that the Biot-Savart operator T above is still continuous when changing its domain to $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$. \square

Next, we prove that our families of compact sets also satisfy $(H3')$ in Theorem 1.15. For this, let $\Pi_0^{X^p} : C([0, T]; H_{loc}) \rightarrow H_{loc}$ and $\Pi_0^{X^1}, \Pi_0^{X^{VS}} : C([0, T]; H_{loc}^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)) \rightarrow H_{loc}^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$ be the time evaluation maps between the given spaces at time $t = 0$. When we discuss all cases simultaneously, we will simply write Π_0^X .

Lemma 2.16. *Let S be a subset of X_0^p which is compact in \mathbb{E} and let K be a compact subset of $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that $S \cap (\text{curl}^p)^{-1}(K)$ is an element of $\mathcal{K}'(X_0^p)$. Then the set $\kappa^p := (\Pi_0^{X^p})^{-1}(S \cap (\text{curl}^p)^{-1}(K)) \cap \mathcal{U}^p$ is compact in $C([0, T]; H_{loc})$.*

Proof. Consider an arbitrary sequence $(u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \kappa^p$. From (1.16), we obtain uniform boundedness of $(u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $L^\infty(0, T; W_{loc}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2))$. Moreover $(\partial_t u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly

bounded in $L^\infty(0, T; H^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2))$ for some $L > 1$ by (1.13). Due to the compact embeddings

$$W_{loc}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2) \cap H_{loc} \hookrightarrow H_{loc} \hookrightarrow H_{loc}^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2),$$

the Aubin-Lions lemma and a diagonal sequence argument imply convergence of a subsequence of $(u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $C([0, T]; H_{loc})$ to some u , so it only remains to show that $u \in \kappa^p$. As each field in the sequence $(u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the weak velocity formulation of the Euler equations given in (1.1), the precompactness in $C([0, T]; H_{loc})$ allows us to pass to the limit in all terms, in particular the quadratic one, so that u is also a weak solution of the Euler equations.

Moreover, from compactness of S in \mathbb{E} and from compactness of K in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$, we may assume

$$\begin{aligned} u^n(0) &\rightarrow u(0) \quad (n \rightarrow \infty) \text{ in } \mathbb{E} \\ \omega(u^n)(0) &\rightarrow \omega(u)(0) \quad (n \rightarrow \infty) \text{ in } L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^2). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $u(0) \in K$ and properties (1.10), (1.13) and (1.16), demanded in the definition of \mathcal{U}^p , can be seen to be satisfied by u from combining this strong convergence of the initial data along with an argument of weak or weak-* lower semicontinuity involving $(u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\omega(u^n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in the respective space. Also, the strong convergence of the initial vorticities shows that after passing yet to another subsequence that $\omega(u)$ is a renormalized solution of the vorticity formulation of the Euler equations (see Lemma 1.8). In particular, $u \in \kappa^p$. \square

Lemma 2.17. *Let K be a compact set in the family $\mathcal{K}'(X_0^{VS})$. Then the set $\kappa^{VS} := (\Pi_0^{X^{VS}})^{-1}(K) \cap \mathcal{U}^{VS}$ is compact in $C([0, T]; H_{loc}^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2))$.*

Proof. Let $(u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \kappa^{VS}$ be a sequence. Since $\omega(u^n)(0) \in \mathcal{M}_c^+(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, by our comments preceding Theorem 1.3, $u_0^n = m(u_0^n)\Sigma + u_{0,kin}^n$ with $m(u_0^n) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \omega(u_0^n)$. Therefore, by compactness of K in \mathbb{E} , this implies that (a subsequence of) the total mass of initial vorticity converges. Hence, $(\partial_t u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(0, T; H^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2))$ due to (1.13). The bound on the local kinetic energy (1.12) and the definition of K yield that $(u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(0, T; H_{loc})$, where H_{loc} compactly embeds into $H_{loc}^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$. Consequently, $(u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is equicontinuous in $C([0, T]; H_{loc}^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2))$ with values in a relatively compact subset of $H_{loc}^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$. Then the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem implies that after passing to a subsequence, $(u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges in $C([0, T]; H_{loc}^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2))$ to some u , so it only remains to show $u \in \kappa^{VS}$. Due to (1.10) and the compactness of K in \mathbb{E} , $(u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{E})$, so that u may also be seen as the weak-* limit in that space.

We are now going to apply Theorem 1.9. Due to (1.15), $(\omega(u^n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(0, T; \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^2))$. Then $\omega(u)$ can be seen as the weak-* limit of $(\omega(u^n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}} = (|\omega(u^n)|)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $L^\infty(0, T; \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^2))$. Since $u \in L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{E})$, $\omega(u)(t)$ is continuous for almost every $0 \leq t \leq T$ (see Remark 1.4 and the comments prior to Theorem 1.9). Therefore, Theorem 1.9 yields that u is indeed a weak solution of the Euler equations. The a priori estimates (1.10), (1.13) and (1.15), demanded in the definition of \mathcal{U}^{VS} , are

also satisfied by the weak limit u . Indeed, one may estimate the left-hand side by classic weak-* compactness arguments along with weak lower semicontinuity in an appropriate sense. The right-hand side in each estimate involving the initial data converges due to the compactness of K with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{E}}$.

As for the continuity of $\omega(u)$ demanded in the definition of \mathcal{U}^{VS} , from boundedness of $(\partial_t u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $L^\infty(0, T; H^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2))$ we obtain boundedness of $(\partial_t \omega(u^n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in the space $L^\infty(0, T; H^{-L-1}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2))$. Then, as remarked in [28][Lemma 3.2], the weak-* convergence of $(\omega(u^n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ to $\omega(u)$ in $L^\infty(0, T; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2))$ allows one to derive that $(\omega(u^n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges in $C_w([0, T]; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2))$ to $\omega(u)$. \square

Lemma 2.18. *Let S be a subset of X_0^1 , which is compact in \mathbb{E} and let K be a compact subset of $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that $S \cap (\text{curl}^1)^{-1}(K)$ is an element of $\mathcal{K}'(X_0^1)$. Then the set $\kappa^1 := (\Pi_0^{X^1})^{-1}(S \cap (\text{curl}^1)^{-1}(K)) \cap \mathcal{U}^1$ is compact in $C([0, T]; H_{loc}^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2))$.*

Proof. Let $(u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \kappa^1$ be a sequence. The precompactness of $(u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in the space $C([0, T]; H_{loc}^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2))$ follows again from the Aubin-Lions lemma as in Lemma 2.17. We denote the limit of a subsequence by u and keep on writing $(u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ for this and for further subsequences. Due to the compactness of K in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$, we may also suppose that $\omega(u^n)(0) \rightarrow \omega(u)(0)$ in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and we can also see u as the weak-* limit of $(u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{E})$ as this sequence is bounded in that space by (1.10).

