# DECAY OF FOURIER MODES OF SOLUTIONS TO THE DISSIPATIVE SURFACE QUASI-GEOSTROPHIC EQUATIONS ON A FINITE DOMAIN

NIKOLAI CHERNOV AND DONG LI

ABSTRACT. We consider the two dimensional dissipative surface quasi-geostrophic equation on the unit square with mixed boundary conditions. Under some suitable assumptions on the initial stream function, we obtain existence and uniqueness of solutions in the form of a fast converging trigonometric series. We prove that the Fourier coefficients of solutions have a non-uniform decay: in one direction the decay is exponential and along the other direction it is only power like.

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND THE FORMULATION OF THE MAIN RESULTS

In this paper we are concerned with the following Cauchy problem for the 2D dissipative surface quasi-geostrophic (SQG) equation

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t} + u \cdot \nabla \theta = -\nu(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2}\theta, & (t,x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \Omega; \\ \theta(0,x,y) = \theta_0(x,y), & (x,y) \in \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where $\nu > 0$, $\gamma \in (0,2]$ are fixed parameters. The parameter $\nu$ is usually called the viscosity coefficient and it controls the strength of the dissipation term. The unknown function $\theta = \theta(t,x) : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ represents the potential temperature in geostrophic flows (see [5] and [26]). The vector-valued function $u = u(t,x,y) : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^2$ is called the velocity and it is expressed in terms of the stream function:

$$u = (u_1, u_2) = \left( -\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x} \right). \tag{1.2}$$

The stream function $\psi : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is then related to the so-called "potential temperature" $\theta$ by the following nonlocal differentiation:

$$(-\Delta)^{1/2}\psi = \theta. \tag{1.3}$$

Here if the set $\Omega$ is the whole of $\mathbb{R}^2$ or the torus, then the fractional Laplacian $(-\Delta)^\alpha$ for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ is defined by the Fourier transform:

$$\widehat{(-\Delta)^\alpha} f(\xi) = |\xi|^{2\alpha} \hat{f}(\xi), \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R}^2, \tag{1.4}$$

where $\hat{f}$ is the Fourier transform (or Fourier coefficient in the periodic case) of $f$. In the physical space, the fractional Laplacian has an integral representation by a singular kernel of power law form. If the set $\Omega$ is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^2$, then one has to consider (1.1) with appropriate boundary conditions, e.g. one can fix the

value of the solution for the whole exterior. In this paper we shall take $\Omega$ to be the square in the positive quadrant of the plane with side lengths equal to $\pi$. We will impose mixed boundary conditions for the stream function $\psi$ (see below). By using the special boundary conditions, we will express $\psi$, $\theta$ and $u$ in terms of convergent trigonometric series. The fractional Laplacian $(-\Delta)^\alpha$ can then be defined the same way as in (1.4).

For SQG the cases when the set $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^2$ or the torus have been widely studied in the literature. The case $\nu = 0$ is called inviscid SQG since no dissipation is present. When $\nu > 0$, the cases $\gamma > 1, \gamma = 1$ and $\gamma < 1$ are called subcritical, critical and supercritical respectively. The inviscid SQG is derived from general quasi-geostrophic equations in the special case of constant potential vorticity and buoyancy frequency (see [5] and [26]). It is an outstanding open problem whether smooth initial data would blow up in finite time. The dissipative SQG (i.e. $\nu > 0$) has been studied intensively. In the subcritical case the global wellposedness result for initial data in certain Sobolev spaces is well-known (cf. [6], [2], [14], [16], [24], [25] and references therein). In the critical case the global wellposedness of SQG was recently settled by Kiselev, Nazarov and Volberg [17] with $C^\infty$ periodic initial data and by Caffarelli, Vasseur [7] in the whole space case with $L^2$ initial data (see also the extension [13]). The problem of global regularity or finite-time blow-up for large initial data in the supercritical case is still open. However some partial results are available (cf. [8], [9]) and blowup can occur in a few related models in which $u$ is not divergence free (cf. [1], [15], [20], [19], [4] and references therein).

The main purpose of this paper is study the SQG equation (1.1) on the two dimensional square with mixed boundary conditions. This is a generalization of our earlier works (see [10] [12] [11]) where we consider two dimensional Navier-stokes systems with special boundary conditions. The objective is to study the quantitative decay of Fourier coefficients of the solutions depending on the geometry of the underlying domain. As we shall see, in our case the Fourier coefficients will display a rather non-uniform behavior: in the horizontal direction they decay exponentially while in the vertical direction they decay only power-like. This is perhaps a bit surprising as opposed to the torus case where the Fourier coefficients decay uniformly exponentially in time. On the other hand one can attribute this non-uniform decay pattern to the fact that our solution tries to accommodate the mixed boundary conditions. We now formulate more precisely our boundary conditions.

**The mixed boundary conditions for the stream function.** Consider the 2D SQG inside the two dimensional square $\Omega$ whose sides are equal to $\pi$. On the vertical two sides, we assume the stream function $\psi$ and the potential temperature vanishes, i.e.

$$\psi(t, 0, y) = \psi(t, \pi, y) = 0, \qquad \forall\, t \geq 0, \ 0 \leq y \leq \pi, \tag{1.5}$$

$$\theta(t, 0, y) = \theta(t, \pi, y) = 0, \qquad \forall\, t \geq 0, \ 0 \leq y \leq \pi. \tag{1.6}$$

On the horizontal two sides, we assume a Neumann type boundary condition, i.e.

$$\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial y}(t, x, 0) = \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial y}(t, x, \pi) = 0, \qquad \forall\, t \geq 0, \ 0 \leq x \leq \pi, \tag{1.7}$$

$$\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial y}(t, x, 0) = \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial y}(t, x, \pi) = 0, \qquad \forall\, t \geq 0, \ 0 \leq x \leq \pi, \tag{1.8}$$

The Cauchy problem (1.1), (1.2), (1.3) together with the boundary conditions (1.5)–(1.8) then form a complete system for which we shall construct our solutions. Remark that the boundary conditions (1.5), (1.7) in general do not preserve the $L_x^2$ norm of $\theta$, i.e. the quantity

$$\int_0^\pi \int_0^\pi \theta(t,x,y)^2 dxdy$$

may grow in time. This is in sharp contrast to the usual case when $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^2$ or the torus, where one can prove that the $L_x^2$ norm (more generally $L_x^p$ norm, see [3]) of $\theta$ does not increase in time. As will become clear soon, the absence of $L_x^2$ conservation is an obstruction to global wellposedness even when the dissipation is subcritical (i.e. $1 < \gamma \le 2$).

