

Leray's Inequality for Fluid Flow in Symmetric Multi-connected Two-dimensional Domains

Reinhard FARWIG and Hiroko MORIMOTO

Darmstadt University of Technology and Meiji University

Abstract. We consider the stationary Navier-Stokes equations with nonhomogeneous boundary condition in a domain with several boundary components. If the boundary value satisfies only the necessary flux condition (GOC), Leray's inequality does not hold in general and we cannot prove the existence of a solution. But for a 2-D domain which is symmetric with respect to a line and where the data is also symmetric, C. Amick showed the existence of solutions by reduction to absurdity; later H. Fujita proved Leray-Fujita's inequality and hence the existence of symmetric solutions. In this paper we give a new short proof of Leray-Fujita's inequality and hence a proof of the existence of weak solutions.

1. Introduction

Suppose Ω is a two-dimensional Lipschitz bounded domain symmetric with respect to the x_2 -axis and such that the boundary $\partial\Omega$ consists of several connected components, $\Gamma_0, \Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_N$ ($N \geq 1$). Consider the stationary Navier-Stokes equations

$$\begin{cases} (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u} = \nu \Delta \mathbf{u} - \nabla p & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathbf{u} = \boldsymbol{\beta} & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (\text{NS})$$

where $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2)$ is the fluid velocity, p the pressure, $\nu > 0$ the kinematic viscosity constant, and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is a given vector function on $\partial\Omega$.

Suppose the boundary value $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ satisfies the *stringent outflow condition*

$$\int_{\Gamma_i} \boldsymbol{\beta} \cdot \mathbf{n} d\sigma = 0 \quad (0 \leq i \leq N) \quad (\text{SOC})$$

where \mathbf{n} is the unit outward normal vector to $\partial\Omega$. Then, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, we can find a solenoidal extension $\mathbf{b}_\varepsilon \in H^1(\Omega)$ of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ which satisfies the inequality (*Leray's inequality*)

$$|((\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{b}_\varepsilon)| \leq \varepsilon \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|^2 \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{v} \in V(\Omega), \quad (\text{L})$$

Received August 31, 2010

Mathematics Subject Classification: 35Q30, 76D05

Key words: 2-dimensional steady Navier-Stokes flow, general outflow condition, symmetry, regularized distance

where (\cdot, \cdot) is the inner product of $L^2(\Omega)$, $\|\cdot\|$ the L^2 -norm and $V(\Omega) = \{u \in H_0^1(\Omega); \operatorname{div} u = 0\}$. Using this inequality, we obtain an *a priori* estimate of solutions to (NS), and the Leray-Schauder principle assures the existence of solutions. See Leray [9], Hopf [6], Fujita [3], Ladyzhenskaya [8].

If the boundary value $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ satisfies only the *general outflow condition*

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} \boldsymbol{\beta} \cdot \mathbf{n} \, d\sigma = 0 \quad (\text{GOC})$$

the inequality (L) does not hold: in many cases, the validity of (L) for all $\varepsilon > 0$ implies (SOC), cf. Takeshita [13], Farwig-Kozono-Yanagisawa [2].

Nevertheless, if the two-dimensional domain is symmetric with respect to a line, with all the boundary components intersecting the line of symmetry, and if $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is also symmetric, then, firstly Amick [1] proved the existence of stationary solutions by reduction to absurdity. Later, Fujita [4] succeeded to construct an extension of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ which satisfies an estimate similar to (L) for symmetric functions and to prove the existence of solutions by the Leray-Schauder principle. In [10], there is a simple approach to prove Leray's inequality yielding a solution with a decomposition into a weak part (in H^1) and very weak part (in L^2).

The main idea in this paper is to find \mathbf{b} – as in the non-symmetric case – in the form $\mathbf{b} = \nabla^\perp(h\varphi) = \left(\frac{\partial(h\varphi)}{\partial x_2}, -\frac{\partial(h\varphi)}{\partial x_1}\right)$ with a stream function $\varphi \in H^2$ and a cut-off function h . However, in the case of a symmetric domain with the x_2 -axis as symmetry axis and boundary values satisfying only (GOC), the cut-off function h is based on the regularized distance to $\partial\Omega$ multiplied by the term $\pm x_1$. This very special construction will lead to the inequality (L).

