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ABSTRACT. We consider electrodiffusion of ions in fluids, described by the Nernst-Planck-Navier-Stokes system, in three dimensional bounded domains, with blocking (no-flux) boundary conditions for the ionic concentrations and Robin boundary conditions for the electric potential, representing the presence of an electrical double layer. We prove global existence of strong solutions for arbitrary initial data in the case of two oppositely charged ionic species and also in the case of more than two species when the diffusivities are equal and the magnitudes of the valences are also equal. This result holds unconditionally in the case where fluid flow is described by the Stokes equations. In the case of Navier-Stokes coupling, the result holds conditionally on Navier-Stokes regularity. We also consider a case of mixed blocking-Dirichlet boundary conditions for the ionic concentrations and prove global regularity for two oppositely charged species when the total concentration of one species is sufficiently low.

1. Introduction

We study the Nernst-Planck-Navier-Stokes (NPNS) system in a connected, bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ with smooth boundary, which models the electrodiffusion of ions in a fluid in the presence of boundaries. The ions diffuse under the influence of their own concentration gradients and are transported by the fluid and an electric field, which is generated by the local charge density and an externally applied potential. The fluid is forced by the electrical force exerted by the ionic charges. The time evolution of the ionic concentrations is determined by the Nernst-Planck equations,

$$\partial_t c_i + u \cdot \nabla c_i = D_i \text{div} (\nabla c_i + z_i c_i \nabla \Phi), \quad i = 1, \ldots, m$$

(1)

coupled to the Poisson equation

$$-\varepsilon \Delta \Phi = \sum_{i=1}^{m} z_i c_i = \rho$$

(2)

and to the Navier-Stokes system,

$$\partial_t u + u \cdot \nabla u - \nu \Delta u + \nabla p = -K \rho \nabla \Phi, \quad \text{div} u = 0$$

(3)

or to the Stokes system

$$\partial_t u - \nu \Delta u + \nabla p = -K \rho \nabla \phi, \quad \text{div} u = 0.$$  

(4)

In this latter case we refer to the system as the Nernst-Planck-Stokes (NPS) system.

The function $c_i$ is the local ionic concentration of the $i$-th species, $u$ is the fluid velocity, $p$ is the pressure, $\Phi$ is a rescaled electrical potential, and $\rho$ is the local charge density. The constant $z_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is the ionic valence of the $i$-th species. The constants $D_i > 0$ are the ionic diffusivities, and $\varepsilon > 0$ is a rescaled dielectric permittivity of the solvent, and it is proportional to the square of the Debye length $\lambda_D$, which is the characteristic length scale of the electrical double layer in a solvent $[18]$. The constant $K > 0$ is a coupling constant given by the product of Boltzmann’s constant $k_B$ and the temperature $T_K$. Finally, $\nu > 0$ is the kinematic viscosity of the fluid. The dimensional counterparts of $\Phi$ and $\rho$ are given by $(k_B T_K/e) \Phi$ and $e \rho$, respectively, where $e$ is elementary charge.

For the ionic concentrations $c_i$ we consider blocking (no-flux) boundary conditions,

$$ (\partial_n c_i(x, t) + z_i c_i(x, t)\partial_n \Phi(x, t))|_{\partial \Omega} = 0 $$

(5)
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where $\partial_n$ is the outward normal derivative along $\partial \Omega$. This boundary condition represents a surface that is impermeable to the $i$-th ionic species. For $c_i$, we also consider selective (Dirichlet) boundary conditions,

$$c_i(x, t)|_{\partial \Omega} = \gamma_i > 0,$$

which, in electrochemistry $[10, 20]$, represents an ion-selective (permselective) membrane that maintains a fixed concentration of ions.

The boundary conditions for the Navier-Stokes (or Stokes) equations are no-slip,

$$u(x, t)|_{\partial \Omega} = 0.$$

The boundary conditions for $\Phi$ are inhomogeneous Robin,

$$(\partial_n \Phi(x, t) + \tau \Phi(x, t))|_{\partial \Omega} = \xi(x).$$

This boundary condition represents the presence of an electrical double layer at the interface of a solvent and a surface $[17, 18]$. The Robin boundary conditions are derived based on the fact that the double layer has the effect of a plate capacitor. The constant $\tau > 0$ represents the capacitance of the double layer, and $\xi : \partial \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth function that represents an externally applied potential on the boundary (see also $[4, 11, 12, 14]$ where the same boundary conditions are used in similar contexts).

In this paper, we discuss the question of global regularity of solutions of NPNS or NPS in three dimensional bounded, connected domains with smooth boundary. The NPNS system is a semilinear parabolic system, and in general, such systems can blow up in finite time. For example, The Keller-Segel equations, which share some common features with NPNS (e.g. the dissipative structure, Section 3.1), are known to admit solutions that blow up in finite time, even in two dimensions, for large initial conditions $[1]$. The NPNS system includes the Navier-Stokes equations, where the question of global regularity, as is well known, is unresolved $[6]$. So for NPNS, we cannot expect at this stage to obtain affirmative results on unconditional global regularity. However, global regularity in three dimensions for the NPS system or even the Nernst-Planck equations, not coupled to fluid flow, is still an open problem except in some special cases.

In both the physical and mathematical literature, many different boundary conditions are considered for the concentrations $c_i$ and the electric potential $\Phi$, all with different physical meanings. The choice of boundary conditions makes a large difference not only when it comes to determining global regularity, but also in characterizing long time behavior. Global existence and stability of solutions to the uncoupled Nernst-Planck equations is obtained in $[2, 3, 5, 12]$ for blocking boundary conditions in two dimensions. The full NPNS system is discussed in $[22]$ where the electric potential is treated as a superposition of an internal potential, determined by the charge density $\rho$ and satisfying homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions, and an external, prescribed potential. In this case global weak solutions are obtained in both two and three dimensions. The case of blocking and selective (Dirichlet) boundary conditions for the concentrations and Dirichlet boundary conditions for the potential are considered in $[7]$ for two dimensions, and the authors obtain global existence and stability of strong solutions. In $[8]$, these results are extended to three dimensions, for initial conditions that are small perturbations of the steady states. In $[4, 11]$ the authors consider blocking boundary conditions for $c_i$ and Robin boundary conditions for $\Phi$, as we do in this paper, and obtain global regularity and stability in two dimensions and global weak solutions in three dimensions. In $[9]$ global regularity in three dimensions is obtained in the case of Dirichlet boundary conditions for both the concentrations and the potential. In $[15]$, the authors establish global existence of weak solutions in the case of no boundaries, $\mathbb{R}^3$.

As established and used effectively in the works referred to in the previous paragraph, the NPNS system, equipped with blocking or uniformly selective (cf. $[7]$) boundary conditions for $c_i$, comes with a dissipative structure (Section 3.1), which in particular leads to stable asymptotic behaviors. Deviations from blocking or uniformly selective boundary conditions are known to lead in general to instabilities as verified experimentally, numerically, and rigorously based on simplified models $[10, 16, 19, 21, 23]$. Such deviations refer to the presence of ion-selective membranes i.e. boundary segments on which the boundary condition for $c_i$ is selective.
In light of these observations, it may come as somewhat of a surprise that in three dimensions, large data global regularity has been established in this unstable regime of selective boundary conditions [9], whereas for blocking or uniformly selective boundary conditions, only nonlinear stability results are currently available [8]. Our first main result of this paper (Theorem 2) is to show that, in three dimensions, for two oppositely charged ionic species with blocking boundary conditions, we do in fact have large data global regularity for NPS and NPNS (conditionally on regularity of Navier-Stokes in the latter case) if we impose Robin boundary conditions for the potential $\Phi$, instead of Dirichlet boundary conditions.

Our second main result (Theorem 3) extends this global regularity result to the case of more than two ionic species when the diffusivities and magnitudes of ionic valences are equal ($D_1 = \ldots = D_m, |z_1| = \ldots = |z_m|$) (see also [9]).

For our third and last main result (Theorem 4) we return to a two-species setting and establish a small data global regularity result for a case of mixed boundary conditions, where the anion $c_2$ is imposed with blocking boundary conditions and the cation $c_1$ is imposed with constant selective boundary conditions. Only the initial total concentration of the anion, $\int_\Omega c_2(x,0) \, dx$, is required to be small.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the relevant function spaces and state the three main results described above.

2. Preliminaries

We are concerned with global existence of strong solutions of NPNS and NPS. To define what we mean by a strong solution, we first introduce the relevant function spaces.

We denote by $L^p(\Omega) = L^p$ and $W^{m,p}(\Omega) = W^{m,p}$ the standard Lebesgue spaces and Sobolev spaces, respectively. In the case $p = 2$, we denote $W^{m,2} = H^m(\Omega) = H^m$. We also consider Lebesgue spaces on the boundary $\partial \Omega$: $L^p(\partial \Omega)$. In this latter case, we always indicate the underlying domain $\partial \Omega$ to avoid ambiguity. We also denote $L^p_tL^q_x = L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))$, $L^p_tW^{m,q}_x = L^p(0,T;W^{m,q}(\Omega))$, where the time $T$ is made clear from context.

Denoting $V = \{ f \in (C_0^\infty(\Omega))^3 \mid \text{div } f = 0 \}$, the spaces $H \subset (L^2(\Omega))^3$ and $V \subset (H^1(\Omega))^3$ are the closures of $V$ in $(L^2(\Omega))^3$ and $(H^1(\Omega))^3$, respectively. The space $V$ is endowed with the Dirichlet norm $\| f \|^2_V = \int_\Omega |\nabla f|^2 \, dx$.