We shall consider solutions of SQG with finite $L_x^2$ norm. Therefore by (1.5)–(1.7) the stream function $\psi$ can be expanded into Fourier series:

$$\psi(t,x,y) = \sum_{m\ge 1, n\ge 0} h(t,m,n)\sin mx \cos ny. \tag{1.9}$$

We assume that this series and all series below like (1.9) converge fast enough so that formal operations like differentiations are possible. The formal operation can be easily justified once we prove the decay of the corresponding Fourier coefficients. By (1.3) and (1.4), we obtain

$$\theta(t,x,y) = \sum_{m\ge 1, n\ge 0} (m^2+n^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot h(t,m,n) \cdot \sin mx \cos ny. \tag{1.10}$$

Therefore

$$\frac{\partial\theta}{\partial x}(t,x,y) = \sum_{m\ge 1, n\ge 0} (m^2+n^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot m \cdot h(t,m,n) \cdot \cos mx \cos ny, \tag{1.11}$$

$$\frac{\partial\theta}{\partial y}(t,x,y) = \sum_{m\ge 1, n\ge 0} (m^2+n^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot (-n) \cdot \sin mx \sin ny. \tag{1.12}$$

For the expansion for the velocities, we use (1.2) to obtain

$$u_1(t,x,y) = \sum_{m\ge 1, n\ge 0} n \cdot h(t,m,n) \cdot \sin mx \sin ny, \tag{1.13}$$

$$u_2(t,x,y) = \sum_{m\ge 1, n\ge 0} m \cdot h(t,m,n) \cdot \cos mx \cos ny. \tag{1.14}$$

Note that in the expansion for $\frac{\partial\theta}{\partial y}$ and $u_1$ the effective summation actually only extends over $n \ge 1$ since the term $n = 0$ vanishes. We shall make use of the expansions (1.9)–(1.14) to derive an ODE system for the Fourier coefficients $h(t,m,n)$, $m \ge 1$, $n \ge 0$.

**System of ODE for $h(t,m,n)$.** By (1.10) and (1.4), we get

$$\left(\frac{\partial\theta}{\partial t} + \nu(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2}\theta\right)(t,x,y)$$

$$= \sum_{m\ge 1, n\ge 0} \left((m^2+n^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \dot{h}(t,m,n) + \nu \cdot (m^2+n^2)^{\frac{\gamma+1}{2}} \cdot h(t,m,n)\right)\sin mx \cos ny.$$

$$\tag{1.15}$$

Here $\dot{h}$ denotes time differentiation.

By using (1.11) and (1.13), we have

$$
\left( u_1 \cdot \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x} \right)(t, x, y)
$$

$$
= \left( \sum_{m' \geq 1, n' \geq 0} n' \cdot h(t, m', n') \cdot \sin m'x \sin n'y \right) \cdot
$$

$$
\left( \sum_{m'' \geq 1, n'' \geq 0} \left((m'')^2 + (n'')^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot m'' \cdot h(t, m'', n'') \cdot \cos m''x \cos n''y \right)
$$

$$
= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\substack{m' \geq 1, m'' \geq 1 \\ n' \geq 0, n'' \geq 0}} n' \cdot \left((m'')^2 + (n'')^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot m'' \cdot h(t, m', n') \cdot h(t, m'', n'')
$$

$$
\cdot \left( \sin(m' + m'')x + \sin(m' - m'')x \right) \cdot \left( \sin(n' + n'')y + \sin(n' - n'')y \right),
$$

$$(1.16)$$

where we have used the trigonometric formula

$$
\sin \alpha \cos \beta = \frac{1}{2} \sin(\alpha + \beta) + \frac{1}{2} \sin(\alpha - \beta).
$$

Similarly by using (1.12) and (1.14) we compute

$$
\left( u_2 \cdot \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial y} \right)(t, x, y)
$$

$$
= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\substack{m' \geq 1, m'' \geq 1 \\ n' \geq 0, n'' \geq 0}} m' \cdot \left((m'')^2 + (n'')^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot (-n'') \cdot h(t, m', n') \cdot h(t, m'', n'')
$$

$$
\cdot \left( \sin(m' + m'')x - \sin(m' - m'')x \right) \cdot \left( \sin(n' + n'')y - \sin(n' - n'')y \right),
$$

$$(1.17)$$

Adding together (1.16), (1.17) and grouping the sums, we obtain

$$
u_1 \cdot \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x} + u_2 \cdot \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial y}
$$

$$
= \sum_{m \geq 1, n \geq 1} \sin mx \sin ny \cdot \left( \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\substack{m' \geq 1, n' \geq 0, m'' \geq 1, n'' \geq 0 \\ m' \pm m'' = \pm m \\ n' \pm n'' = \pm n}} h(t, m', n') h(t, m'', n'') \right.
$$

$$
\cdot ((m'')^2 + (n'')^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \left( m''n' \cdot (-1)^{\nu_1(m', m'', m) + \nu_1(n', n'', n)} \right.
$$

$$
\left. \left. - m'n'' \cdot (-1)^{\nu_2(m', m'', m) + \nu_2(n', n'', n)} \right) \right).
$$

$$(1.18)$$

Here $\nu_1$, $\nu_2$ are integer functions defined as

$$\nu_1(m', m'', m) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } m' - m'' = -m, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$\nu_2(m', m'', m) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } m' - m'' = m, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The formulae (1.15), (1.18) are not enough for giving the equations for $h(t, m, n)$ and an additional step is needed. We remark that the sequence $\{\cos nx, \ n \geq 0\}$ is an orthogonal basis in the Hilbert space $L^2([0, \pi], dx)$. Therefore we can write

$$\sin nx = \sum_{\tilde{n} \geq 0} \Gamma(n, \tilde{n}) \cos \tilde{n} x, \tag{1.19}$$

where

$$\Gamma(n, \tilde{n}) = \begin{cases} \frac{4n}{(n^2 - \tilde{n}^2)\pi}, & \text{if } n - \tilde{n} \text{ is odd}, \ n \geq 1, \ \tilde{n} \geq 1, \\ \frac{2}{n\pi}, & \text{if } n \geq 1, \ \tilde{n} = 0 \text{ and } n \text{ is odd}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{1.20}$$

