

**STOCHASTIC MAGNETOHYDRODYNAMICS SYSTEM:
CROSS AND MAGNETIC HELICITY IN IDEAL CASE; NON-UNIQUENESS
UP TO LIONS' EXPONENTS FROM PRESCRIBED INITIAL DATA**

KAZUO YAMAZAKI

ABSTRACT. We consider the three-dimensional magnetohydrodynamics system forced by random noise. First, for smooth solutions in the ideal case, the cross helicity remains invariant while the magnetic helicity precisely equals the initial magnetic helicity added by a linear temporal growth and multiplied by an exponential temporal growth respectively in the additive and the linear multiplicative case. We employ the technique of convex integration to construct an analytically weak and probabilistically strong solution such that, with positive probability, all of the total energy, cross helicity, and magnetic helicity more than double from initial time. Second, we consider the three-dimensional magnetohydrodynamics system forced by additive noise and diffused up to the Lions' exponent and employ convex integration with temporal intermittency to prove non-uniqueness of solutions starting from prescribed initial data.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Motivation from physics and real-world applications. The study of magnetohydrodynamics (MHD) focuses on the dynamics of electrically conducting fluids and the pioneering works of Alfvén [1], followed by the introduction of the Hall-MHD by Lighthill [53] have captivated the interests from applied scientists in plasma physics, geophysics, and astrophysics. While fluid turbulence is often investigated through the Navier-Stokes equations, MHD turbulence describes the chaotic regimes of magnetofluid flow at high Reynolds number that often occurs in laboratory settings such as fusion confinement devices (e.g. the reversed field pinch), as well as astrophysical systems (e.g. the solar corona); we refer to [5] for details.

In the study of turbulence, theoretical hypothesis such as those of Kolmogorov [48, 49] have been confirmed via experiments. Deferring precise notations, if u_{ν_1} represents the statistically stationary solution to the Navier-Stokes equations with viscosity ν_1 , the Kolmogorov's zeroth law of turbulence postulates the existence of $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\lim_{\nu_1 \searrow 0} \nu_1 \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla u_{\nu_1}\|_{L^2}^2] = \epsilon > 0,$$

where \mathbb{E} denotes the mathematical expectation. Numerical evidence of this phenomena is called anomalous dissipation (e.g. [46] for the Euler equations while [22, 54, 61] for the MHD system), which is considered especially important in MHD: e.g.

dissipation of energy in the limit of high Reynolds number... is an open
problem in 3D for fluids and MHD, and yet it is central for astrophysics

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35A02; 35R60; 76W05.

Key words and phrases. Convex integration; Magnetic helicity; Magnetohydrodynamics turbulence; Random force; Taylor's conjecture.

This work was supported by the Simons Foundation (962572, KY).

where dissipative structures, reconnection, and acceleration of particles are well observed . . . ~ Mininni and Pouquet from [61].

A closely related conjecture from physics community is that of Onsager [65] who predicted that the Hölder regularity exponent $\frac{1}{3}$ is the threshold that determines the energy conservation of fluid velocity when the Reynolds number is infinite.

The MHD system has various invariants such as the total energy (5a) analogously to the energy of the Euler equations. Additionally, the MHD system possesses unique invariants such as magnetic helicity (5b) and cross helicity (5c) which measure the linkage and twist of magnetic field lines, and entanglement of vorticity with magnetic field, respectively. The invariance of magnetic helicity was first discovered by Woltjer [77], and Taylor [73, 74] conjectured that magnetic helicity is approximately conserved for large Reynolds numbers (see also [64, Section 4] by Moffatt).

On the other hand, while the uniqueness of the classical Leray-Hopf weak solution to the 3D Navier-Stokes equations remains open, Lions in [55, p. 263] introduced the generalized Navier-Stokes equations via an addition of a fractional Laplacian “ $(-1)^m \epsilon \Delta^m$ ” and remarkably in [56, p. 96] already claimed the uniqueness of its Leray-Hopf weak solution when $m \geq \frac{d+2}{4}$ in d -dimensional space. Such a result was extended to the generalized MHD system with both viscous and magnetic diffusions given by fractional Laplacians with distinct powers by Wu [78].

The study of stochastic partial differential equations (PDEs), PDEs forced by random noise, has a long history dating back to, at least, [51], and has been utilized in the study of turbulence; e.g. Cho, Lazarian, and Vishniac [19] studied the MHD turbulence via the stochastic MHD system. In this manuscript we explore the three-dimensional (3D) stochastic MHD system; we highlight our results and motivation.

- (1) For smooth solutions in the ideal case, the corresponding cross helicity remains invariant while magnetic helicity grows linearly and exponentially in time when forced respectively by additive and linear multiplicative noise. Using the convex integration technique, we construct solutions such that, with positive probability, its total energy, cross helicity, and magnetic helicity all grow more than twice faster than those of the classical solution; this provides counterexamples to the stochastic analogue of Taylor’s conjecture at low regularity level.
- (2) The convex integration technique has been adapted to the stochastic Navier-Stokes and Euler equations to prove their non-uniqueness in law in recent works (e.g. [38–40]) and many of their proofs of non-uniqueness utilized the energy. Our work may inspire new proofs of non-uniqueness that are available only for the MHD system using cross helicity or magnetic helicity, e.g. for the stochastic compressible MHD system (e.g. [76]) for which the total energy may be more complex to compute than magnetic helicity due to interactions with its density.
- (3) We prove non-uniqueness of 3D MHD system forced by additive noise, fully up to Lions’ exponent starting from prescribed initial data.

1.2. The MHD system and past results. We focus on the spatial domain \mathbb{T}^d for $d \in \{2, 3\}$, although most of our discussions here apply to the case of \mathbb{R}^d as well. We write $\partial_t \triangleq \frac{\partial}{\partial t}$ and recall the spatial Lebesgue and homogeneous Sobolev spaces $L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)$ for $p \in [1, \infty]$ and $\dot{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$ for $s \in \mathbb{R}$ with respective norms $\|\cdot\|_{L_x^p}$, $\|\cdot\|_{\dot{H}_x^s}$, and denote the temporal analogues by $\|\cdot\|_{L_t^p}$. We define the fractional Laplacian $(-\Delta)^m$ as a Fourier operator with a Fourier symbol $|k|^{2m}$. We write $A \lesssim_{\alpha, \beta} B$ and $A \approx_{\alpha, \beta} B$ when there exist a constant $C = C(\alpha, \beta) \geq 0$ such that $A \leq CB$, and $B \lesssim A \lesssim B$, respectively. We also often write $A \stackrel{(\cdot)}{\lesssim} B$ to indicate that

the inequality is due to equation (\cdot) . We define $\mathbb{N}_0 \triangleq \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and designate \mathbb{P} as the Leray projection onto the space of all divergence-free vector fields, as well as

$$\mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} f \triangleq f - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} f dx, \quad \widehat{\mathbb{P}_{\leq k} f}(\xi) \triangleq 1_{B(0,k)}(\xi) \hat{f}(\xi), \quad \mathbb{P}_{>k} f \triangleq (\text{Id} - \mathbb{P}_{\leq k})f.$$

We denote a tensor product and a trace-free tensor product by \otimes and $\overset{\circ}{\otimes}$, respectively. For $p \in [1, \infty]$, $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^3$, we often use an abbreviation of

$$\|g\|_{C_t L_x^p} \triangleq \sup_{s \in [0,t]} \|g(s)\|_{L_x^p}, \quad \text{and} \quad \|g\|_{C_t^N} \triangleq \sum_{0 \leq k+|\alpha| \leq N} \|\partial_t^k D^\alpha g\|_{L^\infty}.$$

We denote the velocity, magnetic, and current density vector fields respectively by $u : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{T}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}^d$, $b : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{T}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}^d$, and $j \triangleq \nabla \times b$, while the pressure scalar field by $\pi : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{T}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}$. The vector components will be denoted via super-indices. We denote the kinematic viscosity by $\nu_1 \geq 0$ which is informally the reciprocal of the Reynolds number. The magnetic resistivity will be represented by $\nu_2 \geq 0$; while our discussion go through for the case $\nu_1 \neq \nu_2$, researchers in numerical analysis (e.g. [22, 54, 61]) typically choose a unit magnetic Prandtl number $P_m \triangleq \frac{\nu_1}{\nu_2}$. At last, we let $h \geq 0$ measure the magnitude of the Hall effect. Then the initial-value-problem of the Hall-MHD system takes the form of

$$\partial_t u + (u \cdot \nabla)u + \nabla \pi + \nu_1 (-\Delta)^{m_1} u = (b \cdot \nabla)b, \quad \nabla \cdot u = 0, \quad (1a)$$

$$\partial_t b + \nabla \times (b \times u) + h \nabla \times (j \times b) + \nu_2 (-\Delta)^{m_2} b = 0, \quad (1b)$$

starting from $(u^{\text{in}}, b^{\text{in}})(x) = (u, b)(0, x)$, where $(b \cdot \nabla)b$ represents the Lorentz force. We always assume $\nabla \cdot b^{\text{in}} = 0$, and observe that in such a case, the divergence-free property is propagated for all $t \geq 0$. When $h = 0$, (1) recovers the MHD system; additionally, if $b \equiv 0$, the system reduces to the Navier-Stokes equations, which turns into the Euler equations when $\nu_1 = 0$. Let us state a precise definition of analytically weak solution to (1).

Definition 1.1. (E.g. [11, Definitions 3.1, 3.5-3.6])

- (1) For all $\nu_1, \nu_2 \geq 0$, $u, b \in C_t^0 L_x^2$ is an analytically weak solution to (1) if for any t , $u(t, \cdot), b(t, \cdot)$ are both weakly divergence-free, have zero mean, and satisfies (1) distributionally.
- (2) In case $\nu_1, \nu_2 > 0$, a pair of

$$u \in C_{\text{weak}}^0([0, T]; L_x^2) \cap L^2(0, T; \dot{H}_x^{m_1}) \text{ and } b \in C_{\text{weak}}^0([0, T]; L_x^2) \cap L^2(0, T; \dot{H}_x^{m_2})$$

is a Leray-Hopf weak solution to (1) if $u(t, \cdot), b(t, \cdot)$ are divergence-free, have zero mean for all $t \in [0, T]$, and satisfies (1) distributionally and the energy inequality

$$\frac{1}{2} (\|u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|b(t)\|_{L^2}^2) + \int_0^t \nu_1 \|u(s)\|_{\dot{H}^{m_1}}^2 + \nu_2 \|b(s)\|_{\dot{H}^{m_2}}^2 ds \leq \frac{1}{2} (\|u^{\text{in}}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|b^{\text{in}}\|_{L^2}^2).$$

It is convenient to denote by A the magnetic potential such that

$$\nabla \times A = b \quad (2)$$

and work on the following form of the Hall-MHD system

$$\partial_t u + (u \cdot \nabla)u + \nabla \pi + \nu_1 (-\Delta)^{m_1} u = (b \cdot \nabla)b, \quad \nabla \cdot u = 0, \quad (3a)$$

$$\partial_t A + b \times u + h(j \times b) + \nabla \chi + \nu_2 (-\Delta)^{m_2} A = 0, \quad (3b)$$

for some χ . Using divergence-free properties and the vector calculus identity of

$$(\Xi \times \Psi) \cdot \Xi = 0 \quad \forall \Xi, \Psi \in \mathbb{R}^3, \quad (4)$$

it can be shown that the following quantities are invariant for the ideal MHD system:

$$\text{total energy at time } t \triangleq \mathcal{E}(t) \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |u(t)|^2 + |b(t)|^2 dx, \quad (5a)$$

$$\text{magnetic helicity at time } t \triangleq \mathcal{H}_b(t) \triangleq \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} A(t) \cdot b(t) dx, \quad (5b)$$

$$\text{cross helicity at time } t \triangleq \mathcal{H}_u(t) \triangleq \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} u(t) \cdot b(t) dx; \quad (5c)$$

both $\mathcal{E}(t)$ and $\mathcal{H}_b(t)$ remain invariant even for the Hall-MHD system.

The mathematical investigation of the MHD system was pioneered by Duvaut and Lions [28] and fundamental results such as the global existence of a Leray-Hopf weak solution in case $d \in \{2, 3\}$ and its uniqueness in case $d = 2$ are well known (e.g. [70, Theorem 3.1]). As we mentioned, Lions [56] extended such a result for the generalized Navier-Stokes equations, (1) when $b \equiv 0$, as long as $m_1 \geq \frac{d+2}{4}$. Because the $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ -norm from the energy in (5a) is considered the most useful quantity among all the bounded quantities upon energy estimates and the Navier-Stokes equations has a scaling invariance of $(u_\lambda, \pi_\lambda)(t, x) \triangleq (\lambda^{2m_1-1}u, \lambda^{4m_1-2}\pi)(\lambda^{2m_1}t, \lambda x)$, we call the case $m_1 < \frac{d+2}{4}$, $m_1 = \frac{d+2}{4}$, and $m_1 > \frac{d+2}{4}$, the $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ -supercritical, critical, and subcritical cases, respectively. Consequently, the uniqueness results obtained by Lions [56] belong to the $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ -critical and subcritical cases; analogous uniqueness results for the generalized MHD system obtained by Wu [78] also fall in the $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ -critical and subcritical cases of $m_1, m_2 \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{d}{4}$. Finally, we mention the global regularity result of logarithmically supercritical Navier-Stokes equations by Tao [72] (see also the logarithmically supercritical MHD system in [79, 81]).

The stochastic MHD system has also caught much attention. We refer to [68, 71, 80] on well-posedness, [2, 82, 83] on ergodicity, [20] on large deviation theory, and [69] on tamed stochastic MHD system. To be precise, let us write down two special cases of our interests. First, we define $L_\sigma^p \triangleq \{f \in L^p(\mathbb{T}^3) : \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} f dx = 0, \nabla \cdot f = 0\}$ and similarly H_σ^s , $s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. For some probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$, we choose additive independent random force $G_k G_k^*$ -Wiener processes valued in some Hilbert space U_k , specifically

$$G_k dB_k = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} G_{k,j} dB_{k,j} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sqrt{\lambda_{k,j}} e_{k,j} d\beta_{k,j}, \quad G_k G_k^* e_{k,j} = \lambda_{k,j} e_{k,j}, \quad k \in \{1, 2\} \quad (6)$$

where $\{\beta_{k,j}\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ are mutually independent \mathbb{R} -valued Brownian motions on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ and $\{e_{k,j}\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ is an orthonormal basis (o.n.b.) of U_k (see [24, Section 4.1]). Then we consider

$$du + [\text{div}(u \otimes u - b \otimes b) + \nabla \pi + \nu_1 (-\Delta)^{m_1} u] dt = G_1 dB_1, \quad \nabla \cdot u = 0, \quad (7a)$$

$$dA + [(b \times u) + \nabla \chi + \nu_2 (-\Delta)^{m_2} A] dt = \nabla \times (-\Delta)^{-1} G_2 dB_2. \quad (7b)$$

Sufficiently smooth solutions to (7) starting from deterministic initial data satisfy

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbf{P}}[\mathcal{E}(t)] + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbf{P}}\left[\int_0^t \nu_1 \|u\|_{H^{m_1}}^2 + \nu_2 \|b\|_{H^{m_2}}^2 ds\right] = \mathcal{E}(0) + \frac{t}{2} \sum_{k=1}^2 \text{Tr}(G_k G_k^*), \quad (8a)$$

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbf{P}}[\mathcal{H}_b(t)] + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbf{P}}\left[\int_0^t 2\nu_2 \langle A, (-\Delta)^{m_2} b \rangle ds\right] = \mathcal{H}_b(0) + t C_{G_2}, \quad (8b)$$

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbf{P}}[\mathcal{H}_u(t)] + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbf{P}}\left[\int_0^t \nu_1 \langle (-\Delta)^{m_1} u, b \rangle + \nu_2 \langle (-\Delta)^{m_2} b, u \rangle ds\right] = \mathcal{H}_u(0), \quad (8c)$$

$$C_{G_2} \triangleq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle \nabla \times (-\Delta)^{-1} G_2 G_2^* e_{2,j}, e_{2,j} \rangle. \quad (9)$$

The second case of interest is the linear multiplicative noise with \mathbb{R} -valued Wiener processes $B_k, k \in \{1, 2\}$ so that

$$du + [\nu_1(-\Delta)^{m_1} u + \operatorname{div}(u \otimes u - b \otimes b) + \nabla \pi] dt = u dB_1, \quad \nabla \cdot u = 0, \quad (10a)$$

$$dA + [\nu_2(-\Delta)^{m_2} A + b \times u + \nabla \chi] dt = A dB_2. \quad (10b)$$

Again, sufficiently smooth solutions starting from deterministic initial data satisfy

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbf{P}}[\mathcal{E}(t)] + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbf{P}}\left[\int_0^t e^{t-s} (\nu_1 \|u\|_{\dot{H}^{m_1}}^2 + \nu_2 \|b\|_{\dot{H}^{m_2}}^2)(s) ds\right] = e^t \mathcal{E}(0), \quad (11a)$$

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbf{P}}[\mathcal{H}_b(t)] + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbf{P}}\left[2\nu_2 \int_0^t e^{t-s} \langle A, (-\Delta)^{m_2} b \rangle(s) ds\right] = e^t \mathcal{H}_b(0), \quad (11b)$$

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbf{P}}[\mathcal{H}_u(t)] + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbf{P}}\left[\int_0^t \nu_1 \langle (-\Delta)^{m_1} u, b \rangle(s) + \nu_2 \langle (-\Delta)^{m_2} b, u \rangle(s) ds\right] = \mathcal{H}_u(0). \quad (11c)$$

Taylor's argument in [73, 74] can be extended to imply that in the ideal case $\nu_1, \nu_2 > 0$ are arbitrarily small, the magnetic helicity on average should grow linearly with the rate of tC_{G_2} and exponentially with the rate of $e^t \mathcal{H}_b(0)$ in the additive and linear multiplicative cases, respectively.

Next, we review recent developments of the convex integration technique. While energy conservation of sufficiently smooth solutions to the 3D Euler equations was proven by Constantin, E, and Titi [21] and Eyink [29] in 1994, the construction of rough solutions, namely those in Hölder space with an exponent less than $\frac{1}{3}$, that do not conserve energy presented significant difficulties. The first monumental breakthroughs were achieved by De Lellis and Székelyhidi Jr. [25–27] in which they adapted the convex integration technique from geometry and particularly constructed in [27, Theorem 1.1] a continuous solution to the 3D Euler equations with prescribed energy. Further improvements (e.g. [8]) led Isett [45] to settle the Onsager's conjecture in all dimensions $d \geq 3$. Via new ingredient of intermittency, Buckmaster and Vicol [10] proved non-uniqueness of weak solutions to the 3D Navier-Stokes equations and further extensions and improvements followed; e.g. [9] on the surface quasi-geostrophic equations, [13] on the power-law model, [59] on Boussinesq system, and [62] on transport equation (see also surveys [11, 12]).

In connection to our manuscript, we elaborate on the MHD system (1). First, Faraco and Lindberg [30] proved by forming a sequence of Leray-Hopf weak solutions depending on $\nu_1, \nu_2 > 0$, that the weak solutions of the ideal MHD system that are weak*-limits in $L_t^\infty L_x^2$ conserve magnetic helicity \mathcal{H}_b . The same authors, together with Székelyhidi Jr., [31] constructed infinitely many bounded non-trivial solutions that are compactly supported in space-time such that they preserve the magnetic helicity \mathcal{H}_b but not total energy \mathcal{E} or cross helicity \mathcal{H}_u . Finally, Beekie, Buckmaster, and Vicol [3] proved that there exists a weak solution (u, b) in $C_t H_x^\beta$ for some $\beta > 0$ to the 3D ideal MHD system such that $|\mathcal{H}_b(1) - \mathcal{H}_b(0)| > 2|\mathcal{H}_b(0)|$ and the corresponding total energy $\mathcal{E}(t)$ and cross helicity $\mathcal{H}_u(t)$ are non-trivial and non-constant. We also refer to [16, 32, 52] for more works that employed the convex integration technique on the MHD system.

Among the researchers on the 3D stochastic Navier-Stokes equations, there were open problems that were unique in the stochastic setting: uniqueness in law [23] and existence of probabilistically strong solution [33]. First, Breit, Feireisl, and Hofmanová [6] and Chiodaroli, Feireisl, and Flandoli [18] proved path-wise non-uniqueness of certain stochastic Euler equations via convex integration. Subsequently, Hofmanová, Zhu, and Zhu [38]

considered the 3D stochastic Navier-Stokes equations and proved that given any $T > 0$ and $\kappa \in (0, 1)$, there exists $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and a \mathbf{P} -almost surely (\mathbf{P} -a.s.) strictly positive stopping time t satisfying $\mathbf{P}(\{t \geq T\}) > \kappa$ and $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted analytically weak solution u that belongs to $C([0, t]; H_x^\gamma)$ \mathbf{P} -a.s. starting from deterministic initial data u^{in} such that

$$\frac{1}{2}\|u(T)\|_{L^2} > 2\left(\frac{1}{2}\|u^{\text{in}}\|_{L^2} + \sqrt{\frac{T}{2}}\|G_1\|_{L_2(U, L_\sigma^2)}\right) \text{ on } \{t \geq T\}.$$

Non-uniqueness in law implies non-uniqueness path-wise due to Yamada-Watanabe theorem and such solutions constructed via convex integration are probabilistically strong and therefore their works contributed to both problems from [23, 33]. This led to many further improvements and extensions to various stochastic PDEs in the past several years: [34, 39] on the Euler equations, [4, 15, 36, 37, 40, 41, 43, 44, 66, 67, 87] on the Navier-Stokes equations, [86] on the Boussinesq system, [35, 42, 75, 88, 90] on the surface quasi-geostrophic equations, and [47, 63] on the transport equation. Following [7, 60] that proved the non-uniqueness of weak solutions to the deterministic 3D generalized Navier-Stokes equations for all $m_1 < \frac{5}{4}$, [84] extended [38] to the case of additional random force of additive and linear multiplicative types ([85] in the 2D case). Moreover, it was proven in [89] that for any $m_1, m_2 \in (0, 1)$ and $\kappa \in (0, 1)$, there exists $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and a \mathbf{P} -a.s. strictly positive stopping time t satisfying $\mathbf{P}(\{t \geq T\}) > \kappa$ and $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted analytically weak, probabilistically strong solution (u, b) to the 3D MHD system forced by additive noise

$$du + [\text{div}(u \otimes u - b \otimes b) + \nabla \pi + \nu_1(-\Delta)^{m_1} u]dt = G_1 dB_1, \quad \nabla \cdot u = 0, \quad (12a)$$

$$db + [\text{div}(b \otimes u - u \otimes b) + \nu_2(-\Delta)^{m_2} b]dt = G_2 dB_2, \quad (12b)$$

starting from deterministic initial data that satisfies

$$\mathcal{E}(T) > 2\left(\mathcal{E}(0) + \frac{T}{2}[\|G_1\|_{L_2(U, L_\sigma^2)}^2 + \|G_2\|_{L_2(U, L_\sigma^2)}^2]\right) \text{ on } \{t \geq T\}; \quad (13)$$

the case of linear multiplicative noise was also obtained with (13) replaced by

$$\mathcal{E}(T) > 2e^T \mathcal{E}(0) \text{ on } \{t \geq T\}. \quad (14)$$

2. STATEMENT OF MAIN RESULTS

To present the first set of main results, we consider the ideal case and construct a solution to (7) in the case of additive noise and (10) in the case of linear multiplicative noise such that their cross and magnetic helicity grow significantly faster than those of classical solutions (recall (8) and (11)). Let us focus on the 3D case and state our first result in the case of an additive noise. We fix the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ and for any Hilbert space H , we denote by $L_2(H, H_\sigma^1)$ the space of all Hilbert-Schmidt operators from H to H_σ^1 . We fix a cylindrical Wiener process B_k on a Hilbert space U_k satisfying $B_k(0) = 0$, $k \in \{1, 2\}$, and let $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ be its canonical filtration of (B_1, B_2) augmented by all the \mathbf{P} -negligible sets.

Theorem 2.1. *Consider (7) with $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = 0$. Suppose that for $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $k \in \{1, 2\}$,*

$$G_k \in L_2(U_k, H_\sigma^{1-\delta}). \quad (15)$$

Then, given $T > 0$ and $\kappa \in (0, 1)$, there exist $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and a \mathbf{P} -a.s. strictly positive stopping time t such that $\mathbf{P}(\{t \geq T\}) > \kappa$ and the following is additionally satisfied. There exists a pair of $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted processes (u, b) that is a weak solution of (7) starting from a deterministic initial data $(u^{\text{in}}, b^{\text{in}})$, satisfies

$$\text{esssup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \|u(\omega)\|_{C_t \dot{H}_x^\gamma} < \infty, \quad \text{esssup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \|b(\omega)\|_{C_t \dot{H}_x^\gamma} < \infty, \quad (16)$$

and on $\{t \geq T\}$,

$$\mathcal{E}(T) > 2 \left(\mathcal{E}(0) + \frac{T}{2} \sum_{k=1}^2 \text{Tr}(G_k G_k^*) \right), \quad \mathcal{H}_b(T) > 2 \left(\mathcal{H}_b(0) + TC_{G_2} \right), \quad \mathcal{H}_u(T) > 2\mathcal{H}_u(0). \quad (17)$$

Remark 2.1. *The only hypothesis on the noise in [89, Theorem 2.1] was*

$$\text{Tr}(G_k G_k^*) < \infty \text{ for both } k \in \{1, 2\}; \quad (18)$$

however, in contrast to [89, Theorem 2.1] which was in the diffusive case with $\nu_1(-\Delta)^{m_1}u$ and $\nu_2(-\Delta)^{m_2}b$ where $\nu_1, \nu_2 > 0$, we cannot rely on the smoothing effect from the diffusion in the ideal case and hence the stronger assumption on the noise. The hypothesis (15) is sufficient to guarantee for all $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{12})$ and all $t > 0$,

$$\max_{k \in \{1, 2\}} \{ \|G_k B_k\|_{C_t H^{1-\delta}}, \|G_k B_k\|_{C_t^{\frac{1}{2}-\delta} L^2} \} < \infty \quad \mathbf{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (19)$$

Next, we state our second result in the case of linear multiplicative noise.

Theorem 2.2. *Consider (10) with $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = 0$. Suppose that B_k is an \mathbb{R} -valued Wiener process on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ for both $k \in \{1, 2\}$. Then, given $T > 0$ and $\kappa \in (0, 1)$, there exist $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and a \mathbf{P} -a.s. strictly positive stopping time \mathfrak{t} such that $\mathbf{P}(\{\mathfrak{t} \geq T\}) > \kappa$ and the following is additionally satisfied. There exists a pair of $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted processes (u, b) that is a weak solution of (10) starting from a deterministic initial data $(u^{\text{in}}, b^{\text{in}})$, satisfies (16) and on $\{t \geq T\}$,*

$$\mathcal{E}(T) > 2e^T \mathcal{E}(0), \quad \mathcal{H}_b(T) > 2e^T \mathcal{H}_b(0), \quad \mathcal{H}_u(T) > 2\mathcal{H}_u(0). \quad (20)$$

Our Theorems 2.1-2.2 indicate that the Taylor's conjecture does not hold in the stochastic setting, extending the deterministic result from [3]. One of the technical difficulties is that the convex integration scheme of [89] is actually more complicated than that of [3]; e.g. the perturbation in [3] did not have temporal corrector (see [3, Equations (5.33)-(5.34)]) while those of [89] did (see [3, Equation (144)]).

Remark 2.2. *It is well known that employing convex integration technique can face challenges in low dimensions; hence, it would be of interest to investigate extensions of Theorems 2.1-2.2 to the 2D case. Moreover, the ideal deterministic Hall-MHD system conserves magnetic helicity, although not cross helicity. Thus, it would also be of interest to extend the second inequalities in (17) and (20) to the stochastic Hall-MHD system (e.g. [80]).*

Remark 2.3. *Let us comment on the non-uniqueness issue of the solutions we constructed in Theorems 2.1-2.2. The proof of non-uniqueness in [89] would not work. In [89], one employs convex integration to construct a solution such that its energy grows as first inequalities of (17) and (20) respectively in cases of additive and linear multiplicative noise, takes such a solution at $t = 0$, and uses it to construct another solution by Galerkin approximation such that the energy satisfies upper bounds from (8a) and (11a) to conclude non-uniqueness. This approach is not applicable in the case of Theorems 2.1-2.2 because Galerkin approximation cannot construct a solution to the ideal stochastic MHD system. This was our original motivation to pursue Theorem 2.3, the case of prescribed initial data.*

We describe our second main result that extends various works, e.g. [40, 52, 84, 89].

Theorem 2.3. *Suppose that (18) holds, B_k is a $G_k G_k^*$ -Wiener process for $k \in \{1, 2\}$, and*

$$m_1, m_2 \in \left[1, \frac{5}{4} \right), \quad \text{and} \quad p \in \left(\frac{6}{5}, \frac{4}{3} \right). \quad (21)$$

Let initial data $(u^{in}, b^{in}) \in L^p_\sigma \times L^p_\sigma$ be independent of the Wiener processes B_1 and B_2 . Then there exist $\zeta > 0$ and infinitely many probabilistically strong processes

$$(u, b) \text{ in } C([0, \infty); L^p(\mathbb{T}^3)) \cap L^2_{loc}([0, \infty); H^\zeta(\mathbb{T}^3)) \text{ P-a.s.,}$$

that solves (12) analytically weakly on $[0, \infty)$ such that $(u, b)|_{t=0} = (u^{in}, b^{in})$.

Corollary 2.4. Define m_1, m_2 , and p by (21). Then, non-uniqueness in law holds for (12) for every given initial law supported in divergence-free vector fields in $L^p(\mathbb{T}^3)$.

Remark 2.4. Our proof of Theorem 2.3 is inspired by [40, 52, 57] but differ in many ways.

- First, in contrast to [40, 57], the convex integration scheme for the MHD system is more complex than that of the Navier-Stokes equations. Thus, we turn to the approach of [52]. However, [52] did not prescribe initial data, and for this purpose, we turn to the approaches of [40, 57].
- One of the major difficulties, in contrast to [40] which treats the Navier-Stokes equations with $m_1 = 1$, is that in order to attain the full $L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)$ -supercritical regime of $m_1, m_2 < \frac{5}{4}$, we can rely on temporal intermittency but only at the cost of reducing the regularity of our solution from $C_t L^2_x$ to $L^2_{t,x}$. This was already observed in [52] and is in sharp contrast to the case of the Navier-Stokes equations; e.g. [84] was able to extend [38] to the full $L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)$ -supercritical regime without relying on the temporal intermittency or reducing regularity. The loss of regularity has a consequence that to prescribe initial data, the inductive solution at a low regularity level must be identically zero in a vanishing time interval near the origin. In [40] for the 3D Navier-Stokes equations, because the natural regularity space was $C_t L^2_x$, the authors in [40] had the $L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)$ -norm equal zero in a vanishing time interval near the origin (see [40, Equation (5.5)]). In our case, the natural regularity space is $L^2_{t,x}$; this is why we chose our inductive solution in $C_t L^p_x$ for $p < 2$. Moreover, in contrast to [40, Equation (5.5)], our inductive solution is identically zero (not in a norm) in a vanishing time interval (see (151c) and (153c)).

Remark 2.5. (1) The restriction of $p < \frac{4}{3}$ in (21) comes from (201). On the other hand, the lower bound $\frac{6}{5} < p$ is rather for convenience of the proof; e.g. in (241), informally we will need to split f^2 in $L^1(\mathbb{T}^3)$ -norm to $\|f\|_{L^p}$ and therefore $\|f\|_{L^{\frac{p}{p-1}}}$ due to Hölder's inequality; then, for convenience in view of Proposition 5.1 we want $p > \frac{6}{5}$ so that we can bound $\|f\|_{L^{\frac{p}{p-1}}} \lesssim \|f\|_{H^{1-\delta}}$. We also mention that allowing different choices of p for u^{in} and b^{in} is immediately possible without any significant modification to the proof of Theorem 2.3; due to heavy notations that we have already, we choose to not pursue this generalization.

- (2) The restriction of $m_k \in [1, \frac{5}{4})$ is a consequence of $p > \frac{6}{5}$. For example, in (241) we need $1 - \frac{3}{m_2 p} + \frac{3}{2m_2 p^2} > 0$ and the requirement of $p^* > 1$ close to 1 and $p > \frac{6}{5}$ lead to $m_2 \geq 1$. Anyway, typically in convex integration schemes, stronger diffusion presents more difficulties and thus we choose to focus on the case $m_k \in [1, \frac{5}{4})$.

Remark 2.6. Just a few months prior to completing this work, the following manuscripts also appeared on ArXiv which seem interesting and of relevance to our work: [14, 17, 50].

We prove Theorems 2.1-2.2 in Section 3-4. Then we prove Theorem 2.3 and Corollary 2.4 in Section 5. We mention that our proof goes through in the setting of deterministic force as well. In Section A.1, we provide preliminaries needed for the proof of Theorems 2.1-2.2; due to difference in convex integration schemes, we devote Section A.2 for further preliminaries needed to prove Theorem 2.3.

