

HOMOGENISATION OF THE STOKES EQUATIONS FOR EVOLVING MICROSTRUCTURE

DAVID WIEDEMANN AND MALTE A. PETER

ABSTRACT. We consider the homogenisation of the Stokes equations in a porous medium which is evolving in time. At the interface of the pore space and the solid part, we prescribe an inhomogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition, which enables to model a no-slip boundary condition at the evolving boundary. We pass rigorously to the homogenisation limit with the two-scale transformation method. In order to derive uniform a priori estimates, we show a Korn-type inequality for the two-scale transformation method and construct a family of ε -scaled operators $\operatorname{div}_\varepsilon^{-1}$, which are right-inverse to the corresponding divergences. The homogenisation result is a new version of Darcy's law. It features a time- and space-dependent permeability tensor, which accounts for the local pore structure, and a macroscopic compressibility condition, which induces a new source term for the pressure. In the case of a no-slip boundary condition at the interface, this source term relates to the change of the local pore volume.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. The Stokes problem on the microscopic scale	5
2.1. Transformation on the periodic reference domain	7
3. Existence and uniform a priori estimates	8
3.1. Korn-type inequality for the two-scale transformation method	10
3.2. Right-inverse divergence operator	12
3.3. Estimates of the data	13
4. Homogenisation in the periodic reference domain	15
4.1. Two-scale convergence of the transformed data	17
4.2. Homogenisation of the transformed Stokes equations	18
5. The limit problem in the evolving domain	24
5.1. Back-transformation of the limit problem	24
5.2. The Darcy law for evolving microstructure	30
References	32

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 76M50; Secondary 35B27, 76S05, 76D07.

Key words and phrases. Darcy's law; Stokes equations; homogenisation; evolving microstructure.

D.W. is partially supported by a doctoral scholarship of Studienstiftung des deutschen Volkes.

1. INTRODUCTION

Effective fluid flow in completely saturated porous media can be described by Darcy's law. Based on results of experiments, it was formulated by Henry Darcy in [Dar56]. This empirical law can be justified by means of homogenisation theory on the basis of general laws of fluid dynamics. Using the formal two-scale expansion, the Darcy's law has been derived from the Stokes equations quite early (see for example [Kel80],[Lio81],[San80]). Assuming a periodic porous medium with disconnected solid matrix, L. Tartar proved rigorously the convergence of the homogenisation for the following ε -scaled Problem in [Tar79]. He considered the Stokes equations in a periodic porous medium Ω with fluid phase Ω_ε (of period ε) with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions

$$(1) \quad -\varepsilon^2 \nu \Delta v_\varepsilon + \nabla p_\varepsilon = f \text{ in } \Omega_\varepsilon, \quad \operatorname{div}(v_\varepsilon) = 0 \text{ in } \Omega_\varepsilon, \quad v_\varepsilon = 0 \text{ in } \partial\Omega_\varepsilon,$$

where v_ε and p_ε denote the velocity and pressure of the fluid and f the density of the forces acting on the fluid. He proved that the extension of v_ε to Ω by 0 converges weakly to v in $L^2(\Omega)$ and P_ε , which is an extension of the pressure p_ε too the solid part of Ω , converges strongly in $L^2(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}$ to p , where v and p are the unique solutions of

$$(2) \quad v = \frac{1}{\nu} K(f - \nabla p) \text{ in } \Omega, \quad \operatorname{div}(v) = 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \quad v \cdot n = 0 \text{ in } \partial\Omega,$$

and K is a positive definite symmetric permeability tensor which is given by solutions of Stokes problems on a reference cell. The main task in the proof of the convergence is the derivation of an ε -independent bound for p_ε . At this point, Tartar had to assume that the solid part of a cell is strictly contained inside the cell. Extending the ideas of L. Tartar, G. Allaire could omit this assumption and proved the convergence for more general domains in [All89]. In [All91] G. Allaire gave some corrector results, which yield a strong convergence of the velocity in $L^2(\Omega)^N$.

The purpose of the present paper is to extend the problem (1) to a domain $\Omega_\varepsilon(t)$ whose microstructure is evolving in time and to prove the convergence of the homogenisation for this new setting. The case of an evolving microstructure is motivated by many different physical, chemical and biological applications such as, crystal precipitation and dissolution processes or biofilm growth models (e.g. see [Pet07b], [PB09], [Noo08], [REK15], [Ray+12], [SK17b], [SK17a]). Some of these publications consider models which include the Stokes equations on an evolving domain. Using the method of formal two-scale expansion there are some effective models derived, which include also a Darcy law (cf. [SK17b]).

In this present paper, we consider the rigorous homogenisation of the Stokes equations for ε -scaled domains $\Omega_\varepsilon(t)$ which are evolving in time. Thus, we consider the Stokes problem

$$\begin{aligned} (3) \quad & -\varepsilon^2 \nu \operatorname{div}(2e(v_\varepsilon)) + \nabla p_\varepsilon = f && \text{in } \Omega_\varepsilon(t), \\ (4) \quad & \operatorname{div}(v_\varepsilon) = 0 && \text{in } \Omega_\varepsilon(t), \\ (5) \quad & v_\varepsilon = v_{\Gamma_\varepsilon} && \text{in } \Gamma_\varepsilon(t), \\ (6) \quad & p_\varepsilon n - \varepsilon^2 \nu 2e(v_\varepsilon)n = p_b n && \text{in } \partial\Omega_\varepsilon(t) \setminus \Gamma_\varepsilon(t) \end{aligned}$$

for a force term f on a time-dependent spatial domain $\Omega_\varepsilon(t)$ with $t \in S$ for the time interval S . Thereby, $e(v_\varepsilon) := (\nabla v_\varepsilon + \nabla v_\varepsilon^\top)/2$ denotes the symmetric gradient of v_ε , which we use noting that in the standard derivation of the Stokes equation from the

momentum balance equation, the continuity equation and the axioms of Newtonian fluids originally imply a symmetric stress tensor. Indeed, the incompressibility condition allows to replace $2e(v_\varepsilon)$ by ∇v_ε in the strong formulation. However, for the weak formulation, this substitution requires Dirichlet boundary values on the whole boundary, which is not the case in our model. For the boundary condition, we distinguish between the interface of pore and solid space, which is denoted by $\Gamma_\varepsilon(t)$, and the remaining boundary. At $\Gamma_\varepsilon(t)$, we use a Dirichlet boundary condition for the fluid velocity with boundary values v_{Γ_ε} . This (inhomogeneous) Dirichlet boundary condition (6) is motivated by the no-slip boundary condition and allows a fluid velocity equal to the velocity of the boundary's deformation, which can be modelled by v_{Γ_ε} . By using a normal stress boundary condition with outer unit normal vector n and a normal boundary stress p_b at $\partial\Omega_\varepsilon(t) \setminus \Gamma_\varepsilon(t)$, we enable fluid in- and outflow at the boundary of the porous medium. Thus, even if the total pore volume is changing, there does not arise an incompatibility with the fluid incompressibility so that we can consider this case as well. In [Mir16], the homogenisation of Stokes flow with such a normal stress boundary condition at the outer boundary is considered for the case of a rigid domain and a homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition at the pore interface.

We prove that the extension of $v_\varepsilon(t)$ by 0 to Ω and the extension of the pressure $p_\varepsilon(t)$ by a cell-wise mean value converges weakly in $L^2(\Omega)$ for a.e. $t \in S$ to the unique solution $(v(t), p(t))$ of the following Darcy law:

$$(7) \quad v(t, x) = \frac{1}{\nu} K(t, x) (f(t, x) - \nabla p(t, x)) \quad \text{in } S \times \Omega,$$

$$(8) \quad \operatorname{div}(v(t, x)) = - \int_{\Gamma_x(t)} v_\Gamma(t, x, y) \cdot n dy \quad (= - \frac{d}{dt} \Theta(t, x)) \quad \text{in } S \times \Omega,$$

$$(9) \quad p = p_b \quad \text{in } S \times \partial\Omega,$$


where v_Γ is the two-scale limit of v_{Γ_ε} and $\Gamma_x(t)$ is the interface of the pore and solid part in the reference cell at the macroscopic position x at time t . If v_{Γ_ε} is the velocity of the boundary deformation the right-hand side of (8) can be simplified to $-\frac{d}{dt} \Theta(t, x)$, where Θ is the porosity of the medium.

Compared to the Darcy law (2), the permeability tensor K depends now on time and space taking into account the shape of a pore $Y_x^P(t)$ at the point $x \in \Omega$ at the time $t \in S$. Moreover, the microscopic incompressibility condition becomes a macroscopic compressibility condition (8). Combined with (7), this gives an additional source or sink term for the pressure p . In the case that v_{Γ_ε} is the velocity of the boundary deformation, this term captures the suction and suppression effects arising from the change of porosity.

For the homogenisation of (3)–(6), we use the *two-scale transformation method*. Thus, we transform the problem to a substitute problem onto a periodic reference domain Ω_ε where we pass to the limit ε to 0 using two-scale convergence. Then, we transform the resulting limit problem back (cf. (10)). This method was proposed for the homogenisation of a diffusion problem in [Pet07a]. Later it was applied in several works – in the same sense that the homogenisation of the substitute problem is proven – ([Pet07b], [PB09], [EM17], [GNP21]). In [Wie21] a rigorous two-scale convergence concept for this transformation method was developed and the method itself proven, i.e. that (10) commutes. Thus, the homogenisation result for the periodic substitute problem can be transferred rigorously to a homogenisation

result of the actual problem.

(10)



After the transformation onto the periodic reference domain, we derive uniform a priori estimates for the velocity field v_ε and the pressure field p_ε . However, the transformation of the equation induces coefficients in the symmetric gradient. Therefore, we derive a uniform Korn-type inequality for the two-scale transformation method, which allows to estimate the transformed symmetric gradient from below.

Since the extension of the inhomogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition inside the domain is not necessarily divergence-free, we cannot estimate the velocity directly without estimating pressure as is done in the existing works on the homogenisation of Stokes flow. Instead, we develop a family of ε -scaled operators $\text{div}_\varepsilon^{-1}$, which are right inverse to the corresponding divergences, using the restriction operator which was introduced in [Tar79] and developed further in [All89]. Using these, we can deduce an ε -independent estimate on the velocity and the pressure during the existence proof without having an a priori estimate on the velocity at hand. For the case of a rectangular macroscopic domain with periodic Dirichlet boundary conditions, such a family of operators was constructed by V. V. Zhikov by a different idea (cf. Ref. [Zhi94]).

Having obtained these uniform a priori estimates, we can pass to the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ in the reference configuration. There, we prove the strong convergence of the extension of the pressure. Then, we use two-scale compactness results in order to derive a microscopic incompressibility condition and a macroscopic compressibility condition. In the last step of the passage to the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we homogenise (3) for divergence-free functions and reconstruct a microscopic pressure. The intermediate result is a two-pressure Stokes system in the cylindrical two-scale domain.

Afterwards, we transform this two-pressure Stokes system back into the reference configuration. Since the system contains not only microscopic derivatives but also macroscopic derivatives, it does not yield a transformation-independent result directly. The same problem occurs also by the formal back-transformation after the homogenisation of diffusion and elasticity equations in a periodic reference domain (cf. [Pet07a], [EM17]). Using the results of [Wie21], the back-transformation can be done rigorously and a transformation-independent two-scale limit problem can be derived. We develop the ideas of [Wie21] further and show how the back-transformed two-pressure Stokes system can be written independent of the transformation. In the last step, we separate the microscopic from the macroscopic scale and derive thereby the *Darcy's law for evolving microstructure*. This Darcy's law is different from the standard Darcy's law by its time- and space-dependent permeability tensor, which corresponds to the time- and space-dependent microscopic porosity. Moreover, it contains a new source term for the pressure equation. This term captures the suction and compression effects arising from the change of the porosity.

The paper is organized as follows: in Section 2, we transform the Stokes problems onto the periodic domain Ω_ε by the two-scale transformation method. In Section 3, we derive a uniform Korn inequality for the two-scale transformation method and a family of ε -scaled operators $\operatorname{div}_\varepsilon^{-1}$, which are right inverse to the corresponding divergences. Using these results, we give uniform a priori estimates, which allow to pass to the homogenisation limit. In Section 4, we pass to the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ in the reference configuration and derive a two-pressure Stokes equation. In Section 5, we transform this two-scale limit problem back to the actual domain and derive (7)–(9), which we call Darcy’s law for evolving microstructure.

Notation 1.1. In the following, let $C \in \mathbb{R}$ be a generic constant independent of $t \in S$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Moreover, let $1 \leq p_s \leq \infty$ and $C(t)$ be a generic time-dependent function independent of ε , where $C \in L^{p_s}(S)$

For an open set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, we write $(f, g)_U$ for the scalar product of $f, g \in L^2(U)$ and define $\|f\|_U := (f, f)_U^{\frac{1}{2}}$. If $G \subset \partial U$ is Lipschitz regular, we define $H_G^1(U) := \{v \in H^1(U) \mid v|_G = 0\}$. Moreover, we define $H_{\Gamma^\#}^1(Y^p) := \{v \in H_\Gamma^1(Y^p) \mid v \text{ is } Y\text{-periodic}\}$ for an open Lipschitz set $Y^p \subset (0, 1)^N$ and $\Gamma = \partial Y^p \cap \partial(Y \setminus Y^p)$. In the following, we identify $H_{\Gamma^\#}^1(Y^p)$ with $\{v \in H_\#^1(Y) \mid v|_{Y \setminus Y^p} = 0\}$ if the function has to be defined on the whole of Y .

2. THE STOKES PROBLEM ON THE MICROSCOPIC SCALE

Let $S = (0, T)$ be the finite time interval. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a bounded and connected domain which can be represented as a finite union of axis-parallel cuboids with corner coordinates in \mathbb{Q}^N , representing the macroscopic domain of the porous medium. Thus, there exists a sequence $(\varepsilon_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\Omega = \operatorname{int} \left(\bigcup_{k \in I_{\varepsilon_n}} k + \varepsilon_n \overline{Y} \right)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where $I_\varepsilon := \{k \in \varepsilon \mathbb{Z}^N \mid \operatorname{int}(k + \varepsilon Y) \subset \Omega\}$ for $\varepsilon > 0$ and $Y := (0, 1)^{N \times N}$ is the microscopic reference cell. We consider in the following such a fixed sequence $(\varepsilon_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $0 < \varepsilon_n < 1$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and write shortly ε . Let $Y^p \subset Y$ be open and $Y^s := \operatorname{int}(Y \setminus Y^p)$ such that

- (1) Y^p and Y^s have positive measure,
- (2) Y^p is a connected set with Lipschitz boundary,
- (3) $\partial Y^p \cap \{x_i = 0\} + e_i = \partial Y^p \cap \{x_i = 1\}$ for every $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$,
- (4) $Y_\#^p := \operatorname{int} \left(\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^N} k + \overline{Y^p} \right)$ is connected and has a C^1 -boundary.

These sets denote the pore part and the solid part of the reference cell. We denote the interface of them by $\Gamma := \partial Y^p \cap \partial Y^s$.

We define Ω_ε , which represents the pore part in the reference configuration, by $\Omega_\varepsilon := \operatorname{int} \left(\bigcup_{k \in I_\varepsilon} k + \varepsilon \overline{Y^p} \right)$, the corresponding solid part by $\Omega_\varepsilon^s := \operatorname{int} \left(\Omega \setminus \Omega_\varepsilon \right)$ and the interface of these by $\Gamma_\varepsilon = \partial \Omega_\varepsilon \cap \partial \Omega_\varepsilon^s$. Note that Ω_ε is connected and Γ_ε as well as the remaining part of the boundary $\partial \Omega_\varepsilon \setminus \Gamma_\varepsilon$ are Lipschitz regular by their construction.

We assume that, for a.e. $t \in S$, the evolving domain $\Omega_\varepsilon(t)$ and the evolving surface Γ_ε can be described by locally periodic transformations $\psi_\varepsilon \in L^\infty(S; C^1(\overline{\Omega})^N)$. That means $\Omega_\varepsilon(t) = \psi_\varepsilon(t, \Omega_\varepsilon)$, $\Omega_\varepsilon^s(t) = \psi_\varepsilon(t, \Omega_\varepsilon^s)$, $\Gamma_\varepsilon(t) = \psi_\varepsilon(t, \Gamma_\varepsilon)$ for a.e. $t \in S$.

We denote the Jacobians of ψ_ε with respect to x by $\Psi_\varepsilon(t, x) = D\psi_\varepsilon(t, x)$ and $J_\varepsilon(t, x) := \det(\Psi_\varepsilon(t, x))$.

