

Small-time global exact controllability to the trajectories for the viscous Boussinesq system

F. W. CHAVES-SILVA* E. FERNÁNDEZ-CARA† K. LE BALC'H‡
J. L. F. MACHADO§¶ D. A. SOUZA||

Abstract

In this paper, we deal with the global exact controllability to the trajectories of the Boussinesq system. We consider 2D and 3D smooth bounded domains. The velocity field of the fluid must satisfy a Navier slip-with-friction boundary condition and a Robin boundary condition is imposed to the temperature. We assume that one can act on the velocity and the temperature on an arbitrary small part of the boundary. The proof relies on three main arguments. First, we transform the problem into a distributed controllability problem by using a domain extension procedure. Then, we prove a global approximate controllability result by following the strategy of Coron, Marbach, Sueur in [9], which deals with the Navier-Stokes equations. This part relies on the controllability of the inviscid Boussinesq system and asymptotic boundary layer expansions. Finally, we conclude with a local controllability result that we establish with the help of a linearization argument and appropriate Carleman estimates.

Keywords: Boussinesq system, controllability, boundary layers, global carleman inequalities

Mathematics Subject Classification: 35Q35, 76D55, 93B05, 93C10

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Main result	3
1.2	Bibliographical comments	4
1.3	Strategy of the proof	4
2	Domain extension and smoothing effect	5
2.1	Domain extension	5
2.2	Smoothing effect of the uncontrolled Boussinesq system	6

*Department of Mathematics, Federal University of Paraíba, UFPB, CEP 58050-085, João Pessoa-PB, Brazil. E-mail: fchaves@mat.ufpb.br.

†University of Sevilla, Dpto. E.D.A.N, Aptdo 1160, 41080 Sevilla, Spain. E-mail: cara@us.es.

‡Institut de Mathématiques de Bordeaux, Bureau 207, 351 Cours de la Libération, 33400 Bordeaux, France. E-mail: kevin.le-balch@math.u-bordeaux.fr.

§Department of Mathematics, Federal University of Pernambuco, UFPE, CEP 50740-545, Recife, PE, Brazil. E-mail: lucasmachado@dmf.ufpe.br. Partially supported by CNPq (Brazil).

¶Federal Institute of Ceará, IFCE, CEP 62320-000, Tianguá, CE, Brazil. E-mail: lucas.machado@ifce.edu.br.

||Department of Mathematics, Federal University of Pernambuco, UFPE, CEP 50740-545, Recife, PE, Brazil. E-mail: diego.souza@dmf.ufpe.br.

3	Approximate controllability problem	7
3.1	Time scaling	8
3.2	The special case of the slip boundary condition	8
3.2.1	Ansatz with no correction term	8
3.2.2	Inviscid flow	9
3.2.3	Flushing	9
3.2.4	Equations and estimates for the remainder	11
3.3	The case of Navier slip-with-friction boundary conditions	12
3.3.1	Ansatz with correction term	12
3.3.2	Well-prepared dissipation method	13
3.3.3	Technical profiles	14
3.3.4	Equation and estimates of the remainder	15
3.4	Towards the trajectory	17
4	Local control of the Boussinesq system	18
4.1	Carleman estimates	20
4.2	Null controllability of the linearized system	21
4.3	Local exact controllability to the trajectories of the Boussinesq system	23
5	Global controllability to the trajectories	26
6	Comments and open questions	27
6.1	Controlling with less controls	27
6.2	Other boundary conditions	28
A	Existence result	28
B	Regularity estimates	30
C	Proof of the global Carleman estimate	34
	References	46

1 Introduction

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ ($n = 2, 3$) be a smooth bounded domain with $\Gamma := \partial\Omega$ and let $\Gamma_c \subset \Gamma$ be a non-empty open subset which intersects all connected components of Γ . It will be said that Γ_c is the control boundary. Let us set

$$L_c^2(\Omega)^n := \{u \in L^2(\Omega)^n : \nabla \cdot u = 0 \text{ in } \Omega, u \cdot \nu = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma \setminus \Gamma_c\},$$

where $\nu = \nu(x)$ is the outward unit normal vector to Ω at the points $x \in \Gamma$. For a given vector field f , we denote by $[f]_{tan}$ the tangential part of f , $D(f)$ the deformation tensor and $N(f)$ the tangential Navier boundary operator, respectively given by the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned} [f]_{tan} &:= f - (f \cdot \nu)\nu, \\ D(f) &:= \frac{1}{2} (\nabla f + \nabla f^t), \\ N(f) &:= [D(f)\nu + Mf]_{tan}, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $M = M(t, x)$ is a smooth, symmetric matrix-valued function related to the rugosity of the boundary, called the *friction matrix*. We also set

$$R(\theta) := \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial \nu} + m\theta, \quad (2)$$

where $m = m(t, x)$ is a smooth function again related to the properties of the boundary, known as the *heat transfer coefficient*.

Let $T > 0$ be a final time. We will consider the Boussinesq system

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u - \Delta u + (u \cdot \nabla)u + \nabla p = \theta e_n & \text{in } (0, T) \times \Omega, \\ \partial_t \theta - \Delta \theta + u \cdot \nabla \theta = 0 & \text{in } (0, T) \times \Omega, \\ \nabla \cdot u = 0 & \text{in } (0, T) \times \Omega, \\ u \cdot \nu = 0, \quad N(u) = 0 & \text{on } (0, T) \times (\Gamma \setminus \Gamma_c), \\ R(\theta) = 0 & \text{on } (0, T) \times (\Gamma \setminus \Gamma_c), \\ u(0, \cdot) = u_0, \quad \theta(0, \cdot) = \theta_0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where the functions $u = u(t, x)$, $\theta = \theta(t, x)$ and $p = p(t, x)$ must be respectively viewed as the velocity field, the temperature and the pressure of the fluid and e_n is the n -th vector of the canonical basis of $\mathbb{R}^n$, i.e., $e_n = (0, 1)$ if $n = 2$ and $e_n = (0, 0, 1)$ if $n = 3$.

In the controlled system (3), at any time $t \in [0, T]$, $(u, \theta)(t, \cdot) : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ will be interpreted as the *state* of the system and its restriction $(u, \theta)(t, \cdot) : \Gamma_c \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ will be regarded as the associated *control*.

1.1 Main result

In this section, we state the main result of the paper, which concerns small-time global boundary exact controllability to the trajectories of (3).

Let us introduce the following notation:

$$W_T(\Omega) := [C_w^0([0, T]; L_c^2(\Omega)^n) \cap L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega)^n)] \times C_w^0([0, T]; L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega)). \quad (4)$$

We have the following result:

Theorem 1.1 *Let $T > 0$ be a positive time, let $(u_0, \theta_0) \in L_c^2(\Omega)^n \times L^2(\Omega)$ be an initial state and let $(\bar{u}, \bar{\theta}) \in W_T(\Omega)$ be a weak trajectory of (3). Then, there exists a weak controlled solution to (3) in $W_T(\Omega)$ that satisfies*

$$(u, \theta)(T, \cdot) = (\bar{u}, \bar{\theta})(T, \cdot). \quad (5)$$

Several comments are in order.

Remark 1.1 For the precise notions of weak trajectory and weak controlled solution, see Definition 2.1 below. Essentially, we require to belong to $W_T(\Omega)$ and satisfy the PDEs in (3) in the weak (distributional) sense.

Remark 1.2 In Theorem 1.1, we do not indicate explicitly which are the controls. Indeed, once the controlled solution is constructed, we see that the associated controls are the appropriate traces of the solution on $(0, T) \times \Gamma_c$.

Remark 1.3 Theorem 1.1 is stated as an existence result. The lack of uniqueness comes from two main reasons:

- If we do not specify any restriction, there exist many controls that drive the solution to (3) to the desired trajectory.
- Even if we select a criterion in order to fix the control without ambiguity, it is not known if weak solutions are unique in the 3-D case (in 2-D, it is known that weak solutions are unique; see [2, 32] for the Navier-Stokes case).

1.2 Bibliographical comments

We now present some existing results in the literature which are related to Theorem 1.1.

There are several papers where the controllability properties of the Boussinesq equations are investigated. Most of them are local results covering boundary conditions of various kinds. For instance, in [17], the local exact boundary controllability to the trajectories was obtained with boundary controls acting over the whole boundary; in [18], the exact controllability with distributed controls and periodic boundary conditions was analyzed; in [24], the author proved the local exact controllability to the trajectories with Dirichlet boundary conditions; this situation is also handled with a reduced number of controls in [3, 11, 12, 22]. For incompressible ideal fluids, this subject has been investigated by Coron [6, 7] and Glass [19, 20, 21] and also by Fernández-Cara *et al.* [15] when heat effect are considered.

On the other hand, the literature on the Navier-Stokes and Boussinesq equations with Navier-slip boundary conditions is scarce. Let us recall some controllability results obtained for the Navier-Stokes system: in [8], a small-time global result for the 2D equations has been proved where the exact controllability can be achieved in the interior of the domain and the information about the solution near the boundaries is unknown; the residual boundary layers are too strong to be handled satisfactorily during the control design strategy. Guerrero proved in [23] the local exact controllability to the trajectories with general nonlinear Navier boundary conditions. Finally, the small-time global exact controllability with Navier slip-with-friction boundary conditions towards weak trajectories was proved in [9] by Coron, Marbach and Sueur. This article answers the famous open question by J.-L. Lions concerning global null-controllability of the Navier-Stokes equations with boundary conditions of this kind. In what concerns the Boussinesq system with Navier-slip boundary conditions, see [28, 31] for some local results.

1.3 Strategy of the proof

We present in this section the main of ideas and results needed for the proof of Theorem 1.1.

- In Section 2, we will reduce the task to a *distributed controllability* problem by applying a classical domain extension technique. Then, we will limit our considerations to *smooth initial data* by using the smoothing effect of the uncontrolled Boussinesq system.
- In Section 3, starting from a sufficiently smooth initial data, we prove a *global approximate controllability* result. In order to do this, we follow the strategy performed by Coron, Marbach and Sueur in [9] in the Navier-Stokes case.
- In Section 4, we prove a *local controllability result* by using Carleman inequalities for the adjoint of the linearized system and a fixed-point strategy.
- In Section 5, we combine all these arguments and achieve the proof.

In general, the notation will be abridged. For instance, if $u \in H^2(\Omega)^n$ and $\theta \in H^1(\Omega)$, $\|(u, \theta)\|_{H^2 \times H^1}$ will stand for the norm of (u, θ) in the space $H^2(\Omega)^n \times H^1(\Omega)$. The scalar product and norm in L^2 spaces will be denoted by $(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $\|\cdot\|$, respectively. The symbol C will stand for a generic positive constant.

2 Domain extension and smoothing effect

2.1 Domain extension

We consider an extended bounded domain $\mathcal{O}$ in such a way that $\Gamma_c \subset \mathcal{O}$ and $\Gamma \setminus \Gamma_c \subset \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}} := \partial\mathcal{O}$. In the sequel, we will denote by $\tilde{\nu} = \tilde{\nu}(x)$ the outward unit normal vector to $\mathcal{O}$ at the points $x \in \partial\mathcal{O}$. We will assume that M and m are extended to $[0, T] \times \partial\mathcal{O}$ as smooth functions such that M is symmetric on $(0, T) \times \partial\mathcal{O}$. This allows to speak of $N(u)$ and $R(\theta)$ on $(0, T) \times \partial\mathcal{O}$.

We will also need the space

$$L_{div}^2(\mathcal{O})^n := \{u \in L^2(\mathcal{O})^n : \nabla \cdot u = 0 \text{ in } \mathcal{O}, \quad u \cdot \nu = 0 \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{O}\}.$$

The following proposition enables us to extend initial conditions to the whole domain $\mathcal{O}$.

Proposition 2.1 *Let $(u_0, \theta_0) \in L_c^2(\Omega)^n \times L^2(\Omega)$ be given. There exist $(u_*, \theta_*) \in L^2(\mathcal{O})^{n+1}$ and $\sigma_* \in C_c^\infty(\mathcal{O} \setminus \overline{\Omega})$ such that*

$$u_* = u_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \theta_* = \theta_0 \text{ in } \Omega, \quad \nabla \cdot u_* = \sigma_* \text{ in } \mathcal{O}, \quad u_* \cdot \tilde{\nu} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{O}. \quad (6)$$

Furthermore, (u_*, θ_*) and σ_* can be chosen depending continuously on (u_0, θ_0) in the following sense:

$$\|u_*\| + \|\sigma_*\| \leq C\|u_0\|, \quad \|\theta_*\| \leq C\|\theta_0\|. \quad (7)$$

Proof: Let $\theta_* \in L^2(\mathcal{O})$ be the extension by zero of θ_0 to the whole domain $\mathcal{O}$, then we have

$$\|\theta_*\| \leq \|\theta_0\|.$$

Next, to find an appropriate extension for u_0 , we first notice that, since $u_0 \in L_c^2(\Omega)^n$, the normal trace $u_0 \cdot \nu$ has a sense in $H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega)$, see [2, Chapter IV, Section 3.2]. Let us split

$$\Gamma_c = \bigcup_{i=1}^k \Gamma_c^i,$$

where Γ_c^i represent the parts of Γ_c in each connected component of Γ and we stand for $(\mathcal{O} \setminus \overline{\Omega})^i$ its related extension. Also, let $\omega^i \subset \subset (\mathcal{O} \setminus \overline{\Omega})^i$ be a non-empty open subset and $\sigma_*^i \in C_c^\infty(\omega^i)$ such that

$$\int_{(\mathcal{O} \setminus \overline{\Omega})^i} \sigma_*^i = -\langle u_0 \cdot \nu, 1 \rangle_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma_c^i), H^{1/2}(\Gamma_c^i)}.$$

The following non homogeneous elliptic problem admits a unique solution $w^i \in H^1((\mathcal{O} \setminus \overline{\Omega})^i)$:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta w^i = -\sigma_*^i & \text{in } (\mathcal{O} \setminus \overline{\Omega})^i, \\ \frac{\partial w^i}{\partial \nu} = u_0 \cdot \nu & \text{on } \Gamma_c^i, \\ \frac{\partial w^i}{\partial \tilde{\nu}} = 0 & \text{on } \partial(\mathcal{O} \setminus \overline{\Omega})^i \setminus \Gamma_c^i. \end{cases}$$

Let us set

$$u_* := \begin{cases} u_0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \nabla w^i & \text{in } (\mathcal{O} \setminus \overline{\Omega})^i, \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, k. \end{cases}$$

It is then clear that $u_* \in L^2(\mathcal{O})^n$, $\nabla \cdot u_* = \sigma_*$ in $\mathcal{O}$ and $u_* \cdot \tilde{\nu} = 0$ on $\partial\mathcal{O}$. On the other hand, we see that, by construction, (6) and (7) are satisfied. $\square$

Let us now present the notion of solution used throughout the paper. To this purpose, let us introduce the following notations $\mathcal{O}_T := (0, T) \times \mathcal{O}$ and $\Lambda_T := (0, T) \times \partial\mathcal{O}$. In the sequel, when there is no ambiguity, we will also denote by ν the outward unit normal to $\mathcal{O}$.

Definition 2.1 *Let $T > 0$ and $(u_0, \theta_0) \in L_c^2(\Omega)^n \times L^2(\Omega)$ be given. It will be said that $(u, \theta) \in W_T(\Omega)$ is a weak controlled trajectory of (3) if it is the restriction to $(0, T) \times \Omega$ of a weak Leray solution, still denoted by (u, θ) , in the space $W_T(\mathcal{O})$, to the nonlinear system*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u - \Delta u + (u \cdot \nabla)u + \nabla p = \theta e_n + v & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \partial_t \theta - \Delta \theta + u \cdot \nabla \theta = w & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \nabla \cdot u = \sigma & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ u \cdot \nu = 0, \quad N(u) = 0 & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ R(\theta) = 0 & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ u(0, \cdot) = u_*, \quad \theta(0, \cdot) = \theta_* & \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

where $v \in H^1(0, T; L^2(\mathcal{O})^n) \cap C^0([0, T]; H^1(\mathcal{O})^n)$ and $w \in H^1(0, T; L^2(\mathcal{O})) \cap C^0([0, T]; H^1(\mathcal{O}))$ are forcing terms supported in $\overline{\mathcal{O}} \setminus \overline{\Omega}$, $\sigma \in C^\infty([0, T] \times \mathcal{O})$ is a nonhomogeneous divergence condition also supported in $\overline{\mathcal{O}} \setminus \overline{\Omega}$ and (u_*, θ_*) is an extension of (u_0, θ_0) furnished by Proposition 2.1, satisfying $\nabla \cdot u_* = \sigma(0, \cdot)$.

Let us state an existence result of weak solution to (8), whose proof is sketched in Appendix A:

Proposition 2.2 *Let us assume that $T > 0$, $(u_*, \theta_*) \in L^2(\mathcal{O})^n \times L^2(\mathcal{O})$ satisfies $u_* \cdot \nu = 0$ on $\partial\mathcal{O}$, $\sigma \in C^\infty([0, T] \times \mathcal{O})$ satisfies $\sigma(0, \cdot) = \nabla \cdot u_*$, $v \in H^1(0, T; L^2(\mathcal{O})^n) \cap C^0([0, T]; H^1(\mathcal{O})^n)$ and $w \in H^1(0, T; L^2(\mathcal{O})) \cap C^0([0, T]; H^1(\mathcal{O}))$. Then there exists at least one weak Leray solution (u, θ) to (8).*

2.2 Smoothing effect of the uncontrolled Boussinesq system

The goal of this section is to show that, starting from L^2 initial data, for any small time interval, one can find a time such that the solution is sufficiently smooth. More precisely, we have the following result:

Lemma 2.1 *Let us assume that $T > 0$ and $(\bar{u}, \bar{\theta}) \in C^\infty([0, T] \times \overline{\mathcal{O}})^{n+1}$ is such that $\nabla \cdot \bar{u} = 0$ in $\mathcal{O}_T$ and $\bar{u} \cdot \nu = 0$ on Λ_T . Then there exists a smooth function $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}^+$ with $\Psi(0) = 0$ such that, for any $(r_*, q_*) \in L_{div}^2(\mathcal{O})^n \times L^2(\mathcal{O})$ and any weak Leray-Hopf solution $(r, q) \in W_T(\mathcal{O})$ to:*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t r - \Delta r + (r \cdot \nabla)r + (\bar{u} \cdot \nabla)r + (r \cdot \nabla)\bar{u} + \nabla \pi = q e_n & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \partial_t q - \Delta q + (r + \bar{u}) \cdot \nabla q + r \cdot \nabla \bar{\theta} = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \nabla \cdot r = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ r \cdot \nu = 0, \quad N(r) = 0 & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ R(q) = 0 & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ r(0, \cdot) = r_*, \quad q(0, \cdot) = q_* & \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

the following property holds:

$$\exists t_0 \in [0, T]; \quad \|(r, q)(t_0, \cdot)\|_{H^3} \leq \Psi(\|(r_*, q_*)\|). \quad (10)$$

The proof of this lemma is quite classical but, for completeness, will be given in Appendix B.

3 Approximate controllability problem

In this section, the goal is to prove the following approximate controllability result starting from sufficiently smooth initial data.

Proposition 3.1 *Let us assume that $T > 0$ and $(\bar{u}, \bar{p}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{v}, \bar{w}, \bar{\sigma}) \in C^\infty([0, T] \times \bar{\mathcal{O}}; \mathbb{R}^{2n+4})$ is a smooth trajectory of (8), with $\bar{v}$ and $\bar{w}$ supported in $\bar{\mathcal{O}} \setminus \bar{\Omega}$. Let $(u_*, \theta_*) \in [H^3(\mathcal{O})^n \cap L^2_{div}(\mathcal{O})^n] \times H^3(\mathcal{O})$ be an initial state. Then, for any $\delta > 0$ there exist regular controls v , w and σ , again supported in $\bar{\mathcal{O}} \setminus \bar{\Omega}$ and an associated weak solution to (8) satisfying*

$$\|(u, \theta)(T, \cdot) - (\bar{u}, \bar{\theta})(T, \cdot)\| \leq \delta.$$

For the proof, we will follow the strategy introduced by Coron, Marbach, Sueur in [9]. Let us explain how it works:

- First, a scale change associated to a small parameter $\varepsilon > 0$ is introduced and (8) is transformed into a Boussinesq system with small viscosity ε that must be solved in the (long) time interval $[0, T/\varepsilon]$ starting from a small initial state, see (12). The advantage of this scaling is that we can benefit from the nonlinear terms $(u \cdot \nabla)u$ and $u \cdot \nabla \theta$.
- By taking formally $\varepsilon = 0$, we obtain the inviscid Boussinesq system. For this hyperbolic system, we construct a particular nontrivial trajectory that connects $(0, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ to itself and sends any particle outside the physical domain before the final time T .
- By linearizing the inviscid Boussinesq system around the previous trajectory, we obtain a new hyperbolic linear system that is small-time globally null-controllable. Actually, what we are doing here is to apply the so called return method, due to Coron, see [5]. Note that the linearization around the trivial state leads to a noncontrollable system.
- In the particular case of the special slip boundary condition, that is, M such that $[\nabla \times u]_{\tan} = 0$ on Λ_T and $m \equiv 0$, we immediately conclude by estimating the remainder terms. We do not need to use the long interval time $[0, T/\varepsilon]$ to control, since the solution is already small at the intermediate time $T \in (0, T/\varepsilon)$.
- Unfortunately, in the general case, a boundary layer appears. This phenomenon was already taken into account in [27] for the Navier-Stokes PDEs. Thus, we have to introduce some corrector terms in the asymptotic expansion of the solution depending on ε in order to estimate the residual layers. The boundary layer decays but not enough. Hence, the corrector is not sufficiently small at the final time T/ε and we still cannot conclude.
- In order to overcome this difficulty, we adapt the well-prepared dissipation method, introduced by Marbach in [33]. The idea is to design a control strategy that reinforces the action of the natural dissipation of the boundary layer after the intermediate time T . A desired small state is obtained at final time and we can finally achieve the proof.

In the sequel, we will frequently need vector functions $(u, p, \theta, v, w, \sigma)$ representing adequate states (u, p, θ) , controls (v, w) and auxiliary functions σ , corresponding to some linear or nonlinear systems. In all cases, it will be implicitly assumed that v and w vanish outside $\overline{\mathcal{O}} \setminus \overline{\Omega}$.

3.1 Time scaling

Let us introduce $u^\varepsilon, p^\varepsilon$, etc., with

$$\begin{aligned} u^\varepsilon(t, x) &:= \varepsilon u(\varepsilon t, x), & p^\varepsilon(t, x) &:= \varepsilon^2 p(\varepsilon t, x), & \theta^\varepsilon(t, x) &:= \varepsilon^2 \theta(\varepsilon t, x), \\ v^\varepsilon(t, x) &:= \varepsilon^2 v(\varepsilon t, x), & w^\varepsilon(t, x) &:= \varepsilon^3 w(\varepsilon t, x), & \sigma^\varepsilon(t, x) &:= \varepsilon \sigma(\varepsilon t, x). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

In these new variables, the original system (8) reads

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u^\varepsilon - \varepsilon \Delta u^\varepsilon + (u^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla) u^\varepsilon + \nabla p^\varepsilon = \theta^\varepsilon e_n + v^\varepsilon & \text{in } (0, T/\varepsilon) \times \mathcal{O}, \\ \partial_t \theta^\varepsilon - \varepsilon \Delta \theta^\varepsilon + u^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla \theta^\varepsilon = w^\varepsilon & \text{in } (0, T/\varepsilon) \times \mathcal{O}, \\ \nabla \cdot u^\varepsilon = \sigma^\varepsilon & \text{in } (0, T/\varepsilon) \times \mathcal{O}, \\ u^\varepsilon \cdot \nu = 0, \quad N(u^\varepsilon) = 0 & \text{on } (0, T/\varepsilon) \times \partial\mathcal{O}, \\ R(\theta^\varepsilon) = 0 & \text{on } (0, T/\varepsilon) \times \partial\mathcal{O}, \\ u^\varepsilon(0, \cdot) = \varepsilon u_*, \quad \theta^\varepsilon(0, \cdot) = \varepsilon^2 \theta_* & \text{in } \mathcal{O}. \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

Instead of working hard in a small time interval, we now work easily during a large time interval $[0, T/\varepsilon]$. The counterpart is the small viscosity that we find now in (12), that can be viewed as a singular perturbation of a nonlinear inviscid system.

To prove Proposition 3.1, it is sufficient to prove that

$$\|u^\varepsilon(T/\varepsilon, \cdot) - \varepsilon \overline{u}(T, \cdot)\| = o(\varepsilon) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\theta^\varepsilon(T/\varepsilon, \cdot) - \varepsilon^2 \overline{\theta}(T, \cdot)\| = o(\varepsilon^2).$$

3.2 The special case of the slip boundary condition

In this section, we consider a special situation where the fluid perfectly slips. In this case, the proof of Proposition 3.1 is more simple (there is no boundary layer). For the moment, we will also assume that the smooth target trajectory is zero, i.e., $(\overline{u}, \overline{p}, \overline{\theta}, \overline{v}, \overline{w}, \overline{\sigma}) \equiv 0$.

