

On the Sharp Vanishing Viscosity Limit of Viscous Incompressible Fluid Flows

H. Beirão da Veiga

Abstract. We consider the classical problem of the convergence of local-in-time regular solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations to a solution of the Euler equations, as the viscosity ν goes to zero. Initial data are given in an $H^k(\Omega)$ space, where $k > 1 + \frac{n}{2}$. Solutions are continuous in time, with values in the initial-data's space. We look for convergence of the solutions v of the Navier-Stokes equations to the solution w of the Euler equations in the space $C([0, T]; H^k)$. We are interested in proofs that apply to the case $n = 3$. This convergence result, in the strong topology, is due to T. Kato, see [8]. We show here a very elementary proof. We assume, together with the convergence of ν to zero, the convergence of the initial data in the H^k norm.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000). 35Q30, 76D05, 76D09, 76D99.

Keywords. ((Please insert keywords))



1. Introduction

Our main concern is showing that (1.4) holds, where v_ν and w are the solutions to the systems (1.1) and (1.2) respectively. See Theorem 1.2 and Corollary 1.2 below. This result was essentially proved, many years ago, by Kato, see [8], by appealing to a completely different method, based on rather general theorems on abstract equations. The proof followed here is borrowed from reference [3], where a substantially more difficult problem is considered (we take this occasion to quote our recent review [4], where an introduction to our methods to prove sharp singular limit results is given). We also refer to Ebin and Marsden, cf. [6], where the limit of zero viscosity is considered in H^s , for $s > 5 + \frac{n}{2}$. See [6], Section 15.4, p. 152.

In considering problems like vanishing viscosity limits, incompressible limits, dependence on initial data, etc., the results are called here *sharp* if convergence is shown in $C([0, T]; X)$, where X is the initial data's space. As remarked by T. Kato in reference [9] this is the more difficult part in a theory dealing with nonlinear equations of evolution. Note that sufficiently strong a priori estimates,

independent of ν , for the solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations immediately lead to non-sharp convergence results, by appealing to suitable compactness theorems and to the uniqueness of the strong solution to the Euler equations. For instance, by assuming that the initial data, a_ν , are bounded in H^s , for some $s > k$, (1.4) follows easily. Many non-sharp vanishing viscosity limit results are known in the literature. Classical, specific references, are [7] and [12]. A simpler approach is given in [5].

In the sequel k_0 denotes the smallest integer such that $k_0 \geq n/2$ and k is a fixed integer satisfying $k \geq k_0 + 1$. The canonical norm in H^k is denoted by $\|\cdot\|_k$. The norm in L^2 is simply denoted by $\|\cdot\|$.

We set

$$H_\sigma^k(\Omega) =: \{ u \in H^k(\Omega) : \nabla \cdot u = 0 \}.$$

We denote by $\|\cdot\|_{l,T}$ the standard norm in $C([0, T]; H^l)$ and by $[\cdot]_{l,T}$ that in $L^2(0, T; H^l)$.

In the sequel $\Omega = [0, 1]^n$ is the n -dimensional torus, $n \geq 2$. Obvious modifications in the proofs allow one to assume that $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n$. The motion of a viscous, incompressible, fluid is described by the system

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v_\nu + (v_\nu \cdot \nabla) v_\nu + \nabla p_\nu = \nu \Delta v_\nu & \text{in } Q_T, \\ \nabla \cdot v_\nu = 0 & \text{in } Q_T, \\ v_\nu(0) = a_\nu(x), \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where $\nabla \cdot a_\nu = 0$ in Ω , and $\nu \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$, the set of nonnegative reals. We also consider the ‘‘limit problem’’

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t w + (w \cdot \nabla) w + \nabla \pi = \bar{\nu} \Delta w & \text{in } Q_T, \\ \nabla \cdot w = 0 & \text{in } Q_T, \\ w(0) = b, \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

where $\nabla \cdot b = 0$. Note that in the more interesting case, namely $\bar{\nu} = 0$, we are dealing with the Euler equation for non-viscous fluids

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t w + (w \cdot \nabla) w + \nabla \pi = 0 & \text{in } Q_T, \\ \nabla \cdot w = 0 & \text{in } Q_T, \\ w(0) = b(x). \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

We are interested in showing that

$$\lim \|v_\nu - w\|_{C([0, T]; H^k)} = 0, \quad (1.4)$$

as $(a_\nu, \nu) \rightarrow (b, \bar{\nu})$ in $H^k \times \mathbb{R}_0^+$.