In order to avoid having to explicitly deal with the pressure term in the Navier-Stokes and Stokes equations, we sometimes work with the equations projected onto the space of divergence free vector fields via the Leray projector $\mathbb{P} : L^2(\Omega)^3 \to H$,

$$\partial_t u + B(u, u) + \nu Au = -K\mathbb{P}(\rho \nabla \Phi) \quad (9)$$
$$\partial_t u + \nu Au = -K\mathbb{P}(\rho \nabla \Phi) \quad (10)$$

where $A = -\mathbb{P}\Delta : \mathcal{D}(A) \to H$, $\mathcal{D}(A) = H^2(\Omega)^3 \cap V$ is the Stokes operator, and $B(u, u) = \mathbb{P}(u \cdot \nabla u)$ (see [6] for related theory).

**Definition 1.** We say that $(c_i, \Phi, u)$ is a strong solution of NPNS [1, 2, 3] or of NPS [1, 2, 4] with boundary conditions [5] (or [6], [7], [8]) on the time interval $[0,T]$ if $c_i \geq 0$, $c_i \in L^\infty(0,T;H^1) \cap L^2(0,T;H^2)$, $u \in L^\infty(0,T;V) \cap L^2(0,T;\mathcal{D}(A))$ and $(c_i, \Phi, u)$ solve the equations in the sense of distributions and satisfy the boundary conditions in the sense of traces.

The NPNS/NPS system is a semilinear parabolic system and local existence and uniqueness of strong solutions have been established by many authors for many different sets of boundary conditions. We refer the reader to [4] where local well-posedness is established for dimensions greater than one, arbitrarily many ionic species, blocking boundary conditions for $c_i$, and Robin boundary conditions for $\Phi$. However, as the authors remark, the proof, based on methods of maximal $L^p$ regularity, can be adapted in a straightforward manner for different boundary conditions, including the selective boundary conditions for $c_i$ considered here. Thus we have the following local existence theorem:
For initial conditions $0 \leq c_i(0) \in H^1$, $u(0) \in V$, there exists $T_0 > 0$ depending on $\|c_i(0)\|_{H^1}$, $\|u(0)\|_V$, the boundary data $\tau, \xi$, the parameters of the problem $D_i, z_i, \epsilon, \nu, K$, and the domain $\Omega$ such that NPNS (1), (2), (3) (and NPS (1), (2), (4)) has a unique strong solution $(c_i, \Phi, u)$ on the time interval $[0, T_0]$ satisfying the boundary conditions (5) (or (6)), (7), (8).

Remark 1. We stress that the nonnegativity of $c_i$ is included in our definition of a strong solution. That nonnegativity is propagated from nonnegative initial conditions $c_i(0) \geq 0$ is not self-evident. Its proof is included in the proof of local well-posedness in [4] (see also [7]).

Henceforth, all occurrences of the constant $C > 0$, with no subscript, refer to a constant depending only on the parameters of the system, the boundary data, and the domain $\Omega$, and this constant may differ from line to line. For brevity, when a constant, other than $C$, is said to depend on the parameters of the system, we mean this to also include boundary data and the domain.

3. Global Regularity for Blocking Boundary Conditions (Two Species)

In this section we consider the NPNS and NPS systems for two ($m = 2$) oppositely charged ($z_1 > 0 > z_2$) ionic species, both satisfying blocking boundary conditions. In this setting, we prove global existence of strong solutions for the NPS system and the same result, conditional on Navier-Stokes regularity, for the NPNS system.

We begin by proving some a priori bounds that are used for the proof of the global regularity result of this section. We prove some of the estimates in more generality (more than two species) so as to invoke them in Section 4 as well. In Sections 4 and 5 for the sake of brevity and fewer repetitive computations, we shall also frequently make references to some estimates from this section that may not hold verbatim but nonetheless hold up to some minor modifications.

3.1. Dissipation Estimate. The NPNS and NPS systems come with a dissipative structure when blocking boundary conditions for $c_i$ and Robin boundary conditions for $\Phi$ are considered. We prove the following proposition:

**Proposition 1.** Let $(c_i, \Phi, u)$ be a strong solution of NPNS or NPS on the time interval $[0, T]$, satisfying boundary conditions (3), (7), (8). Then the functional

$$V(t) = \frac{1}{2K} \|u\|_H^2 + \sum_{i=1}^m \int_\Omega c_i \log c_i \, dx + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \|\nabla \Phi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\epsilon \tau}{2} \|\Phi\|_{L^2(\partial \Omega)}^2$$

satisfies

$$\frac{d}{dt} V + D + \frac{\nu}{K} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 = 0$$

for $t \in [0, T]$, where

$$D = \sum_{i=1}^m D_i \int_\Omega c_i |\nabla \mu_i|^2 \, dx \geq 0$$

and $\mu_i$ is the electrochemical potential,

$$\mu_i = \log c_i + z_i \Phi.$$  

In particular, $V(t)$ is nonincreasing in time.

**Proof.** First we note that (11) can be written

$$\partial_t c_i + u \cdot \nabla c_i = D_i \operatorname{div} (c_i \nabla \mu_i).$$  

Then we multiply (15) by $\mu_i$ and integrate by parts. This part is somewhat formal as we cannot exclude the possibility that $c_i$ attains the values 0, in which case $\log c_i$ becomes undefined. Thus, to make this rigorous, we can work instead with the quantity $\mu_i^\delta = \log(c_i + \delta) + z_i \Phi$ and later pass to the limit $\delta \to 0$, as done in
we have so far, we have uniform in time control of \((\text{div} u)^2\) in the second and third lines we integrated by parts and used the fact that \(\text{div} u = 0\). Collecting what we have so far, we have

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{m} c_i \log c_i \right) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \| \nabla \Phi \|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\epsilon \tau}{2} \| \Phi \|_{L^2(\partial \Omega)}^2 \right) + D = \int_{\Omega} (u \cdot \nabla \Phi) \rho \, dx.
\]

Next we multiply \((13)\) by \(u\) and integrate by parts, noticing that the integral corresponding to the nonlinear term for Navier-Stokes vanishes due to the divergence-free condition,

\[
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \| u \|_{L^2}^2 + \nu \| \nabla u \|_{L^2}^2 = -K \int_{\Omega} (u \cdot \nabla \Phi) \rho \, dx.
\]

Thus, multiplying \((16)\) by \(K^{-1}\) and adding it to \((19)\), we obtain the conclusion of the proposition.

### 3.2. Uniform \(L^2\) Estimate

Using the dissipative estimate from the previous subsection, we obtain uniform in time control of \(\| c_i \|_{L^2}\) in the case of two oppositely charged species satisfying blocking boundary conditions.

**Proposition 2.** Let \((c_i, \Phi, u)\) be a strong solution of NPNS or NPS for two oppositely charged species \((m = 2, z_1 > 0 > z_2)\) on the time interval \([0, T]\), satisfying boundary conditions \((5),(7),(8)\). Then there
exists a constant $M_2 > 0$ independent of time, depending only on the parameters of the system and the initial conditions such that for each $i$,

$$
\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \| c_i(t) \|_{L^2} < M_2.
$$

**Proof.** We multiply (1) by $|z_i|/2 D_i$ and integrate by parts:

$$
\frac{|z_i|}{2 D_i} \int_\Omega c_i^2 \, dx = - |z_i| \int_\Omega |\nabla c_i|^2 \, dx - |z_i| \int_\Omega c_i \nabla c_i \cdot \nabla \Phi \, dx
$$

$$
= - |z_i| \int_\Omega |\nabla c_i|^2 \, dx - |z_i| \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \nabla c_i^2 \cdot \nabla \Phi \, dx
$$

$$
= - |z_i| \int_\Omega |\nabla c_i|^2 \, dx - |z_i| \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \int_\partial \Omega c_i^2 \rho \, dS
$$

$$
= - |z_i| \int_\Omega |\nabla c_i|^2 \, dx - |z_i| \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \int_\partial \Omega c_i^2 \rho \, dS + I_1^{(i)} + I_2^{(i)}
$$

where in the fourth line, we used the Robin boundary conditions (3). We estimate the two boundary integrals using trace inequalities (Lemma 1, Appendix):

$$
|I_1^{(i)}| \leq C \| \Phi \|_{L^4(\partial \Omega)} \| c_i \|_{L^4(\partial \Omega)}^2
$$

$$
\leq \| \Phi \|_{H^1(\Omega)} (C_\delta \| c_i \|_{L^1(\partial \Omega)}^2 + \delta \| \nabla c_i \|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2)
$$

and similarly,

$$
|I_2^{(i)}| \leq \frac{\| z_i \|^2 \| \xi \|_{L^\infty(\partial \Omega)}}{2} \| c_i \|_{L^2(\partial \Omega)}^2 \leq C_\delta \| c_i \|_{L^1}^2 + \delta \| \nabla c_i \|_{L^2}^2.
$$

