On weak-strong uniqueness and singular limit for the compressible Primitive Equations
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Abstract

This paper addresses the weak-strong uniqueness property and singular limit for the compressible Primitive Equations (PE). We show that a weak solution coincides with the strong solution emanating from the same initial data. On the other hand, we prove compressible PE will approach the incompressible inviscid PE equations in the regime of low Mach number and large Reynolds number in the case of well-prepared initial data. To the best of the authors’ knowledge, this is the first work to bridge the link between the compressible PE with incompressible inviscid PE.
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1 Introduction

The earth is surrounded and occupied by atmosphere and ocean, which play an important role in human’s life. From mathematical view and numerical perspective, it is extremely complicated to use the full hydrodynamical and thermodynamical equations to describe the motion and fascinating phenomena of atmosphere and ocean. In order to simplify research, scientists introduce the Primitive Equations (PE) model in meteorology and geophysical fluid dynamics, which helps us to predict the long-term weather and detect the global climate changes. In this paper, we study the following Compressible Primitive Equations (CPE):

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\rho + \text{div}_x(\rho u) + \partial_z(p\rho) &= 0, \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial t}(\rho u) + \text{div}_x(\rho uu) + \partial_z(\rho uw) + \nabla_x p(\rho) &= \mu \Delta_x u + \lambda \partial_{zz}^2 u, \\
\partial_z p(\rho) &= 0,
\end{align*}
\]

(1.1)
in \((0, T) \times \Omega\). Here \(\Omega = \{(x, z) | x \in \mathbb{T}^2, 0 < z < 1\}\), \(x\) denotes the horizontal direction and \(z\) denotes the vertical direction. \(\rho = \rho(t, x), \mathbf{u}(t, x, z) \in \mathbb{R}^2\) and \(w(t, x, z) \in \mathbb{R}\) represent the density, the horizontal velocity and vertical velocity respectively. From the hydrostatic balance equation (1.1)_3, it follows that the density \(\rho\) is independent of \(z\). \(\mu > 0, \lambda \geq 0\) are the constant viscosity coefficients. The system is supplemented by the boundary conditions

\[
\begin{align*}
  w|_{z=0} &= w|_{z=1} = 0, & \partial_z u|_{z=0} &= \partial_z u|_{z=1} = 0, \\
\end{align*}
\]

and initial data

\[
\rho u|_{t=0} = m_0(x, z), \rho|_{t=0} = \rho_0(x).
\]

The pressure \(p(\rho)\) denotes the barotropic pressure law where pressure and density are related by the following formula:

\[
p(\rho) = \rho^{\gamma} \quad (\gamma > 1).
\]

The PE model is widely used in meteorology and geophysical fluid dynamics, due to its accurate theory analysis and practical numerical computing. Concerning geophysical fluid dynamics we can refer to work by Chemin, Desjardins, Gallagher and Grenier [13] or Feireisl, Gallagher, Novotný [23]. There is a great number of results about PE, such as [3, 4, 9, 11, 12, 20, 34, 36, 40, 41, 46, 48, 51]. We just mention some of results. Guillén-González, Masmoudi and Rodríguez-Bellido [28] proved the local existence of strong solutions. The celebrated breakthrough result was made by Cao and Titi [8]. They first proved the global well-posedness of PE. After that a lot of scientists were focused on the dynamics and regularity of PE e.g. [29, 30, 32, 33]. Recently in [9, 11, 12], the authors considered the strong solution for PE with vertical eddy diffusivity and only horizontal dissipation. About random perturbations of PE, the local and global strong solution of PE can refer to [15, 16, 25], large deviation principles in [17] and diffusion limit in [31]. On the other hand, regarding to inviscid PE (hydrostatic incompressible Euler equations), the existence and uniqueness is an outstanding open problem. Only a few results are available. Under the convex horizontal velocity assumptions, Brenier [1] proved the existence of smooth solutions in two-dimensions. Then, Masmoudi and Wong [45] utilized the weighted \(H^s\) a priori estimates and obtained the existence, uniqueness and weak-strong uniqueness. Removing the convex horizontal velocity assumptions, they extended Brenier’s result. By virtue of Cauchy-Kowalewski Theorem, the authors [36] constructed a locally, unique and real-analytic solution. Notably, Brenier [2] suggested that the existence problem may be ill-posed in Sobolev spaces. And Cao et al. [10] established the blow up for certain class of smooth solutions in finite time.

However, there is still a lots of phenomena which cannot be described by PE models even the above the fascinating results about PE. In order to show the atmosphere and ocean compressible property, Ersoy et al. [15] consider that the vertical scale of atmosphere is significantly smaller than the horizontal scales and they derive the CPE from the compressible Navier-Stokes equations. To be precise, the CPE system is obtained by replacing the vertical velocity momentum equation with hydrostatic balance equation. Compared with compressible Navier-Stokes equations, the regularity of vertical velocity is less than horizontal velocity in the CPE system. In the absence of sufficient information about vertical velocity case, it inevitably gives rise to difficulty for obtaining existence. It is Lions, Temman and Wang [38, 39] who firstly study the CPE, which is a fundamental result in this field. Under a smart \(P – coordinates\),
they reformulated the system into the classical PE with the incompressible condition. Later on, Gatapov and Kazhikhov [26], Ersoy and Ngon [19] proved the global existence of weak solutions in 2D case. Liu and Titi [42] used the classical methods to proved the local existence of strong solutions in 3D case. Ersoy et al. [18], Tang and Gao [47] showed the stability of weak solutions with the viscosity coefficients depending on density. The stability means that a subsequence of weak solutions will converge to another weak solutions if it satisfy some conditions. Recently, based on the work [4, 5, 6, 37, 49], Wang et al. [50], Liu and Titi [43] used B-D entropy to prove the global existence of weak solutions separately in the case where the viscosity coefficients are depending on the density. Recently, Liu and Titi [44] studied the zero Mach number limit of CPE, proving it converges to incompressible PE, which is a breakthrough result to bridge the link between CPE and PE system.

Our paper is divided into two parts. The first part concerns the weak-strong uniqueness of CPE. In the second part, inspired by [44], we investigate the singular limit of CPE, showing it converges to incompressible inviscid PE system. This is the first attempt to use the relative entropy method in case of asymptotic limit to CPE. The corner-stone analysis of our results is based on the relative energy inequality. Let us mention that the relative entropy inequality-key tool was invented by Dafermos, see [14]. In the case of compressible fluids was introduce by Germain [27] and generalized by Feireisl [21]. Feireisl and his co-authors [22, 24] used the versatile tool to solve various problems. However, compared with the previous classical results, the process of using relative energy inequality in CPE model is different due to the absence of the information on the vertical velocity. Therefore, it is not straightforward to apply the method from Navier-Stokes to CPE. We utilize the special structure of CPE to find the deeper relationship and reveal the important feature of CPE.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the dissipative weak solutions, relative energy and state our first theorem. In Section 3, we prove the weak-strong uniqueness. We recall the target system, state the singular limit theorem and derive the necessary uniform bounds in Section 4. Section 5 is devoted to proving the convergence of well-prepared initial data.

