

TRANSITION THRESHOLD FOR THE 3D COUETTE FLOW IN A FINITE CHANNEL

QI CHEN, DONGYI WEI, AND ZHIFEI ZHANG

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we study nonlinear stability of the 3D plane Couette flow $(y, 0, 0)$ at high Reynolds number Re in a finite channel $\mathbb{T} \times [-1, 1] \times \mathbb{T}$. It is well known that the plane Couette flow is linearly stable for any Reynolds number. However, it could become nonlinearly unstable and transition to turbulence for small but finite perturbations at high Reynolds number. This is so-called Sommerfeld paradox. One resolution of this paradox is to study the transition threshold problem, which is concerned with how much disturbance will lead to the instability of the flow and the dependence of disturbance on the Reynolds number. This work shows that if the initial velocity v_0 satisfies $\|v_0 - (y, 0, 0)\|_{H^2} \leq c_0 Re^{-1}$ for some $c_0 > 0$ independent of Re , then the solution of the 3D Navier-Stokes equations is global in time and does not transition away from the Couette flow in the L^∞ sense, and rapidly converges to a streak solution for $t \gg Re^{\frac{1}{3}}$ due to the mixing-enhanced dissipation effect. This result confirms the transition threshold conjecture proposed by Trefethen et al. (Science, 261(1993), 578-584). To this end, we develop the resolvent estimate method to establish the space-time estimates for the full linearized Navier-Stokes system around the flow $(V(t, y, z), 0, 0)$, where $V(t, y, z)$ is a small perturbation (but independent of Re) of the Couette flow y .

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	3
2. Linear and nonlinear mechanisms affecting the threshold	7
2.1. 3D lift-up effect	7
2.2. Inviscid damping	7
2.3. Enhanced dissipation	8
2.4. Boundary layer effect	9
2.5. Streak solution and nonlinear interaction	10
3. Key ideas and ingredients of the proof	11
3.1. Reformulation of the perturbation system	11
3.2. Key ingredients when $\Omega = \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}$	11
3.3. New ingredients and ideas when $\Omega = \mathbb{T} \times [-1, 1] \times \mathbb{T}$	13
3.4. Sketch of the estimate of E_5	15
3.5. Resolvent estimates with non-vanishing Neumann data	18
4. Resolvent estimates with Navier-slip boundary condition	19
4.1. Resolvent estimates	21
4.2. Weak type resolvent estimates	27
4.3. Estimates of the Neumann data	29
5. L^p estimate of the solutions for the homogeneous OS	37
5.1. Basic properties of the Airy function	38
5.2. The solution of the homogeneous OS equation	40

5.3. Proof of Proposition 5.1 and Proposition 5.2	42
6. Resolvent estimates via the Neumann boundary data	45
6.1. Resolvent estimates when $V = y$ and $F = 0$	45
6.2. Resolvent estimates with general V and $F = 0$	47
6.3. Resolvent estimates with general V and F	50
7. Resolvent estimates when $V = y$	61
8. Resolvent estimates for the simplified linearized NS system	65
8.1. Resolvent estimates for a toy model	65
8.2. Proof of Proposition 8.1 when $ \lambda \geq 1 - \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} k ^{-\frac{1}{3}}$	67
8.3. Singular part of W	68
8.4. Boundary corrector of U	69
8.5. Construction of good unknown	76
8.6. Proof of Proposition 8.1 when $ \lambda < 1 - \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} k ^{-\frac{1}{3}}$	78
9. Resolvent estimates for the full linearized NS system	84
9.1. Case of $\nu k^2 \geq 1$	84
9.2. Case of $\nu k^2 \leq 1$	87
10. Space-time estimates of the linearized equation	88
10.1. Space-time estimates with Navier-slip boundary condition	88
10.2. Space-time estimates with non-slip boundary condition	92
11. Nonlinear interactions	98
11.1. Anisotropic bilinear estimates	98
11.2. The velocity estimates in terms of the energy	100
11.3. Interaction between nonzero modes	103
11.4. Interaction between zero modes	105
11.5. Interaction between zero mode and nonzero mode	106
12. Energy estimates for zero mode	108
12.1. Estimate of E_1	108
12.2. Estimate of E_2	110
13. Energy estimates for nonzero modes:semi-linear part	114
13.1. Estimate of $E_{3,0}$	115
13.2. Estimate of $E_{3,1}$	117
14. Energy estimates for nonzero modes:quasi-linear part	119
14.1. Resolvent estimate of the linearized operator	119
14.2. Space-time estimate via freezing the coefficient in time	122
14.3. Estimates of quadratic form	127
14.4. Estimate of E_5	130
15. Global stability and long-time behavior	132
15.1. Global existence and uniqueness	132
15.2. Global stability estimates	134
16. Appendix	136
16.1. Sobolev inequalities	136
16.2. Elliptic estimates with the weight	137
16.3. Some basic properties of harmonic function	138
16.4. Maximal inequality of harmonic function	140
16.5. Limiting absorption principle	141
16.6. A simple algebraic inequality	144
16.7. Gearhart-Prüss type lemma	145
Acknowledgement	145

1. INTRODUCTION

Hydrodynamic stability at high Reynolds number has been an important and very active field in the fluid mechanics. Beginning with Reynolds's famous paper in 1883 [56], many famous physicists and mathematicians made an important contribution to this field, such as Rayleigh, Kelvin, Orr, Sommerfeld, Heisenberg, Prandtl, Taylor, Arnold, Kolmogorov, Lin etc. This field is mainly concerned with how the laminar flows become unstable and transition to turbulence [58, 69].

On one hand, the eigenvalue analysis showed that the plane Couette flow is linearly stable for any Reynolds number $Re \geq 0$ [57, 24]. It has been a folklore conjecture since Reynolds's experiment in 1883 that the pipe Poiseuille flow is linearly stable for any Reynolds number. In a recent work [18], we prove the linear stability of pipe Poiseuille flow for general perturbations at high Reynolds number regime. On the other hand, the experiments showed that these flows could be unstable and transition to turbulence for small but finite perturbations at high Reynolds number [15, 28, 53, 58, 69]. In addition, some laminar flows such as plane Poiseuille flow become turbulent at much lower Reynolds number than the critical Reynolds number predicted by the eigenvalue analysis. This is so-called Sommerfeld paradoxes. The resolution of these paradoxes is a long-standing problem in fluid mechanics. There are many attempts to resolve these paradoxes (see [15] and references therein).

The linear mechanism leading to the transition is very different from those due to the existence of growing modes (or unstable eigenvalues). This kind of transition is called subcritical transition or by-pass transition in physical literature. In [59], Trefethen et al provided an important understanding of this transition from the viewpoint of pseudospectra of the linear operator. For both Couette flow and Poiseuille flow, their pseudospectra includes the unstable domain, although their spectrum is stable. This phenomena is due to the non-normality of the linear operator. Psuedospectra has become an important concept for analyzing the stability of non-normal operators [60]. Another consequence of non-normality gives rise to the transient growth of the solution of the linear evolution equation:

$$\partial_t u + Au = 0, \quad u(0) = u_0,$$

where A is a non-normal operator. That is, the solution $\|u(t)\|_X$ could grow polynomially in time, even if A has no unstable eigenvalues.

To understand how the interaction of linear and nonlinear mechanisms leads to the transition to turbulence, an important question firstly proposed by Trefethen et al. [59] is to study the transition threshold problem, which is concerned with how much disturbance will lead to the instability of the flow and the dependence of disturbance on the Reynolds number. This idea may be traced back to Kelvin, who wrote in 1887 (see [40, 59]):

It seems probable, almost certain, indeed, that ... the steady motion is stable for any viscosity, however small; and the practical unsteadiness pointed out by Stokes forty-four years ago, and so admirable investigated by Osborn Reynolds, is to be explained by limits of stability becoming narrower and narrower the smaller is the viscosity.

The following mathematical version of **transition threshold problem** was formulated by Bedrossian, Germain and Masmoudi [9, 10]:

Given a norm $\|\cdot\|_X$, find a $\beta = \beta(X)$ so that

$$\begin{aligned}\|u_0\|_X \leq Re^{-\beta} &\implies \text{stability}, \\ \|u_0\|_X \gg Re^{-\beta} &\implies \text{instability}.\end{aligned}$$

The exponent β is referred to as the transition threshold. It was conjectured by Trefethen et al. in [59] that $\beta \leq 1$:

Notwithstanding these qualification, we conjecture that transition to turbulence of eigenvalue-stable shear flows proceeds analogously to our model in that the destabilizing mechanism is essentially linear in the sense described above and the amplitude threshold for transition is $O(Re^\gamma)$ for some $\gamma < -1$.

A lot of works [2, 15, 25, 44, 49, 54, 61, 69] in applied mathematics and physics are devoted to estimating β . Numerical experiments by Lundbladh, Henningson and Reddy [49] and formal asymptotic analysis by Chapman [15] indicated that

1. Plane Couette flow

- (1) Numerical experiments: $\beta = 1$ for streamwise perturbation and $\beta = \frac{5}{4}$ for oblique perturbation;
- (2) Asymptotic analysis: $\beta = 1$ for streamwise and oblique perturbation.

2. Plane Poiseuille flow

- (1) Numerical experiments: $\beta = \frac{7}{4}$ for streamwise and oblique perturbation;
- (2) Asymptotic analysis: $\beta = \frac{3}{2}$ for streamwise perturbation and $\beta = \frac{5}{4}$ for oblique perturbation.

Furthermore, it was shown in [15] why the numerically determined threshold exponents are not the true asymptotic values. Formal asymptotic analysis in [15] confirms the conjecture for the Couette flow proposed by Trefethen et al. in [59].

In the absence of physical boundary (i.e., $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}$), in the works [9, 7, 8], Bedrossian, Germain and Masmoudi made an important progress on the transition threshold problem for the 3-D Couette flow. It was shown that $\beta \leq 1$ for the perturbations in Gevrey class and $\beta \leq \frac{3}{2}$ for the perturbations in Sobolev space. More precisely, the authors in [9] showed that if the initial perturbation u_0 satisfies $\|u_0\|_{H^\sigma} \leq \delta \nu^{\frac{3}{2}}$ for $\sigma > \frac{9}{2}$, then the solution is global in time, remains within $O(\nu^{\frac{1}{2}})$ of the Couette flow in L^2 for any time, and converges to the streak solution for $t \gg \nu^{-\frac{1}{3}}$. In a recent work [63], the later two authors proved that $\beta \leq 1$ also for the perturbations in Sobolev space, which means that the regularity of the initial data (at least above H^2 regularity) does not play an important role in determining the transition threshold.

In the presence of physical boundary, at high Reynolds number regime, the boundary layer could affect the stability of the flow. To understand the boundary layer effect, in a joint work [19] with Li, we study the transition threshold problem of the 2-D Couette flow in a finite channel $\mathbb{T} \times [-1, 1]$. Since the 2-D Navier-Stokes equations have no lift-up effect, nonlinear effect is weaker so that the threshold is much smaller. More precisely, it was showed that if $\|u_0\|_{H^2} \leq c_0 \nu^{\frac{1}{2}}$ for some $c_0 > 0$, then the solution will remain within $O(\nu^{\frac{1}{2}})$ of the Couette flow in L^∞ for any time. This result is consistent with one for the case of $\Omega = \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$ considered in [13]. In a recent work [50], the threshold has been improved to $\beta \leq \frac{1}{3}$ when $\Omega = \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$. It remains a very interesting problem whether the threshold can be improved to $\beta \leq \frac{1}{3}$ when $\Omega = \mathbb{T} \times [-1, 1]$. Our previous work in 2D provides a foundation to study the 3D problem. In particular, the resolvent estimate method developed in [19] is still very key in 3D case. Main

challenges in 3D is to study how various linear effects (especially, boundary layer effect) and strong nonlinear effect interact to determine the transition threshold.

The goal of this paper is to solve the transition threshold conjecture for the 3D plane Couette flow $U(y) = (y, 0, 0)$ in a finite channel $\Omega = \mathbb{T} \times [-1, 1] \times \mathbb{T}$. We consider the 3D incompressible Navier-Stokes equations at high Reynolds number Re regime:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v - \nu \Delta v + v \cdot \nabla v + \nabla p = 0, \\ \nabla \cdot v = 0, \\ v(0, x, y, z) = v_0(x, y, z), \quad x, z \in \mathbb{T}, y \in [-1, 1]. \end{cases}$$

where $v = (v^1(t, x, y, z), v^2(t, x, y, z), v^3(t, x, y, z))$ is the velocity, $p(t, x, y, z)$ is the pressure, and $\nu = Re^{-1} > 0$ is the viscosity coefficient.

We introduce the perturbation $u(t, x, y, z) = v(t, x, y, z) - U(y)$, which solves

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t u - \nu \Delta u + y \partial_x u + \begin{pmatrix} u^2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \nabla p^L + u \cdot \nabla u + \nabla p^{NL} = 0, \\ \nabla \cdot u = 0, \\ u(0, x, y, z) = u_0(x, y, z), \end{cases}$$

together with the nonslip boundary condition

$$(1.2) \quad u(t, x, \pm 1, z) = 0.$$

Here the pressure p^L and p^{NL} are determined by

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta p^L = -2\partial_x u^2, \\ \Delta p^{NL} = -\operatorname{div}(u \cdot \nabla u) = -\partial_i u^j \partial_j u^i, \\ (\partial_y p^L - \nu \Delta u^2)|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \quad \partial_y p^{NL}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0. \end{cases}$$

To state our result, we define

$$P_0 f = \bar{f} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{T}} f(x, y, z) dx, \quad P_{\neq} f = f_{\neq} = f - P_0 f.$$

Our main result is stated as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that $u_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap H^2(\Omega)$ with $\operatorname{div} u_0 = 0$. There exist constants $\nu_0, c_0, \epsilon, C > 0$, independent of ν so that if $\|u_0\|_{H^2} \leq c_0 \nu$, $0 < \nu \leq \nu_0$, then the solution u of the system (1.1) is global in time and satisfies the following stability estimates:*

- *Uniform bounds and decay of the background streak:*

$$(1.4) \quad \|\bar{u}^1(t)\|_{H^2} + \|\bar{u}^1(t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\nu^{-1} \min(\nu t + \nu^{2/3}, e^{-\nu t}) \|u_0\|_{H^2},$$

$$(1.5) \quad \|\bar{u}^2(t)\|_{H^2} + \|\bar{u}^3(t)\|_{H^1} + \|(\bar{u}^2, \bar{u}^3)(t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C e^{-\nu t} \|u_0\|_{H^2}.$$

- *Rapid convergence to a streak:*

$$(1.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|(\partial_x, \partial_z) \partial_x u_{\neq}^2(t)\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_x, \partial_z) \nabla u_{\neq}^2(t)\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_x^2 + \partial_z^2) u_{\neq}^3(t)\|_{L^2} + \nu^{1/4} \|u_{\neq}^2(t)\|_{H^2} \\ & + \nu^{1/3} \|(u_{\neq}^1, u_{\neq}^3)(t)\|_{H^1} + \|u_{\neq}^2(t)\|_{L^\infty} + \nu^{1/6} \|(u_{\neq}^1, u_{\neq}^3)(t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C e^{-2\epsilon \nu^{1/3} t} \|u_0\|_{H^2}, \end{aligned}$$

$$(1.7) \quad \|u_{\neq}\|_{L^\infty L^2} + \sqrt{\nu} \|t(u_{\neq}^1, u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2 L^2} + \|\nabla u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^\infty L^2} + \|\nabla u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2 L^2} \leq C \|u_0\|_{H^2}.$$

Let us give some remarks on our results.

1. Our rigorous analysis shows that various linear effects(including 3D lift-up effect, boundary layer effect, inviscid damping and enhanced dissipation) and nonlinear interaction play an import role in determining the transition threshold. Surprisingly, the transition threshold obtained in this paper is consistent with one for the case of $\Omega = \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}$ obtained in [63]. This shows that 3D lift-up may be the main mechanism leading to the instability of the flow even in the presence of boundary layer effect. Our explanation on this surprise result is that weak nonlinear interaction(or null structure of nonlinear terms) and good linear mechanisms(inviscid damping and enhanced dissipation) counteract the bad effect of the boundary layer.
2. Global stability estimates in particular imply that

$$\|u(t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq Cc_0 e^{-\nu t} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow +\infty.$$

This means that the 3D Couette flow is nonlinearly stable in L^∞ sense when the perturbation is $o(\nu)$ in H^2 .

3. In [50], the authors formulated the following question on nonlinear enhanced dissipation and inviscid damping:

Given a norm $\|\cdot\|_X$ ($X \subset L^2$), find a $\beta = \beta(X)$ so that for $\|u_0\|_X \ll \nu^\beta$ and for any $t > 0$

$$\|u_\neq(t)\|_{L^2} \leq C e^{-c\nu^{1/3}t} \|u_0\|_X \quad \text{and} \quad \|u_\neq^2\|_{L^2 L^2} \leq C \|u_0\|_X.$$

Our results answer this question for the 3D Couette flow.

4. The transition threshold problem is very interesting in an infinite channel $\Omega = \mathbb{R} \times [-1, 1] \times \mathbb{T}$. In this case, we need to understand the long wave effect in the x variable on the stability. In fact, we conjecture that the threshold may be strictly less than 1 in this case.
5. The dynamics above the threshold should be a challenging problem, which is out of our current method.
6. Formal asymptotic analysis conducted in [15] indicates that the profile of shear flows may affect the transition threshold. From the results in [15], it seems reasonable to conjecture that the threshold $\beta \leq \frac{3}{2}$ for the plane Poiseuille flow. In [43], Li, Wei and Zhang proved that the threshold $\beta \leq \frac{7}{4}$ for the 3D Kolmogorov flow. It is a very interesting question whether one can improve the threshold to $\beta \leq \frac{3}{2}$.
7. The transition threshold for the pipe Poiseuille flow is completely open. However, this flow is probably the most interesting and important, because it is close to the setting of the experiment conducted by Reynolds in 1883. In fact, the linear stability is just proved by our work [18].

Notations. Throughout this paper, we denote by C a constant independent of ν, k, ℓ and $c_0, \varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_1$, which may be different from line to line. Moreover, $\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_1$ are absolute small constants independent of ν, k, ℓ .

The following notations will be constantly used throughout this paper:

- $\Gamma_j = \{(x, j, z) | x, z \in \mathbb{T}\}$ for $j \in \{\pm 1\}$ and $\partial\Omega = \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_{-1}$.
- $P_0 f = \bar{f} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{T}} f(x, y, z) dx$, $P_\neq f = f_\neq = f - P_0 f$.
- $\eta = (k^2 + \ell^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\delta = \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}$.
- $\kappa = \partial_z V / \partial_y V$, $\rho_1 = \frac{\partial_y \kappa + \kappa \partial_z \kappa}{\partial_y V (1 + \kappa^2)}$, $\rho_2 = \frac{\partial_z \kappa - \kappa \partial_y \kappa}{(1 + \kappa^2)}$.
- We denote by $\|\cdot\|_{L^p}$ the $L^p(D)$ norm with $D = \Omega$ or $D = I = (-1, 1)$, which is easy to distinguish from the context(for example, $D = \Omega$ in sections 4, 6, 8, 9).

- We denote by $\|\cdot\|_{H^k}$ the Sobolev norm $\|\cdot\|_{H^k(D)}$ with $D = \Omega$ or $D = I = (-1, 1)$.
- We denote by $\|\cdot\|_{L^q L^p}$ the space-time norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^q(0,t;L^p(D))}$ with $D = \Omega$ or I and $t = T$ (in sections 11, 12, 13) or $+\infty$ (somewhere in section 10, 14).
- Summation convention: the repeated upper and lower indices are summed over $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $\alpha, \beta \in \{2, 3\}$.

2. LINEAR AND NONLINEAR MECHANISMS AFFECTING THE THRESHOLD

There are four kinds of linear effects: 3D lift-up, boundary layer, inviscid damping and enhanced dissipation, which play a key role in determining the transition threshold.

2.1. 3D lift-up effect. To avoid the boundary, we consider $y \in \mathbb{R}$. In this case, the linearized system of (1.1) reads

$$\partial_t u - \nu \Delta u + y \partial_x u + (u^2, 0, 0) - \nabla \Delta^{-1} 2 \partial_x u^2 = 0.$$

Introduce new variables $(\bar{x}, y, z) = (x - ty, y, z)$ and set $\tilde{u}(t, \bar{x}, y, z) = u(t, x, y, z)$, which solves

$$\partial_t \tilde{u} - \nu \Delta_L \tilde{u} + (\tilde{u}^2, 0, 0) - \nabla_L \Delta_L^{-1} 2 \partial_{\bar{x}} \tilde{u}^2 = 0,$$

where $\nabla_L = (\partial_{\bar{x}}, \partial_y - t \partial_{\bar{x}}, \partial_z)$ and $\Delta_L = \nabla_L \cdot \nabla_L$. Notice that $P_0 \tilde{u} = \bar{u}$, and hence it reads

$$\partial_t \bar{u} - \nu \Delta \bar{u} + (\bar{u}^2, 0, 0) = 0.$$

The solution of this linear problem is given by

$$\bar{u}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{\nu t \Delta} (\bar{u}^1(0) - t \bar{u}^2(0)) \\ e^{\nu t \Delta} \bar{u}^2(0) \\ e^{\nu t \Delta} \bar{u}^3(0) \end{pmatrix}.$$

This means that

$$\|\bar{u}^1(t)\|_{L^2} \leq C t e^{-\nu t} \|u(0)\|_{L^2}.$$

This linear growth for times $t \lesssim 1/\nu$ is known as the **lift-up effect** first observed in [26]. This effect is related to the non-normality of the linearized operator, which may give rise to the transient growth of the solution even if the operator is spectrally stable [59, 60].

This turns out to be the main mechanism leading to nonlinear instability of the flow in 3D case, which is absent in 2D fluid flow due to the beautiful structure of the vorticity $\omega = \partial_y v^1 - \partial_x v^2$:

$$\partial_t \omega - \nu \Delta \omega + v \cdot \nabla \omega = 0.$$

2.2. Inviscid damping. Let us consider the 2D linearized Euler equation around a shear flow $(U(y), 0)$ in terms of the vorticity:

$$\partial_t \omega + U(y) \partial_x \omega + U''(y) \partial_x (-\Delta)^{-1} \omega = 0.$$

In particular, when $U(y) = y$, there holds

$$\partial_t \omega + y \partial_x \omega = 0.$$

Thus, $\|\omega(t)\|_{L^p}$ is conserved for any time. However, Orr [25] observed that the velocity will tend to 0 as $t \rightarrow \infty$. More precisely, there holds

$$\|u(t)\| \leq C(1+t)^{-1} \|u_0\|_{H^2}, \quad \|u^2(t)\|_{L^2} \leq C(1+t)^{-2} \|u_0\|_{H^3}.$$

This is so-called the **inviscid damping**, which is due to the mixing of the vorticity induced by a shear flow. This phenomena is analogous to Landau damping in plasma physics found by Landau [48].

For general shear flows, linear inviscid damping is also a difficult problem. In a series of work [65, 66, 67], Wei, Zhang and Zhao proved the linear inviscid damping for monotone flows and non-monotone flows including the Poiseuille and Kolmogorov flows. Let us refer to [70, 71, 5, 68, 55, 39, 22] and references therein for related works and recent progress on linear inviscid damping.

Nonlinear inviscid damping is a challenging problem. Nonlinear Landau damping was proved by Mouhot and Villani [51]. Bedrossian and Masmoudi [11] proved nonlinear inviscid damping for the Couette flow in the domain $\Omega = \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$. On the other hand, nonlinear Landau damping and inviscid damping do not hold for the perturbations in Sobolev spaces of low regularity [46, 47]. Let us refer to [23, 37, 38] for recent important progress on nonlinear inviscid damping.

Let us turn to the 2D linearized Navier-Stokes equations around the Couette flow in a finite channel $\mathbb{T} \times [-1, 1]$:

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t \omega - \nu \Delta \omega + y \partial_x \omega = 0, \\ \Delta \varphi = \omega, \quad \varphi|_{y=\pm 1} = \partial_y \varphi|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \quad u = (-\partial_y \varphi, \partial_x \varphi). \end{cases}$$

In a joint work [19] with Li, we established the inviscid damping result of (2.1) in the sense

$$\|u_\neq\|_{L^2 L^2} \leq C \|\omega(0)\|_{H^1},$$

which plays an important role for 2D transition threshold problem.

In 3D, Δu^2 has a similar structure as the vorticity in 2D:

$$\partial_t W - \nu \Delta W + y \partial_x W = 0, \quad \Delta u^2 = W, \quad u^2|_{y=\pm 1} = \partial_y u^2|_{y=\pm 1} = 0.$$

2.3. Enhanced dissipation. Let us consider the diffusion-convection equation in $\Omega = \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$:

$$\partial_t \omega - \nu \Delta \omega + y \partial_x \omega = 0.$$

Introduce new variables $(\bar{x}, y) = (x - ty, y)$ and set $\tilde{\omega}(t, \bar{x}, y) = \omega(t, x, y)$. Then the solution $\widehat{\tilde{\omega}}(t, k, \xi) = \int_{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}} \tilde{\omega}(t, x, y) e^{-ikx - i\xi y} dx dy$ takes the form

$$\widehat{\tilde{\omega}}_\neq(t, k, \xi) = e^{-\nu(2\pi)^2 \int_0^t (k^2 + (\xi - k\tau)^2) d\tau} \widehat{\tilde{\omega}}_\neq(0, k, \xi).$$

Due to $\int_0^t (k^2 + (\xi - k\tau)^2) d\tau \geq k^2 t^3 / 12$, we deduce that

$$\|\omega_\neq(t)\|_{L^2} \leq e^{-c\nu t^3} \|\omega_\neq(0)\|_{L^2} \leq C e^{-c\nu^{1/3} t} \|\omega_\neq(0)\|_{L^2},$$

which also gives

$$(2.2) \quad \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} \|e^{c\nu^{1/3} t} \omega_\neq(t)\|_{L^2 L^2} \leq C \|\omega_\neq(0)\|_{L^2}.$$

Here the exponent νt^3 gives a dissipation time scale $\nu^{-1/3}$, which is much shorter than the dissipation time scale ν^{-1} . We refer to this phenomenon as the **enhanced dissipation**, which is also due to the mixing mechanism. For the system (2.1), the following enhanced dissipation estimate was essentially proved in [19]:

$$\nu^{\frac{1}{4}} \|e^{c\nu^{1/3} t} \omega_\neq(t)\|_{L^2 L^2} \leq C \|\omega_\neq(0)\|_{H^1}.$$

Compared with (2.2), the loss of $\nu^{\frac{1}{12}}$ is due to the boundary layer effect.

In [20], Constantin et al. gave a sufficient and necessary condition for general incompressible flow on a compact manifold. However, the quantitative enhanced dissipation rate is usually hard to obtain except for some special flows such as shear flow, spiral flow and Anosov flow [21].

The enhanced dissipation for the Kolmogorov flow $(e^{\nu t} \cos y, 0)$, which is a solution of the 2D Navier-Stokes equations on the torus, has been proved by using different methods: resolvent estimate method [43, 36], wave operator method [67] and hypocoercivity method [64, 3]. More precisely, consider the linearized 2D Navier-Stokes equations around the Kolmogorov flow in $\mathbb{T}_{2\pi\delta} \times \mathbb{T}_{2\pi}$:

$$\partial_t \omega - \nu \Delta \omega + e^{-\nu t} \cos y \partial_x (1 + \Delta^{-1}) \omega = 0.$$

If $\delta \in (0, 1)$, then it holds that for $t \lesssim \nu^{-1}$,

$$\|\omega_{\neq}(t)\|_{L^2} \leq C e^{-c\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}t} \|\omega_{\neq}(0)\|_{L^2}.$$

Here the enhanced dissipation rate is smaller than one for the Couette flow. This leads to conjecture that for stable monotone shear flows to the Euler equations, the enhanced dissipation rate should be $\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}$, and the rate should be $\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}$ for stable shear flows with non degenerate critical point.

In addition to the transition threshold problem, the enhanced dissipation also plays an important role for the suppression of blow-up in the Keller-Segel system [42, 6, 35] and axisymmetrization of 2D viscous vortices [27]. Let us refer to [4, 34, 45] for more relevant works.

2.4. Boundary layer effect. Using the Laplace transform, the system (2.1) can be reduced to solving the Orr-Sommerfeld(OS) equation

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{cases} -\nu(\partial_y^2 - k^2)^2 \phi + ik(y - \lambda)(\partial_y^2 - k^2)\phi = F, \\ \phi(\pm 1) = 0, \quad \phi'(\pm 1) = 0. \end{cases}$$

In general, when $\nu \rightarrow 0$, the solution of (2.3) does not converge in a strong sense to the solution of the Rayleigh equation

$$ik(y - \lambda)(\partial_y^2 - k^2)\phi = F, \quad \phi(\pm 1) = 0,$$

because of the mismatch of their boundary conditions.

In [19], we decompose the solution of (2.3) as

$$\phi = \phi_{Na} + c_1 \phi_{b,1} + c_2 \phi_{b,2},$$

where ϕ_{Na} solves the OS equation with the Navier-slip boundary condition:

$$\begin{cases} -\nu(\partial_y^2 - k^2)^2 \phi_{Na} + ik(y - \lambda)(\partial_y^2 - k^2)\phi_{Na} = F, \\ \phi_{Na}(\pm 1) = 0, \quad \phi_{Na}''(\pm 1) = 0, \end{cases}$$

and $\phi_{b,i}, i = 1, 2$ solves the homogeneous OS equation:

$$\begin{cases} -\nu(\partial_y^2 - k^2)^2 \phi_{b,1} + ik(y - \lambda)(\partial_y^2 - k^2)\phi_{b,1} = 0, \\ \phi_{b,1}(\pm 1) = 0, \quad \phi_{b,1}'(1) = 1, \quad \phi_{b,1}'(-1) = 0, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} -\nu(\partial_y^2 - k^2)^2 \phi_{b,2} + ik(y - \lambda)(\partial_y^2 - k^2)\phi_{b,2} = 0, \\ \phi_{b,2}(\pm 1) = 0, \quad \phi_{b,2}'(-1) = 1, \quad \phi_{b,2}'(1) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Via this decomposition, the boundary behavior of the solution ϕ can be described by $\phi_{b,i}$, and the coefficients $c_i, i = 1, 2$ are determined by ϕ_{Na} . Let $w_{b,i} = (\partial_y^2 - k^2)\phi_{b,i}$, which is a linear combination of the following two independent Airy functions:

$$W_1(y) = Ai(e^{i\frac{\pi}{6}}(L(y - \lambda - ik\nu))), \quad W_2(y) = Ai(e^{i\frac{5\pi}{6}}(L(y - \lambda - ik\nu))),$$

where $L = \left(\frac{k}{\nu}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}$. In some sense, this means that the width of the boundary layer is $\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}$. In particular, there is a loss of L when taking the derivative in y variable.

Main advantage of this decomposition is that the resolvent estimate of ϕ_{Na} can be derived by using the energy method under the Navier-slip boundary conditions, and the estimates of $\phi_{b,i}$ can be obtained by using the estimates of the Airy function. This idea introduced in [19] could be used to study the stability problem for general shear flows.

Recently, Grenier, Guo and Nguyen developed Rayleigh-Airy iteration method to solve the OS equation [32, 33]. Gerard-Varet, Maekawa and Masmoudi applied their method to the stability of the boundary layer shear flows [30, 29].

2.5. Streak solution and nonlinear interaction. If the initial data in (1.1) is independent of x , then so is the solution, i.e., $u(t, x, y, z) = u(t, y, z)$. In this case, (u^2, u^3) solves the 2D Navier-Stokes equations, and u^1 solves the linear advection-diffusion equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u^1 - \nu \Delta u^1 + (u^2 \partial_y + u^3 \partial_z) u^1 + u^2 = 0, \\ \partial_t u^2 - \nu \Delta u^2 + (u^2 \partial_y + u^3 \partial_z) u^2 + \partial_y p = 0, \\ \partial_t u^3 - \nu \Delta u^3 + (u^2 \partial_y + u^3 \partial_z) u^3 + \partial_z p = 0, \\ \partial_y u^2 + \partial_z u^3 = 0. \end{cases}$$

This solution is referred to as **the streak**. Our result shows that for $t \gg \nu^{-\frac{1}{3}}$, the streak solutions describe the dynamics of the system if the perturbation is below the threshold.

If we decompose the solution u into $\bar{u} + u_{\neq}$, where $\bar{u}$ denotes zero mode and $u_{\neq}$ denotes nonzero mode, then nonlinear interactions can be classified as follows:

- zero mode and zero mode interaction: $0 \cdot 0 \rightarrow 0$;
- zero mode and nonzero mode interaction: $0 \cdot \neq \rightarrow \neq$;
- nonzero mode and nonzero mode interaction: $\neq \cdot \neq \rightarrow \neq$ or $\neq \cdot \neq \rightarrow 0$.

Due to the lift-up effect, main nonlinear effect comes from the interaction between the streak solution and nonzero modes, especially, $\bar{u}^1 \partial_x u_{\neq}^j, u_{\neq}^j \partial_j \bar{u}^1 (j = 2, 3)$. This seems a primary source so that the solution could become unstable and transition to turbulence if the perturbation exceeds some threshold.

To study how nonlinear and linear mechanisms interact to bring about transition to turbulence, in [59], the authors considered a 2×2 model problem:

$$\frac{du}{dt} = Au + \|u\|Bu,$$

where

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} -R^{-1} & 1 \\ 0 & -2R^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

and R is a large parameter. Now the linear part has a transient growth due to the non-normality of A , and nonlinear term does not create or destroy energy since B is skew-symmetric. This simple model has a strong nonlinear bootstrapping effect so that the threshold amplitude is of order R^{-3} not R^{-1} . However, the Navier-Stokes equations are different from this simple model in two aspects: (1) there are infinitely many different modes, most of which do not experience non-normal linear growth; (2) nonlinear interactions between different modes probably make the quadratic nonlinearity unrealistically strong. Thus, they conjectured that the amplitude threshold of transition for the Navier-Stokes equation is $O(Re^\gamma)$ for some $\gamma < -1$.

Indeed, for the Navier-Stokes equations, nonlinear term has some good(null) structures similar to null forms introduced in [41]. These structures may avoid the worst nonlinear interactions. In some sense, u^2 could be viewed as a good component, $\bar{u}^1$ a bad component, and ∂_x, ∂_z good derivatives, while ∂_y is a bad derivative. Since the nonlinear term takes the form $u^i \partial_i u^j$, there are no worst interactions such as the interaction between $\bar{u}^1$ and itself. For the term $\bar{u}^2 \partial_y u^j$, although ∂_y is bad, $\bar{u}^2$ is good. In other words, a bad term(or derivative) always accompanies a good one for nonlinear interactions.

3. KEY IDEAS AND INGREDIENTS OF THE PROOF

3.1. Reformulation of the perturbation system. Recall that the perturbation $u = v - U$ satisfies

$$(\partial_t - \nu \Delta + y \partial_x)u + \begin{pmatrix} u^2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \nabla p^L + u \cdot \nabla u + \nabla p^{NL} = 0.$$

For the zero mode $\bar{u}$, there holds

$$(3.1) \quad (\partial_t - \nu \Delta) \bar{u}^1 + \bar{u}^2 + \overline{u \cdot \nabla u^1} = 0,$$

$$(3.2) \quad (\partial_t - \nu \Delta) \bar{u}^j + \partial_j \bar{p} + (\bar{u}^2 \partial_y + \bar{u}^3 \partial_z) \bar{u}^j + \overline{u_{\neq}^j \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^j} = 0, \quad j = 2, 3.$$

To estimate the nonzero modes, we will use the formulation in terms of the shear wise velocity u^2 and vorticity $\omega^2 = \partial_z u^1 - \partial_x u^3$:

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t(\Delta u^2) - \nu \Delta^2 u^2 + y \partial_x \Delta u^2 + (\partial_x^2 + \partial_z^2)(u \cdot \nabla u^2) \\ \quad - \partial_y [\partial_x(u \cdot \nabla u^1) + \partial_z(u \cdot \nabla u^3)] = 0, \\ \partial_t \omega^2 - \nu \Delta \omega^2 + y \partial_x \omega^2 + \partial_z u^2 + \partial_z(u \cdot \nabla u^1) - \partial_x(u \cdot \nabla u^3) = 0, \\ \partial_y u^2(t, x, \pm 1, z) = u^2(t, x, \pm 1, z) = 0, \quad \omega^2(x, \pm 1, z) = 0. \end{cases}$$

The idea of using Δu^2 may go back to Kelvin's original paper [40]. The coupled system of $(\Delta u^2, \omega^2)$ was used in many physical literatures such as [15, 58], and our recent work on the stability of 3D Kolmogorov flow [43], and blow-up criterion in terms of one velocity component [16, 17]. The main advantage of using Δu^2 is that the equation of Δu^2 does not destroy the linear structure. This important point has played an important role in the works [9, 63].

3.2. Key ingredients when $\Omega = \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}$. In this subsection, we will review the framework and key ingredients when $\Omega = \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}$ in [63], which will help understand the difficulties and ideas of this work.

For $a \geq 0$, we introduce two norms

$$\begin{aligned} \|w\|_{Y_0} &= \|w\|_{L^\infty L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2 L^2}, \\ \|w\|_{X_a} &= \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} w\|_{L^\infty L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} \nabla w\|_{L^2 L^2} \\ &\quad + \nu^{1/6} \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} w\|_{L^2 L^2} + \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} \nabla \Delta^{-1} \partial_x w\|_{L^2 L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

The norm of Y_0 corresponds to the heat diffusion. The weight $e^{a\nu^{1/3}t}$ in X_a corresponds to the enhanced dissipation, and the fourth part of X_a corresponds to the inviscid damping.

In [63], the following energy functionals were introduced:

$$E_1 = \|\bar{u}\|_{L^\infty H^4} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla \bar{u}\|_{L^2 H^4} + (\|\partial_t \bar{u}\|_{L^\infty H^2} + \|\bar{u}(1)\|_{H^2})/\nu,$$

$$\begin{aligned}
E_2 &= \|\Delta \bar{u}^2\|_{Y_0} + \|\bar{u}^3\|_{Y_0} + \|\nabla \bar{u}^3\|_{Y_0} + \|\min(\nu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \nu t, 1)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta \bar{u}^3\|_{Y_0}, \\
E_3 &= \|\Delta u_{\neq}^2\|_{X_2} + \|(\partial_x^2 + \partial_z^2)u_{\neq}^3\|_{X_2} + \nu^{\frac{2}{3}}\|\Delta u_{\neq}^3\|_{X_3}, \\
E_4 &= \|e^{2\nu^{1/3}t}(\partial_x, \partial_z)u_{\neq}\|_{L^\infty H^3} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}}\|e^{2\nu^{1/3}t}\nabla(\partial_x, \partial_z)u_{\neq}\|_{L^2 H^3}, \\
(E5) \quad E_5 &= \|\partial_x^2 u^2\|_{X_3} + \|\partial_x^2 u^3\|_{X_3}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us give some explanations about the energy functional:

- E_1 is introduced to control the zero mode. Due to the lift-up effect, E_1 is expected to be $o(1)$ at best.
- E_2 is introduced to control good components $\bar{u}^2, \bar{u}^3$. Since there is no lift-up in the equations of $\bar{u}^2$ and $\bar{u}^3$, E_2 is expected to be $o(\nu)$.
- E_4 is mainly introduced to control E_1 , since E_1 involves the fourth order derivative of the solution. Due to the lift-up effect, it is also expected to be $o(1)$.
- E_3 is introduced to control good components Δu^2 and $(\partial_x^2 + \partial_z^2)u_{\neq}^3$.
- The most key part E_5 is introduced to control E_3 . A key difference with E_3 is to use the X_3 norm instead of the X_2 norm, which is very crucial to control some nonlinear terms with the lift-up effect such as $\bar{u}^1 \partial_x u_{\neq}$ and $u_{\neq}^j \partial_j \bar{u}^1 (j = 2, 3)$.

The estimates of E_1 and E_2 are based on the direct energy method. It holds that

$$(3.4) \quad E_1 \leq C(\|\bar{u}(1)\|_{H^4} + \nu^{-1}\|\bar{u}(1)\|_{H^2} + \nu^{-1}E_2 + \nu^{-1}E_3^2 + \nu^{-1}E_3E_4),$$

$$(3.5) \quad E_2 \leq C(\|u(1)\|_{H^2} + \nu^{-1}E_3^2).$$

The estimate of E_3 is based on the space-time estimates for the following linearized system:

$$\mathcal{L}W = \Delta f_1, \quad \mathcal{L}U - 2\partial_x \partial_z \Delta^{-2}W = f_2, \quad \mathcal{L} = \partial_t - \nu \Delta + y \partial_x.$$

That is, if $P_0W = P_0U = P_0f_1 = P_0f_2 = 0$, then it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|W\|_{X_a}^2 + \|(\partial_x^2 + \partial_z^2)U\|_{X_a}^2 &\leq C\left(\|W(1)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|U(1)\|_{H^2}^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \nu^{-1}\|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t}\nabla f_1\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1}\|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t}(\partial_x, \partial_z)f_2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Taking $(W, U) = (\Delta u_{\neq}^2, u_{\neq}^3)$, it was proved that

$$(3.6) \quad E_3 \leq C(\|u(1)\|_{H^2} + \nu^{-1}E_2E_3 + E_1^2E_3 + E_5 + \nu^{-1}E_3^2).$$

The estimate of E_4 is based on the space-time estimates for the linear equation:

$$\mathcal{L}w = \partial_x f_1 + f_2 + \operatorname{div} f_3.$$

That is, if $P_0w = P_0f_1 = P_0f_2 = P_0f_3 = 0$, then it holds that

$$\|w\|_{X_a}^2 \leq C\left(\|w(1)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t}\nabla f_1\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t}f_2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1}\|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t}f_3\|_{L^2 L^2}^2\right).$$

On the right hand side, the second part used the inviscid damping, the third part used the enhanced dissipation, and the last part used the heat diffusion. Taking $w = u_{\neq}$, it was proved that

$$\begin{aligned}
E_4 &\leq C\left(\|u(1)\|_{H^4} + \nu^{-1}E_3 + E_4((E_3 + E_2)/\nu + E_1) \right. \\
(3.7) \quad &\quad \left. + E_1(E_3 + E_5)/\nu + E_3E_2/\nu^2\right).
\end{aligned}$$

The estimate of E_5 is the most difficult. For this part, we first need to establish the space-time estimates of the linearized operator with variable coefficient:

$$\mathcal{L}_V = \partial_t - \nu \Delta + V \partial_x, \quad V = y + \bar{u}^1(t, x, z).$$

This can be reduced to the case of $\mathcal{L}$ by using the coordinate transform under the following key assumption:

$$(3.8) \quad \|\bar{u}^1\|_{L^\infty H^4} + \nu^{-1} \|\partial_t \bar{u}^1\|_{L^\infty H^2} \leq \varepsilon.$$

To estimate E_5 , the most important idea in [19] is to introduce a quantity W^2 defined by

$$W^2 = u_{\neq}^2 + \kappa u_{\neq}^3,$$

where $\kappa(t, y, z) = \partial_z V / \partial_y V$. Then ΔW^2 satisfies

$$\mathcal{L}_V \Delta W^2 = \Delta(-2\nu \nabla \kappa \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^3) + \text{good terms}.$$

However, the term $\Delta(-2\nu \nabla \kappa \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^3)$ is still very singular. To handle it, an important decomposition was introduced

$$(3.9) \quad \nabla \kappa \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^3 = \rho_1 \nabla V \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^3 + \rho_2 (\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y) u_{\neq}^3,$$

where

$$\rho_1 = \frac{\partial_y \kappa + \kappa \partial_z \kappa}{\partial_y V (1 + \kappa^2)}, \quad \rho_2 = \frac{\partial_z \kappa - \kappa \partial_y \kappa}{(1 + \kappa^2)}.$$

Since $(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y)$ has a good commutative relation with $\mathcal{L}_V$, it is a good derivative. So, the second term in (3.9) is good. To remove the singularity from the first term in (3.9), we need to introduce $W^{2,2}$ with solving

$$\mathcal{L}_V W^{2,2} = -\rho_1 \nabla V \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^3, \quad W^{2,2}(1) = 0.$$

We define

$$W^{2,1} = W^2 - \nu W^{2,2},$$

With this decomposition, it was found that $\Delta W^{2,1}$ satisfies a good equation:

$$\mathcal{L}_V \Delta W^{2,1} = \text{good terms}.$$

Then the space-time estimate $\|\Delta W^{2,1}\|_{X_3}$ together with the space-time estimate

$$\sum_{j=2}^3 (\|\partial_x^2 u_{\neq}^j\|_{X_3} + \|\partial_x (\partial_x - \kappa \partial_z) u_{\neq}^j\|_{X_3}) + \nu^{\frac{2}{3}} \|\Delta u^3\|_{X_3}$$

yields that

$$(3.10) \quad E_5 \leq C(\|u(1)\|_{H^2} + \nu^{-1} E_3^2).$$

With the estimates of E_1 - E_5 and $\|u_0\|_{H^2} \leq c_0 \nu$, we can conclude by using a bootstrap argument that

$$E_1 + E_4 \leq C c_0, \quad E_2 + E_3 + E_5 \leq C c_0 \nu.$$

3.3. New ingredients and ideas when $\Omega = \mathbb{T} \times [-1, 1] \times \mathbb{T}$. It seems hard to apply Fourier multiplier method used in [9, 7] based on Fourier analysis to the case of finite channel. There are two main advantages of the framework introduced in [63]:

- (1) the method is not strongly dependent on the use of Fourier analysis, although we used the Fourier transform for the space-time estimates of the linearized system;
- (2) global stability is established in the Sobolev spaces of low regularity, which avoid the singularity due to the boundary layer effect when taking high order derivatives.

Despite these advantages, there are still many challenging problems when applying this framework to the case of finite channel.

First of all, the space-time estimates of $\mathcal{L}_V$ strongly rely on the assumption (3.8). On the other hand, the estimate of E_1 depends on the energy E_4 , while E_4 involves the H^4 estimate of $u_{\neq}$. However, in the presence of the boundary, the high order derivative estimates in y variable lead to singularity due to the boundary layer effect. Our new observations are:

- (1) The estimates of E_3 and E_5 do not depend on E_4 (see (3.6) and (3.10));
- (2) The assumption (3.8) could be replaced by

$$\|\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty H^4} + \nu^{-1} \|\partial_t \bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty H^2} \leq \varepsilon.$$

Here we decompose $\bar{u}^1 = \bar{u}^{1,0} + \bar{u}^{1,\neq}$ with

$$(3.11) \quad (\partial_t - \nu \Delta) \bar{u}^{1,0} + \bar{u}^2 + \bar{u}^2 \partial_y \bar{u}^{1,0} + \bar{u}^3 \partial_z \bar{u}^{1,0} = 0,$$

$$(3.12) \quad (\partial_t - \nu \Delta) \bar{u}^{1,\neq} + \bar{u}^2 \partial_y \bar{u}^{1,\neq} + \bar{u}^3 \partial_z \bar{u}^{1,\neq} + \overline{u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^1} = 0,$$

$$(3.13) \quad \bar{u}^{1,0}|_{t=0} = 0, \quad \bar{u}^{1,\neq}|_{t=0} = \bar{u}^1(0), \quad \bar{u}^{1,0}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \quad \bar{u}^{1,\neq}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0.$$

The key point of this decomposition is that $\bar{u}^{1,\neq}$ has better decay in ν , and thus $\bar{u}^{1,\neq} \partial_x$ could be viewed as a perturbation. Therefore, we avoid the use of the energy E_4 . We introduce the following energy functional to control the zero mode:

$$E_1 = E_{1,0} + \nu^{-2/3} E_{1,\neq},$$

where

$$E_{1,0} = \|\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty H^4} + \nu^{-1} \|\partial_t \bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty H^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_t \bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^2 H^3},$$

$$E_{1,\neq} = \|\bar{u}^{1,\neq}\|_{L^\infty H^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla \bar{u}^{1,\neq}\|_{L^2 H^2},$$

and the energy E_2 is defined by

$$E_2 = \|\Delta \bar{u}^2\|_{L^\infty L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla \Delta \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2 L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\Delta \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2 L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_t \nabla \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}$$

$$+ \|\nabla \bar{u}^3\|_{L^\infty L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\Delta \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2 L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2 L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_t \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2 L^2}$$

$$+ \|\min((\nu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \nu t)^{\frac{1}{2}}, 1 - y^2) \Delta \bar{u}^3\|_{L^\infty L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\min((\nu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \nu t)^{\frac{1}{2}}, 1 - y^2) \nabla \partial_t \bar{u}^3\|_{L^\infty L^2}$$

$$+ \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\min((\nu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \nu t)^{\frac{1}{2}}, 1 - y^2) \nabla \Delta \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2 L^2}.$$

Next we introduce a similar part of E_3 defined by

$$E_3 = E_{3,0} + E_{3,1},$$

where $E_{3,0}$ and $E_{3,1}$ are given by

$$E_{3,0} = \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} (\partial_x, \partial_z) \Delta u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2 L^2} + \nu^{\frac{3}{4}} \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \nabla \Delta u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2 L^2} + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} (\partial_x, \partial_z) \nabla u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^\infty L^2}$$

$$+ \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \partial_x \nabla u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2 L^2} + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} (\partial_x^2 + \partial_z^2) u_{\neq}^3\|_{L^\infty L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} (\partial_x^2 + \partial_z^2) \nabla u_{\neq}^3\|_{L^2 L^2},$$

$$E_{3,1} = \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} (\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \nabla \omega_{\neq}^2\|_{L^\infty L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \Delta \omega_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}).$$

Here and in what follows, the space-time norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^q L^p} = \|\cdot\|_{L^q(0,T;L^p(\Omega))}$ for $T > 0$.

The estimate of E_3 is based on the space-time estimates for the coupled system (3.3) of $(\Delta u^2, \omega^2)$. For this, we need to make the space-time estimates for the linear equation $\partial_t w - \nu \Delta w + y \partial_x w = f$ in a finite channel with nonslip boundary condition or Navier-slip boundary condition. Due to the boundary layer effect, this is highly nontrivial. In our work

[19], we have developed the resolvent estimate method to solve this problem. In 3-D case, the idea is basically similar.

The adaption of E_5 to the present setting is the most challenging. The first important observation is that it is enough to replace E_5 (given by (E5)) by

$$E_5 = \nu^{1/6} \|e^{3\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x^2 u_\neq^2\|_{L^2 L^2} + \nu^{1/6} \|e^{3\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x^2 u_\neq^3\|_{L^2 L^2}.$$

Let $V = y + \bar{u}^{1,0}(t, y, z)$ and $Au = \mathbb{P}(\nu\Delta u - V\partial_x u - (\partial_y V(u^2 + \kappa u^3), 0, 0))$, here $\mathbb{P}$ is the Leray projection. To estimate E_5 , we need to consider the following linearized system

$$\partial_t u_\neq - Au_\neq + \vec{g} = 0.$$

Thus, we need to establish the space-time estimates (without exponential growth) for the linearized system with variable coefficient, which is completely open in 3D case. In fact, even for the following linearized equation

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t w - \nu\Delta w + V\partial_x w = f, \\ \Delta\varphi = w, \quad \varphi|_{y=\pm 1} = \partial_y \varphi|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \end{cases}$$

the linear stability also remains unknown. In a very recent work by Almog and Helffer [1], the linear stability of the Couette flow under a small perturbation $U(y)$ was just proved.

In this work, main challenges are that

- (1) we need to consider a system, which is much more complicated than the scalar equation (3.14). All the difficulties for the domain $\Omega = \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}$ still exist, while the main difficulty for (3.14) only lies in the boundary conditions.
- (2) we need to consider general perturbations of the Couette flow, which depend on (t, y, z) ;
- (3) we need to establish both linear stability and uniform resolvent estimates, which should embody various linear effects: boundary layer, enhanced dissipation and inviscid damping;
- (4) we need to derive the space-time estimates from the resolvent estimates by using the Laplace transform. The trouble is that it is not direct in the case when the perturbation depends on t .

3.4. Sketch of the estimate of E_5 . First of all, to derive the space-time estimates from the resolvent estimate, we will use the method of freezing the coefficient to estimate E_5 , which is sketched as follows.

• **Separation of the time interval:** $[0, T] = \bigcup I_j$, where $I_j = [t_j, t_{j+1}) \cap [0, T]$ with $t_j = j\nu^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ for $j \in [0, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}T) \cap \mathbb{Z}$. Here the choice of t_j is due to the enhanced dissipation rate. We define

$$V_j(y, z) = y + \bar{u}^{1,0}(t_j, y, z), \quad A_j = A_{[V_j]} = \mathbb{P}(\nu\Delta - V_j\partial_x - (\partial_y V_j(u^2 + \kappa_j u^3), 0, 0)).$$

It can be reduced to considering the system in each interval I_j :

$$\partial_t u_\neq - A_j u_\neq + \vec{g} = 0 \quad \text{for } t \in I_j.$$

• **Decomposition of the solution:** we define

$$\vec{g}_{(j)}(t) = 0 \quad \text{for } t \notin I_j, \quad \vec{g}_{(j)}(t) = \vec{g} + \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} (A_k - A_j) \vec{u}_{[k]} \quad \text{for } t \in I_j,$$

and let $\vec{u}_{[j]}$ solve

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \vec{u}_{[j]} - A_j \vec{u}_{[j]} + \vec{g}_{(j)} &= 0, \\ \vec{u}_{[0]}(0) &= P_{\neq} u(0), \quad \vec{u}_{[j]}(0) = 0 \quad \text{for } j \in (0, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} T) \cap \mathbb{Z}. \end{aligned}$$

Then there holds

$$u_{\neq} = \sum_{k=0}^j \vec{u}_{[k]} \quad \text{for } t \in I_j, \quad j \in [0, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} T) \cap \mathbb{Z}, \quad \vec{u}_{[j]}(t) = 0 \quad \text{for } 0 \leq t < t_j.$$

- **Space-time estimates for fixed j :** for $j \in (0, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} T) \cap \mathbb{Z}$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \vec{u}_{[j]}\|_{L^2 Z_j^2} &\leq C e^{4\epsilon j} \|\vec{g}_{(j)}\|_{L^2 Z_j^1}, \\ \|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \vec{u}_{[0]}\|_{L^2 Z_0^2} &\leq C (\|u(0)\|_{H^2} + \|\vec{g}\|_{L^2(I_0, Z_0^1)}), \end{aligned}$$

which can be deduced from the resolvent estimates. The definition of Z_j^k ($k = 1, 2$) norm is given in section 14.2.

- **Summation:** For $j \in [0, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} T) \cap \mathbb{Z}$, let

$$\begin{aligned} a_j &= \sum_{k=0}^j (j-k+1) \|\vec{u}_{[k]}\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^2)}, \quad b_j = e^{-4\epsilon j} \|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \vec{u}_{[j]}\|_{L^2 Z_j^2}, \\ E_6^2 &= \sum_{j=0}^N e^{6\epsilon j} \|u_{\neq}\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^2)}^2, \quad N = \max([0, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} T) \cap \mathbb{Z}). \end{aligned}$$

Using the following important facts that

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\|_{Z_j^2} - \|v\|_{Z_k^2} &\leq C |j-k|^{\frac{1}{2}} E_1 \|v\|_{Z_k^2}, \\ \|(A_k - A_j) \vec{u}_{[k]}\|_{Z_j^1} &\leq C |j-k| E_1 \|\vec{u}_{[k]}\|_{Z_j^2}, \end{aligned}$$

we can deduce from the space-time estimates that

$$\begin{aligned} b_j &\leq C (\|\vec{g}\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^1)} + E_1 a_j), \\ \|\vec{u}_{[k]}\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^2)} &\leq (1 + C |j-k|^{\frac{1}{2}} E_1) e^{-4\epsilon(j-k)} b_k, \end{aligned}$$

which will yield that

$$a_j^2 \leq C \sum_{k=0}^j (j-k+1)^5 e^{-8\epsilon(j-k)} b_k^2 \leq C \sum_{k=0}^j e^{-7\epsilon(j-k)} b_k^2.$$

Then we can conclude that

$$E_6^2 \leq \sum_{j=0}^N e^{6\epsilon j} a_j^2 \leq C \|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + C \sum_{j=0}^N e^{6\epsilon j} \|\vec{g}\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^1)}^2 + C E_1^2 E_6^2.$$

Through the above procedure, the problem is reduced to considering the following linearized resolvent system

$$\begin{cases} (-\nu \Delta + V \partial_x - i\lambda - a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}})u + (\partial_y V(u^2 + \kappa u^3), 0, 0) + \nabla P + \vec{g} = 0, \\ \operatorname{div} u = 0, \quad \Delta P = -2\partial_y V(\partial_x u^2 + \kappa \partial_x u^3), \\ u|_{y=\pm 1} = (\partial_y P + \nu \Delta v^2)|_{y=\pm 1} = 0. \end{cases}$$

We need to prove that if $\vec{g} = 0$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $a \in [0, \epsilon_1]$, then $u = 0$. To our knowledge, these results are new and may be of independent interest. The proof is highly nontrivial.

Motivated by [63], it is natural to introduce $W = u^2 + \kappa u^3$, $U = u^3$. Then (W, U) satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\nu\Delta W + (\partial_x V - i\lambda)W - a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}W + (\partial_y + \kappa\partial_z)P \\ \quad + (g^2 + \kappa g^3) + 2\nu\nabla\kappa \cdot \nabla U + \nu(\Delta\kappa)U = 0, \\ -\nu\Delta U + (\partial_x V - i\lambda)U - a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}U + \partial_z P + g^3 = 0, \\ \Delta P = -2\partial_x(\partial_y V W), \\ W|_{y=\pm 1} = \partial_y W|_{y=\pm 1} = U|_{y=\pm 1} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Taking Fourier transform in x , it can be reduced to the following system

$$(3.15) \quad \begin{cases} -\nu\Delta W + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)W - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}W + (\partial_y + \kappa\partial_z)P \\ \quad + G_1 + \nu(\Delta\kappa)U + 2\nu\nabla\kappa \cdot \nabla U = 0, \\ -\nu\Delta U + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)U - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}U + G_2 + \partial_z P = 0, \\ W|_{y=\pm 1} = \partial_y W|_{y=\pm 1} = U|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\Delta P = -2ik\partial_y V W, \quad \partial_x W = ikW, \quad \partial_x U = ikU, \quad \partial_x P = ikP.$$

To estimate E_5 , the key ingredient is to establish the following resolvent estimates for the system (3.15) under the assumption (4.2):

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}(\|\partial_x^2 U\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)U\|_{L^2}^2) + \nu(\|\nabla\partial_x^2 U\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)U\|_{L^2}^2) \\ & \quad + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\partial_x\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu\|\partial_x\Delta W\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{\frac{5}{3}}\|\partial_x\Delta U\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C\nu^{-1}(\|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_x G_2\|_{L^2}^2). \end{aligned}$$

To this end, we first need to remove the singular part νW_s of W with W_s given by

$$\begin{cases} -\nu\Delta W_s + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)W_s - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}W_s + \rho_1\nabla V \cdot \nabla U = 0, \\ W_s|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \quad \partial_x W_s = ikW_s. \end{cases}$$

Thus, the good unknown W_g seems to be naturally defined by

$$W_g = W - \nu W_s.$$

Since $\Delta U|_{y=\pm 1} \neq 0$, we need to introduce a boundary corrector U_b of U defined by Lemma 8.1. The new good unknown W_g is defined by (for the case $|\lambda| < 1$)

$$W_g = W - \nu\theta W_s - \kappa U_b,$$

where $\theta(y) = \theta_0(|y - \lambda|/(1 - |\lambda|))$ with a fixed $\theta_0 \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ so that $\theta_0(y) = 1$ for $|y| \leq 1/4$, $\theta_0(y) = 0$ for $|y| \geq 1/2$. Now W_g satisfies the following system

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{cases} -\nu\Delta W_g + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)W_g - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}W_g + (\partial_y + \kappa\partial_z)(P^1 + P^2) = F, \\ \Delta P^1 = -2ik\partial_y V W_g, \quad \partial_y P^1|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \quad \Delta P^2 = 0, \\ W_g|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \quad \partial_x W_g = ikW_g, \quad \partial_x P^j = ikP^j (j = 1, 2). \end{cases}$$

Finally, $w_g = \Delta W_g$ satisfies

$$-\nu\Delta w_g + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)w_g - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}w_g = \text{good terms}$$

together with $W_g|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$ and good Neumann data $\partial_y W_g|_{y=\pm 1}$.

The construction of W_g may be the most key part of this paper. The second key part is to establish the resolvent estimates for the linearized system (given $\partial_y \varphi|_{y=\pm 1}$)

$$(3.17) \quad \begin{cases} -\nu \Delta w + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)w - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}w = F_1 + F_2, \\ \Delta \varphi = w, \quad \varphi|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \\ \partial_x w = ikw, \quad \partial_x F_1 = ikF_1, \quad \partial_x F_2 = ikF_2. \end{cases}$$

3.5. Resolvent estimates with non-vanishing Neumann data. To estimate E_3 and E_5 , we need to establish the space-time estimates for the linearized system. In the presence of the boundary, we can not use the Fourier transform method introduced in [63]. Instead, we will use the resolvent estimate method developed in [19].

To estimate E_3 , it is enough to establish the resolvent estimates for the following linearized system when $V = y$:

$$\begin{cases} -\nu \Delta w + ik(V - \lambda)w - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}w = F, \\ \Delta \varphi = w, \quad \varphi|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \end{cases}$$

together with the Navier-slip boundary condition(i.e., $w|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$) or the Neumann data $\partial_y \varphi|_{y=\pm 1} \neq 0$. Even in the case of Navier-slip boundary condition or nonslip boundary condition(i.e., $\partial_y \varphi|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$), the results in [19] can not be applied to the 3D case. In this work, we will develop a general framework for V satisfying (4.2), then apply general results to the special case of $V = y$.

To estimate E_5 , we need to establish the resolvent estimates for the linearized system (3.17). One of the key differences with [19] is that in our applications, $\partial_y \varphi|_{y=\pm 1} \neq 0$. Thus, the resolvent estimates have to show the precise dependence on the Neumann data $\partial_y \varphi|_{y=\pm 1}$. For example, we show that

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{\frac{4}{3}}\|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2} &\leq C\left(\|F_1\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{\frac{7}{6}}\|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\right), \\ \|w\|_{L^2} &\leq C\left(\|(k(y - \lambda)/\nu)^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}}\|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}}\|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\right. \\ &\quad \left.+ (\nu k^2)^{-\frac{5}{12}}\|F_1\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{3}{4}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|F_2\|_{H^{-1}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

In the case of nonslip boundary condition(i.e., $\partial_y \varphi|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$), the above result shows

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{\frac{4}{3}}\|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2} &\leq C(\|F_1\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|F_2\|_{H^{-1}}), \\ \|w\|_{L^2} &\leq C((\nu k^2)^{-\frac{5}{12}}\|F_1\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{3}{4}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|F_2\|_{H^{-1}}), \end{aligned}$$

which are the same as those in the case when $V = y$ (see [19]). This result in particular implies the linear stability of the flow near the Couette flow under the nonslip boundary condition. Thus, our work also gives a new proof of linear stability in [1].

Following the idea introduced in [19], we decompose the solution of (3.17) as $w = w_{Na} + w_I$, where w_{Na} and w_I solve

$$\begin{cases} -\nu \Delta w_{Na} + ik(V - \lambda)w_{Na} - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}w_{Na} = F, \\ w_{Na} = \Delta \varphi_{Na}, \quad \varphi_{Na}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \quad w_{Na}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \\ -\nu \Delta w_I + ik(V - \lambda)w_I - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}w_I = 0, \\ \Delta \varphi_I = w_I, \quad \varphi_I|_{y=\pm 1} = 0 \end{cases}$$

Since w_{Na} satisfies the Navier-slip boundary condition, under the assumption (4.2), we can follow the energy method developed in [19] to establish the resolvent estimates in the case

when the force $F \in H^1, F \in L^2$ or $F \in H^{-1}$ (see Proposition 4.1) and weak type resolvent estimates when $F \in H^{-1}$ (see Proposition 4.4).

New difficulty is that the solution w_I can not be expressed by the Airy function when $V \neq y$. Consider the homogeneous problem

$$\begin{cases} -\nu \Delta w + ik(V - \lambda)w - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}w = 0, \\ \Delta \varphi = w, \quad \varphi|_{y=\pm 1} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Our new idea is to make the decomposition $w = w_{Na} + w_b$, where

$$\begin{cases} -\nu \Delta w_{Na} + ik(V - \lambda)w_{Na} - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}w_{Na} = -ik(V - y)w_b, \\ w_{Na} = \Delta \varphi_{Na}, \quad \varphi_{Na}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \quad w_{Na}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \\ -\nu \Delta w_b + ik(y - \lambda)w_b - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}w_b = 0, \\ w_b = \Delta \varphi_b, \quad \varphi_b|_{y=\pm 1} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Since w_b solves the homogeneous OS equation with constant coefficient, the solution $\widehat{w}_{b,\ell} = \int_{\mathbb{T}} e^{-i\ell z} w_b(x, y, z) dz$ can be expressed as

$$\widehat{w}_{b,\ell} = \partial_y \widehat{\varphi}_{b,\ell}(1) w_{1,\ell} + \partial_y \widehat{\varphi}_{b,\ell}(-1) w_{2,\ell},$$

where $\widehat{\varphi}_{b,\ell} = \int_{\mathbb{T}} e^{-i\ell z} \varphi_b(x, y, z) dz$, and $(w_{1,\ell}, w_{2,\ell})$ given by (5.1) and (5.2) is the boundary corrector. The estimates of $(w_{1,\ell}, w_{2,\ell})$ can be obtained by using the properties of the Airy function. Thus, w_b can be controlled by the Neumann data $\partial_y \varphi|_{y=\pm 1}$ and $\partial_y \varphi_{Na}|_{y=\pm 1}$ due to $\partial_y \varphi_b = \partial_y \varphi - \partial_y \varphi_{Na}$. Main reason why this decomposition works well is due to the fact that $(V - y)|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$ so that $(V - y)w_b$ is a good remainder.

It should be emphasized that the estimates of the Neumann data $\partial_y \varphi_{Na}|_{y=\pm 1}$ are very skilled. The proof will be based on the following key fact: if $\Delta \varphi = w$, $\varphi|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$, then we have

$$\|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\{y=1\})} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_1} |\langle w, f \rangle|,$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}_1 = \left\{ f(x, y, z) = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} a_\ell \frac{\sinh(\eta(1+y))}{\sinh(2\eta)} e^{ikx+i\ell z} \mid \|\{a_\ell\}\|_{\ell^2} = 1, \sup\{|\ell| \mid a_\ell \neq 0\} < +\infty \right\}.$$

To estimate $\langle w, f \rangle$, we need to use the resolvent estimates of w_{Na} , especially weak type resolvent estimates given by Proposition 4.4.

We believe that the resolvent estimate method developed in this paper and [19] could be applied to the stability problem of general shear flows and the other related problems.

4. RESOLVENT ESTIMATES WITH NAVIER-SLIP BOUNDARY CONDITION

In this section, we establish the resolvent estimates of the Orr-Sommerfeld equation with variable coefficient:

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{cases} -\nu \Delta w + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)w - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}w = F, \\ w|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \quad \partial_x w = ikw, \quad \partial_x F = ikF, \end{cases}$$

where $V(y, z)$ satisfies

$$(4.2) \quad \|V - y\|_{H^4} < \varepsilon_0, \quad (V(y, z) - y)|_{y=\pm 1} = 0,$$

with ε_0 small enough determined later.

In this section, we always assume that $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $a \in [0, \epsilon_1]$ for some $\epsilon_1 > 0$ small enough determined later, and let φ solve

$$(4.3) \quad \Delta\varphi = w, \quad \varphi|_{y=\pm 1} = 0.$$

Let us first give some basic estimates involving V .

Lemma 4.1. *It holds that for any $(y, z) \in [-1, 1] \times \mathbb{T}$,*

$$|V(y, z) - y| \leq C\varepsilon_0(1 - y^2), \quad \frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{j - V(y, z)}{j - y} \leq 2 \quad j \in \{\pm 1\}.$$

Proof. Since $\|V - y\|_{H^4} \leq \varepsilon_0$ and $V - y|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$, we deduce that for $y \in [-1, 0]$,

$$\begin{aligned} |V(y, z) - y| &= \left| \int_{-1}^y \partial_y(V - y) dy \right| \leq (1 + y) \|\nabla(V - y)\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leq C\|V - y\|_{H^4}(1 + y) \leq C\varepsilon_0(1 + y) \leq C\varepsilon_0(1 - y^2). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for $y \in [0, 1]$, we have $|V - y| \leq C\varepsilon_0(1 - y^2)$.

Using the first inequality of the lemma, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{j - V}{j - y} &= 1 + \frac{y - V}{j - y} \leq 1 + \frac{|V - y|}{|j - y|} \leq 1 + C\varepsilon_0 \frac{1 - y^2}{|j - y|} \leq 1 + C\varepsilon_0, \\ \frac{j - V}{j - y} &= 1 + \frac{y - V}{j - y} \geq 1 - \frac{|V - y|}{|j - y|} \geq 1 - C\varepsilon_0 \frac{1 - y^2}{|j - y|} \geq 1 - C\varepsilon_0, \end{aligned}$$

which imply by taking ε_0 sufficiently small so that $C\varepsilon_0 \leq \frac{1}{2}$ that

$$\frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{j - V(y, z)}{j - y} \leq 2 \quad j \in \{\pm 1\}.$$

□

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\chi_1 = (V - \lambda - i\delta)^{-1}$ for some $\delta > 0$. It holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\chi_1\|_{L^\infty} &\leq C\delta^{-1}, \quad \|\chi_1\|_{L_{x,z}^\infty L_y^2} \leq C\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \\ \|\nabla \chi_1\|_{L^\infty} &\leq C\delta^{-2}, \quad \|\nabla \chi_1\|_{L_{x,z}^\infty L_y^2} \leq C\delta^{-\frac{3}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Here C is a constant independent of λ, δ .

Proof. The first and third inequality is obvious. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|1/(|V - \lambda| + \delta)\|_{L_{x,z}^\infty L_y^2}^2 &= \left\| \int_{-1}^1 \frac{1}{(|V - \lambda| + \delta)^2} dy \right\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leq C \left\| \int_{-1}^1 \frac{\partial_y V}{(|V - \lambda| + \delta)^2} dy \right\|_{L^\infty} \|1/(\partial_y V)^{-1}\|_{L^\infty} \leq C \|1/(|y - \lambda| + \delta)\|_{L_y^2}^2 \leq C\delta^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives the second inequality. The last inequality can be proved similarly. □

4.1. Resolvent estimates. In this subsection, we establish the resolvent estimates in the case when $F \in H^1, L^2$ or H^{-1} . The proof is similar to the case of $V = y$ considered in [19].

Proposition 4.1. *Let $w \in H^2(\Omega)$ be a solution of (4.1) with $F \in H^1(\Omega)$. Then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu^{\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|w\|_{L^2} + \nu\|\Delta w\|_{L^2} + |k|\|(V - \lambda)w\|_{L^2} \leq C\|F\|_{L^2}, \\ & \nu^{\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|w\|_{L^2} + \nu\|\Delta w\|_{L^2} \leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{-\frac{2}{3}}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2}, \\ & \nu^{\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|w\|_{L^2} \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|F\|_{H^{-1}}, \\ & \nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{\frac{4}{3}}\|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{\frac{5}{6}}\|w\|_{L^2_{x,z}L^1_y} \leq C\|F\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

If $\nu k^2 \leq 1$, then we have

$$\nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{\frac{4}{3}}\|\nabla^2[(V - \lambda)\varphi]\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{\frac{11}{6}}\|\nabla[(V - \lambda)\varphi]\|_{L^2_{x,z}L^\infty_y} \leq C\|F\|_{L^2}.$$

Proof. Step 1. Case of $F \in L^2(\Omega)$.

Taking L^2 inner product with w to (4.1), and integrating by parts, we obtain

$$(4.4) \quad \nu\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|F\|_{L^2}\|w\|_{L^2} + a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|w\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Taking L^2 inner product with $(V - \lambda)w$ to (4.1), we get

$$\left\langle -\nu\Delta w + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)w - a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}w, (V(y, z) - \lambda)w \right\rangle = \langle F, (V(y, z) - \lambda)w \rangle,$$

and then taking the imaginary part, we get

$$|k|\|(V - \lambda)w\|_{L^2}^2 \leq |\mathbf{Im}(\langle \nu\Delta w, (V - \lambda)w \rangle)| + \|F\|_{L^2}\|(V - \lambda)w\|_{L^2},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{Im}(\langle \nu\Delta w, (V - \lambda)w \rangle)| &= |\mathbf{Im}(-\langle \nu\nabla w, (V - \lambda)\nabla w \rangle - \langle \nu\nabla w, (\nabla V)w \rangle)| \\ &= |\mathbf{Im}(-\langle \nu\nabla w, (\nabla V)w \rangle)| \leq \nu\|\nabla V\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}\|w\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we infer that

$$(4.5) \quad |k|\|(V - \lambda)w\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}\|w\|_{L^2} + |k|^{-1}\|F\|_{L^2}^2).$$

Here we used $\|\nabla V\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\|V - y\|_{H^3} + 1 \leq C$.

Using the fact that

$$-2\mathbf{Re}\langle (V - \lambda)w, \partial_y w \rangle = -\langle (V - \lambda), \partial_y |w|^2 \rangle = \langle \partial_y V, |w|^2 \rangle \geq \|w\|_{L^2}^2/2,$$

we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \|w\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq 4\|(V - \lambda)w\|_{L^2}\|\partial_y w\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\left((\nu|k|^{-1}\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}\|w\|_{L^2})^{\frac{1}{2}} + |k|^{-1}\|F\|_{L^2}\right)\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

which along with (4.4) implies that (for a small enough)

$$(4.6) \quad (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|w\|_{L^2} \leq C\|F\|_{L^2}.$$

By (4.5), (4.6) and (4.1), we get

$$\nu\|\Delta w\|_{L^2} \leq |k|\|(V - \lambda)w\|_{L^2} + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|w\|_{L^2} + \|F\|_{L^2}.$$

This shows that

$$(4.7) \quad \nu^{\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|w\|_{L^2} + \nu\|\Delta w\|_{L^2} + |k|\|(V - \lambda)w\|_{L^2} \leq C\|F\|_{L^2}.$$

Step 2. Case of $F \in H^1(\Omega)$.

