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Abstract

We investigate the barotropic compressible Navier-Stokes equations with slip boundary conditions in a three-dimensional (3D) simply connected bounded domain, whose smooth boundary has a finite number of two-dimensional connected components. After obtaining some new estimates on boundary integrals related to the slip boundary condition, we prove that the classical solution to the initial-boundary-value problem of this system exists globally in time provided the initial energy is suitably small. Moreover, the density has large oscillations and contains vacuum states. Finally, it is also shown that the oscillation of the density will grow unboundedly in the long run with an exponential rate provided vacuum appears (even at a point) initially. This is the first result concerning the global existence of classical solutions to the compressible Navier-Stokes equations with density containing vacuum initially for general 3D bounded smooth domains.
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1 Introduction

The viscous barotropic compressible Navier-Stokes equations for isentropic flows express the principles of conservation of mass and momentum in the absence of exterior forces:

\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
\rho_t + \text{div}(\rho u) &= 0, \\
(\rho u)_t + \text{div}(\rho u \otimes u) - \mu \Delta u - (\mu + \lambda)\nabla \text{div} u + \nabla P(\rho) &= 0,
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}

where \((x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T), \Omega\) is a domain in \(\mathbb{R}^N\), \(t \geq 0\) is time, \(x\) is the spatial coordinate, and \(\rho \geq 0, u = (u^1, \cdots, u^N)\) and \(P(\rho) = a\rho^\gamma (a > 0, \gamma > 1)\) are the unknown fluid...
density, velocity and pressure, respectively. The constants $\mu$ and $\lambda$ are the shear and bulk viscosity coefficients respectively satisfying the following physical restrictions:

$$\mu > 0, \quad 2\mu + N\lambda \geq 0. \quad (1.2)$$

In this paper, we assume that $\Omega$ is a simply connected bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$, its boundary $\partial\Omega$ is of class $C^\infty$ and only has a finite number of 2-dimensional connected components. In addition, the system is studied subject to the given initial data

$$\rho(x, 0) = \rho_0(x), \quad \rho u(x, 0) = \rho_0 u_0(x), \quad x \in \Omega, \quad (1.3)$$

and slip boundary condition

$$u \cdot n = 0, \quad \text{curl } u \times n = -A u \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \quad (1.4)$$

where $A = A(x)$ is $3 \times 3$ symmetric matrix defined on $\partial\Omega$.

The mathematical study of compressible Navier-Stokes equations dates back to the late 1950s. For density away from vacuum, Serrin [42] and Nash [34] first considered the mathematical questions of compressible viscous fluid dynamics. An intensive treatment of compressible Navier-Stokes equations started with pioneering papers by Itaya [24], Matsumura & Nishida [32], Kazhikhov & Solonnikov [28], and Hoff [16] on the local theory for nonstationary problems, and by Beirão da Veiga [7, 8], Padula [40], and Novotný & Padula [38, 39] on the theory of stationary problems for small data. For the case that density contains vacuum, a global theory of weak solutions to compressible Navier-Stokes equations was developed by Lions [31] who proved the global existence of so called finite-energy weak solutions when the adiabatic exponent $\gamma$ is suitably large, for example, $\gamma \geq 9/5$ for 3D case. These results were further improved by Feireisl-Novotný-Petzeltová [13] to $\gamma > 3/2$ for three-dimensional case. Hoff [17–19] considered a new type of global weak solutions with small energy that have extra regularity information compared with those large weak ones constructed by Lions and Feireisl et al. However, the regularity and uniqueness of those weak solutions are completely open. Recently, Huang-Li-Xin [23] and Li-Xin [30] established the global well-posedness of classical solutions to the Cauchy problem for the 3D and 2D barotropic compressible Navier-Stokes equations in whole space with smooth initial data that are of small energy but possibly large oscillations, in particular, the initial density is allowed to vanish, and even has compact support. However, it remains completely open for the case of the initial-boundary-value problem for bounded domains: Does there exist a global classical solution to the initial-boundary-value problem (1.1)–(1.3) for general bounded smooth domains $\Omega$ with density containing vacuum initially?

We consider the Navier-type slip boundary condition for the case that $\Omega$ is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$, in which there is a stagnant layer of fluid close to the wall allowing a fluid to slip, and the slip velocity is proportional to the shear stress, that is,

$$u \cdot n = 0, \quad (D(u) n + \vartheta u)_{\text{tan}} = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \quad (1.5)$$

where $D(u) = (\nabla u + (\nabla u)^T)/2$ is the shear stress, $\vartheta$ is a scalar friction function, and the symbol $v_{\text{tan}}$ represents the projection of tangent plane of the vector $v$ on $\partial\Omega$. Such boundary condition can be induced by effects of free capillary boundaries (see [4]), or a rough boundary as in [126], or a perforated boundary, which is then called Beavers-Joseph’s law, see [61, 11], or an exterior electric field as in [11]. This type of boundary
condition was originally introduced by Navier \[35\] in 1823 and later independently by Maxwell \[33\] in 1879, which was followed by many applications, numerical studies and analysis for various fluid mechanical problems, see, for instance \[12, 25, 43\] and the references therein.

For the mathematical analysis of the Navier-Stokes equations with Navier-type slip boundary condition, Solonnikov and Ščadilov \[46\] first studied for the stationary linearized Navier-Stokes system under the boundary condition:

\[
\begin{align*}
  u \cdot n &= 0, \\
  (D(u) n)_{\tan} &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial \Omega, \\
\end{align*}
\]

and the existence and regularity of weak solutions to the stationary Navier-Stokes equations with the Navier-type slip boundary condition \((1.5)\) have been obtained by Beirão da Veiga \[9\] for half-space. In the 2D case \(\Omega = (0, 1) \times (0, 1)\), Vaigant & Kazhikhov \[47\] established global classical large solutions to \((1.1)\) with the boundary condition

\[
\begin{align*}
  u \cdot n &= 0, \\
  \mathrm{curl} \ u &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial \Omega, \\
\end{align*}
\]

when \(\lambda = \rho^\beta\) with \(\beta > 3\). Hoff \[17\] studied the global existence of weak solutions with the Navier-type slip boundary condition on the half space in \(\mathbb{R}^3\) provided the initial energy is suitably small. It should be noted that in \[17,47\], the initial density is strictly away from vacuum and the boundary of \(\Omega\) is flat.

The slip boundary condition \((1.4)\) is more wide than Navier-type slip condition \((1.5)\). In fact, notice that \(u \cdot n = 0\) on \(\partial \Omega\), we get, for any unit tangential vector \(\nu\),

\[
0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} (u \cdot n) = (D(u) n) \cdot \nu - \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{curl} \ u \times n \cdot \nu + \nu \cdot \nabla n \cdot u
\]

\[
= (D(u) n) \cdot \nu - \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{curl} \ u \times n \cdot \nu + \frac{1}{2} u \cdot D(n) \cdot \nu,
\]

where in the last equality we have used the fact \(\mathrm{curl} n \cdot n = 0\). Consequently, \((1.5)\) is equivalent to

\[
\mathrm{curl} \ u \times n = (D(n) - 2 \partial I) u \equiv -B u,
\]

where \(I\) is \(3 \times 3\) identity matrix and we remind the reader that \(B = (2 \partial I - D(n))\) is indeed a \(3 \times 3\) symmetric matrix.

In the case \(A = 0\), \((1.4)\) is reduced to

\[
u \cdot n = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{curl} \ u \times n = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial \Omega.
\]

We shall show that \((1.9)\) is strongly related to \((1.5)\). By \((1.8)\),

\[
0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} (u \cdot n) = (D(u) n) \cdot \nu - \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{curl} \ u \times n \cdot \nu + \frac{\partial n}{\partial \nu} \cdot u,
\]

while \(|\partial n/\partial \nu| = |\nu \cdot \nabla n|\) is the normal curvature of \(\partial \Omega\) in the \(\nu\) direction. Let \(\nu_1\) and \(\nu_2\) be the two unit vertical principal directions, it is clear that \(\frac{\partial n}{\partial \nu_i} = \kappa_{\nu_i} \nu_i\) for \(i = 1, 2\), where \(\kappa_{\nu_i}\) is the corresponding principal curvature in the \(\nu_i\) direction. Consequently, \((1.10)\) is equivalent to

\[
(D(u) n) \cdot \nu - \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{curl} \ u \times n \cdot \nu + \kappa_{\nu_i} \nu_i \cdot \nu = 0,
\]
for $\nu = \nu_i, i = 1, 2$. So the boundary condition (1.9) is in the form of (1.5) when $\partial \Omega$ is of constant curvature, i.e., $k_{\nu_1} = k_{\nu_2}$ on $\partial \Omega$. For example, on flat portions of the boundary, $k_{\nu} \equiv 0$, the boundary condition (1.9) and the Navier-type slip condition (1.6) coincide. On the spherical portions of the boundary, (1.9) is equivalent to

$$u \cdot n = 0, \quad (D(u) n + \kappa u)_{\text{tan}} = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial \Omega,$$

where $\kappa$ is the principal curvature of the spherical portions.

Especially to deserve to be mentioned, in the 2D case, that is, $\Omega$ is a bounded smooth domain in $\mathbb{R}^2$, the Navier-slip boundary condition (1.9) is simply replaced by (1.7). Furthermore, if we parameterize $\partial \Omega$ by arc length, a direct calculation similar to (1.10) gives

$$0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} (u \cdot n) = (D(u) n) \cdot \nu - \frac{1}{2} \text{curl} \ u + \kappa u \cdot \nu,$$

where $\kappa$ is the curvature of $\partial \Omega$. Hence, (1.7) is equivalent to

$$u \cdot n = 0, \quad (D(u) n + \kappa u)_{\text{tan}} = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial \Omega.$$

Therefore, in the 2D case, the boundary condition (1.7) is indeed a Navier-type slip boundary condition, it is a geometrical one. All these reasons above lead us to pay attention to the Navier-Stokes equations with boundary condition (1.4), even when the boundary is not of constant curvature.

Before stating the main results, we explain the notations and conventions used throughout this paper. We first give the definition of simply connected domains.

**Definition 1.1** Let $\Omega$ be a domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$. If the first Betti number of $\Omega$ vanishes, namely, any simple closed curve in $\Omega$ can be contracted to a point, we say that $\Omega$ is simply connected. If the second Betti number of $\Omega$ is zero, we say that $\Omega$ has no holes.
For simplicity, we denote $L^q(\Omega)$, $W^{k,q}(\Omega)$, $H^k(\Omega) \triangleq W^{k,2}(\Omega)$, $H^1_0(\Omega) \triangleq W^{1,2}_0(\Omega)$, and $H^s(\Omega)$ by $L^q$, $W^{k,q}$, $H^k$, $H^1_0$, and $H^s$ respectively.

For two $n \times n$ matrices $A = \{a_{ij}\}$, $B = \{b_{ij}\}$, the symbol $A: B \triangleq \text{tr}(AB) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} a_{ij}b_{ji}$.

Finally, we denote the initial total energy of (1.1) as

\[
C_0 \triangleq \int_{\Omega} \left( \frac{1}{2} \rho_0 |u_0|^2 + \frac{a}{\gamma - 1} \rho_0^\gamma \right) \, dx. \tag{1.11}
\]

Then one of the main purpose of this paper is to establish the following global existence of classical solutions of (1.1)-(1.4) in a general smooth bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$.

**Theorem 1.1** Let $\Omega$ be a simply connected bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and its smooth boundary $\partial \Omega$ has a finite number of 2-dimensional connected components. For given positive constants $M$ and $\hat{\rho}$, suppose that the $3\times3$ symmetric matrix $A$ in (1.4) is smooth and positive semi-definite, and the initial data $(\rho_0, u_0)$ satisfy for some $q \in (3,6)$ and $s \in (1/2,1]$,

\[
(\rho_0, P(\rho_0)) \in W^{2,q}, \quad u_0 \in \left\{ f \in H^2 : f \cdot n = 0, \, \text{curl} f \times n = -Af \text{ on } \partial \Omega \right\}, \tag{1.12}
\]

and the compatibility condition

\[
-\mu \Delta u_0 - (\mu + \lambda) \nabla \text{div} u_0 + \nabla P(\rho_0) = \rho_0^{1/2} g, \tag{1.14}
\]

for some $g \in L^2$. Then there exists a positive constant $\varepsilon$ depending only on $\mu$, $\lambda$, $\gamma$, $a$, $\hat{\rho}$, $s$, $\Omega$, $M$, and the matrix $A$ such that the initial-boundary-value problem (1.1)-(1.4) has a unique classical solution $(\rho, u)$ in $\Omega \times (0, \infty)$ satisfying

\[
0 \leq \rho(x,t) \leq 2\hat{\rho}, \quad (x,t) \in \Omega \times [0,\infty), \tag{1.15}
\]

and for any $0 < \tau < T < \infty$,

\[
\begin{align*}
(\rho, P) \in & C([0,T];W^{2,q}), \\
\nabla u \in & C([0,T];H^1) \cap L^\infty(\tau,T;W^{2,q}), \\
\n u_t \in & L^\infty(\tau,T;H^2) \cap H^1(\tau,T;H^1), \\
\sqrt{\rho} u_t \in & L^\infty(0,\infty;L^2),
\end{align*} \tag{1.16}
\]

provided $C_0 \leq \varepsilon$ with initial energy $C_0$ as in (1.11). Moreover, for any $r \in [1,\infty)$ and $p \in [1,6]$, there exist positive constants $C$ and $\gamma_0$ depending only on $\mu$, $\lambda$, $\gamma$, $a$, $\hat{\rho}$, $M$, $\rho_0$, $\Omega$, $r$, $p$, and the matrix $A$ such that for $t > 0$,

\[
(\|\rho - \rho_0\|_{L^r} + \|u\|_{W^{1,p}} + \|\sqrt{\rho} u_t\|_{L^2}^2) \leq Ce^{-\eta_0 t}. \tag{1.17}
\]

Then, with the exponential decay rate (1.17) at hand, motivated by the proof of [29, Theorem 1.2], we can establish the following large-time behavior of the gradient of the density when vacuum appears initially.
**Theorem 1.2** Under the conditions of Theorem 1.1, assume further that there exists some point $x_0 \in \Omega$ such that $\rho_0(x_0) = 0$. Then the unique global classical solution $(\rho, u)$ to the problem (1.11)-(1.14) obtained in Theorem 1.1 satisfies that for any $r_1 > 3$, there exist positive constants $C_1$ and $\hat{C}_2$ depending only on $\mu, \gamma, a, s, \rho, M, \rho_0, \Omega, r_1$ and the matrix $A$ such that for any $t > 0$,

$$\|\nabla \rho(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{r_1}} \geq \hat{C}_1 e^{\hat{C}_2 t}. \tag{1.18}$$

A few remarks are in order:

**Remark 1.1** Since $q > 3$, it follows from Sobolev’s inequality and (1.16) that

$$\rho, \nabla \rho \in C(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, T]). \tag{1.19}$$

Moreover, it also follows from (1.16) and (1.16) that

$$u, \nabla u, \nabla^2 u, u_t \in C(\bar{\Omega} \times [\tau, T]), \tag{1.20}$$

due to the following simple fact that

$$L^2(\tau, T; H^1) \cap H^1(\tau, T; H^{-1}) \hookrightarrow C([\tau, T]; L^2).$$

Finally, by (1.11), we have

$$\rho_t = -u \cdot \nabla \rho - \rho \text{div} u \in C(\bar{\Omega} \times [\tau, T]),$$

which together with (1.19) and (1.20) shows that the solution obtained by Theorem 1.1 is a classical one.

**Remark 1.2** It seems that our Theorem 1.1 is the first result concerning the global existence of classical solutions to the compressible Navier-Stokes equations (1.1) with the density containing vacuum initially for general 3D bounded smooth domains.

**Remark 1.3** For the sake of simplicity, we assume that the matrix $A$ is smooth and positive semi-definite. However, these conditions can be relaxed. Indeed, we only use the assumption that the matrix $A$ is positive semi-definite in the proof of (3.10) and (3.35) (see (3.12) and (3.36)). Thus, let $\lambda_i(x) (i = 1, 2, 3)$ be the eigenvalues of $A$ whose negative parts are denoted by $\lambda_1^-(x), \lambda_2^-(x)$, and $\lambda_3^-(x)$ respectively. Then one can deduce that (3.10) and (3.35) both still hold provided $\lambda_1^-(x), \lambda_2^-(x), \lambda_3^-(x)$ are bounded by some suitably small positive constant depending only on $\lambda, \mu$, the constants of Poincaré’s inequality and the constant $C_1$ in (2.18) for $p = 2$. The other restriction on $A$ comes from a priori estimates related to $A$, in which (4.14) plays a decisive role. In fact, by Lemma 2.24, 2.25, 2.27 and 2.23, one can find that for any $p \in [2, 6]$,

$$\|\nabla^3 u\|_{L^p} \leq C(\|\text{div} u\|_{W^{2,p}} + \|\text{curl} u\|_{W^{2,p}})$$

$$\leq C(\|\rho u\|_{W^{1,p}} + \|\nabla (Au)\|_{W^{1,p}} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla P\|_{W^{1,p}} + \|P - P\|_{L^p}). \tag{1.21}$$

Therefore, compare with (4.14), it is sufficient to assume that $A \in W^{2,6}$ rather than smooth. Moreover, for the lower order priori estimates in Section 3, it is enough to suppose that $A \in W^{1,6}$, and then the dependence of $\varepsilon$ on $A$ in Theorem 1.1 can be determined by $\|A\|_{W^{1,6}}$. 


Remark 1.4 Theorem 1.2 implies that the oscillation of the density will grow unboundedly in the long run with an exponential rate provided vacuum (even a point) appears initially. This new phenomena is somewhat surprisingly compared with the Cauchy problem ([23, 30]) where there is not any result concerning the growth rate of the gradient of the density.

