

SMOOTH LOCAL SOLUTIONS TO THE SCHRÖDINGER FLOW FOR MAPS FROM A SMOOTH BOUNDED DOMAIN $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ INTO \mathbb{S}^2

BO CHEN AND YOUDE WANG

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we show the existence and uniqueness of short-time very regular or smooth solution to the initial-Neumann boundary value problem of the Schrödinger flow for maps from a smooth bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ into \mathbb{S}^2 in the scale of Sobolev spaces. We provide a precise description of the compatibility conditions at the boundary for the initial data.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we are concerned with the existence and uniqueness for very regular or smooth solutions to the following initial-Neumann boundary value problem of the Schrödinger flow

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u = u \times \Delta u, & (\mathbf{x}, t) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0, & (\mathbf{x}, t) \in \partial\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0 : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2, \end{cases}$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is a smooth bounded domain and u is a map from Ω into a standard sphere \mathbb{S}^2 . More precisely, we will study what compatibility conditions and smooth conditions on the initial value map $u_0 : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ can guarantee the above problem admits a unique smooth or regular solution.

1.1. Definitions and Background. In physics, for a map u from Ω into a standard sphere \mathbb{S}^2 the Landau-Lifshitz (LL) equation

$$(1.1) \quad \partial_t u = -u \times \Delta u$$

is a fundamental evolution equation for the ferromagnetic spin chain and was proposed on the phenomenological ground in studying the dispersive theory of magnetization of ferromagnets. It was first deduced by Landau and Lifshitz in [32], and then proposed by Gilbert in [23] with dissipation as the following form

$$(1.2) \quad \partial_t u = -\alpha u \times (u \times \Delta u) + \beta u \times \Delta u,$$

where β is a real number and $\alpha \geq 0$ is called the Gilbert damping coefficient. And hence, the above equation (1.2) is also called Landau-Lifshitz-Gilbert (LLG) equation. Here “ \times ” denotes the cross product in \mathbb{R}^3 and Δ is the Laplace operator in \mathbb{R}^3 .

Since the negative sign “ $-$ ” in Equation (1.1) does not affect on our analysis and main results, for the sake of convenience, we only consider the classical Schrödinger flow into \mathbb{S}^2

$$\partial_t u = u \times \Delta u.$$

Intrinsically, “ $u \times$ ” can be considered as a complex structure

$$J(u) = u \times : T_u \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow T_u \mathbb{S}^2$$

on \mathbb{S}^2 , which rotates the tangent space at each point of \mathbb{S}^2 anticlockwise by an angle of $\frac{\pi}{2}$ degrees. Therefore, we can write the above equation as

$$\partial_t u = J(u)(\Delta u + |\nabla u|^2 u).$$

From the viewpoint of infinite dimensional symplectic geometry, Ding-Wang [18] proposed to consider the so-called Schrödinger flows for maps from a Riemannian manifold into a symplectic manifold, which can be regarded as an extension of LL equation (5.1) and was also independently introduced by Terng and Uhlenbeck in [52]. Namely, suppose (M, g) is a Riemannian manifold and (N, J, ω) is a symplectic manifold, the Schrödinger flow is a time-dependent map $u : M \times \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow N \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ satisfying

$$\partial_t u = J(u)\tau(u),$$

where $\tau(u)$ is the tension field of u which can be expressed as

$$\tau(u) = \Delta_g u + A(u)(\nabla u, \nabla u)$$

where $A(u)(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the second fundamental form of N in \mathbb{R}^{n+k} .

The PDE aspects of the Schrödinger flow containing the existence, uniqueness and regularities of various kinds of solutions, have been intensively studied in the last two decades. Next, we briefly recall a few of results that are closely related to our work in the present paper.

In 1986, P.L. Sulem, C. Sulem and C. Bardos in [50] proved the existence of global weak solution and local regular solution to the Schrödinger flow for maps from \mathbb{R}^n into \mathbb{S}^2 , by employing difference method. In 1998, Y.D. Wang [54] adopted a geometric approximation method (i.e. The complex structure approximation method) to obtain the global existence of weak solution to the Schrödinger flow for maps from a closed Riemannian manifold or a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^n into \mathbb{S}^2 . The recent development of weak solution to a class of generalized Schrödinger flows and related equations can refer to [27, 28] and references therein for various results.

The local regular solution to the Schrödinger flow from a closed Riemannian manifold or \mathbb{R}^n into a Kähler manifold was given by Ding and the second named author of this paper in [18, 19] by employing a parabolic geometric approximation equation and estimating some intrinsic geometric energy picked suitably. Furthermore, they also obtained the persistence of regularity results, in that the solution always stays as regular as the initial data (as measured in Sobolev norms), provided that one is within the time of existence guaranteed by the local existence theorem.

Later, for low-regularity initial data the initial value problem for Schrödinger flow from an Euclidean space into \mathbb{S}^2 has been studied indirectly using the “modified Schrödinger map equations” and certain enhanced energy methods, for instance, A.R. Nahmod, A. Stefanov and K. K. Uhlenbeck [39] have ever used the standard technique of Picard iteration in some suitable function spaces of the Schrödinger equation to obtain a near-optimal (but conditional) local well-posedness result for the Schrödinger map flow equation from two dimensions into the sphere $X = \mathbb{S}^2$ or hyperbolic space $X = \mathbb{H}^2$. Moreover, they also proved the persistence of regularity results, in that the solution always stays as regular as the initial data, provided that one is within the time interval of existence guaranteed by the local existence theorem.

For one dimensional global existence for Schrödinger flow from \mathbb{S}^1 or \mathbb{R}^1 into a Kähler manifold, we refer to [40, 41] and references therein. The global well-posedness result for the Schrödinger flow from \mathbb{R}^n (with $n \geq 2$) into \mathbb{S}^2 was well researched by Ionescu, Kenig, Bejanaru and et al., we refer to [4, 5, 6, 25] for more details. Especially, in [6] the global well-posedness result for the Schrödinger flow for small data in the critical Sobolev spaces in dimensions $n \geq 2$ was addressed. Recently, in [33, 34] Z. Li proved that the Schrödinger flow from \mathbb{R}^n with $n \geq 2$ to compact Kähler manifold with small initial data in critical Sobolev spaces is global, which solves the open problem raised in [6].

On the contrary, F. Merle, P. Raphaël and I. Rodnianski [37] also considered the energy critical Schrödinger flow problem with the 2-sphere target for equivariant initial data of homotopy index $k = 1$. They showed the existence of a codimension one set of smooth well localized initial data arbitrarily close to the ground state harmonic map in the energy critical norm, which generates

finite time blowup solutions, and gave a sharp description of the corresponding singularity formation which occurs by concentration of a universal bubble of energy. One also found some self-similar solutions to Schrödinger flow from \mathbb{C}^n into $\mathbb{C}P^n$ with local bounded energy which blow up at finite time, for more details we refer to [17, 22].

As for some travelling wave solutions with vortex structures, F. Lin and J. Wei [35] employed perturbation method to consider such solutions for the Schrödinger map flow equation with easy-axis and proved the existence of smooth travelling waves with bounded energy if the velocity of travelling wave is small enough. Moreover, they showed the travelling wave solution has exactly two vortices. Later, J. Wei and J. Yang [56] considered the same Schrödinger map flow equation as in [35], i.e. the Landau-Lifshitz equation describing the planar ferromagnets. They constructed a travelling wave solution possessing vortex helix structures for this equation. Using the perturbation approach, they give a complete characterization of the asymptotic behaviour of the solution.

On the other hand, in the literature, physicists and mathematicians are always interested in the LLG equation with initial-Neumann boundary conditions

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u = -\alpha u \times (u \times \Delta u) + \beta u \times \Delta u, & (\mathbf{x}, t) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0, & (\mathbf{x}, t) \in \partial\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0 : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2. \end{cases}$$

and the corresponding problems of some systems which are closely related to LLG equations (see [11, 42]). Here ν is the outer normal vector of $\partial\Omega$ and u_0 is the initial data.

Next, we retrospect some of the works related to local regular solutions of the initial-Neumann boundary value problem to LLG equations (i.e. Equation (1.2)) with $\alpha > 0$. In the case the base space is a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $n \geq 2$, Carbou and Fabrie proved the local existence and uniqueness of regular solutions to a dissipative LL equation coupled with Maxwell equations in micromagnetism theory in [11]. Recently, the local existence of very regular solution to LLG equation with $\alpha > 0$ was addressed by applying the delicate Galerkin approximation method and adding compatibility initial-boundary condition in [12]. Inspired by the method used in [12], we obtained the local in time very regular solution to LLG equation with spin-polarized transport in [14] very recently.

1.2. Main Results. For the most challenging case that $\alpha = 0$, there is a few results in the literature about the well-posedness of the initial-Neumann boundary value problem of the Schrödinger flow

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t u = u \times \Delta u, & (\mathbf{x}, t) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0, & (\mathbf{x}, t) \in \partial\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0 : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2; \end{cases}$$

except for the authors of the present paper obtained the existence and uniqueness of locally strong solution to (1.3) by assuming that $u_0 \in H^3(\omega)$ with $\frac{\partial u_0}{\partial \nu}|_{\Omega} = 0$ in the previous work [15]. In this paper, we continue to investigate the local existence of very regular solutions to the equation, providing some necessary compatibility conditions of the initial data. Our main conclusions are presented as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Let Ω be a smooth bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^3 . Suppose that $u_0 \in H^5(\Omega, \mathbb{S}^2)$, which satisfies the 1-order compatibility condition defined in (2.6). Then there exists a positive time T_1 depending only on $\|u_0\|_{H^5(\Omega)}$ such that the initial-Neumann boundary value problem (1.3) admits a local in time regular solution u , which satisfies*

$$\partial_t^i u \in L^\infty([0, T_1], H^{5-2i}(\Omega))$$

for $i = 0, 1, 2$.

