

Well-posedness for the incompressible Hall-MHD system with initial magnetic field belonging to $H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$

Shunhang Zhang

Abstract

In this paper, we first prove the local well-posedness of strong solutions to the incompressible Hall-MHD system with initial data $(u_0, B_0) \in H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3) \times H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $\sigma \in (0, 2)$. In particular, if the viscosity coefficient is equal to the resistivity coefficient, we can reduce σ to 0 with the aid of the new formulation of the Hall-MHD system observed by [11]. Moreover, we establish the global well-posedness in $H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3) \times H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $\sigma \in (0, 2)$ for small initial data and get the optimal time-decay rates of solutions. Our results improves some previous works.

Keywords: Hall-MHD; Well-posedness; Sobolev spaces; Optimal time-decay

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: 35A01; 35Q35; 35B40; 76D03; 76W05

1 Introduction

This paper is concerned with the Cauchy problem of the viscous and resistive incompressible Hall-magnetohydrodynamics (Hall-MHD) system in \mathbb{R}^3 :

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u - \mu \Delta u + u \cdot \nabla u + \nabla p = B \cdot \nabla B, \\ \partial_t B - \nu \Delta B - \nabla \times (u \times B) + \kappa \nabla \times ((\nabla \times B) \times B) = 0, \\ \operatorname{div} u = \operatorname{div} B = 0, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x), \quad B(x, 0) = B_0(x). \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

Here, $u = u(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $B(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and the scalar function $p = p(t, x)$ with $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^3$ stand for the velocity field, the magnetic field and the scalar pressure, respectively. The positive parameters μ , ν and κ are viscosity coefficient, resistivity coefficient and Hall effect coefficient, respectively.

Notice that if $\operatorname{div} B_0 = 0$, the divergence-free property $\operatorname{div} B = 0$ is preserved all the time yielding

$$-\nabla \times (u \times B) = u \cdot \nabla B - B \cdot \nabla u. \quad (1.2)$$

Compared with the classical MHD system, the Hall-MHD system possess the so-called Hall-term $\kappa \nabla \times ((\nabla \times B) \times B)$ in the magnetic equation. Due to the appearance of this extra term,

the Hall-MHD system can be applied to describing the magnetic reconnection phenomenon, which occurs in plasmas, star formation, solar flares, neutron stars or geo-dynamo, etc (see [3, 13, 14, 17, 18, 22]). Meanwhile, since the Hall-term contains the second order derivatives, it makes the mathematical analysis of the Hall-MHD system become more complicated.

Owing to its significance in physics and mathematics, the Hall-MHD system has drawn much attention from various researchers. Next, we briefly introduce some of them which are related to our problem. Acheritogaray et al. in [1] gave a rigorous mathematical derivation of (1.1) both from a two-fluids model and from a kinetic model. Chae, Degond and Liu [5] established the global existence of weak solutions and the local well-posedness for large initial data in $H^s(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $s > \frac{5}{2}$. Moreover, they obtained the global well-posedness of strong solutions in $H^s(\mathbb{R}^3)$ for small initial data, namely $\|(u_0, B_0)\|_{H^s} < \varepsilon$ for some small constant $\varepsilon > 0$. Subsequently, some authors [6, 19–21] relaxed the smallness condition by only requiring some suitable Sobolev or Besov norms of initial data to be small. Serrin type blow-up criteria for smooth solutions were proved by Chae and Lee in [6]. The local well-posedness of (1.1) in $H^s(\mathbb{R}^3) \times H^s(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $s > \frac{3}{2}$ was proved by Dai [9] and with $\frac{3}{2} < s \leq \frac{5}{2}$ was obtained in [25]. Very recently, Dai [10] proved that (1.1) is locally well-posed in $H^{s-1+\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3) \times H^s(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $s > \frac{3}{2}$ and $\sigma > 0$. Fan, Huang and Nakamura [12] established the global well-posedness of (1.1) with axisymmetric initial data. The authors in [11, 16] proved the global well-posedness of (1.1) for small initial data in critical Besov spaces by means of some new observations. Regarding the large time behavior of solutions to (1.1), Chae and Schonbek [7] obtained by using the Fourier splitting techniques that if in addition $(u_0, B_0) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$, the global small solutions of (1.1) in $H^m(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $m \geq 3$ satisfy

$$\|\nabla^k u(t)\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla^k B(t)\|_{L^2} \lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{3}{4}-\frac{k}{2}} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq k \leq m. \quad (1.3)$$

Later, Wan and Zhou in [19] showed that if $(u_0, B_0) \in \dot{H}^{-s}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $0 \leq s < \frac{3}{2}$, the following decay rate holds

$$\|u(t)\|_{L^2} + \|B(t)\|_{L^2} \lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{s}{2}}, \quad (1.4)$$

and if $(u_0, B_0) \in \dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, the decay estimate (1.3) with $k = 0$ holds. For more results on the time-decay estimates, we refer readers to [23, 24].

On the other hand, observe that the system (1.1) does not have any scaling invariance as the classical MHD system. However, if we set $B \equiv 0$ in (1.1), then the system (1.1) becomes the incompressible Navier-Stokes system:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u - \mu \Delta u + u \cdot \nabla u + \nabla p = 0, \\ \operatorname{div} u = 0, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x), \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

which is invariant for all $\lambda > 0$ under the change

$$(u(t, x), P(t, x), u_0(x)) \mapsto (\lambda u(\lambda^2 t, \lambda x), \lambda^2 P(\lambda^2 t, \lambda x), \lambda u_0(\lambda x)). \quad (1.6)$$

Also, if $u \equiv 0$, one may see that

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t B - \nu \Delta B + \kappa \nabla \times ((\nabla \times B) \times B) = 0, \\ B(x, 0) = B_0(x), \end{cases} \quad (1.7)$$

which is invariant for all $\lambda > 0$ under the change

$$(B(t, x), B_0(x)) \mapsto (B(\lambda^2 t, \lambda x), B_0(\lambda x)). \quad (1.8)$$

We should point out that all previous results on the local well-posedness for (1.1) in Sobolev spaces requires u_0 is regular than $H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ as well as B_0 is regular than $H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Whereas, from the viewpoint of scaling invariance, (1.6) and (1.8) suggest that $u_0 \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ or $B_0 \in H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ may be a suitable choice for (1.1) to establish local well-posedness. Motivated by this, we attempt to do this in paper. The first result of this paper is to prove the local well-posedness of (1.1) with $B_0 \in H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and u_0 is slightly regular than $H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, which is stated as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $0 < \sigma < 2$ and $(u_0, B_0) \in H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3) \times H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $\operatorname{div} u_0 = \operatorname{div} B_0 = 0$. Then there exists a positive time T such that the system (1.1) admits a unique solution (u, B) with*

$$\begin{aligned} u &\in C([0, T]; H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^2(0, T; H^{\frac{3}{2}+\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3)), \\ B &\in C([0, T]; H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^2(0, T; H^{\frac{5}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3)). \end{aligned} \quad (1.9)$$

Remark 1.1. Compared with the previous local well-posedness results in Sobolev spaces (see e.g. [5, 9, 10, 25]), our result lowers the regularity of the initial magnetic field B_0 to belonging to $H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$.

Remark 1.2. Let us explain why we can tackle the magnetic field B in $H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. In [5, 9, 10, 25], the authors derived the uniform bounds for approximate solutions by establishing the inequality of the type:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2 + \|B(t)\|_{H^r}^2 \right) + \|u(t)\|_{H^{s+1}}^2 + \|B(t)\|_{H^{r+1}}^2 \lesssim \left(\|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2 + \|B(t)\|_{H^r}^2 \right)^{1+\alpha}, \quad (1.10)$$

for some $\alpha > 0$. However, the usual treatment for the Hall-term gives

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\Lambda^r \nabla \times (B \times (\nabla \times B)), \Lambda^r B \right) &\lesssim \|[\Lambda^r, B \times](\nabla \times B)\|_{L^2} \|B\|_{\dot{H}^{r+1}} \\ &\lesssim \|\Lambda^r B\|_{L^{p_1}} \|\nabla B\|_{L^{p_2}} \|B\|_{\dot{H}^{r+1}} \\ &\lesssim \|B\|_{\dot{H}^{r+\frac{3}{p_2}}} \|B\|_{\dot{H}^{1+\frac{3}{p_1}}} \|B\|_{\dot{H}^{r+1}} \\ &\lesssim \left(\|B\|_{\dot{H}^r}^{1-\frac{3}{p_2}} \|B\|_{\dot{H}^{r+1}}^{\frac{3}{p_2}} \right) \left(\|B\|_{\dot{H}^r}^{r-\frac{3}{p_1}} \|B\|_{\dot{H}^{r+1}}^{\frac{3}{p_1}+1-r} \right) \|B\|_{\dot{H}^{r+1}} \\ &\lesssim \|B\|_{\dot{H}^r}^{r-\frac{1}{2}} \|B\|_{\dot{H}^{r+1}}^{\frac{7}{2}-r} \end{aligned} \quad (1.11)$$

with $\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} = \frac{1}{2}$, from which, the requirement $r > \frac{3}{2}$ seems inevitable due to the use of Young's inequality. Therefore, this method should be abandoned when considering $B_0 \in H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Instead, we will use the classical continuity method to establish the uniform bounds in the proof of Theorem 1.1, where the Fourier localization techniques and paradifferential calculus play a crucial role.

Since the estimate

$$\|\nabla \times (u \times B)\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}} \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}-\eta}} \|B\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}+\eta}} + \|u\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}+\theta}} \|B\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}-\theta}} \quad (1.12)$$

only holds for $\eta, \theta > 0$, in order to bound $\|\nabla \times (u \times B)\|_{L_t^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}})}$, the velocity u should belong to $L_t^p(\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}+\theta})$ for some $p > 2$. To attain this, we should let initial data $u_0 \in \dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}$ for some $\sigma > \theta > 0$ due the parabolic smooth effect,. Therefore, it seems that σ in Theorem 1.1 cannot be reduced to 0. Recently, Danchin and Tan in [11] observed that if $\mu = \nu$, regarding $v := u - \kappa \nabla \times B$ as a new unknown, the system (1.1) can be rewritten as (one can see [11, P36-37] for derivation):

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u - \mu \Delta u = B \cdot \nabla B - u \cdot \nabla u - \nabla p, \\ \partial_t B - \mu \Delta B = \nabla \times (v \times B), \\ \partial_t v - \mu \Delta v = B \cdot \nabla B - u \cdot \nabla u - \kappa \nabla \times ((\nabla \times v) \times B) \\ + \nabla \times (v \times u) + 2\kappa \nabla \times (v \cdot \nabla B) - \nabla p, \\ \operatorname{div} u = \operatorname{div} B = \operatorname{div} v = 0. \end{cases} \quad (1.13)$$

Based on this new formulation, they prove the global well-posedness of (1.1) for small data in critical Besov spaces $\dot{B}_{2,r}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3) \times (\dot{B}_{2,r}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3) \cap \dot{B}_{2,r}^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3))$ with $1 \leq r \leq \infty$ and local well-posedness for large data in $\dot{B}_{2,1}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3) \times (\dot{B}_{2,1}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3) \cap \dot{B}_{2,1}^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3))$. In the case that $\mu = \nu$, we find that considering (1.13) instead of (1.1) has more advantages. Specifically, as $\|B\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}} \approx \|u\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \|v\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}}$, it suffices to derive the $\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ -bound of (u, B, v) when considering (1.13), which can help us avoid using the estimate (1.12). Besides, the quasilinear term $\kappa \nabla \times ((\nabla \times v) \times B)$ has a cancelation property. By utilizing (1.13), we indeed can reduce σ to 0 in Theorem 1.1 when $\mu = \nu$. Precisely, we have

Theorem 1.2. *Assume that $\mu = \nu$. Let $(u_0, B_0) \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3) \times H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $\operatorname{div} u_0 = \operatorname{div} B_0 = 0$. Then there exists a positive time T such that the system (1.1) admits a unique solution (u, B) with*

$$\begin{aligned} u &\in C([0, T]; H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^2(0, T; H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3)), \\ B &\in C([0, T]; H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^2(0, T; H^{\frac{5}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3)). \end{aligned} \quad (1.14)$$

Remark 1.3. Because $\dot{B}_{2,1}^s(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $H^s(\mathbb{R}^3)$ are not embedded into each other when $s > 0$, Theorem 1.2 is different from the corresponding local well-posedness result (for large initial data) in [11].

As mentioned above, the global existence and uniqueness of strong solutions to (1.1) with $\mu = \nu$ for small initial data $(u_0, B_0) \in \dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3) \times (\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3) \cap \dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3))$ was proved in [11]. Although their initial data is less regular than that in Theorem 1.1, their proof relies on (1.13) and thus cannot be applied to the general case. To the best of our knowledge, there are no available global well-posedness result concerning (1.1) with $B_0 \in H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ for the general μ and ν , so it is significant to extend the local strong solutions constructed in Theorem 1.1 globally in time. We find that this can be achieved for small initial data. Besides, we obtain the optimal time-decay rates of solutions.

