

# Global regularity of 2D generalized incompressible magnetohydrodynamic equations

Chao Deng<sup>1</sup>, Zhuan Ye<sup>1</sup>, Baoquan Yuan<sup>2</sup>, Jiefeng Zhao<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Jiangsu Normal University,  
101 Shanghai Road, Xuzhou 221116, Jiangsu, PR China

<sup>2</sup> School of Mathematics and Information Science, Henan Polytechnic University,  
Jiaozuo 454003, PR China

E-mails: dengxznu@gmail.com; yezhuan815@126.com  
bqyuan@hpu.edu.cn; zhaojiefeng003@hpu.edu.cn

**Abstract:** In this paper, we are concerned with the two-dimensional (2D) incompressible magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) equations with velocity dissipation given by  $(-\Delta)^\alpha$  and magnetic diffusion given by reducing about logarithmic diffusion from standard Laplacian diffusion. More precisely, we establish the global regularity of solutions to the system as long as the power  $\alpha$  is a positive constant. In particular, our result significantly improves previous works and is more closer to the resolution of the global regularity issue on the 2D resistive MHD equations, namely, the case when the MHD equations only have standard Laplacian magnetic diffusion.

**AMS Subject Classification 2010:** 35Q35; 35B35; 35B65; 76D03.

**Keywords:** Generalized MHD equations; Classical solutions; Global regularity.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The 2D generalized incompressible magnetohydrodynamic (GMHD) equations take the following form

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u + (u \cdot \nabla)u + \nu_1 \mathcal{L}_1 u + \nabla p = (b \cdot \nabla)b, & x \in \mathbb{R}^2, t > 0, \\ \partial_t b + (u \cdot \nabla)b + \nu_2 \mathcal{L}_2 b = (b \cdot \nabla)u, \\ \nabla \cdot u = 0, \quad \nabla \cdot b = 0, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x), \quad b(x, 0) = b_0(x), \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where  $u = (u_1(x, t), u_2(x, t))$  denotes the velocity,  $p = p(x, t)$  the scalar pressure and  $b = (b_1(x, t), b_2(x, t))$  the magnetic field of the fluid.  $u_0(x)$  and  $b_0(x)$  are the given initial data satisfying  $\nabla \cdot u_0 = \nabla \cdot b_0 = 0$ . Here  $\nu_1$  and  $\nu_2$  are nonnegative constants. The operators  $\mathcal{L}_i$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) are Fourier multipliers with symbol  $m_i(\xi)$ , namely,

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}_i f}(\xi) = m_i(\xi) \widehat{f}(\xi).$$

When  $\nu_1 > 0$ ,  $\nu_2 > 0$  and  $m_1(\xi) = m_2(\xi) = |\xi|^2$ , (1.1) reduces to the classical MHD equations, which model the complex interaction between the fluid dynamic phenomena, such as the magnetic reconnection in astrophysics and geomagnetic dynamo in geophysics, plasmas, liquid metals, and salt water, etc (see, e.g., [6, 12]). The fundamental concept

behind MHD is that magnetic fields can induce currents in a moving conductive fluid, which in turn creates forces on the fluid and also changes the magnetic field itself.

Due to the physical background and mathematical relevance, the MHD equations attracted a lot of attention. The most fundamental problem concerning the MHD equations is whether physically relevant regular solutions remain smooth for all time or they develop finite time singularities with general initial data. Actually, there have been substantial developments on the global regularity of the MHD equations with various form of the dissipation. Obviously, the classical 2D MHD equations have a unique global smooth solution (e.g. [13]). In the completely inviscid case, namely,  $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = 0$ , the question of whether the local smooth solution develops singularity in finite time remains open. Therefore, it is interesting to consider the intermediate cases. Actually, one of the most interesting intermediate case reads  $m_1(\xi) = |\xi|^{2\alpha}$ ,  $m_2(\xi) = |\xi|^{2\beta}$ , which becomes the so-called 2D fractional MHD equations, namely,

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u + (u \cdot \nabla)u + (-\Delta)^\alpha u + \nabla p = (b \cdot \nabla)b, & x \in \mathbb{R}^2, t > 0, \\ \partial_t b + (u \cdot \nabla)b + (-\Delta)^\beta b = (b \cdot \nabla)u, \\ \nabla \cdot u = 0, \quad \nabla \cdot b = 0, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x), \quad b(x, 0) = b_0(x), \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

where the fractional operator  $(-\Delta)^\gamma \triangleq \Lambda^{2\gamma}$  is defined by the Fourier transform, namely

$$\widehat{(-\Delta)^\gamma f}(\xi) = |\xi|^{2\gamma} \hat{f}(\xi).$$

We remark the convention that by  $\alpha = 0$  we mean that there is no dissipation in (1.2)<sub>1</sub>, and similarly  $\beta = 0$  represents that there is no diffusion in (1.2)<sub>2</sub>. Recently, there are extensive results concerning the global regularity of (1.2) with general initial data (see e.g. [4, 7, 8, 9, 16, 15, 17, 18, 25, 19, 23] and the references cited therein). To the best of our knowledge, the issue of the global regularity for (1.2) with  $\alpha = 0, \beta = 1$  is still a challenging open problem (see [3, 11]). Interestingly, if more dissipation is added, then the corresponding system do admit a unique global regular solution. On the one hand, when  $\alpha > 0, \beta = 1$ , the global regularity issue was solved by Fan et al. [7], which was further improved by Yuan and Zhao [26] logarithmically. Precisely, they obtained the global regularity of solutions requiring the dissipative operators weaker than any power of the fractional Laplacian. On the other hand, when  $\alpha = 0, \beta > 1$ , the global regularity of smooth solutions for the corresponding system was established in [4, 9] with different approaches, which was also improved by [1, 22] logarithmically. Partially inspired by the result on logarithmically supercritical phenomena for Navier-Stokes equations [14], Wu [18] proved that if  $m_1(\xi) \geq \frac{|\xi|^{2\alpha}}{g_1(\xi)}$ ,  $m_2(\xi) \geq \frac{|\xi|^{2\beta}}{g_2(\xi)}$  with  $g_1 \geq 1, g_2 \geq 1$  are nondecreasing functions satisfying

$$\int_1^\infty \frac{1}{\tau[g_1(\tau) + g_2(\tau)]^2} d\tau = +\infty,$$

where  $\alpha \geq 1, \beta > 0$  and  $\alpha + \beta \geq 2$ , then (1.1) has a unique global classical solution (see the further improved result on a periodic domain [21]). Subsequently, Tran et al. [15] considered the case  $\alpha \geq 2, \beta = 0$  and proved that if  $m_1(\xi) \geq \frac{|\xi|^{2\alpha}}{g_1(\xi)}$  and  $g_1 \geq 1$  is a radial function satisfying  $g_1(\tau) \leq C \ln(e + \tau)$ , then the solution is global regular. This result

was later improved by Yamazaki [20] only requiring

$$\int_e^\infty \frac{1}{\tau \ln \tau g_1(\tau)} d\tau = +\infty.$$

Summarizing the results mentioned above, the direct energy method tells us that to get an  $H^1$ -bound for the solution, we just only have Laplacian magnetic diffusion  $\alpha = 0, \beta \geq 1$  or we ask for  $\alpha + \beta \geq 2, \beta < 1$  (see [17, 18, 15] for details). If  $\beta < 1$ , the necessary power  $\alpha$  jumps from 0 to  $2 - \beta$  immediately! This indicates that it is extremely difficult to establish the global regularity of (1.2) with  $\alpha + \beta < 2$  and  $\beta < 1$ . Actually, up to date, the global existence and uniqueness of regular solution remain completely open for this case  $\alpha + \beta < 2$  and  $\beta < 1$  with large initial data. Just as Tao [14], since it is very difficult to obtain the global regularity for this case, it is possible to achieve this goal when the magnetic diffusion is some logarithmically weaker than a full Laplacian. In fact, we are able to show that if the magnetic diffusion is some logarithmically weaker than a full Laplacian, then the global  $H^1$ -bound of the solution can be achieved as long as the fractional dissipation power of the velocity field is positive. More precisely, this paper is devoted to the global regularity problem of the following 2D incompressible GMHD equations

