

Global solutions and large time behavior for some Oldroyd-B type models in \mathbb{R}^2

Wenjie Deng^{1*}, Zhaonan Luo^{1†} and Zhaoyang Yin^{1,2‡}

¹Department of Mathematics, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou 510275, China

²Faculty of Information Technology,
Macau University of Science and Technology, Macau, China

Abstract

In this paper, we are concerned with global solutions to the co-rotation Oldroyd-B type model and large time behavior for the general Oldroyd-B type model. We first establish the energy estimate and B-K-M criterion for the 2-D co-rotation Oldroyd-B type model. Then, we obtain global solutions by proving the boundedness of vorticity. In general case, we apply Fourier splitting method to prove the H^1 decay rate for global solutions constructed in [7].

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 35Q30, 76B03, 76D05, 76D99.

Keywords: The Oldroyd-B type models; Global strong solutions; Time decay rate.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	The Oldroyd-B type models	3
1.2	The Hooke models	3
1.3	Main results	3
2	Preliminaries	5
3	Global solutions to the co-rotation Oldroyd-B type model	7
3.1	Energy estimate	7
3.2	B-K-M Criterion	9
3.3	Global Solutions	11
3.3.1	The Oldroyd-B type models	11
3.3.2	The Hooke models	13

*E-mail: detective2028@qq.com

†E-mail: 1411919168@qq.com

‡E-mail: mcsyzy@mail.sysu.edu.cn

4 Large time behavior for the general Oldroyd-B type model	17
References	20

1 Introduction

In this paper we investigate the following general Oldroyd-B type model (with $\nu = 0$):

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t u + u \cdot \nabla u + \nabla P = \operatorname{div} \tau + \nu \Delta u, & \operatorname{div} u = 0, \\ \partial_t \tau + u \cdot \nabla \tau + a\tau + Q(\nabla u, \tau) = \alpha D(u) + \mu \Delta \tau, \\ u|_{t=0} = u_0, \quad \tau|_{t=0} = \tau_0. \end{cases}$$

In (1.1), $u(t, x)$ denotes the velocity of the polymeric liquid, $\tau(t, x)$ represents the symmetric tensor of constraints and P is the pressure. The parameters a , μ and ν are nonnegative and $\alpha > 0$. Moreover,

$$Q(\nabla u, \tau) = \tau \Omega - \Omega \tau + b(D(u)\tau + \tau D(u)),$$

with $b \in [-1, 1]$, the vorticity tensor $\Omega = \frac{\nabla u - (\nabla u)^T}{2}$ and the deformation tensor $D(u) = \frac{\nabla u + (\nabla u)^T}{2}$. For more explanations on the modeling, one can refer to in [28, 9, 7].

Taking $b = 1$ and $\alpha = 2$, then the general Oldroyd-B type model (1.1) can be derived from the the following micro-macro models [18, 12] with Hooke potential $\mathcal{U} = \frac{1}{2}|q|^2$ and the drag term $\sigma(u) = \nabla u$:

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t u + u \cdot \nabla u + \nabla P = \operatorname{div} \tau + \nu \Delta u, & \operatorname{div} u = 0, \\ \psi_t + u \cdot \nabla \psi = \operatorname{div}_q [-\sigma(u) \cdot q \psi + \frac{a}{2} \nabla_q \psi + \frac{a}{2} \nabla_q \mathcal{U} \psi] + \mu \Delta \psi, \\ \tau_{ij} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (q_i \nabla_{q_j} \mathcal{U}) \psi dq - Id, \\ u|_{t=0} = u_0, \quad \psi|_{t=0} = \psi_0. \end{cases}$$

In (1.2), the polymer particles are described by the distribution function $\psi(t, x, q)$. Here the polymer elongation q satisfies $q \in \mathbb{R}^2$, which means that the extensibility of the polymers is infinite and $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. τ is an extra-stress tensor which generated by the polymer particles effect. In general, $\sigma(u) = \nabla u$. For the co-rotation case, $\sigma(u) = \Omega$.

The following co-rotation Oldroyd-B type model can be derived from the micro-macro models (1.2) with $\nu = 0$, $\mathcal{U} = \frac{1}{2}|q|^2$ and $\sigma(u) = \Omega$:

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t u + u \cdot \nabla u + \nabla P = \operatorname{div} \tau, & \operatorname{div} u = 0, \\ \partial_t \tau + u \cdot \nabla \tau + a\tau + Q(\Omega, \tau) = \mu \Delta \tau, \\ u|_{t=0} = u_0, \quad \tau|_{t=0} = \tau_0. \end{cases}$$

Notice that the equations (1.3) reduce to the well-known Euler equation by taking $\tau = 0$. However, taking $\tau = 0$ in (1.1), then we have $Du = 0$, which implies $u = 0$ in Sobolev spaces. The observation reveals the essential difference between (1.1) and (1.3).

1.1. The Oldroyd-B type models

T. M. Elgindi and F. Rousset [7] first proved regularity for the 2-D Oldroyd-B type models (1.1) with $\nu = 0$. Later on, T. M. Elgindi and J. Liu [8] obtained the global strong solutions of the 3-D case under the assumption that initial data is sufficiently small.

Taking $\mu = 0$ in (1.1), we obtain the classical Oldroyd-B model. In [11], C. Guillopé, and J. C. Saut first showed that the Oldroyd-B model admits a unique global strong solution in Sobolev spaces. The L^p -setting was given by E. Fernández-Cara, F. Guillén and R. Ortega [10]. The weak solutions of the Oldroyd-B model was proved by P. L. Lions and N. Masmoudi [20] for the case $\alpha = 0$. Notice that the problem for the case $\alpha \neq 0$ is still open, see [22, 23]. Later on, J. Y. Chemin and N. Masmoudi [6] proved the existence and uniqueness of strong solutions in homogenous Besov spaces with critical index of regularity. Optimal decay rates for solutions to the 3-D Oldroyd-B model were obtained by M. Hieber, H. Wen and R. Zi [13]. An approach based on the deformation tensor can be found in [17, 16, 34, 19, 36].

1.2. The Hooke models

Let $\nu, \mu > 0$. The construction of global weak solutions for micro-macro systems was considered in [2, 3, 4, 5, 30, 35]. Recently, the global existence and uniqueness of a large class of initial data for the diffusive 2D models was considered in [15]. It's worthy to mention that the so-called moments $(u, M_{a,b})$ considered in [15] are strong solutions with macroscopic variables (t, x) while ψ is nonnegative measures on $\mathbb{R}_q^2 \times \mathbb{R}_x^2$ merely. Let $\mu = 0$. The local existence of micro-macro systems were proved by many researchers in different settings, see [29, 33]. F.H Lin, C. Liu and P. Zhang [18] studied the incompressible micro-macro polymeric system and proved global existence near equilibrium some assumptions on the potential \mathcal{U} . The global regularity for the 2-D co-rotation Hooke dumbbell model was proved by N. Masmoudi, P. Zhang, and Z. Zhang [25]. The long time behavior for the 3-D micro-macro polymeric system was considered by L. He and P. Zhang [12].

1.3. Main results

Global well-posedness with $d = 2$ and long time behavior for polymeric models is noticed by N. Masmoudi [24]. To our best knowledge, global well-posedness for the Oldroyd-B type model (1.3) and large time behaviour for (1.1) have not been studied yet. In this paper, we first study about global solutions (1.3). The proof is based on the bootstrap argument in [32]. To prove global existence, we derive the energy estimate and B-K-M criterion for (1.3). The main difficulty in the proof is to prove the boundedness of vorticity from (1.3). Motivated by [7], we can cancel $\operatorname{div} \tau$ and $\Delta \tau$ by virtue of the structural trick $\Gamma = \Omega - R\tau$ where $R = -(\Delta)^{-1} \operatorname{curl} \operatorname{div}$. However, for (1.3), there is no dissipation term in the equation of Γ for lack of $D(u)$. We thus fail to use the bootstrap argument as in [7]. Fortunately, the disappearance of $D(u)$ leads to exponential dissipation for τ in H^1 . The effect of exponential dissipation of τ is essential in the estimation of Γ . We finish the proof of global existence by deriving the L^∞ estimate for Ω . To our best knowledge, there is still no any global existence result of the Hooke models (1.2) with $\nu = 0$. As a corollary of Theorem 1.1, we prove the global existence of (1.2) near equilibrium. Finally we study about large time behaviour for (1.1). Since the structural trick Γ transfer dissipation from τ to u for (1.1), we obtain the dissipation energy estimate for (u, τ) which is useful to prove large time behaviour. For any $l \in \mathbb{N}^+$, we get initial time decay rate $\ln^{-l}(e+t)$

for (u, τ) in L^2 by the Fourier splitting method, see [31, 21]. By virtue of the time weighted energy estimate and the logarithmic decay rate, then we improve the time decay rate to $(1+t)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$.

Our main results can be stated as follows:

Theorem 1.1 (Global well-posedness). *Let $d = 2$ and $s > 2$. Assume that $a > 0$, $\mu > 0$ and $\kappa = \min\{a, \mu\}$. Let (u, τ) be a strong solution of (1.3) with the initial data $(u_0, \tau_0) \in H^s$. Then, there exists some sufficiently small constant c such that if*

$$(1.4) \quad \|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2} \leq c\kappa, \quad \|\tau_0\|_{H^1} \leq c(a\mu)^{\frac{1}{2}}\kappa,$$

and

$$(1.5) \quad \|\Gamma_0\|_{L^\infty} \leq ca\mu, \quad \|\tau_0\|_{H^1}^2 \leq \frac{c^2 a \kappa (\mu + 1) \mu}{\ln(C + \|(u_0, \tau_0)\|_{H^s}^2)} \quad \|\tau_0\|_{H^1} \leq c^2 \lambda,$$

where $\lambda = \min\{a^{\frac{1}{2}}, a^{\frac{3}{2}}\mu, (a\mu)^{\frac{3}{2}}, a, \mu, a\mu^{\frac{5}{2}}, \mu^{\frac{3}{2}}\}$. Then the system (1.3) admits a unique global strong solution $(u, \tau) \in C([0, \infty); H^s)$.

