

# STABILITY OF CHANDRASEKHAR'S NONLINEAR FORCE-FREE FIELDS

KEN ABE

**ABSTRACT.** Chandrasekhar's nonlinear force-free field is an axisymmetric magnetic field with a swirl whose current field is supported on a ball in a uniform magnetic field at infinity. We prove its orbital stability in ideal MHD for axisymmetric disturbances in terms of the existence of weak ideal limits of Leray–Hopf solutions introduced by Faraco and Lindberg. The proof is based on a derivation of Taylor's relaxation theory for nonlinear force-free fields under axisymmetry: Woltjer's principle and Taylor's conjecture with generalized magnetic helicity. The main result demonstrates the stability of axisymmetric magnetic fields with swirls in ideal MHD even though blow-up occurs.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Taylor states	3
1.2. Chandrasekhar's nonlinear force-free fields	5
1.3. The main result	6
1.4. Stability: Euler and ideal MHD	8
1.5. Remarks on magnetic relaxation	10
1.6. Ideas and main ingredients	11
2. Linear force-free fields	15
2.1. Magnetic helicity	15
2.2. Rayleigh's formulas	16
2.3. Woltjer's principle	18
2.4. Minimizing sequences	20
2.5. Leray–Hopf solutions	21
2.6. Weak ideal limits	22
2.7. Application to stability	24
3. Nonlinear force-free fields	26
3.1. Clebsch representation	26
3.2. The weighted Hilbert space	28
3.3. Anisotropic estimates	30
3.4. Generalized magnetic helicity	32
4. The variational principle	34
4.1. Axisymmetric nonlinear force-free fields	34
4.2. Symmetric minimizers	38
4.3. Properties of minimum	41
5. Minimizing sequences	42

*Date:* June 3, 2022.

*2020 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35Q31, 35Q35.

*Key words and phrases.* Ideal MHD, force-free fields, stability.

5.1. Concentration–compactness lemma	42
5.2. Lipschitz estimates	46
5.3. Compactness	48
6. Leray–Hopf solutions	52
6.1. Existence	52
6.2. Vector potential equations	53
6.3. Equalities	56
7. Weak ideal limits	57
7.1. Local convergence	57
7.2. Mean-square potential conservation	59
7.3. Global convergence	61
7.4. Helicity conservation	62
8. Orbital stability	63
8.1. Stability of minimizers	64
8.2. Uniqueness	66
Appendix A. Existence of axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solutions	68
References	72

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The magnetohydrodynamics (MHD)

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{aligned} u_t + u \cdot \nabla u + \nabla p &= B \cdot \nabla B + \nu \Delta u, \\ B_t + u \cdot \nabla B &= B \cdot \nabla u + \mu \Delta B, \\ \nabla \cdot u &= \nabla \cdot B = 0, \end{aligned}$$

describes the velocity field  $u(x, t)$ , the magnetic field  $B(x, t)$ , and the total pressure  $p(x, t)$  of electrically conducting fluids for  $x \in \Omega$  and  $t > 0$  in a domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ , where  $\nu > 0$  and  $\mu > 0$  denote viscosity and resistivity. In this paper, we look at the problem (1.1) both for a bounded and simply connected domain  $\Omega$  with a  $C^{1,1}$ -boundary as well as for  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3$ .

We consider the non-slip and perfect conductivity conditions when  $\Omega$  is bounded,

$$(1.2) \quad u = 0, \quad (\nabla \times B) \times n = 0, \quad B \cdot n = 0,$$

for  $x \in \partial\Omega$  and  $t > 0$ , where  $n$  denotes the unit outward normal vector field on  $\partial\Omega$ .

The frozen field equation (1.1)<sub>2</sub> describes the topology-preserving diffusion of magnetic field lines at the zero resistivity limit  $\mu = 0$  (integral curves of  $B$ ). For the frozen field equation (1.1)<sub>2</sub>, we apply the normal trace condition

$$B \cdot n = 0.$$

The cases  $\nu = 0$  and  $\nu > 0$  are known as ideal MHD and nonresistive MHD, respectively. For ideal MHD, we impose the normal trace condition  $u \cdot n = 0$ .

Ideal MHD (and nonresistive MHD) admits steady states  $u = 0$  and  $B = U$  that satisfy the steady Euler flow

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \Pi &= (\nabla \times U) \times U, & \nabla \cdot U &= 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ U \cdot n &= 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned}$$

with the Bernoulli function  $\Pi$ . Those  $U$  that appear in turbulence with vanishing Lorentz force  $(\nabla \times U) \times U$  are known as *force-free fields*. The equations for such  $U$  are expressed using the proportionality factor  $f$  as

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \nabla \times U &= fU, & \nabla \cdot U &= 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ U \cdot n &= 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

The simplest solutions to these equations are *linear* force-free fields, which are eigenfunctions of the rotation operator with eigenvalues  $f \equiv \text{const}$ . In general, the condition  $\nabla \cdot U = 0$  implies the first-order equation

$$(1.4) \quad U \cdot \nabla f = 0,$$

and the equations (1.3) are a *nonlinear* system for  $U$  and  $f \neq \text{const}$ . Magnetic field lines of  $U$  are confined on level sets of  $f$ , according to the equation (1.4). The primary focus of this paper is the *stability* of both linear and nonlinear force-free fields (1.3) in ideal MHD.

**1.1. Taylor states.** In turbulent flows, force-free fields appear as coherent structures. Their stability is based on Taylor's relaxation theory [Tay74], [Tay86], which is based on total energy and magnetic helicity

$$\mathcal{E} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} (|u|^2 + |B|^2) dx, \quad \mathcal{H} = \int_{\Omega} A \cdot B dx,$$

where  $A = \text{curl}^{-1} B$  is a unique vector potential such that  $\nabla \times A = B$ ,  $\nabla \cdot A = 0$  in  $\Omega$ ,  $A \times n = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$  and  $\int_{\Gamma_i} A \cdot ndH = 0$  for connected components  $\Gamma_i$  of  $\partial\Omega$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq I$  as shown in [ABDG98, Theorem 3.17]. Woltjer [Wol58c] used magnetic helicity to find *linear* force-free fields by minimizing total energy. Moreau [Mor61] and Moffatt [Mof69] recognized helicity as a topological quantity measuring knots and links of field lines conserved by the frozen field equation. More precisely, for the solenoidal space  $L_{\sigma}^2(\Omega) = \{B \in L^2(\Omega) \mid \text{div } B = 0 \text{ in } \Omega, B \cdot n = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}$ , minimizers of

$$(1.5) \quad \mathcal{I}_h = \inf \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |B|^2 dx \mid B \in L_{\sigma}^2(\Omega), \int_{\Omega} \text{curl}^{-1} B \cdot B dx = h \right\},$$

are linear force-free fields (Taylor states) [LA91, p.1246]. Rotation is a self-adjoint operator on  $L_{\sigma}^2(\Omega)$  for a simply connected domain and linear force-free fields are countable with eigenvalues  $\dots \leq f_2^- \leq f_1^- < 0 < f_1^+ \leq f_2^+ \leq \dots$  [YG90, Theorem 1]. Taylor states are a finite number of eigenfunctions associated with the least positive eigenvalue or the largest negative eigenvalue (principal eigenvalues), as demonstrated in Lemma 2.4.

Taylor [Tay74], [Tay86] hypothesized that among all sub-helicities [Mof69], only magnetic helicity is approximately conserved with low resistivity in turbulence and used Woltjer's principle as a theoretical foundation for turbulence relaxation toward linear force-free fields as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Taylor's theory predicted the relaxed state in a reversed field pinch and other devices successfully [OS93]. Taylor's conjecture is treated mathematically as a question about magnetic helicity conservation in the ideal limit  $(\nu, \mu) \rightarrow (0, 0)$  [CKS97, p.444]. A gentle review can be found in Buckmaster and Vicol [BV21].

Faraco and Lindberg [FL20] provide proof for Taylor's conjecture in terms of *weak ideal limits* of Leray–Hopf solutions. A weak ideal (resp. nonresistive) limit is a weak-star limit of Leray–Hopf solutions to viscous and resistive MHD (1.1)–(1.2) in  $L_t^\infty L_x^2$  as  $\nu, \mu \rightarrow 0$  (resp. as  $\mu \rightarrow 0$  with fixed  $\nu > 0$ ). They are very weak notions associated with measure-valued solutions, cf. [DM87], [BDLS11], and *conserve* magnetic helicity [FL20] despite the scaling gap to the  $L_t^3 L_x^3$  threshold for magnetic helicity conservation of weak solutions to ideal MHD [Alu09], [KL07], [FL]. See also [FLMV22] on multiply connected domains. Conservation of low regular quantities at ideal limits is also investigated for other hydrodynamical equations; see [CFLS16] for the 2D Euler equations and [CIN18] for the SQG equations.

The conservation of total energy and magnetic helicity to weak solutions of ideal MHD is first investigated in [CKS97], cf. [CET94], [CCFS08] for the Euler equations. In ideal MHD, two regularity thresholds appear for total energy and magnetic helicity conservation, resulting in Onsager-type conjectures [BV21]. Based on the convex integration scheme of De Lellis and Székelyhidi, Jr. [DLS09], Faraco et al. [FLSJ21] constructed bounded weak solutions to ideal MHD with compact support in space and time that dissipate total energy with identically vanishing magnetic helicity. See also [BLFNL15] for the first construction of  $2\frac{1}{2}$ D weak solutions to ideal MHD.

By contrast, using Buckmaster and Vicol intermitted convex integration scheme [BV19], Beekie et al. [BBV20] constructed weak solutions of ideal MHD in  $L_t^\infty L_x^2$  that *do not* conserve magnetic helicity. See also [Dai] for nonunique weak solutions to the hall MHD system. Li et al. [LZZ] demonstrated weak solutions to (hyper) viscous and resistive MHD dissipating magnetic helicity and their strong convergence to ideal limits. Based on the convex integration through staircase laminates [Far03], [AFSJ08], Faraco et al. [FLJ] demonstrated the sharpness of the threshold  $L_t^3 L_x^3$  by constructing weak solutions to the Faraday-Maxwell system in  $L_t^\infty L_x^{3,\infty}$  dissipating magnetic helicity.

Taylor's relaxation theory [Tay74], [Tay86] contains two components: Woltjer's principle and Taylor's conjecture. We begin by noting that proof of Taylor's conjecture for weak ideal limits [FL20], [FLMV22] implies Taylor state stability [Wol58c], [LA91].

**Theorem 1.1** (Taylor state stability). *Let  $S_h$  be a set of eigenfunctions of the rotation operator on  $L_\sigma^2(\Omega)$  associated with the least positive (resp. largest negative) eigenvalue with magnetic helicity  $h > 0$  (resp.  $h < 0$ ). Let  $S_0 = \emptyset$ .*

*The set  $S_h = \{U_j\}_{j=1}^N$  is stable in weak ideal limits of Leray–Hopf solutions to (1.1)–(1.2) in the sense that for arbitrary  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that for  $u_0, B_0 \in L_\sigma^2(\Omega)$  satisfying*

$$\|u_0\|_{L^2} + \inf_{1 \leq j \leq N} \|B_0 - U_j\|_{L^2} + \left| \int_{\Omega} \text{curl}^{-1} B_0 \cdot B_0 dx - h \right| \leq \delta,$$

there exists a weak ideal limit  $(u, B)$  of Leray–Hopf solutions to (1.1)–(1.2) for  $(u_0, B_0)$  such that

$$\|u\|_{L^2} + \inf_{1 \leq j \leq N} \|B - U_j\|_{L^2} \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{for a.e. } t \geq 0.$$

**Remark 1.2.** For weak nonresistive limits of Leray–Hopf solutions, the same stability result as Theorem 1.1 holds. The stability result also holds for unique strong solutions to ideal MHD and nonresistive MHD up to maximal existence time; see [CMZ10] for local well-posedness of ideal MHD.

**1.2. Chandrasekhar’s nonlinear force-free fields.** Recent computer simulations [YRH15], [PWSHG11], and [PCRH16] demonstrated that turbulent flows relax toward *nonlinear* force-free fields rather than linear force-free fields (Taylor states). In a uniform field, they have compactly supported two flux tubes with opposite signs. The presence of such coherent structures is attributed to integrand  $A \cdot B$  redistribution, and sub-helicities are still regarded as important quantities [Yea20], [FLMV22]. They could be used as constraints in an extension of Woltjer’s principle to nonlinear force-free fields [Tay74], [Tay86], [LA91], [Yea20, Section 4] although such a variational principle is unknown.

The existence of nonlinear force-free fields (1.3) is linked to their stability. It has long been debated whether nonlinear force-free fields exist besides symmetric solutions. Enciso and Peralta-Salas [EPS16] demonstrated that force-free fields do not exist if  $f \in C^{2+\alpha}$ ,  $0 < \alpha < 1$ , admits a level set diffeomorphic to a *sphere*. This rigidity result proved non-existence for a wide range of  $f$ , such as radial or having extrema, and contrasts with rigidity results [Nad14], [CC15] based on the decay of the magnetic field at infinity, such as  $U = o(|x|^{-1})$  as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ . The nonlinear system (1.3) is an overdetermined problem in general [EPS16], [CK20], cf. [EPS12], [EPS15], and existence results are available only under symmetry, e.g., [Cha56], [Tur89], [Abe22]. In the axisymmetric setting, both the system (1.3) and the steady Euler flow can be reduced to the Grad–Shafranov equation [GR58], [Sha58]; see [Gav19], [CLV19], and [DVEPS21] for the existence of compactly supported axisymmetric steady Euler flows. Constantin et al. [CDG21a, p.529] posed Grad’s conjecture [Gra67, p.144] which states that nonsymmetric steady Euler flows do not exist. With small force [CDG21b] or piecewise constant Bernoulli functions [BL96], [ELPS], the existence of nonsymmetric steady Euler flows is known. See also [CDG] for more information on the flexibility and rigidity of MHD equilibria.

The explicit solution of Chandrasekhar [Cha56], a particular case of Hicks–Moffatt solution [Hic85], [Mof69], which is an axisymmetric solution with a swirl in  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3$  and a uniform field at infinity, is an important example of nonlinear force-free fields. In terms of the cylindrical coordinate  $(r, \theta, z)$  and the Clebsch representation, the Chandrasekhar’s force-free field is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
(1.6) \quad & U_C = \nabla \times (\Phi_C \nabla \theta) + G_C \nabla \theta, \quad f_C = \lambda^{1/2} 1_{(0, \infty)}(\Phi_C), \\
& \Phi_C(z, r) = \begin{cases} \frac{3}{2} W r^2 \frac{c_{3/2}^{1/2} J_{3/2}(\lambda^{1/2} \rho)}{J_{5/2}(c_{3/2})(\lambda^{1/2} \rho)^{3/2}}, & \rho = \sqrt{z^2 + r^2} < R, \\ -\frac{1}{2} W r^2 \left(1 - \frac{R^3}{\rho^3}\right), & \rho = \sqrt{z^2 + r^2} \geq R, \end{cases} \\
& G_C(z, r) = \lambda^{1/2} \Phi_{C,+}, \quad R = c_{3/2} \lambda^{-1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

The indicator function on  $(0, \infty)$  is  $1_{(0, \infty)}(s)$  and  $s_+ = s 1_{(0, \infty)}(s)$ . The strength of the current field  $\nabla \times U_C \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$  supported in a ball with radius  $R$  is denoted by the parameter  $\lambda > 0$ . The parameter  $W > 0$  denotes the uniform field at infinity, i.e.,  $U \rightarrow -W e_z$  as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$  for  $e_z = {}^t(0, 0, 1)$ . The function  $J_m$  is the  $m$ -th order Bessel function of the first kind and  $c_{3/2} = 4.4934 \dots$  is the first zero point of  $J_{3/2}$ . The factor  $f_C$  is a discontinuous function and the level set  $f_C^{-1}(\lambda^{1/2})$  is a ball, cf. [EPS16].

The explicit solution (1.6) has two distinguishing characteristics that do not appear in linear force-free fields. The first is the computer simulation of the compactly supported current field  $\nabla \times U_C$  [PWSHG11], [YRH15], and [PCRH16]. The second is an integrable magnetic field line structure. They are constrained on nested tori  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid \Phi_C(z, r) = k\}$  for  $k > 0$ , and form torus knots and links.

The purpose of this paper is to show that the nonlinear force-free field (1.6) is stable in weak ideal limits of axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solutions to (1.1) with a uniform field condition at infinity. Under axisymmetry, the system (1.1) has an additional Casimir invariant called *generalized magnetic helicity* [VMI97], cf. [KPSY21]. We look at a derivation of Taylor’s theory [Tay74], [Tay86] under axisymmetry: the Woltjer-type principle for nonlinear force-free fields and the Taylor-type conjecture for generalized magnetic helicity conservation. They are established in [Wol58c], [LA91], [FL20], and [FLMV22] for the stability of Taylor states.

**1.3. The main result.** We consider the system (1.1) under the uniform field condition

$$(1.7) \quad (u, B) \rightarrow (u_\infty, B_\infty) \quad \text{as } |x| \rightarrow \infty,$$

for given constants  $B_\infty = -W e_z$ ,  $W > 0$  and  $u_\infty \in \mathbb{R}^3$  parallel to  $e_z$ . The explicit solution (1.6) offers a specific traveling wave solution,

$$u = u_\infty, \quad B(x, t) = U(x - u_\infty t).$$

The profile  $U$  is a force-free field satisfying

$$(1.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \nabla \times U &= fU, \quad \nabla \cdot U = 0 && \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3, \\ U &\rightarrow B_\infty && \text{as } |x| \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

In terms of an equivalent system for new variables  $(v, b) = (u - u_\infty, B - B_\infty)$ , we state a stability result for the explicit solution (1.6) in the system (1.1) under the condition (1.7) :

$$(1.9) \quad \begin{aligned} v_t + (v + u_\infty) \cdot \nabla v + \nabla p &= (b + B_\infty) \cdot \nabla b + \nu \Delta v, \\ b_t + (v + u_\infty) \cdot \nabla b &= (b + B_\infty) \cdot \nabla v + \mu \Delta b, \\ \nabla \cdot v &= \nabla \cdot b = 0. \end{aligned}$$

We apply Clebsch representation for axisymmetric solenoidal vector fields

$$b = \nabla \times (\phi \nabla \theta) + G \nabla \theta,$$

with unique Clebsch potentials  $\phi(z, r)$  and  $G(z, r)$ ; see Section 3. Potential of  $B_\infty = -W e_z$  is  $-\phi_\infty$  for  $\phi_\infty = W r^2/2 + \gamma$  and arbitrary constant  $\gamma$ . Under the condition (1.7), the total energy and magnetic helicity of the system (1.1) are expressed as

$$\mathcal{E} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (|v|^2 + |b|^2) dx, \quad \mathcal{H} = 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\phi - \phi_\infty) \frac{G}{r^2} dx.$$

Even for square-integrable  $B \in L^2_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , magnetic helicity is ill-defined in  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3$  [FLSJ21, Appendix A]. We instead apply generalized magnetic helicity

$$(1.10) \quad H = 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+ \frac{G}{r^2} dx.$$

If  $G$  is supported in  $\{\phi > \phi_\infty\}$ , generalized magnetic helicity agrees with magnetic helicity. Indeed, generalized magnetic helicity of the explicit solution (1.6) is magnetic helicity

$$(1.11) \quad h_C = 2\lambda^{1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_{C,+}^2 \frac{1}{r^2} dx > 0.$$

For  $W/\lambda$ , the constant  $h_C$  is quadratic [Mof69, p.128], as shown in Proposition 8.4. We show that generalized magnetic helicity is well-defined for axisymmetric  $b = B - B_\infty \in L^2_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^3)$  and constants  $W > 0$  and  $\gamma \geq 0$ . (Generalized magnetic helicity (1.10) is affected by gauge  $\gamma \geq 0$ .)

For small axisymmetric disturbances  $(v_0, b_0)$ , we show that there exists a weak ideal limit  $(v, b)$  such that  $(u, B) = (v + u_\infty, b + B_\infty)$  is close to the traveling wave solution  $(u_\infty, U_C(x - u_\infty t))$  up to translation in  $z$  for all time. This demonstrates the stability of MHD equilibria that differ from Taylor states.

**Theorem 1.3** (Stability of Chandrasekhar's nonlinear force-free fields). *Let  $\lambda, W > 0$ . Let  $B_\infty = -W e_z$  and  $\phi_\infty = W r^2/2$ . Let  $u_\infty$  be a constant parallel to  $e_z$ .*

*The force-free field  $U_C$  in (1.6) with magnetic helicity  $h_C$  is orbitally stable in weak ideal limits of axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solutions to (1.1) under the condition (1.7) in the sense*

that for arbitrary  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that for axisymmetric  $v_0, b_0 \in L^2_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^3)$  satisfying

$$\|v_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \inf_{z \in \mathbb{R}} \|b_0 + B_\infty - U_C(\cdot + ze_z)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \left| 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\phi_0 - \phi_\infty)_+ \frac{G_0}{r^2} dx - hc \right| \leq \delta,$$

for the Clebsch potentials  $\phi_0, G_0$  of  $b_0$ , there exists a weak ideal limit  $(v, b)$  of axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solutions to (1.9) for  $(v_0, b_0)$  such that

$$\|v\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \inf_{z \in \mathbb{R}} \|b + B_\infty - U_C(\cdot + ze_z)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq \varepsilon, \quad \text{for a.e. } t \geq 0.$$

**Remark 1.4.** Theorem 1.3 is a special case  $\gamma = 0$  of a general stability theorem for a particular class of nonlinear force-free fields with discontinuous factors  $f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$  (Theorem 8.2). The stability result also holds for weak nonresistive limits of axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solutions and all time, as well as for unique strong axisymmetric solutions to ideal MHD and non-resistive MHD up to maximal existence time.

**1.4. Stability: Euler and ideal MHD.** The force-free field (1.6) also gives an explicit solution to the Euler equations (vanishing at infinity),

$$u_E = U_C(x + B_\infty t) - B_\infty,$$

which describes an axisymmetric vortex ring with a swirl whose vortex is supported in a ball moving at the speed of  $B_\infty$ . The solution  $u_E$  belongs to the lower regularity space  $W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  than the space  $C^{1,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ ,  $\alpha > 0$ , for which the Euler equations are locally well-posed [Lic25], [Gun27]. Elgindi [Elg21] demonstrated that for some axisymmetric data without a swirl  $u_0 \in C^{1,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  and some  $\alpha > 0$ , the Euler equations exhibit self-similar blow-up. See [VV20], [LVV21] for instability of blow-up solutions. By contrast in Remark 1.4, the explicit solution (1.6) is *stable* in ideal MHD for any axisymmetric disturbances *with* swirls even though blow-up occurs. Moffatt [Mof85], [Mof86] discovered this MHD stability mechanism for shear flows  $G(r)\nabla\theta$ . Let us give a comparison on stability results for the Euler and the ideal MHD equations.

The concept of force-free field stability appeared in the work of Lundquist [Lun50] who investigated stability of the linear force-free field  $U = J_1(fr)e_\theta + J_0(fr)e_z$  for  $e_\theta = r\nabla\theta$  in the presence of axisymmetric disturbances. Trehan [Tre51] investigated the stability of more general explicit solutions. Woltjer studied the stability of linear force-free fields by linearization [Wol58b] and variational arguments [Wol58a] after the seminal work on the variational characterization of linear force-free fields [Wol58c], cf. [CW58], and concluded [Wol59] stability of the lowest energy linear force-free fields. The works [Wol58a], [Wol59], [Wol], and [Cha58] investigated this same variational characterization of other MHD equilibria. Voslamber and Caliebat [VC62] discovered the instability of linear force-free fields for the Lundquist’s solution at large values of  $fr$ . See also [Cha61, IX.] for the Rayleigh-type stability criterion. Bernstein et al. [BFKK58] established a nonlinear stability theorem for MHD equilibria with a sign condition for second derivatives of total energy.



Arnold [Arn65] established a well-known nonlinear stability theorem for steady flows in the Euler equations with a sign condition for second derivatives of kinetic energy, i.e., local maxima or minima in equivortical velocity fields, cf. [BFKK58]. Arnold's stability theorem is useful for 2D steady flows [MP94], [AK98], [GŠb], cf. [WP85], [SV09]. By contrast, he stated [Arn65, p.1007], [Arn66, p.349] that he could not find any examples of 3D steady flows that met his criterion. Rouchon [Rou91, Theorem 1.1] demonstrated that all 3D steady flows are kinetic energy saddle points and concluded that Arnold's criterion is never satisfied; see also [Mof21, 9.3.3].

Later in the 1980s, Moffatt [Mof85, p.374], [Mof86, p.369] observed that the analogy of the existence of steady flows between Euler and ideal MHD does not extend to their stability; see [Mof21, 9.3]. He computed the sign of second derivatives for magnetic energy in the vicinity of the shear flow  $G(r)\nabla\theta$ , which is a steady axisymmetric magnetic/velocity field with a swirl. The sign condition implies that  $G$  is stable in ideal MHD for decreasing  $|G/r^2|$  in  $r > 0$ , e.g.,  $G = r^{-\alpha}$ ,  $\alpha > 1$ . By contrast, such  $G$  is unstable in the Euler equations by Rayleigh's criterion [Ray17], [DR82, Chapter 3]. Szeri and Holmes [SH88, Theorem 4.2] gave a sufficient condition for Lyapunov stability of axisymmetric Euler flows with swirls, cf. [Arn65], [Rou91].

Instability in steady Euler flows has been studied in terms of the spectrum of the linearized Euler operator in [FV91], [LH91], [FV92], [LH93], [Vis93], and [SF05]. Nonlinear instability results can be found in [Lin04], [BGS02], [VF03], and the existence of unstable manifolds can be found in [LZ13], [LZ14], and [LZ22]. Lifschitz and Hameiri [LH93] studied the spectrum of the linearized Euler operator in the vicinity of axisymmetric vortex rings with swirls. It is believed that axisymmetric vortex rings with swirls are *unstable* in the Euler equations. Galley and Smets [GSa] investigated the spectral stability of shear flows  $G(r)\nabla\theta$  (columnar vortices) in the non-symmetric setting; see also [GS18].

Friedlander and Vishik [VF98] investigated the spectrum of the linearized operator for MHD equilibria. The works [BFKK58], [Mof85], [Mof86], [HMRW85], [FV90], [VM95], [VMI96], [VMI97], and [VMI99] all developed nonlinear stability criteria. We are especially interested in the work [VMI97, Criterion 5.2] on nonlinear stability criteria in the axisymmetric setting. The criterion [VMI97] includes axisymmetric MHD equilibria  $B = U$  and  $u = 0$ , although examples satisfying this criterion are unknown, cf. [Arn65], [Rou91].

The energy–Casimir method is a stability principle that appears in the study of other plasma/fluid systems such as the Vlasov–Poisson equations [Guo99], [GR01] or the Euler–Poisson equations [Rei03], [LS09]; see [HMRW85] and [BGM19] for reviews. The energy–Casimir method uses additional conservation (Casimirs) under symmetry and differs from stability principles in general settings [BFKK58], [Arn65]. The stability results [Rei03], [LS09] are called *conditional* because global-in-time solutions are unknown. Instability results can be found in [Jan08], [Jan14].

The Euler and ideal MHD equations are noncanonical Hamiltonian PDEs, and little is known about the orbital stability of traveling wave solutions; see [GSS87] and [LZ22] for the Grillakis–Shatah–Strauss theory for Hamiltonian PDEs. Ideas about the stability of axisymmetric vortex rings without swirls can be traced back to the works of Kelvin [TLK10] and Benjamin [Ben76]. For early work on the stability of Hill's spherical vortex rings, see Wan [Wan86]. The stability principle [Ben76, p.20] is the maximization of kinetic energy through a rearrangement with an impulse constraint.

Burton et al. [BNLLF13] investigated the orbital stability of traveling wave solutions in the 2D Euler equations based on the maximization of kinetic energy using a rearrangement with unknown vorticity functions, cf. [Ben76]. See also Burton [Bur21]. The author and Choi [AC22] investigated stability in a relatively restricted class of traveling waves using minimization of (penalized) enstrophy with prescribed vorticity functions, which is also applicable for the stability of axisymmetric vortex rings without swirl due to additional Casimir invariants. It should be noted that stability results [BNLLF13], [Bur21], and [AC22] are demonstrated for weak solutions without assuming boundedness of vorticity, cf. [Visa], [Visb], [ABC<sup>+</sup>b]. A particular type of vortex ring without swirls is Hill’s spherical vortex rings, which are patch-type solutions; see [Cho] for the stability result in the Yudovich class [UY68].

Asymptotic stability, which is convergence to equilibrium as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , is a more powerful stability concept than orbital (Lyapunov) stability. Bedrossian and Masmoudi [BM15] established nonlinear asymptotic stability of the Euler equations for 2D Couette flows and disturbances in Gevrey classes. This stability mechanism is known as inviscid damping which is related to Landau damping in plasma physics [MV11]. See also [IJ20], [IJ22], [MZ], and [IJ] for nonlinear asymptotic stability results. In [DM], it is demonstrated that instability occurs for disturbances in low regular Gevrey classes. See [BGM19] for more information on the asymptotic stability of the Euler equations. We also discuss recent works [RZ17], [ZZZ21], [LMZZ22] on linear asymptotic stability for sheared velocity and magnetic fields in ideal MHD.

Theorems 1.1 and 1.3 are the first (orbital) stability results for MHD equilibria in ideal MHD in terms of the *existence* of weak ideal limits of Leray–Hopf solutions. They are based on the minimization of total energy following Taylor’s relaxation theory. We describe the ideas of the proofs in subsection 1.6.

Let us finally mention the Cauchy problem of the Navier–Stokes equations. Chen et al. [CSTY08], [CSTY09] and Koch et al. [KNSŠ09] demonstrated that axisymmetric solutions with swirls do not exhibit self-similar blow-up, cf. [Elg21]. Feng and Šverák [FŠ15] showed the existence of global in time solutions for large vortex filaments in the axisymmetric class without swirls. Galley and Šverák [GŠ15], [GŠ19] showed the uniqueness of constructed large solutions. See also Bedrossian et al. [BGHG] and Bedrossian and Golding [BG] for nonsymmetric vortex filament solutions.

Jia, Šverák, and Guillod [JŠ15], [JŠ14], [GŠc] developed a program for the nonuniqueness of Leray–Hopf solutions based on the spectral stability of self-similar solutions. In the groundbreaking work [BV19], Buckmaster and Vicol constructed nonunique finite energy weak solutions to the Navier–Stokes equations by the intermitted convex integration. See also [BCV22] and [Luo19]. Cheskidov and Lou [CL] showed the existence of sharp nonunique weak solutions in the supercritical class to the Ladyzhenskaya–Prodi–Serrin uniqueness criteria. Albritton et al. [ABCa] demonstrated the nonuniqueness of Leray–Hopf solutions with force in the axisymmetric class without swirls based on instability of self-similar solutions, cf. [Visa], [Visb], [ABC<sup>+</sup>b].

**1.5. Remarks on magnetic relaxation.** The total energy of solutions to nonresistive MHD, i.e., (1.1)–(1.2) with  $\mu = 0$ ,  $\nu > 0$ , decreases with the velocity field  $\nabla u \in L^2(0, \infty; L^2)$ . Arnold’s inequality, conversely, limits magnetic energy from below for initial data with nonzero magnetic helicity; see (2.4). By letting  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , one may construct steady Euler

flows for a given  $B_0$ . This means of constructing steady Euler flows is called *magnetic relaxation* posed by Arnold [Arn74], [AK98, ChapterIII] and Moffatt [Mof85], [Mof21, Section 8]. The equations of the velocity field do not have to be the Navier–Stokes equations, and other models are considered in [Mof85], [Mof90], [VCY89], [Nis02], [Bre14], [Pas20], and [BFV22].