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u + (u \cdot \nabla)u + (-\Delta)^\alpha u + \nabla p = (b \cdot \nabla)b, & x \in \mathbb{R}^2, t > 0, \\ \partial_t b + (u \cdot \nabla)b + \mathcal{L}b = (b \cdot \nabla)u, \\ \nabla \cdot u = 0, \quad \nabla \cdot b = 0, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x), \quad b(x, 0) = b_0(x), \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

where the operator  $\mathcal{L}$  is a Fourier multiplier with symbol  $\frac{|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)}$ , namely,

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}b}(\xi) = \frac{|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)} \widehat{b}(\xi),$$

with  $g(\xi) = g(|\xi|)$  a radial non-decreasing smooth function satisfying the following two conditions

(a)  $g$  obeys that

$$g(\xi) \geq C_0 > 0 \quad \text{for all } \xi \geq 0;$$

(b)  $g$  is of the Mihlin-Hörmander type, namely, a constant  $\tilde{C} > 0$  such that

$$|\partial_\xi^k g(\xi)| \leq \tilde{C} |\xi|^{-k} |g(\xi)|, \quad k \in \{1, 2\}, \quad \forall \xi \neq 0.$$

Here we point out that Zhao [27] recently proved the global regularity result for (1.3) as long as  $\alpha > \frac{1}{4}$  and  $g$  fulfills

$$g(\xi) \approx \ln \ln(\sigma + |\xi|) \ln \ln \ln(\sigma + |\xi|) \cdots \underbrace{\ln \ln \cdots \ln}_{k \text{ times}}(\sigma + |\xi|)$$

with  $\sigma \geq \underbrace{\exp \exp \cdots \exp}_{k \text{ times}} \triangleq \sigma(k)$ . As the restrictions in [27] are somewhat unnatural, in

particular the condition  $\alpha > \frac{1}{4}$ , the main goal of this paper is to weaken the conditions required in [27] from two aspects:  $\alpha$  and  $g$ , but the same global regularity result is still guaranteed. More precisely, our main result reads as follows.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $(u_0, b_0) \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^2) \times H^s(\mathbb{R}^2)$  with  $s \geq 2$  and satisfy  $\nabla \cdot u_0 = \nabla \cdot b_0 = 0$ . Assume that  $g$  satisfies (a)-(b) and*

$$g(\xi) \leq \tilde{C} \left( \ln(\sigma + |\xi|) \ln \ln(\sigma + |\xi|) \cdots \underbrace{\ln \ln \cdots \ln}_{k \text{ times}}(\sigma + |\xi|) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (1.4)$$

where the constant  $\tilde{C} > 0$  and  $\sigma \geq \sigma(k)$ . If  $\alpha > 0$ , then (1.3) admits a unique global solution such that

$$u, b \in L^\infty([0, T]; H^s(\mathbb{R}^2)).$$

*Remark 1.1.* Compared with [27], we are not only relaxing the assumption of  $g$ , but also relaxing  $\alpha > \frac{1}{4}$  to  $\alpha > 0$ . Moreover, in the special case when  $g$  is a positive constant, Theorem 1.1 re-establishes the global regularity for (1.2) with  $\alpha > 0, \beta = 1$ .

*Remark 1.2.* On the one hand, it is interesting to consider the problem whether Theorem 1.1 is still valid when  $(-\Delta)^\alpha$  is replaced by some logarithmic operators, such as  $[\ln(e+\Lambda)]^\rho$  for some  $\rho > 0$ . On the other hand, at the moment it is also not clear whether Theorem 1.1 holds true when the power one half of (1.4) is replaced by  $\tau$  with  $\tau > \frac{1}{2}$ . We will investigate these problems further in our future work.

*Remark 1.3.* It follows from the proof of Lemma 3.2 below that the unique global existence classical solution in Sobolev spaces has at least a  $(k+1)$ -multiple exponential upper bound uniformly in times, which particularly implies that it is very difficult to obtain the global regular solution even for reducing logarithm-type diffusion for magnetic field. Furthermore, this also indicates that the well-known global regularity problem on the 2D resistive MHD equations is a critical open problem.

The rest of this paper is divided into two sections. In Section 2, we collect some properties of the operator  $\mathcal{L}$  and the definition of Besov spaces as well as several facts, which will be used in this paper. Section 3 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.1. Throughout this paper, the letter  $C$  denotes various positive and finite constants whose exact values are unimportant and may vary from line to line.

## 2. PRELIMINARY

**2.1. Several properties of the operator  $\mathcal{L}$ .** This subsection is mainly devoted to establishing some properties for the operator  $\mathcal{L}$ , which play some important roles in proving our main theorem. To begin with, we consider the linear inhomogeneous equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t W + \mathcal{L}W = f, \\ W(x, 0) = W_0(x). \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

Thanks to the Fourier transform method, the solution of the linear inhomogeneous equation (2.1) can be explicitly given by

$$W(t) = K(t) * W_0 + \int_0^t K(t - \tau) * f(\tau) d\tau,$$

where the kernel  $K$  satisfies

$$K(x, t) = \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left( e^{\frac{-t|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)}} \right) (x).$$

Now we will establish the following crucial estimate.

**Lemma 2.1.** *For any  $k \geq 0$  and  $s > k - 1$ , there exists a constant  $C$  depending only on  $s$  and  $k$  such that for any  $t > 0$*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{|\xi|^{2s}}{g^k(\xi)} e^{-\frac{2t|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)}} d\xi \leq Ct^{-(s+1)} g(A_t)^{s-k+1}, \quad (2.2)$$

where  $A_t > 0$  is the unique solution of the following equation

$$\frac{g(x)}{x^2} = t. \quad (2.3)$$

*Proof.* To begin with, we split the integral into two parts

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{|\xi|^{2s}}{g^k(\xi)} e^{-\frac{2t|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)}} d\xi = \int_{|\xi| \leq R} \frac{|\xi|^{2s}}{g^k(\xi)} e^{-\frac{2t|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)}} d\xi + \int_{|\xi| \geq R} \frac{|\xi|^{2s}}{g^k(\xi)} e^{-\frac{2t|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)}} d\xi,$$

where  $R > 0$  will be fixed later. Thanks to  $s > k - 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|\xi| \leq R} \frac{|\xi|^{2s}}{g^k(\xi)} e^{-\frac{2t|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)}} d\xi &= (2t)^{-k} \int_{|\xi| \leq R} |\xi|^{2(s-k)} \left( \frac{2t|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)} \right)^k e^{-\frac{2t|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)}} d\xi \\ &\leq Ct^{-k} \int_{|\xi| \leq R} |\xi|^{2s-2k} d\xi \\ &\leq Ct^{-k} \int_0^R r^{2s-2k+1} dr \\ &\leq Ct^{-k} R^{2(s-k+1)}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

where we have used the simple fact

$$\max_{\lambda \geq 0} (\lambda^k e^{-\lambda}) \leq C(k). \quad (2.5)$$

Due to the fact that  $g$  is a logarithmic function like (1.4), it is not hard to check that for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $C(\epsilon)$  such that

$$\frac{r^\epsilon}{g(r)} \geq C(\epsilon) \frac{R^\epsilon}{g(R)}, \quad \forall r \geq R. \quad (2.6)$$

Thanks to (2.5) and (2.6), one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|\xi| \geq R} \frac{|\xi|^{2s}}{g^k(\xi)} e^{-\frac{2t|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)}} d\xi &= (2t)^{-k} \int_{|\xi| \geq R} |\xi|^{2(s-k)} \left( \frac{2t|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)} \right)^k e^{-\frac{t|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)}} e^{-\frac{t|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)}} d\xi \\ &\leq Ct^{-k} \int_{|\xi| \geq R} |\xi|^{2s-2k} e^{-\frac{t|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)}} d\xi \\ &= Ct^{-k} \int_R^{+\infty} r^{2s-2k+1} e^{-\frac{tr^2}{g(r)}} dr \\ &= Ct^{-k} \int_R^{+\infty} r^{2s-2k+1} e^{-tr^{2-\epsilon} \frac{r^\epsilon}{g(r)}} dr \\ &\leq Ct^{-k} \int_R^{+\infty} r^{2s-2k+1} e^{-C_\epsilon tr^{2-\epsilon} \frac{R^\epsilon}{g(R)}} dr \\ &\leq Ct^{-\frac{2(s+1)-k\epsilon}{2-\epsilon}} R^{-\frac{2(s-k+1)\epsilon}{2-\epsilon}} g(R)^{\frac{2(s-k+1)}{2-\epsilon}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