We now argue that u satisfies (1.15). As at the end of the proof of Lemma 2.17, we not only obtain weak-* convergence of $(\omega(u^n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $L^\infty(0, T; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2))$ to $\omega(u)$, but in fact convergence also holds in $C_w([0, T]; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2))$. We particularly obtain $\omega(u^n)(t) \xrightarrow{*} \omega(u)(t)$ ($n \rightarrow \infty$) in $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for every $0 \leq t \leq T$. We combine this with the fact that due to (1.17) and the Dunford-Pettis theorem, by which uniform integrability and weak (sequential) precompactness in $L_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ are equivalent (see Chapter 4 in [2] and in particular Theorem 4.7.18), $(\omega(u^n)(t))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is weakly precompact in $L_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for every $0 \leq t \leq T$. We then necessarily obtain $\omega(u^n)(t) \rightharpoonup \omega(u)(t)$ in $L_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for every $0 \leq t \leq T$. Weak lower semicontinuity of the norm then yields for every $r > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\omega(u)(t)\|_{L^1(B_r(0))} &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\omega(u^n)(t)\|_{L^1(B_r(0))} \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\omega(u^n)(t)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} \\ &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\omega(u^n)(0)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} = \|\omega(u)(0)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} \end{aligned}$$

for every $0 \leq t \leq T$. This means that u also satisfies (1.15), which we demanded in the definition of \mathcal{U}^1 .

Likewise, one may argue that $|\omega(u^n)|$ converges weakly-* in $L^\infty(0, T; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2))$ to an element of $L^\infty(0, T; L^1(\mathbb{R}^2))$ so that the continuity assumption in Theorem 1.9 is satisfied. Therefore, u is indeed a weak solution of the Euler equations.

The properties (1.10), (1.13) and (1.14) demanded in the definition of \mathcal{U}^1 follow as in Lemma 2.17. Property (1.17) follows from strong convergence $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega(u^n)(0) = \omega(u)(0)$ in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and from weak-* lower semicontinuity due to weak-* convergence of $(\omega(u^n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $L^\infty(0, T; \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^2))$. \square

We are now able to state the existence result of trajectory statistical solutions in the classes considered in this subsection. As mentioned in the introduction to this subsection,

for the case of $X^p = H_{loc}$ being the phase space, we will provide the arguments used in the proof of Theorem 1.13, applied to our specific situation for illustrative purposes. In the other two cases we will directly refer to the statement of Theorem 1.15.

In the following, for $u \in X$, we define

$$\|\omega(u)\|_X := \begin{cases} \|\omega(u)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)} & : X = X^p \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \omega(u_0) & : X = X^{VS} , \\ \|\omega(u)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} & : X = X^1 \end{cases} \quad (2.5)$$

with the right-hand side being ∞ if $\omega(u)$ does not lie in the appropriate space. For the next theorem, recall the constant a as given in (1.11).

Theorem 2.19. *Let μ_0 be an arbitrary Borel probability measure on X_0 . Then there exists a \mathcal{U} -trajectory statistical solution ρ satisfying $\Pi_0^X \rho = \mu_0$.*

If $\int_{\mathbb{E}} a^{|m(u_0)|} \|u_{0,kin}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} d\mu_0(u_0) < \infty$, then

$$\int_{C([0,T];\mathbb{E})} \|u_{kin}(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} d\rho(u) \leq \int_{\mathbb{E}} a^{|m(u_0)|} \|u_{0,kin}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} d\mu_0(u_0) \quad (2.6)$$

for almost every $0 \leq t \leq T$.

Moreover, if μ_0 satisfies $\int_X \|\omega(u_0)\|_X d\mu_0(u_0) < \infty$, then

$$\int_{C([0,T];X)} \|\omega(u(t))\|_X d\rho(u) \leq \int_X \|\omega(u_0)\|_X d\mu_0(u_0), \quad (2.7)$$

for every $0 \leq t \leq T$ with equality in case $X = X^p$.

Proof. We consider the case of μ_0 being a Borel probability measure on X_0^p . Assume that μ_0 is concentrated on some compact set $\kappa_0^p := S \cap (\text{curl}^p)^{-1}(K)$ in the family $\mathcal{K}'(X_0^p)$, where S is a subset of X_0^p which is compact with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{E}}$ and K is a compact set in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

Then $C(\kappa_0^p)'$ is the space of finite (signed) Borel measures on κ_0^p . As $C(\kappa_0^p)$ is separable due to the compactness of κ_0^p , the unit ball \mathbb{B} in $C(\kappa_0^p)'$ is weak-* sequentially compact by the Banach-Alaoglu theorem. The non-negative Borel measures \mathbb{B}_+ of total mass less than or equal to one form a weakly-* closed, hence weakly-* compact, and also convex subset of \mathbb{B} . Now the Krein-Milman theorem (see [27][Theorem 3.23]) implies that \mathbb{B}_+ is equal to the closed convex hull of its extremal points, which are the Dirac measures in our case. Hence, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $J^n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $j = 1, \dots, J^n$ there are

$$\theta_j^n \in (0, 1], u_{0,j}^n \in \kappa_0^p$$

satisfying $\sum_{j=1}^{J^n} \theta_j^n = 1$ and

$$\mu_0^n := \sum_{j=1}^{J^n} \theta_j^n \delta_{u_{0,j}^n} \xrightarrow{*} \mu_0 \quad (n \rightarrow \infty)$$

on $C(\kappa_0^p)$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ let $u_j^n \in \mathcal{U}^p$ be a weak solution of the Euler equations with initial data $u_{0,j}^n$. The sequence of Borel probability measures on $C([0, T]; H_{loc})$

$$\rho^n := \sum_{j=1}^n \theta_j^n \delta_{u_j^n}, n \in \mathbb{N},$$

then belongs already to $C(\kappa^p)'$, where $\kappa^p := (\Pi_0^{X^p})^{-1}(\kappa_0^p) \cap \mathcal{U}^p$ is compact in $C([0, T]; H_{loc})$ by Lemma 2.16. Consequently, $C(\kappa^p)$ is separable and by the Banach-Alaoglu theorem there exists a Borel probability measure $\rho \in C(\kappa^p)'$ such that, after possibly passing to a subsequence, $\rho^n \xrightarrow{*} \rho$ ($n \rightarrow \infty$). In particular, ρ is a \mathcal{U}^p -trajectory statistical solution as it is carried by the compact set κ^p in \mathcal{U}^p .

Now we show that $\Pi_0^{X^p} \rho = \mu_0$. On the one hand, due to the very definition of the measures ρ^n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\Pi_0^{X^p} \rho^n = \mu_0^n \xrightarrow{*} \mu_0 \quad (n \rightarrow \infty)$$

on $C(\kappa_0^p)'$. On the other hand, for every $\varphi \in C(\kappa_0^p)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\kappa_0^p} \varphi(u_0) d(\Pi_0^{X^p} \rho^n)(u_0) &= \int_{\kappa^p} \underbrace{(\varphi \circ \Pi_0^{X^p})(u)}_{\in C(\kappa^p)} d\rho^n(u) \\ &\rightarrow \int_{\kappa^p} (\varphi \circ \Pi_0^{X^p})(u) d\rho(u) \quad (n \rightarrow \infty) \\ &= \int_{\kappa_0^p} \varphi(u_0) d(\Pi_0^{X^p} \rho)(u_0), \end{aligned}$$

i.e. $\Pi_0^{X^p} \rho^n \xrightarrow{*} \Pi_0^{X^p} \rho$ ($n \rightarrow \infty$) in $C(\kappa_0^p)'$. Due to uniqueness of the weak-* limit, we obtain equality of $\Pi_0^{X^p} \rho$ and μ_0 as measures on κ_0^p . But then equality also holds as measures on $X^p = H_{loc}$.