We recall the following well-known existence and regularity theorem for local-in-time smooth solutions of (1.1). For the reader’s convenience, in the next section we give a sketch of the proof.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that*

$$\|a_\nu\|_{k_0+1} \leq c_1 \tag{1.5}$$

and

$$\|a_\nu\|_k \leq c_2. \tag{1.6}$$

Then there is a positive constant T depending only on c_1 such that the problem (1.1) has a unique solution in $[0, T]$. Moreover,

$$\|v_\nu\|_{k,T}^2 + \nu [\nabla v_\nu]_{k,T}^2 \leq C, \tag{1.7}$$

and

$$\|\partial_t v_\nu\|_{k-2,T}^2 + \nu [\nabla \partial_t v_\nu]_{k-2,T}^2 \leq C. \tag{1.8}$$

Constants C may depend on k and n , on an arbitrarily fixed upper bound for the values ν , and on c_1 and c_2 . For convenience we do not show the explicit dependence of the various constants C on c_1 and c_2 .

Due to (1.11) below, the reader may assume that the initial data a_ν satisfy the constraint $\|a_\nu\|_k \leq \|b\|_k + 1$, so that T and the constants C that appear in equations (1.7) and (1.8) are fixed once and for all.

Corollary 1.1. *Under the assumption (1.11) one has*

$$v_\nu \rightharpoonup w \text{ in } L^\infty(0, T; H^k)\text{-weak}^* \text{ and in } C(0, T; H^{k-\epsilon}), \tag{1.9}$$

for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough. Moreover,

$$\partial_t v_\nu \rightharpoonup \partial_t w \text{ in } L^\infty(0, T; H^{k-2})\text{-weak}^* \text{ and in } C(0, T; H^{k-2-\epsilon}). \tag{1.10}$$

Corollary 1.1 follows immediately from the uniform estimates (1.7), (1.8), by appealing to well-known compact embedding theorems. These theorems guarantee that we may pass to the limit in equation (1.1), as $\nu \rightarrow 0$. The uniqueness of the strong solution w of equation (1.2) is used in order to show that all the sequences v_ν converge to the same limit w .

The following is the main result here, especially when $\bar{\nu} = 0$.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\bar{\nu} \geq 0$ and $a_\nu, b \in H_\sigma^k(\Omega)$. Assume that*

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}} \|a_\nu - b\|_k = 0. \tag{1.11}$$

Then

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}} (\|v_\nu - w\|_{k,T}^2 + \bar{\nu} [v_\nu - w]_{k+1,T}^2) = 0. \tag{1.12}$$

In particular, (1.4) holds.

Corollary 1.2. *Under the assumptions of the above theorem one has*

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}} (\|\partial_t v_\nu - \partial_t w\|_{k-2,T}^2 + \|\nabla p_\nu - \nabla \pi\|_{k-1,T}^2 + \bar{\nu} [\partial_t v_\nu - \partial_t w]_{k-1,T}^2) = 0. \tag{1.13}$$

Remark 1.1. *Under the sole assumptions of Theorem 1.2 the equation*

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}} (\|\partial_t v_\nu - \partial_t w\|_{k-1, T}^2 + \bar{\nu} [\partial_t v_\nu - \partial_t w]_{k, T}^2) = 0 \quad (1.14)$$

is false in general. Obviously it holds under stronger regularity assumptions on the initial data, and for $t > 0$.