Assumption 2.1. We assume that

- (1) $\psi_\varepsilon(t, \cdot_x)$ is a C^2 -diffeomorphism from $\overline{\Omega}$ onto $\overline{\Omega}$ for a.e. $t \in S$ with inverse $\psi_\varepsilon^{-1}(t, \cdot_x)$ for $\psi_\varepsilon, \psi_\varepsilon^{-1} \in L^\infty(S; C^2(\overline{\Omega}))$
- (2) there exists $c_J > 0$ such that $J_\varepsilon(t) \geq c_J$ for a.e. $t \in S$,
- (3) there exists $C > 0$ such that $\varepsilon^{i-1} \|\check{\psi}_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(S; C^i(\overline{\Omega}))} \leq C$ for $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$,
where $\check{\psi}_\varepsilon(x) := \psi_\varepsilon(x) - x$ are the corresponding displacement mappings,
- (4) there exists $\psi_0 \in L^\infty(S \times \Omega; C^2(\overline{Y}))^N$ such that
 - (a) $\psi_0(t, x, \cdot_y) : \overline{Y} \rightarrow \overline{Y}$ are C^2 -diffeomorphisms for a.e. $(t, x) \in S \times \Omega$ with inverses $\psi_0^{-1}(t, x, \cdot_y)$ for $\psi_0, \psi_0^{-1} \in L^\infty(S \times \Omega; C^2(\overline{Y}))$,
 - (b) the corresponding displacement mapping $\check{\psi}_\varepsilon(t, x, y) := \psi_\varepsilon(t, x, y) - y$, can be extended Y -periodically such that $\check{\psi} \in L^\infty(\Omega; C_\#^2(\overline{Y}))$,
 - (c) $\varepsilon^{|\alpha|-1} D_{x_\alpha} \check{\psi}_\varepsilon(t)$ two-scale converges strongly with respect to every L^p -norm for $p \in (1, \infty)$ to $D_{y_\alpha} \check{\psi}_0(t)$ for every multiindex $\alpha \in \{0, 1, 2\}^N$ with $|\alpha| \leq 2$.

An evolution of the domains which satisfy Assumption 2.1 can be obtained for example from the following model:

Example 2.2. Let $\Theta : [0, T] \times \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow (0, 1)$ be a smooth function with $D\Theta$ small enough (which describes for example the local porosity) and let $\psi_0 : (0, 1) \times Y^p \rightarrow \overline{Y}$ be a smooth mapping such that $\psi_0(\Theta, Y^p)$ gives a cell with porosity Θ and the corresponding displacement mapping $\check{\psi}_0(\Theta, y) = \psi_0(\Theta, y) - y$ can be extended to a Y -periodic function. Then,

$$\psi_\varepsilon(t, x) := x + \varepsilon \check{\psi}_0\left(\Theta(t, x), \frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right), \quad \psi_0(t, x, y) := \check{\psi}_0(\Theta(t, x), y)$$

fulfil Assumptions 2.1.

Assumption 2.3. Let $p_s \in [1, \infty]$ be fixed. We assume on the data that:

- (1) f_ε is a sequence in $L^{p_s}(S; L^2(\Omega))$ such that $\|f_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C(t)$ for a.e. $t \in S$ for $C \in L^{p_s}(S)$
- (2) there exists $f \in L^{p_s}(S; L^2(\Omega))$ such that $f_\varepsilon(t)$ two-scale converges weakly with respect to the L^2 -norm to $f(t)$ for a.e. $t \in S$,
- (3) $p_{b,\varepsilon}$ is a sequence in $L^{p_s}(S; H^1(\Omega))$ such that $\|p_{b,\varepsilon}(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C(t)$ for a.e. $t \in S$ for $C \in L^{p_s}(S)$,
- (4) there exists $(p_b, p_{b,1}) \in L^{p_s}(S; H^1(\Omega)) \times L^{p_s}(S; L^2(\Omega; H_\#^1(Y)/\mathbb{R}))$ such that $\nabla p_{b,\varepsilon}(t)$ two-scale converges weakly with respect to the L^2 -norm to $\nabla_x p_b(t) + \nabla_y p_{b,1}(t)$ for a.e. $t \in S$,
- (5) v_{Γ_ε} is a sequence in $L^{p_s}(S; H^1(\Omega))$ such that $\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \|v_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C(t)$ for a.e. $t \in S$ and $\|\nabla v_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C(t)$ for a.e. $t \in S$ for $C \in L^{p_s}(S)$,
- (6) there exists $v_\Gamma \in L^{p_s}(S; L^2(\Omega; H_\#^1(Y)))$ such that $\frac{1}{\varepsilon} v_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}(t)$ two-scale converges weakly with respect to the L^2 -norm to $v_\Gamma(t)$ for a.e. $t \in S$ and $\nabla v_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}(t)$ two-scale converges weakly with respect to the L^2 -norm to $\nabla_y v_\Gamma(t)$ for a.e. $t \in S$,
- (7) if v_{Γ_ε} should be the velocity of the boundary deformation, i.e. $v_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}(t, x) = \partial_t \psi_\varepsilon(t, \psi_\varepsilon^{-1}(t, x))$, we assume that ψ_ε is a sequence in $W^{1,p_s}(S; H^1(\Omega))$ such that $\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \|\partial_t \psi_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C(t)$ for a.e. $t \in S$ for $C \in L^{p_s}(S)$. Moreover, we assume that $\psi_0 \in W^{1,p_s}(S; L^2(\Omega; H_\#^1(Y)))$ such that $\varepsilon^{|\alpha|-1} D_{x_\alpha} \partial_t \psi_\varepsilon(t)$

two-scale converges weakly with respect to the L^2 -norm to $D_{y_\alpha} \partial_t \psi_0(t)$ for a.e. $t \in S$ and every multiindex $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}^N$ with $|\alpha| \leq 1$.

Since we consider the stationary Stokes equations, time becomes only a parameter. Therefore, we have formulated the previous assumptions in a way that allows us to consider the equation and the homogenisation process pointwise in time for a.e. $t \in S = (0, T)$. However, we have assumed for all used quantities the measurability with respect to time. Thus, we can show that the solutions of the ε -scaled problem can be uniformly bounded for a.e. $t \in S$ by a $L^{p_s}(S)$ bound for a fixed $p_s \in [1, \infty]$, which allows to translate the two-scale convergence into the time-dependent two-scale convergence, which is used in parabolic problems. This allows a coupling of the Stokes problem with such process in future works.

In order to derive a weak form for (3)–(4), we substitute the boundary values and define $w_\varepsilon(t) := v_\varepsilon(t) - v_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}(t)$ and $q_\varepsilon(t) := p_\varepsilon(t) - p_{b,\varepsilon}(t)$. Then, we multiply (3) by test functions φ which are 0 on $\Gamma_\varepsilon(t)$ and integrate over $\Omega_\varepsilon(t)$. After integration by parts and using the boundary conditions (5)–(6), we get (11). In addition, we multiply (4) with a test function $\phi \in L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon(t))$ and integrate over $\Omega_\varepsilon(t)$. Then, we obtain the following weak form:

Find $(w_\varepsilon, q_\varepsilon) \in L^{p_s}(S; H_{\Gamma_\varepsilon(t)}^1(\Omega_\varepsilon(t))) \times L^{p_s}(S; L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon(t)))$ such that, for a.e. $t \in S$,

$$(11) \quad \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon(t)} \nu \varepsilon^2 2e(w_\varepsilon(t, x)) : \nabla \varphi(x) - q_\varepsilon(t, x) \operatorname{div}(\varphi(x)) = \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon(t)} f_\varepsilon(t, x) \cdot \varphi(x) dx$$

$$- \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon(t)} \nu \varepsilon^2 2e(v_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}(t, x)) : \nabla \varphi(x) + \nabla p_{b,\varepsilon}(t, x) \cdot \varphi(x) dx$$

$$(12) \quad \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon(t)} \operatorname{div}(w_\varepsilon(t, x)) \phi(x) dx = - \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon(t)} \operatorname{div}(v_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}(t, x)) \phi(x) dx$$

for every $(\varphi, \phi) \in H_{\Gamma_\varepsilon(t)}^1(\Omega_\varepsilon(t))^N \times L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon(t))$.

2.1. Transformation on the periodic reference domain. We transform the given data on the reference configuration by

$$(13) \quad \hat{f}_\varepsilon(t, x) := f(t, \psi_\varepsilon(t, x)), \quad \hat{p}_{b,\varepsilon}(x, t) := p_{b,\varepsilon}(t, \psi_\varepsilon(t, x)), \quad \hat{v}_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}(x, t) := v_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}(t, \psi_\varepsilon(t, x))$$

and define $A_\varepsilon = J_\varepsilon \Psi_\varepsilon^{-1}$ as well as the transformed symmetric gradient $\hat{e}_{\varepsilon,t}(v) := (\Psi_\varepsilon^{-\top}(t) \nabla v + (\Psi_\varepsilon^{-\top}(t) \nabla v)^\top) / 2$. Then, we transform (14)–(15) onto the periodic reference domain and obtain the following problem:

Find $\hat{w}_\varepsilon, \hat{q}_\varepsilon \in L^{p_s}(S; H_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)) \times L^{p_s}(S; L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon))$ such that for a.e. $t \in S$

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \nu \varepsilon^2 A_\varepsilon(t, x) 2\hat{e}_{\varepsilon, t}(\hat{w}_\varepsilon(t, x)) : \nabla \varphi(x) - \hat{q}_\varepsilon(t, x) \operatorname{div}(A_\varepsilon(t, x) \varphi(x)) \\ &= \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} J_\varepsilon(t, x) \hat{f}_\varepsilon(t, x) \cdot \varphi(x) dx - \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \nu \varepsilon^2 A_\varepsilon(t, x) 2\hat{e}_{\varepsilon, t}(\hat{v}_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}(t, x)) : \nabla \varphi(x) dx \\ & \quad - \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} A_\varepsilon^\top(t, x) \nabla \hat{p}_{b, \varepsilon}(t, x) \cdot \varphi(x) dx \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

$$\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \operatorname{div}(A_\varepsilon(t, x) \hat{w}_\varepsilon(t, x)) \phi(x) dx = - \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \operatorname{div}(A_\varepsilon(t, x) \hat{v}_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}(t, x)) \phi(x) dx \quad (15)$$

for every $(\varphi, \phi) \in H_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)^N \times L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)$.

Lemma 2.4. *Problem (11)–(12) is equivalent to (14)–(15), in the sense that $(w_\varepsilon, q_\varepsilon)$ solves (11)–(12) if and only if $(\hat{w}_\varepsilon, \hat{q}_\varepsilon)$ solves (14)–(15), where the solutions can be transformed by $\hat{w}_\varepsilon(t, x) = w_\varepsilon(t, \psi_\varepsilon(t, x))$ and $\hat{q}_\varepsilon(t, x) = q_\varepsilon(t, \psi_\varepsilon(t, x))$.*

Proof. Using the product rule, we can transform between (11)–(12) and (14)–(15). \square

3. EXISTENCE AND UNIFORM A PRIORI ESTIMATES

In this section, we show the following existence and uniqueness result for (14)–(15) and derive an ε -independent bound for the solution.

Theorem 3.1. *For given $\varepsilon > 0$, Problem (14)–(15) has a unique solution $(\hat{w}_\varepsilon, \hat{q}_\varepsilon) \in L^p(S; H_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)^N) \times L^p(S; L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon))$ such that*

$$\|\hat{w}_\varepsilon(t)\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon} + \varepsilon \|\nabla \hat{w}_\varepsilon(t)\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon} + \|\hat{q}_\varepsilon(t)\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \leq C(t) \quad (16)$$

for a.e. $t \in S$ and $C \in L^{p_s}(S)$.

For the proof of Theorem 3.1, we use the following generic saddle-point formulation, where V and Q are Hilbert spaces and $a : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $b : V \times Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ continuous bilinear forms:

Given $f \in V'$ and $g \in Q'$, find a solution $(v, p) \in V \times Q$ such that:

$$a(v, \varphi) + b(\varphi, p) = \langle f, \varphi \rangle_{V' \times V} \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in V, \quad (17)$$

$$b(v, \phi) = \langle g, \phi \rangle_{Q' \times Q} \quad \text{for all } \phi \in Q. \quad (18)$$

The existence and uniqueness of a solution and a corresponding estimate for such saddle-point problems are given by the following well-known lemma. A proof is given in [BF10], for example.

Lemma 3.2. *If there exist constants $\alpha, \beta > 0$ such that:*

$$a(w, w) \geq \alpha \|w\|_V^2 \quad \text{for all } w \in V, \quad (19)$$

$$\inf_{u \in Q} \sup_{w \in V} \frac{|b(w, u)|}{\|w\|_V \|u\|_Q} \geq \beta, \quad (20)$$

then the saddle-point problem (17)–(18) has a unique solution $(v, p) \in V \times Q$. Furthermore, the following estimates hold for the solution:

$$(21) \quad \|v\|_V \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \|f\|_{V'} + \frac{2\|a\|}{\alpha\beta} \|g\|_{Q'},$$

$$(22) \quad \|p\|_Q \leq \frac{2\|a\|}{\alpha\beta} \|f\|_{V'} + \frac{2\|a\|^2}{\alpha\beta^2} \|g\|_{Q'},$$

where $\|a\| := \sup_{v, w \in V} \frac{|a(v, w)|}{\|v\|_V \|w\|_V}$ and $\|b\| := \sup_{v \in V, p \in Q} \frac{|b(v, p)|}{\|v\|_V \|p\|_Q}$ are the norms on the space of continuous bilinear forms which are given by the continuity constants.

The following Lemma enables us to add time as a parameter in Lemma 3.2. More precisely, we use it later to show that $(w_\varepsilon, q_\varepsilon)$ is measurable with respect to time.

Lemma 3.3. *For the spaces*

$$A := \{a \in \text{Bil}(V, V) \mid a(v, v) \geq \alpha \|v\|_V^2 \text{ for all } v \in V \text{ and } \alpha > 0\},$$

$$B := \left\{ b \in \text{Bil}(V, Q) \mid \inf_{p \in Q} \sup_{v \in V} \frac{|b(v, p)|}{\|v\|_V \|p\|_Q} \geq \beta \text{ for } \beta > 0 \right\}$$

of bilinear forms with their induced norms, which are defined in Lemma 3.2, the unique solution of the corresponding saddle-point problem (17)–(18) given by Lemma 3.2 depends continuously on the data $(a, b, f, g) \in A \times B \times V' \times Q'$.

Proof. Lemma 3.3 can be proven by computations which are similar to those in standard proofs of the estimates of Lemma 3.2. \square

In order to derive the uniform estimate (16), we employ (21) and (22). Hence, we equip $H_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)^N$ with a proper norm and derive a uniform coercivity and a uniform inf-sup estimate for the bilinear forms.

First, we show some uniform estimates for the coefficients (cf. Lemma 3.4). Then, we derive a family of ε -scaled Korn-type inequalities for the two-scale transformation method (cf. Lemma 3.6). These Korn-type inequalities allow to estimate the transformed symmetric gradients $\hat{e}_{\varepsilon, t}(\hat{w}_\varepsilon)$ uniformly from below, which implies the uniform coercivity for the first bilinear form. In order to show the uniform inf-sup estimate for the other bilinear form, we construct a family of ε -scaled operators $\text{div}_\varepsilon^{-1}$, which are right inverses to the divergence operator (cf. Lemma 3.12).

Lemma 3.4. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|J_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(S; C(\overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}))} + \|\Psi_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(S; C(\overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}))} + \|\Psi_\varepsilon^{-1}\|_{L^\infty(S; C(\overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}))} \leq C, \\ & \varepsilon \|\partial_{x_i} J_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(S; C(\overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}))} + \varepsilon \|\partial_{x_i} J_\varepsilon^{-1}\|_{L^\infty(S; C(\overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}))} \leq C, \\ & \varepsilon \|\partial_{x_i} \Psi_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(S; C(\overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}))} + \varepsilon \|\partial_{x_i} A_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(S; C(\overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}))} + \varepsilon \|\partial_{x_i} \Psi_\varepsilon^{-1}\|_{L^\infty(S; C(\overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}))} \leq C \end{aligned}$$

for every $i \in \{0, \dots, N\}$.

Proof. We note that $\Psi_\varepsilon = \mathbb{1} + D\check{\psi}_\varepsilon$. Then the uniform estimate of $D\check{\psi}_\varepsilon$ given by Assumption 2.1 shows that $\|\Psi_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(S; C(\overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}))} \leq C$.