Now we consider the case where μ_0 is an arbitrary Borel probability measure on X_0^p , not concentrated on an element of $\mathcal{K}'(X_0^p)$. By Lemma 2.15, μ_0 is inner regular with respect to the family $\mathcal{K}'(X_0^p)$ and we may find a sequence $(\kappa_0^{p,n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{K}'(X_0^p)$ such that

$$\mu_0 \left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \kappa_0^{p,n} \right) = 1.$$

Furthermore, we may assume $\mu_0(\kappa_0^{p,n+1}) > \mu_0(\kappa_0^{p,n}) > 0$ and $\kappa_0^{p,n+1} \supset \kappa_0^{p,n}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Also, let $D_n := \kappa_0^{p,n} \setminus \kappa_0^{p,n-1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ($\kappa_0^{p,0} := \emptyset$). Then

$$\mu_0 \left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} D_n \right) = \mu_0 \left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \kappa_0^{p,n} \right) = 1$$

and for every Borel measurable set A in X_0^p , we have

$$\mu_0(A) = \mu_0 \left(A \cap \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} D_n \right) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu_0(A \cap D_n).$$

Since $\mu_0(D_n) > 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we may define the Borel probability measures

$$\mu_0^n := \frac{\mu_0(\cdot \cap D_n)}{\mu_0(D_n)}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, μ_0^n is concentrated on $\kappa_0^{p,n}$ and, by the first part of this proof, we may find a \mathcal{U}^p -trajectory statistical solution ρ^n satisfying $\Pi_0^{X^p} \rho^n = \mu_0^n$. Now we define the Borel probability measure

$$\rho := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu_0(D_n) \rho^n.$$

Since for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the measure ρ^n is carried by a measurable subset of \mathcal{U}^p , the same applies for ρ , which means that ρ is a \mathcal{U}^p -trajectory statistical solution. So it only remains to show that $\Pi_0^{X^p} \rho = \mu_0$. Let $\varphi \in C_b(H_{loc})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{H_{loc}} \varphi(u_0) d\Pi_0^{X^p} \rho(u_0) = \int_{C([0,T]; H_{loc})} \varphi(u(0)) d\rho(u) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{C([0,T]; H_{loc})} \mu_0(D_n) \varphi(u(0)) d\rho^n(u) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu_0(D_n) \int_{H_{loc}} \varphi(u_0) d\Pi_0^{X^p} \rho^n(u_0) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu_0(D_n) \int_{H_{loc}} \varphi(u_0) d\mu_0^n(u_0) = \int_{H_{loc}} \varphi(u_0) d\mu_0(u_0), \end{aligned}$$

which yields the claim.

We remark here that in all cases, (2.6) can be proved same as (2.1) or (2.2), based on the deterministic inequality (1.10). Estimate (2.7) also follows analogously to (2.2) based on (1.14) and a measurability result for the p -norm of the vorticity, similar to that of Lemma 2.5.

Next, we consider the case of μ_0 being a Borel probability measure on X_0^{VS} . We apply Theorem 1.15. Condition $(H1')$ is satisfied by Delort's theorem (see Section 1.1). Condition $(H2')$ of inner regularity of μ_0 with respect to the family $\mathcal{K}'(X_0^{VS})$ is satisfied due to Lemma 2.15. The final condition $(H3')$ in Theorem 1.15 was just proved in Lemma 2.17. Likewise to the previous case, estimate (2.7) can be proved analogously to (2.2) based on (1.15) and the Borel measurability of the mapping $\mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, u \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \omega(u_0)$ with respect to \mathbb{E} or the topology of $H_{loc}^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$ (see Lemma 2.11), which may be proved similarly to Lemma 2.5.

Finally, we also apply Theorem 1.15 to the case of μ_0 being a Borel probability measure on X_0^1 . Condition $(H1')$ is satisfied as described in Section 1.1, i.e. for every $u_0 \in X_0^1$ there exists a weak solution of the Euler equations in \mathcal{U}^1 . Condition $(H2')$ of inner regularity of μ_0 with respect to the family $\mathcal{K}'(X_0^1)$ is satisfied by Lemma 2.15. The final condition $(H3')$ in Theorem 1.15 was just proved in Lemma 2.18. Estimate (2.7) may also be proved similarly to (2.2) based on (1.14) and a measurability result for the 1-norm of the vorticity, similar to that of Lemma 2.5 in combination with Lemma 2.11. \square

In the final part of this subsection, we also provide arguments by which \mathcal{U}^p , \mathcal{U}^{VS} or \mathcal{U}^1 -trajectory statistical solutions can alternatively be constructed by consideration of the inviscid limit of \mathcal{U}_{NS}^ν -trajectory statistical solutions as $(\nu \rightarrow 0)$. Our strategy here will be to first consider the \mathcal{U}_{NS}^ν -trajectory statistical solutions as probability measures on a compact set, similar to those in $\mathcal{K}'(X_0^p), \mathcal{K}'(X_0^{VS})$ or $\mathcal{K}'(X_0^1)$, uniformly in ν and obtain a measure as a weak-* limit using the Banach-Alaoglu theorem. Then we argue that this measure does have support in the desired class of weak solutions so that it will ultimately be a trajectory statistical solution as desired.

Lemma 2.20. *Let M be a compact metric space and $(\pi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of measures on the Borel- σ -algebra of M converging weakly-* to some measure π . For every $x \in M$ denote by \mathcal{O}_x its system of open neighbourhoods. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{supp } \pi &\subset \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\text{supp } \pi_n) \\ &:= \{x \in M : \forall O \in \mathcal{O}_x \text{ and all but finitely many } n \in \mathbb{N} : O \cap \text{supp } \pi_n \neq \emptyset\} \\ &= \{x \in M : x \text{ is the limit of a sequence } (x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \text{supp } \pi_n\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $x \in \text{supp } \pi$ and consider an open ball $B_r(x)$ with radius $r > 0$, centred at x . Let $\varphi \in C(M)$ be given by

$$\varphi(y) = \max \left\{ 0, 1 - \frac{2}{r} \text{dist}(y, B_{r/2}(x)) \right\}, y \in M.$$

Then, as $B_{r/2}(x)$ is an open neighbourhood of x , we have

$$0 < \pi(B_{r/2}(x)) \leq \int_M \varphi d\pi = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_M \varphi d\pi_n \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \pi_n(B_r(x)).$$

Therefore, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough, $\pi_n(B_r(x)) > 0$. This does suffice to show that $B_r(x) \cap \text{supp } \pi_n \neq \emptyset$ for such an $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Indeed, suppose the opposite was true, i.e. $B_r(x) \cap \text{supp } \pi_n = \emptyset$. Then for every $y \in B_r(x)$, there exists an open neighbourhood O_y of y in $B_r(x)$ such that $\pi_n(O_y) = 0$. For every $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, the sets $(O_y)_{y \in \overline{B_{r-\varepsilon}}(x)}$ form an open cover of the compact ball $\overline{B_{r-\varepsilon}}(x)$. Hence, for finitely many $y_1^\varepsilon, \dots, y_{N_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon \in B_r(x)$, $\overline{B_{r-\varepsilon}}(x) \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{N_\varepsilon} O_{y_j^\varepsilon}$. In particular $\pi_n(\overline{B_{r-\varepsilon}}(x)) = 0$ by subadditivity. From σ -continuity, we arrive at the contradiction $\pi_n(B_r(x)) = 0$.