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1

Until Section 5, we shall consider $\mathbb{T} = [-\pi, \pi]$ to be precise. Considering (7) with $v_1 = v_2 = 0$, we apply curl operator on (7b) and define

$$(v, \Xi) \triangleq (u - G_1 B_1, b - G_2 B_2) \quad (22)$$

to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t v + \operatorname{div}((v + G_1 B_1) \otimes (v + G_1 B_1) - (\Xi + G_2 B_2) \otimes (\Xi + G_2 B_2)) \\ + \nabla \pi = 0, \quad \nabla \cdot v = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (23a)$$

$$\partial_t \Xi + \operatorname{div}((\Xi + G_2 B_2) \otimes (v + G_1 B_1) - (v + G_1 B_1) \otimes (\Xi + G_2 B_2)) = 0. \quad (23b)$$

For any $\sigma > 0$ arbitrarily small, we define for $L > 1$, $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{12})$, and the Sobolev constant

$$C_S = C_S(\sigma) \geq 0 \text{ such that } \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)} \leq C_S \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{3+\sigma}{2}}(\mathbb{T}^3)}, \quad (24)$$

a stopping time

$$\begin{aligned} T_L \triangleq \inf \left\{ t \geq 0 : C_S \max_{k \in \{1,2\}} \|G_k B_k(t)\|_{H^{1-\delta}} \geq L^{\frac{1}{4}} \right\} \\ \wedge \inf \left\{ t \geq 0 : C_S \max_{k \in \{1,2\}} \|G_k B_k\|_{C_t^{\frac{1}{2}-2\delta} L^2} \geq L^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} \wedge L \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

and observe that $T_L > 0$ and $\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} T_L = +\infty$ **P**-a.s. due to (19). We clarify two reasons why the construction of the convex integration solution up to the stopping time $t = T_L$ for $L \gg 1$ of [89] is expected to go through in our case with minimum modifications.

Remark 3.1.

- (1) First, in the diffusive case of [89], the author considered the solutions z_1 to the stochastic Stokes equation and z_2 to the stochastic heat equation and subtracted them from u and b , respectively (see [89, Equations (50)-(51)]). In the rest of the proof of constructing the solution up to the stopping time, only the regularity of $z_k \in C_T H_x^{1-\delta} \cap C_T^{\frac{1}{2}-\delta} L_x^2$ for all $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, $T > 0$ and both $k \in \{1, 2\}$ was used (see [89, Equation (59)]), and $G_1 B_1$ and $G_2 B_2$ satisfy this condition due to (25).
- (2) Second, it is well known that in general construction of the convex integration solutions, diffusive terms only appear at the end of the proof as linear terms that must be bounded upon verifying the inductive hypothesis on the errors.

For any $a \in 2\mathbb{N}$, $b \in \mathbb{N}$, $\beta \in (0, 1)$, and $L \geq 1$ to be specified, we define

$$\lambda_q \triangleq a^{b^q} \text{ for } q \in \mathbb{N}_0, \quad \delta_q \triangleq \lambda_q^{-2\beta} \text{ for } q \in \mathbb{N}_0, \quad (26)$$

$$M_0 \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \text{ such that } M_0(t) = \begin{cases} L^4 & \text{if } t \leq 0, \\ L^4 e^{4Lt} & \text{if } t \geq T \wedge L, \end{cases} \quad (27a)$$

$$0 \leq M'_0(t) \leq 8LM_0(t), \quad M''_0(t) \leq 32L^2 M_0(t) \quad (27b)$$

(cf. [89, Equations (68)-(69)]). Then we define

$$\alpha \triangleq \frac{1}{1600} \text{ and } (G_k B_k)_q \triangleq \mathbb{P}_{\leq f(q)} G_k B_k \text{ where } f(q) \triangleq \lambda_{q+1}^{\frac{3q}{2}} \text{ for both } k \in \{1, 2\} \quad (28)$$

(cf. [89, Equations (94) and (65)]). Considering (23), we seek a solution $(v_q, \Xi_q, \mathring{R}_q^v, \mathring{R}_q^\Xi)$ to

$$\partial_t v_q + \operatorname{div}((v_q + (G_1 B_1)_q) \otimes (v_q + (G_1 B_1)_q) - (\Xi_q + (G_2 B_2)_q) \otimes (\Xi_q + (G_2 B_2)_q))$$

$$+ \nabla \pi_q = \operatorname{div} \mathring{R}_q^v, \quad \nabla \cdot v_q = 0, \quad (29a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \Xi_q + \operatorname{div} \left((\Xi_q + (G_2 B_2)_q) \otimes (v_q + (G_1 B_1)_q) - (v_q + (G_1 B_1)_q) \otimes (\Xi_q + (G_2 B_2)_q) \right) \\ = \operatorname{div} \mathring{R}_q^\Xi, \quad \nabla \cdot \Xi_q = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (29b)$$

over $[t_q, T_L]$ for $q \in \mathbb{N}_0$ where \mathring{R}_q^v and \mathring{R}_q^Ξ are respectively symmetric trace-free and skew-symmetric matrices and

$$t_q \triangleq -1 + \sum_{1 \leq \iota \leq q} \delta_\iota^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{ with the convention that } \sum_{1 \leq \iota \leq 0} \triangleq 0. \quad (30)$$

We acknowledge that t_q in [89, Equation (67)] was defined as $-2 + \sum_{1 \leq \iota \leq q} \delta_\iota^{\frac{1}{2}}$ but the proofs in [89] can be readily modified to the definition in (30) and we want $t_q \geq -1$ in the proof of Theorem 2.3. Next, we extend B_k to $[-2, 0]$ by $B_k(t) \equiv B_k(0)$ for $k \in \{1, 2\}$ and all $t \in [-2, 0]$. We introduce the following norms for $t \geq t_q$: for all $p \in [1, \infty]$ and $\iota_1 \in \mathbb{N}_0, \iota_2 \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\|f\|_{C_{t,x,q}^{\iota_1}} \triangleq \|f\|_{C_{[t_q,t],x}^{\iota_1}} \triangleq \sup_{s \in [t_q,t]} \sum_{0 \leq j+|\beta| \leq \iota_1} \|\partial_s^j D^\beta f(s)\|_{C_x}, \quad \|f\|_{C_{t,q} L_x^p} \triangleq \sup_{s \in [t_q,t]} \|f(s)\|_{L_x^p} \quad (31a)$$

$$\|f\|_{C_{t,q}^j C_x^{\iota_1}} \triangleq \sum_{0 \leq k \leq j, 0 \leq |\beta| \leq \iota_1} \|\partial_s^k D^\beta f(s)\|_{C_{[t_q,t],x}}, \quad \|f\|_{C_{t,q} H_x^{\iota_2}} \triangleq \sup_{s \in [t_q,t]} \|f(s)\|_{H_x^{\iota_2}}. \quad (31b)$$

We are now ready to state the inductive estimates:

Hypothesis 3.1. *For universal constants $c_v, c_\Xi > 0$ from [89, Equations (120) and (131)], the solution $(v_q, \Xi_q, \mathring{R}_q^v, \mathring{R}_q^\Xi)$ to (29) satisfies for all $t \in [t_q, T_L]$*

$$\|v_q\|_{C_{t,q} L_x^2} \leq M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 + \sum_{1 \leq \iota \leq q} \delta_\iota^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \leq 2M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (32a)$$

$$\|\Xi_q\|_{C_{t,q} L_x^2} \leq M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 + \sum_{1 \leq \iota \leq q} \delta_\iota^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \leq 2M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (32b)$$

$$\|v_q\|_{C_{t,x,q}^1} \leq M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda_q^4, \quad \|\Xi_q\|_{C_{t,x,q}^1} \leq M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda_q^4, \quad (32c)$$

$$\|\mathring{R}_q^v\|_{C_{t,q} L_x^1} \leq c_v M_0(t) \delta_{q+1}, \quad \|\mathring{R}_q^\Xi\|_{C_{t,q} L_x^1} \leq c_\Xi M_0(t) \delta_{q+1}. \quad (32d)$$

The following result is concerned with the initial step $q = 0$.

Proposition 3.1. *Let*

$$v_0(t, x) \triangleq \frac{M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \begin{pmatrix} \sin(x^3) \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \Xi_0(t, x) \triangleq \frac{M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(2\pi)^3} \begin{pmatrix} \sin(x^3) \\ \cos(x^3) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (33)$$

Then, together with

$$\mathring{R}_0^v(t, x) \triangleq \frac{\frac{d}{dt} M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\cos(x^3) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\cos(x^3) & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (34a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &+ \left(v_0 \otimes (G_1 B_1)_0 + (G_1 B_1)_0 \otimes v_0 + (G_1 B_1)_0 \otimes (G_1 B_1)_0 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \Xi_0 \otimes (G_2 B_2)_0 - (G_2 B_2)_0 \otimes \Xi_0 - (G_2 B_2)_0 \otimes (G_2 B_2)_0 \right)(t, x), \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathring{R}_0^\Xi(t, x) \triangleq \frac{\frac{d}{dt} M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(2\pi)^3} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\cos(x^3) \\ 0 & 0 & \sin(x^3) \\ \cos(x^3) & -\sin(x^3) & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (34b)$$

$$+ \left(\Xi_0 \otimes (G_1 B_1)_0 + (G_2 B_2)_0 \otimes v_0 + (G_2 B_2)_0 \otimes (G_1 B_1)_0 \right. \\ \left. - v_0 \otimes (G_2 B_2)_0 - (G_1 B_1)_0 \otimes \Xi_0 - (G_1 B_1)_0 \otimes (G_2 B_2)_0 \right)(t, x),$$

(v_0, Ξ_0) satisfies Hypothesis 3.1 and (29) at level $q = 0$ over $[t_0, T_L]$ provided

$$(40)^{\frac{4}{3}} < L, \quad (35a)$$

$$((2\pi)^3 + 1)^2 20\pi^{\frac{3}{2}} \max\{c_v^{-1}, c_{\Xi}^{-1}\} < a^{2\beta b} 20\pi^{\frac{3}{2}} \max\{c_v^{-1}, c_{\Xi}^{-1}\} \leq L \leq \frac{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}} a^4 - 2}{4}. \quad (35b)$$

Finally, $v_0(t, x)$, $\Xi_0(t, x)$, $\hat{R}_0^v(t, x)$, and $\hat{R}_0^{\Xi}(t, x)$ are all deterministic for all $t \in [t_0, 0]$.

Proof of Proposition 3.1. The claims can be proven similarly to [89, Proposition 4.7]; the difference from the lack of diffusion can be overcome as described in Remark 3.1. \square

The following proposition is a key iteration that allows us to deduce the solution at step $q + 1$ from step q .

Proposition 3.2. *Let L satisfy*

$$\max\{(40)^{\frac{4}{3}}, ((2\pi)^3 + 1)^2 20\pi^{\frac{3}{2}} \max\{c_v^{-1}, c_{\Xi}^{-1}\}\} < L. \quad (36)$$

Then there exist a choice of parameters a, b , and β such that (35) is fulfilled and the following holds. Suppose that $(v_q, \Xi_q, \hat{R}_q^v, \hat{R}_q^{\Xi})$ are $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted processes that solve (29) and satisfy Hypothesis 3.1. Then there exist $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted processes $(v_{q+1}, \Xi_{q+1}, \hat{R}_{q+1}^v, \hat{R}_{q+1}^{\Xi})$ that satisfy Hypothesis 3.1 and solves (29) at level $q + 1$, and for all $t \in [t_{q+1}, T_L]$,

$$\|v_{q+1}(t) - v_q(t)\|_{L_x^2} \leq M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Xi_{q+1}(t) - \Xi_q(t)\|_{L_x^2} \leq M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (37)$$

Finally, if $(v_q, \Xi_q, \hat{R}_q^v, \hat{R}_q^{\Xi})(t, x)$ is deterministic over $[t_q, 0]$, then $(v_{q+1}, \Xi_{q+1}, \hat{R}_{q+1}^v, \hat{R}_{q+1}^{\Xi})(t, x)$ is also deterministic over $[t_{q+1}, 0]$.

Proof of Proposition 3.2. This result can be proven similarly to [89, Proposition 4.8] taking into account of Remark 3.1. For subsequent convenience, we sketch some ideas, state definitions and key estimates from [89]. We fix

$$\eta \in \mathbb{Q}_+ \cap \left(\frac{1}{16}, \frac{1}{8} \right], \quad \sigma \triangleq \lambda_{q+1}^{2\eta-1}, \quad r \triangleq \lambda_{q+1}^{6\eta-1}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mu \triangleq \lambda_{q+1}^{1-\eta}, \quad (38a)$$

$$b \in \{l \in \mathbb{N} : l > 39\alpha^{-1}\}, \quad \text{and} \quad l \triangleq \lambda_{q+1}^{-\frac{3\eta}{2}} \lambda_q^{-2} \quad (38b)$$

where α was defined in (28). We consider $\{\vartheta_l\}_{l>0}$ and $\{\varrho_l\}_{l>0}$, specifically $\vartheta_l(\cdot) \triangleq l^{-1} \vartheta(\frac{\cdot}{l})$ and $\varrho_l(\cdot) \triangleq l^{-3} \varrho(\frac{\cdot}{l})$, as families of standard mollifiers on \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{R}^3 with mass one and compact support, the latter compact support specifically on $(l, 2l]$. Then we mollify $v_q, \Xi_q, \hat{R}_q^v, \hat{R}_q^{\Xi}$, and $(G_k B_k)_q$ for $k \in \{1, 2\}$ in space and time to obtain

$$v_l \triangleq v_q *_x \varrho_l *_t \vartheta_l, \quad \Xi_l \triangleq \Xi_q *_x \varrho_l *_t \vartheta_l, \quad (39a)$$

$$\hat{R}_l^v \triangleq \hat{R}_q^v *_x \varrho_l *_t \vartheta_l, \quad \hat{R}_l^{\Xi} \triangleq \hat{R}_q^{\Xi} *_x \varrho_l *_t \vartheta_l, \quad (G_k B_k)_l \triangleq (G_k B_k)_q *_x \varrho_l *_t \vartheta_l. \quad (39b)$$

It follows that the corresponding mollified system to (29) is

$$\partial_t v_l + \operatorname{div}((v_l + (G_1 B_1)_l) \otimes (v_l + (G_1 B_1)_l) - (\Xi_l + (G_2 B_2)_l) \otimes (\Xi_l + (G_2 B_2)_l)) \\ + \nabla \pi_l = \operatorname{div}(\hat{R}_l^v + R_{\text{com}1}^v), \quad \nabla \cdot v_l = 0, \quad (40a)$$

$$\partial_t \Xi_l + \operatorname{div}((\Xi_l + (G_2 B_2)_l) \otimes (v_l + (G_1 B_1)_l) - (v_l + (G_1 B_1)_l) \otimes (\Xi_l + (G_2 B_2)_l)) \\ = \operatorname{div}(\hat{R}_l^{\Xi} + R_{\text{com}1}^{\Xi}), \quad \nabla \cdot \Xi_l = 0, \quad (40b)$$

where

$$\pi_l \triangleq \pi_q *_x \varrho_l *_t \vartheta_l - \frac{1}{3}(|v_l + (G_1 B_1)_l|^2 - |\Xi_l + (G_2 B_2)_l|^2) \quad (41a)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{3}(|v_q + (G_1 B_1)_q|^2 - |\Xi_q + (G_2 B_2)_q|^2) *_x \varrho_l *_t \vartheta_l,$$

$$R_{\text{coml}}^v \triangleq (v_l + (G_1 B_1)_l) \overset{\circ}{\otimes} (v_l + (G_1 B_1)_l) - (\Xi_l + (G_2 B_2)_l) \overset{\circ}{\otimes} (\Xi_l + (G_2 B_2)_l) \quad (41b)$$

$$- ((v_q + (G_1 B_1)_q) \overset{\circ}{\otimes} (v_q + (G_1 B_1)_q) - (\Xi_q + (G_2 B_2)_q) \overset{\circ}{\otimes} (\Xi_q + (G_2 B_2)_q)) *_x \varrho_l *_t \vartheta_l,$$

$$R_{\text{coml}}^\Xi \triangleq (\Xi_l + (G_2 B_2)_l) \otimes (v_l + (G_1 B_1)_l) - (v_l + (G_1 B_1)_l) \otimes (\Xi_l + (G_2 B_2)_l) \quad (41c)$$

$$- ((\Xi_q + (G_2 B_2)_q) \otimes (v_q + (G_1 B_1)_q) - (v_q + (G_1 B_1)_q) \otimes (\Xi_q + (G_2 B_2)_q)) *_x \varrho_l *_t \vartheta_l$$

(see [89, Equations (101)-(102)]). We let $\chi : [0, \infty) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function such that

$$\chi(z) \begin{cases} = 1 & \text{if } z \in [0, 1], \\ \in [\frac{z}{2}, 2z] & \text{if } z \in (1, 2), \\ = z & \text{if } z \geq 2, \end{cases} \quad (42)$$

and then the magnetic amplitude function for all $\xi \in \Lambda_\Xi$,

$$a_\xi(t, x) \triangleq \rho_{\Xi}^{\frac{1}{2}}(t, x) \gamma_\xi \left(- \frac{\mathring{R}_l^\Xi(t, x)}{\rho_{\Xi}(t, x)} \right) \text{ where } \rho_{\Xi}(t, x) \triangleq 2\delta_{q+1} \epsilon_{\Xi}^{-1} c_{\Xi} M_0(t) \chi \left(\frac{|\mathring{R}_l^\Xi(t, x)|}{c_{\Xi} \delta_{q+1} M_0(t)} \right) \quad (43)$$

(see [89, Equations (110) and (117)]). On the other hand, we define

$$\mathring{G}^\Xi \triangleq \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Xi} a_\xi^2(\xi \otimes \xi - \xi_2 \otimes \xi_2), \quad (44)$$

where ξ and ξ_2 are two of the elements of an o.n.b. that appears in Geometric Lemmas, specifically [89, Lemmas 3.1-3.2] (see Lemmas A.2-A.3). We also define the velocity amplitude functions

$$a_\xi(t, x) \triangleq \rho_v^{\frac{1}{2}}(t, x) \gamma_\xi \left(\text{Id} - \frac{\mathring{R}_l^v(t, x) + \mathring{G}^\Xi(t, x)}{\rho_v(t, x)} \right) \quad \forall \xi \in \Lambda_v \quad (45a)$$

$$\text{where } \rho_v(t, x) \triangleq 2\epsilon_v^{-1} c_v \delta_{q+1} M_0(t) \chi \left(\frac{|\mathring{R}_l^v(t, x) + \mathring{G}^\Xi(t, x)|}{c_v \delta_{q+1} M_0(t)} \right) \quad (45b)$$

(see [89, Equation (128)]). We are now ready to define the perturbations

$$w_{q+1} \triangleq w_{q+1}^p + w_{q+1}^c + w_{q+1}^t \quad \text{and} \quad d_{q+1} \triangleq d_{q+1}^p + d_{q+1}^c + d_{q+1}^t, \quad (46)$$

where the temporal correctors are defined through ϕ_ξ and φ_ξ from (263) as follows:

$$w_{q+1}^t \triangleq -\mu^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda} \mathbb{P}\mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}(a_\xi^2 \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}(\phi_\xi^2 \varphi_\xi^2)) \xi \quad \text{and} \quad d_{q+1}^t \triangleq -\mu^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Xi} \mathbb{P}\mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}(a_\xi^2 \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}(\phi_\xi^2 \varphi_\xi^2)) \xi_2. \quad (47)$$

The specific form of w_{q+1}^p , w_{q+1}^c , d_{q+1}^p , and d_{q+1}^c , are not important for our current proof (see [89, Equations (139)-(140)]) while we will rely on the following identity:

$$w_{q+1}^p + w_{q+1}^c = N_\Lambda^{-2} \lambda_{q+1}^{-2} \text{curl curl} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda} a_\xi \phi_\xi \Psi_\xi \xi, \quad (48a)$$

$$d_{q+1}^p + d_{q+1}^c = N_\Lambda^{-2} \lambda_{q+1}^{-2} \text{curl curl} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Xi} a_\xi \phi_\xi \Psi_\xi \xi_2 \quad (48b)$$

where Ψ_ξ and N_Λ are defined respectively in (263) and (260) (see [89, Equation (142)]). At last, we are able to define the solutions at step $q+1$ via the perturbations as follows:

$$v_{q+1} \triangleq v_l + w_{q+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \Xi_{q+1} \triangleq \Xi_l + d_{q+1} \quad (49)$$

(see [89, Equation (147)]). We will subsequently rely on the following estimate from [89, Equation (122)]:

$$\|a_\xi\|_{C_{t,q+1}C_x^j} \lesssim \delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} t^{-5j-2} M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \forall j \geq 0, \xi \in \Lambda_\Xi \quad (50)$$

□

We are ready to prove Theorem 2.1. Given any $T > 0$ and $\kappa \in (0, 1)$, starting from the quadruple $(v_0, \Xi_0, \hat{R}_0^v, \hat{R}_0^\Xi)$ in Proposition 3.1, by taking $L > 0$ sufficiently large enough to satisfy (36), Proposition 3.2 admits $(v_q, \Xi_q, \hat{R}_q^v, \hat{R}_q^\Xi)$ for all $q \in \mathbb{N}$ that satisfy Hypothesis 3.1, (29), and (37). It is shown in [89, Equation (87)] that such $\{v_q\}_{q \in \mathbb{N}_0}, \{\Xi_q\}_{q \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ are both Cauchy in $C([0, T_L]; \dot{H}^\gamma(\mathbb{T}^3))$, $\gamma \in (0, \frac{\beta}{4+\beta})$. Therefore, we deduce the limiting processes

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} v_q \triangleq v \text{ and } \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \Xi_q \triangleq \Xi \text{ both in } C([0, T_L]; \dot{H}^\gamma(\mathbb{T}^3)). \quad (51)$$

Additionally, it is shown in [89, Equation (90)] that the difference between such Ξ from (51) and Ξ_0 from (33) satisfies

$$\|\Xi(t) - \Xi_0(t)\|_{L_x^2} \leq M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{q \geq 0} \delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (52)$$

and an identical computation shows

$$\|v(t) - v_0(t)\|_{L_x^2} \leq M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{q \geq 0} \delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (53)$$

Using $b^{q+1} \geq b(q+1)$ for all $q \in \mathbb{N}$ as long as $b \geq 2$, we can further bound by

$$\max\{\|\Xi(t) - \Xi_0(t)\|_{L_x^2}, \|v(t) - v_0(t)\|_{L_x^2}\} \stackrel{(26)}{\leq} M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{q \geq 0} a^{-b(q+1)\beta} = M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{a^{-b\beta}}{1 - a^{-b\beta}} \right). \quad (54)$$

Consequently, all the claims in Theorem 2.1 except the second and third inequalities of (17) can be proven similarly to the proof of [89, Theorem 2.1], to which we refer interested readers for details.

3.1. Proof of second inequality in (17). We now prove the second inequality in (17). For a fixed $T > 0$, we take $L > 0$ larger if necessary so that

$$\frac{L^4}{(2\pi)^3} + \frac{3}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}} - 2} \left[2(2L^2 e^{2LT} + L^{\frac{1}{4}}) L^{\frac{1}{4}} + L^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left(\frac{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}} - 2}{3} \right) T C_{G_2} \right] \leq \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{9}{2}}} L^4 e^{4LT}. \quad (55)$$

Because Ξ deduced in (51) is divergence-free and mean-zero, we can define its potential

$$F \text{ such that } \nabla \times F = \Xi. \quad (56)$$

Next, considering our choice of Ξ_0 at first iteration from (33), we can explicitly see its vector potential F_0 defined by

$$F_0(t, x) \triangleq \frac{M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(2\pi)^3} \begin{pmatrix} \sin(x^3) \\ \cos(x^3) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (57)$$

which is identical to $\Xi_0(t, x)$. We define the following random magnetic helicity corresponding to random PDEs (23):

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_b(t) \triangleq \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} F(t, x) \cdot \Xi(t, x) dx \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,b}(t) \triangleq \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} F_0(t, x) \cdot \Xi_0(t, x) dx. \quad (58)$$

Due to the explicit expression of (33) and (57), we can directly compute

$$\|F_0(t)\|_{L^2} = \frac{M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,b}(t) = \frac{M_0(t)}{(2\pi)^3}. \quad (59)$$

Taking limit $q \rightarrow \infty$ in (32b) we see that

$$\|\Xi(t)\|_{L_x^2} \leq 2M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (60)$$

Implementing this, along with Hölder's inequality, (59), and (54) gives us

$$|\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_b(t) - \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,b}(t)| \leq \|F(t) - F_0(t)\|_{L_x^2} 2M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{M_0(t)}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \frac{a^{-b\beta}}{1 - a^{-b\beta}}. \quad (61)$$

We need to estimate $\|F(t) - F_0(t)\|_{L_x^2}$, and to do so, we write

$$\|F(t) - F_0(t)\|_{L_x^2} \stackrel{(51)}{\leq} \sum_{q \geq 0} \|(F_{q+1} - F_q)(t)\|_{L_x^2} \stackrel{(56)}{=} \sum_{q \geq 0} \|\nabla \times (-\Delta)^{-1}(\Xi_{q+1} - \Xi_q)(t)\|_{L_x^2}. \quad (62)$$

Now we apply the identity $\Xi_{q+1} = \Xi_l + d_{q+1}$ from (49) to (62) to deduce

$$\|(F - F_0)(t)\|_{L_x^2} \lesssim I_1(t) + I_2(t) \quad (63)$$

where

$$I_1(t) \triangleq \sum_{q \geq 0} \|\nabla \times (-\Delta)^{-1}(\Xi_l - \Xi_q)(t)\|_{L_x^2} \quad \text{and} \quad I_2(t) \triangleq \sum_{q \geq 0} \|\nabla \times (-\Delta)^{-1}d_{q+1}(t)\|_{L_x^2}. \quad (64)$$

To work on I_1 , we use the mean-zero property of $\Xi_l - \Xi_q$ and mollifier estimate to compute

$$\|\nabla \times (-\Delta)^{-1}(\Xi_l - \Xi_q)(t)\|_{L_x^2} \lesssim \|\Xi_l - \Xi_q\|_{C_{t,x}^1} \stackrel{(39)}{\lesssim} \|\Xi_q\|_{C_{t,x}^1} \stackrel{(32c)(38b)}{\lesssim} M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda_{q+1}^{-\frac{3\alpha}{2} + \frac{2}{b}}. \quad (65)$$

We apply (65) to I_1 of (64), and use the fact that $b > 39\alpha^{-1}$ due to (38b) to estimate by

$$I_1(t) \lesssim M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{q \geq 0} \lambda_{q+1}^{-\frac{3\alpha}{2} + \frac{2}{b}} \lesssim M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{q \geq 0} a^{b(q+1)(-\frac{3\alpha}{2} + \frac{2}{b})} \ll M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{a^{-1}}{1 - a^{-1}}. \quad (66)$$

Next, the estimate of I_2 is more delicate. Thus, we first write using (46), (47), and (48b),

$$d_{q+1} = N_\Lambda^{-2} \lambda_{q+1}^{-2} \operatorname{curl} \operatorname{curl} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Xi} a_\xi \phi_\xi \Psi_\xi \xi_2 - \mu^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Xi} \mathbb{P}\mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}(a_\xi^2 \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}(\phi_\xi^2 \varphi_\xi^2)) \xi_2. \quad (67)$$

Remark 3.2. *The convex integration scheme of [3] did not have a temporal corrector (see “ $d_{q+1} := d_{q+1}^p + d_{q+1}^c$ ” in [3, Equation (5.33b)]) while ours in (46) does. Moreover, the temporal corrector is more difficult to estimate than $d_{q+1}^p + d_{q+1}^c$ because $d_{q+1}^p + d_{q+1}^c$ has the favorable form of curl curl allowing us to take full advantage of $\nabla \times (-\Delta)^{-1}$.*

We apply this decomposition (67) to I_2 of (64) to split to

$$I_2(t) \lesssim I_{21}(t) + I_{22}(t) \quad (68)$$

where

$$I_{21}(t) \triangleq \sum_{q \geq 0} \lambda_{q+1}^{-2} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Xi} \|\nabla \times (a_\xi \phi_\xi \Psi_\xi \xi_2)\|_{C_t L_x^2}, \quad (69a)$$

$$I_{22}(t) \triangleq \mu^{-1} \sum_{q \geq 0} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Xi} \|\nabla \times (-\Delta)^{-1} \mathbb{P}\mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}(a_\xi^2 \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}(\phi_\xi^2 \varphi_\xi^2)) \xi_2\|_{C_t L_x^2}. \quad (69b)$$

To estimate I_{21} , we use the fact that

$$-1 - \beta + \frac{21\alpha}{2} + \frac{14}{b} \stackrel{(38b)}{<} -1 + \frac{21\alpha}{2} + 14\left(\frac{\alpha}{39}\right) \stackrel{(28)}{<} -\frac{1}{2}, \quad (70)$$

to compute

$$\begin{aligned} I_{21}(t) &\stackrel{(69a)}{\lesssim} \sum_{q \geq 0} \lambda_{q+1}^{-2} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_{\Xi}} \|a_{\xi}\|_{C_x C_x^1} \|\nabla(\phi_{\xi} \Psi_{\xi})\|_{C_x L_x^2} \stackrel{(50)(264b)}{\lesssim} \sum_{q \geq 0} \lambda_{q+1}^{-2} (\delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} t^{-7} M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}) \lambda_{q+1} \\ &\stackrel{(26)(38b)}{\approx} M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{q \geq 0} \lambda_{q+1}^{-1-\beta+\frac{2\mu}{2}+\frac{1}{b}} \stackrel{(70)}{\ll} M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{a^{-1}}{1-a^{-1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

Next, we come to I_{22} of (69b) that arises due to the temporal corrector. We observe that $\phi_{\xi}^2 \varphi_{\xi}^2$ is $(\mathbb{T}/\lambda_{q+1}\sigma)^3$ -periodic so that minimal active frequency in $\mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}(\phi_{\xi}^2 \varphi_{\xi}^2)$ is given by $\lambda_{q+1}\sigma$. Therefore, using

$$-5\eta + 21\alpha + \frac{28}{b} < 0 \text{ and } b\left(-5\eta + 21\alpha + \frac{28}{b}\right) < -1$$

that can be verified using (38a), (38b), and (28), we estimate from (69b) by Lemma A.5

$$\begin{aligned} I_{22}(t) &\stackrel{(265)}{\lesssim} \sum_{q \geq 0} \mu^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_{\Xi}} (\lambda_{q+1}\sigma)^{-1} \|a_{\xi}^2\|_{C_x C_x^2} \|(\phi_{\xi} \varphi_{\xi})^2\|_{C_x L_x^2} \\ &\stackrel{(50)(264b)(38a)}{\lesssim} \sum_{q \geq 0} \lambda_{q+1}^{-5\eta+21\alpha+\frac{28}{b}} M_0(t) \ll M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{a^{-1}}{1-a^{-1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

Due to this estimate, we can now conclude that

$$I_2(t) \stackrel{(68)}{\lesssim} I_{21}(t) + I_{22}(t) \stackrel{(72)(71)}{\ll} M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{a^{-1}}{1-a^{-1}}. \quad (73)$$

At last, applying (66) and (73) to (63) gives us

$$\|(F - F_0)(t)\|_{L^2} \stackrel{(63)}{\leq} I_1(t) + I_2(t) \stackrel{(66)(73)}{\ll} M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{a^{-1}}{1-a^{-1}}. \quad (74)$$

Now we use the fact that $(2\pi)^3 + 1 < a^{b\beta}$ from (35b) to deduce from (61)

$$|\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_b(t) - \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,b}(t)| \stackrel{(74)}{\leq} M_0(t) \frac{a^{-1}}{1-a^{-1}} + \frac{M_0(t)}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \frac{a^{-b\beta}}{1-a^{-b\beta}} \stackrel{(59)(35b)}{\leq} \frac{2\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,b}(t)}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \quad (75)$$

for $a \in 2\mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large. Consequently, along with (59) we can deduce

$$0 < \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,b}(t) \left(1 - \frac{2}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}}\right) \leq \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_b(t). \quad (76)$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_b(0)| &\leq |\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_b(0) - \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,b}(0)| + |\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,b}(0)| \stackrel{(75)(59)(27)}{\leq} \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,b}(0) \frac{2}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \frac{L^4}{(2\pi)^3} \\ &\stackrel{(55)(59)}{\leq} \frac{3\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,b}(T)}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} - \frac{3}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}} - 2} \left[2(2M_0(T)^{\frac{1}{2}} + L^{\frac{1}{4}})L^{\frac{1}{4}} + L^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left(\frac{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}} - 2}{3}\right) TC_{G_2} \right] \\ &\stackrel{(76)}{\leq} \left(\frac{3}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}} - 2}\right) \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_b(T) - \frac{3}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}} - 2} \left[2(2M_0(T)^{\frac{1}{2}} + L^{\frac{1}{4}})L^{\frac{1}{4}} + L^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left(\frac{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}} - 2}{3}\right) TC_{G_2} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

At last, we are ready to conclude that the magnetic helicity grows at least twice from initial time on $\{t \geq T\}$ as follows. First, using the fact that $G_2 B_2(0) = 0$, we can write

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} A(0) \cdot b(0) dx \stackrel{(2)(22)}{=} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \nabla \times (-\Delta)^{-1} \Xi(0) \cdot \Xi(0) dx \stackrel{(56)(58)}{=} \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_b(0). \quad (78)$$

Now we are ready to estimate on $\{t \geq T\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} A(0) \cdot b(0) dx \stackrel{(78)(77)}{\leq} \left(\frac{3}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}} - 2} \right) \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_b(T) \\
& - \frac{3}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}} - 2} \left[2(2M_0(T)^{\frac{1}{2}} + L^{\frac{1}{4}})L^{\frac{1}{4}} + L^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left(\frac{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}} - 2}{3} \right) TC_{G_2} \right] \\
& \stackrel{(58)(56)(22)(2)}{\leq} \left(\frac{3}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}} - 2} \right) \left[\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} A(T) \cdot b(T) dx \right. \\
& \quad \left. + 2(\|\Xi\|_{C_T L_x^2} + \|G_2 B_2\|_{C_T L_x^2}) \|G_2 B_2\|_{C_T L_x^2} + \|G_2 B_2\|_{C_T L_x^2}^2 \right] \\
& - \frac{3}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}} - 2} \left[2(2M_0(T)^{\frac{1}{2}} + L^{\frac{1}{4}})L^{\frac{1}{4}} + L^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left(\frac{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}} - 2}{3} \right) TC_{G_2} \right] \\
& \stackrel{(32b)(25)}{\leq} \left(\frac{3}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}} - 2} \right) \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} A(T) \cdot b(T) dx - TC_{G_2}. \tag{79}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by definition of \mathcal{H}_b from (5b), we have shown that

$$\frac{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}} - 2}{3} [\mathcal{H}_b(0) + TC_{G_2}] \leq \mathcal{H}_b(T),$$

which implies the second inequality in (17) because $\frac{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}} - 2}{3} \approx 4.6$.

