

THE SHAKHOV MODEL NEAR A GLOBAL MAXWELLIAN

GI-CHAN BAE AND SEOK-BAE YUN

ABSTRACT. Shakhov model is a relaxation approximation of the Boltzmann equation proposed to overcome the deficiency of the original BGK model, namely, the incorrect production of the Prandtl number. In this paper, we address the existence and the asymptotic stability of the Shakhov model when the initial data is a small perturbation of global equilibrium. We derive a dichotomy in the coercive estimate of the linearized relaxation operator between zero and non-zero Prandtl number, and observe that the linearized relaxation operator is more degenerate in the former case. To remove such degeneracy and recover the full coercivity, we consider a micro-macro system that involves an additional non-conservative quantity related to the heat flux.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. The Shakhov model. The fundamental model describing the dynamics of rarefied gases at the mesoscopic level is the Boltzmann equation. But the complicated structure and the high dimensionality have long hindered the practical application of the Boltzmann equation. In this regard, the model equation introduced in [5, 47], has been popularly used to study various flow problems in place of the Boltzmann equation. However, it was soon revealed that this model, which goes by the BGK model, cannot achieve the correct Navier-Stokes limit in that the Prandtl number computed in the hydrodynamic limit is incorrect.

There have been two major remedies to overcome this drawback. The first such effort goes back to Holway [26], who extended the local Maxwellian into an ellipsoidal Gaussian to obtain an additional degree of freedom in computing the transport coefficients. On the other hand, Shakhov [40] suggested a way to get the correct Prandtl number by multiplying the Maxwellian with an extra term that adjusts the heat flux while leaving the collision invariant untouched. The price to pay for this adjustment is that the H-theorem holds only when the flow remains close to the fluid regime. Even with such apparent defect of the model, the Shakhov model has been widely used in various fields of rarefied gas dynamics, since it reproduces satisfactory qualitative features of the Boltzmann dynamics in many important flow problems [8, 13, 43, 44, 54, 55]. Especially, due to the non-triviality of the heat flux compared to that of the original BGK, it is reported that the Shakhov model works better for non-isothermal flows [13, 54]. To the best of the authors' knowledge, however, the existence of this important kinetic model has never been studied in the mathematical literature, which is the main motivation of the current work.

More precisely, we consider in this paper the following initial value problem of the Shakhov model:

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_t F + v \cdot \nabla_x F &= \frac{1}{\tau} (\mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F) - F), \\ F(x, v, 0) &= F_0(x, v). \end{aligned}$$

The unknown $F : \mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called the velocity distribution function where $F(x, v, t)$ is the number density of molecules in the phase space on the phase point (x, v) at

time t . We define the macroscopic density ρ , bulk velocity U , temperature T , stress tensor Θ , and the heat flux q as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \rho(x, t) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} F(x, v, t) dv, \\
 \rho(x, t)U(x, t) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} F(x, v, t)v dv, \\
 (1.2) \quad 3\rho(x, t)T(x, t) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} F(x, v, t)|v - U(x, t)|^2 dv, \\
 \rho\Theta_{ij}(x, t) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} F(x, v, t)(v_i - U_i(x, t))(v_j - U_j(x, t)) dv, \\
 q(x, t) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} F(x, v, t)(v - U(x, t))|v - U(x, t)|^2 dv.
 \end{aligned}$$

The Shakhov operator is defined as

$$(1.3) \quad \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F)(x, v, t) = \mathcal{M}(F) \left[1 + \frac{1 - Pr}{5} \frac{q(x, t) \cdot (v - U(x, t))}{\rho(x, t)T(x, t)^2} \left(\frac{|v - U(x, t)|^2}{2T(x, t)} - \frac{5}{2} \right) \right],$$

where Pr is the Prandtl number, $\mathcal{M}(F)$ is the standard local Maxwellian:

$$\mathcal{M}(F)(x, v, t) = \frac{\rho(x, t)}{\sqrt{2\pi T(x, t)}^3} \exp \left(-\frac{|v - U(x, t)|^2}{2T(x, t)} \right).$$

Although the stress tensor Θ does not explicitly appears in the definition (1.3), except through the relation:

$$(1.4) \quad 3T = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} \Theta_{ii},$$

we listed it in (1.2) since it will be crucially used in the analysis later. The relaxation time τ takes the following form [8, 32, 43, 48]:

$$(1.5) \quad \frac{1}{\tau} = \frac{1}{\tau_0} \rho^\eta T^w,$$

for some positive constant τ_0 and $\eta \geq 0$, $w \in \mathbb{R}$.

The Shakhov operator satisfies the following identities by construction (See Appendix.):

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F)(x, v, t) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ v \\ |v|^2 \end{pmatrix} dv = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} F(x, v, t) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ v \\ |v|^2 \end{pmatrix} dv,$$

which implies the conservation laws of the total mass, momentum, and energy:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (1.6) \quad & \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} F(x, v, t) dv dx = 0, \\
 & \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} F(x, v, t)v dv dx = 0, \\
 & \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} F(x, v, t)|v|^2 dv dx = 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

The H -theorem is proved only when the F is sufficiently close to the equilibrium in [40] (See Appendix.):

$$(1.7) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} F \ln F dv dx \leq 0.$$

We note that the Shakhov relaxation operator satisfies

$$(1.8) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F) - F)(v_i - U_i)|v - U|^2 dv = -Pr q_i(x, t).$$

This additional cancellation property explains why the Shakhov model has a bigger degeneracy in this case in the vanishing Prantl number regime (See Proposition 2.2). Finally, we mention that the Shakhov model is a generalization of the BGK model in the sense that it reduces to the original BGK model when $Pr = 1$.

1.2. Main results. In this paper, we consider the existence and asymptotic behavior of (1.1) when the initial data is close enough to the normalized global Maxwellian:

$$(1.9) \quad m(v) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^3}} e^{-\frac{|v|^2}{2}}.$$

We define the perturbation f by $F = m + \sqrt{m}f$, and derive following equation for f from (1.1):

$$(1.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f &= \frac{1}{\tau_0} L_{Pr} f + \Gamma(f), \\ f(x, v, 0) &= f_0(x, v). \end{aligned}$$

Here, $f_0(x, v) = (F_0(x, v) - m)/\sqrt{m}$, L_{Pr} , and $\Gamma(f)$ are the linear part and the non-linear part of the linearized relaxation operator (See Section 2 for precise definitions).

We define the energy functional:

$$(1.11) \quad \mathcal{E}(f)(t) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta| \leq N} \|\partial_\beta^\alpha f(t)\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2 + \sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta| \leq N} \int_0^t \|\partial_\beta^\alpha f(s)\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2 ds,$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{L_{x,v}^2}$ is the standard L^2 norm:

$$\|f\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} |f(x, v)|^2 dv dx,$$

and the multi-indices notation was employed for the differential operator:

$$\partial_\beta^\alpha = \partial_t^{\alpha_0} \partial_{x_1}^{\alpha_1} \partial_{x_2}^{\alpha_2} \partial_{x_3}^{\alpha_3} \partial_{v_1}^{\beta_1} \partial_{v_2}^{\beta_2} \partial_{v_3}^{\beta_3},$$

with $\alpha = (\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$, $\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3)$.

We now state the main result of this paper.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $N \geq 3$, and fix $Pr \geq 0$. Assume the initial data satisfies $F_0(x, v) = m + \sqrt{m}f_0(x, v) \geq 0$, and shares the same total mass, momentum and energy with the global equilibrium $m(v)$:*

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} F_0(x, v) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ v \\ |v|^2 \end{pmatrix} dv dx = \int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} m(v) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ v \\ |v|^2 \end{pmatrix} dv dx.$$

In the case of $Pr = 0$, we assume further that the total third moment of the initial data vanishes:

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} F_0(x, v) v |v|^2 dv dx = 0.$$

Then, there exists M such that if $\mathcal{E}(f_0) \leq M$, then there exists the unique global-in-time classical solution f to (1.10) satisfying

- (1) The distribution function F and the Shakhov operator are non-negative for $t \geq 0$:

$$F(x, v, t) = m + \sqrt{m} f(x, v, t) \geq 0, \quad \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F)(x, v, t) \geq 0,$$

and satisfies the conservation laws (2.22).

- (2) The energy functional is uniformly bounded:

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathcal{E}(f)(t) \leq C \mathcal{E}(f_0).$$

- (3) The perturbation f decays exponentially fast:

$$\sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta| \leq N} \|\partial_\beta^\alpha f(t)\|_{L_{x,v}^2} \leq C e^{-\delta t},$$

for some positive constant $C > 0$ and $\delta > 0$.

- (4) Let f and \bar{f} be solutions corresponding to initial data f_0 and \bar{f}_0 , respectively satisfying $\mathcal{E}(f_0) \leq M$ and $\mathcal{E}(\bar{f}_0) \leq M$. Then there exists positive constant C satisfying the following L^2 stability estimate:

$$\|f(t) - \bar{f}(t)\|_{L_{x,v}^2} \leq C \|f_0 - \bar{f}_0\|_{L_{x,v}^2}.$$

Remark 1.2. The study of the vanishing Prandtl number is not only mathematically interesting but also physically relevant even since it can be an approximate model for fluids with a very small Prandtl number. For example, in some thermoacoustic engines, a gas with a low Prandtl number plays a critical role because of its high heat diffusivity. For example, the authors in [3, 9] observed that some mixtures of light and heavy noble gases produce low Prandtl numbers. Besides, zero-Prandtl-number limit is considered in [42] to study the convection with extremely small Prandtl number such as the convection zone of the sun ($Pr \approx 10^{-8}$).

Remark 1.3. In the case of $Pr > 0$, the instant energy functional without the production term is sufficient to close the energy estimate as in [2]. But when $Pr = 0$, the production term must be incorporated into the energy functional. (See details in Proposition 5.1 step 3.)

1.3. Novelties & difficulties. To close the energy estimate to extend the local solution into the global one, it is important to identify the dissipative nature of the linear term L_{Pr} . In this regard, we observe the following dichotomy in the degeneracy of the dissipative estimate: When $Pr > 0$, we have

$$(1.12) \quad \langle L_{Pr} f, f \rangle_{L_v^2} \leq -\min\{Pr, 1\} \|(I - P_c) f\|_{L_v^2}^2,$$

where P_c is a projection operator on the linear space spanned by $\{\sqrt{m}, v\sqrt{m}, |v|^2\sqrt{m}\}$. On the other hand, the dissipation becomes more degenerate in the case $Pr = 0$:

$$(1.13) \quad \langle L_0 f, f \rangle_{L_{x,v}^2} = -\|(I - P_c - P_{nc}) f\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2,$$

where $P_{nc} f$ is a projection operator on the linear space spanned by non-conservative basis $\{|v|^2\sqrt{m}\}$, so that $P_c + P_{nc}$ constitutes a projection operator on a wider space spanned by 8 bases: $\{\sqrt{m}, v\sqrt{m}, |v|^2\sqrt{m}, v|v|^2\sqrt{m}\}$.

This additional degeneracy in the vanishing Prandtl number regime is due to the following cancellation property unobserved in the original BGK model or the Boltzmann equation:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\mathcal{S}_0(F) - F)(v_i - U_i)|v - U|^2 dv = 0,$$

which is obtained by putting $Pr = 0$ in (1.8). The larger kernel (1.13) indicates that the degeneracy is stronger in the vanishing Prandtl number regime since the dissipativity of L_{Pr} stops operating on the null space. In the case $Pr > 0$, the full dissipativity of L_{Pr} can be recovered by the standard argument [23, 25, 50]: the derivatives of the kernels are estimated using the micro-macro equations that govern the evolution of the degenerate part, and the lowest order estimates are derived by combining the derivative estimates and the Poincaré inequality with the vanishing moments of the perturbation up to the second order. On the other hand, when the Prandtl number vanishes, a novel difficulty unobserved in the previous literature arises: The micro-macro system now involves a non-conservative quantity, namely the heat flux part. This leads to a more complicated micro-macro system, and more seriously, the lowest order estimate of these new terms can not be treated in a similar manner as in the previous case, since the third-order moment of the perturbation related to the heat flux does not vanish. To overcome this, we assume that the total third moment of the initial data vanishes:

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} F_0(x, v) v_i |v|^2 dv dx = 0.$$

and use the evolution law for the third moment:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} f v_i (|v|^2 - 5) \sqrt{m} dv dx = \frac{1}{\tau} \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} 2U_i \rho T - \sum_{1 \leq j \leq 3} 2\rho U_j \Theta_{ij} dx \right),$$

to derive the following modified dissipation estimate:

$$\sum_{|\alpha| \leq N} \langle L_{Pr} \partial^\alpha f, \partial^\alpha f \rangle_{L^2_{x,v}} \leq -\delta \sum_{|\alpha| \leq N} \|\partial^\alpha f\|_{L^2_{x,v}}^2 + C\mathcal{E}^2(t),$$

for some positive constant $\delta > 0$, which enables one to construct the global-in-time classical solution.

1.4. Brief history. We briefly overview mathematical results on various BGK models.

(1) Original BGK model: The first existence result goes back to [36] where Perthame established the existence of global weak solutions of the BGK model. The uniqueness was guaranteed in a more stringent weighted L^∞ space in [37] (See [53] for L^p extension). The strong convergence to the Maxwellian is obtained by Desvillettes in [17]. For the stationary case, Ukai constructs the existence theorem with a large boundary data in a 1-dimensional bounded interval. The global-in-time classical solution of the BGK model near equilibrium can be found in [4, 48]. For the particle system immersed in a fluid described by the coupled equation of the Navier-Stokes equation and the BGK model, we refer to [14–16]. For the convergence analysis of numerical schemes of the BGK model, see [27, 38].

(2) ES-BGK model: The revival of interest in this model was brought due to the proof of the H-theorem provided in [1]. A systematic derivation of this model was suggested in [7]. The existence of a classical solution in the weighted L^∞ space was obtained in [49]. In [50], the asymptotic stability of global Maxwellians is considered. The entropy-entropy production estimate is derived in [29, 51]. Convergence analysis of a fully discretized scheme for ES-BGK model was made in [39]. For the mathematical results on the polyatomic version

of the ES-BGK model, we refer to [33–35, 52].

(3) Shakhov model: The mathematical research of the Shakhov model is in the initial state. In [28], the author considered the existence of the stationary 1-dimensional steady state. Latyshev and Yushkanov analytically solved a stationary boundary value problem of the Shakhov type equation in [30]. For the numeric scheme of the Shakhov model, we refer to [8, 32, 43, 44].

A brief review of the literature that compares the ES-BGK model and the Shakhov model is in order. [21] illustrates some numerical examples which indicate that the ES-BGK model works better than the Shakhov model for heat transfer problems. On the other hand, it is reported in [13] that the Shakhov model produces more accurate results under tough conditions such as the shock structure or some particular boundary conditions in the transition regime [13]. Besides, the Shakhov model can capture the velocity slip and the temperature jump near the wall more accurately, and shows good accuracy in predicting the non-equilibrium flow in transition regime [54]. See [55] for an organized comparison between these models.

The general mathematical and physical review of the Boltzmann and the BGK equation can be found in [1, 6, 10–12, 18–20, 45, 46].