Since J_ε and the entries of Ψ_ε are polynomials with respect to the entries of Ψ_ε and J_ε^{-1} , the uniform bound of $J_\varepsilon \geq c_J > 0$ from below (cf. Assumption 2.1) and $\|\Psi_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(S; C(\overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}))} \leq C$ implies $\|J_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(S; C(\overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}))} \leq C$ and $\|\Psi_\varepsilon^{-1}\|_{L^\infty(S; C(\overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}))} \leq C$.

After rewriting $\partial_{x_i} \Psi_\varepsilon = \partial_{x_i} D\psi_\varepsilon = \partial_{x_i} (\mathbb{1} + D\check{\psi}_\varepsilon) = \partial_{x_i} D\check{\psi}_\varepsilon$, Assumption 2.1 shows $\varepsilon \|\partial_{x_i} \Psi_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(S; C(\overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}))} \leq C$ for every $i \in \{0, \dots, N\}$.

We note that A_ε is the adjugate matrix of $\Psi_\varepsilon = \mathbb{1} + D\psi_\varepsilon$. Thus, all of its entries are minors of Ψ_ε . We rewrite the x_i -derivative of these minors with the product rule into the sum of products, where each product has $(n-2)$ -factors which are entries of $\Psi_\varepsilon(t)$ and one factor which is a entry of $\partial_{x_i} \Psi_\varepsilon$. Then, the estimates $\|\Psi_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(S; C(\overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}))} \leq C$ and $\varepsilon \|\partial_{x_i} \Psi_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(S; C(\overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}))} \leq C$ give $\varepsilon \|\partial_{x_i} A_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(S; C(\overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}))} \leq C$.

We obtain $\varepsilon \|\partial_{x_i} J_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(S; C(\overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}))} \leq C$ by the same argumentation as for the estimate of $\varepsilon \|\partial_{x_i} A_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(S; C(\overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}))}$.

Using the chain rule, we rewrite $\partial_{x_i} J_\varepsilon^{-1} = -J_\varepsilon^{-2} \partial_{x_i} J_\varepsilon$. Then, the uniform bound $J_\varepsilon \geq c_J > 0$ from below and the estimate $\varepsilon \|\partial_{x_i} J_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(S; C(\overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}))} \leq C$ imply the estimate $\varepsilon \|\partial_{x_i} J_\varepsilon^{-1}\|_{L^\infty(S; C(\overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}))} \leq C$.

We rewrite $\Psi_\varepsilon^{-1} = J_\varepsilon^{-1} A_\varepsilon$. Then, we obtain $\varepsilon \|\partial_{x_i} \Psi_\varepsilon^{-1}\|_{L^\infty(S; C(\overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}))} \leq C$ with the product rule and the previous estimates. \square

3.1. Korn-type inequality for the two-scale transformation method. In order to derive the Korn-type inequalities for the two-scale transformation method, we need the following ε -scaled Poincaré inequality for periodic domains.

Lemma 3.5. *There exists a constant $C_P \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\|v\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \leq \varepsilon C_P \|\nabla v\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon}$$

for every $v \in H_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)^N$.

Proof. Lemma 3.5 is a standard result and can be proven by covering Ω_ε with ε -scaled copies of Y^P and scaling them on Y^P . Then, applying the Poincaré inequality for piecewise zero boundary values there and scaling back yields the estimate. \square

Lemma 3.6. *There exists a constant $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ independent of ε , such that*

$$(23) \quad \alpha \|\nabla v\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon}^2 \leq \|\hat{e}_{\varepsilon, t}(v)\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon}^2$$

for $\varepsilon > 0$ and all $v \in H_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)^N$.

Proof. Lemma 3.6 follows directly from Lemma 3.7, since the estimates of Lemma 3.4 shows that the prerequisites of Lemma 3.7 are fulfilled. \square

Lemma 3.7. *Let $c, C > 0$. Then, there exists an ε -independent constant $\alpha > 0$ such that*

$$\alpha \|\nabla v\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon}^2 \leq \left\| M_\varepsilon \nabla v + (M_\varepsilon \nabla v)^\top \right\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon}^2$$

for any $v \in H_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)^N$ and for every $M_\varepsilon \in C^{0,1}(\overline{\Omega_\varepsilon})$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \|M_\varepsilon\|_{C(\overline{\Omega_\varepsilon})} + \varepsilon \|M_\varepsilon\|_{C^{0,1}(\overline{\Omega_\varepsilon})} &\leq C, \\ \det(M_\varepsilon(x)) &\geq c > 0 \text{ for every } x \in \overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since $\|M_\varepsilon \nabla v + (M_\varepsilon \nabla v)^\top\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon}^2 = \sum_{k \in I_\varepsilon} \|M_\varepsilon \nabla v + (M_\varepsilon \nabla v)^\top\|_{k+\varepsilon Y^P}^2$ and $\|\nabla v\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon}^2 = \sum_{k \in I_\varepsilon} \|\nabla v\|_{k+\varepsilon Y^P}^2$, we can reduce the problem on the reference cell. After transforming $k + \varepsilon Y^P$ on Y^P it is sufficient to show

$$(24) \quad \alpha \|v\|_{Y^P}^2 \leq \|M \nabla v + (M \nabla v)^\top\|_{Y^P}^2$$

for any $v \in H_F^1(Y^P)^N$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $k \in I_\varepsilon$ where $M(x) := M_\varepsilon(k + \varepsilon x)$. From the Lipschitz continuities of M_ε and the transformation $x \mapsto k + \varepsilon x$, we can conclude that $\|M\|_{C^{0,1}(\overline{Y^P})} \leq C$. The uniform bound of the determinant from below remains preserved under the transformation. Hence $M \in \mathcal{M} := \{M \in C^{0,1}(\overline{Y^P})^{N \times N} \mid \|M\|_{C^{0,1}(\overline{Y^P})} \leq C \text{ and } \det(M) \geq c\}$.

The uniform Lipschitz continuity of \mathcal{M} implies the equicontinuity of \mathcal{M} and since \mathcal{M} is also pointwise bounded, we obtain by the theorem of Arzelà–Ascoli that \mathcal{M} is relatively compact in $C(\overline{Y^P})^{N \times N}$. Then, we apply Lemma 3.8 on the closure of \mathcal{M} in $C(\overline{Y^P})^{N \times N}$ and we obtain Lemma (3.7). \square

Lemma 3.8. *Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be an open connected Lipschitz domain and $G \subset \partial U$ open with $|G| > 0$. Let \mathcal{M} be a compact subset of $C(\overline{U})^{N \times N}$ and assume there exists $c > 0$ such that $\det(M) \geq c$ for every $M \in \mathcal{M}$. Then, there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that*

$$\alpha \|\nabla v\|_U \leq \|(M \nabla v + (M \nabla v)^\top)\|_U$$

for every $M \in \mathcal{M}$ and $v \in H_G^1(U)$.

Proof. Let $M \in \mathcal{M}$, then Lemma 3.9 gives a constant α_M such that

$$(25) \quad \alpha_M \|\nabla v\|_U \leq \|M \nabla v + (M \nabla v)^\top\|_U$$

for every $v \in H_G^1(U)$. We obtain for $B \in \mathcal{M}$

$$\|M \nabla v + (M \nabla v)^\top - (B \nabla v + (B \nabla v)^\top)\|_U \leq 2 \|M - B\|_{C(\overline{U})} \|\nabla v\|_U,$$

which implies

$$(26) \quad \|M \nabla v + (M \nabla v)^\top\|_U \leq \|B \nabla v + (B \nabla v)^\top\|_U + 2 \|M - B\|_{C(\overline{U})} \|\nabla v\|_U.$$

Combining (25) and (26) gives for any $B \in B_{\alpha_M/4}(M)$

$$(27) \quad \frac{1}{2} \alpha_M \|\nabla v\|_U \leq \|B \nabla v + (B \nabla v)^\top\|_U.$$

Then, we cover \mathcal{M} by $\bigcup_{M \in \mathcal{M}} B_{\alpha_M/4}(M)$ and since \mathcal{M} is compact, there exists a finite set \mathcal{I} such that for every $B \in \mathcal{M}$ there exists $M \in \mathcal{I}$ with $B \in B_{\alpha_M/4}(M)$. We choose $\alpha = \min_{M \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_M/2$ and obtain from (27)

$$\alpha \|\nabla v\|_U \leq \frac{\alpha_M}{2} \|\nabla v\|_U \leq \|(B \nabla v + (B \nabla v)^\top)\|_U$$

for every $B \in \mathcal{M}$ and $v \in H_G^1(U)$. \square

Lemma 3.9. *Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be an open connected Lipschitz domain and $G \subset \partial U$ open with $|G| > 0$. Let $A : \overline{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be a continuous mapping with $\det(A) \geq c > 0$. Then, there is a constant $\alpha > 0$ such that*

$$\alpha \|\nabla v\|_U \leq \|(A \nabla v + (A \nabla v)^\top)\|_U$$

for all $v \in H_G^1(U)$.

Proof. Lemma 3.9 is proven in [Pom03]. \square

3.2. Right-inverse divergence operator. In order to construct explicitly the operators $\operatorname{div}_\varepsilon^{-1} : L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow H_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)$, we use the following right inverse divergence operator (see. Lemma 3.10) and the restriction operator (see. Lemma 3.11), which was originally introduced in [Tar79] and developed further in [All89].

Lemma 3.10. *Let U be a bounded, connected Lipschitz domain. Then, there exists a bounded linear operator $\operatorname{div}^{-1} : L^2(U) \rightarrow H^1(U)$ such that $\operatorname{div} \circ \operatorname{div}^{-1} = \operatorname{id}_{L^2(U)}$.*

Proof. Lemma 3.10 can be easily proven by means of the Bogovskii operator. \square

Lemma 3.11. *There exists a linear continuous operator $R_\varepsilon : H^1(\Omega)^N \rightarrow H_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)^N$ such that*

- (1) $u \in H_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)$ implies $R_\varepsilon u = u$ in Ω_ε
- (2) $\operatorname{div}(R_\varepsilon u) = \operatorname{div}(u) + \frac{1}{|Y^p|} \sum_{k \in I_\varepsilon} \chi_{k+\varepsilon Y^p} \int_{k+\varepsilon Y^s} \operatorname{div}(u)$,
- (3) $\operatorname{div}(u) = 0$ implies $\operatorname{div}(R_\varepsilon u) = 0$,
- (4) there exists a constant C such that

$$\|R_\varepsilon u\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon} + \varepsilon \|\nabla(R_\varepsilon u)\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \leq \|u\|_{\Omega} + \varepsilon \|\nabla u\|_{\Omega}$$

for every $u \in H^1(\Omega)^N$.

Proof. In [All89] this restriction operator is explicitly constructed from $H_0^1(\Omega)^N$ to $H_0^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)^N$. Indeed, the construction is done locally so that the same construction yields an operator $R_\varepsilon : H^1(\Omega)^N \rightarrow H_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)^N$. \square

Lemma 3.12. *There exists a linear continuous operator $\operatorname{div}_\varepsilon^{-1} : L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon) \rightarrow H_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)^N$, which is right inverse to the divergence, i.e. $\operatorname{div} \circ \operatorname{div}_\varepsilon^{-1} = \operatorname{id}_{L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)}$, such that*

$$\|\operatorname{div}_\varepsilon^{-1}(f)\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon} + \varepsilon \|\nabla \operatorname{div}_\varepsilon^{-1}(f)\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \leq \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)}$$

for every $f \in L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.10 there exists a linear continuous operator $\operatorname{div}^{-1} : L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow H^1(\Omega)^N$ such that $\operatorname{div}(\operatorname{div}^{-1}(f)) = f$ for every $f \in L^2(\Omega)$. Using this operator and the restriction operator R_ε of Lemma 3.11, we can define

$$\operatorname{div}_\varepsilon^{-1}(f) := R_\varepsilon(\operatorname{div}^{-1}(\tilde{f})),$$

where \tilde{f} denotes the extension of f by 0 to $\Omega \setminus \Omega_\varepsilon$.

The explicit formula for $\operatorname{div} \circ R_\varepsilon$ from Lemma 3.11 shows

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div}(\operatorname{div}_\varepsilon^{-1}(f)) &= \operatorname{div}(R_\varepsilon(\operatorname{div}^{-1}(\tilde{f}))) = \\ &= \operatorname{div}(\operatorname{div}^{-1}(\tilde{f})) + \frac{1}{|Y^p|} \sum_{k \in I_\varepsilon} \chi_{k+\varepsilon Y^p} \int_{k+\varepsilon Y^s} \operatorname{div}(\operatorname{div}^{-1}(\tilde{f}(x))) dx \\ &= \tilde{f} + \frac{1}{|Y^p|} \sum_{k \in I_\varepsilon} \chi_{k+\varepsilon Y^p} \int_{k+\varepsilon Y^s} \tilde{f}(x) dx = f. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, using the estimate of Lemma 3.11, we obtain, for $\varepsilon \leq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\operatorname{div}_\varepsilon^{-1}(f)\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon} + \varepsilon \|\nabla \operatorname{div}_\varepsilon^{-1}(f)\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon} &\leq C \left(\|\operatorname{div}^{-1}(\tilde{f})\|_\Omega + \varepsilon \|\nabla \operatorname{div}^{-1}(\tilde{f})\|_\Omega \right) \\ &\leq C \|\nabla \operatorname{div}^{-1}(\tilde{f})\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq \|\tilde{f}\|_\Omega = C \|f\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

□

3.3. Estimates of the data.

Lemma 3.13. *There exists a constant $C \in L^{p_s}(S)$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\hat{f}_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\hat{p}_{b,\varepsilon}(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla \hat{p}_{b,\varepsilon}(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &+ \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \|\hat{v}_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla \hat{v}_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C(t) \end{aligned}$$

for a.e. $t \in S$.

Proof. We note that $D\psi_\varepsilon^{-1}(t, x) = \Psi_\varepsilon^{-1}(t, \psi_\varepsilon^{-1}(t, x))$. Hence, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{f}_\varepsilon(t)\|_\Omega &= \left(\int_\Omega f_\varepsilon(t, \psi_\varepsilon(t, x))^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \left(\int_\Omega \det(\Psi_\varepsilon^{-1}(t, \psi_\varepsilon^{-1}(t, x))) f_\varepsilon(t, x)^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \left(\int_\Omega J_\varepsilon^{-1}(t, \psi_\varepsilon^{-1}(t, x)) f_\varepsilon(t, x)^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C \left(\int_\Omega f_\varepsilon(t, x)^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \|f_\varepsilon(t)\|_\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the uniform bound of $f_\varepsilon(t)$ given by Assumption 2.3 implies the uniform bound of $\|\hat{f}(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C(t)$ for a.e. $t \in S$. By the same computation, we obtain

$$\|\hat{p}_{b,\varepsilon}(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \|\hat{v}_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C(t).$$

In order to estimate the gradient, we use the chain rule and rewrite $\nabla \hat{p}_{b,\varepsilon}(t, x) = \Psi_\varepsilon^\top(t, x) \nabla p_{b,\varepsilon}(t, \psi_\varepsilon(t, x))$. Then, the uniform estimates of Lemma 3.4 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \hat{p}_{b,\varepsilon}(t)\|_\Omega &= \left(\int_\Omega J_\varepsilon^{-1}(t, \psi_\varepsilon^{-1}(t, x)) \Psi_\varepsilon^{-\top}(t, \psi_\varepsilon^{-1}(t, x)) \nabla p_{b,\varepsilon}^2(t, x) dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \left(\int_\Omega J_\varepsilon^{-1}(t, \psi_\varepsilon^{-1}(t, x)) \nabla p_{b,\varepsilon}^2(t, x) dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C \left(\int_\Omega \nabla p_{b,\varepsilon}^2(t, x) dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C \|\nabla p_{b,\varepsilon}(t)\|_\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

The uniform bound of $\|\nabla p_{b,\varepsilon}(t)\|_\Omega$ given by Assumption 2.3 implies the uniform bound of $\|\nabla \hat{p}_{b,\varepsilon}(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C(t)$ for a.e. $t \in S$. By the same computation, we obtain $\|\nabla \hat{v}_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C(t)$. □