If $\nu k^2 \geq 1$, the proof is obvious due to

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu^{\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|w\|_{L^2} + \nu\|\Delta w\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq C\|F\|_{L^2} = C|k|^{-1}\|kF\|_{L^2} \leq C(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{-1}\|kF\|_{L^2} \leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{-\frac{2}{3}}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we assume $\nu k^2 \leq 1$ and $k > 0$ in this step (the case of $k < 0$ can be proved by taking conjugation). Let $\chi_1(y, z) = 1/(V(y, z) - \lambda - i\delta)$ with $\delta = (\nu/|k|)^{\frac{1}{3}}$. Then we have

$$ik(V - \lambda)w - a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}w = ik(V - \lambda + ia\delta)w.$$

Taking L^2 inner product with $\chi_1 w$ to (4.1), and integrating by parts, we obtain

$$\nu\langle\nabla w, \nabla(\chi_1 w)\rangle + ik\langle w, (V - \lambda - ia\delta)\chi_1 w\rangle = \langle F, \chi_1 w\rangle.$$

Taking the imaginary part, we get

$$(4.8) \quad |k| |\mathbf{Re}\langle w, (V - \lambda - ia\delta)\chi_1 w\rangle| \leq \nu |\langle\nabla w, \nabla(\chi_1 w)\rangle| + |\langle F, \chi_1 w\rangle|.$$

Using the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} (V - \lambda - ia\delta)\chi_1 &= 1 + i(1 - a)\delta\chi_1 = 1 + i(1 - a)(V(y, z) - \lambda + i\delta)\delta|\chi_1|^2, \\ \text{thus, } \mathbf{Re}((V - \lambda + ia\delta)\chi_1) &= 1 - (1 - a)\delta^2|\chi_1|^2 \geq 1 - \delta^2|\chi_1|^2, \end{aligned}$$

we infer that

$$|\mathbf{Re}\langle w, (V - \lambda - ia\delta)\chi_1 w\rangle| \geq \|w\|_{L^2}^2 - \delta^2\|\chi_1 w\|_{L^2}^2.$$

By Lemma 16.1, $\delta^2\|\chi_1 w\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C\delta\|w\|_{L^2}\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}$, hence,

$$(4.9) \quad |\mathbf{Re}\langle w, (V - \lambda - ia\delta)\chi_1 w\rangle| \geq \frac{3}{4}\|w\|_{L^2}^2 - C\delta^2\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^2.$$

By Lemma 4.2, we have

$$(4.10) \quad |\langle\nabla w, \nabla(\chi_1 w)\rangle| \leq \|\nabla w\|_{L^2}\|\nabla(\chi_1 w)\|_{L^2} \leq C\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}(\delta^{-2}\|w\|_{L^2} + \delta^{-1}\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}),$$

$$(4.11) \quad |\langle F, \chi_1 w\rangle| \leq \|\chi_1 F\|_{L^2}\|w\|_{L^2}.$$

Summing up (4.8)-(4.11), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & |k| \left(\frac{3}{4}\|w\|_{L^2}^2 - C\delta^2\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^2 \right) \\ & \leq C\nu\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}(\delta^{-2}\|w\|_{L^2} + \delta^{-1}\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}) + C\|\chi_1 F\|_{L^2}\|w\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

which along with Lemma 16.1 and by recalling $\nu|k|^{-1} = \delta^3$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|w\|_{L^2}^2 & \leq C \left(\delta^2\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu|k|^{-1}\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}(\delta^{-2}\|w\|_{L^2} + \delta^{-1}\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}) + |k|^{-1}\|\chi_1 F\|_{L^2}\|w\|_{L^2} \right) \\ & \leq C \left(\delta\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}\|w\|_{L^2} + \delta^2\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^2 + \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}|k|^{-\frac{3}{2}}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2}\|w\|_{L^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then Young's inequality gives

$$(4.12) \quad \|w\|_{L^2} \leq C(\delta\|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}|k|^{-\frac{3}{2}}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2}).$$

Next we estimate $\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}$ and $\|\Delta w\|_{L^2}$. First of all, we have

$$(4.13) \quad \nu\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^2 \leq a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|w\|_{L^2}^2 + |\mathbf{Re}\langle F, w\rangle|.$$

Taking the imaginary part to

$$\langle -\nu\Delta w + ik(V - \lambda)w - a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}w, \chi_1(y, z)F \rangle = \langle F, \chi_1 F \rangle,$$

we get

$$|k| |\mathbf{Re}\langle w, (V - \lambda - ia\delta)\chi_1 F \rangle| \leq \nu \|\Delta w\|_{L^2} \|\chi_1 F\|_{L^2} + |\mathbf{Im}(\langle F, \chi_1 F \rangle)|.$$

Using the facts that $(V - \lambda - ia\delta)\chi_1 = 1 + i(1 - a)\delta\chi_1$, $\mathbf{Im}\chi_1 = \delta|\chi_1|^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{Re}\langle w, (V - \lambda - ia\delta)\chi_1 F \rangle| &\geq |\mathbf{Re}\langle F, w \rangle| - \delta \|w\|_{L^2} \|\chi_1 F\|_{L^2}, \\ |\mathbf{Im}\langle F, \chi_1 F \rangle| &= \delta \|\chi_1 F\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C|k|^{-1} \|\nabla F\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$|\mathbf{Re}\langle F, w \rangle| \leq \delta \|w\|_{L^2} \|\chi_1 F\|_{L^2} + |k|^{-1} (\nu \|\Delta w\|_{L^2} \|\chi_1 F\|_{L^2} + \delta \|\chi_1 F\|_{L^2}^2),$$

which along with (4.13) and $\delta^3 = \nu/|k|$ implies that

$$(4.14) \quad \nu \|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^2 \leq a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}} \|w\|_{L^2}^2 + (\delta \|w\|_{L^2} + \delta^3 \|\Delta w\|_{L^2}) \|\chi_1 F\|_{L^2} + |k|^{-1} \delta \|\chi_1 F\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Taking L^2 inner product with Δw to (4.1), we have

$$\nu \|\Delta w\|_{L^2}^2 - k \mathbf{Im}(\langle \nabla((V - \lambda)w), \nabla w \rangle) - a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^2 = \mathbf{Re}(\langle F, -\Delta w \rangle).$$

Due to $\|\nabla V\|_{L^\infty} \leq C$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\nu \|\Delta w\|_{L^2}^2 - a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^2 - |\langle F, \Delta w \rangle| \\ &\leq |k| \|\nabla V\|_{L^\infty} \|w\|_{L^2} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2} \leq C|k| \|w\|_{L^2} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Due to $w|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$, we get by integration by parts and Lemma 16.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle F, \Delta w \rangle| &\leq \|\nabla F\|_{L^2} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + \|F\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \|\partial_y w\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\ &\leq \|\nabla F\|_{L^2} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla F\|_{L^2} \|\partial_y w\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla \partial_y w\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \|\nabla F\|_{L^2} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla F\|_{L^2} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\Delta w\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Summing up, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta w\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq a\nu^{-\frac{2}{3}} |k|^{\frac{2}{3}} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^2 + C\nu^{-1} |k| \|w\|_{L^2} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + \nu^{-1} \|\nabla F\|_{L^2} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + C\nu^{-1} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla F\|_{L^2} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\Delta w\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then Young's inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta w\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq C\nu^{-\frac{2}{3}} |k|^{\frac{2}{3}} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^2 + C\nu^{-1} |k| \|w\|_{L^2} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + C\nu^{-1} \|\nabla F\|_{L^2} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + C\nu^{-\frac{4}{3}} |k|^{-\frac{2}{3}} \|\nabla F\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4}{3}} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2}{3}} \\ &\leq C\nu^{-\frac{2}{3}} |k|^{\frac{2}{3}} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^2 + C\nu^{-\frac{4}{3}} |k|^{\frac{4}{3}} \|w\|_{L^2}^2 + C(\nu^{-\frac{5}{3}} |k|^{-\frac{4}{3}} + \nu^{-\frac{4}{3}} |k|^{-\frac{2}{3}}) \|\nabla F\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\delta = (\nu/|k|)^{\frac{1}{3}}$, $\nu k^2 \leq 1$, $\nu^{-\frac{4}{3}} |k|^{-\frac{2}{3}} \leq \nu^{-\frac{5}{3}} |k|^{-\frac{4}{3}} = \delta^{-5} |k|^{-3}$, we have

$$(4.15) \quad \|\Delta w\|_{L^2} \leq C\delta^{-1} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + C\delta^{-2} \|w\|_{L^2} + C\delta^{-\frac{5}{2}} |k|^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|\nabla F\|_{L^2}.$$

Plugging (4.15) into (4.14), we get by (4.12) that

$$\begin{aligned} \nu \|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}} \|w\|_{L^2}^2 + C(\delta \|w\|_{L^2} + \delta^2 \|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|\nabla F\|_{L^2}) \|\chi_1 F\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + |k|^{-1} \delta \|\chi_1 F\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}} \|w\|_{L^2}^2 + C(\delta^2 \|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|\nabla F\|_{L^2}) \|\chi_1 F\|_{L^2} + |k|^{-1} \delta \|\chi_1 F\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

from which, Young's inequality, (4.12) and Lemma 16.1, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned}\nu\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq C(a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|w\|_{L^2}^2 + \delta^{\frac{1}{2}}|k|^{-\frac{3}{2}}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2}\|\chi_1 F\|_{L^2} + |k|^{-1}\delta\|\chi_1 F\|_{L^2}^2) \\ &\leq Ca(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}(\delta\|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}|k|^{-\frac{3}{2}}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2})^2 + C|k|^{-2}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq Ca(\nu\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^2 + |k|^{-2}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2}^2) + C|k|^{-2}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2}^2.\end{aligned}$$

Taking ϵ_1 small enough so that $Ca \leq C\epsilon_1 \leq \frac{1}{2}$, we conclude

$$\nu\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C|k|^{-2}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2}^2,$$

which along with (4.12) and (4.15) gives

$$\nu\|\Delta w\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|w\|_{L^2} \leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{-\frac{2}{3}}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2}.$$

Step 3. Case of $F \in H^{-1}(\Omega)$.

If $\nu k^2 \geq 1$, taking L^2 inner product with w to (4.1), and integrating by parts, we obtain

$$\nu\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|F\|_{H^{-1}}\|w\|_{H^1} + a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|w\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C\|F\|_{H^{-1}}\|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + a(\nu k^2)\|w\|_{L^2}^2.$$

As $a(\nu k^2)\|w\|_{L^2}^2 \leq a\nu\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^2 \leq (\nu/2)\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^2$, we deduce that $\nu\|\nabla w\| \leq C\|F\|_{H^{-1}}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\nu^{\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|w\|_{L^2} &\leq (\nu^{\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}} + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{-1})\|\nabla w\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq 2\nu^{\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\nabla w\|_{L^2} \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|F\|_{H^{-1}}.\end{aligned}$$

Now we assume $\nu k^2 \leq 1$ and $k > 0$ in this step. Then $\delta \leq 1$. By Lemma 4.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|\langle F, \chi_1 w \rangle| &\leq \|F\|_{H^{-1}}(\|\nabla(\chi_1 w)\|_{L^2} + \|\chi_1 w\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C\|F\|_{H^{-1}}(\|\chi_1\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \chi_1\|_{L^\infty}\|w\|_{L^2} + \|\chi_1\|_{L^\infty}\|w\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C\delta^{-2}\|F\|_{H^{-1}}(\delta\|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + \|w\|_{L^2} + \delta\|w\|_{L^2}).\end{aligned}$$

As $\delta \leq 1$, this shows that

$$(4.16) \quad |\langle F, \chi_1 w \rangle| \leq C\|F\|_{H^{-1}}(\delta^{-1}\|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + \delta^{-2}\|w\|_{L^2}).$$

Summing up (4.8)-(4.10) and (4.16), we get

$$\begin{aligned}&|k|\left(\frac{3}{4}\|w\|_{L^2}^2 - C\delta^2\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^2\right) \\ &\leq \nu\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}(\delta^{-2}\|w\|_{L^2} + \delta^{-1}\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}) + \delta^{-2}\|F\|_{H^{-1}}(\delta\|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + \|w\|_{L^2}),\end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned}\|w\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq C\left(\delta^2\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu|k|^{-1}\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}(\delta^{-2}\|w\|_{L^2} + \delta^{-1}\|\nabla w\|_{L^2})\right. \\ &\quad \left.+ \delta^{-2}|k|^{-1}\|F\|_{H^{-1}}(\delta\|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + \|w\|_{L^2})\right) \\ &\leq C\left(\delta\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}\|w\|_{L^2} + \delta^2\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^2 + \delta^{-2}|k|^{-1}\|F\|_{H^{-1}}(\delta\|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + \|w\|_{L^2})\right).\end{aligned}$$

Then Young's inequality gives

$$(4.17) \quad \|w\|_{L^2} \leq C(\delta\|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + \delta^{-2}|k|^{-1}\|F\|_{H^{-1}}).$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\nu\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|w\|_{L^2}^2 + |\langle F, w \rangle| \\ &\leq a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|w\|_{L^2}^2 + \|F\|_{H^{-1}}(\|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + \|w\|_{L^2})\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}} \|w\|_{L^2}^2 + \|F\|_{H^{-1}} (\|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + \delta^{-1} \|w\|_{L^2}).$$

from which and (4.17), and by taking ϵ_1 small enough so that $Ca^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C\epsilon_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{1}{2}$, we infer that

$$(4.18) \quad \nu^{\frac{2}{3}} |k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}} \|w\|_{L^2} \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \|F\|_{H^{-1}}.$$

Step 4. Estimates of $\|w\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^1}$ and $\|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2}$.

By Lemma 4.2 and (4.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|w\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^1} &= \|\chi_1(V - \lambda - i\delta)w\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^1} \\ &\leq \|\chi_1\|_{L_{x,z}^\infty L_y^2} \|(V - \lambda - i\delta)w\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\delta \|w\|_{L^2} + \|(V - \lambda)w\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} |\nu k^2|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|F\|_{L^2} + C\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{-1} \|F\|_{L^2} \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} \|F\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

from which and Lemma 16.3, we infer that

$$(4.19) \quad \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{4}{3}} \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{5}{6}} \|w\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^1} \leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{5}{6}} \|w\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^1} \leq C\|F\|_{L^2}.$$

Step 5. Estimate of $\|\nabla^k((V - \lambda)\varphi)\|$, $k = 1, 2$.

Let $F_1 = (V - \lambda)\varphi$. Then we have

$$\Delta F_1 = (V - \lambda)w + 2\nabla V \cdot \nabla \varphi + \varphi \Delta V, \quad F_1|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \quad \partial_x F_1 = ikF_1.$$

Thus, we get by (4.7) and (4.19) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta F_1\|_{L^2} &\leq \|(V - \lambda)w\|_{L^2} + 2\|\nabla V \cdot \nabla \varphi\|_{L^2} + \|\varphi \Delta V\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C(|k|^{-1} \|F\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2} + \|\varphi\|_{L^2}) \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{4}{3}} \|F\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

As $F_1|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$, $\partial_x F_1 = ikF_1$, by Lemma 16.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^2 F_1\|_{L^2} &\leq C\|\Delta F_1\|_{L^2} \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{4}{3}} \|F\|_{L^2}, \\ \|\nabla F_1\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} &\leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla^2 F_1\|_{L^2} \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{11}{6}} \|F\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

$$\nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{4}{3}} \|\nabla^2[(V - \lambda)\varphi]\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{11}{6}} \|\nabla[(V - \lambda)\varphi]\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} \leq C\|F\|_{L^2}.$$

This completes the proof of the proposition. $\square$

The following proposition is a simple corollary of Proposition 4.1.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $w \in H^2(\Omega)$ be a solution of (4.1) with $F \in L^2(\Omega)$. If $F = F_1 + F_2 + \partial_x f_1 + \partial_y f_2 + \partial_z f_3$ and $F_2|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$, then it holds that*

$$\nu^{\frac{2}{3}} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + (\nu |k|)^{\frac{1}{3}} \|w\|_{L^2} \leq C \left(|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|F_1\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-1} \|\nabla F_2\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|(f_1, f_2, f_3)\|_{L^2} \right).$$

Proof. We decompose w as $w = w_1 + w_2 + w_3$, where w_j ($j = 1, 2, 3$) solves

$$\begin{cases} -\nu \Delta w_1 + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)w_1 - a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}} w_1 = F_1, \\ -\nu \Delta w_2 + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)w_2 - a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}} w_2 = F_2, \\ -\nu \Delta w_3 + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)w_3 - a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}} w_3 = \partial_x f_1 + \partial_y f_2 + \partial_z f_3, \\ w_j|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \quad \partial_x w_j = ikw_j, \quad j = 1, 2, 3. \end{cases}$$

It follows from Proposition 4.1 that

$$\nu^{\frac{2}{3}} |k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\nabla w_1\|_{L^2} + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}} \|w_1\|_{L^2} \leq C\|F_1\|_{L^2},$$

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\nabla w_2\|_{L^2} + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|w_2\|_{L^2} &\leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{-\frac{2}{3}}\|\nabla F_2\|_{L^2}, \\ \nu^{\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\nabla w_3\|_{L^2} + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|w_3\|_{L^2} &\leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|(f_1, f_2, f_3)\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{\frac{2}{3}}\|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + (\nu|k|)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|w\|_{L^2} &\leq |k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\sum_{j=1}^3\left(\nu^{\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\nabla w_j\|_{L^2} + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|w_j\|_{L^2}\right) \\ (4.20) \quad &\leq C\left(|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|F_1\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{-1}\|\nabla F_2\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|(f_1, f_2, f_3)\|_{L^2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

□

The following proposition gives the estimates of w when taking good derivatives ∂_x and $\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y$.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $w \in H^2(\Omega)$ be a solution of (4.1) with $F = f_1 + f_2 + f_3$ and $P_0 f_i = 0$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$). Then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} &(\nu|k|)^{\frac{1}{3}}\left(\|\partial_x^2 w\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)w\|_{L^2}\right) + \nu^{\frac{2}{3}}\left(\|\nabla\partial_x^2 w\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)w\|_{L^2}\right) \\ &\leq C\left(\nu^{\frac{1}{6}}\|f_1\|_{H^2} + |k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|\partial_x^2 f_2\|_{L^2} + |k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)f_2\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|\partial_x f_3\|_{L^2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Thanks to $\partial_x[(V(y, z) - \lambda)w] = (V(y, z) - \lambda)\partial_x w$, $\partial_x f_1 = ikf_1$, we have

$$-\nu\Delta\partial_x^2 w + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)\partial_x^2 w - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}\partial_x^2 w = ik\partial_x f_1 + \partial_x^2 f_2 + \partial_x^2 f_3.$$

Then it follows from Proposition 4.2 that

$$\begin{aligned} &(\nu|k|)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\partial_x^2 w\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{2}{3}}\|\nabla\partial_x^2 w\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\left(\nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{-1}\|ik\nabla\partial_x f_1\|_{L^2} + |k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|\partial_x^2 f_2\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|\partial_x f_3\|_{L^2}\right) \\ (4.21) \quad &\leq C\left(\nu^{\frac{1}{6}}\|f_1\|_{H^2} + |k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|\partial_x^2 f_2\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|\partial_x f_3\|_{L^2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to $(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_x)V(y, z) = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &-\nu\Delta(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)w + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)w - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)w \\ &= -\nu\Delta\kappa\partial_y w + 2\nu(\partial_y(\partial_y\kappa\partial_y w) + \partial_z(\partial_z\kappa\partial_y w)) + (\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)F, \end{aligned}$$

and we write

$$(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)F = (\partial_z f_1 - \kappa\partial_y f_1) + \partial_z f_3 - \partial_y(\kappa f_3) + \partial_y\kappa f_3 + (\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)f_2.$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &-\nu\Delta\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)w + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)\partial_x w - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)\partial_x w \\ &= -\nu\Delta\kappa\partial_x\partial_y w + 2\nu(\partial_y(\partial_y\kappa\partial_x\partial_y w) + \partial_z(\partial_z\kappa\partial_x\partial_y w)) \\ &\quad + ik(\partial_z f_1 - \kappa\partial_y f_1) + \partial_z\partial_x f_3 + \partial_x(f_3\partial_y\kappa) - \partial_y\partial_x(\kappa f_3) + \partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)f_2. \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 4.2 again, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &(\nu|k|)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)w\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{2}{3}}\|\nabla\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)w\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\left(\nu^{\frac{1}{6}}\|\nabla(\partial_z f_1 - \kappa\partial_y f_1)\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{3}}(\|\partial_x f_3\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x(\kappa f_3)\|_{L^2} + \|f_3\partial_y\kappa\|_{L^2}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)f_2\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{2}{3}}\|(\partial_y\kappa, \partial_z\kappa)\partial_y\partial_x w\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla h_1\|_{L^2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta h_1 = \Delta \kappa \partial_x \partial_y w$, $h_1|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$. Note that

$$\|\Delta \kappa\|_{L^4} \leq C \|\Delta \kappa\|_{H^1} \leq C \|\kappa\|_{H^3} \leq C,$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla h_1\|_{L^2}^2 &= -\langle \Delta h_1, h_1 \rangle = -\langle \Delta \kappa \partial_x \partial_y w, h_1 \rangle \\ &\leq \|\Delta \kappa\|_{L^4} \|\partial_x \partial_y w\|_{L^2} \|h_1\|_{L^4} \leq C \|\partial_x \nabla w\|_{L^2} \|h_1\|_{H^1} \leq C \|\nabla \partial_x^2 w\|_{L^2} \|\nabla h_1\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\|\nabla h_1\|_{L^2} \leq C \|\nabla \partial_x^2 w\|_{L^2}$. This along with the facts that $\|\nabla \kappa\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla \kappa\|_{H^2} \leq C \|V - y\|_{H^4} \leq C \varepsilon_0$, shows that

$$\begin{aligned} &(\nu |k|)^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\partial_x (\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y) w\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{2}{3}} \|\nabla \partial_x (\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y) w\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \left(\nu^{\frac{1}{6}} \|f_1\|_{H^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|\partial_x f_3\|_{L^2} + |k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|\partial_x (\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y) f_2\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{2}{3}} \|\nabla \partial_x^2 w\|_{L^2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

from which and (4.21), we deduce our result. $\square$

4.2. Weak type resolvent estimates. In this subsection, we always assume $\nu k^2 \leq 1$, so that $|k\delta| \leq 1$ ($\delta = \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}$). We establish various weak type resolvent estimates, which will play an important role for the estimate of the Neumann data $\partial_y \varphi|_{y=\pm 1}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $k > 0$.

Proposition 4.4. *Let $w \in H^2(\Omega)$ be a solution of (4.1) with $F \in L^2(\Omega)$. If $f \in H^1(\Omega)$, $j \in \{\pm 1\}$, $f|_{y=-j} = 0$, then it holds that*

$$|\langle w(V - \tilde{\lambda}), f \rangle| \leq C |k|^{-1} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} \left(\|f\|_{H^1} + (\|f\|_{L^2(\Gamma_j)} + \delta_1 \|(\partial_x, \partial_z) f\|_{L^2(\Gamma_j)}) (|j - \lambda| + \delta)^{\frac{1}{4}} \delta^{-\frac{3}{4}} \right),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle w, f \rangle| &\leq C |k|^{-1} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} \left((\|f\|_{L^2(\Gamma_j)} + \delta_1 \|(\partial_x, \partial_z) f\|_{L^2(\Gamma_j)}) (|j - \lambda| + \delta)^{-\frac{3}{4}} \delta^{-\frac{3}{4}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|\nabla f / (|V - \lambda| + \delta)\|_{L^2} + \delta^{-1} \|f / (|V - \lambda| + \delta)\|_{L^2} \right), \\ |\langle w, f \rangle| &\leq C |k|^{-1} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} \left(\delta^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|f\|_{L^2_{x,z} L^\infty_y} + \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|(\partial_x, \partial_z) f\|_{L^2(\Gamma_j)} + \delta^{-1} \|\nabla f\|_{L^2} \right) \\ &\leq C |k\delta|^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} \|\nabla f\|_{L^2} + C |k|^{-1} \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} \|(\partial_x, \partial_z) f\|_{L^2(\Gamma_j)}, \\ |\langle w, f \rangle| &\leq C \nu^{-1} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} \|(1 - y^2) f\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{\lambda} = \lambda - ia\delta, \quad \delta_1 = \delta (|k(1 - \lambda)| + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Proof. First of all, for any $f_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ with $f_0|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$, we get by integration by parts that

$$\begin{aligned} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} \|f_0\|_{H^1} &\geq |\langle F, f_0 \rangle| = |\langle -\nu \Delta w + ik(V - \tilde{\lambda})w, f_0 \rangle| \\ &\geq |\langle k(V - \tilde{\lambda})w, f_0 \rangle| - \nu \|\nabla w\|_{L^2} \|\nabla f_0\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

from which and Proposition 4.1, we infer that

$$(4.22) \quad |\langle w(V - \tilde{\lambda}), f_0 \rangle| \leq |k|^{-1} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} \|f_0\|_{H^1}.$$

Next we consider the case when $f \in H^1(\Omega)$, $f(x, -1, z) = 0$. In this case, for every $\delta_* \in (0, \delta] \subseteq [-1, 1]$, let

$$\chi_2(y) = \max(1 - (1 - y)/\delta_*, 0), \quad f_0(x, y, z) = f(x, y, z) - f(x, 1, z) \chi_2(y).$$

Then we have $\chi_2 \in H^1(\Omega)$, $f_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, $I_2 := \text{supp}\chi_2 = \mathbb{T} \times [1 - \delta_*, 1] \times \mathbb{T}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\chi_2\|_{L^\infty} &= 1, \quad \|\chi_2\|_{L_{x,z}^\infty L_y^2} \leq \delta_*^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \|\nabla \chi_2\|_{L_{x,z}^\infty L_y^2} \leq \delta_*^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \\ \|(V - \tilde{\lambda})\chi_2\|_{L^\infty} &\leq \|V - \tilde{\lambda}\|_{L^\infty([1-\delta_*, 1])} \|\chi_2\|_{L^\infty} \leq |1 - \lambda| + \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Due to $w(x, 1, z) = 0$, we have

$$|w(x, y, z)| = \left| \int_y^1 \partial_y w(x, y_1, z) dy_1 \right| \leq |1 - y|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y w(x, \cdot, z)\|_{L_y^2} \leq \delta_*^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y w(x, \cdot, z)\|_{L_y^2}$$

for $y \in [1 - \delta_*, 1]$ and then

$$\|w\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^1(I_2)} \leq \delta_*^{\frac{3}{2}} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2}.$$

Then it follows from Proposition 4.1 and (4.22) that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\langle w(V - \tilde{\lambda}), f \rangle| \\ & \leq |\langle w(V - \tilde{\lambda}), f(x, 1, z)\chi_2 \rangle| + |\langle w(V - \tilde{\lambda}), f_0 \rangle| \\ & \leq \|f\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} \|w\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^1(I_2)} \|(V - \tilde{\lambda})\chi_2\|_{L^\infty} + C|k|^{-1} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} \|f_0\|_{H^1} \\ & \leq \|f\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} \delta_*^{\frac{3}{2}} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2} (|1 - \lambda| + \delta) + C|k|^{-1} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} \|f(x, 1, z)\chi_2\|_{H^1} + C|k|^{-1} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} \|f\|_{H^1} \\ & \leq C\|f\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} \delta_*^{\frac{3}{2}} \nu^{-1} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} (|1 - \lambda| + \delta) + C|k|^{-1} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} \left(\|f(x, 1, z)\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} \|\nabla \chi_2\|_{L_{x,z}^\infty L_y^2} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + (\|\nabla f(x, 1, z)\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} + \|f(x, 1, z)\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty}) \|\chi_2\|_{L_{x,z}^\infty L_y^2} \right) + C|k|^{-1} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} \|f\|_{H^1} \\ & \leq C\|f\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} \delta_*^{\frac{3}{2}} \nu^{-1} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} (|1 - \lambda| + \delta) + C|k|^{-1} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} \left(\|f\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} (\delta_*^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \delta_*^{\frac{1}{2}}) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)f\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} \delta_*^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) + C|k|^{-1} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} \|f\|_{H^1} \\ & \leq C|k|^{-1} \|f\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} (\delta_*^{\frac{3}{2}} (|1 - \lambda| + \delta) \delta^{-3} + \delta_*^{-\frac{1}{2}}) + C|k|^{-1} \delta_*^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)f\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} \\ & \quad + C|k|^{-1} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} \|f\|_{H^1}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used $\nu^{-1}|k| = \delta^{-3}$.

Taking $\delta_* = (|1 - \lambda| + \delta)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta^{\frac{3}{2}} \leq \delta_1$ due to $\nu k^2 \leq 1$, we obtain

$$(4.23) \quad |\langle w(V - \tilde{\lambda}), f \rangle| \leq C|k|^{-1} (\|f\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} + \delta_1 \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)f\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)}) \|F\|_{H^{-1}} (|1 - \lambda| + \delta)^{\frac{1}{4}} \delta^{-\frac{3}{4}} + C|k|^{-1} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} \|f\|_{H^1}.$$

This proves the first inequality of the proposition.

For $f \in H^1(\Omega)$, $f|_{y=-1} = 0$, let $\phi = \chi_1 f$, where $\chi_1 = (V - \lambda - i\delta)^{-1}$. Then we have $\phi \in H^1(\Omega)$, $\phi|_{y=-1} = 0$. Thus, by (4.23) and the fact $(V - \tilde{\lambda})\tilde{\chi}_1 = 1 + i(a - 1)\delta\tilde{\chi}_1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle w, f \rangle| & \leq |\langle w(V - \tilde{\lambda}), \phi \rangle| + |i(a - 1)\delta \langle w, \chi_1 f \rangle| \\ & \leq |\langle w(V - \tilde{\lambda}), \phi \rangle| + C\delta \|w\|_{L^2} \|\chi_1 f\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq C|k|^{-1} (\|\phi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} + \delta_1 \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)\phi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)}) \|F\|_{H^{-1}} (|1 - \lambda| + \delta)^{\frac{1}{4}} \delta^{-\frac{3}{4}} \\ & \quad + C|k|^{-1} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} \|\phi\|_{H^1} + C\delta \|w\|_{L^2} \|\chi_1 f\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to the facts that for $y \in [-1, 1]$,

$$|\chi_1(y, z)| \leq C(|V - \lambda| + \delta)^{-1}, \quad |\nabla \chi_1(y, z)| \leq C(|V - \lambda| + \delta)^{-2},$$

we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\phi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} &\leq \|f\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} \|\chi_1(1, z)\|_{L_z^\infty} \leq C \|f\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} (|1 - \lambda| + \delta)^{-1}, \\
\|(\partial_x, \partial_z)\phi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} &= \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)f\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} \|\chi_1(1, z)\|_{L_z^\infty} + \|f\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} \|\nabla \chi_1(1, z)\|_{L_z^\infty} \\
&\leq C \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)f\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} (|1 - \lambda| + \delta)^{-1} + C \|f\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} (|1 - \lambda| + \delta)^{-2}, \\
\|\phi\|_{H^1} &\leq \|\nabla f \chi_1\|_{L^2} + \|f \nabla \chi_1\|_{L^2} + \|f \chi_1\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq C \|\nabla f / (|V - \lambda| + \delta)\|_{L^2} + C \|f / (|V - \lambda| + \delta)^2\|_{L^2} + C \|f / (|V - \lambda| + \delta)\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq C \|\nabla f / (|V - \lambda| + \delta)\|_{L^2} + C \delta^{-1} \|f / (|V - \lambda| + \delta)\|_{L^2},
\end{aligned}$$

and by Proposition 4.1, we get

$$\delta \|w\|_{L^2} \|\chi_1 f\|_{L^2} \leq C \delta^{-1} |k|^{-1} \|f / (|V - \lambda| + \delta)\|_{L^2} \|F\|_{H^{-1}}.$$

Then, using $\delta_1 \leq \delta$, $\delta_1 (|1 - \lambda| + \delta)^{-2} \leq (|1 - \lambda| + \delta)^{-1}$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle w, f \rangle| &\leq C |k|^{-1} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} \left((\|f\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} + \delta_1 \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)f\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)}) (|1 - \lambda| + \delta)^{-\frac{3}{4}} \delta^{-\frac{3}{4}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \|\nabla f / (|V - \lambda| + \delta)\|_{L^2} + \delta^{-1} \|f / (|V - \lambda| + \delta)\|_{L^2} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

which gives the second inequality.

The third inequality follows from the second inequality and the following facts that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f\|_{L^2(\Gamma_j)} (|j - \lambda| + \delta)^{-\frac{3}{4}} \delta^{-\frac{3}{4}} &\leq \|f\|_{L^2(\Gamma_j)} \delta^{-\frac{3}{2}} \leq \delta^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|f\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty}, \\
\delta_1 \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)f\|_{L^2(\Gamma_j)} (|j - \lambda| + \delta)^{-\frac{3}{4}} \delta^{-\frac{3}{4}} &\leq \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)f\|_{L^2(\Gamma_j)} \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \\
\|\nabla f / (|V - \lambda| + \delta)\|_{L^2} &\leq \delta^{-1} \|\nabla f\|_{L^2}, \\
\delta^{-1} \|f / (|V - \lambda| + \delta)\|_{L^2} &\leq \delta^{-1} \|(|V - \lambda| + \delta)^{-1}\|_{L_{x,z}^\infty L_y^2} \|f\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} \leq C \delta^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|f\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty}, \\
\|f\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} &= |k|^{-1} \|\partial_x f\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} \leq C |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla f\|_{L^2},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used Lemma 16.1 in the last inequality.

By Hardy's inequality and Proposition 4.1, we have (the fourth inequality)

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle w, f \rangle| &\leq \left\| \frac{w}{1 - y^2} \right\|_{L^2} \|(1 - y^2)f\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq C \|\partial_y w\|_{L^2} \|(1 - y^2)f\|_{L^2} \leq C \|\nabla w\|_{L^2} \|(1 - y^2)f\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq C \nu^{-1} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} \|(1 - y^2)f\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

The case of $f|_{y=1} = 0$ can be proved similarly. $\square$

4.3. Estimates of the Neumann data. In this subsection, we will present some uniform estimates of the Neumann data $\partial_y \varphi|_{y=\pm 1}$.

Proposition 4.5. *Let $w \in H^2(\Omega)$ be a solution of (4.1) with $F \in L^2(\Omega)$. Then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{4}{3}} \|\varphi\|_{L^2} + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}} (\|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2} + \|(1 - y^2)w\|_{L^2}) &\leq C (\|(1 - y^2)F\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \|F\|_{L^2}), \\
\|\partial_z \partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} &\leq C |\nu k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F\|_{L^2}, \\
\|\partial_z \partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} &\leq C \nu^{-\frac{5}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{6}} \|F\|_{H^{-1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

If $\nu k^2 \leq 1$, then we have

$$(1 + |k(\lambda - j)|) \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_j)} \leq C \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} \min(1, |k(\lambda + j)| + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{1}{3}}) \|F\|_{L^2}, \quad j \in \{\pm 1\},$$

$$\| |k(y - \lambda)|^{\frac{1}{2}} \partial_y \varphi \|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq C \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} \left(\min(|k(\lambda - 1)|^{\frac{1}{2}}, |k(\lambda + 1)|^{\frac{1}{2}}) + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \right) \|F\|_{L^2}.$$

To estimate $\partial_y \varphi$, we need to use the following facts. First of all, we know that

$$\|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)}^2 = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \left| \left\langle w, \frac{\sinh(\eta(y + 1))}{\sinh(2\eta)} e^{i\ell z + ikx} \right\rangle \right|^2.$$

Let $\{a_\ell\}$ be any complex valued sequence, such that $\{a_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \ell_c^2(\mathbb{Z})$, i.e. $\{\ell \in \mathbb{Z} | a_\ell \neq 0\}$ is a finite set and $\|\{a_\ell\}\|_{\ell^2} = 1$. Then the duality argument gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \sup_{\{a_\ell\} \in \ell_c^2, \|\{a_\ell\}\|_{\ell^2} = 1} \left| \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} a_\ell \left\langle w, \frac{\sinh(\eta(y + 1))}{\sinh(2\eta)} e^{i\ell z + ikx} \right\rangle \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \sup_{\{a_\ell\} \in \ell_c^2, \|\{a_\ell\}\|_{\ell^2} = 1} \left| \left\langle w, \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} a_\ell \frac{\sinh(\eta(y + 1))}{\sinh(2\eta)} e^{i\ell z + ikx} \right\rangle \right|. \end{aligned}$$

We define the set

$$\mathcal{F}_1 = \left\{ f(x, y, z) = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} a_\ell \frac{\sinh(\eta(1 + y))}{\sinh(2\eta)} e^{ikx + i\ell z} \mid \{a_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \ell_c^2(\mathbb{Z}), \|\{a_\ell\}\|_{\ell^2} = 1 \right\}.$$

Thus, we have

$$(4.24) \quad \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_1} |\langle w, f \rangle|.$$

The following lemma gives some basic estimates of functions in the set $\mathcal{F}_1$.

Lemma 4.3. *For $f \in \mathcal{F}_1$, it holds that*

$$(4.25) \quad \|f\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} \leq C, \quad \|f\|_{L^2} \leq C |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}},$$

$$(4.26) \quad \|(1 - y) \nabla f\|_{L_y^\infty L_{x,z}^2} \leq C, \quad \|(1 - y) \nabla f\|_{L^2} \leq C |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}},$$

$$(4.27) \quad \|f\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} \leq C, \quad \|(1 - y) f\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} \leq C |k|^{-1},$$

$$(4.28) \quad \|f/(1 + y)\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} \leq C, \quad \|f/(1 + y)\|_{L^2} \leq C |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Proof. The first inequality of (4.25) is obvious. The second one follows from

$$\|f\|_{L^2}^2 = (2\pi)^2 \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \left\| a_\ell \frac{\sinh(\eta(1 + y))}{\sinh(2\eta)} \right\|_{L_y^2}^2 \leq C \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} (|a_\ell|^2 \eta^{-1}) \leq C |k|^{-1}.$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla f\|_{L_{x,z}^2}^2 &= (2\pi)^2 \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(\left| a_\ell \frac{\eta \sinh(\eta(1 + y))}{\sinh(2\eta)} \right|^2 + \left| a_\ell \frac{\eta \cosh(\eta(1 + y))}{\sinh(2\eta)} \right|^2 \right) \\ &\leq C \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \eta^2 |a_\ell|^2 e^{-2\eta(1-y)} \leq C(1 - y)^{-2} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} |a_\ell|^2 e^{-\eta(1-y)} \\ &\leq C(1 - y)^{-2} e^{-|k|(1-y)}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives $\|(1 - y) \nabla f\|_{L_{x,z}^2} \leq C e^{-|k|(1-y)/2}$, and then

$$\begin{aligned} \|(1 - y) \nabla f\|_{L_y^\infty L_{x,z}^2} &\leq C \|e^{-|k|(1-y)/2}\|_{L_y^\infty} \leq C, \\ \|(1 - y) \nabla f\|_{L^2} &\leq C \|e^{-|k|(1-y)/2}\|_{L_y^2} \leq C |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $f|_{y=-1} = 0$, $\Delta f = 0$, we get by Lemma 16.8 that

$$\|f\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} \leq C \|f\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} \leq C,$$

and by (4.26) and (4.25), we have

$$\|(1-y)f\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} \leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla((1-y)f)\|_{L^2} \leq C|k|^{-1}.$$

Since $f|_{y=-1} = 0$, $\Delta f = 0$, we have

$$\Delta((1-y)^2 f) = 2f - 4(1-y)\partial_y f, \quad (1-y)^2 f|_{y=\pm 1} = 0,$$

and then the elliptic estimate gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^2[(1-y)^2 f]\|_{L^2} &\leq C \|\Delta[(1-y)^2 f]\|_{L^2} \\ (4.29) \quad &\leq C(\|f\|_{L^2} + \|(1-y)\nabla f\|_{L^2}) \leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that $4f/(1+y) = (1-y)^2 f/(1+y) + (3-y)f$, Hardy's inequality, (4.25) and (4.29), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|f/(1+y)\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} &\leq (\|(1-y)^2 f/(1+y)\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} + \|(3-y)f\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty})/4 \\ &\leq \|\nabla[(1-y)^2 f]\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} + \|f\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} \\ &\leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla^2[(1-y)^2 f]\|_{L^2} + C \leq C. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that $2f/(1+y) = (1-y)f/(1+y) + f$, by Hardy's inequality and (4.26), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|f/(1+y)\|_{L^2} &\leq (\|(1-y)f/(1+y)\|_{L^2} + \|f\|_{L^2})/2 \\ &\leq C \|\nabla[(1-y)f]\|_{L^2} + \|f\|_{L^2} \leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

Now we prove Proposition 4.5.

Proof. Let $W = (1-y^2)w$, which satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\nu \Delta W + ik(V-\lambda)W - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3} W = (1-y^2)F + 4\nu y \partial_y w + 2\nu w, \\ W|_{y=\pm 1} = 0. \end{cases}$$

It follows from Proposition 4.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{5}{6}} \|W\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^1} + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}} \|W\|_{L^2} &\leq C \|(1-y^2)F + 4\nu y \partial_y w + 2\nu w\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \|(1-y^2)F\|_{L^2} + C\nu (\|y \partial_y w\|_{L^2} + \|w\|_{L^2}), \end{aligned}$$

and by Proposition 4.1 again,

$$\begin{aligned} \|y \partial_y w\|_{L^2} + \|w\|_{L^2} &\leq \|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + \|w\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\nu^{-\frac{2}{3}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} (1 + |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}}) \|F\|_{L^2} \leq C\nu^{-\frac{2}{3}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|F\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we obtain

$$(4.30) \quad \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{5}{6}} \|W\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^1} + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}} \|W\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|(1-y^2)F\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \|F\|_{L^2}).$$

By Lemma 16.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2} &\leq C \|(1-y^2)w\|_{L^2} = C \|W\|_{L^2}, \\ |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\varphi\|_{L^2} &\leq C \|(1-y^2)w\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^1} \leq C \|W\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^1}, \end{aligned}$$

which together with (4.30) show that

$$\nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{\frac{4}{3}}\|\varphi\|_{L^2} + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}(\|\nabla\varphi\|_{L^2} + \|(1-y^2)w\|_{L^2}) \leq C(\|(1-y^2)F\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|F\|_{L^2}).$$

Thanks to $\int_{-1}^1 \partial_z \partial_y \varphi(x, y_1, z) dy_1 = 0$, we get

$$\|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi\|_{L^2_{x,z} L^\infty_y} \leq C \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y^2 \partial_z \varphi\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C \|w\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

from which and Proposition 4.1, we infer that

$$\|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq C |\nu k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F\|_{L^2}, \quad \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq C \nu^{-\frac{5}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{6}} \|F\|_{H^{-1}}.$$

For the third inequality of the proposition, we just consider the case of $j = 1$. Another case is similar. Notice that $\partial_y[(V - \lambda)\varphi] = (V - \lambda)\partial_y \varphi = (j - \lambda)\partial_y \varphi$ on Γ_j . We get by Proposition 4.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} |j - \lambda| \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_j)} &\leq \|\partial_y[(V - \lambda)\varphi]\|_{L^2(\Gamma_j)} \\ &\leq \|\nabla[(V - \lambda)\varphi]\|_{L^2_{x,z} L^\infty_y} \leq C \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{11}{6}} \|F\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

If $|\lambda - 1| \geq |k|^{-1}$ and $|k(\lambda + 1)| + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \geq 1$, then $1 + |k(\lambda - j)| \leq 2|k(\lambda - j)|$, and then

$$\begin{aligned} (1 + |k(\lambda - 1)|) \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} &\leq 2|k(\lambda - 1)| \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} \leq C \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} \|F\|_{L^2} \\ &= C \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} \min(1, |k(\lambda + 1)| + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}) \|F\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

If $|k(\lambda + 1)| + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq 1$, then we have $1 + |k(\lambda - 1)| \leq 2|k| + 2 \leq 4|k|$. Thus, by Proposition 4.1, Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.3, we deduce that for $f \in \mathcal{F}_1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle w, f \rangle| &= |\langle (1 + V)w, f/(1 + V) \rangle| \\ &= |\langle (V - \lambda)w, f/(1 + V) \rangle + \langle (\lambda + 1)w, f/(1 + V) \rangle| \\ &\leq \|(V - \lambda)w\|_{L^2} \|f/(1 + V)\|_{L^2} + |\lambda + 1| \|w\|_{L^2_{x,z} L^1_y} \|f/(1 + V)\|_{L^2_{x,z} L^\infty_y(\Omega_1)} \\ &\leq C \left(|k|^{-1} \|f/(1 + y)\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} |\lambda + 1| \|f/(1 + y)\|_{L^2_{x,z} L^\infty_y} \right) \|F\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \left(|k|^{-\frac{3}{2}} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} |\lambda + 1| \right) \|F\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} (1 + |k(\lambda - 1)|) |\langle w, f \rangle| &\leq 4|k| |\langle w, f \rangle| \leq C \left(|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} |k(\lambda + 1)| \right) \|F\|_{L^2} \\ &= C \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} \left(|k(\lambda + 1)| + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \right) \|F\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

If $|\lambda - 1| \leq |k|^{-1}$, we get by Proposition 4.1 and Lemma 4.3 that

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle w, f \rangle| &\leq C \|f\|_{L^2_{x,z} L^\infty_y} \|w\|_{L^2_{x,z} L^1_y} \leq C \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} \|F\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C (1 + |k(\lambda - 1)|)^{-1} \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} \|F\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining with two cases, we get by (4.24) that

$$\begin{aligned} (1 + |k(1 - \lambda)|) \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} &= \frac{1 + |k(1 - \lambda)|}{(2\pi)^2} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_1} |\langle w, f \rangle| \\ &\leq C \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} \min(1, |k(\lambda + 1)| + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}) \|F\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

For $j \in \{\pm 1\}$, by the third inequality of the proposition, we have

$$|k(\lambda - j)|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_j)} \leq C \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} |k(\lambda - j)|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|F\|_{L^2},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |k(\lambda - j)|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_j)} &\leq (1 + |k(\lambda - j)|) \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_j)} \\ &\leq C \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} (\min(1, |k(\lambda + j)|) + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{1}{3}}) \|F\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} (|k(\lambda + j)|^{\frac{1}{2}} + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{1}{3}}) \|F\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

from which, it follows that

$$\| |k(y - \lambda)|^{\frac{1}{2}} \partial_y \varphi \|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq C \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} (\min(|k(\lambda - 1)|^{\frac{1}{2}}, |k(\lambda + 1)|^{\frac{1}{2}}) + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{1}{3}}) \|F\|_{L^2}.$$

This completes the proof of the proposition. $\square$

Next we consider the case when $F \in H^{-1}$.

Proposition 4.6. *Let $\nu k^2 \leq 1$, and $w \in H^2(\Omega)$ be a solution of (4.1) with $F \in L^2(\Omega)$. Then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} |k| \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2} &\leq C \|F\|_{H^{-1}}, \\ \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} |k| \|\varphi\|_{L^2} &\leq C \max(1 - |\lambda|, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}) \|F\|_{H^{-1}}, \\ \|(|k(y - \lambda)| + 1)^{\frac{3}{4}} \partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} &\leq C |\nu k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F\|_{H^{-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

In what follows, we assume $\nu k^2 \leq 1$. We need the following lemmas.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $f \in \mathcal{F}_1$. We decompose $f = f^l + f^h$, where*

$$\begin{aligned} f^l(x, y, z) &= \sum_{\ell^2 \leq N_1(k)} a_\ell \frac{\sinh(\eta(1 + y))}{\sinh(2\eta)} e^{ikx + i\ell z}, \\ f^h(x, y, z) &= \sum_{\ell^2 > N_1(k)} a_\ell \frac{\sinh(\eta(1 + y))}{\sinh(2\eta)} e^{ikx + i\ell z}, \end{aligned}$$

where $N_1(k) = \max(\delta^{-2}(|k(1 - \lambda)| + 1) - k^2, 0)$. Then it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(f^l, f^h)\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} &\leq C, \quad \|(1 - y^2)f^h\|_{L^2} \leq C \delta^{\frac{3}{2}} (|k(1 - \lambda)| + 1)^{-\frac{3}{4}}, \\ \|(f^l, f^h)\|_{L^2} &\leq C |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \|\nabla f^l\|_{L^2} \leq C \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} (|k(1 - \lambda)| + 1)^{\frac{1}{4}}, \\ \|(f^l, f^h)\|_{L^2_{x,z} L^\infty_y} &\leq C, \quad \|(1 - y)f^l\|_{L^2_{x,z} L^\infty_y} \leq C |k|^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $\delta_1 \triangleq \delta(|k(1 - \lambda)| + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. It is easy to see that

$$\ell^2 \leq N_1(k) \Leftrightarrow \eta \leq \delta_1^{-1}, \quad \ell^2 > N_1(k) \Leftrightarrow \eta > \delta_1^{-1}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(1 - y^2)f^h\|_{L^2}^2 &= \sum_{\ell^2 > N_1(k)} (2\pi)^2 \left\| a_\ell (1 - y^2) \frac{\sinh(\eta(1 + y))}{\sinh(2\eta)} \right\|_{L_y^2}^2 \leq C \sum_{\ell^2 > N_1(k)} |a_\ell|^2 \eta^{-3} \\ &\leq C \sum_{\ell^2 > N_1(k)} |a_\ell|^2 \delta_1^3 \leq C \delta_1^3, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|\nabla f^l\|_{L^2}^2 = (2\pi)^2 \sum_{\ell^2 \leq N_1(k)} \left(\left\| a_\ell \frac{\eta \sinh(\eta(1 + y))}{\sinh(2\eta)} \right\|_{L_y^2}^2 + \left\| a_\ell \frac{\eta \cosh(\eta(1 + y))}{\sinh(2\eta)} \right\|_{L_y^2}^2 \right)$$

$$\leq C \sum_{\ell^2 \leq N_1(k)} |a_\ell|^2 \eta = C\delta_1^{-1}.$$

The proof of the other inequalities is the same as Lemma 4.3. $\square$

Lemma 4.5. *Let f^l be as in Lemma 4.4. Then it holds that*

$$\|f^l/(|V - \lambda| + \delta)\|_{L^2} + \delta\|\nabla f^l/(|V - \lambda| + \delta)\|_{L^2} \leq C\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}(|k(1 - \lambda)| + 1)^{-\frac{3}{4}}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.4 and Lemma 4.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|f^l/(|V - \lambda| + \delta)\|_{L^2} &\leq \|1/(|V - \lambda| + \delta)\|_{L_{x,z}^\infty L_y^2} \|f^l\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} \leq C\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \\ \delta\|\nabla f^l/(|V - \lambda| + \delta)\|_{L^2} &\leq \|\nabla f^l\|_{L^2} \leq C\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}(|k(1 - \lambda)| + 1)^{\frac{1}{4}}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.4, Lemma 4.2, Lemma 4.1 and $|k\delta| \leq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |1 - \lambda|\|f^l/(|V - \lambda| + \delta)\|_{L^2} &\leq \|(V - \lambda)f^l/(|V - \lambda| + \delta)\|_{L^2} + \|(1 - V)f^l/(|V - \lambda| + \delta)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \|f^l\|_{L^2} + C\|(1 - y)f^l/(|V - \lambda| + \delta)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} + C\|1/(|V - \lambda| + \delta)\|_{L_{x,z}^\infty L_y^2} \|(1 - y)f^l\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} \\ &\leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} + C\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}|k|^{-1} \leq C\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}|k|^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &|1 - \lambda|\delta\|\nabla f^l/(|V - \lambda| + \delta)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \delta\|(V - \lambda)\nabla f^l/(|V - \lambda| + \delta)\|_{L^2} + \delta\|(1 - V)\nabla f^l/(|V - \lambda| + \delta)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \delta\|\nabla f^l\|_{L^2} + \|(1 - V)\nabla f^l\|_{L^2} \leq \delta\|\nabla f^l\|_{L^2} + C\|(1 - y)\nabla f^l\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}(|k(1 - \lambda)| + 1)^{\frac{1}{4}} + C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq C\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}(|k(1 - \lambda)| + 1)^{\frac{1}{4}}. \end{aligned}$$

Summing up, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} (1 + |k(\lambda - 1)|)\|f^l/(|V - \lambda| + \delta)\|_{L^2} &\leq C\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \\ (1 + |k(\lambda - 1)|)\delta\|\nabla f^l/(|V - \lambda| + \delta)\|_{L^2} &\leq C(\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} + |k|\delta^{\frac{1}{2}})(|k(1 - \lambda)| + 1)^{\frac{1}{4}} \leq C\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}(|k(1 - \lambda)| + 1)^{\frac{1}{4}}, \end{aligned}$$

which show that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|f^l/(|V - \lambda| + \delta)\|_{L^2} + \delta\|\nabla f^l/(|V - \lambda| + \delta)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C(1 + |k(\lambda - 1)|)^{-1}\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}[1 + (|k(1 - \lambda)| + 1)^{\frac{1}{4}}] \leq C\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}(|k(1 - \lambda)| + 1)^{-\frac{3}{4}}. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Now we are in a position to prove Proposition 4.6.

Proof. Using Proposition 4.4 and the fact that $\varphi|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$, we deduce that

$$\|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2}^2 = |\langle w, \varphi \rangle| \leq C|k\delta|^{-\frac{3}{2}}\|F\|_{H^{-1}}\|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2},$$

which gives

$$(4.31) \quad \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2} \leq C|k\delta|^{-\frac{3}{2}}\|F\|_{H^{-1}} = C\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}|k|^{-1}\|F\|_{H^{-1}}.$$

We denote

$$N(k) \triangleq \max(|\nu/k|^{-\frac{2}{3}} - k^2, 0), \quad \tilde{\lambda} = \lambda - ia\delta,$$

and let $\Delta\phi = \varphi$, $\phi|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$. We decompose $\phi = \phi^l + \phi^h$, where

$$\begin{aligned}\phi^l(x, y, z) &= \sum_{\ell^2 \leq N(k)} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \phi(x, y, z_1) e^{i\ell(z-z_1)} dz_1, \\ \phi^h(x, y, z) &= \sum_{\ell^2 > N(k)} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \phi(x, y, z_1) e^{i\ell(z-z_1)} dz_1.\end{aligned}$$

It is obvious that $\forall \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $\beta = \{0, 1, 2\}$,

$$(4.32) \quad \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)^\alpha \nabla^\beta \phi^l\|_{L^2} \leq \delta^{-\alpha} \|\nabla^\beta \phi^l\|_{L^2}, \quad \|\nabla^\beta \phi^h\|_{L^2} \leq \delta^\alpha \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)^\alpha \nabla^\beta \phi^h\|_{L^2}.$$

Next we discuss the following two cases.

Case 1. $|\lambda| \leq 1 + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1 + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}$. Then we have

$$|1 - \tilde{\lambda}| \leq \max(1 - \lambda, \lambda - 1) + a\delta \leq \max(1 - |\lambda|, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}) + \delta \leq 2 \max(1 - |\lambda|, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}).$$

Let $\phi_1(x, y, z) = \phi^l(x, y, z)/(y - 1)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_1(x, y, z) &= \frac{1}{1 - y} \int_y^1 \partial_y \phi^l(y_1) dy_1 = \int_0^1 \partial_y \phi^l(x, 1 - (1 - y)s, z) ds, \\ \partial_y \phi_1(x, y, z) &= \int_0^1 s \partial_y^2 \phi^l(x, 1 - (1 - y)s, z) ds,\end{aligned}$$

which imply that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\phi_1\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \phi_1\|_{L^2} &\leq C(\|\partial_y \phi^l\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_y \nabla \phi^l\|_{L^2}) \leq C\|\varphi\|_{L^2}, \\ \|\partial_z \nabla \phi_1\|_{L^2} &\leq C\|\partial_z \partial_y \nabla \phi^l\|_{L^2} \leq C\delta^{-1} \|\nabla^2 \phi^l\|_{L^2} \leq C\delta^{-1} \|\varphi\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Notice that $\phi_1|_{y=1} = (\partial_y \phi^l)|_{y=1}$, $(\partial_x, \partial_z)\phi_1|_{y=1} = ((\partial_x, \partial_z)\partial_y \phi^l)|_{y=1}$, $\phi_1|_{y=-1} = 0$. Then we infer that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\phi_1\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} &\leq C\|\partial_y \phi^l\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} \leq \|\partial_y \phi^l\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} \\ &\leq C\|\partial_y \phi^l\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y^2 \phi^l\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\varphi\|_{L^2},\end{aligned}$$

and by (4.32),

$$\begin{aligned}\|(\partial_x, \partial_z)\phi_1\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} &\leq C\|(\partial_x, \partial_z)\partial_y \phi^l\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} \leq \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)\partial_y \phi^l\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} \\ &\leq C\|(\partial_x, \partial_z)\partial_y \phi^l\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)\partial_y^2 \phi^l\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C\delta^{-1} \|\nabla \phi^l\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla^2 \phi^l\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C\delta^{-1} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\varphi\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 4.4 and Lemma 16.1, we get (here δ_1 is defined in Proposition 4.4)

$$\begin{aligned}|\langle w, \phi^l \rangle| &= |\langle w, (y - 1)\phi_1 \rangle| \\ &= |\langle (V - \tilde{\lambda})w, \phi_1 \rangle + (\tilde{\lambda} - 1)\langle w, \phi_1 \rangle + \langle w, (y - V)\phi_1 \rangle| \\ &\leq C|k|^{-1} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} \left(\|\phi_1\|_{H^1} + (\|\phi_1\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} + \delta_1 \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)\phi_1\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)}) (|1 - \lambda| + \delta)^{\frac{1}{4}} \delta^{-\frac{3}{4}} \right) \\ &\quad + |1 - \tilde{\lambda}| |\langle w, \phi_1 \rangle| + |\langle w, (y - V)\phi_1 \rangle|,\end{aligned}$$

and

$$|\langle w, \phi_1 \rangle| \leq C|k\delta|^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} \|\nabla \phi_1\|_{L^2} + C|k|^{-\frac{3}{2}} \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} \|\partial_z \nabla \phi_1\|_{L^2}.$$

By Lemma 4.1 and integration by parts (using $(y - V)\phi_1|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle w, (y - V)\phi_1 \rangle| &= |\langle \varphi, \Delta[(y - V)\phi_1] \rangle| \\
&\leq |\langle \varphi, (y - V)\Delta\phi_1 \rangle| + 2|\langle \varphi, \nabla(y - V) \cdot \nabla\phi_1 \rangle| + |\langle \varphi, [\Delta(y - V)]\phi_1 \rangle| \\
&\leq C\varepsilon_0 \|\varphi\|_{L^2} (\|(1 - y)\Delta\phi_1\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla\phi_1\|_{L^2} + \|\phi_1\|_{L^2}) \\
&\leq C\varepsilon_0 \|\varphi\|_{L^2} (\|\Delta[(1 - y)\phi_1] + 2\partial_y\phi_1\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla\phi_1\|_{L^2} + \|\phi_1\|_{L^2}) \\
&\leq C\varepsilon_0 \|\varphi\|_{L^2} (\|\varphi\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla\phi_1\|_{L^2} + \|\phi_1\|_{L^2}) \leq C\varepsilon_0 \|\varphi\|_{L^2}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Summing up, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle w, \phi^l \rangle| &\leq C|k|^{-1} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} \left(\|\phi_1\|_{H^1} + (\|\phi_1\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} + \delta_1 \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)\phi_1\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)}) (|1 - \lambda| + \delta)^{\frac{1}{4}} \delta^{-\frac{3}{4}} \right) \\
&\quad + C|1 - \tilde{\lambda}| \left(|k\delta|^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} \|\nabla\phi_1\|_{L^2} + |k|^{-\frac{3}{2}} \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} \|\partial_z \nabla\phi_1\|_{L^2} \right) + C\varepsilon_0 \|\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\leq C(|1 - \lambda| + \delta) |k|^{-1} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} \left(\delta^{-1} \|\phi_1\|_{H^1} + \delta^{-\frac{3}{2}} (\|\phi_1\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} + \delta \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)\phi_1\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|\nabla\phi_1\|_{L^2} + |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_z \nabla\phi_1\|_{L^2} \right) + C\varepsilon_0 \|\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\leq C(|1 - \lambda| + \delta) |k|^{-1} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} \|\varphi\|_{L^2} (\delta^{-1} + |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta^{-\frac{3}{2}}) + C\varepsilon_0 \|\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\leq C \max(1 - \lambda, |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}}) (\nu k^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} \|\varphi\|_{L^2} + C\varepsilon_0 \|\varphi\|_{L^2}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

By (4.31), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle w, \phi^h \rangle| &\leq \|\nabla\varphi\|_{L^2} \|\nabla\phi^h\|_{L^2} \leq \|\nabla\varphi\|_{L^2} (\delta^2 \|\partial_z^2 \nabla\phi^h\|_{L^2}) \\
&\leq C\delta^2 \|\nabla\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{-\frac{8}{3}} \|F\|_{H^{-1}}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 &= |\langle w, \phi \rangle| \leq |\langle w, \phi^l \rangle| + |\langle w, \phi^h \rangle| \\
&\leq C \max(1 - \lambda, |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}}) (\nu k^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} \|\varphi\|_{L^2} + C\nu^{-\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{-\frac{8}{3}} \|F\|_{H^{-1}}^2 + C\varepsilon_0 \|\varphi\|_{L^2}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies (taking ε_0 sufficiently small) that

$$\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} |k| \|\varphi\|_{L^2} \leq C \max(1 - \lambda, |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}}) \|F\|_{H^{-1}}.$$

Case 2. $|\lambda| \geq 1 + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}$.

Let $f_1(x, y, z) = (V - \tilde{\lambda})^{-1} \phi$. Then $f_1|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$, and by Proposition 4.4, we have

$$\|\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 = |\langle w(V - \tilde{\lambda}), f_1 \rangle| \leq C|k|^{-1} \|F\|_{H^{-1}} \|f_1\|_{H^1}.$$

Using the fact that $|V - \tilde{\lambda}|^{-1} \leq C(1 + \delta - |y|)^{-1}$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \frac{\nabla\phi}{V - \tilde{\lambda}} \right\|_{L^2} &\leq C \|\nabla\phi\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} \|(1 + \delta - |y|)^{-1}\|_{L_{x,z}^\infty L_y^2} \leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\varphi\|_{L^2}, \\
\left\| \frac{\phi(\nabla V)}{(V - \tilde{\lambda})^2} \right\|_{L^2} &\leq \left\| \frac{\phi}{1 - |y|} \right\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} \|(1 + \delta - |y|)^{-1}\|_{L_{x,z}^\infty L_y^2} \|\nabla V\|_{L^\infty} \\
&\leq C \|\partial_y \phi\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} \|(1 + \delta - |y|)^{-1}\|_{L^2} \leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\varphi\|_{L^2}, \\
\left\| \frac{\phi}{V - \tilde{\lambda}} \right\|_{L^2} &\leq C \left\| \frac{\phi}{1 - |y|} \right\|_{L^2} \leq C \|\partial_y \phi\|_{L^2} \leq C|k|^{-1} \|\varphi\|_{L^2},
\end{aligned}$$

which give

$$\|f_1\|_{H^1} \leq \left\| \frac{\nabla \phi}{V - \tilde{\lambda}} \right\|_{L^2} + \left\| \frac{\phi(\nabla V)}{(V - \tilde{\lambda})^2} \right\|_{L^2} + \left\| \frac{\phi}{V - \tilde{\lambda}} \right\|_{L^2} \leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\varphi\|_{L^2}$$

Thus, we conclude

$$\|\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C|k|^{-1}|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|F\|_{H^{-1}}\|\varphi\|_{L^2} = C(\nu k^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\delta\|F\|_{H^{-1}}\|\varphi\|_{L^2},$$

which gives

$$\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}|k|\|\varphi\|_{L^2} \leq C|\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|F\|_{H^{-1}} \leq C\max(1 - |\lambda|, |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}})\|F\|_{H^{-1}}$$

Combining with both cases, we prove the second inequality of the proposition.

We decompose f as $f = f^h + f^l$, where f^l and f^h is as in Lemma 4.4. Recall that $N_1(k) = \max(\delta^{-2}(|k(1 - \lambda)| + 1) - k^2, 0)$. Then $l^2 \leq N_1(k) \Leftrightarrow \eta \leq \delta^{-1}(|k(1 - \lambda)| + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Thus, we have

$$\|(\partial_x, \partial_z)f^l\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} \leq \delta^{-1}(|k(1 - \lambda)| + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}}\|f^l\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} = \delta_1^{-1}\|f^l\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)}.$$

Now, by Proposition 4.4, Lemma 4.4 and Lemma 4.5, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle w, f^l \rangle| &\leq C|k|^{-1}\|F\|_{H^{-1}} \left((\|f^l\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} + \delta_1\|(\partial_x, \partial_z)f^l\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)})(|1 - \lambda| + \delta)^{-\frac{3}{4}}\delta^{-\frac{3}{4}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|\nabla f^l/(|V - \lambda| + \delta)\|_{L^2} + \delta^{-1}\|f^l/(|V - \lambda| + \delta)\|_{L^2} \right) \\ &\leq C|k|^{-1}\|F\|_{H^{-1}} \left((|1 - \lambda| + \delta)^{-\frac{3}{4}}\delta^{-\frac{3}{4}} + C\delta^{-\frac{3}{2}}(|k(1 - \lambda)| + 1)^{-\frac{3}{4}} \right) \\ &\leq C|k|^{-1}\delta^{-\frac{3}{2}}(|k(1 - \lambda)| + 1)^{-\frac{3}{4}}\|F\|_{H^{-1}} = C|\nu k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}(|k(1 - \lambda)| + 1)^{-\frac{3}{4}}\|F\|_{H^{-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle w, f^h \rangle| &\leq C\nu^{-1}\|F\|_{H^{-1}}\|(1 - y^2)f^h\|_{L^2} \leq C\nu^{-1}\delta^{\frac{3}{2}}(|k(1 - \lambda)| + 1)^{-\frac{3}{4}}\|F\|_{H^{-1}} \\ &= C|\nu k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}(|k(1 - \lambda)| + 1)^{-\frac{3}{4}}\|F\|_{H^{-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$|\langle w, f \rangle| \leq |\langle w, f^l \rangle| + |\langle w, f^h \rangle| \leq C|\nu k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}(|k(1 - \lambda)| + 1)^{-\frac{3}{4}}\|F\|_{H^{-1}},$$

which along with (4.24) gives

$$\|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} \leq C|\nu k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}(|k(1 - \lambda)| + 1)^{-\frac{3}{4}}\|F\|_{H^{-1}}.$$

For the case of $j = -1$, we can similarly get

$$\|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_{-1})} \leq C|\nu k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}(|k(1 + \lambda)| + 1)^{-\frac{3}{4}}\|F\|_{H^{-1}}.$$

This completes the proof of the proposition. $\square$

5. L^p ESTIMATE OF THE SOLUTIONS FOR THE HOMOGENEOUS OS

Let $w_{1,\ell}$ and $w_{2,\ell}$ be the solution to the homogeneous Orr-Sommerfeld equation

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{cases} -\nu(\partial^2 - \eta^2)w_{1,\ell} + ik(y - \lambda)w_{1,\ell} - a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}w_{1,\ell} = 0, \\ w_{1,\ell} = (\partial_y - \eta^2)\varphi_{1,\ell}, \quad \varphi_{1,\ell}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \\ \partial_y \varphi_{1,\ell}(-1) = 0, \quad \partial_y \varphi_{1,\ell}(1) = 1, \end{cases}$$

and

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{cases} -\nu(\partial^2 - \eta^2)w_{2,\ell} + ik(y - \lambda)w_{2,\ell} - a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}w_{2,\ell} = 0, \\ w_{2,\ell} = (\partial_y - \eta^2)\varphi_{2,\ell}, \quad \varphi_{2,\ell}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \\ \partial_y \varphi_{2,\ell}(-1) = 1, \quad \partial_y \varphi_{2,\ell}(1) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Here $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}, a \in [0, \epsilon_1]$ with $\epsilon_1 \leq \delta_1$ and δ_1 given by Lemma 5.2. In the sequel, we assume that $k > 0$ without loss of generality and let $L = (|k|/\nu)^{1/3}$ (so $L = \delta^{-1}$).

The goal of this section is to establish the following L^p type estimates of $w_{1,\ell}$ and $w_{2,\ell}$, which could be viewed as boundary correctors in the case of nonslip boundary condition, hence describe the boundary behavior of the solution.

Proposition 5.1. *There exists $k_0 > 1$ independent of ν so that if $L \geq k_0$, then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_{1,\ell}\|_{L^\infty} &\leq C \left((|k(\lambda - 1)/\nu| + \eta^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} + (|k|/\nu)^{\frac{1}{3}} \right), \\ \|w_{2,\ell}\|_{L^\infty} &\leq C \left((|k(\lambda + 1)/\nu| + \eta^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} + (|k|/\nu)^{\frac{1}{3}} \right), \\ \|(1 - |y|)^\alpha w_{1,\ell}\|_{L^1} + \|(1 - |y|)^\alpha w_{2,\ell}\|_{L^1} &\leq CL^{-\alpha}, \quad \alpha \geq 0, \\ \|(1 - |y|)^\beta w_{1,\ell}\|_{L^\infty} + \|(1 - |y|)^\beta w_{2,\ell}\|_{L^\infty} &\leq CL^{1-\beta}, \quad \beta \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 5.2. *There exists $k_0 > 1$ independent of ν so that if $L \geq k_0$, then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_{1,\ell}\|_{L^2} &\leq C \left((|k(\lambda - 1)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}} + |k|^{\frac{1}{2}}) + (|k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k|)^{-\frac{1}{2}}|\ell| \right), \\ \|w_{2,\ell}\|_{L^2} &\leq C \left((|k(\lambda + 1)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}} + |k|^{\frac{1}{2}}) + (|k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k|)^{-\frac{1}{2}}|\ell| \right), \\ \|(1 - |y|)^\beta w_{1,\ell}\|_{L^2} + \|(1 - |y|)^\beta w_{2,\ell}\|_{L^2} &\leq CL^{1/2-\beta}, \quad \beta \geq 1/2, \\ \|(\partial_y, \eta)\varphi_{1,\ell}\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_y, \eta)\varphi_{2,\ell}\|_{L^2} &\leq C|\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}}, \\ |k|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\varphi_{1,\ell}\|_{L^2} + |k|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\varphi_{2,\ell}\|_{L^2} &\leq C|\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}}. \end{aligned}$$

In the following sections (section 6-15), we always assume $0 < \nu \leq \nu_0 \leq k_0^{-3}$. Then $L \geq k_0$.

5.1. Basic properties of the Airy function. Let $Ai(y)$ be the Airy function, which is a nontrivial solution of $u'' - yu = 0$. We introduce some notations

$$\begin{aligned} A_0(z) &= \int_{e^{i\pi/6}z}^{\infty} Ai(t)dt = e^{i\pi/6} \int_z^{\infty} Ai(e^{i\pi/6}t)dt, \\ \omega(z, x) &= \frac{A_0(z+x)}{A_0(z)} = \exp \left(\int_0^x \frac{A'_0(z+t)}{A_0(z+t)} dt \right). \end{aligned}$$

The following two lemmas come from [19].

Lemma 5.1. *There exists $c > 0$, δ_0 so that for $\text{Im} z \leq \delta_0$,*

$$\left| \frac{A'_0(z)}{A_0(z)} \right| \leq C(1 + |z|^{\frac{1}{2}}), \quad \text{Re} \frac{A'_0(z)}{A_0(z)} \leq -c(1 + |z|^{\frac{1}{2}}).$$

Lemma 5.2. *There exists $\delta_1 \in (0, \delta_0/2]$ so that for $\text{Im} z \leq \delta_1$ and $x \geq 0$,*

$$|\omega(z, x)| \leq e^{-\frac{x}{3}}.$$

Lemma 5.3. *Let $z \in \mathbb{C}$. It holds that for any $x \geq 0$,*

$$(5.3) \quad \int_0^x (1 + |t + z|^{\frac{1}{2}}) dt \gtrsim x|z|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |x|^{\frac{3}{2}}.$$

Proof. Let $z = z_1 + iz_2$ with $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}$.

If $|z_1| \leq 1$, then we have

$$1 + |t + z|^{\frac{1}{2}} \gtrsim 2 + |t + z_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |z_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq 2 + |t|^{\frac{1}{2}} - |z_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |z_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq 1 + |t|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |z_2|^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

which gives

$$\int_0^x (1 + |t + z|^{\frac{1}{2}}) dt \gtrsim \int_0^x (1 + |t|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |z_2|^{\frac{1}{2}}) dt \gtrsim x + x^{\frac{3}{2}} + x|z_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq x|z|^{\frac{1}{2}} + x^{\frac{3}{2}}.$$

If $|z_1| \geq 1$ and $x \geq |z_1|$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^x |t + z_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} dt &= \int_0^{|z_1|} |t + z_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} dt + \int_{|z_1|}^x |t + z_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} dt \geq \int_0^{|z_1|} (|z_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} - t^{\frac{1}{2}}) dt + \int_{|z_1|}^x (t - |z_1|)^{\frac{1}{2}} dt \\ &\gtrsim |z_1|^{\frac{3}{2}} + (x - |z_1|)^{\frac{3}{2}} \gtrsim x^{\frac{3}{2}} \gtrsim x|z_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} + x^{\frac{3}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\int_0^x (1 + |t + z|^{\frac{1}{2}}) dt \gtrsim \int_0^x (1 + |t + z_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |z_2|^{\frac{1}{2}}) dt \gtrsim x|z_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} + x^{\frac{3}{2}} + x|z_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} \gtrsim x|z|^{\frac{1}{2}} + x^{\frac{3}{2}}.$$

If $|z_1| \geq 1$ and $|z_1| \geq x$, then we have

$$\int_0^x |t + z_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} dt \geq \int_0^{x/2} |t + z_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} dt \geq \int_0^{x/2} (|z_1| - t)^{\frac{1}{2}} dt \geq (|z_1| - x/2)^{\frac{1}{2}} x/2 \gtrsim x|z_1|^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

which gives

$$\int_0^x (1 + |t + z|^{\frac{1}{2}}) dt \gtrsim \int_0^x (1 + |t + z_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |z_2|^{\frac{1}{2}}) dt \gtrsim x|z_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} + x|z_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} \gtrsim x|z|^{\frac{1}{2}} + x^{\frac{3}{2}}.$$

Summing up, we conclude the lemma. $\square$

Lemma 5.4. *Let δ_0 be as in Lemma 5.1. Then it holds that for $\text{Im} z \leq \delta_0$ and $x \geq 0$,*

$$|\omega(z, x)| \leq e^{-c(x|z|^{\frac{1}{2}} + x^{3/2})}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 5.1 and Lemma 5.3, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\omega(z, x)| &\leq \left| \exp \left(\text{Re} \int_0^x \frac{A'_0(z+t)}{A_0(z+t)} dt \right) \right| \\ &\leq \exp \left(-c \int_0^x (1 + |z+t|^{\frac{1}{2}}) dt \right) \leq e^{-c(x|z|^{\frac{1}{2}} + x^{3/2})}. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Lemma 5.5. *Let δ_1 be as in Lemma 5.2. There exists $k_0 > 1$ so that if $L \geq k_0$, $\eta \geq 1$, $\text{Im} z \leq \delta_1 - \eta^2/L^2$, then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \sinh(2\eta) - \frac{\eta}{L} \int_0^{2L} \cosh \left(2\eta - \frac{\eta t}{L} \right) \omega(z, t) dt \right| \\ &\geq \sqrt{2} \left| \sinh(2\eta) \omega(z, 2L) - \frac{\eta}{L} \int_0^{2L} \cosh \left(\frac{\eta t}{L} \right) \omega(z, t) dt \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $c_* > 0$ be the constant c in Lemma 5.4 and $b = \max(1/3, c_*|z|^{\frac{1}{2}})$. It follows from Lemma 5.2 and Lemma 5.4 that for $\text{Im}z \leq \delta_1$, $x \geq 0$ we have $|\omega(z, x)| \leq e^{-bx}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \sinh(2\eta) - \left| \frac{\eta}{L} \int_0^{2L} \cosh(2\eta - \frac{\eta t}{L}) \omega(z, t) dt \right| &\geq \sinh(2\eta) - \frac{\eta}{L} \int_0^{2L} \cosh\left(2\eta - \frac{\eta t}{L}\right) |\omega(z, t)| dt \\ &\geq \sinh(2\eta) - \frac{\eta}{L} \int_0^{2L} \cosh\left(2\eta - \frac{\eta t}{L}\right) e^{-bt} dt \\ &= \int_0^{2L} \sinh\left(2\eta - \frac{\eta t}{L}\right) (be^{-bt}) dt \\ &\geq \int_0^{L/\eta} \sinh(2\eta - 1) (be^{-bt}) dt = \sinh(2\eta - 1) (1 - e^{-bL/\eta}), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\sinh(2\eta - 1) = e^{2\eta-1} (1 - e^{-2(2\eta-1)})/2 \geq e^{2\eta-1} (1 - e^{-2})/2 \geq e^{-1} \sinh(2\eta) (1 - e^{-2}),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} b = \max(1/3, c_*|z|^{\frac{1}{2}}) &= [\max(1/9, c_*^2|z|)]^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq [(1 + |z|)/(9 + c_*^2)]^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ 1 + |z| \geq 1 - \text{Im}z &\geq \eta^2/L^2, \quad b \geq c_1(1 + |z|)^{\frac{1}{2}} = c_1\eta/L, \quad 1 - e^{-bL/\eta} \geq 1 - e^{-c_1}, \end{aligned}$$

with $c_1 = (9 + c_*^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} > 0$. This shows that

$$2 \sinh(2\eta) \geq \left| \sinh(2\eta) - \frac{\eta}{L} \int_0^{2L} \cosh\left(2\eta - \frac{\eta t}{L}\right) \omega(z, t) dt \right| \geq c_2 \sinh(2\eta)$$

with $c_2 = e^{-1}(1 - e^{-2})(1 - e^{-c_1}) \in (0, 1)$.

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \sinh(2\eta) \omega(z, 2L) - \frac{\eta}{L} \int_0^{2L} \cosh\left(\frac{\eta t}{L}\right) \omega(z, t) dt \right| \\ &\leq \sinh(2\eta) |\omega(z, 2L)| + \frac{\eta}{L} \int_0^{2L} \cosh\left(\frac{\eta t}{L}\right) |\omega(z, t)| dt \\ &\leq \sinh(2\eta) e^{-2L/3} + \frac{\eta}{L} \int_0^{2L} \cosh\left(\frac{\eta t}{L}\right) e^{-t/3} dt \\ &= 2 \sinh(2\eta) e^{-2L/3} + \int_0^{2L} \sinh\left(\frac{\eta t}{L}\right) \frac{e^{-t/3}}{3} dt \\ &\leq 2 \sinh(2\eta) e^{-2L/3} + \sinh(2\eta) \int_0^{2L} \frac{t}{2L} \frac{e^{-t/3}}{3} dt \\ &\leq \sinh(2\eta) (2e^{-2L/3} + 3/(2L)) \leq (3/L) \sinh(2\eta). \end{aligned}$$

Here we used the fact that $(\sinh x)/x$ is increasing. Now the result follows by choosing $k_0 = 3\sqrt{2}/c_2 > 1$. $\square$

5.2. The solution of the homogeneous OS equation. Let

$$u_1(y) = Ai(e^{i\frac{\pi}{6}}y), \quad u_2(y) = Ai(e^{i\frac{5\pi}{6}}y).$$

Then u_1 and u_2 are two linearly independent solutions of $u'' - i\eta u = 0$. Hence,

$$W_{1,\ell}(y) = Ai(e^{i\frac{\pi}{6}}(L(y - \lambda - i\nu\eta^2/k) + ia)), \quad W_{2,\ell}(y) = Ai(e^{i\frac{5\pi}{6}}(L(y - \lambda - i\nu\eta^2/k) + ia))$$

are two linearly independent solutions of the homogeneous OS equation

$$-\nu(w'' - \eta^2 w) + ik(y - \lambda)w - a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{\frac{2}{3}}w = 0.$$

We denote

$$d = -1 - \lambda - i\nu\eta^2/k, \quad \tilde{d} = -1 + \lambda - i\nu\eta^2/k.$$

We have the following estimates for $W_{1,\ell}$ and $W_{2,\ell}$.

