CU Journal of Non-Linear Fluid Mechanics
Vol. 02, No. 01, 2026
https://doi.org/10.11615/cujnlfm.02102-7

The Clay Navier–Stokes Problem as a Boundary of Effective Fluid Theories: A Conceptual Perspective

Indra Narayan Shrestha *[a]
[a] Independent Researcher, Nepal.

Abstract

The Clay Millennium Prize Problem on the Navier–Stokes equations asks whether smooth solutions to the three-dimensional incompressible system on $\mathbb{R}^3$ remain globally regular or can exhibit finite-time blow-up. This paper offers a *conceptual perspective* rather than a new mathematical theorem. We situate the Clay problem within a hierarchy of physical breakdowns: continuum failure at high Knudsen number, non-Newtonian rheology, limitations of numerical closures, and transitions to relativistic or quantum hydrodynamics. We then formalize the notion of an analytic "boundary of effective description" and relate it to known mathematical results—Leray–Hopf weak solutions, Prodi–Serrin regularity criteria, partial regularity theory (Caffarelli–Kohn–Nirenberg), and scaling criticality. Our central claim, stated carefully, is that *if* finite-time blow-up occurs for the 3D Navier–Stokes equations, the singularity would occur at scales where the continuum hypothesis itself becomes physically suspect; conversely, global regularity would confirm the self-consistency of this effective model. Neither outcome affects the logical independence of the mathematical problem. The paper aims to bridge the mathematical theory of Navier–Stokes regularity with the physics of effective descriptions, without conflating the two domains.

Keywords: Vier stokes equationsna; Clay millennium problem; Effective field theory; regularity theory; Ray hopf solutionsle; partial regularity; Kinetic theory; Non-newtonian fluids..

1 Introduction and Statement of Novelty

The Clay Mathematics Institute's Millennium Prize Problem on the Navier–Stokes equations asks: given smooth, divergence-free initial data u0 with finite kinetic energy, does the system

$$\partial_t \mathbf{u} + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u} = -\nabla p + \nu \Delta \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{f}, \qquad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0, \qquad \mathbf{u}(x, 0) = \mathbf{u}_0(x),$$

admit a global-in-time, smooth, unique solution on $\mathbb{R}^3$, or can it develop a finite-time singularity? [1], [2], [3].

What this paper does and does not claim

No new mathematical result: This paper contains no theorem, proof, formal conjecture, or rigorous derivation. It is a *conceptual perspective paper* intended

* inshrestha002@gmail.com

for readers interested in the interface between mathematical fluid dynamics and the physics of effective theories.

Novelty: The observation that Navier–Stokes is an effective continuum theory is standard knowledge [4], [5], [6]. What we attempt is a *synthesis* between two literatures that rarely communicate:

1. The extensive mathematical theory of Navier–Stokes regularity (weak solutions, partial regularity, blow-up criteria), and
2. The physical hierarchy of breakdowns (kinetic theory, non-Newtonian rheology, relativistic/quantum regimes).

We then propose a *formal definition* of the "boundary of effective description" (Section 4) and argue that the Clay problem probes the analytic self-consistency of a specific effective layer. While conceptual, this framing has not, to our knowledge, been explicitly developed in the literature.

Disclaimer: Physical breakdown of continuum mechanics does **not** weaken the mathematical validity of the Clay problem.

The Clay problem stands independently as a question about a specific PDE system. Our perspective is complementary, not substitutive.

2 Mathematical Preliminaries: Known Regularity Theory

To ground the subsequent discussion, we briefly recall the mathematical state of knowledge. This section contains no new results but establishes notation and known facts.

2.1 Weak and Strong Solutions

Let $u_0 \in L^2_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^3)$ (divergence-free square-integrable vector fields). A **Leray–Hopf weak solution** [7], [8] satisfies the energy inequality

$$\|\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\nu \int_0^t \|\nabla \mathbf{u}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \, ds \leq \|\mathbf{u}_0\|_{L^2}^2 \quad \text{for a.e. } t \geq 0,$$

and exists globally in time for any initial data. However, uniqueness and smoothness of weak solutions remain open in 3D.

A **strong solution** requires additional regularity, e.g., $u \in L^\infty(0, T; H^1) \cap L^2(0, T; H^2)$. Strong solutions are unique and smooth, but their global existence is unknown.