Theorem 1.3. *Assume that the initial data (u_0, B_0) satisfies the conditions in Theorem 1.1. There exists a small positive constant c_0 such that if*

$$\|u_0\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}} + \|B_0\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}} \leq c_0, \quad (1.15)$$

then the system (1.1) has a unique global solution (u, B) with

$$\begin{aligned} u &\in C([0, \infty); H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3)), \quad \nabla u \in L^2(0, \infty; H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3)), \\ B &\in C([0, \infty); H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3)), \quad \nabla B \in L^2(0, \infty; H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3)). \end{aligned} \quad (1.16)$$

Moreover, if in addition $(u_0, B_0) \in \dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ for some $\gamma \in [0, \frac{5}{2}]$, then it holds that for all $t \geq 1$,

$$\|\Lambda^s u(t)\|_{L^2} + \|\Lambda^s B(t)\|_{L^2} \lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{s+\gamma}{2}} \quad \text{if } s \geq 0. \quad (1.17)$$

Remark 1.4. The time-decay rates in (1.17) are optimal in the sense that they coincide with that of the heat semi-group.

Remark 1.5. In contrast to the time-decay estimates in [7, 19], since $L^1(\mathbb{R}^3) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \hookrightarrow \dot{H}^{-\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^3) \hookrightarrow \dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ for $\gamma \in [0, \frac{3}{2}]$, we relax the regularity condition on the initial data and expand the range of γ from $[0, \frac{3}{2}]$ to $[0, \frac{5}{2}]$.

Remark 1.6. Actually, we do not need to impose additional regularity on initial data when $\gamma = 0$ because $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \hookrightarrow \dot{B}_{2,\infty}^0(\mathbb{R}^3)$.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we recall some basic facts on the Littlewood-Paley theory. Section 3, Section 4 and Section 5 are devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.1, Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3, respectively.

Notation: Throughout the paper, C stands for a generic positive constant, which may vary on different lines. For brevity, we sometimes use $a \lesssim b$ to replace $a \leq Cb$. The notation $a \approx b$ means that both $a \lesssim b$ and $b \lesssim a$ hold. For any two operators A and B , we denote $[A, B] = AB - BA$, the commutator between A and B . For I an interval of \mathbb{R} , we denote by $C(I; X)$ the set of continuous functions on I with values in X . For $p \in [1, +\infty]$, $L^p(I; X)$ denotes the set of measurable functions $u : I \rightarrow X$ such that $t \rightarrow \|u(t)\|_X$ belongs to $L^p(I)$. Also, we use the shorthand notation $L_T^p(X)$ for $L^p(0, T; X)$.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we briefly introduce the Littlewood-Paley decomposition, the definition of the homogeneous Besov space and some related analysis tools. For more details, we refer readers to [2].

Let $\varphi, \chi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ be two radial functions valued in the interval $[0, 1]$ and supported in $\mathcal{C} = \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \frac{3}{4} \leq |\xi| \leq \frac{8}{3}\}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |\xi| \leq \frac{4}{3}\}$ respectively such that

$$\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi(2^{-j}\xi) = 1 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\},$$

and

$$\chi(\xi) + \sum_{j \geq 0} \varphi(2^{-j}\xi) = 1 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3.$$

The dyadic block $\dot{\Delta}_j$ and the low frequency cut-off operator \dot{S}_j with $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ are defined as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\Delta}_j u &:= \varphi(2^{-j}D)u = 2^{3j} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} g(2^j y)u(x-y)dy \quad \text{with } g = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\phi, \\ \dot{S}_j u &:= \chi(2^{-j}D)u = 2^{3j} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tilde{g}(2^j y)u(x-y)dy \quad \text{with } \tilde{g} = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\chi. \end{aligned}$$

We denote by $\mathcal{S}'_h(\mathbb{R}^3)$ the set of tempered distribution u such that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow -\infty} \|\dot{S}_j u\|_{L^\infty} = 0,$$

then the following decompositions hold for all $u \in \mathcal{S}'_h(\mathbb{R}^3)$:

$$u = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \dot{\Delta}_j u \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{S}_j u = \sum_{j' \leq j-1} \dot{\Delta}_{j'} u.$$

Besides, it is easy to check that the Littlewood-Paley decomposition satisfies the almost orthogonality:

$$\dot{\Delta}_k \dot{\Delta}_j u = 0 \quad \text{if } |k-j| \geq 2 \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{\Delta}_k (\dot{S}_{j-1} u \dot{\Delta}_j v) = 0 \quad \text{if } |k-j| \geq 5. \quad (2.1)$$

The following famous Bernstein inequalities will be frequently used in this sequel.

Lemma 2.1 ([2, Lemma 2.1]). *Let $0 < r < R$. There exists a constant C such that for any nonnegative integer k , any couple $(p, q) \in [1, \infty]^2$ with $q \geq p \geq 1$, and any function u in L^p , there holds*

$$\text{supp } \hat{u} \subset \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |\xi| \leq \lambda R\} \implies \sup_{|\alpha|=k} \|\partial^\alpha u\|_{L^q} \leq C^{k+1} \lambda^{k+3(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q})} \|u\|_{L^p},$$

$$\text{supp } \hat{u} \subset \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \lambda r \leq |\xi| \leq \lambda R\} \implies C^{-k-1} \lambda^k \|u\|_{L^p} \leq \sup_{|\alpha|=k} \|\partial^\alpha u\|_{L^p} \leq C^{k+1} \lambda^k \|u\|_{L^p}.$$

Let us recall the definition of the homogeneous Besov space.

Definition 2.1 ([2]). *Let $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $1 \leq p, r \leq \infty$, the homogeneous Besov space $\dot{B}_{p,r}^s(\mathbb{R}^3)$ is defined by*

$$\dot{B}_{p,r}^s(\mathbb{R}^3) := \{u \in \mathcal{S}'_h(\mathbb{R}^3) : \|u\|_{\dot{B}_{p,r}^s} < \infty\}$$

with

$$\|u\|_{\dot{B}_{p,r}^s} := \left\| \left(2^{js} \|\dot{\Delta}_j u\|_{L^p} \right)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \right\|_{\ell^r(\mathbb{Z})}.$$

Remark 2.1. It is not hard to verify that the $\|\cdot\|_{\dot{B}_{2,2}^s}$ norm and the classical homogeneous Sobolev norm $\|\cdot\|_{\dot{H}^s} := \|\Lambda^s \cdot\|_{L^2}$ with $\Lambda^s := (-\Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}}$ are equivalent, so we make no distinction between these two norms throughout this paper.

Lemma 2.2 ([2]). *Let $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $1 \leq p, r \leq \infty$, the following properties hold true:*

(i) *Derivatives: for any k -th order derivative, it holds that*

$$\sup_{|\alpha|=k} \|\partial^\alpha u\|_{\dot{B}_{p,r}^s} \approx \|u\|_{\dot{B}_{p,r}^{s+k}}.$$

(ii) *Embedding: for $1 \leq p \leq \tilde{p} \leq \infty$ and $1 \leq r \leq \tilde{r} \leq \infty$, one has*

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{B}_{p,r}^s(\mathbb{R}^3) &\hookrightarrow \dot{B}_{\tilde{p},\tilde{r}}^{s-3(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{\tilde{p}})}(\mathbb{R}^3), & \dot{B}_{p,1}^{\frac{3}{p}}(\mathbb{R}^3) &\hookrightarrow L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3), \\ \text{and } L^p(\mathbb{R}^3) &\hookrightarrow \dot{B}_{p,\infty}^0(\mathbb{R}^3). \end{aligned}$$

(iii) *Interpolation: for any $s_1 < s_2$ and $0 < \theta < 1$, there holds*

$$\|u\|_{\dot{B}_{p,r}^{\theta s_1 + (1-\theta)s_2}} \leq \|u\|_{\dot{B}_{p,r}^{s_1}}^\theta \|u\|_{\dot{B}_{p,r}^{s_2}}^{1-\theta}, \quad (2.2)$$

$$\|u\|_{\dot{B}_{p,1}^{\theta s_1 + (1-\theta)s_2}} \leq \frac{C}{s_2 - s_1} \left(\frac{1}{\theta} + \frac{1}{1-\theta} \right) \|u\|_{\dot{B}_{p,\infty}^{s_1}}^\theta \|u\|_{\dot{B}_{p,\infty}^{s_2}}^{1-\theta}. \quad (2.3)$$

(iv) *Action of multiplier: Let f be a smooth function on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ which is homogeneous of degree m , then we have*

$$\|f(D)u\|_{\dot{B}_{p,r}^{s-m}} \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{B}_{p,r}^s}.$$

We need the following mixed time-space norm, which was first introduced by Chemin [8].

Definition 2.2. *Let $T > 0$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $1 \leq p, r, q \leq \infty$. For any tempered distribution u on $(0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^3$, we set*

$$\|u\|_{\tilde{L}_T^q(\dot{B}_{p,r}^s)} := \left\| \left(2^{js} \|\dot{\Delta}_j u\|_{L_T^q(L^p)} \right)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \right\|_{\ell^r(\mathbb{Z})}.$$

Remark 2.2. By the Minkowski's inequality, one easily observe that

$$\begin{cases} \|u\|_{\tilde{L}_T^q(\dot{B}_{p,r}^s)} \leq \|u\|_{L_T^q(\dot{B}_{p,r}^s)} & \text{if } q \leq r, \\ \|u\|_{L_T^q(\dot{B}_{p,r}^s)} \leq \|u\|_{\tilde{L}_T^q(\dot{B}_{p,r}^s)} & \text{if } q \geq r. \end{cases}$$

To obtain the nonlinear estimates in Besov spaces, we shall make use of the following Bony's decomposition from [4] in the homogeneous context:

$$uv = \dot{T}_u v + \dot{T}_v u + \dot{R}(u, v), \quad (2.4)$$

where

$$\dot{T}_u v \triangleq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \dot{S}_{j-1} u \dot{\Delta}_j v \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{R}(u, v) \triangleq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{|j'-j| \leq 1} \dot{\Delta}_{j'} u \dot{\Delta}_j v.$$

The operators \dot{T} and \dot{R} above are called the paraproduct operator and remainder operator, respectively.

Lemma 2.3 ([2]). *Let $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $t < 0$ and $1 \leq p, r \leq \infty$, there exists a constant C such that*

$$\|\dot{T}_u v\|_{\dot{B}_{p,r}^s} \leq C \|u\|_{L^\infty} \|v\|_{\dot{B}_{p,r}^s} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\dot{T}_u v\|_{\dot{B}_{p,r}^{s+t}} \leq C \|u\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^t} \|v\|_{\dot{B}_{p,r}^s}. \quad (2.5)$$

Let $s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $1 \leq p, p_1, p_2, r, r_1, r_2 \leq \infty$ with $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ and $\frac{1}{r} \leq \frac{1}{r_1} + \frac{1}{r_2}$. If $s_1 + s_2 > 0$, there exists a constant C such that

$$\|\dot{R}(u, v)\|_{\dot{B}_{p,r}^{s_1+s_2}} \leq C \|u\|_{\dot{B}_{p_1,r_1}^{s_1}} \|v\|_{\dot{B}_{p_2,r_2}^{s_2}}. \quad (2.6)$$

When $r = 1$ and $s_1 + s_2 = 0$, there exists a constant C such that

$$\|\dot{R}(u, v)\|_{\dot{B}_{p,\infty}^0} \leq C \|u\|_{\dot{B}_{p_1,r_1}^{s_1}} \|v\|_{\dot{B}_{p_2,r_2}^{s_2}}. \quad (2.7)$$

We have the following product law in Besov spaces.

Lemma 2.4. Let $s > -\frac{3}{2}$, $1 \leq r \leq \infty$ and $\eta, \theta > 0$, it holds that

$$\|fg\|_{\dot{B}_{2,r}^s} \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{\frac{3}{2}-\eta}} \|g\|_{\dot{B}_{2,r}^{s+\eta}} + \|g\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{\frac{3}{2}-\theta}} \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{2,r}^{s+\theta}}. \quad (2.8)$$

Proof. It follows from the Bony's decomposition that

$$fg = \dot{T}_f g + \dot{T}_g f + \dot{R}(f, g). \quad (2.9)$$

Since $s > -\frac{3}{2}$ and $\eta, \theta > 0$, by Lemma 2.3 and the embedding in Lemma 2.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\dot{T}_f g\|_{\dot{B}_{2,r}^s} &\lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^{-\eta}} \|g\|_{\dot{B}_{2,r}^{s+\eta}} \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{\frac{3}{2}-\eta}} \|g\|_{\dot{B}_{2,r}^{s+\eta}}, \\ \|\dot{T}_g f\|_{\dot{B}_{2,r}^s} &\lesssim \|g\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^{-\theta}} \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{2,r}^{s+\theta}} \lesssim \|g\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{\frac{3}{2}-\theta}} \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{2,r}^{s+\theta}}, \\ \|\dot{R}(f, g)\|_{\dot{B}_{2,r}^s} &\lesssim \|\dot{R}(f, g)\|_{\dot{B}_{1,r}^{s+\frac{3}{2}}} \lesssim \|g\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{\frac{3}{2}-\theta}} \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{2,r}^{s+\theta}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

This completes the proof of (2.8). \square

The following lemma plays a key role in the analysis of the hall term.