Consider again the formula (1.18). In the product $\sin mx \cdot \sin ny$ we replace the second factor by the series (1.19) and this gives us a series w.r.t. $\sin mx \cdot \cos ny$,

$$u_1 \cdot \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x} + u_2 \cdot \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial y}$$

$$= \sum_{m \geq 1, \tilde{n} \geq 0} \sin mx \cos \tilde{n} y \sum_{n \geq 1} \Gamma(n, \tilde{n}) \left( \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\substack{m' \geq 1, n' \geq 0, m'' \geq 1, n'' \geq 0 \\ m' \pm m'' = \pm m \\ n' \pm n'' = \pm n}} h(t, m', n') h(t, m'', n'') \right.$$

$$\cdot ((m'')^2 + (n'')^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \left( m'' n' \cdot (-1)^{\nu_1(m', m'', m) + \nu_1(n', n'', n)} \right.$$

$$\left. \left. - m' n'' \cdot (-1)^{\nu_2(m', m'', m) + \nu_2(n', n'', n)} \right) \right)$$

$$= \sum_{m \geq 1, n \geq 0} \sin mx \cos ny \sum_{k \geq 1} \Gamma(k, n) \left( \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\substack{m' \geq 1, n' \geq 0, m'' \geq 1, n'' \geq 0 \\ m' \pm m'' = \pm m \\ n' \pm n'' = \pm k}} h(t, m', n') h(t, m'', n'') \right.$$

$$\cdot ((m'')^2 + (n'')^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \left( m'' n' \cdot (-1)^{\nu_1(m', m'', m) + \nu_1(n', n'', k)} \right.$$

$$\left. \left. - m' n'' \cdot (-1)^{\nu_2(m', m'', m) + \nu_2(n', n'', k)} \right) \right). \tag{1.21}$$

The equality between the coefficients of the series of this new expression and (1.15) will give us the needed system of equations for $h(t, m, n)$. Collecting the formulae (1.1), (1.15), (1.21), we obtain

$$\dot{h}(t, m, n) + \frac{1}{(m^2 + n^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} N(t, m, n)$$

$$= -\nu \cdot (m^2 + n^2)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} h(t, m, n), \quad \forall m \geq 1, \ n \geq 0, \tag{1.22}$$

Here for $m \geq 1$, $n \geq 0$,

$$
N(t, m, n) = \sum_{k \geq 1} \Gamma(k, n) \Bigg( \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\substack{m' \geq 1, n' \geq 0, m'' \geq 1, n'' \geq 0 \\ m' \pm m'' = \pm m \\ n' \pm n'' = \pm k}} h(t, m', n') h(t, m'', n'')
$$

$$
\cdot ((m'')^2 + (n'')^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \bigg( m'' n' \cdot (-1)^{\nu_1(m', m'', m) + \nu_1(n', n'', k)}
$$

$$
- m' n'' \cdot (-1)^{\nu_2(m', m'', m) + \nu_2(n', n'', k)} \bigg) \Bigg). \tag{1.23}
$$

The RHS of (1.22) describes the influence of viscosity. The infinite system of equations (1.22) is our basic ODE system for the coefficients $h(t, m, n)$, $m \geq 1$, $n \geq 0$. The main result of this paper is the following

**Theorem 1.1** (Wellposedness and mixed decay). *Let $\nu > 0$ and $1 < \gamma \leq 2$. Let $h(0, m, n)$ satisfy the inequalities*

$$
|h(0, m, n)| \leq \frac{D_0}{m^\alpha (n+1)^\beta} \cdot \frac{1}{(m^2 + n^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \quad \forall\, m \geq 1, n \geq 0, \tag{1.24}
$$

*and $\alpha > 2$, $2 < \beta < 3$, $D_0 > 0$. Then there exists a time $T = T(D_0, \alpha, \beta, \nu, \gamma) > 0$, a constant $D_1 = D_1(D_0, \alpha, \beta, \nu, \gamma) > 0$, such that (1.23) has a unique solution $h(t, m, n)$ which satisfies for all $0 \leq t < T$ the inequalities*

$$
|h(t, m, n)| \leq \frac{D_1}{m^\alpha (n+1)^\beta} \cdot e^{-\frac{m}{2}\nu t} \cdot \frac{1}{(m^2 + n^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \quad \forall\, m \geq 1, n \geq 0. \tag{1.25}
$$

*In fact $h(t, m, n)$ satisfies an even stronger inequality. For any $0 < t_0 < T$, there exists a constant $D_2 = D_2(D_0, \alpha, \beta, \nu, \gamma, t_0) > 0$ such that for any $t_0 \leq t < T$, we have*

$$
|h(t, m, n)| \leq \frac{D_2}{(n+1)^{3+\gamma}} e^{-\frac{m}{10}\nu t}, \quad \forall\, m \geq 1, n \geq 0. \tag{1.26}
$$

*Finally if $D_0$ is sufficiently small, then the corresponding solution is global and the estimates (1.25), (1.26) hold for $T = +\infty$.*

*Remark* 1.2. The inequality (1.26) shows that the smoothing effect of the fractional Laplacian is non-uniform: in the horizontal direction the solution is infinitely smooth while in the vertical direction it has finite number of derivatives on the boundary. By Theorem 1.1 and especially the decay estimate (1.25), (1.26), we obtain a classical solution to (1.1) satisfying aforementioned boundary conditions (1.5) (1.7). In particular it is not difficult to check that $\theta$ has strong derivatives up to the boundary and therefore the boundary conditions (1.5), (1.7) hold in the usual sense.