We recall that $\| c_i \|_{L^1}$ remains constant in time, and by Poincaré’s inequality, $\| \Phi \|_{H^1(\Omega)}$ is controlled by $\| \nabla \Phi \|_{L^2}$ and the boundary data (3). Thus recalling Proposition 1, we conclude $\| \Phi \|_{H^1}$ is also uniformly bounded in time. Thus choosing

$$
\delta = \min \left\{ \frac{|z_i|}{4}, \frac{|z_i|}{4 \sup_{t} \| \Phi(t) \|_{H^1}} \right\}
$$

we obtain from (22)-(24), after summing in $i$ and recalling $z_1 > 0 > z_2$,

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{2} \frac{|z_i|}{2 D_i} \int_\Omega c_i^2 \, dx + \sum_{i=1}^{2} \frac{|z_i|}{2} \| \nabla c_i \|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq C_b - \frac{1}{2e} \int_\Omega \rho^2 (z_1 c_1^2 - z_2 c_2^2) \, dx
$$

$$
= C_b - \frac{1}{2e} \int_\Omega \rho^2 (|z_1| c_1 + |z_2| c_2) \, dx
$$

$$
\leq C_b.
$$

Here, $C_b$ depends on $\sup_t \| \Phi(t) \|_{H^1}, \| c_i(0) \|_{L^1}$ along with the various parameters of the system. Next we use a Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality to bound

$$
\| c_i \|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(\| \nabla c_i \|_{L^2}^2 + \| c_i \|_{L^1}^2) \leq C'(\| \nabla c_i \|_{L^2}^2 + 1),
$$
where $C'$ depends on $\|c_i(0)\|_{L^1}$. Thus, for constants $C'_b, C''_b \geq 0$ depending on $\sup_{t} \|\Phi(t)\|_{H^1}, \|c_i(0)\|_{L^1}$ and parameters, we obtain from (26),

$$
\frac{d}{dt} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{2} \frac{|z_i|}{2D_i} \|c_i\|_{L^2}^2 \right) \leq -C'_b \left( \sum_{i=1}^{2} \frac{|z_i|}{2D_i} \|c_i\|_{L^2}^2 \right) + C''_b.
$$

(28)

Thus from a Grönwall estimate, we find

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{2} \frac{|z_i|}{2D_i} \|c_i(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \left( \sum_{i=1}^{2} \frac{|z_i|}{2D_i} \|c_i(0)\|_{L^2}^2 \right) e^{-C'_b t} + \frac{C''_b}{C'_b} (1 - e^{-C'_b t}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{2} \frac{|z_i|}{2D_i} \|c_i(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{C''_b}{C'_b}
$$

(29)

and (21) follows.

3.3. Higher Order Estimates. Now we bootstrap the dissipative and $L^2$ estimates to obtain some higher order estimates.

**Proposition 3.** Let $(c_i, \Phi, u)$ be a strong solution of NPNS or NPS on the time interval $[0, T]$ with $c_i(0) \in L^\infty$, satisfying boundary conditions (3), (7), (8). Assume that for each $i$, $c_i$ satisfies a uniform in time $L^2$ bound,

$$
\|c_i(t)\|_{L^2} < M_2.
$$

(30)

Then there exist constants $M_\infty, M'_2 > 0$ independent of time, depending only on the parameters of the system, the initial conditions and $M_2$ such that for each $i$

$$
\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|c_i(t)\|_{L^\infty} < M_\infty
$$

(31)

$$
\int_0^T \|\nabla \tilde{c}_i(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \, ds < M'_2
$$

(32)

where $\tilde{c}_i = c_i e^{z_i \Phi}$. Specifically for the case of the NPS system, we have

$$
\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|u(t)\|_{V}^2 + \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \|u(s)\|_{H^2}^2 \, ds < B
$$

(33)

for a constant $B$ independent of time. For the NPNS system, we have instead

$$
\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|u(t)\|_{V}^2 + \int_0^T \|u(s)\|_{H^2}^2 \, ds < B_T
$$

(34)

for a time dependent constant $B_T$ depending also on $U(T)$ where

$$
U(T) = \int_0^T \|u(s)\|_{V}^4 \, ds.
$$

(35)

**Remark 2.** For two oppositely charged species, $m = 2$, $z_1 > 0 > z_2$, the hypothesis (30) holds due to Proposition 2.

**Proof.** It follows from (2), (30) and elliptic regularity that for some constants $P_0, P'_\infty$ independent of time, we have,

$$
\|\nabla \Phi(t)\|_{L^6} \leq P_0
$$

(36)

$$
\|\Phi(t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq P'_\infty.
$$

(37)

Now we deduce the uniform in time $L^\infty$ bounds, using a Moser-type iteration (see also [4, 5, 8, 22]). For $k = 2, 3, 4, \ldots$, we multiply (1) by $c_i^{2k-1}$ and integrate by parts to obtain

$$
\frac{1}{2k} \frac{d}{dt} \|c_i\|_{L^{2k}}^{2k} + \frac{2k-1}{k^2} D_i \|\nabla c_i\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \frac{2k-1}{k} \|\nabla \Phi\|_{L^6} \|c_i\|_{L^3} \|\nabla c_i\|_{L^2}.
$$

(38)
We use (36) and interpolate $L^3$ between $L^1$ and $H^1$ to obtain after a Young’s inequality,
\[
\frac{d}{dt}\|c_i\|_{L^2}^{2k} + D_i\|\nabla c_i^k\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C_k\|c_i^k\|_{L^1}^2
\]  
(39)
where $C_k$ satisfies, for some $c > 0$, for some $m$ large enough and for each $k = 2, 3, 4...$
\[
C_k \leq ck^m.
\]  
(40)
Interpolating $L^2$ between $L^1$ and $H^1$,
\[
\|c_i^k\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(\|\nabla c_i^k\|_{L^2}^2 + \|c_i^k\|_{L^1}^2),
\]  
(41)
we obtain from (39),
\[
\frac{d}{dt}\|c_i\|_{L^2}^{2k} \leq -C\|c_i\|_{L^2}^{2k} + C_k\|c_i^k\|_{L^1}^2 = -C\|c_i\|_{L^2}^{2k} + C_k\|c_i\|_{L^2}^{2k}
\]  
(42)
for a different $C_k$ still satisfying (40) for some $c$. We define
\[
S_k = \max\{\|c_i(0)\|_{L^\infty}, \sup_t \|c_i(t)\|_k\}. 
\]  
(43)
Applying a Grönwall inequality to (42), we obtain
\[
\|c_i\|_{L^2}^{2k} \leq \|c_i(0)\|_{L^2}^{2k} + C_kS_k \leq \|c_i(0)\|_{L^\infty}^{2k} + C_kS_k \leq Ck^{m}S_k
\]  
(44)
for a possibly different $C_k$ still satisfying (40) for some $c$. Assuming without loss of generality that $C \geq 1$ in (44),
\[
S_{2k} = \max\{\|c_i(0)\|_{L^\infty}, \sup_t \|c_i(t)\|_{L^2k}\} \leq \max\{\|c_i(0)\|_{L^\infty}, C\frac{1}{k}S_k\} = C\frac{1}{k}S_k.
\]  
(45)
Setting $k = 2^j$, we obtain
\[
S_{2j+1} \leq C\frac{1}{2j+1}2^{j}\frac{1}{k}\frac{1}{2^{j+1}}S_{2j}
\]  
(46)
and thus for all $J \in \mathbb{N}$
\[
S_{2J} \leq C^{a}2^{b}S_2 < \infty
\]  
(47)
where
\[
a = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2j+1} < \infty, \quad b = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{jm}{2^{j+1}} < \infty.
\]  
(48)
Passing $J \to \infty$ in (47), we obtain (31).

Next, (32) follows from (31), (47) and Proposition 1. Indeed, from the proposition, using the fact that
\[
\mu_i = \log \tilde{c}_i,
\]
we obtain
\[
\int_0^T \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \tilde{c}_i|^2 \, dx \, dt \leq C_p \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} |c_i| \nabla \mu_i|^2 \, dx \, dt \leq M'_{2}
\]  
(49)
for $M'_2$ independent of time, and $C_p$ depending on $P'_\infty$ and $M'_\infty$.

Next, to prove (33), we multiply the Stokes equations (10) by $Au$ and integrate by parts,
\[
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt}\|u\|_{V}^2 + \frac{\nu}{2} \|Au\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \|\rho \nabla \Phi\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C'M^2_{\infty}
\]  
(50)
where $C'$ depends on $\sup_t \|\nabla \Phi\|_{L^2}$ (Proposition 1). Using the elliptic bound $\|u\|_V \leq C \|Au\|_{L^2}$, we obtain
\[
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt}\|u\|_{V}^2 \leq -C' \|u\|_{V}^2 + C'M^2_{\infty}
\]  
(51)
which gives us uniform boundedness of $\|u\|_V$, the first half of (33). Integrating (50) in time gives us the second half.
Similarly, for NPNS, we multiply the Navier-Stokes equations (9) by Au and integrate by parts,

\[
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|u\|_V^2 + \frac{\nu}{2} \|Au\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C' M_\infty^2 + \|u\|_{L^6} \|\nabla u\|_{L^3} \|Au\|_{L^2}
\]

\[
\leq C' M_\infty^2 + C \|u\|_V^2 \|Au\|_2^2
\]

so that after a Young’s inequality we obtain

\[
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|u\|_V^2 + \frac{\nu}{4} \|Au\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C' M_\infty^2 + C \|u\|_V^2.
\]

from which we obtain

\[
\frac{1}{2} \|u(t)\|_V^2 + \frac{\nu}{4} \int_0^t \|Au(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \, ds \leq \left( \frac{1}{2} \|u(0)\|_V^2 + C' M_\infty^2 t \right) e^{CU(T)}.
\]

This gives us (34) and completes the proof of the proposition. □

### 3.4. Proof of Global Regularity

Now we prove our main global regularity result of this section.