Lemma 5.6. *It holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{L}{|A_0(Ld + ia)|} \|W_{1,\ell}\|_{L^\infty} &\leq C \left((|k(\lambda + 1)/\nu| + \eta^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} + (|k|/\nu)^{\frac{1}{3}} \right), \\ \frac{L}{|A_0(L\tilde{d} + ia)|} \|W_{2,\ell}\|_{L^\infty} &\leq C \left((|k(\lambda - 1)/\nu| + \eta^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} + (|k|/\nu)^{\frac{1}{3}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and for $\alpha \geq 0, \beta \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{L}{|A_0(Ld + ia)|} \|(1 - |y|)^\alpha W_{1,\ell}\|_{L^1} + \frac{L}{|A_0(L\tilde{d} + ia)|} \|(1 - |y|)^\alpha W_{2,\ell}\|_{L^1} &\leq CL^{-\alpha}, \\ \frac{L}{|A_0(Ld + ia)|} \|(1 - |y|)^\beta W_{1,\ell}\|_{L^\infty} + \frac{L}{|A_0(L\tilde{d} + ia)|} \|(1 - |y|)^\beta W_{2,\ell}\|_{L^\infty} &\leq CL^{1-\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

Here C may depend on α, β .

Proof. Thanks to the definition of $W_{1,\ell}$ and $\omega(z, x)$, Lemma 5.1, Lemma 5.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{L|W_{1,\ell}(y)|}{|A_0(Ld + ia)|} &\leq \left| \frac{L A i (e^{i\frac{\pi}{6}} L(y - \lambda - i\nu\eta^2/|k|) + ia)}{A_0(Ld + ia)} \right| = \left| \frac{L A'_0(L(y + 1) + Ld + ia)}{A_0(Ld + ia)} \right| \\ &= L \left| \frac{A'_0(L(y + 1) + Ld + ia)}{A_0(L(y + 1) + Ld + ia)} \right| |\omega(Ld + ia, L(y + 1))| \\ &\leq CL(1 + |Ld + ia + L(y + 1)|^{\frac{1}{2}}) e^{-L(y+1)/3} \\ &\leq C(L(1 + |Ld|)^{\frac{1}{2}} + CL^{\frac{3}{2}}(y + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}}) e^{-L(y+1)/3} \\ &\leq C(L + L|Ld|^{\frac{1}{2}}) \leq C(|k(1 + \lambda)/\nu| + \eta^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}}, \end{aligned}$$

here we use $L|Ld|^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq (L^3(|1 + \lambda| + \nu\eta^2/|k|))^{\frac{1}{2}} = (|k(1 + \lambda)/\nu| + \eta^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. This yields

$$\frac{L}{|A_0(Ld + ia)|} \|W_{1,\ell}\|_{L^\infty} \leq C \left((|k(\lambda + 1)/\nu| + \eta^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} \right).$$

Thanks to Lemma 5.1, Lemma 5.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{L\|(1 - |y|)^\alpha W_{1,\ell}\|_{L^1}}{|A_0(Ld + ia)|} &= L \int_{-1}^1 (1 - |y|)^\alpha \left| \frac{A i (e^{i\frac{\pi}{6}} (L(y - \lambda - i\nu\eta^2/|k|) + ia))}{A_0(Ld + ia)} \right| dy \\ &= L \int_0^2 (1 - |x - 1|)^\alpha \left| \frac{A i (e^{i\frac{\pi}{6}} (Lx + Ld + ia))}{A_0(Ld + ia)} \right| dx \\ &\leq CL \int_0^2 x^\alpha \left| \frac{A'_0(Lx + Ld + ia)}{A_0(Lx + Ld + ia)} \right| |\omega(Ld + ia, Lx)| dx \\ &\leq CL \int_0^2 x^\alpha (1 + |Lx + Ld + ia|)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-c(|Lx| |Ld + ia|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |Lx|^{\frac{3}{2}})} dx \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq CL \int_0^2 x^\alpha (1 + |Ld + ia|)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-c|Lx|(1+|Ld+ia|^{\frac{1}{2}})} dx \\
&\leq CL^{-\alpha} (1 + |Ld + ia|)^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \int_0^{+\infty} t^\alpha e^{-ct} dt \leq CL^{-\alpha}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we use $(1 + |Lx|)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-c|Lx|^{\frac{3}{2}}} \leq Ce^{-c|Lx|}$ for every $x \geq 0$ and fixed $c > 0$, and make a change of variable $t = Lx(1 + |Ld + ia|)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

Let $x = y + 1 \in [0, 2]$ and $\beta \geq 1$. Thanks to Lemma 5.1, Lemma 5.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{L(1 - |y|)^\beta}{|A_0(Ld + ia)|} |W_{1,\ell}(y)| \\
&\leq (1 - |y|)^\beta \left| \frac{L A i (e^{i\frac{\pi}{6}} (L(y - \lambda - i\nu\eta^2/|k|) + ia))}{A_0(Ld + ia)} \right| \\
&= (1 - |y|)^\beta \left| \frac{L A'_0(L(y + 1) + Ld + ia)}{A_0(Ld + ia)} \right| \\
&= L(1 - |y|)^\beta \left| \frac{A'_0(L(y + 1) + Ld + ia)}{A_0(L(y + 1) + Ld + ia)} \right| |\omega(Ld + ia, L(y + 1))| \\
&\leq CLx^\beta (1 + |Ld + ia + Lx|^{\frac{1}{2}}) e^{-c(Lx|Ld+ia|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |Lx|^{\frac{3}{2}})} \\
&\leq CLx^\beta (1 + |Ld + ia|)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-c(Lx|Ld+ia|^{\frac{1}{2}} + Lx)} \\
&\leq CL^{1-\beta} (1 + |Ld + ia|)^{1/2-\beta/2} ((Lx(1 + |Ld + ia|)^{\frac{1}{2}})^\beta e^{-cLx(1+|Ld+ia|^{\frac{1}{2}})}) \\
&\leq CL^{1-\beta} (1 + |Ld + ia|)^{1/2-\beta/2} \leq CL^{1-\beta},
\end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\frac{L}{|A_0(Ld + ia)|} \|(1 - |y|)^\beta W_{1,\ell}\|_{L^\infty} \leq CL^{1-\beta}.$$

Thus, we finish the estimate for $W_{1,\ell}$. The proof for $W_{2,\ell}$ is similar. $\square$

5.3. Proof of Proposition 5.1 and Proposition 5.2. The solution $w_{1,\ell}$ and $w_{2,\ell}$ of (5.1) and (5.2) can be expressed as

$$(5.4) \quad w_{1,\ell} = C_{11}W_{1,\ell}(y) + C_{12}W_{2,\ell}(y), \quad w_{2,\ell} = C_{21}W_{1,\ell}(y) + C_{22}W_{2,\ell}(y),$$

where $C_{ij}, i, j = 1, 2$ are constants (depending only on ν, k, ℓ). Thanks to the facts that

$$\int_{-1}^1 e^{\eta y} w_{1,\ell}(y) dy = e^\eta, \quad \int_{-1}^1 e^{-\eta y} w_{1,\ell}(y) dy = e^{-\eta},$$

we deduce that

$$\begin{cases} \sinh(2\eta) = C_{11} \int_{-1}^1 \sinh(\eta(y + 1)) W_{1,\ell}(y) dy + C_{12} \int_{-1}^1 \sinh(\eta(y + 1)) W_{2,\ell}(y) dy, \\ 0 = C_{11} \int_{-1}^1 \sinh(\eta(1 - y)) W_{1,\ell}(y) dy + C_{12} \int_{-1}^1 \sinh(\eta(1 - y)) W_{2,\ell}(y) dy. \end{cases}$$

We denote

$$A_1 = \int_{-1}^1 \sinh(\eta(y + 1)) W_{1,\ell}(y) dy, \quad A_2 = \int_{-1}^1 \sinh(\eta(1 - y)) W_{2,\ell}(y) dy,$$

$$B_1 = \int_{-1}^1 \sinh(\eta(1-y))W_{1,\ell}(y)dy, \quad B_2 = \int_{-1}^1 \sinh(\eta(y+1))W_{2,l}(y)dy.$$

If $A_1A_2 - B_1B_2 \neq 0$, then we have

$$(C_{11}, C_{12}) = \frac{\sinh(2\eta)(A_2, -B_1)}{A_1A_2 - B_1B_2}.$$

Similarly, we have

$$(C_{21}, C_{22}) = \frac{\sinh(2\eta)(B_2, -A_1)}{A_1A_2 - B_1B_2}.$$

Lemma 5.7. *Let k_0 be as in Lemma 5.5 and δ_1 be as in Lemma 5.2. If $L \geq k_0$, then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} |C_{11}| &\leq \frac{C}{|A_0(Ld + ia)|}, & |C_{12}| &\leq \frac{CL}{|A_0(L\tilde{d} + ia)|}, \\ |C_{21}| &\leq \frac{CL}{|A_0(Ld + ia)|}, & |C_{22}| &\leq \frac{C}{|A_0(L\tilde{d} + ia)|}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $y + 1 = x = \frac{t}{L}$. Due to $A'_0(z) = -e^{i\pi/6}Ai(e^{i\pi/6}z)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} B_1 &= \int_0^2 \sinh(\eta(2-x))Ai(e^{i\pi/6}(L(x+d)+ia))dx \\ &= \frac{1}{L} \int_0^{2L} \sinh\left(2\eta - \frac{\eta t}{L}\right)Ai(e^{i\pi/6}((t+Ld)+ia))dt \\ &= -\frac{e^{-i\pi/6}}{L} \int_0^{2L} \sinh\left(2\eta - \frac{\eta t}{L}\right)A'_0(t+Ld+ia)dt \\ &= -\frac{e^{-i\pi/6}}{L} \left[-\sinh(2\eta)A_0(Ld+ia) + \frac{\eta}{L} \int_0^{2L} \cosh\left(2\eta - \frac{\eta t}{L}\right)A_0(t+Ld+ia)dt \right] \\ (5.5) \quad &= A_0(Ld+ia) \frac{e^{-i\pi/6}}{L} \left[\sinh(2\eta) - \frac{\eta}{L} \int_0^{2L} \cosh\left(2\eta - \frac{\eta t}{L}\right)\omega(Ld+ia, t)dt \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$A_1 = -A_0(Ld+ia) \frac{e^{-i\pi/6}}{L} \left[\sinh(2\eta)\omega(Ld+ia, 2L) - \frac{\eta}{L} \int_0^{2L} \cosh\left(\frac{\eta t}{L}\right)\omega(Ld+ia, t)dt \right].$$

Due to $d = -1 - \lambda - i\nu\eta^2/k$, $\mathbf{Im}(Ld+ia) = -L\nu\eta^2/k + a = -\eta^2/L^2 + a \leq \delta_1 - \eta^2/L^2$. Then we infer from Lemma 5.5 that

$$(5.6) \quad \left| \frac{A_1}{B_1} \right| = \left| \frac{\sinh(2\eta)\omega(Ld+ia, 2L) - \frac{\eta}{L} \int_0^{2L} \cosh\left(\frac{\eta t}{L}\right)\omega(Ld+ia, t)dt}{\sinh(2\eta) - \frac{\eta}{L} \int_0^{2L} \cosh\left(2\eta - \frac{\eta t}{L}\right)\omega(Ld+ia, t)dt} \right| \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}.$$

Similarly, using $Ai(z) = \overline{Ai(\bar{z})}$ and Lemma 5.5, we have

$$(5.7) \quad \left| \frac{A_2}{B_2} \right| \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}.$$

Now it follows from (5.6) and (5.7) that

$$|A_1A_2 - B_1B_2| \gtrsim |B_1B_2|.$$

From the proof of Lemma 5.5 and (5.5), we know that

$$\begin{aligned} |B_1| &\geq \frac{1}{L} |A_0(Ld + ia)| \left[\sinh(2\eta) - \frac{\eta}{L} \int_0^{2L} \cosh\left(2\eta - \frac{\eta t}{L}\right) \omega(Ld + ia, t) dt \right] \\ &\geq c_2 \frac{\sinh(2\eta)}{L} |A_0(Ld + ia)|. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $|B_2| \geq c_2 \frac{\sinh(2\eta)}{L} |A_0(L\tilde{d} + ia)|$. Thus, we get

$$|A_1 A_2 - B_1 B_2| \gtrsim |A_0(Ld + ia)| |A_0(L\tilde{d} + ia)| \frac{[\sinh(2\eta)]^2}{L^2}.$$

Furthermore, we can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} |B_1| &\leq 2 \frac{\sinh(2\eta)}{L} |A_0(Ld + ia)|, & |B_2| &\leq 2 \frac{\sinh(2\eta)}{L} |A_0(L\tilde{d} + ia)|, \\ |A_1| &\leq 3 \frac{\sinh(2\eta)}{L^2} |A_0(Ld + ia)|, & |A_2| &\leq 3 \frac{\sinh(2\eta)}{L^2} |A_0(L\tilde{d} + ia)|. \end{aligned}$$

Summing up, we can conclude the estimates of C_{ij} . $\square$

Now Proposition 5.1 is an immediate consequence of Lemma 5.7 and Lemma 5.6. Next, let us prove Proposition 5.2.

Proof. By Proposition 5.1 and Hölder inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_{1,\ell}\|_{L^2} &\leq \|w_{1,\ell}\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|w_{1,\ell}\|_{L^1}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C \left((|k(\lambda - 1)/\nu| + \eta^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} + (|k|/\nu)^{\frac{1}{3}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C \left(|k(\lambda - 1)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}} + |\eta|^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \leq C \left(|k(\lambda - 1)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}} + |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |\ell|^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(|k(\lambda - 1)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}} + |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} + (|k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k|)^{\frac{1}{2}} + (|k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k|)^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\ell| \right) \\ &\leq C \left(|k(\lambda - 1)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}} + |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} + (|k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k|)^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\ell| \right), \end{aligned}$$

which gives the first inequality. The second inequality can be proved similarly.

For fixed $\beta \geq 1/2$, by Proposition 5.1 and Hölder inequality, we have

$$\|(1 - |y|)^\beta w_{1,\ell}\|_{L^2} \leq \|(1 - |y|)^{\beta + \frac{1}{2}} w_{1,\ell}\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(1 - |y|)^{\beta - \frac{1}{2}} w_{1,\ell}\|_{L^1}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq CL^{1/2 - \beta}.$$

Similarly, $\|(1 - |y|)^\beta w_{2,\ell}\|_{L^2} \leq CL^{1/2 - \beta}$. This proves the third inequality.

By Lemma 16.4 and the third inequality with $\beta = 1$, we have

$$\|(\partial_y, \eta) \varphi_{1,\ell}\|_{L^2} \leq \|(1 - |y|) w_{1,\ell}\|_{L^2} \leq CL^{-1/2} = C|\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}}.$$

Similarly, $\|(\partial_y, \eta) \varphi_{2,\ell}\|_{L^2} \leq C|\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}}$, thus we conclude the fourth inequality.

By Lemma 16.4 and Proposition 5.1 with $\alpha = 1$, we have

$$|k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\varphi_{1,\ell}\|_{L^2} \leq \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\varphi_{1,\ell}\|_{L^2} \leq \|(1 - |y|) w_{1,\ell}\|_{L^1} \leq CL^{-1} = C|\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}}.$$

Similarly, $|k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\varphi_{2,\ell}\|_{L^2} \leq C|\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}}$, thus we conclude the fifth inequality. $\square$

6. RESOLVENT ESTIMATES VIA THE NEUMANN BOUNDARY DATA

In this section, we consider the Orr-Sommerfeld equation with variable coefficient:

$$(6.1) \quad \begin{cases} -\nu \Delta w + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)w - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}w = F, \\ \Delta \varphi = w, \quad \varphi|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \\ \partial_x w = ikw, \quad \partial_x F = ikF. \end{cases}$$

Our goal of this section is to control w via the Neumann boundary data $\partial_y \varphi|_{y=\pm 1}$ and F .

We assume that $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}, a \in [0, \epsilon_1]$ and V satisfies (4.2). In section 6.1 and section 6.2, we also assume that $L = (|k|/\nu)^{\frac{1}{3}} \geq k_0$ with k_0 given by Proposition 5.1.

6.1. Resolvent estimates when $V = y$ and $F = 0$.

Proposition 6.1. *Let $w \in H^2(\Omega)$ be a solution of (6.1) with $V = y$ and $F = 0$. Then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} \|w\|_{L^2} &\leq C \left(\|(|k(y - \lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}} + |k|^{\frac{1}{2}})\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + (|k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k|)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right), \\ \|w\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} &\leq C \left(\|(|k(y - \lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k|)\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right), \\ \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2} + \|(1 - y^2)w\|_{L^2} &\leq C |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}, \\ |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\varphi\|_{L^2} &\leq C |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}, \\ \|(1 - y^2)^2 w\|_{L^2} &\leq C |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $\hat{w}_\ell = \int_{\mathbb{T}} e^{-i\ell z} w(x, y, z) dz$, which satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\nu(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)\hat{w}_\ell + ik(y - \lambda)\hat{w}_\ell - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}\hat{w}_\ell = 0, \\ \hat{w}_\ell = (\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)\hat{\varphi}_\ell, \quad \hat{\varphi}_\ell|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \quad \partial_x \hat{w}_\ell = ik\hat{w}_\ell. \end{cases}$$

Then we have

$$\hat{w}_\ell = \partial_y \hat{\varphi}_\ell(1)w_{1,\ell} + \partial_y \hat{\varphi}_\ell(-1)w_{2,\ell},$$

where $w_{1,\ell}$ and $w_{2,\ell}$ are given by (5.1) and (5.2).

By Plancherel's theorem, we get

$$\|w\|_{L^2}^2 = C \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\hat{w}_\ell\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(|\partial_y \hat{\varphi}_\ell(1)|^2 \|w_{1,\ell}\|_{L^2}^2 + |\partial_y \hat{\varphi}_\ell(-1)|^2 \|w_{2,\ell}\|_{L^2}^2 \right).$$

By Proposition 5.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} |\partial_y \hat{\varphi}_\ell(1)|^2 \|w_{1,\ell}\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq C \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(|k(\lambda - 1)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}} + (|k|/\nu)^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k| + \ell^2(|k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k|)^{-1} \right) |\partial_y \hat{\varphi}_\ell(1)|^2 \\ &= C(|k(\lambda - 1)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}} + (|k|/\nu)^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k|) \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)}^2 + C(|k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k|)^{-1} \|\partial_z \partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} |\partial_y \hat{\varphi}_\ell(-1)|^2 \|w_{2,\ell}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ \leq C(|k(\lambda + 1)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}} + (|k|/\nu)^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k|) \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_{-1})}^2 + C(|k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k|)^{-1} \|\partial_z \partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_{-1})}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|w\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq C \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} (|\partial_y \hat{\varphi}_\ell(1)|^2 \|w_{1,\ell}\|_{L^2}^2 + |\partial_y \hat{\varphi}_\ell(-1)|^2 \|w_{2,\ell}\|_{L^2}^2) \\
&\leq C \left(\sum_{j \in \{-1,1\}} (|k(\lambda - j)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}} + (|k|/\nu)^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k|) \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_j)}^2 + (|k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k|)^{-1} \|\partial_z \partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_j)}^2 \right) \\
&= C \left((|k(y - \lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}} + |k|^{\frac{1}{2}}) \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}^2 + C(|k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k|)^{-1} \|\partial_z \partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

This shows the first inequality.

By Plancherel's theorem again, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|w\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}^2 &\leq \|w\|_{L_y^\infty L_z^2}^2 = C \left\| \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} |\hat{w}_\ell|^2 \right\|_{L_y^\infty} \leq C \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\hat{w}_\ell\|_{L^\infty}^2 \\
&\leq C \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(|\partial_y \hat{\varphi}_\ell(1)|^2 \|w_{1,\ell}\|_{L^\infty}^2 + |\partial_y \hat{\varphi}_\ell(-1)|^2 \|w_{2,\ell}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 5.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} |\partial_y \hat{\varphi}_\ell(1)|^2 \|w_{1,\ell}\|_{L^\infty}^2 &\leq C \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} (|k(\lambda - 1)/\nu| + (|k|/\nu)^{\frac{2}{3}} + k^2 + \ell^2) |\partial_y \hat{\varphi}_\ell(1)|^2 \\
&= C (|k(\lambda - 1)/\nu| + (|k|/\nu)^{\frac{2}{3}} + k^2) \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)}^2 + C \|\partial_z \partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} |\partial_y \hat{\varphi}_\ell(-1)|^2 \|w_{2,\ell}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \\
&\leq C (|k(\lambda + 1)/\nu| + (|k|/\nu)^{\frac{2}{3}} + k^2) \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_{-1})}^2 + C \|\partial_z \partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_{-1})}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|w\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}^2 &\leq C \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(|\partial_y \hat{\varphi}_\ell(1)|^2 \|w_{1,\ell}\|_{L^\infty}^2 + |\partial_y \hat{\varphi}_\ell(-1)|^2 \|w_{2,\ell}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \right) \\
&\leq C \sum_{j \in \{-1,1\}} (|k(\lambda - j)/\nu| + (|k|/\nu)^{\frac{2}{3}} + k^2) \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_j)}^2 + C \sum_{j \in \{-1,1\}} \|\partial_z \partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_j)}^2 \\
&= C \left((|k(y - \lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k|) \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}^2 + C \|\partial_z \partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}^2 \right),
\end{aligned}$$

which gives the second inequality.

By Plancherel's theorem and Proposition 5.2, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2}^2 &= C \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \|(\partial_y, \eta) \hat{\varphi}_\ell\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\leq C \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(|\partial_y \hat{\varphi}_\ell(1)|^2 \|(\partial_y, \eta) \varphi_{1,\ell}\|_{L^2}^2 + |\partial_y \hat{\varphi}_\ell(-1)|^2 \|(\partial_y, \eta) \varphi_{2,\ell}\|_{L^2}^2 \right) \\
&\leq C \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(|\partial_y \hat{\varphi}_\ell(1)|^2 |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |\partial_y \hat{\varphi}_\ell(-1)|^2 |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \right) = C (\nu/|k|)^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$|k| \|\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 = C |k| \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\hat{\varphi}_\ell\|_{L^2}^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} |k| \left(|\partial_y \hat{\varphi}_\ell(1)|^2 \|\varphi_{1,\ell}\|_{L^2}^2 + |\partial_y \hat{\varphi}_\ell(-1)|^2 \|\varphi_{2,\ell}\|_{L^2}^2 \right) \\
&\leq C \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(|\partial_y \hat{\varphi}_\ell(1)|^2 |\nu/k|^{\frac{2}{3}} + |\partial_y \hat{\varphi}_\ell(-1)|^2 |\nu/k|^{\frac{2}{3}} \right) = C(\nu/|k|)^{\frac{2}{3}} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

For $\beta \in \{1, 2\}$, by Plancherel's theorem and Proposition 5.2, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(1-y^2)^\beta w\|_{L^2}^2 &= C \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \|(1-y^2)^\beta \hat{w}_\ell\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\leq C \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(|\partial_y \hat{\varphi}_\ell(1)|^2 \|(1-y^2)^\beta w_{1,\ell}\|_{L^2}^2 + |\partial_y \hat{\varphi}_\ell(-1)|^2 \|(1-y^2)^\beta w_{2,\ell}\|_{L^2}^2 \right) \\
&\leq C \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(|\partial_y \hat{\varphi}_\ell(1)|^2 L^{1-2\beta} + |\partial_y \hat{\varphi}_\ell(-1)|^2 L^{1-2\beta} \right) = CL^{1-2\beta} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(1-y^2)w\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq CL^{-1} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}^2 = C|\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}^2, \\
\|(1-y^2)^2 w\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq CL^{-3} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}^2 = C|\nu/k| \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

□

6.2. Resolvent estimates with general V and $F = 0$. The following proposition gives the resolvent estimate of (6.1) in the homogeneous case (i.e., $F = 0$). The proof is based on Proposition 6.1 and the perturbation argument.

Proposition 6.2. *Let $w \in H^2(\Omega)$ be a solution of (6.1) with $F = 0$. Then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}
\|w\|_{L^2} &\leq C \left(\left(|k(y-\lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}} + |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + (|k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k|)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right), \\
\|w\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} &\leq C \left(\left(|k(y-\lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k| \right) \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right), \\
\|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2} + \|(1-y^2)w\|_{L^2} &\leq C|\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}, \\
|k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\varphi\|_{L^2} &\leq C|\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We decompose $w = w_{Na} + w_I$, where w_{Na} and w_I solve

$$\begin{cases} -\nu \Delta w_{Na} + ik(y-\lambda)w_{Na} - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3} w_{Na} = -ik(V(y, z) - y)w, \\ w_{Na} = \Delta \varphi_{Na}, \varphi_{Na}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, w_{Na}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \partial_x w_{Na} = ikw_{Na}. \\ -\nu \Delta w_I + ik(y-\lambda)w_I - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3} w_I = 0, \\ w_I = \Delta \varphi_I, \varphi_I|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \partial_x w_I = ikw_I. \end{cases}$$

Then we have

$$-\nu \Delta w_{Na} + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)w_{Na} - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3} w_{Na} = -ik(V(y, z) - y)w_I.$$

By Lemma 4.1, we have

$$(6.2) \quad \|(1-y^2)(V-y)w_I\|_{L^2} \leq C\varepsilon_0 \|(1-y^2)^2 w_I\|_{L^2},$$

$$(6.3) \quad \|(V-y)w_I\|_{L^2} \leq C\varepsilon_0 \|(1-y^2)w_I\|_{L^2}.$$

By Proposition 4.1 and (6.3), we have

$$(6.4) \quad \|w_{Na}\|_{L^2} \leq C\varepsilon_0 |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|(1-y^2)w_I\|_{L^2}.$$

Using Proposition 4.5 with $F = -ik(V - y)w$, we get by (6.2) and (6.3) that

$$(6.5) \quad \nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{\frac{4}{3}}\|\varphi_{Na}\|_{L^2} + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}(\|\nabla\varphi_{Na}\|_{L^2} + \|(1 - y^2)w_{Na}\|_{L^2}) \\ \leq C\varepsilon_0(\|k(1 - y^2)^2w_I\|_{L^2} + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|(1 - y^2)w_I\|_{L^2}),$$

$$(6.6) \quad \left\| |k(y - \lambda)|^{\frac{1}{2}}\partial_y\varphi_{Na} \right\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\ \leq C\varepsilon_0\nu^{-\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{\frac{1}{6}}\left(\min(|k(\lambda - 1)|^{\frac{1}{2}}, |k(\lambda + 1)|^{\frac{1}{2}}) + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\right)\|(1 - y^2)w_I\|_{L^2},$$

and

$$(6.7) \quad \|\partial_y\partial_z\varphi_{Na}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq C\varepsilon_0\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}|k|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|(1 - y^2)w_I\|_{L^2},$$

$$(6.8) \quad \|\partial_y\varphi_{Na}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq C\varepsilon_0\nu^{-\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{\frac{1}{6}}\|(1 - y^2)w_I\|_{L^2}.$$

For w_I , we get by Proposition 6.1 that

$$(6.9) \quad \|w_I\|_{L^2} \leq C\left(\|(|k(y - \lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}} + |k|^{\frac{1}{2}})\partial_y\varphi_I\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right. \\ \left. + (|k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k|)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\partial_y\partial_z\varphi_I\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\right),$$

$$(6.10) \quad \|w_I\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq C\left(\|(|k(y - \lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k|)\partial_y\varphi_I\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\partial_y\partial_z\varphi_I\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\right),$$

$$(6.11) \quad \|\nabla\varphi_I\|_{L^2} + \|(1 - y^2)w_I\|_{L^2} \leq C|\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}}\|\partial_y\varphi_I\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)},$$

$$(6.12) \quad |k|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\varphi_I\|_{L^2} \leq C|\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\partial_y\varphi_I\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)},$$

$$(6.13) \quad \|(1 - y^2)^2w_I\|_{L^2} \leq C|\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\partial_y\varphi_I\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}.$$

By (6.11) and (6.8), we get

$$\|(1 - y^2)w_I\|_{L^2} \leq C|\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}}\|\partial_y\varphi_I\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq C|\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}}(\|\partial_y\varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\partial_y\varphi_{Na}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}) \\ \leq C|\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}}\|\partial_y\varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + C\varepsilon_0\|(1 - y^2)w_I\|_{L^2}.$$

Taking $C\varepsilon_0 \leq 1/2$, we conclude that

$$(6.14) \quad \|(1 - y^2)w_I\|_{L^2} \leq C|\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}}\|\partial_y\varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)},$$

which along with (6.8) gives

$$(6.15) \quad \|\partial_y\varphi_I\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq \|\partial_y\varphi\|_{L^2} + C\varepsilon_0|\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{6}}\|(1 - y^2)w_I\|_{L^2} \leq C\|\partial_y\varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}.$$

By (6.6), (6.8) and (6.14), we have

$$\left\| |k(y - \lambda)|^{\frac{1}{2}}\partial_y\varphi_{Na} \right\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq C\varepsilon_0\left(\min(|k(\lambda - 1)|^{\frac{1}{2}}, |k(\lambda + 1)|^{\frac{1}{2}}) + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\right)\|\partial_y\varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}, \\ \|\partial_y\varphi_{Na}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq C\varepsilon_0\nu^{-\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{\frac{1}{6}}\|(1 - y^2)w_I\|_{L^2} \leq C\varepsilon_0\|\partial_y\varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}.$$

Using the interpolation, we deduce that or $\gamma \in [0, 1]$,

$$\left\| |k(y - \lambda)|^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}\partial_y\varphi_{Na} \right\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq \left\| |k(y - \lambda)|^{\frac{1}{2}}\partial_y\varphi_{Na} \right\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}^\gamma \left\| \partial_y\varphi_{Na} \right\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}^{1-\gamma} \\ \leq C\varepsilon_0\left(\min(|k(\lambda - 1)|^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}, |k(\lambda + 1)|^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}) + \nu^{\frac{\gamma}{6}}|k|^{\frac{\gamma}{3}}\right)\|\partial_y\varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\ \leq C\varepsilon_0\left(\left\| |k(y - \lambda)|^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}\partial_y\varphi \right\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \nu^{\frac{\gamma}{6}}|k|^{\frac{\gamma}{3}}\|\partial_y\varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\right).$$

Here we used the fact that for $\alpha \geq 0$,

$$\min(|k(\lambda - 1)|^\alpha, |k(\lambda + 1)|^\alpha)\|g\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq \| |k(y - \lambda)|^\alpha g \|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}.$$

This shows that for $\gamma \in [0, 1]$,

$$(6.16) \quad \begin{aligned} \| |k(y - \lambda)|^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \partial_y \varphi_I \|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} &\leq \| |k(y - \lambda)|^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \partial_y \varphi_{Na} \|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \| |k(y - \lambda)|^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \partial_y \varphi \|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\ &\leq C \nu^{\frac{\gamma}{6}} |k|^{\frac{\gamma}{3}} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + C \| |k(y - \lambda)|^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \partial_y \varphi \|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

which along with (6.15) gives

$$(6.17) \quad \begin{aligned} &\| (|k(y - \lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k|) \partial_y \varphi_I \|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\ &\leq C \| (|k(y - \lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k|) \partial_y \varphi \|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(6.18) \quad \begin{aligned} &\| (|k(y - \lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}} + |k|^{\frac{1}{2}}) \partial_y \varphi_I \|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\ &\leq C \| (|k(y - \lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}} + |k|^{\frac{1}{2}}) \partial_y \varphi \|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

By (6.4), (6.9), (6.18), (6.7) and (6.14), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|w\|_{L^2} &\leq \|w_{Na}\|_{L^2} + \|w_I\|_{L^2} \leq C |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|(1 - y^2)w_I\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + C \left(\| (|k(y - \lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}} + |k|^{\frac{1}{2}}) \partial_y \varphi_I \|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + (|k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k|)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi_I\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right) \\ &\leq C |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{6}} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + C \left(\| (|k(y - \lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}} + |k|^{\frac{1}{2}}) \partial_y \varphi \|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (|k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k|)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y \partial_z (\varphi - \varphi_{Na})\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right) \\ &\leq C |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{6}} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + C \left(\| (|k(y - \lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}} + |k|^{\frac{1}{2}}) \partial_y \varphi \|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (|k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k|)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right) + C (|k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k|)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(1 - y^2)w_I\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \left(\| (|k(y - \lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}} + |k|^{\frac{1}{2}}) \partial_y \varphi \|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + (|k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k|)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which gives the first inequality.

Due to $w_{Na}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$, we get by (6.10), (6.17), (6.7) and (6.14), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|w\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} &= \|w_I\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq C \left(\| (|k(y - \lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k|) \partial_y \varphi_I \|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi_I\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(\| (|k(y - \lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k|) \partial_y \varphi \|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\partial_y \partial_z (\varphi - \varphi_{Na})\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(\| (|k(y - \lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k|) \partial_y \varphi \|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right) \\ &\quad + \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(1 - y^2)w_I\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \left(\| (|k(y - \lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k|) \partial_y \varphi \|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which gives the second inequality.

It follows from (6.13) and (6.15) that

$$(6.19) \quad \|(1 - y^2)^2 w_I\|_{L^2} \leq C |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y \varphi_I\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq C |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}.$$

By (6.5), (6.11), (6.15), (6.14) and (6.19), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2} + \|(1 - y^2)w\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \|\nabla \varphi_{Na}\|_{L^2} + \|(1 - y^2)w_{Na}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \varphi_I\|_{L^2} + \|(1 - y^2)w_I\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \left(|\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|(1 - y^2)^2 w_I\|_{L^2} + \|(1 - y^2)w_I\|_{L^2} \right) + C |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}} \|\partial_y \varphi_I\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C \left(|\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|(1-y^2)^2 w_I\|_{L^2} + \|(1-y^2) w_I\|_{L^2} \right) + C |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\
&\leq C |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)},
\end{aligned}$$

which gives the third inequality.

By (6.5), (6.12), (6.15), (6.14) and (6.19), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
|k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\varphi\|_{L^2} &\leq |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\varphi_{Na}\|_{L^2} + |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\varphi_I\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq C \left(|\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{6}} \|(1-y^2)^2 w_I\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}} \|(1-y^2) w_I\|_{L^2} \right) + C |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\partial_y \varphi_I\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\
&\leq C \left(|\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{6}} \|(1-y^2)^2 w_I\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}} \|(1-y^2) w_I\|_{L^2} \right) + C |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\
&\leq C |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)},
\end{aligned}$$

which gives the fourth inequality. $\square$

6.3. Resolvent estimates with general V and F . The following proposition gives the resolvent estimates for the inhomogeneous equation.

Proposition 6.3. *Let $\nu k^2 \leq 1$, and $w \in H^2(\Omega)$ be a solution of (6.1) with $F \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $F = F_1 + F_2$. Then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.20) \quad \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{4}{3}} \|\varphi\|_{L^2} &\leq C \left(\|(1-y^2) F_1\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \|F_1\|_{L^2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \max(1-|\lambda|, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}) \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} + |\nu k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

$$(6.21) \quad \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{4}{3}} \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2} \leq C \left(\|F_1\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{\frac{7}{6}} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right),$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.22) \quad \|w\|_{L^2} &\leq C \left(\|(|k(y-\lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}}) \partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}} \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (\nu k^2)^{-\frac{5}{12}} \|F_1\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{3}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.23) \quad \|w\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} &\leq C \left(\|(|k(y-\lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}}) \partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \nu^{-\frac{2}{3}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} \|F_1\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-1} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We decompose the solution w as $w = w_{Na}^{(1)} + w_{Na}^{(2)} + w_I$, where $w_{Na}^{(j)}$ ($j = 1, 2$), w_I solve

$$\begin{cases} -\nu \Delta w_{Na}^{(j)} + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda) w_{Na}^{(j)} - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3} w_{Na}^{(j)} = F_j, \\ w_{Na}^{(j)} = \Delta \varphi_{Na}^{(j)}, \varphi_{Na}^{(j)}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, w_{Na}^{(j)}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \partial_x w_{Na}^{(j)} = ik \partial_x \varphi_{Na}^{(j)}, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} -\nu \Delta w_I + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda) w_I - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3} w_I = 0, \\ w_I = \Delta \varphi_I, \varphi_I|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \partial_x w_I = ik \partial_x \varphi_I. \end{cases}$$

Step 1. Proof of (6.20) and (6.21).

By Proposition 4.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\nu k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y \varphi_{Na}^{(1)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} &\leq C |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \|F_1\|_{L^2}, \\
\nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{\frac{7}{6}} \|\partial_y \varphi_{Na}^{(1)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} &\leq C (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{6}} \|F_1\|_{L^2} \leq C \|F_1\|_{L^2},
\end{aligned}$$

and by Proposition 4.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\nu k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y \varphi_{Na}^{(2)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} &\leq C \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} \leq C |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \max(1 - |\lambda|, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}) \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}}, \\ \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{\frac{7}{6}} \|\partial_y \varphi_{Na}^{(2)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} &\leq C \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{2}{3}} \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} \leq C |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 6.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{4}{3}} \|\varphi_I\|_{L^2} &\leq C |\nu k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y \varphi_I\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\ &\leq C |\nu k|^{\frac{1}{2}} (\|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\partial_y \varphi_{Na}^{(1)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\partial_y \varphi_{Na}^{(2)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}) \\ (6.24) \quad &\leq C |\nu k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + C |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \|F_1\|_{L^2} + C |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \max(1 - |\lambda|, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}) \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{4}{3}} \|\nabla \varphi_I\|_{L^2} &\leq C \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{\frac{7}{6}} \|\partial_y \varphi_I\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\ &\leq C \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{\frac{7}{6}} (\|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\partial_y \varphi_{Na}^{(1)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\partial_y \varphi_{Na}^{(2)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}) \\ (6.25) \quad &\leq C \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{\frac{7}{6}} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + C \|F_1\|_{L^2} + C |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 4.5 and Proposition 4.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{4}{3}} \|\varphi_{Na}^{(1)}\|_{L^2} &\leq C (\|(1 - y^2)F_1\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \|F_1\|_{L^2}), \\ \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{4}{3}} \|\nabla \varphi_{Na}^{(1)}\|_{L^2} &\leq C \|F_1\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

and by Proposition 4.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{4}{3}} \|\varphi_{Na}^{(2)}\|_{L^2} &\leq C |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \max(1 - |\lambda|, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}) \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}}, \\ \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{4}{3}} \|\nabla \varphi_{Na}^{(2)}\|_{L^2} &\leq C |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

which together with (6.24) and (6.25) show that

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{4}{3}} \|\varphi\|_{L^2} &\leq \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{4}{3}} (\|\varphi_I\|_{L^2} + \|\varphi_{Na}^{(1)}\|_{L^2} + \|\varphi_{Na}^{(2)}\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C \left(\|(1 - y^2)F_1\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \|F_1\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \max(1 - |\lambda|, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}) \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |\nu k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{4}{3}} \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2} &\leq \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{4}{3}} (\|\nabla \varphi_I\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \varphi_{Na}^{(1)}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \varphi_{Na}^{(2)}\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C (\|F_1\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{\frac{7}{6}} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}). \end{aligned}$$

Step 2. Proof of (6.22).

By Proposition 4.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(k(y - \lambda)/\nu)^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}} \partial_y \varphi_{Na}^{(1)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} &\leq C \nu^{-\frac{1}{4}} \|(k(y - \lambda))^{\frac{1}{4}} + 1\| \partial_y \varphi_{Na}^{(1)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\ &\leq C \nu^{-\frac{1}{4}} \|(k(y - \lambda)) + 1\| \partial_y \varphi_{Na}^{(1)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq C (\nu k^2)^{-\frac{5}{12}} \|F_1\|_{L^2}, \\ |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}} \|\partial_z \partial_y \varphi_{Na}^{(1)}\|_{L^2} &\leq C (\nu k^2)^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|F_1\|_{L^2} \leq C (\nu k^2)^{-\frac{5}{12}} \|F_1\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

and by Proposition 4.6,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(k(y - \lambda)/\nu)^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}} \partial_y \varphi_{Na}^{(2)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} &\leq C \nu^{-\frac{1}{4}} \|(k(y - \lambda))^{\frac{1}{4}} + 1\| \partial_y \varphi_{Na}^{(2)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\ &\leq C \nu^{-\frac{1}{4}} \|(k(y - \lambda))^{\frac{3}{4}} + 1\| \partial_y \varphi_{Na}^{(2)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq C \nu^{-\frac{3}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

$$|\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}} \|\partial_z \partial_y \varphi_{Na}^{(2)}\|_{L^2} \leq C \nu^{-\frac{2}{3}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} \leq C \nu^{-\frac{3}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}},$$

which together with Proposition 6.2 show that

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_I\|_{L^2} &\leq C \left(\left(|k(y-\lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}} + |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \|\partial_y \varphi_I\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + (|k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k|)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi_I\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(\left(|k(y-\lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}} \right) \|\partial_y \varphi_I\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}} \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi_I\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(\left(|k(y-\lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}} \right) \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}} \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right) \\ &\quad + C \left(\left(|k(y-\lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}} \right) \|\partial_y \varphi_{Na}^{(1)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}} \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi_{Na}^{(1)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right) \\ &\quad + C \left(\left(|k(y-\lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}} \right) \|\partial_y \varphi_{Na}^{(2)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}} \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi_{Na}^{(2)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(\left(|k(y-\lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}} \right) \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}} \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right) \\ &\quad + C \left((\nu k^2)^{-\frac{5}{12}} \|F_1\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{3}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 4.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_{Na}^{(1)}\|_{L^2} + \|w_{Na}^{(2)}\| &\leq C \left((\nu k^2)^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|F_1\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{2}{3}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} \right) \\ &\leq C \left((\nu k^2)^{-\frac{5}{12}} \|F_1\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{3}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|w\|_{L^2} &\leq \|w_I\|_{L^2} + \|w_{Na}^{(1)}\|_{L^2} + \|w_{Na}^{(2)}\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \left(\left(|k(y-\lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}} \right) \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}} \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi_I\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right) \\ &\quad + C \left((\nu k^2)^{-\frac{5}{12}} \|F_1\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{3}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Step 3. Proof of (6.23).

By Proposition 4.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(|k(y-\lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} \right) \|\partial_y \varphi_{Na}^{(1)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} &\leq C \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(|k(y-\lambda)|^{\frac{1}{2}} + 1 \right) \|\partial_y \varphi_{Na}^{(1)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\ &\leq C \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(|k(y-\lambda)| + 1 \right) \|\partial_y \varphi_{Na}^{(1)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq C \nu^{-\frac{2}{3}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} \|F_1\|_{L^2}, \\ \|\partial_z \partial_y \varphi_{Na}^{(1)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} &\leq C |\nu k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F_1\|_{L^2} \leq C \nu^{-\frac{2}{3}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} \|F_1\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

and by Proposition 4.6,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(|k(y-\lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} \right) \|\partial_y \varphi_{Na}^{(2)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} &\leq C \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(|k(y-\lambda)|^{\frac{1}{2}} + 1 \right) \|\partial_y \varphi_{Na}^{(2)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\ &\leq C \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(|k(y-\lambda)|^{\frac{3}{4}} + 1 \right) \|\partial_y \varphi_{Na}^{(2)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq C \nu^{-1} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}}, \\ \|\partial_z \partial_y \varphi_{Na}^{(2)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} &\leq C \nu^{-\frac{5}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{6}} \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} \leq C \nu^{-1} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

which together with Proposition 6.2 show that

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_I\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} &\leq C \left(\left(|k(y-\lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |k| \right) \|\partial_y \varphi_I\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi_I\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(\left(|k(y-\lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} \right) \|\partial_y \varphi_I\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi_I\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(\left(|k(y-\lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} \right) \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right) \\ &\quad + C \left(\left(|k(y-\lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} \right) \|\partial_y \varphi_{Na}^{(1)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi_{Na}^{(1)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right) \\ &\quad + C \left(\left(|k(y-\lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} \right) \|\partial_y \varphi_{Na}^{(2)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi_{Na}^{(2)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(\left(|k(y-\lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}} \right) \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$+ C(\nu^{-\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{-\frac{5}{6}}\|F_1\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-1}|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|F_2\|_{H^{-1}}).$$

Due to $w_{Na}^{(j)}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0 (j = 1, 2)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|w\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} &= \|w_I\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq C(\|(|k(y-\lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}})\partial_y\varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\partial_y\partial_z\varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}) \\ &\quad + C(\nu^{-\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{-\frac{5}{6}}\|F_1\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-1}|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|F_2\|_{H^{-1}}). \end{aligned}$$

□

The following proposition gives some resolvent estimates relating to the inviscid damping effect. In what follows, we always assume $\nu k^2 \leq 1$.

Proposition 6.4. *Let $\nu k^2 \leq 1$, and $w \in H^2(\Omega)$ be a solution of (6.1) with $F \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $F = F_1 + F_2$. Then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{\frac{4}{3}}\|\varphi\|_{L^2} &\leq C\left(\nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{-\frac{2}{3}}\|F_1\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{-\frac{2}{3}}\max(1-|\lambda|, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}})\|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2}\right. \\ &\quad \left.+ |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\max(1-|\lambda|, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}})\|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} + |\nu k|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\partial_y\varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\right), \\ \nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{\frac{4}{3}}\|\nabla\varphi\|_{L^2} &\leq C\left(\nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{-\frac{2}{3}}\|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{\frac{7}{6}}\|\partial_y\varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\right), \\ \|w\|_{L^2} &\leq C\left(\|(|k(y-\lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}})\partial_y\varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}}\|\partial_y\partial_z\varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\right. \\ &\quad \left.+ \nu^{-\frac{1}{4}}|k|^{-\frac{3}{2}}\|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{3}{4}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|F_2\|_{H^{-1}}\right), \\ \|w\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} &\leq C\left(\|(|k(y-\lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}})\partial_y\varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\partial_y\partial_z\varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\right. \\ &\quad \left.+ \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}|k|^{-\frac{3}{2}}\|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-1}|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|F_2\|_{H^{-1}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

We need the following lemmas.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $F \in H^1(\Omega)$, $w_1 = \chi_1 F$, $\chi_1 = (V - \lambda - i\delta)^{-1}$, $\partial_x F = ikF$. Then it holds that for $f_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ with $\partial_x f_0 = ikf_0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle w_1, f_0 \rangle| &\leq C\|\partial_y f_0\|_{L^2}(\max(1-|\lambda|, 0)\|\nabla F\|_{L^2} + \|F\|_{L^2}), \\ |\langle w_1, f_0 \rangle| &\leq C|k|^{-1}\|\nabla f_0\|_{L^2}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2}, \\ |\langle w_1, f_0 \rangle| &\leq C|k|^{-\frac{3}{2}}\|\nabla f_0\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume $\lambda \geq 0$. If $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$, let $y_\lambda(z) \in [-1, 1]$ so that $V(y_\lambda(z), z) = \lambda$. Then we have

$$(6.26) \quad 1 - y_\lambda = (1 - \lambda) \frac{1 - y_\lambda}{V(1, z) - V(y_\lambda, z)} \leq (1 - \lambda) \|[\partial_y V]^{-1}\|_{L^\infty} \leq C(1 - \lambda).$$

First of all, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle w_1, f_0 \rangle| &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \int_{-1}^1 \frac{F \bar{f}_0}{V - \lambda - i\delta} dy dx dz \right| \\ &\leq \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \int_{-1}^1 \frac{F(x, y, z)(\bar{f}_0(x, y, z) - \bar{f}_0(x, y_\lambda, z))}{V - \lambda - i\delta} dy dx dz \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \int_{-1}^1 \frac{F(x, y, z) \bar{f}_0(x, y_\lambda, z)}{V - \lambda - i\delta} dy dx dz \right| \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \|F\|_{L^2} \left\| \frac{f_0(x, y, z) - f_0(x, y_\lambda, z)}{V(y, z) - V(y_\lambda, z)} \right\|_{L^2} + \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \int_{-1}^1 \frac{F(x, y, z) \bar{f}_0(x, y_\lambda, z)}{V - \lambda - i\delta} dy dx dz \right|.$$

By Hardy's inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{f_0(x, y, z) - f_0(x, y_\lambda, z)}{V(y, z) - V(y_\lambda, z)} \right\|_{L^2} &\leq \left\| \frac{f_0(x, y, z) - f_0(x, y_\lambda, z)}{y - y_\lambda} \right\|_{L^2} \left\| \frac{y - y_\lambda}{V(y, z) - V(y_\lambda, z)} \right\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leq C \|\partial_y f_0\|_{L^2} \|[\partial_y V]^{-1}\|_{L^\infty} \leq C \|\partial_y f_0\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 16.11 (with $\delta_* = 1 - \lambda$) and (6.26), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \int_{-1}^1 \frac{F(x, y, z) \bar{f}_0(x, y_\lambda, z)}{V - \lambda - i\delta} dy dx dz \right| &\leq C \left\| (\delta_*^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y F\|_{L_y^2} + \delta_*^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F\|_{L_y^2}) |f_0(x, y_\lambda, z)| \right\|_{L_{x,z}^1} \\ &\leq C (\delta_*^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y F\|_{L^2} + \delta_*^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F\|_{L^2}) \|f_0(x, y_\lambda, z)\|_{L_{x,z}^2} \\ &\leq C (\delta_*^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla F\|_{L^2} + \delta_*^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F\|_{L^2}) \left\| \int_{y_\lambda}^1 \partial_y f_0(x, y_1, z) dy_1 \right\|_{L_{x,z}^2} \\ &\leq C (\delta_*^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla F\|_{L^2} + \delta_*^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F\|_{L^2}) \|(1 - y_\lambda)^{\frac{1}{2}} \partial_y f_0\|_{L^2} \leq C((1 - \lambda) \|\nabla F\|_{L^2} + \|F\|_{L^2}) \|\partial_y f_0\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that for $\lambda \in [0, 1]$,

$$|\langle w_1, f_0 \rangle| \leq C((1 - \lambda) \|\nabla F\|_{L^2} + \|F\|_{L^2}) \|\partial_y f_0\|_{L^2}.$$

If $\lambda \geq 1$, by Hardy's inequality and Lemma 4.1, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle w_1, f_0 \rangle| &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \int_{-1}^1 \frac{F \bar{f}_0}{V - \lambda - i\delta} dy dx dz \right| \leq \|F\|_{L^2} \left\| \frac{f_0}{1 - V} \right\|_{L^2} \leq C \|F\|_{L^2} \left\| \frac{f_0}{1 - y} \right\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \|F\|_{L^2} \|\partial_y f_0\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining two cases, we obtain

$$|\langle w_1, f_0 \rangle| \leq C(\max(1 - |\lambda|, 0) \|\nabla F\|_{L^2} + \|F\|_{L^2}) \|\partial_y f_0\|_{L^2}.$$

Using Lemma 16.11 with $\delta_* = |k|^{-1}$ and Lemma 16.1, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle w_1, f_0 \rangle| &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \int_{-1}^1 \frac{F \bar{f}_0}{V - \lambda - i\delta} dy dx dz \right| \leq \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \left| \int_{-1}^1 \frac{F \bar{f}_0}{V - \lambda - i\delta} dy \right| dx dz \\ &\leq C |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\|\partial_y(F \bar{f}_0)\|_{L_y^2} \|L_{x,z}^1\| + |k| \|F \bar{f}_0\|_{L_y^2} \|L_{x,z}^1\| \right) \\ &\leq C |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\|\partial_y F\|_{L^2} \|f_0\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} + \|F\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} \|\partial_y f_0\|_{L^2} + |k| \|F\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} \|f_0\|_{L^2} \right) \\ &\leq C |k|^{-1} \|\nabla F\|_{L^2} \|\nabla f_0\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle w_1, f_0 \rangle| &\leq C |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\|\partial_y(F \bar{f}_0)\|_{L_y^2} \|L_{x,z}^1\| + |k| \|F \bar{f}_0\|_{L_y^2} \|L_{x,z}^1\| \right) \\ &\leq C |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\|\partial_y F\|_{L^2} \|f_0\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} + \|F\|_{L^2} \|\partial_y f_0\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} + |k| \|F\|_{L^2} \|f_0\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} \right) \\ &\leq C |k|^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|\nabla F\|_{L^2} \|\nabla f_0\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty}, \end{aligned}$$

here we used $\partial_x f_0 = ik f_0$. □

Lemma 6.2. *Let $F \in H^1(\Omega)$, $\Delta\varphi = w_1 = \chi_1 F$, $\varphi|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$, $\chi_1 = (V - \lambda - i\delta)^{-1}$, $\partial_x F = ikF$. Then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla w_1\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|w_1\|_{L^2} &\leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2}, \\ \|(1 - y^2)w_1\|_{L^2} &\leq C\|F\|_{L^2} + C|\nu k^2|^{-\frac{1}{6}}\max(1 - |\lambda|, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}})\|\nabla F\|_{L^2}, \\ \|\varphi\|_{L^2} &\leq C|k|^{-1}(\|F\|_{L^2} + \max(1 - |\lambda|, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}})\|\nabla F\|_{L^2}), \\ \|\nabla\varphi\|_{L^2} &\leq C|k|^{-1}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2}, \\ \|\partial_y\partial_z\varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} &\leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{6}}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2}, \\ (1 + |k(\lambda - j)|)\|\partial_y\varphi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_j)} &\leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + C\ln(2 + (|k(\lambda - j)| + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}})^{-1})\|F\|_{L^2_{x,z}L^\infty_y}, \quad j \in \{\pm 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Lemma 16.1 and $\nu k^2 \leq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla w_1\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|w_1\|_{L^2} &\leq \|\nabla\chi_1\|_{L^\infty_{x,z}L^2_y}\|F\|_{L^2_{x,z}L^\infty_y} + \|\chi_1\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|\chi_1\|_{L^\infty_{x,z}L^2_y}\|F\|_{L^2_{x,z}L^\infty_y} \\ &\leq C\delta^{-\frac{3}{2}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2} + C\delta^{-1}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2} + C\delta^{-1}\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume $\lambda \geq 0$. Using the fact that

$$|1 - y^2| \leq C(1 - |y|) \leq C(1 - V) = C[(1 - \lambda) + (\lambda - V)] \leq C(\max(1 - \lambda, 0) + |V - \lambda|),$$

we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(1 - y^2)w_1\|_{L^2} &\leq C(\max(1 - \lambda, 0)\|w_1\|_{L^2} + \|(V - \lambda)w_1\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C(\max(1 - |\lambda|, 0)\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2} + \|(V - \lambda)\chi_1\|_{L^\infty}\|F\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C(\max(1 - |\lambda|, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}})|\nu k^2|^{-\frac{1}{6}}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2} + \|F\|_{L^2}). \end{aligned}$$

Let ϕ be the unique solution to $\Delta\phi = \varphi$, $\phi|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$. Using Lemma 6.1 with $f_0 = \phi$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 = |\langle w_1, \phi \rangle| &\leq C(\max(1 - |\lambda|, 0)\|\nabla F\|_{L^2} + \|F\|_{L^2})\|\partial_y\phi\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C|k|^{-1}(\max(1 - |\lambda|, 0)\|\nabla F\|_{L^2} + \|F\|_{L^2})\|\varphi\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C|k|^{-1}(\max(1 - |\lambda|, |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}})\|\nabla F\|_{L^2} + \|F\|_{L^2})\|\varphi\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|\nabla\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 = |\langle w_1, \varphi \rangle| \leq C|k|^{-1}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2}\|\nabla\varphi\|_{L^2}.$$

This shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi\|_{L^2} &\leq C|k|^{-1}(\|F\|_{L^2} + \max(1 - |\lambda|, |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}})\|\nabla F\|_{L^2}), \\ \|\nabla\varphi\|_{L^2} &\leq C|k|^{-1}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the first inequality of this lemma, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_y\partial_z\varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} &\leq \|\partial_y\partial_z\varphi\|_{L^2_{x,z}L^\infty_y} \leq C\|\partial_y\partial_z\varphi\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\partial_y^2\partial_z\varphi\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C\|w_1\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla w_1\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{6}}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, let us estimate $\|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}$. Recalling (4.24), we have

$$(6.27) \quad \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_1} |\langle w_1, f \rangle|.$$

The estimate $\langle w_1, f \rangle$ will be split into three cases.

Case 1. $\delta \leq 1 - \lambda \leq |k|^{-1}$.

Let $\chi_4 = \max(1 - |(V - \lambda)/(1 - \lambda)|, 0)$. Then $\chi_4 \in H^1(\Omega)$ and it follows from Lemma 4.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\chi_4\|_{L^\infty} &= 1, \quad |\nabla \chi_4| \leq |\nabla V/(1 - \lambda)| \leq C/(1 - \lambda), \quad \chi_4|_{y=1} = \chi_4|_{y \leq 1-4(1-\lambda)} = 0, \\ \|\chi_4/(1 - y)\|_{L^\infty} &\leq \|\nabla \chi_4\|_{L^\infty} \leq C/(1 - \lambda), \quad \|\chi_4\|_{L_y^2 L_{x,z}^\infty} \leq C(1 - \lambda)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ \|\chi_4/(1 - y)\|_{L_y^2 L_{x,z}^\infty} + \|\nabla \chi_4\|_{L_y^2 L_{x,z}^\infty} &\leq C(1 - \lambda)^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Due to $\delta \leq 1 - \lambda \leq |k|^{-1}$, we get by Lemma 16.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla(\chi_4 F)\|_{L^2} &\leq \|\nabla \chi_4\|_{L_y^2 L_{x,z}^\infty} \|F\|_{L_y^\infty L_{x,z}^2} + \|\chi_4\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla F\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C(1 - \lambda)^{-\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla F\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla F\|_{L^2} \leq C(1 - \lambda)^{-\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla F\|_{L^2}, \\ \|\chi_4 F\|_{L^2} &\leq \|\chi_4\|_{L_y^2 L_{x,z}^\infty} \|F\|_{L_y^\infty L_{x,z}^2} \leq C(1 - \lambda)^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla F\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

For $f \in \mathcal{F}_1$, we get by Lemma 4.3 that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_y(\chi_4 f)\|_{L^2} &\leq \|(\partial_y \chi_4) f\|_{L^2} + \|\chi_4 \partial_y f\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \|\nabla \chi_4\|_{L_y^2 L_{x,z}^\infty} \|f\|_{L_y^\infty L_{x,z}^2} + \|\chi_4/(1 - y)\|_{L_y^2 L_{x,z}^\infty} \|(1 - y) \partial_y f\|_{L_y^\infty L_{x,z}^2} \\ &\leq C(1 - \lambda)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\|f\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} + \|(1 - y) \partial_y f\|_{L_y^\infty L_{x,z}^2}) \leq C(1 - \lambda)^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus by Lemma 6.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \chi_4 F \chi_1, \chi_4 f \rangle| &\leq C \|\partial_y(\chi_4 f)\|_{L^2} (\max(1 - |\lambda|, 0) \|\nabla(\chi_4 F)\|_{L^2} + \|\chi_4 F\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C(1 - \lambda)^{-\frac{1}{2}} ((1 - \lambda) \cdot (1 - \lambda)^{-\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla F\|_{L^2} + (1 - \lambda)^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla F\|_{L^2}) \\ (6.28) \quad &\leq C |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla F\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\Omega_3 = \mathbb{T} \times [1 - 2|k|^{-1}, 1] \times \mathbb{T}$ and $\Omega_3^c = \mathbb{T} \times [-1, 1 - 2|k|^{-1}] \times \mathbb{T}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle (1 - \chi_4^2) F \chi_1, f \rangle| &\leq \|(1 - \chi_4^2) F \chi_1 \bar{f}\|_{L^1(\Omega_3^c)} + \|(1 - \chi_4^2) F \chi_1 \bar{f}\|_{L^1(\Omega_3)} \\ &\leq \|F\|_{L^2} \|f\|_{L^2} \|(1 - \chi_4^2) \chi_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_3^c)} + \|F\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} \|f\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} \|(1 - \chi_4^2) \chi_1\|_{L_{x,z}^\infty L_y^1(\Omega_3)}. \end{aligned}$$

Noticing that

$$\begin{aligned} |(1 - \chi_4^2) \chi_1| &\leq 2|(1 - \chi_4) \chi_1| \leq 2|(V - \lambda)/(1 - \lambda)| |\chi_1| \leq 2/(1 - \lambda), \\ |(1 - \chi_4^2) \chi_1| &\leq |\chi_1| \leq 1/|V - \lambda|, \end{aligned}$$

we deduce that

$$|(1 - \chi_4^2) \chi_1| \leq C/(1 - \lambda + |V - \lambda|) \leq C/(1 - V).$$

Let $\delta_1 = 1 - \lambda$, and then

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(1 - \chi_4^2) \chi_1\|_{L_{x,z}^\infty L_y^1(\Omega_3)} \\ &\leq \|1/(|V - \lambda| + \delta_1)\|_{L_{x,z}^\infty L_y^1(\Omega_3)} = \left\| \int_{1-2|k|^{-1}}^1 \frac{1}{|V - \lambda| + \delta_1} dy \right\|_{L^\infty} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \left\| \int_{1-2|k|^{-1}}^1 \frac{\partial_y V}{|V-\lambda|+\delta_1} dy \right\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_y V\|_{L^\infty} \leq C \left\| \int_{V(1-2|k|^{-1},z)}^1 \frac{1}{|y_1-\lambda|+\delta_1} dy_1 \right\|_{L^\infty} \\
&\leq C \int_{1-4|k|^{-1}}^1 \frac{dy_1}{|y_1-\lambda|+\delta_1} = C \ln((|1-\lambda|+\delta_1)/\delta_1) + C \ln((|1-\lambda-4|k|^{-1}|+\delta_1)/\delta_1) \\
&\leq C \ln((4|k|^{-1}+\delta_1)/\delta_1) = C \ln(1+4|k\delta_1|^{-1}) = C \ln(1+4/|k(\lambda-1)|),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|(1-\chi_4^2)\chi_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_3^c)} \leq C\|(1-V)^{-1}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_3^c)} \leq C\|(1-y)^{-1}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_3^c)} \leq C|k|.$$

Thus, we conclude that

$$|\langle (1-\chi_4^2)F\chi_1, f \rangle| \leq C|k|\|F\|_{L^2}\|f\|_{L^2} + C \ln(1+4/|k(\lambda-1)|)\|F\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty}\|f\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty},$$

which along with (6.28) and the facts that $|k|\|F\|_{L^2} \leq \|\nabla F\|_{L^2}$, $1 \geq |k(\lambda-1)| \geq k\delta = (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}$, $\|f\|_{L^2} \leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\|f\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} \leq C$ due to Lemma 4.3, gives

$$\begin{aligned}
(1+|k(\lambda-1)|)|\langle w_1, f \rangle| &\leq 2|\langle w_1, f \rangle| \leq 2|\langle \chi_4 F\chi_1, \chi_4 f \rangle| + 2|\langle (1-\chi_4^2)F\chi_1, f \rangle| \\
&\leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2} + \ln(2+(|k(\lambda-1)|+(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}})^{-1})\|F\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty}.
\end{aligned}$$

Case 2. $1-\delta \leq \lambda \leq 1+|k|^{-1}$.

In this case, we have

$$|\lambda-1|-(\lambda-1) = 2\max(1-\lambda, 0) \leq 2\delta, \quad \lambda-1+3\delta \geq |\lambda-1|+\delta.$$

Let $\delta_1 = |\lambda-1|+\delta$. By Lemma 4.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|V-\lambda|+3\delta &\geq \lambda-V+3\delta \geq 1-V+|\lambda-1|+\delta \geq (1-y)/2+\delta_1, \\
|\chi_1| &\leq [\max(|V-\lambda|, \delta)]^{-1} \leq C(|V-\lambda|+3\delta)^{-1} \leq C(1-y+\delta_1)^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let Ω_3 and Ω_3^c be defined as in **Case 1**, and then

$$(6.29) \quad \|\chi_1\|_{L_{x,z}^\infty L_y^1(\Omega_3)} \leq C\|(1-y+\delta_1)^{-1}\|_{L^1([1-2|k|^{-1}, 1])} = C \ln((2|k|^{-1}+\delta_1)/\delta_1),$$

$$(6.30) \quad \|\chi_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_3^c)} \leq C\|(1-y)^{-1}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_3^c)} \leq C|k|,$$

which imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle F\chi_1, f \rangle| &\leq \|F\chi_1 \bar{f}\|_{L^1(\Omega_3^c)} + \|F\chi_1 \bar{f}\|_{L^1(\Omega_3)} \\
&\leq \|F\|_{L^2}\|f\|_{L^2}\|\chi_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_3^c)} + \|F\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty}\|f\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty}\|\chi_1\|_{L_{x,z}^\infty L_y^1(\Omega_3)} \\
&\leq C|k|\|F\|_{L^2}\|f\|_{L^2} + C \ln(1+2|k\delta_1|^{-1})\|F\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty}\|f\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the facts that

$$|k|\|F\|_{L^2} \leq \|\nabla F\|_{L^2}, \quad k\delta_1 = |k(\lambda-1)|+(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}, \quad \|f\|_{L^2} \leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \|f\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} \leq C,$$

we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
(1+|k(\lambda-1)|)|\langle w_1, f \rangle| &\leq 2|\langle w_1, f \rangle| \\
&\leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2} + \ln(2+(|k(\lambda-1)|+(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}})^{-1})\|F\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty}.
\end{aligned}$$

Case 3. $|\lambda-1| \geq |k|^{-1}$.

Obviously, we have $(1-V)f \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, and by Lemma 16.1 and Lemma 4.1, we have

$$\|\nabla((1-V)f)\|_{L^2} \leq \|(1-V)\nabla f\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla V\|_{L^\infty}\|f\|_{L^2}$$

$$\leq C(\|(1-y)\nabla f\|_{L^2} + \|f\|_{L^2}) \leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}},$$

and $|(V-\lambda)w_1| = |(V-\lambda)\chi_1 F| \leq |F|$. Thus, it follows from Lemma 6.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} |(1-\lambda)\langle w_1, f \rangle| &= |\langle (V-\lambda)w_1, f \rangle + \langle w_1, (1-V)f \rangle| \\ &\leq C(\|(V-\lambda)w_1\|_{L^2}\|f\|_{L^2} + |k|^{-1}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2}\|\nabla((1-V)f)\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C(\|F\|_{L^2}|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} + |k|^{-1}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2}|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \leq C|k|^{-\frac{3}{2}}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$(1 + |k(\lambda - 1)|)|\langle w_1, f \rangle| \leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2}.$$

Summing up **Case 1-Case 3**, we conclude that

$$(1 + |k(\lambda - 1)|)|\langle w_1, f \rangle| \leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2} + \ln(2 + (|k(\lambda - 1)| + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}})^{-1})\|F\|_{L^2_{x,z}L^\infty_y}.$$

This along with (6.27) shows that

$$\begin{aligned} (1 + |k(\lambda - 1)|)\|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)} &\leq C(1 + |k(\lambda - 1)|) \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_1} |\langle w_1, f \rangle| \\ &\leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2} + \ln(2 + (|k(\lambda - 1)| + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}})^{-1})\|F\|_{L^2_{x,z}L^\infty_y}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of the case $j = -1$ is similar. $\square$

Now we are in a position to prove Proposition 6.4.

Proof. We decompose w as $w = w_1 + w_2$, where w_1 and w_2 solve

$$\begin{cases} ik(V - \lambda - i\delta)w_1 = F_1, \\ -\nu\Delta w_2 + ik(V - \lambda)w_2 - a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}w_2 = F_2 + \nu\Delta w_1 + (a+1)(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}w_1, \\ w_j = \Delta\varphi_j, \quad \varphi_j|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \quad j = \{1, 2\}. \end{cases}$$

Let $F_{1,*} = (a+1)(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}w_1$, $F_{2,*} = F_2 + \nu\Delta w_1$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_{1,*}\|_{L^2} &\leq C(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|w_1\|_{L^2}, \quad \|(1-y^2)F_{1,*}\|_{L^2} \leq C(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|(1-y^2)w_1\|_{L^2}, \\ \|F_{2,*}\|_{H^{-1}} &\leq \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} + C\nu\|\nabla w_1\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from Proposition 6.3 that

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{\frac{4}{3}}\|\varphi_2\|_{L^2} &\leq C\left(\|(1-y^2)F_{1,*}\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|F_{1,*}\|_{L^2} \right. \\ (6.31) \quad &\quad \left. + |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\max(1-|\lambda|, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}})\|F_{2,*}\|_{H^{-1}} + |\nu k|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\partial_y \varphi_2\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\right), \\ &\leq C\left((\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|(1-y^2)w_1\|_{L^2} + |\nu k|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\partial_y \varphi_2\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \max(1-|\lambda|, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}})(|\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} + \nu^{\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}(\|\nabla w_1\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|w_1\|_{L^2}))\right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{\frac{4}{3}}\|\nabla \varphi_2\|_{L^2} &\leq C\left(\|F_{1,*}\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|F_{2,*}\|_{H^{-1}} + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{\frac{7}{6}}\|\partial_y \varphi_2\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\right) \\ (6.32) \quad &\leq C\left(\nu^{\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}(\|\nabla w_1\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|w_1\|_{L^2}) + |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{\frac{7}{6}}\|\partial_y \varphi_2\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(6.33) \quad \|w_2\|_{L^2} \leq C\left(\|(k(y-\lambda)/\nu)^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}}\|\partial_y \varphi_2\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}}\|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi_2\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + (\nu k^2)^{-\frac{5}{12}} \|F_{1,*}\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{3}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F_{2,*}\|_{H^{-1}} \Big), \\
& \leq C \Big(\|(|k(y-\lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}}) \partial_y \varphi_2\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}} \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi_2\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\
& \quad + \nu^{\frac{1}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\|\nabla w_1\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|w_1\|_{L^2}) + \nu^{-\frac{3}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} \Big), \\
(6.34) \quad & \|w_2\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq C \Big(\|(|k(y-\lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}}) \partial_y \varphi_2\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi_2\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\
& \quad + \nu^{-\frac{2}{3}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} \|F_{1,*}\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-1} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F_{2,*}\|_{H^{-1}} \Big) \\
& \leq C \Big(\|(|k(y-\lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}}) \partial_y \varphi_2\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi_2\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\
& \quad + |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\|\nabla w_1\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|w_1\|_{L^2}) + \nu^{-1} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} \Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Thanks to $w_1 = -ik^{-1}\chi_1 F_1$, we get by Lemma 6.2 that

$$(6.35) \quad \|\nabla w_1\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|w_1\|_{L^2} \leq C \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{-1} \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2},$$

$$(6.36) \quad \|(1-y^2)w_1\|_{L^2} \leq C |k|^{-1} \|F_1\|_{L^2} + C \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{4}{3}} \max(1-|\lambda|, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}) \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2},$$

$$(6.37) \quad \|\varphi_1\|_{L^2} \leq C k^{-2} (\|F_1\|_{L^2} + \max(1-|\lambda|, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}) \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2}),$$

$$(6.38) \quad \|\nabla \varphi_1\|_{L^2} \leq C k^{-2} \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2},$$

$$(6.39) \quad \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi_1\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq C \nu^{-\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{-\frac{7}{6}} \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2},$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.40) \quad & (1 + |k(\lambda-j)|) \|\partial_y \varphi_1\|_{L^2(\Gamma_j)} \leq C |k|^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2} \\
& + C |k|^{-1} \ln(2 + (|k(\lambda-j)| + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}})^{-1}) \|F_1\|_{L^2_{x,z} L^\infty_y}, \quad j \in \{\pm 1\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the inequality $\|F_1\|_{L^2_{x,z} L^\infty_y} \leq C \|F_1\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}$, we find from (6.40) that

$$(6.41) \quad \|\partial_y \varphi_1\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq C |k|^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2} + C(\gamma) |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\nu k^2)^{-\gamma} \|F_1\|_{L^2}, \quad \forall \gamma > 0$$

Using (6.40) and the fact that for any $0 < \gamma_1 \leq 1$,

$$\ln(2 + (|k(\lambda-j)| + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}})^{-1}) \leq C + C \nu^{-\gamma_1} (|k(\lambda-j)/\nu| + |k/\nu|^{\frac{2}{3}})^{-\gamma_1},$$

we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
& (|k(\lambda-j)/\nu|^{\gamma_1} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{2}{3}\gamma_1}) \|\partial_y \varphi_1\|_{L^2(\Gamma_j)} \\
& \leq C \nu^{-1} |k|^{-\frac{3}{2}} \frac{|k(\lambda-j)/\nu|^{\gamma_1} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{2}{3}\gamma_1}}{|k(\lambda-j)/\nu| + \nu^{-1}} \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2} \\
& \quad + C \nu^{-1} |k|^{-1} \frac{|k(\lambda-j)/\nu|^{\gamma_1} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{2}{3}\gamma_1}}{|k(\lambda-j)/\nu| + \nu^{-1}} (1 + \nu^{-\gamma_1} (|k(\lambda-j)/\nu| + |k/\nu|^{\frac{2}{3}})^{-\gamma_1}) \|F_1\|_{L^2_{x,z} L^\infty_y} \\
& \leq C \nu^{-\gamma_1} |k|^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2} + C \nu^{-\gamma_1} |k|^{-1} \|F_1\|_{L^2_{x,z} L^\infty_y} \leq C \nu^{-\gamma_1} |k|^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that for $0 < \gamma_1 \leq 1$,

$$(6.42) \quad \|(|k(\lambda-y)/\nu|^{\gamma_1} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{2}{3}\gamma_1}) \partial_y \varphi_1\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq C \nu^{-\gamma_1} |k|^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2}.$$

We infer from (6.31), (6.35) and (6.36) that

$$\nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{4}{3}} \|\varphi_2\|_{L^2} \leq C \Big((\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}} \|(1-y^2)w_1\|_{L^2} + |\nu k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y \varphi_2\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \max(1-|\lambda|, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}) \Big)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \times \left(|\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} + \nu^{\frac{2}{3}} |k|^{\frac{1}{3}} (\|\nabla w_1\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|w_1\|_{L^2}) \right), \\
& \leq C \left(|\nu k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + |\nu k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y \varphi_1\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \|F_1\|_{L^2} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \max(1 - |\lambda|, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}) (|\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{2}{3}} \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2}) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

which along with with (6.37) and (6.41) ($\gamma = 1/3$) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{4}{3}} \|\varphi\|_{L^2} & \leq \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{4}{3}} \|\varphi_1\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{4}{3}} \|\varphi_2\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq C \left(|\nu k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + |\nu k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y \varphi_1\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{2}{3}} (1 + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{6}}) \|F_1\|_{L^2} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \max(1 - |\lambda|, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}) (|\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{2}{3}} \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2}) \right) \\
& \leq C \left(|\nu k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{-1} \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{2}{3}} \|F_1\|_{L^2} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \max(1 - |\lambda|, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}) (|\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{2}{3}} \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2}) \right) \\
& \leq C \left(|\nu k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{2}{3}} \|F_1\|_{L^2} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \max(1 - |\lambda|, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}) (|\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{2}{3}} \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2}) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the first inequality of the proposition.

It follows from (6.32), (6.35), (6.38) and (6.41) with $\gamma = 1/6$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{4}{3}} \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2} & \leq \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{4}{3}} \|\nabla \varphi_2\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{4}{3}} \|\nabla \varphi_1\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq C \left(\nu^{\frac{2}{3}} |k|^{\frac{1}{3}} (\|\nabla w_1\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|w_1\|_{L^2}) + |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{\frac{7}{6}} \|\partial_y \varphi_2\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right) \\
& \quad + C \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{2}{3}} \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq C \left(\nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{2}{3}} \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{\frac{7}{6}} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{\frac{7}{6}} \|\partial_y \varphi_1\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right) \\
& \leq C \left(\nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{2}{3}} (1 + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{6}}) \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \|F_1\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{\frac{7}{6}} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right) \\
& \leq C \left(\nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{2}{3}} \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{\frac{7}{6}} \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

which gives the second inequality of the proposition.

By (6.33) and (6.35), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|w\|_{L^2} & \leq \|w_2\|_{L^2} + \|w_1\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq C \left((|(k(y - \lambda)/\nu)^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}}) \|\partial_y \varphi_2\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}} \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi_2\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \nu^{\frac{1}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\|\nabla w_1\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|w_1\|_{L^2}) + \nu^{-\frac{3}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{4}{3}} \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2} \right) \\
& \leq C \left((|(k(y - \lambda)/\nu)^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}}) \|\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}} \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + (|(k(y - \lambda)/\nu)^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}}) \|\partial_y \varphi_1\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}} \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi_1\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \nu^{-\frac{1}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{3}{2}} (1 + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{12}}) \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{3}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

while by (6.39),

$$|\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}} \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi_1\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq C \nu^{-\frac{1}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{3}{2}} (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{12}} \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2},$$

and by (6.42) with $\gamma_1 = 1/4$,

$$\|(|k(y - \lambda)/\nu|^{1/4} + |k/\nu|^{1/6})\partial_y \varphi_1\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq C\nu^{-1/4}|k|^{-3/2}\|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2}.$$

Thus, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \|w\|_{L^2} \leq & C \left(\|(|k(y - \lambda)/\nu|^{1/4} + |k/\nu|^{1/6})\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + |\nu/k|^{1/6}\|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right. \\ & \left. + \nu^{-3/4}|k|^{-1/2}\|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} + \nu^{-1/4}|k|^{-3/2}\|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which gives the third inequality of the proposition.