In general, we can show the existence of very regular solutions to (1.3) under adding higher order compatibility conditions.

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose that $u_0 \in H^{2k+1}(\Omega, \mathbb{S}^2)$ with $k \geq 2$, which satisfies the $(k-1)$ -order compatibility condition defined in (2.6). Let u and $T_1 > 0$ be given in Theorem 1.1. Then, for any $0 \leq i \leq k$ we have*

$$\partial_t^i u \in L^\infty([0, T_1], H^{2k+1-2i}(\Omega)).$$

In order to get the very regular solution of (1.3), we still adopt a similar parabolic perturbation approximation of (1.3) and geometric energy method as that in [18]. Our strategy is divided into two steps.

In the first step, we consider the parabolic perturbed equation to (1.3)

$$(1.4) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t u = \varepsilon \tau(u) + u \times \Delta u, & (\mathbf{x}, t) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0, & (\mathbf{x}, t) \in \partial\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0 : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2, \end{cases}$$

with $1 > \varepsilon > 0$. The intrinsic explanation of compatibility condition of the initial data in Lemma 2.6 implies that Equation (1.3) and its parabolic perturbed equation (1.4) has the same compatibility condition (2.6). Recall that the local existence of very regular solution to (1.4) has been established in [12](also see [14]), which can be formulated as the following theorem:

Theorem 1.3. *Suppose that $u_0 \in H^{2k+1}(\Omega, \mathbb{S}^2)$ with $k \geq 1$, and satisfies the k -order compatibility conditions (2.6). Then there exists a positive time T_ε (depending only on ε and $\|u_0\|_{H^2(\Omega)}$) such that Equation (1.4) admits a unique local solution u_ε , which satisfies*

$$\partial_t^i u_\varepsilon \in L^\infty([0, T], H^{2k+1-2i}(\Omega)) \cap L^2([0, T], H^{2k+2-2i}(\Omega))$$

for any $T < T_\varepsilon$ and $0 \leq i \leq k$.

In the second step, we start with getting higher order energy estimates of the approximate solution u_ε which are uniform with respect to ε . As mentioned in our previous work [15], for $k \geq 1$, we shall consider the equation of $w_k = \partial_t^k u_\varepsilon$ with the compatibility condition of initial data (2.6), the higher order geometric energy estimates of u_ε can be obtained. More precisely, we will use the following simple process \mathcal{P} to explain the strategy of enhancing energy bounds.

- (1) Assume that $u_0 \in H^3(\Omega, \mathbb{S}^2)$ and satisfies the 0th-order compatibility condition, i.e., $\frac{\partial u_0}{\partial \nu}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$. By considering the equation satisfied by $w_1 = \partial_t u_\varepsilon$, we have given an uniform H^3 -bound of u_ε on some uniform time interval $[0, T_0]$ in [15].
- (2) Assume $u_0 \in H^5(\Omega, \mathbb{S}^2)$ and satisfies the 1th-order compatibility condition. By using the equation satisfied by $w_2 = \partial_t^2 u_\varepsilon$ and applying the estimates obtained in (1), we can show an uniform H^1 -estimate of w_2 on $[0, T_1]$ for some $0 < T_1 \leq T_0$. It implies that there exists an uniform H^5 -estimate on u_ε by using Equation (1.4).
- (3) Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we get a H^5 -regular solution to (1.3). On the other hand, the uniqueness of such solution has been established in [15].

Therefore, Theorem 1.1 can be proved.

To get the higher regularity of the solution u obtained in Theorem 1.1, we need to impose higher order compatibility conditions. Then we can prove Theorem 1.2 by using the method of induction and repeating the above process \mathcal{P} .

The rest of our paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce some basic notations on Sobolev space and some crucial preliminary lemmas. In Section 3, we give the proof of Theorem 1.1. Finally, Theorem 1.2 is built up in Section 4.

2. PRELIMINARY

In this section, we first recall some notations on Sobolev spaces which will be used in whole context. Let $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3) : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2 \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ be a map. We set

$$H^k(\Omega, \mathbb{S}^2) = \{u \in W^{k,2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^3) : |u| = 1 \text{ for a.e. } x \in \Omega\}.$$

Moreover, let $(B, \|\cdot\|_B)$ be a Banach space and $f : [0, T] \rightarrow B$ be a map. For any $p > 0$ and $T > 0$, recall that

$$\|f\|_{L^p([0, T], B)} := \left(\int_0^T \|f\|_B^p dt \right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

and

$$L^p([0, T], B) := \{f : [0, T] \rightarrow B : \|f\|_{L^p([0, T], B)} < \infty\}.$$

In particular, we denote

$$L^p([0, T], H^k(\Omega, \mathbb{S}^2)) = \{u \in L^p([0, T], H^k(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^3)) : |u| = 1 \text{ for a.e. } (x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T]\},$$

where $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $p \geq 1$.

2.1. Some preliminary lemmas. For later convenience, we need to recall some important preliminary lemmas. The L^2 theory of Laplace operator with Neumann boundary condition implies the following Lemma on equivalent Sobolev norms, for the details we refer to [55].

Lemma 2.1. *Let Ω be a bounded smooth domain in \mathbb{R}^m and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. There exists a constant $C_{k,m}$ such that, for all $u \in H^{k+2}(\Omega)$ with $\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$,*

$$(2.1) \quad \|u\|_{H^{2+k}(\Omega)} \leq C_{k,m} (\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\Delta u\|_{H^k(\Omega)}).$$

In particular, we need to define the H^{k+2} -norm of u as the following

$$\|u\|_{H^{k+2}(\Omega)} := \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\Delta u\|_{H^k(\Omega)}.$$

In order to show the uniform estimates and the convergence of solutions to the approximated equation constructed in coming sections, we also need to use the Gronwall inequality and the classical compactness results in [9, 43].

Lemma 2.2. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be a nondecreasing continuous function such that $f > 0$ on $(0, \infty)$ and $\int_1^\infty \frac{1}{f} dx < \infty$. Let y be a continuous function which is nonnegative on \mathbb{R}^+ and let g be a nonnegative function in $L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^+)$. We assume that there exists a $y_0 > 0$ such that for all $t \geq 0$, we have the inequality*

$$y(t) \leq y_0 + \int_0^t g(s) ds + \int_0^t f(y(s)) ds.$$

Then, there exists a positive number T^ depending only on y_0 and f , such that for all $T < T^*$, there holds*

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} y(t) \leq C(T, y_0),$$

for some constant $C(T, y_0)$.

To take an analogous argument to the proof of the above lemma 2.2 in [9], one can easily infer the following result.

Corollary 2.3. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be a positive locally Lipschitz function, which is nondecreasing. Let $z : [0, T^*) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the maximal solution of the Cauchy problem:*

$$\begin{cases} z' = f(z), \\ z(0) = z_0. \end{cases}$$

Let $y : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a $W^{1,1}$ function such that

$$\begin{cases} y' \leq f(y), \\ y(0) \leq z_0. \end{cases}$$

Then, for any $0 < T < T^$, we have*

$$y(t) \leq z(T), \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Proof. Let

$$w(t) = y_0 + \int_0^t f(y(s)) dx.$$

It is easy to see that w is a nondecreasing C^1 function, which satisfies

$$\begin{cases} w' = f(y(t)) \leq f(w(t)), \\ w(0) = y_0 \leq z_0. \end{cases}$$

Here we have used the fact that f is positive and nondecreasing. Then, the classical ODE comparison theorem tells us that

$$w(t) \leq z(t)$$

for any $t \in [0, T^*)$. Therefore, we get the desired result since $y(t) \leq w(t)$. \square

Lemma 2.4 (Aubin-Lions-Simon compact Lemma, see Theorem II.5.16 in [9] or [43]). *Let $X \subset B \subset Y$ be Banach spaces. Suppose that the embedding $B \hookrightarrow Y$ is continuous and that the embedding $X \hookrightarrow B$ is compact. Let $1 \leq p, q, r \leq \infty$. For $T > 0$, we define*

$$E_{p,r} = \{f \in L^p((0, T), X), \frac{df}{dt} \in L^r((0, T), Y)\}.$$

Then, the following properties hold true

- (1) *If $p < \infty$ and $p < q$, the embedding $E_{p,r} \cap L^q((0, T), B)$ in $L^s((0, T), B)$ is compact for all $1 \leq s < q$.*
- (2) *If $p = \infty$ and $r > 1$, the embedding of $E_{p,r}$ in $C^0([0, T], B)$ is compact.*

Lemma 2.5 (Theorem II.5.14 in [9]). *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, then the space*

$$E_{2,2} = \{f \in L^2((0, T), H^{k+2}(\Omega)), \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} \in L^2((0, T), H^k(\Omega))\}$$

is continuously embedded in $C^0([0, T], H^{k+1}(\Omega))$.

2.2. Compatibility conditions of the initial data.

In this subsection, we introduce the compatibility conditions on the initial data, which make the Schrödinger flow (1.3) admit a regular or smooth solution.

For the sake of convenience, we assume u is a smooth solution to the initial-Nueman boundary value problem of the Schrödinger flow (1.3). Since $u \times : T_u \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow T_u \mathbb{S}^2$ is just the standard complex

structure on \mathbb{S}^2 , intrinsically the equation (1.3) can be written as the following equivalent form

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t u = u \times \tau(u), & (\mathbf{x}, t) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0, & (\mathbf{x}, t) \in \partial\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0 : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2, \end{cases}$$

where $\tau(u) = \Delta u + |\nabla u|^2 u \in T_u \mathbb{S}^2$ is the tension field.