Part I: Weak-Strong uniqueness

In this part, we focus on the weak-strong uniqueness of the CPE system.

2 Preliminaries and main result

First of all, we should point out that a proper notion of weak solution to CPE has not been well understood. Recently, Bresch and Jabin [7] consider different compactness method then Lions or Feireisl which can be applied to anisotropical stress tensor similarly. They can obtain the global existence of weak solutions if $|\mu - \lambda|$ are not too large. Let us state one of the possible definitions here.

2.1 Dissipative weak solutions

**Definition 2.1.** We say that $[\rho, u, w]$ is a dissipative weak solution to the system of (1.1), supplemented with initial data (1.3) and pressure follows (1.4) if

\[
\begin{align*}
 u & \in L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega)), \\
|u|^2 & \in L^\infty(0, T; L^1(\Omega)), \\
\rho & \in L^\infty(0, T; L^\gamma(\Omega) \cap L^1(\Omega)).
\end{align*}
\] (2.1)
the continuity equation

\[
\int_{\Omega} \rho \varphi(x,t) dxdz \bigg|_{t=0}^{t=T} = \int_{0}^{T} \int_{\Omega} \rho \partial_t \varphi + \rho u \varphi + \rho w \partial z \varphi dxdz dt,
\]
holds for all \( \varphi \in C^\infty(\Omega) \);

the momentum equation

\[
\int_{\Omega} \rho u \varphi(x,t) dxdz \bigg|_{t=0}^{t=T} = \int_{0}^{T} \int_{\Omega} \rho \partial_t \varphi + \rho u \varphi + \rho w \partial z \varphi + \rho \partial_z u \varphi dxdz dt
- \int_{0}^{T} \int_{\Omega} \left[ \mu \nabla x u \cdot \nabla x \varphi + \lambda \partial_z u \partial_z \varphi \right] dxdz dt,
\]
holds for all \( \varphi \in C^\infty(\Omega) \);

the energy inequality

\[
\int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{2} \rho |u|^2 + P(\rho) - P'(\rho - \rho) \bigg|_{t=0}^{t=T} + \int_{0}^{T} \int_{\Omega} \left( \mu |\nabla x u|^2 + \lambda |\partial_z u|^2 \right) dxdz dt \leq 0,
\]
holds for a.a \( \tau \in (0, T) \), a arbitrary constant \( \rho \), where \( P(\rho) = \rho \int_{\rho}^{\rho_{\text{max}}} \frac{p(z)}{z^2} dz \).

Moreover, as there is no information about \( w \), so we need the following equation:

\[
pw(x, z, t) = -\text{div}_x (\rho \tilde{u}) + z \text{div}_x (\rho \tilde{U}) \quad \text{in the sense of } H^{-1}(\Omega),
\]
where

\[
\tilde{u}(x, z, t) = \int_{0}^{z} u(x, s, t) ds, \quad \tilde{U}(x, t) = \int_{0}^{1} u(x, z, t) dz.
\]

We should emphasize that (2.5) is the key step to obtain the existence of weak solution in [43, 50].

2.2 Relative entropy inequality

Motivated by [21, 22], for any finite weak solution \((\rho, u, w)\) to the CPE system, we introduce the relative energy functional

\[
\mathcal{E}(\rho, u | r, U) = \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{2} (\rho |u - U|^2 + P(\rho) - P'(r)(\rho - r) - P(r)) dxdz
- \int_{\Omega} \rho u \cdot U dxdz + \int_{\Omega} \rho \frac{|U|^2}{2} - P'(r) dxdz + \int_{\Omega} p(r) dxdz
\]
\[
= \sum_{i=1}^{4} I_i,
\]
where \( r > 0 \), \( U \) are smooth “test” functions, \( r, U \) compactly supported in \( \Omega \).

**Lemma 2.1.** Let \((\rho, u, w)\) be a dissipative weak solution introduced in Definition 2.1. Then \((\rho, u, w)\) satisfy the relative entropy inequality

\[
\mathcal{E}(\rho, u | r, U) \bigg|_{t=0}^{t=T} + \int_{0}^{T} \int_{\Omega} \left( \mu \nabla x u \cdot (\nabla x u - \nabla x \tilde{U}) + \lambda \partial_z u (\partial_z u - \partial_z \tilde{U}) \right) dxdz dt
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
&\leq \int_0^T \int_\Omega \rho(U - u) \partial_t U + \rho u(U - u) \cdot \nabla_x U + \rho w(U - u) \cdot \partial_z U - p(\rho) \text{div}_x U \, dx \, dz \\
&\quad - \int_0^T \int_\Omega P''(r)(\rho \partial_t r + \rho u \nabla_x r) \, dx \, dz + \int_0^T \int_\Omega \partial_x p(r) \, dx \, dz \tag{2.7}
\end{align*}
\]

**Proof:** From the weak formulation and energy inequality (2.2)-(2.4) we deduce

\[
I_1|_{t=0}^T + \int_0^T \int_\Omega \left( \mu |\nabla_x u|^2 + \lambda |\partial_z u|^2 \right) \, dx \, dz \leq 0, \tag{2.8}
\]

\[
I_2|_{t=0}^T = - \int_0^T \int_\Omega \mu \partial_t \cdot (U \nabla_x U + \partial_z U \partial_z U) + p(\rho) \text{div}_x U \, dx \, dz \\
&\quad + \int_0^T \int_\Omega \mu \nabla_x : U \nabla_x U + \lambda \partial_z u \partial_z U \, dx \, dz, \tag{2.9}
\]

\[
I_3|_{t=0}^T = \int_0^T \int_\Omega \rho \partial_t U + \rho u \cdot \nabla_x U + \rho w \partial_z U + \rho P''(r) \, dx \, dz \\
&\quad - \int_0^T \int_\Omega \rho P''(r) \partial_t r + P''(r) \rho u \cdot \nabla_x r \, dx \, dz, \tag{2.10}
\]

\[
I_4|_{t=0}^T = \left[ \int_\Omega p(\rho) \, dx \right]|_{t=0}^T. \tag{2.11}
\]

Summing (2.6)-(2.10) together, we obtain

\[
E(\rho, u| r, U)|_{t=0}^T + \int_0^T \int_\Omega \left( \mu \nabla_x u \cdot (\nabla_x u - \nabla_x U) + \lambda \partial_z u (\partial_z u - \partial_z U) \right) \, dx \, dz \\
\leq \int_0^T \int_\Omega \rho(U - u) \partial_t U + \rho u(U - u) \cdot \nabla_x U + \rho w(U - u) \cdot \partial_z U - p(\rho) \text{div}_x U \, dx \, dz \\
&\quad - \int_0^T \int_\Omega P''(r)(\rho \partial_t r + \rho u \nabla_x r) \, dx \, dz + \int_0^T \int_\Omega \partial_x p(r) \, dx \, dz. \tag{2.12}
\]

**2.3 Main result**

Now, we are ready to state our first result.