Hence, $B_r(x) \cap \text{supp } \pi_n \neq \emptyset$ for all but finitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$, which suffices as the balls $(B_r(x))_{r>0}$ form a basis of the neighbourhood system \mathcal{O}_x . \square

To be able to tell that the support of the \mathcal{U}_{NS}^ν -trajectory statistical solutions are indeed contained in \mathcal{U}_{NS}^ν , we may show closedness of this space. The following lemma will be of use in the following sections.

Lemma 2.21. *Let κ_0 be a compact set in \mathbb{E} . Then $\kappa := (\Pi_0^\mathbb{E})^{-1}(\kappa_0) \cap \mathcal{U}_{NS}^\nu$ is compact in $C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})$.*

Proof. Let $(u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be any sequence in κ . From combining the relative energy inequality (1.6) with the gradient control (1.8) (see also the comments thereafter), the compactness of the initial data in κ_0 yields the existence of a subsequence of $(u_{kin}^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, which is Cauchy in $C([0, T]; H)$. Then the corresponding subsequence of $(u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ will be Cauchy in $C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})$, whose limit $u \in C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})$ has initial data in κ_0 . From closedness of \mathcal{U}_{NS}^ν in $C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})$ (Lemma 2.4) we obtain $u \in \kappa$ as desired. \square

Lemma 2.22. *Let μ_0 be a Borel probability measure on \mathbb{E} which is concentrated on some compact set κ_0 in $\mathcal{K}'(X_0)$. Then the support of $S_{NS}^\nu \mu_0$ with respect to $C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})$ is contained in $(\Pi_0^\mathbb{E})^{-1}(\kappa_0) \cap \mathcal{U}_{NS}^\nu$.*

Proof. We recall that in each case κ_0 is in fact compact in \mathbb{E} . Lemma 2.21 then implies that $(\Pi_0^\mathbb{E})^{-1}(\kappa_0) \cap \mathcal{U}_{NS}^\nu$ is compact in $C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})$ and in particular closed. Since in each case this set has measure one with respect to $S_{NS}^\nu \mu_0$, we conclude the proof. \square

Theorem 2.23. *Let μ_0 be a Borel probability measure on X_0 . Then there exists a sequence $\nu^n \searrow 0$ such that $(S_{NS}^{\nu^n} \mu_0)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to some Borel probability measure ρ on $C([0, T]; X)$ in the sense that*

$$\int_{C([0, T]; X)} \varphi(u) dS_{NS}^{\nu^n} \mu_0(u) \rightarrow \int_{C([0, T]; X)} \varphi(u) d\rho(u) \quad (n \rightarrow \infty)$$

for all bounded and continuous functions φ on $C([0, T]; X)$.

Moreover, ρ is a \mathcal{U} -trajectory statistical solution of the Euler equations satisfying $\Pi_0^X \rho = \mu_0$.

Proof. We will discuss all three cases simultaneously. First, we suppose that μ_0 is concentrated on some compact set $\kappa_0 \in \mathcal{K}'(X_0)$. The right-hand side in each of the a priori estimates demanded in the definition of \mathcal{U} does not depend on the viscosity ν , i.e. they are uniform. Therefore, if we let $\kappa \subset (\Pi_0^X)^{-1}(\kappa_0) \subset C([0, T]; X)$ be the set of functions with initial data in κ_0 , which satisfy the same a priori estimates demanded in the definition of \mathcal{U} , then as in Lemma 2.16, Lemma 2.17 or Lemma 2.18, using the Aubin-Lions lemma or the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem yields the compactness of κ in $C([0, T]; X)$.

Due to the Banach-Alaoglu theorem, there exists a sequence $\nu^n \searrow 0$ and a Borel probability measure ρ on κ such that $\rho_{NS}^{\nu^n} := S_{NS}^{\nu^n} \mu_0 \xrightarrow{*} \rho$ in $C(\kappa)'$. The measure ρ may be seen as a measure on $C([0, T]; X)$ due to the Borel measurability of κ . In particular, the convergence of $(S_{NS}^{\nu^n} \mu_0)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ towards ρ holds in the sense described in the theorem.

We now show that ρ is indeed a trajectory statistical solution satisfying $\Pi_0^X \rho = \mu_0$.

By Lemma 2.22, the support of $\rho_{NS}^{\nu^n}$ with respect to $C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})$ is contained in $(\Pi_0^\mathbb{E})^{-1}(\kappa_0) \cap \mathcal{U}_{NS}^{\nu^n}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, which is compact in $C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})$ due to Lemma 2.21. In general, the support is of course depending on the considered topology and not just the Borel- σ -algebra. However, as we have the compact embeddings $\mathbb{E} \hookrightarrow H_{loc} \hookrightarrow H_{loc}^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $(\Pi_0^\mathbb{E})^{-1}(\kappa_0) \cap \mathcal{U}_{NS}^{\nu^n}$ is compact in $C([0, T]; X)$. Consequently, the support in $C([0, T]; X)$ of $\rho_{NS}^{\nu^n}$ will be contained in $(\Pi_0^\mathbb{E})^{-1}(\kappa_0) \cap \mathcal{U}_{NS}^{\nu^n}$ in all three cases and any $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let $u \in \text{supp } \rho \subset \kappa$. By the point we just made about the support of $(\rho_{NS}^{\nu^n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and Lemma 2.20, there exists a sequence $(u_{NS}^{\nu^n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $u_{NS}^{\nu^n} \in (\Pi_0^{\mathbb{E}})^{-1}(\kappa_0) \cap \mathcal{U}_{NS}^{\nu^n}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $u_{NS}^{\nu^n} \rightarrow u$ ($n \rightarrow \infty$) in $C([0, T]; X)$.

To conclude that u is a weak solution of the Euler equations in the desired class \mathcal{U}^p , \mathcal{U}^{VS} or \mathcal{U}^1 , one would need to consider each case individually as we have done for Lemma 2.16, Lemma 2.17 and Lemma 2.18. The arguments provided in those lemmata can be used analogously here mainly for three reasons: First, for the convergence to 0 of the term involving the viscosity, one only needs a uniform bound on the local kinetic energy for the Navier-Stokes equations, which holds due to (1.12) and by κ_0 being compact in \mathbb{E} . Second, the a priori estimates to extract a subsequence which converges in an appropriate way are likewise satisfied in each case by the Navier-Stokes equations as outlined in Section 1.1. Finally, $u_{NS}^{\nu^n}(0) \in \kappa_0$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, which allows us to conclude that the a priori estimates demanded in the definition of \mathcal{U}^p , \mathcal{U}^{VS} and \mathcal{U}^1 are satisfied by u in the respective case. This latter fact of strong convergence of the initial vorticities also implies in the case $X = X^p$, due to Lemma 1.8, that $\omega(u)$ will be a renormalized solution of the vorticity formulation of the Euler equations (see Lemma 1.8).

