

# UC Irvine

## UC Irvine Previously Published Works

### Title

Onsager's Conjecture for the Incompressible Euler Equations in Bounded Domains

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9n34k9sc>

### Journal

Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis, 228(1)

### ISSN

0003-9527

### Authors

Bardos, Claude

Titi, Edriss S

### Publication Date

2018-04-01

### DOI

10.1007/s00205-017-1189-x

### Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

# Onsager's Conjecture for the Incompressible Euler Equations in Bounded Domains

Claude Bardos\*      Edriss S. Titi†

July 10, 2017

## Abstract

The goal of this note is to show that, also in a bounded domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , with  $\partial\Omega \in C^2$ , any weak solution,  $(u(x, t), p(x, t))$ , of the Euler equations of ideal incompressible fluid in  $\Omega \times (0, T) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_t$ , with the impermeability boundary condition:  $u \cdot \vec{n} = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega \times (0, T)$ , is of constant energy on the interval  $(0, T)$  provided the velocity field  $u \in L^3((0, T); C^{0,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}))$ , with  $\alpha > \frac{1}{3}$ .

**Keywords:** Onsager's conjecture, Euler equations, conservation of energy, boundary effect.  
**MSC Subject Classifications:** 35Q31.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction and preliminary remarks</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Fundamental steps toward proving energy conservation</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Remarks</b>	<b>9</b>

## 1 Introduction and preliminary remarks

The aim of this article is to prove the following:

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a bounded domain with  $C^2$  boundary,  $\partial\Omega$ ; and let  $(u(x, t), p(x, t))$  be a weak solution of the incompressible Euler equations in  $\Omega \times (0, T)$ , i.e.,*

$$u \in L^\infty((0, T), L^2(\Omega)), \quad \nabla \cdot u = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \quad \text{and} \quad u \cdot \vec{n} = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T), \quad (1.1)$$

---

\*Laboratoire J.-L. Lions, BP187, 75252 Paris Cedex 05, France. Email: claud.bardos@gmail.com

†Department of Mathematics, Texas A&M University, 3368 TAMU, College Station, TX 77843-3368, USA. Also, Department of Computer Science and Applied Mathematics, The Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot 76100, ISRAEL. Email: titi@math.tamu.edu and edriss.titi@weizmann.ac.il

and for every test vector field  $\Psi(x, t) \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega \times (0, T))$  :

$$\langle u, \partial_t \Psi \rangle_x + \langle u \otimes u : \nabla \Psi \rangle_x + \langle p, \nabla \cdot \Psi \rangle_x = 0, \quad \text{in } L^1(0, T). \quad (1.2)$$

Assume that

$$u \in L^3((0, T); C^{0,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})), \quad (1.3)$$

with  $\alpha > \frac{1}{3}$ , then the energy conservation holds true, that is:

$$\|u(\cdot, t_2)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = \|u(\cdot, t_1)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad \text{for every } t_1, t_2 \in (0, T). \quad (1.4)$$

In the above statement  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_x$  denotes the distributional duality with respect to the spatial variable  $x$ . For the justification of the weak formulation, as it is stated in the above theorem, see, e.g., Lions and Magenes [6] page 8, and Schwartz [12].

Notably, this theorem implies that to dissipate energy a weak solution of Euler equations must not be in the space more regular than  $L^3((0, T); C^{0,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}))$ , with  $\alpha > \frac{1}{3}$ . Such fact was observed, with a formal proof by Onsager in 1949 [11]. Hence it carries the name of Onsager conjecture. In the absence of physical boundary (i.e., in the whole space  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^d$  or for the case of periodic boundary conditions in the torus  $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^n$ ) this conjecture was proven in 1994 by Constantin, E and Titi [4], after a first preliminary result of Eyink [5] (see also [3]). Moreover, the relevance of this issue has been underlined by a series of contributions (cf. Isett [9], Buckmaster, De Lellis, Székelyhidi and Vicol [2] and references therein) where weak solutions,  $u \in C^{0,\alpha}((0, T); \mathbb{T}^n)$ , with  $\alpha < \frac{1}{3}$ , that dissipate energy were constructed. These results are concerning the problem in domains without physical boundaries. However, due to the well recognized dominant role of the boundary in the generation of turbulence (cf. [1] and references therein) it seems very reasonable to investigate the analogue of the Onsager conjecture in bounded domains. Eventually, the need to localize in order to deal with the boundary effect, as it will be shown below, stimulates the construction of a direct proof which may have further applications.