As for the nonsymmetric case, Morimoto-Ukai [11] and Fujita-Morimoto [5] considered boundary values of the form $\mu\nabla h + \beta_1$. Here h is a harmonic function, $\mu \in \mathbf{R}$, and β_1 satisfies (GOC). They obtained, using properties of compact operators, an existence result for all $\mu \in \mathbf{R} \setminus \mathcal{M}$ with small β_1 , where \mathcal{M} is an at most countable set. Recently, Kozono-Yanagisawa [7] proved a more precise result in terms of a smallness condition using harmonic vector fields.

2. Notation and Results

In order to state our results, we need for a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbf{R}^2$ with Lipschitz boundary the function spaces $C_{0,\sigma}^\infty(\Omega) = \{v \in C^\infty(\Omega); \operatorname{div} v = 0\}$ and

$$V(\Omega) = \text{completion of } C_{0,\sigma}^\infty(\Omega) \text{ under the Dirichlet norm } \|\nabla \cdot\|.$$

Assume that Ω is symmetric with respect to the x_2 -axis, i.e., $x = (x_1, x_2) \in \Omega$ if and only if $(-x_1, x_2) \in \Omega$. The vector function $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2)$ is called symmetric with respect to the x_2 -axis (“symmetric” in short) if and only if v_1 is an odd function of x_1 and v_2 an even function of x_1 , i.e.,

$$v_1(-x_1, x_2) = -v_1(x_1, x_2), \quad v_2(-x_1, x_2) = v_2(x_1, x_2)$$

hold true.

REMARK 1. If $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2)$ is smooth and symmetric, then $v_1(0, x_2) = 0$ for $(0, x_2) \in \Omega$.

Then we need the following symmetric function spaces:

$$C_{0,\sigma}^{\infty,S}(\Omega) = \{\mathbf{v} \in C_0^\infty(\Omega); \mathbf{v} \text{ is symmetric, } \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v} = 0\},$$

$$V^S(\Omega) = \text{completion of } C_{0,\sigma}^{\infty,S}(\Omega) \text{ under the Dirichlet norm.}$$

Our main theorem is as follows.

THEOREM 1. *Let Ω be a 2-dimensional bounded Lipschitz domain, symmetric with respect to the x_2 -axis such that every boundary component intersects the x_2 -axis. Further assume that the boundary value $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega)$ is symmetric with respect to the x_2 -axis satisfying (GOC). Then, for every positive ε , there exists a symmetric solenoidal extension $\mathbf{b}_\varepsilon \in H^1(\Omega)$ of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ such that the inequality*

$$|((\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{b}_\varepsilon)| \leq \varepsilon \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|^2 \quad (\mathbf{v} \in V^S(\Omega)) \quad (\text{LF})$$

holds true.

REMARK 2. An a priori estimate for symmetric solutions to (NS) follows from the inequality (LF). Indeed, if \mathbf{u} is a symmetric solution and $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{b}_\varepsilon$, then $\mathbf{w} \in V^S(\Omega)$ and it must solve the variational problem

$$(1) \quad (\nabla \mathbf{w}, \nabla \mathbf{v}) + ((\nabla \mathbf{w} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}) + ((\mathbf{w} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{b}_\varepsilon, \mathbf{v}) + ((\mathbf{b}_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}) = (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v})$$

for all $\mathbf{v} \in V^S(\Omega)$ and a known external force \mathbf{f} . For $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{w}$ we get that

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|^2 + ((\mathbf{w} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{b}_\varepsilon, \mathbf{w}) = (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{w}).$$

Under the condition (LF) we deduce an *a priori* estimate for $\|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|$ in terms of \mathbf{f} , and the Leray-Schauder principle yields a solution $\mathbf{w} \in V^S(\Omega)$ of (1). Since $(\nabla \mathbf{w} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{w}$, $(\mathbf{w} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{b}_\varepsilon$ and $(\mathbf{b}_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{w}$ are symmetric, we easily get that (1) is even satisfied for all test functions $\mathbf{v} \in V(\Omega)$. We can also obtain the solution using the Galerkin method, cf., e.g., Fujita [3].

