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Abstract

First, a new sufficient condition for uniqueness of weak solutions is proved for the system of 2D viscous Primitive Equations. Second, global existence and uniqueness are established for several classes of weak solutions with partial initial regularity, including but not limited to those weak solutions with initial horizontal regularity, rather than vertical regularity. Our results and analyses for the problem with physical boundary conditions can be extended to those with other typical boundary conditions. Most of the results were not available before, even for the periodic case.
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1 Introduction

Consider as in [21] the system of 2D viscous Primitive Equations (PE) for three dimensional Geophysical Fluid Dynamics in the two dimensional spatial domain:

\[ D := \{(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid 0 < x < 1, -h < z < 0\}, \]

where \( h \) is a positive constant.

**Horizontal momentum equations:**

\[
\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + (u, w) \cdot \nabla u = -\frac{\partial p}{\partial x} + v + \Delta u,
\]

\[
\frac{\partial v}{\partial t} + (u, w) \cdot \nabla v = -u + \Delta v.
\]

**Hydrostatic balance:**

\[
\frac{\partial p}{\partial z} + \theta = 0.
\]

**Continuity equation:**

\[
\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial w}{\partial z} = 0.
\]

**Heat equation:**

\[
\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t} + (u, w) \cdot \nabla \theta = \Delta \theta + Q.
\]

In the above equations, the gradient \( \nabla \) and the Laplacian \( \Delta \) are defined as:

\[
\nabla := (\partial_x, \partial_z) = (\partial_1, \partial_2), \quad \Delta := \partial^2_x + \partial^2_z = \partial^2_1 + \partial^2_2.
\]

The unknowns in the above system of 2D viscous PE are the fluid velocity \((u, v, w) \in \mathbb{R}^3\), the pressure \( p \) and the temperature \( \theta \). The heat source \( Q \) is given. For issues concerned in this article and for simplicity of presentation, \( Q \) is assumed to be independent of \( t \). Upon minor modifications, all the results obtained in this article can be extended to the case for time-dependent \( Q \) under suitable assumptions for \( Q \). Some of the coefficients in the above system are already simplified for conciseness of presentation. In particular, viscosity constant, diffusivity constant and Coriolis rotational frequency from \( \beta \)-plane approximation are set as 1. The effect of salinity is omitted.
for simplicity of presentation. All these simplifications lose no mathematical generality.

The boundary $\partial D$ of $D$ is partitioned into three parts $\Gamma_i \cup \Gamma_b \cup \Gamma_l$, where
$$\Gamma_i := \{(x, 0) \in D\}, \quad \Gamma_b := \{(x, -h) \in \overline{D}\}, \quad \Gamma_l := \{(x, z) \in \overline{D}|x = 0, 1\}.$$ 

The following boundary conditions of the PEs are used:

- on $\Gamma_i$: $u_z + \alpha_1 u = v_z + \alpha_2 v = w = \theta_z + \alpha_3 \theta = 0$,
- on $\Gamma_b$: $u = v = w = \theta_z = 0$,
- on $\Gamma_l$: $u = v = \theta_x = 0$,

where $\alpha_i \geq 0$ for $i = 0, 1, 2$ and $u_z, v_z, \theta_x$ and $\theta_z$ are the corresponding partial derivatives of $u, v$ and $\theta$. For convenience of reference, this set of boundary conditions is called physical boundary conditions here, following [5]. See [19] and [21] for geophysical background of these boundary conditions.

Integrating the continuity equation and the hydrostatic balance equation and using the boundary condition $w(x, 0, t) = 0$, one can express $w$ and $p$ as:

$$w(x, z, t) = \int_z^0 u_x(x, \zeta, t) d\zeta, \quad w_t = \Delta u + uu_x + \left( \int_z^0 u_x(x, \zeta, t) d\zeta \right) u_z + q_x + \int_z^0 \theta_x(x, \zeta, t) d\zeta, \quad (1.1)$$

$$p(x, z, t) = q(x, t) + \int_z^0 \theta(x, \zeta, t) d\zeta, \quad (1.2)$$

where $q(x, t) = p(x, 0, t)$ is the pressure on $\Gamma_i$. Eliminating $w$ and $p$ from the previous system of 2D viscous PE results in the following equivalent formulation:

$$u_t - \Delta u + uu_x + \left( \int_z^0 u_x(x, \zeta, t) d\zeta \right) u_z + q_x + \int_z^0 \theta_x(x, \zeta, t) d\zeta = v, \quad (1.3)$$

$$v_t - \Delta v + uv_x + \left( \int_z^0 u_x(x, \zeta, t) d\zeta \right) v_z = -u, \quad (1.4)$$

$$\theta_t - \Delta \theta + u\theta_x + \left( \int_z^0 u_x(x, \zeta, t) d\zeta \right) \theta_z = Q; \quad (1.5)$$
with the following boundary conditions:

\[ u_z + \alpha_1 u \bigg|_{z=0} = u \bigg|_{z=-h} = u \bigg|_{x=0,1} = 0, \quad (1.6) \]
\[ v_z + \alpha_2 v \bigg|_{z=0} = v \bigg|_{z=-h} = v \bigg|_{x=0,1} = 0, \quad (1.7) \]
\[ \int_{-h}^{0} u_x(x, \zeta, t) d\zeta = 0, \quad (1.8) \]
\[ \theta_z + \alpha_3 \theta \bigg|_{z=0} = \theta \bigg|_{z=-h} = \theta_x \bigg|_{x=0,1} = 0. \quad (1.9) \]

The above system of 2D viscous PE will be solved with suitable initial conditions:

\[ u(x, z, 0) = u_0(x, z), \quad v(x, z, 0) = v_0(x, z), \quad \theta(x, z, 0) = \theta_0(x, z). \quad (1.10) \]

Notice that the boundary condition \( w(x, 0, t) = 0 \) is already embedded in the expression (1.1). The other boundary condition for \( w \) is given in (1.8). It follows from (1.6) and (1.8) that

\[ \int_{-h}^{0} u(x, z, t) dz = 0. \quad (1.11) \]

The mathematical framework of the viscous primitive equations for large scale ocean flow in three dimensional spatial domain (3D viscous PE) was formulated in [19], where the notions of weak and strong solutions were defined and existence of weak solutions was proved. Existence of strong solutions \textit{local in time} and their uniqueness were proved in [7] and [24]. Existence of strong solutions \textit{global in time} was proved in [4] and [13] for the case when \( u \) and \( v \) satisfy Neumann boundary condition at the bottom. Existence of strong solutions \textit{global in time} was proved in [15] for the case when \( u \) and \( v \) satisfy physical boundary conditions. See also the results in [8]. Uniform boundedness in \( H^1 \) of strong solutions global in time was proved in [9] and [16]. Uniform boundedness in \( H^2 \) of \( H^2 \) solutions global in time was proved in [10] and [12]. Global uniform boundedness in \( H^m \) \((m \geq 2)\) of \( H^m \) solutions was recently proved in [11].

One of the outstanding unresolved mathematical problems for 3D viscous PE is about uniqueness of weak solutions. Global existence and uniqueness
of $z$-weak solutions to 3D viscous PE were proved in [22] for initial data in $L^6$. A “$z$-weak” solution is a weak solution $(u, v, \theta)$ such that

$$(u_z, v_z, \theta_z) \in L^\infty(0, T; (L^2)^3) \cap L^2(0, T; (H^1)^3).$$

Recently, global existence and uniqueness of $z$-weak solutions was proved in [10]. Uniqueness of weak solutions was proved in [14] for continuous initial data as well. See also [17] for a result on uniqueness of weak solutions for a class of discontinuous initial data.

Indeed, the problem of uniqueness of weak solution is still open even for 2D viscous PE. In [2], existence and uniqueness of $z$-weak solutions, in the name of “weak vorticity solutions”, for 2D hydrostatic Navier-Stokes equations (2D hNSE) were proved for the case when $u$ satisfies a Robin type friction boundary condition at the bottom of spatial domain. The system of 2D hNSE is somewhat simplified from that of 2D PE (1.3)-(1.5). It includes only $u$, $w$ and $q$ as the unknown variables without $v$ or $\theta$. Existence and uniqueness of $z$-weak solution $u$ for 2D hNSE were also proved in [3] for the case with Dirichlet boundary condition at the bottom. For the case when the spatial domain is a rectangle, existence and uniqueness of the weak solution $u$ of the 2D hNSE were proved in [3] with even less demanding regularity:

$$u \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2 \cap L^2),$$

for both the cases of Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions at the bottom. See [3] for notational details. Finally, we mention that existence and uniqueness of $z$-weak solution $(u, v, \theta)$ for 2D viscous PE were proved in [20] for the case with periodic boundary conditions on $(u, v, \theta)$.

This paper will focus on the problem of uniqueness of weak solutions and uniform boundedness of norms of partial regularity for given initial partial regularity of weak solutions to the 2D viscous PE. It studies existence and uniqueness of weak solutions of the system (1.3)-(1.5) in $D$ under physical boundary conditions (1.6)-(1.9).

First, a new sufficient condition for uniqueness of weak solutions is proved. Second, global existence of several classes of weak solutions with initial partial regularity is also proved. Finally, as an application of our
new sufficient condition, uniqueness of these classes of weak solutions with initial partial regularity is also proved. These results are valid as well for other typical boundary conditions for 2D viscous PEs, since our proofs can be easily extended to those cases.

To present our analysis in complete details, we first give the definition of a weak solution carefully and then prove several important results about properties of weak solutions and strong solutions of 2D viscous PEs. These results are included in Theorems 3.1-3.4. Closely related important discussions are also presented in Remarks 3.1-3.3. This section, Section 3, shares some similarity with [17] in terms of strategy. However, the definition of a weak solution of the viscous PE used in this paper is somewhat different from those used in [2], [17] and [19] for viscous PE. The set of boundary conditions used in this paper is also different from those used in [2] and [17]. Hence, many of our detailed arguments and ideas of the proofs are also different from those of [17]. Therefore, we choose to present the full proofs of all these results, which will provide fundamental technical support for our analysis in the rest sections of this paper. Some of these results might also be new in the presented forms.

The main results for existence and uniqueness of weak solutions with initial partial regularity to be presented are Theorem 4.1, Theorem 5.1, Theorem 5.2 and Theorem 6.1. Except that the results for $z$-weak solutions were proved in [20] for periodic case, all of our main results were not previously known even for periodic case. Especially, global existence and uniqueness are proved for weak solutions with initial partial regularity in horizontal direction, rather than vertical direction. The same is proved for several other mixed cases as well. The main ideas of our analysis are careful manipulations of anisotropic inequalities in Sobolev spaces.

The rest of this article is organized as follows:

In Section 2, we give the notations and some definitions, briefly review the background and recall some facts and known results which are important for later analysis. In Section 3, we first give the definition of weak solutions and strong solutions of 2D viscous PE with physical boundary conditions. Then, prove Theorem 3.1-3.4 about important properties of weak solutions
and strong solutions of 2D viscous PE. These theorems will provide helpful technical support for our analysis in the sequel. In Section 4, we prove Theorem 4.1. It gives a new sufficient condition for uniqueness of weak solutions and generalizes an already known one. It is a crucial observation which will be used later in proving our new uniqueness results. In Section 5, we prove Theorem 5.1 and Theorem 5.2. These global existence results, for weak solutions in specific partial regularity classes, not only give corresponding global-in-time uniform bounds and absorbing sets, but also prepare our proof of uniqueness in next section. In Section 6, we prove Theorem 6.1 for uniqueness of the weak solutions with the specific initial partial regularity.

2 Preliminaries

In this paper, $C$ denotes a positive absolute constant, the value of which might vary from line to line. Similarly, $C_{\varepsilon}$ denotes a positive constant depending on $\varepsilon > 0$, the value of which may also vary at different occurrence. The following notations are used for real numbers $A$ and $B$:

$$A \lesssim B \quad \text{if and only if} \quad A \leq C \cdot B,$$

and

$$A \approx B \quad \text{if and only if} \quad c \cdot A \leq B \leq C \cdot A,$$

for some positive constants $c$ and $C$ independent of $A$ and $B$.

Denote by $L^r(D)$, $L^r((0,1))$ and $L^r((-h,0))$ ($1 \leq r < +\infty$) the classic Lebesgue $L^r$ spaces with the norm:

$$\|\varphi\|_r = \begin{cases} 
\left( \int_D |\varphi(x,z)|^r \, dxdz \right)^{\frac{1}{r}}, & \forall \varphi \in L^r(D); \\
\left( \int_0^1 |\varphi(x)|^r \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{r}}, & \forall \varphi \in L^r((0,1)); \\
\left( \int_{-h}^0 |\varphi(z)|^r \, dz \right)^{\frac{1}{r}}, & \forall \varphi \in L^r((-h,0)). 
\end{cases}$$

Standard modification is used when $r = \infty$. When there is no confusion, index $r = 2$ is omitted:

$$\|\varphi\| := \|\varphi\|_2.$$
Denote by $H^m(D)$ ($m \geq 1$) the classic Sobolev spaces for square-integrable functions on $D$ with square-integrable weak derivatives up to order $m$. Domains of the functions spaces will be omitted from notations without confusion.