**Theorem 2.1.** Let \( \gamma > 0 \), \((\rho, u, w)\) be a dissipative weak solution and \((r, U, W)\) be a classical solution of the problem (1.1) - (1.4) on the time interval \([0, T]\), such that

\[
\rho(0, \cdot) = r(0, \cdot) > 0, \quad \rho u(0, \cdot) = r U(0, \cdot),
\]

then

\[
\rho = r, \quad u = U, \quad \text{in } (0, T) \times \Omega.
\]

**Remark 2.1.** Liu and Titi \[24\] obtained the local existence of strong solutions to CPE, with the following regularity:

\[
\rho, u \in L^\infty(0, T; H^2(\Omega)), \quad \partial_x \rho, u \in L^\infty(0, T; H^1(\Omega)),
\]
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\[ u \in L^\infty(0,T; H^2(\Omega)) \cap L^2(0,T; H^3(\Omega)), \quad \partial_t u \in L^2(0,T; H^1(\Omega)), \]
\[ \rho \frac{1}{r} \partial_t u \in L^\infty(0,T; L^2(\Omega)). \]

It is important to point out that our result is valid with the strong solutions obtained in [42].

Section 3 is devoted to the proof of the above theorem.

3 Weak-strong uniqueness

The proof of Theorem 2.1 depends on the relative energy inequality by considering the strong solution \([r, U, W]\) as test function in the relative energy inequality (2.6).

3.1 Step 1

We write
\[
\int_{\Omega} \rho u(U - u) \cdot \nabla_x U \, dx \, dz = \int_{\Omega} \rho(u - U)(U - u) \cdot \nabla_x U \, dx \, dz + \int_{\Omega} \rho U(U - u) \cdot \nabla_x U \, dx \, dz.
\]

As \([r, U, W]\) is a classical solution, it is easy to obtain that
\[
\int_{\Omega} \rho(u - U)(U - u) \cdot \nabla_x U \, dx \, dz \leq C \mathcal{E}(\rho, u | r, U). \tag{3.1}
\]

Moreover, the momentum equation reads as
\[
(rU)_t + \text{div}(rU \otimes U) + \partial_z(rUW) + \nabla_x p(r) = \mu \Delta_x U + \lambda \partial_{zz} U,
\]

implying that
\[
U_t + U \cdot \nabla_x U + W \partial_z U = -r^{-1} \nabla_x p(r) + \frac{\mu}{r^2} \Delta_x U + \frac{\lambda}{r} \partial_{zz} U.
\]

So we rewrite
\[
\int_{\Omega} \rho(U - u) \cdot \partial_t U + \rho U(U - u) \cdot \nabla_x U + \rho W(U - u) \cdot \partial_z U + \rho(w - W)(U - u) \cdot \partial_z U \, dx \, dz
\]
\[
= \int_{\Omega} \frac{2}{r}(U - u)(-\nabla_x p(r) + \mu \Delta_x U + \lambda \partial_{zz} U) \, dx \, dz + \int_{\Omega} \rho(w - W)(U - u) \cdot \partial_z U \, dx \, dz.
\]

Thus, we obtain that
\[
\mathcal{E}(\rho, u | r, U)|_{t=\tau}^T \geq \mathcal{E}(\rho, u | r, U)|_0^T + \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} (\mu \nabla_x u \cdot (\nabla_x u - \nabla_x U) + \lambda \partial_z u(\partial_z u - \partial_z U)) \, dx \, dz \, dt
\]
\[
\leq C \int_0^T \mathcal{E}(\rho, u | r, U) \, dt - \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} P''(r)(\rho \partial_t r + \rho u \nabla_r x) \, dx \, dz \, dt
\]
\[
+ \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \frac{2}{r}(U - u)(\mu \Delta_x U + \lambda \partial_{zz} U) \, dx \, dz - \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \frac{2}{r}(U - u) \nabla_x p(r) \, dx \, dz
\]
\[
+ \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \rho(w - W)(U - u) \cdot \partial_z U \, dx \, dz \, dt + \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \partial_z p(r) \, dx \, dz \, dt - \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} p(r) \text{div}_x U \, dx \, dz \, dt.
\]
Before estimating, we should recall the following useful inequality from [21]:

\[ P(\rho) - P'(r)(\rho - r) - P(r) \leq \begin{cases} C|\rho - r|^2, & \text{when } \frac{\epsilon}{2} < \rho < r, \\ C(1 + \rho^\gamma), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \]

Moreover, from [21], we learn that

\[
\mathcal{E}(\rho, u| r, U)(t) \in L^\infty(0, T), \quad \int_\Omega \chi_{\rho \geq r} \rho^2 dxdz \leq C \mathcal{E}(\rho, u| r, U)(t),
\]

\[
\int_\Omega \chi_{\rho \leq r} \rho^2 dxdz \leq C \mathcal{E}(\rho, u| r, U)(t), \quad \int_\Omega \chi_{\frac{\epsilon}{2} < r < \rho} \rho^2 dxdz \leq C \mathcal{E}(\rho, u| r, U)(t).
\] (3.2)

The main difficulty is to estimate the complicated nonlinear term \( \int_\Omega \rho(w - W)(U - u) \cdot \partial_z U dxdz \), we rewrite it as

\[
\int_\Omega \rho(w - W)(U - u) \cdot \partial_z U dxdz = \int_\Omega \rho w(U - u) \cdot \partial_z U dxdz - \int_\Omega \rho W(U - u) \cdot \partial_z U dxdz. \] (3.3)