In Remark 1.2, weak nonresistive limits are nearby Taylor states for a.e.  $t \geq 0$ . It does not, however, imply convergence to a Taylor state as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Magnetic relaxation can, in fact, produce a broader range of steady flows than that of force-free fields [Kom]. Remember that some  $B_0$  can form nontrivial links with magnetic helicity  $h = 0$  [Mof85, p.367], [Mof21, 8.1.1], [Kom, p.2]. Komendarczyk [Kom] investigated magnetic energy minimization for given  $B_0 \in L^2_\sigma(\Omega)$  among weak  $L^2$ -closure of pushforward  $B = \varphi_* B_0$  with nonincreasing energy for volume-preserving diffeomorphism  $\varphi$  of  $\Omega$  whose restriction on  $\partial\Omega$  is identity, i.e.,

$$\tilde{I}(B_0) = \inf \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |B|^2 dx \mid B \in \overline{M}^w(\Omega, B_0) \right\},$$

for  $M(\Omega, B_0) = \{B \in L^2_\sigma(\Omega) \mid B = \varphi_* B_0, \varphi \in \text{Diff}(\Omega, dx), \|B\|_{L^2} \leq \|B_0\|_{L^2}\}$ . The work [Kom] demonstrated that for some  $B_0 \in L^2_\sigma(\Omega)$  with helicity  $h = 0$ , a set of minimizers  $\tilde{S}(B_0)$  of  $\tilde{I}(B_0)$  is not empty, i.e.,  $\tilde{S}(B_0) \neq \emptyset$ . This means that for such  $B_0$ , magnetic relaxation minimum energy states are nontrivial, whereas Taylor states are trivial, i.e.,  $S_0 = \emptyset$ .

Beekie et al. [BFV22] obtained detailed information on the large time behavior for the velocity field satisfying

$$\nabla p = B \cdot \nabla B - \nu(-\Delta)^\kappa u.$$

The frozen field equation (1.1)<sub>2</sub> with the above velocity field (the MRE equations) is shown to be globally well-posed for  $u_0, B_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{T}^n)$ ,  $s, \kappa > n/2 + 1$ , satisfying  $\nabla \cdot B_0 = 0$ , and the strong convergence limits  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} = 0$  holds [BFV22, Theorems 3.1, 4.1]. In the 2D setting, asymptotic stability of the steady states  $B = e_1$  and  $u = 0$  is obtained, as are examples of 3D exact solutions exhibiting an exponential growth of the current field [BFV22, Theorems 5.1, 6.4]. See also [Elg17] and [CCL19] for asymptotic stability of the IPM equations and [EM20] for an exponential growth of the vorticity field of the 3D Euler equations.

**1.6. Ideas and main ingredients.** The following are the main ideas for proving Theorem 1.3:

- (a) Total energy minimization under the constraint of conserved generalized magnetic helicity,
- (b) Existence of weak ideal limits of axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solutions with nonincreasing total energy and conserved generalized magnetic helicity.

For the stability of traveling wave solutions in the 2D Euler equations, we can consider (a) enstrophy minimization under the kinetic energy constraint [AC22], cf. [BNLLF13],

[Bur21], and (b) the existence of global weak solutions with conserved enstrophy and kinetic energy. The conservation of enstrophy is due to the renormalized property of vorticity equations [LFMNL06], cf. [CS15]. See [CFLS16] for more information on energy conservation. Due to additional Casimir invariants, axisymmetric vortex rings with no swirl have a similar minimization [FT81] and a renormalized property [NS22]. We take advantage of the analogy between 2D hydrodynamic and 3D MHD turbulence [Has85], [Bis93, 7.3].

The simpler case is Taylor state stability (Theorem 1.1). Part (a) corresponds to Woltjer's principle [Wol58c], [LA91], and part (b) to Taylor's conjecture [FL20], [FLMV22]. We exploit from the part (a), (i) *compactness of minimizing sequences*. Namely, we use the fact that any sequences  $\{B_n\} \subset L^2_\sigma(\Omega)$  satisfying  $\frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega |B_n|^2 dx \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_h$ ,  $\int_\Omega \text{curl}^{-1} B_n \cdot B_n dx \rightarrow h$  are relatively compact in  $L^2(\Omega)$ .

A key point of (b) is (ii) *compactness of Leray–Hopf solutions*. For Leray–Hopf solutions  $(u_j, B_j)$  to (1.1)–(1.2) satisfying the equality

$$(1.12) \quad \int_\Omega \text{curl}^{-1} B_j \cdot B_j dx + 2\mu_j \int_0^t \int_\Omega \nabla \times B_j \cdot B_j dx ds = \int_\Omega \text{curl}^{-1} B_0 \cdot B_0 dx,$$

the vector potentials  $\{\text{curl}^{-1} B_j\}$  are relatively compact in  $L^2_{\text{loc}}(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$  by the Aubin–Lions lemma as  $(v_j, \mu_j) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ . By letting  $j \rightarrow \infty$ , the magnetic helicity of weak ideal limits is conserved. (The second term is eliminated by the energy inequality.)

In weak ideal limits, the two points (i) and (ii) imply the stability of a set of minimizers (Taylor states)  $\mathcal{S}_h$  to  $\mathcal{I}_h$ . Theorem 1.1 is derived by characterizing Taylor states as a finite number of eigenfunctions of the rotation operator associated with the principal eigenvalues using Rayleigh's formulas (Lemma 2.4).

To prove the stability of the nonlinear force-free field (1.6) (Theorem 1.3), in part (a), we consider a new minimization principle:

$$(1.13) \quad I_{h,W,\gamma} = \inf \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |b|^2 dx \mid b = \nabla \times (\phi \nabla \theta) + G \nabla \theta \in L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3), 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+ \frac{G}{r^2} dx = h \right\},$$

for given constants  $h \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $W > 0$ , and  $\gamma \geq 0$ , where  $L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  denotes the space of all axisymmetric solenoidal vector fields in  $L^2_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . Minimizers of (1.13) produce axisymmetric nonlinear force-free fields (1.8) for  $B_\infty = -W e_z$  with discontinuous factors  $f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$  (Lemma 4.3). This appears to be the first variational principle that provides nonlinear force-free fields using the conservation of ideal MHD. Previous constructions use un-conserved Euler quantities [Tur89] or a minimax method for flux functions [Abe22].

In the part (b), a key quantity is *generalized magnetic mean-square potential*,

$$(1.14) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+^2 dx.$$

Faraco and Lindberg [FL20, Theorem 5.4] demonstrated the conservation of magnetic mean-square potential at weak ideal limits of Leray–Hopf solutions for 2D bounded and multiply

connected domains. For fixed initial data, we show the conservation of generalized magnetic mean-square potential for weak ideal limits of axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solutions.

The main difficulty for (i) compactness of minimizing sequences and (ii) compactness of Leray–Hopf solutions lies on the *unboundedness* of the domain  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3$ . As sketched below, we prove (i) and (ii) by different ideas.

The approach to proving (i) compactness of minimizing sequences for  $I_h = I_{h,W,\gamma}$  in (1.13) is the strict subadditivity of the minimum

$$(1.15) \quad I_{h_1+h_2} < I_{h_1} + I_{h_2}, \quad h_1, h_2 > 0.$$

We show that any axisymmetric minimizing sequences  $\{b_n\} \subset L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  with potentials  $\phi_n$  and  $G_n$  satisfying

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |b_n|^2 dx \rightarrow I_h, \quad 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\phi_n - \phi_\infty)_+ \frac{G_n}{r^2} dx \rightarrow h,$$

are relatively compact in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$  up to translation in  $z$  by using the strict subadditivity (1.15) and the concentration–compactness principle [Lio84a], [Lio84b]. We derive the strict subadditivity (1.15) from the presence of symmetric minimizers in  $z$ , namely,  $\phi(z, r) = \phi(-z, r)$  and  $G(z, r) = G(-z, r)$ . We also demonstrate that the minimum  $I_h$  is symmetric and lower semi-continuous for  $h$  and increasing for  $|h|$ . Minimizers of  $I_h$  form  $G = \mu(\phi - \phi_\infty)_+$  for  $\phi_\infty = Wr^2/2 + \gamma$ ,  $W > 0$ ,  $\gamma \geq 0$  with a Lagrange multiplier  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$  and a solution of the Grad–Shafranov equation

$$(1.16) \quad -L\phi = \mu^2(\phi - \phi_\infty)_+ \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^2, \quad \phi = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^2,$$

where  $\mathbb{R}_+^2 = \{(z, r) \mid z \in \mathbb{R}, r > 0\}$  and  $L = \partial_z^2 + \partial_r^2 - r^{-1}\partial_r$ . The minimizers yield axisymmetric nonlinear force-free fields  $U = b + B_\infty$  with  $f = \mu 1_{(0, \infty)}(\phi - \phi_\infty)$ .

The desired (ii) compactness of Leray–Hopf solutions  $(v_j, b_j)$  to (1.9) as  $(v_j, \mu_j) \rightarrow (0, 0)$  is the flux *global* convergence

$$(1.17) \quad (\phi_j - \phi_\infty)_+ \rightarrow (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+ \quad \text{in } L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)),$$

for Clebsch potentials  $\phi_j, G_j$  of  $b_j$  and  $\phi, G$  of a weak ideal limit  $b$ . We show the following equalities of generalized magnetic helicity and generalized magnetic mean-square potential for axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solutions,

$$(1.18) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_{j,+} \frac{G_j}{r^2} dx + \mu_j \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla \times B_j \cdot B_j 1_{(0, \infty)}(\Phi_j) dx ds = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_{0,+} \frac{G_0}{r^2} dx,$$

$$(1.19) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\Phi_{j,+}|^2 dx + 2\mu_j \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla \Phi_{j,+}|^2 dx ds = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\Phi_{0,+}|^2 dx,$$

for  $\Phi_j = \phi_j - \phi_\infty$  and  $B_j = b_j + B_\infty$ . They follow from vector potential equations and the drift–diffusion equation,

$$\partial_t \Phi_j + u_j \cdot \nabla \Phi_j = \mu_j \left( \Delta - \frac{2}{r} \partial_r \right) \Phi_j.$$

the Aubin–Lions lemma only implies flux local convergence  $\Phi_{j,+} \rightarrow \Phi_+$  in  $L^2(0, T; L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^3))$ . We strengthen this convergence to the global convergence (1.17) by using the generalized magnetic mean-square potential conservation at the weak ideal limit,

$$(1.20) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\Phi_+|^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\Phi_{0,+}|^2 dx.$$

The equalities (1.19) and (1.20) imply the global convergence (1.17) and generalized magnetic helicity conservation at the weak ideal limit by taking a limit to the equality (1.18).

At vanishing viscosity limits, the vorticity of the 2D Euler equations in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  exhibits a similar global convergence [LFMNL06, p.359]. The difference between the 2D vorticity equations and this one is that the drift  $u$  is only in  $L^\infty(0, T; L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^3))$  and lacks Sobolev regularity. The Sobolev regularity of the drift is critical for the renormalized property of transport equation solutions [DL89, Corollary II.2], [AC14, p.1213] and is used in [LFMNL06] for enstrophy conservation at vanishing viscosity limits, cf. [CS15].

The conservation of (generalized) magnetic mean-square potential, conversely, is due to the Sobolev regularity  $r^{-1} \nabla \Phi \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^3))$ . This Sobolev regularity implies that the nonlinear term  $u \cdot \nabla \Phi$  is integrable and that the flux is a transport equation solution

$$\Phi_t + u \cdot \nabla \Phi = 0.$$

This is demonstrated in [FL20, Lemma 5.7] for the flux of a 2D system. More specifically, the work [FL20] demonstrated that any solutions to the transport equation conserve magnetic mean-square potential with divergence-free drifts in  $L_t^\infty L_x^2$  thanks to the Sobolev regularity of  $\Phi$  in a 2D bounded domain. We show that  $\Phi_+^2$  satisfies the transport equation  $\partial_t \Phi_+^2 + u \cdot \nabla \Phi_+^2 = 0$  in a distributional sense and (1.20) holds. Heuristically, Sobolev regularity of  $\Phi$  (in  $x$  and  $t$ ) implies the renormalized property

$$g(\Phi)_t + u \cdot \nabla g(\Phi) = 0,$$

for regular  $g(s)$  by the chain rule in Sobolev space.

In weak ideal limits of axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solutions, the two points (i) and (ii) imply the stability of a set of minimizers  $S_{h,W,\gamma}$  to  $I_{h,W,\gamma}$  in (1.13) for  $h \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $W > 0$ , and  $\gamma \geq 0$  (Theorem 8.2). Theorem 1.3 is derived from the particular case  $h = h_C$  in (1.11) and  $\gamma = 0$  for which the set of minimizers  $S_{h_C,W,0}$  agrees with the orbit of the explicit solution  $U_C$  for given  $(W, \lambda)$  due to the uniqueness of the Grad–Shafranov equation (1.16) (Theorem 8.3) and the explicit form of the constant  $h_C$  (Proposition 8.4), i.e.,  $S_{h_C,W,0} = \{U_C(\cdot + z e_z) - B_\infty \mid z \in \mathbb{R}\}$ . The moving plane method is used to determine uniqueness [Fra92], [Fra00].

The scaling property of the minimum (1.13) is  $I_{h,W,\gamma} = (W/2)^{-2} I_{\tilde{h},2,\tilde{\gamma}}$ ,  $\tilde{h} = (W/2)^{-2} h$ ,  $\tilde{\gamma} = (W/2)^{-1} \gamma$ . We will fix  $W = 2$  from Section 3 to Section 7 and deduce results for  $W > 0$  from those for  $W = 2$  in Section 8.

The following is how this paper is structured. In Section 2, we demonstrate the stability of Taylor states (Theorem 1.1). In Section 3, we prove Clebsch representation and well-definedness of generalized magnetic helicity (1.10) and generalized magnetic mean-square potential (1.14). Section 4 develops the variational problem (1.13) (for  $W = 2$ ) and establishes the strict subadditivity (1.15). Section 5 demonstrates the compactness of minimizing sequences of (1.13) by the concentration–compactness principle. In Section 6, we show the equalities (1.18) and (1.19) for axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solutions. In Section 7, we prove the conservation of generalized magnetic helicity at weak ideal limits. In Section 8, we prove the orbital stability of a set of minimizers to (1.13) and deduce Theorem 1.3 from a uniqueness theorem.

*Acknowledgements.* This work was made possible in part by the JSPS through the Grant-in-aid for Young Scientist 20K14347 and by MEXT Promotion of Distinctive Joint Research Center Program JPMXP0619217849.

## 2. LINEAR FORCE-FREE FIELDS

We demonstrate Taylor state stability (Theorem 1.1). We show that minimizers of Woltjer’s principle (1.5) (Taylor states) are eigenfunctions of the rotation operator associated with the principal eigenvalues by Rayleigh’s formulas. We then prove Taylor state stability by a contradiction argument. We remark on Woltjer’s principle and Taylor’s conjecture for multiply connected domains in Remarks 2.1, 2.5, and 2.14.

**2.1. Magnetic helicity.** Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  be a bounded and simply connected domain with a  $C^{1,1}$ -boundary  $\partial\Omega$  consisting of connected components  $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_l$ . We consider the direct sum decomposition

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{aligned} L^p(\Omega) &= L^p_\sigma(\Omega) \oplus G^p(\Omega), \quad 1 < p < \infty, \\ L^p_\sigma(\Omega) &= \{u \in L^p(\Omega) \mid \nabla \cdot u = 0 \text{ in } \Omega, u \cdot n = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}, \\ G^p(\Omega) &= \{\nabla q \in L^p(\Omega) \mid q \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)\}, \end{aligned}$$

and the associated projection operator  $\mathbb{P} : L^p(\Omega) \rightarrow L^p_\sigma(\Omega)$ . We denote by  $C^\infty_{c,\sigma}(\Omega)$  the space of all smooth solenoidal vector fields with compact support in  $\Omega$ . The  $L^p$ -closure of  $C^\infty_{c,\sigma}(\Omega)$  is  $L^p_\sigma(\Omega)$  and the  $W^{1,p}$ -closure of  $C^\infty_{c,\sigma}(\Omega)$  is  $L^p_\sigma \cap W^{1,p}_0(\Omega)$ . The same decomposition and density properties hold also for  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3$  [Gal11, Theorem III.1.2, 2.3, 5.1].

According to [ABDG98] and [FL20], we define spaces of vector potentials. Let  $H(\text{div}, \Omega) = \{u \in L^2(\Omega) \mid \nabla \cdot u \in L^2(\Omega)\}$  and  $H(\text{curl}, \Omega) = \{u \in L^2(\Omega) \mid \nabla \times u \in L^2(\Omega)\}$ . By the trace operator  $T : H^1(\Omega) \ni \varphi \mapsto T\varphi \in H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)$ , the tangential trace  $u \times n$  for  $u \in H(\text{curl}, \Omega)$  and the normal trace  $u \cdot n$  for  $u \in H(\text{div}, \Omega)$  are defined as elements in  $H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega) = H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)^*$  in the sense that

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle u \times n, \xi \rangle_{\partial\Omega} &= \int_{\Omega} \nabla \times u \cdot \xi dx - \int_{\Omega} u \cdot \nabla \times \xi dx, \\ \langle u \cdot n, \varphi \rangle_{\partial\Omega} &= \int_{\Omega} u \cdot \nabla \varphi dx + \int_{\Omega} \nabla \cdot u \varphi dx, \end{aligned}$$

for  $\xi, \varphi \in H^1(\Omega)$ . Here,  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\partial\Omega}$  denotes the duality pairing between  $H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega)$  and  $H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)$ . The traces can be defined also in the  $L^p$  setting [FL20]. Let  $X(\Omega) = H(\operatorname{div}, \Omega) \cap H(\operatorname{curl}, \Omega)$ . Let  $X_N(\Omega) = \{u \in X(\Omega) \mid u \times n = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}$  and  $X_T(\Omega) = \{u \in X(\Omega) \mid u \cdot n = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}$ . When  $\Omega$  is  $C^{1,1}$  or convex,  $X_N(\Omega)$  and  $X_T(\Omega)$  continuously embed into  $H^1(\Omega)$  [ABDG98, Theorems 2.9, 2.12, 2.17], i.e.

$$(2.3) \quad X_N(\Omega), X_T(\Omega) \subset H^1(\Omega).$$

When  $\Omega$  is Lipschitz,  $X_N(\Omega)$  and  $X_T(\Omega)$  continuously embed into  $H^s(\Omega)$  for some  $s > 1/2$  and compactly embed into  $L^2(\Omega)$  [ABDG98, Proposition 3.7, Theorem 2.8]. We set  $K_N(\Omega) = \{u \in X_N(\Omega) \mid \nabla \times u = 0, \nabla \cdot u = 0 \text{ in } \Omega\}$  and  $K_T(\Omega) = \{u \in X_T(\Omega) \mid \nabla \times u = 0, \nabla \cdot u = 0 \text{ in } \Omega\}$ . For a simply connected domain  $\Omega$  with connected  $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_I$  of  $\partial\Omega$ ,  $\dim K_T(\Omega) = 0$  and  $\dim K_N(\Omega) = I$  [ABDG98, Propositions 3.14, 3.18].

For  $B \in L^2_{\sigma}(\Omega)$ , there exists a unique  $A \in X_N(\Omega)$  such that  $\nabla \cdot A = 0$  in  $\Omega$  and  $\int_{\Gamma_i} A \cdot n dH = 0$  for  $1 \leq i \leq I$  [ABDG98, Theorem 3.17]. We denote such  $A$  by  $A = \operatorname{curl}^{-1} B$ . Magnetic helicity in a simply connected domain is gauge invariant in the sense that

$$\int_{\Omega} \tilde{A} \cdot B dx = \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{curl}^{-1} B \cdot B dx,$$

for any vector potential  $\tilde{A}$  such that  $\nabla \times \tilde{A} = B$ . We use the integrand  $\operatorname{curl}^{-1} B \cdot B$  for the magnetic helicity.

**2.2. Rayleigh's formulas.** We recall the fact that the rotation operator  $S = \nabla \times$  is a self-adjoint operator on  $L^2_{\sigma}(\Omega)$  [YG90, Theorem 1.1]. Let  $D(S) = \{u \in L^2_{\sigma}(\Omega) \mid Su \in L^2_{\sigma}(\Omega)\}$  and  $Su = \nabla \times u$  for  $u \in D(S)$ . By the continuous embedding (2.3),  $u \times n \in H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)$  for  $u \in D(S) \subset H^1(\Omega)$ . The vector field  $u$  is irrotational on  $\partial\Omega$  for  $u \in D(S)$ , i.e.,  $d\alpha = 0$  for the dual 1-form  $\alpha$  of  $u$  on  $\partial\Omega$  and the exterior derivative  $d$ . Thus there exists a 0-form  $\phi \in H^{3/2}(\partial\Omega)$  such that  $\alpha = d\phi$ .

Let  $D(S^*)$  be a set of all  $v \in L^2_{\sigma}(\Omega)$  such that there exists some  $w \in L^2_{\sigma}(\Omega)$  such that  $(Su, v) = (u, w)$  for all  $u \in L^2_{\sigma}(\Omega)$ , where  $(\cdot, \cdot)$  is the inner product on  $L^2_{\sigma}(\Omega)$ . We set the adjoint operator by  $S^*v = w$  for  $v \in D(S^*)$ . For  $u, v \in D(S)$ , we denote by  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , dual 1-forms of  $u$  and  $v$  on  $\partial\Omega$ . Since  $\alpha = d\phi$  and  $d\beta = 0$ ,

$$d(\phi \wedge \beta) = d\phi \wedge \beta - \phi \wedge d\beta = d\phi \wedge \beta = \alpha \wedge \beta.$$

By Stokes's theorem,



$$\langle n \times u, v \rangle_{\partial\Omega} = \int_{\partial\Omega} u \times v \cdot n dH = \int_{\partial\Omega} \alpha \wedge \beta = \int_{\partial\Omega} d(\phi \wedge \beta) = 0.$$

This implies that  $(Su, v) = (u, Sv)$ ,  $u, v \in D(S)$  and  $D(S) \subset D(S^*)$  by (2.2)<sub>1</sub>. Thus  $S$  is a symmetric operator. For  $\tilde{u} \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ ,  $u = \mathbb{P}\tilde{u} \in D(S)$  since  $\nabla \times u = \nabla \times \tilde{u}$ . By  $(\nabla \times \tilde{u}, v) = (\tilde{u}, S^*v)$ ,  $\nabla \times v = S^*v \in L_\sigma^2(\Omega)$  and  $D(S^*) \subset D(S)$ . Thus  $S$  is a self-adjoint operator. The paper [YG90] assumes that  $\partial\Omega$  is smooth. The same result holds for domains with  $C^{1,1}$ -boundaries by the continuous embedding (2.3).

The operator  $S : L_\sigma^2(\Omega) \supset D(S) \rightarrow L_\sigma^2(\Omega)$  is injective since  $K_T(\Omega) = \emptyset$ . The operator  $S$  is surjective since for  $B \in L_\sigma^2(\Omega)$ , there exists a unique  $\hat{A} \in X_T(\Omega)$  such that  $\nabla \times \hat{A} = B$ ,  $\nabla \cdot \hat{A} = 0$  in  $\Omega$  [ABDG98, Theorem 3.12], i.e.,  $\hat{A} \in D(S)$ . The inverse operator  $S^{-1} : L_\sigma^2(\Omega) \ni B \mapsto \hat{A} \in D(S)$  is compact by (2.3). Thus eigenvalues are countable real numbers. Each eigenfunction space is finite dimensional by the Fredholm alternative and there exist eigenfunctions  $\{\mathbf{B}_j\}$  making a complete orthonormal basis on  $L_\sigma^2(\Omega)$ . They provide eigenvalues  $\{\lambda_j\}$  and eigenfunctions  $\{\mathbf{B}_j\}$  of the operator  $S$ .

We label  $\{\mathbf{B}_j\}$  according to multiplicity of  $\{\lambda_j\}$  so that each eigenvalue  $\lambda_j$  corresponds to one eigenfunction  $\mathbf{B}_j$ . We also denote  $\{\lambda_j\}$  by  $\dots < f_2^- \leq f_1^- < 0 < f_1^+ \leq f_2^+ < \dots$ . The eigenfunction  $\mathbf{B}_j$  and  $\mathbf{A}_j = \text{curl}^{-1}B_j$  satisfy

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathbf{A}_j \cdot \mathbf{B}_k dx = \frac{1}{\lambda_k} \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{A}_j \cdot \nabla \times \mathbf{B}_k dx = \frac{1}{\lambda_k} \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{B}_j \cdot \mathbf{B}_k dx = \frac{1}{\lambda_k} \delta_{j,k}.$$

The expansion of  $B \in L_\sigma^2(\Omega)$  and  $A = \text{curl}^{-1}B$  are

$$B = \sum_j c_j \mathbf{B}_j, \quad c_j = \int_{\Omega} B \cdot \mathbf{B}_j dx, \quad A = \sum_j c_j \mathbf{A}_j.$$

Magnetic helicity of  $B$  is expressed as

$$\int_{\Omega} A \cdot B dx = \sum_j \frac{1}{\lambda_j} c_j^2 = \sum_j \frac{1}{f_j^+} c_j^2 + \sum_j \frac{1}{f_j^-} c_j^2.$$

This helicity expansion yields the best constants for Arnold's inequalities [AK98, p.122]

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} A \cdot B dx &\leq \frac{1}{f_1^+} \int_{\Omega} |B|^2 dx, \\ - \int_{\Omega} A \cdot B dx &\leq \frac{1}{-f_1^-} \int_{\Omega} |B|^2 dx, \end{aligned}$$

for  $B \in L_\sigma^2(\Omega)$  and  $A = \text{curl}^{-1}B$ . The equalities hold for eigenfunctions associated with  $f_1^+$  and  $f_1^-$ . Thus normalization implies Rayleigh's formulas

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} f_1^+ &= \inf \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |B|^2 dx \mid B \in L_{\sigma}^2(\Omega), \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{curl}^{-1} B \cdot B dx = 1 \right\}, \\ -f_1^- &= \inf \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |B|^2 dx \mid B \in L_{\sigma}^2(\Omega), \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{curl}^{-1} B \cdot B dx = -1 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

**Remark 2.1.** When  $\Omega$  is multiply connected, the rotation operator on  $L_{\sigma}^2(\Omega)$  is not self-adjoint. Its spectrum is the point spectrum and agrees with all complex numbers [YG90, Theorem 2]. When  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3$ , linear force-free fields do not exist in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$  since  $-\Delta U = f^2 U$  and the spectrum of the Laplace operator is the essential spectrum. Nevertheless, there exist linear force-free fields with highly nontrivial topology of magnetic field lines decaying by the order  $U = O(|x|^{-1})$  as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$  [EPS12], [EPS15]. It is known [Nad14], [CC15] that the conditions  $U \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)$ ,  $2 \leq q \leq 3$  or  $U = o(|x|^{-1})$  imply non-existence of force-free fields in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ .

**2.3. Woltjer's principle.** According to [LA91, p.1246], we consider Woltjer's principle with the constant  $h \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\mathcal{I}_h = \inf \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |B|^2 dx \mid B \in L_{\sigma}^2(\Omega), \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{curl}^{-1} B \cdot B dx = h \right\}.$$

We denote by  $\mathcal{S}_h$  the set of minimizers to  $\mathcal{I}_h$ . By the scaling  $B = |h|^{1/2} \tilde{B}$ ,

$$(2.6) \quad \mathcal{I}_h = \begin{cases} h\mathcal{I}_1 & h > 0, \\ -h\mathcal{I}_{-1} & h < 0, \\ 0 & h = 0, \end{cases} \quad \mathcal{S}_h = \begin{cases} h^{1/2}\mathcal{S}_1 & h > 0, \\ (-h)^{1/2}\mathcal{S}_{-1} & h < 0, \\ \emptyset & h = 0. \end{cases}$$

The minimum  $\mathcal{I}_h$  is Lipschitz continuous and additive for  $h \in \mathbb{R}$ . Rayleigh's formulas (2.5) are expressed in terms of the minimum as

$$(2.7) \quad f_1^+ = 2\mathcal{I}_1, \quad -f_1^- = 2\mathcal{I}_{-1}.$$

We will identify the set of minimizers  $\mathcal{S}_h$  with the set of a finite number of eigenfunctions associated with  $f_1^+$  for  $h > 0$  (resp.  $f_1^-$  for  $h < 0$ ) by using (2.7) and a Lagrange multiplier [Eva10, 8.4.1], cf. [LA91, p.1247].

**Proposition 2.2.** *Suppose that  $U \in L_{\sigma}^2(\Omega)$  is an eigenfunction of the rotation operator associated with the eigenvalue  $f_1^+$  (resp.  $f_1^-$ ) with helicity 1 (resp.  $-1$ ). Then,  $\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |U|^2 dx = \mathcal{I}_1$  (resp.  $\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |U|^2 dx = \mathcal{I}_{-1}$ ).*

*Proof.* By the formulas (2.7),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |U|^2 dx &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} U \cdot \nabla \times (\operatorname{curl}^{-1} U) dx = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \nabla \times U \cdot \operatorname{curl}^{-1} U dx \\ &= \frac{f_1^+}{2} \int_{\Omega} U \cdot \operatorname{curl}^{-1} U dx = \mathcal{I}_1. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Proposition 2.3.** *Suppose that  $U \in L^2_\sigma(\Omega)$  satisfies  $\frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega |U|^2 dx = \mathcal{I}_1$  with helicity 1 (resp.  $\frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega |U|^2 dx = \mathcal{I}_{-1}$  with helicity  $-1$ ). Then,  $U$  is an eigenfunction of the rotation operator for the eigenvalue  $f_1^+$  (resp.  $f_1^-$ ).*

*Proof.* By  $\int_\Omega \text{curl}^{-1} U \cdot U dx = 1$ , there exists  $U_0 \in L^2_\sigma(\Omega)$  such that  $\int_\Omega \text{curl}^{-1} U \cdot U_0 dx \neq 0$ . We take an arbitrary  $\tilde{U} \in L^2_\sigma(\Omega)$  and set

$$j(\tau, s) = \int_\Omega \text{curl}^{-1}(U + \tau\tilde{U} + sU_0) \cdot (U + \tau\tilde{U} + sU_0) dx.$$

The function  $j(\tau, s)$  satisfies  $j(0, 0) = 1$  and

$$\frac{\partial j}{\partial s}(0, 0) = 2 \int_\Omega \text{curl}^{-1} U \cdot U_0 dx \neq 0.$$

By the implicit function theorem, there exists a  $C^1$ -function  $s = s(\tau)$  such that  $j(\tau, s(\tau)) = 1$  for sufficiently small  $|\tau|$ . By differentiating this by  $\tau$ ,  $\dot{s}(0) = -\partial_\tau j(0, 0) / \partial_s j(0, 0)$ . Since  $U$  is a minimizer,

$$0 = \frac{d}{d\tau} \int_\Omega |U + \tau\tilde{U} + s(\tau)U_0|^2 dx \Big|_{\tau=0} = 2 \int_\Omega U \cdot (\tilde{U} + \dot{s}(0)U_0) dx.$$

By substituting  $\dot{s}(0)$  into the above,

$$\int_\Omega (U - f \text{curl}^{-1} U) \cdot \tilde{U} dx = 0, \quad f = \frac{\int_\Omega U_0 \cdot U dx}{\int_\Omega \text{curl}^{-1} U_0 \cdot U dx}.$$

Since  $\tilde{U} \in L^2_\sigma(\Omega)$  is arbitrary, by (2.1) there exists some  $q$  such that  $U - f \text{curl}^{-1} U = \nabla q$ . Thus  $\nabla \times U = fU$ . By Rayleigh's formulas (2.7),

$$f_1^+ = 2\mathcal{I}_1 = \int_\Omega |U|^2 dx = \int_\Omega U \cdot \nabla \times (\text{curl}^{-1} U) dx = f \int_\Omega U \cdot \text{curl}^{-1} U dx = f.$$

Hence  $U$  is an eigenfunction for the eigenvalue  $f_1^+$ . □

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $\{U_j^+\}_{j=1}^{N^+}$  (resp.  $\{U_j^-\}_{j=1}^{N^-}$ ) be eigenfunctions of the rotation operator associated with the eigenvalues  $f_1^+$  with helicity  $h > 0$  (resp.  $f_1^-$  with helicity  $h < 0$ ). Then,*

$$(2.8) \quad \mathcal{S}_h = \begin{cases} \{U_j^+\}_{j=1}^{N^+} & h > 0, \\ \{U_j^-\}_{j=1}^{N^-} & h < 0, \\ \emptyset & h = 0. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* By Propositions 2.2 and 2.3,

$$\mathcal{S}_1 = \left\{ U \in L^2_\sigma(\Omega) \mid \nabla \times U = f_1^+ U, \int_\Omega \text{curl}^{-1} U \cdot U dx = 1 \right\}.$$

The multiplicity  $N^+$  of  $f_1^+$  is finite and the right-hand side consists of finite elements. By scaling (2.6), (2.8)<sub>1</sub> follows. The same argument applies to the case  $h < 0$ .  $\square$

**Remark 2.5.** (Taylor states) Lemma 2.4 characterizes the lowest energy linear force-free fields of (1.3) (Taylor states) in a simply connected domain as eigenfunctions of the rotation operator associated with the principal eigenvalues. For multiply connected domains, neither Woltjer's principle nor Taylor states seem known; cf. [LA91, p.1245], [YG90, Theorem 2].

