

# ANNALS OF MATHEMATICS

## The Euler equations as a differential inclusion

By CAMILLO DE LELLIS and LÁSZLÓ SZÉKELYHIDI JR.



SECOND SERIES, VOL. 170, NO. 3

November, 2009

ANMAAH

# The Euler equations as a differential inclusion

By CAMILLO DE LELLIS and LÁSZLÓ SZÉKELYHIDI JR.

## Abstract

We propose a new point of view on weak solutions of the Euler equations, describing the motion of an ideal incompressible fluid in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with  $n \geq 2$ . We give a reformulation of the Euler equations as a differential inclusion, and in this way we obtain transparent proofs of several celebrated results of V. Scheffer and A. Shnirelman concerning the non-uniqueness of weak solutions and the existence of energy-decreasing solutions. Our results are stronger because they work in any dimension and yield bounded velocity and pressure.

## 1. Introduction

Consider the Euler equations in  $n$  space dimensions, describing the motion of an ideal incompressible fluid:

$$(1) \quad \partial_t v + \operatorname{div}(v \otimes v) + \nabla p - f = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{div} v = 0.$$

Classical (i.e. sufficiently smooth) solutions of the Cauchy problem exist locally in time for sufficiently regular initial data and driving forces [MB02, Chap. 3.2]. In two dimensions, such existence results are available also for global solutions (see e.g. [MB02, Chaps. 3.3 and 8.2] and the references therein). Classical solutions of Euler's equations with  $f = 0$  conserve the energy, that is,  $t \mapsto \int |v(x, t)|^2 dx$  is a constant function. Hence the energy space for (1) is  $L_t^\infty(L_x^2)$ .

A recurrent issue in the modern theory of PDEs is that one needs to go beyond classical solutions, in particular down to the energy space (see for instance [Daf00], [DM87], [MB02], [Tao06]). A divergence-free vector field  $v \in L_{\text{loc}}^2$  is a *weak solution* of (1) if

$$\int (v \partial_t \varphi + \langle v \otimes v, \nabla \varphi \rangle + \varphi \cdot f) dx dt = 0$$

for every test function  $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}_x^n \times \mathbb{R}_t, \mathbb{R}^n)$  with  $\operatorname{div} \varphi = 0$ . It is well known that then the pressure is determined up to a function depending only on time; see

[Tem84]. In the case of the Euler equations, strong motivation for considering weak solutions comes also from mathematical physics, especially the theory of turbulence laid down by Kolmogorov in 1941 [Cho94], [Fri95]. A celebrated criterion of Onsager related to Kolmogorov's theory says, roughly speaking, that dissipative weak solutions cannot have a Hölder exponent greater than  $1/3$  [CET94], [DR00], [Eyi94], [Ons49]. It is therefore of interest to construct weak solutions with limited regularity.

Weak solutions are not unique. In a well-known paper [Sch93], Scheffer constructed a surprising example of a weak solution to (1) with compact support in space and time when  $f = 0$  and  $n = 2$ . Scheffer's proof is very long and complicated, and a simpler construction was later given by Shnirelman in [Shn97]. However, Shnirelman's proof is still quite difficult. In this paper we obtain a short and elementary proof of the following theorem.

**THEOREM 1.1.** *Let  $f = 0$ . There exists a  $v \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_x^n \times \mathbb{R}_t; \mathbb{R}^n)$  and a  $p \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_x^n \times \mathbb{R}_t)$ , solving (1) in the sense of distributions, such that  $v$  is not identically zero, and  $\text{supp } v$  and  $\text{supp } p$  are compact in spacetime  $\mathbb{R}_x^n \times \mathbb{R}_t$ .*

In mathematical physics, weak solutions to the Euler equations that dissipate energy underlie the Kolmogorov theory of turbulence. In another groundbreaking paper [Shn00], Shnirelman proved the existence of  $L^2$  distributional solutions with  $f = 0$  and energy that decreases in time. His methods are completely unrelated to those in [Sch93] and [Shn97]. In contrast, the following extension of his existence theorem is a simple corollary of our construction.

**THEOREM 1.2.** *There exists  $(v, p)$  as in Theorem 1.1 such that, in addition,*

- $\int |v(x, t)|^2 dx = 1$  for almost every  $t \in ]-1, 1[$  and
- $v(x, t) = 0$  for  $|t| > 1$ .

Our method has several interesting features. First of all, our approach fits nicely in the well-known framework of L. Tartar for the analysis of oscillations in linear partial differential systems coupled with nonlinear pointwise constraints [DP85], [KMŠ03], [Tar79], [Tar83]. Roughly speaking, Tartar's framework amounts to a planewave analysis localized in physical space, in contrast with Shnirelman's method in [Shn97], which is based rather on a wave analysis in Fourier space. In combination with Gromov's convex integration or with Baire category arguments, Tartar's approach leads to a well-understood mechanism for generating irregular oscillatory solutions to differential inclusions; see [Kir03], [KMŠ03], [MŠ03].

Second, the velocity field we construct is in the energy space  $L_t^\infty(L_x^2)$ . This was not the case for the solutions in [Sch93], [Shn97], and it was a natural question whether weak solutions in the energy space were unique. Our first theorem shows that even higher summability assumptions of  $v$  do not rule out such pathologies. The

pressure in [Sch93], [Shn97] is only a distribution solving (1). In our construction  $p$  is actually the potential-theoretic solution of

$$(2) \quad -\Delta p = \partial_{x_i x_j}^2 (v^i v^j).$$

However, being bounded, it has slightly better regularity than the BMO given by the classical estimates for (2).

Next, our point of view reveals connections between the apparently unrelated constructions of Scheffer and Shnirelman. Shnirelman considers sequences of driving forces  $f_k$  converging to 0 in some negative Sobolev space. In particular, he shows that for a suitable choice of  $f_k$  the corresponding solutions of (1) converge in  $L^2$  to a nonzero solution of (1) with  $f = 0$ . Scheffer builds his solution by iterating a certain piecewise constant construction at small scales. On the one hand, both our proof and Scheffer's are based on oscillations localized in physical space. On the other hand, our proof gives as an easy byproduct the following approximation result in Shnirelman's spirit.

**THEOREM 1.3.** *All of the solutions  $(v, p)$  constructed in the proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 have the following property. There exist three sequences  $\{v_k\}, \{f_k\}, \{p_k\} \subset C_c^\infty$  solving (1) such that*

- $f_k$  converges to 0 in  $H^{-1}$ ,
- $\|v_k\|_\infty + \|p_k\|_\infty$  is uniformly bounded, and
- $(v_k, p_k) \rightarrow (v, p)$  in  $L^q$  for every  $q < \infty$ .

Our results give interesting information on which kind of additional (entropy) condition could restore uniqueness of solutions. As already remarked, belonging to the energy space is not sufficient. In fact, in view of our method of construction, there is strong evidence that neither energy-decreasing nor energy-preserving solutions are unique. This issue is investigated further in [DLSJ07].

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we carry out the plane wave analysis of the Euler equations in the spirit of Tartar, and we formulate the core of our construction, Proposition 2.2, which we then prove in Section 3. In Section 4, we show how our main results follow from that proposition. We emphasize that the concluding argument in Section 4 appeals to the—by now standard—methods for solving differential inclusions, either by appealing to the Baire category theorem [BF94], [Cel80], [DM97], [Kir01] or by using the more explicit convex integration method [Gro86], [MŠ03], [MS01]. In our opinion, the Baire category argument developed in [Kir03] and used in Section 4 is, for the purposes of this paper, the most efficient and elegant tool. However, we include in Section 5 an alternative proof which follows the convex integration approach, as it makes easier to visualize the solutions constructed in this paper.