## 2. Numerical simulations

To verify and illustrate the conclusions of Theorem 1.1, we have computed the Fourier modes $h(t, m, n)$ and $f(t, m)$ in a numerical experiment where the initial values were set to

$$
h(0, m, n) = \frac{D_0}{m^\alpha (n+1)^\beta} \cdot \frac{1}{(m^2 + n^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \qquad \forall m \geq 1, n \geq 0 \tag{2.1}
$$

| $t$ | $D_0 = 1$ | | | | $D_0 = 10$ | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | $K = 20$ | | $K = 30$ | | $K = 20$ | | $K = 30$ | |
| | $b_1$ | $b_2$ | $b_1$ | $b_2$ | $b_1$ | $b_2$ | $b_1$ | $b_2$ |
| 0.00 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 2.1 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 2.1 | 2.5 |
| 0.05 | 3.2 | 3.9 | 3.6 | 5.0 | 2.3 | 3.9 | 2.6 | 5.0 |
| 0.10 | 3.7 | 5.3 | 4.1 | 7.5 | 2.6 | 5.3 | 2.7 | 7.4 |
| 0.15 | 4.1 | 6.8 | 4.3 | 9.9 | 2.8 | 6.5 | 2.8 | 9.7 |
| 0.20 | 4.4 | 8.2 | 4.4 | 12.4 | 2.9 | 7.9 | 2.9 | 12.1 |
| 0.30 | 4.6 | 10.9 | 4.6 | 16.9 | 2.9 | 9.7 | 2.9 | 13.3 |
| 0.40 | 4.6 | 13.6 | 4.5 | 20.6 | 3.0 | 10.2 | 3.0 | 14.1 |
| 0.50 | 4.5 | 16.1 | 4.3 | 23.7 | 3.0 | 10.7 | 3.0 | 14.9 |
| 0.60 | 4.4 | 18.3 | 4.2 | 26.2 | 2.9 | 11.2 | 2.9 | 15.9 |

TABLE 1. Power-law decay rates of the Fourier modes: the decay in $n$ is given by $b_1$ and the decay in $m$ is given by $b_2$.

with $\alpha = 2.5$ and $\beta = 2.5$ and some $D_0 > 0$, so that the assumptions (1.24) are valid. We set $\nu = 1$ and $\gamma = 1.5$.

In our numerical solution of the ODE system (1.22) we restricted the indices $m, n$ to a finite interval $1 \le m \le K$, $0 \le n \le K$ (which is a Galerkin approximation to the infinite system (1.22)). Then we solved the resulting finite-dimensional system numerically by the classical Runge-Kutta method. To test the accuracy we have changed the Galerkin size parameter $K$ and the time step $\Delta t$ in the Runge-Kutta scheme several times to make sure that our results remained stable.

After computing the Fourier modes $h(t, m, n)$ we estimated their decay rates in $m$ and $n$ by approximating their logarithms

$$\tilde{h}(t, m, n) = \log |h(t, m, n)|$$

by two linear functions:

$$\tilde{h}(t, m, n) = a_1 - b_1 n \qquad \text{(when } m \text{ is kept fixed)}$$
$$\tilde{h}(t, m, n) = a_2 - b_2 m \qquad \text{(when } n \text{ is kept fixed)}$$

The slopes $b_1$ and $b_2$ represent the powers of the decay rates of $h(t, m, n)$ in $n$ and $m$, respectively. Since the value of $b_1$ depends on $m$ and the value of $b_2$ depends on $n$, we averaged the values of $b_1$ over $m = 1, 2, 3$ and averaged the values of $b_2$ over $n = 0, 1, 2$.

Table 1 shows how the computed values of $b_1$ and $b_2$ change in time. We see that the decay rates in $m$ (given by $b_2$) increase steadily (in the case $D_0 = 1$ it appears that $b_2$ grows linearly in $t$, while in the case $D_0 = 10$ the growth is less regular), indicating that the true decay becomes faster than any power function, which is consistent with the exponential bound (1.25). On the other hand, the decay rate in $n$ (the value of $b_1$), after a short initial growth, stabilizes and in fact starts decreasing. Interestingly, for $D_0 = 1$ the value of $b_1$ stabilizes near $3 + \gamma = 4.5$, which agrees with the stronger bound (1.26).

Our results support the conclusions and conjectures stated in Theorem 1.1: the decay of the Fourier modes in $m$ is indeed much faster than the decay in $n$. Actually, the former is faster than any power function, while the latter remains power-like.

## 3. Proof of Theorem 1.1

In this section we give the proof of Theorem 1.1. Let $h(0, m, n)$ satisfy (1.24). The system (1.22) in the integral form can be written as

$$
h(t, m, n) = e^{-\nu(m^2+n^2)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}t} h(0, m, n)
$$
$$
- \int_0^t \frac{1}{(m^2+n^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} e^{-\nu(m^2+n^2)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}s} N(t-s, m, n) ds, \quad \forall\, m \geq 1,\, n \geq 0.
\tag{3.1}
$$

Note here the terms $N(t, m, n)$, $m \geq 1$, $n \geq 0$ are nonlinear functionals of $h(t, m, n)$, $m \geq 1$, $n \geq 1$. We then seek a solution of (3.1) by iterations. Define the iterates

$$
h^{(1)}(t, m, n) = e^{-(m^2+n^2)^{\gamma/2}\nu t} h(0, m, n), \quad \forall\, m \geq 1,\, n \geq 0,
\tag{3.2}
$$

and for $j \geq 2$

$$
h^{(j)}(t, m, n) = h^{(1)}(t, m, n)
$$
$$
- \int_0^t \frac{1}{(m^2+n^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} e^{-\nu(m^2+n^2)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}s} N^{(j-1)}(t-s, m, n) ds, \quad \forall\, m \geq 1,\, n \geq 0.
\tag{3.3}
$$

Here for $m \geq 1$, $n \geq 0$,

$$
N^{(j-1)}(t, m, n)
$$
$$
= \sum_{k \geq 1} \Gamma(k, n) \Bigg( \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\substack{m' \geq 1, n' \geq 0, m'' \geq 1, n'' \geq 0 \\ m' \pm m'' = \pm m \\ n' \pm n'' = \pm k}} h^{(j-1)}(t, m', n') h^{(j-1)}(t, m'', n'')
$$
$$
\cdot ((m'')^2 + (n'')^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \Big( m''n' \cdot (-1)^{\nu_1(m', m'', m) + \nu_1(n', n'', k)}
$$
$$
- m'n'' \cdot (-1)^{\nu_2(m', m'', m) + \nu_2(n', n'', k)} \Big) \Bigg).
\tag{3.4}
$$

We begin with the following two lemmas which were proved in [12].