Omitting further details, we conclude that ρ is a trajectory statistical solution on the considered set of weak solutions of the Euler equations.

It remains to show $\Pi_0^X \rho = \mu_0$. Note that for any continuous function φ on X , $\varphi \circ \Pi_0^X$ is continuous on $C([0, T]; X)$, from which we immediately derive

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X \varphi(u_0) d\Pi_0^X \rho(u_0) &= \int_{C([0, T]; X)} (\varphi \circ \Pi_0^X)(u) d\rho(u) = \int_{\kappa} (\varphi \circ \Pi_0^X)(u) d\rho(u) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\kappa} (\varphi \circ \Pi_0^X)(u) dS_{NS}^{\nu^n} \mu_0(u) = \int_{\kappa_0} \varphi(u_0) d\mu_0(u_0) = \int_X \varphi(u_0) d\mu_0(u_0). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\Pi_0^X \rho = \mu_0$ as desired.

The general case when μ_0 is no longer concentrated on some set $\kappa_0 \in \mathcal{K}'(X_0)$ is quite similar to that in Theorem 2.19. By Lemma 2.15, μ_0 is inner regular with respect to the family $\mathcal{K}'(X_0)$ and we may find a sequence $(\kappa_0^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{K}'(X_0)$ such that

$$\mu_0 \left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \kappa_0^n \right) = 1.$$

We may assume $\mu_0(\kappa_0^{n+1}) > \mu_0(\kappa_0^n) > 0$ and $\kappa_0^{n+1} \supset \kappa_0^n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Also, let $D_n := \kappa_0^n \setminus \kappa_0^{n-1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ($\kappa_0^0 := \emptyset$). Then

$$\mu_0 \left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} D_n \right) = \mu_0 \left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \kappa_0^n \right) = 1$$

and for every Borel measurable set A in X_0 , we have

$$\mu_0(A) = \mu_0 \left(A \cap \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} D_n \right) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu_0(A \cap D_n).$$

Since $\mu_0(D_n) > 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we may define the Borel probability measures

$$\mu_0^n := \frac{\mu_0(\cdot \cap D_n)}{\mu_0(D_n)}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, μ_0^n is concentrated on κ_0^n and by the first part of this proof and a diagonal sequence argument, we can find a sequence $\nu^n \searrow 0$ such that $(S_{NS}^{\nu^n} \mu_0^k)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to ρ^k for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ in the sense described in the statement of the theorem, where ρ^k is a trajectory statistical solution on the considered class, satisfying $\Pi_0^X \rho^k = \mu_0^k$. Next, we now show that $(S_{NS}^{\nu^n} \mu_0)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to $\rho := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu_0(D_k) \rho^k$ in the described way. In before, we mention that ρ is a trajectory statistical solution of the Euler equations satisfying $\Pi_0^X \rho = \mu_0$, which can be shown identically to Theorem 2.19.

Let φ be a bounded continuous function on $C([0, T]; X)$ and let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there exists $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $k \geq k_0$

$$\mu_0 \left(\bigcup_{l=1}^k D_l \right) \geq 1 - \varepsilon.$$

For $k \geq k_0$, we thereby obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_{C([0, T]; X)} \varphi(u) dS_{NS}^{\nu^n} \mu_0(u) - \int_{C([0, T]; X)} \varphi(u) d\rho(u) \right| \\ & \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=1}^k \mu_0(D_l) \left| \int_{C([0, T]; X)} \varphi(u) dS_{NS}^{\nu^n} \mu_0^l(u) - \int_{C([0, T]; X)} \varphi(u) d\rho^l(u) \right| \\ & \quad + 2\|\varphi\|_{\infty} \sum_{l=k+1}^{\infty} \mu_0(D_l) \\ & = 2\|\varphi\|_{\infty} \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

□

3 Statistical solutions of the Euler equations in phase space

In this section we construct phase space statistical solutions of the Euler equations by projecting the trajectory statistical solutions, which we constructed in the previous section, in time as suggested by Theorem 1.16.

So far, we have worked with the velocity formulation of the (deterministic) Euler and Navier-Stokes equations and will continue to do so here. As the vorticity does not explicitly play a role in this formulation, we may actually use more or less the same definition of phase space statistical solution of the Euler equations in all considered cases, by which we also mean the usage of the same class of test functionals throughout, based on the set of divergence-free test functions $C_c^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2) \cap H$. We remark though that for instance when considering the Yudovich class, one could relatively effortlessly use a larger class of test functionals due to more integrability of the velocity field. As

it makes little to no difference for our work here, we will restrain ourselves from doing so.

Throughout this section, we let $Y = \mathcal{D} \cap H$ be the space of divergence-free test functions, considered as a subspace of $\mathcal{D} := C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$, endowed with the inductive limit topology (see [27][Chapter 6]): We define the spaces $\mathcal{D}_K := \{\varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2) : \text{supp } \varphi \subset K\}$ for every compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ as Fréchet spaces with the topology τ_K coming from the norms $\|\cdot\|_N := \max_{|\alpha| \leq N} \|\partial^\alpha \cdot\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)}$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$. On \mathcal{D} , we then consider the topology associated to the local basis of the origin of convex, balanced sets $W \subset \mathcal{D}$ such that $\mathcal{D}_K \cap W \in \tau_K$ for every compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2$.

On Y' , we consider the strong topology of topological dual spaces, i.e. the topology of uniform convergence on bounded sets. If E is a bounded subset of Y , then $E \subset \mathcal{D}_K$ for some $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and there are numbers $M_N < \infty$ such that

$$\|\varphi\|_N \leq M_N \quad (3.1)$$

for all $N \in \mathbb{N}, \varphi \in E$.

Throughout all considered cases, in the setting of Definition 1.12, we will choose $Z = \mathbb{E}$ and X will be one of the spaces $X^\infty = \mathbb{E}, X^p = H_{loc}^p$ or $X^{VS} = X^1 = H_{loc}^{-L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$ as in the previous section. We are likewise going to use X_0 and \mathcal{U} as general placeholders for the times we wish to prove or formulate a statement that is valid in all cases.

We have the continuous embeddings

$$\mathbb{E} \hookrightarrow X \hookrightarrow Y'_{w*}$$

and we are going to consider the function $F : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow Y'$, given by

$$\langle F(u), v \rangle_{Y', Y} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (u \otimes u) : \nabla v \, dx$$

for every $u \in \mathbb{E}, v \in Y$.

Clearly, $u \in L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{E}) \cap C([0, T]; X)$ is a weak solution of the Euler equations in the sense of Definition 1.1 if and only if $u_t = F(u)$ in the weak sense described in Theorem 1.16. We note that compared to the introductory section on the abstract framework of statistical solutions, we omitted the time interval $[0, T]$ from the domain of F , as F does not explicitly depend on the time.