3.2. Proof of the third inequality in (17). As we will see, although the overall computations are less technical than the proof of the second inequality in (17), the constants must be computed more carefully in order to prove the desired double growth of the cross helicity (see Remark 3.3). For the fixed $T > 0$, we take $L > 1$ larger if necessary to satisfy

$$\frac{L^4}{2^{\frac{5}{2}} \pi^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \left(\frac{2^{\frac{5}{2}} \pi^{\frac{3}{2}} + 2}{4\pi^3 - 2^{\frac{5}{2}} \pi^{\frac{3}{2}} - 1} \right) [4L^2 e^{2LT} L^{\frac{1}{4}} + 3L^{\frac{1}{2}}] \leq \frac{L^4 e^{ALT}}{(2\pi)^{\frac{9}{2}}}. \tag{80}$$

Similarly to (58) we define random cross helicity corresponding to our random PDEs (23):

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_u(t) \triangleq \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v(t, x) \cdot \Xi(t, x) dx \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,u}(t) \triangleq \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v_0(t, x) \cdot \Xi_0(t, x) dx. \tag{81}$$

Considering our choices of v_0 and Ξ_0 in (33), we can directly compute

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,u}(t) = \frac{M_0(t)}{2^{\frac{5}{2}} \pi^{\frac{3}{2}}}. \tag{82}$$

Remark 3.3. As we pointed out already, $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,u}(t) = \frac{M_0(t)}{2^{\frac{5}{2}} \pi^{\frac{3}{2}}}$ from (82) is larger than $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,b}(t) = \frac{M_0(t)}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}}$ from (59). This difference made it impossible for us to prove the double growth of cross helicity in our initial attempt when we used a straight-forward bound of

$$\|\Xi_0(t)\|_{L_x^2} \stackrel{(32b)}{\leq} 2M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

in (84) similarly to (60). It turns out that this can be overcome by relying on the identity

$$\|\Xi_0(t)\|_{L_x^2} = \frac{M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}}. \tag{83}$$

We compute by starting from (81) and relying on (32a) and (83),

$$|\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_u(t) - \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,u}(t)| \leq 2M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\Xi(t) - \Xi_0(t)\|_{L_x^2} + \|v(t) - v_0(t)\|_{L_x^2} \frac{M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}}. \quad (84)$$

Then we can compute considering that $a^{b\beta} > (2\pi)^3 + 1$ from the first inequality of (35b),

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_u(t) - \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,u}(t)| &\stackrel{(84)(54)}{\leq} \frac{M_0(t)}{2^{\frac{5}{2}}\pi^{\frac{3}{2}}} \left[2^{\frac{5}{2}}\pi^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(2 + \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \right) \frac{a^{-b\beta}}{1 - a^{-b\beta}} \right] \\ &\stackrel{(82)}{\leq} \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,u}(t) \left(\frac{2^{\frac{5}{2}}\pi^{\frac{3}{2}} + 1}{4\pi^3} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

It follows that

$$0 < \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,u}(t) \left(1 - \frac{2^{\frac{5}{2}}\pi^{\frac{3}{2}} + 1}{4\pi^3} \right) \leq \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_u(t). \quad (86)$$

This leads to

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_u(0)| &\leq |\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_u(0) - \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,u}(0)| + \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,u}(0) \stackrel{(85)(82)}{\leq} \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,u}(0) \left(\frac{2^{\frac{5}{2}}\pi^{\frac{3}{2}} + 1}{4\pi^3} \right) + \frac{L^4}{2^{\frac{5}{2}}\pi^{\frac{3}{2}}} \\ &\stackrel{(80)(82)(86)}{\leq} \left(\frac{2^{\frac{5}{2}}\pi^{\frac{3}{2}} + 2}{4\pi^3 - 2^{\frac{5}{2}}\pi^{\frac{3}{2}} - 1} \right) \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_u(T) - \left(\frac{2^{\frac{5}{2}}\pi^{\frac{3}{2}} + 2}{4\pi^3 - 2^{\frac{5}{2}}\pi^{\frac{3}{2}} - 1} \right) [4M_0(T)^{\frac{1}{2}}L^{\frac{1}{4}} + 3L^{\frac{1}{2}}]. \end{aligned} \quad (87)$$

We are ready to conclude the third inequality in (17) as follow: as $G_k B_k(0) = 0$ for $k \in \{1, 2\}$, we can write

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (u \cdot b)(0) dx \stackrel{(22)}{=} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (v \cdot \Xi)(0) dx \stackrel{(81)}{=} \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_u(0). \quad (88)$$

and hence on $\{T \leq t\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (u \cdot b)(0) dx \right| &\stackrel{(87)}{\leq} \left(\frac{2^{\frac{5}{2}}\pi^{\frac{3}{2}} + 2}{4\pi^3 - 2^{\frac{5}{2}}\pi^{\frac{3}{2}} - 1} \right) \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_u(T) - \left(\frac{2^{\frac{5}{2}}\pi^{\frac{3}{2}} + 2}{4\pi^3 - 2^{\frac{5}{2}}\pi^{\frac{3}{2}} - 1} \right) [4M_0(T)^{\frac{1}{2}}L^{\frac{1}{4}} + 3L^{\frac{1}{2}}] \\ &\stackrel{(81)(22)}{\leq} \left(\frac{2^{\frac{5}{2}}\pi^{\frac{3}{2}} + 2}{4\pi^3 - 2^{\frac{5}{2}}\pi^{\frac{3}{2}} - 1} \right) \left[\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (u \cdot b)T dx \right. \\ &\quad + (\|v(T)\|_{L_x^2} + \|G_1 B_1(T)\|_{L_x^2}) \|G_2 B_2(T)\|_{L_x^2} + \|G_1 B_1(T)\|_{L_x^2} (\|\Xi(T)\|_{L_x^2} + \|G_2 B_2(T)\|_{L_x^2}) \\ &\quad \left. + \|G_1 B_1(T)\|_{L_x^2} \|G_2 B_2(T)\|_{L_x^2} \right] - \left(\frac{2^{\frac{5}{2}}\pi^{\frac{3}{2}} + 2}{4\pi^3 - 2^{\frac{5}{2}}\pi^{\frac{3}{2}} - 1} \right) [4M_0(T)^{\frac{1}{2}}L^{\frac{1}{4}} + 3L^{\frac{1}{2}}] \\ &\stackrel{(32)(25)}{\leq} \left(\frac{2^{\frac{5}{2}}\pi^{\frac{3}{2}} + 2}{4\pi^3 - 2^{\frac{5}{2}}\pi^{\frac{3}{2}} - 1} \right) \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (u \cdot b)(T) dx. \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$\left(\frac{4\pi^3 - 2^{\frac{5}{2}}\pi^{\frac{3}{2}} - 1}{2^{\frac{5}{2}}\pi^{\frac{3}{2}} + 2} \right) \mathcal{H}_u(0) \leq \mathcal{H}_u(T)$$

which implies the third inequality in (17) because $\left(\frac{4\pi^3 - 2^{\frac{5}{2}}\pi^{\frac{3}{2}} - 1}{2^{\frac{5}{2}}\pi^{\frac{3}{2}} + 2} \right) \approx 2.7$. This concludes the proof of Theorem 2.1.

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.2

Considering (10) with $v_1 = v_2 = 0$, we define

$$v \triangleq \Upsilon_1^{-1} u \text{ where } \Upsilon_1 \triangleq e^{B_1} \text{ and } \Xi \triangleq \Upsilon_2^{-1} b \text{ where } \Upsilon_2 \triangleq e^{B_2} \quad (89)$$

to obtain

$$\partial_t v + \frac{1}{2} v + \operatorname{div}(\Upsilon_1 v \otimes v - \Upsilon_1^{-1} \Upsilon_2^2 \Xi \otimes \Xi) + \Upsilon_1^{-1} \nabla \pi = 0, \quad (90a)$$

$$\partial_t \Xi + \frac{1}{2} \Xi + \operatorname{div}(\Upsilon_1 \Xi \otimes v - \Upsilon_1 v \otimes \Xi) = 0 \quad (90b)$$

(see [89, Equation (20)]). We define for $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$,

$$T_L \triangleq \inf\{t > 0 : \max_{k=1,2} |B_k(t)| \geq L^{\frac{1}{4}}\} \wedge \inf\{t > 0 : \max_{k=1,2} \|B_k\|_{C_t^{\frac{1}{2}-2\delta}} \geq L^{\frac{1}{2}}\} \wedge L \quad (91)$$

so that $T_L > 0$ and $\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} T_L = +\infty$ **P**-a.s. We take the same definitions of λ_q and δ_q from (26), introduce m_L , and define $M_0(t)$ differently from (27) as follows:

$$m_L \triangleq \sqrt{3} L^{\frac{5}{4}} e^{\frac{5}{2} L^{\frac{1}{4}}}, \quad M_0 \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \text{ such that } M_0(t) = \begin{cases} e^{2L} & \text{if } t \leq 0, \\ e^{4Lt+2L} & \text{if } t \geq T \wedge L, \end{cases} \quad (92a)$$

$$0 \leq M_0'(t) \leq 8LM_0(t), \quad M_0''(t) \leq 32L^2 M_0(t) \quad (92b)$$

(see [89, Equation (211)]). We take the same definition of α in (28) and search for the solution $(v_q, \Xi_q, \mathring{R}_q^v, \mathring{R}_q^\Xi)$ for $q \in \mathbb{N}_0$ that solves over $[t_q, T_L]$

$$\partial_t v_q + \frac{1}{2} v_q + \operatorname{div}(\Upsilon_1(v_q \otimes v_q) - \Upsilon_1^{-1} \Upsilon_2^2(\Xi_q \otimes \Xi_q)) + \nabla p_q = \operatorname{div} \mathring{R}_q^v, \quad \nabla \cdot v_q = 0, \quad (93a)$$

$$\partial_t \Xi_q + \frac{1}{2} \Xi_q + \Upsilon_1 \operatorname{div}(\Xi_q \otimes v_q - v_q \otimes \Xi_q) = \operatorname{div} \mathring{R}_q^\Xi, \quad \nabla \cdot \Xi_q = 0, \quad (93b)$$

where t_q was defined in (30), and \mathring{R}_q^v is a symmetric trace-free matrix and \mathring{R}_q^Ξ is a skew-symmetric matrix. We extend B_k to $[-2, 0]$ by $B_k(t) \equiv B_k(0)$ for $k \in \{1, 2\}$ and all $t \in [-2, 0]$ again and consider the following inductive hypothesis.

Hypothesis 4.1. *For universal constants $c_v, c_\Xi > 0$ from [89, Equations (120) and (131)], the solution $(v_q, \Xi_q, \mathring{R}_q^v, \mathring{R}_q^\Xi)$ to (93) satisfies for all $t \in [t_q, T_L]$,*

$$\|v_q\|_{C_{t,q} L_x^2} \leq m_L M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq q} \delta_i^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \leq 2m_L M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (94a)$$

$$\|\Xi_q\|_{C_{t,q} L_x^2} \leq m_L M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq q} \delta_i^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \leq 2m_L M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (94b)$$

$$\|v_q\|_{C_{t,x,q}^1} \leq m_L M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda_q^4, \quad \|\Xi_q\|_{C_{t,x,q}^1} \leq m_L M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda_q^4, \quad (94c)$$

$$\|\mathring{R}_q^v\|_{C_{t,q} L_x^1} \leq c_v M_0(t) \delta_{q+1}, \quad \|\mathring{R}_q^\Xi\|_{C_{t,q} L_x^1} \leq c_\Xi M_0(t) \delta_{q+1}. \quad (94d)$$

Proposition 4.1. *Let*

$$v_0(t, x) \triangleq \frac{m_L M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \begin{pmatrix} \sin(x^3) \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \Xi_0(t, x) \triangleq \frac{m_L M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(2\pi)^3} \begin{pmatrix} \sin(x^3) \\ \cos(x^3) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (95)$$

Then, together with

$$\hat{R}_0^v(t, x) \triangleq \frac{m_L(\frac{d}{dt} + \frac{1}{2})M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\cos(x^3) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\cos(x^3) & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{R}(-\Delta)^{m_1} v_0(t, x)$$

and

$$\hat{R}_0^\Xi(t, x) \triangleq \frac{m_L(\frac{d}{dt} + \frac{1}{2})M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(2\pi)^3} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\cos(x^3) \\ 0 & 0 & \sin(x^3) \\ \cos(x^3) & -\sin(x^3) & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{R}^\Xi(-\Delta)^{m_2} \Xi_0(t, x),$$

(v_0, Ξ_0) satisfies Hypothesis 4.1 and (93) at level $q = 0$ over $[t_0, T_L]$ provided

$$\sqrt{3}((2\pi)^3 + 1)^2 < \sqrt{3}a^{2\beta b} \leq \frac{\min\{c_v, c_\Xi\}e^{L-\frac{5}{2}L^{\frac{1}{4}}}}{L^{\frac{3}{4}}[8(4L + \frac{1}{2})(2\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}} + 36\pi^{\frac{3}{2}}]}, \quad L \leq \frac{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}a^4 - 2}{2}. \quad (96)$$

Finally, $v_0(t, x)$, $\Xi_0(t, x)$, $\hat{R}_0^v(t, x)$, and $\hat{R}_0^\Xi(t, x)$ are all deterministic over $[t_0, 0]$.

Proof of Proposition 4.1. This result can be proven similarly to the proof of [89, Proposition 5.6]. The lack of diffusion in our current case has zero effect in its proof. \square

Proposition 4.2. *Let L satisfy*

$$\sqrt{3}((2\pi)^3 + 1)^2 < \frac{\min\{c_v, c_\Xi\}e^{L-\frac{5}{2}L^{\frac{1}{4}}}}{L^{\frac{3}{4}}[8(4L + \frac{1}{2})(2\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}} + 36\pi^{\frac{3}{2}}]}. \quad (97)$$

Then there exist a choice of parameters a, b , and β such that (96) is fulfilled and the following holds. Suppose that $(v_q, \Xi_q, \hat{R}_q^v, \hat{R}_q^\Xi)$ are $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted processes that solve (93) and satisfy Hypothesis 4.1 over $[t_q, T_L]$. Then there exist $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted processes $(v_{q+1}, \Xi_{q+1}, \hat{R}_{q+1}^v, \hat{R}_{q+1}^\Xi)$ that solve (93) and satisfy Hypothesis 4.1 at level $q + 1$, and for all $t \in [t_{q+1}, T_L]$,

$$\|v_{q+1}(t) - v_q(t)\|_{L_x^2} \leq m_L M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Xi_{q+1}(t) - \Xi_q(t)\|_{L_x^2} \leq m_L M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (98)$$

Finally, if $(v_q, \Xi_q, \hat{R}_q^v, \hat{R}_q^\Xi)(t, x)$ is deterministic over $[t_q, 0]$, then $(v_{q+1}, \Xi_{q+1}, \hat{R}_{q+1}^v, \hat{R}_{q+1}^\Xi)(t, x)$ is also deterministic over $t \in [t_{q+1}, 0]$.

Proof of Proposition 4.2. Again, this result can be proven similarly to [89, Proposition 5.7] by taking into account of Remark 3.1 (2). For subsequent proof again, we sketch some ideas, state definitions and key estimates from [89]. The choice of parameters η, σ, r, μ, b , and l are identical to (38a), and (38b). In addition to v_l, Ξ_l, \hat{R}_l^v , and \hat{R}_l^Ξ in (39), we mollify Υ_k for $k \in \{1, 2\}$ and define $\Upsilon_{k,l} \triangleq \Upsilon_k * \vartheta_l$ for $k \in \{1, 2\}$. It follows that the corresponding mollified system is

$$\partial_t v_l + \frac{1}{2} v_l + \operatorname{div}(\Upsilon_{1,l}(v_l \otimes v_l) - \Upsilon_{1,l}^{-1} \Upsilon_{2,l}^2 (\Xi_l \otimes \Xi_l)) + \nabla p_l = \operatorname{div}(\hat{R}_l^v + R_{\text{coml}}^v), \quad (99a)$$

$$\partial_t \Xi_l + \frac{1}{2} \Xi_l + \Upsilon_{1,l} \operatorname{div}(\Xi_l \otimes v_l - v_l \otimes \Xi_l) = \operatorname{div}(\hat{R}_l^\Xi + R_{\text{coml}}^\Xi), \quad (99b)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} p_l \triangleq & \left(\Upsilon_1 \frac{|v_q|^2}{3} \right) *_{x, \varrho_l} *_{t, \vartheta_l} - \left(\Upsilon_1^{-1} \Upsilon_2^2 \frac{|\Xi_q|^2}{3} \right) *_{x, \varrho_l} *_{t, \vartheta_l} \\ & + p_q *_{x, \varrho_l} *_{t, \vartheta_l} - \Upsilon_{1,l} \frac{|v_l|^2}{3} + \Upsilon_{1,l}^{-1} \Upsilon_{2,l}^2 \frac{|\Xi_l|^2}{3}, \end{aligned} \quad (100a)$$

$$R_{\text{coml}}^v \triangleq -(\Upsilon_1(v_q \otimes v_q)) *_{x, \varrho_l} *_{t, \vartheta_l} + (\Upsilon_1^{-1} \Upsilon_2^2 (\Xi_q \otimes \Xi_q)) *_{x, \varrho_l} *_{t, \vartheta_l}$$

$$+ \Upsilon_{1,l}(v_l \otimes v_l) - \Upsilon_{1,l}^{-1} \Upsilon_{2,l}^2(\Xi_l \otimes \Xi_l), \quad (100b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\text{com1}}^{\Xi} \triangleq & - (\Upsilon_1(\Xi_q \otimes v_q)) *_x \varrho_l *_t \vartheta_l + (\Upsilon_1(v_q \otimes \Xi_q)) *_x \varrho_l *_t \vartheta_l \\ & + \Upsilon_{1,l}(\Xi_l \otimes v_l) - \Upsilon_{1,l}(v_l \otimes \Xi_l) \end{aligned} \quad (100c)$$

(see [89, Equations (239)-(240)]). With the same χ from (42), a_ξ for $\xi \in \Lambda_\Xi$ and ρ_Ξ from (43), we define

$$\bar{a}_\xi(t, x) \triangleq \Upsilon_{1,l}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t) a_\xi(t, x) \stackrel{(43)}{=} \Upsilon_{1,l}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t) \rho_\Xi^{\frac{1}{2}}(t, x) \gamma_\xi \left(-\frac{\hat{R}_l^\Xi(t, x)}{\rho_\Xi(t, x)} \right) \quad \forall \xi \in \Lambda_\Xi$$

(see [89, Equation (220)]). Differently from (44), we need to define

$$\hat{G}^\Xi \triangleq \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Xi} \bar{a}_\xi^2 (\Upsilon_{1,l} \xi \otimes \xi - \Upsilon_{1,l}^{-1} \Upsilon_{2,l}^2 \xi_2 \otimes \xi_2)$$

(see [89, Equation (216)]). We define ρ_v and a_ξ for $\xi \in \Lambda_v$ identically to (49) and then

$$\bar{a}_\xi(t, x) \triangleq \Upsilon_{1,l}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t) a_\xi(t, x) \stackrel{(45)}{=} \Upsilon_{1,l}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t) \rho_v^{\frac{1}{2}}(t, x) \gamma_\xi \left(\text{Id} - \frac{\hat{R}_l^v(t, x) + \hat{G}^\Xi(t, x)}{\rho_v(t, x)} \right) \quad \forall \xi \in \Lambda_v$$

(see [89, Equation (218)]). We define w_{q+1} and d_{q+1} identically to (45) where the temporal correctors are defined identically to (47), and $w_{q+1}^p, w_{q+1}^c, d_{q+1}^p$, and d_{q+1}^c , satisfy this time

$$N_\Lambda^{-2} \lambda_{q+1}^{-2} \text{curl curl} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda} \bar{a}_\xi \phi_\xi \Psi_\xi \xi = w_{q+1}^p + w_{q+1}^c, \quad (101a)$$

$$N_\Lambda^{-2} \lambda_{q+1}^{-2} \text{curl curl} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Xi} \bar{a}_\xi \phi_\xi \Psi_\xi \xi_2 = d_{q+1}^p + d_{q+1}^c \quad (101b)$$

(see [89, Equation (258)]). Under these settings we define (v_{q+1}, Ξ_{q+1}) identically to (50). We will subsequently rely on the following estimate from [89, Equation (248b)]:

$$\|\bar{a}_\xi\|_{C_{t,q+1}^j C_x^j} \lesssim m_L^{\frac{1}{2}} L^{-5j-2} M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \forall j \geq 0, \xi \in \Lambda_\Xi. \quad (102)$$

□

We are ready to prove Theorem 2.2. Given any $T > 0$ and $\kappa \in (0, 1)$, again, starting from the solution $(v_0, \Xi_0, \hat{R}_0^v, \hat{R}_0^\Xi)$ at step $q = 0$ from Proposition 4.1, by taking $L > 0$ sufficiently large enough to satisfy (97), Proposition 4.1 further gives us $(v_q, \Xi_q, \hat{R}_q^v, \hat{R}_q^\Xi)$ for all $q \in \mathbb{N}$ that satisfy Hypothesis 4.1, (93), and (98). Both $\{v_q\}_{q \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ and $\{\Xi_q\}_{q \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ are Cauchy in $C([0, T_L]; \dot{H}^\gamma(\mathbb{T}^3))$ for all $\gamma \in (0, \frac{\beta}{4+\beta})$ and we can define the limiting processes

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} v_q \triangleq v \text{ and } \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \Xi_q \triangleq \Xi \text{ both in } C([0, T_L]; \dot{H}^\gamma(\mathbb{T}^3)). \quad (103)$$

Improving [89, Equations (234)] similarly to (54) we obtain

$$\max\{\|\Xi(t) - \Xi_0(t)\|_{L_x^2}, \|v(t) - v_0(t)\|_{L_x^2}\} \leq m_L M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{a^{-b\beta}}{1 - a^{-b\beta}} \right). \quad (104)$$

All the claims in Theorem 2.2 except the second and third inequalities in (20) follow from [89, Proof of Theorem 2.3]. Thus, we now focus on the proofs of the second and third inequalities in (20).

4.1. **Proof of the second inequality in (20).** For a fixed $T > 0$, we take $L > 0$ larger if necessary so that

$$e^{3L^{\frac{1}{2}}} \left(1 + \frac{2}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \right) \left(\frac{2(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}} - 2} \right) \leq e^{4LT} \text{ and } T \leq L^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (105)$$

First, because Ξ deduced via (103) is divergence-free and mean-zero, we obtain F defined identically to (56). Considering the definition of Ξ_0 in (95), we can explicitly see its vector potential F_0 defined by

$$F_0(t, x) \triangleq \frac{m_L M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(2\pi)^3} \begin{pmatrix} \sin(x^3) \\ \cos(x^3) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (106)$$

which is, again, identical to Ξ_0 . We define $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_b$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,b}$ corresponding to (93) identically to (58) and compute directly

$$\|F_0(t)\|_{L_x^2} = \frac{m_L M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \text{ and } \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,b}(t) = \frac{m_L^2 M_0(t)}{(2\pi)^3}. \quad (107)$$

Due to (94b) we know

$$\|\Xi(t)\|_{L_x^2} \leq 2m_L M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (108)$$

Considering this, along with Hölder's inequality, leads us from (58) to

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_b(t) - \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,b}(t)| &\leq \|F(t) - F_0(t)\|_{L_x^2} \|\Xi(t)\|_{L_x^2} + \|F_0(t)\|_{L_x^2} \|\Xi(t) - \Xi_0(t)\|_{L_x^2} \\ (108)(107)(104) &\leq \|F(t) - F_0(t)\|_{L_x^2} 2m_L M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{m_L^2 M_0(t)}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \left(\frac{a^{-b\beta}}{1 - a^{-b\beta}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (109)$$

Identically to (62), (63), we have

$$\|(F - F_0)(t)\|_{L_x^2} \stackrel{(62)}{\leq} \sum_{q \geq 0} \|\nabla \times (-\Delta)^{-1} (\Xi_{q+1} - \Xi_q)(t)\|_{L_x^2} \stackrel{(63)}{\leq} I_1(t) + I_2(t) \quad (110)$$

for I_1, I_2 defined in (64). Similarly to (65) we can estimate

$$\|\nabla \times (-\Delta)^{-1} (\Xi_l - \Xi_q)(t)\|_{L_x^2} \lesssim \|\Xi_q\|_{C_{l,x}^1} \stackrel{(94c)}{\lesssim} l m_L M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda_q^4 \stackrel{(38b)}{\approx} m_L M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda_{q+1}^{-\frac{3q}{2} + \frac{2}{b}}. \quad (111)$$

Similar computations to (66) give us

$$I_1(t) \stackrel{(64)(111)}{\lesssim} \sum_{q \geq 0} m_L M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda_{q+1}^{-\frac{3q}{2} + \frac{2}{b}} \ll M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{a^{-1}}{1 - a^{-1}}. \quad (112)$$

Similarly to (67) we can write using (46), (47), and (101),

$$d_{q+1} = N_\Lambda^{-2} \lambda_{q+1}^{-2} \operatorname{curl} \operatorname{curl} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Xi} \tilde{a}_\xi \phi_\xi \Psi_\xi \xi_2 - \mu^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Xi} \mathbb{P} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} (a_\xi^2 \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} (\phi_\xi^2 \varphi_\xi^2)) \xi_2. \quad (113)$$

Consequently, we get a bound of I_2 that is analogous to (68) as follows:

$$I_2(t) \lesssim I_{21}(t) + I_{22}(t) \quad (114)$$

where

$$I_{21}(t) \triangleq \sum_{q \geq 0} \lambda_{q+1}^{-2} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Xi} \|\nabla \times (\tilde{a}_\xi \phi_\xi \Psi_\xi \xi_2)\|_{C_t L_x^2}, \quad (115a)$$

$$I_{22}(t) \triangleq \mu^{-1} \sum_{q \geq 0} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Xi} \|\nabla \times (-\Delta)^{-1} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} (a_\xi^2 \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} (\phi_\xi^2 \varphi_\xi^2)) \xi_2\|_{C_t L_x^2}. \quad (115b)$$

We can now estimate $I_{21}(t)$ identically to (70)-(71), with the only exception that we rely on (102) instead of (50) and thereby obtain an extra factor of $m_L^{\frac{1}{2}}$: starting from (115a)

$$\begin{aligned} I_{21}(t) &\lesssim \sum_{q \geq 0} \lambda_{q+1}^{-2} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_{\Xi}} \|\bar{a}_{\xi}\|_{C_t C_x^1} \|\nabla(\phi_{\xi} \Psi_{\xi})\|_{C_t L_x^2} \stackrel{(102)(264b)}{\lesssim} \sum_{q \geq 0} \lambda_{q+1}^{-2} (\delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} t^{-7} m_L^{\frac{1}{2}} M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}) \lambda_{q+1} \\ &\stackrel{(26)(38b)}{\lesssim} m_L^{\frac{1}{2}} M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{q \geq 0} \lambda_{q+1}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \ll M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{a^{-1}}{1-a^{-1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (116)$$

As we described in the proof of Proposition 4.2, the definition of the temporal corrector never changed from the proof of Theorem 2.1 and therefore our I_{22} in (115b) is same as (69b). Hence, the estimate (72) directly applies in our current case, yielding

$$I_2(t) \stackrel{(114)}{\lesssim} I_{21}(t) + I_{22}(t) \stackrel{(116)(72)}{\ll} M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{a^{-1}}{1-a^{-1}}. \quad (117)$$

Applying (112) and (117) to (110) gives us

$$\|(F - F_0)(t)\|_{L_x^2} \stackrel{(110)}{\leq} I_1(t) + I_2(t) \stackrel{(112)(117)}{\ll} M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{a^{-1}}{1-a^{-1}}. \quad (118)$$

Now we apply (118) and use $(2\pi)^3 + 1 < a^{b\beta}$ from (96) to deduce from (109)

$$|\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_b(t) - \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,b}(t)| \leq M_0(t) \frac{a^{-1}}{1-a^{-1}} + \frac{m_L^2 M_0(t)}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \frac{a^{-b\beta}}{1-a^{-b\beta}} \stackrel{(107)(96)}{\leq} \frac{2\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,b}(t)}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \quad (119)$$

for $a \in 2\mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large. Consequently,

$$0 < \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,b}(t) \left(1 - \frac{2}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}}\right) \leq \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_b(t). \quad (120)$$

The following computations will diverge from (77), (78), and (79). First, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_b(0)| &\leq |\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_b(0) - \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,b}(0)| + |\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,b}(0)| \stackrel{(119)(107)(92)}{=} \frac{m_L^2 e^{2L}}{(2\pi)^3} \left(1 + \frac{2}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}}\right) \\ &\stackrel{(105)}{\leq} \left(\frac{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}} - 2}{2(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}}\right) e^{-3L\frac{1}{2}} \frac{m_L^2 e^{4LT+2L}}{(2\pi)^3} \stackrel{(92)(107)}{=} \left(\frac{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}} - 2}{2(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}}\right) e^{-3L\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,b}(T). \end{aligned} \quad (121)$$

We make a key observation from (120) that $\mathcal{H}_b(t) \geq 0$ P-a.s.:

$$\mathcal{H}_b(t) \stackrel{(5b)(89)(56)(58)}{=} e^{-2B_2(t)} \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_b(t) \stackrel{(120)}{\geq} 0. \quad (122)$$

Therefore, using the fact that $B_2(0) = 0$, on $\{t \geq T\}$, we can deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \left|e^T \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (A \cdot b)(0) dx\right| &\stackrel{(105)}{\leq} e^{L\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{H}_b(0) \stackrel{(121)}{\leq} \left(\frac{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}} - 2}{2(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}}\right) e^{-2L\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,b}(T) \\ &\stackrel{(91)}{\leq} e^{-2L\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) e^{2L\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{H}_b(T) \stackrel{(122)}{<} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (A \cdot b)(T) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (123)$$

This implies according to definition from (5b),

$$2e^T \mathcal{H}_b(0) < \mathcal{H}_b(T)$$

and thus the second inequality in (20).

4.2. **Proof of the third inequality in (20).** For the fixed $T > 0$ we take $L > 1$ larger if necessary to satisfy

$$1 + \frac{8}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \leq e^{-2L^{\frac{1}{2}}} e^{4LT} \left(\frac{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}} - 8}{2(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \right). \quad (124)$$

We continue to use the same notations of $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_b, \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,b}$ in (58) and $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_u, \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,u}$ in (81). Directly from (95), we can compute

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,u}(t) = \frac{m_L^2 M_0(t)}{2^{\frac{5}{2}} \pi^{\frac{3}{2}}}. \quad (125)$$

Similarly to (84) we can compute using (94a) and (94b), starting from (81),

$$|\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_u(t) - \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,u}(t)| \leq (\|v(t) - v_0(t)\|_{L_x^2} + \|\Xi(t) - \Xi_0(t)\|_{L_x^2}) 2m_L M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (126)$$

Similarly to (85) we can compute considering that $a^{b\beta} > (2\pi)^3 + 1$ from (96),

$$|\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_u(t) - \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,u}(t)| \stackrel{(126)(104)}{\leq} 4m_L^2 M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{a^{-b\beta}}{1 - a^{-b\beta}} \right) \stackrel{(82)}{\leq} \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,u}(t) \frac{8}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}}. \quad (127)$$

It follows that

$$0 < \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,u}(t) \left(1 - \frac{8}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \right) \leq \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_u(t). \quad (128)$$

Similarly to (122), we make a key observation that \mathbf{P} -a.s.,

$$\mathcal{H}_u(t) \stackrel{(5c)(89)(81)}{=} e^{B_1(t)+B_2(t)} \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_u(t) \stackrel{(128)}{\geq} 0. \quad (129)$$

We are ready to compute

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_u(0)| &\leq |\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_u(0) - \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,u}(0)| + \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,u}(0) \stackrel{(127)}{\leq} \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{0,u}(0) \left(1 + \frac{8}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \right) \\ &\stackrel{(125)(92)(124)}{\leq} m_L^2 e^{-2L^{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{e^{4LT+2L}}{2^{\frac{5}{2}} \pi^{\frac{3}{2}}} \left(\frac{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}} - 8}{2(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \right) \stackrel{(92)(125)(128)}{\leq} \frac{1}{2} e^{-2L^{\frac{1}{2}}} \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_u(T). \end{aligned} \quad (130)$$

Then we may continue to estimate using (88) on $\{t \geq T\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (u \cdot b)(0) dx \right| &\stackrel{(88)(130)(81)}{\leq} \frac{1}{2} e^{-2L^{\frac{1}{2}}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v(T) \cdot \Xi(T) dx \\ &\stackrel{(89)(91)(129)}{\leq} \frac{1}{2} e^{-2L^{\frac{1}{2}}} e^{2L^{\frac{1}{2}}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} u(T) \cdot b(T) dx \stackrel{(129)}{<} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (u \cdot b)(T) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (131)$$

This implies by definition from (5c) that

$$2\mathcal{H}_u(0) < \mathcal{H}_u(T),$$

and thus the third inequality in (20). This concludes the proof of Theorem 2.2.