We now comment on the analysis of this paper. Indeed, compared with the previous results ([23, 30]) where they treated the Cauchy problem, the slip boundary condition (1.4) causes additional difficulties in developing a priori estimates for solutions of the compressible Navier-Stokes equations. To overcome the difficulties, our research bases on three observations. First, thanks to [48], we have
\[
\| \nabla u \|_{L^q} \leq C(\| \text{div } u \|_{L^q} + \| \text{curl } u \|_{L^q})
\]
for any \( q > 1 \), which allows us to control \( \nabla u \) by means of \( \text{div } u \) and \( \text{curl } u \). Next, for \( v = (v^1, v^2, v^3) \), denoting the material derivative \( \dot{v} \triangleq v_t + u \cdot \nabla v \), we rewrite (1.12) in the form
\[
\rho \dot{u} = \nabla F - \mu \nabla \times \text{curl } u,
\]
with
\[
\text{curl } u \triangleq \nabla \times u, \quad F \triangleq (\lambda + 2\mu) \text{div } u - (P - \bar{P}),
\]
where the vorticity \( \text{curl } u \) and the so-called the effective viscous flux \( F \) both play an important role in our following analysis. Since \( u \cdot n = 0 \) on \( \partial \Omega \), we check that
\[
u \cdot \nabla u \cdot n = -u \cdot \nabla n \cdot u,
\]
which implies (see (3.3))
\[
(\dot{u} + (u \cdot \nabla) \times u^\perp) \cdot n = 0 \text{ on } \partial \Omega,
\]
with \( u^\perp \triangleq -u \times n \) on \( \partial \Omega \). As a direct consequence of this observation, we have (see (3.6))
\[
\| \dot{u} \|_{L^6} \leq C(\| \nabla \dot{u} \|_{L^2} + \| \nabla u \|_{L^2}^2).
\]
Similarly, one can get \( (\text{curl } u + (Au^\perp) \times n = 0 \text{ on } \partial \Omega \) by the other boundary condition \( \text{curl } u \times n = -Au \). Combining this with (1.22) implies that one can treat (1.12) as a Helmholtz-Wyle decomposition of \( \rho \dot{u} \) which makes it possible to estimate \( \nabla F \) and \( \nabla \text{curl } u \) (see (2.24)). Finally, since \( u \cdot n = 0 \) on \( \partial \Omega \), we have
\[
u = u^\perp \times n \text{ on } \partial \Omega,
\]
which, combined with the simple fact that \( \text{div } (\nabla u^i \times u^\perp) = -\nabla u^i \cdot \nabla \times u^\perp \), implies that we can bound the following key boundary integrals concerning the effective viscous flux \( F \), the vorticity \( \text{curl } u \), and \( \nabla u \) (see (3.30) and (3.36))
\[
\int_{\partial \Omega} F(u \cdot \nabla u \cdot n \cdot u \), \int_{\partial \Omega} \text{curl } u \times n \cdot \dot{u}.
\]
All these treatments are the key to estimating the integrals on the boundary \( \partial \Omega \).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. First, some notations, known facts and elementary inequalities needed in later analysis are collected in Section 2. Section 3 and Section 4 are devoted to deriving the necessary a priori estimates on classical solutions which can guarantee the extension of the local classical solution to be a global one. Finally, the main results, Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 will be proved in Section 5.
2 Preliminaries

In this section, we recall some known facts and elementary inequalities which will be used later.

First, similar to the proof of [20, Theorem 1.4], we have the local existence of strong and classical solutions.

**Lemma 2.1** Let $\Omega$ be as in Theorem 1.4, assume that $(\rho_0, u_0)$ satisfies (1.12) and (1.14). Then there exist a small time $T > 0$ and a unique strong solution $(\rho, u)$ to the problem (1.11) on $\Omega \times (0, T]$ satisfying for any $\tau \in (0, T)$,

$$
\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
(\rho, P) \in C([0, T]; W^{2, q}), \\
\nabla u \in C([0, T]; H^1) \cap L^\infty(\tau, T; W^{2, q}), \\
u_t \in L^\infty(\tau, T; H^2) \cap H^1(\tau, T; H^1), \\
\sqrt{\rho} u_t \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2).
\end{array} \right.
$$

Next, the well-known Gagliardo-Nirenberg’s inequality (see [36]) will be used frequently later.

**Lemma 2.2 (Gagliardo-Nirenberg)** Assume that $\Omega$ is a bounded Lipschitz domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$. For $p \in [2, 6]$, $q \in (1, \infty)$, and $r \in (3, \infty)$, there exist generic constants $C_i > 0$ ($i = 1, \ldots, 4$) which depend only on $p$, $q$, $r$, and $\Omega$ such that for any $f \in H^1(\Omega)$ and $g \in L^q(\Omega) \cap D^{1, r}(\Omega)$,

$$
\|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C_1 \|f\|_{L^2}^{\frac{6-p}{2p}} \|\nabla f\|_{L^2}^{\frac{3r-6}{2p}} + C_2 \|f\|_{L^2}, \quad (2.1)
$$

$$
\|g\|_{C(\overline{\Omega})} \leq C_3 \|g\|_{L^q}^{\frac{q(r-3)/(3r+q(r-3))}{3r+q(r-3)}} \|\nabla g\|_{L^r}^{\frac{3r(r-3)/(3r+q(r-3))}{3r+q(r-3)}} + C_4 \|g\|_{L^2}. \quad (2.2)
$$

Moreover, if either $f \cdot n|_{\partial \Omega} = 0$ or $\bar{f} = 0$, we can choose $C_2 = 0$. Similarly, the constant $C_4 = 0$ provided $g \cdot n|_{\partial \Omega} = 0$ or $\bar{g} = 0$.

In order to get the uniform (in time) upper bound of the density $\rho$, we need the following Zlotnik’s inequality.

**Lemma 2.3** Suppose the function $y$ satisfies

$$
y'(t) = g(y) + b'(t) \text{ on } [0, T], \quad y(0) = y^0,
$$

with $g \in C(R)$ and $y, b \in W^{1, 1}(0, T)$. If $g(\infty) = -\infty$ and

$$
b(t_2) - b(t_1) \leq N_0 + N_1 (t_2 - t_1) \quad (2.3)
$$

for all $0 \leq t_1 < t_2 \leq T$ with some $N_0 \geq 0$ and $N_1 \geq 0$, then

$$
y(t) \leq \max \{y^0, \zeta_0\} + N_0 < \infty \text{ on } [0, T],
$$

where $\zeta_0$ is a constant such that

$$
g(\zeta) \leq -N_1 \quad \text{for} \quad \zeta \geq \zeta_0. \quad (2.4)
$$
Next, consider the Lamé’s system
\[
\begin{cases}
-\mu \Delta u - (\lambda + \mu) \nabla \text{div} u = f, & x \in \Omega, \\
u \cdot n = 0, \ \text{curl} u \times n = -Au, & x \in \partial \Omega,
\end{cases}
\]
where \( u = (u^1, u^2, u^3), \ f = (f^1, f^2, f^3) \), \( \Omega \) is a bounded smooth domain in \( \mathbb{R}^3 \), and \( \mu, \lambda \) satisfy the condition \((1.2)\). It follows from \( [45] \) that the Lamé’s system is of Petrovsky type. In Petrovsky’s systems, roughly speaking, different equations and unknowns have the same “differentiability order”, see \([44] \). We also recall that Petrovsky’s systems belong to an important subclass of Agmon-Douglis-Nirenberg (ADN) elliptic systems (see \([2]\)), which has the same good properties of self-adjoint ADN systems. Thus, we have the following standard estimates.

**Lemma 2.4 (\([2]\))** Let \( u \) be a smooth solution of the Lamé’s equation \((2.5)\). Then for \( q \in (1, \infty), \ k \geq 0 \), there exists a positive constant \( C \) depending only on \( \lambda, \mu, q, k, \Omega \) and the matrix \( A \) such that
\[
(1) \text{ If } f \in W^{k,q}, \text{ then } \|u\|_{W^{k+2,q}} \leq C(\|f\|_{W^{k,q}} + \|u\|_{L^q}),
\]
\[
(2) \text{ If } f = \nabla g \text{ and } g \in W^{k,q}, \text{ then } \|u\|_{W^{k+1,q}} \leq C(\|g\|_{W^{k,q}} + \|u\|_{L^q}).
\]

Next, the following two lemmas are given in \([3, 48]\), more precisely, Theorem 3.2 in \([48]\) and Propositions 2.6-2.9 in \([3]\).

**Lemma 2.5** Let \( k \geq 0 \) be a integer, \( 1 < q < +\infty \), and assume that \( \Omega \) is a simply connected bounded domain in \( \mathbb{R}^3 \) with \( C^{k+1,1} \) boundary \( \partial \Omega \). Then for \( v \in W^{k+1,q} \) with \( v \cdot n = 0 \) on \( \partial \Omega \), there exists a constant \( C = C(q,k,\Omega) \) such that
\[
\|v\|_{W^{k+1,q}} \leq C(\|\text{div} v\|_{W^{k,q}} + \|\text{curl} v\|_{W^{k,q}}).
\]
In particular, for \( k = 0 \), we have
\[
\|\nabla v\|_{L^q} \leq C(\|\text{div} v\|_{L^q} + \|\text{curl} v\|_{L^q}). \quad (2.6)
\]

**Lemma 2.6** Let \( k \geq 0 \) be an integer, \( 1 < q < +\infty \). Suppose that \( \Omega \) is a bounded domain in \( \mathbb{R}^3 \) and its \( C^{k+1,1} \) boundary \( \partial \Omega \) only has a finite number of 2-dimensional connected components. Then for \( v \in W^{k+1,q} \) with \( v \times n = 0 \) on \( \partial \Omega \), there exists a constant \( C = C(q,k,\Omega) \) such that
\[
\|v\|_{W^{k+1,q}} \leq C(\|\text{div} v\|_{W^{k,q}} + \|\text{curl} v\|_{W^{k,q}} + \|v\|_{L^q}).
\]
In particular, if \( \Omega \) has no holes, then
\[
\|v\|_{W^{k+1,q}} \leq C(\|\text{div} v\|_{W^{k,q}} + \|\text{curl} v\|_{W^{k,q}}).
\]

Next, to estimate the \( L^1(0,T;L^\infty(\Omega)) \)-norm of \( \nabla u \), we need the following Beale-Kato-Majda type inequality with respect to the slip boundary condition \((1.4)\), which was first proved in \([5, 27]\) in the whole 3D spatial space when \( \text{div} u \equiv 0 \).
Lemma 2.7 Let $\Omega$ be a simply connected bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with smooth boundary. For $3 < q < \infty$, assume that $u \cdot n = 0$ and $\text{curl}u \times n = -Au$ on $\partial \Omega$, $u \in W^{2,q}$, then there is a constant $C = C(q, \Omega, A)$ such that the following estimate holds

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \leq C (\|\text{div} u\|_{L^\infty} + \|\text{curl} u\|_{L^\infty}) \ln(e + \|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^q}) + C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2} + C. \quad (2.7)$$

Proof. We borrow some ideas of [21, 22] and make some slight modifications. It follows from [44, 45] that $u$ can be represented in the form

$$u^i = \int G_i(x, y) \cdot (\mu \Delta_y u + (\lambda + \mu) \nabla_y \text{div} u)dy$$

$$\triangleq \int G_{ij}(x, y) (\mu \Delta_y u^j + (\lambda + \mu) \partial_{y\alpha} \text{div} u(y))dy,$$

where, $G = \{G_{ij}\}$ with $G_{ij} = G_{ij}(x, y) \in C^\infty(\Omega \times \Omega \setminus D)$, $D \equiv \{(x, y) \in \Omega \times \Omega : x = y\}$, is Green matrix of the Lamé’s system (2.5) and satisfies that for every multi-indexes $\alpha = (\alpha^1, \alpha^2, \alpha^3)$ and $\beta = (\beta^1, \beta^2, \beta^3)$, there is a constant $C_{\alpha,\beta}$ such that for all $(x, y) \in \Omega \times \Omega \setminus D$, and $i, j = 1, 2, 3$,

$$|\partial^\alpha_x \partial^\beta_y G_{ij}(x, y)| \leq C_{\alpha,\beta} |x - y|^{-1-|\alpha|-|\beta|},$$

here $|\alpha| = \alpha^1 + \alpha^2 + \alpha^3$ and $|\beta| = \beta^1 + \beta^2 + \beta^3$.

Notice that according to the definition of $A$ in (1.1), $Au$ is still a tangential vector on $\partial \Omega$, and then we set

$$(Au)^\perp \triangleq -(Au) \times n, \quad (2.8)$$

so $Au = (Au)^\perp \times n$. Therefore,

$$u^i(x) = (\lambda + 2\mu) \int G_{i.}(x, y) \cdot \nabla_y \text{div} u(y)dy - \mu \int G_{i.}(x, y) \cdot \nabla_y \times \text{curl} u(y)dy$$

$$= (\lambda + 2\mu) \int G_{i.}(x, y) \cdot \nabla_y \text{div} u(y)dy - \mu \int G_{i.}(x, y) \cdot \nabla_y \times (\text{curl} u + (Au)^\perp)dy$$

$$+ \mu \int \nabla_y \times (Au(y))^{\perp} \cdot G_{i.}(x, y) dy \triangleq \sum_{j=1}^{3} U^i_j. \quad (2.9)$$

It suffices to estimate the three terms $U^i_j$, $j = 1, 2, 3$. Let $\delta \in (0, 1]$ be a constant to be chosen and introduce a cut-off function $\eta_\delta(x)$ satisfying $\eta_\delta(x) = 1$ for $|x| < \delta$; $\eta_\delta(x) = 0$ for $|x| > 2\delta$, and $|\nabla \eta_\delta(x)| \leq C\delta^{-1}$. Notice that $G_{i.}(x, y) \cdot n = 0$ on $\partial \Omega$, $\nabla U^i_1$ can be written as

$$\nabla U^i_1 = (\lambda + 2\mu) \int \eta_\delta(|x - y|) \nabla_x G_{i.}(x, y) \nabla_y \text{div} u(y)dy$$

$$+ (\lambda + 2\mu) \int \nabla_y \eta_\delta(|x - y|) \cdot \nabla_x G_{i.}(x, y) \text{div} u(y)dy$$

$$- (\lambda + 2\mu) \int (1 - \eta_\delta(|x - y|)) \nabla_x \text{div} G_{i.}(x, y) \text{div} u(y)dy \quad (2.10)$$

$$\triangleq (\lambda + 2\mu) \sum_{k=1}^{3} \tilde{f}_k.$$
Now we estimate \( \tilde{I}_k, \ k = 1, 2, 3. \)

\[
|\tilde{I}_1| \leq C \| \eta_\delta(|x - y|) \nabla_x G_i, (x, y) \|_{L^q/(q-1)} \| \nabla^2 u \|_{L^q}
\]

\[
\leq C \left( \int_0^{2\delta} r^{-2q/(q-1)} r^2 dr \right)^{(q-1)/q} \| \nabla^2 u \|_{L^q} \quad (2.11)
\]

\[
|\tilde{I}_2| = \left| \int \nabla_y \eta_\delta(|x - y|) \cdot \nabla_x G_i, (x, y) \, \text{div} u(y) \, dy \right|
\]

\[
\leq C \int |\nabla_y \eta_\delta(y) \cdot \nabla_x G_i, (x, y)| \, dy \| \text{div} u \|_{L^\infty}
\]

\[
\leq C \int_{\delta}^{2\delta} \delta^{-1} r^{-2} r^2 dr \| \text{div} u \|_{L^\infty}
\]

\[
\leq C \| \text{div} u \|_{L^\infty}, \quad (2.12)
\]

\[
|\tilde{I}_3| = \left| \int (1 - \eta_\delta(|x - y|)) \nabla_x \nabla_y G_i, (x, y) \, \text{div} u(y) \, dy \right|
\]

\[
\leq C \left( \int_{\delta}^{1} + \int_{|x - y| > 1} \right) \| \nabla_x \nabla_y G_i, (x, y) \| \| \text{div} u(y) \| dy
\]

\[
\leq C \int_{\delta}^{1} r^{-3} r^2 dr \| \text{div} u \|_{L^\infty} + C \left( \int_{1}^{\infty} r^{-6} r^2 dr \right)^{1/2} \| \text{div} u \|_{L^2}
\]

\[
\leq C \ln \delta \| \text{div} u \|_{L^\infty} + C \| \nabla u \|_{L^2}. \quad (2.13)
\]

It follows from (2.10) - (2.13) that

\[
\| \nabla U_1 \|_{L^\infty} \leq C \left( \delta^{(q-3)/q} \| \nabla^2 u \|_{L^q} + (1 - \ln \delta) \| \text{div} u \|_{L^\infty} + \| \nabla u \|_{L^2} \right). \quad (2.14)
\]

Since by \( (1.3) \), \( (\text{curl} u + (Au)^\perp) \times n = 0 \) on \( \partial \Omega \), we rewrite \( \nabla U_2 \) as

\[
\nabla U_2 = -\mu \int \eta_\delta(|x - y|) \nabla_x G_i, (x, y) \cdot \nabla_y \times (\text{curl} u + (Au)^\perp) dy
\]

\[
+ \mu \int \nabla_y \eta_\delta(|x - y|) \times \nabla_x G_i, (x, y) \cdot (\text{curl} u + (Au)^\perp) dy
\]

\[
- \mu \int (1 - \eta_\delta(|x - y|)) \nabla_y \times \nabla_x G_i, (x, y) \cdot (\text{curl} u + (Au)^\perp) dy.
\]

A discussion similar to the previous term gives

\[
\| \nabla U_2 \|_{L^\infty} \leq C \left( \delta^{(q-3)/q} \| \nabla^2 u \|_{L^q} + (1 - \ln \delta) \| \text{curl} u \|_{L^\infty} + \| \nabla u \|_{L^2} \right). \quad (2.15)
\]

Finally, it is clear that

\[
\| \nabla U_3 \|_{L^\infty} \leq C \left( \delta^{(q-3)/q} \| \nabla^2 u \|_{L^q} + (1 - \ln \delta) \| u \|_{L^\infty} + \| \nabla u \|_{L^2} \right). \quad (2.16)
\]

Combining (2.11) with (2.14), (2.15), leads to

\[
\| \nabla u \|_{L^\infty} \leq C \left( \delta^{(q-3)/q} \| \nabla^2 u \|_{L^q} + (1 - \ln \delta) \| \text{curl} u \|_{L^\infty} + \| \nabla u \|_{L^2} \right),
\]

which after choosing \( \delta = \min \{1, \| \nabla^2 u \|_{L^q}^{q/(q-3)} \} \) gives (2.7) and completes the proof of Lemma (2.7).
Next, one has the following conclusion on the problem

\[
\begin{aligned}
\text{div} v &= f, \quad x \in \Omega, \\
v &= 0, \quad x \in \partial \Omega.
\end{aligned}
\]  

(2.17)

**Lemma 2.8** [13] Theorem III.3.1] There exists a linear operator \( B = [B_1, B_2, B_3] \) enjoying the properties:

1) The operator
\[
B : \{ f \in L^p(\Omega) : \bar{f} = 0 \} \mapsto (W^{1,p}_0(\Omega))^3
\]
is a bounded linear one, that is,
\[
\|B[f]\|_{W^{1,p}_0(\Omega)} \leq C(p)\|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)}, \text{ for any } p \in (1, \infty).
\]

2) The function \( v = B[f] \) solve the problem (2.17).