According to [21, 35], we divide the second term on the right side of (3.2) into three parts

\[
\int_\Omega \rho W(U - u) \cdot \partial_z U dxdz
\]

\[= \int_\Omega \chi_{\rho \leq r} \rho W(U - u) \cdot \partial_z U dxdz + \int_\Omega \chi_{\frac{\epsilon}{2} < \rho < r} \rho W(U - u) \cdot \partial_z U dxdz + \int_\Omega \chi_{\rho \geq r} \rho W(U - u) \cdot \partial_z U dxdz \]

\[
\leq \| \chi_{\rho \leq r} \|_{L^2(\Omega)} \| r \|_{L^\infty} \| W \partial_z U \|_{L^2} \| U - u \|_{L^6(\Omega)} + \int_\Omega \chi_{\rho \geq r} \rho^2 W \partial_z U \cdot (U - u) dxdz
\]

\[
+ C \| \chi_{\frac{\epsilon}{2} < \rho < r} \|_{L^2(\Omega)} \| W \partial_z U \|_{L^2} \| U - u \|_{L^6(\Omega)}
\]

\[
\leq C \int_\Omega \chi_{\rho \leq r} \rho^2 dxdz + C \int_\Omega \chi_{\frac{\epsilon}{2} < \rho < r} (\rho - r)^2 dxdz + C \int_\Omega \chi_{\rho \geq r} \rho^2 dxdz + \delta \| U - u \|^2_{L^6(\Omega)}
\]

\[
\leq C \mathcal{E}(\rho, u| r, U) + \delta \| \nabla_x U - \nabla_x u \|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \delta \| \partial_z U - \partial_z u \|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2,
\] (3.4)

where in the last inequality, we have used the following celebrated inequality from Feireisl [20]:

**Lemma 3.1.** Let \( 2 \leq p \leq 6, \) and \( \rho \geq 0 \) such that \( 0 < \int_\Omega \rho dx \leq M \) and \( \int_\Omega \rho^\gamma dx \leq E_0 \) for some \( (\gamma > 1) \) then

\[ \| f \|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C \| \nabla_x f \|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \| \rho^\gamma f \|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}, \]

where \( C \) depends on \( M \) and \( E_0. \)

On the other hand, we take (2.5) into the first term on the right hand of (3.3), and get

\[
\int_\Omega \rho w(U - u) \cdot \partial_z U dxdz
\]

\[= \int_\Omega [ - \text{div}_x(\rho \tilde{u}) + z \text{div}_x(\rho \overline{\nabla}_x U) ] \partial_z U \cdot (U - u) dxdz
\]

\[= \int_\Omega (\rho \tilde{u} - z \rho \overline{\nabla}_x U) \partial_z U \cdot (U - u) dxdz + \int_\Omega (\rho \tilde{u} - z \rho \overline{\nabla}_x U) \partial_z (\nabla_x U - \nabla_x u) dxdz, \] (3.5)

In the following, we will estimate the terms on the right hand side of (3.5). We choose the most complicated terms as examples to estimates. Firstly, we deal with \( \int_\Omega \rho \tilde{u} \partial_z \nabla_x U \cdot (U - u) dxdz, \)

\[
\int_\Omega \rho \tilde{u} \partial_z \nabla_x U \cdot (U - u) dxdz = \int_\Omega (\rho \tilde{u} - \rho \overline{U}) \partial_z \nabla_x U \cdot (U - u) dxdz + \int_\Omega \rho \overline{U} \partial_z \nabla_x U \cdot (U - u) dxdz
\]
\[ J = J_1 + J_2. \]

where \( \tilde{U} = \int_0^t U(x, s, t)ds. \)

Similar to the above analysis, we divide the term \( J_2 \) into three parts

\[
J_2 = \int_\Omega \rho \tilde{U} \partial_x \nabla_x U \cdot (U - u)dx
\]

\[
= \int_\Omega \chi_{\rho \leq \frac{1}{2}}\rho \tilde{U} \partial_x \nabla_x U \cdot (U - u)dx + \int_\Omega \chi_{\rho \leq r} \rho \tilde{U} \partial_x \nabla_x U \cdot (U - u)dx
\]

\[ + \int_\Omega \chi_{\rho > r} \rho \tilde{U} \partial_x \nabla_x U \cdot (U - u)dx \]

\[ \leq \left\| \partial_x \nabla_x U \right\|_{L^\infty} \left( \int_\Omega \rho |\tilde{U} - \tilde{U}|^2 dx + \int_\Omega \rho |u - U|^2 dx \right)
\]

\[ \leq C \int_\Omega \rho \left( \int_0^1 (u(s) - U(s))ds \right)^2 dx + \mathcal{E}(\rho, u|\rho, U)
\]

\[ \leq C \int_\Omega \rho \left( \int_0^1 |u - U|^2 ds \right) dx + \mathcal{E}(\rho, u|\rho, U)
\]

\[ \leq C \int_\Omega \rho |u - U|^2 dx + \mathcal{E}(\rho, u|\rho, U)
\]

\[ \leq C \mathcal{E}(\rho, u|\rho, U). \] (3.6)

Secondly, we will tackle with another complicated nonlinear term \( \int_\Omega \rho \tilde{\rho} \partial_x z \cdot (\nabla_x U - \nabla_x u)dx \).

It is easy to rewrite it as

\[
\int_\Omega \rho \tilde{\rho} \partial_x z \cdot (\nabla_x U - \nabla_x u)dx
\]

\[ = \int_\Omega (\chi_{\rho < \frac{1}{2}}\rho \tilde{\rho} \partial_x z \cdot (\nabla_x U - \nabla_x u)dx + \int_\Omega (\chi_{\rho \geq \frac{1}{2}}\rho \tilde{\rho} \partial_x z \cdot (\nabla_x U - \nabla_x u)dx. \] (3.7)

where

\[
\int_\Omega (\chi_{\rho < \frac{1}{2}}\rho \tilde{\rho} \partial_x z \cdot (\nabla_x U - \nabla_x u)dx
\]

\[ = \int_\Omega (\chi_{\rho < \frac{1}{2}}\rho \tilde{\rho} \partial_x z \cdot (\nabla_x U - \nabla_x u)dx + \int_\Omega (\chi_{\rho \geq \frac{1}{2}}\rho \tilde{\rho} \partial_x z \cdot (\nabla_x U - \nabla_x u)dx
\]

\[ = \int_\Omega (\chi_{\rho < \frac{1}{2}}\rho \tilde{\rho} \partial_x z \cdot (\nabla_x U - \nabla_x u)dx + \int_\Omega (\chi_{\rho \geq \frac{1}{2}}\rho \tilde{\rho} \partial_x z \cdot (\nabla_x U - \nabla_x u)dx
\]

\[ + \int_\Omega (\chi_{\rho \geq \frac{3}{2}}\rho \tilde{\rho} \partial_x z \cdot (\nabla_x U - \nabla_x u)dx
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
&\leq \|\chi_{\rho<\rho}^2\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\|\sqrt{\gamma}(\tilde{u} - \tilde{U})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\partial_\gamma U\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\|\nabla_x U - \nabla_x u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\quad + \|\chi_{\rho<\rho}^2\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\tilde{U}\partial_\gamma U\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\|\nabla_x U - \nabla_x u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\quad + \|\chi_{\rho<\rho}^2\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|r\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\|\tilde{U}\partial_\gamma U\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\|\nabla_x U - \nabla_x u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\leq C\mathcal{E}(\rho, u|r, U)(t) + \delta\|\nabla_x U - \nabla_x u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.
\end{align*}
\]