Lemma 2.5. Let $s > -\frac{3}{2}$, $1 \leq r \leq \infty$, $0 < \eta < \frac{5}{2}$ and $\theta > 0$, the following estimate holds true,

$$\|2^{js} \|[\dot{\Delta}_j, f]g\|_{L^2} \|_{\ell^r(\mathbb{Z})} \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{2,r}^{\frac{5}{2}-\eta}} \|g\|_{\dot{B}_{2,r}^{s+\eta-1}} + \|g\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{\frac{3}{2}-\theta}} \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{2,r}^{s+\theta}}. \quad (2.11)$$

Proof. By the Bony's decomposition,

$$[\dot{\Delta}_j, f]g = [\dot{\Delta}_j, \dot{T}_f]g + \dot{\Delta}_j(\dot{T}_g f + \dot{R}(f, g)) - (\dot{T}_{\dot{\Delta}_j g} f + \dot{R}(\dot{\Delta}_j g, f)). \quad (2.12)$$

From (2.1), the first term can be written as

$$[\dot{\Delta}_j, \dot{T}_f]g = \sum_{|j-j'| \leq 4} [\dot{\Delta}_j, \dot{S}_{j'-1} f] \dot{\Delta}_{j'} g. \quad (2.13)$$

According to [2, Lemma 2.97], one has

$$\|[\dot{\Delta}_j, \dot{S}_{j'-1} f] \dot{\Delta}_{j'} g\|_{L^2} \lesssim 2^{-j} \|\nabla \dot{S}_{j'-1} f\|_{L^\infty} \|\dot{\Delta}_{j'} g\|_{L^2}. \quad (2.14)$$

Because $\eta > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \dot{S}_{j'-1} f\|_{L^\infty} &\leq \sum_{j'' \leq j'-2} \|\nabla \dot{\Delta}_{j''} f\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leq \|\nabla f\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty, \infty}^{-\eta}} \sum_{j'' \leq j'-2} 2^{j''\eta} \lesssim 2^{j'\eta} \|\nabla f\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty, \infty}^{-\eta}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{js} \|[\dot{\Delta}_j, \dot{T}_f]g\|_{L^2} &\leq 2^{js} \sum_{|j-j'| \leq 4} \|[\dot{\Delta}_j, \dot{S}_{j'-1} f] \dot{\Delta}_{j'} g\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \|\nabla f\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty, \infty}^{-\eta}} \sum_{|j-j'| \leq 4} 2^{j'(s+\eta-1)} \|\dot{\Delta}_{j'} g\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

Taking the $\ell^r(\mathbb{Z})$ norm for both sides of (2.16) and using the embedding in Lemma 2.2 (ii) implies that

$$\|2^{js} \|[\dot{\Delta}_j, \dot{T}_f]g\|_{L^2}\|_{\ell^r(\mathbb{Z})} \lesssim \|\nabla f\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty, \infty}^{-\eta}} \|g\|_{\dot{B}_{2,r}^{s+\eta-1}} \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{\frac{5}{2}-\eta}} \|g\|_{\dot{B}_{2,r}^{s+\eta-1}}. \quad (2.17)$$

Since $\theta > 0$ and $s > -\frac{3}{2}$, we get by applying Lemma 2.3 and the embedding in Lemma 2.2 (ii) that

$$\|2^{js} \|\dot{\Delta}_j \dot{T}_g f\|_{L^2}\|_{\ell^r(\mathbb{Z})} \lesssim \|g\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty, \infty}^{-\theta}} \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{2,r}^{s+\theta}} \lesssim \|g\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{\frac{3}{2}-\theta}} \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{2,r}^{s+\theta}}, \quad (2.18)$$

$$\|2^{js} \|\dot{\Delta}_j \dot{R}(f, g)\|_{L^2}\|_{\ell^r(\mathbb{Z})} \lesssim \|\dot{R}(f, g)\|_{\dot{B}_{1,r}^{s+\frac{3}{2}}} \lesssim \|g\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{\frac{3}{2}-\theta}} \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{2,r}^{s+\theta}}. \quad (2.19)$$

Note that

$$\dot{T}_{\dot{\Delta}_j g} f + \dot{R}(\dot{\Delta}_j g, f) = \sum_{j' \geq j-2} \dot{S}_{j'+2} \dot{\Delta}_j g \dot{\Delta}_{j'} f. \quad (2.20)$$

Hence, by using Bernstein inequalities, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{js} \|\dot{T}_{\dot{\Delta}_j g} f + \dot{R}(\dot{\Delta}_j g, f)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \sum_{j' \geq j-2} 2^{js} \|\dot{\Delta}_j g\|_{L^\infty} \|\dot{\Delta}_{j'} f\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{j' \geq j-2} 2^{j(s+\frac{3}{2})} \|\dot{\Delta}_j g\|_{L^2} \|\dot{\Delta}_{j'} f\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \|g\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{s+\eta-1}} \sum_{j' \geq j-2} 2^{(j-j')(\frac{5}{2}-\eta)} 2^{j'(\frac{5}{2}-\eta)} \|\dot{\Delta}_{j'} f\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.21)$$

Since $\eta < \frac{5}{2}$, taking the $\ell^r(\mathbb{Z})$ norm of both sides of (2.21) and using the convolution inequality entails that

$$\|2^{js} \|\dot{T}_{\dot{\Delta}_j g} f + \dot{R}(\dot{\Delta}_j g, f)\|_{L^2}\|_{\ell^r(\mathbb{Z})} \lesssim \|g\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{s+\eta-1}} \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{2,r}^{\frac{5}{2}-\eta}} \quad (2.22)$$

Thus, the proof of (2.11) is finished. \square

Lemma 2.6 ([15]). *Let $p, p_1, p_3 \in (1, \infty)$ and $p_2, p_4 \in [1, \infty]$ satisfying $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} = \frac{1}{p_3} + \frac{1}{p_4}$. Then for any $s > 0$, there holds*

$$\|[\Lambda^s, f]g\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|\Lambda^s f\|_{L^{p_1}} \|g\|_{L^{p_2}} + \|\Lambda^{s-1} g\|_{L^{p_3}} \|\nabla f\|_{L^{p_4}}.$$

We end this section with the following Sobolev embedding inequality.

Lemma 2.7 ([2, Theorem 1.38]). *Let $0 \leq s < \frac{3}{2}$, the following embedding relation holds*

$$\dot{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^3) \hookrightarrow L^{\frac{6}{3-2s}}(\mathbb{R}^3). \quad (2.23)$$

3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

In this section, we are going to prove Theorem 1.1. For simplicity, we set $\mu = \nu = \kappa = 1$ in the rest of this paper. For presentation clarity, we divide the proof into the following several steps.

First step: A priori estimates

Our goal in this step is to establish the following statement.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $0 < \sigma < 2$ and $T > 0$. If (u, B) solves the system (1.1) on $[0, T]$, then there exists positive constants $C_1 > 1$, C_2 and c such that the following a priori estimates hold true,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u\|_{L_T^\infty(H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})} + \|\nabla u\|_{L_T^2(H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})} + \|B\|_{L_T^\infty(H^{\frac{3}{2}})} + \|\nabla B\|_{L_T^2(H^{\frac{3}{2}})} \\ & \leq C_1 \left(\|u_0\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}} + \|B_0\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}} + T^{\frac{\sigma}{4\sigma+6}} \|u\|_{L_T^\infty(H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})}^{\frac{3\sigma+3}{2\sigma+3}} \|\nabla u\|_{L_T^2(H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})}^{\frac{\sigma+3}{2\sigma+3}} \right. \\ & \quad + T^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\sigma}{4}} \|B\|_{L_T^\infty(H^{\frac{3}{2}})}^{2-\frac{\sigma}{2}} \|\nabla B\|_{L_T^2(H^{\frac{3}{2}})}^{\frac{\sigma}{2}} \\ & \quad + T^{\frac{\sigma}{4}} \|u\|_{L_T^\infty(H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})} \|B\|_{L_T^\infty(H^{\frac{3}{2}})}^{\frac{\sigma}{2}} \|\nabla B\|_{L_T^2(H^{\frac{3}{2}})}^{1-\frac{\sigma}{2}} \\ & \quad \left. + T^{\frac{\sigma}{4}} \|u\|_{L_T^\infty(H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})}^{\frac{\sigma}{2}} \|\nabla u\|_{L_T^2(H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})}^{1-\frac{\sigma}{2}} \|B\|_{L_T^\infty(H^{\frac{3}{2}})} + \|B\|_{L_T^4(\dot{H}^2)}^2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|B\|_{L_T^4(\dot{H}^2)} & \leq C_2 \left(\left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} (1 - e^{-4c2^{2j}T})^{\frac{1}{2}} (2^j)^{\frac{3}{2}} \|\dot{\Delta}_j B_0\|_{L^2} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \right. \\ & \quad + T^{\frac{\sigma}{4}} \|u\|_{L_T^\infty(H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})} \|B\|_{L_T^\infty(H^{\frac{3}{2}})}^{\frac{\sigma}{2}} \|\nabla B\|_{L_T^2(H^{\frac{3}{2}})}^{1-\frac{\sigma}{2}} \\ & \quad \left. + T^{\frac{\sigma}{4}} \|u\|_{L_T^\infty(H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})}^{\frac{\sigma}{2}} \|\nabla u\|_{L_T^2(H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})}^{1-\frac{\sigma}{2}} \|B\|_{L_T^\infty(H^{\frac{3}{2}})} + \|B\|_{L_T^4(\dot{H}^2)}^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

Proof. Taking the inner product of (1.1) with u and B , respectively, and adding up the resulting equations, one easily have

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (\|u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|B\|_{L^2}^2) + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla B\|_{L^2}^2 = 0, \quad (3.3)$$

where we have used the fact that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla \times ((\nabla \times B) \times B) \cdot B dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} ((\nabla \times B) \times B) \cdot (\nabla \times B) dx = 0.$$

Hence, integrating (3.3) over $[0, T]$ both sides leads to

$$\|u\|_{L_T^\infty(L^2)} + \|B\|_{L_T^\infty(L^2)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L_T^2(L^2)} + \|\nabla B\|_{L_T^2(L^2)} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{L^2} + \|B_0\|_{L^2}. \quad (3.4)$$

Applying the operator $\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}$ to the first equation of (1.1) and taking the inner product with $\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}u$, then using Hölder's inequality and Young's inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Lambda^{\frac{3}{2}+\sigma}u\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &= -\left(\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}(u \cdot \nabla u), \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}u\right) + \left(\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}(B \cdot \nabla B), \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}u\right) \\ &\leq C\|\Lambda^{\sigma-\frac{1}{2}}(u \cdot \nabla u)\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|\Lambda^{\sigma-\frac{1}{2}}(B \cdot \nabla B)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\Lambda^{\frac{3}{2}+\sigma}u\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

whence, integrating with respect to time gives

$$\|u\|_{L_T^\infty(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})} + \|\nabla u\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}} + \|u \cdot \nabla u\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\sigma-\frac{1}{2}})} + \|B \cdot \nabla B\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\sigma-\frac{1}{2}})}. \quad (3.6)$$

To derive the high-order estimates of B , we use the Fourier localization techniques. Applying the operator $\dot{\Delta}_j$ to the second equation in (1.1) and taking the inner product with $\dot{\Delta}_j B$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\dot{\Delta}_j B\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \dot{\Delta}_j B\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq \|\dot{\Delta}_j \nabla \times (u \times B)\|_{L^2} \|\dot{\Delta}_j B\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + \left(\dot{\Delta}_j(\nabla \times (B \times (\nabla \times B))), \dot{\Delta}_j B\right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

Thanks to Bernstein inequalities and the cancelation property, there exists universal constants c and C such that

$$\|\nabla \dot{\Delta}_j B\|_{L^2}^2 \geq c2^{2j} \|\dot{\Delta}_j B\|_{L^2}^2, \quad (3.8)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\dot{\Delta}_j(\nabla \times (B \times (\nabla \times B))), \dot{\Delta}_j B\right) \\ &= \left(\dot{\Delta}_j(B \times (\nabla \times B)) - B \times (\nabla \times \dot{\Delta}_j B), \nabla \times \dot{\Delta}_j B\right) \\ &= \left([\dot{\Delta}_j, B \times](\nabla \times B), \nabla \times \dot{\Delta}_j B\right) \\ &\leq \|[\dot{\Delta}_j, B \times](\nabla \times B)\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \times \dot{\Delta}_j B\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C2^j \|[\dot{\Delta}_j, B \times](\nabla \times B)\|_{L^2} \|\dot{\Delta}_j B\|_{L^2} \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