3) If, moreover, \( f \) can be written in the form \( f = \text{div} g \) for a certain \( g \in L^r(\Omega) \), \( g \cdot n|_{\partial \Omega} = 0 \), then
\[
\|B[f]\|_{L^r(\Omega)} \leq C(r)\|g\|_{L^r(\Omega)}, \text{ for any } r \in (1, \infty).
\]

Next, for \( F, \text{curl} u \) as in (2.23), we have the following key a priori estimates which will be used frequently.

**Lemma 2.9** Assume \( \Omega \) is a simply connected bounded domain in \( \mathbb{R}^3 \) and its smooth boundary \( \partial \Omega \) only has a finite number of 2-dimensional connected components. Let \((p, u)\) be a smooth solution of (1.1) with slip boundary condition (1.4). Then for any \( p \in [2, 6], \ 1 < q < +\infty \), there exist positive constants \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) depending only on \( p, q, \mu, \lambda \) and \( \Omega \) (with \( C \) depending on \( A \) also) such that
\[
\|\nabla u\|_{L^q} \leq C_1(\|\text{div} u\|_{L^p} + \|\text{curl} u\|_{L^p}), 
\]  

(2.18)
\[
\|F\|_{L^p} + \|\text{curl} u\|_{L^p} \leq C(\|\rho \cdot u\|_{L^p} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} + \|P - \bar{P}\|_{L^p}),
\]  

(2.19)
\[
\|F\|_{L^p} \leq C(\|\rho \cdot u\|_{L^p} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} + \|P - \bar{P}\|_{L^p})^2(\|\nabla u\|_{L^p}^2 + \|P - \bar{P}\|_{L^p})^{(6-p)/2p}
\]  

(2.20)
\[
\text{curl} u \|_{L^p} \leq C(\|\rho \cdot u\|_{L^p} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2})^2 + C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}.
\]  

Moreover,
\[
\|F\|_{L^p} + \|\text{curl} u\|_{L^p} \leq C(\|\rho \cdot u\|_{L^p} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^p}),
\]  

(2.22)
\[
\|\nabla u\|_{L^p} \leq C(\|\rho \cdot u\|_{L^p} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^p})^2 + C(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2} + \|P - \bar{P}\|_{L^p}).
\]  

(2.23)

**Proof.** First, the inequality (2.18) is a direct result of Lemma 2.5 since \( u \cdot n = 0 \) on \( \partial \Omega \).
Next, for $\mathbf{A} \perp$ as in (2.8) and $\mathbf{curl} \mathbf{u} + (\mathbf{A} \perp) \times \mathbf{n} = 0$ on $\partial \Omega$, we have, for any $\eta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$,
\[
\int \nabla \times \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \eta \, dx
\]
\[
= \int \nabla \times (\mathbf{curl} + (\mathbf{A} \perp)) \cdot \nabla \eta \, dx - \int \nabla \times (\mathbf{A} \perp) \cdot \nabla \eta \, dx
\]
\[
= - \int \nabla \times (\mathbf{A} \perp) \cdot \nabla \eta \, dx,
\]
which together with (1.1) yields that the viscous flux $F$ satisfies
\[
\int \nabla F \cdot \nabla \eta \, dx = \int \left( \rho \dot{\mathbf{u}} - \nabla \times (\mathbf{A} \perp) \right) \cdot \nabla \eta \, dx, \quad \forall \eta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3),
\]
that is,
\[
\begin{cases}
\Delta F = \text{div} (\rho \dot{\mathbf{u}}), & x \in \Omega, \\
\frac{\partial F}{\partial n} = (\rho \dot{\mathbf{u}} - \nabla \times (\mathbf{A} \perp)) \cdot \mathbf{n}, & x \in \partial \Omega.
\end{cases}
\]
It follows from [37, Lemma 4.27] that
\[
\| \nabla F \|_{L^q} \leq C \left( \| \rho \dot{\mathbf{u}} \|_{L^q} + \| \nabla \times (\mathbf{A} \perp) \|_{L^q} \right)
\]
\[
\leq C \left( \| \rho \dot{\mathbf{u}} \|_{L^q} + \| \nabla \mathbf{u} \|_{L^q} \right), \quad (2.24)
\]
and for any integer $k \geq 0$,
\[
\| \nabla F \|_{W^{k+1, q}} \leq C \left( \| \rho \dot{\mathbf{u}} \|_{W^{k+1, q}} + \| \nabla \times (\mathbf{A} \perp) \|_{W^{k+1, q}} \right), \quad (2.25)
\]
On the other hand, one can rewrite (1.1) as $\mu \nabla \times \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{u} = \nabla F - \rho \dot{\mathbf{u}}$. Notice that $(\mathbf{curl} + (\mathbf{A} \perp)) \times \mathbf{n} = 0$ on $\partial \Omega$ and $\text{div} (\nabla \times \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{u}) = 0$, by Lemma 2.6 we get
\[
\| \nabla \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{u} \|_{L^q} \leq C \left( \| \nabla \times \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{u} \|_{L^q} + \| \nabla \mathbf{u} \|_{L^q} \right)
\]
\[
\leq C \left( \| \rho \dot{\mathbf{u}} \|_{L^q} + \| \nabla \mathbf{u} \|_{L^q} \right), \quad (2.26)
\]
and for any integer $k \geq 0$,
\[
\| \nabla \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{u} \|_{W^{k+1, q}} \leq C \left( \| \nabla \times \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{u} \|_{W^{k+1, q}} + \| \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{u} \|_{L^q} + \| (\mathbf{A} \perp) \|_{W^{k+1, q}} \right)
\]
\[
\leq C \left( \| \rho \dot{\mathbf{u}} \|_{W^{k+1, q}} + \| \nabla (\mathbf{A} \perp) \|_{W^{k+1, q}} + \| \nabla \mathbf{u} \|_{L^q} \right), \quad (2.27)
\]
where we have taken advantage of (2.25).

Furthermore, since $\tilde{F} = 0$, one can deduce from (2.1) and (2.24) that for $p \in [2, 6]$, \[
\| F \|_{L^p} \leq C \| F \|_{L^2} \left( \frac{6-p}{2p} \right) \| \nabla F \|_{L^2} \left( \frac{3p-6}{2p} \right)
\]
\[
\leq C \| \rho \dot{\mathbf{u}} \|_{L^2} \left( \frac{3p-6}{2p} \right) \left( \| \nabla \mathbf{u} \|_{L^2} + \| \mathbf{P} - \bar{\mathbf{P}} \|_{L^2} \right)^{6-p} \left( \frac{6-p}{2p} \right) + C \| \nabla \mathbf{u} \|_{L^2}
\]
\[
+ C \| \mathbf{P} - \bar{\mathbf{P}} \|_{L^2},
\]
and
\[
\| F \|_{L^p} \leq C \| \nabla F \|_{L^2} \leq C \left( \| \rho \dot{\mathbf{u}} \|_{L^2} + \| \nabla \mathbf{u} \|_{L^2} \right).
Similarly, by Gagliardo-Nirenberg’s inequality and \((2.26)\), we get \((2.21)\), and then \((2.22)\) are established.

Finally, by virtue of \((2.18)\), \((2.20)\) and \((2.21)\), it indicates that
\[
\|\nabla u\|_{L^p} \leq C (\|\text{div} u\|_{L^p} + \|\text{curl} u\|_{L^p} + \|P - \bar{P}\|_{L^p})
\leq C (\|F\|_{L^p} + \|\text{curl} u\|_{L^p} + \|P - \bar{P}\|_{L^p})
\leq C (\|\rho \dot{u}\|_{L^2}^{(3p-6)/(2p)} (\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|P - \bar{P}\|_{L^2}^{6-p)/(2p)})
+ C (\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|P - \bar{P}\|_{L^p}),
\]
which together with \((2.24)\) and \((2.26)\) gives \((2.19)\). This completes the proof of Lemma 2.9.

3 A priori estimates (I): lower order estimates

Let \(T > 0\) be a fixed time and \((\rho, u)\) be a smooth solution to \((1.1)-(1.4)\) on \(\Omega \times (0, T)\) with smooth initial data \((\rho_0, u_0)\) satisfying \((1.12)\) and \((1.13)\). We will establish some necessary a priori bounds for smooth solutions to the problem \((1.1)-(1.4)\) to extend the local classical solutions guaranteed by Lemma 2.1.

Setting \(\sigma = \sigma(t) \triangleq \min\{1, t\}\), we define
\[
A_1(T) \triangleq \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} (\sigma \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2) + \int_0^T \int_0^t \sigma |\dot{u}|^2 \, dx \, dt,
\]
\[
A_2(T) \triangleq \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \sigma^3 \int_0^T \int_0^t \rho |\dot{u}|^3 \, dx \, dt,
\]
and
\[
A_3(T) \triangleq \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int_0^T \rho |u|^3 \, dx.
\]

Now we will give the main result in this section, which guarantees the existence of a global classical solution of \((1.1)-(1.4)\).

**Proposition 3.1** Under the conditions of Theorem 1.1, for \(\delta_0 \triangleq \frac{2s-1}{4s} \in (0, \frac{1}{4}]\), there exists a positive constant \(\epsilon\) depending on \(\mu, \lambda, a, \gamma, \hat{\rho}, s, \Omega, M\) and the matrix \(A\) such that if \((\rho, u)\) is a smooth solution of \((1.1)-(1.4)\) on \(\Omega \times (0, T)\) satisfying
\[
\sup_{\Omega \times [0,T]} \rho \leq 2\hat{\rho}, \quad A_1(T) + A_2(T) \leq 2C_0^{1/2}, \quad A_3(\sigma(T)) \leq 2C_0^{\delta_0},
\]
then the following estimates hold
\[
\sup_{\Omega \times [0,T]} \rho \leq 7\hat{\rho}/4, \quad A_1(T) + A_2(T) \leq C_0^{1/2}, \quad A_3(\sigma(T)) \leq C_0^{\delta_0},
\]
provided \(C_0 \leq \epsilon\).

**Proof.** Proposition 3.1 is a consequence of the following Lemmas 3.6–3.8

One can extend the function \(n\) to \(\Omega\) such that \(n \in C^3(\bar{\Omega})\), and in the following discussion we still denote the extended function by \(n\).

Now using the boundary condition \((1.4)\), we have the following estimates on the material derivative of \(u\).
Lemma 3.2. Let \((\rho, u)\) be a smooth solution of (1.1) with slip boundary condition (1.4). Then there exists a positive constant \(C\) depending only on \(\Omega\) such that

\[
\|\dot{u}\|_{L^6} \leq C(\|\nabla \dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2),
\]  
(3.6)

\[
\|\nabla \dot{u}\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|\text{div} \dot{u}\|_{L^2} + \|\text{curl} \dot{u}\|_{L^2} + \|\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2).
\]  
(3.7)

**Proof.** First, setting \(u^\perp \triangleq -u \times n\), we have by (1.4)

\[
\dot{u} \cdot n = u \cdot \nabla u \cdot n = -u \cdot \nabla n \cdot u = -(u \cdot \nabla n) \times u^\perp \cdot n \text{ on } \partial \Omega,
\]  
(3.8)
due to the following simple fact

\[
v \times (u \times n) = (v \cdot n) u - (v \cdot u) n,
\]  
with \(v = u \cdot \nabla n\). It thus follows for (3.8) that

\[
(\dot{u} + (u \cdot \nabla n) \times u^\perp) \cdot n = 0 \text{ on } \partial \Omega,
\]  
(3.9)

which together with Poincaré’s inequality gives

\[
\|\dot{u} + (u \cdot \nabla n) \times u^\perp\|_{L^6} \leq C\|\nabla (\dot{u} + (u \cdot \nabla n) \times u^\perp)\|_{L^2}.
\]

Thus, we have

\[
\|\dot{u}\|_{L^6} \leq C\|\nabla \dot{u}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2,
\]

which together with Sobolev’s embedding theorem yields (3.6).

Finally, taking \(v = \dot{u} + (u \cdot \nabla n) \times u^\perp\) in (2.6) yields (3.7) due to (3.9). \qed

In the following, we will use the convention that \(C\) denotes a generic positive constant depending on \(\mu, \lambda, \gamma, a, \hat{\rho}, s, \Omega, M\) and the matrix \(A\), and use \(C(\alpha)\) to emphasize that \(C\) depends on \(\alpha\).

We begin with the following standard energy estimate for \((\rho, u)\).

Lemma 3.3. Let \((\rho, u)\) be a smooth solution of (1.1)–(1.4) on \(\Omega \times (0,T]\). Then there is a positive constant \(C\) depending only on \(\mu, \lambda, \gamma\) such that

\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int_\Omega \left( \rho|u|^2 + \frac{a}{\gamma - 1} \rho^\gamma \right) dx + \int_0^T \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 dt \leq CC_0.
\]  
(3.10)

**Proof.** First, since

\[
-\Delta u = -\nabla \text{div} u + \nabla \times \text{curl} u,
\]

we rewrite (1.1) as

\[
\rho \ddot{u} - (\lambda + 2\mu) \nabla \text{div} u + \mu \nabla \times \text{curl} u + \nabla P = 0.
\]  
(3.11)

Multiplying (3.11) by \(u\) and integrating the resulting equality over \(\Omega\), along with (1.4), gives

\[
\frac{1}{2} \left( \int_\Omega \rho|u|^2 dx \right)_t + \int (\lambda + 2\mu) |\text{div} u|^2 dx + \mu \int |\text{curl} u|^2 dx
\]

\[
+ \mu \int_{\partial \Omega} u \cdot A \cdot u ds = \int P \text{div} u dx.
\]  
(3.12)
By \(1.1,1\), one can check that
\[ P_t + \text{div}(Pu) + (\gamma - 1)P\text{div}u = 0, \quad (3.13) \]
or
\[ P_t + \nabla P \cdot u + \gamma P\text{div}u = 0. \quad (3.14) \]

Then, integrating (3.13) over \(\Omega\) and applying slip boundary condition (1.4) show that
\[ \left( \int \frac{a}{\gamma - 1} \rho^\gamma dx \right)_t + \int P\text{div}udx = 0, \quad (3.15) \]
which together with the positive semi-definiteness of \(A\), (3.12) and (2.18) give (3.10).

The following conclusion shows preliminary \(L^2\) bounds for \(\nabla u\) and \(\rho^{1/2} \dot{u}\).