2.2 Prodi–Serrin Regularity Criteria

A classical result [9], [10], [11] states that if a weak solution satisfies

$$\mathbf{u} \in L^p(0, T; L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)) \quad \text{with } \frac{2}{p} + \frac{3}{q} = 1, \; q \in (3, \infty],$$

then it is smooth on $(0, T]$. The endpoint $q = 3$, $p = \infty$ (Ladyzhenskaya–Prodi–Serrin) remains open; the limiting case $q = 3$ requires $L^\infty(0, T; L^3)$ or a logarithmic improvement [12].

2.3 Scaling Criticality

The 3D Navier–Stokes equations are invariant under the scaling

$$\mathbf{u}_\lambda(x,t) = \lambda \mathbf{u}(\lambda x, \lambda^2 t), \qquad p_\lambda(x,t) = \lambda^2 p(\lambda x, \lambda^2 t).$$

The critical Sobolev space for this scaling is $\dot{H}^{1/2}$ (or L^3 for the velocity). The Prodi–Serrin criteria are precisely those Lebesgue spaces invariant under this scaling.

2.4 Partial Regularity Theory

Scheffer [13] and Caffarelli–Kohn–Nirenberg [14] proved that the singular set of a suitable weak solution has 1D parabolic Hausdorff measure zero. More precisely, there exists a closed set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, \infty)$ with $\mathcal{P}^1(S) = 0$ such that the solution is smooth on the complement. The best known bound on the Hausdorff dimension of S is at most one [15].

2.5 Blow-up Criteria

Various sufficient conditions for blow-up have been established: if a singularity occurs at time $T*$, then necessarily

$$\int_0^{T^*} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^\infty}\, dt = \infty, \quad \text{or} \quad \int_0^{T^*} \|\omega(t)\|_{L^\infty}\, dt = \infty,$$

where $\omega = \nabla \times u$ is the vorticity [16]. Finite-time blow-up for the Euler equations in 3D remains open, and for Navier–Stokes the question is whether viscous dissipation can prevent singularity formation.

3 The Navier–Stokes Equations as an Effective Continuum Theory

The Navier–Stokes equations are not fundamental laws but emerge from kinetic theory under low-Knudsen-number limits [17], [18]. The Chapman–Enskog expansion of the Boltzmann equation yields the compressible Navier–Stokes–Fourier system at first order, with the incompressible limit obtained at low Mach number.

3.1 Formal Definition of an Effective Theory

For our purposes, we adopt the following working definition:

Definition 1. *An effective fluid theory is a set of partial differential equations governing macroscopic fields (density, velocity, pressure, temperature) derived from a more fundamental kinetic or statistical description by coarse-graining or asymptotic expansion, valid within a specified domain of scales (length $L \gg \ell_{mfp}$, time $T \gg \tau_{coll}$, velocity $v \ll c$, etc.). The theory is not UV-complete; it signals its own breakdown through the appearance of unphysical singularities or violation of its underlying assumptions.*

The incompressible Navier–Stokes system on R_3 is an effective theory with domain:

$$\mathrm{Kn} := \frac{\ell_{\mathrm{mfp}}}{L} \ll 1, \quad \mathrm{Ma} := \frac{U}{c_s} \ll 1, \quad \mathrm{Re} := \frac{UL}{\nu} \text{ arbitrary (but assumptions of Newtonian rheology hold).}$$

Remark 1. *The Clay problem fixes* $\nu > 0$ *and asks about global regularity within this effective theory, without reference to whether the underlying kinetic description remains regular. The two questions are mathematically independent [19].*

4 Formalizing the "Boundary of Effective Theories"

We now propose a formal definition of the notion invoked heuristically in the title.

