ENTROPY DECREASE AND EMERGENCE OF ORDER IN COLLECTIVE DYNAMICS

EITAN TADMOR

In memory of Haïm Brezis

Abstract. We study the hydrodynamic description of collective dynamics driven by velocity *alignment*. It is known that such Euler alignment systems must flock towards a limiting "flocking" velocity, provided their solutions remain globally smooth. To address this question of global existence we proceed in two steps. (i) Entropy and closure. The system lacks a closure, reflecting lack of detailed energy balance in collective dynamics. We discuss the decrease of entropy and the asymptotic behavior towards a mono-kinetic closure; and (ii) Mono-kinetic closure. We prove that global regularity persists for all time for a large class of initial conditions satisfying a critical threshold condition, which is intimately linked to the decrease of entropy. The result applies in any number of spatial dimensions, thus addressing the open question of existence beyond two dimensions.

Contents

Date: June 24, 2025.
2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 92D25, 35Q31, 76N10.
Key words and phrases. flocking, alignment, hydrodynamics, regularity, critical thresholds.
I thank Thomas Chen for helpful discussions. Research was supported by ONR grant N00014-2412659, NSF grant DMS-2508407 and by the Fondation Sciences Mathématiques de Paris (FSMP) while being hosted by LJLL at Sorbonne University.

1. Introduction and statement of main results

We are concerned with the existence and large-time behavior of global smooth solutions for the multi-dimensional Euler alignment system

$$
\begin{cases} \rho_t + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot (\rho \mathbf{u}) = 0, \\ (\rho \mathbf{u})_t + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot (\rho \mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u} + \mathbb{P}) = \tau \displaystyle\int \phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\big(\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{y}) - \mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{x})\big)\rho(t,\mathbf{x})\rho(t,\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}. \end{cases} \tag{1.1}
$$

A solution pair of density-velocity, $(\rho, \mathbf{u}) : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n$, is sought subject to compactly supported initial data $\big(\rho(0,\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{u}(0,\mathbf{x})\big) = \big(\rho_0(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{u}_0(\mathbf{x})\big)$, either in the whole space, $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n$, or in the n-dimensional torus $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^n$. System (1.1) is the large-crowd hydrodynamic description of 'social agents' identified by positions and velocities, $\{\mathbf{x}_i(t), \mathbf{v}_i(t)\}_{i=1}^N$, $N \gg 1$, governed by the Cucker-Smale alignment model [CS2007]

$$
\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{x}}_i = \mathbf{v}_i \\ \dot{\mathbf{v}}_i = \dfrac{\tau}{N} \displaystyle\sum_{j=1}^N \phi(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)(\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}_i). \end{cases} \tag{1.2}
$$

Alignment dynamics is a canonical model governing emergence phenomena in collective dynamics of flocking, swarming etc. The dynamics is driven by a non-negative symmetric *communication kernel*, $\phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) = \phi(\mathbf{y},\mathbf{x}) \geqslant 0$, with amplitude $\tau > 0$. We have two main examples of symmetric kernels in mind — the canonical Cucker-Smale class of *metric kernels*, see [CS2007]

$$
\phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) = \phi(|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|), \tag{1.3}
$$

and the class of topologically-based kernels [ST2020b]

$$
\phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) = \phi_1(|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|)\phi_2(d_\rho(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})), \qquad d_\rho(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) := \int_{\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})} \rho(t,\mathbf{z})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{z},
$$

reflecting the dependence on the mass in an intermediate 'domain of communication', $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$, enclosed between $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$.

The Euler alignment system (1.1) involves the pressure $\mathbb{P}$ — a symmetric positive definite tensor which should encode the thermodynamics of large-crowd collective dynamics. But (1.1) is not a closed system: it lacks closure of $\mathbb{P}$ in terms of the macroscopic variables ρ and $\mathbf{u}$. This reflects the fact that unlike physical particles, the social agents engaged in collective dynamics form a thermo-dynamically open system which is far from equilibrium and does not admit a universal closure. Indeed, most of the relevant literature *assumes* a mono-kinetic closure, $\mathbb{P} \equiv 0$. Accordingly, our study of solutions of (1.1) proceeds in two main stages:
(i) We investigate a rather general class of so-called *entropic pressures* introduced in [Tad2023] and conclude that their strong solutions must approach mono-kinetic closure. Indeed, strong Euler alignment solutions with isentropic closure experience a uniform entropy *decrease* to $-\infty$, and if we reject such a scenario then we must impose *mono-kinetic closure*, $\mathbb{P} \equiv 0$.
(ii) We consider the pressure-less or mono-kinetic Euler alignment, proving existence of global smooth solutions under certain *threshold conditions*. This addresses the open question of existence for $n \geqslant 3$, extending the known results for dimensions $n = 1, 2$ [TT2014, CCTT2016, HT2017].

1.1. **The road to mono-kinetic closure.** To investigate this mono-kinetic assumption we let ρE denote the (total) energy associated with the pressure in (1.1) (here and below, $|\mathbf{w}|$ denotes the ℓ_2-norm of $\mathbf{w}$ and $|\mathbf{w}|_\infty$ denote its L^∞-norm),

$$\rho E := \tfrac{1}{2}\rho|\mathbf{u}|^2 + \rho e, \qquad \rho e := \tfrac{1}{2}\mathrm{trace}(\mathbb{P}), \tag{1.4}$$

Since the social agents engaged in collective dynamics are often driven by energy received from the "outside", the detailed energy balance associated with (1.1) may be less relevant, [VZ2012, §1.1]. Instead, lack of thermal equilibrium in the form of closure *equalities*, can be relaxed to certain *inequalities*, which are compatible with the decay of *energy fluctuations*. We impose the notion of an *entropic pressure* in which $\mathbb{P}$, augmented with arbitrary "heat-flux" vector function $\mathbf{q}$, are required to satisfy the inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}(\rho E)_t &+ \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\cdot(\rho E\mathbf{u} + \mathbb{P}\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{q})\\ &\leqslant -\tau\int \phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\big(2\rho E(t,\mathbf{x}) - \rho\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{x})\cdot\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{y})\big)\rho(t,\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}.\end{aligned} \tag{1.5}$$

This can be expressed in an equivalent form[1] in term of an entropic inequality for the internal energy, ρe, stating [Tad2023, Definition 1.1],

$$(\rho e)_t + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\cdot(\rho e\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{q}) + \mathrm{trace}\big(\mathbb{P}\nabla\mathbf{u}\big) \leqslant -2\tau\int \phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\rho e(t,\mathbf{x})\rho(t,\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}. \tag{1.6}$$

The entropic inequalities (1.5) or (1.6) are flexible enough to cover pressure tensors derived from an underlying kinetic formulation discussed in §2, as well as the mono-kinetic closure $\mathbb{P} \equiv 0$. They imply *depletion of fluctuations* and in particular, as we shall see later on, that the pressure in entropic alignment dynamics approaches the mono-kinetic closure. In §3 we discuss several results which quantify this statement of "approach towards mono-kinetic closure". To state one of these results, we need the following notations.

Notations. We let $\nabla_S\mathbf{u}$ denote the symmetric gradient, $(\nabla_S\mathbf{u})_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}\Big(\dfrac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_j} + \dfrac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_i}\Big)$. We order the real eigenvalues of $\nabla_S\mathbf{u}$: $\lambda_- := \lambda_1 \leqslant \lambda_2 < \ldots \leqslant \lambda_n =: \lambda_+$, and in general, given a closed set $X \subset \mathbb{R}$ we let X_+ and X_- denote its largest, respectively smallest elements. We use η_c to denote different positive constants. Finally, we use $\phi * \rho$ to denote the average density, or *thickness*,

$$\phi * \rho(t,\mathbf{x}) := \int \phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\rho(t,\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y};$$

of course, in case of metric kernel, this coincides with the usual notion of convolution. In §3 we prove the following.

Theorem 1.1 (**Decay towards mono-kinetic closure).** *Let $(\rho,\mathbf{u},\mathbb{P})$ be a strong entropic solution of* (1.1) *and assume the following threshold condition holds: there exists a constant, $\eta_c > 0$, such that*

$$\lambda_-(\nabla_S\mathbf{u})(t,\cdot) + \tau\phi * \rho(t,\cdot) \geqslant \eta_c > 0. \tag{1.7}$$

[1]The formal manipulation $(1.1)_2\cdot\mathbf{u} - (1.1)_1 \times \frac{|\mathbf{u}|^2}{2}$ yields

$$\big(\tfrac{1}{2}\rho|\mathbf{u}|^2\big)_t + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\cdot(\tfrac{1}{2}\rho|\mathbf{u}|^2\mathbf{u} + \mathbb{P}\mathbf{u}) - \mathrm{trace}(\mathbb{P}\nabla\mathbf{u}) = -\tau\int\phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\rho\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{x})\cdot\big(\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{y})\big)\rho(t,\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}.$$

Combining this equality with (1.6) is equivalent with (1.5).

Then $\displaystyle\int \|\mathbb{P}(t,\mathbf{x})\|\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \leqslant e^{-\eta_c t}\int \|\mathbb{P}_0(\mathbf{x})\|\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}$.

1.2. **Communications kernels and thickness.** Different classes of communication kernels $\phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ are treated in the literature, classified according to their short- and long-range behavior where $\mathbf{x}\approx\mathbf{y}$, and, respectively, $|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|\gg 1$. The class of singular kernels $\phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\sim|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^{-\alpha}$ was treated in [FP2024] where it was shown that the enstrophy associated with strongly singular kernels, $\alpha\in[n,n+2)$, enforced mono-kinetic closure. Existence and flocking behavior of the 1D mono-kinetic case with strongly singular kernels was studied in [DKRT2018, ST2017a, ST2017b, ST2018].
In this paper we restrict attention to the case of bounded kernels, $\phi(\cdot,\cdot)\leqslant\phi_+$. The results can be extended to the case of integrable kernel with weak singularity, $\phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\sim|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^{-\alpha}$ with $\alpha<n$. Alignment with such weakly singular kernels were studied in [MMPZ2019].