Remark 1.2. Let $\phi(x) = A(x_2 e^{-|x|^2}, -x_1 e^{-|x|^2})^T$ and $\varphi(x) = A e^{-|x|^2} \text{Id}$. Consider $u_0 = \varepsilon \phi(\varepsilon x)$ and $\tau_0 = \varepsilon \varphi(\varepsilon x)$, then we can verify that $\text{div } u_0 = 0$. We infer by direct calculation that $\|u_0\|_{L^2} = \|\phi_0\|_{L^2}$ and $\|\tau_0\|_{L^2} = \|\varphi_0\|_{L^2}$. Moreover, we deduce that $\|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^s} = \varepsilon^s \|\phi_0\|_{\dot{H}^s}$ and $\|\tau_0\|_{\dot{H}^s} = \varepsilon^s \|\varphi_0\|_{\dot{H}^s}$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Finally, we can construct large initial data in H^s which satisfies (1.4) and (1.5) by taking A sufficiently large and ε small enough.

Remark 1.3. For any a and μ , the equations (1.3) reduce to the well-known Euler equation by taking $\tau = 0$. In this case, the parameters a and μ in Theorem 1.1 can be regarded as infinity, which means that our results cover the global existence for the 2D Euler equation in Sobolev spaces H^s .

Theorem 1.4 (Large time behaviour). *Let (u, τ) be a strong solution of (1.1) with the initial data (u_0, τ_0) under the condition in Theorem 4.1. In addition, if $(u_0, \tau_0) \in L^1$, then there exists $C > 0$ such that for every $t > 0$ we have*

$$(1.6) \quad \|(u, \tau)\|_{H^1} \leq C(1+t)^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Remark 1.5. Notice that Theorem 4.1 don't provide information for the global solution of (1.1) in $L^\infty([0, \infty); H^s)$ with some large initial data. However, by virtue of the Fourier splitting method and the time weighted energy estimate, we can prove the large time behaviour by taking full advantage of the H^1 energy estimation (4.2) and the low-frequency assumption $(u_0, \tau_0) \in L^1$. The proof does not involve the higher derivative, which is useful in studying the large time behaviour for the global solution with some large initial data.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce some notations and give some preliminaries which will be used in the sequel. In Section 3 we prove that the 2-D co-rotation Oldroyd-B type model admits a unique global strong solution. As a corollary, we prove the global existence of the Hooke models near equilibrium. In Section 4 we study the H^1 decay of global solutions to the general Oldroyd-B type model for $d = 2$ by virtue of the Fourier splitting method.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we introduce some notations and useful lemmas which will be used in the sequel.

Let $\psi_\infty(q) = \frac{e^{-\mathcal{U}(q)}}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\mathcal{U}(q)} dq}$. For $p \geq 1$, we denote by \mathcal{L}^p the space

$$\mathcal{L}^p = \left\{ \psi \mid \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{L}^p}^p = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi_\infty |\psi|^p dq < \infty \right\}.$$

We will use the notation $L_x^p(\mathcal{L}^{p'})$ to denote $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathcal{L}^{p'})$:

$$L_x^p(\mathcal{L}^{p'}) = \left\{ \psi \mid \|\psi\|_{L_x^p(\mathcal{L}^{p'})} = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi_\infty |\psi|^{p'} dq \right)^{\frac{p}{p'}} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty \right\}.$$

We now recall the Littlewood-Paley decomposition theory and Besov spaces.

Proposition 2.1. [1] *Let \mathcal{C} be the annulus $\{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d : \frac{3}{4} \leq |\xi| \leq \frac{8}{3}\}$. There exist radial functions χ and φ , valued in the interval $[0, 1]$, belonging respectively to $\mathcal{D}(B(0, \frac{4}{3}))$ and $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{C})$, and such that*

$$\forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \chi(\xi) + \sum_{j \geq 0} \varphi(2^{-j}\xi) = 1,$$

$$\forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}, \quad \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi(2^{-j}\xi) = 1,$$

$$|j - j'| \geq 2 \Rightarrow \text{Supp } \varphi(2^{-j}\cdot) \cap \text{Supp } \varphi(2^{-j'}\cdot) = \emptyset,$$

$$j \geq 1 \Rightarrow \text{Supp } \chi(\cdot) \cap \text{Supp } \varphi(2^{-j}\cdot) = \emptyset.$$

The set $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} = B(0, \frac{2}{3}) + \mathcal{C}$ is an annulus, and we have

$$|j - j'| \geq 5 \Rightarrow 2^j \mathcal{C} \cap 2^{j'} \tilde{\mathcal{C}} = \emptyset.$$

Further, we have

$$\forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \frac{1}{2} \leq \chi^2(\xi) + \sum_{j \geq 0} \varphi^2(2^{-j}\xi) \leq 1,$$

$$\forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}, \quad \frac{1}{2} \leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi^2(2^{-j}\xi) \leq 1.$$

\mathcal{F} represents the Fourier transform and its inverse is denoted by \mathcal{F}^{-1} . Let u be a tempered distribution in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$. For all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, define

$$\Delta_j u = 0 \text{ if } j \leq -2, \quad \Delta_{-1} u = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\chi \mathcal{F} u), \quad \Delta_j u = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\varphi(2^{-j}\cdot) \mathcal{F} u) \text{ if } j \geq 0, \quad S_j u = \sum_{j' < j} \Delta_{j'} u.$$

Then the Littlewood-Paley decomposition is given as follows:

$$u = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \Delta_j u \quad \text{in } \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Let $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $1 \leq p, r \leq \infty$. The nonhomogeneous Besov space $B_{p,r}^s$ and $B_{p,r}^s(\mathcal{L}^{p'})$ is defined by

$$B_{p,r}^s = \left\{ u \in \mathcal{S}' : \|u\|_{B_{p,r}^s} = \left\| (2^{js} \|\Delta_j u\|_{L^p})_j \right\|_{l^r(\mathbb{Z})} < \infty \right\},$$

$$B_{p,r}^s(\mathcal{L}^{p'}) = \left\{ \phi \in \mathcal{S}' : \|\phi\|_{B_{p,r}^s(\mathcal{L}^{p'})} = \left\| (2^{js} \|\Delta_j \phi\|_{L_x^p(\mathcal{L}^{p'})})_j \right\|_{l^r(\mathbb{Z})} < \infty \right\}.$$

This is a standard tool for nonlinear estimates. We have the following product laws:

Lemma 2.2. [1] For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\|uv\|_{B_{\infty,1}^0} \leq C(\|u\|_{L^\infty}\|v\|_{B_{\infty,1}^0} + \|u\|_{B_{\infty,1}^0}\|v\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^\epsilon}).$$

The following lemma is useful to estimate $\|\tau\|_{B_{\infty,1}^0}$.

Lemma 2.3. [1] Let \mathcal{C} be an annulus. Positive constants c and C exist such that for any p in $[1, +\infty]$ and any couple (t, λ) of positive real numbers, we have

$$(2.1) \quad \text{Supp } \hat{u} \subset \lambda \mathcal{C} \Rightarrow \|e^{t\Delta}u\|_{L^p} \leq Ce^{-ct\lambda^2}\|u\|_{L^p}.$$

The following commutator lemma is useful to estimate Γ .

Lemma 2.4. [7] Let $\text{div } u = 0$ and $R = \Delta^{-1} \text{curl } \text{div}$. Then we have

(1) For every $(p, r) \in [2, \infty) \times [1, \infty]$, there exists a constant $C = C(p, r)$ such that

$$(2.2) \quad \|R, u \cdot \nabla \tau\|_{B_{p,r}^0} \leq C\|\nabla u\|_{L^p}(\|\tau\|_{B_{\infty,r}^0} + \|\tau\|_{L^p}).$$

(2) For every $r \in [1, \infty]$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a constant $C = C(r, \varepsilon)$ such that

$$(2.3) \quad \|[R, u \cdot \nabla] \tau\|_{B_{\infty,r}^0} \leq C(\|\omega\|_{L^\infty} + \|\omega\|_{L^2})(\|\tau\|_{B_{\infty,r}^\varepsilon} + \|\tau\|_{L^2}).$$

The following lemma is the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality of Sobolev type.

Lemma 2.5. [27] Let $d \geq 2$, $p \in [2, +\infty)$ and $0 \leq s, s_1 \leq s_2$, then there exists a constant C such that

$$\|\Lambda^s f\|_{L^p} \leq C\|\Lambda^{s_1} f\|_{L^2}^{1-\theta} \|\Lambda^{s_2} f\|_{L^2}^\theta,$$

where $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$ and θ satisfy

$$s + d\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}\right) = s_1(1 - \theta) + \theta s_2.$$

Note that we require that $0 < \theta < 1$, $0 \leq s_1 \leq s$, when $p = \infty$.

We introduce a commutator lemma.

Lemma 2.6. [26] Let $s \geq 1$, $p, p_1, p_4 \in (1, \infty)$ and $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} = \frac{1}{p_3} + \frac{1}{p_4}$, then we have

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{cases} \|[\Lambda^s, f]g\|_{L^p} \leq C(\|\Lambda^s f\|_{L^{p_1}}\|g\|_{L^{p_2}} + \|\nabla f\|_{L^{p_3}}\|\Lambda^{s-1}g\|_{L^{p_4}}), \\ \|[\Lambda^s, f]g\|_{L^p(\mathcal{L}^2)} \leq C(\|\Lambda^s f\|_{L^{p_1}}\|g\|_{L^{p_2}(\mathcal{L}^2)} + \|\nabla f\|_{L^{p_3}}\|\Lambda^{s-1}g\|_{L^{p_4}(\mathcal{L}^2)}). \end{cases}$$

The following lemma allows us to dealing with $\frac{1}{\psi_\infty} \nabla_q \cdot (\Omega q g \psi_\infty)$ in the proof of the global existence of the Hooke models.