1.5. Notations: The following notations, conventions, and definitions will be fixed throughout the paper.

- The constant C in an estimate denotes a generically defined constant.
- (x_1, \dots, x_n) is understood as an n -dimensional column vector.
- \mathbb{I}_n is the n -tuple of 1: $(1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^n$.
- 0^n stands for the n -dimension zero vector. For example $(1, 0^3) = (1, 0, 0, 0)$.
- We use the standard L_v^2 and $L_{x,v}^2$ inner product on \mathbb{R}_v^3 and $\mathbb{T}_x^3 \times \mathbb{R}_v^3$, respectively.

$$\langle f, g \rangle_{L_v^2} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f(v)g(v)dv, \quad \langle f, g \rangle_{L_{x,v}^2} = \int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} f(x, v)g(x, v)dvd x.$$

- We use the standard L_v^2 norm and $L_{x,v}^2$ norm on \mathbb{R}_v^3 and $\mathbb{T}_x^3 \times \mathbb{R}_v^3$, respectively.

$$\|f\|_{L_v^2} = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |f(v)|^2 dv \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \|f\|_{L_{x,v}^2} = \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} |f(x, v)|^2 dvd x \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

- We use the multi-indices notations $\alpha = (\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$, $\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3)$, and differential operator:

$$\partial_\beta^\alpha = \partial_t^{\alpha_0} \partial_{x_1}^{\alpha_1} \partial_{x_2}^{\alpha_2} \partial_{x_3}^{\alpha_3} \partial_{v_1}^{\beta_1} \partial_{v_2}^{\beta_2} \partial_{v_3}^{\beta_3}.$$

- Throughout this paper, we fix γ to denote pure temporal derivative:

$$\gamma = (\gamma_0, 0, 0, 0),$$

so that

$$\partial^\gamma f = \partial_t^{\gamma_0} f.$$

This paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we linearize the Shakhov model near a global Maxwellian. Section 3 is devoted to proving some estimates of the macroscopic fields and the non-linear term to construct the local-in-time solution. In Section 4 and Section 5, we establish the coercivity estimate for $Pr > 0$ and $Pr = 0$, respectively. From the coercivity estimate, we establish the existence of the global-in-time classical solution in the last section.

2. LINEARIZATION

2.1. Linearization of the Shakhov operator. In this section, we linearize the Shakhov operator $\mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F)$ near the global Maxwellian. We start with the definition of the Shakhov projection operator.

Definition 2.1. We define the 8-dimensional macroscopic projection operator as follows:

$$P_{Pr}f = P_c f + (1 - Pr)P_{nc}f,$$

where P_c and P_{nc} are projections on the conservative space and non-conservative space respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} P_c f &= \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f \sqrt{m} dv \right) \sqrt{m} + \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f v \sqrt{m} dv \right) \cdot v \sqrt{m} + \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f \frac{|v|^2 - 3}{\sqrt{6}} \sqrt{m} dv \right) \frac{|v|^2 - 3}{\sqrt{6}} \sqrt{m}, \\ P_{nc} f &= \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f \frac{v(|v|^2 - 5)}{\sqrt{10}} \sqrt{m} dv \right) \cdot \frac{v(|v|^2 - 5)}{\sqrt{10}} \sqrt{m}. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 2.2. We define G_{ij} and H_i ($1 \leq i, j \leq 3$) by

$$(2.1) \quad G_{ij} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} (\rho \Theta_{ii} + \rho U_i^2 - \rho), & \text{if } i = j, \\ \rho \Theta_{ij} + \rho U_i U_j, & \text{if } i \neq j, \end{cases}$$

for $1 \leq i, j \leq 3$, and

$$(2.2) \quad H_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{10}} \left(q_i + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq 3} 2\rho U_j \Theta_{ij} + \rho U_i |U|^2 + \rho U_i (\Theta_{11} + \Theta_{22} + \Theta_{33}) - 5\rho U_i \right),$$

for $i = 1, \dots, 3$, where Θ is the stress tensor defined in (1.2). Since G (or Θ) is symmetric 3×3 matrix, we view it as a component of \mathbb{R}^6 :

$$(2.3) \quad G = \{G_{11}, G_{22}, G_{33}, G_{12}, G_{23}, G_{31}\},$$

for simplicity.

Proposition 2.1. Let $F = m + \sqrt{m}f$. Then the Shakhov operator is linearized into the following form:

$$\mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F) = m + P_{Pr}f\sqrt{m} + \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq 13} \int_0^1 \left\{ D_{(\rho_\theta, \rho_\theta U_\theta, G_\theta, H_\theta)}^2 \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta) \right\}_{ij} (1 - \theta) d\theta \langle f, e_i \rangle_{L_v^2} \langle f, e_j \rangle_{L_v^2},$$

where

$$\mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta) = \frac{\rho_\theta}{\sqrt{2\pi T_\theta}^3} \exp \left(-\frac{|v - U_\theta|^2}{2T_\theta} \right) \left[1 + \frac{1 - Pr}{5} \frac{q_\theta \cdot (v - U_\theta)}{\rho_\theta T_\theta^2} \left(\frac{|v - U_\theta|^2}{2T_\theta} - \frac{5}{2} \right) \right],$$

and the transitional macroscopic fields ρ_θ , U_θ , Θ_θ and q_θ are given by

$$(2.4) \quad \rho_\theta = \theta \rho + (1 - \theta), \quad \rho_\theta U_\theta = \theta \rho U, \quad G_\theta = \theta G, \quad H_\theta = \theta H.$$

The 13-basis $\{e_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq 13}$ denote

$$\begin{aligned} e_1 &= \sqrt{m}, & e_{i+1} &= v_i \sqrt{m}, & e_{i+4} &= \frac{v_i^2 - 1}{2} \sqrt{m}, \\ e_8 &= v_1 v_2 \sqrt{m}, & e_9 &= v_2 v_3 \sqrt{m}, & e_{10} &= v_1 v_3 \sqrt{m}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$e_{i+10} = \frac{v_i |v|^2 \sqrt{m} - 5v_i \sqrt{m}}{\sqrt{10}},$$

for $i = 1, 2, 3$.

Proof. We apply Taylor's theorem:

$$(2.5) \quad \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(1) = \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(0) + \mathcal{S}'_{Pr}(0) + \int_0^1 \mathcal{S}''_{Pr}(\theta)(1-\theta)d\theta.$$

We can easily see that

$$\mathcal{S}_{Pr}(0) = m, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(1) = \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F).$$

• Computation of $\mathcal{S}'_{Pr}(0)$: An explicit computation with a change of variable

$$(2.6) \quad (\rho, U, \Theta, q) \rightarrow (\rho, \rho U, G, H),$$

gives

$$(2.7) \quad \mathcal{S}'_{Pr}(0) = \left(\frac{d(\rho_\theta, \rho_\theta U_\theta, G_\theta, H_\theta)}{d\theta} \right)^T \left(\frac{\partial(\rho_\theta, \rho_\theta U_\theta, G_\theta, H_\theta)}{\partial(\rho_\theta, U_\theta, \Theta_\theta, q_\theta)} \right)^{-1} \nabla_{(\rho_\theta, U_\theta, \Theta_\theta, q_\theta)} \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=0}.$$

To proceed further, we need the following two auxiliary lemmas.

Lemma 2.3. *Let J denote the Jacobian matrix:*

$$J \equiv \frac{\partial(\rho, \rho U, G, H)}{\partial(\rho, U, \Theta, q)}.$$

Then we have

(1) *TJ is given by*

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ U_1 & & & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ U_2 & & \rho I_3 & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ U_3 & & & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ (\Theta_{11} + U_1^2 - 1)/2 & \rho U_1 & 0 & 0 & & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ (\Theta_{22} + U_2^2 - 1)/2 & 0 & \rho U_2 & 0 & & \frac{\rho}{2} I_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ (\Theta_{33} + U_3^2 - 1)/2 & 0 & 0 & \rho U_3 & & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \Theta_{12} + U_1 U_2 & \rho U_2 & \rho U_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & & & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \Theta_{23} + U_2 U_3 & 0 & \rho U_3 & \rho U_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & & \rho I_3 & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \Theta_{31} + U_3 U_1 & \rho U_3 & 0 & \rho U_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & & & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ & & & & & & \frac{2\rho U_2}{\sqrt{10}} & 0 & \frac{2\rho U_3}{\sqrt{10}} & & & & & \\ & A & & B & & C & \frac{2\rho U_1}{\sqrt{10}} & \frac{2\rho U_3}{\sqrt{10}} & 0 & & \frac{1}{\sqrt{10}} I_3 & & & \\ & & & & & & 0 & \frac{2\rho U_2}{\sqrt{10}} & \frac{2\rho U_1}{\sqrt{10}} & & & & & \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$A_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{10}} \left(\sum_{1 \leq j \leq 3} 2U_j \Theta_{ij} + U_i |U|^2 + U_i (\Theta_{11} + \Theta_{22} + \Theta_{33}) - 5\rho U_i \right),$$

$$B_{ij} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{10}} \left(2\rho \Theta_{ij} + 2\rho U_i U_j + (\rho(\Theta_{11} + \Theta_{22} + \Theta_{33}) + \rho |U|^2 - 5\rho) \delta_{ij} \right),$$

and

$$C_{ij} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{10}} (2\rho U_i \delta_{ij} + \rho U_j),$$

for $i, j = 1, 2, 3$.

(2) The inverse of J reads

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{U_1}{\rho} & & & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{U_2}{\rho} & & \frac{1}{\rho} I_3 & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{U_3}{\rho} & & & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{-\Theta_{11}+U_1^2+1}{\rho} & -\frac{2U_1}{\rho} & 0 & 0 & & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{-\Theta_{22}+U_2^2+1}{\rho} & 0 & -\frac{2U_2}{\rho} & 0 & & \frac{2}{\rho} I_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{-\Theta_{33}+U_3^2+1}{\rho} & 0 & 0 & -\frac{2U_3}{\rho} & & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{-\Theta_{12}+U_1 U_2}{\rho} & -\frac{U_2}{\rho} & -\frac{U_1}{\rho} & 0 & 0 & 0 & & & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{-\Theta_{23}+U_2 U_3}{\rho} & 0 & -\frac{U_3}{\rho} & -\frac{U_2}{\rho} & 0 & 0 & 0 & & & \frac{1}{\rho} I_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{-\Theta_{31}+U_3 U_1}{\rho} & -\frac{U_3}{\rho} & 0 & -\frac{U_1}{\rho} & 0 & 0 & 0 & & & & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ A' & & B' & & C' & & -2U_2 & 0 & -2U_3 & & & & \\ & & & & & & -2U_1 & -2U_3 & 0 & & \sqrt{10} I_3 & & \\ & & & & & & 0 & -2U_2 & -2U_1 & & & & \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$A'_i = 2 \sum_{i \neq j} (U_j \Theta_{ij} - U_j^2 U_i) - A_i \sqrt{10} + \frac{\sqrt{10}}{\rho} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq 3} (U_j B_{ij} + C_{ij} (\Theta_{jj} - U_j^2 - 1)),$$

$$B'_{ij} = \frac{1}{5\rho} (10\rho U_i U_j + (|U|^2 - 2U_i^2) \delta_{ij} - 5B_{ij} \sqrt{10} + 10\sqrt{10} U_j C_{ij}),$$

and

$$C'_{ij} = -\frac{2\sqrt{10}}{\rho} C_{ij},$$

for $i, j = 1, 2, 3$.

Proof. We omit it since it is straightforward and tedious. \square

Lemma 2.4. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} (1) \quad \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta)}{\partial \rho \theta} \Big|_{\theta=0} &= m, & (2) \quad \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta)}{\partial U_{\theta i}} \Big|_{\theta=0} &= v_i m, \\ (3) \quad \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta)}{\partial \Theta_{\theta ii}} \Big|_{\theta=0} &= \frac{|v|^2 - 3}{6} m, & (4) \quad \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta)}{\partial \Theta_{\theta ij}} \Big|_{\theta=0} &= 0 \quad (\text{for } i \neq j), \\ (5) \quad \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta)}{\partial q_{\theta i}} \Big|_{\theta=0} &= \left[\frac{1 - Pr}{5} v_i \left(\frac{|v|^2}{2} - \frac{5}{2} \right) \right] m, \end{aligned}$$

for $i, j = 1, 2, 3$.

Proof. All these identities follow from substituting

$$(\rho_\theta, U_\theta, \Theta_\theta, T_\theta, q_\theta)|_{\theta=0} = (1, 0^3, 1^3, 0^3, 1, 0^3).$$

into the following identities:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F)}{\partial \rho} &= \frac{1}{\rho} \mathcal{M}(F). \\
\frac{\partial \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F)}{\partial U_i} &= \frac{v_i - U_i}{T} \left[1 + \frac{1 - Pr}{5} \frac{q \cdot (v - U)}{\rho T^2} \left(\frac{|v - U|^2}{2T} - \frac{5}{2} \right) \right] \mathcal{M}(F) \\
&\quad - \left[\frac{1 - Pr}{5} \frac{q_i}{\rho T^2} \left(\frac{|v - U|^2}{2T} - \frac{5}{2} \right) + \frac{1 - Pr}{5} \frac{q \cdot (v - U)}{\rho T^2} \left(\frac{v_i - U_i}{T} \right) \right] \mathcal{M}(F), \\
\frac{\partial \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F)}{\partial \Theta_{ii}} &= \frac{\partial T}{\partial \Theta_{ii}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F)}{\partial T} \\
&= \frac{1}{3} \left(-\frac{3}{2T} + \frac{|v - U|^2}{2T^2} \right) \left[1 + \frac{1 - Pr}{5} \frac{q \cdot (v - U)}{\rho T^2} \left(\frac{|v - U|^2}{2T} - \frac{5}{2} \right) \right] \mathcal{M}(F) \\
&\quad - \left[\frac{1 - Pr}{5} \frac{q \cdot (v - U)}{\rho T^2} \left(\frac{|v - U|^2}{2T^2} - \frac{5}{3T} \right) \right] \mathcal{M}(F), \\
\frac{\partial \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F)}{\partial \Theta_{ij}} &= 0, \\
\frac{\partial \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F)}{\partial q_i} &= \left[\frac{1 - Pr}{5} \frac{v_i - U_i}{\rho T^2} \left(\frac{|v - U|^2}{2T} - \frac{5}{2} \right) \right] \mathcal{M}(F).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Now we turn back to (2.7), and evaluate each term in 2.7 at $\theta = 0$. From the definition of the transitional macroscopic fields (2.4), we compute

$$(2.8) \quad \frac{d(\rho_\theta, \rho_\theta U_\theta, G_\theta, H_\theta)}{d\theta} = (\rho - 1, \rho U, G, H).$$

We express each term as a moment of f . First, substituting $F = m + \sqrt{m}f$ into (1.2)₁ and (1.2)₂, we easily get

$$(2.9) \quad \rho - 1 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \sqrt{m} f dv, \quad \rho U = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \sqrt{m} f v dv.$$

For G and H , we rewrite (1.2)₄ and (1.2)₅ as

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.10) \quad &\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} F(x, v, t) v_i v_j dv = \rho \Theta_{ij} + \rho U_i U_j, \\
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} F(x, v, t) v_i |v|^2 dv = q_i + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq 3} 2\rho U_j \Theta_{ij} + \rho U_i |U|^2 + U_i \rho \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} \Theta_{ii},
\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \sqrt{m} f v_i v_j dv = \begin{cases} \rho \Theta_{ii} + \rho U_i^2 - 1, & \text{if } i = j, \\ \rho \Theta_{ij} + \rho U_i U_j, & \text{if } i \neq j, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \sqrt{m} f v_i |v|^2 dv = q_i + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq 3} 2\rho U_j \Theta_{ij} + \rho U_i |U|^2 + U_i \rho \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} \Theta_{ii}.$$

Recalling the definition of G and H in (2.1) and (2.2), these identities yield

$$(2.11) \quad G_{ij} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (v_i^2 - 1) f \sqrt{m} dv, & \text{if } i = j, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v_i v_j f \sqrt{m} dv, & \text{if } i \neq j, \end{cases}$$

and

$$(2.12) \quad H_i = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v_i \frac{|v|^2 - 5}{\sqrt{10}} f \sqrt{m} dv.$$

Replacing entries in R.H.S of (2.8) with (2.9), (2.11), (2.12), we derive the following expression:

$$(2.13) \quad \frac{d(\rho_\theta, \rho_\theta U_\theta, G_\theta, H_\theta)}{d\theta} = \left(\langle f, e_1 \rangle_{L_v^2}, \dots, \langle f, e_{13} \rangle_{L_v^2} \right).$$

The Jacobian term follows directly from Lemma 2.3 (2):

$$(2.14) \quad \left(\frac{\partial(\rho_\theta, \rho_\theta U_\theta, G_\theta, H_\theta)}{\partial(\rho_\theta, U_\theta, \Theta_\theta, q_\theta)} \right)^{-1} \Big|_{\theta=0} = \text{diag} \left(1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1, \sqrt{10}, \sqrt{10}, \sqrt{10} \right).$$

Finally, Lemma 2.4 gives

$$(2.15) \quad \nabla_{(\rho_\theta, U_\theta, \Theta_\theta, q_\theta)} \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=0} = \left(1, v, \left(\frac{|v|^2 - 3}{6} \right) \mathbb{I}_3, 0^3, \frac{1 - Pr}{5} v \left(\frac{|v|^2}{2} - \frac{5}{2} \right) \right) m,$$

where \mathbb{I}_3 denotes $(1, 1, 1)$.