Next, we make the distinction between long-range and short-range kernels. Assume that $\phi(\cdot,\cdot)$ admits a metric lower envelope, $\phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\gtrsim\varphi(|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|)$, with decreasing radial φ. Heavy-tailed kernels is the subclass of long-range kernels that naturally arise in connection with the unconditional flocking behavior of (1.1), [HT2008, HL2009, CFTV2010, CFRT2010]

$$\int^\infty \varphi(r)\mathrm{d}r=\infty.$$

Heavy-tails rule out short-range kernels with finite support which are important in applications. In this latter case, flocking is secured if the Euler alignment dynamics remains uniformly non-vacuous, $\rho\geqslant\rho_->0$ [Tad2021, Theorem 3], [Shv2024, §7.3].
We proceed by making the following thickness condition. This corresponds to the notion of ball-thickness introduced in [Shv2024, §3.7.2]. The scenario of (uniform) thickness covers both cases of long-range (– heavy-tailed) kernels and short-range (non-vacuous) kernels; this will be discussed in §4 below.

Assumption 1.1 (**Thickness**)**.** *The following thickness condition holds*

$$\int^\infty \min_{\mathbf{x}}\phi*\rho(t,\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}t=\infty.$$

In particular, a uniform thickness *condition holds if there exists a constant, $c_*>0$, such that*

$$\phi*\rho(t,\cdot)\geqslant c_*>0. \tag{1.8}$$

1.3. **Decrease of entropy and emergence of order.** We restrict attention to scalar pressure, $\mathbb{P}=p\mathbb{I}_{n\times n}$. In this case we have the isentropic closure, $p=\frac{1}{n}\mathrm{trace}(\mathbb{P})=\frac{2}{n}\rho e$, and the entropic inequality (1.6) reads

$$p_t+\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}p+\gamma p\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\cdot\mathbf{u}\leqslant-2\tau p\phi*\rho,\qquad \gamma:=1+\frac{2}{n}.$$

Next we manipulate — multiplying the last inequality by $\rho^{-\gamma}$ and adding a multiple of the mass equation, $-\gamma\rho^{\gamma-1}p\times(1.1)_1$, to find

$$(p\rho^{-\gamma})_t+\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}(p\rho^{-\gamma})\leqslant-2\tau p\rho^{-\gamma}\phi*\rho.$$

We conclude that the entropy inequality we imposed in (1.6) amounts to an inequality on the specific entropy, $\ln(p\rho^{-\gamma})$,

$$S_t+\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}S\leqslant-2\tau\phi*\rho<0,\qquad S:=\ln(p\rho^{-\gamma}). \tag{1.9}$$

The conclusion that entropy decreases in time is quite striking in the sense that it counters the usual tendency of entropy to quantify disorganization as expressed by the second law of entropy increase in physical systems. Ever since [Sch1944] stipulated that life maintains its own organization by extracting order from its environment, stating "*life ... feeds on negative entropy*", there have been many attempts to link living systems to a reversed second law which drives organisms towards higher ordered content, [Cha1978, Ave2003]. We have shown here that the self-organization of alignment dynamics decreases the entropy by communicating "information" in the whole flow-field through decrease of fluctuations. In §3 we further elaborate on implications of the entropy decrease in alignment dynamics. Here is one manifestation of (1.9) proved in §3.1.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $(\rho, \mathbf{u})$ be a strong entropic solution of (1.1) with isentropic closure $\mathbb{P} = \frac{2}{n}\rho e \mathbb{I}_{n\times n}$, and assume the thickness condition holds. Then there is an entropy decay $S(t,\cdot) \stackrel{t\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} -\infty$, unless $\mathbb{P} \equiv 0$.*

Theorem 1.2 expresses the following dichotomy between two possible scenarios for a non-vacuous strong isentropic solutions: either, for $\rho, p > 0$, there is large time decay towards a mono-kinetic closure — in fact the uniform thickness (1.8) implies exponential decay *uniformly for all* $\mathbf{x}$

$$\max_{\mathbf{x}} p\rho^{-\gamma}(t,\mathbf{x}) \lesssim e^{-2\tau c_* t} \stackrel{t\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0, \tag{1.10}$$

or else a mono-kinetic closure $p \equiv 0$. If we reject the first scenario then we conclude Euler alignment system can admit global strong solutions only in the setting of mono-kinetic closure.

1.4. **Strong solutions with mono-kinetic closure.** We now turn to investigate the existence of strong solutions of the alignment dynamics system (1.1) with mono-kinetic closure $\mathbb{P} \equiv 0$,

$$\begin{cases} \rho_t + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot (\rho \mathbf{u}) = 0, \\ \mathbf{u}_t + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{u} = \tau \displaystyle\int \phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\big(\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{y}) - \mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{x})\big)\rho(t,\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}. \end{cases} \tag{1.11}$$

The 1D system (1.11) with metric kernel (1.3) admits global smooth solution if and only if the initial condition satisfies the following lower critical threshold [CCTT2016], $u_0' + \tau\phi * \rho_0 > 0$. This was extended to the class of uni-directional flows, $\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{x}) := (u(t,\mathbf{x}), 0, \ldots, 0)$ with $u : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, in [LS2020], and to 2D metric case in [HT2017]. In §4 we address the open question of existence of solution of Euler alignment system (1.11) with general symmetric kernels in $n > 2$ spatial dimensions. The case of metric kernels is summarized in the following.

Theorem 1.3 (Global strong solutions with sub-critical data). *Consider the mono-kinetic Euler alignment (1.11) with metric communication kernel $\phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) = \phi(|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|) > 0$ satisfying a uniform thickness (1.8), $\phi * \rho(t,\cdot) \geqslant c_* > 0$. The system is subject to initial conditions $(\rho_0, \mathbf{u}_0) \in L^1_+ \times W^{1,\infty}$ with velocity fluctuations which do not exceed,*

$$8|\phi'|_\infty \cdot \delta u_0 < \tau c_*^2, \qquad \delta u(t) := \sup_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}\in \mathrm{supp}\{\rho(t,\cdot)\}} |\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{y})|. \tag{1.12}$$

Assume that the initial data $(\rho_0, \mathbf{u}_0)$ satisfy a sub-critical threshold condition

$$\lambda_-(\nabla_S \mathbf{u}_0)(\mathbf{x}) + \tau\phi * \rho_0(\mathbf{x}) \geqslant \eta_c > 0, \quad \eta_c := \tfrac{1}{2}\tau c_*. \tag{1.13}$$

Then the Euler alignment system (1.11)–(1.13) *admits a global smooth solution,* $(\rho(\cdot,t),\mathbf{u}(\cdot,t))\in L^1_+\times W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$*, with uniformly bounded velocity gradient,* $|\nabla\mathbf{u}(t,\cdot)|_{L^\infty}\leqslant\max\{|\nabla\mathbf{u}_0|_{L^\infty},c_*,C_0\}<\infty$.

Remark 1.1 (**What does the threshold condition mean?**). *Considering the limiting case* $\tau=0$ *then the threshold condition* (1.13) *requires* $\lambda_-(\nabla_S\mathbf{u}_0)(\mathbf{x})>0$*. In the one-dimensional case, this reflects the fact that the inviscid Burgers' equation admits global smooth solution for increasing profile* $u_0'>0$*; however, this is a rather restricted set of initial profiles. Similarly, in the n-dimensional case, the threshold* (1.13) *with* $\tau=0$ *reflects global smooth solutions of the pressure-less Euler* $\mathbf{u}_t+\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{u}=0$ *for the restricted class of initial configurations* $\lambda_-(\nabla_S\mathbf{u}_0)(\mathbf{x})>0$ *(for which* $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\cdot\mathbf{u}_0>0$ *excludes, for example,* $|\mathbf{u}(t,\cdot)|\stackrel{|\mathbf{x}|\to\infty}{\longrightarrow}0$*). Thus, the essence of the threshold condition* (1.13) *is securing global existence for a large set of initial configurations, by allowing* $\lambda_-(\nabla_S\mathbf{u}_0)$ *(or* $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\cdot\mathbf{u}_0$*) to admit negative values dictated by the local thickness,* $\tau\phi*\rho$*. Observe that according* (1.13)*, the admissible values of* $\lambda_-(\nabla_S\mathbf{u}_0)$ *include the negative range*

$$\lambda_-(\nabla_S\mathbf{u}_0)\geqslant\eta_c-\tau\phi*\rho,\qquad \eta_c-\tau\phi*\rho\leqslant-\tfrac12\tau c_*,\quad \eta_c=\tfrac12\tau c_*.$$

This type of critical threshold which secures global regularity with negative "initial slopes" as long as they are "not too negative" was introduced in the context of Euler-Poisson equations in [ELT2001, LT2002] *and is found useful for Euler alignment models,* [TT2014, CCTT2016]*; see* [Shv2024] *and the references therein.*