**Lemma 3.4** Let \((\rho, u)\) be a smooth solution of \((1.1)-(1.4)\) on \(\Omega \times (0, T]\) satisfying (3.4). Then there is a positive constant \(C\) depending only on \(\mu, \lambda, \alpha, \gamma,  \hat{\rho}, \Omega\) and the matrix \(A\) such that
\[ A_1(T) \leq CC_0 + C \int_0^T \int |\nabla u|^3 dxdt, \quad (3.16) \]
and
\[ A_2(T) \leq CC_0 + CA_1(T) + C \int_0^T \int |\nabla u|^4 dt. \quad (3.17) \]

**Proof.** We will adopt some ideas due to Hoff [15]. Let \(m \geq 0\) be a real number which will be determined later. Now we set out to prove (3.16). Multiplying (1.1)2 by \(\sigma^m \dot{u}\) and then integrating the resulting equality over \(\Omega\) lead to
\[
\int \sigma^m \rho |\dot{u}|^2 dx = -\int \sigma^m \dot{u} \cdot \nabla P dx + (\lambda + 2\mu) \int \sigma^m \nabla \text{div}u \cdot \dot{u} dx \\
- \mu \int \sigma^m \nabla \times \text{curl}u \cdot \dot{u} dx \\
\triangleq I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \quad (3.18)
\]
We will estimate \(I_1, I_2\) and \(I_3\) one by one. First, a direct calculation by applying (3.13) gives
\[
I_1 = -\int \sigma^m \dot{u} \cdot \nabla P dx \\
= \int \sigma^m P \text{div}u dx - \int \sigma^m u \cdot \nabla u \cdot \nabla P dx \\
= \left( \int \sigma^m P \text{div}udx \right)_t - m\sigma^{m-1} \int \sigma^m P \text{div}u dx + \int \sigma^m P \nabla u : \nabla u dx \\
+ (\gamma - 1) \int \sigma^m P (\text{div}u)^2 dx - \int_{\partial \Omega} \sigma^m P u \cdot \nabla u \cdot nds \\
\leq \left( \int \sigma^m P \text{div}udx \right)_t + C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + Cm\sigma^{m-1} \sigma C_0 - \int_{\partial \Omega} \sigma^m P u \cdot \nabla u \cdot nds. \quad (3.19)
\]
For the last term on the righthand side of (3.19), it follows from (1.24) that
\[
-\int_{\partial \Omega} \sigma^m P u \cdot \nabla u \cdot nds = \int_{\partial \Omega} \sigma^m P u \cdot \nabla n \cdot nds \\
\leq C \int_{\partial \Omega} \sigma^m |u|^2 ds \leq C \sigma^m \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2.
\]

Hence,
\[
I_1 \leq \left( \int \sigma^m P \div u \, dx \right)_t + C \| \nabla u \|_{L^2}^2 + C m \sigma^{m-1} \sigma' C_0. \tag{3.20}
\]

Similarly, by (1.24), it indicates that
\[
I_2 = (\lambda + 2\mu) \int \sigma^m \nabla \div u \cdot \dot{u} \, dx
\]
\[
= (\lambda + 2\mu) \int_{\partial \Omega} \sigma^m \div (\dot{u} \cdot n) \, ds - (\lambda + 2\mu) \int \sigma^m \div \div u \, dx
\]
\[
= (\lambda + 2\mu) \int_{\partial \Omega} \sigma^m \div (u \cdot \nabla u \cdot n) \, ds - \frac{\lambda + 2\mu}{2} \left( \int \sigma^m (\div u)^2 \, dx \right)_t
\]
\[
- (\lambda + 2\mu) \int \sigma^m \div (u \cdot \nabla u) \, dx + 2m(\lambda + 2\mu) \sigma^{m-1} \sigma' \int (\div u)^2 \, dx \tag{3.21}
\]
\[
= - (\lambda + 2\mu) \int_{\partial \Omega} \sigma^m \div (u \cdot \nabla u \cdot u) \, ds - \frac{\lambda + 2\mu}{2} \left( \int \sigma^m (\div u)^2 \, dx \right)_t
\]
\[
+ \frac{\lambda + 2\mu}{2} \int \sigma^m (\div u)^3 \, dx - (\lambda + 2\mu) \int \sigma^m \div \nabla u \cdot \nabla u \, dx
\]
\[
+ \frac{m(\lambda + 2\mu)}{2} \sigma^{m-1} \sigma' \int (\div u)^2 \, dx.
\]

For the first term on the righthand side of (3.21), we have
\[
\left| \int_{\partial \Omega} \div (u \cdot \nabla u \cdot u) \, ds \right|
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{\lambda + 2\mu} \left| \int_{\partial \Omega} (F + P - P)(u \cdot \nabla u \cdot u) \, ds \right|
\]
\[
\leq C \left( \int_{\partial \Omega} |F| |u|^2 \, ds + \int_{\partial \Omega} |u|^2 \, ds \right)
\]
\[
\leq C (\|F\|_{H^1} \|u\|_{H^1}^2 + \|u\|_{H^1}^2)
\]
\[
\leq C (\|\nabla F\|_{L^2} + 1) \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2
\]
\[
\leq \frac{1}{4} \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + C (\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^4).
\]

Therefore,
\[
I_2 \leq - \frac{\lambda + 2\mu}{2} \left( \int \sigma^m (\div u)^2 \, dx \right)_t + C \sigma^m \| \nabla u \|_{L^2}^3
\]
\[
+ \frac{1}{4} \sigma^m \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + C \sigma^m \| \nabla u \|_{L^2}^4 + C \| \nabla u \|_{L^2}^2. \tag{3.22}
\]
Finally, by (1.14) and (2.19), a straightforward computation shows that

\[ I_3 = -\mu \int \sigma^m \nabla \times \text{curl} u \cdot \dot{u} dx \]

\[ = -\mu \int \sigma^m \text{curl} u \cdot \text{curl} \dot{u} dx + \mu \int_{\partial \Omega} \sigma^m \text{curl} u \times n \cdot \dot{u} ds \]

\[ = -\frac{\mu}{2} \left( \int \sigma^m |\text{curl} u|^2 dx + \int_{\partial \Omega} \sigma^m u \cdot A \cdot ds \right) + \frac{\mu m}{2} \sigma^{-1} \sigma' \int |\text{curl} u|^2 dx \]

\[ + \frac{\mu m}{2} \sigma^{-1} \sigma' \int_{\partial \Omega} u \cdot A \cdot ds - \mu \int \sigma^m \text{curl} u \cdot \text{curl} (u \cdot \nabla u) dx \]

\[ + \mu \int_{\partial \Omega} \sigma^m (Au)^{1/2} \times (u \cdot \nabla u) \cdot nds \]

\[ = -\frac{\mu}{2} \left( \int \sigma^m |\text{curl} u|^2 dx + \int_{\partial \Omega} \sigma^m u \cdot A \cdot ds \right) + \frac{\mu m}{2} \sigma^{-1} \sigma' \int |\text{curl} u|^2 dx \quad (3.23) \]

\[ + \frac{\mu m}{2} \sigma^{-1} \sigma' \int_{\partial \Omega} u \cdot A \cdot ds - \mu \int \sigma^m (\nabla u^i \times \nabla_i u) \cdot \text{curl} u dx \]

\[ + \frac{\mu}{2} \int \sigma^m |\text{curl} u|^2 \text{div} u dx + \mu \int \sigma^m \text{curl} ((Au)^{1/2}) \times (u \cdot \nabla u) dx \]

\[ - \mu \int \sigma^m (\nabla u^i \times \nabla_i u) \cdot (Au)^{1/2} dx - \mu \int \sigma^m (u \cdot \nabla \text{curl} u) \cdot (Au)^{1/2} dx \]

\[ \leq -\frac{\mu}{2} \left( \int \sigma^m |\text{curl} u|^2 dx + \int_{\partial \Omega} \sigma^m u \cdot A \cdot ds \right) + C \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + C \sigma^m \|\nabla u\|^3_{L^3} \]

\[ + C \sigma^m \|\nabla u\|_L^4 + \frac{1}{4} \sigma^m \|\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2. \]

It follows from (3.18) and (3.20)-(3.23) that

\[ \left( \int \sigma^m (\text{div} u)^2 + \mu \sigma^m |\text{curl} u|^2 dx + \mu \int_{\partial \Omega} \sigma^m u \cdot A \cdot ds \right) \]

\[ \leq \left( 2 \int \sigma^m \text{div} u dx \right) + C m \sigma^{-1} \sigma' C_0 + C \sigma^m \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^4 
\]

\[ + C \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + C \sigma^m \|\nabla u\|^3_{L^3}. \quad (3.24) \]

Integrating (3.24) over (0, T), by (2.18), Lemma 3.3 and Young’s inequality, we conclude that for any \( m \geq 1 \),

\[ \sigma^m \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^T \int \sigma^m \rho |\dot{u}|^2 dx \] \] \[ \leq CC_0 + C \int_0^T \sigma^m \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^4 dt + C \int_0^T \sigma^m \|\nabla u\|^3_{L^3} dt, \]

which, after choosing \( m = 1 \), together with (3.4) and (3.10) gives (3.16).

Now we will prove (3.17). Rewrite (1.1)_2 as

\[ \rho \dot{u} = \nabla F - \mu \nabla \times \text{curl} u. \quad (3.25) \]

Operating \( \sigma^m \dot{u}^j [\partial_t + \text{div}(u \cdot \cdot) \] to (3.25)_j, summing with respect to \( j \), and integrating
over \( \Omega \) yields
\[
\left( \frac{\sigma^m}{2} \int \rho |\dot{u}|^2 dx \right)_t - \frac{m}{2} \sigma^{m-1} \sigma' \int \rho |\dot{u}|^2 dx \\
= \int \sigma^m (\dot{u} \cdot \nabla F_t + \dot{u}^j \text{div}(u \partial_j F)) dx \\
+ \mu \int \sigma^m (-\dot{u} \cdot \nabla \times \text{curl} u_t - \dot{u}^j \text{div}((\nabla \times \text{curl} u)^j u)) dx \\
\triangleq J_1 + \mu J_2.
\] (3.26)

For \( J_1 \), using (3.14) and (3.14), a direct computation shows
\[
J_1 = \int \sigma^m \dot{u} \cdot \nabla F_t dx + \int \sigma^m \dot{u}^j \text{div}(u \partial_j F) dx \\
= \int_{\partial \Omega} \sigma^m F_t \dot{u} \cdot nds - \int \sigma^m F_t \text{div}\dot{u} dx - \int \sigma^m u \cdot \nabla \dot{u}^j \partial_j F dx \\
= \int_{\partial \Omega} \sigma^m F_t \dot{u} \cdot nds - (2\mu + \lambda) \int \sigma^m (\text{div}\dot{u})^2 dx \\
+ (2\mu + \lambda) \int \sigma^m \text{div}\dot{u} v u : \nabla u dx + \int \sigma^m \text{div}\dot{u} u \cdot \nabla F dx \\
- \gamma \int \sigma^m P \text{div}\text{div}\dot{u} dx - \int \sigma^m u \cdot \nabla \dot{u}^j \partial_j F dx \\
- (\gamma - 1) \gamma P \text{div}\dot{u} \int \sigma^m \text{div}\dot{u} dx
\] (3.27)

where in the third equality we have used
\[
F_t = (2\mu + \lambda) \text{div}\dot{u} - P_t + \dot{P}_t \\
= (2\mu + \lambda) \text{div}\dot{u} - (2\mu + \lambda) \text{div}(u \cdot \nabla u) + u \cdot \nabla P + \gamma P \text{div}u - (\gamma - 1) \gamma P \text{div}u
\]

For the first term on the right-hand side of (3.27), we have
\[
\int_{\partial \Omega} \sigma^m F_t \dot{u} \cdot nds \\
= - \int_{\partial \Omega} \sigma^m F_t (u \cdot \nabla n \cdot u) ds \\
= - \left( \int_{\partial \Omega} \sigma^m (u \cdot \nabla n \cdot u) F ds \right)_t + m \sigma^{m-1} \sigma' \int_{\partial \Omega} (u \cdot \nabla n \cdot u) F ds \\
+ \sigma^m \int_{\partial \Omega} F \dot{u} \cdot \nabla n \cdot u ds + \sigma^m \int_{\partial \Omega} F u \cdot \nabla n \cdot \dot{u} ds \\
- \sigma^m \int_{\partial \Omega} F (u \cdot \nabla) u \cdot \nabla n \cdot u ds - \sigma^m \int_{\partial \Omega} F u \cdot \nabla n \cdot (u \cdot \nabla) u ds \\
\leq - \left( \int_{\partial \Omega} \sigma^m (u \cdot \nabla n \cdot u) F ds \right)_t + C m \sigma' \sigma^{m-1} \| \nabla u \|_{L^2}^2 \| F \|_{H^1} \\
+ \delta \sigma^m \| \dot{u} \|_{H^1}^2 + C(\delta) \sigma^m \| \nabla u \|_{L^2}^2 \| F \|_{H^1}^2 \\
- \sigma^m \int_{\partial \Omega} F (u \cdot \nabla) u \cdot \nabla n \cdot u ds - \sigma^m \int_{\partial \Omega} F u \cdot \nabla n \cdot (u \cdot \nabla) u ds,
\] (3.28)
where in the last inequality we have used

\[
\left| \int_{\partial \Omega} (u \cdot \nabla n \cdot u) F ds \right| \leq C \| \nabla u \|_{L^2}^2 \| F \|_{H^1}.
\]  

(3.29)

Since \( u \cdot n \big|_{\partial \Omega} = 0 \), we have

\[ u = -(u \times n) \times n \triangleq u^\perp \times n \text{ on } \partial \Omega, \]

which yields that

\[
- \int_{\partial \Omega} F(u \cdot \nabla)u \cdot \nabla n \cdotuds \\
= - \int_{\partial \Omega} u^\perp \times n \cdot \nabla u_i \nabla n \cdot uF ds \\
= - \int_{\partial \Omega} n \cdot (\nabla u^i \times u^\perp) \nabla n \cdot uF ds \\
= - \int_{\Omega} \text{div}((\nabla u^i \times u^\perp) \nabla n \cdot uF) dx \\
= - \int_{\Omega} \nabla (\nabla n \cdot uF) \cdot (\nabla u^i \times u^\perp) dx + \int_{\Omega} \nabla u^i \cdot \nabla \times u^\perp \nabla n \cdot uF dx
\]

(3.30)

\[ \leq C \int_{\Omega} |F| \| \nabla u \|_{L^2}^2 dx + C \int_{\Omega} |F|(|\nabla u|_{L^6}^2 |u|_{L^6}^2 + C \| F \|_{L^2} \| \nabla u \|_{L^4} \| u \|_{L^6}^2 \\
+ C \| F \|_{L^2} \| \nabla u \|_{L^4} \| u \|_{L^6}^2 \\
\leq C \| \nabla F \|_{L^6} \| \nabla u \|_{L^2}^2 + C \| F \|_{H^1} \| \nabla u \|_{L^2} \left( \| \nabla u \|_{L^4}^2 + \| \nabla u \|_{L^2}^2 \right) \\
\leq \delta \| \nabla F \|_{L^6}^2 + C(\delta) \| \nabla u \|_{L^2}^2 + C \| \nabla u \|_{L^4}^2 + C \| \nabla u \|_{L^2}^2 + 1, \]

where in the fourth equality we have used

\[ \text{div}(\nabla u^i \times u^\perp) = -\nabla u^i \cdot \nabla \times u^\perp. \]

Similarly, we have

\[
- \int_{\partial \Omega} F u \cdot \nabla n \cdot (u \cdot \nabla)uds \\
\leq \delta \| \nabla F \|_{L^6}^2 + C(\delta) \| \nabla u \|_{L^2}^2 + C \| \nabla u \|_{L^4}^2 + C \| \nabla u \|_{H^1}^2 \left( \| \nabla u \|_{L^2}^2 + 1 \right). 
\]

(3.31)

Notice that, by Lemma 2.3, (3.3) and (3.7),

\[ \| F \|_{H^1} + \| \text{curl} u \|_{H^1} \leq C(\| \rho \dot{u} \|_{L^2} + \| \nabla u \|_{L^2}) \]

(3.32)

and

\[
\| \nabla F \|_{L^6} + \| \text{curl} u \|_{L^6} \\
\leq C \| \dot{u} \|_{H^1} + C \| \nabla u \|_{L^2} \\
\leq C \| (\text{div} \dot{u}) \|_{L^2} + \| \text{curl} u \|_{L^2} + \| \nabla u \|_{L^2} + \| \nabla u \|_{L^2}^2 + \| \nabla u \|_{L^4}^4. 
\]

Putting (3.28), (3.30), and (3.31) into (3.27), we obtain after using (3.6), (3.10), (3.32), and (3.33) that

\[
J_1 \leq C m \sigma^{m-1} \sigma' \left( \| \rho \frac{\dot{u}}{L^2} \|_{L^2}^2 + \| \nabla u \|_{L^2}^2 + \| \nabla u \|_{L^2}^4 \right) - \left( \int_{\partial \Omega} \sigma^m (u \cdot \nabla n \cdot u) F ds \right) t \\
+ C \delta \sigma^m \| \nabla u \|_{L^2}^2 + C(\delta) \sigma^m \| \rho \frac{\dot{u}}{L^2} \|_{L^2} \left( \| \nabla u \|_{L^2}^4 + 1 \right) - (\lambda + 2\mu) \int \sigma^m (\text{div} \dot{u})^2 dx \\
+ C(\delta) \sigma^m \left( \| \nabla u \|_{L^2}^2 + \| \nabla u \|_{L^2}^6 + \| \nabla u \|_{L^4}^4 \right). 
\]

(3.34)
Note that \( \text{curl} u_t = \text{curl} \dot{u} - u \cdot \nabla \text{curl} u - \nabla u^i \times \nabla_i u \),

\[
J_2 = - \int \sigma^m |\text{curl} \dot{u}|^2 dx + \int \sigma^m \text{curl} \dot{u} \cdot (\nabla u^i \times \nabla_i u) dx \\
+ \int_{\partial \Omega} \sigma^m \text{curl} u_t \times n \cdot \dot{u} ds + \int \sigma^m u \cdot \nabla \text{curl} u \cdot \text{curl} \dot{u} ds \\
+ \int \sigma^m u \cdot \nabla \dot{u} \cdot (\nabla \times \text{curl} u) ds \tag{3.35}
\]

\[
\leq - \int \sigma^m |\text{curl} \dot{u}|^2 dx + \delta \sigma^m \| \nabla \dot{u} \|^2_{L^2} + \delta \sigma^m \| \nabla \text{curl} u \|^2_{L^6} \\
+ C(\delta) \sigma^m \| \nabla u \|^4_{L^4} + C(\delta) \sigma^m \| \nabla u \|^4_{L^2} \| \nabla \text{curl} u \|^2_{L^2},
\]

where in the last inequality we have utilized the fact

\[
\int_{\partial \Omega} \text{curl} u_t \times n \cdot \dot{u} ds = - \int_{\partial \Omega} u_t \cdot A \cdot \dot{u} ds \\
= - \int_{\partial \Omega} \dot{u} \cdot A \cdot \dot{u} ds + \int_{\partial \Omega} (u \cdot \nabla u) \cdot A \cdot \dot{u} ds \\
= - \int_{\partial \Omega} \dot{u} \cdot A \cdot \dot{u} ds + \int_{\partial \Omega} u^\perp \times n \cdot \nabla u^i (A_i \cdot \dot{u}) ds \\
= - \int_{\partial \Omega} \dot{u} \cdot A \cdot \dot{u} ds + \int_{\partial \Omega} n \cdot (\nabla u^i \times u^\perp) A_i \cdot \dot{u} ds \tag{3.36} \\
= - \int_{\partial \Omega} \dot{u} \cdot A \cdot \dot{u} ds + \int_{\Omega} \nabla (A_i \cdot \dot{u}) \cdot (\nabla u^i \times u^\perp) dx \\
- \int_{\Omega} \nabla u^i \cdot \nabla \times u^\perp (A_i \cdot \dot{u}) dx,
\]

here the symbol \( A_i \) denotes the \( i \)-th row of the matrix \( A \).