Now, we substitute (2.13), (2.14) and (2.15) into (2.7) to derive the following expression for $\mathcal{S}'_{Pr}(0)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}'_{Pr}(0) &= \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f \sqrt{m} dv \right) m + \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f v \sqrt{m} dv \right) v m + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f \frac{v_i^2 - 1}{2} \sqrt{m} dv \right) \frac{|v|^2 - 3}{3} m \\ &\quad + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f v_i \frac{|v|^2 - 5}{\sqrt{10}} \sqrt{m} dv \right) (1 - Pr) v_i \frac{|v|^2 - 5}{\sqrt{10}} m \\ &= P_c f \sqrt{m} + (1 - Pr) P_{nc} f \sqrt{m}. \end{aligned}$$

- Expression of the integral term: An explicit computation gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}''_{Pr}(\theta) &= \frac{d^2 \mathcal{S}_{Pr}}{d\theta^2}(\rho_\theta, \rho_\theta U_\theta, G_\theta, H_\theta) \\ &= (\rho - 1, \rho U, G, H)^T \left\{ D^2_{(\rho_\theta, \rho_\theta U_\theta, G_\theta, H_\theta)} \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta) \right\} (\rho - 1, \rho U, G, H). \end{aligned}$$

Then, (2.13) yields

$$\mathcal{S}''_{Pr}(\theta) = \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq 13} \left\{ D^2_{(\rho_\theta, \rho_\theta U_\theta, G_\theta, H_\theta)} \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta) \right\}_{ij} \langle f, e_i \rangle_{L_v^2} \langle f, e_j \rangle_{L_v^2}.$$

This completes the proof. \square

In the following lemma, we rewrite the second-order term $\mathcal{S}_{Pr}''(\theta)$ in a more tractable manner.

Lemma 2.5. *Each element of $D_{(\rho_\theta, \rho_\theta U_\theta, G_\theta, H_\theta)}^2 \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta)$ can be expressed in the following form:*

$$\{D_{(\rho_\theta, \rho_\theta U_\theta, G_\theta, H_\theta)}^2 \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta)\}_{ij} = \frac{\mathcal{P}_{ij}(\rho_\theta, U_\theta, \Theta_\theta, q_\theta, (v_i - U_{\theta i}), 1 - Pr)}{\rho_\theta^m T_\theta^n} \mathcal{M}(\theta),$$

where

- $\mathcal{M}(\theta)$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{M}(\theta) = \frac{\rho_\theta}{\sqrt{2\pi} T_\theta^3} \exp\left(-\frac{|v - U_\theta|^2}{2T_\theta}\right),$$

with

$$3T_\theta = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} \Theta_{\theta ii}.$$

- \mathcal{P} is a generically defined polynomial of the following form :

$$\mathcal{P}_{ij}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_k a_k x_1^{k_1} \dots x_n^{k_n},$$

for a multi-index $k = (k_1, \dots, k_n)$ where k_i ($i = 1, \dots, n$) is non-negative integers.

- m and n are non-negative integers that are not simultaneously zero at the same time.

Proof. Applying (2.6) twice,

$$\begin{aligned} D_{(\rho_\theta, \rho_\theta U_\theta, G_\theta, H_\theta)}^2 \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta) &= \left(\frac{\partial(\rho_\theta, \rho_\theta U_\theta, G_\theta, H_\theta)}{\partial(\rho_\theta, U_\theta, \Theta_\theta, q_\theta)} \right)^{-1} \\ &\quad \times \nabla_{(\rho_\theta, U_\theta, \Theta_\theta, q_\theta)} \left[\left(\frac{\partial(\rho_\theta, \rho_\theta U_\theta, G_\theta, H_\theta)}{\partial(\rho_\theta, U_\theta, \Theta_\theta, q_\theta)} \right)^{-1} \nabla_{(\rho_\theta, U_\theta, \Theta_\theta, q_\theta)} \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

For simplicity, we only consider the (1, 1) and (1, 2) components of $D_{(\rho_\theta, \rho_\theta U_\theta, G_\theta, H_\theta)}^2 \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta)$. Let us define the quantity in the second line as B :

$$B = \nabla_{(\rho_\theta, U_\theta, \Theta_\theta, q_\theta)} \left[\left(\frac{\partial(\rho_\theta, \rho_\theta U_\theta, G_\theta, H_\theta)}{\partial(\rho_\theta, U_\theta, \Theta_\theta, q_\theta)} \right)^{-1} \nabla_{(\rho_\theta, U_\theta, \Theta_\theta, q_\theta)} \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta) \right].$$

The (1, 1) component of $D_{(\rho_\theta, \rho_\theta U_\theta, G_\theta, H_\theta)}^2 \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta)$ is determined by inner product of first row of J^{-1} and first column of B . As we can see in Lemma 2.3 (2), the components of the first row of J^{-1} are all zeros except the first component. Thus we only need to compute the (1, 1) component of B :

$$(B)_{11} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho_\theta} \left[\left(\frac{\partial(\rho_\theta, \rho_\theta U_\theta, G_\theta, H_\theta)}{\partial(\rho_\theta, U_\theta, \Theta_\theta, q_\theta)} \right)^{-1} \nabla_{(\rho_\theta, U_\theta, \Theta_\theta, q_\theta)} \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta) \right]_1 = \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho_\theta} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta)}{\partial \rho_\theta} \right).$$

Applying the computation in Lemma 2.4 (1) gives

$$(B)_{11} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho_\theta} \left(\frac{1}{\rho_\theta} \mathcal{M}(\theta) \right) = 0.$$

Thus we have

$$\left\{ D_{(\rho_\theta, \rho_\theta U_\theta, G_\theta, H_\theta)}^2 \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta) \right\}_{11} = 0.$$

Similarly (1, 2) component of $D_{(\rho_\theta, \rho_\theta U_\theta, G_\theta, H_\theta)}^2 \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta)$ is determined by the inner product of the first row of J^{-1} and second column of B . Since the components of first row of J^{-1} are all zeros except the first component, we only need to compute (1, 2) component of B ,

$$(B)_{12} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho_\theta} \left[\left(\frac{\partial(\rho_\theta, \rho_\theta U_\theta, G_\theta, H_\theta)}{\partial(\rho_\theta, U_\theta, \Theta_\theta, q_\theta)} \right)^{-1} \nabla_{(\rho_\theta, U_\theta, \Theta_\theta, q_\theta)} \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta) \right]_2.$$

The second component in the square brackets is inner product of second row of J^{-1} and $\nabla_{(\rho_\theta, U_\theta, \Theta_\theta, q_\theta)} \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta)$. Thus we have

$$(B)_{12} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho_\theta} \left[-\frac{U_{\theta 1}}{\rho_\theta} \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta)}{\partial \rho_\theta} + \frac{1}{\rho_\theta} \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta)}{\partial U_{\theta 1}} \right].$$

Combining the above computations, we obtain

$$\left\{ D_{(\rho_\theta, \rho_\theta U_\theta, G_\theta, H_\theta)}^2 \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta) \right\}_{12} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho_\theta} \left(-\frac{U_{\theta 1}}{\rho_\theta} \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta)}{\partial \rho_\theta} + \frac{1}{\rho_\theta} \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta)}{\partial U_{\theta 1}} \right).$$

Applying Lemma 2.4, it is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ D_{(\rho_\theta, \rho_\theta U_\theta, G_\theta, H_\theta)}^2 \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta) \right\}_{12} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho_\theta} \left(-\frac{U_{\theta 1}}{\rho_\theta^2} \mathcal{M}(\theta) + \frac{1}{\rho_\theta} \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta)}{\partial U_{\theta 1}} \right) \\ &= \left(\frac{U_{\theta 1}}{\rho_\theta^3} \mathcal{M}(\theta) - \frac{1}{\rho_\theta^2} \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta)}{\partial U_{\theta 1}} + \frac{1}{\rho_\theta} \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta)}{\partial \rho_\theta \partial U_{\theta 1}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta)}{\partial U_{\theta 1}} &= \frac{v_i - U_{\theta i}}{T_\theta} \left[1 + \frac{1 - Pr}{5} \frac{q_\theta \cdot (v - U_\theta)}{\rho_\theta T_\theta^2} \left(\frac{|v - U_\theta|^2}{2T_\theta} - \frac{5}{2} \right) \right] \mathcal{M}(\theta) \\ &\quad - \left[\frac{1 - Pr}{5} \frac{q_{\theta i}}{\rho_\theta T_\theta^2} \left(\frac{|v - U_\theta|^2}{2T_\theta} - \frac{5}{2} \right) + \frac{1 - Pr}{5} \frac{q_\theta \cdot (v - U_\theta)}{\rho_\theta T_\theta^2} \left(\frac{v_i - U_{\theta i}}{T_\theta} \right) \right] \mathcal{M}(\theta), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta)}{\partial \rho_\theta \partial U_{\theta 1}} = \frac{v_i - U_{\theta i}}{\rho_\theta T_\theta} \mathcal{M}(\theta).$$

This shows that (1, 2) component of $D_{(\rho_\theta, \rho_\theta U_\theta, G_\theta, H_\theta)}^2 \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta)$ follows the proposed form of this Lemma. Other terms are similar. We omit it. \square

It remains to linearize the collision frequency.

Lemma 2.6. *The general collision frequency (1.5) is linearized as follows:*

$$\frac{1}{\tau} = \frac{1}{\tau_0} \left(1 + \int_0^1 A_1(\theta) d\theta \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f \sqrt{m} dv \right) + \int_0^1 A_2(\theta) d\theta \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f \frac{|v|^2 - 3}{\sqrt{6}} \sqrt{m} dv \right) \right),$$

where

$$A_1(\theta) = \left(1 + \frac{|U_\theta|^2 - 3T_\theta + 3}{3\rho_\theta}\right) \eta \rho_\theta^{\eta-1} T_\theta^w, \quad A_2(\theta) = w \rho_\theta^\eta T_\theta^{w-1}.$$

Proof. As in the proof of Proposition 2.1, we first define the transition of the macroscopic fields:

$$\rho_\theta = \theta \rho + (1 - \theta), \quad \rho_\theta U_\theta = \theta \rho U, \quad K_\theta = \theta K,$$

where

$$K_\theta = \frac{3\rho_\theta T_\theta + \rho_\theta |U_\theta|^2 - 3\rho_\theta}{\sqrt{6}},$$

and the transitional collision frequency depending on $(\rho_\theta, U_\theta, T_\theta)$:

$$A(\theta) = \frac{1}{\tau_0} \rho_\theta^\eta T_\theta^w.$$

We then expand $A(\theta)$ as

$$A(1) = A(0) + \int_0^1 A'(\theta) d\theta.$$

Then the chain rule gives

$$(2.16) \quad A'(\theta) = \frac{1}{\tau_0} \left(\frac{d\rho_\theta}{d\theta}, \frac{d\rho_\theta U_\theta}{d\theta}, \frac{dK_\theta}{d\theta} \right) \left[\frac{\partial(\rho_\theta, \rho_\theta U_\theta, K_\theta)}{\partial(\rho_\theta, U_\theta, T_\theta)} \right]^{-1} \nabla_{(\rho_\theta, U_\theta, T_\theta)} \rho_\theta^\eta T_\theta^w,$$

where each component of (2.16) can be computed by the following three equality:

$$(2.17) \quad \left(\frac{d\rho_\theta}{d\theta}, \frac{d\rho_\theta U_\theta}{d\theta}, \frac{dK_\theta}{d\theta} \right) = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f \sqrt{m} dv, \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f v \sqrt{m} dv, \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f \frac{|v|^2 - 3}{\sqrt{6}} \sqrt{m} dv \right),$$

and

$$(2.18) \quad \left[\frac{\partial(\rho_\theta, \rho_\theta U_\theta, K_\theta)}{\partial(\rho_\theta, U_\theta, T_\theta)} \right]^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{U_\theta}{\rho_\theta} & \frac{1}{\rho_\theta} I_3 & 0 \\ \frac{|U_\theta|^2 - 3T_\theta + 3}{3\rho_\theta} & -\frac{2}{3} \frac{U_\theta}{\rho_\theta} & \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \frac{1}{\rho_\theta} \end{bmatrix},$$

and

$$(2.19) \quad \nabla_{(\rho_\theta, U_\theta, T_\theta)} \rho_\theta^\eta T_\theta^w = \left(\eta \rho_\theta^{\eta-1} T_\theta^w, 0^3, w \rho_\theta^\eta T_\theta^{w-1} \right).$$

Substituting (2.17)-(2.19) into (2.16), we get the desired result. \square

2.2. Linearized Shakhov model. We are ready to derive the linearized Shakhov model. We insert $F = m + \sqrt{m}f$ in (1.1) and apply Proposition 2.1 and Lemma 2.5, to get

$$(2.20) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f &= \frac{1}{\tau_0} L_{Pr} f + \Gamma(f), \\ f(x, v, 0) &= f_0(x, v), \end{aligned}$$

where $f_0(x, v) = (F_0(x, v) - m)/\sqrt{m}$. The linear operator L_{Pr} is

$$L_{Pr} f = P_{Pr} f - f,$$

where the projection operator P_{Pr} is defined in Definition 2.1, and the non-linear term is decomposed as

$$(2.21) \quad \Gamma(f) = \sum_{i=1}^3 \Gamma_i(f),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_1(f) &= \left(\frac{1}{\tau} - \frac{1}{\tau_0} \right) L_{Pr} f, \\ \Gamma_2(f) &= \frac{1}{\tau_0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq 13} \int_0^1 \left\{ D_{(\rho_\theta, \rho_\theta U_\theta, G_\theta, H_\theta)}^2 \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta) \right\}_{ij} (1 - \theta) d\theta \langle f, e_i \rangle_{L_v^2} \langle f, e_j \rangle_{L_v^2}, \\ \Gamma_3(f) &= \left(\frac{1}{\tau} - \frac{1}{\tau_0} \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq 13} \int_0^1 \left\{ D_{(\rho_\theta, \rho_\theta U_\theta, G_\theta, H_\theta)}^2 \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta) \right\}_{ij} (1 - \theta) d\theta \langle f, e_i \rangle_{L_v^2} \langle f, e_j \rangle_{L_v^2}. \end{aligned}$$