For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\partial_t^k u$ satisfies the following equation

$$\partial_t \partial_t^k u = \sum_{i+j=k} C_k^i \partial_t^i u \times \partial_t^j \tau(u),$$

with the initial data

$$\partial_t^k u|_{t=0} = \partial_t^k u(x, 0),$$

where $C_k^i = \frac{i!}{k!(k-i)!}$ is the number of combination.

If we denote $V_k(u_0) = \partial_t^k u(x, 0)$ and $\tilde{V}_k = \partial_t^{k-1} \tau(u)(x, 0)$, then

$$(2.3) \quad V_{k+1}(u_0) = \partial_t \partial_t^k u(x, 0) = \sum_{i+j=k} C_k^i V_i \times \tilde{V}_{j+1}.$$

In particular, we have

$$V_1 = u_0 \times \tau(u_0) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{V}_1 = \tau(u_0).$$

For convenience, we also denote $V_0 = \tilde{V}_0 = u_0$.

On the other hand, since $\langle \tau(u), u \rangle = 0$, it is easy to see that there holds true the following

$$(2.4) \quad \langle \tilde{V}_{k+1}, u_0 \rangle = - \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} C_k^j \langle \tilde{V}_{j+1}, V_{k-j} \rangle,$$

or, equivalently

$$\langle \tilde{V}_{k+1}, V_0 \rangle = - \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} C_k^j \langle \tilde{V}_{j+1}, V_{k-j} \rangle.$$

Now, we are in the position to state the compatibility conditions on the initial value map u_0 associated to Equation (2.2).

Definition 2.1. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $u_0 \in H^{2k+2}(\Omega, \mathbb{S}^2)$. We say u_0 satisfies the compatibility condition at order k , if for any $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$, there holds*

$$(2.5) \quad \frac{\partial V_j}{\partial \nu} \Big|_{\partial\Omega} = 0.$$

By taking account of the fact $|u| = 1$ and using the precise intrinsic formula of V_k (to see (2.3)), we can see easily that the compatibility conditions defined in (2.1) has the below equivalent characterization.

Proposition 2.6. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $u_0 \in H^{2k+2}(\Omega, \mathbb{S}^2)$. We say u_0 satisfies the compatibility condition of order k , if and only if for any $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$, there holds*

$$(2.6) \quad \frac{\partial \tilde{V}_j}{\partial \nu} \Big|_{\partial\Omega} = 0.$$

Proof. The sufficiency can be deduced directly by applying the formula (2.3). So, the remaining is to verify the contrary part. In order to prove it, we take an induction argument on k .

The result trivially holds true for the case that $k = 0$. Now we assume the result has been established for $k = n$ with $n \geq 0$. For the case of $k = n + 1$, the precise formula (2.3) gives

$$\begin{aligned} V_{n+1} &= \partial_t \partial_t^n u(x, 0) = \sum_{i+j=n} C_n^i V_i \times \tilde{V}_j \\ &= u_0 \times \tilde{V}_{n+1} + V_n \times \tilde{V}_1 + \sum_{i+j=n, i, j < n} C_n^i V_i \times \tilde{V}_{j+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, it follows from the assumptions of induction

$$0 = \frac{\partial V_{n+1}}{\partial \nu} \Big|_{\partial \Omega} = u_0 \times \frac{\partial \tilde{V}_{n+1}}{\partial \nu} \Big|_{\partial \Omega}.$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \tilde{V}_{n+1}}{\partial \nu} \Big|_{\partial \Omega} &= \left\langle \frac{\partial \tilde{V}_{n+1}}{\partial \nu} \Big|_{\partial \Omega}, u_0 \right\rangle u_0 \\ &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} \left\langle \tilde{V}_{n+1}, u_0 \right\rangle \Big|_{\partial \Omega} u_0 \\ &= - \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} C_n^j \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} \left\langle \tilde{V}_{j+1}, V_{n-j} \right\rangle \Big|_{\partial \Omega} u_0 \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we have used the formula (2.3). Therefore, the proof is completed. \square

Remark 2.7. *The above Proposition 2.6 implies that the compatibility conditions on u_0 corresponding to the following parabolic perturbed equation*

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t u = \varepsilon \tau(u) + u \times \tau(u), & (x, t) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0, & (x, t) \in \partial \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0 : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2, \end{cases}$$

is the same as that for Equation (2.2) (cf. Proposition 2.9 in [14]). For convenience, in the sequel we denote

$$W_k(u_0) = \partial_t^k u(x, 0) = \varepsilon (\Delta W_{k-1} + \sum_{i+j+l=k-1} \nabla W_i \# \nabla W_j \# W_l) + \sum_{i+j=k-1} W_i \# \Delta W_j$$

for any $k \geq 1$, where $W_0 = u_0$,

$$W_1 = \varepsilon \tau(u_0) + u_0 \times \tau(u_0)$$

and $\#$ denotes the linear contraction.

We also need to make use of the following conclusions on compatibility conditions to vanish the boundary term in the process of energy estimates in the context.

Proposition 2.8. *Let Ω be a smooth bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^m , $u : \Omega \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a map satisfying*

$$\partial_t^i u \in L^2([0, T], H^{2k-2i}(\Omega))$$

for any $0 \leq i \leq k$, where $k \geq 1$. If

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} \Big|_{\partial \Omega \times [0, T]} = 0$$

in the sense of trace, then, for $0 \leq j < k$ there hold true

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} \partial_t^j u|_{\partial\Omega \times [0, T]} = 0.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume $k \geq 2$. We only need to show

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} \partial_t u|_{\partial\Omega \times [0, T]} = 0$$

in the sense of trace, the remaining cases can be dealt with by some almost same arguments.

Let $\phi \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, T])$. It is easy to see that there holds true

$$(2.8) \quad \int_0^T \int_\Omega \langle \Delta u, \partial_t \phi \rangle dx dt = - \int_0^T \int_\Omega \langle \nabla u, \partial_t \nabla \phi \rangle dx dt,$$

since

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}|_{\partial\Omega \times [0, T]} = 0.$$

Then, a simple calculation shows

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LHS of (2.8)} &= - \int_0^T \int_\Omega \langle \partial_t \Delta u, \phi \rangle dx dt + \int_\Omega \langle \Delta u, \phi \rangle dx(T) \\ &\quad - \int_\Omega \langle \Delta u, \phi \rangle dx(0) \\ &= - \int_0^T \int_\Omega \langle \partial_t \Delta u, \phi \rangle dx dt - \int_\Omega \langle \nabla u, \nabla \phi \rangle dx(T) \\ &\quad + \int_\Omega \langle \nabla u, \nabla \phi \rangle dx(0) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{RHS of (2.8)} &= - \int_0^T \int_\Omega \langle \nabla u, \partial_t \nabla \phi \rangle dx dt \\ &= \int_0^T \int_\Omega \langle \nabla \partial_t u, \nabla \phi \rangle dx dt - \int_\Omega \langle \nabla u, \nabla \phi \rangle dx(T) \\ &\quad + \int_\Omega \langle \nabla u, \nabla \phi \rangle dx(0). \end{aligned}$$

It follows

$$\int_0^T \int_\Omega \langle \Delta \partial_t u, \phi \rangle dx dt = - \int_0^T \int_\Omega \langle \nabla \partial_t u, \nabla \phi \rangle dx dt.$$

This is just what we want to prove. Here we have used Lemma 2.5 which tells us that

$$u \in C^0([0, T], H^3(\Omega)).$$

On the other hand, if we take $\phi(x, t) = \eta(t)f(x)$, then

$$\int_0^T \left(\int_\Omega \langle \Delta u, f \rangle dx + \int_\Omega \langle \nabla u, \nabla f \rangle dx \right) \eta(t) dt = 0.$$

This implies

$$\int_\Omega \langle \Delta u, f \rangle dx = - \int_\Omega \langle \nabla u, \nabla f \rangle dx$$

for any $t \in [0, T]$. □

3. H^5 -REGULAR SOLUTION

Let $u_0 \in H^5(\Omega, \mathbb{S}^2)$, satisfying the 1-order compatibility condition (to see (2.6)). We consider the parabolic perturbed equation (i.e. Landau-Lifshitz equation)

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t u = \varepsilon \tau(u) + u \times \Delta u & (\mathbf{x}, t) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0 & (\mathbf{x}, t) \in \partial\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0 : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2, \end{cases}$$

with $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$.

Recall that we have proved the following theorem in [14, 15](also see [12]).

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that $u_0 \in H^5(\Omega, \mathbb{S}^2)$, and satisfies the 1-order compatibility condition (to see (2.6)). Then there exists a positive time T_ε (depending only on ε and $\|u_0\|_{H^2(\Omega)}$) such that Equation (2.7) admits a unique regular solution u_ε , which satisfies for any $T < T_\varepsilon$ that*

$$\partial_t^i u_\varepsilon \in L^\infty([0, T], H^{5-2i}(\Omega)) \cap L^2([0, T], H^{6-2i}(\Omega)).$$

for $0 \leq i \leq 2$.

Moreover, there exists an uniform positive number $T_0 < T_\varepsilon$ depending only on $\|u_0\|_{H^3}$, such that u_ε satisfies

$$(3.2) \quad \sup_{0 \leq T < T_0} (\|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^3(\Omega)}^2 + \|\frac{\partial u_\varepsilon}{\partial t}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}) \leq C(\|u_0\|_{H^3}).$$

Proof. By Theorem 3.1 in [15] we take the same arguments as in the step 2 of the proof of main Theorem 1.1 in [15] to conclude that there exists a maximal existence time T_ε (depending only on ε and $\|u_0\|_{H^2(\Omega)}$) such that Equation (3.1) admits a unique regular solution u_ε , which satisfies that for any $T < T_\varepsilon$

- (1) $u_\varepsilon \in L^\infty([0, T], H^3(\Omega)) \cap L^2([0, T], H^4(\Omega))$;
- (2) $\frac{\partial u_\varepsilon}{\partial t} \in L^\infty([0, T], H^1(\Omega)) \cap L^2([0, T], H^2(\Omega))$ and $\frac{\partial^2 u_\varepsilon}{\partial t^2} \in L^2([0, T], L^2(\Omega))$.