Combining (3.34) with (3.35), we deduce from (3.20) that

\[
\left( \frac{\sigma^m}{2} \| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{u} \|^2_{L^2} \right)_t + (\lambda + 2\mu) \sigma^m \| \text{div} \dot{u} \|^2_{L^2} + \mu \sigma^m \| \text{curl} \dot{u} \|^2_{L^2} \\
\leq C m \sigma^{m-1} \sigma' \left( \| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{u} \|^2_{L^2} + \| \nabla u \|^2_{L^2} + \| \nabla u \|^4_{L^2} \right) - \left( \int_{\partial \Omega} \sigma^m (u \cdot \nabla n \cdot u) F ds \right)_t \\
+ \delta \sigma^m \| \nabla \dot{u} \|^2_{L^2} + C \sigma^m \| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{u} \|^2_{L^2} \left( \| \nabla u \|^4_{L^2} + 1 \right) \\
+ C(\delta) \sigma^m \left( \| \nabla u \|^4_{L^2} + \| \nabla u \|^6_{L^2} + \| \nabla u \|^4_{L^4} \right),
\]

which together with (3.7), after choosing \( \delta \) suitably small, implies

\[
\left( \sigma^m \| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{u} \|^2_{L^2} \right)_t + (\lambda + 2\mu) \sigma^m \| \text{div} \dot{u} \|^2_{L^2} + \mu \sigma^m \| \text{curl} \dot{u} \|^2_{L^2} \\
\leq C m \sigma^{m-1} \sigma' \left( \| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{u} \|^2_{L^2} + \| \nabla u \|^2_{L^2} + \| \nabla u \|^4_{L^2} \right) - \left( \int_{\partial \Omega} \sigma^m (u \cdot \nabla n \cdot u) F ds \right)_t \tag{3.37} \\
+ C \sigma^m \| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{u} \|^2_{L^2} \left( \| \nabla u \|^4_{L^2} + 1 \right) + C \sigma^m \left( \| \nabla u \|^2_{L^2} + \| \nabla u \|^6_{L^2} + \| \nabla u \|^4_{L^4} \right).
\]

Now integrating (3.37) with \( m = 3 \) over \((0, T)\), we get (3.17) from (3.20) and (3.4), which completes the proof of Lemma 3.3.
Lemma 3.5 Assume that \((\rho, u)\) is a smooth solution of (1.4)-(1.4) satisfying (3.3). Then there exist positive constants \(C\) and \(\varepsilon_1\) depending only on \(\mu, \lambda, \gamma, a, \hat{\rho}, \hat{s}, \Omega, M\) and the matrix \(A\) such that\
\[
\begin{align*}
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq \sigma(T)} t^{1-s} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^{\sigma(T)} t^{1-s} \int_\Omega \rho |\dot{u}|^2 \, dx \, dt &\leq C(\hat{\rho}, M), \\
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq \sigma(T)} t^{2-s} \int_\Omega \rho |\dot{u}|^2 \, dx + \int_0^{\sigma(T)} t^{2-s} \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 \, dx \, dt &\leq C(\hat{\rho}, M),
\end{align*}
\]
provide that \(C_0 \leq \varepsilon_1\).

Proof. For \(Lf = \rho \dot{f} - \mu \Delta f - (\lambda + \mu) \nabla \text{div} f\), suppose that \(w_1(x, t)\) and \(w_2(x, t)\) solve the following problems respectively
\[
\begin{align*}
Lw_1 &= 0, & x &\in \Omega, \\
w_1(x, 0) &= w_{10}(x), & x &\in \Omega, \\
w_1 \cdot n &= 0, \text{curl} w_1 \times n = -Aw_1 & x &\in \partial\Omega,
\end{align*}
\]
and
\[
\begin{align*}
Lw_2 &= -\nabla (P - \bar{P}), & x &\in \Omega, \\
w_2(x, 0) &= 0, & x &\in \Omega, \\
w_2 \cdot n &= 0, \text{curl} w_2 \times n = -Aw_2 & x &\in \partial\Omega.
\end{align*}
\]

Just as we have done in the proof of Lemma 2.9 by Lemma 2.4 and Sobolev’s inequality, for any \(p \in [2, 6]\), we have
\[
\|\nabla^2 w_1\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|\rho \dot{w}_1\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla w_1\|_{L^2}),
\]
\[
\|\nabla w_1\|_{L^p} \leq C \|w_1\|_{W^{2,2}} \leq C(\|\rho \dot{w}_1\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla w_1\|_{L^2}),
\]
\[
\|\nabla F_{w_2}\|_{L^p} \leq C(\|\rho \dot{w}_2\|_{L^p} + \|\nabla w_2\|_{L^2} + \|P - \bar{P}\|_{L^p}),
\]
\[
\|F_{w_2}\|_{L^p} \leq C \|\nabla F_{w_2}\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|\rho \dot{w}_2\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla w_2\|_{L^2}),
\]
\[
\|\nabla w_2\|_{L^p} \leq C(\|\rho \dot{w}_2\|_{L^p} \frac{3p-6}{2p} (\|\nabla w_2\|_{L^2} + \|P - \bar{P}\|_{L^2})^{6-p} + C(\|\nabla w_2\|_{L^2} + \|P - \bar{P}\|_{L^p}),
\]
where \(F_{w_2} = (\lambda + 2\mu) \text{div} w_2 - (P - \bar{P})\).

A similar way as for the proof of (3.10) shows that
\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq \sigma(T)} \int_\Omega \rho |w_1|^2 \, dx + \int_0^{\sigma(T)} \int_\Omega |\nabla w_1|^2 \, dx \, dt \leq C \int_\Omega |w_{10}|^2 \, dx, \tag{3.46}
\]
and
\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq \sigma(T)} \int_\Omega \rho |w_2|^2 \, dx + \int_0^{\sigma(T)} \int_\Omega |\nabla w_2|^2 \, dx \, dt \leq CC_0. \tag{3.47}
\]
Multiplying (3.40) by $w_{1t}$ and integrating over $\Omega$, by (3.42), (3.44), Young's inequality, we obtain
\[
(\lambda + 2\mu)\frac{1}{2}\int (\text{div}w_1)^2dx + \int |\text{curl}w_1|^2dx + \frac{\mu}{2}\int w_1 \cdot A \cdot w_1ds) + \int \rho |\dot{w}_1|^2dx
= \int \rho \dot{w}_1 \cdot (u \cdot \nabla w_1)dx
\leq C\|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{w}_1\|_{L^2}\|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} u\|_{L^3}\|\nabla w_1\|_{L^6}
\leq CC_0^{\frac{5}{3}} (\|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{w}_1\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla w_1\|_{L^2}^2),
\]
which together with (3.40), Gronwall's inequality and Lemma 2.5 yields
\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq \sigma(T)} \|\nabla w_1\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^{\sigma(T)} \int \rho |\dot{w}_1|^2dxdt \leq C\|\nabla w_{10}\|_{L^2}^2,
(3.48)
\]
and
\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq \sigma(T)} t \|\nabla w_1\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^{\sigma(T)} t \int \rho |\dot{w}_1|^2dxdt \leq C\|w_{10}\|_{L^2}^2,
(3.49)
\]
provided $C_0 \leq \hat{\varepsilon}_1 \triangleq (2C)^{-\frac{3}{6}}$.

Since the solution operator $w_{10} \mapsto w_1(\cdot, t)$ is linear, by the standard Stein-Weiss interpolation argument \[10\], one can deduce from (3.48) and (3.49) that for any $\theta \in [8, 1],$
\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq \sigma(T)} t^{1-\theta} \|\nabla w_1\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^{\sigma(T)} t^{1-\theta} \int \rho |\dot{w}_1|^2dxdt \leq C\|w_{10}\|_{H^\theta}^2,
(3.50)
\]
with a uniform constant $C$ independent of $\theta$.

Multiplying (3.41) by $w_{2t}$ and integrating over $\Omega$ give that
\[
\left(\lambda + 2\mu\right)\frac{1}{2}\int (\text{div}w_2)^2dx + \int |\text{curl}w_2|^2dx - \int P \text{div}w_2 dx + \int w_2 \cdot A \cdot w_2ds)
+ \int \rho |\dot{w}_2|^2dx
= \int \rho \dot{w}_2 \cdot (u \cdot \nabla w_2)dx - \int P_t \text{div}w_2 dx
= \int \rho \dot{w}_2 \cdot (u \cdot \nabla w_2)dx - \frac{1}{\lambda + 2\mu} \int P(F_{w_2} \text{div}u + \nabla F_{w_2} \cdot u)dx
- \frac{1}{2(\lambda + 2\mu)} \int (P - \bar{P})^2\text{div}udx + \gamma \int P \text{div}u w_2 dx
\leq C(\|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{w}_2\|_{L^2} + ||F_{w_2}||_{L^2} + ||\nabla u||_{L^2} + ||\nabla F_{w_2}||_{L^2} + ||u||_{L^2})
+ C(||P - \bar{P}||_{L^2} + ||\nabla u||_{L^2} + ||\nabla F_{w_2}||_{L^2})
\leq CC_0^{\frac{5}{4}} (\|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{w}_2\|_{L^2} + ||F_{w_2}||_{L^2} + ||\nabla u||_{L^2} + ||\nabla F_{w_2}||_{L^2})
+ C(||P - \bar{P}||_{L^2} + ||\nabla u||_{L^2} + ||\nabla F_{w_2}||_{L^2})
\leq CC_0^{\frac{5}{4}} (\|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{w}_2\|_{L^2} + \frac{1}{4} ||\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{w}_2||_{L^2}^2 + C(||\nabla u||_{L^2}^2 + ||\nabla u||_{L^2}^2 + ||P - \bar{P}||_{L^2}^2),
\]
where we have utilized (3.29), (3.41), (3.44)-(3.45), Hölder’s, Poincaré’s and Young’s inequalities. Choosing $C_0 \leq \hat{\varepsilon}_2 \triangleq (4C)^{-\frac{1}{6}}$ thus gives
\[
\begin{align*}
&\left(\lambda + 2\mu\right)\|\text{div}w_2\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu\|\text{curl}w_2\|_{L^2}^2 - 2 \int P\text{div}w_2 dx + \mu \int_{\partial D} w_2 \cdot A \cdot w_2 ds \right) t \\
&+ \int \rho|\dot{w}_2|^2 dx \\
\leq C \left(\|\nabla w_2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|P - \bar{P}\|_{L^2}^2\right),
\end{align*}
\]
which together with Gronwall’s inequality, (3.47), and Lemmas 2.5 and 3.3 leads to
\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq \sigma(T)} \|\nabla w_2\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^{\sigma(T)} \int \rho|\dot{w}_2|^2 dx dt \leq C C_0^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\]

Now let $w_{10} = u_0$, so that $w_1 + w_2 = u$, we derive (3.38) from (3.50) and (3.51) directly under certain condition $C_0 \leq \varepsilon_1 \triangleq \min\{\hat{\varepsilon}_1, \hat{\varepsilon}_2\}$.

In order to prove (3.39), taking $m = 2 - s$ in (3.37), and integrating over $(0, \sigma(T)]$ instead of $(0, T]$, we obtain by (3.47),
\[
\begin{align*}
&\sup_{0 \leq t \leq \sigma(T)} t^{2-s}\|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{u}\|_{L^2} + \int_0^{\sigma(T)} t^{2-s}\|\nabla \dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 dt \\
&\leq C \int_0^{\sigma(T)} t^{1-s}\|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 dt + C \int_0^{\sigma(T)} t^{2-s}\|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 (\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^4 + 1)dt \\
&+ C \int_0^{\sigma(T)} t^{2-s}(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^4) dt + C \int_0^{\sigma(T)} t^{2-s}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^4 dt \\
&+ C \int_0^{\sigma(T)} t^{1-s}(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^4) dt + C \int_0^{\sigma(T)} t^{2-s}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^4 dt \\
&\leq C \int_0^{\sigma(T)} t^{2-s}\|\nabla u\|_{L^4}^4 dt + C(\hat{\rho}, M),
\end{align*}
\]
where we have taken advantage of (3.29) and (3.38).

By (3.23) and (3.38), we have
\[
\begin{align*}
&\int_0^{\sigma(T)} t^{2-s}\|\nabla u\|_{L^4}^4 dt \\
&\leq C \int_0^{\sigma(T)} t^{2-s}\|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{u}\|_{L^2}^3 (\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^4 + \|P - \bar{P}\|_{L^2}^4) dt \\
&+ C \int_0^{\sigma(T)} t^{2-s}(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^4 + \|P - \bar{P}\|_{L^2}^4) dt \\
&\leq C \int_0^{\sigma(T)} t^{\frac{2s-1}{2}} (t^{1-s}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2)\frac{3}{2} (t^{2-s}\|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2)\frac{1}{2} (t^{1-s}\|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2)\frac{1}{2} dt + C \\
&\leq C(\hat{\rho}, M) \left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq \sigma(T)} t^{2-s}\|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C,
\end{align*}
\]
which together with (3.52) gives (3.39).
Lemma 3.6 If \((\rho, u)\) is a smooth solution of \((1.1)-(1.4)\) satisfying \((3.3)\) and the initial data condition \(\|u_0\|_{H^2} \leq M\) in \((1.13)\), then there exists a positive constant \(\varepsilon_2\) depending only on \(\mu, \lambda, \gamma, a, \hat{\rho}, s, \Omega, M\) and the matrix \(A\) such that

\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq \sigma(T)} \int \rho|u|^3 dx \leq C_0^5,
\]

provided \(C_0 \leq \varepsilon_2\).

Proof. Multiplying \((1.1)_2\) by \(3|u|u\), and integrating the resulting equation over \(\Omega\) lead to

\[
3 \int |u|\rho \dot{u} \cdot u dx - 3(\lambda + 2\mu) \int |u|\nabla u \cdot u dx + 3\mu \int |\nabla \times \nabla u| dx = 0,
\]

which implies that

\[
\left( \int \rho|u|^3 dx \right)_t + 3(\lambda + 2\mu) \int \text{div} u \cdot \text{div}(|u|u) dx + 3\mu \int \text{curl} \nabla \cdot \text{curl}(|u|u) dx + 3\mu \int_{\partial \Omega} |u|u \cdot A \cdot u ds - 3 \int (P - \tilde{P}) \text{div}(|u|u) dx = 0.
\]

Hence, by \((2.23)\) and \((3.10)\),

\[
\left( \int \rho|u|^3 dx \right)_t \leq C \int |u||\nabla u|^2 dx + C \int |P - \tilde{P}||u||\nabla u| dx
\]

\[
\leq C\|u\|_{L^6} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^3 \|\nabla u\|_{L^6}^3 + C\|P - \tilde{P}\|_{L^3} \|u\|_{L^6} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}
\]

\[
\leq C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^3 \|\rho \dot{u}\|_{L^2} + \|P - \tilde{P}\|_{L^2} + \|P - \tilde{P}\|_{L^6} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^3 + CC_0^\frac{5}{6} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^6
\]

\[
\leq C(t^{2\delta_0 - 3/2}(t^{-1-s} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2)^{-2\delta_0 + 3/4} \cdot (t^{1-s} \|\dot{\rho}\|_{L^2}^2)^2 \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^{4\delta_0}
\]

\[
+ CC_0^{\frac{1}{2}} t^{-3(1-s)/4}(t^{-1-s} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} + C t^{s-1}(t^{-1-s} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2) \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}
\]

\[
+ CC_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2,
\]

which together with \((3.10)\) and \((3.38)\) indicates that

\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq \sigma(T)} \int \rho|u|^3 dx
\]

\[
\leq C(\hat{\rho}, M) \left( \int_0^{\sigma(T)} t^{-2(1-4\delta_0)(1-s)/3} dt \right)^{\frac{3 - 8\delta_0}{4}} \left( \int_0^{\sigma(T)} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 dt \right)^{2\delta_0} + CC_0^{\frac{1}{2}}
\]

\[
+ C(\hat{\rho}, M)C_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_0^{\sigma(T)} t^{-3(1-s)/2} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_0^{\sigma(T)} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \int \rho_0|u_0|^3 dx
\]

\[
\leq C(\hat{\rho}, M)C_0^{2\delta_0},
\]
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provided $C_0 \leq \varepsilon_1$, where in the last inequality we have used the simple fact
\[
\int \rho_0 |u_0|^3 dx \leq C \|\rho_0^{\frac{1}{2}} u_0\|_{L^2}^{3(2s-1)/2s} \|u_0\|_{H^s}^{3/2s} \leq C(\hat{\rho}, M) C_0^{2\delta_0},
\]
and $\frac{2(3-4\delta_0)(1-s)}{3-8\delta_0} = 1 - \frac{s(2s-1)}{2s} < 1$, due to $\delta_0 = \frac{2s-1}{4s} \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$.