Remark 1.2 (**Comparing the threshold conditions**). *It is instructive that the threshold condition for global existence sought in* (1.13)*,* $\lambda_-(\nabla_S\mathbf{u}_0)+\tau\phi*\rho_0\geqslant\eta_c>0$*, is the same condition we met earlier,* (1.7)*, in the context of decay towards mono-kinetic closure.*
We compare this threshold condition with the results available in current literature on the global regularity of mono-kinetic Euler alignment system (1.11) *in one- and two dimensions. Global smooth solutions in the 1D case, and in the more general setup of* uni-directional *flows, exist if and only if the initial configuration satisfies the initial threshold* $u_0'(x)+\tau\phi*\rho_0(x)\geqslant0$*,* [CCTT2016, LS2020, Les2020]*. This corresponds to the limiting case* $\eta_c=0$*. For the role of the zero set* $\{x\mid u_0'(x)+\tau\phi*\rho_0(x)=0\}$ *we refer to* [LLST2022].
A sufficient threshold for 2D regularity, [HT2017, Theorem 2.1]*, requires the initial threshold* $\nabla\cdot\mathbf{u}_0+\tau\phi*\rho_0>0$ and $(\lambda_+-\lambda_-)(\nabla_S\mathbf{u}_0)\leqslant\tau\delta_0$ *with* $\delta_0=\frac12 m_0\phi(D_\infty)$*. Noting that* $\nabla\cdot\mathbf{u}=\lambda_++\lambda_-$ *then*

$$\lambda_-(\nabla_S\mathbf{u}_0)+\tau\phi*\rho_0=\frac{\lambda_++\lambda_-}{2}+\tau\phi*\rho_0-\frac{\lambda_+-\lambda_-}{2}\geqslant\frac{\tau\phi*\rho}{2}-\frac{\tau\delta_0}{2},\qquad \phi*\rho\geqslant m_0\phi(D_\infty).$$

Thus, this 2D result is covered by Theorem 1.3 subject to threshold $\lambda_-(\nabla_S\mathbf{u}_0)+\tau\phi*\rho_0\geqslant\eta_c>0$ *with* $\eta_c=\frac12\delta_0$.

2. Kinetic formulation

The passage from the agent-based description (1.2) to the hydrodynamic description (1.1) goes through a kinetic formulation,

$$\partial_t f+\mathbf{v}\cdot\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}f=-\tau\nabla_{\mathbf{v}}\cdot Q_\phi(f,f),\qquad (t,\mathbf{x},\mathbf{v})\in\mathbb{R}_+\times\Omega\times\mathbb{R}^n,\tag{2.1}$$

which governs the empirical distribution

$$f = f_N(t,\mathbf{x},\mathbf{v}) := \frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^{N} \delta_{\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}_j(t)} \otimes \delta_{\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{v}_j(t)},$$

and is driven by pairwise communication protocol on the right of $(1.2)_2$

$$Q_\phi(f,f) := \iint_{\mathbb{R}^n\times\Omega} \phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})(\mathbf{v}'-\mathbf{v})f(t,\mathbf{x},\mathbf{v})f(t,\mathbf{y},\mathbf{v}')\mathrm{d}\mathbf{v}'\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}. \tag{2.2}$$

The formal derivation of (2.1) was introduced in [HT2008] and was justified in increasing order of rigor in [HL2009, CFTV2010, FK2019, NP2022, NS2022, PT2022]. For large crowds of N agents, $N \gg 1$, the dynamics (2.1) is captured by its first three limiting moments which are assumed to exist in a proper sense: the density $\rho(t,\mathbf{x}) := \lim\limits_{N\to\infty}\displaystyle\int f_N(t,\mathbf{x},\mathbf{v})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{v}$, momentum $\rho\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{x}) := \lim\limits_{N\to\infty}\displaystyle\int \mathbf{v} f_N(t,\mathbf{x},\mathbf{v})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{v}$ and pressure $\mathbb{P}(t,\mathbf{x}) := \lim\limits_{N\to\infty}\displaystyle\int (\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{u})\otimes(\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{u})f_N(t,\mathbf{x},\mathbf{v})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{v}$, governed by the Euler alignment system (1.1).

To address the lack of closure we consider the energy balance associated with the limiting quadratic moment of (2.1) (which is assumed to exist) $\rho E(t,\mathbf{x}) := \lim\limits_{N\to\infty}\displaystyle\int \frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{v}|^2 f_N(t,\mathbf{x},\mathbf{v})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{v}$,

$$(\rho E)_t + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\cdot(\rho E\mathbf{u} + \mathbb{P}\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{q}) = -\tau\int \phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\big(2\rho E(t,\mathbf{x}) - \rho\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{x})\cdot\rho\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{y})\big)\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}.$$

The total energy ρE admits a decomposition into its kinetic and internal parts, $\rho E = \frac{1}{2}\rho|\mathbf{u}|^2 + \rho e$, corresponding to the two-term decomposition[2] $|\mathbf{v}|^2$ "$=$" $|\mathbf{u}|^2 + |\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{u}|^2$, namely,

$$\rho E = \tfrac{1}{2}\rho|\mathbf{u}|^2 + \rho e, \qquad (\rho e)(t,\mathbf{x}) := \lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{2}\int |\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{u}|^2 f_N(t,\mathbf{x},\mathbf{v})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{v} = \tfrac{1}{2}\mathrm{trace}(\mathbb{P}).$$

The energy flux on the left, $\rho E\mathbf{u} + \mathbb{P}\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{q}$, is recovered as the quadratic moment of (2.1) corresponding to the three-term decomposition,

$$|\mathbf{v}|^2\mathbf{v} \text{ “}=\text{” } |\mathbf{v}|^2\mathbf{u} + 2(\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{u})\otimes(\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{u})\mathbf{u} + |\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{u}|^2(\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{u}).$$

This results in an energy flux expressed in terms of the pressure $\mathbb{P}$ and "heat flux" $\mathbf{q}(t,\mathbf{x}) := \lim\limits_{N\to\infty}\dfrac{1}{2}\displaystyle\int(\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{u})|\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{u}|^2 f_N(t,\mathbf{x},\mathbf{v})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{v}$. To address the lack of closure problem we impose the notion of an entropic pressure which relaxes the energy equality, requiring $(\mathbb{P},\mathbf{q})$ to satisfy the corresponding inequality (1.5)

$$(\rho E)_t + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\cdot(\rho E\mathbf{u} + \mathbb{P}\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{q}) \leqslant -\tau\int \phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\big(2\rho E(t,\mathbf{x}) - \rho\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{x})\cdot\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{y})\big)\rho(t,\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}.$$

3. Decay of fluctuations towards mono-kinetic closure

We discuss various scenarios in which an entropic pressure decays towards mono-kinetic closure.

---

[2]Here and below, "$=$" is interpreted as "equality modulo linear moments", noting that linear moments vanish $\displaystyle\int(\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{u})f_N(t,\mathbf{x},\mathbf{v})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{v} = 0$.

Mono-kinetic closure with heavy-tailed kernels. The formulation of the entropy inequality in terms of the total energy is equivalent to imposing an instantaneous decay of energy fluctuations. Indeed, integration of (1.5) implies

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\int \big(\tfrac{1}{2}\rho|\mathbf{u}|^2(t,\mathbf{x})+\rho e(t,\mathbf{x})\big)\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}&\\ \leqslant -\tau\iint \phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\big(\rho|\mathbf{u}|^2(t,\mathbf{x})+2\rho e(t,\mathbf{x})-\rho\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{x})\cdot\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{y})\big)\rho(t,\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}.&\end{aligned}$$

Symmetrization of the integrand on the left using the fact that $\displaystyle\int \rho\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}\equiv m_0$, and symmetrization of the integrand of the right using the assumed symmetry of ϕ, finally yields the decay of fluctuations

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\frac{1}{2m_0}\iint \Big(\tfrac{1}{2}|\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{x})-\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{y})|^2+e(t,\mathbf{x})+e(t,\mathbf{y})\Big)\rho(\mathbf{x})\rho(\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}&\\ \leqslant -\tau\iint \phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\Big(\tfrac{1}{2}|\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{x})-\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{y})|^2+e(t,\mathbf{x})+e(t,\mathbf{y})\Big)\rho(\mathbf{x})\rho(\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}.&\end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

We conclude the following result of [Tad2023, Theorem 4.1].

Theorem 3.1. *Consider the Euler alignment system with heavy-tailed kernel*

$$\phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\gtrsim \langle|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|\rangle^{-\theta},\quad \theta\leqslant 1,\qquad \langle r\rangle:=(1+r^2)^{1/2} \tag{3.2}$$

Let $(\rho,\mathbf{u})$ be a non-vacuous strong solution of (1.1) with entropic pressure $\mathbb{P}$. Let $D(t)$ denote the diameter of $\operatorname{supp}\rho(t,\cdot)$*, and assume the dispersion bound,*

$$\int \langle D(t)\rangle^{-\theta}\mathrm{d}t=\infty,\qquad D(t):=\max_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}\in\operatorname{supp}\rho(t,\cdot)}|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|. \tag{3.3}$$

Then unconditional flocking holds

$$\iint \Big(\tfrac{1}{2}|\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{x})-\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{y})|^2+e(t,\mathbf{x})+e(t,\mathbf{y})\Big)\rho(t,\mathbf{x})\rho(t,\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}\stackrel{t\rightarrow\infty}{\longrightarrow}0,$$

and in particular, asymptotic mono-kinetic closure holds, $\displaystyle\int \|\mathbb{P}(t,\mathbf{x})\|\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}\stackrel{t\rightarrow\infty}{\longrightarrow}0.$

This shows that under the dispersion bound (3.3), the same mechanism that is responsible for unconditional flocking, $\|\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{x})-\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{y})\|_{L^2(\mathrm{d}\rho(\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}\rho(\mathbf{y}))}\stackrel{t\rightarrow\infty}{\longrightarrow}0$, drives the alignment dynamics with *any* entropic pressure towards mono-kinetic closure, $\|\mathbb{P}(t,\cdot)\|_{L^1}<2\displaystyle\int \rho e(,\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}\stackrel{t\rightarrow\infty}{\longrightarrow}0$.