Moreover, there exists a positive number T_0 depending only on $\|u_0\|_{H^3}$, such that u_ε satisfies

$$\sup_{0 \leq T < T_0} (\|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^3(\Omega)}^2 + \|\frac{\partial u_\varepsilon}{\partial t}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}) \leq C(\|u_0\|_{H^3}).$$

Hence, by applying Theorem 1.3 in [14] to enhance the regularity of u_ε , we get the desired estimates of u_ε in this theorem. \square

Next, we follow a similar argument as that in [15] to show the uniform H^3 -estimates of

$$v = \partial_t u_\varepsilon.$$

And then, by using Equation (3.1) again, we can improve the uniform estimates of u_ε such that $u \in L^\infty([0, T_1], H^5(\Omega))$ for some uniform positive number $T_1 \leq T_0$. Thus, we obtain the desired H^5 -regular solution to (1.3) by letting ε to 0.

3.1. Uniform H^2 -estimates. First of all, we show an uniform H^2 -estimate of v by directed energy estimates. Theorem 3.1 implies that there holds true

$$v \in L^\infty([0, T], H^3(\Omega)) \cap L^2([0, T], H^4(\Omega))$$

for any $0 < T < T_\varepsilon$, and

$$\sup_{0 \leq T < T_0} \|v\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \leq C(\|u_0\|_{H^3}).$$

for $0 < T_0 < T_\varepsilon$.

Let

$$w = \partial_t^2 u_\varepsilon.$$

It belongs to the space $L^\infty([0, T], H^1(\Omega)) \cap L^2([0, T], H^2(\Omega))$, and satisfies the following equation

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t w = \varepsilon \Delta w + u_\varepsilon \times \Delta w + 2\varepsilon \nabla w \cdot \nabla u_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon + \varepsilon |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 w + w \times \Delta u_\varepsilon + f(u_\varepsilon, v), \\ \frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu} |_{\partial \Omega} = 0, \\ w(x, 0) = W_2(u_0), \end{cases}$$

where

$$f(u_\varepsilon, v) = 4\varepsilon \nabla v \cdot \nabla u_\varepsilon v + 2\varepsilon |\nabla v|^2 u_\varepsilon + v \times \Delta v.$$

By taking w as a test function to Equation (3.3), we can derive the following

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int_{\Omega} |w|^2 dx + \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w|^2 dx &= \int_{\Omega} \langle u_\varepsilon \times \Delta w, w \rangle dx + \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \langle |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 w, w \rangle dx \\ &+ 2\varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \langle \nabla w \cdot \nabla u_\varepsilon u, w \rangle dx + \int_{\Omega} \langle f(u_\varepsilon, v), w \rangle dx \\ &= I + II + III + IV. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have applied Proposition 2.8 to give $\frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial \nu} |_{\partial \omega \times [0, T]} = 0$.

Next, we estimate the above I, II, III and IV term by term.

$$\begin{aligned} |I| &= \left| \int_{\Omega} \langle \operatorname{div}(u_\varepsilon \times \nabla w), w \rangle - \langle \nabla u \times \nabla w, w \rangle dx \right| \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_\varepsilon| |\nabla w| |w| dx \\ &\leq C \|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^3}^2 \int_{\Omega} |w|^2 + |\nabla w|^2 dx, \\ |II| &= \varepsilon \left| \int_{\Omega} \langle |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 w, w \rangle dx \right| \leq C \varepsilon \|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^3}^2 \int_{\Omega} |w|^2 dx, \\ |III| &= 2\varepsilon \left| \int_{\Omega} \langle \nabla w \cdot \nabla u_\varepsilon, w \rangle dx \right| \leq C \varepsilon \|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^3}^2 \int_{\Omega} |w|^2 + \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w|^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the fact

$$\int_{\Omega} \langle \operatorname{div}(u_\varepsilon \times \nabla w), w \rangle dx = - \int_{\Omega} \langle u_\varepsilon \times \nabla w, \nabla w \rangle dx = 0$$

and the Sobolev embedding inequality

$$|\nabla u_\varepsilon|_{L^\infty} \leq C \|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^3(\Omega)}.$$

For the last term, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |IV| &\leq 4\varepsilon \left| \int_{\Omega} \langle \nabla v \cdot \nabla u_\varepsilon v, w \rangle dx \right| + 2\varepsilon \left| \int_{\Omega} \langle |\nabla v|^2 u_\varepsilon, w \rangle dx \right| + \left| \int_{\Omega} \langle v \times \Delta v, w \rangle dx \right| \\ &= a + b + c \\ &\leq C \|v\|_{H^1}^2 (\varepsilon \|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^3}^2 + \|v\|_{H^2}^2) + C \|w\|_{H^1}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
|a| &\leq 4\varepsilon \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v| |\nabla u_{\varepsilon}| |v| |w| dx \\
&\leq C\varepsilon \|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^3} \|\nabla v\|_{L^2} \|v\|_{L^3} \|w\|_{L^6} \\
&\leq C\varepsilon \|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^3}^2 \|v\|_{H^1}^4 + \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \|w\|_{H^1}^2, \\
|b| &\leq \varepsilon \|\nabla v\|_{L^2} \|\nabla v\|_{L^3} \|w\|_{L^6} \\
&\leq C\varepsilon \|v\|_{H^1}^2 \|v\|_{H^2}^2 + \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \|w\|_{H^1}^2, \\
|c| &\leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v| |v| |\nabla w| dx \\
&\leq C \|v\|_{H^1}^2 \|v\|_{H^2}^2 + C \|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

In order to get the desired energy bounds, we need the following estimates on equivalent norms of $\|v\|_{H^2}$ and $\|v\|_{H^3}$.

Lemma 3.2. *Assume that u_{ε} is the solution of (2.7) obtained in Theorem 3.1, then there exists a constant C independent of ε such that for a.e. $t \in [0, T_0]$, the following estimates hold.*

$$(3.5) \quad \|v\|_{H^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq C \|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^3}^2 (\|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^3}^2 + 1) \|v\|_{H^1}^2 + C \int_{\Omega} |w|^2 dx,$$

$$(3.6) \quad \|v\|_{H^3(\Omega)}^2 \leq C (\|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^3}^2, \|v\|_{H^1}^2) (\|w\|_{H^1}^2 + 1).$$

Proof. By using Equation (2.7), we can see easily that

$$\Delta u_{\varepsilon} = -|\nabla u_{\varepsilon}|^2 u_{\varepsilon} + \frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon^2} (\varepsilon \partial_t u_{\varepsilon} - u_{\varepsilon} \times \partial_t u_{\varepsilon}).$$

This leads to

$$\Delta v = -|\nabla u_{\varepsilon}|^2 v - 2\nabla v \cdot \nabla u_{\varepsilon} u_{\varepsilon} + \frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon^2} (\varepsilon w - u_{\varepsilon} \times w).$$

Here, recall that we have denote $v = \partial_t u_{\varepsilon}$ and $w = \partial_t v$.

A direct computation shows

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Omega} |\Delta v|^2 dx &\leq C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^2 |\nabla u_{\varepsilon}|^2 dx + C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_{\varepsilon}|^4 |v|^2 dx + \frac{C}{1 + \varepsilon^2} \int_{\Omega} |w|^2 dx \\
&\leq C \|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^3}^2 (\|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^3}^2 + 1) \|v\|_{H^1}^2 + C \int_{\Omega} |w|^2 dx.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla \Delta v &= \nabla^2 v \# \nabla u_{\varepsilon} \# u_{\varepsilon} + \nabla v \# \nabla^2 u_{\varepsilon} \# u_{\varepsilon} + \nabla v \# \nabla u_{\varepsilon} \# \nabla u_{\varepsilon} + 2\nabla^2 u_{\varepsilon} \# \nabla u_{\varepsilon} \# v \\
&\quad + |\nabla u_{\varepsilon}|^2 \nabla v + \frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon^2} (\varepsilon \nabla w - \nabla u_{\varepsilon} \times w - u_{\varepsilon} \times \nabla w).
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \Delta v|^2 dx &\leq C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla^2 v|^2 |\nabla u_{\varepsilon}|^2 dx + C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^2 |\nabla^2 u_{\varepsilon}|^2 dx + C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla^2 u_{\varepsilon}|^2 |\nabla u_{\varepsilon}|^2 |v|^2 dx \\
&\quad + C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^2 |\nabla u_{\varepsilon}|^4 dx + \frac{C}{1 + \varepsilon^2} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w|^2 dx + \frac{C}{(1 + \varepsilon^2)^2} \int_{\Omega} |w|^2 |\nabla u_{\varepsilon}|^2 dx \\
&\leq C \|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^3}^2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla^2 v|^2 dx + C \|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^3}^2 \|v\|_{H^2}^2 + C \|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^3}^4 \|v\|_{H^1}^2 \\
&\quad + C \|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^3}^4 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^2 dx + C(1 + \|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^3}^2) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w|^2 + |w|^2 dx \\
&\leq C(\|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^3}^2 + \|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^3}^4) \|v\|_{H^2}^2 + C(1 + \|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^3}^2) \|w\|_{H^1}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

This is the L^2 -estimate of $\nabla \Delta v$. By taking consideration of the fact $\frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu}|_{\Omega} = 0$, Lemma 2.1 implies the desired results in this lemma. \square

Therefore, by combining the above estimates of $I - IV$ with the above formula (3.4), and applying Lemma 3.2, we have that for any $0 < t \leq T_0$

$$(3.7) \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int_{\Omega} |w|^2 dx + \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w|^2 dx \leq C \left(\sup_{0 < t \leq T_0} \|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^3} \right) \left(\int_{\Omega} (|w|^2 + |\nabla w|^2) dx + 1 \right).$$

3.2. Uniform H^3 -estimates.

In this subsection, we are intend to showing an uniform H^3 -estimate of $v = \partial_t u_{\varepsilon}$. By a similar argument as that in the above subsection, we choose $-\Delta w$ as a test function to (3.3). However, it seems that it is difficult to get desired energy estimates directly, since the lower regularity of w , and hence integration by parts do not make sense.