## 2. Plane wave analysis of Euler’s equations

We start by briefly explaining Tartar’s framework [Tar79]. One considers nonlinear PDEs that can be expressed as a system of linear PDEs (conservation laws)

$$(3) \quad \sum_{i=1}^m A_i \partial_i z = 0$$

coupled with a pointwise nonlinear constraint (constitutive relations)

$$z(x) \in K \subset \mathbb{R}^d \text{ almost everywhere,}$$

where  $z : \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  is the unknown state variable. The idea is then to consider *planewave* solutions to (3), that is, solutions of the form

$$(4) \quad z(x) = ah(x \cdot \xi),$$

where  $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . The *wave cone*  $\Lambda$  is given by the states  $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that, for any choice of the profile  $h$ , the function (4) solves (3), that is,

$$(5) \quad \Lambda := \{a \in \mathbb{R}^d : \exists \xi \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \{0\} \text{ with } \sum_{i=1}^m \xi_i A_i a = 0\}.$$

The oscillatory behavior of solutions to the nonlinear problem is then determined by the compatibility of the set  $K$  with the cone  $\Lambda$ .

The Euler equations can be naturally rewritten in this framework. The domain is  $\mathbb{R}^m = \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ , and the state variable  $z$  is defined as  $z = (v, u, q)$ , where

$$q = p + \frac{1}{n}|v|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad u = v \otimes v - \frac{1}{n}|v|^2 I_n,$$

so that  $u$  is a symmetric  $n \times n$  matrix with vanishing trace; here  $I_n$  denotes the  $n \times n$  identity matrix. From now on the linear space of symmetric  $n \times n$  matrices will be denoted by  $\mathcal{S}^n$  and the subspace of trace-free symmetric matrices by  $\mathcal{S}_0^n$ . The following lemma is straightforward.

LEMMA 2.1. *Suppose  $v \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_x^n \times \mathbb{R}_t; \mathbb{R}^n)$ ,  $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_x^n \times \mathbb{R}_t; \mathcal{S}_0^n)$ , and  $q \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_x^n \times \mathbb{R}_t)$  solve*

$$(6) \quad \partial_t v + \operatorname{div} u + \nabla q = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{div} v = 0$$

*in the sense of distributions. If in addition*

$$(7) \quad u = v \otimes v - \frac{1}{n}|v|^2 I_n \quad \text{almost everywhere in } \mathbb{R}_x^n \times \mathbb{R}_t,$$

*then  $v$  and  $p := q - \frac{1}{n}|v|^2$  solve (1) with  $f \equiv 0$ . Conversely, if  $v$  and  $p$  solve (1) distributionally, then  $v$ ,  $u := v \otimes v - \frac{1}{n}|v|^2 I_n$  and  $q := p + \frac{1}{n}|v|^2$  solve (6) and (7).*

Consider the  $(n + 1) \times (n + 1)$  symmetric matrix in block form

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} u + qI_n & v \\ v & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $I_n$  is the  $n \times n$  identity matrix. Notice that by introducing new coordinates  $y = (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ , system (6) becomes simply  $\operatorname{div}_y U = 0$ . Here, as usual, a divergence-free matrix field is a matrix of functions with rows that are divergence-free vectors. Therefore the wave cone corresponding to (6) is given by

$$\Lambda = \left\{ (v, u, q) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{S}_0^n \times \mathbb{R} : \det \begin{pmatrix} u + qI_n & v \\ v & 0 \end{pmatrix} = 0 \right\}.$$

*Remark 1.* A simple computation in linear algebra shows that for every  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $u \in \mathcal{S}_0^n$ , there exists a  $q \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $(v, u, q) \in \Lambda$ , which reveals that the wave cone is very large. Indeed, let  $V^\perp \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be the linear space orthogonal to  $v$ , and consider on  $V^\perp$  the quadratic form  $\xi \mapsto \xi \cdot u \xi$ . Then  $\det U = 0$  if and only if  $-q$  is an eigenvalue of this quadratic form.

In order to exploit this fact for constructing irregular solutions to the nonlinear system, one needs planewave-like solutions to (6) that are localized in space. Clearly an exact planewave as in (4) has compact support only if it is identically zero. Therefore this can only be done by introducing an error in the range of the wave, deviating from the line spanned by the wave state  $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . However, this error can be made arbitrarily small. This is the content of the following proposition, which is the building block of our construction.

**PROPOSITION 2.2 (Localized plane waves).** *Let  $a = (v_0, u_0, q_0) \in \Lambda$  with  $v_0 \neq 0$ , and denote by  $\sigma$  the line segment in  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{S}_0^n \times \mathbb{R}$  joining the points  $-a$  and  $a$ . For every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists a smooth solution  $(v, u, q)$  of (6) with the properties that*

- *the support of  $(v, u, q)$  is contained in  $B_1(0) \subset \mathbb{R}_x^n \times \mathbb{R}_t$ ,*
- *the image of  $(v, u, q)$  is contained in the  $\varepsilon$ -neighborhood of  $\sigma$ , and*
- *$\int |v(x, t)| dx dt \geq \alpha |v_0|$ ,*

where  $\alpha > 0$  is a dimensional constant.

### 3. Localized plane waves

For the proof of Proposition 2.2 there are two main points. First, we appeal to a particular large group of symmetries of the equations in order to reduce the problem to some special  $\Lambda$ -directions. Second, to achieve a cutoff that preserves the linear equations (6), we introduce a suitable potential.

*Definition 3.1.* We denote by  $\mathcal{M}$  the set of symmetric  $(n + 1) \times (n + 1)$  matrices  $A$  such that  $A_{(n+1)(n+1)} = 0$ . Clearly, the map

$$\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{S}_0^n \times \mathbb{R} \ni (v, u, q) \longmapsto U = \begin{pmatrix} u + qI_n & v \\ v & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{M}$$

is a linear isomorphism.

As already observed, in the variables  $y = (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ , the system (6) is equivalent to  $\operatorname{div} U = 0$ . Therefore Proposition 2.2 follows immediately from another proposition:

PROPOSITION 3.2. *Let  $\bar{U} \in \mathcal{M}$  be such that  $\det \bar{U} = 0$  and  $\bar{U} e_{n+1} \neq 0$ , and consider the line segment  $\sigma$  with endpoints  $-\bar{U}$  and  $\bar{U}$ . Then there exists a constant  $\alpha > 0$  such that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a smooth divergence-free matrix field  $U : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  with the properties*

- (p1)  $\operatorname{supp} U \subset B_1(0)$ ,
- (p2)  $\operatorname{dist}(U(y), \sigma) < \varepsilon$  for all  $y \in B_1(0)$ , and
- (p3)  $\int |U(y) e_{n+1}| dy \geq \alpha |\bar{U} e_{n+1}|$ ,

where  $\alpha > 0$  is a dimensional constant.

The proof of Proposition 3.2 relies on two lemmas. The first deals with the symmetries of the equations.

LEMMA 3.3 (The Galilean group). *Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be the subgroup of  $\operatorname{GL}_{n+1}(\mathbb{R})$  defined by*

$$\{A \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+1) \times (n+1)} : \det A \neq 0, A e_{n+1} = e_{n+1}\}.$$

For every divergence-free map  $U : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  and every  $A \in \mathcal{G}$ , the map

$$V(y) := A^t \cdot U(A^{-t} y) \cdot A$$

is also a divergence-free map  $V : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ .

The second deals with the potential.