The conservation laws (1.6) are rewritten as follows:

$$(2.22) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} f(x, v, t) \sqrt{m} dv dx &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} f_0(x, v) \sqrt{m} dv dx, \\ \int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} f(x, v, t) v \sqrt{m} dv dx &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} f_0(x, v) v \sqrt{m} dv dx, \\ \int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} f(x, v, t) |v|^2 \sqrt{m} dv dx &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} f_0(x, v) |v|^2 \sqrt{m} dv dx. \end{aligned}$$

2.3. Properties of the linear term. In this section, we establish the coercivity of L_{Pr} . We observe the dichotomy in the dissipative nature of L_{Pr} between the case $Pr > 0$ and $Pr = 0$. We first define the following basis:

$$(2.23) \quad \bar{e}_1 = \sqrt{m}, \quad \bar{e}_{i+1} = v_i \sqrt{m}, \quad \bar{e}_5 = \frac{|v|^2 - 3}{\sqrt{6}} \sqrt{m}, \quad \bar{e}_{i+5} = \frac{v_i |v|^2 - 5v_i}{\sqrt{10}} \sqrt{m},$$

for $i = 1, 2, 3$, and write $P_{Pr} f$ (See Definition 2.1) as

$$\begin{aligned} P_{Pr} f &= P_c f + (1 - Pr) P_{nc} f \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 5} \langle f, \bar{e}_i \rangle_{L_v^2} \bar{e}_i + (1 - Pr) \sum_{6 \leq i \leq 8} \langle f, \bar{e}_i \rangle_{L_v^2} \bar{e}_i. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.7. *The projection operator P_c and P_{nc} satisfy the following properties:*

(1) P_c and P_{nc} are orthonormal projection.

$$P_c^2 = P_c, \quad P_{nc}^2 = P_{nc}.$$

(2) P_c and P_{nc} are orthogonal.

$$P_c \perp P_{nc}.$$

Proof. The first statement follows from that each of the following:

$$\{\bar{e}_1, \bar{e}_2, \bar{e}_3, \bar{e}_4, \bar{e}_5\},$$

and

$$\{\bar{e}_6, \bar{e}_7, \bar{e}_8\},$$

forms an orthonormal basis, while the second statement is derived from

$$\langle \bar{e}_i, \bar{e}_j \rangle_{L_v^2} = 0 \quad (1 \leq i \leq 5, 6 \leq j \leq 8),$$

which can be checked through a direct computation. \square

In the following proposition, we prove the main result of this section, namely the dichotomy between $Pr > 0$ and $Pr = 0$ in the dissipative property of the linearized Shakhov operator. We note that the degeneracy of the estimate is stronger in the case of $Pr = 0$.

Proposition 2.2. (1) *In the case $Pr > 0$, $L_{Pr}f$ satisfies*

$$\langle L_{Pr}f, f \rangle_{L_v^2} \leq -\min\{Pr, 1\} \|(I - P_c)f\|_{L_v^2}^2.$$

(2) *When $Pr = 0$, L_{Pr} satisfies*

$$\langle L_{Pr}f, f \rangle_{L_{x,v}^2} = -\|(I - P_{Pr})f\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2 = -\|(I - P_c - P_{nc})f\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2.$$

Proof. (1) By an explicit computation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle L_{Pr}f, f \rangle_{L_v^2} &= \langle P_cf - f + (1 - Pr)P_{nc}f, f \rangle_{L_v^2} \\ &= \langle P_cf - f, f \rangle_{L_v^2} + (1 - Pr)\langle P_{nc}f, f \rangle_{L_v^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\bar{e}_1, \dots, \bar{e}_5$ constitute an orthonormal basis, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle P_cf - f, f \rangle_{L_v^2} &= -\langle (I - P_c)f, f \rangle_{L_v^2} \\ &= -\langle (I - P_c)f, (I - P_c)f \rangle_{L_v^2} - \langle (I - P_c)f, P_cf \rangle_{L_v^2} \\ &= -\|(I - P_c)f\|_{L_v^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$(2.24) \quad \langle L_{Pr}f, f \rangle_{L_v^2} = -\|(I - P_c)f\|_{L_v^2}^2 + (1 - Pr)\langle P_{nc}f, f \rangle_{L_v^2}.$$

Applying the property $P_{nc} \perp P_c$ in Lemma 2.7 (2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle P_{nc}f, f \rangle_{L_v^2} &= \langle P_{nc}(P_cf + (I - P_c)f), P_cf + (I - P_c)f \rangle_{L_v^2} \\ &= \langle P_{nc}(I - P_c)f, (I - P_c)f \rangle_{L_v^2} \\ &= \|P_{nc}(I - P_c)f\|_{L_v^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$(2.25) \quad 0 \leq \langle P_{nc}f, f \rangle_{L_v^2} \leq \|(I - P_c)f\|_{L_v^2}^2.$$

When $0 < Pr \leq 1$, substituting (2.25) in (2.24) yields

$$\langle L_{Pr}f, f \rangle_{L_v^2} \leq -Pr\|(I - P_c)f\|_{L_v^2}^2.$$

In the case $1 < Pr$, since $\langle P_{nc}f, f \rangle_{L_v^2}$ is non-negative, we can ignore the second term in the R.H.S of (2.24), to obtain

$$\langle L_{Pr}f, f \rangle_{L_v^2} \leq -\|(I - P_c)f\|_{L_v^2}^2.$$

We combine the above two inequalities to get the desired result.

(2) Since $P_{Pr}f = P_cf + P_{nc}f$ is a projection operator onto the space spanned by the 8-dimensional orthonormal basis $\{\bar{e}_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq 8}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle L_{Pr}f, f \rangle_{L_{x,v}^2} &= -\langle (I - P_{Pr})f, f \rangle_{L_{x,v}^2} \\ &= -\langle (I - P_{Pr})f, (I - P_{Pr})f \rangle_{L_{x,v}^2} - \langle (I - P_{Pr})f, P_{Pr}f \rangle_{L_{x,v}^2} \\ &= -\|(I - P_{Pr})f\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Lemma 2.8. *When $Pr > 0$, the kernel of the linear operator L_{Pr} is given by the following 5-dimensional space:*

$$\text{Ker} L = \text{span}\{\sqrt{m}, v\sqrt{m}, |v|^2\sqrt{m}\},$$

while in the case of $Pr = 0$, L_{Pr} has a larger kernel spanned by the following 8 functions:

$$\text{Ker} L = \text{span}\{\sqrt{m}, v\sqrt{m}, |v|^2\sqrt{m}, v|v|^2\sqrt{m}\}.$$

Proof. This follows directly from Proposition 2.2. \square

3. LOCAL SOLUTION

In this section, we construct the local-in-time classical solution. We first estimate macroscopic fields ρ , U , Θ and q .

3.1. Estimates for the macroscopic fields.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $N \geq 3$. For sufficiently small $\mathcal{E}(t)$, there exist positive constants C such that*

- (1) $|\rho(x, t) - 1| \leq C\sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)}$,
- (2) $|U(x, t)| \leq C\sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)}$,
- (3) $|\Theta_{ij}(x, t) - \delta_{ij}| \leq C\sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)}$,
- (4) $|q_i(x, t)| \leq C\sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)}$,

for $1 \leq i, j \leq 3$.

Proof. (1) Since

$$(3.1) \quad \rho = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} m + \sqrt{m}f dv = 1 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \sqrt{m}f dv.$$

The Hölder inequality and the Sobolev embedding $H^2 \subset L^\infty$ give

$$|\rho - 1| \leq C \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^3} \|f\|_{L_v^2} \leq \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} \|\partial^\alpha f\|_{L_{x,v}^2} \leq C\sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)}.$$

(2) We write the bulk velocity U as

$$\rho U = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (m + \sqrt{m}f)v dv = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \sqrt{m}f v dv.$$

Then, the Hölder inequality and the Sobolev embedding, together with the lower bound of ρ in (1) yields

$$|U| \leq \frac{\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |f|^2 dv\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} m|v|^2 dv\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{1 - C\sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)}} \leq \frac{C\sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)}}{1 - C\sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)}} \leq C\sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)}.$$

(3) For the estimate of Θ , we recall the computation in (2.10)₁:

$$\rho \Theta_{ij} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} F(v_i - U_i)(v_j - U_j) dv = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (m + \sqrt{m}f)v_i v_j dv - \rho U_i U_j.$$

When $i = j$, we apply the Hölder inequality and the estimates in (1) and (2) to get

$$|\rho \Theta_{ii} - 1| \leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |f|^2 dv\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} m v_i^4 dv\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C(1 + C\sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)})\mathcal{E}(t) \leq C\sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)},$$

which gives

$$|\Theta_{ii} - 1| \leq C\sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)}.$$

When $i \neq j$, since $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} mv_i v_j dv = 0$, we get

$$|\Theta_{ij}| \leq \frac{\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |f|^2 dv\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} mv_i^2 v_j^2 dv\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C(1 + C\sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)})\mathcal{E}(t)}{1 - C\sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)}} \leq C\sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)}.$$

(4) Recall the computation in (2.10)₂ that

$$q_i = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} Fv_i |v|^2 dv - \sum_{1 \leq j \leq 3} 2U_j \rho \Theta_{ij} - \rho U_i |U|^2 - U_i \rho \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} \Theta_{ii}.$$

Combining this with the above estimates (1)-(3), we have

$$|q_i| \leq C\|f\|_{L_v^2} + C\sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)} \leq C\sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)}.$$

□

Lemma 3.2. *Let $N = |\alpha| \geq 1$. For sufficiently small $\mathcal{E}(t)$, there exist positive constants C and C_α such that*

- (1) $|\partial^\alpha \rho(x, t)| \leq C\|\partial^\alpha f\|_{L_v^2},$
- (2) $|\partial^\alpha U(x, t)| \leq C_\alpha \sum_{|\alpha_1| \leq |\alpha|} \|\partial^{\alpha_1} f\|_{L_v^2},$
- (3) $|\partial^\alpha \Theta_{ij}(x, t)| \leq C_\alpha \sum_{|\alpha_1| \leq |\alpha|} \|\partial^{\alpha_1} f\|_{L_v^2},$
- (4) $|\partial^\alpha q_i(x, t)| \leq C_\alpha \sum_{|\alpha_1| \leq |\alpha|} \|\partial^{\alpha_1} f\|_{L_v^2},$

for $1 \leq i, j \leq 3$.

Proof. (1) Taking ∂^α on (3.1) and applying the Hölder inequality give

$$|\partial^\alpha \rho| = \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \sqrt{m} \partial^\alpha f dv \right| \leq C\|\partial^\alpha f\|_{L_v^2}.$$

(2) Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial^\alpha U| &= \left| \partial^\alpha \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \sqrt{m} f v dv}{\rho} \right| \\ &\leq C_\alpha \sum_{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = \alpha} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \sqrt{m} \partial^{\alpha_1} f v dv \right| \left| \partial^{\alpha_2} \frac{1}{\rho} \right| \\ &\leq C_\alpha \sum_{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = \alpha} \|\partial^{\alpha_1} f\|_{L_v^2} \left| \partial^{\alpha_2} \frac{1}{\rho} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

We then use the boundedness of ρ and $\partial^\alpha \rho$ in Lemma 3.1, and the estimate (1) of this lemma, and apply the Sobolev embedding $H^2 \subset \subset L^\infty$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \partial^{\alpha_2} \frac{1}{\rho} \right| &\leq \left(\prod_{\sum |\alpha_{2i}| \leq |\alpha_2|} |\partial^{\alpha_{2i}} \rho| \right) \left(\sum_{0 \leq n \leq |\alpha|} \left| \frac{1}{\rho} \right|^{n+1} \right) \\ &\leq \left(C \sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)} \sum_{|\alpha_2| - 1 \leq |\alpha_{2i}| \leq |\alpha_2|} \|\partial^{\alpha_{2i}} f\|_{L_v^2} \right) \left(\sum_{0 \leq n \leq |\alpha|} \left| \frac{1}{1 - C \sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)}} \right|^{n+1} \right) \\ &\leq C_\alpha \sum_{|\alpha_1| \leq |\alpha|} \|\partial^{\alpha_1} f\|_{L_v^2}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives the desired result.

(3) Taking ∂^α on Θ_{ij} gives

$$|\partial^\alpha \Theta_{ij}| \leq \left| \partial^\alpha \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (m + \sqrt{m} f) v_i v_j dv}{\rho} \right| + \partial^\alpha (U_i U_j).$$

Then by the Sobolev embedding $H^2 \subset \subset L^\infty$,

$$|\partial^\alpha (U_i U_j)| \leq \sum_{|\alpha_1| + |\alpha_2| = |\alpha|} |\partial^{\alpha_1} U_i| |\partial^{\alpha_2} U_j| \leq C_\alpha \sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)} \|\partial^\alpha f\|_{L_v^2}.$$

For sufficiently small $\mathcal{E}(t)$, the Hölder inequality gives

$$|\partial^\alpha \Theta_{ij}| \leq C_\alpha \sum_{|\alpha_1| \leq |\alpha|} \|\partial^{\alpha_1} f\|_{L_v^2}.$$

(4) Similarly, taking ∂^α on q gives

$$\partial^\alpha q_i = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \partial^\alpha F v_i |v|^2 dv - 2 \sum_{1 \leq j \leq 3} \partial^\alpha (\rho U_j \Theta_{ij}) - \partial^\alpha (\rho U_i |U|^2) - \partial^\alpha \left(U_i \rho \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} \Theta_{ii} \right).$$

The previous results and the Hölder inequality yields

$$|\partial^\alpha q_i| \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v_i |v|^2 \sqrt{m} \partial^\alpha f dv + C_\alpha \mathcal{E}(t) \sum_{|\alpha_1| \leq |\alpha|} \|\partial^{\alpha_1} f\|_{L_v^2} \leq C_\alpha \sum_{|\alpha_1| \leq |\alpha|} \|\partial^{\alpha_1} f\|_{L_v^2}.$$

□

We also estimate the macroscopic fields depending on θ .

Lemma 3.3. *For sufficiently small $\mathcal{E}(t)$, there exist positive constants C such that*

- (1) $|\rho_\theta(x, t) - 1| \leq C \sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)},$
- (2) $|U_\theta(x, t)| \leq C \sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)},$
- (3) $|\Theta_{\theta ij}(x, t) - \delta_{ij}| \leq C \sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)},$
- (4) $|q_{\theta i}(x, t)| \leq C \sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)},$

for $1 \leq i, j \leq 3$.