Proof of Theorem 3.1. First, we show that there exists a solution $(\hat{w}_\varepsilon(t), \hat{q}_\varepsilon(t)) \in H_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)^N \times L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)$ of (14)–(15) for a.e. $t \in S$. Due to the Poincaré inequality from Lemma 3.5, $\|\cdot\|_{V_\varepsilon} : H_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $v \mapsto \|v\|_{V_\varepsilon} := \varepsilon \|\nabla v\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon}$ defines a norm on $H_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)^N$. We define the following bilinear forms for a.e. $t \in S$

$$\begin{aligned} a_\varepsilon(t) : H_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)^N \times H_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)^N &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, & (v, w) &\mapsto (\varepsilon^2 \nu A_\varepsilon(t) \hat{e}_{\varepsilon,t}(v), \nabla w)_{\Omega_\varepsilon}, \\ b_\varepsilon(t) : H_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)^N \times L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon) &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, & (v, p) &\mapsto (\operatorname{div}(A_\varepsilon(t)v), p)_{\Omega_\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the uniform estimates of Lemma 3.4 and the Korn-type inequality for the two-scale transformation method (see. Lemma 3.6), we obtain the following uniform coercivity and continuity estimate for the bilinear form $a_\varepsilon(t)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 a_\varepsilon(t)(w, w) &= (\varepsilon^2 \nu A_\varepsilon(t) \hat{e}_{\varepsilon,t}(w), \nabla w)_{\Omega_\varepsilon} = (\varepsilon^2 \nu J_\varepsilon(t) \hat{e}_{\varepsilon,t}(w), \Psi_\varepsilon^{-\top}(t) \nabla w)_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \\
 &= (\varepsilon^2 \nu J_\varepsilon(t) \hat{e}_{\varepsilon,t}(w), (\Psi_\varepsilon^{-\top} \nabla w + (\Psi_\varepsilon^{-\top} \nabla w)^\top)/2)_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \\
 &= (\varepsilon^2 \nu J_\varepsilon(t) \hat{e}_{\varepsilon,t}(w), \hat{e}_{\varepsilon,t}(w))_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \\
 (28) \quad &\geq \varepsilon^2 \nu c_J \|\hat{e}_{\varepsilon,t}(w)\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon}^2 \geq \varepsilon^2 \nu c_J \alpha \|\nabla w\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon}^2 \geq C \|w\|_{V_\varepsilon}^2,
 \end{aligned}$$

(29)

$$a_\varepsilon(t)(v, w) = (\varepsilon^2 \nu J_\varepsilon(t) \Psi_\varepsilon^{-1}(t) (\Psi_\varepsilon^{-\top} \nabla v + (\Psi_\varepsilon^{-\top} \nabla v)^\top), \nabla w)_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \leq C \|v\|_{V_\varepsilon} \|w\|_{V_\varepsilon}.$$

In order to give a uniform estimate of the inf-sup constant, we choose an arbitrary $\phi \in L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)$. Then, Lemma 3.12 gives a constant $C \in \mathbb{R}$, independent of ε and ϕ , and a function $\hat{v} \in H_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)^N$ such that

$$(30) \quad \operatorname{div}(\hat{v}) = \phi, \quad \varepsilon \|\hat{v}\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \leq C \|\phi\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon}.$$

We define $v := J_\varepsilon^{-1}(t) \Psi_\varepsilon(t) \hat{v} \in H_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)^N$. Using the product rule, the estimates from Lemma 3.4 and the ε -scaled Poincaré inequality (cf. Lemma 3.5), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|v\|_{V_\varepsilon} &= \varepsilon \|D(J_\varepsilon^{-1}(t) \Psi_\varepsilon(t) \hat{v})\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \leq \varepsilon \|D(J_\varepsilon^{-1}(t) \Psi_\varepsilon(t)) \hat{v}\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon} + \varepsilon \|J_\varepsilon^{-1}(t) \Psi_\varepsilon(t) D\hat{v}\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \\
 &\leq C \|\hat{v}\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon} + C\varepsilon \|D\hat{v}\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \leq C \|\hat{v}\|_{V_\varepsilon} \leq C \|\phi\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon}.
 \end{aligned}$$

With this choice of v , we see that

$$(31) \quad \sup_{v \in H_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)^N} \frac{|b_\varepsilon(t)(v, \phi)|}{\|v\|_{V_\varepsilon}} \geq \frac{(\phi, \phi)_{\Omega_\varepsilon}}{\|v\|_{V_\varepsilon}} \geq \frac{\|\phi\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon}^2}{C \|\phi\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon}} = C \|\phi\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon}$$

for a.e. fixed $t \in S$.

The continuity of the bilinear form $b_\varepsilon(t)$ follows with the product rule and the ε -scaled Poincaré inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
 b_\varepsilon(t)(v, p) &= (\operatorname{div}(A_\varepsilon(t)v), p) \leq (\|\operatorname{div}(A_\varepsilon(t)v)\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon} + \|A_\varepsilon(t) : \nabla v\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon}) \|p\|_{L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)} \\
 (32) \quad &\leq C(\varepsilon^{-1} \|v\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon} + \|\nabla v\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon}) \|p\|_{L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)} \leq \varepsilon^{-1} C \|v\|_{V_\varepsilon} \|p\|_{L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Note that a more precise estimate like for the inf-sup constant does not yield an ε -independent constant for $b_\varepsilon(t)$. However, the norm of b_ε does not appear in the right-hand sides of (21) and (22). Nevertheless, the continuity and the coercivity constant of $a_\varepsilon(t)$ as well as the inf-sup constant of $b_\varepsilon(t)$, which occur in (21) and (22), do not depend on ε or t .

Now, we estimate the right-hand sides of (14) and (15). For the first summand of the right-hand side of (14), we obtain with Lemma 3.4, Lemma 3.13 and the ε -scaled Poincaré inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\left\| J_\varepsilon(t) \hat{f}_\varepsilon(t) - A_\varepsilon(t) \nabla \hat{p}_{b,\varepsilon} \right\|_{V'_\varepsilon} \\
 &= \sup_{v \in H_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)^N} \frac{\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} (J_\varepsilon(t, x) \hat{f}_\varepsilon(t, x) - A_\varepsilon^\top(t, x) \nabla \hat{p}_{b,\varepsilon}(t, x)) \cdot v(x) \, dx}{\|v\|_{V_\varepsilon}} \\
 (33) \quad &\leq \frac{C(t) \|v\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon}}{\|v\|_{V_\varepsilon}} \leq \frac{C(t) \|v\|_{V_\varepsilon}}{\|v\|_{V_\varepsilon}} \leq C(t),
 \end{aligned}$$

where $C \in L^{p_s}(S)$. We rewrite the second summand of (14) and obtain from the continuity estimate (29) of $a_\varepsilon(t)$

$$(34) \quad \| -a_\varepsilon(t)(\partial_t \psi(t), \cdot) \|_{V'_\varepsilon} \leq C \|\partial_t \psi(t)\|_{V'_\varepsilon} \leq \varepsilon C.$$

Later this term will also vanish during the homogenisation because it is of order $O(\varepsilon)$. We can estimate the right-hand side of (15) with the continuity estimate (32) of $b_\varepsilon(t)$ and Lemma 3.13 by

$$(35) \quad \| -b_\varepsilon(t)(\hat{v}_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}(t), \cdot) \|_{L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)'} \leq \varepsilon^{-1} C \|\hat{v}_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}(t)\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \leq \varepsilon^{-1} \varepsilon C(t) \leq C(t)$$

for $C \in L^p(S)$. Using Lemma 3.2 with the estimates (28), (29), (31), (33), (34) and (35) yields, for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough and a.e. $t \in S$, the existence of a unique solution $(\hat{w}_\varepsilon(t), \hat{q}_\varepsilon(t)) \in H_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)^N \times L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)$ of (14)–(15) such that

$$(36) \quad \|\hat{w}_\varepsilon(t)\|_{V_\varepsilon} + \|\hat{q}_\varepsilon(t)\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \leq C(t)$$

for $C \in L^p(S)$.

By the definition of the norm V_ε and Lemma 3.5, we can estimate further

$$(37) \quad \|\hat{w}_\varepsilon(t)\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon} + \varepsilon \|\nabla \hat{w}_\varepsilon(t)\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon} + \|\hat{q}_\varepsilon(t)\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \leq C(t)$$

for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, a.e. $t \in S$ and $C \in L^p(S)$.

By Lemma 3.3, we get the continuity of the solution with respect to the bilinear forms and the right-hand sides. Since the bilinear forms and the right-hand sides are measurable in time, $\hat{w}_\varepsilon : S \rightarrow H_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)^N$ and $\hat{q}_\varepsilon : S \rightarrow L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)$ are measurable functions and thus $\hat{w}_\varepsilon \in L^{p_s}(S, H_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)^N)$ and $\hat{q}_\varepsilon \in L^{p_s}(S; L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon))$ \square

Remark 3.14. Another ansatz for the proof of Theorem 3.1 would be to substitute \hat{w}_ε , so that we obtain a homogeneous divergence condition. Then, we could use the Lemma of Lax–Milgram for functions v with $\operatorname{div}(A_\varepsilon(t)v) = 0$. Using the same preliminary work, we could prove the same uniform bounds for the velocity and the pressure. But the difficulty with this ansatz is that the measurability with respect to time cannot be concluded directly, since the space of functions v satisfying $\operatorname{div}(A_\varepsilon(t)v) = 0$ depends on time.

4. HOMOGENISATION IN THE PERIODIC REFERENCE DOMAIN

In this section, we pass to the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ in (14)–(15) using the notion of two-scale convergence (cf. [All92], [LNW02]) and derive the two-pressure Stokes system (38)–(40) as two-scale limit problem.

Find $(\hat{w}_0, \hat{q}, \hat{q}_1) \in L^{p_s}(S; L^2(\Omega; H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^P))) \times L^{p_s}(S; H_0^1(\Omega)) \times L^{p_s}(S; L^2(\Omega; L_0^2(Y^P)))$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y^P} \nu A_0(t, x, y) \Psi_0^{-\top}(t, x, y) \nabla_y \hat{w}_0(t, x, y) : \nabla_y \varphi(x, y) dy dx \\
 & + \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y^P} A_0^{\top}(t, x, y) \nabla_x \hat{q}(t, x) \cdot \varphi(x, y) + \hat{q}_1(t) \operatorname{div}_y (A_0(t, x, y) \varphi(x, y)) dy dx \\
 (38) \quad & = \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y^P} (J_0(t, x, y) f(t, x) - A_0^{\top}(t, x, y) \nabla p_b(t, x)) \cdot \varphi(x, y) dy dx
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 (39) \quad & \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y^P} \operatorname{div}_y (A_0(t, x, y) \hat{w}_0(t, x, y)) \theta_1(x, y) dy dx = 0 \\
 & \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{div}_x \left(\int_{Y^P} A_0(t, x, y) \hat{w}_0(t, x, y) dy \right) \theta_0(x) dx
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 (40) \quad & = - \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y^P} \operatorname{div}_y (A_0(t, x, y) \hat{v}_{\Gamma}(t, x, y)) dy \theta_0(x) dx
 \end{aligned}$$

for every $(\varphi, \theta_0, \theta_1) \in L^2(\Omega; H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^P)) \times H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega; L_0^2(Y^P))$.

Definition 4.1. Let $p, q \in (1, \infty)$ with $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$. We say that a sequence u_{ε} two-scale converges weakly to $u_0 \in L^p(\Omega \times Y)$ if

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon}(x) \varphi \left(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon} \right) dx = \int_{\Omega} u_0(x, y) \varphi(x, y) dy dx$$

for every $\varphi \in L^q(\Omega; C_{\#}(Y))$. If additionally $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|v_{\varepsilon}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} = \|v_0\|_{L^p(\Omega \times Y)}$, we say u_{ε} two-scale converges strongly to u_0 .

The following theorem is one of the fundamental compactness results in the notion of two-scale convergence.

Theorem 4.2. Let $p \in (1, \infty)$ and let u_{ε} be a bounded sequence in $L^p(\Omega)$. Then, there exists a subsequence and $u_0 \in L^p(\Omega \times Y)$ such that this subsequence two-scale converges weakly to u_0 .

The following result allows us to handle the coefficients in the homogenisation.

Lemma 4.3. Let $1 < p, q, r < \infty$ with $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{r}$. Let u_{ε} be a sequence in $L^p(\Omega)$ which two-scale converges strongly to $u_0 \in L^p(\Omega \times Y)$ and let v_{ε} be a sequence in $L^q(\Omega)$ which two-scale converges weakly (resp. strongly) to $v_0 \in L^q(\Omega \times Y)$. Then, $u_{\varepsilon} v_{\varepsilon}$ is a sequence of functions in $L^r(\Omega)$ which two-scale converges weakly (resp. strongly) to $u_0 v_0 \in L^r(\Omega \times Y)$.

In order to translate the two-scale convergence of the data and the solution between the actual and the transformed configuration, we use the following transformation result of [Wie21].

Theorem 4.4. Let $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $t \in S$. Let u_{ε} be a sequence in $L^p(\Omega)$ and $\hat{u}_{\varepsilon} = u_{\varepsilon} \circ \psi_{\varepsilon}(t)$ with ψ_{ε} as in Assumption 2.1. Then, for a.e. $t \in S$, u_{ε} two-scale

converges weakly with respect to the L^p -norm to $u_0 \in L^p(\Omega \times Y)$ if and only if \hat{u}_ε two-scale converges weakly with respect to the L^p -norm to $\hat{u}_0 \in L^p(\Omega \times Y)$. Moreover, $\hat{u}_0(\cdot_x, \cdot_y) = u_0(\cdot_x, \psi_0(\cdot_x, \cdot_y))$ holds and, equivalently, $u_0 = \hat{u}_0(\cdot_x, \psi_0^{-1}(t, \cdot_x, \cdot_y))$.

Proof. For a proof of Theorem 4.4 see [Wie21]. Note, that there the deformations ψ_ε are only defined on $\Omega_\varepsilon \subset \Omega$, which is why the transformation result has to deal with the extension of the functions by 0. However, the results there holds for $\Omega_\varepsilon = \Omega$, which proves Theorem 4.4. \square

Further two-scale transformation results for weakly differentiable functions can be found in [Wie21]. Moreover, the following result of [Wie21] allows to transform the strong two-scale convergence.

Theorem 4.5. *Let $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $t \in S$. Let u_ε be a sequence in $L^p(\Omega)$ and $u_0 \in L^p(\Omega \times Y)$ such that u_ε two-scale converges weakly to u_0 . Let $\hat{u}_\varepsilon = u_\varepsilon \circ \psi_\varepsilon(t)$ be a sequence in $L^p(\Omega)$ with ψ_ε as in Assumption 2.1 such that \hat{u}_ε two-scale converges weakly to $\hat{u}_0 \in L^p(\Omega \times Y)$ with $\hat{u}_0 = u_0(\cdot_x, \psi_0(t, \cdot_x, \cdot_y))$. Then, for a.e. $t \in S$, the following statements hold:*

- (1) *If u_ε two-scale converges strongly to u_0 with respect to the L^p -norm, then \hat{u}_ε two-scale converges strongly to \hat{u}_0 with respect to every $L^{p'}$ -norm for $p' \in (1, p)$,*
- (2) *If \hat{u}_ε two-scale converges strongly to \hat{u}_0 with respect to the L^p -norm, then u_ε two-scale converges strongly to u_0 with respect to every $L^{p'}$ -norm for $p' \in (1, p)$.*

Proof. The proof of Theorem 4.5 follows in the same way as Theorem 4.4 from the results of [Wie21]. \square

4.1. Two-scale convergence of the transformed data.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $\hat{f}_\varepsilon, \hat{p}_{b,\varepsilon}$ and $\hat{v}_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}$ be defined by (13). Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f}_\varepsilon(t) &\rightarrow f(t) && \text{weakly in the two-scale sense,} \\ \nabla \hat{p}_{b,\varepsilon}(t) &\rightarrow \nabla_x p_b(t) + \nabla_y \hat{p}_{b,1} && \text{weakly in the two-scale sense,} \\ \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \hat{v}_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}(t) &\rightarrow \hat{v}_\Gamma(t) && \text{weakly in the two-scale sense,} \\ \nabla \hat{v}_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}(t) &\rightarrow \nabla_y \hat{v}_\Gamma(t) && \text{weakly in the two-scale sense} \end{aligned}$$

for a.e. $t \in S$, where f, p_b and v_Γ are the two-scale limits given in Assumption 2.3, $\hat{p}_{b,1}(t) = p_{b,1}(t, \cdot_x, \psi_0(t, \cdot_x, \cdot_y)) + \psi_0 \cdot \nabla_x p_b(t)$ and $\hat{v}_\Gamma(t) = v_\Gamma(t, \cdot_x, \psi_0(t, \cdot_x, \cdot_y))$.

Proof. The two-scale convergence of $\hat{f}_\varepsilon(t)$ and of $\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \hat{v}_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}$ follows from Theorem 4.4. The two-scale convergence of $\nabla \hat{p}_{b,\varepsilon}(t)$ follows from [Wie21, Theorem 3.10] and the two-scale convergence of $\nabla \hat{v}$ from [Wie21, Theorem 3.9]. \square

Moreover, we need the two-scale convergence of the transformation coefficients, which are given by the following result.