Lemma 3.1. *The mapping $F : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow Y'$ is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{E})$ - $\mathcal{B}(Y')$ measurable. Moreover, the corresponding Nemytskii operator $(t, u) \mapsto F(u(t))$ is $\mathcal{L}([0, T]) \otimes \mathcal{B}(C([0, T]; X))$ - $\mathcal{B}(Y')$ measurable when F is extended by 0 from \mathbb{E} to X .*

Proof. We show that F is even continuous. As \mathbb{E} is a normed space, it suffices to show sequential continuity. Let $(u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a converging sequence in \mathbb{E} with limit u . We now show $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(u^n) = F(u)$ in Y' . Let $B \subset Y$ be bounded. By (3.1), there exists some compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and $M_1 > 0$ such that for all $\varphi \in B$, we have

$$\text{supp } \varphi \subset K \text{ and } \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq M_1.$$

Consequently,

$$\sup_{\varphi \in B} |\langle F(u^n) - F(u), \varphi \rangle_{Y', Y}| \leq \|(u^n \otimes u^n) - (u \otimes u)\|_{L^1(K)} M_1.$$

The right-hand side converges to 0 since convergence in \mathbb{E} particularly implies convergence in $L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$ so that $(u^n \otimes u^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges in $L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})$.

The measurability of the corresponding Nemytskii operator is a general result (see Proposition 2.1 in [3]). \square

As before, $\Pi_t^X : C([0, T]; X) \rightarrow X$ denotes the time evaluation mapping at time $t \in [0, T]$. We are now going to construct projected phase space statistical solutions. In the Yudovich class, we may construct them in an elementary way using the solution operator $S^\infty : X_0^\infty \rightarrow C([0, T]; X^\infty)$ that we introduced in Section 2.1. The arguments are very close to the ones used in the proof of Theorem 1.17 and Theorem 1.18 in [3], to which we will refer in the other cases.

In the following, for $u \in X$, $\|\omega(u)\|_X$ is defined as in (2.5) if $X = X^p, X^{VS}, X^1$ and $\|\omega(u)\|_{X^\infty} := \|\omega(u)\|_{(L^1 \cap L^\infty)(\mathbb{R}^2)}$.

Theorem 3.2. *Let μ_0 be a Borel probability measure on X_0 satisfying*

$$\int_{X_0} \gamma(u_0)^2 d\mu_0(u_0) < \infty \quad (3.2)$$

with γ as in (1.12).

Let ρ be a \mathcal{U} -trajectory statistical solution satisfying $\Pi_0^X \rho = \mu_0$. Then the family of Borel probability measures $\{\rho_t\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}$, $\rho_t = \Pi_t^X \rho$ for every $0 \leq t \leq T$, is a statistical solution in phase space of the equation $u_t = F(u)$, satisfying $\rho_0 = \mu_0$ as well as

$$\int_{\mathbb{E}} \|u_{kin}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} d\rho_t(u) \leq \int_{\mathbb{E}} a^{|m(u_0)|} \|u_{0,kin}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} d\mu_0(u_0) \quad (3.3)$$

for almost every $0 \leq t \leq T$ in the cases $X = X^p, X^{VS}, X^1$ and every $0 \leq t \leq T$ if $X = X^\infty$.

Moreover, if μ_0 satisfies $\int_X \|\omega(u_0)\|_X d\mu_0(u_0) < \infty$, then

$$\int_X \|\omega(u)\|_X d\rho_t(u) \leq \int_X \|\omega(u_0)\|_X d\mu_0(u_0) \quad (3.4)$$

for every $0 \leq t \leq T$, with equality if $X = X^\infty$ or $X = X^p$.

Proof. We begin with the case $X = X^\infty = \mathbb{E}$. Let $\rho^\infty = S^\infty \mu_0$ be the \mathcal{U}^∞ -trajectory statistical solution from Theorem 2.6 so that $\rho_t^\infty = \Pi_t^{\mathbb{E}} \rho^\infty$ for all $0 \leq t \leq T$. We will check in an elementary way in this case that $\{\rho_t^\infty\}_{0 \leq t \leq T} = \{(\Pi_t^{\mathbb{E}} \circ S^\infty) \mu_0\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ satisfies all four conditions in Definition 1.12.

i) Let $\varphi \in C_b(\mathbb{E})$. We obtain from the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem that

$$t \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{E}} \varphi(u) d\rho_t(u) = \int_{C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})} \varphi(u(t)) d\rho(u)$$

is continuous and obviously bounded.

ii), iii) Since solutions in \mathcal{U}^∞ are in $C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})$, it is clear that ρ_t is carried by $Z = \mathbb{E}$ for every $0 \leq t \leq T$. As we have already shown sufficient measurability properties of F and its associated Nemytskii operator in Lemma 3.1, to verify ii) and iii) in Definition 1.12, we only need to show that F is bounded appropriately by integrable functions, which we will do in one step.

Let $0 \leq t \leq T$ and $u_0 \in X_0^\infty$ with associated weak solution of the Euler equations $u = S^\infty(u_0) \in \mathcal{U}^\infty$. For any $v \in Y$, there exists $r > 0$ such that v has compact support in $B_r(0)$. Then we may estimate using (1.12)

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle F^\infty(u(t)), v \rangle_{Y, Y'}| &\leq \|\nabla v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} \|u(t)\|_{L^2(B_r(0))}^2 \\ &\leq C \|\nabla v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} \max\{1, r^2\} \gamma(u_0)^2 \end{aligned}$$

with the right-hand side being independent of t . Therefore, the integrability assumption (3.2) shows that $|\langle F(u(t)), v \rangle_{Y', Y}|$ can even be dominated by a $dt \otimes \rho$ integrable function on $[0, T] \times C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})$. As ρ_t is given as the projection of ρ at time t , this shows that both ii) and iii) hold.

iv) Finally, let Φ be a cylindrical test function in Y' , i.e. there exists $\phi \in C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^k)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $v_1, \dots, v_k \in Y$, such that

$$\Phi(w) = \phi(\langle w, v_1 \rangle_{Y', Y}, \dots, \langle w, v_k \rangle_{Y', Y})$$

for all $w \in Y'$. Let $u \in \mathcal{U}^\infty$ be a weak solution. We note that for almost every $0 \leq s \leq T$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{ds} \Phi(u(s)) \\ &= \frac{d}{ds} \phi(\langle u(s), v_1 \rangle_{Y', Y}, \dots, \langle u(s), v_k \rangle_{Y', Y}) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^k \partial_{x_j} \phi(\langle u(s), v_1 \rangle_{Y', Y}, \dots, \langle u(s), v_k \rangle_{Y', Y}) \frac{d}{ds} \langle u(s), v_j \rangle_{Y', Y} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^k \partial_{x_j} \phi(\langle u(s), v_1 \rangle_{Y', Y}, \dots, \langle u(s), v_k \rangle_{Y', Y}) \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (u(s) \otimes u(s)) : \nabla v_j \, dx \\ &= \langle u(s) \otimes u(s), \sum_{j=1}^k \partial_{x_j} \phi(\langle u(s), v_1 \rangle_{Y', Y}, \dots, \langle u(s), v_k \rangle_{Y', Y}) \nabla v_j \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2), L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} \\ &= \langle u(s) \otimes u(s), \nabla \Phi'(u(s)) \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2), L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} \\ &= \langle F(u(s)), \Phi'(u(s)) \rangle_{Y', Y}. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating from t' to t , $0 \leq t' \leq t \leq T$, then yields

$$\Phi(u(t)) = \Phi(u(t')) + \int_{t'}^t \langle F(u(s)), \Phi'(u(s)) \rangle_{Y', Y} \, ds.$$