Using the interpolation $\|w_1\|_{L^2_{x,z}L^\infty_y} \leq C\|w_1\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\|\partial_y w_1\|_{L^2}^{1/2}$ and (6.35), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|w\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} & \leq \|w_1\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|w_2\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq \|w_1\|_{L^2_{x,z}L^\infty_y} + \|w_2\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\ & \leq C|\nu/k|^{1/6}(\|\partial_y w_1\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{-1/3}\|w_1\|_{L^2}) + \|w_2\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\ & \leq C\nu^{-1/3}|k|^{-7/6}\|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2} + \|w_2\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Then by (6.34), (6.35), (6.39) and (6.42) with $\gamma_1 = 1/2$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|w\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} & \leq C\nu^{-1/3}|k|^{-7/6}\|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2} + \|w_2\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\ & \leq C\nu^{-1/3}|k|^{-7/6}\|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2} + C \left(\|(|k(y - \lambda)/\nu|^{1/2} + |k/\nu|^{1/3})\partial_y \varphi_2\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi_2\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + |k|^{-1/2}(\|\nabla w_1\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{-1/3}\|w_1\|_{L^2}) + \nu^{-1}|k|^{-1/2}\|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} \right) \\ & \leq C\nu^{-1/2}|k|^{-3/2}(1 + (\nu k^2)^{1/6})\|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2} + C \left(\|(|k(y - \lambda)/\nu|^{1/2} + |k/\nu|^{1/3})\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \nu^{-1}|k|^{-1/2}\|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} \right) \\ & \quad + C \left(\|(|k(y - \lambda)/\nu|^{1/2} + |k/\nu|^{1/3})\partial_y \varphi_1\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi_1\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right) \\ & \leq C\nu^{-1/2}|k|^{-3/2}(1 + (\nu k^2)^{1/6})\|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2} + C \left(\|(|k(y - \lambda)/\nu|^{1/2} + |k/\nu|^{1/3})\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \nu^{-1}|k|^{-1/2}\|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} \right) \\ & \leq C\nu^{-1/2}|k|^{-3/2}\|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2} + C \left(\|(|k(y - \lambda)/\nu|^{1/2} + |k/\nu|^{1/3})\partial_y \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|\partial_y \partial_z \varphi\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \nu^{-1}|k|^{-1/2}\|F_2\|_{H^{-1}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the last inequality of the proposition. $\square$

7. RESOLVENT ESTIMATES WHEN $V = y$

In this section, we consider the Orr-Sommerfeld equation when $V = y$:

$$(7.1) \quad \begin{cases} -\nu(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)w + ik(y - \lambda)w - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}w = F, \\ w|_{y=\pm 1} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Here (7.1) is slightly different from one considered in [19] with k^2 instead of η^2 . We will use the results from last section to establish the resolvent estimates of (7.1).

In this section, we take $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $a \in [0, \epsilon_1]$. Let $u = (\partial_y \varphi, -i\eta\varphi)$ with φ solving $(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)\varphi = w$, $\varphi|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$.

Notice that if $V = y$ and $(w(y), F(y))$ solves (7.1), then $(w(y)e^{i(kx+\ell z)}, F(y)e^{i(kx+\ell z)})$ solves (4.1). Thus, it follows from Proposition 4.1 that

Proposition 7.1. *Let $w \in H^2(I)$ be a solution of (7.1) with $F \in L^2(I)$. Then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{\frac{5}{6}}\|w\|_{L^1} + \nu^{\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|w'\|_{L^2} + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|w\|_{L^2} + |k|\|(y-\lambda)w\|_{L^2} &\leq C\|F\|_{L^2}, \\ \nu\|w'\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|w\|_{L^2} &\leq C\|F\|_{H^{-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 7.2. *Let $w \in H^2(I)$ be a solution of (7.1) with $F = ikf_1 + \partial_y f_2 + i\ell f_3 \in L^2(I)$. If $\nu\eta^3 \leq |k|$, then it holds that*

$$\nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{\frac{5}{6}}|\eta|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|u\|_{L^2} \leq C\|F\|_{L^2}, \quad (\nu|k\eta|)^{\frac{1}{2}}\|u\|_{L^2} \leq C\|(f_1, f_2, f_3)\|_{L^2}.$$

Proof. It follows from Lemma 16.4 and Proposition 7.1 that

$$\nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{\frac{5}{6}}|\eta|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|u\|_{L^2} \leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{\frac{5}{6}}\|w\|_{L^1} \leq C\|F\|_{L^2},$$

which gives the first inequality.

Thanks to $\nu|k|^2 \leq \nu\eta^3/|k| \leq 1$, $\eta \leq \delta^{-1}$. By Proposition 7.4 and Lemma 16.4, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{L^2}^2 &= \langle -w, \varphi \rangle \leq C|k|^{-1}\|(f_1, f_2, f_3)\|_{L^2}(\delta^{-\frac{3}{2}}\|\varphi\|_{L^\infty} + \delta^{-1}\|(\partial_y \varphi, \eta \varphi)\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C|k|^{-1}\|(f_1, f_2, f_3)\|_{L^2}(\delta^{-\frac{3}{2}}|\eta|^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \delta^{-1})\|u\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C|k|^{-1}\|(f_1, f_2, f_3)\|_{L^2}\delta^{-\frac{3}{2}}|\eta|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|u\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$(\nu|k\eta|)^{\frac{1}{2}}\|u\|_{L^2} = |k|\delta^{\frac{3}{2}}|\eta|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|u\|_{L^2} \leq C\|(f_1, f_2, f_3)\|_{L^2}.$$

□

Proposition 7.3. *Let $w \in H^2(I)$ be a solution of (7.1) with $F = F_1 + \partial_y F_2$. If $\nu\eta^3 \leq |k|$, then it holds that*

$$|k\eta|\|u\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}}\eta^{\frac{1}{2}}|k|^{\frac{5}{6}}\|w\|_{L^2} + (\nu|k\eta|)^{\frac{1}{2}}\|w'\|_{L^2} \leq C(\nu^{-\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{\frac{1}{6}}\eta^{\frac{1}{2}}\|F_1\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}|k\eta|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|F_2\|_{L^2}).$$

Proof. We decompose $w = w_1 + w_2$, where w_1, w_2 solves

$$\begin{cases} -\nu(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)w_1 + ik(y-\lambda)w_1 - a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}w_1 = F_1, \\ -\nu(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)w_2 + ik(y-\lambda)w_2 - a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}w_2 = \partial_y F_2, \\ w_1|_{y=\pm 1} = w_2|_{y=\pm 1} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Then the proposition follows from Proposition 7.1 and Proposition 7.2. □

Applying Proposition 4.4 to the case when

$$\begin{aligned} V &= y, \quad w = w_0(y)e^{i(kx+\ell z)}, \quad f = f_0(y)e^{i(kx+\ell z)}, \\ F &= F_0(y)e^{i(kx+\ell z)} = \operatorname{div}[(f_1(y), f_2(y), f_3(y))e^{i(kx+\ell z)}], \end{aligned}$$

we can deduce that

Proposition 7.4. *Let $w \in H^2(I)$ be a solution of (7.1) with $F = ikf_1 + \partial_y f_2 + i\ell f_3 \in L^2(I)$ and $\nu k^2 \leq 1$. Then it holds that for $f \in H_0^1(I)$,*

$$|\langle w, f \rangle| \leq C|k|^{-1}\|(f_1, f_2, f_3)\|_{L^2} \left((\delta^{-\frac{3}{2}} + \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}\eta)\|f\|_{L^\infty} + \delta^{-1}\|(\partial_y f, \eta f)\|_{L^2} \right).$$

Applying Proposition 4.6 to the case when $V = y, F = \partial_y f_2(y)e^{ikx+ilz}$, $w = w_0(y)e^{ikx+ilz}$, and applying Proposition 4.5 to the case when $V = y, F = f_1(y)e^{ikx+ilz}$, $w = w_0(y)e^{ikx+ilz}$, we can deduce that

Proposition 7.5. *Let $w \in H^2(I)$ be a solution of (7.1) and $\nu k^2 \leq 1$. If $F = \partial_y f_2 \in L^2(I)$, then we have*

$$(|k(j - \lambda)| + 1)^{\frac{3}{4}} |\partial_y \varphi(j)| \leq C |\nu k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|f_2\|_{L^2}, \quad j = \pm 1.$$

If $F = f_1 \in L^2(I)$, then we have

$$(|k(j - \lambda)| + 1) |\partial_y \varphi(j)| \leq C \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} \|f_1\|_{L^2}, \quad j = \pm 1.$$

In particular, if $F = f_1 + \partial_y f_2$, then we have

$$(|k(j - \lambda)| + 1)^{\frac{3}{4}} |\partial_y \varphi(j)| \leq C |\nu k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|f_2\|_{L^2} + C \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} \|f_1\|_{L^2}.$$

Proposition 7.6. *Let $w \in H^2(I)$ be a solution of (7.1) with $F \in H^1(I)$ and $F(\pm 1) = 0$. If $\nu \eta^3 \leq |k|$, then it holds that*

$$|k\eta| \|u\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{\frac{5}{6}} \|w\|_{L^2} + (\nu |k\eta|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|w'\|_{L^2} \leq C (\|F'\|_{L^2} + |\eta| \|F\|_{L^2}).$$

Proof. We write $w = w_1 + w_2$, where $w_1 = \chi_1 F / (ik)$ with $\chi_1(y) = (y - \lambda - i\delta)^{-1}$. Let $\varphi_j = (\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)^{-1} w_j$, $u_j = (\partial_y \varphi_j, -i\eta \varphi_j)$, $j = 1, 2$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $k > 0$. It is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\chi_1\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \|\chi_1\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \delta^{-1}, \quad \|\chi_1'\|_{L^2} \lesssim \delta^{-\frac{3}{2}}, \\ ik(y - \lambda)w_1 + (\nu k^2)^{1/3} w_1 &= F, \\ -\nu(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)w_2 + ik(y - \lambda)w_2 - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3} w_2 \\ &= \nu \partial_y^2 w_1 + ((a + 1)(\nu k^2)^{1/3} - \nu \eta^2)w_1, \\ w_1(\pm 1) &= 0, \quad w_2(\pm 1) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then it follows from Proposition 7.3 that

$$\begin{aligned} &|k\eta| \|u_2\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{\frac{5}{6}} \|w_2\|_{L^2} + (\nu |k\eta|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|w_2'\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \left(\nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{1}{6}} \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} ((a + 1)(\nu k^2)^{1/3} - \nu \eta^2) w_1 \|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} |k\eta|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nu \partial_y w_1\|_{L^2} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(\nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{1}{6}} \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} (\nu k^2)^{1/3} \|w_1\|_{L^2} + (\nu |k\eta|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|w_1'\|_{L^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

As $\nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{1}{6}} \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} (\nu k^2)^{1/3} = \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{\frac{5}{6}}$ and $w = w_1 + w_2$, $u = u_1 + u_2$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} &|k\eta| \|u\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{\frac{5}{6}} \|w\|_{L^2} + (\nu |k\eta|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|w'\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \left(|k\eta| \|u_1\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{\frac{5}{6}} \|w_1\|_{L^2} + (\nu |k\eta|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|w_1'\|_{L^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Let $G = \|F'\|_{L^2} + \eta \|F\|_{L^2}$. Using the fact that $\|F\|_{L^\infty} \leq C |\eta|^{-\frac{1}{2}} G$ by Lemma 16.4, we get

$$\|w_1\|_{L^2} = \|\chi_1 F / (ik)\|_{L^2} \leq \|\chi_1\|_{L^2} \|F\|_{L^\infty} / |k| \leq C \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\eta|^{-\frac{1}{2}} G / |k| = CG / (\nu^{\frac{1}{6}} \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{\frac{5}{6}}),$$

and by $\delta \leq \eta^{-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_1'\|_{L^2} &= \|(\chi_1 F)' / (ik)\|_{L^2} \leq (\|\chi_1'\|_{L^2} \|F\|_{L^\infty} + \|\chi_1\|_{L^\infty} \|F'\|_{L^2}) / |k| \\ &\leq C (\delta^{-\frac{3}{2}} |\eta|^{-\frac{1}{2}} G + \delta^{-1} G) / |k| \leq C \delta^{-\frac{3}{2}} |\eta|^{-\frac{1}{2}} G / |k| = CG / (\nu |k\eta|)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to the definition of φ_1 , w_1 , we have

$$(y - \lambda - i\delta)(\varphi_1'' - \eta^2 \varphi_1) = (y - \lambda - i\delta)w_1 = F_1/(ik), \quad \varphi_1(\pm 1) = 0.$$

Then it follows from Proposition 16.1 that

$$\|u_1\|_{L^2} \leq \|\partial_y \varphi_1\|_{L^2} + \eta \|\varphi_1\|_{L^2} \leq C\eta^{-1}(\|\partial_y F_1/(ik)\|_{L^2} + \eta \|F_1/(ik)\|_{L^2}) = C\eta^{-1}G/|k|.$$

Summing up we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & |k\eta| \|u\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{\frac{5}{6}} \|w\|_{L^2} + (\nu|k\eta|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|w'\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq C(|k\eta| \|u_1\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{\frac{5}{6}} \|w_1\|_{L^2} + (\nu|k\eta|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|w_1'\|_{L^2}) \\ & \leq CG = C(\|F'\|_{L^2} + |\eta| \|F\|_{L^2}). \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of the proposition. $\square$

Now we consider the linear equation with non-vanishing boundary Neumann data:

$$(7.2) \quad \begin{cases} -\nu(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)w + ik(y - \lambda)w - a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}w = F, \\ (\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)\varphi = w, \quad \varphi|_{y=\pm 1} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Applying Proposition 6.3 to the case $F_1 = f_1(y)e^{ikx+i\ell z}$, $F_2 = \partial_y f_2(y)e^{ikx+i\ell z}$, $V = y$, and $w = w_0(y)e^{ikx+i\ell z}$, we deduce that

Proposition 7.7. *Let $w \in H^2(I)$ be a solution of (7.2) with $F = f_1 + \partial_y f_2$. If $\nu\eta^3 \leq |k|$, then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} \|w\|_{L^2} & \leq C \sum_{j \in \{\pm 1\}} (|k(j - \lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{4}} + |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{6}} + \eta|\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{6}}) |\partial_y \varphi(j)| \\ & \quad + C((\nu k^2)^{-\frac{5}{12}} \|f_1\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{3}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|f_2\|_{L^2}) \\ & \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{4}} (|k(1 - \lambda)| + 1)^{\frac{1}{4}} |\partial_y \varphi(1)| + (|k(1 + \lambda)| + 1)^{\frac{1}{4}} |\partial_y \varphi(-1)| \\ & \quad + C((\nu k^2)^{-\frac{5}{12}} \|f_1\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{3}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|f_2\|_{L^2}). \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 7.8. *Let $w \in H^2(I)$ be a solution of (7.2) with $F = f_1 + \partial_y f_2$. If $\nu\eta^3 \leq |k|$, then it holds that*

$$\eta^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u\|_{L^2} \leq C \left(\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|f_2\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} \|f_1\|_{L^2} + |\partial_y \varphi(1)| + |\partial_y \varphi(-1)| \right),$$

where $u = (\partial_y \varphi, -i\eta \varphi)$.

Proof. Let (w_{Na}, φ_{Na}) solve

$$\begin{cases} -\nu(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)w_{Na} + ik(y - \lambda)w_{Na} - a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}w_{Na} = F, \\ (\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)\varphi_{Na} = w_{Na}, \quad w_{Na}|_{y=\pm 1} = \varphi_{Na}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \end{cases}$$

and $c_1 = \varphi'(1) - \varphi'_{Na}(1)$, $c_2 = \varphi'(-1) - \varphi'_{Na}(-1)$. By Proposition 7.5, we have

$$|c_1| + |c_2| \lesssim \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|f_2\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} \|f_1\|_{L^2} + |\partial_y \varphi(1)| + |\partial_y \varphi(-1)|.$$

Then we have $w = w_{Na} + c_1 w_{1,\ell} + c_2 w_{2,\ell}$ and

$$u = u_{Na} + c_1 u_{1,\ell} + c_2 u_{2,\ell},$$

where $u_{Na} = (\partial_y \varphi_{Na}, -i\eta \varphi_{Na})$ and $u_{j,\ell} = (\partial_y \varphi_{j,\ell}, -i\eta \varphi_{j,\ell})$ and $(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)\varphi_{j,\ell} = w_{j,\ell}$ with $\varphi_{j,\ell}(\pm 1) = 0$, $j = 1, 2$.

Now we infer from Proposition 7.3, Lemma 16.4 and Proposition 5.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{L^2} &\leq \|u_{Na}\|_{L^2} + |c_1| \|u_{1,\ell}\|_{L^2} + |c_2| \|u_{2,\ell}\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C(|\nu k \eta|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|f_2\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} |\eta|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|f_1\|_{L^2}) + C|\eta|^{-\frac{1}{2}} (|c_1| \|w_{1,\ell}\|_{L^1} + |c_2| \|w_{2,\ell}\|_{L^1}) \\ &\leq C|\eta|^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|f_2\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} \|f_1\|_{L^2} + |\partial_y \varphi(1)| + |\partial_y \varphi(-1)|). \end{aligned}$$

The proof is completed. $\square$

8. RESOLVENT ESTIMATES FOR THE SIMPLIFIED LINEARIZED NS SYSTEM

In this section, we prove the resolvent estimates for a slightly simplified linearized NS system when $\nu k^2 \leq 1$:

$$(8.1) \quad \begin{cases} -\nu \Delta W + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)W - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}W + (\partial_y + \kappa \partial_z)(p^{L(0)} + p^{L(1)}) \\ \quad + G + \nu(\Delta \kappa)U + 2\nu \nabla \kappa \cdot \nabla U = 0, \\ -\nu \Delta U + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)U - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}U + \partial_z p^{L(0)} = 0, \\ \Delta p^{L(0)} = -2ik \partial_y V W, \quad \partial_y p^{L(0)}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \quad \Delta p^{L(1)} = 0, \\ W|_{y=\pm 1} = \partial_y W|_{y=\pm 1} = U|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\partial_x W = ikW, \quad \partial_x U = ikU, \quad \partial_x p^{L(0)} = ikp^{L(0)}, \quad \partial_x p^{L(1)} = ikp^{L(1)}.$$

In this section, we always assume $\nu k^2 \leq 1$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $a \in [0, \epsilon_1]$ and V satisfies (4.2).

Proposition 8.1. *Let $W \in H^4(\Omega)$ and $U \in H^2(\Omega)$ be a solution of (8.1). Then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} &\nu^{\frac{1}{3}} (\|\partial_x^2 U\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y)U\|_{L^2}^2) + \nu (\|\nabla \partial_x^2 U\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y)U\|_{L^2}^2) \\ &\quad + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\partial_x \nabla W\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu \|\partial_x \Delta W\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{\frac{5}{3}} \|\partial_x \Delta U\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1} \|\partial_x \nabla p^{L(1)}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C\nu^{-1} \|\nabla G\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

8.1. Resolvent estimates for a toy model. Let us first study the following toy model:

$$(8.2) \quad \begin{cases} -\nu \Delta W + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)W - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}W + (\partial_y + \kappa \partial_z)p^L = F, \\ \Delta p^{L(1)} = -2ik \partial_y V W, \quad W|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \quad \partial_x W = ikW. \end{cases}$$

We can decompose $p^L = p^{L(0)} + p^{L(1)}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta p^{L(0)} &= -2ik \partial_y V W, \quad \partial_y p^{L(0)}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \\ \Delta p^{L(1)} &= 0, \quad (\partial_y p^{L(1)} - \nu \Delta W - F)|_{y=\pm 1} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 8.2. *Let $W \in H^4(\Omega)$ be a solution of (8.2). Then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} &\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} |k| \|\nabla W\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{3}{4}} |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\Delta W\|_{L^2} + \nu |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\Delta W\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\partial_x \nabla p^{L(1)}\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \left(\|\nabla F\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} (|k(y - \lambda)| + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y W\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \nu^{\frac{11}{12}} |k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\partial_y \partial_z W\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} |k| \|W\|_{L^2} &\leq C \max(1 - |\lambda|, |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}}) \left(\|\nabla F\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} (|k(y - \lambda)| + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y W\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \nu^{\frac{11}{12}} |k|^{-\frac{2}{3}} \|\partial_y \partial_z W\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right) + C\nu^{\frac{5}{6}} |k|^{\frac{1}{6}} \|\partial_y W\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We introduce

$$\begin{aligned} h_1(y, z) &= \Delta V - 2(\partial_y + \kappa \partial_z) \partial_y V, \\ h_2(x, y, z) &= 2\nabla \kappa \cdot \nabla \partial_z p^{L(0)} + (\Delta \kappa) \partial_z p^{L(0)}, \\ h_3(x, y, z) &= 2\nabla \kappa \cdot \nabla \partial_z p^{L(1)} + (\Delta \kappa) \partial_z p^{L(1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $w = \Delta W$, which satisfies

$$(8.3) \quad \begin{cases} -\nu \Delta w + ik(V - \lambda)w - a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}w = -ikh_1W - h_2 - h_3 + \Delta F, \\ W|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \quad \partial_x W = ikW. \end{cases}$$

Thanks to $\|\kappa\|_{H^3} \leq C\varepsilon_0$, it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|h_1\|_{H^2} &\leq C\|\nabla^2 V\|_{H^2} + \|\kappa \partial_z \partial_y V\|_{H^2} \leq C\|(V - y)\|_{H^4} + C\|\kappa\|_{H^2}\|\partial_z \partial_y V\|_{H^2} \leq C\varepsilon_0, \\ \|h_2\|_{H^1} &\leq C\|\nabla \kappa\|_{H^2}\|\nabla \partial_z p^{L(0)}\|_{H^1} + C\|\Delta \kappa\|_{H^1}\|\partial_z p^{L(0)}\|_{H^2} \leq C\|\kappa\|_{H^3}\|\Delta p^{L(0)}\|_{H^1} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon_0|k|\|\partial_y V\|_{H^2}\|W\|_{H^1} \leq C\varepsilon_0|k|\|\nabla W\|_{L^2}, \\ \|h_2\|_{L^2} &\leq 2\|\nabla \kappa \cdot \nabla \partial_z p^{L(0)}\|_{L^2} + \|(\Delta \kappa) \partial_z p^{L(0)}\|_{L^2} \leq 2\|\nabla \kappa\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla \partial_z p^{L(0)}\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + C\|\Delta \kappa\|_{H^1}\|\partial_z p^{L(0)}\|_{H^1} \leq C\varepsilon\|\Delta p^{L(0)}\|_{L^2} \leq C\varepsilon_0|k|\|W\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

and for any $f \in H^1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |(\Delta \kappa) \partial_z p^{L(1)}, f| &\leq \|\partial_z p^{L(1)}\|_{L^2} \|(\Delta \kappa) f\|_{L^2} \leq \|\nabla p^{L(1)}\|_{L^2} \|\Delta \kappa\|_{H^1} \|f\|_{H^1} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon_0 \|\nabla p^{L(1)}\|_{L^2} \|f\|_{H^1}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\|(\Delta \kappa) \partial_z p^{L(1)}\|_{H^{-1}} \leq C\varepsilon_0 \|\nabla p^{L(1)}\|_{L^2}.$$

Then we have

$$(8.4) \quad \|h_2\|_{H^1} + \|\nabla(kh_1W)\|_{L^2} \leq C\varepsilon_0|k|\|\nabla W\|_{L^2} + C|k|\|h_1\|_{H^2}\|W\|_{H^1} \leq C\varepsilon_0|k|\|\nabla W\|_{L^2},$$

$$(8.5) \quad \|h_2\|_{L^2} + \|kh_1W\|_{L^2} \leq C\varepsilon_0|k|\|W\|_{L^2},$$

$$\begin{aligned} (8.6) \quad \|h_3\|_{H^{-1}} &\leq 2\|\operatorname{div}(\partial_z p^{L(1)} \nabla \kappa)\|_{H^{-1}} + \|(\Delta \kappa) \partial_z p^{L(1)}\|_{H^{-1}} \\ &\leq C(\|\partial_z p^{L(1)} \nabla \kappa\|_{L^2} + \varepsilon_0 \|\nabla p^{L(1)}\|_{L^2}) \leq C\varepsilon_0 \|\nabla p^{L(1)}\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

We get by integration by parts that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla p^{L(1)}\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq |\langle \Delta p^{L(1)}, p^{L(1)} \rangle| + |\langle \partial_y p^{L(1)}, p^{L(1)} \rangle_{\partial\Omega}| \leq \|\partial_y p^{L(1)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \|p^{L(1)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\ &\leq \|\partial_y p^{L(1)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \|p^{L(1)}\|_{L^2_{x,z} L^\infty_y} \leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y p^{L(1)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \|\nabla p^{L(1)}\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

then by $(\partial_y p^{L(1)} - \nu \Delta W - F)|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_x \nabla p^{L(1)}\|_{L^2} &\leq C|k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y p^{L(1)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq C|k|^{\frac{1}{2}} (\nu \|\Delta W\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|F\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}) \\ &\leq C\nu|k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\Delta W\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + C\|\nabla F\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Now it follows from Proposition 6.4, (8.4) and (8.6) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}|k|\|\nabla W\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{3}{4}}|k|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\Delta W\|_{L^2} + \nu|k|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\Delta W\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\partial_x \nabla p^{L(1)}\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \nu^{\frac{1}{2}}|k|\|\nabla W\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{3}{4}}|k|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\Delta W\|_{L^2} + C\nu|k|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\Delta W\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + C\|\nabla F\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}|k|^{-1}(\|\nabla(kh_1W)\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla h_2\|_{L^2}) + C(\|\Delta F\|_{H^{-1}} + \|h_3\|_{H^{-1}}) + C\nu^{\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{\frac{5}{6}}\|\partial_y W\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + C\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}|k|^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\left(|k(y-\lambda)|^{\frac{1}{4}} + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{12}}\right)\partial_y W\right)_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + C\nu^{\frac{11}{12}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\partial_y\partial_z W\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\
& + C\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}|k|^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\left(|k(y-\lambda)|^{\frac{1}{2}} + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{6}}\right)\partial_y W\right)_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + C\nu|k|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\partial_y\partial_z W\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + C\|\nabla F\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq C\varepsilon_0\left(\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla W\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla p^{L(1)}\|_{L^2}\right) + C\|\nabla F\|_{L^2} + C\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}|k|^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\left(|k(y-\lambda)| + 1\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\partial_y W\right)_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\
& + C\nu^{\frac{11}{12}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\partial_y\partial_z W\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking ε_0 small enough so that $C\varepsilon_0 \leq 1/2$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
(8.7) \quad & \nu^{\frac{1}{2}}|k|\|\nabla W\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{3}{4}}|k|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\Delta W\|_{L^2} + \nu|k|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\Delta W\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\partial_x \nabla p^{L(1)}\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq C\left(\|\nabla F\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}}|k|^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\left(|k(y-\lambda)| + 1\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\partial_y W\right)_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \nu^{\frac{11}{12}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\partial_y\partial_z W\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 6.4, (8.4), (8.5) and (8.7), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}|k|\|W\|_{L^2} & \leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}|k|^{-1}\max(1-|\lambda|, |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}})\left(\|\nabla(kh_1W)\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla h_2\|_{L^2}\right) + C\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}|k|^{-1} \times \\
& \quad \left(\|kh_1W\|_{L^2} + \|h_2\|_{L^2}\right) + C\max(1-|\lambda|, |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}})\left(\|\Delta F\|_{H^{-1}} + \|h_3\|_{H^{-1}}\right) \\
& \quad + C\nu^{\frac{5}{6}}|k|^{\frac{1}{6}}\|\partial_y W\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\
& \leq C\max(1-|\lambda|, |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}})\left(\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla W\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla F\|_{L^2} + |k|^{-1}\|\partial_x \nabla p^{L(1)}\|_{L^2}\right) \\
& \quad + C\varepsilon_0\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}\|W\|_{L^2} + C\nu^{\frac{5}{6}}|k|^{\frac{1}{6}}\|\partial_y W\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\
& \leq C\max(1-|\lambda|, |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}})\left(\|\nabla F\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left(\left(|k(y-\lambda)| + 1\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\partial_y W\right)_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\right. \\
& \quad \left.+ \nu^{\frac{11}{12}}|k|^{-\frac{2}{3}}\|\partial_y\partial_z W\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\right) + C\varepsilon_0\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}\|W\|_{L^2} + C\nu^{\frac{5}{6}}|k|^{\frac{1}{6}}\|\partial_y W\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}.
\end{aligned}$$

which gives by taking ε_0 small enough so that $C\varepsilon_0 \leq 1/2$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}|k|\|W\|_{L^2} & \leq C\max(1-|\lambda|, |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}})\left(\|\nabla F\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left(\left(|k(y-\lambda)| + 1\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\partial_y W\right)_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\right. \\
& \quad \left.+ \nu^{\frac{11}{12}}|k|^{-\frac{2}{3}}\|\partial_y\partial_z W\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\right) + C\nu^{\frac{5}{6}}|k|^{\frac{1}{6}}\|\partial_y W\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the proposition. $\square$

8.2. Proof of Proposition 8.1 when $|\lambda| \geq 1 - \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}$. Let

$$G_3 = G_1 + \nu(\Delta\kappa)U + 2\nu\nabla\kappa \cdot \nabla U.$$

It follows from Proposition 8.2 that

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu|k|\|\Delta W\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}}|k|\|\nabla W\|_{L^2} & \leq \nu^{\frac{3}{4}}|k|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\Delta W\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}}|k|\|\nabla W\|_{L^2} \leq C\|\nabla G_3\|_{L^2}, \\
\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}|k|\|W\|_{L^2} & \leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|\nabla G_3\|_{L^2}, \\
\|\partial_x \nabla p^{L(1)}\|_{L^2} & \leq C\|\nabla G_3\|_{L^2},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used $|\lambda| \geq 1 - \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ for the second inequality.

Since $\Delta p^{L(0)} = -2ik\partial_y VW$, $\partial_y p^{L(0)}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$ and $\|\nabla V\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla^2 V\|_{L^\infty} \leq C$, we can deduce that

$$(8.8) \quad \|\nabla\partial_z p^{L(0)}\|_{L^2} \leq C\|\Delta p^{L(0)}\|_{L^2} \leq C|k|\|W\|_{L^2} \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|\nabla G_3\|_{L^2},$$

$$(8.9) \quad \|\partial_z p^{L(0)}\|_{H^2} \leq C\|\Delta\partial_z p^{L(0)}\|_{L^2} \leq C|k|\|\nabla W\|_{L^2} \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla G_3\|_{L^2}.$$

By Proposition 4.1 and (8.8), we have

$$\nu\|\Delta U\|_{L^2} \leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{-\frac{2}{3}}\|\nabla\partial_z p^{L(0)}\|_{L^2} \leq C|k|^{-1}\|\nabla G_3\|_{L^2}.$$

Thanks to $\|\kappa\|_{H^3} \leq C\varepsilon_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla G_3\|_{L^2} &\leq \|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2} + C\nu\|\Delta\kappa\|_{H^1}\|U\|_{H^2} + C\nu\|\nabla\kappa\|_{H^2}\|\nabla U\|_{H^1} \\ &\leq \|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2} + C\nu\varepsilon_0\|\Delta U\|_{L^2} \leq \|\nabla G\|_{L^2} + C\varepsilon_0|k|^{-1}\|\nabla G_3\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking ε_0 small enough so that $C\varepsilon_0 < 1/2$, we conclude that

$$\|\nabla G_3\|_{L^2} \leq 2\|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2}, \quad \nu\|\Delta U\|_{L^2} \leq C|k|^{-1}\|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2}.$$

Summing up, we obtain

$$\|\partial_x \nabla W\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu\|\partial_x \Delta W\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu\|\partial_x \Delta U\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1}\|\partial_x \nabla p^{L(1)}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C\nu^{-1}\|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2}^2.$$

By Proposition 4.3 and (8.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}(\|\partial_x^2 U\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)U\|_{L^2}^2) + \nu(\|\nabla\partial_x^2 U\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)U\|_{L^2}^2) \\ &\leq C\|\partial_z p^{L(0)}\|_{H^2}^2 \leq C\nu^{-1}\|\nabla G_3\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C\nu^{-1}\|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

This finished the proof of Proposition 8.1 when $|\lambda| \geq 1 - \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}$.

Remark 8.1. We assume $|\lambda| \leq 1 - \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ in section 8.3-8.6. Then (8.9) still holds true since $\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}|k|\|\nabla W\|_{L^2} \leq C\|\nabla G_3\|_{L^2}$ by Proposition 8.2. Thus, we get by Proposition 4.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} &\nu^{\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\nabla U\|_{L^2} + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|U\|_{L^2} + \nu\|\Delta U\|_{L^2} \leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{-\frac{2}{3}}\|\nabla\partial_z p^{L(0)}\|_{L^2} \\ (8.10) \quad &\leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{-\frac{2}{3}}\|\Delta p^{L(0)}\|_{L^2} \leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|W\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

8.3. Singular part of W . To deal with main trouble term $-2\nu\nabla\kappa \cdot \nabla U$ appeared in (8.1), we introduce the singular part of W . Let

$$(8.11) \quad \rho_1 = \frac{\partial_y \kappa + \kappa \partial_z \kappa}{\partial_y V(1 + \kappa^2)}, \quad \rho_2 = \frac{\partial_z \kappa - \kappa \partial_y \kappa}{1 + \kappa^2}.$$

We introduce W_s and $\widetilde{W}_s$ defined by

$$(8.12) \quad \begin{cases} -\nu\Delta W_s + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)W_s - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}W_s + \rho_1 \nabla V \cdot \nabla U = 0, \\ -\nu\Delta \widetilde{W}_s + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)\widetilde{W}_s - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}\widetilde{W}_s + \nabla V \cdot \nabla U = 0, \\ W_s|_{y=\pm 1} = \widetilde{W}_s|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \quad \partial_x W_s = ikW_s, \quad \partial_x \widetilde{W}_s = ik\widetilde{W}_s. \end{cases}$$

By Proposition 4.1, we have

$$(8.13) \quad \begin{aligned} &\nu^{\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\nabla W_s\|_{L^2} + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|W_s\|_{L^2} + \nu\|\Delta W_s\|_{L^2} + |k|\|(V - \lambda)W_s\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\|\rho_1 \nabla V \cdot \nabla U\|_{L^2} \leq C\|\rho_1\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla V\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla U\|_{L^2} \leq C\varepsilon_0\|\nabla U\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(8.14) \quad \begin{aligned} &\nu^{\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\nabla \widetilde{W}_s\|_{L^2} + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\widetilde{W}_s\|_{L^2} + \nu\|\Delta \widetilde{W}_s\|_{L^2} + |k|\|(V - \lambda)\widetilde{W}_s\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\|\nabla V \cdot \nabla U\|_{L^2} \leq C\|\nabla V\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla U\|_{L^2} \leq C\|\nabla U\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to $\partial_x V = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)(\nabla V \cdot \nabla U) = (\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)(\nabla V) \cdot (\nabla\partial_x U) + \nabla V \cdot \partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)\nabla U, \\ &\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)\nabla U = \nabla\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)U + (\nabla\kappa)\partial_x\partial_y U, \\ &\partial_x^2(\nabla V \cdot \nabla U) = \nabla V \cdot (\nabla\partial_x^2 U), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(8.15) \quad \|\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)\nabla U\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|\nabla\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)U\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla\partial_x^2 U\|_{L^2}).$$

Then we infer from Proposition 4.3 that

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}} \|(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y) \widetilde{W}_s\|_{L^2} = |k|^{-1} (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\partial_x (\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y) \widetilde{W}_s\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq C |k|^{-1} (\|\partial_x^2 (\nabla V \cdot \nabla U)\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x (\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y) (\nabla V \cdot \nabla U)\|_{L^2}) \\
& \leq C |k|^{-1} (\|\nabla V \cdot \nabla \partial_x^2 U\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla V \cdot [\nabla \partial_x (\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y) U]\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x \partial_y U \nabla \kappa \cdot \nabla V\|_{L^2} \\
& \quad + \|(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y) (\nabla V) \cdot (\nabla \partial_x U)\|_{L^2}) \\
& \leq C |k|^{-1} \|\nabla V\|_{L^\infty} (\|\nabla \partial_x^2 U\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \partial_x (\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y) U\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \kappa\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla \partial_x U\|_{L^2}) \\
& \quad + C |k|^{-1} \|(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y) (\nabla V)\|_{L^\infty} \|(\nabla \partial_x U)\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq C |k|^{-1} (\|\nabla \partial_x^2 U\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \partial_x (\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y) U\|_{L^2}) \\
(8.16) \quad & = C (\|\nabla \partial_x U\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla (\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y) U\|_{L^2}).
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we find that

$$\begin{cases} -\nu \Delta (W_s - \rho_1 \widetilde{W}_s) + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)(W_s - \rho_1 \widetilde{W}_s) - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3} (W_s - \rho_1 \widetilde{W}_s) \\ \quad = -\nu (\Delta \rho_1) \widetilde{W}_s + 2\nu \operatorname{div}(\widetilde{W}_s \nabla \rho_1), \\ (W_s - \rho_1 \widetilde{W}_s)|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \quad \partial_x (W_s - \rho_1 \widetilde{W}_s) = ik(W_s - \rho_1 \widetilde{W}_s). \end{cases}$$

Let h_1 solve $\Delta h_1 = \nu (\Delta \rho_1) \widetilde{W}_s$, $h_1|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$. By Proposition 4.1 and Lemma 11.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\nabla (W_s - \rho_1 \widetilde{W}_s)\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \| (W_s - \rho_1 \widetilde{W}_s) \|_{L^2} \\
& \leq C (\nu^{-1} \|\nabla h_1\|_{L^2} + \|\widetilde{W}_s \nabla \rho_1\|_{L^2}) \leq C \|\rho_1\|_{H^2} (\|\widetilde{W}_s\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y) \widetilde{W}_s\|_{L^2}) \\
& \leq C \varepsilon_0 (\|\widetilde{W}_s\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y) \widetilde{W}_s\|_{L^2}),
\end{aligned}$$

which along with (8.16) and (8.14) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
(8.17) \quad & \|\nabla (W_s - \rho_1 \widetilde{W}_s)\|_{L^2} + |\nu/k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \| (W_s - \rho_1 \widetilde{W}_s) \|_{L^2} \\
& \leq C \varepsilon_0 (\nu k^2)^{-\frac{1}{3}} (\|\nabla \partial_x U\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla (\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y) U\|_{L^2}).
\end{aligned}$$

8.4. Boundary corrector of U .

Lemma 8.1. *If $\nu k^2 \leq 1$, $|\lambda| \leq 1 - |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}}$, then there exists U_b so that*

$$\begin{cases} -\nu \Delta U_b + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda) U_b - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3} U_b = f_b, \\ -\nu \Delta^2 U_b + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda) \Delta U_b - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3} \Delta U_b = F_b, \\ (ik(V(y, z) - \lambda) U_b - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3} U_b + \partial_z p^{L(0)})|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \\ \Delta(U - U_b)|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \\ U_b = 0 \quad \text{for } |y| \leq (3 + |\lambda|)/4, \end{cases}$$

where $f_b|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$ and

$$(8.18) \quad \|f_b\|_{L^2} + \|(1 - |y|) \nabla f_b\|_{L^2} + |k| \|(1 - |y|) U_b\|_{L^2} \leq C \nu^{\frac{3}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{4}} (1 - |\lambda|)^{-\frac{7}{4}} \|W\|_{L^2}.$$

$$(8.19) \quad \|F_b\|_{L^2} \leq C \nu^{-\frac{1}{4}} |k|^{\frac{3}{4}} (1 - |\lambda|)^{-\frac{3}{4}} \|W\|_{L^2},$$

$$(8.20) \quad \|\nabla G_b\|_{L^2} \leq C \nu^{\frac{1}{4}} |k|^{\frac{1}{4}} (1 - |\lambda|)^{-\frac{5}{4}} \|W\|_{L^2},$$

with G_b solving $\Delta G_b = F_b$, $G_b|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\kappa U_b\|_{H^1} &\leq C\varepsilon_0\nu^{\frac{1}{4}}|k|^{-\frac{3}{4}}(1-|\lambda|)^{-\frac{5}{4}}\|W\|_{L^2}, \\ \|\kappa U_b\|_{H^2} &\leq C\varepsilon_0\nu^{-\frac{1}{4}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{4}}(1-|\lambda|)^{-\frac{3}{4}}\|W\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We introduce

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_{-1}(k, y, \ell) &= \exp\left(- (1+y)\sqrt{\eta^2 - a|k/\nu|^{\frac{2}{3}} - ik(1+\lambda)/\nu}\right), \\ \phi_1(k, y, \ell) &= \exp\left(- (1-y)\sqrt{\eta^2 - a|k/\nu|^{\frac{2}{3}} + ik(1-\lambda)/\nu}\right),\end{aligned}$$

here $\eta = \sqrt{k^2 + \ell^2}$ and $\sqrt{z}$ be the branch of the square root defined on the complement of the non-positive real numbers. Then for $j \in \{\pm 1\}$, ϕ_j satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\nu(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)\phi_j + ik(j-\lambda)\phi_j - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}\phi_j = 0, \\ \phi_j|_{y=j} = 1. \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, due to $2a|k/\nu|^{\frac{2}{3}} \leq |k(1 \pm \lambda)/\nu|$, we deduce from Lemma 16.12 that

$$\begin{aligned}|\phi_{-1}(k, y, \ell)| &\leq \exp\left(-c(1+y)(\eta^2 + |k(1+\lambda)/\nu|)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \leq C \exp\left(-c(1-|y|)|k(1+\lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}}\right), \\ |\phi_1(k, y, \ell)| &\leq \exp\left(-c(1-y)(\eta^2 + |k(1-\lambda)/\nu|)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \leq C \exp\left(-c(1-|y|)|k(1-\lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}}\right), \\ |(k, \partial_y, \ell)^m \phi_j(k, y, \ell)| &\leq C(\eta^2 + |k(1-\lambda)/\nu|)^{\frac{m}{2}} \exp\left(-c|j-y|(\eta^2 + |k(j-\lambda)/\nu|)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right),\end{aligned}$$

and for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\alpha \geq 0$, $j \in \{\pm 1\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}(8.21) \quad &\|(1-|y|)^\alpha (k, \partial_y, \ell)^m \phi_j(k, y, \ell)\|_{L_y^2} \\ &\leq C(\eta^2 + |k(j-\lambda)/\nu|)^{\frac{m}{2}} \|j-y\|^\alpha \exp\left(-c|j-y|(\eta^2 + |k(j-\lambda)/\nu|)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \|L^2(I) \\ &\leq C(\eta^2 + |k(j-\lambda)/\nu|)^{\frac{m}{2} - \frac{\alpha}{2} - \frac{1}{4}}.\end{aligned}$$

We denote

$$w^{(j)}(x, z) = \frac{\partial_z p^{L(0)}(x, j, z)}{ik(j-\lambda) - a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}}, \quad \hat{w}^{(j)}(k, \ell) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} w^{(j)}(x, z) e^{-ikx - i\ell z} dx dz,$$

and let $w_{1,j}$ be defined by

$$w_{1,j}(x, y, z) = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \phi_j(k, y, \ell) \hat{w}^{(j)}(k, \ell) e^{ikx + i\ell z}.$$

Then we have

$$(8.22) \quad \begin{cases} -\nu \Delta w_{1,j} + ik(j-\lambda)w_{1,j} - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}w_{1,j} = 0, \\ (ik(V-\lambda)w_{1,j} - a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}w_{1,j} - \partial_z p^{L(0)})|_{y=j} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Using the fact that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\partial_z p^{L(0)}\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma_j)} &\leq \|p^{L(0)}\|_{H^{3/2}(\Gamma_j)} \leq C\|p^{L(0)}\|_{H^2} \\ &\leq C\|\Delta p^{L(0)}\|_{L^2} \leq C|k|\|\partial_y V\|_{L^\infty}\|W\|_{L^2} \leq C|k|\|W\|_{L^2},\end{aligned}$$

we deduce that

$$(8.23) \quad \|w^{(j)}\|_{H^{1/2}} \leq |k|^{-1}(1-|\lambda|)^{-1}\|\partial_z p^{L(0)}\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma_j)} \leq C(1-|\lambda|)^{-1}\|W\|_{L^2},$$

$$(8.24) \quad \|w^{(j)}\|_{L^2} \leq |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|w^{(j)}\|_{H^{1/2}} \leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}(1-|\lambda|)^{-1}\|W\|_{L^2}.$$

Thus, by Plancherel's theorem, (8.21) and (8.24), we deduce that for $\alpha \geq m$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(1 - |y|)^\alpha \nabla^m w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} &= C \left(\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \|(1 - |y|)^\alpha (k, \partial_y, \ell)^m \phi_j(k, y, \ell)\|_{L_y^2}^2 |\hat{w}^{(j)}(k, \ell)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C \left(\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} (\eta^2 + |k(1 - \lambda)/\nu|)^{m-\alpha-\frac{1}{2}} |\hat{w}^{(j)}(k, \ell)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C |k(1 - \lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{m-\alpha}{2}-\frac{1}{4}} \left(\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} |\hat{w}^{(j)}(k, \ell)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C |k(1 - \lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{m-\alpha}{2}-\frac{1}{4}} \|w^{(j)}\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq C |k(1 - \lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{m-\alpha}{2}-\frac{1}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} (1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} \|W\|_{L^2} \\
(8.25) \quad &= C \nu^{\frac{\alpha-m}{2}+\frac{1}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{\alpha-m}{2}-\frac{3}{4}} (1 - |\lambda|)^{-\frac{\alpha-m}{2}-\frac{5}{4}} \|W\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

For $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, we get by (8.21) with $\alpha = m - 1$, (8.23) and (8.24) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(1 - |y|)^{m-1} \nabla^m w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} &= C \left(\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \|(1 - |y|)^{m-1} (k, \partial_y, \ell)^m \phi_j(k, y, \ell)\|_{L_y^2}^2 |\hat{w}^{(j)}(k, \ell)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C \left(\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} (\eta^2 + |k(1 - \lambda)/\nu|)^{\frac{1}{2}} |\hat{w}^{(j)}(k, \ell)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C \|w^{(j)}\|_{H^{1/2}} + C |k(1 - \lambda)/\nu|^{\frac{1}{4}} \|w^{(j)}\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq C (1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} \|W\|_{L^2} + C \nu^{-\frac{1}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{4}} (1 - |\lambda|)^{-\frac{3}{4}} \|W\|_{L^2} \\
(8.26) \quad &\leq C \nu^{-\frac{1}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{4}} (1 - |\lambda|)^{-\frac{3}{4}} \|W\|_{L^2},
\end{aligned}$$

Here we used the fact that $(1 - |\lambda|)/|\nu k| \geq |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}}/|\nu k| = (\nu k^2)^{-\frac{2}{3}} \geq 1$.

Take $\theta_0 \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ so that $\theta_0(y) = 1$ for $|y| \leq 1/4$ and $\theta_0(y) = 0$ for $|y| \geq 1/2$. Let

$$\theta_j(y) = \theta_j(x, y, z) = \theta_0(2|y - j|/(1 - |\lambda|)), \quad j \in \{\pm 1\}.$$

Then $\theta_j(x, y, z) = 1$ for $|y - j| \leq (1 - |\lambda|)/8$, $\theta_j(x, y, z) = 0$ for $|y - j| \geq (1 - |\lambda|)/4$, and there holds that

$$|\nabla^m \theta_j| \leq C(1 - |\lambda|)^{-m}, \quad |\nabla^{m+1} \theta_j| \leq C(1 - |\lambda|)^{-m-1} (1 - |y|)^{m_1-m-1}, \quad m, m_1 \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Now we construct

$$(8.27) \quad U_b = \sum_{j=\pm 1} \theta_j(y) w_{1,j}(x, y, z).$$

We find from (8.22) that

$$-\nu \Delta U_b + ik(V - \lambda)U_b - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3} U_b = f_b,$$

where

$$f_b = \sum_{j=\pm 1} (-\nu \Delta \theta_j w_{1,j} - 2\nu \nabla \theta_j \cdot \nabla w_{1,j} + ik(V - j)\theta_j w_{1,j}),$$

and

$$(ik(V - \lambda)U_b - a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}} U_b)|_{y=j} = (ik(V - \lambda)w_{1,j} - a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}} w_{1,j})|_{y=j} = \partial_z p^{L(0)}|_{y=j}.$$

It is obvious that $f_b|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$, which implies that

$$(-\nu\Delta U_b + \partial_z p^{L(0)})|_{y=\pm 1} = 0.$$

On the other hand, $(-\nu\Delta U + \partial_z p^{L(0)})|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$. This shows that

$$\Delta(U - U_b)|_{y=\pm 1} = 0.$$

For $|y| \leq (3 + |\lambda|)/4$, $j \in \{\pm 1\}$, we have $|y - j| \geq (1 - |\lambda|)/4$, $\theta_j(x, y, z) = 0$, and then $U_b(x, y, z) = 0$ for $|y| \leq (3 + |\lambda|)/4$.

Now we estimate U_b and f_b . By (8.25), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|U_b\|_{L^2} &\leq C \sum_{j=\pm 1} \|\theta_j w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} \leq C \nu^{\frac{1}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{3}{4}} (1 - |\lambda|)^{-\frac{5}{4}} \|W\|_{L^2}, \\ \|(1 - |y|)U_b\|_{L^2} &\leq C \sum_{j=\pm 1} \|(1 - |y|)w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} \leq C \nu^{\frac{3}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{4}} (1 - |\lambda|)^{-\frac{7}{4}} \|W\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

By (8.25) and the fact that $(1 - |y|)|\nabla \theta_j| \leq C$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(1 - |y|)\nabla U_b\|_{L^2} &\leq C \sum_{j=\pm 1} \|(1 - |y|)\nabla(\theta_j w_{1,j})\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \sum_{j=\pm 1} (\|(1 - |y|)\nabla w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} + \|w_{1,j}\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C \nu^{\frac{1}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{3}{4}} (1 - |\lambda|)^{-\frac{5}{4}} \|W\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\theta_j w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} &\leq C \|w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} \leq C \nu^{\frac{1}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{3}{4}} (1 - |\lambda|)^{-\frac{5}{4}} \|W\|_{L^2}, \\ \|(\Delta \theta_j) w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} &\leq C (1 - |\lambda|)^{-2} \|w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} \leq C \nu^{\frac{1}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{3}{4}} (1 - |\lambda|)^{-\frac{13}{4}} \|W\|_{L^2}, \\ \|\nabla \theta_j \cdot \nabla w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} &\leq C (1 - |\lambda|)^{-2} \|(1 - |y|)\nabla w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} \leq C \nu^{\frac{1}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{3}{4}} (1 - |\lambda|)^{-\frac{13}{4}} \|W\|_{L^2}, \\ \|k(V - j)\theta_j w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} &\leq C |k| \|(1 - |y|)w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} \leq C \nu^{\frac{3}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{4}} (1 - |\lambda|)^{-\frac{7}{4}} \|W\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used $|(V(y, z) - j)\theta_j(y)| \leq C(1 - |y|)$. Summing up, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_b\|_{L^2} &= \sum_{j=\pm 1} \|-\nu\Delta \theta_j w_{1,j} - 2\nu\nabla \theta_j \cdot \nabla w_{1,j} + ik(V - j)\theta_j w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \sum_{j=\pm 1} (\nu\|(\Delta \theta_j) w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} + \nu\|\nabla \theta_j \cdot \nabla w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} + \|k(V - j)\theta_j w_{1,j}\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C (\nu^{\frac{5}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{3}{4}} (1 - |\lambda|)^{-\frac{13}{4}} + \nu^{\frac{3}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{4}} (1 - |\lambda|)^{-\frac{7}{4}}) \|W\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \nu^{\frac{3}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{4}} (1 - |\lambda|)^{-\frac{7}{4}} \|W\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that $|\nabla^m \theta_j| \leq C(1 - |\lambda|)^{-2}(1 - |y|)^{2-m}$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, we get by (8.25) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(1 - |y|)\nabla(\Delta \theta_j w_{1,j} + 2\nabla \theta_j \cdot \nabla w_{1,j})\|_{L^2} &\leq C \sum_{m_2=1}^3 \|(1 - |y|)|\nabla^{m_2} \theta_j| |\nabla^{3-m_2} w_{1,j}|\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C (1 - |\lambda|)^{-2} \sum_{m_2=1}^3 \|(1 - |y|)^{3-m_2} \nabla^{3-m_2} w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} \leq C \nu^{\frac{1}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{3}{4}} (1 - |y|)^{-\frac{13}{4}} \|W\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Using $|(V - j)\theta_j| \leq C(1 - |y|)$ and $|(\nabla V)\theta_j| + |(V - j)\nabla\theta_j| \leq C$ and (8.25), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|ik(1 - |y|)\nabla[(V - j)\theta_j w_{1,j}]\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq C|k| \left(\|(1 - |y|)(V - j)\theta_j \nabla w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} + \|(1 - |y|)(V - j)(\nabla\theta_j)w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \|(1 - |y|)(\nabla V)\theta_j w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} \right) \\
& \leq C|k| \left(\|(1 - |y|)^2 \nabla w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} + \|(1 - |y|)w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} \right) \\
& \leq C|k| \left(\nu^{\frac{3}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{4}} (1 - |\lambda|)^{-\frac{7}{4}} \right) \|W\|_{L^2} = C\nu^{\frac{3}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{4}} (1 - |\lambda|)^{-\frac{7}{4}} \|W\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(1 - |y|)\nabla f_b\|_{L^2} & \leq \sum_{j=\pm 1} \left(\nu \|(1 - |y|)\nabla(\Delta\theta_j w_{1,j} + 2\nabla\theta_j \cdot \nabla w_{1,j})\|_{L^2} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \|ik(1 - |y|)\nabla[(V - j)\theta_j w_{1,j}]\|_{L^2} \right) \\
& \leq C(\nu^{\frac{5}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{3}{4}} (1 - |\lambda|)^{-\frac{13}{4}} + \nu^{\frac{3}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{4}} (1 - |\lambda|)^{-\frac{7}{4}}) \|W\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq C\nu^{\frac{3}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{4}} (1 - |\lambda|)^{-\frac{7}{4}} \|W\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

This finished the proof of (8.18).

It is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\kappa U_b\|_{H^1} & \leq \|\kappa(\nabla U_b)\|_{L^2} + \|(\nabla\kappa)U_b\|_{L^2} + \|\kappa U_b\|_{L^2} \leq C\varepsilon_0 (\|(1 - |y|)\nabla U_b\|_{L^2} + \|U_b\|_{L^2}) \\
& \leq C\varepsilon_0 \nu^{\frac{1}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{3}{4}} (1 - |\lambda|)^{-\frac{5}{4}} \|W\|_{L^2},
\end{aligned}$$

and by (8.26) and (8.25), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\kappa U_b\|_{H^2} & \leq C\|\Delta(\kappa U_b)\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|\kappa(\Delta U_b)\|_{L^2} + \|(\nabla\kappa)\nabla U_b\|_{L^2} + \|(\Delta\kappa)U_b\|_{L^2}) \\
& \leq C\varepsilon_0 (\|(1 - |y|)\Delta U_b\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla U_b\|_{L^2} + \|U_b\|_{H^1}) \\
& \leq C\varepsilon_0 \sum_{j=\pm 1} (\|(1 - |y|)\Delta w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} + (1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} \|w_{1,j}\|_{L^2}) \\
& \leq C\varepsilon_0 (\nu^{-\frac{1}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{4}} (1 - |\lambda|)^{-\frac{3}{4}} + \nu^{\frac{1}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{3}{4}} (1 - |\lambda|)^{-\frac{9}{4}}) \|W\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq C\varepsilon_0 \nu^{-\frac{1}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{4}} (1 - |\lambda|)^{-\frac{3}{4}} \|W\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we used the facts that $U_b = \theta_1 w_{1,1} + \theta_{-1} w_{1,1}$, $1 - |\lambda| \geq |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}}$, and that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\kappa/(1 - |y|)\|_{L^\infty} & \leq \|\nabla\kappa\|_{L^\infty} + \|\kappa\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\|\kappa\|_{H^3} \leq C\varepsilon_0, \\
\|(\Delta\kappa)U_b\|_{L^2} & \leq C\|(\Delta\kappa)\|_{H^1} \|U_b\|_{H^1} \leq C\|\kappa\|_{H^3} \|U_b\|_{H^1} \leq C\varepsilon_0 \|U_b\|_{H^1}, \\
\|(1 - |y|)\Delta(\theta_j w_{1,j})\|_{L^2} & \leq C(\|(1 - |y|)\Delta w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} + (1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} \|w_{1,j}\|_{L^2}), \\
\|\nabla(\theta_j w_{1,j})\|_{L^2} & \leq C(\|\nabla w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} + (1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} \|w_{1,j}\|_{L^2}).
\end{aligned}$$

Direct calculations show that

$$-\nu\Delta^2 U_b + ik(V - \lambda)\Delta U_b - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3} \Delta U_b = F_b,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
F_b & = \Delta f_b - ik(\Delta V)U_b - 2ik\nabla V \cdot \nabla U_b \\
& = \sum_{j=\pm 1} \left[\Delta(-\nu\Delta\theta_j w_{1,j} - 2\nu\nabla\theta_j \cdot \nabla w_{1,j}) + ik\Delta((V - j)\theta_j w_{1,j}) - ik(\Delta V)\theta_j w_{1,j} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -2ik\nabla V \cdot \nabla(\theta_j w_{1,j}) \Big] \\
& = \sum_{j=\pm 1} [\Delta(-\nu\Delta\theta_j w_{1,j} - 2\nu\nabla\theta_j \cdot \nabla w_{1,j}) + ik(V-j)\Delta(\theta_j w_{1,j})].
\end{aligned}$$

Using the fact $|\nabla^m \theta_j| \leq C(1-|\lambda|)^{-4}(1-|y|)^{4-m}$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, we get by (8.25) with $\alpha = m = 4 - m_2$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Delta(\Delta\theta_j w_{1,j} + 2\nabla\theta_j \cdot \nabla w_{1,j})\|_{L^2} & \leq C \sum_{m_2=1}^4 \|\nabla^{m_2} \theta_j\| \|\nabla^{4-m_2} w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq C(1-|\lambda|)^{-4} \sum_{m_2=1}^4 \|(1-|y|)^{4-m_2} \nabla^{4-m_2} w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{3}{4}} (1-|\lambda|)^{-\frac{21}{4}} \|W\|_{L^2},
\end{aligned}$$

and using the facts that $|(V-j)\theta_j| \leq C(1-|y|)$, $|(V-j)\nabla\theta_j| \leq C(1-|\lambda|)^{-1}(1-|y|)$, $|(V-j)\nabla^2\theta_j| \leq C(1-|\lambda|)^{-1}$, we get by (8.25) with $\alpha = m \in \{0, 1\}$ and (8.26) with $m = 2$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|ik(V-j)\Delta(\theta_j w_{1,j})\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq C|k|(\|(1-|y|)\nabla^2 w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} + (1-|\lambda|)^{-1}\|(1-|y|)\nabla w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} + (1-|\lambda|)^{-1}\|w_{1,j}\|_{L^2}) \\
& \leq C(\nu^{-\frac{1}{4}}|k|^{\frac{3}{4}}(1-|\lambda|)^{-\frac{3}{4}} + \nu^{\frac{1}{4}}|k|^{\frac{1}{4}}(1-|\lambda|)^{-\frac{9}{4}})\|W\|_{L^2} \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{4}}|k|^{\frac{3}{4}}(1-|\lambda|)^{-\frac{3}{4}}\|W\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we used $1-|\lambda| \geq |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}}$. This shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|F_b\|_{L^2} & \leq \nu\|\Delta(\Delta\theta_j w_{1,j} + 2\nabla\theta_j \cdot \nabla w_{1,j})\|_{L^2} + \|ik(V-j)\Delta(\theta_j w_{1,j})\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq C(\nu^{\frac{5}{4}}|k|^{-\frac{3}{4}}(1-|\lambda|)^{-\frac{21}{4}} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{4}}|k|^{\frac{3}{4}}(1-|\lambda|)^{-\frac{3}{4}})\|W\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{4}}|k|^{\frac{3}{4}}(1-|\lambda|)^{-\frac{3}{4}}\|W\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\Delta G_b = F_b$, $G_b|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$, by Hardy's inequality, we get

$$\|\nabla G_b\|_{L^2}^2 = -\langle G_b, F_b \rangle \leq \|G_b/(1-|y|)\|_{L^2} \|(1-|y|)F_b\|_{L^2} \leq C\|\nabla G_b\|_{L^2} \|(1-|y|)F_b\|_{L^2},$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla G_b\|_{L^2} & \leq C\|(1-|y|)F_b\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq C \sum_{j=\pm 1} (\nu\|(1-|y|)\Delta(\Delta\theta_j w_{1,j} + 2\nabla\theta_j \cdot \nabla w_{1,j})\|_{L^2} + \|ik(1-|y|)(V-j)\theta_j\Delta w_{1,j}\|_{L^2}) \\
& \leq C(\nu^{\frac{7}{4}}|k|^{-\frac{5}{4}}(1-|\lambda|)^{-\frac{23}{4}} + \nu^{\frac{1}{4}}|k|^{\frac{1}{4}}(1-|\lambda|)^{-\frac{5}{4}})\|W\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{4}}|k|^{\frac{1}{4}}(1-|\lambda|)^{-\frac{5}{4}}\|W\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we used the facts that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(1-|y|)\Delta(\Delta\theta_j w_{1,j} + 2\nabla\theta_j \cdot \nabla w_{1,j})\|_{L^2} & \leq C \sum_{m_2=1}^4 \|(1-|y|)|\nabla^{m_2} \theta_j| \|\nabla^{4-m_2} w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq C(1-|\lambda|)^{-4} \sum_{m_2=1}^4 \|(1-|y|)^{5-m_2} \nabla^{4-m_2} w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq C\nu^{\frac{3}{4}}|k|^{-\frac{5}{4}}(1-|\lambda|)^{-\frac{23}{4}}\|W\|_{L^2},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|k(1 - |y|)(V - j)\Delta(\theta_j w_{1,j})\|_{L^2} &\leq C|k|(\|(1 - |y|)^2 \Delta w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} + \|(1 - |y|)\nabla w_{1,j}\|_{L^2} + \|w_{1,j}\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{4}}|k|^{\frac{1}{4}}(1 - |\lambda|)^{-\frac{5}{4}}\|W\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 8.2. *It holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\Delta(U - U_b)\|_{L^2} + |k|\|(V - \lambda)\Delta(U - U_b)\|_{L^2} &\leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}|k|\|W\|_{L^2} + C|k|\|\nabla W\|_{L^2}, \\ (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\Delta(U - U_b) - 2ik\widetilde{W}_s\|_{L^2} &\leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{\frac{2}{3}}(1 - |\lambda|)^{-1}\|W\|_{L^2} + C|k|\|\nabla W\|_{L^2}, \\ |k|\|\nabla^2[(1 - \theta)(U - U_b)]\|_{L^2} &\leq C(1 - |\lambda|)^{-1}(\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}|k|\|W\|_{L^2} + |k|\|\nabla W\|_{L^2}). \end{aligned}$$

Here $\theta(x, y, z) = \theta_0(|y - \lambda|/(1 - |\lambda|))$ with $\theta_0 \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ so that $\theta_0(y) = 1$ for $|y| \leq 1/4$, $\theta_0(y) = 0$ for $|y| \geq 1/2$.

Proof. Recall that $(U, U_b, \widetilde{W}_s)$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\nu\Delta^2 U + ik(V - \lambda)\Delta U - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}\Delta U + ik(2\nabla V \cdot \nabla U + (\Delta V)U) + \partial_z \Delta p^{L(0)} = 0, \\ -\nu\Delta^2 U_b + ik(V - \lambda)\Delta U_b - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}\Delta U_b = F_b, \\ -\nu\Delta \widetilde{W}_s + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)\widetilde{W}_s - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}\widetilde{W}_s + \nabla V \cdot \nabla U = 0, \\ \Delta(U - U_b)|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \quad \widetilde{W}_s|_{y=\pm 1} = 0. \end{cases}$$

By Proposition 4.1, (8.9), (8.10) and Lemma 8.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\Delta(U - U_b)\|_{L^2} + |k|\|(V - \lambda)\Delta(U - U_b)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\|ik(2\nabla V \cdot \nabla U + (\Delta V)U) + \partial_z \Delta p^{L(0)} + F_b\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C|k|\|\nabla V\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla U\|_{L^2} + C|k|\|\Delta V\|_{L^\infty}\|U\|_{L^2} + C|k|\|\nabla W\|_{L^2} + C\|F_b\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C(\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}|k|\|W\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{\frac{2}{3}}\|W\|_{L^2}) + C(|k|\|\nabla W\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{4}}|k|^{\frac{3}{4}}(1 - |\lambda|)^{-\frac{3}{4}}\|W\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}|k|\|W\|_{L^2} + C|k|\|\nabla W\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\Delta(U - U_b) - 2ik\widetilde{W}_s\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\|ik(\Delta V)U + \partial_z \Delta p^{L(0)}\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\nabla G_b\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C|k|\|U\|_{L^2} + C|k|\|\nabla W\|_{L^2} + C\nu^{-\frac{1}{12}}|k|^{\frac{7}{12}}(1 - |\lambda|)^{-\frac{5}{4}}\|W\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{\frac{2}{3}}(1 - |\lambda|)^{-1}\|W\|_{L^2} + C|k|\|\nabla W\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

These show the first and second inequalities.

Let $I_j = \{|y - \lambda| \leq (1 - |\lambda|)/2^j\}$, $I_j^c = [-1, 1] \setminus I_j$. If $y \in I_2^c$ (i.e., $|y - \lambda| > (1 - |\lambda|)/4$), then we have by Lemma 4.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} |V - \lambda| &\geq |y - \lambda| - |V - y| \geq (1 - |\lambda|)/2 - C\varepsilon_0(1 - |y|) \\ &\geq (1 - |\lambda|)/2 - C\varepsilon_0(1 - |\lambda| + |y - \lambda|) \geq (1 - C\varepsilon_0)(1 - |\lambda|)/2, \end{aligned}$$

which gives by taking ε_0 small enough so that $C\varepsilon_0 \leq 1/2$ that

$$1 - \theta \leq \mathbf{1}_{I_2^c} \leq 8(1 - |\lambda|)^{-1}|V - \lambda|.$$

Then by the first inequality of the lemma, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |k| \|(1 - \theta)\Delta(U - U_b)\|_{L^2} &\leq C|k|(1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} \|(V - \lambda)\Delta(U - U_b)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C(1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} (\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} |k| \|\varphi\|_{L^2} + |k| \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $(ik(V - \lambda)U_b - a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}U_b - \partial_z p^{L(0)})|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$, we have

$$U_b = \partial_z p^{L(0)} / (k(j - \lambda) - a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}) \quad \text{on } \Gamma_j, \quad j \in \{\pm 1\}.$$

Thus, we get

$$\|U_b\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\partial\Omega)} \leq \sum_{j=\pm 1} |k(j - \lambda)|^{-1} \|\partial_z p^{L(0)}\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Gamma_j)} \leq 2|k|(1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} \|\partial_z p^{L(0)}\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\partial\Omega)},$$

where

$$\|\partial_z p^{L(0)}\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\partial\Omega)} \leq C\|\partial_z p^{L(0)}\|_{H^2} \leq C\|p^{L(0)}\|_{H^3} \leq C\|\nabla \Delta p^{L(0)}\|_{L^2} \leq C|k| \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}.$$

This gives

$$(8.28) \quad \|U_b\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\partial\Omega)} \leq 2|k|(1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} \|\partial_z p^{L(0)}\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\partial\Omega)} \leq C(1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}.$$

As $\text{supp}(\theta) \subseteq I_1$ and $U_b = 0$ for $|y| \leq (3 + |\lambda|)/4$, we have

$$|\nabla \theta| |\nabla U_b| = |\nabla^2 \theta| |U_b| = 0.$$

Then by (8.10), (8.28) and standard elliptic estimate, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &|k| \|\nabla^2[(1 - \theta)(U - U_b)]\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C|k| \|\Delta[(1 - \theta)(U - U_b)]\|_{L^2} + C|k| \|(1 - \theta)(U - U_b)\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\partial\Omega)} \\ &= C|k| \|\Delta[(1 - \theta)(U - U_b)]\|_{L^2} + C|k| \|U_b\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\partial\Omega)} \\ &\leq C|k| (\|[(1 - \theta)\Delta(U - U_b)]\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \theta \cdot \nabla(U - U_b)\|_{L^2} + \|(\Delta \theta)(U - U_b)\|_{L^2}) \\ &\quad + C|k| \|U_b\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\partial\Omega)} \\ &\leq C|k| (\|[(1 - \theta)\Delta(U - U_b)]\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \theta \cdot \nabla U\|_{L^2} + \|(\Delta \theta)U\|_{L^2}) + C|k| \|U_b\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\partial\Omega)} \\ &\leq C(1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} (\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} |k| \|W\|_{L^2} + |k| \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}) + C(1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} |k| \|W\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + C(1 - |\lambda|)^{-2} \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{2}{3}} \|W\|_{L^2} + C|k| \|U_b\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\partial\Omega)} \\ &\leq C(1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} (\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} |k| \|W\|_{L^2} + |k| \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}). \end{aligned}$$

This is the third inequality. $\square$

8.5. Construction of good unknown. We introduce the following good unknown

$$(8.29) \quad W_g = W - \nu \theta W_s - \kappa U_b,$$

where $\theta = \theta_0(|y - \lambda|/(1 - |\lambda|))$ with a fixed $\theta_0 \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ so that $\theta_0(y) = 1$ for $|y| \leq 1/4$, $\theta_0(y) = 0$ for $|y| \geq 1/2$.

Let us derive the equation of W_g . For this, we first introduce some notations. Let $p^{L(01)}, p^{L(02)}$ and $p^{L(03)}$ solve

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta p^{L(01)} &= -2ik \partial_y V(\theta W_s), \quad \partial_y p^{L(01)}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \\ \Delta p^{L(02)} &= -\partial_y V(\theta \rho_1 \Delta U), \quad \partial_y p^{L(02)}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \\ \Delta p^{L(03)} &= -2ik \partial_y V(\kappa U_b), \quad \partial_y p^{L(03)}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Let $p^{L(2)} = p^{L(0)} - \nu p^{L(01)} - p^{L(03)}$. Then we have

$$\Delta p^{L(2)} = -2ik\partial_y V W_g, \quad \partial_y p^{L(2)}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0.$$

We denote

$$\begin{aligned} F_1 &= \theta \rho_1 \nabla V \cdot \nabla U + (\partial_y + \kappa \partial_z) p^{L(01)} \\ &= (\theta \rho_1 \partial_y V \partial_y U + \partial_y p^{L(01)}) + \kappa (\theta \rho_1 \partial_y V \partial_z U + \partial_z p^{L(01)}) \\ &= F_2^1 + \kappa F_3^1, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$F_j^l = (\theta \rho_1 \partial_y V \partial_j U + \partial_j p^{L(0l)}), \quad j \in \{2, 3\}, \quad l \in \{1, 2\},$$

We denote

$$\begin{aligned} F_2 &= -\nu(\Delta \kappa)(U - U_b) - 2\nu \nabla \kappa \cdot \nabla(U - U_b) + 2\nu \theta \rho_1 \nabla V \cdot \nabla U \\ &= -\nu(\Delta \kappa)(\theta U + U_1) - 2\nu \nabla \kappa \cdot \nabla(\theta U + U_1) + 2\nu \theta \rho_1 \nabla V \cdot \nabla U \\ &= -\nu((\Delta \kappa)\theta + 2\nabla \kappa \cdot \nabla \theta)U + 2\nu \theta(\rho_1 \nabla V \cdot \nabla U - \nabla \kappa \cdot \nabla U) \\ &\quad - \nu(\Delta \kappa)U_1 - 2\nu \nabla \kappa \cdot \nabla U_1 \\ (8.30) \quad &= -\nu((\Delta \kappa)\theta + 2\nabla \kappa \cdot \nabla \theta)U - 2\nu \theta \rho_2(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y)U - \nu(\Delta \kappa)U_1 - 2\nu \nabla \kappa \cdot \nabla U_1, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$U_1 = (1 - \theta)U - U_b, \quad U = \theta U + U_1 + U_b.$$

We denote

$$(8.31) \quad F_3 = F_2 + \nu^2(2\nabla \theta \cdot \nabla W_s + \Delta \theta W_s) - \kappa f_b - \nu F_1 - (\partial_y + \kappa \partial_z) p^{L(03)}.$$

Now, direct calculations show that

$$\begin{aligned} & -\nu \Delta(W - W_g) + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)(W - W_g) - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}(W - W_g) \\ &= \nu \theta [-\nu \Delta W_s + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)W_s - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}W_s] - \nu^2(2\nabla \theta \cdot \nabla W_s + \Delta \theta W_s) \\ &\quad + \kappa [-\nu \Delta U_b + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)U_b - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}U_b] - \nu(\Delta \kappa)U_b - 2\nu \nabla \kappa \cdot \nabla U_b \\ &= -\nu \theta \rho_1 \nabla V \cdot \nabla U - \nu^2(2\nabla \theta \cdot \nabla W_s + \Delta \theta W_s) + \kappa f_b - \nu(\Delta \kappa)U_b - 2\nu \nabla \kappa \cdot \nabla U_b, \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} & -\nu \Delta W_g + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)W_g - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}W_g + (\partial_y + \kappa \partial_z)(p^{L(0)} - \nu p^{L(01)} + p^{L(1)}) \\ &= -\nu(\Delta \kappa)(U - U_b) - 2\nu \nabla \kappa \cdot \nabla(U - U_b) + \nu \theta \rho_1 \nabla V \cdot \nabla U + \nu^2(2\nabla \theta \cdot \nabla W_s + \Delta \theta W_s) \\ &\quad - \kappa f_b - \nu(\partial_y + \kappa \partial_z) p^{L(01)} - G_1 \\ (8.32) \quad &= F_2 + \nu^2(2\nabla \theta \cdot \nabla W_s + \Delta \theta W_s) - \kappa f_b - \nu F_1 - G_1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we conclude that

$$(8.33) \quad \begin{cases} -\nu \Delta W_g + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)W_g - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}W_g + (\partial_y + \kappa \partial_z)(p^{L(2)} + p^{L(1)}) \\ \quad + G_1 - F_3 = 0, \\ \Delta p^{L(2)} = -2ik\partial_y V W_g, \quad \partial_y p^{L(2)}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \\ W_g|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \quad \partial_x W_g = ikW_g. \end{cases}$$

Let us conclude this subsection by the following lemma.

Lemma 8.3. *If $|\lambda| \leq 1 - \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}$, then we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nu\theta W_s\|_{L^2} + \|\kappa U_b\|_{L^2} &\leq C\varepsilon_0\nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{-\frac{2}{3}}\|W\|_{L^2}, \\ \|W\|_{L^2} &\leq \|W_g\|_{L^2} + C\varepsilon_0\nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{-\frac{2}{3}}\|W\|_{L^2}, \\ \|\nabla W\|_{L^2} &\leq \|\nabla W_g\|_{L^2} + C\varepsilon_0\nu^{-\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|W\|_{L^2}, \\ \|\Delta W\|_{L^2} &\leq \|\Delta W_g\|_{L^2} + C\varepsilon_0\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|W\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

The second inequality implies that if ε_0 is small enough, then $\|W\|_{L^2} \leq 2\|W_g\|_{L^2}$.

Proof. By (8.13), (8.10), (8.18) and the fact that $|\kappa/(1-|y|)| \leq C\|\nabla\kappa\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\|\kappa\|_{H^3} \leq C\varepsilon_0$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nu\theta W_s\|_{L^2} + \|\kappa U_b\|_{L^2} &\leq C\nu\|W_s\|_{L^2} + \|\kappa/(1-|y|)\|_{L^\infty}\|(1-|y|)U_b\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon_0\nu(\nu k^2)^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|\nabla U\|_{L^2} + C\varepsilon_0\nu^{\frac{3}{4}}|k|^{-\frac{5}{4}}(1-|\lambda|)^{-\frac{7}{4}}\|W\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon_0\nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{-\frac{2}{3}}\|W\|_{L^2},\end{aligned}$$

which gives the first two inequalities.