Lemma 4.7. *Let ψ_ε and ψ_0 be given by Assumption 2.1. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_\varepsilon(t) &\rightarrow \Psi_0(t), \quad \Psi_\varepsilon^{-1}(t) \rightarrow \Psi_0^{-1}(t), \quad J_\varepsilon(t) \rightarrow J_0(t), \quad J_\varepsilon^{-1}(t) \rightarrow J_0^{-1}(t), \quad A_\varepsilon(t) \rightarrow A_0(t), \\ \varepsilon D_x A_\varepsilon(t) &\rightarrow D_y A_0(t), \quad \varepsilon D_x A_\varepsilon^{-1}(t) \rightarrow D_y A_0(t) \end{aligned}$$

strongly in the two-scale sense, for a.e. $t \in S$, where the strong two-scale convergence holds with respect to every L^p -norm for $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $A_0 := J_0 \Psi_0^{-1}$.

Proof. Using the results of [Wie21] it remains to prove that $\varepsilon D_x A_\varepsilon(t) \rightarrow D_y A_0(t)$ and $\varepsilon D_x A_\varepsilon^{-1}(t) \rightarrow D_y A_0(t)$ strongly in the two-scale sense. Therefore, we note that $\varepsilon D_x \Psi_\varepsilon(t) = \varepsilon D_x \nabla \psi_\varepsilon^\top(t)$ two-scale converges strongly to $D_y \Psi_0(t) = D_y \nabla \psi_0^\top(t)$ by Assumption 2.1.

We rewrite $D_x A_\varepsilon(t)$ into the sum of polynomials like in the proof of Lemma 3.4. Then, we pass to the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ using the two-scale convergence of $\varepsilon D_x \Psi_\varepsilon(t)$ and $\Psi_\varepsilon(t)$.

By the same argumentation, we obtain the strong two-scale convergence of $\varepsilon D_x J_\varepsilon(t)$ to $D_y J_0(t)$. Then, we rewrite $A_\varepsilon^{-1}(t) = J_\varepsilon^{-1}(t) \Psi_\varepsilon(t)$. Using the quotient rule and the previously proven two-scale convergences, we obtain the strong two-scale convergence of $\varepsilon D_x A_\varepsilon^{-1}(t)$ to $D_y A_0^{-1}(t)$. \square

4.2. Homogenisation of the transformed Stokes equations.

Theorem 4.8. *Let \hat{w}_ε and $\hat{q}_\varepsilon(t)$ be the solution of (14)–(15). Let \hat{Q}_ε be the extension of \hat{q}_ε as defined in Lemma 4.9 and $\hat{w}_\varepsilon \in L^{p_s}(S; H^1(\Omega))$ be the extension of \hat{w}_ε by 0 on $\Omega \setminus \Omega_\varepsilon$. Then, $\hat{w}_\varepsilon(t)$ two-scale converges to $\hat{w}_0(t)$ and $\hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t)$ converges strongly in $L^2(\Omega)$ to $\hat{q}(t)$, for a.e. $t \in S$, where $(\hat{w}_0, \hat{q}, \hat{q}_1) \in L^{p_s}(S; L^2(\Omega; H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^P))) \times L^{p_s}(S; H_0^1(\Omega)) \times L^{p_s}(S; L^2(\Omega; L_0^2(Y^P)))$ is the unique solution of (38)–(40).*

In order to pass to the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ in (14), we test it by $A_\varepsilon^{-1}(t)\varphi$ and obtain

$$(41) \quad \begin{aligned} & (\varepsilon^2 \nu A_\varepsilon(t) \hat{e}_{\varepsilon,t}(\hat{w}_\varepsilon(t)), \nabla(A_\varepsilon^{-1}(t)\varphi))_{\Omega_\varepsilon} - (\hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t), \operatorname{div}(\varphi))_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \\ & = (\Psi_\varepsilon^\top(t) \hat{f}_\varepsilon(t) - \nabla \hat{p}_{b,\varepsilon}, \varphi)_{\Omega_\varepsilon} - (\varepsilon^2 \nu A_\varepsilon(t) \hat{e}_{\varepsilon,t}(\hat{v}_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}(t)), \nabla(A_\varepsilon^{-1}(t)\varphi))_{\Omega_\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $A_\varepsilon^{-1}(t)$ is invertible (14) can be replaced by (41).

First, we prove the strong convergence of $\hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t)$. Thereto, we transfer the argumentation of [All89] on our weak form with the different function spaces.

Lemma 4.9. *Let \hat{q}_ε be the second part of the solution of (14)–(15) and \hat{Q}_ε be the extension of \hat{q}_ε on Ω defined by*

$$(42) \quad \hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t, x) := \begin{cases} \hat{q}_\varepsilon(t, x) & \text{if } x \in \Omega_\varepsilon, \\ \frac{1}{|Y^P|} \int_{k+\varepsilon Y^P} \hat{q}_\varepsilon(t, x) & \text{if } x \in k + \varepsilon Y^P \text{ for } k \in I_\varepsilon. \end{cases}$$

Then, for a.e. $t \in S$, there exists $\hat{q}(t) \in L^2(\Omega)$ and a subsequence of $\hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t)$ which converges strongly in $L^2(\Omega)$ to $\hat{q}(t)$.

Proof. We define $F_\varepsilon(t) \in (H^1(\Omega)^N)'$ by

$$(43) \quad \langle F_\varepsilon(t), \varphi \rangle_{H^1(\Omega)', H^1(\Omega)} := \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \hat{q}_\varepsilon(t, x) \operatorname{div}(R_\varepsilon \varphi(x)) dx.$$

From (41), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \hat{q}_\varepsilon(t) \operatorname{div}(R_\varepsilon \varphi) dx = (\varepsilon^2 \nu A_\varepsilon(t) \hat{e}_{\varepsilon,t}(\hat{w}_\varepsilon(t)), \nabla(A_\varepsilon^{-1}(t) R_\varepsilon \varphi))_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \\ & - (\Psi_\varepsilon^\top(t) \hat{f}_\varepsilon(t) - \nabla \hat{p}_{b,\varepsilon}, R_\varepsilon \varphi)_{\Omega_\varepsilon} - (\varepsilon^2 \nu A_\varepsilon(t) \hat{e}_{\varepsilon,t}(\hat{v}_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}(t)), \nabla(A_\varepsilon^{-1}(t) R_\varepsilon \varphi))_{\Omega_\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can estimate $F_\varepsilon(t)$ using the estimates of $\varepsilon \nabla \hat{w}_\varepsilon(t)$ (cf. (16)), the coefficients (cf. Lemma 3.4) and the data (cf. Assumption 2.3) as well as the product rule by

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle F_\varepsilon(t), \varphi \rangle_{H^1(\Omega)', H^1(\Omega)}| &\leq C\varepsilon \|\nabla(A_\varepsilon^{-1} R_\varepsilon \varphi)\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon} + C \|R_\varepsilon \varphi\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon} + \varepsilon^2 \|\nabla(A_\varepsilon^{-1} R_\varepsilon \varphi)\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \\ &\leq C(\varepsilon + \varepsilon^2) \|\nabla R_\varepsilon \varphi\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon} + C(1 + \varepsilon) \|R_\varepsilon \varphi\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the estimates of Lemma 3.11 imply, for $\varepsilon \leq 1$,

$$(44) \quad |\langle F_\varepsilon(t), \varphi \rangle_{H^1(\Omega)', H^1(\Omega)}| \leq C(\|\varphi\|_\Omega + \varepsilon \|\nabla \varphi\|_\Omega)$$

and in particular $\|F_\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^1(\Omega)'} \leq C$.

Because $\operatorname{div}(R_\varepsilon \varphi) = 0$ if $\operatorname{div}(\varphi) = 0$, we obtain

$$\langle F_\varepsilon(t), \varphi \rangle_{H^1(\Omega)', H^1(\Omega)} = \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \hat{q}_\varepsilon(t, x) \operatorname{div}(R_\varepsilon \varphi(x)) dx = \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \hat{q}_\varepsilon(t, x) \operatorname{div}(\varphi(x)) dx = 0$$

for every $\varphi \in H^1(\Omega)$ with $\operatorname{div}(\varphi) = 0$. Since div has closed range (cf. Lemma 3.10), the closed-range theorem implies that there exists $\hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t) \in L^2(\Omega)$ such that

$$(45) \quad \int_{\Omega} \hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t) \operatorname{div}(\varphi) dx = \langle F_\varepsilon(t), \varphi \rangle_{H^1(\Omega)', H^1(\Omega)} = \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \hat{q}_\varepsilon(t, x) \operatorname{div}(R_\varepsilon \varphi(x)) dx.$$

Moreover, we obtain with Lemma 3.12 the uniform boundedness of $\|\hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 &= \int_{\Omega} \hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t) \operatorname{div}(\operatorname{div}^{-1}(\hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t))) = |\langle F_\varepsilon(t), \operatorname{div}^{-1}(\hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t)) \rangle_{H^1(\Omega)', H^1(\Omega)}| \\ (46) \quad &\leq C \|\operatorname{div}^{-1}(\hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t))\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C \|\hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

In order to identify $\hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t)$ with \hat{q}_ε on Ω_ε , we note that $R_\varepsilon(\tilde{\varphi}) = \varphi$ for every $\varphi \in H_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)$, where $\tilde{\varphi}$ is the extension by 0 of φ . Then, we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} \hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t) \operatorname{div}(\tilde{\varphi}) dx = \int_{\Omega} \hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t) \operatorname{div}(\varphi) dx = \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \hat{q}_\varepsilon(t) \operatorname{div}(\varphi) dx.$$

Lemma 3.12 gives the existence of a function $\varphi \in H_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)$ with $\operatorname{div}(\varphi) = \hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t) - \hat{q}_\varepsilon(t)$. Testing with this φ implies $\hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t) = \hat{q}_\varepsilon(t)$ on Ω_ε .

In order to show the strong convergence of $\hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t)$, we note that the boundedness of $\hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t)$ in $L^p(\Omega)$ allows us to pass to a subsequence, which we still denote by $\hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t)$, such that $\hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t)$ converges weakly to a function $\hat{q}(t) \in L^2(\Omega)$. Now, we consider $\varphi_\varepsilon = \operatorname{div}^{-1}(\hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t))$, which converges weakly to $\varphi = \operatorname{div}^{-1}(\hat{q}(t))$ in $H^1(\Omega)$, where div^{-1} is given by Lemma 3.10. Then, we obtain from (45) and (44)

$$(\hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t), \operatorname{div}(\varphi_\varepsilon - \varphi))_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \leq C(\|\varphi_\varepsilon - \varphi\|_\Omega + \varepsilon \|\nabla(\varphi_\varepsilon - \varphi)\|_\Omega).$$

The compact embedding of $H^1(\Omega)$ into $L^2(\Omega)$ implies that $\|\varphi_\varepsilon - \varphi\|_\Omega \rightarrow 0$. Since $\|\nabla(\varphi_\varepsilon - \varphi)\|_\Omega$ is bounded, we obtain

$$(\hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t), \hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t) - \hat{q}(t)) = (\hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t), \operatorname{div}(\varphi_\varepsilon - \varphi))_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0.$$

By using additionally the weak convergence of $\hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t)$, we obtain

$$\left\| \hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t) - \hat{q}(t) \right\|_\Omega^2 \leq (\hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t), \hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t) - \hat{q}_\varepsilon(t)) - (\hat{q}(t), \hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t) - \hat{q}_\varepsilon(t)) \rightarrow 0,$$

which shows the strong convergence of $\hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t)$.

The explicit formula (42) of $\hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t)$ can be directly transferred from [All89]. \square

In the second step, we pass to the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ in the divergence condition (15) and derive the microscopic incompressibility condition (39) and macroscopic compressibility condition (40).

Lemma 4.10. *Let $\hat{w}_\varepsilon \in L^{p_s}(S; \Omega_\varepsilon)$ be the first part of the solution of (14)–(15) and $\widetilde{w}_\varepsilon$ defined as in Theorem 4.8. Then, there exists, for a.e. $t \in S$, a subsequence $\widetilde{w}_\varepsilon(t)$ and $\hat{w}_0(t) \in H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^p)$ such that, for this subsequence, $\widetilde{w}_\varepsilon(t)$ and $\varepsilon \nabla \widetilde{w}_\varepsilon(t)$ two-scale converge to $\hat{w}_0(t)$ and $\nabla_y \hat{w}_0(t)$, respectively. Furthermore, $\hat{w}_0(t)$ satisfies (39) and (40).*

Proof. The uniform estimate (16) implies that $\widetilde{w}_\varepsilon(t)$ and $\varepsilon \nabla \widetilde{w}_\varepsilon(t)$ are bounded as well. Then, by a standard two-scale compactness result there exists, for a.e. $t \in S$, a subsequence and a function $\hat{w}_0(t) \in L^2(\Omega; H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y))^N$ such that for this subsequence $\widetilde{w}_\varepsilon(t) \rightarrow w_0(t)$ and $\varepsilon \nabla \widetilde{w}_\varepsilon(t) \rightarrow \nabla_y w_0(t)$ in the two-scale sense. Using arbitrary two-scale test functions $\varphi \in C(\overline{\Omega}; C_{\#}^\infty(Y))^N$ which are 0 on $\Omega \times Y^p$ shows $w_0(t) = 0$ in $\Omega \times Y^s$, which means $w_0(t) \in H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^p)$.

By applying the estimates of Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 3.13 on the incompressibility condition (15), we obtain

$$\|\operatorname{div}(A_\varepsilon(t)\hat{w}_\varepsilon(t))\|_{L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)} = \|\operatorname{div}(A_\varepsilon(t)\hat{v}_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}(t))\|_{L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)} \leq C(t)$$

for a.e. $t \in S$ for $C \in L^{p_s}(S)$. Using this estimate, the Y -periodicity of \hat{w}_0 , $A_0(t)$ and the two-scale test functions as well as the strong two-scale convergence of the coefficients given by Lemma 4.7, we can conclude for $\theta \in D(\Omega; C_{\#}^\infty(Y))$ and for a.e. $t \in S$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y^p} \operatorname{div}_y(A_0(t, x, y)\hat{w}_0(t, x, y))\theta(x, y)dydx \\ &= - \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y^p} A_0(t, x, y)\hat{w}_0(t, x, y) \cdot \nabla_y \theta(x, y)dydx \\ &= - \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} A_\varepsilon(t, x)\hat{w}_\varepsilon(t, x) \cdot \left(\varepsilon \nabla_1 \theta\left(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) + \nabla_y \theta\left(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) \right) dx \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \varepsilon \operatorname{div}(A_\varepsilon(t, x)\hat{w}_\varepsilon(t, x))\theta\left(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) dx = 0. \end{aligned}$$

By the density of $D(\Omega; C_{\#}^\infty(Y))$ in $L^2(\Omega; L^2(Y^p))$, we obtain the microscopic incompressibility condition (39).

In order to derive the macroscopic compressibility condition, we test (15) with $\theta \in D(\Omega)$ and pass to the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Using the two-scale convergence of $A_\varepsilon(t)$

and $\hat{v}_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}(t)$ and their derivatives yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{div}_x \left(\int_{Y^{\mathbb{P}}} A_0(t, x, y) \hat{w}_0(t, x, y) dy \right) \theta(x) dx \\
&= - \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y^{\mathbb{P}}} A_0(t, x, y) \hat{w}_0(t, x, y) dy \cdot \nabla_x \theta(x) dx \\
&= - \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} A_\varepsilon(t, x, y) \hat{w}_\varepsilon(t, x) \cdot \nabla_x \theta(x) dx = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \operatorname{div}_x (A_\varepsilon(t, x) \hat{w}_\varepsilon(t, x)) \theta(x) dx \\
&= - \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \operatorname{div}_x (A_\varepsilon(t, x) \hat{v}_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}(t, x)) \theta(x) dx \\
&= - \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y^{\mathbb{P}}} \operatorname{div}_y (A_0(t, x, y) \hat{v}_{\Gamma}(t, x, y)) dy \theta(x) dx.
\end{aligned}$$

By the density of $D(\Omega)$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$, we can conclude the macroscopic compressibility condition (40). \square

In the third step, we can pass to the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ in (41).

Proof of Theorem 4.8. Employing Lemma 4.10 and Lemma 4.9, there exists, for a.e. $t \in S$, a subsequence, $\hat{q}(t) \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $\hat{w}(t) \in L^2(\Omega; H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^{\mathbb{P}}))$ such that, for this subsequence, $\hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t)$ converges strongly to $\hat{q}(t)$, $\widehat{w}_\varepsilon(t)$ and $\varepsilon \nabla \widehat{w}_\varepsilon(t)$ two-scale converge weakly to $\hat{w}_0(t)$ and $\nabla_y \hat{w}_0(t)$, respectively. We consider this subsequence in the following.