Thus, the friction coefficient M is assumed to be the Weingarten map (or shape operator) M_w . Thanks to [9, Lemma 1], on the uncontrolled boundary one has

$$u \cdot \nu = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad [\nabla \times u]_{tan} = 0 \quad \text{on } \Lambda_T. \quad (13)$$

3.2.1 Ansatz with no correction term

Let us consider an asymptotic expansion of the solution:

$$\begin{aligned} u^\varepsilon &= u^0 + \varepsilon u^1 + \varepsilon r^\varepsilon, & p^\varepsilon &= p^0 + \varepsilon p^1 + \varepsilon \pi^\varepsilon, & \theta^\varepsilon &= \theta^0 + \varepsilon^2 \theta^1 + \varepsilon^2 q^\varepsilon \\ v^\varepsilon &= v^0 + \varepsilon v^1, & w^\varepsilon &= w^0 + \varepsilon^2 w^1, & \sigma^\varepsilon &= \sigma^0. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

There is some intuition behind (14). The first term $(u^0, p^0, \theta^0, v^0, w^0)$ is the solution to an inviscid system, take $\varepsilon = 0$ in (12). It models a smooth reference trajectory around which we linearize the original system. This is exactly what we have to do when we apply the return method of Coron, see [5]. It will be chosen in such a way that the flow flushes the initial data off the physical domain before time T . The second term $(u^1, p^1, \theta^1, v^1, w^1)$ takes into account the initial data (u_*, θ_*) . Then, $(r^\varepsilon, \pi^\varepsilon, q^\varepsilon)$ contains higher order terms. At the end, we need to prove that $\|(r^\varepsilon, q^\varepsilon)(T, \cdot)\| = o(1)$, in order to be able to conclude.

3.2.2 Inviscid flow

By taking $\varepsilon = 0$ in (12), we obtain the following system

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u^0 + (u^0 \cdot \nabla) u^0 + \nabla p^0 = \theta^0 e_n + v^0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \partial_t \theta^0 + u^0 \cdot \nabla \theta^0 = w^0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \nabla \cdot u^0 = \sigma^0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ u^0 \cdot \nu = 0 & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ u^0(0, \cdot) = u^0(T, \cdot) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \\ \theta^0(0, \cdot) = \theta^0(T, \cdot) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

where v^0 , w^0 and σ^0 are smooth forcing terms spatially supported in $\overline{\mathcal{O}} \setminus \overline{\Omega}$. We want to control (15) during the shorter time interval $[0, T]$ instead of $[0, T/\varepsilon]$. Let us introduce the flow $\Phi^0 = \Phi^0(s; t, x)$ associated to u^0 , ie., for any (t, x) , $\Phi^0(\cdot, t, x)$ solves

$$\begin{cases} \partial_s \Phi^0(s; t, x) &= u^0(s, \Phi^0(s; t, x)), \\ \Phi^0(s; t, x)|_{s=t} &= x. \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

Hence, we look for trajectories such that:

$$\forall x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}}, \exists t_x \in (0, T), \Phi^0(t_x; 0, x) \notin \overline{\Omega}. \quad (17)$$

This property is obvious for the points x already located in $\overline{\mathcal{O}} \setminus \overline{\Omega}$. For points $x \in \overline{\Omega}$, we use the following result, whose proof can be found in [6, 7, 8, 9] in the 2D case and [21] in the 3D case:

Lemma 3.1 *There exists a non-zero solution to (15) $(u^0, p^0, \theta^0, v^0, w^0, \sigma^0) \in C^\infty([0, T] \times \overline{\mathcal{O}}; \mathbb{R}^{2n+4})$ such that the associated flow Φ_0 , defined in (16), satisfies (17). Moreover, we can choose u^0 , θ^0 and w^0 such that*

$$\theta^0 = w^0 = 0 \text{ and } \nabla \times u^0 = 0 \text{ in } [0, T] \times \overline{\mathcal{O}} \quad (18)$$

and $u^0, p^0, \theta^0, v^0, w^0$ and σ^0 are compactly supported in time in $(0, T)$.

Note that, in the proof of this result, the assumption that Γ_c intersects all connected components of Γ must be used.

In the sequel, if needed, it will be assumed that $u^0, p^0, \theta^0, v^0, w^0$ and σ^0 have been extended by zero after time T .

3.2.3 Flushing

Let (u^1, θ^1) be the solution to the linear problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u^1 + (u^0 \cdot \nabla) u^1 + (u^1 \cdot \nabla) u^0 + \nabla p^1 = \Delta u^0 + v^1 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \partial_t \theta^1 + u^0 \cdot \nabla \theta^1 = w^1 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \nabla \cdot u^1 = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ u^1 \cdot \nu = 0 & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ u^1(0, \cdot) = u_*, \quad \theta^1(0, \cdot) = \theta_* & \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

where v^1 and w^1 are forcing terms spatially supported in $\overline{\mathcal{O}} \setminus \overline{\Omega}$. Thanks to (18), we have $\Delta u^0 = \nabla(\nabla \cdot u^0) = \nabla \sigma^0$. Thus, it is smooth and can be absorbed by the source term v^1 . Of course, (19) is a linear uncoupled system.

Lemma 3.2 *Let us assume that $(u_*, \theta_*) \in [H^3(\mathcal{O})^n \cap L^2_{div}(\mathcal{O})^n] \times H^3(\mathcal{O})$. There exist forcing terms*

$$v^1 \in C^1([0, T]; H^1(\mathcal{O})^n) \cap C^0([0, T]; H^2(\mathcal{O})^n), \quad w^1 \in C^1([0, T]; H^2(\mathcal{O})) \cap C^0([0, T]; H^3(\mathcal{O})), \quad (20)$$

with

$$\text{supp}(v^1, w^1) \subset \subset \overline{\mathcal{O}} \setminus \overline{\Omega} \quad (21)$$

such that the associated solution (u^1, θ^1) to (19) satisfies $(u^1, \theta^1)(T, \cdot) = (0, 0)$ in $\mathcal{O}$. Moreover, (u^1, θ^1) is bounded (with respect to ε) in $L^\infty(0, T; H^3(\mathcal{O})^n) \times L^\infty(0, T; H^3(\mathcal{O}))$.

Proof: First, note that the result for u^1 is proved in [9, Lemma 3].

For θ^1 , we have a similar situation and we can apply the same arguments. For completeness, let us sketch the main ideas. We will use the smooth partition of unity η_ℓ for $1 \leq \ell \leq L$ defined in [9, Appendix A] which is related to Φ^0 as follows: thanks to (17), we can find $\varepsilon > 0$ and balls B_ℓ for $1 \leq \ell \leq L$ covering $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$ such that

$$\forall \ell, \exists t_\ell \in (\varepsilon, T - \varepsilon), \exists m_\ell \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{M}\} \text{ such that } \Phi^0(s; 0, B_\ell) \subset Q_{m_\ell} \quad \forall s \in (t_\ell - \varepsilon, t_\ell + \varepsilon), \quad (22)$$

where the Q_{m_ℓ} are squares (or cubes) that never intersect $\overline{\Omega}$; hence, every ball spends a positive amount of time within a given square (cube) where we can use a localized control to act on the θ^1 profile. Here, it is assumed that the η_ℓ satisfy $0 \leq \eta_\ell(x) \leq 1$, $\sum \eta_\ell = 1$ and $\text{supp}(\eta_\ell) \subset B_\ell$.

Let us introduce a smooth function $\beta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with $\beta = 1$ on $(-\infty, -\varepsilon)$ and $\beta = 0$ on $(\varepsilon, +\infty)$.

For each ℓ , we consider the solution $\overline{\theta}_\ell$ to

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \overline{\theta}_\ell + u^0 \cdot \nabla \overline{\theta}_\ell = 0 & \text{in } (0, T) \times \overline{\mathcal{O}}, \\ \overline{\theta}_\ell(0, \cdot) = \eta_\ell \theta_* & \text{in } \overline{\mathcal{O}}, \end{cases}$$

and we set $\theta_\ell(t, x) := \beta(t - t_\ell) \overline{\theta}_\ell(t, x)$. Since $\beta(T - t_\ell) = 0$ and $\beta(-t_\ell) = 1$, θ_ℓ solves

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \theta_\ell + u^0 \cdot \nabla \theta_\ell = w_\ell & \text{in } (0, T) \times \overline{\mathcal{O}}, \\ \theta_\ell(0, \cdot) = \eta_\ell \theta_*, \quad \theta_\ell(T, \cdot) = 0 & \text{in } \overline{\mathcal{O}}, \end{cases}$$

where $w_\ell(t, x) := \beta'(t - t_\ell) \overline{\theta}_\ell$. Thanks to (22), since β' vanish outside $(-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$, it is easy to see that w_ℓ is supported in Q_{m_ℓ} .

At this point, we take

$$\theta^1 := \sum_\ell \theta_\ell \quad \text{and} \quad w^1 := \sum_\ell w_\ell$$

and we see that the second PDE and the second initial condition in (19) are satisfied. Thanks to this explicit construction, the spatial regularity of w^1 and $\overline{\theta}_\ell$ are the same. Then, $w^1 \in C^1([0, T], H^2(\mathcal{O})) \cap C^0([0, T], H^3(\mathcal{O}))$. The fact that θ^1 is bounded in $L^\infty(0, T; H^3(\mathcal{O}))$ readily comes from the fact that each θ_ℓ is bounded in $L^\infty(0, T; H^3(\mathcal{O}))$. This ends the proof. $\square$

Lemma 3.2 is a null-controllability result. Thanks to the linearity and reversibility of (19), it leads to an exact controllability result:

Lemma 3.3 *Let us assume that $(u_*, \theta_*), (u_T, \theta_T) \in [H^3(\mathcal{O})^n \cap L^2_{div}(\mathcal{O})^n] \times H^3(\mathcal{O})$. There exist v^1 and w^1 as in (20) and (21) such that the associated solution to (19) satisfies $(u^1, \theta^1)(T, \cdot) = (u_T, \theta_T)$. Moreover, (u^1, θ^1) is bounded (with respect to ε) in $L^\infty(0, T; H^3(\mathcal{O})^n) \times L^\infty(0, T; H^3(\mathcal{O}))$.*

3.2.4 Equations and estimates for the remainder

The equations for r^ε , π^ε and q^ε in the extended domain $\mathcal{O}$ are

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t r^\varepsilon - \varepsilon \Delta r^\varepsilon + (u^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla) r^\varepsilon + \nabla \pi^\varepsilon = f^\varepsilon - A^\varepsilon r^\varepsilon + \varepsilon q^\varepsilon e_n + \varepsilon \theta^1 e_n & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \partial_t q^\varepsilon - \varepsilon \Delta q^\varepsilon + u^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla q^\varepsilon = h^\varepsilon - B^\varepsilon r^\varepsilon & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \nabla \cdot r^\varepsilon = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ r^\varepsilon \cdot \nu = 0, \quad [\nabla \times r^\varepsilon]_{tan} = -[\nabla \times u^1]_{tan} & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ R(q^\varepsilon) = -R(\theta^1) & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ r^\varepsilon(0, \cdot) = 0, \quad q^\varepsilon(0, \cdot) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

where we have introduced

$$f^\varepsilon := \varepsilon \Delta u^1 - \varepsilon (u^1 \cdot \nabla) u^1, \quad A^\varepsilon r^\varepsilon := (r^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla)(u^0 + \varepsilon u^1), \quad (24)$$

$$h^\varepsilon := \varepsilon \Delta \theta^1 - \varepsilon u^1 \cdot \nabla \theta^1, \quad B^\varepsilon r^\varepsilon := \varepsilon r^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla \theta^1. \quad (25)$$

We can establish energy estimates for the remainder by multiplying (23)₁ by r^ε and (23)₂ by q^ε . Indeed, after integration by parts, and thanks to the interpolation inequality in [2, Theorem III.2.36]), we easily obtain the following estimates

$$- \int_{\partial \mathcal{O}} q^\varepsilon \frac{\partial q^\varepsilon}{\partial \nu} d\Gamma = \int_{\partial \mathcal{O}} m |q^\varepsilon|^2 d\Gamma + \int_{\partial \mathcal{O}} q^\varepsilon R(\theta^1) d\Gamma, \quad (26)$$

$$\left| \int_{\partial \mathcal{O}} q^\varepsilon R(\theta^1) d\Gamma \right| \leq \|q^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\partial \mathcal{O})} \|R(\theta^1)\|_{L^2(\partial \mathcal{O})} \leq C \|q^\varepsilon\|_{H^1} \|\theta^1\|_{H^2}, \quad (27)$$

$$\left| \int_{\partial \mathcal{O}} m |q^\varepsilon|^2 d\Gamma \right| \leq C \|q^\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \|q^\varepsilon\|_{H^1} \quad (28)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} (\|r^\varepsilon\|^2 + \|q^\varepsilon\|^2) + \varepsilon (\|\nabla \times r^\varepsilon\|^2 + \|\nabla q^\varepsilon\|^2) \\ & \leq C(\varepsilon + \|\sigma^0\|_{L^\infty} + \|f^\varepsilon\| + \|A^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty} + \|B^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty} + \|h^\varepsilon\|) (\|r^\varepsilon\|^2 + \|q^\varepsilon\|^2) \\ & \quad + (2\varepsilon \|u^1\|_{H^2}^2 + \|f^\varepsilon\| + C\varepsilon \|\theta^1\|_{H^2}^2 + \|h^\varepsilon\|), \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where the boundary term for r^ε is bounded in a similar way as in [9, Section 2.5].

By applying Gronwall's inequality and Lemma 3.2, we deduce that

$$\|r^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(L^2)}^2 + \|q^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(L^2)}^2 + \varepsilon (\|\nabla \times r^\varepsilon\|^2 + \|\nabla q^\varepsilon\|^2) = O(\varepsilon). \quad (30)$$

Consequently, at time T , since $(u^0, \theta^0)(T, \cdot) = (u^1, \theta^1)(T, \cdot) = (0, 0)$, we find:

$$\|u^\varepsilon(T, \cdot)\| \leq \|\varepsilon r^\varepsilon(T, \cdot)\| \leq O(\varepsilon^{3/2}) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\theta^\varepsilon(T, \cdot)\| \leq \|\varepsilon^2 q^\varepsilon(T, \cdot)\| \leq O(\varepsilon^{5/2}).$$

This concludes the proof of Proposition 3.1 in the slip boundary condition case.

Remark 3.1 In the previous proof, we have used in a crucial way the homogeneous Robin boundary conditions satisfied by θ^ε . Indeed, we have used (26), among others. Contrarily, with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions on q^ε , we have

$$\left| \int_{\partial \mathcal{O}} q^\varepsilon \frac{\partial q^\varepsilon}{\partial \nu} d\Gamma \right| = \left| \int_{\partial \mathcal{O}} \theta^1 \frac{\partial q^\varepsilon}{\partial \nu} d\Gamma \right| \leq C \|q^\varepsilon\|_{H^2} \|\theta^1\|_{H^1}. \quad (31)$$

But unfortunately, the norm $\|q^\varepsilon\|_{H^2}$ cannot be absorbed by the left hand side of (29).

3.3 The case of Navier slip-with-friction boundary conditions

We come back to the general case, i.e. Navier slip-with-friction boundary conditions.

3.3.1 Ansatz with correction term

Let us introduce a smooth function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ such that $\varphi = 0$ on $\partial\mathcal{O}$, $\varphi > 0$ in $\mathcal{O}$, $\varphi < 0$ outside of $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$ and $|\varphi(x)| = \text{dist}(x, \partial\mathcal{O})$ in a small neighborhood of $\partial\mathcal{O}$. Then, $\nu = -\nabla\varphi$ near $\partial\mathcal{O}$ and ν can be extended smoothly within the full domain $\mathcal{O}$.

Following the original boundary layer expansion for Navier slip-with-friction boundary conditions proved in [27] by Iftimie and Sueur, we introduce the following expansions of the variables and the forcing terms:

$$\begin{cases} u^\varepsilon(t, x) &= u^0(t, x) + \sqrt{\varepsilon}\rho\left(t, x, \frac{\varphi(x)}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}\right) + \varepsilon u^1(t, x) + \cdots + \varepsilon r^\varepsilon(t, x), \\ p^\varepsilon(t, x) &= p^0(t, x) + \varepsilon p^1(t, x) + \cdots + \varepsilon \pi^\varepsilon(t, x), \\ \theta^\varepsilon(t, x) &= \theta^0(t, x) + \varepsilon^2 \theta^1(t, x) + \varepsilon^2 q^\varepsilon(t, x), \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

$$\begin{cases} v^\varepsilon(t, x) &= v^0(t, x) + \sqrt{\varepsilon}v^\rho\left(t, x, \frac{\varphi(x)}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}\right) + \varepsilon v_1^1(t, x), \\ w^\varepsilon(t, x) &= w^0(t, x) + \varepsilon^2 w^1(t, x), \\ \sigma^\varepsilon(t, x) &= \sigma^0(t, x). \end{cases}$$

Compared to the previous expansion (14), since u^0 cannot satisfy the Navier slip-with-friction boundary condition on $\partial\mathcal{O}$, the expansion (32) introduces a boundary correction ρ . This profile is expressed in terms of both the slow space variable $x \in \mathcal{O}$ and a fast scalar variable $z = \varphi(x)/\sqrt{\varepsilon}$. In the equations of (32), the missing terms will help us to prove that the remainder is small; the details are given in Section 3.3.4. We use the profiles (u^0, θ^0) and (u^1, θ^1) (extended by zero for $t > T$) introduced in the previous sections, see Sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.3. The following sections are devoted to analyze and estimate the terms of the expansion in (32).

The boundary layer corrector will be given as the solution to an initial boundary value problem with a boundary condition associated to the extra variable. As in [27], the boundary layer correction will be described by a tangential vector field $\rho = \rho(t, x, z)$ satisfying the equation:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho + [(u^0 \cdot \nabla)\rho + (\rho \cdot \nabla)u^0]_{tan} + u_b^0 z \partial_z \rho - \partial_{zz} \rho = v^\rho & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+ \times \overline{\mathcal{O}} \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\ \partial_z \rho(t, x, 0) = g^0(t, x) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+ \times \overline{\mathcal{O}}, \\ \rho(0, x, z) = 0 & \text{in } \overline{\mathcal{O}} \times \mathbb{R}_+, \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

where we have used the following notation:

$$u_b^0(t, x) := -\frac{u^0(t, x) \cdot \nu(x)}{\varphi(x)} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathcal{O}, \quad (34)$$

$$g^0(t, x) := 2\chi(x)N(u^0)(t, x) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathcal{O}, \quad (35)$$

with a smooth cut-off function χ satisfying $\chi = 1$ in a neighbourhood of the boundary $\partial\mathcal{O}$.

We can formally obtain (33) by plugging the expansion $u^0 + \sqrt{\varepsilon}\rho(t, x, \varphi(x)/\sqrt{\varepsilon})$ into (12) and keeping the terms of order $\sqrt{\varepsilon}$.

The following points are in order:

- v^ρ must be viewed as a smooth control whose spatial support is located outside of $\overline{\Omega}$. With the help of the transport term, this control will enable us to modify the behavior of ρ inside the physical domain Ω .
- ρ depends on $n+1$ spatial variables (n slow variables x_i and one fast variable z); it is thus not set in curvilinear coordinates. It is implicitly assumed that ν actually refers to the extension $-\nabla\varphi$ of the normal and, in turn, this furnishes extensions of the identities in (1).
- We will check that the construction above satisfies $v^\rho \cdot \nu = 0$. Since the equation is linear, it preserves the relation $\rho(0, x, z) \cdot \nu(x) = 0$ at initial time. Thus, the boundary profile will be tangential, even inside the domain. Actually, this is the reason why the equation (33) is linear; see [27, Section 2] for more details.
- In (35), the role of the function χ is to ensure that ρ is compactly supported near $\partial\mathcal{O}$.
- Since u^0 is smooth and tangent to the boundary, a Taylor expansion proves that u_b^0 is smooth in $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$.
- The boundary layer profile ρ does not depend on ε .

3.3.2 Well-prepared dissipation method

Unlike in the previous section, where T is the fixed time control, we will use here virtually long time intervals $[0, T/\varepsilon]$ to dissipate the boundary layer.

The most natural strategy would be to use that u^0 is equal to 0 after time T . Then (33) would be reduced to a heat equation posed on the half line $\mathbb{R}^+$ with homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions and the boundary layer would decay. Unfortunately, this decay is too slow: one can prove that $\sqrt{\varepsilon}\rho(T/\varepsilon, \cdot, \varphi(\cdot))/\sqrt{\varepsilon} = O(\varepsilon)$, see [9, Section 3.2]. Therefore, by dividing by ε , $u(T, \cdot) = O(1)$ and this is not enough for using the local result at the end.

This is why we use the source v^ρ to prepare the dissipation of the boundary layer.

Let us define the following weighted Sobolev spaces

$$H^{s,k}(\mathbb{R}) := \left\{ f \in H^s(\mathbb{R}) ; \sum_{|\alpha|=0}^s \int_{\mathbb{R}} (1+|z|^2)^k |\partial^\alpha f(z)|^2 dz < +\infty \right\}, \quad (36)$$

endowed with the corresponding (natural) norms. In [9, Lemma 7], the following result is proved:

Lemma 3.4 *Let $k \geq 1$ and $u^0 \in C^\infty([0, T] \times \overline{\mathcal{O}})$ be a fixed reference flow in (15). There exists $v^\rho \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \overline{\mathcal{O}} \times \mathbb{R}_+)$ with $v^\rho \cdot \nu = 0$, such that the x -support is included in $\overline{\mathcal{O}} \setminus \overline{\Omega}$, the time support is compact in $(0, T)$ and, for any $s, p \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $0 \leq m \leq k$, the associated boundary layer profile satisfies:*

$$|\rho(t, \cdot, \cdot)|_{H_x^p(H_z^{s,m})} \leq C \left| \frac{\log(2+t)}{2+t} \right|^{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{k}{2} - \frac{m}{2}}, \quad (37)$$

where the positive constant C depends on p, s, m and u^0 but not on t .

The interest of Lemma 3.4 is twofold.

- The estimate (37) will be used to show that the source terms generated by the boundary layer are integrable in long time and the equation satisfied by the remainder term is well-posed.

- It will be also used to prove that the boundary layer is sufficiently small at time T/ε .

Remark 3.2 A more ambitious idea would be to design a control strategy to get exactly $\rho(T, \cdot, \varphi(\cdot)/\sqrt{\varepsilon}) \equiv 0$. But, unfortunately, it can be proved that (33) is not null-controllable at time T , see [9, Section 3.5].