Some anisotropic Lebesgue spaces and Sobolev spaces will be used. For example, for $r, s \in [1, \infty)$, $L_{r}^{s}(L_{x}^{z})$ denotes the standard function space of (classes of) Lebesgue measurable functions on $D$ such that

$$\|\varphi\|_{L_{r}^{s}(L_{x}^{z})} := \left( \int_{0}^{1} \left( \int_{-h}^{0} |\varphi(x,z)|^{s} \, dz \right)^{\frac{r}{s}} \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} < \infty,$$

with stand modifications when $r$ or $s$ is $\infty$.

We will also use $C_B((\alpha, \infty))$ to denote the set of uniformly bounded functions in $C((\alpha, \infty))$, for an interval $[\alpha, \infty) \subset \mathbb{R}$.

Following [21], the following function spaces are defined:

$$H := H_1 \times H_2 \times H_3, \quad V := V_1 \times V_2 \times V_3,$$

where

$$H_1 := \left\{ \varphi \in L^2(D) \mid \int_{-h}^{0} \varphi(x,z) \, dz = 0, \varphi|_{\Gamma_1} = 0 \right\},$$

$$V_1 := \left\{ \varphi \in H^1(D) \mid \int_{-h}^{0} \varphi(x,z) \, dz = 0, \varphi|_{\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_b} = 0 \right\},$$

$$H_2 := L^2(D), \quad V_2 := \left\{ \varphi \in H^1(D) \mid \varphi|_{\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_b} = 0 \right\},$$

$$H_3 := L^2(D), \quad V_3 := H^1(D), \quad \text{if } \alpha_3 > 0,$$

and

$$H_3 := \left\{ \varphi \in L^2(D) \mid \int_{D} \varphi = 0 \right\}, \quad V_3 := H_3 \cap H^1(D), \quad \text{if } \alpha_3 = 0.$$

Define the bilinear form: $a_i : V_i \times V_i \to \mathbb{R}$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$, such that

$$a_i(\phi, \psi) = \int_{D} \nabla \phi \cdot \nabla \psi \, dx \, dz + \alpha_i \int_{0}^{1} \phi(x,0) \psi(x,0) \, dx,$$
and the corresponding linear operator $A_i : V_i \mapsto V_i'$, such that

$$\langle A_i v, \varphi \rangle = a_i(v, \varphi), \quad \forall v, \varphi \in V_i,$$

where $V_i'$ is the dual space of $V_i$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes scalar product between $V_i'$ and $V_i$ and the inner product in $H_i$. Define:

$$D(A_i) = \{ \phi \in V_i \mid A_i \phi \in H_i \}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3.$$

Define: $A : V \mapsto V'$ as $A(u, v, \theta) := (A_1 u, A_2 v, A_3 \theta)$, for $(u, v, \theta) \in V$. Then,

$$D(A) = D(A_1) \times D(A_2) \times D(A_3).$$

Since $A_i^{-1}$ is a self-adjoint compact operator in $H_i$, by the classic spectral theory, the power $A_i^s$ can be defined for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Then,

$$D(A_i)' = D(A_i^{-1})$$

is the dual space of $D(A_i)$ and

$$V_i = D(A_i^\frac{1}{2}), \quad V_i' = D(A_i^{-\frac{1}{2}}).$$

Moreover,

$$D(A_i) \subset V_i \subset H_i \subset V_i' \subset D(A_i)^',$$

and the embeddings above are all continuous and compact and each space above is dense in the one following it. Define the norm of $V_i$ as

$$\| \varphi \|_{V_i}^2 = a_i(\varphi, \varphi) = \langle A_i \varphi, \varphi \rangle = \langle A_i^\frac{1}{2} \varphi, A_i^\frac{1}{2} \varphi \rangle, \quad i = 1, 2, 3.$$

Then, for $\varphi \in V_i$ and $i = 1, 2, 3$,

$$\| \varphi \| \leq \| \varphi \|_{V_i} \approx \| \varphi \|_{H^1}.$$

By the above discussion and elliptic regularity for linear 3D stationary PE (see e.g. [24]), we also have for $\varphi \in D(A_i)$ and $i = 1, 2, 3$,

$$\| \varphi \|_{V_i} \leq \| A_i \varphi \| \approx \| \varphi \|_{H^2}.$$

Next, we introduce the following anisotropic estimate which will be very useful for our later discussion:
Lemma 2.1 Let $\psi, \psi_x, \phi, \phi_z, \varphi \in L^2(D)$. Then,

$$
\left| \int_D \psi \phi \varphi \right| \leq \|\psi\|^2 (\|\psi\| + \|\psi_x\|) \|\phi\|^2 (\|\phi\| + \|\phi_z\|) \|\varphi\|.
$$

Proof:

$$
\left| \int_D \psi \phi \varphi \right| \leq \int_0^1 \|\phi\|_{L^\infty_x} \|\psi\|_{L^2_x} \|\varphi\|_{L^2_x} dx
\leq \int_0^1 \|\phi\|_{L^\infty_x}^{\frac{1}{2}} (\|\phi\|_{L^2_x} + \|\phi_z\|_{L^2_z}) \|\psi\|_{L^2_x} \|\varphi\|_{L^2_x} dx
\leq \|\psi\|_{L^2_x} \|\phi\|_{L^\infty_x} (\|\phi\| + \|\phi_z\|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\varphi\|
\leq \|\psi\| \|\phi\|^{\frac{1}{2}} (\|\phi\| + \|\phi_z\|) \|\varphi\|.
$$

Notice that, in the last step of the above derivations, we have used the following estimate:

$$
\|\psi\|_{L^2_x(L^\infty_z)} = \int_{-h}^0 \|\psi\|_{L^\infty_z} dz
\leq \int_{-h}^0 \|\psi\|_{L^2_z} (\|\psi\|_{L^2_z} + \|\psi_x\|_{L^2_z})
\leq \|\psi\| (\|\psi\| + \|\psi_x\|).
$$

An immediate application of Lemma 2.1 is the following result:

Lemma 2.2 The following statements are valid:

(a) Suppose $(u, v, \theta) \in V$ and $w$ is given by (1.1). Then, for $\varphi \in V_1$,

$$
|\langle uw_x, \varphi \rangle| \leq \|u\| \|u_x\| \frac{1}{2} \|u_z\| \frac{1}{2} \|\varphi_x\|, \quad (2.1)
$$

$$
|\langle uw_z, \varphi \rangle| \leq \|u\| \|u_x\| \frac{1}{2} \|u_z\| \frac{1}{2} \|\varphi_x\| + \|u\| \frac{1}{2} \|u_x\| \frac{1}{2} \|\varphi_z\|. \quad (2.2)
$$

for $\varphi \in V_2$, with $i, j = 1, 2$, $i' = 3 - i$ and $j' = 3 - j$,

$$
|\langle vw_x, \varphi \rangle| \leq \|u_x\| \|v\| \frac{1}{2} \|\theta v\| \frac{1}{2} \|\varphi\| \frac{1}{2} \|\varphi_x\| + \|u\| \frac{1}{2} \|u_x\| \frac{1}{2} \|\varphi_x\|, \quad (2.3)
$$

$$
|\langle vw_z, \varphi \rangle| \leq \|u_x\| \|v\| \frac{1}{2} \|\theta v\| \frac{1}{2} \|\varphi\| \frac{1}{2} \|\varphi_z\| + \|u_x\| \|v\| \frac{1}{2} \|v_x\| \frac{1}{2} \|\varphi_x\|. \quad (2.4)
$$
for \( \varphi \in V_3 \), with \( i, j = 1, 2 \), \( i' = 3 - i \) and \( j' = 3 - j \),

\[
|\langle u\theta, \varphi \rangle| \lesssim \|u\| \|\theta\| \|\varphi\| \|\partial i \varphi\|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial j \theta\|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\varphi_x\|^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
+ \|u\|^{\frac{1}{2}} ||\varphi|| \|u\|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\varphi\|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\varphi_x\|
\]  

\[
(2.5)
\]

\[
|\langle w\theta, \varphi \rangle| \lesssim \|u\| \|\theta\| \|\varphi\| \|\varphi_x\|^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
+ ||u||^{\frac{1}{2}} ||\varphi||^{\frac{1}{2}} ||\varphi||^{\frac{1}{2}} ||\varphi_x||^{\frac{1}{2}}
\]  

\[
(2.6)
\]

Therefore,

\[
u u_x, w u_z \in V_1', \quad w v_x, w v_z \in V_2', \quad u \theta_x, w \theta_z \in V_3'.
\]

(b) Suppose \((u, v, \theta) \in L^\infty(0, T; H) \cap L^2(0, T; V)\). Then,

\[
u u_x \in L^2(0, T; V_1'), \quad w u_z \in L^4(0, T; V_1'), \\
w v_x, w v_z \in L^4(0, T; V_2'), \quad u \theta_x, w \theta_z \in L^4(0, T; V_3').
\]

Proof: For \( u, \varphi \in V_1 \), Lemma 2.1 yields

\[
|\langle uu_x, \varphi \rangle| \lesssim ||u||^{\frac{1}{2}} ||u_x||^{\frac{1}{2}} ||\varphi||^{\frac{1}{2}} ||\varphi_x||^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad |\langle u^2, \varphi_x \rangle| \lesssim ||u|| ||u_x||^{\frac{1}{2}} ||u_z||^{\frac{1}{2}} ||\varphi_x||.
\]

Then, a density argument using Lemma 2.1 again, along with the above two inequalities, proves

\[
\langle uu_x, \varphi \rangle = -\frac{1}{2} \langle u^2, \varphi_x \rangle,
\]

from which (2.1) follows. Similarly, Lemma 2.1 yields

\[
|\langle wu_z, \varphi \rangle| \lesssim ||u||^{\frac{1}{2}} ||w_z||^{\frac{1}{2}} ||\varphi||^{\frac{1}{2}} ||\varphi_x||^{\frac{1}{2}} ||u_z|| \lesssim ||u_x|| ||u_z|| ||\varphi||^{\frac{1}{2}} ||\varphi_x||^{\frac{1}{2}},
\]

and

\[
|\langle wu, \varphi_z \rangle| \lesssim ||u||^{\frac{1}{2}} ||u_x||^{\frac{1}{2}} ||\varphi_x||.
\]

The above two inequalities plus (2.1), along with Lemma 2.1, then imply via a density argument that

\[
\langle wu_z, \varphi \rangle = \langle u_x u, \varphi \rangle - \langle wu, \varphi \rangle,
\]

from which, we immediately prove (2.2) by (2.1) and (2.8).

Similarly, we can prove (2.3)-(2.6). Then, it is easy to prove (2.7) and part (b) using (2.1)-(2.6).
3 Weak Solutions and Strong Solutions

In this section, some important properties about weak solutions and strong solutions will be discussed. These will provide important technical support in the proofs of the main results of this paper to be presented in the next few sections.

The following definitions of weak and strong solutions of the initial boundary value problem (1.3)-(1.10) for the 2D viscous PEs will be used in this paper:

**Definition 3.1** Suppose \( Q \in L^2(D), (u_0, v_0, \theta_0) \in H \) and \( T > 0 \). The triple \((u, v, \theta)\) is called a weak solution of the viscous PEs (1.3)-(1.10) on the time interval \((0, T)\) if it satisfies (1.3)-(1.5) in weak sense, that is, if

\[
\begin{align*}
(u, v, \theta) & \in L^\infty(0, T; H) \cap L^2(0, T; V), \\
\langle u_t, \varphi \rangle + a_1(u, \varphi) + \int_0^t \theta_x \cdot \varphi \, ds = 0, & \forall \varphi \in V_1, \\
\langle v_t, \varphi \rangle + a_2(v, \varphi) + \langle u, \varphi \rangle \cdot \nabla v - u, \varphi \rangle = 0, & \forall \varphi \in V_2, \\
\langle \theta_t, \varphi \rangle + a_3(\theta, \varphi) + \langle u, \varphi \rangle \cdot \nabla \theta - Q, \varphi \rangle = 0, & \forall \varphi \in V_3,
\end{align*}
\]

satisfies the follow equations in the sense of distribution on \((0, T)\):

\[
\begin{align*}
\langle u_t, \varphi \rangle + a_1(u, \varphi) + \int_0^t \theta_x \cdot \varphi \, ds = 0, & \forall \varphi \in V_1, \\
\langle v_t, \varphi \rangle + a_2(v, \varphi) + \langle u, \varphi \rangle \cdot \nabla v - u, \varphi \rangle = 0, & \forall \varphi \in V_2, \\
\langle \theta_t, \varphi \rangle + a_3(\theta, \varphi) + \langle u, \varphi \rangle \cdot \nabla \theta - Q, \varphi \rangle = 0, & \forall \varphi \in V_3,
\end{align*}
\]

where \( w \) is given by (1.1) in weak sense. Moreover,

\[
\lim_{t \to 0^+} (u(t), v(t), \theta(t)) = (u_0, v_0, \theta_0),
\]

in weak topology of \( H \), and the following energy inequalities are satisfied for almost every \( t_0 \in [0, T] \) and almost every \( t \in (t_0, T) \):

\[
\begin{align*}
\|u(t)\|^2 + 2 \int_{t_0}^{t} \left( \|u(s)\|_{V_1} + \langle -v + \int_0^s \theta_x, u \rangle \right) ds & \leq \|u(t_0)\|^2, \\
\|v(t)\|^2 + 2 \int_{t_0}^{t} \left( \|v(s)\|_{V_2} + \langle u, v \rangle \right) ds & \leq \|v(t_0)\|^2, \\
\|\theta(t)\|^2 + 2 \int_{t_0}^{t} \left( \|\theta(s)\|_{V_3} - \langle Q, \theta(s) \rangle \right) ds & \leq \|\theta(t_0)\|^2.
\end{align*}
\]
Further more, the above energy inequalities (3.6)-(3.8) are also satisfied for
\( t_0 = 0 \) and for almost every \( t \in (0, T) \).