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let $0 < \tilde{\alpha} < \infty$, $n \geq 0$. There exists a constant $C_1 > 0$ depending only on $\tilde{\alpha}$, such that*

$$
\sum_{\substack{k \neq n \\ k \geq 1}} |\Gamma(k, n)| \cdot \frac{1}{k^{\tilde{\alpha}}} \leq
\begin{cases}
C_1, & \text{if } 0 \leq n \leq 4 \\
C_1 \cdot \frac{\log n}{n^{\tilde{\alpha}}}, & \text{if } 0 < \tilde{\alpha} \leq 2,\, n \geq 5 \\
C_1 \cdot \frac{1}{n^2}, & \text{if } \tilde{\alpha} > 2,\, n \geq 5.
\end{cases}
\tag{3.5}
$$

*Here $\Gamma(k, n)$ is defined in (1.20).*

*Proof.* See [12]. $\qquad\qquad\square$

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let $\alpha_1 > 1$, $\alpha_2 > 1$. Let $k \geq 1$ be an integer. There is a constant $C_2 > 0$ depending only on $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ such that*

$$\sum_{\substack{k_1 \geq 1, \, k_2 \geq 1 \\ |k_1 \pm k_2| = k}} \frac{1}{k_1^{\alpha_1}} \cdot \frac{1}{k_2^{\alpha_2}} \leq C_2 \cdot \frac{1}{k^{\alpha_3}}, \tag{3.6}$$

*where $\alpha_3 = \min\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$.*

*Proof.* See [12]. $\qquad\square$

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let $\alpha > 2$, $\beta > 2$. Let $m \geq 1$, $k \geq 1$ be integers. There exists a constant $C_3 > 0$ depending only on $(\alpha, \beta)$ such that*

$$\sum_{\substack{m' \geq 1, n' \geq 0, m'' \geq 1, n'' \geq 0 \\ |m' \pm m''| = m \\ |n' \pm n''| = k}} \frac{1}{(m')^\alpha (n'+1)^\beta} \cdot \frac{1}{(m'')^\alpha (n''+1)^\beta} \cdot \frac{m'n''}{((m')^2 + (n')^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}$$

$$\leq C_2 \cdot \frac{1}{m^\alpha k^{\beta-1}}, \tag{3.7}$$

$$\sum_{\substack{m' \geq 1, n' \geq 0, m'' \geq 1, n'' \geq 0 \\ |m' \pm m''| = m \\ |n' \pm n''| = k}} \frac{1}{(m')^\alpha (n'+1)^\beta} \cdot \frac{1}{(m'')^\alpha (n''+1)^\beta} \cdot \frac{m''n'}{((m')^2 + (n')^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}$$

$$\leq C_2 \cdot \frac{1}{m^{\alpha-1} k^\beta}. \tag{3.8}$$

*Proof of Lemma 3.3.* We first deal with (3.7). By Lemma 3.2,

$|\text{LHS of (3.7)}|$

$$\leq \sum_{\substack{m' \geq 1, n' \geq 0, m'' \geq 1, n'' \geq 0 \\ |m' \pm m''| = m \\ |n' \pm n''| = k}} \frac{1}{(m')^{\alpha-1} (n'+1)^\beta} \cdot \frac{1}{(m'')^\alpha (n''+1)^{\beta-1}} \cdot \frac{1}{((m')^2 + (n')^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}$$

$$\leq \sum_{\substack{m', m'' \geq 1 \\ |m' \pm m''| = m}} \frac{1}{(m')^\alpha (m'')^\alpha} \cdot \sum_{\substack{n', n'' \geq 0 \\ |n' \pm n''| = k}} \frac{1}{(n'+1)^\beta (n''+1)^{\beta-1}}$$

$$\leq C_2 \cdot \frac{1}{m^\alpha k^{\beta-1}}.$$

Similarly

$|\text{LHS of (3.8)}|$

$$\leq \sum_{\substack{m' \geq 1, n' \geq 0, m'' \geq 1, n'' \geq 0 \\ |m' \pm m''| = m \\ |n' \pm n''| = k}} \frac{1}{(m')^\alpha (n'+1)^{\beta-1}} \cdot \frac{1}{(m'')^{\alpha-1} (n''+1)^\beta} \cdot \frac{1}{((m')^2 + (n')^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}$$

$$\leq \sum_{\substack{m', m'' \geq 1 \\ |m' \pm m''| = m}} \frac{1}{(m')^\alpha (m'')^{\alpha-1}} \cdot \sum_{\substack{n', n'' \geq 0 \\ |n' \pm n''| = k}} \frac{1}{(n'+1)^\beta (n''+1)^\beta}$$

$$\leq C_2 \cdot \frac{1}{m^{\alpha-1} k^\beta}.$$

$\square$

Now for any $\alpha > 2$, $\beta > 2$, $T > 0$, we introduce the Banach space $X_{\alpha,\beta,T}$ consisting of continuous functions $\tilde{h}(t) = (\tilde{h}(t,m,n))_{m \geq 1, n \geq 0}$, endowed with the norm

$$\left\| \tilde{h} \right\|_{X_{\alpha,\beta,T}} := \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \sup_{m \geq 1, n \geq 0} |\tilde{h}(t,m,n)| \cdot (m^2 + n^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot m^\alpha (n+1)^\beta \cdot e^{\frac{1}{2} m\nu t},$$

We will prove Theorem 1.1 by a contraction argument in the space $X_{\alpha,\beta,T}$ for some sufficiently small $T > 0$.