Lemma 2.7. [14] Assume $g \in H^s(\mathcal{L}^2)$ with $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g \psi_\infty dq = 0$, then

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{cases} \|\nabla_q \mathcal{U}g\|_{H^s(\mathcal{L}^2)}, \|qg\|_{H^s(\mathcal{L}^2)} \lesssim \|\nabla_q g\|_{H^s(\mathcal{L}^2)}, \\ \|q \nabla_q \mathcal{U}g\|_{H^s(\mathcal{L}^2)}, \| |q|^2 g \|_{H^s(\mathcal{L}^2)} \lesssim \|\langle q \rangle \nabla_q g\|_{H^s(\mathcal{L}^2)}, \end{cases}$$

and

$$(2.6) \quad \begin{cases} \|q \nabla_q \mathcal{U} \nabla_\beta^\alpha g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)} \lesssim \|\langle q \rangle \nabla_q \nabla_\beta^\alpha g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)} + \|\nabla_\beta^\alpha g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}, \\ \| |q|^2 \nabla_\beta^\alpha g \|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)} \lesssim \|\langle q \rangle \nabla_q \nabla_\beta^\alpha g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)} + \|\nabla_\beta^\alpha g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}. \end{cases}$$

The following lemma is about Calderon-Zygmund operator.

Lemma 2.8. *[1, 7] (1) For any $a \in [1, \infty)$ and $b \in [1, \infty]$, there exists positive constant C such that*

$$(2.7) \quad \|\Delta_{-1} \nabla v\|_{L^\infty} \leq C \min\{\|\Omega\|_{L^a}, \|v\|_{L^b}\}.$$

(2) For all $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $1 \leq p, r \leq \infty$, there exists a constant C' such that

$$(2.8) \quad \|(Id - \Delta_{-1})Rf\|_{B_{p,r}^s} \leq C' \|f\|_{B_{p,r}^s}.$$

From Lemma 2.8, we immediately infer the following estimate:

Lemma 2.9. *[1, 7] There exists positive constant C such that*

$$(2.9) \quad \|u\|_{L^\infty} \leq C(\|u\|_{L^2} + \|\Omega\|_{L^\infty}).$$

We introduce a interpolation inequality.

Lemma 2.10. *Let $s > \frac{d}{2}$. Then there exist $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|u\|_{B_{\infty,1}^0} \leq C \|u\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^0} \ln(e + \|u\|_{H^s}) + C.$$

Proof. According to the Littlewood-Paley decomposition theory, we have

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|u\|_{B_{\infty,1}^0} = \sum_{-1 \leq j \leq N} \|\Delta_j u\|_{L^\infty} + \sum_{j \geq N} \|\Delta_j u\|_{L^\infty},$$

for integer $N > 0$ which will be chosen later on. There exist $C > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{-1 \leq j \leq N} \|\Delta_j u\|_{L^\infty} \leq NC \|u\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^0},$$

and

$$\sum_{j \geq N} \|\Delta_j u\|_{L^\infty} \leq C 2^{-N(s-\frac{d}{2})} \|u\|_{H^s}.$$

Consider $N = \lceil \frac{\ln(e + \|u\|_{H^s})}{s-\frac{d}{2}} \rceil + 1$, then we complete the proof of Lemma 2.10. \square

3 Global solutions to the co-rotation Oldroyd-B type model

In this section, we are concerned with global solutions to the co-rotation Oldroyd-B type model. We divide it to three steps to prove Theorem 1.1.

3.1. Energy estimate

From now on, we derive the energy estimate which is useful to prove global existence. We prove boundness and conservation law for (1.3) in the following Proposition.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $(u, \tau) \in C([0, T]; H^s) \times C([0, T]; H^s) \cap L^2([0, T]; H^{s+1})$ be a solution for (1.3). Then we obtain*

$$(3.1) \quad \|u\|_{L^2} \leq \|u_0\|_{L^2} + (4\mu a)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\tau_0\|_{L^2}, \quad e^{2at} \|\tau\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\mu \int_0^t e^{2as} \|\nabla \tau\|_{L^2}^2 ds = \|\tau_0\|_{L^2}^2,$$

Moreover, for any $t \in [0, T]$, if $\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} \leq 4c\kappa$ with $\kappa = \min\{a, \mu\}$ and sufficiently small constant c , then we obtain

$$(3.2) \quad e^{at}\|\tau\|_{H^1}^2 + \mu \int_0^t e^{as}\|\nabla \tau\|_{H^1}^2 ds \leq \|\tau_0\|_{H^1}^2,$$

and

$$(3.3) \quad \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} \leq \|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2} + (\mu a)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\tau_0\|_{H^1}.$$

Proof. Firstly, we consider the L^2 estimate of (u, τ) . Taking the L^2 inner product with τ to (1.3)₂, we obtain

$$(3.4) \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\tau\|_{L^2}^2 + a\|\tau\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu\|\nabla \tau\|_{L^2}^2 = 0,$$

which implies that

$$(3.5) \quad e^{2at}\|\tau\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\mu \int_0^t e^{2as}\|\nabla \tau\|_{L^2}^2 ds = \|\tau_0\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Taking the L^2 inner product with u to (1.3)₁, we obtain

$$(3.6) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \|u\|_{L^2} \leq \|\nabla \tau\|_{L^2}.$$

Integrating (3.6) over $[0, t]$ with s , we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{L^2} &\leq \|u_0\|_{L^2} + \int_0^t \|\nabla \tau\|_{L^2} ds \\ &\leq \|u_0\|_{L^2} + \left(\int_0^t e^{2as}\|\nabla \tau\|_{L^2}^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^t e^{-2as} ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \|u_0\|_{L^2} + (4\mu a)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\tau_0\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that (u, τ) are bound in L^2 . Taking the L^2 inner product with $\Delta \tau$ to (1.3)₂ and using Lemma 2.5, we have

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla \tau\|_{L^2}^2 + a\|\nabla \tau\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu\|\nabla^2 \tau\|_{L^2}^2 &= -\langle u \cdot \tau, \Delta \tau \rangle + \langle Q(\Omega, \tau), \Delta \tau \rangle \\ &\leq C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}\|\nabla \tau\|_{L^2}\|\Delta \tau\|_{L^2} + C\|\Omega\|_{L^2}(\|\tau\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla^2 \tau\|_{L^2})\|\Delta \tau\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Adding up (3.4) and (3.7), we infer that

$$(3.8) \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\tau\|_{H^1}^2 + a\|\tau\|_{H^1}^2 + \mu\|\nabla \tau\|_{H^1}^2 \leq C(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}\|\nabla \tau\|_{L^2} + \|\Omega\|_{L^2}\|\tau\|_{H^2})\|\Delta \tau\|_{L^2}.$$

Assume that $\|\nabla u\|_{L^2} \leq 4c \min\{a, \mu\}$ with sufficiently small constant c , then we obtain

$$(3.9) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \|\tau\|_{H^1}^2 + a\|\tau\|_{H^1}^2 + \mu\|\nabla \tau\|_{H^1}^2 \leq 0,$$

which implies that

$$(3.10) \quad e^{at}\|\tau\|_{H^1}^2 + \mu \int_0^t e^{as}\|\nabla \tau\|_{H^1}^2 ds \leq \|\tau_0\|_{H^1}^2.$$

We now consider the L^2 estimate of ∇u . Taking the L^2 inner product with Δu to (1.3)₂, we can deduce that $\langle u \cdot \nabla u, \Delta u \rangle = 0$ with $d = 2$ and $\operatorname{div} u = 0$. Then we have

$$(3.11) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} \leq \|\nabla^2 \tau\|_{L^2}.$$

Integrating (3.11) over $[0, t]$ with s and using (3.10), we deduce that

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^2} \leq \|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2} + \int_0^t \|\nabla^2 \tau\|_{L^2} ds \leq \|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2} + (\mu a)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\tau_0\|_{H^1}.$$

Combining (3.5) and (3.10), we complete the proof of Proposition 3.1. \square

Corollary 3.2. *Under the conditions in Proposition 3.1, we have the following estimates:*

$$(3.12) \quad \begin{cases} \int_0^t \|\tau\|_{H^1} ds \leq a^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\tau_0\|_{H^1}, \\ \int_0^t \|\tau\|_{H^2} ds \leq (a^{-\frac{1}{2}} + (\mu a)^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \|\tau_0\|_{H^1}, \\ \int_0^t \|\tau\|_{H^2}^2 ds \leq (a^{-1} + \mu^{-1}) \|\tau_0\|_{H^1}^2. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Using (3.9) and (3.10), we can deduce that

$$\int_0^t \|\tau\|_{H^1} ds \leq \left(\int_0^t e^{-as} ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\tau_0\|_{H^1} \leq a^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\tau_0\|_{H^1},$$

and

$$\int_0^t \|\tau\|_{H^2}^2 ds \leq \int_0^t \|\tau\|_{H^1}^2 ds + \int_0^t \|\nabla^2 \tau\|_{L^2}^2 ds \leq (a^{-1} + \mu^{-1}) \|\tau_0\|_{H^1}^2.$$

Similarly, we have

$$\int_0^t \|\tau\|_{H^2} ds \leq \int_0^t \|\tau\|_{L^2} ds + \left(\int_0^t e^{-as} ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^t e^{as} \|\nabla \tau\|_{H^1}^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq (a^{-\frac{1}{2}} + (\mu a)^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \|\tau_0\|_{H^1}.$$

\square

3.2. B-K-M Criterion

In Proposition 3.1, it's clear that u is merely bound in L^2 while τ decay exponentially in L^2 . Then we can state a blow-up criterion for (1.3) which depends on $\|\Omega\|_{L^\infty}$ and $\|\tau\|_{L^\infty}$ in the following Proposition.