Mono-kinetic closure with a threshold condition. The dispersion bound sought in (3.3) can be replaced by a threshold condition. To this we revisit the entropy inequality (1.6) which is re-written in terms of the re-scaled pressure $\overline{\mathbb{P}}=\dfrac{\mathbb{P}}{2\rho e}$

$$\partial_t(\rho e)+\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\cdot(\rho e\mathbf{u}+\mathbf{q})\leqslant -\big(\operatorname{trace}(\overline{\mathbb{P}}\nabla\mathbf{u})+\tau\phi*\rho\big)2\rho e(t,\mathbf{x}),\quad \overline{\mathbb{P}}:=\frac{\mathbb{P}}{2\rho e} \tag{3.4}$$

Observe that $\overline{\mathbb{P}}$ is a symmetric positive definite matrix with unit trace. For such unit-trace matrices we have

$$\operatorname{trace}(\overline{\mathbb{P}}M)\geqslant \lambda_-(M_S),\qquad M_S:=\frac{1}{2}(M+M^\top).$$

Indeed, if we let $\{\lambda_i > 0, \mathbf{w}_i\}$ be the complete eigen-system of $\overline{\mathbb{P}}$ then

$$\operatorname{trace}(\overline{\mathbb{P}}M) = \sum_i \langle \overline{\mathbb{P}}M\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{w}_i\rangle = \sum_i \lambda_i(\overline{\mathbb{P}})\langle M\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{w}_i\rangle \geqslant \sum_i \lambda_i(\overline{\mathbb{P}})\lambda_-(M_S) = \lambda_-(M_S).$$

In particular, therefore, (3.4) yields

$$\partial_t(\rho e) + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\cdot(\rho e\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{q}) \leqslant -2\big(\lambda_-(\nabla_S\mathbf{u}) + \tau\phi*\rho\big)\rho e(t,\mathbf{x}).$$

We conclude that if the threshold condition (1.7) holds

$$\eta(t,\mathbf{x}) \equiv \eta(\rho(t,\mathbf{x}),\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{x})) := \lambda_-(\nabla_S\mathbf{u})(t,\mathbf{x}) + \tau\phi*\rho(t,\mathbf{x}) \geqslant \eta_c > 0, \tag{3.5}$$

then the decay of internal energy follows,

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\int \rho e(t,\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \leqslant -2\eta_c\int \rho e(t,\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x},$$

which in turn proves Theorem 1.1. The key question is whether such threshold inequality $\eta(t,\mathbf{x}) \geqslant \eta_c > 0$ persists in time. Observe that (3.5) is independent of the thermo-dynamical state $\{e,\mathbb{P}\}$, and in particular, therefore, applies to the mono-kinetic closure $\mathbb{P} = 0$. This motivates our search in §4 for a *critical threshold* in the space of initial configurations, $\eta(\rho_0(\mathbf{x}),\mathbf{u}_0(\mathbf{x})) \geqslant \eta_c > 0$.

3.1. **Entropy decrease and mono-kinetic closure.** We restrict attention to the case of isentropic closure $p = (\gamma-1)\rho e$ which led to the reverse entropy inequality (1.9).

$$S_t + \mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}S \leqslant -2\tau\phi*\rho < 0, \qquad S = p\rho^{-\gamma}. \tag{3.6}$$

The Euler alignment system (1.1),(1.5) can be viewed as hyperbolic system of conservation laws for $\mathbf{w} = (\rho, \rho\mathbf{u}, \rho E)$, which we abbreviate as

$$\mathbf{w}_t + \operatorname{div}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{w}) = \tau\mathbb{A}(\mathbf{w}), \quad \tau > 0$$

where $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{w})$ is the flux and $\mathbb{A}(\mathbf{w})$,

$$\mathbb{A}(\mathbf{w}) := \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \displaystyle\int \phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\big(\mathbf{u}(t,y) - \mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{x})\big)\rho(t,\mathbf{x})\rho(t,\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y} \\ \displaystyle\leqslant \int \phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\big(2\rho E(t,\mathbf{x})\rho(t,\mathbf{y}) - \rho\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{x})\cdot\rho\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{y})\big)\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}\end{bmatrix},$$

encodes the alignment terms on the right of (1.1),(1.5). In this context, $(-\rho S, -\rho\mathbf{u}S)$ forms an *entropy pair*: combining (3.6) and the mass equation, (3.6)$\times\rho$ + $(1.1)_1\times S$, implies that the convex entropy $-\rho S$ is *increasing*,

$$U(\mathbf{w})_t + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\cdot\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{w}) > 0, \qquad U(\mathbf{w}) = -\rho S, \quad \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{w}) = -\rho\mathbf{u}S,$$

in contrast to the celebrated statement of convex entropy decrease in presence of diffusion, $\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{w})$, [Lax1957, God1962],[Kru1970, §7],[Lax1971, Daf2005],

$$\mathbf{w}_t + \operatorname{div}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{w}) = \sigma\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{w}) \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad U(\mathbf{w})_t + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\cdot\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{w}) < 0, \qquad \sigma > 0.$$

It follows that alignment and diffusion compete in driving the dynamics in different directions of increasing order and, respectively, disorder. This is realized in the reversed entropy inequality (3.6) which implies the maximum principle, $S(t,\cdot) \leqslant \max S_0$, in contrast to the minimum principle in the vanishing difussive Euler equations [Tad1986]

$$S_t + \mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}S \geqslant 0 \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad S(t,\cdot) \geqslant \min S_0.$$

In fact, uniform thickness in (3.6) implies

$$S^\eta_t + \mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} S^\eta < 0, \qquad S^\eta(t,\mathbf{x}) := S(t,\mathbf{x}) + 2\tau c_* t,$$

which in turn enforces the decay of $S(t,\cdot)$ asserted in Theorem 1.2. We verify this by setting[3] $\mathcal{H}(S) := (S-S_*)^+$ with S_* to be determined. Since $\mathcal{H}(\cdot)$ is non-decreasing then $(\partial_t + \mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla_{\mathbf{x}})\mathcal{H}(S^\eta) \leqslant 0$, and the entropy inequality follows

$$(\rho\mathcal{H}(S^\eta))_t + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\cdot\big(\rho\mathbf{u}\mathcal{H}(S^\eta)\big) \leqslant 0.$$

Now let $S_* := \max_{\mathbf{x}}(S^\eta)_0 = \max_{\mathbf{x}} S_0$, then integration of the entropy inequality yields

$$\int_{\mathbf{x}} \rho(S^\eta(t,\mathbf{x}) - S_*)^+ \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \leqslant \int_{\mathbf{x}} \rho(S_0(\mathbf{x}) - S_*)^+ \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = 0,$$

implying that the non-negative integrand on the left must vanish. Hence $S^\eta(t,\mathbf{x}) \leqslant S_* \leqslant \max_{\mathbf{x}} S_0$ and (1.10) follows,

$$p\rho^{-\gamma}(t,\mathbf{x}) \leqslant K e^{-2\tau c_* t}, \quad K = e^{\max_{\mathbf{x}} S_0}.$$

Similar arguments apply to the uniform decay $S(t,\cdot) \stackrel{t\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} -\infty$ asserted in Theorem 1.2 under a general thickness condition.

The "competition" between entropy production and entropy dissipation is demonstrated in the one-dimensional Navier-Stokes alignment (NSA) equations which we abbreviate

$$\mathbf{w}_t + \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{w})_x = \tau\mathbb{A}(\mathbf{w}) + \sigma\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{w}), \quad \sigma\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{w}) := \sigma_1 \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ u \\ \frac{1}{2}u^2 \end{bmatrix}_{xx} + \sigma_2 \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ T \end{bmatrix}_x \quad C_v T = e, \tag{3.7}$$

with the corresponding entropy balance

$$(-\rho S)_t + \big(-\rho u S + \sigma_2(\ln T)_x\big)_x = 2\tau(\phi*\rho)\rho - \sigma_1\frac{u_x^2}{T} - \sigma_2\left(\frac{T_x}{T}\right)^2. \tag{3.8}$$

The entropy increase rate on the first term on the right of (3.8) follows from (3.6); the terms involved the temperature T encode the usual entropy decrease associated with the diffusion term in Navier-Stokes, $\sigma\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{w})$. Observe that whenever the NSA dynamics (3.7) with vanishing amplitudes $\tau,\sigma \ll 1$ develops sharp gradients, then the diffusive entropy dissipation terms, $\sigma_1 u_x^2, \sigma_2 T_x^2 \gg 1$, dominate the bounded entropy increase due to alignment, $\phi*\rho \leqslant Const.$.

Finally, we note that the "competition" between entropy production and entropy dissipation is realized already at the kinetic level. We consider the kinetic formulation (2.1) driven by both alignment and diffusion, [Shv2024, §6],[Shv2025]

$$\partial_t f + \mathbf{v}\cdot\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f + \tau\nabla_{\mathbf{v}}\cdot Q_\phi(f,f) = \sigma\Delta_{\mathbf{v}} f.$$

It follows that $H(f) := f\log f - f$ satisfies

$$\partial_t \int H(f)\mathrm{d}\mathbf{v} + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\cdot\int \mathbf{v}H(f)\mathrm{d}\mathbf{v} = \tau\phi*\rho\int f\mathrm{d}\mathbf{v} - 4\sigma\int |\nabla_{\mathbf{v}}\sqrt{f}|^2\mathrm{d}\mathbf{v}. \tag{3.9}$$

The first term on the right shows that alignment increases the kinetic entropy functional $\displaystyle\int H(f)\mathrm{d}\mathbf{v}$ due to communication satisfying the uniform thickness assumption (1.8), $\tau\phi*$

[3] $X^+ := \begin{cases} X & X>0 \\ 0 & X\leqslant 0 \end{cases}$ denotes the "positive part of X".