2. Preliminaries

For the reader's convenience, we give in this section a sketch of the proof of equations (1.7) and (1.8). Here the parameter ν is fixed. Hence we denote v_ν simply by v and $\partial_t v_\nu$ by v_t .

We start by some useful results.

For convenience, we denote integrals $\int_\Omega f(x) dx$ simply by $\int f(x)$, or even by $\int f$. If D^α denotes partial differentiation, $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$, we set

$$\tilde{D}^\alpha \{fg\} = D^\alpha (fg) - f D^\alpha g$$

and $|D^m f|^2 = \sum_{|\alpha|=m} |D^\alpha f|^2$. In the sequel we appeal to the following three results.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $|\alpha| \leq l$. Then*

$$\|\tilde{D}^\alpha \{fg\}\| \leq c(|Df|_\infty \|g\|_{l-1} + |g|_\infty \|Df\|_{l-1}). \quad (2.1)$$

For a proof see [10], Lemma A.1.

Lemma 2.2. *For $0 \leq |\alpha| \leq m \leq k$,*

$$\|D^\alpha (fg)\| \leq c\|f\|_m \|g\|_{k-1} + c\delta_k^m |f|_\infty \|g\|_k. \quad (2.2)$$

See [3], equation (3.4).

Lemma 2.3. *Let $k > 1 + n/2$ and $1 \leq l \leq k$. If $|\alpha| \leq l$ then*

$$\|\tilde{D}^\alpha \{fg\}\| \leq c\|Df\|_{k-1} \|g\|_{l-1}. \quad (2.3)$$

For a proof see [1] Appendix A, Corollary A.4.

By applying the operator D^α to both sides of (1.1), by multiplying by $D^\alpha v$, and by integrating in Ω , we show that

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|D^\alpha v\|^2 + \int \tilde{D}^\alpha \{(v \cdot \nabla) v\} \cdot D^\alpha v + \nu \|\nabla D^\alpha v\|^2 = 0. \quad (2.4)$$

Then we add the above equations, side by side, for $0 \leq |\alpha| \leq m$. By taking into account (2.1), and also $|\cdot|_\infty \leq c\|\cdot\|_{k_0}$, it readily follows that

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|v\|_m^2 + \nu \|\nabla v\|_m^2 \leq c\|v\|_{k_0+1} \|v\|_m^2. \quad (2.5)$$

By setting $m = k_0 + 1$, well-known methods lead to (1.7) for $k = k_0$, (with dependence of T only on c_1). The estimate (1.7) for $k = k_0$, together with (2.5) written for $m = k$, shows (1.7) for k .

Lemma 2.4. *Assume that (1.5) and (1.6) hold. Let l be an integer satisfying $0 \leq l \leq k - 2$. Then there is a constant C such that*

$$\|v_t\|_{l,T}^2 + \nu \|\nabla v_t\|_{l,T}^2 \leq C. \quad (2.6)$$

In particular (1.8) holds.

Proof. From (1.1) it follows that

$$\partial_{tt} v + (v \cdot \nabla) v_t + (v_t \cdot \nabla) v + \nabla p_t = \nu \Delta v_t. \quad (2.7)$$

Next apply D^α , $|\alpha| \leq l$, to both sides of the above equation, multiply by $D^\alpha v_t$ and integrate over Ω . This gives

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|D^\alpha v_t\|^2 + \int \tilde{D}^\alpha \{(v \cdot \nabla) v_t\} \cdot D^\alpha v_t + \int D^\alpha [(v_t \cdot \nabla) v] \cdot D^\alpha v_t + \nu \|\nabla D^\alpha v_t\|^2 = 0. \quad (2.8)$$

By using (2.3) and (2.2) we show that

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|D^\alpha v_t\|^2 + \nu \|\nabla D^\alpha v_t\|^2 \leq c \|Dv\|_{k-1} \|v_t\|_l \|D^\alpha v_t\|.$$