If \((u_0, v_0, \theta_0) \in V\), then \((u, v, \theta)\) is called a strong solution of (1.3)-(1.10)
on the time interval \([0, T]\) if it satisfies (3.2)-(3.5) and
\[
(u, v, \theta) \in L^\infty(0, T; V) \cap L^2(0, T; D(A)).
\]
(3.9)

If \( T > 0 \) in the above can be arbitrarily large, then the corresponding weak
or strong solution is global. \( \square \)

**Remark 3.1** There are somewhat different ways to define weak solutions
of the PE. For examples, see [1], [2], [17], [19], [21] and [24]). Especially,
to define a weak solution of the 3D PE with physical boundary conditions,
the domain of \( \varphi \) in (3.2)-(3.4) was chosen as \( D(A_i) \) in [19], [21] and [24],
for \( i = 1, 2, 3 \) respectively instead of \( V_i \). Definition 3.1 is formally more
restrictive than the one given in [19], [21] and [24]. However, \( D(A_i) \) is dense
in \( V_i \) and, by Lemma 2.2, the nonlinear terms of the 2D PE are in \( V_i' \) for
\((u, v, \theta) \in V \) and in \( L^\infty(0, T; V_i') \) for \((u, v, \theta) \in L^\infty(0, T; H) \cap L^2(0, T; V) \).
Thus, for 2D case, a weak solution defined in [19], [21] and [24], if satisfying
(3.6)-(3.8), is also a weak solution in the sense of Definition 3.1. \( \square \)

We first state and prove the following theorem on some basic properties
satisfied by every weak solution.

**Theorem 3.1** There exists at least one global weak solution of (1.3)-(1.10)
in the sense of Definition 3.1. If \((u, v, \theta)\) is a weak solution on \((0, T)\), then\(^1\)
\[
\langle u, \varphi_1 \rangle, \langle v, \varphi_2 \rangle, \langle \theta, \varphi_3 \rangle \in C([0, T]), \quad \forall \ (\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3) \in H.
\]
(3.10)

Moreover, there exists a zero measure set \( E \subset (0, \infty) \), such that
\[
\lim_{E^c \ni t \to 0^+} \|(u(t), v(t), \theta(t)) - (u_0, v_0, \theta_0)\|_H = 0,
\]
(3.11)
where \( E^c := (0, \infty) \setminus E \).

\(^1\)If \( T = \infty \), the space \( C([0, T]) \) in (3.10) is replaced by \( C_B([0, \infty)) \).
Proof: It is proved in [19] that there exists at least one global weak solution (in their sense) for 3D PE and it satisfies energy inequalities (3.6)-(3.8). Moreover, any weak solution as defined in [19] is weakly continuous from $[0, T]$ into $H$ if $T$ is finite and weakly continuous from $[0, T)$ into $H$ if $T = \infty$. By Remark 3.1, these results imply existence of at least one global weak solution $(u, v, \theta)$ of (1.3)-(1.10) in the sense of Definition 3.1 and that (3.10) is satisfied by any weak solution $(u, v, \theta)$ in the sense of Definition 3.1.

By Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2, we can also prove existence of at least one global weak solutions $(u, v, \theta)$ of the 2D problem (1.3)-(1.10) using Definition 3.1 directly, by following the standard approach of [23] for Navier-Stokes equations. Moreover, we can prove that any weak solution $(u, v, \theta)$ satisfies (3.10).

Finally, due to the fact that a weak solution satisfies the energy inequalities (3.6)-(3.8) for $t_0 = 0$ and for almost every $t \in [0, T]$ by Definition 3.1, there exists a zero measure set $E \subset (0, \infty)$ such that, for all $t \in E^c$,

$$
\|u(t)\|^2 + 2 \int_0^t \left( \|u(s)\|^2_{V_1} + \left\langle -v + \int_0^s \theta_x, u \right\rangle \right) ds \leq \|u_0\|^2, \quad (3.12)
$$

$$
\|v(t)\|^2 + 2 \int_0^t \left( \|v(s)\|^2_{V_2} + \langle u, v \rangle \right) ds \leq \|v_0\|^2, \quad (3.13)
$$

$$
\|\theta(t)\|^2 + 2 \int_0^t \left( \|\theta(s)\|^2_{V_3} - \langle Q, \theta(s) \rangle \right) ds \leq \|\theta_0\|^2. \quad (3.14)
$$

Notice that, by definition, $(u, v, \theta) \in L^2(0, T; V)$. Therefore, taking lim sup on both sides of (3.12) for $t(\in E^c) \to 0^+$, we have

$$
\limsup_{E^c \ni t \to 0^+} \|u(t)\|^2 \leq \|u_0\|^2.
$$

By (3.10) and weak lower semi-continuity, we also have

$$
\|u_0\|^2 \leq \liminf_{E^c \ni t \to 0^+} \|u(t)\|^2.
$$

Thus,

$$
\lim_{E^c \ni t \to 0^+} \|u(t)\|^2 = \|u_0\|^2.
$$
Hence,
\[
\lim_{E^c \ni t \to 0^+} \|u(t) - u_0\|^2 = \lim_{E^c \ni t \to 0^+} (\|u(t)\|^2 - 2 \langle u(t), u_0 \rangle + \|u_0\|^2) = \lim_{E^c \ni t \to 0^+} (\|u(t)\|^2 - \|u_0\|^2) = 0.
\]

The second equality above is due to weak continuity (3.10). This weak continuity argument was also used in [17] to prove (3.11).

Different proofs of existence of global weak solutions of 3D PE can also be found in [1] and [24]. Different sets of boundary conditions and different definitions of weak solution were used in [1], [2] and [17].

Remark 3.2 Existence and uniqueness of global strong solution for 3D PE with Neumann boundary condition for \((u,v)\) at bottom was proved in [4]. See also [13] for a different proof of existence of global strong solution with the same boundary conditions when initial data is in \(H^2\). Existence and uniqueness of global strong solution was proved in [15] and [16] for 3D viscous PE with physical boundary condition. The strong solutions are uniformly bounded in \(V\) and a bounded absorbing set for the solutions exists in \(V\). These results apply to the 2D case as well. See also [21] for a direct proof of global existence of the strong solution of the 2D viscous PE (1.3)-(1.10). Moreover, following the argument of [9] for the case of 3D PE with Neumann boundary conditions, we can prove (see [5]) for the 3D PE with physical boundary conditions that, if \((u_0,v_0,θ_0)\) ∈ \(V\), then the strong solution \((u,v,θ)\) satisfies

\[
(u_t, v_t, θ_t) ∈ L^2(0, T; H), \quad ∀T > 0,
\]

and

\[
(u(t), v(t), θ(t)) ∈ C_B([0, ∞); V).
\]

The next theorem shows that energy equalities are satisfied by every strong solution. Therefore, the strong solution is also a weak solution.
Theorem 3.2 Let \((u, v, \theta)\) be the unique global strong solution of (1.3)-(1.10) with \((u_0, v_0, \theta_0) \in V\). Then, for every \(t_0 \in [0, \infty)\) and \(t \in (t_0, \infty)\),

\[
\begin{align*}
\|u(t)\|^2 + 2 \int_{t_0}^{t} \left( \|u(s)\|_{V_1}^2 + \left\langle -v(s) + \int_{x}^{0} \theta_x(s), u(s) \right\rangle \right) \, ds &= \|u(t_0)\|^2, \\
\|v(t)\|^2 + 2 \int_{t_0}^{t} \left( \|v(s)\|_{V_2}^2 + \langle u(s), v(s) \rangle \right) \, ds &= \|v(t_0)\|^2, \\
\|\theta(t)\|^2 + \int_{t_0}^{t} \left( \|\theta(s)\|_{V_3}^2 - \langle Q, \theta(s) \rangle \right) \, ds &= \|\theta(t_0)\|^2.
\end{align*}
\] (3.17) (3.18) (3.19)

Therefore, the strong solution is also a weak solution.

Proof: By (3.9), (3.15) and a lemma of Lions and Magenes (see [18] and [23]), we have in the sense of distribution on \([0, \infty)\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{d}{dt}\|u\|^2 &= 2 \langle u_t, u \rangle, \\
\frac{d}{dt}\|v\|^2 &= 2 \langle v_t, v \rangle, \\
\frac{d}{dt}\|\theta\|^2 &= 2 \langle \theta_t, \theta \rangle. 
\end{align*}
\] (3.20)

Therefore, by (3.16), (3.20) and Definition 3.1, we have in classic sense on \([0, \infty)\),

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt}\|u\|^2 + \|u\|_{V_1}^2 + \left\langle \int_{x}^{0} \theta_x, u \right\rangle &= \langle v, u \rangle, \\
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt}\|v\|^2 + \|v\|_{V_2}^2 + \langle u, v \rangle &= 0, \\
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt}\|\theta\|^2 + \|\theta\|_{V_3}^2 &= \langle Q, \theta \rangle.
\end{align*}
\] (3.21) (3.22) (3.23)

In the above derivation, we have also used the cancellation property for \((u, v, \theta) \in V\):

\[
\langle (u, w) \cdot \nabla u, u \rangle = \langle (u, w) \cdot \nabla v, v \rangle = \langle (u, w) \cdot \nabla \theta, \theta \rangle = 0,
\] (3.24)

which can be justified by Lemma 2.1, as shown in the proof of Lemma 2.2. Integrating (3.21)-(3.23) finishes the proof.

\[\square\]

Weak-strong uniqueness was proved in [17]. That is, a weak solution with initial data in the space of strong solutions \(V\) is the strong solution with the same initial data, and is thus the unique weak (and strong) solution. The definition of weak solution used in [17] is somewhat different
from Definition 3.1. In the following, we give a completely different proof of weak-strong uniqueness result. Our prove is a direct proof using Definition 3.1 and properties of weak and strong solutions. The argument of our proof is also different from that of [23] for a related uniqueness result.

**Theorem 3.3** Let \((u,v,\theta)\) be a weak solution of (1.3)-(1.10) on \((0,T)\) in the sense of Definition 3.1 with \((u_0,v_0,\theta_0) \in V\). Then, \((u,v,\theta)\) is the strong solution of (1.3)-(1.10). Thus, \((u,v,\theta)\) is the unique weak (and strong) solution.

*Proof:* Let \((u_1,v_1,\theta_1)\) be the global strong solution and \((u_2,v_2,\theta_2)\) be a weak solution on \((0,T)\) for some \(T > 0\), with the same initial value \((u_0,v_0,\theta_0) \in V\). For convenience of presentation, assume \(T\) is finite. The case of \(T = \infty\) is then an easy consequence.