Combining (2.4) and (2.7) yields

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{|\xi|^{2s}}{g^k(\xi)} e^{-\frac{2t|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)}} d\xi \leq Ct^{-k} R^{2(s-k+1)} + Ct^{-\frac{2(s+1)-k\epsilon}{2-\epsilon}} R^{-\frac{-2(s-k+1)\epsilon}{2-\epsilon}} g(R)^{\frac{2(s-k+1)}{2-\epsilon}}.$$

Now we fix  $R$  such that

$$t^{-k} R^{2(s-k+1)} = t^{-\frac{2(s+1)-k\epsilon}{2-\epsilon}} R^{-\frac{-2(s-k+1)\epsilon}{2-\epsilon}} g(R)^{\frac{2(s-k+1)}{2-\epsilon}}$$

or equivalently

$$\frac{g(R)}{R^2} = t.$$

Then we deduce

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{|\xi|^{2s}}{g^k(\xi)} e^{-\frac{2t|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)}} d\xi \leq 2Ct^{-(s+1)} g(R)^{s-k+1} = 2Ct^{-(s+1)} g(A_t)^{s-k+1}.$$

As a result, this completes the proof of Lemma 2.1.  $\square$

The following lemma is a consequence of Lemma 2.1.

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $s > -1$ , then there exists a constant  $C$  depending only on  $s$  such that for any  $t > 0$*

$$\|K(t)\|_{\dot{H}^s} \leq Ct^{-\frac{s+1}{2}} g(A_t)^{\frac{s+1}{2}}, \quad (2.8)$$

where  $A_t$  is given by (2.3).

*Proof.* According to (2.2), one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \|K(t)\|_{\dot{H}^s}^2 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\xi|^{2s} |\widehat{K}(\xi, t)|^2 d\xi \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\xi|^{2s} e^{-\frac{2t|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)}} d\xi \\ &\leq Ct^{-(s+1)} g(A_t)^{s+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we conclude the proof of Lemma 2.2.  $\square$

Next we would like to show the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.3.** *There exists a constant  $C$  such that for any  $t > 0$*

$$\|\Lambda^{2-\delta} K(t)\|_{L^1} \leq Ct^{-(1-\frac{\delta}{2})} g^{1-\frac{\delta}{2}}(A_t), \quad (2.9)$$

where  $\delta \in [0, 1)$  and  $A_t$  is given by (2.3).

*Proof.* For any radial function  $g$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , we have

$$\widehat{g}(x) = \check{g}(x),$$

where  $\check{g}$  denotes the inverse Fourier transform of  $g$ . Since  $\widehat{K}(\cdot, t)$  is a radial function, then we infer that  $K(\cdot, t)$  is also a radial function. Based on this observation and the following interpolation inequality (see [22, (2.12)])

$$\|\widehat{h}\|_{L^1} \leq C \|h\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|h\|_{\dot{H}^2}^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

it yields that

$$\|\Lambda^{2-\delta} K(t)\|_{L^1} = \|\mathcal{F}(|\xi|^{2-\delta} \check{K}(\xi, t))\|_{L^1}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \|\mathcal{F}(|\xi|^{2-\delta}\widehat{K}(\xi, t))\|_{L^1} \\
&\leq C\| |\xi|^{2-\delta}\widehat{K}(\xi, t) \|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla_{\xi}^2(|\xi|^{2-\delta}\widehat{K}(\xi, t))\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

Using (2.8), we have

$$\| |\xi|^{2-\delta}\widehat{K}(\xi, t) \|_{L^2} \leq Ct^{-\frac{3-\delta}{2}} g^{\frac{3-\delta}{2}}(A_t). \tag{2.11}$$

It follows from some direct computations that

$$|\nabla_{\xi}^2(|\xi|^{2-\delta}\widehat{K}(\xi, t))| \leq C(|\xi|^{-\delta}|\widehat{K}(\xi, t)| + |\xi|^{1-\delta}|\nabla_{\xi}\widehat{K}(\xi, t)| + |\xi|^{2-\delta}|\nabla_{\xi}^2\widehat{K}(\xi, t)|).$$

Recalling  $\widehat{K}(\xi, t) = e^{-\frac{t|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)}}$  and the property  $|\partial_{\xi}^k g(\xi)| \leq \widetilde{C}|\xi|^{-k}|g(\xi)|$ ,  $k \in \{1, 2\}$ , it is not hard to check

$$\begin{aligned}
|\nabla_{\xi}\widehat{K}(\xi, t)| &\leq C\left(\frac{t|\xi|}{g(\xi)} + \frac{t|\xi|^2}{g^2(\xi)}|\partial_{\xi}g(\xi)|\right)|\widehat{K}(\xi, t)| \leq C\frac{t|\xi||\widehat{K}(\xi, t)|}{g(\xi)}, \\
|\nabla_{\xi}^2\widehat{K}(\xi, t)| &\leq C\left(\frac{t^2|\xi|^2}{g^2(\xi)} + \frac{t^2|\xi|^4|\partial_{\xi}g(\xi)|^2}{g^4(\xi)} + \frac{t}{g(\xi)} + \frac{t|\xi|^2|\partial_{\xi}g(\xi)|^2}{g^3(\xi)}\right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{t|\xi||\partial_{\xi}g(\xi)|}{g^2(\xi)} + \frac{t|\xi|^2|\partial_{\xi}^2g(\xi)|}{g^2(\xi)}\right)|\widehat{K}(\xi, t)| \\
&\leq C\left(\frac{t^2|\xi|^2}{g^2(\xi)} + \frac{t}{g(\xi)}\right)|\widehat{K}(\xi, t)|.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$|\nabla_{\xi}^2(|\xi|^{2-\delta}\widehat{K}(\xi, t))| \leq C\left(|\xi|^{-\delta} + \frac{t|\xi|^{2-\delta}}{g(\xi)} + \frac{t^2|\xi|^{4-\delta}}{g^2(\xi)}\right)|\widehat{K}(\xi, t)|.$$

We appeal to (2.2) to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla_{\xi}^2(|\xi|^{2-\delta}\widehat{K}(\xi, t))\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq C\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}|\xi|^{-2\delta}e^{-\frac{2t|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)}}d\xi + Ct^2\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\frac{|\xi|^{4-2\delta}}{g^2(\xi)}e^{-\frac{2t|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)}}d\xi \\
&\quad + Ct^4\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\frac{|\xi|^{8-2\delta}}{g^4(\xi)}e^{-\frac{2t|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)}}d\xi \\
&\leq Ct^{-(1-\delta)}g^{1-\delta}(A_t) + Ct^2t^{-(3-\delta)}g^{1-\delta}(A_t) + Ct^4t^{-(5-\delta)}g^{1-\delta}(A_t) \\
&\leq Ct^{-(1-\delta)}g^{1-\delta}(A_t),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

where  $\delta \in [0, 1)$ . Inserting (2.11) and (2.12) into (2.10) yields

$$\|\Lambda^{2-\delta}K(t)\|_{L^1} \leq Ct^{-(1-\frac{\delta}{2})}g^{1-\frac{\delta}{2}}(A_t).$$

We thus complete the proof of Lemma 2.3.  $\square$

Now we are ready to show the following key lemma.