3. Proof of Theorem 1

Let

$$\Omega_+ = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \Omega; x_1 > 0\}, \quad \Omega_- = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \Omega; x_1 < 0\}.$$

Suppose that $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega)$ is symmetric with respect to the x_2 -axis and satisfies (GOC). Then there exists a solenoidal extension $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, b_2)$ in $H^1(\Omega)$, symmetric with respect to

the x_2 -axis, i.e.,

$$\operatorname{div} \mathbf{b} = 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \quad \mathbf{b}|_{\partial\Omega} = \boldsymbol{\beta}.$$

REMARK 3. Note that $b_1(0, x_2) = 0$ for $(0, x_2) \in \Omega$, and

$$\int_{\partial\Omega_+} \mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{n} \, d\sigma = \int_{\partial\Omega_-} \mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{n} \, d\sigma = 0$$

where \mathbf{n} is the unit outward normal vector to the boundary of Ω_+ , or Ω_- .

Since Ω_+ is simply connected, there exists a scalar function (stream function) $\varphi \in H^2(\Omega_+)$ such that

$$\mathbf{b} = \nabla^\perp \varphi = \left(\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_2}, -\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_1} \right) \text{ in } \Omega_+.$$

Let $h(t) = h(t; \kappa, \delta)$ be a C^∞ function in $t \geq 0$, depending on the parameters $\delta > 0$ and $1/4 > \kappa > 0$, and satisfying

$$h(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & (0 \leq t \leq \kappa\delta) \\ 0 & (t \geq (1 - \kappa)\delta) \end{cases}, \quad 0 \leq h \leq 1,$$

$$(2) \quad \sup_{0 \leq t \leq \delta} |t h'(t)| \rightarrow 0 \quad (\kappa \rightarrow 0) \quad \text{uniformly in } \delta > 0.$$

Furthermore, let $d(x)$ be the regularized distance from $\partial\Omega$, i.e., $d(x)$ is a smooth function on Ω , equivalent to the Euclidean distance function to $\partial\Omega$, and its gradient $\nabla d(x)$ is bounded; see Stein [12, p.171, Theorem 2]. Therefore, there exists a constant M such that

$$0 \leq d(x) < M, \quad |\nabla d(x)| < M \quad (x \in \Omega).$$

Finally, we define

$$\rho(x) = x_1 d(x) \quad (x \in \Omega_+).$$

Then, $\rho(x)$ is smooth, $\rho(x) > 0$ for $x \in \Omega_+$, $\rho(x) = 0$ for $x \in \partial\Omega_+$ and its first order derivatives are

$$(3) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} \rho(x) = d(x) + x_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} d(x)$$

$$(4) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} \rho(x) = x_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} d(x).$$

Let $0 < \delta$ be small and $r_0 = \sup\{x_1; (x_1, x_2) \in \Omega_+\}$. Put

$$\Omega_{+,2} = \left\{ x \in \Omega_+; d(x) < \frac{\sqrt{\delta}}{r_0} \right\}$$

$$\Omega_{+,1} = \{x \in \Omega_+ \setminus \Omega_{+,2}; x_1 < r_0\sqrt{\delta}\}.$$

Then, we have

$$(5) \quad \frac{\sqrt{\delta}}{r_0}x_1 \leq \rho(x) = x_1d(x) < x_1M \quad (x \in \Omega_{+,1}),$$

$$(6) \quad \rho(x) = x_1d(x) \geq r_0\sqrt{\delta} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{\delta}}{r_0} = \delta \quad (x \in \Omega_+ \setminus \overline{\Omega_{+,1} \cup \Omega_{+,2}}).$$

Therefore, $\rho(x) \sim x_1$ in $\Omega_{+,1}$ and $h(\rho(x)) = 0$ in $\Omega_+ \setminus \overline{\Omega_{+,1} \cup \Omega_{+,2}}$.