The proof of the theorem will consist of several fundamental steps presented in the following propositions.

**Proposition 1.2.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 the pair  $(u, p)$  satisfies the following regularity properties*

$$u \otimes u \in L^3((0, T); L^2(\Omega)), \quad p \in L^{\frac{3}{2}}((0, T); C^{0,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})), \quad (1.5a)$$

$$\partial_t u = -\nabla \cdot (u \otimes u) - \nabla p \in L^{\frac{3}{2}}((0, T); H^{-1}(\Omega)). \quad (1.5b)$$

*Proof.* The first part of (1.5a) is an immediate consequence of the assumption that  $u \in L^\infty((0, T); L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^3((0, T); C^{0,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}))$ . For the second part of (1.5a) we first observe that, from the definition of weak solutions of the Euler equations, the pressure,  $p$ , is a solution of the following elliptic boundary-value problem:

$$-\Delta p = \sum_{i,j=1}^n \partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} (u_i u_j) \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial p}{\partial \vec{n}} = - \sum_{i,j=1}^n u_j u_j \partial_{x_i} \vec{n}_j \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \quad (1.6)$$

Observe that the boundary condition in (1.6) follows from simple calculations for the case of classical solutions using the fact that  $u \cdot \vec{n} = 0$  (see, e.g., [13]), which is considered here to be the suitable boundary condition in the definition of weak solution for the pressure. Applying the classical theory of elliptic equations in Hölder spaces applied to (1.6) (cf., e.g., [10] chapters 5 and 6) implies the estimate

$$\|p(\cdot, t)\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \leq C \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{C^{0,\alpha}}^2, \quad (1.7)$$

from which one infers the second part of (1.5a). Eventually, (1.5b) follows from (1.2) and (1.5a).  $\square$

To investigate the boundary effect one introduces the distance to the boundary:

for any  $x \in \overline{\Omega}$ ,  $d(x) = \inf_{y \in \partial\Omega} |x - y|$ , and the open set  $\Omega_h = \{x \in \Omega \mid \text{such that } d(x) < h\}$ .

Since  $\partial\Omega$  is assumed to be a  $C^2$  compact manifold, there exists  $h_0(\Omega) > 0$  with the following properties (for an explicit construction see, e.g., [7] page 9):

- 1 For any  $x \in \overline{\Omega_{h_0}}$ , the function  $x \mapsto d(x)$  belongs to  $C^1(\overline{\Omega_{h_0}})$ ;
- 2 for any  $x \in \overline{\Omega_{h_0}}$  there exists a unique point  $\sigma(x) \in \partial\Omega$  such that

$$d(x) = |x - \sigma(x)| \quad \text{and one has} \quad \nabla d(x) = -\vec{n}(\sigma(x)). \quad (1.8)$$

Then one introduces a  $C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  nondecreasing function  $\eta : \mathbb{R} \mapsto [0, 1]$ , with  $\eta(s) = 0$ , for  $s \in (-\infty, \frac{1}{2}]$ , and  $\eta(s) = 1$ , for  $s \in [1, \infty)$ . For  $h \in (0, h_0)$  the function  $\theta_h(x) = \eta(\frac{d(x)}{h})$ , is compactly supported  $C^1(\Omega)$  function. We will also denote by  $\theta_h$  its extension, by zero, outside  $\Omega$ . Similarly, for any  $w \in L^\infty(\Omega)$  the compactly supported function  $\theta_h w$  is well defined in  $\Omega$ , and its extension, by zero outside  $\Omega$ , is also well defined over all  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and will be also denoted by  $\theta_h w$ . Next, one has the following :

**Lemma 1.3.** *Let  $h \in (0, h_0)$ . For any vector field  $w \in C^{0,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ , with  $w \cdot \vec{n} = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$ , one has the following estimates (with a constant  $C$  independant of  $h$ , but might depend on  $\Omega$ ):*

$$|w(x) \cdot \nabla \theta_h(x)| \leq C \|w\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(\Omega)} h^{\alpha-1}, \quad \text{for every } x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (1.9a)$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |w(x) \cdot \nabla \theta_h(x)| dx \leq C \|w\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(\Omega)} h^\alpha. \quad (1.9b)$$