Hence, for $|\alpha| \leq l$,

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|D^\alpha v_t\|^2 + \nu \|\nabla D^\alpha v_t\|^2 \leq C \|v_t\|_l^2, \quad (2.9)$$

and a well-known argument leads to (2.6). Note that, by applying the divergence operator to both sides of the first equation (1.1), we show that $\|\nabla p\|_{k-2,T} \leq C$. In particular, it readily follows that $\|v_t(0)\|_{k-2} \leq C$. \square

3. Proof of Theorem 1.2

In the sequel we appeal to Fourier series

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(x) &= \sum_{\xi} \widehat{\phi}(\xi) e^{2\pi i \xi \cdot x}, \\ \widehat{\phi}(\xi) &= \int_{\Omega} e^{-2\pi i \xi \cdot x} \phi(x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

The ξ_i 's are nonnegative integers, and $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$. The Euclidian norm of ξ is denoted by $|\xi|$. For each nonnegative real s one has

$$\|\phi\|_s^2 = \sum_{\xi} (1 + |\xi|^2)^s |\widehat{\phi}(\xi)|^2.$$

Given $\delta \in]0, 1]$, we define linear operators

$$T^\delta \phi = \sum_{|\xi| \leq 1/\delta} \widehat{\phi}(\xi) e^{2\pi i \xi \cdot x}, \quad (3.1)$$

where ϕ is a scalar or a vector field, and set

$$a_\nu^\delta = T^\delta a_\nu, \quad b^\delta = T^\delta b. \quad (3.2)$$

Since T^δ commutes with the divergence operator, a_ν^δ and b^δ are divergence free. Clearly, for each nonnegative real s , T^δ is a bounded linear operator. In particular, $\| \| T^\delta \| \|_{s,s} \leq 1$ where, in general, we denote by $\| \| \cdot \| \|_{s,r}$ the canonical norm in the space of bounded linear operators from H^s to H^r . So, a_ν^δ satisfies the assumptions (1.5), (1.6) with the same constants c_1 and c_2 .

Also note that

$$\| \| T^\delta \| \|_{s,m} \leq (2/\delta)^{m-s}, \quad \| \| T^\delta - I \| \|_{m,s} \leq \delta^{m-s}, \quad (3.3)$$

if $0 \leq s \leq m$, where s and m are nonnegative integers. In particular

$$\| a_\nu^\delta \|_{k_0+1} \leq c_1, \quad \| a_\nu^\delta \|_{k+1} \leq \frac{2c_2}{\delta}. \quad (3.4)$$

and

$$\| a_\nu^\delta - b^\delta \|_{k+1} \leq \frac{2}{\delta} \| a_\nu - b \|_k. \quad (3.5)$$

Note that

$$a_\nu^\delta \rightarrow b^\delta \quad \text{in } H^{k+1} \quad \text{if } a_\nu \rightarrow b \quad \text{in } H^k.$$

The following system plays here a very central role:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v_\nu^\delta + (v_\nu^\delta \cdot \nabla) v_\nu^\delta + \nabla p_\nu^\delta = \nu \Delta v_\nu^\delta & \text{in } Q_T, \\ \nabla \cdot v_\nu^\delta = 0 & \text{in } Q_T, \\ v_\nu^\delta(0) = a_\nu^\delta. \end{cases} \quad (3.6)$$

We also consider the (inviscid, if $\bar{\nu} = 0$) counterpart of the system (3.6), namely

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t w^\delta + (w^\delta \cdot \nabla) w^\delta + \nabla \pi^\delta = \bar{\nu} \Delta w^\delta & \text{in } Q_T, \\ \nabla \cdot w^\delta = 0 & \text{in } Q_T, \\ w^\delta(0) = b^\delta. \end{cases} \quad (3.7)$$

From Corollary 1.1, with k replaced by $k+1$, applied to the solutions v_ν^δ and w^δ of the above problems, and also by taking into account (3.4) and (3.5), one shows the following result.