Due to the measurability of F shown in Lemma 3.1 and the estimates in part ii), we may integrate with respect to μ_0 , apply Fubini's theorem and use the definition of $\{\rho_t\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ to obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{E}} \Phi(u) d\rho_t(u) = \int_{\mathbb{E}} \Phi(u) d\rho_{t'}(u) + \int_{t'}^t \int_{\mathbb{E}} \langle F(u), \Phi'(u) \rangle_{Y', Y} d\rho_s(u) ds.$$

Estimates (3.3) and (3.4) are immediate consequences of (2.1) and (2.2).

For the remaining cases, we will directly apply Theorem 1.18. Conditions $(H1')$ - $(H3')$ have been checked in preparation for Theorem 2.19. Condition $(H4)$ is satisfied by Lemma 2.11. $(H5)$ follows from $\mathcal{U} \subset L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{E})$, our choice of F , Lemma 3.1 and the weak formulation of the Euler equations. Finally, $(H6)$ can be verified as we just did in step ii) in the case of $X = X^\infty = \mathbb{E}$.

Finally, (3.4) and (3.3) are consequences of (2.6) and (2.7). \square

Remark 3.3. *From the uniqueness of the \mathcal{U}^∞ -trajectory statistical solutions we can immediately conclude that $\{\rho_t\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ in Theorem 3.2 is the unique projected statistical solution in phase space in that specific case.*

However, there may be other statistical solutions in phase space which cannot be obtained from projecting a \mathcal{U}^∞ -trajectory solution. Formally, computations as in [18] in the case of the two-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations on bounded domains, or adaptations for the case of \mathbb{R}^2 , as indicated in [22], may be used to show uniqueness among all statistical solutions in phase space. However, making those computations rigorous requires some kind of Fréchet-differentiable dependence on the initial data. In [18], this problem was overcome with quite some effort by considering the Galerkin approximations which stem from an ordinary differentiable equation, where differentiable dependence on the initial data clearly holds.

To close this section, let us briefly point out that the inviscid limit results Theorem 2.10 and Theorem 2.23 also yield analogous results for the phase space statistical solutions. For phase space statistical solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations with viscosity $\nu > 0$ in the framework of [3], we let $Z = X = \mathbb{E}$ and choose Y as in the previously considered case of phase space statistical solutions of the Euler equations. To be more in line with previous work on phase space statistical solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations, in particular [22], we could also choose $X = \mathbb{E}$ and $Z_{NS} = \{u \in \mathbb{E} : \nabla u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})\}$, endowed with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{Z_{NS}} := \|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{E}} + \|\nabla \cdot\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})}$ and for the space of test functions let $Y_{NS} = H_c^1(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2) \cap H$ with a similar type of inductive limit topology. We remark that the different choice here makes little difference since in either case, the projected phase space statistical solution is given by $\{(S_{NS}^\nu \circ \Pi_t^\mathbb{E})\mu_0\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ and the only difference is that we would view them as measures on different subspaces.

Let $F_{NS}^\nu : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow Y'$ be given by

$$\langle F_{NS}^\nu(u), v \rangle_{Y', Y} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (u \otimes u) : \nabla v dx + \nu \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} u \cdot \Delta v dx$$

for every $u \in \mathbb{E}$ and $v \in Y$. A function $u \in C([0, T]; \mathbb{E})$ with gradient $\nabla u \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}))$ is a weak solution of the Navier-Stokes equations with viscosity ν in the sense of Definition 1.2 if and only if $\partial_t u = F_{NS}^\nu(u)$ in the weak sense described in Theorem 1.16. Moreover, similarly to Lemma 3.1, F_{NS}^ν can be shown to be continuous so that all desired measurability properties are satisfied.

Lemma 3.4. *The mapping $F_{NS}^\nu : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow Y'$ is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{E})$ - $\mathcal{B}(Y')$ measurable. Moreover, the corresponding Nemytskii operator $(t, u) \mapsto F_{NS}^\nu(u(t))$ is $\mathcal{L}([0, T]) \otimes \mathcal{B}(C([0, T]; \mathbb{E}))$ - $\mathcal{B}(Y')$ measurable.*

We then obtain (see also Theorem 7.1 in [22]).

Theorem 3.5. *Let μ_0 be a Borel probability measure on \mathbb{E} satisfying*

$$\int_{\mathbb{E}} \gamma(u_0)^2 d\mu_0(u_0) < \infty$$

with γ as in (1.12). Then the family of Borel probability measures $\{\rho_t^\nu\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}$, $\rho_t^\nu = (\Pi_t^\mathbb{E} \circ S_{NS}^\nu)\mu$ for every $0 \leq t \leq T$, is a statistical solution in phase space of the equation $u_t = F_{NS}^\nu(u)$, satisfying $\rho_0^\nu = \mu_0$.

Remark 3.6. *i) As we pointed out for the trajectory statistical solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations, one can also obtain an energy inequality for phase space statistical solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations as well as other properties, derived from the deterministic equations. As these serve no further purpose here, we again refer the reader to Sections 6 and 7 in [22].*

ii) In [22][Theorem 7.1], it has been shown that under the assumption of μ_0 having support in $\{u \in \mathbb{E} : \nabla u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})\}$, bounded with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{E}}$, the phase space statistical solution in Theorem 3.5 is unique. The case of uniqueness of phase space statistical solutions with unbounded initial supports appears to be open. The assumption of a bounded support of the initial distribution could also not be completely omitted in the classical case, where the underlying domain is bounded, but only be relaxed by instead making further assumptions on $\{\rho_t^\nu\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ (see for instance the discussion on p. 266 in [18]).

Going back to the phase space statistical solutions of the Euler equations with phase space X , for any bounded continuous function $\varphi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the composition $\varphi \circ \Pi_t^X$ is a real-valued, bounded continuous function on $C([0, T]; X)$.

Therefore, we immediately obtain the following result from Theorem 2.10, Theorem 2.23 and the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem.

Theorem 3.7. *Let μ_0 be a Borel probability measure on X_0 satisfying*

$$\int_{X_0} \gamma(u_0)^2 d\mu_0(u_0) < \infty$$

with γ as in (1.12). Then there exists a \mathcal{U} -trajectory statistical solution ρ satisfying $\Pi_0 \rho = \mu_0$ and a sequence $\nu^n \searrow 0$ such that the projected phase space statistical solutions

$\{\Pi_t^X S_{NS}^{\nu^n} \mu_0\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ of the Navier-Stokes equations converge to a family of projected phase space statistical solutions $\{\Pi_t^X \rho\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ of the Euler equations, in the sense that for every bounded continuous function φ on X and every $0 \leq t \leq T$

$$\int_X \varphi(u) d(\Pi_t^X S_{NS}^{\nu^n} \mu_0)(u) \rightarrow \int_X \varphi(u) d(\Pi_t^X \rho)(u) \quad (n \rightarrow \infty).$$

In the case $X = X^\infty$, this holds for every subsequence $\nu^n \searrow 0$.