Use \(w_i(q_i)\) for \(i = 1, 2\), to denote corresponding vertical velocity and surface pressure. Denote:

\[
\left(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}, \tilde{w}, \tilde{q}\right) := (u_1 - u_2, v_1 - v_2, \theta_1 - \theta_2, w_1 - w_2, q_1 - q_2).
\]

Notice that, by (3.15) and (3.16), for the strong solution,

\[
u_1 \in C([0,T]; V_1) \cap L^2(0,T; D(A_1)), \quad \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial t} \in L^2(0,T; H_1)\text{.}
\]

For a weak solution \(u_2\),

\[
u_2 \in L^\infty(0,T; H_1) \cap L^2(0,T; V_1), \quad \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial t} \in L^1(0,T; V'_1).
\]

Therefore, by standard regularization approximation on \((0,T)\), we can obtain sequences of functions \(\{u_{1,m}\}_{m=1}^\infty\) and \(\{u_{2,m}\}_{m=1}^\infty\) such that

\[
u_{1,m} \in C^\infty([0,T]; D(A_1)), \quad \nu_{2,m} \in C^\infty([0,T]; V_1), \quad \forall m \geq 1,
\]

and as \(m \to \infty\),

\[
u_{1,m} \to \nu_1 \quad \text{in} \quad L^2_{\text{loc}}(0,T; D(A_1)) \quad \text{and} \quad C([0,T]; V_1),
\]

\[
u_{1,m} \to \nu_1 \quad \text{in} \quad L^2_{\text{loc}}(0,T; H_1),
\]

\[
u_{2,m} \to \nu_2 \quad \text{in} \quad L^2_{\text{loc}}(0,T; V_1),
\]

\[
u_{2,m} \to \nu_2 \quad \text{in} \quad L^1_{\text{loc}}(0,T; V'_1),
\]

\[
(3.25)
\]
It is obvious that, for any \( m \geq 1 \),
\[
\frac{d}{dt} \langle u_{1,m}, u_{2,m} \rangle = \langle (u_{1,m})_t, u_{2,m} \rangle + \langle (u_{2,m})_t, u_{1,m} \rangle. \tag{3.26}
\]
As \( m \to \infty \), we have by (3.25) that, in \( L^1_{loc}(0,T) \),
\[
\langle u_{1,m}, u_{2,m} \rangle \to \langle u_1, u_2 \rangle,
\]
\[
\langle (u_{1,m})_t, u_{2,m} \rangle \to \langle u_{1,t}, u_2 \rangle,
\tag{3.27}
\]
\[
\langle (u_{2,m})_t, u_{1,m} \rangle \to \langle u_{2,t}, u_1 \rangle.
\]
These convergences are also valid in the distribution sense. Therefore, we can take the limit \( m \to \infty \) in (3.26) in the sense of distribution to obtain
\[
\frac{d}{dt} \langle u_1, u_2 \rangle = \langle u_{1,t}, u_2 \rangle + \langle u_{2,t}, u_1 \rangle, \tag{3.28}
\]
in the sense of distribution. Notice that
\[
\langle u_{1,t}, u_2 \rangle \in L^2(0,T), \quad \langle u_{2,t}, u_1 \rangle \in L^1(0,T).
\]
Therefore, \( \langle u_1, u_2 \rangle \in W^{1,1}(0,T) \). Thus, it is absolutely continuous in \( t \) and for any \( t_0 \in [0,T) \) and \( t \in (t_0,T] \),
\[
\langle u_1(t), u_2(t) \rangle = \langle u_1(t_0), u_2(t_0) \rangle + \int_{t_0}^{t} (\langle u_{1,t}(s), u_2(s) \rangle + \langle u_{2,t}(s), u_1(s) \rangle) \, ds. \tag{3.29}
\]
By the regularity of \( (u_i, v_i, \theta_i), i = 1,2 \), we have as well
\[
u_i = -A_1 u_i - (u_i, w_i) \cdot \nabla u_i + v_i - \int_z^{0} \theta_{i,x}, \quad i = 1,2. \tag{3.30}
\]
From (3.29)-(3.30), we obtain, for any \( t_0 \in [0,T) \) and \( t \in (t_0,T] \),
\[
\langle u_1(t), u_2(t) \rangle + 2 \int_{t_0}^{t} a_1(u_1(s), u_2(s)) \, ds
\]
\[
+ \int_{t_0}^{t} \left( \langle (u_1, w_1) \cdot \nabla u_1 - v_1 + \int_z^{0} \theta_{1,x}, u_2 \rangle \right) \, ds
\]
\[
+ \int_{t_0}^{t} \left( \langle (u_2, w_2) \cdot \nabla u_2 - v_2 + \int_z^{0} \theta_{1,x}, u_1 \rangle \right) \, ds
\]
\[
= \langle u_1(t_0), u_2(t_0) \rangle. \tag{3.31}
\]
Similarly, we can also obtain, for any \( t_0 \in [0, T) \) and \( t \in (t_0, T) \),
\[
\langle v_1(t), v_2(t) \rangle + 2 \int_{t_0}^t a_2(v_1(s), v_2(s))ds \\
+ \int_{t_0}^t ((u_1, w_1) \cdot \nabla v_1 + u_1, v_2) ds \\
+ \int_{t_0}^t ((u_2, w_2) \cdot \nabla v_2 + u_2, v_1) ds \\
= \langle v_1(t_0), v_2(t_0) \rangle,
\]
and for any \( t_0 \in [0, T) \) and \( t \in (t_0, T) \),
\[
\langle \theta_1(t), \theta_2(t) \rangle + 2 \int_{t_0}^t a_3(\theta_1(s), \theta_2(s))ds \\
+ \int_{t_0}^t ((u_1, w_1) \cdot \nabla \theta_1, \theta_2) ds \\
+ \int_{t_0}^t ((u_2, w_2) \cdot \nabla \theta_2, \theta_1) ds \\
= \langle \theta_1(t_0), \theta_2(t_0) \rangle + \int_{t_0}^t \langle Q, \theta_1 + \theta_2 \rangle ds.
\]
By Definition 3.1, \((u_2, v_2, \theta_2)\) satisfies the energy inequalities (3.6)-(3.8) for almost every \( t \in (0, T] \). By Theorem 3.2, \((u_1, v_1, \theta_1)\) satisfies the energy equalities (3.17)-(3.19) for any \( t_0 \in [0, T) \) and \( t \in (t_0, T) \). Combining these with (3.31)-(3.33), we obtain, for almost every \( t \in (0, T] \),
\[
\|	ilde{v}(t)\|^2 + 2 \int_0^t \|	ilde{v}\|^2_{H_2} ds \leq -2 \int_0^t \left\langle \tilde{v}v_{1,x} + \tilde{w}v_{1,z} - \tilde{u}, \tilde{v} \right\rangle ds,
\]
(3.34)
\[
\|	ilde{\theta}(t)\|^2 + 2 \int_0^t \|	ilde{\theta}\|^2_{W_3} ds \leq -2 \int_0^t \left\langle \tilde{\theta}\theta_{1,x} + \tilde{w}\theta_{1,z}, \tilde{\theta} \right\rangle ds.
\]
(3.35)
Notice that some cancellations are used in the derivation of the above inequalities, which can be justified using Lemma 2.1. We omit justifications of these cancellations here, since we have done similar justifications before.
Now, we estimate the terms on the right-hand side of equations (3.34)-(3.36). By Lemma 2.1, we have
\[
\langle \tilde{u}u_{1,x}, \tilde{u} \rangle \lesssim \|u_{1,x}\| \|\tilde{u}\| V_{1},
\]
\[
\langle \tilde{w}u_{1,z}, \tilde{u} \rangle \lesssim \|u_{1,z}\| \|\tilde{u}\|^3 V_{1},
\]
\[
\langle \tilde{w}v_{1,x}, \tilde{v} \rangle \lesssim \|v_{1,x}\| \|\tilde{u}\|^\frac{1}{2} \|\tilde{v}\|^\frac{3}{2} V_{1},
\]
\[
\langle \tilde{w}v_{1,z}, \tilde{v} \rangle \lesssim \|v_{1,z}\| \|\tilde{u}\| \|\tilde{v}\|^\frac{1}{2} V_{2}.
\]
(3.37)

Summing up (3.34)-(3.36), applying the estimates in (3.37) and using Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we get for almost every \(t \in (0, T]\),
\[
\| (\tilde{u}(t), \tilde{v}(t), \tilde{\theta}(t)) \|_{H}^2 + \int_{0}^{t} \| (\tilde{u}(t), \tilde{v}(t), \tilde{\theta}(t)) \|_{V}^2 dt \lesssim \int_{0}^{t} (1 + \|u_{1}\|^{4}_{V}) \| (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}) \|_{H}^2 dt.
\]

Applying a generalized version of Gronwall lemma to the above inequality yields
\[
\| (\tilde{u}(t), \tilde{v}(t), \tilde{\theta}(t)) \|_{H} = 0, \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in [0, T].
\]

Therefore, \((u_{1}, v_{1}, \theta_{1}) = (u_{2}, v_{2}, \theta_{2})\), for almost every \(t \in [0, T]\).

\(\square\)

**Remark 3.3** We have in fact proved, for general \((\tilde{u}(0), \tilde{v}(0), \tilde{\theta}(0)) \in H\) and \((u_{1}(0), v_{1}(0), \theta_{1}(0)) \in V\), the following Lipschitz continuity property for every \(^2 t \in [0, T]\),
\[
\| (\tilde{u}(t), \tilde{v}(t), \tilde{\theta}(t)) \|_{H}^2 \lesssim \| (\tilde{u}(0), \tilde{v}(0), \tilde{\theta}(0)) \|_{H}^2 \exp \left\{ \int_{0}^{t} (1 + \|u_{1}\|^{4}_{V}) dt \right\}.
\]
(3.38)

\(^2\)See (3.42).
The following theorem gives a much deeper description of a weak solution than Definition 3.1 and Theorem 3.1 combined.

**Theorem 3.4** Let \((0, T)\) be the largest interval of existence for a weak solution \((u, v, \theta)\) of the problem (1.3)-(1.10) with \((u_0, v_0, \theta_0) \in H\). Then, \(T = \infty\). Moreover,

\[
(u, v, \theta) \in C((0, \infty), V), \tag{3.39}
\]

\[
(u(t), v(t), \theta(t)) \in D(A), \quad \text{for a.e. } t > 0, \tag{3.40}
\]

and, for any \(t_0 \in [0, \infty)\), \(t \in (t_0, \infty)\), the energy equalities (3.17)-(3.19) are valid. Moreover,

\[
\lim_{t \to 0^+} \|(u(t), v(t), \theta(t)) - (u_0, v_0, \theta_0)\|_H = 0. \tag{3.41}
\]

Therefore,

\[
(u, v, \theta) \in C_B([0, \infty), H). \tag{3.42}
\]

**Proof:** Let \((0, T)\) be the largest interval of existence for a weak solution \((u, v, \theta)\) of (1.3)-(1.10). Since \((u, v, \theta) \in L^2(0, T; V)\), we have

\[
(u(t), v(t), \theta(t)) \in V, \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in (0, T].
\]

Choose \(\tau \in (0, T)\) such that \((u(\tau), v(\tau), \theta(\tau)) \in V\) and that (3.6)-(3.8) are satisfied with \(t_0 = \tau\). Then, by Remark 3.2, there is a strong solution \((u_1, v_1, \theta_1)\) of (1.3)-(1.10) on \([\tau, \infty)\) such that

\[
(u_1(\tau), v_1(\tau), \theta_1(\tau)) = (u(\tau), v(\tau), \theta(\tau)).
\]

By Definition 3.1, \((u, v, \theta)\) is a weak solution on \([\tau, T]\). Therefore, by Theorem 3.3, \((u_1, v_1, \theta_1) = (u, v, \theta)\) on \([\tau, T]\). By Theorem 3.2, \((u_1, v_1, \theta_1)\) is also a weak solution on \([\tau, \infty)\). By Theorem 3.3 again, \((u_1, v_1, \theta_1)\) is the unique weak solution on \([\tau, \infty)\). This proves \(T = \infty\).

Notice that the above \(\tau\) can be chosen arbitrarily small. Therefore, (3.39) follows from continuity property (3.16) for a strong solution, (3.40) follows from the definition of a strong solution, and by Theorem 3.2, for any \(t_0 > 0\) and all \(t \in (t_0, \infty)\), the energy equalities (3.17)-(3.19) are satisfied.
Next, we prove validity of (3.17)-(3.19) for $t_0 = 0$ and all $t > 0$. By Theorem 3.1, there exists a set $E \subset (0, \infty)$ such that (3.11) is valid. So, we can choose a sequence
\[ \{t_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \subset (0, \infty) \setminus E, \]
which is monotonically decreasing to 0 as $n \to \infty$ and
\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} \| (u(t_n), v(t_n), \theta(t_n)) - (u_0, v_0, \theta_0) \|_H = 0. \] (3.43)
Since $t_n > 0$ for every $n \geq 1$, we have just proved, for any $t > t_n$,
\[ \begin{align*}
\| u(t) \|^2 + 2 \int_{t_n}^{t} \left( \| u(s) \|^2_{V_1} + \left\langle -v(s) + \int_{z}^{0} \theta_x(s), u(s) \right\rangle \right) \, ds &= \| u(t_n) \|^2, \\
\| v(t) \|^2 + 2 \int_{t_n}^{t} \left( \| v(s) \|^2_{V_2} + \left\langle u(s), v(s) \right\rangle \right) \, ds &= \| v(t_n) \|^2, \\
\| \theta(t) \|^2 + \int_{t_n}^{t} \left( \| \theta(s) \|^2_{V_3} - \langle Q, \theta(s) \rangle \right) \, ds &= \| \theta(t_n) \|^2.
\end{align*} \] (3.44)-(3.46)

Now, take the limit $n \to \infty$ in (3.44)-(3.46) and using the continuity property (3.43) and the fact that $(u, v, \theta) \in L^2(0, \infty; V)$, we have, for any $t > 0$,
\[ \begin{align*}
\| u(t) \|^2 + 2 \int_{0}^{t} \left( \| u(s) \|^2_{V_1} + \left\langle -v(s) + \int_{z}^{0} \theta_x(s), u(s) \right\rangle \right) \, ds &= \| u_0 \|^2, \\
\| v(t) \|^2 + 2 \int_{0}^{t} \left( \| v(s) \|^2_{V_2} + \left\langle u(s), v(s) \right\rangle \right) \, ds &= \| v_0 \|^2, \\
\| \theta(t) \|^2 + \int_{0}^{t} \left( \| \theta(s) \|^2_{V_3} - \langle Q, \theta(s) \rangle \right) \, ds &= \| \theta_0 \|^2.
\end{align*} \] (3.47)-(3.49)

These are (3.17)-(3.19) for $t_0 = 0$ and all $t > 0$.