Let $\varphi \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega}; C_{\Gamma\#}^\infty(Y^{\mathbb{P}}))^N$ such that $\operatorname{div}_y(\varphi) = 0$. Then, we test (41) with $\varphi(\cdot, x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon})$ and pass to the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, which yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y^{\mathbb{P}}} \nu A_0(t, x, y) \hat{e}_{y,t}(\hat{w}_0(t, x, y)) : \nabla_y (A_0^{-1}(t, x, y) \varphi(x, y)) dy dx \\
& - \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y^{\mathbb{P}}} \hat{q}(t, x) \operatorname{div}_x(\varphi(x, y)) = \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y^{\mathbb{P}}} \Psi_0^\top(t, x, y) f(t, x) \cdot \varphi(x, y) dy dx \\
(47) \quad & - \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y^{\mathbb{P}}} (\nabla_x p_b(t, x) + \nabla_y \hat{p}_{b,1}(t)) \cdot \varphi(x, y) dy dx
\end{aligned}$$

for any $\varphi \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega}; C_{\Gamma\#}^\infty(Y))^N$ such that $\operatorname{div}_y(\varphi) = 0$. Since $C^\infty(\overline{\Omega}; C_{\Gamma\#}^\infty(Y^{\mathbb{P}}))^N$ is dense in $L^2(\Omega; H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^{\mathbb{P}}))$ and $\operatorname{div}_y : L^2(\Omega; H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^{\mathbb{P}})) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega \times Y^{\mathbb{P}})$ is continuous, (47) holds for every $\varphi \in L^2(\Omega; H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^{\mathbb{P}}))$ with $\operatorname{div}_y(\varphi) = 0$.

Moreover, the following integration by parts shows that we can omit $\nabla_y \hat{p}_{b,1}(t)$

$$\int_{\Omega} \int_{Y^{\mathbb{P}}} \nabla_y \check{\psi}_0^{-1} \nabla p_b(t) \cdot \varphi(x, y) dy dx = - \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y^{\mathbb{P}}} \nabla_y \hat{p}_{b,1}(t) \operatorname{div}_y(\varphi(x, y)) dy dx = 0.$$

The boundary term in this integration by parts vanish since $p_{b,1}(t)$ is Y -periodic. Now, we choose $\varphi = \phi \phi_i$ in (47), for $\phi \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$ and $\phi_i \in H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^{\mathbb{P}})^N$, with $\phi_i = 0$ in Y^s , $\operatorname{div}(\phi_i) = 0$ and $\int_{Y^{\mathbb{P}}} \phi_i(y) dy = e_i$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ (for the existence of ϕ_i see

[Mir16, Lemma 6]), and obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} -\hat{q}(t, x) \partial_{x_i} \phi(x) - G_i(t, x) \varphi(x) dx = 0$$

for

$$\begin{aligned} G(t, x) = & - \int_{Y^P} \nu A_0(t, x, y) \hat{e}_{y,t}(\hat{w}_0(t, x, y)) : \nabla_y (A_0^{-1}(t, x, y) \varphi(x, y)) dy \\ & + \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y^P} (\Psi_0^{\top}(t, x, y) f(t, x) - \nabla_x p_b(t, x)) \cdot \varphi(x, y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

Since $G_i(t) \in L^2(\Omega)$ it follows that $\hat{q}(t) \in H_0^1(\Omega)$.

Employing the Bogovskiĭ-operator on Y^P , we obtain that $\text{div} : L^2(\Omega; H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^P)) \supset L^2(\Omega; H_0^1(Y^P)) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega; L_0^2(Y^P))$ is surjective. Then, the closed-range theorem gives $\hat{q}_1(t) \in L^2(\Omega; L_0^2(Y^P))$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y^P} \nu A_0(t, x, y) \hat{e}_{y,t}(\hat{w}_0(t, x, y)) : \nabla_y (A_0^{-1}(t, x, y) \varphi(x, y)) dy dx \\ & + \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y^P} \nabla_x \hat{q}_0(t, x) \cdot \varphi(x, y) + \hat{q}_1(t) \text{div}_y(\varphi(x, y)) dy dx \\ (48) \quad & = \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y^P} (\Psi_0^{\top}(t, x, y) f(t, x) - \nabla p_b(t, x)) \cdot \varphi(x, y) dy dx \end{aligned}$$

for all $\varphi \in L^2(\Omega; H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^P))$. Since $A_0^{-1}(t)$ is invertible (48) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y^P} \nu A_0(t, x, y) \hat{e}_{y,t}(\hat{w}_0(t, x, y)) : \nabla_y \varphi(x, y) dy dx \\ & + \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y^P} A_0^{\top}(t, x, y) \nabla_x \hat{q}(t, x) \cdot \varphi(x, y) + \hat{q}_1(t) \text{div}_y(A_0(t, x, y) \varphi(x, y)) dy dx \\ (49) \quad & = \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y^P} (J_0(t, x, y) f(t, x) - A_0(t, x, y) \nabla p_b(t, x)) \cdot \varphi(x, y) dy dx. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, (39)–(40) follow from Lemma 4.10. Then, the microscopic incompressibility condition (39), the Y -periodicity and the zero boundary values of φ on Γ imply that

$$\int_{Y^P} \nu A_0(t, x, y) (\Psi_0^{-\top}(t, x, y) \nabla \hat{w}(t, x, y))^{\top} : \nabla \varphi(y) dy = 0$$

for all $\varphi \in H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^P)$, which simplifies (49) to (38). Since (38)–(40) has a unique solution (cf. Theorem 4.12), the convergence holds for the whole sequence. \square

In order to show the existence and uniqueness of the solution of (38)–(40), we derive the following inf-sup estimate for the div-conditions.

Lemma 4.11. *There exists a constant $C \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$(50) \quad \sup_{v \in L^2(\Omega; H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^P))} \frac{(A_0(t)v, \nabla \phi_0)_{\Omega \times Y^P} - (\text{div}_y(A_0(t)v), \phi_1)_{\Omega \times Y^P}}{\|v\|_{L^2(\Omega; H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^P))} \|(\phi_0, \phi_1)\|_{H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega; L_{0\#}^2(Y^P))}} \geq \beta$$

for a.e. $t \in S$ and any $(\phi_0, \phi_1) \in H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega; L_{0\#}^2(Y^P))$.

Proof. Let $(\phi_0, \phi_1) \in H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega; L_0^2(Y^P))$. From the Bogovskii-operator, we obtain $u \in L^2(\Omega; H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^P))$ such that

$$\operatorname{div}_y(u) = \phi_1, \quad \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega; H_0^1(Y^P))} \leq C \|\phi_1\|_{L^2(\Omega; L_{0\#}^2(Y^P))}$$

for a constant C which only depends on Ω and Y^P and not on ϕ_1 .

We define the functions $v_1, \dots, v_n \in H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^P)^N$ as the solutions of the following Stokes problems: Find $(v_i, p_i) \in H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^P)^N \times L_0^2(Y^P)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} (\nabla v_i, \nabla \varphi)_{Y^P} - (p_i, \operatorname{div}(v_i))_{Y^P} &= (e_i, \varphi)_{Y^P}, \\ (\operatorname{div}(v_i), \phi)_{Y^P} &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

for any $(\varphi, \phi) \in H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^P)^N \times L_0^2(\Omega)$. Choosing $\varphi = v_j$ gives

$$(51) \quad A := \begin{pmatrix} \vdots & & \vdots \\ \int_{Y^P} v_1(y) dy & \cdots & \int_{Y^P} v_n(y) dy \\ \vdots & & \vdots \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (\nabla v_1, \nabla v_1)_{Y^P} & \cdots & (\nabla v_1, \nabla v_n)_{Y^P} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ (\nabla v_n, \nabla v_1)_{Y^P} & \cdots & (\nabla v_n, \nabla v_n)_{Y^P} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ are linearly independent in $H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^P)^N$, A is symmetric and positive definite. This guarantees that the following boundary-value problem is well-defined: Find a solution $w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$(52) \quad (A \nabla w, \nabla \varphi)_\Omega = (\nabla \phi_0, \nabla \varphi)_\Omega + \left(\int_{Y^P} u(\cdot, y) dy, \nabla \varphi \right)_\Omega$$

for any $\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$.

By the Theorem of Lax–Milgram, we obtain unique solutions $w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, which can be estimated by

$$(53) \quad \|w\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} \leq C(\|\phi_0\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} + \|u\|_{\Omega \times Y^P}).$$

We define $v(x, y) := A_0^{-1}(t, x, y) (\sum_{i=1}^n v_i(y) \partial_{x_i} w(x) - u(x, y))$ and estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega; H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^P))} &\leq C(\|w\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} + \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega; H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^P))}) \\ &\leq C(\|\phi_0\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} + \|\phi_1\|_{L^2(\Omega; L_{0\#}^2(Y^P))}). \end{aligned}$$

for C independent of t . Then, we obtain

$$(A_0(t)v, \nabla \phi_0)_{\Omega \times Y^P} = \left(A \nabla w - \int_{Y^P} u(\cdot, y) dy, \nabla \phi_0 \right)_\Omega = (\nabla \phi_0, \nabla \phi_0)_\Omega,$$

$$\operatorname{div}_y(A_0(t)v) = \sum_{i=1}^n \operatorname{div}_y(v_i(y)) \partial_{x_i} w(x) - \operatorname{div}_y(u(x, y)) = -\phi_1(x).$$

Using this explicitly constructed v , we can conclude (50) for $C > 0$, which is independent of t . \square

Theorem 4.12. *There exists a unique solution $(\hat{w}_0, \hat{q}, \hat{q}_1) \in L^p(S; L^2(\Omega; H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^P))) \times L^p(S; H_0^1(\Omega)) \times L^p(S; L^2(\Omega; L_{0\#}^2(Y^P)))$ of (38)–(40).*

Proof. Note that the existence of a solution for a.e. $t \in S$ is, up to the measurability with respect to time, already secured by the homogenisation process. However, it remains to prove the uniqueness. We rewrite (38)–(40) in the setting of the generic saddle-point formulation of Lemma 3.2. Therefore, we define the following time-dependent bilinear forms:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (54) \quad & a_t : L^2(\Omega; H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^P)) \times L^2(\Omega; H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^P)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \\
 & (v, w) \mapsto (\nu A_0(t) \Psi_0^{-\top}(t) \nabla_y v, \nabla_y w)_{\Omega \times Y^P}, \\
 & b_t : L^2(\Omega; H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^P)) \times (H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega; L_0^2(Y^P))) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \\
 (55) \quad & (v, (p_0, p_1)) \mapsto (A_0^\top(t) \nabla_x p_0, v)_{\Omega \times Y^P} - (p_1, \operatorname{div}_y(A_0(t)v))_{\Omega \times Y^P}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Using the time-independent boundedness of the transformation $\psi_0(t)$, the boundedness of $J_0 \geq c_J$ from below and the Poincaré inequality for $H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^P)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 a_t(v, v) &= (\nu J_0(t) \Psi_0^{-\top}(t) \nabla_y v, \Psi_0^{-\top}(t) \nabla_y v)_{\Omega \times Y^P} \geq \nu c_J \|\Psi_0^{-\top}(t) \nabla_y v\|_{L^2(\Omega; H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^P))}^2 \\
 &\geq \nu c_J \|\Psi_0^\top\|_{L^\infty(S \times \Omega \times Y^P)}^{-2} \|\nabla_y v\|_{\Omega \times Y^P}^2 \geq C \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega; H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^P))}^2, \\
 a_t(v, w) &\leq \left\| \sqrt{J_0} \Psi_0^{-\top} \right\|_{L^\infty(S \times \Omega \times Y^P)}^2 \|\nabla_y v\|_{\Omega \times Y^P} \|\nabla_y w\|_{\Omega \times Y^P} \\
 &\leq C \|w\|_{L^2(\Omega; H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^P))} \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega; H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^P))}
 \end{aligned}$$

for any $v, w \in L^2(\Omega; H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^P))$ for a time-independent constant C .

Now, let $(v, (p_0, p_1)) \in L^2(\Omega; H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^P)) \times (H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega; L_0^2(Y^P)))$. Using the product rule, as well as the Poincaré inequalities for $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^P)$, yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 b_t(v, (p_0, p_1)) &= (J_0(t) \Psi_0^{-\top}(t) \nabla_x p_0, v)_{\Omega \times Y^P} - (p_1, \operatorname{div}_y(J_0(t) \Psi_0^{-1}(t)v))_{\Omega \times Y^P} \\
 &\leq C \|\nabla p_0\|_{\Omega} \|v\|_{\Omega \times Y^P} + C \|p_1\|_{\Omega \times Y^P} \|v\|_{\Omega \times Y^P} + C \|p_1\|_{\Omega \times Y^P} \|\nabla v\|_{\Omega \times Y^P} \\
 &\leq C(\|p_0\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} + \|p_1\|_{\Omega \times Y^P}) \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega; H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^P))}
 \end{aligned}$$

for a time-independent constant C .

From Lemma 4.11, we get a time-independent inf-sup constant for b_t .

Since the right-hand sides of (38)–(40) can be bounded pointwise for a.e. $t \in S$ by $C \in L^{p_s}(S)$, we can conclude for a.e. $t \in S$ with Lemma 3.2 the existence of a unique solution $(\hat{w}(t), \hat{q}(t), \hat{q}_1(t)) \in L^2(\Omega; H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^P)) \times H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega; L_0^2(Y^P))$ such that

$$(56) \quad \|\hat{w}(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega; H_{\Gamma\#}^1(Y^P))} + \|\hat{q}(t)\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\hat{q}_1(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega; L_0^2(Y^P))} \leq C(t)$$

for $C \in L^p(S)$

Using the same argumentation as in the proof of Theorem 3.1, we obtain additionally the measurability of $(\hat{w}_0, \hat{q}, \hat{q}_1)$ with respect to time. \square

5. THE LIMIT PROBLEM IN THE EVOLVING DOMAIN

5.1. Back-transformation of the limit problem. Now, we transform the two-pressure Stokes problem (38)–(40) from the cylindrical substitute domain into the actual two-scale domain. The result is the two-pressure Stokes problem (57)–(59), which does not depend on the transformation ψ_0 . Thereby, the two-scale-transformation method (cf. [Wie21]) transforms the two-scale convergence results

of the substitute problem (cf. Theorem 4.8) into two-scale convergence results of the untransformed setting (cf. Theorem 5.1).

Moreover, the homogenisation of the Stokes problem yields not only the two-scale convergence for the pressure but a strong convergence for an appropriate extension of it (cf. Lemma 4.9). Using the two-scale-transformation method, we can transform the strong convergence of \hat{Q} back and obtain the strong convergence for the back-transformed extension of the pressure $Q' = \hat{Q} \circ \psi_\varepsilon^{-1}$ (cf. Lemma 5.4). Indeed Q' is some extension of the pressure of the original problem but this extension is not transformation-independent. Nevertheless, it can be used in order to show the strong convergence for the extension of the pressure Q_ε which we have chosen in Theorem 5.5. This extension is the transformation-independent counterpart of the extension of Lemma 4.9 for the untransformed setting.

In the last step, we separate the y -dependency in the two-pressure Stokes problem (57)–(59) and derive the Darcy law for evolving microstructure (7)–(9).

