

PRANDTL-BACHELOR FLOWS ON A DISK

MINGWEN FEI, CHEN GAO, ZHIWU LIN, AND TAO TAO

ABSTRACT. For steady two-dimensional flows with a single eddy (i.e. nested closed streamlines), Prandtl (1905) and Batchelor (1956) proposed that in the limit of vanishing viscosity the vorticity is constant in an inner region separated from the boundary layer. In this paper, by constructing higher order approximate solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations and establishing the validity of Prandtl boundary layer expansion, we give a rigorous proof of the existence of Prandtl-Batchelor flows on a disk with the wall velocity slightly different from the rigid-rotation. The leading order term of the flow is the constant vorticity solution (i.e. rigid rotation) satisfying Batchelor-Wood formula.

1. INTRODUCTION

In his famous paper [34] on the birth of boundary layer theory, Prandtl (1904) noted that in the limit of infinite Reynolds number, the vorticity of steady two-dimensional laminar flows becomes constant within a region of nested closed streamlines (i.e. a single eddy). The same property was later rediscovered by Batchelor (1956) in [1]. See also the conference abstract [6] of Feynman and Lagerstrom (1956). This class of result is now usually referred to as Prandtl-Batchelor theory and such laminar flows are called Prandtl-Batchelor (PB) flows in the literature. For PB flows on a circular disk, the formula of the limiting vorticity constant was given in ([1, 6, 43]) and is usually referred to as the Batchelor-Wood formula. For PB flows on more general domains, it is more difficult to determine the limiting vorticity constant and partial results were given in ([5, 6, 26, 38, 39, 43]). The Prandtl-Batchelor theory plays an important role in many studies involving laminar flows with small viscosity, for example, the nonlinear critical layer theory near shear flows in [28]. It also implies a selection mechanism of the Navier-Stokes equations in the inviscid limit. Although the Euler equations have infinitely many steady solutions, only those Euler solutions satisfying the PB theory can appear in the inviscid limit. That is, the vorticity of the compatible Euler solution must be a constant within each eddy.

Moreover, the Prandtl-Batchelor theory can be applied to general 2D advection diffusion equation of a passive scalar field $\theta(x, y)$

$$u \cdot \nabla \theta - R^{-1} \Delta \theta = 0,$$

where $u(x, y)$ is a given steady incompressible flow, and R^{-1} is the diffusion coefficient. Then Prandtl-Batchelor theory implies that when R^{-1} tends to zero, θ should tend to a constant within any single eddy associated with the flow u . The first example is the homogenization of potential vorticity in the ocean circulation theory ([33, 36, 37]), where θ is the potential vorticity in the 2D quasi-geostrophic model and R is the Peclet number. Another example is the flux expulsion in the self-excited dynamo theory ([29, 30, 42]), where θ is the magnetic potential and R is the magnetic Reynolds number. Then PB theory implies that within each eddy of the flow u , the magnetic field (i.e. $\nabla \theta$) should become zero when R^{-1} tends to zero.

Despite the importance of PB theory and its wide applications to fluids, there is relatively little mathematical work on this problem. In the existing “proof” of PB theory stemming from [1, 34],

the eddy structure of the laminar flow is a priori assumed. In the Appendix, we give such a proof for the case of a single eddy. It is based on the assumptions that: for sufficiently small viscosity i) the steady flow of Navier-Stokes has a single eddy (i.e. no hyperbolic stagnation point of the stream function); ii) any interior domain is separated from the boundary layer uniformly for vanishing viscosity; iii) inside the interior domain, steady NS solutions tend to a steady Euler solution in C^2 . However, given a domain and the boundary condition, it is difficult to understand the eddy structures (i.e. streamline structures) of the steady solutions of NS equations and control the boundary layer. The above assumptions were never verified in any case rigorously. In a series of works ([20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26]), Kim initiated a mathematical study of PB flows on a disk. In particular, when the boundary velocity is slightly different from a constant, the well-posedness of the Prandtl equation under the Batchelor-Wood condition was shown in [21] and some asymptotic study of the boundary layer expansion was given in [20]. However, it remains difficult to show the convergence of the boundary layer expansion to the steady Navier-Stokes solution.

In this paper, we give the first proof of the existence of PB flow on a disk. As in [21], we assume the boundary condition to be slightly different from a constant rotation. We first construct steady solutions of Euler equations (leading order term of the Navier-Stokes equations) to be the constant vorticity solution (i.e. rigid rotation) satisfying the Batchelor-Wood formula. Then, by constructing higher order approximate solutions and establishing the convergence of Prandtl boundary layer expansion, we construct a class of Prandtl-Batchelor flows to the steady Navier-Stokes equations on a disk. More precisely, we consider the steady Navier-Stokes equations in two dimensional disk $B_1(0)$

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon + \nabla p^\varepsilon - \varepsilon^2 \Delta \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon = 0, \\ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon = 0, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

with rotating boundary

$$\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon|_{\partial B_1} = (\alpha + \eta f(\theta))\mathbf{t}, \quad (1.2)$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$ is reciprocal to Reynolds number, $\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon$ is the velocity, p^ε is the pressure, $\alpha > 0$, η is a small number, $\mathbf{t}$ is the unit tangential vector to ∂B_1 , and $f(\theta)$ is a 2π -periodic smooth function. Let $u^\varepsilon(\theta, r)$ be the tangential component and $v^\varepsilon(\theta, r)$ be the normal component of $\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon$ in polar coordinates, then (1.1) reads

$$\begin{cases} u^\varepsilon u_\theta^\varepsilon + r v^\varepsilon u_r^\varepsilon + u^\varepsilon v^\varepsilon + p_\theta^\varepsilon - \varepsilon^2 (r u_{rr}^\varepsilon + u_r^\varepsilon + \frac{u_{\theta\theta}^\varepsilon}{r} + \frac{2}{r} v_\theta^\varepsilon - \frac{u^\varepsilon}{r}) = 0, \\ u^\varepsilon v_\theta^\varepsilon + r v^\varepsilon v_r^\varepsilon - (u^\varepsilon)^2 + r p_r^\varepsilon - \varepsilon^2 (r v_{rr}^\varepsilon + v_r^\varepsilon + \frac{v_{\theta\theta}^\varepsilon}{r} - \frac{2}{r} u_\theta^\varepsilon - \frac{v^\varepsilon}{r}) = 0, \\ u_\theta^\varepsilon + r v_r^\varepsilon + v^\varepsilon = 0, \\ u^\varepsilon(\theta, 1) = \alpha + \eta f(\theta), \quad v^\varepsilon(\theta, 1) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

where $(\theta, r) \in \Omega := [0, 2\pi] \times (0, 1]$. Formally, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we obtain the steady Euler equations

$$\begin{cases} u_e \partial_\theta u_e + v_e r \partial_r u_e + u_e v_e + \partial_\theta p_e = 0, \\ u_e \partial_\theta v_e + v_e r \partial_r v_e - (u_e)^2 + r \partial_r p_e = 0, \\ \partial_\theta u_e + \partial_r (r v_e) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (1.4)$$

We will show the existence of solution $(u^\varepsilon, v^\varepsilon)$ to (1.3) which converges to a solution of steady Euler equations (1.4) with constant vorticity as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. We first choose a steady Euler flow with constant vorticity (rigid rotation) which satisfies the Batchelor-Wood formula, then construct a solution $(u^\varepsilon, v^\varepsilon)$ to (1.3) by perturbing this steady Euler flow. However, in general, there is a mismatch between the tangential velocities of the Euler flow u_e and the prescribed Navier-Stokes flows u^ε . Due to the mismatch on the boundary, Prandtl in 1904 formally introduced the boundary layer theory to correct this mismatch, but the justification of this formal boundary expansion is a challenging problem. A first step for the justification of this formal boundary expansion is to

understand the approximate terms in the formal expansion, that is the steady Prandtl equations and linearized steady Prandtl equations, see [3, 13, 32, 35, 40, 41]. For the validity of Prandtl boundary layer expansion, there are some important results in recent years. For the moving boundary, Guo and Nguyen made the first important progress in [10] where they considered the Navier-Stokes equations over a moving plate. Then Iyer in [14] extended Guo-Nguyen's result to the case of a rotating disk by considering the curvature effect. The leading order of Euler flows in [10] and [14] are both shear flows, and the width of the region in [10] and the angle of sector in [14] are small. Later, Iyer in [15] justified the global steady Prandtl expansions over a moving plane under the assumption of the smallness of the mismatch, and considered the situation that Euler flow is a perturbation of shear flow in [16]. For the no-slip boundary, there are also some important works. In [11], Guo and Iyer justified the validity of 2d steady Prandtl layer expansion in a narrow region, and later they extended their result in [12] where they considered the 2d steady Navier-Stokes equations with external force. Gao and Zhang in [7] justified the validity of 2d steady Prandtl layer expansion by introducing the stream function in the error estimates and removed the smallness of the width for shear flow. Then, Iyer and Masmoudi in [17, 18] justified the global-in- x steady Prandtl boundary layer expansion. Very recently, Gao and Zhang in [8] justified the Prandtl expansion under the situation of non-shear Euler flow when the width of the region is small. Moreover, the stability in Sobolev space for some class of shear flows of Prandtl type has been studied by Gerard-Varet and Maekawa in [9], see also [2].

In the current work, we assume that $\int_0^{2\pi} f(\theta)d\theta = 0$ and the leading order of Euler flow $(u_e(\theta, r), v_e(\theta, r))$ is the Couette flow

$$(u_e, v_e) = (ar, 0).$$

There is an important basis for this choice—Prandtl-Batchelor theory in [1](also see Appendix C). This theory shows that if the Euler flow $(u_e(\theta, r), v_e(\theta, r))$ in the disk $B_1(0)$ is the vanishing viscosity limit of Navier-Stokes flow whose streamlines are closed, then it must be the Couette flow

$$(u_e(\theta, r), v_e(\theta, r)) = (ar, 0),$$

where a is a constant. While the Batchelor-Wood formula in [43] shows

$$u_e^2(1) = \alpha^2 + \frac{\eta^2}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f^2(\theta)d\theta.$$

So we take the leading order of Euler flow $(u_e(\theta, r), v_e(\theta, r))$ as follows

$$u_e(\theta, r) = u_e(r) := ar, \quad v_e(\theta, r) = 0, \tag{1.5}$$

where

$$a = \left(\alpha^2 + \frac{\eta^2}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f^2(\theta)d\theta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Then, we introduce the steady Prandtl equations near $r = 1$

$$\begin{cases} (u_e(1) + u_p^{(0)})\partial_\theta u_p^{(0)} + (v_p^{(1)} - v_p^{(1)}(\theta, 0))\partial_Y u_p^{(0)} - \partial_{YY} u_p^{(0)} = 0, \\ \partial_\theta u_p^{(0)} + \partial_Y v_p^{(1)} = 0, \\ u_p^{(0)}(\theta, Y) = u_p^{(0)}(\theta + 2\pi, Y), \quad v_p^{(1)}(\theta, Y) = v_p^{(1)}(\theta + 2\pi, Y), \\ u_p^{(0)}|_{Y=0} = \alpha + \eta f(\theta) - u_e(1), \quad \lim_{Y \rightarrow -\infty} (u_p^{(0)}, v_p^{(1)}) = (0, 0). \end{cases} \tag{1.6}$$

The above steady Prandtl equations will be derived by matched asymptotic expansion and the solvability will be studied in next section.

Now our main theorem is stated as follows.

Theorem 1.1. Assume that $f(\theta)$ is a 2π -periodic smooth function which satisfies $\int_0^{2\pi} f(\theta)d\theta = 0$, then there exist $\varepsilon_0 > 0, \eta_0 > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0), \eta \in (0, \eta_0)$, the Navier-Stokes equations (1.3) have a solution $(u^\varepsilon(\theta, r), v^\varepsilon(\theta, r))$ which satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| u^\varepsilon(\theta, r) - u_e(r) - u_p^{(0)}\left(\theta, \frac{r-1}{\varepsilon}\right) \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} &\leq C\varepsilon, \\ \|v^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} &\leq C\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where $(u_e(r), 0)$ is the Couette flow in (1.5), and $u_p^{(0)}$ is the solution of steady Prandtl equations in (1.6).

Moreover, for any $r < 1$, there holds

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|w^\varepsilon - 2a\|_{L^\infty(B_r(0))} = 0,$$

where $w^\varepsilon(\theta, r)$ is the vorticity of $(u^\varepsilon(\theta, r), v^\varepsilon(\theta, r))$.

Remark 1.2. The condition $\int_0^{2\pi} f(\theta)d\theta = 0$ can be dropped due to the fact

$$\alpha + \eta f(\theta) = \alpha + \frac{\eta}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f(\theta)d\theta + \eta \tilde{f}(\theta)$$

where $\int_0^{2\pi} \tilde{f}(\theta)d\theta = 0$. Moreover, the smoothness of $f(\theta)$ can be relaxed, but we don't pursue this issue here.

Now we present a sketch of the proof and some key ideas.

Step 1: Construction of the approximate solution. We construct an approximate solution (u^a, v^a) by matched asymptotic expansion. The approximate solution consists of Euler part (u_e^a, v_e^a) and Prandtl part (u_p^a, v_p^a) , and satisfies the following estimates

$$|\partial_\theta u_e^a(\theta, r) + v_e^a(\theta, r)| \leq C\varepsilon\eta r, \quad |\partial_\theta v_e^a(\theta, r) - u_e^a(\theta, r) + ar| \leq C\varepsilon\eta r$$

which will be used frequently in the error estimate. The details of constructing the approximate solution will be given in Section 2. After the construction of approximate solution, we derive the equations (3.1) for the error $(u, v) := (u^\varepsilon - u^a, v^\varepsilon - v^a)$, then establish the well-posedness of (3.1). Notice that the nonlinear term can be easily handled by higher order approximation, hence we only need to consider the linearized error equations:

$$\begin{cases} u^a u_\theta + v^a r u_r + u u_\theta^a + v r u_r^a + v^a u + v u^a + p_\theta - \varepsilon^2 \left(r u_{rr} + \frac{u_{\theta\theta}}{r} + 2 \frac{v_\theta}{r} + u_r - \frac{u}{r} \right) = F_u, \\ u^a v_\theta + v^a r v_r + u v_\theta^a + v r v_r^a - 2 u u^a + r p_r - \varepsilon^2 \left(r v_{rr} + \frac{v_{\theta\theta}}{r} - 2 \frac{u_\theta}{r} + v_r - \frac{v}{r} \right) = F_v, \\ u_\theta + (rv)_r = 0, \\ u(\theta + 2\pi, r) = u(\theta, r), \quad v(\theta + 2\pi, r) = v(\theta, r), \\ u(\theta, 1) = 0, \quad v(\theta, 1) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (1.7)$$

Step 2: Linear stability estimate for (1.7). Equations (1.7) are the linearized Navier-Stokes equations around the approximate solution (u^a, v^a) . The leading order of (u^a, v^a) is $\left(ar + \chi(r) u_p^{(0)}\left(\theta, \frac{r-1}{\varepsilon}\right), 0 \right)$, where $\chi(r)$ is a cut-off function, see (2.59). Since $|u_\theta^a| = |u_{p\theta}^{(0)}| \lesssim \eta$, the leading order of the system (1.7) can be simplified as

$$\begin{cases} u^a u_\theta + v r u_r^a + v u^a + p_\theta - \varepsilon^2 \left(r u_{rr} + \frac{u_{\theta\theta}}{r} + 2 \frac{v_\theta}{r} + u_r - \frac{u}{r} \right) = F_u, \\ u^a v_\theta - 2 u u^a + r p_r - \varepsilon^2 \left(r v_{rr} + \frac{v_{\theta\theta}}{r} - 2 \frac{u_\theta}{r} + v_r - \frac{v}{r} \right) = F_v, \\ u_\theta + (rv)_r = 0, \\ u(\theta + 2\pi, r) = u(\theta, r), \quad v(\theta + 2\pi, r) = v(\theta, r), \\ u(\theta, 1) = 0, \quad v(\theta, 1) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (1.8)$$

where u^a can be regarded as $ar + \chi(r)u_p^{(0)}(\theta, \frac{r-1}{\varepsilon})$.

The linear stability estimate consists of a basic energy estimate and a positivity estimate. In fact, it's easy to know that the basic energy estimate is not good enough for obtaining aprior estimate of (1.8) because ε is small. The key point is the following observation which gives the important positivity estimate: u^a is strictly positive, we should make use of the terms $u^a u_\theta$ and $u^a v_\theta$ to obtain a positive quantity from the convective term. To do this, we choose (u_θ, v_θ) as the multiplier, the pressure is eliminated due to the divergence-free condition and the diffusion terms also vanish. It is easy to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (u^a u_\theta + v r u_r^a + v u^a) u_\theta d\theta dr + \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (u^a v_\theta - 2u u^a) v_\theta d\theta dr \\ &= \underbrace{\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (a r u_\theta + 2a r v) u_\theta d\theta dr + \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (a r v_\theta - 2a r u) v_\theta d\theta dr}_I \\ &+ \underbrace{\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (\chi(r) u_p^{(0)} u_\theta + v r \partial_r (\chi(r) u_p^{(0)}) + v \chi(r) u_p^{(0)}) u_\theta d\theta dr + \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (\chi(r) u_p^{(0)} v_\theta - 2u \chi(r) u_p^{(0)}) v_\theta d\theta dr}_{II}. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to get

$$I_1 = a \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r(u_\theta^2 + v_\theta^2) d\theta dr.$$

Moreover, since $\chi(r) = 0$ for $r < \frac{1}{2}$, by the Hardy inequality, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} v r \partial_r (\chi(r) u_p^{(0)}) u_\theta d\theta dr \right| \\ & \leq \left| \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} v r \chi'(r) u_p^{(0)} u_\theta d\theta dr \right| + \left| \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{v r}{r-1} \chi(r) Y \partial_Y u_p^{(0)} u_\theta d\theta dr \right| \\ & \leq C\eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r(u_\theta^2 + v_\theta^2) d\theta dr \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} u \chi(r) u_p^{(0)} v_\theta d\theta dr \right| \\ & \leq \varepsilon \left| \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{u}{r-1} \chi(r) Y u_p^{(0)} v_\theta d\theta dr \right| \leq C\varepsilon\eta \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r u_r^2 d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r v_\theta^2 d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

The other terms in II can be handled by the same argument. Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (u^a u_\theta + v r u_r^a + v u^a) u_\theta d\theta dr + \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (u^a v_\theta - 2u u^a) v_\theta d\theta dr \\ & \geq (a - C\eta) \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r(u_\theta^2 + v_\theta^2) d\theta dr - C\varepsilon^2\eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r u_r^2 d\theta dr. \end{aligned}$$

When η is sufficiently small, $(a - C\eta) \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r(u_\theta^2 + v_\theta^2) d\theta dr$ is a positive quantity. The details of the positivity estimate can be found in Lemma 3.2.

However, the positive quantity $\|\sqrt{r}(u_\theta, v_\theta)\|_2$ don't contain zero-frequency of (u, v) which is needed to obtain the L^∞ estimate for the error (u, v) . Notice that $\int_0^{2\pi} v(\theta, r) d\theta = 0$ because of the divergence-free condition and the boundary condition, we can dominate $\|v\|_2$ by $\|v_\theta\|_2$ using the Poincaré inequality. However $u_0(r) := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} u(\theta, r) d\theta \neq 0$, we need to obtain the estimate of $|u_0(r)|$ from the basic energy estimate.

Now we give a sketch of the basic energy estimate. Choose u_0 as a multiplier to the first equation in (1.8). The diffusion term is

$$\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} -\varepsilon^2 \left(r u_{rr} + \frac{u_{\theta\theta}}{r} + 2 \frac{v_{\theta}}{r} + u_r - \frac{u}{r} \right) u_0(r) d\theta dr = \varepsilon^2 \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \left(r |u'_0|^2 + \frac{u_0^2}{r} \right) d\theta dr.$$

Recall that $u^a = ar + \chi(r)u_p^{(0)}(\theta, \frac{r-1}{\varepsilon})$. It's direct to deduce that the following quantity vanishes:

$$\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (ar u_{\theta} + 2arv + p_{\theta}) u_0 d\theta dr = 0,$$

where we used $\int_0^{2\pi} v(\theta, r) d\theta = 0$. Moreover, the Prandtl part can be handled by the Hardy inequality as above

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (u_p^{(0)} u_{\theta} + vr \partial_r u_p^{(0)} + v u_p^{(0)}) u_0 d\theta dr \\ & \approx \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \varepsilon \chi(r) \left(Y u_p^{(0)} u_{\theta} + \frac{vr}{r-1} Y^2 \partial_Y u_p^{(0)} + v Y u_p^{(0)} \right) \frac{u_0}{r-1} d\theta dr \lesssim \eta \varepsilon \|\sqrt{r}(u_{\theta}, v_{\theta})\|_2 \|\sqrt{r}u'_0\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain that $\varepsilon^2 \|\sqrt{r}u'_0\|_2 \lesssim \|\sqrt{r}(u_{\theta}, v_{\theta})\|_2$. One can see the details of the basic energy estimate in Lemma 3.1.

Combining the positivity estimate and basic energy estimate, we obtain the linear stability of equations (1.8).

Step 3: H^2 estimate for error. To close the nonlinearity, we need the L^∞ estimate. However, the quantity $\|\sqrt{r}(u_{\theta}, v_{\theta})\|_2$ can't be used to control $\|(u, v)\|_0$ due to the weight r , and we can only use $\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r(u_r^2 + v_r^2) d\theta dr$ which comes from the diffusion term. To do this, we first rewrite the error equations and the associated linear stability estimate in Euler coordinates, then get the H^2 estimate by Stokes estimates in a smooth bounded domain, finally $\|(u, v)\|_0$ can be obtained by Sobolev embedding.

Finally, combining the linear stability estimate, H^2 estimate and Sobolev embedding, we can establish the well-posedness of error equations by contraction mapping theorem.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we construct an approximate solution by matched asymptotic expansion method and study the property of this approximate solution. In Section 3, we derive the error equations and establish their linear stability estimate. The linear stability estimate consists of the basic energy estimate and the positivity estimate. In Section 4, we firstly rewrite the error equations and the associated linear stability estimate in Euler coordinates, then obtain H^2 estimate by the Stokes estimate in a smooth bounded domain. In Section 5, we complete the proof of Theorem 1.1 by combining the linear stability estimate and H^2 estimate.

2. CONSTRUCTION OF APPROXIMATE SOLUTIONS

In this section, we construct an approximate solution of the Navier-Stokes equations (1.3) by matched asymptotic expansion.

2.1. Euler expansions.

Away from the boundary, we make the following formal expansions

$$u^\varepsilon(\theta, r) = u_e^{(0)}(\theta, r) + \varepsilon u_e^{(1)}(\theta, r) + \cdots,$$

$$v^\varepsilon(\theta, r) = v_e^{(0)}(\theta, r) + \varepsilon v_e^{(1)}(\theta, r) + \cdots,$$

$$p^\varepsilon(\theta, r) = p_e^{(0)}(\theta, r) + \varepsilon p_e^{(1)}(\theta, r) + \cdots.$$

2.1.1. Equations for $(u_e^{(0)}, v_e^{(0)}, p_e^{(0)})$.

By substituting the above expansions into (1.3) and collecting the ε -zeroth order terms, we deduce that $(u_e^{(0)}, v_e^{(0)}, p_e^{(0)})$ satisfies the following steady nonlinear Euler equations

$$\begin{cases} u_e^{(0)} \partial_\theta u_e^{(0)} + r v_e^{(0)} \partial_r u_e^{(0)} + u_e^{(0)} v_e^{(0)} + \partial_\theta p_e^{(0)} = 0, \\ u_e^{(0)} \partial_\theta v_e^{(0)} + r v_e^{(0)} \partial_r v_e^{(0)} - (u_e^{(0)})^2 + r \partial_r p_e^{(0)} = 0, \\ \partial_\theta u_e^{(0)} + r \partial_r v_e^{(0)} + v_e^{(0)} = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

Due to the Prandtl-Bathelor theory in [1], the leading order Euler flows $(u_e^{(0)}, v_e^{(0)})$ with closed streamlines must be the Couette flows in Ω

$$u_e^{(0)}(\theta, r) = u_e(r) =: ar, \quad v_e^{(0)}(\theta, r) = 0, \quad (2.2)$$

where the value of a is a constant determined by the Wood formula (2.11).

Then equations (2.1) reduce to

$$\partial_\theta p_e^{(0)}(\theta, r) = 0, \quad \partial_r p_e^{(0)}(\theta, r) = \frac{1}{r} u_e^2.$$

Thus, we deduce that

$$p_e^{(0)}(\theta, r) = p_e(r), \quad p_e'(r) = a^2 r. \quad (2.3)$$

2.1.2. Equations for $(u_e^{(1)}, v_e^{(1)}, p_e^{(1)})$.

By collecting the ε -order terms, we deduce that $(u_e^{(1)}, v_e^{(1)}, p_e^{(1)})$ satisfies the following linearized Euler equations in Ω

$$\begin{cases} ar \partial_\theta u_e^{(1)} + 2ar v_e^{(1)} + \partial_\theta p_e^{(1)} = 0, \\ ar \partial_\theta v_e^{(1)} - 2ar u_e^{(1)} + r \partial_r p_e^{(1)} = 0, \\ \partial_\theta u_e^{(1)} + r \partial_r v_e^{(1)} + v_e^{(1)} = 0, \end{cases} \quad (2.4)$$

which are equipped with the boundary condition

$$v_e^{(1)}|_{r=1} = -v_p^{(1)}|_{Y=0}, \quad v_e^{(1)}(\theta, r) = v_e^{(1)}(\theta + 2\pi, r), \quad (2.5)$$

where $v_p^{(1)}$ is the solution of Prandtl equations which will be derived in next subsection.

The equations for $(u_e^{(i)}, v_e^{(i)}, p_e^{(i)})$, $i = 2, 3, 4$ will be derived later.