*Proof.* Observe that  $w(x) \cdot \nabla \theta_h(x) = 0$ , for every  $x \in (\Omega_h)^c$ . Moreover, for  $x \in \Omega_h$ , thanks to (1.8), one has:

$$\nabla \theta_h(x) = -\frac{1}{h} \eta'(\frac{d(x)}{h}) \vec{n}(\sigma(x)). \quad (1.10)$$

Then for every  $x \in \Omega_h$ , we use the fact that  $w(\sigma(x)) \cdot \vec{n}(\sigma(x)) = 0$ , to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} |w(x) \cdot \nabla \theta_h(x)| &= \frac{1}{h} \eta'(\frac{d(x)}{h}) |w(x) - w(\sigma(x)) \cdot \vec{n}(\sigma(x))| \\ &\leq \frac{C}{h} \|w\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} |x - \sigma(x)|^\alpha \leq C \|w\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} h^{\alpha-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.11)$$

Combining all the above we conclude (1.9a). Estimate (1.9b) follows by integrating (1.9a) over  $\mathbb{R}^n$  taking into account the facts that the support of  $\nabla\theta_h$  is a subset of  $\overline{\Omega_h}$ , and that  $|\Omega_h| \leq Ch$ .  $\square$

As in [4], we introduce a nonnegative radially symmetric  $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  mollifier,  $\phi(x)$ , with support in  $|x| \leq 1$ , and  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \phi(x)dx = 1$ . Furthermore, for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , we denote by  $\phi_\epsilon = \frac{1}{\epsilon^n}\phi(\frac{x}{\epsilon})$ , and by  $v^\epsilon = v \star \phi_\epsilon$ , for any  $v \in \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . Moreover, for  $h \in (0, h_0)$ , the distributions  $(\theta_h v)^\epsilon$  and  $((\theta_h v)^\epsilon)^\epsilon$  belong to  $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ ; in addition, they are compactly supported inside  $\Omega$ , whenever  $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{h}{4})$ .

## 2 Fundamental steps toward proving energy conservation

In this section we work under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, and we assume, all along, that the regularization parameters  $h$  and  $\epsilon$  satisfy  $h \in (0, h_0)$  and  $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{h}{4})$ . First observe that by virtue of Proposition 1.2 equation (1.2) remains valid for test vector field  $\Psi \in W^{1,3}((0, T); H_0^1(\Omega))$ . Therefore, we take in (1.2)  $\Psi = \theta_h((\theta_h u)^\epsilon)^\epsilon \in W^{1,3}((0, T); H_0^1(\Omega))$  to obtain:

$$\langle u, \partial_t(\theta_h((\theta_h u)^\epsilon)^\epsilon) \rangle_x + \langle u \otimes u : \nabla(\theta_h((\theta_h u)^\epsilon)^\epsilon) \rangle_x + \langle p, \nabla \cdot (\theta_h((\theta_h u)^\epsilon)^\epsilon) \rangle_x = 0, \quad (2.1)$$

in  $L^1(0, T)$ . The last equation involves three terms:

$$J_1 = \langle u, \partial_t(\theta_h((\theta_h u)^\epsilon)^\epsilon) \rangle_x, \quad J_2 = \langle u \otimes u : \nabla(\theta_h((\theta_h u)^\epsilon)^\epsilon) \rangle_x, \quad \text{and} \quad J_3 = \langle p, \nabla \cdot (\theta_h((\theta_h u)^\epsilon)^\epsilon) \rangle_x. \quad (2.2)$$

For the term  $J_1$  we have the following:

**Proposition 2.1.** *Let  $u$  be as in Theorem 1.1. Then for any  $(t_1, t_2) \in (0, T)$  one has:*

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \langle u, \partial_t(\theta_h((\theta_h u)^\epsilon)^\epsilon) \rangle_x dt = \frac{1}{2} \|u(t_2)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|u(t_1)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \quad (2.3)$$