Using (3) and (4), we see,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} \rho(x) \right| &\leq d(x) + x_1 \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} d(x) \right| \leq M(1 + r_0\sqrt{\delta}) \quad (x \in \Omega_{+,1}) \\ \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} \rho(x) \right| &\leq x_1M \leq r_0\sqrt{\delta}M \quad (x \in \Omega_{+,1}). \end{aligned}$$

Put

$$(7) \quad \tilde{\mathbf{b}}(x) = \nabla^\perp \{h(\rho(x))\varphi(x)\} \quad (x \in \Omega_+)$$

where the derivative is taken in the sense of distribution. Then $\operatorname{div} \tilde{\mathbf{b}} = 0$,

$$(8) \quad \tilde{\mathbf{b}}(x) = h(\rho(x))\nabla^\perp \varphi(x) + h'(\rho)\{\nabla^\perp \rho(x)\}\varphi(x),$$

and we see $\tilde{\mathbf{b}} \in H^1(\Omega_+)$. Furthermore, we have

$$\tilde{\mathbf{b}}|_{\partial\Omega_+} = \mathbf{b}|_{\partial\Omega_+}$$

because $h'(t) \equiv 0$ in a neighbourhood of $t = 0$.

Let ε be an arbitrary positive number. Our aim is to show that if we choose $\delta > 0$ and $\kappa > 0$ sufficiently small, then the estimate

$$(9) \quad |(\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}, \tilde{\mathbf{b}})_{\Omega_+}| \leq \varepsilon \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{\Omega_+}^2 \quad (\forall \mathbf{v} \in V^S(\Omega))$$

holds. Since $C_{0,\sigma}^{\infty,S}(\Omega)$ is dense in $V^S(\Omega)$, we need prove (9) only for $C_{0,\sigma}^{\infty,S}(\Omega)$. Suppose $\mathbf{v} \in C_{0,\sigma}^{\infty,S}(\Omega)$. Using the formula $(\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{v} = \frac{1}{2}\nabla|\mathbf{v}|^2 - \omega\mathbf{v}^\perp$ where

$$\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2), \quad \omega = \frac{\partial v_2}{\partial x_1} - \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial x_2}, \quad \mathbf{v}^\perp = (v_2, -v_1), \quad |\mathbf{v}|^2 = v_1^2 + v_2^2,$$

we have

$$(10) \quad ((\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{v}, \tilde{\mathbf{b}})_{\Omega_+} = \int_{\Omega_+} \frac{1}{2} \nabla|\mathbf{v}|^2 \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{b}} \, dx - \int_{\Omega_+} \omega \mathbf{v}^\perp \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{b}} \, dx.$$

Since $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}$ belongs to $L^2(\Omega_+)$ and $\operatorname{div} \tilde{\mathbf{b}} = 0$, it holds that

$$|\mathbf{v}|^2 \tilde{\mathbf{b}} \in L^2(\Omega_+), \quad \operatorname{div}(|\mathbf{v}|^2 \tilde{\mathbf{b}}) = \nabla |\mathbf{v}|^2 \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{b}} \in L^2(\Omega_+).$$

Furthermore, $|\mathbf{v}|^2 \tilde{\mathbf{b}} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0$ on the boundary $\partial\Omega_+$. Therefore Gauss' divergence theorem proves that the first term of the right-hand side of (10) vanishes. As for the second term of the right-hand side of (10), using the expression (8) for $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}$, we have

$$(11) \quad \int_{\Omega_+} \omega \mathbf{v}^\perp \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{b}} \, dx = \int_{\Omega_+} \omega \mathbf{v}^\perp h(\rho) \nabla^\perp \varphi \, dx + \int_{\Omega_+} \omega \mathbf{v}^\perp h'(\rho) \varphi \nabla^\perp \rho \, dx.$$

By virtue of (6) and the properties of h , it is sufficient to calculate the integration only on the domain $\Omega_{+,1} \cup \Omega_{+,2}$. Therefore,

$$\int_{\Omega_+} \omega \mathbf{v}^\perp h(\rho) \nabla^\perp \varphi \, dx = \int_{\Omega_{+,1} \cup \Omega_{+,2}} \omega \mathbf{v}^\perp h(\rho) \nabla^\perp \varphi \, dx =: I.$$

Using Poincaré's inequality for $v \in V^S(\Omega)$, we see that we may choose $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small so that $|I|$ is less than $\varepsilon \|\nabla v\|^2$. We fix this δ .