2.2. Prandtl expansion near $r = 1$.

We introduce the scaled variable $Y = \frac{r-1}{\varepsilon} \in (-\infty, 0]$ and make the following Prandtl expansions near $r = 1$

$$\begin{aligned} u^\varepsilon &= u_e(r) + u_p^{(0)}(\theta, Y) + \varepsilon [u_e^{(1)}(\theta, r) + u_p^{(1)}(\theta, Y)] + \cdots, \\ v^\varepsilon &= v_p^{(0)}(\theta, Y) + \varepsilon [v_e^{(1)}(\theta, r) + v_p^{(1)}(\theta, Y)] + \varepsilon^2 [v_e^{(2)}(\theta, r) + v_p^{(2)}(\theta, Y)] + \cdots, \\ p^\varepsilon &= p_e(r) + p_p^{(0)}(\theta, Y) + \varepsilon [p_e^{(1)}(\theta, r) + p_p^{(1)}(\theta, Y)] + \varepsilon [p_e^{(2)}(\theta, r) + p_p^{(2)}(\theta, Y)] + \cdots, \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

where as $Y \rightarrow -\infty$

$$\partial_\theta^l \partial_Y^m v_p^{(i)}(\theta, Y) \rightarrow 0, \quad \partial_\theta^l \partial_Y^m p_p^{(i)}(\theta, Y) \rightarrow 0, \quad (2.7)$$

here $l, m \geq 0, i = 0, 1, \dots$, which satisfies the following boundary condition

$$\begin{aligned} u_e^{(i)}(\theta, 1) + u_p^{(i)}(\theta, 0) &= \alpha + \eta f(\theta), \quad u_e^{(i)}(\theta, 1) + u_p^{(i)}(\theta, 0) = 0, \quad i \geq 1, \\ v_e^{(i)}(\theta, 1) + v_p^{(i)}(\theta, 0) &= 0, \quad i \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The boundary conditions of $u_p^{(i)}(\theta, Y)$ as $Y \rightarrow -\infty$ will be given later.

2.2.1. Equations for $(v_p^{(0)}, p_p^{(0)})$.

By substituting the above expansions into (1.3) and collecting the $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$ order terms, we get

$$\partial_Y v_p^{(0)}(\theta, Y) = 0, \quad \partial_Y p_p^{(0)}(\theta, Y) = 0,$$

which together with (2.7) imply

$$v_p^{(0)} = 0, \quad p_p^{(0)} = 0.$$

2.2.2. Equations for $(u_p^{(0)}, v_p^{(1)}, p_p^{(1)})$.

By substituting the above expansions into (1.3) and collecting the ε -zeroth order terms, we obtain the following steady Prandtl equations for $(u_p^{(0)}, v_p^{(1)})$

$$\begin{cases} (u_e(1) + u_p^{(0)})\partial_\theta u_p^{(0)} + (v_e^{(1)}(\theta, 1) + v_p^{(1)})\partial_Y u_p^{(0)} - \partial_{YY} u_p^{(0)} = 0, \\ \partial_\theta u_p^{(0)} + \partial_Y v_p^{(1)} = 0, \\ u_p^{(0)}(\theta, Y) = u_p^{(0)}(\theta + 2\pi, Y), \quad v_p^{(1)}(\theta, Y) = v_p^{(1)}(\theta + 2\pi, Y), \\ u_p^{(0)}|_{Y=0} = \alpha + \eta f(\theta) - u_e(1), \quad \lim_{Y \rightarrow -\infty} (u_p^{(0)}, v_p^{(1)}) = (0, 0) \end{cases} \quad (2.8)$$

and the pressure $p_p^{(1)}$ satisfies

$$\partial_Y p_p^{(1)}(\theta, Y) = (u_p^{(0)})^2(\theta, Y) + 2u_e(1)u_p^{(0)}(\theta, Y), \quad \lim_{Y \rightarrow -\infty} p_p^{(1)}(\theta, Y) = 0. \quad (2.9)$$

2.2.3. Equations for $(u_p^{(1)}, v_p^{(2)})$.

By substituting the above expansions into the first and third equation in (1.3) and collecting the ε -order terms, we obtain the following linearized steady Prandtl equations for $(u_p^{(1)}, v_p^{(2)})$

$$\begin{cases} (u_e(1) + u_p^{(0)})\partial_\theta u_p^{(1)} + (v_e^{(1)}(\theta, 1) + v_p^{(1)})\partial_Y u_p^{(1)} + (v_e^{(2)}(\theta, 1) + v_p^{(2)})\partial_Y u_p^{(0)} \\ \quad + (u_p^{(1)} + u_e^{(1)}(\theta, 1))\partial_\theta u_p^{(0)} - \partial_{YY} u_p^{(1)} = f_1(\theta, Y) \\ \partial_\theta u_p^{(1)} + \partial_Y v_p^{(2)} + \partial_Y (Y v_p^{(1)}) = 0, \\ u_p^{(1)}(\theta, Y) = u_p^{(1)}(\theta + 2\pi, Y), \quad v_p^{(2)}(\theta, Y) = v_p^{(2)}(\theta + 2\pi, Y), \\ u_p^{(1)}|_{Y=0} = -u_e^{(1)}|_{r=1}, \quad \lim_{Y \rightarrow -\infty} (\partial_Y u_p^{(1)}, v_p^{(2)}) = (0, 0), \end{cases} \quad (2.10)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(\theta, Y) = & -\partial_\theta p_p^{(1)} + Y \partial_{YY} u_p^{(0)} + \partial_Y u_p^{(0)} \\ & - u_p^{(0)}(\partial_\theta u_e^{(1)}(\theta, 1) + v_e^{(1)}(\theta, 1) + v_p^{(1)}) - u_e'(1)Y \partial_\theta u_p^{(0)} \\ & - (\partial_r v_e^{(1)}(\theta, 1) + v_e^{(1)}(\theta, 1))Y \partial_Y u_p^{(0)} - (u_e'(1) + Y \partial_Y u_p^{(0)} + u_e(1))v_p^{(1)}. \end{aligned}$$

The equations for $(u_p^{(i)}, v_p^{(i+1)})$, $i = 2, 3, 4$ will be derived later.

2.3. Solvabilities of Euler equations and Prandtl equations.

The order in which we solve the equations is as follows

$$(u_e(r), 0) \rightarrow (u_p^{(0)}, v_p^{(1)}) \rightarrow (u_e^{(1)}, v_e^{(1)}) \rightarrow (u_p^{(1)}, v_p^{(2)}) \rightarrow \dots$$

2.3.1. Prandtl equations and their solvabilities.

We first derive some necessary condition for the solvability of Prandtl equations.

Lemma 2.1. (*Batchelor-Wood formula [20][21]*) *Let $\int_0^{2\pi} f(\theta)d\theta = 0$. If the nonlinear Prandtl equations (2.8) have a solution $(u_p^{(0)}, v_p^{(1)})$ which satisfies*

$$u_e(1) + u_p^{(0)}(\theta, Y) > 0, \quad \forall Y \leq 0, \quad \|u_p^{(0)}\|_0 \leq M,$$

where $M > 0$ is a constant, then there holds

$$u_e^2(1) = \alpha^2 + \frac{\eta^2}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f^2(\theta)d\theta. \quad (2.11)$$

Proof. We introduce the von Mises variable

$$\psi = \int_0^Y (u_e(1) + u_p^{(0)}(\theta, z))dz, \quad \mathcal{U}^{(0)}(\theta, \psi) = u_e(1) + u_p^{(0)}(\theta, Y).$$

Then from (2.8), we deduce that $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} 2\mathcal{U}_\theta^{(0)} = (\mathcal{U}^{(0)})^2_{\psi\psi}, \\ \mathcal{U}^{(0)}(\theta, \psi) = \mathcal{U}^{(0)}(\theta + 2\pi, \psi), \\ \mathcal{U}^{(0)}|_{\psi=0} = \alpha + \eta f(\theta), \quad \lim_{\psi \rightarrow -\infty} \mathcal{U}^{(0)} = u_e(1). \end{cases} \quad (2.12)$$

Here we have used the facts:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\theta u_p^{(0)} &= \mathcal{U}_\theta^{(0)} + \mathcal{U}_\psi^{(0)} \int_0^Y \partial_\theta u_p^{(0)}(\theta, z)dz \\ &= \mathcal{U}_\theta^{(0)} + \mathcal{U}_\psi^{(0)} (v_p^{(1)}(\theta, 0) - v_p^{(1)}(\theta, Y)) = \mathcal{U}_\theta^{(0)} - \mathcal{U}_\psi^{(0)} (v_p^{(1)}(\theta, 1) + v_p^{(1)}(\theta, Y)), \\ \partial_Y u_p^{(0)} &= \mathcal{U}_\psi^{(0)} \mathcal{U}^{(0)}. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating the first equation in (2.12) from 0 to 2π about θ leads to

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \psi^2} \int_0^{2\pi} (\mathcal{U}^{(0)})^2(\theta, \psi)d\theta = 0.$$

Notice that $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ is bounded at $\psi \rightarrow -\infty$, we deduce that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \psi} \int_0^{2\pi} (\mathcal{U}^{(0)})^2(\theta, \psi)d\theta = 0.$$

Therefore combining the boundary condition in (2.12), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} u_e^2(1) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} (\alpha + \eta f(\theta))^2(\theta)d\theta = \alpha^2 + \frac{\alpha\eta}{\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f(\theta)d\theta + \frac{\eta^2}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f^2(\theta)d\theta \\ &= \alpha^2 + \frac{\eta^2}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f^2(\theta)d\theta. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we complete the proof of this lemma. $\square$

The following Corollary is a direct result of Lemma 2.1.

Corollary 2.1. *If Lemma 2.1 holds, then*

$$a = \left(\alpha^2 + \frac{\eta^2}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f^2(\theta) d\theta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Next we aim to solve the steady Prandtl equations (2.8) and we use the method of [21].

Proposition 2.2. *There exists $\eta_0 > 0$ such that for any $\eta \in (0, \eta_0)$, the equation (2.12) has a unique solution $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ which satisfies the following estimates*

$$\sum_{j+k \leq m} \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} \left| \partial_\theta^j \partial_\psi^k (\mathcal{U}^{(0)} - u_e(1)) \right|^2 \langle \psi \rangle^{2l} d\theta d\psi \leq C(m, l) \eta^2, \quad m, l \geq 0$$

here $\langle \psi \rangle = \sqrt{1 + \psi^2}$.

Proof. We use the contraction mapping theorem to prove the desired conclusions and divide the proof into five steps.

Step 1: *Derivation of equivalent equation.*

Let $Q(\theta, \psi) := (\mathcal{U}^{(0)})^2(\theta, \psi) - u_e^2(1)$ and we rewrite (2.12) as

$$\begin{cases} Q_\theta = \mathcal{U}^{(0)} Q_{\psi\psi}, \\ Q(\theta, \psi) = Q(\theta + 2\pi, \psi), \\ Q|_{\psi=0} = \alpha^2 + 2\alpha\eta f(\theta) + \eta^2 f^2(\theta) - u_e^2(1), \quad Q|_{\psi \rightarrow -\infty} = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.13)$$

Defining

$$\mathcal{G}(Q) = Q - 2u_e(1)\sqrt{Q + u_e^2(1)} + 2u_e^2(1),$$

then (2.13) is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} Q_\theta - u_e(1)Q_{\psi\psi} = (\mathcal{G}(Q))_\theta, \\ Q(\theta, \psi) = Q(\theta + 2\pi, \psi), \\ Q|_{\psi=0} = \alpha^2 + 2\alpha\eta f(\theta) + \eta^2 f^2(\theta) - u_e^2(1), \quad Q|_{\psi \rightarrow -\infty} = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.14)$$

Let Q_0 be the solution to

$$\begin{cases} (Q_0)_\theta = u_e(1)(Q_0)_{\psi\psi}, \\ Q_0(\theta, \psi) = Q_0(\theta + 2\pi, \psi), \\ Q_0|_{\psi=0} = \alpha^2 + 2\alpha\eta f(\theta) + \eta^2 f^2(\theta) - u_e^2(1), \quad Q_0|_{\psi \rightarrow -\infty} = 0, \end{cases} \quad (2.15)$$

which will be solved in Appendix A, then (2.14) is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} Q_\theta - u_e(1)Q_{\psi\psi} = (\mathcal{H}(Q))_\theta, \\ Q(\theta, \psi) = Q(\theta + 2\pi, \psi), \\ Q|_{\psi=0} = 0, \quad Q|_{\psi \rightarrow -\infty} = 0, \end{cases} \quad (2.16)$$

where

$$\mathcal{H}(Q) = Q + Q_0 - 2u_e(1)\sqrt{Q + Q_0 + u_e^2(1)} + 2u_e^2(1).$$

Defining the linear operator $\mathcal{L} : \Lambda \mapsto \Phi$ such that

$$\Phi = \mathcal{L}\Lambda \iff \begin{cases} \Phi_\theta - u_e(1)\Phi_{\psi\psi} = \Lambda_\theta, \\ \Phi(\theta, \psi) = \Phi(\theta + 2\pi, \psi), \\ \Phi|_{\psi=0} = 0, \quad \Phi|_{\psi \rightarrow -\infty} = 0, \end{cases} \quad (2.17)$$

then (2.16) is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} Q = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}(Q)), \\ Q(\theta, \psi) = Q(\theta + 2\pi, \psi), \\ Q|_{\psi=0} = 0, \quad Q|_{\psi=-\infty} = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.18)$$

Defining the function space X as follows

$$X = \left\{ Q : Q(\theta, \psi) = Q(\theta + 2\pi, \psi), \quad Q|_{\psi=0} = Q|_{\psi \rightarrow -\infty} = 0, \right. \\ \left. \|Q\|_X^2 := \sum_{j+k \leq m, l \geq 0} \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} |\partial_\theta^j \partial_\psi^k Q|^2 \langle \psi \rangle^l d\theta d\psi < +\infty. \right\}$$

and a ball B_0 in X

$$B_0 = \{Q \in X : \|Q\|_X \leq r_0\},$$

here r_0 is a small number which will be determined later, m is a positive integer.

In the next three steps, we will verify that $\mathcal{L} \circ \mathcal{H}$ is a contraction map from B_0 to B_0 with a suitable small r_0 .

Step 2: *Boundedness of $\mathcal{L}$ in X .*

In this step, we prove that for any $m \geq 0, l \geq 0$, there holds

$$\sum_{j+k \leq m} \|\partial_\theta^j \partial_\psi^k \Phi \langle \psi \rangle^l\|_2 \leq C(m, l) \sum_{j+k \leq m, q \leq l} \|\partial_\theta^j \partial_\psi^k \Lambda \langle \psi \rangle^q\|_2. \quad (2.19)$$

First, we prove (2.19) for $l = 0$. Multiplying the equation in (2.17) by Φ and integrating with respect to $(\theta, \psi) \in (0, 2\pi) \times (-\infty, 0)$, we obtain

$$u_e(1) \|\Phi_\psi\|_2 \leq C(\lambda) \|\Lambda_\theta\|_2 + \lambda \|\Phi_\theta\|_2. \quad (2.20)$$

Then, multiplying the equation in (2.17) by Φ_θ and integrating with respect to $(\theta, \psi) \in (0, 2\pi) \times (-\infty, 0)$, one has

$$\|\Phi_\theta\|_2 \leq C(\lambda) \|\Lambda_\theta\|_2 + \lambda \|\Phi_\theta\|_2. \quad (2.21)$$

Combining (2.20)-(2.21) and choosing small $\lambda > 0$ we get

$$\|(\Phi_\psi, \Phi_\theta)\|_2 \leq C\|(\Lambda, \Lambda_\theta)\|_2. \quad (2.22)$$

Integrating (2.17) with respect to $\theta \in (0, 2\pi)$ gives

$$\frac{d^2}{d\psi^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \Phi(\theta, \psi) d\theta = 0,$$

which combines $\Phi|_{\psi=0} = \Phi|_{\psi \rightarrow -\infty} = 0$ imply

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \Phi(\theta, \psi) d\theta = 0. \quad (2.23)$$

Due to (2.23) and the Poincaré inequality we have

$$\|\Phi\|_2 \leq C\|\Phi_\theta\|_2 \leq C\|(\Lambda, \Lambda_\theta)\|_2. \quad (2.24)$$

For any $j \geq 0, k \geq 2$, from the equation (2.17), we deduce that

$$\|\partial_\theta^j \partial_\psi^k \Phi\|_2 \leq C(\|\partial_\theta^j \partial_\psi^{k-2} \Phi\|_2 + \|\partial_\theta^j \partial_\psi^{k-2} \Lambda_\theta\|_2). \quad (2.25)$$

For any $j \geq 0$, applying ∂_θ^j to the equation in (2.17), multiplying the resultant equation by $\partial_\theta^j \Phi$, integrating with respect to $(\theta, \psi) \in (0, 2\pi) \times (-\infty, 0)$ and using the Young inequality one has

$$\|\partial_\theta^j \partial_\psi \Phi\|_2 \leq C\|\partial_\theta^{j+1} \Lambda\|_2 + C\|\partial_\theta^j \Phi\|_2. \quad (2.26)$$

For any $j \geq 0$, multiplying the equation in (2.17) by $\partial_\theta^{2j-1}\Phi$, integrating with respect to $(\theta, \psi) \in (0, 2\pi) \times (-\infty, 0)$, one can get

$$\|\partial_\theta^j \Phi\|_2^2 = \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} \partial_\theta^{2j-1} \Phi \Lambda_\theta d\theta d\psi \leq C \|\partial_\theta^j \Phi\|_2 \|\partial_\theta^j \Lambda\|_2. \quad (2.27)$$

Combining (2.25), (2.26) and (2.27), we obtain that for any $m \geq 2$, there holds

$$\sum_{j+k=m} \|\partial_\theta^j \partial_\psi^k \Phi\|_2 \leq C \sum_{j+k \leq m-1} \|\partial_\theta^j \partial_\psi^k \Phi\|_2 + C \sum_{j+k \leq m} \|\partial_\theta^j \partial_\psi^k \Lambda\|_2.$$

Thus, by induction and (2.22), (2.24), we deduce that for any $m \geq 0$, there holds

$$\sum_{j+k \leq m} \|\partial_\theta^j \partial_\psi^k \Phi\|_2 \leq C(m) \sum_{j+k \leq m} \|\partial_\theta^j \partial_\psi^k \Lambda\|_2. \quad (2.28)$$

Next, we prove (2.19) for $m \leq 1, l \geq 1$. Multiplying the equation in (2.17) by $\Phi \psi^{2l}$, integrating with respect to $(\theta, \psi) \in (0, 2\pi) \times (-\infty, 0)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} \Phi_\psi^2 \psi^{2l} d\theta d\psi &\leq C \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} \Phi^2 \psi^{2(l-1)} d\theta d\psi \\ &\quad + C(\lambda) \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} \Lambda^2 \psi^{2l} d\theta d\psi + \lambda \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} \Phi_\theta^2 \psi^{2l} d\theta d\psi. \end{aligned} \quad (2.29)$$

Multiplying the equation in (2.17) by $\Phi_\theta \psi^{2l}$, integrating with respect to $(\theta, \psi) \in (0, 2\pi) \times (-\infty, 0)$, we obtain

$$\int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} \Phi_\theta^2 \psi^{2l} d\theta d\psi \leq C \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} \Phi_\psi^2 \psi^{2(l-1)} d\theta d\psi + C \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} \Lambda_\theta^2 \psi^{2l} d\theta d\psi. \quad (2.30)$$

Combining (2.29)-(2.30), using the Poincaré inequality and choosing small $\lambda > 0$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} (\Phi^2 + \Phi_\psi^2 + \Phi_\theta^2) \psi^{2l} d\theta d\psi \\ &\leq \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} (\Phi^2 + \Phi_\psi^2 + \Phi_\theta^2) \psi^{2(l-1)} d\theta d\psi + C \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} (\Lambda^2 \psi^{2l} + \Lambda_\theta^2 \psi^{2l}) d\theta d\psi. \end{aligned}$$

By induction on l and using (2.28), we deduce that for any $l \geq 1$, there holds

$$\|(\Phi_\psi, \Phi_\theta, \Phi) \psi^l\|_2 \leq C(l) \sum_{q \leq l} \|(\Lambda, \Lambda_\theta) \psi^q\|_2. \quad (2.31)$$

Finally, we prove (2.19) any $m \geq 2, l \geq 1$. When $j + k = m, k \geq 2$, from the equation (2.17), we deduce that

$$\|\partial_\theta^j \partial_\psi^k \Phi \psi^l\|_2 \leq C \left(\|\partial_\theta^j \partial_\psi^{k-2} \partial_\theta \Phi \psi^l\|_2 + \|\partial_\theta^j \partial_\psi^{k-2} \partial_\theta \Lambda \psi^l\|_2 \right). \quad (2.32)$$

Applying ∂_θ^{m-1} to the equation in (2.17), multiplying the resultant equation by $\partial_\theta^{m-1} \Phi \psi^{2l}$, integrating with respect to $(\theta, \psi) \in (0, 2\pi) \times (-\infty, 0)$ and using the Young inequality one has

$$\|\partial_\theta^{m-1} \partial_\psi \Phi \psi^l\|_2 \leq C \|\partial_\theta^m \Lambda \psi^l\|_2 + C \|\partial_\theta^{m-1} \Phi \psi^l\|_2 + C(l) \|\partial_\theta^{m-1} \Phi \psi^{l-1}\|_2. \quad (2.33)$$

Multiplying the equation in (2.17) by $\partial_\theta^{2m-1} \Phi \psi^{2l}$, integrating with respect to $(\theta, \psi) \in (0, 2\pi) \times (-\infty, 0)$, one can get

$$\|\partial_\theta^m \Phi \psi^l\|_2 \leq C \|\partial_\theta^m \Lambda \psi^l\|_2 + C(l) \|\partial_\theta^{m-1} \partial_\psi \Phi \psi^{l-1}\|_2. \quad (2.34)$$

Combining (2.32), (2.33) and (2.34), we obtain that for any $m \geq 2, l \geq 1$, there holds

$$\sum_{j+k=m} \left\| \partial_\theta^j \partial_\psi^k \Phi \psi^l \right\|_2 \leq C(m, l) \sum_{j+k \leq m-1, q \leq l} \left\| \partial_\theta^j \partial_\psi^k \Phi \psi^q \right\|_2 + C(m, l) \sum_{j+k \leq m} \left\| \partial_\theta^j \partial_\psi^k \Lambda \psi^l \right\|_2.$$

Thus, by induction m and using (2.31), we deduce that for any $m \geq 2, l \geq 1$, there holds

$$\sum_{j+k \leq m} \left\| \partial_\theta^j \partial_\psi^k \Phi \psi^l \right\|_2 \leq C(m, l) \sum_{j+k \leq m, q \leq l} \left\| \partial_\theta^j \partial_\psi^k \Lambda \psi^q \right\|_2. \quad (2.35)$$

This complete the proof of (2.19). Thus, we obtain

$$\|\mathcal{L}\Lambda\|_X \leq C\|\Lambda\|_X, \quad \forall \Lambda \in X. \quad (2.36)$$

Step 3: $\mathcal{L} \circ \mathcal{H}$ is a continuous map from B_0 to B_0 .