LEMMA 3.4 (Potential in the general case). *Let  $E_{ij}^{kl} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$  be functions for  $i, j, k, l = 1, \dots, n + 1$  such that the tensor  $E$  is skew-symmetric in  $ij$  and  $kl$ , that is,*

$$(8) \quad E_{ij}^{kl} = -E_{ij}^{lk} = -E_{ji}^{kl} = E_{ji}^{lk}.$$

Then

$$U_{ij} = \mathcal{L}(E) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,l} \partial_{kl}^2 (E_{kj}^{il} + E_{ki}^{jl})$$

is symmetric and divergence-free. If in addition

$$E_{(n+1)i}^{(n+1)j} = 0 \quad \text{for every } i \text{ and } j,$$

then  $U$  takes values in  $\mathcal{M}$ .

*Remark 2.* A suitable potential in the case  $n = 2$  can be obtained in a more direct way. Indeed, let  $w \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)$  be a divergence-free vector field and consider the map  $U : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  given by

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_2 w_1 & \frac{1}{2} \partial_2 w_2 - \frac{1}{2} \partial_1 w_1 & \frac{1}{2} \partial_2 w_3 \\ \frac{1}{2} \partial_2 w_2 - \frac{1}{2} \partial_1 w_1 & -\partial_1 w_2 & -\frac{1}{2} \partial_1 w_3 \\ \frac{1}{2} \partial_2 w_3 & -\frac{1}{2} \partial_1 w_3 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then it can be readily checked that  $U$  is divergence-free and that  $w$  is the curl of a vector field  $\omega$ . However, this is just a particular case of [Lemma 3.4](#). Indeed, given  $E$  as in the lemma, define the tensor  $D_{ij}^k = \sum_l \partial_l E_{ij}^{kl}$ . Note that  $D$  is skew-symmetric in  $ij$  and, for each  $ij$ , the vector  $(D_{ij}^k)_{k=1, \dots, n+1}$  is divergence-free. Moreover,

$$U_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \partial_k (D_{kj}^i + D_{ki}^j).$$

Then the vector field  $w$  is simply the special choice where  $D_{12}^k = -D_{21}^k = w_k$  and all other  $D$ 's are zero; a corresponding relation can be found for  $E$  and  $\omega$ .

We postpone the proofs of the two lemmas until the end of the section.

*Proof of [Proposition 3.2](#).*

*Step 1.* First we treat the case when  $\bar{U} \in \mathcal{M}$  is such that

$$\bar{U} e_1 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{U} e_{n+1} \neq 0.$$

Let

$$(9) \quad E_{i1}^{j1} = -E_{1i}^{j1} = -E_{1i}^{1j} = E_{1i}^{1j} = \bar{U}_{ij} \frac{\sin(Ny_1)}{N^2},$$

and let all the other entries equal 0. Note that by our assumption,  $\bar{U}_{ij} = 0$  whenever one index is 1 or both of them are  $n + 1$ . This ensures that the tensor  $E$  is well defined and satisfies the properties of [Lemma 3.4](#).

We remark that in the case  $n = 2$  the matrix  $\bar{U}$  takes necessarily the form

$$\bar{U} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a & b \\ 0 & b & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

with  $b \neq 0$ , and we can use the potential of [Remark 2](#) by simply setting

$$w = \frac{1}{N} (0, a \cos(Ny_1), 2b \cos(Ny_1)),$$

$$\omega = \frac{1}{N^2} (0, 2b \sin(Ny_1), -a \sin(Ny_1)).$$

We come back to the general case. Let  $E$  be defined as in (9), fix a smooth cutoff function  $\varphi$  such that



- $|\varphi| \leq 1$ ,
- $\varphi = 1$  on  $B_{1/2}(0)$ , and
- $\text{supp}(\varphi) \subset B_1(0)$ ,

and consider the map  $U = \mathcal{L}(\varphi E)$ . Clearly,  $U$  is smooth and supported in  $B_1(0)$ . By Lemma 3.4,  $U$  is  $\mathcal{M}$ -valued and divergence-free. Moreover

$$U(y) = \bar{U} \sin(Ny_1) \quad \text{for } y \in B_{1/2}(0),$$

and in particular

$$\int |U(y)e_{n+1}| dy \geq |\bar{U}e_{n+1}| \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} |\sin(Ny_1)| dy \geq 2\alpha |\bar{U}e_{n+1}|,$$

for some positive dimensional constant  $\alpha = \alpha(n)$  for sufficiently large  $N$ .

Finally, observe that  $U - \varphi\tilde{U} = \mathcal{L}(\varphi E) - \varphi\mathcal{L}(E)$  is a sum of products of first-order derivatives of  $\varphi$  with first-order derivatives of components of  $E$  and of second-order derivatives of  $\varphi$  with components of  $E$ . Thus,

$$\|U - \varphi\tilde{U}\|_\infty \leq C \|\varphi\|_{C^2} \|E\|_{C^1} \leq \frac{C'}{N} \|\varphi\|_{C^2},$$

and by choosing  $N$  sufficiently large we obtain  $\|U - \varphi\tilde{U}\|_\infty < \varepsilon$ . On the other hand, since  $|\varphi| \leq 1$  and  $\tilde{U}$  takes values in  $\sigma$ , the image of  $\varphi\tilde{U}$  is also contained in  $\sigma$ . This shows that the image of  $U$  is contained in the  $\varepsilon$ -neighborhood of  $\sigma$ .

*Step 2.* We treat the general  $\bar{U}$  case by reducing to the situation above. Let  $\bar{U} \in \mathcal{M}$  be as in the proposition, so that  $\bar{U}f = 0$  and  $\bar{U}e_{n+1} \neq 0$ , where  $f \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus \{0\}$  is such that  $\{f, e_{n+1}\}$  are linearly independent. Let  $f_1, \dots, f_{n+1}$  be a basis for  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  such that  $f_1 = f$  and  $f_{n+1} = e_{n+1}$ , and consider the matrix  $A$  such that  $Ae_i = f_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n+1$ . Then  $A \in \mathcal{G}$  (compare with the definition of  $\mathcal{G}$  given in Lemma 3.3), and the map

$$T : X \mapsto (A^{-1})^t X A^{-1}$$

is a linear isomorphism of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ . Set

$$\bar{V} = A^t \bar{U} A,$$

so that  $\bar{V} \in \mathcal{M}$  satisfies  $\bar{V}e_1 = 0$  and  $\bar{V}e_{n+1} \neq 0$ . Given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , using Step 1 we construct a smooth map  $V : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  supported in  $B_1(0)$  with the image lying in the  $\|T\|^{-1}\varepsilon$ -neighborhood of the line segment  $\tau$  with endpoints  $-\bar{V}$  and  $\bar{V}$ , and such that  $V(y) = \bar{V} \sin(Ny_1)$ . Let  $U$  be the  $\mathcal{M}$ -valued map

$$U(y) = (A^{-1})^t V(A^t y) A^{-1}.$$

By our discussion above, the isomorphism  $T : X \mapsto (A^{-1})^t X A^{-1}$  maps the line segment  $\tau$  onto  $\sigma$ . Therefore,

- $U$  is supported in  $A^{-t}(B_1(0))$  and smooth,
- $U$  is divergence-free by [Lemma 3.3](#),
- $U$  takes values in an  $\varepsilon$ -neighborhood of the segment  $\sigma$ ,

and furthermore

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_{A^{-t}(B_1(0))} |U(y)e_{n+1}| dy &= \int_{A^{-t}(B_1(0))} |A^{-t}V(A^t y)e_{n+1}| dy \\
 &= \int_{B_1(0)} |A^{-t}V(z)e_{n+1}| \frac{dz}{|\det A^t|} \\
 (10) \qquad \qquad \qquad &\geq \frac{2\alpha |A^{-t}\bar{V}e_{n+1}|}{|\det A|} = \frac{2\alpha}{|\det A|} |\bar{U}e_{n+1}|.
 \end{aligned}$$