Finally, setting $\varepsilon_2 \triangleq \min\{\varepsilon_1, (C(\hat{\rho}, M))^{-\frac{1}{\delta_0}}\}$, we finish the proof. \qed

**Lemma 3.7** Let $(\rho, u)$ be a smooth solution of (1.1)-(1.4) on $\Omega \times (0, T]$ satisfying (3.4) and the initial data condition $\|u_0\|_{H^s} \leq M$ in (1.13). Then there exists a positive constant $\varepsilon_3$ depending only on $\mu, \gamma, a, s, \hat{\rho}, M, \Omega$ and the matrix $A$ such that
\[
A_1(T) + A_2(T) \leq C_0^{\frac{1}{2}},
\]
provided $C_0 \leq \varepsilon_3$.

**Proof.** First, multiplying (1.1) by $B[P - \bar{P}]$ and integrating over $\Omega$ shows
\[
\int (P - \bar{P})^2 dx = \left(\int \rho u \cdot B[P - \bar{P}] dx\right)_t - \int \rho u \cdot \nabla B[P - \bar{P}] \cdot u dx - \int \rho u \cdot B[P_t - \bar{P}_t] dx
\]
\[
+ \mu \int \nabla u \cdot \nabla B[P - \bar{P}] dx + (\lambda + \mu) \int (P - \bar{P}) \text{div} u dx
\]
\[
\leq \left(\int \rho u \cdot B[P - \bar{P}] dx\right)_t + C\|u\|_{L^6}^2 \|P - \bar{P}\|_{L^{3/2}} + C\|u\|_{L^2} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}
\]
\[
+ C\|P - \bar{P}\|_{L^2} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}
\]
\[
\leq \left(\int \rho u \cdot B[P - \bar{P}] dx\right)_t + \delta\|P - \bar{P}\|_{L^2}^2 + C(\delta)\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2,
\]
where in the first inequality we have used
\[
\|B[P_t - \bar{P}_t]\|_{L^2} = \|B[\text{div}(Pu)] + (\gamma - 1)B[P \text{div} u - \bar{P} \text{div} u]\|_{L^2}
\]
\[
\leq C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2},
\]
Combining (3.57), (3.10), and Lemma 2.8 gives
\[
\int_0^T \int (P - \bar{P})^2 dx dt \leq C C_0.
\]
Now we will prove (3.56). By (2.23), (3.4), (3.59), and Lemmas 3.3, 3.5 one can
check that
\[
\int_0^T \sigma^3 \| \nabla u \|^4_{L^4} dt
\leq C \int_0^T \sigma^3 \| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{u} \|^3_{L^2} (\| \nabla u \|_{L^2} + \| P - \bar{P} \|_{L^2}) dt
+ C \int_0^T \sigma^3 (\| \nabla u \|^3_{L^2} + \| P - \bar{P} \|^3_{L^2}) dt
\leq C \left( \int_0^T (\sigma^{\frac{3}{2}} \| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{u} \|_{L^2}) (\sigma \| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{u} \|^2_{L^2} \| \nabla u \|^2_{L^2})^\frac{3}{4} dt \right)
+ C \left( \int_0^T (\sigma \| \nabla u \|^2_{L^2} \| \nabla u \|^2_{L^2} dt \right) + C \left( \int_0^T (\sigma \| P - \bar{P} \|^2_{L^2}) dt \right)
\leq C \left[ A_1^\frac{1}{2}(T) + C_0^\frac{1}{2} A_2(T) A_1(T) + C_0 \right]
\leq C C_0,
\]
which along with (3.16) and (3.17) gives
\[
A_1(T) + A_2(T) \leq C \left( C_0 + \int_0^T \sigma \| \nabla u \|^3_{L^3} dt \right).
\tag{3.61}
\]

By (2.23), (3.4), (3.59) and Lemmas 3.3 again, it indicates that
\[
\int_0^{\sigma(T)} \sigma \| \nabla u \|^3_{L^3} dt
\leq C \int_0^{\sigma(T)} \sigma \| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{u} \|^3_{L^2} (\| \nabla u \|^3_{L^2} + \| P - \bar{P} \|^3_{L^2}) dt
+ C \int_0^{\sigma(T)} \sigma (\| \nabla u \|^3_{L^2} + \| P - \bar{P} \|^3_{L^2}) dt
\leq C \int_0^{\sigma(T)} \left( t^{-\frac{3}{4}} \| \nabla u \|_{L^2} \right) \| \nabla u \|_{L^2} (\sigma \| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{u} \|^2_{L^2})^\frac{3}{4} dt
+ C \int_0^{\sigma(T)} \sigma^{\frac{3}{4}} \| P - \bar{P} \|^3_{L^2} (\sigma \| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{u} \|^2_{L^2})^\frac{3}{4} dt
+ C \left( \int_0^{\sigma(T)} (\sigma \| \nabla u \|^2_{L^2}) \| \nabla u \|_{L^2} dt \right) + C \left( \int_0^{\sigma(T)} (\sigma \| P - \bar{P} \|^2_{L^2}) dt \right)
\leq C(M) \left( \int_0^{\sigma(T)} \| \nabla u \|^2_{L^2} dt \right)^\frac{3}{4} \left( \int_0^{\sigma(T)} (\sigma \| \rho \dot{u} \|^2_{L^2} dt \right)^\frac{3}{4} + C C_0
\leq C(\hat{\rho}, M)(A_1(T))^\frac{1}{4} C_0^\frac{3}{4} + C C_0
\leq C(\hat{\rho}, M) C_0^\frac{3}{4},
\]
provided \( C_0 \leq \varepsilon_2 \).
On the other hand, by (3.60) and (3.10),
\[
\int_{\sigma(T)}^{T} \sigma \| \nabla u \|_{L^4}^3 dt \leq \int_{\sigma(T)}^{T} \sigma \| \nabla u \|_{L^4}^4 dt + \int_{\sigma(T)}^{T} \sigma \| \nabla u \|_{L^2}^2 dt \leq CC_0.
\] (3.63)

Hence, by (3.61)-(3.63), we have
\[
A_1(T) + A_2(T) \leq C(\hat{\rho}, M)C_0^{\frac{5}{8}},
\] which gives (3.56) provided \(C_0 \leq \varepsilon_3\) with \(\varepsilon_3 \triangleq \min\{\varepsilon_2, (C(\hat{\rho}, M))^{-8}\}\).

We now proceed to derive a uniform (in time) upper bound for the density, which turns out to be the key to obtaining all the higher order estimates and thus to extending the classical solution globally. We will use an approach motivated by the works \[23,29\].

**Lemma 3.8** There exists a positive constant \(\varepsilon\) depending on \(\mu, \lambda, \gamma, a, \hat{\rho}, s, \Omega, M,\) and the matrix \(A\) such that, if \((\rho, u)\) is a smooth solution of (1.1)-(1.4) on \(\Omega \times (0, T]\) satisfying (3.4) and the initial data condition \(\|u_0\|_{H^s} \leq M\) in (1.13), then
\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\rho(t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{7\hat{\rho}}{4},
\] (3.64)

provided \(C_0 \leq \varepsilon\).

**Proof.** First, the equation of mass conservation (1.1) can be equivalently rewritten in the form
\[
D_t \rho = g(\rho) + b'(t),
\] (3.65)
where
\[
D_t \rho \triangleq \rho_t + u \cdot \nabla \rho, \quad g(\rho) \triangleq -\frac{\rho P}{2\mu + \lambda}, \quad b(t) \triangleq \frac{1}{2\mu + \lambda} \int_0^t \rho \bar{P} - \rho F dt.
\]

Then, for \(t \in [0, \sigma(T)]\), one deduces from (2.2), (2.19), (2.22), (3.6), (3.4), Lemmas
and \(3.5\) that for \(\delta_0\) as in Proposition \(3.4\) and for all \(0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq \sigma(T)\),

\[
|b(t_2) - b(t_1)| 
\leq C \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \| (\rho F)(\cdot, t) \|_{L^\infty} \, dt + CC_0
\]

\[
\leq C \int_0^{\sigma(T)} \| F \|_{L^6} \| \nabla F \|_{L^6} \, dt + CC_0^{\frac{1}{2}}
\]

\[
\leq C \int_0^{\sigma(T)} \left( \| \rho \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \|_{L^2} + \| \nabla u \|_{L^2} \right) \left( \| \rho \hat{u} \|_{L^6} + \| \nabla u \|_{L^2} + C_{0}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \, dt + CC_0^{\frac{1}{2}}
\]

\[
\leq C \int_0^{\sigma(T)} \| \rho \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \|_{L^2} \| \nabla u \|_{L^2} \, dt + C \int_0^{\sigma(T)} \| \nabla u \|_{L^2} \| \nabla \hat{u} \|_{L^2} \, dt
\]

\[
+ C(M) \int_0^{\sigma(T)} t^{-\frac{4}{3}+\frac{1}{3}} \left( \| \nabla u \|_{L^2} + \| \nabla u \|_{L^2} + C_{0}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \, dt + CC_0^{\frac{1}{2}}(3.66)
\]

\[
\leq C \int_0^{\sigma(T)} t^{(2-s)(\frac{4}{3}+\frac{1}{3})} \left( \| \rho \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \|_{L^2} \right) \left( \| \rho \hat{u} \|_{L^2} \right) \left( \| \nabla u \|_{L^2} \right) \left( \| \nabla \hat{u} \|_{L^2} \right) \, dt + C \int_0^{\sigma(T)} \| \rho \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \|_{L^2} \| \nabla \hat{u} \|_{L^2} \, dt + C(M)C_{0}^{\frac{1}{2}}
\]

\[
\leq C(M) \left( \int_0^{\sigma(T)} t^{-\frac{4}{3}+\frac{1}{3}+\frac{4}{3}0} \, dt \right)^{\frac{3(1-\delta_0)}{4}} \left( \int_0^{\sigma(T)} t^{\frac{4}{3}+\frac{1}{3}} \, dt \right)^{\frac{3\delta_0}{4}}
\]

\[
+ C(M)C_{0}^{\frac{1}{2}}
\]

\[
\leq C(\hat{\rho}, M)C_{0}^{\frac{3\delta_0}{4}}
\]

provide \(C_0 \leq \varepsilon_1\). Choosing \(N_1 = 0\), \(N_0 = C(\hat{\rho}, M)C_{0}^{\frac{3\delta_0}{4}}\), and \(\zeta_0 = \hat{\rho}\) in Lemma \(2.3\), we use \(3.66\), \(3.65\), and Lemma \(2.3\) to get

\[
\sup_{t \in [0, \sigma(T)]} \| \rho \|_{L^\infty} \leq \hat{\rho} + C(\hat{\rho}, M)C_{0}^{\frac{3\delta_0}{4}} \leq \frac{3\hat{\rho}}{2}, \quad (3.67)
\]

provided \(C_0 \leq \hat{\varepsilon}_3 \triangleq \min \left\{ \tilde{\varepsilon}_3, \left( \frac{\hat{\rho}}{2C(\hat{\rho}, M)} \right)^{\frac{3\delta_0}{4}} \right\} \).

On the other hand, for \(t \in [\sigma(T), T]\), \(\sigma(T) \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq T\), it follows from \(2.19\), \(2.22\), \(3.6\), \(3.4\), \(3.10\) and \(3.59\) that

\[
|b(t_2) - b(t_1)| \leq C \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \| F \|_{L^\infty} \, dt + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \rho \hat{F} \, dt
\]

\[
\leq \frac{(a + C(\hat{\rho})C_0)\hat{\rho}^{\gamma+1}}{2(\lambda + 2\mu)}(t_2 - t_1) + C \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \| F \|_{L^\infty} \, dt
\]

\[
\leq \frac{(a + C(\hat{\rho})C_0)\hat{\rho}^{\gamma+1}}{2(\lambda + 2\mu)}(t_2 - t_1) + C \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \| F \|_{L^6} \| \nabla F \|_{L^6} \, dt
\]

\[
\leq \frac{(a + C(\hat{\rho})C_0)\hat{\rho}^{\gamma+1}}{2(\lambda + 2\mu)}(t_2 - t_1) + CC_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\sigma(T)}^{T} \| \nabla \hat{u} \|_{L^2} \, dt + CC_0^{\frac{1}{2}}
\]

\[
\leq \frac{a\hat{\rho}^{\gamma+1}}{\lambda + 2\mu}(t_2 - t_1) + CC_0^{\frac{1}{2}},
\]
provided $C_0 \leq \hat{\xi}_4 = \frac{\hat{\rho}}{C(\rho)}$.

Now choosing $N_0 = CC_0^{\frac{1}{2}}$, $N_1 = \frac{\hat{\rho}^{\gamma+1}}{\lambda + 2\mu}$ in (2.3) and setting $\zeta_0 = \hat{\rho}$ in (2.4), we have for all $\zeta \geq \zeta_0 = \hat{\rho}$,

$$
g(\zeta) = -\frac{a\zeta^{\gamma+1}}{\lambda + 2\mu} \leq -\frac{\hat{\rho}^{\gamma+1}}{\lambda + 2\mu} = -N_1,
$$

which together with Lemma 2.3, 3.67, and (3.68) leads to

$$
\sup_{t \in \sigma(T), T} \|\rho\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{3\hat{\rho}}{2} + CC_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{7\hat{\rho}}{4},
$$

provided

$$
C_0 \leq \varepsilon \equiv \min \{\hat{\xi}_3, \hat{\xi}_4, (\frac{\hat{\rho}}{4C})^2\}.
$$

(3.70)

The combination of (3.67) with (3.69) completes the proof of Lemma 3.8.

\[\square\]

4 A priori estimates (II): higher order estimates

Let $(\rho, u)$ be a smooth solution of (1.1)–(1.4). The purpose of this section is to derive some necessary higher order estimates, which make sure that one can extend the classical solution globally in time. Here we adopt the method of the article [23,30], and follow their work with a few modifications. We sketch it here for completeness.

In this section, we always assume that the initial energy $C_0$ satisfies (3.70), and the positive constant $C$ may depend on

$$
T, \quad \|g\|_{L^2}, \quad \|\nabla u_0\|_{H^1}, \quad \|\rho_0\|_{W^{2,q}}, \quad \|P(\rho_0)\|_{W^{2,q}},
$$

for $q \in (3,6)$ besides $\mu, \lambda, a, \gamma, \hat{\rho}, s, \Omega, M$ and the matrix $A$, where $g \in L^2(\Omega)$ is given as in (1.14).

**Lemma 4.1** There exists a positive constant $C$, such that

$$
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{u}\|_{L^2} + \int_0^T \|
abla \dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 dt \leq C,
$$

(4.1)

$$
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left(\|\nabla \rho\|_{L^6} + \|u\|_{H^2}\right) + \int_0^T \left(\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^6}^2\right) dt \leq C.
$$

(4.2)

**Proof.** First, taking $s = 1$ in (3.38) along with (3.56) gives

$$
\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^T \rho |\dot{u}|^2 dx dt \leq C.
$$

(4.3)

Choosing $m = 0$ in (3.37), by (2.28) and (3.7), we have

$$
\left(\|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2\right)_t + \|\nabla \dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2
\leq - \left(\int_{\partial \Omega} (u \cdot \nabla n \cdot u) F ds\right)_t + C \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 (\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^4 + 1)
+ C (\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^6 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^4}^4)
\leq - \left(\int_{\partial \Omega} (u \cdot \nabla n \cdot u) F ds\right)_t + C \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 (\|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^4 + 1)
+ C (\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^6 + \|P - \bar{P}\|_{L^4}^4).
$$

(4.4)
By Gronwall’s inequality and the compatibility condition (1.17), we deduce (4.4) from (4.4), (4.3) and (3.29).

Next, we prove (4.2) by following the proof of Lemma 5 in [22]. For $2 \leq p \leq 6$, $|\nabla \rho|^p$ satisfies
\[
|\nabla \rho|^p_t + \text{div}(|\nabla \rho|^p u) + (p - 1)|\nabla \rho|^p \text{div} u + p|\nabla \rho|^{p-2}(\nabla \rho)^{tr} \nabla u(\nabla \rho) + pp|\nabla \rho|^{p-2}\nabla \rho \cdot \nabla \text{div} u = 0,
\]
where $(\nabla \rho)^{tr}$ is the transpose of $\nabla \rho$.