In this section, we first prove that for any $m \geq 2, l \geq 0$, there holds

$$\sum_{j+k \leq m} \left\| \partial_\theta^j \partial_\psi^k \mathcal{H}(Q) \langle \psi \rangle^l \right\|_2 \leq C(m, l) \left(\sum_{j+k \leq m} \left\| \partial_\theta^j \partial_\psi^k Q \langle \psi \rangle^l \right\|_2 + \sum_{j+k \leq m} \left\| \partial_\theta^j \partial_\psi^k Q_0 \langle \psi \rangle^l \right\|_2 \right)^2. \quad (2.37)$$

Set

$$\tilde{H}(x) = x - 2u_e(1)\sqrt{x + u_e^2(1)} + 2u_e^2(1), \quad |x| \ll u_e^2(1),$$

then $\mathcal{H}(Q) = \tilde{H}(Q + Q_0)$. Direct computation gives

$$|\tilde{H}'(x)| \leq C|x|, \quad |\tilde{H}^{(k)}(x)| \leq C, \quad k \geq 2. \quad (2.38)$$

Since

$$\mathcal{H}(Q) = (\sqrt{Q + Q_0 + u_e^2(1)} - u_e(1))^2 = \left(\frac{Q + Q_0}{\sqrt{Q + Q_0 + u_e^2(1)} + u_e(1)} \right)^2,$$

it's easy to get

$$\mathcal{H}^2(Q) \langle \psi \rangle^l \leq C \|Q + Q_0\|_{L^\infty}^2 (Q^2 \langle \psi \rangle^l + Q_0^2 \langle \psi \rangle^l), \quad l \geq 0.$$

Using (2.38), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_\psi \mathcal{H}(Q))^2 \langle \psi \rangle^l &\leq C \|Q + Q_0\|_{L^\infty}^2 (Q_\psi^2 \langle \psi \rangle^l + (Q_0)_\psi^2 \langle \psi \rangle^l), \quad l \geq 0, \\ (\partial_\theta \mathcal{H}(Q))^2 \langle \psi \rangle^l &\leq C \|Q + Q_0\|_{L^\infty}^2 (Q_\theta^2 \langle \psi \rangle^l + (Q_0)_\theta^2 \langle \psi \rangle^l), \quad l \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j+k \leq 1} \left\| \partial_\theta^j \partial_\psi^k \mathcal{H}(Q) \langle \psi \rangle^l \right\|_2 \\ &\leq C \|Q + Q_0\|_{L^\infty} \left(\sum_{j+k \leq 1} \left\| \partial_\theta^j \partial_\psi^k Q \langle \psi \rangle^l \right\|_2 + \sum_{j+k \leq 1} \left\| \partial_\theta^j \partial_\psi^k Q_0 \langle \psi \rangle^l \right\|_2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.39)$$

Since

$$\partial_{\psi\theta} \mathcal{H}(Q) = \tilde{H}'(Q + Q_0)(\partial_{\psi\theta} Q + \partial_{\psi\theta} Q_0) + \tilde{H}''(Q + Q_0)(\partial_\theta Q + \partial_\theta Q_0)(\partial_\psi Q + \partial_\psi Q_0),$$

thus, using (2.38), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \partial_{\psi\theta} \mathcal{H}(Q) \langle \psi \rangle^l \right\|_{L^2} &\leq C \|Q + Q_0\|_{L^\infty} \left(\left\| Q_{\psi\theta} \langle \psi \rangle^l \right\|_{L^2} + \left\| (Q_0)_{\psi\theta} \langle \psi \rangle^l \right\|_{L^2} \right) \\ &\quad + C \|Q_\psi + (Q_0)_\psi\|_{L^4} \|(Q_\theta + (Q_0)_\theta) \langle \psi \rangle^l\|_{L^4} \\ &\leq C \|Q + Q_0\|_{L^\infty} \left(\left\| Q_{\psi\theta} \langle \psi \rangle^l \right\|_{L^2} + \left\| (Q_0)_{\psi\theta} \langle \psi \rangle^l \right\|_{L^2} \right) \\ &\quad + C \|Q_\psi + (Q_0)_\psi\|_{H^1} \|(Q_\theta + (Q_0)_\theta) \langle \psi \rangle^l\|_{H^1}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence by the Sobolev embedding, we deduce that

$$\left\| \partial_{\psi\theta} \mathcal{H}(Q) \langle \psi \rangle^l \right\|_2 \leq C \left(\sum_{j+k \leq 2} \left\| \partial_{\theta}^j \partial_{\psi}^k Q \langle \psi \rangle^l \right\|_2 + \sum_{j+k \leq 2} \left\| \partial_{\theta}^j \partial_{\psi}^k Q_0 \langle \psi \rangle^l \right\|_2 \right)^2.$$

Same estimates hold for $\left\| \partial_{\theta\theta} \mathcal{H}(Q) \langle \psi \rangle^l \right\|_2$ and $\left\| \partial_{\psi\psi} \mathcal{H}(Q) \langle \psi \rangle^l \right\|_2$. Thus, combining the estimate (2.39), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j+k \leq 2} \left\| \partial_{\theta}^j \partial_{\psi}^k \mathcal{H}(Q) \langle \psi \rangle^l \right\|_2 \\ & \leq C \left(\sum_{j+k \leq 2} \left\| \partial_{\theta}^j \partial_{\psi}^k Q \langle \psi \rangle^l \right\|_2 + \sum_{j+k \leq 2} \left\| \partial_{\theta}^j \partial_{\psi}^k Q_0 \langle \psi \rangle^l \right\|_2 \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using (2.38) and repeat the above argument, we obtain (2.37).

Consequently, if we take $r_0 = \|Q_0\|_X$ and η small enough, then

$$\|\mathcal{LH}(Q)\|_X \leq C\|\mathcal{H}(Q)\|_X \leq 4Cr_0^2 \leq 4C\eta r_0 \leq r_0, \quad \forall Q \in B_0,$$

here we have used (6.2). Thus, $\mathcal{LH}$ is a continuous map from B_0 to B_0 for small η .

Step 4: $\mathcal{L} \circ \mathcal{H}$ is a contraction map in B_0 .

Noting firstly that

$$\mathcal{H}(Q_1) - \mathcal{H}(Q_2) = (Q_1 - Q_2) \left(1 - \frac{2u_e(1)}{\sqrt{Q_1 + Q_0 + u_e^2(1)} + \sqrt{Q_2 + Q_0 + u_e^2(1)}} \right)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & 1 - \frac{2u_e(1)}{\sqrt{Q_1 + Q_0 + u_e^2(1)} + \sqrt{Q_2 + Q_0 + u_e^2(1)}} \\ & = \frac{Q_1 + Q_0}{(\sqrt{Q_1 + Q_0 + u_e^2(1)} + \sqrt{Q_2 + Q_0 + u_e^2(1)})(\sqrt{Q_1 + Q_0 + u_e^2(1)} + u_e(1))} \\ & \quad + \frac{Q_2 + Q_0}{(\sqrt{Q_1 + Q_0 + u_e^2(1)} + \sqrt{Q_2 + Q_0 + u_e^2(1)})(\sqrt{Q_2 + Q_0 + u_e^2(1)} + u_e(1))}. \end{aligned}$$

With the help of the similar arguments in Step 3, we can obtain that there exist $\eta_0 > 0$ such that for any $\eta \in (0, \eta_0)$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{LH}(Q_1) - \mathcal{LH}(Q_2)\|_X & \leq C\|\mathcal{H}(Q_1) - \mathcal{H}(Q_2)\|_X \\ & \leq C\|Q_1 - Q_2\|_X (\|Q_0\|_X + \|Q_1\|_X + \|Q_2\|_X) \\ & \leq C\|Q_0\|_X \|Q_1 - Q_2\|_X \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2}\|Q_1 - Q_2\|_X, \end{aligned}$$

that is, $\mathcal{LH}$ is a contraction map in B_0 .

Step 5: *Existence and uniqueness of the equation (2.12).*

By the standard contraction mapping principle, we know that there exists $\eta_0 > 0$ such that for any $\eta \in (0, \eta_0)$ and any $m, l \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, the equation (2.12) has a unique solution $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ which satisfies

$$\sum_{j+k \leq m} \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} \left| \partial_{\theta}^j \partial_{\psi}^k (\mathcal{U}^{(0)} - u_e(1)) \right|^2 \langle \psi \rangle^{2l} d\theta d\psi \leq C(m, l) \eta^2,$$

this completes the proof of this proposition. $\square$

Return to the equations (2.8), we have the following result.

Corollary 2.2. *There exists $\eta_0 > 0$ such that for any $\eta \in (0, \eta_0)$, equations (2.8) have a unique solution $(u_p^{(0)}, v_p^{(1)})$ which satisfies*

$$\sum_{j+k \leq m} \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} \left| \partial_\theta^j \partial_Y^k (u_p^{(0)}, v_p^{(1)}) \right|^2 \langle Y \rangle^{2l} d\theta dY \leq C(m, l) \eta^2, \quad m, l \geq 0. \quad (2.40)$$

Notice that

$$v_p^{(1)}(\theta, Y) = \int_{-\infty}^Y \partial_Y v_p^{(1)}(\theta, Y') dY' = - \int_{-\infty}^Y \partial_\theta u_p^{(0)}(\theta, Y') dY',$$

we have

$$\int_0^{2\pi} v_p^{(1)}(\theta, Y) d\theta = 0, \quad \forall Y \leq 0.$$

Finally, solving (2.9), we obtain $p_p^{(1)}(\theta, Y)$ which decay very fast as $Y \rightarrow -\infty$.

Remark 2.3. *Kim established the well-posedness of Prandtl equations (1.6) in [21]. He first rewrote the equations in an equivalent integral form, then constructed a sequence of approximate solutions by Picard iteration and studied the structure of approximate solution sequence by infinite series expansion, finally proved the convergence of approximate solution sequence in some suitable space. In this paper, we use a different approach. Like Kim, we also first rewrite the equations in an equivalent integral form, then we establish a priori estimate in a different space by energy method, and the well-posedness of Prandtl equations (1.6) can be obtained by contraction mapping principle directly. The flows constructed above have non-monotone velocity profile. It was shown by Renardy that solutions of steady Prandtl equations with monotone profile do not exist.*

2.3.2. *Linearized Euler equations for $(u_e^{(1)}, v_e^{(1)}, p_e^{(1)})$ and their solvabilities.*

Proposition 2.4. *The linearized Euler equations (2.4) have a solution $(u_e^{(1)}, v_e^{(1)}, p_e^{(1)})$ which satisfies*

$$|\partial_\theta u_e^{(1)} + v_e^{(1)}|(\theta, r) \leq C\eta r, \quad |\partial_\theta v_e^{(1)} - u_e^{(1)}|(\theta, r) \leq C\eta r, \quad \forall (\theta, r) \in \Omega, \quad (2.41)$$

$$\|\partial_\theta^k \partial_r^j (u_e^{(1)}, v_e^{(1)})\|_2 \leq C(k, j)\eta, \quad \forall j, k \geq 0, \quad (2.42)$$

$$r^2 \Delta u_e^{(1)} - u_e^{(1)} + 2\partial_\theta v_e^{(1)} = 0, \quad \int_0^{2\pi} v_e^{(1)}(\theta, r) d\theta = 0, \quad (2.43)$$

here and below, $\Delta = \partial_{rr} + \frac{\partial_r}{r} + \frac{\partial_{\theta\theta}}{r^2}$.

Proof. Eliminating the pressure $p_e^{(1)}$ in the equation (2.4), we obtain the following equation for $rv_e^{(1)}$ in Ω

$$\begin{cases} -r\Delta(rv_e^{(1)}) = 0, \\ rv_e^{(1)}|_{r=1} = -v_p^{(1)}|_{Y=0}. \end{cases} \quad (2.44)$$

Since $\int_0^{2\pi} v_p^{(1)} d\theta = 0$, we can assume

$$-v_p^{(1)}(\theta, 0) = \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} [a_{n1} \cos(n\theta) + b_{n1} \sin(n\theta)].$$

By (2.40), we deduce that

$$|a_{n1}| + |b_{n1}| \leq C \frac{\eta}{n^k}, \quad \forall k \geq 0. \quad (2.45)$$

It's easy to justify that

$$v_e^{(1)}(\theta, r) = \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} [a_{n1} r^{n-1} \cos(n\theta) + b_{n1} r^{n-1} \sin(n\theta)]$$

solves the equation (2.44). Set

$$u_e^{(1)}(\theta, r) = \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} [-a_{n1} r^{n-1} \sin(n\theta) + b_{n1} r^{n-1} \cos(n\theta)],$$

then

$$\partial_\theta u_e^{(1)} + \partial_r(r v_e^{(1)}) = 0, \quad r^2 \Delta u_e^{(1)} - u_e^{(1)} + 2\partial_\theta v_e^{(1)} = 0,$$

$$\|\partial_\theta^k \partial_r^j(u_e^{(1)}, v_e^{(1)})\|_2 \leq C(k, j)\eta, \quad \forall k, j \geq 0,$$

which give (2.42) and (2.43).

Moreover, there hold

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\theta u_e^{(1)}(\theta, r) + v_e^{(1)}(\theta, r) &= \sum_{n=2}^{+\infty} [(1-n)a_{n1} r^{n-1} \cos(n\theta) + (1-n)b_{n1} r^{n-1} \sin(n\theta)], \\ \partial_\theta v_e^{(1)}(\theta, r) - u_e^{(1)}(\theta, r) &= \sum_{n=2}^{+\infty} [(1-n)a_{n1} r^{n-1} \sin(n\theta) + (n-1)b_{n1} r^{n-1} \cos(n\theta)]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain (2.41) by using (2.45). After obtaining $(u_e^{(1)}, v_e^{(1)})$, we construct $p_e^{(1)}$ as following

$$p_e^{(1)}(\theta, r) := \phi(r) - \int_0^\theta [u_e(r) \partial_{\theta'} u_e^{(1)} + r u_e' v_e^{(1)} + u_e v_e^{(1)}](\theta', r) d\theta',$$

where $\phi(r)$ is a function which satisfies

$$r \partial_r \phi(r) + u_e(r) \partial_\theta v_e^{(1)}(0, r) - 2u_e(r) u_e^{(1)}(0, r) = 0.$$

Combining the equation of $(u_e^{(1)}, v_e^{(1)})$, it's direct to obtain

$$u_e \partial_\theta v_e^{(1)} - 2u_e u_e^{(1)} + r \partial_r p_e^{(1)} = 0.$$

Hence, $(u_e^{(1)}, v_e^{(1)}, p_e^{(1)})$ solves the equations (2.4). □

2.3.3. Linearized Prandtl equations for $(u_p^{(1)}, v_p^{(2)})$ and their solvabilities.

In this subsection, we consider the solvability of linearized Prandtl equations (2.10)

Proposition 2.5. *There exists $\eta_0 > 0$ such that for any $\eta \in (0, \eta_0)$, equations (2.10) have a unique solution $(u_p^{(1)}, v_p^{(2)})$ which satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j+k \leq m} \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} |\partial_\theta^j \partial_Y^k (u_p^{(1)} - A_{1\infty}, v_p^{(2)})|^2 \langle Y \rangle^{2l} d\theta dY &\leq C(m, l) \eta^2, \quad m, l \geq 0; \\ \int_0^{2\pi} v_p^{(2)}(\theta, Y) d\theta &= 0, \quad \forall Y \leq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{2.46}$$

where $A_{1\infty} := \lim_{Y \rightarrow -\infty} u_p^{(1)}(\theta, Y)$ is a constant which satisfies $|A_{1\infty}| \leq C\eta$.

Proof. Let $\eta \in C_c^\infty((-\infty, 0])$ satisfy

$$\eta(0) = 1, \quad \int_0^{+\infty} \eta(y) dy = 0.$$

For simple, we set

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{u} &:= u_e(1) + u_p^{(0)}, \quad \bar{v} := v_e^{(1)}(\theta, 1) + v_p^{(1)}, \\ u &:= u_p^{(1)} + u_e^{(1)}(\theta, 1)\eta(Y), \quad v := v_p^{(2)} - v_p^{(2)}(\theta, 0) + Yv_p^{(1)} - \partial_\theta u_e^{(1)}(\theta, 1) \int_0^Y \eta(z) dz.\end{aligned}$$

Then, the equations (2.10) reduce to

$$\begin{cases} \bar{u}\partial_\theta u + \bar{v}\partial_Y u + u\partial_\theta \bar{u} + v\partial_Y \bar{u} - \partial_{Y\theta} u = \tilde{f}, \\ \partial_\theta u + \partial_Y v = 0, \\ u(\theta, Y) = u(\theta + 2\pi, Y), \quad v(\theta, Y) = v(\theta + 2\pi, Y) \\ u|_{Y=0} = v|_{Y=0} = 0, \quad \lim_{Y \rightarrow -\infty} \partial_Y u = 0, \end{cases} \quad (2.47)$$

where $\tilde{f}(\theta, Y)$ is 2π -periodic function and decay fast as $Y \rightarrow -\infty$. We can solve the equations (2.47) by consider the following approximate system. Let $\delta > 0$ be a constant, we consider the following elliptic equation.

$$\begin{cases} \bar{u}\partial_\theta u^\delta + \bar{v}\partial_Y u^\delta + \left[\int_Y^0 \partial_\theta u^\delta(\theta, z) dz \right] \partial_Y \bar{u} + u^\delta \partial_\theta \bar{u} - \partial_{Y\theta} u^\delta - \delta \partial_{\theta\theta} u^\delta = \tilde{f}, \\ u^\delta(\theta, Y) = u^\delta(\theta + 2\pi, Y), \\ u^\delta|_{Y=0} = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.48)$$

We expect the solution of this equation is in $\dot{H}_0^1 = \{u | \partial_\theta u \in L^2, \partial_Y u \in L^2, u|_{Y=0} = 0\}$ rather than $H_0^1 = \{u | u \in L^2, \partial_\theta u \in L^2, \partial_Y u \in L^2, u|_{Y=0} = 0\}$. Now we establish apriori estimate of equation (2.48). Multiplying the first equation in (2.48) by u^δ and integrating in $(\theta, r) \in (0, 2\pi) \times (-\infty, 0)$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} \left[\bar{u}\partial_\theta u^\delta + \bar{v}\partial_Y u^\delta + \left(\int_Y^0 \partial_\theta u^\delta(\theta, z) dz \right) \partial_Y \bar{u} + u^\delta \partial_\theta \bar{u} - \partial_{Y\theta} u^\delta - \delta \partial_{\theta\theta} u^\delta \right] u^\delta d\theta dY \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} \tilde{f} u^\delta d\theta dY. \end{aligned}$$

It's easy to get

$$\int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} \left[-\partial_{Y\theta} u^\delta - \delta \partial_{\theta\theta} u^\delta \right] u^\delta d\theta dY = \|\partial_Y u^\delta\|_2^2 + \delta \|\partial_\theta u^\delta\|_2^2.$$

Recall the estimates (2.40) and (2.42), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_\theta^j \partial_Y^k (\bar{u} - u_e(1)) \langle Y \rangle^l| &\leq C(j, k, l) \eta, \\ |\partial_\theta^j \partial_Y^k (\bar{v} - v_e^{(1)}(\theta, 1)) \langle Y \rangle^l| &\leq C(j, k, l) \eta, \quad |\partial_\theta^j v_e^{(1)}(\theta, 1)| \leq C(j) \eta, \end{aligned}$$

thus, we can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} \left[\bar{u}\partial_\theta u^\delta + \bar{v}\partial_Y u^\delta + \left(\int_Y^0 \partial_\theta u^\delta(\theta, z) dz \right) \partial_Y \bar{u} + u^\delta \partial_\theta \bar{u} \right] u^\delta d\theta dY + \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} \tilde{f} u^\delta d\theta dY \\ &\leq \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{1}{2} [\partial_\theta \bar{u} + \partial_Y \bar{v}] (u^\delta)^2 d\theta dr + \|Y^2 \bar{u}_Y\|_\infty \left\| \frac{\int_Y^0 \partial_\theta u^\delta dz}{Y} \right\|_2 \left\| \frac{u^\delta}{Y} \right\|_2 \\ &\quad + \|Y^2 \bar{u}_\theta\|_\infty \left\| \frac{u^\delta}{Y} \right\|_2^2 + \|Y \tilde{f}\|_2 \left\| \frac{u^\delta}{Y} \right\|_2 \\ &\leq C\eta [\|\partial_\theta u^\delta\|_2^2 + \|\partial_Y u^\delta\|_2^2] + C\|Y \tilde{f}\|_2 \|\partial_Y u^\delta\|_2, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the $\bar{u}_\theta + \bar{v}_Y = 0$ and the Hardy inequality

$$\left\| \frac{\int_Y^0 \partial_\theta u^\delta dz}{Y} \right\|_2 \leq C \|\partial_\theta u^\delta\|_2, \quad \left\| \frac{u^\delta}{Y} \right\|_2 \leq C \|\partial_Y u^\delta\|_2.$$

Collecting the above estimates, we obtain

$$\|\partial_Y u^\delta\|_2^2 + \delta \|\partial_\theta u^\delta\|_2^2 \leq C\eta [\|\partial_\theta u^\delta\|_2^2 + \|\partial_Y u^\delta\|_2^2] + C\|Y\tilde{f}\|_2 \|\partial_Y u^\delta\|_2,$$

where C is independent on η and δ . If η is small enough, there holds

$$\|\partial_Y u^\delta\|_2^2 + \delta \|\partial_\theta u^\delta\|_2^2 \leq C\eta \|\partial_\theta u^\delta\|_2^2 + C\|Y\tilde{f}\|_2^2. \quad (2.49)$$

Next we multiply the first equation in (2.48) by $\partial_\theta u^\delta$ and integrate in $(\theta, r) \in (0, 2\pi) \times (-\infty, 0)$, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} \left[\bar{u} \partial_\theta u^\delta + \bar{v} \partial_Y u^\delta + \left(\int_Y^0 \partial_\theta u^\delta(\theta, z) dz \right) \partial_Y \bar{u} + u^\delta \partial_\theta \bar{u} - \partial_{YY} u^\delta - \delta \partial_{\theta\theta} u^\delta \right] \partial_\theta u^\delta d\theta dY \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} \tilde{f} \partial_\theta u^\delta d\theta dY. \end{aligned}$$

It's direct to obtain

$$\int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} \bar{u} \partial_\theta u^\delta \partial_\theta u^\delta d\theta dY = \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} \bar{u} |\partial_\theta u^\delta|^2 d\theta dY \geq (\alpha - C\eta) \|\partial_\theta u^\delta\|_2^2.$$

The diffusion term can be computed as follows

$$\int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} [-\partial_{YY} u^\delta - \delta \partial_{\theta\theta} u^\delta] \partial_\theta u^\delta d\theta dY = \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} \left(\frac{1}{2} \partial_\theta (\partial_Y u^\delta)^2 - \frac{\delta}{2} \partial_\theta (\partial_\theta u^\delta)^2 \right) d\theta dY = 0.$$

Moreover, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} \left[\bar{v} \partial_Y u^\delta + \left(\int_Y^0 \partial_\theta u^\delta(\theta, z) dz \right) \partial_Y \bar{u} + u^\delta \partial_\theta \bar{u} \right] \partial_\theta u^\delta d\theta dY + \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} \tilde{f} \partial_\theta u^\delta d\theta dY \\ & \leq \|\bar{v}\|_\infty \|\partial_Y u^\delta\|_2 \|\partial_\theta u^\delta\|_2 + \|Y\bar{u}_Y\|_\infty \left\| \frac{\int_Y^0 \partial_\theta u^\delta dz}{Y} \right\|_2 \|\partial_\theta u^\delta\|_2 \\ & \quad + \|Y\partial_\theta \bar{u}\|_\infty \left\| \frac{u^\delta}{Y} \right\|_2 \|\partial_\theta u^\delta\|_2 + \|\tilde{f}\|_2 \|\partial_\theta u^\delta\|_2 \\ & \leq C\eta [\|\partial_Y u^\delta\|_2^2 + \|\partial_\theta u^\delta\|_2^2] + \|\tilde{f}\|_2 \|\partial_\theta u^\delta\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\alpha \|\partial_\theta u^\delta\|_2^2 \leq C\eta [\|\partial_\theta u^\delta\|_2^2 + \|\partial_Y u^\delta\|_2^2] + \|\tilde{f}\|_2 \|\partial_\theta u^\delta\|_2.$$

Since C is independent on η and δ , η is small enough, hence there holds

$$\alpha \|\partial_\theta u^\delta\|_2^2 \leq C\eta \|\partial_Y u^\delta\|_2^2 + \|\tilde{f}\|_2^2. \quad (2.50)$$

Combining (2.49) and (2.50), we have

$$\alpha \|\partial_\theta u^\delta\|_2^2 + \|\partial_Y u^\delta\|_2^2 + \delta \|\partial_\theta u^\delta\|_2^2 \leq C\|Y\tilde{f}\|_2^2 + C\|\tilde{f}\|_2^2. \quad (2.51)$$

According the first equation in (2.48), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\partial_{YY} u^\delta\|_2^2 + 2\delta \|\partial_{\theta Y} u^\delta\|_2^2 + \delta^2 \|\partial_{\theta\theta} u^\delta\|_2^2 = \left\| \partial_{YY} u^\delta + \delta \partial_{\theta\theta} u^\delta \right\|_2^2 \\ &= \left\| \bar{u} \partial_\theta u^\delta + \bar{v} \partial_Y u^\delta + \left(\int_Y^0 \partial_\theta u^\delta(\theta, z) dz \right) \partial_Y \bar{u} + u^\delta \partial_\theta \bar{u} - \tilde{f} \right\|_2^2 \\ &\leq C [\|\tilde{f}\|_2^2 + \|\partial_\theta u^\delta\|_2^2 + \|\partial_Y u^\delta\|_2^2] \leq C\|Y\tilde{f}\|_2^2 + C\|\tilde{f}\|_2^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.52)$$

Collecting the estimate (2.51) and (2.52), we obtain

$$\alpha \|\partial_\theta u^\delta\|_2^2 + \|\partial_Y u^\delta\|_2^2 + \|\partial_{Y^2} u^\delta\|_2^2 + \delta \|\partial_\theta u^\delta\|_2^2 + 2\delta \|\partial_{\theta Y} u^\delta\|_2^2 + \delta^2 \|\partial_{\theta\theta} u^\delta\|_2^2 \leq C \|\langle Y \rangle \tilde{f}\|_2^2.$$

The above inequality shows the existences and uniqueness of solution about system (2.48) for any $\delta > 0$ in space $\dot{H}_0^1$, moreover, the solution is smooth if $\tilde{f}$ is smooth enough. Set

$$u := \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} u^\delta, \quad v := \int_Y^0 \partial_\theta u(\theta, d) dz,$$

then

$$\alpha \|\partial_\theta u\|_2^2 + \|\partial_Y u\|_2^2 + \|\partial_{Y^2} u\|_2^2 \leq C \|\langle Y \rangle \tilde{f}\|_2^2. \quad (2.53)$$

and $[u, v]$ solves the system (2.47).

Finally, we show that the derivatives of u, v decay fast as $Y \rightarrow -\infty$. Let $\psi = \int_0^Y \bar{u}(\theta, z) dz$ and

$$\tilde{u}(\theta, \psi) = u(\theta, Y(\theta, \psi)), \quad \tilde{v}(\theta, \psi) = v(\theta, Y(\theta, \psi)), \quad F(\theta, \psi) = \frac{\tilde{f}(\theta, Y(\theta, \psi))}{\bar{u}(\theta, Y(\theta, \psi))},$$

then there hold

$$\begin{cases} \partial_\theta \tilde{u} - \partial_\psi (a(\theta, \psi) \partial_\psi \tilde{u}) + b(\theta, \psi) \tilde{u} + c(\theta, \psi) \tilde{v} = F(\theta, \psi), \\ \tilde{u}(\theta + 2\pi, \psi) = \tilde{u}(\theta, \psi), \\ \tilde{u}(\theta, 0) = 0, \quad \lim_{\psi \rightarrow -\infty} \partial_\psi \tilde{u}(\theta, \psi) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (2.54)$$

where

$$a(\theta, \psi) = \bar{u}(\theta, Y(\theta, \psi)), \quad b(\theta, \psi) = \frac{\partial_\theta \bar{u}(\theta, Y(\theta, \psi))}{\bar{u}(\theta, Y(\theta, \psi))}, \quad c(\theta, \psi) = \frac{\partial_Y \bar{u}(\theta, Y(\theta, \psi))}{\bar{u}(\theta, Y(\theta, \psi))}.$$

Notice that there exist $\eta_0 > 0$ such that for any $\eta \in (0, \eta_0)$, there holds

$$\frac{\alpha}{2} \leq \bar{u}(\theta, Y) \leq \alpha, \quad \forall (\theta, Y) \in [0, 2\pi] \times (-\infty, 0].$$

Thus, we deduce that $\frac{\alpha}{2} \leq \frac{|\psi|}{|Y|} \leq \alpha$.