Proposition 3.3. *Assume that $d = 2$, $s > 2$, $a > 0$ and $\mu > 0$. Let (u, τ) be a strong solution of (1.3) with the initial data $(u_0, \tau_0) \in H^s$. If T^* is the maximal existence time, then the solution blows up in finite time $T^* < \infty$ if and only if*

$$(3.13) \quad \int_0^{T^*} \|\tau\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|\Omega(t)\|_{L^\infty}^2 dt = \infty.$$

Proof. Applying Λ^s to (1.3)₁, taking the L^2 inner product with $\Lambda^s u$ and using Lemma 2.6, we have

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\Lambda^s u\|_{L^2}^2 &= -\langle \Lambda^s(u \cdot \nabla u), \Lambda^s u \rangle + \langle \operatorname{div} \Lambda^s \tau, \Lambda^s u \rangle \\ &\leq \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \|\Lambda^s u\|_{L^2}^2 + C_\mu \|\Lambda^s u\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\mu}{4} \|\nabla \Lambda^s \tau\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $C_\mu = \frac{C}{\mu}$. Applying Λ^s to (1.3)₂, taking the L^2 inner product with $\Lambda^s \tau$ and using Lemmas 2.5-2.6, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.15) \quad & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\Lambda^s \tau\|_{L^2}^2 + a \|\Lambda^s \tau\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu \|\nabla \Lambda^s \tau\|_{L^2}^2 = -\langle [\Lambda^s, u] \tau, \nabla \Lambda^s \tau \rangle + \langle \Lambda^s Q(\Omega, \tau), \Lambda^s \tau \rangle \\
 & \leq C_\mu \|\tau\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\Lambda^s u\|_{L^2}^2 + C_\mu \|u\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\Lambda^s \tau\|_{L^2}^2 + C_\mu \|\Lambda^{s-1} Q(\Omega, \tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\mu}{4} \|\nabla \Lambda^s \tau\|_{L^2}^2 \\
 & \leq C_\mu \|\tau\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\Lambda^s u\|_{L^2}^2 + C_\mu (\|u\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|\Omega\|_{L^\infty}^2) \|\tau\|_{H^s}^2 + \frac{\mu}{4} \|\nabla \Lambda^s \tau\|_{L^2}^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

We infer from (3.4), (3.6), (3.14) and (3.15) that

$$(3.16) \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|(u, \tau)\|_{H^s}^2 \leq (\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} + C_\mu \|\tau\|_{L^\infty}^2 + C_\mu) \|u\|_{H^s}^2 + C_\mu (\|u\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|\Omega\|_{L^\infty}^2) \|\tau\|_{H^s}^2,$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.17) \quad & \|(u, \tau)\|_{H^s}^2 \leq \|(u_0, \tau_0)\|_{H^s}^2 + \int_0^t (2\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} + C_\mu \|\tau\|_{L^\infty}^2 + C_\mu) \|u\|_{H^s}^2 ds \\
 & + \int_0^t C_\mu (\|u\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|\Omega\|_{L^\infty}^2) \|\tau\|_{H^s}^2 ds.
 \end{aligned}$$

By Gronwall's inequality, we deduce that

$$(3.18) \quad C + \|(u, \tau)\|_{H^s}^2 \leq (C + \|(u_0, \tau_0)\|_{H^s}^2) e^{\int_0^t \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} + C_\mu (\|\tau\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|u\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|\Omega\|_{L^\infty}^2 + 1) ds}.$$

According to Lemma 2.10, we have

$$(3.19) \quad \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{B_{\infty, \infty}^0} \ln(C + \|u\|_{H^s}^2) + C.$$

By (3.18) and (3.19), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.20) \quad & \ln(C + \|(u, \tau)\|_{H^s}^2) \leq \ln(C + \|(u_0, \tau_0)\|_{H^s}^2) + \int_0^t C_\mu (\|\tau\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|u\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|\Omega\|_{L^\infty}^2 + 1) ds \\
 & + Ct + C \int_0^t \|\nabla u\|_{B_{\infty, \infty}^0} \ln(C + \|(u, \tau)\|_{H^s}^2) ds.
 \end{aligned}$$

Applying Gronwall's inequality to (3.20), we infer that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.21) \quad & \ln(C + \|(u, \tau)\|_{H^s}^2) \leq (\ln(C + \|(u_0, \tau_0)\|_{H^s}^2) + Ct) e^{\int_0^t \|\nabla u\|_{B_{\infty, \infty}^0} ds} \\
 & + e^{\int_0^t \|\nabla u\|_{B_{\infty, \infty}^0} ds} \int_0^t C_\mu (\|\tau\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|u\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|\Omega\|_{L^\infty}^2 + 1) ds.
 \end{aligned}$$

Assume that $T^* < \infty$ and $\int_0^{T^*} \|\tau\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|\Omega(t)\|_{L^\infty}^2 dt < \infty$. By virtue of Lemmas 2.8 and 2.9, we obtain

$$\|\nabla u\|_{B_{\infty, \infty}^0} + \|u\|_{L^\infty} \leq C(\|u\|_{L^2} + \|\Omega(t)\|_{L^\infty}),$$

which implies that $(u, \tau) \in L^\infty([0, T^*]; H^s)$ and hence contradicts the assumption that T^* is the maximal existence time. \square

Remark 3.4. We can deduce that

$$\|[\Lambda^s, u] \tau\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C_\mu \|\tau\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\Lambda^s u\|_{L^2}^2 + C_\mu \|\nabla u\|_{L^4}^2 \|\Lambda^{s-1} \tau\|_{L^4}^2$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq C_\mu \|\tau\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\Lambda^s u\|_{L^2}^2 + C_\mu \|\Omega\|_{L^4}^2 \|\tau\|_{H^s}^2 \\ &\leq C_\mu \|\tau\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\Lambda^s u\|_{L^2}^2 + C_\mu (\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Omega\|_{L^\infty}^2) \|\tau\|_{H^s}^2. \end{aligned}$$

One can see that (3.21) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} (3.22) \quad \ln(C + \|(u, \tau)\|_{H^s}^2) &\leq (\ln(C + \|(u_0, \tau_0)\|_{H^s}^2) + Ct) e^{\int_0^t \|\nabla u\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^0} ds} \\ &\quad + e^{\int_0^t \|\nabla u\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^0} ds} \int_0^t C_\mu (\|\tau\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Omega\|_{L^\infty}^2 + 1) ds, \end{aligned}$$

which is of significance in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

3.3. Global Solutions

3.3.1 The Oldroyd-B type models

The proof of Theorem 1.1:

The proof of the local well-posedness of (1.3) is standard. We thus omit it and present the result here. For any $T < T^*$, we have

$$u \in C([0, T]; H^s), \quad \tau \in C([0, T]; H^s) \cap L^2([0, T]; H^{s+1}).$$

To get the global existence, the key point is to obtain the uniform estimate of $\|\Omega\|_{L^\infty}$. However, due to the linear term $\nabla \times \operatorname{div} \tau$, it is difficult to get the global estimate of $\|\Omega\|_{L^\infty}$ from the following equation

$$(3.23) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \Omega + u \cdot \nabla \Omega = \nabla \times \operatorname{div} \tau.$$

Motivated by [7], we can cancel $\nabla \times \operatorname{div} \tau$ with the dissipation term $\Delta \tau$. Define

$$\Gamma = \mu \Omega - R\tau, \quad R = \Delta^{-1} \operatorname{curl} \operatorname{div}.$$

Since $RDu = \Omega$, we obtain

$$(3.24) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \Gamma + u \cdot \nabla \Gamma = aR\tau + RQ(\Omega, \tau) + [R, u \cdot \nabla] \tau = \sum_{i=1}^3 F_i.$$

Different from [7], there is no damping phenomenon for Γ or Ω . It seems impossible to expect the global existence even in small initial data case. However, the disappearance of $D(u)$ leads to exponential dissipation for τ in H^1 , which is useful to estimate Γ in L^∞ . Assume that

$$(3.25) \quad \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq 4c\kappa, \quad \|\Gamma(t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq 4ca\mu,$$

for any $t \in [0, T]$. By Proposition 3.1 and the condition (1.4), we deduce that $\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} \leq 2c\kappa$ for any $t \in [0, T]$. Then we focus on $\|\Gamma\|_{L^\infty}$. According to (3.24), we obtain

$$(3.26) \quad \|\Gamma\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|\Gamma_0\|_{L^\infty} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \int_0^t \|F_i\|_{L^\infty} ds.$$