Remark 3.8. *The inviscid limit result of phase space statistical solutions here is fundamentally different from previous work that we pointed at in the introduction of this article such as [4], [9] or [22]. Unlike we did here, in these articles, the phase space statistical solutions of the Euler equations have been constructed by an inviscid limit argument. Not only does this require the construction of a family of measures as some sort of limit of the time-parametrized measures that are the phase space statistical solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations. The sense in which this convergence holds needs to be strong enough to prove that each term in the Foias-Liouville equation (1.18) corresponding to the Navier-Stokes equations converges appropriately to conclude that this limit satisfies the Foias-Liouville equation corresponding to the Euler equations.*

In our work, in the cases $X = \mathbb{E}$ or $X = H_{loc}$, we have convergence of the phase space statistical solutions in an H_{loc} related sense, which would suffice to argue that each integral in the Foias-Liouville equation of the Navier-Stokes equations converges appropriately. However, this is not even necessary, as we do already know from the discussions on the inviscid limit for the trajectory statistical solutions that we obtain convergence of a subsequence to a projected phase space statistical solution of the Euler equations, where we know independently from this convergence that it satisfies the desired Foias-Liouville equation.

References

- [1] D. Albritton, E. Brué, and M. Colombo. Non-uniqueness of Leray solutions of the forced Navier-Stokes equations. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.03116>, 2021.
- [2] V. I. Bogachev. *Measure Theory, Volume 1*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2007.
- [3] A. Bronzi, C. Mondaini, and R. Rosa. Abstract framework for the theory of statistical solutions. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 260(12):8428–8484, 2016.
- [4] D. Chae. The vanishing viscosity limit of statistical solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations. i. 2-D periodic case. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 155(2):437 – 459, 1991.
- [5] D. Chae. The vanishing viscosity limit of statistical solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations. ii. the general case. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 155(2):460 – 484, 1991.

- [6] J.-Y. Chemin. A remark on the inviscid limit for two-dimensional incompressible fluids. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 21(11-12):1771–1779, 1996.
- [7] J.-Y. Chemin. *Perfect Incompressible Fluids*, translated by Gallagher, I. and Iftimie, D. Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications 14. Clarendon Press, 1998.
- [8] G. Ciampa, G. Crippa, and S. Spirito. Strong convergence of the vorticity for the 2D Euler equations in the inviscid limit. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 240(1):295–326, Mar. 2021.
- [9] P. Constantin and J. Wu. Statistical solutions of the Navier–Stokes equations on the phase space of vorticity and the inviscid limits. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 38(6):3031–3045, 1997.
- [10] G. Crippa, C. Nobili, C. Seis, and S. Spirito. Eulerian and Lagrangian solutions to the continuity and Euler equations with L^1 vorticity. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 49(5):3973–3998, 2017.
- [11] G. Crippa and S. Spirito. Renormalized solutions of the 2D Euler equations. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 339(1):191–198, 2015.
- [12] J.-M. Delort. Existence de nappes de tourbillon en dimension deux. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 4(3):553–586, 1991.
- [13] R. J. DiPerna and P. L. Lions. Ordinary differential equations, transport theory and sobolev spaces. *Inventiones Mathematicae*, 98(3):511–547, 1989.
- [14] R. J. Diperna and A. J. Majda. Concentrations in regularizations for 2-D incompressible flow. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 40(3):301–345, 1987.
- [15] M. C. L. Filho, A. L. Mazzucato, and H. J. N. Lopes. Weak solutions, renormalized solutions and enstrophy defects in 2D turbulence. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 179(3):353–387, 2006.
- [16] C. Foias. Statistical study of Navier-Stokes equations, i. *Rendiconti del Seminario Matematico della Università di Padova*, 48:219–348, 1972.
- [17] C. Foias. Statistical study of Navier-Stokes equations, ii. *Rendiconti del Seminario Matematico della Università di Padova*, 49:9–123, 1973.
- [18] C. Foias, O. Manley, R. Rosa, and R. Temam. *Navier-Stokes Equations and Turbulence*. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- [19] C. Foias, R. M. S. Rosa, and R. Temam. Properties of time-dependent statistical solutions of the three-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations. *Annales de l’Institut Fourier*, 63(6):2515–2573, 2013.

- [20] U. Frisch. *Turbulence: The Legacy of A. N. Kolmogorov*. Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- [21] J. Hounie, M. Lopes-Filho, H. Nussenzweig-Lopes, and S. Schochet. A priori temporal regularity for the stream function of 2D incompressible, inviscid flow. *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, 35(7):871–884, 1999.
- [22] J. Kelliher. Infinite-energy 2D statistical solutions to the equations of incompressible fluids. *Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations*, 21:631–661, 04 2009.
- [23] H. J. N. Lopes, C. Seis, and E. Wiedemann. On the vanishing viscosity limit for 2D incompressible flows with unbounded vorticity. *Nonlinearity*, 34(5):3112–3121, May 2021.
- [24] A. J. Majda. Remarks on weak solutions for vortex sheets with a distinguished sign. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal*, 42(3):921–939, 1993.
- [25] A. J. Majda and A. L. Bertozzi. *Vorticity and Incompressible Flow*. Cambridge Texts in Applied Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- [26] K. R. Parthasarathy. *Probability measures on metric spaces*. Academic Press, New York, 1967.
- [27] W. Rudin. *Functional Analysis*. International series in pure and applied mathematics. McGraw-Hill, 2nd edition, 1991.
- [28] S. Schochet. The weak vorticity formulation of the 2-d Euler equations and concentration-cancellation. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 20(5-6):1077–1104, 1995.
- [29] L. Székelyhidi Jr. Weak solutions to the incompressible Euler equations with vortex sheet initial data. *Comptes Rendus Mathématique*, 349(19):1063–1066, 2011.
- [30] F. Topsoe. *Topology and Measure*, volume 133 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, 1970.
- [31] I. Vecchi and S. Wu. On L^1 -vorticity for 2-D incompressible flow. *Manuscripta mathematica*, 78(4):403–412, 1993.
- [32] M. Vishik. Instability and non-uniqueness in the Cauchy problem for the Euler equations of an ideal incompressible fluid. part i. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1805.09426>, 2018.
- [33] M. Vishik. Instability and non-uniqueness in the Cauchy problem for the Euler equations of an ideal incompressible fluid. part ii. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1805.09440>, 2018.
- [34] M. J. Vishik and A. V. Fursikov. *Mathematical Problems of Statistical Hydromechanics*. Number 9 in Mathematics and Its Applications. Kluwer Academic Publishers, first edition, 1988.

- [35] V. Yudovich. Non-stationary flow of an ideal incompressible liquid. *USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics*, 3(6):1407 – 1456, 1963.