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Abstract. We prove a stability result of constant equilibra for the three dimensional Navier-
Stokes-Poisson system uniform in the inviscid limit. We allow the initial density to be close to
a constant and the potential part of the initial velocity to be small independently of the rescaled
viscosity parameter \( \varepsilon \) while the incompressible part of the initial velocity is assumed to be small
compared to \( \varepsilon \). We then get a unique global smooth solution. We also prove a uniform in \( \varepsilon \) time
decay rate for these solutions. Our approach allows to combine the parabolic energy estimates that
are efficient for the viscous equation at \( \varepsilon \) fixed and the dispersive techniques (dispersive estimates
and normal form transformation) that are useful for the inviscid irrotational system.

1. Introduction

The Navier-Stokes-Poisson system is a hydrodynamical model of plasma which describes the
dynamics of electrons and ions that interact with its self-consistent electric field. If we neglect
the motion of ions, then the dynamics of electrons can be described by the following electron Navier-
Stokes-Poisson system (ENSP)

\[
\begin{cases}
\partial_t \rho^\varepsilon + \text{div} (\rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon) = 0, \\
\partial_t (\rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon) + \text{div} (\rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon) - \varepsilon \Delta \rho^\varepsilon + \nabla p(\rho^\varepsilon) - \rho^\varepsilon \nabla \phi^\varepsilon = 0, \\
\Delta \phi^\varepsilon = \rho^\varepsilon - 1, \\
u(t=0) = u_0^\varepsilon, \rho |_{t=0} = \rho_0^\varepsilon.
\end{cases}
\] (1.1)

We shall always consider in this paper that the spatial domain is the whole space, \( x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \). Here the
unknowns \( \rho^\varepsilon(t,x) \in \mathbb{R}_+, \ u^\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^3, \ \nabla \phi^\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^3 \) are the electron density, the electron velocity and the
self-consistent electric field respectively. The thermal pressure of electron \( p(\rho^\varepsilon) \) is usually assumed
to follow a polytropic \( \gamma \)-law: \( p(\rho^\varepsilon) = C(\rho^\varepsilon)^\gamma \), \( \gamma > 1 \) while the viscous term is under the form

\[
\mathcal{L}u^\varepsilon = \mu \Delta u^\varepsilon + (\mu + \lambda) \nabla \text{div} u^\varepsilon
\]

where the Lamé coefficients \( \mu, \lambda \) are supposed to be constants which satisfy the condition:

\[
\mu > 0 \quad 2\mu + \lambda > 0
\]

Note that we consider a scaled version of the system with the coefficient \( \varepsilon \) which is the inverse of
a Reynolds number and which will be assumed small in this paper in front of the diffusion terms.
For the simplicity of the presentation, we shall assume in this paper that \( \mu = 1, \lambda = -1 \) and that
\( p(\rho^\varepsilon) = \frac{(\rho^\varepsilon)^2}{2} \). Nevertheless, there is no special cancellation arising from this choice (the easiest
case for the analysis in this paper would be the choice \( \mu(\rho) = \rho, \lambda = -\mu \), since in this case there
are curl free solutions of (1.1)). The results of this paper can thus be easily extended to general
pressure and to general density dependent \( \mu, \lambda \) as long as \( \mu(1) > 0, 2\mu(1) + \lambda(1) > 0 \). We shall also
handle in this paper a simplified system for the dynamics of ions, the electrons being considered in
thermodynamical equilibrium which reads
\begin{align}
\begin{cases}
\partial_t \rho_+^\varepsilon + \text{div} \left( \rho_+^\varepsilon u_+^\varepsilon \right) = 0, \\
\partial_t (\rho_+^\varepsilon u_+^\varepsilon) + \text{div} \left( \rho_+^\varepsilon u_+^\varepsilon - \varepsilon \mathcal{L} u_+^\varepsilon + \nabla p(\rho_+^\varepsilon) - \rho_+^\varepsilon \nabla \phi_+^\varepsilon \right) = 0, \\
\Delta \phi_+^\varepsilon - \phi_+^\varepsilon = \rho_+^\varepsilon, \\
u_+|_{t=0} = u_+^{\varepsilon 0}, \rho_+|_{t=0} = \rho_+^{\varepsilon 0}.
\end{cases}
\end{align}

(1.2)

There is a large body of literature dealing with the stability under small and smooth enough perturbations of the constant equilibrium (say \((\rho^0, u^0) = (1, 0)\)) of (ENSP) when \(\varepsilon = 1\). Here stability means global existence and decay for small perturbations. We refer for example to [20] where global existence in \(H^l\) for \(l \geq 4\) is proven under the assumption that the initial perturbation is small in \(H^l\) and \(L^1\). An explicit time decay rate for the perturbation is obtained by a careful analysis of the Green function of the linearized system (we also refer to [14]). More recently, in [27] global existence in \(H^N (N \geq 3)\) of (ENSP) is obtained by using only energy estimates under the assumption that the initial perturbation belongs to \(H^N\) and is small in \(H^3\). Moreover, as in works on the compressible Navier-Stokes system [11], by assuming that the initial data is in a negative Sobolev space \(\dot H^{-s} (0 < s < \frac{3}{2})\), explicit decay rates can be obtained by using interpolation inequalities and energy estimates. These results use heavily the fact that the equation for the velocity is a parabolic equation and that the coupling between the two evolution equations of (ENSP) yields decay of the density. In [20], global existence in dimension \(d\) is obtained in hybrid Besov spaces when the initial perturbation is close to equilibrium in a \(L^2\) critical norm by using energy estimates and by considering low and high frequencies differently. This result was then generalized to a \(L^p\) critical frameworks [28, 3].

All these works deal with an unscaled system, that is to say (ENSP) with \(\varepsilon = 1\). We can easily check that for the \(\varepsilon\) dependent system, these works give global smooth solutions if the initial perturbation is small enough compared to \(\varepsilon\) and that the obtained decay rates hold in terms of the slow time variable \(\varepsilon t\) (for example [27] would give that in \(L^\infty\), \((\rho^\varepsilon - 1)\) is bounded by \(\varepsilon (1 + \varepsilon t)^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}\). Indeed, global existence is obtained by bootstrap arguments and a priori estimates. There are roughly two ways to get the a priori estimates. One way is, as in [20, 27], to use energy estimates and to get dissipation for \(u^\varepsilon\) by using the diffusion term \(\varepsilon \Delta u^\varepsilon\) and dissipation for \(\rho^\varepsilon - 1\) by using a "cross energy estimate". The nonlinear terms can be absorbed if some quantity is small compared to \(\varepsilon\). The other way is, as in [13, 28, 3] when considering global existence in critical Besov spaces is to use the maximal smoothing effect of the heat kernel \(e^{t \Delta}\), which gives for the scaled heat equation
\[\|e^{t \Delta} f\|_{L^1_\varepsilon(B^{s+1}_{p,1})} \lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \|f\|_{L^1_\varepsilon(B^{s}_{p,1})}.\]

Therefore, to control the nonlinear terms, this also leads to the assumption that the size of the initial perturbation has to be small proportional to \(\varepsilon\).

Nevertheless, when \(\varepsilon = 0\), the system (1.1) reduces to the so-called electron Euler-Poisson (EEP) system. For the (EEP) system, the global existence of smooth solutions close to the constant equilibrium \((1, 0)\) was first obtained by Guo [3] under neutral, irrotational, small perturbation to the reference equilibrium \((\rho^0, u^0) = (1, 0)\). The neutral assumption \((\int (\rho^0) - 1) dx = 0\) was then removed in [5]. The important property which was used in these works is that the (EEP) system has better dispersive properties than the Euler equations for compressible fluids due to the presence of the electric field. For example, when restricted to irrotational solutions, the linearized (EEP) system can be rewritten as a Klein-Gordon equation which verifies in space dimension \(d\) the decay estimate
\[\|e^{i t \nabla} f\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{k}{2}} \|f\|_{W^{d,1}}\]
which is better than the one of the wave equation. Nevertheless, in dimension 3, the only use of energy estimates and of the above dispersive decay (or its \(L^p \to L^p\) counterpart) is not enough to
get global smooth solutions in the presence of quadratic nonlinearities. Some additional ingredient is thus needed namely either energy estimates using the vector fields methods or the normal form method. For the Euler-Poisson system the normal form method of Shatah \[24\] or more generally, the ‘space-time resonances’ philosophy can be used to control the nonlinear terms. We refer to \[24\] and \[4, 5\] for more information about normal form method and the ‘space-time resonance’ approach. This type of approach was recently successfully used to handle the (EEP) system in dimension two \[19, 15\] and one \[9\].

Since in concrete physical flows the Reynolds number is usually very high (thus \(\varepsilon\) very small), it is natural to ask for stability results that hold uniformly with respect to \(\varepsilon\) for (ENSP). Though the methods used in the two lines of results that we just presented are completely different, it is rather natural to expect to get global smooth solutions for perturbations of the constant equilibrium \((1,0)\) with a smallness assumption on the perturbation that is independent of \(\varepsilon\) except for the curl part of the velocity (remember that for \(\varepsilon = 0\) we have global smooth solutions only for irrotational data). This is the result that we shall obtain in this paper. A first attempt to get such a result would be to write the solution of (ENSP) as the global solution of (EEP) plus a remainder and to try to control the remainder. Since the source term in the equation for the perturbation is of order \(\varepsilon\), one could hope to use the parabolic methods described above to control the remainder. Nevertheless, such a naive approach cannot work. Indeed, even in dimension 3, the source term in the equation for the remainder has a non integrable decay in the energy norm so that there is no hope to be able to control the remainder globally in time. We thus really need to develop a method that allows to use the type of ideas introduced in the study of dispersive PDE when there is a small dissipative term in addition. This is the main aim of this paper. As far as we know, there are few works addressing this type of question, in \[2\] it is the extension of the vector field method that is developed. The situation that we are dealing with here for (ENSP) occurs for many other systems of mathematical physics. Indeed, there are many other systems for which we have for the viscous version of the physical model, global existence for small, viscosity dependent data and for the inviscid version (which is often a dispersive perturbation of a compressible type Euler equation) global existence for small irrotational data. We can think about MHD, water-waves...We thus hope that the approach developed in this paper can be useful to handle other systems. As an illustration, we shall also handle the Navier-Stokes-Poisson system for ions, the results are described in the end of the introduction.

We shall denote by \(\mathcal{P}\) the Leray projector on divergence free vector fields so that \(\mathcal{P}^\perp = \text{Id} - \mathcal{P} = \nabla\Delta^{-1}\text{div}\). The following is our main result for the (ENSP) system:

**Theorem 1.1.** There exists \(\delta_0 > 0\) such that for every family of initial data that satisfy for every \(\varepsilon \in (0,1]\) the estimates:

\[
\|\rho_0^\varepsilon - 1, \nabla \phi_0^\varepsilon, \mathcal{P}^\perp u_0^\varepsilon\|_{W^{\sigma,3,1}} + \|\rho_0^\varepsilon - 1, \nabla \phi_0^\varepsilon, \mathcal{P}^\perp u_0^\varepsilon\|_{H^N} \leq \delta_0
\]

\[
\|\mathcal{P} u_0^\varepsilon\|_{H^3} \leq \delta_0 \varepsilon
\]

with \(\sigma \geq 5\) and \(N \geq \sigma + 7\), then, for every \(\varepsilon \in (0,1]\), there exists a unique global solution of the (ENSP) system \((1.1)\) in \(C([0, +\infty), H^3)\). If in addition, we assume that \(\sup_{\varepsilon \in (0,1]} \|\mathcal{P} u_0^\varepsilon\|_{H^{-s}} < +\infty\) for some \(0 < s < \frac{1}{2}\), then we have the following time decay estimates that are uniform in \(\varepsilon\). There exists \(C > 0\) such that for every \(\varepsilon \in (0,1]\), we have

\[
\|\rho_0^\varepsilon - 1, \nabla \phi_0^\varepsilon, u_0^\varepsilon\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \leq C\left( \min\{\varepsilon, (1 + t)^{-\frac{\sigma}{2 + \sigma}}\} + \varepsilon (1 + t)^{-\frac{1}{3}} + (1 + t)^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sigma}{2 + \sigma}} \right), \quad \forall t \geq 0.
\]

**Remark 1.2.** If in addition, \(\mathcal{P} u_0^\varepsilon\) is in \(H^M\) (say \(\sup_{\varepsilon \in (0,1]} \|\mathcal{P} u_0^\varepsilon\|_{H^M} < +\infty\) and \(\sigma \geq M + 2 > 5\), then the solution constructed in Theorem \(1.1\) also belongs to \(C([0, \infty), H^M)\).
Note that the assumption that we make on the size of the "curl" part of the initial data, that is to say the assumption on $P'u^0_\varepsilon$, seems to be the natural one. Indeed, even if we assume that $P'u^0_\varepsilon = 0$, this property is not propagated by the system (ENSP), the convection diffusion equation for the rotational part of the velocity is forced by a source term of size $\varepsilon$ so that a curl part of size $\varepsilon$ is instantaneously created.

The main difficulty in order to get Theorem 1.1 lies in the interaction between the dynamics of the potential part and the incompressible part of the solution. For the potential part we could expect a $L^\infty$ decay given by the linear inviscid dispersive estimates of the order $(1 + t)^{-\frac{3}{2}}$. For the incompressible part, we expect that this component will remain of order $\varepsilon$ in $H^s$ but its decay is driven by the heat equation with diffusivity $\varepsilon$, in terms of uniform in $\varepsilon$ estimate this can only yield at best a rather slow decay rate of order $(1 + t)^{-1}$ which could be difficult to handle especially in the control of the interaction with the potential part. Our strategy to prove Theorem 1.1 is to split the system into two viscous systems, with initial data $(\rho^\varepsilon_0 - 1, \nabla \phi^\varepsilon_0, P'u^\varepsilon_0)$ and $(0, 0, P'u^\varepsilon_0)$ respectively. The first one will have global solutions under $\varepsilon$-independent assumptions on the initial data $(\rho^\varepsilon_0 - 1, \nabla \phi^\varepsilon_0, P'u^\varepsilon_0)$ and the solutions will enjoy the same decay estimates as the (EEP) system. The other is just the perturbation of the original system (1.1) by the solution to the former one, the important points are that for this system the initial data and the source term are small compared to $\varepsilon$ and that the source term has integrable decay in $L^2$. We can thus use energy estimates and the good decay properties of the solutions of the former one to prove global existence and decay.

More precisely, we write the solution $(\rho^\varepsilon, \nabla \phi^\varepsilon, u^\varepsilon)$ of (ENSP) as 

$$(\rho^\varepsilon, \nabla \phi^\varepsilon, u^\varepsilon) = (\rho, \nabla \phi, u) + (n, \nabla \psi, v),$$

where $(\rho, \nabla \phi, u)$ and $(n, \nabla \psi, v)$ are the solutions of the following systems:

\[
\begin{aligned}
\partial_t \rho + \text{div} (\rho u) &= 0, \\
\partial_t u + u \cdot \nabla u - \varepsilon \Delta u + \nabla \rho - \nabla \phi &= 0, \\
\Delta \phi &= \rho - 1, \\
u|_{t=0} &= P'u^\varepsilon_0, \rho|_{t=0} = \rho^\varepsilon_0.
\end{aligned}
\]

\[
\begin{aligned}
\partial_t n + \text{div} (\rho v + nu + nv) &= 0, \\
\partial_t v + u \cdot \nabla v + v \cdot (\nabla u + \nabla v) - \varepsilon \Delta v + \nabla n - \nabla \psi &= \varepsilon \left(1 - \frac{1}{\rho + n}ight) (\Delta v + \Delta u), \\
\Delta \psi &= n, \\
v|_{t=0} &= P'u^\varepsilon_0, n|_{t=0} = 0.
\end{aligned}
\]

Note that for these two systems we skip the $\varepsilon$ dependence of the solutions in our notation.

We can set $\varrho = \rho - 1$, to change system (1.3) into:

\[
\begin{aligned}
\partial_t \varrho + \text{div} (\varrho u) &= -\text{div} (\rho u), \\
\partial_t u + u \cdot \nabla u - \varepsilon \Delta u + \nabla \varrho - \nabla \phi &= 0, \\
\Delta \phi &= \varrho, \\
u|_{t=0} &= P'u^\varepsilon_0, \varrho|_{t=0} = \varrho_0 = \rho^\varepsilon_0 - 1.
\end{aligned}
\]

Note that the initial datum for the last system is such that $\text{curl}(P'u^\varepsilon_0) = 0$, and this irrotational property will be propagated which means that a smooth solution of this system will remain irrotational. This system is thus a really good viscous approximation of the Euler-Poisson system. As we shall see below, the linear part of this system has the same decay properties for low frequencies as the (EEP) system, that is for localized initial data, the $L^p$ norm of $(\varrho, \nabla \phi, u)$ decay like $(1 + t)^{-\frac{3}{2}(1 - \frac{p}{2})}$ uniformly for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$.

The following is the main result for the system (1.5).
Theorem 1.3. For any $6 < p < +\infty$, there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that for any family of initial data satisfying

$$\sup_{\varepsilon \in (0,1]} \left( \| (\varrho_0, \nabla \varphi_0, \mathcal{P}^{-1} u_0^\varepsilon) \|_{W^{\sigma,3,1}} + \| (\varrho_0, \nabla \varphi_0, \mathcal{P}^{-1} u_0^\varepsilon) \|_{H^N} \right) \leq \delta_0$$

with $\sigma \geq 3, N \geq \sigma + 7$, then for every $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$, there exist a unique solution for system (1.5) in $C([0, \infty), H^N)$. Moreover, we have the following time decay estimates that are uniform for $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$. There exists a constant $C$ such that for every $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$, we have

$$\| (\varrho, \nabla \varphi, u)(t) \|_{W^{\sigma,p}} \leq C \delta_0 (1 + t)^{-\frac{\sigma}{2}(1-\frac{2}{p})}, \quad \forall t \geq 0. \quad (1.6)$$

Let us now explain the main ideas for the proof. Using the ‘curl-free’ condition, we consider the new unknown $V = (h, c) = (\frac{\nabla \varphi}{|\nabla \varphi|}, u)$. The linearized system for $V$ is

$$\partial_t V + AV = 0, \quad A = \left( \begin{array}{cc} 0 & \langle \nabla \rangle \\ -\langle \nabla \rangle & -2\varepsilon \Delta \end{array} \right).$$

The eigenvalues for this system are

$$\lambda_{\pm} = -\varepsilon|\xi|^2 \pm i\sqrt{1 + |\xi|^2 - \varepsilon^2|\xi|^4} \triangleq -\varepsilon|\xi|^2 \pm ib(\xi)$$

A toy model to present the ideas is thus

$$\begin{cases} \\
\partial_t \beta - \lambda_- (D) \beta = \beta^2 \\
\beta|_{t=0} = \beta_0
\end{cases}$$

The key observations are, on the one hand, when we focus on low frequencies, (say $\varepsilon|\xi|^2 \leq 2\kappa_0$ with $\kappa_0$ to be chosen small but independent of $\varepsilon$) then $b(\xi)$ is very close to $\langle \xi \rangle$, this indicates that the imaginary part $e^{itb(D)}$ should give us an $L^p$ decay estimate ($p > 2$) which is uniform for $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$.

On the other hand, when we deal with high frequencies (in the sense that $\varepsilon|\xi|^2 \geq \kappa_0$), direct computations show that there exists a positive constant $c = c(\kappa_0)$ such that $\text{Re} (\lambda_{\pm}) \leq -c(\kappa_0)$ for any $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$, so we can expect that the solution has good decay even in $L^2$ norm.

Define $\beta = P^L \beta + P^H \beta = \beta^L + \beta^H$ where $P^L, P^H$ are the Fourier multipliers that project on low and high frequencies in the above sense respectively. We then define the norm

$$\| \beta \|_{X_T} = \sup_{t \in [0,T]} \| \beta \|_{H^{10}} + \langle t \rangle^{\frac{5}{2}} \| \beta^H \|_{H^9} + \langle t \rangle^{\frac{5}{2}(1-\frac{2}{p})} \| \beta^L \|_{W^{3,p}}. \quad (1.7)$$

The first Sobolev norm can be estimated by standard energy estimates. The other two terms involve time decay estimates. The high frequencies piece is easier because we have uniform (with respect to $\varepsilon$) upper bounds for $\text{Re} (\lambda_{\pm})$ and thus an $L^2$ to $L^2$ type estimate with exponential decay uniformly in $\varepsilon$ for the semi-group. The low frequency piece is more difficult to get. We first check that $e^{itb(D)}$ enjoys the same dispersive estimates as $e^{it\langle \nabla \rangle}$ uniformly for $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$. As for the (EEP) systems the linear dispersive estimates are not enough to control the quadratic nonlinearity, we thus have to use a normal form to close the low frequencies decay estimate. In this step, we have to carefully track the contribution of the viscous term that creates new error terms. More precisely, let us write $\alpha = e^{-itb(D)}P^L \beta$ then, $\alpha$ satisfies the equation

$$\partial_t \alpha - \varepsilon \Delta \alpha = e^{-itb(D)}(\beta^2)^L.$$

By Duhamel’s formula, we have:

$$\beta = e^{itb(D)} \alpha = e^{itb(D)} (e^{it\Delta} \beta_0^L + \int_0^t e^{i(t-s)\Delta} e^{-isb(D)} \chi^L(D)((\beta^L)^2 + \beta^H + \beta^H \beta^L)(s) ds).$$
We focus only on the first term in the above integral, the decay for the other terms is easy to obtain because of the $L^2$ decay of the high frequency part. We can see the first term as
\[ e^{itb(D)} \mathcal{F}^{-1} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} e^{i(t-s)|\xi|^2} e^{i\varepsilon \varphi} \tilde{\alpha}(s, \xi - \eta) \tilde{\alpha}(s, \eta) d\eta ds \]  
(1.8)
where $\varphi = -b(\xi) + b(\eta) + b(\xi - \eta) > 0$ for $\kappa_0$ small enough. Following the ‘space-time resonance’ method, by using the identity $e^{it\varphi} = \frac{1}{\varphi} \partial_\xi e^{it\varphi}$, we can integrate by parts in time so that (1.8) becomes:
\[ i \int_0^t e^{it(s-t)\varepsilon b(D)} e^{i(t-s)\Delta} (\varepsilon \Delta T_{1\varepsilon} (\beta L, \beta L) + T_{1\varepsilon} (\varepsilon \Delta \beta L + (\beta^2) L, \beta L)) ds \]
plus boundary terms and symmetric term which are similar to handle (we refer to Section 2 for the definition of the bilinear operator $T_{1\varepsilon}$). The last term is cubic and thus can be estimated as in the study of the (EEP) system (we shall check that for $\kappa_0$ sufficiently small the operator $T_{1\varepsilon}$ has the same continuity properties as in the inviscid case). The first two terms are still quadratic but are $\varepsilon$ small, we can thus get additional decay by using the decay provided by the heat equation: for example, we expect that the $L^2$ norm of $\varepsilon \Delta \beta L$ has decay like $(1 + t)^{-1}$. This is enough to get Theorem 1.3 for $6 < p \leq 12$. To propagate the estimate for larger $p$’s which involves a faster rate of decay, the previous $(1 + t)^{-1}$ gain is not enough and we shall therefore perform another step of integration by parts in time in order to close the estimate.

Let us now consider the system (1.4). We shall see the system (1.4) as a perturbation of (1.1) by $(\rho, \nabla \phi, u)$. Thanks to the good decay estimates for $(\rho, \nabla \phi, u)$ (in the sense that the time decay of the $L^\infty$ norm is integrable in time), we can still get global existence by energy estimates for this system.