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.3 AND COROLLARY 2.4

As we mentioned, we now assume $\mathbb{T} = [0, 1]$ for convenience. For brevity we assume $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = 1$ in (12). For the prescribed $(u^{\text{in}}, b^{\text{in}})$, let $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ be the augmented joint canonical filtration on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ generated by (B_1, B_2) and $(u^{\text{in}}, b^{\text{in}})$. Then B_1 and B_2 are both $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ -Wiener processes and $u^{\text{in}}, b^{\text{in}}$ are both \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable. We define

$$z_1^{\text{in}}(t, x) \triangleq e^{-t(-\Delta)^{m_1}} u^{\text{in}}(x) \quad \text{and} \quad z_2^{\text{in}}(t, x) \triangleq e^{-t(-\Delta)^{m_2}} b^{\text{in}}(x) \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T_L], \quad (132)$$

and then split (12) to the following two systems:

$$dz_1 + [\nabla \pi_1 + (-\Delta)^{m_1} z_1] dt = dB_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla \cdot z_1 = 0 \quad \text{for } t > 0, \quad z_1(0, x) = 0, \quad (133a)$$

$$dz_2 + (-\Delta)^{m_2} z_2 dt = dB_2 \quad \text{and } \nabla \cdot z_2 = 0 \text{ for } t > 0, \quad z_2(0, x) = 0. \quad (133b)$$

and

$$\partial_t v + \nabla \pi_2 + (-\Delta)^{m_1} v + \operatorname{div} \left((v + z_1^{\text{in}} + z_1) \otimes (v + z_1^{\text{in}} + z_1) \right) \quad (134a)$$

$$- (\Theta + z_2^{\text{in}} + z_2) \otimes (\Theta + z_2^{\text{in}} + z_2) = 0, \quad \nabla \cdot v = 0 \text{ for } t > 0, \quad \text{and } v(0) = 0,$$

$$\partial_t \Theta + (-\Delta)^{m_2} \Theta + \operatorname{div} \left(\Theta + z_2^{\text{in}} + z_2 \right) \otimes (v + z_1^{\text{in}} + z_1) \quad (134b)$$

$$- (v + z_1^{\text{in}} + z_1) \otimes (\Theta + z_2^{\text{in}} + z_2) = 0, \quad \nabla \cdot \Theta = 0 \text{ for } t > 0, \quad \text{and } \Theta(0) = 0.$$

We can solve (133) to see that

$$z_1(t) = \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)(-\Delta)^{m_1}} \mathbb{P} dB_1(s) \quad \text{and} \quad z_2(t) = \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)(-\Delta)^{m_2}} dB_2(s). \quad (135)$$

so that

$$(u, b) = (v + z_1^{\text{in}} + z_1, \Theta + z_2^{\text{in}} + z_2), \quad \text{along with } \pi = \pi_1 + \pi_2, \quad (136)$$

satisfies (12) starting from the prescribed initial data of $(u^{\text{in}}, b^{\text{in}})$.

Proposition 5.1. ([40, Proposition 3.1] and [86, Proposition 4.4]) Under the hypothesis (18), the solutions z_k for both $k \in \{1, 2\}$ to (133) satisfy for any $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, $T > 0$, and $l \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbf{P}} \left[\|z_k\|_{C_T \dot{H}^{1-\delta}}^l + \|z_k\|_{C_T^{\frac{1}{2}-\delta} L^2}^l \right] < \infty.$$

With the same Sobolev constant C_S from (24), we define differently from (25),

$$T_L \triangleq \inf \left\{ t \geq 0 : C_S \max_{k=1,2} \|z_k(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{1-\delta}} \geq L \right\} \\ \wedge \inf \left\{ t \geq 0 : C_S \max_{k=1,2} \|z_k\|_{C_T^{\frac{1}{2}-2\delta} L^2} \geq L \right\} \wedge L, \quad 0 < \delta < \frac{5p-6}{2p} < \frac{1}{8} \quad (137)$$

and observe that $T_L > 0$ and $\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} T_L = +\infty$ \mathbf{P} -a.s. due to Proposition 5.1. The fact that $\delta < \frac{5p-6}{2p}$ justifies the embedding of $H^{1-\delta}(\mathbb{T}^3) \hookrightarrow L^{\frac{p}{p-1}}(\mathbb{T}^3)$ and also implies $\frac{6}{5-2\delta} < p$ which will be used subsequently (e.g. (252)). We fix

$$\epsilon \in \mathbb{Q}_+ \text{ such that } \epsilon \in \left(0, \min \left\{ \frac{1}{20}, \frac{1}{8} \left(\frac{5}{2} - 2m_k \right), 1 - \frac{6-3p}{2m_k p} \right\} \right). \quad (138)$$

We impose that $a \in 5\mathbb{N}$ such that $a^\epsilon \in 5\mathbb{N}$ and that $b \in 2\mathbb{N}$ to satisfy

$$b > \max \left\{ \frac{(28)(56)^2}{\epsilon}, \max_{k \in \{1,2\}} \left(1 - \frac{6-3p}{2m_k p} \right)^{-1} \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad l^{-1} \triangleq \lambda_q^{14} \lambda_{q+1}^{\frac{\epsilon}{112}}. \quad (139)$$

We keep the same definition of λ_q in (26) but modify δ_q as follows:

$$\lambda_q \triangleq a^{b^q} \text{ for } q \in \mathbb{N}_0, \quad \delta_q \triangleq \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \lambda_1^{2\beta} \lambda_q^{-2\beta} & \text{for all } q \in \mathbb{N}, \\ 1 & \text{if } q = -1, 0; \end{cases} \quad (140)$$

we will use the fact that $\delta_1 = 1$ subsequently (e.g. (158)). We define

$$r_\perp \triangleq \lambda_{q+1}^{-1+2\epsilon}, \quad r_\parallel \triangleq \lambda_{q+1}^{-1+6\epsilon}, \quad \mu \triangleq \lambda_{q+1}^{\frac{3}{11}-6\epsilon}, \quad \tau \triangleq \lambda_{q+1}^{1-6\epsilon}, \quad \sigma \triangleq \lambda_{q+1}^{2\epsilon}. \quad (141)$$

We observe that due to $a^\epsilon \in 5\mathbb{N}$ and $b \in 2\mathbb{N}$, we have $\lambda_{q+1} r_\perp = \lambda_{q+1}^{2\epsilon} \in \mathbb{N}$. We define

$$z_{k,q} \triangleq \mathbb{P}_{\leq f(q)} z_k \text{ where } f(q) \triangleq \lambda_{q+1}^{\frac{40\epsilon}{11}} \text{ for both } k \in \{1, 2\}. \quad (142)$$

With (134) in mind, for all $q \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we consider over $[t_q, T_L]$

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t v_q + \nabla \pi_q + (-\Delta)^{m_1} v_q + \operatorname{div} \left((v_q + z_1^{\text{in}} + z_{1,q}) \otimes (v_q + z_1^{\text{in}} + z_{1,q}) \right. \\ \left. - (\Theta_q + z_2^{\text{in}} + z_{2,q}) \otimes (\Theta_q + z_2^{\text{in}} + z_{2,q}) \right) = \operatorname{div} \mathring{R}_q^v, \quad \nabla \cdot v_q = 0 \text{ for } t > 0, \text{ and } v_q(0) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (143a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \Theta_q + (-\Delta)^{m_2} \Theta_q + \operatorname{div} \left((\Theta_q + z_2^{\text{in}} + z_{2,q}) \otimes (v_q + z_1^{\text{in}} + z_{1,q}) \right. \\ \left. - (v_q + z_1^{\text{in}} + z_{1,q}) \otimes (\Theta_q + z_2^{\text{in}} + z_{2,q}) \right) = \operatorname{div} \mathring{R}_q^\Theta, \quad \nabla \cdot \Theta_q = 0 \text{ for } t > 0, \text{ and } \Theta_q(0) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (143b)$$

We assume hereafter that

$$\frac{4\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}-5} \leq a^{b\beta} \text{ so that } \sum_{q \geq 1} \delta_q^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{4}{5} \text{ and } 2\delta_{q+1} \leq \delta_q \text{ for all } q \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad (144)$$

Remark 5.1. As we mentioned in the beginning of this Section 5, we redefined $\mathbb{T} = [0, 1]$ for convenience, and the fact that $t_q \geq -1$ by (30) is related because we will need $|t| \in (0, 1)$ in (258). Now, for all $t \in [t_q, 0)$, $q \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we assume

$$z_1^{\text{in}}(t) = e^{-|t|(-\Delta)^{m_1}} u^{\text{in}}, \quad z_2^{\text{in}}(t) = e^{-|t|(-\Delta)^{m_2}} b^{\text{in}}, \quad (145a)$$

$$z_1 \equiv z_2 \equiv v_q \equiv \Theta_q \equiv 0, \quad \mathring{R}_q^v = (z_1^{\text{in}} \otimes z_1^{\text{in}} - z_2^{\text{in}} \otimes z_2^{\text{in}}), \quad \mathring{R}_q^\Theta = (z_2^{\text{in}} \otimes z_1^{\text{in}} - z_1^{\text{in}} \otimes z_2^{\text{in}}). \quad (145b)$$

As we will see in (151c), the inductive hypothesis guarantees that v_q, Θ_q both vanish near $t = 0$ so that $\partial_t v_q(0) = \partial_t \Theta_q(0) = 0$; because z_1, z_2 also vanish as $t \rightarrow 0^+$ continuously, our extensions allow the system (143) to be solved on $[t_q, T_L]$. At the inductive step $q = 0$, we will need to verify $z_k^{\text{in}} \otimes z_k^{\text{in}} \in L^1_{t,x}$ to bound $L^1_{t,x}$ -norms of \mathring{R}_0^v and \mathring{R}_0^Θ although $z_1^{\text{in}}(0) \stackrel{(132)}{=} u^{\text{in}} \in L^p(\mathbb{T}^3)$ and $z_2^{\text{in}}(0) \stackrel{(132)}{=} b^{\text{in}} \in L^p(\mathbb{T}^3)$ for $p < 2$ and thus Hölder's inequality cannot deduce the desired regularity. This is why, in contrast to previous works, we cannot just extend z_k^{in} by its value at $t = 0$, and hence our extension in (145a) (see [57, Remark 3.5]).

Next, with $u^{\text{in}}, b^{\text{in}} \in L^p(\mathbb{T}^3)$ fixed, we fix $N \geq 1$ sufficiently large such that

$$\|u^{\text{in}}\|_{L^p} + \|b^{\text{in}}\|_{L^p} \leq N \quad \mathbf{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (146)$$

We can directly compute using the embedding of $W^{\frac{3}{p}-\frac{3}{2}, p}(\mathbb{T}^3) \hookrightarrow L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)$,

$$\sum_{k=1}^2 \|z_k^{\text{in}}\|_{L^2_{[0, T_L] \times \mathbb{T}^3}}^2 \lesssim \int_0^{T_L} t^{-\frac{6-3p}{2m_1 p}} \|u^{\text{in}}\|_{L^p}^2 + t^{-\frac{6-3p}{2m_2 p}} \|b^{\text{in}}\|_{L^p}^2 dt \stackrel{(146)(137)}{\lesssim} N^2 \sum_{k=1}^2 L^{1-\frac{6-3p}{2m_k p}}. \quad (147)$$

We also fix a sufficiently large deterministic constant

$$M_L \triangleq M_L(N) \gg \left\{ L^3, N^2 \sum_{k=1}^2 L^{1-\frac{6-3p}{2m_k p}} \right\} \quad (148)$$

so that (147) implies

$$\sum_{k=1}^2 \|z_k^{\text{in}}\|_{L^2_{[0, T_L] \times \mathbb{T}^3}}^2 \ll M_L. \quad (149)$$

The fact that $M_L \gg L^3$ is used e.g. in (158). Next, we define, for $\delta > 0$ from (137),

$$\sigma_q \triangleq \delta_q \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{N}_0 \cup \{-1\}, \quad \gamma_q \triangleq \begin{cases} \delta_q & \forall q \in \mathbb{N}_0 \setminus \{3\}, \\ K \gg 1 & \text{if } q = 3, \end{cases} \quad (150a)$$

$$A \gg M_L \max \left\{ \frac{1}{1 - \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{6-3p}{4m_k p}}, \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{1}{1 - \frac{6-3p}{2m_k p}} \right\}, \quad (150b)$$

$$1 < p^* < \min \left\{ \frac{2-8\epsilon}{2m_k - \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon(\frac{45}{56})}, \frac{2-8\epsilon}{2 - \epsilon(\frac{249}{28})}, \frac{3-14\epsilon}{2 - \epsilon(\frac{24917}{56})}, \frac{6}{6-2\delta}, \frac{3p}{2(3-m_k p)} \right\}, \quad (150c)$$

which is well defined due to the choice of δ in (137) and ϵ in (138). We mention that the lower bound on A is used e.g. in (162), (256), and (259).

Hypothesis 5.1. *For a universal constant $M_0 > 0$ to be explained from the subsequent proof (see e.g. (188), (194), (190), (194)), the solution $(v_q, \Theta_q, \mathring{R}_q^v, \mathring{R}_q^\Theta)$ that solves (143) satisfies the following:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|v_q\|_{L^2_{[\sigma_q \wedge T_L, T_L], x}} \vee \|\Theta_q\|_{L^2_{[\sigma_q \wedge T_L, T_L], x}} \\ & \leq M_0 \left(M_L^{\frac{3}{4}} \sum_{r=1}^q \delta_r^{\frac{1}{2}} + \sqrt{2} M_L^{\frac{1}{4}} \sum_{r=1}^q \gamma_r^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) + \sqrt{2} M_0 (M_L + A)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{r=1}^{q-1} (r \sigma_{r-1})^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned} \quad (151a)$$

$$\leq M_0 M_L^{\frac{3}{4}} + \sqrt{2} M_0 M_L^{\frac{1}{4}} (K^{\frac{1}{2}} + 1) + 17 M_0 (M_L + A)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (151b)$$

$$v_q(t) = \Theta_q(t) = 0 \quad \forall t \in [t_q, \sigma_q \wedge T_L], \quad (151c)$$

$$\|v_q\|_{C^1_{[t_q, T_L], x}} \vee \|\Theta_q\|_{C^1_{[t_q, T_L], x}} \leq \lambda_q^7 M_L^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (151d)$$

$$\|v_q\|_{C^1_{[0, T_L], L_x^p}} \vee \|\Theta_q\|_{C^1_{[0, T_L], L_x^p}} \leq M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{r=1}^q \delta_r^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq M_L^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (151e)$$

$$\|\mathring{R}_q^v\|_{L^1_{[\sigma_{q-1} \wedge T_L, T_L], x}} \vee \|\mathring{R}_q^\Theta\|_{L^1_{[\sigma_{q-1} \wedge T_L, T_L], x}} \leq \delta_{q+1} M_L, \quad (152a)$$

$$\|\mathring{R}_q^v\|_{L^1_{[0, T_L], x}} \vee \|\mathring{R}_q^\Theta\|_{L^1_{[0, T_L], x}} \leq \delta_{q+1} M_L + 2(q+1)A \left(\sum_{k=1}^2 \sigma_q^{1 - \frac{6-3p}{2m_k p}} + \sigma_q^{1 - \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{6-3p}{4m_k p}} \right), \quad (152b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{a \in [t_q, (\sigma_q \wedge T_L) - h]} \|\mathring{R}_q^v\|_{L^1_{[a, a+h], x}} + \sup_{a \in [t_q, (\sigma_q \wedge T_L) - h]} \|\mathring{R}_q^\Theta\|_{L^1_{[a, a+h], x}} \\ & \leq 2(q+1)A \left(\sum_{k=1}^2 \left(\frac{h}{2} \right)^{1 - \frac{6-3p}{2m_k p}} + \left(\frac{h}{2} \right)^{1 - \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{6-3p}{4m_k p}} \right) \quad \forall h \in (0, (\sigma_q \wedge T_L) - t_q]. \end{aligned} \quad (152c)$$

The following is the key iterative result that is the crux of the proof of Theorem 2.3.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $L \geq 1$ and N satisfy (146). Then there exists a choice of a, b , and β such that the following holds. Suppose that $(v_q, \Theta_q, \mathring{R}_q^v, \mathring{R}_q^\Theta)$ for some $q \in \mathbb{N}_0$ is a $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted solution to (143) that satisfies the Hypothesis 5.1. Then there exists $(v_{q+1}, \Theta_{q+1}, \mathring{R}_{q+1}^v, \mathring{R}_{q+1}^\Theta)$ that is $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted, solves (143) that satisfies for p in (21),*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|v_{q+1} - v_q\|_{L^2_{[(2\sigma_{q-1}) \wedge T_L], x}} \vee \|\Theta_{q+1} - \Theta_q\|_{L^2_{[(2\sigma_{q-1}) \wedge T_L], x}} \\ & \leq M_0 (M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \gamma_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}}) (M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} - 2\sigma_{q-1})^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (153a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \|v_{q+1} - v_q\|_{L^2_{[\sigma_{q+1} \wedge T_L, (2\sigma_{q-1}) \wedge T_L], x}} \vee \|\Theta_{q+1} - \Theta_q\|_{L^2_{[\sigma_{q+1} \wedge T_L, (2\sigma_{q-1}) \wedge T_L], x}} \\ & \leq M_0 \left((M_L + qA)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \gamma_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) (2\sigma_{q-1})^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (153b)$$

$$v_{q+1}(t) = \Theta_{q+1}(t) = 0 \quad \forall t \in [t_{q+1}, \sigma_{q+1} \wedge T_L], \quad (153c)$$

$$\|v_{q+1} - v_q\|_{C_{[0,T_L]}L_x^p} \vee \|\Theta_{q+1} - \Theta_q\|_{C_{[0,T_L]}L_x^p} \leq M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda_{q+1}^{-\frac{\epsilon}{112}} \leq M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (153d)$$

and consequently the Hypothesis 5.1 at level $q + 1$. Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \left(\|v_{q+1}\|_{L_{[2 \wedge T_L, T_L]}^2}^2 - \|\Theta_{q+1}\|_{L_{[2 \wedge T_L, T_L]}^2}^2 \right) - \left(\|v_q\|_{L_{[2 \wedge T_L, T_L]}^2}^2 - \|\Theta_q\|_{L_{[2 \wedge T_L, T_L]}^2}^2 \right) - 3\gamma_{q+1}(T_L - 2 \wedge T_L) \right| \\ & \leq 11\epsilon_v^{-1} \max \left\{ 1, \epsilon_\Theta^{-1} \sum_{k \in \Lambda_\Theta} \|\gamma_k\|_{C(B_{\epsilon_\Theta}(0))} \right\} \delta_{q+1} M_L. \end{aligned} \quad (154)$$

We will prove Proposition 5.2 subsequently; for the time being, we assume it and prove Theorem 2.3. Let us start with an intermediary result in preparation to prove Theorem 2.3.

Proposition 5.3. *Define p by (21). There exists a \mathbf{P} -a.s. strongly positive stopping time T_L , that can be made arbitrarily large by choosing $L > 1$ to be large, such that for any initial data $u^{\text{in}}, b^{\text{in}} \in L_\sigma^p$ \mathbf{P} -a.s. that are independent of the Wiener processes B_1 and B_2 , the following holds. There exists $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted processes*

$$u, b \in C([0, T_L]; L^p(\mathbb{T}^3)) \cap L^2(0, T_L; H^\zeta(\mathbb{T}^3)) \quad \mathbf{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (155)$$

for some $\zeta > 0$, that solves (12) analytically weakly such that $(u, b)|_{t=0} = (u^{\text{in}}, b^{\text{in}})$. Finally, there exist infinitely many such solutions (u, b) .

Proof of Proposition 5.3. At step $q = 0$, we consider $v_0 \equiv \Theta_0 \equiv 0$ on $[t_0, T_L]$; this way, all the inductive hypothesis (151a)-(151e) are trivially satisfied. Moreover, for $t \in [0, T_L]$,

$$\dot{R}_0^v = (z_1^{\text{in}} + z_{1,0}) \otimes (z_1^{\text{in}} + z_{1,0}) - (z_2^{\text{in}} + z_{2,0}) \otimes (z_2^{\text{in}} + z_{2,0}), \quad (156a)$$

$$\dot{R}_0^\Theta = (z_2^{\text{in}} + z_{2,0}) \otimes (z_1^{\text{in}} + z_{1,0}) - (z_1^{\text{in}} + z_{1,0}) \otimes (z_2^{\text{in}} + z_{2,0}), \quad (156b)$$

while for $t \in [t_q, 0)$, due to Remark 5.1,

$$\dot{R}_0^v = z_1^{\text{in}} \otimes z_1^{\text{in}} - z_2^{\text{in}} \otimes z_2^{\text{in}}, \quad \dot{R}_0^\Theta = z_2^{\text{in}} \otimes z_1^{\text{in}} - z_1^{\text{in}} \otimes z_2^{\text{in}}. \quad (157)$$

We can estimate \dot{R}_0^v as an example: for any $\iota > 0$, as $\delta_{-1} = 1$ due to (140),

$$\|\dot{R}_0^v\|_{L_{[0, T_L]}^1} \stackrel{(156a)}{\lesssim} \int_0^{T_L} \sum_{k=1}^2 \|z_k^{\text{in}}\|_{L_x^2}^2 + \|z_{k,0}\|_{L_x^2}^2 dt \stackrel{(149)(137)}{\leq} \iota M_L + CL^3 \stackrel{(148)}{\leq} \delta_1 M_L. \quad (158)$$

Therefore, the inductive hypothesis (152a) and (152b) at level $q = 0$ are satisfied. Concerning (152c) at level $q = 0$, for all $t \in (0, 1]$, the first inequality of (147) shows that

$$\sum_{k=1}^2 \|z_k^{\text{in}}(t)\|_{L_x^2}^2 \lesssim t^{-\frac{6-3p}{2m_1 p}} \|u^{\text{in}}\|_{L_x^p}^2 + t^{-\frac{6-3p}{2m_2 p}} \|b^{\text{in}}\|_{L_x^p}^2 \stackrel{(146)}{\lesssim} N^2 \sum_{k=1}^2 t^{-\frac{6-3p}{2m_k p}}. \quad (159)$$

As $-\frac{6-3p}{2m_k p} < 0$ for both $k \in \{1, 2\}$ and $|t| < 1$ for all $t \in (0, 1]$, we can also bound

$$\|\dot{R}_0^v(t)\|_{L_x^1} \stackrel{(156a)}{\lesssim} \sum_{k=1}^2 \|z_k^{\text{in}}\|_{L_x^2}^2 + \|z_{k,0}\|_{L_x^2}^2 \stackrel{(159)}{\lesssim} (N^2 + L^2) \sum_{k=1}^2 t^{-\frac{6-3p}{2m_k p}}. \quad (160)$$

On the other hand, for $t \in [-1, 0)$,

$$\|\dot{R}_0^v(t)\|_{L_x^1} \stackrel{(157)}{\lesssim} |t|^{-\frac{6-3p}{2m_1 p}} \|u^{\text{in}}\|_{L_x^p}^2 + |t|^{-\frac{6-3p}{2m_2 p}} \|b^{\text{in}}\|_{L_x^p}^2 \stackrel{(146)}{\lesssim} N^2 \sum_{k=1}^2 |t|^{-\frac{6-3p}{2m_k p}}. \quad (161)$$

Therefore, as $t_0 = -1$ due to (30) and $\sigma_0 = 1$ due to (150), for all $a \in [-1, (1 \wedge T_L) - h]$ where $h \in (0, (1 \wedge T_L) + 1]$,

$$\|\mathring{R}_0^v\|_{L^1_{[a, a+h], x}} \ll A \left[\sum_{k=1}^2 \left(\frac{h}{2}\right)^{1-\frac{6-3p}{2mkp}} + \left(\frac{h}{2}\right)^{1-\sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{6-3p}{4mkp}} \right]. \quad (162)$$

Hence, Hypothesis 5.1 at level $q = 0$ holds and we can apply Proposition 5.2 to obtain $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted processes $(v_q, \Theta_q, \mathring{R}_q^v, \mathring{R}_q^\Theta)_{q \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ that satisfies Hypothesis 5.1 and rely on (153d) to deduce the limit (v, Θ) such that

$$v_q \rightarrow v \text{ and } \Theta_q \rightarrow \Theta \text{ in } C_{[0, T_L]} L^p_x. \quad (163)$$

Moreover, we can compute for any $\zeta \in (0, \frac{2\beta}{2\beta+21b^2})$, due to (137), (148), (151d), (151c), (153), and (150),

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{T_L} \|v_{q+1} - v_q\|_{H^\zeta}^2 dt &\lesssim \left(M_0 [A^{\frac{1}{2}} + M_L^{\frac{3}{4}}] \delta_{q-1}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)^{2(1-\zeta)} M_L^{\frac{3\zeta}{2}} \lambda_{q+1}^{14\zeta} \\ &\lesssim \left(M_0 [A^{\frac{1}{2}} + M_L^{\frac{3}{4}}] \right)^{2(1-\zeta)} M_L^{\frac{3\zeta}{2}} \delta_{q-1}^{\frac{2(1-\zeta)}{3} - \frac{14\zeta b^2}{2\beta}} a^{14\zeta b^3} \searrow 0 \end{aligned} \quad (164)$$

as $q \nearrow +\infty$, where the first inequality used the fact that $q^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta_q^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim 1$. Together with similar computations for $\Theta_{q+1} - \Theta_q$, we conclude that $v_q \rightarrow v$ and $\Theta_q \rightarrow \Theta$ in $L^2([0, T_L]; H^\zeta(\mathbb{T}^3))$ for all $\zeta \in (0, \frac{2\beta}{2\beta+21b^2})$. Moreover, it follows from (152b) that (v, Θ) satisfy the equations in (134) weakly. Concerning initial data, (151c) and (163) imply that $v(0) = 0$ and similarly $\Theta(0) = 0$. Concerning non-uniqueness, we find a constant C independent of q such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \|v\|_{L^2_{[2 \wedge T_L, T_L], x}}^2 - \|\Theta\|_{L^2_{[2 \wedge T_L, T_L], x}}^2 - 3K(T_L - 2 \wedge T_L) \right| \\ (150)(154) \quad &\leq 11\epsilon_v^{-1} \max\{1, \epsilon_\Theta^{-1} \sum_{k \in \Lambda_\Theta} \|\gamma_k\|_{C(B_{\epsilon_\Theta}(0))}\} M_L \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} \delta_{q+1} + 3M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{q \neq 2} \gamma_{q+1} \triangleq C. \end{aligned} \quad (165)$$

For $L > 1$ sufficiently large so that $\mathbf{P}\{T_L > 2\} > 0$, on $\{T_L > 2\}$, for $K \neq K'$ such that

$$|K - K'| > \frac{2C}{3(T_L - 2)}, \quad (166)$$

the corresponding limits (v_K, Θ_K) and $(v_{K'}, \Theta_{K'})$ satisfy, as a consequence of (165),

$$\left(\|v_K\|_{L^2_{[2, T_L], x}}^2 - \|\Theta_K\|_{L^2_{[2, T_L], x}}^2 \right) - \left(\|v_{K'}\|_{L^2_{[2, T_L], x}}^2 - \|\Theta_{K'}\|_{L^2_{[2, T_L], x}}^2 \right) \stackrel{(165)(166)}{>} 0;$$

this implies $(u_K, b_K) \neq (u_{K'}, b_{K'})$. The existence of infinitely many such solutions follows from the fact that we can choose different K 's. The proof of Proposition 5.3 is complete. \square

The proofs of Theorem 2.3 and Corollary 2.4 follow from Proposition 5.3 similarly to [40]; we include details in the Appendix Sections B.1-B.2 for completeness.