To complete the proof we appeal to a standard covering/rescaling argument. That is, we can find a finite number of points  $y_k \in B_1(0)$  and radii  $r_k > 0$  such that the rescaled and translated sets  $A^{-t}(B_{r_k}(y_k))$  are pairwise disjoint, all contained in  $B_1(0)$ , and

$$(11) \qquad \qquad \qquad \sum_k |A^{-t}(B_{r_k}(y_k))| \geq \frac{1}{2} |B_1(0)|.$$

Let  $U_k(y) = U((y - y_k)/r_k)$  and  $\tilde{U} = \sum_k U_k$ . Then  $\tilde{U} : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  is smooth, clearly satisfies [\(p1\)](#) and [\(p2\)](#), and

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int |\tilde{U}(y)e_{n+1}| dy &= \sum_k \int_{A^{-t}B_{r_k}(y_k)} |U_k(y)e_{n+1}| dy \\
 &\geq \sum_k 2\alpha |\bar{U}e_{n+1}| |\det A|^{-1} \frac{|B_{r_k}(y_k)|}{|B_1(0)|} && \text{by (10)} \\
 &= 2\alpha |\bar{U}e_{n+1}| \frac{\sum_k |A^{-t}(B_{r_k}(y_k))|}{|B_1(0)|} \\
 &\geq \alpha |\bar{U}e_{n+1}| && \text{by (11).} \quad \square
 \end{aligned}$$

*Proof of Lemma 3.3.* First of all we check that  $B \in \mathcal{M}$  implies  $A^t B A \in \mathcal{M}$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{G}$ . Indeed,  $A^t B A$  is symmetric, and since  $A$  satisfies  $Ae_{n+1} = e_{n+1}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (A^t B A)_{(n+1)(n+1)} &= e_{n+1} \cdot A^t B A e_{n+1} = A e_{n+1} \cdot B A e_{n+1} \\
 &= e_{n+1} \cdot B e_{n+1} = B_{(n+1)(n+1)} = 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Now, let  $A, U$  and  $V$  be as in the statement. The argument above shows that  $V$  is  $\mathcal{M}$ -valued. It remains to check that if  $U$  is divergence-free, then  $V$  is also divergence-free. So let  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}; \mathbb{R}^{n+1})$  be a compactly supported test function, and consider  $\tilde{\phi} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}; \mathbb{R}^{n+1})$  defined by  $\tilde{\phi}(x) = A\phi(A^t x)$ . Then

$\nabla \tilde{\phi}(x) = A \nabla \phi(A^t x) A^t$ , and by a change of variables we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int \operatorname{tr}(V(y) \nabla \phi(y)) dy &= \int \operatorname{tr}(A^t U(A^{-t} y) A \nabla \phi(y)) dy \\ &= \int \operatorname{tr}(U(A^{-t} y) A \nabla \phi(y) A^t) dy \\ &= \int \operatorname{tr}(U(x) A \nabla \phi(A^t x) A^t) (\det A)^{-1} dx \\ &= (\det A)^{-1} \int \operatorname{tr}(U(x) \nabla \tilde{\phi}(x)) dx = 0, \end{aligned}$$

since  $U$  is divergence-free. But this implies that  $V$  is also divergence-free. □

*Proof of Lemma 3.4.* First,  $U$  is clearly symmetric and  $U_{(n+1)(n+1)} = 0$ . Hence  $U$  takes values in  $\mathcal{M}$ . To see that  $U$  is divergence-free, we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_j \partial_j U_{ij} &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,l,j} \partial_{jkl}^3 (E_{kj}^{il} + E_{ki}^{jl}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_l \partial_l \left( \sum_{jk} \partial_{jk}^2 E_{kj}^{il} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \partial_k \left( \sum_{jl} \partial_{jl}^2 E_{ki}^{jl} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which vanishes by (8). This completes the proof of the lemma. □

### 4. Proof of the main results

For clarity we now state the precise form of our main result. Theorems 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 are direct corollaries.

**THEOREM 4.1.** *Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}_x^n \times \mathbb{R}_t$  be a bounded open domain. There exists  $(v, p) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_x^n \times \mathbb{R}_t)$  solving the Euler equations*

$$\partial_t v + \operatorname{div}(v \otimes v) + \nabla p = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{div} v = 0$$

such that

- $|v(x, t)| = 1$  for almost all  $(x, t) \in \Omega$ , and
- $v(x, t) = 0$  and  $p(x, t) = 0$  for almost all  $(x, t) \in (\mathbb{R}_x^n \times \mathbb{R}_t) \setminus \Omega$ .

Moreover, there exists a sequence of functions  $(v_k, p_k, f_k) \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$  such that

- $\partial_t v_k + \operatorname{div}(v_k \otimes v_k) + \nabla p_k = f_k$  and  $\operatorname{div} v_k = 0$ ,
- $f_k$  converges to 0 in  $H^{-1}$ ,
- $\|v_k\|_\infty + \|p_k\|_\infty$  is uniformly bounded, and
- $(v_k, p_k) \rightarrow (v, p)$  in  $L^q$  for every  $q < \infty$ .

We remark that the statements of Theorems 1.1 and 1.3 are just subsets of the statement of Theorem 4.1. As for Theorem 1.2, note that it suffices to choose, for instance,  $\Omega = B_r(0) \times ]-1, 1[$ , where  $B_r(0)$  is the ball of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with volume 1.

We recall from Lemma 2.1 that for the first half of the theorem it suffices to prove that there exist  $(v, u, q) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_x^n \times \mathbb{R}_t; \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{G}_0^n \times \mathbb{R})$ , with support in  $\Omega$ , such that  $|v| = 1$  almost everywhere in  $\Omega$  and (6) and (7) are satisfied. In Proposition 2.2 we constructed compactly supported solutions  $(v, u, q)$  to (6). The point is thus to find solutions that also satisfy the pointwise constraint (7). The main idea is to consider the sets

$$(12) \quad K = \left\{ (v, u) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{G}_0^n : u = v \otimes v - \frac{1}{n} |v|^2 I_n, |v| = 1 \right\},$$

and

$$(13) \quad \mathcal{U} = \text{int}(K^{\text{co}} \times [-1, 1]),$$

where  $\text{int}$  denotes the topological interior of the set in  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{G}_0^n \times \mathbb{R}$ , and  $K^{\text{co}}$  denotes the convex hull of  $K$ . Thus, a triple  $(v, u, q)$  solving (6) and taking values in the convex extremal points of  $\overline{\mathcal{U}}$  is indeed a solution to (7). We will prove that  $0 \in \mathcal{U}$ , and therefore there exist planewaves taking values in  $\mathcal{U}$ . The goal is to add them so to get an infinite sum  $(v, u, q) = \sum_{i=1}^\infty (v_i, u_i, q_i)$  with the properties that

- the partial sums  $\sum_{i=0}^k (v_i, u_i, q_i)$  take values in  $\mathcal{U}$ ,
- $(v, u, q)$  is supported in  $\Omega$ ,
- $(v, u, q)$  takes values in the convex extremal points of  $\overline{\mathcal{U}}$  almost everywhere in  $\Omega$ , and
- $(v, u, q)$  solves the linear partial differential equations (6).

There are two important reasons why this construction is possible. First, since the wave cone  $\Lambda$  is very large, we can always get closer and closer to the extremal point of  $\mathcal{U}$  with the sequence  $(v_k, u_k, p_k)$ . Second, because the waves are localized in spacetime, by choosing the supports smaller and smaller we can achieve strong convergence of the sequence. In view of Lemma 2.1, this gives the solution of Euler that we are looking for. The partial sums give the approximating sequence of the theorem.