From Lemma 2.8, we have

$$(3.27) \quad \|F_1\|_{L^\infty} \leq a\|\Delta_{-1} R\tau\|_{L^\infty} + a\|(Id - \Delta_{-1}) R\tau\|_{L^\infty}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq Ca\|\tau\|_{L^2} + Ca\|\tau\|_{B_{\infty,1}^0} \\ &\leq Ca\|\tau\|_{H^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemmas 2.7, 2.8 and 2.10, we get

$$\begin{aligned} (3.28) \quad \|F_2\|_{L^\infty} &\leq \|\Delta_{-1}RQ(\Omega, \tau)\|_{L^\infty} + \|(Id - \Delta_{-1})RQ(\Omega, \tau)\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leq C\|Q(\Omega, \tau)\|_{L^2} + C\|Q(\Omega, \tau)\|_{B_{\infty,1}^0} \\ &\leq C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}\|\tau\|_{H^2} + C\|\Omega\|_{B_{\infty,1}^0}\|\tau\|_{H^2} \\ &\leq C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}\|\tau\|_{H^2} + C\|\Omega\|_{L^\infty} \ln(C + \|u\|_{H^s})\|\tau\|_{H^2} + C\|\tau\|_{H^2}. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 2.4, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (3.29) \quad \|F_3\|_{L^\infty} &\leq C(\|\Omega\|_{L^2} + \|\Omega\|_{L^\infty})\|\tau\|_{H^2} \\ &\leq C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}\|\tau\|_{H^2} + C_\mu\|\Gamma\|_{L^\infty}\|\tau\|_{H^2} + C_\mu\|R\tau\|_{L^\infty}\|\tau\|_{H^2} \\ &\leq C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}\|\tau\|_{H^2} + C_\mu\|\Gamma\|_{L^\infty}\|\tau\|_{H^2} + C_\mu\|\tau\|_{H^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging (3.27)-(3.29) into (3.26), we deduce from (1.4), (3.25) and Corollary 3.2 that

$$\begin{aligned} (3.30) \quad \|\Gamma\|_{L^\infty} &\leq \|\Gamma_0\|_{L^\infty} + C \int_0^t (1+a)\|\tau\|_{H^2} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}\|\tau\|_{H^2} + C_\mu\|\Gamma\|_{L^\infty}\|\tau\|_{H^2} + C_\mu\|\tau\|_{H^2}^2 \\ &\quad + C_\mu\|\tau\|_{H^2}^2 \ln(C + \|u\|_{H^s}) + C_\mu\|\Gamma\|_{L^\infty}\|\tau\|_{H^2} \ln(C + \|u\|_{H^s}) ds \\ &\leq \|\Gamma_0\|_{L^\infty} + C(1+a)(a^{-\frac{1}{2}} + (a\mu)^{-\frac{1}{2}})\|\tau_0\|_{H^1} + C_\mu \int_0^t \|\tau\|_{H^2}^2 \ln(C + \|u\|_{H^s}) ds \\ &\quad + C_\mu \int_0^t \|\Gamma\|_{L^\infty}\|\tau\|_{H^2} \ln(C + \|u\|_{H^s}) ds. \end{aligned}$$

By (1.5), we get

$$(3.31) \quad \|\Gamma\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{3}{2}ca\mu + C_\mu \int_0^t \|\tau\|_{H^2}^2 \ln(C + \|u\|_{H^s}) ds + C_\mu \int_0^t \|\Gamma\|_{L^\infty}\|\tau\|_{H^2} \ln(C + \|u\|_{H^s}) ds,$$

where we using the condition $\|\tau_0\|_{H^1} \leq c^2\lambda$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= \min\{a^{\frac{1}{2}}\mu, a^{\frac{1}{2}}, a^{\frac{3}{2}}\mu, (a\mu)^{\frac{3}{2}}, (a\mu)^{\frac{1}{2}}, a, \mu, a\mu, \mu^{\frac{3}{2}}a, a\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}, a\mu^{\frac{5}{2}}, \mu^{\frac{3}{2}}\} \\ &= \min\{a^{\frac{1}{2}}, a^{\frac{3}{2}}\mu, (a\mu)^{\frac{3}{2}}, a, \mu, a\mu^{\frac{5}{2}}, \mu^{\frac{3}{2}}\}. \end{aligned}$$

According to Lemma 2.8, we obtain

$$(3.32) \quad \|\nabla u\|_{L^4} \leq \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} + \|\Omega\|_{L^\infty},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (3.33) \quad \int_0^t \|\nabla u\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^0} ds &\leq C \int_0^t \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} + \|\Omega\|_{L^\infty} ds \\ &\leq \frac{a}{8}t + C_\mu \int_0^t \|\tau\|_{H^2} ds \\ &\leq \frac{a}{8}t + C_\mu(a^{-\frac{1}{2}} + (a\mu)^{-\frac{1}{2}})\|\tau_0\|_{H^1} \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \frac{a}{8}t + C.$$

By (3.22), (3.32) and (3.33), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} (3.34) \quad \ln(C + \|(u, \tau)\|_{H^s}^2) &\leq Ce^{\frac{a}{8}t} [\ln(C + \|(u_0, \tau_0)\|_{H^s}^2) + t(1 + c^2k + c^2a^2 + \mu^{-1}) + c^2a + c^4(a + \mu)] \\ &\leq Ce^{\frac{a}{4}t} [\ln(C + \|(u_0, \tau_0)\|_{H^s}^2) + (a\mu)^{-1} + a^{-1} + a + \mu] \\ &= A_0 e^{\frac{a}{4}t}, \end{aligned}$$

where $A_0 = C[\ln(C + \|(u_0, \tau_0)\|_{H^s}^2) + (a\mu)^{-1} + a^{-1} + a + \mu]$. Plugging (3.34) into (3.31), using (1.5) and applying Proposition 3.1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (3.35) \quad \|\Gamma\|_{L^\infty} &\leq \frac{3}{2}ca\mu + C_\mu \int_0^t \|\tau\|_{H^2}^2 A_0 e^{\frac{a}{4}s} ds + C_\mu \int_0^t \|\Gamma\|_{L^\infty} \|\tau\|_{H^2} A_0 e^{\frac{a}{4}s} ds \\ &\leq \frac{3}{2}ca\mu + C_\mu (\mu^{-1} + a^{-1}) \|\tau_0\|_{H^1}^2 A_0 + (\mu^{-1} + a^{-1}) \|\tau_0\|_{H^1}^2 A_0 \\ &\leq 2ca\mu + (C_\mu + 1)(\mu^{-1} + a^{-1}) \|\tau_0\|_{H^1}^2 \ln(C + \|(u_0, \tau_0)\|_{H^s}^2) \\ &\leq 3ca\mu, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\|\Gamma\|_{L^\infty([0, T^*]; L^\infty)} \leq 3ca\mu.$$

According to Propositions 3.1 and 3.3, we can deduce that $T^* = +\infty$. We thus complete the proof of Theorem 1.1. \square

3.3.2 The Hooke models

Taking $\psi = (g + 1)\psi_\infty$ and $\nu = 0$, $a = 2$, $\mu = 1$ in (1.2), we obtain

$$(3.36) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t u + u \cdot \nabla u + \nabla P = \operatorname{div} \tau, & \operatorname{div} u = 0, \\ \partial_t g + u \cdot \nabla g + \frac{1}{\psi_\infty} \nabla_q \cdot (\Omega q g \psi_\infty) - \Delta g = \frac{1}{\psi_\infty} \nabla_q \cdot (\nabla_q g \psi_\infty). \end{cases}$$

Let $\langle q \rangle = \sqrt{1 + q^2}$. We can get the following Global well-posedness for the Hooke model.

Corollary 3.5. *Let (u, g) be a strong solution of (3.36) with the initial data $(u_0, g_0) \in H^s \times H^s(\mathcal{L}^2)$ and $(\langle q \rangle g_0, \langle q \rangle \nabla_q g_0, \langle q \rangle \nabla_q^2 g_0) \in L^\infty(\mathcal{L}^2)$. Let $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} g_0 \psi_\infty dq = 0$. There exists some positive constant ε sufficiently small such that if*

$$(3.37) \quad \|\Gamma_0\|_{L^\infty}, \|(u_0, \tau_0)\|_{H^1}, \|g_0\|_{B_{\infty,1}^0(\mathcal{L}^2)} < \varepsilon,$$

then the Hooke model (3.36) admits a unique global strong solution $(u, g) \in C([0, \infty); H^s \times H^s(\mathcal{L}^2))$.

Proof. Firstly, we have $\|g\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{L}^2)} \leq \|g_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{L}^2)}$ by noticing that the term $\frac{1}{\psi_\infty} \nabla_q \cdot (\Omega q g \psi_\infty)$ would vanish since the antisymmetry of Ω . Moreover, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} g \psi_\infty dq = 0$. More details can refer to [25].

Then, we claim that there exists positive constant C such that

$$(3.38) \quad \|\langle q \rangle g\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{L}^2)}, \|\langle q \rangle \nabla_q g\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{L}^2)}, \|\langle q \rangle^2 \nabla_q g\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{L}^2)}, \|\langle q \rangle \nabla_q^2 g\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{L}^2)} \leq Ce^{Ct}.$$

For $\|\langle q \rangle g\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{L}^2)}$, taking \mathcal{L}^2 inner product with $\langle q \rangle^2 g$ to (3.36), we infer that

$$(3.39) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\langle q \rangle g\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} u \cdot \nabla \|\langle q \rangle g\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \Delta \|\langle q \rangle g\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\langle q \rangle \nabla g\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 + \|\langle q \rangle \nabla_q g\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \\ &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{1}{\psi_\infty} \nabla_q \cdot (\Omega q g \psi_\infty) \langle q \rangle^2 g \psi_\infty dq + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} g^2 \psi_\infty dq - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} q^2 g^2 \psi_\infty dq. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$(3.40) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{1}{\psi_\infty} \nabla_q \cdot (\Omega q g \psi_\infty) \langle q \rangle^2 g \psi_\infty dq &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \Omega q g \psi_\infty \cdot (2qg + \langle q \rangle^2 \nabla_q g) dq \\ &= - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \Omega q \psi_\infty \langle q \rangle^2 \nabla_q g^2 dq \\ &= - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \Omega^{ik} (\delta_k^i \langle q \rangle^2 + q_i q_k) g^2 \psi_\infty dq \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

we deduce that for any $p \geq 4$,

$$(3.41) \quad \frac{1}{p} \frac{d}{dt} \|\langle q \rangle g\|_{L^p(\mathcal{L}^2)}^p \leq C \|\langle q \rangle g\|_{L^p(\mathcal{L}^2)}^p,$$

which implies $\|\langle q \rangle g\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{L}^2)} \leq C e^{Ct}$. Similarly, for $\|\langle q \rangle^n \nabla_q g\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{L}^2)}$, $n = 1, 2$, we have

$$(3.42) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla_q \left(\frac{1}{\psi_\infty} \nabla_q \cdot (\Omega q g \psi_\infty) \right) \langle q \rangle^n \nabla_q g \psi_\infty dq \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla_q^l (\Omega^{ik} q_k \nabla_q^l g - \Omega^{ik} q_k q_i g) \langle q \rangle^n \nabla_q^l g \psi_\infty dq \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (\Omega^{ik} \delta_k^l \nabla_q^i g + \Omega^{ik} q_k \nabla_q^{il} g - \Omega^{ik} (\delta_k^l q_i + \delta_i^l q_k) g - \Omega^{ik} q_k q_i \nabla_q^l g) \langle q \rangle^n \nabla_q^l g \psi_\infty dq \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