Inserting (3.8) and (3.9) into (3.7), and dividing through by $\|\dot{\Delta}_j B\|_{L^2}$, we find that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\dot{\Delta}_j B\|_{L^2} + c2^{2j} \|\dot{\Delta}_j B\|_{L^2} \leq \|\dot{\Delta}_j \nabla \times (u \times B)\|_{L^2} + C2^j \|[\dot{\Delta}_j, B \times](\nabla \times B)\|_{L^2}. \quad (3.10)$$

Multiplying both sides of (3.10) by $e^{c2^{2j}t}$ gives

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(e^{c2^{2j}t} \|\dot{\Delta}_j B\|_{L^2} \right) \leq e^{c2^{2j}t} \left(\|\dot{\Delta}_j \nabla \times (u \times B)\|_{L^2} + C2^j \|[\dot{\Delta}_j, B \times](\nabla \times B)\|_{L^2} \right). \quad (3.11)$$

After time integration, we get that for any $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\dot{\Delta}_j B(t)\|_{L^2} &\leq e^{-c2^{2j}t} \|\dot{\Delta}_j B_0\|_{L^2} + \int_0^t e^{-c2^{2j}(t-\tau)} \left(\|\dot{\Delta}_j \nabla \times (u \times B)\|_{L^2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + C2^j \|[\dot{\Delta}_j, B \times](\nabla \times B)\|_{L^2} \right) d\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Applying convolution inequalities to (3.12) implies that for any $p, q \in [2, \infty]$ with $1 + \frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{q}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\dot{\Delta}_j B\|_{L_T^p(L^2)} &\leq \left(\frac{1 - e^{-pc2^{2j}T}}{pc2^{2j}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \|\dot{\Delta}_j B_0\|_{L^2} + \left(\frac{1 - e^{-qc2^{2j}T}}{qc2^{2j}}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(\|\dot{\Delta}_j \nabla \times (u \times B)\|_{L_T^2(L^2)}\right. \\ &\quad \left. + C2^j \|[\dot{\Delta}_j, B \times](\nabla \times B)\|_{L_T^2(L^2)}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Multiplying both sides of (3.13) by $2^{j(\frac{3}{2} + \frac{2}{p})}$ and taking the $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ norm, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \|B\|_{\tilde{L}_T^p(\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2} + \frac{2}{p}})} &\leq \frac{1}{(pc)^{\frac{1}{p}}} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} (1 - e^{-pc2^{2j}T})^{\frac{2}{p}} (2^{j\frac{3}{2}} \|\dot{\Delta}_j B_0\|_{L^2})^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + C \left(\|\nabla \times (u \times B)\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}})} + \left\| \left\| 2^{j\frac{3}{2}} \|[\dot{\Delta}_j, B \times](\nabla \times B)\|_{L^2} \right\|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})} \right\|_{L_T^2} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

Thus, due to fact that $\|f\|_{H^a} \approx \|f\|_{L^2} + \|f\|_{\dot{H}^a}$ and Remark 2.2, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|u\|_{L_T^\infty(H^{\frac{1}{2} + \sigma})} + \|\nabla u\|_{L_T^2(H^{\frac{1}{2} + \sigma})} + \|B\|_{L_T^\infty(H^{\frac{3}{2}})} + \|\nabla B\|_{L_T^2(H^{\frac{3}{2}})} \\ &\lesssim \|u\|_{L_T^\infty(L^2)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L_T^2(L^2)} + \|B\|_{L_T^\infty(L^2)} + \|\nabla B\|_{L_T^2(L^2)} \\ &\quad + \|u\|_{L_T^\infty(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2} + \sigma})} + \|u\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2} + \sigma})} + \|B\|_{\tilde{L}_T^\infty(\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}})} + \|B\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{5}{2}})} \\ &\lesssim \|u_0\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2} + \sigma}} + \|B_0\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \|u \cdot \nabla u\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\sigma - \frac{1}{2}})} + \|B \cdot \nabla B\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\sigma - \frac{1}{2}})} \\ &\quad + \|\nabla \times (u \times B)\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}})} + \left\| \left\| 2^{j\frac{3}{2}} \|[\dot{\Delta}_j, B \times](\nabla \times B)\|_{L^2} \right\|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})} \right\|_{L_T^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|B\|_{L_T^4(\dot{H}^2)} &\leq \|B\|_{\tilde{L}_T^4(\dot{H}^2)} \lesssim \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} (1 - e^{-4c2^{2j}T})^{\frac{1}{2}} (2^{j\frac{3}{2}} \|\dot{\Delta}_j B_0\|_{L^2})^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + \|\nabla \times (u \times B)\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}})} + \left\| \left\| 2^{j\frac{3}{2}} \|[\dot{\Delta}_j, B \times](\nabla \times B)\|_{L^2} \right\|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})} \right\|_{L_T^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

Let us now turn to the nonlinear estimates for the right-hand sides of (3.15) and (3.16). Recall that $0 < \sigma < 2$, it is clear that the following two product laws stem from Lemma 2.4 with $(s, r, \eta, \theta) = (\frac{1}{2} + \sigma, 2, 1 - \frac{\sigma}{2}, 1 - \frac{\sigma}{2})$ and $(s, r, \eta, \theta) = (\frac{3}{2}, 2, 1 - \frac{\sigma}{2}, \frac{\sigma}{2})$ respectively:

$$\|fg\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2} + \sigma}} \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sigma}{2}}} \|g\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2} + \frac{\sigma}{2}}} + \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2} + \frac{\sigma}{2}}} \|g\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sigma}{2}}}, \quad (3.17)$$

$$\|fg\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}} \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sigma}{2}}} \|g\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{5}{2} - \frac{\sigma}{2}}} + \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2} + \frac{\sigma}{2}}} \|g\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2} - \frac{\sigma}{2}}}. \quad (3.18)$$

Due to the condition $\operatorname{div} u = \operatorname{div} B = 0$, one has

$$u \cdot \nabla u = \operatorname{div}(u \otimes u), \quad B \cdot \nabla B = \operatorname{div}(B \otimes B).$$

Using (3.17), Hölder's inequality, Sobolev interpolation and the embedding $H^a \hookrightarrow H^b \hookrightarrow \dot{H}^b$ for

$a \geq b \geq 0$, the right-hand side of (3.6) can be bounded as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u \cdot \nabla u\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\sigma-\frac{1}{2}})} &\lesssim \|u \otimes u\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})} \\
&\lesssim \|u\|_{L_T^\infty(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\sigma}{2}})} \|u\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}+\frac{\sigma}{2}})} \\
&\lesssim \|u\|_{L_T^\infty(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\sigma}{2}})} \left(\|u\|_{L_T^2(L^2)}^{\frac{\sigma}{2\sigma+3}} \|\nabla u\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})}^{\frac{\sigma+3}{2\sigma+3}} \right) \\
&\lesssim \|u\|_{L_T^\infty(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\sigma}{2}})} \left(T^{\frac{\sigma}{4\sigma+6}} \|u\|_{L_T^\infty(L^2)}^{\frac{\sigma}{2\sigma+3}} \|\nabla u\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})}^{\frac{\sigma+3}{2\sigma+3}} \right) \\
&\lesssim T^{\frac{\sigma}{4\sigma+6}} \|u\|_{L_T^\infty(H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})}^{\frac{3\sigma+3}{2\sigma+3}} \|\nabla u\|_{L_T^2(H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})}^{\frac{\sigma+3}{2\sigma+3}},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\|B \cdot \nabla B\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\sigma-\frac{1}{2}})} &\lesssim \|B \otimes B\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})} \\
&\lesssim \|B\|_{L_T^\infty(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\sigma}{2}})} \|B\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}+\frac{\sigma}{2}})} \\
&\lesssim \|B\|_{L_T^\infty(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\sigma}{2}})} \|B\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}})}^{1-\frac{\sigma}{2}} \|\nabla B\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}})}^{\frac{\sigma}{2}} \\
&\lesssim T^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\sigma}{4}} \|B\|_{L_T^\infty(H^{\frac{3}{2}})}^{2-\frac{\sigma}{2}} \|\nabla B\|_{L_T^2(H^{\frac{3}{2}})}^{\frac{\sigma}{2}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

Likewise, resorting to (3.18), Hölder's inequality and Sobolev interpolation gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla \times (u \times B)\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}})} &\lesssim \|u \times B\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}})} \\
&\lesssim \|u\|_{L_T^\infty(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\sigma}{2}})} \|B\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{5}{2}-\frac{\sigma}{2}})} + \|u\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}+\frac{\sigma}{2}})} \|B\|_{L_T^\infty(\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}-\frac{\sigma}{2}})} \\
&\lesssim \|u\|_{L_T^\infty(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\sigma}{2}})} \left(\|B\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}})}^{\frac{\sigma}{2}} \|\nabla B\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}})}^{1-\frac{\sigma}{2}} \right) \\
&\quad + \left(\|u\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})}^{\frac{\sigma}{2}} \|\nabla u\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})}^{1-\frac{\sigma}{2}} \right) \|B\|_{L_T^\infty(\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}-\frac{\sigma}{2}})} \\
&\lesssim T^{\frac{\sigma}{4}} \|u\|_{L_T^\infty(H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})} \|B\|_{L_T^\infty(H^{\frac{3}{2}})}^{\frac{\sigma}{2}} \|\nabla B\|_{L_T^2(H^{\frac{3}{2}})}^{1-\frac{\sigma}{2}} \\
&\quad + T^{\frac{\sigma}{4}} \|u\|_{L_T^\infty(H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})}^{\frac{\sigma}{2}} \|\nabla u\|_{L_T^2(H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})}^{1-\frac{\sigma}{2}} \|B\|_{L_T^\infty(H^{\frac{3}{2}})}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

For the commutator term, applying Lemma 2.5 with $(s, r, \eta, \theta) = (\frac{3}{2}, 2, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ yields that

$$\left\| \|2^j\|^{\frac{3}{2}} \|[\dot{\Delta}_j, B \times] (\nabla \times B)\|_{L^2} \| \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}) \| \right\|_{L_T^2} \lesssim \|B\|_{L_T^4(\dot{H}^2)} \|\nabla \times B\|_{L_T^4(\dot{H}^1)} \lesssim \|B\|_{L_T^4(\dot{H}^2)}^2. \tag{3.22}$$

Thus, plugging (3.19)-(3.22) into (3.15) and (3.16) yields (3.1) and (3.2) respectively. \square

Second step: Construction of approximate solutions

We will construct a sequence smooth approxiamte solutions $\{(u_n, B_n)\}$. For each positive integer n , the spectral cut-off operator \mathcal{J}_n is defined as

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{J}_n f)(\xi) = 1_{\{|\xi| \leq n\}} \mathcal{F}(f)(\xi).$$

We smooth out the initial data (u_0, B_0) by $u_{0,n} = \mathcal{J}_n u_0$ and $B_{0,n} = \mathcal{J}_n B_0$. It is clear that $(u_{0,n}, B_{0,n}) \in H^\infty$ where $H^\infty := \bigcap_{s>0} H^s$, and

$$(u_{0,n}, B_{0,n}) \rightarrow (u_0, B_0) \quad \text{in} \quad H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma} \times H^{\frac{3}{2}}. \quad (3.23)$$

Consider the Hall-MHD system supplemented with smooth initial data $(u_{0,n}, B_{0,n})$:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u_n - \Delta u_n + u_n \cdot \nabla u_n + \nabla p_n = B_n \cdot \nabla B_n, \\ \partial_t B_n - \Delta B_n + u_n \cdot \nabla B_n + \nabla \times ((\nabla \times B_n) \times B_n) = B_n \cdot \nabla u_n, \\ \operatorname{div} u_n = \operatorname{div} B_n = 0, \\ u_n(x, 0) = u_{0,n}(x), \quad B_n(x, 0) = B_{0,n}(x). \end{cases} \quad (3.24)$$

According to the local well-posedness result for smooth initial data (see [5]), the above system admits a unique solution $(u_n, B_n) \in C([0, T_n]; H^\infty)$ on some maximal time interval $[0, T_n)$. Furthermore, the blow-up criterion in [6, Theorem 2] indicates that if the maximal time $T_n < \infty$, there holds

$$\int_0^{T_n} (\|u_n\|_{BMO}^2 + \|\nabla B_n\|_{BMO}^2) dt = \infty. \quad (3.25)$$

Third step: Uniform bounds for the approximate solutions

Notice that the definition of cut-off operator ensures $\|\mathcal{J}_n u_0\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}} \leq \|u_0\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}}$, $\|\mathcal{J}_n B_0\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}} \leq \|B_0\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}}$ and $\|\dot{\Delta}_j \mathcal{J}_n B_0\|_{L^2} \leq \|\dot{\Delta}_j B_0\|_{L^2}$. Hence, denote

$$\begin{aligned} X_n(t) &:= \|u_n\|_{L_t^\infty(H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})} + \|\nabla u_n\|_{L_t^2(H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})} + \|B_n\|_{L_t^\infty(H^{\frac{3}{2}})} + \|\nabla B_n\|_{L_t^2(H^{\frac{3}{2}})}, \\ Y_n(t) &:= \|B_n\|_{L_t^4(\dot{H}^2)}, \end{aligned}$$

and follow the same process leading to (3.1), we can deduce that for all $t \in [0, T_n)$,

$$\begin{aligned} X_n(t) &\leq C_1 \left(\|u_0\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}} + \|B_0\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}} + t^{\frac{\sigma}{4\sigma+6}} X_n^2(t) + t^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\sigma}{4}} X_n^2(t) + 2t^{\frac{\sigma}{4}} X_n^2(t) + Y_n^2(t) \right), \\ Y_n(t) &\leq C_2 \left(\left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} (1 - e^{-4c2^{2j}t})^{\frac{1}{2}} (2^{j\frac{3}{2}} \|\dot{\Delta}_j B_0\|_{L^2})^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} + 2t^{\frac{\sigma}{4}} X_n^2(t) + Y_n^2(t) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.26)$$