This sketch of the proof is philosophically closer to the method of convex integration, where the difficulty is to ensure strong convergence of the partial sums. The Baire category argument avoids this difficulty by introducing a metric for the space of solutions to (6) with values in  $\mathcal{U}$ , and proving that in its closure a generic element takes values in the convex extreme points. An interesting corollary of the Baire category argument is that, within the class of solutions to the Euler equations with driving force in some particular bounded subset of  $H^{-1}$ , the typical (in the sense of category) element has the properties of Theorem 4.1 .

We split the proof of [Theorem 4.1](#) into several lemmas and a short concluding argument, which is given at the beginning of [Section 4.3](#). For the purpose of this section, we could have presented a shorter proof, avoiding [Lemma 4.3](#) and without giving the explicit bound (17) of [Lemma 4.6](#). However, these statements will be needed in the convex integration proof of [Section 5](#).

4.1. *The geometric setup.*

LEMMA 4.2. *Let  $K$  and  $\mathcal{U}$  be defined as in (12) and (13), that is,*

$$K = \{(v, u) \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times \mathcal{P}_0^n : u = v \otimes v - I_n/n\}.$$

Then  $0 \in \text{int } K^{\text{co}}$ , and hence  $0 \in \mathcal{U}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mu$  be the Haar measure on  $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ , and consider the linear map

$$T : C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}_0^n, \quad \phi \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (v, v \otimes v - I_n/n) \phi(v) d\mu.$$

Clearly, if

$$(14) \quad \phi \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \phi d\mu = 1,$$

then  $T(\phi) \in K^{\text{co}}$ . Notice that  $T(1) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (v, v \otimes v - I_n/n) d\mu = 0$ , and hence  $0 \in K^{\text{co}}$ . Moreover, whenever  $\psi \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$  is such that

$$(15) \quad \alpha = 1 - \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \psi d\mu \geq \|\psi\|_{C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})},$$

$\phi = \alpha + \psi$  satisfies (14), and hence  $T(\psi) = T(\phi) \in K^{\text{co}}$ . Since (15) holds whenever  $\|\psi\|_{C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})} < 1/2$ , it suffices to show that  $T$  is surjective to prove that  $K^{\text{co}}$  contains a neighborhood of 0.

The surjectivity of  $T$  follows from orthogonality in  $L^2(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ . Indeed, letting  $\phi = v_i$  for each  $i$ , we obtain

$$T(\phi) = \beta_1(e_i, 0), \quad \text{where } \beta_1 = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} v_1^2 d\mu.$$

Furthermore, setting  $\phi = v_i v_j$  with  $i \neq j$ , we obtain

$$T(\phi) = \beta_2(0, e_i \otimes e_j + e_j \otimes e_i), \quad \text{where } \beta_2 = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} v_1^2 v_2^2 d\mu.$$

Finally, setting  $\phi = v_i^2 - 1/n$  we obtain

$$T(\phi) = \beta_3\left(0, e_i \otimes e_i - \frac{1}{(n-1)} \sum_{j \neq i} e_j \otimes e_j\right),$$

where  $\beta_3 = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (v_1^2 - 1/n)^2 d\mu$ . This shows that the image of  $T$  contains  $n + \frac{1}{2}n(n+1) - 1$  linearly independent elements, hence a basis for  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}_0^n$ .  $\square$

LEMMA 4.3. *There exists a dimensional constant  $C > 0$  such that for any  $(v, u, q) \in \mathcal{U}$ , there exists  $(\bar{v}, \bar{u}) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{G}_0^n$  such that  $(\bar{v}, \bar{u}, 0) \in \Lambda$ , the line segment  $\sigma$  with endpoints  $(v, u, q) \pm (\bar{v}, \bar{u}, 0)$  is contained in  $\mathcal{U}$ , and*

$$|\bar{v}| \geq C(1 - |v|^2), \quad \min_{z \in \sigma} \text{dist}(z, \partial \mathcal{U}) \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}((v, u, q), \partial \mathcal{U}).$$

*Proof.* Let  $z = (v, u) \in \text{int } K^{\text{co}}$ . By Carathéodory's theorem,  $(v, u)$  lies in the interior of a simplex in  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{G}_0^n$  spanned by elements of  $K$ . In other words  $z = \sum_{i=1}^{N+1} \lambda_i z_i$ , where  $\lambda_i \in ]0, 1[$ ,  $z_i = (v_i, u_i) \in K$ ,  $\sum_{i=1}^{N+1} \lambda_i = 1$ , and  $N = n(n+3)/2 - 1$  is the dimension of  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{G}_0^n$ . Assume that the coefficients are ordered so that  $\lambda_1 = \max_i \lambda_i$ . Then for any  $j > 1$

$$z \pm \frac{1}{2} \lambda_j (z_j - z_1) \in \text{int } K^{\text{co}}.$$

Indeed,  $z \pm \frac{1}{2} \lambda_j (z_j - z_1) = \sum_i \mu_i z_i$ , where  $\mu_1 = \lambda_1 \mp \frac{1}{2} \lambda_j$ ,  $\mu_j = \lambda_j \pm \frac{1}{2} \lambda_j$  and  $\mu_i = \lambda_i$  for  $i \notin \{1, j\}$ . It is easy to see that  $\mu_i \in ]0, 1[$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, N+1$ .

On the other hand,  $z - z_1 = \sum_{i=2}^{N+1} \lambda_i (z_i - z_1)$ , so that in particular

$$|v - v_1| \leq N \max_{i=2, \dots, N+1} \lambda_i |v_i - v_1|.$$

Let  $j > 1$  be such that  $\lambda_j |v_j - v_1| = \max_{i=2 \dots N+1} \lambda_i |v_i - v_1|$ , and let

$$(\bar{v}, \bar{u}) = \frac{1}{2} \lambda_j (z_j - z_1).$$

The line segment with endpoints  $(v, u) \pm 2(\bar{v}, \bar{u})$  is contained in  $K^{\text{co}}$ , hence by the convexity of  $\mathcal{U}$ , the segment  $\sigma$  with endpoints  $(v, u, q) \pm (\bar{v}, \bar{u}, 0)$  satisfies

$$\min_{z \in \sigma} \text{dist}(z, \partial \mathcal{U}) \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}((v, u, q), \partial \mathcal{U}).$$

Furthermore

$$\frac{1}{4N} (1 - |v|^2) \leq \frac{1}{2N} (1 - |v|) \leq \frac{1}{2N} (|v - v_1|) \leq |\bar{v}|.$$

Finally, we show that  $(\bar{v}, \bar{u}, 0) \in \Lambda$ . This amounts to showing that whenever  $a, b \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ , the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} a \otimes a - I_n/n & a \\ a & 0 \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} b \otimes b - I_n/n & b \\ b & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

has zero determinant and hence lies in the wave cone  $\Lambda$  defined in (5). Let  $P \in \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{R})$  with  $Pa = e_1$  and  $Pb = e_2$ . Note that

$$\begin{pmatrix} P & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a \otimes a & a \\ a & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} P^t & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} Pa \otimes Pa & Pa \\ Pa & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

so that it suffices to check the determinant of

$$\begin{pmatrix} e_1 \otimes e_1 & e_1 \\ e_1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} e_2 \otimes e_2 & e_2 \\ e_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since  $e_1 + e_2 - e_{n+1}$  is in the kernel of this matrix, it has indeed determinant zero. This completes the proof.  $\square$

4.2. *The functional setup.* We define the complete metric space  $X$  as follows. Let  $X_0$  be the set of elements  $(v, u, q) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_x^n \times \mathbb{R}_t)$  such that

- $\text{supp}(v, u, q) \subset \Omega$ ,
- $(v, u, q)$  solves (6) in  $\mathbb{R}_x^n \times \mathbb{R}_t$ , and
- $(v(x, t), u(x, t), q(x, t)) \in \mathcal{U}$  for all  $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}_x^n \times \mathbb{R}_t$ .