We will prove the following result.

**Theorem 1.4.** We fix the number $p \geq 24$ in Theorem 1.3. Consider $(\varrho, u, \nabla \phi)$ and $\delta_0$ given by Theorem 1.3. If $\delta_0$ is small enough and $\|\mathcal{P} u_0^\delta\|_{H^3} \leq \delta_0 \varepsilon$, then the system (1.4) has a solution in $C([0, +\infty), H^3)$ and
\[
\sup_{0 \leq t < +\infty} \|(n, \nabla \psi, v)(t)\|_{H^3} \leq 2\delta_0 \varepsilon.
\]
Moreover, if we assume in addition that for some $s$, $0 < s < \frac{1}{2}$, $\sup_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)} \|\mathcal{P} u_0^\delta\|_{H^{s-\varepsilon}} < +\infty$, then we have the following uniform in $\varepsilon$ time decay estimates for $(n, \nabla \psi, v)$. There exists $C > 0$ which does not depend on $\varepsilon$, such that
\[
\|\nabla^l(n, \nabla \psi, v)(t)\|_{H^{3-l}} \leq C \left( \min\{\varepsilon, (1 + t)^{-\frac{l}{2s+l}}\} + \varepsilon (1 + t)^{-\frac{s}{2}} \right)
\]
where $l = 0, 1, 2$.

**Remark 1.5.** If in addition, $\mathcal{P} u_0^\delta$ is in $H^M$, where $3 \leq M \leq \sigma - 2$, then the solution to (1.4) constructed above belongs to $C([0, +\infty), H^M)$. Besides, as we do not assume that $\|\mathcal{P} u_0^\delta\|_{H^M}$ is small, we have some time decay estimate in terms of slow variable $\varepsilon t$:
\[
\|\nabla^k(n, \nabla \psi, v)(t)\|_{H^{M-k}} \leq C (1 + \varepsilon t)^{-\frac{k}{2s+k}} + \varepsilon (1 + t)^{-\frac{s}{2}}
\]
where $k = 0, 1, 2 \cdots M - 1$.

Inspired by 11 27, we use merely energy estimates to prove global existence. By using a modified energy functional $\tilde{E}_M$ that roughly controls the same Sobolev norms as the usual energy functional
\[
\tilde{E}_M(n, v, \nabla \psi) = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq M} \frac{1}{2} \int \rho |\partial^\alpha v|^2 + |\partial^\alpha u|^2 + |\partial^\alpha \nabla \psi|^2 dx,
\]
for \( M \geq 3 \), we shall get that if \( E_3 \leq \delta \varepsilon^2 \), and \( \delta \) small enough, we have a positive constant \( C \) such that the inequality
\[
\partial_t \hat{E}_M + C \varepsilon (n\|H^M + \|
abla u\|^2_{H^M}) \lesssim \delta^3 \varepsilon^2 (1 + t)^{-\frac{2}{3}}
\]
holds. Note that the interest of this modified functional is that it detects also damping of the \( n \) component. The global existence then follows from continuation arguments.

For the decay estimate, we first prove that the solution remains bounded in \( \dot{H}^{-s} \) if the initial data is in \( \dot{H}^{-s} \). Then by using an interpolation inequality and (11), we can obtain the energy inequality: \( \partial_t \hat{E}_M + C \varepsilon (\hat{E}_M)^{1 + \frac{2}{3}} \lesssim \varepsilon^2 (1 + t)^{-\frac{2}{3}} \) from which we get the desired decay estimate.

Once we have proven Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4, Theorem 1.1 is an easy consequence of them.

In the last part of the paper, we shall explain how we can also handle the Navier-Stokes-Poisson system for the ions dynamics (INSP) introduced in (1.2) by using the same approach. Note that we have used the so-called linearized approximation since in the (INSP) system, we have replaced the Poisson equation \( \Delta \Phi_\varepsilon = \rho_\varepsilon^0 - e^{-\Phi_\varepsilon^0} \), by a linearized version. This is not a stringent assumption since we are again dealing with small perturbations of the constant equilibrium \((1, 0)\). For the Euler-Poisson system describing ions dynamics (IEP) (that is \( \varepsilon = 0 \) in (1.2)), global smooth irrotational solutions with small amplitude have been constructed by Guo and Pausader [10]. The idea is again to find dispersive estimates for the linearized system (which turn out to be weaker than the one of the linear Klein-Gordon equations) and to use the normal form method. Nevertheless, the analysis for this model is much more involved. Indeed, the dispersion relation is closer to the one of the wave equation which leads to the appearance of "time resonances". For example, the 'time resonances' of the phase function \( \Phi_{\pm} = -p(\xi) + p(\xi - \eta) + p(\eta), (p(\xi) = \|\xi\|^{2+2|\xi|^2} + 1) \) is \( \{\eta = 0\} \cup \{\xi = 0\} \). After integration in time, the multilinear operators now have a singular kernel and to control them the use of \( H^{-1} \) norms is needed.

We now state the analogous result of Theorem 1.1

**Theorem 1.6.** Let us fix some absolute number \( \kappa > 0 \) small enough. There exists \( \delta_2 > 0 \) such that for any family of initial conditions that satisfy for every \( \varepsilon \in (0, 1] \) the estimates
\[
\|(\rho_\varepsilon^{\varepsilon_0} - 1, P^{\perp}u_\varepsilon^{\varepsilon_0})\|_{W^{\sigma, 3 + 8s/3}_k} + \|\nabla|^{-1}(\rho_\varepsilon^{\varepsilon_0} - 1, P^{\perp}u_\varepsilon^{\varepsilon_0})\|_{H^N} \lesssim \delta_2,
\]
\[
\|P^\perp u_\varepsilon^{\varepsilon_0}\|_{H^3} \lesssim \delta_2 \varepsilon
\]
with \( s_k = \frac{8}{1 - 8\varepsilon}, \sigma \geq 6, N \geq 2\sigma + 1 \), then we have that for every \( \varepsilon \in (0, 1] \) there exists a unique global solution for system (1.2) in \( C([0, +\infty), H^3) \). Besides, if \( \sup_{\varepsilon \in (0, 1]} \|P^\perp u_\varepsilon^{\varepsilon_0}\|_{H^s} < +\infty \) with \( s < \frac{2}{3} \), then we have the following time decay estimates. There exists \( C > 0 \) such that for every \( \varepsilon \in (0, 1] \), we have the estimate
\[
\|(\rho_\varepsilon - 1, u_\varepsilon^{\varepsilon_0})\|_{W^{1, \infty}} \lesssim C \left( \min \{\varepsilon, (1 + t)^{-\frac{8}{3 + 2\varepsilon}}\} + \varepsilon (1 + t)^{-\frac{2}{3}} + (1 + t)^{-\frac{2}{3 + 2\varepsilon}} \right), \quad \forall t \geq 0.
\]

**Organization of the paper.** In the second section, we introduce some notations. In Section 3, we establish some useful preliminary estimates (in particular linear decay estimates) in order to prove Theorem 1.3 Then, we prove Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4 in Section 4, and Section 5 respectively. In Section 6, we shall explain how to deal with the ions system. Finally, we recall some classical inequalities in the appendix.
2. Some Notations

- We define \( \varphi_0(\xi), \chi(\xi) \) as two radial symmetric \( C^\infty \) functions, which are both supported on \( \{\xi | |\xi| \leq 2\} \) and equal to 1 when \( \{\xi | |\xi| \leq 1\} \), and \( \tilde{\chi} \in C^\infty \) equal to 1 on \( \{\xi | |\xi| \leq 3\} \) and vanish on \( \{\xi | |\xi| \geq 5\} \).
- We shall also use the truncation function \( \chi_{\varepsilon, k_0}(\xi) = \chi(\sqrt{\varepsilon/k_0} \xi) \) in the proof of Theorem 1.3.
- We also introduce the classical Littlewood-Paley decomposition: define \( \varphi(\xi) = \varphi_0(\xi) - \varphi_0(2\xi) \) and \( \varphi_j = \varphi(\frac{\xi}{2^j}), j \in \mathbb{N}^* \), \( \Delta_j f = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\varphi_j(\xi)\mathcal{F}(f(\xi))), j \in \mathbb{N} \). The inhomogeneous Besov space \( B^s_{p,r}(p,r \geq 1, s \in \mathbb{R}) \) is defined by its norm

\[
\|f\|_{B^s_{p,r}} = \left( \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \|\Delta_j f\|_{L^p}^r 2^{jsr} \right)^{\frac{1}{r}}.
\]

- For a given function \( m(\zeta, \eta) \), we define the bilinear operator \( T_m(f, g) \) as:

\[
T_m(f, g) \triangleq \mathcal{F}^{-1}\left( \int m(\xi - \eta, \eta) \hat{f}(\xi - \eta) \hat{g}(\eta) d\eta \right) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}}} \int m(\zeta, \eta) \hat{f}(\xi) \hat{g}(\eta) e^{ix(\zeta + \eta)} d\zeta d\eta \quad (2.1)
\]

3. Preliminary estimates

In this section, we analyze the system (1.5). At first, we observe that as long as a smooth solution exists on an interval \([0, T]\), then \( \omega(t) \triangleq \text{curl} u(t) = 0 \) on this interval. Indeed, by taking the curl in the second equation of system (1.5), we get the equation for \( \omega \):

\[
\begin{aligned}
\partial_t \omega - \varepsilon \Delta \omega + \omega \text{div} u + (u \cdot \nabla) \omega - (\omega \cdot \nabla) u &= 0 \\
\omega|_{t=0} &= 0
\end{aligned}
\]

By the standard energy estimate and Grönwall’s inequality, we have

\[
\|\omega(t)\|^2_{L^2} \leq e^{\int_0^t \|\nabla u(s)\|_{L^\infty} ds} \|\omega_0\|^2_{L^2} = 0
\]

A direct consequence is that \( u = \mathcal{P} u = \nabla \Delta^{-1} \text{div} u \). Thus by using the identity \( \text{curl} \text{curl} u = -\Delta u + \nabla \text{div} u \), the second equation of system (1.5) turns out to be:

\[
\partial_t u + u \cdot \nabla u - 2\varepsilon \Delta u + \nabla \rho - \nabla \phi = 0.
\]

Based on the above facts, let us set

\[
h = \frac{\langle \nabla \rangle}{|\nabla|} u, \quad c = \frac{\text{div} u}{|\nabla|}, \quad V = (h, c)^T,
\]

we then obtain that \((h, c)\) satisfies the system:

\[
\begin{aligned}
\partial_t h + \langle \nabla \rangle c &= \langle \nabla \rangle \frac{\text{div} u}{|\nabla|} (\frac{|\nabla|}{\langle \nabla \rangle} h \cdot \mathcal{R} c) = \langle \nabla \rangle \mathcal{R}^* (\frac{|\nabla|}{\langle \nabla \rangle} h \cdot \mathcal{R} c), \\
\partial_t c - \langle \nabla \rangle h - 2\varepsilon \Delta c &= \frac{\text{div} u}{|\nabla|} \nabla |\mathcal{R} c|^2 = \mathcal{R}^* \mathcal{R} |\mathcal{R} c|^2, \\
h|_{t=0} &= \frac{\langle \nabla \rangle}{|\nabla|} u_0, c|_{t=0} = \frac{\text{div} u}{|\nabla|} u_0.
\end{aligned}
\quad (3.1)
\]
which we shall rewrite as:
\[ \partial_t V + A(D)V = \left( \langle \nabla \rangle R^* \left( \frac{\langle \nabla \rangle h \cdot \mathcal{R}c}{\mathcal{R}^* \nabla |\mathcal{R}c|^2} \right) \right) \triangleq B(V,V), \quad A(D) = \left( \begin{array}{cc} 0 & -\langle \nabla \rangle \\ \langle \nabla \rangle & -2\varepsilon \Delta \end{array} \right). \] (3.2)

In the above systems, \( \mathcal{R} \) is the vectorial Riesz transform: \( \mathcal{R} = \frac{\nabla}{|\nabla|} \) and \( \mathcal{R}^* = \frac{\nabla}{|\nabla|} \) is its adjoint for the \( L^2 \) scalar product.

By elementary computations, we get that the eigenvalues of \(-A(\xi)\) are:
\[ \lambda_\pm = -\varepsilon|\xi|^2 \pm i\sqrt{1 + |\xi|^2 - \varepsilon^2|\xi|^4} \triangleq -\varepsilon|\xi|^2 \pm ib(\xi) \] (3.3)
where we cut the lower half imaginary axis to define the square root of a complex number. Note that \( b \) is in fact dependent on \( \varepsilon \), but we do not write it explicitly for simplicity. One can easily check that the Green matrix is
\[ e^{-tA(\xi)} = \frac{1}{\lambda_+ - \lambda_-} \left( \begin{array}{cc} \lambda_+ e^{\lambda_+ t} - \lambda_- e^{\lambda_- t} & (e^{\lambda_+ t} - e^{\lambda_- t}) \langle \xi \rangle \\ (e^{\lambda_+ t} - e^{\lambda_- t}) \langle \xi \rangle & \lambda_+ e^{\lambda_+ t} - \lambda_- e^{\lambda_- t} \end{array} \right) \triangleq \left( \begin{array}{cc} G_1 & -G_2 \\ G_2 & G_3 \end{array} \right). \]

Note that \( G_1, G_2, G_3 \) are actually well defined everywhere since there is no singularity when \( \lambda_+ = \lambda_- \) (see the proof of Lemma 3.5).

Let us observe that for low frequencies, i.e., when \( \varepsilon|\xi|^2 \leq 2\kappa_0 \ll 1 \) (since the eigenvalues do not cross), we can smoothly diagonalize \( A \) under the form:
\[ A(D) = Q \left( \begin{array}{cc} -\lambda_- & 0 \\ 0 & -\lambda_+ \end{array} \right) Q^{-1}, \quad Q^{-1} = \left( \begin{array}{cc} \lambda_+ & \langle \nabla \rangle \\ -\lambda_- & -\langle \nabla \rangle \end{array} \right) \frac{1}{2ib}. \] (3.4)

Since by Duhamel principle, we can rewrite (3.2) as
\[ V = e^{-tA}V_0 + \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)A}B(V,V)(s)ds, \] (3.5)
we shall first study the main properties of \( e^{-tA} \) and \( B(V,V) \) in the following two subsections.

### 3.1. Linear estimates.
This subsection is devoted to the study of \( e^{-tA} \). We shall carry out the analysis in any space dimension \( \mathbb{R}^d, \ d \geq 2 \) although in this paper, we only use it for dimension 3. The behavior will be different for low frequencies \( \varepsilon|\xi|^2 \lesssim 1 \) where uniform in \( \varepsilon \) decay estimates will come from the dispersive behavior and for high frequencies \( \varepsilon|\xi|^2 \gtrsim 1 \) where dissipative damping dominates.

#### 3.1.1. Linear estimates for low frequencies: \( \varepsilon|\xi|^2 \leq 2\kappa_0 \).
For low frequencies, we can get decay estimates that are similar to the ones of the linear Klein-Gordon equation by using dispersive properties. Let us recall that we use the notation \( \chi_{\varepsilon,\kappa_0}(\xi) = \chi(\sqrt{\kappa_0}\xi) \) (see Section 2). We will fix the threshold \( \kappa_0 \) in the proof of Lemma 3.1.

**Lemma 3.1.** There exists \( \kappa_0 > 0 \), small enough such that uniformly for \( \varepsilon \in (0,1] \), and for every \( f \in B^d_{1,2} \), we have the estimate
\[ \|e^{ib(D)}\chi_{\varepsilon,\kappa_0}(D)f\|_{B^d_{q_2,2}} \lesssim \kappa_0 (1 + t)^{-\frac{d}{2}}\|f\|_{B^d_{q_2,2}}. \]

The key point is that this dispersive estimate is uniform with respect to \( \varepsilon \).
Proof. Note that on the support of $\chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}$, $b(\xi)$ behaves like $\langle \xi \rangle$, thus, to prove this lemma, we can follow the proof of the dispersive estimate for the linear Klein-Gordon equation by keeping track of the perturbation.

The proof will thus follow from the following two lemmas.

**Lemma 3.2.** For every $\kappa_0$ small enough, we have uniformly for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, the estimate
\[
\| e^{itb(D)} \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}(D) \varphi_0(D) f \|_{L^\infty} \lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{d}{2}} \| f \|_{L^1}.
\]

**Proof.** By using the Fourier transform, we only need to show that
\[
\| \int e^{itb(\xi)} e^{ix \cdot \xi} \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}(D)(\xi) \varphi_0(\xi) d\xi \|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \kappa_0 (1 + t)^{-\frac{d}{2}}.
\]
At first, note that:
\[
\| \int e^{itb(\xi)} e^{ix \cdot \xi} \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}(D)(\xi) \varphi_0(\xi) d\xi \|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \| \varphi_0 \|_{L^1}.
\]
Thus in the following, we only prove that:
\[
\| \int e^{itb(\xi)} e^{ix \cdot \xi} \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}(D)(\xi) \varphi_0(\xi) d\xi \|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \kappa_0 t^{-\frac{d}{2}}.
\]
Let us write
\[
\int e^{itb(\xi)} e^{ix \cdot \xi} \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}(D)(\xi) \varphi_0(\xi) d\xi = \int e^{it\Phi(\xi)} \chi_{\varepsilon}(\xi) \varphi_0(\xi) d\xi, \quad \Phi(\xi) = b(\xi) + \frac{x}{t} \cdot \xi.
\]
By direct computations, the first and second derivative of $\Phi(\xi)$ are given by the following expressions:
\[
\nabla_\xi \Phi(\xi) = \nabla_\xi b + \frac{x}{t} = \frac{(1 - 2\varepsilon^2|\xi|^2)}{b(\xi)} \xi + \frac{x}{t}
\]
\[
\partial_{\xi_i} \partial_{\xi_j} \Phi(\xi) = \frac{1 - 2\varepsilon^2|\xi|^2}{b(\xi)}(\delta_{ij} - \frac{(1 + 4\varepsilon^2)\xi_i \xi_j}{b^2(\xi)(1 - 2\varepsilon^2|\xi|^2)}).
\]
We then obtain that on the support of $\chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}(\xi) \varphi_0(\xi) \subset \{ \xi | |\xi| \leq 2, \varepsilon |\xi|^2 \leq \frac{1}{30} \}$, we have
\[
\det(\nabla^2 \Phi(\xi)) = \frac{(1 - 2\varepsilon^2|\xi|^2)^d}{b(\xi)} \frac{1 - 6\varepsilon^2|\xi|^2 - 3\varepsilon^2|\xi|^4 + 2\varepsilon^4|\xi|^6}{b^2(\xi)(1 - 2\varepsilon^2|\xi|^2)} \geq \frac{(1 - 4\varepsilon \kappa_0)^d(1 - 12\varepsilon \kappa_0 - 12\kappa_0^2)}{b^{d+2}(\xi)} \geq \frac{1}{2b^{d+2}(\xi)} \geq \frac{1}{2^{d+1} \cdot 5^{\frac{d+4}{2}}}
\]
for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ as long as $\kappa_0$ is small enough.

By using the classical stationary phase lemma (we refer to [23, 29] for example), we arrive at the desired result.

**Lemma 3.3.** For every $\kappa_0 > 0$ small enough and for every $\lambda \geq 1$, we have uniformly for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$,
\[
\| e^{itb(D)} \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}(D) \varphi(\frac{D}{\lambda}) f \|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \kappa_0 t^{-\frac{d}{2}} \lambda^{\frac{d+2}{2}} \| f \|_{L^1},
\]
\[
\| e^{itb(D)} \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}(D) \varphi(\frac{D}{\lambda}) f \|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \kappa_0 \lambda^d \| f \|_{L^1}.
\]

**Proof.** It suffices to prove:
\[
\| \int e^{itb(\xi)} e^{ix \cdot \xi} \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}(\xi) \varphi(\frac{x}{\lambda}) d\xi \|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \kappa_0 t^{-\frac{d}{2}} \lambda^{\frac{d+2}{2}},
\]
\[
\| \int e^{itb(\xi)} e^{ix \cdot \xi} \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}(\xi) \varphi(\frac{x}{\lambda}) d\xi \|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \kappa_0 \lambda^d.
\]
The second estimate just comes from a change of variable, we thus only need to prove the first one. As $\chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}, \phi, b$ are all radially symmetric, we actually have:

$$\int e^{ibt(\xi)}e^{-i\xi \cdot x} \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}(\xi)\varphi\left(\frac{\xi}{\lambda}\right) d\xi = \int_0^{+\infty} e^{ibt(\xi)} \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}(\xi)\varphi\left(\frac{r}{\lambda}\right) J_{\frac{s}{2}}(|x|r) dr = \lambda^d \int_{\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{ibt(\xi)} \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}(\xi)\varphi(r) J_{\frac{s}{2}}(\lambda|x|r) dr$$

where $d \geq 2$ and the Fourier transform of the Lebesgue measure on the sphere $\sigma_{d-1}(x)$ is

$$J_{\frac{s}{2}}(|x|) = e^{i\xi|x|} Z(|x|) - e^{-i\xi|x|} \bar{Z}(|x|)$$

where $Z(s)$ satisfies (c.f [23]) for all integer $k \geq 0$ and all $s > 0$,

$$|\partial^k Z(s)| \lesssim_{k,d} (1 + s)^{-\frac{d+1}{4} - k}.$$  (3.6)

Therefore, we can write:

$$\int e^{ibt(\xi)}e^{-i\xi \cdot x} \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}(\xi)\varphi\left(\frac{\xi}{\lambda}\right) d\xi = \sum_{\pm} \lambda^d \int_{\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{ibt(\xi)} \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}(\xi)\varphi(r) Z_{\pm}(\lambda|x|r) dr$$

where $Z_{\pm} = Z, \bar{Z}$ and $\Phi^\pm(\xi) = b(\lambda r) \pm \lambda r |\xi|$.  

For the ‘+’ case, we can easily check that

$$\partial_r \Phi^+ = \lambda b'(\lambda r) + \frac{\lambda |x|}{t} = \lambda \frac{\lambda r(1 - 2\varepsilon^2 \lambda^2 r^2)}{b(\lambda r)} + \frac{\lambda |x|}{t} \geq \lambda \frac{\lambda r(1 - 2\varepsilon^2 \lambda^2 r^2)}{b(r)} \gtrsim_{\kappa_0} \lambda$$

as long as $\kappa_0$ is small enough. Moreover, for $k \geq 2$, we have

$$|\partial^k \Phi^+| = |\lambda^k \partial^k b(\lambda r)| \lesssim_{\kappa_0} \lambda.$$  

This yields by direct induction, that

$$|\partial_r \frac{1}{\partial_r \Phi^+}| \lesssim_{\kappa_0, k} \lambda^{-1}.  \quad (3.7)$$

In addition, by [36] we have on the support of $\phi$, that

$$|\partial^k (Z_{\pm}(\lambda|x|r))| \lesssim (\lambda |x|)^k (1 + \lambda |x|r)^{-\frac{d+1}{4} - k} \lesssim (1 + \lambda |x|r)^{-\frac{d+1}{4}} \lesssim 1.$$  \quad (3.8)$$

Consequently, by using the classical (non-)stationary phase lemma and (3.7),(3.8), we have that for any integer $N \geq 0$

$$\left| \int_{\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{ibt(\xi)} \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}(\lambda r)\phi(r) Z_{\pm} dr \right| \lesssim_{\kappa_0} (\lambda t)^{-N}.$$  

To conclude, we choose $N = \frac{d+1}{2}$ if $d$ is even, and we choose $N = \frac{d+1}{2}$ if $d$ is odd to get:

$$\left| \int_{\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{ibt(\xi)} \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}(\lambda r)\phi(r) Z_{\pm} dr \right| \lesssim_{\kappa_0} (\lambda t)^{-\frac{d}{2}} \lesssim \lambda^{-\frac{d+2}{2}t^{-\frac{d}{2}}}$$

which is the desired result for ‘+’ case.