**Lemma 2.4.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, there holds for  $\delta \in (0, 1)$*

$$\int_0^T \|\Lambda^{1-\delta}K(t)\|_{L^2} dt + \int_0^T \|\Lambda^{2-\delta}K(t)\|_{L^1} dt \leq C(T). \tag{2.13}$$

*Proof.* By (2.8) and (2.9), it follows that

$$\|\Lambda^{1-\delta}K(t)\|_{L^2} + \|\Lambda^{2-\delta}K(t)\|_{L^1} \leq Ct^{-(1-\frac{\delta}{2})}g^{1-\frac{\delta}{2}}(R),$$

where  $R$  satisfies

$$t = \frac{g(R)}{R^2}.$$

Obviously, one gets

$$dt = (-2R^{-3}g(R) + R^{-2}g'(R)) dR,$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T t^{-(1-\frac{\delta}{2})}g^{1-\frac{\delta}{2}}(R) dt &= - \int_{+\infty}^{A_T} R^{2-\delta} (-2R^{-3}g(R) + R^{-2}g'(R)) dR \\ &= \int_{A_T}^{+\infty} R^{2-\delta} (2R^{-3}g(R) - R^{-2}g'(R)) dR \\ &= 2 \int_{A_T}^{+\infty} R^{-1-\delta}g(R) dR - \int_{A_T}^{+\infty} R^{-\delta}g'(R) dR \\ &\leq C(T), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we have used the fact that  $g$  is a logarithmic function satisfying (1.4) and (b). Consequently, we achieve

$$\int_0^T \|\Lambda^{1-\delta}K(t)\|_{L^2} dt + \int_0^T \|\Lambda^{2-\delta}K(t)\|_{L^1} dt \leq C(T).$$

This concludes the proof of Lemma 2.4.  $\square$

**2.2. Besov spaces and some useful facts.** This subsection provides the definition of Besov spaces and several useful facts. Let us recall briefly the definition of the Littlewood-Paley decomposition (see [2] for more details). More precisely, we take some smooth radial non increasing function  $\chi$  with values in  $[0, 1]$  such that  $\chi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$  supported in the ball  $\mathcal{B} \triangleq \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2, |\xi| \leq \frac{4}{3}\}$  and with value 1 on  $\{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2, |\xi| \leq \frac{3}{4}\}$ , then we define  $\varphi(\xi) \triangleq \chi(\frac{\xi}{2}) - \chi(\xi)$ . It is clear that  $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$  is supported in the annulus  $\mathcal{C} \triangleq \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2, \frac{3}{4} \leq |\xi| \leq \frac{8}{3}\}$  and satisfies

$$\chi(\xi) + \sum_{j \geq 0} \varphi(2^{-j}\xi) = 1, \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^2; \quad \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi(2^{-j}\xi) = 1, \quad \forall \xi \neq 0.$$

Let  $h = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\varphi)$  and  $\tilde{h} = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\chi)$ , then the inhomogeneous dyadic blocks  $\Delta_j$  of our decomposition by setting

$$\Delta_j u = 0, \quad j \leq -2; \quad \Delta_{-1} u = \chi(D)u = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \tilde{h}(y)u(x-y) dy;$$

$$\Delta_j u = \varphi(2^{-j}D)u = 2^{jn} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} h(2^j y)u(x-y) dy, \quad \forall j \geq 0.$$

The homogeneous dyadic blocks  $\dot{\Delta}_j$  reads

$$\dot{\Delta}_j u = \varphi(2^{-j}D)u = 2^{2j} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} h(2^j y)u(x-y) dy, \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

The inhomogeneous Besov spaces are defined by the Littlewood-Paley decomposition as follows.

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $(p, r) \in [1, +\infty]^2$ . The inhomogeneous Besov space  $B_{p,r}^s$  is defined as a space of  $f \in S'(\mathbb{R}^n)$  such that

$$B_{p,r}^s = \{f \in S'(\mathbb{R}^n); \|f\|_{B_{p,r}^s} < \infty\},$$

where

$$\|f\|_{B_{p,r}^s} \triangleq \begin{cases} \left( \sum_{j \geq -1} 2^{jrs} \|\Delta_j f\|_{L^p}^r \right)^{\frac{1}{r}}, & r < \infty, \\ \sup_{j \geq -1} 2^{js} \|\Delta_j f\|_{L^p}, & r = \infty. \end{cases}$$

We denote the tempered distributions by  $S'(\mathbb{R}^2)$ , and polynomials by  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ . Now the homogeneous Besov spaces are defined as follows.

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $(p, r) \in [1, +\infty]^2$ . The homogeneous Besov space  $\dot{B}_{p,r}^s$  is defined as a space of  $f \in S'(\mathbb{R}^2)/\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^2)$  such that

$$\dot{B}_{p,r}^s = \{f \in S'(\mathbb{R}^2)/\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^2); \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p,r}^s} < \infty\},$$

where

$$\|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p,r}^s} \triangleq \begin{cases} \left( \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} 2^{jrs} \|\dot{\Delta}_j f\|_{L^p}^r \right)^{\frac{1}{r}}, & 1 \leq r < \infty, \\ \sup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} 2^{js} \|\dot{\Delta}_j f\|_{L^p}, & r = \infty. \end{cases}$$

The following one is the classical Bernstein type inequality (see [2, Lemma 2.1]).

**Lemma 2.5.** Let  $1 \leq a \leq b \leq \infty$  and  $\mathcal{C}$  be an annulus and  $\mathcal{B}$  a ball of  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , then

$$\text{Supp} \hat{f} \subset \lambda \mathcal{B} \Rightarrow \|\nabla^k f\|_{L^b} \leq C_1 \lambda^{k+2(\frac{1}{a}-\frac{1}{b})} \|f\|_{L^a},$$

$$\text{Supp} \hat{f} \subset \lambda \mathcal{C} \Rightarrow C_2 \lambda^k \|f\|_{L^b} \leq \|\nabla^k f\|_{L^b} \leq C_3 \lambda^{k+2(\frac{1}{a}-\frac{1}{b})} \|f\|_{L^a},$$

where  $C_1$ ,  $C_2$  and  $C_3$  are positive constants depending on  $k$ ,  $a$  and  $b$  only.

We next recall the following lower bound associated with the fractional dissipation term, which is due to Chamorro and Lemarié-Rieusset (see [5, Theorem 4.2]).

**Lemma 2.6.** Let  $q \in [2, \infty)$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , then there is a positive constant  $C(\alpha, q)$  such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \Lambda^{2\alpha} f (|f|^{q-2} f) dx \geq C(\alpha, q) \|f\|_{B_{q,q}^{\frac{2\alpha}{q}}}^q. \quad (2.14)$$

Finally, we state the following refined logarithmic Gronwall inequality (see [24, Lemma 2.8]), which will be used to show the global  $H^1$ -bound of the solution.

**Lemma 2.7.** *Assume that  $l(t)$ ,  $m(t)$ ,  $n(t)$  and  $f(t)$  are all nonnegative and integrable functions on  $(0, T)$ . Let  $A(t)$  and  $B(t)$  be two absolutely continuous and nonnegative functions on  $(0, T)$  for any given  $T > 0$ , satisfying for any  $t \in (0, T)$*

$$A'(t) + B(t) \leq \left[ l(t) + m(t) \ln(A + \alpha_0) + n(t) G(k, \ln(A + B + \alpha_0)) \right] (A + \alpha_0) + f(t),$$

where  $\alpha_0 = \alpha_0(k) \geq 2$  is suitably large such that for example  $\underbrace{\ln \cdots \ln}_{k \text{ times}} \alpha_0 \geq 1$ , and

$$G(k, r) = r \ln r \times \cdots \times \underbrace{\ln \cdots \ln}_{k \text{ times}} r, \quad k \geq 1, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_+.$$

Assume further that there are three constants  $K \in [0, \infty)$ ,  $\alpha \in [0, \infty)$  and  $\beta \in [0, 1)$  such that for any  $t \in (0, T)$

$$n(t) \leq K (A(t) + \alpha_0)^\alpha (A(t) + B(t) + \alpha_0)^\beta.$$

Then the following estimate holds true for any  $t \in (0, T)$

$$A(t) + \int_0^t B(s) ds \leq C.$$

### 3. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

By the classical hyperbolic method, there exists a finite time  $T_0$  such that the system (1.3) is local well-posedness in the interval  $[0, T_0]$  in  $H^s$  with  $s > 2$ . Thus, it is sufficient to establish *a priori* estimates in the interval  $[0, T]$  for the given  $T > T_0$ .