5.1. Proof of Proposition 5.2. We mollify $v_q, \Theta_q, \mathring{R}_q^v$, and \mathring{R}_q^Θ , identically to (39); additionally, we mollify z_k to obtain $z_{k,l} \triangleq z_k *_x \varrho_l *_t \vartheta_l$ for $k \in \{1, 2\}$. We write the mollified system from (143) as

$$\partial_t v_l + (-\Delta)^{m_1} v_l + \nabla p_l + \operatorname{div} N_{\text{com}}^v = \operatorname{div}(\mathring{R}_l^v + R_{\text{com}1}^v), \quad \nabla \cdot v_l = 0, \quad (167a)$$

$$\partial_t \Theta_l + (-\Delta)^{m_2} \Theta_l + \operatorname{div} N_{\text{com}}^\Theta = \operatorname{div}(\mathring{R}_l^\Theta + R_{\text{com}1}^\Theta), \quad \nabla \cdot \Theta_l = 0, \quad (167b)$$

where we defined

$$N_{\text{com}}^v \triangleq (v_q + z_1^{\text{in}} + z_{1,q}) \otimes (v_q + z_1^{\text{in}} + z_{1,q}) - (\Theta_q + z_2^{\text{in}} + z_{2,q}) \otimes (\Theta_q + z_2^{\text{in}} + z_{2,q}), \quad (168a)$$

$$N_{\text{com}}^\Theta \triangleq (\Theta_q + z_2^{\text{in}} + z_{2,q}) \otimes (v_q + z_1^{\text{in}} + z_{1,q}) - (v_q + z_1^{\text{in}} + z_{1,q}) \otimes (\Theta_q + z_2^{\text{in}} + z_{2,q}), \quad (168b)$$

$$R_{\text{com}1}^v \triangleq \hat{N}_{\text{com}}^v - \hat{N}_{\text{com}}^v *_{x} \varrho_l *_{t} \vartheta_l, \quad R_{\text{com}1}^\Theta \triangleq N_{\text{com}}^\Theta - N_{\text{com}}^\Theta *_{x} \varrho_l *_{t} \vartheta_l, \quad (168c)$$

$$p_l \triangleq p_q *_{x} \varrho_l *_{t} \vartheta_l - \frac{1}{3} \text{Tr}(N_{\text{com}}^v - N_{\text{com}}^v *_{x} \varrho_l *_{t} \vartheta_l), \quad (168d)$$

where \hat{N}_{com}^v is the trace-free part of N_{com}^v . We define with ϵ_Θ the radius from Lemma A.2,

$$\rho_\Theta \triangleq \epsilon_\Theta^{-1} \sqrt{l^2 + |\hat{R}_l^\Theta|^2} \quad \text{so that} \quad \left| \frac{\hat{R}_l^\Theta}{\rho_\Theta} \right| \leq \epsilon_\Theta \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_\Theta \geq \epsilon_\Theta^{-1} \max\{l, |\hat{R}_l^\Theta|\}. \quad (169)$$

Now we define the amplitude function of the magnetic perturbations:

$$a_\xi(t, x) \triangleq \rho_\Theta^{\frac{1}{2}}(t, x) \gamma_\xi \left(-\frac{\hat{R}_l^\Theta(t, x)}{\rho_\Theta(t, x)} \right) \quad \text{for } \xi \in \Lambda_\Theta, \quad (170)$$

where γ_ξ is from Lemma A.2. The following is a consequence of Lemma A.2 and (268):

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Theta} a_\xi^2 g_\xi^2 (D_\xi \otimes W_\xi - W_\xi \otimes D_\xi) \quad (171) \\ &= -\hat{R}_l^\Theta + \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Theta} a_\xi^2 g_\xi^2 \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}(D_\xi \otimes W_\xi - W_\xi \otimes D_\xi) + \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Theta} a_\xi^2 (g_\xi^2 - 1) \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} D_\xi \otimes W_\xi - W_\xi \otimes D_\xi dx. \end{aligned}$$

We can verify the following estimates similarly to previous works (e.g. [57, Equation (5.6)]): for all $\xi \in \Lambda_\Theta$ and all $N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\|a_\xi\|_{C_{(2\sigma_{q-1}) \wedge T_L, T_L, x}} \lesssim l^{-\frac{5}{2}} \delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} M_L^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \|a_\xi\|_{C_{[0, T_L], x}} \lesssim l^{-\frac{5}{2}} (M_L + qA)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (172a)$$

$$\|a_\xi\|_{C_{(2\sigma_{q-1}) \wedge T_L, T_L, x}^N} \lesssim l^{-15N - \frac{5}{2}} \delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} M_L^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \|a_\xi\|_{C_{[0, T_L], x}^N} \lesssim l^{-15N - \frac{5}{2}} (M_L + qA)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (172b)$$

Next, we define

$$\mathring{G}^\Theta \triangleq \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Theta} a_\xi^2 \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} W_\xi \otimes W_\xi - D_\xi \otimes D_\xi dx. \quad (173)$$

The following estimates can be verified using (172) similarly to previous works such as [52, Equation (4.19)], although the time intervals must be distinguished here: for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\|\mathring{G}^\Theta\|_{C_{(2\sigma_{q-1}) \wedge T_L, T_L, x}} \stackrel{(172a)}{\lesssim} l^{-5} \delta_{q+1} M_L, \quad \|\mathring{G}^\Theta\|_{C_{(2\sigma_{q-1}) \wedge T_L, T_L, x}^N} \lesssim l^{-15N - 5} \delta_{q+1} M_L, \quad (174a)$$

$$\|\mathring{G}^\Theta\|_{C_{[0, T_L], x}} \stackrel{(172a)}{\lesssim} l^{-5} (M_L + qA), \quad \|\mathring{G}^\Theta\|_{C_{[0, T_L], x}^N} \lesssim l^{-15N - 5} (M_L + qA). \quad (174b)$$

We define

$$\rho_v \triangleq \epsilon_v^{-1} \sqrt{l^2 + |\hat{R}_l^v + \mathring{G}^\Theta|^2} + \gamma_{q+1} \quad \text{so that} \quad \left| \frac{\hat{R}_l^v + \mathring{G}^\Theta}{\rho_v} \right| \leq \epsilon_v, \rho_v \geq \frac{\max\{l, |\hat{R}_l^v + \mathring{G}^\Theta|\}}{\epsilon_v}. \quad (175)$$

Furthermore, we define for $\xi \in \Lambda_v$,

$$a_\xi \triangleq \rho_v^{\frac{1}{2}} \gamma_\xi \left(\text{Id} - \frac{\hat{R}_l^v + \mathring{G}^\Theta}{\rho_v} \right), \quad (176)$$

which satisfies the following identity as a consequence of Lemma A.3 and (268),

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu} a_\xi^2 g_\xi^2 W_\xi \otimes W_\xi = & \rho_\nu \text{Id} - \hat{R}_l^\nu - \hat{G}^\Theta + \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu} a_\xi^2 g_\xi^2 \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}(W_\xi \otimes W_\xi) \\ & + \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu} a_\xi^2 (g_\xi^2 - 1) \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} W_\xi \otimes W_\xi dx, \end{aligned} \quad (177)$$

as well as the following estimates, similarly to (172): for all $\xi \in \Lambda_\nu$ and all $N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\|a_\xi\|_{C_{[2\sigma_{q-1}] \wedge T_L, T_L, x}} \lesssim l^{-\frac{5}{2}} \delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} + \gamma_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \|a_\xi\|_{C_{[0, T_L], x}} \lesssim l^{-\frac{5}{2}} (M_L + qA)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \gamma_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (178a)$$

$$\|a_\xi\|_{C_{[2\sigma_{q-1}] \wedge T_L, T_L, x}^N} \lesssim l^{-28N - \frac{5}{2}} (\delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} + \gamma_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}}), \quad (178b)$$

$$\|a_\xi\|_{C_{[0, T_L], x}^N} \lesssim l^{-28N - \frac{5}{2}} (M_L + qA + \gamma_{q+1})^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (178c)$$

Next, we define

$$\chi(t) \begin{cases} = 0 & \text{if } t \leq \sigma_{q+1}, \\ \in (0, 1) & \text{if } t \in (\sigma_{q+1}, 2\sigma_{q+1}), \\ = 1 & \text{if } t \geq 2\sigma_{q+1}, \end{cases} \quad \text{such that } \|\chi'\|_{C_t} \leq \sigma_{q+1}^{-1}. \quad (179)$$

We now define all the pieces of our perturbations:

$$w_{q+1}^p \triangleq \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu \cup \Lambda_\Theta} a_\xi g_\xi W_\xi, \quad d_{q+1}^p \triangleq \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Theta} a_\xi g_\xi D_\xi, \quad (180a)$$

$$w_{q+1}^c \triangleq \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu \cup \Lambda_\Theta} g_\xi \left(\text{curl}(\nabla a_\xi \times W_\xi^c) + \nabla a_\xi \times \text{curl} W_\xi^c + a_\xi \tilde{W}_\xi^c \right), \quad (180b)$$

$$d_{q+1}^c \triangleq \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Theta} g_\xi \left(\text{curl}(\nabla a_\xi \times D_\xi^c) + \nabla a_\xi \times \text{curl} D_\xi^c + a_\xi \tilde{D}_\xi^c \right), \quad (180c)$$

$$w_{q+1}^t \triangleq -\mu^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu \cup \Lambda_\Theta} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}(a_\xi^2 g_\xi^2 \psi_{\xi_1}^2 \phi_{\xi_1}^2 \xi_1), \quad d_{q+1}^t \triangleq -\mu^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Theta} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}(a_\xi^2 g_\xi^2 \psi_{\xi_1}^2 \phi_{\xi_1}^2 \xi_2), \quad (180d)$$

$$\begin{aligned} w_{q+1}^o \triangleq & -\sigma^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \left(h_\xi \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} W_\xi \otimes W_\xi dx \nabla a_\xi^2 \right) \\ & - \sigma^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Theta} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \left(h_\xi \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} [W_\xi \otimes W_\xi - D_\xi \otimes D_\xi] dx \nabla a_\xi^2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (180e)$$

$$d_{q+1}^o \triangleq -\sigma^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Theta} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \left(h_\xi \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} [D_\xi \otimes W_\xi - W_\xi \otimes D_\xi] dx \nabla a_\xi^2 \right), \quad (180f)$$

so that they can be shown to satisfy the following identities (see [52]):

$$\begin{aligned} & d_{q+1}^p \otimes w_{q+1}^p - w_{q+1}^p \otimes d_{q+1}^p + \hat{R}_l^\Theta \\ = & \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Theta} a_\xi^2 g_\xi^2 \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}(D_\xi \otimes W_\xi - W_\xi \otimes D_\xi) + \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Theta} a_\xi^2 (g_\xi^2 - 1) \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} D_\xi \otimes W_\xi - W_\xi \otimes D_\xi dx \\ & + \left(\sum_{\xi, \xi' \in \Lambda_\Theta, \xi \neq \xi'} + \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu, \xi' \in \Lambda_\Theta} \right) a_\xi a_{\xi'} g_\xi g_{\xi'} (D_{\xi'} \otimes W_\xi - W_\xi \otimes D_{\xi'}), \end{aligned} \quad (181a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & w_{q+1}^p \otimes w_{q+1}^p - d_{q+1}^p \otimes d_{q+1}^p + \hat{R}_l^\nu \\ = & \rho_\nu \text{Id} + \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu} a_\xi^2 g_\xi^2 \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}(W_\xi \otimes W_\xi) + \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Theta} a_\xi^2 g_\xi^2 \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}(W_\xi \otimes W_\xi - D_\xi \otimes D_\xi) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu} a_\xi^2 (g_\xi^2 - 1) \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} W_\xi \otimes W_\xi dx + \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\theta} a_\xi^2 (g_\xi^2 - 1) \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} W_\xi \otimes W_\xi - D_\xi \otimes D_\xi dx \\
& + \sum_{\xi, \xi' \in \Lambda_\nu \cup \Lambda_\theta; \xi \neq \xi'} a_\xi a_{\xi'} g_\xi g_{\xi'} W_\xi \otimes W_{\xi'} - \sum_{\xi, \xi' \in \Lambda_\theta; \xi \neq \xi'} a_\xi a_{\xi'} g_\xi g_{\xi'} D_\xi \otimes D_{\xi'}, \tag{181b}
\end{aligned}$$

$$w_{q+1}^p + w_{q+1}^c = \text{curl curl} \left(\sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu \cup \Lambda_\theta} a_\xi g_\xi W_\xi^c \right), d_{q+1}^p + d_{q+1}^c = \text{curl curl} \left(\sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\theta} a_\xi g_\xi D_\xi^c \right), \tag{181c}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \partial_t w_{q+1}^f + \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu \cup \Lambda_\theta} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \left(a_\xi^2 g_\xi^2 \text{div}(W_\xi \otimes W_\xi) \right) \\
& = (\nabla \Delta^{-1} \text{div}) \mu^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu \cup \Lambda_\theta} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \partial_t \left(a_\xi^2 g_\xi^2 \psi_{\xi_1}^2 \phi_{\xi_1}^2 \xi_1 \right) - \mu^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu \cup \Lambda_\theta} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \left(\partial_t (a_\xi^2 g_\xi^2) \psi_{\xi_1}^2 \phi_{\xi_1}^2 \xi_1 \right), \tag{181d}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \partial_t d_{q+1}^t + \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\theta} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \left(a_\xi^2 g_\xi^2 \text{div}(D_\xi \otimes W_\xi - W_\xi \otimes D_\xi) \right) \\
& = (\nabla \Delta^{-1} \text{div}) \mu^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\theta} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \partial_t \left(a_\xi^2 g_\xi^2 \psi_{\xi_1}^2 \phi_{\xi_1}^2 \xi_2 \right) - \mu^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\theta} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \left(\partial_t (a_\xi^2 g_\xi^2) \psi_{\xi_1}^2 \phi_{\xi_1}^2 \xi_2 \right), \tag{181e}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \partial_t w_{q+1}^o + \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \left((g_\xi^2 - 1) \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} W_\xi \otimes W_\xi dx \nabla(a_\xi^2) \right) \\
& + \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\theta} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \left((g_\xi^2 - 1) \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} W_\xi \otimes W_\xi - D_\xi \otimes D_\xi dx \nabla(a_\xi^2) \right) \\
& = (\nabla \Delta^{-1} \text{div}) \sigma^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \partial_t \left(h_\xi \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} W_\xi \otimes W_\xi dx \nabla(a_\xi^2) \right) \\
& + (\nabla \Delta^{-1} \text{div}) \sigma^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\theta} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \partial_t \left(h_\xi \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} [W_\xi \otimes W_\xi - D_\xi \otimes D_\xi] dx \nabla(a_\xi^2) \right) \\
& - \sigma^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \left(h_\xi \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} W_\xi \otimes W_\xi dx \partial_t \nabla(a_\xi^2) \right) \\
& - \sigma^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\theta} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \left(h_\xi \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} [W_\xi \otimes W_\xi - D_\xi \otimes D_\xi] dx \partial_t \nabla(a_\xi^2) \right), \tag{181f}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \partial_t d_{q+1}^o + \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\theta} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \left((g_\xi^2 - 1) \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} [D_\xi \otimes W_\xi - W_\xi \otimes D_\xi] dx \nabla(a_\xi^2) \right) \\
& = (\nabla \Delta^{-1} \text{div}) \sigma^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\theta} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \partial_t \left(h_\xi \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} [D_\xi \otimes W_\xi - W_\xi \otimes D_\xi] dx \nabla(a_\xi^2) \right) \\
& - \sigma^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\theta} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \left(h_\xi \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} D_\xi \otimes W_\xi - W_\xi \otimes D_\xi dx \partial_t \nabla(a_\xi^2) \right). \tag{181g}
\end{aligned}$$

Then we define, with χ from (179),

$$\tilde{w}_{q+1}^p \triangleq w_{q+1}^p \chi, \quad \tilde{w}_{q+1}^c \triangleq w_{q+1}^c \chi, \quad \tilde{w}_{q+1}^f \triangleq w_{q+1}^f \chi^2, \quad \tilde{w}_{q+1}^o \triangleq w_{q+1}^o \chi^2, \tag{182a}$$

$$\tilde{d}_{q+1}^p \triangleq d_{q+1}^p \chi, \quad \tilde{d}_{q+1}^c \triangleq d_{q+1}^c \chi, \quad \tilde{d}_{q+1}^t \triangleq d_{q+1}^t \chi^2, \quad \tilde{d}_{q+1}^o \triangleq d_{q+1}^o \chi^2, \tag{182b}$$

and finally

$$w_{q+1} \triangleq \tilde{w}_{q+1}^p + \tilde{w}_{q+1}^c + \tilde{w}_{q+1}^f + \tilde{w}_{q+1}^o, \quad v_{q+1} \triangleq v_l + w_{q+1}, \tag{183a}$$

$$d_{q+1} \triangleq \tilde{d}_{q+1}^p + \tilde{d}_{q+1}^c + \tilde{d}_{q+1}^t + \tilde{d}_{q+1}^o, \quad \Theta_{q+1} \triangleq \Theta_l + d_{q+1}. \quad (183b)$$

5.1.1. *Case* $t \in ((2\sigma_{q-1}) \wedge T_L, T_L]$. If $T_L \leq 2\sigma_{q-1}$, then there is nothing to prove and thus we assume that $2\sigma_{q-1} < T_L$ which implies that $\chi(t) = 1$ on $(2\sigma_{q-1}, T_L]$. We first deduce the following estimates using Lemma A.7 similarly to previous works (e.g. [57, Equations (5.24)-(5.27)]): for all $t \in (2\sigma_{q-1}, T_L]$, all $\rho \in (1, \infty)$, and all $N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\|w_{q+1}^p(t)\|_{L_x^\rho} \lesssim \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu \cup \Lambda_\Theta} |g_\xi(t)| (l^{-\frac{5}{2}} \delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} + \gamma_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}}) r_\perp^{\rho-\frac{1}{2}} r_\parallel^{\rho-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (184a)$$

$$\|d_{q+1}^p(t)\|_{L_x^\rho} \lesssim \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Theta} |g_\xi(t)| (l^{-\frac{5}{2}} \delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} M_L^{\frac{1}{2}}) r_\perp^{\rho-\frac{1}{2}} r_\parallel^{\rho-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (184b)$$

$$\|\nabla^N w_{q+1}^p(t)\|_{L_x^\rho} \lesssim \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu \cup \Lambda_\Theta} |g_\xi(t)| l^{-\frac{5}{2}} (\delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} + \gamma_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}}) r_\perp^{\rho-\frac{1}{2}} r_\parallel^{\rho-\frac{1}{2}} \lambda_{q+1}^N, \quad (184c)$$

$$\|\nabla^N d_{q+1}^p(t)\|_{L_x^\rho} \lesssim \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Theta} |g_\xi(t)| l^{-\frac{5}{2}} (\delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} M_L^{\frac{1}{2}}) r_\perp^{\rho-\frac{1}{2}} r_\parallel^{\rho-\frac{1}{2}} \lambda_{q+1}^N, \quad (184d)$$

$$\|w_{q+1}^c(t)\|_{L_x^\rho} \lesssim \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu \cup \Lambda_\Theta} |g_\xi(t)| l^{-\frac{5}{2}} (\delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} + \gamma_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}}) r_\perp^{\rho+\frac{1}{2}} r_\parallel^{\rho-\frac{3}{2}}, \quad (184e)$$

$$\|d_{q+1}^c(t)\|_{L_x^\rho} \lesssim \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Theta} |g_\xi(t)| l^{-\frac{5}{2}} \delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} r_\perp^{\rho+\frac{1}{2}} r_\parallel^{\rho-\frac{3}{2}}, \quad (184f)$$

$$\|\nabla^N w_{q+1}^c(t)\|_{L_x^\rho} \lesssim \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu \cup \Lambda_\Theta} |g_\xi(t)| l^{-\frac{5}{2}} (\delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} + \gamma_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}}) r_\perp^{\rho+\frac{1}{2}} r_\parallel^{\rho-\frac{3}{2}} \lambda_{q+1}^N, \quad (184g)$$

$$\|\nabla^N d_{q+1}^c(t)\|_{L_x^\rho} \lesssim \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Theta} |g_\xi(t)| l^{-\frac{5}{2}} (\delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} M_L^{\frac{1}{2}}) r_\perp^{\rho+\frac{1}{2}} r_\parallel^{\rho-\frac{3}{2}} \lambda_{q+1}^N, \quad (184h)$$

$$\|w_{q+1}^t(t)\|_{L_x^\rho} \lesssim \mu^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu \cup \Lambda_\Theta} |g_\xi(t)|^2 (l^{-5} \delta_{q+1} M_L + \gamma_{q+1}) r_\perp^{\rho-\frac{1}{2}} r_\parallel^{\rho-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (184i)$$

$$\|d_{q+1}^t(t)\|_{L_x^\rho} \lesssim \mu^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Theta} |g_\xi(t)|^2 l^{-5} \delta_{q+1} M_L r_\perp^{\rho-\frac{1}{2}} r_\parallel^{\rho-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (184j)$$

$$\|\nabla^N w_{q+1}^t(t)\|_{L_x^\rho} \lesssim \mu^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu \cup \Lambda_\Theta} |g_\xi(t)|^2 l^{-5} [\delta_{q+1} M_L + \gamma_{q+1}] r_\perp^{\rho-\frac{1}{2}} r_\parallel^{\rho-\frac{1}{2}} \lambda_{q+1}^N, \quad (184k)$$

$$\|\nabla^N d_{q+1}^t(t)\|_{L_x^\rho} \lesssim \mu^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Theta} |g_\xi(t)|^2 l^{-5} \delta_{q+1} M_L r_\perp^{\rho-\frac{1}{2}} r_\parallel^{\rho-\frac{1}{2}} \lambda_{q+1}^N, \quad (184l)$$

$$\|w_{q+1}^o(t)\|_{L_x^\rho} \lesssim \sigma^{-1} l^{-33} (\delta_{q+1} M_L + \gamma_{q+1}), \quad (184m)$$

$$\|d_{q+1}^o(t)\|_{L_x^\rho} \lesssim \sigma^{-1} l^{-20} \delta_{q+1} M_L, \quad (184n)$$

$$\|\nabla^N w_{q+1}^o(t)\|_{L_x^\rho} \lesssim \sigma^{-1} l^{-28N-33} (\delta_{q+1} M_L + \gamma_{q+1}), \quad (184o)$$

$$\|\nabla^N d_{q+1}^o(t)\|_{L_x^\rho} \lesssim \sigma^{-1} l^{-15N-20} \delta_{q+1} M_L. \quad (184p)$$

Over the whole temporal domain $[0, T_L]$, we obtain the following estimates: for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\|w_{q+1}^p\|_{C_{[0, T_L], x}^N} + \|d_{q+1}^p\|_{C_{[0, T_L], x}^N} + \|w_{q+1}^c\|_{C_{[0, T_L], x}^N} + \|d_{q+1}^c\|_{C_{[0, T_L], x}^N} \ll \lambda_{q+1}^{\frac{5N}{2} + \frac{3}{2}}, \quad (185a)$$

$$\|w_{q+1}^t\|_{C_{[0, T_L], x}^N} + \|d_{q+1}^t\|_{C_{[0, T_L], x}^N} \ll \lambda_{q+1}^{\frac{5N}{2} + \frac{5}{2}}, \quad \|w_{q+1}^o\|_{C_{[0, T_L], x}^N} + \|d_{q+1}^o\|_{C_{[0, T_L], x}^N} \ll \lambda_{q+1}^{(1-4\epsilon)N}. \quad (185b)$$

Next, using the improved Hölder's inequality (e.g. [13, Proposition 3]), we can estimate

$$\|\tilde{w}_{q+1}^p(t)\|_{L_x^2} \lesssim \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_v \cup \Lambda_\theta} |g_\xi(t)| (\|\rho_v(t)\|_{L_x^1}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} + \gamma_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}}). \quad (186)$$

We recall that $2\sigma_{q-1} < T_L$ by assumption, choose $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\frac{n_1-1}{\sigma} < 2\sigma_{q-1} \leq \frac{n_1}{\sigma}$, $\frac{n_2-1}{\sigma} \leq T_L < \frac{n_2}{\sigma}$, define $\rho_v(t) \equiv \rho_v(T_L)$ for all $t \in (T_L, \frac{n_2}{\sigma}]$, and estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| g_\xi \|\rho_v\|_{L_x^1}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^2([2\sigma_{q-1}, T_L])} \lesssim \|g_\xi\|_{L^2([(\frac{n_1-1}{\sigma}, \frac{n_1}{\sigma}])]} \|\rho_v\|_{C_{[0, T_L], x}^1}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & + \|g_\xi\|_{L^2([(\frac{n_1}{\sigma}, \frac{n_2}{\sigma}])]} \|\rho_v\|_{L^1_{[(\frac{n_1}{\sigma}, \frac{n_2}{\sigma}])]} + \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|g_\xi\|_{L^2([0, 1])} \left\| \|\rho_v\|_{L_x^1}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{C^{0,1}([(\frac{n_1}{\sigma}, \frac{n_2}{\sigma}])]} \left(T_L + \frac{1}{\sigma} - 2\sigma_{q-1} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \lesssim (\delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} + \gamma_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}}) \left(T_L + \frac{1}{\sigma} - 2\sigma_{q-1} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (187)$$

Thus, taking $L^2([2\sigma_{q-1}, T_L])$ -norm over integrating (186), relying on (187) and (273a), we are able to deduce for $M_0 \gg 1$ sufficiently large,

$$\|\tilde{w}_{q+1}^p\|_{L^2_{[2\sigma_{q-1}, T_L], x}} \leq \frac{1}{2} M_0 (\delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} + \gamma_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}}) (M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} - 2\sigma_{q-1})^{\frac{1}{2}}; \quad (188)$$

an analogous upper bound without the addition of $\gamma_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ in the first parenthesis holds for $\|\tilde{d}_{q+1}^p\|_{L^2_{[2\sigma_{q-1}, T_L], x}}$.

5.1.2. *Case $t \in (\sigma_{q+1} \wedge T_L, T_L]$.* If $\sigma_{q+1} \geq T_L$, then there is nothing to prove and thus we assume that $\sigma_{q+1} < T_L$. Therefore, $\chi(t) \in (0, 1]$ according to (179). We can estimate for all $t \in (\sigma_{q+1}, T_L]$, using the improved Hölder's inequality (e.g. [13, Proposition 3]) again,

$$\|\tilde{w}_{q+1}^p(t)\|_{L_x^2} \lesssim \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_v \cup \Lambda_\theta} |g_\xi(t)| \left[\|\rho_\theta(t)\|_{L_x^1}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|\rho_v(t)\|_{L_x^1}^{\frac{1}{2}} + (M_L + qA)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \gamma_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right]. \quad (189)$$

Consequently, similarly to the derivation of (188), for $n_3, n_4 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\frac{n_3-1}{\sigma} < \sigma_{q+1} \leq \frac{n_3}{\sigma}$, $\frac{n_4-1}{\sigma} < (2\sigma_{q-1}) \wedge T_L \leq \frac{n_4}{\sigma}$, for $M_0 \gg 1$ sufficiently large,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\tilde{w}_{q+1}^p\|_{L^2_{[\sigma_{q+1}, (2\sigma_{q-1}) \wedge T_L], x}} \stackrel{(273a)}{\lesssim} \left((M_L + qA)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \gamma_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \left[(2\sigma_{q-1}) \wedge T_L + \frac{2}{\sigma} - \sigma_{q+1} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & + \left(\int_{\frac{n_3-1}{\sigma}}^{\frac{n_4}{\sigma}} \|\rho_v\|_{L_x^1} + \|\rho_\theta\|_{L_x^1} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left[(2\sigma_{q-1}) \wedge T_L + \frac{2}{\sigma} - \sigma_{q+1} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} t^{-\frac{41}{2}} (M_L + qA + \gamma_{q+1}) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} M_0 \left((M_L + qA)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \gamma_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) (2\sigma_{q-1})^{\frac{1}{2}}; \end{aligned} \quad (190)$$

an identical upper bound holds for $\|\tilde{d}_{q+1}^p\|_{L^2_{[\sigma_{q+1}, (2\sigma_{q-1}) \wedge T_L], x}}$.

5.1.3. *Verifications of (153a), (153b), (153c).* We apply (188) and (190) together to conclude

$$\|\tilde{w}_{q+1}^p\|_{L^2_{[\sigma_{q+1}, T_L], x}} \lesssim \left((M_L + qA)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \gamma_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) M_L^{\frac{1}{4}}, \quad (191)$$

and the same upper bound holds for $\|\tilde{d}_{q+1}^p\|_{L^2_{[\sigma_{q+1}, T_L], x}}$. Next, for $t \in (\sigma_{q+1}, T_L]$, we can get the same estimates by same derivations of (184): for all $\rho \in (1, \infty)$, and all $N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\|w_{q+1}^p(t)\|_{L_x^\rho} \lesssim \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_v \cup \Lambda_\theta} |g_\xi(t)| \left(t^{-\frac{5}{2}} [M_L + qA]^{\frac{1}{2}} + \gamma_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) r_\perp^{\rho - \frac{1}{2}} r_\parallel^{\rho - \frac{1}{2}}, \quad (192a)$$

$$\|d_{q+1}^p(t)\|_{L_x^p} \lesssim \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Theta} |g_\xi(t)| t^{-\frac{5}{2}} [M_L + qA]^{\frac{1}{2}} r_\perp^{\frac{1}{2}} r_\parallel^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (192b)$$

$$\|\nabla^N w_{q+1}^p(t)\|_{L_x^p} \lesssim \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu \cup \Lambda_\Theta} |g_\xi(t)| t^{-\frac{5}{2}} ([M_L + qA]^{\frac{1}{2}} + \gamma_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}}) r_\perp^{\frac{1}{2}} r_\parallel^{-\frac{1}{2}} \lambda_{q+1}^N, \quad (192c)$$

$$\|\nabla^N d_{q+1}^p(t)\|_{L_x^p} \lesssim \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Theta} |g_\xi(t)| t^{-\frac{5}{2}} [M_L + qA]^{\frac{1}{2}} r_\perp^{\frac{1}{2}} r_\parallel^{-\frac{1}{2}} \lambda_{q+1}^N, \quad (192d)$$

$$\|w_{q+1}^c(t)\|_{L_x^p} \lesssim \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu \cup \Lambda_\Theta} |g_\xi(t)| t^{-\frac{5}{2}} ([M_L + qA]^{\frac{1}{2}} + \gamma_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}}) r_\perp^{\frac{1}{2}} r_\parallel^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{3}{2}}, \quad (192e)$$

$$\|d_{q+1}^c(t)\|_{L_x^p} \lesssim \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu \cup \Lambda_\Theta} |g_\xi(t)| t^{-\frac{5}{2}} [M_L + qA]^{\frac{1}{2}} r_\perp^{\frac{1}{2}} r_\parallel^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{3}{2}}, \quad (192f)$$

$$\|\nabla^N w_{q+1}^c(t)\|_{L_x^p} \lesssim \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu \cup \Lambda_\Theta} |g_\xi(t)| t^{-\frac{5}{2}} ([M_L + qA]^{\frac{1}{2}} + \gamma_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}}) r_\perp^{\frac{1}{2}} r_\parallel^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{3}{2}} \lambda_{q+1}^N, \quad (192g)$$

$$\|\nabla^N d_{q+1}^c(t)\|_{L_x^p} \lesssim \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu \cup \Lambda_\Theta} |g_\xi(t)| t^{-\frac{5}{2}} ([M_L + qA]^{\frac{1}{2}}) r_\perp^{\frac{1}{2}} r_\parallel^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{3}{2}} \lambda_{q+1}^N, \quad (192h)$$

$$\|w_{q+1}^t(t)\|_{L_x^p} \lesssim \mu^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu \cup \Lambda_\Theta} |g_\xi(t)|^2 t^{-5} (M_L + qA + \gamma_{q+1}) r_\perp^{\frac{1}{2}} r_\parallel^{-1}, \quad (192i)$$

$$\|d_{q+1}^t(t)\|_{L_x^p} \lesssim \mu^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu \cup \Lambda_\Theta} |g_\xi(t)|^2 t^{-5} (M_L + qA) r_\perp^{\frac{1}{2}} r_\parallel^{-1}, \quad (192j)$$

$$\|\nabla^N w_{q+1}^t(t)\|_{L_x^p} \lesssim \mu^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu \cup \Lambda_\Theta} |g_\xi(t)|^2 t^{-5} (M_L + qA + \gamma_{q+1}) r_\perp^{\frac{1}{2}} r_\parallel^{-1} \lambda_{q+1}^N, \quad (192k)$$

$$\|\nabla^N d_{q+1}^t(t)\|_{L_x^p} \lesssim \mu^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu \cup \Lambda_\Theta} |g_\xi(t)|^2 t^{-5} (M_L + qA) r_\perp^{\frac{1}{2}} r_\parallel^{-1} \lambda_{q+1}^N, \quad (192l)$$

$$\|w_{q+1}^o(t)\|_{L_x^p} \lesssim \sigma^{-1} t^{-33} (M_L + qA + \gamma_{q+1}), \quad (192m)$$

$$\|d_{q+1}^o(t)\|_{L_x^p} \lesssim \sigma^{-1} t^{-20} (M_L + qA), \quad (192n)$$

$$\|\nabla^N w_{q+1}^o(t)\|_{L_x^p} \lesssim \sigma^{-1} t^{-28N-33} (M_L + qA + \gamma_{q+1}), \quad (192o)$$

$$\|\nabla^N d_{q+1}^o(t)\|_{L_x^p} \lesssim \sigma^{-1} t^{-15N-20} (M_L + qA). \quad (192p)$$

Next, for all $t \in ((2\sigma_{q-1} \wedge T_L, T_L]$, we can rely on (184) to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\tilde{w}_{q+1}^c(t) + \tilde{w}_{q+1}^t(t) + \tilde{w}_{q+1}^o(t)\|_{L_x^2} + \|\tilde{d}_{q+1}^c(t) + \tilde{d}_{q+1}^t(t) + \tilde{d}_{q+1}^o(t)\|_{L_x^2} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu \cup \Lambda_\Theta} (\delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} + \gamma_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}}) [t^{-\frac{5}{2}} \lambda_{q+1}^{-4\epsilon} |g_\xi(t)| + t^{-\frac{11}{2}} \lambda_{q+1}^{-\frac{1}{2}+2\epsilon} |g_\xi(t)|^2 + t^{-\frac{67}{2}} \lambda_{q+1}^{-2\epsilon}]. \end{aligned} \quad (193)$$

Taking $L^2((2\sigma_{q-1} \wedge T_L, T_L])$ -norm on (193) and applying (275), (273a), and (273b) lead us to, for $M_0 \gg 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\tilde{w}_{q+1}^c + \tilde{w}_{q+1}^t + \tilde{w}_{q+1}^o\|_{L^2_{(2\sigma_{q-1}) \wedge T_L, T_L], x}} + \|\tilde{d}_{q+1}^c + \tilde{d}_{q+1}^t + \tilde{d}_{q+1}^o\|_{L^2_{(2\sigma_{q-1}) \wedge T_L, T_L], x}} \\ & \lesssim (\delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} + \gamma_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}}) \left(T_L - (2\sigma_{q-1}) \wedge T_L + \frac{2}{\sigma} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} t^{-\frac{11}{2}} \lambda_{q+1}^{-\epsilon} \leq \frac{M_0}{4} (M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \gamma_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}}) (M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} - 2\sigma_{q-1})^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (194)$$

Similarly, we can derive

$$\|\tilde{w}_{q+1}^c + \tilde{w}_{q+1}^t + \tilde{w}_{q+1}^o\|_{L^2_{(\sigma_{q+1} \wedge T_L, (2\sigma_{q-1}) \wedge T_L), x}} + \|\tilde{d}_{q+1}^c + \tilde{d}_{q+1}^t + \tilde{d}_{q+1}^o\|_{L^2_{(\sigma_{q+1} \wedge T_L, (2\sigma_{q-1}) \wedge T_L), x}}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lesssim (M_L + qA + \gamma_{q+1})^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(l^{-\frac{5}{2}} \lambda_{q+1}^{-4\epsilon} \left(\int_{\sigma_{q+1} \wedge T_L}^{(2\sigma_{q-1}) \wedge T_L} |g_\xi(t)|^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + l^{-\frac{11}{2}} \lambda_{q+1}^{-\frac{1}{2} + 2\epsilon} \left(\int_{\sigma_{q+1} \wedge T_L}^{(2\sigma_{q-1}) \wedge T_L} |g_\xi(t)|^4 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + l^{-\frac{67}{2}} \lambda_{q+1}^{-2\epsilon} \left(\int_{\sigma_{q+1} \wedge T_L}^{(2\sigma_{q-1}) \wedge T_L} |h_\xi(t)|^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{M_0}{4} \left((M_L + qA)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \gamma_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) (2\sigma_{q-1})^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{195}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we are now able to conclude by applying (188) and (194) to (183a),

$$\|w_{q+1}\|_{L^2_{[(2\sigma_{q-1}) \wedge T_L, T_L]_x}} \leq \frac{3}{4} M_0 (M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \gamma_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}}) (M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} - 2\sigma_{q-1})^{\frac{1}{2}}; \tag{196}$$

an identical bound holds for $\|d_{q+1}\|_{L^2_{[(2\sigma_{q-1}) \wedge T_L, T_L]_x}}$. Next, by applying (190) and (195) to (183a), we deduce

$$\|w_{q+1}\|_{L^2_{[\sigma_{q+1} \wedge T_L, (2\sigma_{q-1}) \wedge T_L]_x}} \leq \frac{3}{4} M_0 \left((M_L + qA)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \gamma_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) (2\sigma_{q-1})^{\frac{1}{2}}; \tag{197}$$

the same bound applies for $\|d_{q+1}\|_{L^2_{[\sigma_{q+1} \wedge T_L, (2\sigma_{q-1}) \wedge T_L]_x}}$. We can now verify (153a) using (183a), (196), and (151d),

$$\|v_{q+1} - v_q\|_{L^2_{[(2\sigma_{q-1}) \wedge T_L, T_L]_x}} \leq M_0 (M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \gamma_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}}) (M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} - 2\sigma_{q-1})^{\frac{1}{2}}; \tag{198}$$

and identical upper bound holds for $\|\Theta_{q+1} - \Theta_q\|_{L^2_{[(2\sigma_{q-1}) \wedge T_L, T_L]_x}}$. We also verify (153b) via (197) and (151d):

$$\|v_{q+1} - v_q\|_{L^2_{[\sigma_{q+1} \wedge T_L, (2\sigma_{q-1}) \wedge T_L]_x}} \leq M_0 \left((M_L + qA)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \gamma_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) (2\sigma_{q-1})^{\frac{1}{2}};$$

the same upper bound holds for $\|\Theta_{q+1} - \Theta_q\|_{L^2_{[\sigma_{q+1} \wedge T_L, (2\sigma_{q-1}) \wedge T_L]_x}}$. Finally, for $t \in [t_{q+1}, \sigma_{q+1} \wedge T_L]$, we have $\chi(t) = 0$ due to (179). Therefore, $w_{q+1} \equiv d_{q+1} \equiv 0$ due to (183). By (151c) we have $v_q \equiv \Theta_q \equiv 0$ on $[t_q, \sigma_q \wedge T_L]$. Because $2l \ll \delta_{q+1}$, it follows that on $[t_{q+1}, \sigma_{q+1} \wedge T_L]$ $v_l \equiv \Theta_l \equiv 0$ and hence $v_{q+1} \equiv \Theta_{q+1} \equiv 0$ which verifies (153c).