Proof. (1) Since $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$, we have from Lemma 3.1 that

$$|\rho_\theta - 1| = \theta|\rho - 1| \leq C\sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)}.$$

(2) Applying the estimate (1) above and Lemma 3.1 gives

$$|U_\theta| = \left| \frac{\theta \rho U}{\rho_\theta} \right| \leq C\sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)}.$$

(3) From the definition of G in (2.1), we see that

$$\left(\rho_\theta \Theta_{\theta ii} + \rho_\theta U_{\theta i}^2 - \rho_\theta \right) = \theta \left(\rho \Theta_{ii} + \rho U_i^2 - \rho \right),$$

for $i = j$ case. Applying Lemma 3.1 and estimates of (1) and (2) of this lemma, we have

$$(3.2) \quad |\Theta_{\theta ii} - 1| = \left| \theta \frac{\rho \Theta_{ii} + \rho U_i^2 - \rho}{\rho_\theta} - U_{\theta i}^2 \right| \leq C\sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)}.$$

When $i \neq j$, the definition $G_\theta = \theta G$ implies

$$\rho_\theta \Theta_{\theta ij} + \rho_\theta U_{\theta i} U_{\theta j} = \theta(\rho \Theta_{ij} + \rho U_i U_j).$$

Therefore,

$$(3.3) \quad |\Theta_{\theta ij}| = \left| \theta \frac{\rho \Theta_{ij} + \rho U_i U_j}{\rho_\theta} - U_{\theta i} U_{\theta j} \right| \leq C\sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)}.$$

(4) The definition of H_θ in (2.4) with the definition of H in (2.2) implies

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} & q_{\theta i} + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq 3} 2\rho_\theta U_{\theta j} \Theta_{\theta ij} + \rho_\theta U_{\theta i} |U_\theta|^2 + \rho_\theta U_{\theta i} (\Theta_{\theta 11} + \Theta_{\theta 22} + \Theta_{\theta 33}) - 5\rho_\theta U_{\theta i} \\ &= \theta \left(q_i + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq 3} 2\rho U_j \Theta_{ij} + \rho U_i |U|^2 + \rho U_i (\Theta_{11} + \Theta_{22} + \Theta_{33}) - 5\rho U_i \right). \end{aligned}$$

We then apply (1)-(3) of this lemma and Lemma 3.1 to obtain the desired result. \square

Lemma 3.4. *Let $|\alpha| \geq 1$. For a sufficiently small $\mathcal{E}(t)$, there exist positive constants C and C_α such that*

$$\begin{aligned} (1) \quad & |\partial^\alpha \rho_\theta(x, t)| \leq C \|\partial^\alpha f\|_{L_v^2}, \\ (2) \quad & |\partial^\alpha U_\theta(x, t)| \leq C_\alpha \sum_{|\alpha_1| \leq |\alpha|} \|\partial^{\alpha_1} f\|_{L_v^2}, \\ (3) \quad & |\partial^\alpha \Theta_{\theta ij}(x, t)| \leq C_\alpha \sum_{|\alpha_1| \leq |\alpha|} \|\partial^{\alpha_1} f\|_{L_v^2}, \\ (4) \quad & |\partial^\alpha q_{\theta i}(x, t)| \leq C_\alpha \sum_{|\alpha_1| \leq |\alpha|} \|\partial^{\alpha_1} f\|_{L_v^2}, \end{aligned}$$

for $1 \leq i, j \leq 3$.

Proof. (1) The definition of ρ_θ and Lemma 3.2 yield

$$|\partial^\alpha \rho_\theta| = \theta |\partial^\alpha \rho| \leq C \|\partial^\alpha f\|_{L_v^2}.$$

(2) Using the definition of U_θ , we can write

$$|\partial^\alpha U_\theta| = \theta \left| \partial^\alpha \frac{\rho U}{\rho_\theta} \right|.$$

Since $\rho U \leq C\sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)}$, by exactly the same argument in Lemma 3.2 (2), we obtain

$$|\partial^\alpha U_\theta| \leq C_\alpha \sum_{|\alpha_1| \leq |\alpha|} \|\partial^{\alpha_1} f\|_{L_v^2}.$$

(3) For a convenience of notation Θ_θ , we combine the previous computation (3.2) and (3.3) as follows:

$$\Theta_{\theta ij} = \theta \frac{\rho \Theta_{ij} + \rho U_i U_j - \rho \delta_{ij}}{\rho_\theta} - U_{\theta i} U_{\theta j} + \delta_{ij}.$$

Note that the numerator part can be estimated by Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.2 as

$$|\partial^\alpha (\rho \Theta_{ij} + \rho U_i U_j - \rho \delta_{ij})| \leq C_\alpha \mathcal{E}(t) \sum_{|\alpha_1| \leq |\alpha|} \|\partial^{\alpha_1} f\|_{L_v^2}.$$

Then from the same way as in Lemma 3.2 (2), we have

$$|\partial^\alpha \Theta_{\theta ij}| \leq C_\alpha \sum_{|\alpha_1| \leq |\alpha|} \|\partial^{\alpha_1} f\|_{L_v^2}.$$

(4) Recall that the form of q_θ in (3.4). We already obtained the estimates for all other terms ρ , U , Θ . Therefore taking ∂^α on (3.4) gives

$$|\partial^\alpha q_{\theta i}| \leq C_\alpha \sum_{|\alpha_1| \leq |\alpha|} \|\partial^{\alpha_1} f\|_{L_v^2}.$$

□

3.2. Estimate for the nonlinear term. We now estimate the nonlinear perturbations.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{E}(t)$ be sufficiently small. Then we have*

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \partial_\beta^\alpha \Gamma(f) g dv \right| \leq C\sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)} \sum_{|\alpha_1| + |\alpha_2| + |\alpha_3| \leq |\alpha|} \|\partial^{\alpha_1} f\|_{L_v^2} \|\partial^{\alpha_2} f\|_{L_v^2} \|\partial^{\alpha_3} f\|_{L_v^2} \|g\|_{L_v^2}.$$

Proof. Since the other terms are similar, we only consider Γ_2 . We apply ∂_β^α to the non-linear term Γ_2 in (2.21):

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\beta^\alpha \Gamma_2(f) &= \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i, j \leq 13 \\ \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 = \alpha}} \frac{1}{\tau_0} \int_0^1 \partial_\beta^{\alpha_1} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \left\{ D_{(\rho_\theta, \rho_\theta U_\theta, G_\theta, H_\theta)}^2 \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta) \right\}_{ij} \right) (1 - \theta) d\theta \\ &\quad \times \langle \partial^{\alpha_2} f, e_i \rangle_{L_v^2} \langle \partial^{\alpha_3} f, e_j \rangle_{L_v^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since we have from Lemma 2.5 that

$$\{D_{(\rho_\theta, \rho_\theta U_\theta, G_\theta, H_\theta)}^2 \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(\theta)\}_{ij} = \frac{\mathcal{P}_{ij}(\rho_\theta, U_\theta, \Theta_\theta, q_\theta, (v_i - U_{\theta i}), 1 - Pr)}{\rho_\theta^m T_\theta^n} \mathcal{M}(\theta).$$

We consider

$$\partial_\beta^\alpha \left(\frac{\mathcal{P}_{ij}(\rho_\theta, U_\theta, \Theta_\theta, q_\theta, (v_i - U_{\theta i}), 1 - Pr)}{\rho_\theta^m T_\theta^n} \mathcal{M}(\theta) / \sqrt{m} \right).$$

Using the estimates of macroscopic fields in Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.4, we have

$$\partial_\beta^\alpha \left(\frac{\mathcal{P}_{ij}(\rho_\theta, U_\theta, \Theta_\theta, q_\theta, (v_i - U_{\theta i}), 1 - Pr)}{\rho_\theta^m T_\theta^n} \right) \leq C_\alpha \sum_{|\alpha_1| \leq |\alpha|} \|\partial^{\alpha_1} f\|_{L_v^2} \mathcal{P}(v_i),$$

for some generically defined polynomial \mathcal{P} . The remaining exponential part can be estimated similarly:

$$\partial_\beta^\alpha (\mathcal{M}(\theta)/\sqrt{m}) \leq C_\alpha \sum_{|\alpha_1| \leq |\alpha|} \|\partial^{\alpha_1} f\|_{L_v^2} \mathcal{P}(v_i) \exp\left(-\frac{|v - U_\theta|^2}{2T_\theta} + \frac{|v|^2}{4}\right).$$

Combining these computations with the Hölder inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \partial_\beta^\alpha \Gamma_2(f) g dv \right| &\leq C \sum_{|\alpha_1| + |\alpha_2| + |\alpha_3| \leq |\alpha|} \|\partial^{\alpha_1} f\|_{L_v^2} \|\partial^{\alpha_2} f\|_{L_v^2} \|\partial^{\alpha_3} f\|_{L_v^2} \|g\|_{L_v^2} \\ &\quad \times \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \mathcal{P}(v_i) \exp\left(-\frac{|v - U_\theta|^2}{2T_\theta} + \frac{|v|^2}{2}\right) dv \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, since $U_\theta < 1$ and $T_\theta \leq 3/2$ for sufficiently small $\mathcal{E}(t)$, we have

$$\exp\left(-\frac{|v - U_\theta|^2}{2T_\theta} + \frac{|v|^2}{2}\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{|v - 4U_\theta|^2}{6} + 2|U_\theta|^2\right) \leq C \exp\left(-\frac{|v|^2}{6}\right).$$

This completes the proof. \square

3.3. Local solution. We are now ready to construct the local smooth solution.

Theorem 3.5. *Let $N \geq 3$ and $F_0(x, v) \geq 0$. Then there exists M_0 and $T_* \geq 0$ such that if $\mathcal{E}(f_0) \leq M_0/2$, then (2.20) has the unique local-in-time classical solution that exists for $0 \leq t < T_*$ satisfying*

- (1) *The energy of perturbation is continuous and satisfies*

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T_*} \mathcal{E}(f)(t) \leq M_0.$$

- (2) *The distribution function is non-negative:*

$$F(x, v, t) = m + \sqrt{m} f(x, v, t) \geq 0.$$

- (3) *The Shakhov operator is non-negative:*

$$\mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F) \geq 0.$$

- (4) *The perturbation f satisfies the conservation laws (2.22) for $0 \leq t \leq T_*$.*

Proof. We define F^{n+1} iteratively by the following scheme:

$$\begin{aligned} (3.5) \quad \partial_t F^{n+1} + v \cdot \nabla_x F^{n+1} &= \frac{1}{\tau(F^n)} (\mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F^n) - F^{n+1}), \\ F^{n+1}(x, v, 0) &= F_0(x, v), \end{aligned}$$

with $F^0(x, v, t) = F_0(x, v)$. We use induction argument. We assume the statement (1) - (4) for n -th step. We first observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F^n) &= \frac{\rho_n}{\sqrt{2\pi T_n}^3} \left[1 + \frac{1 - Pr}{5} \frac{q_n \cdot v}{\rho_n T_n^2} \left(\frac{|v|^2}{2T_n} - \frac{5}{2} \right) \exp\left(-\frac{|v|^2}{2T_n}\right) \right] \\ &\geq \mathcal{M}(F^n) \left(1 - C \frac{1 - Pr}{5} \frac{|q_n|}{\rho_n T_n^{3/2}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we used

$$\left| x^m \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2T}\right) \right| \leq CT^{m/2}.$$

Applying Lemma 3.1 and the induction hypothesis yields

$$\mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F^n) \geq \mathcal{M}(F^n) \left(1 - C\sqrt{\mathcal{E}(f^n)}\right) \geq \mathcal{M}(F^n) (1 - CM_0).$$

Therefore for sufficiently small M_0 , we have $\mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F^n) \geq 0$. Then the non-negativity of F^n follows directly from the mild formulation of (3.5):

$$\begin{aligned} F^{n+1}(x, v, t) &= e^{-\int_0^t \frac{1}{\tau(F^n)} dt} F_0(x - vt, v) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\tau(F^n)} e^{-\int_s^t \frac{1}{\tau(F^n)} dt} \int_0^{T_*} \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F^n)(x + v(s - t), v, s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Now we prove the uniform boundedness of the energy norm. For this, we substitute $F^{n+1} = m + \sqrt{m}f^{n+1}$ into (3.5) to get

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t f^{n+1} + v \cdot \nabla_x f^{n+1} + \frac{1}{\tau_0} f^{n+1} &= \frac{1}{\tau_0} P_{Pr}(f^n) + \Gamma(f^n), \\ f^{n+1}(x, v, 0) &= f_0(x, v), \end{aligned}$$

where $f_0^n(x, v) = (F_0(x, v) - m)/\sqrt{m}$. Taking ∂_β^α on both sides:

$$\partial_t \partial_\beta^\alpha f^{n+1} + v \cdot \nabla_x \partial_\beta^\alpha f^{n+1} + \frac{1}{\tau_0} \partial_\beta^\alpha f^{n+1} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \partial_{\beta - \bar{k}_i}^{\alpha + \bar{k}_i} \partial_\beta^\alpha f^{n+1} = \frac{1}{\tau_0} \partial_\beta P_{Pr}(\partial^\alpha f^n) + \partial_\beta^\alpha \Gamma(f^n),$$

and taking product with $\partial_\beta^\alpha f^{n+1}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\partial_\beta^\alpha f^{n+1}\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2 + \frac{1}{\tau_0} \|\partial_\beta^\alpha f^{n+1}\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2 &\leq \sum_{i=1}^3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{T}^3} \partial_\beta^\alpha f^{n+1} \partial_{\beta - \bar{k}_i}^{\alpha + \bar{k}_i} \partial_\beta^\alpha f^{n+1} dv dx \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\tau_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{T}^3} (\partial_\beta^\alpha f^{n+1} \partial_\beta P_{Pr}(\partial^\alpha f^n) + \partial_\beta^\alpha f^{n+1} \partial_\beta^\alpha \Gamma(f^n)) dv dx, \end{aligned}$$

where k_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) are coordinate unit vectors and $\bar{k}_1 = (0, 1, 0, 0)$, $\bar{k}_2 = (0, 0, 1, 0)$, $\bar{k}_3 = (0, 0, 0, 1)$. We then integrate for time and recall Proposition 3.1 to derive

$$(1 - CT_*) \mathcal{E}(f^{n+1})(t) \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} + CT_* + CT_* M_0^2 \right) M_0.$$

For sufficiently small M_0 and T_* , we conclude that

$$\mathcal{E}(f^{n+1})(t) \leq M_0.$$

The remaining part can be obtained from the standard argument [23–25]. We omit it. \square

4. COERCIVITY ESTIMATE FOR $Pr > 0$

In this section, we fill up the degeneracy of the linearized Shakov operator L_{Pr} and recover the full coercivity. As is observed in Proposition 2.2 and Lemma 2.8, the degeneracy of the linear operator L_{Pr} is strictly larger when $Pr = 0$ than $Pr > 0$. The case of $Pr > 0$ can be treated by a rather standard argument, which is briefly presented in this section.