Next, we define

$$T'_n := \sup \left\{ t \in [0, T_n) : X_n(t) \leq 2C_1 (\|u_0\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}} + \|B_0\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}}), Y_n(t) \leq \delta \right\}, \quad (3.27)$$

where the constant δ will be determined later, and choose a positive constant T_* such that

$$\begin{cases} T_*^{\frac{\sigma}{4\sigma+6}} 4C_1^2 (\|u_0\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}} + \|B_0\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}})^2 \leq \frac{1}{8} (\|u_0\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}} + \|B_0\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}}), \\ T_*^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\sigma}{4}} 4C_1^2 (\|u_0\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}} + \|B_0\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}})^2 \leq \frac{1}{8} (\|u_0\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}} + \|B_0\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}}), \\ \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} (1 - e^{-4c2^{2j}T_*})^{\frac{1}{2}} (2^{j\frac{3}{2}} \|\dot{\Delta}_j B_0\|_{L^2})^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{\delta}{8C_2}, \\ T_*^{\frac{\sigma}{4}} 4C_1^2 (\|u_0\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}} + \|B_0\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}})^2 \leq \frac{\delta}{8C_2}. \end{cases} \quad (3.28)$$

Note that T_* is a fixed constant independent of n . Let us explain why the third condition in (3.28) can be fulfilled. Actually, since $\|B_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}} = \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} (2^{j\frac{3}{2}} \|\dot{\Delta}_j B_0\|_{L^2})^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty$, taking N_0 large enough can ensure that

$$\left[\sum_{|j| > N_0} (2^{j\frac{3}{2}} \|\dot{\Delta}_j B_0\|_{L^2})^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{\delta}{16C_2}. \quad (3.29)$$

For the remaining finite terms, choosing T_* sufficiently small such that

$$\left[\sum_{|j| \leq N_0} (1 - e^{-4c2^{2j}T_*})^{\frac{1}{2}} (2^{j\frac{3}{2}} \|\dot{\Delta}_j B_0\|_{L^2})^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{\delta}{16C_2}. \quad (3.30)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} (1 - e^{-4c2^{2j}T_*})^{\frac{1}{2}} (2^{j\frac{3}{2}} \|\dot{\Delta}_j B_0\|_{L^2})^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq \left[\sum_{|j| \leq N_0} (1 - e^{-4c2^{2j}T_*})^{\frac{1}{2}} (2^{j\frac{3}{2}} \|\dot{\Delta}_j B_0\|_{L^2})^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \quad + \left[\sum_{|j| > N_0} (2^{j\frac{3}{2}} \|\dot{\Delta}_j B_0\|_{L^2})^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq \frac{\delta}{8C_2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.31)$$

We assert that when δ is sufficiently small, there holds $T_* < T'_n$. Actually, if $T'_n \leq T_* < \infty$, it follows from (3.26), (3.27) and (3.28) that for all $t \in [0, T'_n)$,

$$\begin{aligned} X_n(t) & \leq \frac{5C_1}{4} \left(\|u_0\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}} + \|B_0\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}} \right) + \frac{C_1\delta}{4C_2} + C_1\delta^2, \\ Y_n(t) & \leq \frac{3\delta}{8} + C_2\delta^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.32)$$

Taking δ small enough such that

$$\frac{C_1\delta}{4C_2} + C_1\delta^2 \leq \frac{C_1}{4} (\|u_0\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}} + \|B_0\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}}) \quad \text{and} \quad C_2\delta \leq \frac{1}{8},$$

which leads to that for all $t \in [0, T'_n)$,

$$\begin{aligned} X_n(t) & \leq \frac{3C_1}{2} \left(\|u_0\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}} + \|B_0\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}} \right), \\ Y_n(t) & \leq \frac{\delta}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

At this stage, by the definition of T'_n and the continuity of $X_n(t)$ and $Y_n(t)$, one may conclude that $T_n = T'_n < \infty$. However, due to the embedding $\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3) \hookrightarrow BMO(\mathbb{R}^3)$ (see [2, Theorem 1.48]),

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{T_n} (\|u_n\|_{BMO}^2 + \|\nabla B_n\|_{BMO}^2) dt & \leq C \int_0^{T_n} (\|\nabla u_n\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + \|\nabla B_n\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}}^2) dt \\ & \leq C \sup_{t \in [0, T'_n)} X_n^2(t) < \infty, \end{aligned} \quad (3.34)$$

which contradicts with (3.25). Thus, $T_* < T'_n \leq T_n$ for all $n \geq 1$. By the definition of T'_n , we have for all $n \geq 1$,

$$\|u_n\|_{L^\infty_{T_*}(H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})} + \|\nabla u_n\|_{L^2_{T_*}(H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})} + \|B_n\|_{L^\infty_{T_*}(H^{\frac{3}{2}})} + \|\nabla B_n\|_{L^2_{T_*}(H^{\frac{3}{2}})} \leq L, \quad (3.35)$$

where the constant $L > 0$ depends on the norm of (u_0, B_0) .

Fourth step: Existence

We first show that the solution sequence $\{(u_n, B_n)\}$ constructed in the second step tends to some limit (u, B) in $C([0, T_*]; L^2)$. Making the difference between the system (3.24) with m and n , and taking the inner product with $u^m - u^n$ and $B^m - B^n$ respectively, one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\|u_m - u_n\|_{L^2}^2 + \|B_m - B_n\|_{L^2}^2 \right) + \|\nabla(u_m - u_n)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla(B_m - B_n)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &= - \left(u_m \cdot \nabla u_m - u_n \cdot \nabla u_n, u_m - u_n \right) + \left(B_m \cdot \nabla B_m - B_n \cdot \nabla B_n, u_m - u_n \right) \\ & \quad - \left(u_m \cdot \nabla B_m - u_n \cdot \nabla B_n, B_m - B_n \right) + \left(B_m \cdot \nabla u_m - B_n \cdot \nabla u_n, B_m - B_n \right) \\ & \quad - \left(\nabla \times ((\nabla \times B_m) \times B_m) - \nabla \times ((\nabla \times B_n) \times B_n), B_m - B_n \right) \\ &= A_1 + A_2 + A_3 + A_4 + A_5. \end{aligned} \quad (3.36)$$

We split A_2 and A_4 as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} A_2 &= \left((B_m - B_n) \cdot \nabla B_m, u_m - u_n \right) + \left(B_n \cdot \nabla(B_m - B_n), u_m - u_n \right), \\ &= A_{2,1} + A_{2,2}, \\ A_4 &= \left((B_m - B_n) \cdot \nabla u_m, B_m - B_n \right) + \left(B_n \cdot \nabla(u_m - u_n), B_m - B_n \right) \\ &= A_{4,1} + A_{4,2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.37)$$

Applying Hölder's inequality, Lemma 2.7 and Young's inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned} A_{4,1} &\leq \|B_m - B_n\|_{L^2} \|\nabla u_m\|_{L^3} \|B_m - B_n\|_{L^6} \\ &\leq C \|B_n - B_m\|_{L^2} \|\nabla u_m\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} \|\nabla(B_n - B_m)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \|\nabla u_m\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \|B_m - B_n\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{8} \|\nabla(B_m - B_n)\|_{L^2}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (3.38)$$

Proceeding in a same way,

$$A_{2,1} \leq C \|\nabla B_n\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \|B_n - B_m\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{8} \|\nabla(u_n - u_m)\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (3.39)$$

By the divergence-free property, it is easily seen that $A_{2,2} + A_{4,2} = 0$. As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} A_2 + A_4 &= A_{2,1} + A_{4,1} \\ &\leq C (\|\nabla B_n\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}}^2 + \|\nabla u_m\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}}^2) \|B_m - B_n\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{8} \|\nabla(u_m - u_n)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{8} \|\nabla(B_m - B_n)\|_{L^2}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (3.40)$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &\leq C \|\nabla u_m\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}}^2 \|u_m - u_n\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{8} \|\nabla(u_m - u_n)\|_{L^2}^2, \\ A_3 &\leq C \|\nabla B_n\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}}^2 \|u_m - u_n\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{8} \|\nabla(B_m - B_n)\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.41)$$

For the last term A_5 , we rewrite it as

$$\begin{aligned} A_5 &= - \left(\nabla \times ((\nabla \times (B_m - B_n)) \times B_m), B_m - B_n \right) \\ &\quad - \left(\nabla \times ((\nabla \times B_n) \times (B_m - B_n)), B_m - B_n \right) \\ &= A_{5,1} + A_{5,2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.42)$$

Obviously,

$$A_{5,1} = - \left((\nabla \times (B_m - B_n)) \times B_m, \nabla \times (B_m - B_n) \right) = 0. \quad (3.43)$$

Therefore, we get by using Hölder's inequality, Lemma 2.7, interpolation and Young's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} A_5 &= A_{5,2} \\ &= - \left((\nabla \times B_n) \times (B_m - B_n), \nabla \times (B_m - B_n) \right) \\ &\leq \|\nabla \times B_n\|_{L^4} \|B_m - B_n\|_{L^4} \|\nabla \times (B_m - B_n)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \|B_n\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{7}{4}}} \|B_m - B_n\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{4}}} \|\nabla(B_m - B_n)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \left(\|B_n\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}}^{\frac{3}{4}} \|\nabla B_n\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}}^{\frac{1}{4}} \right) \left(\|B_m - B_n\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{4}} \|\nabla(B_m - B_n)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{3}{4}} \right) \|\nabla(B_m - B_n)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \|B_n\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}}^{\frac{3}{4}} \|\nabla B_n\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}}^{\frac{1}{4}} \|B_m - B_n\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{4}} \|\nabla(B_m - B_n)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{7}{4}} \\ &\leq C \|B_n\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}}^6 \|\nabla B_n\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}}^2 \|B_m - B_n\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{8} \|\nabla(B_m - B_n)\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.44)$$

Plugging (3.40), (3.41) and (3.44) into (3.36), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt} \left(\|u_m - u_n\|_{L^2}^2 + \|B_m - B_n\|_{L^2}^2 \right) + \|\nabla(u_m - u_n)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla(B_m - B_n)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq C \left(\|\nabla B_n\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}}^2 + \|\nabla u_m\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}}^2 + \|B_n\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}}^6 \|\nabla B_n\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}}^2 \right) \left(\|u_m - B_n\|_{L^2}^2 + \|B_m - B_n\|_{L^2}^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.45)$$

By Gronwall's inequality and uniform bounds in (3.35), one has

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T_*} \|u_m - u_n\|_{L^2}^2 + \|B_m - B_n\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \left(\|u_{0,m} - u_{0,n}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|B_{0,m} - B_{0,n}\|_{L^2}^2 \right). \quad (3.46)$$

Obviously, the right-hand side above tends to zero as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$, which means that $\{(u_n, B_n)\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $C([0, T_*]; L^2)$. Consequently, there is a function pair $(u, B) \in C([0, T_*]; L^2)$ such that

$$(u_n, B_n) \rightarrow (u, B) \quad \text{in } C([0, T_*]; L^2), \quad (3.47)$$

From (3.45), we also get

$$(\nabla u_n, \nabla B_n) \rightarrow (\nabla u, \nabla B) \quad \text{in } L^2(0, T_*; L^2). \quad (3.48)$$

Using the uniform bounds in (3.35) and interpolation, one can easily show that for any $s_1 \in (0, \frac{1}{2} + \sigma)$ and any $s_2 \in (0, \frac{3}{2})$,

$$\begin{aligned} u_n &\rightarrow u && \text{in } C([0, T_*]; H^{s_1}), \\ \nabla u_n &\rightarrow \nabla u && \text{in } L^2(0, T_*; H^{s_1}), \\ B_n &\rightarrow B && \text{in } C([0, T_*]; H^{s_2}), \\ \nabla B_n &\rightarrow \nabla B && \text{in } L^2(0, T_*; H^{s_2}). \end{aligned} \tag{3.49}$$

Furthermore, due to the uniform bounds in (3.35), the Banach-Alaoglu theorem ensures that there exists a subsequence $\{(u_{n,k}, B_{n,k})\}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} u_{n,k} &\rightharpoonup u && \text{weakly* in } L^\infty(0, T_*; H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}) \cap L^2(0, T_*; H^{\frac{3}{2}+\sigma}), \\ B_{n,k} &\rightharpoonup B && \text{weakly* in } L^\infty(0, T_*; H^{\frac{3}{2}}) \cap L^2(0, T_*; H^{\frac{5}{2}}). \end{aligned} \tag{3.50}$$

In order to verify the limit (u, B) is indeed the solution to (1.1), we need to pass to the limit in the nonlinear terms in (3.24). This procedure is relatively simple, as an example, we only deal with the hall term, the other nonlinear terms can be treated by a same way. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} &\nabla \times ((\nabla \times B_n) \times B_n) - \nabla \times ((\nabla \times B) \times B) \\ &= \nabla \times ((\nabla \times (B_n - B)) \times B_n) + \nabla \times ((\nabla \times B) \times (B_n - B)). \end{aligned} \tag{3.51}$$

Using Hölder's inequality and Lemma 2.7 gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \times ((\nabla \times (B_n - B)) \times B_n)\|_{\dot{H}^{-1}} &\leq C \|\nabla \times (B_n - B)\|_{L^3} \|B_n\|_{L^6} \\ &\leq C \|\nabla(B_n - B)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} \|B_n\|_{H^1}, \\ \|\nabla \times ((\nabla \times B) \times (B_n - B))\|_{\dot{H}^{-1}} &\leq C \|\nabla \times B\|_{L^3} \|B_n - B\|_{L^6} \\ &\leq C \|\nabla B\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} \|B_n - B\|_{H^1}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.52}$$

In view of (3.35), (3.49) and (3.50), we have

$$\nabla \times ((\nabla \times B_n) \times B_n) \rightarrow \nabla \times ((\nabla \times B) \times B) \quad \text{in } L^2(0, T_*; \dot{H}^{-1}).$$

Thus, we end up with that the limit (u, B) solves the Hall-MHD system (1.1) with some suitable pressure function p .