By (8.13) and (8.10), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nu\theta W_s\|_{H^1} &\leq C\nu\|\theta\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla W_s\|_{L^2} + C\nu\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^\infty}\|W_s\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\nu\varepsilon_0(\nu^{-\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} + (1-|\lambda|)^{-1}(\nu k^2)^{-\frac{1}{3}})\|\nabla U\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\nu\varepsilon_0\nu^{-\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|\nabla U\|_{L^2} \leq C\varepsilon_0\nu^{-\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|W\|_{L^2},\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nu\theta W_s\|_{H^2} &\leq C\nu(\|\theta\|_{L^\infty}\|\Delta W_s\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla\theta\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla W_s\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla^2\theta\|_{L^\infty}\|W_s\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C\nu\varepsilon_0(\nu^{-1} + (1-|\lambda|)^{-1}\nu^{-\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} + (1-|\lambda|)^{-2}(\nu k^2)^{-\frac{1}{3}})\|\nabla U\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon_0\|\nabla U\|_{L^2} \leq C\varepsilon_0\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|W\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

from which and Lemma 8.1, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla W\|_{L^2} &\leq \|\nabla W_g\|_{L^2} + (\|\nu\theta W_s\|_{H^1} + \|\kappa U_b\|_{H^1}) \\ &\leq \|\nabla W_g\|_{L^2} + C\varepsilon_0\nu^{-\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|W\|_{L^2} + C\varepsilon_0\nu^{\frac{1}{4}}|k|^{-\frac{3}{4}}(1-|\lambda|)^{-\frac{5}{4}}\|W\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \|\nabla W_g\|_{L^2} + C\varepsilon_0\nu^{-\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|W\|_{L^2},\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Delta W\|_{L^2} &\leq \|\Delta W_g\|_{L^2} + \|\nu\theta W_s\|_{H^2} + \|\kappa U_b\|_{H^2} \\ &\leq \|\Delta W_g\|_{L^2} + C\varepsilon_0(\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{4}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{4}}(1-|\lambda|)^{-\frac{3}{4}})\|W\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \|\Delta W_g\|_{L^2} + C\varepsilon_0\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|W\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

□

8.6. Proof of Proposition 8.1 when $|\lambda| \leq 1 - \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}$.

8.6.1. H^1 estimate of source term. Let us first estimate $\|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2}$. Notice that

$$\Delta(p^{L(01)} - p^{L(02)}) = -2ik\partial_y V\theta(W_s - \rho_1\widetilde{W}_s) + \partial_y V\theta\rho_1(\Delta U - 2ik\widetilde{W}_s).$$

Then by (8.17), Lemma 8.2, $\|\rho_1\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|\rho_1\|_{H^2} \leq C\varepsilon_0$ and the fact that $\text{supp}(U_b) \cap \text{supp}(\theta) = \text{supp}(U_b) \cap I_1 = \emptyset$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^2(p^{L(01)} - p^{L(02)})\|_{L^2} &\leq C\|\Delta(p^{L(01)} - p^{L(02)})\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C|k|\|W_s - \rho_1\widetilde{W}_s\|_{L^2} + C\|\rho_1\|_{L^\infty}\|\theta(\Delta U - 2ik\widetilde{W}_s)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C|k|\|W_s - \rho_1\widetilde{W}_s\|_{L^2} + C\varepsilon_0\|\theta(\Delta(U - U_b) - 2ik\widetilde{W}_s)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon_0|k|^{-1}(\|\nabla\partial_x^2 U\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)U\|_{L^2}) + C\varepsilon_0\|\Delta(U - U_b) - 2ik\widetilde{W}_s\|_{L^2} \\ (8.34) \quad &\leq C\varepsilon_0|k|^{-1}(\|\nabla\partial_x^2 U\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)U\|_{L^2}) \\ &\quad + C\varepsilon_0(\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(1 - |\lambda|)^{-1}\|W\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\nabla W\|_{L^2}). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\phi_1 = \theta\rho_1\partial_y V$, and then

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta F_j^2 &= \Delta(\theta\rho_1\partial_y V\partial_j U) + \partial_j(\Delta p^{L(02)}) = \Delta(\phi_1\partial_j U) - \partial_j(\phi_1\Delta U) \\ &= \text{div}(\nabla\phi_1\partial_j U - \partial_j\phi_1\nabla U) + \partial_j(\nabla\phi_1 \cdot \nabla U), \end{aligned}$$

with $F_2^l|_{y=\pm 1} = \partial_y F_3^l|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$. Then we have

$$\|\nabla F_j^2\|_{L^2}^2 = -\langle \Delta F_j^2, F_j^2 \rangle = \langle \nabla\phi_1\partial_j U - \partial_j\phi_1\nabla U, \nabla F_j^2 \rangle + \langle \nabla\phi_1 \cdot \nabla U, \partial_j F_j^2 \rangle,$$

which gives

$$(8.35) \quad \|\nabla F_j^2\|_{L^2} \leq C\|\nabla\phi_1\|\|\nabla U\|_{L^2}.$$

Using the facts that $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$, $|\nabla\theta| \leq C(1 - |\lambda|)^{-1}$, $|\nabla V| + |\nabla^2 V| \leq C$, $\|\rho_1\|_{H^2} \leq C\varepsilon_0$, we deduce that

$$|\nabla\phi_1| \leq C(1 - |\lambda|)^{-1}|\rho_1| + C|\nabla\rho_1|,$$

and hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla\phi_1\|\|\nabla U\|_{L^2} &\leq C(1 - |\lambda|)^{-1}\|\rho_1\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla U\|_{L^2} + C\|\nabla\rho_1\|\|\nabla U\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C(1 - |\lambda|)^{-1}\|\rho_1\|_{H^2}\|\nabla U\|_{L^2} + C\|\nabla\rho_1\|_{H^1}(\|\nabla U\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)\nabla U\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C\varepsilon_0(1 - |\lambda|)^{-1}\|\nabla U\|_{L^2} + C\varepsilon_0(\|\nabla U\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)\nabla U\|_{L^2}) \\ (8.36) \quad &\leq C\varepsilon_0(1 - |\lambda|)^{-1}\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|W\|_{L^2} + C\varepsilon_0|k|^{-1}(\|\nabla\partial_x^2 U\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)U\|_{L^2}), \end{aligned}$$

here we used Lemma 11.4, (8.15) and (8.10).

Note that for $j \in \{2, 3\}$,

$$F_j^1 - F_j^2 = \partial_j(p^{L(01)} - p^{L(02)}), \quad \|\nabla(F_j^1 - F_j^2)\|_{L^2} \leq \|\nabla^2(p^{L(01)} - p^{L(02)})\|_{L^2}.$$

We infer from (8.35), (8.34) and (8.36) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2} &\leq \|\nabla F_2^1\|_{L^2} + C\|\kappa\|_{H^2}\|\nabla F_3^1\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C(\|\nabla\phi_1\|\|\nabla U\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla^2(p^{L(01)} - p^{L(02)})\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C\varepsilon_0|k|^{-1}(\|\nabla\partial_x^2 U\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)U\|_{L^2}) \\ (8.37) \quad &\quad + C\varepsilon_0((1 - |\lambda|)^{-1}\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|W\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\nabla W\|_{L^2}). \end{aligned}$$

Next we estimate $\|F_2\|_{H^1}$. Using $|\nabla^j\theta| \leq C(1 - |\lambda|)^{-j}$ and Lemma 11.4, we deduce that

$$\|F_2\|_{H^1} \leq \nu(\|\Delta\kappa U\|_{H^1}\|\theta\|_{L^\infty} + \|\Delta\kappa U\|_{L^2}\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^\infty}) + C\nu(\|\nabla\kappa U\|_{H^1}\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^\infty})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \|\nabla \kappa U\|_{L^2} \|\nabla^2 \theta\|_{L^\infty} + 2\nu (\|\rho_2(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y)U\|_{H^1} \|\theta\|_{L^\infty} \\
& + \|\rho_2(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y)U\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \theta\|_{L^\infty}) + \nu (\|\Delta \kappa U_1\|_{H^1} + 2\nu \|\nabla \kappa \cdot \nabla U_1\|_{H^1} \\
& \leq C\nu \|\Delta \kappa U\|_{H^1} + C\nu(1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} (\|\Delta \kappa U\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \kappa U\|_{H^1}) + C\nu(1 - |\lambda|)^{-2} \|\nabla \kappa U\|_{L^2} \\
& + C\nu \|\rho_2(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y)U\|_{H^1} + C\nu(1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} \|\rho_2(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y)U\|_{L^2} \\
& + C\nu (\|\Delta \kappa\|_{H^1} \|U_1\|_{H^2} + \|\nabla \kappa\|_{H^2} \|\nabla U_1\|_{H^1}) \\
& \leq C\nu \|\Delta \kappa\|_{H^1} (\|U\|_{H^1} + \|(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y)U\|_{H^1}) + C\nu(1 - |\lambda|)^{-2} \|\nabla \kappa\|_{L^\infty} \|U\|_{L^2} \\
& + C\nu(1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} (\|\Delta \kappa\|_{H^1} \|U\|_{H^1} + \|\nabla \kappa\|_{H^2} \|U\|_{H^1}) \\
& + C\nu \|\rho_2\|_{H^2} \|(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y)U\|_{H^1} + C\nu(1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} \|\rho_2\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla U\|_{L^2} \\
& + C\nu \|\kappa\|_{H^3} \|U_1\|_{H^2} \\
(8.38) \quad & \leq C\nu (\|\kappa\|_{H^3} + \|\rho_2\|_{H^2}) \left((1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} \|\nabla U\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y)U\|_{H^1} \right. \\
& \left. + (1 - |\lambda|)^{-2} \|U\|_{L^2} + \|U_1\|_{H^2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\text{supp}(\theta) \cap \text{supp}(U_b) = I_1 \cap \text{supp}(U_b) = \emptyset$, we have

$$U_1 = (U - U_b) - \theta U = (1 - \theta)(U - U_b),$$

which along with Lemma 8.2 gives

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|U_1\|_{H^2} = \|(1 - \theta)(U - U_b)\|_{H^2} \leq C \|\nabla^2[(1 - \theta)(U - U_b)]\|_{L^2} \\
(8.39) \quad & \leq C(1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} (\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|k\| \|W\|_{L^2} + \|k\| \|W\|_{L^2}).
\end{aligned}$$

Then by the fact that $\|\kappa\|_{H^3} + \|\rho_2\|_{H^2} \leq C\varepsilon_0$, (8.10), (8.38) and (8.39), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|F_2\|_{H^1} \leq C\nu (\|\kappa\|_{H^3} + \|\rho_2\|_{H^2}) \left((1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} \|\nabla U\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y)U\|_{H^1} \right. \\
& \left. + (1 - |\lambda|)^{-2} \|U\|_{L^2} + \|U_1\|_{H^2} \right) \\
& \leq C\nu \varepsilon_0 \left((1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|W\|_{L^2} + |k|^{-1} \|\nabla \partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y)U\|_{L^2} \right. \\
& \left. + (1 - |\lambda|)^{-2} \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|W\|_{L^2} + |k|^{-1} (1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} (\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|k\| \|W\|_{L^2} + \|k\| \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}) \right) \\
(8.40) \quad & \leq C\nu \varepsilon_0 \left((1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|W\|_{L^2} + |k|^{-1} \|\nabla \partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y)U\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\nabla W\|_{L^2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, let us estimate $\|\nabla F_3\|_{L^2}$. By (8.13) and (8.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(8.41) \quad & \|\nu^2(2\nabla \theta \cdot \nabla W_s + \Delta \theta W_s)\|_{H^1} \\
& \leq C\nu^2 \left(\|\nabla \theta\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla W_s\|_{H^1} + \|\nabla^2 \theta\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla W_s\|_{L^2} + \|\Delta \theta\|_{L^\infty} \|W_s\|_{H^1} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \|\nabla \Delta \theta\|_{L^\infty} \|W_s\|_{L^2} \right) \\
& \leq C\nu^2 (1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} \|W_s\|_{H^2} + C\nu^2 (1 - |\lambda|)^{-2} \|W_s\|_{H^1} + C\nu^2 (1 - |\lambda|)^{-3} \|W_s\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq C\nu^2 (1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} (\|\Delta W_s\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\nabla W_s\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{2}{3}} |k|^{\frac{2}{3}} \|W_s\|_{L^2}) \\
& \leq C\nu \varepsilon_0 (1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} \|\nabla U\|_{L^2} \leq C\varepsilon_0 (1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|W\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\|\kappa/(1 - |y|)\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla \kappa\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\|\nabla \kappa\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\varepsilon_0$, we get by Lemma 8.1 that

$$\|\kappa f_b\|_{H^1} \leq C\varepsilon_0 (\|f_b\|_{L^2} + \|(1 - |y|)\nabla f_b\|_{L^2})$$

$$(8.42) \quad \leq C\varepsilon_0\nu^{\frac{3}{4}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{4}}(1-|\lambda|)^{-\frac{7}{4}}\|W\|_{L^2} \leq C\varepsilon_0\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}(1-|\lambda|)^{-1}\|W\|_{L^2}.$$

Since $\Delta p^{L(03)} = -2ik\partial_y V(\kappa U_b)$, $\partial_y p^{L(03)}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$, we get by Lemma 8.1 that

$$(8.43) \quad \begin{aligned} \|(\partial_y + \kappa\partial_z)p^{L(03)}\|_{H^1} &\leq C\|p^{L(03)}\|_{H^2} \leq C\|\Delta p^{L(03)}\|_{L^2} \leq C|k|\|\kappa U_b\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C|k|\|\kappa/(1-|y|)\|_{L^\infty}\|(1-|y|)U_b\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C|k|\varepsilon_0\|(1-|y|)U_b\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon_0\nu^{\frac{3}{4}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{4}}(1-|\lambda|)^{-\frac{7}{4}}\|W\|_{L^2} \leq C\varepsilon_0\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}(1-|\lambda|)^{-1}\|W\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $F_3 := F_2 + \nu^2(2\nabla\theta \cdot \nabla W_s + \Delta\theta W_s) - \kappa f_b - \nu F_1 - (\partial_y + \kappa\partial_z)p^{L(03)}$. Then by (8.40), (8.41), (8.42), (8.37) and (8.43), we conclude that

$$(8.44) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\nabla F_3\|_{L^2} &\leq C\nu\varepsilon_0|k|^{-1}(\|\nabla\partial_x^2 U\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)U\|_{L^2}) \\ &\quad + C\varepsilon_0((1-|\lambda|)^{-1}\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}\|W\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\nabla W\|_{L^2}). \end{aligned}$$

8.6.2. *Estimate of Neumann data $\partial_y W_g$.* Using the fact that

$$(ik(V - \lambda)U_b - a(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}U_b - \partial_z p^{L(0)})|_{y=\pm 1} = (V - y)|_{y=\pm 1} = 0,$$

we find that

$$|k(y - \lambda)U_b| \leq |\partial_z p^{L(0)}|, \quad |k(y - \lambda)\partial_z U_b| \leq |\partial_z^2 p^{L(0)}| \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega.$$

Then by Lemma 16.1, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|k(y - \lambda)U_b\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} &\leq C\|\partial_z p^{L(0)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq C\|\partial_z p^{L(0)}\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} \\ &\leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|p^{L(0)}\|_{H^2} \leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\Delta p^{L(0)}\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C|k|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\partial_y V\|_{L^\infty}\|W\|_{L^2} \leq C|k|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|W\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|k(y - \lambda)\partial_z U_b\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} &\leq C\|\partial_z^2 p^{L(0)}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq C\|\partial_z^2 p^{L(0)}\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} \\ &\leq C\|(\partial_z^2 \partial_y, \partial_z^2)p^{L(0)}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\partial_z^2 p^{L(0)}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C\|\nabla\Delta p^{L(0)}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\Delta p^{L(0)}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C|k|\|\partial_y V W\|_{H^1}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\partial_y V W\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C|k|(\|\partial_y V\|_{H^2}\|W\|_{H^1})^{\frac{1}{2}}(\|\partial_y V\|_{L^\infty}\|W\|_{L^2})^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C|k|\|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|W\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that

$$[\partial_y(\theta W_s)]|_{y=\pm 1} = \partial_y W|_{y=\pm 1} = \kappa|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \quad W_g = W - \nu\theta W_s - \kappa U_b,$$

we deduce that

$$\|k(y - \lambda)\partial_y W_g\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq \|\partial_y \kappa\|_{L^\infty}\|k(y - \lambda)U_b\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq C\varepsilon_0|k|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|U\|_{L^2},$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_y W_g\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} &\leq C|k|(1-|\lambda|)^{-1}\|k(y - \lambda)\partial_y W_g\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon_0(1-|\lambda|)^{-1}|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|W\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

By the interpolation, we get

$$\|(1 + |k(y - \lambda)|)^\alpha \partial_y W_g\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq \|(1 + |k(y - \lambda)|)\partial_y W_g\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}^\alpha \|\partial_y W_g\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}^{1-\alpha}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C\varepsilon_0 |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} ((1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} + |k|)^\alpha (1 - |\lambda|)^{\alpha-1} \|W\|_{L^2} \\
(8.45) \quad &\leq C\varepsilon_0 |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} (1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} |k|^\alpha \|W\|_{L^2}, \quad \alpha \in [0, 1].
\end{aligned}$$

Due to $\kappa|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$, we have

$$\partial_y \partial_z (\kappa U_b)|_{y=j} = (\partial_z \partial_y \kappa) U_b|_{y=j} + (\partial_y \kappa) \partial_z U_b|_{y=j} \quad j \in \{\pm 1\},$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\partial_y \partial_z (\kappa U_b)\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} &\leq \|(\partial_y \partial_z \kappa) U_b\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|(\partial_y \kappa) \partial_z U_b\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\
&\leq \|\partial_y \partial_z \kappa\|_{L^2_z(\partial\Omega)} \|U_b\|_{L^2_x L^\infty_z(\partial\Omega)} + \|\partial_y \kappa\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_z U_b\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\
&\leq \|\partial_y \partial_z \kappa\|_{L^\infty_y L^2_z} \|(1, \partial_z) U_b\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + C \|\kappa\|_{H^3} \|\partial_z U_b\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\
&\leq C\varepsilon_0 (\|U_b\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\partial_z U_b\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}).
\end{aligned}$$

Thanks to $[\partial_z \partial_y (\theta W_s)]|_{y=\pm 1} = \partial_z \partial_y W|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\partial_y \partial_z W_g\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} &\leq \|\partial_y \partial_z (\kappa U_b)\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq C\varepsilon_0 (\|U_b\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\partial_z U_b\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}) \\
&\leq C\varepsilon_0 |k|^{-1} (1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} (\|k(y - \lambda) U_b\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|k(y - \lambda) \partial_z U_b\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}) \\
&\leq C\varepsilon_0 (1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} \|W\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

which along with $1 - |\lambda| \geq |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}} = \nu^{\frac{2}{3}} |k|^{\frac{1}{3}} (\nu k^2)^{-\frac{1}{3}} \geq \nu^{\frac{2}{3}} |k|^{\frac{1}{3}}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
(1 - |\lambda|) \nu^{\frac{11}{12}} |k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\partial_y \partial_z W_g\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} &\leq C\varepsilon_0 \nu^{\frac{11}{12}} |k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \|W\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C\varepsilon_0 (\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|W\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{4}{3}} |k|^{\frac{2}{3}} \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}) \\
(8.46) \quad &\leq C\varepsilon_0 (\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|W\|_{L^2} + (1 - |\lambda|) \nu^{\frac{2}{3}} |k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}).
\end{aligned}$$

8.6.3. *Completion of the proof.* By Proposition 8.2, (8.44), (8.45) and (8.46), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} |k| \|W_g\|_{L^2} &\leq C(1 - |\lambda|) \left(\|\nabla(G_1 - F_3)\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|(1 + |k(y - \lambda)|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \partial_y W_g\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \right) \\
&\quad + C\nu^{\frac{5}{6}} |k|^{\frac{1}{6}} \|\partial_y W_g\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + (1 - |\lambda|) \nu^{\frac{11}{12}} |k|^{-\frac{2}{3}} \|\partial_y \partial_z W_g\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\
(8.47) \quad &\leq C(1 - |\lambda|) \|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2} + C\nu\varepsilon_0 |k|^{-1} (1 - |\lambda|) (\|\nabla \partial_x^2 U\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \partial_x (\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y) U\|_{L^2}) \\
&\quad + C\varepsilon_0 (\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|W\|_{L^2} + (1 - |\lambda|) \nu^{\frac{2}{3}} |k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} |k| \|\nabla W_g\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{3}{4}} |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\Delta W_g\|_{L^2} + \nu |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\Delta W_g\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\partial_x \nabla p^{L(1)}\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq C \|\nabla(G_1 - F_3)\|_{L^2} + C\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(1 + |k(y - \lambda)|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \partial_y W_g\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\
&\quad + C\nu^{\frac{11}{12}} |k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\partial_y \partial_z W_g\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\
&\leq C \|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2} + C\nu\varepsilon_0 |k|^{-1} (\|\nabla \partial_x^2 U\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \partial_x (\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y) U\|_{L^2}) \\
&\quad + C\varepsilon_0 (1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} (\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{\frac{1}{2}}) \|W\|_{L^2} + C\varepsilon_0 \nu^{\frac{2}{3}} |k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\nabla W\|_{L^2} \\
(8.48) \quad &\leq C \|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2} + C\nu\varepsilon_0 |k|^{-1} (\|\nabla \partial_x^2 U\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \partial_x (\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y) U\|_{L^2}) \\
&\quad + C\varepsilon_0 (1 - |\lambda|)^{-1} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|W\|_{L^2} + C\varepsilon_0 \nu^{\frac{2}{3}} |k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling that $p^{L(0)} = p^{L(2)} + \nu p^{L(01)} + p^{L(03)}$, we get by Proposition 4.3 and Lemma 8.3 that

$$\nu^{\frac{1}{3}} (\|\partial_x^2 U\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x (\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y) U\|_{L^2}) + \nu^{\frac{2}{3}} (\|\nabla \partial_x^2 U\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \partial_x (\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y) U\|_{L^2})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{6}}\|\partial_z p^{L(2)}\|_{H^2} + C|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\left(\|\partial_x^2 \partial_z(\nu p^{L(01)} + p^{L(03)})\|_{L^2}\right. \\
&\quad \left. + \|\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y) \partial_z(\nu p^{L(01)} + p^{L(03)})\|_{L^2}\right) \\
&\leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{6}}\|\partial_z p^{L(2)}\|_{H^2} + C|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|\nabla \partial_x \partial_z(\nu p^{L(01)} + p^{L(03)})\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{6}}\|\Delta \partial_z p^{L(2)}\|_{L^2} + C|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}|k|\|\Delta(\nu p^{L(01)} + p^{L(03)})\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{6}}\|\nabla W_g\|_{L^2} + C|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}|k|^2(\|\nu \theta W_s\|_{L^2} + \|\kappa U_b\|_{L^2}) \\
(8.49) \quad &\leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{6}}\|\nabla W_g\|_{L^2} + C\varepsilon_0 \nu^{\frac{1}{6}}|k|\|W\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we infer from (8.47), (8.49) and Lemma 8.3 that

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}|k|(1-|\lambda|)^{-1}\|W\|_{L^2} &\leq C\|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2} + C\varepsilon_0 \nu^{\frac{1}{2}}|k|^{-1}(\|\nabla W_g\|_{L^2} + |k|\|W\|_{L^2}) \\
&\quad + C\varepsilon_0 \nu^{\frac{1}{2}}(1-|\lambda|)^{-1}\|W\|_{L^2} + C\varepsilon_0 \nu^{\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\nabla W\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq C\|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2} + C\varepsilon_0 \nu^{\frac{1}{2}}(1-|\lambda|)^{-1}\|W\|_{L^2} + C\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}\varepsilon_0\|\nabla W_g\|_{L^2},
\end{aligned}$$

which gives by taking ε_0 small enough so that $C\varepsilon_0 \leq 1/2$ that

$$(8.50) \quad \nu^{\frac{1}{2}}|k|(1-|\lambda|)^{-1}\|W\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2} + \varepsilon_0 \nu^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla W_g\|_{L^2}).$$

Then by (8.48), (8.49), (8.50) and Lemma 8.3, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}|k|\|\nabla W_g\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{3}{4}}|k|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\Delta W_g\|_{L^2} + \nu|k|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\Delta W_g\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\partial_x \nabla p^{L(1)}\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq C\|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2} + C\varepsilon_0 \nu^{\frac{1}{2}}|k|^{-1}(\|\nabla W_g\|_{L^2} + |k|\|W\|_{L^2}) \\
&\quad + C\varepsilon_0(1-|\lambda|)^{-1}\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}|k|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|W\|_{L^2} + C\varepsilon_0 \nu^{\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\nabla W\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq C\|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2} + C\varepsilon_0 \nu^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla W_g\|_{L^2} + C\varepsilon_0 \nu^{\frac{1}{2}}\|W\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq C\|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2} + C\varepsilon_0 \nu^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla W_g\|_{L^2},
\end{aligned}$$

which gives by taking ε_0 small enough so that $C\varepsilon_0 \leq 1/2$ that

$$(8.51) \quad \nu^{\frac{1}{2}}|k|\|\nabla W_g\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{3}{4}}|k|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\Delta W_g\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x \nabla p^{L(1)}\|_{L^2} \leq C\|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2}.$$

Now, by (8.51), (8.50) and (8.49), we get

$$(8.52) \quad \nu^{\frac{1}{2}}|k|(1-|\lambda|)^{-1}\|W\|_{L^2} \leq C\|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2},$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(8.53) \quad &\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}(\|\partial_x^2 U\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y)U\|_{L^2}) + \nu^{\frac{2}{3}}(\|\nabla \partial_x^2 U\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y)U\|_{L^2}) \\
&\leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

and by Lemma 8.3,

$$\begin{aligned}
(8.54) \quad &\|\partial_x \nabla W\|_{L^2} = |k|\|\nabla W\|_{L^2} \leq C|k|(\|\nabla W_g\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}}|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|W\|_{L^2}) \\
&\leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2} + C\nu^{-\frac{2}{3}}\|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2} \leq C\nu^{-\frac{2}{3}}\|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

By (8.51), (8.52) and Lemma 8.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(8.55) \quad &\|\partial_x \Delta W\|_{L^2} = |k|\|\Delta W\|_{L^2} \leq C|k|(\|\Delta W_g\|_{L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|W\|_{L^2}) \\
&\leq C\nu^{-\frac{3}{4}}|k|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2} + C\nu^{-1}\|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2} \leq C\nu^{-1}\|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

By (8.10), (8.51) and Lemma 8.3, we have

$$(8.56) \quad \begin{aligned} \nu \|\partial_x \Delta U\|_{L^2} &\leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{4}{3}} \|W\|_{L^2} \leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{\frac{4}{3}} \|W_g\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k| \|\nabla W_g\|_{L^2} \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we can conclude the proposition by (8.53)-(8.56) and (8.51).

9. RESOLVENT ESTIMATES FOR THE FULL LINEARIZED NS SYSTEM

In this section, we consider the full linearized NS system

$$(9.1) \quad \begin{cases} -\nu \Delta W + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)W - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}W + (\partial_y + \kappa \partial_z)p^{L1} \\ \quad + G_1 + \nu(\Delta \kappa)U + 2\nu \nabla \kappa \cdot \nabla U = 0, \\ -\nu \Delta U + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)U - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}U + G_2 + \partial_z p^{L1} = 0, \\ W|_{y=\pm 1} = \partial_y W|_{y=\pm 1} = u|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\Delta p^{L1} = -2ik\partial_y VW, \quad \partial_x W = ikW, \quad \partial_x U = ikU, \quad \partial_x p^{L1} = ikp^{L1}.$$

We assume that $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}, a \in [0, \epsilon_1]$ and V satisfies (4.2).

Proposition 9.1. *Let $W \in H^4(\Omega)$, $U \in H^2(\Omega)$ be a solution of (9.1). Then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} &\nu^{\frac{1}{3}} (\|\partial_x^2 U\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y)U\|_{L^2}^2) + \nu (\|\nabla \partial_x^2 U\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y)U\|_{L^2}^2) \\ &\quad + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\partial_x \nabla W\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu \|\partial_x \Delta W\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{\frac{5}{3}} \|\partial_x \Delta U\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq C\nu^{-1} (\|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_x G_2\|_{L^2}^2). \end{aligned}$$

The proof will be split into two cases: $\nu k^2 \geq 1$ and $\nu k^2 \leq 1$.

9.1. Case of $\nu k^2 \geq 1$. First of all, we consider the following system

$$(9.2) \quad \begin{cases} -\nu \Delta W + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)W - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}W + \partial_y p^{L1} + G = 0, \\ -\nu \Delta U + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)U - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}U + \partial_z p^{L1} = 0, \\ W|_{y=\pm 1} = \partial_y W|_{y=\pm 1} = U|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \\ \partial_x W = ikW, \quad \partial_x U = ikU, \quad \partial_x p^{L1} = ikp^{L1}. \end{cases}$$

where $\Delta p^{L1} = -2ik(\partial_y VW + \partial_z VU)$.

Lemma 9.1. *Let $\nu k^2 \geq 1$, and $W \in H^4(\Omega)$, $U \in H^2(\Omega)$ be a solution of (9.2). Then it holds that*

$$\nu (\|\partial_x \Delta U\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x \Delta W\|_{L^2}) \leq C \|\nabla G\|_{L^2}.$$

Proof. We get by integration by parts that

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle ik(V - \lambda)W + \partial_y p^{L1}, \Delta W \rangle + \langle ik(V - \lambda)\nabla W, \nabla W \rangle + \langle ik(\nabla V)W, \nabla W \rangle \\ &= \langle \partial_y \Delta p^{L1}, W \rangle = -\langle \Delta p^{L1}, \partial_y W \rangle = \langle 2ik(\partial_y VW + \partial_z VU), \partial_y W \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle ik(V - \lambda)W + \partial_y p^{L1}, \Delta W \rangle = \langle \nu \Delta W + a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}W - G, \Delta W \rangle \\ &= \nu \|\Delta W\|_{L^2}^2 - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3} \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2 - \langle G, \Delta W \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

from which, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu \|\Delta W\|_{L^2}^2 - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3} \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2 - \langle G, \Delta W \rangle + \langle ik(V - \lambda) \nabla W, \nabla W \rangle \\ &= \langle ik(\partial_y V, -\partial_z V) W, (\partial_y, \partial_z) W \rangle + \langle 2ik \partial_z V U, \partial_y W \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the real part, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu \|\Delta W\|_{L^2}^2 - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3} \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2 - \|G\|_{L^2} \|\Delta W\|_{L^2} - 2|k| \|\partial_z V\|_{L^\infty} \|U\|_{L^2} \|\partial_y W\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq |k| \|\nabla V\|_{L^\infty} \|W\|_{L^2} \|(\partial_y, \partial_z) W\|_{L^2} \leq \|\nabla V\|_{L^\infty} (|k|^2 \|W\|_{L^2}^2 + \|(\partial_y, \partial_z) W\|_{L^2}^2) / 2 \\ & = \|\nabla V\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2 / 2. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\Delta W\|_{L^2}^2 = \|[(\partial_y^2 + \partial_z^2) - k^2] W\|_{L^2}^2 = k^2 \|W\|_{L^2}^2 + 2|k| \|(\partial_y, \partial_z) W\|_{L^2}^2 + \|(\partial_y^2 + \partial_z^2) W\|_{L^2}^2, \\ & \Rightarrow k^2 \|W\|_{L^2} \leq \|\Delta W\|_{L^2}, \quad |k| \|\nabla W\|_{L^2} \leq \|\Delta W\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

and $\|\nabla V\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|\nabla(y)\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla(V - y)\|_{L^\infty} \leq 1 + C\varepsilon_0$ and $\nu k^2 \geq 1$. Take $\varepsilon_0, \epsilon_1$ sufficiently small so that $\|\nabla V\|_{L^\infty} / 2 + a \leq (1 + C\varepsilon_0) / 2 + \epsilon_1 \leq 3/4$, and then

$$(\|\nabla V\|_{L^\infty} / 2 + a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}) \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2 \leq (\|\nabla V\|_{L^\infty} / 2 + a)(\nu k^2) \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2 \leq (3/4) \nu \|\Delta W\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Thus, we deduce that that

$$\nu \|\Delta W\|_{L^2}^2 / 4 - \|G\|_{L^2} \|\Delta W\|_{L^2} \leq 2|k| \|\partial_z V\|_{L^\infty} \|U\|_{L^2} \|\partial_y W\|_{L^2} \leq C\varepsilon_0 \|U\|_{L^2} \|\Delta W\|_{L^2},$$

which gives

$$(9.3) \quad \nu \|\Delta W\|_{L^2} \leq C \|G\|_{L^2} + C\varepsilon_0 \|U\|_{L^2}.$$

To proceed, we need to estimate the pressure p^{L1} . Let $F_1 = (V - \lambda)W$, which satisfies

$$\Delta F_1 = (V - \lambda) \Delta W + 2 \nabla V \cdot \nabla W + \Delta V W, \quad F_1|_{y=\pm 1} = \partial_y F_1|_{y=\pm 1} = 0.$$

We get by integration by parts that

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \partial_y p^{L1}, \Delta F_1 \rangle = \langle \partial_y \Delta p^{L1}, F_1 \rangle = -\langle \Delta p^{L1}, \partial_y F_1 \rangle, \\ & \langle ik(V - \lambda)W, \Delta F_1 \rangle = \langle ikF_1, \Delta F_1 \rangle = -ik \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2}^2, \\ & \langle \nu \Delta W, \Delta F_1 \rangle = \langle \nu \Delta W, (V - \lambda) \Delta W \rangle + \langle \nu \Delta W, 2 \nabla V \cdot \nabla W + \Delta V W \rangle, \\ & \langle -a(\nu k^2)^{1/3} W + G, \Delta F_1 \rangle = a(\nu k^2)^{1/3} \langle \nabla W, \nabla F_1 \rangle - \langle \nabla G, \nabla F_1 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Then by (9.2), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & -\langle \nu \Delta W, (V - \lambda) \Delta W \rangle - \langle \nu \Delta W, 2 \nabla V \cdot \nabla W + \Delta V W \rangle - ik \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & + a(\nu k^2)^{1/3} \langle \nabla W, \nabla F_1 \rangle - \langle \nabla G, \nabla F_1 \rangle - \langle \Delta p^{L1}, \partial_y F_1 \rangle = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the imaginary part, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & |k| \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2}^2 - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3} \|\nabla W\|_{L^2} \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2} - \|\Delta p^{L1}\|_{L^2} \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2} - \|\nabla G\|_{L^2} \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq \nu \|\Delta W\|_{L^2} \|2 \nabla V \cdot \nabla W + \Delta V W\|_{L^2} \leq C \nu \|\Delta W\|_{L^2} (\|\nabla W\|_{L^2} + \|W\|_{L^2}) \leq C \nu |k|^{-1} \|\Delta W\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2} & \leq C(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{-1} \|\nabla W\|_{L^2} + C|k|^{-1} (\|\Delta p^{L1}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla G\|_{L^2}) + C\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{-1} \|\Delta W\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq C|k|^{-1} (\|\Delta p^{L1}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla G\|_{L^2}) + C\nu \|\Delta W\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used $\nu k^2 \geq 1$ and

$$(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{-1} \|\nabla W\|_{L^2} \leq (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{-1} \|\nabla W\|_{L^2} = \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla W\|_{L^2} \leq \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{-1} \|\Delta W\|_{L^2} \leq \nu \|\Delta W\|_{L^2}.$$

Since $-\nu\Delta W + ikF_1 - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}W + \partial_y p^{L1} + G = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\partial_y p^{L1}\|_{L^2} &\leq \nu\|\Delta W\|_{L^2} + a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}\|W\|_{L^2} + \|kF_1\|_{L^2} + \|G\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq 2\nu\|\Delta W\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla F_1\|_{L^2} + |k|^{-1}\|\nabla G\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\nu\|\Delta W\|_{L^2} + C|k|^{-1}(\|\Delta p^{L1}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla G\|_{L^2}).\end{aligned}$$

Here we used $(\nu k^2)^{1/3}\|W\|_{L^2} \leq \nu k^2\|W\|_{L^2} \leq \nu\|\Delta W\|_{L^2}$. On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|k|^{-1}\|\Delta p^{L1}\|_{L^2} &= |k|^{-1}\|2ik(\partial_y VW + \partial_z VU)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq 2\|\partial_y V\|_{L^\infty}\|W\|_{L^2} + 2\|\partial_z V\|_{L^\infty}\|U\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|W\|_{L^2} + \varepsilon_0\|U\|_{L^2})\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Lemma 16.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\partial_z p^{L1}\|_{L^2} &\leq C(\|\partial_y p^{L1}\|_{L^2} + |k|^{-1}\|\Delta p^{L1}\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C\nu\|\Delta W\|_{L^2} + C|k|^{-1}(\|\Delta p^{L1}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla G\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C\nu\|\Delta W\|_{L^2} + C(\|W\|_{L^2} + \varepsilon_0\|U\|_{L^2} + |k|^{-1}\|\nabla G\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C\|G\|_{L^2} + C\varepsilon_0\|U\|_{L^2} + C|k|^{-1}\|\nabla G\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon_0\|U\|_{L^2} + C|k|^{-1}\|\nabla G\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Here we used

$$\|W\|_{L^2} \leq |k|^{-2}\|\Delta W\|_{L^2} \leq \nu\|\Delta W\|_{L^2} \leq C\|G\|_{L^2} + C\varepsilon_0\|U\|_{L^2}.$$

Now, by Proposition 4.1, we have

$$\nu k^2\|U\|_{L^2} \leq \nu\|\Delta U\|_{L^2} \leq C\|\partial_z p^{L1}\|_{L^2} \leq C\varepsilon_0\|U\|_{L^2} + C|k|^{-1}\|\nabla G\|_{L^2}.$$

Due to $\nu k^2 \geq 1$, taking ε_0 small enough so that $C\varepsilon_0 \leq 1/2$, we obtain

$$\|U\|_{L^2} \leq \nu k^2\|U\|_{L^2} \leq C|k|^{-1}\|\nabla G\|_{L^2}, \quad \nu\|\Delta U\|_{L^2} \leq C|k|^{-1}\|\nabla G\|_{L^2},$$

which along with (9.3) gives

$$\begin{aligned}\nu\|\partial_x \Delta U\|_{L^2} + \nu\|\partial_x \Delta W\|_{L^2} &= |k|(\nu\|\Delta U\|_{L^2} + \nu\|\Delta W\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C\|\nabla G\|_{L^2} + C|k|(\|G\|_{L^2} + \varepsilon_0\|U\|_{L^2}) \leq C\|\nabla G\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma. $\square$

Now let us prove Proposition 9.1 when $\nu k^2 \geq 1$.

Proof. We decompose $U = U_1 + U_2$, where (U_1, U_2) solves

$$\begin{cases} -\nu\Delta U_1 + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)U_1 - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}U_1 + \partial_z p^{L1} = 0, \\ -\nu\Delta U_2 + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)U_2 - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}U_2 + G_2 = 0, \\ U_1|_{y=\pm 1} = U_2|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \\ \partial_x U_1 = ikU_1, \quad \partial_x U_2 = ikU_2. \end{cases}$$

Let $G_3 = G_1 + \nu(\Delta \kappa)U_2 + 2\nu\nabla \kappa \cdot \nabla U_2$. Then we find that

$$\begin{cases} -\nu\Delta(W - \kappa U_1) + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)(W - \kappa U_1) - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}(W - \kappa U_1) + \partial_y p^{L1} + G_3 = 0, \\ -\nu\Delta U_1 + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)U_1 - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}U_1 + \partial_z p^{L1} = 0, \\ \Delta p^{L1} = -2ik[\partial_y V(W - \kappa U_1) + \partial_z VU_1], \\ (W - \kappa U_1)|_{y=\pm 1} = \partial_y(W - \kappa U_1)|_{y=\pm 1} = U_1|_{y=\pm 1} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Then we infer from Lemma 9.1 that

$$\nu(\|\partial_x \Delta U_1\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x \Delta W\|_{L^2}) \leq C\nu(\|\partial_x \Delta U_1\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x \Delta(W - \kappa U_1)\|_{L^2}) \leq C\|\nabla G_3\|_{L^2}.$$

And by Proposition 4.1, we have

$$\nu\|\Delta U_2\|_{L^2} \leq C\|G_2\|_{L^2}.$$

Thanks to the definition of G_3 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla G_3\|_{L^2} &\leq \|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2} + C\nu\|\nabla[(\Delta\kappa)U_2]\|_{L^2} + C\nu\|\nabla(\nabla\kappa \cdot \nabla U_2)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2} + C\nu(\|\Delta\kappa\|_{H^1}\|U_2\|_{H^2} + \|\nabla\kappa\|_{H^2}\|\nabla U_2\|_{H^1}) \\ &\leq \|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2} + C\nu\varepsilon_0\|\Delta U_2\|_{L^2} \leq \|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2} + C\varepsilon_0\|G_2\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$\nu(\|\partial_x \Delta U\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x \Delta W\|_{L^2}) \leq C\|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2} + C|k|\|G_2\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x G_2\|_{L^2}),$$

from which and $\nu k^2 \geq 1$, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} &\nu^{\frac{2}{3}}(\|\partial_x^2 U\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)U\|_{L^2}) + \nu(\|\nabla\partial_x^2 U\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)U\|_{L^2}) \\ &\quad + \nu^{\frac{2}{3}}\|\partial_x \nabla W\|_{L^2} + \nu\|\partial_x \Delta W\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{4}{3}}\|\partial_x \Delta U\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\left(\nu^{\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{-1}\|\partial_x \Delta U\|_{L^2} + \nu\|\partial_x \Delta U\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{-1}\|\partial_x \Delta W\|_{L^2} + \nu\|\partial_x \Delta W\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{4}{3}}\|\partial_x \Delta U\|_{L^2}\right) \\ &\leq C\nu(\|\partial_x \Delta U\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x \Delta W\|_{L^2}) \leq C(\|\partial_x G_2\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2}). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof when $\nu k^2 \geq 1$. $\square$

9.2. Case of $\nu k^2 \leq 1$. First of all, we decompose $U = U_1 + U_2$ and $p^{L1} = p^{L(0)} + p^{L(1)}$, where (U_1, U_2, W) solve

$$(9.4) \quad \begin{cases} -\nu\Delta W + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)W - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}W + (\partial_y + \kappa\partial_z)p^{L1} \\ \quad + G_1 + \nu(\Delta\kappa)U + 2\nu\nabla\kappa \cdot \nabla U = 0, \\ -\nu\Delta U_1 + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)U_1 - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}U_1 + \partial_z p^{L(0)} = 0, \\ -\nu\Delta U_2 + ik(V(y, z) - \lambda)U_2 - a(\nu k^2)^{1/3}U_2 + G_2 + \partial_z p^{L(1)} = 0, \\ \Delta p^{L(0)} = -2ik\partial_y VW, \quad \partial_y p^{L(0)}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \quad \Delta p^{L(1)} = 0, \\ W|_{y=\pm 1} = \partial_y W|_{y=\pm 1} = U_1|_{y=\pm 1} = U_2|_{y=\pm 1} = 0. \end{cases}$$

With this decomposition, we can apply Proposition 8.1 with $G = G_1 + \nu(\Delta\kappa)U_2 + 2\nu\nabla\kappa \cdot \nabla U_2$ to the system (9.4) of (W, U_1) to obtain

$$(9.5) \quad \begin{aligned} &\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}(\|\partial_x^2 U_1\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)U_1\|_{L^2}^2) + \nu(\|\nabla\partial_x^2 U_1\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)U_1\|_{L^2}^2) \\ &\quad + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\partial_x \nabla W\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu\|\partial_x \Delta W\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{\frac{5}{3}}\|\partial_x \Delta U_1\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1}\|\partial_x \nabla p^{L(1)}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq C\nu^{-1}\|\nabla G\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 4.1 and (9.5), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\nabla U_2\|_{L^2} + \nu\|\Delta U_2\|_{L^2} &\leq C(\|G_2\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla p^{L(1)}\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C|k|^{-1}(\|\partial_x G_2\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla G\|_{L^2}). \end{aligned}$$

As in the case above, we have

$$\|\nabla G\|_{L^2} \leq \|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2} + C\nu\varepsilon_0\|\Delta U_2\|_{L^2} \leq \|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2} + C\varepsilon_0|k|^{-1}(\|\partial_x G_2\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla G\|_{L^2}),$$

which gives by taking ε_0 small enough so that $C\varepsilon_0 \leq 1/2$ that

$$(9.6) \quad \|\nabla G\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x G_2\|_{L^2}).$$

Then we obtain

$$(9.7) \quad \begin{aligned} & \nu^{\frac{2}{3}}(\|\partial_x^2 U_2\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)U_2\|_{L^2}) + \nu(\|\nabla\partial_x^2 U_2\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)U_2\|_{L^2}) \\ & + \nu^{\frac{4}{3}}\|\partial_x\Delta U_2\|_{L^2} \leq C(\nu^{\frac{2}{3}}\|\partial_x\nabla U_2\|_{L^2} + \nu\|\partial_x\Delta U_2\|_{L^2}) \\ & \leq C|k|(\nu^{\frac{2}{3}}\|\nabla U_2\|_{L^2} + \nu\|\Delta U_2\|_{L^2}) \leq C(\|\partial_x G_2\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla G\|_{L^2}). \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (9.5), (9.7) and (9.6) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}(\|\partial_x^2 U\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)U\|_{L^2}^2) + \nu(\|\nabla\partial_x^2 U\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)U\|_{L^2}^2) \\ & + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\partial_x\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu\|\partial_x\Delta W\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{\frac{5}{3}}\|\partial_x\Delta U\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C\nu^{-1}(\|\partial_x G_2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla G_1\|_{L^2}^2). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the case of $\nu k^2 \leq 1$.

10. SPACE-TIME ESTIMATES OF THE LINEARIZED EQUATION

In this section, we denote $\|F\|_{L^q L^p} = \|F\|_{L^q(0,T;L^p(I))}$ or $\|F\|_{L^q(0,+\infty;L^p(I))}$ when the function F is extended to $t \geq T$.

10.1. Space-time estimates with Navier-slip boundary condition. In this subsection, we study the space-time estimate of the following linearized equation:

$$(10.1) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t \omega - \nu(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)\omega + iky\omega = -ikf_1 - \partial_y f_2 - i\ell f_3 - f_4, \\ \omega|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \quad \omega|_{t=0} = \omega_{in}. \end{cases}$$

In what follows, we assume $a \in [0, \epsilon_1]$.

Proposition 10.1. *Let ω be a solution of (10.1) with $f_4(t, \pm 1) = 0$ and $\omega_{in}(\pm 1) = 0$. Then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|e^{av^{1/3}t}\omega\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu\|e^{av^{1/3}t}\omega'\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + (\nu\eta^2 + (\nu k^2)^{1/3})\|e^{av^{1/3}t}\omega\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C\left(\|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1}\|e^{av^{1/3}t}f_2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + (\eta|k|)^{-1}\|e^{av^{1/3}t}\partial_y f_4\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \eta|k|^{-1}\|e^{av^{1/3}t}f_4\|_{L^2 L^2}^2\right. \\ & \quad \left.+ \min((\nu\eta^2)^{-1}, (\nu k^2)^{-1/3})\|e^{av^{1/3}t}(kf_1 + \ell f_3)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|e^{av^{1/3}t}\omega'\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu\|e^{av^{1/3}t}\omega''\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu\eta^2\|e^{av^{1/3}t}\omega'\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C\|\omega'_{in}\|_{L^2}^2 + C\nu^{-\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{\frac{2}{3}}\left(\|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2}^2 + (\eta|k|)^{-1}\|e^{av^{1/3}t}\partial_y f_4\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \eta|k|^{-1}\|e^{av^{1/3}t}f_4\|_{L^2 L^2}^2\right) \\ & + C\nu^{-1}\left(\|e^{av^{1/3}t}(kf_1 + \ell f_3)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu^{-\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{\frac{2}{3}}\|e^{av^{1/3}t}f_2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|e^{av^{1/3}t}\partial_y f_2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\tilde{\omega} = e^{av^{1/3}t}\omega$ and $\tilde{f}_j = e^{av^{1/3}t}f_j$. Then $\tilde{\omega}$ satisfies

$$(10.2) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t \tilde{\omega} - \nu(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)\tilde{\omega} + iky\tilde{\omega} - av^{1/3}\tilde{\omega} = -ik\tilde{f}_1 - \partial_y \tilde{f}_2 - i\ell\tilde{f}_3 - \tilde{f}_4, \\ \tilde{\omega}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \quad \tilde{\omega}|_{t=0} = \omega_{in}. \end{cases}$$

We decompose $\tilde{\omega}$ as $\tilde{\omega} = \omega_I + \omega_H$, where ω_H and ω_I solve

$$(10.3) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t \omega_I - \nu(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)\omega_I + iky\omega_I - av^{1/3}\omega_I = -ik\tilde{f}_1 - \partial_y \tilde{f}_2 - i\ell\tilde{f}_3 - \tilde{f}_4, \\ \omega_I|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \quad \omega_I|_{t=0} = 0, \end{cases}$$

and

$$(10.4) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t \omega_H - \nu(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2) \omega_H + iky \omega_H - a\nu^{1/3} \omega_H = 0, \\ \omega_H|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \quad \omega_H|_{t=0} = \omega_{in}. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 10.1. *Let ω_H be a solution of (10.4) with $\omega_{in}(\pm 1) = 0$. Then it holds that*

$$\|\omega_H\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu \|\omega'_H\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + (\nu\eta^2 + (\nu k^2)^{1/3}) \|\omega_H\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C \|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Proof. Let $L_{k,\ell} = \nu(k^2 + \ell^2 - \partial_y^2) + iky$ with $D(L_{k,\ell}) = H^2 \cap H_0^1(-1, 1)$. Then we have

$$\omega_H(t) = e^{-tL_{k,\ell} + t a \nu^{1/3}} \omega_{in}.$$

Thanks to the fact that for $f \in D(L_{k,\ell})$

$$(10.5) \quad \operatorname{Re} \langle L_{k,\ell} f, f \rangle = \nu(k^2 + \ell^2) \|f\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu \|f'\|_{L^2}^2,$$

the operator $L_{k,\ell}$ is accretive for any $k, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Thanks to Proposition 7.3, when $\nu\eta^3 \leq |k|$, there exists $c > 0$ so that for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\Psi(L_{k,\ell}) \geq c(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}} \geq 2a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}$$

for $0 \leq a \leq \epsilon_1$ small enough, and when $\nu\eta^3 \geq |k|$, we get by (10.5) that

$$\Psi(L_{k,\ell}) \geq \nu\eta^2 \geq \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{\frac{2}{3}} \geq 2a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}.$$

Then it follows from Lemma 16.13 that

$$\|\omega_H(t)\|_{L^2} \leq e^{-t\Psi(L_{k,\ell}) + \pi/2 + t a \nu^{1/3}} \|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2} \leq C e^{-\frac{ct}{2}(\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}} \|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2},$$

which gives

$$(10.6) \quad \|\omega_H\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + (\nu k^2)^{1/3} \|\omega_H\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C \|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2}^2.$$

The basic energy estimate yields that

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\omega_H\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu \|\omega'_H\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu\eta^2 \|\omega_H\|_{L^2}^2 = a\nu^{1/3} \|\omega_H\|_{L^2}^2,$$

which gives

$$(10.7) \quad \|\omega_H\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu \|\omega'_H\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu\eta^2 \|\omega_H\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C (\|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2}^2 + a\nu^{1/3} \|\omega_H\|_{L^2 L^2}^2).$$

Now the result follows from (10.6), (10.7) and the fact that $a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}$. $\square$

Lemma 10.2. *Let ω_I be a solution of (10.3) with $\tilde{f}_4(t, \pm 1) = 0$. If $\nu\eta^3 \leq |k|$, then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\omega_I\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu \|\omega'_I\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + (\nu\eta^2 + (\nu k^2)^{1/3}) \|\omega_I\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \eta |k| \|\omega_I\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C \left((\nu k^2)^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|k \tilde{f}_1 + \ell \tilde{f}_3\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1} \|\tilde{f}_2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + (\eta |k|)^{-1} \|\partial_y \tilde{f}_4\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \eta |k|^{-1} \|\tilde{f}_4\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Here $u_I = (\partial_y \varphi_I, -i\eta \varphi_I)$ and $\varphi_I = (\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)^{-1} \omega_I$.

Proof. We first extend the solution ω_I to $t > T$ by solving (10.3) with $\tilde{f}_j = 0$ for $t > T$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{u}(\lambda, y) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} u_I(t, y) e^{-i\lambda t} dt, \quad w(\lambda, y) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \omega_I(t, y) e^{-i\lambda t} dt, \\ \hat{f}_j(\lambda, y) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \tilde{f}_j(t, y) e^{-i\lambda t} dt, \quad j = 1, 2, 3, 4. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{cases} -\nu(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)w + ik(y + \lambda/k)w - a\nu^{1/3}w = -ik\hat{f}_1 - \partial_y\hat{f}_2 - i\ell\hat{f}_3 - \hat{f}_4, \\ w|_{y=\pm 1} = 0. \end{cases}$$

It follows from Proposition 7.3 and Proposition 7.6 that

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu\|w'\|_{L^2}^2 + (\nu k^2)^{1/3}\|w\|_{L^2}^2 + \eta|k|\|\hat{u}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C\left((\nu k^2)^{-1/3}\|k\hat{f}_1 + \ell\hat{f}_3\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1}\|\hat{f}_2\|_{L^2}^2 + (\eta|k|)^{-1}(\|\partial_y\hat{f}_4\|_{L^2}^2 + \eta^2\|\hat{f}_4\|_{L^2}^2)\right), \end{aligned}$$

from which and Plancherel's theorem, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu\|\omega'_I\|_{L_t^2 L^2}^2 + (\nu k^2)^{1/3}\|\omega_I\|_{L_t^2 L^2}^2 + \eta|k|\|u_I\|_{L_t^2 L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C(\nu\|w'\|_{L_\lambda^2 L^2}^2 + (\nu k^2)^{1/3}\|w\|_{L_\lambda^2 L^2}^2 + \eta|k|\|\hat{u}\|_{L_\lambda^2 L^2}^2) \\ & \leq C\left((\nu k^2)^{-1/3}\|k\hat{f}_1 + \ell\hat{f}_3\|_{L_\lambda^2 L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1}\|\hat{f}_2\|_{L_\lambda^2 L^2}^2 + (\eta|k|)^{-1}(\|\partial_y\hat{f}_4\|_{L_\lambda^2 L^2}^2 + \eta^2\|\hat{f}_4\|_{L_\lambda^2 L^2}^2)\right) \\ & \leq C\left((\nu k^2)^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|k\tilde{f}_1 + \ell\tilde{f}_3\|_{L_t^2 L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1}\|\tilde{f}_2\|_{L_t^2 L^2}^2 + (\eta|k|)^{-1}(\|\partial_y\tilde{f}_4\|_{L_t^2 L^2}^2 + \eta^2\|\tilde{f}_4\|_{L_t^2 L^2}^2)\right). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, the basic energy estimate yields that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\omega_I\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu\|\omega'_I\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu\eta^2\|\omega_I\|_{L^2}^2 - a\nu^{1/3}\|\omega_I\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \leq \|k\tilde{f}_1 + \ell\tilde{f}_3\|_{L^2}\|\omega_I\|_{L^2} + \|\tilde{f}_2\|_{L^2}\|\partial_y\omega_I\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_y\tilde{f}_4\|_{L^2}\|\partial_y\varphi_I\|_{L^2} + \eta^2\|\tilde{f}_4\|_{L^2}\|\varphi_I\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq ((\nu k^2)^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|k\tilde{f}_1 + \ell\tilde{f}_3\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1}\|\tilde{f}_2\|_{L^2}^2 + (\eta|k|)^{-1}(\|\partial_y\tilde{f}_4\|_{L^2}^2 + \eta^2\|\tilde{f}_4\|_{L^2}^2)) \\ & \quad + ((\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\omega_I\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu\|\partial_y\omega_I\|_{L^2}^2 + \eta|k|\|u_I\|_{L^2}^2)/4, \end{aligned}$$

here we used $|\langle \tilde{f}_4, \omega_I \rangle| = |\langle \tilde{f}_4, (\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)\varphi_I \rangle| \leq \|\partial_y\tilde{f}_4\|_{L^2}\|\partial_y\varphi_I\|_{L^2} + \eta^2\|\tilde{f}_4\|_{L^2}\|\varphi_I\|_{L^2}$. This shows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\omega_I\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu\|\omega'_I\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu\eta^2\|\omega_I\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C\left((\nu k^2)^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|k\tilde{f}_1 + \ell\tilde{f}_3\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1}\|\tilde{f}_2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + (\eta|k|)^{-1}(\|\partial_y\tilde{f}_4\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \eta^2\|\tilde{f}_4\|_{L^2 L^2}^2)\right) \\ & \quad + C((\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}} + a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}})\|\omega_I\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + C\eta|k|\|u_I\|_{L^2 L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Summing up and noting that $a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}$, we conclude the proof of the lemma. $\square$

Now we are in a position to prove Proposition 10.1.

Proof. We first consider the case of $\nu\eta^3 \leq |k|$. In this case, we have $\nu\eta^2 \leq (\nu k^2)^{1/3}$. It follows from Lemma 10.1 and lemma 10.2 that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\tilde{\omega}\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu\|\tilde{\omega}'\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + (\nu\eta^2 + (\nu k^2)^{1/3})\|\tilde{\omega}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C\left(\|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1}\|\tilde{f}_2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + (\eta|k|)^{-1}\|\partial_y\tilde{f}_4\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \eta|k|^{-1}\|\tilde{f}_4\|_{L^2 L^2}^2\right. \\ & \quad \left.+ (\nu k^2)^{-1/3}\|k\tilde{f}_1 + \ell\tilde{f}_3\|_{L^2 L^2}^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

For the case of $\nu\eta^3 \geq |k|$, we have $\nu\eta^2 \geq (\nu k^2)^{1/3}$, $(\nu\eta^2)^{-1} \leq \eta|k|^{-1}$. The basic energy estimate yields that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\tilde{\omega}\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu\|\tilde{\omega}'\|_{L^2}^2 + (\nu\eta^2 - a\nu^{1/3})\|\tilde{\omega}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \leq \|ik\tilde{f}_1 + i\ell\tilde{f}_3 + \tilde{f}_4\|_{L^2}\|\tilde{\omega}\|_{L^2} + \|\tilde{f}_2\|_{L^2}\|\partial_y\tilde{\omega}\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq ((\nu\eta^2)^{-1}\|ik\tilde{f}_1 + i\ell\tilde{f}_3 + \tilde{f}_4\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1}\|\tilde{f}_2\|_{L^2}^2) \\ &\quad + (\nu\eta^2\|\tilde{\omega}\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu\|\partial_y\tilde{\omega}\|_{L^2}^2)/4, \end{aligned}$$

which shows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\tilde{\omega}\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu\|\tilde{\omega}'\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu\eta^2\|\tilde{\omega}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\ &\leq C(\|\omega'_{in}\|_{L^2}^2 + (\nu\eta^2)^{-1}\|ik\tilde{f}_1 + i\ell\tilde{f}_3 + \tilde{f}_4\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1}\|\tilde{f}_2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2) \\ &\leq C(\|\omega'_{in}\|_{L^2}^2 + (\nu\eta^2)^{-1}\|ik\tilde{f}_1 + i\ell\tilde{f}_3\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \eta|k|^{-1}\|\tilde{f}_4\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1}\|\tilde{f}_2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2). \end{aligned}$$

This shows the first inequality of the proposition.

It remains to prove the second inequality. The basic energy estimate yields that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|\tilde{\omega}'\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu\|\tilde{\omega}''\|_{L^2}^2 + (\nu\eta^2 - a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}})\|\tilde{\omega}'\|_{L^2}^2 + \mathbf{Re}\left(ik\int_{-1}^1\tilde{\omega}\tilde{\omega}'dy\right) \\ &= \mathbf{Re}(\langle ik\tilde{f}_1 + \partial_y\tilde{f}_2 + i\ell\tilde{f}_3 + \tilde{f}_4, \partial_y^2\tilde{\omega} \rangle) = \mathbf{Re}(\langle ik\tilde{f}_1 + \partial_y\tilde{f}_2 + i\ell\tilde{f}_3, \partial_y^2\tilde{\omega} \rangle - \langle \partial_y\tilde{f}_4, \partial_y\tilde{\omega} \rangle) \\ &\leq \nu^{-1}\|ik\tilde{f}_1 + \partial_y\tilde{f}_2 + i\ell\tilde{f}_3\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu\|\tilde{\omega}''\|_{L^2}^2/4 + \|\partial_y\tilde{f}_4\|_{L^2}\|\partial_y\tilde{\omega}\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt}\|\tilde{\omega}'\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu\|\tilde{\omega}''\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\nu\eta^2\|\tilde{\omega}'\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq C(|k|\|\tilde{\omega}\|_{L^2}\|\tilde{\omega}'\|_{L^2} + a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\partial_y\tilde{\omega}\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1}\|ik\tilde{f}_1 + \partial_y\tilde{f}_2 + i\ell\tilde{f}_3\|_{L^2}^2) + 2\|\partial_y\tilde{f}_4\|_{L^2}\|\partial_y\tilde{\omega}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq C(\nu^{-\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{\frac{4}{3}}\|\tilde{\omega}\|_{L^2}^2 + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\tilde{\omega}'\|_{L^2}^2 + a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\tilde{\omega}'\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1}\|ik\tilde{f}_1 + \partial_y\tilde{f}_2 + i\ell\tilde{f}_3\|_{L^2}^2) \\ &\quad + (\nu\eta^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\nu k^2)^{-\frac{1}{6}}\|\partial_y\tilde{f}_4\|_{L^2}^2 + (\nu\eta^2 + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}})\|\partial_y\tilde{\omega}\|_{L^2}^2/2. \end{aligned}$$

and hence,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt}\|\tilde{\omega}'\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu\|\tilde{\omega}''\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu\eta^2\|\tilde{\omega}'\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq C\left(\nu^{-\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{\frac{4}{3}}\|\tilde{\omega}\|_{L^2}^2 + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\tilde{\omega}'\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1}\|ik\tilde{f}_1 + \partial_y\tilde{f}_2 + i\ell\tilde{f}_3\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{-\frac{2}{3}}\eta^{-1}|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|\partial_y\tilde{f}_4\|_{L^2}^2\right), \end{aligned}$$

from which and the first inequality of the proposition, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\tilde{\omega}'\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu\|\tilde{\omega}''\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu\eta^2\|\tilde{\omega}'\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\ &\leq C\left(\|\omega'_{in}\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{-\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{\frac{4}{3}}\|\tilde{\omega}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + (\nu k^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\tilde{\omega}'\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu^{-\frac{2}{3}}\eta^{-1}|k|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|\partial_y\tilde{f}_4\|_{L^2 L^2}^2\right. \\ &\quad \left.+ \nu^{-1}\|ik\tilde{f}_1 + \partial_y\tilde{f}_2 + i\ell\tilde{f}_3\|_{L^2 L^2}^2\right) \\ &\leq C\|\omega'_{in}\|_{L^2}^2 + C\nu^{-\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{\frac{2}{3}}(\|\tilde{\omega}\|_{Y_{k,\ell}^0}^2 + |\eta k|^{-1}\|\partial_y\tilde{f}_4\|_{L^2}^2) + C\nu^{-1}\|ik\tilde{f}_1 + \partial_y\tilde{f}_2 + i\ell\tilde{f}_3\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\ &\leq C\|\omega'_{in}\|_{L^2}^2 + C\nu^{-\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{\frac{2}{3}}\left(\|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1}\|\tilde{f}_2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + (\eta|k|)^{-1}\|\partial_y\tilde{f}_4\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \eta|k|^{-1}\|\tilde{f}_4\|_{L^2 L^2}^2\right. \\ &\quad \left.+ (\nu k^2)^{-1/3}\|k\tilde{f}_1 + l\tilde{f}_3\|_{L^2 L^2}^2\right) + C\nu^{-1}\|ik\tilde{f}_1 + \partial_y\tilde{f}_2 + i\ell\tilde{f}_3\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\ &\leq C\|\omega'_{in}\|_{L^2}^2 + C\nu^{-\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{\frac{2}{3}}(\|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2}^2 + (\eta|k|)^{-1}\|\partial_y\tilde{f}_4\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \eta|k|^{-1}\|\tilde{f}_4\|_{L^2 L^2}^2) \\ &\quad + C\nu^{-1}(\|k\tilde{f}_1 + \ell\tilde{f}_3\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu^{-\frac{2}{3}}|k|^{\frac{2}{3}}\|\tilde{f}_2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|\partial_y\tilde{f}_2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the second inequality of the proposition. (See section 13 for the definition of the norm $\|\cdot\|_{Y_{k,\ell}^0}$). $\square$

10.2. Space-time estimates with non-slip boundary condition. In this subsection, we study the space-time estimate of the following linearized equation with non-slip boundary condition:

$$(10.8) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t \omega - \nu(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)\omega + iky\omega = F, \\ (\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)\varphi = \omega, \quad \partial_y \varphi|_{y=\pm 1} = \varphi|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \\ \omega|_{t=0} = \omega_{in}. \end{cases}$$

Here $\eta \geq k$ and $0 < \nu \leq \nu_0$, $0 \leq a \leq \epsilon_1 \leq 1/8$.

Proposition 10.2. *Let ω solve (10.8) with $\partial_y \varphi_{in}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$ and $F = ikf_1 + \partial_y f_2 + i\ell f_3$. Then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} & |k\eta|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}(\partial_y, \eta)\varphi\|_{L^2 L^2} + \nu^{\frac{3}{4}} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\partial_y \omega\|_{L^2 L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \eta \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\omega\|_{L^2 L^2} + \eta \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}(\partial_y, \eta)\varphi\|_{L^\infty L^2} \\ & + \nu^{\frac{1}{4}} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\omega\|_{L^\infty L^2} \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}(f_1, f_2, f_3)\|_{L^2 L^2} + C(\eta^{-1} \|\partial_y \omega_{in}\|_{L^2} + \|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2}). \end{aligned}$$

The proof is based on the following lemmas.

Lemma 10.3. *Let ω solve (10.8) with $\partial_y \varphi_{in}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$ and $F = f_1 + \partial_y f_2$. If $\nu\eta^3 \leq |k|$, then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & |k\eta|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}(\partial_y, \eta)\varphi\|_{L^2 L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{4}} |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\omega\|_{L^2 L^2} \\ & \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}f_2\|_{L^2 L^2} + |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}f_1\|_{L^2 L^2}) + C(\eta^{-1} \|\partial_y \omega_{in}\|_{L^2} + \|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We first extend the solution ω to $t > T$ by solving (10.8) with $F = 0$ for $t > T$, and extend the solution ω to $t < 0$ by

$$\omega(t, y) = e^{-itky + (\nu k^2)^{1/3}t} \omega_{in}(y) \quad t < 0,$$

i.e., $\partial_t \omega + iky\omega - (\nu k^2)^{1/3}\omega = 0$ for $t < 0$, and extend φ to $t < 0$ by

$$(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)\varphi = \omega, \quad \varphi|_{y=\pm 1} = 0 \quad \text{for } t < 0,$$

and extend F, f_1, f_2 to $t < 0$ by

$$F = -\nu(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)\omega + (\nu k^2)^{1/3}\omega, \quad f_1 = (\nu\eta^2 + (\nu k^2)^{1/3})\omega, \quad f_2 = -\nu\partial_y \omega \quad \text{for } t < 0.$$

Then it holds that for $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)\varphi = \omega$, $\varphi|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$ and

$$\partial_t \omega - \nu(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)\omega + iky\omega = F = f_1 + \partial_y f_2.$$

We denote

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\varphi}(\lambda, y) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi(t, y) e^{a\nu^{1/3}t - i\lambda t} dt, \quad w(\lambda, y) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \omega(t, y) e^{a\nu^{1/3}t - i\lambda t} dt, \\ F_j(\lambda, y) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_j(t, y) e^{a\nu^{1/3}t - i\lambda t} dt \quad j = 1, 2. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{cases} -\nu(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)w + ik(y + \lambda/k)w - a\nu^{1/3}w = F_1 + \partial_y F_2, \\ (\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)\hat{\varphi} = w, \quad \hat{\varphi}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0. \end{cases}$$

It follows from Proposition 7.7 and Proposition 7.8 that

$$\begin{aligned} \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(\partial_y, \eta)\hat{\varphi}\|_{L_y^2} &\leq C(\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F_2\|_{L_y^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} \|F_1\|_{L_y^2} + |\partial_y \hat{\varphi}(\lambda, 1)| + |\partial_y \hat{\varphi}(\lambda, -1)|), \\ \|w\|_{L_y^2} &\leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{4}} ((|k(1 + \lambda/k)| + 1)^{\frac{1}{4}} |\partial_y \hat{\varphi}(\lambda, 1)| + (|k(1 - \lambda/k)| + 1)^{\frac{1}{4}} |\partial_y \hat{\varphi}(\lambda, -1)|) \end{aligned}$$

$$+ C((\nu k^2)^{-\frac{5}{12}} \|F_1\|_{L_y^2} + \nu^{-\frac{3}{4}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F_2\|_{L_y^2}).$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(\partial_y, \eta) \hat{\varphi}\|_{L_y^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{4}} \|w\|_{L_y^2} &\leq C(\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F_2\|_{L_y^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} \|F_1\|_{L_y^2}) \\ &\quad + C((|k + \lambda| + 1)^{\frac{1}{4}} |\partial_y \hat{\varphi}(\lambda, 1)| + (|k - \lambda| + 1)^{\frac{1}{4}} |\partial_y \hat{\varphi}(\lambda, -1)|). \end{aligned}$$

from which and Plancherel's theorem, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} &\eta^{\frac{1}{2}} \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t}(\partial_y, \eta)\varphi(t, y)\|_{L_{t \in \mathbb{R}}^2 L_y^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{4}} \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t}\omega(t, y)\|_{L_{t \in \mathbb{R}}^2 L_y^2} \\ &\leq \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(\partial_y, \eta)\hat{\varphi}(\lambda, y)\|_{L_\lambda^2 L_y^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{4}} \|w(\lambda, y)\|_{L_\lambda^2 L_y^2} \\ &\leq C(\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F_2\|_{L_\lambda^2 L_y^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} \|F_1\|_{L_\lambda^2 L_y^2}) \\ &\quad + C((|k + \lambda| + 1)^{\frac{1}{4}} \|\partial_y \hat{\varphi}(\lambda, 1)\|_{L_\lambda^2} + (|k - \lambda| + 1)^{\frac{1}{4}} \|\partial_y \hat{\varphi}(\lambda, -1)\|_{L_\lambda^2}) \\ &\leq C(\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} f_2\|_{L_{t \in \mathbb{R}}^2 L_y^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} f_1\|_{L_{t \in \mathbb{R}}^2 L_y^2}) \\ &\quad + C((|k + \lambda| + 1)c_1\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} + (|k - \lambda| + 1)c_2\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}), \end{aligned}$$

here we denote

$$\begin{aligned} c_1(\lambda) &= \partial_y \hat{\varphi}(\lambda, 1) = \int_{-1}^1 \frac{\sinh(\eta(1+y))}{\sinh(2\eta)} w(\lambda, y) dy, \\ c_2(\lambda) &= -\partial_y \hat{\varphi}(\lambda, -1) = \int_{-1}^1 \frac{\sinh(\eta(1-y))}{\sinh(2\eta)} w(\lambda, y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

Since $f_1 = (\nu\eta^2 + (\nu k^2)^{1/3})\omega$, $f_2 = -\nu\partial_y\omega$ for $t < 0$, $\nu\eta^3 \leq |k|$, $\nu\eta^2 \leq (\nu k^2)^{1/3}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} f_2\|_{L_t^2(-\infty, 0)} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} f_1\|_{L_t^2(-\infty, 0)} \\ &\leq \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y \omega\|_{L_t^2(-\infty, 0)} + C\nu^{\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{6}} \|\omega\|_{L_t^2(-\infty, 0)} \\ &\leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left\| ((-ikt, |k/\nu|^{\frac{1}{3}})\omega_{in}(y), \partial_y \omega_{in}(y)) e^{-ikty + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{\frac{2}{3}} t} \right\|_{L_t^2(-\infty, 0]} \\ &\leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\omega_{in}| + \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} |\partial_y \omega_{in}|) \\ &\leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} (|\omega_{in}| + |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}} |\partial_y \omega_{in}|) \leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} (|\omega_{in}| + \eta^{-1} |\partial_y \omega_{in}|), \end{aligned}$$

which shows that

$$\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} f_2\|_{L_{t < 0}^2 L_y^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} f_1\|_{L_{t < 0}^2 L_y^2} \leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2} + \eta^{-1} \|\partial_y \omega_{in}\|_{L^2}).$$

and then,

$$\begin{aligned} &\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} f_2\|_{L_{t \in \mathbb{R}}^2 L_y^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} f_1\|_{L_{t \in \mathbb{R}}^2 L_y^2} \leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2} + \eta^{-1} \|\partial_y \omega_{in}\|_{L^2}) \\ &\quad + \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} f_2\|_{L^2 L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{5}{6}} \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} f_1\|_{L^2 L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to estimate $c_1(\lambda)$ and $c_2(\lambda)$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} a_1(t) &= e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \int_{-1}^1 \frac{\sinh(\eta(1+y))}{\sinh(2\eta)} \omega(t, y) dy, \\ \tilde{a}_1(t) &= e^{(a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}} + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |k|^{\frac{2}{3}})t} \int_{-1}^1 \frac{\sinh(\eta(1+y))}{\sinh(2\eta)} \omega_{in}(y) e^{ikt(1-y)} dy. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$c_1(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} a_1(t) e^{-i\lambda t} dt, \quad a_1(t) = e^{ikt} \tilde{a}_1(t) \text{ for } t < 0,$$

and due to $\partial_y \varphi|_{y=\pm 1} = \varphi|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$ for $t > 0$, we have $a_1(t) = 0$ for $t > 0$. By Plancherel's theorem, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|a_1(t)\|_{L^2(-\infty, 0)}^2 &\leq \|e^{-(a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}} + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{\frac{2}{3}})t} \tilde{a}_1(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 = \frac{2\pi}{|k|} \int_{-1}^1 \left| \frac{\sinh(\eta(1+y))}{\sinh(2\eta)} \omega_{in}(y) \right|^2 dy \\ &\leq C|k|^{-1} \|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Let $b = (a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}} + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{\frac{2}{3}}) \leq 2\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{\frac{2}{3}} \leq 2$. For $t \leq 0$, we have

$$e^{-(a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}} + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}|k|^{\frac{2}{3}})t} (\partial_t \tilde{a}_1(t) - b\tilde{a}_1(t)) = \int_{-1}^1 \frac{\sinh(\eta(1+y))}{\sinh(2\eta)} \omega_{in}(y) ik(1-y) e^{ikt(1-y)} dy,$$

hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t \tilde{a}_1(t) - b\tilde{a}_1(t)\|_{L^2(-\infty, 0)}^2 &\leq \frac{2\pi}{|k|} \int_{-1}^1 \left| \frac{\sinh(\eta(1+y))}{\sinh(2\eta)} ik(1-y) \omega_{in}(y) \right|^2 dy \\ &\leq C|k|\eta^{-2} \|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C|k|^{-1} \|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \|e^{-ikt} a_1(t)\|_{H^1(-\infty, 0)} &\leq C(\|\partial_t \tilde{a}_1(t) - b\tilde{a}_1(t)\|_{L^2(-\infty, 0)} + (1+b)\|a_1(t)\|_{L^2(-\infty, 0)}) \\ &\leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

As $\langle \frac{\sinh(\eta(1+y))}{\sinh(2\eta)}, \omega_{in} \rangle = 0$, we have $\tilde{a}_1(0) = 0$, using also $a_1(t) = e^{ikt} \tilde{a}_1(t)$ for $t < 0$, $a_1(t) = 0$ for $t > 0$, we know that a_1 is continuous at $t = 0$, and that $e^{-ikt} a_1(t) \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$ and then

$$\|e^{-ikt} a_1(t)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} = \|e^{-ikt} a_1(t)\|_{H^1(-\infty, 0)} \leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2}.$$

Recalling that $c_1(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} a_1(t) e^{-i\lambda t} dt$, we have

$$\|(1 + |\lambda + k|)c_1(\lambda)\|_{L^2} = \|(1 + |\lambda|)c_1(\lambda - k)\|_{L^2} = C\|e^{-ikt} a_1(t)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} \leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2}.$$

Similarly, we have

$$\|(1 + |\lambda - k|)c_2(\lambda)\|_{L^2} \leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2}.$$

Summing up, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} &|k\eta|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} (\partial_y, \eta) \varphi\|_{L^2 L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{4}} |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \omega\|_{L^2 L^2} \\ &\leq |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\eta^{\frac{1}{2}} \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} (\partial_y, \eta) \varphi(t, y)\|_{L_{t \in \mathbb{R}}^2 L_y^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{4}} \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} \omega(t, y)\|_{L_{t \in \mathbb{R}}^2 L_y^2} \right) \\ &\leq C(\|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2} + \eta^{-1} \|\partial_y \omega_{in}\|_{L^2}) + C\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} f_2\|_{L^2 L^2} + C\nu^{-\frac{1}{6}} |k|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} f_1\|_{L^2 L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

Lemma 10.4. *Let ω solve (10.8) with $\partial_y \varphi_{in}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$ and $F = ikf_1 + \partial_y f_2 + i\ell f_3$. Then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu\eta^2 \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t}\omega\|_{L^2L^2}^2 + \eta^2 \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t}(\partial_y, \eta)\varphi\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 \\ & \leq (|k\eta| + 2a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}\eta^2) \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}(\partial_y, \eta)\varphi\|_{L^2L^2}^2 + C\nu^{-1} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}(f_1, f_2, f_3)\|_{L^2L^2}^2 + C\|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\omega\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}(\partial_y, \eta)\omega\|_{L^2L^2}^2 \leq C(\|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}(f_1, f_2, f_3)\|_{L^2L^2}^2) \\ & + C\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}|k\eta|^{\frac{3}{2}} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\varphi\|_{L^2L^2}^2 + C(|k/\eta| + \nu\eta^2) \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\omega\|_{L^2L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Taking L^2 inner product between (10.8) and φ , we get

$$\langle (\partial_t - \nu(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2) + iky)\omega, -\varphi \rangle = \langle ikf_1 + \partial_y f_2 + i\ell f_3, -\varphi \rangle,$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \partial_t(\partial_y, \eta)\varphi, (\partial_y, \eta)\varphi \rangle + \nu \|\omega\|_{L^2}^2 + ik \int_{-1}^1 \varphi' \bar{\varphi} dy + ik \int_{-1}^1 y|\varphi'|^2 dy + ik\eta^2 \int_{-1}^1 y|\varphi|^2 dy \\ & = \langle ikf_1 + \partial_y f_2 + i\ell f_3, -\varphi \rangle = -\langle ikf_1 + i\ell f_3, \varphi \rangle + \langle f_2, \partial_y \varphi \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the real part, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|(\partial_y, \eta)\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu \|\omega\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \leq |k| \int_{-1}^1 |\varphi' \varphi| dy + \frac{1}{\nu\eta^2} \|(f_1, f_3)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\nu\eta^4}{4} \|\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{\nu\eta^2} \|f_2\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\nu\eta^2}{4} \|\varphi'\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \leq \frac{|k|}{2\eta} (\|\varphi'\|_{L^2}^2 + \eta^2 \|\varphi\|_{L^2}^2) + \frac{\nu\eta^2}{4} (\|\varphi'\|_{L^2}^2 + \eta^2 \|\varphi\|_{L^2}^2) + \frac{1}{\nu\eta^2} \|(f_1, f_2, f_3)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \leq \frac{|k|}{2\eta} \|(\partial_y, \eta)\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\nu}{4} \|\omega\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{\nu\eta^2} \|(f_1, f_2, f_3)\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$\begin{aligned} (10.9) \quad & \frac{d}{dt} \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t}(\partial_y, \eta)\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{3\nu}{2} \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t}\omega\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \leq (|k/\eta| + 2a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}) \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t}(\partial_y, \eta)\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 + 2/(\nu\eta^2) \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t}(f_1, f_2, f_3)\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t}(\partial_y, \eta)\varphi(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu \int_0^t \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}s}\omega(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \\ & \leq (|k/\eta| + 2a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}) \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t}(\partial_y, \eta)\varphi\|_{L^2L^2}^2 + 2/(\nu\eta^2) \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t}(f_1, f_2, f_3)\|_{L^2L^2}^2 + \|(\partial_y, \eta)\varphi(0)\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

This gives the first inequality by noting that $\eta^2 \|(\partial_y, \eta)\varphi(0)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|\omega(0)\|_{L^2}^2 = \|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2}^2$.