Recall the macroscopic projection operator P_c from Definition 2.1:

$$P_c f = a_0(x, t)\sqrt{m} + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} b_{0i}(x, t)v_i\sqrt{m} + c_0(x, t)|v|^2\sqrt{m},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a_0(x, t) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f\sqrt{m}dv - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f(|v|^2 - 3)\sqrt{m}dv, \\ b_{0i}(x, t) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f v_i \sqrt{m}dv, \\ c_0(x, t) &= \frac{1}{6} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f(|v|^2 - 3)\sqrt{m}dv, \end{aligned}$$

for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Substituting $f = P_c f + (I - P_c)f$ into (2.20) gives

$$(4.1) \quad \{\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x\} \{P_c f\} = l_0(f) + h_0(f),$$

where

$$l_0(f) = -\{\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x\} \{(I - P_c)f\} + \frac{1}{\tau_0} L_{Pr} \{(I - P_c)f\}, \quad h_0(f) = \Gamma(f).$$

By an explicit computation, the left-hand side of (4.1) is expressed as a linear combination of the following 13-basis $\{\sqrt{m}, v_i\sqrt{m}, v_i v_j \sqrt{m}, v_i |v|^2 \sqrt{m}\}$ ($1 \leq i, j \leq 3$):

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\{ \partial_t a_0 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} (\partial_{x_i} a_0 + \partial_t b_{0i})v_i + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} (\partial_{x_i} b_{0i} + \partial_t c_0)v_i^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{i < j} (\partial_{x_i} b_{0j} + \partial_{x_j} b_{0i})v_i v_j + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} (\partial_{x_i} c_0)v_i |v|^2 \right\} \sqrt{m}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $(l_{0c}, l_{0i}, l_{0ij}, l_{0is}, l_{0ijs})$, and $(h_{0c}, h_{0i}, h_{0ij}, h_{0is}, h_{0ijs})$ be the coefficient corresponding to the linear expansion w.r.t the above basis when l_0 and h_0 are expanded to the above 13 basis, respectively. Then comparing the coefficients of both sides yields the following system:

$$\begin{aligned} (4.2) \quad &\partial_t a = l_{0c} + h_{0c}, \\ &\partial_{x_i} a + \partial_t b_i = l_{0i} + h_{0i}, \\ &\partial_{x_i} b_i + \partial_t c = l_{0ii} + h_{0ii}, \\ &\partial_{x_i} b_j + \partial_{x_j} b_i = l_{0ij} + h_{0ij} \quad (i \neq j), \\ &\partial_{x_i} c = l_{0is} + h_{0is}. \end{aligned}$$

for $i, j = 1, 2, 3$. For the notational simplicity we define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{l}_0 &= l_{0c} + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} (l_{0i} + l_{0is}) + \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq 3} (l_{0ij} + l_{0ijs}), \\ \tilde{h}_0 &= h_{0c} + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} (h_{0i} + h_{0is}) + \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq 3} (h_{0ij} + h_{0ijs}). \end{aligned}$$

The analysis for this system is now standard, which can be found, for example, in [23–25, 48] to yield

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{|\alpha| \leq N} \|P_{Pr} \partial^\alpha f\|_{L_{x,v}^2} &\leq C \sum_{|\alpha| \leq N} \left(\|\partial^\alpha a\|_{L_x^2} + \|\partial^\alpha b\|_{L_x^2} + \|\partial^\alpha c\|_{L_x^2} \right) \\
&\leq C \sum_{|\alpha| \leq N-1} \left(\|\partial^\alpha \tilde{l}_0\|_{L_x^2} + \|\partial^\alpha \tilde{h}_0\|_{L_x^2} \right) \\
&\leq C \sum_{|\alpha| \leq N} \|(I - P_{Pr}) \partial^\alpha f\|_{L_{x,v}^2} + CM_0 \sum_{|\alpha| \leq N} \|\partial^\alpha f\|_{L_{x,v}^2},
\end{aligned}$$

for sufficiently small $\mathcal{E}(t)$. This, combined with the degenerate coercive estimate in Proposition 2.2 (1), leads to the following full coercivity estimate for sufficiently small $\mathcal{E}(t)$:

$$(4.3) \quad \sum_{|\alpha| \leq N} \langle L_{Pr} \partial^\alpha f, \partial^\alpha f \rangle_{L_{x,v}^2} \leq -\delta \sum_{|\alpha| \leq N} \|\partial^\alpha f\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2.$$

5. COERCIVITY ESTIMATE FOR $Pr = 0$

Due to the bigger degeneracy of L_{Pr} in the case of $Pr = 0$, a new idea is to need to recover the full coercivity. More precisely, the presence of an additional 3-dimensional null space leads to a bigger differential system than (4.2) that involves non-conservative quantities, which cannot be merged into the coercivity estimate using the previous arguments.

First, we write $P_{Pr}f$ in Definition 2.1 as

$$P_{Pr}f = a(x, t)\sqrt{m} + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} b_i(x, t)v_i\sqrt{m} + c(x, t)|v|^2\sqrt{m} + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} d_i(x, t)v_i|v|^2\sqrt{m},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
a(x, t) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f\sqrt{m}dv - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f(|v|^2 - 3)\sqrt{m}dv, \\
b_i(x, t) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f v_i \sqrt{m}dv - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f v_i (|v|^2 - 5)\sqrt{m}dv, \\
c(x, t) &= \frac{1}{6} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f (|v|^2 - 3)\sqrt{m}dv, \\
d_i(x, t) &= \frac{1}{10} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f v_i (|v|^2 - 5)\sqrt{m}dv,
\end{aligned}$$

for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Substituting $f = P_{Pr}f + (I - P_{Pr})f$ into (2.20), we get the similar equation as in (4.1):

$$(5.1) \quad \{\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x\} \{P_{Pr}f\} = l(f) + h(f),$$

where

$$l(f) = -\{\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x\} \{(I - P_{Pr})f\} + \frac{1}{\tau_0} L_{Pr} \{(I - P_{Pr})f\}, \quad h(f) = \Gamma(f).$$

This time, we expand the L.H.S. of (5.1) using the following 19-basis ($1 \leq i, j \leq 3$):

$$(5.2) \quad \{\sqrt{m}, v_i \sqrt{m}, v_i v_j \sqrt{m}, v_i |v|^2 \sqrt{m}, v_i v_j |v|^2 \sqrt{m}\},$$

to get

$$\left\{ \partial_t a + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} (\partial_{x_i} a + \partial_t b_i) v_i + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} (\partial_{x_i} b_i + \partial_t c) v_i^2 + \sum_{i < j} (\partial_{x_i} b_j + \partial_{x_j} b_i) v_i v_j \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} (\partial_{x_i} c + \partial_t d_i) v_i |v|^2 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} \partial_{x_i} d_i v_i^2 |v|^2 + \sum_{i < j} (\partial_{x_i} d_j + \partial_{x_j} d_i) v_i v_j |v|^2 \right\} \sqrt{m}.$$

Let $(l_c, l_i, l_{ij}, l_{is}, l_{ijs})$, and $(h_c, h_i, h_{ij}, h_{is}, h_{ijs})$ be the coefficient for the linear expansion of l and h w.r.t (5.2) respectively. Then we can derive the following system:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t a &= l_c + h_c, \\ \partial_{x_i} a + \partial_t b_i &= l_i + h_i, \\ \partial_{x_i} b_i + \partial_t c &= l_{ii} + h_{ii}, \\ \partial_{x_i} b_j + \partial_{x_j} b_i &= l_{ij} + h_{ij} \quad (i \neq j), \\ \partial_{x_i} c + \partial_t d_i &= l_{is} + h_{is}, \\ \partial_{x_i} d_i &= l_{iis} + h_{iis}, \\ \partial_{x_i} d_j + \partial_{x_j} d_i &= l_{ijs} + h_{ijs} \quad (i \neq j), \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

for $i, j = 1, 2, 3$. For a notational simplicity we define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{l} &= l_c + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} (l_i + l_{is}) + \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq 3} (l_{ij} + l_{ijs}), \\ \tilde{h} &= h_c + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} (h_i + h_{is}) + \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq 3} (h_{ij} + h_{ijs}). \end{aligned}$$

The desired full coercivity estimate is stated in the following theorem. Note that we need an additional moment condition on the initial data.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $Pr = 0$ and $|\alpha| \leq N$. Let f be the local smooth solution obtained in Theorem 3.5. Suppose further that the third moment of the initial data is zero:*

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} F_0(x, v) v_i |v|^2 dv dx = 0, \tag{5.4}$$

for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Then we have

$$\sum_{|\alpha| \leq N} \langle L_{Pr} \partial^\alpha f, \partial^\alpha f \rangle_{L_{x,v}^2} \leq -\delta \sum_{|\alpha| \leq N} \|\partial^\alpha f\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2 + C\mathcal{E}^2(t).$$

The following estimate of macroscopic variables is the key estimate for the proof of Theorem 5.1.

Proposition 5.1. *Under the same assumption as in Theorem 5.1, we have*

$$\|\partial^\alpha a\|_{L_x^2} + \|\partial^\alpha b\|_{L_x^2} + \|\partial^\alpha c\|_{L_x^2} + \|\partial^\alpha d\|_{L_x^2} \leq C \sum_{|\alpha| \leq N-1} \left(\|\partial^\alpha \tilde{l}\|_{L_x^2} + \|\partial^\alpha \tilde{h}\|_{L_x^2} \right) + C\mathcal{E}(t).$$

Proof. Note that the new variable d is coupled only with c . Therefore, the estimates for a and b are the same as the previous $Pr > 0$ case, which is

$$\|\partial^\alpha a\|_{L_x^2} + \|\partial^\alpha b\|_{L_x^2} \leq C \sum_{|\alpha| \leq N-1} \left(\|\partial^\alpha \tilde{l}\|_{L_x^2} + \|\partial^\alpha \tilde{h}\|_{L_x^2} \right). \tag{5.5}$$

We divide the estimate of c and d into the following four steps:

- (Step 1) $\|\partial^\alpha \partial_t c\|_{L_x^2},$
- (Step 2) $\|\nabla_x \partial^\alpha d_i\|_{L_x^2}, \quad (|\alpha| \leq N-1)$
- (Step 3) $\|\partial^\gamma d_i\|_{L_x^2},$
- (Step 4) $\|c\|_{L_x^2} + \|\nabla_x \partial^\alpha c\|_{L_x^2},$

where ∂^γ is pure time derivatives for $|\gamma| \leq N$, that is, $\partial^\gamma = \partial_t^{|\gamma|}$.

- **Step 1.** The estimate of $\|\partial^\alpha \partial_t c\|_{L_x^2}$: Taking ∂^α on (5.3)₃ gives

$$\partial^\alpha \partial_t c = \partial^\alpha l_{ii} + \partial^\alpha h_{ii} - \partial^\alpha \partial_{x_i} b_i.$$

Multiplying both sides by $\partial^\alpha \partial_t c$ and applying the Hölder inequality yields

$$\|\partial^\alpha \partial_t c\|_{L_x^2}^2 \leq \|\partial^\alpha l_{ii}\|_{L_x^2}^2 + \|\partial^\alpha h_{ii}\|_{L_x^2}^2 + \|\partial^\alpha \partial_{x_i} b_i\|_{L_x^2}^2.$$

We then combine this with the estimate of b in (5.5) to get

$$\|\partial^\alpha \partial_t c\|_{L_x^2} \leq C \sum_{|\alpha| \leq N-1} \left(\|\partial^\alpha \tilde{l}\|_{L_x^2} + \|\partial^\alpha \tilde{h}\|_{L_x^2} \right).$$

- **Step 2.** The estimate of $\|\nabla_x \partial^\alpha d_i\|_{L_x^2}$: Using (5.3)₆ and (5.3)₇, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta d_i &= \sum_{1 \leq j \leq 3} \partial_{jj} d_i \\ &= \sum_{j \neq i} \partial_{jj} d_i + \partial_{ii} d_i \\ &= \sum_{j \neq i} (\partial_j l_{ijs} + \partial_j h_{ijs} - \partial_{ji} d_j) + \partial_i l_{iis} + \partial_i h_{iis}. \end{aligned}$$

We then use (5.3)₆ to get

$$\Delta d_i = \sum_{j \neq i} (\partial_j l_{ijs} + \partial_j h_{ijs} - \partial_i l_{jjs} - \partial_i h_{jjs}) + \partial_i l_{iis} + \partial_i h_{iis},$$

which implies

$$\|\nabla_x d\|_{L_x^2} \leq C \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq 3} (\|l_{ijs}\|_{L_x^2} + \|h_{ijs}\|_{L_x^2} + \|l_{iis}\|_{L_x^2} + \|h_{iis}\|_{L_x^2}).$$

The same argument holds when d_i is replaced by $\partial^\alpha d_i$. This completes the proof of Step 2.

- **Step 3.** The estimate of $\|\partial^\gamma d_i\|_{L_x^2}$: We divide the proof into the following 3 cases: $|\gamma| = 0$, $|\gamma| = 1$ and $2 \leq |\gamma| \leq N$. We start with $|\gamma| = 1$.

(1) The case of $|\gamma| = 1$: We employ the Poincaré inequality to derive

$$(5.6) \quad \|\partial_t d_i\|_{L_x^2} \leq \|\nabla_x \partial_t d_i\|_{L_x^2} + C \left\| \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \partial_t d_i dx \right\|_{L_x^2}.$$

Note that, in the case of a, b, c , the last term on the R.H.S. vanishes due to the conservation laws, which is not the case for non-conservative quantity d . To control $\int \partial^\gamma d_i dx$, we multiply

$v_i|v|^2$ and integrate with respect to $dvdx$ on the equation (1.1).

$$(5.7) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} F v_i |v|^2 dv dx = \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} (\mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F) - F) v_i |v|^2 dv dx.$$

We recall from (2.10)₂ that the energy flux can be expressed as follows:

$$(5.8) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} F(x, v, t) v_i |v|^2 dv = q_i + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq 3} 2\rho U_j \Theta_{ij} + \rho U_i |U|^2 + U_i \rho \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} \Theta_{ii}.$$

On the other hand, an explicit computation using the following decomposition of $v_i|v|^2$

$$\begin{aligned} v_i|v|^2 &= (v_i - U_i)|v - U|^2 + 2(v_i - U_i)(v - U) \cdot U + (v_i - U_i)|U|^2 \\ &\quad + U_i|v - U|^2 + 2U_i(v - U) \cdot U + U_i|U|^2, \end{aligned}$$

gives

$$(5.9) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F)(x, v, t) v_i |v|^2 dv = (1 - Pr)q_i + 2U_i \rho T + \rho U_i |U|^2 + U_i 3\rho T.$$

Inserting (5.8) and (5.9) into (5.7), we get the following evolution law for the energy flux for $Pr = 0$:

$$(5.10) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} F(x, v, t) v_i |v|^2 dv dx = \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \left(2U_i \rho T - \sum_{1 \leq j \leq 3} 2\rho U_j \Theta_{ij} \right) dx,$$

which, combined with the momentum conservation law:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} F(x, v, t) v dv dx = 0,$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v_i |v|^2 m dv = 0,$$

gives the evolution law for d_i :

$$(5.11) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} d_i(x, t) dx = \frac{1}{10\tau} \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} 2U_i \rho T - \sum_{1 \leq j \leq 3} 2\rho U_j \Theta_{ij} dx \right).$$

Then, from Lemma 3.1,

$$U, \rho T, \rho \Theta \leq \|f\|_{L_v^2},$$

we get

$$(5.12) \quad \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \partial_t d_i(x, t) dx \right| = \left| \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} d_i(x, t) dx \right| \leq C \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \|f\|_{L_v^2}^2 dx \leq C\mathcal{E}(t).$$

Inserting this, into the Poincaré inequality (5.6), we get the desired estimate for $|\gamma| = 1$:

$$\|\partial_t d_i\|_{L_x^2} \leq \|\nabla_x \partial_t d_i\|_{L_x^2} + C\mathcal{E}(t).$$

(2) The case of $|\gamma| = 0$: We note from (5.4) that

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} d_i(x, 0) dx = \int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} \frac{v_i(|v|^2 - 5)}{10} F(x, v, 0) dv dx = 0.$$

Therefore, integration (5.11) with respect to dt gives

$$(5.13) \quad \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} d_i(x, t) dx = \frac{1}{10\tau} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \frac{2}{3} U_i \rho (\Theta_{11} + \Theta_{22} + \Theta_{33} - 3\Theta_{ii}) - \sum_{j \neq i} 2\rho U_j \Theta_{ij} dx dt,$$

where we used $3T = \Theta_{11} + \Theta_{22} + \Theta_{33}$. To estimate the first term of the R.H.S., we observe

$$\rho(\Theta_{jj} - \Theta_{ii}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} F(v_j^2 - v_i^2) dv + \rho U_j^2 - \rho U_i^2.$$