Definition 2. *Let* $\mathcal{T}$ *be an effective theory described by a system of PDEs* $\mathcal{E}[u] = 0$ *with initial data* u_0 *in a function space X. Suppose* $\mathcal{T}$ *is derived from a more fundamental theory* $\mathcal{T}_{fund}$ *via a limit* $\epsilon \to 0$ *(where* ϵ *is a dimensionless parameter such as Knudsen number, Mach number, or ratio of microscopic to macroscopic scales). The* ***analytic boundary*** *of* $\mathcal{T}$ *is the set of initial data* $u_0 \in X$ *for which the maximal interval of existence of smooth solutions is finite, i.e.,* $T_{max}(u_0) < \infty$*, provided that for the corresponding data in* $\mathcal{T}_{fund}$ *(when appropriately lifted) the solution remains smooth for all time.*

Remark 2. *This definition makes explicit the relativity to a more fundamental theory. For the Clay problem,* $\mathcal{T}_{fund}$ *could be:*

- *The Boltzmann equation (kinetic theory),*
- *The compressible Navier–Stokes system with non-Newtonian corrections,*
- *Relativistic hydrodynamics,*
- *The Euler equations (if one views viscosity as the effective parameter),*
- *Or even molecular dynamics.*

The Clay problem asks whether the analytic boundary of the incompressible Navier–Stokes theory (relative to its own assumptions, not necessarily a specific $\mathcal{T}_{fund}$*) is non-empty. The physical interpretation of any such boundary depends on which* $\mathcal{T}_{fund}$ *one has in mind.*

Definition 3. *A singularity of* $\mathcal{E}[u] = 0$ *is* ***self-undermining*** *if, as* $t \to T*$*, the solution violates one or more of the explicit assumptions under which* $\mathcal{E}$ *was derived. For the incompressible Navier–Stokes equations, candidate violations include:*

1. *The local Knudsen number* $Kn_{loc} := \ell_{mfp}/\ell_{vorticity} \to \infty$ *(continuum breakdown),*
2. *The Mach number* $Ma_{loc} \to 1$ *(compressibility becomes relevant),*
3. *Gradients* $\|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty} \to \infty$ *sufficiently fast that the Newtonian constitutive relation (linear stress-strain) is no longer the leading term in a systematic expansion [17].*

Proposition 1. *[Conceptual, not rigorous] If a finite-time singularity exists for the 3D incompressible Navier–Stokes equations, then under generic assumptions about the scaling of the solution near the singularity, the local Knudsen number diverges, implying breakdown of the continuum hypothesis.*

Heuristic sketch. Suppose a singularity occurs at time T^* with blow-up of vorticity: $\|\omega(t)\|_{L^\infty} \sim (T^* - t)^{-\gamma}, \gamma > 0$. The characteristic length scale of the singularity is $\ell_{\text{sing}}(t) \sim \|\omega(t)\|_{L^\infty}^{-1} \sim (T^* - t)^{\gamma}$. The local Knudsen number is $\text{Kn}_{\text{loc}}(t) = \ell_{\text{mfp}}/\ell_{\text{sing}}(t) \sim$

$(T^* - t)^{-\gamma} \to \infty$ as $t \to T^*$. Thus at sufficiently late times, the continuum assumption fails. (This scaling heuristic assumes the mean free path remains constant; in reality, it is the ratio that becomes large.)

Remark 3. *The above heuristic is not a proof but illustrates how a mathematical singularity would, under plausible scaling assumptions, exit the domain of validity of the continuum approximation. The converse—that physical breakdown precludes mathematical singularity—does* ***not*** *hold; the PDE could in principle blow up even if the physical fluid does not.*

5 Physical Breakdown Regimes

We briefly survey known physical breakdowns to contextualize the analytic boundary.

5.1 Kinetic Theory and the Continuum Limit

From the Boltzmann equation, the incompressible Navier–Stokes equations emerge in the double limit Kn → 0, Ma → 0 with fixed Reynolds number [20]. For finite Knudsen number, higher-order terms (Burnett, super-Burnett) appear. The Boltzmann equation itself is conjectured to have global smooth solutions for sufficiently nice initial data [21], though this remains open.

5.2 Non-Newtonian Rheology

Many complex fluids violate the linear Newtonian stress-strain relation [22], [23]. Generalized models (Oldroyd-B, Carreau, Casson) introduce additional stress equations. Some of these models have better regularity properties thanNewtonian Navier–Stokes due to additional dissipation [24].

5.3 Numerical Closures

Large Eddy Simulation (LES) and Reynolds-Averaged Navier–Stokes (RANS) introduce sub-grid models that break exact symmetries [25], [26]. Numerical dissipation can prevent observed blow-up in under-resolved simulations, but this is an artifact of discretization, not a property of the continuous equations [27].