Proposition 3.1. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.2 one has*

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}} (\| v_\nu^\delta - w^\delta \|_{k,T}^2 + \bar{\nu} \| v_\nu^\delta - w^\delta \|_{k+1,T}^2) = 0, \quad (3.8)$$

for each fixed $\delta > 0$.

The following estimate will be useful in the sequel:

$$\| a_\nu^\delta - a_\nu \|_k^2 \leq 2 \| b - a_\nu \|_k^2 + 2 \sum_{|\xi| > 1/\delta} (1 + |\xi|^2)^k |\widehat{b}(\xi)|^2. \quad (3.9)$$

The proof is left to the reader.

In the sequel we denote by δ_k^m the Kronecker symbol and set

$$\bar{\nu} = v_\nu^\delta - v_\nu, \quad \bar{p} = p_\nu^\delta - p_\nu.$$

Clearly, $\bar{\nu}$ and \bar{p} depend on δ and ν .

Our next step is to prove the following result.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $0 \leq m \leq k$. Then, for each $\delta > 0$,*

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\bar{v}\|_m^2 + \nu \|\nabla \bar{v}\|_m^2 \leq C \|\bar{v}\|_m^2 + c \delta_k^m \|v_\nu^\delta\|_{k+1} |\bar{v}|_\infty \|\bar{v}\|_m. \quad (3.10)$$

Proof. In the calculations that follow the reader should take into account that the quantities $\|v_\nu\|_{k,T}$, $\|v_\nu^\delta\|_{k,T}$, $\nu [v_\nu]_{k+1,T}$ and $\nu [v_\nu^\delta]_{k+1,T}$ are uniformly bounded by constants C .

By taking the termwise difference between the equations (3.6) and (1.1) we find that

$$\bar{v}_t + (v_\nu \cdot \nabla) \bar{v} + \nabla \bar{p} = -(\bar{v} \cdot \nabla) v_\nu^\delta + \nu \Delta \bar{v}. \quad (3.11)$$

Apply D^α to (3.11), multiply by $D^\alpha \bar{v}$ and integrate on Ω . Using previous estimates and formulae (in particular (2.3) and (2.2)), straightforward manipulations show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|D^\alpha \bar{v}\|^2 + \nu \|\nabla D^\alpha \bar{v}\|^2 \\ & \leq C \|\bar{v}\|_m^2 + c \delta_k^m \|v_\nu^\delta\|_{k+1} |\bar{v}|_\infty \|\bar{v}\|_m. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Equation (3.10) follows. \square

Next, fix a real β_0 such that $0 < \beta_0 < k_0 - (n/2)$. Clearly, $0 < \beta_0 < 1$. Since $k_0 - \beta_0 > n/2$, one has $|\cdot|_\infty \leq c \|\cdot\|_{k_0 - \beta_0}$. Well-known interpolation results for L^2 -Sobolev spaces show that

$$|\cdot|_\infty \leq c \|\cdot\|_{k_0 - 1}^{\beta_0} \|\cdot\|_{k_0}^{1 - \beta_0}. \quad (3.13)$$

Theorem 3.2. *For each $\delta > 0$,*

$$|\bar{v}|_{\infty, T} \leq C \delta^{2(k - k_0 + \beta_0)}. \quad (3.14)$$

Proof. Let $0 \leq m \leq k - 1$. From (1.7) one has $\nu [\nabla v_\nu^\delta]_{k,T}^2 \leq C$. Hence, by appealing to (3.10), it follows that

$$\|\bar{v}(t)\|_m^2 \leq C \|\bar{v}(0)\|_m^2, \quad \forall t \in [0, T].$$

So,

$$\|\bar{v}\|_{m, T}^2 \leq C \|a_\nu^\delta - a_\nu\|_m^2.$$

By appealing to this inequality for $m = k_0$ and $m = k_0 - 1$, and by taking into account (3.13), we show that

$$|\bar{v}|_{\infty, T}^2 \leq C \|a_\nu^\delta - a_\nu\|_{k_0 - 1}^{2\beta_0} \|a_\nu^\delta - a_\nu\|_{k_0}^{2(1 - \beta_0)}. \quad (3.15)$$