For the ‘−’ case, the first derivative of $\Phi^-(\lambda r)$ can vanish. Indeed, we have

$$\partial_r \Phi^- = \lambda b'(\lambda r) - \frac{\lambda |x|}{t} = \lambda \frac{\lambda r(1 - 2\varepsilon^2 \lambda^2 r^2)}{b(\lambda r)} - \frac{\lambda |x|}{t}.$$  

At first, if $|x| \leq \frac{t}{100}$ or $t \leq \frac{|x|}{100}$, then we have

$$|\partial_r \Phi^-| \gtrsim_{\kappa_0} \frac{\lambda}{t}(|x| + t)$$
and for $k \geq 2$,

$$|\partial_k^k \Phi_\lambda| = |\partial_k^k \Phi_\lambda| \lesssim_{\kappa_0} \lambda \leq \frac{\lambda}{t} (|x| + t).$$

As before, this yields by induction,

$$|\partial_k^k \frac{1}{\partial_r \Phi_\lambda}| \lesssim_{\kappa_0} (\lambda(|x| + t))^{-1}. t.$$

Consequently, by using again the (non-)stationary phase method, we get:

$$|\int_{\frac{1}{2}}^{2} e^{it\Phi_\lambda(r)} \chi_{\epsilon, \kappa_0}(\lambda r) \phi(r) \frac{Z(\lambda)}{Z}(\lambda |x| r) dr| \lesssim_{\kappa_0} \lambda |(t + |x|)|^{-N}.$$

If $|x| \approx t$, ie $\frac{1}{100} \leq \frac{|x|}{t} \leq 100$, in light of the fact $\partial^2 \Phi_\lambda \gtrsim_{\kappa_0} \lambda$ and the behavior of $Z$ (see 3.6), we apply Van der Corput Lemma (see for example [26]) to get

$$|\int_{\frac{1}{2}}^{2} e^{it\Phi_\lambda(r)} \chi_{\epsilon, \kappa_0}(\lambda r) \phi(r) \frac{Z(\lambda)}{Z}(\lambda |x| r) dr| \lesssim_{\kappa_0} \lambda^{-\frac{d}{2}} (1 + \lambda |x|)^{-\frac{d}{2}} \lesssim_{\kappa_0} \lambda^{-\frac{d}{2}} + \frac{1}{t} \lesssim_{\kappa_0} \lambda^{-\frac{d}{2}}.$$

This ends the proof.

Once we have the above two lemmas, we can sum the frequencies over the dyadic decomposition to get Lemma 3.1.

From now on, we fix $\kappa_0$ sufficiently small independent of $\epsilon$ such that the statement of Lemma 3.1 and proposition 7.3 in Appendix holds.

**Corollary 3.4.** For $j = 1, 2, 3$ and $f \in B^d_{1,2}$, we have uniformly in $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ the estimate

$$\|G_j(D)\chi_{\epsilon, \kappa_0}(D)f\|_{B^d_{1,2}} \lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{d}{2}}\|f\|_{B^d_{1,2}}.$$

**Proof.** We focus on the proof for $G_1$, the other two terms can be handled with similar arguments. Simple computations show that:

$$G_1 = \frac{1}{2} e^{\epsilon t\Delta} \left( (e^{ib(D)t} + e^{-ib(D)t}) + i \frac{\epsilon \Delta}{b(D)} (e^{ib(D)t} - e^{-ib(D)t}) \right).$$

By Lemma 3.1 and the continuous property of the operator $e^{\epsilon t\Delta}$ on $L^p$, $1 \leq p \leq +\infty$, we only need to show the same result as in Lemma 3.1 when $e^{ib(D)}\chi_{\epsilon, \kappa_0}(D)$ is changed into $e^{ib(D)}\chi_{\epsilon, \kappa_0}(D) \frac{\epsilon \Delta}{b(D)}$. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 3.1 once we notice that on the support of $\chi_{\epsilon, \kappa_0}$, $\partial_r^k \left( \frac{s^2r^2}{b(r)} \right) \lesssim C$, we thus omit the details.

$\square$
Lemma 3.5. There exists $c > 0$ such that, for $j = 1, 2, 3$ and for every $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, we have the estimate

$$|(1 - \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}) G_j(\xi)| \lesssim e^{-ct}.$$ 

Proof. There are two cases:

Case 1: $1 + |\xi|^2 \geq \varepsilon^2 |\xi|^4$. We first observe that

$$G_1 = \frac{\lambda_+ e^{\lambda_+ t} - \lambda_- e^{\lambda_- t}}{\lambda_+ - \lambda_-} = e^{-\varepsilon |\xi|^2 t} \left( \cos(bt) + \varepsilon \frac{\sin(bt)}{b} |\xi|^2 \right),$$

$$G_3 = \frac{\lambda_+ e^{\lambda_+ t} - \lambda_- e^{\lambda_- t}}{\lambda_+ - \lambda_-} = e^{-\varepsilon |\xi|^2 t} \left( \cos(bt) - \varepsilon \frac{\sin(bt)}{b} |\xi|^2 \right).$$

Therefore, for $k = 1, 3$, we have:

$$|(1 - \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}) G_k| \leq |(1 - \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0})| e^{-\varepsilon |\xi|^2 t} (1 + \varepsilon |\xi|^2 t) \lesssim |(1 - \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0})| e^{-\frac{1}{8} \varepsilon |\xi|^2 t} \lesssim e^{-\frac{1}{8} \kappa_0 t}.$$ 

For $G_2$, if $b(\xi) \geq \frac{\xi}{2}$, then we have

$$|(1 - \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}) G_2| = |(1 - \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0})| e^{-\varepsilon |\xi|^2 t} \left| \sin(bt) \right| e^{-\frac{1}{8} \varepsilon |\xi|^2 t} \lesssim e^{-\frac{1}{8} \kappa_0 t}.$$ 

If $b(\xi) \leq \frac{\xi}{2}$, we have $2e^{-\varepsilon |\xi|^2 t}$, thus

$$|(1 - \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}) G_2| \leq e^{-\varepsilon |\xi|^2 t} 2e^{-\varepsilon |\xi|^2 t I_{\xi|\xi|^2 \geq \kappa_0}} \lesssim e^{-\frac{1}{8} \kappa_0 t}.$$ 

Case 2. $1 + |\xi|^2 \leq \varepsilon^2 |\xi|^4$. Let us introduce $\tilde{b} = \sqrt{\varepsilon^2 |\xi|^4 - (1 + |\xi|^2)}$ then $\lambda_{\pm} = -\varepsilon |\xi|^2 + \tilde{b}(\xi)$.

Firstly, we have

$$|(1 - \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}) G_1| = |(1 - \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0})| e^{\lambda_+ t} (1 + \frac{1 - e^{-2bt}}{2b} (-\lambda_-))$$

$$\leq e^{\lambda_- t} (1 + (-\lambda_-) t) \lesssim e^{\frac{1}{2} \lambda_- t} \lesssim e^{-\frac{1}{8} t} \lesssim e^{-\frac{1}{8} t}$$

Here we have used the fact $\lambda_+ > -2\varepsilon |\xi|^2, \lambda_- = \frac{1 + |\xi|^2}{\lambda_+} \leq -\frac{1}{2\varepsilon}$.

Secondly, we also have

$$|(1 - \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}) G_2| \leq |e^{\lambda_- t} (\frac{1 - e^{-2bt}}{2b})| \lesssim e^{\lambda_- t} \leq 2\varepsilon e^{-\frac{1}{8} t} \lesssim e^{-\frac{1}{8} t} \lesssim e^{-\frac{1}{8} t}.$$ 

Finally, for $G_3 = e^{\lambda_- t} [1 + \lambda_+ \frac{1 - e^{-2bt}}{2b}]$, we write

- if $\tilde{b} > \frac{\varepsilon |\xi|^2}{2}$, then $|(1 - \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}) G_3| \leq e^{\lambda_- t} (1 + \frac{\lambda_+}{b}) \lesssim 5e^{\lambda_- t} \lesssim e^{-\frac{1}{8} t};$
- if $0 \leq \tilde{b} \leq \frac{\varepsilon |\xi|^2}{2}$, then $\lambda_- \leq -\frac{1}{2\varepsilon |\xi|^2}$, and therefore,

$$|(1 - \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}) G_3| \leq e^{\lambda_- t} (1 + (-\lambda_+) t) I_{\xi|\xi|^2 \geq \kappa_0} \lesssim e^{\lambda_- t} (1 + 2\varepsilon |\xi|^2 t) I_{\xi|\xi|^2 \geq \kappa_0} \lesssim e^{-\frac{1}{8} \varepsilon |\xi|^2 t} I_{\xi|\xi|^2 \geq \kappa_0} \lesssim e^{-\frac{1}{8} \kappa_0 t}.$$ 

This ends the proof.
3.1.3. Additional estimates of $e^{tA}$.

**Lemma 3.6.** For $j=1,2,3$, for every $s \geq 0$ and uniformly for $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$, we have the estimate
\[
\|G_j(D)f\|_{H^s} \lesssim \|f\|_{H^s}.
\]

**Proof.** We only need to show that $|G_j(\xi)| \leq C$. Note that we have proven in the last lemma that if $\varepsilon|\xi|^2 \geq \kappa_0$, then we have $|G_j(\xi)| \leq e^{-ct}$. In the remaining region $\varepsilon|\xi|^2 \leq 2\kappa_0$, we have,
\[
|G_1| = |e^{-\varepsilon|\xi|^2t}(\cos(bt) + \varepsilon|\xi|^2\sin(bt)b)| \leq e^{-\varepsilon|\xi|^2t}(1 + \varepsilon|\xi|^2t) \leq C,
\]
\[
|G_2| = |e^{-\varepsilon|\xi|^2t}\sin(bt)(\xi)| \leq e^{-\varepsilon|\xi|^2t} \frac{\langle \xi \rangle}{\sqrt{1 - 4\kappa_0^2 + |\xi|^2}} \leq C.
\]
The estimate of $G_3$ is similar to that of $G_1$. This ends the proof. \(\square\)

By combining Corollary 3.4 and Lemma 3.6 we also obtain:

**Corollary 3.7.** For $p \geq 2$, we have uniformly for $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$ the estimates
\[
\|e^{ib(D)}\chi_{\varepsilon,\kappa_0}(D)f\|_{L^p} \lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{d}{2}(1 - \frac{2}{p})}\|f\|_{W^{(1 - \frac{2}{p})d,p'}};
\]
\[
\|G_j(D)\chi_{\varepsilon,\kappa_0}(D)f\|_{L^p} \lesssim (1 + t)^{-d(1 - \frac{2}{p})}\|f\|_{W^{(1 - \frac{2}{p})d,p'}}.
\]

**Corollary 3.8.** For $j=1,2,3$, for every $s \geq 0$ and uniformly for $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$ we have the estimate
\[
\|G_j(D)f\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{d}{2}}\|f\|_{W^{3,1}} + e^{-ct}\|f\|_{H^\frac{d+1}{2}}.
\]

**Proof of Corollaries 3.7, 3.8.** For Corollary 3.7 we can interpolate in a classical way between the estimates of Corollary 3.4 and Lemma 3.6 and use the embeddings $B_{p,2}^s \hookrightarrow W^{s,p}, W^{s,p'} \hookrightarrow B_{p',2}^s$ with $p \geq 2, s \geq 0$. One can refer for example to the books [1, 7] for the relations between Besov spaces and Sobolev spaces.

For Corollary 3.8 we just write that $G_j(D)f = G_j(D)\chi_{\varepsilon,\kappa_0}(D)f + G_j(D)(1 - \chi_{\varepsilon,\kappa_0})(D)f$, and the result follows from the previous estimate and Lemma 3.5 since
\[
\|G_j(D)(1 - \chi_{\varepsilon,\kappa_0})(D)f\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim e^{-ct}\|f\|_{L^1} \lesssim e^{-ct}\|f\|_{H^{\frac{d+1}{2}}}.
\]

\(\square\)

**Lemma 3.9.** Let us define the operators
\[
n_1(D) = \frac{\text{div}}{\|\cdot\|} \nabla \text{ or } \varepsilon\Delta \tilde{\chi}_{\varepsilon,\kappa_0}(D) \frac{\text{div}}{\|\cdot\|} \text{ or } ib(D)\tilde{\chi}_{\varepsilon,\kappa_0}(D) \frac{\text{div}}{\|\cdot\|},
\]
\[
n_2 = \frac{\varepsilon\Delta + b(D)}{\|\cdot\|} \tilde{\chi}_{\varepsilon,\kappa_0}(D) \text{ or } \mathcal{R} \text{ or } \frac{\|\cdot\|}{\|\cdot\|}.
\]
Then, for any $p \in (1,\infty)$, we have the estimate:
\[
\|n_1(D)f\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|f\|_{W^{1,p}} \quad \|n_2(D)f\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p}
\]

**Proof.** We can apply the Hörmander-Mikhlin Theorem (we refer for example to Theorem 5.2.7 of the book [6]). One can easily check that $n_1(\xi), n_2(\xi)$ satisfy homogeneous 0 type conditions uniformly in $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$.

\(\square\)

From the definition of $Q(D), Q^{-1}(D)$ (see (3.1)), we also have the following property for $Q(D), Q^{-1}(D)$:
Corollary 3.10. For any $1 < p < +\infty$, $\chi_{\varepsilon,k_0}(D)Q(D),\chi_{\varepsilon,k_0}(D)Q^{-1}(D)$ are both continuous in $L^p$ uniformly in $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$:

$$\|\chi_{\varepsilon,k_0}(D)Q(D)F\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|F\|_{L^p}, \quad \|\chi_{\varepsilon,k_0}(D)Q^{-1}(D)F\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|F\|_{L^p}.$$ 

We will finally also need to use some elementary parabolic estimates.

Lemma 3.11. For any integer $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $1 < q < +\infty$, we have:

$$\|e^{\varepsilon t\Delta}(\varepsilon\Delta)^k\chi_{\varepsilon,k_0}(D)f\|_{L^q} \lesssim (1+t)^{-k}\|f\|_{L^q}.$$ 

Proof. On the one hand, by Young's inequality, we have

$$\|e^{\varepsilon t\Delta}(\varepsilon\Delta)^k\chi_{\varepsilon,k_0}(D)f\|_{L^q} \lesssim t^{-k}\|\chi_{\varepsilon,k_0}(D)f\|_{L^q} \lesssim t^{-k}\|f\|_{L^q}.$$ 

On the other hand, as $(\varepsilon\Delta)^k\chi_{\varepsilon,k_0}(D)$ is a $L^q$ multiplier, we also have:

$$\|e^{\varepsilon t\Delta}(\varepsilon\Delta)^k\chi_{\varepsilon,k_0}(D)f\|_{L^q} \lesssim \|e^{\varepsilon t\Delta}(\varepsilon\Delta)^k\chi_{\varepsilon,k_0}(D)f\|_{L^q} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^q}.$$ 

\[\square\]

3.2. Nonlinear and bilinear estimates.

Lemma 3.12. For every $1 < p < +\infty$, $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2} = \frac{1}{r_1} + \frac{1}{r_2}$, $1 < r_1, q_1 \leq +\infty$, $1 \leq r_2, q_2 < +\infty$, we have the estimate

$$\|B(V,V)\|_{W^{s,p}} \lesssim \|V\|_{W^{s+1,q_1}}\|V\|_{L^{r_1}} + \|V\|_{L^{r_2}}\|V\|_{W^{s+1,q_2}}. \quad (3.9)$$

Proof. By the definition of $B$, the boundedness of the Riesz transform in $L^q(1 < q < +\infty)$ and the Kato-Ponce inequality (recalled in Lemma 7.1 in the appendix), we have

$$\|B(V,V)\|_{W^{s,p}} \lesssim \|h\|_{R^c}\|\nabla h\|_{W^{s+1,p}} \lesssim \|h\|_{W^{s+1,q_1}}\|R\|_{L^{r_1}} + \|\nabla h\|_{L^{r_2}}\|R\|_{W^{s+1,q_2}} \lesssim \|h\|_{W^{s+1,q_1}}\|c\|_{L^{r_1}} + \|h\|_{L^{r_2}}\|c\|_{W^{s+1,q_2}}.$$ 

The estimates of the other components follow from the same arguments, we omit the proof. \[\square\]

As a consequence, we also get that:

Corollary 3.13. For every $p \geq 2$, $\sigma \geq 2$, and $k \geq 0$, we have uniformly for $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$ that

$$\|Q^{-1}\chi_{\varepsilon,k_0}(D)B(V,V)\|_{H^k} \lesssim \|V\|_{H^{k+1}}\|V\|_{W^{s,p}}.$$ 

Proof. It suffices to combine Corollary 3.10 and Lemma 3.12 to get

$$\|Q^{-1}\chi_{\varepsilon,k_0}(D)B(V,V)\|_{H^k} \lesssim \|B(V,V)\|_{H^k} \lesssim \|V\|_{H^{k+1}}\|RV\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|V\|_{H^{k+1}}\|V\|_{W^{s,p}}.$$ 

\[\square\]

We finally state the bilinear estimate that will be heavily used in Section 4. We will give the proof in the appendix.
Lemma 3.14. Let us assume that $d=3$, and let us define
\[ \phi_{j,k}(\xi, \eta) = (-1)^{j+1}b(\xi) + (-1)^{k+1}b(\eta) - b(\xi + \eta), \quad j, k = 1, 2 \]
and
\[ m(\xi, \eta) = \tilde{\chi}_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}(\xi)\tilde{\chi}_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}(\eta)\tilde{\chi}_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}(\xi + \eta)\frac{\langle \xi + \eta \rangle}{2ib(\xi + \eta)}. \]

Then, we have the following estimates that are uniform for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$:
\[
\|T_{\sigma, \eta}^m(\xi, \eta)\|_{W^{\sigma,p}} \lesssim \|f\|_{W^{\sigma+2+\eta,1}}\|g\|_{W^{2,\eta}} + \|f\|_{W^{2,\eta}}\|g\|_{W^{\sigma+2+\eta,2}}.
\]
\[
\|T_{\sigma, \eta}^m(\xi, \eta)\|_{W^{\sigma,p}} \lesssim \|f\|_{W^{\sigma+2+\eta,1}}\|g\|_{W^{3,\eta}} + \|f\|_{W^{3,\eta}}\|g\|_{W^{\sigma+2+\eta,2}}.
\]
where $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{r_1} = \frac{1}{q_2} + \frac{1}{r_2}$, $1 < r_1, r_2 \leq +\infty$, $1 \leq q_1, q_2 < +\infty$ and $T_{\sigma, \eta}^m$ is the bilinear operator defined in (2.1).

4. Proof of Theorem 1.3

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.3. Let us observe that from a standard iteration argument, (similar to the one for the compressible Navier-Stokes system as in [21]), one can show that the system (1.3) admits a unique solution in $C([0, T_\varepsilon), H^3)$ for some $T_\varepsilon > 0$ and that if the initial data are in $H^l$, $l \geq 3$, then this additional regularity also propagates on $[0, T_\varepsilon)$. We thus only concentrate on the proof of a priori estimates that are uniform in time and in $\varepsilon$ in the following.

We shall use the norms:
\[
\|X\|_Y \triangleq \|X\|_{W^{\sigma+3(1-\frac{2}{p})}} + \|X\|_{H^N},
\]
\[
\|U\|_{X_T} \triangleq \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \langle t \rangle^{\frac{2}{2}}\|U\|_{W^{\sigma,p}} + \langle t \rangle^{(1-\frac{2}{p})}\|\chi^H(D)U\|_{H^{N-1}} + \|U\|_{H^N}.
\]
where $U = (\varphi, \nabla \varphi, u)$, $\chi^H(D) = (1 - \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0})(D)$, $\kappa_0 = \frac{1}{200}$ and $6 < p < +\infty$, $\sigma \geq 3, N \geq \sigma + 7$.

By standard bootstrap argument, it suffices to prove that there exists $\delta_1 > 0$, and $C > 0$ that are independent of $T$ such that for every $\delta_1 \in (0, \tilde{\delta}_1)$, if $\|U\|_{X_T} \leq \delta_1$, then we have uniformly for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ an estimate under the form
\[
\|U\|_{X_T} \leq C \left(\|U(0)\|_Y + \|U\|_{X_T}^2 + \|U\|_{X_T}^4 + \|U\|_{X_T}^6\right). \tag{4.1}
\]
Indeed, let us set
\[
T_* = \sup\{T \in [0, T_\varepsilon), \|U\|_{X_T} \leq \delta_1\}.
\]
Then, we can deduce from (4.1) that $T_* = T_\varepsilon$ by choosing $\delta$ (which is such that $\|U(0)\|_Y \leq \delta$) and $\delta_1$ small enough such that by (4.1), $\|U\|_{X_T} \leq C(\delta + 3\delta_1^2) < \delta_1$ for any $T < T_*$. The result follows by time continuity and the local well-posedness result.

The a priori estimate (4.1) will follow from the following two propositions.