The original application of Taylor's theory was for a periodic cylinder  $\Omega = D \times [0, L]$ , where  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  is a disk and  $L > 0$ . This domain has a nontrivial 1D de Rham cohomology group due to the harmonic vector field  $e_z$  and is simpler than multiply connected domains. Taylor states are computed in [Rei80] without variational principle by using explicit solutions given by Bessel functions of the first kind under the flux condition for  $\int_D B \cdot ndx'$ ; see also [Bis93, 9.1.1] and [Yea20, Example 2.3]. It is known that for a given (sufficiently large) helicity, there exist multiple axisymmetric linear force-free fields of (1.3). The Taylor state is axisymmetric for small helicity. As helicity increases and reaches a certain value, bifurcation occurs and after that, the Taylor state remains helical.

**2.4. Minimizing sequences.** To prove the stability of the set  $\mathcal{S}_h$ , we use compactness of minimizing sequences.

**Lemma 2.6.** *Let  $h \in \mathbb{R}$ . For a sequence  $\{B_n\} \subset L^2_\sigma(\Omega)$  satisfying  $\frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega |B_n|^2 dx \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_h$  and  $\int_\Omega \text{curl}^{-1} B_n \cdot B_n dx \rightarrow h$ , there exist  $\{n_k\}$  and  $B \in \mathcal{S}_h$  such that  $B_{n_k} \rightarrow B$  in  $L^2(\Omega)$ .*

*Proof.* By (2.3) and the Rellich–Kondrakov theorem, there exists a subsequence (still denoted by  $\{B_n\}$ ) and  $B \in L^2_\sigma(\Omega)$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} B_n &\rightharpoonup B \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega), \\ A_n = \text{curl}^{-1} B_n &\rightarrow A = \text{curl}^{-1} B \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega). \end{aligned}$$

They imply that

$$\left| \int_\Omega (A_n \cdot B_n - A \cdot B) dx \right| \leq \|A_n - A\|_{L^2} \sup_n \|B_n\|_{L^2} + \left| \int_\Omega (A \cdot B_n - A \cdot B) dx \right| \rightarrow 0.$$

By  $\int_\Omega A \cdot B dx = h$  and

$$\mathcal{I}_h \leq \int_\Omega |B|^2 dx \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_\Omega |B_n|^2 dx = \mathcal{I}_h,$$

we conclude that  $B \in \mathcal{S}_h$  and  $B_n \rightarrow B$  in  $L^2(\Omega)$ .  $\square$

For application to stability, we state Lemma 2.6 in terms of total energy.

**Theorem 2.7.** *Let  $h \in \mathbb{R}$ . For a sequence  $\{(u_n, B_n)\} \subset L^2_\sigma(\Omega)$  satisfying  $\frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega (|u_n|^2 + |B_n|^2) dx \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_h$  and  $\int_\Omega \text{curl}^{-1} B_n \cdot B_n dx \rightarrow h$ . There exist  $\{n_k\} \subset \mathbb{N}$  and  $B \in \mathcal{S}_h$  such that  $(u_{n_k}, B_{n_k}) \rightarrow (0, B)$  in  $L^2(\Omega)$ .*

*Proof.* For  $h_n = \int_\Omega \text{curl}^{-1} B_n \cdot B_n dx$ ,

$$\mathcal{I}_{h_n} \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega |B_n|^2 dx \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega (|u_n|^2 + |B_n|^2) dx.$$

Since  $\mathcal{I}_h$  is continuous for  $h \in \mathbb{R}$ , letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  implies that

$$\int_\Omega |B_n|^2 dx \rightarrow I_h, \quad \int_\Omega |u_n|^2 dx \rightarrow 0.$$

We apply Lemma 2.6 and conclude.  $\square$

**Remark 2.8.** The assertion of Lemma 2.6 holds even for domains with Lipschitz boundaries since the embedding from  $X_N(\Omega)$  into  $L^2(\Omega)$  is compact. (The  $C^1$ -regularity is assumed in [LA91, p.1247]). The paper [LA91] also studies minimization with an inhomogeneous boundary condition by using relative helicity [BF84], [JC84], [FA85].

**2.5. Leray–Hopf solutions.** To prove stability of force-free fields in weak ideal limits (Theorem 1.1), we recall definitions of Leray–Hopf solutions to (1.1)–(1.2) [FL20, p.716], [GLBL06, p.60] and of their weak ideal limits [FL20, p.709]. The existence of Leray–Hopf solutions has been demonstrated for simply connected domains in [DL72], [ST83, p.647], [GLBL06, p.60], and [FL20, Theorem 2.1] and for multiply connected domains in [FL20, Appendix A].

**Definition 2.9** (Leray–Hopf solutions). Let  $u_0, B_0 \in L^2_\sigma(\Omega)$ . Let

$$u \in C_w([0, T]; L^2_\sigma(\Omega)) \cap L^2(0, T; H^1_0(\Omega)), \quad B \in C_w([0, T]; L^2_\sigma(\Omega)) \cap L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega)).$$

Suppose that  $u_t \in L^1(0, T; (L^2_\sigma \cap H^1_0)(\Omega)^*)$ ,  $B_t \in L^1(0, T; (L^2_\sigma \cap H^1)(\Omega)^*)$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u_t, \xi \rangle + \int_\Omega (u \cdot \nabla u - B \cdot \nabla B) \cdot \xi dx + \nu \int_\Omega \nabla u : \nabla \xi dx &= 0, \\ \langle B_t, \zeta \rangle + \int_\Omega (B \times u) \cdot \nabla \times \zeta dx + \mu \int_\Omega \nabla \times B \cdot \nabla \times \zeta dx &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

for a.e.  $t \in [0, T]$  and every  $\xi \in L^2_\sigma \cap H^1_0(\Omega)$ ,  $\zeta \in L^2_\sigma \cap H^1(\Omega)$ . Suppose furthermore that  $(u(\cdot, 0), B(\cdot, 0)) = (u_0, B_0)$  and

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} (|u|^2 + |B|^2) dx + \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} (\nu |\nabla u|^2 + \mu |\nabla B|^2) dx ds \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} (|u_0|^2 + |B_0|^2) dx,$$

for all  $t \in [0, T]$ . Then, we call  $(u, B)$  Leray–Hopf solutions to (1.1)–(1.2).

**Theorem 2.10.** *There exists a Leray–Hopf solution to (1.1)–(1.2).*

**Definition 2.11** (Weak ideal limits). Let  $(u_j, B_j)$  be a Leray–Hopf solution to (1.1)–(1.2) for  $\nu_j, \mu_j > 0$  and  $(u_{0,j}, B_{0,j})$  such that  $(u_{0,j}, B_{0,j}) \rightharpoonup (u_0, B_0)$  in  $L^2(\Omega)$  as  $(\nu_j, \mu_j) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ . Assume that

$$(u_j, B_j) \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} (u, B) \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega)).$$

Then, we call  $(u, B)$  a weak ideal limit of  $(u_j, B_j)$ . If instead  $\nu_j = \nu > 0$  for every  $j$  and  $\mu_j \rightarrow 0$ , we call  $(u, B)$  a weak nonresistive limit of  $(u_j, B_j)$ .

By the equation (1.1)<sub>2</sub>, the vector potential  $A = \text{curl}^{-1} B$  and some potential  $Q$  satisfy

$$(2.9) \quad A_t + B \times u + \nabla Q = -\mu \nabla \times B.$$

For smooth solutions, the equality of magnetic helicity (1.12) follows by multiplying  $B$  by (2.9) and  $A$  by (1.1)<sub>2</sub>, respectively, and integration by parts. The equality (1.12) for Leray–Hopf solutions for all  $t \in [0, T]$  is proved in [FL20, Lemma 4.5] by an approximation argument for the time variable.

**2.6. Weak ideal limits.** We state magnetic helicity conservation at weak ideal limits [FL20, Theorem 1.2] in terms of the vector potential  $\text{curl}^{-1} B$ .

**Theorem 2.12.** *Suppose that  $(u, B)$  is a weak ideal limit of Leray–Hopf solutions to (1.1)–(1.2). Then,*

$$(2.10) \quad \int_{\Omega} \text{curl}^{-1} B \cdot B dx = \int_{\Omega} \text{curl}^{-1} B_0 \cdot B_0 dx,$$

for a.e.  $t \in [0, T]$ .

**Theorem 2.13.** *There exists a weak ideal limit  $(u, B)$  of Leray–Hopf solutions to (1.1)–(1.2) for  $(u_0, B_0) \in L^2_\sigma(\Omega)$  satisfying (2.10) and*

$$\int_{\Omega} (|u|^2 + |B|^2) dx \leq \int_{\Omega} (|u_0|^2 + |B_0|^2) dx,$$

for a.e.  $t \in [0, T]$ .

*Proof.* By Theorems 2.10, 2.12 and lower semi-continuity of the norm for the weak-star convergence in  $L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$ , the assertion follows.  $\square$

**Remark 2.14.** When  $\Omega$  is multiply connected, helicity conservation at weak ideal limits is demonstrated in [FLMV22] by using a gauge-invariant definition of magnetic helicity [MV19], cf. [FL20]. (The boundary regularity is reduced from  $C^{1,1}$  to Lipschitz in [MV19].)

The proof of Theorem 2.12 is based on the following approximation lemma and the Aubin–Lions lemma [FL20, Lemmas 2.10, 2.12], [HvNVW16, Proposition 1.2.32]. We state these lemmas for the later usage in Sections 6 and 7.

Let  $X$  be a Banach space. Let  $0 < \delta < T/2$ . Let  $g \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  satisfy  $\text{spt } g \in (-\delta, \delta)$ . For  $f \in L^1(0, T; X)$ , we denote the convolution in  $(0, T)$  by  $f * g = \int_0^T f(s)g(t-s)ds \in C^\infty((\delta, T-\delta); X)$ . For  $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  satisfying  $\text{spt } \chi \in (-1, 1)$  and  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi dt = 1$ , we set  $\chi^\varepsilon(t) = \varepsilon^{-1}\chi(\varepsilon^{-1}t)$  for  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $f^\varepsilon = f * \chi^\varepsilon$ .

**Lemma 2.15.** *Let  $0 < \delta < T/2$  and  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . For  $f \in L^p(0, T; X)$ ,  $f^\varepsilon \rightarrow f$  in  $L^p(\delta, T - \delta; X)$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ .*

**Lemma 2.16** (Aubin–Lions lemma). *Let  $X, Y$ , and  $Z$  be reflexive Banach spaces such that  $X$  embeds compactly into  $Y$  and  $Y$  embeds into  $Z$ . Let  $1 < p < \infty$  and  $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ . The space  $\{A \in L^p(0, T; X) \mid A_t \in L^q(0, T; Z)\}$  embeds compactly into  $L^p(0, T; Y)$ .*

A key part of the proof of Theorem 2.12 for a simply connected domain is the strong convergence of the vector potential

$$A_j = \text{curl}^{-1} B_j \rightarrow A = \text{curl}^{-1} B \quad \text{in } L_{\text{loc}}^2(0, T; L^2(\Omega)),$$

for Leray–Hopf solutions  $(u_j, B_j)$  and the weak ideal limit  $(u, B)$  by application of the Aubin–Lions lemma. This convergence implies (2.10) by letting  $j \rightarrow \infty$  to the equality (1.12). To apply the Aubin–Lions lemma, the paper [FL20] showed a uniform bound

$$\sup_j \|\partial_t A_j^{\varepsilon_j}\|_{L^2(\delta, T-\delta; (L_\sigma^2 \cap W_0^{1,4})(\Omega)^*)} < \infty.$$

This uniform bound is demonstrated by the equation (2.9) and the Sobolev embedding  $W_0^{1,4}(\Omega) \subset L^\infty(\Omega)$ . The vector potential  $A_j$  is approximated by  $A_j^{\varepsilon_j}$  with  $\varepsilon_j > 0$  to deduce (2.9) from the definition of Leray–Hopf solutions (Definition 2.9).

**Remark 2.17** (2D case). For 2D bounded and multiply connected domains, magnetic mean-square potential conservation at weak ideal limits of Leray–Hopf solutions is demonstrated in [FL20, Theorem 5.4]. For a simply connected domain, there exist a flux function  $\phi$  and a stream function  $\psi$  vanishing on  $\partial\Omega$  such that  $B = \nabla^\perp \phi$  and  $u = \nabla^\perp \psi$  for  $\nabla^\perp = {}^t(\partial_{x_2}, -\partial_{x_1})$ . An equivalent equation to (1.1)<sub>2</sub> in this setting is

$$\phi_t + u \cdot \nabla \phi = \mu \Delta \phi.$$

Leray–Hopf solutions satisfy this equation on  $L^2(\Omega)$  for a.e.  $t \in [0, T]$ , and by integration by parts, the equality

$$\int_{\Omega} |\phi|^2 dx + 2\mu \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \phi|^2 dx ds = \int_{\Omega} |\phi_0|^2 dx,$$

holds for  $t \in [0, T]$ . The paper [FL20] showed a uniform bound

$$\sup_j \|\partial_t \phi_j\|_{L^1(0, T; H_0^1(\Omega)^*)} < \infty,$$

by applying the Hardy space theory of compensated compactness of Coifmann et al. [CLMS93] and Fefferman’s  $\mathcal{H}^1$  – BMO duality [FS72] for the zero extension of  $(u, B)$  to  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . The uniform bound implies the strong convergence

$$\phi_j \rightarrow \phi \quad \text{in } L^2(0, T; L^2(\Omega)),$$

and that the limit  $\phi$  is a distributional solution to the transport equation

$$\phi_t + u \cdot \nabla \phi = 0.$$

It is remarked that the convergence of  $\phi_j$  implies  $\phi_j^2 \rightarrow \phi^2$  in  $L^2(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$  by the uniform bound of  $\nabla \phi_j \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$ , and the limit  $\phi^2$  satisfies the equation  $\partial_t \phi^2 + u \cdot \nabla \phi^2 = 0$  in the distributional sense. Magnetic mean-square potential conservation at weak ideal limits follows by integrating this equation in time. The paper [FL20, Lemma 5.7] showed magnetic mean-square potential conservation more generally for any transport equation solutions under the condition  $u \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$  and  $\nabla \phi \in C_w([0, T]; L^2(\Omega))$  by an approximation argument for spatial and time variables, cf. [DL89], [AC14].

**2.7. Application to stability.** Theorems 2.7 and 2.13 imply the stability of the set of minimizers  $\mathcal{S}_h$ .

**Proposition 2.18.** *Let  $h \in \mathbb{R}$ . Let  $\mathcal{S}_h$  be as in (2.6). For  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that for  $u_0, B_0 \in L^2_\sigma(\Omega)$  satisfying*

$$\|u_0\|_{L^2} + \inf_{U \in \mathcal{S}_h} \|B_0 - U\|_{L^2} + \left| \int_{\Omega} \text{curl}^{-1} B_0 \cdot B_0 dx - h \right| \leq \delta,$$

*there exists a weak ideal limit  $(u, B)$  of Leray–Hopf solutions to (1.1)–(1.2) for  $(u_0, B_0)$  such that*

$$\text{ess sup}_{t>0} \left\{ \|u\|_{L^2} + \inf_{U \in \mathcal{S}_h} \|B - U\|_{L^2} \right\} \leq \varepsilon.$$



*Proof.* We argue by contradiction. Suppose that the assertion were false. Then there exists some  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  such that for any  $n \geq 1$ , there exists  $u_{0,n}, B_{0,n} \in L^2_\sigma(\Omega)$  such that

$$\|u_{0,n}\|_{L^2} + \inf_{U \in \mathcal{S}_h} \|B_{0,n} - U\|_{L^2} + \left| \int_\Omega \operatorname{curl}^{-1} B_{0,n} \cdot B_{0,n} dx - h \right| \leq \frac{1}{n},$$

and the weak ideal limit  $(u_n, B_n)$  of Leray–Hopf solutions in Theorem 2.13 satisfying

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t>0} \left\{ \|u_n\|_{L^2} + \inf_{U \in \mathcal{S}_h} \|B_n - U\|_{L^2} \right\} \geq \varepsilon_0 > 0.$$

We denote by  $F_n$  the set of all points  $t \in (0, \infty)$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega (|u_n|^2 + |B_n|^2) dx &\leq \int_\Omega (|u_{0,n}|^2 + |B_{0,n}|^2) dx, \\ \int_\Omega \operatorname{curl}^{-1} B_n \cdot B_n dx &= \int_\Omega \operatorname{curl}^{-1} B_{0,n} \cdot B_{0,n} dx. \end{aligned}$$

The set  $F_n^c = (0, \infty) \setminus F_n$  has measure zero. For  $F = \bigcap_{n=1}^\infty F_n$ ,  $F^c$  has measure zero and the above inequalities hold for all  $t \in F$  and  $n \geq 1$ . We take a point  $t_n \in F$  such that

$$\|u_n\|_{L^2}(t_n) + \inf_{U \in \mathcal{S}_h} \|B_n - U\|_{L^2}(t_n) \geq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}.$$

We write  $(u_n, B_n) = (u_n, B_n)(\cdot, t_n)$  by suppressing  $t_n$ . For  $h_n = \int_\Omega \operatorname{curl}^{-1} B_{0,n} \cdot B_{0,n} dx$ ,

$$\mathcal{I}_{h_n} \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega |B_{0,n}|^2 dx \leq \frac{1}{2} \left( \inf_{U \in \mathcal{S}_h} \|B_{0,n} - U\|_{L^2} + \sqrt{2} \mathcal{I}_h^{1/2} \right)^2.$$

By continuity of  $\mathcal{I}_h$  for  $h \in \mathbb{R}$ , letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  implies that

$$\begin{aligned} h_n &\rightarrow h, \\ \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega (|u_{0,n}|^2 + |B_{0,n}|^2) dx &\rightarrow \mathcal{I}_h. \end{aligned}$$

By helicity conservation and nonincreasing total energy,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega \operatorname{curl}^{-1} B_n \cdot B_n dx &= \int_\Omega \operatorname{curl}^{-1} B_{0,n} \cdot B_{0,n} dx = h_n, \\ \mathcal{I}_{h_n} &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega (|u_n|^2 + |B_n|^2) dx \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega (|u_{0,n}|^2 + |B_{0,n}|^2) dx, \end{aligned}$$

letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  implies that

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} (|u_n|^2 + |B_n|^2) dx \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_h.$$

By Theorem 2.7, there exists a subsequence (still denoted by  $\{(u_n, B_n)\}$ ) and some  $B \in \mathcal{S}_h$  such that  $(u_n, B_n) \rightarrow (0, B)$  in  $L^2(\Omega)$ . Thus

$$0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{\|u_n\|_{L^2} + \|B_n - B\|_{L^2}\} \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \|u_n\|_{L^2} + \inf_{U \in \mathcal{S}_h} \|B_n - U\|_{L^2} \right\} \geq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} > 0.$$

We obtained a contradiction. The proof is complete.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* By the characterization of  $\mathcal{S}_h$  in Lemma 2.4, we deduce Theorem 1.1 from Proposition 2.18.  $\square$

**Remark 2.19.** It is emphasized that Theorem 1.1 is stability of a set of minimizers  $\{U_j\}_{j=1}^N$  for  $N \geq 2$ . For symmetric elliptic operators, the principal eigenvalue is simple, i.e.  $N = 1$ , thanks to the strong maximum principle, e.g., [Eva10, 6.5.1]. On the other hand, two Taylor states can exist for a periodic cylinder due to the bifurcation as noted in Remark 2.5.

**Remark 2.20.** It is observed from the proof of Theorem 1.1 that the same stability result holds for weak nonresistive limits of Leray–Hopf solutions (decreasing total energy) by their magnetic helicity conservation [FL20, Theorem 1.5]. The stability also holds for unique strong solutions to ideal MHD and nonresistive MHD up to maximal existence time.

### 3. NONLINEAR FORCE-FREE FIELDS

We apply Clebsch representation for axisymmetric solenoidal vector fields in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$  and their vector potential, and define generalized magnetic helicity (1.10) and generalized magnetic mean-square potential (1.14) with the function  $\phi_\infty = r^2 + \gamma$  for  $\gamma \geq 0$ .

**3.1. Clebsch representation.** Clebsch representation is a generalization of the stream (flux) function for 3D symmetric solenoidal vector fields. For translationally symmetric solenoidal vector fields  $b(x_1, x_2) = {}^t(b_1(x_1, x_2), b_2(x_1, x_2), b_3(x_1, x_2)) \in L^2_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^2)$ , Clebsch representation is

$$b(x_1, x_2) = \nabla \times (\phi(x_1, x_2) \nabla z) + G(x_1, x_2) \nabla z.$$

Here,  $\nabla = \nabla_x$  is gradient for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$  and  $z = x_3$ . We call  $\phi$  and  $G$  Clebsch potentials. The  $L^2$ -norm of  $b$  is

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |b|^2 dx' = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (|\nabla \phi|^2 + |G|^2) dx'.$$

The flux function  $\phi$  is unique up to constant. The 3-dimensional space  $L^2_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^2)$  is identified with the product space  $\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ . Clebsch representation of the vector potential of  $b$  is

$$a(x_1, x_2) = \nabla \times (\eta(x_1, x_2)\nabla z) + \phi(x_1, x_2)\nabla z,$$

where  $\eta$  is a solution of the Poisson equation  $-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2}\eta = G$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . The vector field  $a \in \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^2)$  is a unique potential such that  $\nabla \times a = b$  and  $\nabla \cdot a = 0$ .

We consider Clebsch representation for axisymmetric solenoidal vector fields  $b \in L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3) = \{b \in L^2_{\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3) \mid b : \text{axisymmetric}\}$ ,

$$(3.1) \quad b(x) = \nabla \times (\phi(z, r)\nabla\theta) + G(z, r)\nabla\theta.$$

Here,  $(r, \theta, z)$  is the polar coordinate. The  $L^2$ -norm of  $b$  is

$$(3.2) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |b|^2 dx = 2\pi \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} (|\nabla\phi|^2 + |G|^2) \frac{1}{r} dz dr.$$

Clebsch representation of the vector potential of  $b$  is

$$(3.3) \quad a(x) = \nabla \times (\eta(z, r)\nabla\theta) + \phi(z, r)\nabla\theta,$$

where  $\eta$  is a solution of the Dirichlet problem

$$(3.4) \quad -L\eta = G \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^2, \quad \eta = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^2,$$

for the operator  $L = \Delta_{z,r} - r^{-1}\partial_r$ . The Green function of this problem [FT81, p.4], [Fri82, p.472], [Šve, 19.1] is

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \eta(z, r) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathcal{G}(z, r, z', r') \frac{G(z', r')}{r'} dz' dr', \\ \mathcal{G}(z, r, z', r') &= \frac{rr'}{2\pi} \int_0^\pi \frac{\cos \theta d\theta}{\sqrt{|z - z'|^2 + r^2 + r'^2 - 2rr' \cos \theta}}. \end{aligned}$$

We denote (3.5)<sub>1</sub> by  $\eta = (-L)^{-1}G$ . The Green function can be estimated by asymptotic expansions of complete elliptic integrals of the first and the second kind, e.g., [Fri82]. Its higher-order estimates are derived in [FŠ15, Corollary 2.9] from the representation

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(z, r, z', r') &= \frac{\sqrt{rr'}}{2\pi} F(s), \quad s = \frac{|z - z'|^2 + |r - r'|^2}{rr'}, \\ F(s) &= \int_0^\pi \frac{\cos \theta}{\sqrt{2(1 - \cos \theta) + s}} d\theta. \end{aligned}$$

The function  $F(s)$  has the asymptotics  $F(s) = -(1/2) \log s + \log 8 - 2 + O(s \log s)$  as  $s \rightarrow 0$

and  $O(s^{-3/2})$  as  $s \rightarrow \infty$ . The  $k$ -th derivative  $F^{(k)}(s)$  is also estimated from the asymptotic expansion. They satisfy

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} F(s) &\lesssim \frac{1}{s^\tau}, \quad 0 < \tau \leq \frac{3}{2}, \\ F^{(k)}(s) &\lesssim \frac{1}{s^{k+\tau}}, \quad 0 \leq \tau \leq \frac{3}{2}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \end{aligned}$$

**3.2. The weighted Hilbert space.** Let  $L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})$  denote the weighted  $L^2$  space on the cross section  $\mathbb{R}_+^2 = \{(z, r) \mid z \in \mathbb{R}, r > 0\}$  with the measure  $r^{-1} dz dr$ . Let  $\dot{H}_0^1(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})$  denote the homogeneous  $L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})$ -Sobolev space of trace zero functions on  $\partial\mathbb{R}_+^2$ . We take the trace at  $r = 0$  in  $H_{\text{loc}}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R})$  by  $L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1}) \subset L_{\text{loc}}^2(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^2})$ . By the weighted Sobolev inequality [dVVS13, Lemma 3],

$$(3.8) \quad \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} |\phi|^p \frac{1}{r^{2+p/2}} dz dr \right)^{1/p} \leq C \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} |\nabla \phi|^2 \frac{1}{r} dz dr \right)^{1/2}, \quad 2 \leq p < \infty,$$

the space  $\dot{H}_0^1(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})$  continuously embeds into  $L^p(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-2-p/2})$ . Moreover, the Rellich–Kondrakov theorem holds in the weighted space [Abe22, Lemma 3.1], i.e.,

$$(3.9) \quad \dot{H}_0^1(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1}) \subset\subset L^p(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^2}; r^{-1}), \quad 1 \leq p < \infty.$$

The space  $\dot{H}_0^1(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})$  is a Hilbert space isometrically isomorphic to  $\dot{H}_{\text{axi}}^1(\mathbb{R}^5) = \{\varphi \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^5) \mid \varphi : \text{axisymmetric}\}$  [AF88, Lemma 2.2] by the transform

$$(3.10) \quad \phi(z, r) \mapsto \varphi(y) = \frac{\phi(z, r)}{r^2}, \quad y = {}^t(y_1, y'), \quad y_1 = z, \quad |y'| = r,$$

in the sense that

$$(3.11) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \nabla \phi \cdot \nabla \tilde{\phi} \frac{2\pi^2}{r} dz dr = \int_{\mathbb{R}^5} \nabla_y \varphi \cdot \nabla_y \tilde{\varphi} dy, \quad \varphi = \frac{\phi}{r^2}, \quad \tilde{\varphi} = \frac{\tilde{\phi}}{r^2}.$$

The inverse transform of (3.10) induces the isometries from  $L^1(\mathbb{R}^5)$  into  $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$  and from  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^5)$  into  $L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})$ , respectively, in the sense that

$$(3.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\phi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} &= \frac{1}{\pi} \|\varphi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^5)}, \\ \|\phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^5)}. \end{aligned}$$

We show the Poincaré inequality with the weighted measure for the later usage in Section 5.

**Proposition 3.1.** *There exists a constant  $C$  such that*

$$(3.13) \quad \int_{D(0,2R) \setminus D(0,R)} |\phi|^2 \frac{1}{r} dz dr \leq CR^2 \int_{D(0,2R) \setminus D(0,R)} |\nabla \phi|^2 \frac{1}{r} dz dr,$$

for  $\phi \in \dot{H}_0^1(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})$ , where  $D(0, R) = \{(z, r) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 \mid |z|^2 + r^2 < R^2\}$  and  $R > 0$ .

*Proof.* We reduce to the case  $R = 1$  by dilation. Suppose that (3.13) were false, then there exists a sequence  $\{\phi_n\} \subset \dot{H}_0^1(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})$  such that

$$\int_{D(0,2) \setminus D(0,1)} |\phi_n|^2 \frac{1}{r} dz dr = 1, \quad \int_{D(0,2) \setminus D(0,1)} |\nabla \phi_n|^2 \frac{1}{r} dz dr \rightarrow 0.$$

By the transform (3.10),  $\varphi_n = \phi_n / r^2$  satisfies

$$\int_{B(0,2) \setminus B(0,1)} |\nabla \varphi_n|^2 dy = \int_{D(0,2) \setminus D(0,1)} |\nabla \phi_n|^2 \frac{2\pi^2}{r} dz dr,$$

where  $B(0, R_0)$  denotes the open ball in  $\mathbb{R}^5$  centered at the origin with radius  $R_0 > 0$ . By the Rellich–Kondrakov theorem, there exist  $\{n_k\}$  and some axisymmetric  $\varphi$  such that  $\varphi_{n_k} \rightarrow \varphi$  in  $L^2(B(0, 2) \setminus B(0, 1))$ . Thus the function  $\phi = r^2 \varphi$  satisfies

$$\int_{D(0,2) \setminus D(0,1)} |\phi_{n_k} - \phi|^2 \frac{2\pi^2}{r} dz dr = \int_{B(0,2) \setminus B(0,1)} |\varphi_{n_k} - \varphi|^2 dy \rightarrow 0.$$

This implies that

$$\int_{D(0,2) \setminus D(0,1)} |\phi|^2 \frac{1}{r} dz dr = 1.$$

Since  $\nabla \phi = 0$  and  $\phi(z, 0) = 0$ , we have  $\phi \equiv 0$ . We obtained a contradiction.  $\square$

**Remark 3.2.** The weighted Sobolev inequality (3.8) holds also in a disk  $D(0, R)$ . For example,

$$(3.14) \quad \left( \int_{D(0,R)} |\phi|^{10/3} \frac{1}{r^{11/3}} dz dr \right)^{3/10} \leq C \left( \int_{D(0,R)} |\nabla \phi|^2 \frac{1}{r} dz dr \right)^{1/2},$$

holds for  $\phi \in \dot{H}_0^1(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})$ . The Poincaré inequality  $\|\phi\|_{L^2(D(0,1); r^{-1})} \leq C \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2(D(0,1); r^{-1})}$  can be demonstrated in a similar way as (3.13) and hence the homogeneous Sobolev inequality  $\|\varphi\|_{L^{10/3}(B(0,1))} \leq C \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2(B(0,1))}$  holds for  $\varphi \in \dot{H}_{\text{axi}}^1(\mathbb{R}^5)$  by the transform (3.10). The inverse transform of (3.10) and a dilation argument imply (3.14).