Therefore, substituting $F = m + \sqrt{m}f$ and applying the Hölder inequality, we get

$$(5.14) \quad \begin{aligned} |\rho(\Theta_{jj} - \Theta_{ii})| &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (m + \sqrt{m}f) (v_j^2 - v_i^2) dv + \frac{(\rho U_j)^2 + (\rho U_i)^2}{\rho} \\ &\leq C\|f\|_{L_v^2} + C\|f\|_{L_v^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the lower bound of ρ in Lemma 3.1 (1) and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} m(v_j^2 - v_i^2) dv = 0.$$

We insert (5.14) into (5.13), and apply $\rho U/\rho \leq C\|f\|_{L_v^2}$ and $\rho\Theta \leq C\|f\|_{L_v^2}$ to obtain

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} d_i(x, t) dx \right| \leq C \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \|f\|_{L_v^2}^2 + \|f\|_{L_v^2}^3 dx dt.$$

We then apply the Sobolev embedding $H^2 \subset\subset L^\infty$ to bound

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \|f\|_{L_v^2}^3 dx \leq \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^3} \|f\|_{L_v^2} \|f\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2 \leq \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} \|\partial^\alpha f\|_{L_{x,v}^2} \|f\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2 \leq \sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)} \|f\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2.$$

Therefore,

$$(5.15) \quad \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} d_i(x, t) dx \right| \leq (1 + \sqrt{M_0}) \int_0^t \|f\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2 dt \leq (1 + \sqrt{M_0}) \mathcal{E}(t),$$

where M_0 is from Theorem 3.5 (1). We note that this is why we use the energy functional with the time integration of the production term. Combining (5.15) with (5.12) gives

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \partial^\gamma d_i(x, t) dx \right| \leq C(1 + \sqrt{M_0}) \mathcal{E}(t),$$

for $|\gamma| = 0, 1$. Substituting it into (5.6) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial^\gamma d_i\|_{L_x^2} &\leq \|\nabla_x \partial^\gamma d_i\|_{L_x^2} + C(1 + \sqrt{M_0}) \mathcal{E}(t) \\ &\leq C \left(\|\partial^\gamma \tilde{l}\|_{L_x^2} + \|\partial^\gamma \tilde{h}\|_{L_x^2} \right) + C(1 + \sqrt{M_0}) \mathcal{E}(t), \end{aligned}$$

where we used the result of (Step 2).

(3) The case of $2 \leq |\gamma| \leq N$: We have from (5.3)₅

$$\partial_t^{|\gamma|} d_i = \partial_t^{|\gamma|-1} l_{is} + \partial_t^{|\gamma|-1} h_{is} - \partial_t^{|\gamma|-1} \partial_{x_i} c.$$

Since the last term $\partial_t^{|\gamma|-1} \partial_{x_i} c$ has at least one time derivative, we can apply the estimate of $\partial_t c$ in (Step 1):

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t^{|\gamma|} d_i\|_{L_x^2} &\leq C \left(\|\partial_t^{|\gamma|-1} l_{is}\|_{L_x^2} + \|\partial_t^{|\gamma|-1} h_{is}\|_{L_x^2} + \|\partial_t^{|\gamma|-1} \partial_{x_i} c\|_{L_x^2} \right) \\ &\leq C \sum_{|\alpha| \leq N-1} (\|\partial^\alpha \tilde{l}\|_{L_x^2} + \|\partial^\alpha \tilde{h}\|_{L_x^2}). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we combine (1)-(3) to get the desired result:

$$\|\partial^\gamma d_i\|_{L_x^2} \leq C \sum_{|\alpha| \leq N-1} (\|\partial^\alpha \tilde{l}\|_{L_x^2} + \|\partial^\alpha \tilde{h}\|_{L_x^2}) + C\mathcal{E}(t).$$

• **Step 4:** We first consider the estimate of c which has at least one spatial derivative. We take ∂^α on (5.3)₅ to get

$$\partial^\alpha \partial_{x_i} c = \partial^\alpha l_{is} + \partial^\alpha h_{is} - \partial^\alpha \partial_t d_i.$$

Using (Step 3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial^\alpha \partial_{x_i} c\|_{L_x^2} &\leq \|\partial^\alpha l_{is}\|_{L_x^2} + \|\partial^\alpha h_{is}\|_{L_x^2} + \|\partial^\alpha \partial_t d_i\|_{L_x^2} \\ &\leq C \sum_{|\alpha| \leq N-1} (\|\partial^\alpha \tilde{l}\|_{L_x^2} + \|\partial^\alpha \tilde{h}\|_{L_x^2}) + C\mathcal{E}(t). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we use the Poincaré inequality to get the estimate of c without derivative:

$$\|c\|_{L_x^2} \leq \|\nabla_x c\|_{L_x^2} \leq C \sum_{|\alpha| \leq N-1} (\|\partial^\alpha \tilde{l}\|_{L_x^2} + \|\partial^\alpha \tilde{h}\|_{L_x^2}) + C\mathcal{E}(t).$$

This completes the proof of Proposition 5.1. \square

Finally, we need to estimate the R.H.S. of (5.1).

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose that $\mathcal{E}(t)$ is sufficiently small. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} (1) \quad &\sum_{|\alpha| \leq N-1} \|\partial^\alpha \tilde{l}\|_{L_x^2} \leq C \sum_{|\alpha| \leq N} \|(I - P_{Pr})\partial^\alpha f\|_{L_{x,v}^2}, \\ (2) \quad &\sum_{|\alpha| \leq N} \|\partial^\alpha \tilde{h}\|_{L_x^2} \leq CM_0 \sum_{|\alpha| \leq N} \|\partial^\alpha f\|_{L_{x,v}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. These estimates are standard (See for example [23, 24, 48]). The only difference is that, as we can see in (5.2), the number of basis changes from 13 to 19, so we omit it. \square

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 5.1.

5.1. Proof of Theorem 5.1. From Proposition 5.1, we have Lemma 5.2,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq N} \|P_{Pr} \partial^\alpha f\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2 &\leq C \sum_{|\alpha| \leq N} \left(\|\partial^\alpha a\|_{L_x^2}^2 + \|\partial^\alpha b\|_{L_x^2}^2 + \|\partial^\alpha c\|_{L_x^2}^2 + \|\partial^\alpha d\|_{L_x^2}^2 \right) \\ &\leq C \sum_{|\alpha| \leq N-1} \left(\|\partial^\alpha \tilde{l}\|_{L_x^2} + \|\partial^\alpha \tilde{h}\|_{L_x^2} + C\mathcal{E}(t) \right)^2 \\ &\leq C \sum_{|\alpha| \leq N} \|(I - P_{Pr})\partial^\alpha f\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2 + CM_0 \sum_{|\alpha| \leq N} \|\partial^\alpha f\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2 + C\mathcal{E}^2(t). \end{aligned}$$

Adding $\sum \|(I - P_{Pr})\partial^\alpha f\|_{L^2_{x,v}}^2$ on both side, we get

$$\sum_{|\alpha| \leq N} \|\partial^\alpha f\|_{L^2_{x,v}}^2 \leq C \sum_{|\alpha| \leq N} \|(I - P_{Pr})\partial^\alpha f\|_{L^2_{x,v}}^2 + C\mathcal{E}^2(t),$$

for the sufficiently small M_0 . This, combined with the degenerate coercivity estimate in Proposition 2.2 (2), lead to the following modified coercivity estimate for sufficiently small $\mathcal{E}(t)$:

$$\sum_{|\alpha| \leq N} \langle L_{Pr}\partial^\alpha f, \partial^\alpha f \rangle_{L^2_{x,v}} \leq -\delta \sum_{|\alpha| \leq N} \|\partial^\alpha f\|_{L^2_{x,v}}^2 + C\mathcal{E}^2(t),$$

for some positive constant $\delta > 0$. This completes the proof of Theorem 5.1.

6. GLOBAL EXISTENCE

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.1. We will only prove

$$(6.1) \quad \sum_{\substack{|\alpha|+|\beta| \leq N \\ |\beta| \leq m}} \left\{ C_{m_1} \frac{d}{dt} \|\partial_\beta^\alpha f\|_{L^2_{x,v}}^2 + \delta_m \sum_{|\alpha| \leq N} \|\partial_\beta^\alpha f\|_{L^2_{x,v}}^2 \right\} \leq C_{m_2} \mathcal{E}^2(t),$$

for some positive constants C_{m_1} , C_{m_2} , and δ_m for $0 \leq m \leq N$, since the standard argument in [23, 24, 48] leads to the desired result.

Proof of (6.1): Let f be a local-in-time solution constructed in Theorem 3.5. We apply the induction argument for the momentum derivative $|\beta| = m$. For $m = 0$, taking ∂^α on (2.20) and applying inner product with $\partial^\alpha f$ give

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\partial^\alpha f\|_{L^2_{x,v}}^2 = \frac{1}{\tau_0} \langle \partial^\alpha f, L_{Pr}\partial^\alpha f \rangle_{L^2_{x,v}} + \langle \partial^\alpha f, \partial^\alpha \Gamma(f) \rangle_{L^2_{x,v}}.$$

We then apply the coercivity estimate (4.3) in the case $Pr > 0$, and apply Theorem 5.1 in the degenerate case $Pr = 0$, to obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\partial^\alpha f\|_{L^2_{x,v}}^2 + \delta \|\partial^\alpha f\|_{L^2_{x,v}}^2 \leq \langle \partial^\alpha f, \partial^\alpha \Gamma(f) \rangle_{L^2_{x,v}}.$$

For the nonlinear term, we apply Proposition 3.1 to have

$$\langle \partial^\alpha f, \partial^\alpha \Gamma(f) \rangle_{L^2_{x,v}} \leq C\sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)} \sum_{|\alpha_1|+|\alpha_2| \leq |\alpha|} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \|\partial^{\alpha_1} f\|_{L_v^2} \|\partial^{\alpha_2} f\|_{L_v^2} \|\partial^\alpha f\|_{L_v^2} dx.$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $|\alpha_1| \leq |\alpha_2|$, and employ the Sobolev embedding $H^2 \subset\subset L^\infty$ to get

$$\langle \partial^\alpha f, \partial^\alpha \Gamma(f) \rangle_{L^2_{x,v}} \leq C\sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)} \left(\sum_{|\alpha_1| \leq |\alpha|} \|\partial^{\alpha_1} f\|_{L^2_{x,v}} \right)^2 \|\partial^\alpha f\|_{L^2_{x,v}} \leq \mathcal{E}^2(t).$$

Thus we obtain the following estimate of $|\beta| = 0$:

$$\mathcal{E}_0^\alpha : \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\partial^\alpha f\|_{L^2_{x,v}}^2 + \delta \|\partial^\alpha f\|_{L^2_{x,v}}^2 \leq C\mathcal{E}^2(t).$$

Now we consider the case $|\beta| = m > 0$. We take ∂_β^α on (2.20) and apply inner product with $\partial_\beta^\alpha f$.

$$(6.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_\beta^\alpha &: \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\partial_\beta^\alpha f\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2 + \frac{1}{\tau_0} \|\partial_\beta^\alpha f\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^3 \langle \partial_\beta^\alpha f, \partial_{\beta-k_i}^{\alpha+\bar{k}_i} \partial_\beta^\alpha f \rangle_{L_{x,v}^2} + \frac{1}{\tau_0} \langle \partial_\beta^\alpha f, \partial_\beta P_{Pr}(\partial^\alpha f) \rangle_{L_{x,v}^2} + \langle \partial_\beta^\alpha f, \partial_\beta^\alpha \Gamma(f) \rangle_{L_{x,v}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

The first two terms on the second line can be estimated by Young's inequality:

$$\langle \partial_\beta^\alpha f, \partial_{\beta-k_i}^{\alpha+\bar{k}_i} \partial_\beta^\alpha f \rangle_{L_{x,v}^2} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} \|\partial_\beta^\alpha f\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \|\partial_{\beta-k_i}^{\alpha+\bar{k}_i} f\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2,$$

and

$$\langle \partial_\beta^\alpha f, \partial_\beta P_{Pr}(\partial^\alpha f) \rangle_{L_{x,v}^2} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} \|\partial_\beta^\alpha f\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \|\partial^\alpha f\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2,$$

where we used

$$\|\partial_\beta P_{Pr}(\partial^\alpha f)\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2 \leq \|\partial^\alpha f\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2.$$

To estimate the last term of (6.2), we apply Proposition 3.1.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_\beta^\alpha &: \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\partial_\beta^\alpha f\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2 + \frac{1}{\tau_0} \|\partial_\beta^\alpha f\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2 \\ &\leq C_\epsilon \|\partial_\beta^\alpha f\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \sum_{i=1}^3 \|\partial_{\beta-k_i}^{\alpha+\bar{k}_i} f\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \|\partial^\alpha f\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2 + C\mathcal{E}^2(t). \end{aligned}$$

For sufficiently small ϵ , the right-hand side of $\|\partial_\beta^\alpha f\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2$ can be absorbed in the left-hand side of that. Once we take $\sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta|\leq N}$ and $\sum_{|\beta|=m+1}$ on each side, then the 2-nd and the 3-rd terms of the second line is bounded by the induction hypothesis:

$$\sum_{\substack{|\alpha|+|\beta|\leq N \\ |\beta|=m+1}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^3 \|\partial_{\beta-k_i}^{\alpha+\bar{k}_i} f\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2 + \|\partial^\alpha f\|_{L_{x,v}^2}^2 \right) \leq C_m \sum_{\substack{|\alpha|+|\beta|\leq N \\ |\beta|\leq m}} \mathcal{E}_\beta^\alpha + C_0 \sum_{|\alpha|\leq N} \mathcal{E}^\alpha \leq C\mathcal{E}^2(t).$$

Thus we have the desired result. This completes the proof.

Acknowledgement: G.-C. Bae is supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea(NRF) grant funded by the Korea government(MSIT) (No. 2021R1C1C2094843). S.-B. Yun is supported by Samsung Science and Technology Foundation under Project Number SSTF-BA1801-02.

7. APPENDIX

In this part, we prove the conservation laws (1.6), the H -theorem (1.7), and the cancellation property (1.8) of the Shakhov model. We present the proof in detail for the reader's convenience.