For $\|\langle q \rangle \nabla_q^2 g\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{L}^2)}$, we also have

$$(3.43) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla_q^2 \left(\frac{1}{\psi_\infty} \nabla_q \cdot (\Omega q g \psi_\infty) \right) \langle q \rangle^2 \nabla_q^2 g \psi_\infty dq \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla_q^{lm} (\Omega^{ik} q_k \nabla_q^i g - \Omega^{ik} q_k q_i g) \langle q \rangle^2 \nabla_q^{lm} g \psi_\infty dq \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla_q^m (\Omega^{il} \nabla_q^i g + \Omega^{ik} q_k \nabla_q^{il} g - (\Omega^{il} q_i + \Omega^{lk} q_k) g - \Omega^{ik} q_k q_i \nabla_q^l g) \langle q \rangle^2 \nabla_q^{lm} g \psi_\infty dq \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (\Omega^{il} \nabla_q^{im} g + \Omega^{im} \nabla_q^{il} g - \Omega^{ik} q_k \nabla_q^{ilm} g - \Omega^{ik} q_k q_i \nabla_q^{lm} g - (\Omega^{ml} + \Omega^{lm}) g \\ &\quad - (\Omega^{il} q_i + \Omega^{lk} q_k) \nabla_q^m g - (\Omega^{im} q_i + \Omega^{mk} q_k) \nabla_q^l g) \langle q \rangle^2 \nabla_q^{lm} g \psi_\infty dq \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

We thus complete the proof of the claim (3.38).

By virtue of Theorem 1.1, we obtain the global existence of u . To obtain the global existence of g , the following lemma is of great significance.

Lemma 3.6. *Let (u, τ) be a strong solution of (1.3) considered in Theorem 1.1. Then for any $\sigma > 0$, there exist positive constant ε sufficiently small, such that $\|\Omega\|_{L^\infty} < \sigma$ whenever $\|\Gamma_0\|_{L^\infty}$, $\|(u_0, \tau_0)\|_{H^1}$, $\|g_0\|_{B_{\infty,1}^0(\mathcal{L}^2)} < \varepsilon$.*

Proof. By virtue of Lemma 2.8, we deduce that

$$(3.44) \quad \|\Omega\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|\Gamma\|_{L^\infty} + \|R\tau\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|\Gamma\|_{L^\infty} + \|\tau\|_{L^2} + \|(Id - \Delta_{-1})\tau\|_{B_{\infty,1}^0}.$$

It's follows from the proof of Theorem 1.1 and Proposition 3.1 that

$$\|\Gamma\|_{L^\infty} + \|\tau\|_{L^2} \leq C\varepsilon < \frac{\sigma}{2},$$

provided $\varepsilon < \frac{\sigma}{2C}$. We need to prove $\|(Id - \Delta_{-1})\tau\|_{B_{\infty,1}^0} < \frac{\sigma}{2}$. Applying Δ_j to (1.3)₂ with $j \geq 0$ yields

$$(3.45) \quad \partial_t \Delta_j \tau + 2\Delta_j \tau + \Delta_j Q(\Omega, \tau) = \Delta \Delta_j \tau - \Delta_j(u \cdot \nabla \tau).$$

Therefore

$$(3.46) \quad \Delta_j \tau = e^{-2t\Delta} \Delta_j \tau_0 - \int_0^t e^{-2(t-s)\Delta} e^{(t-s)\Delta} (\Delta_j Q(\Omega, \tau) + \Delta_j(u \cdot \nabla \tau)) ds.$$

We infer from Lemma 2.3 that

$$(3.47) \quad \begin{aligned} \left\| \int_0^t e^{-2(t-s)\Delta} e^{(t-s)\Delta} \Delta_j Q(\Omega, \tau) ds \right\|_{L^\infty} &\leq \int_0^t e^{-2^{2j}(t-s)} \|\Delta_j Q(\Omega, \tau)\|_{L^\infty} ds \\ &\leq \int_0^t e^{-2^{2j}(t-s)} 2^j \|\Delta_j Q(\Omega, \tau)\|_{L^2} ds \\ &\leq \int_0^t e^{-2^{2j}(t-s)} 2^{\frac{3}{2}j} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} \|\tau\|_{L^\infty} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, by virtue of $\operatorname{div} u = 0$, we have

$$(3.48) \quad \begin{aligned} &\left\| \int_0^t e^{-a(t-s)} e^{(t-s)\Delta} \Delta_j(u \cdot \nabla \tau) ds \right\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leq \int_0^t e^{-2^{2j}(t-s)} 2^j \|\Delta_j(u \otimes \tau)\|_{L^\infty} ds \\ &\leq \int_0^t e^{-2^{2j}(t-s)} 2^{\frac{3}{2}j} \|u \otimes \tau\|_{L^4} ds \\ &\leq \int_0^t e^{-2^{2j}(t-s)} 2^{\frac{3}{2}j} \|u\|_{H^1} \|\tau\|_{L^\infty} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$(3.49) \quad \|\tau\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\|g\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{L}^2)} \leq C\|g_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{L}^2)},$$

and

$$(3.50) \quad \sup_{t \geq 0} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} \int_0^t e^{-2^{2j}(t-s)} 2^{\frac{3}{2}j} ds \leq C,$$

we deduce that

$$(3.51) \quad \|(Id - \Delta_{-1})\tau\|_{B_{\infty,1}^0} \leq \|\tau_0\|_{B_{\infty,1}^0} + C\|u\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^1)} \|g_0\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^\infty(\mathcal{L}^2))} \leq C(\varepsilon + \varepsilon^2) < \frac{\sigma}{2}.$$

We thus complete the proof of Lemma 3.6. \square

Taking $L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)$ inner product with g to (3.36), we deduce that

$$(3.52) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \|g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 + \|\nabla g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 + \|\nabla_q g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 = 0,$$

Applying Λ^s to (3.36) and taking $L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)$ inner product with $\Lambda^s g$, we obtain

$$(3.53) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \|\Lambda^s g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 + \|\Lambda^{s+1} g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 + \|\nabla_q \Lambda^s g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 \\ & \leq C_\varepsilon \|u\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\Lambda^s g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 + C_\varepsilon \|u\|_{H^s}^2 \|g\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 + \varepsilon \|\Lambda^{s+1} g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 \\ & \quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2} \Lambda^s \left(\frac{1}{\psi_\infty} \nabla_q \cdot (\Omega q g \psi_\infty) \right) \Lambda^s g \psi_\infty dq dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$(3.54) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2} \Lambda^s \left(\frac{1}{\psi_\infty} \nabla_q \cdot (\Omega q g \psi_\infty) \right) \Lambda^s g \psi_\infty dq dx \\ & \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \|\Lambda^{s-1} (\Omega^{ik} q_i \nabla_q^k g + \Omega^{ik} q_i q_k g)\|_{L^2} \|\Lambda^{s+1} g\|_{L^2} \psi_\infty dq \\ & \leq C_\varepsilon \|\Lambda^{s-1} (\Omega^{ik} q_i \nabla_q^k g + \Omega^{ik} q_i q_k g)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)} + \varepsilon \|\Lambda^{s+1} g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 \\ & \leq C_\varepsilon \|\Omega\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\langle q \rangle \nabla_q \Lambda^{s-1} g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 + C_\varepsilon \|u\|_{H^s}^2 \|\langle q \rangle \nabla_q g\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 + \varepsilon \|\Lambda^{s+1} g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality we obtain from Lemma 2.6. Therefore

$$(3.55) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \|\Lambda^s g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 + \|\Lambda^{s+1} g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 + \|\nabla_q \Lambda^s g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 \\ & \leq C (\|u\|_{L^\infty} \|\Lambda^s g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 + \|\Omega\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\langle q \rangle \nabla_q \Lambda^{s-1} g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 \\ & \quad + \|u\|_{H^s}^2 (\|g\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 + \|\langle q \rangle \nabla_q g\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2)). \end{aligned}$$

The appearance of the term $\|\langle q \rangle \nabla_q g\|_{H^{s-1}(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2$ forces us to consider mixed derivative estimates just as what have been shown in [25] and [14]. Applying Λ^m to (3.36) and taking $L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)$ inner product with $\langle q \rangle^2 \Lambda^m g$, $m = 0, s$, we deduce that

$$(3.56) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \|\langle q \rangle g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 + \|\langle q \rangle \nabla g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 + \|\langle q \rangle \nabla_q g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 \leq C \|g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2,$$

and

$$(3.57) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \|\langle q \rangle \Lambda^s g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 + \|\langle q \rangle \Lambda^{s+1} g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 + \|\langle q \rangle \nabla_q \Lambda^s g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 \\ & \leq C \|\Lambda^s g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 + C \|u\|_{L^\infty} \|\langle q \rangle \Lambda^s g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 + C \|\Omega\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\langle q \rangle \nabla_q^2 \Lambda^{s-1} g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 \\ & \quad + C \|u\|_{H^s}^2 (\|g\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 + \|\langle q \rangle^2 \nabla_q g\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2). \end{aligned}$$