We claim that for any $l \in \mathbb{N}$, there holds

$$\|\partial_\theta \tilde{u} \psi^l\|_2 + \|\partial_\psi \tilde{u} \psi^l\|_2 + \|\partial_{\psi\psi} \tilde{u} \psi^l\|_2 \leq C(\delta, l) \|F\langle \psi \rangle^{l+1}\|_2, \quad (2.55)$$

where

$$\tilde{u}_\neq = \tilde{u} - u_0(\psi), \quad u_0(\psi) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \tilde{u}(\theta, \psi) d\theta.$$

From (2.53), we deduce that

$$\|\partial_\theta \tilde{u}\|_2 + \|\partial_\psi \tilde{u}\|_2 + \|\partial_{\psi\psi} \tilde{u}\|_2 \leq C(\delta) \|F\langle \psi \rangle\|_2,$$

thus (2.55) holds for $l = 0$.

For any $l \geq 1$, multiplying $\tilde{u}_\neq \psi^{2l}$ in (2.54) and integrating in $[0, 2\pi] \times (-\infty, 0]$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \underbrace{\int_0^{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^0 \partial_\theta \tilde{u} \tilde{u}_\neq \psi^{2l} d\psi d\theta}_{I_1} - \underbrace{\int_0^{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^0 \partial_\psi (a(\theta, \psi) \partial_\psi \tilde{u}) \tilde{u}_\neq \psi^{2l} d\psi d\theta}_{I_2} \\ &= \underbrace{\int_0^{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^0 [F(\theta, \psi) - b(\theta, \psi) \tilde{u} - c(\theta, \psi) \tilde{v}] \tilde{u}_\neq \psi^{2l} d\psi d\theta}_{I_3}. \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, $I_1 = 0$. Due to the fast decay of $b(\theta, \psi), c(\theta, \psi)$ as $\psi \rightarrow -\infty$, we deduce that

$$|I_3| \leq C \|F\langle \psi \rangle^{l+1}\|_2 \|\partial_\theta \tilde{u}_\neq \psi^{l-1}\|_2 + C(\delta) (\|\partial_\theta \tilde{u}\|_2^2 + \|\partial_\psi \tilde{u}\|_2^2)$$

$$\leq C(\delta) \|F\langle\psi\rangle^{l+1}\|_2^2 + C(\delta) \|\partial_\theta \tilde{u} \psi^{l-1}\|_2^2.$$

Moreover, there holds

$$I_2 = \underbrace{\int_0^{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^0 a(\theta, \psi) \partial_\psi \tilde{u} \partial_\psi \tilde{u} \psi^{2l} d\psi d\theta}_{I_{21}} + \underbrace{2l \int_0^{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^0 a(\theta, \psi) \partial_\psi \tilde{u} \tilde{u} \psi^{2l-1} d\psi d\theta}_{I_{22}}.$$

Notice that $a(\theta, \psi) = u_e(1) + u_p^{(0)}(\theta, Y(\theta, \psi))$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} I_{21} &= u_e(1) \int_0^{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^0 \partial_\psi \tilde{u} \partial_\psi \tilde{u} \psi^{2l} d\psi d\theta + \int_0^{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^0 u_p^{(0)}(\theta, Y(\theta, \psi)) \partial_\psi \tilde{u} \partial_\psi \tilde{u} \psi^{2l} d\psi d\theta \\ &= u_e(1) \int_0^{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^0 \partial_\psi \tilde{u} \partial_\psi \tilde{u} \psi^{2l} d\psi d\theta + \int_0^{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^0 u_p^{(0)}(\theta, Y(\theta, \psi)) \partial_\psi \tilde{u} \partial_\psi \tilde{u} \psi^{2l} d\psi d\theta \\ &\geq \frac{\alpha}{2} \|\partial_\psi \tilde{u} \psi^l\|_2^2 - C(\delta) \|\partial_\psi \tilde{u}\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by Hölder inequality and Póincare inequality, there holds

$$|I_{22}| \leq C(\delta, l) \|\partial_\psi \tilde{u} \psi^l\|_2 \|\partial_\theta \tilde{u} \psi^{l-1}\|_2.$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\|\partial_\psi \tilde{u} \psi^l\|_2 \leq C(\delta, l) \|\partial_\theta \tilde{u} \psi^{l-1}\|_2 + C(\delta) \|F\langle\psi\rangle^{l+1}\|_2. \quad (2.56)$$

Moreover, we can easily get

$$\partial_\theta \tilde{u} - a(\theta, \psi) \partial_\psi \tilde{u} = F(\theta, \psi) + \partial_\psi a(\theta, \psi) \partial_\psi \tilde{u} - b(\theta, \psi) \tilde{u} - c(\theta, \psi) \tilde{v},$$

thus there holds

$$\|[\partial_\theta \tilde{u} - a(\theta, \psi) \partial_\psi \tilde{u}] \psi^l\|_2^2 = \| [F(\theta, \psi) + \partial_\psi a(\theta, \psi) \partial_\psi \tilde{u} - b(\theta, \psi) \tilde{u} - c(\theta, \psi) \tilde{v}] \psi^l \|_2^2.$$

The right side can be controlled by

$$C(\delta) \|F\langle\psi\rangle^l\|_2^2 + C(\delta) (\|\partial_\theta \tilde{u}\|_2^2 + \|\partial_\psi \tilde{u}\|_2^2).$$

Moreover, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} &\|[\partial_\theta \tilde{u} - a(\theta, \psi) \partial_\psi \tilde{u}] \psi^l\|_2^2 \\ &= \|\partial_\theta \tilde{u} \psi^l\|_2^2 + \|a(\theta, \psi) \partial_\psi \tilde{u} \psi^l\|_2^2 - 2 \int_0^{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^0 a(\theta, \psi) \partial_\theta \tilde{u} \partial_\psi \tilde{u} \psi^{2l} d\psi d\theta \\ &\geq \|\partial_\theta \tilde{u} \psi^l\|_2^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|\partial_\psi \tilde{u} \psi^l\|_2^2 - 2 \underbrace{\int_0^{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^0 a(\theta, \psi) \partial_\theta \tilde{u} \partial_\psi \tilde{u} \psi^{2l} d\psi d\theta}_I. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating by parts, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} I &= 2 \underbrace{\int_0^{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^0 \partial_\psi a(\theta, \psi) \partial_\theta \tilde{u} \partial_\psi \tilde{u} \psi^{2l} d\psi d\theta}_{I_1} + 4l \underbrace{\int_0^{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^0 a(\theta, \psi) \partial_\theta \tilde{u} \partial_\psi \tilde{u} \psi^{2l-1} d\psi d\theta}_{I_2} \\ &\quad + 2 \underbrace{\int_0^{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^0 a(\theta, \psi) \partial_{\theta\psi} \tilde{u} \partial_\psi \tilde{u} \psi^{2l} d\psi d\theta}_{I_3}. \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, there holds

$$|I_1| + |I_3| \leq C(\delta) (\|\partial_\theta \tilde{u}\|_2^2 + \|\partial_\psi \tilde{u}\|_2^2).$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_2| &= \left| 4lu_e(1) \int_0^{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^0 \partial_\theta \tilde{u} \psi^{2l-1} \partial_\psi \tilde{u} d\psi d\theta + 4l \int_0^{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^0 u_p^{(0)}(\theta, Y(\theta, \psi)) \partial_\theta \tilde{u} \psi^{2l-1} \partial_\psi \tilde{u} d\psi d\theta \right| \\
&= \left| 4lu_e(1) \int_0^{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^0 \partial_\theta \tilde{u} \psi^{2l-1} \partial_\psi \tilde{u} d\psi d\theta + 4l \int_0^{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^0 u_p^{(0)}(\theta, Y(\theta, \psi)) \partial_\theta \tilde{u} \psi^{2l-1} \partial_\psi \tilde{u} d\psi d\theta \right| \\
&\leq C(l) \|\partial_\theta \tilde{u} \psi^l\|_2 \|\partial_\psi \tilde{u} \psi^{l-1}\|_2 + C(\delta, l) (\|\partial_\theta \tilde{u}\|_2^2 + \|\partial_\psi \tilde{u}\|_2^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\|\partial_\theta \tilde{u} \psi^l\|_2 + \|\partial_{\psi\psi} \tilde{u} \psi^l\|_2 \leq C(\delta, l) \|\partial_\psi \tilde{u} \psi^{l-1}\|_2 + C(\delta, l) \|F\langle\psi\rangle^{l+1}\|_2. \quad (2.57)$$

Combining the estimate (2.56) and (2.57), we obtain that for any $l \geq 1$, there holds

$$\|\partial_\theta \tilde{u} \psi^l\|_2 + \|\partial_\psi \tilde{u} \psi^l\|_2 + \|\partial_{\psi\psi} \tilde{u} \psi^l\|_2 \leq C(\delta, l) (\|\partial_\psi \tilde{u} \psi^{l-1}\|_2 + \|\partial_\theta \tilde{u} \psi^{l-1}\|_2) + C(\delta, l) \|F\langle\psi\rangle^l\|_2.$$

Thus, by induction, we obtain (2.55).

Furthermore, by the Hardy inequality, we have

$$\|\partial_\psi \tilde{u} \psi^{l-1}\|_2 \leq C \|\partial_{\psi\psi} \tilde{u} \psi^l\|_2,$$

hence there holds

$$\|\partial_\theta \tilde{u} \psi^l\|_2 + \|\partial_\psi \tilde{u} \psi^{l-1}\|_2 + \|\partial_{\psi\psi} \tilde{u} \psi^l\|_2 \leq C(\delta) \|F\langle\psi\rangle^{l+1}\|_2.$$

Returning to the original variable, we obtain that for any $l \geq 1$, there holds

$$\|\langle Y \rangle^l \partial_{Y Y} u\|_2^2 + \|\langle Y \rangle^{l-1} \partial_\theta u\|_2^2 + \|\langle Y \rangle^{l-1} \partial_Y u\|_2^2 \leq C(\delta, l) \|\langle Y \rangle^{l+1} \tilde{f}\|_2^2.$$

Furthermore, by induction, we obtain that for any $m \in \mathbb{N}_+$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j+k \leq m} \left(\|\langle Y \rangle^l \partial_\theta^j \partial_Y^k \partial_{Y Y} u\|_2^2 + \|\langle Y \rangle^{l-1} \partial_\theta^j \partial_Y^k \partial_\theta u\|_2^2 + \|\langle Y \rangle^{l-1} \partial_\theta^j \partial_Y^k \partial_Y u\|_2^2 \right) \\
&\leq C(\delta, m, l) \sum_{j+k \leq m} \|\langle Y \rangle^{l+1} \partial_\theta^j \partial_Y^k \tilde{f}\|_2^2 \leq C(\delta, m, l) \eta^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Noting that $\lim_{Y \rightarrow -\infty} (u_\theta, u_Y) = 0$ and $A_{1\infty} := \lim_{Y \rightarrow -\infty} u(\theta, Y)$ is a constant independent on θ , then by the Hardy inequality we have for any $l \geq 2$

$$\|Y^{l-2} (u - A_{1\infty})\|_2 \leq C(\delta, l) \|Y^{l-1} \partial_Y u\|_2 \leq C(\delta, l) \eta^2.$$

This completes the proof of this proposition. $\square$

Remark 2.6. Unlike the usual case, we can not expect $\lim_{Y \rightarrow -\infty} u_p^{(1)} = 0$ due to the periodic boundary condition on θ direction. However, the behaviour on $-\infty$ of boundary layer profile $u_p^{(1)}$ does not affect the out flow $[u_e^{(1)}, v_e^{(1)}]$ because $[u_e^{(1)} + A_{1\infty}, v_e^{(1)}]$ also solves the equations (2.4). Motivated by this observation, we modify the Euler flow $[u_e^{(1)}, v_e^{(1)}]$ in (2.61).

Next, we construct the pressure $p_p^{(2)}(\theta, Y)$. Consider the equation

$$\partial_Y p_p^{(2)}(\theta, Y) = g_1(\theta, Y), \quad \lim_{Y \rightarrow -\infty} p_p^{(2)}(\theta, Y) = 0, \quad (2.58)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
g_1(\theta, Y) &= -Y \partial_Y p_p^{(1)} + \partial_{Y Y} v_p^{(1)} - u_e(1) \partial_\theta v_p^{(1)} - u_p^{(0)} (\partial_\theta v_e^{(1)}(\theta, 1) + \partial_\theta v_p^{(1)}) \\
&\quad - \partial_Y v_p^{(1)} (v_e^{(1)}(\theta, 1) + v_p^{(1)}) - 2(Y u_e'(1) u_p^{(0)} + u_e(1) \tilde{u}_p^{(1)} + [u_e^{(1)}(\theta, 1) + A_1] u_p^{(0)} + u_p^{(0)} \tilde{u}_p^{(1)}),
\end{aligned}$$

here and below,

$$\tilde{u}_p^{(1)} = u_p^{(1)} - A_{1\infty}.$$

$g_1(\theta, Y)$ can be obtained by replacing $u_p^{(1)}$ by $\tilde{u}_p^{(1)}$ in the expansion (2.6) and putting the new expansion into the second equation of (1.3), then collecting the ε^1 -order terms together. Notice that $g_1(\theta, Y)$ decay fast as $Y \rightarrow -\infty$, we can get $p_p^{(2)}(\theta, Y)$ by solving (2.58) and deduce that $p_p^{(2)}(\theta, Y)$ decay fast as $Y \rightarrow -\infty$.

2.3.4. *Linearized Euler equations for $(u_e^{(2)}, v_e^{(2)}, p_e^{(2)})$ and their solvabilities.*

Let $\chi(r) \in C^\infty([0, 1])$ be an increasing smooth function such that

$$\chi(r) = \begin{cases} 0, & r \in [0, \frac{1}{2}], \\ 1, & r \in [\frac{3}{4}, 1]. \end{cases} \quad (2.59)$$

Then, let $\phi_1(r) = -A_{1\infty}(r\chi''(r) + \chi'(r) - \frac{\chi(r)}{r})$ and

$$A_1(r) := a_1 r + r \int_0^r \frac{\phi_1(s)}{2s} - \frac{1}{r} \int_0^r \frac{s\phi_1(s)}{2} ds,$$

where a_1 is a constant such that $A_1(1) = 0$. Obviously, $|a_1| \leq C\eta$ and

$$\begin{cases} rA_1''(r) + A_1'(r) - \frac{A_1(r)}{r} = -\phi_1(r), & 0 < r \leq 1 \\ A_1(1) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.60)$$

Direct computation gives $\|\partial_r^k A_1(r)\|_\infty \leq C(k)\eta$. Moreover, notice that $\chi(r) = 0$ for $r \leq \frac{1}{2}$, we deduce that $A_1(r) = a_1 r$ for $r \leq \frac{1}{2}$.

Set

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u}_e^{(1)}(\theta, r) &:= u_e^{(1)}(\theta, r) + \chi(r)A_{1\infty} + A_1(r), \\ \tilde{v}_e^{(1)}(\theta, r) &:= v_e^{(1)}(\theta, r), \\ \tilde{p}_e^{(1)}(\theta, r) &:= p_e^{(1)}(\theta, r) + 2a \int_0^r [\chi(s)A_{1\infty} + A_1(s)] ds, \end{aligned} \quad (2.61)$$

then $(\tilde{u}_e^{(1)}, \tilde{v}_e^{(1)}, \tilde{p}_e^{(1)})$ also satisfies the linearized Euler equations (2.4) with the boundary condition (2.5). Moreover, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_\theta \tilde{u}_e^{(1)} + \tilde{v}_e^{(1)}|(\theta, r) &\leq C\eta r, \quad |\partial_\theta \tilde{v}_e^{(1)} - \tilde{u}_e^{(1)}|(\theta, r) \leq C\eta r, \quad \forall (\theta, r) \in \Omega, \\ \|\partial_\theta^k \partial_r^j (\tilde{u}_e^{(1)}, \tilde{v}_e^{(1)})\|_2 &\leq C(k, j)\eta, \quad \forall j, k \geq 0; \\ r^2 \Delta \tilde{u}_e^{(1)} - \tilde{u}_e^{(1)} + 2\partial_\theta \tilde{v}_e^{(1)} &= 0, \quad \int_0^{2\pi} \tilde{v}_e^{(1)} d\theta = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.62)$$

Putting

$$\begin{aligned} u^\varepsilon(\theta, r) &= u_e(r) + \varepsilon \tilde{u}_e^{(1)}(\theta, r) + \varepsilon^2 u_e^{(2)}(\theta, r) + \dots, \\ v^\varepsilon(\theta, r) &= \varepsilon \tilde{v}_e^{(1)}(\theta, r) + \varepsilon^2 v_e^{(2)}(\theta, r) + \dots, \\ p^\varepsilon(\theta, r) &= p_e(r) + \varepsilon \tilde{p}_e^{(1)}(\theta, r) + \varepsilon^2 p_e^{(2)}(\theta, r) + \dots \end{aligned}$$

into the Navier-Stokes equations (1.3), we obtain the following linearized Euler equations for $(u_e^{(2)}, v_e^{(2)}, p_e^{(2)})$

$$\begin{cases} ar\partial_\theta u_e^{(2)} + 2arv_e^{(2)} + \partial_\theta p_e^{(2)} + \tilde{u}_e^{(1)}\partial_\theta \tilde{u}_e^{(1)} + \tilde{v}_e^{(1)}r\partial_r \tilde{u}_e^{(1)} + \tilde{u}_e^{(1)}\tilde{v}_e^{(1)} = 0, \\ ar\partial_\theta v_e^{(2)} - 2aru_e^{(2)} + r\partial_r p_e^{(2)} + \tilde{u}_e^{(1)}\partial_\theta \tilde{v}_e^{(1)} + \tilde{v}_e^{(1)}r\partial_r \tilde{v}_e^{(1)} - (\tilde{u}_e^{(1)})^2 = 0, \\ \partial_\theta u_e^{(2)} + r\partial_r v_e^{(2)} + v_e^{(2)} = 0, \end{cases} \quad (2.63)$$

with the boundary condition

$$v_e^{(2)}|_{r=1} = -v_p^{(2)}|_{Y=0}, \quad v_e^{(2)}(\theta, r) = v_e^{(2)}(\theta + 2\pi, r). \quad (2.64)$$

Proposition 2.7. *The linearized Euler equations (2.63) have a solution $(u_e^{(2)}, v_e^{(2)}, p_e^{(2)})$ which satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_\theta u_e^{(2)} + v_e^{(2)}|(\theta, r) &\leq C\eta r, \quad |\partial_\theta v_e^{(2)} - u_e^{(2)}|(\theta, r) \leq C\eta r, \quad \forall(\theta, r) \in \Omega, \\ \|\partial_\theta^k \partial_r^j (u_e^{(2)}, v_e^{(2)})\|_2 &\leq C(k, j)\eta, \quad \forall j, k \geq 0, \\ r^2 \Delta u_e^{(2)} - u_e^{(2)} + 2\partial_\theta v_e^{(2)} &= 0, \quad \int_0^{2\pi} v_e^{(2)} d\theta = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Eliminating the pressure $p_e^{(2)}$ in the equation (2.63), we obtain

$$-ar^2 \Delta(rv_e^{(2)}) - \tilde{u}_e^{(1)} r \Delta(r\tilde{v}_e^{(1)}) + \tilde{v}_e^{(1)}(r^2 \Delta \tilde{u}_e^{(1)} - \tilde{u}_e^{(1)} + 2\partial_\theta \tilde{v}_e^{(1)}) = 0.$$

Recall that $\Delta(rv_e^{(1)}) = 0$ and using (2.62), we obtain the following equation for $rv_e^{(2)}$ in Ω

$$\begin{cases} -ar^2 \Delta(rv_e^{(2)}) = 0, \\ rv_e^{(2)}|_{r=1} = -v_p^{(2)}(\theta, 0). \end{cases}$$

Then, we can complete the proof of this proposition by following the argument of Proposition 2.4 line by line, we omit the details. $\square$

2.3.5. Linearized Prandtl equations for $(u_p^{(2)}, v_p^{(3)})$ and their solvabilities.

Putting the expansion

$$\begin{aligned} u^\varepsilon(\theta, r) &= u_e(r) + u_p^{(0)}(\theta, Y) + \varepsilon[\tilde{u}_e^{(1)}(\theta, r) + \tilde{u}_p^{(1)}(\theta, Y)] + \varepsilon^2[u_e^{(2)}(\theta, r) + u_p^{(2)}(\theta, Y)] + \dots, \\ v^\varepsilon(\theta, r) &= \varepsilon[\tilde{v}_e^{(1)}(\theta, r) + v_p^{(1)}(\theta, Y)] + \varepsilon^2[v_e^{(2)}(\theta, r) + v_p^{(2)}(\theta, Y)] + \varepsilon^3[v_e^{(3)}(\theta, r) + v_p^{(3)}(\theta, Y)] + \dots, \\ p^\varepsilon(\theta, r) &= p_e(r) + \varepsilon[\tilde{p}_e^{(1)}(\theta, r) + p_p^{(1)}(\theta, Y)] + \varepsilon^2[p_e^{(2)}(\theta, r) + p_p^{(2)}(\theta, Y)] + \varepsilon^3[p_p^{(3)}(\theta, Y)] + \dots \end{aligned}$$

with the boundary conditions

$$u_e^{(2)}(\theta, 1) + u_p^{(2)}(\theta, 0) = 0, \quad v_e^{(3)}(\theta, 1) + v_p^{(3)}(\theta, 0) = 0, \quad \lim_{Y \rightarrow -\infty} (\partial_Y u_p^{(2)}, v_p^{(3)}) = (0, 0)$$

into the first and third equation of (1.3), collecting ε^2 -order terms together, we obtain the following linearized steady Prandtl equations for $(u_p^{(2)}, v_p^{(3)})$

$$\begin{cases} (u_e(1) + u_p^{(0)})\partial_\theta u_p^{(2)} + (v_e^{(1)}(\theta, 1) + v_p^{(1)})\partial_Y u_p^{(2)} + (v_e^{(3)}(\theta, 1) + v_p^{(3)})\partial_Y u_p^{(0)} \\ \quad + (u_p^{(2)} + u_e^{(2)}(\theta, 1))\partial_\theta u_p^{(0)} - \partial_{YY} u_p^{(2)} = f_2(\theta, Y), \\ \partial_\theta u_p^{(2)} + \partial_Y v_p^{(3)} + \partial_Y(Y v_p^{(2)}) = 0, \\ u_p^{(2)}(\theta, Y) = u_p^{(2)}(\theta + 2\pi, Y), \quad v_p^{(3)}(\theta, Y) = v_p^{(3)}(\theta + 2\pi, Y), \\ u_p^{(2)}|_{Y=0} = -u_e^{(2)}|_{r=1}, \quad \lim_{Y \rightarrow -\infty} (\partial_Y u_p^{(2)}, v_p^{(3)}) = (0, 0), \end{cases} \quad (2.65)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} f_2(\theta, Y) &= -\partial_\theta p_p^{(2)} + Y\partial_{YY} u_p^{(1)} + \partial_Y u_p^{(1)} + \partial_{\theta\theta} u_p^{(0)} - u_p^{(0)} - \tilde{u}_p^{(1)}\partial_\theta u_p^{(1)} - v_p^{(2)}\partial_Y u_p^{(1)} - \sum_{i+j=2} v_p^{(i)} Y \partial_Y u_p^{(j)} \\ &\quad - \sum_{k=0}^2 \sum_{i+j=2-k, (k,j) \neq (0,2)} \left(\frac{\partial_r^k \tilde{u}_e^{(i)}(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^k \partial_\theta \tilde{u}_p^{(j)} + \tilde{u}_p^{(j)} \frac{\partial_r^k \partial_\theta \tilde{u}_e^{(i)}(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^k \right) + u_e^{(2)}(\theta, 1) \partial_\theta u_p^{(0)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \sum_{k=0}^1 \sum_{i+j=2-k} \left(\frac{\partial_r^k \tilde{v}_e^{(i)}(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^{k+1} \partial_Y \tilde{u}_p^{(j)} + v_p^{(i)} \frac{\partial_r^k (r \partial_r \tilde{u}_e^{(j)})(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^k \right) \\
& - \sum_{k=0}^2 \sum_{i+j=3-k, (k,j) \neq (0,2), (0,0)} \frac{\partial_r^k \tilde{v}_e^{(i)}(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^k \partial_Y \tilde{u}_p^{(j)}
\end{aligned}$$

with $\tilde{u}_p^{(0)} = u_p^{(0)}$, $\tilde{u}_e^{(0)} = u_e(r)$, $\tilde{u}_e^{(2)} = u_e^{(2)}$, $\tilde{v}_e^{(2)} = v_e^{(2)}$.

Proposition 2.8. *There exists $\eta_0 > 0$ such that for any $\eta \in (0, \eta_0)$, equations (2.65) have a unique solution $(u_p^{(2)}, v_p^{(3)})$ which satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j+k \leq m} \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} \left| \partial_\theta^j \partial_Y^k (u_p^{(2)} - A_{2\infty}, v_p^{(3)}) \right|^2 \langle Y \rangle^{2l} d\theta dY \leq C(m, l) \eta^2, \quad m, l \geq 0, \\
& \int_0^{2\pi} v_p^{(3)}(\theta, Y) d\theta = 0, \quad \forall Y \leq 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.66}$$

where $A_{2\infty} := \lim_{Y \rightarrow -\infty} u_p^{(2)}(\theta, Y)$ is a constant which satisfies $|A_{2\infty}| \leq C\eta$.