$\rho f > \tau c_* f > 0$. This reversed H theorem was already observed by us in [HT2008, §6]. In contrast, the decrease of the kinetic entropy functional due to diffusion is dictated by Fisher information $-4\sigma|\nabla_{\mathbf{v}}\sqrt{f}|^2 < 0$. They balance each other to zero entropy production with a Maxwellian profile

$$f(t,\mathbf{x},\mathbf{v}) = \frac{\rho}{(2\pi\theta)^{n/2}}e^{-\frac{|\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{u}|^2}{2\theta}}, \qquad \theta(t,\mathbf{x}) \sim \left(\frac{\sigma}{\tau}\frac{\rho}{\phi*\rho}\right)^{(\gamma-1)/\gamma}.$$

4. Alignment with mono-kinetic closure

Our main result settles the open question of existence of strong solutions of the multi-dimensional mono-kinetic Euler alignment system (1.1) in $n \geqslant 3$ dimensions subject to general C^1 symmetric communication kernels.

4.1. **Existence of strong solutions.** The mono-kinetic closure reduces the momentum equation $(1.1)_2$ to $(1.11)_2$

$$\mathbf{u}_t(t,\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{x}) = \int\phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})(\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{y})-\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{x}))\rho(t,\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y},\ \ \mathbf{x}\in\mathrm{supp}\,(\rho(t,\cdot)). \tag{4.1}$$

The existence result involves three quantities which do not increase in time: the mass $m(t) := \displaystyle\int \rho(t,\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = m_0$, the velocity fluctuation, $\delta u(t)$, (see (4.13) below),

$$\delta u(t) \leqslant \delta u_0, \qquad \delta u(t) := \sup_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}\big\{|\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{x})-\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{y})|\ :\ \mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}\in\mathrm{supp}\{\rho(t,\cdot)\}\big\}, \tag{4.2}$$

and the total kinetic energy, $\mathcal{E}(t) := \displaystyle\int \tfrac{1}{2}\rho|\mathbf{u}|^2(t,\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \leqslant \mathcal{E}(0)$. We assume that their initial amplitudes are not too large relative to the uniform thickness, $c_* > 0$,

$$(8\alpha_0 + 4\beta_0)m_0 < \tau c_*^2, \qquad \left\{\begin{array}{l}\alpha_0 := |\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\phi|_\infty|\delta u_0|_\infty\\ \beta_0 := |(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}+\nabla_{\mathbf{y}})\phi|_\infty\left(\dfrac{2\mathcal{E}_0}{m_0}\right)^{1/2}\end{array}\right. . \tag{4.3}$$

Theorem 4.1 (Global strong solutions with sub-critical data). *Consider the multiD Euler alignment system (1.11) with C^1 symmetric communication kernel, $\phi(\cdot,\cdot) > 0$, satisfying the uniform thickness (1.8), $\phi*\rho(t,\cdot) \geqslant c_* > 0$, and subject to initial conditions $(\rho_0,\mathbf{u}_0)\in L^1_+\times W^{1,\infty}$ with bounded amplitudes (4.3).*
Assume that the threshold condition holds:

$$\eta(\rho_0,\mathbf{u}_0) = \lambda_-(\nabla_S\mathbf{u}_0)(\mathbf{x}) + \tau\phi*\rho_0(\mathbf{x}) \geqslant \eta_c > 0, \qquad \eta_c = \tfrac{1}{2}\tau c_*. \tag{4.4}$$

Then, Euler alignment (1.11),(4.3)–(4.4) admits a global smooth solution, $(\rho(\cdot,t),\mathbf{u}(\cdot,t)) \in L^1_+\times W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and the following uniform bound holds

$$|\nabla\mathbf{u}(t,\cdot)|_{L^\infty} \leqslant \max\{|\nabla\mathbf{u}_0|_{L^\infty}, c_*, C_0\}.$$

The constant $C_0 = C\left(\max_{\mathbf{x}}\|\nabla\mathbf{u}_0\|, m_0, \phi_+\right)$ is specified in (4.11) below.

In the canonical case of metric kernels, Theorem 4.1 holds with $\beta_0 = 0$. This is summarized in Theorem 1.3.

Remark 4.1 (**Large class of sub-critical initial data**). *Observe that the threshold condition* (4.4) *is the same threshold condition which secured decay towards mono-kinetic closure for general class of entropic pressures in Theorem 1.1. It allows a "large" set of sub-critical initial configurations* $(\rho_0,\mathbf{u}_0)$ *in* (4.4) *such that* $\lambda_-(\nabla_S\mathbf{u}_0)$ *admits negative values* $\lambda_-(\nabla_S\mathbf{u}_0) > \eta_c - \tau\phi*\rho$ *with* $\eta_c - \tau\phi*\rho \leqslant -\frac{1}{2}\tau c_*$*; consult Remark 1.1. One can state the existence result with a smaller threshold* η_c *(thus allowing even larger range of "negative slopes"* $\lambda_-(\nabla_S\mathbf{u}_0)$*) at the expense of more restricted range of initial amplitudes* (α_0,β_0)*.*

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Our purpose is to show that the derivatives $\{\partial_j u_i\}$ are uniformly bounded. We proceed in four steps.

Step 1. We begin by identifying an invariant region associated with the threshold $\eta(t,\mathbf{x}) = \lambda_-(\nabla_S\mathbf{u})+\tau\phi*\rho$. The goal is to show that the threshold condition (4.4) secures a sub-critical region in configuration space which persists in time, $\eta(\rho_0,\mathbf{u}_0)\geqslant\eta_c>0 \rightsquigarrow \eta(\rho(t,\cdot),\mathbf{u}(t,\cdot))\geqslant \eta_c>0$.

Let $'$ abbreviate differentiation along particle path,

$$\Box' := (\partial_t+\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla)\Box.$$

Differentiation of (4.1) implies that the $n\times n$ velocity gradient matrix, $M=\nabla\mathbf{u}$, satisfies

$$M'+M^2+\tau\phi*\rho M=\tau R, \tag{4.5}$$

where R is the $n\times n$ matrix

$$R_{ij} := \int \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial x_j}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\big(u_i(t,\mathbf{y})-u_i(t,\mathbf{x})\big)\rho(t,\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}.$$

The following observation of the residual R is at the heart of matter; in the special case of *metric* kernels it goes back to [CCTT2016] in the 1D case, and to [HT2017] in the 2D case,

$$\mathrm{trace}\, R = -(\phi*\rho)'+\psi*\rho, \qquad \psi(t,\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) := \sum_i\left(\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial x_i}+\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial y_i}\right)u_i(t,\mathbf{y}). \tag{4.6}$$

Verification of (4.6): integration by parts followed by the mass equation $(1.1)_1$ yield

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{trace}R &= \int\sum_i\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial x_i}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\big(u_i(t,\mathbf{y})-u_i(t,\mathbf{x})\big)\rho(t,\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}\\
&= -\int\sum_i\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial y_i}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})u_i(t,\mathbf{y})\rho(t,\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y} - \int\sum_i\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial x_i}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})u_i(t,\mathbf{x})\rho(t,\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}\\
&\quad +\int\sum_i\left(\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial x_i}+\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial y_i}\right)(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})u_i(t,\mathbf{y})\rho(t,\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}\\
&= \int\phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\cdot(\rho\mathbf{u})(t,\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\int\phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\rho(t,\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y} + \int\psi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\rho(t,\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}\\
&= \int\phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\times-\rho_t(t,\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\phi*\rho+\psi*\rho\\
&= -(\partial_t+\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla_{\mathbf{x}})\phi*\rho+\psi*\rho.
\end{aligned}$$

We decompose M into its symmetric and skew-symmetric arts, $M=S+\Omega$ and trace the symmetric part of (4.5), $S=\nabla_S\mathbf{u}$, to find

$$S'+S^2+\Omega^2+\tau\phi*\rho S=\tau R_S, \qquad R_S := \tfrac{1}{2}(R+R^\top). \tag{4.7}$$

Since Ω is skew-symmetric then $S' + S(S + \tau\phi * \rho\mathbb{I}) \geqslant \tau R_S$. Hence, the minimal eigen-pair of S, $\lambda_- := \min_\lambda \lambda(S)$ with the corresponding unit eigenvector $\mathbf{w}_-$, satisfies

$$\lambda'_-(t,\mathbf{x}) + \lambda_-(t,\mathbf{x})\big(\lambda_-(t,\mathbf{x}) + \tau\phi * \rho(t,\mathbf{x})\big) \geqslant \tau\langle R_S\mathbf{w}_-, \mathbf{w}_-\rangle. \tag{4.8}$$

Here comes the main motivation for (4.6): we use it to express (4.8) in terms of $\eta := \lambda_- + \tau\phi*\rho$ as follows:

$$\eta' + (\eta - \tau\phi * \rho)\eta \geqslant \tau\chi, \qquad \chi := \langle (R_S - \operatorname{trace} R_S)\mathbf{w}_-, \mathbf{w}_-\rangle + \psi * \rho,$$

and since by uniform thickness $\phi * \rho \geqslant c_*$ hence,

$$\eta'(t,\mathbf{x}) \geqslant \eta(\tau c_* - \eta) - \tau|\chi|. \tag{4.9}$$

Our purpose is to secure that the quantity on the right of (4.9) is positive for the threshold $\eta \downarrow \eta_c$, so that $\eta(t,\cdot)$ always increases whenever it approaches $\eta_c = \frac{1}{2}\tau c_*$ from above, and hence $\eta(\rho(t,\cdot),\mathbf{u}(t,\cdot)) \geqslant \eta_c$ remains an invariant region in time. To this end, we need to upper-bound $|\chi|$.