Applying $\nabla_q \Lambda^m$ to (3.36) and taking $L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)$ inner product with $\langle q \rangle^2 \nabla_q \Lambda^m g$, $m = 0, s-1$, we deduce that

$$(3.58) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \|\langle q \rangle \nabla_q g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 + \|\langle q \rangle \nabla_q \nabla g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 + \|\langle q \rangle \nabla_q^2 g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 \leq C \|\langle q \rangle \nabla_q g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2,$$

and

$$(3.59) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \|\langle q \rangle \nabla_q \Lambda^{s-1} g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 + \|\langle q \rangle \nabla_q \Lambda^s g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 + \|\langle q \rangle \nabla_q^2 \Lambda^{s-1} g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\leq C\|\langle q \rangle \nabla_q \Lambda^{s-1} g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 + C\|u\|_{L^\infty} \|\langle q \rangle \nabla_q \Lambda^{s-1} g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 \\
 &+ C\|\Omega\|_{L^\infty}^2 (\|\nabla_q \Lambda^{s-1} g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 + \|\langle q \rangle \nabla_q^2 \Lambda^{s-1} g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2) \\
 &+ C\|u\|_{H^s}^2 (\|g\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 + \|\nabla_q g\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 + \|\langle q \rangle \nabla_q^2 g\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2).
 \end{aligned}$$

Together with Lemma 2.9 and the following estimate

$$(3.60) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \|u\|_{H^s}^2 \leq C(\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} + 1) \|u\|_{H^s}^2 + C\|g\|_{H^{s+1}(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2,$$

we infer from the Gronwall's inequality

$$(3.61) \quad \|\langle q \rangle g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 + \|\langle q \rangle \nabla_q g\|_{H^{s-1}(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 \leq C(\|u_0\|_{H^s}^2 + \|\langle q \rangle g_0\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2 + \|\langle q \rangle \nabla_q g_0\|_{H^{s-1}(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2) e^{C e^{Ct}}.$$

We thus complete the proof of Corollary 3.5. \square

Remark 3.7. *It is worth mentioning that the estimate of $\|\langle q \rangle \nabla_q g\|_{H^{s-1}(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2$ instead of $\|\langle q \rangle \nabla_q g\|_{H^s(\mathcal{L}^2)}^2$ enable us to stop the growth of power $\langle q \rangle$ caused by the term $\frac{1}{\psi_\infty} \nabla_q \cdot (\Omega q g \psi_\infty)$.*

Remark 3.8. *The estimate of $\langle q \rangle^n \nabla_q^m g$ in $L^\infty(\mathcal{L}^2)$ and the smallness of $\|\Omega\|_{L^\infty}$ is extremely significant in the proof of Corollary 3.5. The global existence of (3.36) for arbitrary initial data and the global existence of the non-corotation Hooke model are interesting problems. We are going to studying about these problems in the future.*

4 Large time behavior for the general Oldroyd-B type model

In this section we consider large time behavior of global solutions for (1.1) in H^1 . For simplify, the parameters in (1.1) will be taken as the constant 1.

For the readers convenience, we first recall the following Theorem.

Theorem 4.1. *[7] Let $d = 2$ and $s > 2$. Assume that $a > 0$ and $\mu > 0$. Let (u, τ) be a strong solution of (1.2) with the initial data $(u_0, \tau_0) \in H^s$. Then, there exists some sufficiently small constant δ such that if*

$$(4.1) \quad \|(u_0, \tau_0)\|_{H^1} + \|(\omega_0, \tau)\|_{B_{\infty,1}^0} \leq \delta, \quad \omega_0 = \text{curl } u_0,$$

then the system (1.3) admits a unique global strong solution $(u, \tau) \in C([0, \infty); H^s)$. Moreover, by virtue of the energy estimation for (u, τ, Γ) with $\Gamma = \Omega - R\tau$, then

$$(4.2) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \|(u, \tau)\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\tau\|_{H^2}^2 \leq 0.$$

Motivated by [12] and [21], we can cancel $\text{div } \tau$ in Fourier space and prove the following initial time decay rate of (u, τ) in H^1 by the Fourier splitting method and the bootstrap argument.

Proposition 4.2. *Under the condition in Theorem 1.4. Then there exists $C > 0$ such that for any $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t > 0$, we have*

$$(4.3) \quad \|(u, \tau)\|_{H^1} \leq C \ln^{-l}(e + t).$$

Proof. Let $S_0(t) = \{\xi : f(t)|\xi|^2 \leq 2C_2 f'(t)\}$ with C_2 large enough. According to Theorem 4.1, we have

$$(4.4) \quad \frac{d}{dt}[f(t)\|(u, \tau)\|_{H^1}^2] + C_2 f'(t)\|u\|_{L^2}^2 + f(t)\|\tau\|_{H^2}^2 \leq C f'(t) \int_{S_0(t)} |\hat{u}|^2 d\xi + 2f'(t)\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2,$$

for some $t > 0$ sufficiently large. Applying Fourier transformation to (1.1), we obtain

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt}\hat{u} + i\xi^T \mathcal{F}(u \otimes u) + i\xi \hat{p} = i\xi^T \hat{\tau}, \\ \frac{d}{dt}\hat{\tau} + \hat{\tau} + \mathcal{F}(u \cdot \nabla \tau) + |\xi|^2 \hat{\tau} + \mathcal{F}Q(\nabla u, \tau) = \frac{i}{2}(\xi \otimes \hat{u} + \hat{u} \otimes \xi). \end{cases}$$

Multiplying (4.5) by $(\bar{\hat{u}}, \bar{\hat{\tau}})$ and taking the real part, we deduce that

$$(4.6) \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} |\hat{u}|^2 = \mathcal{R}e[-i\xi^T \mathcal{F}(u \otimes u) \bar{\hat{u}} + i\xi^T \hat{\tau} \bar{\hat{u}}],$$

and

$$(4.7) \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} |\hat{\tau}|^2 + |\hat{\tau}|^2 + |\xi|^2 |\hat{\tau}|^2 = \mathcal{R}e[\mathcal{F}(u \cdot \nabla \tau) : \bar{\hat{\tau}} - \mathcal{F}Q(\nabla u, \tau) : \bar{\hat{\tau}} + \frac{i}{2}(\xi \otimes \hat{u} + \hat{u} \otimes \xi) : \bar{\hat{\tau}}].$$

Since τ is symmetric, we have

$$(4.8) \quad \mathcal{R}e[i\xi^T \hat{\tau} \bar{\hat{u}} + \frac{i}{2}(\xi \otimes \hat{u} + \hat{u} \otimes \xi) : \bar{\hat{\tau}}] = 0,$$

which implies that

$$(4.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (|\hat{u}|^2 + |\hat{\tau}|^2) + |\hat{\tau}|^2 + |\xi|^2 |\hat{\tau}|^2 &= \mathcal{R}e[-i\xi^T \mathcal{F}(u \otimes u) \bar{\hat{u}} - \mathcal{F}(u \cdot \nabla \tau) : \bar{\hat{\tau}} - \mathcal{F}Q(\nabla u, \tau) : \bar{\hat{\tau}}] \\ &\leq |\xi| |\mathcal{F}(u \otimes u)| |\hat{u}| + |\mathcal{F}(u \cdot \nabla \tau)|^2 + |\mathcal{F}Q(\nabla u, \tau)|^2 + |\hat{\tau}|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Let $f(t) = \ln^3(e + t)$. According to Theorem 4.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{S_0(t)} |\hat{u}|^2 + |\hat{\tau}|^2 d\xi &\leq \|(u_0, \tau_0)\|_{L^1}^2 \frac{f'(t)}{f(t)} + \int_0^t \int_{S_0(s)} |\xi| |\mathcal{F}(u \otimes u)| |\hat{u}| d\xi ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_{S_0(s)} |\mathcal{F}(u \cdot \nabla \tau)|^2 + |\mathcal{F}Q(\nabla u, \tau)|^2 d\xi ds \\ &\leq C \frac{f'(t)}{f(t)} + \int_0^t \|u\|_{L^2}^3 \left(\int_{S_0(s)} |\xi|^2 d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} ds + \frac{f'(t)}{f(t)} \int_0^t \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 \|\tau\|_{L^2}^2 + \|u\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla \tau\|_{L^2}^2 ds \\ &\leq C \frac{f'(t)}{f(t)} + C \frac{f'(t)}{f(t)} \int_0^t \|u\|_{L^2}^3 ds \\ &\leq C \frac{f'(t)}{f(t)} + C \frac{f'(t)}{f(t)} (1 + t) \\ &\leq C \ln^{-1}(e + t). \end{aligned}$$

This together with (4.4) and (4.2) ensure that

$$\begin{aligned} f(t)\|(u, \tau)\|_{H^1}^2 &\leq C + C \int_0^t f'(s) \ln^{-1}(e + s) ds + C \int_0^t f'(s) \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 ds \\ &\leq C \ln^2(e + t), \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$(4.10) \quad \|(u, \tau)\|_{H^1}^2 \leq \ln^{-1}(e+t).$$

We prove (4.3) by induction. Assume that

$$(4.11) \quad \|(u, \tau)\|_{H^1}^2 \leq \ln^{-l}(e+t).$$

Let $f(t) = \ln^{l+3}(e+t)$. Using (4.11), we can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{S_0(t)} |\hat{u}|^2 + |\hat{\tau}|^2 d\xi &\leq C \frac{f'(t)}{f(t)} + \frac{f'(t)}{f(t)} \int_0^t \|u\|_{L^2}^3 ds \\ &\leq C \ln^{-\frac{3l}{2}-1}(e+t). \end{aligned}$$