Theorem 5.1. *Let $(w_\varepsilon, q_\varepsilon) \in L^{p_s}(S; H_{\Gamma_\varepsilon(t)}^1(\Omega_\varepsilon(t))) \times L^{p_s}(S; L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon(t)))$ be the solution of (11)–(12) and let $(\widetilde{w}_\varepsilon, \widetilde{q}_\varepsilon) \in L^{p_s}(S; H^1(\Omega)) \times L^{p_s}(S; L^2(\Omega))$ be the corresponding extensions by 0. Then, for a.e. $t \in S$, $\widetilde{w}_\varepsilon(t), \varepsilon \nabla \widetilde{w}_\varepsilon(t)$ and $\widetilde{q}_\varepsilon(t)$ two-scale converge weakly with respect to the L^2 -norm to $\widetilde{w}_0(t), \nabla \widetilde{w}_0(t)$ and $\chi_{Y_x^p(t)} q(t)$, respectively, where \widetilde{w}_0 is the extension of w_0 by 0 on $S \times \Omega \times Y$ and (w_0, q, q_1) the solution of (57)–(59). Moreover, for every $p \in (1, 2)$, $\widetilde{q}_\varepsilon(t)$ two-scale converge weakly with respect to the L^p -norm to $\chi_{Y_x^p(t)} q(t)$.*

The transformation-independent two-pressure Stokes problem in the actual two-scale domain is given by: Find $(w_0, q, q_1) \in L^{p_s}(S; L^2(\Omega; H_{\Gamma(t)}^1(Y_x^p(t)))) \times L^{p_s}(S; H_0^1(\Omega)) \times L^{p_s}(S; L^2(\Omega; L_0^2(Y_x^p(t))))$ such that

$$\int_{\Omega} \int_{Y_x^p(t)} \nu \nabla_y v_0(t, x, y) : \nabla_y \varphi(x, y) + \nabla_x q(t, x) \cdot \varphi(x, y) dy dx$$

(57)

$$- \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y_x^p(t)} q_1(t, x, y) \operatorname{div}(\varphi(x, y)) dy dx = \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y_x^p(t)} (f(t, x) + \nabla_x p_b(t, x)) \cdot \varphi(x, y) dy dx$$

(58)

$$\int_{\Omega} \int_{Y_x^p(t)} \operatorname{div}_y(v_0(t, x, y)) \phi_1(x, y) dy dx = 0$$

(59)

$$\int_{\Omega} \operatorname{div}_x \left(\int_{Y_x^p(t)} v_0(t, x, y) dy \right) \phi_0(x) dx = \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y_x^p(t)} \operatorname{div}_y(v_\Gamma(t, x, y)) dy \phi_0(x) dx$$

for every $(\varphi, \phi_0, \phi_1) \in L^2(\Omega; H_{\Gamma(t)\#}^1(Y_x^p(t))) \times H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega; L_0^2(Y_x^p(t)))$.

Proof. Let $\widetilde{w}_\varepsilon, \widetilde{q}_\varepsilon$ be defined as in Theorem 5.1. Then, we obtain from Lemma 2.4 that $\widetilde{w}_\varepsilon(t, \psi_\varepsilon(t, \cdot_x)) = \widehat{w}_\varepsilon(t, \cdot_x)$ and $\widetilde{q}_\varepsilon(t, \psi_\varepsilon(t, \cdot_x)) = \hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t, \cdot_x) \chi_{\Omega_\varepsilon}$ for a.e. $t \in S$. The two-scale transformation rule (cf. Theorem 4.4) provides, for a.e. $t \in S$, that $\widetilde{w}_\varepsilon(t)$ and $\nabla \widetilde{w}_\varepsilon(t)$ two-scale converge to $\widetilde{w}_0(t, \cdot_x, \cdot_y) = \widehat{w}_0(t, \cdot_x, \psi_0^{-1}(t, \cdot_x, \cdot_y))$ and $\nabla_y \widetilde{w}_0(t, x, y)$, respectively, where \widehat{w}_0 is the two-scale limit of \widehat{w}_ε given by Theorem

4.8. Moreover, the strong convergence of $\hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t)$ to $\hat{q}(t)$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ and the strong two-scale convergence of $\chi_{\Omega_\varepsilon}$ to χ_{Y^P} with respect to every L^p -norm for $p \in (1, \infty)$ gives the strong two-scale convergence of $\tilde{q}_\varepsilon(t) = \chi_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t, \cdot_x)$ to $\chi_{Y^P} \hat{q}(t)$ with respect to every L^p -norm for $p \in (1, 2)$. Theorem 4.5 transforms this into the strong two-scale convergence of $\tilde{q}_\varepsilon(t)$ to $\chi_{Y_x^P(t)} \hat{q}(t)$ with respect to every L^p -norm for $p \in (1, 2)$. In order to obtain additionally the weak two-scale convergence with respect to the L^2 -norm, it is sufficient to show that $\|\tilde{q}_\varepsilon(t)\|_\Omega$ is bounded. By transforming \tilde{q}_ε back and using the uniform boundedness of J_ε and the estimate on $\hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t)$ (see (46)), we obtain this boundedness

$$(60) \quad \|\tilde{q}_\varepsilon(t)\|_\Omega = \left\| \sqrt{J_\varepsilon(t)} \hat{Q}_\varepsilon \right\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \leq \left\| \sqrt{J_\varepsilon(t)} \hat{Q}_\varepsilon \right\|_\Omega \leq C.$$

We still have to derive the transformation-independent limit problem (57)–(59) in its actual coordinates. Therefore, we test (38)–(40) with $\hat{\varphi}(x, y) = \varphi(x, \psi_0(t, x, y))$ and transform the Y^P -integral with $\psi_0^{-1}(t, x, \cdot_y)$. Then, we obtain:

$$(61) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y_x^P(t)} \nu \nabla_y w_0(t, x, y) : \nabla_y \varphi(x, y) dy dx \\ & + \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y_x^P(t)} \Psi_0^\top(t, x, \psi_0^{-1}(t, x, y)) (\nabla_x q(t, x) + \nabla_x p_b(t, x)) \cdot \varphi(x, y) dy dx \end{aligned}$$

$$(62) \quad - \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y_x^P(t)} \hat{q}_1(t, x, \psi_0^{-1}(t, x, y)) \operatorname{div}(\varphi(x, y)) dy dx = \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y_x^P(t)} f(t, x) \cdot \varphi(x, y) dy dx$$

$$(63) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y_x^P(t)} \operatorname{div}_y(v_0(t, x, y)) \phi_1(x, y) dy dx = 0 \\ & \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{div}_x \left(\int_{Y_x^P(t)} \Psi_0^{-\top}(t, x, \psi_0^{-1}(t, x, y)) v_0(t, x, y) dy \right) \phi_0(x) dx \end{aligned}$$

$$(64) \quad = \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y_x^P(t)} \operatorname{div}_y(v_\Gamma(t, x, y)) dy \phi_0(x) dx$$

Note that the transformation coefficients vanish in front of the y -derivatives because of the product rule. However, we want to get completely rid of them and note that

$$\Psi_0^{-\top}(t, x, \psi_0^{-1}(t, x, y)) = \nabla_y \psi_0^{-1}(t, x, y) = \mathbb{1} + \nabla_y \tilde{\psi}_0^{-1}(t, x, y).$$

Thus, we can rewrite the macroscopic pressure terms and obtain after integration by parts

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y_x^P(t)} \Psi_0^{-\top}(t, x, \psi_0^{-1}(t, x, y)) (\nabla_x q(t, x) + \nabla_x p_b(t, x)) \cdot \varphi(x, y) dy dx \\
&= \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y_x^P(t)} (\nabla_x q(t, x) + \nabla_x p_b(t, x)) \cdot \varphi(x, y) dy dx \\
&\quad + \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y_x^P(t)} \nabla_y \check{\psi}_0^{-1}(t, x, y) (\nabla_x q(t, x) + \nabla_x p_b(t, x)) \cdot \varphi(x, y) dy dx \\
&= \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y_x^P(t)} (\nabla_x q(t, x) + \nabla_x p_b(t, x)) \cdot \varphi(x, y) dy dx \\
(65) \quad & - \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y_x^P(t)} \check{\psi}_0^{-1}(t, x, y) (\nabla_x q(t, x) + \nabla_x p_b(t, x)) \operatorname{div}_y(\varphi(x, y)) dy dx.
\end{aligned}$$

The boundary integral, which arises in the integration by parts in (65), vanishes on $\partial Y^P \cap \partial Y$ because all the terms are Y -periodic and on $\partial Y^P \setminus \partial Y$ because $\varphi = 0$ there. As the last term of (65) has only a microscopic contribution, we can add it to the microscopic pressure. We define

$$q_1(t, x, y) := \hat{q}_1(t, x, \psi_0^{-1}(t, x, y)) + \check{\psi}_0^{-1}(t, x, y) \cdot (\nabla_x q(t, x) + \nabla_x p_b(t, x))$$

so that the pressure terms of (62) transform to the pressure terms in (57). By a similar argumentation, we rewrite the left-hand side of (64)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{div}_x \left(\int_{Y_x^P(t)} \Psi_0^{-\top}(t, x, \psi_0^{-1}(t, x, y)) v_0(t, x, y) dy \right) \varphi(x) dx \\
(66) \quad &= \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{div}_x \left(\int_{\Omega} \int_{Y_x^P(t)} v_0(t, x, y) + \check{\psi}_0^{-1}(t, x, y) \operatorname{div}_y(v_0(t, x, y)) dy \right) \varphi(x) dx.
\end{aligned}$$

The second summand on the right-hand side of (66) vanishes because of the microscopic incompressibility condition (63). Thus, we have rewritten the left-hand side of (64) into the left-hand side of (59). \square

For the case of a no-slip boundary condition at the interface Γ_ε , in which $v_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}(t, x) = \psi_\varepsilon(t, \psi_\varepsilon^{-1}(t, x))$ models the boundary deformation, we can simplify the right-hand side of the macroscopic compressibility condition (59) in the two-pressure Stokes system.

Corollary 5.2. *If v_{Γ_ε} is the velocity of the boundary deformation, i.e. $v_{\Gamma_\varepsilon} = \partial_t \psi_\varepsilon(t, \psi_\varepsilon^{-1}(t, x, y))$, the right-hand side of (40), and equivalently the right-hand side of (59), can be rewritten into*

$$(67) \quad - \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y^P} \operatorname{div}_y(A_0(t) \hat{v}_\Gamma(t, x, y)) dy \varphi_0(x) dx = - \int_{\Omega} \partial_t |Y_x^P(t)| \varphi_0(x) dx$$

Proof. First, we note that $v_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}(t, x, y) = \partial_t \psi_\varepsilon(t, \psi_\varepsilon^{-1}(t, x, y))$ yields $\hat{v}_{\Gamma_\varepsilon} = \partial_t \psi_\varepsilon$, which implies $\hat{v}_\Gamma = \partial_t \psi_0$. Thus, we can rewrite

$$-\int_{\Omega} \int_{Y^p} \operatorname{div}_y(A_0(t) \hat{v}_\Gamma(t, x, y)) dy \varphi_0(x) dx = -\int_{\Omega} \int_{Y^p} \operatorname{div}_y(A_0(t) \partial_t \psi_0(t, x, y)) dy \varphi_0(x) dx.$$

Then, the Piola identity implies $\operatorname{div}_y(J_0 \Psi_0^{-1} \partial_t \psi_0) = \partial_t J_0$, which gives

$$\begin{aligned} -\int_{\Omega} \int_{Y^p} \operatorname{div}_y(A_0(t) \partial_t \psi_0(t, x, y)) dy \varphi_0(x) dx &= -\int_{\Omega} \int_{Y^p} \partial_t J_0(t, x, y) dy \varphi_0(x) dx = \\ &= -\int_{\Omega} \partial_t \int_{Y_x^p(t)} dy \varphi_0(x) dx = -\int_{\Omega} \partial_t |Y_x^p(t)| \varphi_0(x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

□

In the next step, we consider the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ of the actual fluid velocity v_ε . Therefore, we extend v_ε on Ω by 0, which is not regularity preserving but conforms with the physical model that no fluid flow happens in the solid phase.

Corollary 5.3. *Let $v_\varepsilon := w_\varepsilon - v_{\Gamma_\varepsilon} \in L^{p_s}(S; H_{\Gamma_\varepsilon(t)}^1(\Omega_\varepsilon(t)))$, where w_ε is the solution of (11)–(12). Let $\widetilde{v}_\varepsilon$ and $\widetilde{\nabla} v_\varepsilon$ be the extension by zero on $\Omega \times Y$. Then, $\widetilde{v}_\varepsilon(t)$ and $\varepsilon \widetilde{\nabla} v_\varepsilon(t)$ two-scale converge to the extension by 0 of $w_0(t)$ and $\nabla_y w_0(t)$, respectively, where w_0 is the solution of (57)–(59).*

Proof. We note that $\widetilde{v}_\varepsilon(t) - \widetilde{w}_\varepsilon(t) = \chi_{\Omega_\varepsilon(t)} v_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}$ and $\widetilde{\nabla} v_\varepsilon(t) - \widetilde{\nabla} w_\varepsilon(t) = \chi_{\Omega_\varepsilon(t)} \nabla v_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}$. Since $\|v_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}(t)\|_\Omega + \varepsilon \|\nabla v_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}(t)\|_\Omega \leq \varepsilon C(t)$ for a.e. $t \in S$ for $C \in L^{p_s}(S)$, Theorem 5.1 gives the desired two-scale convergence. □

By transforming the extension of the pressure back, we obtain the following strong convergence result.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $Q'_\varepsilon(t, x) := \hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t, \psi_\varepsilon^{-1}(t, x))$, where \hat{Q}_ε is given by Lemma 4.9. Then, Q'_ε is an extension of q_ε , where q_ε is the solution of (11)–(12), and $Q'_\varepsilon(t)$ converges strongly to $q(t)$ in $L^p(\Omega)$ for a.e. $t \in S$ and every $p \in [1, 2)$. Moreover, $Q'_\varepsilon(t)$ two-scale converges weakly with respect to the L^2 -norm to $q(t)$.*

Proof. Theorem 4.8 shows that $\hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t)$ converges strongly in $L^2(\Omega)$ to $\hat{q}(t)$ for a.e. $t \in S$. This implies the strong two-scale convergence of $Q_\varepsilon(t)$ with respect to the L^2 -norm. Then, the two-scale transformation method translates this convergence into the strong convergence of $Q'_\varepsilon(t, x) := \hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t, \psi_\varepsilon^{-1}(t, x))$ to $q(t)$ with respect to the L^p -norm for $p \in (1, 2)$ (cf. Theorem 4.5). Since the two-scale limit $q(t)$ does not depend on y it does not have to be transformed back. Furthermore, because $q(t)$ is independent of y , the strong two-scale convergence with respect to the L^p -norm is equivalent to the strong convergence in $L^p(\Omega)$.

In order to prove additionally the weak two-scale convergence with respect to the L^2 -norm, it is sufficient to show that $\|Q'_\varepsilon(t)\|_\Omega$ is bounded. This boundedness follows immediately from the uniform boundedness of J_ε and the uniform boundedness of $\|\hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t)\|_\Omega$ (cf. (46)) by $\|Q'_\varepsilon(t)\|_\Omega = \left\| \sqrt{J_\varepsilon(t)} \hat{Q}_\varepsilon(t) \right\|_\Omega \leq C$. □

Note that the extension Q'_ε of q_ε given by Lemma 5.4 is not transformation-independent. In particular, if $\psi_\varepsilon(k + \varepsilon Y) \neq k + \varepsilon Y$ for $k \in I_\varepsilon$, it can be easily seen

that Q'_ε is not constant on $\psi_\varepsilon(k + \varepsilon Y^s) \neq k + \varepsilon Y \cap \Omega_\varepsilon^s(t)$. However, Lemma 5.4 makes it possible to prove the strong convergence for the following transformation-independent extension of q_ε , which is the counterpart of the extension in the substitute problem Q_ε (see. 4.9).

Theorem 5.5. *Assume that $|k + \varepsilon Y \cap \Omega_\varepsilon(t)| \geq c$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and $k \in I_\varepsilon$ with a time- and space-independent constant $c > 0$. Let*

(68)

$$Q_\varepsilon(t, x) := \begin{cases} q_\varepsilon(t, x) & \text{if } x \in \Omega_\varepsilon(t), \\ \frac{1}{|k + \varepsilon Y \cap \Omega_\varepsilon(t)|} \int_{k + \varepsilon Y \cap \Omega_\varepsilon(t)} q_\varepsilon(t, z) dz & \text{if } x \in k + \varepsilon Y \cap \Omega_\varepsilon^s(t) \text{ for } k \in I_\varepsilon, \end{cases}$$

where q_ε is the second part of the solution of (11)–(12). Then, for a.e. $t \in S$, $Q_\varepsilon(t)$ converges strongly in $L^p(\Omega)$, for every $p \in [1, 2)$ to $q(t)$, where $q \in L^{p_s}(S; H^1(\Omega))$ is the second part of the solution of (57)–(59). Moreover, $Q_\varepsilon(t)$ two-scale converges weakly with respect to the L^2 -norm to $q(t)$.