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Let $\nu > 0$, $1 < \gamma \leq 2$. Define the iterations according to (3.2), (3.3). We first show that if $T$ is sufficiently small depending on $(D_0, \alpha, \beta, \nu, \gamma)$, then

$$\left\| h^{(j)} \right\|_{X_{\alpha,\beta,T}} \leq 2D_0, \quad \forall j \geq 1. \tag{3.9}$$

By (1.24) and (3.2), we have

$$\left\| h^{(1)} \right\|_{X_{\alpha,\beta,T}} \leq \sup_{\substack{m \geq 1, n \geq 0 \\ 0 \leq t \leq T}} D_0 \cdot e^{-\left( (m^2 + n^2)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} - \frac{m}{2} \right) \nu t}$$

$$\leq D_0,$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $m \geq 1$, $n \geq 0$ and $1 < \gamma \leq 2$. Assume (3.9) holds for $1 \leq j < j_0$, $j_0 \geq 2$. Then for $j = j_0$, $n \geq 0$, we have

$$|N^{(j_0-1)}(t,m,n)|$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{4} \sum_{k \geq 1} |\Gamma(k,n)| \left( \sum_{\substack{m' \geq 1, n' \geq 0, m'' \geq 1, n'' \geq 0 \\ m' \pm m'' = \pm m \\ n' \pm n'' = \pm k}} |h^{(j_0-1)}(t,m',n')| \cdot |h^{(j_0-1)}(t,m'',n'')| \right.$$

$$\left. \cdot ((m'')^2 + (n'')^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot (m''n' + m'n'') \right)$$

$$\leq D_0^2 \sum_{k \geq 1} |\Gamma(k,n)| \cdot \left( \sum_{\substack{m' \geq 1, n' \geq 0, m'' \geq 1, n'' \geq 0 \\ m' \pm m'' = \pm m \\ n' \pm n'' = \pm k}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(m'+m'')\nu t} \cdot \frac{1}{((m')^2 + (n')^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right.$$

$$\left. \cdot \frac{1}{(m')^\alpha (n'+1)^\beta} \cdot \frac{m''n' + m'n''}{(m'')^\alpha \cdot (n''+1)^\beta} \right). \tag{3.10}$$

Now remark that if $|m' \pm m''| = m$, then $m' + m'' \geq m$. Therefore by Lemma 3.3, Lemma 3.2, Lemma 3.1, we have

$$|\text{RHS of (3.10)}| \leq D_0^2 \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{2}m\nu t} \cdot \sum_{k \geq 1} |\Gamma(k,n)| \cdot C_3 \cdot \left( \frac{1}{m^{\alpha-1} k^\beta} + \frac{1}{m^\alpha k^{\beta-1}} \right)$$

$$\leq C_4 \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{2}m\nu t} \cdot \left( \frac{1}{m^{\alpha-1}(n+1)^\beta} + \frac{\log(n+5)}{m^\alpha (n+1)^{\beta-1}} \right),$$

where $C_3$, $C_4$ are constants depending only on $(D_0, \alpha, \beta)$. Substituting this estimate into (3.3), we get

$$|h^{(j_0)}(t, m, n)| \leq e^{-\nu(m^2+n^2)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} t} \cdot \frac{1}{(m^2+n^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \cdot \frac{D_0}{m^\alpha(n+1)^\beta}$$
$$+ \frac{1}{(m^2+n^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \cdot C_4 \cdot \int_0^t e^{-(m^2+n^2)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}\nu s} \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{2}\nu m(t-s)} ds$$
$$\cdot \left( \frac{1}{m^{\alpha-1}(n+1)^\beta} + \frac{\log(n+5)}{m^\alpha(n+1)^{\beta-1}} \right)$$
$$\leq e^{-\nu(m^2+n^2)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} t} \cdot \frac{1}{(m^2+n^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \cdot \frac{D_0}{m^\alpha(n+1)^\beta}$$
$$+ \frac{1}{(m^2+n^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \cdot C_4 \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{2}\nu mt} \int_0^t e^{-\nu((m^2+n^2)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} - \frac{1}{2}m)s} ds$$
$$\cdot \left( \frac{1}{m^{\alpha-1}(n+1)^\beta} + \frac{\log(n+5)}{m^\alpha(n+1)^{\beta-1}} \right). \tag{3.11}$$

Now since $m \geq 1$, $n \geq 0$, $1 < \gamma \leq 2$, we have

$$\frac{1}{2}(m^2+n^2)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \geq \frac{1}{2}m,$$

and therefore

$$\int_0^t e^{-\nu((m^2+n^2)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} - \frac{1}{2}m)s} ds \leq \int_0^t e^{-\frac{\nu}{2}(m^2+n^2)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} s} ds$$
$$\leq \frac{2}{\nu} \cdot \frac{1 - e^{-\frac{\nu}{2}(m^2+n^2)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} t}}{(m^2+n^2)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}}.$$

Plugging this estimate into the RHS of (3.11), we obtain

$$|\text{RHS of } (3.11)| \leq e^{-\nu(m^2+n^2)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} t} \cdot \frac{1}{(m^2+n^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \cdot \frac{D_0}{m^\alpha(n+1)^\beta} + e^{-\frac{1}{2}\nu mt} \cdot \frac{1}{(m^2+n^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \cdot C_4$$
$$\cdot \frac{2}{\nu} \cdot \frac{1}{(m^2+n^2)^{\frac{\gamma+1}{2}}} \cdot \frac{1 - e^{-\frac{\nu}{2}(m^2+n^2)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} t}}{((m^2+n^2)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \cdot \frac{\nu}{2}t)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}}} \cdot \left( \frac{\nu}{2} \right)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}}$$
$$\cdot t^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}} \cdot \left( \frac{1}{m^{\alpha-1}(n+1)^\beta} + \frac{\log(n+5)}{m^\alpha(n+1)^{\beta-1}} \right). \tag{3.12}$$