By using (3.3)₂ for $m = k$ and $m = k_0 - 1$, we obtain

$$\|a_\nu^\delta - a_\nu\|_{k_0 - 1}^2 \leq \delta^{2(k - k_0 + 1)} \|a_\nu\|_k^2. \quad (3.16)$$

Again by (3.3)₂, one has

$$\|a_\nu^\delta - a_\nu\|_{k_0}^2 \leq \delta^{2(k - k_0)} \|a_\nu\|_k^2. \quad (3.17)$$

The estimates (3.15), (3.16) and (3.17) lead to (3.14). \square

Corollary 3.1. *One has, for each $\delta \in]0, 1]$,*

$$\|\bar{v}\|_{\infty, T} \|v_\nu^\delta\|_{k+1, T} \leq C \delta^{k-k_0-1+\beta_0}. \quad (3.18)$$

Proof. By applying the estimate (1.7) to the solution v_ν^δ , with k replaced by $k+1$, and by appealing to (3.3)₁ for $m = k+1$ and $s = k$, it follows that

$$\|v_\nu^\delta\|_{k+1, T}^2 \leq C/\delta^2. \quad (3.19)$$

This estimate together with (3.14) shows (3.18). \square

Theorem 3.3. *For each $\delta \in]0, 1]$,*

$$\|\bar{v}\|_{k, T}^2 + \nu \int_0^T \|\nabla \bar{v}(t)\|_k^2 dt \leq C (\|a_\nu^\delta - a_\nu\|_k^2 + \delta^{2\beta_0}). \quad (3.20)$$

Proof. From equation (3.10) for $m = k$, together with (3.18), we get

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\bar{v}(t)\|_k^2 + \nu \|\nabla \bar{v}\|_k^2 \leq C \|\bar{v}\|_k^2 + C \|\bar{v}\|_k \delta^{\beta_0}. \quad (3.21)$$

Standard techniques yield

$$\|\bar{v}\|_{k, T} \leq e^{CT} (\|\bar{v}(0)\|_k + \delta^{\beta_0}). \quad (3.22)$$

Equation (3.20) follows easily. Note that e^{CT} is a constant of type C . \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2

Define

$$\|u\|^2 =: \|u\|_{k, T}^2 + \bar{\nu} [\nabla u]_{k, T}^2.$$

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be fixed. From (3.20) and (3.9) it follows that

$$\|\bar{v}\|_{k, T}^2 \leq C \left(\|b - a_\nu\|_k^2 + \sum_{|\xi| > 1/\delta} (1 + |\xi|^2)^k |\hat{b}(\xi)|^2 + \delta^{2\beta_0} + |\nu - \bar{\nu}| \right).$$

In particular,

$$\|\bar{v}\|_{k, T}^2 \leq C (\|b - a_\nu\|_k^2 + \hat{h}(\delta) + |\nu - \bar{\nu}|), \quad (3.23)$$

where $\hat{h}(\delta)$ depends only on δ (b and k are fixed), and satisfies

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \hat{h}(\delta) = 0.$$

We fix (once and for all) $\delta = \delta(\epsilon)$ such that $C \hat{h}(\delta) \leq \epsilon/3$. It follows that

$$\|v_\nu^\delta - v_\nu\|_{k, T}^2 < \frac{\epsilon}{3} + C (\|b - a_\nu\|_k^2 + |\nu - \bar{\nu}|). \quad (3.24)$$

The same argument applied to the particular case in which $(a_\nu, \nu) = (b, \bar{\nu})$ shows that

$$\|w^\delta - w\|_{k, T}^2 \leq \frac{\epsilon}{3}. \quad (3.25)$$

On the other hand, Proposition 3.1 shows that there is $\lambda = \lambda(\delta(\epsilon), \epsilon)$ for which

$$\|v_\nu^\delta - w^\delta\|_{k, T}^2 \leq \epsilon, \quad (3.26)$$

if $|\nu - \bar{\nu}| < \lambda$.