Proposition 4.1 (Energy estimates). We define the energy functional
\[
E_N = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq N} E_\alpha = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq N} \int \left(\frac{\partial^\alpha \varphi}{2} + \frac{|\partial^\alpha \nabla \varphi|^2}{2} + \rho |\partial^\alpha u|^2\right)dx.
\]
Assuming that \( \|q\|_{\dot{H}^2} \leq \delta_1 \) and that \( \delta_1 \) is small enough so that \( \|q\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{1}{2}, \|\nabla q\|_{L^3} < \frac{1}{2^3} \) where \( c \) is the biggest one among the Sobolev constants coming from the embedding \( \dot{H}^2 \hookrightarrow L^\infty, \dot{H}^1 \hookrightarrow \dot{L}^3, \dot{H}^1 \hookrightarrow L^6 \), then there exists a constant \( C > 0 \) which depends only on \( c \), such that
\[
\sup_{0 \leq t < T} E_N(t) \leq E_N(0) + C\|U\|_{X_T}^3. \tag{4.2}
\]

**Proof.** By taking the time derivative of the energy functional and by using the equations, we get:
\[
\frac{d}{dt} E_N = -\int \div (\rho u) \|\partial^\alpha u\|^2 + \rho \partial^\alpha u \cdot \partial^\alpha \left[ (u \cdot \nabla u) + \nabla q - \nabla \phi - 2\varepsilon \Delta u \right] + \partial^\alpha \rho \partial^\alpha \div (\rho u) - \partial^\alpha \nabla \phi \cdot \partial^\alpha \nabla \partial_t \phi \, dx
\]
\[
= \int \rho \partial^\alpha u \cdot \left[ \partial^\alpha, u \right] \nabla u + \partial^\alpha \rho \div (\partial^\alpha, u) \rho \right] + \left[ \partial^\alpha \nabla \phi \cdot \partial^\alpha \nabla \phi + \partial^\alpha u \cdot \partial^\alpha \nabla \phi \right] + 2\varepsilon \rho \partial^\alpha u \cdot \partial^\alpha \Delta u \, dx
\]
\[\triangleq J_1 + J_2 + J_3 + J_4.
\]
We now estimate these four terms. For \( J_1 \), by using Lemma 7.1 in the appendix, we have,
\[J_1 = \int \rho \partial^\alpha u \cdot \left[ \partial^\alpha, u \right] \nabla u \, dx \leq \|\rho\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial^\alpha u\|_{L^2} \|\left[ \partial^\alpha, u \right] \nabla u\|_{L^2} \leq 2\|u\|_{H^{1,\alpha}} \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}.
\]
For \( J_2 \), which is non-zero only if \(|\alpha| \geq 1\), by using Lemma 7.1 again, we have
\[J_2 = \int \partial^\alpha \rho \div (\rho \partial^\alpha u) - \partial^\alpha \div (\rho u) \leq \|\partial^\alpha \rho\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} + \|u\|_{H^{1,\alpha}} \|\rho\|_{H^{1,\alpha}} (\|\nabla \rho\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}).
\]
In a similar way, we estimate \( J_3 \) and \( J_4 \) as follows:
\[J_3 = \int \rho \partial^\alpha u \partial^\alpha \nabla \phi + \partial^\alpha \rho \partial^\alpha \div (\rho u) \, dx = -\int \partial^\alpha \nabla \phi \partial^\alpha, \rho \|u\|_{H^{1,\alpha}} \|\nabla \rho\|_{H^{1,\alpha}} + \|u\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho\|_{H^{1,\alpha}},
\]
\[J_4 = 2\varepsilon \int \rho \partial^\alpha u \partial^\alpha \Delta u \, dx = -2\varepsilon \int \rho \partial^\alpha \nabla u \|^2 + \nabla \rho \partial^\alpha u \cdot \partial^\alpha \nabla u \, dx.
\]
we estimate the second term in the above equality by \( c \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^3} \|\nabla u\|_{H^{1,\alpha}}^2 \) where \( c \) is Sobolev constant associated to Sobolev embedding \( \dot{H}^1 \hookrightarrow L^6 \). We finally get:
\[
\frac{d}{dt} E_N + \varepsilon \sum_{|\alpha| \leq N} \int \rho \partial^\alpha \nabla u \|^2 + \nabla \rho \partial^\alpha u \cdot \partial^\alpha \nabla u \, dx \leq (\|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}} + \|\rho\|_{W^{1,\infty}}) \|U\|_{H^{1,\alpha}}^2.
\]
By integrating in time and by using the definition of \( \|U\|_{X_T} \), we get the inequality (4.2).

\[\square\]

**Remark 4.2.** Note that by the assumptions of Proposition 4.1 we have \( \frac{5}{6} \leq \rho \leq \frac{7}{6} \) so that
\[E_N \approx \|U\|_{H^{1,\alpha}}^2.
\]
Then by (4.2) and (4.4), we also obtain:
\[\sup_{0 \leq t < T} \|U(t)\|_{H^{1,\alpha}} \lesssim \|U(0)\|_{H^{1,\alpha}} + \|U\|_{X_T}^\frac{3}{2}.
\]

Now we begin to deal with the other two terms in the definition of the $X_T$ norm. By the definition of $V$ and the boundedness of the Riesz transform in $L^q$, $1 < q < +\infty$, we have $\|U\|_{X_T} \sim \|V\|_{X_T}$ which leads us to prove the corresponding estimate for $V$.

**Proposition 4.3.** For any $6 < p < \infty$, we have the decay estimate:

$$\sup_{t \in (0,T)} (t)^{\frac{2}{3}(1 - \frac{2}{p})} \|V\|_{W^{s,p}} + (t)^{\frac{2}{3}(1 - \frac{2}{p})} \|X^H(D)V\|_{\dot{H}^{N-1}} \lesssim \|V(0)\|_Y + \|V(0)\|_{Y^p}^2 + \|V\|_{X_T}^2 + \|V\|_{X_T}^3.$$

**Proof.** For notational convenience, we denote $V^L = \chi^{L}(D)V = \chi_{\varepsilon,\kappa_0}(D)V, V^H = \chi^{H}(D)V$. By using \((3.5)\), Lemma \(3.5\) and Lemma \(3.12\) we get:

$$\|V^H(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{N-1}} \lesssim \|e^{-tA}X^H(D)V(0)\|_{\dot{H}^{N-1}} + \int_0^t \|e^{-(t-s)A}X^H(D)B(V,V)(s)\|_{\dot{H}^{N-1}} ds$$

$$\lesssim e^{-ct}\|V(0)\|_{\dot{H}^{N-1}} + \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)}\|B(V,V)(s)\|_{\dot{H}^{N-1}} ds$$

$$\lesssim e^{-ct}\|V(0)\|_{\dot{H}^{N-1}} + \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)}\|V(s)\|_{W^{s,p}} ds$$

$$\lesssim e^{-ct}\|V(0)\|_{\dot{H}^{N-1}} + (1 + t)^{-\frac{2}{3}(1 - \frac{2}{p})}\|V\|_{X_T}^2.$$

For the $W^{s,p}$ estimate, we just use Sobolev embedding and the above estimate,

$$\|V^H(t)\|_{W^{s,p}} \lesssim \|V^H(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{s+(\frac{4}{3}-2\frac{2}{p})}} \lesssim e^{-ct}\|V(0)\|_{\dot{H}^{N-1}} + (1 + t)^{-\frac{2}{3}(1 - \frac{2}{p})}\|V\|_{X_T}^2.$$

We shall now prove the decay estimate for low frequencies. By applying $Q^{-1}\chi^L$ to the system for $V$ (see \((4.2)\)) and by setting $R = (r_1, r_2)^T = Q^{-1}\chi^L(D)V$, we find that $R$ solves the system:

$$\partial_t R + \begin{pmatrix} -\lambda_-(D) & 0 \\ 0 & -\lambda_+(D) \end{pmatrix} R = Q^{-1}\chi^L(D)B(V,V)$$

with initial data $R(0) = \chi^L(D)V(0)$. We thus obtain from the Duhamel formula that

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} e^{\lambda_-(D)t} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{\lambda_+(D)t} \end{pmatrix} R_0 + \int_0^t \begin{pmatrix} e^{\lambda_-(D)(t-s)} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{\lambda_+(D)(t-s)} \end{pmatrix} Q^{-1}\chi^L(D)B(V,V) ds$$

$$\triangleq J_1 + J_2 + J_3 + J_4$$

where:

$$J_1 = \begin{pmatrix} e^{\lambda_-(t)} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{\lambda_+(t)} \end{pmatrix} R_0,$$

$$J_2 = \int_0^t \begin{pmatrix} e^{\lambda_-(t-s)} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{\lambda_+(t-s)} \end{pmatrix} Q^{-1}\chi^L(D)B(V^H,V) ds,$$

$$J_3 = \int_0^t \begin{pmatrix} e^{\lambda_-(t-s)} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{\lambda_+(t-s)} \end{pmatrix} Q^{-1}\chi^L(D)B(V^L,V^H) ds,$$

$$J_4 = \int_0^t \begin{pmatrix} e^{\lambda_-(t-s)} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{\lambda_+(t-s)} \end{pmatrix} Q^{-1}\chi^L(D)B(V^L,V^L) ds.$$

For the term $J_1$, note that $R_0 = Q^{-1}\chi^L(D)V(0) = \tilde{\chi}_{\varepsilon,\kappa_0}(D)Q^{-1}\chi^L(D)V(0)$, thus by Corollary \(3.7\), \(3.10\) we have:

$$\|J_1\|_{W^{s,p}} \lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{2}{3}(1 - \frac{2}{p})}\|Q^{-1}\chi^L(D)V(0)\|_{W^{s+(\frac{4}{3}-2\frac{2}{p}),p'}} \lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{2}{3}(1 - \frac{2}{p})}\|V(0)\|_{W^{s+(\frac{4}{3}-2\frac{2}{p}),p'}}.$$
For the term $J_2$, we use Corollary 3.7, 3.10 and Lemma 3.12 to get:

$$
\|J_2\|_{W^{\sigma,p}} \lesssim \int_0^t (1 + t - s)^{-\frac{3}{2}(1 - \frac{2}{p})} \|Q^{-1} \chi^L(D)B((V^H, V)\|_{W^{\sigma+3(1 - \frac{2}{p}), p'}} ds
$$

$$
\lesssim \int_0^t (1 + t - s)^{-\frac{3}{2}(1 - \frac{2}{p})} \|V^H\|_{W^{\sigma+3(1 - \frac{2}{p}), 1 + 2p}} + \|V^H\|_{L^2} \|V\|_{W^{\sigma+3(1 - \frac{2}{p}), 1 + 2p}} ds
$$

$$
\lesssim \int_0^t (1 + t - s)^{-\frac{3}{2}(1 - \frac{2}{p})}(1 + s)^{-\frac{1}{2}(1 - \frac{2}{p})} \|V\|^2_{X_T} ds \lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{3}{2}(1 - \frac{2}{p})} \|V\|_{X_T}.
$$

The estimate for $J_3$ is similar to the one for $J_2$, we thus skip it.

It remains to estimate $J_4$ which is the most difficult one. To get over the difficulty of a quadratic nonlinearity, we need to use the normal form method. By the definition of $Q, Q^{-1}$ in (3.4) and $R = Q^{-1} \chi^L(D)V$, we have that

$$
B(V^L, V^L) = B(QR, QR) = \left( -\langle \nabla \rangle R^s \left\{ \left( \frac{\hat{\chi}}{H} (r_1 + r_2) R^s \hat{\chi} (r_2 - r_1) \right) + \frac{\hat{\chi}}{H} (r_1 + r_2) \right\} \right)
$$

$$
\triangleq \left( B_1(R, R), B_2(R, R) \right).
$$

Define:

$$
A(R, R) = Q^{-1} B(QR, QR) = \left( \frac{1}{2b} (\lambda_+ B_1 + \langle \nabla \rangle B_2) \right) \triangleq \left( A_1(R, R), A_2(R, R) \right).
$$

We shall only study the first component, i.e.

$$
J_{41} = \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\lambda_-(D)} \chi_{\xi, \kappa_0}(D) A_1(R, R) ds,
$$

the other can be handled in a similar way. For notational convenience (although with a little abuse of notation), we write $A_1(R, R) = \sum n_1(D)(n_2(D)r_1 \cdot n_2(D)r_2)$, here the summation runs over all the possibilities in the definition of $n_1(D), n_2(D)$ defined in Lemma 3.9 from the definition of $\lambda_\pm, b$.

Set $\tilde{R} = n_2(D)R$, then $J_{41}$ is the sum of the following term:

$$
G_{jk} = e^{-ib(D)t} F^{-1} \left( \int_0^t e^{-\varepsilon|\xi|^2(t-s)} e^{ib(\xi)s} m(\xi - \eta, \eta)n_1(\xi)\chi_{\xi, \kappa_0}(\xi) \tilde{r}_j(s, \xi, \eta) \tilde{r}_k(s, \eta) d\eta ds \right).
$$

Set $W = (W_1, W_2) = \left( \begin{array}{cc} e^{ib(D)t} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-ib(D)t} \end{array} \right) R$, then from 4.5, $W$ satisfies:

$$
\partial_t W = \left( \begin{array}{cc} e^{ib(D)t} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-ib(D)t} \end{array} \right) \left[ \varepsilon \Delta R + Q^{-1} \chi^L(D) B(V, V) \right].
$$

By the definition of $W$, we have $w_j = e^{i(1)^j b(D)r_j}$, so by defining $\tilde{w}_j = e^{i(1)^j b(D)\tilde{r}_j}$ we get:

$$
G_{jk} = e^{-ib(D)t} F^{-1} \left( \int_0^t \int_{R^3} e^{-\varepsilon|\xi|^2(t-s)} e^{-i\phi_{jk}(\xi)s} m(\xi - \eta, \eta)n_1(\xi)\chi_{\xi, \kappa_0}(\xi) \tilde{w}_j(s, \xi, \eta) \tilde{w}_k(s, \eta) d\eta ds \right).
$$
thus, by using that $\phi_{jk}$ does not vanish in the support of $\chi_{\varepsilon,k_0}(D)$, we can integrate by parts in time:

$$e^{ib(D)t}G_{jk} = \mathcal{F}^{-1} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} e^{-\varepsilon|\xi|^2(t-s)} \frac{\partial_x e^{-is\phi_{jk}}}{-i\phi_{jk}} m(\xi - \eta, \eta) n_1(\xi) \chi_{\varepsilon,k_0}(\xi) \hat{w}_j(s, \xi - \eta) \hat{w}_k(s, \eta) \, d\eta \, ds$$

$$= e^{ib(D)t} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{7} I_j \right)$$

(4.7)

where

$$I_1 = i\chi_{\varepsilon,k_0}(D)n_1(D)T_{\frac{m}{\sigma_{jk}}}(\tilde{r}_j(t), \tilde{r}_k(t)),$$

$$I_2 = -ie^{\varepsilon\Delta} e^{-itb(D)} \chi_{\varepsilon,k_0}(D)n_1(D)T_{\frac{m}{\sigma_{jk}}}(\tilde{r}_j(0), \tilde{r}_k(0)),$$

$$I_3 = i \int_0^t e^{\varepsilon(t-s)\Delta} e^{i(t-s)b(D)} (\varepsilon\Delta) \chi_{\varepsilon,k_0}(D)n_1(D)T_{\frac{m}{\sigma_{jk}}}(\tilde{r}_j(s), \tilde{r}_k(s)) \, ds,$$

$$I_4 = -i \int_0^t e^{\varepsilon(t-s)\Delta} e^{i(t-s)b(D)} \chi_{\varepsilon,k_0}(D)n_1(D)T_{\frac{m}{\sigma_{jk}}}(\varepsilon\Delta \tilde{r}_j, \tilde{r}_k(s)) \, ds,$$

$$I_5 = \int_0^t e^{\varepsilon(t-s)\Delta} e^{i(t-s)b(D)} \chi_{\varepsilon,k_0}(D)n_1(D)T_{\frac{m}{\sigma_{jk}}}(\tilde{B}_j, \tilde{r}_k(s)) \, ds,$$

$$I_6 = \int_0^t e^{\varepsilon(t-s)\Delta} e^{i(t-s)b(D)} \chi_{\varepsilon,k_0}(D)n_1(D)T_{\frac{m}{\sigma_{jk}}}(\tilde{r}_j, \varepsilon\Delta \tilde{r}_k(s)) \, ds,$$

$$I_7 = \int_0^t e^{\varepsilon(t-s)\Delta} e^{i(t-s)b(D)} \chi_{\varepsilon,k_0}(D)n_1(D)T_{\frac{m}{\sigma_{jk}}}(\tilde{r}_j, \tilde{B}_k) \, ds$$

and $\tilde{B} = n_2(D)Q^{-1} \chi^2 B(V, V)$, we recall that $B(V, V), Q^{-1}$ are defined in $(3.2)$ and $(3.4)$. We now estimate $I_1$ to $I_7$. In the following, we shall use the estimates for the bilinear operator $T_{\frac{m}{\sigma_{jk}}}$ in Lemma 3.14 with the choice $(k)_+ = \frac{3}{p}$.

By Lemma 3.14 Corollary 3.13 and Sobolev embedding, we can estimate $I_1$ as follows:

$$\|I_1\|_{W^{\sigma,p}} \lesssim \|T_{\frac{m}{\sigma_{jk}}}(\tilde{r}_j(t), \tilde{r}_k(t))\|_{W^{\sigma+1,p}} \lesssim \|\tilde{r}_j(t)\|_{W^{\sigma+3+\frac{3}{p},p}} \|\tilde{r}_k(t)\|_{W^{2,\infty}} \|\tilde{r}_j(t)\|_{W^{\sigma+3+\frac{3}{p},p}}$$

$$\lesssim \|R(t)\|_{H^{\sigma+3+\frac{3}{p}(1-\frac{3}{4})+3+\frac{3}{p}}} \|R(t)\|_{W^{3,p}} \lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{3}{2}(1-\frac{3}{4})} \|V\|_{X_T}^2.$$
For the term $I_5$, we have:

$$
\|I_5\|_{W^{\sigma,p}} \lesssim \int_0^t (1 + t - s)^{-\frac{3}{2}(1 - \frac{2}{p})} \|T_{\sigma jk} (\tilde{B}_j, \tilde{r}_k)\|_{W^{\sigma+3(1 - \frac{2}{p})+1,\rho'}} ds \\
\lesssim \int_0^t (1 + t - s)^{-\frac{3}{2}(1 - \frac{2}{p})} (\|B_j\|_{H^{\sigma+3(1 - \frac{2}{p})+3_+}} \|r_k\|_{W^{-\frac{3}{2}\rho',\rho}} + \|B_j\|_{W^{2,\rho}} \|r_k\|_{H^{\sigma+3(1 - \frac{2}{p})+3_+}}) ds \\
\lesssim \int_0^t (1 + t - s)^{-\frac{3}{2}(1 - \frac{2}{p})} (\|B_j\|_{H^{\sigma+3(1 - \frac{2}{p})+3_+}} \|R\|_{H^4} + \|B_j\|_{H^4} \|R\|_{H^{\sigma+3(1 - \frac{2}{p})+3_+}}) ds \\
\lesssim \int_0^t (1 + t - s)^{-\frac{3}{2}(1 - \frac{2}{p})} (1 + s)^{-\frac{3}{2}(1 - \frac{2}{p})} \|V\|^3_{X_p} ds \lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{3}{2}(1 - \frac{2}{p})} \|V\|^3_{X_p}.
$$

Here, we have used Corollaries 3.7, 3.10, 3.13 and Lemma 3.14. The estimate for $I_7$ is very similar to that of $I_5$, we omit the details.

The terms $I_3, I_4$ correspond to the error terms created by $\varepsilon \Delta$. As explained in the introduction, since one can only expect that $\|\varepsilon \Delta u\|_{H^{N-1}} \lesssim (1 + t)^{-1}$ which is not a fast enough decay, to control them, we need to perform normal form transformation again.

By integrating by parts again, we get

$$
I_4 = i \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\Delta} e^{-i(t-s)b(D)} n_1(D) T_{\sigma jk} (\varepsilon \Delta \tilde{r}_j, \tilde{r}_k) ds \\
= -\chi_{\varepsilon,\kappa_0}(D)n_1(D)T_{\sigma jk} (\varepsilon \Delta \tilde{r}_j(t), \tilde{r}_k(t)) + e^{\varepsilon \Delta} e^{-itb(D)} \chi_{\varepsilon,\kappa_0}(D)n_1(D)T_{\sigma jk} (\varepsilon \Delta \tilde{r}_j(0), \tilde{r}_k(0)) \\
- \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\Delta} e^{-i(t-s)b(D)} (\varepsilon \Delta) \chi_{\varepsilon,\kappa_0}(D)n_1(D)T_{\sigma jk} (\varepsilon \Delta \tilde{r}_j, \tilde{r}_k) ds \\
+ \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\Delta} e^{-i(t-s)b(D)} \chi_{\varepsilon,\kappa_0}(D)n_1(D) [T_{\sigma jk} (\varepsilon \Delta \tilde{r}_j + \varepsilon \Delta \tilde{B}_j, \tilde{r}_k) + T_{\sigma jk} (\varepsilon \Delta \tilde{r}_j, \varepsilon \Delta \tilde{r}_k + \tilde{B}_k)] ds \\
\triangleq I_{41} + \cdots + I_{47}. \quad (4.8)
$$

The terms $I_{41}, I_{42}$ are similar to $I_1, I_2$. For example, by using the fact that $\varepsilon \Delta \chi_{\varepsilon,\kappa_0}(D)$ is a bounded multiplier in $L^p$, $1 < p < \infty$, we get

$$
\|I_{41}\|_{W^{\sigma,p}} \lesssim \|T_{\sigma jk} (\varepsilon \Delta \tilde{r}_j(t), \tilde{r}_k(t))\|_{W^{\sigma+1,p}} \\
\lesssim \|\varepsilon \Delta r_j(t)\|_{W^{\sigma+3_+}} \|r_k(t)\|_{W^{3,p}} + \|\varepsilon \Delta r_j(t)\|_{W^{3,p}} \|r_k(t)\|_{W^{\sigma+3_+,\infty}} \\
\lesssim \|R\|_{W^{\sigma+3_+,\infty}} \|R\|_{W^{\sigma,p}} \lesssim \|R\|_{H^{\sigma+5}} \|R\|_{W^{\sigma,p}} \lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{3}{2}(1 - \frac{2}{p})} \|V\|^2_{X_p}.
$$

Up to now, we have only used the dispersive estimates, but not yet the viscous dissipation, we shall use it in the estimate for $I_{43}$. We write

$$
I_{43} = \int_0^{t-1} + \int_{t-1}^t e^{(t-s)\Delta} e^{-i(t-s)b(D)} (\varepsilon \Delta) \chi_{\varepsilon,\kappa_0}(D)n_1(D)T_{\sigma jk} (\varepsilon \Delta \tilde{r}_j, \tilde{r}_k) ds \triangleq I_{431} + I_{432}
$$
By using Young’s inequality, and Lemma 3.14 Sobolev embedding, we get:

\[
||I_{431}||_{W^{\sigma,p}} \lesssim \int_0^{t-1} ||\chi(t)2e^{-\varepsilon(t-s)||\xi||^2}||_{L^{2p+2}} ||e^{-i(t-s)b(D)}T_{\frac{m}{\lambda_j}}(\varepsilon\Delta\tilde{r}_j, \tilde{r}_k)\||_{H^{\sigma+1}} ds
\]

\[
\lesssim \int_0^{t-1} \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\frac{2p-2}{2p})(t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} ||T_{\frac{m}{\lambda_j}}(\Delta\tilde{r}_j, \tilde{r}_k)||_{H^{\sigma+1}} ds
\]

\[
\lesssim \int_0^{t-1} \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\frac{2p-2}{2p})(t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} ||R(s)||_{H^{\sigma+\frac{1}{2}}} ||R(s)||_{W^{3,p}} ds
\]

\[
\lesssim \varepsilon^{1-\frac{3}{2}}(\frac{p-2}{2p}) \int_0^{t-1} (t-s)^{-\frac{3}{2}}(1+s)^{-\frac{3}{2}} ||V||_{\tilde{X}_T}^2 ds
\]

\[
\lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{1}{2}} ||V||_{\tilde{X}_T}^2.
\]

Here, we have used that: \(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\frac{2p-2}{2p}) \leq \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq 1, \quad \frac{1}{2} - \frac{3}{2p} \geq \frac{3}{2}(1 - \frac{2}{p})\) and \(\frac{3}{2} < \frac{1}{2}\) if \(6 \leq p < +\infty\). By using again the fact that \(\varepsilon\Delta\chi_{\varepsilon,\kappa_0}(D)\) is a bounded multiplier in \(L^p\), \(1 < p < \infty\), we have:

\[
||I_{432}||_{W^{\sigma,p}} \lesssim \int_{t-1}^t ||T_{\frac{m}{\lambda_j}}(\varepsilon\Delta\tilde{r}_j, \tilde{r}_k)||_{H^{\sigma+1}} ds
\]

\[
\lesssim \int_{t-1}^t ||\varepsilon\Delta r_j||_{H^{\sigma+\frac{1}{2}}} ||r_k||_{W^{\sigma+\frac{1}{2}}} + ||\varepsilon\Delta r_j||_{W^{\sigma}} ||r_k||_{H^{\sigma+\frac{1}{2}}} ds
\]

\[
\lesssim \int_{t-1}^t ||R||_{H^{\sigma+\frac{1}{2}}} ||R||_{W^{\sigma}} ds \lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{1}{2}} ||V||_{\tilde{X}_T}^2.
\]