We equip  $X_0$  with the topology of  $L^\infty$  weak\* convergence of  $(v, u, q)$ , and we let  $X$  be the closure of  $X_0$  in this topology.

LEMMA 4.4. *The set  $X$  with the topology of  $L^\infty$  weak\* convergence is a nonempty compact metrizable space. Moreover, if  $(v, u, q) \in X$  is such that  $|v(x, t)| = 1$  for almost every  $(x, t) \in \Omega$ , then  $v$  and  $p := q - \frac{1}{n}|v|^2$  is a weak solution of (1) in  $\mathbb{R}_x^n \times \mathbb{R}_t$  such that  $v(x, t) = 0$  and  $p(x, t) = 0$  for all  $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}_x^n \times \mathbb{R}_t \setminus \Omega$ .*

*Proof.* In Lemma 4.2 we showed that  $0 \in \mathcal{U}$ , and hence  $X$  is nonempty. Moreover,  $X$  is a bounded and closed subset of  $L^\infty(\Omega)$ ; hence with the weak\* topology it becomes a compact metrizable space. Since  $\overline{\mathcal{U}}$  is a compact convex set, any  $(v, u, q) \in X$  satisfies  $\text{supp}(v, u, q) \subset \overline{\Omega}$ , solves (6), and takes values in  $\overline{\mathcal{U}}$ . In particular,  $(v, u)(x, t) \in K^{\text{co}}$  almost everywhere. Finally, observe also that if  $(v, u)(x, t) \in K^{\text{co}}$ , then  $(v, u)(x, t) \in K$  if and only if  $|v(x, t)| = 1$ . In light of Lemma 2.1, this concludes the proof.  $\square$

Fix a metric  $d_\infty^*$  inducing the weak\* topology of  $L^\infty$  in  $X$ , so that  $(X, d_\infty^*)$  is a complete metric space.

LEMMA 4.5. *The identity map  $I : (X, d_\infty^*) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}_x^n \times \mathbb{R}_t)$  defined by  $(v, u, q) \mapsto (v, u, q)$  is a Baire-1 map, and therefore the set of points of continuity is residual in  $(X, d_\infty^*)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\phi_r(x, t) = r^{-(n+1)}\phi(rx, rt)$  be any regular spacetime convolution kernel. For each fixed  $(v, u, q) \in X$ , we have

$$(\phi_r * v, \phi_r * u, \phi_r * q) \rightarrow (v, u, q) \text{ strongly in } L^2 \text{ as } r \rightarrow 0.$$

On the other hand, for each  $r > 0$  and  $(v^k, u^k, q^k) \in X$ ,

$$(v^k, u^k, q^k) \xrightarrow{*} (v, u, q) \text{ in } L^\infty \text{ implies } \phi_r * (v^k, u^k, q^k) \rightarrow \phi_r * (v, u, q) \text{ in } L^2.$$

Therefore each map  $I_r : (X, d_\infty^*) \rightarrow L^2$ ,  $(u, v, q) \mapsto (\phi_r * v, \phi_r * u, \phi_r * q)$  is continuous, and  $I(v, u, q) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} I_r(v, u, q)$  for all  $(v, u, q) \in X$ . This shows that  $I : (X, d_\infty^*) \rightarrow L^2$  is a pointwise limit of continuous maps; hence it is a Baire-1 map. Therefore the set of points of continuity of  $I$  is residual in  $(X, d_\infty^*)$ ; see [Oxt80].  $\square$

4.3. *Points of continuity of the identity map.* The proof of Theorem 4.1 will follow from Lemmas 4.4 and 4.5 once we prove this:

CLAIM. *If  $(v, u, q) \in X$  is a point of continuity of  $I$ , then*

$$(16) \quad |v(x, t)| = 1 \quad \text{for almost every } (x, t) \in \Omega.$$

Indeed, if the claim is true, then the set of  $(v, u, q) \in X$  such that  $|v| = 1$  almost everywhere is nonempty, yielding solutions of (1). Furthermore, any such  $(v, u, q)$  must be the strong  $L^2$  limit of some sequence  $\{(v_k, u_k, q_k)\} \subset X_0$ . Therefore, with  $p_k = q_k - \frac{1}{n}|v_k|^2$  and

$$f_k = \operatorname{div}(v_k \otimes v_k - \frac{1}{n}|v_k|^2 \operatorname{Id} - u_k),$$

we obtain  $\operatorname{div} v_k = 0$  and  $\partial_t v_k + \operatorname{div} v_k \otimes v_k + \nabla p_k = f_k$ . Also,  $f_k \rightarrow 0$  in  $H^{-1}$ .

Therefore it remains to prove our claim. Observe that since  $|v(x, t)| \leq 1$  for almost all  $(x, t) \in \Omega$ , (16) is equivalent to  $\|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = |\Omega|^{1/2}$ , where  $|\Omega|$  denotes the  $(n + 1)$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure of  $\Omega$ . The claim then follows immediately from the following lemma.

LEMMA 4.6. *There exists a dimensional constant  $\beta > 0$  with the property that given  $(v_0, u_0, q_0) \in X_0$  there exists a sequence  $(v_k, u_k, q_k) \in X_0$  such that*

$$(17) \quad \|v_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \geq \|v_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \beta(|\Omega| - \|v_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2)^2,$$

and  $(v_k, u_k, q_k) \xrightarrow{*} (v_0, u_0, q_0)$  in  $L^\infty(\Omega)$ .

Indeed, assume for a moment that  $(v, u, q)$  is a point of continuity of  $I$ . Fix a sequence  $\{(v_k, u_k, q_k)\} \subset X_0$  that converges weakly\* to  $(v, u, q)$ . Using Lemma 4.6 and a standard diagonal argument, we can produce a second sequence  $(\tilde{v}_k, \tilde{u}_k, \tilde{q}_k)$  that converges weakly\* to  $(v, u, q)$  and satisfies

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\tilde{v}_k\|_2^2 \geq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\|v_k\|_2^2 + \beta(|\Omega| - \|v_k\|_2^2)^2).$$

Since  $I$  is continuous at  $(v, u, q)$ , both  $v_k$  and  $\tilde{v}_k$  converge strongly to  $v$ . Hence

$$\|v\|_2^2 \geq \|v\|_2^2 + \beta(|\Omega| - \|v\|_2^2)^2.$$

Therefore,  $\|v\|_2^2 = |\Omega|$ . On the other hand, since  $v = 0$  almost everywhere outside  $\Omega$ , and  $|v| \leq 1$  almost everywhere on  $\Omega$ , this implies (16).



*Proof of Lemma 4.6.*

*Step 1.* Let  $(v_0, u_0, q_0) \in X_0$ . By Lemma 4.3, for any  $(x, t) \in \Omega$  there exists a direction  $(\bar{v}(x, t), \bar{u}(x, t)) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{S}_0^n$  such that the line segment with endpoints  $(v_0(x, t), u_0(x, t), q_0(x, t)) \pm (\bar{v}(x, t), \bar{u}(x, t), 0)$  is contained in  $\mathcal{U}$ , and  $|\bar{v}(x, t)| \geq C(1 - |v_0(x, t)|^2)$ . Moreover, since  $(v_0, u_0, q_0)$  is uniformly continuous, there exists an  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that for any  $(x, t), (x_0, t_0) \in \Omega$  with  $|x - x_0| + |t - t_0| < \varepsilon$ , the  $\varepsilon$ -neighborhood of the line segment with endpoints

$$(v_0(x, t), u_0(x, t), q_0(x, t)) \pm (\bar{v}(x_0, t_0), \bar{u}(x_0, t_0), 0)$$

is also contained in  $\mathcal{U}$ .