The proof is same with Proposition 2.5 by noticing that $f_2(\theta, Y)$ is decay very fast as $Y \rightarrow -\infty$, we omit the details.

We construct the pressure $p_p^{(3)}(\theta, Y)$ by considering the equation

$$\partial_Y p_p^{(3)}(\theta, Y) = g_2(\theta, Y), \quad \lim_{Y \rightarrow -\infty} p_p^{(3)}(\theta, Y) = 0, \tag{2.67}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
g_2(\theta, Y) &= \partial_{YY} v_p^{(2)} + Y \partial_{YY} v_p^{(1)} + \partial_Y v_p^{(1)} - 2 \partial_\theta u_p^{(0)} - Y \partial_Y p_p^{(2)} - \sum_{i+j=3} v_p^{(i)} \partial_Y v_p^{(j)} \\
& - \sum_{i+j=2} \left(\tilde{u}_p^{(i)} \partial_\theta v_p^{(j)} + v_p^{(i)} Y \partial_Y v_p^{(j)} - \tilde{u}_p^{(i)} \tilde{u}_p^{(j)} + \tilde{v}_e^{(i)}(\theta, 1) Y \partial_Y v_p^{(j)} + v_p^{(i)} \partial_r \tilde{v}_e^{(j)}(\theta, 1) \right) \\
& - \sum_{k=0}^1 \sum_{i+j=2-k} \left(\frac{\partial_r^k \tilde{u}_e^{(i)}(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^k \partial_\theta v_p^{(j)} + \frac{\partial_r^k \partial_\theta \tilde{v}_e^{(j)}(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^k \partial_\theta \tilde{u}_p^{(i)} \right) \\
& - \sum_{k=0}^2 \sum_{i+j=2-k} \left(\frac{\partial_r^k \tilde{u}_e^{(i)}(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^k \tilde{u}_p^{(j)} + \frac{\partial_r^k \tilde{u}_e^{(j)}(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^k \tilde{u}_p^{(i)} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{u}_p^{(0)} = u_p^{(0)}$, $\tilde{u}_e^{(0)} = u_e(r)$, $\tilde{u}_e^{(2)} = u_e^{(2)} + A_{2\infty}$, $\tilde{v}_e^{(2)} = v_e^{(2)}$, and here and below $\tilde{u}_p^{(2)} = u_p^{(2)} - A_{2\infty}$. $g_2(\theta, Y)$ can be derived by the same argument as $g_1(\theta, Y)$. Moreover, notice that $g_2(\theta, Y)$ decay fast as $Y \rightarrow -\infty$, we can obtain $p_p^{(2)}$ by solving (2.67) and $p_p^{(2)}$ also decay fast as $Y \rightarrow -\infty$.

2.3.6. Linearized Euler equations for $(u_e^{(3)}, v_e^{(3)}, p_e^{(3)})$ and their solvabilities.

Let $\phi_2(s) = -A_{2\infty}(r\chi''(r) + \chi'(r) - \frac{\chi(r)}{r})$ and

$$A_2(r) := a_2 r + r \int_0^r \frac{\phi_2(s)}{2s} - \frac{1}{r} \int_0^r \frac{s\phi_2(s)}{2} ds,$$

where a_2 is a constant such that $A_2(1) = 0$. Obviously, $|a_2| \leq C\eta$,

$$\begin{cases} r A_2''(r) + A_2'(r) - \frac{A_2(r)}{r} = -\phi_2(r), & 0 < r < 1 \\ A_2(1) = 0, \end{cases} \tag{2.68}$$

and $\|\partial_r^k A_2(r)\|_\infty \leq C(k)\eta$. Moreover, notice that $\chi(r) = 0$ for $r \leq \frac{1}{2}$, we deduce that $A_2(r) = a_2 r$ for $r \leq \frac{1}{2}$.

Set

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{u}_e^{(2)}(\theta, r) &:= u_e^{(2)}(\theta, r) + \chi(r)A_{2\infty} + A_2(r), \\ \tilde{v}_e^{(2)}(\theta, r) &:= v_e^{(2)}(\theta, r), \\ \tilde{p}_e^{(2)}(\theta, r) &:= p_e^{(2)}(\theta, r) + 2a \int_0^r [\chi(s)A_{2\infty} + A_2(s)]ds,\end{aligned}$$

then $(\tilde{u}_e^{(2)}, \tilde{v}_e^{(2)}, \tilde{p}_e^{(2)})$ also satisfies the linearized Euler equations (2.63) with the boundary condition (2.64). Moreover, there holds

$$\begin{aligned}|\partial_\theta \tilde{u}_e^{(2)} + \tilde{v}_e^{(2)}|(\theta, r) &\leq C\eta r, \quad |\partial_\theta \tilde{v}_e^{(2)} - \tilde{u}_e^{(2)}|(\theta, r) \leq C\eta r, \quad \forall(\theta, r) \in \Omega, \\ \|\partial_\theta^k \partial_r^j(\tilde{u}_e^{(2)}, \tilde{v}_e^{(2)})\|_2 &\leq C(k, j)\eta, \quad \forall j, k \geq 0; \\ r^2 \Delta \tilde{u}_e^{(2)} - \tilde{u}_e^{(2)} + 2\partial_\theta \tilde{v}_e^{(2)} &= 0, \quad \int_0^{2\pi} \tilde{v}_e^{(2)} d\theta = 0.\end{aligned}\tag{2.69}$$

Putting

$$\begin{aligned}u^\varepsilon(\theta, r) &= u_e(r) + \sum_{i=1}^2 \varepsilon^i \tilde{u}_e^{(i)}(\theta, r) + \varepsilon^3 u_e^{(3)} + \dots, \\ v^\varepsilon(\theta, r) &= \sum_{i=1}^2 \varepsilon^i \tilde{v}_e^{(i)}(\theta, r) + \varepsilon^3 v_e^{(3)} + \dots, \\ p^\varepsilon(\theta, r) &= p_e(r) + \sum_{i=1}^2 \varepsilon^i \tilde{p}_e^{(i)}(\theta, r) + \varepsilon^3 p_e^{(3)} + \dots\end{aligned}$$

into the Navier-Stokes equations (1.3), we find that $(u_e^{(3)}, v_e^{(3)}, p_e^{(3)})$ satisfies the following linearized Euler equations in Ω

$$\begin{cases} ar\partial_\theta u_e^{(3)} + 2arv_e^{(3)} + \partial_\theta p_e^{(3)} + f_e(\theta, r) = 0, \\ ar\partial_\theta v_e^{(3)} - 2aru_e^{(3)} + r\partial_r p_e^{(3)} + g_e(\theta, r) = 0, \\ \partial_\theta u_e^{(3)} + r\partial_r v_e^{(3)} + v_e^{(3)} = 0, \end{cases}\tag{2.70}$$

and equipped with the boundary conditions

$$rv_e^{(3)}|_{r=1} = -v_p^{(3)}|_{Y=0}, \quad v_e^{(3)}(\theta, r) = v_e^{(3)}(\theta + 2\pi, r),\tag{2.71}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}f_e(\theta, r) &= \tilde{u}_e^{(1)}\partial_\theta \tilde{u}_e^{(2)} + \tilde{u}_e^{(2)}\partial_\theta \tilde{u}_e^{(1)} + \tilde{v}_e^{(1)}r\partial_r \tilde{u}_e^{(2)} + \tilde{v}_e^{(2)}r\partial_r \tilde{u}_e^{(1)} + \tilde{u}_e^{(1)}\tilde{v}_e^{(2)} + \tilde{u}_e^{(2)}\tilde{v}_e^{(1)} \\ &\quad - \underbrace{\left(\frac{\partial_{\theta\theta}\tilde{u}_e^{(1)}}{r} + r\partial_{rr}\tilde{u}_e^{(1)} + \partial_r \tilde{u}_e^{(1)} + \frac{2}{r}\partial_\theta \tilde{v}_e^{(1)} - \frac{\tilde{u}_e^{(1)}}{r}\right)}_{I_1}, \\ g_e(\theta, r) &= \tilde{u}_e^{(1)}\partial_\theta \tilde{v}_e^{(2)} + \tilde{u}_e^{(2)}\partial_\theta \tilde{v}_e^{(1)} + \tilde{v}_e^{(1)}r\partial_r \tilde{v}_e^{(2)} + \tilde{v}_e^{(2)}r\partial_r \tilde{v}_e^{(1)} - 2\tilde{u}_e^{(1)}\tilde{u}_e^{(2)} \\ &\quad - \underbrace{\left(\frac{\partial_{\theta\theta}\tilde{v}_e^{(1)}}{r} + r\partial_{rr}\tilde{v}_e^{(1)} + \partial_r \tilde{v}_e^{(1)} - \frac{2}{r}\partial_\theta \tilde{u}_e^{(1)} - \frac{\tilde{v}_e^{(1)}}{r}\right)}_{I_2}.\end{aligned}$$

We claim that $I_1 = I_2 = 0$. In fact,

$$I_1 = \frac{1}{r}[r^2 \Delta \tilde{u}_e^{(1)} - \tilde{u}_e^{(1)} + 2\partial_\theta \tilde{v}_e^{(1)}] = 0, \quad I_2 = \Delta(rv_e^{(1)}) - \frac{2(\partial_\theta u_e^{(1)} + \partial_r(rv_e^{(1)}))}{r} = 0,$$

where we used (2.62).

Proposition 2.9. *The linearized Euler equations (2.70) have a solution $(u_e^{(3)}, v_e^{(3)}, p_e^{(3)})$ which satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_\theta u_e^{(3)} + v_e^{(3)}|(\theta, r) &\leq C\eta r, \quad |\partial_\theta v_e^{(3)} - u_e^{(3)}|(\theta, r) \leq C\eta r, \quad \forall(\theta, r) \in \Omega, \\ \|\partial_\theta^k \partial_r^j(u_e^{(3)}, v_e^{(3)})\|_2 &\leq C(j, k)\eta, \quad j, k \geq 0; \\ r^2 \Delta u_e^{(3)} - u_e^{(3)} + 2\partial_\theta v_e^{(3)} &= 0, \quad \int_0^{2\pi} v_e^{(3)} d\theta = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.72)$$

Proof. Using the same argument as Proposition 2.7, we deduce that

$$\begin{cases} -ar^2 \Delta(rv_e^{(3)}) + v_e^{(2)}(r^2 \Delta \tilde{u}_e^{(1)} - \tilde{u}_e^{(1)} + 2\partial_\theta \tilde{v}_e^{(1)}) + v_e^{(1)}(r^2 \Delta \tilde{u}_e^{(2)} - \tilde{u}_e^{(2)} + 2\partial_\theta \tilde{v}_e^{(2)}) = 0, \\ rv_e^{(3)}|_{r=1} = -v_p^{(3)}(\theta, 0). \end{cases}$$

where we used $\Delta(rv_e^{(1)}) = \Delta(rv_e^{(2)}) = 0$. Using (2.62) and (2.69), we obtain the following equation for $rv_e^{(3)}$ in Ω

$$\begin{cases} -ar^2 \Delta(rv_e^{(3)}) = 0, \\ rv_e^{(3)}|_{r=1} = -v_p^{(3)}(\theta, 0). \end{cases}$$

Thus, we can complete the proof of this proposition by the same argument as Proposition 2.4. $\square$

2.3.7. Linearize Prandtl equations for $(u_p^{(3)}, v_p^{(4)})$ and their solvabilities.

Let

$$u^\varepsilon(\theta, r) = u_e(r) + u_p^{(0)}(\theta, Y) + \sum_{i=1}^2 \varepsilon^i [\tilde{u}_e^{(i)}(\theta, r) + \tilde{u}_p^{(i)}(\theta, Y)] + \varepsilon^3 [u_e^{(3)}(\theta, r) + u_p^{(3)}(\theta, Y)] + \cdots,$$

$$v^\varepsilon(\theta, r) = \sum_{i=1}^2 \varepsilon^i [\tilde{v}_e^{(i)}(\theta, r) + v_p^{(i)}(\theta, Y)] + \varepsilon^3 [v_e^{(i)}(\theta, r) + v_p^{(i)}(\theta, Y)] + \varepsilon^4 [v_e^{(4)} + v_p^{(4)}(\theta, Y)] + \cdots,$$

$$p^\varepsilon(\theta, r) = p_e(r) + \sum_{i=1}^2 \varepsilon^i [\tilde{p}_e^{(i)}(\theta, r) + p_p^{(i)}(\theta, Y)] + \varepsilon^3 [p_e^{(3)}(\theta, r) + p_p^{(3)}(\theta, Y)] + \varepsilon^4 p_p^{(4)}(\theta, Y) + \cdots$$

with the following boundary conditions

$$u_e^{(3)}(\theta, 1) + u_p^{(3)}(\theta, 0) = 0, \quad v_e^{(4)}(\theta, 1) + v_p^{(4)}(\theta, 0) = 0, \quad \lim_{Y \rightarrow \infty} (\partial_Y u_p^{(3)}, v_p^{(4)}) = (0, 0).$$

As the derivation of equations for $(u_p^{(2)}, v_p^{(3)})$, we obtain the following linearized Prandtl problem for $(u_p^{(3)}, v_p^{(4)})$

$$\begin{cases} (u_e(1) + u_p^{(0)}) \partial_\theta u_p^{(3)} + (v_e^{(1)}(\theta, 1) + v_p^{(1)}) \partial_Y u_p^{(3)} + (u_p^{(3)} + u_e^{(3)}(\theta, 1)) \partial_\theta u_p^{(0)} \\ \quad (v_p^{(4)} + v_e^{(4)}(\theta, 1)) \partial_Y u_p^{(0)} - \partial_{YY} u_p^{(3)} = f_3(\theta, Y) \\ \partial_\theta u_p^{(3)} + \partial_Y v_p^{(4)} + \partial_Y(Y v_p^{(3)}) = 0, \\ u_p^{(3)}(\theta, Y) = u_p^{(3)}(\theta + 2\pi, Y), \quad v_p^{(4)}(\theta, Y) = v_p^{(4)}(\theta + 2\pi, Y), \\ u_p^{(3)}|_{Y=0} = -u_e^{(3)}|_{r=1}, \quad \lim_{Y \rightarrow \infty} (\partial_Y u_p^{(3)}, v_p^{(4)}) = (0, 0) \end{cases} \quad (2.73)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
f_3(\theta, Y) = & -\partial_\theta p_p^{(3)} + Y\partial_{Y Y} u_p^{(3)} + \partial_Y u_p^{(3)} + \sum_{k=0}^1 (-1)^k \frac{Y^k \partial_{\theta\theta} \tilde{u}_p^{(1-k)}}{k!} + 2\partial_\theta v_p^{(2)} - 2Y\partial_\theta v_p^{(1)} \\
& - \sum_{k=0}^1 (-1)^k \frac{Y^k \tilde{u}_p^{(1-k)}}{k!} - \sum_{i+j=3, 1 \leq i \leq 2} \tilde{u}_p^{(i)} \partial_\theta \tilde{u}_p^{(j)} - \sum_{i+j=3} [v_p^{(i)} Y \partial_Y \tilde{u}_p^{(j)} + \tilde{u}_p^{(i)} v_p^{(j)}] \\
& - \sum_{k=0}^3 \sum_{i+j=3-k, (k,j) \neq (0,3)} \left(\frac{\partial_r^k \tilde{u}_e^{(i)}(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^k \partial_\theta \tilde{u}_p^{(j)} + \tilde{u}_p^{(i)} \frac{\partial_r^k \partial_\theta \tilde{u}_e^{(j)}(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^k \right) \\
& - \sum_{k=0}^3 \sum_{i+j=3-k} \left(\frac{\partial_r^k \tilde{v}_e^{(i)}(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^{k+1} \partial_Y \tilde{u}_p^{(j)} + v_p^{(i)} \frac{\partial_r^k (r \partial_r \tilde{u}_e^{(j)})(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^k \right) \\
& - \sum_{k=0}^3 \sum_{i+j=4-k, (k,j) \neq (0,3), (0,0), i \leq 3} \frac{\partial_r^k \tilde{v}_e^{(i)}(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^k \partial_Y \tilde{u}_p^{(j)} \\
& - \sum_{k=0}^3 \sum_{i+j=3-k} \left(\frac{\partial_r^k \tilde{u}_e^{(i)}(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^k v_p^{(j)} + \tilde{u}_p^{(i)} \frac{\partial_r^k \tilde{v}_e^{(j)}(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^k \right)
\end{aligned}$$

with $\tilde{u}_p^{(0)} = u_p^{(0)}$, $\tilde{u}_e^{(0)} = u_e(r)$, $(\tilde{u}_e^{(3)}, \tilde{v}_e^{(3)}) = (u_e^{(3)}, v_e^{(3)})$.

Proposition 2.10. *There exists $\eta_0 > 0$ such that for any $\eta \in (0, \eta_0)$, equations (2.73) have a unique solution $(u_p^{(3)}, v_p^{(4)})$ which satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j+k \leq m} \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} |\partial_\theta^j \partial_Y^k (u_p^{(3)} - A_{3\infty}, v_p^{(4)})|^2 \langle Y \rangle^{2l} d\theta dY \leq C(m, l) \eta^2, \quad m, l \geq 0, \\
& \int_0^{2\pi} v_p^{(3)}(\theta, Y) d\theta = 0, \quad \forall Y \leq 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.74}$$

where $A_{3\infty} := \lim_{Y \rightarrow -\infty} u_p^{(3)}$ is a constant which satisfies $|A_{3\infty}| \leq C\eta$.

The proof is same with Proposition 2.5, we omit the details. Moreover, we can construct $p_p^{(4)}(\theta, Y)$ by solving the equation

$$\partial_Y p_p^{(4)}(\theta, Y) = g_3(\theta, Y), \quad \lim_{Y \rightarrow -\infty} p_p^{(4)}(\theta, Y) = 0,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
g_3(\theta, Y) = & \partial_{Y Y} v_p^{(3)} + Y\partial_{Y Y} v_p^{(2)} + \partial_Y v_p^{(2)} + \partial_{\theta\theta} v_p^{(1)} - \sum_{k=0}^1 (-1)^k \frac{Y^k}{k!} \partial_\theta \tilde{u}_p^{(2-k)} - v_p^{(1)} - Y\partial_Y p_p^{(3)} \\
& - \sum_{i+j=3} [\tilde{u}_p^{(i)} \partial_\theta v_p^{(j)} + v_p^{(i)} Y \partial_Y v_p^{(j)} - \tilde{u}_p^{(i)} \tilde{u}_p^{(j)}] - \sum_{i+j=4} v_p^{(i)} Y \partial_Y v_p^{(j)} - \sum_{k=0}^2 \sum_{i+j=4-k} \frac{\partial_r^k \tilde{v}_e^{(i)}(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^k \partial_Y v_p^{(j)} \\
& - \sum_{k=0}^3 \sum_{i+j=3-k} \left(\frac{\partial_r^k \tilde{u}_e^{(i)}(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^k \partial_\theta v_p^{(j)} + \tilde{u}_p^{(i)} \frac{\partial_r^k \partial_\theta \tilde{v}_e^{(j)}(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^k \right) \\
& + \sum_{k=0}^3 \sum_{i+j=3-k} \left(\frac{\partial_r^k \tilde{u}_e^{(i)}(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^k \tilde{u}_p^{(j)} + \tilde{u}_p^{(i)} \frac{\partial_r^k \tilde{u}_e^{(j)}(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^k \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$-\sum_{k=0}^1 \sum_{i+j=3-k} \left(\frac{\partial_r^k \tilde{v}_e^{(i)}(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^{k+1} \partial_Y v_p^{(j)} + v_p^{(i)} \frac{\partial_r^k (r \partial_r \tilde{v}_e^{(j)})(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^k \right)$$

with $\tilde{u}_p^{(0)} = u_p^{(0)}$, $\tilde{u}_e^{(0)} = u_e(r)$, $(\tilde{u}_e^{(3)}, \tilde{v}_e^{(3)}) = (u_e^{(3)} + A_{3\infty}, v_e^{(3)})$, and here and below $\tilde{u}_p^{(3)} = u_p^{(3)} - A_{3\infty}$. $g_3(\theta, Y)$ was obtained by the same argument as $g_1(\theta, Y)$. Moreover, due to $g_3(\theta, Y)$ decay fast as $Y \rightarrow -\infty$, we can obtain $p_p^{(4)}$ and deduce that $p_p^{(4)}$ also decay fast as $Y \rightarrow -\infty$.

2.3.8. *Linearized Euler equations for $(u_e^{(4)}, v_e^{(4)}, p_e^{(4)})$ and their solvabilities.*

Let $\phi_3(s) = -A_{3\infty}(r\chi''(r) + r\chi'(r) - \frac{\chi(r)}{r})$ and

$$A_3(r) := a_3 r + r \int_0^r \frac{\phi_3(s)}{2s} - \frac{1}{r} \int_0^r \frac{s\phi_3(s)}{2} ds,$$

where a_3 is a constant such that $A_3(1) = 0$. Obviously, $|a_3| \leq C\eta$,

$$\begin{cases} rA_3''(r) + A_3'(r) - \frac{A_3(r)}{r} = -\phi_3(r), & 0 < r \leq 1 \\ A_3(1) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (2.75)$$

and $\|\partial_r^k A_3(r)\|_\infty \leq C(k)\eta$. Moreover, notice that $\chi(r) = 0$ for $r \leq \frac{1}{2}$, we deduce that $A_3(r) = a_3 r$ for $r \leq \frac{1}{2}$.

Set

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u}_e^{(3)}(\theta, r) &:= u_e^{(3)}(\theta, r) + \chi(r)A_{3\infty} + A_3(r), \\ \tilde{v}_e^{(3)}(\theta, r) &:= v_e^{(3)}(\theta, r), \\ \tilde{p}_e^{(3)}(\theta, r) &:= p_e^{(3)}(\theta, r) + 2a \int_0^r [\chi(s)A_{3\infty} + A_3(s)] ds, \end{aligned}$$

then $(\tilde{u}_e^{(3)}, \tilde{v}_e^{(3)}, \tilde{p}_e^{(3)})$ also satisfies the linearized Euler equations (2.70) with the boundary condition (2.71). Moreover, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_\theta \tilde{u}_e^{(3)} + \tilde{v}_e^{(3)}|(\theta, r) &\leq C\eta r, \quad |\partial_\theta \tilde{v}_e^{(3)} - \tilde{u}_e^{(3)}|(\theta, r) \leq C\eta r, \quad \forall (\theta, r) \in \Omega, \\ \|\partial_\theta^k \partial_r^j (\tilde{u}_e^{(3)}, \tilde{v}_e^{(3)})\|_2 &\leq C(k, j)\eta, \quad \forall j, k \geq 0; \\ r^2 \Delta \tilde{u}_e^{(3)} - \tilde{u}_e^{(3)} + 2\partial_\theta \tilde{v}_e^{(3)} &= 0, \quad \int_0^{2\pi} \tilde{v}_e^{(3)} d\theta = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.76)$$

Putting

$$\begin{aligned} u^\varepsilon(\theta, r) &= u_e(r) + \sum_{i=1}^4 \varepsilon^i \tilde{u}_e^{(i)}(\theta, r) + \cdots, \\ v^\varepsilon(\theta, r) &= \sum_{i=1}^4 \varepsilon^i \tilde{v}_e^{(i)}(\theta, r) + \cdots, \\ p^\varepsilon(\theta, r) &= p_e(r) + \sum_{i=1}^4 \varepsilon^i \tilde{p}_e^{(i)}(\theta, r) + \cdots \end{aligned}$$

into the Navier-Stokes equations (1.3), we find that $(\tilde{u}_e^{(4)}, \tilde{v}_e^{(4)}, \tilde{p}_e^{(4)})$ satisfies the following linearized Euler equations in Ω

$$\begin{cases} ar\partial_\theta \tilde{u}_e^{(4)} + 2ar\tilde{v}_e^{(4)} + \partial_\theta \tilde{p}_e^{(4)} + f_{4e}(\theta, r) = 0, \\ ar\partial_\theta \tilde{v}_e^{(4)} - 2ar\tilde{u}_e^{(4)} + r\partial_r \tilde{p}_e^{(4)} + g_{4e}(\theta, r) = 0, \\ \partial_\theta \tilde{u}_e^{(4)} + r\partial_r \tilde{v}_e^{(4)} + \tilde{v}_e^{(4)} = 0, \end{cases} \quad (2.77)$$

and equipped with the boundary conditions

$$r\tilde{v}_e^{(4)}|_{r=1} = -v_p^{(4)}|_{Y=0}, \quad \tilde{v}_e^{(4)}(\theta, r) = \tilde{v}_e^{(4)}(\theta + 2\pi, r),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} f_{4e}(\theta, r) &= \tilde{u}_e^{(1)}\partial_\theta \tilde{u}_e^{(3)} + \tilde{u}_e^{(3)}\partial_\theta \tilde{u}_e^{(1)} + \tilde{v}_e^{(1)}r\partial_r \tilde{u}_e^{(3)} + \tilde{v}_e^{(3)}r\partial_r \tilde{u}_e^{(1)} + \tilde{u}_e^{(1)}\tilde{v}_e^{(3)} + \tilde{u}_e^{(3)}\tilde{v}_e^{(1)} \\ &\quad + \tilde{u}_e^{(2)}\partial_\theta \tilde{u}_e^{(2)} + \tilde{v}_e^{(2)}r\partial_r \tilde{u}_e^{(2)} + \tilde{u}_e^{(2)}\tilde{v}_e^{(2)} \\ &\quad - \underbrace{\left(\frac{\partial_{\theta\theta} \tilde{u}_e^{(2)}}{r} + r\partial_{rr} \tilde{u}_e^{(2)} + \partial_r \tilde{u}_e^{(2)} + \frac{2}{r}\partial_\theta \tilde{v}_e^{(2)} - \frac{\tilde{u}_e^{(2)}}{r} \right)}_{=0}, \\ g_{4e}(\theta, r) &= \tilde{u}_e^{(1)}\partial_\theta \tilde{v}_e^{(3)} + \tilde{u}_e^{(3)}\partial_\theta \tilde{v}_e^{(1)} + \tilde{v}_e^{(1)}r\partial_r \tilde{v}_e^{(3)} + \tilde{v}_e^{(3)}r\partial_r \tilde{v}_e^{(1)} - 2\tilde{u}_e^{(1)}\tilde{u}_e^{(3)} \\ &\quad + \tilde{u}_e^{(2)}\partial_\theta \tilde{v}_e^{(2)} + \tilde{v}_e^{(2)}r\partial_r \tilde{v}_e^{(2)} - (\tilde{u}_e^{(2)})^2 \\ &\quad - \underbrace{\left(\frac{\partial_{\theta\theta} \tilde{v}_e^{(2)}}{r} + r\partial_{rr} \tilde{v}_e^{(2)} + \partial_r \tilde{v}_e^{(2)} - \frac{2}{r}\partial_\theta \tilde{u}_e^{(2)} - \frac{\tilde{v}_e^{(2)}}{r} \right)}_{=0}. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 2.11. *The linearized Euler equations (2.77) have a solution $(\tilde{u}_e^{(4)}, \tilde{v}_e^{(4)}, \tilde{p}_e^{(4)})$ which satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_\theta \tilde{u}_e^{(4)} + \tilde{v}_e^{(4)}|(\theta, r) &\leq C\eta r, \quad |\partial_\theta \tilde{v}_e^{(4)} - \tilde{u}_e^{(4)}|(\theta, r) \leq C\eta r, \quad \forall(\theta, r) \in \Omega, \\ \|\partial_\theta^k \partial_r^j (\tilde{u}_e^{(4)}, \tilde{v}_e^{(4)})\|_2 &\leq C(k, j)\eta, \quad \forall j, k \geq 0; \\ r^2 \Delta \tilde{u}_e^{(4)} - \tilde{u}_e^{(4)} + 2\partial_\theta \tilde{v}_e^{(4)} &= 0, \quad \int_0^{2\pi} \tilde{v}_e^{(4)} d\theta = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.78)$$