What is left is to prove the continuity of (u, B) in $H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma} \times H^{\frac{3}{2}}$ with respect to time. We see that u satisfies the heat equation:

$$\partial_t u - \Delta u = \mathcal{P}(B \cdot \nabla B - u \cdot \nabla u), \tag{3.53}$$

where $\mathcal{P} := \text{Id} + (-\Delta)^{-1} \nabla \text{div}$ is the Leray projection operator. Since \mathcal{P} is bounded on Sobolev spaces, it follows from (3.19) and (3.20) that the right-hand side above belongs to $L^2(0, T_*; H^{\sigma-\frac{1}{2}})$. Therefore, the standard property of solutions to the linear heat equation (see [11, Proposition A.4]) implies that $u \in C([0, T_*]; H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})$. However, the classical product laws do not allow us to prove that $\nabla \times ((\nabla \times B) \times B)$ belongs to $L^2(0, T_*; H^{\frac{1}{2}})$, so we can not obtain the continuity of B in

$H^{\frac{3}{2}}$ by the way mentioned above. Observe that $(u(t), B(t)) \in H^{\frac{3}{2}+\sigma} \times H^{\frac{5}{2}}$ almost everywhere on $[0, T_*]$ since $(u, B) \in L^2(0, T_*; H^{\frac{3}{2}+\sigma} \times H^{\frac{5}{2}})$. Hence, for any $\delta > 0$, there exists some $T_1 \in (0, \delta)$ such that $(u(T_1), B(T_1)) \in H^r \times H^r$ with $r = \min\{\frac{3}{2}+\sigma, \frac{5}{2}\} > \frac{3}{2}$. Taking $(u(T_1), B(T_1))$ as initial data for (1.1) at $t = T_1$, according to the local well-posedness result for the Hall-MHD system in H^s with $s > \frac{3}{2}$ (see [9, 25]), we obtain a solution (\tilde{u}, \tilde{B}) on some time interval $[T_1, T'_1] \subset [0, T_*]$ with $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{B}) \in C([T_1, T'_1]; H^r) \cap L^2(T_1, T'_1; H^{r+1})$. Thanks to the uniqueness stated in the next step, we have $(u, B) = (\tilde{u}, \tilde{B})$ on $[T_1, T'_1]$. By a same way, we also can get that there exists some $T_2 \in (T_1, \delta)$ such that $(u, B) \in C([T_2, T'_2]; H^{r+1}) \cap L^2(T_2, T'_2; H^{r+2})$ on some time interval $[T_2, T'_2] \subset [0, T_*]$. Arguing as in (3.34) (the blow-up criterion (3.25) is corresponding to the local strong solution $(u, B) \in H^s \times H^s$ with $s > \frac{5}{2}$, see [6, Theorem 2]), T'_2 can be chosen to be equal to T_* , which together with the arbitrariness of δ yields that $(u, B) \in C((0, T_*]; H^{r+1})$. It is not hard to see that by iteration, we can prove that $(u, B) \in C((0, T_*]; H^\infty)$. On the other hand, remember that $B \in C([0, T_*]; H^{s_2})$ with $s_2 < \frac{3}{2}$ and $B \in L^\infty(0, T_*; H^{\frac{3}{2}})$, since H^{-s_2} is dense in $H^{-\frac{3}{2}}$, by means of an $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$ -argument, it is easy to show that B is continuous in the weak topology of $H^{\frac{3}{2}}$ with respect to time, which implies that

$$\varliminf_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \|B(t)\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}} \geq \|B_0\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}}. \quad (3.54)$$

Besides, it follows from (3.14) with $p = \infty$ that for all $t \in (0, T_*]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|B\|_{L_t^\infty(\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}})} &\leq \|B_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}} + C \left(\|B \cdot \nabla u\|_{L_t^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}})} + \|u \cdot \nabla B\|_{L_t^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}})} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left\| \left\| 2^{j\frac{3}{2}} [\dot{\Delta}_j, B \times] (\nabla \times B) \right\|_{L^2} \right\|_{L_t^2(\mathbb{Z})} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.55)$$

so taking $t \rightarrow 0^+$ gives

$$\overline{\lim}_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \|B(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}} \leq \|B_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}}. \quad (3.56)$$

Meanwhile, recall that $B \in C([0, T_*]; L^2)$, we thus have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \|B(t)\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}} = \|B_0\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}}, \quad (3.57)$$

namely, B is strongly right continuous at $t = 0$. As a result, $B \in C([0, T_*]; H^{\frac{3}{2}})$.

Fifth step: Uniqueness

The proof of uniqueness is almost the same as the L^2 -convergence procedure in the previous step, so we omit it.

This means that the proof of Theorem 1.1 is finished.

4 Proof of Theorem 1.2

From the previous section, we see that the core of the proof of Theorem 1.1 is to establish the uniform bounds for the approximate solutions. In what follows, we only show how to use (1.13) to derive the desired bound of a smooth solution on a short time interval $[0, T_*]$, the remainder of the proof can be proceed in a same way as in the previous section and thus is omitted.

Proposition 4.1. *Assume that $\mu = \nu$. If (u, B) is a smooth solution to (1.1) on the maximal time interval $[0, T)$, then there exists a time $T_* < T$ such that*

$$\|u\|_{L_{T_*}^\infty(H^{\frac{1}{2}})} + \|\nabla u\|_{L_{T_*}^2(H^{\frac{1}{2}})} + \|B\|_{L_{T_*}^\infty(H^{\frac{3}{2}})} + \|\nabla B\|_{L_{T_*}^2(H^{\frac{3}{2}})} \leq M, \quad (4.1)$$

where T_* and M only depend on the norm of initial data.

Proof. Apply the operator $\dot{\Delta}_j$ to both sides of (1.13), notice that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\dot{\Delta}_j(\nabla \times (B \times (\nabla \times v))), \dot{\Delta}_j v \right) \\ &= \left(\dot{\Delta}_j(B \times (\nabla \times v)) - B \times (\nabla \times \dot{\Delta}_j v), \nabla \times \dot{\Delta}_j v \right) \\ &= \left([\dot{\Delta}_j, B \times](\nabla \times v), \nabla \times \dot{\Delta}_j v \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

then following the arguments similar as (3.7)-(3.13), we have that for any $t < T$ and any $p, q \in [2, \infty]$ with $1 + \frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{q}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\dot{\Delta}_j u, \dot{\Delta}_j B, \dot{\Delta}_j v)\|_{L_t^p(L^2)} &\lesssim \left(\frac{1 - e^{-pc2^{2j}t}}{pc2^{2j}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \|(\dot{\Delta}_j u_0, \dot{\Delta}_j B_0, \dot{\Delta}_j v_0)\|_{L^2} \\ &+ \left(\frac{1 - e^{-qc2^{2j}t}}{qc2^{2j}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(\|\dot{\Delta}_j \operatorname{div}(B \otimes B)\|_{L_t^2(L^2)} + \|\dot{\Delta}_j \operatorname{div}(u \otimes u)\|_{L_t^2(L^2)} \right. \\ &+ \|\dot{\Delta}_j \nabla \times (v \times B)\|_{L_t^2(L^2)} + \|\dot{\Delta}_j \nabla \times (v \times u)\|_{L_t^2(L^2)} \\ &\left. + \|\dot{\Delta}_j \nabla \times (v \cdot \nabla B)\|_{L_t^2(L^2)} + 2^j \|[\dot{\Delta}_j, B \times](\nabla \times v)\|_{L_t^2(L^2)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

Multiplying both sides of (3.13) by $2^{j(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{2}{p})}$ and taking the $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ norm, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \|(u, B, v)\|_{\tilde{L}_t^p(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{2}{p}})} &\lesssim \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} (1 - e^{-pc2^{2j}t})^{\frac{2}{p}} (2^{j\frac{1}{2}} \|(\dot{\Delta}_j u, \dot{\Delta}_j B, \dot{\Delta}_j v)\|_{L^2})^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &+ \|B \otimes B\|_{L_t^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}})} + \|u \otimes u\|_{L_t^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}})} + \|v \times B\|_{L_t^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}})} + \|v \times u\|_{L_t^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}})} \\ &+ \|v \cdot \nabla B\|_{L_t^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}})} + \left\| \|2^{j\frac{1}{2}} \|[\dot{\Delta}_j, B \times](\nabla \times v)\|_{L^2} \|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})} \right\|_{L_t^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

Set $(r, s, \eta, \theta) = (2, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ in Lemma 2.4, we have the following product law

$$\|fg\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}} \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{H}^1} \|g\|_{\dot{H}^1}. \quad (4.5)$$

Hence, applying (4.5), the first five nonlinear terms in the right-hand side of (4.3) can be bounded by $C\|(u, B, \nabla B, v)\|_{L_t^4(\dot{H}^1)}^2$. Thanks to Lemma 2.5 with $(r, s, \theta, \eta) = (2, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2})$, the commutator term can be bounded as follows

$$\left\| \|2^{j\frac{1}{2}} \|[\dot{\Delta}_j, B \times](\nabla \times v)\|_{L^2} \|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})} \right\|_{L_t^2} \lesssim \|B\|_{L_t^4(\dot{H}^2)} \|v\|_{L_t^4(\dot{H}^1)}.$$

In view of the vector identity

$$\nabla \times (\nabla \times w) + \Delta w = \nabla \operatorname{div} w,$$

one sees that

$$B = (-\Delta)^{-1} \nabla \times (\nabla \times B) = (-\Delta)^{-1} \nabla \times (u - v).$$

Since $(-\Delta)^{-1} \nabla \times$ is a homogeneous Fourier multiplier of degree -1 , it follows from Lemma 2.2 (iv) that

$$\|B\|_{\dot{H}^{s+1}} \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{H}^s} + \|v\|_{\dot{H}^s}.$$

Therefore, all the nonlinear terms are controlled by $C\|(u, B, v)\|_{L_t^4(\dot{H}^1)}^2$. Taking $p = 4$ in (4.4) gives us that there exists a constant $C_3 > 1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(u, B, v)\|_{L_t^4(\dot{H}^1)} &\leq C_3 \left(\left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} (1 - e^{-4c2^{2j}t})^{\frac{1}{2}} (2^{j\frac{1}{2}} \|(\dot{\Delta}_j u, \dot{\Delta}_j B, \dot{\Delta}_j v)\|_{L^2})^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|(u, B, v)\|_{L_t^4(\dot{H}^1)}^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

Recall the fact that for any $\delta > 0$, there exists a positive time T_* such that

$$\left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} (1 - e^{-4c2^{2j}T_*})^{\frac{1}{2}} (2^{j\frac{1}{2}} \|(\dot{\Delta}_j u, \dot{\Delta}_j B, \dot{\Delta}_j v)\|_{L^2})^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} < \delta.$$

Define

$$T_{**} = \sup \left\{ t \in [0, \min\{T, T_*\}], \|(u, B, v)\|_{L_t^4(\dot{H}^1)} \leq 2C_3\delta \right\},$$

where δ will be determined later on. Hence, it follows from (4.6) that for all $t \in [0, T_{**})$,

$$\|(u, B, v)\|_{L_t^4(\dot{H}^1)} \leq C_3\delta(1 + 4C_3^2\delta). \quad (4.7)$$

Taking δ small enough such that $4C_3^2\delta < \frac{1}{2}$ yields that for all $t \in [0, T_{**})$,

$$\|(u, B, v)\|_{L_t^4(\dot{H}^1)} < \frac{3}{2}C_3\delta. \quad (4.8)$$

Then by the continuity of $\|(u, B, v)\|_{L_t^4(\dot{H}^1)}$, we have $T_{**} = \min\{T, T_*\}$.