This together with (4.4) and (4.2) ensure that

$$\begin{aligned} f(t) \|(u, \tau)\|_{H^1}^2 &\leq C + C \int_0^t f'(s) \ln^{-\frac{3l}{2}-1}(e+s) ds + C \int_0^t f'(s) \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 ds \\ &\leq C \ln^2(e+t), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\|(u, \tau)\|_{H^1}^2 \leq \ln^{-l-1}(e+t).$$

We thus complete the proof of Proposition 4.2. \square

The proof of Theorem 1.4:

Now we are going to improve initial time decay rate in Proposition 4.2. Let $S(t) = \{\xi \mid |\xi|^2 \leq C_2(1+t)^{-1}\}$ with sufficiently large $C_2 > 0$ and $t > 0$. According to Theorem 4.1, we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} (\|(u, \tau)\|_{H^1}^2) + C_2(1+t)^{-1} \|u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\tau\|_{H^2}^2 \leq C(1+t)^{-1} \int_{S(t)} |\hat{u}|^2 d\xi,$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} (4.12) \quad &\frac{d}{dt} [(1+t)^2 \|(u, \tau)\|_{H^1}^2] + \frac{1}{2} C_2 (1+t) \|u\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} (1+t)^2 \|\tau\|_{H^2}^2 \\ &\leq C(1+t) \int_{S(t)} |\hat{u}|^2 d\xi + C(1+t) \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating (4.9) over $S(t) \times [0, t]$ with (ξ, s) and according to Theorem 4.1, we can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} (4.13) \quad &\int_{S(t)} |\hat{u}|^2 + |\hat{\tau}|^2 d\xi \leq \frac{C}{1+t} + \int_0^t \int_{S(t)} |\xi| |\mathcal{F}(u \otimes u)| |\hat{u}| + |\mathcal{F}(u \cdot \nabla \tau)|^2 + |\mathcal{F}Q(\nabla u, \tau)|^2 d\xi ds \\ &\leq \frac{C}{1+t} + \frac{C}{1+t} \int_0^t \|u\|_{L^2}^3 ds. \end{aligned}$$

This together with (4.12) and (4.2) ensure that

$$(4.14) \quad (1+t)^2 \|(u, \tau)\|_{H^1}^2 \leq \|(u_0, \tau_0)\|_{H^1}^2 + C(1+t) + C \int_0^t \int_0^s \|u\|_{L^2}^3 ds' ds + C \int_0^t (1+s) \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 ds$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C(1+t) + C(1+t) \int_0^t \|u\|_{L^2}^3 ds + C \int_0^t \|(u, \tau)\|_{H^1}^2 ds \\
&\leq C(1+t) + C(1+t) \int_0^t \|u\|_{L^2}^3 ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $M(t) = \sup_{s \in [0, t]} (1+s) \|(u, \tau)\|_{H^1}^2$. Using (4.14) and (4.3) with $l = 2$, we obtain

$$(4.15) \quad M(t) \leq C + C \int_0^t M(s)(1+s)^{-1} \ln^{-2}(e+t) ds,$$

Applying Gronwall's inequality to (4.15), we get

$$M(t) \leq C e^{C \int_0^t (1+s)^{-1} \ln^{-2}(e+t) ds} \leq C,$$

which implies that

$$\|u\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\tau\|_{H^1}^2 \leq (1+t)^{-1}.$$

We thus complete the proof of Theorem 1.4. \square

Acknowledgments This work was partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No.11671407 and No.11701586), the Macao Science and Technology Development Fund (No. 098/2013/A3), and Guangdong Province of China Special Support Program (No. 8-2015), and the key project of the Natural Science Foundation of Guangdong province (No. 2016A030311004).

References

- [1] H. Bahouri, J.-Y. Chemin, and R. Danchin. *Fourier analysis and nonlinear partial differential equations*, volume 343 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften*. Springer, Heidelberg, 2011.
- [2] J. Barrett, C. Schwab, and E. Süli. Existence of global weak solutions for some polymeric flow models. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 15(6):939–983, 2005.
- [3] J. Barrett and E. Süli. Existence of global weak solutions to some regularized kinetic models for dilute polymers. *Multiscale Model. Simul.*, 6(2):506–546(electronic), 2007.
- [4] J. Barrett and E. Süli. Existence of global weak solutions to dumbbell models for dilute polymers with microscopic cut-off. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 18(6):935–971, 2008.
- [5] J. Barrett and E. Süli. Existence and equilibration of global weak solutions to kinetic models for dilute polymers ii: Hookean-type bead-spring chains. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 22(5), 2012, to appear.
- [6] J.-Y. Chemin and N. Masmoudi. About lifespan of regular solutions of equations related to viscoelastic fluids. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 33(1):84–112, 2001.
- [7] T. M. Elgindi and R. Frederic. Global regularity for some Oldroyd-B type models. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 68(11), 2015.

-
- [8] T. M. Elgindi and J. Liu. Global wellposedness to the generalized Oldroyd type models in R^3 . *Journal of Differential Equations*, 259(5):1958–1966, 2015.
 - [9] D. Fang and R. Zi. Incompressible limit of Oldroyd-B fluids in the whole space. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 256(7):2559–2602, 2014.
 - [10] E. Fernández-Cara, F. Guillén, and R. Ortega. Some theoretical results concerning non-Newtonian fluids of the Oldroyd kind. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4)*, 26(1):1–29, 1998.
 - [11] C. Guillopé and J.-C. Saut. Global existence and one-dimensional nonlinear stability of shearing motions of viscoelastic fluids of Oldroyd type. *RAIRO Modél. Math. Anal. Numér.*, 24(3):369–401, 1990.
 - [12] L. He and P. Zhang. L^2 Decay of Solutions to a Micro-Macro Model for Polymeric Fluids Near Equilibrium. *Siam Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 40(5):1905–1922, 2009.
 - [13] M. Hieber, H. Wen, and R. Zi. Optimal decay rates for solutions to the incompressible Oldroyd-B model in R^3 . *Nonlinearity*, 32:833–852, 2019.
 - [14] N. Jiang, Y. Liu, and T.-F. Zhang. Global classical solutions to a compressible model for micro-macro polymeric fluids near equilibrium. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 50(4):4149–4179, 2018.
 - [15] L. Joonhyun. On diffusive 2d fokker-planck-navier-stokes systems. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 235:1531–1588, 2020.
 - [16] Z. Lei, C. Liu, and Y. Zhou. Global solutions for incompressible viscoelastic fluids. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 188(3):371–398, 2008.
 - [17] Z. Lei and Y. Zhou. Global existence of classical solutions for the two-dimensional Oldroyd model via the incompressible limit. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 37(3):797–814, 2005.
 - [18] F. H. Lin, C. Liu, and P. Zhang. On a micro-macro model for polymeric fluids near equilibrium. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 60(6):838–866, 2007.
 - [19] F. H. Lin, C. Liu, and P. Zhang. On hydrodynamics of viscoelastic fluids. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 58(11):1437–1471, 2010.
 - [20] P. L. Lions and N. Masmoudi. Global solutions for some Oldroyd models of non-Newtonian flows. *Chinese Ann. Math. Ser. B*, 21(2):131–146, 2000.
 - [21] W. Luo and Z. Yin. The Liouville Theorem and the L^2 Decay for the FENE Dumbbell Model of Polymeric Flows. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 224(1):209–231, 2017.
 - [22] N. Masmoudi. Global existence of weak solutions to macroscopic models of polymeric flows. *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées*, 96(5):502–520, 2011.
 - [23] N. Masmoudi. Global existence of weak solutions to the FENE dumbbell model of polymeric flows. *Invent. Math.*, 191(2):427–500, 2013.
 - [24] N. Masmoudi. *Equations for Polymeric Materials*. Handbook of Mathematical Analysis in Mechanics of Viscous Fluids, 2016.

-
- [25] N. Masmoudi, P. Zhang, and Z. Zhang. Global well-posedness for 2d polymeric fluid models and growth estimate. *Physica D Nonlinear Phenomena*, 237(10-12):1663–1675, 2008.
 - [26] J. Moser. A rapidly convergent iteration method and non-linear partial differential equations. I. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (3)*, 20:265–315, 1966.
 - [27] L. Nirenberg. On elliptic partial differential equations. *Ann.scuola Norm.sup.pisa*, 1959.
 - [28] J. G. Oldroyd. Non-newtonian effects in steady motion of some idealized elastico-viscous liquids. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A*, 245(1241):278–297, 1958.
 - [29] M. Renardy. An existence theorem for model equations resulting from kinetic theories of polymer solutions. *Siam Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 22(2):313–327, 1989.
 - [30] M. Schonbek. Existence and decay of polymeric flows. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 41(2):564–587, 2009.
 - [31] M. E. Schonbek. L^2 decay for weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 88(3):209–222, 1985.
 - [32] D. Wei and Z. Zhang. Global well-posedness for the 2-d MHD equations with magnetic diffusion. *Communications in Mathematical Research*, v.36(04):5–17, 2020.
 - [33] E. Weinan, T. J. Li, and P. W. Zhang. Well-posedness for the dumbbell model of polymeric fluids. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 248(2):409–427, 2004.
 - [34] B. Yuan. On the initial-boundary value problem of the incompressible viscoelastic fluid system. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 61(5):539–558, 2010.
 - [35] L. Zhang, H. Zhang, and P. Zhang. Global existence of weak solutions to the regularized hookean dumbbell model. *Commun. Math. Sci.*, 6(1):85–124, 2008.
 - [36] T. Zhang and D. Fang. Global existence of strong solution for equations related to the incompressible viscoelastic fluids in the critical L^p framework. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 44(4):2266–2288, 2012.