Proof. The proof is same as Proposition 2.9, we omit the details. $\square$

2.3.9. Linearize Prandtl equations for $(u_p^{(4)}, v_p^{(5)})$ and their solvabilities.

Let

$$u^\varepsilon(\theta, r) = u_e(r) + u_p^{(0)}(\theta, Y) + \sum_{i=1}^3 \varepsilon^i [\tilde{u}_e^{(i)}(\theta, r) + \tilde{u}_p^{(i)}(\theta, Y)] + \varepsilon^4 [\tilde{u}_e^{(4)}(\theta, r) + u_p^{(4)}(\theta, Y)] + \dots,$$

$$v^\varepsilon(\theta, r) = \sum_{i=1}^4 \varepsilon^i [\tilde{v}_e^{(i)}(\theta, r) + v_p^{(i)}(\theta, Y)] + \varepsilon^5 v_p^{(5)}(\theta, Y) + \dots,$$

$$p^\varepsilon(\theta, r) = p_e(r) + \sum_{i=1}^4 \varepsilon^i [\tilde{p}_e^{(i)}(\theta, r) + p_p^{(i)}(\theta, Y)] + \varepsilon^5 p_p^{(5)}(\theta, Y) + \dots$$

with the boundary conditions

$$\tilde{u}_e^{(4)}(\theta, 1) + u_p^{(4)}(\theta, 0) = 0, \quad \lim_{Y \rightarrow \infty} \partial_Y u_p^{(4)}(\theta, Y) = v_p^{(5)}(\theta, 0) = 0, \quad p_p^{(5)}(\theta, 0) = 0.$$

As the derivation for equations of $(u_p^{(2)}, v_p^{(3)})$, we obtain the following linearized Prandtl problem for $(u_p^{(4)}, v_p^{(5)})$

$$\begin{cases} (u_e(1) + u_p^{(0)})\partial_\theta u_p^{(4)} + (v_e^{(1)}(\theta, 1) + v_p^{(1)})\partial_Y u_p^{(4)} + u_p^{(4)}\partial_\theta u_p^{(0)} \\ \quad v_p^{(5)}\partial_Y u_p^{(0)} - \partial_Y u_p^{(4)} = f_4(\theta, Y) \\ \partial_\theta u_p^{(4)} + \partial_Y v_p^{(5)} + \partial_Y(Y v_p^{(4)}) = 0, \\ u_p^{(4)}(\theta, Y) = u_p^{(4)}(\theta + 2\pi, Y), \quad v_p^{(5)}(\theta, Y) = v_p^{(5)}(\theta + 2\pi, Y), \\ u_p^{(4)}|_{Y=0} = -\tilde{u}_e^{(4)}|_{r=1}, \quad \lim_{Y \rightarrow \infty} \partial_Y u_p^{(4)}(\theta, Y) = v_p^{(5)}(\theta, 0) = 0 \end{cases} \quad (2.79)$$

and the pressure $p_p^{(5)}$ satisfies

$$\partial_Y p_p^{(5)}(\theta, Y) = g_4(\theta, Y), \quad p_p^{(5)}(\theta, 0) = 0, \quad (2.80)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} f_4(\theta, Y) = & -\partial_\theta p_p^{(4)} + Y\partial_Y u_p^{(3)} + \partial_Y u_p^{(3)} + \sum_{k=0}^2 (-1)^k \frac{Y^k \partial_{\theta\theta} \tilde{u}_p^{(2-k)}}{k!} + 2\partial_\theta v_p^{(2)} - 2Y\partial_\theta v_p^{(1)} \\ & - \sum_{k=0}^2 (-1)^k \frac{Y^k \tilde{u}_p^{(2-k)}}{k!} - \sum_{i+j=4, 1 \leq i \leq 3} \tilde{u}_p^{(i)} \partial_\theta \tilde{u}_p^{(j)} - \sum_{i+j=4} [v_p^{(i)} Y \partial_Y \tilde{u}_p^{(j)} + \tilde{u}_p^{(i)} v_p^{(j)}] \\ & - \sum_{k=0}^4 \sum_{i+j=4-k, (k,j) \neq (0,4)} \left(\frac{\partial_r^k \tilde{u}_e^{(i)}(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^k \partial_\theta \tilde{u}_p^{(j)} + \tilde{u}_p^{(i)} \frac{\partial_r^k \partial_\theta \tilde{u}_e^{(j)}(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^k \right) \\ & - \sum_{k=0}^4 \sum_{i+j=4-k} \left(\frac{\partial_r^k \tilde{v}_e^{(i)}(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^{k+1} \partial_Y \tilde{u}_p^{(j)} + v_p^{(i)} \frac{\partial_r^k (r \partial_r \tilde{u}_e^{(j)})(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^k \right) \\ & - \sum_{k=0}^4 \sum_{i+j=5-k, (k,j) \neq (0,4), i \leq 4} \frac{\partial_r^k \tilde{v}_e^{(i)}(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^k \partial_Y \tilde{u}_p^{(j)} \\ & - \sum_{k=0}^4 \sum_{i+j=4-k} \left(\frac{\partial_r^k \tilde{u}_e^{(i)}(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^k v_p^{(j)} + \tilde{u}_p^{(i)} \frac{\partial_r^k \tilde{v}_e^{(j)}(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^k \right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} g_4(\theta, Y) = & \partial_Y u_p^{(4)} + Y\partial_Y v_p^{(3)} + \partial_Y v_p^{(3)} + [\partial_{\theta\theta} v_p^{(2)} - Y\partial_{\theta\theta} v_p^{(1)}] - \sum_{k=0}^2 (-1)^k \frac{Y^k}{k!} \partial_\theta \tilde{u}_p^{(2-k)} - [v_p^{(2)} - Yv_p^{(1)}] \\ & - Y\partial_Y p_p^{(4)} - \sum_{i+j=4} [\tilde{u}_p^{(i)} \partial_\theta v_p^{(j)} + v_p^{(i)} Y \partial_Y v_p^{(j)} - \tilde{u}_p^{(i)} \tilde{u}_p^{(j)}] - \sum_{i+j=5} v_p^{(i)} Y \partial_Y v_p^{(j)} \\ & - \sum_{k=0}^4 \sum_{i+j=4-k} \left(\frac{\partial_r^k \tilde{u}_e^{(i)}(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^k \partial_\theta v_p^{(j)} + \tilde{u}_p^{(i)} \frac{\partial_r^k \partial_\theta \tilde{v}_e^{(j)}(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^k \right) \\ & + \sum_{k=0}^4 \sum_{i+j=4-k} \left(\frac{\partial_r^k \tilde{u}_e^{(i)}(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^k \tilde{u}_p^{(j)} + \tilde{u}_p^{(i)} \frac{\partial_r^k \tilde{u}_e^{(j)}(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^k \right) - \sum_{k=0}^3 \sum_{i+j=5-k} \frac{\partial_r^k \tilde{v}_e^{(i)}(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^k \partial_Y v_p^{(j)} \\ & - \sum_{k=0}^2 \sum_{i+j=4-k} \left(\frac{\partial_r^k \tilde{v}_e^{(i)}(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^{k+1} \partial_Y v_p^{(j)} + v_p^{(i)} \frac{\partial_r^k (r \partial_r \tilde{v}_e^{(j)})(\theta, 1)}{k!} Y^k \right) \end{aligned}$$

here $\tilde{u}_p^{(0)} = u_p^{(0)}$, $\tilde{u}_p^{(4)} = u_p^{(4)}$, $\tilde{u}_e^{(0)} = u_e(r)$.

Proposition 2.12. *There exists $\eta_0 > 0$ such that for any $\eta \in (0, \eta_0)$, equations (2.79) have a unique solution $(u_p^{(4)}, v_p^{(5)})$ which satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{0 < j+k \leq m} \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{2\pi} |\partial_\theta^j \partial_Y^k (u_p^{(4)}, v_p^{(5)})|^2 \langle Y \rangle^{2l} d\theta dY &\leq C(m, l) \eta^2, \quad m \geq 1, l \geq 0, \\ \int_0^{2\pi} v_p^{(5)}(\theta, Y) d\theta &= 0, \quad \forall Y \leq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (2.81)$$

and

$$\|(u_p^{(4)}, v_p^{(5)})\|_\infty \leq C\eta.$$

The proof is same with Proposition 2.5, we omit the details. Moreover, we can construct $p_p^{(5)}$ by solving the equation (2.80).

2.4. Approximate solutions.

In this subsection, we construct an approximate solution of Navier-Stokes equations (1.3). Set

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u}_p^a(\theta, r) &:= \chi(r) \left(u_p^{(0)}(\theta, Y) + \sum_{i=1}^3 \varepsilon^i \tilde{u}_p^{(i)}(\theta, Y) + \varepsilon^4 u_p^{(4)}(\theta, Y) \right) := \chi(r) u_p^a, \\ \tilde{v}_p^a(\theta, r) &:= \chi(r) \left(\sum_{i=1}^5 \varepsilon^i v_p^{(i)}(\theta, Y) \right) := \chi(r) v_p^a, \\ \tilde{p}_p^a(\theta, r) &:= \chi^2(r) \left(\sum_{i=1}^5 \varepsilon^i p_p^{(i)}(\theta, Y) \right) := \chi^2(r) p_p^a, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} u_e^a(\theta, r) &:= u_e(r) + \sum_{i=1}^4 \varepsilon^i \tilde{u}_e^{(i)}(\theta, r), \\ v_e^a(\theta, r) &:= \sum_{i=1}^4 \varepsilon^i \tilde{v}_e^{(i)}(\theta, r), \\ p_e^a(\theta, r) &:= p_e(r) + \sum_{i=1}^4 \varepsilon^i \tilde{p}_e^{(i)}(\theta, r). \end{aligned}$$

We construct an approximate solution

$$\begin{aligned} u^a(\theta, r) &:= u_e^a(\theta, r) + \tilde{u}_p^a(\theta, r) + \varepsilon^5 h(\theta, r), \\ v^a(\theta, r) &:= v_e^a(\theta, r) + \tilde{v}_p^a(\theta, r), \\ p^a(\theta, r) &:= p_e^a(\theta, r) + \tilde{p}_p^a(\theta, r), \end{aligned} \quad (2.82)$$

where the corrector $h(\theta, r)$ will be given in Appendix B which satisfies

$$h(\theta, 1) = 0, \quad \|\partial_\theta^j \partial_r^k h\|_2 \leq C(j, k) \varepsilon^{-k}$$

and makes (u^a, v^a) be divergence-free

$$u_\theta^a + r v_r^a + v^a = 0.$$

Moreover, (u^a, v^a) satisfies the following boundary condition

$$\begin{aligned} u^a(\theta + 2\pi, r) &= u^a(\theta, r), \quad v^a(\theta + 2\pi, r) = v^a(\theta, r), \\ u^a(\theta, 1) &= \alpha + \eta f(\theta), \quad v^a(\theta, 1) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

And v^a satisfies

$$\int_0^{2\pi} v^a d\theta = 0. \quad (2.83)$$

Notice that $\chi(r) = 0$ and $A_i(r) = a_i r$ for $r \leq \frac{1}{2}$, by collecting the estimate (2.62), (2.69), (2.76), (2.78) and (2.40), (2.46), (2.66), (2.74), (2.81), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_e^a - ar\|_0 + \|(\partial_r(u_e^a - ar), \partial_\theta u_e^a)\|_0 &\leq C\varepsilon\eta, \quad \|v_e^a\|_0 + \|(\partial_r v_e^a, \partial_\theta v_e^a)\|_0 \leq C\varepsilon\eta, \\ |\partial_\theta u_e^a(\theta, r) + v_e^a(\theta, r)| &\leq C\varepsilon\eta r, \quad |\partial_\theta v_e^a(\theta, r) - u_e^a(\theta, r) + ar| \leq C\varepsilon\eta r, \quad \forall(\theta, r) \in \Omega \end{aligned} \quad (2.84)$$

and

$$\|(Y^j \partial_Y^k u_p^a, Y^j \partial_\theta^k u_p^a)\|_0 \leq C\eta, \quad \|(Y^j \partial_Y^k v_p^a, Y^j \partial_\theta^k v_p^a)\|_0 \leq C\varepsilon\eta, \quad \forall j \leq 2, k \leq 1. \quad (2.85)$$

Finally, set

$$\begin{aligned} R_u^a &:= u^a u_\theta^a + v^a r u_r^a + u^a v^a + p_\theta^a - \varepsilon^2 \left(r u_{rr}^a + \frac{u_{\theta\theta}^a}{r} + 2 \frac{v_\theta^a}{r} + u_r^a - \frac{u^a}{r} \right), \\ R_v^a &:= u^a v_\theta^a + v^a r v_r^a - (u^a)^2 + r p_r^a - \varepsilon^2 \left(r v_{rr}^a + \frac{v_{\theta\theta}^a}{r} - 2 \frac{u_\theta^a}{r} + v_r^a - \frac{v^a}{r} \right), \end{aligned}$$

then there hold

$$\left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{(R_u^a)^2(\theta, r)}{r} d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C\varepsilon^5, \quad \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{(R_v^a)^2(\theta, r)}{r} d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C\varepsilon^5 \quad (2.86)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} u^a u_\theta^a + v^a r u_r^a + u^a v^a + p_\theta^a - \varepsilon^2 \left(r u_{rr}^a + \frac{u_{\theta\theta}^a}{r} + 2 \frac{v_\theta^a}{r} + u_r^a - \frac{u^a}{r} \right) = R_u^a, & (\theta, r) \in \Omega \\ u^a v_\theta^a + v^a r v_r^a - (u^a)^2 + r p_r^a - \varepsilon^2 \left(r v_{rr}^a + \frac{v_{\theta\theta}^a}{r} - 2 \frac{u_\theta^a}{r} + v_r^a - \frac{v^a}{r} \right) = R_v^a, & (\theta, r) \in \Omega \\ u_\theta^a + (r v^a)_r = 0, & (\theta, r) \in \Omega \\ u^a(\theta + 2\pi, r) = u^a(\theta, r), \quad v^a(\theta + 2\pi, r) = v^a(\theta, r), & (\theta, r) \in \Omega \\ u^a(\theta, 1) = \alpha + f(\theta)\eta, \quad v^a(\theta, 1) = 0, & \theta \in [0, 2\pi]. \end{cases}$$

In fact, when $r \leq \frac{1}{2}$, there hold

$$\begin{aligned} R_u^a &= u_e^a \partial_\theta u_e^a + v_e^a r \partial_r u_e^a + u_e^a v_e^a + \partial_\theta p_e^a - \varepsilon^2 \left(r \partial_{rr} u_e^a + \frac{\partial_{\theta\theta} u_e^a}{r} + 2 \frac{\partial_\theta v_e^a}{r} + \partial_r u_e^a - \frac{u_e^a}{r} \right) \\ &= \sum_{m=5}^8 \varepsilon^m \left(\sum_{i+j=m, i, j \leq 4} \tilde{u}_e^{(i)} [\partial_\theta \tilde{u}_e^{(j)} + \tilde{v}_e^{(j)}] + \sum_{i+j=m, i, j \leq 4} \tilde{v}_e^{(i)} r \partial_r \tilde{u}_e^{(j)} \right), \\ R_v^a &= u_e^a \partial_\theta v_e^a + v_e^a r \partial_r v_e^a - (u_e^a)^2 + r \partial_r p_e^a - \varepsilon^2 \left(r \partial_{rr} v_e^a + \frac{\partial_{\theta\theta} v_e^a}{r} + 2 \frac{\partial_\theta u_e^a}{r} + \partial_r v_e^a - \frac{v_e^a}{r} \right) \\ &= \sum_{m=5}^8 \varepsilon^m \left(\sum_{i+j=m, i, j \leq 4} \tilde{u}_e^{(i)} [\partial_\theta \tilde{v}_e^{(j)} - \tilde{u}_e^{(j)}] + \sum_{i+j=m, i, j \leq 4} \tilde{v}_e^{(i)} r \partial_r \tilde{v}_e^{(j)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Using (2.62), (2.69), (2.76) and (2.78), we deduce that

$$|R_u^a(\theta, r)| + |R_v^a(\theta, r)| \leq C\varepsilon^5 r, \quad r < \frac{1}{2}.$$

Moreover, when $\frac{1}{2} \leq r < 1$, there holds $\|R_u^a\|_2 + \|R_v^a\|_2 \leq C\varepsilon^5$. Thus, we obtain (2.86).

3. LINEAR STABILITY ESTIMATES OF ERROR EQUATIONS

In this section, we derive the error equations and establish linear stability estimates.

3.1. Error equations.

Set the error

$$u := u^\varepsilon - u^a, \quad v := v^\varepsilon - v^a, \quad p := p^\varepsilon - p^a,$$

then there hold

$$\begin{cases} u^a u_\theta + u u_\theta^a + u u_\theta + v^a r u_r + v r u_r^a + v r u_r + v^a u + v u^a + v u + p_\theta - \varepsilon^2 \left(r u_{rr} + \frac{u_{\theta\theta}}{r} + 2 \frac{v_\theta}{r} + u_r - \frac{u}{r} \right) = R_u^a, \\ u^a v_\theta + u v_\theta^a + u v_\theta + v^a r v_r + v r v_r^a + v r v_r - (u^2 + 2 u u^a) + r p_r - \varepsilon^2 \left(r v_{rr} + \frac{v_{\theta\theta}}{r} - 2 \frac{u_\theta}{r} + v_r - \frac{v}{r} \right) = R_v^a, \\ u_\theta + (r v)_r = 0, \\ u(\theta + 2\pi, r) = u(\theta, r), \quad v(\theta + 2\pi, r) = v(\theta, r), \\ u(\theta, 1) = 0, \quad v(\theta, 1) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} S_u &:= u^a u_\theta + v^a r u_r + u u_\theta^a + v r u_r^a + v^a u + v u^a, \\ S_v &:= u^a v_\theta + v^a r v_r + u v_\theta^a + v r v_r^a - 2 u u^a, \end{aligned}$$

then the error equations become

$$\begin{cases} -\varepsilon^2 \left(r u_{rr} + \frac{u_{\theta\theta}}{r} + 2 \frac{v_\theta}{r} + u_r - \frac{u}{r} \right) + p_\theta + S_u = R_u, \\ -\varepsilon^2 \left(r v_{rr} + \frac{v_{\theta\theta}}{r} - 2 \frac{u_\theta}{r} + v_r - \frac{v}{r} \right) + r p_r + S_v = R_v, \\ u_\theta + (r v)_r = 0, \\ u(\theta, r) = u(\theta + 2\pi, r), \quad v(\theta, r) = v(\theta + 2\pi, r), \\ u(\theta, 1) = 0, \quad v(\theta, 1) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

where

$$R_u := R_u^a - u u_\theta - v r u_r - v u, \quad R_v := R_v^a - u v_\theta - v r v_r + u^2.$$

3.2. Linear stability estimate.

In this subsection, we consider the linear equations

$$\begin{cases} -\varepsilon^2 \left(r u_{rr} + \frac{u_{\theta\theta}}{r} + 2 \frac{v_\theta}{r} + u_r - \frac{u}{r} \right) + p_\theta + S_u = F_u, \\ -\varepsilon^2 \left(r v_{rr} + \frac{v_{\theta\theta}}{r} - 2 \frac{u_\theta}{r} + v_r - \frac{v}{r} \right) + r p_r + S_v = F_v, \\ u_\theta + (r v)_r = 0, \\ u(\theta, r) = u(\theta + 2\pi, r), \quad v(\theta, r) = v(\theta + 2\pi, r), \\ u(\theta, 1) = 0, \quad v(\theta, 1) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

and establish its stability estimate. Due to the divergence-free condition and the boundary condition of v , we deduce that

$$\int_0^{2\pi} v(\theta, r) d\theta = 0, \quad r \in (0, 1].$$

So the Poincaré inequality is valid:

$$\int_0^{2\pi} v^2 d\theta \leq \int_0^{2\pi} v_\theta^2 d\theta. \quad (3.3)$$

We also give the following Hardy-type inequality which will be used frequently.

Lemma 3.1. *If $u(r)$ is a bounded function in $[0, 1]$ and $u(1) = 0$, then there hold*

$$\int_0^1 r^\alpha u^2 dr \leq C(\alpha) \int_0^1 r^{\alpha+2} u_r^2 dr, \quad \forall \alpha > -1. \quad (3.4)$$

$$\int_0^1 \frac{ru^2}{(1-r)^2} dr \leq C \int_0^1 ru_r^2 dr. \quad (3.5)$$

Proof. By integrating by parts, we deduce that

$$\int_0^1 r^\alpha u^2 dr = -\frac{2}{\alpha+1} \int_0^1 r^{\alpha+2} uu_r dr \leq C(\alpha) \left(\int_0^1 r^\alpha u^2 dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^1 r^{\alpha+2} u_r^2 dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Thus, there hold

$$\int_0^1 r^\alpha u^2 dr \leq C(\alpha) \int_0^1 r^{\alpha+2} u_r^2 dr, \quad \forall \alpha > -1.$$

By integrating by parts,

$$\int_0^1 \frac{ru^2}{(1-r)^2} dr = \int_0^1 ru^2 d\frac{1}{1-r} = -\int_0^1 \frac{1}{1-r} d(ru^2) = -\int_0^1 \left(\frac{u^2}{1-r} + \frac{ruu_r}{1-r} \right) dr.$$

So we deduce that

$$\int_0^1 \frac{ru^2}{(1-r)^2} dr + \int_0^1 \frac{u^2}{1-r} dr = -\int_0^1 \frac{2ruu_r}{1-r} dr \leq C \left(\int_0^1 \frac{ru^2}{(1-r)^2} dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^1 ru_r^2 dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Thus, there holds

$$\int_0^1 \frac{ru^2}{(1-r)^2} dr \leq C \int_0^1 ru_r^2 dr.$$

□

Since $\chi(r)$ is a smooth cut-off function satisfying $\chi|_{[0, \frac{1}{2}]} = 0$, by inequality (3.5),

$$\int_0^1 \left(\frac{\chi u^2}{(1-r)^2} + \frac{|\chi'|u^2}{(1-r)^2} \right) dr \leq C \int_0^1 \frac{ru^2}{(1-r)^2} dr \leq C \int_0^1 ru_r^2 dr. \quad (3.6)$$

3.2.1. Basic energy estimate.

In this subsection, we establish the following basic energy estimate of (3.2).

Lemma 3.1. *Let (u, v) be a bounded solution of (3.2), then there holds*

$$\begin{aligned} & \varepsilon^2 \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{(u_\theta + v)^2 + (v_\theta - u)^2}{r} d\theta dr + \varepsilon^2 \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r(u_r^2 + v_r^2) d\theta dr \\ & \leq C \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r(u_\theta^2 + v_\theta^2) d\theta dr + C \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} [uF_u + vF_v] d\theta dr. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

Proof. Multiplying the first equation in (3.1) by u , the second equation in (3.1) by v , adding them together and integrating in Ω , we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \underbrace{-\varepsilon^2 \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \left[(ru_{rr} + \frac{u_{\theta\theta}}{r} + 2\frac{v_\theta}{r} + u_r - \frac{u}{r})u + (rv_{rr} + \frac{v_{\theta\theta}}{r} - 2\frac{u_\theta}{r} + v_r - \frac{v}{r})v \right] d\theta dr}_{\text{diffusion term}} \\ & + \underbrace{\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (p_\theta u + p_r rv) d\theta dr}_{\text{pressure term}} + \underbrace{\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (uS_u + vS_v) d\theta dr}_{\text{convective term}} \\ & = \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} [uF_u + vF_v] d\theta dr. \end{aligned}$$

We deal with them term by terms.