Moreover, by (3.47) and that $(u, v, \theta) \in L^2(0, \infty; V)$, we obtain
\[ \limsup_{t \to 0^+} \| u(t) \|^2 \leq \| u_0 \|^2. \]

By (3.10), we also have
\[ \| u_0 \|^2 \leq \liminf_{t \to 0^+} \| u(t) \|^2. \]
Thus, \[
\lim_{t \to 0^+} \|u(t)\|^2 = \|u_0\|^2.
\]
Using (3.10) again, we obtain
\[
\lim_{t \to 0^+} \|u(t) - u_0\|^2 = 0.
\]
Similarly, we have
\[
\lim_{t \to 0^+} \|v(t) - v_0\|^2 = \lim_{t \to 0^+} \|\theta(t) - \theta_0\|^2 = 0.
\]
This proves (3.41).
Finally, by definition, as a weak solution,
\[
(u, v, \theta) \in L^\infty(0, T_0; H), \quad \forall T_0 > 0.
\]
As a strong solution, the uniform boundedness in \( V \) is valid:
\[
(u, v, \theta) \in L^\infty(T_0, \infty; V).
\]
Therefore,
\[
(u, v, \theta) \in L^\infty(0, \infty; H).
\]
Then, (3.42) follows from the above uniform boundedness in \( H \), (3.39) and (3.41).

\[\square\]

4 A Sufficient Condition for Uniqueness

In this section, we present a new sufficient condition for uniqueness of weak solutions of 2D viscous PE (1.3)-(1.10). First, we mention the following result for a sufficient condition for uniqueness of weak solutions of (1.3)-(1.10):

**Proposition 4.1** Let \((u_i, v_i, \theta_i)\), for \(i = 1, 2\), be weak solutions of (1.3)-(1.10). Suppose \((u_0, v_0, \theta_0) \in H\) and for some \(T > 0\),
\[
(u_{1,z}, v_{1,z}, \theta_{1,z}) \in L^4(0, T; [L^2(D)]^3).
\]
Then, \((u_1, v_1, \theta_1) \equiv (u_2, v_2, \theta_2)\) for \(t \in [0, T]\).
Proposition 4.1 was proved in [7] for the 2D hydrostatic Navier-Stokes equations, where \( v, \theta \) are neglected. In [7], the definition of weak solution is somewhat different from Definition 3.1 and the boundary condition is also somewhat different.

As the first main result of this section, the following Theorem 4.1 generalizes Proposition 4.1 and allows one to find new classes of weak solutions of the system of (1.3)-(1.10), within which the weak solutions are unique. Especially, it is crucial for proving our main uniqueness result in Section 6.

**Theorem 4.1** Let \((u_i, v_i, \theta_i), i = 1, 2, \) be weak solutions of (1.3)-(1.10). Suppose \( (u_0, v_0, \theta_0) \in H \) and for some \( T > 0, \)

\[
(u_{1,z}, v_{1,z}, \theta_{1,z}) \in \left[ L^4(0, T; L^2(D)) \cup L^2(0, T; L^\infty_x(L^2_z)) \right]^3. \tag{4.1}
\]

Then, \((u_1, v_1, \theta_1) \equiv (u_2, v_2, \theta_2) \) for all \( t \in [0, T]. \)

**Proof:**

We will prove Lipschitz continuity of the weak solutions with respect to initial data in \( L^2, \) assuming \((u_1, v_1, \theta_1) \) satisfies the regularity condition (4.1).

Denote:

\[
\tilde{u} = u_1 - u_2, \quad \tilde{v} = v_1 - v_2, \quad \tilde{\theta} = \theta_1 - \theta_2, \\
\tilde{u}_0 = u_{1,0} - u_{2,0}, \quad \tilde{v}_0 = v_{1,0} - v_{2,0}, \quad \tilde{\theta}_0 = \theta_{1,0} - \theta_{2,0}, \\
\text{and} \\
\tilde{w} = w_1 - w_2, \quad \tilde{q} = q_1 - q_2.
\]

Let \( t_0 \in (0, T). \) Then \((u_1, v_1, \theta_1) \) and \((u_2, v_2, \theta_2) \) are both strong solutions on \([t_0, T]. \) Therefore, we can follow the proof of Theorem 3.3 and apply it to \((u_1, v_1, \theta_1) \) and \((u_2, v_2, \theta_2) \) on \([t_0, T]\) to obtain, for every \( t \in [t_0, T], \)

\[
\|\tilde{u}(t)\|^2 + 2 \int_{t_0}^{t} \|\tilde{u}\|^2_{V_1} ds \\
= \|\tilde{u}(t_0)\|^2 - 2 \int_{t_0}^{t} \langle \tilde{u} u_{1,x} + \tilde{w} u_{1,z} + \int_{z}^{0} \tilde{\theta}_x d\zeta + \tilde{v}, \tilde{u} \rangle ds, \tag{4.2}
\]

\(\)
Notice that equalities (4.2)-(4.4) are obtained similarly to inequalities (3.34)-(3.36). Since \((u_1, v_1, \theta_1)\) and \((u_2, v_2, \theta_2)\) are both strong solutions on \([t_0, T]\), we indeed have above equalities and they are valid for every \(t \in [t_0, T]\).

By Theorem 3.4, \((u_i, v_i, \theta_i) \in C([t_0, T], V)\) for \(i = 1, 2\). Thus, (4.2)-(4.4) along with Lemma 2.1 imply \(\|\tilde{u}\|, \|\tilde{v}\|, \|\tilde{\theta}\| \in C^1([t_0, T])\). Therefore, we have in classic sense for every \(t \in [t_0, T]\) that

\[
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\tilde{u}\|^2 + \|\tilde{v}\|^2 \|v_1\| = - \left\langle \tilde{u} u_{1,x} + \tilde{w} v_{1,z} + \int_z^0 \tilde{\theta}_x d\zeta + \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{u} \right\rangle, \tag{4.5}
\]

\[
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\tilde{v}\|^2 + \|\tilde{\theta}\|^2 \|v_2\|^2 = - \left\langle v_{1,x} \tilde{u} + \tilde{w} v_{1,z} - \tilde{u}, \tilde{v} \right\rangle, \tag{4.6}
\]

\[
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\tilde{\theta}\|^2 + \|\tilde{\theta}\|^2 \|v_3\|^2 = - \left\langle \tilde{u} \theta_{1,x} + \tilde{w} \theta_{1,z}, \tilde{\theta} \right\rangle. \tag{4.7}
\]

Summing up (4.5)-(4.7) yields, for every \(t \in [t_0, T]\),

\[
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left( \|\tilde{u}\|^2 + \|\tilde{v}\|^2 + \|\tilde{\theta}\|^2 \right) + \|\tilde{u}\|^2 \|v_1\|^2 + \|\tilde{v}\|^2 \|v_2\|^2 + \|\tilde{\theta}\|^2 \|v_3\|^2 = - \left\langle \tilde{u} u_{1,x} + \tilde{w} u_{1,z} + \int_z^0 \tilde{\theta}_x d\zeta, \tilde{u} \right\rangle \tag{4.8}
\]

\[
- \left\langle v_{1,x} \tilde{u} + \tilde{w} v_{1,z}, \tilde{v} \right\rangle - \left\langle \tilde{u} \theta_{1,x} + \tilde{w} \theta_{1,z}, \tilde{\theta} \right\rangle
\]

Now, we estimate all the terms on the right side of (4.8). The bilinear term is easily estimated by Cauchy-Schwartz inequality:

\[
\left| \left\langle \int_z^0 \tilde{\theta}_x d\zeta, \tilde{u} \right\rangle \right| \leq \|\tilde{\theta}_x\| \|\tilde{u}\| \leq C_\varepsilon \|\tilde{u}\|^2 + \varepsilon \|\tilde{\theta}_x\|^2. \tag{4.9}
\]

Next, by Agmon’s inequality, we have

\[
\|\tilde{u}_{1,x}\| \leq \int_0^1 \|\tilde{u}\|_L^\infty \left( \int_{-h}^0 \|u_{1,x}\|dz \right) dx
\]

\[
\leq \int_0^1 \|\tilde{u}\|_L^2 \|\tilde{u}_z\|_L^2 \|u_{1,x}\|_L^2 \|\tilde{u}\|_L^2 dx
\]

\[
\leq \|\tilde{u}\|_L^\infty \|\tilde{u}_z\|_L^2 \|u_{1,x}\|_L^2 dx
\]

\[
\leq \|\tilde{u}\|_L^\infty \|\tilde{u}_z\|_L^2 \|u_{1,x}\|_L^2 dx
\]

\[
\leq \|\tilde{u}\|_L^\infty \|\tilde{u}_z\|_L^2 \|u_{1,x}\|_L^2 dx.
\]
where Hölder’s inequality is applied in the last step. Then, by Minkowski’s inequality:

$$
\| \tilde{u} \|_{L^\infty_t(L^2)} \leq \| \tilde{u} \|_{L^2_t(L^\infty_x)},
$$

we get

$$
| \langle \tilde{u}_{1,x}, \tilde{u} \rangle | \leq \| \tilde{u} \|_{L^2_t(L^\infty_x)} \| \tilde{u} \| \| \tilde{u}_{1,x} \|
\leq \text{Agmon’s inequality}
\leq \| u_{1,x} \| \| \tilde{u} \| \| \tilde{u}_{1,x} \| = \| u_{1,x} \| \| \tilde{u} \| \| \tilde{u}_{1,x} \| \leq C \| u_{1,x} \| \| \tilde{u} \|^2 + \| \nabla \tilde{u} \|^2.
$$

(4.10) It follows similarly that

$$
| \langle \tilde{u}_{1,x}, \tilde{v} \rangle | \leq \| \tilde{u} \| \| \tilde{v} \| \| \tilde{u}_{1,x} \| \| \tilde{v}_{1,z} \| \leq C \| \tilde{u} \| \| \tilde{v} \| \| \tilde{u}_{1,x} \| \| \tilde{v}_{1,z} \| \leq C \| \tilde{u} \| \| \tilde{v} \| \| \tilde{u}_{1,x} \| \| \tilde{v}_{1,z} \| \leq C \| u_{1,x} \| \| \tilde{v} \|^2 + \| \tilde{u} \|^2 + \varepsilon (\| \tilde{v}_{1,z} \|^2 + \| \tilde{u}_{1,x} \| + \| \tilde{v}_{1,z} \|).
$$

(4.11) and

$$
| \langle \tilde{u}_{1,x}, \tilde{\theta} \rangle | \leq \| \tilde{u} \| \| \tilde{\theta} \| \| \tilde{u}_{1,x} \| \| \tilde{\theta}_{1,z} \| \leq C \| \tilde{u} \| \| \tilde{\theta} \| \| \tilde{u}_{1,x} \| \| \tilde{\theta}_{1,z} \| \leq C \| \tilde{u} \| \| \tilde{\theta} \| \| \tilde{u}_{1,x} \| \| \tilde{\theta}_{1,z} \| \leq C \| u_{1,x} \| \| \tilde{\theta} \|^2 + \| \tilde{u} \|^2 + \varepsilon (\| \tilde{u}_{1,x} \|^2 + \| \tilde{\theta}_{1,z} \|).
$$

(4.12) Finally, similar to above estimates, we have

$$
| \langle \tilde{w}_{1,z}, \tilde{u} \rangle | \leq \int_0^1 \| \tilde{w} \|_{L^\infty_t} \left( \int_{-h}^0 \| u_{1,z} \| dz \right) dx
\leq \int_0^1 \| \tilde{w} \|_{L^2_t} \| \tilde{u}_{1,z} \|_{L^2_t} dx
\leq \int_0^1 \| \tilde{u}_{1,z} \|_{L^2_t} \| \tilde{u} \|_{L^2_t} dx.
$$

The right-hand side of the above inequality can be further estimated in two different ways:

$$
| \langle \tilde{w}_{1,z}, \tilde{u} \rangle | \leq C \| \tilde{u} \|_{L^\infty_t(L^2)} \int_0^1 \| \tilde{u}_{1,z} \|_{L^2_t} \| u_{1,z} \|_{L^2_t} dx
\leq C \| \tilde{u} \|_{L^2_t(L^\infty_x)} \| u_{1,z} \| \| \tilde{u}_{1,z} \|
\leq C \| \tilde{u} \|_{L^2_t(L^\infty_x)} \| u_{1,z} \| \| \tilde{u}_{1,z} \|
\leq C \| u_{1,z} \| \| \tilde{u} \|^2 + \| \tilde{u}_{1,z} \|^2.
$$