*Proof.* With the regularity estimates (1.5a) and (1.5b) the duality between  $L^3((0, T); H_0^1(\Omega))$  and  $L^{\frac{3}{2}}(0, T; H^{-1}(\Omega))$  gives:

$$\langle u, \partial_t(\theta_h((\theta_h u)^\epsilon)^\epsilon) \rangle_x = \langle (\theta_h u)^\epsilon, \partial_t(\theta_h u)^\epsilon \rangle_x = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |((\theta_h u)^\epsilon)|^2 dx, \quad \text{in } L^1(0, T), \quad (2.4)$$

and the result follows, after integration in time, from the Lebesgue Dominant Convergence Theorem and the fact that  $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{h}{4})$ .  $\square$

For the second term  $J_2 = \langle u \otimes u : \nabla(\theta_h((\theta_h u)^\epsilon)^\epsilon) \rangle_x$  one has the following:

**Proposition 2.2.** *Let  $u$  be as in Theorem 1.1. Then*

$$|J_2| = |\langle u \otimes u : \nabla(\theta_h((\theta_h u)^\epsilon)^\epsilon) \rangle_x| \leq Ch^\alpha \|u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \|u\|_{L^\infty}^2 + C \|u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \epsilon^{\alpha-1} (\|u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \epsilon^\alpha + \|u\|_{L^\infty} \frac{\epsilon}{h})^2 \quad (2.5)$$

*Proof.* One writes  $J_2 = J_{21} + J_{22}$  with

$$\begin{aligned} J_{21} &= \langle u \otimes u : (\nabla \theta_h) \otimes ((\theta_h u)^\epsilon)^\epsilon \rangle_x \\ J_{22} &= \langle u \otimes u : \theta_h \nabla ((\theta_h u)^\epsilon)^\epsilon \rangle_x \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

To estimate the term  $J_{21}$  one uses Lemma 1.3 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |J_{21}| &= |\langle u \otimes u : (\nabla \theta_h) \otimes ((\theta_h u)^\epsilon)^\epsilon \rangle_x| = \left| \int_{\Omega_h} (u \cdot \nabla \theta_h(x))(u(x) \cdot ((\theta_h u)^\epsilon)^\epsilon) dx \right| \\ &\leq Ch^\alpha \|u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \|u\|_{L^\infty}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

Next, we turn into estimating the term  $J_{22}$ . First we observe that since  $u^\epsilon(x)$  is a divergence free smooth vector field for every  $x \in \text{supp}(\theta_h u)^\epsilon \subset \subset \Omega$ , therefore, one has:

$$\langle (u^\epsilon \otimes (\theta_h u)^\epsilon) : \nabla(\theta_h u)^\epsilon \rangle_x = \int_{\Omega} (u^\epsilon \cdot \nabla(\theta_h u)^\epsilon) \cdot (\theta_h u)^\epsilon dx = 0. \quad (2.8)$$

Consequently, one has the following estimate for  $J_{22}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} |J_{22}| &= |\langle u \otimes u : \theta_h \nabla((\theta_h u)^\epsilon)^\epsilon \rangle_x| = |\langle (u \otimes \theta_h u) : \nabla((\theta_h u)^\epsilon)^\epsilon \rangle_x| = \\ &|\langle (u \otimes \theta_h u)^\epsilon : \nabla(\theta_h u)^\epsilon \rangle_x| = |\langle \left( (u \otimes \theta_h u)^\epsilon - (u^\epsilon \otimes (\theta_h u)^\epsilon) \right) : \nabla(\theta_h u)^\epsilon \rangle_x|. \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

To treat the term

$$\langle \left( (u \otimes \theta_h u)^\epsilon - (u^\epsilon \otimes (\theta_h u)^\epsilon) \right) : \nabla(\theta_h u)^\epsilon \rangle_x$$

one uses similar computations to those in [4] (cf. Remark 3.1 below) which relate  $(u \otimes \theta_h u)^\epsilon$  to  $(u^\epsilon \otimes (\theta_h u)^\epsilon)$ . More precisely, for any two distributions,  $v, w \in \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , one has the following identity:

$$\begin{aligned} (v \otimes w)^\epsilon(x) - (v^\epsilon \otimes w^\epsilon)(x) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_y^n} (\delta_y v \otimes \delta_y w)(x) \phi_\epsilon(y) dy + (v - v^\epsilon)(x) \otimes (w - w^\epsilon)(x) \\ \text{with } (\delta_y v)(x) &= v(x - y) - v(x), \quad \text{and } (\delta_y w)(x) = w(x - y) - w(x). \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