**Theorem 2.** For initial conditions \(0 < c_1(0) \in H^1 \cap L^{\infty}\), \(u(0) \in V\) and for all \(T > 0\), NPS (1),(2),(3) for two oppositely charged species \((m = 2, z_1 > 0 > z_2)\) has a unique strong solution \((c_i, \Phi, u)\) on the time interval \([0, T]\) satisfying the boundary conditions (5),(7),(8). NPNS (1),(2),(3) for two oppositely charged species has a unique strong solution on \([0, T]\) satisfying the initial and boundary conditions provided

\[
U(T) = \int_0^T \|u(s)\|_V^4 \, ds < \infty.
\]

Moreover, the solution to NPS satisfies (33) in addition to

\[
\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|c_i(t)\|_{H^1} + \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \|c_i(s)\|_{H^2}^2 \, ds \leq M
\]

\[
\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|\nabla c_i(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^T \|\Delta c_i(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \, ds \leq M'
\]

for \(\tilde{c}_i = e^{z_i \Phi}\) and constants \(M, M'\) depending only on the parameters of the system and the initial conditions but not on \(T\). The solution to NPNS satisfies (34) in addition to

\[
\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|c_i(t)\|_{H^1} + \int_0^T \|c_i(s)\|_{H^2}^2 \, ds \leq M_T
\]

for a constant \(M_T\) depending on the parameters of the system, the initial conditions, \(T\), and \(U(T)\).

**Proof.** We prove the a priori estimates (56)-(58), which together with the bounds on \(u\), (33) and (34), and the local existence theorem allow us to uniquely extend a local solution to a global one by virtue of the fact that the strong norms in Definition 1 do not blow up before time \(T\).

Due to (31), it follows from elliptic regularity that

\[
\|\Phi(t)\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \leq P_\infty
\]

for all \(t\), where \(P_\infty\) depends only on the parameters of the system and uniform \(L^p\) bounds on \(\rho\).

Next, in order to obtain estimates for \(\nabla c_i\), we note that the auxiliary variable

\[
\tilde{c}_i = c_i e^{z_i \Phi}
\]

satisfies

\[
\partial_t \tilde{c}_i + u \cdot \nabla \tilde{c}_i = D_i \Delta \tilde{c}_i - D_i z_i \nabla \tilde{c}_i \cdot \nabla \Phi + z_i ((\partial_t + u \cdot \nabla) \Phi) \tilde{c}_i
\]

together with homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions

\[
\partial_n \tilde{c}_i |_{\partial \Omega} = 0.
\]
Multiplying (61) by $-\Delta \tilde{c}^i$ and using (62) to integrate by parts, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla \tilde{c}^i\|_{L^2}^2 + D_i \|\Delta \tilde{c}^i\|_{L^2}^2 = \int_\Omega \left( u \cdot \nabla \tilde{c}^i \right) \Delta \tilde{c}^i \, dx + D_i \int_\Omega \left( \nabla \tilde{c}^i \cdot \nabla \Phi \right) \Delta \tilde{c}^i \, dx$$

$$- z_i \int_\Omega \left( (\partial_t + u \cdot \nabla) \Phi \right) \tilde{c}^i \Delta \tilde{c}^i \, dx$$

$$= I_1 + I_2 + I_3.$$  

We estimate using Hölder and Young’s inequalities and elliptic estimates,

$$|I_1| \leq \|u\|_V \|\nabla \tilde{c}^i\|_{L^3} \|\Delta \tilde{c}^i\|_{L^2}$$

$$\leq C \|u\|_V \|\nabla \tilde{c}^i\|_{L^3}^{1/2} \|\Delta \tilde{c}^i\|_{L^2}^{3/2}$$

$$\leq \frac{D_i}{4} \|\Delta \tilde{c}^i\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|u\|_V^4 \|\nabla \tilde{c}^i\|_{L^2}^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (64)

$$|I_2| \leq C \|\nabla \Phi\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla \tilde{c}^i\|_{L^3} \|\Delta \tilde{c}^i\|_{L^2}$$

$$\leq \frac{D_i}{4} \|\Delta \tilde{c}^i\|_{L^2}^2 + C'_g \|u\|_V^2 \|\nabla \tilde{c}^i\|_{L^2}^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (65)

where $C_g$ depends on $P_\infty$. Next we split

$$I_3 = - z_i \int_\Omega \left( u \cdot \nabla \Phi \right) \tilde{c}^i \Delta \tilde{c}^i \, dx - z_i \int_\Omega \left( \partial_t \Phi \right) \tilde{c}^i \Delta \tilde{c}^i \, dx = I_{31} + I_{32}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (66)

First we estimate $I_{31}$. Noting that

$$\|\tilde{c}^i\|_{L^3} \leq C M_\infty e^{\beta_3 |z_i|} = \beta_3$$  \hspace{1cm} (67)

we bound

$$|I_{31}| \leq C \|u\|_V \|\nabla \Phi\|_{L^\infty} \|\tilde{c}^i\|_{L^3} \|\Delta \tilde{c}^i\|_{L^2}$$

$$\leq \frac{D_i}{8} \|\Delta \tilde{c}^i\|_{L^2}^2 + C' \|u\|_V^2 \|\tilde{c}^i\|_{L^3}^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (68)

where $C'_g$ depends on $\beta_3$ and $P_\infty$.

In order to bound $I_{32}$, first we note that the Nernst-Planck equations (1) can be written

$$\partial_t c^i + u \cdot \nabla c^i = D_i \text{div} \left( e^{-z_i \Phi} \nabla \tilde{c}^i \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (69)

so that in particular we have

$$\partial_t \rho = \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{z_i}{D_i} \text{div} \left( e^{-z_i \Phi} \nabla \tilde{c}^i \right) - u \cdot \nabla \rho.$$  \hspace{1cm} (70)

We multiply (70) by $e^{-1} \partial_t \Phi$ and integrate by parts. On the left hand side, we have

$$\int_\Omega \partial_t \rho \left( e^{-1} \partial_t \Phi \right) \, dx = - \int_\Omega \partial_t \Delta \Phi \partial_t \Phi \, dx = - \int_\Omega \partial_t \partial_n \Phi \partial_t \Phi \, dx + \int_\Omega |\nabla \partial_t \Phi|^2 \, dx$$

$$= \tau \int_{\partial \Omega} |\partial_t \Phi|^2 \, dS + \int_\Omega |\nabla \partial_t \Phi|^2 \, dx$$  \hspace{1cm} (71)
where in the second line we used the Robin boundary conditions \((\ref{8})\). Therefore

\[
\|\partial_t \nabla \Phi\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \sum_{j=1}^2 \left( \int_\Omega \text{div} (e^{-z_j} \nabla \tilde{c}_j) \partial_t \Phi \, dx \right) + C \int_\Omega \text{div} (u \rho) \partial_t \Phi \, dx 
\]

\[
\leq C \sum_{j=1}^2 \int_\Omega e^{z_j} |\nabla \tilde{c}_j| |\partial_t \Phi| \, dx + C \int_\Omega M_\infty |u| |\partial_t \nabla \Phi| \, dx
\]

\[
\leq C_t \left( \sum_{j=1}^2 \|\nabla \tilde{c}_j\|_{L^2} + \|u\|_V \right) \|\partial_t \nabla \Phi\|_{L^2}
\]

where \(C_t\) depends on \(M_\infty, P_\infty\). Therefore, we obtain

\[
\|\partial_t \nabla \Phi\|_{L^2} \leq C_t \left( \sum_{j=1}^2 \|\nabla \tilde{c}_j\|_{L^2} + \|u\|_V \right)
\]

and from elliptic regularity, noting that \(\partial_t \Phi\) satisfies homogeneous Robin boundary conditions,

\[
\|\partial_t \Phi\|_{L^6} \leq C C_t \left( \sum_{j=1}^2 \|\nabla \tilde{c}_j\|_{L^2} + \|u\|_V \right).
\]

Now we bound \(I_3^2\) using \((\ref{74})\)

\[
|I_3^2| \leq \frac{D_i}{8} \|\Delta \tilde{c}_i\|_{L^2}^2 + C_3 \left( \sum_{j=1}^2 \|\nabla \tilde{c}_j\|_{L^2}^2 + \|u\|_{L^2}^2 \right)
\]

where \(C_3\) depends on \(\beta_3\).

Thus, adding the estimates for \(I_1, I_2, I_3, I_3^2\) and summing the estimates for \(i = 1, 2\), we obtain from \((\ref{63})\),

\[
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \sum_{i=1}^2 \|\nabla \tilde{c}_i\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{D_i}{4} \sum_{i=1}^2 \|\Delta \tilde{c}_i\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C_F (\|u\|_{L^4}^4 + 1) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^2 \|\nabla \tilde{c}_i\|_{L^2}^2 + C'_F \|u\|_{L^4}^4
\]

where \(C_F, C'_F\) depend on \(M_\infty, P_\infty\).

In the case of NPNS, we obtain from \((\ref{76})\),

\[
\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^2 \|\nabla \tilde{c}_i(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{D_i}{4} \int_0^t \|\Delta \tilde{c}_i(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \, ds \leq \left( \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^2 \|\nabla \tilde{c}_i(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + C'_F \int_0^t \|u(s)\|_{L^4}^4 \, ds \right) \exp \left( C_F \int_0^t \|u(s)\|_{L^4}^4 + 1 \, ds \right).
\]

This gives us \((\ref{58})\) after converting to the original variables \(c_i\) using the definition of \(\tilde{c}_i\) and the uniform bounds on \(c_i, \Phi\).

For the NPS system, we recall from Propositions \((\ref{1})\) and \((\ref{3})\) that \(\|u\|_V\) is uniformly bounded in time and that \(\|u\|_{L^4}^4\) and \(\|\nabla \tilde{c}_i\|_{L^2}^2\) decay and are integrable in time, with a bound that is independent of \(T\). Therefore, integrating \((\ref{76})\) in time, we find that the right hand side is bounded by a constant independent of time, giving us \((\ref{57})\). Converting back to the variables \(c_i\) gives us \((\ref{56})\). \(\Box\)
4. Global Regularity for Blocking Boundary Conditions (Multiple Species)

The results of Sections 3.1 and 3.3 hold for more than two species, \( m > 2 \). Therefore the question of whether or not we can extend our global regularity result to a multiple species setting boils down to whether or not we can establish the uniform \( L^2 \) estimates from Section 3.2 in our current setting. Once such a bound is established, the proof of global regularity for multiple species follows exactly as in the proof of Theorem 2.