The diffusion term: Integrating by parts, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\varepsilon^2 \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \left[(ru_{rr} + \frac{u_{\theta\theta}}{r} + 2\frac{v_\theta}{r} + u_r - \frac{u}{r})u + (rv_{rr} + \frac{v_{\theta\theta}}{r} - 2\frac{u_\theta}{r} + v_r - \frac{v}{r})v \right] d\theta dr \\
& = \varepsilon^2 \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \left(\frac{u_\theta^2 + v_\theta^2}{r} + \frac{u^2 + v^2}{r} + 2\frac{u_\theta v - uv_\theta}{r} \right) d\theta dr + \varepsilon^2 \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r(u_r^2 + v_r^2) d\theta dr \\
& = \varepsilon^2 \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{(u_\theta + v)^2 + (v_\theta - u)^2}{r} d\theta dr + \varepsilon^2 \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r(u_r^2 + v_r^2) d\theta dr.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

Pressure term: Integrating by parts and using the divergence-free condition, we deduce that

$$\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (p_\theta u + p_r(rv)) d\theta dr = 0. \tag{3.9}$$

Convective term: Integrating by part and using the divergence-free condition, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (uS_u + vS_v) d\theta dr \\
& = \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} [u^a u_\theta u + rv^a u_r u + uu_\theta^a u + vv_r^a r u + (v^a u + v u^a)u] d\theta dr \\
& \quad + \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} [u^a v_\theta v + rv^a v_r v + uv_\theta^a v + vv_r^a r v - 2uu^a v] d\theta dr \\
& = \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} [u^2 u_\theta^a + v^2 rv_r^a + v^a u^2 + uvv_\theta^a + uv(ru_r^a - u^a)] d\theta dr,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used

$$\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (u^a u_\theta u + rv^a u_r u) d\theta dr = \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (u^a v_\theta v + rv^a v_r v) d\theta dr = 0.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (uS_u + vS_v) d\theta dr \\
& = \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} [u^2(u_\theta^a + v^a) + uv(v_\theta^a - u^a + ar) + v^2rv_r^a + uv(ru_r^a - ar)] d\theta dr \\
& = \underbrace{\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (v^2rv_r^a + uv(ru_r^a - ar)) d\theta dr}_{I_1} + \underbrace{\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} u^2(u_\theta^a + v^a) d\theta dr}_{I_2} + \underbrace{\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} uv(v_\theta^a - u^a + ar) d\theta dr}_{I_3}.
\end{aligned}$$

1) Estimate of I_1 : We divide it into Euler part and Prandtl part. By (2.84), the Poincaré inequality (3.3) and the Hardy-type inequality (3.4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (v^2 r \partial_r v_e^a + uv(r \partial_r u_e^a - ar)) d\theta dr \right| \\
& \leq C\varepsilon\eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (rv^2 + r|uv|) d\theta dr \\
& \leq C\varepsilon\eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} rv^2 d\theta dr + C\varepsilon\eta \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} rv^2 d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru^2 d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq C\varepsilon\eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} rv_\theta^2 d\theta dr + C\varepsilon\eta \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} rv_\theta^2 d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_r^2 d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq C \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r v_\theta^2 d\theta dr + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{20} \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r u_r^2 d\theta dr.$$

Moreover, notice that $\chi(r) = 0$ for $r \leq \frac{1}{2}$, using (2.85), the Poincaré inequality (3.3), and the Hardy inequality (3.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} u v r \partial_r (\chi u_p^a) d\theta dr \right| \\ & \leq \left| \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} u v r \chi'(r) u_p^a d\theta dr \right| + \left| \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{r u v}{r-1} \chi(r) Y \partial_Y u_p^a d\theta dr \right| \\ & \leq \varepsilon \left| \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{u v r}{r-1} \chi'(r) Y u_p^a d\theta dr \right| + \varepsilon \left| \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{r u v}{(r-1)^2} \chi(r) Y^2 \partial_Y u_p^a d\theta dr \right| \\ & \leq C \varepsilon \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r v^2 d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{r u^2}{(r-1)^2} d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \quad + C \varepsilon \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{r (r v)^2}{(r-1)^2} d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{r u^2}{(r-1)^2} d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq C \varepsilon \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r v_\theta^2 d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r u_r^2 d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \quad + C \varepsilon \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r [(r v)_r]^2 d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r u_r^2 d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq C \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r (u_\theta^2 + v_\theta^2) d\theta dr + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{20} \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r u_r^2 d\theta dr. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality above used the divergence-free condition $u_\theta = -(r v)_r$. By (2.85) and the Poincaré inequality (3.3), we deduce that

$$\left| \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} v^2 r \partial_r (\chi(r) v_p^a) d\theta dr \right| \leq C \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r v_\theta^2 d\theta dr.$$

Thus, we obtain

$$|I_1| \leq C \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r (u_\theta^2 + v_\theta^2) d\theta dr + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{10} \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r u_r^2 d\theta dr.$$

2) Estimate of I_2 : We decompose $u(\theta, r) = u_0(r) + \tilde{u}(\theta, r)$, where $u_0(r) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} u(\theta, r) d\theta$, and notice that $\int_0^{2\pi} v^a(r, \theta) d\theta = 0$, $\forall r \in (0, 1]$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} u^2 (u_\theta^a + v^a) d\theta dr &= \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (u_\theta^a + v^a) (2u_0 \tilde{u} + \tilde{u}^2) d\theta dr \\ &= \underbrace{\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (\partial_\theta u_e^a + v_e^a) (2u_0 \tilde{u} + \tilde{u}^2) d\theta dr}_{I_{21}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (\partial_\theta \tilde{u}_p^a + \tilde{v}_p^a) (2u_0 \tilde{u} + \tilde{u}^2) d\theta dr}_{I_{22}}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, using (2.84), the Poincaré inequality and Hardy inequality (3.4), we deduce that

$$|I_{21}| \leq C \varepsilon \eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r |2u_0 \tilde{u} + \tilde{u}^2| d\theta dr$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C\varepsilon\eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_\theta^2 d\theta dr + C\varepsilon\eta \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r\tilde{u}^2 d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_0^2(r) d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C\varepsilon\eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_\theta^2 d\theta dr + C\varepsilon\eta \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_\theta^2 d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r(u'_0(r))^2 d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_\theta^2 d\theta dr + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{20} \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_r^2 d\theta dr.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, notice that $\chi(r) = 0$ for $r \leq \frac{1}{2}$, by (2.85) and the Hardy inequality (3.6), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_{22}| &\leq 2\varepsilon \left| \int_{\frac{1}{2}}^1 \int_0^{2\pi} Y \partial_\theta \tilde{u}_p^a \frac{u_0 \tilde{u}}{r-1} d\theta dr \right| + 2\varepsilon \left| \int_{\frac{1}{2}}^1 \int_0^{2\pi} u_0 \tilde{u} d\theta dr \right| + C \int_{\frac{1}{2}}^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \chi(r) \tilde{u}^2 d\theta dr \\
&\leq C\varepsilon\eta \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r\tilde{u}^2 d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{ru_0^2(r)}{(r-1)^2} d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad + C\varepsilon \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r\tilde{u}^2 d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_0^2(r) d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_\theta^2 d\theta dr \\
&\leq C\varepsilon\eta \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_\theta^2 d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r(u'_0(r))^2 d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_\theta^2 d\theta dr \\
&\leq C \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_\theta^2 d\theta dr + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{20} \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_r^2 d\theta dr.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$|I_2| \leq C \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_\theta^2 d\theta dr + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{10} \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_r^2 d\theta dr.$$

3) Estimate of I_3 : First, there holds

$$I_3 = \underbrace{\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} uv(\partial_\theta v_e^a - u_e^a + ar) d\theta dr}_{I_{31}} + \underbrace{\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} uv(\partial_\theta \tilde{v}_p^a - \tilde{u}_p^a) d\theta dr}_{I_{32}}.$$

Using (2.84) and (3.4), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_{31}| &\leq C\varepsilon\eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r|uv| d\theta dr \\
&\leq C \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} rv_\theta^2 d\theta dr + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{20} \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_r^2 d\theta dr.
\end{aligned}$$

The similar estimate as (3.10) gives

$$|I_{32}| \leq C \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} rv_\theta^2 d\theta dr + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{20} \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_r^2 d\theta dr.$$

Thus, there holds

$$|I_3| \leq C \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} rv_\theta^2 d\theta dr + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{10} \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_r^2 d\theta dr.$$

Finally, summing the estimate of $I_1 - I_3$, we obtain

$$\left| \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (uS_u + vS_v) d\theta dr \right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{3} \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r(u_r^2 + v_r^2) d\theta dr + C \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r(v_\theta^2 + u_\theta^2) d\theta dr. \tag{3.11}$$

Collecting the estimates (3.8), (3.9) and (3.11), we obtain (3.7). $\square$

3.2.2. Positivity estimate.

In this subsection, we establish the following positivity estimate.

Lemma 3.2. *Let (u, v) be a bounded solution of (3.2), then there exists $\eta_0 > 0$ such that for any $\eta \in (0, \eta_0)$, there holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r(u_\theta^2 + v_\theta^2) d\theta dr &\leq C\varepsilon^2 \eta \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{(u_\theta + v)^2 + (v_\theta - u)^2}{r} d\theta dr + \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r(u_r^2 + v_r^2) d\theta dr \right) \\ &\quad + C \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} [u_\theta F_u + v_\theta F_v] d\theta dr. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Proof. Multipling the first equation by u_θ and the second equation by v_θ , integrating in Ω and summing two terms together, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{r_0}^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \left[-\varepsilon^2 \left(r u_{rr} + \frac{u_\theta \theta}{r} + 2 \frac{v_\theta}{r} + u_r - \frac{u}{r} \right) + p_\theta + S_u \right] u_\theta d\theta dr \\ &\quad + \int_{r_0}^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \left[-\varepsilon^2 \left(r v_{rr} + \frac{v_\theta \theta}{r} - 2 \frac{u_\theta}{r} + v_r - \frac{v}{r} \right) + r p_r + S_v \right] v_\theta d\theta dr \\ &= \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} [u_\theta F_u + v_\theta F_v] d\theta dr. \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Positivity term: We first deal with these terms which is related to S_u, S_v . For simplicity of notation, we set $\bar{u} = u^a - ar$, $\bar{v} = v^a$, thus we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} [S_u u_\theta + S_v v_\theta] d\theta dr \\ &= \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (aru_\theta + vra + var) u_\theta d\theta dr + \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (arv_\theta - 2uar) v_\theta d\theta dr \\ &\quad + \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (\bar{u}u_\theta + \bar{v}ru_r + u\bar{u}_\theta + vr\bar{u}_r + \bar{v}u + v\bar{u}) u_\theta d\theta dr \\ &\quad + \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (\bar{u}v_\theta + \bar{v}rv_r + u\bar{v}_\theta + vr\bar{v}_r - 2u\bar{u}) v_\theta d\theta dr \\ &= \underbrace{\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (aru_\theta + 2arv) u_\theta d\theta dr + \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (arv_\theta - 2aru) v_\theta d\theta dr}_{I_1} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (\bar{v}ru_r u_\theta + \bar{v}rv_r v_\theta) d\theta dr}_{I_2} + \underbrace{\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (rv\bar{u}_r u_\theta + rv\bar{v}_r v_\theta) d\theta dr}_{I_3} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (\bar{u}_\theta + \bar{v}) u u_\theta d\theta dr}_{I_4} + \underbrace{\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \bar{u} u_\theta (v + u_\theta) d\theta dr}_{I_5} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (v_\theta - u) \bar{u} v_\theta d\theta dr}_{I_6} + \underbrace{\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} uv_\theta (\bar{v}_\theta - \bar{u}) d\theta dr}_{I_7}. \end{aligned}$$

Direct computation gives that

$$I_1 = \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ar(u_\theta^2 + v_\theta^2) d\theta dr.$$

Next, we estimate $\{I_i\}_{i=2}^7$ term by term.

1) Estimate of I_2 . Using (2.84) and (2.85), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \bar{v} r u_r u_\theta d\theta dr \right| \\ & \leq C\varepsilon\eta \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r u_r^2 d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r u_\theta^2 d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq \eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r u_\theta^2 d\theta dr + C\varepsilon^2\eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r u_r^2 d\theta dr. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \bar{v} r v_r v_\theta d\theta dr \right| \\ & \leq \eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r v_\theta^2 d\theta dr + C\varepsilon^2\eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r v_r^2 d\theta dr. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$I_2 \leq \eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r(u_\theta^2 + v_\theta^2) d\theta dr + C\varepsilon^2\eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r(u_r^2 + v_r^2) d\theta dr.$$

2) Estimate of I_3 . Firstly, by (2.84) and the Poincaré inequality (3.3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r v \partial_r (u_e^a - a r) u_\theta d\theta dr \right| \leq C\varepsilon\eta \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r u_\theta^2 d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r v_\theta^2 d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ & \left| \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r v \partial_r v_e^a v_\theta d\theta dr \right| \leq C\varepsilon\eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r v_\theta^2 d\theta dr. \end{aligned}$$

Then, notice that $\chi(r) = 0$ for $r \leq \frac{1}{2}$, by (2.85) and the Hardy inequality (3.6)

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r v \partial_r (\chi u_p^a) u_\theta d\theta dr \right| \\ & = \left| \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r v \chi' u_p^a u_\theta d\theta dr + \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r v \chi \partial_r u_p^a u_\theta d\theta dr \right| \\ & = \left| \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r v \chi' u_p^a u_\theta d\theta dr + \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{r v}{r-1} \chi Y \partial_Y u_p^a u_\theta d\theta dr \right| \\ & \leq C\eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r(u_\theta^2 + v_\theta^2) d\theta dr. \end{aligned}$$

By (2.85) and the Poincaré inequality (3.3), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r v \partial_r (\chi v_p^a) v_\theta d\theta dr \right| \\ & = \left| \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r v \chi' v_p^a v_\theta d\theta dr + \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r v \chi \partial_r v_p^a v_\theta d\theta dr \right| \leq C\eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r v_\theta^2 d\theta dr. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, there holds

$$|I_3| \leq C\eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r(u_\theta^2 + v_\theta^2) d\theta dr.$$

3) Estimate of I_4 and I_7 : we first decompose I_4 into two parts

$$I_4 = \underbrace{\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (\partial_\theta u_e^a + v_e^a) u u_\theta d\theta dr}_{I_{41}} + \underbrace{\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (\partial_\theta \tilde{u}_p^a + \tilde{v}_p^a) u u_\theta d\theta dr}_{I_{42}}$$

By (2.84) and (3.4), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_{41}| &\leq C\varepsilon\eta \left| \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ruu_\theta dr d\theta \right| \\
&\leq C\varepsilon\eta \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_r^2 dr d\theta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_\theta^2 dr d\theta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_\theta^2 d\theta dr + C\varepsilon^2\eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_r^2 d\theta dr.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, notice that $\chi(r) = 0$ for $r \leq \frac{1}{2}$, by (2.85) and the Hardy inequality (3.6), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_{42}| &= \varepsilon \left| \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} Y(\partial_\theta \tilde{u}_p^a + \tilde{v}_p^a) \frac{uu_\theta}{r-1} d\theta dr \right| \\
&\leq \eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_\theta^2 d\theta dr + C\varepsilon^2\eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_r^2 d\theta dr.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, there holds

$$|I_4| \leq \eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_\theta^2 d\theta dr + C\varepsilon^2\eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_r^2 d\theta dr.$$

Same argument gives

$$|I_7| \leq \eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} rv_\theta^2 d\theta dr + C\varepsilon^2\eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_r^2 d\theta dr.$$

Thus, there holds

$$|I_4| + |I_7| \leq \eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r(u_\theta^2 + v_\theta^2) d\theta dr + C\varepsilon^2\eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_r^2 d\theta dr.$$

4) Estimate of I_5 and I_6 : By (2.84) and (2.85), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_5| &\leq \underbrace{\left| \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \chi(r) u_p^{(0)} u_\theta (v + u_\theta) d\theta dr \right|}_{I_{51}} \\
&\quad + C\varepsilon\eta \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_\theta^2 d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{(u_\theta + v)^2}{r} d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq I_{51} + \eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_\theta^2 d\theta dr + C\varepsilon^2\eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{(u_\theta + v)^2}{r} d\theta dr.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, notice that $\chi(r) = 0$ for $r < \frac{1}{2}$, by (2.85) and the Hardy inequality (3.6), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{51} &\leq C\eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_\theta^2 d\theta dr + \varepsilon \left| \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} Y u_p^{(0)} u_\theta \frac{\chi(r)v}{r-1} d\theta dr \right| \\
&\leq C\eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_\theta^2 d\theta dr + C\varepsilon\eta \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_\theta^2 d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} rv_r^2 d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, there holds

$$|I_5| \leq C\eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_\theta^2 d\theta dr + C\varepsilon^2\eta \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{(u_\theta + v)^2}{r} d\theta dr + \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} rv_r^2 d\theta dr \right).$$

Similar argument gives that

$$|I_6| \leq C\eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} rv_\theta^2 d\theta dr + C\varepsilon^2\eta \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{(v_\theta - u)^2}{r} d\theta dr + \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} ru_r^2 d\theta dr \right).$$

Thus, we deduce that

$$|I_5| + |I_6| \leq C\eta \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r(u_\theta^2 + v_\theta^2) d\theta dr \\ + C\varepsilon^2 \eta \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{(u_\theta + v)^2 + (v_\theta - u)^2}{r} d\theta dr + \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r(u_r^2 + v_r^2) d\theta dr \right).$$

Finally, collecting these estimates $I_1 - I_7$, we can choose $\eta_0 > 0$ such that for any $\eta \in (0, \eta_0)$, there holds

$$\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} [S_u u_\theta + S_v v_\theta] d\theta dr \\ \geq (a - C\eta) \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r(u_\theta^2 + v_\theta^2) dr d\theta \\ - C\varepsilon^2 \eta \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r(u_r^2 + v_r^2) dr d\theta + \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{(u_\theta + v)^2 + (v_\theta - u)^2}{r} d\theta dr \right). \quad (3.14)$$

Pressure estimate: Integrating by parts, we deduce that

$$\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} p_\theta u_\theta d\theta dr + \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r p_r v_\theta d\theta dr = 0. \quad (3.15)$$

Diffusion term: Finally, we deal with the diffusion term:

$$\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \left[-\varepsilon^2 \left(r u_{rr} + \frac{u_\theta \theta}{r} + 2 \frac{v_\theta}{r} + u_r - \frac{u}{r} \right) \right] u_\theta d\theta dr \\ + \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \left[-\varepsilon^2 \left(r v_{rr} + \frac{v_\theta \theta}{r} - 2 \frac{u_\theta}{r} + v_r - \frac{v}{r} \right) \right] v_\theta d\theta dr \\ = -\varepsilon^2 \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (r u_{rr} + u_r) u_\theta d\theta dr - \varepsilon^2 \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (r v_{rr} + v_r) v_\theta d\theta dr = 0. \quad (3.16)$$

Finally, collecting the estimate (3.14), (3.15) and (3.16) together, we obtain (3.12) which completes the proof of this lemma. $\square$

3.2.3. Linear stability estimate.

Proposition 3.2. *Let (u, v) be a bounded solution of (3.2), then there exist $\varepsilon_0 > 0, \eta_0 > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0), \eta \in (0, \eta_0)$, there holds*

$$\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r(u_\theta^2 + v_\theta^2) d\theta dr + \varepsilon^2 \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{(u_\theta + v)^2 + (v_\theta - u)^2}{r} d\theta dr + \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r(u_r^2 + v_r^2) d\theta dr \right) \\ \leq C\varepsilon^{-2} \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \left(\frac{F_u^2}{r} + \frac{F_v^2}{r} \right) d\theta dr. \quad (3.17)$$

Proof. By combining the estimates (3.7) and (3.13), we can choose $\varepsilon_0 > 0, \eta_0 > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0), \eta \in (0, \eta_0)$, there holds

$$\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r(u_\theta^2 + v_\theta^2) d\theta dr + \varepsilon^2 \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{(u_\theta + v)^2 + (v_\theta - u)^2}{r} d\theta dr + \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r(u_r^2 + v_r^2) d\theta dr \right) \\ \leq C \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (u F_u + v F_v) d\theta dr + C \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} [u_\theta F_u + v_\theta F_v] d\theta dr. \quad (3.18)$$

By the Hölder inequality, we deduce that

$$\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (u_\theta F_u + v_\theta F_v) d\theta dr \leq \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r(u_\theta^2 + v_\theta^2) d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \left(\frac{F_u^2}{r} + \frac{F_v^2}{r} \right) d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

$$\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (uF_u + vF_v) d\theta dr \leq \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r(u_r^2 + v_r^2) d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (F_u^2 + F_v^2) d\theta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where we used (3.4) in the second inequality. Putting this into (3.18), we obtain (3.17). $\square$

4. EXISTENCE OF ERROR EQUATIONS

In this section we rewrite the error equations and the associated linear stability estimate in Euler coordinates, then obtain H^2 estimate by the Stokes estimate in a smooth bounded domain.

4.1. Error equations in Euler coordinates.

Let

$$\vec{e}_\theta = \begin{pmatrix} -\sin \theta \\ \cos \theta \end{pmatrix}, \quad \vec{e}_r = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta \\ \sin \theta \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{u}(x, y) \\ \tilde{v}(x, y) \end{pmatrix} = u(\theta, r)\vec{e}_\theta + v(\theta, r)\vec{e}_r, \quad \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{u}^a(x, y) \\ \tilde{v}^a(x, y) \end{pmatrix} = u^a(\theta, r)\vec{e}_\theta + v^a(\theta, r)\vec{e}_r,$$

$$\tilde{p}(x, y) = p(\theta, r), \quad \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{R}_u^a(x, y) \\ \tilde{R}_v^a(x, y) \end{pmatrix} = \frac{R_u^a(\theta, r)}{r}\vec{e}_\theta + \frac{R_v^a(\theta, r)}{r}\vec{e}_r.$$

Then the error equations (3.1) can be written in Euler coordinates as follows

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{u}^a \partial_x \tilde{u} + \tilde{v}^a \partial_y \tilde{u} + \tilde{u} \partial_x \tilde{u}^a + \tilde{v} \partial_y \tilde{u}^a + \partial_x \tilde{p} + \tilde{u} \partial_x \tilde{u} + \tilde{v} \partial_y \tilde{u} - \varepsilon^2 \Delta \tilde{u} = \tilde{R}_u^a, \\ \tilde{u}^a \partial_x \tilde{v} + \tilde{v}^a \partial_y \tilde{v} + \tilde{u} \partial_x \tilde{v}^a + \tilde{v} \partial_y \tilde{v}^a + \partial_y \tilde{p} + \tilde{u} \partial_x \tilde{v} + \tilde{v} \partial_y \tilde{v} - \varepsilon^2 \Delta \tilde{v} = \tilde{R}_v^a, \\ \partial_x \tilde{u} + \partial_y \tilde{v} = 0, \\ (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})|_{\partial B_1} = (0, 0). \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

4.2. Linear stability estimate in Euler coordinates.

Let

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{F}_u(x, y) \\ \tilde{F}_v(x, y) \end{pmatrix} = \frac{F_u(\theta, r)}{r}\vec{e}_\theta + \frac{F_v(\theta, r)}{r}\vec{e}_r.$$

Then, the equations (3.2) become

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{u}^a \partial_x \tilde{u} + \tilde{v}^a \partial_y \tilde{u} + \tilde{u} \partial_x \tilde{u}^a + \tilde{v} \partial_y \tilde{u}^a + \partial_x \tilde{p} - \varepsilon^2 \Delta \tilde{u} = \tilde{F}_u, \\ \tilde{u}^a \partial_x \tilde{v} + \tilde{v}^a \partial_y \tilde{v} + \tilde{u} \partial_x \tilde{v}^a + \tilde{v} \partial_y \tilde{v}^a + \partial_y \tilde{p} - \varepsilon^2 \Delta \tilde{v} = \tilde{F}_v, \\ \partial_x \tilde{u} + \partial_y \tilde{v} = 0, \\ (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})|_{\partial B_1} = (0, 0). \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

Moreover, from the linear stability estimate (3.17), we can deduce that there exist $\varepsilon_0 > 0, \eta_0 > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0), \eta \in (0, \eta_0)$ and any solution $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})$ of (4.2), there holds

$$\varepsilon \|\nabla(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})\|_2 \leq C \varepsilon^{-1} \|(\tilde{F}_u, \tilde{F}_v)\|_2. \quad (4.3)$$

4.3. Existence of error equations.

We apply the contraction mapping theorem to prove the existence of the error equations (3.1).