To proceed, we need to improve the regularity of w by applying the L^2 -estimates of parabolic equation as follows. We know that $w \in L^{\infty}([0, T], H^1(\Omega)) \cap L^2([0, T], H^2(\Omega))$ with $0 < T < T_{\varepsilon}$ and satisfies the following equation

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t w = \varepsilon \Delta w + u_{\varepsilon} \times \Delta w + \tilde{f}, \\ \frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu}|_{\partial \Omega} = 0, \\ w(x, 0) = W_2(u_0), \end{cases}$$

where

$$\tilde{f} = 2\varepsilon \nabla w \cdot \nabla u_{\varepsilon} u_{\varepsilon} + \varepsilon |\nabla u_{\varepsilon}|^2 w + w \times \Delta u_{\varepsilon} + f(u_{\varepsilon}, v).$$

It is not difficult to show

$$\tilde{f} \in L^2([0, T], H^1(\Omega)).$$

Hence, the classical L^2 -estimates of parabolic equation (to see Theorem A.1 in [15]) tells us that

$$w \in L_{loc}^2((0, T], H^3(\Omega))$$

and

$$\frac{\partial w}{\partial t} \in L_{loc}^2((0, T], H^1(\Omega)),$$

which guarantee integration by parts in the following process of energy estimates make sense.

By taking Δw as a test function of (3.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w|^2 + \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} |\Delta w|^2 dx \\
&= - \int_{\Omega} \langle w \times \Delta u_{\varepsilon}, \Delta w \rangle dx - \int_{\Omega} \langle v \times \Delta v, \Delta w \rangle dx \\
(3.9) \quad & - \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \langle |\nabla u_{\varepsilon}|^2 w, \Delta w \rangle dx - 2\varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \langle \nabla w, \nabla u_{\varepsilon} \rangle \langle u_{\varepsilon}, \Delta w \rangle dx \\
& - 4\varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \langle \nabla v, \nabla u_{\varepsilon} \rangle \langle v, \Delta w \rangle dx - 2\varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \langle |\nabla v|^2 u_{\varepsilon}, \Delta w \rangle dx \\
&= I^* + II^* + III^* + IV^* + V^* + VI^*.
\end{aligned}$$

To proceed, we estimate the above six terms in (3.9) step by steps as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
|I^*| &= \left| \int_{\Omega} \langle w \times \nabla \Delta u_{\varepsilon}, \nabla w \rangle dx \right| \\
&\leq \|\nabla w\|_{L^2} \|w\|_{L^6} \|\nabla \Delta u_{\varepsilon}\|_{L^3} \\
&\leq C \|w\|_{H^1}^2 \|\nabla \Delta u_{\varepsilon}\|_{L^3} \\
&\leq C (\|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^3}) (1 + \|v\|_{H^2}) \|w\|_{H^1}^2 \\
&\leq C \|w\|_{H^1}^2 (1 + \|w\|_{L^2}).
\end{aligned}$$

Here, we have used the following formula

$$\Delta u_{\varepsilon} = \frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon^2} (\varepsilon v - u_{\varepsilon} \times v) - |\nabla u_{\varepsilon}|^2 u_{\varepsilon},$$

to show

$$\|\nabla \Delta u_{\varepsilon}\|_{L^3} \leq C (\|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^3}) (1 + \|v\|_{W^{1,3}}).$$

$$\begin{aligned}
|II^*| &= \left| \int_{\Omega} \langle \nabla v \times \Delta v, \nabla w \rangle dx + \int_{\Omega} \langle v \times \nabla \Delta v, \nabla w \rangle dx \right| \\
&\leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^2 |\Delta v|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega} |v|^2 |\nabla \Delta v|^2 dx \\
&\leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w|^2 dx + C \|v\|_{H^2}^2 \|v\|_{H^3}^2 \\
&\leq C (1 + \|w\|_{H^1}^2) (1 + \|w\|_{L^2}^2), \\
|III^*| &= \varepsilon \left| \int_{\Omega} \langle |\nabla u_{\varepsilon}|^2 w, \Delta w \rangle dx \right| \leq C \varepsilon \|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^2}^4 \int_{\Omega} |w|^2 dx + \frac{\varepsilon}{8} \int_{\Omega} |\Delta w|^2 dx, \\
|IV^*| &= 2\varepsilon \left| \int_{\Omega} \langle \nabla w, \nabla u_{\varepsilon} \rangle \langle u_{\varepsilon}, \Delta w \rangle dx \right| \leq C \varepsilon \|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^2}^2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w|^2 dx + \frac{\varepsilon}{8} \int_{\Omega} |\Delta w|^2 dx, \\
|V^*| &= 4\varepsilon \left| \int_{\Omega} \langle \nabla v, \nabla u_{\varepsilon} \rangle \langle v, \Delta w \rangle dx \right| \leq \varepsilon C (\|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^2}^2) \left(\int_{\Omega} |w|^2 dx + 1 \right) + \frac{\varepsilon}{8} \int_{\Omega} |\Delta w|^2 dx, \\
|VI^*| &= 2\varepsilon \left| \int_{\Omega} \langle |\nabla v|^2 u_{\varepsilon}, \Delta w \rangle dx \right| \leq C \varepsilon \|v\|_{H^1}^2 (1 + \|w\|_{H^1}^2) + \frac{\varepsilon}{8} \int_{\Omega} |\Delta w|^2 dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, for any $0 < t \leq T_0$ we have

$$(3.10) \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w|^2 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \int_{\Omega} |\Delta w|^2 dx \leq C \left(\sup_{0 < t \leq T_0} \|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^3} \right) (1 + \|w\|_{H^1}^2) (1 + \|w\|_{L^2}^2).$$

By combining inequalities (3.7) with (3.10), the classical comparison theorem of ODE (i.e. Corollary 2.3) implies the following H^1 -estimates of w , and hence we can get the uniform H^5 -estimates of u_ε by applying Equation (2.7) again.

Proposition 3.3. *There exist a constant C and T_1 depending only on $\|u_0\|_{H^5}$ such that the solution u_ε to (2.7) obtained in Theorem 3.1 satisfies the following uniform bounds*

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq T_1} \|\partial_t^i u_\varepsilon\|_{H^{5-2i}(\Omega)}^2 \leq C$$

for $i = 0, 1, 2$.

Proof. Let $y(t) = \|w\|_{H^1}^2$. Since u_ε is a solution to (2.7) in Theorem 3.1, we have

$$w \in L^\infty([0, T], H^1(\Omega)) \cap L^2([0, T], H^2(\Omega))$$

and

$$\frac{\partial w}{\partial t} \in L^2([0, T], L^2(\Omega))$$

by using Equation (3.3). Hence, Lemma 2.5 implies

$$w \in C^0([0, T], H^1(\Omega))$$

for any $0 < T \leq T_0$, which follows $y(t)$ is a continuous function on $[0, T_0]$.

On the other hand, the inequalities (3.7) and (3.10) tell us that y satisfies the following differential inequality

$$\begin{cases} y'(t) \leq C(1 + y)^2, \\ y(0) = \|w\|_{H^1}^2|_{t=0} = \|W_2\|_{H^1}^2. \end{cases}$$

Let $T > 0$ be the maximal existence time of solution to the below ODE

$$\begin{cases} z'(t) = C(1 + z)^2, \\ z(0) = \|W_2\|_{H^1}^2. \end{cases}$$

Then, by applying Corollary 2.3, we have

$$y(t) \leq z(t) \leq z(T) = C(\|W_2\|_{H^1})$$

for $0 < t < \min\{T_0, T\}$.

To end the proof of the proposition, it remains to estimate $\|W_2\|_{H^1}$. Since

$$W_2(u_0) = \partial_t^2 u_\varepsilon|_{t=0},$$

it is not difficult to show

$$\|W_2\|_{H^1} \leq C(\|u_0\|_{H^5}).$$

Therefore, by setting $T_1 = \min\{T_0, T\}$, we have

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq T_1} \|w\|_{H^1}^2 \leq C.$$

Consequently, Lemma (3.2) implies

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq T_1} \|v\|_{H^3}^2 \leq C,$$

and hence we have

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq T_1} \|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^5}^2 \leq C,$$

by using Equation (2.2) again and applying the L^2 -estimates of elliptic equation. \square

With the above proposition 3.3 at hand, we are in position to provide the proof of Theorem 1.1 by taking an argument of convergence.

The proof of Theorem 1.1. Proposition 3.3 tells us that there exists a number $T_1 > 0$ independent of ε such that u_ε has the following uniform estimate with respect to ε

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq T_1} \|\partial_t^i u_\varepsilon\|_{H^{5-2i}(\Omega)}^2 \leq C$$

for $i = 0, 1, 2$.