Now remark that since $1 < \gamma \leq 2$,

$$\sup_{x>0} \frac{1 - e^{-x}}{x^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}}} \leq C_5 < \infty,$$

where $C_5$ is a constant depending only on $\gamma$. Also it is clear that

$$\left( \frac{\nu}{2} \right)^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}} \cdot \frac{1}{(m^2+n^2)^{\frac{\gamma+1}{2}}} \cdot \left( \frac{1}{m^{\alpha-1}(n+1)^\beta} + \frac{\log(n+5)}{m^\alpha(n+1)^{\beta-1}} \right)$$
$$\leq C_6 \cdot \frac{1}{m^\alpha} \cdot \frac{1}{(n+1)^\beta},$$

where $C_6$ is another constant depending only on $(D_0, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \nu)$. Substituting the above two estimates into the RHS of (3.12), we obtain

$$|h^{(j_0)}(t,m,n)| \leq e^{-\frac{1}{2}\nu m t} \cdot \frac{1}{(m^2+n^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \cdot \frac{1}{m^\alpha(n+1)^\beta} \cdot (D_0 + t^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}} \cdot C_4 \cdot C_5 \cdot C_6).$$

Let $T \leq \left(\frac{D_0}{C_4 \cdot C_5 \cdot C_6}\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}$. Then for $0 < t < T$ we get

$$|h^{(j_0)}(t,m,n)| \leq e^{-\frac{1}{2}\nu m t} \cdot \frac{1}{(m^2+n^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \cdot \frac{1}{m^\alpha(n+1)^\beta} \cdot 2D_0, \qquad (3.13)$$

which implies that (3.9) holds for $j = j_0$. This finishes the induction step and (3.9) is proved for all $j \geq 1$. By essentially repeating the above estimates, we also obtain strong contraction of the sequence $h^{(j)}(t)$. Namely there exists $T_0 = T_0(D_0, \alpha, \beta, \nu, \gamma) > 0$ and a constant $0 < \theta < 1$, such that if $T \leq T_0$ then

$$\left\|h^{(j+1)} - h^{(j)}\right\|_{X_{\alpha,\beta,T}} \leq \theta \cdot \left\|h^{(j)} - h^{(j-1)}\right\|_{X_{\alpha,\beta,T}}, \quad \forall j \geq 2.$$

This shows that $(h^{(j)}(t))$ is Cauchy in $X_{\alpha,\beta,T}$ and hence we have shown the existence and uniqueness of a solution to (3.1) in $X_{\alpha,\beta,T}$. Consequently (1.25) holds with $D_1 = 2D_0$. We still have to show (1.26). We shall establish this by a bootstrap argument. Without loss of generality assume $t_0 < \frac{T}{100}$. Denote $\hat{h}(t) = h(t + \frac{t_0}{2})$. Then $\hat{h}(t)$ solves (3.1) with $h(\frac{t_0}{2})$ as initial data. For $0 \leq t < T - \frac{t_0}{2}$, by (1.25), we get

$$|\hat{h}(t,m,n)| = |h(t + \frac{t_0}{2}, m, n)|$$

$$\leq \frac{D_1}{m^\alpha(n+1)^\beta} \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{2}\nu m t} \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{4}m\nu t_0} \cdot \frac{1}{(m^2+n^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}$$

$$\leq D_1 \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{2}m\nu t} \cdot \frac{1}{(n+1)^{\beta+1}} \cdot \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{4}m\nu t_0}}{m^\alpha}.$$

Since $m \geq 1$ and $t_0 > 0$, we have

$$D_1 \cdot \sup_{m \geq 1} \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{4}m\nu t_0}}{m^\alpha} \cdot m^{10} \leq D_3 < \infty,$$

where $D_3$ is a constant depending only on $(D_0, \alpha, \beta, \nu, t_0)$. Therefore we obtain

$$|\hat{h}(t,m,n)| \leq D_3 \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{2}m\nu t} \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{4}m\nu t_0} \cdot \frac{1}{(n+1)^{\beta+1}m^{10}}, \quad \forall m \geq 1, n \geq 0. \quad (3.14)$$

Denote $\hat{N}(t)$ as the expression in (1.23) with $h(t)$ now replaced by $\hat{h}(t)$. Then by Lemma 3.2, Lemma 3.3, Lemma 3.1 and (3.14), we have for any $0 \leq s < T - \frac{t_0}{2}$,

$$|\hat{N}(s,m,n)| \leq e^{-\frac{1}{2}m\nu s - \frac{1}{4}m\nu t_0} \cdot D_4 \cdot \frac{\log(n+5)}{(n+1)^{\beta-1}},$$

where $D_4$ is another constant depending only on $(D_0, \alpha, \beta, \nu, \gamma, t_0)$. Plugging this estimate into the RHS of (3.1) and using again (3.14) for $\hat{h}(0, m, n)$, we obtain for

$t \geq \frac{t_0}{100}$,

$$|\hat{h}(t,m,n)| \leq e^{-(m^2+n^2)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}\nu t}|\hat{h}(0,m,n)| + e^{-\frac{1}{4}m\nu t_0} \cdot D_4 \cdot \frac{\log(n+5)}{(n+1)^\beta} \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{2}m\nu t}$$

$$\cdot \int_0^t e^{-((m^2+n^2)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}-\frac{m}{2})\nu s} ds$$

$$\leq e^{-(m^2+n^2)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}\nu t} \cdot D_3 \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{4}m\nu t_0} \cdot \frac{1}{(n+1)^{\beta+1}m^{10}}$$

$$+ 10^\gamma \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{4}m\nu t_0 - \frac{1}{2}m\nu t} \cdot D_4 \cdot \frac{\log(n+5)}{(n+1)^{\beta+\gamma}}$$

$$\leq D_5 \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{2}m\nu t - \frac{1}{4}m\nu t_0} \cdot \frac{\log(n+5)}{(n+1)^{\beta+\gamma}},$$

where $D_5$ depends only on $(D_0, \alpha, \beta, \nu, \gamma, t_0)$. Compare this bound with (3.14), we have a better estimate of $\hat{h}(t,m,n)$ with the decay in $n$ improved from $n^{-(\beta+1)}$ to $n^{-(\beta+\gamma)} \cdot \log(n+5)$. Iterating the above process once more and noting that (3.5) only produces a decay of $n^{-2}$ for $\tilde{\alpha} > 2$, we obtain for any $\frac{t_0}{100} \leq s < T - \frac{t_0}{2}$,

$$|\hat{N}(s,m,n)| \leq e^{-\frac{1}{2}m\nu s - \frac{1}{7}m\nu t_0} \cdot D_6 \cdot \frac{1}{(n+1)^2},$$

and consequently

$$|\hat{h}(t,m,n)| \leq D_7 \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{2}m\nu t - \frac{1}{8}m\nu t_0} \cdot (n+1)^{-3-\gamma}.$$