For \(I_{44}\), we need to use the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.4.** For \(k \leq N - 1\), we have the following uniform for \(\varepsilon \in (0, 1]\) estimates:

\[
||\varepsilon\Delta r||_{H^k} \lesssim (1 + t)^{-1} (||\varepsilon\Delta(0)||_{Y} + ||\varepsilon\Delta(0)||_{\tilde{X}_T}),
\]

\[
||\varepsilon\Delta^2 r||_{H^k} \lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (||\varepsilon\Delta(0)||_{Y} + ||\varepsilon\Delta(0)||_{\tilde{X}_T}).
\]

**Proof.** By using the equation (4.6) for \(R\), we obtain from Lemma 3.11 and Corollary 3.13

\[
||\varepsilon\Delta r||_{H^k} \leq ||e^{\varepsilon\Delta(0)}||_{H^k} + \int_0^t ||e^{\varepsilon(t-s)}\varepsilon\Delta\chi_{\varepsilon,\kappa_0}(D)Q^{-1}V(0)||_{H^k} ds
\]

\[
\lesssim (1 + t)^{-1} ||V(0)||_{H^k} + \int_0^t (1 + t - s)^{-1} ||\varepsilon\Delta\chi_{\varepsilon,\kappa_0}(D)Q^{-1}B(V, V)||_{H^k} ds
\]

\[
\lesssim (1 + t)^{-1} ||V(0)||_{H^k} + \int_0^t (1 + t - s)^{-1} (1 + s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} ||V||_{\tilde{X}_T}^2 ds
\]

\[
\lesssim (1 + t)^{-1} ||V(0)||_{H^k} + ||V||_{\tilde{X}_T}^2.
\]

where we have used that for \(6 \leq p < +\infty, 1 < \frac{3}{2}(1 - \frac{2}{p}) < \frac{3}{2}\). The other inequality follows from the same arguments by noticing that \(\frac{1}{2}(1 - \frac{2}{p}) < 2\). \[\square\]
We go back to the estimate of $I_{44}$ in (4.3). By using the last lemma, we get:
\[
\|I_{44}\|_{W^{\sigma,p}} \lesssim \int_0^t (1 + t - s)^{-\frac{3}{2}(1 - \frac{2}{p})} \|T_{\frac{e}{\sigma_jk}} (\varepsilon \Delta)^2 \tilde{r}_j, \tilde{r}_k\|_{W^{\sigma + 3(1 - \frac{2}{p}) + 1, p}} ds
\]
\[
\lesssim \int_0^t (1 + t - s)^{-\frac{3}{2}(1 - \frac{2}{p})} \left( \|\varepsilon \Delta r_j\|_{H^{\sigma + 3(1 - \frac{2}{p}) + 3} \times H^{\sigma + 3(1 - \frac{2}{p}) + 3}} \right) ds
\]
\[
\lesssim \int_0^t (1 + t - s)^{-\frac{3}{2}(1 - \frac{2}{p})} (1 + s)^{-\frac{3}{2}(1 - \frac{2}{p})} \|\varepsilon \Delta r_j\|_{H^{\sigma + 3(1 - \frac{2}{p}) + 3} \times H^{\sigma + 3(1 - \frac{2}{p}) + 3}} ds
\]
\[
\lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{3}{2}(1 - \frac{2}{p})} \|\varepsilon \Delta r_j\|_{H^{\sigma + 3(1 - \frac{2}{p}) + 3}} ds.
\]

The term $I_{46}$ can be estimated in the same way as $I_{44}$:
\[
\|I_{46}\|_{W^{\sigma,p}} \lesssim \int_0^t (1 + t - s)^{-\frac{3}{2}(1 - \frac{2}{p})} \|T_{\frac{e}{\sigma_jk}} (\varepsilon \Delta \tilde{r}_j, \varepsilon \Delta \tilde{r}_k\|_{W^{\sigma + 3(1 - \frac{2}{p}) + 1, p}} ds
\]
\[
\lesssim \int_0^t (1 + t - s)^{-\frac{3}{2}(1 - \frac{2}{p})} \left( \|\varepsilon \Delta r_j\|_{H^{\sigma + 3(1 - \frac{2}{p}) + 3} \times H^{\sigma + 3(1 - \frac{2}{p}) + 3}} + \|\varepsilon \Delta r_k\|_{H^{\sigma + 3(1 - \frac{2}{p}) + 3} \times H^{\sigma + 3(1 - \frac{2}{p}) + 3}} \right) ds
\]
\[
\lesssim \int_0^t (1 + t - s)^{-\frac{3}{2}(1 - \frac{2}{p})} (1 + s)^{-\frac{3}{2}(1 - \frac{2}{p})} \|\varepsilon \Delta r_j\|_{H^{\sigma + 3(1 - \frac{2}{p}) + 3} \times H^{\sigma + 3(1 - \frac{2}{p}) + 3}} ds.
\]

The terms $I_{45}, I_{47}$ are similar to $I_5, I_7$, so we can skip them.

It remains to estimate
\[
I_3 = i \int_0^t e^{i(t-s)} \Delta e^{i(t-s)b(D)} \varepsilon \Delta \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}(D) T_{\frac{e}{\sigma_jk}} (r_j(s), r_k(s)) ds.
\]

Integrating by parts in time again, we get
\[
I_3 = i \int_0^t e^{i(t-s)} \Delta e^{i(t-s)b(D)} \varepsilon \Delta \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}(D) n_1(D) T_{\frac{e}{\sigma_jk}} (r_j(t), r_k(t)) ds
\]
\[
- e^{i(t-s)} \Delta e^{-i(t-s)b(D)} \varepsilon \Delta \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}(D) n_1(D) T_{\frac{e}{\sigma_jk}} (\tilde{r}_j(t), \tilde{r}_k(t)) ds
\]
\[
+ \int_0^t e^{i(t-s)} \Delta e^{-i(t-s)b(D)} \varepsilon \Delta \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}(D) n_1(D) \left[ T_{\frac{e}{\sigma_jk}} (\varepsilon \Delta \tilde{r}_j + \tilde{B}_j, r_k) + T_{\frac{e}{\sigma_jk}} (\tilde{r}_j, \varepsilon \Delta \tilde{r}_k + \tilde{B}_k) \right] ds
\]
\[
\triangleq I_{31} + \cdots + I_{37}.
\]

Note that $I_{34} = I_{33}$, and that the estimates for $I_{31}, I_{32}, I_{35}, I_{37}$ are similar to the ones for $I_1, I_2, I_{45}, I_{47}$, so we can skip them.

For $I_{33}$, we use Lemma 3.14 and Lemma 3.11 to get:
\[
\|I_{33}\|_{W^{\sigma,p}} \lesssim \int_0^t \|e^{i(t-s)} \Delta (\varepsilon \Delta)^2 \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}(D) n_1(D) T_{\frac{e}{\sigma_jk}} (r_j, r_k)(s)\|_{H^{\sigma + 3(1 - \frac{2}{p})}} ds
\]
\[
\lesssim \int_0^t (1 + t - s)^{-\frac{3}{2}(1 - \frac{2}{p})} \left( \|T_{\frac{e}{\sigma_jk}} (r_j, r_k)(s)\|_{H^{\sigma + 3(1 - \frac{2}{p}) + 1}} \right) ds
\]
\[
\lesssim \int_0^t (1 + t - s)^{-\frac{3}{2}(1 - \frac{2}{p})} (1 + s)^{-\frac{3}{2}(1 - \frac{2}{p})} \|\varepsilon \Delta r_j\|_{H^{\sigma + 3(1 - \frac{2}{p}) + 3} \times H^{\sigma + 3(1 - \frac{2}{p}) + 3}} ds.
\]
This ends the proof of Proposition 4.3.

We thus have (4.1) by combining Proposition 4.1 and 4.3. Theorem 1.3 then follows from the interpolation inequality: for any $1 < p' < 2$,

$$
\|(q_0^\xi, \nabla \phi_0^\xi, P_+ u_0^\xi)\|_{W^{\sigma+3, p'}} \lesssim \|(q_0^\xi, \nabla \phi_0^\xi, P_+ u_0^\xi)\|_{W^{\sigma+3, 1}}^{\theta} \|(q_0^\xi, \nabla \phi_0^\xi, P_+ u_0^\xi)\|_{H^{\sigma+1}}^{1-\theta}.
$$

**Remark 4.5.** If we only prove the Theorem 1.3 for $6 < p \leq 12$, the decay estimate for $I_3, I_4$ will be easier, that is, we do not need to integrate by parts in time again. Indeed, for example, when $p = 12$, we could estimate $I_3$ as follows:

$$
\|I_3\|_{W^{\sigma, 12}} \lesssim \|I_3\|_{W^{\sigma+1, \frac{12}{7}}} \lesssim \int_0^t (1 + t - s)^{-\frac{5}{2}} \|T_m \sigma_{jk} \nabla_\sigma (\tilde{r}, \tilde{r})\|_{W^{\sigma+\frac{5}{2}, \frac{12}{7}}} ds
$$

$$
\lesssim \int_0^t (1 + t - s)^{-\frac{5}{2}} \|\tilde{r}\|_{W^{\sigma+3, \frac{12}{7}}} ds
$$

$$
\lesssim \int_0^t (1 + t - s)^{-\frac{5}{2}} (1 + s)^{-\frac{5}{2}} ds \|U\|_{X_T}^3 \lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{5}{2}} \|U\|_{X_T}^3.
$$

For the estimate of $I_4$, we can use the identity

$$
T_m \sigma_{jk} (\epsilon \Delta \tilde{r}, \tilde{r}) = \epsilon \Delta T_m \sigma_{jk} (\tilde{r}, \tilde{r}) - 2 \sum_{l=1}^3 T_m \sigma_{jk} (\epsilon \frac{\partial \tilde{r}}{\partial l}, \epsilon \frac{\partial \tilde{r}}{\partial l}).
$$

and the a priori estimates:

$$
\|\epsilon \frac{1}{2} \nabla \tilde{r}\|_{H^{N-1}} \lesssim (1 + s)^{-\frac{5}{2}} \|U\|_{X}, \quad \|\epsilon \frac{1}{2} \nabla \tilde{r}\|_{W^{N-2, \frac{12}{7}}} \lesssim (1 + s)^{-\frac{5}{2}} \|U\|_{X}.
$$

Nevertheless, we are interested also in $12 < p < \infty$, and in this case, it is necessary to use a normal form transformation again because $p'$ is too small to allow us to conclude the estimate directly.

**Remark 4.6.** We now choose $24 \leq p < +\infty$. By interpolation, for any $2 \leq q \leq p$, we have the decay estimate:

$$
\|(q, u)\|_{W^{\sigma, q}} \lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{5}{2}(1-\frac{2}{q})} \|(q, u)\|_{X},
$$

$$
\|(q, u)(t)\|_{W^{\sigma, \infty}} \lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{5}{2}} \|(q, u)\|_{X}.
$$

Indeed, we only need to prove (4.9) for $\nabla^\sigma (q, u)$ as the other is almost obvious. By the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality, we have:

$$
\|\nabla^\sigma (q, u)\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|(q, u)\|_{W^{\sigma, q}}^{\theta} \|(q, u)\|_{H^{\sigma+\frac{5}{2}}}^{1-\theta} \lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{5}{2}(1-\frac{2}{q})} \|(q, u)\|_{X},
$$

where $\theta = 1 - \frac{1}{(4-\frac{2}{q})p+1}$ and $l = 7$. When $p \geq 24$, we have: $\frac{3}{2}(1 - \frac{2}{p})\theta > \frac{4}{3}$.

5. **Proof of Theorem 1.3**

Now our aim is to prove Theorem 1.4, that is to say, to get global existence for system (1.4) under the assumption that the incompressible part of the initial velocity is small compared to $\epsilon$. We adapt the energy estimate showed in [27] where the original (ENSP) system was treated. However, we need to focus more on the perturbation term where we should make the most use of the integrability of time decay of $(q, u)$ in some Sobolev spaces. Global existence for $(n, u, \nabla \psi)$ follows from the energy estimate (see lemma 5.1 and lemma 5.2) and classical bootstrap arguments. To prove the decay estimate, again, inspired by [27] we use an interpolation argument between the energy estimate and an $H^{-\frac{s}{2}}$ estimate which is true if the initial data is in this space. This yields a good energy inequality (see (5.28)), which finally gives the decay estimate.
We define the energy functional:

\[ E(n, u, \nabla \psi) = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq M} E_\alpha = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq M} \frac{1}{2} \int \rho |\partial^\alpha v|^2 + |\partial^\alpha n|^2 + |\partial^\alpha \nabla \psi|^2 \, dx. \]  

(5.2)

Denote also \( E_k = \sum_{|\alpha| = k} E_\alpha \). We carry out energy estimates in the following two lemmas.

**Lemma 5.1.** Assuming that \((\rho = q + 1, \nabla \phi, u)\) are given by Theorem 1.3, so that in particular \( \|(q, \nabla \phi, u)\|_{H^3} \leq C\delta \), and that \( E_3 \leq C\delta \varepsilon \), with \( C \) an absolute constant and \( \delta \) small enough, such that \( \|\phi, n\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\|\phi, n\|_{H^2} \leq C\delta \leq \frac{1}{10} \). Then the following energy inequality holds: for any \( k = 1, 2 \cdots M \) we have:

\[
\frac{d}{dt} E_k + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq M} E_\alpha = \frac{3}{2} \int (u, \partial^\alpha v) \, dx + (E_3^2 + \varepsilon \|\phi\|_{H^2}^2) \|\nabla v, n\|_{H^2}^2 + \varepsilon^2 \|\phi\|_{H^2}^2 (E_3 + E_3^2) \|\phi\|_{W^1}^2 + \varepsilon \|\phi\|_{W^1}^2. \]

(5.3)

where \( 3 \leq M \leq \sigma - 2 \).

**Proof.** By local existence, we have enough regularity to do energy estimates. We take the time derivative of the energy functional \( E_\alpha, |\alpha| = k \), and we make use of the equation (5.1) to get:

\[
\frac{d}{dt} E_\alpha + \varepsilon \int (u, \partial^\alpha v) \, dx = \sum_{j=1}^{10} F_j.
\]

(5.4)

where

\[
F_1 = \int \partial^\alpha n \left( \partial^\alpha (\rho \partial^\alpha v) - \partial^\alpha (\rho \partial^\alpha v) \right) \, dx, \quad F_2 = \int \partial^\alpha \nabla \psi \cdot \rho \partial^\alpha v - \partial^\alpha \nabla \psi \cdot \partial^\alpha (\rho v) \, dx,
\]

\[
F_3 = \int \rho \partial^\alpha v \left( u \cdot \partial^\alpha v - \partial^\alpha (u \cdot \partial^\alpha v) \right) \, dx, \quad F_4 = -\int \rho \partial^\alpha v \partial^\alpha (v \cdot \partial^\alpha u) \, dx,
\]

\[
F_5 = -\int \partial^\alpha n \partial^\alpha (nu) \, dx, \quad F_6 = -\int \partial^\alpha \nabla \psi \cdot \partial^\alpha (nu) \, dx,
\]

\[
F_7 = -\varepsilon \int \nabla q \cdot \partial^\alpha v \partial^\alpha \nabla v + (\nabla q \otimes \partial^\alpha v) \cdot \partial^\alpha \nabla v \, dx,
\]

\[
F_8 = \varepsilon \int \rho \partial^\alpha v \partial^\alpha \left( \left( \frac{1}{p + n} - 1 \right) \nabla v \right) \, dx, \quad F_9 = \varepsilon \int \rho \partial^\alpha v \partial^\alpha \left( \left( \frac{1}{p + n} - 1 \right) \nabla u \right) \, dx,
\]

\[
F_{10} = -\int \rho \partial^\alpha v \partial^\alpha (v \cdot \nabla v) + \partial^\alpha n \partial^\alpha (nu) + \partial^\alpha \nabla \psi \partial^\alpha (nu) \, dx.
\]
Of course, \(F_1, F_2, F_3\) equal to 0 when \(|\alpha| = k = 0\). When \(k \geq 1\), using product estimate and Young’s inequality, we have for \(F_1\)

\[
F_1 = -\int \partial^n a (|a|^2, \rho) \text{div} v + \partial^n (\nabla a \cdot v) - \nabla a \cdot \partial^n v) \, dx
\]

\[
\lesssim \|\partial^n a\|_{L^2} (\|\nabla v\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla v\|_{H^{2,1}}) \|\nabla \rho\|_{W^{1,\infty}} + (\|v\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla v\|_{H^{2,1}}) \|\nabla \rho\|_{W^{1,\infty}}
\]

\[
\lesssim \|\nabla \psi\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|\nabla v\|_{H^{2,1}} + \|\nabla \psi\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|\nabla v\|_{H^{2,1}}
\]

\[
\lesssim \|\nabla \psi\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|\nabla v\|_{H^{2,1}} + \|\nabla \psi\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|\nabla v\|_{H^{2,1}}
\]

\[
(\|\nabla \psi\|_{W^{1,\infty}} + \|\nabla \psi\|_{W^{1,\infty}}) (\|\nabla v\|_{H^{2,1}} + \|\nabla v\|_{H^{2,1}}) + \mathcal{E}_3 \|\nabla \psi\|_{W^{1,\infty}}
\]

\[
\lesssim \|\nabla \psi\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|\nabla \psi\|_{W^{1,\infty}}.
\]

(5.5)

Here, in the last inequality we have used that \(\|\nabla \psi\|_{W^{1,\infty}}\) is small. We point out that we use the power \(\frac{5}{4}\) in the above mainly to get more time integrability for the ‘perturbation term’, that is we want \(b\) larger than \(\frac{5}{4}\) in (5.24) and (5.25) which will lead to the better decay estimate for \((n, \nabla \psi, v)\).

The estimates for \(F_2\) and \(F_3\). For \(F_2\), we write

\[
F_2 = \int \partial^n a \psi \cdot (x \partial^n a - \partial^n (a v)) \, dx \leq \|\partial^n a \psi\|_{L^2} \|a\|_{W^{1,\infty}} (\|v\|_{L^2} + \|v\|_{H^{2,1}})
\]

\[
\lesssim (\|\psi\|_{W^{1,\infty}} + \|\psi\|_{W^{1,\infty}}) (\|\nabla v\|_{H^{2,1}} + \|\nabla v\|_{H^{2,1}}) + \mathcal{E}_3 \|\nabla \psi\|_{W^{1,\infty}}
\]

\[
\lesssim \|\psi\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \mathcal{E}_k + \mathcal{E}_3 \|\nabla \psi\|_{W^{1,\infty}}.
\]

(5.6)

and we can get in the same way

\[
F_3 \lesssim \|\nabla u\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \mathcal{E}_k + \mathcal{E}_3 \|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}}.
\]

(5.7)

We now estimate \(F_4 - F_7\) with \(|\alpha| = k \geq 0\). By product estimates and Young’s inequality again, we have for \(F_4\),

\[
F_4 \lesssim \|\partial^n a\|_{L^2} (\|\nabla u\|_{W^{1,\infty}} (\|v\|_{L^2} + \|v\|_{H^{2,1}})) \lesssim (\|\nabla u\|_{W^{1,\infty}} + \|\nabla u\|_{W^{1,\infty}}) \|\nabla v\|_{H^{2,1}} + \mathcal{E}_3 \|\nabla u\|_{W^{1,\infty}}
\]

\[
\lesssim \|\nabla u\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \mathcal{E}_k + \mathcal{E}_3 \|\nabla u\|_{W^{1,\infty}}.
\]

(5.8)

For \(F_5\), we integrate by parts for the first term and use Hölder’s inequality for the other two terms to get

\[
F_5 = -\int \partial^n a (|a|^2, \rho) \text{div} u + \partial^n a \nabla n + \partial^n (n \text{div} u) \, dx
\]

\[
\lesssim \|\partial^n a\|_{L^2} \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} + \|\partial^n a\|_{L^2} \|\nabla u\|_{W^{1,\infty}} (\|n\|_{H^{2,1}} + \|n\|_{H^{2,1}})
\]

\[
\lesssim (\|\nabla u\|_{W^{1,\infty}} + \|\nabla u\|_{W^{1,\infty}}) \|n\|_{H^{2,1}} + \mathcal{E}_3 \|\nabla u\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|n\|_{H^{2,1}}
\]

\[
\lesssim \|\nabla u\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \mathcal{E}_k + \mathcal{E}_3 \|\nabla u\|_{W^{1,\infty}}.
\]

(5.9)

In a similar way, we have

\[
F_6 \lesssim \|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|\nabla u\|_{H^{2,1}} + \mathcal{E}_3 \|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \lesssim \|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \mathcal{E}_k + \mathcal{E}_3 \|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}}.
\]

(5.10)

as well as

\[
F_7 \lesssim \varepsilon \|\nabla \psi\|_{L^2} (\|v\|_{H^{2,1}} + \|v\|_{H^{2,1}}).
\]

(5.11)
For $F_8$, we only handle $k = |\alpha| > 0$ since the case $k = |\alpha| = 0$ is easier. Integrating by parts, and denoting $\partial^\alpha = \partial_j \partial^\alpha$ and using Lemma 5.2, we get that:

$$F_8 = -\varepsilon \int (\rho \partial_j \partial^\alpha v + \partial_j \rho \partial^\alpha v) \partial^j ((1 + (1 - 1) \mathcal{L} v)$$

$$\leq \varepsilon (\|\rho\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^3}) \|\nabla v\|_{H^{|\alpha|}} ((1 + (1 - 1) \mathcal{L} v)_{H^{|\alpha|} - 1}$$

$$\leq \varepsilon \|\nabla v\|_{H^{|\alpha|}} (\|\varphi + n\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla^2 v\|_{H^{|\alpha|} - 1} + \|1 \mathcal{W}^{|\alpha| - 1, 6} \|\nabla^2 v\|_{L^3})$$

$$\leq \varepsilon \|\nabla v\|_{H^{|\alpha|}} (\|\varphi + n\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla^2 v\|_{H^{|\alpha|} - 1} + \|\varphi + n\|_{W^{|\alpha| - 1, 6}} \|\nabla^2 v\|_{L^3})$$

$$\leq \varepsilon (\mathcal{E}_3^2 + \|\varphi\|_{H^M}) \|\nabla v\|_{H^{|\alpha|}}^2 + \varepsilon \mathcal{E}_3^2 \|\varphi\|_{W^{|\alpha| - 1, 6}}^2,$$

(5.12)

where we have used the fact that $\|\varphi\|_{H^2}$ is bounded in the second inequality.