Then we will deal with the second term on the right side of (3.7):
\[
I_2 = \int_\Omega \chi_{\rho \geq r}\tilde{\rho}\tilde{\partial}_\gamma U \cdot (\nabla_x U - \nabla_x u)dx dz
\]
\[
= \int_\Omega \chi_{\rho \geq r}\rho(\tilde{u} - \tilde{U})\partial_\gamma U \cdot (\nabla_x U - \nabla_x u)dx dz + \int_\Omega \chi_{\rho \geq r}\rho\tilde{u}\partial_\gamma U \cdot (\nabla_x U - \nabla_x u)dx dz
\]
\[
= I_1 + I_2,
\]
where
\[
I_2 \leq \int_\Omega \chi_{\rho \geq r}\rho^2\tilde{\rho}\tilde{\partial}_\gamma U \cdot (\nabla_x U - \nabla_x u)dx dz
\]
\[
\leq \|\chi_{\rho \geq r}\rho^2\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\tilde{U}\partial_\gamma U\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\|\nabla_x U - \nabla_x u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}
\]
\[
\leq C\|\chi_{\rho \geq r}\rho^2\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\partial_\gamma U\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \delta\|\nabla_x U - \nabla_x u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}
\]
\[
\leq C\|\chi_{\rho \geq r}\rho^2\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\chi_{\rho \geq r}(\tilde{u} - \tilde{U})\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \delta\|\nabla_x U - \nabla_x u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}
\]
\[
\leq C\|\chi_{\rho \geq r}\rho^2\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\chi_{\rho \geq r}(\tilde{u} - \tilde{U})\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \delta\|\nabla_x U - \nabla_x u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}
\]
\[
\leq C\|\chi_{\rho \geq r}\rho^2\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\chi_{\rho \geq r}(\tilde{u} - \tilde{U})\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \delta\|\nabla_x U - \nabla_x u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}
\]
\[
+ \delta\|\partial_\gamma \tilde{U} - \partial_\gamma \tilde{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \delta\|\nabla_x U - \nabla_x u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2,
\]
where we have used the interpolation inequality
\[
\|f\|_{L^p} \leq \|f\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|f\|_{H^1}^{1/2}.
\]
According to (3.9) and (3.10), we have
\[
\|\chi_{\rho \geq r}\rho\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \left(\int_{\rho \geq r} \rho^2 dxdz\right)^{1/2} \leq \mathcal{E}(\rho, u|r, U)(t),
\]
and
\[
\|\chi_{\rho \geq r}(\tilde{u} - \tilde{U})\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = \int_{\rho \geq r} |\tilde{u} - \tilde{U}|^2 dxdz = \int_{\rho \geq r} \frac{1}{\rho} |\tilde{u} - \tilde{U}|^2 dxdz \leq \frac{1}{\|r\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}} \mathcal{E}(\rho, u|r, U)(t).
\]

Similar to the estimate of (3.9), we can obtain
\[
\|\nabla_x \tilde{U} - \nabla_x \tilde{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|\nabla_x U - \nabla_x u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\partial_\gamma \tilde{U} - \partial_\gamma \tilde{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|\partial_\gamma U - \partial_\gamma u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.
\]
Combining the above estimates, we get

\[
\int_0^T I_1 dt \leq C \int_0^T h(t) \mathcal{E}(\rho, u| r, U)(t) dt + \delta \int_0^T \| \nabla_x U - \nabla_x u \|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \| \partial_x U - \partial_x u \|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} dt,
\]

where \( h(t) \in L^1(0, T) \).

We can also use the same method to estimate the remaining terms. Therefore, we conclude that

\[
\mathcal{E}(\rho, u| r, U)|_{t=0}^T + \int_0^T \left( \mu \nabla_x u \cdot (\nabla_x u - \nabla_x U) + \lambda \partial_x u(\partial_x u - \partial_x U) \right) dx dt \\
\leq C \int_0^T h(t) \mathcal{E}(\rho, u| r, U) dt + \delta \int_0^T \| \nabla_x U - \nabla_x u \|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \| \partial_x U - \partial_x u \|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} dt \\
+ \int_0^T \int_\Omega \left( \frac{\rho}{r}(U - u)(\mu \Delta_x U + \lambda \partial_x U) dx dt \right) - \int_0^T \int_\Omega \frac{\rho}{r}(U - u) \nabla_x p(r) dx dt \\
- \int_0^T \int_\Omega P''(r)(\rho \partial_x r + \rho u \nabla_x r) dx dt + \int_0^T \int_\Omega \partial_x p(r) dx dt - \int_0^T \int_\Omega p(\rho) \text{div}_x U dx dt.
\]

Then we deduce that

\[
\mathcal{E}(\rho, u| r, U)|_{t=0}^T + \int_0^T \left( \mu \nabla_x u \cdot (\nabla_x u - \nabla_x U) + \lambda (\partial_x u - \partial_x U)^2 \right) dx dt \\
\leq C \int_0^T h(t) \mathcal{E}(\rho, u| r, U) dt + \delta \int_0^T \| \nabla_x U - \nabla_x u \|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \| \partial_x U - \partial_x u \|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} dt \\
+ \int_0^T \int_\Omega \left( \frac{\rho}{r}(U - u)(\mu \Delta_x U + \lambda \partial_x U) dx dt \right) - \int_0^T \int_\Omega \frac{\rho}{r}(U - u) \nabla_x p(r) dx dt \\
- \int_0^T \int_\Omega P''(r)(\rho \partial_x r + \rho u \nabla_x r) dx dt + \int_0^T \int_\Omega \partial_x p(r) dx dt - \int_0^T \int_\Omega p(\rho) \text{div}_x U dx dt.
\]

It is easy to check that

\[
- \int_0^T \int_\Omega \frac{\rho}{r}(U - u) \nabla_x p(r) dx dt + p(\rho) \text{div}_x U + P''(r)(\rho \partial_x r + \rho u \nabla_x r) dx dt + \int_0^T \int_\Omega \partial_x p(r) dx dt \\
= - \int_0^T \int_\Omega (\rho - r)P''(r) \partial_x r + P''(r) \rho u \nabla_x r + \rho P''(r)(U - u) \cdot \nabla_x r + p(\rho) \text{div}_x U dx dt \\
= - \int_0^T \int_\Omega (\rho - r)P''(r) \partial_x r + P''(r) \rho U \cdot \nabla_x r + p(\rho) \text{div}_x U dx dt \\
= - \int_0^T \int_\Omega \rho P''(r)(\partial_x r + U \cdot \nabla_x r) - (\rho - r)W dx dt \\
= \int_0^T \int_\Omega \text{div}_x U (p(\rho) - p'(r)(\rho - r) - \rho) dx dt + \int_0^T \int_\Omega p'(r)(\rho - r) \partial_x W dx dt,
\]

where we have used the fact that \( \partial_x r + \text{div}_x U r + U \cdot \nabla_x r + r \partial_x W = 0 \).