*Step 2.* Fix  $(x_0, t_0) \in \Omega$  for the moment. Use Proposition 2.2 with

$$a = (\bar{v}(x_0, t_0), \bar{u}(x_0, t_0), 0) \in \Lambda$$

and  $\varepsilon > 0$  to obtain a smooth solution  $(v, u, q)$  of (6) with the properties stated in the proposition, and for any  $r < \varepsilon$  let

$$(v_r, u_r, q_r)(x, t) = (v, u, q)\left(\frac{x-x_0}{r}, \frac{t-t_0}{r}\right).$$

Then  $(v_r, u_r, q_r)$  is also a smooth solution of (6), with the properties that

- the support of  $(v_r, u_r, q_r)$  is contained in  $B_r(x_0, t_0) \subset \mathbb{R}_x^n \times \mathbb{R}_t$ ,
- the image of  $(v_r, u_r, q_r)$  is contained in the  $\varepsilon$ -neighborhood of the line-segment with endpoints  $\pm(\bar{v}(x, t), \bar{u}(x, t), 0)$ , and
- $\int |v_r(x, t)| dx dt \geq \alpha |\bar{v}(x_0, t_0)| |B_r(x_0, r_0)|$ .

In particular, for any  $r < \varepsilon$ , we have  $(v_0, u_0, q_0) + (v_r, u_r, q_r) \in X_0$ .

*Step 3.* Next, observe that since  $v_0$  is uniformly continuous, there exists an  $r_0 > 0$  such that for any  $r < r_0$  there exists a finite family of pairwise disjoint balls  $B_{r_j}(x_j, t_j) \subset \Omega$  with  $r_j < r$  such that

$$(18) \quad \int_{\Omega} (1 - |v_0(x, t)|^2) dx dt \leq 2 \sum_j (1 - |v_0(x_j, t_j)|^2) |B_{r_j}(x_j, t_j)|.$$

Fix  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $1/k < \min\{r_0, \varepsilon\}$ , and choose a finite family of pairwise disjoint balls  $B_{r_{k,j}}(x_{k,j}, t_{k,j}) \subset \Omega$  with radii  $r_{k,j} < 1/k$  such that (18) holds. In each ball  $B_{r_{k,j}}(x_{k,j}, t_{k,j})$ , we apply the construction above to obtain  $(v_{k,j}, u_{k,j}, q_{k,j})$ , and in particular we then have

$$(v_k, u_k, q_k) := (v_0, u_0, q_0) + \sum_j (v_{k,j}, u_{k,j}, q_{k,j}) \in X_0,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int |v_k(x, t) - v_0(x, t)| dx dt &= \sum_j \int |v_{k,j}(x, t)| dx dt \\
 &\geq \alpha \sum_j |\bar{v}(x_{k,j}, t_{k,j})| |B_{r_{k,j}}(x_{k,j}, t_{k,j})| \\
 &\geq C\alpha \sum_j (1 - |v_0(x_{k,j}, t_{k,j})|^2) |B_{r_{k,j}}(x_{k,j}, t_{k,j})| \\
 (19) \qquad \qquad \qquad &\geq \frac{1}{2} C\alpha \int_{\Omega} (1 - |v_0(x, t)|^2) dx dt.
 \end{aligned}$$

Observe that, since  $\int (v_{k,j}, u_{k,j}, q_{k,j}) = 0$ , by letting  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , the above construction yields a sequence  $(v_k, u_k, q_k) \in X_0$  such that

$$(20) \qquad \qquad \qquad (v_k, u_k, q_k) \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} (v_0, u_0, q_0).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|v_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 &= \|v_0\|_2^2 + \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} (2\langle v_0, (v_k - v_0) \rangle_2 + \|v_k - v_0\|_2^2) \\
 &= \|v_0\|_2^2 + \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|v_k - v_0\|_2^2 \qquad \qquad \qquad \text{by (20)} \\
 (21) \qquad \qquad \qquad &\geq \|v_0\|_2^2 + |\Omega| \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\|v_k - v_0\|_{L^1(\Omega)})^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

Combining (19) and (21), we get

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|v_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \geq \|v_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{4} |\Omega| C^2 \alpha^2 (|\Omega| - \|v_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2)^2,$$

which gives (17) with  $\beta = \frac{1}{4} |\Omega| C^2 \alpha^2$ . □

### 5. A proof of Theorem 4.1 using convex integration

In this section we provide an alternative, more direct proof for Theorem 4.1, following the method of convex integration as presented for example in [MŠ03].

In fact the two approaches (i.e. Baire category methods and convex integration) can be unified to a large extent. For a discussion comparing the two approaches we refer to the end of [Kir03, §3.3]; see also the paper [Syc06] for a different point of view. Nevertheless, in order to get a feeling for the type of solution that Theorem 4.1 produces, it helps to see the direct construction of the convex integration method.

We will freely refer to the notation of the previous sections. In particular the proof relies on Lemmas 4.2, 4.3, 4.4 and 4.6. These results enable us to construct an approximating sequence, as explained briefly at the beginning of Section 4, by adding (almost-)planewaves on top of each other. It is only the limiting step that is more explicit in this approach. The following argument is essentially from [MŠ03, §3.3].

*Alternative proof of Theorem 4.1.* Using Lemma 4.6, we construct inductively a sequence  $(v_k, u_k, q_k) \in X_0$  and a sequence of numbers  $\eta_k > 0$  as follows. Let  $\rho_\varepsilon$  be a standard mollifying kernel in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1} = \mathbb{R}_x^n \times \mathbb{R}_t$ , and set  $(v_1, u_1, q_1) \equiv 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}_x^n \times \mathbb{R}_t$ .

Having obtained  $z_j := (v_j, u_j, q_j)$  for  $j \leq k$  and  $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{k-1}$  we choose

$$(22) \quad \eta_k < 2^{-k} \quad \text{so that } \|z_k - z_k * \rho_{\eta_k}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} < 2^{-k}.$$

Then we apply Lemma 4.6 to obtain  $z_{k+1} = (v_{k+1}, u_{k+1}, q_{k+1}) \in X_0$  such that

$$(23) \quad \|v_{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \geq \|v_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \beta(|\Omega| - \|v_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2)^2, \text{ and}$$

$$(24) \quad \|(z_{k+1} - z_k) * \rho_{\eta_j}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} < 2^{-k} \quad \text{for all } j \leq k.$$

The sequence  $\{z_k\}$  is bounded in  $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_x^n \times \mathbb{R}_t)$ , therefore by passing to a suitable subsequence we may assume without loss of generality that  $z_k \xrightarrow{*} z$  in  $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_x^n \times \mathbb{R}_t)$  for some  $z = (v, u, q) \in X$ , and that the sequence  $\{z_k\}$  and the corresponding sequence  $\{\eta_k\}$  satisfy the properties (22), (23) and (24). Then, for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} \|z_k * \rho_{\eta_k} - z * \rho_{\eta_k}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \|z_{k+j} * \rho_{\eta_k} - z_{k+j+1} * \rho_{\eta_k}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{-(k+j)} \leq 2^{-k+1}, \end{aligned}$$

and since

$$\|z_k - z\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|z_k - z_k * \rho_{\eta_k}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|z_k * \rho_{\eta_k} - z * \rho_{\eta_k}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|z * \rho_{\eta_k} - z\|_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

we deduce that  $v_k \rightarrow v$  strongly in  $L^2(\Omega)$ .