Hence  $J_{22} = J_{221} + J_{222}$  with:

$$\begin{aligned} J_{221} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_x^n} \left( \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}_y^n} (\delta_y u \otimes \delta_y(\theta_h u))(x) \phi_\epsilon(y) dy \right) : \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}_z^n} \nabla \phi_\epsilon(z) \otimes (\theta_h u)(x - z) dz \right) \right) dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \left( \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}_y^n} (\delta_y u \otimes \delta_y(\theta_h u))(x) \phi_\epsilon(y) dy \right) : \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}_z^n} \nabla \phi_\epsilon(z) \otimes (\theta_h u)(x - z) dz \right) \right) dx \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} J_{222} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_x^n} \left( ((u - u^\epsilon) \otimes ((\theta_h u) - (\theta_h u)^\epsilon)) : \nabla(\theta_h u)^\epsilon \right) dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \left( ((u - u^\epsilon) \otimes ((\theta_h u) - (\theta_h u)^\epsilon)) : \nabla(\theta_h u)^\epsilon \right) dx \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

To estimate  $J_{221}$ , first, one uses the facts that for every  $|y| \leq \epsilon$  one has  $|(\delta_y \theta_h)(x)| \leq C \frac{\epsilon}{h}$ , and that the  $\text{supp } \phi_\epsilon \subset \{y \mid |y| \leq \epsilon\}$ , together with the  $C^{0,\alpha}$  regularity of  $u$  to obtain that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_y^n} (\delta_y u \otimes \delta_y (\theta_h u))(x) \phi_\epsilon(y) dy \right| = \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_y^n} (\delta_y u)(x) \otimes (\theta_h(x-y)(\delta_y u)(x) + (\delta_y \theta_h)(x)u(x-y)) \phi_\epsilon(y) dy \right| \\ & \leq C \epsilon^\alpha \|u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \int_{\mathbb{R}_y^n} (\epsilon^\alpha \|u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} + \frac{\epsilon}{h} \|u\|_{L^\infty}) \phi_\epsilon(y) dy = C \epsilon^\alpha \|u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} (\epsilon^\alpha \|u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} + \frac{\epsilon}{h} \|u\|_{L^\infty}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

Second,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_z^n} (\nabla \phi_\epsilon(z) \otimes (\theta_h u)(x-z)) dz \right| = \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_z^n} (\nabla \phi_\epsilon(z) \otimes ((\theta_h u)(x-z) - (\theta_h u)(x))) dz \right| \\ & = \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_z^n} (\nabla \phi_\epsilon(z) \otimes (\delta_z \theta_h(x)u(x-z) + \theta_h(x) \delta_z u(x))) dz \right| \\ & \leq C \left( \frac{\epsilon}{h} \|u\|_{L^\infty} + \epsilon^\alpha \|u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \right) \int_{\mathbb{R}_z^n} |\nabla \phi_\epsilon(z)| dz \leq C \epsilon^{-1} \left( \frac{\epsilon}{h} \|u\|_{L^\infty} + \epsilon^\alpha \|u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

where in the last inequality we used the fact that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}_z^n} |\nabla \phi_\epsilon(z)| dz \leq C \epsilon^{-1}$ . Hence from all the above one has:

$$|J_{221}| \leq C \epsilon^{\alpha-1} \|u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \left( \frac{\epsilon}{h} \|u\|_{L^\infty} + \epsilon^\alpha \|u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \right)^2. \quad (2.15)$$

To complete the proof of the Proposition 2.2, it remains to estimate the term:

$$\begin{aligned} J_{222} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_x^n} \left( (u - u^\epsilon) \otimes ((\theta_h u) - (\theta_h u)^\epsilon) : \nabla (\theta_h u)^\epsilon \right) dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \left( (u - u^\epsilon) \otimes ((\theta_h u) - (\theta_h u)^\epsilon) : \nabla (\theta_h u)^\epsilon \right) dx \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

First, as in (2.14) one has:

$$|\nabla (\theta_h u)^\epsilon(x)| \leq C \epsilon^{-1} \left( \frac{\epsilon}{h} \|u\|_{L^\infty} + \epsilon^\alpha \|u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \right). \quad (2.17)$$