Thus, taking $p = 6$, by (2.19), (3.6) and (4.3),
\[
(\|\nabla \rho\|_{L^6})_t \leq C(1 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty})\|\nabla \rho\|_{L^6} + C\|\nabla F\|_{L^6} \\
\leq C(1 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty})\|\nabla \rho\|_{L^6} + C\|\rho \dot{u}\|_{L^6} \\
\leq C(1 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty})\|\nabla \rho\|_{L^6} + C(\|\nabla \dot{u}\|_{L^2} + 1).
\]

Then, it follows from Gagliardo-Nirenberg’s inequality, (3.6), (2.19), and (4.3) that
\[
\|\text{div} u\|_{L^\infty} + \|\text{curl} u\|_{L^\infty} \\
\leq C(\|\text{div} u\|_{L^\infty} + \|\text{curl} u\|_{L^\infty}) + \|\text{curl} u\|_{L^\infty} \\
\leq C(\|F\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla F\|_{L^6} + \|\text{curl} u\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \text{curl} u\|_{L^6} + \|P - \tilde{P}\|_{L^\infty}) \\
\leq C(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2} + \|P - \tilde{P}\|_{L^2} + \|\rho \dot{u}\|_{L^6} + \|P - \tilde{P}\|_{L^\infty}) \\
\leq C(\|\nabla \dot{u}\|_{L^2} + 1).
\]

Together with Lemma 2.71 (4.6), and (3.6), we have
\[
\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \leq C(\|\text{div} u\|_{L^\infty} + \|\text{curl} u\|_{L^\infty}) \ln(e + \|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^6}) + C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2} + C \\
\leq C(1 + \|\nabla \dot{u}\|_{L^2}) \ln(e + \|\nabla \dot{u}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^6}) \\
\leq C(1 + \|\nabla \dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + C(1 + \|\nabla \dot{u}\|_{L^2}) \ln(e + \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^6}).
\]

where in the second inequality, we have used the fact that for any $p \in [2, 6]$,
\[
\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^p} \leq C(\|\rho \dot{u}\|_{L^p} + \|\nabla P\|_{L^p} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} + \|P - \tilde{P}\|_{L^p}),
\]
due to Lemma 2.2 for the following system
\[
\begin{cases}
-\mu \Delta u - (\lambda + \mu) \text{div} u = -\rho \dot{u} - \nabla (P - \tilde{P}), & x \in \Omega, \\
u \cdot n = 0 \text{ and } \text{curl} u \times n = -Au, & x \in \partial \Omega.
\end{cases}
\]

Combining (4.7) with (4.5) yields
\[
(\|\nabla \rho\|_{L^6})_t \leq C(1 + \|\nabla \dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + (1 + \|\nabla \dot{u}\|_{L^2}) \ln(e + \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^6}) (e + \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^6}),
\]
which can be rewritten as
\[
(\ln(e + \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^6}))_t \leq C(1 + \|\nabla \dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + C(1 + \|\nabla \dot{u}\|_{L^2}) \ln(e + \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^6}).
\]

By Gronwall’s inequality and (4.4), we derive
\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^6} \leq C,
\]
which together with (4.7), (4.8), (3.6), (4.1), and (4.3) gives (4.2) and finishes the proof of Lemma 4.4. 

Lemma 4.2 There exists a positive constant $C$ such that

\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} u_t\|^2_{L^2} + \int_0^T \int |\nabla u_t|^2 \, dx \, dt \leq C, \tag{4.10}
\]

and

\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} (\|\rho - \bar{\rho}\|_{H^2} + \|P - \bar{P}\|_{H^2}) \leq C. \tag{4.11}
\]

Proof. By Lemma 4.1, a straightforward calculation yields that

\[
\|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} u_t\|^2_{L^2} \leq \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{u}\|^2_{L^2} + \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} u \cdot \nabla u\|^2_{L^2} \leq C + C \|u\|^2_{L^2} \|\nabla u\|^2_{L^2}, \tag{4.12}
\]

and

\[
\int_0^T \|\nabla u_t\|^2_{L^2} \, dt \leq \int_0^T \|\nabla \dot{u}\|^2_{L^2} \, dt + \int_0^T \|\nabla (u \cdot \nabla u)\|^2_{L^2} \, dt \leq C + \int_0^T \|\nabla u\|^4_{L^4} + \|u\|^2_{L^\infty} \|\nabla^2 u\|^2_{L^2} \, dt \leq C + C \int_0^T (\|\nabla^2 u\|^2_{L^2} + \|\nabla u\|_{H^1} \|\nabla^2 u\|^2_{L^2}) \, dt \leq C, \tag{4.13}
\]

so we obtain (4.10).

It remains to prove (4.11). We deduce from (4.9) and Lemma 2.4 that for any $p \in [2, 6],$

\[
\|\nabla^3 u\|_{L^p} \leq C(\|\rho \dot{u}\|_{W^{1,p}} + \|\nabla P\|_{W^{1,p}} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} + \|P - \bar{P}\|_{L^p}), \tag{4.14}
\]

which together with (3.14), (1.1) 1, (4.8), and Lemma 4.1 gives

\[
\frac{d}{dt}(\|\nabla^2 P\|^2_{L^2} + \|\nabla^2 \rho\|^2_{L^2}) \leq C(1 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty})(\|\nabla^2 P\|^2_{L^2} + \|\nabla^2 \rho\|^2_{L^2}) + C\|\nabla \dot{u}\|^2_{L^2} + C.
\]

Consequently, combining this, Gronwall’s inequality, and Lemma 4.1 leads to

\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} (\|\nabla^2 P\|^2_{L^2} + \|\nabla^2 \rho\|^2_{L^2}) \leq C.
\]

Thus the proof of Lemma 4.2 is finished. \qed

Lemma 4.3 There exists a positive constant $C,$ such that

\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} (\|\rho_t\|_{H^1} + \|P_t\|_{H^1}) + \int_0^T (\|\rho_t\|^2_{L^2} + \|P_t\|^2_{L^2}) \, dt \leq C, \tag{4.15}
\]

and

\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \sigma \|\nabla u_t\|^2_{L^2} + \int_0^T \sigma \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} u_{tt}\|^2_{L^2} \, dt \leq C. \tag{4.16}
\]
Proof. It follows from (3.14) and Lemma 4.1 that
\[ \|P_t\|_{L^2} \leq C\|u\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla P\|_{L^2} + C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2} \leq C. \quad (4.17) \]
Differentiating (3.14) yields
\[ \nabla P_t + u \cdot \nabla \nabla P + \nabla u \cdot \nabla P + \gamma \nabla P \text{div} u + \gamma P \nabla \text{div} u = 0. \]
Hence, by Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2, we get
\[ \|\nabla P_t\|_{L^2} \leq C\|u\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla^2 P\|_{L^2} + C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2} \leq C. \quad (4.18) \]
Combining (4.17) with (4.18) implies
\[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|P_t\|_{H^1} \leq C. \quad (4.19) \]
It follows from (3.14) that \( P_{tt} \) satisfies
\[ P_{tt} + \gamma P \text{div} u + \gamma P \text{div} u_t + u_t \cdot \nabla P + u \cdot \nabla P_t = 0. \quad (4.20) \]
Multiplying (4.20) by \( P_{tt} \) and integrating over \( \Omega \times [0, T] \), we deduce from (4.19), Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2 that
\[
\int_0^T \|P_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 dt = - \int_0^T \int \gamma P_{tt} P_t \text{div} u dx dt - \int_0^T \int \gamma P_{tt} P \text{div} u_t dx dt \\
- \int_0^T \int P_{tt} u_t \cdot \nabla P dx dt - \int_0^T \int P_{tt} u \cdot \nabla P dx dt \\
\leq C \int_0^T \|P_t\|_{L^2} \left( \|P_t\|_{L^2} \|\nabla u\|_{L^6} + \|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2} \right) dt \\
+ C \int_0^T \|P_{tt}\|_{L^2} \left( \|u_t\|_{L^3} \|\nabla P\|_{L^6} + \|u\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla P_t\|_{L^2} \right) dt \\
\leq C \int_0^T \|P_{tt}\|_{L^2} (1 + \|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}) dt \\
\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \|P_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 dt + C \int_0^T \|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2 dt + C \\
\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \|P_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 dt + C,
\]
where we have utilized Sobolev’s inequality. Therefore, it holds
\[ \int_0^T \|P_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 dt \leq C. \]
One can deal with \( \rho_t \) and \( \rho_{tt} \) similarly. Thus (4.15) is proved.

It remains to prove (4.16). Since \( u_t \cdot n = 0 \) on \( \partial\Omega \), by Lemma 2.3, we have
\[ \|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2 \leq CH(t), \quad (4.21) \]
with
\[ H(t) \triangleq (\lambda + 2\mu) \int (\text{div} u_t)^2 dx + \mu \int |\text{curl} u_t|^2 dx. \]
Differentiating \( \frac{d}{dt}H(t) + 2 \int \rho |u_t|^2dx \) with respect to \( t \), then multiplying by \( u_t \), we obtain

\[
\frac{d}{dt}H(t) + 2 \int \rho |u_t|^2dx = \frac{d}{dt} \left( -\int \rho_t |u_t|^2dx - 2 \int \rho_t u \cdot \nabla u \cdot u_t dx + 2 \int P_t \text{div} u_t dx - 2 \mu \int_{\partial \Omega} u_t \cdot A \cdot u_t ds \right) \\
+ \int \rho |u_t|^2dx + 2 \int (\rho u \cdot \nabla u)_t \cdot u_t dx - 2 \int \rho u_t \cdot \nabla u \cdot u_t dx \\
- 2 \int \rho u \cdot \nabla u_t \cdot u_t dx - 2 \int P_t \text{div} u_t dx \\
\triangleq \frac{d}{dt}I_0 + \sum_{i=1}^5 I_i.
\]

Let us estimate \( I_i, i = 0, 1, \cdots, 5 \). We conclude from (1.1), (3.9), (4.1), (4.2), (4.3), (4.10), (4.15), (4.21), and Sobolev’s and Poincaré’s inequalities that

\[
I_0 = -\int \rho_t |u_t|^2dx - 2 \int \rho_t u \cdot \nabla u \cdot u_t dx + 2 \int P_t \text{div} u_t dx + 2 \mu \int_{\partial \Omega} u_t \cdot A \cdot u_t ds \\
\leq \left| \int \text{div}(\rho u) |u_t|^2dx \right| + C\|\rho_t\|_{L^3}\|u\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}\|u_t\|_{L^6} + C\|P_t\|_{L^2}\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2} \\
\leq C \int |\rho u_t| |\nabla u_t| dx + C\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2} (4.23)
\]

\[
|I_1| = \left| \int \rho u_t |u_t|^2dx \right| = \left| \int \text{div}(\rho u_t) |u_t|^2dx \right| = 2 \left| \int (\rho u + \rho u_t) \cdot \nabla u_t \cdot u_t dx \right| \\
\leq C \left( \|\rho_t\|_{H^1} \|u\|_{H^2} + \|\rho^{1/2} u_t\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \right) \|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2 (4.24)
\]

\[
|I_2| = 2 \left| \int (\rho u_t \cdot \nabla u)_t \cdot u_t dx \right| \\
= 2 \left| \int (\rho u_t \cdot \nabla u \cdot u_t + \rho u_t \cdot \nabla u \cdot u_t + \rho u \cdot \nabla u_t \cdot u_t) dx \right| \\
\leq \|\rho u_t\|_{L^2} \|u \cdot \nabla u\|_{L^3} \|u_t\|_{L^6} + \|\rho_t\|_{L^2} \|u_t\|_{L^6} \|\nabla u\|_{L^6} \\
+ \|\rho_t\|_{L^3} \|u\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2} \|u_t\|_{L^6} \\
\leq C \|\rho u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2 (4.25)
\]

\[
|I_3| + |I_4| = 2 \left| \int \rho u_t \cdot \nabla u \cdot u_{tt} dx \right| + 2 \left| \int \rho u \cdot \nabla u_t \cdot u_{tt} dx \right| \leq C \|\rho^{1/2} u_{tt}\|_{L^2} \left( \|u_t\|_{L^6} \|\nabla u\|_{L^3} + \|u\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2} \right) (4.26)
\]

\[
\leq \|\rho^{1/2} u_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2,
\]
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and
\[ |I_5| = 2 \left| \int P_t \text{div} u_t \, dx \right| \leq C \|P_t\|_{L^2} \|\text{div} u_t\|_{L^2} \leq C \|P_t\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2. \] (4.27)
Consequently, together with (4.10), (4.15) and (4.23), we derive that
\[ \frac{d}{dt}(\sigma H(t) - \sigma I_0) + \sigma \int P_t \|u_t\|^2 \, dx \leq C(1 + \|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2)\sigma H(t) + C(1 + \|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\rho_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \|P_t\|_{L^2}^2), \]
By Gronwall's inequality, (4.10), (4.15) and (4.23), we derive that
\[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} (\sigma H(t)) + \int_0^T \sigma \|\rho_t\|_{L^2}^2 \, dt \leq C. \]
As a result, by (4.21),
\[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \sigma \|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^T \sigma \|\rho_t\|_{L^2}^2 \, dt \leq C. \]
This finishes the proof of Lemma 4.3.

Lemma 4.4 For \( q \in (3, 6) \), there exists a positive constant \( C \) such that
\[ \sup_{t \in [0,T]} \sigma \|\nabla u\|_{H^2}^2 + \int_0^T (\|\nabla u\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\nabla^2 u\|_{W^{1,q}}^p + \sigma \|\nabla u_t\|_{H^1}^2) \, dt \leq C, \] (4.28)
\[ \sup_{t \in [0,T]} (\|\rho - \bar{\rho}\|_{W^{2,q}} + \|P - \bar{P}\|_{W^{2,q}}) \leq C, \] (4.29)
where \( p_0 = \frac{9q - 6}{12q - 12} \in (1, \frac{7}{5}). \)

Proof. First, by Lemma 1.1 and Poincaré’s, Sobolev’s inequalities, one can check that
\[ \|\nabla(\rho u_t)\|_{L^2} \leq \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^2} + \|\rho \nabla u_t\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^2} + \|\rho \nabla \nabla u\|_{L^2} + \|\rho \nabla u\|_{L^2} + \|\rho \|_{L^2} + \|\rho \nabla u\|_{L^2} \]
\[ \leq \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^3} + \|u_t\|_{L^6} + C \|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2} + C \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^3} \|u\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla u\|_{L^6} + C \|\nabla u\|_{L^3} \|\nabla u\|_{L^6} + C \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^2} \]
\[ \leq C + C \|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}, \]
which together with (4.11) and Lemma 1.1 yields
\[ \|\nabla^2 u\|_{H^2} \leq C(\|\rho u_t\|_{H^1} + \|P - \bar{P}\|_{H^2} + \|u\|_{L^2}) \leq C + C \|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}. \] (4.30)
It then follows from (4.30), (4.2), (4.10) and (4.16) that
\[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \sigma \|\nabla u\|_{H^2}^2 + \int_0^T \|\nabla u\|_{H^2}^2 \, dt \leq C. \] (4.31)
We deduce from Lemma (4.11) and (4.16) that
\[
\|\nabla^2 u_t\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|\rho u_t\|_{L^2} + \|P_t\|_{H^1} + \|u_t\|_{L^2})
\]
\[
\leq C(\|u_t\|_{H^1} + \rho u_t \cdot \nabla u + \rho u_t \cdot \nabla u_t + \rho u \cdot \nabla u_t) + C(\|\nabla P_t\|_{L^2} + \|u_t\|_{L^2})
\]
\[
\leq C(\|u_t\|_{H^1} + \rho u_t \cdot \nabla u + \rho u_t \cdot \nabla u_t) + C(\|\nabla P_t\|_{L^2} + \|u_t\|_{L^2})
\]
\[
\leq C(\|u_t\|_{H^1} + \|u_t\|_{L^2} + \|u\|_{L^2} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} + \|P_t\|_{L^2} + \|u_t\|_{L^2}) + C,
\]
where in the first inequality, we have utilized Lemma (2.4) for the following elliptic system
\[
\begin{cases}
\mu \Delta u_t + (\lambda + \mu) \nabla \text{div} u_t = (\rho u_t) + \nabla P_t & \text{in } \Omega, \\
u_t \cdot n = 0 \text{ and } \text{curl} u_t \times n = -Au_t & \text{on } \partial \Omega.
\end{cases}
\]
Combining (4.32) with (4.16) yields
\[
\int_0^T \sigma \|\nabla u_t\|^2_{H^1} dt \leq C. \tag{4.33}
\]
By Sobolev’s inequality, (3.6), (4.2), (4.11) and (4.16), we get for any \( q \in (3, 6), \)
\[
\|\nabla(\rho u_t)\|_{L^q} \leq C \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^q} (\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^q} + \|\nabla \dot{u}\|_{L^q} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2) + C \|\nabla u\|_{L^q}
\]
\[
\leq C(\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^q} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^q} + \|\nabla u\cdot \nabla u\|_{L^q})
\]
\[
\leq C(\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^q} + 1) + C \|\nabla u_t\|_{L^q}^2 \|\nabla u_t\|_{L^q}^{3(q-2)2} + C\|\nabla u\|_{L^q}^{3(q-2)2} + C
\]
\[
\leq C\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} + C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2} + C\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\sigma \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2) + C. \tag{4.34}
\]
Integrating (4.34) over \([0, T], \) by (4.1) and (4.33), we have
\[
\int_0^T \|\nabla(\rho u_t)\|_{L^q}^p dt \leq C. \tag{4.35}
\]
On the other hand, the combination of (3.14) with (4.11) gives
\[
(\|\nabla^2 P\|_{L^q})_t \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla^2 P\|_{L^q} + C \|\nabla^2 u\|_{W^{1, q}}
\]
\[
\leq C(1 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}) \|\nabla^2 P\|_{L^q} + C(1 + \|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}) + C \|\nabla \rho u\|_{L^q}, \tag{4.36}
\]
where in the last inequality we have used the following simple fact that
\[
\|\nabla^2 u\|_{W^{1, q}} \leq C(\|\rho \dot{u}\|_{L^q} + \|\nabla(\rho u)\|_{L^q} + \|\nabla^2 P\|_{L^q} + \|\nabla P\|_{L^q}
\]
\[
+ \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} + \|P - \bar{P}\|_{L^2} + \|P - \bar{P}\|_{L^q})
\]
\[
\leq C(1 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla(\rho \dot{u})\|_{L^q} + \|\nabla^2 P\|_{L^q}), \tag{4.37}
\]
due to (1.8), (4.11), (4.11) and (4.11).