**3.3. Anisotropic estimates.** We demonstrate the Clebsch representation (3.1) and (3.3).

**Lemma 3.3.** *For  $b \in L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , there exist unique  $\phi \in \dot{H}_0^1(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})$  and  $G \in L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})$  such that (3.1) holds.*

*Proof.* For  $b \in L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , we set  $G(z, r) = r^2 b \cdot \nabla \theta$ . Then  $b - G \nabla \theta$  is axisymmetric without a swirl, and there exists an axisymmetric stream function  $\phi(z, r)$  such that  $b - G \nabla \theta = \nabla \times (\phi \nabla \theta)$ . The functions  $\nabla \phi$  and  $G$  belong to  $L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})$  by (3.2). For smooth  $b$ , we may assume that  $\phi(z, 0) = 0$  since  $\nabla \phi$  vanishes on  $\{r = 0\}$  by

$$rb = \nabla \phi \times r \nabla \theta + Gr \nabla \theta.$$

For general  $b \in L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , we take a sequence  $\{b_m\} \subset C^\infty \cap L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  such that  $b_m \rightarrow b$  in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . The potentials  $\phi_m \in \dot{H}_0^1(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})$  and  $G_m \in L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})$  of  $b_m$  satisfy

$$0 = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |b - b_m|^2 dx = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} (|\nabla(\phi - \phi_m)|^2 + |G - G_m|^2) \frac{2\pi}{r} dz dr.$$

Thus  $\phi(z, 0) = 0$ . The potentials  $\phi \in \dot{H}_0^1(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})$  and  $G \in L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})$  of (3.1) are unique by the trace condition at  $r = 0$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 3.4.** *For  $G \in L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})$ ,  $\eta = (-L)^{-1}G$  satisfies*

$$(3.15) \quad \|\nabla_{z,r} \eta\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})}(r) \lesssim r^{1/p+1/2} \|G\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})}, \quad r > 0, \quad 2 \leq p < \infty.$$

*Proof.* By the 1-dimensional convolution  $*_1$  for  $z$ -variable,

$$\nabla_{z,r} \eta(z, r) = \int_0^\infty \nabla_{z,r} \mathcal{G} *_1 G(\cdot, r') \frac{1}{r'} dr'.$$

By Young's inequality for  $1/p = 1/q - 1/2$ ,  $1 \leq q < 2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_{z,r} \eta\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})}(r) &\leq \int_0^\infty \|\nabla \mathcal{G}\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R})}(r, r') \|G\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \frac{1}{r'} dr' \\ &\leq \left( \int_0^\infty \|\nabla \mathcal{G}\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R})}^2(r, r') \frac{1}{r'} dr' \right)^{1/2} \|G\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})}. \end{aligned}$$

By the pointwise estimates (3.7),

$$|\nabla_{z,r} \mathcal{G}(z, r, z', r')| \lesssim \frac{1}{s^{1/2+\tau}} + \sqrt{\frac{r'}{r}} \frac{1}{s^{\tilde{\tau}}}, \quad 0 < \tau \leq \frac{3}{2}, \quad 0 \leq \tilde{\tau} \leq \frac{3}{2}.$$

By using

$$\left\| \frac{1}{s^\alpha} \right\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R})} = C \frac{(rr')^\alpha}{|r-r'|^{2\alpha-1/q}}, \quad \alpha > \frac{1}{2q},$$

we estimate

$$\|\nabla_{z,r}\mathcal{G}\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R})}^2(r,r') \lesssim \left( \frac{(rr')^{2\tau+1}}{|r-r'|^{4\tau+2-2/q}} + \frac{r'(rr')^{2\tilde{\tau}}}{r|r-r'|^{4\tilde{\tau}-2/q}} \right), \quad \frac{1}{2q} - \frac{1}{2} < \tau \leq \frac{3}{2}, \quad \frac{1}{2q} < \tilde{\tau} \leq \frac{3}{2}.$$

For  $1/(2q) - 1/2 < \tau \leq 3/2$ ,

$$\int_{\{|r-r'| < r/2\}} \frac{(rr')^{2\tau+1}}{|r-r'|^{4\tau+2-2/q}r'} dr' = Cr^{2/q}.$$

For  $1/q - 1/2 < \tau \leq 3/2$ ,

$$\int_{\{|r-r'| \geq r/2\}} \frac{(rr')^{2\tau+1}}{|r-r'|^{4\tau+2-2/q}r'} dr' = Cr^{2/q}.$$

Thus

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{(rr')^{2\tau+1}}{|r-r'|^{4\tau+2-2/q}r'} dr' = Cr^{2/q}.$$

By choosing different  $\tilde{\tau}$  in  $|r-r'| < r/2$  and in  $|r-r'| \geq r/2$  in a similar way,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{r'(rr')^{2\tilde{\tau}+1}}{|r-r'|^{4\tilde{\tau}-2/q}r'} dr' = Cr^{2/q}.$$

Thus (3.15) holds.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.5.** *The vector potential  $a \in L^6(\mathbb{R}^3)$  in (3.3) is a unique potential of  $b \in L^2_{\sigma,axi}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  such that  $\nabla \times a = b$  and  $\nabla \cdot a = 0$ .*

*Proof.* By (3.8) and (3.15),  $a$  is locally integrable in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  and  $\nabla \times a = b$  and  $\nabla \cdot a = 0$ . By  $\|\nabla a\|_{L^2} = \|\nabla \times a\|_{L^2} = \|b\|_{L^2}$  and Sobolev embedding,  $a$  belongs to  $L^6(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . The uniqueness follows from the Liouville theorem.  $\square$

**Remark 3.6.** The condition  $a \in L^6(\mathbb{R}^3)$  implies that  $\nabla_{z,r}\eta$  and  $\phi$  belong to  $L^6(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-5})$ . The weighted Sobolev inequality (3.8) implies more general properties  $\phi \in L^p(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-2-p/2})$  for  $2 \leq p < \infty$ , whereas (3.15) yields the weaker integrability for  $\nabla_{z,r}\eta$  at  $r = 0$  and  $r = \infty$ , i.e.,

$$\|\nabla_{z,r}\eta\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})}^p \frac{1}{r^{2+p/2}} \leq \frac{C}{r} \|G\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})}^p \quad r > 0.$$

The trace of  $\nabla_{z,r}\eta$  at  $r = 0$  vanishes on  $L^p(\mathbb{R})$  by (3.15).

**Remark 3.7.** The constant  $B_\infty = -2e_z$  can be expressed as  $B_\infty = -\nabla \times (\phi_\infty \nabla \theta)$  by the function  $\phi_\infty = r^2 + \gamma$  for any  $\gamma \geq 0$ . The Clebsch representation (3.1) and (3.3) imply those for  $B = b + B_\infty$  and its vector potential  $A$ ,

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{aligned} B &= \nabla \times (\Phi \nabla \theta) + G \nabla \theta, \\ A &= \nabla \times (\eta \nabla \theta) + \Phi \nabla \theta, \\ \Phi &= \phi - \phi_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

The (pseudo-)scaler  $A \cdot B$  is expressed as

$$A \cdot B = 2\Phi \frac{G}{r^2} + \nabla \cdot (\Phi \nabla \theta \times A).$$

**Proposition 3.8.** *Let  $1 < q < 3$  and  $1/p = 1/q - 1/3$ . For  $b \in L^q_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , there exists a unique  $a \in L^p_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^3)$  such that  $\nabla a \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)$  and  $\nabla \times a = b$ .*

*Proof.* For  $b \in C^\infty_{c,\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , we set  $a = E * (\nabla \times b)$  by the fundamental solution of the Laplace equation  $E(x) = (4\pi)^{-1}|x|^{-1}$  and the convolution  $*$  in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Then,  $\nabla \times a = b$  and  $\nabla \cdot a = 0$ . By the Calderon-Zygmund inequality for the Newton potential [GT01, Theorem 9.9] and the Sobolev inequality,

$$\|\nabla a\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \|a\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C \|b\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)}.$$

For  $b \in L^q_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , we take a sequence  $\{b_n\} \subset C^\infty_{c,\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  such that  $b_n \rightarrow b$  in  $L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . Then,  $a_n = E * (\nabla \times b_n) \rightarrow a$  in  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$  and  $\nabla a_n \rightarrow \nabla a$  in  $L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)$  for some  $a$  by the above inequality. The limit  $a$  satisfies the desired properties. The uniqueness follows from the Liouville theorem.  $\square$

**3.4. Generalized magnetic helicity.** We define generalized magnetic helicity (1.10) and generalized mean-square potential (1.14) for any axisymmetric solenoidal vector fields in  $L^2_{\sigma,\text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ .

**Proposition 3.9.** *Let  $1 \leq q < \infty$ . Let  $\phi_\infty = r^2 + \gamma$  and  $\gamma \geq 0$ . For  $\phi \in \dot{H}^1_0(\mathbb{R}^2_+; r^{-1})$ ,*

$$(3.17) \quad |\{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid \phi(x) > \phi_\infty\}| \lesssim \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2_+; r^{-1})}^2,$$

$$(3.18) \quad \|(\phi - \phi_\infty)_+\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^2_+; r^{-1})} \lesssim \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2_+; r^{-1})}^{4/3+2/(3q)},$$

$$(3.19) \quad \|(\phi - \phi_\infty)_+\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)} \lesssim \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2_+; r^{-1})}^{4/3+2/q},$$

where  $|\cdot|$  denotes the Lebesgue measure in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ .

*Proof.* By the weighted Sobolev inequality (3.8),

$$|\{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid \phi(x) > \phi_\infty\}| = \int_{\{\phi > \phi_\infty\}} dx = 2\pi \int_{\{\phi > \phi_\infty\}} \frac{1}{r} dz dr \leq 2\pi \int_{\{\phi > r^2\}} \phi^2 \frac{1}{r^3} dz dr \lesssim \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2_+; r^{-1})}^2.$$



Thus (3.17) holds. For  $1 \leq q < \infty$ , we set  $p = l + q$  and  $l = (q + 2)/3$  to estimate

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+^q \frac{1}{r} dz dr \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \phi^{l+q} \frac{1}{r^{2l+1}} dz dr = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \phi^p \frac{1}{r^{p/2+2}} dz dr \lesssim \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})}^p.$$

Thus (3.18) holds. Similarly, we set  $p = l + q$  and  $l = q/3 + 2$  to estimate

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+^q dx \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \phi^{q+l} \frac{1}{r^{2l-1}} dz dr = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \phi^p \frac{1}{r^{p/2+2}} dz dr \lesssim \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})}^p.$$

Thus (3.19) holds. □

**Lemma 3.10** (Arnold-type inequality).

$$(3.20) \quad \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+ G \frac{1}{r^2} dx \right| \lesssim \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |b|^2 dx \right)^{4/3},$$

$$(3.21) \quad \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+^2 dx \right| \lesssim \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |b|^2 dx \right)^{7/3},$$

for  $b = \nabla \times (\phi \nabla \theta) + G \nabla \theta \in L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ .

*Proof.* By Hölder's inequality, (3.18) and (3.2),

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\phi - \phi)_+ G \frac{1}{r^2} dx \right| &= 2\pi \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} (\phi - \phi)_+ G \frac{1}{r} dz dr \right| \leq 2\pi \|(\phi - \phi)_+\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})} \|G\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})} \\ &\lesssim \|b\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{8/3}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus (3.20) holds. The inequality (3.21) follows from (3.19) and (3.2). □

**Definition 3.11.** Let  $\phi_\infty = r^2 + \gamma$  and  $\gamma \geq 0$ . For  $v, b = \nabla \times (\phi \nabla \theta) + G \nabla \theta \in L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , we set

$$(3.22) \quad E[b] = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |b|^2 dx \quad (\text{magnetic energy}),$$

$$(3.23) \quad H_\gamma[b] = 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+ \frac{G}{r^2} dx \quad (\text{generalized magnetic helicity}),$$

$$(3.24) \quad M_\gamma[b] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+^2 dx \quad (\text{generalized magnetic mean-square potential}),$$

$$(3.25) \quad \mathcal{E}[v, b] = E[v] + E[b] \quad (\text{total energy}).$$

We denote by  $H[\cdot] = H_\gamma[\cdot]$  and  $M[\cdot] = M_\gamma[\cdot]$  by suppressing  $\gamma$ .

Magnetic helicity reflects direction of vector fields since  $\text{curl}^{-1} B \cdot B$  is a pseudo-scalar, i.e.,  $\text{curl}^{-1} \tilde{B} \cdot \tilde{B}(x) = -(\text{curl}^{-1} B \cdot B)(-x)$  for  $\tilde{B}(x) = B(-x)$ . A special property of generalized magnetic helicity is symmetry with respect to the  $\theta$ -component of axisymmetric solenoidal

vector fields.

**Proposition 3.12** (Symmetry of generalized magnetic helicity).

$$(3.26) \quad H[\nabla \times (\phi \nabla \theta) + G \nabla \theta] = -H[\nabla \times (\phi \nabla \theta) - G \nabla \theta]$$

for  $b = \nabla \times (\phi \nabla \theta) + G \nabla \theta \in L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ .

**Remark 3.13** (Gauge dependence). We will see in Section 6 that (3.23) and (3.24) are conserved for smooth solutions of ideal MHD (1.1) under the condition (1.7). The quantities (3.23) and (3.24) depend on the gauge  $\gamma \geq 0$  since the potential  $\phi_\infty = r^2 + \gamma$  of  $B_\infty = -e_z$  has freedom on the choice of  $\gamma$ .

**Remark 3.14.** Generalized magnetic helicity (3.23) and generalized magnetic mean-square potential (3.24) are also well-defined with  $\phi_\infty = Wr^2/2 + \gamma$ ,  $W > 0$ , and  $\gamma \geq 0$  for  $b \in L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ .

#### 4. THE VARIATIONAL PRINCIPLE

We develop the variational problem (1.13). Our goal is to demonstrate that the minimum (1.13) is symmetric and lower semi-continuous for  $h \in \mathbb{R}$  and increasing and strictly subadditive for  $|h|$  as stated in Lemma 4.10. We derive these properties from the presence of symmetric minimizers for  $z$ -variable by using the Steiner symmetrization. In the next section, we apply these properties of the minimum to demonstrate the compactness of (non-symmetric) minimizing sequences.

**4.1. Axisymmetric nonlinear force-free fields.** We set a variational problem and demonstrate that minimizers provide axisymmetric nonlinear force-free fields with discontinuous factors in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . We also show that flux functions of minimizers are non-negative solutions to the Grad–Shafranov equation.

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $h \in \mathbb{R}$ . Let  $\phi_\infty = r^2 + \gamma$  and  $\gamma \geq 0$ . Let  $E[\cdot]$  and  $H[\cdot]$  be as in (3.22) and (3.23). We set

$$(4.1) \quad I_{h, \gamma} = \inf \left\{ E[b] \mid b \in L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3), H[b] = h \right\},$$

$$(4.2) \quad S_{h, \gamma} = \left\{ b \in L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3) \mid E[b] = I_{h, \gamma}, H[b] = h \right\}.$$

We denote by  $I_h = I_{h, \gamma}$  and  $S_h = S_{h, \gamma}$  by suppressing  $\gamma$ .

**Proposition 4.2** (Lagrange multiplier). *Let  $h \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\gamma \geq 0$ . Let  $\phi_\infty = r^2 + \gamma$ . Let  $b = \nabla \times (\phi \nabla \theta) + G \nabla \theta \in L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  satisfy  $E[b] = I_h$  and  $H[b] = h$ . There exists a constant  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $G = \mu(\phi - \phi_\infty)_+$  and  $\phi \in \dot{H}_0^1(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})$  is a weak solution of*

$$(4.3) \quad -L\phi = \mu^2(\phi - \phi_\infty)_+ \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^2, \quad \phi = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^2,$$

in the sense that

$$(4.4) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \nabla \phi \cdot \nabla \tilde{\phi} \frac{1}{r} dz dr = \mu^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+ \tilde{\phi} \frac{1}{r} dz dr,$$

for all  $\tilde{\phi} \in \dot{H}_0^1(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})$ . The constant  $\mu$  satisfies

$$(4.5) \quad h = 2\mu \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+^2 \frac{1}{r^2} dx.$$

*Proof.* For  $b_0, \tilde{b} \in L_{\sigma, \text{axi}}^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , we set

$$j(\tau, s) = H[b + \tau \tilde{b} + sb_0], \quad \tau, s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

By differentiating this by  $s$ , for  $b_0 = \nabla \times (\phi_0 \nabla \theta) + G_0 \nabla \theta$ ,

$$\frac{\partial j}{\partial s}(0, 0) = 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\phi_0 1_{(0, \infty)} (\phi - \phi_\infty) G + (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+ G_0) \frac{1}{r^2} dx.$$

Suppose that  $\partial_s j(0, 0) = 0$  for all  $b_0 \in L_{\sigma, \text{axi}}^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . Then,  $(\phi - \phi_\infty)_+ = 0$  and

$$h = H[b] = 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+ \frac{G}{r^2} dx = 0.$$

By  $0 = I_0 = E[b]$ , we have  $b = 0$ . Thus the assertion holds for  $\mu = 0$ .

We may assume that  $\partial_s j(0, 0) \neq 0$  for some  $b_0 \in L_{\sigma, \text{axi}}^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . By the implicit function theorem, there exists a function  $s = s(\tau)$  such that for small  $|\tau|$ ,

$$j(\tau, s(\tau)) = h.$$

By differentiating this by  $\tau$ ,

$$\dot{s}(0) = -\frac{\partial_\tau j(0, 0)}{\partial_s j(0, 0)}.$$

We set

$$\mu = \frac{2}{\partial_s j(0, 0)} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} b \cdot b_0 dx \right).$$

Since  $b$  is a minimizer,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \frac{d}{d\tau} E[b + \tau \tilde{b} + s(\tau) b_0] \Big|_{\tau=0} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} b \cdot (\tilde{b} + \dot{s}(0) b_0) dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} b \cdot \tilde{b} dx - \frac{1}{\partial_s j(0,0)} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} b \cdot b_0 dx \right) \partial_\tau j(0,0), \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} b \cdot \tilde{b} dx - \frac{\mu}{2} \partial_\tau j(0,0).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\nabla \phi \cdot \nabla \tilde{\phi} + G \tilde{G}) \frac{1}{r^2} dx = \mu \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\tilde{\phi} 1_{(0,\infty)}(\phi - \phi_\infty) G + (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+ \tilde{G}) \frac{1}{r^2} dx.$$

Since  $\tilde{b} \in L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  is arbitrary,  $G = \mu(\phi - \phi_\infty)_+$  and (4.4) holds. The identity (4.5) follows from  $G = \mu(\phi - \phi_\infty)_+$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $B_\infty = -2e_z$ . Let  $b \in L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  be a minimizer of (4.1). Let  $\phi$  and  $\mu$  be as in Proposition 4.2. Then,  $U = b + B_\infty$  is a nonlinear force-free field (1.8) for  $f = \mu 1_{(0,\infty)}(\phi - \phi_\infty)$ .*

*Proof.* By  $-L\phi_\infty = 0$  and  $B_\infty = -2e_z = -\nabla \times (\phi_\infty \nabla \theta)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
U &= b + B_\infty = \nabla \times ((\phi - \phi_\infty) \nabla \theta) + G \nabla \theta, \\
\nabla \times U &= \nabla \times (G \nabla \theta) - L\phi \nabla \theta.
\end{aligned}$$

By  $G = \mu(\phi - \phi_\infty)_+$  and (4.3),

$$\nabla \times U = \mu 1_{(0,\infty)}(\phi - \phi_\infty) U.$$

Thus  $U$  satisfies (1.8) for  $f = \mu 1_{(0,\infty)}(\phi - \phi_\infty)$ .  $\square$

To investigate the properties of the minimum in (4.1) for  $h \in \mathbb{R}$ , we show that the minimum  $I_h$  is invariant under the restriction of admissible functions  $b = \nabla \times (\phi \nabla \theta) + G \nabla \theta \in L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  to those with non-negative  $\phi \geq 0$  and  $G = \mu(\phi - \phi_\infty)_+$ . The constant  $\mu$  is chosen so that  $H[b] = h$ , i.e.,  $h = 2\mu \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+^2 r^{-2} dx$ .

**Proposition 4.4.** *The function  $\phi$  in Proposition 4.2 is non-negative.*

*Proof.* By (4.4) and the transform (3.10),  $\varphi = \phi/r^2 \in \dot{H}^1_{\text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^5)$  satisfies

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^5} \nabla_y \varphi \cdot \nabla_y \tilde{\varphi} dy = \mu^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^5} \left( \varphi - 1 - \frac{\gamma}{r^2} \right)_+ \tilde{\varphi} dy,$$

for  $\tilde{\varphi} \in \dot{H}^1_{\text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^5)$ . This equality is extendable for all  $\tilde{\varphi} \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^5)$  since

$$\tilde{\varphi} = \int_{S^3} \tilde{\varphi} dH + \left( \tilde{\varphi} - \int_{S^3} \tilde{\varphi} dH \right) = \tilde{\varphi}_1 + \tilde{\varphi}_2 \in \dot{H}^1_{\text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^5) \oplus \dot{H}^1_{\text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^5)^\perp,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^5} \nabla_y \varphi \cdot \nabla_y \tilde{\varphi}_2 dy &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^5} \nabla_y \varphi \cdot \nabla_y \left( \int_{S^3} \tilde{\varphi}_2 dH \right) dy = 0, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^5} \left( \varphi - 1 - \frac{\gamma}{r^2} \right) \tilde{\varphi}_2 dy &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^5} \left( \varphi - 1 - \frac{\gamma}{r^2} \right) \left( \int_{S^3} \tilde{\varphi}_2 dH \right) dy = 0.\end{aligned}$$

Here,  $S^3$  is the unit sphere in  $\mathbb{R}^4$ . Thus  $\varphi$  is a weak solution of

$$-\Delta_y \varphi = \mu^2 \left( \varphi - 1 - \frac{\gamma}{r^2} \right)_+ \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^5.$$

By Sobolev embedding,  $\varphi \in L^{10/3}(\mathbb{R}^5)$  and  $(\varphi - 1 - \gamma/r^2)_+ \in L^{10/3}(\mathbb{R}^5)$ . By differentiability of weak solutions to the Poisson equation [GT01, Theorem 8.8],  $\varphi \in H_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}^5)$  and  $-\Delta \varphi = \mu^2(\varphi - 1 - \gamma/r^2)_+ \in L^{10/3}(\mathbb{R}^5)$ . By the Calderon-Zygmund inequality [GT01, Corollary 9.10],

$$\|\nabla^2 \varphi\|_{L^{10/3}(\mathbb{R}^5)} \lesssim \|\Delta \varphi\|_{L^{10/3}(\mathbb{R}^5)}.$$

Thus  $\varphi$  is continuous and  $\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{|x| \geq R} |\varphi(x)| = 0$ . Since  $\varphi$  is super-harmonic, by the maximum principle [LL01, 9.4 THEOREM],

$$\varphi(y) \geq \inf \{ \varphi(y) \mid |y| = R \}, \quad |y| \leq R.$$

By letting  $R \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\varphi(y) = \phi(z, r)/r^2 \geq 0$  follows.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.5.** *Let  $h \in \mathbb{R}$ . Let  $T_h$  be a set of all  $b = \nabla \times (\phi \nabla \theta) + G \nabla \theta \in L_{\sigma, \text{axi}}^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$  such that*

$$(4.6) \quad \phi \geq 0, \quad h = 2\mu \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+^2 \frac{1}{r^2} dx, \quad G = \mu(\phi - \phi_\infty)_+.$$

*Then,  $H[b] = h$  for  $b \in T_h$  and*

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned}S_h &\subset T_h \subset \{ b \in L_{\sigma, \text{axi}}^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \mid H[b] = h \}, \\ I_h &= \inf \{ E[b] \mid b \in T_h \}.\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* By Propositions 4.2 and 4.4, (4.7)<sub>1</sub> follows. The property (4.7)<sub>2</sub> follows from (4.7)<sub>1</sub>.  $\square$

**4.2. Symmetric minimizers.** To prove existence of symmetric minimizers for  $z$ -variable, we recall the Steiner symmetrization (symmetric decreasing rearrangement in the variable  $z$ ) [FB74, Appendix I], [Fri82, p.293], [LL01, Chapter 3]. For a non-negative measurable function  $\phi(z, r)$ , the Steiner symmetrization  $\phi^*$  satisfies

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \phi^*(z, r) &\geq 0, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}, r > 0, \\ \phi^*(z, r) &= \phi^*(-z, r), \quad z \in \mathbb{R}, r > 0, \\ \phi^*(z_1, r) &\geq \phi^*(z_2, r), \quad 0 \leq z_1 \leq z_2, r > 0, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} g(\phi(z, r), r) dz dr &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} g(\phi^*(z, r), r) dz dr, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} |\nabla \phi^*(z, r)|^2 \frac{1}{r} dz dr &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} |\nabla \phi(z, r)|^2 \frac{1}{r} dz dr, \end{aligned}$$

for increasing functions  $g(s, r)$  for  $s \geq 0$  satisfying  $g(0, r) = 0$ . The property (4.8)<sub>4</sub> follows from the layer case representation of  $g(\phi, r)$ . The property (4.8)<sub>5</sub> follows from the isometry (3.11) and Riesz's rearrangement inequality for the heat kernel [LL01, THEOREM 1.13, 3.7].

**Proposition 4.6.** *Let  $\tilde{T}_h$  denote the space of all  $b = \nabla \times (\phi \nabla \theta) + G \nabla \theta \in T_h$  such that  $\phi(z, r)$  is non-negative, symmetric and nonincreasing in the sense of (4.8)<sub>1</sub> – (4.8)<sub>3</sub>. Then,*

$$(4.9) \quad I_h = \inf \{E[b] \mid b \in \tilde{T}_h\}.$$

*Proof.* The left-hand side is smaller than the right-hand side by  $\tilde{T}_h \subset T_h$  and (4.7)<sub>2</sub>. For  $b = \nabla \times (\phi \nabla \theta) + G \nabla \theta \in T_h$ , we take the Steiner symmetrization  $\phi^*$ . By (4.8)<sub>4</sub>,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+^2 \frac{1}{r} dz dr = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} (\phi^* - \phi_\infty)_+^2 \frac{1}{r} dz dr.$$

With the constant  $\mu$  in (4.6), we set  $\tilde{G} = \mu(\phi^* - \phi_\infty)_+$  and  $\tilde{b} = \nabla \times (\phi^* \nabla \theta) + \tilde{G} \nabla \theta$ . Then,  $b \in \tilde{T}_h$  and by (4.8)<sub>5</sub>,

$$E[\tilde{b}] = \pi \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} (|\nabla \phi^*|^2 + \mu^2(\phi^* - \phi_\infty)_+^2) \frac{1}{r} dz dr \leq \pi \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} (|\nabla \phi|^2 + \mu^2(\phi - \phi_\infty)_+^2) \frac{1}{r} dz dr = E[b].$$

By (4.7)<sub>2</sub>,

$$I_h \leq \inf \{E[b] \mid b \in \tilde{T}_h\} \leq \inf \{E[b] \mid b \in T_h\} = I_h,$$

and (4.9) holds.  $\square$

We show the existence of symmetric minimizers to (4.9). The magnetic helicity of  $b \in \tilde{T}_h$  concentrates near the origin  $Q = \{^t(z, r) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 \mid |z| < Z, r < R\}$  because of the symmetry and nonincreasing properties for  $z$ -variable. We use the fact that the set  $\{^t(z, r) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 \mid \phi(z, r) > \phi_\infty\}$  is below the graph  $r = C|z|^{-1/2}$  [FT81, Lemma 4.6], and estimate magnetic helicity

in  $\mathbb{R}_+^2 \setminus Q$  to reduce the compactness of minimizing sequences in  $\tilde{T}_h$  to that in the bounded domain  $Q$ .

**Proposition 4.7.** For  $\phi \in \dot{H}_0^1(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})$  satisfying (4.8)<sub>1</sub> – (4.8)<sub>3</sub>,

$$(4.10) \quad 2r|z|^{1/2} 1_{(0,\infty)}(\phi - \phi_\infty) \leq \|\nabla\phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})}, \quad {}^t(z, r) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2.$$

*Proof.* We take a point  ${}^t(z, r) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$  such that  $\phi(z, r) > \phi_\infty$ . Since  $\phi$  is nonincreasing for  $0 \leq z' \leq z$  and vanishes on  $\{r = 0\}$ ,

$$r^2 < \phi(z, r) \leq \phi(z', r) - \phi(z', 0) = \int_0^r \partial_{r'}\phi(z', r')dr.$$

By integrating both sides in  $[0, z]$  and applying Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} r^2 z &\leq \int_0^z \int_0^r \partial_{r'}\phi(z', r')dr'dz' \leq \left( \int_0^z \int_0^r r'dr'dz' \right)^{1/2} \left( \int_0^z \int_0^r |\partial_{r'}\phi(z', r')|^2 \frac{1}{r'} dr'dz' \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{r\sqrt{z}}{2} \|\nabla\phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus (4.10) holds.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.8.** Let  $Z, R \geq 1$ . Let  $Q = \{{}^t(z, r) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 \mid |z| < Z, r < R\}$ . There exists  $C > 0$  such that

$$(4.11) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2 \setminus Q} (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+^2 \frac{1}{r} dzdr \leq \frac{C}{\min\{Z, A\}} \|\nabla\phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})}^4,$$

for  $\phi \in \dot{H}_0^1(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})$  satisfying (4.8)<sub>1</sub> – (4.8)<sub>3</sub>.

*Proof.* We estimate

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2 \setminus Q} (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+^2 \frac{1}{r} dzdr = \int_{\{r \geq R\}} (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+^2 \frac{1}{r} dzdr + 2 \int_{\{z \geq Z, r < R\}} (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+^2 \frac{1}{r} dzdr.$$

By the weighted Sobolev inequality (3.8),

$$\int_{\{r \geq R\}} (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+^2 \frac{1}{r} dzdr \leq \int_{\{r \geq R\}} (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+^2 \frac{\phi^2}{r^5} dzdr \leq \frac{1}{R} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \phi^4 \frac{1}{r^4} dzdr \lesssim \frac{1}{R} \|\nabla\phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})}^4.$$

By the pointwise estimate (4.10) and (3.8),

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\{z>Z, r<R\}} (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+^2 \frac{1}{r} dz dr &\lesssim \|\nabla\phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})}^2 \int_{\{z>Z, r<R\}} (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+^2 \frac{1}{zr^3} dr dz \\
&\leq \frac{1}{Z} \|\nabla\phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})}^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \phi^2 \frac{1}{r^3} dz dr \\
&\lesssim \frac{1}{Z} \|\nabla\phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})}^4.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus (4.11) holds.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.9** (Existence of symmetric minimizers). *Let  $h \in \mathbb{R}$ . Let  $\{b_n\} \subset \tilde{T}_h$  be a sequence such that  $E[b_n] \rightarrow I_h$ . Then, there exist  $\{n_k\}$  and  $b \in \tilde{T}_h \cap S_h$  such that  $b_{n_k} \rightarrow b$  in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ .*

*Proof.* By the Rellich–Kondrakov theorem in the weighted space (3.9), there exist a subsequence of  $b_n = \nabla \times (\phi_n \nabla \theta) + G_n \nabla \theta$  (still denoted by  $\{b_n\}$ ) and  $b = \nabla \times (\phi \nabla \theta) + G \nabla \theta$  such that

$$\begin{aligned}
b_n &\rightharpoonup b \quad \text{in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^3), \\
\phi_n &\rightarrow \phi \quad \text{in } L_{\text{loc}}^2(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^2}; r^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

For  $Z, R \geq 1$  and  $Q = \{|z| < Z, r < R\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
H[b_n] &= 4\pi \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} (\phi_n - \phi_\infty)_+ G_n \frac{1}{r} dz dr \\
&= 4\pi \int_Q (\phi_n - \phi_\infty)_+ G_n \frac{1}{r} dz dr + 4\pi \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2 \setminus Q} (\phi_n - \phi_\infty)_+ G_n \frac{1}{r} dz dr.
\end{aligned}$$

By Hölder's inequality, (4.11) and (3.2),

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2 \setminus Q} (\phi_n - \phi_\infty)_+ G_n \frac{1}{r} dz dr \right| &\leq \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2 \setminus Q} (\phi_n - \phi_\infty)_+^2 \frac{1}{r} dz dr \right|^{1/2} \|G_n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \setminus Q; r^{-1})} \\
&\leq \frac{C}{\min\{Z, R\}^{1/2}} \sup_n \|b_n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^3.
\end{aligned}$$

By  $|\tau_+ - s_+| \leq |\tau - s|$ , Hölder's inequality and (3.2),

$$\left| \int_Q (\phi_n - \phi_\infty)_+ G_n \frac{1}{r} dz dr - \int_Q (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+ G_n \frac{1}{r} dz dr \right| \leq \|\phi_n - \phi\|_{L^2(Q; r^{-1})} \left( \sup_n \|b_n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \right).$$

Thus



$$\begin{aligned}
|H[b_n] - H[b]| &\leq 4\pi\|\phi_n - \phi\|_{L^2(Q; r^{-1})} \left( \sup_n \|b_n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \right) \\
&+ 4\pi \left| \int_Q (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+ G_n \frac{1}{r} dz dr - \int_Q (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+ G \frac{1}{r} dz dr \right| \\
&+ \frac{C}{\min\{Z, R\}^{1/2}} \left( \sup_n \|b_n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^3 + \|b\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^3 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $G_n$  weakly converges in  $L^2(Q; r^{-1})$  and  $H[b_n] = h$ , letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and then  $Z \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $R \rightarrow \infty$  imply  $h = H[b]$ . By

$$I_h \leq E[b] \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E[b_n] = I_h,$$

the limit  $b \in L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  is a minimizer of  $I_h$ . The convergence  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|b_n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} = \|b\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}$  implies that  $b_n \rightarrow b$  in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . The limit  $b$  belongs to  $\tilde{T}_h$  since  $\phi$  satisfies (4.8)<sub>1</sub>–(4.8)<sub>3</sub> and  $b \in S_h \subset T_h$ .  $\square$

**4.3. Properties of minimum.** We derive properties of the minimum  $I_h$  for  $h \in \mathbb{R}$  from (4.9) and the presence of symmetric minimizers  $b \in \tilde{T}_h$  in Theorem 4.9.