Moreover, following similar arguments as in the above estimates for  $J_{221}$  one can show that for every  $x \in \text{supp } \theta_h$  one has

$$|(u - u^\epsilon)(x)| \leq \epsilon^\alpha \|u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \quad \text{and} \quad |(\theta_h u)(x) - (\theta_h u)^\epsilon(x)| \leq C \left( \epsilon^\alpha \|u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} + \frac{\epsilon}{h} \|u\|_{L^\infty} \right). \quad (2.18)$$

Summing up, one has the following estimate for:

$$|J_{222}| \leq C \epsilon^{\alpha-1} \|u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \left( \frac{\epsilon}{h} \|u\|_{L^\infty} + \epsilon^\alpha \|u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \right)^2. \quad (2.19)$$

Collecting the estimates on  $J_2$  from  $J_{21}$  and  $J_{22}$  one obtains (2.5).  $\square$

Eventually, the introduction of the localized cutoff-function  $\theta_h$  affects the divergence free property of the velocity field,  $u$ , of the solution  $(u, p)$ . Therefore, to estimate the term  $J_3$  in (2.2), which involves the pressure,  $p$ , one needs the following:

**Proposition 2.3.** *Let  $h \in (0, h_0)$  and  $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{h}{4})$ . Suppose  $(u, p)$  is a weak solution of the Euler equations with  $u \in L^3((0, T); C^{0,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}))$ . Then one has the following estimate:*

$$|\langle p, \nabla \cdot (\theta_h((\theta_h u)^\epsilon)^\epsilon) \rangle_x| \leq C \|u(t)\|_{C^{0,\alpha}}^3 (h^\alpha + \epsilon^\alpha). \quad (2.20)$$

*Proof.* Thanks for Proposition 1.2 one can write:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle p, \nabla \cdot (\theta_h((\theta_h u)^\epsilon)^\epsilon) \rangle_x &= \int_{\Omega} p \nabla \cdot (\theta_h((\theta_h u)^\epsilon)^\epsilon) dx = J_{31} + J_{32} \\ \text{with } J_{31} &= \int_{\Omega} (p \theta_h) \nabla \cdot ((\theta_h u)^\epsilon)^\epsilon dx \quad \text{and } J_{32} = \int_{\Omega} p (\nabla \theta_h) \cdot ((\theta_h u)^\epsilon)^\epsilon dx. \end{aligned} \quad (2.21)$$

For the term  $J_{31}$  one obtains the following sequence of equalities by integration by parts and successive use of the fact that  $\nabla_x \phi_\epsilon(x - y) = -\nabla_y \phi_\epsilon(x - y)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} J_{31} &= \int_{\Omega} \left( (p(x) \theta_h(x)) \nabla_x \cdot \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}_y^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}_z^n} u(z) \theta_h(z) \phi_\epsilon(z - y) \phi_\epsilon(x - y) dz dy \right) \right) dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \left( p(x) \theta_h(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}_z^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}_y^n} u(z) \theta_h(z) \phi_\epsilon(z - y) \cdot \nabla_x \phi_\epsilon(x - y) dy dz \right) dx \\ &= - \int_{\Omega} \left( p(x) \theta_h(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}_z^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}_y^n} u(z) \theta_h(z) \phi_\epsilon(z - y) \cdot \nabla_y \phi_\epsilon(x - y) dy dz \right) dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \left( p(x) \theta_h(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}_z^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}_y^n} u(z) \theta_h(z) \phi_\epsilon(x - y) \cdot \nabla_y \phi_\epsilon(z - y) dy dz \right) dx \\ &= - \int_{\Omega} p(x) \theta_h(x) \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}_z^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}_y^n} u(z) \theta_h(z) \phi_\epsilon(x - y) \cdot \nabla_z \phi_\epsilon(z - y) dy dz \right) dx \\ &= - \int_{\Omega} \left( p(x) \theta_h(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}_y^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}_z^n} u(z) \phi_\epsilon(x - y) \cdot \left( \nabla_z (\theta_h(z) \phi_\epsilon(z - y)) - \phi_\epsilon(z - y) \nabla \theta_h(z) \right) dz dy \right) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (2.22)$$

Observe that for every fixed  $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , the function  $\theta_h(z) \phi_\epsilon(z - y)$ , as a function of  $z$ , is compactly supported in  $\Omega$ , and that there exists a sequence  $\chi_k(\cdot, y) \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega)$ ,  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ , such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\chi_k(\cdot, y) - \theta_h(\cdot) \phi_\epsilon(\cdot - y)\|_{C^1(\Omega)} = 0. \quad (2.23)$$