We now deal with $F_9$ in the same fashion:

$$F_9 \leq \varepsilon \|\partial^\alpha v\|_{L^2} \|\partial^\alpha ((1 + (1 - 1) \mathcal{L} u)\|_{L^2}$$

$$\leq \varepsilon \|\partial^\alpha v\|_{L^2} (\|\nabla^2 u\|_{W^{|\alpha|, \infty}} (\|\varphi + n\|_{L^2} + \|\varphi + n\|_{H^{|\alpha|}})$$

$$\leq \|\nabla^2 u\|_{W^{|\alpha|, \infty}} \|\varphi\|_{H^{|\alpha|}} + \varepsilon \|\nabla^2 u\|_{W^{|\alpha|, \infty}} (\|\varphi\|_{H^{|\alpha|}}^2 + \mathcal{E}_3)$$

$$+ \varepsilon \|\nabla^2 u\|_{W^{|\alpha|, \infty}} (\|\varphi\|_{H^{|\alpha|}} + \|\varphi\|_{H^{|\alpha|}}^2)$$

$$\leq \|\nabla^2 u\|_{W^{|\alpha|, \infty}} \|\varphi\|_{H^{|\alpha|}} + \varepsilon \|\nabla^2 u\|_{W^{|\alpha|, \infty}} (\|\varphi\|_{H^{|\alpha|}}^2 + \mathcal{E}_3).$$

(5.13)

Finally, for $F_{10}$, inspired by [27], we actually have:

$$F_{10} \leq \mathcal{E}_3^2 (\|\nabla v\|_{H^{|\alpha|}}^2 + \|n\|_{H^{|\alpha|}}^2).$$

(5.14)

We just give details for the third term of $F_{10}$, the first two terms are similar and easier. Integrating by parts and using the Poisson equation, we have:

$$\int \partial^\alpha \nabla \psi \cdot \partial^\alpha (n v) dx = \int \nabla \psi \cdot \partial^\alpha (\Delta \psi v) dx = \int \partial^\alpha \nabla^2 \psi \cdot \partial^\alpha (\nabla \psi \otimes v) + \partial^\alpha \nabla \psi \cdot \partial^\alpha ((\nabla \psi \cdot \nabla) v) dx$$

$$= (5.15)_1 + (5.15)_2. \quad \Delta$$

(5.15)

For the estimate of $(5.15)_1$, we use Kato-Ponce inequality (see Lemma 5.1) again to get:

$$\|\nabla^2 \psi\|_{H^{|\alpha|}} (\|\nabla \psi\|_{W^{|\alpha|, 6}} + \|\varphi\|_{W^{|\alpha|, 6}}) \|\nabla v\|_{L^3}) \leq \mathcal{E}_3^2 (\|n\|_{H^{|\alpha|}}^2 + \|\nabla v\|_{H^{|\alpha|}}^2).$$

(5.15)

For $(5.15)_2$, by using Kato-Ponce inequality and Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality, we have:

$$\|\nabla^2 \psi\|_{W^{|\alpha|, 6}} \|\nabla v\|_{W^{|\alpha|, 6}}$$

$$\leq \|n\|_{H^{|\alpha|}} (\|\nabla \psi\|_{H^{|\alpha|}} + \|\nabla \psi\|_{W^{|\alpha|, 3}} \|\nabla v\|_{L^2})$$

$$\leq \|n\|_{H^{|\alpha|}} (\|\nabla \psi\|_{H^{|\alpha|}} + \|\nabla \psi\|_{W^{|\alpha|, 3}} \|\nabla v\|_{L^2})$$

$$\leq \|n\|_{H^{|\alpha|}} (\|\nabla \psi\|_{H^{|\alpha|}} + \|\nabla \psi\|_{W^{|\alpha|, 3}} \|\nabla v\|_{L^2})$$

$$\leq \mathcal{E}_3^2 \|n\|_{H^{|\alpha|}} \|\nabla^2 \psi\|_{H^{|\alpha|}}^2,$$

where in the above $\theta = \frac{1}{|\alpha| + 1}$ and $s = \frac{1}{2|\alpha| + 1} \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. Using $(5.5, 5.14)$, and summing up for any $|\alpha| = k$ we get the Lemma 5.1.

As indicated in [27], to close the energy estimate, we must get some damping for $n$, this can be achieved by doing the ‘cross’ energy estimate.
Lemma 5.2. Under the assumption of Lemma 5.1, we have for any $k = 0, 1 \cdots M - 1$,

$$\sum_{|\alpha|=k} \frac{d}{dt} \int \partial^\alpha \nabla n \cdot \partial^\alpha v dx + \frac{1}{2} (\|n\|^2_{H^k} + \|n\|^2_{H^{k+1}}) \lesssim (\|v\|^2_{H^{k+1}} + \|v\|^2_{L^2}) + (\|(\varrho, u)\|_{W^{k+2,\infty}} + \|(\varrho, u)\|^3_{W^{k+2,\infty}})(\mathcal{E}_k + \mathcal{E}_{k+1})$$

(5.16) + $\varepsilon \mathcal{E}_3(\|(\varrho, u)\|^2_{W^{k+2,\infty}} + \|(\varrho, u)\|^2_{W^{\alpha,6}})$. 

Proof. Taking $\partial^\alpha \nabla (\text{resp. } \partial^\alpha)$ on the first (resp. second) equation in system (5.1), multiplying by $\partial^\alpha v (\text{resp. } \partial^\alpha \nabla n)$, integrating in space and adding together, we get

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int \partial^\alpha \nabla v \cdot \partial^\alpha v dx + \int |\partial^\alpha \nabla n|^2 + |\partial^\alpha n|^2 dx = G_1 + G_2 + G_3 + G_4 + G_5$$

(5.17)

We handle the estimates for $|\alpha| \geq 1$, $\alpha = 0$ being easier.

Similar to the estimate in $|\alpha| \geq 1$, by Hölder’s and Young’s inequality, we have that

$$G_1 = \int \partial^\alpha \nabla v \cdot \partial^\alpha \nabla (v + \varrho v + nu) dx$$

(5.18)

as well as

$$G_2 = -\int \partial^\alpha \nabla n \cdot \partial^\alpha (u \cdot \nabla v + v \cdot \nabla u) dx$$

(5.19)

By Lemma 7.1, 7.2 in the appendix, we estimate $G_3$ as follows:

$$G_3 = -\varepsilon \int \partial^\alpha \nabla n \cdot \partial^\alpha \left( \frac{1}{\rho + n} L v \right) dx$$

(5.20)
using that \( c\varepsilon^3 \leq c\delta\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{8} \) where \( \delta \) is small enough. Next, \( G_4 \) can be estimated exactly as \( F_9 \). For \( |\alpha| = k \geq 1 \), we have:

\[
G_4 = -\varepsilon \int \partial^\alpha \nabla n \cdot \partial^\alpha ((\frac{1}{\rho + n} - 1)L\alpha) dx
\]

\[
\leq \varepsilon \|\partial^\alpha \nabla n\|_L^2 \left( \|\nabla^2 u\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \right) (\|\rho + n\|_{L^2} + \|\rho + n\|_{H^{|\alpha|}})
\]

\[
\leq (\|\nabla^2 u\|_{W^{1,\infty}} + \|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^2} \|\nabla u\|_{H^{|\alpha|}} + \varepsilon \mathcal{E}_3 \|\nabla^2 u\|_{H^{|\alpha|}} + \varepsilon^2 \|\rho\|_{H^k}^2 \|\nabla^2 u\|^2_{W^{1,\infty}})
\]

\[
\leq \|\nabla^2 u\|^3_{W^{1,\infty}} (\varepsilon_k + \varepsilon_{k+1})^3 + \varepsilon \mathcal{E}_3 \|\nabla^2 u\|^2_{H^{|\alpha|}} + \varepsilon^2 \|\rho\|^2_{H^k} \|\nabla^2 u\|^2_{H^{|\alpha|}}. \tag{5.21}
\]

For \( G_5 \), as in [27], one can show that if \( \varepsilon_3^\frac{3}{4} \leq \delta\varepsilon \) with \( \delta \) small enough, we have:

\[
G_5 \leq \frac{1}{8} (\|n\|^2_{H_k} + \|\nabla n\|^2_{H_k}) + c(\|\rho\|^2_{H_k} + \|\nabla^2 u\|^2_{H_k}). \tag{5.22}
\]

Summing up from (5.18) to (5.22), we get Lemma 5.2

**Proof of Theorem 7.4** We first prove global existence. Summing up from \( k = 0 \) to \( k = M \), we can conclude from Lemma 5.1 and Lemma 5.2, Remark 4.6 that if \( \mathcal{E}_3 \leq \delta^2 \varepsilon^2 \) and \( \delta \) is small enough, then there are some constants which depend only on \( M \), st.

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{E}_M + C\varepsilon \|\nabla v\|^2_{H^M}
\]

\[
\leq C_1 (1 + t)^{-a} \|(q, u)\|_{X}^3 \mathcal{E}_M + C_2 \delta\varepsilon \|\nabla v, n\|^2_{H^M} + C_3 \varepsilon^2 (1 + t)^{-b} \|(q, u)\|^2_{X} + \|(q, u)\|^2_{X} \tag{5.23}
\]

\[
\leq C_1 \delta^\frac{3}{4} (1 + t)^{-a} \mathcal{E}_M + C_2 \delta\varepsilon \|\nabla v, n\|^2_{H^M} + C_3 \delta^\varepsilon^2 (1 + t)^{-b},
\]

and

\[
\sum_{|\alpha| \leq M-1} \frac{d}{dt} \|\partial^\alpha \nabla n \cdot \partial^\alpha v dx + \frac{1}{2} \|n\|^2_{H^N}
\]

\[
\leq C_4 \|\nabla v\|^2_{H^M} + C_5 (1 + t)^{-a} \|(q, u)\|_{X} \mathcal{E}_M + C_6 \mathcal{E}_3 (1 + t)^{-b} \|(q, u)\|_{X} \tag{5.24}
\]

\[
\leq C_4 \|\nabla v\|^2_{H^M} + C_5 (1 + t)^{-a} \|(q, u)\|^2_{X} \mathcal{E}_M + C_6 \delta^\varepsilon^2 (1 + t)^{-b},
\]

where \( a > 1, b > \frac{5}{4} \) (here we use \( \|(q, u)\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \leq (1 + t)^{-\frac{a}{4}} \).)

Multiplying (5.24) by \( 8C_2 \delta\varepsilon \) and add it to (5.23), if \( \varepsilon_3^\frac{1}{4} \leq \delta\varepsilon \) and \( \delta \) is small enough, (say, \( 32C_2C_4 \delta \leq C \)) we get there exist constant \( C_7, C_8, C_9 \), st.

\[
\frac{d}{dt} (\mathcal{E}_M + 8C_2 \delta\varepsilon \sum_{|\alpha| \leq M-1} \|\partial^\alpha \nabla n \cdot \partial^\alpha v dx + \frac{1}{2} \|n\|^2_{H^M} \leq C_8 (1 + t)^{-a} \delta^\frac{3}{4} \mathcal{E}_M + C_9 \delta^\varepsilon^2 (1 + t)^{-b}. \tag{5.25}
\]

Define \( \hat{\mathcal{E}}_M = \mathcal{E}_M + 8C_2 \delta\varepsilon \sum_{|\alpha| \leq M-1} \|\partial^\alpha \nabla n \cdot \partial^\alpha v dx \), we see that \( \hat{\mathcal{E}}_M \approx \mathcal{E}_M \) (say \( \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{E}_M \leq \hat{\mathcal{E}}_M \leq 2\mathcal{E}_M \)) if \( \delta \) is small enough.

From inequality (5.25), Grönwall’s inequality and the fact \( \|(q, u)\|_{X} \leq \delta \), we achieve that:

\[
\mathcal{E}_M(t) + C_7 \varepsilon \int_0^t \|\nabla v\|^2_{H^M} ds \leq C_6 \delta^\frac{3}{4} \int_0^t (1 + s)^{-a} \mathcal{E}_M(0) + 2C_9 \delta \varepsilon^2 \int_0^t (1 + s)^{-b} ds \tag{5.26}
\]

\[
\leq C_10 \mathcal{E}_M(0) + C_{11} \delta^3 \varepsilon^2.
\]
Global existence of \((n, \nabla \psi, v)\) in \(C([0, +\infty), H^3)\) then is direct by bootstrap arguments. Moreover, we have \(\mathcal{E}_3(t) \leq \delta^2 \varepsilon^2\) if \(\mathcal{E}_3(0) \leq \frac{1}{16} \delta^2 \varepsilon^2\) and \(\delta\) is small enough (Note that \(C_{10} \leq 8\) if \(\delta\) is small enough.) Finally, as can be seen easily from \((5.26)\), in if addition, \(\mathcal{E}_M(0) < +\infty\), then the solution constructed also belongs to \(C([0, \infty), H^M)\).

**Remark 5.3.** If we define \(\mathcal{E}_k^M = \sum_{i=k}^M \mathcal{E}_i\), then by adding \((5.3)\) from \(k\) to \(M\), \((5.10)\) from \(k\) to \(M - 1\) and the same arguments for proving \((5.25)\), we can have (with another constant \(C_T\):

\[
\frac{d}{dt}(\mathcal{E}_k^M + 8C_2 \delta \varepsilon \sum_{i=k}^{M-1} \int \partial^a \nabla n \cdot \partial^a v dx) + C_7 \varepsilon (\|\nabla^{k+1} n\|_{H^{M-k}}^2 + \|\nabla^{k+1} v\|_{H^{M-k}}^2)
\leq C_8 (1 + t)^{-\alpha} \delta^2 \varepsilon^2 \mathcal{E}_k^M + C_T \delta \varepsilon^2 \delta^3 (1 + t)^{-b}.
\]

Motivated by [27], we can prove that if the initial data belongs to some negative Sobolev spaces, the solution for system \((1.4)\) will propagate in this space. This will allow by interpolation to get some time decay for \((n, \nabla \psi, v)\).

**Lemma 5.4.** For \(0 < s \leq \frac{1}{2}\), we have:

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \int |\Lambda^{-s} n|^2 + |\Lambda^{-s} \nabla \psi|^2 + |\Lambda^{-s} v|^2 \, dx\]
\[
\leq (\|\Lambda^{-s} n\|^2_{L^2} + \|\Lambda^{-s} \nabla \psi\|^2_{L^2} + \|\Lambda^{-s} v\|^2_{L^2}) (\|n\|^2_{H^s} + \|\nabla v\|^2_{H^1} + \|(\rho, u)\|_{W^{2,3/s}} (\|(n, v)\|_{H^1} + \|(\rho, u)\|_{H^s})).
\]

**Proof.** Applying \(\Lambda^{-s}\) to the equations \((1.4)\) and multiplying by \(\Lambda^{-s} n, \Lambda^{-s} v\) respectively, we get after using the Poisson equation:

\[
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int |\Lambda^{-s} n|^2 + |\Lambda^{-s} \nabla \psi|^2 + |\Lambda^{-s} v|^2 \, dx\]
\[
= - \int \Lambda^{-s} v \Lambda^{-s} (u \cdot \nabla v + v \cdot \nabla u + v \cdot \nabla v) - \Lambda^{-s} v \Lambda^{-s} (\frac{1}{\rho + n} - 1) (\mathcal{L} u + \mathcal{L} v) \, dx
\]
\[
- \int \Lambda^{-s} n \Lambda^{-s} \nabla \psi \Lambda^{-s} (\rho v + nu + nv) + \Lambda^{-s} \nabla \psi \Lambda^{-s} (\rho v + nu + nv) \, dx
\]
\[
\equiv H_1 + H_2 + H_3 + H_4.
\]

We only estimate \(H_1, H_2\), since the other two terms can be handled by similar arguments. Using Hölder’s inequality and the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality:

\[
\|\Lambda^{-s} f\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{\frac{2}{s + 2}}} 0 \leq s < \frac{3}{2},
\]

we get:

\[
H_1 = - \int \Lambda^{-s} v \Lambda^{-s} (u \cdot \nabla v + v \cdot \nabla u + v \cdot \nabla v) \, dx
\]
\[
\lesssim \|\Lambda^{-s} v\|_{L^2} (\|\nabla v\|_{L^2} \|u\|_{L^{3/s}} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^{3/s}} \|v\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla v\|_{L^2} \|v\|_{L^{3/s}})
\]
\[
\lesssim \|\Lambda^{-s} v\|_{L^2} (\|\nabla v\|^2_{H^1} + \|u\|_{W^{1,3/s}} \|v\|_{H^1}).
\]

\[
H_2 = \int \Lambda^{-s} v \Lambda^{-s} (\frac{1}{\rho + n} - 1) (\mathcal{L} u + \mathcal{L} v) \, dx
\]
\[
\lesssim \|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^2} (\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^2} \|(\rho, n)\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla^2 v\|_{L^2} \|(\rho, n)\|_{L^{3/s}})
\]
\[
\lesssim \|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^2} (\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^2} \|(\rho, n)\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla^2 v\|^2_{L^2} + \|n\|^2_{H^2} + \|\theta\|_{L^{3/s}} \|\nabla^2 v\|_{L^2}).
\]

This ends the proof. \(\square\)
Now we can prove the decay estimate for \((n, \nabla \psi)\) which is stated in Theorem 1.4. Here we follow the arguments in [27] with a few considerations on perturbation terms.

Step 1: Prove \((n, \nabla \psi, v)\) propagate in the negative Sobolev space \(H^{-s}\). We should make use of the damping property of \((n, \nabla v)\) and decay estimate in time of \((\varrho, u)\).

Define
\[
\mathcal{E}_{-s} = \| (n, \nabla \psi, v) \|_{H^{-s}}^2.
\]
By Lemma 5.4, the decay estimate of \((\varrho, u)\): \(\| (\varrho, u) \|_{W^{2, \frac{3}{2}}} \lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{3}{2} (1 - \frac{2s}{3})}\) (note \(\frac{3}{2} (1 - \frac{2s}{3}) > 1\) if \(0 < s < \frac{1}{2}\)) and the damping property of \((n, \nabla v)\) (see (5.26)), we have:
\[
\begin{align*}
&\sup_{0 \leq \tau \leq t} \mathcal{E}_{-s}(\tau) \\
&\leq \mathcal{E}_{-s}(0) + C \int_0^t \| n \|_{H^2}^2 + \| \nabla v \|_{H^1}^2 + \| (\varrho, u) \|_{W^{2, 3/4}} \| (n, v) \|_{H^1} + \| (\varrho, u) \|_{H^1} d\tau \\
&\leq \mathcal{E}_{-s}(0) + (\sup_{0 \leq \tau \leq t} \mathcal{E}_{-s}) \frac{1}{\beta},
\end{align*}
\]
which yields the boundedness of \(\| (n, \nabla \psi, v) \|_{H^{-s}}\) if we suppose \(\mathcal{E}_{-s}(0) < +\infty\).

Step 2: Using interpolation and energy estimate to get new energy inequality, and then get the time decay estimate.
By interpolation, we have:
\[
\| u \|_{L^2} \leq \| u \|_{H^{-s}} \| u \|_{H^1} \| u \|_{H^s},
\]
which is equivalent to
\[
\| u \|_{H^1} \geq \| u \|_{L^2} \| u \|_{H^{-s}} \| u \|_{H^s}.
\]
Combined with (5.26), we get that:
\[
\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{E}_M + C_{12} \varepsilon (\| n \|_{H^M}^2 + \| v \|_{H^M}^2)^{1 + \frac{1}{2}} \leq C_{13} (1 + t)^{-b} \varepsilon^2 + C_{14} (1 + t)^{-a} \mathcal{E}_M. \quad (5.28)
\]
We now prove the decay estimate in time when \(M = 3\). We recall that we assume \(\mathcal{E}_3(0)\) is small with respect to \(\varepsilon\). Defining firstly \(\beta_s = \frac{a}{s} + 1\), \(f = \exp(-\frac{C_{14}}{a-1}(1 + t)^{-a(1-1)})\mathcal{E}_3\), then multiplying (5.28) by \((1 + \varepsilon^{\beta_s} t)^{-\gamma}\) and integrating in time, we have:
\[
\begin{align*}
&f (0) + \gamma \varepsilon^{\beta_s} \int_0^t (1 + \varepsilon^{\beta_s} t)^{-\gamma} f^{1 + \frac{1}{2}} (\tau) d\tau \\
&\leq f (0) + \gamma \varepsilon^{\beta_s} \int_0^t (1 + \varepsilon^{\beta_s} t)^{-\gamma} f^{1 + \frac{1}{2}} (\tau) d\tau + \frac{C_{13}}{a-1} \varepsilon^2 (1 + t)^{-(b-1)} (1 + \varepsilon^{\beta_s} t)^{\gamma} \\
&\leq f (0) + \frac{C_{12}}{2} \varepsilon \int_0^t (1 + \varepsilon^{\beta_s} t)^{-\gamma} f^{1 + \frac{1}{2}} (\tau) d\tau + C_{15} \varepsilon^2 (1 + \varepsilon^{\beta_s} t)^{-s} + \frac{C_{13}}{a-1} \varepsilon^2 (1 + t)^{-(b-1)} (1 + \varepsilon^{\beta_s} t)^{\gamma},
\end{align*}
\]
which yields:
\[
f \lesssim \varepsilon^2 (1 + \varepsilon^{\beta_s} t)^{-s} + \varepsilon^2 (1 + \varepsilon^{\beta_s} t)^{-s} + \varepsilon^2 (1 + t)^{-(b-1)} \lesssim \varepsilon^2 (1 + \varepsilon^{\beta_s} t)^{-s} + \varepsilon^2 (1 + t)^{-(b-1)}.
\]
We thus get that:
\[
\| (n, \nabla \psi, v) (t) \|_{H^s} \lesssim \varepsilon (1 + \varepsilon^{\beta_s} t)^{-\frac{3}{4}} + \varepsilon (1 + t)^{-\frac{b+1}{1-1}}.
\]
which, by considering \(\varepsilon^{\beta_s} t \lesssim 1\) and \(\varepsilon^{\beta_s} t \gtrsim 1\) respectively, yields
\[
\| (n, \nabla \psi, v) (t) \|_{H^s} \leq \varepsilon (1 + \varepsilon^{\beta_s} t)^{-\frac{3}{4}} + \varepsilon (1 + t)^{-\frac{b+1}{1-1}} \lesssim \min\{\varepsilon, (1 + t)^{-\frac{3}{2(1-1)}}\} + \varepsilon (1 + t)^{-\frac{b+1}{1-1}}. \quad (5.29)
\]
This ends the proof of Theorem 1.4.

Remark 5.5. For $M > 3$, as we do not assume the initial data $\|Pu_0\|_{HM}$ is small proportional to $\varepsilon$, we do not expect that $\|(n, \nabla \psi, u)\|_{HM}$ has decay like (5.24) which is independent of $\varepsilon$. However, we still could get some decay in the slow variable "$\varepsilon t$". Defining $g = \exp(-C_{14}\int_0^t (1 + \tau)^{-a} d\tau)E_M = \exp(-\frac{C_{14}}{a}(1 + t)^{-(a-1)})E_M$. We choose again a constant $\gamma > s$ and multiply (5.28) by $(1 + \varepsilon t)^{-\gamma}$, integrate then in time, we achieve that:

$$(1 + \varepsilon t)^\gamma g + C_{12}\varepsilon \int_0^t (1 + \varepsilon \tau)^\gamma g^{1 + \frac{1}{2}}(\tau) d\tau$$

$$\leq g(0) + \gamma \varepsilon \int_0^t (1 + \varepsilon \tau)^{\gamma - 1} g(\tau) d\tau + \frac{C_{13}}{a - 1} \varepsilon^2 (1 + t)^{-(b-1)}(1 + \varepsilon t)$$

$$\leq g(0) + \frac{C_{13}}{2} \varepsilon \int_0^t (1 + \varepsilon \tau)^{\gamma + \frac{1}{2}}(\tau) d\tau + C_{15}(1 + \varepsilon t)^{\gamma - s} + \frac{C_{13}}{a - 1} \varepsilon^2 (1 + t)^{-(b-1)}(1 + \varepsilon t),$$

which yields:

$$g \lesssim (1 + \varepsilon t)^{-\gamma} + (1 + \varepsilon t)^{-s} + \varepsilon^2 (1 + t)^{-(b-1)} \lesssim (1 + \varepsilon t)^{-s} + \varepsilon^2 (1 + t)^{-(b-1)}.$$  

Remark 5.6. By (5.27) and interpolation $\|v\|_{\dot{H}^{k+1}} \geq \|v\|_{\dot{H}^{k+\frac{1}{2}}} \|u\|_{\dot{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}}$, we can also have:

$$\|\nabla^k(n, \nabla \psi, v)\|_{\dot{H}^{M-k}} \lesssim \varepsilon (1 + t)^{-\frac{k}{2} + \beta_{k,l}} + (1 + \varepsilon t)^{-\frac{k}{2}},$$

$$\|\nabla^l(n, \nabla \psi, v)\|_{\dot{H}^{3-l}} \lesssim \varepsilon (1 + \varepsilon \beta_{k,l})t^{-\frac{l}{2} + \beta_{k,l}} + \varepsilon (1 + t)^{-\frac{l}{2} + \beta_{k,l}} \lesssim \min\{\varepsilon, (1 + t)^{-\frac{l}{2} + \beta_{k,l}}\} + \varepsilon (1 + t)^{-\frac{l}{2} + \beta_{k,l}}.$$  

where $k = 0, 1, 2 \cdots M - 1$, $l = 0, 1, 2$ and $\beta_{k,l} = 1 + \frac{2}{l+2}.$

6. Navier-Stokes-Poisson system for ion dynamics

In this section, we consider the ion dynamic Navier-Stokes-Poisson system (1.2). We shall give a sketch of the proof of Theorem 1.6.