3.3.3 Technical profiles

For a function $f = f(t, x, z)$, we will use the notation $\{f\}$ to denote its values at points (t, x, z) with $z = \varphi(x)/\sqrt{\varepsilon}$. The full decomposition will be the following

$$\begin{aligned} u^\varepsilon &= u^0 + \sqrt{\varepsilon}\{\rho\} + \varepsilon u^1 + \varepsilon \nabla \zeta^\varepsilon + \varepsilon \{\beta\} + \varepsilon r^\varepsilon, \\ p^\varepsilon &= p^0 + \varepsilon \{\psi\} + \varepsilon p^1 + \varepsilon \mu^\varepsilon + \varepsilon \pi^\varepsilon, \\ \theta^\varepsilon &= \theta^0 + \varepsilon^2 \theta^1 + \varepsilon^2 q^\varepsilon, \\ v^\varepsilon &= v^0 + \sqrt{\varepsilon}\{v^\rho\} + \varepsilon v^1, \\ w^\varepsilon &= w^0 + \varepsilon^2 w^1, \\ \sigma^\varepsilon &= \sigma^0. \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

The functions β , ζ^ε and ψ are given as follows:

$$\beta(t, x, z) = -2e^{-z}N(\rho)(t, x, 0) - \nu(x) \int_z^{+\infty} \nabla_x \cdot \rho(t, x, z') dz', \tag{39}$$

$$\begin{cases} \Delta \zeta^\varepsilon = -\{\nabla \cdot \beta\} & \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \\ \partial_\nu \zeta^\varepsilon = -\beta(t, \cdot, 0) \cdot \nu & \text{on } \partial\mathcal{O}, \end{cases} \tag{40}$$

$$\psi = \psi(t, x, z) \text{ satisfies } [(u^0 \cdot \nabla)\rho + (\rho \cdot \nabla)u^0] \cdot \nu = \partial_z \psi \text{ and } \psi(t, x, z) \longrightarrow 0 \text{ as } z \longrightarrow +\infty. \tag{41}$$

It is proved in [9, Section 4.2] that the definitions (39), (40) and (41) are compatible with (12) and, furthermore, the following estimates hold:

$$\|\beta(t, \cdot, \cdot)\|_{H_x^p(H_z^{s,k})} \leq C \|\rho(t, \cdot, \cdot)\|_{H_x^{p+1}(H_z^{s+1,k+2})}, \tag{42}$$

$$\|\zeta^\varepsilon(t, \cdot)\|_{H^4} \leq C \left(\varepsilon^{-3/4} \|\beta(t, \cdot, \cdot)\|_{H_x^4(H_z^{2,0})} + \|\rho(t, \cdot, \cdot)\|_{H_x^3(H_z^{0,1})} \right), \tag{43}$$

$$\|\zeta^\varepsilon(t, \cdot)\|_{H^3} \leq C \left(\varepsilon^{-1/4} \|\beta(t, \cdot, \cdot)\|_{H_x^3(H_z^{1,0})} + \|\rho(t, \cdot, \cdot)\|_{H_x^2(H_z^{0,1})} \right), \tag{44}$$

$$\|\zeta^\varepsilon(t, \cdot)\|_{H^2} \leq C \left(\varepsilon^{1/4} \|\beta(t, \cdot, \cdot)\|_{H_x^2(H_z^{0,0})} + \|\rho(t, \cdot, \cdot)\|_{H_x^1(H_z^{0,1})} \right), \tag{45}$$

$$\|\psi(t, \cdot, \cdot)\|_{H_x^1(H_z^{0,0})} \leq C \|\rho(t, \cdot, \cdot)\|_{H_x^2(H_z^{0,2})}. \tag{46}$$

3.3.4 Equation and estimates of the remainder

We will now analyze the remainder defined in (38), which is in fact a solution in the extended domain $\mathcal{O}$ to

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t r^\varepsilon - \varepsilon \Delta r^\varepsilon + (u^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla) r^\varepsilon + \nabla \pi^\varepsilon = \{f^\varepsilon\} - \{A^\varepsilon r^\varepsilon\} + \varepsilon q^\varepsilon e_n + \varepsilon \theta^1 e_n & \text{in } (0, +\infty) \times \mathcal{O}, \\ \partial_t q^\varepsilon - \varepsilon \Delta q^\varepsilon + u^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla q^\varepsilon = \{h^\varepsilon\} - B^\varepsilon r^\varepsilon & \text{in } (0, +\infty) \times \mathcal{O}, \\ \nabla \cdot r^\varepsilon = 0 & \text{in } (0, +\infty) \times \mathcal{O}, \\ r^\varepsilon \cdot \nu = 0, \quad N(r^\varepsilon) = -N(g^\varepsilon) & \text{on } (0, +\infty) \times \partial\mathcal{O}, \\ R(q^\varepsilon) = -R(\theta^1) & \text{on } (0, +\infty) \times \partial\mathcal{O}, \\ r^\varepsilon(0, \cdot) = 0, \quad q^\varepsilon(0, \cdot) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \end{cases} \quad (47)$$

where $g^\varepsilon := u^1 + \nabla \zeta^\varepsilon + \beta|_{z=0}$. Let us introduce the amplification operators A^ε and B^ε , given by

$$A^\varepsilon r^\varepsilon := (r^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla)(u^0 + \sqrt{\varepsilon} \rho + \varepsilon u^1 + \varepsilon \nabla \zeta^\varepsilon + \varepsilon \beta) - (r^\varepsilon \cdot \nu)(\partial_z \rho + \sqrt{\varepsilon} \partial_z \beta) \quad (48)$$

and

$$B^\varepsilon r^\varepsilon := \varepsilon r^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla \theta^1 \quad (49)$$

and the forcing terms f^ε and h^ε , with

$$\begin{aligned} f^\varepsilon := & (\Delta \varphi \partial_z \rho - 2(\nu \cdot \nabla) \partial_z \rho + \partial_{zz} \beta) + \sqrt{\varepsilon} (\Delta \rho + \Delta \varphi \partial_z \beta - 2(\nu \cdot \nabla) \partial_z \beta) \\ & + \varepsilon (\Delta \beta + \Delta u^1 + \Delta \nabla \zeta^\varepsilon) - ((\rho + \sqrt{\varepsilon}(\beta + u^1 + \nabla \zeta^\varepsilon)) \cdot \nabla)(\rho + \sqrt{\varepsilon}(\beta + u^1 + \nabla \zeta^\varepsilon)) \\ & - (u^0 \cdot \nabla) \beta - (\beta \cdot \nabla) u^0 - u_b^0 z \partial_z \beta + (\beta + u^1 + \nabla \zeta^\varepsilon) \cdot \nu \partial_z (\rho + \sqrt{\varepsilon} \beta) \\ & - \nabla \psi - \partial_t \beta \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

and

$$h^\varepsilon := \varepsilon \Delta \theta^1 - (\sqrt{\varepsilon} \rho + \varepsilon(u^1 + \nabla \zeta^\varepsilon + \beta)) \cdot \nabla \theta^1. \quad (51)$$

We have to estimate the size of the remainder $(r^\varepsilon, q^\varepsilon)$ at final time and check that it is small. We begin by establishing an energy estimate. Thus, we multiply equation (47)₁ by r^ε and the equation (47)₂ by q^ε and integrate by parts. We proceed as before, term by term, the unique different being the terms coming from the boundary.

We recall the following identity, see [27, Lemma 2.2] which will be used throughout the paper

$$\int_{\mathcal{O}} (-\Delta u) \cdot v = 2 \int_{\mathcal{O}} D(u) \cdot D(v) - 2 \int_{\partial\mathcal{O}} [D(u)\nu]_{tan} \cdot v \, d\Gamma_{\mathcal{O}}, \quad (52)$$

where u and v are smooth vector fields such that v is divergence free and tangent to the boundary.

Therefore, it follows that

$$-\varepsilon \int_{\mathcal{O}} \Delta r^\varepsilon \cdot r^\varepsilon = 2\varepsilon \|D(r^\varepsilon)\|^2 + 2\varepsilon \int_{\partial\mathcal{O}} ([Mr^\varepsilon]_{tan} - N(g^\varepsilon)) \cdot r^\varepsilon \, d\Gamma_{\mathcal{O}},$$

and we estimate the boundary term as follows

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \left| \int_{\partial\mathcal{O}} ([Mr^\varepsilon]_{tan} - N(g^\varepsilon)) \cdot r^\varepsilon \, d\Gamma_{\mathcal{O}} \right| &= 2 \left| \int_{\partial\mathcal{O}} Mr^\varepsilon \cdot r^\varepsilon - N(g^\varepsilon) \cdot r^\varepsilon \, d\Gamma_{\mathcal{O}} \right| \\ &\leq \lambda \|\nabla r^\varepsilon\|^2 + C_\lambda (\|r^\varepsilon\|^2 + \|N(g^\varepsilon)\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{O})}^2) \\ &\leq \lambda \|\nabla r^\varepsilon\|^2 + C_\lambda (\|r^\varepsilon\|^2 + \|g^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{O})}^2 + \|D(g^\varepsilon)\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{O})}^2) \\ &\leq \lambda \|\nabla r^\varepsilon\|^2 + C_\lambda (\|r^\varepsilon\|^2 + \|g^\varepsilon\|_{H^2}^2), \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

for any $\lambda > 0$, where C_λ is a constant depending on λ . Let us absorb the term $\|\nabla r^\varepsilon\|^2$ in (53). Thanks to the classical Korn's inequality (see Lemma A.1), since $\nabla \cdot r^\varepsilon = 0$ in $\mathcal{O}$ and $r^\varepsilon \cdot \nu = 0$ on $\partial\mathcal{O}$, we have

$$\|r^\varepsilon\|_{H^1}^2 \leq C_K \|r^\varepsilon\|^2 + C_K \|D(r^\varepsilon)\|^2.$$

for some $C_K > 0$. Choosing $\lambda = 1/(2C_K)$, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \|r^\varepsilon\|^2 + \varepsilon \|D(r^\varepsilon)\|^2 &\leq \left(\|\sigma^0\|_\infty + C\varepsilon + \|\{f^\varepsilon\}\| + 2\|\{A^\varepsilon\}\|_\infty \right) \|r^\varepsilon\|^2 \\ &\quad + \left(C\varepsilon \|g^\varepsilon\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\{f^\varepsilon\}\| + \varepsilon \|\theta^1\|^2 \right) + \varepsilon \|q^\varepsilon\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \|q^\varepsilon\|^2 + \varepsilon \|\nabla q^\varepsilon\|^2 &\leq \left(\|\sigma^0\|_\infty + \|\{h^\varepsilon\}\| + \|\{B^\varepsilon\}\|_\infty + C\varepsilon \right) \|q^\varepsilon\|^2 \\ &\quad + \left(\|\{h^\varepsilon\}\| + C\varepsilon \|\theta^1\|_{H^2}^2 \right) + \|\{B^\varepsilon\}\|_\infty \|r^\varepsilon\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Adding the two estimates above, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} (\|r^\varepsilon\|^2 + \|q^\varepsilon\|^2) + \varepsilon (\|D(r^\varepsilon)\|^2 + \|\nabla q^\varepsilon\|^2) \\ \leq \left(\|\sigma^0\|_\infty + C\varepsilon + \|\{f^\varepsilon\}\| + 2\|\{A^\varepsilon\}\|_\infty + \|\{h^\varepsilon\}\| + \|\{B^\varepsilon\}\|_\infty \right) \\ \times \left(\|r^\varepsilon\|^2 + \|q^\varepsilon\|^2 \right) + \left(C\varepsilon \|g^\varepsilon\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\{f^\varepsilon\}\| + \|\{h^\varepsilon\}\| + C\varepsilon \|\theta^1\|_{H^2}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Applying Gronwall's inequality in the interval $(0, T/\varepsilon)$, and using the fact that the initial datum is equal to 0 and the estimates

$$\|\{A^\varepsilon\}\|_{L^1(L^\infty)} + \|B^\varepsilon\|_{L^1(L^\infty)} = O(1), \quad (54)$$

$$\varepsilon \|\theta^1\|_{L^2(H^2)}^2 + \varepsilon \|g^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(H^2)}^2 = O(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{4}}), \quad (55)$$

$$\|\{f^\varepsilon\}\|_{L^1(L^2)} + \|\{h^\varepsilon\}\|_{L^1(L^2)} = O(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{4}}), \quad (56)$$

we obtain:

$$\|r^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(L^2)}^2 + \|q^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(L^2)}^2 + \varepsilon \|D(r^\varepsilon)\|_{L^2(L^2)}^2 + \varepsilon \|\nabla q^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(L^2)}^2 = O(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{4}}). \quad (57)$$

The estimates (54), (55) and (56) hold on the whole interval $[0, +\infty)$. The estimates for $\{A^\varepsilon\}$, g^ε and $\{f^\varepsilon\}$ can be found in [9, Section 4.4]. Here, we give some details to obtain the estimates for B^ε , θ^1 and $\{h^\varepsilon\}$, which are new.

First, the estimates of B^ε and θ^1 are straightforward by using (49), and Lemma 3.2. Indeed, we easily get that $\|B^\varepsilon\|_{L^1(L^\infty)} = O(1)$ and that $\varepsilon \|\theta^1\|_{L^2(H^2)}^2 = O(\varepsilon)$.

Now, let us justify the estimate of $\{h^\varepsilon\}$. Note that the fast scaling variable enables us to win a factor $\varepsilon^{1/4}$, see [27, Lemma 3]. In what follows, we estimate each one of the terms in (51). The first term is $O(\varepsilon)$, thanks to the regularity of θ^1 . The second one can be treated as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sqrt{\varepsilon}\{\rho(t, \cdot)\} \cdot \nabla \theta^1(t, \cdot)\| &\leq C\sqrt{\varepsilon}\|\{\rho(t, \cdot)\}\|_{H^1} \|\nabla \theta^1(t, \cdot)\|_{H^1} \\ &\leq C \left(\sqrt{\varepsilon} \|\rho(t, \cdot, \cdot)\|_{H_x^1(H_z^{0,0})} + \|\{\partial_z \rho(t, \cdot)\}\| \right) \|\nabla \theta^1(t, \cdot)\|_{H^1} \\ &\leq C \left(\sqrt{\varepsilon} \|\rho(t, \cdot, \cdot)\|_{H_x^1(H_z^{0,0})} + \varepsilon^{1/4} \|\rho(t, \cdot, \cdot)\|_{H_x^1(H_z^{1,0})} \right) \|\nabla \theta^1(t, \cdot)\|_{H^1} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon^{1/4} \|\rho(t, \cdot, \cdot)\|_{H_x^1(H_z^{1,0})} \|\nabla \theta^1(t, \cdot)\|_{H^1}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, integrating by parts this last inequality with respect to time over $(0, T/\varepsilon)$, using Lemma 3.4 for $k = 4$ and also the fact that θ^1 is bounded in $L^\infty(0, T; H^3(\mathcal{O}))$, we get:

$$\|\sqrt{\varepsilon}\{\rho(\cdot, \cdot)\} \cdot \nabla \theta^1\|_{L^1(L^2)} = O(\varepsilon^{1/4}).$$

Now, for the third term, by using (42) and (45) we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varepsilon \nabla_x \zeta^\varepsilon(t, \cdot) \cdot \nabla \theta^1(t, \cdot)\| &\leq C\varepsilon \|\nabla_x \zeta^\varepsilon(t, \cdot)\|_{H^1} \|\nabla \theta^1(t, \cdot)\|_{H^1} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon \|\zeta^\varepsilon(t, \cdot)\|_{H^2} \|\nabla \theta^1(t, \cdot)\|_{H^1} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon \left(\varepsilon^{1/4} \|\beta(t, \cdot, \cdot)\|_{H_x^2(H_z^{0,0})} + \|\rho(t, \cdot, \cdot)\|_{H_x^1(H_z^{0,1})} \right) \|\nabla \theta^1(t, \cdot)\|_{H^1} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon \|\rho(t, \cdot, \cdot)\|_{H_x^3(H_z^{1,2})} \|\nabla \theta^1(t, \cdot)\|_{H^1}. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating by parts this last inequality, with respect to time, and using again Lemma 3.4 for $k = 3$ and the fact that θ^1 is bounded in $L^\infty(0, T; H^3(\mathcal{O}))$, we find that

$$\|\varepsilon \nabla_x \zeta^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot) \cdot \nabla \theta^1(\cdot, \cdot)\|_{L^1(L^2)} = O(\varepsilon^{1/4}).$$

The last term can be estimated in a similar way, using (42).

3.4 Towards the trajectory

In this section, we deduce a small-time global approximate controllability result to smooth trajectories. For that, we will use Lemma 3.4 and the estimates on the remainder term (57).

Let $(u^\varepsilon, p^\varepsilon, \theta^\varepsilon)$ be the solution to the equation (12) on the time interval $[0, T/\varepsilon]$. First, during the interval $[0, T]$, we use the expansions

$$\begin{aligned} u^\varepsilon &= u^0 + \sqrt{\varepsilon}\{\rho\} + \varepsilon u^{1,\varepsilon} + \varepsilon \nabla \zeta^\varepsilon + \varepsilon \{\beta\} + \varepsilon r^\varepsilon, \\ \theta^\varepsilon &= \theta^0 + \varepsilon^2 \theta^{1,\varepsilon} + \varepsilon^2 q^\varepsilon, \end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

where $u^{1,\varepsilon}(0, \cdot) = u_*$, $\theta^{1,\varepsilon}(0, \cdot) = \theta_*$ and $u^{1,\varepsilon}(T, \cdot) = \bar{u}(\varepsilon T, \cdot)$, $\theta^{1,\varepsilon}(T, \cdot) = \bar{\theta}(\varepsilon T, \cdot)$. The couple $(u^{1,\varepsilon}, \theta^{1,\varepsilon})$ solves, together with some $p^{1,\varepsilon}$, the usual first-order system (19) and the profiles $u^{1,\varepsilon}$ and $\theta^{1,\varepsilon}$ depend on ε . However, since the reference trajectory belongs to C^∞ , all the required estimates can be made independent of ε . In a second step, for large times $t \geq T$, we change our expansions and set:

$$\begin{aligned} u^\varepsilon &= \sqrt{\varepsilon}\{\rho\} + \varepsilon \bar{u}(\varepsilon t, \cdot) + \varepsilon \nabla \zeta^\varepsilon + \varepsilon \{\beta\} + \varepsilon r^\varepsilon, \\ p^\varepsilon &= \varepsilon^2 \bar{p}(\varepsilon t, \cdot) + \varepsilon \mu^\varepsilon + \varepsilon \pi^\varepsilon, \\ v^\varepsilon &= \sqrt{\varepsilon} v^\rho + \varepsilon^2 \bar{v}, \\ \theta^\varepsilon &= \varepsilon^2 \bar{\theta}(\varepsilon t, \cdot) + \varepsilon^2 q^\varepsilon, \\ w^\varepsilon &= \varepsilon^3 \bar{w}. \end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

Note that, for $t \geq T$, we have $u^0 = 0$ and the profile (u^1, θ^1) is the main trajectory and changing (58) by (59) allow us to get rid of some terms in the equation satisfied by the remainder. Indeed, terms such as $\varepsilon \Delta u^1$, $\varepsilon(u^1 \cdot \nabla)u^1$, $\varepsilon u^1 \cdot \nabla \theta^1$ and $\varepsilon \Delta \theta^1$ will not appear any more in (50) and (51) because they are already taken into account by $(\bar{u}, \bar{\theta})$. Actually, despite the presence of the profile (u^1, θ^1) in both steps, the estimates obtained for the remainder profile are as in Section 3.3.4.

Let us introduce

$$u^{(\varepsilon)}(t, x) := \frac{1}{\varepsilon} u^\varepsilon \left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}, x \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \theta^{(\varepsilon)}(t, x) := \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \theta^\varepsilon \left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}, x \right).$$

Then, thanks to (42), (45) and (57), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| u^{(\varepsilon)}(T, \cdot) - \bar{u}(T, \cdot) \right\| &= \left\| \varepsilon^{-1/2} \{ \rho(T/\varepsilon, \cdot) \} + \nabla \zeta^\varepsilon(T/\varepsilon, \cdot) + \{ \beta(T/\varepsilon, \cdot) \} + r^\varepsilon(T/\varepsilon, \cdot) \right\| \\ &\leq \varepsilon^{-1/2} \left\| \{ \rho(T/\varepsilon, \cdot) \} \right\| + \varepsilon^{1/4} \left\| \beta(T/\varepsilon, \cdot, \cdot) \right\|_{H_x^2(H_z^{0,0})} \\ &\quad + \left\| \rho(T/\varepsilon, \cdot, \cdot) \right\|_{H_x^1(H_z^{0,1})} + \left\| \{ \beta(T/\varepsilon, \cdot) \} \right\| + \left\| r^\varepsilon(T/\varepsilon, \cdot) \right\| \\ &\leq \varepsilon^{-1/2} \left\| \{ \rho(T/\varepsilon, \cdot) \} \right\| + \varepsilon^{1/4} \left\| \rho(T/\varepsilon, \cdot, \cdot) \right\|_{H_x^3(H_z^{1,2})} \\ &\quad + \left\| \rho(T/\varepsilon, \cdot, \cdot) \right\|_{H_x^1(H_z^{0,1})} + \left\| \rho(T/\varepsilon, \cdot, \cdot) \right\|_{H_x^1(H_z^{1,2})} + O(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{8}}). \end{aligned}$$

We can use (37) to estimate the terms containing ρ in the estimates above. First, note that

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\log s}{s^{1/2}} = 0$$

and, consequently, there exists a positive constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\frac{\log s}{s} \leq C s^{-1/2} \quad \forall s \geq 1.$$

Then, by taking ε sufficiently small, the following is found for $k \geq 2$:

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left\| \{ \rho(T/\varepsilon, \cdot) \} \right\| &= \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left\| \rho(T/\varepsilon, \cdot, \cdot) \right\|_{H_x^0(H_z^{0,0})} \leq C \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left| \frac{\log(2 + T/\varepsilon)}{2 + T/\varepsilon} \right|^{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{k}{2}} \leq C \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{8} + \frac{k}{4}}, \\ \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{4}} \left\| \rho(T/\varepsilon, \cdot, \cdot) \right\|_{H_x^3(H_z^{1,2})} &\leq C \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{4}} \left| \frac{\log(2 + T/\varepsilon)}{2 + T/\varepsilon} \right|^{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{k}{2} - 1} \leq C \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{8} + \frac{k}{4} - \frac{1}{2}}, \\ \left\| \rho(T/\varepsilon, \cdot, \cdot) \right\|_{H_x^1(H_z^{0,1})} &\leq C \left| \frac{\log(2 + T/\varepsilon)}{2 + T/\varepsilon} \right|^{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{k}{2} - \frac{1}{2}} \leq C \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{8} + \frac{k}{4} - \frac{1}{4}}, \\ \left\| \rho(T/\varepsilon, \cdot, \cdot) \right\|_{H_x^1(H_z^{1,2})} &\leq C \left| \frac{\log(2 + T/\varepsilon)}{2 + T/\varepsilon} \right|^{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{k}{2} - 1} \leq C \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{8} + \frac{k}{4} - \frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we choosing k large enough, we conclude that

$$\left\| u^{(\varepsilon)}(T, \cdot) - \bar{u}(T, \cdot) \right\| = O(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{8}})$$

and, from (57), we have

$$\left\| \theta^{(\varepsilon)}(T, \cdot) - \bar{\theta}(T, \cdot) \right\| = \left\| q^\varepsilon(T/\varepsilon, \cdot) \right\| = O(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{8}}).$$

This concludes the proof of Proposition 3.1 holds.

4 Local controllability of the Boussinesq system with non-linear boundary conditions

Let ω_c and ω be two non-empty open subsets such that $\omega_c \subset \subset \omega \subset \subset \mathcal{O} \setminus \overline{\Omega}$ and let χ_ω be a cut-off function such that $\chi_\omega = 0$ outside ω and $\chi_\omega = 1$ in ω_c .

The goal of this section is to prove the local exact controllability to trajectories for the Boussinesq system with distributed controls:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u - \Delta u + (u \cdot \nabla)u + \nabla p = \theta e_n + v \chi_\omega & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \partial_t \theta - \Delta \theta + u \cdot \nabla \theta = w \chi_\omega & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \nabla \cdot u = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ u \cdot \nu = 0, \quad N(u) + [f(u)]_{tan} = 0 & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ R(\theta) + g(\theta) = 0 & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ u(0, \cdot) = u_*, \quad \theta(0, \cdot) = \theta_* & \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \end{cases} \quad (60)$$

where $f \in C^3(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}^n)$ with a symmetric Jacobian matrix (or equivalently, f is an irrotational field) and $g \in C^3(\mathbb{R})$. Note that, to prove Theorem 1.1, we only need to prove a local-controllability result for (8), with linear Navier boundary conditions $N(u)$ as in (1) and linear Robin boundary conditions $R(\theta)$ as (2). However, for sake of completeness, we establish a local controllability result for the Boussinesq system with nonlinear Navier boundary conditions on the velocity field and nonlinear Fourier boundary conditions on the temperate.

Since (60) is nonlinear, we first begin by proving a (global) null-controllability result for the following system

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t z - \Delta z + ((a+b) \cdot \nabla)z + (z \cdot \nabla)b + \nabla q = h e_n + v \chi_\omega & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \partial_t h - \Delta h + (a+b) \cdot \nabla h + z \cdot \nabla c = w \chi_\omega & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \nabla \cdot z = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ z \cdot \nu = 0, \quad [D(z)\nu + Az]_{tan} = 0 & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ \frac{\partial h}{\partial \nu} + B h = 0 & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ z(0, \cdot) = z_*, \quad h(0, \cdot) = h_* & \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \end{cases} \quad (61)$$

where the vector fields a, b , the scalar function c , the symmetric matrix A and the scalar function B satisfy the following assumptions:

$$a, b \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2_{div}(\mathcal{O})^n \cap L^\infty(\mathcal{O})^n), \quad a_t, b_t \in L^2(0, T; L^r(\mathcal{O})^n), \quad (62)$$

$$c \in L^\infty(0, T; L^\infty(\mathcal{O})), \quad c_t \in L^2(0, T; L^r(\mathcal{O})), \quad (63)$$

$$A \in P := H^{1-\ell}(0, T; W^{\vartheta_1, \vartheta_1+1}(\partial\mathcal{O})^{n \times n}) \cap H^{(3-\ell)/2}(0, T; H^{\vartheta_2}(\partial\mathcal{O})^{n \times n}), \quad (64)$$

$$B \in Q := H^{1-\ell}(0, T; W^{\vartheta_1, \vartheta_1+1}(\partial\mathcal{O})) \cap H^{(3-\ell)/2}(0, T; H^{\vartheta_2}(\partial\mathcal{O})), \quad (65)$$

with $0 < \ell < 1/2$ arbitrarily close to $1/2$, $r = 2n$, $\vartheta_2 = (1/2)(3-n) + (1-\ell)(n-2)$ and $\vartheta_1 > 1$ (arbitrarily small) if $n = 3$ and $\vartheta_1 = 1$ if $n = 2$. By Sobolev embeddings, we readily have $P \hookrightarrow L^\infty((0, T) \times \partial\mathcal{O})^{n \times n}$ and $Q \hookrightarrow L^\infty((0, T) \times \partial\mathcal{O})$.

It is well-known, that the null-controllability of system (61) is equivalent to prove an observability estimate for the adjoint system:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} -\partial_t \varphi - \Delta \varphi - (a \cdot \nabla) \varphi - D(\varphi)b + \nabla \pi = c \nabla \psi & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ -\partial_t \psi - \Delta \psi - (a + b) \cdot \nabla \psi = \varphi \cdot e_n & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \nabla \cdot \varphi = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \varphi \cdot \nu = 0, \quad [D(\varphi)\nu + A\varphi]_{tan} = 0 & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \nu} + B\psi = 0 & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ \varphi(T, \cdot) = \varphi_*, \quad \psi(T, \cdot) = \psi_* & \text{in } \mathcal{O}. \end{array} \right. \quad (66)$$

The desired observability inequality will be a consequence of a global Carleman inequality for (66), see Proposition 4.1 below.