In the proof of Proposition 2 of Section 3.2, specifically in (26), we use the fact that, due to the assumption of two species and \( z_1 > 0 > z_2 \),

\[
(z_1^2 c_1^2 - z_2^2 c_2^2) \rho = (|z_1| c_1 - |z_2| c_2) (|z_1| c_1 + |z_2| c_2) \rho = \rho^2 (|z_1| c_1 + |z_2| c_2) \geq 0.
\]  

(78)

Even for the simplest extension of taking 3 species, with \( z_1, z_2 > 0 > z_3 \), the corresponding leftmost term in (78) is \((z_1^2 c_1^2 + z_2^2 c_2^2 - z_3^2 c_3^2) \rho\), and in general this term need not be nonnegative. Due to this fact, an analogous proof does not work for more than two species. However, there is one special multiple species setting where we do have global regularity: namely if all the diffusivities are equal \( D_1 = \ldots = D_m \) and all the valences have the same magnitude (e.g. \( z_1 = z_2 = 1 = -z_3 \) (see also (9))). Indeed, we have the following theorem.

**THEOREM 3.** For initial conditions \( 0 \leq c_0 (0) \in H^1 \cap L^\infty (i = 1, ..., m), u(0) \in V \) and for all \( T > 0 \), if \( D_1 = \ldots = D_m = D \) for a common value \( D \) and \( |z_1| = \ldots = |z_m| = z \) for a common value \( z \), then NPS (1), (2), (3) has a unique strong solution \((c_i, \Phi, u)\) on the time interval \([0, T]\) satisfying the boundary conditions (5), (7), (8). For NPNS (1), (2), (3), a unique strong solution on \([0, T]\) satisfying the initial and boundary conditions exists provided

\[
\int_0^T \| u(s) \|_V^4 \, ds < \infty.
\]  

(79)

Moreover, in the case of NPS, the solution satisfies the bounds (31), (32), (34), (36), (37) for each \( i \). In the case of NPNS, the solution satisfies the bounds (31), (32), (34), (38) for each \( i \).

**PROOF.** We only prove the result corresponding to Proposition 2. As discussed at the beginning of this section, the other results leading to the proof of global regularity extend naturally from Section 3.

This special case of multiple species effectively boils down to a two species setting. The variables \( \rho \) and \( \sigma = z(c_1 + c_2 + \ldots + c_m) \geq 0 \) satisfy

\[
\partial_t \rho + u \cdot \nabla \rho = D \text{div} (\nabla \rho + z \sigma \nabla \Phi)
\]

(80)

\[
\partial_t \sigma + u \cdot \nabla \sigma = D \text{div} (\nabla \sigma + z \rho \nabla \Phi)
\]

(81)

and boundary conditions

\[
(\partial_n \rho + z \sigma \partial_n \Phi)|_{\partial \Omega} = (\partial_n \sigma + z \rho \partial_n \Phi)|_{\partial \Omega} = 0.
\]  

(82)

Multiplying (80) and (81) by \( \rho \) and \( \sigma \) respectively and integrating by parts, we obtain

\[
\frac{1}{2D} \frac{d}{dt} \| \rho \|_{L^2}^2 + \| \nabla \rho \|_{L^2}^2 = -z \int_\Omega \sigma \nabla \rho \cdot \nabla \Phi \, dx
\]

(83)

\[
\frac{1}{2D} \frac{d}{dt} \| \sigma \|_{L^2}^2 + \| \nabla \sigma \|_{L^2}^2 = -z \int_\Omega \rho \nabla \sigma \cdot \nabla \Phi \, dx.
\]  

(84)

We estimate the right hand side of (83) using the boundary conditions,

\[
- z \int_\Omega \sigma \nabla \rho \cdot \nabla \Phi \, dx = -z \int_{\partial \Omega} \sigma \rho \partial_n \Phi \, dS + z \int_\Omega \rho \nabla \sigma \cdot \nabla \Phi \, dx + \frac{z}{\epsilon} \int_\Omega \rho^2 \sigma \, dx
\]

\[
\leq z \int_{\partial \Omega} \sigma \rho \Phi \, dS - z \int_{\partial \Omega} \sigma \rho \xi \, dS + z \int_\Omega \rho \nabla \sigma \cdot \nabla \Phi \, dx
\]

\[
= I_1 + I_2 + z \int_\Omega \rho \nabla \sigma \cdot \nabla \Phi \, dx.
\]  

(85)
As in 23 and 24, we obtain using Lemma 1 in the Appendix,
\[ |I_1| \leq C \|\Phi\|_{L^4(\partial \Omega)} \|\rho\|_{L^8(\partial \Omega)} \|\sigma\|_{L^4(\partial \Omega)} \]
\[ \leq \|\Phi\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \left( C_\delta (\|\rho\|_{L^1}^2 + \|\sigma\|_{L^1}^2) + \delta (\|\nabla \rho\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \sigma\|_{L^2}^2) \right) \]  
(86) and similarly
\[ |I_2| \leq C_\delta (\|\rho\|_{L^1}^2 + \|\sigma\|_{L^1}^2) + \delta (\|\nabla \rho\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \sigma\|_{L^2}^2). \]  
(87) Thus choosing
\[ \delta = \min \left\{ \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4 \sup_t \|\Phi(t)\|_{H^1(\Omega)}} \right\} \]  
(88) we obtain by adding (83) and (84) and using the estimates (85)–(87),
\[ \frac{1}{2D} \frac{d}{dt} (\|\rho\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\sigma\|_{L^2}^2) + \frac{1}{2} (\|\nabla \rho\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \sigma\|_{L^2}^2) < R \]  
(89) where \( R \) is a constant that depends on uniform bounds on \( \|\Phi\|_{H^1}, \|\rho\|_{L^1} \) and \( \|\sigma\|_{L^1} \), along with the parameters of the system. Thus by applying Poincaré inequalities to \( \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^2} \) and \( \|\nabla \sigma\|_{L^2} \) as in (27), we conclude after a Grönewall estimate on (89) that \( \|\rho\|_{L^2} \) and \( \|\sigma\|_{L^2} \) remain uniformly bounded in time. In particular, because \( c_i \) are nonnegative, it follows from the boundedness of \( \|\sigma\|_{L^2} \) that \( \|c_i\|_{L^2} \) are uniformly bounded in time for each \( i \). This result replaces Proposition 2 □

5. Global Regularity for Mixed Boundary Conditions

In this section, we again consider NPNS and NPS for two oppositely charged species. Suppose \( \partial \Omega \) represents a cation selective membrane which allows for permeation of cations but blocks anions. As previously mentioned, ion selectivity is typically modelled by Dirichlet boundary conditions. So in this case, the boundary conditions for \( c_i \), assuming \( z_1 > 0 > z_2 \), are
\[ c_1(x,t)|_{\partial \Omega} = \gamma_1 > 0 \]  
(90)
\[ (\partial_n c_2(x,t) + z_2 c_2(x,t) \partial_n \Phi(x,t))|_{\partial \Omega} = 0 \]  
(91) where \( \gamma_1 \) is constant. The boundary conditions for \( \Phi \) and \( u \) are unchanged (see (7),(8)).

As briefly discussed in the introduction, such configurations are known, in general, to lead to electrophoretic instabilities whereby, for large enough voltage drops \( \sup \xi - \inf \xi \), one starts seeing vortical flow patterns, and for even larger drops, even chaotic behavior, resembling fluid turbulence and reminiscent of thermal turbulence in Rayleigh-Bénard convection 10.

To prove global regularity in this mixed setting, we aim to obtain a priori control of the growth of the strong norms, which characterize strong solutions, namely \( c_i \in L^\infty_t H^1_x \cap L^2_t H^2_x, u \in L^\infty_t V \cap L^2_t H^2_x \). At this stage, it is unclear whether such control is possible for arbitrarily large initial data. However, we prove below that it is possible if we assume that the anion \( (i = 2) \) concentration is sufficiently low i.e. if \( \|c_2(0)\|_{L^1} \) is sufficiently small. This smallness condition is needed to obtain \( L^\infty_t L^2_x \) bounds for \( c_i \) in the spirit of Proposition 2.

PROPOSITION 4. Let \( (c_i, \Phi, u) \) be a strong solution of NPNS \( (7),(2),(3) \) or NPS \( (7),(2),(4) \) for two oppositely charged species \( (m = 2, z_1 > 0 > z_2) \) on the time interval \( [0,T] \) satisfying boundary conditions \( (90),(91),(7),(8) \). Then there exists a constant \( i_o > 0 \) depending only on the parameters such that the following holds: if \( \|c_2(0)\|_{L^1} \leq i_o \), then there exist \( \bar{M}_2, \bar{m}_2 > 0 \) depending on the parameters of the system and the initial conditions such that for each \( i = 1,2 \)
\[ \sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|c_i(t)\|_{L^2} < \bar{M}_2 e^{\bar{m}_2 T} = M_2(T). \]  
(92)
Proof. Step 1. Time integrability of $\|\rho\|_{L^2}^2$. Smallness Condition. Unlike in Section 3.2 it is necessary to treat $c_1, c_2$ separately as they satisfy different boundary conditions. We first consider $c_1$. Multiplying (I) for $i = 1$ by $\frac{1}{D_1}(\log c_1 - \log \gamma_1)$ and integrating by parts, we obtain

$$ \frac{1}{D_1} \frac{d}{dt} \left( \int_\Omega c_1 \log c_1 - c_1 - c_1 \log \gamma_1 \, dx \right) = - \int_\Omega \frac{|\nabla c_1|^2}{c_1} + z_1 \nabla \Phi \cdot \nabla c_1 \, dx $$

$$ = - 4 \int_\Omega \nabla \sqrt{c_1^2} \, dx - z_1 \int_\Omega \nabla \Phi \cdot \nabla (c_1 - \gamma_1) \, dx \tag{93} $$

$$ = - 4 \int_\Omega \nabla \sqrt{c_1^2} \, dx + \frac{z_1}{\epsilon} \gamma_1 \int_\Omega \rho \, dx - \frac{z_1}{\epsilon} \int_\Omega c_1 \rho \, dx $$

We observe that no boundary terms occur because $c_1 = \gamma_1$ on the boundary, and the advective involving $u$ also vanishes because $\text{div } u = 0$ and because $\log \gamma_1$ is a constant.