Without loss of generality, we assume that there exists a map in $u \in L^\infty([0, T_1], H^5(\Omega))$ such that

$$u_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup u \quad \text{weakly* in } u \in L^\infty([0, T_1], H^5(\Omega)),$$

and

$$\frac{\partial u_\varepsilon}{\partial t} \rightharpoonup \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \quad \text{weakly in } L^2([0, T_1], H^3(\Omega)).$$

Let $X = H^5(\Omega)$, $B = H^4(\Omega)$ and $Y = L^2(\Omega)$. Then Lemma 2.4 implies

$$u_\varepsilon \rightarrow u \quad \text{strongly in } L^\infty([0, T_1], H^4(\Omega)),$$

and hence, we have

$$u_\varepsilon \rightarrow u \quad \text{a.e. } (x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T_1].$$

On the other hand, since u_ε is a strong solution to (2.7), there holds

$$\int_0^{T_1} \int_\Omega \left\langle \frac{\partial u_\varepsilon}{\partial t}, \phi \right\rangle dx dt - \varepsilon \int_0^{T_1} \int_\Omega \langle \Delta u_\varepsilon + |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 u_\varepsilon, \phi \rangle dx dt = \int_0^{T_1} \int_\Omega \langle u_\varepsilon \times \Delta u_\varepsilon, \phi \rangle dx dt,$$

for all $\phi \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, T_1])$.

By using the above convergence results of u_ε , it is direct to show u is a strong solution to (1.3) by letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Moreover, the lower semi-continuity of weak convergence implies

$$\partial_t^i u \in L^\infty([0, T_1], H^{5-2i}(\Omega)),$$

for $i = 0, 1, 2$.

To complete the proof, we still need to check that u satisfies the Neumann boundary condition, that is that we need to verify $\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}|_{\partial\Omega \times [0, T_0]} = 0$. Since for any $\xi \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, T_1])$, there holds

$$\int_0^{T_1} \int_\Omega \langle \Delta u_\varepsilon, \xi \rangle dx dt = - \int_0^{T_1} \int_\Omega \langle \nabla u_\varepsilon, \nabla \xi \rangle dx dt.$$

Let $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\int_0^{T_1} \int_\Omega \langle \Delta u, \xi \rangle dx dt = - \int_0^{T_1} \int_\Omega \langle \nabla u, \nabla \xi \rangle dx dt,$$

that is just

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}|_{\partial\Omega \times [0, T_1]} = 0.$$

□

4. VERY REGULAR SOLUTION

In this section, we adopt the method of induction to show the existence of very regular solution to (1.3) by proving the following theorem, namely the previous Theorem 1.2.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose that $u_0 \in H^{2k+1}(\Omega, \mathbb{S}^2)$ with $k \geq 2$, which satisfies the $(k-1)$ -order compatibility conditions defined by (2.6). Let u and $T_1 > 0$ be the same as that in Theorem 1.1. Then for any $0 \leq i \leq k$, we have*

$$\partial_t^i u \in L^\infty([0, T_1], H^{2k+1-2i}(\Omega)).$$

Recall that the existence of very regular solution u_ε to the parabolic perturbed equation (2.7) of Equation (1.3) has been showed in [12] as the below theorem(also see authors' work [14]).

Theorem 4.2. *Suppose that $u_0 \in H^{2k+1}(\Omega, \mathbb{S}^2)$ with $k \geq 2$, which satisfies the $(k-1)$ -order compatibility condition defined in (2.6). Let u_ε and $T_\varepsilon > 0$ be the same as that in Theorem 3.1. Then, for $0 \leq i \leq k$ and $0 < T < T_\varepsilon$ there holds true*

$$\partial_t^i u \in L^\infty([0, T], H^{2k+1-2i}(\Omega)) \cap L^2([0, T], H^{2k+2-2i}(\Omega)).$$

In the next context, we shall get higher order uniform energy estimates of u_ε and then take $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ to prove Theorem 4.1. To this end, we use the method of induction on k to show higher order uniform energy estimates of u_ε by considering the equation of

$$w_k = \partial_t^k u_\varepsilon$$

with matching initial-boundary data. Namely, we will prove the following Proposition.

Proposition 4.3. *Under the same assumption as in the above theorem 4.2, then for $0 \leq i \leq k$, there exists a positive constant C_i depending only on $\|u_0\|_{H^{2k+1}(\Omega)}$ such that*

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq T_1} \|w_i\|_{H^{2k+1-2i}(\Omega)} \leq C_i.$$

In fact, one can see easily that, in the previous subsection, the conclusions in Proposition 4.3 have been shown for $k = 2$.

Next, suppose that the estimates in Proposition 4.3 are already established for $k-1 \geq 2$, then we want to prove that the conclusions are also true in the case of k . For any $k \geq 3$, Theorem 4.2 shows that $w_k \in L^\infty([0, T], H^1(\Omega)) \cap L^2([0, T], H^2(\Omega))$, satisfying the following equation

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t w_k = \varepsilon \Delta w_k + u_\varepsilon \times \Delta w_k + K_k(\nabla w_k) + L_k(w_k) + F_k(u_\varepsilon) & (x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T_\varepsilon], \\ \frac{\partial w_k}{\partial \nu} = 0 & (x, t) \in \partial\Omega \times [0, T_\varepsilon], \\ w(x, 0) = W_k(u_0) & x \in \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Here

$$\begin{aligned} K_k(\nabla w_k) &= 2\varepsilon \nabla w_k \cdot \nabla u_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon, \\ L_k(w_k) &= \varepsilon |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 w_k + w_k \times \Delta u_\varepsilon, \\ F_k(u_\varepsilon) &= \sum_{i+j+l=k, 0 \leq i, j, l < k} \nabla w_i \# \nabla w_j \# w_l + \sum_{i+j=k, 0 \leq i, j < k} C_k^i w_i \times \Delta w_j, \end{aligned}$$

$W_k(u_0)$ is defined in Remark (2.7), and $\#$ denotes the linear contraction.

On the other hand, the assumption of induction shows that for any $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$ there exists a constant $C(i, \|u_0\|_{H^{2k-1}})$, which does not depend on ε , such that

$$(4.2) \quad \sup_{0 < t \leq T_1} \|w_i\|_{H^{2(k-i-1)+1}} \leq C(i, \|u_0\|_{H^{2k-1}}).$$

Next, we will adopt a similar procedure as in section 3 for $w_2 = \partial_t^2 u_\varepsilon$ to get the uniform H^1 -estimates of w_k .

4.1. Estimates of equivalent norms. For later application, we need to establish some lemmas on Sobolev space and the equivalent norms of the energy which we try to estimate. First of all, let us recall the following

Lemma 4.4. *Let Ω be a smooth bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^3 , $n \geq 0$ and $m \geq 2$. Suppose $f \in H^n(\Omega)$ (and we also denote $H^0(\Omega) = L^2(\Omega)$) and $g \in H^m(\Omega)$, then $fg \in H^l(\Omega)$ with $l = \min\{n, m\}$. Moreover, there exists a constant $C(\|f\|_{H^n}, \|g\|_{H^m})$ such that we have*

$$\|fg\|_{H^l(\Omega)} \leq C(\|f\|_{H^n}, \|g\|_{H^m}).$$

Its proof of the lemma can be founded in [12].

Lemma 4.5. *Assume u_ε is the solution of (2.7) established in Theorem 4.2, then there exists constants C_k independent of ε such that*

$$(4.3) \quad \|w_{k-1}\|_{H^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq C_k (\|u_0\|_{H^{2(k-1)+1}}^2) + 2 \int_{\Omega} |w_k|^2 dx,$$

$$(4.4) \quad \|w_{k-1}\|_{H^3(\Omega)}^2 \leq C_k (\|u_0\|_{H^{2(k-1)+1}}^2) (\|w_k\|_{H^1}^2 + 1),$$

for a.e. $t \in [0, T_1]$.

Proof. Our proof is divided into two steps.

Step 1: H^2 -estimates of w_{k-1} .

By using Equation (2.7), we have

$$\Delta u_\varepsilon = \frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon^2} (\varepsilon w_1 - u_\varepsilon \times w_1) - |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 u_\varepsilon.$$

Then, a direct calculation shows

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta w_i &= \frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon^2} (\varepsilon w_{i+1} - u_\varepsilon \times w_{i+1} - w_i \times w_1) - 2 \nabla w_i \# \nabla u_\varepsilon \# u_\varepsilon - |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 w_i \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon^2} \sum_{l+s=i, l, s < i} C_i^l w_l \times w_{s+1} - \sum_{l+s+m=i, l, s, m < i} \nabla w_l \# \nabla w_s \# w_m, \end{aligned}$$

where $0 \leq i \leq k-1$. And hence, by taking $i = k-1$, it follows

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |\Delta w_{k-1}|^2 dx &\leq 2 \int_{\Omega} |w_k|^2 dx + C \int_{\Omega} |w_{k-1}|^2 |w_1|^2 dx + C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_{k-1}|^2 |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 dx \\ &\quad + C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^4 |w_{k-1}|^2 dx + C \sum_{l+s=k-1, l, s < k-1} \int_{\Omega} |w_l|^2 |w_{s+1}|^2 dx \\ (4.5) \quad &\quad + C \sum_{l+s+m=k-1, l, s, m < k-1} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_l|^2 |\nabla w_s|^2 |w_m|^2 dx \\ &= 2 \int_{\Omega} |w_k|^2 dx + I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4 + I_5. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we estimate the last five terms on the right hand side of the above formula (4.5) term by term.

$$\begin{aligned} |I_1| &= C \int_{\Omega} |w_{k-1}|^2 |w_1|^2 dx \\ &\leq C \|w_{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2 \|w_1\|_{H^2}^2 \leq C (\|u_0\|_{H^{2k-1}(\Omega)}), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} |I_2| &= C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_{k-1}|^2 |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 dx \\ &\leq C \|\nabla w_{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla u_\varepsilon\|_{H^2}^2 \leq C (\|u_0\|_{H^{2k-1}(\Omega)}), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} |I_3| &= C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^4 |w_{k-1}|^2 dx \\ &\leq C \|w_{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla u_\varepsilon\|_{H^2}^4 \leq C (\|u_0\|_{H^{2k-1}(\Omega)}), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_4| &= \sum_{l+s=k-1, l, s < k-1} \int_{\Omega} |w_l|^2 |w_{s+1}|^2 dx \\
&\leq \sum_{l+s=k-1, l, s < k-1} \|w_l\|_{H^1}^2 \|w_{s+1}\|_{H^1}^2 \leq C(\|u_0\|_{H^{2k-1}}(\Omega)),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_5| &= C \sum_{l+s+m=k-1, l, s, m < k-1} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_l|^2 |\nabla w_s|^2 |w_m|^2 dx \\
&\leq C \sum_{l+s+m=k-1, l, s, m < k-1} \|w_l\|_{H^2}^2 \|w_s\|_{H^2}^2 \|w_m\|_{L^\infty}^2 \leq C(\|u_0\|_{H^{2k-1}}(\Omega)).
\end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the estimates (4.2) obtained by the assumption of induction and Lemma 4.4.