4.1 Carleman estimates

Before stating the required Carleman inequality, let us introduce several classical weights in the study of Carleman inequalities for parabolic equations, see [16]. The basic weight will be a function $\eta^0 \in C^2(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$ verifying

$$\eta^0 > 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \quad \eta^0 \equiv 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\mathcal{O}, \quad |\nabla \eta^0| > 0 \quad \text{in } \overline{\mathcal{O} \setminus \omega'}, \quad (67)$$

where $\omega' \subset \subset \omega_c$ is a non-empty open set.

Thus, for any $\lambda > 0$ we set:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(x, t) &= \frac{e^{2\lambda\|\eta^0\|_\infty} - e^{\lambda\eta^0(x)}}{t^4(T-t)^4}, \quad \xi(x, t) = \frac{e^{\lambda\eta^0(x)}}{t^4(T-t)^4}, \\ \alpha^*(t) &= \max_{x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}}} \alpha(x, t), \quad \hat{\alpha}(t) = \min_{x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}}} \alpha(x, t), \\ \xi^*(t) &= \min_{x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}}} \xi(x, t), \quad \hat{\xi}(t) = \max_{x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}}} \xi(x, t). \end{aligned}$$

We also introduce the following notation:

$$\begin{aligned} I(s, \lambda; \varphi) &= s^3 \lambda^4 \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |\varphi|^2 + s \lambda^2 \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi |\nabla \varphi|^2 \\ &\quad + s^{-1} \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^{-1} (|\varphi_t|^2 + |\Delta \varphi|^2), \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

where s and λ are positive real numbers and $\varphi = \varphi(t, x)$.

We have the following Carleman inequality for (66):

Proposition 4.1 *Assume that the assumptions (62), (63), (64), (65) are fulfilled. There exist positive constants $\tilde{\lambda}$, $\tilde{s}$ and $C = C(\mathcal{O}, \omega_c)$ such that, for any $(\varphi_*, \psi_*) \in L^2_{div}(\mathcal{O}) \times L^2(\mathcal{O})$, the corresponding solution to (66) verifies:*

$$I(s, \lambda; \varphi) + I(s, \lambda; \psi) \leq C(1 + T^2) s^{15/2} \lambda^8 \iint_{(0, T) \times \omega_c} e^{-4s\hat{\alpha} + 2s\alpha^*} \hat{\xi}^{15/2} (|\varphi|^2 + |\psi|^2), \quad (69)$$

for all $\lambda \geq \tilde{\lambda}$ and $s \geq \tilde{s}$. Furthermore, $\tilde{\lambda}$ and $\tilde{s}$ have the form $\tilde{\lambda} = \tilde{\lambda}_0 e^{\tilde{\lambda}_1 T}$ and $\tilde{s} = \tilde{s}_0 e^{\tilde{s}_1 T} (T^4 + T^8)$, where $\tilde{\lambda}_0$, $\tilde{\lambda}_1$ and $\tilde{s}_0$ only depend on $\|a\|_\infty$, $\|b\|_\infty$, $\|c\|_\infty$, $\|a_t\|_{L^2(L^r)}$, $\|b_t\|_{L^2(L^r)}$, $\|c_t\|_{L^2(L^r)}$, $\|A\|_P$ and $\|B\|_Q$, and $\tilde{s}_1$ only depend on $\mathcal{O}$ and ω_c .

The proof of Proposition 4.1 follows the arguments of [23]. For completeness and because of the presence of the equation satisfied by ψ , we provide its details in Appendix C.

4.2 Null controllability of the linearized system

In this section we will deduce the null-controllability of the linear system (61) as a consequence of the inequality (69). We introduce the following notation for denoting the space where the control is found:

$$\mathcal{H} := H^1(0, T; L^2(\mathcal{O})^n) \cap C^0([0, T]; H^1(\mathcal{O})^n) \times H^1(0, T; L^2(\mathcal{O})) \cap C^0([0, T]; H^1(\mathcal{O})). \quad (70)$$

Proposition 4.2 *Let $(z_*, h_*) \in L^2_{div}(\mathcal{O})^n \times L^2(\mathcal{O})$ and let us suppose that (62), (63), (64) and (65) holds. Then, there exist controls $(v, w) \in \mathcal{H}$ such that the corresponding solution to (61) satisfies*

$$z(T, \cdot) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad h(T, \cdot) = 0. \quad (71)$$

Moreover, the following estimate holds

$$\|\kappa^{1/2} v \chi_\omega\| + \|\kappa^{1/2} w \chi_\omega\| + \|v\|_{H^1(L^2)} + \|v\|_{L^\infty(H^1)} + \|w\|_{H^1(L^2)} + \|w\|_{L^\infty(H^1)} \leq C(\|z_*\| + \|h_*\|),$$

where the positive constant C , depending only on $\mathcal{O}$, ω , T , $\|a\|_\infty$, $\|b\|_\infty$, $\|c\|_\infty$, $\|a_t\|_{L^2(L^r)}$, $\|b_t\|_{L^2(L^r)}$, $\|c_t\|_{L^2(L^r)}$, $\|A\|_P$ and $\|B\|_Q$, and $\kappa(t) = e^{4s\hat{\alpha} - 2s\alpha^*} \hat{\xi}^{-15/2}$ and s , λ , $\hat{\alpha}$, α^* and $\hat{\xi}$ are defined at the beginning of the previous section.

Proof: It follows the ideas of [23]. It is based on a penalized Hilbert Uniqueness Method. Thus, let $(z_*, h_*) \in L^2_{div}(\mathcal{O})^n \times L^2(\mathcal{O})$, and for each $\varepsilon > 0$, let consider the extremal problem

$$\begin{cases} \text{Minimize} & \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} \kappa(t) (|v|^2 + |w|^2) \chi_\omega + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} (\|z(T, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|h(T, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^2) \\ \text{Subject to} & v \in L^2(\mathcal{O}_T), w \in L^2(\mathcal{O}_T) \text{ and } (z, h, v, w) \text{ solves (61).} \end{cases} \quad (72)$$

There exists a (unique) solution to (72), denoted by $(z^\varepsilon, h^\varepsilon, v^\varepsilon, w^\varepsilon)$, with $\kappa(t)^{1/2}(v^\varepsilon, w^\varepsilon) \in L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)^n \times L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)$, since the functional in (72) is coercive, strictly convex and C^1 in the Hilbert space $L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)^{n+1}$. The associated Euler-Lagrange equation yields

$$\iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} \kappa(t) (v^\varepsilon \cdot v + w^\varepsilon w) \chi_\omega + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\mathcal{O}} [z^\varepsilon(T, \cdot) \cdot Z(T, \cdot) + h^\varepsilon(T, \cdot) H(T, \cdot)] = 0 \quad (73)$$

for all $(v, w) \in L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)^n \times L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)$, where (Z, H) is, together with some Π , the solution to the system

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t Z - \Delta Z + ((a+b) \cdot \nabla) Z + (Z \cdot \nabla) b + \nabla \Pi = H e_n + v \chi_\omega & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \partial_t H - \Delta H + (a+b) \cdot \nabla H + Z \cdot \nabla c = w \chi_\omega & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \nabla \cdot Z = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ Z \cdot \nu = 0, \quad [D(Z)\nu + AZ]_{tan} = 0 & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ \frac{\partial H}{\partial \nu} + BH = 0 & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ Z(0, \cdot) = 0, \quad H(0, \cdot) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}. \end{cases} \quad (74)$$

Let us now introduce the solution $(\varphi^\varepsilon, \pi^\varepsilon, \psi^\varepsilon)$ to the following homogeneous adjoint system:

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t \varphi^\varepsilon - \Delta \varphi^\varepsilon - (a \cdot \nabla) \varphi^\varepsilon - D \varphi^\varepsilon b + \nabla \pi^\varepsilon = c \nabla \psi^\varepsilon & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ -\partial_t \psi^\varepsilon - \Delta \psi^\varepsilon - (a + b) \cdot \nabla \psi^\varepsilon = \varphi^\varepsilon \cdot e_n & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \nabla \cdot \varphi^\varepsilon = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \varphi^\varepsilon \cdot \nu = 0, \quad [D(\varphi^\varepsilon) \nu + A \varphi^\varepsilon]_{tan} = 0 & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ \frac{\partial \psi^\varepsilon}{\partial \nu} + B \psi^\varepsilon = 0 & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ \varphi^\varepsilon(T, \cdot) = -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z^\varepsilon(T, \cdot), \quad \psi^\varepsilon(T, \cdot) = -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} h^\varepsilon(T, \cdot) & \text{in } \mathcal{O}. \end{cases}$$

The duality between $(\varphi^\varepsilon, \psi^\varepsilon)$ and (Z, H) give

$$-\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\mathcal{O}} [z^\varepsilon(T, \cdot) \cdot Z(T, \cdot) + h^\varepsilon(T, \cdot) H(T, \cdot)] = \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} (v \cdot \varphi^\varepsilon + w \psi^\varepsilon) \chi_\omega$$

which, combined with (73), yields

$$\iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} (v \cdot \varphi^\varepsilon + w \psi^\varepsilon) \chi_\omega = \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} \kappa(t) (v^\varepsilon \cdot v + w^\varepsilon w) \chi_\omega$$

for all $(v, w) \in L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)^n \times L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)$. Consequently, we have the following identify

$$v^\varepsilon = \kappa^{-1}(t) \varphi^\varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad w^\varepsilon = \kappa^{-1}(t) \psi^\varepsilon$$

The duality between the systems fulfilled by $(z^\varepsilon, h^\varepsilon)$ and $(\varphi^\varepsilon, \psi^\varepsilon)$, gives

$$-\frac{1}{\varepsilon} (\|z^\varepsilon(T, \cdot)\|^2 + \|w^\varepsilon(T, \cdot)\|^2) = \int_{\mathcal{O}} z_* \cdot \varphi^\varepsilon(0, \cdot) + h_* \psi^\varepsilon(0, \cdot) + \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} \kappa^{-1}(t) (|\varphi^\varepsilon|^2 + |\psi^\varepsilon|^2) \chi_\omega.$$

Moreover, the Carleman inequality (69) applied to $(\varphi^\varepsilon, \psi^\varepsilon)$ gives

$$\|\varphi^\varepsilon(0, \cdot)\|^2 + \|\psi^\varepsilon(0, \cdot)\|^2 \leq C(\mathcal{O}, \omega, T, a, b, c, A, B) \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} \kappa^{-1}(t) (|\varphi^\varepsilon|^2 + |\psi^\varepsilon|^2) \chi_\omega.$$

Hence, we conclude that

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \|z^\varepsilon(T, \cdot)\|^2 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \|w^\varepsilon(T, \cdot)\|^2 + \|\kappa^{1/2} v^\varepsilon \chi_\omega\|^2 + \|\kappa^{1/2} w^\varepsilon \chi_\omega\|^2 \leq C (\|z_*\|^2 + \|h_*\|^2) \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0. \quad (75)$$

Let us now estimate the norms of $(v^\varepsilon, w^\varepsilon)$ in $\mathcal{H}$. To this purpose, let us introduce the functions $(\tilde{\varphi}^\varepsilon, \tilde{\pi}^\varepsilon, \tilde{\psi}^\varepsilon) := \kappa(t)^{-1}(\varphi^\varepsilon, \pi^\varepsilon, \psi^\varepsilon)$, which satisfy

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t \tilde{\varphi}^\varepsilon - \Delta \tilde{\varphi}^\varepsilon - (a \cdot \nabla) \tilde{\varphi}^\varepsilon - D(\tilde{\varphi}^\varepsilon) b + \nabla \tilde{\pi}^\varepsilon = c \nabla \tilde{\psi}^\varepsilon - \partial_t [\kappa(t)^{-1}] \varphi^\varepsilon & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ -\partial_t \tilde{\psi}^\varepsilon - \Delta \tilde{\psi}^\varepsilon - (a + b) \cdot \nabla \tilde{\psi}^\varepsilon = \tilde{\varphi}^\varepsilon \cdot e_n - \partial_t [\kappa(t)^{-1}] \psi^\varepsilon & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \nabla \cdot \tilde{\varphi}^\varepsilon = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \tilde{\varphi}^\varepsilon \cdot \nu = 0, \quad [D(\tilde{\varphi}^\varepsilon) \nu + A \tilde{\varphi}^\varepsilon]_{tan} = 0 & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ \frac{\partial \tilde{\psi}^\varepsilon}{\partial \nu} + B \tilde{\psi}^\varepsilon = 0 & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ \tilde{\varphi}^\varepsilon(T, \cdot) = 0, \quad \tilde{\psi}^\varepsilon(T, \cdot) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}. \end{cases}$$

Then, it is not difficult to deduce the following energy estimate

$$\|\tilde{\varphi}^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(H^1)} + \|\tilde{\psi}^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(H^1)} \leq C e^{CT(\|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2 + \|c\|_\infty^2 + \|A\|_\infty^2 + \|B\|_\infty^2)} (\|(\kappa^{-1})_t \varphi^\varepsilon\| + \|(\kappa^{-1})_t \psi^\varepsilon\|).$$

Now, applying strong energy estimates for the Stokes equations with Navier slip boundary conditions, see [23, Proposition 1.1], and for the heat equation with Robin boundary conditions, see [14, Proposition 2], we deduce that

$$\|\tilde{\varphi}_t^\varepsilon\| + \|\tilde{\psi}_t^\varepsilon\| + \|\tilde{\varphi}^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(H^2)} + \|\tilde{\psi}^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(H^2)} + \|\tilde{\varphi}^\varepsilon\|_{C^0(H^1)} + \|\tilde{\psi}^\varepsilon\|_{C^0(H^1)} \leq C \left(\|(\kappa^{-1})_t \varphi^\varepsilon\| + \|(\kappa^{-1})_t \psi^\varepsilon\| \right),$$

where $C = C(\mathcal{O}, \omega, T, a, b, c, A, B)$. Combining the previous estimate and the Carleman estimate (69), we get

$$\|v_t^\varepsilon\| + \|w_t^\varepsilon\| + \|v^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(H^2)} + \|w^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(H^2)} + \|v^\varepsilon\|_{C^0(H^1)} + \|w^\varepsilon\|_{C^0(H^1)} \leq C \left(\|\kappa^{1/2} v^\varepsilon \chi_\omega\| + \|\kappa^{1/2} w^\varepsilon \chi_\omega\| \right).$$

Finally, thanks to (75), there exists a control pair (v, w) such that

$$(v, w) \in H^1(0, T; L^2(\mathcal{O})^{n+1}) \cap L^2(0, T; H^2(\mathcal{O})^{n+1}) \cap C^0(0, T; H^1(\mathcal{O})^{n+1}),$$

$$\|v\|_{H^1(L^2)} + \|w\|_{H^1(L^2)} + \|v\|_{L^2(H^2)} + \|w\|_{L^2(H^2)} + \|v\|_{C^0(H^1)} + \|w\|_{C^0(H^1)} \leq C \left(\|z_*\|_H^2 + \|h_*\|^2 \right).$$

and the associated solution to (61), denoted by (z, q, h) , satisfies (71) and, moreover,

$$\|\kappa^{1/2} v \chi_\omega\|^2 + \|\kappa^{1/2} w \chi_\omega\|^2 \leq C(\|z_*\|^2 + \|h_*\|^2).$$

This concludes the proof. $\square$

4.3 Local exact controllability to the trajectories of the Boussinesq system

This section is devoted to prove the local exact controllability to the trajectories of (60). Let $(\bar{u}, \bar{p}, \bar{\theta})$ an uncontrolled solution of (60), that is, a solution of

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \bar{u} - \Delta \bar{u} + (\bar{u} \cdot \nabla) \bar{u} + \nabla \bar{p} = \bar{\theta} e_n & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \partial_t \bar{\theta} - \Delta \bar{\theta} + \bar{u} \cdot \nabla \bar{\theta} = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \nabla \cdot \bar{u} = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \bar{u} \cdot \nu = 0, \quad N(\bar{u}) + [f(\bar{u})]_{tan} = 0 & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ R(\bar{\theta}) + g(\bar{\theta}) = 0 & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ \bar{u}(0, \cdot) = \bar{u}_*, \quad \bar{\theta}(0, \cdot) = \bar{\theta}_* & \text{in } \mathcal{O}. \end{cases}$$

We will assume the following regularity for the trajectories:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u} &\in X := H^{(3-\ell)/2}(0, T; H^{\vartheta_2+1/2}(\mathcal{O})^n \cap L_{div}^2(\mathcal{O})^n) \cap H^{1-\ell}(0, T; W^{\vartheta_1+1/2, \vartheta_1+1}(\mathcal{O})^n), \\ \bar{u}_* &\in H^3(\mathcal{O})^n \cap L_{div}^2(\mathcal{O})^n, \quad N(\bar{u}_*) + [f(\bar{u}_*)]_{tan} = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\mathcal{O}, \\ \bar{\theta} &\in Y := H^{(3-\ell)/2}(0, T; H^{\vartheta_2+1/2}(\mathcal{O})) \cap H^{1-\ell}(0, T; W^{\vartheta_1+1/2, \vartheta_1+1}(\mathcal{O})), \\ \bar{\theta}_* &\in H^3(\mathcal{O}), \quad R(\bar{\theta}_*) + g(\bar{\theta}_*) = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\mathcal{O}. \end{aligned} \tag{76}$$

We have the following result:

Proposition 4.3 *Let $f \in C^3(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}^n)$, $g \in C^3(\mathbb{R})$, $T > 0$, $(\bar{u}_*, \bar{\theta}_*)$ satisfying (76). Then, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that, for every $(u_*, \theta_*) \in [H^3(\mathcal{O})^n \cap L_{div}^2(\mathcal{O})^n] \times H^3(\mathcal{O})$ satisfying the compatibility condition*

$$N(u_*) + [f(u_*)]_{tan} = 0, \quad R(\theta_*) + g(\theta_*) = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\mathcal{O} \tag{77}$$

and such that $\|u_ - \bar{u}_*\|_{H^3} \leq \delta$ and $\|\theta_* - \bar{\theta}_*\|_{H^3} \leq \delta$, there exist controls $(v, w) \in \mathcal{H}$ and associated solutions (u, p, θ) to (60) satisfying*

$$u(T, \cdot) = \bar{u}(T, \cdot) \quad \text{and} \quad \theta(T, \cdot) = \bar{\theta}(T, \cdot) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{O}. \tag{78}$$

Proof: Let us denote $z = u - \bar{u}$ and $h = \theta - \bar{\theta}$. Making the difference between the system fulfilled by $\bar{u}$ and system (60), we have:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t z - \Delta z + (z \cdot \nabla)z + (z \cdot \nabla)\bar{u} + (\bar{u} \cdot \nabla)z + \nabla q = h e_n + v \chi_\omega & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \partial_t h - \Delta h + z \cdot \nabla h + \bar{u} \cdot \nabla h + z \cdot \nabla \bar{\theta} = w \chi_\omega & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \nabla \cdot z = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ z \cdot \nu = 0, \quad N(z) + [F(\bar{u}, z)z]_{tan} = 0 & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ R(h) + G(\bar{\theta}, h)h = 0 & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ z(0, \cdot) = u_* - \bar{u}_* = z_*, \quad h(0, \cdot) = \theta_* - \bar{\theta}_* = h_* & \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \end{cases}$$

where

$$F_i(\bar{u}, z) = \int_0^1 \nabla f_i(\bar{u} + sz) ds, \quad F(\bar{u}, z) = (F_1(\bar{u}, z), \dots, F_n(\bar{u}, z)) \quad \text{and} \quad G(\bar{\theta}, h) = \int_0^1 g'(\bar{\theta} + sh) ds.$$

Now, our goal is to find controls (v, w) such that $z(T, \cdot) \equiv 0$ and $h(T, \cdot) \equiv 0$. To this purpose, we will use Proposition 4.2 and a fixed-point argument.

First, we introduce the following closed linear manifolds

$$X_0 = \{\Phi \in X : \Phi(0, \cdot) = z_* \text{ in } \mathcal{O}\} \quad \text{and} \quad Y_0 = \{\Psi \in Y : \Psi(0, \cdot) = h_* \text{ in } \mathcal{O}\}.$$

Then, for each $(\Phi, \Psi) \in X_0 \times Y_0$, we can apply Proposition 4.2 to guarantee the existence of controls $(v_{(\Phi, \Psi)}, w_{(\Phi, \Psi)}) \in \mathcal{H}$ such that the associated solution to

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t z - \Delta z + (\Phi \cdot \nabla)z + (z \cdot \nabla)\bar{u} + (\bar{u} \cdot \nabla)z + \nabla q = h e_n + v \chi_\omega & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \partial_t h - \Delta h + \Phi \cdot \nabla h + \bar{u} \cdot \nabla h + z \cdot \nabla \bar{\theta} = w \chi_\omega & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \nabla \cdot z = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ z \cdot \nu = 0, \quad N(z) + [F(\bar{u}, \Phi)z]_{tan} = 0 & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ R(h) + G(\bar{\theta}, \Psi)h = 0 & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ z(0, \cdot) = u_* - \bar{u}_* = z_*, \quad h(0, \cdot) = \theta_* - \bar{\theta}_* = h_* & \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \end{cases} \quad (79)$$

verifies $z_{(\Phi, \Psi)}(T, \cdot) = 0$, $h_{(\Phi, \Psi)}(T, \cdot) = 0$. Since $F \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$ and $G \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R})$ and $\bar{u}$ and $\bar{\theta}$ verify (76), we have $F_i(\bar{u}, \Phi) \in X$ for all $\Phi \in X_0$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and $G(\bar{\theta}, \Psi) \in Y$ for all $\Psi \in Y_0$. Moreover, since f is an irrotational field, we have that $F(\bar{u}, \Phi)$ is symmetric.

Furthermore, these controls can be chosen satisfying

$$\|v_{(\Phi, \Psi)}\|_{H^1(L^2)} + \|w_{(\Phi, \Psi)}\|_{H^1(L^2)} + \|v_{(\Phi, \Psi)}\|_{L^\infty(H^1)} + \|w_{(\Phi, \Psi)}\|_{L^\infty(H^1)} \leq C (\|z_*\|^2 + \|h_*\|^2), \quad (80)$$

for some positive constant $C = C(\mathcal{O}, \omega, T, \bar{u}, \bar{\theta}, \|\Phi\|_X, \|A\|_P, \|B\|_Q, \|F(\bar{u}, \Phi)\|_X, \|G(\bar{\theta}, \Psi)\|_Y)$.

Next, since we can prove that the terms $(\Phi \cdot \nabla)z_{(\Phi, \Psi)}$, $(z_{(\Phi, \Psi)} \cdot \nabla)\bar{u}$, $(\bar{u} \cdot \nabla)z_{(\Phi, \Psi)}$, $h_{(\Phi, \Psi)}e_n$ and $v_{(\Phi, \Psi)}\chi_\omega$ belong to $L^\infty(0, T; H^1(\mathcal{O})^n) \cap H^1(0, T; L^2(\mathcal{O})^n)$. Thanks to (76) and (77), we see that $z_* \in H^3(\mathcal{O})^n \cap L_{div}^2(\mathcal{O})^n$ satisfies the compatibility condition $N(z_*) + [F(\bar{u}, \Phi)(0, \cdot)z_*]_{tan} = 0$. Hence, we can apply [23, Proposition 1.2] to deduce that

$$z_{(\Phi, \Psi)} \in \tilde{X} := H^2(0, T; L_{div}^2(\mathcal{O})) \cap H^1(0, T; H^2(\mathcal{O})^n \cap L_{div}^2(\mathcal{O})).$$

Likewise, one can prove that the terms $\Phi \cdot \nabla h_{(\Phi, \Psi)}$, $\bar{u} \cdot \nabla h_{(\Phi, \Psi)}$, $z_{(\Phi, \Psi)} \cdot \nabla \bar{\theta}$ and $w_{(\Phi, \Psi)}\chi_\omega$ belong to $L^\infty(0, T; H^1(\mathcal{O})) \cap H^1(0, T; L^2(\mathcal{O}))$ and, thanks to equations (76) and (77), $h_* \in H^3(\mathcal{O})$ satisfies the compatibility condition $R(h_*) + G(\bar{\theta}, \Psi)(0, \cdot)h_* = 0$. Therefore, we have

$$h_{(\Phi, \Psi)} \in \tilde{Y} := H^2(0, T; L^2(\mathcal{O})) \cap H^1(0, T; H^2(\mathcal{O})).$$

Moreover, there exists a positive constant $\tilde{C} = \tilde{C}(\mathcal{O}, \omega, T, \bar{u}, \bar{\theta}, \|\Phi\|_X, \|A\|_P, \|B\|_Q, \|F(\bar{u}, \Phi)\|_X, \|G(\bar{\theta}, \Psi)\|_Y)$ such that

$$\|(z_{(\Phi, \Psi)}, h_{(\Phi, \Psi)})\|_{\tilde{X} \times \tilde{Y}} \leq \tilde{C}(\|z_*\|_{H^3 \cap W} + \|h_*\|_{H^3}). \quad (81)$$

From well-known interpolation arguments, one has $\tilde{X} \subset\subset X$ and $\tilde{Y} \subset\subset Y$, where the notation $\subset\subset$ stands for compact embedding.