In short, from (3.24), (3.25) and (3.26) it follows that given $\epsilon > 0$ there is a $\lambda = \lambda(\epsilon)$ such that

$$\|v_\nu - w\|_{k,T}^2 \leq \epsilon, \quad (3.27)$$

if $|\nu - \bar{\nu}| < \lambda$. This proves (1.12).

Proof of Corollary 1.2

Proof. One has

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_t (v_\nu - w) + (v_\nu \cdot \nabla)(v_\nu - w) + ((v_\nu - w) \cdot \nabla) w + \nabla(p_\nu - \pi) \\ & = \nu \Delta (v_\nu - w), \quad \text{in } Q_T. \end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

In particular, by applying the divergence operator to both sides of (3.28), one gets

$$-\Delta(p_\nu - \pi) = \nabla \cdot \{ (v_\nu \cdot \nabla)(v_\nu - w) + ((v_\nu - w) \cdot \nabla) w \}.$$

It readily follows, by appealing to previous estimates, that

$$\| (v_\nu \cdot \nabla)(v_\nu - w) + ((v_\nu - w) \cdot \nabla) w \|_{k-1,T} \leq C \|v_\nu - w\|_{k,T}.$$

The pressure-estimate in equation (1.13) follows from classical regularity results for solutions to elliptic equations $-\Delta u = f$, together with (1.12).

Now, the time-derivative estimates in equation (1.13) follow from (3.28). Note that more elaborate manipulations lead to better results concerning the convergence of $\partial_t v_\nu$ to $\partial_t w$, but not to (1.14). \square

References

- [1] Beirão da Veiga, H., “Perturbation theory and well-posedness in Hadamard’s sense of hyperbolic initial-boundary value problems”, *Nonlinear Analysis: TMA*, vol. 22 (1994), 1285–1308.
- [2] Beirão da Veiga, H., “Singular limits in fluid dynamics”, *Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova*, 94 (1995), 55–69.
- [3] Beirão da Veiga, H., “Singular limits in compressible fluid dynamics”, *Arch. Rat. Mech. Analysis*, 128 (1994), 317–327.
- [4] Beirão da Veiga, H., “A review on some contributions to perturbation theory, singular limits and well-posedness”, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, (2008), doi: 10.1016/j.jmaa.2008.06.024.
- [5] Constantin, P., Foias, C., “Navier-Stokes Equations”, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 1988.
- [6] Ebin, D.G., Marsden, J.E., “Groups of diffeomorphisms and the motion of an incompressible fluid”, *Annals of Mathematics*, **92** (1970), 102–163.
- [7] Kato, T., “Nonstationary flows of viscous and ideal fluids in \mathbb{R}^3 ”, *J. Functional Anal.*, **9** (1972), 296–305.
- [8] Kato, T., “Quasi-linear equations of evolution with applications to partial differential equations”, in “Spectral Theory and Differential Equations”, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, **448**, Springer-Verlag (1975).

- [9] Kato, T., Lai, C.Y., “Nonlinear evolution equations and the Euler flow”, *J. Func. Analysis*, **56** (1984), 15–28.
- [10] Klainerman, S., Majda, A., “Singular limits of quasilinear hyperbolic systems with large parameters and the incompressible limits of compressible fluids”, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **34** (1981), 481–524.
- [11] Klainerman, S., Majda, A., “Compressible and incompressible fluids”, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **35** (1982), 629–653.
- [12] Swann, H.S.G., “The convergence with vanishing viscosity of nonstationary Navier-Stokes flow to ideal flow in R_3 ”, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **157** (1971), 373–397.

H. Beirão da Veiga
((Please insert address))

←