Therefore, plugging the above inequalities I_1 - I_5 into formula (4.5), we get the estimate (4.2) by applying Lemma 2.1, since $\frac{\partial w_{k-1}}{\partial \nu}|_{\Omega} = 0$ which are implied by Proposition 2.8.

Step 2: H^3 -estimates of w_{k-1} .

On the other hand, a simple calculation shows

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.6) \quad \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \Delta w_{k-1}|^2 dx &\leq C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_k|^2 dx + C \int_{\Omega} |w_k|^2 |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 dx + C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_{k-1}|^2 |w_1|^2 dx \\
&\quad + C \int_{\Omega} |w_{k-1}|^2 |\nabla w_1|^2 dx + C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla^2 w_{k-1}|^2 |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 dx \\
&\quad + C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_{k-1}|^2 |\nabla^2 u_\varepsilon|^2 dx + C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^4 |\nabla w_{k-1}|^2 dx \\
&\quad + C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla^2 u_\varepsilon|^2 |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 |\nabla w_{k-1}|^2 dx \\
&\quad + C \sum_{l+s=k-1, l, s < k-1} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(w_l \# w_{s+1})|^2 dx \\
&\quad + C \sum_{l+s+m=k-1, l, s, m < k-1} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(\nabla w_l \# \nabla w_s \# w_m)|^2 dx \\
&= C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_k|^2 dx + M_1 + M_2 + M_3 \\
&\quad + M_4 + M_5 + M_6 + M_7 + M_8 + M_9.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, again by applying the estimates (4.2), we can show

$$\begin{aligned}
M_1 &= C \int_{\Omega} |w_k|^2 |\nabla u_{\varepsilon}|^2 dx \leq C \|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^3}^2 \int_{\Omega} |w_k|^2 dx \leq C (\|u_0\|_{H^{2k-1}}(\Omega)) \int_{\Omega} |w_k|^2 dx, \\
M_2 &= C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_{k-1}|^2 |w_1|^2 dx \leq \|w_{k-1}\|_{H^1}^2 \|w_1\|_{H^2}^2 \leq C (\|u_0\|_{H^{2k-1}}(\Omega)), \\
M_3 &= C \int_{\Omega} |w_{k-1}|^2 |\nabla w_1|^2 dx \leq \|w_{k-1}\|_{H^1}^2 \|w_1\|_{H^2}^2 \leq C (\|u_0\|_{H^{2k-1}}(\Omega)), \\
M_4 &= C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla^2 w_{k-1}|^2 |\nabla u_{\varepsilon}|^2 dx \leq C \|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^3}^2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla^2 w_{k-1}|^2 dx, \\
&\leq C (\|u_0\|_{H^{2k-1}}(\Omega)) (1 + \int_{\Omega} |w_k|^2 dx), \\
M_5 &= C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_{k-1}|^2 |\nabla^2 u_{\varepsilon}|^2 dx \leq C \|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^4}^2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_{k-1}|^2 dx \leq C (\int_{\Omega} |w_k|^2 dx), \\
M_6 &= C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_{\varepsilon}|^4 |\nabla w_{k-1}|^2 dx \leq C \|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^3}^4 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_{k-1}|^2 dx \leq C (\int_{\Omega} |w_k|^2 dx), \\
M_7 &= C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla^2 u_{\varepsilon}|^2 |\nabla u_{\varepsilon}|^2 |\nabla w_{k-1}|^2 dx \leq C \|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^3}^2 \|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^4}^2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_{k-1}|^2 dx \leq C (\int_{\Omega} |w_k|^2 dx),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
M_8 &\leq C \sum_{l+s=k-1, l, s < k-1} \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla w_l|^2 |w_{s+1}|^2 + |w_l|^2 |\nabla w_{s+1}|^2) dx \\
&\leq C \sum_{l+s=k-1, l, s < k-1} \|\nabla w_l\|_{H^1}^2 \|w_{s+1}\|_{H^1}^2 \\
&\quad + C \sum_{l+s=k-1, l, s < k-1} \|w_l\|_{H^2}^2 \|\nabla w_{s+1}\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\leq C (\|u_0\|_{H^{2k-1}}(\Omega)),
\end{aligned}$$

since $2(k-l-1)+1 \geq 3$ and $2(k-(s+1)-1)+1 \geq 1$ for $l, s < k-1$. Similarly, we can also show

$$M_9 \leq C (\|u_0\|_{H^{2k-1}}(\Omega)).$$

Then, by substituting the estimates on M_1 - M_9 into the above inequality (4.6), we have

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \Delta w_{k-1}|^2 dx \leq C (\|u_0\|_{H^{2k-1}}(\Omega)) (\|w_k\|_{H^1}^2 + 1).$$

Therefore, we can use Lemma 2.1 to get the desire result (4.3). \square

With Lemma 4.5 at hand, it is not difficult to show the following estimate of the nonhomogeneous term F_k .

Lemma 4.6. *Under the assumption of induction (namely Theorem 2.3 holds for $k-1 \geq 2$), then there exists a constant C_k independent of ε , such that we have*

$$\sup_{0 < t < T_1} \int_{\Omega} |F_k|^2 dx \leq C_k (1 + \int_{\Omega} |w_k|^2 dx).$$

Proof. A direct computation shows

$$\begin{aligned}
F_k(u_\varepsilon) &= \sum_{i+j+l=k, 0 \leq i, j, l < k} \nabla w_i \# \nabla w_j \# w_l + \sum_{i+j=k, 0 \leq i, j < k} C_k^i w_i \times \Delta w_j \\
&= \nabla w_{k-1} \# \nabla w_1 \# u_\varepsilon + \nabla w_{k-1} \# \nabla u_\varepsilon \# w_1 + \nabla w_1 \# \nabla u_\varepsilon \# w_{k-1} \\
&\quad + k(w_{k-1} \times \Delta w_1 + w_1 \times \Delta w_{k-1}) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i+j+l=k, 0 \leq i, j, l < k-1} \nabla w_i \# \nabla w_j \# w_l + \sum_{i+j=k, 0 \leq i, j < k-1} C_k^i w_i \times \Delta w_j \\
&= \nabla w_{k-1} \# \nabla w_1 \# u_\varepsilon + \nabla w_{k-1} \# \nabla u_\varepsilon \# w_1 + \nabla w_1 \# \nabla u_\varepsilon \# w_{k-1} \\
&\quad + k(w_{k-1} \times \Delta w_1 + w_1 \times \Delta w_{k-1}) + \tilde{F}_k(u_\varepsilon) \\
&= I_1^* + I_2^* + I_3^* + I_4^* + I_5^* + \tilde{F}_k(u_\varepsilon).
\end{aligned}$$

Then, by applying the estimates (4.2) obtained by the assumption of induction and using Hölder inequality, we can estimate the six terms on the right hand side of the above identity as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Omega} |I_1^*|^2 dx &\leq C \|w_{k-1}\|_{H^1}^2 \|w_1\|_{H^3}^2 \leq C(\|u_0\|_{H^{2k-1}}), \\
\int_{\Omega} |I_2^*|^2 dx &\leq C \|w_{k-1}\|_{H^1}^2 \|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^3}^2 \|w_1\|_{H^2}^2 \leq C(\|u_0\|_{H^{2k-1}}), \\
\int_{\Omega} |I_3^*|^2 dx &\leq C \|w_{k-1}\|_{H^1}^2 \|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^3}^2 \|w_1\|_{H^2}^2 \leq C(\|u_0\|_{H^{2k-1}}), \\
\int_{\Omega} |I_4^*|^2 dx &\leq C \|w_{k-1}\|_{H^1}^2 \|w_1\|_{H^3}^2 \leq C(\|u_0\|_{H^{2k-1}}), \\
\int_{\Omega} |I_5^*|^2 dx &\leq C \|w_{k-1}\|_{H^2}^2 \|w_1\|_{H^3}^2 \leq C(\|u_0\|_{H^{2k-1}}) \left(1 + \int_{\Omega} |w_k|^2 dx\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Then it remains to estimate the L^2 -norm of $\tilde{F}(u_\varepsilon)$. For $s, l, j < k-1$, by using Lemma 4.4, we have

$$\|\nabla w_s \# \nabla w_l \# w_j\|_{H^3(\Omega)} \leq C(\|u_0\|_{H^{2k-1}}(\Omega)).$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\|\Delta w_j\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C \|w_j\|_{H^3} \leq C(\|u_0\|_{H^{2k-1}}(\Omega))$$

for $j < k-1$. Then, again Lemma 4.4 yields

$$\|\nabla w_l \# \Delta w_j\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C(\|u_0\|_{H^{2k-1}}(\Omega)).$$

Namely, we have

$$\|\tilde{F}_k(u_\varepsilon)\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C(\|u_0\|_{H^{2k-1}}(\Omega)).$$

Therefore, we can easily get the desired estimates from the estimates on $I_1^* - I_5^*$ and the above estimate of $\tilde{F}(u_\varepsilon)$. \square