For each $(\Phi, \Psi) \in X \times Y$, let the set of admissible controls $\Lambda(\Phi, \Psi)$ be, by definition, the family of controls $(v_{(\Phi, \Psi)}, w_{(\Phi, \Psi)}) \in \mathcal{H}$ that drive the solution $(z_{(\Phi, \Psi)}, h_{(\Phi, \Psi)})$ to zero at time T and such that (80) holds. On the other hand, let us set

$$\mathcal{E}(\Phi, \Psi) := \left\{ (z_{(\Phi, \Psi)}, h_{(\Phi, \Psi)}) \in \tilde{X} \times \tilde{Y} : (z_{(\Phi, \Psi)}, h_{(\Phi, \Psi)}) \text{ solves (79) with } (v_{(\Phi, \Psi)}, w_{(\Phi, \Psi)}) \in \Lambda(\Phi, \Psi) \right\}.$$

Notice that $\mathcal{E}(\Phi, \Psi) \subset \tilde{X} \times \tilde{Y} \subset\subset X \times Y$.

In what follows, we will prove that the set-valued mapping $\mathcal{E}: X_0 \times Y_0 \mapsto 2^{X_0 \times Y_0}$ possesses at least one fixed point. We will use the additional hypothesis $\|(z_*, h_*)\|_{H^3 \times H^3} \leq \delta$ for some sufficiently small δ depending on $\mathcal{O}$, ω and T and we will apply Kakutani's Theorem. More precisely, we will check that the mapping $\mathcal{E}$ satisfies the following assumptions:

- i) $\mathcal{E}(\Phi, \Psi)$ is a non-empty closed and convex set of $X_0 \times Y_0$ for all $(\Phi, \Psi) \in X_0 \times Y_0$;
- ii) There exists a convex compact set $K \subset X_0 \times Y_0$ such that $\mathcal{E}((\Phi, \Psi)) \subset K$ for all $(\Phi, \Psi) \in K$;
- iii) $\mathcal{E}(\Phi, \Psi)$ is upper-hemicontinuous in $X_0 \times Y_0$, i.e. for any $\mathcal{T} \in X'_0 \times Y'_0$ the mapping

$$(\Phi, \Psi) \mapsto \sup_{(\bar{\Phi}, \bar{\Psi}) \in \mathcal{E}(\Phi, \Psi)} \langle \mathcal{T}, (\bar{\Phi}, \bar{\Psi}) \rangle_{X'_0 \times Y'_0, X_0 \times Y_0}$$

is upper semicontinuous.

Then, in view of Kakutani's Theorem, there exists $(z, h) \in K$ such that $(z, h) \in \mathcal{E}(z, h)$.

Proof of assumption i) of Kakutani's Theorem. This is easy. Indeed, for every $(\Phi, \Psi) \in X_0 \times Y_0$, $\mathcal{E}(\Phi, \Psi)$ is a non-empty set because of the null controllability property of (79). On the other hand, since (79) is linear, we readily have that $\mathcal{E}(\Phi, \Psi)$ is closed and convex.

Proof of assumption ii) of Kakutani's Theorem. Let $R > 0$ be given and let us introduce

$$C(R) := \sup_{\|(\Phi, \Psi)\|_{X \times Y} \leq R} \tilde{C}(\mathcal{O}, \omega, T, \bar{u}, \bar{\theta}, \|\Phi\|_X, \|A\|_P, \|B\|_Q, \|F(\bar{u}, \Phi)\|_X, \|G(\bar{\theta}, \Psi)\|_Y),$$

where $\tilde{C}$ is the constant arising in (81). If we choose $\delta \leq R/C(R)$ and from (81) and the fact that $\tilde{X} \times \tilde{Y} \subset\subset X \times Y$, we see that $\mathcal{E}$ maps the closed convex set

$$\tilde{K} = \{(\Phi, \Psi) \in X_0 \times Y_0; \|(\Phi, \Psi)\|_{X \times Y} \leq R\}$$

into a compact set $K \subset \tilde{K}$.

Proof of assumption iii) of Kakutani's Theorem. Let us prove that $\mathcal{E}$ is upper-hemicontinuous. In fact, let $\{(\Phi_k, \Psi_k)\}$ be such that

$$(\Phi_k, \Psi_k) \rightarrow (\Phi, \Psi) \quad \text{in } X_0 \times Y_0.$$

From the compactness of $\mathcal{E}(\Phi_k, \Psi_k)$ into $X \times Y$, we deduce that there exist $(z_k, h_k) \in \mathcal{E}(\Phi_k, \Psi_k)$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots$ such that

$$\sup_{(\bar{\Phi}, \bar{\Psi}) \in \mathcal{E}(\Phi_k, \Psi_k)} \langle \mathcal{Y}, (\bar{\Phi}, \bar{\Psi}) \rangle_{X' \times Y', X \times Y} = \langle \mathcal{Y}, (z_k, h_k) \rangle_{X' \times Y', X \times Y} \quad \forall k \geq 1.$$

We can choose a subsequence $\{(\Phi_{k'}, \Psi_{k'})\}$ such that

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(\bar{\Phi}, \bar{\Psi}) \in \mathcal{E}(\Phi_k, \Psi_k)} \langle \mathcal{Y}, (\bar{\Phi}, \bar{\Psi}) \rangle_{X' \times Y', X \times Y} = \lim_{k' \rightarrow \infty} \langle \mathcal{Y}, (z_{k'}, h_{k'}) \rangle_{X' \times Y', X \times Y}.$$

Denote by $(v_{k'}, w_{k'}) \in \Lambda(\Phi_{k'}, \Psi_{k'})$ controls associated to $(z_{k'}, h_{k'})$ solution of following systems:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t z_{k'} - \Delta z_{k'} + (\Phi_{k'} \cdot \nabla) z_{k'} + (z_{k'} \cdot \nabla) \bar{u} + (\bar{u} \cdot \nabla) z_{k'} + \nabla q_{k'} = h_{k'} e_n + v_{k'} \chi_\omega & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \partial_t h_{k'} - \Delta h_{k'} + \Phi_{k'} \cdot \nabla h_{k'} + \bar{u} \cdot \nabla h_{k'} + z_{k'} \cdot \nabla \bar{\theta} = w_{k'} \chi_\omega & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \nabla \cdot z_{k'} = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ z_{k'} \cdot \nu = 0, \quad N(z_{k'}) + [F(\bar{u}, \Phi_{k'}) z_{k'}]_{tan} = 0 & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ R(h_{k'}) + G(\bar{\theta}, \Psi_{k'}) h_{k'} = 0 & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ z_{k'}(0, \cdot) = z_*, \quad h_{k'}(0, \cdot) = h_* & \text{in } \mathcal{O}. \end{cases}$$

Then, using the fact the $F(\bar{u}, \Phi_{k'}) \rightarrow F(\bar{u}, \Phi)$ in X and $G(\bar{\theta}, \Psi_{k'}) \rightarrow G(\bar{\theta}, \Psi)$ in Y , we find that the constants in (80) and (81) can be chosen independent of k' . Therefore, the compact embedding $\tilde{X} \times \tilde{Y} \subset\subset X \times Y$, together with the estimates (80) and (81), guarantees that, at least for a subsequence, we have

$$(z_{k'}, h_{k'}) \rightarrow (z, h) \quad \text{in } X \times Y,$$

$$v_{k'} \rightarrow v \quad \text{weakly in } H^1(0, T; L^2(\mathcal{O})^n) \cap L^\infty(0, T; H^1(\mathcal{O})^n),$$

$$w_{k'} \rightarrow w \quad \text{weakly in } H^1(0, T; L^2(\mathcal{O})) \cap L^\infty(0, T; H^1(\mathcal{O})).$$

It is not difficult to conclude that $(v, w) \in \Lambda(\Phi, \Psi)$ and that $(z, h) \in \mathcal{E}(\Phi, \Psi)$. Therefore, one has:

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(\bar{\Phi}, \bar{\Psi}) \in \mathcal{E}(\Phi_k, \Psi_k)} \langle \mathcal{Y}, (\bar{\Phi}, \bar{\Psi}) \rangle_{X' \times Y', X \times Y} &= \langle \mathcal{Y}, (z, h) \rangle_{X' \times Y', X \times Y} \\ &\leq \sup_{(\bar{z}, \bar{h}) \in \mathcal{E}(\Phi, \Psi)} \langle \mathcal{Y}, (\bar{z}, \bar{h}) \rangle_{X' \times Y', X \times Y}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the upper-hemicontinuity of $\mathcal{E}$.

Thus, we have proved that $\mathcal{E}$ has a fixed-point (z, h) and this achieves the proof of Proposition 4.3. $\square$

5 Global controllability to the trajectories

This section is devoted to explain how the previous arguments can be chained in order to prove our main result, that is, Theorem 1.1.

First, we reduce the controllability to weak trajectories to controllability smooth trajectories as follows.

Despite that $(\bar{u}, \bar{p}, \bar{\theta})$ is only a weak solution in $[0, T]$, there exists an interval time $[T_1, T_2] \subset (0, T)$ such that $(\bar{u}, \bar{p}, \bar{\theta})$ is smooth in $[T_1, T_2]$. Then, we can start our control strategy by doing nothing in $[0, T_1]$, that is, taking $v = w = \sigma = 0$ in (8), and wait for the reference trajectory to

be regularized. Thus, the weak trajectory will move from (u_*, θ_*) to some $(u, \theta)(T_1, \cdot)$, that will be considered the new initial data. Hence, without loss of generality, we can work with a smooth reference trajectory.

We split the control strategy into four steps.

Step 1: Regularization of the data. We begin by extending Ω to a new domain $\mathcal{O}$, as explained in Section 2.1. We also use Proposition 2.1 to guarantee the existence of $(u_*, \theta_*, \sigma_*) \in L^2(\mathcal{O})^n \times L^2(\mathcal{O}) \times C_c^\infty(\omega_0)$ satisfying (6). We set $\sigma(t, x) := \beta(t/T)\sigma_*(x)$ with β a smooth decreasing function such that $\beta \equiv 1$ near 0 and $\beta \equiv 0$ near $1/8$. The function σ must satisfy the compatibility condition $\nabla \cdot u_* = \sigma(0, \cdot)$. Then, we let system (8) evolve with $v = w = 0$ in the time interval $(0, T/8)$ in order to reach some data $(u, \theta)(T/8, \cdot) \in L_{div}^2(\mathcal{O})^n \times L^2(\mathcal{O})$. Next, by using the smoothing effect of the uncontrolled Boussinesq system starting from divergence free data (see Lemma 2.1), we deduce that there exists $T_1 \in (0, T/4)$ such that $(u, \theta)(T_1, \cdot) \in H^3(\mathcal{O})^n \cap L_{div}^2(\mathcal{O})^n \times H^3(\mathcal{O})$. Accordingly, we can apply Lemma 3.3.

Step 2: Global approximate controllability result in $L^2(\mathcal{O})$. Let us set $T_2 := T/2$. Starting from the new initial data $(u, \theta)(T_1, \cdot)$, we use the global approximate controllability result stated in Proposition 3.1 in a time interval of size $T_2 - T_1 \geq T/4$. Thus, for any $\delta > 0$, we can build a trajectory starting from $(u, \theta)(T_1, \cdot)$ and such that

$$\|(u, \theta)(T_2, \cdot) - (\bar{u}, \bar{\theta})(T_2, \cdot)\| \leq \delta.$$

In particular, we can find δ small enough such that

$$\Psi_{T/4}(\delta) \leq \delta_{T/4}, \quad (82)$$

where $\delta_{T/4}$ is the radius of local controllability result given in Proposition 4.3, for $f = 0$ and $g = 0$, and the function $\Psi_{T/4}$ appears in the regularity result for the free Boussinesq system; see Lemma 2.1.

Step 3: Regularizing argument. Now, we use again Lemma 2.1 to obtain the existence of a time $T_3 \in (T/2, 3T/4)$ such that

$$\|(u, \theta)(T_3, \cdot) - (\bar{u}, \bar{\theta})(T_3, \cdot)\|_{H^3} \leq \Psi_{T/4}(\delta) \leq \delta_{T/4}.$$

Step 4: Local controllability in $H^3(\mathcal{O})$. Finally, we use the local controllability result in $[T_3, T_3 + T/4]$, and get

$$(u, \theta)(T_3 + T/4, \cdot) = (\bar{u}, \bar{\theta})(T_3 + T/4, \cdot).$$

Then, extending the control by zero for $t \in [T_3 + T/4, T]$, we obtain (5) and the proof is complete.

6 Comments and open questions

6.1 Controlling with less controls

A natural extension of our main result would be the global exact controllability with a reduced number of controls acting on a small part of the boundary. Unfortunately, in this situation, one

cannot use the extension domain technique.

However, in the spirit of [12, 25], one could try to establish a small-time global null controllability for the internal control system (8) in 2-D by acting only on the temperature. Roughly speaking, the intuition behind a result of this kind is the following: the temperature θ is directly controlled by w , then θ acts as an indirect control through the coupling term θe_2 to control the component u_2 , then u_2 acts also as an indirect control through the incompressibility condition to control the component u_1 . Results of this kind will be analyzed in a forthcoming paper.

One could also try get the local control result acting only on the motion equation, that is, with $w = 0$ in (60). However, at least in the case of Neumann boundary conditions for θ , that is, with $m \equiv 0$ and $g \equiv 0$, the system does not seem to be controllable. To justify this assertion, note that, by integrating in $\mathcal{O}$ the equation satisfied by θ , integrating by parts and using the incompressibility and impermeability conditions, we find that the total mass of θ is conserved:

$$\int_{\mathcal{O}} \theta(T, \cdot) = \int_{\mathcal{O}} \theta_*.$$

Therefore, we cannot expect general null controllability.

6.2 Other boundary conditions

Another natural question is if Theorem 1.1 holds with u and θ subject to other boundary conditions.

For Dirichlet boundary conditions on the temperature, this is an interesting open problem. As noticed for the slip case in Remark 3.1, the main difficulty is to obtain good estimates for the remainder terms.

When we consider Dirichlet boundary conditions for the velocity, we face a challenging open problem. This is related to a well know conjecture by Jacques-Louis Lions. As pointed in [9], the boundary layer has a behavior which is not good as in the case of Navier boundary conditions. This implies many difficulties to estimate the boundary layer profiles and the remainder terms.

Appendix A Sketch of the proof of Proposition 2.2

In this section, we give a sketch of the proof of Proposition 2.2.

First, since the divergence source term is smooth, we start by solving a Stokes problem in order to lift the non homogeneous divergence condition. To do that, we define (u_σ, p_σ) as the solution to:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u_\sigma - \Delta u_\sigma + \nabla p_\sigma = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \nabla \cdot u_\sigma = \sigma & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ u_\sigma \cdot \nu = 0, \quad N(u_\sigma) = 0 & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ u_\sigma(0, \cdot) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}. \end{cases}$$

Smoothness (in time and space) of σ immediately gives smoothness on u_σ . These are standard maximal regularity estimates for the Stokes problem in the case of the Dirichlet boundary condition. For Navier slip-with-friction boundary conditions, we refer to [35], [36] and [37]. Then, by using Sobolev embeddings, we get that there exists a positive constant $C > 0$ depending on σ such that

$$\|u_\sigma\|_{L^\infty(0,T;W^{1,\infty}(\mathcal{O}))} \leq C. \quad (83)$$

Decomposing $u = u_\sigma + u_h$ and $p = p_\sigma + p_h$, we obtain the following system for (u_h, p_h, θ) :

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u_h - \Delta u_h + (u_\sigma \cdot \nabla) u_h + (u_h \cdot \nabla) u_\sigma + (u_h \cdot \nabla) u_h + \nabla p_h = \theta e_n + v - (u_\sigma \cdot \nabla) u_\sigma & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \partial_t \theta - \Delta \theta + (u_h + u_\sigma) \cdot \nabla \theta = w & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \nabla \cdot u_h = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ u_h \cdot \nu = 0, \quad N(u_h) = 0 & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ R(\theta) = 0 & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ u_h(0, \cdot) = u_*, \quad \theta(0, \cdot) = \theta_* & \text{in } \mathcal{O}. \end{cases} \quad (84)$$

So, it is sufficient to obtain the existence result for the system (84). We define weak solutions to (84) as follows.

Recall that

$$W_T(\mathcal{O}) = [C_w^0([0, T]; L_{div}^2(\mathcal{O})^n) \cap L^2(0, T; H^1(\mathcal{O})^n)] \times [C_w^0([0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{O})) \cap L^2(0, T; H^1(\mathcal{O}))].$$

We say that $(u_h, \theta) \in W_T(\mathcal{O})$ is a weak solution to (84) if it satisfies the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & - \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} u_h \partial_t \phi + \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} ((u_\sigma \cdot \nabla) u_h + (u_h \cdot \nabla) u_\sigma + (u_h \cdot \nabla) u_h) \phi + 2 \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} D(u_h) \cdot D(\phi) \\ & = \int_{\mathcal{O}} u_* \cdot \phi(0, x) - 2 \iint_{\partial \mathcal{O}_T} (Mu_h) \cdot \phi + \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} (v - (u_\sigma \cdot \nabla) u_\sigma) \phi + \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} \theta e_n \phi, \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & - \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} \theta \partial_t \psi + \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} ((u_h \cdot \nabla) \theta + (u_\sigma \cdot \nabla) \theta) \psi + \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} \nabla \theta \cdot \nabla \psi \\ & = \int_{\mathcal{O}} \theta_* \psi(0, x) - \iint_{\partial \mathcal{O}_T} m \theta \psi + \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} w \psi, \end{aligned} \quad (86)$$

for any which is divergence free and tangent to $\partial \mathcal{O}$ function $\phi \in C_c^\infty([0, T] \times \overline{\mathcal{O}})^n$ and any $\psi \in C_c^\infty([0, T] \times \overline{\mathcal{O}})$. We moreover require that they satisfy the so-called *strong energy inequality* for almost every $t \in (0, T)$

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u_h(t, \cdot)\|^2 + \|\theta(t, \cdot)\|^2 + 4 \iint_{\mathcal{O}_t} |D(u_h)|^2 + 2 \iint_{\mathcal{O}_t} |\nabla \theta|^2 \leq \|u_h(0, \cdot)\|^2 + \|\theta(0, \cdot)\|^2 \\ & - 4 \iint_{\partial \mathcal{O}_t} (Mu_h) \cdot u_h - 2 \iint_{\partial \mathcal{O}_t} m |\theta|^2 \\ & + 2 \iint_{\mathcal{O}_t} [\sigma |u_h|^2 - (u_h \cdot \nabla) u_\sigma \cdot u_h + (v - (u_\sigma \cdot \nabla) u_\sigma + \theta e_n) \cdot u_h + \sigma |\theta|^2 + w \theta]. \end{aligned} \quad (87)$$

Proof of the existence of solutions to (84). We recall the following identity, which will be used throughout the paper:

$$- \int_{\mathcal{O}} \Delta \tilde{u} \cdot \tilde{v} = 2 \int_{\mathcal{O}} D(\tilde{u}) \cdot D(\tilde{v}) - 2 \int_{\partial \mathcal{O}} [D(\tilde{u}) \nu]_{tan} \cdot \tilde{v}, \quad (88)$$

where $\tilde{u}$ and $\tilde{v}$ are smooth vector fields such that $\tilde{v}$ is divergence free and tangent to the boundary. Therefore, using above $\phi = u_h$ and $\psi = \theta$, we obtain formally the energy equality (87) replacing $\leq$ by $=$. We can get a bound of the right hand side term of (87) by using a L^∞ bound of σ and (83).

Thus, we deduce that there exists a positive constant $C > 0$ depending on σ, v and w such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u_h(t, \cdot)\|^2 + \|\theta(t, \cdot)\|^2 + 4 \iint_{\mathcal{O}_t} |D(u_h)|^2 + 2 \iint_{\mathcal{O}_t} |\nabla \theta|^2 \\ & \leq C \left(\|u_h(0, \cdot)\|^2 + \|\theta(0, \cdot)\|^2 + \iint_{\mathcal{O}_t} |u_h|^2 + |\theta|^2 \right) - 4 \iint_{\partial \mathcal{O}_t} (Mu_h) \cdot u_h - 2 \iint_{\partial \mathcal{O}_t} m|\theta|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (89)$$

From (89), and Gronwall Lemma, we obtain an a priori bound for (u_h, θ) in $L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\mathcal{O})^n \times L^2(\mathcal{O}))$. Before continuing, let us recall the following Korn inequality.

Lemma A.1 *[Second Korn inequality] There exist two positive constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that, for every $u \in H^1(\mathcal{O})^n$, one has*

$$C_1 (\|u\| + \|D(u)\|) \leq \|u\|_{H^1} \leq C_2 (\|u\| + \|D(u)\|). \quad (90)$$

By using the previous a priori bound for (u_h, θ) in $L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\mathcal{O})^{n+1})$, the estimate (89) and the second Korn inequality, we also obtain an a priori bound in $L^2(0, T; H^1(\mathcal{O})^{n+1})$. A standard Galerkin procedure implies the existence of a solution with this regularity.

We next justify that this solution can be assumed to verify the energy inequality. We recall the standard argument to justify the energy inequality. Let (u_h^N, θ^N) be the approximate solution obtained via the Galerkin method. We write the energy inequality (87) that holds true for (u_h^N, θ^N) and pass to the limit as $N \rightarrow +\infty$. We observe that the right-hand side converges, because (u_h^N, θ^N) converges strongly to (u_h, θ) in $L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$; this is a consequence the two previous bounds and, for instance, Aubin-Lions Lemma. For the left-hand side, it is enough to use convexity, lower semicontinuity of the norms and weak convergence.

Appendix B Proof of regularity for the uncontrolled Boussinesq system

Let us present the proof of Lemma 2.1. In the following, we will use Korn's inequality recurrently, see Lemma A.1. We will also need the following results:

Lemma B.1 *There exist positive constants $C_l, C_r, K > 0$ such that, for every $u \in H^1(\mathcal{O})^n$, we have*

$$C_l \|u\|_{K,M} \leq \|u\|_{H^1} \leq C_r \|u\|_{K,M}, \quad (91)$$

$$\text{where } \|u\|_{K,M} := \left(K \|u\|^2 + \int_{\partial \mathcal{O}} Mu \cdot u + \|D(u)\|^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

Lemma B.2 *There exist positive constants $C_l, C_r, \gamma > 0$ such that, for every $\theta \in H^1(\mathcal{O})$, we have*

$$C_l \|\theta\|_{\gamma,m} \leq \|\theta\|_{H^1} \leq C_r \|\theta\|_{\gamma,m}, \quad (92)$$

$$\text{where } \|\theta\|_{\gamma,m} := \left(\gamma \|\theta\|^2 + \int_{\partial \mathcal{O}} m|\theta|^2 + \|\nabla \theta\|^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

The proofs of the two above Lemmas rely on the interpolation inequality [2, Theorem III.2.36]. In particular, it is used that there exists a positive constant C such that

$$\|u\|_{L^2(\partial \mathcal{O})} \leq C \|u\|^{1/2} \|u\|_{H^1}^{1/2} \quad \forall u \in H^1(\mathcal{O}).$$

Lemma B.3 (Proposition III.2.35, [2]) *Let $p \in [1, +\infty]$ and $q \in [p, p^*]$, where p^* is the critical exponent associated with p . Then, there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|u\|_{L^q} \leq C \|u\|_{L^p}^{1+n/q-n/p} \|u\|_{W^{1,p}}^{n/p-n/q} \quad \forall u \in W^{1,p}(\mathcal{O}).$$

Lemma B.4 (Pages 490-494, [23]) *Let $f \in L^2(\mathcal{O})^n$ and $g \in H^{1/2}(\partial\mathcal{O})^n$. Then, there exists a unique strong solution $(u, p) \in H^2(\mathcal{O})^n \times H^1(\mathcal{O})$ to the Stokes problem*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + \nabla p = f & \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \\ \nabla \cdot u = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \\ u \cdot \nu = 0, \quad N(u) = g & \text{on } \partial\mathcal{O}, \end{cases}$$

and there exists a positive constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\|u\|_{H^2} + \|p\|_{H^1} \leq C(\|f\| + \|g\|_{H^{1/2}}). \quad (93)$$

Moreover, if $f \in H^k(\mathcal{O})^n$ and $g \in H^{k+1/2}(\partial\mathcal{O})^n$ for some $k \geq 0$, then $(u, p) \in H^{k+2}(\mathcal{O})^n \times H^{k+1}(\mathcal{O})$ and we have

$$\|u\|_{H^{k+2}} + \|p\|_{H^{k+1}} \leq C(\|f\|_{H^k} + \|g\|_{H^{k+1/2}}).$$

Lemma B.5 *Let $S : D(S) \rightarrow L^2_{div}(\mathcal{O})^n$ be the Stokes operator, where $D(S) = \{v \in H^2(\mathcal{O})^n \cap L^2_{div}(\mathcal{O})^n : N(v) = 0\}$ and $S := -\mathbb{P}\Delta$. There exists a positive constant $C > 0$ such that, for every $u \in D(S)$, we have*

$$\|u\|_{H^2} \leq C(\|Su\| + \|u\|_{H^1}). \quad (94)$$

Moreover, if $Su \in H^k(\mathcal{O})^n$ for some $k \geq 0$, then $u \in H^{k+2}(\mathcal{O})^n$ and we have

$$\|u\|_{H^{k+2}} \leq C(\|Su\|_{H^k} + \|u\|_{H^{k+1}}).$$

Lemma B.6 *Let $u \in H^1(\mathcal{O})$ satisfy $\Delta u \in L^2(\mathcal{O})$ and*

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} + mu = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\mathcal{O},$$

where $m \in L^\infty(\partial\mathcal{O})$. Then, there exists a constant $C > 0$, only depending on $\mathcal{O}$, such that

$$\|u\|_{H^2} \leq C(\|\Delta u\| + \|mu\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial\mathcal{O})}).$$

Moreover, if $\Delta u \in H^k(\mathcal{O})$ for some $k \geq 0$, then $u \in H^{k+2}(\mathcal{O})$ and we have

$$\|u\|_{H^{k+2}} \leq C(\|\Delta u\|_{H^k} + \|mu\|_{H^{k+1/2}(\partial\mathcal{O})}).$$

The proof this Lemma is consequence of [2, Theorem III.4.3].