Taking L^2 inner product between (10.8) and ω , we get

$$\langle (\partial_t - \nu(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2) + iky)\omega, \omega \rangle = \langle ikf_1 + \partial_y f_2 + i\ell f_3, \omega \rangle,$$

which gives

$$\langle \partial_t \omega, \omega \rangle + \nu \|(\partial_y, \eta)\omega\|_{L^2}^2 + ik \int_{-1}^1 y|\omega|^2 dy = \langle f_4, \omega \rangle - \langle f_2, \partial_y \omega \rangle + (\nu \partial_y \omega + f_2) \bar{\omega}|_{y=-1}^{y=1},$$

here $f_4 = ikf_1 + i\ell f_3$. Taking the real part, we get

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\omega\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu \|(\partial_y, \eta)\omega\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|(f_2, \eta^{-1}f_4)\|_{L^2} \|(\partial_y, \eta)\omega\|_{L^2} + \|\nu\partial_y\omega + f_2\|_{l^1(\{\pm 1\})} \|\omega\|_{L^\infty}.$$

Here $\|f\|_{l^1(\{\pm 1\})} := |f(t, 1)| + |f(t, -1)|$. Thus,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\omega\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu \|(\partial_y, \eta)\omega\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \nu^{-1} \|(f_2, \eta^{-1}f_4)\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\|\nu\partial_y\omega + f_2\|_{l^1(\{\pm 1\})} \|\omega\|_{L^\infty}.$$

Let

$$(10.10) \quad \gamma_1(y) = \frac{\sinh(\eta(y+1))}{\sinh(2\eta)}, \quad \gamma_{-1}(y) = \frac{\sinh(\eta(1-y))}{\sinh(2\eta)}.$$

Since $(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)\varphi = \omega$, $\partial_y\varphi|_{y=\pm 1} = \varphi|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$, we find that

$$\langle \omega, \gamma_j \rangle = \langle (\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)\varphi, \gamma_j \rangle = \langle \varphi, (\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)\gamma_j \rangle = 0, \quad j \in \{\pm 1\},$$

and $\langle \partial_t\omega, \gamma_j \rangle = 0$ for $j \in \{\pm 1\}$, which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \langle \partial_t\omega, \gamma_j \rangle = \langle \nu(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)\omega - ik y\omega + ikf_1 + \partial_y f_2 + i\ell f_3, \gamma_j \rangle \\ &= \langle \nu\omega, (\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)\gamma_j \rangle + \langle \omega, ik y\gamma_j \rangle + \langle f_4, \gamma_j \rangle - \langle f_2, \partial_y\gamma_j \rangle + ((\nu\partial_y\omega + f_2)\gamma_j - \nu\omega\partial_y\gamma_j)|_{-1}^1 \\ &= 0 + \langle (\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)\varphi, ik y\gamma_j \rangle + \langle f_4, \gamma_j \rangle - \langle f_2, \partial_y\gamma_j \rangle + j(\nu\partial_y\omega + f_2)(t, j) - (\nu\omega\partial_y\gamma_j)|_{-1}^1, \end{aligned}$$

and we also have

$$\langle (\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)\varphi, ik y\gamma_j \rangle = \langle \varphi, (\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)(ik y\gamma_j) \rangle = \langle \varphi, 2ik\partial_y\gamma_j \rangle.$$

Thanks to $|\gamma'_j(-j)| = |\gamma'_j(j)| = \eta \coth(2\eta) \leq C\eta$ for $j \in \{\pm 1\}$, we get

$$\|\gamma'_j\|_{L^2}^2 + \eta^2 \|\gamma_j\|_{L^2}^2 = -\langle \gamma_j, (\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)\gamma_j \rangle + \gamma'_j\gamma_j|_{-1}^1 = |\gamma'_j\gamma_j(j)| = |\gamma'_j(j)| \leq C\eta.$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |(\nu\partial_y\omega + f_2)(t, j)| &= |\langle \varphi, 2ik\partial_y\gamma_j \rangle + \langle f_4, \gamma_j \rangle - \langle f_2, \partial_y\gamma_j \rangle - (\nu\omega\partial_y\gamma_j)|_{-1}^1| \\ &\leq 2|k| \|\varphi\|_{L^2} \|\gamma'_j\|_{L^2} + \|(f_2, \eta^{-1}f_4)\|_{L^2} \|(\partial_y, \eta)\gamma_j\|_{L^2} + \nu \|\gamma'_j\|_{l^1(\{\pm 1\})} \|\omega\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leq C|k|\eta^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\varphi\|_{L^2} + C\eta^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(f_2, \eta^{-1}f_4)\|_{L^2} + C\nu\eta \|\omega\|_{L^\infty}, \end{aligned}$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \|\omega\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu \|(\partial_y, \eta)\omega\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq \nu^{-1} \|(f_2, \eta^{-1}f_4)\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\|\nu\partial_y\omega + f_2\|_{l^1(\{\pm 1\})} \|\omega\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leq \nu^{-1} \|(f_2, \eta^{-1}f_4)\|_{L^2}^2 + C(|k|\eta^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\varphi\|_{L^2} + \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(f_2, \eta^{-1}f_4)\|_{L^2} + \nu\eta \|\omega\|_{L^\infty}) \|\omega\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leq C(\nu^{-1} \|(f_2, \eta^{-1}f_4)\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} |k\eta|^{\frac{3}{2}} \|\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 + (|\nu k/\eta|^{\frac{1}{2}} + \nu\eta) \|\omega\|_{L^\infty}^2) \\ &\leq C(\nu^{-1} \|(f_1, f_2, f_3)\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} |k\eta|^{\frac{3}{2}} \|\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 + (|\nu k/\eta|^{\frac{1}{2}} + \nu\eta) \|\omega\|_{L^2} \|\partial_y\omega\|_{L^2}), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\omega\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\nu}{2} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}(\partial_y, \eta)\omega\|_{L^2}^2 \\ \leq C \left(\nu^{-1} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}(f_1, f_2, f_3)\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} |k\eta|^{\frac{3}{2}} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 + (|k/\eta| + \nu\eta^2) \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\omega\|_{L^2}^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

here we used the fact that $\nu^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq |1/\eta| + \nu\eta^2 \leq |k/\eta| + \nu\eta^2$. This shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\omega\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}(\partial_y, \eta)\omega\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 &\leq C(\|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}(f_1, f_2, f_3)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2) \\ &\quad + C\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} |k\eta|^{\frac{3}{2}} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\varphi\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + C(|k/\eta| + \nu\eta^2) \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\omega\|_{L^2 L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

Now let us prove Proposition 10.2.

Proof. We denote

$$[RHS] = \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}(f_1, f_2, f_3)\|_{L^2L^2} + \eta^{-1} \|\partial_y \omega_{in}\|_{L^2} + \|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2}.$$

We first consider the case of $\nu\eta^3 \leq |k|$. By Lemma 10.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |k\eta|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}(\partial_y, \eta)\varphi\|_{L^2L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{4}} |k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\omega\|_{L^2L^2} \\ & \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}f_2\|_{L^2L^2} + |\nu/k|^{\frac{1}{3}} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}(ikf_1 + i\ell f_3)\|_{L^2L^2} \right) + C(\eta^{-1} \|\partial_y \omega_{in}\|_{L^2} + \|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2}) \\ & \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}(f_1, f_2, f_3)\|_{L^2L^2} + C(\eta^{-1} \|\partial_y \omega_{in}\|_{L^2} + \|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2}) = C[RHS], \end{aligned}$$

which along with Lemma 10.4 and $\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}\eta \leq |k|$ implies that

$$(10.11) \quad \nu\eta^2 \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\omega\|_{L^2L^2}^2 + \eta^2 \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}(\partial_y, \eta)\varphi\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + |k\eta| \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}(\partial_y, \eta)\varphi\|_{L^2L^2}^2 \leq C[RHS]^2.$$

Thanks to $1 \leq |k| \leq \eta$, $\nu\eta^3 \leq |k|$, $|k\eta|^{\frac{3}{2}} \leq \eta^3$, $\nu\eta^2 \leq |k/\eta| \leq 1$, we get by Lemma 10.4 that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\omega\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\partial_y \omega\|_{L^2L^2}^2 \leq C(\|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}(f_1, f_2, f_3)\|_{L^2L^2}^2) \\ & + C\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} |k\eta|^{\frac{3}{2}} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\varphi\|_{L^2L^2}^2 + C(|k/\eta| + \nu\eta^2) \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\omega\|_{L^2L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C[RHS]^2 + C\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \eta^3 \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\varphi\|_{L^2L^2}^2 + C\|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\omega\|_{L^2L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C[RHS]^2 + C\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} |k|^{-1} [RHS]^2 \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} [RHS]^2, \end{aligned}$$

which along with (10.11) gives our result when $\nu\eta^3 \leq |k|$.

Next we consider the case of $\nu\eta^3 \geq |k|$. In this case, we have (for $0 \leq a \leq 1/8$)

$$(|k/\eta| + 2a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}) \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t}(\partial_y, \eta)\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 \leq (|k/\eta^3| + 2a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}\eta^{-2}) \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t}\omega\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \frac{5\nu}{4} \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t}\omega\|_{L^2}^2,$$

from which and (10.9), we infer that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t}(\partial_y, \eta)\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\nu}{4} \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t}\omega\|_{L^2}^2 \leq 2/(\nu\eta^2) \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t}(f_1, f_2, f_3)\|_{L^2}^2,$$

and then

$$\nu\eta^2 \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t}\omega\|_{L^2L^2}^2 \leq C\nu^{-1} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}(f_1, f_2, f_3)\|_{L^2L^2}^2 + C\|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2}^2.$$

This in turn gives

$$\begin{aligned} & (|k\eta| + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}\eta^2) \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t}(\partial_y, \eta)\varphi\|_{L^2L^2}^2 \leq C\nu\eta^2 \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t}\omega\|_{L^2L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C\nu^{-1} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}(f_1, f_2, f_3)\|_{L^2L^2}^2 + C\|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

which along with Lemma 10.4 gives (10.11). Due to $\nu\eta^3 \geq |k|$, we have $|k/\eta| \leq \nu\eta^2$ and $\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}|k\eta|^{\frac{3}{2}} \leq |k\eta^3|$. Then we get by Lemma 10.4 that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\omega\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\partial_y \omega\|_{L^2L^2}^2 \leq C(\|\omega_{in}\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}(f_1, f_2, f_3)\|_{L^2L^2}^2) \\ & + C\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} |k\eta|^{\frac{3}{2}} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\varphi\|_{L^2L^2}^2 + C(|k/\eta| + \nu\eta^2) \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\omega\|_{L^2L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C[RHS]^2 + C|k\eta^3| \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\varphi\|_{L^2L^2}^2 + C\nu\eta^2 \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\omega\|_{L^2L^2}^2 \leq C[RHS]^2, \end{aligned}$$

which along with (10.11) gives our result when $\nu\eta^3 \geq |k|$. $\square$

11. NONLINEAR INTERACTIONS

11.1. Anisotropic bilinear estimates.

Lemma 11.1. *For $\{j, k\} = \{1, 3\}$, it holds that*

$$(11.1) \quad \|f_1 f_2\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|\partial_k f_1\|_{H^1} + \|f_1\|_{H^1})(\|\partial_j f_2\|_{L^2} + \|f_2\|_{L^2}),$$

$$(11.2) \quad \|f_1 f_2\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_j(f_1 f_2)\|_{L^2} \leq C\|(\partial_x \partial_z f_1, \partial_x f_1, \partial_z f_1, f_1)\|_{H^1} \|(\partial_j f_2, f_2)\|_{L^2},$$

$$(11.3) \quad \|f_1 f_2\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_j(f_1 f_2)\|_{L^2} \leq C\|(\partial_j f_1, f_1)\|_{H^1} \|(\partial_x \partial_z f_2, \partial_x f_2, \partial_z f_2, f_2)\|_{L^2},$$

$$(11.4) \quad \|\nabla(f_1 f_2)\|_{L^2} \leq C\|(\partial_x \partial_z f_1, \partial_x f_1, \partial_z f_1, f_1)\|_{H^1} \|f_2\|_{H^1},$$

$$(11.5) \quad \|\nabla(f_1 f_2)\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|\partial_k f_1\|_{H^1} + \|f_1\|_{H^1})(\|\partial_j f_2\|_{H^1} + \|f_2\|_{H^1}),$$

and

$$(11.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\nabla(f_1 f_2)\|_{L^2} &\leq C(\|(\partial_k f_1, f_1)\|_{H^2} \|(\partial_j f_2, f_2)\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + \|(\partial_x \partial_z f_1, \partial_x f_1, \partial_z f_1, f_1)\|_{L^2} \|f_2\|_{H^2}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Hölder inequality and Sobolev embedding, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_1 f_2\|_{L^2} &\leq \left\| \|f_1\|_{L_y^\infty} \|f_2\|_{L_y^2} \right\|_{L_{x,z}^2} \leq C \left\| (\|\partial_y f_1\|_{L_y^2} + \|f_1\|_{L_y^2}) \|f_2\|_{L_y^2} \right\|_{L_{x,z}^2} \\ &\leq C \left\| (\|\partial_y f_1\|_{L_z^\infty L_y^2} + \|f_1\|_{L_z^\infty L_y^2}) \|f_2\|_{L_{z,y}^2} \right\|_{L_x^2} \\ &\leq C \left\| (\|(\partial_z \partial_y f_1, \partial_y f_1)\|_{L_z^2 L_y^2} + \|(\partial_z f_1, f_1)\|_{L_z^2 L_y^2}) \|f_2\|_{L_{z,y}^2} \right\|_{L_x^2} \\ &\leq C \|(\partial_z \partial_y f_1, \partial_z f_1, \partial_y f_1, f_1)\|_{L^2} \|f_2\|_{L_x^\infty L_{z,y}^2} \\ &\leq C(\|\partial_z f_1\|_{H^1} + \|f_1\|_{H^1})(\|\partial_x f_2\|_{L^2} + \|f_2\|_{L^2}). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the (11.1) for the case of $(j, k) = (1, 3)$, and the case of $(j, k) = (3, 1)$ is similar.

Using the fact that

$$\|f\|_{L_{x,z}^\infty L_y^2} = \left\| \|f\|_{L_x^\infty L_y^2} \right\|_{L_z^\infty} \leq C \left\| \|(\partial_x f, f)\|_{L_x^2 L_y^2} \right\|_{L_z^\infty} \leq C \|(\partial_x \partial_z f, \partial_x f, \partial_z f, f)\|_{L^2},$$

we infer that

$$\|(\partial_y f, f)\|_{L_{x,z}^\infty L_y^2} \leq C \|(\partial_x \partial_z f, \partial_x f, \partial_z f, f)\|_{H^1},$$

which gives

$$(11.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \|f_1 f_2\|_{L^2} &\leq C \left\| \|(\partial_y f_1, f_1)\|_{L_y^2} \|f_2\|_{L_y^2} \right\|_{L_{x,z}^2} \leq C \|(\partial_y f_1, f_1)\|_{L_{x,z}^\infty L_y^2} \|f_2\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \|(\partial_x \partial_z f_1, \partial_x f_1, \partial_z f_1, f_1)\|_{H^1} \|f_2\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(11.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \|f_1 f_2\|_{L^2} &\leq C \left\| \|(\partial_y f_1, f_1)\|_{L_y^2} \|f_2\|_{L_y^2} \right\|_{L_{x,z}^2} \leq C \|(\partial_y f_1, f_1)\|_{L^2} \|f_2\|_{L_{x,z}^\infty L_y^2} \\ &\leq C \|f_1\|_{H^1} \|(\partial_x \partial_z f_2, \partial_x f_2, \partial_z f_2, f_2)\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

By (11.1) and (11.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_j(f_1 f_2)\|_{L^2} &\leq \|\partial_j f_1 f_2\|_{L^2} + \|f_1 \partial_j f_2\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\|(\partial_k \partial_j f_1, \partial_j f_1)\|_{H^1} \|(\partial_j f_2, f_2)\|_{L^2} + C\|(\partial_x \partial_z f_1, \partial_x f_1, \partial_z f_1, f_1)\|_{H^1} \|\partial_j f_2\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq C \|(\partial_x \partial_z f_1, \partial_x f_1, \partial_z f_1, f_1)\|_{H^1} \|(\partial_j f_2, f_2)\|_{L^2},$$

which gives (11.2).

By (11.8) and (11.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_j(f_1 f_2)\|_{L^2} &\leq \|\partial_j f_1 f_2\|_{L^2} + \|f_1 \partial_j f_2\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \|\partial_j f_1\|_{H^1} \|(\partial_x \partial_z f_2, \partial_x f_2, \partial_z f_2, f_2)\|_{L^2} + C \|(\partial_j f_1, f_1)\|_{H^1} \|(\partial_k \partial_j f_2, \partial_j f_2)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \|(\partial_j f_1, f_1)\|_{H^1} \|(\partial_x \partial_z f_2, \partial_x f_2, \partial_z f_2, f_2)\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives (11.3).

By (11.7) and (11.8), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla(f_1 f_2)\|_{L^2} &\leq \|f_1 \nabla f_2\|_{L^2} + \|(\nabla f_1) f_2\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \|(\partial_x \partial_z f_1, \partial_x f_1, \partial_z f_1, f_1)\|_{H^1} \|\nabla f_2\|_{L^2} + C \|\nabla(\partial_x \partial_z f_1, \partial_x f_1, \partial_z f_1, f_1)\|_{L^2} \|f_2\|_{H^1} \\ &\leq C \|(\partial_x \partial_z f_1, \partial_x f_1, \partial_z f_1, f_1)\|_{H^1} \|f_2\|_{H^1}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives (11.4).

By (11.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_1 \nabla f_2\|_{L^2} &\leq C (\|\partial_k f_1\|_{H^1} + \|f_1\|_{H^1}) (\|\partial_j \nabla f_2\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla f_2\|_{L^2}), \\ \|(\nabla f_1) f_2\|_{L^2} &\leq C (\|\partial_k \nabla f_1\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla f_1\|_{L^2}) (\|\partial_j f_2\|_{H^1} + \|f_2\|_{H^1}), \end{aligned}$$

which give (11.5). By (11.1) and (11.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\nabla f_1) f_2\|_{L^2} &\leq C (\|\partial_k \nabla f_1\|_{H^1} + \|\nabla f_1\|_{H^1}) (\|\partial_j f_2\|_{L^2} + \|f_2\|_{L^2}), \\ \|f_1 \nabla f_2\|_{L^2} &\leq C \|(\partial_x \partial_z f_1, \partial_x f_1, \partial_z f_1, f_1)\|_{L^2} \|\nabla f_2\|_{H^1}, \end{aligned}$$

which give (11.6). This completes the proof. $\square$

Lemma 11.2. *If $\partial_x f_1 = 0$, then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_1 f_2\|_{L^2} &\leq C \|f_1\|_{H^1} (\|f_2\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_z f_2\|_{L^2}), \\ \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)(f_1 f_2)\|_{L^2} &\leq C (\|f_1\|_{H^1} + \|\partial_z f_1\|_{H^1}) (\|f_2\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_x, \partial_z) f_2\|_{L^2}), \\ \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)(f_1 f_2)\|_{L^2} &\leq C (\|f_1\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_z f_1\|_{L^2}) (\|f_2\|_{H^1} + \|(\partial_x, \partial_z) f_2\|_{H^1}), \\ \|\partial_x(f_1 f_2)\|_{L^2} &\leq C \|f_1\|_{H^1} (\|\partial_x f_2\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_z \partial_x f_2\|_{L^2}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The first inequality follows from (11.1) in Lemma 11.1 by taking $(j, k) = (3, 1)$ and using $\partial_x f_1 = 0$. The second and third inequality follows from (11.2) and (11.3) in Lemma 11.1 by noting that

$$\|(\partial_x \partial_z f_1, \partial_x f_1, \partial_z f_1, f_1)\|_{H^k} = \|(\partial_z f_1, f_1)\|_{H^k}, \quad k = 0, 1.$$

As $\partial_x(f_1 f_2) = f_1 \partial_x f_2$, the fourth inequality follows from the first inequality. $\square$

Lemma 11.3. *If $\partial_x f_1 = 0$, then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_1\|_{L^\infty} &\leq C (\|f_1\|_{H^1} + \|\partial_z f_1\|_{H^1}), \\ \|\nabla(f_1 f_2)\|_{L^2} &\leq C (\|f_1\|_{H^1} + \|\partial_z f_1\|_{H^1}) \|f_2\|_{H^1}, \\ \|\nabla(f_1 f_2)\|_{L^2} &\leq C \|f_1\|_{H^1} (\|f_2\|_{H^1} + \|\partial_z f_2\|_{H^1}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The first inequality follows by noting that

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_1\|_{L^\infty} &\leq C \|(\|\partial_y f_1\|_{L_y^2} + \|f_1\|_{L_y^2})\|_{L_z^\infty} \\ &\leq C (\|\partial_z \partial_y f_1\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_y f_1\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_z f_1\|_{L^2} + \|f_1\|_{L^2}) \leq C (\|f_1\|_{H^1} + \|\partial_z f_1\|_{H^1}). \end{aligned}$$

The second and third inequality follows from (11.4) and (11.5) in Lemma 11.1 by taking $(j, k) = (3, 1)$ and using $\partial_x f_1 = 0$. $\square$

Lemma 11.4. *Let V satisfy $\|V - y\|_{H^4} \leq \varepsilon_0$, $\partial_x V = 0$, $(V - y)|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$ and $\kappa = \partial_z V / \partial_y V$. If $\partial_x f_1 = 0$, $P_0 f_2 = 0$, then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_1 f_2\|_{L^2} &\leq C \|f_1\|_{H^1} (\|f_2\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y) f_2\|_{L^2}), \\ \|\nabla(f_1 f_2)\|_{L^2} &\leq C \|f_1\|_{H^1} (\|f_2\|_{H^1} + \|(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y) f_2\|_{H^1}). \end{aligned}$$

Let h solve $\Delta h = f_1 f_2$, $h|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$, and assume $\partial_x f_2 = ik f_2$, $k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$. Then we have

$$\|\nabla h\|_{L^2} \leq C \|f_1\|_{L^2} (\|f_2\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y) f_2\|_{L^2}).$$

Proof. Take $F_l(X, Y, Z)$ so that $F_l(x, V(t, y, z), z) = f_l(x, y, z)$. Using the facts that $(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y) f_2(x, y, z) = \partial_Z F_2(x, V(t, y, z), z)$ and for $k = 0, 1$,

$$\|F_l\|_{H^k} \sim \|f_l\|_{H^k}, \quad \|\nabla(F_1 F_2)\|_{L^2} \sim \|\nabla(f_1 f_2)\|_{L^2}, \quad \|\partial_z F_2\|_{H^k} \sim \|(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y) f_2\|_{H^k},$$

we can deduce the first two inequalities from Lemma 11.2 and Lemma 11.3.

Since $\partial_x f_1 = 0$, $\partial_x f_2 = ik f_2$, we have $\partial_x h = ikh$, and we can write $h(x, y, z) = e^{ikx} h_k(y, z)$. Thus, $\|\nabla h\|_{L^2} \geq \|h\|_{L^2}$ and

$$\|\nabla h\|_{L^2}^2 = -\langle \Delta h, h \rangle = -\langle f_1 f_2, h \rangle \leq \|f_1\|_{L^2} \|f_2 h\|_{L^2} = \|f_1\|_{L^2} \|f_2 h_k\|_{L^2}.$$

By the first inequality of the lemma, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_2 h_k\|_{L^2} &\leq C \|h_k\|_{H^1} (\|f_2\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y) f_2\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C \|\nabla h\|_{L^2} (\|f_2\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y) f_2\|_{L^2}). \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\|\nabla h\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|f_1\|_{L^2} \|f_2 h_k\|_{L^2} \leq C \|f_1\|_{L^2} \|\nabla h\|_{L^2} (\|f_2\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y) f_2\|_{L^2}),$$

which gives the third inequality. $\square$

11.2. The velocity estimates in terms of the energy.

Lemma 11.5. *It holds that for $k \geq 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^k(\partial_x, \partial_z) \partial_x u_{\neq}\|_{L^2} &\leq C (\|\nabla^k(\partial_x^2 + \partial_z^2) u_{\neq}^3\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla^{k+1}(\partial_x, \partial_z) u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2}), \\ \|\Delta(\partial_x, \partial_z) u_{\neq}\|_{L^2} &\leq \|\Delta \omega_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \Delta u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Thanks to $\operatorname{div} u_{\neq} = \partial_x u_{\neq}^1 + \partial_y u_{\neq}^2 + \partial_z u_{\neq}^3 = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^k(\partial_x, \partial_z) \partial_x u_{\neq}\|_{L^2} &\leq \|\nabla^k(\partial_x, \partial_z) \partial_x u_{\neq}^1\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla^k(\partial_x, \partial_z) \partial_x u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla^k(\partial_x, \partial_z) \partial_x u_{\neq}^3\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \|\nabla^k(\partial_x, \partial_z) \partial_y u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla^k(\partial_x, \partial_z) \partial_z u_{\neq}^3\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + \|\nabla^k(\partial_x, \partial_z) \partial_x u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla^k(\partial_x, \partial_z) \partial_x u_{\neq}^3\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C (\|\nabla^{k+1}(\partial_x, \partial_z) u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla^k(\partial_x^2, \partial_x \partial_z, \partial_z^2) u_{\neq}^3\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C (\|\nabla^k(\partial_x^2 + \partial_z^2) u_{\neq}^3\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla^{k+1}(\partial_x, \partial_z) u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2}). \end{aligned}$$

Using the formula $\|(\partial_x, \partial_z)(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^2}^2 = \|(\partial_z f_1 - \partial_x f_2, \partial_x f_1 + \partial_z f_2)\|_{L^2}^2$, we can deduce that

$$\|\Delta(\partial_x, \partial_z)(u_{\neq}^1, u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2}^2 = \|\Delta \omega_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Delta \partial_y u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2}^2,$$

which implies the second inequality. $\square$

Lemma 11.6. *It holds that*

$$\|\bar{u}^1\|_{H^2} \leq CE_1 \min(\nu t + \nu^{2/3}, 1).$$

Proof. As $\bar{u}^{1,0}|_{t=0} = 0$, we have

$$\|\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{H^2} \leq \int_0^t \|\partial_t \bar{u}^{1,0}(s)\|_{H^2} ds \leq C\nu t E_1,$$

on the other hand, $\|\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{H^2} \leq \|\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty H^4} \leq E_1$. Thus, we get

$$\|\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{H^2} \leq CE_1 \min(\nu t, 1).$$

As $\|\bar{u}^{1,\neq}\|_{H^2} \leq E_{1,\neq} \leq \nu^{2/3} E_1$, we get

$$\|\bar{u}^1\|_{H^2} \leq \|\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{H^2} + \|\bar{u}^{1,\neq}\|_{H^2} \leq CE_1 (\min(\nu t, 1) + \nu^{2/3}) \leq CE_1 \min(\nu t + \nu^{2/3}, 1).$$

□

Lemma 11.7. *It holds that*

$$\left\| \frac{\partial_z \bar{u}^{1,0}}{\min((\nu t)^{\frac{1}{2}}, 1 - y^2)} \right\|_{L^\infty L^\infty}^2 \leq C (\|\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty H^4}^2 + \nu^{-2} \|\partial_t \bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty H^2}^2) \leq CE_{1,0}^2.$$

Proof. As $\bar{u}^{1,0}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$, $\partial_z \bar{u}^{1,0}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$, and then

$$\left\| \frac{\partial_z \bar{u}^{1,0}}{1 - y^2} \right\|_{L^\infty}^2 \leq C \|\partial_y \partial_z \bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \leq C \|\partial_y \partial_z \bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{H^2}^2 \leq C \|\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{H^4}^2,$$

which gives

$$(11.9) \quad \left\| \frac{\partial_z \bar{u}^{1,0}}{1 - y^2} \right\|_{L^\infty L^\infty}^2 \leq C \|\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty H^4}^2.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\|\partial_z \bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \leq C \|\partial_z \bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{H^2}^2 \leq C \|\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{H^3}^2 \leq C \|\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{H^4} \|\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{H^2},$$

and due to $\bar{u}^{1,0}|_{t=0} = 0$, we have

$$\|\bar{u}^{1,0}(t)\|_{H^2} \leq \int_0^t \|\partial_s \bar{u}^{1,0}(s)\|_{H^2} ds \leq t \|\partial_t \bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty H^2}.$$

This along with (11.9) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\partial_z \bar{u}^{1,0}}{\min((\nu t)^{\frac{1}{2}}, 1 - y^2)} \right\|_{L^\infty L^\infty}^2 &\leq C (\|\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty H^4}^2 + \|\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty H^4} \|\bar{u}^{1,0}/(\nu t)\|_{L^\infty H^2}) \\ &\leq C (\|\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty H^4}^2 + (\nu^{-1} \|\partial_t \bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty H^2})^2) \leq CE_{1,0}^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 11.8. *It holds that for $k \in \{2, 3\}$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{u}^2\|_{H^2} + \|\nabla \bar{u}^2\|_{H^1} + \|\bar{u}^3\|_{H^1} + \|\partial_z \bar{u}^3\|_{H^1} &\leq CE_2, \\ \|\bar{u}^k\|_{L^\infty L^\infty} + \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla \bar{u}^k\|_{L^2 L^\infty} &\leq CE_2, \\ \|\nabla(\bar{u}^k f)\|_{L^2} + \|\bar{u}^k \nabla f\|_{L^2} &\leq CE_2 \|f\|_{H^1}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Thanks to $\partial_y \bar{u}^2 + \partial_z \bar{u}^3 = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{u}^2\|_{H^2} + \|\nabla \bar{u}^2\|_{H^1} + \|\bar{u}^3\|_{H^1} + \|\partial_z \bar{u}^3\|_{H^1} &\leq C(\|\Delta \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_y \bar{u}^2\|_{H^1}) \\ &\leq C(\|\Delta \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2}) \leq CE_2. \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to Lemma 11.3, we have

$$\|\bar{u}^2\|_{L^\infty} + \|\bar{u}^3\|_{L^\infty} \leq C(\|\bar{u}^2\|_{H^1} + \|\partial_z \bar{u}^2\|_{H^1} + \|\bar{u}^3\|_{H^1} + \|\partial_z \bar{u}^3\|_{H^1}) \leq CE_2,$$

for any $t \in [0, T]$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2 L^\infty} &\leq C \|\nabla \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2 H^2} \leq C \|\nabla \Delta \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2 L^2} \leq C \nu^{-1/2} E_2, \\ \|\nabla \bar{u}^3\|_{L^\infty} &\leq C(\|\partial_z \nabla \bar{u}^3\|_{H^1} + \|\nabla \bar{u}^3\|_{H^1}) \leq C(\|\nabla \Delta \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2} + \|\Delta \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2}), \end{aligned}$$

for any $t \in [0, T]$, and then

$$\|\nabla \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2 L^\infty} \leq C(\|\nabla \Delta \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2 L^2} + \|\Delta \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2 L^2}) \leq C \nu^{-1/2} E_2.$$

By Lemma 11.3 again, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla(\bar{u}^k f)\|_{L^2} + \|\bar{u}^k \nabla f\|_{L^2} &\leq (\|\bar{u}^k\|_{H^1} + \|\partial_z \bar{u}^k\|_{H^1}) \|f\|_{H^1} + \|\bar{u}^k\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla f\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq CE_2 \|f\|_{H^1} \quad k \in \{2, 3\}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 11.9. *It holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{1/6} \|e^{\frac{9}{4}\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x \nabla u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2 L^2} &\leq E_5^{\frac{1}{4}} E_3^{\frac{3}{4}}, \\ \nu^{1/6} \|e^{\frac{9}{4}\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x (\partial_x, \partial_z) u_{\neq}^k\|_{L^2 L^2} &\leq CE_5^{\frac{1}{2}} E_3^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad k \in \{2, 3\}, \\ \nu^{1/6} \|e^{\frac{9}{4}\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x^2 u_{\neq}^1\|_{L^2 L^2} &\leq C(E_5^{\frac{1}{4}} E_3^{\frac{3}{4}} + E_5^{\frac{1}{2}} E_3^{\frac{1}{2}}), \\ \nu^{1/2} \left(\|e^{\frac{17}{8}\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x \nabla u_{\neq}\|_{L^2 L^2} + \|e^{\frac{17}{8}\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_z \nabla (u_{\neq}^2, u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2 L^2} \right) &\leq C(E_5^{\frac{1}{8}} E_3^{\frac{7}{8}} + E_5^{\frac{1}{4}} E_3^{\frac{3}{4}}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since $\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x \nabla u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2 L^2} \leq E_{3,0} \leq E_3$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \|e^{\frac{5}{2}\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x \nabla u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2 L^2} &\leq \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \Delta u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|e^{3\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x^2 u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x \Delta u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} (\nu^{-1/6} E_5)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq (\nu^{-1/2} E_3)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\nu^{-1/6} E_5)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \nu^{-1/3} E_5^{\frac{1}{2}} E_3^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{1/6} \|e^{\frac{9}{4}\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x \nabla u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2 L^2} &\leq \nu^{1/6} \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x \nabla u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|e^{\frac{5}{2}\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x \nabla u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \nu^{1/6} E_3^{\frac{1}{2}} (\nu^{-1/3} E_5^{\frac{1}{2}} E_3^{\frac{1}{2}})^{\frac{1}{2}} = E_5^{\frac{1}{4}} E_3^{\frac{3}{4}}. \end{aligned}$$

For $k \in \{2, 3\}$, we have

$$\|\partial_x (\partial_x, \partial_z) u_{\neq}^k\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|\partial_x^2 u_{\neq}^k\|_{L^2} \|(\partial_x^2 + \partial_z^2) u_{\neq}^k\|_{L^2} \leq \|\partial_x^2 u_{\neq}^k\|_{L^2} e^{-2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} E_3,$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|e^{\frac{9}{4}\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\partial_x(\partial_x, \partial_z)u_{\neq}^k\|_{L^2L^2}^2 &\leq \|e^{\frac{5}{2}\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\partial_x^2u_{\neq}^k\|_{L^1L^2}E_3 \\ &\leq \|e^{3\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\partial_x^2u_{\neq}^k\|_{L^2L^2}\|e^{-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\|_{L^2(0,T)}E_3 \\ &\leq (\nu^{-1/6}E_5)(C\nu^{-1/6})E_3 = C\nu^{-1/3}E_5E_3. \end{aligned}$$

Due to $\partial_x^2u_{\neq}^1 = -\partial_x\partial_yu_{\neq}^2 - \partial_x\partial_zu_{\neq}^3$, the third inequality follows from the first two inequalities.

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_x\nabla u_{\neq}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_z\nabla(u_{\neq}^2, u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq \|\partial_x^2u_{\neq}\|_{L^2}\|\Delta u_{\neq}\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_z\Delta(u_{\neq}^2, u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2}\|\partial_z(u_{\neq}^2, u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\|(\partial_x, \partial_z)\Delta u_{\neq}\|_{L^2}(\|\partial_x^2u_{\neq}\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x\partial_z(u_{\neq}^2, u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2}), \end{aligned}$$

which along with Lemma 11.5 gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\nu\left(\|e^{\frac{17}{8}\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\partial_x\nabla u_{\neq}\|_{L^2L^2}^2 + \|e^{\frac{17}{8}\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\partial_z\nabla(u_{\neq}^2, u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2L^2}^2\right) \\ &\leq C\nu\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}(\partial_x, \partial_z)\Delta u_{\neq}\|_{L^2L^2}\left(\|e^{\frac{9}{4}\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\partial_x^2u_{\neq}\|_{L^2L^2} + \|e^{\frac{9}{4}\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\partial_x\partial_z(u_{\neq}^2, u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2L^2}\right) \\ &\leq C\nu\left(\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\nabla\Delta u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2L^2} + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\Delta\omega_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2L^2}\right)(\nu^{-1/6}(E_5^{\frac{1}{4}}E_3^{\frac{3}{4}} + E_5^{\frac{1}{2}}E_3^{\frac{1}{2}})) \\ &\leq C\nu^{5/6}(\nu^{-3/4}E_{3,0} + \nu^{-5/6}E_{3,1})(E_5^{\frac{1}{4}}E_3^{\frac{3}{4}} + E_5^{\frac{1}{2}}E_3^{\frac{1}{2}}) \leq CE_3(E_5^{\frac{1}{4}}E_3^{\frac{3}{4}} + E_5^{\frac{1}{2}}E_3^{\frac{1}{2}}). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

11.3. Interaction between nonzero modes.

Lemma 11.10. *It holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} (11.10) \quad &\|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}|u_{\neq}|^2\|_{L^2L^2}^2 + \|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}\|_{L^2L^2}^2 + \|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\partial_x(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq})\|_{L^2L^2}^2 \\ &+ \|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\partial_z(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2L^2}^2 + \|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\nabla(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^2)\|_{L^2L^2}^2 \leq C\nu^{-1}E_3^4, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(11.11) \quad \|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\nabla(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq})\|_{L^2L^2}^2 \leq C\nu^{-\frac{5}{3}}E_3^4.$$

In particular, we have

$$(11.12) \quad \|(\nu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \nu t)^{\frac{1}{2}}\nabla(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2L^2}^2 \leq C\nu^{-1}E_3^4.$$

Proof. By (11.1) in Lemma 11.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \| |u_{\neq}|^2 \|_{L^2} &\leq C(\|\partial_x u_{\neq}\|_{H^1} + \|u_{\neq}\|_{H^1})(\|\partial_z u_{\neq}\|_{L^2} + \|u_{\neq}\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C\|\nabla\partial_x^2u_{\neq}\|_{L^2}\|(\partial_x, \partial_z)\partial_x u_{\neq}\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

and for $k \in \{1, 3\}$, by (11.2) in Lemma 11.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_{\neq}^k\partial_k u_{\neq}\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x(u_{\neq}^k\partial_k u_{\neq})\|_{L^2} &\leq C\|(\partial_x\partial_zu_{\neq}^k, \partial_xu_{\neq}^k, \partial_zu_{\neq}^k, u_{\neq}^k)\|_{H^1}\|(\partial_x\partial_k u_{\neq}, \partial_k u_{\neq})\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\|\nabla(\partial_x, \partial_z)\partial_x u_{\neq}\|_{L^2}\|(\partial_x, \partial_z)\partial_x u_{\neq}\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

and by (11.2) again, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_z(u_{\neq}^k\partial_k u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2} &\leq C\|(\partial_x\partial_zu_{\neq}^k, \partial_xu_{\neq}^k, \partial_zu_{\neq}^k, u_{\neq}^k)\|_{H^1}\|(\partial_z\partial_k u_{\neq}^3, \partial_k u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\|\nabla(\partial_x, \partial_z)\partial_x u_{\neq}\|_{L^2}\|(\partial_x^2 + \partial_z^2)u_{\neq}^3\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

For $k = 2$, by (11.3) in Lemma 11.1, we have

$$\|u_{\neq}^k\partial_k u_{\neq}\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)(u_{\neq}^k\partial_k u_{\neq})\|_{L^2}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C \|(\partial_x u_{\neq}^k, \partial_z u_{\neq}^k, u_{\neq}^k)\|_{H^1} \|(\partial_x \partial_z \partial_k u_{\neq}, \partial_x \partial_k u_{\neq}, \partial_z \partial_k u_{\neq}, \partial_k u_{\neq})\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq C \|(\partial_x, \partial_z) \nabla u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2} \|\nabla(\partial_x, \partial_z) \partial_x u_{\neq}\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Summing up, we get by Lemma 11.5 that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\| |u_{\neq}|^2 \|_{L^2} + \|u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq})\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_z(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq C \|\nabla(\partial_x, \partial_z) \partial_x u_{\neq}\|_{L^2} (\|(\partial_x, \partial_z) \partial_x u_{\neq}\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_x^2 + \partial_z^2) u_{\neq}^3\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_x, \partial_z) \nabla u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2}) \\
&\leq C \left(\|(\partial_x, \partial_z) \Delta u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_x^2 + \partial_z^2) \nabla u_{\neq}^3\|_{L^2} \right) (\|(\partial_x, \partial_z) \nabla u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_x^2 + \partial_z^2) u_{\neq}^3\|_{L^2}).
\end{aligned}$$

For $k \in \{1, 3\}$, by (11.4) in Lemma 11.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla(u_{\neq}^k \partial_k u_{\neq}^2)\|_{L^2} &\leq C \|(\partial_x \partial_z u_{\neq}^k, \partial_x u_{\neq}^k, \partial_z u_{\neq}^k, u_{\neq}^k)\|_{H^1} \|\partial_k u_{\neq}^2\|_{H^1} \\
&\leq C \|\nabla(\partial_x, \partial_z) \partial_x u_{\neq}\|_{L^2} \|(\partial_x, \partial_z) \nabla u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2},
\end{aligned}$$

and for $k = 2$, by (11.5) in Lemma 11.1, we have

$$\|\nabla(u_{\neq}^k \partial_k u_{\neq}^2)\|_{L^2} \leq \|(\partial_z u_{\neq}^k, u_{\neq}^k)\|_{H^1} \|(\partial_x \partial_k u_{\neq}^2, \partial_k u_{\neq}^2)\|_{H^1} \leq C \|(\partial_x, \partial_z) \nabla u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2} \|\partial_x \Delta u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2}.$$

Then it follows from Lemma 11.5 that

$$\|\nabla(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^2)\|_{L^2} \leq C (\|(\partial_x, \partial_z) \Delta u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_x^2 + \partial_z^2) \nabla u_{\neq}^3\|_{L^2}) \|(\partial_x, \partial_z) \nabla u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2}.$$

This shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} |u_{\neq}|^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \partial_x(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq})\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\
&+ \|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \partial_z(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \nabla(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^2)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\
&\leq C (\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} (\partial_x, \partial_z) \Delta u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \nabla(\partial_x^2 + \partial_z^2) u_{\neq}^3\|_{L^2 L^2}^2) (\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} (\partial_x, \partial_z) \nabla u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 \\
&+ \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} (\partial_x^2 + \partial_z^2) u_{\neq}^3\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2) \leq C \nu^{-1} E_3^4.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves (11.10).

For $k \in \{1, 3\}$, by (11.6) in Lemma 11.1 and Lemma 11.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla(u_{\neq}^k \partial_k u_{\neq})\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq C \left(\|(\partial_z u_{\neq}^k, u_{\neq}^k)\|_{H^2}^2 \|(\partial_x \partial_k u_{\neq}, \partial_k u_{\neq})\|_{L^2}^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \|(\partial_x \partial_z u_{\neq}^k, \partial_x u_{\neq}^k, \partial_z u_{\neq}^k, u_{\neq}^k)\|_{L^2}^2 \|\partial_k u_{\neq}\|_{H^2}^2 \right) \\
&\leq C \left(\|\Delta(\partial_x, \partial_z) u_{\neq}^k\|_{L^2}^2 \|(\partial_x, \partial_z) \partial_x u_{\neq}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|(\partial_x, \partial_z) \partial_x u_{\neq}^k\|_{L^2}^2 \|\Delta \partial_k u_{\neq}\|_{L^2}^2 \right) \\
&\leq C \left(\|\nabla \Delta u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Delta \omega_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2}^2 \right) (\|(\partial_x^2 + \partial_z^2) u_{\neq}^3\|_{L^2}^2 + \|(\partial_x, \partial_z) \nabla u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2}^2),
\end{aligned}$$

and for $k = 2$, by (11.5) in Lemma 11.1 and Lemma 11.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla(u_{\neq}^k \partial_k u_{\neq})\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq C \|(\partial_z u_{\neq}^k, u_{\neq}^k)\|_{H^1} \|(\partial_x \partial_k u_{\neq}, \partial_k u_{\neq})\|_{H^1} \\
&\leq C \|(\partial_x, \partial_z) \nabla u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2}^2 \|\Delta \partial_x u_{\neq}\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\leq C \|(\partial_x, \partial_z) \nabla u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2}^2 (\|\nabla \Delta u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Delta \omega_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2}^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \nabla(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq})\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\
&\leq C \left(\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \nabla \Delta u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \Delta \omega_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right) \left(\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} (\partial_x^2 + \partial_z^2) u_{\neq}^3\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 \right.
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}(\partial_x, \partial_z)\nabla u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2) \\
& \leq C(\nu^{-\frac{3}{2}}E_{3,0}^2 + \nu^{-\frac{5}{3}}E_{3,1}^2)E_3^2 \leq C\nu^{-\frac{5}{3}}E_3^4,
\end{aligned}$$

which gives (11.11). Finally, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(\nu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \nu t)^{\frac{1}{2}}\nabla(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 & \leq C\nu^{\frac{2}{3}}\|(1 + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t)^{\frac{1}{2}}e^{-4\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}e^{4\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\nabla(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\
& \leq C\nu^{\frac{2}{3}}\|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\nabla(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C\nu^{-1}E_3^4,
\end{aligned}$$

which gives (11.12). $\square$

11.4. Interaction between zero modes.

Lemma 11.11. *It holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Delta(\bar{u}^2\partial_y\bar{u}^{1,0} + \bar{u}^3\partial_z\bar{u}^{1,0})\|_{L^2}^2 & \leq C\left\{(\|\Delta\bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla\bar{u}^3\|_{L^2}^2)\|\nabla\Delta\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^2}^2\right. \\
& \quad \left. + \|\min((\nu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \nu t)^{\frac{1}{2}}, 1 - y^2)\Delta\bar{u}^3\|_{L^2}^2\left\|\frac{\partial_z\bar{u}^{1,0}}{\min((\nu t)^{\frac{1}{2}}, 1 - y^2)}\right\|_{L^\infty}^2\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. For $k \in \{2, 3\}$, by Lemma 11.2, Lemma 11.3 and $\partial_y\bar{u}^2 + \partial_z\bar{u}^3 = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\bar{u}^k\Delta\partial_k\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla\bar{u}^k\nabla\partial_k\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& \leq \|\bar{u}^k\|_{L^\infty}^2\|\Delta\partial_k\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^2}^2 + C(\|\partial_z\nabla\bar{u}^k\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla\bar{u}^k\|_{L^2}^2)\|\nabla\partial_k\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{H^1}^2 \\
& \leq C(\|\partial_z\bar{u}^k\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\bar{u}^k\|_{H^1}^2)\|\nabla\partial_k\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{H^1}^2 \leq C(\|\Delta\bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla\bar{u}^k\|_{L^2}^2)\|\nabla\Delta\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^2}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that

$$\|\Delta\bar{u}^2\partial_y\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|\Delta\bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2\|\partial_y\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \leq C\|\Delta\bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2\|\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{H^3}^2 \leq C\|\Delta\bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2\|\nabla\Delta\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^2}^2,$$

and

$$\|\Delta\bar{u}^3\partial_z\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|\min((\nu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \nu t)^{\frac{1}{2}}, 1 - y^2)\Delta\bar{u}^3\|_{L^2}^2\left\|\frac{\partial_z\bar{u}^{1,0}}{\min((\nu t)^{\frac{1}{2}}, 1 - y^2)}\right\|_{L^\infty}^2.$$

Summing up, we conclude the result. $\square$

Lemma 11.12. *It holds that*

$$\|\partial_t\nabla(\bar{u}^2\partial_y\bar{u}^{1,0})\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|\partial_t\nabla(\bar{u}^3\partial_z\bar{u}^{1,0})\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C\nu E_2^2 E_{1,0}^2.$$

Proof. First of all, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\partial_t\nabla(\bar{u}^2\partial_y\bar{u}^{1,0})\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\
& \leq C\left(\|\partial_t\nabla\bar{u}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2\|\partial_y\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty L^\infty}^2 + \|\nabla\bar{u}^2\|_{L^2 L^\infty}^2\|\partial_t\partial_y\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2\right. \\
& \quad \left.+ \|\bar{u}^2\|_{L^\infty L^\infty}^2\|\partial_t\nabla\partial_y\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|\partial_t\bar{u}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2\|\nabla\partial_y\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty L^\infty}^2\right) \\
& \leq C\left(\|\partial_t\nabla\bar{u}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2\|\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty H^4}^2 + \|\nabla\Delta\bar{u}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2\|\partial_t\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty H^1}^2\right. \\
& \quad \left.+ \|\Delta\bar{u}^2\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2\|\partial_t\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^2 H^2}^2 + \|\partial_t\bar{u}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2\|\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty H^4}^2\right) \\
& \leq C\left(\nu E_2^2 E_{1,0}^2 + \nu^{-1}E_2^2(\nu E_{1,0})^2 + E_2^2(\nu E_{1,0}^2) + \nu E_2^2 E_{1,0}^2\right) \leq C\nu E_2^2 E_{1,0}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 11.7 and Lemma 11.8, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\partial_t \nabla(\bar{u}^3 \partial_z \bar{u}^{1,0})\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\
& \leq C \left(\left\| \min((\nu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \nu t)^{\frac{1}{2}}, 1 - y^2) \partial_t \nabla \bar{u}^3 \right\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \left\| \frac{\partial_z \bar{u}^{1,0}}{\min((\nu t)^{\frac{1}{2}}, 1 - y^2)} \right\|_{L^\infty L^\infty}^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \|\nabla \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2 L^\infty}^2 \|\partial_t \partial_z \bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \|\bar{u}^3\|_{L^\infty L^\infty}^2 \|\partial_t \nabla \partial_z \bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|\partial_t \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \|\nabla \partial_z \bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty L^\infty}^2 \right) \\
& \leq C \left(\left\| \min((\nu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \nu t)^{\frac{1}{2}}, 1 - y^2) \partial_t \nabla \bar{u}^3 \right\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 E_{1,0}^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \nu^{-1} E_2^2 \|\partial_t \partial_z \bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + E_2^2 \|\partial_t \Delta \bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu E_2^2 \|\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty H^4}^2 \right) \\
& \leq C(\nu E_2^2 E_{1,0}^2 + \nu E_2^2 E_{1,0}^2).
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

11.5. Interaction between zero mode and nonzero mode. The following lemma gives the reaction between $\bar{u}^1$ and $u_{\neq}^2, u_{\neq}^3$.

Lemma 11.13. *It holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}(\partial_x, \partial_z)(\bar{u}^1 \partial_x u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}(\partial_x, \partial_z)(\bar{u}^1 \partial_x u_{\neq}^2)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\
& + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x((u_{\neq}^2 \partial_y + u_{\neq}^3 \partial_z) \bar{u}^1)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C\nu E_1^2 E_3 E_5.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. For $k \in \{2, 3\}$, by Lemma 11.2 and Lemma 11.6, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)(\bar{u}^1 \partial_x u_{\neq}^k)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_x(u_{\neq}^k \partial_k \bar{u}^1)\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& \leq C(\|\bar{u}^1\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\nabla \bar{u}^1\|_{H^1}^2)(\|\partial_x(\partial_x, \partial_z)u_{\neq}^k\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_x u_{\neq}^k\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_z \partial_x u_{\neq}^k\|_{L^2}^2) \\
& \leq C\|\bar{u}^1\|_{H^2}^2 \|\partial_x(\partial_x, \partial_z)u_{\neq}^k\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C\nu^{\frac{4}{3}} E_1^2 (1 + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} t)^2 \|\partial_x(\partial_x, \partial_z)u_{\neq}^k\|_{L^2}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, using Lemma 11.9 and the fact that $(1 + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} t) \leq C e^{\frac{1}{4}\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}(\partial_x, \partial_z)(\bar{u}^1 \partial_x u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}(\partial_x, \partial_z)(\bar{u}^1 \partial_x u_{\neq}^2)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\
& + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x((u_{\neq}^2 \partial_y + u_{\neq}^3 \partial_z) \bar{u}^1)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\
& \leq C\nu^{\frac{4}{3}} E_1^2 \|(1 + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} t) e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x(\partial_x, \partial_z)(u_{\neq}^2, u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\
& \leq C\nu^{\frac{4}{3}} E_1^2 \|e^{\frac{9}{4}\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x(\partial_x, \partial_z)(u_{\neq}^2, u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\
& \leq C\nu^{\frac{4}{3}} E_1^2 (\nu^{-\frac{1}{3}} E_5 E_3) = C\nu E_1^2 E_3 E_5.
\end{aligned}$$

$\square$

The following Lemma describes the reaction between $\bar{u}^1$ and $u_{\neq}^1$.

Lemma 11.14. *It holds that*

$$\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x(\bar{u}^1 \partial_x u_{\neq}^1)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C\nu(E_1^2 E_3^{\frac{3}{2}} E_5^{\frac{1}{2}} + E_1^2 E_3 E_5).$$

Proof. By Lemma 11.6, we have

$$\|\partial_x(\bar{u}^1 \partial_x u_{\neq}^1)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|\bar{u}^1\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\partial_x^2 u_{\neq}^1\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C\|\bar{u}^1\|_{H^2}^2 \|\partial_x^2 u_{\neq}^1\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C\nu^{\frac{4}{3}} E_1^2 (1 + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} t)^2 \|\partial_x^2 u_{\neq}^1\|_{L^2}^2,$$

which along with Lemma 11.9 gives

$$\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x(\bar{u}^1 \partial_x u_{\neq}^1)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C\nu^{\frac{4}{3}} E_1^2 \|(1 + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} t) e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x^2 u_{\neq}^1\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C\nu^{\frac{4}{3}} E_1^2 \|e^{\frac{9}{4}\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x^2 u_{\neq}^1\|_{L^2 L^2}^2$$

$$\leq C\nu^{\frac{4}{3}}E_1^2\nu^{-\frac{1}{3}}(E_5^{\frac{1}{2}}E_3^{\frac{3}{2}} + E_5E_3) = C\nu(E_1^2E_3^{\frac{3}{2}}E_5^{\frac{1}{2}} + E_1^2E_3E_5).$$

□

The following lemma gives the reactions between $\bar{u}^2, \bar{u}^3$ with nonzero modes. This lemma suggests that $\bar{u}^2$ and $\bar{u}^3$ are good components.

Lemma 11.15. *It holds that for $k \in \{2, 3\}$,*

$$\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}(\partial_x, \partial_z)(\bar{u}^k \nabla u_{\neq})\|_{L^2L^2} + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}(\partial_x, \partial_z)(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla \bar{u}^k)\|_{L^2L^2} \leq C\nu^{-1/2}E_2E_3.$$

Proof. By Lemma 11.2, Lemma 11.8 and Lemma 11.5, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)(\bar{u}^k \nabla u_{\neq})\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla \bar{u}^k)\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq C(\|\bar{u}^k\|_{H^1} + \|\partial_z \bar{u}^k\|_{H^1})(\|\nabla u_{\neq}\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)\nabla u_{\neq}\|_{L^2}) \\ & \quad + C(\|\nabla \bar{u}^k\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_z \nabla \bar{u}^k\|_{L^2})(\|u_{\neq}\|_{H^1} + \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)u_{\neq}\|_{H^1}) \\ & \leq C(\|\bar{u}^k\|_{H^1} + \|\partial_z \bar{u}^k\|_{H^1})\|\nabla(\partial_x, \partial_z)\partial_x u_{\neq}\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq CE_2(\|(\partial_x, \partial_z)\Delta u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_x^2 + \partial_z^2)\nabla u_{\neq}^3\|_{L^2}), \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}(\partial_x, \partial_z)(\bar{u}^k \nabla u_{\neq})\|_{L^2L^2} + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}(\partial_x, \partial_z)(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla \bar{u}^k)\|_{L^2L^2} \\ & \leq CE_2(\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}(\partial_x, \partial_z)\Delta u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2L^2} + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}(\partial_x^2 + \partial_z^2)\nabla u_{\neq}^3\|_{L^2L^2}) \\ & \leq C\nu^{-1/2}E_2E_3. \end{aligned}$$

□

The following lemma will be used to estimate $E_{3,1}$.

Lemma 11.16. *It holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\partial_z(\bar{u}^1\partial_x u_{\neq}^1)\|_{L^2L^2}^2 + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\partial_z((u_{\neq}^2\partial_y + u_{\neq}^3\partial_z)\bar{u}^1)\|_{L^2L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C\nu^{1/3}E_1^2E_3(E_5 + E_3^{\frac{3}{4}}E_5^{\frac{1}{4}}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Lemma 11.2 and Lemma 11.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\partial_z(\bar{u}^1\partial_x u_{\neq}^1)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_z((u_{\neq}^2\partial_y + u_{\neq}^3\partial_z)\bar{u}^1)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C(\|\bar{u}^1\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\partial_z \bar{u}^1\|_{H^1}^2)(\|\partial_x u_{\neq}^1\|_{L^2}^2 + \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)\partial_x u_{\neq}^1\|_{L^2}^2) \\ & \quad + C(\|\partial_y \bar{u}^1\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_z \partial_y \bar{u}^1\|_{L^2}^2)(\|u_{\neq}^2\|_{H^1}^2 + \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)u_{\neq}^2\|_{H^1}^2) \\ & \quad + C(\|\partial_z \bar{u}^1\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_z^2 \bar{u}^1\|_{L^2}^2)(\|u_{\neq}^3\|_{H^1}^2 + \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)u_{\neq}^3\|_{H^1}^2) \\ & \leq C\|\bar{u}^1\|_{H^2}^2(\|\nabla \partial_x u_{\neq}^1\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla(\partial_x, \partial_z)u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla(\partial_x, \partial_z)u_{\neq}^3\|_{L^2}^2) \\ & \leq \nu^{\frac{4}{3}}E_1^2(1 + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t)^2(\|\nabla \partial_x u_{\neq}^1\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \partial_z(u_{\neq}^2, u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2}^2), \end{aligned}$$

which along with Lemma 11.9 gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\partial_z(\bar{u}^1\partial_x u_{\neq}^1)\|_{L^2L^2}^2 + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\partial_z((u_{\neq}^2\partial_y + u_{\neq}^3\partial_z)\bar{u}^1)\|_{L^2L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C\nu^{\frac{4}{3}}E_1^2\left(\|e^{\frac{17}{8}\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\nabla \partial_x u_{\neq}^1\|_{L^2L^2}^2 + \|e^{\frac{17}{8}\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\nabla \partial_z(u_{\neq}^2, u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2L^2}^2\right) \\ & \leq C\nu^{\frac{4}{3}}E_1^2\nu^{-1}(E_5^{\frac{1}{4}}E_3^{\frac{7}{4}} + E_5^{\frac{1}{2}}E_3^{\frac{3}{2}}) \leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}E_1^2E_3(E_5 + E_3^{\frac{3}{4}}E_5^{\frac{1}{4}}). \end{aligned}$$

□

12. ENERGY ESTIMATES FOR ZERO MODE

12.1. Estimate of E_1 .

Proposition 12.1. *It holds that*

$$(12.1) \quad E_{1,0} \leq C\nu^{-1}(\|\bar{u}(0)\|_{H^2} + E_2 + E_2 E_{1,0}),$$

$$(12.2) \quad E_{1,\neq} \leq C(\|\bar{u}(0)\|_{H^2} + \nu^{-1}E_2 E_{1,\neq} + \nu^{-\frac{4}{3}}E_3^2).$$

Proof. Step 1. Estimate of $E_{1,0}$.

Thanks to (3.11), we know that

$$(12.3) \quad (\partial_t - \nu\Delta)\Delta\bar{u}^{1,0} + \Delta\bar{u}^2 + \Delta(\bar{u}^2\partial_y\bar{u}^{1,0} + \bar{u}^3\partial_z\bar{u}^{1,0}) = 0$$

with $\Delta\bar{u}^{1,0}|_{y=\pm 1} = \bar{u}^{1,0}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$.

Taking the time derivative to (12.3), and then taking L^2 inner product with $\partial_t\Delta\bar{u}^{1,0}$ to the resulting equation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\partial_t\Delta\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu \|\partial_t\nabla\Delta\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^2}^2 - \langle \partial_t\nabla\bar{u}^2, \partial_t\nabla\Delta\bar{u}^{1,0} \rangle \\ & - \langle \partial_t\nabla(\bar{u}^2\partial_y\bar{u}^{1,0} + \bar{u}^3\partial_z\bar{u}^{1,0}), \partial_t\nabla\Delta\bar{u}^{1,0} \rangle = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\partial_t\Delta\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu \|\partial_t\nabla\Delta\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C\nu^{-1} \left(\|\partial_t\nabla\bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_t\nabla(\bar{u}^2\partial_y\bar{u}^{1,0} + \bar{u}^3\partial_z\bar{u}^{1,0})\|_{L^2}^2 \right).$$

This gives that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\partial_t\Delta\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu \|\partial_t\nabla\Delta\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C \left(\|\partial_t\Delta\bar{u}^{1,0}(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1} \|\partial_t\nabla\bar{u}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1} \|\partial_t\nabla(\bar{u}^2\partial_y\bar{u}^{1,0} + \bar{u}^3\partial_z\bar{u}^{1,0})\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

which along with $\partial_t\Delta\bar{u}^{1,0}|_{t=0} = -\Delta\bar{u}^2|_{t=0}$ and the definition of E_2 gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu^{-2} \|\partial_t\Delta\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1} \|\partial_t\nabla\Delta\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C\nu^{-2} \left(\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + E_2^2 + \nu^{-1} \|\partial_t\nabla(\bar{u}^2\partial_y\bar{u}^{1,0} + \bar{u}^3\partial_z\bar{u}^{1,0})\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

from which and Lemma 11.12, we infer that

$$\nu^{-2} \|\partial_t\Delta\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1} \|\partial_t\nabla\Delta\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C\nu^{-2} (\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + E_2^2 + E_2^2 E_{1,0}^2).$$

Thanks to (12.3), we get

$$\nu^2 \|\Delta^2\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 \leq C \left(\|\partial_t\Delta\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \|\Delta\bar{u}^2\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \|\Delta(\bar{u}^2\partial_y\bar{u}^{1,0} + \bar{u}^3\partial_z\bar{u}^{1,0})\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 \right),$$

which along with Lemma 11.11 and Lemma 11.7 gives

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^2 \|\Delta^2\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 & \leq C (\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + E_2^2 + E_2^2 E_{1,0}^2 + \|\Delta(\bar{u}^2\partial_y\bar{u}^{1,0} + \bar{u}^3\partial_z\bar{u}^{1,0})\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2) \\ & \leq C \left(\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + E_2^2 + E_2^2 E_{1,0}^2 + (\|\Delta\bar{u}^2\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \|\nabla\bar{u}^3\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2) \|\nabla\Delta\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|\min((\nu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \nu t)^{\frac{1}{2}}, 1 - y^2) \Delta\bar{u}^3\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 \left\| \frac{\partial_z\bar{u}^{1,0}}{\min((\nu t)^{\frac{1}{2}}, 1 - y^2)} \right\|_{L^\infty L^\infty}^2 \right) \\ & \leq C (\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + E_2^2 + E_2^2 E_{1,0}^2). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\Delta\bar{u}^{1,0}|_{y=\pm 1} = \bar{u}^{1,0}|_{y=\pm 1} = \partial_t\bar{u}^{1,0}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$, we obtain

$$E_{1,0} = \|\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty H^4} + \nu^{-1} \|\partial_t\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty H^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_t\bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^2 H^3}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C(\|\Delta \bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty H^2} + \nu^{-1}\|\partial_t \Delta \bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\partial_t \Delta \bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^2 H^1}) \\
&\leq C(\|\Delta^2 \bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty L^2} + \nu^{-1}\|\partial_t \Delta \bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty L^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\partial_t \nabla \Delta \bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^2 L^2}) \\
&\leq C\nu^{-1}(\|\bar{u}(0)\|_{H^2} + E_2 + E_2 E_{1,0}).
\end{aligned}$$

This proves (12.1).

Step 2. Estimate of $E_{1,\neq}$.

Recall that $\bar{u}^{1,\neq}$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t - \nu \Delta) \bar{u}^{1,\neq} + \bar{u}^2 \partial_y \bar{u}^{1,\neq} + \bar{u}^3 \partial_z \bar{u}^{1,\neq} + \overline{u_\neq \cdot \nabla u_\neq^1} = 0, \\ \bar{u}^{1,\neq}|_{t=0} = \bar{u}^1(0), \quad \Delta \bar{u}^{1,\neq}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \quad \bar{u}^{1,\neq}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Thus, we have

$$(\partial_t - \nu \Delta) \Delta \bar{u}^{1,\neq} + \Delta(\bar{u}^2 \partial_y \bar{u}^{1,\neq} + \bar{u}^3 \partial_z \bar{u}^{1,\neq} + \overline{u_\neq \cdot \nabla u_\neq^1}) = 0.$$

Thanks to $\Delta \bar{u}^{1,\neq}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$, the energy estimate gives

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\Delta \bar{u}^{1,\neq}\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\nu \|\nabla \Delta \bar{u}^{1,\neq}\|_{L^2}^2 - 2 \left\langle \nabla(\bar{u}^2 \partial_y \bar{u}^{1,\neq} + \bar{u}^3 \partial_z \bar{u}^{1,\neq} + \overline{u_\neq \cdot \nabla u_\neq^1}), \nabla \Delta \bar{u}^{1,\neq} \right\rangle = 0,$$

which gives

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\Delta \bar{u}^{1,\neq}\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu \|\nabla \Delta \bar{u}^{1,\neq}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C\nu^{-1} \left(\|\nabla(\bar{u}^2 \partial_y \bar{u}^{1,\neq} + \bar{u}^3 \partial_z \bar{u}^{1,\neq})\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla(\overline{u_\neq \cdot \nabla u_\neq^1})\|_{L^2}^2 \right).$$

It is easy to see that

$$\|\nabla(\bar{u}^k \partial_k \bar{u}^{1,\neq})\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \|\bar{u}^k\|_{H^1}^2 \|\partial_k \bar{u}^{1,\neq}\|_{H^2}^2 \leq C \|\nabla \bar{u}^k\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla \Delta \bar{u}^{1,\neq}\|_{L^2}^2.$$

which gives

$$\|\nabla(\bar{u}^2 \partial_y \bar{u}^{1,\neq} + \bar{u}^3 \partial_z \bar{u}^{1,\neq})\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(\|\nabla \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2}^2) \|\nabla \Delta \bar{u}^{1,\neq}\|_{L^2}^2,$$

which along with Lemma 11.10 gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\Delta \bar{u}^{1,\neq}\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu \|\nabla \Delta \bar{u}^{1,\neq}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\
&\leq \|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + C\nu^{-1} \left(\|\nabla(\bar{u}^2 \partial_y \bar{u}^{1,\neq} + \bar{u}^3 \partial_z \bar{u}^{1,\neq})\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|\nabla(\overline{u_\neq \cdot \nabla u_\neq^1})\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right) \\
&\leq \|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + C\nu^{-1} E_2^2 \|\nabla \Delta \bar{u}^{1,\neq}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + C\nu^{-\frac{8}{3}} E_3^4.
\end{aligned}$$

As $\Delta \bar{u}^{1,\neq}|_{y=\pm 1} = \bar{u}^{1,\neq}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{1,\neq}^2 &= (\|\bar{u}^{1,\neq}\|_{L^\infty H^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla \bar{u}^{1,\neq}\|_{L^2 H^2})^2 \\
&\leq C(\|\Delta \bar{u}^{1,\neq}\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu \|\nabla \Delta \bar{u}^{1,\neq}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2) \\
&\leq C(\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + \nu^{-2} E_2^2 E_{1,\neq}^2 + \nu^{-\frac{8}{3}} E_3^4).
\end{aligned}$$

This proves (12.2). $\square$

12.2. Estimate of E_2 . Let us assume that $\nu \in (0, \nu_0]$, $\nu_0, \epsilon \in (0, 1)$, $\nu_0^{2/3} \leq 4\epsilon < \epsilon_1$. Then $e^{\nu t} \leq e^{4\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}$ for $t > 0$.

Proposition 12.2. *It holds that*

$$E_2 \leq C(1 + \nu^{-1}E_2)(\|u(0)\|_{H^2} + \nu^{-1}E_3^2).$$

The proposition is an immediate consequence of the following lemmas.