The basic energy estimate reads as follows.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $(u_0, b_0)$  satisfy the conditions stated in Theorem 1.1, then it holds*

$$\|u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|b(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t (\|\Lambda^\alpha u(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} b(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2) d\tau \leq \|u_0\|_{L^2}^2 + \|b_0\|_{L^2}^2, \quad (3.1)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}}$  is defined by

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} b}(\xi) = \frac{|\xi|}{\sqrt{g(\xi)}} \widehat{b}(\xi).$$

In order to get the  $H^1$ -bound of  $(u, b)$ , we apply  $\nabla \times$  to the MHD equations (1.3) to obtain the governing equations for the vorticity  $\omega \triangleq \nabla \times u = \partial_{x_1} u_2 - \partial_{x_2} u_1$  and the current  $j \triangleq \nabla \times b = \partial_{x_1} b_2 - \partial_{x_2} b_1$  as follows

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \omega + (u \cdot \nabla) \omega + \Lambda^{2\alpha} \omega = (b \cdot \nabla) j, \\ \partial_t j + (u \cdot \nabla) j + \mathcal{L} j = (b \cdot \nabla) \omega + T(\nabla u, \nabla b), \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

where

$$T(\nabla u, \nabla b) = 2\partial_{x_1} b_1 (\partial_{x_2} u_1 + \partial_{x_1} u_2) - 2\partial_{x_1} u_1 (\partial_{x_2} b_1 + \partial_{x_1} b_2).$$

We now prove that the solution of (1.3) admits a global  $H^1$ -bound as stated in the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $(u_0, b_0)$  satisfy the conditions stated in Theorem 1.1, then it holds for any  $t \in [0, T]$*

$$\|\omega(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|j(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t (\|\Lambda^\alpha \omega(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} j(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2) d\tau \leq C(t, u_0, b_0). \quad (3.3)$$

*Proof.* Taking the inner products of (3.2)<sub>1</sub> with  $\omega$ , (3.2)<sub>2</sub> with  $j$ , adding them up and using the incompressible condition, we find

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (\|\omega(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|j(t)\|_{L^2}^2) + \|\Lambda^\alpha \omega\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} j\|_{L^2}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} T(\nabla u, \nabla b) j \, dx,$$

where we have used the following fact

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (b \cdot \nabla j) \omega \, dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (b \cdot \nabla \omega) j \, dx = 0.$$

By the simple interpolation inequality, it yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} T(\nabla u, \nabla b) j \, dx &\leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} \|\nabla b\|_{L^4} \|j\|_{L^4} \\ &\leq C \|\omega\|_{L^2} \|j\|_{L^4}^2, \end{aligned}$$

which leads to

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (\|\omega(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|j(t)\|_{L^2}^2) + \|\Lambda^\alpha \omega\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} j\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \|\omega\|_{L^2} \|j\|_{L^4}^2.$$

In view of the Littlewood-Paley decomposition and the Bernstein inequality (see Lemma 2.5), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|j\|_{L^4}^2 &\leq \|j\|_{B_{4,2}^0}^2 \\ &\leq \|\Delta_{-1} j\|_{L^4}^2 + \sum_{k \geq 0} \|\Delta_k j\|_{L^4}^2 \\ &\leq C \|b\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{0 \leq k \leq M} \|\Delta_k j\|_{L^4}^2 + \sum_{k > M} \|\Delta_k j\|_{L^4}^2 \\ &\leq C \|b\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{0 \leq k \leq M} 2^k \|\Delta_k j\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{k > M} 2^{-k} \|\Delta_k \Lambda j\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &= C \|b\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{0 \leq k \leq M} 2^k \left\| \Delta_k \left( \frac{j}{\sqrt{g(\Lambda)}} \right) \right\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{k > M} 2^{-k} \left\| \Delta_k \left( \frac{\Lambda}{\sqrt{g(\Lambda)}} j \right) \right\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq C \|b\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{0 \leq k \leq M} 2^k g(2^k) \left\| \Delta_k \left( \frac{\nabla b}{\sqrt{g(\Lambda)}} \right) \right\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{k > M} 2^{-k} g(2^k) \left\| \Delta_k \left( \frac{\Lambda}{\sqrt{g(\Lambda)}} j \right) \right\|_{L^2}^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C\|b\|_{L^2}^2 + C \sum_{0 \leq k \leq M} 2^k g(2^k) \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} b(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + C \sum_{k > M} 2^{-k} g(2^k) \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} j(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\leq C\|b\|_{L^2}^2 + C \sum_{0 \leq k \leq M} 2^k g(2^k) \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} b(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + C \sum_{k > M} 2^{-(1-\epsilon)k} \frac{g(2^k)}{2^{k\epsilon}} \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} j(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\leq C\|b\|_{L^2}^2 + C \sum_{0 \leq k \leq M} 2^k g(2^k) \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} b(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + C \sum_{k > M} 2^{-(1-\epsilon)k} \frac{g(2^M)}{2^{M\epsilon}} \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} j(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\leq C\|b\|_{L^2}^2 + C 2^M g(2^M) \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} b(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + C 2^{-(1-\epsilon)M} \frac{g(2^M)}{2^{M\epsilon}} \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} j(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\leq C + C 2^M g(2^M) \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} b(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + C 2^{-M} g(2^M) \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} j(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the property (2.6). As a result, one gets

$$\|j\|_{L^4}^2 \leq C + C 2^M g(2^M) \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} b(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + C 2^{-M} g(2^M) \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} j(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Therefore, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (\|\omega(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|j(t)\|_{L^2}^2) + \|\Lambda^\alpha \omega\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} j\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\leq C \|\omega\|_{L^2} \left( 1 + 2^M g(2^M) \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} b(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + 2^{-M} g(2^M) \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} j(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 \right) \\
&\leq C \|\omega\|_{L^2} \left( 1 + 2^M g(2^M) (1 + \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} b(\tau)\|_{L^2})^2 + 2^{-M} g(2^M) \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} j(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 \right). \tag{3.4}
\end{aligned}$$

We take  $M$  large enough such that

$$2^M g(2^M) (1 + \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} b(\tau)\|_{L^2})^2 \approx 2^{-M} g(2^M) \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} j(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2,$$

which implies

$$2^M \approx \frac{\|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} j(\tau)\|_{L^2}}{1 + \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} b(\tau)\|_{L^2}}.$$

It follows from (3.4) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (\|\omega(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|j(t)\|_{L^2}^2) + \|\Lambda^\alpha \omega\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} j\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\leq C \|\omega\|_{L^2} + C \|\omega\|_{L^2} \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} j(\tau)\|_{L^2} g \left( \frac{\|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} j(\tau)\|_{L^2}}{1 + \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} b(\tau)\|_{L^2}} \right) (1 + \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} b(\tau)\|_{L^2}) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} j(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\omega\|_{L^2} + C \|\omega\|_{L^2}^2 g^2 \left( \frac{\|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} j(\tau)\|_{L^2}}{1 + \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} b(\tau)\|_{L^2}} \right) (1 + \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} b(\tau)\|_{L^2})^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt} (\|\omega(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|j(t)\|_{L^2}^2) + \|\Lambda^\alpha \omega\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} j\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\leq C \|\omega\|_{L^2} + C \|\omega\|_{L^2}^2 g^2 \left( \frac{\|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} j(\tau)\|_{L^2}}{1 + \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} b(\tau)\|_{L^2}} \right) (1 + \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} b(\tau)\|_{L^2})^2. \tag{3.5}
\end{aligned}$$

For simplicity, we denote

$$G(\xi) \triangleq \ln(\sigma + |\xi|) \ln \ln(\sigma + |\xi|) \cdots \underbrace{\ln \ln \cdots \ln(\sigma + |\xi|)}_{k \text{ times}}.$$

We thus deduce from (3.5) and (1.4) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{dt} (\|\omega(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|j(t)\|_{L^2}^2) + \|\Lambda^\alpha \omega\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} j\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& \leq C \|\omega\|_{L^2} + C \|\omega\|_{L^2}^2 G \left( \frac{\|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} j(\tau)\|_{L^2}}{1 + \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} b(\tau)\|_{L^2}} \right) (1 + \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} b(\tau)\|_{L^2})^2 \\
& \leq C \|\omega\|_{L^2} + C \|\omega\|_{L^2}^2 G \left( \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} j(\tau)\|_{L^2} \right) (1 + \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} b(\tau)\|_{L^2})^2 \\
& \leq C \|\omega\|_{L^2} + C (1 + \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} b(\tau)\|_{L^2})^2 \|\omega\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& \quad \times \ln(\sigma + \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} j\|_{L^2}) \ln \ln(\sigma + \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} j\|_{L^2}) \cdots \underbrace{\ln \ln \cdots \ln}_{k \text{ times}}(\sigma + \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} j\|_{L^2}). \tag{3.6}
\end{aligned}$$

We denote

$$\begin{aligned}
A(t) & \triangleq \sigma + \|\omega(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|j(t)\|_{L^2}^2, \quad B(t) \triangleq \sigma + \|\Lambda^\alpha \omega(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} j(t)\|_{L^2}^2, \\
n(t) & \triangleq (1 + \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} b(t)\|_{L^2})^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, one derives from (3.6) that

$$\frac{d}{dt} A(t) + B(t) \leq n(t) A(t) \ln(\sigma + B(t)) \ln \ln(\sigma + B(t)) \cdots \underbrace{\ln \ln \cdots \ln}_{k \text{ times}}(\sigma + B(t)). \tag{3.7}$$