Therefore, since  $\nabla \cdot u = 0$  in  $\mathcal{D}'(\Omega)$ , one has:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_z^n} u(z) \cdot \nabla_z \chi_k(z, y) dz = 0. \quad (2.24)$$



Thus, for every fixed  $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , by virtue of (2.23) and the fact that  $u \in C^{0,\alpha}(\Omega)$  one infers from (2.24), by letting  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , that:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_z^n} u(z) \cdot \nabla_z(\theta_h(z)\phi_\epsilon(z-y))dz = 0. \quad (2.25)$$

Hence, as a result of (2.22) and (2.25) one has:

$$J_{31} = \int_{\Omega} \left( p(x)\theta_h(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}_y^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}_z^n} \phi_\epsilon(x-y)\phi_\epsilon(z-y)u(z) \cdot \nabla\theta_h(z)dzdy \right) dx.$$

Consequently, by virtue of Lemma 1.3 one has

$$|J_{31}| \leq C\|p\|_{L^\infty}\|u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}}h^\alpha. \quad (2.26)$$

Concerning the term  $J_{32}$  observe again that the support of  $\nabla\theta_h$  is contained in  $\overline{\Omega_h}$ , therefore, one has :

$$\begin{aligned} J_{32} &= \int_{\Omega_h} \left( p(x)\nabla\theta_h(x) \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}_z^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}_y^n} \theta_h(x-y+z)u(x-y+z)\phi_\epsilon(y)\phi_\epsilon(z)dydz \right) dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega_h} p(x) \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}_y^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}_z^n} \phi_\epsilon(y)\phi_\epsilon(z)\theta_h(x-y+z) \left( u(x-y+z) - u(x) \right) \cdot \nabla\theta_h(x)dydz \right) dx \\ &+ \int_{\Omega_h} p(x) \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}_y^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}_z^n} \phi_\epsilon(y)\phi_\epsilon(z)u(x) \cdot \nabla\theta_h(x)dydz \right) dx =: J_{321} + J_{322}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.27)$$

In order to estimate the term  $J_{321}$ , one observes that for the relevant  $x, y, z$  for which the integrand in the definition of  $J_{321}$  is not zero one has  $|(u(x-y+z) - u(x))| \leq C\|u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}}\epsilon^\alpha$ , and that  $\int_{\Omega_h} |\nabla\theta_h(x)|dx < C$ . As a result one obtains:

$$|J_{321}| \leq C\|p\|_{L^\infty}\|u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}}\epsilon^\alpha. \quad (2.28)$$

As for estimating  $J_{322}$ , Lemma 1.3 is used to obtain:

$$|J_{322}| \leq \int_{\Omega_h} |p(x)| \int_{\mathbb{R}_y^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}_z^n} |u(x) \cdot \nabla\theta_h(x)|\phi_\epsilon(y)\phi_\epsilon(z)dydzdx \leq C\|p(x)\|_{L^\infty}\|u(t)\|_{C^{0,\alpha}}h^\alpha. \quad (2.29)$$

□

Now, we are ready to complete the proof of Theorem 1.1. Let us integrate equation (2.1) over the interval  $(t_1, t_2) \subset (0, T)$  to obtain

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \langle u, \partial_t(\theta_h((\theta_h u)^\epsilon)) \rangle_x dt = - \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \langle u \otimes u, \nabla(\theta_h((\theta_h u)^\epsilon)) \rangle_x dt - \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \langle p, \nabla(\theta_h((\theta_h u)^\epsilon)) \rangle_x dt \quad (2.30)$$

At this stage we choose  $\epsilon = o(h^{\frac{2}{1+\alpha}})$ , and since  $\alpha > \frac{1}{3}$ , then Theorem 1.1 follows from Propositions 1.2, 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 by letting  $h \rightarrow 0$ .