Lemma 12.1. *It holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|e^{\nu t}(\bar{u}^2, \bar{u}^3)\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu \|e^{\nu t}(\nabla \bar{u}^2, \nabla \bar{u}^3)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C(\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + \nu^{-2}E_3^4), \\ & \|e^{\nu t}(\nabla \bar{u}^2, \nabla \bar{u}^3)\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1} \|e^{\nu t}(\partial_t \bar{u}^2, \partial_t \bar{u}^3)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C(1 + \nu^{-2}E_2^2)(\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + \nu^{-2}E_3^4). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Recall that $\bar{u}^k (k = 2, 3)$ satisfies

$$(\partial_t - \nu \Delta) \bar{u}^k + \partial_k \bar{p} + (\bar{u}^2 \partial_y + \bar{u}^3 \partial_z) \bar{u}^k + \overline{u_\neq \cdot \nabla u_\neq^k} = 0.$$

As $\bar{u}^j|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$, L^2 energy estimate gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} (\|\bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\bar{u}^3\|_{L^2}^2) + 2\nu (\|\nabla \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2}^2) \\ & = 2\langle \bar{p}, \partial_y \bar{u}^2 \rangle + 2\langle \bar{p}, \partial_z \bar{u}^3 \rangle - 2 \sum_{k=2,3} \langle (\bar{u}^2 \partial_y + \bar{u}^3 \partial_z) \bar{u}^k, \bar{u}^k \rangle \\ & \quad - 2\langle \overline{u_\neq \cdot \nabla u_\neq^2}, \bar{u}^2 \rangle - 2\langle \overline{u_\neq \cdot \nabla u_\neq^3}, \bar{u}^3 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

As $\partial_y \bar{u}^2 + \partial_z \bar{u}^3 = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} (\|\bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\bar{u}^3\|_{L^2}^2) + 2\nu (\|\nabla \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2}^2) \\ & = -2 \sum_{k=2,3} \langle \overline{u_\neq \cdot \nabla u_\neq^k}, \bar{u}^k \rangle = 2 \sum_{k=2,3} \langle u_\neq \cdot \nabla \bar{u}^k, u_\neq^k \rangle \\ & \leq 2\|u_\neq\|_{L^2}^2 (\|\nabla \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2}), \end{aligned}$$

from which and the fact that $\|\nabla \bar{u}^j\|_{L^2}^2 \geq (\pi/2)^2 \|\bar{u}^j\|_{L^2}^2$, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{2\nu t} (\|\bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\bar{u}^3\|_{L^2}^2) + \nu \int_0^t e^{2\nu s} (\|\nabla \bar{u}^2(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \bar{u}^3(s)\|_{L^2}^2) ds \\ & \leq C\|\bar{u}^2(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|\bar{u}^3(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + C\nu^{-1} \int_0^t e^{2\nu s} \|u_\neq(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds, \end{aligned}$$

which along with Lemma 11.10 gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \|e^{\nu t}(\bar{u}^2, \bar{u}^3)\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu \|e^{\nu t}(\nabla \bar{u}^2, \nabla \bar{u}^3)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C(\|u(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1} \|e^{\nu t} |u_\neq|^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2) \leq C(\|u(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{-2}E_3^4). \end{aligned}$$

Now H^1 energy estimate gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu \frac{d}{dt} (\|\nabla \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2}^2) + 2(\|\partial_t \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_t \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2}^2) \\ & = -2 \sum_{k=2,3} \langle (\bar{u}^2 \partial_y + \bar{u}^3 \partial_z) \bar{u}^k, \partial_t \bar{u}^k \rangle - 2\langle \overline{u_\neq \cdot \nabla u_\neq^2}, \partial_t \bar{u}^2 \rangle - 2\langle \overline{u_\neq \cdot \nabla u_\neq^3}, \partial_t \bar{u}^3 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 11.8, we have

$$\|e^{\nu t}(\bar{u}^2 \partial_y + \bar{u}^3 \partial_z) \bar{u}^k\|_{L^2} \leq C E_2 \|e^{\nu t} \nabla \bar{u}^k\|_{L^2},$$

and by Lemma 11.10, we have

$$\|e^{\nu t}(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq})\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C \nu^{-1} E_3^4.$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|e^{\nu t}(\nabla \bar{u}^2, \nabla \bar{u}^3)\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1} \|e^{\nu t}(\partial_t \bar{u}^2, \partial_t \bar{u}^3)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C \|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + C \nu \|e^{\nu t}(\nabla \bar{u}^2, \nabla \bar{u}^3)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + C \nu^{-2} E_3^4 \\ & \quad + C \nu^{-1} E_2^2 \|e^{\nu t}(\nabla \bar{u}^2, \nabla \bar{u}^3)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C(1 + \nu^{-2} E_2^2) (\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + \nu^{-2} E_3^4). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 12.2. *It holds that*

$$\|e^{\nu t} \Delta \bar{u}^2\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1} \|e^{\nu t} \nabla \partial_t \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C(1 + \nu^{-2} E_2^2) (\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + \nu^{-2} E_3^4).$$

Proof. Recall that $\Delta \bar{u}^2$ satisfies

$$(12.4) \quad (\partial_t - \nu \Delta) \Delta \bar{u}^2 + \Delta \partial_y \bar{p} + \Delta(\overline{u \cdot \nabla u^2}) = 0, \quad \nabla \bar{u}^2|_{y=\pm 1} = 0.$$

Taking the L^2 inner product with $-2\bar{u}^2$, we get

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\nu \|\Delta \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\langle \Delta \bar{p}, \partial_y \bar{u}^2 \rangle - 2\langle \bar{u}^2 \partial_y \bar{u}^2 + \bar{u}^3 \partial_z \bar{u}^2 + \overline{u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^2}, \Delta \bar{u}^2 \rangle = 0,$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} \nu \|e^{\nu t} \Delta \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 & \lesssim \|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + \nu^{-1} \|e^{\nu t} \Delta \bar{p}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu \|e^{\nu t} \nabla \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\ (12.5) \quad & + \nu^{-1} \|e^{\nu t}(\bar{u}^2 \partial_y + \bar{u}^3 \partial_z) \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1} \|e^{\nu t} \overline{u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^2}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now by Lemma 11.3 and Lemma 12.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|e^{\nu t} \nabla(\bar{u}^k \partial_k \bar{u}^j)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 & \leq \|e^{\nu t} \bar{u}^k\|_{L^\infty H^1}^2 \|(\partial_k \bar{u}^j, \partial_z \partial_k \bar{u}^j)\|_{L^2 H^1}^2 \\ & \leq C \|e^{\nu t}(\nabla \bar{u}^2, \nabla \bar{u}^3)\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 \|(\Delta \bar{u}^2, \Delta \bar{u}^3, \nabla \Delta \bar{u}^2)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C(\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + \nu^{-2} E_3^4) \nu^{-1} E_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$(12.6) \quad \nu^{-1} \|e^{\nu t} \nabla(\bar{u} \cdot \nabla \bar{u}^k)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C \nu^{-2} E_2^2 (\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + \nu^{-2} E_3^4), \quad k \in \{2, 3\}.$$

Notice that

$$\Delta \bar{p} = -\overline{\partial_j u^i \partial_i u^j} = -\partial_j \bar{u}^i \partial_i \bar{u}^j - \overline{\partial_j u_{\neq}^i \partial_i u_{\neq}^j},$$

where by Lemma 11.10 and $\operatorname{div} u_{\neq} = 0$, we have

$$\|e^{\nu t} \overline{\partial_j u_{\neq}^i \partial_i u_{\neq}^j}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 = \|e^{\nu t} \overline{\partial_j (u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^j)}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq \|e^{\nu t} \partial_j (u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^j)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C \nu^{-1} E_3^4,$$

and

$$\|e^{\nu t} \partial_j \bar{u}^i \partial_i \bar{u}^j\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 = \|e^{\nu t} \partial_\alpha (\bar{u} \cdot \nabla \bar{u}^\alpha)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C(\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + \nu^{-2} E_3^4) \nu^{-1} E_2^2.$$

This shows that

$$(12.7) \quad \nu^{-1} \|e^{\nu t} \Delta \bar{p}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C(1 + \nu^{-2} E_2^2) (\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + \nu^{-2} E_3^4).$$

Then it follows from (12.5), (12.6), (12.7) and Lemma 11.10 that

$$(12.8) \quad \nu \|e^{\nu t} \Delta \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C(1 + \nu^{-2} E_2^2) (\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + \nu^{-2} E_3^4).$$

Next, we take the L^2 inner product with $-2\partial_t \bar{u}^2$ to (12.4) to obtain

$$\|\partial_t \nabla \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\nu \frac{d}{dt} \|\Delta \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\langle \Delta \bar{p}, \partial_t \partial_y \bar{u}^2 \rangle + 2\langle \nabla(\overline{u \cdot \nabla u^2}), \partial_t \nabla \bar{u}^2 \rangle = 0,$$

which gives

$$\|\partial_t \nabla \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu \partial_t \|\Delta \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(\|\Delta \bar{p}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla(\overline{u \cdot \nabla u^2})\|_{L^2}^2),$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu^{-1} e^{2\nu t} \|\partial_t \nabla \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{d}{dt} (e^{2\nu t} \|\Delta \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2) \\ & \leq C\nu^{-1} \left(e^{2\nu t} \|\Delta \bar{p}\|_{L^2}^2 + e^{2\nu t} \|\nabla(\overline{u \cdot \nabla u^2})\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^2 e^{2\nu t} \|\Delta \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

which along with (12.8), (12.6) and (12.7) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \|e^{\nu t} \Delta \bar{u}^2\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1} \|e^{\nu t} \partial_t \nabla \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C(\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + \nu^{-1} \|e^{\nu t} \Delta \bar{p}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1} \|e^{\nu t} \nabla(\overline{u \cdot \nabla u^2})\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu \|e^{\nu t} \Delta \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2) \\ & \leq C(1 + \nu^{-2} E_2^2) (\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + \nu^{-2} E_3^4). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 12.3. *It holds that*

$$\nu \|e^{\nu t} \nabla \Delta \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu \|e^{\nu t} \Delta \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C(1 + \nu^{-2} E_2^2) (\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + \nu^{-2} E_3^4).$$

Proof. Using the equation

$$(\partial_t - \nu \Delta) \partial_z \bar{u}^2 + \partial_z \partial_y \bar{p} + \partial_z (\overline{u \cdot \nabla u^2}) = 0, \quad \nabla \bar{u}^2|_{y=\pm 1} = 0,$$

we get by integration by parts that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\partial_t \partial_z \bar{u}^2 + \partial_z (\overline{u \cdot \nabla u^2})\|_{L^2}^2 = \|\nu \Delta \partial_z \bar{u}^2 - \partial_z \partial_y \bar{p}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & = \nu^2 \|\Delta \partial_z \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_z \partial_y \bar{p}\|_{L^2}^2 - 2\nu \langle \Delta \partial_z \bar{u}^2, \partial_z \partial_y \bar{p} \rangle \\ & = \nu^2 \|\Delta \partial_z \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_z \partial_y \bar{p}\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\nu \langle \nabla \partial_z \bar{u}^2, \nabla \partial_z \partial_y \bar{p} \rangle \\ & = \nu^2 \|\Delta \partial_z \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_z \partial_y \bar{p}\|_{L^2}^2 - 2\nu \langle \partial_z^2 \partial_y \bar{u}^2, \Delta \bar{p} \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

which shows that

$$(12.9) \quad \nu^2 \|\Delta \partial_z \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_z \partial_y \bar{p}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(\|\Delta \bar{p}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_t \partial_z \bar{u}^2 + \partial_z (\overline{u \cdot \nabla u^2})\|_{L^2}^2).$$

Then by Lemma 12.2, (12.6) and Lemma 11.10, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu \|e^{\nu t} \Delta \partial_z \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1} \|e^{\nu t} \partial_z \partial_y \bar{p}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C\nu^{-1} \left(\|e^{\nu t} \Delta \bar{p}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|e^{\nu t} \partial_t \partial_z \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|e^{\nu t} \partial_z (\overline{u \cdot \nabla u^2})\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|e^{\nu t} \partial_z (\overline{u \cdot \nabla u^2})\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right) \\ & \leq C(1 + \nu^{-2} E_2^2) (\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + \nu^{-2} E_3^4). \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to Lemma 16.7, we find that

$$\|\partial_y^2 \bar{p}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_z^2 \bar{p}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(\|\partial_z \partial_y \bar{p}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Delta \bar{p}\|_{L^2}^2),$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu^{-1} (\|e^{\nu t} \partial_y^2 \bar{p}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|e^{\nu t} \partial_z^2 \bar{p}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2) \leq C\nu^{-1} (\|e^{\nu t} \partial_z \partial_y \bar{p}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|e^{\nu t} \Delta \bar{p}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2) \\ (12.10) \quad & \leq C(1 + \nu^{-2} E_2^2) (\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + \nu^{-2} E_3^4). \end{aligned}$$

Now using the equation

$$(\partial_t - \nu \Delta) \partial_y \bar{u}^2 + \partial_y^2 \bar{p} + \partial_y (\bar{u}^2 \partial_y \bar{u}^2 + \bar{u}^3 \partial_z \bar{u}^2) + \partial_y (\overline{u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^2}) = 0,$$

we deduce that

$$\nu \|\Delta \partial_y \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \nu^{-1} \left(\|\partial_t \partial_y \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_y^2 \bar{p}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_y (\bar{u} \cdot \nabla \bar{u}^2)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_y (\overline{u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^2})\|_{L^2}^2 \right).$$

Thus, we have

$$\nu \|e^{\nu t} \Delta \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C (1 + \nu^{-2} E_2^2) (\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + \nu^{-2} E_3^4).$$

Using the fact that $\|\partial_z \bar{p}\|_{L^2} \leq \|\partial_z^2 \bar{p}\|_{L^2}$ and the equation $(\partial_t - \nu \Delta) \bar{u}^3 + \partial_z \bar{p} + \overline{u \cdot \nabla u^3} = 0$, we deduce that

$$\nu \|\Delta \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \nu^{-1} \left(\|\partial_t \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_z \bar{p}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|(\bar{u}^2 \partial_y \bar{u}^3 + \bar{u}^3 \partial_z \bar{u}^3)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\overline{u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^3}\|_{L^2}^2 \right).$$

As above, we can obtain

$$\nu \|e^{\nu t} \Delta \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C (1 + \nu^{-2} E_2^2) (\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + \nu^{-2} E_3^4).$$

□

Lemma 12.4. *We assume that $E_2 \leq \varepsilon_0 \nu$, then $\exists C > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\min((\nu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \nu t)^{\frac{1}{2}}, 1 - y^2) \Delta \bar{u}^3\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1} \|\min((\nu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \nu t)^{\frac{1}{2}}, 1 - y^2) \partial_t \nabla \bar{u}_3\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\ & + \nu \|\min((\nu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \nu t)^{\frac{1}{2}}, 1 - y^2) \nabla \Delta \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C (1 + \nu^{-2} E_2^2) (\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + \nu^{-2} E_3^4). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Recall that $\nabla \bar{u}^3$ satisfies

$$(12.11) \quad (\partial_t - \nu \Delta) \nabla \bar{u}^3 + \nabla \partial_z \bar{p} + \nabla (\overline{u \cdot \nabla u^3}) = 0.$$

For a smooth function $\rho(t, y)$ satisfying $\rho|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$, $0 \leq \rho \leq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\rho(\partial_t - \nu \Delta) \nabla \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & = \|\rho \partial_t \nabla \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^2 \|\rho \nabla \Delta \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2}^2 - 2\nu \langle \rho^2 \partial_t \nabla \bar{u}^3, \nabla \Delta \bar{u}^3 \rangle \\ & = \|\rho \partial_t \nabla \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^2 \|\rho \nabla \Delta \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\nu \langle \nabla \cdot [\rho^2 \partial_t \nabla \bar{u}^3], \Delta \bar{u}^3 \rangle \\ & = \|\rho \partial_t \nabla \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^2 \|\rho \nabla \Delta \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\nu \langle \rho^2 \partial_t \Delta \bar{u}^3, \Delta \bar{u}^3 \rangle + 4\nu \langle \rho \partial_y \rho \partial_t \partial_y \bar{u}^3, \Delta \bar{u}^3 \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\rho(\partial_t - \nu \Delta) \nabla \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2}^2 = \|\rho \partial_t \nabla \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^2 \|\rho \nabla \Delta \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & + \nu \partial_t \|\rho \Delta \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2}^2 - 2\nu \langle (\rho \partial_t \rho) \Delta \bar{u}^3, \Delta \bar{u}^3 \rangle + 4\nu \langle \rho \partial_y \rho \partial_t \partial_y \bar{u}^3, \Delta \bar{u}^3 \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu^{-1} \|\rho \partial_t \nabla \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu \|\rho \nabla \Delta \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|\rho \Delta \bar{u}^3\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C \left(\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + \nu^{-1} \|\rho(\partial_t - \nu \Delta) \nabla \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right. \\ (12.12) \quad & \left. + \nu (\|\nu^{-1} |\rho \partial_t \rho| + |\partial_y \rho|^2\|_{L^\infty L^\infty}) \|\Delta \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now we take

$$\chi(x) = 1 - e^{-x}, \quad \Psi(s, y) = s \chi\left(\frac{1 - y^2}{s}\right), \quad \rho(t, y) = \Psi((\nu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \nu t)^{\frac{1}{2}}, y).$$

Then we find that

$$\chi(x) \sim \min(1, x), \quad |\chi'(x)| + |x \chi'(x)| \leq C \quad x \geq 0,$$

$$\Psi(t, y) \sim \min(t, 1 - y^2), \quad |\partial_s \Psi(s, y)| + |\partial_y \Psi(s, y)| \leq C \quad s > 0, y \in [-1, 1].$$

Thus, for $t \geq 0$, $y \in [-1, 1]$, we have

$$\rho(t, y) \sim \min((\nu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \nu t)^{\frac{1}{2}}, 1 - y^2),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & 2\nu^{-1} |\rho \partial_t \rho|(t, y) + |\partial_y \rho(t, y)|^2 \\ &= (\nu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \nu t)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \cdot |\Psi \partial_s \Psi|((\nu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \nu t)^{\frac{1}{2}}, y) + |\partial_y \Psi((\nu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \nu t)^{\frac{1}{2}}, y)|^2 \\ &\leq C(\nu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \nu t)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \min((\nu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \nu t)^{\frac{1}{2}}, 1 - y^2) + C \leq C, \end{aligned}$$

With this choice of ρ , we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu^{-1} \|\rho \partial_t \nabla \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu \|\rho \nabla \Delta \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|\rho \Delta \bar{u}^3\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 \\ &\leq C \left(\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + \nu^{-1} \|\rho [\nabla \partial_z \bar{p} + \nabla(\bar{u} \cdot \nabla \bar{u}^3)]\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu \|\Delta \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right) \\ &\leq C \left(\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + \nu \|\Delta \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu \|\nabla \partial_z \bar{p}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \nu^{-1} \|\nabla(\bar{u} \cdot \nabla \bar{u}^3)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1} \|(\nu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \nu t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(\bar{u} \cdot \nabla \bar{u}^3)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

which along with Lemma 12.3, (12.9), (12.10), (12.6) and Lemma 11.10 gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu^{-1} \|\rho \partial_t \nabla \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu \|\rho \nabla \Delta \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|\rho \Delta \bar{u}^3\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 \\ &\leq C(1 + \nu^{-2} E_2^2) (\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + \nu^{-2} E_3^4). \end{aligned}$$

This proves our result due to the choice of ρ . $\square$

13. ENERGY ESTIMATES FOR NONZERO MODES: SEMI-LINEAR PART

In this part, the energy estimate is based on the formulation in terms of $(\Delta u^2, \omega^2)$:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t(\Delta u^2) - \nu \Delta^2 u^2 + y \partial_x \Delta u^2 + (\partial_x^2 + \partial_z^2)(u \cdot \nabla u^2) - \partial_y [\partial_x(u \cdot \nabla u^1) + \partial_z(u \cdot \nabla u^3)] = 0, \\ \partial_t \omega^2 - \nu \Delta \omega^2 + y \partial_x \omega^2 + \partial_z u^2 + \partial_z(u \cdot \nabla u^1) - \partial_x(u \cdot \nabla u^3) = 0, \\ \partial_y u^2(t, x, \pm 1, z) = u^2(t, x, \pm 1, z) = 0, \quad u^2|_{t=0}(x, y, z) = u^2(0), \\ \omega^2(x, \pm 1, z) = 0, \quad \omega^2|_{t=0} = \partial_x u^3(0) - \partial_z u^1(0). \end{cases}$$

We denote

$$\widehat{\Delta} = \widehat{\Delta}_{k,\ell} = \partial_y^2 - k^2 - \ell^2, \quad f_{k,\ell}(y) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} f(x, y, z) e^{-ikx - i\ell z} dx dz.$$

Taking Fourier transform in (x, z) , we obtain

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t(\widehat{\Delta} u_{k,\ell}^2) - \nu \widehat{\Delta}^2 u_{k,\ell}^2 + ik y \widehat{\Delta} u_{k,\ell}^2 - (k^2 + \ell^2)(u \cdot \nabla u^2)_{k,\ell} \\ \quad - \partial_y [\partial_x(u \cdot \nabla u^1) + \partial_z(u \cdot \nabla u^3)]_{k,\ell} = 0, \\ \partial_t \omega_{k,\ell}^2 - \nu(\partial_y^2 - k^2 - \ell^2) \omega_{k,\ell}^2 + ik y \omega_{k,\ell}^2 + i\ell u_{k,\ell}^2 + i\ell(u \cdot \nabla u^1)_{k,\ell} - ik(u \cdot \nabla u^3)_{k,\ell} = 0, \\ \partial_y u_{k,\ell}^2|_{y=\pm 1} = u_{k,\ell}^2|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \quad u_{k,\ell}^2|_{t=0} = u_{k,\ell}^2(0), \\ \omega_{k,\ell}^2|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \quad \omega_{k,\ell}^2|_{t=0} = ik u_{k,\ell}^3(0) - i\ell u_{k,\ell}^1(0). \end{cases}$$

Let $a \geq 0$ and $\eta = \sqrt{k^2 + \ell^2}$. We introduce the following norms:

$$\|f\|_{X_{k,\ell}^a}^2 = \eta \|k\| \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} (-\partial_y, i\eta) f\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu \eta^2 \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} (\partial_y^2 - \eta^2) f\|_{L^2 L^2}^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \nu^{3/2} \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_y (\partial_y^2 - \eta^2) f\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \eta^2 \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} (-\partial_y, i\eta) f\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 \\
& + \nu^{1/2} \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} (\partial_y^2 - \eta^2) f\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|f\|_{Y_{k,\ell}^a}^2 = \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} f\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_y f\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + ((\nu k^2)^{1/3} + \nu \eta^2) \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} f\|_{L^2 L^2}^2,$$

and

$$\|f\|_{X_a}^2 = \sum_{k \neq 0; \ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\hat{f}(k, \ell)\|_{X_{k,\ell}^a}^2, \quad \|f\|_{Y_a}^2 = \sum_{k \neq 0; \ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\hat{f}(k, \ell)\|_{Y_{k,\ell}^a}^2.$$

Thus, it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned}
(13.1) \quad & \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x \nabla f_{\neq}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} (\partial_x, \partial_z) \Delta f_{\neq}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu^{3/2} \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_y \Delta f_{\neq}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\
& + \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} (\partial_x, \partial_z) \nabla f_{\neq}\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu^{1/2} \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} \Delta f_{\neq}\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 \leq \|f\|_{X_a}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

$$(13.2) \quad \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} f_{\neq}\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu \|e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} \nabla f_{\neq}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq \|f\|_{Y_a}^2.$$

Lemma 13.1. *It holds that*

$$E_{3,0}^2 \leq C(\|u_{\neq}^2\|_{X_{2\epsilon}}^2 + \|\partial_x \omega_{\neq}^2\|_{Y_{2\epsilon}}^2).$$

Proof. Using the fact $\omega^2 = \partial_z u^1 - \partial_x u^3$ and $\partial_x u^1 + \partial_y u^2 + \partial_z u^3 = 0$, we know that $(\partial_x^2 + \partial_z^2)u_{\neq}^3 = -\partial_x \omega_{\neq}^2 - \partial_z \partial_y u_{\neq}^2$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} (\partial_x^2 + \partial_z^2) u_{\neq}^3\|_{L^\infty L^2} + \nu^{1/2} \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} (\partial_x^2 + \partial_z^2) \nabla u_{\neq}^3\|_{L^2 L^2} \\
& \leq \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x \omega_{\neq}^2\|_{L^\infty L^2} + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_z \partial_y u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^\infty L^2} \\
& + \nu^{1/2} \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x \nabla \omega_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2 L^2} + \nu^{1/2} \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_z \partial_y \nabla u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2 L^2},
\end{aligned}$$

from which, (13.1), (13.2) and the definition of $E_{3,0}$, we deduce the lemma. $\square$

In what follows, we take $\epsilon = \epsilon_1/8$.

13.1. Estimate of $E_{3,0}$.

Proposition 13.1. *It holds that*

$$E_{3,0}^2 + \|u_{\neq}^2\|_{X_{2\epsilon}}^2 \leq C\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + C\left(E_3^4/\nu^2 + E_2^2 E_3^2/\nu^2 + E_1^2 E_3 E_5 + E_1^2 E_3^{\frac{3}{2}} E_5^{\frac{1}{2}}\right).$$

Proof. By Proposition 10.2 and Proposition 10.1 and $\partial_y u_{k,\ell}^2 + iku_{k,\ell}^1 + i\ell u_{k,\ell}^3 = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{X_{k,\ell}^{2\epsilon}}^2 \leq C\left(\|\widehat{\Delta} u_{k,\ell}^2(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + (k^2 + \ell^2)^{-1} \|\widehat{\Delta}(iku_{k,\ell}^1(0) + i\ell u_{k,\ell}^3(0))\|_{L^2}^2\right) \\
& + C\nu^{-1} \left(\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} [\partial_x(u \cdot \nabla u^1) + \partial_z(u \cdot \nabla u^3)]_{k,\ell}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} (k, \ell)(u \cdot \nabla u^2)_{k,\ell}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2\right),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\omega_{k,\ell}^2\|_{Y_{k,\ell}^{2\epsilon}}^2 \leq C\left(\|\omega_{k,\ell}^2(0)\|_{L^2}^2 \right. \\
& + \min\{(\nu\eta^2)^{-1}, (\nu k^2)^{-1/3}\} \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} (k(u \cdot \nabla u^3)_{k,\ell} - \ell(u \cdot \nabla u^1)_{k,\ell})\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\
& + (\ell^2(|k|\eta)^{-1}) \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_y u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + (\ell^2 \eta |k|^{-1}) \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \Big) \\
& \leq C\left(\|\omega_{k,\ell}^2(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{-1} (\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} (u \cdot \nabla u^3)_{k,\ell}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} (u \cdot \nabla u^1)_{k,\ell}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2)\right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ (\ell^2(|k|\eta)^{-1}) \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_y u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + (\ell^2 \eta |k|^{-1}) \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \Big).$$

Using the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k \neq 0; \ell \in \mathbb{Z}} k^2 \left((\ell^2(|k|\eta)^{-1}) \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_y u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + (\ell^2 \eta |k|^{-1}) \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right) \\ & \leq \sum_{k \neq 0; \ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \eta |k| \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} (\partial_y, i\eta) u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq \sum_{k \neq 0; \ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \|u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{X_{k,\ell}^{2\epsilon}}^2 = \|u_{\neq}^2\|_{X_{2\epsilon}}^2, \end{aligned}$$

we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_x \omega_{\neq}^2\|_{Y_{2\epsilon}}^2 & \leq C \sum_{k \neq 0; \ell \in \mathbb{Z}} k^2 \left(\|\omega_{k,\ell}^2(0)\|_{L^2}^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \nu^{-1} (\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} (u \cdot \nabla u^3)_{k,\ell}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} (u \cdot \nabla u^1)_{k,\ell}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2) \right) \\ & \quad + C \sum_{k \neq 0; \ell \in \mathbb{Z}} k^2 \left((\ell^2(|k|\eta)^{-1}) \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_y u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + (\ell^2 \eta |k|^{-1}) \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right) \\ & \leq C \|\omega_{\neq}^2(0)\|_{H^1}^2 + C \nu^{-1} \left(\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x (u \cdot \nabla u^3)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x (u \cdot \nabla u^1)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right) + C \|u_{\neq}^2\|_{X_{2\epsilon}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then we infer from Lemma 13.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} E_{3,0}^2 + \|u_{\neq}^2\|_{X_{2\epsilon}}^2 & \leq C (\|u_{\neq}^2\|_{X_{2\epsilon}}^2 + \|\partial_x \omega_{\neq}^2\|_{Y_{2\epsilon}}^2) \\ & \leq C \|\omega_{\neq}^2(0)\|_{H^1}^2 + C \nu^{-1} \left(\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x (u \cdot \nabla u^3)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x (u \cdot \nabla u^1)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right) + C \|u_{\neq}^2\|_{X_{2\epsilon}}^2 \\ & \leq C \|\omega_{\neq}^2(0)\|_{H^1}^2 + C \nu^{-1} \left(\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x (u \cdot \nabla u^3)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x (u \cdot \nabla u^1)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right) \\ & \quad + C \nu^{-1} \sum_{k \neq 0; \ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} [\partial_x (u \cdot \nabla u^1) + \partial_z (u \cdot \nabla u^3)]_{k,\ell}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} (k, \ell) (u \cdot \nabla u^2)_{k,\ell}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right) \\ & \quad + C \sum_{k \neq 0; \ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(\|\widehat{\Delta}_{k,\ell} u_{k,\ell}^2(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + (k^2 + \ell^2)^{-1} \|\widehat{\Delta}_{k,\ell} (iku_{k,\ell}^1(0) + i\ell u_{k,\ell}^3(0))\|_{L^2}^2 \right) \\ & \leq C \|\omega_{\neq}^2(0)\|_{H^1}^2 + C \nu^{-1} \left(\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x (u \cdot \nabla u^3)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x (u \cdot \nabla u^1)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right) \\ & \quad + C \nu^{-1} \left(\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} [\partial_x (u \cdot \nabla u^1) + \partial_z (u \cdot \nabla u^3)]_{\neq}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} (\partial_x, \partial_z) (u \cdot \nabla u^2)_{\neq}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right) \\ & \quad + C \left(\|\Delta u_{\neq}^2(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Delta u_{\neq}^1(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Delta u_{\neq}^3(0)\|_{L^2}^2 \right) \\ & \leq C \|u_{\neq}(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + C \nu^{-1} \left(\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} (\partial_x, \partial_z) (u \cdot \nabla u^3)_{\neq}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x (u \cdot \nabla u^1)_{\neq}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} (\partial_x, \partial_z) (u \cdot \nabla u^2)_{\neq}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Let us estimate each term on the right hand side. For $k \in \{2, 3\}$, we get by Lemma 11.10 that

$$\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} (\partial_x, \partial_z) (u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^k)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C \nu^{-1} E_3^4,$$

and by Lemma 11.15,

$$\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} (\partial_x, \partial_z) (u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla \bar{u}^k)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C \nu^{-1} E_2^2 E_3^2,$$

and by Lemma 11.13 and Lemma 11.15,

$$\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} (\partial_x, \partial_z) (\bar{u} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^k)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq C \left(\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}(\partial_x, \partial_z)(\bar{u}^1 \partial_x u_{\neq}^k)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}(\partial_x, \partial_z)((\bar{u}^2 \partial_y + \bar{u}^3 \partial_z)u_{\neq}^k)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right) \\ &\leq C\nu E_1^2 E_3 E_5 + C\nu^{-1} E_2^2 E_3^2. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that $(fg)_{\neq} = \bar{f}g_{\neq} + f_{\neq}\bar{g} + (f_{\neq}g_{\neq})_{\neq}$. This shows that for $k = 2, 3$

$$(13.3) \quad \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}(\partial_x, \partial_z)(u \cdot \nabla u^k)_{\neq}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C(\nu^{-1} E_3^4 + \nu^{-1} E_2^2 E_3^2 + \nu E_1^2 E_3 E_5).$$

By Lemma 11.10, we have

$$\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\partial_x(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^1)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C\nu^{-1} E_3^4,$$

and by Lemma 11.13,

$$\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\partial_x(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla \bar{u}^1)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C\nu E_1^2 E_3 E_5,$$

and by Lemma 11.14 and Lemma 11.15,

$$\begin{aligned} &\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\partial_x(\bar{u} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^1)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\ &\leq C \left(\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\partial_x(\bar{u}^1 \partial_x u_{\neq}^1)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\partial_x((\bar{u}^2 \partial_y + \bar{u}^3 \partial_z)u_{\neq}^1)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right) \\ &\leq C\nu E_1^2 E_3^{\frac{3}{2}} E_5^{\frac{1}{2}} + C\nu^{-1} E_2^2 E_3^2, \end{aligned}$$

which show that

$$\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\partial_x(u \cdot \nabla u^1)_{\neq}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C(\nu^{-1} E_3^4 + \nu^{-1} E_2^2 E_3^2 + \nu E_1^2 E_3 E_5 + \nu E_1^2 E_3^{\frac{3}{2}} E_5^{\frac{1}{2}}).$$

Summing up, we conclude that

$$E_{3,0}^2 + \|u_{\neq}^2\|_{X_{2\epsilon}}^2 \leq C\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + C\left(E_3^4/\nu^2 + E_2^2 E_3^2/\nu^2 + E_1^2 E_3 E_5 + E_1^2 E_3^{\frac{3}{2}} E_5^{\frac{1}{2}}\right).$$

This completes the proof of the proposition. $\square$

13.2. Estimate of $E_{3,1}$.

Proposition 13.2. *It holds that*

$$E_{3,1}^2 \leq C \left(\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + \nu^{-2} E_3^4 + \nu^{-\frac{4}{3}} E_2^2 E_3^2 + E_1^2 E_3 E_5 + E_1^2 E_3^{\frac{7}{4}} E_5^{\frac{1}{4}} + E_1^2 E_3^{\frac{3}{2}} E_5^{\frac{1}{2}} \right).$$

Proof. Recall that

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \omega_{k,\ell}^2 - \nu(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2) \omega_{k,\ell}^2 + iky \omega_{k,\ell}^2 + i\ell u_{k,\ell}^2 + i\ell(u \cdot \nabla u^1)_{k,\ell} - ik(u \cdot \nabla u^3)_{k,\ell} = 0, \\ \omega_{k,\ell}^2(\pm 1) = 0, \quad \omega_{k,\ell}^2|_{t=0} = ik u_{k,\ell}^3(0) - i\ell u_{k,\ell}^1(0). \end{cases}$$

It follows from Proposition 10.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(k, \ell) \omega_{k,\ell}^2\|_{Y_{k,\ell}^{2\epsilon}}^2 \leq C\eta^2 \|\omega_{k,\ell}^2\|_{Y_{k,\ell}^{2\epsilon}}^2 \\ &\leq C\eta^2 \|\omega_{k,\ell}^2(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + C\eta^2 (\nu\eta^2)^{-1} \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}(k(u \cdot \nabla u^3)_{k,\ell} - \ell(u \cdot \nabla u^1)_{k,\ell})\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\ &\quad + C\eta^2 \min\{(\nu\eta^2)^{-1}, (\nu k^2)^{-1/3}\} \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\ell u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\ &\leq C\eta^2 \|\omega_{k,\ell}^2(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + C(\nu k^2)^{-\frac{2}{3}} (\ell^2 |k| \eta) \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\ &\quad + C\nu^{-1} \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}(k(u \cdot \nabla u^3)_{k,\ell} - \ell(u \cdot \nabla u^1)_{k,\ell})\|_{L^2 L^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

(here we used $\min\{(\nu\eta^2)^{-1}, (\nu k^2)^{-1/3}\} \leq (\nu\eta^2)^{-1/2} (\nu k^2)^{-1/6} = (\nu k^2)^{-\frac{2}{3}} |k| \eta^{-1}$) and

$$\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_y \omega_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_y^2 \omega_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu \eta^2 \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_y \omega_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C \left(\|\partial_y \omega_{k,\ell}^2(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + (\nu/|k|)^{-\frac{2}{3}} \|\omega_{k,\ell}^2(0)\|_{L^2}^2 \right) \\
&\quad + C(\nu/|k|)^{-\frac{2}{3}} \left((\ell^2|k|\eta^{-1}) \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_y u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + (\ell^2 \eta |k|^{-1}) \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right) \\
&\quad + C\nu^{-1} \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} (k(u \cdot \nabla u^3)_{k,\ell} - \ell(u \cdot \nabla u^1)_{k,\ell})\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\
&\leq C(1 + (\nu k^2)^{-\frac{2}{3}}) \left(\|\partial_y \omega_{k,\ell}^2(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + k^2 \|\omega_{k,\ell}^2(0)\|_{L^2}^2 \right) \\
&\quad + C(\nu k^2)^{-\frac{2}{3}} \left((\ell^2|k|\eta^{-1}) \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_y u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + (\ell^2 \eta |k|) \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right) \\
&\quad + C\nu^{-1} \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} (k(u \cdot \nabla u^3)_{k,\ell} - \ell(u \cdot \nabla u^1)_{k,\ell})\|_{L^2 L^2}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which show that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_y \omega_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} (\partial_y^2 - \eta^2) \omega_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 / 2 + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} (k, \ell) \omega_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 \\
&\leq \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_y \omega_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_y^2 \omega_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\
&\quad + \nu \eta^2 \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} (k, \ell) \omega_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} (k, \ell) \omega_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 \\
&\leq \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_y \omega_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_y^2 \omega_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|(k, \ell) \omega_{k,\ell}^2\|_{Y_{k,\ell}^{2\epsilon}}^2 \\
&\leq C(1 + (\nu k^2)^{-\frac{2}{3}}) \left(\|\partial_y \omega_{k,\ell}^2(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + \eta^2 \|\omega_{k,\ell}^2(0)\|_{L^2}^2 \right) \\
&\quad + C(\nu k^2)^{-\frac{2}{3}} \left((\ell^2|k|\eta^{-1}) \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_y u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + (\ell^2 \eta |k|) \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right) \\
&\quad + C\nu^{-1} \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} (k(u \cdot \nabla u^3)_{k,\ell} - \ell(u \cdot \nabla u^1)_{k,\ell})\|_{L^2 L^2}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k \neq 0; \ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \left((\ell^2|k|\eta^{-1}) \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_y u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + (\ell^2 \eta |k|) \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{k \neq 0; \ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \eta |k| \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} (\partial_y, i\eta) u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq \sum_{k \neq 0; \ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \|u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{X_{k,\ell}^{2\epsilon}}^2 = \|u_{\neq}^2\|_{X_{2\epsilon}}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nu^{\frac{2}{3}} (\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \nabla \omega_{\neq}^2\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \Delta \omega_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2) \\
&\leq \nu^{\frac{2}{3}} \sum_{k \neq 0; \ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_y \omega_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} (\partial_y^2 - \eta^2) \omega_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} (k, \ell) \omega_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 \right) \\
&\leq C \sum_{k \neq 0; \ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \nu^{\frac{2}{3}} (1 + (\nu k^2)^{-\frac{2}{3}}) (\|\partial_y \omega_{k,\ell}^2(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + \eta^2 \|\omega_{k,\ell}^2(0)\|_{L^2}^2) \\
&\quad + C \sum_{k \neq 0; \ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \left((\ell^2|k|\eta^{-1}) \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_y u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + (\ell^2 \eta |k|) \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right) \\
&\quad + C\nu^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} (\partial_x(u \cdot \nabla u^3) - \partial_z(u \cdot \nabla u^1))_{\neq}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\
&\leq C \|\omega_{\neq}^2(0)\|_{H^1}^2 + C \|u_{\neq}^2\|_{X_{2\epsilon}}^2 + C\nu^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} (\partial_x(u \cdot \nabla u^3) - \partial_z(u \cdot \nabla u^1))_{\neq}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Now let us estimate each term on the right hand side. By (13.3), we have

$$\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \partial_x(u \cdot \nabla u^3)_{\neq}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C(\nu^{-1} E_3^4 + \nu^{-1} E_2^2 E_3^2 + \nu E_1^2 E_3 E_5).$$

By Lemma 11.10, we have

$$\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\partial_z(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^1)_{\neq}\|_{L^2L^2}^2 \leq C\nu^{-\frac{5}{3}}E_3^4,$$

and by Lemma 11.16, we have

$$\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\partial_z(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla \bar{u}^1)_{\neq}\|_{L^2L^2}^2 \leq C\nu^{1/3}E_1^2E_3(E_5 + E_3^{\frac{3}{4}}E_5^{\frac{1}{4}}),$$

and by Lemma 11.16 and Lemma 11.15,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\partial_z(\bar{u} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^1)\|_{L^2L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C \left(\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\partial_z(\bar{u}^1 \partial_x u_{\neq}^1)\|_{L^2L^2}^2 + \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\partial_z((\bar{u}^2 \partial_y + \bar{u}^3 \partial_z)u_{\neq}^1)\|_{L^2L^2}^2 \right) \\ & \leq C\nu^{1/3}E_1^2E_3(E_5 + E_3^{\frac{3}{4}}E_5^{\frac{1}{4}}) + C\nu^{-1}E_2^2E_3^2, \end{aligned}$$

which show that

$$\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\partial_z(u \cdot \nabla u^1)_{\neq}\|_{L^2L^2}^2 \leq C \left(\nu^{-\frac{5}{3}}E_3^4 + \nu^{-1}E_2^2E_3^2 + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}E_1^2E_3E_5 + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}E_1^2E_3^{\frac{7}{4}}E_5^{\frac{1}{4}} \right).$$

Summing up, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} E_{3,1}^2 &= \nu^{\frac{2}{3}} (\|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\nabla \omega_{\neq}^2\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu \|e^{2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\Delta \omega_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2L^2}^2) \\ &\leq C\|\omega^2(0)\|_{H^1}^2 + C\|u_{\neq}^2\|_{X_{2\epsilon}}^2 + C \left(\nu^{-2}E_3^4 + \nu^{-\frac{4}{3}}E_2^2E_3^2 + E_1^2E_3E_5 + E_1^2E_3^{\frac{7}{4}}E_5^{\frac{1}{4}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which along with Proposition 13.1 gives

$$E_3^2 \leq C\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + C \left(E_3^4/\nu^2 + E_2^2E_3^2/\nu^2 + E_1^2E_3E_5 + E_1^2E_3^{\frac{7}{4}}E_5^{\frac{1}{4}} + E_1^2E_3^{\frac{3}{2}}E_5^{\frac{1}{2}} \right).$$

This completes the proof of the proposition. $\square$

14. ENERGY ESTIMATES FOR NONZERO MODES: QUASI-LINEAR PART

14.1. Resolvent estimate of the linearized operator. Let $\overset{\circ}{J}(\Omega)$, $J_{2,0}^{(k)}(\Omega)$ denote the closure of the set of vector field, which is smooth and solenoidal in Ω and vanish on $\partial\Omega$, in the topology, respectively, of $L^2(\Omega)$ and Sobolev space $W^{k,2}(\Omega)$. In this section, u, v stands for generic functions rather than the solution introduced in section 1.

We define

$$\begin{aligned} Q(u, v) &= \mathbb{P}(u \cdot \nabla v + v \cdot \nabla u), \\ Q_1(f, v) &= Q((f, 0, 0), v), \quad A_{[V]}v = \nu\mathbb{P}\Delta v - Q_1(V, v). \end{aligned}$$

Here V satisfies (4.2) and $\mathbb{P}$ is a projector in $L^2(\Omega)$ onto $\overset{\circ}{J}(\Omega)$. Then the operator $A_{[V]}$ defined on $J_{2,0}^{(2)}(\Omega)$ is invariant in the subspace $\mathcal{H} = \{f \in L^2(\Omega) | P_0 f = 0\}$.

We denote by $m(\nu, V)$ the upper bound of the real parts of points of the spectrum of $A_{[V]}$ in the subspace $J_{2,0}^{(2)}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{H}$. More precisely, we consider $A_{[V]}$ as a closed linear operator in the Hilbert space $\overset{\circ}{J}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{H}$ with the domain $D(A_{[V]}) = J_{2,0}^{(2)}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{H}$.

Let $\kappa = \partial_z V / \partial_y V$. For $v = (v^1, v^2, v^3)$, we introduce the notations:

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\|_{Z_{[V]}^1}^2 &= \nu^{-1} (\|\nabla(v^2 + \kappa v^3)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_x v^3\|_{L^2}^2), \\ \|v\|_{Z_{[V]}^2}^2 &= \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} (\|\partial_x^2 v^3\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y)v^3\|_{L^2}^2) + \nu (\|\nabla \partial_x^2 v^3\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa \partial_y)v^3\|_{L^2}^2) \\ &\quad + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\partial_x \nabla(v^2 + \kappa v^3)\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu \|\partial_x \Delta(v^2 + \kappa v^3)\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{\frac{5}{3}} \|\partial_x \Delta v^3\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The following Lemma ensures that $\|\cdot\|_{Z_{[V]}^2}$ defines a norm (in a subspace).

Lemma 14.1. *It holds that for any $v \in J_{2,0}^{(3)}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{H}$,*

$$C^{-1}\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\partial_x^2 v\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|v\|_{Z_{[V]}^2}^2 \leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\partial_x v\|_{H^2}^2.$$

and more precisely, we have

$$\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}(\|\partial_x^2 v^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)v^2\|_{L^2}^2) + \nu(\|\nabla\partial_x^2 v^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)v^2\|_{L^2}^2) \leq C\|v\|_{Z_{[V]}^2}^2.$$

Proof. The upper bound of first inequality is obvious. For the lower bound, it is enough to note that

$$-\partial_x^2 v^1 = \partial_x\partial_y(v^2 + \kappa v^3) + \partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)v^3 - \partial_y\kappa\partial_x v^3.$$

Direct calculations show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)v^2\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x^2 v^2\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq \|\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)(v^2 + \kappa v^3)\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)(\kappa v^3)\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x^2(v^2 + \kappa v^3)\|_{L^2} + \|\kappa\partial_x^2 v^3\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq (\|\kappa\|_{L^\infty} + 1)\|\partial_x\nabla(v^2 + \kappa v^3)\|_{L^2} + \|\kappa\|_{L^\infty}\|\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)v^3\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)\kappa\|_{L^\infty}\|\partial_x v^3\|_{L^2} \\ & \quad + \|\partial_x^2(v^2 + \kappa v^3)\|_{L^2} + \|\kappa\|_{L^\infty}\|\partial_x^2 v^3\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq C(\|\partial_x\nabla(v^2 + \kappa v^3)\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)v^3\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x v^3\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x^2 v^3\|_{L^2}) \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{6}}\|v\|_{Z_{[V]}^2}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)v^2\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla\partial_x^2 v^2\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq \|\nabla\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)(v^2 + \kappa v^3)\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)(\kappa v^3)\|_{L^2} \\ & \quad + \|\nabla\partial_x^2(v^2 + \kappa v^3)\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla(\kappa\partial_x^2 v^3)\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq C\left((1 + \|\kappa\|_{H^2})\|\partial_x\nabla(v^2 + \kappa v^3)\|_{H^1} + \|\nabla\partial_x(\kappa(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)v^3)\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla\partial_x(v^3(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)\kappa)\|_{L^2}\right. \\ & \quad \left.+ \|\nabla\partial_x^2(v^2 + \kappa v^3)\|_{L^2} + \|\kappa\|_{H^2}\|\partial_x^2 v^3\|_{H^1}\right) \\ & \leq C\left(\|\partial_x\Delta(v^2 + \kappa v^3)\|_{L^2} + \|\kappa\|_{H^2}\|\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)v^3\|_{H^1} + \|(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)\kappa\|_{H^2}\|\partial_x v^3\|_{H^1}\right. \\ & \quad \left.+ \|\nabla\partial_x^2(v^2 + \kappa v^3)\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla\partial_x^2 v^3\|_{L^2}\right) \\ & \leq C\left(\|\partial_x\Delta(v^2 + \kappa v^3)\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)v^3\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla\partial_x^2 v^3\|_{L^2}\right) \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|v\|_{Z_{[V]}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used $\|(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)\kappa\|_{H^2} \leq C(\|\kappa\|_{H^3} + \|\kappa\|_{H^2}\|\partial_y\kappa\|_{H^2}) \leq C$. $\square$

Proposition 14.1. *Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, $\mathbf{Re}(\lambda) \in [0, \epsilon_1\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}]$. It holds that for any $v \in J_{2,0}^{(3)}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{H}$,*

$$\|v\|_{Z_{[V]}^2} \leq C\|(A_{[V]} + \lambda)v\|_{Z_{[V]}^1}.$$

Proof. Let $\vec{g} = (A_{[V]} + \lambda)v = (g^1, g^2, g^3)$ and $\lambda = i\lambda_i + a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}$ with $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $a \in [0, \epsilon_1]$. Due to $\partial_x V = 0$, we have

$$-A_{[V]}v = \mathbb{P}(-\nu\Delta v + V\partial_x v + (\partial_y V(v^2 + \kappa v^3), 0, 0)),$$

Then we get

$$\mathbb{P}(-\nu\Delta v + V\partial_x v) + \mathbb{P}(\partial_y V(v^2 + \kappa v^3), 0, 0) - i\lambda_i v - a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}v = \vec{g}.$$

This means that

$$\begin{cases} (-\nu\Delta + V\partial_x - i\lambda_I - a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}})v + (\partial_y V(v^2 + \kappa v^3), 0, 0) + \nabla P + \vec{g} = 0, \\ \operatorname{div} v = 0, \quad \Delta P = -2\partial_y V(\partial_x v^2 + \kappa\partial_x v^3), \\ v|_{y=\pm 1} = (\partial_y P - \nu\Delta v^2)|_{y=\pm 1} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Let $W = v^2 + \kappa v^3$, $U = v^3$. Then (W, U) satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\nu\Delta W + (\partial_x V - i\lambda_i)W - a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}W + (\partial_y + \kappa\partial_z)P \\ \quad + (g^2 + \kappa g^3) + 2\nu\nabla\kappa \cdot \nabla U + \nu(\Delta\kappa)U = 0, \\ -\nu\Delta U + (\partial_x V - i\lambda_i)U - a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}U + \partial_z P + g^3 = 0, \\ \Delta P = -2\partial_x(\partial_y VW), \quad W|_{y=\pm 1} = \partial_y W|_{y=\pm 1} = U|_{y=\pm 1} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Here we used $\partial_y W|_{y=\pm 1} = (\partial_y v^2 + (\partial_y \kappa)v^3 + \kappa\partial_y v^3)|_{y=\pm 1} = (-\partial_x v^1 - \partial_z v^3 + (\partial_y \kappa)v^3 + \kappa\partial_y v^3)|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$.

We denote

$$\begin{aligned} v_k(x, y, z) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{T}} e^{ik(x-x_1)} v(x_1, y, z) dx_1, \quad \vec{g}_k(x, y, z) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{2\pi\mathbb{T}} e^{ik(x-x_1)} \vec{g}(x_1, y, z) dx_1, \\ P_k(x, y, z) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{2\pi\mathbb{T}} e^{ik(x-x_1)} P(x_1, y, z) dx_1, \quad W_k = v_k^2 + \kappa v_k^3, \quad U_k = v_k^3. \end{aligned}$$

Then (W_k, U_k) satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\nu\Delta W_k + ik(V - \lambda_i/k)W_k - a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}W_k + (\partial_y + \kappa\partial_z)P_k \\ \quad + (g_k^2 + \kappa g_k^3) + 2\nu\nabla\kappa \cdot \nabla U_k + \nu(\Delta\kappa)U_k = 0, \\ -\nu\Delta U_k + ik(V - \lambda_i/k)U_k - a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}U_k + \partial_z P_k + g_k^3 = 0, \\ \Delta P_k = -2ik\partial_y VW_k, \quad W_k|_{y=\pm 1} = \partial_y W_k|_{y=\pm 1} = U_k|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \\ \partial_x W_k = ikW_k, \quad \partial_x U_k = ikU_k, \quad \partial_x P_k = ikP_k. \end{cases}$$

For $k \neq 0$, we apply Proposition 9.1 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}(\|\partial_x^2 U_k\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)U_k\|_{L^2}^2) + \nu(\|\nabla\partial_x^2 U_k\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)U_k\|_{L^2}^2) \\ &\quad + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\partial_x\nabla W_k\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu\|\partial_x\Delta W_k\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{\frac{5}{3}}\|\partial_x\Delta U_k\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C\nu^{-1}(\|\nabla(g_k^2 + \kappa g_k^3)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_x g_k^3\|_{L^2}^2). \end{aligned}$$

which gives by Plancherel's theorem that

$$\begin{aligned} &\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}(\|\partial_x^2 U\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)U\|_{L^2}^2) + \nu(\|\nabla\partial_x^2 U\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)U\|_{L^2}^2) \\ &\quad + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\partial_x\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu\|\partial_x\Delta W\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{\frac{5}{3}}\|\partial_x\Delta U\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C\nu^{-1}(\|\nabla(g^3 + \kappa g^2)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_x g^3\|_{L^2}^2). \end{aligned}$$

Recalling that $W = v^2 + \kappa v^3$, $U = v^3$ and the definition of $Z_{[V]}^1$, $Z_{[V]}^2$, we infer that

$$\|v\|_{Z_{[V]}^2}^2 \leq C\|\vec{g}\|_{Z_{[V]}^1}^2 = C\|(A_{[V]} + \lambda)v\|_{Z_{[V]}^1}^2.$$

This finished the proof of the proposition. $\square$

Therefore, the spectrum of $A_{[V]}$ in the subspace $J_{2,0}^{(2)}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{H}$ does not contain the region $\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} | \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) \in [-\epsilon_1 \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}, 0]\}$, so does that of $A_{[y+s(V-y)]}$ for $s \in [0, 1]$, which implies $m(\nu, y + s(V-y)) \notin (-\epsilon_1 \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}, 0)$. Moreover $\mathbb{P}\Delta$ is a dissipative self-adjoint operator with compact resolvent, and $A_{[y+s(V-y)]}$ for $s \in [0, 1]$ form a continuous family of operators with relative compact perturbations. In particular, the spectrum of $A_{[y+s(V-y)]}$ is always discrete and depends continuously on s , and $m(\nu, y + s(V-y))$ is a continuous function of s . We also know that $m(\nu, y) < 0$, thus,

$$m(\nu, y) \leq -\epsilon_1 \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}, \quad m(\nu, y + s(V-y)) \leq -\epsilon_1 \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} \quad \text{for } s \in [0, 1].$$

Due to $m(\nu, V) \leq -\epsilon_1 \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}$, there holds that for $\mu \in (0, -m(\nu, V))$,

$$\|e^{A_{[V]}t}f\|_{H^1} \leq C(\nu, \mu, V)e^{-\mu t}\|f\|_{H^1} \quad \text{for any } f \in J_{2,0}^{(2)}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{H}, \quad t > 0.$$

14.2. Space-time estimate via freezing the coefficient in time. Let $t_j = j\nu^{-\frac{1}{3}}$, $I_j = [t_j, t_{j+1}) \cap [0, T]$. We define

$$\begin{aligned} V_j(y, z) &= y + \bar{u}^{1,0}(t_j, y, z), \quad \kappa_j = \partial_z V_j / \partial_y V_j, \quad A_j = A_{[V_j]}, \\ u^{1,1} &= y + \bar{u}^1 - V_j, \quad t \in I_j, \quad j \in [0, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}T) \cap \mathbb{Z}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $e^{a\nu^{1/3}t} \sim e^{aj}$ for $t \in I_j$. We denote

$$\|v\|_{Z_j^l} = \|v\|_{Z_{[V_j]}^l} \quad \text{for } j \in [0, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}T) \cap \mathbb{Z}, \quad l \in \{1, 2\}.$$

Recall that $u_{\neq}$ satisfies

$$\partial_t u_{\neq} - \nu \mathbb{P}\Delta u_{\neq} + Q_1(y, u_{\neq}) + Q(\bar{u}, u_{\neq}) + \mathbb{P}(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq})_{\neq} = 0,$$

We can write

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1(y, u_{\neq}) + Q(\bar{u}, u_{\neq}) &= Q_1(y + \bar{u}^1, u_{\neq}) + Q((0, \bar{u}^2, \bar{u}^3), u_{\neq}) \\ &= Q_1(V_j, u_{\neq}) + Q_1(u^{1,1}, u_{\neq}) + Q((0, \bar{u}^2, \bar{u}^3), u_{\neq}). \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\partial_t u_{\neq} - A_j u_{\neq} + \vec{g} = 0 \quad \text{for } t \in I_j,$$

where

$$\vec{g} = Q_1(u^{1,1}, u_{\neq}) + Q((0, \bar{u}^2, \bar{u}^3), u_{\neq}) + \mathbb{P}(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq})_{\neq}.$$

We define $\vec{g}_{(j)}$, $\vec{u}_{[j]}$ for $j \in [0, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}T) \cap \mathbb{Z}$ iteratively by solving

$$\vec{g}_{(j)}(t) = 0 \quad \text{for } t \notin I_j, \quad \vec{g}_{(j)}(t) = \vec{g} + \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} (A_k - A_j) \vec{u}_{[k]} \quad \text{for } t \in I_j,$$

$$\partial_t \vec{u}_{[j]} - A_j \vec{u}_{[j]} + \vec{g}_{(j)} = 0, \quad \vec{u}_{[j]}(t) \in J_{2,0}^{(3)}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{H}, \quad \text{for } t \in [0, +\infty),$$

$$\vec{u}_{[0]}(0) = P_{\neq} u(0), \quad \vec{u}_{[j]}(0) = 0 \quad \text{for } j \in (0, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}T) \cap \mathbb{Z}.$$

Then we find that

$$u_{\neq} = \sum_{k=0}^j \vec{u}_{[k]} \quad \text{for } t \in I_j, \quad j \in [0, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}T) \cap \mathbb{Z}, \quad \vec{u}_{[j]}(t) = 0 \quad \text{for } 0 \leq t < t_j.$$

Proposition 14.2. *Let $\epsilon = \epsilon_1/8$ and V_j satisfy (4.2) for $j \in [0, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}T) \cap \mathbb{Z}$. Then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} \|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\vec{u}_{[j]}\|_{L^2Z_j^2} &\leq C\|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\vec{g}_{(j)}\|_{L^2Z_j^1} \leq Ce^{4\epsilon j}\|\vec{g}_{(j)}\|_{L^2Z_j^1} \quad \text{for } j \in (0, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}T) \cap \mathbb{Z}, \\ \|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\vec{u}_{[0]}\|_{L^2Z_0^2} &\leq C(\|u(0)\|_{H^2} + \|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\vec{g}_{(0)}\|_{L^2Z_0^1}) \leq C(\|u(0)\|_{H^2} + \|\vec{g}\|_{L^2(I_0, Z_0^1)}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Here we just establish a priori estimates of the solution under the assumption $e^{4\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\vec{u}_{[j]} \in L^2(0, +\infty; Z_j^2)$. Rigorous justification could consult section 4.2 in [12].

We decompose $\vec{u}_{[0]} = u_H + u_I$, where u_H and u_I solve

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t - \nu\Delta + y\partial_x)u_I + (u_I^2, 0, 0) + \nabla P_I + \vec{g}_{(0)} = 0, \\ \operatorname{div} u_I = 0, \quad \Delta P = -2\partial_x u_I^2, \quad u_I|_{t=0} = 0, \quad u_I|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t - \nu\Delta + y\partial_x)u_H + (u_H^2, 0, 0) + \nabla P_H = 0, \\ \operatorname{div} u_H = 0, \quad \Delta P = -2\partial_x u_H^2, \quad u_H|_{t=0} = P_{\neq}u(0), \quad u_H|_{y=\pm 1} = 0. \end{cases}$$

That is,

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u_I - A_0 u_I + \vec{g}_{(0)} = 0, \\ \partial_t u_H - A_0 u_H = 0. \end{cases}$$

For $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, let

$$\begin{aligned} v_j(\lambda, x, y, z) &= \int_0^\infty \vec{u}_{[j]}(t) e^{-it\lambda + 4\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} dt \quad j \in (0, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}T) \cap \mathbb{Z}, \\ v_0(\lambda, x, y, z) &= \int_0^\infty u_I(t) e^{-it\lambda + 4\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} dt, \quad \tilde{g}_{(j)}(\lambda) = \int_0^\infty \vec{g}_{(j)}(t) e^{-it\lambda + 4\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} dt \quad j \in [0, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}T) \cap \mathbb{Z}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$(A_j - i\lambda + 4\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}})v_j = \tilde{g}_{(j)}, \quad v_j \in J_{2,0}^{(3)}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{H}, \quad j \in [0, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}T) \cap \mathbb{Z}.$$

It follows from Proposition 14.1 that

$$\|v_j\|_{Z_j^2} \leq C\|(A_j - i\lambda + 4\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}})v_j\|_{Z_j^1} = C\|\tilde{g}_{(j)}\|_{Z_j^1}.$$

By Plancherel's theorem, it holds that for $j \in [0, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}T) \cap \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\vec{u}_{[j]}\|_{L_t^2 Z_j^2} \leq C\|v_j\|_{L_\lambda^2 Z_j^2} \leq C\|\tilde{g}_{(j)}\|_{L_\lambda^2 Z_j^1} \leq C\|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\vec{g}_{(j)}\|_{L^2 Z_j^1} \leq Ce^{4\epsilon j}\|\vec{g}_{(j)}\|_{L^2 Z_j^1}.$$

This proves the first inequality of the lemma, and

$$(14.1) \quad \|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}u_I\|_{L^2 Z_0^2} \leq Ce^{4\epsilon j}\|\vec{g}_{(0)}\|_{L^2 Z_0^1}.$$

Let $\omega_H^2 = \partial_z u_H^1 - \partial_x u_H^3$. Due to $\partial_x u_H^1 + \partial_y u_H^2 + \partial_z u_H^3 = 0$, we know that $(\partial_x^2 + \partial_z^2)u_H^3 = -\partial_x \omega_H^2 - \partial_z \partial_y u_H^2$. Using the fact that $\|(\partial_x, \partial_z)(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^2}^2 = \|(\partial_z f_1 - \partial_x f_2, \partial_x f_1 + \partial_z f_2)\|_{L^2}^2$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_x(\partial_x, \partial_z)(u_H^1, u_H^3)\|_{L^2}^2 &= \|\partial_x \omega_H^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_x \partial_y u_H^2\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|\partial_x \omega_H^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_x \nabla u_H^2\|_{L^2}^2, \\ \|\partial_x \nabla(\partial_x, \partial_z)(u_H^1, u_H^3)\|_{L^2}^2 &= \|\partial_x \nabla \omega_H^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_x \nabla \partial_y u_H^2\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|\partial_x \nabla \omega_H^2\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|\partial_x \Delta u_H^2\|_{L^2}^2, \\ \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)\Delta(u_H^1, u_H^3)\|_{L^2}^2 &= \|\Delta \omega_H^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_y \Delta u_H^2\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, for $j = 0$, $V_j = y$, $\kappa_j = 0$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_H\|_{Z_0^2}^2 = & \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\partial_x(\partial_x, \partial_z)u_H^3\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu \|\partial_x \nabla(\partial_x, \partial_z)u_H^3\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\partial_x \nabla u_H^2\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & + \nu \|\partial_x \Delta u_H^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{\frac{5}{3}} \|\partial_x \Delta u_H^3\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$(14.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \|u_H\|_{Z_0^2}^2 \leq & C(\nu^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\partial_x \omega_H^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu \|\partial_x \nabla \omega_H^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\partial_x \nabla u_H^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu \|\partial_x \Delta u_H^2\|_{L^2}^2) \\ & + C\nu^{\frac{5}{3}} (\|\Delta \omega_H^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_y \Delta u_H^2\|_{L^2}^2). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that u_H satisfies

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t - \nu \Delta + y \partial_x)u_H + (u_H^2, 0, 0) + \nabla P_H = 0, \\ \operatorname{div} u_H = 0, \quad \Delta P = -2\partial_x u_H^2, \quad u_H|_{t=0} = P_{\neq} u(0). \end{cases}$$

Then $(\omega_H^2, \Delta u_H^2)$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t(\Delta u_H^2) - \nu \Delta(\Delta u_H^2) + y \partial_x(\Delta u_H^2) = 0, \\ u_H^2|_{y=\pm 1} = \partial_y u_H^2|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \quad u_H^2|_{t=0} = u_{\neq}^2(0), \\ \partial_t \omega_H^2 - \nu \Delta \omega_H^2 + y \partial_x \omega_H^2 + \partial_z u_H^2 = 0, \\ \omega_H^2|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \quad \omega_H^2|_{t=0} = (\partial_z u_{\neq}^1(0) - \partial_x u_{\neq}^3(0)). \end{cases}$$

Let $\hat{\Delta} = \hat{\Delta}_{k,\ell} := \partial_y^2 - k^2 - \ell^2$, $\eta = \sqrt{k^2 + \ell^2}$, and

$$u_{k,\ell}^j(y) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} u_H^j(x, y, z) e^{-i(kx + \ell z)} dx dz, \quad \omega_{k,\ell}^2(y) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \omega_H^2(x, y, z) e^{-i(kx + \ell z)} dx dz.$$

Taking Fourier transformation in x, z , we obtain

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t(\hat{\Delta} u_{k,\ell}^2) - \nu \hat{\Delta}(\hat{\Delta} u_{k,\ell}^2) + iky(\hat{\Delta} u_{k,\ell}^2) = 0, \\ u_{k,\ell}^2|_{y=\pm 1} = \partial_y u_{k,\ell}^2|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \\ \partial_t \omega_{k,\ell}^2 - \nu \hat{\Delta} \omega_{k,\ell}^2 + iky \omega_{k,\ell}^2 + i\ell u_{k,\ell}^2 = 0, \\ \omega_{k,\ell}^2|_{y=\pm 1} = 0. \end{cases}$$

By Proposition 10.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nu \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}(\partial_y, \eta) \omega_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \omega_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 & \leq C \left(\|\omega_{k,\ell}^2(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + |\eta k|^{-1} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}(\partial_y, \eta) i\ell u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right), \\ \nu \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}(\partial_y, \eta)(k, \ell) \omega_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}(k, \ell) \omega_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C \left((k^2 + \ell^2) \|\omega_{k,\ell}^2(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + \min((\nu \eta^2)^{-1}, (\nu k^2)^{-1/3}) \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}(k, \ell) i\ell u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \nu \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \partial_y^2 \omega_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 & \leq C \nu^{-\frac{2}{3}} |k|^{\frac{2}{3}} \left(\|\omega_{k,\ell}^2(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + |\eta k|^{-1} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}(\partial_y, \eta) i\ell u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right) \\ & + C \|\partial_y \omega_{k,\ell}^2(0)\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that $\min((\nu \eta^2)^{-1}, (\nu k^2)^{-1/3}) \leq \nu^{-2/3} \eta^{-1} |k|^{-1/3}$, we deduce that

$$(14.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \nu \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} k(\partial_y, \eta) \omega_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} k \omega_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu^{\frac{5}{3}} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2) \omega_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\ \leq C \left(\|\eta \omega_{k,\ell}^2(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_y \omega_{k,\ell}^2(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + |k\eta| \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}(\partial_y, \eta) u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

By proposition 10.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \eta(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2) u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + |k\eta| \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} (\partial_y, \eta) u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu^{\frac{3}{2}} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \partial_y (\partial_y^2 - \eta^2) u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C \left(\|\eta^{-1} \partial_y (\partial_y^2 - \eta^2) u_{k,\ell}^2(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2) u_{k,\ell}^2(0)\|_{L^2}^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

which along with (14.3) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} k(\partial_y, \eta) \omega_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} k \omega_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu^{\frac{5}{3}} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} (\partial_y^2 - \eta^2) \omega_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\ & + \nu \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \eta(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2) u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + |k\eta| \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} (\partial_y, \eta) u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu^{\frac{3}{2}} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \partial_y (\partial_y^2 - \eta^2) u_{k,\ell}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C \left(\|\eta \omega_{k,\ell}^2(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)(u_{k,\ell}^1, u_{k,l}^3)(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2) u_{k,\ell}^2(0)\|_{L^2}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Here we used $iku_{k,\ell}^1 + \partial_y u_{k,\ell}^2 + i\ell u_{k,\ell}^3 = 0$. This shows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \partial_x \nabla \omega_H^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \partial_x \omega_H^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu^{\frac{5}{3}} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \partial_y \nabla \omega_H^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \partial_x \Delta u_{k,l}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\ & + \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \partial_x \nabla u_H^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu^{\frac{3}{2}} \|e^{a\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \partial_y \Delta u_H^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C \|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to (14.2) and $\nu^{\frac{5}{3}} \leq \nu^{\frac{3}{2}}$, and taking $a = 4\epsilon \leq \epsilon_1$, we conclude that

$$\|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} u_H\|_{L^2 Z_0^2} \leq C \|u(0)\|_{H^2},$$

from which and (14.1), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \vec{u}_{[0]}\|_{L^2 Z_0^2} & \leq \|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} u_I\|_{L^2 Z_0^2} + \|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} u_H\|_{L^2 Z_0^2} \leq C (\|u(0)\|_{H^2} + \|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \vec{g}_{(0)}\|_{L^2 Z_0^1}) \\ & \leq C (\|u(0)\|_{H^2} + \|\vec{g}\|_{L^2(I_0, Z_0^1)}). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the proposition. $\square$

The following lemma gives some important properties of V_j .

Lemma 14.2. *Let V_j satisfy (4.2) for $j \in [0, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}T) \cap \mathbb{Z}$. For $j, k \in [0, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}T) \cap \mathbb{Z}$, $v = (v^1, v^2, v^3) \in J_{2,0}^{(3)}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{H}$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \|V_j - V_k\|_{H^2} + \|\kappa_j - \kappa_k\|_{H^1} & \leq C \nu^{\frac{2}{3}} |j - k| E_1, \quad \|\kappa_j - \kappa_k\|_{H^2} \leq C \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |j - k|^{\frac{1}{2}} E_1, \\ \|u^{1,1}\|_{H^2} & \leq C \nu^{\frac{2}{3}} E_1, \quad \|v\|_{Z_j^2} - \|v\|_{Z_k^2} \leq C |j - k|^{\frac{1}{2}} E_1 \|v\|_{Z_k^2}. \end{aligned}$$

For $j \in [0, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}T) \cap \mathbb{Z}$, $t \in I_j$ we have

$$\|\kappa_j \nabla \vec{u}^3\|_{H^1} \leq C E_1 E_2.$$

For $j \in [0, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}T) \cap \mathbb{Z}$, $\vec{f} = (f^1, f^2, f^3) \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, we have

$$\nu^{1/2} \|\mathbb{P} \vec{f}\|_{Z_j^1} \leq C (\|\nabla f^2\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_x, \partial_z) f^3\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x f^1\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} j^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla f^3\|_{L^2}).$$

Proof. Since $\|\partial_y V_j\|_{L^\infty} \geq 1 - \|\partial_y (V_j - y)\|_{L^\infty} \geq 1 - C \|V_j - y\|_{H^4} \geq 1 - C \epsilon_0$, we get $|\partial_y V_j| \geq 1/2$ by taking ϵ_0 small enough so that $C \epsilon_0 \leq 1/2$. Then we have

$$\left\| \frac{1}{\partial_y V_j} \right\|_{H^3} \leq C \max(\|(\partial_y V_j)^{-1}\|_{L^\infty}^4, 1) (\|\partial_y V_j\|_{H^3}^3 + 1) \leq C (1 + \|V_j - y\|_{H^4})^3 \leq C.$$

and then

$$\|\kappa_j\|_{H^3} \leq C \|\partial_z V_j\|_{H^3} \left\| \frac{1}{\partial_y V_j} \right\|_{H^3} \leq C E_1.$$

Thanks to $V_j - V_k = \bar{u}^{1,0}(t_j, y, z) - \bar{u}^{1,0}(t_k, y, z) = \int_{t_k}^{t_j} \partial_t \bar{u}^{1,0}(s, y, z) ds$, we deduce that

$$\|V_j - V_k\|_{H^2} \leq |t_j - t_k| \|\partial_t \bar{u}^{1,0}\|_{L^\infty H^2} \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{3}} |j - k| \nu E_1 \leq C\nu^{\frac{2}{3}} |j - k| E_1.$$

Using the formula

$$\kappa_j - \kappa_k = \frac{\partial_z V_j}{\partial_y V_j} - \frac{\partial_z V_k}{\partial_y V_k} = \frac{\partial_z (V_j - V_k)}{\partial_y V_j} + \frac{(\partial_z V_k) \partial_y (V_k - V_j)}{(\partial_y V_k)(\partial_y V_j)},$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\kappa_j - \kappa_k\|_{H^1} &\leq C \|V_j - V_k\|_{H^2} \left(\left\| \frac{1}{\partial_y V_j} \right\|_{H^2} + \left\| \frac{\kappa_k}{\partial_y V_j} \right\|_{H^2} \right) \\ &\leq C \|V_j - V_k\|_{H^2} \leq C\nu^{\frac{2}{3}} |j - k| E_1. \end{aligned}$$

By the interpolation, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\kappa_j - \kappa_k\|_{H^2} &\leq C \|\kappa_j - \kappa_k\|_{H^1}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\kappa_j - \kappa_k\|_{H^3}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C \|\kappa_j - \kappa_k\|_{H^1}^{\frac{1}{2}} (\|\kappa_j\|_{H^3} + \|\kappa_k\|_{H^3})^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C \|\kappa_j - \kappa_k\|_{H^1}^{\frac{1}{2}} E_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |j - k|^{\frac{1}{2}} E_1. \end{aligned}$$

For $t \in I_j$, then we have $u^{1,1} = \bar{u}^1(t, y, z) - \bar{u}^{1,0}(t_j, y, z) = \bar{u}^{1,\neq} + \int_{t_j}^t \partial_t \bar{u}^{1,0}(s, y, z) dz$, so

$$\begin{aligned} \|u^{1,1}\|_{H^2} &\leq \|\bar{u}^{1,\neq}\|_{H^2} + \int_{t_j}^t \|\partial_t \bar{u}^{1,0}(s)\|_{H^2} ds \leq E_{1,\neq} + |t - t_j| \|\partial_t \bar{u}^{1,0}(s)\|_{L^\infty H^2} \\ &\leq E_{1,\neq} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{3}} \nu E_{1,0} \leq \nu^{\frac{2}{3}} E_1. \end{aligned}$$

Direct calculations show that

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} (\|\partial_x (\partial_z - \kappa_j \partial_y) v^3\|_{L^2} - \|\partial_x (\partial_z - \kappa_k \partial_y) v^3\|_{L^2}) &\leq \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} \|(\kappa_j - \kappa_k) \partial_y \partial_x v^3\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} \|\kappa_j - \kappa_k\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla \partial_x v^3\|_{L^2} \leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} |j - k|^{\frac{1}{2}} E_1 \|\nabla \partial_x^2 v^3\|_{L^2} \leq C |j - k|^{\frac{1}{2}} E_1 \|v\|_{Z_k^2}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} (\|\nabla \partial_x (\partial_z - \kappa_j \partial_y) v^3\|_{L^2} - \|\nabla \partial_x (\partial_z - \kappa_k \partial_y) v^3\|_{L^2}) &\leq \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla [(\kappa_j - \kappa_k) \partial_x \partial_y v^3]\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\kappa_j - \kappa_k\|_{H^2} \|\partial_x \partial_y v^3\|_{H^1} \leq C\nu^{\frac{5}{6}} |j - k|^{\frac{1}{2}} E_1 \|\partial_x \Delta v^3\|_{L^2} \leq C |j - k|^{\frac{1}{2}} E_1 \|v\|_{Z_k^2}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} (\|\partial_x \nabla (v^2 + \kappa_j v^3)\|_{L^2} - \|\partial_x \nabla (v^2 + \kappa_k v^3)\|_{L^2}) &\leq \nu^{\frac{1}{6}} \|\partial_x \nabla [(\kappa_j - \kappa_k) v^3]\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{6}} \|\kappa_j - \kappa_k\|_{H^2} \|\partial_x v^3\|_{H^1} \leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} |j - k|^{\frac{1}{2}} E_1 \|\nabla \partial_x^2 v^3\|_{L^2} \leq C |j - k|^{\frac{1}{2}} E_1 \|v\|_{Z_k^2}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} (\|\partial_x \Delta (v^2 + \kappa_j v^3)\|_{L^2} - \|\partial_x \Delta (v^2 + \kappa_k v^3)\|_{L^2}) &\leq \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_x \Delta [(\kappa_j - \kappa_k) v^3]\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\kappa_j - \kappa_k\|_{H^2} \|\partial_x v^3\|_{H^2} \leq C\nu^{\frac{5}{6}} |j - k|^{\frac{1}{2}} E_1 \|\partial_x \Delta v^3\|_{L^2} \leq C |j - k|^{\frac{1}{2}} E_1 \|v\|_{Z_k^2}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$\|v\|_{Z_j^2} - \|v\|_{Z_k^2} \leq C |j - k|^{\frac{1}{2}} E_1 \|v\|_{Z_k^2}.$$

Since $|\kappa_j| \leq C \|\nabla \kappa_j\|_{L^\infty} (1 - |y|) \leq C E_1 (1 - |y|)$, $V_0 - y = \bar{u}^{1,0}|_{t=0} = 0$, we have $\partial_z V_j = 0$, $\kappa_0 = 0$, and then

$$\|\kappa_j\|_{H^2} = \|\kappa_j - \kappa_0\|_{H^2} \leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{3}} |j|^{\frac{1}{2}} E_1 = C(\nu t_j)^{\frac{1}{2}} E_1,$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} |\kappa_j| &\leq CE_1 \min((\nu + \nu t_j)^{\frac{1}{2}}, (1 - |y|)) \leq CE_1 \min((\nu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \nu t_j)^{\frac{1}{2}}, (1 - |y|)) \\ &\leq CE_1 \min((\nu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \nu t)^{\frac{1}{2}}, (1 - |y|)) \quad \text{for } t \in I_j. \end{aligned}$$

Then we infer that for $t \in I_j$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\kappa_j \bar{u}^3\|_{H^2} &\lesssim \|\Delta(\kappa_j \bar{u}^3)\|_{L^2} + \|\kappa_j \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\kappa_j \Delta \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \kappa_j \cdot \nabla \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2} + \|(\Delta \kappa_j, \kappa_j) \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim E_1 \|\min((\nu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \nu t)^{\frac{1}{2}}, (1 - |y|)) \Delta \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \kappa_j\|_{H^2} \|\nabla \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + \|(\Delta \kappa_j, \kappa_j)\|_{H^1} \|\bar{u}^3\|_{H^1} \leq CE_1 E_2, \end{aligned}$$

and then

$$\|\kappa_j \nabla \bar{u}^3\|_{H^1} \leq C(\|\kappa_j \bar{u}^3\|_{H^2} + \|(\nabla \kappa_j) \bar{u}^3\|_{H^1}) \leq C(\|\kappa_j \bar{u}^3\|_{H^2} + \|\nabla \kappa_j\|_{H^2} \|\bar{u}^3\|_{H^1}) \leq CE_1 E_2.$$

For $\vec{f} \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, we know that

$$\begin{cases} \mathbb{P}\vec{f} = \vec{f} + \nabla p, \\ \Delta p = -\operatorname{div} \vec{f}, \quad \partial_y p|_{y=\pm 1} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume $\langle p, 1 \rangle = 0$. Due to $\kappa_0 = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla(f^2 + \kappa_j f^3)\|_{L^2} &\leq \|\nabla f^2\|_{L^2} + C\|\kappa_j\|_{H^2} \|f^3\|_{H^1} \leq C(\|\nabla f^2\|_{L^2} + \|\kappa_j - \kappa_0\|_{H^2} \|\nabla f^3\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C(\|\nabla f^2\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} j^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla f^3\|_{L^2}), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|\nabla(\partial_y p + \kappa_j \partial_z p)\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x \partial_z p\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|p\|_{H^2} + \|\kappa_j\|_{H^2} \|\partial_z p\|_{H^1}) \leq C\|\Delta p\|_{L^2} \leq C\|\operatorname{div} \vec{f}\|_{L^2},$$

which show that

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\mathbb{P}\vec{f}\|_{Z_j^1} &\leq C(\|\nabla(f^2 + \kappa_j f^3)\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x f^3\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla(\partial_y p + \kappa_j \partial_z p)\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x \partial_z p\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C(\|\nabla f^2\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} j^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla f^3\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x f^3\|_{L^2} + \|\operatorname{div} \vec{f}\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C(\|\nabla f^2\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_x, \partial_z) f^3\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x f^1\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} j^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla f^3\|_{L^2}). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma. $\square$

14.3. Estimates of quadratic form.

Lemma 14.3. *It holds that for $\partial_x f = 0, v = (v^1, v^2, v^3) \in J_{2,0}^{(3)}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{H}$,*

$$\|Q_1(f, v)\|_{Z_{[V]}^1} \leq C\nu^{-\frac{2}{3}} \|f\|_{H^2} \|v\|_{Z_{[V]}^2}.$$

Proof. Since $Q_1(f, v) = \mathbb{P}(f \partial_x v + (v \cdot \nabla f, 0, 0))$, we know that

$$\begin{cases} Q_1(f, v) = f \partial_x v + (v \cdot \nabla f, 0, 0) + \nabla P, \\ \Delta P = -\operatorname{div}(f \partial_x v + (v \cdot \nabla f, 0, 0)) = -2\nabla f \cdot \partial_x v, \\ Q_1(f, v)^2|_{y=\pm 1} = \partial_y P|_{y=\pm 1} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla(f \partial_x v^2 + \kappa f \partial_x v^3)\|_{L^2} &\leq C\|f\|_{H^2} \|\partial_x v^2 + \kappa \partial_x v^3\|_{H^1} \leq C\|f\|_{H^2} \|\nabla(\partial_x v^2 + \kappa \partial_x v^3)\|_{L^2}, \\ \|\partial_x(f v^3)\|_{L^2} &= \|f \partial_x(v^3)\|_{L^2} \leq \|f\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_x v^3\|_{L^2} \leq C\|f\|_{H^2} \|\partial_x v^3\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\partial_x v + (v \cdot \nabla f, 0, 0)\|_{Z_{[V]}^1} &\leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\|\nabla(f\partial_x v^2 + \kappa f\partial_x v^3)\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x(fv^3)\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|f\|_{H^2}(\|\nabla(\partial_x v^2 + \kappa\partial_x v^3)\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x(fv^3)\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C\nu^{-\frac{2}{3}}\|f\|_{H^2}\|v\|_{Z_{[V]}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to $\partial_y P|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$, we get by Lemma 11.4 and Lemma 14.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} \|P\|_{H^2} &\leq C\|\Delta P\|_{L^2} \leq C\|\nabla f \cdot \partial_x v\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|(\partial_y f)\partial_x v^2\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_z f)\partial_x v^3\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C\|\nabla f\|_{H^1}(\|\partial_x v^2\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)v^2\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x v^3\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x(\partial_z - \kappa\partial_y)v^3\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{6}}\|f\|_{H^2}\|v\|_{Z_{[V]}^2}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla(\partial_y P + \kappa\partial_z P)\|_{L^2} &\leq C(\|P\|_{H^2} + \|\kappa\|_{H^2}\|\partial_z P\|_{H^1}) \leq C\|P\|_{H^2} \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{6}}\|f\|_{H^2}\|v\|_{Z_{[V]}^2}, \\ \|\partial_x \partial_z P\|_{L^2} &\leq C\|P\|_{H^2} \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{6}}\|f\|_{H^2}\|v\|_{Z_{[V]}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$\|\nabla P\|_{Z_{[V]}^1} \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\|\nabla(\partial_y P + \kappa\partial_z P)\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x \partial_z P\|_{L^2}) \leq C\nu^{-\frac{2}{3}}\|f\|_{H^2}\|v\|_{Z_{[V]}^2}.$$

Thus, we conclude that

$$\|Q_1(f, v)\|_{Z_{[V]}^1} \leq \|f\partial_x v + (v \cdot \nabla f, 0, 0)\|_{Z_{[V]}^1} + \|\nabla P\|_{Z_{[V]}^1} \leq C\nu^{-\frac{2}{3}}\|f\|_{H^2}\|v\|_{Z_{[V]}^2}.$$

□

Lemma 14.4. For $j \in [0, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}T) \cap \mathbb{Z}$, $v = (v^1, v^2, v^3) \in J_{2,0}^{(3)}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{H}$, $t \in I_j$, we have

$$\|Q((0, \bar{u}^2, \bar{u}^3), v)\|_{Z_j^1} \leq C\nu^{-1}E_2\|v\|_{Z_j^2}.$$

Proof. Let $\alpha, \beta \in \{2, 3\}$, $t \in I_j$, and

$$\begin{aligned} W_j^2 &= v^2 + \kappa_j v^3, \\ g_{\alpha,1} &= (\bar{u}^2 \partial_y + \bar{u}^3 \partial_z)v^\alpha, \quad g_{\alpha,2} = v \cdot \nabla \bar{u}^\alpha, \\ G_{2,1} &= g_{2,1} + \kappa_j g_{3,1} = (\bar{u}^2 \partial_y + \bar{u}^3 \partial_z)W_j^2 - v^3(\bar{u}^2 \partial_y + \bar{u}^3 \partial_z)\kappa_j, \\ G_{2,2} &= g_{2,2} + \kappa_j g_{3,2}, \quad \Delta p^{(3)} = -2\partial_\alpha \bar{u}^\beta \partial_\beta v^\alpha, \quad \partial_y p^{(3)}|_{y=\pm 1} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then we find that

$$\begin{aligned} Q((0, \bar{u}^2, \bar{u}^3), v) &= \mathbb{P}((\bar{u}^2 \partial_y + \bar{u}^3 \partial_z)v + (0, v \cdot \nabla \bar{u}^2, v \cdot \nabla \bar{u}^3)) \\ &= \mathbb{P}((\bar{u}^2 \partial_y + \bar{u}^3 \partial_z)v^1, g_{2,1} + g_{2,2}, g_{3,1} + g_{3,2}). \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\operatorname{div}((\bar{u}^2 \partial_y + \bar{u}^3 \partial_z)v + (0, v \cdot \nabla \bar{u}^2, v \cdot \nabla \bar{u}^3)) = 2\partial_\alpha \bar{u}^\beta \partial_\beta v^\alpha.$$

Thus, we have

$$(14.4) \quad Q((0, \bar{u}^2, \bar{u}^3), v)^2 = g_{2,1} + g_{2,2} + \partial_y p^{(3)}, \quad Q((0, \bar{u}^2, \bar{u}^3), v)^3 = g_{3,1} + g_{3,2} + \partial_z p^{(3)}.$$