Recalling the boundary condition \( W|_{z=0,1} = 0 \), we have

\[
\int_0^T \int_\Omega p'(r)(\rho - r) \partial_x W dx dt = \int_0^T dt \int_{\Omega^2} (\int_0^1 \partial_z W dz) p'(r)(\rho - r) dx = 0.
\]
Moreover, we can use the method as [35] Section 6.3 to get
\[
\int_\Omega \left( \frac{\mu}{r} - 1 \right) (U - u)(\mu \Delta_x U + \lambda \partial_{zz} U) dxdz \\
\leq C \mathcal{E}(\rho, u|r, U) + \delta \| \nabla_x u - \nabla_x U \|_{L^2}^2 + \delta \| \partial_{zz} u - \partial_{zz} U \|_{L^2}^2.
\] (3.13)

Putting (3.10) – (3.13) together, we have
\[
\mathcal{E}(\rho, u|r, U)(\tau) \leq C \int_0^\tau h(t) \mathcal{E}(\rho, u|r, U)(t) dt.
\] (3.14)

Then applying the Gronwall’s inequality, we finish the proof of Theorem 2.1.

Part II: Singular limit of CPE

This part is devoted to studying the singular limit of the CPE at the case of well-prepared initial data.

4 Preliminaries and main result

From the notable survey Klein [34], singular limits of fluids play an important role in mathematical, physical and meteorology. We consider the following scale CPE system with Coriolis forces:
\[
\begin{cases}
\partial_t \rho_\epsilon + \text{div}_x (\rho_\epsilon u_\epsilon) + \partial_x (\rho_\epsilon w_\epsilon) = 0, \\
\partial_t (\rho_\epsilon u_\epsilon) + \text{div}_x (\rho_\epsilon u_\epsilon \otimes u_\epsilon) + \partial_x (\rho_\epsilon u_\epsilon w_\epsilon) + \rho_\epsilon u_\epsilon \times \omega + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \nabla p(\rho_\epsilon) = \mu \Delta_x u_\epsilon + \lambda \partial_{zz}^2 u_\epsilon, \\
\partial_z p(\rho_\epsilon) = 0,
\end{cases}
\] (4.1)

where \( \epsilon \) represents the Mach number, \( \omega = (0, 0, 1) \) is the rotation axis. The boundary condition and pressure is the same as (1.2) and (1.4). Problem (4.1) is supplemented with initial data
\[
\rho_\epsilon(0, \cdot) = \rho_{0,\epsilon} = \overline{\rho} + \epsilon \rho_{0,1}, \quad u_\epsilon(0, \cdot) = u_{0,\epsilon}.
\] (4.2)

There is a quite broad consensus that the compressible fluid flows becomes incompressible in the low Mach number limit. In the following sections, we assume \( \rho = \rho_\epsilon \) and \( u = u_\epsilon \). In this part, our goal is to study system (4.1) in the singular limit \( \epsilon \to 0 \), meaning the inviscid, incompressible limit. Precisely speaking, we want to show that the weak solutions of CPE converge to the incompressible PE system.

4.1 Target equation

The expected limit problem reads
\[
\begin{align*}
\partial_t V + (V \cdot \nabla_x) V + \partial_x VW + V^\perp + \nabla_x \Pi &= 0, \\
\text{div}_x V + \partial_x W &= 0, \\
\partial_z \Pi &= 0,
\end{align*}
\] (4.3)

where \( V^\perp = (v_2, -v_1) \) and the \( \Pi \) is the pressure. We supplement the system with the initial condition
\[
V|_{t=0} = V_0.
\]
As shown by Kukavica et al. [33], the problem (4.3) possesses a local unique analytic solution \( V \) and \( \Pi \) for some \( T > 0 \) and any initial solution \( V_0 \in C^\infty(\Omega), \int_0^1 \text{div} V_0 dz = 0 \). (4.4)

### 4.2 Relative energy inequality

According to the previous definition, we define the relative entropy functional,

\[
\mathcal{E}(\rho, u| r, V) = \int_\Omega \left[ \frac{1}{2} \rho |u - V|^2 + \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} (P(\rho) - P'(\rho)(\rho - r) - P(r)) \right] dx dz,
\]

where \( r \) and \( V \) are continuously differentiable ”text functions”. The following relation can be deduced

\[
\mathcal{E}(\rho, u| r, V)|_{t=\tau} + \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \left( \mu \nabla u \cdot (\nabla u - \nabla V) + \lambda \partial_z u (\partial_z u - \partial_z V) \right) dx dz dt
\]

\[
\leq \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \rho (V - u) \partial_t V + \rho u (V - u) \cdot \nabla_x V + \rho w (V - u) \partial_z V - \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \rho |\text{div} x V| dx dz dt
\]

\[
- \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega P''(r)(\rho \partial_t r + \rho u \nabla_x r) dx dz dt + \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \partial_t \rho(\rho) dx dz dt
\]

\[
- \int_\Omega (\rho u \times \omega) \cdot (V - u) dx dz dt,
\]

for any \( r, V \in C'(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \Omega), r > 0 \).

### 4.3 Main result

The second result concerns the singular limit.

**Theorem 4.1.** Let \( \gamma > 6 \), and \((\rho, u, w)\) be a weak solution of the scaled system (4.1) on a time interval \((0, T)\) with well-prepared initial data satisfying the following

\[
\|\rho^{(1)}(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} + \|u_0\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \leq D,
\]

\[
\frac{\rho_0 - \overline{\rho}}{\epsilon} \to 0 \text{ in } L^1(\Omega), \quad u_{0,\epsilon} \to V_0 \text{ in } L^2(\Omega).
\]

Let \( V \) be the unique analytic solution of the target problem (4.3). Suppose that \( T < T_{\text{max}} \), where \( T_{\text{max}} \) denotes the maximal life-span of the regular solution to the incompressible PE system (4.3) with initial data \( V_0 \), then

\[
\sup_{\epsilon \in [0, T]} \int_\Omega [\rho |u - V|^2 + \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} (P(\rho) - P'(\overline{\rho})(\rho - \overline{\rho}) - P(\overline{\rho}))]
\]

\[
\leq C[\epsilon + \mu + \lambda + \int_\Omega |u_{0,\epsilon} - V_0|^2],
\]

where the constant \( C \) depends on the initial data \( \rho_0, u_0, V_0 \) and \( T \), and the size \( D \) of the initial data perturbation. The constant \( \overline{\rho} \) can be taken arbitrary.