Similarly, multiplying (I) for $i = 2$ by $\frac{1}{D_2} \log c_2$ and integrating by parts, we obtain

$$ \frac{1}{D_2} \frac{d}{dt} \left( \int_\Omega c_2 \log c_2 - c_2 \, dx \right) = - \int_\Omega \frac{|\nabla c_2|^2}{c_2} + z_2 \nabla \Phi \cdot \nabla c_2 \, dx $$

$$ = - 4 \int_\Omega \nabla \sqrt{c_2^2} \, dx - z_2 \int_\partial \Omega c_2 \partial_n \Phi \, dS - \frac{z_2}{\epsilon} \int_\Omega c_2 \rho \, dx \tag{94} $$

We bound the boundary term using the Robin boundary conditions (8) and Lemma 1 in the Appendix (specifically (140) with $p = 2$),

$$ \left| z_2 \int_{\partial \Omega} c_2 \partial_n \Phi \, dS \right| \leq \tau |z_2| \int_{\partial \Omega} c_2 \Phi \, dS + \|\xi\|_{L^\infty(\partial \Omega)} |z_2| \int_{\partial \Omega} c_2 \, dS $$

$$ \leq C(\|\Phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|\xi\|_{L^\infty(\partial \Omega)}) \|\sqrt{c_2}\|_{L^2(\partial \Omega)}^2 $$

$$ \leq C(\|\rho\|_{L^2} + 1)(\|\sqrt{c_2}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\sqrt{c_2}\|_{L^2})^2 $$

$$ \leq C_\delta (1 + \|c_2\|_{L^1}^2) + \delta \|\rho\|_{L^2}^2 + C_\delta \|c_2\|_{L^1} \|\sqrt{c_2}\|_{L^2}^2. \tag{95} $$

The last line follows from Young’s inequalities. In the third line we used the fact that $H^2(\Omega)$ is embedded in a Hölder space $C^\alpha(\Omega)$ for some $\alpha > 0$. Also, this fact that $\Phi$ is continuous up to the boundary justifies the bound $\|\Phi\|_{L^\infty(\partial \Omega)} \leq \|\Phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$. The constant $\delta > 0$ is chosen below.

Defining

$$ \mathcal{E} = \frac{1}{D_1} \int_\Omega c_1 \log c_1 - c_1 - c_1 \log \gamma_1 \, dx + \frac{1}{D_2} \int_\Omega c_2 \log c_2 - c_2 \, dx \tag{96} $$

we obtain by adding (93) to (94), using (95), and recalling $\rho = z_1 c_1 + z_2 c_2$,

$$ \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{E} + 4 \int_\Omega |\nabla \sqrt{c_1^2}|^2 + |\nabla \sqrt{c_2^2}|^2 \, dx + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \int_\Omega \rho^2 \, dx $$

$$ \leq \frac{z_1}{\epsilon} \gamma_1 \int_\Omega \rho \, dx + C_\delta (1 + \|c_2\|_{L^1}^2) + \delta \|\rho\|_{L^2}^2 + C_\delta \|c_2\|_{L^1} \|\sqrt{c_2}\|_{L^2}^2. \tag{97} $$

Choosing $\delta = \frac{1}{4\epsilon}$ and using a Young’s inequality to absorb the term $\int_\Omega \rho \, dx$ into $\int_\Omega \rho^2 \, dx$ on the left hand side, we obtain

$$ \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{E} + 4 \int_\Omega |\nabla \sqrt{c_1^2}|^2 + |\nabla \sqrt{c_2^2}|^2 \, dx + \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \int_\Omega \rho^2 \, dx $$

$$ \leq C_\delta (1 + \|c_2\|_{L^1}^2) + C_\delta \|c_2\|_{L^1} \|\sqrt{c_2}\|_{L^2}^2. \tag{98} $$

Since $c_2$ satisfies blocking boundary conditions, the quantity $\|c_2(t)\|_{L^1}$ is constant in time. So if

$$ \|c_2(0)\|_{L^1} \leq i_c = \frac{4}{C_\delta} \tag{99} $$
we have
\[ \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{E} + \frac{1}{2c} \| \rho \|_{L^2}^2 \leq C_0'(1 + \| c_2(0) \|_{L^1}) . \] (100)
Therefore
\[ 2c \mathcal{E}(T) + \int_0^T \| \rho(s) \|_{L^2}^2 \, ds \leq 2c (\mathcal{E}(0) + C_0'(1 + \| c_2(0) \|_{L^1}) T) = r(T) . \] (101)
Lastly, we observe that because \( x \log x \) is superlinear, for any \( c > 0 \) there exists \( C > 0 \) depending only on \( c \) such that \(-C \leq x \log x - cx \) for all \( x > 0 \). It follows that \( \mathcal{E}(T) \) is bounded below \( \mathcal{E}(T) > -C \), with \( C \) independent of \( T \). Therefore
\[ \int_0^T \| \rho(s) \|_{L^2}^2 \, ds \leq r(T) + 2c C = R(T) . \] (102)

**Step 2.** \( L^\infty L^2 \) bounds for \( c_1 \). Equipped with this time dependent bound, we proceed to control \( c_1 \) in \( L^2 \). Multiplying (1) for \( i = 2 \) by \( \frac{|z_2|}{D_2} c_2 \) and integrating by parts, we obtain exactly as in (22),
\[ \frac{|z_2|}{2D_2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_\Omega c_2^2 \, dx = -|z_2| \int_\Omega |\nabla c_2|^2 \, dx - \frac{z_2|z_2|}{2c} \int_\Omega c_2^2 \rho \, dx 
+ z_2|z_2| \frac{\tau}{2} \int_\partial \Omega c_2\Phi \, dS - \frac{z_2|z_2|}{2} \int_{\partial \Omega} c_2^2 \xi \, dS 
= -|z_2| \int_\Omega |\nabla c_2|^2 \, dx - \frac{z_2|z_2|}{2c} \int_\Omega c_2^2 \rho \, dx + I_1 + I_2 . \] (103)
We bound the boundary integrals using Lemma [1] in the Appendix,
\[ |I_1| \leq C \| \Phi \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \| c_2 \|_{L^2(\partial \Omega)}^2 \]
\[ \leq C \| \rho \|_{L^2}^2 + 1 \| c_2 \|_{L^2} \| \nabla c_2 \|_{L^2} + \| c_2 \|_{L^2}^2 \] (104)
Similarly,
\[ |I_2| \leq C \| \xi \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \| c_2 \|_{L^2(\partial \Omega)}^2 \]
\[ \leq C \| \xi \|_{L^\infty(\partial \Omega)} \| c_2 \|_{L^2} \| \nabla c_2 \|_{L^2} + \| c_2 \|_{L^2} \] (105)
From (103), using (104) and (105), we obtain
\[ \frac{|z_2|}{2D_2} \frac{d}{dt} \| c_2 \|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{|z_2|}{2} \| \nabla c_2 \|_{L^2}^2 \leq C (\| \rho \|_{L^2}^2 + 1) \| c_2 \|_{L^2}^2 - \frac{z_2|z_2|}{2c} \int_\Omega c_2^2 \rho \, dx . \] (106)
Next we obtain the corresponding estimate for \( c_1 \). We observe that \( q_1 = c_1 - \gamma_1 \) satisfies
\[ \partial_t q_1 + u \cdot \nabla q_1 = D_1 \div (\nabla q_1 + z_1 q_1 \nabla \Phi) - \frac{D_1 z_1 \gamma_1}{\epsilon} \rho . \] (107)
Using the fact that \( q_1 \) vanishes on the boundary, we multiply (107) by \( \frac{|z_1|}{D_1} q_1 \) and integrate by parts
\[ \frac{|z_1|}{2D_1} \frac{d}{dt} \| q_1 \|_{L^2}^2 + |z_1| \| \nabla q_1 \|_{L^2}^2 = -\frac{z_1|z_1|}{2} \int_\Omega \nabla q_1^2 \cdot \nabla \Phi \, dx - \frac{z_1|z_1| \gamma_1}{\epsilon} \int_\Omega \rho q_1 \, dx 
\leq -\frac{z_1|z_1|}{2c} \int_\Omega q_1^2 \rho \, dx + C \| \rho \|_{L^2} \| q_1 \|_{L^2} . \] (108)
Now we add (106) to (108) to obtain
\[
\frac{d}{dt} \left( \frac{|z_1|}{2D_1} ||q_1||^2_{L^2} + \frac{|z_2|}{2D_2} ||c_2||^2_{L^2} \right) + |z_1|||\nabla q_1||^2_{L^2} + \frac{|z_2|}{2} ||\nabla c_2||^2_{L^2} \\
\leq - \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \int_{\Omega} (z_1|z_1|q_1^2 + z_2|z_2|c_2^2) \rho \, dx + C(||\rho||^2_{L^2} + 1) ||c_2||^2_{L^2} + C||\rho||_{L^2} ||q_1||_{L^2} \\
\leq - \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \int_{\Omega} (z_1|z_1|q_1^2 + z_2|z_2|c_2^2) \rho \, dx + C(||\rho||^2_{L^2} + 1)(||q_1||^2_{L^2} + ||c_2||^2_{L^2}) + C
\] (109)