Throughout the proof of Lemma 2.1, the constants C can increase from line to line and depend on T and the trajectory $(\bar{u}, \bar{\theta})$. For simplicity, we consider the case $n = 3$.

Step 1: Weak estimates in $(0, T/3)$. Let us first multiply $(9)_1$ by r and $(9)_2$ by q , integrate by parts, and sum. We get:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (\|r\|^2 + \|q\|^2) + 2\|Dr\|^2 + \|\nabla q\|^2 + 2 \int_{\partial\mathcal{O}} Mr \cdot r + \int_{\partial\mathcal{O}} m|q|^2 \\ & = (qe_n, r) - \int_{\mathcal{O}} (r \cdot \nabla) \bar{u} \cdot r - \int_{\mathcal{O}} r \cdot \nabla \bar{\theta} q. \end{aligned}$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz and Young inequalities, we obtain:

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (\|r\|^2 + \|q\|^2) + 2\|Dr\|^2 + \|\nabla q\|^2 + 2 \int_{\partial\mathcal{O}} Mr \cdot r + \int_{\partial\mathcal{O}} m|q|^2 \leq C(\|r\|^2 + \|q\|^2).$$

Using Lemmas B.1 and B.2, we deduce

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (\|r\|^2 + \|q\|^2) + \frac{2}{C_l^2} (\|r\|_{H^1}^2 + \|q\|_{H^1}^2) \leq (C + 2K)\|r\|^2 + (C + 2\gamma)\|q\|^2. \quad (95)$$

By applying Gronwall Lemma, we have for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$ that

$$\|r(t, \cdot)\|^2 + \|q(t, \cdot)\|^2 + \int_0^t (\|r(s, \cdot)\|_{H^1}^2 + \|q(s, \cdot)\|_{H^1}^2) ds \leq e^{Ct} (\|r_*\|^2 + \|q_*\|^2). \quad (96)$$

Therefore, from the Mean Value Theorem, we deduce by contradiction that there exists $0 \leq t_1 \leq T/3$ such that

$$\|r(t_1, \cdot)\|_{H^1}^2 + \|q(t_1, \cdot)\|_{H^1}^2 \leq C_1 (\|r_*\|^2 + \|q_*\|^2), \quad (97)$$

for a positive constant C_1 independent of t_1 .

Step 2: Strong estimates in $(t_1, 2T/3)$. Let $\mathbb{P}$ be the classical Leray projector. We multiply (9)₁ and (9)₂ by $-Sr$ and $-\Delta q$, respectively, then integrate by parts. Since M is symmetric, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \left(\|Dr\|^2 + \int_{\partial\mathcal{O}} Mr \cdot r \right) + \|Sr\|^2 \\ &= \int_{\partial\mathcal{O}} (M_t)r \cdot r + \int_{\mathcal{O}} \left((r \cdot \nabla)r \cdot Sr + (\bar{u} \cdot \nabla)r \cdot Sr + (r \cdot \nabla)\bar{u} \cdot Sr - (qe_n, Sr) \right) \\ &\leq C\|r\|_{H^1}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|Sr\|^2 + C\|q\|^2 + \|r\|_{L^6}^2 \|\nabla r\|_{L^3}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (98)$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\|\nabla q\|^2 + \int_{\partial\mathcal{O}} m|q|^2 \right) + \|\Delta q\|^2 &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial\mathcal{O}} (m_t)q \cdot q + (r \cdot \nabla q, \Delta q) \\ &\quad + (\bar{u} \cdot \nabla q, \Delta q) + (r \cdot \nabla \bar{\theta}, \Delta q) \\ &\leq C\|q\|_{H^1}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\Delta q\|^2 + C\|r\|^2 + \|r\|_{L^6}^2 \|\nabla q\|_{L^3}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (99)$$

Multiplying (95) by $\varsigma = \max\{K, \gamma\}$, adding the above inequalities and using Lemmas B.1 – B.6, we deduce the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} (\|r\|_{\varsigma, M}^2 + \|q\|_{\varsigma, m}^2) + \|r\|_{H^2}^2 + \|q\|_{H^2}^2 &\leq C(\|r\|_{\varsigma, M}^2 + \|q\|_{\varsigma, m}^2 + \|r\|_{L^6}^2 \|\nabla r\|_{L^3}^2 + \|r\|_{L^6}^2 \|\nabla q\|_{L^3}^2) \\ &\leq C [(\|r\|_{\varsigma, M}^2 + \|q\|_{\varsigma, m}^2) + (\|r\|_{\varsigma, M}^2 + \|q\|_{\varsigma, m}^2)^3]. \end{aligned} \quad (100)$$

Introducing $Y(t) := \|r(t, \cdot)\|_{\varsigma, M}^2 + \|q(t, \cdot)\|_{\varsigma, m}^2$, we see that Y is a.e. differentiable and, from (100), we have that

$$Y' \leq C(Y^3 + Y). \quad (101)$$

In view of (101), we obtain

$$Y(t)^2 \leq \frac{e^{C(t-t_1)} Y(t_1)^2}{Y(t_1)^2 + 1 - e^{C(t-t_1)} Y(t_1)^2}.$$

Let us take $t - t_1 \leq \tau_1$ small enough and such that $e^{C(t-t_1)} \leq 1 + \frac{1}{2Y(t_1)^2}$. Then, $Y(t)^2 \leq 2e^{C(t-t_1)}Y(t_1)^2$ and, from (97), we deduce that $Y(t) \leq CY_*$, where $Y_* := \|r_*\|^2 + \|q_*\|^2$. Therefore,

$$\|r(t, \cdot)\|_{\zeta, M}^2 + \|q(t, \cdot)\|_{\zeta, m}^2 + \int_{t_1}^t (\|r(s, \cdot)\|_{H^2}^2 + \|q(s, \cdot)\|_{H^2}^2) ds \leq CY_* + C(Y_* + Y_*^3)\tau_1.$$

Taking τ_1 small enough such that $\tau_1 \leq (1 + Y_*^2)^{-1}$, we have that $CY_* + C(Y_* + Y_*^3)\tau_1 \leq C_2Y_*$. Therefore, one has

$$\|r(t, \cdot)\|_{\zeta, M}^2 + \|q(t, \cdot)\|_{\zeta, m}^2 + \int_{t_1}^t (\|r(s, \cdot)\|_{H^2}^2 + \|q(s, \cdot)\|_{H^2}^2) ds \leq C_2 (\|r_*\|^2 + \|q_*\|^2) \quad (102)$$

for $t_1 \leq t \leq t_1 + \tau_1$. This ensures the existence of $t_1 \leq t_2 < \min\{2T/3, t_1 + \tau_1\}$ such that

$$\|r(t_2, \cdot)\|_{H^2}^2 + \|q(t_2, \cdot)\|_{H^2}^2 \leq \frac{C_2}{\tau_1} (\|r_*\|^2 + \|q_*\|^2).$$

Step 3: Third energy estimate in (t_2, T) . At this point, we differentiate (9) with respect to time and multiply by $\partial_t r$ and $\partial_t q$. Then, we integrate by parts to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|r_t\|^2 + 2 \|Dr_t\|^2 + 2 \int_{\partial\mathcal{O}} Mr_t \cdot r_t \\ &= -2 \int_{\partial\mathcal{O}} M_t r \cdot r_t + (q_t e_n, r_t) - (r_t \cdot \nabla) r \cdot r_t - (\bar{u}_t \cdot \nabla) r \cdot r_t - (r_t \cdot \nabla) \bar{u} \cdot r_t - (r \cdot \nabla) \bar{u}_t \cdot r_t \\ &\leq C (\|r\|_{H^1} \|r_t\|_{H^1} + \|q_t\|^2 + \|r_t\|^2 + \|r_t\|_3 \|\nabla r\| \|r_t\|_6 + \|r\|_{H^1}^2) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|q_t\|^2 + \|\nabla q_t\|^2 + \int_{\partial\mathcal{O}} m|q_t|^2 = - \int_{\partial\mathcal{O}} m_t q q_t - ((r_t + \bar{u}) \cdot \nabla q, q_t) - (r_t \cdot \nabla \bar{\theta}, q_t) - (r \cdot \nabla \bar{\theta}_t, q_t) \\ &\leq C (\|q\|_{H^1} \|q_t\|_{H^1} + \|q\|_{H^1}^2 + \|q_t\|^2 + \|r_t\|^2 + \|r_t\|_3 \|\nabla q\| \|r_t\|_6). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, using Lemmas B.1 – B.3 and adding the two above inequalities, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} (\|r_t\|^2 + \|q_t\|^2) + \|r_t\|_{H^1}^2 + \|q_t\|_{H^1}^2 \\ &\leq C (\|r\|_{H^1}^4 + \|q\|_{H^1}^4 + 1) \|r_t\|^2 + \|q_t\|^2 + \|r\|_{H^1}^2 + \|q\|_{H^1}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now, introducing $Z(t) := \|r_t(t, \cdot)\|^2 + \|q_t(t, \cdot)\|^2$, we find from (102) that

$$Z' \leq C[(1 + Y_*^2)Z + Y_*] \quad (103)$$

for $t_2 \leq t \leq t_1 + \tau_1$. By applying Gronwall's Lemma, we have for a.e. $t \in [t_2, t_1 + \tau_1]$

$$Z(t) \leq e^{C(1+Y_*^2)(t-t_2)} (Z(t_2) + CY_*(t-t_2)).$$

Since we have $Z(t_2) \leq \Psi_1(Y_*)$ for some nonnegative regular Ψ_1 with $\Psi_1(0) = 0$, we find that $Z(t) \leq \Psi_2(Y_*)$, with

$$\Psi_2(s) := e^{C(1+s^2)} (\Psi_1(s) + Cs) \quad \forall s \geq 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\|r_t(t, \cdot)\|^2 + \|q_t(t, \cdot)\|^2 + \int_{t_2}^t (\|r_t(s, \cdot)\|_{H^1}^2 + \|q_t(s, \cdot)\|_{H^1}^2) ds \leq \Psi_3(Y_*) \quad \forall t \in [t_2, t_1 + \tau_1], \quad (104)$$

where $\Psi_3(s) := C[(1 + s^2)\Psi_2(s) + s]$. In particular, this yields the existence of $t_3 \in (t_2, t_1 + \tau_1)$ such that

$$\|r_t(t_3, \cdot)\|_{H^1}^2 + \|q_t(t_3, \cdot)\|_{H^1}^2 \leq \frac{\Psi_3(Y_*)}{(t_1 - t_2 + \tau_1)}. \quad (105)$$

Actually, it is not difficult to check that the set of times $t_3 \in (t_2, t_1 + \tau_1)$ satisfying (105) has a positive measure.

Step 4: Conclusion. Using (102) and (104), we deduce an estimate of r in $L^\infty(H^2)$. It suffices to view $(9)_1$ as a family of Stokes problems (see Lemma B.4 and the arguments presented in [38, Theorem 3.8]). Then, looking $(9)_2$ as a family of elliptic problems, we also find $L^\infty(H^2)$ estimates for q , see Lemma B.6. Both estimates depend on Y_* continuously. Therefore, repeating the procedure, we see that $(r(t_3), q(t_3)) \in H^3 \times H^3$ with an estimate of the form $\Psi(Y_*)$.

Appendix C Proof of the global Carleman estimate

This section is dedicated to the proof of Proposition 4.1.

The proof is divided into eight steps and is inspired by the ideas of [23]. In the following, the positive constants C vary from line to line and depend only on $\mathcal{O}$ and ω .

Let the non-empty open sets ω' and ω_c be given, with $\omega' \subset \subset \omega_0 \subset \subset \omega_c$.

Step 1: Global Carleman estimates for ϕ and ψ and absorption of global terms.

We apply the Carleman estimate [23, Proposition 2.1] for the heat system $(66)_1$ with source term $G := c\nabla\psi - \nabla\pi + D\phi b + (a \cdot \nabla)\phi$, to get

$$\begin{aligned} I(s, \lambda; \varphi) \leq & C \left(s^3 \lambda^4 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega_0} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |\varphi|^2 + \lambda (\|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2) \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\alpha} |\nabla \varphi|^2 \right. \\ & \left. + \lambda \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\alpha} |\nabla \pi|^2 + \lambda \|c\|_\infty^2 \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\alpha} |\nabla \psi|^2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (106)$$

for $\lambda \geq \widehat{\lambda} e^{\widehat{\lambda} T \|A\|_P^2} (1 + \|A\|_P^5)$ and $s \geq \widehat{s} e^{4\lambda \|\eta^0\|_\infty} (T^6 + T^8)$ and $\widehat{\lambda}, \widehat{s}$ only depend on $\mathcal{O}$ and ω . Thanks to the definition of ξ , we have $1 \leq CT^8 \xi \leq Cs\xi$ and we can eliminate the second term in the right-hand side of (106) with the term in $s\lambda^2$ that appears in the expression of $I(s, \lambda; \varphi)$. Indeed, if we take $\lambda \geq \widehat{\lambda} (\|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} I(s, \lambda; \varphi) \leq & C \left(s^3 \lambda^4 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega_0} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |\varphi|^2 + \lambda \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\alpha} |\nabla \pi|^2 \right. \\ & \left. + \lambda \|c\|_\infty^2 \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\alpha} |\nabla \psi|^2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (107)$$

for any $\lambda \geq \widehat{\lambda} e^{\widehat{\lambda} T \|A\|_P^2} (1 + \|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2 + \|A\|_P^5)$ and any $s \geq \widehat{s} e^{4\lambda \|\eta^0\|_\infty} (T^6 + T^8)$.

Next, we apply the known Carleman estimates for the heat equation with homogeneous Robin boundary condition fulfilled by ψ , which gives

$$\begin{aligned} I(s, \lambda; \psi) \leq & C \left(s^3 \lambda^4 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega_0} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |\psi|^2 + (\|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2) \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\alpha} |\nabla \psi|^2 \right. \\ & \left. + \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\alpha} |\varphi \cdot e_n|^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

for $\lambda \geq \widehat{\lambda} e^{\widehat{\lambda} T (\|A\|_P^2 + \|B\|_Q^2)} (1 + \|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2 + \|B\|_Q^5 + \|A\|_P^5)$ and $s \geq \widehat{s} e^{4\lambda \|\eta^0\|_\infty} (T^4 + T^8)$. The same argument above yields

$$I(s, \lambda; \psi) \leq C \left(s^3 \lambda^4 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega_0} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |\psi|^2 + \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\alpha} |\varphi \cdot e_n|^2 \right), \quad (108)$$

for any $\lambda \geq \widehat{\lambda} e^{\widehat{\lambda} T (\|A\|_P^2 + \|B\|_Q^2)} (1 + \|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2 + \|B\|_Q^5 + \|A\|_P^5)$ and any $s \geq \widehat{s} e^{4\lambda \|\eta^0\|_\infty} (T^4 + T^8)$.

From (107) and (108), we get

$$\begin{aligned} I(s, \lambda; \psi) + I(s, \lambda; \varphi) &\leq C \left(s^3 \lambda^4 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega_0} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |\varphi|^2 + s^3 \lambda^4 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega_0} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |\psi|^2 \right. \\ &\quad + \lambda \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\alpha} |\nabla \pi|^2 + \lambda \|c\|_\infty^2 \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\alpha} |\nabla \psi|^2 \\ &\quad \left. + \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\alpha} |\varphi \cdot e_n|^2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (109)$$

for any $\lambda \geq \widehat{\lambda} e^{\widehat{\lambda} T (\|A\|_P^2 + \|B\|_Q^2)} (1 + \|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2 + \|B\|_Q^5 + \|A\|_P^5)$ and any $s \geq \widehat{s} e^{4\lambda \|\eta^0\|_\infty} (T^4 + T^8)$. Using the parameters $s^3 \lambda^4$, $s \lambda^2$ appearing in $I(s, \lambda; \varphi)$ and $I(s, \lambda; \psi)$ we can absorb the lower order terms on the right-hand side of (109). This way, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I(s, \lambda; \psi) + I(s, \lambda; \varphi) &\leq C \left(s^3 \lambda^4 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega_0} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |\varphi|^2 + s^3 \lambda^4 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega_0} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |\psi|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \lambda \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\alpha} |\nabla \pi|^2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (110)$$

for every $\lambda \geq \widehat{\lambda} e^{\widehat{\lambda} T (\|A\|_P^2 + \|B\|_Q^2)} (1 + \|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2 + \|c\|_\infty^2 + \|B\|_Q^5 + \|A\|_P^5)$ and any $s \geq \widehat{s} e^{4\lambda \|\eta^0\|_\infty} (T^4 + T^8)$.

Step 2: Localization of the pressure term by a global elliptic Carleman estimate.

We estimate the integral on the pressure term in (110). To do that, let us take the divergence operator in the equation verified by φ , thus

$$\Delta \pi(t, \cdot) = \nabla \cdot ((a \cdot \nabla) \varphi + D \varphi b + c \nabla \psi) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{O} \quad \text{a.e. } t \in (0, T). \quad (111)$$

Now, since the right-hand side of (111) is a H^{-1} term, we can apply the elliptic Carleman inequality given in [29, Theorem 0.1]. Hence, there exist two positive constants $\tilde{\tau} \geq 1$ and $\tilde{\lambda} \geq 1$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathcal{O}} e^{2\tau\eta} |\nabla \pi(t, \cdot)|^2 + \tau^2 \lambda^2 \int_{\mathcal{O}} e^{2\tau\eta} \eta^2 |\pi(t, \cdot)|^2 \\ &\leq C \left(\tau^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{2\tau} \|\pi(t, \cdot)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega)}^2 + \tau \int_{\mathcal{O}} e^{2\tau\eta} \eta |(a \cdot \nabla) \varphi + D \varphi b + c \nabla \psi|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \tau^2 \lambda^2 \int_{\omega'} e^{2\tau\eta} \eta^2 |\pi(t, \cdot)|^2 + \int_{\omega'} e^{2\tau\eta} |\nabla \pi(t, \cdot)|^2 \right) \\ &\leq C \left(\tau (\|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2) \int_{\mathcal{O}} e^{2\tau\eta} \eta |\nabla \varphi(t, \cdot)|^2 + \tau \|c\|_\infty^2 \int_{\mathcal{O}} e^{2\tau\eta} \eta |\nabla \psi(t, \cdot)|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \tau^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{2\tau} \|\pi(t, \cdot)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\mathcal{O})}^2 + \tau^2 \lambda^2 \int_{\omega'} e^{2\tau\eta} \eta^2 |\pi(t, \cdot)|^2 + \int_{\omega'} e^{2\tau\eta} |\nabla \pi(t, \cdot)|^2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

for $\tau \geq \widehat{\tau}$ and $\lambda \geq \widehat{\lambda} e^{\widehat{\lambda} T (\|A\|_P^2 + \|B\|_Q^2)} (1 + \|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2 + \|c\|_\infty^2 + \|B\|_Q^5 + \|A\|_P^5)$. Here, for each $\lambda > 0$, the function η is given by $\eta(x) = e^{\lambda \eta^0(x)}$ where the function η^0 is defined in (67). Let us

now set $\tau = s/(t^4(T-t)^4)$. We multiply the previous inequality by $\exp(-2se^{2\lambda\|\eta^0\|_\infty}/(t^4(T-t)^4))$ and integrate between $t = 0$ and $t = T$. It is not difficult to see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\alpha} |\nabla \pi|^2 + s^2 \lambda^2 \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^2 |\pi|^2 \\ & \leq C \left(s(\|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2) \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi |\nabla \varphi|^2 + s\|c\|_\infty^2 \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi |\nabla \psi|^2 \right. \\ & \quad + s^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^T e^{-2s\alpha^*} (\xi^*)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\pi(t, \cdot)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\mathcal{O})}^2 + s^2 \lambda^2 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega'} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^2 |\pi|^2 \\ & \quad \left. + \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega'} e^{-2s\alpha} |\nabla \pi|^2 \right) \end{aligned} \quad (112)$$

for $\lambda \geq \widehat{\lambda} e^{\widehat{\lambda} T(\|A\|_P^2 + \|B\|_Q^2)} (1 + \|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2 + \|c\|_\infty^2 + \|B\|_Q^5 + \|A\|_P^5)$ and $s \geq \widehat{s} e^{4\lambda\|\eta^0\|_\infty} (T^4 + T^8)$. Combining (112) with (110), we can absorb the first and second terms in the right hand side of (112) to get

$$\begin{aligned} I(s, \lambda; \psi) + I(s, \lambda; \varphi) & \leq C \left(s^3 \lambda^4 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega_0} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |\varphi|^2 + s^3 \lambda^4 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega_0} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |\psi|^2 \right. \\ & \quad + s^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda \int_0^T e^{-2s\alpha^*} (\xi^*)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\pi(t, \cdot)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\mathcal{O})}^2 + s^2 \lambda^3 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega'} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^2 |\pi|^2 \\ & \quad \left. + \lambda \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega'} e^{-2s\alpha} |\nabla \pi|^2 \right) \end{aligned} \quad (113)$$

for $\lambda \geq \widehat{\lambda} e^{\widehat{\lambda} T(\|A\|_P^2 + \|B\|_Q^2)} (1 + \|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2 + \|c\|_\infty^2 + \|B\|_Q^5 + \|A\|_P^5)$ and $s \geq \widehat{s} e^{4\lambda\|\eta^0\|_\infty} (T^4 + T^8)$.

Step 3: Estimate of the trace of the pressure.

We introduce the followings functions:

$$\beta(t) = s^{\frac{1}{4}} e^{-s\alpha^*} (\xi^*)^{\frac{1}{4}}, \quad \tilde{\varphi} = \beta\varphi \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\pi} = \beta\pi,$$

which satisfy

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t \tilde{\varphi} - \Delta \tilde{\varphi} - (a \cdot \nabla) \tilde{\varphi} - D \tilde{\varphi} b + \nabla \tilde{\pi} = \beta c \nabla \psi - \beta_t \varphi & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \nabla \cdot \tilde{\varphi} = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \tilde{\varphi} \cdot \nu = 0, \quad [D(\tilde{\varphi})\nu + A\tilde{\varphi}]_{tan} = 0 & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ \tilde{\varphi}(T, \cdot) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}. \end{cases} \quad (114)$$

Let us regard $\tilde{\varphi}$ as a weak solution to (114). In particular, $\tilde{\varphi}$ satisfies, by well-known energy estimates for the Stokes equation (see the beginning of the proof of [23, Proposition 1.1]), the following:

$$\|\tilde{\varphi}\|_{L^2(H^1)}^2 \leq e^{CT(\|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2 + \|A\|_\infty^2)} \|\beta c \nabla \psi - \beta_t \varphi\|^2.$$

Again from energy estimates, using the fact that $P \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\Lambda_T)^{n \times n}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\pi}\|_{L^2(H^1)}^2 & \leq C e^{CT(\|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2 + \|A\|_P^2)} (1 + \|A\|_P^4) (1 + \|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2) \\ & \quad \times \left(s^{\frac{5}{2}} e^{4\lambda\|\eta^0\|_\infty} T^2 \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\alpha^*} (\xi^*)^3 |\varphi|^2 + \|c\|_\infty^2 s^{\frac{1}{2}} \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\alpha^*} (\xi^*)^{\frac{1}{2}} |\nabla \psi|^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $\|\alpha_t^*\| + \|\xi_t^*\| \leq CT e^{2\lambda\|\eta^0\|_\infty} (\xi^*)^{5/4}$.

Taking $\lambda \geq \widehat{\lambda} e^{\widehat{\lambda} T (\|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2 + \|A\|_P^2 + \|B\|_Q^2)} (1 + \|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2) (1 + \|A\|_P^5 + \|B\|_Q^5) (1 + \|c\|_\infty^2)$ and $s \geq \widehat{s} e^{8\lambda\|\eta^0\|_\infty} (T^4 + T^8)$, from this last estimate and (112), we get:

$$\begin{aligned} & \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\alpha} |\nabla \pi|^2 + s^2 \lambda^2 \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^2 |\pi|^2 \\ & \leq C \left(s(\|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2) \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi |\nabla \varphi|^2 \right. \\ & \quad + s\|c\|_\infty^2 \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi |\nabla \psi|^2 + s^2 \lambda^2 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega'} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^2 |\pi|^2 \\ & \quad \left. + \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega'} e^{-2s\alpha} |\nabla \pi|^2 + s^3 \lambda \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |\varphi|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Combining this and (113) and absorbing the lower order terms, we also get the estimates

$$\begin{aligned} I(s, \lambda; \psi) + I(s, \lambda; \varphi) & \leq C \left(s^3 \lambda^4 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega_0} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |\varphi|^2 \right. \\ & \quad + s^3 \lambda^4 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega_0} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |\psi|^2 \\ & \quad \left. + s^2 \lambda^3 \iint_{\omega' \times (0,T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^2 |\pi|^2 + \lambda \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega'} e^{-2s\alpha} |\nabla \pi|^2 \right) \end{aligned} \quad (115)$$

for $\lambda \geq \widehat{\lambda} e^{\widehat{\lambda} T (\|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2 + \|A\|_P^2 + \|B\|_Q^2)} (1 + \|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2) (1 + \|A\|_P^5 + \|B\|_Q^5) (1 + \|c\|_\infty^2)$ and $s \geq \widehat{s} e^{8\lambda\|\eta^0\|_\infty} (T^4 + T^8)$.