We assert that $T_* < T$. Indeed, if $T \leq T_* < \infty$, we infer from (4.4) with $p = 2$ that

$$\|(u, B, v)\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}})} \lesssim \|(u_0, B_0, v_0)\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \|(u, B, v)\|_{L_T^4(\dot{H}^1)}^2 < \infty.$$

By $\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3) \hookrightarrow \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, the above inequality contradicts with the blow-up criterion (3.25).

Consequently, $T_* < T$. Thus, combining (3.4) and (4.4) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} &\|u\|_{L_{T_*}^\infty(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}})} + \|\nabla u\|_{L_{T_*}^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}})} + \|B\|_{L_{T_*}^\infty(\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}})} + \|\nabla B\|_{L_{T_*}^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}})} \\ &\lesssim \|u\|_{L_{T_*}^\infty(L^2)} + \|B\|_{L_{T_*}^\infty(L^2)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L_{T_*}^2(L^2)} + \|\nabla B\|_{L_{T_*}^2(L^2)} \\ &\quad + \|u\|_{\tilde{L}_{T_*}^\infty(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}})} + \|v\|_{\tilde{L}_{T_*}^\infty(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}})} + \|u\|_{L_{T_*}^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}})} + \|v\|_{L_{T_*}^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}})} \\ &\lesssim \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \|B_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \|(u, B, v)\|_{L_t^4(\dot{H}^1)}^2 \\ &\lesssim \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \|B_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \delta^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

This completes the proof of Proposition 4.1. \square

5 Proof of Theorem 1.3

This section is devoted to Theorem 1.3. In the first subsection, we extend the local solutions constructed in Theorem 1.1 globally in time provided the initial data is small enough. The optimal time-decay rates of solutions will be derived in the second subsection.

5.1 Global existence for small initial data

We denote by T^* the largest time such that there holds (1.9) in Theorem 1.1. It suffices to prove that $T^* = \infty$ under the assumption (1.15).

From (3.15), we have that for all $t \in [0, T^*)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u\|_{L_t^\infty(H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})} + \|\nabla u\|_{L_t^2(H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})} + \|B\|_{L_T^\infty(H^{\frac{3}{2}})} + \|\nabla B\|_{L_t^2(H^{\frac{3}{2}})} \\ & \lesssim \|u_0\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}} + \|B_0\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \|u \cdot \nabla u\|_{L_t^2(\dot{H}^{\sigma-\frac{1}{2}})} + \|B \cdot \nabla B\|_{L_t^2(\dot{H}^{\sigma-\frac{1}{2}})} \\ & \quad + \|\nabla \times (u \times B)\|_{L_t^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}})} + \left\| \|2^{j\frac{3}{2}} \|[\dot{\Delta}_j, B \times](\nabla \times B)\|_{L^2} \|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})} \right\|_{L_t^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

Thanks to the product laws (3.17) and (3.18), we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \|u \cdot \nabla u\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\sigma-\frac{1}{2}})} & \lesssim \|u \otimes u\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})} \\ & \lesssim \|u\|_{L_T^\infty(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\sigma}{2}})} \|u\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}+\frac{\sigma}{2}})} \\ & \lesssim \|u\|_{L_T^\infty(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\sigma}{2}})} \|\nabla u\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\sigma}{2}})} \\ & \lesssim \|u\|_{L_T^\infty(H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})} \|\nabla u\|_{L_T^2(H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|B \cdot \nabla B\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\sigma-\frac{1}{2}})} & \lesssim \|B \otimes B\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})} \\ & \lesssim \|B\|_{L_T^\infty(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\sigma}{2}})} \|B\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}+\frac{\sigma}{2}})} \\ & \lesssim \|B\|_{L_T^\infty(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\sigma}{2}})} \|\nabla B\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\sigma}{2}})} \\ & \lesssim \|B\|_{L_T^\infty(H^{\frac{3}{2}})} \|\nabla B\|_{L_T^2(H^{\frac{3}{2}})}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \times (u \times B)\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}})} & \lesssim \|u \times B\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}})} \\ & \lesssim \|u\|_{L_T^\infty(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\sigma}{2}})} \|B\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{5}{2}-\frac{\sigma}{2}})} + \|u\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}+\frac{\sigma}{2}})} \|B\|_{L_T^\infty(\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}-\frac{\sigma}{2}})} \\ & \lesssim \|u\|_{L_T^\infty(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\sigma}{2}})} \|\nabla B\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}-\frac{\sigma}{2}})} + \|\nabla u\|_{L_T^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\sigma}{2}})} \|B\|_{L_T^\infty(\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}-\frac{\sigma}{2}})} \\ & \lesssim \|u\|_{L_T^\infty(H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})} \|\nabla B\|_{L_T^2(H^{\frac{3}{2}})} + \|\nabla u\|_{L_T^2(H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})} \|B\|_{L_T^\infty(H^{\frac{3}{2}})}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

Tackling the commutator term as (3.22) and using the interpolation additionally, we can get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \|2^{j\frac{3}{2}} \|[\dot{\Delta}_j, B \times](\nabla \times B)\|_{L^2} \| \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}) \| \right\|_{L_t^2} \\
& \lesssim \|B\|_{L_t^4(\dot{H}^2)}^2 \lesssim \left(\|B\|_{L_t^\infty(\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}})}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla B\|_{L_t^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}})}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)^2 \\
& \lesssim \|B\|_{L_t^\infty(\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}})} \|\nabla B\|_{L_t^2(\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}})}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

Denote

$$\mathcal{E}(t) := \|u\|_{L_t^\infty(H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})} + \|\nabla u\|_{L_t^2(H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma})} + \|B\|_{L_t^\infty(H^{\frac{3}{2}})} + \|\nabla B\|_{L_t^2(H^{\frac{3}{2}})}.$$

Plugging (5.2)-(5.5) into (5.1), we can deduce that there exists a constant $C_4 > 1$ such that for all $t \in [0, T^*)$,

$$\mathcal{E}(t) \leq C_4(\mathcal{E}(0) + \mathcal{E}^2(t)). \tag{5.6}$$

Define

$$T^{**} := \sup \left\{ t \in [0, T^*) : \mathcal{E}(t) \leq 2C_4\mathcal{E}(0) \right\}. \tag{5.7}$$

It follows from (5.6) that for all $t \in [0, T^{**})$ that

$$\mathcal{E}(t) \leq C_4(\mathcal{E}(0) + 4C_4^2\mathcal{E}^2(0)). \tag{5.8}$$

Since $\mathcal{E}(0) \leq c_0$ where c_0 is given in (1.15), taking c_0 small enough such that $4C_4^2c_0 < \frac{1}{2}$, we can get

$$\mathcal{E}(t) < \frac{3}{2}C_4\mathcal{E}(0) \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T^{**}). \tag{5.9}$$

Then, by the continuity of $\mathcal{E}(t)$, we conclude that $T^{**} = T^*$.

We assert that $T^* = \infty$. Because $\mathcal{E}(t)$ is uniformly bounded on $[0, T^*)$, it follows from Theorem 1.1 and (3.28) that for any $t_0 \in [0, T^*)$, we can solve (1.1) on $[t_0, t_0 + T']$ with some fixed constant T' . If $T^* < +\infty$, choosing $t_0 > T^* - T'$ means that the solution (u, B) can be continued beyond T^* , which contradicts with the definition of T^* . Thus, $T^* = +\infty$. This completes the proof of the global well-posedness part of Theorem 1.2.

5.2 Optimal time-decay rates of solutions

In this subsection, we are going to derive the optimal time-decay rates of the global solutions constructed in the above subsection. Recall that $(u(t), B(t)) \in H^\infty$ for all $t > 0$. By performing a standard energy argument, one easily have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{dt} (\|\Lambda^s u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Lambda^s B\|_{L^2}^2) + \|\Lambda^{s+1} u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Lambda^{s+1} B\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& \lesssim (\|u \cdot \nabla u\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}} + \|B \cdot \nabla B\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}}) \|\Lambda^{s+1} u\|_{L^2} \\
& \quad + (\|\nabla \times (u \times B)\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}} + \|[\Lambda^s, B \times](\nabla \times B)\|_{L^2}) \|\Lambda^{s+1} B\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

Set $(s, r, \eta, \theta) = (l, 2, 1, 1)$ in Lemma 2.4, the following product law holds:

$$\|fg\|_{\dot{H}^l} \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{l}{2}}} \|g\|_{\dot{H}^{l+1}} + \|g\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{l}{2}}} \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{l+1}} \quad \text{for } l > -\frac{3}{2}. \tag{5.11}$$

Hence, using (5.11) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla \times (u \times B)\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}} &\lesssim \|u \times B\|_{\dot{H}^s} \\
&\lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}} \|B\|_{\dot{H}^{s+1}} + \|B\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}} \|u\|_{\dot{H}^{s+1}} \\
&\lesssim \|u\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}} \|B\|_{\dot{H}^{s+1}} + \|B\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}} \|u\|_{\dot{H}^{s+1}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u \cdot \nabla u\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}} &\lesssim \|u\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}} \|u\|_{\dot{H}^{s+1}}, \\
\|B \cdot \nabla B\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}} &\lesssim \|B\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}} \|B\|_{\dot{H}^{s+1}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

Taking advantage of Lemma 2.6 and Lemma 2.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|[\Lambda^s, B \times](\nabla \times B)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \|\Lambda^s B\|_{L^6} \|\nabla \times B\|_{L^3} + \|\Lambda^{s-1}(\nabla \times B)\|_{L^6} \|\nabla B\|_{L^3} \\
&\lesssim \|B\|_{\dot{H}^{s+1}} \|B\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

Then, inserting (5.12)-(5.14) into (5.10) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt} (\|\Lambda^s u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Lambda^s B\|_{L^2}^2) + \|\Lambda^{s+1} u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Lambda^{s+1} B\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\lesssim (\|u\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}} + \|B\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}}) (\|\Lambda^{s+1} u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Lambda^{s+1} B\|_{L^2}^2) \\
&\lesssim \mathcal{E}(0) (\|\Lambda^{s+1} u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Lambda^{s+1} B\|_{L^2}^2)
\end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

Since $\mathcal{E}(0) \ll 1$, we conclude that

$$\frac{d}{dt} (\|\Lambda^s u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Lambda^s B\|_{L^2}^2) + c_1 (\|\Lambda^{s+1} u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Lambda^{s+1} B\|_{L^2}^2) \leq 0 \tag{5.16}$$

for some constant $c_1 > 0$. Assume for the moment that there holds

$$\|u(t)\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}} + \|B(t)\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}} \leq C_0 \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0, \tag{5.17}$$

with some constant $C_0 > 0$, which will be proved in Proposition 5.1 below later. If $s > 0$, it follows from the interpolation inequality (2.3) in Lemma 2.2 (iii) that

$$\|\Lambda^s(u, B)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \left(\|(u, B)\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}} \right)^{\frac{1}{s+\gamma+1}} \left(\|\Lambda^{s+1}(u, B)\|_{L^2} \right)^{1-\frac{1}{s+\gamma+1}} \tag{5.18}$$

By means of (5.17), we get

$$\|\Lambda^{s+1}(u, B)\|_{L^2} \geq C \left(\|\Lambda^s(u, B)\|_{L^2} \right)^{1+\frac{1}{s+\gamma}}. \tag{5.19}$$

Thus, thanks to (5.16), there exists a constant $c_2 > 0$ such that the following Lyapunov-type inequality holds

$$\frac{d}{dt} (\|\Lambda^s u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Lambda^s B\|_{L^2}^2) + c_2 \left(\|\Lambda^s u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Lambda^s B\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1+\frac{1}{s+\gamma}} \leq 0. \tag{5.20}$$

Solving this inequality directly gives that for all $t \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Lambda^s u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Lambda^s B(t)\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq \left[\left(\|\Lambda^s u(1)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Lambda^s B(1)\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{-\frac{1}{s+\gamma}} + \frac{c_2}{s+\gamma} (t-1) \right]^{-(s+\gamma)} \\
&\lesssim (1+t)^{-(s+\gamma)},
\end{aligned} \tag{5.21}$$

which implies (1.17) with $s > 0$. On the other hand, if $\gamma > 0$, (1.17) with $s = 0$ can be obtained by using the interpolation

$$\|(u, B)(t)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|(u, B)(t)\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}}^{\frac{1}{1+\gamma}} \|(u, B)(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1}^{\frac{\gamma}{1+\gamma}} \lesssim C_0^{\frac{1}{1+\gamma}} (1+t)^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}}. \quad (5.22)$$

If $\gamma = 0$, (1.17) with $s = 0$ certainly holds. This means that the proof of (1.17) is finished.

At the last step, we should get back to prove (5.17), namely, the evolution of negative Besov norms of solutions. Actually, we have the following statement.