Next, we observe that because \( z_1 > 0 > z_2 \) and denoting \( \sigma = z_1c_1 + |z_2|c_2 \geq 0 \),
\[
(z_1|z_1|q_1^2 + z_2|z_2|c_2^2) \rho = (z_1^2q_1^2 - z_2^2c_2^2) \rho = (z_1q_1 + z_2c_2)(z_1q_1 + z_2c_2) \rho = (\sigma - z_1\gamma_1) (\rho - z_1\gamma_1) \rho = \rho^2\sigma - 2z_1^2\gamma_1c_2 \rho + z_2^2\gamma_2^2 \rho \\
\geq - 2z_1^2\gamma_1c_2 \rho + z_2^2\gamma_2^2 \rho.
\] (110)

We note that in the last line, there is no cubic term. So using (110) together with Young’s inequalities, we obtain from (109),
\[
\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{F} \leq C(||\rho||^2_{L^2} + 1) + C(||\rho||^2_{L^2} + 1)(||q_1||^2_{L^2} + ||c_2||^2_{L^2}) \\
\leq C(||\rho||^2_{L^2} + 1) + C(||\rho||^2_{L^2} + 1)\mathcal{F}
\] (111)

for
\[
\mathcal{F} = \frac{|z_1|}{2D_1} ||q_1||^2_{L^2} + \frac{|z_2|}{2D_2} ||c_2||^2_{L^2}.
\] (112)

Thus recalling (102), a Grönwall estimate gives us
\[
\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \mathcal{F}(t) \leq (\mathcal{F}(0) + C(R(T) + T)) \exp(C(R(T) + T)).
\] (113)

This completes the proof of the proposition. □

As in the case of blocking boundary conditions, the \( L^2 \) bounds obtained in the previous proposition are sufficient, in the mixed boundary conditions setting, to obtain control of \( c_i \) in the space \( L^\infty_t H^1_x \cap L_T^2 H^2_x \). Since the \( L^2 \) bound (92) is time dependent, all higher regularity bounds are also time dependent. In particular, even for NPS, no time independent bounds of the type (57) are available.

**Theorem 4.** For initial conditions \( 0 \leq c_1(0) \in H^1, u(0) \in V \) with \( ||c_2(0)|| \leq i_c \) (Proposition 4) and for all \( T > 0 \), NPS (1), (2), (4) for two oppositely charged species \( (m = 2, z_1 > 0 > z_2) \) has a unique strong solution \( (c_i, \Phi, u) \) on the time interval \( [0, T] \) satisfying the boundary conditions (90), (91), (7), (8). Under the same hypotheses, NPPNS (7), (2), (4) for two oppositely charged species has a unique strong solution on \( [0, T] \) satisfying the initial and boundary conditions provided
\[
U(T) = \int_0^T ||u(s)||^4_V \, ds < \infty.
\] (114)

Moreover, the solution to NPS satisfies
\[
\sup_{t \in [0,T]} ||c_i(t)||^2_{H^1} + \int_0^T ||c_i(s)||^2_{H^2} \, ds \leq M(T)
\] (115)
\[
\sup_{t \in [0,T]} ||u(t)||^2_V + \int_0^T ||u(s)||^2_{H^2} \, ds \leq B'(T)
\] (116)
for time dependent constants $M(T), B'(T)$ depending also on the parameters of the system and the initial conditions. The solution to NPNS satisfies

$$
sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|c_i(t)\|_{H^1}^2 + \int_0^T \|c_i(s)\|_{H^2}^2 \, ds \leq M_U(T) \tag{117}
$$

$$
sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|u(t)\|_{V}^2 + \int_0^T \|u(s)\|_{H^2}^2 \, ds \leq B'_U(T) \tag{118}
$$

for time dependent constants $M_U(T), B'_U(T)$ depending also on the parameters of the system, the initial conditions, and $U(T)$.

Remark 3. We remark that, from a modelling point of view, one of the main hypotheses in the derivation of the Nernst-Planck-Poisson (1), (2) model is the treatment of ions as point charges, and this simplification is justified for sufficiently dilute solutions (17). Thus, requiring the total concentration $\|c_2(0)\|_{L^1}$ to be small is at least self-consistent.

Proof. As in the proofs of Theorems 2 and 3, global existence of strong solutions follows from the local existence theorem and the a priori bounds (115)-(118).

Step 1. $L^\infty_t L^4_x$ bounds for $c_i, L^\infty_t W^{1,\infty}_x$ bounds for $\Phi, L^\infty_t V \cap L^2_t H^2_x$ bounds for $u$. From (92) and elliptic regularity, we obtain as in (36),

$$\|\nabla \Phi\|_{L^6} \leq P_6(T) \tag{119}$$

for some time dependent constant $P_6(T)$. Then multiplying (11) for $i = 2$ by $c_i^2$, and integrating by parts, we find (cf. (38)),

$$\frac{1}{4} \frac{d}{dt} \|c_2\|_{L^4}^4 + \frac{3}{4} \int D_2 \|\nabla c_2^2\|_{L^2}^2 \leq CP_6(T) \|c_2\|_{L^4}^2 \|\nabla c_2\|_{L^2}^2 \tag{120}$$

which, after interpolating $L^3$ between $L^2$ and $H^1$ and using a Young’s inequality, gives

$$\frac{1}{4} \frac{d}{dt} \|c_2\|_{L^4}^4 + \frac{1}{4} \int D_2 \|\nabla c_2^2\|_{L^2}^2 \leq CP_6(T)^4 \|c_2\|_{L^4}^4. \tag{121}$$

Therefore, for a time dependent constant $M'_4(T)$ we have

$$\|c_2\|_{L^4} \leq M'_4(T). \tag{122}$$

Then multiplying (107) by $q_1^2$ and integrating by parts, we get

$$\frac{1}{4} \frac{d}{dt} \|q_1\|_{L^4}^4 + \frac{3}{4} \int D_1 \|\nabla q_1^2\|_{L^2}^2 \leq CP_6(T) \|q_1^2\|_{L^3} \|\nabla q_1^2\|_{L^2}^2 + C(1 + \|q_1\|_{L^4}^4 + \|c_2\|_{L^4}^4) \tag{123}$$

which gives after an interpolation,

$$\frac{1}{4} \frac{d}{dt} \|q_1\|_{L^4}^4 + \frac{1}{4} \int D_1 \|\nabla q_1^2\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(P_6(T)^4 + 1) \|q_1\|_{L^4}^4 + C(1 + \|c_2\|_{L^4}^4) \tag{124}$$

This, together with (122), allows us to conclude that there exists a time dependent constant $M_4(T)$ such that for each $i$,

$$\|c_i\|_{L^4} \leq M_4(T). \tag{125}$$

Furthermore, since $W^{2,4} \hookrightarrow W^{1,\infty}$, we have for a time dependent constant $P_\infty(T),

$$\|\Phi\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \leq P_\infty(T). \tag{126}$$

At this point, we have established enough bounds to mimic the derivations of (51), (53) to obtain the bounds (116), (118) for $u$.

Step 2. $L^\infty_t H^1_x \cap L^2_t H^2_x$ bounds for $c_1$. Now we bound derivatives of $c_1$. First we multiply (107) by $-\Delta q_1$ and integrate by parts to obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla q_1\|_{L^2}^2 + D_1 \|\Delta q_1\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C\|u\|_{V} \|\nabla q_1\|_{L^2}^2 \|\Delta q_1\|_{L^2}^2 + CP_\infty(T) \|\nabla q_1\|_{L^2}^2 \|\Delta q_1\|_{L^2}^2 \tag{127}$$

$$+ C(M_4(T)^2 + 1) \|\Delta q_1\|_{L^2}^2 + CM_2(T) \|\Delta q_1\|_{L^2}^2$$
so that from Young’s inequalities, we obtain
\[
\frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d}{dt} \| \nabla q_1 \|^2_{L^2} + \frac{D_1}{2} \| \Delta q_1 \|^2_{L^2} \leq C(T) + C(P_\infty(T)^2 + \| u \|^2_V) ||\nabla q_1||^2_{L^2}
\] (128)
for a time dependent constant \( C(T) \). Using a Grönwall estimate, from (128), we obtain (117) for \( c_1 \) in the case of NPNS. In the case of constant \( C(t) \), (128) together with (115) gives us (115) for \( c_1 \).