The rank-one integrand in R implies $|\langle R_S\mathbf{w}_-, \mathbf{w}_-\rangle| \leqslant |\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\phi|_\infty \delta u(t) m_0$, and the velocity fluctuations bound $(4.2)_2$ yields[4]

$$\big|\big\langle (R_S - \operatorname{trace} R)\mathbf{w}_-, \mathbf{w}_-\big\rangle\big| \leqslant 2\alpha_0 m_0 \qquad \alpha_0 = |\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\phi|_\infty \delta u_0; \tag{4.10}$$

the kinetic energy bound $(4.2)_3$ yields

$$|\psi * \rho| \leqslant \beta_0 m_0, \qquad \beta_0 = |(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} + \nabla_{\mathbf{y}})\phi|_\infty \sqrt{\frac{2\mathcal{E}_0}{m_0}}.$$

Therefore, since the initial amplitudes assumed in (4.3) are not too large,

$$\tau|\chi| \leqslant \tau|\langle (R_S - \operatorname{trace} R_S)\mathbf{w}_-, \mathbf{w}_-\rangle| + \tau|\psi * \rho| \leqslant \tfrac{1}{4}(\tau c_*)^2,$$

and (4.9) yields

$$\eta'(t,\mathbf{x}) > \eta(\tau c_* - \eta) - \tfrac{1}{4}(\tau c_*)^2_{|\eta=\eta_c} = 0, \qquad \eta_c = \tfrac{1}{2}\tau c_*.$$

Thus, the initial threshold bound $\eta(\rho_0, \mathbf{u}_0) \geqslant \eta_c$ with $\eta_c = \frac{1}{2}\tau c_*$, will persist for all time, $\eta(\rho,\mathbf{u}) \geqslant \eta_c$.

Step 2. Next we upper-bound the skew-symmetric part of (4.5)

$$\Omega' + \tfrac{1}{2}(S\Omega + \Omega S) + \tau\phi * \rho\Omega = \tau R_\Omega, \qquad R_\Omega := \tfrac{1}{2}\left(R - R^\top\right).$$

If $(\mu_+, \mathbf{z}_+)$ is the maximal eigen-pair of Ω with purely imaginary eigenvalue μ_+ such that $|\mu_+| = \max_\mu |\mu(\Omega)|$ and normalized eigenvector $\mathbf{z}_+$, then

$$\mu'_+(t,\mathbf{x}) + \mu_+(t,\mathbf{x})\big(\langle S\mathbf{z}_+, \mathbf{z}_+\rangle + \tau\phi * \rho\big) = \tau\langle R_\Omega\mathbf{z}_+, \mathbf{z}_+\rangle.$$

The threshold established in step 1 tells us, $\langle S\mathbf{z}_+, \mathbf{z}_+\rangle + \tau\phi * \rho \geqslant \eta_c > 0$ and hence

$$|\mu_+|'(t,\mathbf{x}) + \eta_c|\mu_+(t,\mathbf{x})| \leqslant |\mu_+|'(t,\mathbf{x}) + |\mu_+(t,\mathbf{x})|\big(\langle S\mathbf{z}_+, \mathbf{z}_+\rangle + \tau\phi * \rho\big) \leqslant \tau|\langle R_\Omega\mathbf{z}_+, \mathbf{z}_+\rangle|.$$

As before, $|\langle R_\Omega\mathbf{z}_+, \mathbf{z}_+\rangle| \leqslant \alpha_0 m_0 < \frac{1}{8}\tau c_*^2$ and we end up with a uniform bound of the vorticity whch involves the constant $\frac{1}{8}\tau^2 c_*^2/\eta_c = \frac{1}{4}\tau c_*$,

$$\|\Omega(t,\mathbf{x})\| \leqslant \gamma_0, \qquad \gamma_0 := \max\left\{\max_{\mathbf{x}} \|\Omega_0(\mathbf{x})\|, \tfrac{1}{4}\tau c_*\right\}.$$

[4]The entries integrated in $R_{ij} \mapsto r_i s_j$ with $r_i = \phi_{x_i}$ and $s_j = u_i(t,\mathbf{y}) - u_i(t,\mathbf{x})$ yields, $\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{w}_-\rangle\langle \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{w}_-\rangle - \sum r_i s_i \leqslant 2|\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\phi|\delta u(t)$.

Step 3. Now we can bound $\|S(t,\mathbf{x})\|$, that is, the maximal eigenvalue of $\lambda_+ = \max_\lambda \lambda(S)$. We revisit (4.7), this time with the upper bound of $-\Omega^2$, to derive the reverse inequality (4.9) for $\zeta(t,\mathbf{x}) := \lambda_+(t,\mathbf{x}) + \tau\phi * \rho(t,\mathbf{x})$,

$$\zeta'(t,\mathbf{x}) + \tau c_* \zeta(t,\mathbf{x}) \leqslant \zeta' + \tau\phi * \rho\zeta \leqslant \tau|\langle R_S \mathbf{w}_+, \mathbf{w}_+\rangle| + \|\Omega\|^2.$$

Again, since the initial amplitudes assumed in (4.3) are not too large, $\tau|\langle R_S \mathbf{w}_+, \mathbf{w}_+\rangle| \leqslant \frac{1}{8}(\tau c_*)^2$ and together with $\|\Omega\| \leqslant \gamma_0$, this yields

$$\max_{\mathbf{x}} \lambda_+(t,\mathbf{x}) \leqslant \max\left\{\max_{\mathbf{x}} \lambda_+(S_0)(\mathbf{x}), \delta_0\right\}, \qquad \delta_0 = \tfrac{1}{8}\tau c_* + \frac{\gamma_0^2}{\tau c_*}..$$

And finally, combined with the lower threshold $\lambda_-(S) \geqslant -\tau\phi * \rho \geqslant -\tau\phi_+ m_0$ we conclude

$$\|S(t,\mathbf{x})\| \leqslant \max\left\{\max_{\mathbf{x}} \lambda_+(S_0)(\mathbf{x}), \delta_0, \tau\phi_+ m_0\right\}.$$

Step 4. The bounds of S and Ω imply that $\nabla\mathbf{u}$ is uniformly bounded in time

$$\left|\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_j}(t,\mathbf{x})\right| \leqslant \max\left\{\max_{\mathbf{x}} \|\nabla\mathbf{u}_0\|, \frac{1}{4}\tau c_*, \delta_0, \tau\phi_+ m_0\right\}. \qquad \square \tag{4.11}$$

Remark 4.2. *Observe that the velocity fluctuations $\delta u(t)$ decay exponentially in time, see* (4.17) *below. If we use this improved bound in* (4.10) *then one can deduce an improved threshold condition with larger set of restricted initial fluctuations, e.g.,* [ST2020a, Remark 6.1].

4.2. **Uniform thickness and flocking.** We now turn to the question of uniform thickness assumed in Theorem 4.1 which is addressed in the next sections for the two main classes of heavy-tailed and short-range kernels.

4.2.1. *Uniform thickness with heavy-tailed kernels.* Consider communication kernels, quantified in terms of the Pareto-type tail

$$\phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \geqslant C\langle|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|\rangle^{-\theta}, \qquad \theta \in (0,1) \tag{4.12}$$

A key feature of such heavy-tailed kernels is that their alignment dynamics maintains global communication: each part of the crowd with mass distribution $\rho(\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}$ communicates *directly* with every other part with mass distribution $\rho(\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}$. Indeed, in this case,

$$\phi_-(t) := \min_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}\in \mathrm{supp}\{\rho(t,\cdot)\}} \phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \gtrsim \langle D(t)\rangle^{-\theta} > 0, \qquad D(t) := \mathrm{diam}(\mathrm{supp}\{\rho(t,\cdot)\})$$

and for $\theta < 1$ this implies that $\phi_-(t)$ remains uniformly bounded in time away from zero. The uniform-in-time bound follows by combining two standard arguments:

#1. Decay of velocity fluctuations. In the case of mono-kinetic closure, $\mathbb{P} \equiv 0$, the momentum equation $(1.1)_2$ decouples into n scalar equations, each of which satisfies a maximum principle; in fact there is a decay quantified in [TT2014, Theorem 2.1],[HT2017, Theorem 1.1],

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\delta u(t) \leqslant -(\tau m_0 \phi_-(t))\delta u(t), \qquad \delta u(t) = \max_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}\in \mathrm{supp}\{\rho(t,\cdot)\}} |\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{y})|. \tag{4.13}$$

#2. The decay rate of $\delta u(t)$,

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\delta u(t) \leqslant -C\tau m_0 \langle D(t)\rangle^{-\theta}\delta u(t) \tag{4.14a}$$

is dictated by the dispersion of $\text{supp}\{\rho(t,\cdot)\}$, which in turn does not exceed

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}D(t) \leqslant \delta u(t). \tag{4.14b}$$

It follows [HL2009] that $H(t) := C\tau m_0 \langle D(t)\rangle^{1-\theta} + (1-\theta)\delta u(t)$ is non-increasing, $\dot{H}(t) \leqslant 0$, and therefore $\text{supp}\{\rho(t,\cdot)\}$ is kept uniformly bounded in time,

$$D(t) \leqslant D_\infty := \left(\frac{H_0}{\tau m_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\theta}}, \qquad H_0 = C\tau m_0 \langle D_0\rangle^{1-\theta} + (1-\theta)\delta u_0. \tag{4.15}$$

In particular, $\phi_-(t) \geqslant C\langle D(t)\rangle^{-\theta} \geqslant C\langle D_\infty\rangle^{-\theta} > 0$ and uniform thickness (1.8) follows

$$\phi * \rho(t) \geqslant \phi_-(t)\int \rho(t,\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \geqslant c_* := C\langle D_\infty\rangle^{-\theta} m_0. \tag{4.16}$$

An alternative derivation of the uniform-in-time bounds is outlined in §4.3 below.