**Lemma 4.10.**

$$(4.12) \quad I_h = I_{-h} \geq I_0 = 0, \quad h \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (\text{symmetry}),$$

$$(4.13) \quad 0 < I_{h_1} < I_{h_2}, \quad 0 < h_1 < h_2, \quad (\text{monotonicity}),$$

$$(4.14) \quad I_{\theta h} < \theta I_h, \quad \theta > 1, h > 0,$$

$$(4.15) \quad I_{h_1+h_2} < I_{h_1} + I_{h_2}, \quad h_1, h_2 > 0, \quad (\text{strict subadditivity}),$$

$$(4.16) \quad I_{h_1} = \lim_{h \rightarrow h_1} I_h, \quad h_1 > 0,$$

$$(4.17) \quad I_{h_1} \leq \liminf_{h \rightarrow h_1} I_h, \quad h_1 \in \mathbb{R} \quad (\text{lower semi-continuity}),$$

*Proof.* The symmetry (4.12) follows from (3.26). By Theorem 4.9, for  $h > 0$ , there exists  $b = \nabla \times (\phi \nabla \theta) + G \nabla \theta \in S_h$  such that  $I_h = E[b]$  and  $h = H[b]$ . If  $I_h = 0$ ,  $E[b] = 0$  and  $h = H[b] = 0$ . Thus  $I_h > 0$ . For  $\tau > 1$ ,

$$\tilde{b} = \nabla \times (\phi \nabla \theta) + \frac{1}{\tau} G \nabla \theta,$$

satisfies  $H[\tilde{b}] = H[b]/\tau = h/\tau$  and

$$I_{h/\tau} \leq E[\tilde{b}] = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla \phi|^2 \frac{1}{r^2} dx + \frac{1}{2\tau^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |G|^2 \frac{1}{r^2} dx = E[b] - \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\tau^2}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |G|^2 \frac{1}{r^2} dx < I_h.$$

Thus the monotonicity (4.13) holds.

By Proposition 4.2, for some  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$H[b] = 2\mu \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+^2 \frac{1}{r^2} dx.$$

For  $t > 1$ ,  $H[tb]$  is continuous and

$$H[tb] = 2t^2\mu \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left(\phi - \frac{\phi_\infty}{t}\right)_+^2 \frac{1}{r^2} dx > 2t^2\mu \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+^2 \frac{1}{r^2} dx = t^2 H[b] = t^2 h.$$

For  $\theta > 1$ , we take  $t_1 > 1$  such that  $H[t_1 b] > t_1^2 h > \theta h$ . By the intermediate value theorem, there exists  $1 < t = t(\theta) < t_1$  such that  $\theta h = H[t(\theta)b]$  and  $\theta > t(\theta)^2$ . Thus

$$I_{\theta h} \leq E[t(\theta)b] = t(\theta)^2 E[b] = t(\theta)^2 I_h < \theta I_h,$$

and (4.14) holds.

We take  $h_1, h_2 > 0$ . We may assume that  $h_1 < h_2$ . By (4.14),  $I_{h_2} < (h_2/h_1)I_{h_1}$ . For  $\vartheta = (h_1 + h_2)/h_2$ ,

$$I_{h_1+h_2} = I_{\vartheta h_2} < \vartheta I_{h_2} = \left(\frac{h_1}{h_2} + 1\right) I_{h_2} < I_{h_1} + I_{h_2}.$$

Thus the strict subadditivity (4.15) holds.

By (4.13) and (4.14), for  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} I_h &< I_{h+\varepsilon}, & I_h &< \frac{h}{h-\varepsilon} I_{h-\varepsilon}, \\ I_{h-\varepsilon} &< I_h, & I_{h+\varepsilon} &< \frac{h+\varepsilon}{h} I_h. \end{aligned}$$

Letting  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  implies the continuity (4.16) for  $h_1 > 0$ . By (4.12) and (4.13),  $I_h$  is lower semi-continuous at  $h_1 = 0$  and (4.17) holds.  $\square$

## 5. MINIMIZING SEQUENCES

We demonstrate the compactness of (non-symmetric) minimizing sequences to the variational problem (4.1) in  $L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  up to translation in  $z$ . We apply the concentration–compactness principle in  $\mathbb{R}^2_+$  [Lio84a], [Lio84b] and exclude possibilities of dichotomy and vanishing of minimizing sequences to obtain the desired compactness. The key part of the proof is the exclusion of dichotomy by application of the strict subadditivity, monotonicity, and lower semi-continuity of the minimum shown in Lemma 4.10.

**5.1. Concentration–compactness lemma.** We derive a concentration–compactness lemma for sequences in  $L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  from the concentration–compactness lemma in  $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2_+)$  [Lio84a], [Lio84b]. We then modify the derived lemma in the case of dichotomy so that two sequences have disjoint supports by a cut-off function argument.

**Proposition 5.1.** Let  $\{\rho_n\} \subset L^1(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$  be a sequence such that  $\rho_n \geq 0$  and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \rho_n dz dr \rightarrow l > 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Then, there exists a subsequence  $\{\rho_{n_k}\}$  such that one of the following holds:

(i) *Compactness:* there exists  $z_k \in \mathbb{R}$  such that for  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $R_\varepsilon > 0$  such that for  $D(z_k, R_\varepsilon) = \{(z, r) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 \mid |z - z_k|^2 + r^2 < R_\varepsilon^2\}$ ,

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{D(z_k, R_\varepsilon)} \rho_{n_k} dz dr \geq l - \varepsilon.$$

(ii) *Vanishing:* for each  $R > 0$ ,

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{z_0 \in \mathbb{R}} \int_{D(z_0, R)} \rho_{n_k} dz dr = 0.$$

(iii) *Dichotomy:* there exists  $\alpha \in (0, l)$  such that for  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exist  $z_k \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $R_k \geq R_0$  such that  $R_k \rightarrow \infty$  and,

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \left| \int_{D(z_k, R_0)} \rho_{n_k} dz dr - \alpha \right| + \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2 \setminus D(z_k, R_k)} \rho_k dz dr - (l - \alpha) \right| + \int_{D(z_k, R_k) \setminus D(z_k, R_0)} \rho_k dz dr \right\} \leq \varepsilon.$$

*Proof.* For the case of fixed mass,  $l_n = l$  for  $l_n = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \rho_n dz dr$ , we apply a similar argument as  $\mathbb{R}^2$  for the Lévy's (partial) concentration function  $Q_n(t) = \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} \int_{D(z, t)} \rho_n dz dr$  and conclude [Lio84a, Lemma I.1], [Lio84b, p.279]. The case of varying mass  $l_n \rightarrow l$  is reduced to the case of fixed mass by the normalization  $\tilde{\rho}_n = \rho_n l / l_n$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.2.** Let  $\{b_n\} \subset L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  be a sequence such that

$$(5.1) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |b_n|^2 dx \rightarrow l > 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

There exists a subsequence  $\{b_{n_k}\}$  such that one of the following holds:

(i) There exists  $z_k \in \mathbb{R}$  such that for  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $R_\varepsilon > 0$  such that for  $B(z_k e_z, R_\varepsilon) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid |x - z_k e_z| < R_\varepsilon\}$ ,

$$(5.2) \quad \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B(z_k e_z, R_\varepsilon)} |b_{n_k}|^2 dx \geq l - \varepsilon.$$

(ii) For each  $R > 0$ ,

$$(5.3) \quad \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{z_0 \in \mathbb{R}} \int_{B(z_0 e_z, R)} |b_{n_k}|^2 dx = 0.$$

(iii) There exists  $\alpha \in (0, l)$  such that for  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $z_k \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $R_k \geq R_0$  such that  $R_k \rightarrow \infty$  and,

$$(5.4) \quad \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \left| \|b_{n_k}\|_{L^2(B(z_k e_z, R_0))}^2 - \alpha \right| + \left| \|b_{n_k}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B(z_k e_z, R_k))}^2 - (l - \alpha) \right| + \|b_{n_k}\|_{L^2(B(z_k e_z, R_k) \setminus B(z_k e_z, R_0))}^2 \right\} \leq \varepsilon.$$

*Proof.* We apply Proposition 5.1 for  $b_n = \nabla \times (\phi_n \nabla \theta) + G_n \nabla \theta \in L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  and

$$\rho_n = \left( |\nabla \phi_n|^2 + |G_n|^2 \right) \frac{2\pi}{r}.$$

□

**Proposition 5.3.** *In the case of the dichotomy (iii) in Lemma 5.2, there exist  $b_{i, n_k} = \nabla \times (\phi_{i, n_k} \nabla \theta) + G_{i, n_k} \nabla \theta \in L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , such that*

$$(5.5) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{spt } \phi_{1, n_k}, \text{spt } G_{1, n_k} \subset D(z_k, 2R_0), \\ & \text{spt } \phi_{2, n_k}, \text{spt } G_{2, n_k} \subset \mathbb{R}_+^2 \setminus \overline{D(z_k, R_k/2)}, \\ & \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \left| \|b_{1, n_k}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 - \alpha \right| + \left| \|b_{2, n_k}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 - (l - \alpha) \right| + \|b_n - b_{1, n_k} - b_{2, n_k}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \right\} \\ & \leq C\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We construct  $b_{i, n_k} \in L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  satisfying (5.5) by a cut-off function argument. We may assume  $z_k = 0$  by translation. For simplicity of notation, we denote  $b_{n_k}$  by  $b_n$ . We take a function  $\chi \in C_c^\infty[0, \infty)$  such that  $\chi = 1$  in  $[0, 1]$  and  $\chi = 0$  in  $[2, \infty)$  and set  $\chi_{R_0}(z, r) = \chi(R_0^{-1} \sqrt{|z|^2 + |r|^2})$  so that  $\chi_{R_0} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$  satisfies  $\chi_{R_0} = 1$  in  $D(0, R_0)$  and  $\chi_{R_0} = 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}_+^2 \setminus \overline{D(0, 2R_0)}$ . We set  $b_{1, n} = \nabla \times (\phi_{1, n} \nabla \theta) + G_{1, n} \nabla \theta$  by

$$\phi_{1, n} = \phi_n \chi_{R_0}, \quad G_{1, n} = G_n \chi_{R_0},$$

so that (5.5)<sub>1</sub> holds. By the Poincaré inequality (3.13),

$$(5.6) \quad \int_{D(0, 2R_0) \setminus D(0, R_0)} |\phi_n|^2 \frac{1}{r} dz dr \leq CR_0^2 \int_{D(0, 2R_0) \setminus D(0, R_0)} |\nabla \phi_n|^2 \frac{1}{r} dz dr,$$

and we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} |\nabla \phi_{1, n}|^2 \frac{1}{r} dz dr - \int_{D(0, R_0)} |\nabla \phi_n|^2 \frac{1}{r} dz dr &= \int_{D(0, 2R_0) \setminus D(0, R_0)} |\nabla \phi_n \chi_{R_0} + \phi_n \nabla \chi_{R_0}|^2 \frac{1}{r} dz dr \\ &\leq C \int_{D(0, 2R_0) \setminus D(0, R_0)} |\nabla \phi_n|^2 \frac{1}{r} dz dr. \end{aligned}$$

For  $\rho_{1, n} = \left( |\nabla \phi_{1, n}|^2 + |G_{1, n}|^2 \right) 2\pi r^{-1}$  and  $\rho_n = \left( |\nabla \phi_n|^2 + |G_n|^2 \right) 2\pi r^{-1}$ ,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \rho_{1,n} dz dr - \int_{D(0,R_0)} \rho_n dz dr \leq C \int_{D(0,2R_0) \setminus D(0,R_0)} \rho_n dz dr.$$

In terms of  $b_{1,n}$  and  $b_n$ ,

$$\|b_{1,n}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 - \|b_n\|_{L^2(B(0,R_0))}^2 \leq C \|b_n\|_{L^2(B(0,2R_0) \setminus B(0,R_0))}^2.$$

By applying (5.4) to

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \|b_{1,n}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 - \alpha \right| &\leq \left| \|b_{1,n}\|_{L^2(B(0,2R_0))}^2 - \|b_n\|_{L^2(B(0,R_0))}^2 \right| + \left| \|b_n\|_{L^2(B(0,R_0))}^2 - \alpha \right| \\ &\leq C \|b_n\|_{L^2(B(0,2R_0) \setminus B(0,R_0))}^2 + \left| \|b_n\|_{L^2(B(0,R_0))}^2 - \alpha \right|, \end{aligned}$$

and we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \|b_{1,n}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 - \alpha \right| \leq C\varepsilon.$$

Similarly, we set  $b_{2,n} = \nabla \times (\phi_{2,n} \nabla \theta) + G_{2,n} \nabla \theta$  by

$$\phi_{2,n} = \phi_n(1 - \chi_{R_n/2}), \quad G_{2,n} = G_n(1 - \chi_{R_n/2}),$$

so that (5.5)<sub>2</sub> holds. By (3.13),

$$(5.7) \quad \int_{D(0,R_n) \setminus D(0,R_n/2)} |\phi_n|^2 \frac{1}{r} dz dr \leq CR_n^2 \int_{D(0,R_n) \setminus D(0,R_n/2)} |\nabla \phi_n|^2 \frac{1}{r} dz dr.$$

Similarly as we estimated  $b_{1,n}$ , by (5.4) and

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \|b_{2,n}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 - (l - \alpha) \right| &\leq \left| \|b_{2,n}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B(0,R_n/2))}^2 - \|b_n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B(0,R_n))}^2 \right| + \left| \|b_n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B(0,R_n))}^2 - (l - \alpha) \right| \\ &\leq C \|b_n\|_{L^2(B(0,R_n) \setminus B(0,R_n/2))}^2 + \left| \|b_n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B(0,R_n))}^2 - (l - \alpha) \right|, \end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \|b_{2,n}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 - (l - \alpha) \right| \leq C\varepsilon.$$

By using (5.6) and (5.7) for

$$b_n - b_{1,n} - b_{2,n} = \nabla \times (\phi_n(\chi_{R_n/2} - \chi_{R_0}) \nabla \theta) + G_n(\chi_{R_n/2} - \chi_{R_0}) \nabla \theta,$$

we estimate

$$\|b_n - b_{1,n} - b_{2,n}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \leq C \int_{D(0,R_n) \setminus D(0,R_0)} (|\nabla \phi_n|^2 + |G_n|^2) \frac{1}{r} dz dr = C \|b_n\|_{L^2(B(0,R_n) \setminus B(0,R_0))}^2.$$

By (5.4),

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \left| \|b_{1,n}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 - \alpha \right| + \left| \|b_{2,n}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 - (l - \alpha) \right| + \|b_n - b_{1,n} - b_{2,n}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \right\} \leq C\varepsilon.$$

Thus (5.5)<sub>3</sub> holds.  $\square$

**5.2. Lipschitz estimates.** Proposition 5.3 states that  $\|b_{n_k}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \approx l$  can be divided into two parts

$$\|b_{1,n_k}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \approx \alpha, \quad \|b_{2,n_k}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \approx l - \alpha.$$

We further show that  $H[b_{n_k}]$  can be divided into two parts  $H[b_{1,n_k}]$  and  $H[b_{2,n_k}]$ . Recall that  $H[\cdot] : L^2_{\sigma,axi}(\mathbb{R}^3) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is locally bounded by the Arnold-type inequality (3.20),

$$|H[b]| \lesssim \|b\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{8/3}.$$

We extend this estimate to the following Lipschitz estimate and derive the desired decomposition property for magnetic helicity.

**Proposition 5.4.**

$$(5.8) \quad |H[b_1] - H[b_2]| \lesssim \left( \max_{i=1,2} \|b_i\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{5/3} \right) \|b_1 - b_2\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}, \quad \text{for } b_1, b_2 \in L^2_{\sigma,axi}(\mathbb{R}^3),$$

$$(5.9) \quad |H[b_0] - H[b_1] - H[b_2]| \lesssim \left( \max_{0 \leq i \leq 2} \|b_i\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{5/3} \right) \|b_0 - b_1 - b_2\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)},$$

for  $b_i = \nabla \times (\phi_i \nabla \theta) + G_i \nabla \theta \in L^2_{\sigma,axi}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ ,  $i = 0, 1, 2$ , such that  $\text{spt } \phi_i \cap \text{spt } G_j = \emptyset$ ,  $i \neq j$ ,  $i, j = 1, 2$ .

*Proof.* By the monotonicity of the indicator function,

$$(5.10) \quad \begin{aligned} |(\phi_1 - \phi_\infty)_+ - (\phi_2 - \phi_\infty)_+| &= \left| \int_0^1 \frac{d}{d\tau} (\tau \phi_1 + (1 - \tau) \phi_2 - \phi_\infty)_+ d\tau \right| \\ &= \left| \int_0^1 (\phi_1 - \phi_2) 1_{(0,\infty)} (\tau \phi_1 + (1 - \tau) \phi_2 - \phi_\infty) d\tau \right| \\ &\leq |\phi_1 - \phi_2| 1_{(0,\infty)} (|\phi_1| + |\phi_2| - \phi_\infty). \end{aligned}$$

By Hölder's inequality, (5.10), (3.2) and (3.18),

$$\begin{aligned}
|H[b_1] - H[b_2]| &\leq 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |((\phi_1 - \phi_\infty)_+ - (\phi_2 - \phi_\infty)_+)G_1| \frac{1}{r^2} dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\phi_2 - \phi_\infty)_+ |G_1 - G_2| \frac{1}{r^2} dx \\
&\lesssim \|(\phi_1 - \phi_\infty)_+ - (\phi_2 - \phi_\infty)_+\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})} \|G_1\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})} \\
&\quad + \|(\phi_2 - \phi_\infty)_+\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})} \|G_1 - G_2\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})} \\
&\lesssim \|(\phi_1 - \phi_2)1_{(0, \infty)}(|\phi_1| + |\phi_2| - \phi_\infty)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})} \|b_1\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\
&\quad + \|b_2\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{5/3} \|b_1 - b_2\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Hölder's inequality, (3.8) and (3.2),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|(\phi_1 - \phi_2)1_{(0, \infty)}(|\phi_1| + |\phi_2| - \phi_\infty)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})}^2 \\
&\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} |\phi_1 - \phi_2|^2 \left( \frac{|\phi_1| + |\phi_2|}{\phi_\infty} \right)^{4/3} \frac{1}{r} dz dr \\
&\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} |\phi_1 - \phi_2|^2 \frac{1}{r^{11/5}} (|\phi_1| + |\phi_2|)^{4/3} \frac{1}{r^{22/15}} dz dr \\
&\leq \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} |\phi_1 - \phi_2|^{10/3} \frac{1}{r^{2+5/3}} dz dr \right)^{3/5} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} (|\phi_1| + |\phi_2|)^{10/3} \frac{1}{r^{2+5/3}} dz dr \right)^{2/5} \\
&\lesssim \|b_1 - b_2\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \left( \max_{i=1,2} \|b_i\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \right)^{4/3}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus (5.8) holds.

In a similar way as (5.10),

$$|(\phi_1 + \phi_2 - \phi_\infty)_+ - (\phi_1 - \phi_\infty)_+| \leq |\phi_2|1_{(0, \infty)}(|\phi_1 + \phi_2| + |\phi_1| - \phi_\infty).$$

Since  $\text{spt } \phi_2 \cap \text{spt } G_1 = \emptyset$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\phi_1 + \phi_2 - \phi_\infty)_+ G_1 \frac{1}{r^2} dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\phi_1 - \phi_\infty)_+ G_1 \frac{1}{r^2} dx \right| \\
&\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\phi_2|1_{(0, \infty)}(|\phi_1 + \phi_2| + |\phi_1| - \phi_\infty) |G_1| \frac{1}{r^2} dx = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\phi_1 + \phi_2 - \phi_\infty)_+ G_1 \frac{1}{r^2} dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\phi_1 - \phi_\infty)_+ G_1 \frac{1}{r^2} dx.$$

In a similar way, by  $\text{spt } \phi_1 \cap \text{spt } G_2 = \emptyset$ ,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\phi_1 + \phi_2 - \phi_\infty)_+ G_2 \frac{1}{r^2} dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\phi_2 - \phi_\infty)_+ G_2 \frac{1}{r^2} dx.$$

Thus  $H[b_1 + b_2] = H[b_1] + H[b_2]$ . By applying (5.8) to  $H[b_0] - H[b_1] - H[b_2] = H[b_0] - H[b_1 + b_2]$ , (5.9) follows.  $\square$

**5.3. Compactness.** We now demonstrate the compactness of minimizing sequences for the variational problem (4.1) by using Lemma 4.10.

**Theorem 5.5.** *Let  $h \in \mathbb{R}$ . Let  $\{b_n\} \subset L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  be a sequence such that  $E[b_n] \rightarrow I_h$  and  $H[b_n] \rightarrow h$ . There exists  $\{n_k\} \subset \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\{z_k\} \subset \mathbb{R}$  and  $b \in S_h$  such that  $b_{n_k}(\cdot + z_k e_z) \rightarrow b$  in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ .*

*Proof.* For  $h = 0$ , the assertion holds for  $b = 0$  since  $I_0 = 0$ . We may assume that  $h > 0$  by the symmetry (4.12). For a sequence  $\{b_n\}$  satisfying  $E[b_n] \rightarrow I_h$  and  $H[b_n] \rightarrow h$ , we apply Lemma 5.2 with  $l = 2I_h$ . Then, by choosing a subsequence (still denoted by  $\{b_n\}$ ), one of the 3 cases – compactness, vanishing, dichotomy – should occur.

*Case 1: dichotomy.*

By Proposition 5.3, there exist  $b_{1,n}, b_{2,n} \in L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  such that (5.5) holds. By (5.5)<sub>3</sub> and (3.20),  $E[b_{i,n}]$  and  $H[b_{i,n}]$  are uniformly bounded for  $n$  and  $\varepsilon$ . By choosing a subsequence, we may assume that  $h_{i,n} = H[b_{i,n}] \rightarrow \bar{h}_i$  for some  $\bar{h}_i \in \mathbb{R}$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . By (5.5)<sub>1</sub> and (5.5)<sub>2</sub>, we apply Proposition 5.4 to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & |H[b_n] - H[b_{1,n}] - H[b_{2,n}]| \\ & \lesssim \max \left\{ \|b_{1,n}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}, \|b_{2,n}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}, \|b_n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \right\}^{5/3} \|b_n - b_{1,n} - b_{2,n}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}. \end{aligned}$$

By (5.5)<sub>3</sub>,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |H[b_n] - H[b_{1,n}] - H[b_{2,n}]| \leq C\varepsilon^{1/2}.$$

Letting  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  implies that  $h = \bar{h}_1 + \bar{h}_2 > 0$ . Since  $\text{spt } b_{1,n} \cap \text{spt } b_{2,n} = \emptyset$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} E[b_n] &= E[b_{1,n}] + E[b_{2,n}] + E[b_n - b_{1,n} - b_{2,n}] + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (b_{1,n} + b_{2,n}) \cdot (b_n - b_{1,n} - b_{2,n}) dx \\ &\geq E[b_{1,n}] + E[b_{2,n}] - \left( \sup_{i,n} \|b_{i,n}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \right) \|b_n - b_{1,n} - b_{2,n}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\ &\geq I_{h_{1,n}} + I_{h_{2,n}} - \left( \sup_{i,n} \|b_{i,n}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \right) \|b_n - b_{1,n} - b_{2,n}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}. \end{aligned}$$

By the lower semi-continuity of the minimum (4.17) and (5.5), letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  imply



$$I_h \geq I_{\bar{h}_1} + I_{\bar{h}_2}.$$

If  $\bar{h}_1 > 0$  and  $\bar{h}_2 > 0$ , this contradicts the strict subadditivity (4.15). Thus  $\bar{h}_i \leq 0$  for  $i = 1$  or  $i = 2$ . We may assume  $\bar{h}_1 \leq 0$ . Since

$$E[b_n] \geq E[b_{1,n}] + I_{h_{2,n}} - \left( \sup_{i,n} \|b_{i,n}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \right) \|b_n - b_{1,n} - b_{2,n}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)},$$

and  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |2E[b_{1,n}] - \alpha| \leq C\varepsilon$  by (5.5), letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  imply

$$I_h \geq \frac{\alpha}{2} + I_{\bar{h}_2} > I_{\bar{h}_2}.$$

Since  $0 < h = \bar{h}_1 + \bar{h}_2 \leq \bar{h}_2$ , this contradicts the monotonicity (4.13). We conclude that dichotomy does not occur.

*Case 2: vanishing.*

By Hölder's inequality and (3.2),

$$\begin{aligned} |H[b_n]| &= 4\pi \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} (\phi_n - \phi_\infty)_+ G_n \frac{1}{r} dz dr \right| \leq 4\pi \|(\phi_n - \phi_\infty)_+\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})} \|G_n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})} \\ &\leq 4\pi \|(\phi_n - r^2)_+\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})} \left( \sup_n \|b_n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

For arbitrary  $R > 0$ , we estimate

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} (\phi_n - r^2)_+ \frac{1}{r} dz dr = \int_{\{r < R\}} (\phi_n - r^2)_+ \frac{1}{r} dz dr + \int_{\{r \geq R\}} (\phi_n - r^2)_+ \frac{1}{r} dz dr.$$

By the weighted Sobolev inequality (3.8),

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\{r \geq R\}} (\phi_n - r^2)_+ \frac{1}{r} dz dr &\leq \frac{1}{R} \int_{\{r \geq R\}} \phi_n^4 \frac{1}{r^4} dz dr \leq \frac{C}{R} \sup_n \|\nabla \phi_n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})}^4, \\ \int_{\{r < R\}} (\phi_n - r^2)_+ \frac{1}{r} dz dr &\leq \int_{\{r < R\}} \phi_n^{10/3} \frac{1}{r^{11/3}} dz dr. \end{aligned}$$

For  $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $R' > R$ , we apply the weighted Sobolev inequality in  $D(z_0, R')$  (3.14) to estimate

$$\int_{D(z_0, R')} |\phi_n|^{10/3} \frac{1}{r^{11/3}} dz dr \leq C \left( \int_{D(z_0, R')} |\nabla \phi_n|^2 \frac{1}{r} dz dr \right)^{5/3} = C \|\nabla \phi_n\|_{L^2(D(z_0, R'); r^{-1})}^{10/3}.$$

By summing up  $D(z_0, R')$  for countable points  $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\int_{\{r < R\}} |\phi_n|^{10/3} \frac{1}{r^{11/3}} dz dr \leq C \left( \sup_n \|\nabla \phi_n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})}^2 \right) \left( \sup_{z_0 \in \mathbb{R}} \|\nabla \phi_n\|_{L^2(D(z_0, R'); r^{-1})}^{4/3} \right).$$

By (3.2),

$$\int_{\{r < R\}} |\phi_n|^{10/3} \frac{1}{r^{11/3}} dz dr \leq C \left( \sup_n \|b_n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \right) \left( \sup_{z_0 \in \mathbb{R}} \|b_n\|_{L^2(B(z_0, R'))}^{4/3} \right).$$

The right-hand side vanishes as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  by (5.3). Thus

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} (\phi_n - r^2)_+^2 \frac{1}{r} dz dr \leq \frac{C}{R} \left( \sup_n \|b_n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^4 \right).$$

Letting  $R \rightarrow \infty$  implies that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} H[b_n] = 0$ . This contradicts  $H[b_n] \rightarrow h > 0$ . We conclude that vanishing does not occur.

*Case 3: compactness.*

It remains to show compactness of the sequence  $\{b_n\}$  satisfying (5.2). By translation, we may assume that (5.2) holds for  $z_n = 0$ . We may assume that for all  $n$ ,

$$(5.11) \quad 2\pi \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2 \setminus D(0, R_\varepsilon)} (|\nabla \phi_n|^2 + |G_n|^2) \frac{1}{r} dz dr \leq \varepsilon.$$

By the Rellich–Kondrakov theorem in the weighted space (3.9), there exists a subsequence and  $b = \nabla \times (\phi \nabla \theta) + G \nabla \theta$  such that  $b_n \rightharpoonup b$  in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$  and  $\phi_n \rightarrow \phi$  in  $L_{\text{loc}}^2(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^2}; r^{-1})$ . For  $D = D(0, R_\varepsilon)$ ,

$$H[b_n] = 4\pi \int_D (\phi_n - \phi_\infty)_+ G_n \frac{1}{r} dz dr + 4\pi \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2 \setminus D} (\phi_n - \phi_\infty)_+ G_n \frac{1}{r} dz dr.$$

In a similar way as we proved Theorem 4.9,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_D (\phi_n - \phi_\infty)_+ G_n \frac{1}{r} dz dr = \int_D (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+ G \frac{1}{r} dz dr.$$

By Hölder's inequality, (3.18), (3.2) and (5.11),

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2 \setminus \overline{D}} (\phi_n - \phi_\infty)_+ G_n \frac{1}{r} dz dr \right| \leq \|(\phi_n - \phi_\infty)_+\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})} \|G_n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2 \setminus \overline{D}; r^{-1})} \lesssim \left( \sup_n \|b_n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{5/3} \right) \varepsilon^{1/2}.$$

Thus

$$|H[b] - h| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |H[b] - H[b_n]| \leq \left( \sup_n \|b_n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{5/3} + \|b\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{5/3} \right) \varepsilon^{1/2}.$$

By letting  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ ,  $H[b] = h$  and

$$I_h \leq E[b] \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E[b_n] = I_h.$$

Thus  $b$  is a minimizer of  $I_h$ . By  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|b_n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} = \|b\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}$ ,  $b_n \rightarrow b$  in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . The proof is now complete.  $\square$

**Theorem 5.6.** *Let  $h \in \mathbb{R}$ . Let  $\{(v_n, b_n)\} \subset L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  be a sequence such that  $\mathcal{E}[v_n, b_n] \rightarrow I_h$  and  $H[b_n] \rightarrow h$ . There exist  $\{n_k\} \subset \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\{z_k\} \subset \mathbb{R}$  and  $b \in S_h$  such that  $(v_{n_k}, b_{n_k}(\cdot + z_k e_z)) \rightarrow (0, b)$  in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ .*

*Proof.* For  $h_n = H[b_n]$ ,

$$I_{h_n} \leq E[b_n] \leq \mathcal{E}[v_n, b_n].$$

By the lower semi-continuity of the minimum (4.17), letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  implies that  $E[b_n] \rightarrow I_h$  and  $E[v_n] \rightarrow 0$ . We apply Theorem 5.5 and conclude.  $\square$

**Remark 5.7.** The variational problem (1.13) is also well-defined with the function  $\phi_\infty = Wr^2/2 + \gamma$  for  $W > 0$  and  $\gamma \geq 0$  as noted in Remark 3.14. The same compactness theorem as Theorem 5.6 holds for minimizing sequences to (1.13). Namely, for given  $h \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $W > 0$ ,  $\gamma \geq 0$ , and a sequence  $\{(v_n, b_n)\} \subset L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (|v_n|^2 + |b_n|^2) dx &\rightarrow I_{h, W, \gamma}, \\ 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\phi_n - \phi_\infty)_+ \frac{G_n}{r^2} dx &\rightarrow h, \end{aligned}$$

there exist  $\{n_k\}$ ,  $\{z_k\}$  and a minimizer  $b \in S_{h, W, \gamma}$  of  $I_{h, W, \gamma}$  such that  $(v_{n_k}, b_{n_k}(\cdot + z_k e_z)) \rightarrow (0, b)$  in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . In fact, for  $\tilde{h} = (W/2)^{-2}h$  and  $\tilde{\gamma} = (W/2)^{-1}\gamma$ ,  $b \in L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  and  $\tilde{b} = (W/2)^{-1}b$  satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\tilde{b}|^2 dx &= \left(\frac{W}{2}\right)^{-2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |b|^2 dx, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\tilde{\phi} - r^2 - \tilde{\gamma})_+ \frac{\tilde{G}}{r^2} dx &= \left(\frac{W}{2}\right)^{-2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left(\phi - \frac{W}{2}r^2 - \gamma\right)_+ \frac{G}{r^2} dx. \end{aligned}$$

Minimizers of  $I_{h, W, \gamma}$  are those of  $I_{\tilde{h}, 2, \tilde{\gamma}}$  and vice versa. The scaling of the minimum is

$$I_{h,W,\gamma} = \left(\frac{W}{2}\right)^{-2} I_{\tilde{h},2,\tilde{\gamma}}.$$

The compactness of minimizing sequences to  $I_{h,W,\gamma}$  is derived from that for  $I_{\tilde{h},2,\tilde{\gamma}}$  by Theorem 5.5.

## 6. LERAY–HOPF SOLUTIONS

We show that axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solutions to (1.9) satisfy the equalities of generalized magnetic helicity (1.18) and generalized magnetic mean-square potential (1.19) by using the vector potential equations. We provide proof of the existence of axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solutions in Appendix A.

**6.1. Existence.** Leray–Hopf solutions to viscous and resistive MHD in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  can be defined similarly as those for the Navier–Stokes equations, e.g., [SSS96, p.718], cf. [Mas84], [Soh01], [LR02]. We define Leray–Hopf solutions to (1.9) with  $u_\infty, B_\infty \in \mathbb{R}^3$  and their weak ideal limits by adapting the definitions for the case of bounded domains in Definitions 2.9 and 2.11.