Here again $D_6, D_7$ are constants depending only on $(D_0, \alpha, \beta, \nu, \gamma, t_0)$. Hence (1.26) holds. Finally we remark that the small data result follows along the same lines as in the proof of the local contraction argument. We omit the standard details. The theorem is proved. $\qquad \square$

## References

[1] Balodis P., Córdoba A., Inequality for Riesz transforms implying blow-up for some nonlinear and nonlocal transport equations, *Adv. Math.* **214** (2007) no. 1, 1–39.

[2] Carrilo J.A., Ferreira, L.C.F., The asymptotic behaviour of subcritical dissipative quasi-geostrophic equations. *Nonlinearity* 21 (2008), no. 5, 1001–1018.

[3] Córdoba A., Córdoba D. A maximum principle applied to quasi-geostrophic equations, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **249** (2004), 511–528.

[4] Córdoba A., Córdoba D. and Fontelos M.A., Formation of singularities for a transport equation with nonlocal velocity, *Ann. of Math.* **162** (2005) (3), 1375–1387.

[5] Constantin P., Majda A. J., Tabak E., Formation of strong fronts in the 2-D quasigeostrophic thermal active scalar. *Nonlinearity* **7** (1994), no. 6, 1495–1533.

[6] Constantin, P. Córdoba, D. and Wu, J., On the critical dissipative quasi-geostrophic equation. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* 50, Special Issue, 97–107 (2001)

[7] Caffarelli, L. and Vasseur, A. Drift diffusion equations with fractional diffusion and the quasi-geostrophic equation. Preprint, arXiv:math.AP/0608447.

[8] Constantin, P. and Wu, J. Regularity of Hölder continuous solutions of the supercritical quasi-geostrophic equation. Preprint, arXiv:math.AP/0701592.

[9] Constantin, P. and Wu, J. Hölder continuity of solutions of supercritical dissipative hydrodynamic transport equations. Preprint, arXiv:math.AP/0701594.

[10] Dinaburg, E., Li, D. and Sinai Ya.G. Navier-Stokes system on the flat cylinder and unit square with slip boundary conditions. To appear in *Commun. Contemp. Math.*

[11] Chernov, N. Numerical studies of a two-dimensional Navier-Stokes system with new boundary conditions. *J. Stat. Phys.* 135(4):751–761, 2009.

[12] Dinaburg, E., Li, D. and Sinai Ya.G. A new boundary problem for the two dimensional Navier-Stokes system. *J. Stat. Phys.* 135(4):737–750, 2009.

[13] Dong, H. and Du, D. Globall well-posedness and a decay estimate for the critical dissipative quasi-geostrophic equation in the whole space. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* 21 (2008), no. 4, 1095–1101.

[14] Dong, H., Li, D. Spatial Analyticity of the Solutions to the Subcritical Dissipative Quasi-geostrophic Equations. *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.* 189 (2008), no. 1, 131–158.

[15] Dong, H., Li, D. Finite time singularities for a class of generalized surface quasi-geostrophic equations. *Proc. of Amer. Math. Soc.* 136 (2008), 2555-2563

[16] Ju N., Dissipative quasi-geostrophic equation: local well-posedness, global regularity and similarity solutions, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* 56 (2007), no. 1, 187–206.

[17] Kiselev, A., Nazarov, F. and Volberg, A. Global well-posedness for the critical 2D dissipative quasi-geostrophic equation. *Invent. Math.* 167(2007), no. 3, 445–453.

[18] Lemarié-Rieusset, P., *Recent developments in the Navier-Stokes problem*. Chapman & Hall/CRC Press, Boca Raton, 2002.

[19] Li D. and Rodrigo J., Blow up of solutions for a 1D transport equation with nonlocal velocity and supercritical dissipation, *Advances in Mathematics* 217, 2563–2568 (2008)

[20] Li D. and Rodrigo J., Blow Up for the Generalized Surface Quasi-Geostrophic Equation with Supercritical Dissipation, *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 286(1): 111–124, 2009.

[21] Li D. and Sinai Ya.G. Blow ups of complex solutions of the 3D Navier-Stokes system and renormalization group method. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* 10 (2008), no. 2, 267–313.

[22] Li D. and Sinai Ya.G. Complex singularities of solutions of some 1D hydrodynamic models. *Phys. D* 237 (2008), no. 14-17, 1945–1950.

[23] Li D. and Sinai Ya.G. Complex Singularities of the Burgers System and Renormalization Group method. *Current developments in mathematics 2006*, International Press.

[24] Li D. and Zhang X. *Global wellposedness of a generalized dissipative quasi-geostrophic equation*. Submitted

[25] Li D. Existence theorems for the 2D quasi-geostrophic equation with plane wave initial conditions. *Nonlinearity* 22: 1639–1651, 2009.

[26] Pedlosky J., *Geophysical Fluid Dynamics*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1987.

[27] Sinai Ya.G. Power series for solutions of the 3D Navier-Stokes system on $\mathbb{R}^3$. *J. Stat. Phys.* 121(2005), no. 5–6, 779–803.

[28] Sinai Ya.G. Diagramatic approach to the 3D Navier-Stokes system. *Russ. Math. Surv.* 60(2005), no. 5, 47–70.

(N. Chernov) Department of Mathematics, University of Alabama at Birmingham, 452 Campbell Hall, Birmingham AL 35294-1170, USA

   *E-mail address*: chernov@math.uab.edu


(D. Li) School of Mathematics, Institute for Advanced Study, 1st Einstein Drive, Princeton, NJ 08540, USA

   *E-mail address*: dongli@math.ias.edu