It is easy to check

$$\begin{aligned}
n(t) & = (1 + \|\widehat{\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} b}\|_{L^2})^2 \\
& = C \left( 1 + \left\| \frac{|\xi|}{\sqrt{g(\xi)}} \widehat{b}(\xi) \right\|_{L^2} \right)^2 \\
& \leq C \left( 1 + \left\| |\xi| \widehat{b}(\xi) \right\|_{L^2} \right)^2 \\
& \leq C (1 + \|\nabla b\|_{L^2})^2 \\
& \leq C (1 + \|j\|_{L^2})^2 \\
& \leq CA(t),
\end{aligned}$$

which shows

$$n(t) \leq CA(t). \tag{3.8}$$

Keeping in mind (3.8) and applying the refined logarithmic Gronwall inequality (see Lemma 2.7) to (3.7), it is not hard to obtain (3.3). Therefore, we complete the proof of Lemma 3.2.  $\square$

Repeating the proof of [27, Lemma 3.4], we are able to show the following estimate.

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $\alpha > 0$ , then it holds for any  $r \in [0, \alpha)$*

$$\|\Lambda^r j(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Lambda^r j(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \leq C(t, u_0, b_0). \tag{3.9}$$

The following result is an easy consequence of (3.3) and (3.9).

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $\alpha > 0$ , then it holds for any  $r \in [0, \alpha)$*

$$\|\omega(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|j(t)\|_{H^r}^2 + \int_0^t (\|\Lambda^\alpha \omega(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} j(\tau)\|_{H^r}^2) d\tau \leq C(t, u_0, b_0). \quad (3.10)$$

The next lemma is a crucial component of this paper, which plays an important role in obtaining the global bound for  $(u, b)$  in  $H^s$  with  $s \geq 2$ .

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $(u_0, b_0)$  satisfy the conditions stated in Theorem 1.1, then it holds for any  $t \in [0, T]$  and for any  $q \in (2, \infty)$*

$$\|\omega(t)\|_{L^q} + \int_0^t \|\nabla j(\tau)\|_{L^q} d\tau \leq C(t, u_0, b_0). \quad (3.11)$$

In particular, it holds

$$\int_0^t \|\nabla b(\tau)\|_{L^\infty} d\tau \leq C(t, u_0, b_0). \quad (3.12)$$

*Proof.* It follows from (3.2)<sub>2</sub> that

$$\partial_t(\Lambda j) + \mathcal{L}\Lambda j = \Lambda \partial_{x_i}(b_i \omega - u_i j) + \Lambda T(\nabla u, \nabla b),$$

which along with its Fourier transform reads

$$\partial_t(\widehat{\Lambda j})(\xi, t) + \frac{|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)}(\widehat{\Lambda j})(\xi, t) = \mathcal{F}(\Lambda \partial_{x_i}(b_i \omega - u_i j))(\xi, t) + \mathcal{F}(\Lambda T(\nabla u, \nabla b))(\xi, t).$$

As a result, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\widehat{\Lambda j})(\xi, t) &= e^{\frac{-t|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)}} (\widehat{\Lambda j_0})(\xi) + \int_0^t e^{\frac{-(t-\tau)|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)}} \mathcal{F}(\Lambda \partial_{x_i}(b_i \omega - u_i j))(\xi, \tau) d\tau \\ &\quad + \int_0^t e^{\frac{-(t-\tau)|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)}} \mathcal{F}(\Lambda T(\nabla u, \nabla b))(\xi, \tau) d\tau \\ &= e^{\frac{-t|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)}} |\xi| \widehat{j_0}(\xi) + \int_0^t |\xi|^{2-\delta} e^{\frac{-(t-\tau)|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)}} |\xi|^{\delta-2} \mathcal{F}(\Lambda \partial_{x_i}(b_i \omega - u_i j))(\xi, \tau) d\tau \\ &\quad + \int_0^t |\xi|^{1-\delta} e^{\frac{-(t-\tau)|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)}} |\xi|^{\delta-1} \mathcal{F}(\Lambda T(\nabla u, \nabla b))(\xi, \tau) d\tau \\ &= |\xi|^{2-\delta} e^{\frac{-t|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)}} \widehat{\Lambda^{\delta-1} j_0}(\xi) + \int_0^t |\xi|^{2-\delta} e^{\frac{-(t-\tau)|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)}} \mathcal{F}(\Lambda^{\delta-1} \partial_{x_i}(b_i \omega - u_i j))(\xi, \tau) d\tau \\ &\quad + \int_0^t |\xi|^{1-\delta} e^{\frac{-(t-\tau)|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)}} \mathcal{F}(\Lambda^\delta T(\nabla u, \nabla b))(\xi, \tau) d\tau, \end{aligned}$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned} (\widehat{\Lambda j})(\xi, t) &= |\xi|^{2-\delta} e^{\frac{-t|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)}} \widehat{\Lambda^{\delta-1} j_0}(\xi) + \int_0^t |\xi|^{2-\delta} e^{\frac{-(t-\tau)|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)}} \mathcal{F}(\Lambda^{\delta-1} \partial_{x_i}(b_i \omega - u_i j))(\xi, \tau) d\tau \\ &\quad + \int_0^t |\xi|^{1-\delta} e^{\frac{-(t-\tau)|\xi|^2}{g(\xi)}} \mathcal{F}(\Lambda^\delta T(\nabla u, \nabla b))(\xi, \tau) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Applying inverse Fourier transform to above equality shows

$$\Lambda j(t) = \Lambda^{2-\delta} K(t) * \Lambda^{\delta-1} j_0 + \int_0^t \Lambda^{2-\delta} K(t-\tau) * (\Lambda^{\delta-1} \partial_{x_i}(b_i \omega - u_i j))(\tau) d\tau$$

$$+ \int_0^t \Lambda^{1-\delta} K(t-\tau) * (\Lambda^\delta T(\nabla u, \nabla b))(\tau) d\tau.$$

Taking  $L^q$ -norm (for any  $q \in (2, \infty)$ ) to the both sides of the above equality in terms of space variable and using the Young inequality, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla j(t)\|_{L^q} &\leq \|\Lambda j(t)\|_{L^q} \\ &\leq \|\Lambda^{2-\delta} K(t) * \Lambda^{\delta-1} j_0\|_{L^q} \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \|\Lambda^{2-\delta} K(t-\tau) * \{\Lambda^{\delta-1} \partial_{x_i} (b_i \omega - u_i j)\}(\tau)\|_{L^q} d\tau \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \|\Lambda^{1-\delta} K(t-\tau) * \Lambda^\delta T(\nabla u, \nabla b)(\tau)\|_{L^q} d\tau \\ &\leq C \|\Lambda^{2-\delta} K(t)\|_{L^1} \|\Lambda^{\delta-1} j_0\|_{L^q} \\ &\quad + C \int_0^t \|\Lambda^{2-\delta} K(t-\tau)\|_{L^1} (\|\Lambda^\delta (b\omega)(\tau)\|_{L^q} + \|\Lambda^\delta (uj)(\tau)\|_{L^q}) d\tau \\ &\quad + C \int_0^t \|\Lambda^{1-\delta} K(t-\tau)\|_{L^2} \|\Lambda^\delta T(\nabla u, \nabla b)(\tau)\|_{L^{\frac{2q}{q+2}}} d\tau \\ &\leq C \|\Lambda^{1-\delta} K(t)\|_{L^2} \|\Lambda^\delta b_0\|_{L^q} \\ &\quad + C \int_0^t \|\Lambda^{2-\delta} K(t-\tau)\|_{L^1} (\|\Lambda^\delta (b \otimes \omega)(\tau)\|_{L^q} + \|\Lambda^\delta (u \otimes j)(\tau)\|_{L^q}) d\tau \\ &\quad + C \int_0^t \|\Lambda^{1-\delta} K(t-\tau)\|_{L^2} \|\Lambda^\delta T(\nabla u, \nabla b)(\tau)\|_{L^{\frac{2q}{q+2}}} d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Taking  $L^1$ -norm in terms of time variable and appealing to the convolution Young inequality, one concludes by using (2.13) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla j(t)\|_{L_t^1 L^q} &\leq C \|\Lambda^{2-\delta} K(t)\|_{L_t^1 L^1} + C \|\Lambda^{1-\delta} K(t)\|_{L_t^1 L^2} \|\Lambda^\delta T(\nabla u, \nabla b)\|_{L_t^1 L^{\frac{2q}{q+2}}} \\ &\quad + C \|\Lambda^{2-\delta} K(t)\|_{L_t^1 L^1} (\|\Lambda^\delta (b\omega)\|_{L_t^1 L^q} + \|\Lambda^\delta (uj)\|_{L_t^1 L^q}) \\ &\leq C + C \|\Lambda^\delta T(\nabla u, \nabla b)\|_{L_t^1 L^{\frac{2q}{q+2}}} + C (\|\Lambda^\delta (b\omega)\|_{L_t^1 L^q} + \|\Lambda^\delta (uj)\|_{L_t^1 L^q}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Taking  $\delta < \alpha$  and using (3.10), we may derive