Remark 4.3 (**Flocking I).** *The dispersion bound* (4.15) *implies an exponential decay of velocity fluctuations*

$$\delta u(t) \lesssim e^{-\tau m_0 D_\infty^{-\theta} t}\delta u_0. \tag{4.17}$$

Since the mean velocity is time-invariant, $\overline{\mathbf{u}}(t) := \dfrac{1}{m_0}\displaystyle\int \rho\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}$*, there follows the flocking behavior*

$$\max_{\mathbf{x}\in\text{supp}\{\rho(t,\cdot)\}} |\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{x}) - \overline{\mathbf{u}}_0|_\infty \lesssim e^{-\tau m_0 D_\infty^{-\theta} t}|\delta\mathbf{u}_0|_\infty. \tag{4.18}$$

Flocking behavior for heavy-tailed metric-based kernels $\phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \mapsto \phi(|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|)$ goes back to Cucker-Smale [CS2007, HT2008, HL2009]*. Here we observe that it extends to general heavy-tailed symmetric kernels. It corresponds to the flocking behavior at the level of agent-based description e.g.,* [MT2011, definition 1.1]*, in which a cohesive flock of a finite diameter* $\max_{i,j}|x_i(t)-x_j(t)| \leqslant D_\infty < \infty$*, is approaching a limiting velocity,* $\max_{i,j}|\mathbf{v}_i(t)-\mathbf{v}_j(t)| \to 0$ *as $t\to\infty$.*

Remark 4.4 (**Flocking II).** *The enstrophy in* (3.1) *drives the the decay of the energy fluctuations*

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\delta\mathcal{E}(t) \leqslant -\frac{C\tau m_0}{\langle D(t)\rangle^\theta}\delta\mathcal{E}(t),$$
$$\delta\mathcal{E}(t) := \left(\iint \left(\tfrac{1}{2}|\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x})-\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{y})|^2 + e(\mathbf{x}) + e(\mathbf{y})\right)\mathrm{d}\rho(\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}\rho(\mathbf{y})\right)^{1/2}.$$

Observe that the last inequality applies to general Euler alignment systems (1.1), independent *of the specific closure for the pressure tensor. In particular, <u>if</u> we can control the dispersion*

$$D(t) \lesssim \langle t\rangle^\gamma, \quad \gamma \geqslant 0, \tag{4.19}$$

then we would conclude that both — the L^2-velocity fluctuations and internal energy fluctuations decay to zero

$$\delta\mathcal{E}(t) \lesssim e^{-\eta t^{1-\gamma\theta}}\delta\mathcal{E}(0), \qquad \eta = \frac{C\tau m_0}{2(1-\gamma\theta)u_\infty}, \quad \gamma\theta < 1. \tag{4.20}$$

We mention three examples.
1 (A uniformly bounded velocity). $|\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{x})| \leqslant u_\infty$ *implies — in view of* (4.14b), *that* (4.19) *holds with* $\gamma = 1$, $D(t) \leqslant D_0 + 2u_\infty t$, *and* L^2*-flocking follows for* $\theta < 1$. *This covers the mono-kinetic scenario discussed in the previous remark.*
2 (Matrix communication kernels). When (1.1) *is driven by symmetric positive definite* matrix *kernel,* $\phi \mapsto \Phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$, *then a dispersion bound is secured with* $\gamma = 2/3$, *and* (4.20) *follows for* $\theta < 2/3$, [ST2021, Proposition 3.1],[Tad2023, Appendix C].
3 (Singular kernels). When $\phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \sim |\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^{-\alpha}$, $\alpha \in (n, n+2)$, *their enstrpohy enforces that* (4.19) *holds with* $\gamma = \gamma_{\alpha,n} > 1$ [Tad2023, Appendix E], *and flocking follows for a restricted set of* $\theta < 1/\gamma$. *This proves flocking independent of the specific closure for the pressure and independent whether the kernel* $\phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ *is long- or short-range.*

4.2.2. *Uniform thickness with short-range kernels.* We restrict attention to compactly supported metric kernels (1.3). In this case, alignment takes place in local neighborhoods of size $\leqslant D_0$, which is assumed much smaller than the diameter of the ambient space — the 2π-periodic torus $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^n$. With lack of global, direct communication, existence and large-time behavior of strong solution of (1.1) depends on having a bounded, non-vacuous density,

$$0 < \rho_- \leqslant \rho(t,\mathbf{x}) \leqslant \rho_+ < \infty. \tag{4.21}$$

In particular, uniform thickness (1.8) follows

$$\phi * \rho(t) \geqslant c_* := \int \phi(|\mathbf{x}|)\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}\, \rho_- > 0. \tag{4.22}$$

Remark 4.5 (Flocking III). *We mention the flocking of alignment dynamics with short-range kernels in finite tours, as long as the the non-vacuous condition* (4.21) *holds,* [Tad2021, Theorem 3],[Shv2024, §4.4]. *Again, flocking of non-vacuous dynamics holds independent of the closure of pressure: the key question is securing the uniform-in-time bound* (4.22) *or, as noted in* [Tad2021, Remark p. 499] *at least* $\displaystyle\int^\infty \rho_-(t)\mathrm{d}t = \infty$ *which in tun would lead to (non-uniform) thickness,* $\displaystyle\int^\infty \min_{\mathbf{x}} \phi * \rho(t,\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}t = \infty$. *This question was addressed in the case of 1D singular kernel in* [ST2017a, DKRT2018], *but is open for bounded short-kernels.*

4.3. **Uniform bounds revisited.** A necessary main ingredient in the analysis of (1.1) is the uniform-in-time bounds of $\mathrm{diam}(\mathrm{supp}\{\rho(t,\cdot)\}), \phi_-(t)$, and the amplitude of velocity $\displaystyle\max_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathrm{supp}\{\rho(t,\cdot)\}} |\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x},t)|$. An alternative approach to the standard arguments in §4.2.1 is advocated in our work [ST2020a, Lemma 3.2]. Here, we extend our argument to general symmetric kernels. The next lemma shows that whenever one has a uniform bound of $|\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x},t)| + |\mathbf{x}|$ for the *restricted* class of lower-bounded ϕ's which scales like $\mathcal{O}(1/\min\phi)$, then it implies a uniform bound of $|\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x},t)| + |\mathbf{x}|$ for the general class of admissible ϕ's (4.12).

Lemma 4.1 (The reduction to lower-bounded ϕ's). *Consider* (1.1) *with a with the restricted class of uniformly lower-bounded* ϕ*'s:*

$$0 < \phi_- \leqslant \phi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \leqslant \phi_+ < \infty. \tag{4.23}$$

Assume that the solutions $(\widetilde{\rho}, \widetilde{\mathbf{u}})$ *associated with the restricted* (1.1),(4.23), *satisfy the uniform bound (with constants* $C_\pm$ *depending on* ϕ_+, m_0 *and* $\mathcal{E}_0$*)*

$$\max_{t\geqslant 0,\, \mathbf{x}\in\mathrm{supp}\widetilde{\rho}(\cdot,t)} (|\widetilde{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{x},t)| + |\mathbf{x}|) \leqslant \max\left\{ C_+ \cdot \max_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathrm{supp}\ \widetilde{\rho}_0} (|\widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_0(\mathbf{x})| + |\mathbf{x}|)\, , \frac{C_-}{\phi_-} \right\}. \tag{4.24}$$

Then the following holds for solutions associated with a general class of admissible kernels ϕ satisfying (4.12): if $(\rho, \mathbf{u})$ is a smooth solution of (1.1), then there exists $\beta > 0$ depending on the initial data $(\rho_0, \mathbf{u}_0)$, such that $(\rho, \mathbf{u})$ coincides with the solution, $(\widetilde{\rho}_\beta, \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_beta)$, associated with the lower-bounded

$$\phi_\beta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \max\{\phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), \beta\}$$

This means that if ϕ belongs to the general class of admissible kernels (4.12), then we can assume, without loss of generality, that ϕ coincides with the lower bounded ϕ_β and hence the uniform bound (4.24) holds with $\phi_- = \beta$. The justification of this reduction step is outlined below.