5.4 Relativistic and Quantum Regimes

Relativistic hydrodynamics requires acausality-free formulations such as Israel–Stewart [28]. Quantum fluids (superfluids, Bose–Einstein condensates) obey Gross–Pitaevskii or quantum hydrodynamic equations [29]. The non-relativistic Navier–Stokes equations are the $c \to \infty$, $\hbar \to 0$ limit of these theories.

6 The Clay Problem as a Boundary Question

Synthesizing the above: The Clay problem asks whether the analytic boundary (Definition 2) of the incompressible Navier–Stokes theory is non-empty. The physical breakdown regimes tell us that *if* such a boundary exists, it coincides with scales where the theory's assumptions are violated. However, this observation does **not** answer the mathematical question; it merely provides an interpretation.

6.1 Careful Statement of the Thesis

We can now state our central claim with precision:

Thesis: The 3D incompressible Navier–Stokes equations, as an effective continuum theory, have a finite domain of validity in parameter space. The Clay Millennium Prize Problem probes whether this effective theory is analytically self-consistent within its own domain, or whether it inevitably generates configurations that violate its own assumptions (self-undermining, Definition 3). Independent of the resolution, physical fluids—governed by more fundamental theories—remain well-defined. Thus the Clay problem should be understood as a question about the internal consistency of a particular macroscopic idealization, not as a question about all fluids in nature.

This thesis does not claim that physical breakdown mathematically implies regularity, nor that mathematical blow-up physically occurs. It merely reframes the Clay problem as a question about the self-consistency of an effective description.

7 Engagement with Mathematical Literature

We now explicitly address the mathematical literature noted by reviewers as under-emphasized.

7.1 Leray–HopfWeak Solutions

Leray [7] proved global existence of weak solutions satisfying the energy inequality. These solutions are not known to be unique or smooth. The Clay problem asks whether strong (smooth, unique) solutions exist globally.

7.2 Partial Regularity: Caffarelli–Kohn–Nirenberg

The CKN theory [14] shows that suitable weak solutions are smooth outside a singular set of 1D parabolic Hausdorff measure zero. In particular, singularities cannot form on a set of positive measure in space-time. This implies that any blow-up, if it occurs, must be highly localized. Subsequent improvements [15], [30] have refined the dimension bounds but not eliminated the possibility of point singularities.

7.3 Prodi–Serrin and Escauriaza–Seregin–Šverák

The Prodi–Serrin criteria provide sufficient conditions for regularity. The endpoint case $q = 3$, $p = \infty$ was resolved by Escauriaza, Seregin, and Šverák [12]: if a weak solution belongs to $L^\infty(0, T; L^3(\mathbb{R}^3))$, then it is smooth. This eliminates the possibility of a "Type I" blow-up with bounded L^3 norm.

7.4 Scaling and Critical Spaces

The critical space for Navier–Stokes is $\dot{H}^{1/2}$ (or L^3). Global well-posedness is known for small data in critical Besov spaces [31], [32], [33]. The Clay problem concerns large data, where no global regularity result exists.

7.5 Tao's Averaged Equation and Finite-Time Blow-Up

Tao [34], [35] constructed a finite-time blow-up solution for an averaged version of the 3D Navier–Stokes equation (the "Tao equation") that preserves many key properties. While not a blow-up for the true equations, this demonstrates that the functional setting is subtle and that blow-up mechanisms exist in nearby systems.

7.6 Constantin–Fefferman–Majda and Vortex Stretching

The vortex stretching term $\omega \cdot \nabla u$ is the primary obstacle to regularity [36]. The Beale–Kato–Majda criterion [16] shows that blow-up requires unbounded vorticity.

8 Synthesis and Discussion

The hierarchy of physical breakdowns and the mathematical regularity theory together suggest a coherent picture: the Navier–Stokes equations occupy a middle layer in a tower of effective theories. The Clay problem asks whether this middle layer is analytically self-consistent.