6.1. A viscous perturbation of ion Euler-Poisson. Following the global scheme of the proof for the electrons case, we shall first study the following intermediate system which has the property of propagating curl free solutions.

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t \rho + \text{div} u &= -\text{div}(\rho u), \\
\partial_t u + (u \cdot \nabla) u - 2\varepsilon \Delta u + \nabla \rho - \nabla \phi &= 0, \\
(\Delta - 1) \phi &= \rho, \\
u|_{t=0} &= Pu_0, \rho|_{t=0} &= \rho_0 = \rho_0^\delta - 1.
\end{aligned}$$

(6.1)

We first prove the following result:

Proposition 6.1. There exists $\delta_3 > 0$ such that for any family of initial data satisfying

$$\sup_{\varepsilon \in (0,1]} \left( \|(\rho_0^\varepsilon, Pu_0^\varepsilon)\|_{W^{\sigma + \frac{1}{2}(1+\delta), s_k^\varepsilon}} + \|\nabla|^{-1}(\rho_0^\varepsilon, Pu_0^\varepsilon)\|_{H^{N}} \right) \leq \delta_3$$

with $\sigma \geq 5, \kappa \geq 2\sigma + 1, s_k = \frac{8}{3 - 2\kappa}, \kappa = \frac{1}{2M}$. Then for every $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$, there exist a unique solution for system (6.1) in $C([0,\infty), H^N)$. Moreover, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for every $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$, we have the estimate

$$\|(\rho, \nabla \phi, u)(t)\|_{W^{\sigma, s_k}} \leq C \delta_3 (1 + t)^{-(1+\kappa)}, \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$
Remark 6.2. The choice of the $L^p$ type exponent $8_\kappa$ in the above result comes from a constraint in order to get continous properties of the bilinear operators used in the normal form transformation and the slow decay of viscous term. More explanations are given after Proposition 6.6.

Let $h = \sqrt{1 + (1 - \Delta)^{-1}}q$, $c = \frac{\div (|\nabla|)u}{|\nabla|}$, then we get as a counterpart of (3.1),

\[\begin{cases}
\partial_t h + p(|\nabla|)c = q(|\nabla|)\div \left(\frac{h}{\sqrt{1 + (1 - \Delta)^{-1}}} \cdot R\right), \\
\partial_t c - p(|\nabla|)h - 2\varepsilon |\xi| c = R^*|\nabla|\xi c, \\
h|_{t=0} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + (1 - \Delta)^{-1}}} g_0, c|_{t=0} = R^* u_0.
\end{cases}\]

where $p(|\nabla|) = |\nabla|\sqrt{1 + (1 - \Delta)^{-1}}$. We note that we still have (3.2) - (3.3) by replacing $\langle \nabla \rangle$ with $p(|\nabla|)$. We will analysis the high and low frequency separately as before. As for high frequency, similar arguments as in Lemma 3.5 show that the smoothing effect of $\chi^H e^{-|A|}$ is still true. We now focus on the low frequency. To start, we need to analysis $b(r) = \sqrt{p(r)^2 - (\varepsilon r)^2}$ precisely.

Lemma 6.3. Suppose $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, $\kappa_0$ small enough, then on the region $\{\varepsilon r^2 \leq 2\kappa_0\}$, $b(r)$ satisfies the following property:

1. $b'(r) \geq c_1(\kappa_0) > 0$,
2. $b''(r)$ only have one zero point $r_0^{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}$ and $1 \leq r_0^{\varepsilon, \kappa_0} \leq 10$,
3. There exists a small interval $[r_0^{\varepsilon, \kappa_0} - \iota, r_0^{\varepsilon, \kappa_0} + \iota]$ st. $b''(r) \geq c_2 > 0$, where $c_2$ is a small constant independent of $\varepsilon$.

Proof.

\[b'(r) = \sqrt{\frac{2 + r^2}{1 + r^2} - \varepsilon^2 r^2 - r \frac{r}{2} \frac{r}{1 + r^2} + \frac{\varepsilon^2 r}{2} \frac{r}{1 + r^2} + \frac{\varepsilon^2 r^2}{2} \frac{r}{1 + r^2} = \frac{1 + \frac{1}{(1 + r^2)^2} - 2\varepsilon^2 r^2}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{1 + r^2} - \varepsilon^2 r^2}} \geq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\]
on the support of $\chi^{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}(\xi)$ if $4\varepsilon\kappa_0 \leq 4\kappa_0 \leq \frac{1}{2}$.

2. After direct but tedious computations, we have that:

\[b''(r) = (1 + r^2)^{-4}(2 + r^2 - \varepsilon^2 r^2)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \{[1 - (5 - 8\varepsilon^2)\varepsilon^2 r^4]r^4 - [2 - 2\varepsilon^4 r^8 + (22 - 12\varepsilon^2)\varepsilon^2 r^4]r^2 - [6 + (31 - 8\varepsilon^2)\varepsilon^2 r^4 + (20\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^3)\varepsilon r^2 + 6\varepsilon^2]}.\]

Note that if $\varepsilon \leq 1$ and $\kappa_0$ is small enough, then on the region $\{\varepsilon r^2 \leq 2\kappa_0\}$, we have that for $\kappa_0$ sufficiently small, the polynomial in the bracket is a small perturbation of $r^4 - 2r^2 - 6(1 + \varepsilon^2)$ which for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ has only one real simple positive root which is uniformly in $[2, 9]$. Therefore, for $\kappa_0$ small enough $b''$ has only one nonnegative zero which is uniformly for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ in $[1, 10]$.

3. For simplicity, we write $r_0 = r_0^{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}$. One can check that:

\[b''(r_0) = (1 + r_0^2)^{-4}(2 + r_0^2 - \varepsilon^2 r_0^2)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \{[4 - 8(5 - 8\varepsilon^2)\varepsilon^2 r_0^4]r_0^4 - [4 - 20\varepsilon^4 r_0^8 + 6(22 - 12\varepsilon^2)\varepsilon^2 r_0^4]r_0^2 - [4(31 - 8\varepsilon^2)\varepsilon^2 r_0^4 - 2\varepsilon r_0^2]}.\]

\[\Delta = (1 + r_0^2)^{-4}(2 + r_0^2 - \varepsilon^2 r_0^2)^{-\frac{3}{2}}(a_1 r_0^4 + a_2 r_0^2 - a_3)\]

Notice that when $\kappa_0$ is very close to 0, $a_1$ and $a_2$ are very close to 4, $a_3$ is very close to 0. Therefore, as long as $\kappa_0$ is small enough, there exist constants $\iota, c_2$ which are independent of $\varepsilon$, st. $b''(r) \geq c_2 > 0$ on the interval $[r_0 - \iota, r_0 + \iota]$. \[\square\]
This lemma in hand, we could keep track of the proof of Lemma 3.1-3.3 of [10] to get:

**Lemma 6.4.** Suppose \( \kappa_0 \) satisfy the assumptions of the Lemma 6.3, then

\[
\|e^{itb(D)} \chi_{\epsilon, \kappa_0}(D)f\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim_{\kappa_0} (1 + t)^{-\frac{3}{4}} \|f\|_{W^{3,1}},
\]

\[
\|e^{itb(D)} \chi_{\epsilon, \kappa_0}(D)f\|_{L^p} \lesssim_{\kappa_0} (1 + t)^{-\frac{3}{4}(1\frac{-2}{p})} \|f\|_{W^{3,\frac{3}{2}p\nu'}}.
\]

We omit the proof, since thanks to the above properties of \( b \), it follows exactly the same lines as in [10] in the same way as the proof of Lemma 6.1 was following the proof for the classical Klein-Gordon equation. Note that again the above estimates are independent of \( \epsilon \) as before.

To treat low frequencies, we need also to get some continuous property of \( T_{m/\phi_{j,k}} \) on \( L^p \).

**Lemma 6.5. Bilinear estimate:** Define \( \phi_{j,k}(\xi, \eta) = (-1)^{j+1}b(\xi) + (-1)^{k+1}b(\eta) - b(\xi + \eta), j, k = 1, 2 \)

\( m(\xi, \eta) = \tilde{\chi}_{\epsilon, \kappa_0}(\xi) \tilde{\chi}_{\epsilon, \kappa_0}(\eta) \tilde{\chi}_{\epsilon, \kappa_0}(\xi - \eta)|\xi|n_1(\xi)n_2(\xi - \eta)n_3(\eta) \)

where \( n_1, n_2, n_3 \) are homogeneous-0 functions whose corresponding multiplier is bounded in \( L^p(1 < p < +\infty) \). By choosing \( \kappa_0 \) smaller if necessary, we have similar results as in Proposition 6.1 in [10]:

\[
\|T_{m/\phi_{j,k}}(f, g)\|_{W^{s,r'}} \lesssim_{\kappa_0} \|\nabla^{-1}f\|_{H^{s+\lambda}} \|\nabla^{-1}g\|_{W^{s,r}} + \|\nabla^{-1}f\|_{W^{s,r}} \|\nabla^{-1}g\|_{H^{s+\lambda}}.
\]

(6.2)

where \( \lambda \geq \frac{\alpha}{4} + \kappa \), and \( \frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{p} = 1 - \frac{2\alpha}{3}, 2 \leq p, r \leq \frac{12}{3+2\alpha}, \kappa \) can be chosen very small.

**Proof.** This Lemma is a consequence of the next proposition along with Theorem 6.1 of [10] which states that if \( M(\xi, \eta) \) satisfies \( \|M\|_{L^\infty H^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} + \|M\|_{L^\infty_{\xi} H^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} < \infty \), then

\[
\|T_M(f, g)\|_{L^{p'}} \lesssim \|g\|_{L^2} \|f\|_{L^p},
\]

where \( \frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{p} = 1 - \frac{\alpha}{3}, 2 \leq p, r \leq \frac{6}{3-2s} \). \( \square \)

**Proposition 6.6.** Define \( M_{j,k}(\xi, \eta) = \Phi(\xi, \eta) \tilde{\chi}_{\epsilon, \kappa_0}(\xi) \tilde{\chi}_{\epsilon, \kappa_0}(\eta) \tilde{\chi}_{\epsilon, \kappa_0}(\xi - \eta) \)

where \( \Phi \in C^\infty_c(\mathbb{R}) \) is supported in \( \mathcal{B}_2(\mathbb{R}) \), then for any \( \kappa > 0 \), if \( \lambda > \frac{\alpha}{4} + \kappa \), then the following estimate holds:

\[
\|M_{j,k}\|_{L^\infty_{\xi} \dot{H}^{\frac{\alpha}{2} - \kappa}_{\eta}} + \|M_{j,k}\|_{L^\infty_{\xi} \dot{H}^{\frac{\alpha}{2} - \kappa}_{\eta}} \lesssim_{\kappa} 1.
\]

**Proof.** For the proof of this proposition, we can adapt the proof of Proposition 6.1 in [10]. We only explain for the case \( \phi_{11} \) as other cases could be obtained by symmetry. We split \( \mathbb{R}^3 \) into three regions \( \{\eta < \frac{1}{2}|\xi|\}, \{\xi < \frac{1}{2}|\eta|\} \) and \( \{\frac{1}{3} \leq \frac{|\xi|}{|\eta|} \leq 3\} \). For example, on the region \( \{\eta < \frac{1}{2}|\xi|\} \), to estimate \( \|M_{11}\|_{L^\infty_{\xi} \dot{H}^{\frac{\alpha}{2} - \kappa}_{\eta}} \), one first fix \( \eta \) and compute the \( \|\varphi_l(\xi)M_{11}\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{\alpha}{2} - \kappa}} \) norm by interpolation between \( \|\varphi_l(\xi)M_{11}\|_{L^2} \) and \( \|\varphi_l(\xi)M_{11}\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{\alpha}{2} - \kappa}} \) for any \( l \) (recall \( \varphi_l \) is \( l \)-th dyadic function), and find the optimal number \( s \) (which finally turns out to be \( \frac{5}{4} - \) such that it is summable for \( l \) uniformly for \( \eta \). In light of this strategy, one sees that the main ingredients are the elementary estimates for \( \phi_{11} \). We list briefly the properties needed for \( \phi_{11} \) which are essentially the same as Lemma 6.3 and Lemma 6.4 of [10].

1. Lower boundedness of \( \phi_{11} \).

If \( |\xi| \leq \min\{|\xi - \eta|, |\eta|\} \), then \( \phi_{11}(\xi, \eta) = |b(\xi - \eta) + b(\eta) - b(\xi)| \geq_{\kappa_0} \max\{|\xi - \eta|, |\eta|\}; \)

if \( |\xi| \) is not biggest, for example, \( |\eta| \leq \min\{|\xi - \eta|, |\xi|\} \), then \( \phi_{11}(\xi, \eta) \geq_{\kappa_0} |\xi| |\xi - \eta| |\eta| (1 - \cos \beta + 1 - \cos \theta) \) where \( \beta, \theta \) are the angle between \( \eta \) and \( \xi - \eta \), \( \eta \), and \( \xi \) respectively.
2. The first and second derivative for $\phi_{11}$ can be estimated as

$$|\partial_\xi \phi_{11}| \lesssim_{\kappa_0} \frac{|\eta|}{\max\{||\xi - \eta||, ||\xi||\}} \frac{|\xi|}{\min\{||\xi - \eta||, ||\xi||\}} + 2|\sin \frac{\gamma}{2}|,$$

$$|\partial_\eta \phi_{11}| \lesssim_{\kappa_0} \frac{|\eta|}{\max\{||\xi - \eta||, ||\xi||\}} \frac{|\xi|}{\min\{||\xi - \eta||, ||\xi||\}} + 2|\sin \frac{\beta}{2}|,$$

$$|\Delta_\xi \phi_{11}(\xi, \eta)| \lesssim_{\kappa_0} \frac{|\eta|}{||\xi - \eta|| ||\xi||}, \quad |\Delta_\eta \phi_{11}(\xi, \eta)| \lesssim_{\kappa_0} \frac{1}{\min\{||\xi - \eta||, ||\eta||\}}.$$

where $\gamma$ denotes the angle between $\xi$ and $\xi - \eta$.

Nevertheless, as in [10], all the information needed for $b(r)$ and $q(r) = \frac{1}{2} b(r) = \sqrt{\frac{2 + r^2}{1 + r^2} - \varepsilon^2 r^2}$

to prove the above two properties are the following facts which are consistent with the case $\varepsilon = 0$.

(1) $b''(r) \lesssim_{\kappa_0} 1$,

(2) if $\kappa_0$ is sufficient small, one still has that there exists two constants $K_1, K_2$ which are independent of $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, st.

$$-q'(r) \approx \frac{1}{r}, \quad \text{when} \quad r \leq K_1,$$

$$-q'(r) \approx \frac{1}{r^3}, \quad b''(r) \approx \frac{1}{r^3}, \quad b'''(r) \approx \frac{1}{r^4} \quad \text{when} \quad r \geq K_2.$$ 

Since the above two facts are easy to see, we omit the proof. \hfill \square

From now on, we fix $\kappa_0$ such that Lemma [6.3 (1-3), Lemma 6.4 and Lemma 6.5 holds.

In view of Lemma 6.4, we can only expect to get decay estimates in some $L^p$ framework with $8 < p < 12$ (due to the appearance of ‘time resonances’, we can only perform the normal form transformation one time). To overcome the difficulty that $||\Delta_\xi \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}(D) R||_{L^2}$ decays only like $(1 + t)^{-1}$, we need to use a ‘slow’ decay estimate for $||\nabla||^{-1} R||_{L^p}$ where $r$ is larger but close to 2. By Lemma 6.5, if we choose $p$ larger, we need to estimate $||\nabla||^{-1} R||_{L^p}$ for a smaller $r$ which obviously has slower decay. Therefore, to close our decay estimate, we need to choose $p$ small, this is why we choose $p = 8_{\kappa}$, where $\frac{1}{8_{\kappa}} = \frac{1}{8} - \frac{3\kappa}{8}$. By this choice, we have that:

$$\|e^{itb(D)\chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}}(D)f\|_{L^8_{\varepsilon, \kappa}} \lesssim (1 + t)^{-1(\kappa)} \|f\|_{W^{\frac{2}{3}, 3}_{\varepsilon, \kappa}}.$$

Proof of Proposition 6.1. We shall use the norm:

$$\|V\|_{X_T} \triangleq (1 + t)^{-1(\kappa)} \|V\|_{W^{\sigma, s_\kappa}_{\varepsilon, \kappa}} + (1 + t)^{-1(\kappa)} \|\nabla(1 - \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0})(D)V\|_{H^{N-2}} + \|\nabla V\|_{H^N},

\|f\|_{Y} \triangleq \|f\|_{W^{\sigma, s_{\frac{6}{4}}(1+\kappa)}} + \|\nabla f\|_{H^N}.$$ 

where $\sigma \geq 5, N \geq 2\sigma + 1$.

Global existence for $(\rho, u)$ follows if we prove the a priori estimate:

$$\|V\|_{X_T} \lesssim \|V_0\|_{Y} + \|\nabla V\|_{X_T}^2 + \|\nabla V\|_{X_T} + \|V\|_{X_T}^3. \quad (6.3)$$

Sketch of the proof of (6.3):

1. The bound for $H^N$ norm. We can perform energy estimates in the same way as in Proposition 4.1. One only needs to change the norm a little bit by

$$E_N = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq N} E_{\alpha} = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq N} \int \frac{|\partial^\alpha \rho|^2}{2} + \frac{|\partial^\alpha (\nabla) \phi|^2}{2} + \rho |\partial^\alpha u|^2 dx.$$
2. The bound for $H^{-1}$ norm.

It can easily be seen that the nonlinear terms are under the form $B_l(V, V) = \sum |\nabla|n_l(D)(n_2(D)V_n_3(D)V)$ where $n_1(D), n_2(D), n_3(D)$ are $L^p(1 < p < +\infty)$ multipliers. So by Duhamel’s principle, tame estimates and Sobolev embedding, we have:

\[
\|\nabla^{-1}V\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\nabla^{-1}V_0\|_{L^2} + \int_0^t \|\nabla^{-1}B(V, V)\|_{L^2} ds \lesssim \|\nabla^{-1}V_0\|_{L^2} + \int_0^t \|V\|_{L^2}\|V\|_{W^{\sigma, \kappa}} ds
\]

\[
\lesssim \|\nabla^{-1}V_0\|_{L^2} + \|V\|^2_{X_T}.
\]

3. Estimates of $\|\chi^H V\|_{H^{N-2}}$ and $\|\chi^H V\|_{W^{\sigma, \kappa}}$ can be performed in the same fashion as in the electron case, we thus skip them.

4. Estimate of $\|\chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0} V\|_{W^{\sigma, \kappa}}$. For clarity, we will use the same notation as in the electron case. More precisely, we set $R = Q_{\leq \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}} V = \sum_{k=1}^4 J_k$ where $J_1 - J_4$ are defined in (4.6). Nevertheless, $J_1, J_2, J_3$ can be easily estimated using the Kato-Ponce inequality (Lemma 7.1), we thus omit their estimate.

Now, it remains to estimate the typical term of $J_4$: $G_{j,k} = \sum_{j=1}^7 I_j$, which is defined in the same way as in the electron case (with slightly adaptation of multiplier $m$ and $n_j$, see (4.7). We need to prove that

\[
\|G_{j,k}\|_{W^{\sigma, \kappa}} \lesssim \kappa_0 (1 + t)^{-(1+\kappa)}\|V\|_{X_T}.
\]

In the above decomposition, $I_1, I_2, I_5, I_7$ correspond to boundary terms and cubic terms, which have essentially been treated in (10) where the authors proved global existence for the ions Euler-Poisson system. Note that in (10), the authors proved $L^{10}$ decay estimate. Nevertheless, it is the same to prove decay in $L^3$ framework, we leave the details. We will only detail the estimate of the ‘viscous term’ $I_4$, since $I_6$ is ‘symmetric’ term and the estimate for $I_3$ can be reduced to that for $I_4$.

To start, we prove the following two claims:

Claim 1:

\[
\|\nabla^{-1}R(t)\|_{W^{\lambda, r}} \lesssim (1 + t)^{-\kappa}\|V\|_{X_T},
\]

where $\frac{1}{\rho} = \frac{11 + 17\kappa}{24}$, $\lambda = \frac{9}{4} + \kappa$.

Claim 2:

\[
\|\nabla\Delta R\|_{H^{N-1}} \lesssim (1 + t)^{-1}(\|\nabla^{-1}V_0\|_{H^{N-1}} + \|V\|^2_{X_T}),
\]

\[
\|\nabla\Delta R\|_{W^{\sigma, r}} \lesssim (1 + t)^{-(1+\kappa)}(\|V_0\|_{Y} + \|V\|^2_{X_T}).
\]

**Proof of Claim 1:** By interpolation, we have

\[
\|\nabla^{-1}R\|_{W^{\lambda, s}} \lesssim \|\nabla^{-1}R\|_{W^{\lambda, \frac{24}{1+7\kappa}}} \lesssim \|\nabla^{-1}R\|_{W^{\lambda, s}} \|\nabla^{-1}R\|_{H^{\lambda}} \lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{1+7\kappa}{9(1+\kappa)}}\|V\|_{X_T}.
\]

where $\theta = \frac{1+9\kappa}{9(1+\kappa)}$. Claim 1 follows from another interpolation, that is:

\[
\|\nabla^{-1}R(t)\|_{W^{\lambda, r}} \lesssim \|\nabla^{-1}R(t)\|_{W^{\lambda, s}} \|\nabla^{-1}R(t)\|_{H^{\lambda}} \lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{1+9\kappa}{9(1+\kappa)}}\|V\|_{X_T}.
\]

where $\vartheta = \frac{1+9\kappa}{9(1+\kappa)}$ and $\frac{1+9\kappa}{9(1+\kappa)} \geq \frac{1}{100}$ if we choose $\kappa$ small enough, say $\kappa \leq \frac{1}{200}$.