**Definition 6.1** (Leray–Hopf solutions). Let  $u_\infty, B_\infty \in \mathbb{R}^3$ . Let  $v_0, b_0 \in L^2_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . Let

$$(v, b) \in C_w([0, T]; L^2_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^2(0, T; H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)).$$

Suppose that  $(v_t, b_t) \in L^1(0, T; (L^2_\sigma \cap H^1)(\mathbb{R}^3)^*)$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v_t, \xi \rangle + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} ((v + u_\infty) \cdot \nabla v - (b + B_\infty) \cdot \nabla b) \cdot \xi \, dx + \nu \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla v : \nabla \xi \, dx &= 0, \\ \langle b_t, \zeta \rangle + \int_{\Omega} (b \times v + B_\infty \times v + b \times u_\infty) \cdot \nabla \times \zeta \, dx + \mu \int_{\Omega} \nabla \times b \cdot \nabla \times \zeta \, dx &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

for a.e.  $t \in [0, T]$  and every  $\xi, \zeta \in L^2_\sigma \cap H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . Suppose furthermore that  $(v(\cdot, 0), b(\cdot, 0)) = (v_0, b_0)$  and

$$(6.1) \quad \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (|v|^2 + |b|^2) \, dx + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\nu |\nabla v|^2 + \mu |\nabla b|^2) \, dx \, ds \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (|v_0|^2 + |b_0|^2) \, dx,$$

for all  $t \in [0, T]$ . Then, we call  $(v, b)$  Leray–Hopf solutions to (1.9).

**Definition 6.2** (Weak ideal limits). Let  $(v_j, b_j)$  be a Leray–Hopf solution to (1.9) for  $\nu_j, \mu_j > 0$  and  $(v_{0,j}, b_{0,j})$  such that  $(v_{0,j}, b_{0,j}) \rightharpoonup (v_0, b_0)$  in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$  as  $(\nu_j, \mu_j) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ . Assume that

$$(6.2) \quad (v_j, b_j) \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} (v, b) \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)).$$

Then, we call  $(v, b)$  a weak ideal limit of  $(v_j, b_j)$ . If instead  $\nu_j = \nu > 0$  for every  $j$  and  $\mu_j \rightarrow 0$ , we call  $(v, b)$  a weak nonresistive limit of  $(v_j, b_j)$ .

We construct Leray–Hopf solutions to (1.9) by Leray’s method in Appendix A. They are axisymmetric for constants  $u_\infty, B_\infty$  parallel to  $e_z$  and axisymmetric data  $v_0, b_0 \in L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ .

**Theorem 6.3.** *Let  $B_\infty = -2e_z$ . Let  $u_\infty$  be a constant parallel to  $e_z$ . For  $v_0, b_0 \in L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , there exists an axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solution to (1.9).*

**6.2. Vector potential equations.** For a smooth solution  $(v, b)$  to (1.9),  $(u, B) = (v + u_\infty, b + B_\infty)$  is a solution to (1.1) and (1.7). We apply the Clebsch representation (3.16) for  $B$  and its vector potential  $A$  with the function  $\phi_\infty = r^2 + \gamma$  and  $\gamma \geq 0$ . By the equation (1.1)<sub>2</sub> and some potential  $Q$ , the vector potential equations can be expressed as

$$(6.3) \quad A_t + B \times u + \nabla Q = -\mu \nabla \times B.$$

The  $\theta$ -component of this equation is the drift-diffusion equation for  $\Phi = \phi - \phi_\infty$  and the flux function  $\phi$  of  $b$ ,

$$(6.4) \quad \Phi_t + u \cdot \nabla \Phi = \mu \left( \Delta - \frac{2}{r} \partial_r \right) \Phi.$$

The quantities

$$(6.5) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} g(\Phi) \frac{G}{r^2} dx, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} g(\Phi) dx,$$

are conserved at the zero resistivity limit  $\mu = 0$  for arbitrary regular functions  $g = g(s)$  due to the transport equation (6.4). We apply the identity for axisymmetric magnetic fields

$$(6.6) \quad A_t \cdot B \dot{g}(\Phi) = \partial_t \left( g(\Phi) \frac{G}{r^2} \right) + \nabla \cdot (g(\Phi) \nabla \theta \times A_t).$$

This identity follows from (3.16) and  $B \dot{g}(\Phi) = \nabla \times (g(\Phi) \nabla \theta) + G \dot{g}(\Phi) \nabla \theta$ . We can observe generalized magnetic helicity conservation from (6.6) by multiplying the solenoidal  $B \dot{g}(\Phi)$  by (6.3) and integration by parts. We take  $g(s) = 2s_+$  for generalized magnetic helicity and  $g(s) = s_+^2$  for generalized magnetic mean-square potential. Their equalities with resistivity  $\mu > 0$  are

$$(6.7) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_+ \frac{G}{r^2} dx + \mu \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla \times B \cdot B 1_{(0, \infty)}(\Phi) dx ds = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_{0,+} \frac{G_0}{r^2} dx,$$

$$(6.8) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_+^2 dx + 2\mu \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla \Phi_+|^2 dx ds = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_{0,+}^2 dx.$$

We demonstrate (6.7) and (6.8) for axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solutions by showing that the equations (6.3) hold on  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$  for a.e.  $t \in [0, T]$ . In terms of the projection operator  $\mathbb{P}$ , associated with (2.1) in  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3$ , the equations (6.3) can be expressed as

$$A_t + \mathbb{P}(B \times u) = -\mu \nabla \times B \quad \text{on } L^2_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

At the heuristic level, the conditions  $B \times u, \nabla \times B = \nabla \times b \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$  imply that  $\nabla Q = -(1 - \mathbb{P})(B \times u) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . Hence a distributional solution  $A$  of (6.3) satisfies  $A_t \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$  and (6.3) holds on  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . We approximate  $A$  for the time variable and derive (6.3) from the definition of Leray–Hopf solutions.

**Proposition 6.4.** *For axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solutions  $(v, b)$  to (1.9) for  $B_\infty = -2e_z$  and  $u_\infty$  parallel to  $e_z$ ,  $(u, B) = (v + u_\infty, b + B_\infty)$  satisfies*

$$(6.9) \quad \begin{aligned} B \times u &\in L^{4/3}(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)), \\ \nabla \times B &\in L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for  $A$  defined by (3.16), there exists some  $Q$  such that

$$(6.10) \quad A_t, \nabla Q \in L^{4/3}(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)),$$

and (6.3) holds on  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$  for a.e.  $t \in [0, T]$ .

*Proof.* For the vector potential  $a$  of  $b$  defined by (3.3),

$$\begin{aligned} A_t &= a_t, \\ B \times u &= b \times v + b \times u_\infty + B_\infty \times v, \\ \nabla \times B &= \nabla \times b. \end{aligned}$$

By  $L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^2(0, T; H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)) \subset L^{8/3}(0, T; L^4(\mathbb{R}^3))$ , (6.9) holds. By the definition of Leray–Hopf solutions,

$$b_t + \nabla \times (B \times u) + \mu \nabla \times (\nabla \times b) = 0 \quad \text{on } (L^2_\sigma \cap H^1)(\mathbb{R}^3)^*,$$

for a.e.  $t \in [0, T]$ . Thus

$$\nabla \times (a_t + (B \times u) + \mu \nabla \times b) = 0 \quad \text{on } (L^2_\sigma \cap H^1)(\mathbb{R}^3)^*.$$

We take arbitrary  $0 < \delta < T/2$  and  $\varepsilon < \delta$ . By the mollifier in Lemma 2.15,

$$\nabla \times (a_t^\varepsilon + (B \times u)^\varepsilon + \mu \nabla \times b^\varepsilon) = 0 \quad \text{on } (L^2_\sigma \cap H^1)(\mathbb{R}^3)^*,$$

for  $t \in (\delta, T - \delta)$ . By Lemma 3.5,  $a \in L^\infty(0, T; L^6(\mathbb{R}^3))$  and  $a_t^\varepsilon \in C^\infty(\delta, T - \delta; L^6(\mathbb{R}^3))$ . For an arbitrary  $\zeta \in L^2_\sigma \cap H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$  satisfying  $\nabla \times \zeta \in L^{6/5}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , by integration by parts,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (a_t^\varepsilon + (B \times u)^\varepsilon + \mu \nabla \times b^\varepsilon) \cdot \nabla \times \zeta \, dx = 0.$$

We take an arbitrary  $\xi \in L^{6/5} \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$  and apply Proposition 3.8 to take  $\zeta \in L_\sigma^2 \cap L^6(\mathbb{R}^3)$  such that  $\nabla \zeta \in L^{6/5} \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$  and  $\nabla \times \zeta = \mathbb{P}\xi$ . Then, for  $\nabla Q^\varepsilon = -(I - \mathbb{P})(B \times u)^\varepsilon$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (a_t^\varepsilon + (B \times u)^\varepsilon + \mu \nabla \times b^\varepsilon) \cdot \mathbb{P}\xi \, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (a_t^\varepsilon + \mathbb{P}(B \times u)^\varepsilon + \mu \nabla \times b^\varepsilon) \cdot \xi \, dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (a_t^\varepsilon + (B \times u)^\varepsilon + \nabla Q^\varepsilon + \mu \nabla \times b^\varepsilon) \cdot \xi \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $(B \times u)^\varepsilon \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$  for  $t \in (\delta, T - \delta)$  and  $\xi \in L^{6/5} \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$  is arbitrary,  $\nabla Q^\varepsilon, a_t^\varepsilon \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$  and

$$a_t^\varepsilon + (B \times u)^\varepsilon + \nabla Q^\varepsilon = -\mu \nabla \times b^\varepsilon \quad \text{on } L^2(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

By Lemma 2.15, letting  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  implies that

$$\begin{aligned} (B \times u)^\varepsilon &\rightarrow B \times u \quad \text{in } L^{4/3}(\delta, T - \delta; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)), \\ \nabla \times b^\varepsilon &\rightarrow \nabla \times b \quad \text{in } L^2(\delta, T - \delta; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $\nabla Q = -(1 - \mathbb{P})(B \times u)$  and  $a_t = A_t$  satisfy (6.10). Since  $0 < \delta < T/2$  is arbitrary, (6.3) holds for a.e.  $t \in [0, T]$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 6.5.** *The equation (6.4) holds on  $L_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$  for a.e.  $t \in [0, T]$  for axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solutions to (1.9) for  $B_\infty = -2e_z$  and  $u_\infty$  parallel to  $e_z$ . Moreover,*

$$(6.11) \quad \partial_t \Phi_+^2 + u \cdot \nabla \Phi_+^2 = \mu \left( \Delta - \frac{2}{r} \partial_r \right) \Phi_+^2 - 2\mu |\nabla \Phi_+|^2 \quad \text{on } L_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

*Proof.* By (3.16),

$$\begin{aligned} A_t \cdot r \nabla \theta &= \frac{1}{r} \Phi_t, \\ (B \times u) \cdot r \nabla \theta &= \frac{1}{r} u \cdot \nabla \Phi, \\ \nabla \times B \cdot r \nabla \theta &= -\frac{1}{r} \left( \Delta - \frac{2}{r} \partial_r \right) \Phi. \end{aligned}$$

Each term belongs to  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$  by (6.9) and (6.10). By multiplying  $r \nabla \theta$  by (6.3),

$$\frac{1}{r} \left( \Phi_t + u \cdot \nabla \Phi - \mu \left( \Delta - \frac{2}{r} \partial_r \right) \Phi \right) = 0 \quad \text{on } L^2(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

Thus (6.4) holds on  $L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . Since  $\Phi_+ \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$  by (3.19) and (3.2), by multiplying  $2\Phi_+$  by the above equation, (6.11) follows.  $\square$

**6.3. Equalities.** We show the equalities (6.7) and (6.8) for axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solutions to (1.9).

**Proposition 6.6.** *For axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solutions to (1.9) for  $B_\infty = -2e_z$  and  $u_\infty$  parallel to  $e_z$ ,*

$$(6.12) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_+ \frac{G}{r^2} dx = -\mu \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla \times B \cdot B1_{(0,\infty)}(\Phi) dx,$$

in the sense of distribution.

*Proof.* The field  $B1_{(0,\infty)}(\Phi) = \nabla \times (\Phi_+ \nabla \theta) + G1_{(0,\infty)}(\Phi) \nabla \theta$  is solenoidal. By (3.17) and (3.2),

$$(6.13) \quad \|B1_{(0,\infty)}(\Phi)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} = \|(b + B_\infty)1_{(0,\infty)}(\Phi)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \lesssim \|b\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}.$$

By multiplying  $B1_{(0,\infty)}(\Phi) \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^3))$  by (6.3),

$$A_t \cdot B1_{(0,\infty)}(\Phi) + \nabla Q \cdot B1_{(0,\infty)}(\Phi) = -\mu \nabla \times B \cdot B1_{(0,\infty)}(\Phi) \quad \text{on } L^1(\mathbb{R}^3),$$

for a.e.  $t \in [0, T]$ . Thus

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} A_t \cdot B1_{(0,\infty)}(\Phi) dx = -\mu \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla \times B \cdot B1_{(0,\infty)}(\Phi) dx.$$

For  $\chi \in C_c^\infty[0, \infty)$  satisfying  $\chi = 1$  in  $[0, 1]$  and  $\chi = 0$  in  $[2, \infty)$ , we set  $\chi_R(x) = \chi(R^{-1}|x|)$ . For arbitrary  $\rho \in C_c^\infty(0, T)$ , by multiplying  $\chi_R \rho$  by (6.6) and integration by parts,

$$\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} A_t \cdot B1_{(0,\infty)}(\Phi) \chi_R \rho dx dt = - \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_+ \frac{G}{r^2} \chi_R \dot{\rho} dx dt - \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\Phi_+ \nabla \theta \times A_t) \cdot \nabla \chi_R \rho dx dt.$$

Since  $\Phi_+ \nabla \theta \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$  and  $A_t \in L^{4/3}(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$  by (3.18), (3.2) and (6.10),  $\Phi_+ \nabla \theta \times A_t \in L^{4/3}(0, T; L^1(\mathbb{R}^3))$ . The last term vanishes as  $R \rightarrow \infty$ . Since  $\rho \in C_c^\infty(0, T)$  is arbitrary,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_+ \frac{G}{r^2} dx = -\mu \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla \times B \cdot B1_{(0,\infty)}(\Phi) dx,$$

in the sense of distribution. Thus (6.12) holds.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.7.** *The equality (6.7) holds for axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solutions to (1.9) for  $B_\infty = -2e_z$  and  $u_\infty$  parallel to  $e_z$  and for all  $t \in [0, T]$ . Moreover,*



$$(6.14) \quad \left\| \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_+ \frac{G}{r^2} dx \right\|_{L^2(0,T)} \leq C\mu^{1/2} (\|v_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 + \|b_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2).$$

*Proof.* By (6.13),

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla \times B \cdot B 1_{(0,\infty)}(\Phi) dx \right| = \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla \times b \cdot B 1_{(0,\infty)}(\Phi) dx \right| \lesssim \|\nabla \times b\|_{L^2} \|b\|_{L^2}.$$

By (6.12) and (6.1),

$$\left\| \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_+ \frac{G}{r^2} dx \right\|_{L^2(0,T)} \lesssim \mu \|\nabla \times b\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))} \|b\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))} \lesssim \mu^{1/2} (\|v_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 + \|b_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2).$$

Thus (6.14) holds. The equality (6.7) follows by integrating (6.12) in time.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.8.** *The equality (6.8) holds for axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solutions to (1.9) for  $B_\infty = -2e_z$  and  $u_\infty$  parallel to  $e_z$  and for all  $t \in [0, T]$ .*

*Proof.* We take nonincreasing  $\chi \in C_c^\infty[0, \infty)$  such that  $\chi = 1$  in  $[0, 1]$  and  $\chi = 0$  in  $[2, \infty)$  and set  $\chi_R(x) = \chi(R^{-1}|x|)$ . Since  $\Phi_+ = (-\gamma)_+ = 0$  on  $\{r = 0\}$ , by multiplying  $\chi_R$  by (6.11) and integration by parts,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_+^2 \chi_R dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_{0,+}^2 \chi_R dx + 2\mu \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla \Phi_+|^2 \chi_R dx ds \\ &= \mu \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_+^2 \left( \Delta + \frac{2}{r} \partial_r \right) \chi_R dx ds + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u \cdot \nabla \chi_R \Phi_+^2 dx ds. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\Phi_+ \in L^\infty(0, T; L^q(\mathbb{R}^3))$  for  $1 \leq q < \infty$  by (3.19) and  $u = v + u_\infty$  for  $v \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$ , the right-hand side vanishes as  $R \rightarrow \infty$ . The equality (6.8) follows from the monotone convergence theorem.  $\square$

## 7. WEAK IDEAL LIMITS

We demonstrate generalized magnetic helicity conservation at weak ideal limits of axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solutions to (1.9) for fixed initial data in Theorems 7.5. We show flux local convergence by the vector potential equations (6.3) and the Aubin–Lions lemma, and the generalized magnetic mean-square potential conservation at weak ideal limits. The equality of generalized magnetic mean-square potential for axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solutions (6.8) strengthens the flux convergence from local to global. By taking a limit to the equality of generalized magnetic helicity for axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solutions (6.7), we show the desired generalized magnetic helicity conservation at weak ideal limits.

**7.1. Local convergence.** We estimate the time derivative of the vector potential by the equations (6.3) and apply the Aubin–Lions lemma.

**Proposition 7.1.** *Let  $(v_j, b_j)$  be an axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solution to (1.9) for fixed  $v_0, b_0 \in L^2_{\sigma,axi}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  with  $(v_j, \mu_j)$ ,  $B_\infty = -2e_z$ , and  $u_\infty$  parallel to  $e_z$ . Let  $(v, b)$  be a weak*

ideal limit of  $(v_j, b_j)$  as  $(v_j, \mu_j) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ . Let  $A_j$  and  $A$  be vector potentials of  $B_j = b_j + B_\infty$  and  $B = b + B_\infty$  defined by (3.16). There exists a subsequence such that

$$(7.1) \quad A_j \rightarrow A \quad \text{in } L^2(0, T; L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)).$$

In particular, for flux functions  $\phi_j$  of  $b_j$  and  $\phi$  of  $b$ ,

$$(7.2) \quad \frac{1}{r}\phi_j \rightarrow \frac{1}{r}\phi \quad \text{in } L^2(0, T; L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)).$$

*Proof.* By Proposition 6.4, the vector potential  $a_j$  of  $b_j$  defined by (3.3) and  $u_j = v_j + u_\infty$  satisfy

$$\partial_t a_j + \mathbb{P}(B_j \times u_j) = -\mu_j \nabla \times b_j \quad \text{on } L^2_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^3),$$

for a.e.  $t \in [0, T]$ , where  $\mathbb{P}$  is the projection operator associated with (2.1). We take an open ball  $B(0, R) \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  with radius  $R > 0$  and an arbitrary  $\xi \in W_0^{1,4}(B(0, R))$ . We extend  $\xi$  to  $\mathbb{R}^3$  by the zero extension and denote it by the same symbol. By multiplying  $\xi$  by the above equation and integration by parts,

$$\int_{B(0, R)} \partial_t a_j \cdot \xi dx + \int_{B(0, R)} B_j \times u_j \cdot \mathbb{P}\xi dx = -\mu_j \int_{B(0, R)} b_j \cdot \nabla \times \xi dx.$$

By the Sobolev embedding and boundedness of  $\mathbb{P}$  on  $L^4(\mathbb{R}^3)$ ,

$$\|\mathbb{P}\xi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \lesssim \|\mathbb{P}\xi\|_{W^{1,4}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \lesssim \|\xi\|_{W^{1,4}(\mathbb{R}^3)} = \|\xi\|_{W^{1,4}(B(0, R))}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{B(0, R)} \partial_t a_j \cdot \xi dx \right| &\lesssim \|B_j \times u_j\|_{L^1(B(0, R))} \|\xi\|_{W^{1,4}(B(0, R))} + \mu_j \|b_j\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \|\nabla \xi\|_{L^2(B(0, R))} \\ &\lesssim (\|B_j \times u_j\|_{L^1(B(0, R))} + \mu_j \|b_j\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}) \|\xi\|_{W^{1,4}(B(0, R))}. \end{aligned}$$

By taking the supremum for  $\xi$ ,

$$\|\partial_t a_j\|_{W_0^{1,4}(B(0, R))^*} \lesssim \|B_j \times u_j\|_{L^1(B(0, R))} + \mu_j \|b_j\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}.$$

Since  $B_j \times u_j = b_j \times v_j + B_\infty \times v_j + b_j \times u_\infty$  is uniformly bounded in  $L^\infty(0, T; L^1(B(0, R)))$  by (6.1), so is  $\partial_t a_j$  in  $L^\infty(0, T; W_0^{1,4}(B(0, R))^*)$ . By Lemma 2.16, there exists a subsequence such that for the vector potential  $a$  of  $b$  defined by (3.3),

$$a_j \rightarrow a \quad \text{in } L^2(0, T; L^2(B(0, R))).$$

Since  $R > 0$  is arbitrary, by a diagonal argument

$$a_j \rightarrow a \quad \text{in } L^2(0, T; L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^3)).$$

Thus (7.1) holds for  $A_j = a_j - \phi_\infty \nabla \theta$ ,  $\phi_\infty = r^2 + \gamma$  and  $\gamma \geq 0$ . By taking the  $\theta$ -component  $a_j \cdot r \nabla \theta = r^{-1} \phi_j$  and (7.2) follows.  $\square$

**7.2. Mean-square potential conservation.** We show that the convergence (7.2) implies that for  $u = v + u_\infty$ ,  $\Phi = \phi - \phi_\infty$  is a distributional solution to

$$(7.3) \quad \Phi_t + u \cdot \nabla \Phi = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, T).$$

Furthermore, we show that  $\Phi_+^2$  is a distributional solution to

$$(7.4) \quad \partial_t \Phi_+^2 + u \cdot \nabla \Phi_+^2 = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, T),$$

and conserves generalized magnetic mean-square potential.

**Proposition 7.2.** *Let  $\phi_j, \phi, v$  and  $u_\infty$  be as in Proposition 7.1. Let  $\phi_\infty = r^2 + \gamma$  and  $\gamma \geq 0$ . For  $\Phi_j = \phi_j - \phi_\infty$  and  $\Phi = \phi - \phi_\infty$ ,*

$$(7.5) \quad \Phi_j \rightarrow \Phi \quad \text{in } L^2(0, T; L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^3)).$$

*For  $u = v + u_\infty$ ,  $\Phi$  is a distributional solution to (7.3). Moreover,*

$$(7.6) \quad \Phi_{j,+} \rightarrow \Phi_+ \quad \text{in } L^2(0, T; L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^3)),$$

$$(7.7) \quad \Phi_{j,+}^2 \rightarrow \Phi_+^2 \quad \text{in } L^2(0, T; L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^3)).$$

*The function  $\Phi_+^2$  is a distributional solution to (7.4) and satisfies*

$$(7.8) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_+^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_{0,+}^2 dx,$$

*for a.e.  $t \in [0, T]$ .*

*Proof.* The convergence (7.2) implies (7.5). For an arbitrary  $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times [0, T])$ , we take  $R > 0$  such that  $\text{spt } \varphi \subset B(0, R) \times [0, T]$ . The function  $\Phi_j$  satisfies (6.4) on  $L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  for a.e.  $t \in [0, T]$  by Proposition 6.5. By multiplying  $\varphi$  by (6.4) and integration by parts,

$$\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_j (\partial_t \varphi + (v_j + u_\infty) \cdot \nabla \varphi) dx ds + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_0 \varphi_0 dx = -\mu_j \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left( \Phi_j \Delta \varphi - \frac{2}{r} \partial_r \Phi_j \varphi \right) dx ds.$$

The function  $\Phi_j$  is uniformly bounded in  $L^2(0, T; L^2(B(0, R)))$ . By (3.2) and (6.1),  $r^{-1} \nabla \Phi_j$

is uniformly bounded in  $L^\infty(0, T; L^2(B(0, R)))$ . Thus the right-hand side vanishes as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ . The field  $v_j$  is uniformly bounded in  $L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$  by (6.1). By

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\Phi_j v_j - \Phi v) \cdot \nabla \varphi dx ds \right| &\leq \sup_j \|v_j\|_{L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))} \|\Phi_j - \Phi\|_{L^1(0, T; L^2(B))} \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, T))} \\ &\quad + \left| \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (v_j - v) \Phi \cdot \nabla \varphi dx ds \right| \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

the limit  $\Phi$  satisfies

$$\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi (\partial_t \varphi + (v + u_\infty) \cdot \nabla \varphi) dx ds = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_0 \varphi_0 dx,$$

and (7.3) holds in the distributional sense.

The convergence (7.5) implies (7.6) since  $|\tau_+ - s_+| \leq |\tau - s|$  for  $\tau, s \in \mathbb{R}$ . The function  $\Phi_{j,+}$  is uniformly bounded in  $L^\infty(0, T; L^q(\mathbb{R}^3))$  for  $1 \leq q < \infty$  by (3.19) and (6.1). By Hölder's inequality, for  $l > 4$  and  $\theta \in (0, 1)$  satisfying  $1/4 = \theta/2 + (1 - \theta)/l$ ,

$$\|\Phi_{j,+} - \Phi_+\|_{L^4(B(0, R))} \leq \|\Phi_{j,+} - \Phi_+\|_{L^2(B(0, R))}^\theta \|\Phi_{j,+} - \Phi_+\|_{L^l(B(0, R))}^{1-\theta}.$$

This implies that  $\Phi_{j,+} \rightarrow \Phi_+$  in  $L^2(0, T; L^4_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^3))$  since  $2\theta < 1$ . By applying Hölder's inequality for  $\Phi_{j,+}^2 - \Phi_+^2 = (\Phi_{j,+} - \Phi_+)(\Phi_{j,+} + \Phi_+)$ ,

$$\|\Phi_{j,+}^2 - \Phi_+^2\|_{L^2(B(0, R))} \leq \|\Phi_{j,+} - \Phi_+\|_{L^4(B(0, R))} \|\Phi_{j,+} + \Phi_+\|_{L^4(B(0, R))}.$$

Thus (7.7) holds. By Proposition 6.5,  $\Phi_{j,+}^2$  satisfies (6.11). For arbitrary  $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times [0, T])$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_{j,+}^2 (\partial_t \varphi + (v_j + u_\infty) \cdot \nabla \varphi) dx ds + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_{0,+}^2 \varphi_0 dx \\ &= -\mu_j \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left( \Phi_{j,+}^2 \Delta \varphi + \frac{2}{r} \partial_r \Phi_{j,+}^2 \varphi - 2|\nabla \Phi_{j,+}|^2 \varphi \right) dx ds. \end{aligned}$$

We take  $R > 0$  such that  $\text{spt } \varphi \subset B(0, R) \times [0, T]$ . The functions  $\Phi_{j,+}$  and  $r^{-1} \partial_r \Phi_j$  are uniformly bounded in  $L^\infty(0, T; L^2(B(0, R)))$ . Hence  $r^{-1} \partial_r \Phi_{j,+}^2 = 2r^{-1} \partial_r \Phi_j \Phi_{j,+}$  is uniformly bounded in  $L^\infty(0, T; L^1(B(0, R)))$ . By  $|\nabla \Phi_{j,+}| = \nabla \Phi_j 1_{(0, \infty)}(\Phi_j) \leq |\nabla \Phi_j|$ ,  $|\nabla \Phi_{j,+}|^2 \in L^\infty(0, T; L^1(B(0, R)))$  is uniformly bounded. Thus the right-hand side vanishes as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ . By (7.7) and (6.2), in a similar way as we showed (7.3), letting  $j \rightarrow \infty$  implies that

$$\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_+^2 (\partial_t \varphi + (v + u_\infty) \cdot \nabla \varphi) dx ds = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_{0,+}^2 \varphi_0 dx.$$

Thus  $\Phi_+^2$  is a distributional solution to (7.4).

We take  $\chi \in C_c^\infty[0, \infty)$  such that  $\chi = 1$  in  $[0, 1]$  and  $\chi = 0$  on  $[2, \infty)$  and set  $\chi_R(x) = \chi(R^{-1}|x|)$ . For arbitrary  $\rho \in C_c^\infty[0, T)$ , substituting  $\varphi = \chi_R \rho$  into the above and letting  $R \rightarrow \infty$  imply that

$$\int_0^T \dot{\rho}(t) \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_+^2 dx \right) dt = -\rho(0) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_{0,+}^2 dx.$$

Thus (7.8) holds for a.e.  $t \in [0, T]$ .  $\square$

**7.3. Global convergence.** We strengthen the local convergence (7.6) to the following global convergence (7.9) by using the equalities (6.8) and (7.8). We then adjust it to the desired form by the isometries (3.12) to demonstrate generalized magnetic helicity conservation at weak ideal limits.

**Proposition 7.3.**

$$(7.9) \quad \Phi_{j,+} \rightarrow \Phi_+ \quad \text{in } L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)).$$

*Proof.* By (3.19), (3.2) and (6.1),  $\Phi_{j,+}$  is uniformly bounded in  $L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$ . By choosing a subsequence,  $\Phi_{j,+} \rightharpoonup \Phi_+$  in  $L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$ . By (6.8) and (7.8),

$$T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_{0,+}^2 dx = \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_+^2 dx dt \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_{j,+}^2 dx dt \leq T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_{0,+}^2 dx.$$

Thus  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|\Phi_{j,+}\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))} = \|\Phi_+\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))}$  and (7.9) holds.  $\square$

**Proposition 7.4.**

$$(7.10) \quad \Phi_{j,+} \rightarrow \Phi_+ \quad \text{in } L^7(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})).$$

*Proof.* The function  $\Phi_{j,+} - \Phi_+$  is supported in  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid \Phi_j(x) > 0\} \cup \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid \Phi(x) > 0\}$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi_{j,+} - \Phi_+| &= |\Phi_{j,+} - \Phi_+| (1_{(0, \infty)}(\Phi_j) + 1_{(0, \infty)}(\Phi) - 1_{(0, \infty)}(\Phi_j) 1_{(0, \infty)}(\Phi)) \\ &\leq |\Phi_{j,+} - \Phi_+| (1_{(0, \infty)}(\Phi_j) + 1_{(0, \infty)}(\Phi)). \end{aligned}$$

By (3.17), (3.2) and (6.1),  $1_{(0, \infty)}(\Phi_j)$  is uniformly bounded in  $L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$ . The convergence (7.9) implies that

$$\Phi_{j,+} \rightarrow \Phi_+ \quad \text{in } L^2(0, T; L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)).$$

By the isometry (3.12)<sub>1</sub> for  $\varphi_j = \phi_j/r^2$  and  $\varphi = \phi/r^2$ ,

$$\left( \varphi_j - 1 - \frac{\gamma}{r^2} \right)_+ \rightarrow \left( \varphi - 1 - \frac{\gamma}{r^2} \right)_+ \quad \text{in } L^2(0, T; L^1(\mathbb{R}^5)).$$

By (3.11), (3.2) and (6.1),  $\varphi_j$  is uniformly bounded in  $L^\infty(0, T; \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^5))$ . By  $(\varphi_j - 1 - \gamma/r^2)_+ \leq$

$|\varphi_j|$  and  $\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^5) \subset L^{10/3}(\mathbb{R}^5)$ ,  $(\varphi_j - 1 - \gamma/r^2)_+$  is uniformly bounded in  $L^\infty(0, T; L^{10/3}(\mathbb{R}^5))$ . By Hölder's inequality,

$$\|\varsigma\|_{L^7(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^5))} \leq \|\varsigma\|_{L^\infty(0, T; L^{10/3}(\mathbb{R}^5))}^{5/7} \|\varsigma\|_{L^2(0, T; L^1(\mathbb{R}^5))}^{2/7},$$

$\varsigma = (\varphi_j - 1 - \gamma/r^2)_+ - (\varphi - 1 - \gamma/r^2)_+$  converges to zero in  $L^7(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^5))$ . By the isometry (3.12)<sub>2</sub>, (7.10) holds.  $\square$

**7.4. Helicity conservation.** We now demonstrate generalized magnetic helicity conservation at weak ideal limits for axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solutions.

**Theorem 7.5.** *Let  $B_\infty = -2e_z$ . Let  $u_\infty$  be a constant parallel to  $e_z$ . Let  $\phi_\infty = r^2 + \gamma$  and  $\gamma \geq 0$ . Suppose that  $(v, b)$  is a weak ideal limit of axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solutions to (1.9) for fixed  $(v_0, b_0)$ . Then, for the Clebsch potentials  $\phi, G$  of  $b$  and  $\Phi = \phi - \phi_\infty$ ,*

$$(7.11) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_+ \frac{G}{r^2} dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_{0,+} \frac{G_0}{r^2} dx,$$

for a.e.  $t \in [0, T]$ .