(4.13)
and

\[ | \langle \hat{w}u_{1,z}, \tilde{u} \rangle | \leq C \| u_{1,z} \|_{L^\infty_x(L^2_x)} \int_0^1 \| \tilde{u}_x \|_{L^2_x} \| \tilde{u} \|_{L^2_x} dx \]
\[ \leq C \| u_{1,z} \|_{L^\infty_x(L^2_x)} \| \tilde{u}_x \| \| \tilde{u} \| \]
\[ \leq C \varepsilon \| u_{1,z} \|_{L^\infty_x(L^2_x)}^2 \| \tilde{u} \|^2 + \varepsilon \| \tilde{u}_x \|^2. \] (4.14)

In the above estimates (4.13) and (4.14), we have used ideas similar to those used in (4.10). It now follows, similar to (4.13) and (4.14), that

\[ | \langle \hat{w}v_{1,z}, \tilde{v} \rangle | \leq C \| \tilde{v} \|_{L^\infty_x(L^2_x)} \int_0^1 \| \tilde{u}_x \|_{L^2_x} \| v_{1,z} \|_{L^2_x} dx \]
\[ \leq C \| \tilde{v} \|_{L^\infty_x(L^2_x)} \| v_{1,z} \| \| \tilde{u}_x \| \]
\[ \leq C \varepsilon \| v_{1,z} \|_{L^\infty_x(L^2_x)}^2 \| \tilde{v} \|^2 + \varepsilon \| \tilde{u}_x \|^2, \] (4.15)

\[ | \langle \hat{w}v_{1,z}, \tilde{v} \rangle | \leq C \| v_{1,z} \|_{L^\infty_x(L^2_x)} \int_0^1 \| \tilde{u}_x \|_{L^2_x} \| \tilde{v} \|_{L^2_x} dx \]
\[ \leq C \| v_{1,z} \|_{L^\infty_x(L^2_x)} \| \tilde{u}_x \| \| \tilde{v} \| \]
\[ \leq C \varepsilon \| v_{1,z} \|_{L^\infty_x(L^2_x)}^2 \| \tilde{v} \|^2 + \varepsilon \| \tilde{u}_x \|^2, \] (4.16)

and

\[ \left| \langle \hat{w}_\theta_{1,z}, \tilde{\theta} \rangle \right| \leq C \varepsilon \| \tilde{\theta}_{1,z} \|_{L^\infty_x(L^2_x)}^2 \| \tilde{\theta} \|^2 + \varepsilon \| \tilde{\theta}_x \|^2, \] (4.17)

\[ \left| \langle \hat{w}_\theta_{1,z}, \tilde{\theta} \rangle \right| \leq C \varepsilon \| \theta_{1,z} \|_{L^\infty_x(L^2_x)}^2 \| \tilde{\theta} \|^2 + \varepsilon \| \tilde{\theta}_x \|^2. \] (4.18)

Plug the estimates (4.9)-(4.12), (4.13) or (4.14), (4.15) or (4.16), and (4.17) or (4.18) into (4.8) and choose sufficiently small \( \varepsilon > 0 \) to absorb the dissipation terms. Then, assume that \((u_1, v_1, \theta_1)\) satisfies (4.1) and apply Gronwall lemma to finish the proof. Notice that global regularity result of weak solutions of (1.3)-(1.10) is also used in justifying applicability of Gronwall lemma. As an example to demonstrate the details, we now finish the proof for a special case of (4.1) when \((u_1, v_1, \theta_1)\) satisfies:

\[ (u_{1,z}, v_{1,z}, \theta_{1,z}) \in \left[ L^2(0, T; L^\infty_x(L^2_x)) \right]^3. \] (4.19)
Plug (4.9)-(4.12), (4.14), (4.16) and (4.18) into (4.8) and choose sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, we obtain, for $t \in [t_0, T]$,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \| (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}) \|^2_H + \| (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}) \|^2_V \leq \left[ 1 + \| (u_1, v_1, \theta_1)_x \|^2_H + \| (u_1, v_1, \theta_1)_z \|^2_{(L_x^\infty(L_z^2))^3} \right] \| (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}) \|^2_H. \quad (4.20)$$

Noticing (4.19), we can use Gronwall inequality to obtain, for $t \in [t_0, T]$,

$$\| (\tilde{u}(t), \tilde{v}(t), \tilde{\theta}(t)) \|^2_H \leq \| (\tilde{u}(t_0), \tilde{v}(t_0), \tilde{\theta}(t_0)) \|^2_H \times \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^{t} \left[ 1 + \| (u_1, v_1, \theta_1)_x \|^2_H + \| (u_1, v_1, \theta_1)_z \|^2_{(L_x^\infty(L_z^2))^3} \right] ds \right\}.$$

Now, take the limit $t_0 \to 0^+$ and use Theorem 3.4, we get

$$\| (\tilde{u}(t), \tilde{v}(t), \tilde{\theta}(t)) \|^2_H \leq \| (\tilde{u}_0, \tilde{v}_0, \tilde{\theta}_0) \|^2_H \times \exp \left\{ \int_{0}^{t} \left[ 1 + \| (u_1, v_1, \theta_1)_x \|^2_H + \| (u_1, v_1, \theta_1)_z \|^2_{(L_x^\infty(L_z^2))^3} \right] ds \right\}.$$

Since the above inequality is independent of $t_0$ and $t_0$ can be chosen arbitrarily small, it is valid for all $t \in (0, T]$. This proves that $(u_1, v_1, \theta_1) \equiv (u_2, v_2, \theta_2)$, if $(\tilde{u}_0, \tilde{v}_0, \tilde{\theta}_0) = (0, 0, 0)$. The other cases covered by (4.1) can be similarly proved.

\[\square\]

## 5 Global Existence

In this section, we prove global in time uniform boundedness of the norms of some partial derivatives of the weak solutions. These results are also important for proving our uniqueness result in Section 6.

Let us mention first that it is not immediately clear whether or not the global uniform $L_x^2 H_z^{1/2}$ boundedness for the solutions of the 2D hydrostatic Navier-Stokes equations as obtained in [3] can be extended to the problem of (1.3)-(1.10). This is due to the fact that the boundary conditions (1.6) and
(1.7) for \((u, v)\) are different from the boundary condition (1.9) for \(\theta\) and the possibility that \(\alpha_1\) and \(\alpha_2\) may be different. This problem will be studied elsewhere.

We begin with a theorem for global in time uniform boundedness of \((u_z, v_z, \theta_z)\) in \([L^2(D)]^3\) for (1.3)-(1.10). Recall that global existence and uniqueness of \(z\)-weak solutions were proved in [20] for 2D viscous PE in the case of periodic boundary conditions; and in [10] for 3D viscous PE in case of Neumann boundary condition for horizontal velocity at bottom of the physical domain. However, these analyses do not apply to the system (1.3)-(1.10) due to different boundary conditions. A possible approach might be a proper modification of that of [3] in obtaining boundedness for \(z\)-weak solutions of the simplified 2D hydrostatic Navier-Stokes equations, where \(v\) and \(\theta\) were omitted. Nevertheless, new issues will come up again due to boundary conditions. Instead, we will take advantage of a result of [21] directly in our proof of the following Theorem 5.1.

**Theorem 5.1** Suppose \(Q \in L^2(D)\), \((u_0, v_0, \theta_0) \in H\) and \((u, v, \theta)\) is a weak solution of (1.3)-(1.10). The following statements are valid:

(a) If \(\partial_z u_0 \in L^2(D)\), then there exists a weak solution \((u, v, \theta)\) of (1.3)-(1.10), such that

\[
u_z \in L^{\infty}(0, \infty; [L^2(D)]^2) \cap L^2(0, \infty; [H^1(D)]^2).
\]

Moreover, there exists a bounded absorbing set for \(u_z\) in \([L^2(D)]^2\).

(b) If \((\partial_z u_0, \partial_z v_0) \in (L^2(D))^2\), then there exists a weak solution \((u, v, \theta)\) of (1.3)-(1.10), such that

\[
(u_z, v_z) \in L^{\infty}(0, \infty; [L^2(D)]^2) \cap L^2(0, \infty; [H^1(D)]^2).
\]

Moreover, there exists a bounded absorbing set for \((u_z, v_z)\) in \([L^2(D)]^2\).

(c) If \((\partial_z u_0, \partial_z \theta_0) \in (L^2(D))^2\), then there exists a weak solution \((u, v, \theta)\) of (1.3)-(1.10), such that

\[
(u_z, \theta_z) \in L^{\infty}(0, \infty; [L^2(D)]^2) \cap L^2(0, \infty; [H^1(D)]^2).
\]

Moreover, there exists a bounded absorbing set for \((u_z, \theta_z)\) in \([L^2(D)]^2\).
Remark: Quite unexpectedly, it seems to be a non-trivial problem whether or not global in time uniform boundedness of \( \| (u_z, v_x) \|_{L^2(D)}^2 \) or \( \| (u_z, \theta_x) \|_{L^2(D)}^2 \) is still valid when \((u_0, v_0) \in [L^2(D)]^2 \) or \((u_0, \theta_0) \in [L^2(D)]^2 \).

\[ \square \]

Proof:

**Step 1.** Proof of part (a) of Theorem 5.1.

By Theorem 3.4, we can choose a monotonically decreasing sequence 

\[ \{ t_n \}_{n=1}^\infty \subset (0, \infty), \text{ such that } \lim_{n \to \infty} t_n = 0, \]

and

\[ (u, v, \theta) \in C([t_n, \infty), V) \cap L^2(t_n, \infty; D(A)), \quad \forall \ n \geq 1. \]  \hfill (5.1)

Moreover, there exists an absorbing set for \((u, v, \theta)\) in \(V\), when the time interval \([t_1, \infty)\) is considered. Therefore, what is still needed to be proved is just the following:

\[ u_z \in L^\infty(0, t_1; L^2(D)) \cap L^2(0, t_1; H^1(D)). \]  \hfill (5.2)

By the estimate of \( \| u_z \| \) in §3.3 of [21] for a strong solution \((u, v, \theta)\) on \([t_n, \infty)\) with initial data \((u(t_n), v(t_n), \theta(t_n)) \in V\) and by Theorem 3.3, we have for almost every \( t \in [t_n, \infty) \),

\[ \frac{d}{dt} \left( \| u_z(t) \|^2 + \alpha_1 \| u(t) \|_{z=0}^2 \right) + \| \nabla u_z \|^2 + \alpha_1 \| u_x \|_{z=0}^2 \leq \| \nabla u \|^2 + \| v \|^2 + \| \theta_x \|^2. \]  \hfill (5.3)

Notice that (5.1) is used in deriving (5.3). Therefore, we have for \( t \in [t_n, t_1] \) with \( n > 1 \),

\[ \| u_z(t) \|^2 + \alpha_1 \| u(t) \|_{z=0}^2 \leq \int_{t_n}^t \left( \| \nabla u_z \|^2 + \alpha_1 \| u_x \|_{z=0}^2 \right) ds \]

\[ \leq \| u(z(t_n)) \|^2 + \alpha_1 \| u(t_n) \|_{z=0}^2 + C \int_{t_n}^t \left[ \| \nabla u \|^2 + \| v \|^2 + \| \theta_x \|^2 \right] ds. \]  \hfill (5.4)

Since \( u(t_n) \in V_1 \), we have

\[ \| u(t_n) \|_{z=0} = \left\| \int_{-h}^0 u_z(t_n) dz \right\| \leq \| u_z(t_n) \|. \]  \hfill (5.5)
Due to the fact that \((u, v, \theta)\) is a weak solution on \((0, \infty)\), we also have, for \(t \in [t_n, t_1]\),
\[
\int_{t_n}^{t} (\|\nabla u\|^2 + \|v\|^2 + \|\theta_x\|^2)ds \leq \int_{0}^{t_1} (\|\nabla u\|^2 + \|v\|^2 + \|\theta_x\|^2)ds,
\] (5.6)
the upper bound of which depends only on \(\|(u_0, v_0, \theta_0)\|_H, \|Q\|\) and \(t_1\).