**Remark 4.1.** Theorem 4.1 yields that \( \rho_\epsilon \) and \( u_\epsilon \) convergence to the solution of target system in the regime of \( \epsilon \to 0 \) and \( \mu, \lambda \to 0 \) for the well-prepared initial data, in other words, the expression of the right hand of (4.8) tends to zero.
4.4 Uniform bounds

Before proving Theorems 4.1, we should derive some available uniform bounds of weak solutions \((\rho, u)\). Here and hereafter, the constant \(C\) denotes a positive constant, independent on \(\epsilon\), that will not have the same value when used in different parts of text. The following uniform bounds are derived from the relative energy inequality \([4.6]\), if we take \(r = \overline{p}\) and \(U = 0\):

\[
\text{ess sup}_{t \in (0, T)} \left\| \frac{\rho - \overline{p}}{\epsilon} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega) + L^\gamma(\Omega)} \leq C,
\]

\[
\text{ess sup}_{t \in (0, T)} \left\| \sqrt{\overline{p}} u \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C, \quad \text{ess sup}_{t \in (0, T)} \left( \sqrt{\overline{p}} |\nabla u|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \sqrt{\lambda} |\partial_\tau u|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right) \leq C. \tag{4.9}
\]

5 Convergence of well-prepared initial data

The proof of convergence is based on the ansatz

\[
r = \overline{p}, \quad U = V, \tag{5.1}
\]

in the relative energy inequality \([4.6]\), where \(V\) is the analytic solution of the target problem \([4.3]\). The corresponding relative energy inequality reads as:

\[
\mathcal{E}(\rho, u; \overline{p}, V)(r) + \int_0^r \int_\Omega \mu (\nabla_x u - \nabla_x V) : (\nabla_x u - \nabla_x V) + \lambda (\partial_\tau u - \partial_\tau V)^2 \ dx \ dz \ dt
\]

\[
\leq \mathcal{E}(\rho, u; \overline{p}, V)(0) + \int_0^r \int_\Omega (\rho V - u) \partial_\tau V + \rho u (V - u) \cdot \nabla_x V + \rho w (V - u) \partial_\tau V \ dx \ dz \ dt
\]

\[
- \frac{1}{\epsilon} \int_0^r \int_\Omega \rho(\rho) \text{div}_x V \ dx \ dz \ dt - \int_0^r \int_\Omega (\rho u \times \omega) \cdot (V - u) \ dx \ dz \ dt
\]

\[
+ \int_0^r \int_\Omega \mu \nabla_x V (\nabla_x u - \nabla_x V) \ dx \ dz \ dt + \int_0^r \int_\Omega \lambda \partial_\tau V (\partial_\tau u - \partial_\tau V) \ dx \ dz \ dt. \tag{5.2}
\]

First we deal with initial data and viscous term. It is easy to computer the initial relative energy inequality:

\[
\mathcal{E}(\rho, u; \overline{p}, V)|_{t=0} \leq C \int_\Omega |u_{0,\epsilon} - V_0|^2 + |\rho_{0,\epsilon} - \overline{p}|^2 \ dx, \tag{5.3}
\]

and viscous term

\[
\mu \int_0^r \int_\Omega \nabla_x V (\nabla_x u - \nabla_x V) \ dx \ dz \ dt \leq \int_0^r \frac{\mu}{2} \left\| \nabla_x u - \nabla_x V \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\mu}{2} \left\| \nabla_x V \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \ dz \ dt,
\]

\[
\lambda \int_0^r \int_\Omega \partial_\tau V (\partial_\tau u - \partial_\tau V) \ dx \ dz \ dt \leq \int_0^r \frac{\lambda}{2} \left\| \nabla_x u - \nabla_x V \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \left\| \partial_\tau V \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \ dz \ dt. \tag{5.4}
\]

Next, we consider the rest terms. Utilizing \((4.3)_1\), we get that

\[
\int_0^r \int_\Omega \rho(V - u) \partial_\tau V + \rho u (V - u) \cdot \nabla_x V + \rho w (V - u) \partial_\tau V \ dx \ dz \ dt
\]

\[
= \int_0^r \int_\Omega \rho(V - u) (\partial_\tau V + (V \cdot \nabla_x) V + W \partial_\tau V) + \rho (u - V) (V - u) \nabla_x V
\]

\[
+ \rho (V - u) (w - W) \partial_\tau V \ dx \ dz \ dt
\]
\[
\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \rho(u - V)(\nabla_\perp + V) + \rho(u - V)(V - u)\nabla_\perp V + \rho(V - u)(v - W)\partial_z V \, dx \, dz \, dt.
\]

(5.5)

It is easy to check that
\[
\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \rho(u - V)(V - u)\nabla_\perp V \, dx \, dz \, dt \leq C \int_0^\tau \mathcal{E}(\rho, u|\rho, V)(t) \, dt.
\]

Next, we estimate the term \( \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \rho V \cdot \nabla_\perp \Pi \, dx \, dz \, dt \), rewriting it as:
\[
\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \rho V \cdot \nabla_\perp \Pi \, dx \, dz \, dt = \epsilon \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \frac{\rho - \overline{\Pi}}{\epsilon} V \cdot \nabla_\perp \Pi \, dx \, dz \, dt + \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega V \cdot \nabla_\perp \Pi \, dx \, dz \, dt,
\]

(5.6)

The second term on the right side of (5.6) is estimated as:
\[
\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega V \nabla_\perp \Pi \, dx \, dz \, dt = - \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \text{div}_x V \Pi \, dx \, dz \, dt = \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \partial_z W \Pi \, dx \, dz \, dt = 0,
\]

where we have used the fact that \( \Pi \) is independent of \( z \). We deduce from the energy inequality that
\[
\int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} (P(\rho) - P(r)(\rho - r) - P(r)) \, dx \, dz \leq C, \quad \text{uniformly as } \epsilon \to 0.
\]

(5.7)

Similar to the previous analysis, it is enough to establish a uniform bound
\[
\int_{\Omega} \frac{\rho - \overline{\Pi}}{\epsilon} \, dx \, dz \leq C.
\]

As we know that the pressure \( \Pi \) is analytic, so that the rightmost integral of (5.6) can be vanished as \( \epsilon \to 0 \).