*Proof.* By the uniform bound (6.14),

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_{j,+} \frac{G_j}{r^2} dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_{0,+} \frac{G_0}{r^2} dx \right| &\leq \int_0^T \left| \frac{d}{dt} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_{j,+} \frac{G_j}{r^2} dx \right) \right| dt \\ &\lesssim T^{1/2} \mu_j^{1/2} (\|v_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 + \|b_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$(7.12) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_{j,+} \frac{G_j}{r^2} dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_{0,+} \frac{G_0}{r^2} dx \quad \text{uniformly in } [0, T].$$

For an arbitrary  $\rho \in C_c^\infty[0, T]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \dot{\rho}(t) \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_{j,+} \frac{G_j}{r^2} dx \right) dt - \int_0^T \dot{\rho}(t) \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_+ \frac{G}{r^2} dx \right) dt &= \int_0^T \dot{\rho}(t) \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\Phi_{j,+} - \Phi_+) \frac{G_j}{r^2} dx \right) dt \\ &\quad + \int_0^T \dot{\rho}(t) \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_+ (G_j - G) \frac{1}{r^2} dx \right) dt. \end{aligned}$$

The last term converges to zero as  $j \rightarrow \infty$  since  $G_j \rightharpoonup G$  weakly-star in  $L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1}))$  by (6.2) and  $\Phi_+ \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1}))$  by (3.18). By (7.10),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_0^T \dot{\rho}(t) \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\Phi_{j,+} - \Phi_+) \frac{G_j}{r^2} dx \right) dt \right| \\
&= 2\pi \left| \int_0^T \dot{\rho}(t) \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} (\Phi_{j,+} - \Phi_+) \frac{G_j}{r} dz dr \right) dt \right| \\
&\leq 2\pi \|\dot{\rho}\|_{L^{7/6}(0,T)} \|\Phi_{j,+} - \Phi_+\|_{L^7(0,T;L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2;r^{-1}))} \left( \sup_j \|G_j\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2;r^{-1}))} \right) \rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

By the uniform convergence (7.12),

$$\int_0^T \dot{\rho}(t) \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_+ \frac{G}{r^2} dx \right) dt = -\rho(0) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_{0,+} \frac{G_0}{r^2} dx.$$

Thus (7.11) holds for a.e.  $t \in [0, T]$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 7.6.** *Let  $B_\infty = -2e_z$ . Let  $u_\infty$  be a constant parallel to  $e_z$ . Let  $\phi_\infty = r^2 + \gamma$  and  $\gamma \geq 0$ . There exists a weak ideal limit  $(v, b)$  of axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solutions to (1.9) for  $v_0, b_0 \in L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  satisfying*

$$(7.13) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (|v|^2 + |b|^2) dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (|v_0|^2 + |b_0|^2) dx,$$

$$(7.14) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\phi - \phi_\infty)_+ \frac{G}{r^2} dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\phi_0 - \phi_\infty)_+ \frac{G_0}{r^2} dx,$$

for a.e.  $t \in [0, T]$ , where  $\phi, G$  are the Clebsch potentials of  $b$ .

*Proof.* We take  $(v_j, \mu_j)$  such that  $(v_j, \mu_j) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ . By Theorem 6.3, there exists an axisymmetric Leray–Hopf weak solution  $(v_j, b_j)$  to (1.9) for  $(v_0, b_0)$ . By (6.1), there exists a subsequence and  $(v, b)$  such that (6.2) holds. The limit  $(v, b)$  satisfies (7.13) by the lower semicontinuity of the norm for the weak-star convergence (6.2). The conservation (7.14) follows from Theorem 7.5.  $\square$

**Remark 7.7.** The results in Sections 6 and 7 hold also for  $B_\infty = -We_z$ ,  $\phi_\infty = Wr^2/2 + \gamma$ ,  $W > 0$ , and  $\gamma \geq 0$ .

## 8. ORBITAL STABILITY

We complete the proof of Theorem 1.3. We first show the stability of a set of minimizers to the variational problem (4.1) with parameters  $(h, 2, \gamma)$  in weak ideal limits of axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solutions by the compactness result in Theorem 5.6 and the existence result for weak ideal limits in Theorem 7.6. We then extend the result for general parameters  $(h, W, \gamma)$ . We derive Theorem 1.3 from the uniqueness of the Grad–Shafranov equation (4.3) for  $\gamma = 0$  and the explicit form of the constant  $h_C$  in (1.11).

**8.1. Stability of minimizers.** We denote the suppressed constant  $\gamma \geq 0$  explicitly for  $H[\cdot] = H_\gamma[\cdot]$ ,  $I_h = I_{h,\gamma}$  and  $S_h = S_{h,\gamma}$  in (3.26), (4.1), and (4.2).

**Proposition 8.1.** *Let  $h \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\gamma \geq 0$ . Let  $\phi_\infty = r^2 + \gamma$  and  $B_\infty = -2e_z$ . Let  $u_\infty$  be a constant parallel to  $e_z$ . The set  $S_{h,\gamma}$  in (4.2) is orbitally stable in weak ideal limits of axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solutions to (1.9) in the sense that for arbitrary  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that for  $v_0, b_0 \in L^2_{\sigma,axi}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  satisfying*

$$\|v_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \inf \left\{ \|b_0 - \tilde{b}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \mid \tilde{b} \in S_{h,\gamma} \right\} + |H_\gamma[b_0] - h| \leq \delta,$$

*there exists a weak ideal limit  $(v, b)$  of axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solutions to (1.9) for  $(v_0, b_0)$  such that*

$$\text{ess sup}_{t>0} \left( \|v\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \inf \left\{ \|b - \tilde{b}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \mid \tilde{b} \in S_{h,\gamma} \right\} \right) \leq \varepsilon.$$

*Proof.* Suppose that the assertion were false. Then, there exists  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  such that for any  $n \geq 1$ , there exists  $(v_{0,n}, b_{0,n})$  satisfying

$$\|v_{0,n}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \inf \left\{ \|b_{0,n} - \tilde{b}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \mid \tilde{b} \in S_{h,\gamma} \right\} + |H_\gamma[b_{0,n}] - h| \leq \frac{1}{n},$$

and the weak ideal limit  $(v_n, b_n)$  in Theorem 7.6 satisfying

$$\text{ess sup}_{t>0} \left( \|v_n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \inf \left\{ \|b_n - \tilde{b}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \mid \tilde{b} \in S_{h,\gamma} \right\} \right) \geq \varepsilon_0.$$

We denote by  $F_n$  the set of all points  $t \in (0, \infty)$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}[v_n, b_n] &\leq \mathcal{E}[v_{0,n}, b_{0,n}], \\ H_\gamma[b_n] &= H_\gamma[b_{0,n}]. \end{aligned}$$

The set  $F_n^c$  has measure zero. For  $F = \bigcap_{n=1}^\infty F_n$ ,  $F^c$  has measure zero and the above inequality and equality hold for all  $t \in F$  and  $n \geq 1$ . We take a point  $t_n \in F$  such that

$$\|v_n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}(t_n) + \inf \left\{ \|b_n - \tilde{b}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \mid \tilde{b} \in S_{h,\gamma} \right\}(t_n) \geq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} > 0,$$

and write  $(v_n, b_n) = (v_n, b_n)(\cdot, t_n)$  by suppressing  $t_n$ .

For  $h_n = H_\gamma[b_{0,n}]$ ,

$$I_{h_n,\gamma} \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |b_{0,n}|^2 dx \leq \frac{1}{2} \left( \inf \left\{ \|b_{0,n} - \tilde{b}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \mid \tilde{b} \in S_{h,\gamma} \right\} + \sqrt{2} I_{h,\gamma}^{1/2} \right)^2.$$

By the lower semi-continuity (4.17), letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  implies that



$$H_\gamma[b_{0,n}] \rightarrow h, \quad \mathcal{E}[v_{0,n}, b_{0,n}] \rightarrow I_{h,\gamma}.$$

By helicity conservation and nonincreasing total energy,

$$\begin{aligned} H_\gamma[b_n] &= H_\gamma[b_{0,n}] = h_n, \\ I_{h,\gamma} &\leq \mathcal{E}[v_n, b_n] \leq \mathcal{E}[v_{0,n}, b_{0,n}]. \end{aligned}$$

Letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  implies that

$$H_\gamma[b_n] \rightarrow h, \quad \mathcal{E}[v_n, b_n] \rightarrow I_{h,\gamma}.$$

By Theorem 5.6, there exists  $\{n_k\}$ ,  $\{z_k\}$  and some  $b \in S_{h,\gamma}$  such that

$$(v_{n_k}, b_{n_k}(\cdot + z_k e_z)) \rightarrow (0, b) \quad \text{in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \|v_{n_k}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \|b_{n_k}(\cdot + z_k e_z) - b\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \right\} \\ &\geq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left( \|v_{n_k}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \inf \left\{ \|b_{n_k} - \tilde{b}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \mid \tilde{b} \in S_{h,\gamma} \right\} \right) \geq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

We obtained a contradiction. The proof is complete.  $\square$

**Theorem 8.2** (Stability of nonlinear force-free fields with discontinuous factors). *Let  $h \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $W > 0$  and  $\gamma \geq 0$ . Let  $\phi_\infty = Wr^2/2 + \gamma$  and  $B_\infty = -We_z$ . Let  $u_\infty$  be a constant parallel to  $e_z$ . The set of minimizers  $S_{h,W,\gamma}$  to  $I_{h,W,\gamma}$  in (1.13) is orbitally stable in weak ideal limits of axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solutions to (1.9) in the sense that for arbitrary  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that for  $v_0, b_0 \in L^2_{\sigma,axi}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  satisfying*

$$\|v_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \inf \left\{ \|b_0 - \tilde{b}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \mid \tilde{b} \in S_{h,W,\gamma} \right\} + \left| 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\phi_0 - \phi_\infty)_+ \frac{G_0}{r^2} dx - h \right| \leq \delta,$$

*for the Clebsch potentials  $\phi_0, G_0$  of  $b_0$ , there exists a weak ideal limit  $(v, b)$  of axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solutions to (1.9) for  $(v_0, b_0)$  such that*

$$\text{ess sup}_{t>0} \left( \|v\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \inf \left\{ \|b - \tilde{b}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \mid \tilde{b} \in S_{h,W,\gamma} \right\} \right) \leq \varepsilon.$$

*Proof.* The assertion follows from the same argument as the proof of Proposition 8.1 for  $W = 2$  by the compactness of minimizing sequences to  $I_{h,W,\gamma}$  (Remark 5.7) and the existence of weak ideal limits conserving generalized magnetic helicity (Remark 7.7).  $\square$

**8.2. Uniqueness.** For given constants  $(W, \lambda)$  and the constant  $h_C$  in (1.11), we show that the set of minimizers  $S_{h_C, W, 0}$  is translations of  $U_C - B_\infty$  for the explicit solution  $U_C$  in (1.6). The following uniqueness result is due to Fraenkel [Fra92, Theorem 4], [Fra00, Exercise 4.23].

**Theorem 8.3.** *Let  $W > 0$ ,  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\phi_\infty = Wr^2/2$ . Let  $\phi \in \dot{H}_0^1(\mathbb{R}_+^2; r^{-1})$  be a weak solution to (4.3). There exists  $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\phi - \phi_\infty = \Phi_C(\cdot + z_0 e_z)$  for  $\Phi_C$  with  $(W, \mu^2)$  in (1.6).*

The proof of Theorem 8.3 is based on the moving plane method. As proved in the proof of Proposition 4.4,  $\varphi = \phi/r^2$  is a continuous decaying solution to

$$(8.1) \quad -\Delta_y \varphi = \mu^2 \left( \varphi - \frac{W}{2} \right)_+ \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^5.$$

The decay implies that the set  $\{y \in \mathbb{R}^5 \mid \varphi > W/2\}$  is compact in  $\mathbb{R}^5$ . Therefore,  $\varphi$  is expressed in terms of the Newton potential,

$$\varphi(y) = \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \int_{\{\varphi > W/2\}} \frac{\mu^2}{|y-w|^3} \left( \varphi - \frac{W}{2} \right)_+ dw.$$

This potential representation implies that  $\varphi$  is a positive solution to (8.1) satisfying an admissible asymptotic behavior as  $|y| \rightarrow \infty$  which enables one to apply the moving plane method [Fra00, Theorem 4.2] to deduce that a translation of  $\varphi$  in  $y_1$ -direction is radially symmetric and decreasing.

The symmetry of  $\varphi$  implies the explicit form (1.6) for  $\lambda = \mu^2$  [Mof69], cf. [Fra92], [Fra00]. The equation of  $\varphi = \varphi(\rho)$  for  $\rho = \sqrt{z^2 + r^2}$  is

$$-\left( \partial_\rho^2 + \frac{4}{\rho} \partial_\rho \right) \varphi = \mu^2 \left( \varphi - \frac{W}{2} \right)_+, \quad \rho > 0.$$

Since  $\varphi$  is decreasing, there exists a unique  $R > 0$  such that  $\varphi(R) = W/2$ . The function  $\tilde{\varphi} = \varphi - W/2$  satisfies

$$-\left( \partial_\rho^2 + \frac{4}{\rho} \partial_\rho \right) \tilde{\varphi} = \mu^2 \tilde{\varphi}_+, \quad \rho > 0.$$

The scaled  $\hat{\varphi} = \tilde{\varphi}(\rho/|\mu|)$  satisfies  $-(\partial_\rho^2 + 4\rho^{-1}\partial_\rho)\hat{\varphi} = \hat{\varphi}$  and  $\hat{\varphi} > 0$  for  $0 < \rho < R_0 = |\mu|R$  and  $\hat{\varphi}(R_0) = 0$ . By the transform  $\kappa = \rho^{3/2}\hat{\varphi}$ , this equation is reduced to the Bessel's differential equation,

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{\kappa} + \frac{1}{\rho} \dot{\kappa} + \left( 1 - \frac{(3/2)^2}{\rho^2} \right) \kappa &= 0, \quad \kappa > 0, \quad 0 < \rho < R_0, \\ \kappa(R_0) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

By the boundedness of  $\kappa$  at  $\rho = 0$ ,  $\kappa$  is the 3/2-th order Bessel function of the first kind with some constant  $C_1$ , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa &= C_1 J_{3/2}(\rho), \\ R_0 &= c_{3/2}.\end{aligned}$$

The function  $\tilde{\varphi}$  is harmonic for  $\rho > R$  and expressed as  $\tilde{\varphi} = C_2 + C_3/\rho^3$  for  $\rho > R$  with  $C_2 = -W/2$  and  $C_3 = WR^2/2$  by the boundary conditions  $\tilde{\varphi} \rightarrow -W/2$  as  $\rho \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\tilde{\varphi}(R) = 0$ . By continuity of  $\partial_\rho \tilde{\varphi}$  at  $\rho = R$  and  $J_{3/2}(c_{3/2}) = -J_{5/2}(c_{3/2})$ ,

$$C_1 = \frac{3}{2} W \frac{c_{3/2}^{1/2}}{|\mu|^3 J_{5/2}(c_{3/2})}.$$

This implies the explicit form (1.6) with  $(W, \mu^2)$ , i.e.,  $\Phi = \Phi_C$ , since  $\tilde{\varphi} = \Phi/r^2$  for  $\Phi = \phi - \phi_\infty$ .

The constant  $h_C$  in (1.11) was computed by Moffatt [Mof69, p.128]. We write it with our symbols.

**Proposition 8.4.** *The constant  $h_C$  in (1.11) is*

$$(8.2) \quad h_C = \left(\frac{W}{\lambda}\right)^2 \frac{12\pi c_{3/2}}{J_{5/2}^2(c_{3/2})} \int_0^{c_{3/2}} \rho J_{3/2}^2(\rho) d\rho.$$

*Proof.* By (1.11), for  $\phi = \Phi_C + Wr^2/2$  and  $\varphi = \phi/r^2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}h_C &= 2\lambda^{1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_{C,+}^2 \frac{1}{r^2} dx = 2\lambda^{1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left(\phi - \frac{W}{2}r^2\right)_+^2 \frac{1}{r^2} dx = \frac{2\lambda^{1/2}}{\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^5} \left(\varphi - \frac{W}{2}\right)_+^2 dy \\ &= \frac{2}{\pi\lambda^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^5} \left(\varphi\left(\frac{w}{\lambda^{1/2}}\right) - \frac{W}{2}\right)_+^2 dw.\end{aligned}$$

The function  $\varphi_1(w) = \varphi(w/\lambda^{1/2})$  is a solution to (8.1) for  $\mu = 1$ . By  $\varphi_1(w) - W/2 = C_1 J_{3/2}(\rho)\rho^{-3/2}$  for  $\rho = |w| < c_{3/2}$  with  $C_1 = 3Wc_{3/2}^{1/2}/(2J_{5/2}(c_{3/2}))$  and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^5} \left(\varphi_1(w) - \frac{W}{2}\right)_+^2 dw = \frac{8\pi^2}{3} C_1^2 \int_0^{c_{3/2}} \rho J_{3/2}^2(\rho) d\rho,$$

the constant  $h_C$  is given by (8.2). □

**Theorem 8.5.** *Let  $W > 0$  and  $\lambda > 0$ . Let  $U_C$  be as in (1.6). Let  $h_C > 0$  be as in (1.11). Let  $B_\infty = -We_z$ . Let  $S_{h_C, W, 0}$  be as in Theorem 8.2. Then,*

$$(8.3) \quad S_{h_C, W, 0} = \left\{ U_C(\cdot + ze_z) - B_\infty \mid z \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$

*Proof.* We take an arbitrary  $b = \nabla \times (\phi \nabla \theta) + G \nabla \theta \in S_{h_C, W, 0}$ . By Proposition 4.2,  $G = \mu(\phi - \phi_\infty)_+$  for  $\phi_\infty = Wr^2/2$  and some  $\mu > 0$ , and  $\phi$  is a weak solution to (4.3). By Theorem 8.3,  $\phi - \phi_\infty$  is a translation of the explicit solution (1.6) with parameters  $W > 0$  and  $\tilde{\lambda} = \mu^2$ . By (8.2), generalized magnetic helicity of  $b$  is  $C(W/\tilde{\lambda})^2$  for some exact constant  $C$ . Since  $b \in S_{h_C, W, 0}$ , generalized magnetic helicity of  $b$  is  $h_C = C(W/\lambda)^2$ . Thus  $\tilde{\lambda} = \lambda$  and  $\phi - \phi_\infty = \Phi_C(\cdot + z_0 e_z)$ ,  $G = G_C(\cdot + z_0 e_z)$  for  $\Phi_C$  and  $G_C$  in (1.11) and some  $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ . By  $B_\infty = -\nabla \times (\phi_\infty \nabla \theta)$ ,

$$U_C = \nabla \times (\Phi_C \nabla \theta) + G_C \nabla \theta = b(\cdot - z_0 e_z) + B_\infty.$$

We proved that  $S_{h_C, W, 0} \subset \{U_C(\cdot + z e_z) - B_\infty \mid z \in \mathbb{R}\}$ . The translations of  $b = U_C(\cdot + z_0 e_z) - B_\infty$  are also elements of  $S_{h_C, W, 0}$ . Thus the equality (8.3) holds.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.3.* By Theorem 8.5 for  $h = h_C$  and  $\gamma = 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \inf \left\{ \|b_0 - \tilde{b}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \mid \tilde{b} \in S_{h_C, W, 0} \right\} &= \inf \left\{ \|b_0 - \tilde{b}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \mid \tilde{b} = U_C(\cdot + z e_z) - B_\infty, z \in \mathbb{R} \right\} \\ &= \inf \left\{ \|b_0 + B_\infty - U_C(\cdot + z e_z)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \mid z \in \mathbb{R} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The assertion follows from Theorem 8.2.  $\square$

**Remark 8.6.** The existence and the stability of axisymmetric nonlinear force-free fields with continuous factors  $f \in C(\mathbb{R}^3)$  may be studied by replacing  $g(s) = 2s_+$  of generalized magnetic helicity in (6.5) with sufficiently regular  $g(s)$ , e.g.,  $g(s) = 2s_+^\alpha$ ,  $\alpha > 1$ , cf. [Abe22].

#### APPENDIX A. EXISTENCE OF AXISYMMETRIC LERAY–HOPF SOLUTIONS

We provide proof for the existence of axisymmetric Leray–Hopf solutions to (1.9) stated in Theorem 6.3. The existence of weak solutions to viscous and resistive MHD in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  constructed by Leray’s method can be found in [FDJ21]. We construct Leray–Hopf solutions to the system (1.9) with constants  $u_\infty, B_\infty \in \mathbb{R}^3$ .

**Theorem A.1.** *Let  $u_\infty, B_\infty \in \mathbb{R}^3$ . For  $v_0, b_0 \in L^2_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , there exists a Leray–Hopf solution to (1.9).*

We take  $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$  such that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \chi dx = 1$  and set  $\chi_\varepsilon(x) = \varepsilon^{-3} \chi(\varepsilon^{-1} x)$  for  $\varepsilon > 0$ . We look at the approximated system of (1.9):

$$\begin{aligned} (A.1) \quad v_t + (w + u_\infty) \cdot \nabla v + \nabla p &= (d + B_\infty) \cdot \nabla b + \nu \Delta v, \\ b_t + (w + u_\infty) \cdot \nabla b + \nabla q &= (d + B_\infty) \cdot \nabla v + \mu \Delta b, \\ \nabla \cdot v &= \nabla \cdot b = 0, \\ w &= \chi_\varepsilon * v, \quad d = \chi_\varepsilon * b. \end{aligned}$$

For solutions to (A.1), the energy equality

$$(A.2) \quad \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (|v|^2 + |b|^2) dx + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\nu |\nabla v|^2 + \mu |\nabla b|^2) dx ds = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (|v_0|^2 + |b_0|^2) dx,$$

holds for all  $t \in [0, T]$ . For simplicity of notation, we apply block matrices

$$(A.3) \quad \varphi = \begin{bmatrix} v \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \quad F = \begin{bmatrix} (d + B_\infty) \otimes b - (w + u_\infty) \otimes v \\ (d + B_\infty) \otimes v - (w + u_\infty) \otimes b \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{L} = \begin{bmatrix} \nu & 0 \\ 0 & \mu \end{bmatrix} \Delta.$$

We denote  $v, b \in L^2_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^3)$  by  $\varphi = {}^t[v, b] \in L^2_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . In terms of the projection operator  $\mathbb{P}$ , associated with (2.1), the system (A.1) can be expressed as

$$(A.4) \quad \varphi_t = \mathcal{L}\varphi + \mathbb{P}\nabla \cdot F \quad \text{on } L^2_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

We denote the heat semigroup by

$$S(t) = \begin{bmatrix} e^{t\nu\Delta} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{t\mu\Delta} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The integral form of (A.4) is

$$(A.5) \quad \varphi = S(t)\varphi_0 + \int_0^t S(t-s)\mathbb{P}\nabla \cdot F(s)ds.$$

We construct solutions of (A.5) in the energy space  $C([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^2(0, T; H^1(\mathbb{R}^3))$  equipped with the norm  $\|\varphi\|_T = \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))} + \|\varphi\|_{L^2(0, T; H^1(\mathbb{R}^3))}$ . By integration by parts,  $S(t)$  satisfies the linear estimates

$$(A.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \|S(t)\varphi_0\|_T &\leq C\|\varphi_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}, \\ \left\| \int_0^t S(t-s)\mathbb{P}\nabla \cdot F_0(s)ds \right\|_T &\leq C'\|F_0\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))}. \end{aligned}$$

The constants  $C$  and  $C'$  are independent of  $T$ . For  $F_0$  satisfying  $\nabla \cdot F_0 \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$ ,

$$(A.7) \quad \nabla^2 \int_0^t S(t-s)\mathbb{P}\nabla \cdot F_0 ds \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)),$$

by the maximal regularity, e.g., [Soh01, 1.6.2 Lemma]. Solutions of the integral equation (A.5) in the energy space satisfies (A.4) for a.e.  $t \in [0, T]$  since  $\nabla \cdot F \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$  by the estimate of the mollifier,

$$(A.8) \quad \|\chi_\varepsilon * \varphi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{3/2}} \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}.$$

**Proposition A.2.** *Let  $T > 0$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . For  $\varphi_0 \in L^2_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , there exists a unique solution  $\varphi \in C([0, T]; L^2_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^2(0, T; H^1(\mathbb{R}^3))$  of (A.5). The solution  $\varphi = {}^t[v, b]$  satisfies*

$$(A.9) \quad \varphi_t, \nabla^2 \varphi \in L_{loc}^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)),$$

and (A.2) holds for all  $t \in [0, T]$ .

*Proof.* We set  $\varphi_1 = S(t)\varphi_0$  and  $\varphi_{j+1}$  for  $j \geq 1$  by

$$\varphi_{j+1} = S(t)\varphi_0 + \int_0^t S(t-s)\mathbb{P}\nabla \cdot F_j(s)ds.$$

for  $F_j$  defined by  $\varphi_j$  and (A.3). By (A.8),

$$\|F_j\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))} \leq CT^{1/2} \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{3/2}} K_j + 1 \right) K_j,$$

for  $K_j = \|\varphi_j\|_T$ . By (A.6),

$$K_{j+1} \leq K_1 + CT^{1/2} \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{3/2}} K_j + 1 \right) K_j.$$

The constant  $C$  is independent of  $T$  and  $j$ . Thus for some  $T_0 < T$ ,  $\varphi_j \in C([0, T_0]; L_\sigma^2(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^2(0, T_0; H^1(\mathbb{R}^3))$  is uniformly bounded. By estimating  $\varphi_{j+1} - \varphi_j$  in a similar way, for some  $T_1 < T_0$ ,

$$\varphi_j \rightarrow \varphi \quad \text{in } C([0, T_1]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^2(0, T_1; H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)),$$

and  $\varphi$  is a unique solution to (A.5). By (A.7),  $\varphi$  satisfies (A.9) and (A.4) for a.e.  $t \in [0, T_1]$ . By multiplying  $\varphi$  by (A.4) and integration by parts, for  $\delta \leq t \leq T_1$ ,

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (|v|^2 + |b|^2) dx + \int_\delta^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (v|\nabla v|^2 + \mu|\nabla b|^2) dx ds = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (|v|^2 + |b|^2) (\delta) dx.$$

The solution  $\varphi$  is strongly continuous at  $t = 0$ . Letting  $\delta \rightarrow 0$  implies (A.2) for  $t \in [0, T_1]$ . By the energy equality (A.2), the local-in-time solution is extendable and (A.2) holds for all  $t \in [0, T]$ .  $\square$

**Proposition A.3.** *The solution  $\varphi$  in Proposition A.2 satisfies*

$$(A.10) \quad \sup_{\varepsilon > 0} \|\varphi_t\|_{L^{4/3}(0, T; H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)^*)} < \infty.$$

*Proof.* By  $L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)) \subset L^{8/3}(0, T; L^4(\mathbb{R}^3))$  and (A.2),  $F$  in (A.3) is uniformly bounded in  $L^{4/3}(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$ . By multiplying functions in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$  by (A.4) and integration by parts,

$$\|\varphi_t\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)^*} \leq C(\|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}).$$

Thus (A.10) holds.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem A.1.* We take  $\{\varepsilon_j\}$  such that  $\varepsilon_j \rightarrow 0$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$  and denote solutions in Proposition A.2 by  $\varphi_j$ . By  $H_0^1(B(0, R))^* \supset H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)^*$  for  $R > 0$ , (A.2), (A.10), Lemma 2.16 and a diagonal argument, there exists a subsequence and  $\varphi = {}^t[v, b]$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla\varphi_j &\rightharpoonup \nabla\varphi \quad \text{in } L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)), \\ \varphi_j &\rightarrow \varphi \quad \text{in } L^2(0, T; L_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}^3)), \\ \partial_t\varphi_j &\rightharpoonup \partial_t\varphi \quad \text{in } L^{4/3}(0, T; H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)^*), \\ \varphi_j &\overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \varphi \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)). \end{aligned}$$

By  $\varphi_t \in L^{4/3}(0, T; H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)^*)$  and  $\varphi \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$ ,  $\varphi \in C_w([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$  follows [Tem77, Ch.III, Lemma 1.4]. By the lower semi-continuity for the weak-star convergence in  $L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$  and the weak continuity of the limit, the energy inequality (6.1) holds for all  $t \in [0, T]$ . Since  $(L_\sigma^2 \cap H^1)(\mathbb{R}^3)^* \supset H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)^*$ ,  $\varphi_t \in L^1(0, T; L_\sigma^2 \cap H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)^*)$  follows.

It remains to show that  $\varphi$  satisfies  $\varphi(\cdot, 0) = {}^t[v_0, b_0]$  and (1.9) in the sense of Definition 6.1. We take arbitrary  $\rho \in C_c^\infty[0, T)$  and  $\xi, \zeta \in C_{c,\sigma}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . Since  $\varphi_j$  satisfies (A.4) for a.e.  $t \in [0, T]$ , by multiplying  ${}^t[\rho\xi, \rho\zeta]$  by (A.4) and integration by parts,

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v_j \cdot \xi \dot{\rho} dx dt - \rho(0) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v_0 \cdot \xi dx + \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} ((w_j + u_\infty) \cdot \nabla v_j - (d_j + B_\infty) \cdot \nabla b_j) \cdot \xi \rho dx dt \\ & \quad + v \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla v_j : \nabla \xi \rho dx dt = 0, \\ & - \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} b_j \cdot \zeta \dot{\rho} dx dt - \rho(0) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} b_0 \cdot \zeta dx + \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} ((w_j + u_\infty) \cdot \nabla b_j - (d_j + B_\infty) \cdot \nabla v_j) \cdot \zeta \rho dx dt \\ & \quad + \mu \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla \times b_j \cdot \nabla \times \zeta \rho dx dt = 0. \end{aligned}$$

By using the strong convergence of  $\varphi_j$  in  $L^2(0, T; L_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$  and letting  $j \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v \cdot \xi \dot{\rho} dx dt - \rho(0) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v_0 \cdot \xi dx + \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} ((v + u_\infty) \cdot \nabla v - (b + B_\infty) \cdot \nabla b) \cdot \xi \rho dx dt \\ & \quad + v \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla v : \nabla \xi \rho dx dt = 0, \\ & - \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} b \cdot \zeta \dot{\rho} dx dt - \rho(0) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} b_0 \cdot \zeta dx + \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} ((v + u_\infty) \cdot \nabla b - (b + B_\infty) \cdot \nabla v) \cdot \zeta \rho dx dt \\ & \quad + \mu \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla \times b \cdot \nabla \times \zeta \rho dx dt = 0. \end{aligned}$$

We extend  $\xi, \zeta$  to functions in  $L_\sigma^2 \cap H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$  by density of  $C_{c,\sigma}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$  in  $L_\sigma^2 \cap H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . Since  $\rho \in C_c^\infty[0, T)$  is arbitrary,  $\varphi(\cdot, t) \rightarrow \varphi(\cdot, 0) = {}^t[v_0, b_0]$  in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$  as  $t \rightarrow 0$ . Thus  $\varphi(\cdot, t) \rightarrow \varphi(\cdot, 0)$

in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$  by (6.1). By integration by parts,  $(v, b)$  satisfies (1.9) in the sense of Definition 6.1.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 6.3.* The system (1.1) is invariant under the rotation around the  $z$ -axis. For constants  $B_\infty, u_\infty$  parallel to  $e_z$  and axisymmetric  $\chi$ , the system (1.9) as well as (A.1) are also invariant under the rotation. By the uniqueness, solutions in Proposition A.2 for  $\varepsilon_j > 0$  are axisymmetric for axisymmetric  $v_0, b_0 \in L^2_{\sigma, \text{axi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . Their limits as  $\varepsilon_j \rightarrow 0$  are also axisymmetric.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [ABCa] D. Albritton, E. Brué, and M. Colombo. Non-uniqueness of Leray solutions of the forced Navier-Stokes equations. arXiv:2112.03116v1.
- [ABC<sup>+</sup>b] D. Albritton, E. Brué, M. Colombo, C. De Lellis, V. Giri, M. Janisch, and H. Kwon. Instability and nonuniqueness for the 2d Euler equations in vorticity form, after M. Vishik. arXiv:2112.04943.
- [ABDG98] C. Amrouche, C. Bernardi, M. Dauge, and V. Girault. Vector potentials in three-dimensional non-smooth domains. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, 21:823–864, (1998).
- [Abe22] K. Abe. Existence of vortex rings in Beltrami flows. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 391:873–899, (2022).
- [AC14] L. Ambrosio and G. Crippa. Continuity equations and ODE flows with non-smooth velocity. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, 144(6):1191–1244, (2014).
- [AC22] K. Abe and K. Choi. Stability of Lamb dipoles. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 244:877–917, (2022).
- [AF88] C. J. Amick and L. E. Fraenkel. The uniqueness of a family of steady vortex rings. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 100:207–241, (1988).
- [AFSJ08] K. Astala, D. Faraco, and L. Székelyhidi Jr. Convex integration and the  $L^p$  theory of elliptic equations. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5)*, 7:1–50, (2008).
- [AK98] V. I. Arnold and B. A. Khesin. *Topological methods in hydrodynamics*, volume 125 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998.
- [Alu09] H. Aluie. *Hydrodynamic and magnetohydrodynamic turbulence: invariants, cascades, and locality*. PhD thesis, Johns Hopkins University, (2009).
- [Arn65] V. I. Arnold. Variational principle for three-dimensional steady-state flows of an ideal fluid. *Prikl. Math. I Mech.*, 29:846–851, (1965).
- [Arn66] V. I. Arnold. Sur la géométrie différentielle des groupes de Lie de dimension infinie et ses applications à l’hydrodynamique des fluides parfaits. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 16:319–361, (1966).
- [Arn74] V.I. Arnold. The asymptotic hopf invariant and it applications. volume 561, (1974).
- [BBV20] R. Beekie, T. Buckmaster, and V. Vicol. Weak solutions of ideal MHD which do not conserve magnetic helicity. *Ann. PDE*, 6:Paper No. 1, 40, (2020).
- [BCV22] T. Buckmaster, M. Colombo, and V. Vicol. Wild solutions of the Navier–Stokes equations whose singular sets in time have Hausdorff dimension strictly less than 1. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, 24:3333–3378, (2022).
- [BDLS11] Y. Brenier, C. De Lellis, and L. Székelyhidi, Jr. Weak-strong uniqueness for measure-valued solutions. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 305:351–361, (2011).
- [Ben76] T. B. Benjamin. The alliance of practical and analytical insights into the nonlinear problems of fluid mechanics. pages 8–29. *Lecture Notes in Math.*, 503, 1976.
- [BF84] M.A. Berger and G.B. Field. The topological properties of magnetic helicity. *J. Fluid Mech.*, 147:133–148, (1984).
- [BFKK58] I. B. Bernstein, E. A. Frieman, M. D. Kruskal, and R. M. Kulsrud. An energy principle for hydro-magnetic stability problems. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A*, 244:17–40, (1958).
- [BFV22] R. Beekie, S. Friedlander, and V. Vicol. On Moffatt’s magnetic relaxation equations. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 390:1311–1339, (2022).
- [BG] J. Bedrossian and W. Golding. Uniqueness Criteria for the Oseen Vortex in the 3d Navier-Stokes Equations. arXiv:2004.07302v2.