Combining (5.4)-(5.6), we have, for \(t \in [t_n, t_1]\),
\[
\|u_z(t)\|^2 + \alpha_1 \|u(t)|_{z=0}\|^2 + \int_{t_n}^{t} (\|\nabla u_z\|^2 + \alpha_1 \|u_z|_{z=0}\|^2) ds
\] \[
\leq \|u_z(t_n)\|^2 + \int_{0}^{t_1} [\|\nabla u\|^2 + \|v\|^2 + \|\theta_x\|^2] ds.
\] (5.7)

Now, choose any \(\phi \in C_0^\infty(D)\). Then, \(\phi_z \in V_1\). Thus, by weak continuity of \((u, v, \theta)\) on \([0, \infty)\) (see Theorem 3.1), we have
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \langle u_z(t_n) - \partial_z u_0, \phi \rangle = - \lim_{n \to \infty} \langle u(t_n) - u_0, \phi_z \rangle = 0.
\]

Since \(C_0^\infty(D)\) is dense in \(L^2(D)\), we have weak convergence:
\[
u_z(t_n) \rightharpoonup \partial_z u_0, \text{ in } L^2(D).
\]

Therefore, \(\{u_z(t_n)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}\) is bounded in \(L^2(D)\). Now, taking the limit \(t_n \to 0\) in (5.7), we have, for all \(t \in (0, t_1)\),
\[
\|u_z(t)\|^2 + \alpha_1 \|u(t)|_{z=0}\|^2 + \int_{0}^{t} (\|\nabla u_z\|^2 + \alpha_1 \|u_z|_{z=0}\|^2) ds
\] \[
\leq \sup_{n \geq 1} \|u_z(t_n)\|^2 + \int_{0}^{t_1} [\|\nabla u\|^2 + \|v\|^2 + \|\theta_x\|^2] ds.
\] (5.8)

This proves (5.2) and thus finishes Step 1.

**Step 2.** Proof of Theorem 5.1 part (b).

For simplicity of presentation, in the proof of part (b) of Theorem 5.1, we will only provide the key estimate of \(\|v_z\|\) under the assumption that \((u, v, \theta)\) is a strong solution on \([0, \infty)\). The justification that this estimate is sufficient for a rigorous proof of part (b) of Theorem 5.1 is almost the same as the one we provided in **Step 1** for our proof of part (a) of Theorem 5.1. Thus, it is omitted for conciseness.
Taking inner product of (1.4) with $-v_{zz}$ yields:

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left( \|v_z\|^2 + \alpha_2 \|v(z = 0)\|^2 \right) + \|\nabla v_z\|^2 + \alpha_2 \|v_x(z = 0)\|^2 = \langle w_x + w v_z - u, v_{zz} \rangle. \quad (5.9)$$

The following computations are used in deriving (5.9):

$$- \int v_t v_{zz} = - \int_0^1 \left( v_t v_z \bigg|_{z=-h}^{0} - \int_{-h}^{0} v_{zz} v_z \right) \, dx$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|v_z\|^2 + \int_0^1 v_t \alpha_2 v \bigg|_{z=0} \, dx$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|v_z\|^2 + \frac{\alpha_2}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|v(z = 0)\|^2,$$

$$\int_D v_{zz} v_{xx} = \int_{-h}^{0} \left( v_{zz} v_x \bigg|_{x=0}^{1} - \int_0^1 v_{xzz} v_x \, dx \right) \, dz$$

$$= - \int_D v_{xzz} v_x \, dx \, dz$$

$$= - \int_0^1 \left( v_{xzz} v_x \bigg|_{z=-h}^{0} - \int_{-h}^{0} v_{xzz}^2 \, dz \right) \, dx$$

$$= \|v_{xx}\|^2 + \alpha_2 \|v_x(z = 0)\|^2.$$

The two tri-linear terms on the right-hand side of (5.9) will be estimated in the following.

First, we have

$$\int_D w v_z v_{zz} = \frac{1}{2} \int_D w \partial_z (v_z^2)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \left( w v_z^2 \bigg|_{-h}^{0} - \int_{-h}^{0} w_z v_z^2 \right) \, dx$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \int_D u_x v_z^2 \quad (5.10)$$

$$\leq C \|u_x\| \|v_z\| \|v_{xx}\| \frac{1}{2} \|v_{zz}\| \frac{1}{2}$$

$$\leq C \varepsilon \|u_x\|^2 \|v_z\|^2 + \varepsilon \|\nabla v_z\|^2.$$

Contrary to the common intuition from experience, the other tri-linear term is more complicated to deal with. Integrating by parts and applying bound-
ary conditions, one has
\[
\int_D uv_x v_z = \int_0^1 \left[ \left. uv_x v_z \right|_{z=h}^{z=0} - \int_{-h}^0 (u_x v_x v_z + u v_x v_z) dz \right] dx
\]
\[
= - \alpha_2 \int_0^1 uv_x v_z \bigg|_{z=0} dx - \int_D u_x v_x v_z dx dz - \int_D u v_x v_z dx dz
\]
\[
= I_0 + I_1 + I_2.
\]
In the following, we estimate $I_0$, $I_1$ and $I_2$ respectively. First, we have
\[
|I_1| \leq C \|u_z\| \left\| v_x \right\| \frac{1}{2} \left\| v_{xz} \right\| \frac{1}{2} \left\| v_{xx} \right\| \frac{1}{2} \left\| v_{xz} \right\| \frac{1}{2}
\]
\[
= C \|u_z\| \left\| v_x \right\| \frac{1}{2} \left\| v_{xz} \right\| \frac{1}{2} \left\| v_{xx} \right\| \frac{1}{2}
\]
\[
\leq C_\varepsilon \left( \|u_z\| \frac{4}{2} + \|v_x\|^2 \|v_x\|^2 \right) + \varepsilon \|v_{xz}\|^2,
\]
and
\[
|I_2| \leq C \|v_{xz}\| \left\| u \right\| \left\| u_x \right\| \left\| v_x \right\| \frac{1}{2} \left\| v_{xz} \right\| \frac{1}{2}
\]
\[
= C \|u\| \left\| u_x \right\| \left\| v_x \right\| \frac{1}{2} \left\| v_{xz} \right\| \frac{1}{2}
\]
\[
\leq C_\varepsilon \|u\|^2 \|u_x\|^2 \|v_x\|^2 \frac{1}{2} \left\| v_{xz} \right\| \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon \|v_{xz}\|^2.
\]
Noticing that $u(0, z, t) = 0$, we have
\[
u^2(x, 0, t) = 2 \int_0^x u(\xi, 0, t) u_x(\xi, 0, t) d\xi.
\]
Thus,
\[
\| u(z = 0) \|_{\infty}^2 \leq 2 \| u(z = 0) \| \| u_x(z = 0) \|.
\]
So, we can estimate $I_0$ as following:
\[
|I_0| \leq \alpha_2 \| u(z = 0) \|_{\infty} \| v(z = 0) \| \| v_x(z = 0) \|
\leq \alpha_2 \| u(z = 0) \|_{\infty}^2 \| v(z = 0) \|^2 + \alpha_2 \| v_x(z = 0) \|^2
\leq \alpha_2 \| u(z = 0) \| \| u_x(z = 0) \| \| v(z = 0) \|^2 + \frac{\alpha_2}{2} \| v_x(z = 0) \|^2.
\]
(5.11)
Due to the boundary condition $u(z = -h) = 0$, it holds that,
\[
u(z = 0) = \int_{-h}^0 u_x(x, \zeta, t) d\zeta,
\]
and thus
\[
\|u(z = 0)\| = \left[ \int_0^1 \left( \int_{-h}^0 u_{z} d\zeta \right)^2 dx \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
\leq \left[ \int_0^1 \left( \int_{-h}^0 |u_{z}| d\zeta \right)^2 dx \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
\leq \text{(Minkowski inequality)} \\
\leq \int_{-h}^0 \left( \int_0^1 u_{z}^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dz \\
\leq h^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u_{z}\|.
\] (5.12)

Similar to (5.12), we also have \(\|u_{x}(z = 0)\| \leq h^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u_{xz}\|\). Therefore,
\[
I_0 \leq \alpha_2 h \|u_{z}\| \|u_{xz}\| \|v(z = 0)\|^2 + \frac{\alpha_2}{2} \|v_x(z = 0)\|^2.
\]

Combining the above estimates of \(I_1, I_2\) and \(I_0\), we have
\[
\left| \int_D u v_x v_{zz} dxdz \right| \leq C_\varepsilon (\|u\| \|u_{z}\|^2 + \|v_{x}\|^2) \|v_{z}\|^2 + \alpha_2 h \|u_{z}\| \|u_{xz}\| \|v(z = 0)\|^2 + C_\varepsilon \|u_{z}\|^4 + \varepsilon \|v_{xz}\|^2 + \frac{\alpha_2}{2} \|v_x(z = 0)\|^2.
\] (5.13)

Finally, it follows from (5.9), (5.10) and (5.13) that, for \(\varepsilon > 0\) chosen sufficiently small,
\[d \|v_{z}\|^2 + \alpha_2 \|v(z = 0)\|^2 + \|\nabla v_{z}\|^2 + \alpha_2 \|v_x(z = 0)\|^2 \leq (\|u_{x}\|^2 + \|v_{x}\|^2 + \|u\|^2 \|u_{z}\|^2) \|v_{z}\|^2 + \alpha_2 \|u_{z}\| \|u_{xz}\| \|v(z = 0)\|^2 + \|u_{z}\|^4 + \|u\|^2 \]
\[\approx (\|u_{x}\|^2 + \|v_{x}\|^2 + \|u\|^2 \|u_{z}\|^2) \|v_{z}\|^2 + \alpha_2 \|u_{z}\| \|u_{xz}\| \|v(z = 0)\|^2 + \|u_{z}\| \|u_{xz}\|) \times (\|v_{z}\|^2 + \alpha_2 \|v(z = 0)\|^2) + \|u_{z}\|^4 + \|u\|^2.
\] (5.14)

Notice that, by (5.12), for \(v_{0,z} \in L^2\),
\[
\|v_0(z = 0)\| \leq h^{\frac{1}{2}} \|v_{0,z}\| < \infty.
\]
By Theorem 5.1 (a), (5.14) and Gronwall lemma, we have local in time boundedness of $\|v_z\|$ on some interval $[0, t_0]$, with $t_0 > 0$. This yields global uniform boundedness and an absorbing set for $\|v_z\|$, since we have uniform boundedness and an absorbing set for $(u, v, \theta)$ in $V$ when considered in $[t_0, \infty)$ as a strong solution.

Finally, with (5.14) we can justify as in our proof of part (a), that Theorem 5.1 (b) is valid for a weak solution $(u, v, \theta)$ when $\partial_z u_0, \partial_z v_0 \in L^2(D)$.

Proof of Theorem 5.1 (c) is similar to that for (b).

Notice that vertical regularity $(u_z, v_z, \theta_z) \in L^2$ of weak solutions of 2D and 3D viscous PE played a very prominent or even crucial role in almost all previous analytic works in dealing with solution regularity and uniqueness properties, for example, as shown in (4.1). However, to the contrary of this intuitive impression, we see next that horizontal regularity might actually force weak solutions to behave somewhat better, at least for the 2D problem. This is manifested in the following Theorem 5.2, which is our second main result of this section.

**Theorem 5.2** Suppose $Q \in L^2(D)$, $(u_0, v_0, \theta_0) \in H$ and $(u, v, \theta)$ is a weak solution of (1.3)-(1.10). The following statements are valid:

(a) If $\partial_x u_0 \in L^2(D)$, then

$$u_x \in L^\infty(0, +\infty; L^2(D)) \cap L^2(0, \infty; H^1(D)).$$

Moreover, there exists a bounded absorbing set for $u_x$ in $L^2(D)$.

(b) If $(\partial_x u_0, \partial_x v_0) \in [L^2(D)]^2$, then

$$(u_x, v_x) \in L^\infty(0, +\infty; [L^2(D)]^2) \cap L^2(0, \infty; [H^1(D)]^2).$$

Moreover, there exists a bounded absorbing set for $(u_x, v_x)$ in $[L^2(D)]^2$.

(c) If $(\partial_x u_0, \partial_x \theta_0) \in [L^2(D)]^2$, then

$$(u_x, \theta_x) \in L^\infty(0, +\infty; [L^2(D)]^2) \cap L^2(0, \infty; [H^1(D)]^2).$$

Moreover, there exists a bounded absorbing set for $(u_x, \theta_x)$ in $[L^2(D)]^2$. 
(d) If \((\partial_x u_0, \partial_z v_0) \in [L^2(D)]^2\), then
\((u_x, v_z) \in L^\infty(0, +\infty; [L^2(D)]^2) \cap L^2(0, \infty; [H^1(D)]^2)\).

Moreover, there exists a bounded absorbing set for \((u_x, v_z)\) in \([L^2(D)]^2\).

(e) If \((\partial_x u_0, \partial_z \theta_0) \in [L^2(D)]^2\), then
\((u_x, \theta_z) \in L^\infty(0, +\infty; [L^2(D)]^2) \cap L^2(0, \infty; [H^1(D)]^2)\).

Moreover, there exists a bounded absorbing set for \((u_x, \theta_z)\) in \([L^2(D)]^2\).

Proof:
Again, for simplicity of presentation, in the proof of Theorem 5.2, we will only provide the key estimates of \(\|u_x\|, \|v_x\|, \|\theta_x\|, \|v_z\|\) and \(\|\theta_z\|\) under the assumption that \((u, v, \theta)\) is a strong solution on \([0, \infty)\). The justification that these estimates are sufficient for a rigorous proof of Theorem 5.2 is almost the same as the one we provided in our proof of Theorem 5.1 (a). Thus, it is omitted for conciseness.