From the previous definition of dissipative weak solutions, we choose \( \Pi \) as the test function, so that
\[
\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \rho u \nabla_\perp \Pi \, dx \, dz \, dt
\]
\[
= [\int_\Omega \rho \Pi \, dx \, dz]_{t=0}^{t=\tau} - \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \rho \partial_\perp \Pi \, dx \, dz \, dt - \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \rho w \partial_z \Pi \, dx \, dz \, dt
\]
\[
= \epsilon [\int_\Omega \frac{\rho - \overline{\Pi}}{\epsilon} \Pi \, dx \, dz]_{t=0}^{t=\tau} - \epsilon \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \frac{\rho - \overline{\Pi}}{\epsilon} \partial_\perp \Pi \, dx \, dz \, dt \to 0, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \to 0.
\]

Compared with Navier-Stokes equations case, the pressure term is easy to estimate. By virtue of incompressible condition and \((4.3)\), we have that
\[
- \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega p(\rho) \text{div}_x V \, dx \, dz \, dt = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega p(\rho) \partial_z W \, dx \, dz \, dt = 0.
\]

By computing, we find that
\[
\int_{\Omega} \rho(u - V) \cdot V \, dx \, dz + \int_{\Omega} (\rho(u \times \omega) \cdot (V - u)) \, dx \, dz = 0.
\]
Now, utilizing (3.6), we deal the complex nonlinear term
\[ \int_0^T \int_\Omega \rho(V - u)(w - W)\partial_z V dxdzdt \]
\[ = \int_0^T \int_\Omega (V - u)\partial_z V \left(-\text{div}_x(\rho\tilde{u}) + z\text{div}_x(\rho\bar{\pi}) - \rho W\right) dxdzdt. \]

These nonlinear terms are estimated one by one
\[ - \int_\Omega (V - u)\partial_z V \text{div}_x(\rho\tilde{u}) dxdz = \int_\Omega \rho\tilde{u}(\nabla_x V - \nabla_x u) \cdot \partial_z V dxdz + \int_\Omega \rho\tilde{u}(V - u) \cdot \partial_z \nabla_x V dxdz. \]  
(5.8)

From the incompressible condition, it means that \( W = -\int_0^t \text{div}_x V(x,s,t)ds \). We define \( \tilde{V} = \int_0^t V(x,s,t)ds \) and get
\[ \int_\Omega \rho\tilde{u}(\nabla_x V - \nabla_x u) \cdot \partial_z V dxdz \]
\[ = \int_\Omega \chi_{\rho \leq \rho_0}(\nabla_x V - \nabla_x u) \partial_z V dxdz + \int_\Omega \chi_{\rho \geq \rho_0}(\nabla_x V - \nabla_x u) \partial_z V dxdz \]
\[ = \int_\Omega \chi_{\rho \leq \rho_0}(\tilde{u} - \tilde{V})(\nabla_x V - \nabla_x u) \partial_z V dxdz + \int_\Omega \chi_{\rho \leq \rho_0}(\tilde{V})(\nabla_x V - \nabla_x u) \partial_z V dxdz \]
\[ + \int_\Omega \chi_{\rho \geq \rho_0}(\nabla_x V - \nabla_x u) \partial_z V dxdz \]  
(5.9)

The foremost two terms on the right side of (5.9) can be handed as (3.7)
\[ \int_\Omega \chi_{\rho \leq \rho_0}(\tilde{u} - \tilde{V})(\nabla_x V - \nabla_x u) \partial_z V dxdz \]
\[ + \int_\Omega \chi_{\rho \leq \rho_0}(\tilde{V})(\nabla_x V - \nabla_x u) \partial_z V dxdz \]
\[ \leq \delta \|\nabla_x V - \nabla_x u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + C\mathcal{E}(\rho, u, \bar{\pi}, V)(t). \]  
(5.10)

On the other hand, following (3.8), we have
\[ \int_0^T \int_\Omega \chi_{\rho \geq \rho_0}(\nabla_x V - \nabla_x u) \partial_z V dxdz \]
\[ = \int_0^T \int \chi_{\rho \geq \rho_0}(\tilde{u} - \tilde{V})(\nabla_x V - \nabla_x u) \partial_z V dxdz + \int \chi_{\rho \geq \rho_0}(\tilde{V})(\nabla_x V - \nabla_x u) \partial_z V dxdz \]
\[ \leq C \int_0^T h(t)\mathcal{E}(\rho, u, r, U)(t)dt + \delta \int_0^T \|\nabla_x V - \nabla_x u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\partial_x V - \partial_x u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 dt. \]  
(5.11)

Similarly, the second nonlinear term on the right side of (3.8) is divided into two parts:
\[ \int_\Omega \rho\tilde{u}(V - u) \cdot \partial_z \nabla_x V dxdz = \int_\Omega \rho(\tilde{u} - \tilde{V})(V - u) \partial_z \nabla_x V dxdz + \int_\Omega \rho\tilde{V}(V - u) \partial_z \nabla_x V dxdz. \]

Utilizing the similar estimates in (3.6), we have
\[ \int_\Omega \rho(\tilde{u} - \tilde{V})(V - u) \partial_z \nabla_x V dxdz \leq C\mathcal{E}(\rho, u, \bar{\pi}, V)(t). \]  
(5.12)
Moreover, similar to (5.4), we get
\[
\int_{\Omega} \rho \tilde{V}(V - u) \partial_z \nabla_x V dx dz = \int_{\Omega} \chi_{\rho \leq \tilde{\rho}} \rho \tilde{V}(V - u) \partial_z \nabla_x V dx dz + \int_{\Omega} \chi_{\tilde{\rho} < \rho < \rho \tilde{\rho}} \rho \tilde{V}(V - u) \partial_z \nabla_x V dx dz + \int_{\Omega} \chi_{\rho \tilde{\rho} \geq \rho} \rho \tilde{V}(V - u) \partial_z \nabla_x V dx dz \leq \delta \| \nabla_x V - \nabla_x u \|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \delta \| \partial_z V - \partial_z u \|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + CE(\rho, u | \tilde{\rho}, V)(t),
\]
(5.13)
and
\[
\int_{\Omega} (V - u) \partial_z V \text{div}_x (\rho \tilde{\rho}) dx dz \leq \delta \| \nabla_x V - \nabla_x u \|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \delta \| \partial_z V - \partial_z u \|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + CE(\rho, u | \tilde{\rho}, V)(t).
\]
(5.14)

The last term
\[
\int_{\Omega} \rho (V - u) \partial_z V W dx dz = \int_{\Omega} \chi_{\rho \leq \tilde{\rho}} \rho (V - u) \partial_z V W dx dz + \int_{\Omega} \chi_{\tilde{\rho} < \rho < \rho \tilde{\rho}} \rho (V - u) \partial_z V W dx dz + \int_{\Omega} \chi_{\rho \tilde{\rho} \geq \rho} \rho (V - u) \partial_z V W dx dz \leq \delta \| \nabla_x V - \nabla_x u \|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \delta \| \partial_z V - \partial_z u \|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + CE(\rho, u | \tilde{\rho}, V)(t).
\]

Combining the above estimates together and using Gronwall inequality, we prove Theorem 4.1.
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