Proposition 5.1. *Let $\gamma \in [0, \frac{5}{2}]$ and $(u_0, B_0) \in \dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, it holds that for all $t \geq 0$,*

$$\|u(t)\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}} + \|B(t)\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}} \leq C_0 \quad (5.23)$$

for some constant $C_0 > 0$ depends on the initial data.

Proof. We first consider the case that $\gamma \in [0, \frac{3}{2})$. Apply the operator $\dot{\Delta}_j$ to (1.1), by means of a standard energy argument, the Bernstein inequality and Young's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\dot{\Delta}_j u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\dot{\Delta}_j \nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq \left(\|\dot{\Delta}_j (u \cdot \nabla u)\|_{L^2} + \|\dot{\Delta}_j (B \cdot \nabla B)\|_{L^2} \right) \|\dot{\Delta}_j u\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C 2^{-2j} \left(\|\dot{\Delta}_j (u \cdot \nabla u)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\dot{\Delta}_j (B \cdot \nabla B)\|_{L^2}^2 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla \dot{\Delta}_j u\|_{L^2}^2, \\ \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\dot{\Delta}_j B\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\dot{\Delta}_j \nabla B\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq \|\dot{\Delta}_j \nabla \times (u \times B)\|_{L^2} \|\dot{\Delta}_j B\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + \|\dot{\Delta}_j [B \times] (\nabla \times B)\|_{L^2} \|\dot{\Delta}_j (\nabla \times B)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \left(2^{-2j} \|\dot{\Delta}_j \nabla \times (u \times B)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\dot{\Delta}_j [B \times] (\nabla \times B)\|_{L^2}^2 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla \dot{\Delta}_j B\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.24)$$

whence, after time integration, multiplying both sides by $2^{-2j\gamma}$ and taking the $\ell^\infty(\mathbb{Z})$ norm yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|u(t)\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}}^2 + \|B(t)\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}}^2 &\leq \|u_0\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}}^2 + \|B_0\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}}^2 + C \left(\|u \cdot \nabla u\|_{\dot{L}_t^2(\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma-1})}^2 + \|B \cdot \nabla B\|_{\dot{L}_t^2(\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma-1})}^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|\nabla \times (u \times B)\|_{\dot{L}_t^2(\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma-1})}^2 + \|2^{-j\gamma} \|\dot{\Delta}_j [B \times] (\nabla \times B)\|_{L_t^2 \ell^\infty(\mathbb{Z})}^2 \right) \\ &\leq \|u_0\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}}^2 + \|B_0\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}}^2 + C \int_0^t \|u \cdot \nabla u\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma-1}}^2 + \|B \cdot \nabla B\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma-1}}^2 \\ &\quad + \|\nabla \times (u \times B)\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma-1}}^2 + \|2^{-j\gamma} \|\dot{\Delta}_j [B \times] (\nabla \times B)\|_{L^2 \ell^\infty(\mathbb{Z})}^2 d\tau, \end{aligned} \quad (5.25)$$

Set $(s, r, \eta, \theta) = (-\gamma, \infty, \gamma + \frac{3}{2}, \gamma + \frac{3}{2})$ in Lemma 2.4, the following product law holds:

$$\|fg\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}} \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}} \|g\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \|g\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}} \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{\frac{3}{2}}}. \quad (5.26)$$

Hence, resorting to (5.26) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \times (u \times B)\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma-1}} &\lesssim \|u \times B\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}} \\ &\lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}} \|\nabla B\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \|B\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}} \|\nabla u\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{\frac{1}{2}}} \\ &\lesssim \|B\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}} \|\nabla u\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \|u\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}} \|\nabla B\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}} \\ &\lesssim \|B\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}} \|\nabla u\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}} + \|u\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}} \|\nabla B\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.27)$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \|u \cdot \nabla u\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma-1}} &\lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}} \|\nabla u\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}}, \\ \|B \cdot \nabla B\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma-1}} &\lesssim \|B\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}} \|\nabla B\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.28)$$

Applying Lemma 2.5 with $(s, r, \eta, \theta) = (-\gamma, \infty, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ and interpolation yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\|2^{-j\gamma} \|[\dot{\Delta}_j, B \times](\nabla \times B)\|_{L^2} \| \ell^\infty(\mathbb{Z}) \\ &\lesssim \|B\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^2} \|\nabla \times B\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma-\frac{1}{2}}} + \|\nabla \times B\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^1} \|B\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma+\frac{1}{2}}} \\ &\lesssim \|B\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^2} \|B\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma+\frac{1}{2}}} \\ &\lesssim \left(\|B\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}}^{\frac{1}{2\gamma+5}} \|\nabla B\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{\frac{2\gamma+4}{2\gamma+5}}} \right) \left(\|B\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}}^{\frac{2\gamma+4}{2\gamma+5}} \|\nabla B\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{\frac{1}{2\gamma+5}}} \right) \\ &\lesssim \|B\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}} \|\nabla B\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.29)$$

Therefore, inserting (5.27)-(5.29) into (5.25), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u(t)\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}}^2 + \|B(t)\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}}^2 &\leq \|u_0\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}}^2 + \|B_0\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}}^2 \\ &\quad + C \int_0^t \left(\|\nabla u\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}}^2 + \|\nabla B\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}}^2 \right) \left(\|u\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}}^2 + \|B\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}}^2 \right) d\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (5.30)$$

Applying the Gronwall's inequality to (5.30) yields (5.23) with $\gamma \in [0, \frac{3}{2})$.

Next, we consider the case that $\gamma \in [\frac{3}{2}, \frac{5}{2}]$. By performing a routine procedure, one can reach

$$\begin{aligned} &\|u(t)\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}}^2 + \|B(t)\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}}^2 \\ &\leq \|u_0\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}}^2 + \|B_0\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}}^2 + C \int_0^t \left(\|u \cdot \nabla u\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}} + \|B \cdot \nabla B\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|\nabla \times (u \times B)\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}} + \|\nabla \times ((\nabla \times B) \times B)\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}} \right) \left(\|u\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}} + \|B\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}} \right) d\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (5.31)$$

By means of the embedding in Lemma 2.2 (ii), Hölder's inequality and Lemma 2.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \times (u \times B)\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}} &\lesssim \|u \times B\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{1-\gamma}} \\ &\lesssim \|u \times B\|_{\dot{B}_{2\gamma+1, \infty}^0} \lesssim \|u \times B\|_{L^{\frac{6}{2\gamma+1}}} \\ &\lesssim \|u\|_{L^{\frac{12}{2\gamma+1}}} \|B\|_{L^{\frac{12}{2\gamma+1}}} \\ &\lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{5-2\gamma}{4}}} \|B\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{5-2\gamma}{4}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.32)$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \|u \cdot \nabla u\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}} &\lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{5-2\gamma}{4}}}^2, \\ \|B \cdot \nabla B\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}} &\lesssim \|B\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{5-2\gamma}{4}}}^2, \\ \|\nabla \times ((\nabla \times B) \times B)\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}} &\lesssim \|B\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{9-2\gamma}{4}}} \|B\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{5-2\gamma}{4}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.33)$$

Observe that $(u_0, B_0) \in \dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\frac{5}{4}}$ because of the embedding $\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma} \cap L^2 \hookrightarrow \dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma'}$ for any $\gamma' \in [0, \gamma]$. Since we have derived the evolution of $\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\frac{5}{4}}$ norm and $0 \leq \frac{5-2\gamma}{4} \leq \frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{7-\gamma}{4} \leq \frac{3}{2}$, we can obtain from (1.17) with $\gamma = \frac{5}{4}$ that for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\|(u, B)(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{5-2\gamma}{4}}} \lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{5-\gamma}{4}}, \quad \|B(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{9-2\gamma}{4}}} \lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{7-\gamma}{4}}. \quad (5.34)$$

Therefore, denote

$$\mathcal{F}(t) := \|u(t)\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}}^2 + \|B(t)\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}}^2,$$

then it follows from (5.31) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(t) &\leq \|u_0\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}}^2 + \|B_0\|_{\dot{B}_{2,\infty}^{-\gamma}}^2 + C \int_0^t (1+\tau)^{-\frac{5-\gamma}{2}} d\tau \sup_{0 \leq \tau \leq t} \sqrt{\mathcal{F}(\tau)} \\ &\lesssim 1 + \sup_{0 \leq \tau \leq t} \sqrt{\mathcal{F}(\tau)}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.35)$$

which implies (5.23) with $\gamma \in [\frac{3}{2}, \frac{5}{2}]$. This completes the proof of Proposition 5.1. \square

References

- [1] M. Acheritogaray, P. Degond, A. Frouvelle, and J.-G. Liu. Kinetic formulation and global existence for the Hall-Magneto-hydrodynamics system. *Kinet. Relat. Models*, 4(4):901–918, 2011.
- [2] H. Bahouri, J.-Y. Chemin, and R. Danchin. *Fourier analysis and nonlinear partial differential equations*, volume 343 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer, Heidelberg, 2011.
- [3] S. A. Balbus and C. Terquem. Linear analysis of the hall effect in protostellar disks. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 552(1):235, 2001.
- [4] J.-M. Bony. Calcul symbolique et propagation des singularités pour les équations aux dérivées partielles non linéaires. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 14(2):209–246, 1981.
- [5] D. Chae, P. Degond, and J.-G. Liu. Well-posedness for Hall-magnetohydrodynamics. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 31(3):555–565, 2014.
- [6] D. Chae and J. Lee. On the blow-up criterion and small data global existence for the Hall-magnetohydrodynamics. *J. Differential Equations*, 256(11):3835–3858, 2014.
- [7] D. Chae and M. Schonbek. On the temporal decay for the Hall-magnetohydrodynamic equations. *J. Differential Equations*, 255(11):3971–3982, 2013.
- [8] J.-Y. Chemin. Théorèmes d’unicité pour le système de Navier-Stokes tridimensionnel. *J. Anal. Math.*, 77:27–50, 1999.
- [9] M. Dai. Local well-posedness of the Hall-MHD system in $H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $s > \frac{n}{2}$. *Math. Nachr.*, 293(1):67–78, 2020.
- [10] M. Dai. Local well-posedness for the Hall-MHD system in optimal Sobolev spaces. *J. Differential Equations*, 289:159–181, 2021.

- [11] R. Danchin and J. Tan. On the well-posedness of the Hall-magnetohydrodynamics system in critical spaces. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 46(1):31–65, 2021.
- [12] J. Fan, S. Huang, and G. Nakamura. Well-posedness for the axisymmetric incompressible viscous Hall-magnetohydrodynamic equations. *Appl. Math. Lett.*, 26(9):963–967, 2013.
- [13] T. Forbes. Magnetic reconnection in solar flares. *Geophysical & Astrophysical Fluid Dynamics*, 62(1-4):15–36, 1991.
- [14] H. Homann and R. Grauer. Bifurcation analysis of magnetic reconnection in Hall-MHD systems. *Phys. D*, 208(1-2):59–72, 2005.
- [15] T. Kato and G. Ponce. Commutator estimates and the Euler and Navier-Stokes equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 41(7):891–907, 1988.
- [16] L. Liu and J. Tan. Global well-posedness for the Hall-magnetohydrodynamics system in larger critical Besov spaces. *J. Differential Equations*, 274:382–413, 2021.
- [17] P. D. Mininni, D. O. Gómez, and S. M. Mahajan. Dynamo action in magnetohydrodynamics and hall-magnetohydrodynamics. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 587(1):472, 2003.
- [18] D. Shalybkov and V. Urpin. The hall effect and the decay of magnetic fields. *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 321:685–690, 1997.
- [19] R. Wan and Y. Zhou. On global existence, energy decay and blow-up criteria for the Hall-MHD system. *J. Differential Equations*, 259(11):5982–6008, 2015.
- [20] R. Wan and Y. Zhou. Global well-posedness, BKM blow-up criteria and zero h limit for the 3D incompressible Hall-MHD equations. *J. Differential Equations*, 267(6):3724–3747, 2019.
- [21] R. Wan and Y. Zhou. Global well-posedness for the 3D incompressible Hall-magnetohydrodynamic equations with Fujita-Kato type initial data. *J. Math. Fluid Mech.*, 21(1):Paper No. 5, 16, 2019.
- [22] M. Wardle. Star formation and the hall effect. In *Magnetic Fields and Star Formation*, pages 231–237. Springer, 2004.
- [23] S. Weng. On analyticity and temporal decay rates of solutions to the viscous resistive Hall-MHD system. *J. Differential Equations*, 260(8):6504–6524, 2016.
- [24] S. Weng. Space-time decay estimates for the incompressible viscous resistive MHD and Hall-MHD equations. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 270(6):2168–2187, 2016.
- [25] X. Wu, Y. Yu, and Y. Tang. Well-posedness for the incompressible Hall-MHD equations in low regularity spaces. *Mediterr. J. Math.*, 15(2):Paper No. 48, 14, 2018.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, SHANGHAI JIAO TONG UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI 200240, P.R.CHINA

E-mail address: zhangshunhang@sjtu.edu.cn