**Proof of Claim 2:** The first inequality can be proved like Lemma 4.3 we thus do not detail it. For the second inequality, we have by the decay estimate (6.4) and the Kato-Ponce inequality (Lemma 7.1).
that
\[ \| \frac{\varepsilon \Delta}{|\nabla|} R \|_{W^{\lambda,r}} \lesssim \left\| \begin{pmatrix} e^{-(D)t} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{+(D)t} \end{pmatrix} \frac{\varepsilon \Delta}{|\nabla|} R_0 \|_{W^{\lambda,r}} + \int_0^t \| \begin{pmatrix} e^{-(D)(t-s)} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{+(D)(t-s)} \end{pmatrix} \frac{\varepsilon \Delta}{|\nabla|} Q^{-1} \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}(D) B(V, V) \|_{W^{\lambda,r}} \, ds \right\| \]
\[ \lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{10-17\kappa}{9}} \| \nabla |^{-1} V_0 \|_{W^{\lambda+3(1-\frac{2}{7}), \sigma, r'}} + \int_0^t (1 + t - s)^{-\frac{10-17\kappa}{9}} \| \nabla |^{-1} B(V, V) \|_{W^{\lambda+3(1-\frac{2}{7}), \sigma, r'}} \, ds \]
\[ \lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{10-17\kappa}{9}} \| \nabla |^{-1} V_0 \|_{W^{\sigma, r'}} + \int_0^t (1 + t - s)^{-\frac{10-17\kappa}{9}} \| V \|_{H^\sigma} \| V \|_{W^{\lambda+3(1-\frac{2}{7}), 1-\frac{16}{17}\kappa}} \, ds \]
\[ \lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{(1+\kappa)}{2}} \| \nabla |^{-1} V_0 \|_{W^{\sigma, r'}} + \| V \|_{X_T}^2 \lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{(1+\kappa)}{2}} \| V \|_Y + \| V \|_{X_T}^2, \]
where \( r' = \frac{24}{13-17\kappa} \). Note that \( \lambda + 3(1 - \frac{2}{7}) \leq \sigma - 1 \). In the last inequality, we used the fact \( \frac{1}{7} + \frac{1}{3} < \frac{1}{8\kappa} \) and interpolation to get:
\[ \| \nabla |^{-1} V_0 \|_{W^{\sigma, r'}} \lesssim \| V_0 \|_{W^{\sigma, r'}}^{\frac{24}{13-17\kappa}} \lesssim \| V_0 \|_Y. \]
These two claims at hand, we can combine with the bilinear estimate (6.2) to estimate
\[ I_4 = -i \int_0^t e^{i(t-s)\Delta} e^{i(t-s)b(D)} \chi_{\varepsilon, \kappa_0}(D) T_{\frac{m}{\varepsilon \kappa}}(\varepsilon \Delta \tilde{r}_j, \tilde{r}_k) \]
as follows:
\[ \| I_4 \|_{W^{\sigma, r'}} \lesssim \int_0^t (1 + t - s)^{-(1+\kappa)} \| T_{\frac{m}{\varepsilon \kappa}}(\varepsilon \Delta \tilde{r}_j, \tilde{r}_k) \|_{W^{\sigma + \frac{9(1+\kappa)}{4}, \sigma, r'}} \, ds \]
\[ \lesssim \int_0^t (1 + t - s)^{-(1+\kappa)} \left( \| \frac{\varepsilon \Delta}{|\nabla|} \tilde{r}_j \|_{H^{\sigma + \frac{9(1+\kappa)}{4}} \nabla^{-1} \tilde{r}_k \|_{W^{\lambda, r}} + \| \frac{\varepsilon \Delta}{|\nabla|} \tilde{r}_j \|_{W^{\lambda, r}} \| \nabla^{-1} \tilde{r}_k \|_{H^{\sigma + \frac{9(1+\kappa)}{4}} \nabla^{-1}} \right) \, ds \]
\[ \lesssim \int_0^t (1 + t - s)^{-(1+\kappa)} (1 + s)^{-(1+\kappa)} \| V \|_{X_T}^2 \, ds \lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{(1+\kappa)}{2}} \| V \|_{X_T}^2. \]
For the estimate of \( I_3 \), we use the identity
\[ \varepsilon \Delta T_{\frac{m}{\varepsilon \kappa}}(\tilde{r}, \tilde{r}) = T_{\frac{m}{\varepsilon \kappa}}(\varepsilon \Delta \tilde{r}, \tilde{r}) + 2 \sum_{l=1}^3 T_{\frac{m}{\varepsilon \kappa}}(\varepsilon \frac{1}{l} \partial_j \tilde{r}, \varepsilon \frac{1}{l} \partial_i \tilde{r}) \]
and the following inequalities whose proofs are similar to that of Claim 2.
\[ \| \frac{\varepsilon \Delta}{|\nabla|} R \|_{H^{\frac{N-1}{2}}} \lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \| \nabla |^{-1} V_0 \|_{H^{\frac{N-1}{2}}} + \| V \|_{X_T}^2, \]
\[ \| \frac{\varepsilon \Delta}{|\nabla|} R \|_{W^{\lambda, r}} \lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{(1+\kappa)}{2}} (\| V_0 \|_Y + \| V \|_{X_T}^2). \]
This ends the proof of a priori estimate (6.3).

6.2. Perturbing the ion Navier-Stokes-Poisson by the solution of (6.1). As before, we consider now the following system:
\[
\begin{align*}
\partial_t n + \text{div} \left( p v + n u + n v \right) &= 0, \\
\partial_t u + u \cdot \nabla v + v \cdot (\nabla u + \nabla v) - \varepsilon L v + \nabla n - \nabla \psi &= \varepsilon \left( \frac{1}{\rho + n} - 1 \right) (L v + L u), \\
\Delta \psi - \psi &= n, \\
v|_{t=0} &= P u_+^\varepsilon, n|_{t=0} = 0.
\end{align*}
\]
then \((\rho^*_+, u^*_+, \phi^*_+)= (n, \psi, v) + (\rho, u, \phi)\).

We define the energy functional similar to (5.2):
\[
\mathcal{E}_M(n, u, \nabla \psi) = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq M} \mathcal{E}_\alpha = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq M} \frac{1}{2} \int \rho |\partial^\alpha v|^2 + |\partial^\alpha n|^2 + |\partial^\alpha (\nabla) \psi|^2 dx.
\]

We can derive similar energy estimates as in the electron case by using almost the same computations as in Lemma 5.1 and Lemma 5.2. In fact, one can check that (5.3) in Lemma 5.1 do not change, while (5.17) in Lemma 5.2 is changed by replacing \(\int |\partial^\alpha n|^2 dx\) by \(\int |\partial^\alpha \psi|^2 dx\). We finally get the following a priori estimate: if we have
\[
|\alpha|,|\beta|,|\kappa| \ll 1
\]
then
\[
\mathcal{E}_3(t) \lesssim \mathcal{E}_3(0) + \int_0^t (1 + s)^{-(1+\kappa)}(\delta \mathcal{E}_3(s) + \varepsilon^2 \delta^3) ds.
\]

Global existence for system (6.4) follows again by bootstrap arguments. The decay estimate follows in the similar way as that in electron case, the only difference is now that it is the \(L^6\) that has the critical decay \((1 + t)^{-1}\).

7. Appendix

We first recall two classical estimates:

**Lemma 7.1** (Kato-Ponce inequality). Given real number \(s > 0\), two functions \(f, g\), we have:
\[
\|fg\|_{W^{s,q}} \lesssim \|f\|_{W^{s,p_1}} \|g\|_{L^{r_1}} + \|f\|_{L^{r_2}} \|g\|_{W^{s,p_2}},
\]
(7.1)
\[
\|fg\|_{\dot{W}^{s,q}} \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{W}^{s,p_1}} \|g\|_{L^{r_1}} + \|f\|_{L^{r_2}} \|g\|_{\dot{W}^{s,p_2}}
\]
(7.2)
where \(\frac{1}{p_j} + \frac{1}{r_j} = \frac{1}{q}\), \(q \leq p_j < +\infty\), \(q < r_j \leq +\infty\).

**Lemma 7.2.** Suppose \(F: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\) is a smooth function with the condition \(F(0) = 0\). Then for any function \(u\) that belongs to \(L^\infty \cap W^{k,p}\) \((k \geq 0\) is an integer and \(1 \leq p \leq +\infty\)), we have:
\[
\|F(u)\|_{\dot{W}^{k,p}} \lesssim C(\|u\|_{L^\infty}) \|u\|_{\dot{W}^{k,p}}.
\]
(7.3)

**Proof.** For \(k = 0\), we Taylor expand \(F\) at first order. For \(k > 0\), we use the Gagliardo-Nirenberg interpolation inequality. Indeed, for any \(|\alpha| = k > 0\), we have:
\[
\partial^\alpha F(u) = \sum F^{(m)}(u) \partial^{\alpha_1} u \partial^{\alpha_2} u \cdots \partial^{\alpha_r} u.
\]
where \(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \cdots + \alpha_r = \alpha\) and by using
\[
\|u\|_{\dot{W}^{\alpha_1, p_1}} \lesssim \|u\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_{\dot{W}^{\alpha_2, p_2}} \cdots \|u\|_{\dot{W}^{\alpha_r, p_r}},
\]
where \(p_j|\alpha_j| = kp\). The result follows from the Hölder inequality. \(\square\)

At last, we present the proof of the bilinear estimate stated in Lemma 3.14. We first give a proposition which shows that \(\frac{m}{\phi_{jk}}\) has the same properties as the Klein-Gordon phase \(1 \pm (\zeta) \pm (\eta) = (\zeta + \eta)\) as long as the threshold \(\kappa_0\) is small enough.

**Proposition 7.3.** Let \(m\) and \(\phi_{jk}\) defined in 3.14, if \(\kappa_0\) is small enough, then for any multi-index \(\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^3\), we have the following estimate uniformly in \(\varepsilon \in (0,1)\):
\[
|\partial^\alpha \phi^\beta_{jk} \frac{m}{\phi_{jk}}(\xi - \eta, \eta)| \lesssim_{\alpha, \beta, \kappa_0} \min\{\langle \xi \rangle, \langle \eta \rangle, \langle \xi - \eta \rangle\},
\]
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\[ |\partial^2_x \partial^2_\eta \frac{m}{\phi_{jk}}(\xi - \eta, \eta)| \lesssim_{\alpha, \beta, \kappa_0} \min\{ (\xi)^2, (\eta)^2, (\xi - \eta)^2 \}. \]

We postpone the proof of this proposition until the end of the section and prove first Lemma 3.14.

**Proof of Lemma 3.14** We choose two smooth functions \( \psi_1, \psi_2 \in C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^6) \) which satisfy the following conditions:

\[
\begin{align*}
\psi_1 + \psi_2 &= 1 \quad \forall (\xi, \eta), \\
\text{Supp } \psi_1 &\subset \{(\xi, \eta) | |\xi - \eta| \geq \frac{\langle \eta \rangle}{2}\}, \\
\text{Supp } \psi_2 &\subset \{(\xi, \eta) | \langle \eta \rangle > |\xi - \eta|\}.
\end{align*}
\]

And write

\[
\langle \xi \rangle^\sigma \frac{m}{\phi_{jk}}(\xi - \eta, \eta) = \frac{m\psi_1(\xi - \eta, \eta)\langle \xi \rangle^\sigma}{\phi_{jk} (\xi - \eta)^{\sigma/2} + \langle \eta \rangle^2} (\xi - \eta)^2 + \frac{m\psi_2(\xi - \eta, \eta)\langle \xi \rangle^\sigma}{\phi_{jk} (\eta)^{\sigma/2} + (\xi - \eta)^2} (\eta)^2 + (\xi - \eta)^2.
\]

\[ \triangleq M_1(\xi - \eta, \eta) (\xi - \eta)^2 + M_2(\xi - \eta, \eta) (\eta)^2 + (\xi - \eta)^2. \]

By Proposition 7.3 we have for any \( \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^3 \) with \( |\alpha| + |\beta| \leq 4 \),

\[ |\partial^2_x \partial^2_\eta M_1| \leq 1 \langle \xi - \eta \rangle^{-2}, \langle \eta \rangle^{-1}. \]

In particular, we have proved that \( M_1, \partial^2_x M_1, \partial^2_\eta M_1 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^6) \). So we get that \( F^{-1}(M_1)(x, y) \in L^1_{x,y} \), as

\[ \|F^{-1}(M_1)(x,y)\|_{L^1_{x,y}} \lesssim \|1 + |x| + |y|\|_{L^2_{x,y}} - \|M_1\|_{L^2} + \|\partial^2_x M_1\|_{L^2} + \|\partial^2_\eta M_1\|_{L^2}. \]

By using the definition of the bilinear operator \( T_m \) (2.1) and properties of the Fourier transform, we can write:

\[ T_{M_1(\xi)^{\sigma/2} + (\eta)^2}(f, g) = \int (F^{-1}M_1)(x', y') \langle D_x \rangle^{\sigma/2} f(x - x') \langle D_x \rangle^2 g(x - y') dx' dy', \]

thus by the Minkowski’s inequality, we have:

\[ \|T_{M_1(\xi)^{\sigma/2} + (\eta)^2}(f, g)\|_{L^p} \leq \int \|\langle D_x \rangle^{\sigma} f\|_{L^1} \|\langle D_x \rangle^2 g\|_{L^1} \|F^{-1}M_1\|_{L^1} dx \|f\|_{W^{\sigma/2, p_1}} \|g\|_{W^{2, r_1}}. \]

The similar result for \( M_2 \) can be derived in the same fashion. \( \square \)

**Proof of Proposition 7.3** We only prove the estimate of \( \frac{m}{\phi_{11}} \), the ones of \( \frac{m}{\phi_{12}}, \frac{m}{\phi_{21}} \) can be obtained by symmetry, \( \frac{m}{\phi_{22}} \) is easier. At first, we have

\[ \frac{1}{\phi_{11}}(\xi, \eta) = \frac{b(x) + b(\eta) + b(\xi + \eta)}{(b(x) + b(\eta))^2 - b^2(\xi + \eta)} \triangleq \frac{b(\xi) + b(\eta) + b(\xi + \eta)}{A}. \]

Note that \( A \) has the lower bound:

\[ A = 1 + 2b(\xi) b(\eta) - 2\xi \cdot \eta + e^2(|\xi|^4 + |\eta|^4 - |\xi + \eta|^4) \geq 1 - 2\kappa_0^2 + 2b(\xi) b(\eta) - 2\xi \cdot \eta \]

\[ = \frac{(1 - 2\kappa_0^2 + 2b(\xi) b(\eta))^2 - 4|\xi \cdot \eta|^2}{1 - 2\kappa_0^2 + 2b(\xi) b(\eta) + 2\xi \cdot \eta} \gtrsim \frac{(b(\xi) + b(\eta))^2}{b(\xi) b(\eta)} \gtrsim_{\kappa_0} \frac{(\xi + \eta)^2}{\langle \xi \rangle \langle \eta \rangle} \gtrsim 1. \quad (7.4) \]

Note that if \( \kappa_0 \leq \frac{1}{200} \), we have \( \frac{99}{100} (\xi) \leq b(\xi) \leq (\xi) \) on the support \( m(\xi, \eta) = \chi^L(\xi) \chi(\eta) \chi^L(\xi + \eta) \frac{\langle \xi + \eta \rangle}{2b(\xi + \eta)}. \)
Inspired by [19], we will prove that on the support of \( m(\xi, \eta) \), for any multi-index \( \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^3 \), the following property holds:

\[
|\partial_\xi^\alpha \partial_\eta^\beta \frac{1}{A}| \lesssim_{\alpha, \beta, \kappa_0} \frac{1}{A}.
\]

(7.5)

This is an easy consequence of Leibniz’s rule and the estimate

\[
|\partial_\xi^\alpha \partial_\eta^\beta A| \lesssim_{\alpha, \beta, \kappa_0} A, \quad \forall \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^3.
\]

(7.6)

In the following, we will thus prove (7.6). At first, we prove that

\[
|\partial_\xi \eta A| \lesssim_{\kappa_0} A.
\]

(7.7)

We will focus on \( \partial_\xi A \lesssim_{\kappa_0} A \). One first notices that on the support of \( \chi^L(\xi) \chi^L(\eta) \chi^L(\xi + \eta) \)

\[
|\partial_\xi A| = \left| 2\partial_\xi b(\xi) b(\eta) - 2\eta + \varepsilon^2 (4|\xi|^2 \xi - 4|\eta|^2(\xi + \eta)) \right|
\]

\[
= \left| 2\frac{b(\eta)}{b(\xi)} (1 - 2\varepsilon^2 |\xi|^2) \xi - 2\eta + \varepsilon^2 (4|\xi|^2 \xi - 4|\xi + \eta|^2(\xi + \eta)) \right|
\]

\[
\leq 2 \left| \frac{b(\eta)}{b(\xi)} (1 - 2\varepsilon^2 |\xi|^2) \xi - 2\eta \right| + 4\varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} \kappa_0^\frac{3}{2},
\]

thus it suffices to show that

\[
\left| \frac{b(\eta)}{b(\xi)} (1 - 2\varepsilon^2 |\xi|^2) \xi - 2\eta \right| \lesssim_{\kappa_0} 1 + b(\xi) b(\eta) - \xi \cdot \eta.
\]

Then, we also observe that on the support of \( \chi^L(\xi) \chi^L(\eta) \chi^L(\xi + \eta) \), if \( |\eta| \lesssim |\xi| \), we have \( \frac{b(\eta)}{b(\xi)} \varepsilon^2 |\xi|^3 \lesssim \varepsilon^\frac{3}{2} \kappa_0^\frac{3}{2} \) and if \( |\xi| \leq |\eta| \), we have \( \frac{b(\eta)}{b(\xi)} \varepsilon^2 |\xi|^2 |\eta| \lesssim \varepsilon^\frac{3}{2} \kappa_0^\frac{3}{2} \). We thus only need to prove that

\[
\left| \frac{b(\eta)}{b(\xi)} \xi - \eta \right| \lesssim_{\kappa_0} 1 + b(\xi) b(\eta) - \xi \cdot \eta.
\]

(7.8)

Let \( \theta = \frac{\xi \cdot \eta}{|\xi||\eta|} \), to prove (7.8), we only need to prove that there exists a constant \( C, 4 < \theta < \infty \), such that:

\[
\frac{b^2(\eta)}{b^2(\xi)} |\xi|^2 + |\eta|^2 - 2\frac{b(\eta)}{b(\xi)} |\xi||\eta| \theta \leq C[1 + b^2(\xi) b^2(\eta) + |\xi|^2 |\eta|^2 \theta^2 - 2b(\xi) b(\eta) |\xi||\eta| \theta]
\]

Define \( F(\theta) = (|\xi|^2 |\eta|^2) \theta^2 - 2b(\eta) |\xi||\eta| (b(\xi) - \frac{1}{C b(\xi)}) \theta \). The critical point of \( F(\theta) \) is \( \theta_0 = \frac{b(\eta)(b(\xi) - \frac{1}{C b(\xi)})}{|\xi||\eta|} \)
and

\[
\theta_0 \geq 1 \iff |\xi|^2 |\eta|^2 b^2(\xi) \leq b^2(\eta) (b^2(\xi) - \frac{1}{C})^2.
\]

\[
\iff |\xi|^2 |\eta|^2 (1 + |\xi|^2 - \varepsilon^2 |\eta|^4) \leq \left( (1 + |\xi|^2 - \varepsilon^2 |\eta|^4)^2 + \frac{1}{C^2} \right) \left( C (1 + |\xi|^2 - \varepsilon^2 |\eta|^4) \right) (1 + |\eta|^2 - \varepsilon^2 |\eta|^4)
\]

The right hand side of the last inequality has lower bound \( ((1 - \kappa_0^2)^2 + |\xi|^4 + 2(1 - \kappa_0^2)|\xi|^2 + \frac{1}{C^2} - \frac{2}{\xi}(1 + |\xi|^2))(1 - \kappa_0^2 + |\eta|^2) \) so we choose \( C \) large enough, st. \( 2\kappa_0^2 + \frac{2}{C} < 1, (1 - \kappa_0^2)^2 + \frac{1}{C^2} - \frac{2}{C} > 0 \), then we have \( \theta_0 \geq 1 \). We thus only need to prove (7.8) for \( \theta = 1 \). However,

\[
|\frac{b(\eta)}{b(\xi)} |\xi| - |\eta| \leq (b(\eta) - |\eta|) \frac{|\xi|}{b(\xi)} + (1 - \frac{|\xi|}{b(\xi)}) |\eta| 
\]

\[
\leq 1 + \frac{|\eta| (b(\xi) - |\xi|)}{b(\xi)} \leq 1 + b(\xi) b(\eta) - |\xi||\eta|,
\]

this proves (7.8) for \( \theta = 1 \) which finish the proof of (7.7).
We now prove \( \partial^\alpha_\xi \partial^\beta_\eta A \lesssim_{\kappa_0} A \) for \(|\alpha| + |\beta| \geq 2\). Indeed, it is direct to show
\[
\partial^\alpha_\xi \partial^\beta_\eta A \lesssim_{\kappa_0} \frac{\langle \eta \rangle}{\langle \xi \rangle} + \frac{\langle \xi \rangle}{\langle \eta \rangle}, \quad |\alpha| + |\beta| \geq 2.
\]
which, combined with (7.4), yields \( \partial^\alpha_\xi \partial^\beta_\eta A \lesssim_{\kappa_0} A \). This ends the proof of (7.6) and thus of (7.5).

Next, we have
\[
\frac{1}{b(\xi) + b(\eta) - b(\xi + \eta)} = \frac{b(\xi) + b(\eta) + b(\xi + \eta)}{A} \lesssim_{\kappa_0} \min\{b(\xi), b(\eta), b(\xi + \eta)\}.
\]
In fact, if \( b(\xi + \eta) \) is not the biggest, we have
\[
b(\xi) + b(\eta) - b(\xi + \eta) \geq \min\{b(\xi), b(\eta)\} \geq 1.
\]
Otherwise, by the lower bound for \( A \) (7.4),
\[
\frac{b(\xi) + b(\eta) + b(\xi + \eta)}{A} \lesssim_{\kappa_0} (b(\xi) + b(\eta) + b(\xi + \eta)) \frac{b(\xi) b(\eta)}{(b(\xi) + b(\eta))^2} \lesssim_{\kappa_0} \min\{b(\xi), b(\eta)\}.
\]
Finally, by inequality (7.5), we have:
\[
|\partial^\alpha_\xi \partial^\beta_\eta \frac{m(\xi, \eta)}{\phi_{11}^2}| = \left| \sum c_{\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \beta_1 \beta_2} \partial^\alpha_\xi \partial^\beta_\eta \partial^{\alpha_1}_\xi \partial^{\beta_1}_\eta (m_{++}(\xi, \eta)) \partial^{\alpha_2}_\xi \partial^{\beta_2}_\eta \frac{b(\xi) + b(\eta) + b(\xi + \eta)}{A} \right| \lesssim_{\kappa_0} \frac{1}{A} \lesssim_{\kappa_0} \min\{\langle \xi \rangle, \langle \eta \rangle, \langle \xi - \eta \rangle\}.
\]
Similarly, one has:
\[
|\partial^\alpha_\xi \partial^\beta_\eta \frac{m(\xi, \eta)}{\phi_{11}^2}| \lesssim_{\kappa_0} \frac{1}{\phi_{11}^2} \lesssim_{\kappa_0} \min\{\langle \xi \rangle^2, \langle \eta \rangle^2, \langle \xi + \eta \rangle^2\}.
\]

\[\Box\]
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