Proposition 4.1. *There exist $\varepsilon_0 > 0, \eta_0 > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0), \eta \in (0, \eta_0)$, the error equations (3.1) have a unique solution (u, v) which satisfies*

$$\|(u, v)\|_\infty \leq C\varepsilon.$$

Proof. For each smooth function $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})$ which satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \partial_x \tilde{u} + \partial_y \tilde{v} = 0, \\ (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})|_{\partial B_1} = (0, 0), \end{cases} \quad (4.4)$$

we consider the following linear system

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{u}^a \partial_x \bar{u} + \tilde{v}^a \partial_y \bar{u} + \bar{u} \partial_x \tilde{u}^a + \bar{v} \partial_y \tilde{u}^a + \partial_x \bar{p} - \varepsilon^2 \Delta \bar{u} = \tilde{R}_u^a - \tilde{u} \partial_x \tilde{u} - \tilde{v} \partial_y \tilde{u}, \\ \tilde{u}^a \partial_x \bar{v} + \tilde{v}^a \partial_y \bar{v} + \bar{u} \partial_x \tilde{v}^a + \bar{v} \partial_y \tilde{v}^a + \partial_y \bar{p} - \varepsilon^2 \Delta \bar{v} = \tilde{R}_v^a - \tilde{u} \partial_x \tilde{v} - \tilde{v} \partial_y \tilde{v}, \\ \partial_x \bar{u} + \partial_y \bar{v} = 0, \\ (\bar{u}, \bar{v})|_{\partial B_1} = (0, 0). \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$

By linear stability estimate (4.3), we deduce that there exist $\varepsilon_0 > 0, \eta_0 > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0), \eta \in (0, \eta_0)$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon \|\nabla(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_2 &\leq C\varepsilon^{-1} \|(\tilde{R}_u^a - \tilde{u} \partial_x \tilde{u} - \tilde{v} \partial_y \tilde{u}, \tilde{R}_v^a - \tilde{u} \partial_x \tilde{v} - \tilde{v} \partial_y \tilde{v})\|_2 \\ &\leq C\varepsilon^{-1} \|(\tilde{R}_u^a, \tilde{R}_v^a)\|_2 + C\varepsilon^{-1} \|(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})\|_\infty \|\nabla(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})\|_2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

Then, by Stokes estimates in smooth domain, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon^2 \|\nabla^2(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_2 &\leq C \|(\tilde{R}_u^a - \tilde{u} \partial_x \tilde{u} - \tilde{v} \partial_y \tilde{u} - (\tilde{u}^a \partial_x \bar{u} + \tilde{v}^a \partial_y \bar{u} + \bar{u} \partial_x \tilde{u}^a + \bar{v} \partial_y \tilde{u}^a))\|_2 \\ &\quad + C \|(\tilde{R}_v^a - \tilde{u} \partial_x \tilde{v} - \tilde{v} \partial_y \tilde{v} - (\tilde{u}^a \partial_x \bar{v} + \tilde{v}^a \partial_y \bar{v} + \bar{u} \partial_x \tilde{v}^a + \bar{v} \partial_y \tilde{v}^a))\|_2 \\ &\leq C \|(\tilde{R}_u^a, \tilde{R}_v^a)\|_2 + C \|(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})\|_\infty \|\nabla(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})\|_2 \\ &\quad + C \|\tilde{u}^a \partial_x \bar{u} + \tilde{v}^a \partial_y \bar{u} + \bar{u} \partial_x \tilde{u}^a + \bar{v} \partial_y \tilde{u}^a\|_2 \\ &\quad + C \|\tilde{u}^a \partial_x \bar{v} + \tilde{v}^a \partial_y \bar{v} + \bar{u} \partial_x \tilde{v}^a + \bar{v} \partial_y \tilde{v}^a\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Using $\|(\tilde{u}^a, \tilde{v}^a)\|_\infty \leq C$, it is easy to obtain

$$\|\tilde{u}^a \partial_x \bar{u} + \tilde{v}^a \partial_y \bar{u}\|_2 + \|\tilde{u}^a \partial_x \bar{v} + \tilde{v}^a \partial_y \bar{v}\|_2 \leq C \|\nabla(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_2.$$

Moreover, let

$$\begin{pmatrix} \bar{u}(x, y) \\ \bar{v}(x, y) \end{pmatrix} = \hat{u}(\theta, r) \vec{e}_\theta + \hat{v}(\theta, r) \vec{e}_r,$$

then there holds

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\bar{u} \partial_x \tilde{u}^a + \bar{v} \partial_y \tilde{u}^a\|_2^2 + \|\bar{u} \partial_x \tilde{v}^a + \bar{v} \partial_y \tilde{v}^a\|_2^2 \\ &= \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{[\hat{u}(\partial_\theta u^a + v^a) + \hat{v}r \partial_r u^a]^2}{r} d\theta dr + \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{[\hat{u}(\partial_\theta v^a - u^a) + \hat{v}r \partial_r v^a]^2}{r} d\theta dr \\ &\leq C \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r[\hat{u}^2(\theta, r) + \hat{v}^2(\theta, r)] d\theta dr + C \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{r\hat{v}^2(\theta, r)}{(r-1)^2} d\theta dr. \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, there holds

$$\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r[\hat{u}^2(\theta, r) + \hat{v}^2(\theta, r)] d\theta dr = \|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_2^2.$$

By the Hardy inequality (3.5), there holds

$$\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{r\hat{v}^2(\theta, r)}{(r-1)^2} d\theta dr \leq C \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r(\partial_r \hat{v})^2 d\theta dr \leq C \|\nabla(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_2^2.$$

Hence, we have

$$\varepsilon^2 \|\nabla^2(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_2 \leq C \|(\tilde{R}_u^a, \tilde{R}_v^a)\|_2 + C \|(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})\|_\infty \|\nabla(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})\|_2 + C \|\nabla(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_2. \quad (4.7)$$

Set

$$\|(u, v)\|_Y := \varepsilon \|\nabla(u, v)\|_2 + \varepsilon^3 \|\nabla^2(u, v)\|_2.$$

By (4.6) and (4.7), we deduce that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, $\eta \in (0, \eta_0)$, there holds

$$\|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_Y \leq C\varepsilon^{-1} \|(\tilde{R}_u^a, \tilde{R}_v^a)\|_2 + C\varepsilon^{-1} \|(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})\|_\infty \|\nabla(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})\|_2. \quad (4.8)$$

Moreover, by the Sobolev embedding, we have

$$\|(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})\|_\infty \leq C \|\nabla(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})\|_2^{\frac{3}{4}} \|\nabla^2(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})\|_2^{\frac{1}{4}}.$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_Y \leq C\varepsilon^{-1} \|(\tilde{R}_u^a, \tilde{R}_v^a)\|_2 + C\varepsilon^{-\frac{7}{2}} \|(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})\|_Y^2. \quad (4.9)$$

Let $Y = \{(u, v) \in C^\infty : (u, v) \text{ satisfies (4.4) and } \|(u, v)\|_Y < +\infty\}$. Thus, due to

$$\|(\tilde{R}_u^a, \tilde{R}_v^a)\|_2 \leq C\varepsilon^5,$$

there exist $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, the operator

$$(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) \mapsto (\bar{u}, \bar{v})$$

maps the ball $\{(u, v) : \|(u, v)\|_Y \leq 2C^2\varepsilon^4\}$ in Y into itself. Moreover, for every two pairs $(\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{v}_1)$ and $(\tilde{u}_2, \tilde{v}_2)$ in this ball, we have

$$\|(\bar{u}_1 - \bar{u}_2, \bar{v}_1 - \bar{v}_2)\|_Y \leq C\varepsilon^{-\frac{7}{2}} (\|(\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{v}_1)\|_Y + \|(\tilde{u}_2, \tilde{v}_2)\|_Y) \|(\tilde{u}_1 - \tilde{u}_2, \tilde{v}_1 - \tilde{v}_2)\|_Y. \quad (4.10)$$

In fact, set

$$\bar{U} := \bar{u}_1 - \bar{u}_2, \quad \bar{V} := \bar{v}_1 - \bar{v}_2, \quad \bar{P} = \bar{p}_1 - \bar{p}_2,$$

then there holds

$$\begin{cases} -\varepsilon^2 \Delta \bar{U} + \partial_x \bar{P} + \tilde{u}^a \partial_x \bar{U} + \tilde{v}^a \partial_y \bar{U} + \bar{U} \partial_x \tilde{u}^a + \bar{V} \partial_y \tilde{u}^a = \tilde{R}_U, \\ -\varepsilon^2 \Delta \bar{V} + \partial_y \bar{P} + \tilde{u}^a \partial_x \bar{V} + \tilde{v}^a \partial_y \bar{V} + \bar{U} \partial_x \tilde{v}^a + \bar{V} \partial_y \tilde{v}^a = \tilde{R}_V, \\ \partial_x \bar{U} + \partial_y \bar{V} = 0, \\ (\bar{U}, \bar{V})|_{\partial B_1} = (0, 0), \end{cases}$$

where

$$\tilde{R}_U = -\tilde{u}_1 \partial_x (\tilde{u}_1 - \tilde{u}_2) - \tilde{v}_1 \partial_y (\tilde{u}_1 - \tilde{u}_2) - (\tilde{u}_1 - \tilde{u}_2) \partial_x \tilde{u}_2 - (\tilde{v}_1 - \tilde{v}_2) \partial_y \tilde{u}_2,$$

$$\tilde{R}_V = -\tilde{u}_1 \partial_x (\tilde{v}_1 - \tilde{v}_2) - \tilde{v}_1 \partial_y (\tilde{v}_1 - \tilde{v}_2) - (\tilde{u}_1 - \tilde{u}_2) \partial_x \tilde{v}_2 - (\tilde{v}_1 - \tilde{v}_2) \partial_y \tilde{v}_2.$$

Thus, following the estimate (4.9) line by line, we obtain (4.10). Hence, there exist $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, $\eta_0 > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, $\eta \in (0, \eta_0)$, the operator

$$(u, v) \mapsto (\bar{u}, \bar{v})$$

maps the ball $\{(u, v) : \|(u, v)\|_Y \leq 2C^2\varepsilon^4\}$ in Y into itself and is a contraction mapping. Thus, for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, $\eta \in (0, \eta_0)$, the error equations (4.1) have a unique solution $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})$ which satisfies

$$\|(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})\|_Y \leq C\varepsilon^4.$$

Hence, there holds $\|(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})\|_\infty \leq C\varepsilon$. Notice that

$$u(\theta, r) = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{u}(x, y) \\ \tilde{v}(x, y) \end{pmatrix} \cdot \vec{e}_\theta, \quad v(\theta, r) = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{u}(x, y) \\ \tilde{v}(x, y) \end{pmatrix} \cdot \vec{e}_r,$$

we deduce $\|(u, v)\|_\infty \leq C\varepsilon$. This complete the proof of this proposition. $\square$

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

Finally, we give the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proof. Combining the Proposition 4.1 and the approximate solution (2.82) of the Navier-Stokes equations (1.3), we easily obtain Theorem 1.1. $\square$

6. APPENDIX

Appendix A: Constant coefficient periodic PDE

In this appendix we give a brief argument to solve the following problem

$$\begin{cases} (Q_0)_\theta = u_e(1)(Q_0)_{\psi\psi}, \\ Q_0(\theta, \psi) = Q_0(\theta + 2\pi, \psi), \\ Q_0|_{\psi=0} = g(\theta), \quad Q_0|_{\psi \rightarrow -\infty} = 0, \end{cases} \quad (6.1)$$

where

$$g(\theta) = \alpha^2 + 2\alpha\eta f(\theta) + \eta^2 f^2(\theta) - u_e^2(1) = 2\alpha\eta f(\theta) + \eta^2 f^2(\theta) - \frac{\eta^2}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f^2(\theta) d\theta.$$

Let $Q_0(\theta, \psi) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{ik\theta} Q_{0k}(\psi)$ and substitute it into (6.1), we obtain

$$\begin{cases} ikQ_{0k} = u_e(1)Q_{0k}'' , \\ Q_{0k}|_{\psi=0} = \hat{g}(k) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} e^{-ik\theta} g(\theta) d\theta, \\ Q_{0k}|_{\psi \rightarrow -\infty} = 0. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to get

$$Q_{0k}(\psi) = \hat{g}(k) e^{\alpha_k \psi}$$

with $\alpha_k = \sqrt{\frac{|k|}{2u_e(1)}}(1 + \operatorname{sgn} k \cdot i)$. Then

$$Q_0(\theta, \psi) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{ik\theta} \hat{g}(k) e^{\alpha_k \psi} \in X$$

and

$$\|Q_0\|_X \leq C\eta. \quad (6.2)$$

Appendix B: Construction of corrector $h(\theta, r)$

In this section, we give a construction of corrector $h(\theta, r)$. Firstly, we give a simple lemma.

Lemma 6.1. *Assume that $K(\theta, r)$ is a 2π -periodic smooth function which satisfies*

$$\int_0^{2\pi} K(\theta, r) d\theta = 0, \quad \forall r \in (0, 1]; \quad K(\theta, 1) = 0,$$

then there exists a 2π -periodic function $h(\theta, r)$ such that

$$\partial_\theta h(\theta, r) = K(\theta, r); \quad h(\theta, 1) = 0;$$

$$\int_0^{2\pi} h(\theta, r) d\theta = 0, \quad \|\partial_\theta^j \partial_r^k h\|_2 \leq C \|\partial_\theta^j \partial_r^k K\|_2. \quad (6.3)$$

Proof. Let

$$K(\theta, r) = \sum_{n \neq 0} K_n(r) e^{in\theta}, \quad K_n(1) = 0.$$

Set

$$h(\theta, r) = \sum_{n \neq 0} \frac{K_n(r)}{in} e^{in\theta}.$$

It's easy to justify that $h(\theta, r)$ satisfies (6.3) which completes the proof. $\square$

Next, we construct the corrector $h(\theta, r)$ by the above lemma. Direct computation gives

$$u_\theta^a + r v_r^a + v^a = \varepsilon^5 \partial_\theta h(\theta, r) + K(\theta, r),$$

where

$$K(\theta, r) = \varepsilon^5 \chi(r) [Y \partial_Y v_p^{(5)}(\theta, Y) + v_p^{(5)}(\theta, Y)] + r \chi'(r) \left(\sum_{i=1}^5 \varepsilon^i v_p^{(i)}(\theta, Y) \right).$$

Notice that $\chi'(r) = 0$, $r \in [0, \frac{1}{2}] \cup [\frac{3}{4}, 1]$ and the property of $v_p^{(i)}$, we deduce that $K(\theta, r) = O(\varepsilon^5)$ and

$$K(\theta, 1) = 0.$$

Moreover, notice that

$$\int_0^{2\pi} v_p^i(\theta, Y) d\theta = 0, \quad \forall Y \leq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, 5,$$

we deduce that

$$\int_0^{2\pi} K(\theta, r) d\theta = 0, \quad \forall r \in (0, 1].$$

Thus, we can choose $h(\theta, r)$ by Lemma 6.1 such that

$$\varepsilon^5 \partial_\theta h(\theta, r) + K(\theta, r) = 0, \quad h(\theta, 1) = 0, \quad \|\partial_\theta^j \partial_r^k h\|_2 \leq C \varepsilon^{-k}.$$

Appendix C: Prandtl-Batchlor theory in disk.

For the convenience of readers, we give an introduction of the Prandtl-Batchlor theory, one can see [1, 20, 21, 31, 43] for more details.

Theorem 6.2. *We consider the steady Navier-Stokes equations in two dimensional simply-connected domain Ω*

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon + \nabla p^\varepsilon - \varepsilon^2 \Delta \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon = 0, \\ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon = 0, \\ \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \quad \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{t}|_{\partial\Omega} = g, \end{cases} \quad (6.4)$$

where $\mathbf{n}$ is the unit normal vector to $\partial\Omega$ and $\mathbf{t}$ is the unit tangential vector to $\partial\Omega$, g is a smooth function. We assume that (i) the stream function ψ^ε of equation (6.4) has no hyperbolic critical point (i.e. nested closed streamlines and single eddy); (ii) for any $\Omega_1 \subset\subset \Omega$, there exist $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for any $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, Ω_1 is away from the boundary layer of equation (6.4) and $\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathbf{u}^e$ in $C^2(\Omega_1)$, where $\mathbf{u}^e$ is a solution of steady Euler equations in Ω . Then the vorticity $w^e = \nabla \times \mathbf{u}^e$ is a constant in Ω .

Proof. Let $\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon = (u^\varepsilon, v^\varepsilon)$ and $w^\varepsilon = \partial_y u^\varepsilon - \partial_x v^\varepsilon$ be the vorticity, then it's easy to obtain that

$$\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla w^\varepsilon - \varepsilon \Delta w^\varepsilon = 0.$$

The boundary is taken to be defined by $\psi^\varepsilon = 0$ and $0 < \psi^\varepsilon < c_1$ throughout the interior of the eddy. For any $0 < c < c_1$, integrating the Navier-Stokes equations over the domain which is surrounded by the closed streamline $\{(x, y) | \psi^\varepsilon(x, y) = c\}$ and using the divergence theorem, we obtain

$$\int_{\{\psi^\varepsilon=c\}} \frac{\partial w^\varepsilon}{\partial n} dl = 0, \quad \forall c \in (0, c_1). \quad (6.5)$$

Moreover, due to $\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathbf{u}^e$ in C^2 , then there holds $w^\varepsilon \rightarrow w^e$ in C^1 .

Let ψ^e be the associated stream function of Euler equations, then $w^e = F(\psi^e)$. In fact, we introduce the action-angle transform $(x, y) \rightarrow (r^\varepsilon, \theta^\varepsilon)$, where

$$r^\varepsilon = \psi^\varepsilon(x, y), \quad \frac{2\pi}{v^\varepsilon(r)} = \oint_{\{\psi^\varepsilon=r^\varepsilon\}} \frac{1}{|\nabla \psi^\varepsilon|}, \quad \theta^\varepsilon = v^\varepsilon(r) \int_0^l \frac{dl'}{|\nabla \psi^\varepsilon|},$$

and l is the arc-length variable on the curve $\{\psi^\varepsilon = r^\varepsilon\}$. Then the transformation $(x, y) \rightarrow (r^\varepsilon, \theta^\varepsilon)$ has Jacobian 1 and the operator $u^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla$ becomes $v^\varepsilon(r) \partial_{\theta^\varepsilon}$. In Ω_1 , $(r^\varepsilon, \theta^\varepsilon) \rightarrow (r^0, \theta^0)$ in C^1 and $r^0 = \psi^e$. Then (ψ^e, θ^0) is a coordinate system and the steady vorticity ω^e is a single-valued function $F(\psi^e)$.

Taking $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ in (6.5), we obtain

$$F'(c) = 0, \quad \forall c \in (0, c_1).$$

Thus, w_e is a constant in Ω . □

Remark 6.3. In the disk $B_1(0)$: due to $\vec{u}_e = u_e(\theta, r)\vec{e}_\theta + v_e(\theta, r)\vec{e}_r$, we deduce

$$w_e = \frac{1}{r}(\partial_r(ru_e) - \partial_\theta v_e) = a, \quad v_e|_{\partial\Omega} = 0.$$

Solving this equation, we obtain

$$(u_e, v_e) = \left(\frac{a}{2}r, 0\right),$$

where a is any constant.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

M.Fei is partially supported by NSF of China under Grant No.11871075 and 11971357. Z.Lin is partially supported by the NSF grants DMS-1715201 and DMS-2007457. T.Tao is partially supported by the NSF of China under Grant 11901349 and the NSF of Shandong Province grant ZR2019QA001. C.Gao and T.Tao are deeply grateful to professor L.Zhang for very valuable suggestion.

REFERENCES

- [1] G.K.Batchelor, *On steady laminar flow with closed streamlines at large Reynolds number*, J.Fluid Mech., 7(1956), no.1, 177-190.
- [2] Q.Chen, D.Wu and Z.Zhang, *On the stability of shear flows of Prandtl type for the steady Navier-Stokes equations*, arXiv:2106.04173.
- [3] A.Dalibard and N.Masmoudi, *Separation for the stationary Prandtl equation*, Publ.Math.Inst.Hautes Études Sci., 130(2019), 187-297.
- [4] E. Dormy and D. Gerard-Varet, *On the ill-posedness of the Prandtl equation*, J. Am. Math. Soc., 23(2010), 591-609.
- [5] D. A. Edwards, *Viscous boundary-layer effects in nearly inviscid cylindrical flows*, Nonlinearity, 10(1997), 277-290.
- [6] R. P. Feynman, and P. A. Lagerstrom, *Remarks on high Reynolds number flows in finite domains*, Proc. IX International Congress on Applied Mechanics, Brussels, 3(1956), 342-343.
- [7] C.Gao and L.Zhang, *On the steady Prandtl boundary layer expansion*, arXiv:2001.10700.

- [8] C.Gao and L.Zhang, *Remarks on the steady Prandtl boundary layer expansion*, arXiv:2107.08372.
- [9] D.Gerard-Verat and Y.Maekawa, *Sobolev stability of Prandtl expansions for the steady Navier-Stokes equations*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 233 (2019), no. 3, 1319-1382.
- [10] Y.Guo and T.Nguyen, *Prandtl boundary layer expansions of steady Navier-Stokes flows over a moving plate*, Ann.PDE, 2017, DOI 10.1007/s40818-016-0020-6.
- [11] Y.Guo and S.Iyer, *Validity of steady Prandtl layer expansions*, arXiv:1805.05891v5.
- [12] Y.Guo and S.Iyer, *Steady Prandtl layer expansions with external forcing*, arXiv:1810.06662.
- [13] Y.Guo and S.Iyer, *Regularity and expansion for steady Prandtl equations*, Comm. Math. Phys., 382 (2021), no. 3, 1403-1447.
- [14] S.Iyer, *Steady Prandtl boundary layer expansions over a rotating disk*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 224 (2017), no.2, 421-469.
- [15] S.Iyer, *Global steady Prandtl boundary layer over a moving boundary*, Peking Math. J., I: 2 (2019), no. 2, 155-238; II: 2 (2019), no. 3-4, 353-437; III: 3 (2020), no. 1, 47-102.
- [16] S. Iyer, *Steady Prandtl boundary layer over a moving boundary: nonshear Euler flow*, SIAM J.Math.Anal., 51(2019), no.3, 1657-1685.
- [17] S.Iyer and N.Masmoudi, *Boundary layer expansions of steady Navier-Stokes equation*, arXiv:2103.09170.
- [18] S.Iyer and N.Masmoudi, *Global-in-x stability of steady Prandtl expansions for 2D Navier-Stokes flows*, arXiv:2008.12347.
- [19] S. Iyer and C.Zhou, *Stationary inviscid limit to shear flow*, J. Differential Equations 267 (2019), no.12, 7135-7153.
- [20] S.-C. Kim, *On Prandtl-Batchelor theory of a cylindrical eddy: asymptotic study*, SIAM J. Appl. Math. 58(1998), 1394-1413.
- [21] S.-C. Kim, *On Prandtl-Batchelor theory of a cylindrical eddy: existence and uniqueness*, Z. Angew. Math. Phys. 51(2000), 674-686.
- [22] S.-C. Kim, *Asymptotic study of Navier-Stokes flows*, Trends in Mathematics, information center for Mathematical sciences, 6 (2003), 29-33.
- [23] S. C. Kim and S. Childress, *Vorticity selection with multiple eddies in two-dimensional steady flow at high Reynolds number*, SIAM J. Appl. Math., 61 (2001), no. 5, 1605-1617.
- [24] S. C. Kim, *A free-boundary problem for Euler flows with constant vorticity*, Appl. Math. Lett., 12(1999), 101-104.
- [25] S. C. Kim, *On Prandtl-Batchelor theory of steady flow at large Reynolds number*, Ph.D thesis, New York University, 1996.
- [26] S. C. Kim, *Batchelor-Wood formula for negative wall velocity*, Phys. Fluids, 11 (1999), 1685-1687.
- [27] P. A. Lagerstrom, *Solutions of the Navier-Stokes equation at large Reynolds number*, SIAM J. Appl. Math. vol. 28, No. 1 (1975), 202-214.
- [28] S. A. Maslowe, *Critical layers in shear flows*, Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics, 18:1, (1986), 405-432.
- [29] H. K. Moffatt and E. Dormy, *Self-exciting fluid dynamos*, Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- [30] H. K. Moffatt, *Magnetic field generation in electrically conducting fluids*, Cambridge University Press, 1978.
- [31] H.Okamoto, *A variational problem arising in the two-dimensional Navier-Stokes equation with vanishing viscosity*, Appl. Math. Lett., 7(1994), no.1, 29-33.
- [32] O.A.Oleinik and V.N.Samokhin, *Mathematical models in boundary layer theory*, Applied Mathematics and Mathematical Computation, 15. Champan and Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 1999.
- [33] J. Pedlosky, *Ocean circulation theory*, Springer-Verlag, 1996.
- [34] L. Prandtl, 1905. *Über Flüssigkeitsbewegung bei sehr kleiner Reibung*. Verhandlungen des III. Internationalen Mathematiker Kongresses, Heidelberg, 1904, pp. 484-491, Teubner, Leipzig. See Gesammelte Abhandlungen II, pp. 575-584.
- [35] M. Renardy, *On non-existence of steady periodic solutions of the Prandtl equations*, J. Fluid Mech., 717(2013), R7, 1-5.
- [36] P. B. Rhines, and W. R. Young, *How rapidly is a passive scalar mixed within closed streamlines*, J. Fluid Mech., 133 (1983), 133-145.
- [37] P. B. Rhines, and W. R. Young, *Homogenization of potential vorticity in planetary gyres*, J. Fluid Mech., 122 (1982), 347-367.
- [38] N. Riley, *High Reynolds number flows with closed streamlines*, J. Eng. Math., 15 (1981), 15-27.
- [39] L. Van Wijngaarden, *Prandtl-Batchelor flows revisited*, Fluid Dyn. Res., 39 (2007), 267-278.
- [40] W.Shen, Y.Wang and Z.Zhang, *Boundary layer separation and local behavior for the steady Prandtl equation*, Adv. Math., 389 (2021),107896, 25pp.
- [41] Y.Wang and Z.Zhang, *Global C^∞ regularity of the steady Prandtl equation with favorable pressure gradient*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire, 38 (2021), no. 6, 1989-2004.
- [42] N. O. Weiss, *The expulsion of magnetic flux by eddies*, Proc. R. Soc. London, Ser. A, 293 (1966), 310-328.
- [43] W.W.Wood, *Boundary layers whose streamlines are closed*, J.Fluid Mech., 1(1957), no.2, 77-87.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, ANHUI NORMAL UNIVERSITY, WUHU 241002, CHINA
Email address: `mwfei@ahnu.edu.cn`

BEIJING INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR MATHEMATICAL RESEARCH, PEKING UNIVERSITY, BEIJING, 100871, CHINA
Email address: `gaochen@amss.ac.cn`

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, 30332, ATLANTA, GA, USA
Email address: `zlin@math.gatech.edu`

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, SHANDONG UNIVERSITY, JINAN, SHANDONG, 250100, CHINA
Email address: `taotao@sdu.edu.cn`