### 3 Remarks

**Remark 3.1.** *The proof of Proposition 2.2 is an adaptation, to domain with boundary, of the main argument of [4]. The proof involves the expression*

$$((u \otimes \theta_h u)^\epsilon - (u^\epsilon \otimes (\theta_h u)^\epsilon))$$

*which is reminiscent of the Reynolds stress tensor as it appears in statistical theory of turbulence or in the vanishing viscosity weak limit of solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations, according to the formula:*

$$\overline{(u_\epsilon \otimes v_\epsilon)} - \bar{u}_\epsilon \otimes \bar{v}_\epsilon = \overline{(\bar{u}_\epsilon - u_\epsilon) \otimes (\bar{v}_\epsilon - v_\epsilon)}. \quad (3.1)$$

*However, in the present work the localization and regularization do not exactly behave as an average and this is the reason for the presence (both in [4] and in this work) of the term*

$$J_{221} = \int_{\mathbb{R}_x^n} \left( \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}_y^n} (\delta_y u \otimes \delta_y (\theta_h u))(x) \phi_\epsilon(y) dy \right) : \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}_z^n} \nabla \phi_\epsilon(z) \otimes (\theta_h u)(x - z) dz \right) \right) dx \quad (3.2)$$

*which has to be estimated.*

**Remark 3.2.** *As expected the impermeability boundary condition ( $u \cdot \vec{n} = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$ ) plays an essential role in the arguments presented in this work. It is the main hypothesis in Lemma 1.3, which is then used for the estimation of  $J_{21}$ , in formula (2.7), and in the estimation of the pressure contribution term in formula (2.29).*

**Remark 3.3.** *Besides corresponding to physical situations that appear in nature, the introduction of boundary and boundary conditions is a stimulus for the construction of a direct proof avoiding, for instance, the use of Besov space. However, the arguments presented in this work may well be adapted for proving similar results while replacing the Hölder spaces  $C^{0,\alpha}$  by some “exotic” function spaces. Moreover, the ideas introduced in this article may be also well adapted to consider the Onsager’s conjecture for compressible fluids in bounded domains, hence extending some preliminary results of [8, 14] and references therein.*

### Acknowledgements

The authors are thankful to the kind and warm hospitality of the ICERM, Brown University, where this work was initiated. C.B. is also thankful to the generous hospitality of the Weizmann Institute of Science where this work was completed. The work of E.S.T. was supported in part by the ONR grant N00014-15-1-2333.

### References

- [1] C. Bardos and E.S. Titi, Mathematics and turbulence: where do we stand? *Jour. Turbulence*, **14(3)**, (2013), 42–76.

- [2] T. Buckmaster, C. De Lellis, L. Székelyhidi Jr., and V. Vicol Onsager’s conjecture for admissible weak solutions, arXiv:1701.08678 .
- [3] A. Cheskidov, P. Constantin, S. Friedlander and R. Shvydkoy, Energy conservation and Onsager’s conjecture for the Euler equations, *Nonlinearity*, **21(6)**, (2008), 1233–1252.
- [4] 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
- [5] G.L. Eyink, Energy dissipation without viscosity in ideal hydrodynamics, I. Fourier analysis and local energy transfer, *Phys. D*, **78(3-4)**, (1994), 222–240.
- [6] J.-L. Lions and E. Magenes, Problèmes aux Limites Non Homogènes et Applications, Vol. 1, (1968), Dunod, Paris.
- [7] V. Guillemin and S. Sternberg, Geometric Asymptotic, American Mathematical Society, 1977.
- [8] P. Gwiazda, M. Michálek and A. Swierczewska-Gwiazda, A note on weak solutions of conservation laws and energy/entropy conservation, arXiv:1706.10154.
- [9] P. Isett, A Proof of Onsager’s conjecture, (2016), arXiv:1608.08301.
- [10] N.V. Krylov, Lectures on Elliptic and Parabolic Equations in Holder Spaces. Graduate Studies in Mathematics Volume 12 . American Mathematical Society.
- [11] L. Onsager, Statistical hydrodynamics, *Nuovo Cimento*, **(9) 6**, Supplemento, 2(Congresso Internazionale di Meccanica Statistica)(1949), 279–287.
- [12] L. Schwartz, Théorie des distributions á valeurs vectorielles. II. *Ann. Inst. Fourier. Grenoble*, **8**, (1958), 1–209. (French)
- [13] R. Temam, On the Euler equations of incompressible perfect fluids, *Journal of Functional Analysis*, **20**, (1975), 32–43.
- [14] C. Yu, Energy conservation for the weak solutions of the compressible Navier-Stokes equations, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., (to appear), (2017).