$$\begin{aligned} C \|\Lambda^\delta T(\nabla u, \nabla b)\|_{L_t^1 L^{\frac{2q}{q+2}}} &\leq C \|\Lambda^\delta \nabla u\|_{L_t^2 L^2} \|\nabla b\|_{L_t^2 L^q} + C \|\Lambda^\delta \nabla b\|_{L_t^\infty L^2} \|\nabla u\|_{L_t^1 L^q} \\ &\leq C \|\Lambda^\delta \omega\|_{L_t^2 L^2} \|j\|_{L_t^2 L^q} + C \|\Lambda^\delta j\|_{L_t^\infty L^2} \|\omega\|_{L_t^1 L^q} \\ &\leq C + C \|\omega\|_{L_t^1 L^q}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

Similarly, one has by taking  $\delta < \alpha$  and using (3.10) that

$$\begin{aligned} C (\|\Lambda^\delta (b\omega)\|_{L_t^1 L^q} + \|\Lambda^\delta (uj)\|_{L_t^1 L^q}) &\leq C (\|b\|_{L_t^\infty L^\infty} \|\Lambda^\delta \omega\|_{L_t^1 L^q} + \|\Lambda^\delta b\|_{L_t^\infty L^{\frac{2}{\delta}}} \|\omega\|_{L_t^1 L^{\frac{2q}{2-\delta q}}}) \\ &\quad + \|\Lambda^\delta u\|_{L_t^2 L^m} \|j\|_{L_t^2 L^{\frac{mq}{m-q}}} + \|u\|_{L_t^2 L^\infty} \|\Lambda^\delta j\|_{L_t^2 L^q} \\ &\leq C + C \|\Lambda^\delta \omega\|_{L_t^1 L^q}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

Putting (3.14) and (3.15) into (3.13) shows

$$\|\nabla j(t)\|_{L_t^1 L^q} \leq C + C\|\omega\|_{L_t^1 L^q} + C\|\Lambda^\delta \omega\|_{L_t^1 L^q}. \quad (3.16)$$

To bound the terms at the righthand side of (3.16), we deduce from (3.2)<sub>1</sub> that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{q} \frac{d}{dt} \|\omega(t)\|_{L^q}^q + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \Lambda^{2\alpha} \omega (|\omega|^{q-2} \omega) dx &\leq C \|b\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla j\|_{L^q} \|\omega\|_{L^q}^{q-1} \\ &\leq C \|\nabla j\|_{L^q} \|\omega\|_{L^q}^{q-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

Thanks to (2.14), one obtains

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \Lambda^{2\alpha} \omega (|\omega|^{q-2} \omega) dx \geq C(\alpha, q) \|\omega\|_{\dot{B}_{q,q}^{\frac{2\alpha}{q}}}^q. \quad (3.18)$$

Putting (3.18) into (3.17) leads to

$$\frac{1}{q} \frac{d}{dt} \|\omega(t)\|_{L^q}^q + C \|\omega\|_{\dot{B}_{q,q}^{\frac{2\alpha}{q}}}^q \leq C \|\nabla j\|_{L^q} \|\omega\|_{L^q}^{q-1}. \quad (3.19)$$

Obviously, it follows from (3.19) that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\omega(t)\|_{L^q} \leq C \|\nabla j\|_{L^q},$$

which implies

$$\|\omega(t)\|_{L^q} \leq C + \|\nabla j\|_{L_t^1 L^q}. \quad (3.20)$$

Keeping in mind (3.19) and making use of (3.20), we are able to show

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t \|\omega(\tau)\|_{\dot{B}_{q,q}^{\frac{2\alpha}{q}}}^q d\tau &\leq C + C \int_0^t \|\nabla j(\tau)\|_{L^q} \|\omega(\tau)\|_{L^q}^{q-1} d\tau \\ &\leq C + C \int_0^t \|\nabla j(\tau)\|_{L^q} (C + \|\nabla j\|_{L_\tau^1 L^q})^{q-1} d\tau \\ &\leq C + C (C + \|\nabla j\|_{L_t^1 L^q})^{q-1} \int_0^t \|\nabla j(\tau)\|_{L^q} d\tau \\ &\leq C + C \|\nabla j\|_{L_t^1 L^q}^q, \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\|\omega(\tau)\|_{L_t^q \dot{B}_{q,q}^{\frac{2\alpha}{q}}} \leq C + C \|\nabla j\|_{L_t^1 L^q}. \quad (3.21)$$

Coming back to (3.16) and using (3.21), we derive by further restricting  $\delta < \frac{2\alpha}{q}$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla j(t)\|_{L_t^1 L^q} &\leq C + C\|\omega\|_{L_t^1 L^q} + C\|\Lambda^\delta \omega\|_{L_t^1 L^q} \\ &\leq C + C\|\omega\|_{L_t^1 L^q} + C \int_0^t \|\omega(\tau)\|_{L^2}^{1-\frac{(1+\delta)q-2}{q-2(1-\alpha)}} \|\omega(\tau)\|_{\dot{B}_{q,q}^{\frac{2\alpha}{q}}}^{\frac{(1+\delta)q-2}{q-2(1-\alpha)}} d\tau \\ &\leq C + C\|\omega\|_{L_t^1 L^q} + C \left( \int_0^t \|\omega(\tau)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{(2\alpha-\delta)q}{q[q-2(1-\alpha)]-(1+\delta)q+2}} d\tau \right)^{\frac{q[q-2(1-\alpha)]-(1+\delta)q+2}{q[q-2(1-\alpha)]}} \\ &\quad \times \left( \int_0^t \|\omega(\tau)\|_{\dot{B}_{q,q}^{\frac{2\alpha}{q}}}^q d\tau \right)^{\frac{(1+\delta)q-2}{q[q-2(1-\alpha)]}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C + C\|\omega\|_{L_t^1 L^q} + C\|\omega(\tau)\|_{L_t^q \dot{B}_{q,q}^{\frac{2\alpha}{q}}}^{\frac{(1+\delta)q-2}{q-2(1-\alpha)}} \\
&\leq C + C\|\omega\|_{L_t^1 L^q} + C\|\nabla j\|_{L_t^1 L^q}^{\frac{(1+\delta)q-2}{q-2(1-\alpha)}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla j(t)\|_{L_t^1 L^q} + C + C\|\omega\|_{L_t^1 L^q},
\end{aligned}$$

which yields

$$\|\nabla j(t)\|_{L_t^1 L^q} \leq C + C\|\omega\|_{L_t^1 L^q}. \quad (3.22)$$

Denoting

$$A(t) \triangleq \|\nabla j(t)\|_{L_t^1 L^q},$$

we deduce from (3.20) and (3.22) that

$$A(t) \leq C + C \int_0^t A(\tau) d\tau.$$

Applying the Gronwall inequality to the above inequality, we obtain

$$A(t) \leq C(t, u_0, b_0),$$

which further implies for any  $q \in (2, \infty)$  that

$$\|\omega(t)\|_{L^q} + \int_0^t \|\nabla j(\tau)\|_{L^q} d\tau \leq C(t, u_0, b_0).$$

This achieves the proof of Lemma 3.5.  $\square$

Finally we prove Theorem 1.1.