**Step 3.** \( L_t^\infty H^1_\omega \cap L_2^2 H^2_\omega \) bounds for \( c_2 \). To obtain the corresponding bounds for \( c_2 \), we start with (63), which holds verbatim for \( t \geq 2 \):
\[
\frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d}{dt} \| \nabla c_2 \|^2_{L^2} + D_2 \| \Delta \tilde{c}_2 \|^2_{L^2} = \int_{\Omega} (u \cdot \nabla \tilde{c}_2) \Delta \tilde{c}_2 \, dx + D_2 z_2 \int_{\Omega} (\nabla \tilde{c}_2 \cdot \nabla \Phi) \Delta \tilde{c}_2 \, dx
\]
\[
- z_2 \int_{\Omega} ((\partial_t + u \cdot \nabla) \Phi) \tilde{c}_2 \Delta \tilde{c}_2 \, dx
\]
\[
= I_1 + I_2 + I_3.
\] (129)
The term \( I_1 \) is bounded identically (see (64)):
\[
|I_1| \leq \frac{D_2}{4} \| \Delta \tilde{c}_2 \|^2_{L^2} + C \| u \|^2_V \| \nabla \tilde{c}_2 \|^2_{L^2}.
\] (130)
The term \( I_2 \) is also bounded identically (see (65)), noting that this time we have a time dependent coefficient \( C_g(t) \), depending on \( P_\infty(T) \):
\[
|I_2| \leq \frac{D_2}{4} \| \Delta \tilde{c}_2 \|^2_{L^2} + C_g(T) \| \nabla \tilde{c}_2 \|^2_{L^2}.
\] (131)
As for the term \( I_3 = I_3^1 + I_3^2 \) (see (66), we note that
\[
\| \tilde{c}_2 \|^2_{L^2} \leq C M_4(T) e^{-|x_2|P_\infty(T)} = \beta_3(T)
\] (132)
so that
\[
|I_3^1| \leq C \| u \|^2_V \| \nabla \Phi \|^2_{L^\infty} \| \tilde{c}_2 \|^2_{L^2} \| \Delta \tilde{c}_2 \|^2_{L^2}
\]
\[
\leq \frac{D_2}{8} \| \Delta \tilde{c}_2 \|^2_{L^2} + C_g'(T) \| u \|^2_V
\] (133)
where \( C_g'(T) \) depends on \( \beta_3(T) \) and \( P_\infty(T) \). Lastly, in order to bound \( I_3^2 \), we first estimate \( \partial_t \nabla \Phi \) as in (70)-(72), but this time we work around the fact that \( \partial_\tau \tilde{c}_1 |_{\partial \Omega} = 0 \) does not hold:
\[
\| \partial_t \nabla \Phi \|^2_{L^2} \leq C \sum_{j=1}^2 \left| \int_\Omega \text{div} (e^{-z_j \Phi} \nabla \tilde{c}_j) \partial_t \Phi \, dx \right| + C \int_\Omega \left| \int_\Omega \text{div} (u \partial_t \Phi) \, dx \right|
\]
\[
\leq C \int_\Omega e^{-|z_j|P_\infty(T)} |\nabla \tilde{c}_j| |\partial_t \nabla \Phi| \, dx + C \int_\Omega \left| \int_\Omega \text{div} (e^{-z_1 \Phi} \nabla \tilde{c}_1) \partial_t \Phi \, dx \right|
\]
\[
+ C \int_\Omega |\rho| |u| |\partial_t \Phi| \, dx
\]
\[
\leq C \int_\Omega e^{-|z_j|P_\infty(T)} |\nabla \tilde{c}_j| |\partial_t \nabla \Phi| \, dx + C P_\infty(T) e^{-|z_1|P_\infty(T)} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \tilde{c}_1| |\partial_t \Phi| \, dx
\]
\[
+ C e^{-|z_1|P_\infty(T)} \int_{\Omega} \| \Delta \tilde{c}_1 \| |\partial_t \Phi| \, dx + C \int_\Omega |\rho| |u| |\partial_t \nabla \Phi| \, dx
\]
\[
\leq C_1(T) \left( \sum_{j=1}^2 \| \nabla \tilde{c}_j \|_{L^2} + \| \Delta \tilde{c}_1 \|_{L^2} + \| u \|_V \right) \| \partial_t \Phi \|_{L^2}
\] (134)
where \( C_1(T) \) depends on \( P_\infty(T) \) and \( M_4(T) \), and we used \( \| \partial_t \Phi \|_{L^2} \leq C \| \partial_t \nabla \Phi \|_{L^2} \), which holds because \( \partial_t \Phi \) satisfies homogeneous Robin boundary conditions. Then recalling that we already have the bounds (115), (117) for \( c_1 \), we obtain, using the embedding \( H^1 \hookrightarrow L^6 \),
\[
\| \partial_t \Phi \|^2_{L^6} \leq C_1(T, U(T))(\| \nabla \tilde{c}_2 \|_{L^2} + \| \Delta \tilde{c}_1 \|_{L^2} + \| u \|_V + 1)
\] (135)
for a time dependent constant $C_1(T,U(T))$ depending also on $U(T)$ (though in the case of NPS, this latter dependence is redundant). Thus we bound $I_3^2$ as in (75),

\[
|I_3^2| \leq \frac{D_2}{8} \left\| \Delta \tilde{c}_2 \right\|_{L^2}^2 + C_3(T,U(T))(\left\| \nabla \tilde{c}_2 \right\|_{L^2}^2 + \left\| \Delta \tilde{c}_1 \right\|_{L^2}^2 + \left\| u \right\|_{V}^2 + 1)
\]  

(136)

Collecting our estimates for $I_1, I_2, I_3$, we obtain as in (76),

\[
0 \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left\| \nabla \tilde{c}_2 \right\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{D_2}{4} \left\| \Delta \tilde{c}_2 \right\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C_P(T,U(T))(\left\| u \right\|_{V}^2 + 1) \left\| \nabla \tilde{c}_2 \right\|_{L^2}^2 + C'_P(T,U(T))(\left\| \Delta \tilde{c}_1 \right\|_{L^2}^2 + \left\| u \right\|_{V}^2 + 1).
\]

(137)

It is straightforward to verify using the chain rule that

\[
\left\| \Delta \tilde{c}_1 \right\|_{L^2} \leq C_P(T)(\left\| \Delta c_1 \right\|_{L^2} + \left\| \nabla c_1 \right\|_{L^2} + \left\| c_1 \right\|_{L^2} + \left\| c_1 \rho \right\|_{L^2})
\]

(138)

for a time dependent constant $C_P(T)$ depending on $P_{\infty}(T)$. So, by the previously established bounds (115), (117) for $c_1$ (cf. (128)), together with (125), we have

\[
\int_0^T \left\| \Delta \tilde{c}_1 \right\|_{L^2}^2 \, dt = S(T) < \infty.
\]

(139)

Then from (137), a Grönwall estimate together with (139) gives us (117) for $i = 2$ in the case of NPS, after we convert back to the variable $c_2$. In the case of NPS, (116), together with (137) and (139) gives us (115) for $i = 2$.

\[\square\]

**Appendix A. Trace Inequalities**

**Lemma 1.** Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be an open, bounded domain with Lipschitz boundary. Then for $p \in [2,4]$, we have the embedding $H^1(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^p(\partial \Omega)$. Moreover, for $p \in [2,4]$, there exist constants $C_p, C'_p$ depending only on $\Omega$ and $p$ such that

\[
\left\| f \right\|_{L^p(\partial \Omega)} \leq C_p \left\| \nabla f \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\| f \right\|_{L^2(\partial \Omega)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{2}} + C'_p \left\| f \right\|_{L^p(\Omega)}.
\]

(140)

In particular, for $p = 4$, there exists a constant $c_4$ depending only on $\Omega$ such that

\[
\left\| f \right\|_{L^4(\partial \Omega)} \leq c_4 \left\| f \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}.
\]

(141)

And, for $p \in [2,4]$ and any $\gamma > 0$ there exists $C_\gamma$ depending on $\Omega$, $p$ and $\gamma$ such that

\[
\left\| f \right\|_{L^p(\partial \Omega)}^2 \leq \gamma \left\| \nabla f \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + C_\gamma \left\| f \right\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^2.
\]

(142)

**Proof.** The proof is based on the proof of Theorem 1.5.1.10 in [13]. Because $C^1(\Omega)$ is dense in $H^1(\Omega)$, we assume without loss of generality that $f \in C^1(\Omega)$. Next we use the fact (Lemma 1.5.1.9, [13]) that for bounded Lipschitz domains $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, there exists $\mu \in (C^\infty(\Omega))^3$ and a constant $\delta > 0$ such that $\mu \cdot n \geq \delta$ almost everywhere on $\partial \Omega$, where $n$ is the outward pointing normal vector on $\partial \Omega$. Then, on one hand, we have

\[
\int_\Omega \nabla \left| f \right|^p \cdot \mu \, dx = p \int_\Omega \left| f \right|^{p-2} f \nabla f \cdot \mu \, dx.
\]

(143)

On the other hand, integrating by parts, we have

\[
\int_\Omega \nabla \left| f \right|^p \cdot \mu \, dx = \int_{\partial \Omega} \left| f \right|^p \mu \cdot n \, dS - \int_\Omega \left| f \right|^p \text{div} \mu \, dx.
\]

(144)
Therefore,
\[
\delta \int_{\partial \Omega} |f|^p \, dS \leq \int_{\partial \Omega} |f|^p \mu \cdot n \, dS
\]
\[= p \int_{\Omega} |f|^{p-2} f \nabla f \cdot \mu \, dx + \int_{\Omega} |f|^p \text{div} \mu \, dx
\]
\[\leq p \|\mu\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \int_{\Omega} |f|^{p-1} |\nabla f| \, dx + \|\text{div} \mu\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \int_{\Omega} |f|^p \, dx
\]
\[\leq p \|\mu\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|\nabla f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|f\|^{p-1}_{L^{2(p-1)}(\Omega)} + \|\text{div} \mu\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p
\]
where the last line follows from a Hölder inequality. Then, (140) follows from taking both sides of (145) to the \(p^{-1}\) power. Taking \(p = 4\) in (140) we have
\[
\|f\|_{L^4(\partial \Omega)} \leq C_4 \|\nabla f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|f\|_{L^8(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{3}} + C'_4 \|f\|_{L^4(\Omega)},
\]
so (141) follows from the embedding \(H^1(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^6(\Omega)\). Lastly, (142) follows from (140) by interpolating the spaces \(L^{2(p-1)}(\Omega)\) and \(L^p(\Omega)\) between \(L^1(\Omega)\) and \(H^1(\Omega)\), followed by Young’s inequalities. \(\square\)
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