Let us first claim that

$$(14.5) \quad \|\nabla G_{2,1}\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x g_{3,1}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla g_{2,2}\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)g_{3,2}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla(\kappa_j g_{3,2})\|_{L^2}$$

$$+ \|\Delta p^{(3)}\|_{L^2} \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}E_2\|v\|_{Z_j^2}.$$

Then by (14.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla(Q((0, \bar{u}^2, \bar{u}^3), v)^2 + \kappa_j Q((0, \bar{u}^2, \bar{u}^3), v)^3)\|_{L^2} \\ &= \|\nabla(G_{2,1} + G_{2,2} + (\partial_y + \kappa_j \partial_z)p^{(3)})\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \|\nabla G_{2,1}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla g_{2,2}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla(\kappa_j g_{3,2})\|_{L^2} + C(1 + \|\kappa_j\|_{H^3})\|p^{(3)}\|_{H^2} \\ &\leq \|\nabla G_{2,1}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla g_{2,2}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla(\kappa_j g_{3,2})\|_{L^2} + C\|\Delta p^{(3)}\|_{L^2} \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}E_2\|v\|_{Z_j^2}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|\partial_x(Q((0, \bar{u}^2, \bar{u}^3), v)^3)\|_{L^2} \leq \|\partial_x g_{3,1}\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x g_{3,2}\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x \partial_z p^{(3)}\|_{L^2} \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}E_2\|v\|_{Z_j^2}.$$

This gives

$$\|Q((0, \bar{u}^2, \bar{u}^3), v)\|_{L^2} \leq CE_2\|v\|_{Z_j^2}.$$

It remains to prove (14.5). By Lemma 11.8, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla G_{2,1}\|_{L^2} &\leq CE_2(\|W_j^2\|_{H^2} + \|v^3 \nabla \kappa_j\|_{H^1}) \leq CE_2(\|\Delta W_j^2\|_{L^2} + \|v^3\|_{H^1} \|\nabla \kappa_j\|_{H^2}) \\ &\leq CE_2(\|\partial_x \Delta W_j^2\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \partial_x^2 v^3\|_{L^2}) \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}E_2\|v\|_{Z_j^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to $\partial_x g_{3,1} = (\bar{u}^2 \partial_y + \bar{u}^3 \partial_z) \partial_x v^3$, we get by Lemma 11.8 that

$$\|\partial_x g_{3,1}\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|\bar{u}^2\|_{L^\infty} + \|\bar{u}^3\|_{L^\infty}) \|\partial_x \nabla v^3\|_{L^2} \leq CE_2 \|\partial_x \nabla v^3\|_{L^2} \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}E_2\|v\|_{Z_j^2},$$

We get by Lemma 11.4 that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla g_{2,2}\|_{L^2} &\leq \|\nabla(v^\alpha \partial_\alpha \bar{u}^2)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\|(\partial_y, \partial_z) \bar{u}^2\|_{H^1} (\|(v^2, v^3)\|_{H^1} + \|(\partial_z - \kappa_j \partial_y)(v^2, v^3)\|_{H^1}) \\ &\leq CE_2(\|\nabla(v^2, v^3)\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla(\partial_z - \kappa_j \partial_y)(v^2, v^3)\|_{L^2}) \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}E_2\|v\|_{Z_j^2}. \end{aligned}$$

We write

$$g_{3,2} = v \cdot \nabla \bar{u}^3 = (v^2 \partial_y + v^3 \partial_z) \bar{u}^3 = W_j^2 \partial_y \bar{u}^3 + v^3 (\partial_z \bar{u}^3 - \kappa_j \partial_y \bar{u}^3).$$

Then by (11.8) and Lemma 11.8, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)(W_j^2 \partial_y \bar{u}^3)\|_{L^2} &\leq \|((\partial_x, \partial_z) W_j^2) \partial_y \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2} + \|W_j^2 (\partial_z \partial_y \bar{u}^3)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\|(\partial_x, \partial_z) W_j^2\|_{H^1} \|(\partial_z, 1) \partial_y \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2} + C\|W_j^2\|_{H^2} \|\partial_z \partial_y \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq CE_2 \|\Delta W_j^2\|_{L^2} \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}E_2\|v\|_{Z_j^2}, \end{aligned}$$

Due to Lemma 14.2, $\|\kappa_j \nabla \bar{u}^3\|_{H^1} \leq CE_2$, which along with Lemma 11.8 gives $\|\partial_z \bar{u}^3 - \kappa_j \partial_y \bar{u}^3\|_{H^1} \leq CE_2$, and then

$$\|\nabla(\kappa_j W_j^2 \partial_y \bar{u}^3)\|_{L^2} \leq C\|W_j^2\|_{H^2} \|\kappa_j \partial_y \bar{u}^3\|_{H^1} \leq C\|\Delta W_j^2\|_{L^2} E_2 \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}E_2\|v\|_{Z_j^2}.$$

By Lemma 11.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|v^3 (\partial_z \bar{u}^3 - \kappa_j \partial_y \bar{u}^3)\|_{H^1} &\leq C(\|v^3\|_{H^1} + \|(\partial_z - \kappa_j \partial_y) v^3\|_{H^1}) \|\partial_z \bar{u}^3 - \kappa_j \partial_y \bar{u}^3\|_{H^1} \\ &\leq CE_2(\|\nabla v^3\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla(\partial_z - \kappa_j \partial_y) v^3\|_{L^2}) \leq C\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}E_2\|v\|_{Z_j^2}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\|\nabla[\kappa_j v^3(\partial_z \bar{u}^3 - \kappa_j \partial_z \bar{u}^3)]\|_{L^2} \leq C \|\kappa_j\|_{H^2} \|v^3(\partial_z \bar{u}^3 - \kappa_j \partial_z \bar{u}^3)\|_{H^1} \leq C \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} E_2 \|v\|_{Z_j^2}.$$

Summing up, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)g_{3,2}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla(\kappa_j g_{2,3})\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq C(\|(\partial_x, \partial_z)(W_j^2 \partial_y \bar{u}^3)\|_{L^2} + \|v^3(\partial_z \bar{u}^3 - \kappa_j \partial_z \bar{u}^3)\|_{H^1} + \|\nabla(\kappa_j W_j^2 \partial_y \bar{u}^3)\|_{L^2} \\ & \quad + \|\nabla[\kappa_j v^3(\partial_z \bar{u}^3 - \kappa_j \partial_z \bar{u}^3)]\|_{L^2}) \leq C \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} E_2 \|v\|_{Z_j^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Using $\partial_y \bar{u}^2 + \partial_z \bar{u}^3 = 0$, we may write

$$\Delta p^{(3)} = -2\partial_\alpha \bar{u}^\beta \partial_\beta v^\alpha = -2\partial_\beta(\partial_\alpha \bar{u}^\beta v^\alpha) = -2(\partial_y g_{2,2} + \partial_z g_{3,2}),$$

therefore,

$$\|\Delta p^{(3)}\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|\nabla g_{2,2}\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_z g_{3,2}\|_{L^2}) \leq C \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} E_2 \|v\|_{Z_j^2}.$$

This proves (14.5) and the lemma. $\square$

14.4. Estimate of E_5 . Let $N = \max([0, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}T) \cap \mathbb{Z})$ and we define

$$E_6^2 = \sum_{j=0}^N e^{6\epsilon j} \|u_{\neq}\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^2)}^2,$$

By Lemma 14.1, we have

$$\nu^{\frac{1}{3}} (\|\partial_x^2 u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_x^2 u_{\neq}^3\|_{L^2}^2) \leq C \|u_{\neq}\|_{Z_j^2}^2,$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned} E_5^2 &= \nu^{1/3} \|e^{3\epsilon \nu^{1/3} t} \partial_x^2 u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu^{1/3} \|e^{3\epsilon \nu^{1/3} t} \partial_x^2 u_{\neq}^3\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\ &\leq C \sum_{j=0}^N \nu^{1/3} e^{6\epsilon j} (\|\partial_x^2 u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2(I_j, L^2)}^2 + \|\partial_x^2 u_{\neq}^3\|_{L^2(I_j, L^2)}^2) \\ &\leq C \sum_{j=0}^N e^{6\epsilon j} \|u_{\neq}\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^2)}^2 = C E_6^2. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 14.3. *It holds that*

$$E_5^2 \leq E_6^2 \leq C \|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + C(E_1^2 + \nu^{-2} E_2^2) E_6^2 + C \nu^{-2} E_3^4.$$

Proof. For $j \in [0, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}T) \cap \mathbb{Z}$, let

$$a_j = \sum_{k=0}^j (j-k+1) \|\vec{u}_{[k]}\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^2)}, \quad b_j = e^{-4\epsilon j} \|e^{4\epsilon \nu^{1/3} t} \vec{u}_{[j]}\|_{L^2 Z_j^2}.$$

Thanks to the definition of $\vec{g}_{(j)}$, we have

$$\|\vec{g}_{(j)}\|_{L^2 Z_j^1} \leq \|\vec{g}\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^1)} + \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} \|(A_k - A_j) \vec{u}_{[k]}\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^1)}.$$

Notice that

$$(A_k - A_j) \vec{u}_{[k]} = (A_{[V_k]} - A_{[V_j]}) \vec{u}_{[k]} = Q_1(V_j - V_k, \vec{u}_{[k]}).$$

We get by Lemma 14.3 and Lemma 14.2 that

$$\|(A_k - A_j)\vec{u}_{[k]}\|_{Z_j^1} \leq C\nu^{-\frac{2}{3}}\|V_j - V_k\|_{H^2}\|\vec{u}_{[k]}\|_{Z_j^2} \leq C|j - k|E_1\|\vec{u}_{[k]}\|_{Z_j^2}.$$

Then we infer from Proposition 14.2 that

$$b_0 \leq C(\|u(0)\|_{H^2} + \|\vec{g}\|_{L^2(I_0, Z_0^1)}),$$

and for $j \in (0, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}T) \cap \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\begin{aligned} b_j &\leq C\|\vec{g}_{(j)}\|_{L^2 Z_j^1} \leq C\|\vec{g}\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^1)} + C\sum_{k=0}^{j-1}\|(A_k - A_j)\vec{u}_{[k]}\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^1)} \\ &\leq C\|\vec{g}\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^1)} + C\sum_{k=0}^{j-1}|j - k|E_1\|\vec{u}_{[k]}\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^1)} \leq C(\|\vec{g}\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^1)} + E_1a_j). \end{aligned}$$

For $j, k \in [0, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}T) \cap \mathbb{Z}$, we get by Lemma 14.2 that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\vec{u}_{[k]}\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^2)} &\leq (1 + C|j - k|^{\frac{1}{2}}E_1)\|\vec{u}_{[k]}\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_k^2)} \leq (1 + C|j - k|^{\frac{1}{2}}E_1)e^{-4\epsilon j}\|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\vec{u}_{[k]}\|_{L^2 Z_k^2} \\ &\leq (1 + C|j - k|^{\frac{1}{2}}E_1)e^{-4\epsilon(j-k)}b_k, \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} a_j &= \sum_{k=0}^j(j - k + 1)\|\vec{u}_{[k]}\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^2)} \leq \sum_{k=0}^j(j - k + 1)(1 + C|j - k|^{\frac{1}{2}}E_1)e^{-4\epsilon(j-k)}b_k \\ &\leq C\sum_{k=0}^j(j - k + 1)^{\frac{3}{2}}e^{-4\epsilon(j-k)}b_k, \end{aligned}$$

and hence,

$$a_j^2 \leq C\sum_{k=0}^j(j - k + 1)^5e^{-8\epsilon(j-k)}b_k^2 \leq C\sum_{k=0}^je^{-7\epsilon(j-k)}b_k^2.$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^Ne^{6\epsilon j}a_j^2 &\leq C\sum_{j=0}^Ne^{6\epsilon j}\sum_{k=0}^je^{-7\epsilon(j-k)}b_k^2 = C\sum_{k=0}^N\sum_{j=k}^Ne^{6\epsilon k - \epsilon(j-k)}b_k^2 \\ &\leq C\sum_{j=0}^Ne^{6\epsilon j}b_j^2 \leq C\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + C\sum_{j=0}^Ne^{6\epsilon j}(\|\vec{g}\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^1)}^2 + E_1^2a_j^2). \end{aligned}$$

Then we conclude that

$$E_6^2 \leq \sum_{j=0}^Ne^{6\epsilon j}a_j^2 \leq C\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + C\sum_{j=0}^Ne^{6\epsilon j}\|\vec{g}\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^1)}^2 + CE_1^2E_6^2.$$

Thanks to the definition of $\vec{g}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\vec{g}\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^1)} &\leq \|Q_1(u^{1,1}, u_{\neq})\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^1)} + \|Q((0, \vec{u}^2, \vec{u}^3), u_{\neq})\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^1)} \\ &\quad + \|\mathbb{P}(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq})_{\neq}\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^1)}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 14.3, Lemma 14.2 and Lemma 14.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q_1(u^{1,1}, u_{\neq})\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^1)} &\leq C\nu^{-\frac{2}{3}}\|u^{1,1}\|_{L^\infty H^2}\|u_{\neq}\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^2)} \leq CE_1\|u_{\neq}\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^2)}, \\ \|Q((0, \bar{u}^2, \bar{u}^3), u_{\neq})\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^1)} &\leq C\nu^{-1}E_2\|u_{\neq}\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^2)}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{1/2}\|\mathbb{P}(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq})_{\neq}\|_{Z_j^1} &\leq C(\|\nabla(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^2)\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + \|\partial_x(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^1)\|_{L^2} + \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}j^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq Ce^{\epsilon j}\left(\|\nabla(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^2)\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^1)\|_{L^2}\right. \\ &\quad \left.+ \nu^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\nabla(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Summing up, we get by Lemma 11.10 that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^N e^{6\epsilon j}\|\bar{g}\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^1)}^2 &\leq C \sum_{j=0}^N e^{6\epsilon j}\left(\|Q_1(u^{1,1}, u_{\neq})\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^1)}^2 + \|Q((0, \bar{u}^2, \bar{u}^3), u_{\neq})\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^1)}^2\right. \\ &\quad \left.+ \|\mathbb{P}(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq})_{\neq}\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^1)}^2\right) \\ &\leq C \sum_{j=0}^N e^{6\epsilon j}\left(E_1^2\|u_{\neq}\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^2)}^2 + \nu^{-2}E_2^2\|u_{\neq}\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^2)}^2\right) + \sum_{j=0}^N e^{8\epsilon j}\nu^{-1}\left(\|\nabla(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^2)\|_{L^2(I_j, L^2)}^2\right. \\ &\quad \left.+ \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2(I_j, L^2)}^2 + \|\partial_x(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^1)\|_{L^2(I_j, L^2)}^2 + \nu^{\frac{2}{3}}\|\nabla(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2(I_j, L^2)}^2\right) \\ &\leq C(E_1^2 + \nu^{-2}E_2^2)E_6^2 + C\nu^{-1}\left(\|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\nabla(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^2)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}(\partial_x, \partial_z)(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2\right. \\ &\quad \left.+ \|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\partial_x(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^1)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \nu^{\frac{2}{3}}\|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\nabla(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2\right) \\ &\leq C(E_1^2 + \nu^{-2}E_2^2)E_6^2 + C\nu^{-2}E_3^4. \end{aligned}$$

Then we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} E_6^2 &\leq C\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + C \sum_{j=0}^N e^{6\epsilon j}\|\bar{g}\|_{L^2(I_j, Z_j^1)}^2 + CE_1^2E_6^2 \\ &\leq C\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + C(E_1^2 + \nu^{-2}E_2^2)E_6^2 + C\nu^{-2}E_3^4. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the proposition. $\square$

15. GLOBAL STABILITY AND LONG-TIME BEHAVIOR

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.1. Let us assume that $\nu \in (0, \nu_0]$, $\nu_0, \epsilon \in (0, 1)$, $\nu_0^{2/3} \leq 4\epsilon < \epsilon_1$. Then $e^{\nu t} \leq e^{4\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}$ for $t > 0$.

15.1. Global existence and uniqueness. The classical well-posedness theory ensures that there exists a unique solution $u \in C([0, T^*), H^2(\Omega)) \cap L_{loc}^2([0, T^*), H^3(\Omega))$ to the Navier-Stokes equations (1.1), where T^* is the maximal existence time of the solution. Furthermore, for the linear equation (3.11) and (3.12), it is easy to prove the existence of the solution with

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}^{1,\neq} &\in C([0, T^*), H^2(\Omega)) \cap L_{loc}^2([0, T^*), H^3(\Omega)), \\ \bar{u}^{1,0} &\in C([0, T^*), H^4(\Omega)) \cap L_{loc}^2([0, T^*), H^5(\Omega)). \end{aligned}$$

To be precise, we write $E_j = E_j(T)$ for $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 5\}$ and $T \in (0, T^*)$. Then $E_j(T)$ is a continuous and increasing function of $T \in (0, T^*)$, and

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow 0+} E_j(T) \leq C \|u(0)\|_{H^2} \leq C c_0 \nu, \quad j \in \{1, 2, 3, 5\}.$$

Here all norms are taken over the interval $[0, T]$ unless stated otherwise, such as

$$\|f\|_{L^p H^s} = \left\| \|f(t)\|_{H^s(\Omega)} \right\|_{L^p(0, T)}, \quad \|f\|_{L^p L^q} = \left\| \|f(t)\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \right\|_{L^p(0, T)}.$$

Our goal is to prove that $T^* = +\infty$. The proof is based on a continuity argument. Let us first assume that

$$(15.1) \quad E_1 \leq \varepsilon_1, \quad E_2 \leq \varepsilon_1 \nu, \quad E_3 \leq \varepsilon_1 \nu.$$

where ε_1 is determined later. First of all, we take $\varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon_0$ so that

$$\|V_j - y\|_{H^4} \leq E_1 < \varepsilon_0 \quad \text{for } j \in [0, \nu^{\frac{1}{3}} T) \cap \mathbb{Z}.$$

Now it follows from Proposition 12.1, Proposition 12.2, Proposition 13.1, Proposition 13.2 and Proposition 14.3 that

$$\begin{aligned} E_{1,0} &\leq C \nu^{-1} (\|\bar{u}(0)\|_{H^2} + E_2 + E_2 E_{1,0}), \\ E_{1,\neq} &\leq C (\|\bar{u}(0)\|_{H^2} + \nu^{-1} E_2 E_{1,\neq} + \nu^{-\frac{4}{3}} E_3^2), \\ E_2 &\leq C (1 + \nu^{-1} E_2) (\|u(0)\|_{H^2} + \nu^{-1} E_3^2), \\ E_{3,0}^2 &\leq C \|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + C \left(E_3^4 / \nu^2 + E_2^2 E_3^2 / \nu^2 + E_1^2 E_3 E_5 + E_1^2 E_3^{\frac{3}{2}} E_5^{\frac{1}{2}} \right), \\ E_{3,1}^2 &\leq C \left(\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + \nu^{-2} E_3^4 + \nu^{-\frac{4}{3}} E_2^2 E_3^2 + E_1^2 E_3 E_5 + E_1^2 E_3^{\frac{7}{4}} E_5^{\frac{1}{4}} + E_1^2 E_3^{\frac{3}{2}} E_5^{\frac{1}{2}} \right), \\ E_5^2 &\leq E_6^2 \leq C \|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + C (E_1^2 + \nu^{-2} E_2^2) E_6^2 + C \nu^{-2} E_3^4. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that by taking ε_1 small enough, we can deduce from (15.1) that

$$E_3 + E_5 \leq C \|u(0)\|_{H^2} \leq C c_0 \nu.$$

Then we can get

$$E_2 \leq C (\|u(0)\|_{H^2} + \varepsilon_1 E_3) \leq C \|u(0)\|_{H^2} \leq C c_0 \nu,$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned} E_{1,0} &\leq C \nu^{-1} (\|\bar{u}(0)\|_{H^2} + E_2) \leq C \nu^{-1} \|u(0)\|_{H^2} \leq C c_0, \\ E_{1,\neq} &\leq C (\|\bar{u}(0)\|_{H^2} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{3}} \varepsilon_1 E_3) \leq C \nu^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|\bar{u}(0)\|_{H^2} \leq C c_0 \nu^{\frac{2}{3}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$E_1 = E_{1,0} + \nu^{-2/3} E_{1,\neq} \leq C c_0.$$

Now we take $c_0 > 0$ small enough so that $C c_0 < \varepsilon_1 / 2$. We define

$$T_0 = \sup \{T \in (0, T^*) \mid \max(\nu E_1(T), E_2(T), E_3(T)) \leq \varepsilon_1 \nu\}.$$

The argument as above implies that $T_0 = T^*$, and the argument as below implies that $\|u(t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C \nu^{-1} \|u(0)\|_{H^2}$ for any $t \in [0, T^*)$, which in turn implies $T^* = +\infty$.

15.2. Global stability estimates. By Lemma 12.1, we have

$$e^{\nu t} (\|\Delta \bar{u}^2(t)\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \bar{u}^3(t)\|_{L^2}) \leq C(\|u(0)\|_{H^2} + \nu^{-1} E_3^2) \leq C\|u(0)\|_{H^2}.$$

As $\partial_y \bar{u}^2 + \partial_z \bar{u}^3 = 0$, we have

$$\|\bar{u}^2\|_{H^2} + \|\bar{u}^3\|_{H^1} + \|\partial_z \bar{u}^3\|_{H^1} \leq C(\|\Delta \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2}),$$

which implies that

$$\|\bar{u}^2(t)\|_{H^2} + \|\bar{u}^3(t)\|_{H^1} + \|\partial_z \bar{u}^3(t)\|_{H^1} \leq C e^{-\nu t} \|u(0)\|_{H^2}.$$

Thanks to Lemma 11.3, we have

$$\|\bar{u}^2(t)\|_{L^\infty} + \|\bar{u}^3(t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C(\|\bar{u}^2(t)\|_{H^2} + \|\bar{u}^3(t)\|_{H^1} + \|\partial_z \bar{u}^3(t)\|_{H^1}) \leq C e^{-\nu t} \|u(0)\|_{H^2}.$$

This proves (1.5).

Now we prove (1.6). First of all, we have

$$e^{2\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} (\|(\partial_x, \partial_z) \nabla u_{\neq}^2(t)\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_x^2 + \partial_z^2) u_{\neq}^3(t)\|_{L^2}) \leq E_{3,0} \leq E_3 \leq C\|u(0)\|_{H^2},$$

and by Lemma 11.5, we have

$$\|(\partial_x, \partial_z) \partial_x u_{\neq}(t)\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|(\partial_x, \partial_z) \nabla u_{\neq}^2(t)\|_{L^2} + \|(\partial_x^2 + \partial_z^2) u_{\neq}^3(t)\|_{L^2}) \leq C e^{-2\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \|u(0)\|_{H^2}.$$

By (13.1) and Proposition 13.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{1/2} e^{4\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \|\Delta u_{\neq}^2(t)\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq \|u_{\neq}^2\|_{X_{2\epsilon}}^2 \\ &\leq C\|u_{\neq}(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + C(E_3^4/\nu^2 + E_2^2 E_3^2/\nu^2 + E_1^2 E_3 E_5 + E_1^2 E_3^{\frac{3}{2}} E_5^{\frac{1}{2}}) \leq C\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of $E_{3,1}$, we have

$$e^{2\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \|\nabla \omega_{\neq}^2(t)\|_{L^2} \leq \nu^{-1/3} E_{3,1} \leq \nu^{-1/3} E_3 \leq C \nu^{-1/3} \|u(0)\|_{H^2}.$$

Using the fact that

$$\|\nabla(\partial_x, \partial_z)(u_{\neq}^1, u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2}^2 = \|\nabla \omega_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \partial_y u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2}^2,$$

we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla(\partial_x, \partial_z)(u_{\neq}^1, u_{\neq}^3)(t)\|_{L^2} &\leq C(\|\nabla \omega_{\neq}^2(t)\|_{L^2} + \|\Delta u_{\neq}^2(t)\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C(\nu^{-1/3} e^{-2\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \|u(0)\|_{H^2} + \nu^{-1/4} e^{-2\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \|u(0)\|_{H^2}) \leq C \nu^{-1/3} e^{-2\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \|u(0)\|_{H^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|(u_{\neq}^1, u_{\neq}^3)(t)\|_{H^1} &\leq C\|\nabla \partial_x(u_{\neq}^1, u_{\neq}^3)(t)\|_{L^2} \leq C \nu^{-1/3} e^{-2\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \|u(0)\|_{H^2}, \\ \nu^{1/4} \|u_{\neq}^2(t)\|_{H^2} &\leq C \nu^{1/4} \|\Delta u_{\neq}^2(t)\|_{L^2} \leq C e^{-2\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t} \|u(0)\|_{H^2}. \end{aligned}$$

By (1.6), we have

$$\|u_{\neq}(t)\|_{L^2} \leq \|\partial_x^2 u_{\neq}(t)\|_{L^2} \leq C e^{-2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t} \|u(0)\|_{H^2},$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_{\neq}\|_{L^\infty L^2} + \sqrt{\nu} \|t(u_{\neq}^1, u_{\neq}^3)\|_{L^2 L^2} \\ \leq C\|e^{-2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\|_{L^\infty(0,+\infty)} \|u(0)\|_{H^2} + \sqrt{\nu} \|t e^{-2\epsilon\nu^{1/3}t}\|_{L^2(0,+\infty)} \|u(0)\|_{H^2} \leq C\|u(0)\|_{H^2}. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of E_3 , we have

$$\|\nabla u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^\infty L^2} + \|\nabla u_{\neq}^2\|_{L^2 L^2} \leq C E_3 \leq C\|u(0)\|_{H^2}.$$

This proves (1.7).

It remains to prove the stability estimate in L^∞ norm. By Lemma 16.2, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_{\neq}^2(t)\|_{L^\infty} &\leq C\|(\partial_x, \partial_z)\partial_x u_{\neq}^2(t)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|(\partial_x, \partial_z)\nabla u_{\neq}^2(t)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq Ce^{-2\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\|u(0)\|_{H^2}, \\ \|u_{\neq}^j(t)\|_{L^\infty} &\leq C\|(\partial_x, \partial_z)\partial_x u_{\neq}^j(t)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|(\partial_x, \partial_z)\nabla u_{\neq}^j(t)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C\nu^{-1/6}e^{-2\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\|u(0)\|_{H^2}, \end{aligned}$$

here $j \in \{1, 3\}$. Thus, we also conclude (1.6).

Recall that $\bar{u}^1$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t - \nu\Delta)\bar{u}^1 + \bar{u}^2 + \bar{u}^2\partial_y\bar{u}^1 + \bar{u}^3\partial_z\bar{u}^1 + \overline{u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^1} = 0, \\ \bar{u}^1|_{t=0} = \bar{u}^1(0), \quad \Delta\bar{u}^1|_{y=\pm 1} = 0, \quad \bar{u}^1|_{y=\pm 1} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Then $\Delta\bar{u}^1$ solves

$$(15.2) \quad (\partial_t - \nu\Delta)\Delta\bar{u}^1 + \Delta\bar{u}^2 + \Delta(\bar{u}^2\partial_y\bar{u}^1 + \bar{u}^3\partial_z\bar{u}^1 + \overline{u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^1}) = 0.$$

Since $\Delta\bar{u}^1|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$, H^2 energy estimate gives

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\Delta\bar{u}^1\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\nu\|\nabla\Delta\bar{u}^1\|_{L^2}^2 - 2\langle \nabla(\bar{u}^2 + \bar{u}^2\partial_y\bar{u}^1 + \bar{u}^3\partial_z\bar{u}^1 + \overline{u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^1}), \nabla\Delta\bar{u}^1 \rangle = 0,$$

which gives

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\Delta\bar{u}^1\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu\|\nabla\Delta\bar{u}^1\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C\nu^{-1}\left(\|\nabla(\bar{u}^2\partial_y\bar{u}^1 + \bar{u}^3\partial_z\bar{u}^1)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla\bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla(\overline{u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^1})\|_{L^2}^2\right).$$

Thanks to $\|\nabla\Delta\bar{u}^1\|_{L^2}^2 \geq (\pi/2)^2\|\Delta\bar{u}^1\|_{L^2}^2$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|e^{\nu t}\Delta\bar{u}^1\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 + \nu\|e^{\nu t}\nabla\Delta\bar{u}^1\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 &\leq \|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + C\nu^{-1}\|e^{\nu t}\nabla(\bar{u}^2\partial_y\bar{u}^1 + \bar{u}^3\partial_z\bar{u}^1)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \\ &\quad + C\nu^{-1}\|e^{\nu t}\nabla\bar{u}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + C\nu^{-1}\|e^{\nu t}\nabla(\overline{u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^1})\|_{L^2 L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla(\bar{u}^k\partial_k\bar{u}^1)\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq \|\bar{u}^k\partial_k\bar{u}^1\|_{H^1}^2 \leq C\|\bar{u}^k\|_{H^2}^2\|\partial_k\bar{u}^1\|_{H^1}^2 \\ &\leq C\|\Delta\bar{u}^k\|_{L^2}^2\|\bar{u}^1\|_{H^2}^2 \quad k = 2, 3, \end{aligned}$$

we infer that

$$\|\nabla(\bar{u}^2\partial_y\bar{u}^1 + \bar{u}^3\partial_z\bar{u}^1)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(\|\Delta\bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Delta\bar{u}^3\|_{L^2}^2)\|\bar{u}^1\|_{H^2}^2.$$

Then by Lemma 12.2, Lemma 12.3 and Lemma 11.6, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|e^{\nu t}\nabla(\bar{u}^2\partial_y\bar{u}^1 + \bar{u}^3\partial_z\bar{u}^1)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 &\leq C\|e^{\nu t}(\Delta\bar{u}^2, \Delta\bar{u}^3)\|_{L^2 L^2}^2\|\bar{u}^1\|_{L^\infty H^2}^2 \\ &\leq C\nu^{-1}(\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + \nu^{-2}E_3^4)E_1^2 \leq C\nu^{-1}\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 12.1, we have

$$\|e^{\nu t}\nabla\bar{u}^2\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C\nu^{-1}(\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + \nu^{-2}E_3^4) \leq C\nu^{-1}\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2.$$

Since $0 < \nu \leq \nu_0$, $\nu_0^{2/3} \leq 4\epsilon$, we get by (11.11) that

$$\|e^{\nu t}\nabla(\overline{u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq}^1})\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq \|e^{4\epsilon\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}t}\nabla(u_{\neq} \cdot \nabla u_{\neq})\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 \leq C\nu^{-\frac{5}{3}}E_3^4 \leq C\nu^{\frac{1}{3}}\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2.$$

Summing up, we conclude that

$$\|e^{\nu t}\Delta\bar{u}^1\|_{L^\infty L^2}^2 \leq \|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + C(\nu^{-2}\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + \nu^{-\frac{8}{3}}E_3^4) \leq C\nu^{-2}\|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2,$$

which gives

$$\|\bar{u}^1(t)\|_{H^2} \leq C\|\Delta\bar{u}^1(t)\|_{L^2} \leq C\nu^{-1}e^{-\nu t}\|u(0)\|_{H^2}.$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 11.6, we have

$$\|\bar{u}^1(t)\|_{H^2} \leq CE_1 \cdot (\nu t + \nu^{2/3}) \leq C\nu^{-1}(\nu t + \nu^{2/3})\|u(0)\|_{H^2}.$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\|\bar{u}^1(t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\|\bar{u}^1(t)\|_{H^2} \leq C\nu^{-1} \min(\nu t + \nu^{2/3}, e^{-\nu t})\|u(0)\|_{H^2}.$$

This proves (1.4).

16. APPENDIX

16.1. Sobolev inequalities.

Lemma 16.1. *If f satisfies $\partial_x f = ikf$, $|k| \geq 1$, then we have*

$$\|f\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} + \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\chi_1 f\|_{L^2} + \|f\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq C\|f\|_{L_y^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla f\|_{L_y^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla f\|_{L^2}.$$

Here χ_1 is given by Lemma 4.2, and C is a constant independent of λ, δ, k .

Proof. Due to $\partial_x f = ikf$, we have

$$\|f\|_{L^2} \leq |k| \|f\|_{L^2} \leq \|\partial_x f\|_{L^2} \leq \|\nabla f\|_{L^2}.$$

For fixed x, z , we have $\|f\|_{L_y^\infty} \leq C\|f\|_{L_y^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(\partial_y, 1)f\|_{L_y^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}$, which shows that

$$(16.1) \quad \|f\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} \leq C\|f\|_{L_y^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(\partial_y, 1)f\|_{L_y^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C\|f\|_{L_y^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla f\|_{L_y^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla f\|_{L^2}.$$

By Lemma 4.2, we get

$$\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\chi_1 f\|_{L^2} + \|f\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\chi_1\|_{L_{x,z}^\infty L_y^2} \|f\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty} + 2\|f\|_{L_y^\infty L_{x,z}^2} \leq C\|f\|_{L_{x,z}^2 L_y^\infty},$$

which along with (16.1) gives the lemma. $\square$

Lemma 16.2. *If $P_0 f = 0$, then we have*

$$\|f\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\|(\partial_x, \partial_z)\partial_x f\|_{L_y^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)\nabla f\|_{L_y^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Proof. Let $f_{k,\ell}(y) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} f(x, y, z) e^{-ikx - i\ell z} dx dz$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{L^\infty} &\leq C \sum_{k \neq 0; \ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \|f_{k,\ell}\|_{L^\infty} \leq C \sum_{k \neq 0; \ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \|f_{k,\ell}\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|(\partial_y, 1)f_{k,\ell}\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \\ &\leq C \left(\sum_{k \neq 0; \ell \in \mathbb{Z}} k^2 \eta^2 \|f_{k,\ell}\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\sum_{k \neq 0; \ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \eta^2 \|(\partial_y, 1)f_{k,\ell}\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\sum_{k \neq 0; \ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{1}{|k|(k^2 + \ell^2)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)\partial_x f\|_{L_y^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)\nabla f\|_{L_y^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{k \neq 0} \frac{1}{|k|^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)\partial_x f\|_{L_y^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(\partial_x, \partial_z)\nabla f\|_{L_y^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Here $\eta^2 = k^2 + \ell^2$ and we used the fact that for $k \neq 0$,

$$\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{1}{k^2 + \ell^2} \leq \frac{1}{k^2} + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{dz}{k^2 + z^2} \leq \frac{1}{k^2} + \frac{\pi}{|k|} \leq \frac{\pi+1}{|k|}.$$

$\square$

16.2. Elliptic estimates with the weight.

Lemma 16.3. *Let φ be a unique solution of $\Delta\varphi = w$, $\varphi(\pm 1) = 0$. It holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla\varphi\|_{L^2} &\leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|w\|_{L^2_{x,z}L^1_y}, \\ \|\nabla\varphi\|_{L^2} &\leq C\|(1-y^2)w\|_{L^2}, \\ \|\varphi\|_{L^2} &\leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|(1-y^2)w\|_{L^2_{x,z}L^1_y}.\end{aligned}$$

Here C is a constant independent of k .

Proof. Thanks to $\partial_x w = ikw$ and $\Delta\varphi = w$, we have $\partial_x\varphi = ik\varphi$. By Lemma 16.1, we have

$$\|\varphi\|_{L^2_{x,z}L^\infty_y} \leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla\varphi\|_{L^2},$$

and by integration by parts,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 &= -\langle\varphi, \Delta\varphi\rangle = -\langle\varphi, w\rangle \\ &\leq \|\varphi\|_{L^2_{x,z}L^\infty_y}\|w\|_{L^2_{x,z}L^1_y} \leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla\varphi\|_{L^2}\|w\|_{L^2_{x,z}L^1_y},\end{aligned}$$

which gives the first inequality.

Due to $\varphi|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$, we get by Hardy's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 &= -\langle\varphi, w\rangle \leq \|\varphi/(1-y^2)\|_{L^2}\|(1-y^2)w\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\|\nabla\varphi\|_{L^2}\|(1-y^2)w\|_{L^2},\end{aligned}$$

which gives the second inequality.

Let ϕ solve $\Delta\phi = \varphi$, $\phi|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$. Then we have

$$\partial_x\phi = ik\phi, \quad \|\phi\|_{H^2} \leq C\|\varphi\|_{L^2}.$$

As $\phi|_{y=\pm 1} = 0$, for fixed x, z , we have $\|\phi/(1-|y|)\|_{L^\infty_y} \leq \|\partial_y\phi\|_{L^\infty_y}$, and then

$$\|\phi/(1-|y|)\|_{L^2_{x,z}L^\infty_y} \leq \|\partial_y\phi\|_{L^2_{x,z}L^\infty_y},$$

and by Lemma 16.1, we have

$$\|\partial_y\phi\|_{L^2_{x,z}L^\infty_y} \leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\partial_y^2\phi\|_{L^2} \leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\phi\|_{H^2} \leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\varphi\|_{L^2}.$$

This shows that

$$\|\phi/(1-|y|)\|_{L^2_{x,z}L^\infty_y} \leq C|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\varphi\|_{L^2},$$

and then,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 &= \langle\varphi, \Delta\phi\rangle = \langle\Delta\varphi, \phi\rangle = \langle w, \phi\rangle \\ &\leq \|(1-|y|)w\|_{L^2_{x,z}L^1_y}\|\phi/(1-|y|)\|_{L^2_{x,z}L^\infty_y} \\ &\leq C\|(1-y^2)w\|_{L^2_{x,z}L^1_y}|k|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\varphi\|_{L^2},\end{aligned}$$

which gives the third inequality. $\square$

Lemma 16.4. *Let φ be a unique solution of $(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)\varphi = w$, $\varphi(\pm 1) = 0$. Then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} C^{-1}|\eta|\|\varphi\|_{L^\infty}^2 &\leq \|\varphi'\|_{L^2}^2 + \eta^2\|\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 = \langle -w, \varphi \rangle \leq C|\eta|^{-1}\|w\|_{L^1}^2, \\ \|\varphi\|_{L^2} &\leq C\eta^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|(1-|y|)w\|_{L^1}, \\ \|(\partial_y, \eta)\varphi\|_{L^2} &\leq C\|(1-|y|)w\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The first inequality follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty} &\leq C\|\varphi'\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\varphi\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C(|\eta|^{-1}\|\varphi'\|_{L^2}^2 + |\eta|\|\varphi\|_{L^2}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} = C|\eta|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|(\partial_y, \eta)\varphi\|_{L^2}, \\ \|\varphi'\|_{L^2}^2 + \eta^2\|\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 &= \langle -w, \varphi \rangle \leq \|w\|_{L^1}\|\varphi\|_{L^\infty} \leq C|\eta|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|w\|_{L^1}\|(\partial_y, \eta)\varphi\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Let φ_1 solve $(\partial_y^2 - \eta^2)\varphi_1 = \varphi$, $\varphi_1(\pm 1) = 0$. Then we have

$$\|\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 = \eta^4\|\varphi_1\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\eta^2\|\partial_y\varphi_1\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_y^2\varphi_1\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Since $\varphi_1(y) = \int_{-1}^y \varphi_1'(z)dz$ for $y \in [-1, 0]$, $\varphi_1(y) = -\int_y^1 \varphi_1'(z)dz$ for $y \in [0, 1]$, we conclude

$$\left\| \frac{\varphi_1}{1-|y|} \right\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|\partial_y\varphi_1\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\|\partial_y\varphi_1\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\partial_y^2\varphi_1\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C\eta^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\varphi\|_{L^2},$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 &= |\langle \varphi_1, w \rangle| \leq \left\| \frac{\varphi_1}{1-|y|} \right\|_{L^\infty} \|(1-|y|)w\|_{L^1} \\ &\leq C\eta^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\varphi\|_{L^2}\|(1-|y|)w\|_{L^1}, \end{aligned}$$

and thus the second inequality.

By Hardy's inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\partial_y, \eta)\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 &= |\langle \varphi, w \rangle| \leq \left\| \frac{\varphi}{1-|y|} \right\|_{L^2} \|(1-|y|)w\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\|\partial_y\varphi\|_{L^2}\|(1-|y|)w\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives the third inequality. $\square$

16.3. Some basic properties of harmonic function.

Lemma 16.5. *If f is a harmonic function in $\Omega := \mathbb{T} \times [-1, 1] \times \mathbb{T}$, then we have*

$$\|\nabla f\|_{L^2} \leq C\|\partial_y f\|_{L^2}.$$

Proof. As $\Delta f = 0$, we get by taking Fourier transform in x, z that

$$(\partial_y^2 - (k^2 + \ell^2))f_{k,\ell}(y) = 0,$$

which means that

$$f_{k,\ell} = C_1 e^{\sqrt{k^2 + \ell^2}y} + C_2 e^{-\sqrt{k^2 + \ell^2}y}, \quad f'_{k,\ell} = \sqrt{k^2 + \ell^2} \left(C_1 e^{\sqrt{k^2 + \ell^2}y} - C_2 e^{-\sqrt{k^2 + \ell^2}y} \right),$$

where $C_j = a_j + ib_j$, $a_j, b_j \in \mathbb{R}$ ($j = 1, 2$).

For $k^2 + \ell^2 \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{-1}^1 |C_1 e^{\sqrt{k^2 + \ell^2}y} \pm C_2 e^{-\sqrt{k^2 + \ell^2}y}|^2 dy \\ &= \int_{-1}^1 |a_1 e^{\sqrt{k^2 + \ell^2}y} \pm a_2 e^{-\sqrt{k^2 + \ell^2}y}|^2 dy + \int_{-1}^1 |b_1 e^{\sqrt{k^2 + \ell^2}y} \pm b_2 e^{-\sqrt{k^2 + \ell^2}y}|^2 dy \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{a_1^2 + a_2^2}{2\sqrt{k^2 + \ell^2}} \left(e^{2\sqrt{k^2 + \ell^2}} - e^{-2\sqrt{k^2 + \ell^2}} \right) \pm 4a_1a_2 + \frac{b_1^2 + b_2^2}{2\sqrt{k^2 + \ell^2}} \left(e^{2\sqrt{k^2 + \ell^2}} - e^{-2\sqrt{k^2 + \ell^2}} \right) \pm 4b_1b_2 \\
&\sim \frac{a_1^2 + a_2^2}{\sqrt{k^2 + \ell^2}} \left(e^{2\sqrt{k^2 + \ell^2}} - e^{-2\sqrt{k^2 + \ell^2}} \right) + \frac{b_1^2 + b_2^2}{\sqrt{k^2 + \ell^2}} \left(e^{2\sqrt{k^2 + \ell^2}} - e^{-2\sqrt{k^2 + \ell^2}} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$(k^2 + \ell^2) \|f_{k,\ell}\|_{L_y^2}^2 \leq C \|f'_{k,\ell}\|_{L_y^2}^2,$$

and then the lemma follows by using Plancherel's formula. $\square$

Lemma 16.6. *If $f \in H^2(\Omega)$, $\partial_x f = ikf$, $|k| \geq 1$, then we have*

$$\|\nabla f\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|\partial_y f\|_{L^2} + |k|^{-1} \|\Delta f\|_{L^2}).$$

Proof. We decompose $f = f_1 + f_2$, where f_1, f_2 solve

$$\Delta f_1 = 0, \quad \Delta f_2 = \Delta f, \quad f_2|_{y=\pm 1} = 0.$$

It is easy to see that

$$(16.2) \quad |k| \|\nabla f_2\|_{L^2} = \|\partial_x \nabla f_2\|_{L^2} \leq \|\nabla^2 f_2\|_{L^2} \leq C \|\Delta f\|_{L^2}.$$

Thanks to Lemma 16.5 and (16.2), we have

$$\|\nabla f_1\| \leq C \|\partial_y f_1\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|\partial_y f\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_y f_2\|_{L^2}) \leq C(\|\partial_y f\|_{L^2} + |k|^{-1} \|\Delta f\|_{L^2}),$$

which gives

$$\|\nabla f\| \leq \|\nabla f_1\| + \|\nabla f_2\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|\partial_y f\|_{L^2} + |k|^{-1} \|\Delta f\|_{L^2}).$$

$\square$

Lemma 16.7. *If f is a function in $[-1, 1] \times 2\pi\mathbb{T}$, i.e. $f = f(y, z)$, then we have*

$$\|\partial_y^2 f\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_z^2 f\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|\partial_z \partial_y f\|_{L^2} + \|\Delta f\|_{L^2}).$$

Proof. We make the same decomposition for f as in Lemma 16.6. First of all, we have

$$(16.3) \quad \|\partial_y^2 f_2\|_{L^2} + 2\|\partial_z \partial_y f_2\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_z^2 f_2\|_{L^2} \leq C \|\Delta f\|_{L^2}.$$

Thanks to Lemma 16.5, we have

$$\|\partial_z^2 f_1\| \leq C \|\partial_z \partial_y f_1\|_{L^2},$$

which along with (16.3) gives

$$\|\partial_z^2 f\| \leq C \|\partial_z \partial_y f_1\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|\partial_z \partial_y f\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_z \partial_y f_2\|_{L^2}) \leq C(\|\partial_z \partial_y f\|_{L^2} + \|\Delta f\|_{L^2}).$$

This shows that

$$\|\partial_z^2 f\|_{L^2} \leq \|\partial_z^2 f_1\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_z^2 f_2\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|\partial_z \partial_y f\|_{L^2} + \|\Delta f\|_{L^2}),$$

which also gives

$$\|\partial_y^2 f\|_{L^2} \leq \|\partial_y^2 f_1\|_{L^2} + \|\Delta f\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|\partial_z \partial_y f\|_{L^2} + \|\Delta f\|_{L^2}).$$

$\square$

16.4. Maximal inequality of harmonic function.

Lemma 16.8. *Let $j \in \{\pm 1\}$. If $\Delta f = 0$, $f|_{y=-j} = 0$ and $f \in C^0(\Omega)$, then we have*

$$\|f\|_{L^2_{x,z} L^\infty_y(\Omega)} \leq 6\|f\|_{L^2(\Gamma_j)}.$$

We need to use some definitions and conclusions from Chapter 2 in [31]. The centered Hardy-Littlewood maximal function is defined by

$$\mathcal{M}(h)(q) = \sup_{r>0} \text{Avg}_{B(q,r)} |h| = \sup_{r>0} \frac{1}{\pi r^2} \|h\|_{L^1(B(q,r))},$$

where $B(q, r) := \{q' \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid |q' - q| < r\}$ for $q \in \mathbb{R}^2$. It is well-known that $\mathcal{M}$ is bounded from $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with constant at most $3^{n/p} p/(p-1)$. In particular, we have

$$(16.4) \quad \|\mathcal{M}(h)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq 6\|h\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} \quad \forall h \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2).$$

The following lemma shows that the same is true with $L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)$ instead of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Here we identify a function on $\mathbb{T}^2$ with a function on $\mathbb{R}^2$ satisfying $f(q + 2\pi m) = f(q)$, $\forall m \in \mathbb{Z}^2$.

Lemma 16.9. *For every $h \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)$, we have $\|\mathcal{M}(h)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \leq 6\|h\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)}$.*

Proof. For $a > 0$, let $Q_a = \{(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid |x| < a, |z| < a\}$, $\chi_a = \mathbf{1}_{Q_a}$ and

$$\mathcal{M}_a(h)(q) = \sup_{0 < r < a} \frac{1}{\pi r^2} \|h\|_{L^1(B(q,r))}.$$

It is easy to see that for $h \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)$, $q \in \mathbb{R}^2$,

$$(16.5) \quad \mathcal{M}_a(h)(q) \uparrow \mathcal{M}(h)(q) \quad \text{as } a \uparrow +\infty,$$

$$(16.6) \quad \|h\|_{L^2(Q_{\pi n})}^2 = \|h\chi_{\pi n}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 = n^2 \|h\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)}^2, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{Z}, n > 0.$$

For $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $m, n > 0$, $q \in Q_{\pi n}$, $0 < r < \pi m$, we have $B(q, r) \subset Q_{\pi(m+n)}$, and

$$\|h\|_{L^1(B(q,r))} = \|h\chi_{\pi(m+n)}\|_{L^1(B(q,r))} \leq \pi r^2 \mathcal{M}(h\chi_{\pi(m+n)})(q),$$

which implies that $\mathcal{M}_{\pi m}(h)(q) \leq \mathcal{M}(h\chi_{\pi(m+n)})(q)$ and then by (16.4),

$$\|\mathcal{M}_{\pi m}(h)\|_{L^2(Q_{\pi n})} \leq \|\mathcal{M}(h\chi_{\pi(m+n)})\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq 6\|h\chi_{\pi(m+n)}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}.$$

which along with (16.6) gives

$$\|\mathcal{M}_{\pi m}(h)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \leq 6(1 + m/n)\|h\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)}, \quad \forall m, n \in \mathbb{Z}, m, n > 0, h \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^2).$$

Letting $n \rightarrow +\infty$, we get

$$\|\mathcal{M}_{\pi m}(h)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \leq 6\|h\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)}, \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{Z}, m > 0, h \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^2).$$

Letting $m \rightarrow +\infty$, using (16.5) and monotone convergence theorem, we get

$$\|\mathcal{M}(h)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \leq 6\|h\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)}, \quad \forall h \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^2).$$

This completes the proof. □

Now we give the proof of Lemma 16.8.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we only need to consider the case of $j = 1$. Let $f_0(x, z) = |f(x, 1, z)|$ and let

$$P(x, z) = c/(1 + x^2 + z^2)^{3/2},$$

where $c = \Gamma(3/2)/\pi^{3/2}$ is a constant so that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} P(x, z) dx dz = 1,$$

The function P is called the Poisson kernel. We define L^1 dilates P_t of the Poisson kernel P by setting

$$P_t(x, z) = t^{-2}P(x/t, z/t), \quad t > 0.$$

Then the function

$$F(x, y, z) = (f_0 * P_{1-y})(x, z),$$

solves the Dirichlet problem

$$\Delta F = 0 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R} \times (-\infty, 1) \times \mathbb{R}, \quad F(x, 1, z) = f_0(x, z) \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^2.$$

We also have $F \in C^0(\Omega)$ and $F \geq 0$ on Ω . Since $f|_{y=-1} = 0$, $|f|_{y=1} = f_0 = F|_{y=1}$, we have $|f| \leq F$ on $\partial\Omega$. For fixed $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, let $f_{[\theta]} = \mathbf{Re}(e^{i\theta}f)$. Since $\Delta f = 0$, we have $\Delta f_{[\theta]} = 0$ on Ω , and $f_{[\theta]}$ is real valued. Now we have $\Delta F = \Delta f_{[\theta]} = 0$ on Ω , and $f_{[\theta]} \leq |f| \leq F$ on $\partial\Omega$. Using the maximum principle, we deduce that $f_{[\theta]} \leq F$ on Ω for every $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus, $|f| = \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} f_{[\theta]} \leq F$ on Ω , and then

$$\|f\|_{L^2_{x,z}L^\infty_y(\Omega)} \leq \|F\|_{L^2_{x,z}L^\infty_y(\Omega)},$$

Since $F(x, y, z) \leq \mathcal{M}(f_0)(x, z)$ for $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $y \leq 1$ (see [31]), we get

$$\|f\|_{L^2_{x,z}L^\infty_y(\Omega)} \leq \|F\|_{L^2_{x,z}L^\infty_y(\Omega)} \leq \|\mathcal{M}(f_0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)},$$

which along with Lemma 16.9 shows that

$$\|f\|_{L^2_{x,z}L^\infty_y(\Omega)} \leq \|\mathcal{M}(f_0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \leq 6\|f_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} = 6\|f\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1)}.$$

The case of $f|_{y=1} = 0$ can be proved similarly. $\square$

16.5. Limiting absorption principle. In this section, we establish the limiting absorption principle for the Rayleigh equation

$$(16.7) \quad (y - c)(\Phi'' - \alpha^2\Phi) = \omega, \quad \Phi(-1) = \Phi(1) = 0,$$

where $c \in \mathbb{C}$, $\mathbf{Im}(c) \neq 0$.

Proposition 16.1. *Let $\alpha \geq 1$, $\mathbf{Im}(c) \neq 0$. Then the unique solution Φ to (16.7) satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_y \Phi\|_{L^2} + \alpha\|\Phi\|_{L^2} &\leq C\alpha^{-1}(\|\partial_y \omega\|_{L^2} + \alpha\|\omega\|_{L^2}), \\ \|\Phi\|_{L^2} &\leq C\alpha^{-1}(\max(1 - |c_r|, 0)\|\partial_y \omega\|_{L^2} + \|\omega\|_{L^2}), \end{aligned}$$

where $c_r = \mathbf{Re}(c)$ is the real part of c .

We need the following lemma.

Lemma 16.10. *Let $a, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $f \in H^1([-1, 1])$, $\delta_* > 0$, $a \neq 0$. If $f(\pm 1) = 0$ or $1 - |\lambda| \geq \delta_* > 0$, then it holds that*

$$\left| \int_{-1}^1 \frac{f(y)}{y - \lambda + ia} dy \right| \leq C(\delta_*^{\frac{1}{2}} \|f'\|_{L^2} + \delta_*^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|f\|_{L^2}),$$

where C is a constant independent of a, δ_* .

Proof. For the case of $1 - |\lambda| \geq \delta_*$, we have $[\lambda - \delta_*, \lambda + \delta_*] \subseteq [-1, 1]$, and then

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{-1}^1 \frac{f(y)}{y - \lambda + ia} dy \right| &\leq \left| \int_{\lambda - \delta_*}^{\lambda + \delta_*} \frac{f(y)}{y - \lambda + ia} dy \right| + \left| \int_{|y - \lambda| \geq \delta_*} \frac{f(y)}{y - \lambda + ia} dy \right| \\ &\leq \left| \int_{\lambda}^{\lambda + \delta_*} \frac{f(y)}{y - \lambda + ia} + \frac{f(2\lambda - y)}{\lambda - y + ia} dy \right| + \|f\|_{L^2} \|(y - \lambda)^{-1}\|_{L^2(\{|y - \lambda| \geq \delta_*\})} \\ &\leq \left| \int_{\lambda}^{\lambda + \delta_*} \frac{f(y)}{y - \lambda + ia} + \frac{f(2\lambda - y)}{\lambda - y + ia} dy \right| + C\delta_*^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|f\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int_{\lambda}^{\lambda + \delta_*} \frac{f(y)}{y - \lambda + ia} + \frac{f(2\lambda - y)}{\lambda - y + ia} dy \right| \\ &\leq \left| \int_{\lambda}^{\lambda + \delta_*} \frac{(y - \lambda)(f(y) - f(2\lambda - y))}{(y - \lambda)^2 + a^2} dy \right| + \left| \int_{\lambda}^{\lambda + \delta_*} \frac{\epsilon(f(y) + f(2\lambda - y))}{(y - \lambda)^2 + a^2} dy \right| \\ &\leq \left| \int_{\lambda}^{\lambda + \delta_*} \frac{(y - \lambda) \int_{\lambda - y}^{y - \lambda} f'(z + \lambda) dz}{(y - \lambda)^2 + a^2} dy \right| + \|f\|_{L^\infty} \left| \int_{\lambda}^{\lambda + \delta_*} \frac{2a}{(y - \lambda)^2 + a^2} dy \right| \\ &\leq \left| \int_{\lambda}^{\lambda + \delta_*} \frac{C(y - \lambda)^{\frac{3}{2}} \|f'\|_{L^2}}{(y - \lambda)^2 + a^2} dy \right| + 2\|f\|_{L^\infty} \arctan\left(\frac{\delta_*}{a}\right) \\ &\leq C \left(\int_0^{\delta_*} \frac{z^{\frac{1}{2}}}{z + |a|} dz \right) \|f'\|_{L^2} + C\|f\|_{L^\infty} \leq C(\delta_*^{\frac{1}{2}} \|f'\|_{L^2} + \delta_*^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|f\|_{L^2}). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the case of $1 - |\lambda| \geq \delta_*$.

For the case of $f(\pm 1) = 0$, we can first extend f to be a function in $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ by taking $f(y) = 0$ for $|y| \geq 1$, then follow the proof as above. $\square$

Now let us prove Proposition 16.1.

Proof. It is easy to get that

$$\|\partial_y \Phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \alpha^2 \|\Phi\|_{L^2}^2 = - \int_{-1}^1 \frac{\omega \bar{\Phi}}{y - c} dy.$$

Thanks to $\omega \bar{\Phi}(\pm 1) = 0$, we get by Lemma 16.10 with $\delta_* = \alpha^{-1}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_y \Phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \alpha^2 \|\Phi\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq \left| \int_{-1}^1 \frac{\omega \bar{\Phi}}{y - c} dy \right| \leq C(\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y(\omega \bar{\Phi})\|_{L^2} + \alpha^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\omega \bar{\Phi}\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C \left(\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\|\partial_y w\|_{L^2} \|\Phi\|_{L^\infty} + \|\omega\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_y \Phi\|_{L^2}) + \alpha^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\omega\|_{L^2} \|\Phi\|_{L^\infty} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\|\partial_y w\|_{L^2} \|\partial_y \Phi\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\Phi\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} + (\|\partial_y \omega\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\omega\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|\omega\|_{L^2}) \|\partial_y \Phi\|_{L^2}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \alpha^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\omega\|_{L^2} \|\partial_y \Phi\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\Phi\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq C\alpha^{-1}(\|\partial_y \omega\|_{L^2} + \alpha\|\omega\|_{L^2})(\|\partial_y \Phi\|_{L^2} + \alpha\|\Phi\|_{L^2}).$$

This shows that

$$\|\partial_y \Phi\|_{L^2} + \alpha\|\Phi\|_{L^2} \leq C\alpha^{-1}(\|\partial_y \omega\|_{L^2} + \alpha\|\omega\|_{L^2}).$$

For the second inequality, let ϕ be a unique solution of $(\partial_y^2 - \alpha^2)\phi = \Phi$, $\phi(\pm 1) = 0$. Then we have

$$\|\Phi\|_{L^2}^2 = \langle \Phi, (\partial_y^2 - \alpha^2)\phi \rangle = - \int_{-1}^1 \frac{\omega \bar{\phi}}{y - c} dy \leq \left| \int_{-1}^1 \frac{\omega \bar{\phi}}{y - c} dy \right|.$$

If $|c_r| \geq 1$, we get by Hardy's inequality that

$$\|\Phi\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \left| \int_{-1}^1 \frac{\omega \bar{\phi}}{y - c} dy \right| \leq \|\omega\|_{L^2} \left\| \frac{\phi}{1 - |y|} \right\|_{L^2} \leq \|\omega\|_{L^2} \|\partial_y \phi\|_{L^2} \leq C\alpha^{-1} \|\omega\|_{L^2} \|\Phi\|_{L^2},$$

which gives

$$\|\Phi\|_{L^2} \leq C\alpha^{-1} \|\omega\|_{L^2}.$$

If $|c_r| < 1$, by Lemma 16.10 with $\delta_* = 1 - |c_r|$ and Hardy's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{-1}^1 \frac{\omega \bar{\phi}}{y - c} dy \right| &\leq \left| \int_{-1}^1 \frac{\omega(y) \bar{\phi}(c_r)}{y - c} dy \right| + \left| \int_{-1}^1 \frac{\omega(y) (\bar{\phi}(y) - \bar{\phi}(c_r))}{y - c} dy \right| \\ &\leq |\phi(c_r)| \left| \int_{-1}^1 \frac{\omega(y)}{y - c} dy \right| + \|\omega\|_{L^2} \left\| \frac{\phi(y) - \phi(c_r)}{y - c_r} \right\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C|\phi(c_r)| ((1 - |c_r|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y \omega\|_{L^2} + (1 - |c_r|)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\omega\|_{L^2}) + C\|\omega\|_{L^2} \|\partial_y \phi\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C|\phi(c_r)| ((1 - |c_r|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y \omega\|_{L^2} + (1 - |c_r|)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\omega\|_{L^2}) + C\alpha^{-1} \|\omega\|_{L^2} \|\Phi\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to $\phi(\pm 1) = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi(c_r)| &\leq \min \left(\left| \int_{-1}^{c_r} \partial_y \phi(y) dy \right|, \left| \int_{c_r}^1 \partial_y \phi(y) dy \right| \right) \\ &\leq \min \left((1 + c_r)^{\frac{1}{2}}, (1 - c_r)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \|\partial_y \phi\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq (1 - |c_r|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y \phi\|_{L^2} \leq \alpha^{-1} (1 - |c_r|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\Phi\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Summing up, we obtain

$$\|\Phi\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \left| \int_{-1}^1 \frac{\omega \bar{\phi}}{y - c} dy \right| \leq C\alpha^{-1} ((1 - |c_r|) \|\partial_y \omega\|_{L^2} + \|\omega\|_{L^2}) \|\Phi\|_{L^2}.$$

This shows the second inequality. □

The following lemma is a variant of Lemma 16.10.

Lemma 16.11. *Let V satisfy (4.2). Let $a, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $a \neq 0$, $f \in H^1(\Omega)$, $f(x, \pm 1, z) = 0$ or $0 < \delta_* \leq 1 - |\lambda|$. Then it holds that*

$$\left| \int_I \frac{f(x, y, z)}{V(y, z) - \lambda + ia} dy \right| \leq C(\delta_*^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y f\|_{L_y^2} + \delta_*^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|f\|_{L_y^2}).$$

where C is a constant independent of a, λ, x, z and δ_* .

Proof. Make a change of variable: $(x, y, z) \rightarrow (x, V(y, z), z) \triangleq (X, Y, Z)$. We denote

$$F(x, V(y, z), z) = f(x, y, z), \quad \psi(V(y, z), z) = \partial_y V(y, z), \quad H(V(y, z), z) = \partial_y^2 V(y, z).$$

For fixed x, z , it is obvious that

$$\frac{1}{2} \leq |\psi| \leq 2, \quad \|H\|_{L_Y^\infty} \leq 1, \quad \psi(V(y, z), z) \partial_Y F(x, V(y, z), z) = \partial_y f(x, y, z)$$

so that

$$\|F\|_{L_Y^2} \leq C\|f\|_{L_y^2}, \quad \|\partial_Y F\|_{L_Y^2} \leq C\|\partial_y f\|_{L_y^2}.$$

Then we have

$$\left| \int_{-1}^1 \frac{f(x, y, z)}{V - \lambda + ia} dy \right| = \left| \int_{-1}^1 \frac{F(x, Y, z) \psi(Y, z)^{-1}}{Y - \lambda + ia} dY \right|.$$

By Lemma 16.10 and using the fact that $\partial_Y(\psi^{-1}) = -\psi^{-3}H$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{-1}^1 \frac{F(x, Y, z) \psi^{-1}(Y, z)}{Y - \lambda + ia} dY \right| \\ & \leq C(\delta_*^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_Y(F\psi^{-1})\|_{L_Y^2} + \delta_*^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F\psi^{-1}\|_{L_Y^2}) \\ & \leq C(\delta_*^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_Y F\|_{L_Y^2} \|\psi^{-1}\|_{L_Y^\infty} + \delta_*^{\frac{1}{2}} \|F\|_{L_Y^2} \|\psi^{-3}\|_{L_Y^\infty} \|H\|_{L_Y^\infty} + \delta_*^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F\|_{L_Y^2} \|\psi^{-1}\|_{L_Y^\infty}) \\ & \leq C(\delta_*^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y f\|_{L_y^2} + \delta_*^{\frac{1}{2}} \|f\|_{L_y^2} + \delta_*^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|f\|_{L_y^2}) \leq C(\delta_*^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y f\|_{L_y^2} + \delta_*^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|f\|_{L_y^2}). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma. $\square$

16.6. A simple algebraic inequality.

Lemma 16.12. *Let $D = A_1 - A_2 + iB$ with $A_1, A_2, B \in \mathbb{R}$, $|B| \geq 2A_2$ and $|B|, A_1, A_2 > 0$. Then there exists a constant $c > 0$, so that*

$$\operatorname{Re}(\sqrt{D}) \geq c(A_1 + |B|)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

here $\sqrt{z}$ be the branch of the square root defined on the complement of the non-positive real numbers.

Proof. without loss of generality, we may assume that $B > 0$. Then $\sqrt{D} = a + ib$ with $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $a, b > 0$. Then we have

$$a^2 - b^2 = A \triangleq A_1 - A_2, \quad 2ab = B.$$

A direct calculation gives

$$a^2 = A + b^2 \geq -B/2 + b^2 \geq b^2 - ab \Rightarrow (a/b)^2 + (a/b) - 1 \geq 0.$$

As $a/b > 0$, we get $a/b \geq (\sqrt{5} - 1)/2$. Thus, there exist constants $c_1 > c_2 > 0$, such that

$$a^2 \geq c_1(a^2 + b^2) = c_1|D| = c_1((A_1 - A_2)^2 + B^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq c_2(A_1 - A_2 + |B|) \geq c_2(A_1 + |B|/2),$$

which implies that

$$\operatorname{Re}(\sqrt{D}) = a \geq c(A_1 + |B|)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

$\square$

16.7. Gearhart-Prüss type lemma. An operator A in a Hilbert space H is accretive if $\operatorname{Re}\langle Af, f \rangle \geq 0$ for all $f \in D(A)$, or equivalently $\|(\lambda + A)f\| \geq \lambda\|f\|$ for all $f \in D(A)$ and all $\lambda > 0$. The operator A is called m -accretive if in addition any $\lambda < 0$ belongs to the resolvent set of A . We define

$$\Psi(A) = \inf \{ \|(A - i\lambda)f\| : f \in D(A), \lambda \in \mathbb{R}, \|f\| = 1 \}.$$

The following Gearhart-Prüss type lemma comes from [62].

Lemma 16.13. *Let A be an m -accretive operator in a Hilbert space H . Then we have*

$$\|e^{-tA}\| \leq e^{-t\Psi(A)+\pi/2} \quad \text{for any } t \geq 0.$$

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors thank Te Li for helpful discussions. Z. Zhang is partially supported by NSF of China under Grant 11425103.

REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Almog and B. Helffer, *On the stability of laminar flows between plates*, arXiv:1908.06328.
- [2] J. Baggett and L. Trefethen, *Low-dimensional models of subcritical transition to turbulence*, Phys. Fluids, 9 (1997), 1043-1053.
- [3] M. Beck and C. E. Wayne, *Metastability and rapid convergence to quasi-stationary bar states for the two-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A, 143 (2013), 905-927.
- [4] J. Bedrossian, M. Coti Zelati, *Enhanced dissipation, hypoellipticity, and anomalous small noise inviscid limits in shear flows*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 224 (2017), 1161-1204.
- [5] J. Bedrossian, M. Coti Zelati, V. Vicol, *Vortex axisymmetrization, inviscid damping, and vorticity depletion in the linearized 2D Euler equations*, Ann. PDE, 5 (2019), Art. 4, 192 pp.
- [6] J. Bedrossian and S. He, *Suppression of blow-up in Patlak-Keller-Segel via shear flows*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 49 (2017), 4722-4766.
- [7] J. Bedrossian, P. Germain and N. Masmoudi, *Dynamics near the subcritical transition of the 3D Couette flow I: Below threshold case*, arXiv:1506.03720, to appear in Mem of the AMS.
- [8] J. Bedrossian, P. Germain and N. Masmoudi, *Dynamics near the subcritical transition of the 3D Couette flow II: Above threshold case*, arXiv:1506.03721, to appear in Mem of the AMS.
- [9] J. Bedrossian, P. Germain and N. Masmoudi, *On the stability threshold for the 3D Couette flow in Sobolev regularity*, Annals of Math., 185(2017), 541-608.
- [10] J. Bedrossian, P. Germain and N. Masmoudi, *Stability of the Couette flow at high Reynolds number in 2D and 3D*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.), 56 (2019), 373-414.
- [11] J. Bedrossian and N. Masmoudi, *Inviscid damping and the asymptotic stability of planar shear flows in the 2D Euler equations*, Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci., 122(2015), 195-300.
- [12] J. Bedrossian, N. Masmoudi and C. Mouhot, *Landau damping: paraproducts and Gevrey regularity*, Ann. PDE, 2(2016), Art. 4, 71 pp.
- [13] J. Bedrossian, N. Masmoudi and V. Vicol, *Enhanced dissipation and inviscid damping in the inviscid limit of the Navier-Stokes equations near the two dimensional Couette flow*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 219(2016), 1087-1159.
- [14] J. Bedrossian, F. Wang and V. Vicol, *The Sobolev stability threshold for 2D shear flows near Couette*, J. Nonlinear Sci., 28 (2018), 2051-2075.
- [15] S. J. Chapman, *Subcritical transition in channel flows*, J. Fluid Mech., 451(2002), 35-97.
- [16] J. Y. Chemin and P. Zhang, *On the critical one component regularity for 3-D Navier-Stokes systems*, Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér., 49 (2016), 131-167.
- [17] J. Y. Chemin, P. Zhang and Z. Zhang, *On the critical one component regularity for 3-D Navier-Stokes system: general case*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 224 (2017), 871-905.
- [18] Q. Chen, D. Wei and Z. Zhang, *Linear stability of pipe Poiseuille flow at high Reynolds number*, arXiv:1910.14245.
- [19] Q. Chen, T. Li, D. Wei and Z. Zhang, *Transition threshold for the 2-D Couette flow in a finite channel*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., online.

- [20] P. Constantin, A. Kiselev, L. Ryzhik and A. Zlatoš, *Diffusion and mixing in fluid flow*, Ann. of Math., 168(2008), 643-674.
- [21] M. Coti Zelati, M. G. Delgadino and T. M. Elgindi, *On the relation between enhanced dissipation timescales and mixing rates*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 73(2020), 1205-1244.
- [22] M. Coti Zelati and C. Zillinger, *On degenerate circular and shear flows: the point vortex and power law circular flows*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, 44 (2019), 110-155.
- [23] Y. Deng and N. Masmoudi, *Long time instability of the Couette flow in low gevrey spaces*, arXiv:1803.01246.
- [24] P. Drazin and W. Reid, *Hydrodynamic Stability*, Cambridge Monographs Mech. Appl. Math., Cambridge Univ. Press, New York, 1981.
- [25] Y. Duguet, L. Brandt and B. Larsson, *Towards minimal perturbations in transitional plane Couette flow*, Phys. Rev. E, 82 (2010), 026316, 13.
- [26] T. Ellingsen and E. Palm, *Stability of linear flow*, Phys. Fluids, 18(1975), 487-488.
- [27] T. Gallay, *Enhanced dissipation and axisymmetrization of two-dimensional viscous vortices*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 230 (2018), 939-975.
- [28] T. Gebhardt and S. Grossmann, *Chaos transition despite linear stability*, Phys. Rev. E, 50(1994), 3705-3711.
- [29] D. Gerard-Varet and Y. Maekawa, *Sobolev stability of Prandtl expansions for the steady Navier-Stokes equations*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 233 (2019), 1319-1382.
- [30] D. Gerard-Varet, Y. Maekawa and N. Masmoudi, *Gevrey stability of Prandtl expansions for 2-dimensional Navier-Stokes flows*, Duke Math. J., 167 (2018), 2531-2631.
- [31] L. Grafakos, *Classical Fourier Analysis*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics 249, Springer.
- [32] E. Grenier, Y. Guo and T. Nguyen, *Spectral instability of characteristic boundary layer flows*, Duke Math. J., 165 (2016), 3085-3146.
- [33] E. Grenier, Y. Guo and T. Nguyen, *Spectral instability of general symmetric shear flows in a two-dimensional channel*, Adv. Math., 292 (2016), 52-110.
- [34] E. Grenier, T. Nguyen, F. Rousset and A. Soffer, *Linear inviscid damping and enhanced viscous dissipation of shear flows by using the conjugate operator method*, arXiv:1804.08291.
- [35] S. He, *Suppression of blow-up in parabolic-parabolic Patlak-Keller-Segel via strictly monotone shear flows*, Nonlinearity, 31(2018), 3651-3688.
- [36] S. Ibrahim, Y. Maekawa and N. Masmoudi, *On pseudospectral bound for non-selfadjoint operators and its application to stability of Kolmogorov flows*, arXiv:1710.05132.
- [37] A. Ionescu and H. Jia, *Inviscid damping near the Couette flow in a channel*, Comm. Math. Phys., 374 (2020), 2015-2096.
- [38] A. Ionescu and H. Jia, *Axi-symmetrization near point vortex solutions for the 2D Euler equation*, arXiv:1904.09170.
- [39] H. Jia, *Linear inviscid damping near monotone shear flows*, arXiv:1902.06849.
- [40] L. Kelvin, *Stability of fluid motion-rectilinear motion of viscous fluid between two parallel plates*, Phil. Mag., 24(1887), 188-196.
- [41] S. Klainerman, *Long-time behavior of solutions to nonlinear evolution equations*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., 78(1982), 73-98.
- [42] A. Kiselev and X. Xu, *Suppression of chemotactic explosion by mixing*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 222 (2016), 1077-1112.
- [43] T. Li, D. Wei and Z. Zhang, *Pseudospectral bound and transition threshold for the 3D Kolmogorov flow*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 73(2020), 465-557.
- [44] M. Liefvendahl and G. Kreiss, *Bounds for the threshold amplitude for plane Couette flow*, J. Nonlinear Math. Phys., 9 (2002), 311-324.
- [45] Z. Lin and M. Xu, *Metastability of Kolmogorov flows and inviscid damping of shear flows*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 231 (2019), 1811-1852.
- [46] Z. Lin and C. Zeng, *Inviscid dynamical structures near couette flow*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., 200(2011), 1075-1097.
- [47] Z. Lin and C. Zeng, *Small BGK waves and nonlinear Landau damping*, Comm. Math. Phys., 306(2011), 291-331.
- [48] L. Landau, *On the vibrations of the electronic plasma*, Acad. Sci. USSR. J. Phys., 10 (1946), 25-34.
- [49] A. Lundbladh, D. Henningson and S. Reddy, *Threshold amplitudes for transition in channel flows*, in Transition, Turbulence and Combustion, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994, pp. 309-318.

- [50] N. Masmoudi and Z. Zhao, *Stability threshold of the 2D Couette flow in Sobolev spaces*, arXiv:1908.11042.
- [51] C. Mouhot and C. Villani, *On Landau damping*, Acta Math., 207 (2011), 29-201.
- [52] W. Orr, *The stability or instability of steady motions of a perfect liquid and of a viscous liquid. Part I: A perfect liquid*, Proc. Royal Irish Acad. Sec. A: Math. Phys. Sci., 27(1907), 9-68.
- [53] S. Orszag and L. Kells, *Transition to turbulence in plane Poiseuille and plane Couette flow*, J. of Fluid Mech., 96(1980), 159-205.
- [54] S. Reddy, P. Schmid, J. Baggett and D. Henningson, *On stability of streamwise streaks and transition thresholds in plane channel flows*, J. Fluid Mech., 365 (1998), 269-303.
- [55] S. Ren and W. Zhao, *Linear damping of Alfvén waves by phase mixing*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 49 (2017), 2101-2137.
- [56] O. Reynolds, *An experimental investigation of the circumstances which determine whether the motion of water shall be direct or sinuous, and of the law of resistance in parallel channels*, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. , 35(1883), 84.
- [57] V. A. Romanov, *Stability of plane-parallel Couette flow*, Funkcional. Anal. i Priložen, 7 (1973), 62-73.
- [58] P. Schmid and D. Henningson, *Stability and Transition in Shear Flows*, Applied Mathematical Sciences 142, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001.
- [59] L. Trefethen, A. Trefethen, S. Reddy and T. Driscoll, *Hydrodynamic stability without eigenvalues*, Science, 261(1993), 578-584.
- [60] L. N. Trefethen, *Pseudospectra of linear operators*, SIAM Review, 39(1997), 383-406.
- [61] F. Waleffe, *Transition in shear flows. Nonlinear normality versus non-normal linearity*, Phys. Fluids, 7(1995), 3060-3066.
- [62] D. Wei, *Diffusion and mixing in fluid flow via the resolvent estimate*, arXiv:1811.11904.
- [63] D. Wei and Z. Zhang, *Transition threshold for the 3D Couette flow in Sobolev space*, arXiv:1803.01359, to appear in Comm. Pure Appl. Math.
- [64] D. Wei and Z. Zhang, *Enhanced dissipation for the Kolmogorov flow via the hypocoercivity method*, Sci. China Math., 62 (2019), 1219-1232.
- [65] D. Wei, Z. Zhang and W. Zhao, *Linear inviscid damping for a class of monotone shear flow in Sobolev spaces*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 71(2018), 617-687.
- [66] D. Wei, Z. Zhang and W. Zhao, *Linear inviscid damping and vorticity depletion for shear flows*, Annals of PDE, 5(2019), 5:3.
- [67] D. Wei, Z. Zhang and W. Zhao, *Linear inviscid damping and enhanced dissipation for the Kolmogorov flow*, Adv. Math., 362 (2020), 106963.
- [68] D. Wei, Z. Zhang and H. Zhu, *Linear inviscid damping for the β -plane equation*, Comm. Math. Phys., 375 (2020), 127-174.
- [69] A. Yaglom, *Hydrodynamic instability and transition to turbulence*, Fluid Mech. Appl. 100, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2012.
- [70] C. Zillinger, *Linear inviscid damping for monotone shear flows*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 369 (2017), 8799-8855.
- [71] C. Zillinger, *Linear inviscid damping for monotone shear flows in a finite periodic channel, boundary effects, blow-up and critical Sobolev regularity*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 221(2016), 1449-1509.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCE, PEKING UNIVERSITY, 100871, BEIJING, P. R. CHINA
E-mail address: chenqi940224@gmail.com

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCE, PEKING UNIVERSITY, 100871, BEIJING, P. R. CHINA
E-mail address: jnwdyi@163.com

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCE, PEKING UNIVERSITY, 100871, BEIJING, P. R. CHINA
E-mail address: zfzhang@math.pku.edu.cn