8.1 What a resolution would mean

- **If global regularity is proved:** Then the specific Newtonian, incompressible, Galilean effective model is mathematically stable. This would be a non-trivial statement about the PDE system, independent of whether physical fluids are Newtonian.
- **If finite-time blow-up is proved:** Then the effective theory has a non-empty analytic boundary. The singularity would occur at scales where the continuum hypothesis breaks down (under plausible scaling assumptions), meaning the theory self-undermines. This would be a striking mathematical result, but it would *not* imply that physical fluids blow up, since kinetic or quantum effects regularize the dynamics at small scales.

8.2 Caveats and limitations

- The heuristic linking blow-up to continuum breakdown (Proposition 1) depends on scaling assumptions that may not hold for all conceivable singularity scenarios (e.g., if the singularity is not isolated in scale or if viscosity prevents the smallest scales from reaching the mean free path).
- Conversely, the existence of physical breakdown regimes does *not* provide mathematical evidence for or against blow-up.
- The definition of analytic boundary (Definition 2) is conceptual, not constructive. A fully rigorous formulation would require a specific choice of T_{fund} and a proof that its solutions remain smooth when lifted from Navier–Stokes data—an open problem.

9 Outlook

Several directions could tighten the bridge between the conceptual framework and mathematical analysis:

- **Kinetic regularization:** Can one prove that for any smooth Navier–Stokes initial data, the corresponding Boltzmann solution (with appropriately scaled mean free path) remains smooth, even if the Navier–Stokes solution would blow up? This would demonstrate explicit regularization.

- **Non-Newtonian comparison:** Are there non-Newtonian constitutive relations that are globally regular while the Newtonian limit exhibits blow-up? This would show that the Newtonian assumption is critical for singularity formation.
- **Renormalization group perspective:** Can the Navier–Stokes equations be interpreted as a relevant deformation of a Gaussian fixed point, with blow-up corresponding to a Landau pole? [37], [38]
- **Rigorous scaling analysis:** Formalize the heuristic linking blow-up rates to Knudsen number divergence, possibly using the framework of "vanishing viscosity" and "non-Newtonian" limits [19].

These efforts would move the present conceptual perspective toward a more rigorous mathematical program.

Acknowledgements

The author thanks the open access and preprint communities for maintaining platforms that enable independent researchers to disseminate conceptual work without financial barriers. No AI tools were used to generate mathematical content; the author acknowledges using grammar assistance for language polishing only.

Data Availability

No datasets were generated, collected, or analyzed during the current study. This is a conceptual and theoretical perspective paper that does not involve empirical data, computational simulations, or experimental results. As such, data availability is not applicable to this work.

References

[1] Clay Mathematics Institute, "Navier-Stokes Equation", *Millennium Prize Problems*, 2000. doi: https : / / www . claymath.org/millenniumproblems/navier-stokes-equation

[2] Fefferman C. L., "Existence and smoothness of the Navier-Stokes equation", 2000.

[3] Fefferman C. L., "Existence and smoothness of the Navier-Stokes equation", *The Millennium Prize Problems*, pp. 57–67, 2006.

[4] Batchelor G. K., *An Introduction to Fluid Dynamics*. Cambridge University Press, 2000.

[5] Landau L. D. and Lifshitz E. M., *Fluid Mechanics*. Elsevier, 1987, vol. 6.

[6] Constantin P. and Foiaş C., *Navier-Stokes equations*. University of Chicago Press, 1988.

[7] Leray J., "Sur le mouvement d'un liquide visqueux emplissant l'espace", *Acta mathematica*, vol. 63, (1), pp. 193–248, 1934.

[8] Hopf E., "Über die Anfangswertaufgabe für die hydrodynamischen Grundgleichungen. Erhard Schmidt zu seinem 75. Geburtstag gewidmet", *Mathematische Nachrichten*, vol. 4, (1-6), pp. 213–231, 1950.

[9] Prodi G., "Un teorema di unicita per le equazioni di Navier-Stokes", *Annali di Matematica pura ed applicata*, vol. 48, (1), pp. 173–182, 1959.

[10] Serrin J., “On the interior regularity of weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations”, *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, vol. 9, (1), pp. 187–195, 1962.

[11] Ladyzhenskaya O. A., “The Mathematical Theory of Viscous Incompressible Flow (2nd ed., Revised)”, 1963.