Step 4: Local estimates of the pressure.

We now follow the ideas of [10] to estimate the local terms on the pressure. Indeed, we assume that the pressure π has mean-value zero in ω' :

$$\int_{\omega'} \pi(t, \cdot) = 0 \quad \text{a.e. } t \in (0, T).$$

Then, using that $e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^2 \leq e^{-2s\hat{\alpha}} \hat{\xi}^2$ and the Poincaré-Wirtinger's inequality, we have

$$s^2 \lambda^3 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega'} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^2 |\pi|^2 \leq C s^2 \lambda^3 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega'} e^{-2s\hat{\alpha}} \hat{\xi}^2 |\nabla \pi|^2$$

and

$$\lambda \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega'} e^{-2s\alpha} |\nabla \pi|^2 \leq C s^2 \lambda^3 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega'} e^{-2s\hat{\alpha}} \hat{\xi}^2 |\nabla \pi|^2.$$

Now, using that

$$\nabla \pi = \partial_t \varphi + \Delta \varphi + (a \cdot \nabla) \varphi + D\varphi b + c \nabla \psi,$$

the estimate (115) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
I(s, \lambda; \psi) + I(s, \lambda; \varphi) &\leq C \left(s^3 \lambda^4 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega_0} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |\varphi|^2 + s^3 \lambda^4 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega_0} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |\psi|^2 \right. \\
&\quad + s^2 \lambda^3 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega'} e^{-2s\hat{\alpha}} \hat{\xi}^2 |\varphi_t|^2 + s^2 \lambda^3 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega'} e^{-2s\hat{\alpha}} \hat{\xi}^2 |\Delta \varphi|^2 \\
&\quad + s^2 \lambda^3 (\|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2) \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega'} e^{-2s\hat{\alpha}} \hat{\xi}^2 |\nabla \varphi|^2 \\
&\quad \left. + s^2 \lambda^3 \|c\|_\infty^2 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega'} e^{-2s\hat{\alpha}} \hat{\xi}^2 |\nabla \psi|^2 \right) \tag{116}
\end{aligned}$$

for $\lambda \geq \widehat{\lambda} e^{\widehat{\lambda} T (\|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2 + \|A\|_P^2 + \|B\|_Q^2)} (1 + \|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2) (1 + \|A\|_P^5 + \|B\|_Q^5) (1 + \|c\|_\infty^2)$ and $s \geq \widehat{s} e^{8\lambda \|\eta^0\|_\infty (T^4 + T^8)}$.

Step 5: Local estimate of the term on $\Delta \varphi$.

Now, we present a local estimate of the integral on $\Delta \varphi$ in the right-hand side of (116); this follows the ideas included in [10, Step 4 of the proof of Theorem 1].

Let us introduce an additional open set ω_1 such that $\omega' \subset \subset \omega_1 \subset \subset \omega_0 \subset \subset \omega_c$, $\text{dist}(\partial \omega', \partial \omega^1) \geq \text{dist}(\partial \omega^1, \partial \omega^0)$ and a positive function $\zeta \in \mathcal{D}(\omega_0)$ satisfying $\zeta = 1$ in ω_1 . Let $\hat{\eta}(t) := s \lambda^{\frac{3}{2}} e^{-s\hat{\alpha}(t)} \hat{\xi}(t)$ and

$$\tilde{u}(t, x) := \hat{\eta}(t) \zeta(x) \Delta \varphi(T - t, x) \quad \text{in } (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where $\tilde{u}$ has been extended by zero outside ω_0 .

Applying Laplace operator to (66)₁, we get

$$(\Delta \varphi(T - t, \cdot))_t - \Delta(\Delta \varphi(T - t, \cdot)) = \tilde{f} \quad \text{in } Q, \tag{117}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{f} &:= \Delta((a \cdot \nabla) \varphi)(T - t, \cdot) + \Delta(D\varphi b)(T - t, \cdot) + \Delta(c \nabla \psi)(T - t, \cdot) \\
&\quad - \nabla(\nabla \cdot ((a \cdot \nabla) \varphi)(T - t, \cdot)) - \nabla(\nabla \cdot (D\varphi b)(T - t, \cdot)) - \nabla(\nabla \cdot (c \nabla \psi)(T - t, \cdot)).
\end{aligned}$$

From (117), we deduce that $\tilde{u}$ solves

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \tilde{u} - \Delta \tilde{u} = \tilde{F} & \text{in } (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \tilde{u}(0, \cdot) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases} \tag{118}$$

with

$$\tilde{F} = \hat{\eta} \zeta \tilde{f} + \hat{\eta}' \zeta \Delta \varphi(T - t, \cdot) - 2\hat{\eta} \nabla \zeta \cdot \nabla \Delta \varphi(T - t, \cdot) - \hat{\eta} \Delta \zeta \Delta \varphi(T - t, \cdot).$$

Notice that $\tilde{F} \in L^2(0, T; H^{-2}(\mathbb{R}^n)^n)$ and we a priori know that $\tilde{u} \in L^2((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n)^n$ (from its definition). From (118), we have that $\tilde{u}_t \in L^2(0, T; H^{-2}(\mathbb{R}^n)^n)$, so that $u(0, \cdot)$ makes sense. Now, we rewrite $\tilde{F}$ in a more appropriate way, so that it is given by the sum of two functions: in the first one, we include all the terms with derivatives of second order of $(a \cdot \nabla) \varphi$, $D\varphi b$, $c \nabla \psi$ and φ ; in the second one, we consider all the other terms. Notice that this second function has a support contained in $\omega_0 \setminus \overline{\omega}_1$ (because derivatives of ζ appear everywhere). More precisely, we set $\tilde{F} = \tilde{F}_1 + \tilde{F}_2$, with

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{F}_1 &= \hat{\eta} \Delta(\zeta((a \cdot \nabla) \varphi)(T - t, \cdot)) + \hat{\eta} \Delta(\zeta(D\varphi b)(T - t, \cdot)) + \hat{\eta} \Delta(\zeta(c \nabla \psi)(T - t, \cdot)) \\
&\quad - \hat{\eta} \nabla(\nabla \cdot (\zeta((a \cdot \nabla) \varphi)(T - t, \cdot))) - \hat{\eta} \nabla(\nabla \cdot (\zeta(D\varphi b)(T - t, \cdot))) \\
&\quad - \hat{\eta} \nabla(\nabla \cdot (\zeta(c \nabla \psi)(T - t, \cdot))) + \hat{\eta}' \Delta(\zeta \varphi(T - t, \cdot)),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{F}_2 = & -2\hat{\eta}\nabla\zeta \cdot \nabla((a \cdot \nabla)\varphi)(T-t, \cdot) - \hat{\eta}\Delta\zeta((a \cdot \nabla)\varphi)(T-t, \cdot) - 2\hat{\eta}\nabla\zeta \cdot \nabla(D\varphi b)(T-t, \cdot) \\
& - \hat{\eta}\Delta\zeta(D\varphi b)(T-t, \cdot) - 2\hat{\eta}\nabla\zeta \cdot \nabla(c\nabla\psi)(T-t, \cdot) - \hat{\eta}\Delta\zeta(c\nabla\psi)(T-t, \cdot) \\
& + \hat{\eta}\nabla(\nabla\zeta \cdot ((a \cdot \nabla)\varphi)(T-t, \cdot)) + \hat{\eta}\nabla\zeta(\nabla \cdot ((a \cdot \nabla)\varphi)(T-t, \cdot)) \\
& + \hat{\eta}\nabla(\nabla\zeta \cdot (D\varphi b)(T-t, \cdot)) + \hat{\eta}\nabla\zeta(\nabla \cdot (D\varphi b)(T-t, \cdot)) \\
& + \hat{\eta}\nabla(\nabla\zeta \cdot (c\nabla\psi)(T-t, \cdot)) + \hat{\eta}\nabla\zeta(\nabla \cdot (c\nabla\psi)(T-t, \cdot)) \\
& - 2\hat{\eta}'\nabla\zeta \cdot \nabla\varphi(T-t, \cdot) - \hat{\eta}'\Delta\zeta\varphi(T-t, \cdot) - 2\hat{\eta}\nabla\zeta \cdot \nabla\Delta\varphi(T-t, \cdot) - \hat{\eta}\Delta\zeta\Delta\varphi(T-t, \cdot).
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that $\tilde{F}, \tilde{F}_1 \in L^2(0, T; H^{-2}(\mathbb{R}^n)^n)$, while $\tilde{F}_2 \in L^2(0, T; H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)^n)$.

Next, we introduce two functions $\tilde{u}^1$ and $\tilde{u}^2$ in $L^2((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n)^n$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \tilde{u}^i - \Delta \tilde{u}^i = \tilde{F}_i & \text{in } (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \tilde{u}^i(0, \cdot) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases} \quad (119)$$

for $i = 1, 2$. It is clear that $\tilde{u} = \tilde{u}^1 + \tilde{u}^2$ then

$$\iint_{(0, T) \times \omega'} |\tilde{u}|^2 \leq 2 \left(\iint_{(0, T) \times \omega'} |\tilde{u}^1|^2 + \iint_{(0, T) \times \omega'} |\tilde{u}^2|^2 \right).$$

Step 5.a: Estimates of $\tilde{u}^1$.

We see $\tilde{u}^1$ as the transposition solution of the Cauchy problem for the heat equation (119) for $i = 1$. This means that $\tilde{u}^1$ is the unique function in $L^2((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n)^n$ that, for each $h \in L^2((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n)^n$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\iint_{(0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n} \tilde{u}^1 \cdot h &= \iint_{(0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n} (\hat{\eta}\zeta((a \cdot \nabla)\varphi + D\varphi b + c\nabla\psi)(T-t, \cdot)) \cdot \Delta z \\
&- \iint_{(0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n} \hat{\eta}\zeta((a \cdot \nabla)\varphi + D\varphi b + c\nabla\psi)(T-t, \cdot) \cdot \nabla(\nabla \cdot z) \\
&+ \iint_{(0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n} \hat{\eta}'\zeta\varphi(T-t, \cdot) \cdot \Delta z,
\end{aligned}$$

where z is the solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t z - \Delta z = h & \text{in } (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ z(T, \cdot) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases} \quad (120)$$

Remark that, for every $h \in L^2((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n)^n$, equation (120) possesses exactly one solution $z \in L^2(0, T; H^2(\mathbb{R}^n)^n)$ that depends continuously on h . Therefore, $\tilde{u}^1$ is well defined and

$$\|\tilde{u}^1\|_{L^2((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n)^n} \leq C \|\tilde{F}_1\|_{L^2(0, T; H^{-2}(\mathbb{R}^n)^n)}. \quad (121)$$

Furthermore, it is not difficult to show that $\tilde{u}^1 \in C^0([0, T]; H^{-2}(\mathbb{R}^n)^n)$ and solves (119) for $i = 1$ in the distributional sense. Moreover, from (121) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\iint_{(0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n} |\tilde{u}^1|^2 &\leq C \left(\iint_{(0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n} |\hat{\eta}\zeta(a \cdot \nabla)\varphi|^2 + \iint_{(0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n} |\hat{\eta}\zeta D\varphi b|^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \iint_{(0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n} |\hat{\eta}\zeta c\nabla\psi|^2 + \iint_{(0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n} |\hat{\eta}'\zeta\varphi|^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Here, we have used the fact that $\hat{\eta}(T-t, \cdot) = \hat{\eta}(t, \cdot) \quad \forall t \in (0, T)$. Thanks to the properties of ζ , we finally get

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega'} |\tilde{u}^1|^2 &\leq \iint_{(0,T) \times \mathbb{R}^n} |\tilde{u}^1|^2 \\ &\leq C \left(\iint_{(0,T) \times \omega_0} |\hat{\eta}(a \cdot \nabla) \varphi|^2 + \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega_0} |\hat{\eta} D \varphi b|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega_0} |\hat{\eta} c \nabla \psi|^2 + \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega_0} |\hat{\eta}' \varphi|^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (122)$$

Step 5.b: Estimates of $\tilde{u}^2$.

Now, we deal with the Cauchy problem (119) for $i = 2$, where the right-hand side is in $L^2(0, T; H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)^n)$. The existence and uniqueness of a solution $\tilde{u}^2 \in L^2(0, T; H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)^n)$ is classical. Recall that $\tilde{F}_2(t, \cdot)$ has support in $\omega_0 \setminus \bar{\omega}_1$ for almost every t , while we would like to estimate the L^2 -norm of the solution in ω' and ω' is disjoint of $\omega_0 \setminus \bar{\omega}_1$. We will start by writing $\tilde{u}^2$ in terms of the fundamental solution $G = G(t, x)$ of the heat equation. To do this, we first notice that $\tilde{F}_2$ can be written in the form

$$\tilde{F}_2 = \tilde{F}_{21} + \nabla \cdot \tilde{F}_{22},$$

where $\tilde{F}_{21}$ and $\tilde{F}_{22}$ are L^2 functions supported in $[0, T] \times (\omega_0 \setminus \bar{\omega}_1)$ which can be written as sums of derivatives up to the second order of products $\hat{\eta} D^\beta \zeta \varphi$, $\hat{\eta} D^\beta \zeta (a \cdot \nabla) \varphi$, $\hat{\eta} D^\beta \zeta D \varphi b$, $\hat{\eta} D^\beta \zeta c \nabla \psi$ and $\hat{\eta}' D^\beta \zeta \varphi$ with $1 \leq |\beta| \leq 4$. Thus, we have:

$$\tilde{u}^2(t, x) = \int_0^t \int_{\omega_0 \setminus \bar{\omega}_1} G(t-s, x-y) \tilde{F}_{21}(s, y) dy ds - \int_0^t \int_{\omega_0 \setminus \bar{\omega}_1} \nabla_y G(t-s, x-y) \cdot \tilde{F}_{22}(s, y) dy ds, \quad (123)$$

for all $(t, x) \in (0, T) \times \omega'$, where G is the fundamental solution for the heat operator given by

$$G(t, x) = \frac{e^{-|x|^2/2t}}{(4\pi t)^{n/2}} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad \forall t > 0.$$

Notice that the above formula makes sense because the integration is over a region far from the singularity of G , i.e. for any $y \in \omega_0 \setminus \bar{\omega}_1$ and any $x \in \omega'$, one has $|x-y| \geq \text{dist}(\partial\omega_1, \partial\omega_0) > 0$. Integrating by parts with respect to y in (123) and passing all the derivatives from $\tilde{F}_{21}$ and $\tilde{F}_{22}$ to G and $\nabla_y G$, we obtain an expression for $\tilde{u}^2$ of the form

$$\tilde{u}^2(t, x) = \iint_{(0,t) \times (\omega_0 \setminus \bar{\omega}_1)} \sum_{\alpha \in I, \beta \in J} D_y^\alpha G(t-s, x-y) D_y^\beta \zeta(y) z_{\alpha, \beta}(s, y) dy ds,$$

where all $\alpha \in I$ satisfy $|\alpha| \leq 3$, all $\beta \in J$ satisfy $1 \leq |\beta| \leq 4$ and

$$\begin{aligned} z_{\alpha, \beta}(s, y) &= \hat{\eta}(s) (C_{\alpha, \beta} \varphi(s, y) + D_{\alpha, \beta}((a \cdot \nabla) \varphi)(s, y) + E_{\alpha, \beta}(D \varphi b)(s, y) + F_{\alpha, \beta}(c \nabla \psi)(s, y)) \\ &\quad + L_{\alpha, \beta} \hat{\eta}'(s) \varphi(s, y), \end{aligned}$$

with $C_{\alpha, \beta}$, $D_{\alpha, \beta}$, $E_{\alpha, \beta}$, $F_{\alpha, \beta}$, $L_{\alpha, \beta} \in \mathbb{R}$. The expression for $\tilde{u}^2$ yields

$$|\tilde{u}^2(t, x)| \leq \iint_{(0,t) \times (\omega_0 \setminus \bar{\omega}_1)} \sum_{\alpha \in I} |D_y^\alpha G(t-s, x-y)| |z(s, y)| dy ds$$

for all $(t, x) \in (0, T) \times \omega'$, where

$$z(s, y) = \hat{\eta}(s) (C_1 \varphi(s, y) + C_2((a \cdot \nabla) \varphi)(s, y) + C_3(D \varphi b)(s, y) + C_4(c \nabla \psi)(s, y)) + C_5 \hat{\eta}'(s) \varphi(s, y).$$

Now, for every $0 < \delta < \text{dist}(\partial\omega_1, \partial\omega_0)$ there exists a positive constant $C(\delta, \omega_c)$ such that

$$|D^\alpha G(t-s, x-y)| \leq C \exp\left(\frac{-\delta^2}{2(t-s)}\right), \forall \alpha \in I, (t, x) \in (0, T) \times \omega', \forall (s, y) \in (0, t) \times (\omega_0 \setminus \overline{\omega_1}).$$

Thus, we have that

$$|\tilde{u}^2(t, x)| \leq C \iint_{(0, t) \times (\omega_0 \setminus \overline{\omega_1})} \exp\left(\frac{-\delta^2}{2(t-s)}\right) |z(s, y)| dy ds.$$

Next, we integrate this last estimate in $(0, T) \times \omega'$ and use Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{(0, T) \times \omega'} |\tilde{u}^2(t, x)|^2 &\leq C \int_0^T \left(\int_0^t \int_{\omega_0 \setminus \overline{\omega_1}} \exp\left(\frac{-\delta^2}{2(t-s)}\right) |z(s, y)| dy ds \right)^2 dt \\ &\leq CT \int_0^T \left(\int_0^t \exp\left(\frac{-\delta^2}{2(t-s)}\right) \|z(s)\|_{L^2(\omega_0)}^2 ds \right) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, observe that we can write the last term of the previous estimate as a convolution, i.e.

$$\int_0^T \left(\int_0^t \exp\left(\frac{-\delta^2}{2(t-s)}\right) \|z(s, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\omega_0)}^2 ds \right) dt = \int_0^T (f_1 * f_2)(t) dt,$$

where

$$f_1(t) := e^{-\delta^2/2t} 1_{[0, T]}(t) \quad \text{and} \quad f_2(t) := \|z(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\omega_0)}^2 1_{[0, T]}(t),$$

that is, $f_1, f_2 \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$. From Young's inequality, we obtain

$$\iint_{(0, T) \times \omega'} |\tilde{u}^2(t, x)|^2 \leq CT^2 \iint_{(0, T) \times \omega_0} |z(t, x)|^2$$

and the definition of z gives

$$\iint_{(0, T) \times \omega'} |\tilde{u}^2(t, x)|^2 \leq CT^2 \left(\iint_{(0, T) \times \omega_0} |\hat{\eta}' \varphi|^2 + |\hat{\eta}|^2 (|\varphi|^2 + |(a \cdot \nabla) \varphi|^2 + |D\varphi b|^2 + |c \nabla \psi|^2) \right).$$

Hence, from (122), and the previous estimates of $\tilde{u}^1$ and $\tilde{u}^2$, we deduce the following

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{(0, T) \times \omega'} |\hat{\eta}|^2 |\Delta \varphi|^2 &\leq C(1+T^2) \left(\iint_{(0, T) \times \omega_0} |\hat{\eta}' \varphi|^2 + |\hat{\eta}|^2 (|\varphi|^2 + |(a \cdot \nabla) \varphi|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |D\varphi b|^2 + |c \nabla \psi|^2) \right) \\ &\leq C(1+T^2) \left(s^{9/2} \lambda^4 \iint_{(0, T) \times \omega_0} e^{-2s\hat{\alpha}} \hat{\xi}^{9/2} |\varphi|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + s^2 \lambda^3 (\|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2) \iint_{(0, T) \times \omega_0} e^{-2s\hat{\alpha}} \hat{\xi}^2 |\nabla \varphi|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + s^2 \lambda^3 \|c\|_\infty^2 \iint_{(0, T) \times \omega_0} e^{-2s\hat{\alpha}} \hat{\xi}^2 |\nabla \psi|^2 \right) \\ &\leq C(1+T^2) \left(s^{9/2} \lambda^4 \iint_{(0, T) \times \omega_0} e^{-2s\hat{\alpha}} \hat{\xi}^{9/2} |\varphi|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + s^2 \lambda^4 \iint_{(0, T) \times \omega_0} e^{-2s\hat{\alpha}} \hat{\xi}^2 (|\nabla \varphi|^2 + |\nabla \psi|^2) \right), \end{aligned} \tag{124}$$

for $\lambda \geq \widehat{\lambda} e^{\widehat{\lambda} T (\|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2 + \|A\|_P^2 + \|B\|_Q^2)} (1 + \|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2) (1 + \|A\|_P^5 + \|B\|_Q^5) (1 + \|c\|_\infty^2)$ and $s \geq \widehat{s} e^{8\lambda \|\eta^0\|_\infty} (T^4 + T^8)$.

Step 6: Local estimate of φ_t .

In this step, we estimate the local term on φ_t in (116). First, integration by parts gives

$$\begin{aligned} s^2 \lambda^3 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega'} e^{-2s\hat{\alpha}\hat{\xi}^2} |\varphi_t|^2 &= \frac{1}{2} s^2 \lambda^3 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega'} \left(e^{-2s\hat{\alpha}\hat{\xi}^2} \right)_{tt} |\varphi|^2 \\ &\quad - s^2 \lambda^3 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega'} e^{-2s\hat{\alpha}\hat{\xi}^2} \varphi \cdot \varphi_{tt}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, since there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\left| \left(e^{-2s\hat{\alpha}\hat{\xi}^2} \right)_{tt} \right| \leq C s^2 T^2 e^{-2s\hat{\alpha}\hat{\xi}^2} \quad \text{and} \quad e^{-2s\hat{\alpha}\hat{\xi}^2} \leq C e^{-4s\hat{\alpha} + 2s\alpha^*}$$

we have that

$$\begin{aligned} s^2 \lambda^3 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega'} e^{-2s\hat{\alpha}\hat{\xi}^2} |\varphi_t|^2 &\leq C s^{15/2} \lambda^8 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega'} e^{-4s\hat{\alpha} + 2s\alpha^*} \hat{\xi}^{15/2} |\varphi|^2 \\ &\quad + \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega'} |\eta^*|^2 |\varphi_{tt}|^2, \end{aligned} \tag{125}$$

with

$$\eta^* := s^{-7/4} \lambda^{-1} e^{-s\alpha^*} \hat{\xi}^{-7/4}.$$

In what follows, we estimate the second term in the right-hand side of (125). To do this, we set $(y, q, \phi) := (\eta^* \varphi_t, \eta^* \pi_t, \eta^* \psi_t)$, and note that (y, q, ϕ) solves

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t y - \Delta y - (a \cdot \nabla) y - D y b + \nabla q = c \nabla \phi + G_1 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ -\partial_t \phi - \Delta \phi - (a + b) \cdot \nabla \phi = y \cdot e_n + G_2 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \nabla \cdot y = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ y \cdot \nu = 0, \quad [D(y)\nu + A y]_{tan} = -\eta^* A_t \varphi & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \nu} + B \phi = -\eta^* B_t \psi & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ y(T, \cdot) = 0, \quad \phi(T, \cdot) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \end{cases} \tag{126}$$

where

$$G_1 = -\eta_t^* \varphi_t + \eta^* (a_t \cdot \nabla) \varphi + \eta^* D \varphi b_t + \eta^* c_t \nabla \psi$$

and

$$G_2 = -\eta_t^* \psi_t + \eta^* (a + b)_t \cdot \nabla \psi.$$

To see that (y, q, ϕ) solves (126), one can take a sequence of regular functions (a^k, b^k, c^k) such that

$$(a^k, b^k, c^k) \longrightarrow (a, b, c) \quad \text{weakly star in } L^\infty(0, T; L^\infty(\mathcal{O})^n)$$

and

$$(a_t^k, b_t^k, c_t^k) \longrightarrow (a_t, b_t, c_t) \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathcal{O})^n).$$

Since there exists a unique solution (y^k, q^k, ϕ^k) to (126) with (a, b, c) replaced by (a^k, b^k, c^k) , one can take limits and conclude that (y, q, ϕ) solves (126).