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* With a priori estimates achieved above, it is a standard procedure to complete the proof of Theorem 1.1. The first step is to construct a local-in-time solution which can be achieved by quite standard arguments and is thus omitted here. The last step is to show the global  $H^s$ -bound. To this end, we apply  $\Lambda^s$  to the equations  $u$  and  $b$ , and take the  $L^2$  inner product of the resulting equations with  $(\Lambda^s u, \Lambda^s b)$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (\|\Lambda^s u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Lambda^s b(t)\|_{L^2}^2) + \|\Lambda^{s+\alpha} u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Lambda^s b\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} [\Lambda^s, u \cdot \nabla] u \cdot \Lambda^s u \, dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} [\Lambda^s, b \cdot \nabla] b \cdot \Lambda^s u \, dx \\
&\quad - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} [\Lambda^s, u \cdot \nabla] b \cdot \Lambda^s b \, dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} [\Lambda^s, b \cdot \nabla] u \cdot \Lambda^s b \, dx \\
&= J_1 + J_2 + J_3 + J_4,
\end{aligned}$$

where  $[a, b]$  is the standard commutator notation, namely  $[a, b] = ab - ba$ . By means of the following Kato-Ponce inequality (see [10])

$$\|[\Lambda^s, f]g\|_{L^p} \leq C(\|\nabla f\|_{L^\infty} \|\Lambda^{s-1} g\|_{L^p} + \|g\|_{L^\infty} \|\Lambda^s f\|_{L^p}), \quad 1 < p < \infty,$$

one can deduce that

$$J_1 \leq C\|\nabla u\|_{L^q} \|\Lambda^s u\|_{L^{\frac{2q}{q-1}}}^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C\|\nabla u\|_{L^q}\|\Lambda^s u\|_{L^2}^{2-\frac{2}{\alpha q}}\|\Lambda^{s+\alpha}u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2}{\alpha q}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2}\|\Lambda^{s+\alpha}u\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|\omega\|_{L^q}^{\frac{\alpha q}{\alpha q-1}}\|\Lambda^s u\|_{L^2}^2, \\
J_2 &\leq C\|\nabla b\|_{L^\infty}(\|\Lambda^s u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Lambda^s b\|_{L^2}^2), \\
J_3 + J_4 &\leq C(\|[\Lambda^s, u \cdot \nabla]b\|_{L^2} + \|[\Lambda^s, b \cdot \nabla]u\|_{L^2})\|\Lambda^s b\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq C(\|\nabla b\|_{L^\infty}\|\Lambda^s u\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^q}\|\Lambda^s b\|_{L^{\frac{2q}{q-2}}})\|\Lambda^s b\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq C(\|\nabla b\|_{L^\infty}\|\Lambda^s u\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^q}\|\Lambda^s b\|_{L^2}^{1-\eta}\|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}}b\|_{H^s}^\eta)\|\Lambda^s b\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2}\|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}}\Lambda^s b\|_{L^2}^2 + C\left(\|\nabla b\|_{L^\infty} + \|\omega\|_{L^q}^{\frac{2}{1-\eta}}\right)(\|\Lambda^s u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Lambda^s b\|_{L^2}^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt}(\|\Lambda^s u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Lambda^s b(t)\|_{L^2}^2) + \|\Lambda^{s+\alpha}u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}}\Lambda^s b\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\leq C(\|\omega\|_{L^q}^{\frac{\alpha q}{\alpha q-1}} + \|\omega\|_{L^q}^{\frac{2}{1-\eta}} + \|\nabla b\|_{L^\infty})(\|\Lambda^s u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Lambda^s b\|_{L^2}^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Applying the Gronwall type inequality and the estimates (3.11) and (3.12), we eventually obtain

$$\|\Lambda^s u(t)\|_{L^2} + \|\Lambda^s b(t)\|_{L^2} \leq C(t),$$

which along with (3.1) yields the desired global  $H^s$ -bound. Thanks to the global  $H^s$ -bound, the uniqueness follows immediately, and thus omit the details.  $\square$

**Acknowledgements.** Ye was supported by the Qing Lan Project of Jiangsu Province. Zhao was partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 11901165, No. 11971446).

## REFERENCES

- [1] L. Agelas, *Global regularity for logarithmically critical 2D MHD equations with zero viscosity*, Monatsh. Math. **181** (2016), 245–266.
- [2] H. Bahouri, J.-Y. Chemin, R. Danchin: *Fourier Analysis and Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations*, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, 343, Springer (2011).
- [3] C. Cao, J. Wu, *Global regularity for the 2D MHD equations with mixed partial dissipation and magnetic diffusion*, Adv. Math. **226** (2011), 1803–1822.
- [4] C. Cao, J. Wu, B. Yuan, *The 2D incompressible magnetohydrodynamics equations with only magnetic diffusion*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **46** (2014), 588–602.
- [5] D. Chamorro, P.G. Lemarie-Rieusset, *Quasi-geostrophic equation, nonlinear Bernstein inequalities and  $\alpha$ -stable processes*, Rev. Mat. Iberoam. **28** (2012), 1109–1122.
- [6] P.A. Davidson, *An Introduction to Magnetohydrodynamics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2001.
- [7] J. Fan, H. Malaikah, S. Monaque, G. Nakamura, Y. Zhou, *Global Cauchy problem of 2D generalized MHD equations*, Monatsh. Math. **175** (2014), 127–131.
- [8] Q. Jiu, J. Zhao, *A remark on global regularity of 2D generalized magnetohydrodynamic equations*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **412** (2014), 478–484.
- [9] Q. Jiu, J. Zhao, *Global regularity of 2D generalized MHD equations with magnetic diffusion*, Z. Angew. Math. Phys. **66** (2015), 677–687.

- [10] T. Kato, G. Ponce, *Commutator estimates and the Euler and the Navier-Stokes equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **41** (1988), 891–907.
- [11] Z. Lei, Y. Zhou, *BKM's criterion and global weak solutions for magnetohydrodynamics with zero viscosity*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **25** (2009), 575–583.
- [12] E. Priest, T. Forbes, *Magnetic reconnection, MHD theory and Applications*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.
- [13] M. Sermange, R. Temam, *Some mathematical questions related to the MHD equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **36** (1983), 635–664.
- [14] T. Tao, *Global regularity for a logarithmically supercritical hyperdissipative Navier-Stokes equation*, Anal. PDE **2** (2009), 361–366.
- [15] C. V. Tran, X. Yu, Z. Zhai, *Note on solution regularity of the generalized magnetohydrodynamic equations with partial dissipation*, Nonlinear Anal. **85** (2013), 43–51.
- [16] C. V. Tran, X. Yu, Z. Zhai, *On global regularity of 2D generalized magnetohydrodynamics equations*, J. Differential. Equations **254** (2013), 4194–4216.
- [17] J. Wu, *The generalized MHD equations*, J. Differential. Equations, **195** (2003), 284–312.
- [18] J. Wu, *Global regularity for a class of generalized magnetohydrodynamic equations*, J. Math. Fluid Mech, **13** (2011), 295–305.
- [19] K. Yamazaki, *On the global regularity of two-dimensional generalized magnetohydrodynamics system*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **416** (2014), 99–111.
- [20] K. Yamazaki, *Global regularity of the logarithmically supercritical MHD system with zero diffusivity*, Appl. Math. Lett. **29** (2014), 46–51.
- [21] K. Yamazaki, *Global regularity of logarithmically supercritical MHD system with improved logarithmic powers*, Dyn. Partial Differ. Equ. **15** (2018), 147–173.
- [22] Z. Ye, *Remark on the global regularity of 2D MHD equations with almost Laplacian magnetic diffusion*, J. Evol. Equ. **18** (2018), no. 2, 821–844.
- [23] Z. Ye, X. Xu, *Global regularity of the two-dimensional incompressible generalized magnetohydrodynamics system*, Nonlinear Anal. **100** (2014), 86–96.
- [24] Z. Ye, *Some new regularity criteria for the 2D Euler-Boussinesq equations via the temperature*, Acta Appl Math **157** (2018), 141–169.
- [25] B. Yuan, L. Bai, *Remarks on global regularity of 2D generalized MHD equations*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **413** (2014), 633–640.
- [26] B. Yuan, J. Zhao, *Global regularity of 2D almost resistive MHD Equations*, Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl. **41** (2018), 53–65.
- [27] J. Zhao, *Global regularity for solutions to 2D generalized MHD equations with multiple exponential upper bound uniformly in time*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **514** (2022), no. 1, Paper No. 126306.