- [BGHG] J. Bedrossian, P. Germain, and B. Harrop-Griffiths. Vortex filament solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations. arXiv:1809.04109.
- [BGM19] J. Bedrossian, P. Germain, and N. Masmoudi. Stability of the Couette flow at high Reynolds numbers in two dimensions and three dimensions. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 56:373–414, (2019).
- [BGS02] C. Bardos, Y. Guo, and W. Strauss. Stable and unstable ideal plane flows. *Chinese Ann. Math. Ser. B*, 23(2):149–164, 2002.
- [Bis93] D. Biskamp. Nonlinear magnetohydrodynamics. pages xiv+378, 1993.
- [BL96] O. P. Bruno and P. Laurence. Existence of three-dimensional toroidal MHD equilibria with non-constant pressure. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 49:717–764, (1996).
- [BLFNL15] A. C. Bronzi, M. C. Lopes Filho, and H. J. Nussenzweig Lopes. Wild solutions for 2D incompressible ideal flow with passive tracer. *Commun. Math. Sci.*, 13:1333–1343, (2015).
- [BM15] J. Bedrossian and N. Masmoudi. Inviscid damping and the asymptotic stability of planar shear flows in the 2D Euler equations. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.*, 122:195–300, (2015).
- [BNLLF13] G. R. Burton, H. J. Nussenzweig Lopes, and M. C. Lopes Filho. Nonlinear stability for steady vortex pairs. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 324:445–463, (2013).
- [Bre14] Y. Brenier. Topology-preserving diffusion of divergence-free vector fields and magnetic relaxation. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 330:757–770, (2014).
- [Bur21] G. R. Burton. Compactness and stability for planar vortex-pairs with prescribed impulse. *J. Differential Equations*, 270:547–572, (2021).
- [BV19] T. Buckmaster and V. Vicol. Nonuniqueness of weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equation. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 189:101–144, (2019).
- [BV21] T. Buckmaster and V. Vicol. Convex integration constructions in hydrodynamics. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 58:1–44, (2021).
- [CC15] D. Chae and P. Constantin. Remarks on a Liouville-type theorem for Beltrami flows. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, pages 10012–10016, (2015).
- [CCFS08] A. Cheskidov, P. Constantin, S. Friedlander, and R. Shvydkoy. Energy conservation and Onsager’s conjecture for the Euler equations. *Nonlinearity*, 21:1233–1252, (2008).
- [CCL19] Á. Castro, D. Córdoba, and D. Lear. Global existence of quasi-stratified solutions for the confined IPM equation. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 232:437–471, (2019).
- [CDG] P. Constantin, T. D. Drivas, and D. Ginsberg. Flexibility and rigidity of free boundary MHD equilibria. arXiv:2108.05977v2.
- [CDG21a] P. Constantin, T. D. Drivas, and D. Ginsberg. Flexibility and rigidity in steady fluid motion. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 385:521–563, (2021).
- [CDG21b] P. Constantin, T. D. Drivas, and D. Ginsberg. On quasisymmetric plasma equilibria sustained by small force. *J. Plasma Phys.*, 87:905870111, (2021).
- [CET94] P. Constantin, W. E, and E. S. Titi. Onsager’s conjecture on the energy conservation for solutions of Euler’s equation. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 165:207–209, (1994).
- [CFLS16] A. Cheskidov, M. C. Lopes Filho, H. J. Nussenzweig Lopes, and R. Shvydkoy. Energy conservation in two-dimensional incompressible ideal fluids. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 348:129–143, (2016).
- [Cha56] S. Chandrasekhar. On force-free magnetic fields. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 42:1–5, (1956).
- [Cha58] S. Chandrasekhar. On the equilibrium configurations of an incompressible fluid with axisymmetric motions and magnetic fields. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S.*, 44:842–847, (1958).
- [Cha61] S. Chandrasekhar. Hydrodynamic and hydromagnetic stability. pages xix+654 pp. (16 plates), 1961.
- [Cho] K. Choi. Stability of Hill’s spherical vortex. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* to appear, arXiv:2011.06808.
- [CIN18] P. Constantin, M. Ignatova, and H. Q. Nguyen. Inviscid limit for SQG in bounded domains. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 50:6196–6207, (2018).
- [CK20] J. N. Clelland and T. Klotz. Beltrami fields with nonconstant proportionality factor. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 236:767–800, (2020).
- [CKS97] R. E. Caffisch, I. Klapper, and G. Steele. Remarks on singularities, dimension and energy dissipation for ideal hydrodynamics and MHD. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 184:443–455, (1997).

- [CL] A. Cheskidov and X. Luo. Sharp nonuniqueness for the Navier–Stokes equations. arXiv:2009.06596.
- [CLMS93] R. Coifman, P.-L. Lions, Y. Meyer, and S. Semmes. Compensated compactness and hardy spaces. *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 72:247–286, (1993).
- [CLV19] P. Constantin, J. La, and V. Vicol. Remarks on a paper by Gavrilov: Grad-Shafranov equations, steady solutions of the three dimensional incompressible Euler equations with compactly supported velocities, and applications. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 29:1773–1793, (2019).
- [CMZ10] Q. Chen, C. Miao, and Z. Zhang. On the well-posedness of the ideal MHD equations in the Triebel-Lizorkin spaces. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 195:561–578, (2010).
- [CS15] G. Crippa and S. Spirito. Renormalized solutions of the 2D Euler equations. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 339:191–198, (2015).
- [CSTY08] C.-C. Chen, R. M. Strain, T.-P. Tsai, and H.-T. Yau. Lower bound on the blow-up rate of the axisymmetric Navier-Stokes equations. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, pages Art. ID rnn016, 31, (2008).
- [CSTY09] C.-C. Chen, R. M. Strain, T.-P. Tsai, and H.-T. Yau. Lower bounds on the blow-up rate of the axisymmetric Navier-Stokes equations. II. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 34:203–232, (2009).
- [CW58] S. Chandrasekhar and L. Woltjer. On force-free magnetic fields. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S.*, 44:285–289, (1958).
- [Dai] M. Dai. Non-unique weak solutions in Leray-Hopf class of the 3d Hall-MHD system. arXiv:1812.11311.
- [DL72] G. Duvaut and J.-L. Lions. Inéquations en thermoélasticité et magnétohydrodynamique. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 46:241–279, (1972).
- [DL89] R. J. DiPerna and P.-L. Lions. Ordinary differential equations, transport theory and Sobolev spaces. *Invent. Math.*, 98:511–547, (1989).
- [DLS09] C. De Lellis and L. Székelyhidi, Jr. The Euler equations as a differential inclusion. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 170:1417–1436, (2009).
- [DM] Y. Deng and N. Masmoudi. Long time instability of the Couette flow in low Gevrey spaces. arXiv:1803.01246.
- [DM87] R. J. DiPerna and A. J. Majda. Oscillations and concentrations in weak solutions of the incompressible fluid equations. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 108:667–689, (1987).
- [DR82] P. G. Drazin and W. H. Reid. Hydrodynamic stability. pages xiv+527, 1982.
- [DVEPS21] M. Domínguez-Vázquez, A. Enciso, and D. Peralta-Salas. Piecewise smooth stationary Euler flows with compact support via overdetermined boundary problems. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 239:1327–1347, (2021).
- [dVVS13] S. de Valeriola and J. Van Schaftingen. Desingularization of vortex rings and shallow water vortices by a semilinear elliptic problem. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 210:409–450, (2013).
- [Elg17] T. M. Elgindi. On the asymptotic stability of stationary solutions of the inviscid incompressible porous medium equation. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 225:573–599, (2017).
- [Elg21] T. M. Elgindi. Finite-time singularity formation for  $C^{1,\alpha}$  solutions to the incompressible Euler equations on  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 194:647–727, (2021).
- [ELPS] A. Enciso, A. Luque, and D. Peralta-Salas. MHD equilibria with nonconstant pressure in nondegenerate toroidal domains. arXiv:2104.08149v1.
- [EM20] T. M. Elgindi and N. Masmoudi.  $L^\infty$  ill-posedness for a class of equations arising in hydrodynamics. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 235:1979–2025, (2020).
- [EPS12] A. Enciso and D. Peralta-Salas. Knots and links in steady solutions of the Euler equation. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 175:345–367, (2012).
- [EPS15] A. Enciso and D. Peralta-Salas. Existence of knotted vortex tubes in steady Euler flows. *Acta Math.*, 214:61–134, (2015).
- [EPS16] A. Enciso and D. Peralta-Salas. Beltrami fields with a nonconstant proportionality factor are rare. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 220:243–260, (2016).
- [Eva10] L. C. Evans. *Partial differential equations*, volume 19 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, second edition, 2010.

- [FA85] J.M. Finn and T.M. Antonsen. Magnetic helicity: what is it and what is it good for ? *Comments Plasma Phys. Controlled Fusion*, 9:111–126, (1985).
- [Far03] D. Faraco. Milton’s conjecture on the regularity of solutions to isotropic equations. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire*, 20(5), (2003).
- [FB74] L. E. Fraenkel and M. S. Berger. A global theory of steady vortex rings in an ideal fluid. *Acta Math.*, 132:13–51, (1974).
- [FDJ21] P. G. Fernández-Dalgo and O. Jarrín. Discretely self-similar solutions for 3D MHD equations and global weak solutions in weighted  $L^2$  spaces. *J. Math. Fluid Mech.*, 23:Paper No. 22, 30, (2021).
- [FL] D. Faraco and S. Lindberg. Magnetic helicity and subsolutions in ideal MHD. arXiv:1801.04896.
- [FL20] D. Faraco and S. Lindberg. Proof of Taylor’s conjecture on magnetic helicity conservation. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 373:707–738, (2020).
- [FLJ] D. Faraco, S. Lindberg, and L. Székelyhidi Jr. Magnetic helicity, weak solutions and relaxation of ideal MHD. arXiv:2109.09106v1.
- [FLMV22] D. Faraco, S. Lindberg, D. MacTaggart, and A. Valli. On the proof of Taylor’s conjecture in multiply connected domains. *Appl. Math. Lett.*, 124:Paper No. 107654, 7, (2022).
- [FLSJ21] D. Faraco, S. Lindberg, and L. Székelyhidi Jr. Bounded solutions of ideal MHD with compact support in space-time. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 239:51–93, (2021).
- [Fra92] L. E. Fraenkel. On steady vortex rings with swirl and a Sobolev inequality. In *Progress in partial differential equations: calculus of variations, applications (Pont-à-Mousson, 1991)*, volume 267 of *Pitman Res. Notes Math. Ser.*, pages 13–26. Longman Sci. Tech., Harlow, 1992.
- [Fra00] L. E. Fraenkel. *An introduction to maximum principles and symmetry in elliptic problems*, volume 128. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.
- [Fri82] A. Friedman. *Variational principles and free-boundary problems*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1982.
- [FS72] C. Fefferman and E. Stein.  $h_p$  spaces of several variables. *Act Math.*, 129:137–193, (1972).
- [FŠ15] H. Feng and V. Šverák. On the Cauchy problem for axi-symmetric vortex rings. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 215:89–123, (2015).
- [FT81] A. Friedman and B. Turkington. Vortex rings: existence and asymptotic estimates. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 268:1–37, (1981).
- [FV90] S. Friedlander and M. Vishik. Nonlinear stability for stratified magnetohydrodynamics. *Geophys. Astrophys. Fluid Dynam.*, 55:19–45, (1990).
- [FV91] S. Friedlander and M. Vishik. Dynamo theory, vorticity generation, and exponential stretching. *Chaos*, (no. 2):198–205, (1991).
- [FV92] S. Friedlander and M. Vishik. Instability criteria for steady flows of a perfect fluid. *Chaos*, 2(no. 3):455–460, (1992).
- [Gal11] G. P. Galdi. *An introduction to the mathematical theory of the Navier-Stokes equations*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, New York, second edition, 2011.
- [Gav19] A. V. Gavrilov. A steady Euler flow with compact support. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 29:190–197, (2019).
- [GLBL06] J. Gerbeau, C. Le Bris, and T. Lelièvre. *Mathematical methods for the magnetohydrodynamics of liquid metals*. Numerical Mathematics and Scientific Computation. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2006.
- [GR58] H. Grad and H. Rubin. Hydromagnetic equilibria and force-free fields. *Proceedings of the Second United Nations Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy*, 31:190–197, (1958).
- [GR01] Y. Guo and G. Rein. Isotropic steady states in galactic dynamics. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 219:607–629, (2001).
- [Gra67] H. Grad. Toroidal containment of a plasma. *The Physics of Fluids*, 10:137–154, (1967).
- [GSa] Th. Gallay and D. Smets. Spectral stability of inviscid columnar vortices. arXiv:1805.05064.
- [GŠb] Th. Gallay and V. Šverák. Arnold’s variational principle and its application to the stability of planar vortices. arXiv:2110.13739v1.
- [GŠc] J. Guillod and V. Šverák. Numerical investigations of non-uniqueness for the Navier-Stokes initial value problem in borderline spaces. arXiv:1704.00560.
- [GŠ15] Th. Gallay and V. Šverák. Remarks on the Cauchy problem for the axisymmetric Navier-Stokes equations. *Confluentes Mathematici*, 7:67–92, (2015).

- [GS18] Th. Galley and D. Smets. On the linear stability of vortex columns in the energy space. *J. Math. Fluid Mech.*, 21:Paper No. 48, (2018).
- [GŠ19] Th. Galley and V. Šverák. Uniqueness of axisymmetric viscous flows originating from circular vortex filaments. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 52:1025–1071, (2019).
- [GSS87] M. Grillakis, J. Shatah, and W. Strauss. Stability theory of solitary waves in the presence of symmetry. I. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 74:160–197, (1987).
- [GT01] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001.
- [Gun27] N. Gunther. On the motion of fluid in a moving container. *Izvestia Akad. Nauk USSR, Ser. Fiz.-Mat.*, 20:1323–1348, (1927).
- [Guo99] Y. Guo. Variational method for stable polytropic galaxies. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 150:209–224, (1999).
- [Has85] A. Hasegawa. Self-organization processes in continuous media. *Advances in Physics*, 34:1–42, (1985).
- [Hic85] W. M. Hicks. Researches on the theory of vortex rings—part ii. *Philos. Trans. Roy. Soc. London, A*, 176:725–780, (1885).
- [HMRW85] D. D. Holm, J. E. Marsden, T. Ratiu, and A. Weinstein. Nonlinear stability of fluid and plasma equilibria. *Phys. Rep.*, 123:116, (1985).
- [HvNVW16] T. Hytönen, J. van Neerven, M. Veraar, and L. Weis. Analysis in Banach spaces. Vol. I. Martingales and Littlewood-Paley theory. 2016.
- [IJ] A. D. Ionescu and H. Jia. Nonlinear inviscid damping near monotonic shear flows. arXiv:2001.03087.
- [IJ20] A. D. Ionescu and H. Jia. Inviscid damping near the Couette flow in a channel. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 374:2015–2096, (2020).
- [IJ22] A. D. Ionescu and H. Jia. Axi-symmetrization near point vortex solutions for the 2D Euler equation. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 75:818–891, (2022).
- [Jan08] J. Jang. Nonlinear instability in gravitational Euler-Poisson systems for  $\gamma = \frac{6}{5}$ . *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 188:265–307, (2008).
- [Jan14] J. Jang. Nonlinear instability theory of Lane–Emden stars. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.*, 67:1418–1465, (2014).
- [JC84] T. H. Jensen and M. S. Chu. Current drive and helicity injection. *The Physics of Fluids*, 27:2881, (1984).
- [JŠ14] H. Jia and V. Šverák. Local-in-space estimates near initial time for weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations and forward self-similar solutions. *Invent. Math.*, 196(1):233–265, (2014).
- [JŠ15] H. Jia and V. Šverák. Are the incompressible 3d Navier–Stokes equations locally ill-posed in the natural energy space? *J. Funct. Anal.*, 268:3734–3766, (2015).
- [KL07] E. Kang and J. Lee. Remarks on the magnetic helicity and energy conservation for ideal magneto-hydrodynamics. *Nonlinearity*, 20:2681–2689, (2007).
- [KNSŠ09] G. Koch, N. Nadirashvili, G. A. Seregin, and V. Šverák. Liouville theorems for the Navier-Stokes equations and applications. *Acta Math.*, 203:83–105, (2009).
- [Kom] R. Komendarczyk. On Woltjer’s force free minimizers and Moffatt’s magnetic relaxation. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.*, to appear, arXiv:2001.04616.
- [KPSY21] B. Khesin, D. Peralta-Salas, and C. Yang. A basis of casimirs in 3d Magneto-hydrodynamics. *Int. Math. Res.*, 18:13645–13660, (2021).
- [LA91] P. Laurence and M. Avellaneda. On Woltjer’s variational principle for force-free fields. volume 32, pages 1240–1253, (1991).
- [LFMNL06] M. C. Lopes Filho, A. L. Mazzucato, and H. J. Nussenzweig Lopes. Weak solutions, renormalized solutions and enstrophy defects in 2D turbulence. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 179:353–387, (2006).
- [LH91] A. Lifschitz and E. Hameiri. Local stability conditions in fluid dynamics. *Phys. Fluids A*, 3(no. 11):2644–2651, (1991).
- [LH93] A. Lifschitz and E. Hameiri. Localized instabilities of vortex rings with swirl. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 46(10):1379–1408, (1993).

- [Lic25] L. Lichtenstein. Über einige Existenzprobleme der Hydrodynamik homogener, unzusammendrückbarer, reibungsloser Flüssigkeiten und die Helmholtzschen Wirbelsätze. *Math. Z.*, 23:89–154, (1925).
- [Lin04] Z. Lin. Nonlinear instability of ideal plane flows. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, (41):2147–2178, (2004).
- [Lio84a] P.-L. Lions. The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations. The locally compact case. I. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 1:109–145, (1984).
- [Lio84b] P.-L. Lions. The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations. The locally compact case. II. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 1:223–283, (1984).
- [LL01] E. H. Lieb and M. Loss. *Analysis*. 14:xxii+346, 2001.
- [LMZZ22] H. Liu, N. Masmoudi, C. Zhai, and W. Zhao. Linear damping and depletion in flowing plasma with strong sheared magnetic fields. *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 158:1–41, (2022).
- [LR02] P. G. Lemarié-Rieusset. *Recent developments in the Navier-Stokes problem*, volume 431. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 2002.
- [LS09] T. Luo and J. Smoller. Existence and non-linear stability of rotating star solutions of the compressible Euler-Poisson equations. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 191:447–496, (2009).
- [Lun50] S. Lundquist. Magneto-hydrostatic fields. *Arkiv Fysik* 2, 361, (1950).
- [Luo19] X. Luo. Stationary solutions and nonuniqueness of weak solutions for the navier–stokes equations in high dimensions. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 233:701–747, (2019).
- [LVV21] L. Lafleche, A. F. Vasseur, and M. Vishik. Instability for axisymmetric blow-up solutions to incompressible Euler equations. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* (9), 155:140–154, (2021).
- [LZ13] Z. Lin and C. Zeng. Unstable manifolds of euler equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 66(11):1803–1836, (2013).
- [LZ14] Z. Lin and C. Zeng. Corrigendum: Unstable manifolds of euler equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 67(7):1215–1217, (2014).
- [LZ22] Z. Lin and C. Zeng. Instability, index theorem, and exponential trichotomy for linear Hamiltonian PDEs. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 275(1347):v+136, (2022).
- [LZZ] Y. Li, Z. Zeng, and D. Zhang. Non-uniqueness of weak solutions to 3d magnetohydrodynamic equations. arXiv:2112.10515.
- [Mas84] K. Masuda. Weak solutions of Navier-Stokes equations. *Tohoku Math. J.* (2), 36:623–646, (1984).
- [Mof69] H. K. Moffatt. Degree of knottedness of tangled vortex lines. *J. Fluid Mech.*, 35:117–129, (1969).
- [Mof85] H. K. Moffatt. Magnetostatic equilibria and analogous Euler flows of arbitrarily complex topology. I. Fundamentals. *J. Fluid Mech.*, 159:359–378, (1985).
- [Mof86] H. K. Moffatt. Magnetostatic equilibria and analogous Euler flows of arbitrarily complex topology. II. Stability considerations. *J. Fluid Mech.*, 166:359–378, (1986).
- [Mof90] H. K. Moffatt. Structure and stability of solutions of the Euler equations: a Lagrangian approach. *Philos. Trans. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A*, 333(1631):321–342, (1990).
- [Mof21] H. K. Moffatt. Some topological aspects of fluid dynamics. *J. Fluid Mech.*, 914:Paper No. P1, 56, (2021).
- [Mor61] J.-J. Moreau. Constantes d’un îlot tourbillonnaire en fluid parfait barotrope. *C. R. Hebd. Seances Acad. Sci., Paris*, 252:2810–2812, (1961).
- [MP94] C. Marchioro and M. Pulvirenti. *Mathematical theory of incompressible nonviscous fluids*, volume 96 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994.
- [MV11] C. Mouhot and C. Villani. On Landau damping. *Acta Math.*, 207:29–201, (2011).
- [MV19] D. MacTaggart and A. Valli. Magnetic helicity in multiply connected domains. *J. Plasma Phys.*, 85:775850501, (2019).
- [MZ] N. Masmoudi and W. Zhao. Nonlinear inviscid damping for a class of monotone shear flows in finite channel. arXiv: 2001.08564.
- [Nad14] N. Nadirashvili. Liouville theorem for Beltrami flow. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 24:916–921, (2014).
- [Nis02] T. Nishiyama. Magnetohydrodynamic approach to solvability of the three-dimensional stationary euler equations. *Glasg. Math. J.*, 44:411–418, (2002).
- [NS22] C. Nobili and C. Seis. Renormalization and energy conservation for axisymmetric fluid flows. *Math. Ann.*, 382:1–36, (2022).
- [OS93] S. Ortolani and D. Schnack. *Magnetohydrodynamics of plasma relaxation*. World Scientific, 1993.

- [Pas20] F. Pasqualotto. *Nonlinear Waves in General Relativity and Fluid Dynamics*. PhD thesis, 2020. Thesis (Ph.D.)–Princeton University.
- [PCRH16] D. I. Pontin, S. Candelaresi, A. J. B. Russell, and G. Hornig. Braided magnetic fields: equilibria, relaxation and heating. *Plasma Phys. Contr. Fusion*, 58:054008, (2016).
- [PWSHG11] D. I. Pontin, A. L. Wilmot-Smith, G. Hornig, and K. Galsgaard. Dynamics of braided coronal loops. ii. cascade to multiple small-scale reconnection events astron. *Astrophys*, 525:A57, (2011).
- [Ray17] L. Rayleigh. On the dynamics of revolving fluids. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A*, 93:148–154, (1917).
- [Rei80] A. Reiman. Minimum energy state of a toroidal discharge. *The Physics of Fluids*, 23:230–231, (1980).
- [Rei03] G. Rein. Non-linear stability of gaseous stars. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 168:115–130, (2003).
- [Rou91] P. Rouchon. On the arnol’d stability criterion for steady-state flows of an ideal fluid. *Eur. J. Mech. B/Fluids*, 10:651–661, (1991).
- [RZ17] S. Ren and W. Zhao. Linear damping of alfvén waves by phase mixing. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 49:2101–2137, (2017).
- [SF05] R. Shvydkoy and S. Friedlander. On recent developments in the spectral problem for the linearized Euler equation. In *Nonlinear partial differential equations and related analysis*, volume 371, pages 271–295. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2005.
- [SH88] A. Szeri and P. Holmes. Nonlinear stability of axisymmetric swirling flows. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. London A*, 326:327–354, (1988).
- [Sha58] V. D. Shafranov. On magnetohydrodynamical equilibrium configurations. *Soviet Physics JETP*, 6:545–554, (1958).
- [Soh01] H. Sohr. *The Navier-Stokes equations*. Birkhäuser Advanced Texts: Basler Lehrbücher. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2001.
- [SSS96] M. E. Schonbek, T. P. Schonbek, and E. Süli. Large-time behaviour of solutions to the magneto-hydrodynamics equations. *Math. Ann.*, 304:717–756, (1996).
- [ST83] M. Sermange and R. Temam. Some mathematical questions related to the MHD equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 36:635–664, (1983).
- [SV09] T. C. Sideris and L. Vega. Stability in  $L^1$  of circular vortex patches. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 137:4199–4202, (2009).
- [Šve] V. Šverák. Lecture notes on “topics in mathematical physics”. <http://math.umn.edu/sverak/course-notes2011>.
- [Tay74] J. B. Taylor. Relaxation of toroidal plasma and generation of reverse magnetic fields. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 33:1139–1141, 1974.
- [Tay86] J. B. Taylor. Relaxation and magnetic reconnection in plasmas. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 58:741–763, 1986.
- [Tem77] R. Temam. *Navier-Stokes equations. Theory and numerical analysis*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York-Oxford, 1977.
- [TLK10] W. Thomson (Lord Kelvin). Maximum and minimum energy in vortex motion, Nature 574, 618–620 (1880). In *Mathematical and Physical Papers 4*, pages 172–183. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910.
- [Tre51] K. Trehan. On the stability of force-free magnetic fields. *Astrophys. J.*, 126:429–456, (1951).
- [Tur89] B. Turkington. Vortex rings with swirl: axisymmetric solutions of the Euler equations with nonzero helicity. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 20:57–73, (1989).
- [UY68] M. R. Ukhovskii and V. I. Yudovich. Axially symmetric flows of ideal and viscous fluids filling the whole space. *J. Appl. Math. Mech.*, 32:52–61, (1968).
- [VC62] D. Voslamber and D. K. Caliebaud. Stability of force-free magnetic fields. *Physical review*, 128:2016–2021, (1962).
- [VCY89] G. K. Vallis, G. F. Carnevale, and W. R. Young. Extremal energy properties and construction of stable solutions of the Euler equations. *J. Fluid Mech.*, 207:133–152, (1989).
- [VF98] M. Vishik and S. Friedlander. Asymptotic methods for magnetohydrodynamic instability. *Quart. Appl. Math.*, 56:377–398, (1998).
- [VF03] M. Vishik and S. Friedlander. Nonlinear instability in two dimensional ideal fluids: the case of a dominant eigenvalue. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 243:261–273, (2003).

- [Visa] M. Vishik. Instability and non-uniqueness in the Cauchy problem for the Euler equations of an ideal incompressible fluid. Part I. arXiv:1805.09426.
- [Visb] M. Vishik. Instability and non-uniqueness in the Cauchy problem for the Euler equations of an ideal incompressible fluid. Part II. arXiv:1805.09440.
- [Vis93] M. Vishik. Dynamo theory methods for hydrodynamic stability. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* (9), 72(no. 2):145–180, (1993).
- [VM95] V. A. Vladimirov and H. K. Moffatt. On general transformations and variational principles for the magnetohydrodynamics of ideal fluids. part I. Fundamental principles. *J. Fluid Mech.*, 283:125–139, (1995).
- [VMI96] V. A. Vladimirov, H. K. Moffatt, and K. I. Ilin. On general transformations and variational principles for the magnetohydrodynamics of ideal fluids. part II. Stability criteria for two-dimensional flows. *J. Fluid Mech.*, 329:187–205, (1996).
- [VMI97] V. A. Vladimirov, H. K. Moffatt, and K. I. Ilin. On general transformations and variational principles for the magnetohydrodynamics of ideal fluids. Part III. Stability criteria for axisymmetric flows. *J. Plasma Phys.*, 57:89–120, (1997).
- [VMI99] V. A. Vladimirov, H. K. Moffatt, and K. I. Ilin. On general transformations and variational principles for the magnetohydrodynamics of ideal fluids. part IV. Generalized isovorticity principle for three-dimensional flows. *J. Fluid Mech.*, 390:127–150, (1999).
- [VV20] A. F. Vasseur and M. Vishik. Blow-up solutions to 3D Euler are hydrodynamically unstable. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 378:557–568, (2020).
- [Wan86] Y. H. Wan. The stability of rotating vortex patches. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 107:1–20, (1986).
- [Wol] L. Woltjer. Hydromagnetic equilibrium. iii. axisymmetric incompressible media. *Astrophysical Journal*, 130:p.400.
- [Wol58a] L. Woltjer. On hydromagnetic equilibrium. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S.*, 44:489, (1958).
- [Wol58b] L. Woltjer. The stability of force-free magnetic fields. *Astrophys. J.*, 128(384), (1958).
- [Wol58c] L. Woltjer. A theorem on force-free magnetic fields. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 44:489–491, (1958).
- [Wol59] L. Woltjer. On hydromagnetic equilibrium ii. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S.*, 45:769, (1959).
- [WP85] Y. H. Wan and M. Pulvirenti. Nonlinear stability of circular vortex patches. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 99:435–450, (1985).
- [Yea20] A.R. Yeates. Magnetohydrodynamic relaxation theory. In D. MacTaggart and A. Hillier, editors, *Topics in Magnetohydrodynamic Topology, Reconnection and Stability Theory*, pages 117–143. Springer, 2020.
- [YG90] Z. Yoshida and Y. Giga. Remarks on spectra of operator rot. *Math. Z.*, 204:235–245, (1990).
- [YRH15] A. R. Yeates, A. J. B. Russell, and G. Hornig. Physical role of topological constraints in localized magnetic relaxation. *Proc. Roy. Soc. A*, 471:20150012, (2015).
- [ZZZ21] C. Zhai, Z. Zhang, and W. Zhao. Long-time behavior of alfvén waves in a flowing plasma: Generation of the magnetic island. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 242:1317–1394, (2021).

(K. ABE) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SCIENCE, OSAKA METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY, 3-3-138 SUGIMOTO, SUMIYOSHI-KU OSAKA, 558-8585, JAPAN  
*Email address:* kabe@omu.ac.jp