We provide these key estimates in three steps.

**Step 1.** Estimate for \(\|u_x\|_2\).
Taking inner product of (1.3) with \(-u_{xx}\) yields
\[
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|u_x\|^2 + \|\nabla u_x\|^2 + \alpha_1 \|u_x(z = 0)\|^2 = \left< uu_x + wu_z + v + q_x + \int_{z} \theta_x(x, \zeta, t) d\zeta, u_{xx} \right>.
\]
(5.15)
The following computations, along with the boundary conditions (1.6)-(1.9) and the constraint (1.11), are used in the derivation of (5.15):
\[
- \int_D u_t u_{xx} dx dz = - \int_{-h}^0 \left( u_t u_x \bigg|_{x=0}^1 - \int_0^1 u_{xt} u_x \right) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|u_x\|^2,
\]
\[
\int_D u_{xx} u_{zz} dx dz = \int_{-h}^0 \left( u_{xx} u_{zz} \bigg|_{x=0}^1 - \int_0^1 u_{x} u_{xxz} dx \right) dz
\]
\[
= - \int_D u_x u_{xz} dx dz
\]
\[
= - \int_0^1 \left( u_x u_{xz} \bigg|_{z=-h}^0 - \int_{-h}^0 |u_{xz}|^2 dz \right) dx
\]
\[
= \alpha_1 \|u_x(z = 0)\|^2 + \|u_{xx}\|^2.
\]
\[
\int_{D} q_{x} u_{xx} dxdz = \int_{-h}^{1} q_{x} \left( \int_{-h}^{0} u_{xx} dz \right) dx = \int_{-h}^{1} q_{x} \partial_{x} \left( \int_{-h}^{0} u_{x} dz \right) dx = 0.
\]

Now, we estimate the two tri-linear terms on the right-hand side of (5.15) as following:

\[
\langle uu_{x}, u_{xx} \rangle = \int_{-h}^{0} \int_{0}^{1} u \partial_{x} \left( \frac{u_{x}^{2}}{2} \right) dxdz = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{D} u_{x}^{3} \leq C \|u_{x}\|^{2} \|u_{xx}\|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u_{xx}\|^{\frac{1}{2}}
\]

\[
\leq C \|u_{x}\|^{4} + \epsilon \|\nabla u_{x}\|^{2}.
\]

\[
\langle wu_{x}, u_{xx} \rangle \leq C \|w\|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|w_{z}\|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u_{x}\|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u_{xx}\|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u_{xx}\|
\]

\[
\leq C \|u_{x}\| \|u_{x}\|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u_{xx}\|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u_{xx}\|
\]

\[
\leq C \|\nabla u_{x}\|^{2} \|u_{x}\|^{4} + \epsilon \|\nabla u_{x}\|^{2}.
\]

Therefore, it follows from (5.15) that

\[
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|u_{x}\|^{2} + \|\nabla u_{x}\|^{2} + \alpha_{1} \|u_{x}(z = 0)\|^{2}
\]

\[
\leq 2 \epsilon \|\nabla u_{x}\|^{2} + C \epsilon (1 + \|u_{z}\|^{2}) \|u_{x}\|^{4} + (\|v\| + \|\theta_{x}\|) \|u_{xx}\|
\]

\[
\leq 3 \epsilon \|\nabla u_{x}\|^{2} + C \epsilon (1 + \|u_{z}\|^{2}) \|u_{x}\|^{4} + C \epsilon (\|v\|^{2} + \|\theta_{x}\|^{2})
\]

Thus, if \( \epsilon > 0 \) is chosen sufficiently small, then

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \|u_{x}\|^{2} + \|\nabla u_{x}\|^{2} + \alpha_{1} \|u_{x}(z = 0)\|^{2}
\]

\[
\leq (1 + \|u_{z}\|^{2}) \|u_{x}\|^{4} + \|v\|^{2} + \|\theta_{x}\|^{2}.
\]

A local in time upper bound of \( \|u_{x}\| \) can be obtained from (5.16) as follows. By (5.16),

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \|u_{x}\|^{2} \leq C (1 + \|u_{z}\|^{2} + \|v\|^{2} + \|\theta_{x}\|^{2})(\|u_{x}\|^{2} + 1)^{2}.
\]

Denote:

\[
y(t) := \|u_{x}\|^{2} + 1, \quad g(t) := C (1 + \|u_{z}\|^{2} + \|v\|^{2} + \|\theta_{x}\|^{2}).
\]

Then

\[
y'(t) \leq g(t)y^{2}(t).
\]
Notice that \( y(t) \geq 1, g(t) \geq C(>0) \) and \( g \in L^1(0, +\infty) \). Therefore,
\[
y(t) \leq \frac{y(0)}{1 - y(0) \int_0^t g(s)ds},
\]
for \( t \in (0, t_*) \) where \( t_* \) is decided by the following equation:
\[
y(0) \int_0^{t_*} g(s)ds = 1.
\]
Thus, for \( t \in (0, t_*) \)
\[
\|u_x\|^2 + 1 \leq \frac{\|u_{0,x}\|^2 + 1}{1 - (\|u_{0,x}\|^2 + 1) \int_0^t g(s)ds}.
\]
This finishes the proof of local in time boundedness of \( \|u_x\| \).

One the other hand, there exists \( t_0 \in (0, t_*) \), such that
\[
(u(t_0), v(t_0), \theta(t_0)) \in V.
\]
Therefore, by the result of uniform boundedness of strong solutions (see \( \S 3.3 \) of [21] and [16]) and its uniqueness on \([t_0, +\infty)\), there exists a bounded absorbing set for \((u, v, \theta) \) in \( V \) for \( t \in [t_0, \infty) \), thus a bounded absorbing set for \( u_x \) in \( L^2 \) for \( t \in [0, \infty) \). It also proves the uniform boundedness:
\[
u_x \in L^\infty(0, +\infty; L^2).
\]
Then, integrating (5.16) for \( t \) from 0 to \( \infty \) proves
\[
\nabla u_x \in L^2(0, +\infty; L^2).
\]
This finishes proof of Theorem 5.2 (a).

**Step 2.** Estimate of \( \|v_x\|_2 \) and \( \|\theta_x\| \).
Similar to **Step 1**, taking inner product of (1.4) with \(-v_{xx} \) yields:
\[
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|v_x\|^2 + \|\nabla v_x\|^2 + \alpha_2 \|v_x(z=0)\|^2 = \langle uv_x + wv_z - u, v_{xx} \rangle. \tag{5.17}
\]
The tri-linear terms on the right-hand side of (5.17) can be estimated as following:

\[
\int_D uw_x v_{xx} = \frac{1}{2} \int_D u \partial_x (v_x^2) dxdz = -\frac{1}{2} \int_D u_x v_x^2 dxdz \\
\leq C \| u_x \| \| v_x \| \| v_{xx} \| \frac{1}{2} \| v_{xz} \| \frac{1}{2} \\
\leq C \varepsilon \| u_x \|^2 \| v_x \|^2 + \varepsilon \| \nabla v_x \|^2.
\]

\[
\int_D w v_x v_{xx} \leq C \| w \| \frac{1}{2} \| v_x \| \frac{1}{2} \| v_{xx} \| \frac{1}{2} \| v_{xz} \| \frac{1}{2} \| v_{xx} \|
\leq C \| u_x \| \| v_x \| \frac{1}{2} \| v_{xx} \| \frac{1}{2} \| v_{xx} \|
\leq C \varepsilon \| u_x \|^4 \| v_x \|^2 + \varepsilon \| \nabla v_x \|^2.
\]

Thus, if \( \varepsilon > 0 \) is chosen sufficiently small, then

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \| v_x \|^2 + \| \nabla v_x \|^2 + \alpha_2 \| v_x (z = 0) \|^2 \leq C (\| u_x \|^2 \| v_x \|^2 + \| u_x \|^4 \| v_x \|^2 + \| u \|^2).
\]

(5.18)

Similarly, we have

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \| \theta_x \|^2 + \| \nabla \theta_x \|^2 + \alpha_0 \| \theta_x (z = 0) \|^2 \leq C (\| u_x \|^2 \| \theta_x \|^2 + \| u_x \|^4 \| \theta_x \|^2 + \| Q \|^2).
\]

(5.19)

Notice the fact that \( v_x, \theta_x \in L^2(0, \infty; L^2) \). Thus, as argued in Step 1, Theorem 5.2 (b) follows from Theorem 5.2 (a) and (5.18); Theorem 5.2 (c) follows from Theorem 5.2 (a) and (5.19).

Step 3. Estimate of \( \| v_z \|_2 \) and \( \| \theta_z \| \).

Recall (5.9). The two tri-linear terms on the right-hand side of (5.9) can be estimated in the following.

First, we have

\[
\int_D w v_x v_{zz} \leq C \| u \| \frac{1}{2} \| u_x \| \frac{1}{2} \| v_x \| \frac{1}{2} \| v_{xz} \| \frac{1}{2} \| v_{zz} \|
\leq C \varepsilon \| u \|^2 \| u_x \|^2 \| v_x \|^2 + \varepsilon \| \nabla v_z \|^2.
\]

(5.20)
Next, the estimate (5.10) will be used again. Thus, if $\varepsilon > 0$ is chosen sufficiently small, then
\[
\frac{d}{dt} \left( \|v_z\|^2 + \alpha_2 \|v(z = 0)\|^2 \right) + \|\nabla v_z\|^2 + \alpha_2 \|v_x(z = 0)\|^2 \\
\leq 2\|u\|^2 \|u_x\|^2 \|v_x\|^2 + 2\|u_x\|^2 \|v_z\|^2 + 2\|Q\|^2.
\]
(5.21)

Similarly, we have
\[
\frac{d}{dt} \left( \|\theta_z\|^2 + \alpha_0 \|\theta(z = 0)\|^2 \right) + \|\nabla \theta_z\|^2 + \alpha_2 \|\theta_x(z = 0)\|^2 \\
\leq 2\|u\|^2 \|u_x\|^2 \|\theta_x\|^2 + 2\|u_x\|^2 \|\theta_z\|^2 + 2\|Q\|^2.
\]
(5.22)

Now, Theorem 5.2 (d) and (e) follow from (5.21) and (5.22) respectively as in Step 1 and Step 2.

6 Uniqueness

In this section, we state and prove our last main result, Theorem 6.1, on uniqueness of weak solutions of 2D viscous PE (1.3)-(1.10) when some initial partial regularity is assumed.

**Theorem 6.1** Suppose $Q \in L^2(D)$, $(u_0, v_0, \theta_0) \in H$ and $(u, v, \theta)$ is a weak solution of (1.3)-(1.10). Suppose further that one of the following initial regularity is valid:

- $(\partial_x u_0, \partial_x v_0, \partial_x \theta_0) \in (L^2(D))^3$, or
- $(\partial_x u_0, \partial_x v_0, \partial_z \theta_0) \in (L^2(D))^3$,
- $(\partial_z u_0, \partial_x v_0, \partial_x \theta_0) \in (L^2(D))^3$, or
- $(\partial_z u_0, \partial_x v_0, \partial_z \theta_0) \in (L^2(D))^3$.

Then, the following are valid:

(a) The norm for the corresponding solution regularity is uniformly bounded for all time $t \geq 0$ and an absorbing set exists for the norm of the corresponding solution regularity.
(b) The weak solution is unique.

Proof:
The claim (a) for solution regularity is an immediate consequence of Theorem 5.1 and Theorem 5.2. Moreover, assuming any one of the above five initial conditions, we have

\[(u_{xz}, v_{xz}, \theta_{xz}) \in \left[ L^2(0, \infty; L^2(D)) \right]^3. \quad (6.1)\]

Notice that

\[\|u_z\|_{L^\infty(L^\infty_x)} = \left\| \left( \int_{-h}^0 |u_z|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^\infty_x} \leq \text{(Minkowski inequality)} \]
\[\leq \left( \int_{-h}^0 \|u_z\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \text{(Agmon’s inequality)} \]
\[\leq C \left( \int_{-h}^0 \|u_z\| L^2_x \|u_{xz}\| L^2_x \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C \|u_z\|^\frac{1}{2} \|u_{xz}\|^\frac{1}{2}. \]

Therefore, for any \( T > 0, \)

\[\int_0^T \|u_z\|^2_{L^\infty(L^2_x)} dt \leq C \int_0^T \|u_z\| \|u_{xz}\| dt \leq C \left( \int_0^T \|u_z\|^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_0^T \|u_{xz}\|^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (6.2)\]

Notice that for any weak solution \((u, v, \theta),\)

\[(u_z, v_z, \theta_z) \in L^2(0, T; L^2(D)).\]

Thus, by (6.1) and (6.2), we have

\[u_z \in L^2(0, T; L^\infty_x(L^2_x)).\]

Similarly,

\[(u_z, v_z, \theta_z) \in \left[ L^2(0, T; L^\infty_x(L^2_x)) \right]^3. \]

Thus, Theorem 6.1 (b) is proved by Theorem 4.1.
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