[12] Escauriaza L., Seregin G., and Šverák V., “L3,∞-solutions of Navier-Stokes equations and backward uniqueness”, *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk*, vol. 58, (2), p. 350, 2003.

[13] Scheffer V., “Partial regularity of solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations”, *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, vol. 66, (2), pp. 535–552, 1976.

[14] Caffarelli L., Kohn R., and Nirenberg L., “Partial regularity of suitable weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations”, *Communications on pure and applied mathematics*, vol. 35, (6), pp. 771–831, 1982.

[15] Lin F., “A new proof of the Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg theorem”, *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics: A Journal Issued by the Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences*, vol. 51, (3), pp. 241–257, 1998.

[16] Beale J. T., Kato T., and Majda A., “Remarks on the breakdown of smooth solutions for the 3-D Euler equations”, *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, vol. 94, (1), pp. 61–66, 1984.

[17] Chapman S. and Cowling T. G., *The mathematical theory of non-uniform gases: an account of the kinetic theory of viscosity, thermal conduction and diffusion in gases*. Cambridge University Press, 1990.

[18] Cercignani C., Illner R., and Pulvirenti M., *The mathematical theory of dilute gases*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.

[19] Constantin, P., “Vanishing viscosity and the Navier-Stokes equations”, *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, vol. 133, (3), pp. 215–232, 1995.

[20] Bardos C., Golse F., and Levermore C. D., “Fluid dynamic limits of the Boltzmann equation I”, *Journal of Statistical Physics*, vol. 63, pp. 323–344, 1991.

[21] Villani C., “A review of mathematical topics in collisional kinetic theory”, *Handbook of mathematical fluid dynamics*, vol. 1, pp. 71–74, 2002.

[22] Larson R. G., “The Structure and Rheology of Complex Fluids”, 1999.

[23] Barnes H. A., “Thixotropy—a review”, *Journal of Non-Newtonian fluid mechanics*, vol. 70, (1-2), pp. 1–33, 1997.

[24] Masmoudi, N., “Well-posedness for the Oldroyd-B model”, *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 65, (6), pp. 789–832, 2012.

[25] Pope S. B. et al., *Turbulent flows*. Cambridge University Press, 2000, vol. 20.

[26] Lesieur M., *Turbulence in fluids*. Springer, 2008.

[27] Ghosal S. and Moin P., “The basic equations for the large eddy simulation of turbulent flows in complex geometry”, *Journal of Computational Physics*, vol. 118, (1), pp. 24–37, 1995.

[28] Israel W. and Stewart J. M., “Transient relativistic thermodynamics and kinetic theory”, *Annals of Physics*, vol. 118, (2), pp. 341–372, 1979.

[29] B. Doyon, “Generalized hydrodynamics”, *Journal of Physics A*, vol. 53, 2020, Art. no. 093001.

[30] Vasseur A. F., “A new proof of partial regularity of solutions to Navier-Stokes equations”, *Nonlinear Differential Equations and Applications NoDEA*, vol. 14, (5), pp. 753–785, 2007.

[31] Cannone M., “Ondelettes, paraproduits et Navier-Stokes”, Ph.D. dissertation, Paris 9, 1994.

[32] Meyer Y., “Wavelets, paraproducts, and Navier-Stokes equations”, *Current developments in mathematics*, vol. 1996, (1), pp. 105–212, 1996.

[33] Planchon F., “Global strong solutions in Sobolev or Lebesgue spaces to the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations in 3”, in *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré C, Analyse non linéaire*, Elsevier, vol. 13, 1996, pp. 319–336.

[34] Tao T., “Finite time blowup for an averaged three-dimensional Navier-Stokes equation”, *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 29, (3), pp. 601–674, 2016.

[35] Tao T., “Finite time blowup constructions for supercritical partial differential equations”, *Notices of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 65, (3), pp. 282–289, 2018.

[36] Constantin P., Fefferman C., and Majda A. J., “Geometric constraints on potentially singular solutions for the 3-D Euler equations”, *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, vol. 21, (3-4), 1996.

[37] Wilson K. G., “The renormalization group and critical phenomena”, *Reviews of Modern Physics*, vol. 55, (3), p. 583, 1983.

[38] Peskin M. E., Schroeder D. V., and Martinec E., *An Introduction to quantum field theory*, 1996.