Lemma 7.1. *The Shakhov model satisfies the conservation laws (1.6) and the additional cancellation property (1.8).*

Proof. It is enough to show that

$$\begin{aligned}
(1) \quad & \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F)(x, v, t) dv = \rho, \\
(2) \quad & \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (v - U) \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F)(x, v, t) dv = 0, \\
(3) \quad & \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |v - U|^2 \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F)(x, v, t) dv = 3\rho T, \\
(4) \quad & \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F) - F)(v_i - U_i) |v - U|^2 dv = -Prq_i.
\end{aligned}$$

(1) We integrate the Shakhov operator (1.3) with respect to dv and take the change of variable $(v - U) \rightarrow v$ to get

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F) dv = \rho + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{\rho}{\sqrt{2\pi T}^3} \exp\left(-\frac{|v|^2}{2T}\right) \frac{1 - Pr}{5} \frac{q \cdot v}{\rho T^2} \left(\frac{|v|^2}{2T} - \frac{5}{2}\right) dv = \rho.$$

(2) Multiplying $\mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F)$ by $(v_i - U_i)$ and applying the change of variable $(v - U) \rightarrow v$ yield

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (v_i - U_i) \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F) dv &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v_i \frac{\rho}{\sqrt{2\pi T}^3} \exp\left(-\frac{|v|^2}{2T}\right) \frac{1 - Pr}{5} \frac{q \cdot v}{\rho T^2} \left(\frac{|v|^2}{2T} - \frac{5}{2}\right) dv \\
&= \frac{1 - Pr}{5} \frac{\rho}{\sqrt{2\pi T}^3} \frac{1}{\rho T^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} q_i v_i^2 \left(\frac{|v|^2}{2T} - \frac{5}{2}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{|v|^2}{2T}\right) dv \\
&= \frac{1 - Pr}{5} \frac{\rho}{\sqrt{2\pi T}^3} \frac{1}{\rho T^2} \frac{1}{3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} q_i |v|^2 \left(\frac{|v|^2}{2T} - \frac{5}{2}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{|v|^2}{2T}\right) dv.
\end{aligned}$$

We then take another change of variable $v/\sqrt{2T} \rightarrow v$ to obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (v_i - U_i) \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F) dv = \frac{1 - Pr}{15} \frac{q_i}{4\pi^{3/2} T^4} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |v|^4 e^{-|v|^2} dv - \frac{5}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |v|^2 e^{-|v|^2} dv \right) = 0,$$

where we used

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |v|^4 e^{-|v|^2} dv = \frac{15\pi^{\frac{3}{2}}}{4}, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |v|^2 e^{-|v|^2} dv = \frac{3\pi^{\frac{3}{2}}}{2}.$$

(3) We integrate $\mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F)$ with respect to $|v - U|^2 dv$ and the change of variable $(v - U) \rightarrow v$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |v - U|^2 \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F) dv &= 3\rho T + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |v|^2 \frac{\rho}{\sqrt{2\pi T}^3} \exp\left(-\frac{|v|^2}{2T}\right) \frac{1 - Pr}{5} \frac{q \cdot v}{\rho T^2} \left(\frac{|v|^2}{2T} - \frac{5}{2}\right) dv \\
&= 3\rho T.
\end{aligned}$$

(4) Integrating the Shakhov operator $\mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F)$ with respect to $(v_i - U)|v - U|^2 dv$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F)(v_i - U)|v - U|^2 dv &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v_i |v|^2 \left[1 + \frac{1 - Pr}{5} \frac{q \cdot v}{\rho T^2} \left(\frac{|v|^2}{2T} - \frac{5}{2} \right) \right] \frac{\rho}{\sqrt{2\pi T^3}} e^{-\frac{|v|^2}{2T}} dv \\
&= \frac{1 - Pr}{5} \frac{q_i}{\rho T^2} \frac{\rho}{\sqrt{2\pi T^3}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left[\left(\frac{v_i^2 |v|^4}{2T} - \frac{5}{2} v_i^2 |v|^2 \right) \right] e^{-\frac{|v|^2}{2T}} dv \\
&= \frac{1 - Pr}{15} \frac{q_i}{\rho T^2} \frac{\rho}{\sqrt{2\pi T^3}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left[\left(\frac{|v|^6}{2T} - \frac{5}{2} |v|^4 \right) \right] e^{-\frac{|v|^2}{2T}} dv \\
&= (1 - Pr) q_i.
\end{aligned}$$

Then by the definition of the heat flux q_i , we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F) - F)(v_i - U)|v - U|^2 dv = -Pr q_i.$$

□

Lemma 7.2. [40] *The Shakhov model satisfies the H-theorem (1.7) when the distribution function $F(x, v, t)$ is sufficiently close to the global Maxwellian in the sense that*

$$|\rho - 1| + |U| + |T - 1| + |q| \ll 1.$$

Remark 7.3. We remark that the above smallness condition is satisfied by the solution derived in Theorem 1.1.

Proof. We take $(1 + \ln F) dv dx$ on both sides of (1.1):

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} F \ln F dv dx &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} (\mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F) - F) \ln F dv dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} (\mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F) - F) \ln \frac{F}{\mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F)} dv dx \\
&\quad + \int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} (\mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F) - F) \ln \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F) dv dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Since the first term is non-positive, we only consider the second term. We expand $\ln \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F)$ with respect to q as

$$\ln \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F) = \ln \mathcal{M} + \frac{1 - Pr}{5} \frac{(v - U)}{\rho T^2} \left(\frac{|v - U|^2}{2T} - \frac{5}{2} \right) \cdot q + O(q^2),$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} (\mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F) - F) \ln \mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F) dv dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} (\mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F) - F) \times \left[\ln \mathcal{M} + \frac{1 - Pr}{5} \frac{q \cdot (v - U)}{\rho T^2} \left(\frac{|v - U|^2}{2T} - \frac{5}{2} \right) + O(q^2) \right] dv dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \frac{1 - Pr}{5\rho T^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F) - F) \times \left[q \cdot (v - U) \left(\frac{|v - U|^2}{2T} - \frac{5}{2} \right) \right] dv dx + O(q^2) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \frac{-Pr(1 - Pr)|q|^2}{10\rho T^3} dx + O(q^2).
\end{aligned}$$

In the last line, we used

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\mathcal{S}_{Pr}(F) - F)(v - U)|v - U|^2 dv = -Prq(x, t).$$

Since ρ and T have lower bounds by the assumption, for sufficiently small q , we have the desired result. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Andries, P., Le Tallec, P., Perlat, J.-P., Perthame, B.: The Gaussian-BGK model of Boltzmann equation with small Prandtl number. *Eur. J. Mech. B Fluids* **19** (2000), no. 6, 813-830.
- [2] Bae, G.-C., Yun, S.-B.: Quantum BGK model near a global Fermi-Dirac distribution. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **52** (2020), no. 3, 2313-2352.
- [3] Belcher, J. R., Slaton, W. V., Raspet, R., Bass, H. E., and Lightfoot, J.: Working gases in thermoacoustic engines. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, **105** (1999), no. 5, 2677-2684.
- [4] Bellouquid, A.: Global existence and large-time behavior for BGK model for a gas with non-constant cross section. *Transport Theory Statist. Phys.* **32** (2003), no. 2, 157-184.
- [5] Bhattachagor, P., Gross, E. and Krook, M.: A model for collision processes in gases. *Physical Review*, **94** (1954), no. 3, 511.
- [6] Bouchut, F., Perthame, B.: A BGK model for small Prandtl number in the Navier-Stokes approximation. *J. Statist. Phys.* **71** (1993), no. 1-2, 191-207.
- [7] Brull, S., Schneider, J.: A new approach of the Ellipsoidal Statistical Model. *Cont. Mech. Thermodyn.* **20** (2008), no.2, 63-74.
- [8] Cai, Z., Li, R., Qiao, Z. . NR xx simulation of microflows with Shakhov model. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, **34** (2012), no.1, A339-A369.
- [9] Campo, A., Papari, M. M., and Abu-Nada, E.: Estimation of the minimum Prandtl number for binary gas mixtures formed with light helium and certain heavier gases: Application to thermoacoustic refrigerators. *Applied Thermal Engineering*, **31** (2011) no. 16, 3142-3146.
- [10] Cercignani, C.: The Boltzmann equation and its applications. *Applied Mathematical Sciences*, 67. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1988.
- [11] Cercignani, C., Illner, R., Pulvirenti, M.: The mathematical theory of dilute gases. *Applied Mathematical Sciences*, 106. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994.
- [12] Chapman, S., Cowling, T. G.: The mathematical theory of non-uniform gases. An account of the kinetic theory of viscosity, thermal conduction and diffusion in gases. Third edition, prepared in co-operation with D. Burnett Cambridge University Press, London 1970.
- [13] Chen, S., Xu, K., Cai, Q.: A comparison and unification of ellipsoidal statistical and Shakhov BGK models. *Adv. Appl. Math. Mech.* **7** (2015), no. 2, 245-266.
- [14] Choi, Y.-P., Yun, S.-B.: A BGK kinetic model with local velocity alignment forces. *Netw. Heterog. Media* **15** (2020), no. 3, 389-404. (with Cho, Y.-P.)
- [15] Choi, Y.-P., Yun, S.-B.: Global existence of weak solutions for Navier-Stokes-BGK system. *Nonlinearity*. **33** (2020), no. 4, 1925-1955. (with Choi, Y.-P.)

- [16] Choi, Y.-P., Yun, S.-B.: Strong solutions to the inhomogeneous Navier-Stokes-BGK system. *Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl.* **57** (2021), 103196. (with Choi, Y.-P., Lee, J.)
- [17] Desvillettes, L.: Convergence to equilibrium in large time for Boltzmann and B.G.K. equations. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **110** (1990), no. 1, 73-91.
- [18] DiPerna, R. J., Lions, P.-L.: On the Cauchy problem for Boltzmann equations: global existence and weak stability. *Ann. of Math. (2)* **130** (1989), no. 2, 321-366.
- [19] Glassey, R.: The Cauchy problem in kinetic theory. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 1996.
- [20] Grad, H.: Asymptotic theory of the Boltzmann equation. II. 1963 Rarefied Gas Dynamics (Proc. 3rd Internat. Sympos., Palais de l'UNESCO, Paris, 1962), Vol. I pp. 26-59 Academic Press, New York.
- [21] Graur, I. A., Polikarpov, A. P.: Comparison of different kinetic models for the heat transfer problem. *Heat and Mass Transfer*, **46** (2009) no. 2, 237-244.
- [22] Greenberg, W., Polewczak, J.: A global existence theorem for the nonlinear BGK equation. *J. Statist. Phys.* **55** (1989), no. 5-6, 1313-1321.
- [23] Guo, Y.: The Vlasov-Poisson-Boltzmann system near Maxwellians. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **55** (2002), no. 9, 1104-1135.
- [24] Guo, Y.: The Vlasov-Maxwell-Boltzmann system near Maxwellians. *Invent. Math.* **153** (2003), no. 3, 593-630.
- [25] Guo, Y.: The Boltzmann equation in the whole space. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **53** (2004), no. 4, 1081-1094.
- [26] Holway, L. H. Jr.: Kinetic theory of shock structure using an ellipsoidal distribution function. 1966 Rarefied Gas Dynamics, Vol. I (Proc. Fourth Internat. Sympos., Univ. Toronto, 1964) pp. 193-215 Academic Press, New York.
- [27] Issautier, D.: Convergence of a weighted particle method for solving the Boltzmann (B.G.K.) equation, *Siam Journal on Numerical Analysis*, **33**, no 6 (1996), 2099-2199. 119135
- [28] Khachatryan, A. Kh., Khachatryan, A. A.: Some solvability problems for the Boltzmann equation in the framework of the Shakhov model. *Teoret. Mat. Fiz.* **191** (2017), no. 3, 441-455.
- [29] Kim, D., Lee, M.-S., Yun, S.-B.: Entropy production estimate for the ES-BGK model with the correct Prandtl number. Available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.14328>
- [30] Latyshev, A. V., Yushmanov, A. A.: Analytic solution of boundary value problems for the Shakhov equation with the collision frequency proportional to the molecule velocity. *Fluid Dynam.* **38** (2003), no. 4, 632-645.
- [31] Liu, G.: A method for constructing a model form for the Boltzmann equation. *Physics of Fluids A: Fluid Dynamics*, **2** (1990), no. 2, 277-280.
- [32] Pantazis, S., Valougeorgis, D.: Heat transfer through rarefied gases between coaxial cylindrical surfaces with arbitrary temperature difference. *European Journal of Mechanics-B/Fluids*, **29** (2010), no. 6, 494-509.
- [33] Park, S.-J., Yun, S.-B.: Cauchy problem for ellipsoidal BGK model for polyatomic particles. *J. Differential Equations* **266** (2019), no.11, 7678-7708.
- [34] Park, S.-J., Yun, S.-B.: Entropy production estimates for the polyatomic ellipsoidal BGK model. *Appl. Math. Lett.* **58** (2016), 26-33.
- [35] Park, S.-J., Yun, S.-B.: On a positive decomposition of entropy production functional for the polyatomic BGK model. *Appl. Math. Lett.* **77** (2018), 122-129.
- [36] Perthame, B.: Global existence to the BGK model of Boltzmann equation. *J. Differential Equations* **82** (1989), no. 1, 191-205.
- [37] Perthame, B., Pulvirenti, M.: Weighted L^∞ bounds and uniqueness for the Boltzmann BGK model. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **125** (1993), no. 3, 289-295.
- [38] Russo, G., Santagati, P. and Yun, S.-B.: Convergence of a semi-Lagrangian scheme for the BGK model of the Boltzmann equation. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **50** (2012), no. 3, 1111-1135.
- [39] Russo, G. and Yun, S.-B.: Convergence of a Semi-Lagrangian Scheme for the Ellipsoidal BGK Model of the Boltzmann Equation. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, **56** (2018), no. 6, 3580-3610.
- [40] Shakhov, E. M.: Generalization of the Krook kinetic relaxation equation. *Fluid dynamics*, **3** (1968), no. 5, 95-96.
- [41] Struchtrup, H.: The BGK-model with velocity-dependent collision frequency. *Contin. Mech. Thermodyn.* **9** (1997), no. 1, 23-31.
- [42] Thual, O.: Zero-Prandtl-number convection. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, **240**, (1992) 229-258.

- [43] Titarev, V. A.: Conservative numerical methods for model kinetic equations. *Comput. Fluids* **36** (2007), no. 9, 1446-1459.
- [44] Todorova, B., Steijl, R.: Derivation and numerical comparison of Shakhov and ellipsoidal statistical kinetic models for a monoatomic gas mixture. *Eur. J. Mech. B Fluids* **76** (2019), 390-402.
- [45] Ukai, S.: On the existence of global solutions of mixed problem for non-linear Boltzmann equation. *Proc. Japan Acad.* **50** (1974), 179-184.
- [46] Villani, C.: A review of mathematical topics in collisional kinetic theory. *Handbook of mathematical fluid dynamics*, Vol. I, 71-305, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2002.
- [47] Welander, P.: On the temperature jump in a rarefied gas. *Ark. Fys.* **7** (1954), 507-553.
- [48] Yun, S.-B.: Cauchy problem for the Boltzmann-BGK model near a global Maxwellian. *J. Math. Phys.* **51** (2010), no. 12, 123514, 24 pp.
- [49] Yun, S.-B.: Classical solutions for the ellipsoidal BGK model with fixed collision frequency. *J. Differential Equations* **259** (2015), no. 11, 6009-6037.
- [50] Yun, S.-B.: Ellipsoidal BGK model near a global Maxwellian. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **47** (2015), no. 3, 2324-2354.
- [51] Yun, S.-B.: Entropy production for ellipsoidal BGK model of the Boltzmann equation. *Kinet. Relat. Models* **9** (2016), no. 3, 605-619.
- [52] Yun, S.-B.: Ellipsoidal BGK model for polyatomic molecules near Maxwellians: a dichotomy in the dissipation estimate. *J. Differential Equations* **266** (2019), no. 9, 5566-5614.
- [53] Zhang, X., Hu, S.: L^p solutions to the Cauchy problem of the BGK equation. *J. Math. Phys.* **48** (2007), no. 11, 113304, 17 pp.
- [54] Zhang, Y., Xu, A., Zhang, G., Chen, Z., Wang, P.: Discrete Boltzmann method for non-equilibrium flows: based on Shakhov model. *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **238** (2019), 50-65.
- [55] Zheng, Y., Struchtrup, H.: Ellipsoidal statistical Bhatnagar–Gross–Krook model with velocity-dependent collision frequency. *Physics of fluids*, **17** (2005), no. 12, 127103.

RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, SEOUL NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, SEOUL 08826, REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Email address: gcbae02@snu.ac.kr

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SUNGKYUNKWAN UNIVERSITY, SUWON 16419, REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Email address: sbyun01@skku.edu