Proof. In order to prove the two-scale convergence, we use the unfolding operator $\mathcal{T}_\varepsilon : L^p(\Omega) \rightarrow L^p(\Omega \times Y)$, which was introduced in [CDG02] and the notations there. The unfolding operator allows us to translate between the strong two-scale convergence and the strong convergence in $L^p(\Omega \times Y)$ (cf. [Wie21]). Thus, $Q_\varepsilon(t)$ two-scale converges strongly to $q(t)$ if and only if $\mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(Q_\varepsilon(t))$ converges strongly in $L^p(\Omega \times Y)$ to $q(t)$. Using the definition of \mathcal{T}_ε , we can rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(Q_\varepsilon(t))(x, y) &= \begin{cases} q_\varepsilon(t, \varepsilon \left[\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right]_Y + \varepsilon y) & \text{if } \varepsilon \left[\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right]_Y + \varepsilon y \in \Omega_\varepsilon(t), \\ \frac{1}{|\Omega_\varepsilon(t) \cap \varepsilon \left[\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right]_Y + \varepsilon Y|} \int_{\varepsilon \left[\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right]_Y + \varepsilon Y} \tilde{q}_\varepsilon(t, z) dz & \text{if } \varepsilon \left[\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right]_Y + \varepsilon y \in \Omega_\varepsilon^s(t) \end{cases} \\ &= \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(\tilde{q}_\varepsilon(t))(x, y) + \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(\chi_{\Omega_\varepsilon^s(t)})(x, y) \frac{1}{|\Omega_\varepsilon(t) \cap \varepsilon \left[\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right]_Y + \varepsilon Y|} \int_Y \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(\tilde{q}_\varepsilon(t))(x, z) dz \\ (69) \quad &= \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(\tilde{q}_\varepsilon(t))(x, y) + \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(\chi_{\Omega_\varepsilon^s(t)})(x, y) \frac{1}{\int_Y \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(\chi_{\Omega_\varepsilon(t)})(x, z) dz} \int_Y \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(\tilde{q}_\varepsilon(t))(x, z) dz, \end{aligned}$$

where \tilde{q}_ε is the extension by 0 of q_ε .

In order to pass to the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we note that $\chi_{\Omega_\varepsilon}$ two-scale converges strongly to χ_{Y^p} with respect to the L^p -norm for every $p \in (1, \infty)$. Then, Theorem 4.5 implies that $\chi_{\Omega_\varepsilon(t)}$ two-scale converges strongly to $\chi_{Y_x^p(t)}$ with respect to every L^p -norm for $p \in (1, \infty)$, which is equivalent to

$$(70) \quad \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(\chi_{\Omega_\varepsilon(t)}) \rightarrow \chi_{Y_x^p(t)} \text{ in } L^p(\Omega \times Y) \text{ for every } p \in (1, \infty)$$

and gives also the strong convergence of $\mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(\chi_{\Omega_\varepsilon^s(t)})$ to $\chi_{Y \setminus Y_x^p(t)}$ in $L^p(\Omega \times Y)$ for every $p \in (1, \infty)$. Using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we obtain additionally the strong convergence of $\int_Y \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(\chi_{\Omega_\varepsilon(t)})(\cdot, z) dz$ to $\int_Y \chi_{Y_x^p(t)}(\cdot, z) dz$ in $L^p(\Omega)$ for every $p \in (1, \infty)$. Since $\int_Y \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(\chi_{\Omega_\varepsilon(t)})(\cdot, z) dz \geq c > 0$ is uniformly bounded from below

and $\int_Y \chi_{Y_x^p}(t)(\cdot_x, z) dz = \int_{Y^p} J_0(t, \cdot_x, z) dz \geq |Y^p| c_J > 0$ as well, we get

$$(71) \quad \left(\int_Y \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(\chi_{\Omega_\varepsilon(t)})(\cdot_x, z) dz \right)^{-1} \rightarrow \left(\int_Y \chi_{Y_x^p}(t)(z) dz \right)^{-1} \text{ in } L^p(\Omega) \text{ for every } p \in (1, \infty).$$

Moreover, we note that $\tilde{q}_\varepsilon(t) = \chi_{\Omega_\varepsilon(t)} Q'_\varepsilon$ for Q'_ε defined in Lemma 5.4. Then, the strong two-scale convergences of $\chi_{\Omega_\varepsilon(t)}$ and of $Q'_\varepsilon(t)$, which is given by Lemma 5.4, imply the strong two-scale convergence of $\tilde{q}_\varepsilon(t) = \chi_{\Omega_\varepsilon(t)} Q'_\varepsilon(t)$ to $\chi_{Y_x^p(t)} q(t)$ with respect to the L^p -norm for every $p \in (1, 2)$. Hence, we obtain

$$(72) \quad \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(\tilde{q}_\varepsilon(t)) \rightarrow \chi_{Y_x^p(t)} q(t) \text{ in } L^p(\Omega \times Y) \text{ for every } p \in (1, 2).$$

Using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we obtain additionally

$$(73) \quad \int_Y \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(\tilde{q}_\varepsilon(t))(\cdot_x, z) dz \rightarrow \int_Y \chi_{Y_x^p(t)} q(t)(\cdot_x, z) dz \text{ in } L^p(\Omega) \text{ for every } p \in (1, 2).$$

By combining (70), (71), (72) and (73), we can pass to the limit in (69) and obtain

$$(74) \quad \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(\tilde{q}_\varepsilon(t)) \rightarrow \chi_{Y_x^p(t)} q(t) + \chi_{Y \setminus Y_x^p(t)} \frac{1}{\int_Y \chi_{Y_x^p(t)}(z) dz} \int_Y \chi_{Y_x^p(t)} q(t) dz = q(t)$$

in $L^p(\Omega \times Y)$ for every $p \in (1, 2)$.

In order to obtain the weak two-scale convergence with respect to the L^2 -norm, we have to show the boundedness of $\|Q_\varepsilon\|_\Omega^2 = \|\tilde{q}_\varepsilon(t)\|_{\Omega(t)}^2 + \|Q_\varepsilon(t)\|_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_\varepsilon(t)}^2$. By employing the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q_\varepsilon(t)\|_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_\varepsilon(t)}^2 &= \sum_{k \in I_\varepsilon} \int_{k+\varepsilon Y} \left(\frac{1}{|k+\varepsilon Y \cap \Omega_\varepsilon(t)|} \int_{k+\varepsilon Y} \tilde{q}_\varepsilon(t, z) dz \right)^2 dy \\ &\leq \sum_{k \in I_\varepsilon} \int_{k+\varepsilon Y} C \|\tilde{q}_\varepsilon(t)\|_{k+\varepsilon Y}^2 dy \leq \sum_{k \in I_\varepsilon} C \|\tilde{q}_\varepsilon(t)\|_{k+\varepsilon Y}^2 \leq C \|q_\varepsilon(t)\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon(t)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we estimate with the uniform boundedness of J_ε and the estimate on \hat{q}_ε (cf. (16))

$$\|Q_\varepsilon(t)\|_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_\varepsilon(t)}^2 \leq C \|q_\varepsilon(t)\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon(t)}^2 = \left\| \sqrt{J_\varepsilon(t)} \hat{q}_\varepsilon(t) \right\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon}^2 \leq C \|\hat{q}_\varepsilon(t)\|_{\Omega_\varepsilon}^2 \leq C.$$

□

5.2. The Darcy law for evolving microstructure. In the last step, we derive the Darcy law (7)–(9) by separating the y -dependence in (57)–(59). It contains the time- and space-dependent permeability tensor $K \in L^\infty(S \times \Omega)^{N \times N}$, which can be computed explicitly by

$$(75) \quad K(t, x)_{ij} = (\nabla u_i(t, x), \nabla u_j(t, x))_{Y_x^p(t)},$$

where $u_i \in L^\infty(S \times \Omega; H_{\Gamma^\#}^1(Y_x^P(t)))$ are the unique solution of the local Stokes problems on the cell domains $Y_x^P(t)$,

$$\begin{aligned} (76) \quad & -\Delta_y u_i(t, x, y) - \nabla_y \pi_i(t, x, y) = e_i && \text{in } Y_x^P(t), \\ (77) \quad & \operatorname{div}(u_i(t, x, y)) = 0 && \text{in } Y_x^P(t), \\ (78) \quad & u_i(t, x, y) = 0 && \text{on } \partial\Gamma_x(t), \\ (79) \quad & y \mapsto \pi(t, x, y), u_i(t, x, y) && \text{is } Y\text{-periodic.} \end{aligned}$$

The corresponding weak formulation of (7)–(9) consists of the following Dirichlet boundary-value problem (80) for the pressure and the explicit equation for the fluid velocity (81), where $p = q + p_b$: Find $q \in L^{p_s}(S; H_0^1(\Omega))$ such that, for a.e. $t \in S$,

$$\begin{aligned} (80) \quad & \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\nu} K(t, x) \nabla_x q(t, x) \cdot \nabla \varphi dx = \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\nu} K(t, x) \nabla_x (f(t, x) - \nabla p_b(t, x)) \cdot \nabla \varphi dx \\ & - \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y^P} \operatorname{div}_y (v_{\Gamma}(t, x)) dy \varphi(x) dy dx \end{aligned}$$

for every $\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, where $K \in L^\infty(S \times \Omega)^{N \times N}$ is defined by (75) and let

$$(81) \quad v(t) = \frac{1}{\nu} K(t) (f(t) - \nabla_x p(t)),$$

where $p = q + p_b$.

In the case of Corollary 5.2, the last term of (80) can be simplified into

$$- \int_{\Omega} \int_{Y^P} \operatorname{div}_y (v_{\Gamma}(t, x, y)) dy \varphi(x) dy = \int_{\Omega} \partial_t |Y_x^P(t)| \varphi(x) dx$$

Theorem 5.6. *Let $(\tilde{v}_\varepsilon, Q_\varepsilon)$ be defined by Corollary 5.3 and Theorem 5.5, respectively. Then, for a.e. $t \in S$, $Q_\varepsilon(t)$ converges weakly with respect to the L^2 -norm to $q(t)$ and strongly with respect to the L^p -norm for every $p \in (1, 2)$, where $q \in L^{p_s}(S; H_0^1(\Omega))$ is the unique solution of (80). Moreover, $\tilde{v}_\varepsilon(t)$ converges weakly with respect to the L^2 -norm to $v(t)$, where $v \in L^{p_s}(S; L^2(\Omega))$ is given by (81).*

Proof. The linearity of (57) gives

$$(82) \quad v_0(t, x, y) = \frac{1}{\nu} \sum_{i=1}^N (f_i(t, x) - \partial_{x_i}(q(t, x) + p_b(t, x))) u_i(t, x, y),$$

$$(83) \quad q_1(t, x, y) = \frac{1}{\nu} \sum_{i=1}^N (\partial_{x_i}(q(t, x) + p_b(t, x)) - f_i(t, x)) \pi_i(t, x, y),$$

where (u_i, π_i) is the solution of (76)–(79) for $i = \{1, \dots, N\}$. Then, we obtain $v(t, x) = \frac{1}{\nu} K(t, x) (f(t, x) - (\nabla q(t, x) + \nabla p_b(t, x)))$ for $v(t, x) := \int_{Y^P} v_0(t, x, y) dy$ by taking the average over Y^P , which gives (81). Moreover, with (59), we obtain the compressibility condition $\operatorname{div}(v) = \int_{Y^P} v_{\Gamma}(t, x, y) dy$ and in the case of Corollary 5.2, we can simply it to $\operatorname{div}(v) = \partial_t |Y_x^P(t)|$. Combining this compressibility condition with (81) yields (80). \square

By stating the compressibility condition $\operatorname{div}(v) = \int_{Y^P} v_{\Gamma}(t, x, y) dy = \partial_t |Y_x^P(t)|$, which we have derived in the proof of Theorem 5.6 separately, we obtain the strong

formulation of the Darcy law for evolving microstructure (7)–(9). It differs in three points from the Darcy law for fixed microstructure (2). The first is the time- and space-dependent permeability tensor, which arises from the time- and space-dependent (evolving) microstructure. The second and most interesting difference is the macroscopic compressibility condition, which arises from the homogenisation of the inhomogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition. The last difference is the Dirichlet boundary condition in (7)–(9) which is caused from the homogenisation of the pressure boundary condition.

Remark 5.7. Instead of the homogenisation for a.e. $t \in S$ separately, the two-scale convergence with respect to the $L^{p_s}(S; L^p(\Omega))$ -norm for $1 < p_s, p < \infty$ could have been used. Thus, the assumption on the data (cf. Assumption 2.3) can be weakened accordingly.

Acknowledgements. *We would like to thank Markus Gahn for some useful comments on this subject.*

REFERENCES

- [All89] G. Allaire. “Homogenization of the Stokes Flow in a Connected Porous Medium”. In: *Asymptotic Analysis* 2 (1989), pp. 203–222.
- [All91] G. Allaire. “Continuity of the Darcy’s law in the low-volume fraction limit”. In: *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa* 18 (1991), pp. 475–499.
- [All92] G. Allaire. “Homogenization and two-scale convergence”. In: *Siam J. Math. Anal.* 23 (1992), pp. 1482–1518.
- [CDG02] D. Cioranescu, A. Damlamian, and G. Griso. “Periodic unfolding and homogenization”. In: *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I* 335 (2002), pp. 99–104.
- [Dar56] H. Darcy. *Les Fontaines Publiques de la Ville de Dijon*. 1856.
- [EM17] M. Eden and A. Muntean. “Homogenization of a fully coupled thermoelasticity problem for a highly heterogeneous medium with a priori known phase transformations”. In: *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.* 40 (2017), pp. 955–972.
- [GNP21] M. Gahn, M. Neuss-Radu, and I. S. Pop. “Homogenization of a reaction-diffusion-advection problem in an evolving micro-domain and including nonlinear boundary conditions”. In: *J. Differ. Equations* 289 (2021), pp. 95–127.
- [Kel80] J. B. Keller. “Darcy’s law for flow in porous media and the two-space method”. In: ed. by R. L. Sternberg. 54 vols. New York: Dekker, 1980, pp. 429–443.
- [Lio81] J. L. Lions. *Some Methods in the Mathematical Analysis of Systems and Their Control*. New York: Gordon and Breach, 1981.
- [LNW02] D. Lukkassen, G. Nguetseng, and P. Wall. “Two-scale convergence”. In: *Int. J. Pure Appl. Math.* 2 (2002), pp. 35–86.
- [Mir16] E. Miroshnikova. *Some new results in homogenization of flow in porous media with mixed boundary condition*. 2016.
- [Noo08] T. L. van Noorden. “Crystal precipitation and dissolution in a porous medium: Effective equations and numerical experiments”. In: *Multiscale Model. Simul.* 7 (2008), pp. 1220–1236.

- [PB09] M. A. Peter and M. Böhm. “Coupled reaction–diffusion processes inducing an evolution of the microstructure: Analysis and homogenization”. In: *Nonlinear Anal.* 70 (2009), pp. 806–821.
- [Pet07a] M. A. Peter. “Homogenisation in domains with evolving microstructure”. In: *C. R. Mecanique* 335 (2007), pp. 357–362.
- [Pet07b] M. A. Peter. “Homogenisation of a chemical degradation mechanism inducing an evolving microstructure”. In: *C. R. Mecanique* 335 (2007), pp. 679–684.
- [Pom03] W. Pompe. “Korn’s first inequality with variable coefficients and its generalization”. In: *Comment Math. Univ. Carol.* 44 (2003), pp. 57–70.
- [Ray+12] N. Ray et al. “Multiscale Modeling of Colloid and Fluid Dynamics in Porous Media Including an Evolving Microstructure”. In: *Transport in Porous Media* 95 (2012), pp. 669–696.
- [REK15] N. Ray, T. Elbinger, and P. Knabner. “Upscaling the flow and transport in an evolving porous medium with general interaction potentials”. In: *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* 75 (2015), pp. 2170–2192.
- [San80] E. Sanchez-Palencia. *Non-Homogeneous Media and Vibration Theory*. 1980.
- [SK17a] R. Schulz and P. Knabner. “An effective model for biofilm growth made by chemotactical bacteria in evolving porous media”. In: *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* 77 (2017), pp. 1653–1677.
- [SK17b] R. Schulz and P. Knabner. “Derivation and analysis of an effective model for biofilm growth in evolving porous media”. In: *Math. Method Appl. Sci.* 40 (2017), pp. 2930–2948.
- [Tar79] L. Tartar. Convergence of the homogenization process. In: *Appendix of [San80]*. 1979.
- [Wie21] D. Wiedemann. “The two-scale transformation method”. In: *arXiv:2106.13730* (2021).
- [Zhi94] V. V. Zhikov. “On the homogenization of the system of Stokes equations in a porous medium”. In: *Russian Acad. Sci. Dokl. Math.* 49 (1994), pp. 52–57.

(D.W.) INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF AUGSBURG, 86135 AUGSBURG, GERMANY
Email address: david.wiedemann@math.uni-augsburg.de

(M.A.P.) INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF AUGSBURG, 86135 AUGSBURG, GERMANY AND AUGSBURG CENTRE FOR INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES, UNIVERSITÄT AUGSBURG, 86135 AUGSBURG, GERMANY
Email address: malte.peter@math.uni-augsburg.de