Therefore, passing into the limit in (23), we conclude

$$\|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \geq \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \beta(|\Omega| - \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2)^2$$

and hence  $\|v\|_2^2 = |\Omega|$ . Since  $v$  vanishes outside  $\Omega$  and  $|v| \leq 1$  in  $\Omega$ , we conclude that  $|v| = \mathbf{1}_\Omega$ . Since  $(v, u, q) \in X$ , we also have that  $(v, u)(x, t) \in K^{\text{co}}$  for almost all  $(x, t) \in \Omega$ . From this we deduce that  $(v, u)(x, t) \in K$  for almost all  $(x, t) \in \Omega$ , thus concluding the proof.  $\square$

## References

- [BF94] A. BRESSAN and F. FLORES, [On total differential inclusions](#), *Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova* **92** (1994), 9–16. [MR 96b:35244](#) [Zbl 0821.35158](#)
- [Cel80] A. CELLINA, [On the differential inclusion  \$x' \in \[-1, +1\]\$](#) , *Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Natur.* **69** (1980), 1–6 (1981). [MR 83g:34012](#) [Zbl 0922.34009](#)
- [Cho94] A. J. CHORIN, [Vorticity and turbulence](#), *Applied Mathematical Sciences* **103**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994. [MR 95m:76043](#) [Zbl 0795.76002](#)
- [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** (1994), 207–209. [MR 96e:76025](#) [Zbl 0818.35085](#)

- [DM97] B. DACOROGNA and P. MARCELLINI, [General existence theorems for Hamilton-Jacobi equations in the scalar and vectorial cases](#), *Acta Math.* **178** (1997), 1–37. MR 98d:35029 Zbl 0901.49027
- [Daf00] C. M. DAFERMOS, *Hyperbolic Conservation Laws in Continuum Physics*, *Grundlehren Math. Wiss.* **325**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000. MR 2001m:35212 Zbl 0940.35002
- [DLSJ07] C. DE LELLIS and L. SZÉKLYHIDI JR., [On admissibility criteria for weak solutions of the Euler equations](#), 2007. arXiv 0712.3288
- [DP85] R. J. DI PERNA, [Compensated compactness and general systems of conservation laws](#), *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **292** (1985), 383–420. MR 87g:35148 Zbl 0606.35052
- [DM87] R. J. DI PERNA and A. J. MAJDA, [Concentrations in regularizations for 2-D incompressible flow](#), *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **40** (1987), 301–345. MR 88e:35149 Zbl 0850.76730
- [DR00] J. DUCHON and R. ROBERT, [Inertial energy dissipation for weak solutions of incompressible Euler and Navier–Stokes equations](#), *Nonlinearity* **13** (2000), 249–255. MR 2001c:76032 Zbl 1009.35062
- [Eyi94] G. L. EYINK, [Energy dissipation without viscosity in ideal hydrodynamics, I: Fourier analysis and local energy transfer](#), *Phys. D* **78** (1994), 222–240. MR 95m:76020 Zbl 0817.76011
- [Fri95] U. FRISCH, *Turbulence: The legacy of A. N. Kolmogorov*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1995. MR 98e:76002 Zbl 0832.76001
- [Gro86] M. GROMOV, *Partial Differential Relations*, *Ergeb. Math. Grenzgeb.* **9**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1986. MR 90a:58201 Zbl 0651.53001
- [Kir03] B. KIRCHHEIM, [Rigidity and geometry of microstructures](#), habilitation thesis, Universität Leipzig, 2003. Available at <http://www.mis.mpg.de/publications/other-series/ln/lecturenote-1603.html>
- [Kir01] B. KIRCHHEIM, [Deformations with finitely many gradients and stability of quasiconvex hulls](#), *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.* **332** (2001), 289–294. MR 2001m:49016 Zbl 0989.49013
- [KMŠ03] B. KIRCHHEIM, S. MÜLLER, and V. ŠVERÁK, [Studying nonlinear PDE by geometry in matrix space](#), in *Geometric Analysis and Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations* (S. HILDEBRANDT and H. KARCHER, eds.), Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003, pp. 347–395. MR 2006f:35087 Zbl 01944370
- [MB02] A. J. MAJDA and A. L. BERTOZZI, *Vorticity and Incompressible Flow*, *Cambridge Texts in Appl. Math.* **27**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2002. MR 2003a:76002 Zbl 0983.76001
- [MŠ03] S. MÜLLER and V. ŠVERÁK, [Convex integration for Lipschitz mappings and counterexamples to regularity](#), *Ann. of Math.* **157** (2003), 715–742. MR 2005i:35028 Zbl 1083.35032
- [MS01] S. MÜLLER and M. A. SYCHEV, [Optimal existence theorems for nonhomogeneous differential inclusions](#), *J. Funct. Anal.* **181** (2001), 447–475. MR 2002c:35281 Zbl 0989.49012
- [Ons49] L. ONSAGER, [Statistical hydrodynamics](#), *Nuovo Cimento* **6** (1949), 279–287. MR 12,60f
- [Oxt80] J. C. OXTOBY, *Measure and Category: A Survey of the Analogies Between Topological and Measure Spaces*, second ed., *Grad. Texts. Math.* **2**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1980. MR 81j:28003 Zbl 0435.28011
- [Sch93] V. SCHEFFER, [An inviscid flow with compact support in space-time](#), *J. Geom. Anal.* **3** (1993), 343–401. MR 94h:35215 Zbl 0836.76017

- [Shn97] A. SHNIRELMAN, *On the nonuniqueness of weak solution of the Euler equation*, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **50** (1997), 1261–1286. [MR 98j:35149](#) [Zbl 0909.35109](#)
- [Shn00] ———, *Weak solutions with decreasing energy of incompressible Euler equations*, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **210** (2000), 541–603. [MR 2002g:76009](#) [Zbl 1011.35107](#)
- [Syc06] M. A. SYCHEV, *A few remarks on differential inclusions*, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A* **136** (2006), 649–668. [MR 2006m:34027](#) [Zbl 1106.35153](#)
- [Tao06] T. TAO, *Nonlinear Dispersive Equations: Local and Global Analysis*, *Regional Conf. Series in Math.* **106**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2006. [MR 2233925](#) [Zbl 1106.35001](#)
- [Tar79] L. TARTAR, *Compensated compactness and applications to partial differential equations*, in *Nonlinear Analysis and Mechanics: Heriot-Watt Symposium*, Vol. IV (R. J. KNOPS, ed.), *Res. Notes in Math.* **39**, Pitman, Boston, 1979, pp. 136–212. [MR 81m:35014](#) [Zbl 0437.35004](#)
- [Tar83] L. TARTAR, *The compensated compactness method applied to systems of conservation laws*, in *Systems of Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations* (Oxford, 1982) (J. M. BALL, ed.), *NATO Adv. Sci. Inst. Ser. C Math. Phys. Sci.* **111**, Reidel, Dordrecht, 1983, pp. 263–285. [MR 85e:35079](#) [Zbl 0536.35003](#)
- [Tem84] R. TEMAM, *Navier-Stokes Equations: Theory and Numerical Analysis*, third ed., *Studies in Math. Appl.* **2**, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984. [MR 86m:76003](#) [Zbl 0568.35002](#)

(Received March 2, 2007)

(Revised November 7, 2007)

*E-mail address:* [camillo.delellis@math.unizh.ch](mailto:camillo.delellis@math.unizh.ch)

INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSITÄT ZÜRICH, CH-8057 ZÜRICH, SWITZERLAND

*E-mail address:* [szekelyh@math.ethz.ch](mailto:szekelyh@math.ethz.ch)

DEPARTEMENT MATHEMATIK, ETH ZÜRICH, CH-8092 ZÜRICH, SWITZERLAND

<http://szekelyhidi.googlepages.com>