5.2. Verifications of (151a)-(151b) at level $q + 1$. As a consequence of (153a), (153b), and (153c) that we already verified, we see that

$$\|v_{q+1} - v_q\|_{L^2_{[0, T_L]_x}} \leq M_0 (M_L + qA)^{\frac{1}{2}} (2\sigma_{q-1})^{\frac{1}{2}} + M_0 M_L^{\frac{3}{4}} \delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} + M_0 \gamma_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{2} M_L^{\frac{1}{4}}. \tag{199}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|v_{q+1}\|_{L^2_{[0, T_L]_x}} &\leq M_0 \left(M_L^{\frac{3}{4}} \sum_{r=1}^{q+1} \delta_r^{\frac{1}{2}} + \sqrt{2} M_L^{\frac{1}{4}} \sum_{r=1}^{q+1} \gamma_r^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) + \sqrt{2} M_0 (M_L + A)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{r=1}^q (r\sigma_{r-1})^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq M_0 \left(M_L^{\frac{3}{4}} + \sqrt{2} M_L^{\frac{1}{4}} (K^{\frac{1}{2}} + 1) + 17(M_L + A)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

which verifies (151a)-(151b) at level $q + 1$ as the same upper bound holds for $\|\Theta_{q+1}\|_{L^2_{[0, T_L]_x}}$.

5.3. Verification of (153d) and (151e) at level $q + 1$. For all $m \in (1, \infty)$, (192a), (192e), (192i), and (192m) give us

$$\|w_{q+1}\|_{C_{[0, T_L]_x} L_x^m} \lesssim \lambda_{q+1}^{\frac{3}{2} - 7\epsilon + \frac{8\epsilon - 2}{m}} l^{-3} + \lambda_{q+1}^{-2\epsilon} l^{-34}. \tag{200}$$

Consequently, we are able to verify (153d): using (183a) and (200),

$$\|v_{q+1} - v_q\|_{C_{[0, T_L]_x} L_x^p} \lesssim \lambda_{q+1}^{\frac{3}{2} - 7\epsilon + \frac{8\epsilon - 2}{m}} l^{-3} + \lambda_{q+1}^{-2\epsilon} l^{-34} + \|v_l - v_q\|_{C_{[0, T_L]_x}} \leq M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda_{q+1}^{-\frac{6}{112}} \leq M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}}; \tag{201}$$

the same upper bound applies for $\|\Theta_{q+1} - \Theta_q\|_{C_{[0,T_L]L_x^p}}$. In turn, (153d) now leads to (151e) at level $q + 1$, specifically, together with (144),

$$\|v_{q+1}\|_{C_{[0,T_L]L_x^p}} \leq \|v_{q+1} - v_q\|_{C_{[0,T_L]L_x^p}} + \|v_q\|_{C_{[0,T_L]L_x^p}} \leq M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{r=1}^{q+1} \delta_r^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq M_L^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and the same upper bound holds for $\|\Theta_{q+1}\|_{C_{[0,T_L]L_x^p}}$. Next, upon estimating $\|v_{q+1}\|_{C_{[0,T_L]L_x^p}^1}$ and $\|\Theta_{q+1}\|_{C_{[0,T_L]L_x^p}^1}$, when the temporal derivative ∂_t falls on χ , we know $\|\chi'\|_{C_t} \leq \sigma_{q+1}^{-1} = \delta_{q+1}^{-1} \lesssim t^{-1}$ due to (179) and (150) which will not create any significant problems. Therefore, applying (185) to (183a) immediately leads us to

$$\|v_{q+1}\|_{C_{[q+1,T_L]L_x^p}^1} + \|\Theta_{q+1}\|_{C_{[q+1,T_L]L_x^p}^1} = \|w_{q+1} + v_l\|_{C_{[0,T_L]L_x^p}^1} + \|d_{q+1} + \Theta_l\|_{C_{[0,T_L]L_x^p}^1} \leq \lambda_{q+1}^7 M_L^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

verifying (151d) at level $q + 1$.

5.4. Verification of (154). For $t \in (2 \wedge T_L, T_L]$, we have $\chi(t) = 1$ due to (179) and

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| (\|v_{q+1}\|_{L_{[2 \wedge T_L, T_L]L_x^p}^2}^2 - \|\Theta_{q+1}\|_{L_{[2 \wedge T_L, T_L]L_x^p}^2}^2) - (\|v_q\|_{L_{[2 \wedge T_L, T_L]L_x^p}^2}^2 - \|\Theta_q\|_{L_{[2 \wedge T_L, T_L]L_x^p}^2}^2) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - 3\gamma_{q+1}(T_L - 2 \wedge T_L) \right| \leq \sum_{k=1}^6 \mathbb{I}_k, \end{aligned} \quad (202)$$

where

$$\mathbb{I}_1 \triangleq \left| \int_{2 \wedge T_L}^{T_L} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |w_{q+1}^p|^2 - |d_{q+1}^p|^2 dx dt - 3\gamma_{q+1}(T_L - 2 \wedge T_L) \right|, \quad (203a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{I}_2 \triangleq & 2\|w_{q+1}^p \cdot (w_{q+1}^c + w_{q+1}^t + w_{q+1}^o)\|_{L_{[2 \wedge T_L, T_L]L_x^p}^1} \\ & + 2\|(w_{q+1}^c + w_{q+1}^t + w_{q+1}^o) \cdot v_l\|_{L_{[2 \wedge T_L, T_L]L_x^p}^1}, \end{aligned} \quad (203b)$$

$$\mathbb{I}_3 \triangleq 2\|d_{q+1}^p \cdot (d_{q+1}^c + d_{q+1}^t + d_{q+1}^o)\|_{L_{[2 \wedge T_L, T_L]L_x^p}^1} + 2\|(d_{q+1}^c + d_{q+1}^t + d_{q+1}^o) \cdot \Theta_l\|_{L_{[2 \wedge T_L, T_L]L_x^p}^1}, \quad (203c)$$

$$\mathbb{I}_4 \triangleq \|w_{q+1}^c + w_{q+1}^t + w_{q+1}^o\|_{L_{[2 \wedge T_L, T_L]L_x^p}^2}^2 + \|d_{q+1}^c + d_{q+1}^t + d_{q+1}^o\|_{L_{[2 \wedge T_L, T_L]L_x^p}^2}^2, \quad (203d)$$

$$\mathbb{I}_5 \triangleq 2\|w_{q+1}^p \cdot v_l\|_{L_{[2 \wedge T_L, T_L]L_x^p}^1} + 2\|d_{q+1}^p \cdot \Theta_l\|_{L_{[2 \wedge T_L, T_L]L_x^p}^1}, \quad (203e)$$

$$\mathbb{I}_6 \triangleq \left| \|v_l\|_{L_{[2 \wedge T_L, T_L]L_x^p}^2}^2 - \|v_q\|_{L_{[2 \wedge T_L, T_L]L_x^p}^2}^2 \right| + \left| \|\Theta_l\|_{L_{[2 \wedge T_L, T_L]L_x^p}^2}^2 - \|\Theta_q\|_{L_{[2 \wedge T_L, T_L]L_x^p}^2}^2 \right|. \quad (203f)$$

Concerning \mathbb{I}_1 , using (175) and (181b), we can estimate

$$\mathbb{I}_1 \leq \sum_{k=1}^6 \mathbb{I}_{1,k} \quad (204)$$

where

$$\mathbb{I}_{1,1} \triangleq 3\epsilon_v^{-1}IT_L, \quad \mathbb{I}_{1,2} \triangleq 3\epsilon_v^{-1} \left(\|\mathring{R}_l^v\|_{L_{[2 \wedge T_L, T_L]L_x^p}^1} + \|\mathring{G}^\Theta\|_{L_{[2 \wedge T_L, T_L]L_x^p}^1} \right), \quad (205a)$$

$$\mathbb{I}_{1,3} \triangleq \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_v} \left| \int_{2 \wedge T_L}^{T_L} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} a_\xi^2 g_\xi^2 \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} |W_\xi|^2 dx dt \right|, \quad (205b)$$

$$\mathbb{I}_{1,4} \triangleq \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Theta} \left| \int_{2 \wedge T_L}^{T_L} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} a_\xi^2 g_\xi^2 \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} (|W_\xi|^2 - |D_\xi|^2) dx dt \right|, \quad (205c)$$

$$\mathbb{I}_{1,5} \triangleq \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_v} \left| \int_{2 \wedge T_L}^{T_L} (g_\xi^2 - 1) |a_\xi|_{L_x^2}^2 dt \right|, \quad (205d)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{I}_{1,6} \triangleq & \sum_{\xi, \xi' \in \Lambda_\nu \cup \Lambda_\Theta, \xi \neq \xi'} \left| \int_{2\wedge T_L}^{T_L} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} a_\xi a_{\xi'} g_\xi g_{\xi'} W_\xi \cdot W_{\xi'} dx dt \right| \\ & + \sum_{\xi, \xi' \in \Lambda_\Theta, \xi \neq \xi'} \left| \int_{2\wedge T_L}^{T_L} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} a_\xi a_{\xi'} g_\xi g_{\xi'} D_\xi \cdot D_{\xi'} dx dt \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (205e)$$

We can estimate by relying on (152a) and (268),

$$\mathbb{I}_{1,1} \ll M_L \delta_{q+1}, \quad \mathbb{I}_{1,2} \leq 3\epsilon_\nu^{-1} \delta_{q+1} M_L + 7\epsilon_\nu^{-1} \epsilon_\Theta^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Theta} \|\gamma_\xi\|_{C(B_{e_\Theta}(0))} \delta_{q+1} M_L. \quad (206)$$

Next, for $N > \frac{1}{\epsilon} [1 - \frac{\epsilon}{112} (442 - \frac{3}{28})]$, using the fact that W_ξ is $(\mathbb{T}/\lambda_{q+1} r_\perp)^3$ -periodic leads to

$$\mathbb{I}_{1,3} \leq \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu} \|g_\xi\|_{L^2_{[2\wedge T_L, T_L]}}^2 \sup_{t \in [2\wedge T_L, T_L]} \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (-\Delta)^{\frac{N}{2}} a_\xi^2(t) (-\Delta)^{-\frac{N}{2}} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} |W_\xi(t)|^2 dx \right| \ll \delta_{q+1} M_L; \quad (207)$$

similar computations with $N > \frac{7}{13\epsilon} [1 - \frac{\epsilon}{112} (442 - \frac{3}{28})]$ also shows that $\mathbb{I}_{1,4} \ll \delta_{q+1} M_L$.

Next, we find $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $\frac{n_1}{\sigma} < 2 \wedge T_L \leq \frac{n_1+1}{\sigma}$, $\frac{n_2}{\sigma} \leq T_L < \frac{n_2+1}{\sigma}$, define $a_\xi(t) = a_\xi(T_L)$ for all $t \in [T_L, \frac{n_2+1}{\sigma}]$, observe that $g_\xi^2 - 1$ is mean-zero so that we can estimate using (277),

$$\mathbb{I}_{1,5} \leq \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu} \left| \int_{\frac{n_1+1}{\sigma}}^{\frac{n_2}{\sigma}} (g_\xi^2 - 1) \|a_\xi\|_{L^2_x}^2 dt \right| + \left(\int_{2\wedge T_L}^{\frac{n_1+1}{\sigma}} + \int_{\frac{n_2}{\sigma}}^{T_L} \right) (g_\xi^2 + 1) \|a_\xi\|_{L^2_x}^2 dt \ll M_L \delta_{q+1}. \quad (208)$$

Next, using (266), (267), (273a), and (272) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{I}_{1,6} \lesssim & \sum_{\xi, \xi' \in \Lambda_\nu \cup \Lambda_\Theta, \xi \neq \xi'} \|a_\xi\|_{C_{[2\wedge T_L, T_L], x}} \|a_{\xi'}\|_{C_{[2\wedge T_L, T_L], x}} \\ & \times \|g_\xi\|_{L^2_{[2\wedge T_L, T_L]}} \|g_{\xi'}\|_{L^2_{[2\wedge T_L, T_L]}} \|\psi_{\xi_1} \phi_\xi \psi_{\xi_1} \phi_{\xi'}\|_{C_{[2\wedge T_L, T_L], L^1_x}} \ll M_L \delta_{q+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (209)$$

Considering (206), (207), (208), and (209) to (204) allows us to conclude that for any $\iota > 0$,

$$\mathbb{I}_1 \leq \iota M_L \delta_{q+1} + 3\epsilon_\nu^{-1} \delta_{q+1} M_L + 7\epsilon_\nu^{-1} \epsilon_\Theta^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Theta} \|\gamma_\xi\|_{C(B_{e_\Theta}(0))} \delta_{q+1} M_L. \quad (210)$$

Next, we rely on (151b), (188), and (194) to deduce

$$\mathbb{I}_2 \lesssim [\|v_q\|_{L^2_{(2\wedge T_L, T_L], x}} + \|w_{q+1}^p\|_{L^2_{((2\sigma_{q-1}) \wedge T_L, T_L], x}}] \|w_{q+1}^c + w_{q+1}^f + w_{q+1}^o\|_{L^2_{(2\wedge T_L, T_L], x}} \ll M_L \delta_{q+1}; \quad (211)$$

the same bound can be deduced essentially identically for \mathbb{I}_3 while applying (194) to \mathbb{I}_4 immediately gives the same bound. Next, using (184a), (184b), (151d), and (273a), we estimate from (203e)

$$\mathbb{I}_5 \leq \left[\int_{2\wedge T_L}^{T_L} |g_\xi(t)| dt \right]^{-\frac{5}{2}} \left(\delta_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} + \gamma_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} r_\perp^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \lambda_q^7 M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} \ll \delta_{q+1} M_L. \quad (212)$$

Finally, relying on (151b) and (151d) gives us

$$\mathbb{I}_6 \lesssim \|v_l - v_q\|_{L^\infty_{(2\wedge T_L, T_L], x}} \|v_q\|_{L^2_{(q, T_L], x}} + \|\Theta_l - \Theta_q\|_{L^\infty_{(2\wedge T_L, T_L], x}} \|\Theta_q\|_{L^2_{(q, T_L], x}} \ll \delta_{q+1} M_L. \quad (213)$$

Considering (210), (211), (212), and (213) into (202) allows us to verify (154).

5.5. Decomposition of the Reynolds and magnetic Reynolds stress. The following decomposition relies on (181) and differs from [52] due to stochastic terms and temporal cutoff χ ; on the other hand, it differs from [57] due to coupling with Maxwell's equation:

$$\mathring{R}_{q+1}^\ominus = R_{\text{lin}}^\ominus + R_{\text{cor}}^\ominus + R_{\text{osc}}^\ominus + R_{\text{com1}}^\ominus + R_{\text{com2}}^\ominus + R_{\text{stoc}}^\ominus \quad (214)$$

where, besides R_{com1}^\ominus already defined in (168), with \mathcal{R}^\ominus from Lemma A.1,

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\text{lin}}^\ominus &\triangleq \mathcal{R}^\ominus \left(\partial_t (\tilde{d}_{q+1}^p + \tilde{d}_{q+1}^c) \right) + \mathcal{R}^\ominus (-\Delta)^{m_2} d_{q+1} \\ &\quad + d_{q+1} \otimes v_l - v_l \otimes d_{q+1} + \Theta_l \otimes w_{q+1} - w_{q+1} \otimes \Theta_l, \end{aligned} \quad (215a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\text{cor}}^\ominus &\triangleq \mathcal{R}^\ominus \mathbb{P} \operatorname{div} \left(\tilde{d}_{q+1}^p \otimes (\tilde{w}_{q+1}^c + \tilde{w}_{q+1}^t + \tilde{w}_{q+1}^o) - (\tilde{w}_{q+1}^c + \tilde{w}_{q+1}^t + \tilde{w}_{q+1}^o) \otimes d_{q+1} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (\tilde{d}_{q+1}^c + \tilde{d}_{q+1}^t + \tilde{d}_{q+1}^o) \otimes w_{q+1} - \tilde{w}_{q+1}^p \otimes (\tilde{d}_{q+1}^c + \tilde{d}_{q+1}^t + \tilde{d}_{q+1}^o) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (215b)$$

$$R_{\text{osc}}^\ominus \triangleq \sum_{k=1}^4 R_{\text{osc},k}^\ominus + \mathcal{R}^\ominus \left((\chi^2)' (d_{q+1}^t + d_{q+1}^o) \right) + \left(\mathring{R}_l^\ominus (1 - \chi^2) \right), \quad (215c)$$

$$R_{\text{com2}}^\ominus \triangleq \Theta_l \otimes v_l - \Theta_q \otimes v_q + v_q \otimes \Theta_q - v_l \otimes \Theta_l, \quad (215d)$$

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\text{stoc}}^\ominus &\triangleq \mathcal{R}^\ominus \mathbb{P} \operatorname{div} \left([\Theta_{q+1} - \Theta_q] \otimes z_1^{\text{in}} + [v_q - v_{q+1}] \otimes z_2^{\text{in}} + \Theta_{q+1} \otimes z_{1,q+1} - \Theta_q \otimes z_{1,q} \right. \\ &\quad + z_2^{\text{in}} \otimes [v_{q+1} - v_q] + z_{2,q+1} \otimes v_{q+1} - z_{2,q} \otimes v_q - v_{q+1} \otimes z_{2,q+1} + v_q \otimes z_{2,q} \\ &\quad + [z_{2,q+1} - z_{2,q}] \otimes z_1^{\text{in}} + z_{2,q+1} \otimes z_{1,q+1} - z_{2,q} \otimes z_{1,q} + z_2^{\text{in}} \otimes [z_{1,q+1} - z_{1,q}] \\ &\quad + z_{1,q} \otimes \Theta_q - z_{1,q+1} \otimes \Theta_{q+1} + [z_{1,q} - z_{1,q+1}] \otimes z_2^{\text{in}} \\ &\quad \left. + z_1^{\text{in}} \otimes [\Theta_q - \Theta_{q+1}] + z_1^{\text{in}} \otimes [z_{2,q} - z_{2,q+1}] + z_{1,q} \otimes z_{2,q} - z_{1,q+1} \otimes z_{2,q+1} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (215e)$$

$$R_{\text{osc},1}^\ominus \triangleq \chi^2 \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Theta} \mathcal{R}^\ominus \mathbb{P} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \left(g_\xi^2 \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} (D_\xi \otimes W_\xi - W_\xi \otimes D_\xi) \nabla (a_\xi^2) \right), \quad (216a)$$

$$R_{\text{osc},2}^\ominus \triangleq -\chi^2 \mu^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Theta} \mathcal{R}^\ominus \mathbb{P} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \left(\partial_t (a_\xi^2 g_\xi^2) \psi_{\xi_1}^2 \phi_\xi^2 \xi_2 \right), \quad (216b)$$

$$R_{\text{osc},3}^\ominus \triangleq -\chi^2 \sigma^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Theta} \mathcal{R}^\ominus \mathbb{P} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \left(h_\xi \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} D_\xi \otimes W_\xi - W_\xi \otimes D_\xi dx \partial_t \nabla (a_\xi^2) \right), \quad (216c)$$

$$R_{\text{osc},4}^\ominus \triangleq \chi^2 \left(\sum_{\xi, \xi' \in \Lambda_\Theta: \xi \neq \xi'} + \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu, \xi' \in \Lambda_\Theta} \right) \mathcal{R}^\ominus \mathbb{P} \operatorname{div} \left(a_\xi a_{\xi'} g_\xi g_{\xi'} (D_{\xi'} \otimes W_\xi - W_\xi \otimes D_{\xi'}) \right). \quad (216d)$$

Similarly, with appropriate pressure terms that we refrain from writing details as they will not play significant roles in our proof (see [52, 57]), we decompose

$$\mathring{R}_{q+1}^\vee = R_{\text{lin}}^\vee + R_{\text{cor}}^\vee + R_{\text{osc}}^\vee + R_{\text{com1}}^\vee + R_{\text{com2}}^\vee + R_{\text{stoc}}^\vee \quad (217)$$

where, besides R_{com1}^\vee already defined in (168), with \mathcal{R} from Lemma A.1,

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\text{lin}}^\vee &\triangleq \mathcal{R} \left(\partial_t (\tilde{w}_{q+1}^p + \tilde{w}_{q+1}^c) \right) + \mathcal{R} (-\Delta)^{m_1} w_{q+1} \\ &\quad + v_l \otimes w_{q+1} + w_{q+1} \otimes v_l - \Theta_l \otimes d_{q+1} - d_{q+1} \otimes \Theta_l, \end{aligned} \quad (218a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\text{cor}}^\vee &\triangleq \mathcal{R} \mathbb{P} \operatorname{div} \left((\tilde{w}_{q+1}^c + \tilde{w}_{q+1}^t + \tilde{w}_{q+1}^o) \otimes w_{q+1} + \tilde{w}_{q+1}^p \otimes (\tilde{w}_{q+1}^c + \tilde{w}_{q+1}^t + \tilde{w}_{q+1}^o) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - (\tilde{d}_{q+1}^c + \tilde{d}_{q+1}^t + \tilde{d}_{q+1}^o) \otimes d_{q+1} - \tilde{d}_{q+1}^p \otimes (\tilde{d}_{q+1}^c + \tilde{d}_{q+1}^t + \tilde{d}_{q+1}^o) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (218b)$$

$$R_{\text{osc}}^v \triangleq \sum_{k=1}^4 R_{\text{osc},k}^v + \mathcal{R}((\chi^2)'(w_{q+1}^t + w_{q+1}^o)) + \hat{R}_l^v(1 - \chi^2), \quad (218c)$$

$$R_{\text{com}2}^v \triangleq v_l \otimes v_l - v_q \otimes v_q + \Theta_q \otimes \Theta_q - \Theta_l \otimes \Theta_l, \quad (218d)$$

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\text{stoc}}^v \triangleq & \mathcal{R} \mathbb{P} \operatorname{div} \left([v_{q+1} - v_q] \otimes z_1^{\text{in}} + [\Theta_q - \Theta_{q+1}] \otimes z_2^{\text{in}} + v_{q+1} \otimes z_{1,q+1} - v_q \otimes z_{1,q} \right. \\ & + z_2^{\text{in}} \otimes [\Theta_q - \Theta_{q+1}] + z_{1,q+1} \otimes v_{q+1} - z_{1,q} \otimes v_q - \Theta_{q+1} \otimes z_{2,q+1} + \Theta_q \otimes z_{2,q} \\ & + [z_{1,q+1} - z_{1,q}] \otimes z_1^{\text{in}} + z_{1,q+1} \otimes z_{1,q+1} - z_{1,q} \otimes z_{1,q} + z_2^{\text{in}} \otimes [z_{2,q} - z_{2,q+1}] \\ & + z_{2,q} \otimes \Theta_q - z_{2,q+1} \otimes \Theta_{q+1} + [z_{2,q} - z_{2,q+1}] \otimes z_2^{\text{in}} \\ & \left. + z_1^{\text{in}} \otimes [v_{q+1} - v_q] + z_1^{\text{in}} \otimes [z_{1,q+1} - z_{1,q}] - z_{2,q+1} \otimes z_{2,q+1} + z_{2,q} \otimes z_{2,q} \right), \quad (218e) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\text{osc},1}^v \triangleq & \chi^2 \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_v} \mathcal{R} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \left(g_\xi^2 \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}(W_\xi \otimes W_\xi) \nabla(a_\xi^2) \right) \\ & + \chi^2 \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Theta} \mathcal{R} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \left(g_\xi^2 \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}(W_\xi \otimes W_\xi - D_\xi \otimes D_\xi) \nabla(a_\xi^2) \right), \quad (219a) \end{aligned}$$

$$R_{\text{osc},2}^v \triangleq -\chi^2 \mu^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_v \cup \Lambda_\Theta} \mathcal{R} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \left(\partial_t (a_\xi^2 g_\xi^2) \psi_{\xi_1}^2 \phi_{\xi_1}^2 \xi_1 \right), \quad (219b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\text{osc},3}^v \triangleq & -\chi^2 \sigma^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_v} \mathcal{R} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \left(h_\xi \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} W_\xi \otimes W_\xi dx \partial_t \nabla(a_\xi^2) \right) \\ & - \chi^2 \sigma^{-1} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Theta} \mathcal{R} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} \left(h_\xi \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} W_\xi \otimes W_\xi - D_\xi \otimes D_\xi dx \partial_t \nabla(a_\xi^2) \right), \quad (219c) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\text{osc},4}^v \triangleq & \chi^2 \sum_{\xi, \xi' \in \Lambda_v \cup \Lambda_\Theta: \xi \neq \xi'} \mathcal{R} \mathbb{P} \operatorname{div} (a_\xi a_{\xi'} g_\xi g_{\xi'} W_\xi \otimes W_{\xi'}) \\ & - \chi^2 \sum_{\xi, \xi' \in \Lambda_\Theta: \xi \neq \xi'} \mathcal{R} \mathbb{P} \operatorname{div} (a_\xi a_{\xi'} g_\xi g_{\xi'} D_\xi \otimes D_{\xi'}). \quad (219d) \end{aligned}$$

5.6. Verification of (152a) at level $q+1$. Over $[\sigma_q \wedge T_L, T_L]$, if $T_L \leq \sigma_q$, there is nothing to prove; thus, we assume that $\sigma_q < T_L$. On this interval, $\chi \equiv 1$ due to (179). We estimate the temporal derivatives within R_{lin}^Θ and R_{lin}^v of (215a) and (218a) for all $t \in [0, T_L]$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathcal{R}^\Theta \partial_t (d_{q+1}^p + d_{q+1}^c)(t)\|_{L_x^1} + \|\mathcal{R} \partial_t (w_{q+1}^p + w_{q+1}^c)(t)\|_{L_x^1} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_v \cup \Lambda_\Theta} |g_\xi(t)| l^{-3} \lambda_{q+1}^{\frac{5}{2} + \frac{8\epsilon-2}{p^*} - 18\epsilon} + |\partial_t g_\xi(t)| l^{-3} \lambda_{q+1}^{\frac{8\epsilon-2}{p^*} - 4\epsilon}. \quad (220) \end{aligned}$$

Integrating (220) over $[\sigma_q \wedge T_L, T_L]$ and making use of (273a) give us

$$\|\mathcal{R}^\Theta \partial_t (\tilde{d}_{q+1}^p + \tilde{d}_{q+1}^c)\|_{L_{[\sigma_q \wedge T_L, T_L], x}^1} + \|\mathcal{R} \partial_t (\tilde{w}_{q+1}^p + \tilde{w}_{q+1}^c)\|_{L_{[\sigma_q \wedge T_L, T_L], x}^1} \lesssim l^{-3} \lambda_{q+1}^{2 + \frac{8\epsilon-2}{p^*} - 15\epsilon}. \quad (221)$$

Next, considering (21), we can split w_{q+1} and d_{q+1} to four pieces according to (183), rely on (192) to estimate for all $t \in (\sigma_{q+1}, T_L]$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathcal{R}(-\Delta)^{m_1} w_{q+1}(t)\|_{L_x^{p^*}} + \|\mathcal{R}^\Theta(-\Delta)^{m_2} d_{q+1}(t)\|_{L_x^{p^*}} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_v \cup \Lambda_\Theta} \sum_{k=1}^2 |g_\xi(t)| l^{-3} \lambda_{q+1}^{2m_k - 4\epsilon + \frac{8\epsilon-2}{p^*}} + |g_\xi(t)|^2 l^{-6} \lambda_{q+1}^{2m_k - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{8\epsilon-2}{p^*} - 2\epsilon} + \lambda_{q+1}^{-2\epsilon} l^{-8\epsilon}. \quad (222) \end{aligned}$$

Integrating (222) over $(\sigma_q, T_L]$, we are able to conclude via (273a),

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathcal{R}(-\Delta)^{m_1} w_{q+1}\|_{L^1_{[\sigma_q, T_L]} L^p_x} + \|\mathcal{R}^\Theta(-\Delta)^{m_2} d_{q+1}\|_{L^1_{[\sigma_q, T_L]} L^p_x} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{k=1}^2 T^{-3} \lambda_{q+1}^{2m_k - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{8\epsilon-2}{p} - \epsilon} + M_L \lambda_{q+1}^{-2\epsilon} T^{-88}. \end{aligned} \quad (223)$$

The remaining term of R_{lin}^Θ and R_{lin}^v of (215a) and (218a) can be estimated as follows: for $t \in (\sigma_{q+1}, T_L]$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\nu_l \otimes w_{q+1} + w_{q+1} \otimes \nu_l - \Theta_l \otimes d_{q+1} - d_{q+1} \otimes \Theta_l)(t)\|_{L^p_x} \\ & + \|(d_{q+1} \otimes \nu_l - \nu_l \otimes d_{q+1} + \Theta_l \otimes w_{q+1} - w_{q+1} \otimes \Theta_l)(t)\|_{L^p_x} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu \cup \Lambda_\Theta} \lambda_q^7 M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(|g_\xi(t)| T^{-3} \lambda_{q+1}^{\frac{8\epsilon-2}{p} + 1 - 4\epsilon} + |g_\xi(t)|^2 T^{-6} \lambda_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{8\epsilon-2}{p} - 2\epsilon} + T^{-34} \lambda_{q+1}^{-2\epsilon} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (224)$$

Integrating (224) over $[\sigma_q, T_L]$ now gives us

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\nu_l \otimes w_{q+1} + w_{q+1} \otimes \nu_l - \Theta_l \otimes d_{q+1} - d_{q+1} \otimes \Theta_l)\|_{L^1_{[\sigma_q, T_L]} L^p_x} \\ & + \|(d_{q+1} \otimes \nu_l - \nu_l \otimes d_{q+1} + \Theta_l \otimes w_{q+1} - w_{q+1} \otimes \Theta_l)\|_{L^1_{[\sigma_q, T_L]} L^p_x} \lesssim M_L \lambda_q^7 T^{-34} \lambda_{q+1}^{-2\epsilon}. \end{aligned} \quad (225)$$

Considering (221), (223), and (225) to (218a) and (215a), we now conclude that

$$\|R_{\text{lin}}^v\|_{L^1_{[\sigma_q, T_L]} L^p_x} + \|R_{\text{lin}}^\Theta\|_{L^1_{[\sigma_q, T_L]} L^p_x} \ll M_L \delta_{q+2}. \quad (226)$$

Next, we estimate the corrector terms using (192): for all $t \in (\sigma_{q+1}, T_L]$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|R_{\text{cor}}^v(t)\|_{L^p_x} + \|R_{\text{cor}}^\Theta(t)\|_{L^p_x} \lesssim [\|w_{q+1}^p(t)\|_{L^2_x} + \|w_{q+1}(t)\|_{L^2_x} + \|d_{q+1}^p(t)\|_{L^2_x} + \|d_{q+1}(t)\|_{L^2_x}] \\ & \times \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu \cup \Lambda_\Theta} [|g_\xi(t)| T^{-3} r_\perp^{\frac{1}{p}} r_\parallel^{\frac{1}{p} - 2} + |g_\xi(t)|^2 T^{-6} \mu^{-1} r_\perp^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{3}{2}} r_\parallel^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{3}{2}} + \sigma^{-1} T^{-34}]. \end{aligned} \quad (227)$$

We integrate (227) over $[\sigma_q, T_L]$ and use (191), (196), (197), and (273a) to obtain

$$\|R_{\text{cor}}^v\|_{L^1_{[\sigma_q, T_L]} L^p_x} + \|R_{\text{cor}}^\Theta\|_{L^1_{[\sigma_q, T_L]} L^p_x} \ll M_L \delta_{q+2}. \quad (228)$$

Next, we estimate the oscillations errors: first, for $t \in (\sigma_{q+1}, T_L]$, by relying on (265), (178), and (172),

$$\|R_{\text{osc},1}^v(t)\|_{L^p_x} + \|R_{\text{osc},1}^\Theta(t)\|_{L^p_x} \lesssim \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu \cup \Lambda_\Theta} |g_\xi(t)|^2 T^{-90} \lambda_{q+1}^{2-10\epsilon + \frac{8\epsilon-2}{p}}. \quad (229)$$