Using (3) and (4), we have

$$(12) \quad \begin{aligned} \omega \mathbf{v}^\perp h'(\rho) \varphi \nabla^\perp \rho &= \omega \varphi h'(\rho) \left(v_1 \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x_1} + v_2 \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x_2} \right) \\ &= \omega \varphi \left\{ v_1(x) \frac{d(x)}{\rho(x)} + \frac{x_1}{\rho} \left(v_1 \frac{\partial d}{\partial x_1} + v_2 \frac{\partial d}{\partial x_2} \right) \right\} \rho h'(\rho) \\ &= \omega \varphi \left\{ v_1(x) \frac{1}{x_1} + \frac{1}{d(x)} \left(v_1 \frac{\partial d}{\partial x_1} + v_2 \frac{\partial d}{\partial x_2} \right) \right\} \rho h'(\rho). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$(13) \quad \begin{aligned} &\left| \int_{\Omega_+} \omega \mathbf{v}^\perp h'(\rho) \varphi \nabla^\perp \rho \, dx \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{\rho} |\rho h'(\rho)| \|\varphi\|_\infty \|\omega\| \left(\left\| \frac{v_1}{x_1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_{+,1} \cup \Omega_{+,2})} + M \left\| \frac{v}{d} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_{+,1} \cup \Omega_{+,2})} \right). \end{aligned}$$

As for the last term in (13) note that $1/d(x) \leq r_0/\sqrt{\delta}$ for $x \in \Omega_{+,1}$ so that

$$\left\| \frac{v}{d} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_{+,1})} \leq C \|v\|.$$

Moreover, since $v_1 = v_2 = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, we can apply Hardy's inequality to v in $\Omega_{+,2}$ and obtain

$$\left\| \frac{v}{d} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_{+,2})} \leq C \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega_+)}.$$

Hence

$$\left\| \frac{v}{d} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_{+,1} \cup \Omega_{+,2})} \leq C \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega_+)}.$$

Concerning the norm $\|v_1/x_1\|_{L^2(\Omega_{+,1}\cup\Omega_{+,2})}$ in (13) we use a slightly different decomposition of the set $\Omega_{+,1} \cup \Omega_{+,2}$ and define

$$\Omega_{+,12} = \{x \in \Omega_{+,2}; x_1 < r_0\sqrt{\delta}\}.$$

Note that $\Omega_{+,1} \cup \Omega_{+,12}$ is a set of rectangular type with boundary components of class $C^{0,1}$ and that v_1 vanishes on the component $\{x_1 = 0\}$ of $\partial(\Omega_{+,1} \cup \Omega_{+,12})$. It is easy to see that using a change of variables in the x_2 -variable for every $0 < x_1 < r_0\sqrt{\delta}$, we may apply Hardy's inequality to v_1 on several subsets of $\Omega_{+,1} \cup \Omega_{+,12}$. Hence we obtain the estimate

$$\left\| \frac{v_1}{x_1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_{+,1}\cup\Omega_{+,12})} \leq C \|\nabla v_1\|.$$

On $\Omega_{+,2} \setminus \Omega_{+,12}$ we have $x_1 > r_0\sqrt{\delta}$ and it holds the estimate

$$\left\| \frac{v_1}{x_1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_{+,2}\setminus\Omega_{+,12})} \leq \frac{1}{r_0\sqrt{\delta}} \|v_1\|.$$

Summing up the previous inequalities we see that (13) leads to the estimate

$$(14) \quad \left| \int_{\Omega_+} \omega v^\perp h'(\rho) \varphi \nabla^\perp \rho \, dx \right| \leq C \sup_\rho |\rho h'(\rho)| \|\varphi\|_\infty \|\omega\| \|\nabla v\|.$$

If we choose κ sufficiently small, we have

$$(15) \quad \left| \int_{\Omega_+} \omega v^\perp h'(\rho) \varphi \nabla^\perp \rho \, dx \right| \leq \varepsilon \|\nabla v\|^2,$$

and the estimate (9) holds true.