Proof of Lemma 4.1. By (4.12) one could take large enough r such that $r \cdot \min\limits_{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|\leqslant r} \phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \geqslant 2C_-$ and

$$r \geqslant 2C_+ \cdot \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \text{supp } \rho_0} (|\mathbf{u}_0(\mathbf{x})| + |\mathbf{x}|). \tag{4.25}$$

Let $\beta := \min\limits_{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|\leqslant r} \phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$. By assumption, (4.24) holds for the lower-bounded ϕ_β, so that

$$\max_{t \geqslant 0,\, \mathbf{x} \in \text{supp } \rho_\beta(\cdot, t)} (|\mathbf{u}_\beta(\mathbf{x}, t)| + |\mathbf{x}|) \leqslant \max\left\{ C_+ \cdot \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \text{supp } \rho_0} (|\mathbf{u}_0(\mathbf{x})| + |\mathbf{x}|), \frac{C_-}{\beta} \right\} \tag{4.26}$$

where $(\rho_\beta, \mathbf{u}_\beta)$ is the smooth solution of (1.1) with interaction kernel ϕ_β, which we assume to exist. By definition,

$$\frac{C_-}{\beta} = \frac{C_-}{\min\limits_{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|\leqslant r} \phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} \leqslant \frac{r}{2}. \tag{4.27}$$

Fix $t \geqslant 0$, then (4.25)–(4.27) imply that the distance for any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \text{supp } \rho_\beta(\cdot, t)$ does not exceed

$$|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| \leqslant |\mathbf{x}| + |\mathbf{y}| \leqslant 2 \max\left\{ C_+ \cdot \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \text{supp } \rho_0} (|\mathbf{u}_0(\mathbf{x})| + |\mathbf{x}|), \frac{C_-}{\beta} \right\} \leqslant r. \tag{4.28}$$

Thus, for any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \text{supp } \rho_\beta(\cdot, t)$ there holds $\phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \geqslant \beta$ and hence ϕ_β coincides with ϕ for $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \text{supp}\{\rho(t, \cdot)\}$, so that the dynamics of $(\rho_\beta, \mathbf{u}_\beta)$ coincides with $(\rho, \mathbf{u})$. $\square$

Example. If the uniform lower bound $\phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \geqslant \phi_-$ holds then according to (4.13)

$$\delta u(t) \leqslant \delta u_0 \cdot e^{-(\tau m_0 \phi_-)t},$$

and hence $D(t) \leqslant D_0 + \dfrac{1}{\tau m_0 \phi_-}$. Therefore, existence of strong solutions and their flocking behavior follows long range ϕ's with Pareto's tail (4.12).

References

[Ave2003] J. Avery, Information Theory and Evolution, World Scientific, 2003.

[CCR2009] J. A. Canizo, J.A. Carrillo and J. Rosado, A well-posedness theory in measures for kinetic models of collective motion, Math. Mod. Meth. Appl. Sci., 21 (2009), 515-539.

[CFTV2010] J. A. Carrillo, M. Fornasier, G. Toscani and F. Vecil. Particle, kinetic, and hydrodynamic models of swarming, 2010. in "*Mathematical Modeling of Collective Behavior in Socio-Economic and Life Sciences*" (G. Naldi L. Pareschi G. Toscani eds.), Birkhauser, pages 297–336, 2010.

[CCP2017] J. Carrillo, Y.-P. Choi and S. Perez, A review on attractive-repulsive hydrodynamics for consensus in collective behavior, in "*Active Particles, Volume 1. Advances in Theory, Models, and Applications*" (N. Bellomo, P. Degond and E. Tadmor, eds.), Birkhäuser 2017.

[CCTT2016] J. A. Carrillo, Y.-P. Choi, E. Tadmor and C. Tan, Critical thresholds in 1D Euler equations with nonlocal forces, Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences 26(1) (2016) 185-206.

[CFRT2010] J. Carrillo, M. Fornasier, J. Rosado and G. Toscani, Asymptotic flocking dynamics for the kinetic Cucker-Smale model, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 42(218) (2010), 218-236.

[Cha1978] G. Chaitin, Towards a mathematical definition of "Life", in "The Maximum Entropy Formalism" (R. D. Levine and M. Tribus, eds.), MIT Press, 1979, pp. 477–498

[CS2007] F. Cucker and S. Smale, Emergent behavior in flocks, IEEE Trans. Autom. Control, 52, no. 5, (2007): 852-862.

[Daf2005] C. Dafermos, Hyperbolic conservation laws in continuum physics. Vol. 3. Berlin, Springer, 2005.

[DKRT2018] T. Do, A. Kiselev, L. Ryzhik and C. Tan, Global regularity for the fractional Euler alignment system. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 228(1), 1–37 (2018)

[ELT2001] S. Engelberg, H. Liu and E. Tadmor, Critical thresholds in Euler-Poisson equations, Indiana Univ. Math J. 50 (2001), 109-157

[FP2024] M. Fabisiak and J. Peszek, Inevitable monokineticity of strongly singular alignment. Math. Ann. 390, (2024) 589-637.

[FK2019] A. Figalli and M.-J. Kang, A rigorous derivation from the kinetic Cucker–Smale model to the pressureless Euler system with nonlocal alignment Anal. PDE, 1293) (2019), 843-866.

[God1962] S. K. Godunov, The problem of a generalized solution in the theory of quasilinear equations and in gas dynamics, Russian Mathl Surveys 17(3) (1962): 145.

[HL2009] S. Y. Ha and J. G Liu, A simple proof of the Cucker-Smale flocking dynamics and mean-field limit. Comm. in Math. Sciences, 7(2):297–325, 2009.

[HT2008] S.-Y. Ha and E. Tadmor, From particle to kinetic and hydrodynamic descriptions of flocking, Kinetic and Related Models, 1(3), (2008), 415-435.

[HT2017] S. He and E. Tadmor, Global regularity of two-dimensional flocking hydrodynamics. Comptes rendus - Mathématique Ser. I 355 (2017) 795-805.

[Kru1970] S. Kruzkov, First order quasilinear equations in several independent variables, Math. of the USSR-Sbornik 10.2 (1970): 217.

[Lax1957] P. D. Lax, Hyperbolic systems of conservation laws. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 10 (1957), 537-566.

[Lax1971] P. Lax, Shock waves and entropy, in "*Contributions to nonlinear functional analysis*", Academic Press, 1971. 603-634.

[LS2020] D. Lear and R. Shvydkoy, Existence and stability of unidirectional flocks in hydrodynamic Euler alignment systems, Analysis & PDE 15(1) (2022), 175-196.

[Les2020] T. M. Leslie, On the Lagrangian Trajectories for the One-Dimensional Euler Alignment Model without Vacuum Velocity, Comptes Rendus Mathématique 358(4) (2020) 421-433.

[LLST2022] D. Lear, T. M. Leslie, R. Shvydkoy and E. Tadmor, Geometric structure of mass concentration sets for pressureless Euler alignment systems, Advances in Mathmematics 401(4) (2022) 108290.

[LT2002] H. Liu and E. Tadmor, Spectral dynamics of the velocity gradient field in restricted flows, Communications in Mathematical Physics 228 (2002), 435-466.

[MMPZ2019] P. Minakowski, P.B. Mucha, J. Peszek and E. Zatorska, Singular Cucker-Smale dynamics. in "*Active Particles, Volume 2: Advances in Theory, Models, and Applications*" (N. Bellomo, P. Degond, E. Tadmor eds.), Springer 2019, pp. 201-243.

[MT2011] S. Motsch and E. Tadmor, A new model for self-organized dynamics and its flocking behavior, Journal of Statistical Physics 144(5) (2011) 923-947.

[MT2014] S. Motsch and E. Tadmor, Heterophilious dynamics enhances consensus, SIAM Review 56(4) (2014) 577-621.

[NP2022] R. Natalini and T. Paul, On the mean field limit for Cucker-Smale models. Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. B. 27 (5) (2022) 2873-2889.

[NS2022] V. Nguyen and R. Shvydkoy, Propagation of chaos for the Cucker-Smale systems under heavy tail communication, Comm. in PDEs 47(9) (2022) 1883–1906.

[PT2022] T. Paul and E. Trélat, From microscopic to macroscopic scale equations: mean field, hydrodynamic and graph limits, arXiv:2209.08832. (2022)

[Sch1944] E. Schrödinger, What is Life – the Physical Aspect of the Living Cell. Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-42708-1.

[ST2020a] R. Shu and E. Tadmor, Flocking hydrodynamics with external potentials, Archive Rational Mech. and Anal. 238 (2020) 347-381.

[Shv2024] R. Shvydkoy, Environmental Averaging. EMS Surveys in Math Sci. 11 (2024), 277-413

[Shv2025] R. Shvydkoy, Global well-posedness and relaxation for solutions of the Fokker-Planck-Alignment equations, arXiv:2412.20294v2.

[ST2017a] R. Shvydkoy and E. Tadmor, Eulerian dynamics with a commutator forcing, Trans. in Math. and Applications, 1(1) (2017), 1-26.

[ST2017b] R. Shvydkoy and E. Tadmor, Eulerian dynamics with a commutator forcing II: flocking, Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems-A 37(11) (2017) 5503-5520.

[ST2018] R. Shvydkoy and E. Tadmor, Eulerian dynamics with a commutator forcing III. Fractional diffusion of order $0 < \alpha < 1$. Phys. D 376/377, 131-137 (2018)

[ST2020b] R. Shvydkoy and E. Tadmor, Topologically-based fractional diffusion and emergent dynamics with short-range interactions, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 52(6) (2020) 5792-5839.

[ST2021] R. Shu and E. Tadmor, Anticipation breeds alignment, Archive Rational Mech. and Anal. 240 (2021) 203-241.

[Tad1986] E. Tadmor, A minimum entropy principle in the gas dynamics equations Applied Numerical Mathematics 2 (1986), 211-219.

[Tad2021] E. Tadmor, On the mathematics of swarming: emergent behavior in alignment dynamics, Notices of the AMS 68(4) (2021) 493-503.

[Tad2023] E. Tadmor, Swarming: hydrodynamic alignment with pressure, Bulletin AMS 60(3) (2023) 285-325.

[TT2014] E. Tadmor and C. Tan, Critical thresholds in flocking hydrodynamics with non-local alignment, Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Math., Phys. and Engin. Sciences 372.2028 (2014): 20130401.

[VZ2012] T. Vicsek and A. Zefeiris, Collective motion, Physics Reprints, 517 (2012) 71-140.

Department of Mathematics and IPST, University of Maryland, College Park.
Email address: tadmor@umd.edu