Integrating (229) over $[\sigma_q, T_L]$ and making use of (273a) give us

$$\|R_{\text{osc},1}^v\|_{L^1_{[\sigma_q, T_L]} L^p_x} + \|R_{\text{osc},1}^\Theta\|_{L^1_{[\sigma_q, T_L]} L^p_x} \lesssim T^{-90} \lambda_{q+1}^{2-10\epsilon + \frac{8\epsilon-2}{p}} \ll \delta_{q+2} M_L. \quad (230)$$

Second, for $t \in (\sigma_{q+1}, T_L]$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|R_{\text{osc},2}^v(t)\|_{L^p_x} + \|R_{\text{osc},2}^\Theta(t)\|_{L^p_x} \\ & \lesssim \lambda_{q+1}^{-\frac{3}{2} + 6\epsilon + (-2+8\epsilon)(\frac{1}{p}-1)} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\nu \cup \Lambda_\Theta} \left[T^{-34} |g_\xi(t)|^2 + T^{-6} |g_\xi(t)| |\partial_t g_\xi(t)| \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (231)$$

Integrating (231) over $(\sigma_q, T_L]$ and making use of (273a) give us

$$\|R_{\text{osc},2}^v\|_{L^1_{[\sigma_q, T_L]} L^p_x} + \|R_{\text{osc},2}^\Theta\|_{L^1_{[\sigma_q, T_L]} L^p_x} \lesssim T^{-6} \lambda_{q+1}^{\frac{3}{2} + \frac{8\epsilon-2}{p} - 6\epsilon} \ll \delta_{q+2} M_L. \quad (232)$$

Next, for all $t \in (\sigma_{q+1}, T_L]$, we can compute using (268),

$$\|R_{\text{osc},3}^{\text{v}}(t)\|_{L_x^{p^*}} + \|R_{\text{osc},3}^{\Theta}(t)\|_{L_x^{p^*}} \lesssim \lambda_{q+1}^{-2\epsilon} t^{-62}. \quad (233)$$

Integrating (233) over $(\sigma_q, T_L]$, we obtain

$$\|R_{\text{osc},3}^{\text{v}}\|_{L_{[\sigma_q, T_L]}^1 L_x^{p^*}} + \|R_{\text{osc},3}^{\Theta}\|_{L_{[\sigma_q, T_L]}^1 L_x^{p^*}} \ll M_L \delta_{q+2}. \quad (234)$$

Next, for all $t \in (\sigma_{q+1}, T_L]$, relying on (266), (267), (172), (178), and (272) gives us

$$\|R_{\text{osc},4}^{\text{v}}(t)\|_{L_x^{p^*}} + \|R_{\text{osc},4}^{\Theta}(t)\|_{L_x^{p^*}} \lesssim \sum_{\xi, \xi' \in \Lambda_1 \cup \Lambda_{\Theta}; \xi \neq \xi'} |g_{\xi} g_{\xi'}(t)| t^{-6} \lambda_{q+1}^{2-8\epsilon + \frac{14\epsilon-3}{p^*}}. \quad (235)$$

Integrating (235) over $(\sigma_q, T_L]$ and relying on (273a) give us

$$\|R_{\text{osc},4}^{\text{v}}\|_{L_{[\sigma_q, T_L]}^1 L_x^{p^*}} + \|R_{\text{osc},4}^{\Theta}\|_{L_{[\sigma_q, T_L]}^1 L_x^{p^*}} \lesssim t^{-6} \lambda_{q+1}^{2-8\epsilon + \frac{14\epsilon-3}{p^*}} \ll \delta_{q+2} M_L. \quad (236)$$

Due to (230), (232), (234), and (236), we conclude that

$$\|R_{\text{osc}}^{\text{v}}\|_{L_{[\sigma_q, T_L]}^1 L_x^{p^*}} + \|R_{\text{osc}}^{\Theta}\|_{L_{[\sigma_q, T_L]}^1 L_x^{p^*}} \ll \delta_{q+2} M_L. \quad (237)$$

Next, we can bound for all $t \in (\sigma_{q+1}, T_L]$, starting from (168)

$$\begin{aligned} & \|R_{\text{com}1}^{\text{v}}(t)\|_{L_x^{p^*}} + \|R_{\text{com}1}^{\Theta}(t)\|_{L_x^{p^*}} \\ & \leq \|(\dot{N}_{\text{com}}^{\text{v}} - \dot{N}_{\text{com}}^{\text{v}} *_{x} \varrho_l *_{t} \vartheta_l)(t)\|_{L_x^{p^*}} + \|(N_{\text{com}}^{\Theta} - N_{\text{com}}^{\Theta} *_{x} \varrho_l *_{t} \vartheta_l)(t)\|_{L_x^{p^*}} \\ & \leq \lambda_q^7 M_L + l \left(\lambda_q^7 M_L [\delta_{q+1}^{-[\frac{3}{m_1} \frac{2-p}{4p} + 1]} + \delta_{q+1}^{-[\frac{3}{m_1} \frac{2-p}{4p} + \frac{1}{2m_1}]}] \right) \\ & \quad + M_L \lambda_q^7 l^{\frac{1}{2}-2\delta} + l M_L \left(\delta_{q+1}^{-[\frac{3}{m_1} \frac{2-p}{4p} + \frac{1}{2m_1}]} + \delta_{q+1}^{-[\frac{3}{m_1} (\frac{2-p}{4p} + 1)}] \right) \delta_{q+1}^{-[\frac{3}{m_1} \frac{2-p}{4p} + \frac{3(p^*-1)}{2p^* m_1}]} \\ & \quad + l \left(\delta_{q+1}^{-[\frac{3}{m_1} \frac{2-p}{4p} + 1]} + \delta_{q+1}^{-[\frac{3}{m_1} \frac{2-p}{4p} + \frac{1}{2m_1}]} \right) M_L + \delta_{q+1}^{-[\frac{3}{m_1} \frac{2-p}{4p} + \frac{3(p^*-1)}{2m_1 p^*}]} l^{\frac{1}{2}-2\delta} M_L \ll M_L \delta_{q+2}. \end{aligned} \quad (238)$$

Next, we can bound for all $t \in [0, T_L]$ by relying on (151d) and (151e),

$$\|R_{\text{com}2}^{\text{v}}(t)\|_{L_x^{p^*}} + \|R_{\text{com}2}^{\Theta}(t)\|_{L_x^{p^*}} \lesssim l (\lambda_q^7 M_L^{\frac{1}{2}}) M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} \ll M_L \delta_{q+2}. \quad (239)$$

Finally, we can bound for all $t \in [0, T_L]$, using (151d)

$$\begin{aligned} \|R_{\text{stoc}}^{\Theta}(t)\|_{L_x^{p^*}} & \lesssim \lambda_{q+1}^{-\frac{\epsilon}{112}} M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{k=1}^2 \left((1 + t^{-\frac{3}{m_k p} + \frac{3}{2m_1 p^*}}) N + L \right) \\ & \quad + f(q)^{-(1-\delta - \frac{6(p^*-1)}{2p^*})} L \left(\|v_q(t)\|_{L_x^2} + \|\Theta_q(t)\|_{L_x^2} + \|v_{q+1}(t)\|_{L_x^2} + \sum_{k=1}^2 \|z_k^{\text{in}}(t)\|_{L_x^2} + L \right), \end{aligned} \quad (240)$$

and hence, integrating over $[0, T_L]$ and relying on (149), (151e), and (142) give us

$$\|R_{\text{stoc}}^{\Theta}\|_{L_{[0, T_L]}^1 L_x^{p^*}} \lesssim \lambda_{q+1}^{-\frac{\epsilon}{112}} M_L^{\frac{3}{2}} \sum_{k=1}^2 \left(T_L^{1 - \frac{3}{m_2 p} + \frac{3}{2m_2 p^*}} + 1 \right) \ll M_L \delta_{q+2}; \quad (241)$$

the same upper bounds hold for $R_{\text{stoc}}^{\text{v}}$ as well. Due to (226), (228), (237), (238), (239), (241), we conclude (152a) at level $q+1$.

5.7. Verification of (152b) at level $q + 1$. Having verified (152a) at level $q + 1$ on $(\sigma_q \wedge T_L, T_L]$, we now work on the interval $(\sigma_{q+1} \wedge T_L, \sigma_q \wedge T_L]$. If $T_L \leq \sigma_{q+1}$, there is nothing to prove and hence we assume that $\sigma_{q+1} < T_L$ so that $t \in (\sigma_{q+1}, \sigma_q \wedge T_L]$. By (179) this implies that $\chi(t) \in (0, 1)$ so that all the estimates on R_{cor}^Θ in (215b), R_{cor}^v in (218b), R_{com1}^Θ in and R_{com1}^v in (168), R_{com2}^Θ in (215d), R_{com2}^v in (218d), R_{stoc}^Θ in (215e), and R_{stoc}^v in (218e) from previous section apply with minimum modifications. For convenience we define

$$R_{\text{cut}}^v \triangleq \chi' \mathcal{R}(w_{q+1}^p + w_{q+1}^c) + (\chi^2)' \mathcal{R}(w_{q+1}^t + w_{q+1}^o), \quad (242a)$$

$$R_{\text{cut}}^\Theta \triangleq \chi' \mathcal{R}^\Theta(d_{q+1}^p + d_{q+1}^c) + (\chi^2)' \mathcal{R}^\Theta(d_{q+1}^t + d_{q+1}^o). \quad (242b)$$

We estimate for all $t \in (\sigma_{q+1}, \sigma_q \wedge T_L]$, using (179), (150), and (192),

$$\begin{aligned} & \|R_{\text{cut}}^v(t)\|_{L_x^{p^*}} + \|R_{\text{cut}}^\Theta(t)\|_{L_x^{p^*}} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_v \cup \Lambda_\Theta} |g_\xi(t)| t^{-4} \lambda_{q+1}^{1 + \frac{8\epsilon-2}{p^*} - 4\epsilon} + |g_\xi(t)|^2 t^{-7} \lambda_{q+1}^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{8\epsilon-2}{p^*} - 2\epsilon} + t^{-35} \lambda_{q+1}^{-2\epsilon}. \end{aligned} \quad (243)$$

With this, we are ready to estimate the $L^1([\sigma_{q+1}, \sigma_q \wedge T_L] \times \mathbb{T}^3)$ -norm of $\mathring{R}_{q+1}^\Theta$ and \mathring{R}_{q+1}^v . First, we observe that v_q and Θ_q vanish on $[t_q, \sigma_q \wedge T_L]$ due to (151c) at level both q and $q + 1$, and consequently so do v_l and Θ_l , which implies that $(d_{q+1} \otimes v_l - v_l \otimes d_{q+1} + \Theta_l \otimes w_{q+1} - w_{q+1} \otimes \Theta_l)$ within R_{lin}^Θ of (215a) vanishes reducing our work to estimate only $\mathcal{R}^\Theta[\partial_t(\tilde{d}_{q+1}^p + \tilde{d}_{q+1}^c) + (-\Delta)^{m_2} d_{q+1}]$. We can apply (243), (220), (222), and (275) to deduce similarly to (226)

$$\|R_{\text{lin}}^\Theta\|_{L^1_{[\sigma_{q+1}, \sigma_q \wedge T_L], x}} \ll M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{k=1}^2 \sigma_{q+1}^{1 - \frac{6-3p}{2mkp}} + \sigma_{q+1}^{1 - \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{6-3p}{4mkp}} \right). \quad (244)$$

Next, by making use of (227), (275), (190), and (197), we can compute similarly to (228)

$$\|R_{\text{cor}}^\Theta\|_{L^1_{[\sigma_{q+1}, \sigma_q \wedge T_L], x}} \ll M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{k=1}^2 \sigma_{q+1}^{1 - \frac{6-3p}{2mkp}} + \sigma_{q+1}^{1 - \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{6-3p}{4mkp}} \right). \quad (245)$$

Next, for any $\iota > 0$ small, by making use of (229), (231), (233), (235), and (243), we can compute

$$\|R_{\text{osc}}^\Theta\|_{L^1_{[\sigma_{q+1}, \sigma_q \wedge T_L], x}} \leq \iota M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{k=1}^2 \sigma_{q+1}^{1 - \frac{6-3p}{2mkp}} + \sigma_{q+1}^{1 - \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{6-3p}{4mkp}} \right) + \|\mathring{R}_l^\Theta\|_{L^1_{[\sigma_{q+1}, (2\sigma_{q+1}) \wedge T_L], x}}. \quad (246)$$

Next, computations in (238) and the fact that v_l and Θ_l vanish over $[t_q, \sigma_q \wedge T_L]$ due to (151c) show that

$$\|R_{\text{com1}}^\Theta\|_{L^1_{[\sigma_{q+1}, \sigma_q \wedge T_L], x}} \ll M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{k=1}^2 \sigma_{q+1}^{1 - \frac{6-3p}{2mkp}} + \sigma_{q+1}^{1 - \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{6-3p}{4mkp}} \right), \|R_{\text{com2}}^\Theta\|_{L^1_{[\sigma_{q+1}, \sigma_q \wedge T_L], x}} = 0, \quad (247)$$

respectively. Finally, our computations in (240) and (241) show that we can also bound $\|R_{\text{stoc}}^\Theta\|_{L^1_{[\sigma_{q+1}, \sigma_q \wedge T_L], x}}$ similarly so that together with, (244), (245), (246), and (247), it allows us to conclude that for any $\iota > 0$ small,

$$\|\mathring{R}_{q+1}^\Theta\|_{L^1_{[\sigma_{q+1}, \sigma_q \wedge T_L], x}} \leq \iota M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{k=1}^2 \sigma_{q+1}^{1 - \frac{6-3p}{2mkp}} + \sigma_{q+1}^{1 - \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{6-3p}{4mkp}} \right) + \|\mathring{R}_l^\Theta\|_{L^1_{[\sigma_{q+1}, (2\sigma_{q+1}) \wedge T_L], x}}, \quad (248)$$

and analogous computation shows

$$\|\mathring{R}_{q+1}^v\|_{L^1_{[\sigma_{q+1}, \sigma_q \wedge T_L], x}} \leq \iota M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{k=1}^2 \sigma_{q+1}^{1-\frac{6-3p}{2mkp}} + \sigma_{q+1}^{1-\sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{6-3p}{4mkp}} \right) + \|\mathring{R}_l^v\|_{L^1_{[\sigma_{q+1}, (2\sigma_{q+1}) \wedge T_L], x}}.$$

Next, we consider the time interval of $[0, \sigma_{q+1} \wedge T_L]$. From (151c) that we verified for $q+1$, we know $v_l \equiv v_{q+1} \equiv \Theta_l \equiv \Theta_{q+1} \equiv 0$, which implies due to (183) that w_{q+1} and d_{q+1} and therefore \tilde{w}_{q+1} and \tilde{d}_{q+1} all vanish. Directly from (215) and (218), this implies that

$$\mathring{R}_{q+1}^\Theta = \mathring{R}_l^\Theta + R_{\text{com}1}^\Theta + R_{\text{stoc}}^\Theta \quad \text{and} \quad \mathring{R}_{q+1}^v = \mathring{R}_l^v + R_{\text{com}1}^v + R_{\text{stoc}}^v. \quad (249)$$

Working on $R_{\text{com}1}^\Theta$, we estimate for all $t \in [0, \sigma_{q+1} \wedge T_L]$,

$$\|R_{\text{com}1}^\Theta(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq \|N_{\text{com}}^\Theta(t)\|_{L_x^1} + \|N_{\text{com}}^\Theta * \varrho_l * \vartheta_l(t)\|_{L_x^1} \quad (250)$$

where from (168) we see that because Θ_q and v_q vanish on $(0, \sigma_{q+1} \wedge T_L]$,

$$N_{\text{com}}^\Theta = (z_2^{\text{in}} + z_{2,q}) \otimes (z_1^{\text{in}} + z_{1,q}) - (z_1^{\text{in}} + z_{1,q}) \otimes (z_2^{\text{in}} + z_{2,q}). \quad (251)$$

We can estimate directly for all $t \in [0, \sigma_{q+1} \wedge T_L]$, by relying on (146), (137), (148), and the embedding $H^{1-\delta}(\mathbb{T}^3) \hookrightarrow L^{\frac{p}{p-\delta}}(\mathbb{T}^3)$ due to (137),

$$\|N_{\text{com}}^\Theta(t)\|_{L_x^1} \ll M_L t^{-\sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{6-3p}{4mkp}} \quad \text{while} \quad \|\mathring{N}_{\text{com}}^v(t)\|_{L_x^1} \ll M_L \sum_{k=1}^2 t^{-\frac{6-3p}{2mkp}}. \quad (252)$$

Moreover, for $t \in [t_{q+1}, 0)$ so that $|t| < \frac{4}{5}$ due to (30) and (144), $\Theta_q \equiv v_q \equiv z_1 \equiv z_2 \equiv 0$ due to Remark 5.1 so that $z_{1,q} \equiv z_{2,q} \equiv 0$; therefore, we can verify

$$\|N_{\text{com}}^\Theta(t)\|_{L_x^1} \ll M_L |t|^{-\sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{6-3p}{4mkp}} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathring{N}_{\text{com}}^v(t)\|_{L_x^1} \ll M_L \sum_{k=1}^2 |t|^{-\frac{6-3p}{2mkp}}. \quad (253)$$

On the other hand, for any $0 \leq t_1 < t_2 \leq \sigma_{q+1} \wedge T_L$,

$$\|N_{\text{com}}^\Theta * \varrho_l * \vartheta_l\|_{L^1_{[t_1, t_2], L_x^1}} \leq \frac{2M_L}{1 - \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{6-3p}{4mkp}} (t_2 - t_1)^{1-\sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{6-3p}{4mkp}}. \quad (254)$$

Next, for all $t \in [0, \sigma_{q+1} \wedge T_L]$, as v_q, Θ_q, v_{q+1} , and Θ_{q+1} all vanish due to (151d) at both levels q and $q+1$, we can estimate by making use of $H^{1-\delta}(\mathbb{T}^3) \hookrightarrow L^{\frac{pp^*}{p-p^*}}(\mathbb{T}^3)$,

$$\|R_{\text{stoc}}^\Theta(t)\|_{L_x^{p^*}} \lesssim L(N+L) \ll M_L t^{-\sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{6-3p}{4mkp}}. \quad (255)$$

Therefore, applying (252), (254), (255), and (250) to (249) leads to

$$\|\mathring{R}_{q+1}^\Theta\|_{L^1_{[0, \sigma_{q+1} \wedge T_L], x}} \leq \|\mathring{R}_l^\Theta\|_{L^1_{[0, \sigma_{q+1} \wedge T_L], x}} + A(\sigma_{q+1} \wedge T_L)^{1-\sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{6-3p}{4mkp}}. \quad (256)$$

At last, considering (256), (248), and (152c) at level q leads to

$$\|\mathring{R}_{q+1}^\Theta\|_{L^1_{[0, T_L], x}} \leq \delta_{q+2} M_L + 2(q+2)A \left(\sigma_{q+1}^{1-\frac{6-3p}{2m_1p}} + \sigma_{q+1}^{1-\frac{6-3p}{2m_2p}} + \sigma_{q+1}^{1-\sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{6-3p}{4mkp}} \right),$$

which verifies (152b) at level $q+1$; analogous computations verify (152b) at level $q+1$. To verify (152c) at level $q+1$, we first compute for all $0 \leq a \leq a+h \leq \sigma_{q+1} \wedge T_L$,

$$\|\mathring{R}_{q+1}^\Theta\|_{L^1_{[a, a+h], x}} \leq 2(q+2)A \left(\sum_{k=1}^2 \left(\frac{h}{2} \right)^{1-\frac{6-3p}{2mkp}} + \left(\frac{h}{2} \right)^{1-\sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{6-3p}{4mkp}} \right). \quad (257)$$

We now focus on the case $t \in [t_{q+1}, 0)$. We have $z_1 \equiv z_2 \equiv v_q \equiv \Theta_q \equiv 0$ due to (145b) and $\chi \equiv 0$ due to (179) so that $w_{q+1} \equiv d_{q+1} \equiv 0$ and consequently $v_{q+1} \equiv \Theta_{q+1} \equiv 0$ due

to (183). Therefore, (143) shows that $\operatorname{div} \hat{R}_{q+1}^\Theta = \operatorname{div}(z_2^{\text{in}} \otimes z_1^{\text{in}} - z_1^{\text{in}} \otimes z_2^{\text{in}})$. Hence, identical computations to (253) verify that for all $t \in [t_{q+1}, 0)$, using the fact that $|t| \leq |t_{q+1}| < \frac{4}{5}$ due to (30) and (144),

$$\|\hat{R}_{q+1}^\Theta(t)\|_{L_x^1} \ll M_L |t|^{-\sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{6-3p}{4mkp}} \text{ and } \|\hat{R}_{q+1}^v(t)\|_{L_x^1} \ll M_L \sum_{k=1}^2 |t|^{-\left(\frac{6-3p}{2mkp}\right)}. \quad (258)$$

For $t_{q+1} \leq a - h \leq a < 0$, we can verify using (258) and (150),

$$\|\hat{R}_{q+1}^\Theta\|_{L_{[a-h,a],x}^1} \leq Ah^{1-\sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{6-3p}{4mkp}} \text{ and } \|\hat{R}_{q+1}^v\|_{L_{[a-h,a],x}^1} \leq \sum_{k=1}^2 Ah^{1-\frac{6-3p}{2mkp}}. \quad (259)$$

To verify (152c), we consider the case $t_{q+1} \leq a \leq (\sigma_{q+1} \wedge T_L) - h$ for $h \in (0, (\sigma_{q+1} \wedge T_L) - t_{q+1}]$. We see that the case $a \geq 0$ is treated by (257) while the case $a + h \leq 0$ is treated by (259). In case $a < 0 < a + h$, we can estimate using (258),

$$\|\hat{R}_{q+1}^\Theta\|_{L_{[a,a+h],x}^1} = \|\hat{R}_{q+1}^\Theta\|_{L_{[a,0],x}^1} + \|\hat{R}_{q+1}^\Theta\|_{L_{[0,a+h],x}^1} \leq 2(q+2)A \left(\sum_{k=1}^2 \left(\frac{h}{2}\right)^{1-\frac{6-3p}{2mkp}} + \left(\frac{h}{2}\right)^{1-\sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{6-3p}{4mkp}} \right);$$

\hat{R}_{q+1}^v can be bounded analogously, verifying (152c).

Finally, $(v_{q+1}, \Theta_{q+1}, \hat{R}_{q+1}^v, \hat{R}_{q+1}^\Theta)$ can be shown to be $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted following previous works (e.g. [40]); thus, we omit its proof. This completes the proof of Proposition 5.2.

APPENDIX A. PRELIMINARIES

A.1. Preliminaries for the proof of Theorems 2.1-2.2.

Lemma A.1. ([11, Equation (5.34)] and [3, Sections 6.1-6.2]) Define

$$(\mathcal{R}f)^{kl} \triangleq (\partial^k \Delta^{-1} f^l + \partial^l \Delta^{-1} f^k) - \frac{1}{2}(\delta^{kl} + \partial^k \partial^l \Delta^{-1}) \operatorname{div} \Delta^{-1} f, \quad k, l \in \{1, 2, 3\}$$

for any $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)$ that is mean-zero. Then $\mathcal{R}f(x)$ is a symmetric trace-free matrix for each $x \in \mathbb{T}^3$, and satisfies $\operatorname{div}(\mathcal{R}f) = f$. Moreover, \mathcal{R} satisfies the classical Calderón-Zygmund and Schauder estimates: $\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{R}\|_{L_x^q \rightarrow L_x^q} + \|\mathcal{R}\|_{L_x^q \rightarrow L_x^q} + \|\mathcal{R}\|_{C_x \rightarrow C_x} \lesssim 1$ for all $q \in (1, \infty)$. Additionally, we define for $f : \mathbb{T}^3 \mapsto \mathbb{R}^3$ such that $\nabla \cdot f = 0$,

$$(\mathcal{R}^\Xi f)^{ij} \triangleq \epsilon_{ijk} (-\Delta)^{-1} (\nabla \times f)^k \text{ where } \epsilon_{ijk} \text{ is the Levi-Civita tensor.}$$

Then $\operatorname{div} \mathcal{R}^\Xi(f) = f$, $\mathcal{R}^\Xi(f) = -(\mathcal{R}^\Xi(f))^T$, and $(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{R}^\Xi$ is a Calderón-Zygmund operator.

The following are two geometric lemmas for the MHD system.

Lemma A.2. ([52, Lemma 3.1]; see also [16, Proposition 2.3], [3, Lemma 4.1]) There exists a set $\Lambda_\Xi \subset \mathbb{S}^2 \cap \mathbb{Q}^3$ consisting of vectors ξ with associated o.n.b. (ξ, ξ_1, ξ_2) , $\epsilon_\Xi > 0$, and smooth positive functions $\gamma_\xi : B_{\epsilon_\Xi}(0) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, where $B_{\epsilon_\Xi}(0)$ is the ball of radius ϵ_Ξ centered at 0 in the space of 3×3 skew-symmetric matrices, such that for all $Q \in B_{\epsilon_\Xi}(0)$, $Q = \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_\Xi} (\gamma_\xi(Q))^2 (\xi_2 \otimes \xi_1 - \xi_1 \otimes \xi_2)$.

Lemma A.3. ([52, Lemma 3.2]; see also [16, Proposition 2.2], [3, Lemma 4.2]) There exists a set $\Lambda_v \subset \mathbb{S}^2 \cap \mathbb{Q}^3$ consisting of vectors ξ with associated o.n.b. (ξ, ξ_1, ξ_2) , $\epsilon_v > 0$, and smooth positive functions $\gamma_\xi : B_{\epsilon_v}(\operatorname{Id}) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, where $B_{\epsilon_v}(\operatorname{Id})$ is the ball of radius ϵ_v centered at the identity in the space of 3×3 symmetric matrices, such that for all $Q \in B_{\epsilon_v}(\operatorname{Id})$, $Q = \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda_v} (\gamma_\xi(Q))^2 (\xi_1 \otimes \xi_1)$.

We can choose Λ_{Ξ} and Λ_{ν} so that $\Lambda_{\Xi} \cap \Lambda_{\nu} = \emptyset$ and their o.n.b.'s satisfy $\xi_1 \neq \xi'_1$ when $\xi \neq \xi'$. We set $\Lambda \triangleq \Lambda_{\Xi} \cup \Lambda_{\nu}$ and find $N_{\Lambda} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\{N_{\Lambda}\xi, N_{\Lambda}\xi_1, N_{\Lambda}\xi_2\} \subset N_{\Lambda}\mathbb{S}^2 \cap \mathbb{Z}^3. \quad (260)$$

We let $\Psi : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth cutoff function supported on $[-1, 1]$ such that

$$\phi \triangleq -\frac{d^2}{(dx)^2}\Psi \text{ satisfies } \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi^2(x)dx = 2\pi. \quad (261)$$

For parameters $0 < \sigma \ll r \ll 1$, specified in (38a), we define the rescaled functions:

$$\phi_r(x) \triangleq r^{-\frac{1}{2}}\phi\left(\frac{x}{r}\right), \quad \phi_{\sigma}(x) \triangleq \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\phi\left(\frac{x}{\sigma}\right), \quad \text{and } \Psi_{\sigma}(x) \triangleq \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Psi\left(\frac{x}{\sigma}\right). \quad (262)$$

We periodize these functions so that we can view the resulting functions, which we continue to denote respectively as ϕ_r, ϕ_{σ} , and Ψ_{σ} , as functions defined on \mathbb{T} . Then we fix a parameter λ such that $\lambda\sigma \in \mathbb{N}$, as well as a large time-oscillation parameter $\mu \gg \sigma^{-1}$, both specified in (38a), and define for every $\xi \in \Lambda$

$$\phi_{\xi}(t, x) \triangleq \phi_r(\lambda\sigma N_{\Lambda}(\xi \cdot x + \mu t)), \quad \varphi_{\xi}(x) \triangleq \phi_{\sigma}(\lambda\sigma N_{\Lambda}\xi_1 \cdot x), \quad \Psi_{\xi}(x) \triangleq \Psi_{\sigma}(\lambda\sigma N_{\Lambda}\xi_1 \cdot x). \quad (263)$$

Lemma A.4. ([16, Lemma 2.5], cf. [3, Lemmas 5.1-5.2]) For any $q \in [1, \infty]$, $M, N \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\xi \neq \xi'$, the following estimates hold:

$$\|\nabla^M \partial_t^N \phi_{\xi}\|_{C_t L_x^q} \lesssim (\lambda\sigma)^{M+N} r^{\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{2}-M-N} \mu^N, \quad \|\nabla^M \varphi_{\xi}\|_{L_x^q} + \|\nabla^M \Psi_{\xi}\|_{L_x^q} \lesssim \lambda^M \sigma^{\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (264a)$$

$$\|\nabla^M (\phi_{\xi} \varphi_{\xi'})\|_{C_t L_x^q} + \|\nabla^M (\phi_{\xi} \Psi_{\xi'})\|_{C_t L_x^q} \lesssim \lambda^M r^{\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma^{\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \|\phi_{\xi} \varphi_{\xi'} \phi_{\xi''} \varphi_{\xi'''}\|_{C_t L_x^q} \lesssim \sigma^{\frac{2}{q}-1} r^{-1}, \quad (264b)$$

where the implicit constants only depend on p, N , and M .