Hence, applying Gronwall’s inequality in (4.36), we deduce from (4.2), (4.10) and (4.35) that
\[
\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\nabla^2 P\|_{L^q} \leq C, \tag{4.38}
\]
which along with (4.10), (4.11), (4.37) and (4.35) also gives

$$\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \| P - \bar{P} \|_{W^{2,\varrho}} + \int_0^T \| \nabla^2 u \|_{W^{1,\varrho}}^2 dt \leq C. \quad (4.39)$$

Similarly, one has

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \| \rho - \bar{\rho} \|_{W^{2,\varrho}} \leq C,$$

which together with (4.39) gives (4.29). The proof of Lemma 4.4 is finished. □

**Lemma 4.5** For \( q \in (3,6) \), there exists a positive constant \( C \) such that

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \sigma (\| \nabla u_t \|_{H^1} + \| \nabla u \|_{W^{2,\varrho}}) + \int_0^T \sigma^2 \| \nabla u_{tt} \|_{L^2}^2 dt \leq C. \quad (4.40)$$

**Proof.** First, differentiating (1.1) with respect to \( t \) twice implies

$$\rho u_{ttt} + \rho u \cdot \nabla u_{tt} - (\lambda + 2\mu) \nabla \text{div} u_{tt} + \mu \nabla \times \text{curl} u_{tt}$$

$$= 2 \text{div}(\rho u) u_{tt} + \text{div}(\rho u)_{tt} u_{tt} - 2(\rho u_{tt} \cdot \nabla u_t - (\rho u_t + 2\rho_t u_t) \cdot \nabla u)$$

$$- \rho u_{tt} \cdot \nabla u - \nabla P_{tt}. \quad (4.41)$$

Then, multiplying (4.41) by \( 2u_{tt} \) and integrating over \( \Omega \) lead to

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int \rho |u_{tt}|^2 dx + 2(\lambda + 2\mu) \int \text{div} u_{tt}^2 dx + 2\mu \int |\text{curl} u_{tt}|^2 dx$$

$$= -8 \int \rho u_{tt} u \cdot \nabla u_{tt} dx - 2 \int (\rho u)_{tt} [\nabla (u_t \cdot u_{tt}) + 2\nabla u_t \cdot u_{tt}] dx$$

$$- 2 \int (\rho u_t + 2\rho_t u_t) \cdot \nabla u \cdot u_{tt} dx - 2 \int \rho u_{tt} \cdot \nabla u \cdot u_{tt} dx$$

$$+ 2 \int P_{tt} \text{div} u_{tt} dx \equiv \sum_{i=1}^5 J_i. \quad (4.42)$$

Let us estimate \( J_i \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, 5 \). Hölder’s inequality and (1.2) give

$$|J_1| \leq C \| \rho^{1/2} u_{tt} \|_{L^2} \| \nabla u_{tt} \|_{L^2} \| u \|_{L^\infty}$$

$$\leq \delta \| \nabla u_{tt} \|_{L^2}^2 + C(\delta) \| \rho^{1/2} u_{tt} \|_{L^2}^2. \quad (4.43)$$

By (4.1), (4.10), (4.15) and (4.16), we conclude that

$$|J_2| \leq C (\| \rho u_t \|_{L^3} + \| \rho u_t \|_{L^3}) (\| u_{tt} \|_{L^6} \| \nabla u_t \|_{L^2} + \| \nabla u_{tt} \|_{L^2} \| u_t \|_{L^6})$$

$$\leq C \left( \| \rho^{1/2} u_{tt} \|_{L^2}^{1/2} \| u_{tt} \|_{L^6}^{1/2} + \| \rho_t u_t \|_{L^6} \| u \|_{L^6} \right) \| \nabla u_{tt} \|_{L^2} \| \nabla u_t \|_{L^2}$$

$$\leq \delta \| \nabla u_{tt} \|_{L^2}^2 + C(\delta) \sigma^{-3/2}, \quad (4.44)$$

$$|J_3| \leq C (\| \rho u_t \|_{L^2} \| u \|_{L^\infty} \| \nabla u \|_{L^3} + \| \rho \|_{L^6} \| u_t \|_{L^6} \| \nabla u \|_{L^2}^2) \| u_{tt} \|_{L^6}$$

$$\leq \delta \| \nabla u_{tt} \|_{L^2}^2 + C(\delta) \| \rho u_t \|_{L^2}^2 + C(\delta) \sigma^{-1}, \quad (4.45)$$

and

$$|J_4| + |J_5| \leq C \| \rho u_{tt} \|_{L^2} \| \nabla u \|_{L^3} \| u_{tt} \|_{L^6} + C \| P_{tt} \|_{L^2} \| \nabla u_{tt} \|_{L^2}$$

$$\leq \delta \| \nabla u_{tt} \|_{L^2}^2 + C(\delta) \| \rho^{1/2} u_{tt} \|_{L^2}^2 + C(\delta) \| P_{tt} \|_{L^2}^2. \quad (4.46)$$
Noticing that
\[ \| \nabla u_{tt} \|_{L^2} \leq C(\| \text{div} u_{tt} \|_{L^2} + \| \text{curl} u_{tt} \|_{L^2}), \] (4.47)
due to Lemma 2.5 since \( u_{tt} \cdot n = 0 \) on \( \partial \Omega \), Substituting (4.43)–(4.46) into (4.42), and choosing \( \delta \) small enough, we get
\[
\frac{d}{dt} \| \rho^{1/2} u_{tt} \|_{L^2}^2 + \| \nabla u_{tt} \|_{L^2}^2 \\
\leq C(\| \rho^{1/2} u_{tt} \|_{L^2}^2 + \| \rho u_{tt} \|_{L^2}^2 + \| P_{tt} \|_{L^2}^2) + C\sigma^{-3/2},
\] (4.48)
which together with (4.15), (4.16), and Gronwall’s inequality yields that
\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \sigma \| \rho^{1/2} u_{tt} \|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^T \sigma^2 \| \nabla u_{tt} \|_{L^2}^2 dt \leq C. \quad (4.49)
\]
Furthermore, it follows from (4.32) and (4.16) that
\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \sigma \| \nabla u_t \|_{H^1} \leq C. \quad (4.50)
\]
Finally, we deduce from (4.37), (4.31), (4.16), (4.29), (4.28), (4.49) and (4.50) that
\[
\sigma \| \nabla^2 u \|_{W^{1,q}} \leq C(\sigma + \sigma \| \nabla u \|_{L^2} + \sigma \| \nabla (\rho u_t) \|_{L^2} + \sigma \| \nabla^2 P \|_{L^2}) \\
\leq C(\sigma + \sigma^{1/2} + \sigma \| \nabla u \|_{H^2} + \sigma^{1/2}(\sigma \| \nabla u_t \|_{H^1}^{2(q-2)})^{\frac{4(q-2)}{4-q}}) \\
\leq C\sigma + C\sigma^{1/2}(\sigma^{-1})^{\frac{2(q-2)}{4-q}} \leq C,
\]
which together with (4.49) and (4.50) yields (4.40) and this completes the proof of Lemma 4.5.

5 Proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2

With all the a priori estimates in Section 3 and Section 4 at hand, we are going to prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By Lemma 2.1 there exists a \( T_* > 0 \) such that the system
(1.1)–(1.4) has a unique classical solution \( (\rho, u) \) on \( \Omega \times (0, T_*) \). One may use the a priori estimates, Proposition 3.1 and Lemmas 4.3–4.5 to extend the classical solution \( (\rho, u) \) globally in time.

First, by the definition of \( A_1(T) \), \( A_2(T) \) (see (3.1), (3.2)), the assumption of the initial data (1.13) and (3.55), one immediately checks that
\[
A_1(0) + A_2(0) = 0, \quad 0 \leq \rho_0 \leq \bar{\rho}, \quad A_3(0) \leq C^{\delta_0}_0.
\]
Therefore, there exists a \( T_1 \in (0, T_*) \) such that
\[
0 \leq \rho_0 \leq 2\hat{\rho}, \quad A_1(T) + A_2(T) \leq 2C^{\frac{1}{2}}_0, \quad A_3(\sigma(T)) \leq 2C^{\delta_0}_0 \]
hold for \( T = T_1 \).

Next, we set
\[
T^* = \sup\{T \mid (5.1) \text{ holds}\}. \quad (5.2)
\]
Then $T^* \geq T_1 > 0$. Hence, for any $0 < \tau < T \leq T^*$ with $T$ finite, it follows from Lemmas 4.3-4.5 that
\[
\rho \in C([0, T]; W^{2,q}) \cap C([\tau, T]; L^q), \quad \nabla u, \nabla^2 u \in C([\tau, T]; C(\Omega)),
\] (5.3)
where one has taken advantage of the standard embedding
\[
L^\infty(\tau, T; H^1) \cap H^1(\tau, T; H^{-1}) \hookrightarrow C([\tau, T]; L^q), \quad \text{for any } q \in [1, 6).
\]
This in particular yields
\[
\rho^{1/2} u_t, \quad \rho^{1/2} \dot{u} \in C([\tau, T]; L^2).
\] (5.4)
Finally, we claim that $T^* = \infty$. (5.5)
Otherwise, $T^* < \infty$. Then by Proposition 3.1 it holds that
\[
0 \leq \rho \leq \frac{7}{4} \hat{\rho}, \quad A_1(T^*) + A_2(T^*) \leq C_0^\frac{1}{2}, \quad A_3(\sigma(T^*)) \leq C_0^{\delta_0}.
\] (5.6)
It follows from Lemmas 4.4, 4.5 and (5.4) that $(\rho(x, T^*), u(x, T^*))$ satisfy the initial data condition (1.12)-(1.14) except $u(\cdot, T^*) \in H^s$, where $g(x) \triangleq \rho^{1/2} \dot{u}(x, T^*), \ x \in \Omega$. Thus, Lemma 2.1 implies that there exists some $T^{**} > T*$ such that (5.1) holds for $T = T^{**}$, which contradicts the definition of $T^*$.

By Lemmas 2.1 and 4.3-4.5 it indicates that $(\rho, u)$ is in fact the unique classical solution defined on $\Omega \times (0, T]$ for any $0 < T < T^* = \infty$.

It remains to prove (1.17). Integrating (1.1), over $\Omega \times (0, T)$ and using (1.4) yields that
\[
\bar{\rho} = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} \rho(x, t)dx = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} \rho_0 dx.
\]
For
\[
G(\rho) \triangleq \rho \int_{\bar{\rho}}^{\rho} \frac{P(s) - P(\bar{\rho})}{s^2} ds,
\]
there exists a positive constant $\tilde{C} < 1$ depending only on $\gamma, \rho_0$, and $\hat{\rho}$ such that for any $\rho \in [0, 2\bar{\rho}]$,
\[
\tilde{C}^2 (\rho - \bar{\rho})^2 \leq \tilde{C} G(\rho) \leq (\rho^\gamma - \bar{\rho}^\gamma)(\rho - \bar{\rho}).
\] (5.7)

Similar to (3.12) and (3.15), we have
\[
\left( \int \frac{1}{2} \rho |u|^2 + G(\rho)dx \right)_t + \phi(t) \leq 0,
\] (5.8)
with
\[
\phi(t) \triangleq (\lambda + 2\mu)(\nabla u)^2_{L^2} + \mu \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2.
\]
On the other hand, multiplying \( (1.1) \) by \( B|\rho - \bar{\rho}| \), we get
\[
\int (P - P(\bar{\rho}))(\rho - \bar{\rho})dx
= \left( \int \rho u \cdot B|\rho - \bar{\rho}|dx \right)_t - \int \rho u \cdot \nabla B|\rho - \bar{\rho}| \cdot u dx - \int \rho u \cdot B|\rho_t|dx
+ \mu \int \nabla u \cdot \nabla B|\rho - \bar{\rho}|dx + (\lambda + \mu) \int (\rho - \bar{\rho}) \text{div} u dx
\leq \left( \int \rho u \cdot B|\rho - \bar{\rho}|dx \right)_t + C \|\rho u^\frac{1}{4}\|_{L^1}^2 \|\rho - \bar{\rho}\|_{L^2} + C \|\rho u\|_{L^2}^2
+ C \|\rho - \bar{\rho}\|_{L^2} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}
\leq \left( \int \rho u \cdot B|\rho - \bar{\rho}|dx \right)_t + \delta \|\rho - \bar{\rho}\|_{L^2}^2 + C(\delta) \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2,
\]
which, along with (5.7) and (2.18), leads to
\[
a \tilde{C} \int G(\rho)dx \leq a \int (\tilde{\rho}^\gamma - \tilde{\rho}^\gamma)(\rho - \bar{\rho})dx
\leq 2 \left( \int \rho u \cdot B|\rho - \bar{\rho}|dx \right)_t + C_1 \phi(t). \tag{5.9}
\]

Moreover, it follows from (5.7) that
\[
\left| \int \rho u \cdot B|\rho - \bar{\rho}|dx \right| \leq C_2 \left( \frac{1}{2} \|\sqrt{\rho} u\|_{L^2}^2 + \int G(\rho)dx \right),
\]
which gives
\[
\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} \|\sqrt{\rho} u\|_{L^2}^2 + \int G(\rho)dx \right) \leq W(t) \leq 2 \left( \frac{1}{2} \|\sqrt{\rho} u\|_{L^2}^2 + \int G(\rho)dx \right), \tag{5.10}
\]
where
\[
W(t) = \int \left( \frac{1}{2} \rho |u|^2 + G(\rho) \right) dx - \delta_1 \int \rho u \cdot B|\rho - \bar{\rho}|dx,
\]
with \( \delta_1 = \min\left\{ \frac{1}{2C_1}, \frac{1}{2C_3} \right\} \).

Adding (5.9) multiplied by \( \delta_1 \) to (5.8) and utilizing
\[
\int \rho |u|^2 dx \leq C \|
abla u\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C_3 \phi(t),
\]
we obtain for \( \delta_2 = \min\left\{ \frac{\alpha_1 \tilde{C}_0}{2}, \frac{1}{2C_3} \right\} \),
\[
W'(t) + \delta_2 W(t) \leq 0,
\]
which together with (5.10) yields that for any \( t > 0 \),
\[
\int \left( \frac{1}{2} \rho |u|^2 + G(\rho) \right) dx \leq 4C_0 e^{-\delta_3 t}. \tag{5.11}
\]
Furthermore, by (5.8), we also have for \( 0 < \delta_3 < \delta_2 \),
\[
\int_0^\infty \phi(t)e^{\delta_3 t} dt \leq C. \tag{5.12}
\]
Choosing \( m = 0 \) in (3.24), along with (2.18), (2.23), (3.13) and (4.3), a direct calculation leads to
\[
\left( \phi(t) + \mu \int_{\partial \Omega} \sigma^m u \cdot A \cdot u ds - 2 \int (P - P(\bar{\rho})) \div u dx \right)_t + \frac{1}{2} \| \sqrt{\rho} \dot{u} \|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \phi(t),
\]
(5.13)

Multiplying (5.13) by \( e^{\delta_3 t} \), and using the facts that
\[
\| \int (P - P(\bar{\rho})) \div u dx \| \leq C \| \rho - \bar{\rho} \|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{4} \phi(t)
\]
and that
\[
\int_{\partial \Omega} \sigma^m u \cdot A \cdot u ds \leq C \phi(t),
\]
we get
\[
\left( e^{\delta_3 t} \phi(t) + \mu e^{\delta_3 t} \int_{\partial \Omega} \sigma^m u \cdot A \cdot u ds - 2 e^{\delta_3 t} \int (P - P(\bar{\rho})) \div u dx \right)_t + \frac{1}{2} e^{\delta_3 t} \| \sqrt{\rho} \dot{u} \|_{L^2}^2 \\
\leq C e^{\delta_3 t} (\| \rho - \bar{\rho} \|_{L^2}^2 + \phi(t)),
\]
which, together with (5.11) and (5.12), yields that for any \( t > 0 \),
\[
\| \nabla u \|_{L^2}^2 \leq C e^{-\delta_3 t},
\]
(5.14)
and
\[
\int_0^\infty e^{\delta_3 t} \| \sqrt{\rho} \dot{u} \|_{L^2}^2 dt \leq C.
\]
(5.15)
A similar analysis based on (4.4) and (5.15) shows
\[
\| \sqrt{\rho} \dot{u} \|_{L^2}^2 \leq C e^{-\delta_3 t}.
\]
(5.16)

By (5.11), (5.14), (5.16) and (2.23), we obtain (1.17) for some \( \eta_0 \) depending only on \( \mu, \lambda, \gamma, a, \bar{s}, \bar{\rho}, M, \Omega, p, q, C_0 \) and the matrix \( A \), and finish the proof.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. For \( T > 0 \), we introduce the Lagrangian coordinates
\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} X(\tau; t, x) &= u(X(\tau; t, x), \tau), \quad 0 \leq \tau \leq T \\
X(t; t, x) &= x, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \ x \in \bar{\Omega}.
\end{align*}
\]
(5.17)
By (1.16), the transformation (5.17) is well-defined. Therefore, by (1.1), we get
\[
\rho(x, t) = \rho_0(X(0; t, x)) \exp\{- \int_0^t \div u(X(\tau; t, x), \tau) d\tau\}.
\]
(5.18)
Since \( \rho_0(x_0) = 0 \) on some point \( x_0 \in \Omega \), for any \( t > 0 \), there is a point \( x_0(t) \in \bar{\Omega} \) such that \( X(0; t, x_0(t)) = x_0 \). Hence, by (5.18), \( \rho(x_0(t), t) \equiv 0 \) for any \( t \geq 0 \). As a result of Gagliardo-Nirenberg’s inequality (2.22), we get that for \( \tau_1 \in (3, \infty) \),
\[
\bar{\rho}_0 \equiv \bar{\rho} \leq \| \rho - \bar{\rho} \|_{C(\bar{T})} \leq C \| \rho - \bar{\rho} \|_{L^2} \| \nabla \rho \|_{L^{1+\theta_1}}^{1-\theta_1},
\]
where \( \theta_1 = 2(r_1 - 3)/(5r_1 - 6) \). Combining this with (1.17) gives (1.18) and completes the proof.
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