Put

$$b_\varepsilon(x_1, x_2) = \begin{cases} (\tilde{b}_1(x_1, x_2), \tilde{b}_2(x_1, x_2)) & (x_1, x_2) \in \Omega_+ \\ (-\tilde{b}_1(-x_1, x_2), \tilde{b}_2(-x_1, x_2)) & (x_1, x_2) \in \Omega_- \end{cases}.$$

Then $b_\varepsilon \in H^1(\Omega)$ is solenoidal in Ω , symmetric with respect to the x_2 -axis, extends the boundary values β and satisfies (LF). \square

References

- [1] C. J. AMICK, Existence of solutions to the nonhomogeneous steady Navier-Stokes equations, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **33** (1984), 817–830.
- [2] R. FARWIG, H. KOZONO, T. YANAGISAWA, Leray's inequality in general multi-connected domains in \mathbf{R}^n , *Math. Ann.* (to appear).
- [3] H. FUJITA, On the existence and regularity of the steady-state solutions of the Navier-Stokes equation, *J. Fac. Sci., Univ. Tokyo, Sec. I*, **9** (1961), 59–102.
- [4] H. FUJITA, On stationary solutions to Navier-Stokes equations in symmetric plane domains under general out-flow condition, *Proceedings of International Conference on Navier-Stokes Equations, Theory and Numerical Methods*, June 1997, Varenna Italy, Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics 388, pp. 16–30.

- [5] H. FUJITA and H. MORIMOTO, A remark on the existence of the Navier-Stokes flow with non-vanishing outflow condition, *Gakuto International Series Mathematical Science and Applications*, Vol. 10 (1997) *Nonlinear Waves*, pp. 53–61.
- [6] E. HOPF, Ein allgemeiner Endlichkeitssatz der Hydrodynamik, *Math. Ann.* **117** (1941), 764–775.
- [7] H. KOZONO and T. YANAGISAWA, Leray’s problem on the stationary Navier-Stokes equations with inhomogeneous boundary data, *Math. Z.* **262** (2009), 27–39.
- [8] O.A. LADYZHENSKAYA, *The Mathematical Theory of Viscous Incompressible Flow*, Gordon and Breach, 1969.
- [9] J. LERAY, Etude de diverses équations intégrales nonlinéaires et de quelques problèmes que pose l’hydrodynamique, *J. Math. Pure Appl.* **12** (1933), 1–82.
- [10] H. MORIMOTO, A remark on the existence of 2-D steady Navier-Stokes flow in symmetric domain under general outflow condition, *J. Math. Fluid Mech.* **9** (2007), 411–418.
- [11] H. MORIMOTO and S. UKAI, Perturbation of the Navier-Stokes flow in an annular domain with the non-vanishing outflow condition, *J. Math. Sci., Univ. Tokyo* **3** (1996), 73–82.
- [12] E. STEIN, *Singular Integrals and Differentiability Properties of Functions*, Princeton Univ. Press, 1970.
- [13] A. TAKESHITA, A remark on Leray’s inequality, *Pacific J. Math.*, **157** (1993), 151–158.

Present Addresses:

REINHARD FARWIG
DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS,
DARMSTADT UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY,
64289 DARMSTADT, GERMANY.
e-mail: farwig@mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de

HIROKO MORIMOTO
64–5, WADA 1 CHOME,
SUGINAMI-KU, TOKYO, 166–0012 JAPAN.
e-mail: hmor1645@jcom.home.ne.jp