Lemma A.5. ([16, Lemma 4.1], cf. [58, Lemma 7.4]) Let $g \in C^2(\mathbb{T}^3)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$\|(-\Delta)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0}(g \mathbb{P}_{\geq k} f)\|_{L_x^q} \lesssim k^{-1} \|g\|_{C_x^2} \|f\|_{L_x^q} \quad \forall q \in (1, \infty) \text{ and } f \in L^q(\mathbb{T}^3). \quad (265)$$

A.2. Additional preliminaries for the proof of Theorem 2.3. For the purpose of proofs of Theorems 2.1-2.2, it was convenient to consider $\mathbb{T} = [-\pi, \pi]$; however, hereafter, for convenience we consider $\mathbb{T} = [0, 1]$ by renormalizing. In contrast to σ, r , and μ in (38a), we will consider $\sigma, r_{\perp}, r_{\parallel}, \mu$, and τ in (141). We can take the same Ψ and ϕ from (261) and additionally let $\psi : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth, mean-zero function, supported on $[-1, 1]$ such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi^2(x)dx = 2\pi$. The cut-off functions are now defined by

$$\phi_{r_{\perp}}(x) \triangleq r_{\perp}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\phi\left(\frac{x}{r_{\perp}}\right), \quad \Psi_{r_{\perp}}(x) \triangleq r_{\perp}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Psi\left(\frac{x}{r_{\perp}}\right), \quad \psi_{r_{\parallel}}(x) \triangleq r_{\parallel}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\psi\left(\frac{x}{r_{\parallel}}\right).$$

We periodize $\phi_{r_{\perp}}, \Psi_{r_{\perp}}$, and $\psi_{r_{\parallel}}$ so that they can be considered as functions on \mathbb{T} . The intermittent velocity flows and intermittent magnetic flows are respectively defined by

$$W_{\xi} \triangleq \psi_{r_{\parallel}}(\lambda r_{\perp} N_{\Lambda}(\xi_1 \cdot x + \mu t)) \phi_{r_{\perp}}(\lambda r_{\perp} N_{\Lambda} \xi \cdot x) \xi_1, \quad \xi \in \Lambda_{\nu} \cup \Lambda_{\Theta}, \quad (266a)$$

$$D_{\xi} \triangleq \psi_{r_{\parallel}}(\lambda r_{\perp} N_{\Lambda}(\xi_1 \cdot x + \mu t)) \phi_{r_{\perp}}(\lambda r_{\perp} N_{\Lambda} \xi \cdot x) \xi_2, \quad \xi \in \Lambda_{\Theta}, \quad (266b)$$

for o.n.b. (ξ, ξ_1, ξ_2) of \mathbb{R}^3 from Lemmas A.2-A.3; such W_{ξ} and D_{ξ} are $(\mathbb{T}/\lambda r_{\perp})^3$ -periodic. Differently from (263) we introduce

$$\phi_{\xi} \triangleq \phi_{r_{\perp}}(\lambda r_{\perp} N_{\Lambda} \xi \cdot x), \quad \Psi_{\xi}(x) \triangleq \Psi_{r_{\perp}}(\lambda r_{\perp} N_{\Lambda} \xi \cdot x), \quad \psi_{\xi_1}(x) \triangleq \psi_{r_{\parallel}}(\lambda r_{\perp} N_{\Lambda}(\xi_1 \cdot x + \mu t)). \quad (267)$$

We have the following useful identities from [52, Equations (3.11)-(3.12)]:

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} W_{\xi} \otimes W_{\xi} dx = \xi_1 \otimes \xi_1, \quad \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} D_{\xi} \otimes D_{\xi} dx = \xi_2 \otimes \xi_2, \quad (268a)$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} W_\xi \otimes D_\xi dx = \xi_1 \otimes \xi_2, \quad \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} D_\xi \otimes W_\xi dx = \xi_2 \otimes \xi_1, \quad (268b)$$

$$\operatorname{div}(W_\xi \otimes W_\xi) = \mu^{-1} \partial_t(\psi_{\xi_1}^2 \phi_\xi^2 \xi_1), \quad \operatorname{div}(D_\xi \otimes D_\xi) = 0, \quad (268c)$$

$$\operatorname{div}(D_\xi \otimes W_\xi) = \mu^{-1} \partial_t(\psi_{\xi_1}^2 \phi_\xi^2 \xi_2), \quad \operatorname{div}(W_\xi \otimes D_\xi) = 0. \quad (268d)$$

We also introduce

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{W}_\xi^c &\triangleq \lambda^{-2} N_\Lambda^{-2} \nabla \psi_{\xi_1} \times \operatorname{curl}(\Psi_\xi \xi_1), \quad W_\xi^c \triangleq \lambda^{-2} N_\Lambda^{-2} \psi_{\xi_1} \Psi_\xi \xi_1 \quad \text{so that } W_\xi + \tilde{W}_\xi^c = \operatorname{curl} \operatorname{curl} W_\xi^c, \\ \tilde{D}_\xi^c &\triangleq -\lambda^{-2} N_\Lambda^{-2} \Delta \psi_{\xi_1} \Psi_\xi \xi_2, \quad D_\xi^c \triangleq \lambda^{-2} N_\Lambda^{-2} \psi_{\xi_1} \Psi_\xi \xi_2 \quad \text{so that } D_\xi + \tilde{D}_\xi^c = \operatorname{curl} \operatorname{curl} D_\xi^c. \end{aligned} \quad (269)$$

Lemma A.6. ([52, Lemmas 3.3–3.4]) For all $q \in [1, \infty]$, $N, M \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\|\nabla^N \partial_t^M \psi_{\xi_1}\|_{C_t L_x^q} \lesssim r_\parallel^{\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{r_\perp \lambda}{r_\parallel}\right)^N \left(\frac{r_\perp \lambda \mu}{r_\parallel}\right)^M, \quad \|\nabla^N \phi_\xi\|_{L_x^q} + \|\nabla^N \Psi_\xi\|_{L_x^q} \lesssim r_\perp^{\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{2}} \lambda^N. \quad (270)$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^N \partial_t^M W_\xi\|_{C_t L_x^q} + r_\parallel r_\perp^{-1} \|\nabla^N \partial_t^M \tilde{W}_\xi^c\|_{C_t L_x^q} + \lambda^2 \|\nabla^N \partial_t^M W_\xi^c\|_{C_t L_x^q} \\ \lesssim r_\perp^{\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{2}} r_\parallel^{\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{2}} \lambda^N \left(\frac{r_\perp \lambda \mu}{r_\parallel}\right)^M, \quad \text{for } \xi \in \Lambda_\nu \cup \Lambda_\theta, \end{aligned} \quad (271a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^N \partial_t^M D_\xi\|_{C_t L_x^q} + r_\parallel r_\perp^{-1} \|\nabla^N \partial_t^M \tilde{D}_\xi^c\|_{C_t L_x^q} + \lambda^2 \|\nabla^N \partial_t^M D_\xi^c\|_{C_t L_x^q} \\ \lesssim r_\perp^{\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{2}} r_\parallel^{\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{2}} \lambda^N \left(\frac{r_\perp \lambda \mu}{r_\parallel}\right)^M, \quad \text{for } \xi \in \Lambda_\theta. \end{aligned} \quad (271b)$$

Finally, for $\xi, \xi' \in \Lambda_\nu \cup \Lambda_\theta$ such that $\xi \neq \xi'$ and any $q \in [1, \infty]$,

$$\|\psi_{\xi_1} \phi_\xi \psi_{\xi'_1} \phi_{\xi'}\|_{C_t L_x^q} \lesssim r_\perp^{\frac{1}{q}-1} r_\parallel^{\frac{2}{q}-1}. \quad (272)$$

Following [57, pp. 43–44], we let $G \in C_c^\infty(0, 1)$ be mean-zero and satisfy $\|G\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})} = 1$. For any $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $\tilde{g}_\xi : \mathbb{T} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ as the 1-periodic extension of $\tau^{\frac{1}{2}} G(\tau(t - t_\xi))$ where t_ξ are chosen so that \tilde{g}_ξ have disjoint supports for different ξ ; i.e., $\tilde{g}_\xi(t) \triangleq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \tau^{\frac{1}{2}} G(\tau(n + t - t_\xi))$. We also define

$$g_\xi(t) \triangleq \tilde{g}_\xi(\sigma t) \text{ that satisfies } \|g_\xi\|_{W^{m,q}([0,1])} \lesssim (\sigma \tau)^M \tau^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{q}} \quad \forall q \in [1, \infty], M \in \mathbb{N}_0, \quad (273a)$$

$$h_\xi(t) \triangleq \int_0^{\sigma t} (\tilde{g}_\xi^2(s) - 1) ds \text{ that satisfies } \|h_\xi\|_{L^\infty} \leq 1. \quad (273b)$$

Lemma A.7. ([57, Remark B.2]) Because g_ξ is \mathbb{T}/σ -periodic, for any $n, n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $n_1 < n_2$, and $q \in [1, \infty]$, we can write

$$\|g_\xi\|_{W^{n,q}([\frac{n_1}{\sigma}, \frac{n_2}{\sigma}])}^q = \frac{n_2 - n_1}{\sigma} \|g_\xi\|_{W^{n,q}([0,1])}^q. \quad (274)$$

For arbitrary values of $0 < a_0 < b_0$, it is possible to find $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0$ satisfying $\frac{n_1}{\sigma} < a_0 \leq \frac{n_1+1}{\sigma}$, $\frac{n_2}{\sigma} \leq b_0 < \frac{n_2+1}{\sigma}$ so that

$$\|g_\xi\|_{W^{n,q}([a_0, b_0])}^q \leq \|g_\xi\|_{W^{n,q}([\frac{n_1}{\sigma}, \frac{n_2+1}{\sigma}])}^q \leq \left(b_0 - a_0 + \frac{2}{\sigma}\right) \|g_\xi\|_{W^{n,q}([0,1])}^q. \quad (275)$$

Lemma A.8. ([57, Theorem C.1]) Let $q \in [1, \infty]$, $m, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $m < n$, $a \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R})$, $f \in L^q(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})$. Then for any $\sigma \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\left| \|af(\sigma \cdot)\|_{L^q([\frac{m}{\sigma}, \frac{n}{\sigma}]^d)} - \|a\|_{L^q([\frac{m}{\sigma}, \frac{n}{\sigma}]^d)} \|f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{T}^d)} \right| \lesssim \sigma^{-\frac{1}{q}} \left(\frac{n-m}{\sigma}\right)^{\frac{d}{q}} \|a\|_{C^{0,1}([\frac{m}{\sigma}, \frac{n}{\sigma}]^d)} \|f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{T}^d)}, \quad (276)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{C^{0,1}}$ represents the Lipschitz norm. In particular, in case $d = 1$ and f is mean-zero,

$$\left| \int_{\frac{m}{\sigma}}^{\frac{n}{\sigma}} a(t)f(\sigma t)dt \right| \lesssim \frac{n-m}{\sigma^2} \|a\|_{C^{0,1}(\frac{m}{\sigma}, \frac{n}{\sigma})} \|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T})}. \quad (277)$$

APPENDIX B. FURTHER DETAILS

B.1. Proof of Theorem 2.3. First, the probabilistically strong solution u, b on $[0, T_L]$ starting from the given $u^{\text{in}}, b^{\text{in}} \in L^p_\sigma$ \mathbf{P} -a.s. that was constructed in Proposition 5.3 satisfies

$$\|u(T_L)\|_{L^p} + \|b(T_L)\|_{L^p} \stackrel{(136)(137)(146)(153d)}{\lesssim} N + L + \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} M_L^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda_{q+1}^{-\frac{q}{172}} \lesssim N + L.$$

Now we define

$$(u_1, b_1)(0) = (u, b)(T_L), \quad (\hat{B}_1, \hat{B}_2)(t) = (B_1, B_2)(T_L + t) - (B_1, B_2)(T_L), \quad (278a)$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}}_t = \sigma\left(\{(\hat{B}_1, \hat{B}_2)(s)\}_{s \leq t}\right) \vee \sigma((u, b)(T_L)), \quad (278b)$$

where the last is defined to be the smallest σ -algebra that contains $\sigma\left(\{(\hat{B}_1, \hat{B}_2)(s)\}_{s \leq t}\right) \cup \sigma((u, b)(T_L))$. Let

$$\begin{cases} d\hat{z}_1 + (-\Delta)^{m_1} \hat{z}_1 dt + \nabla p dt = d\hat{B}_1, \quad \nabla \cdot \hat{z}_1 = 0, \\ \hat{z}_1(0) = 0, \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} d\hat{z}_2 + (-\Delta)^{m_2} \hat{z}_2 dt = d\hat{B}_2, \\ \hat{z}_2(0) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (279)$$

Then

$$\begin{cases} d\left(z_1(t+T_L) - e^{-t(-\Delta)^{m_1}} z_1(T_L)\right) + (-\Delta)^{m_1} \left(z_1(t+T_L) - e^{-t(-\Delta)^{m_1}} z_1(T_L)\right) = \mathbb{P}d\hat{B}_1, \\ [z_1(t+T_L) - e^{-t(-\Delta)^{m_1}} z_1(T_L)]|_{t=0} = 0, \end{cases} \quad (280a)$$

$$\begin{cases} d\left(z_2(t+T_L) - e^{-t(-\Delta)^{m_2}} z_2(T_L)\right) + (-\Delta)^{m_2} \left(z_2(t+T_L) - e^{-t(-\Delta)^{m_2}} z_2(T_L)\right) = d\hat{B}_2, \\ [z_2(t+T_L) - e^{-t(-\Delta)^{m_2}} z_2(T_L)]|_{t=0} = 0. \end{cases} \quad (280b)$$

By uniqueness of the solutions to (279), we see that

$$\hat{z}_k(t) = z_k(t+T_L) - e^{-t(-\Delta)^{m_k}} z_k(T_L) \text{ for } k \in \{1, 2\}. \quad (281)$$

In comparison to (137), we now define

$$\begin{aligned} T_{L+1} &\triangleq \inf \left\{ t \geq 0 : C_S \max_{k=1,2} \|z_k(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{1-\delta}} \geq L+1 \right\} \\ &\wedge \inf \left\{ t \geq 0 : C_S \max_{k=1,2} \|z_k\|_{C_t^{\frac{1}{2}-2\delta} L^2} \geq L+1 \right\} \wedge (L+1). \end{aligned} \quad (282)$$

Considering (281), we define

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{T}_{L+1} &\triangleq \inf \left\{ t \geq 0 : C_S \max_{k=1,2} \|\hat{z}_k(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{1-\delta}} \geq 2(L+1) \right\} \\ &\wedge \inf \left\{ t \geq 0 : C_S \max_{k=1,2} \|\hat{z}_k\|_{C_t^{\frac{1}{2}-2\delta} L^2} \geq 2(L+1) \right\} \wedge (L+1). \end{aligned} \quad (283)$$

It follows that for all $t \leq T_{L+1} - T_L$,

$$\|\hat{z}_k(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{1-\delta}} < 2(L+1), \quad \|\hat{z}_k\|_{C_t^{\frac{1}{2}-2\delta} L^2} < 2(L+1) \text{ and consequently } T_{L+1} - T_L \leq \hat{T}_{L+1}. \quad (284)$$

We define

$$\Omega_N \triangleq \{N-1 \leq \min\{\|u(T_L)\|_{L^p}, \|b(T_L)\|_{L^p}\}, \max\{\|u(T_L)\|_{L^p}, \|b(T_L)\|_{L^p}\} < N\} \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_0,$$

and construct similarly to Proposition 5.3 a solution (u_1^N, b_1^N) on Ω_N to (12) with (B_1, B_2) replaced by (\hat{B}_1, \hat{B}_2) on $[0, \hat{T}_{L+1}]$ with initial data $(u, b)(T_L)$ and consequently,

$$(\bar{u}_1, \bar{b}_1) \triangleq \left(\sum_{N \in \mathbb{N}} u_1^N 1_{\Omega_N}, \sum_{N \in \mathbb{N}} b_1^N 1_{\Omega_N} \right) \quad (285)$$

is a solution on $[0, \hat{T}_{L+1}]$ to (12) with (B_1, B_2) replaced by (\hat{B}_1, \hat{B}_2) , that is $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted. Now we define

$$(u_1, b_1)(t) = \left(u(t)1_{t \leq T_L} + \bar{u}_1(t - T_L)1_{t > T_L}, b(t)1_{t \leq T_L} + \bar{b}_1(t - T_L)1_{t > T_L} \right). \quad (286)$$

For $t \leq T_L$, $(u_1, b_1)(t) = (u, b)(t)$ and thus (u_1, b_1) solves the system on $[0, T_L]$. For $t \in (T_L, T_{L+1}]$ where $T_{L+1} \leq \hat{T}_{L+1} + T_L$ due to (284),

$$\bar{u}_1(t - T_L) = u(0) - \int_0^t (-\Delta)^{m_1} u_1 + \mathbb{P} \operatorname{div}(u_1 \otimes u_1 - b_1 \otimes b_1)(s) ds + B_1(t),$$

and similar computation for $\bar{b}_1(t - T_L)$ apply and lead to show that (u_1, b_1) satisfies (12) up to T_{L+1} . We now define

$$T_L^n \triangleq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{k}{2^n} 1_{\{\frac{k-1}{2^n} \leq T_L < \frac{k}{2^n}\}} \quad (287)$$

and it follows that T_L^n is a stopping time and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_L^n = T_L$ \mathbf{P} -a.s. Moreover, it follows from (285) and (278) that $\bar{u}_1, \bar{b}_1(t) \in \mathcal{F}_{T_L^n + t}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Now let D be any closed domain in $L^p(\mathbb{T}^3)$ and suppose that

$$\omega \in \{(\bar{u}_1, \bar{b}_1)(t) \in D\} \cap \{T_L^n + t \leq s\}.$$

We know $\{(\bar{u}_1, \bar{b}_1)(t) \in D\} \in \mathcal{F}_{T_L^n + t}$. As $T_L^n + t \leq s$ by assumption, we have $\{(\bar{u}_1, \bar{b}_1)(t) \in D\} \in \mathcal{F}_{T_L^n + t} \subset \mathcal{F}_s$. On the other hand, immediately we have $\{T_L^n + t \leq s\} \in \mathcal{F}_s$. Therefore,

$$\{(\bar{u}_1, \bar{b}_1)(t) \in D\} \cap \{T_L^n + t \leq s\} \in \mathcal{F}_s$$

and it follows that $\bar{u}_1(t - T_L^n)1_{\{t > T_L^n\}}$ and $\bar{b}_1(t - T_L^n)1_{\{t > T_L^n\}}$ are both measurable with respect to $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ and consequently, u_1 and b_1 are both $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted.

Lastly, we iterate the steps above. Starting from $(u_k, b_k)(T_{L+k})$ and (u_{k+1}, b_{k+1}) up to T_{L+k+1} , we define

$$\bar{u}(t) \triangleq u(t)1_{\{t \leq T_L\}} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} u_k(t)1_{\{T_{L+k-1} < t \leq T_{L+k}\}}, \quad \bar{b}(t) \triangleq b(t)1_{\{t \leq T_L\}} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k(t)1_{\{T_{L+k-1} < t \leq T_{L+k}\}}$$

which become a probabilistically strong solution with the regularity of $C([0, \infty); L^p(\mathbb{T}^3)) \cap L^2_{\text{loc}}([0, \infty); L^2(\mathbb{T}^3))$. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.3

B.2. Proof of Corollary 2.4. We take $L \gg 1$ so that $\mathbf{P}(\{T_L > 2\}) > \frac{1}{2}$. With same notations from the proof of Proposition 5.3, we take $K \neq K'$ such that $3K(T_L - 2) \wedge 3K'(T_L - 2) > C$; assuming w.l.o.g. that $K > K'$, we also choose them such that $K - K' > \frac{2C}{3(T_L - 2)}$ and consequently

$$[3K(T_L - 2) - C, 3K(T_L - 2) + C] \cap [3K'(T_L - 2) - C, 3K'(T_L - 2) + C] = \emptyset.$$

This, along with (165), implies that the laws of (u_K, b_K) and $(u_{K'}, b_{K'})$ are different, completing the proof of Corollary 2.4.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author expresses deep gratitude to Prof. Bradley Shadwick and Prof. Adam Larios for valuable discussions concerning MHD system and Dr. Rajendra Beekie concerning [3].

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Alfvén, *On the existence of electromagnetic-hydrodynamic waves*, Ark. Mat., Astron. Fys., **29B** (1942), pp. 1–7.
- [2] V. Barbu and G. Da Prato, *Existence and ergodicity for the two-dimensional stochastic magneto-hydrodynamics equations*, Appl. Math. Optim., **56** (2007), pp. 145–168.
- [3] R. Beekie, T. Buckmaster, and V. Vicol, *Weak solutions of ideal MHD which do not conserve magnetic helicity*, Annals of PDE, **6** (2020), pp. 1–40.
- [4] S. E. Berkemeier, *On the 3D Navier-Stokes equations with a linear multiplicative noise and prescribed energy*, J. Evol. Equ., **23** (2023), pp. 1–50.
- [5] D. Biskamp, *Magneto-hydrodynamic Turbulence*, Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- [6] D. Breit, E. Feireisl, and M. Hofmanová, *On solvability and ill-posedness of the compressible Euler system subject to stochastic forces*, Anal. PDE, **13** (2020), pp. 371–402.
- [7] T. Buckmaster, M. Colombo and V. Vicol, *Wild solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations whose singular sets in time have Hausdorff dimension strictly less than 1*, J. Eur. Math. Soc., **24** (2022), pp. 3333–3378.
- [8] T. Buckmaster, C. De Lellis, P. Isett, and L. Székelyhidi Jr., *Anomalous dissipation for 1/5-Hölder Euler flows*, Ann. of Math., **182** (2015), pp. 127–172.
- [9] T. Buckmaster, S. Shkoller, and V. Vicol, *Nonuniqueness of weak solutions to the SQG equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **LXXII** (2019), pp. 1809–1874.
- [10] T. Buckmaster and V. Vicol, *Nonuniqueness of weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equation*, Ann. of Math., **189** (2019), pp. 101–144.
- [11] T. Buckmaster and V. Vicol, *Convex integration and phenomenologies in turbulence*, EMS Surveys in Mathematical Sciences, **6** (2019), pp. 173–263.
- [12] T. Buckmaster and V. Vicol, *Convex integration constructions in hydrodynamics*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc., **58** (2020), pp. 1–14.
- [13] J. Burczak, S. Modena, and L. Székelyhidi Jr., *Non uniqueness of power-law flows*, Comm. Math. Phys., **388** (2021), pp. 199–243, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-021-04231-7>.
- [14] W. Cao, Y. Li, and D. Zhang, *Existence and non-uniqueness of probabilistically strong solutions to 3D stochastic magnetohydrodynamic equations*, arXiv:2408.05450 [math.AP], 2024.
- [15] W. Chen, Z. Dong, and X. Zhu, *Sharp non-uniqueness of solutions to stochastic Navier-Stokes equations*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., **56** (2024), <https://doi.org/10.1137/23M156314>.
- [16] K. Chen and J. Liu, *Weak solutions of the three-dimensional hypoviscous elastodynamics with finite kinetic energy*, J. Differential Equations, **339** (2022), pp. 637–665.
- [17] A. Cheskidov, Z. Zeng, and D. Zhang, *Existence and non-uniqueness of weak solutions with continuous energy to the 3D deterministic and stochastic Navier-Stokes equations*, arXiv:2407.17463 [math.AP], 2024.
- [18] E. Chiodaroli, E. Feireisl, and F. Flandoli, *Ill posedness for the full Euler system driven by multiplicative white noise*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., **70** (2021), pp. 1267–1282. DOI: 10.1512/iumj.2021.70.8591
- [19] J. Cho, A. Lazarian, and E. T. Vishniac, *Simulations of magnetohydrodynamic turbulence in a strongly magnetized medium*, The Astrophysical Journal, **564** (2002), pp. 291–301.
- [20] I. Chueshov and A. Millet, *Stochastic 2D hydrodynamical type systems: well posedness and large deviations*, Appl. Math. Optim., **61** (2010), pp. 379–420.
- [21] 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), pp. 207–209.
- [22] V. Dallas and A. Alexakis, *The signature of initial conditions on magnetohydrodynamic turbulence*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, **788** (2014), pp. 1–4.
- [23] G. Da Prato and A. Debussche, *Ergodicity for the 3D stochastic Navier-Stokes equations*, J. Math. Pures Appl., **82** (2003), pp. 877–947.
- [24] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk, *Stochastic Equations in Infinite Dimensions*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2014.
- [25] C. De Lellis and L. Székelyhidi Jr., *The Euler equations as a differential inclusion*, Ann. of Math., **170** (2009), pp. 1417–1436.
- [26] C. De Lellis and L. Székelyhidi Jr., *On admissibility criteria for weak solutions of the Euler equations*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., **195** (2010), pp. 225–260.

- [27] C. De Lellis and L. Székelyhidi Jr., *Dissipative continuous Euler flows*, *Invent. Math.*, **193** (2013), pp. 377–407.
- [28] G. Duvaut and J. L. Lions, *Inéquations en thermoélasticité et magnétohydrodynamique*, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **46** (1972), pp. 241–279.
- [29] G. L. Eyink, *Energy dissipation without viscosity in ideal hydrodynamics, I. Fourier analysis and local energy transfer*, *Phys. D*, **78** (1994), pp. 222–240.
- [30] D. Faraco and S. Lindberg, *Proof of Taylor’s conjecture on magnetic helicity conservation*, *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **373** (2020), pp. 707–738.
- [31] D. Faraco, S. Lindberg, and L. Székelyhidi Jr., *Bounded solutions of ideal MHD with compact support in space-time*, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **239** (2021), pp. 51–93.
- [32] D. Faraco, S. Lindberg, and L. Székelyhidi Jr., *Magnetic helicity, weak solutions and relaxation of ideal MHD*, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **77** (2024), pp. 2387–2412.
- [33] F. Flandoli, *An Introduction to 3D Stochastic Fluid Dynamics*: In: G. Da Prato, M. Růckner (Eds.) *SPDE in Hydrodynamic: Recent Progress and Prospects. Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, **1942**, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, (2008), pp. 51–150.
- [34] M. Hofmanová, T. Lange, and U. Pappalettera, *Global existence and non-uniqueness of 3D Euler equations perturbed by transport noise*, *Probab. Theory Related Fields* (2023), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00440-023-01233-5>.
- [35] M. Hofmanová, X. Luo, R. Zhu, and X. Zhu, *Surface quasi-geostrophic equation perturbed by derivatives of space-time white noise*, *Math. Ann.* (2024), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00208-024-02881-1>.
- [36] M. Hofmanová, U. Pappalettera, R. Zhu, and X. Zhu, *Kolmogorov 4/5 law for the forced 3D Navier-Stokes equations*, arXiv:2304.14470v2 [math.AP], 2023.
- [37] M. Hofmanová, U. Pappalettera, R. Zhu, and X. Zhu, *Anomalous and total dissipation due to advection by solutions of randomly forced Navier-Stokes equations*, arXiv:2305.08090v2 [math.AP], 2023.
- [38] M. Hofmanová, R. Zhu, and X. Zhu, *Non-uniqueness in law of stochastic 3D Navier-Stokes equations*, *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* (2023), DOI 10.4171/JEMS/1360.
- [39] M. Hofmanová, R. Zhu, and X. Zhu, *On ill- and well-posedness of dissipative martingale solutions to stochastic 3D Euler equations*, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **75** (2022), pp. 2446–2510.
- [40] M. Hofmanová, R. Zhu, and X. Zhu, *Global-in-time probabilistically strong and Markov solutions to stochastic 3D Navier-Stokes equations: existence and non-uniqueness*, *Ann. Probab.*, **51** (2023), pp. 524–579.
- [41] M. Hofmanová, R. Zhu, and X. Zhu, *Global existence and non-uniqueness for 3D Navier-Stokes equations with space-time white noise*, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **46** (2023), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00205-023-01872-x>.
- [42] M. Hofmanová, R. Zhu, and X. Zhu, *A class of supercritical/critical singular stochastic PDEs: existence, non-uniqueness, non-Gaussianity, non-unique ergodicity*, *J. Funct. Anal.*, **285** (2023), pp. 1–43.
- [43] M. Hofmanová, R. Zhu, and X. Zhu, *Non-unique ergodicity for deterministic and stochastic 3D Navier-Stokes and Euler equations*, arXiv:2208.08290 [math.PR], 2022.
- [44] M. Hofmanová, R. Zhu, and X. Zhu, *Non-uniqueness of Leray-Hopf solutions for stochastic forced Navier-Stokes equations*, arXiv:2309.03668 [math.PR], 2023.
- [45] P. Isett, *A proof of Onsager’s conjecture*, *Ann. of Math.*, **188** (2018), pp. 871–963.
- [46] Y. Kaneda, T. Ishihara, M. Yokokawa, K. Itakura, A. Uno, *Energy dissipation rate and energy spectrum in high resolution direct numerical simulations of turbulence in a periodic box*, *Physics of Fluids*, **15** (2003), pp. 21–24.
- [47] U. Koley and K. Yamazaki, *Non-uniqueness in law of transport-diffusion equation forced by random noise*, *J. Differential Equations*, **416** (2025), pp. 82–142.
- [48] A. N. Kolmogorov, *Dissipation of energy in the locally isotropic turbulence*, *C. R. (Doklady) Acad. Sci. URSS (N.S.)*, **32** (1941), pp. 16–18.
- [49] A. N. Kolmogorov, *The local structure of turbulence in incompressible viscous fluid for very large Reynolds numbers*, *C. R. (Doklady) Acad. Sci. URSS (N.S.)*, **30** (1941), pp. 301–305.
- [50] K. Kinra and U. Koley, *Non-uniqueness of Hölder continuous solutions for stochastic Euler and hypodissipative Navier-Stokes equations*, arXiv:2407.20270 [math.AP], 2024.
- [51] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Hydrodynamic fluctuations*, *J. Exptl. Theoret. Phys. (U.S.S.R.)* **32** (1957), pp. 618–619.
- [52] Y. Li, Z. Zeng, and D. Zhang, *Non-uniqueness of weak solutions to 3D magnetohydrodynamic equations*, *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, **165** (2022), pp. 232–285.
- [53] M. J. Lighthill, F. R. S., *Studies on magneto-hydrodynamic waves and other anisotropic wave motions*, *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A*, **252** (1960), pp. 397–430.
- [54] M. F. Linkmann, A. Berera, W. D. McComb, and M. E. McKay, *Nonuniversality and finite dissipation in decaying magnetohydrodynamic turbulence*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **114** (2015), pp. 1–6.

- [55] J.-L. Lions, *Quelques résultats d'existence dans des équations aux dérivées partielles non linéaires*, Bull. Soc. Math. France, **87** (1959), pp. 245–273.
- [56] J.-L. Lions, *Quelques Méthodes de Résolution des Problèmes aux Limites Non Linéaires*, Dunod, Gauthiers-Villars, Paris, 1969.
- [57] H. Lü and X. Zhu, *Sharp non-uniqueness of solutions to 2D Navier-Stokes equations with space-time white noise*, arXiv:2304.06526v2 [math.PR], 2023.
- [58] T. Luo and P. Qu, *Non-uniqueness of weak solutions to 2D hypoviscous Navier-Stokes equations*, J. Differential Equations, **269** (2020), pp. 2896–2919.
- [59] T. Luo, T. Tao, and L. Zhang, *Finite energy weak solutions of 2D Boussinesq equations with diffusive temperature*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst., **40** (2020), pp. 3737–3765.
- [60] T. Luo and E. S. Titi, *Non-uniqueness of weak solutions to hyperviscous Navier-Stokes equations - on sharpness of J.-L. Lions exponent*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations, **59** (2020), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00526-020-01742-4>.
- [61] P. D. Mininni and A. Pouquet, *Finite dissipation and intermittency in magnetohydrodynamics*, Phys. Rev. E, **80** 025401 (R), (2009), pp. 1–4.
- [62] S. Modena and G. Sattig, *Convex integration solutions to the transport equation with full dimensional concentration*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire, **37** (2020), pp. 1075–1108.
- [63] S. Modena and A. Schenke, *Local nonuniqueness for stochastic transport equations with deterministic drift*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., **56** (2024), <https://doi.org/10.1137/23M1589104>.
- [64] H. K. Moffatt, *Some remarks on topological fluid mechanics*. In R. L. Ricca (ed.) *An Introduction to the Geometry and Topology of Fluid Flows*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Netherlands (2001), pp. 3–10.
- [65] L. Onsager, *Statistical hydrodynamics*, Nuovo Cim, **6** (1949), pp. 279–287.
- [66] U. Pappalettera, *Global existence and non-uniqueness for the Cauchy problem associated to 3D Navier-Stokes equations perturbed by transport noise*, Stoch. PDE: Anal. Comp. (2023), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40072-023-00318-5>.
- [67] M. Rehmeier and A. Schenke, *Nonuniqueness in law for stochastic hypodissipative Navier-Stokes equations*, Nonlinear Anal., **227** (2023), 113179.
- [68] M. Sango, *Magnetohydrodynamic turbulent flows: existence results*, Phys. D., **239** (2010), pp. 912–923.
- [69] A. Schenke, *The stochastic tamed MHD equations: existence, uniqueness and invariant measures*, Stoch. PDE: Anal. Comp. (2021), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40072-021-00205-x>.
- [70] M. Sermange and R. Temam, *Some mathematical questions related to the MHD equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **36** (1983), pp. 635–664.
- [71] S. S. Sritharan and P. Sundar, *The stochastic magneto-hydrodynamic system*, Infin. Dimens. Anal. Quantum Probab. Relat. Top., **2** (1999), pp. 241–265.
- [72] T. Tao, *Global regularity for a logarithmically supercritical hyperdissipative Navier-Stokes equation*, Anal. PDE, **2** (2009), pp. 361–366.
- [73] J. B. Taylor, *Relaxation of toroidal plasma and generation of reverse magnetic fields*, Phys. Rev. Lett., **33** (1974), pp. 1139–1141.
- [74] J. B. Taylor, *Relaxation and magnetic reconnection in plasmas*, Rev. Modern Phys., **58** (1986), pp. 741–763.
- [75] E. Walker and K. Yamazaki, *Surface quasi-geostrophic equations forced by random noise: prescribed energy and non-unique Markov selections*, arXiv:2407.00920 [math.AP], 2024.
- [76] H. Wang, *Martingale solutions for the compressible MHD systems with stochastic external forces*, arXiv:2108.03844 [math.AP], 2021.
- [77] L. Woltjer, *A theorem on force-free magnetic fields*, Proc. Natl. Aca. Sci. USA, **44** (1958), pp. 489–491.
- [78] J. Wu, *Generalized MHD equations*, J. Differential Equations, **195** (2003), pp. 284–312.
- [79] J. Wu, *Global regularity for a class of generalized magnetohydrodynamic equations*, J. Math. Fluid Mech., **13** (2011), pp. 295–305.
- [80] K. Yamazaki, *Stochastic Hall-magneto-hydrodynamics system in three and two and a half dimensions*, J. Stat. Phys., **166** (2017), pp. 368–397.
- [81] K. Yamazaki, *Global regularity of logarithmically supercritical MHD system with improved logarithmic powers*, Dyn. Partial Differ. Equ., **15** (2018), pp. 147–173.
- [82] K. Yamazaki, *Markov selections for the magnetohydrodynamics and the Hall-magnetohydrodynamics systems*, J. Nonlinear Sci., **29** (2019), pp. 1761–1812.
- [83] K. Yamazaki, *Irreducibility of the three, and two and a half dimensional Hall-magnetohydrodynamics system*, Phys. D, **401** (2020), 13299 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physd.2019.132199>.
- [84] K. Yamazaki, *Remarks on the non-uniqueness in law of the Navier-Stokes equations up to the J.-L. Lions' exponent*, Stochastic Process. Appl., **147** (2022), pp. 226–269.

- [85] K. Yamazaki, *Non-uniqueness in law for two-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations with diffusion weaker than a full Laplacian*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., **54** (2022), pp. 3997–4042.
- [86] K. Yamazaki, *Non-uniqueness in law for Boussinesq system forced by random noise*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations, **61** (2022), pp. 1–65, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00526-022-02285-6>.
- [87] K. Yamazaki, *Non-uniqueness in law of three-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations diffused via a fractional Laplacian with power less than one half*, Stoch. PDE: Anal. Comp. (2023), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40072-023-00293-x>.
- [88] K. Yamazaki, *Non-uniqueness in law of the two-dimensional surface quasi-geostrophic equations forced by random noise*, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat., to appear.
- [89] K. Yamazaki, *Non-uniqueness in law of three-dimensional magnetohydrodynamics system forced by random noise*, Potential Anal. (2024), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11118-024-10128-6>.
- [90] K. Yamazaki, *Non-uniqueness in law of the surface quasi-geostrophic equations: the case of linear multiplicative noise*, arXiv:2312.15558 [math.AP], 2023.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA, LINCOLN, 243 AVERY HALL, PO Box, 880130, LINCOLN, NE 68588-0130, U.S.A.; PHONE: 402-473-3731; FAX: 402-472-8466
Email address: kyamazaki2@unl.edu