Next, using the fact that $\varphi \in L^2(0, T; H^1(\mathcal{O})^n) \cap H^1(0, T; H^{-1}(\mathcal{O})^n)$, $\psi \in L^2(0, T; H^1(\mathcal{O})) \cap H^1(0, T; H^{-1}(\mathcal{O}))$ and the hypothesis on a , b , c , A and B , we see that $G_1 \in L^2(0, T; H^{-1}(\mathcal{O})^n)$, $G_2 \in L^2(0, T; H^{-1}(\mathcal{O}))$, $\eta^* A_t \varphi \in L^2(0, T; H^{-1/2}(\partial\mathcal{O})^n)$ and $\eta^* B_t \psi \in L^2(0, T; H^{-1/2}(\partial\mathcal{O}))$. Moreover, the following estimate holds

$$\begin{aligned} & \|y\|_{L^2(H^1)}^2 + \|\phi\|_{L^2(H^1)}^2 \\ & \leq C e^{CT(\|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2 + \|c\|_\infty^2 + \|A\|_\infty^2)} \left(\|(G_1, G_2)\|_{L^2(H^{-1})}^2 + \|\eta^*(A_t \varphi, B_t \psi)\|_{L^2(H^{-1/2})}^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (127)$$

Notice that this is still not enough to absorb the local term on φ_{tt} in (125). Thus, we must show that y is actually a strong solution of (126)_{1,3,4,6}, which will be true if we prove that $G_1 \in L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)^n$ and $\eta^* A_t \varphi \in H^{(1-l)/2}(0, T; H^{(l-1/2)}(\partial\mathcal{O})^n) \cap L^2(0, T; H^{1/2}(\partial\mathcal{O})^n)$.

To see that $G_1 \in L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)^n$, we must verify that $\eta^*(a_t \cdot \nabla)\varphi$, $\eta^* D\varphi b_t$ and $\eta^* c_t \nabla \psi$ belong to $L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)^n$. In fact, since $y \in L^2(0, T; H^1(\mathcal{O})^n)$, we have that $\eta^* \nabla \varphi \in H^1(0, T; L^2(\mathcal{O})^{n \times n})$ and, using that $\eta^* \nabla \varphi \in L^2(0, T; H^1(\mathcal{O})^{n \times n})$ and [2, Theorem II.5.14], we conclude that

$$\eta^* \nabla \varphi \in C^0([0, T]; H^{1/2}(\mathcal{O})^{n \times n}).$$

Analogously, we have that

$$\eta^* \nabla \psi \in C^0([0, T]; H^{1/2}(\mathcal{O})^n).$$

Hence, from the assumptions on a_t , b_t and c_t , we readily see that $\eta^*(a_t \cdot \nabla)\varphi \in L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)^n$, $\eta^* D\varphi b_t \in L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)^n$ and $\eta^* c_t \nabla \psi \in L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)^n$. Moreover, the following estimate holds

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\eta^*(a_t \cdot \nabla)\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)^n}^2 + \|\eta^* D\varphi b_t\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)^n}^2 + \|\eta^* c_t \nabla \psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)^n}^2 \\ & \leq C \left(\|a_t\|_{L^2(L^r)}^2 + \|b_t\|_{L^2(L^r)}^2 + \|c_t\|_{L^2(L^r)}^2 \right) \\ & \quad \times \left(\|\eta^* \varphi\|_{L^2(H^2)}^2 + \|\eta_t^* \varphi\|_{L^2(H^1)}^2 + \|y\|_{L^2(H^1)}^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|\eta^* \psi\|_{L^2(H^2)}^2 + \|\eta_t^* \psi\|_{L^2(H^1)}^2 + \|\phi\|_{L^2(H^1)}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Let us now prove that $\eta^* A_t \varphi \in H^{(1-l)/2}(0, T; H^{(l-1/2)}(\partial\mathcal{O})^n) \cap L^2(0, T; H^{1/2}(\partial\mathcal{O})^n)$. Indeed, from estimate (127) we see that $\eta^* \varphi \in H^1(0, T; H^{1/2}(\partial\mathcal{O})^n)$ and, together with assumption (64) on A , we obtain

$$\eta^* A_t \varphi \in H^{(1-l)/2}(0, T; H^{\vartheta_2}(\partial\mathcal{O})^n) \subset H^{(1-l)/2}(0, T; H^{l-1/2}(\partial\mathcal{O})^n),$$

with the following estimate

$$\|\eta^*(\partial_t A)\varphi\|_{H^{(1-l)/2}(H^{l-1/2})}^2 \leq C \|A\|_{H^{(3-l)/2}(H^{\vartheta_2})}^2 \left(\|\eta_t^* \varphi\|_{L^2(H^1)}^2 + \|y\|_{L^2(H^1)}^2 + \|\eta^* \varphi\|_{L^2(H^1)}^2 \right).$$

Also, since $\eta^* \varphi \in L^2(0, T; H^2(\mathcal{O})^n) \cap H^1(0, T; H^1(\mathcal{O})^n)$, we have that $\eta^* \varphi \in H^{1/4}(0, T; H^{5/4}(\partial\mathcal{O})^n)$, which gives $\eta^* A_t \varphi \in L^2(0, T; H^{1/2}(\partial\mathcal{O})^n)$, because $A_t \in H^{(1-l)/2}(0, T; H^{\vartheta_2}(\partial\mathcal{O}^{n \times n}))$. Moreover,

$$\|\eta^* A_t \varphi\|_{L^2(H^{1/2})}^2 \leq C \|A\|_{H^{(3-l)/2}(H^{\vartheta_2})}^2 \left(\|\eta_t^* \varphi\|_{L^2(H^2)}^2 + \|\eta_t^* \varphi\|_{L^2(H^1)}^2 + \|y\|_{L^2(H^1)}^2 \right).$$

Thus, we have proved that y is a strong solution of (126)_{1,3,4,6}. Recalling [23, Proposition 1.1],

we deduce in particular that $y_t \in L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \|y_t\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)}^2 &\leq C e^{CT\|A\|_P^2} (1 + \|A\|_P^4) \left(\|G_1\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)^n}^2 + \|(a \cdot \nabla)y\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)^n}^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|Dyb\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)^n}^2 + \|c\nabla\phi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)^n}^2 + \|\eta^* A_t \varphi\|_{L^2(H^{1/2})}^2 + \|\eta^* A_t \varphi\|_{H^{(1-l)/2}(H^{l-1/2})}^2 \right) \\ &\leq C e^{CT\|A\|_P^2} (1 + \|A\|_P^4) (1 + \|A\|_P^2) \left[\left(1 + \|a_t\|_{L^2(L^r)}^2 + \|b_t\|_{L^2(L^r)}^2 + \|c_t\|_{L^2(L^r)}^2 \right) \right. \\ &\quad \times \left(\|\eta_t^* \varphi_t\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)^n}^2 + \|\eta^* \varphi\|_{L^2(H^2)}^2 + \|\eta_t^* \varphi\|_{L^2(H^1)}^2 + \|y\|_{L^2(H^1)}^2 + \|\eta^* \psi\|_{L^2(H^2)}^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|\eta_t^* \psi\|_{L^2(H^1)}^2 + \|\phi\|_{L^2(H^1)}^2 \right) + (\|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2 + \|c\|_\infty^2) \left(\|y\|_{L^2(H^1)}^2 + \|\phi\|_{L^2(H^1)}^2 \right) \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\|\eta^* \varphi\|_{L^2(H^2)}^2 + \|\eta_t^* \varphi\|_{L^2(H^1)}^2 + \|y\|_{L^2(H^1)}^2 \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Taking now $\lambda \geq \widehat{\lambda} e^{\widehat{\lambda} T (\|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2 + \|A\|_P^2 + \|B\|_Q^2)} (1 + \|A\|_P^2) (1 + \|A\|_P^5 + \|B\|_Q^5) (1 + \|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2 + \|c\|_\infty^2 + \|a_t\|_{L^2(L^r)}^2 + \|b_t\|_{L^2(L^r)}^2 + \|c_t\|_{L^2(L^r)}^2) (1 + \|c\|_\infty^2)$ and $s \geq \widehat{s} e^{8\lambda\|\eta^0\|^\infty} (T^4 + T^8)$, from (127) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\eta^* \varphi_{tt}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)}^2 &\leq C \lambda^2 \left(\|\eta_t^* \varphi_t\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)^n}^2 + \|\eta_t^* \psi_t\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)}^2 + \|\eta^* \varphi\|_{L^2(H^2)}^2 + \|\eta_t^* \varphi\|_{L^2(H^1)}^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|\eta^* \psi\|_{L^2(H^2)}^2 + \|\eta_t^* \psi\|_{L^2(H^1)}^2 + \|y\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)}^2 + \|\phi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $|\eta_t^*| \leq \varepsilon \lambda^{-1} s^{-1/2} \widehat{\xi}^{-1/2} e^{-s\alpha^*}$, for ε sufficiently small, the following is found:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\eta^* \varphi_{tt}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)}^2 &\leq C \varepsilon \left(s^{-1} \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\alpha^*} \widehat{\xi}^{-1} (|\varphi_t|^2 + |\psi_t|^2) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + s^{-1} \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\alpha^*} \widehat{\xi}^{-1} (|\nabla\varphi|^2 + |\nabla\psi|^2) \right) \\ &\quad + C \lambda^2 \left(\|\eta^* \varphi\|_{L^2(H^2)}^2 + \|\eta^* \psi\|_{L^2(H^2)}^2 \right). \end{aligned} \tag{128}$$

We need to estimate the terms $\|\eta^* \varphi\|_{L^2(H^2)}^2$ and $\|\eta^* \psi\|_{L^2(H^2)}^2$. Thus, let us set $(\hat{\varphi}, \hat{\pi}, \hat{\psi}) := \eta^*(\varphi, \pi, \psi)$. One has:

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t \hat{\varphi} - \Delta \hat{\varphi} - (a \cdot \nabla) \hat{\varphi} - D \hat{\varphi} b + \nabla \hat{\pi} = \eta^* c \nabla \psi - \eta_t^* \varphi & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ -\partial_t \hat{\psi} - \Delta \hat{\psi} - (a + b) \cdot \nabla \hat{\psi} = \eta^* \varphi \cdot e_n - \eta_t^* \psi & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \nabla \cdot \hat{\varphi} = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T, \\ \hat{\varphi} \cdot \nu = 0, \quad [D(\hat{\varphi})\nu + A\hat{\varphi}]_{tan} = 0 & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ \frac{\partial \hat{\psi}}{\partial \nu} + B\hat{\psi} = 0 & \text{on } \Lambda_T, \\ \hat{\varphi}(T, \cdot) = 0, \quad \hat{\psi}(T, \cdot) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}. \end{cases}$$

Again, from energy estimates [23, Proposition 1.1], we find that

$$\|\hat{\varphi}\|_{L^2(H^2)}^2 \leq C e^{CT(\|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2 + \|A\|_P^2)} (1 + \|A\|_P^4) (1 + \|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2) (\|\eta_t^* \varphi\|^2 + \|c\|_\infty^2 \|\eta^* \nabla \psi\|^2),$$

and, from maximal L^2 -regularity estimates for the heat equation with homogeneous Robin boundary conditions (similar arguments as in [14, Proposition 2]), we deduce that

$$\|\hat{\psi}\|_{L^2(H^2)}^2 \leq C e^{CT(\|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2 + \|B\|_Q^2)} (1 + \|B\|_Q^4) (1 + \|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2) (\|\eta^* \varphi\|^2 + \|\eta_t^* \psi\|^2).$$

Adding the last two inequalities, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\varphi}\|_{L^2(H^2)}^2 + \|\hat{\psi}\|_{L^2(H^2)}^2 &\leq \lambda (\|\eta_t^* \varphi\|^2 + \|\eta_t^* \psi\|^2 + \|\eta^* \nabla \psi\|^2 + \|\eta^* \varphi\|^2) \\ &\leq \lambda \left(\varepsilon s^{-1} \lambda^{-2} \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\alpha^*} \hat{\xi}^{-1} (|\varphi|^2 + |\psi|^2) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + s^{-7/2} \lambda^{-2} \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\alpha^*} \hat{\xi}^{-7/2} |\nabla \psi|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

From this last estimate, (128) and (125), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} s^2 \lambda^3 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega'} e^{-2s\hat{\alpha}} \hat{\xi}^2 |\varphi_t|^2 &\leq C s^{15/2} \lambda^8 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega'} e^{-4s\hat{\alpha} + 2s\alpha^*} \hat{\xi}^{15/2} |\varphi|^2 \\ &\quad + \varepsilon I(s, \lambda; \varphi) + \varepsilon I(s, \lambda; \psi), \end{aligned} \quad (129)$$

for $\lambda \geq \widehat{\lambda} e^{\widehat{\lambda} T (\|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2 + \|A\|_P^2 + \|B\|_Q^2)} (1 + \|A\|_P^2) (1 + \|A\|_P^5) (1 + \|B\|_Q^5) (1 + \|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2 + \|c\|_\infty^2 + \|a_t\|_{L^2(L^r)}^2 + \|b_t\|_{L^2(L^r)}^2 + \|c_t\|_{L^2(L^r)}^2 + \|B\|_\infty^2) (1 + \|c\|_\infty^2)$ and $s \geq \widehat{s} e^{8\lambda \|\eta^0\|_\infty} (T^4 + T^8)$.

Step 7: Arrangements.

Combining (116), (124) and (129), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} I(s, \lambda; \psi) + I(s, \lambda; \varphi) &\leq C(1 + T^2) \left(s^{15/2} \lambda^8 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega_0} e^{-4s\hat{\alpha} + 2s\alpha^*} \hat{\xi}^{15/2} |\varphi|^2 \right. \\ &\quad + s^3 \lambda^4 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega_0} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |\psi|^2 \\ &\quad \left. + s^2 \lambda^4 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega_0} e^{-2s\hat{\alpha}} \hat{\xi}^2 (|\nabla \varphi|^2 + |\nabla \psi|^2) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (130)$$

for $\lambda \geq \widehat{\lambda} e^{\widehat{\lambda} T (\|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2 + \|A\|_P^2 + \|B\|_Q^2)} (1 + \|A\|_P^2) (1 + \|A\|_P^5) (1 + \|B\|_Q^5) (1 + \|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2 + \|c\|_\infty^2 + \|a_t\|_{L^2(L^r)}^2 + \|b_t\|_{L^2(L^r)}^2 + \|c_t\|_{L^2(L^r)}^2 + \|B\|_\infty^2) (1 + \|c\|_\infty^2)$ and $s \geq \widehat{s} e^{8\lambda \|\eta^0\|_\infty} (T^4 + T^8)$.

Step 8: Estimates of the local gradient terms.

Let us consider a cut-off function $\rho \in C^1(\overline{\omega}_c)$ with $\rho = 1$ in ω_0 , $\text{supp } \rho \subset \subset \omega_c$. Then,

$$s^2 \lambda^4 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega_0} e^{-2s\hat{\alpha}} \hat{\xi}^2 |\nabla \varphi|^2 \leq s^2 \lambda^4 \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\hat{\alpha}} \hat{\xi}^2 \rho |\nabla \varphi|^2.$$

After integration by parts, thanks to Hölder and Young inequalities, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} s^2 \lambda^4 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega_0} e^{-2s\hat{\alpha}} \hat{\xi}^2 |\nabla \varphi|^2 &\leq \varepsilon s^{-1} \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\alpha^*} \hat{\xi}^{-1} (|\Delta \varphi|^2 + |\nabla \varphi|^2) \\ &\quad + C s^5 \lambda^8 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega_c} e^{-4s\hat{\alpha} + 2s\alpha^*} \hat{\xi}^5 |\varphi|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where ε is a small enough constant.

Similar computations yield

$$\begin{aligned} s^2 \lambda^4 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega_0} e^{-2s\hat{\alpha}} \hat{\xi}^2 |\nabla \psi|^2 &\leq \varepsilon s^{-1} \iint_{\mathcal{O}_T} e^{-2s\alpha^*} \hat{\xi}^{-1} (|\Delta \psi|^2 + |\nabla \psi|^2) \\ &\quad + C s^5 \lambda^8 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega_c} e^{-4s\hat{\alpha} + 2s\alpha^*} \hat{\xi}^5 |\psi|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then, using (130), and these inequalities, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
I(s, \lambda; \psi) + I(s, \lambda; \varphi) &\leq C(1 + T^2) \left(s^{15/2} \lambda^8 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega_c} e^{-4s\hat{\alpha} + 2s\alpha^*} \hat{\xi}^{15/2} |\varphi|^2 \right. \\
&\quad + s^5 \lambda^8 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega_c} e^{-4s\hat{\alpha} + 2s\alpha^*} \hat{\xi}^5 |\varphi|^2 \\
&\quad + s^3 \lambda^4 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega_c} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |\psi|^2 \\
&\quad \left. + s^5 \lambda^8 \iint_{(0,T) \times \omega_c} e^{-4s\hat{\alpha} + 2s\alpha^*} \hat{\xi}^5 |\psi|^2 \right) \\
&\quad + \varepsilon I(s, \lambda; \varphi) + \varepsilon I(s, \lambda; \psi),
\end{aligned}$$

for $\lambda \geq \widehat{\lambda} e^{\widehat{\lambda} T (\|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2 + \|A\|_P^2 + \|B\|_Q^2)} (1 + \|A\|_P^2) (1 + \|A\|_P^5) (1 + \|B\|_Q^5) (1 + \|a\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2 + \|c\|_\infty^2 + \|a_t\|_{L^2(L^r)}^2 + \|b_t\|_{L^2(L^r)}^2 + \|c_t\|_{L^2(L^r)}^2 + \|B\|_\infty^2) (1 + \|c\|_\infty^2)$ and $s \geq \widehat{s} e^{8\lambda \|\eta^0\|_\infty} (T^4 + T^8)$. Finally, we easily obtain the desired Carleman estimate (69) by taking ε sufficiently small.

This concludes the proof.

References

- [1] C. AMROUCHE AND A. REJAIBA, *L^p-theory for Stokes and Navier-Stokes equations with Navier boundary condition*. J. Differential Equations, **256** (2014), no. 4, 1515–1547.
- [2] F. BOYER, P. FABRIE, *Mathematical Tools for the Study of the Incompressible Navier-Stokes Equations and Related Models*. Applied Mathematical Sciences 183. New York: Springer. (2013) pp. 102-106. ISBN 978-1-4614-5975-0.
- [3] N. CARREÑO, *Local controllability of the N-dimensional Boussinesq system with N-1 scalar controls in an arbitrary control domain*, Mathematical Control and Related Fields **2** (2012), no. 4, 361–382.
- [4] T. CLOPEAU, A. MIKELIĆ, R. ROBERT, *On the vanishing viscosity limit for the 2D incompressible Navier-Stokes equations with the friction type boundary conditions*, Nonlinearity **11** (1998), no. 6, 1625–1636.
- [5] J. -M CORON, *Global asymptotic stabilization for controllable systems without drift*, Math. Control Signals Systems (1992), 295–312.
- [6] J. -M CORON, *Contrôlabilité exacte frontière de l'équation d'Euler des fluides parfaits incompressibles bidimensionnels*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math., 317 (1993), pp. 271–276.
- [7] J. -M CORON, *On the controllability of 2-D incompressible perfect fluids*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9), 75 (1996), pp. 155–188.
- [8] J. -M CORON, *On the controllability of the 2-D incompressible Navier-Stokes equations with the Navier slip boundary conditions*, ESAIM: COCV **1** (1996), 35–75.
- [9] J. -M CORON, F. MARBACH, F. SUEUR, *Small-time global exact controllability of the Navier-Stokes equation with Navier slip-friction boundary conditions*. J. European Mathematical Society, Electronically published on February 11, 2020. doi: 10.4171/JEMS/952.

- [10] E. FERNÁNDEZ-CARA, S. GUERRERO, O.Y. IMANUVILOV, J.-P. PUEL, *Local exact controllability of the Navier-Stokes system*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **83** (2004), 1501–1542.
- [11] E. FERNÁNDEZ-CARA, S. GUERRERO, O.Y. IMANUVILOV, J.-P. PUEL, *On the controllability of N -dimensional Navier-Stokes and Boussinesq systems with $N-1$ scalar controls*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Serie I t. **340** (2005), no. 4, 275–280.
- [12] E. FERNÁNDEZ-CARA, S. GUERRERO, O.Y. IMANUVILOV, J.-P. PUEL, *Some controllability results for the N -dimensional Navier-Stokes and Boussinesq systems with $N-1$ scalar controls*, SIAM J. Control Optimiz. **45** (2006), no. 1, 146–173.
- [13] E. FERNÁNDEZ-CARA, M. GONZÁLEZ-BURGOS, S. GUERRERO, J.-P. PUEL, *Null controllability of the heat equation with boundary Fourier conditions: the linear case*, ESAIM Control, Optimization and Calculus of Variations, **12** (3)(2006), 442–465.
- [14] E. FERNÁNDEZ-CARA, M. GONZÁLEZ-BURGOS, S. GUERRERO, J.-P. PUEL, *Null controllability of the heat equation with boundary Fourier conditions: the linear case*, ESAIM Control, Optimization and Calculus of Variations, **12** (3)(2006), 466–483.
- [15] E. FERNÁNDEZ-CARA, M. C. SANTOS, D. A. SOUZA, *Boundary controllability of incompressible Euler fluids with Boussinesq heat effects*, Math. Control Signals Syst. **28**, 7 (2016).
- [16] A. FURSIKOV, O.YU. IMANUVILOV, *Controllability of Evolution Equations*, Lecture Notes #34, Seoul National University, Korea (1996).
- [17] A. FURSIKOV, O.YU. IMANUVILOV, *Local exact boundary controllability of the Boussinesq equation*, SIAM J. Control Optim. **32** (1998), no. 2, 391–421.
- [18] A. FURSIKOV, O.YU. IMANUVILOV, *Exact controllability of the Navier-Stokes and Boussinesq equations*, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk, **54**:3(327) (1999), 93–146; Russian Math. Surveys **54** (1999), no. 3, 565–618.
- [19] O. GLASS, *Contrôlabilité exacte frontière de l'équation d'Euler des fluides parfaits incompressibles en dimension 3*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math., 325 (1997), pp. 987–992.
- [20] ———, *Contrôlabilité de l'équation d'Euler tridimensionnelle pour les fluides parfaits incompressibles*, in Séminaire sur les Équations aux Dérivées Partielles, 1997–1998, École Polytech., Palaiseau, 1998, pp. Exp. No. XV, 11.
- [21] ———, *Exact boundary controllability of 3-D Euler equation*, ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var. (2000), no. 5, 1–44.
- [22] M. GONZÁLEZ-BURGOS, S. GUERRERO, J.-P. PUEL, *Local exact controllability to the trajectories of the Boussinesq system via a fictitious control on the divergence equation*, Communic. Pure and Appl. Analysis **8** (2009), no. 1, 311–332.
- [23] S. GUERRERO, *Local exact controllability to the trajectories of the Navier-Stokes system with nonlinear Navier-slip boundary conditions*, ESAIM: COCV **12** (2006), no. 3, 484–544.
- [24] S. GUERRERO, *Local exact controllability to the trajectories of the Boussinesq system*, Ann. l. H. Poincaré - AN **23** (2006), no. 1, 29–61.

- [25] S. GUERRERO, C. MONTTOYA, *Local null controllability of the N -dimensional Navier-Stokes system with nonlinear Navier-slip boundary conditions and $N - 1$ scalar controls*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **113** (2018), 37–69.
- [26] D. IFTIMIE, G. PLANAS, *Inviscid limits for the Navier-Stokes equations with Navier friction boundary conditions*, Nonlinearity **19** (2006), no. 4, 899–918.
- [27] D. IFTIMIE, F. SUEUR, *Viscous boundary layers for the Navier-Stokes equations with the Navier slip conditions*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **199** (2011), no. 1, 145–175.
- [28] O. Y. IMANUVILOV, *Local exact controllability for the 2-D Boussinesq equations with the Navier slip boundary conditions*, ESAIM: Proc., **4** (1998), 153–170.
- [29] O.YU. IMANUVILOV, J. P. PUEL, *Global Carleman estimates for weak elliptic nonhomogeneous Dirichlet problems*, Comptes Rendus Mathématique **335** (2002), no. 1, 33–38.
- [30] J. KELLIHER, *Navier-Stokes equations with Navier boundary conditions for a bounded domain in the plane*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **38** (2006), no. 1, 210–232.
- [31] T. KIM, D. CAO, *Local exact controllability of the Boussinesq with Boundary conditions on the pressure*, Handbook on Navier-stokes Equations: Theory and Applied Analysis.
- [32] J. LERAY, *Essai sur les mouvements plans d'un liquide visqueux que limitent des parois*. J. Math. Pures Appl. **13** (1934), 331–418.
- [33] F. MARBACH, *Small time global null controllability for a viscous Burgers' equation despite the presence of a boundary layer*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **102** (2014), no. 2, 364–384.
- [34] C. L. M. H. NAVIER, *Sur les lois d'équilibre et du mouvement des corps élastiques*, Mém. Acad. Sci **7** (1827), no. 2, 375–394.
- [35] R. SHIMADA, *On the $L_p - L_q$ maximal regularity for Stokes equations with Robin boundary condition in a bounded domain*, Math. Methods Appl. Sci., **30** (2007), no. 3, 257–289.
- [36] Y. SHIBATA, R. SHIMADA, *On a generalized resolvent estimate for the Stokes system with Robin boundary condition*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **59** (2007), no. 2, 469–519.
- [37] Y. SHIBATA, R. SHIMADA, *On the Stokes equation with Robin boundary condition. In Asymptotic analysis and singularities - hyperbolic and dispersive PDEs and fluid mechanics*, volume 47 of Adv. Stud, Pure Math, pages 341–248. Math. Soc. Japan, Tokyo, 2007.
- [38] R. TEMAN, *Navier-Stokes Equations: theory and numerical analysis*, North-Holland Publishing Company Amsterdam-New York-Oxford (1977), ISBN: 07204-2840-8.