4.2. Uniform L^2 -estimate of w_k .

Now, we intend to show an uniform L^2 -estimate of w_k by direct energy estimates. By taking w_k as a test function of (4.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.7) \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int_{\Omega} |w_k|^2 dx + \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} |\Delta w_k|^2 dx &= \int_{\Omega} \langle u_\varepsilon \times \Delta w_k, w_k \rangle dx + \int_{\Omega} \langle K_k(\nabla w_k), w_k \rangle dx \\
&\quad + \int_{\Omega} \langle L_k(w_k), w_k \rangle dx + \int_{\Omega} \langle F_k(u_\varepsilon), w_k \rangle dx \\
&= J_1 + J_2 + J_3 + J_4.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we can estimate the four terms on the right hand side of the above inequality 4.7 as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
|J_1| &\leq \left| \int_{\Omega} \langle u_{\varepsilon} \times \Delta w_k, w_k \rangle dx \right| \leq C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_{\varepsilon}| |\nabla w_k| |w_k| dx, \\
&\leq C \|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^3} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_k|^2 + |w_k|^2 dx, \\
|J_2| &\leq 2\varepsilon \left| \int_{\Omega} \langle \nabla w_k \cdot \nabla u_{\varepsilon} u_{\varepsilon}, w_k \rangle dx \right| \leq C\varepsilon \|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^3}^2 \int_{\Omega} |w_k|^2 dx + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_k|^2 dx, \\
|J_3| &= \left| \int_{\Omega} \langle L_k(w_k), w_k \rangle dx \right| \leq \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_{\varepsilon}| |w_k|^2 dx \leq C\varepsilon \|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^3}^2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_k|^2 dx.
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
|J_4| &\leq C \int_{\Omega} |F_k(u_{\varepsilon})| |w_k| dx \\
&\leq C \int_{\Omega} |F_k(u_{\varepsilon})|^2 dx + C \int_{\Omega} |w_k|^2 dx \\
&\leq C(\|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^{2k-1}}(\Omega)) + C \int_{\Omega} |w_k|^2 dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by substituting the above estimates J_1 - J_4 into the inequality (4.7), we have

$$(4.8) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int_{\Omega} |w_k|^2 dx + \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} |\Delta w_k|^2 dx \leq C(\|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{H^{2k-1}}(\Omega)) \left(1 + \int_{\Omega} (|w_k|^2 + |\nabla w_k|^2) dx \right),$$

where the constant C does not depend on ε .

4.3. Uniform H^1 -estimate of w_k . To get a uniform bound of H^1 -norm of w_k with respect to ε , we should enhance the regularity of w_k to guarantee that integration by parts makes sense during the process of energy estimates. By Theorem 4.2, we know

$$w_k \in L^{\infty}([0, T], H^1(\Omega)) \cap L^2([0, T], H^2(\Omega)),$$

which satisfies the following equation

$$(4.9) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t w_k = \varepsilon \Delta w_k + u_{\varepsilon} \times \Delta w_k + f_k, \\ \frac{\partial w_k}{\partial \nu} |_{\partial \Omega} = 0, \\ w(x, 0) = W_k, \end{cases}$$

where

$$f_k = K_k(\nabla w_k) + L_k(w_k) + F_k(u_{\varepsilon}).$$

Since we have shown

$$F_k(u_{\varepsilon}) \in L^2([0, T], H^2(\Omega))$$

in Proposition 4.4 of [14], it is not difficult to get

$$f_k \in L^2([0, T], H^1(\Omega)),$$

for any $0 < T < T_{\varepsilon}$.

Hence, the classical L^2 -estimates of parabolic equation (to see Theorem A.1 in [15]) tells us that

$$w_k \in L^2_{loc}((0, T], H^3(\Omega))$$

and

$$\frac{\partial w_k}{\partial t} \in L^2_{loc}((0, T], H^1(\Omega)),$$

which guarantee integration by parts in the following process of energy estimates makes sense. By choosing Δw_k as a test function of (4.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.10) \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_k|^2 dx + \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} |\Delta w_k|^2 dx &= - \int_{\Omega} \langle K_k(\nabla w_k), \Delta w_k \rangle dx - \int_{\Omega} \langle L_k(w_k), \Delta w_k \rangle dx \\
&\quad - \int_{\Omega} \langle F_k(u_\varepsilon), \Delta w_k \rangle dx \\
&= J_1^* + J_2^* + J_3^* + J_4^*.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we estimate the four terms on the right hand side of the above inequality 4.10 step by steps.

$$\begin{aligned}
|J_1^*| &= \left| \int_{\Omega} \langle K_k(\nabla w_k), \Delta w_k \rangle dx \right| \\
&\leq 2\varepsilon \left| \int_{\Omega} \langle \nabla w_k \cdot \nabla u_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon, \Delta w_k \rangle dx \right| \\
&\leq C\varepsilon \|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^3}^2 \int_{\Omega} |w_k|^2 dx + \frac{\varepsilon}{8} \int_{\Omega} |\Delta w_k|^2 dx. \\
|J_2^*| &= \left| \int_{\Omega} \langle L_k(w_k), \Delta w_k \rangle dx \right| \\
&\leq \varepsilon \left| \int_{\Omega} \langle |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 w_k, \Delta w_k \rangle dx \right| + \left| \int_{\Omega} \langle w_k \times \nabla \Delta u_\varepsilon, \nabla w_k \rangle dx \right| \\
&\leq C\varepsilon \|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^3}^4 \int_{\Omega} |w_k|^2 dx + \frac{\varepsilon}{8} \int_{\Omega} |\Delta w_k|^2 dx \\
&\quad + \|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^5}^2 \int_{\Omega} |w_k|^2 dx + C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_k|^2 dx. \\
|J_3^*| &= \varepsilon \left| \int_{\Omega} \left\langle \sum_{i+j+l=k, 0 \leq i, j, l < k} \nabla w_i \# \nabla w_j \# w_l, \Delta w_k \right\rangle dx \right| \\
&\leq C \sum_{i+j+l=k, 0 \leq i, j, l < k} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_i|^2 |\nabla w_j|^2 |w_l|^2 dx + \frac{\varepsilon}{8} \int_{\Omega} |\Delta w_k|^2 dx \\
&\leq C(\|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^{2k-1}}(\Omega)) + \frac{\varepsilon}{8} \int_{\Omega} |\Delta w_k|^2 dx.
\end{aligned}$$

For the last term IV , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|J_4^*| &= C \left| \int_{\Omega} \sum_{i+j=k, 0 \leq i, j < k} \langle w_i \times \Delta w_j, \Delta w_k \rangle dx \right| \\
&\leq C \sum_{i+j=k, 0 \leq i, j < k} \left| \int_{\Omega} \langle \nabla w_i \times \Delta w_j, \nabla w_k \rangle dx \right| \\
&\quad + C \sum_{i+j=k, 0 \leq i, j < k} \left| \int_{\Omega} \langle w_i \times \nabla \Delta w_j, \nabla w_k \rangle dx \right| \\
&= C(a^* + b^*).
\end{aligned}$$

Here,

$$\begin{aligned}
a^* &= \left| \int_{\Omega} \langle \nabla w_{k-1} \times \Delta w_1, \nabla w_k \rangle dx \right| + \left| \int_{\Omega} \langle \nabla w_1 \times \Delta w_{k-1}, \nabla w_k \rangle dx \right| \\
&\quad + \sum_{i+j=k, 0 \leq i, j < k-1} \left| \int_{\Omega} \langle \nabla w_i \times \Delta w_j, \nabla w_k \rangle dx \right| \\
&\leq \|\nabla w_{k-1}\|_{L^6} \|\Delta w_1\|_{L^3} \|\nabla w_k\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla w_1\|_{L^\infty} \|\Delta w_{k-1}\|_{L^2} \|\nabla w_k\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad + \sum_{i+j=k, 0 \leq i, j < k-1} \|\nabla w_i\|_{L^6} \|\Delta w_j\|_{L^3} \|\nabla w_k\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq C \|w_1\|_{H^3}^2 \|w_{k-1}\|_{H^2}^2 + C \|\nabla w_k\|_{L^2}^2 + C \sum_{i+j=k, 0 \leq i, j < k-1} \|w_i\|_{H^2}^2 \|w_j\|_{H^3}^2 \\
&\leq C_k (1 + \|w_k\|_{H^1}^2),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
b^* &= \left| \int_{\Omega} \langle w_{k-1} \times \nabla \Delta w_1, \nabla w_k \rangle dx \right| + \left| \int_{\Omega} \langle w_1 \times \nabla \Delta w_{k-1}, \nabla w_k \rangle dx \right| \\
&\quad + \sum_{i+j=k, 0 \leq i, j < k-1} \left| \int_{\Omega} \langle w_i \times \nabla \Delta w_j, \nabla w_k \rangle dx \right| \\
&\leq \|w_{k-1}\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla \Delta w_1\|_{L^2} \|\nabla w_k\|_{L^2} + \|w_1\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla \Delta w_{k-1}\|_{L^2} \|\nabla w_k\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad + \sum_{i+j=k, 0 \leq i, j < k-1} \|w_i\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla \Delta w_j\|_{L^2} \|\nabla w_k\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq \|w_{k-1}\|_{H^2}^2 \|w_1\|_{H^3}^2 + C \|\nabla w_k\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|w_1\|_{H^2}^2 \|\nabla \Delta w_{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\quad + C \sum_{i+j=k, 0 \leq i, j < k-1} \|w_i\|_{H^2}^2 \|w_j\|_{H^3}^2 \leq C_k (1 + \|w_k\|_{H^1}^2),
\end{aligned}$$

where we have applied Lemma 4.5 and used the estimates (4.2) from the assumption of induction. Hence, it follows that

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq T_1} \|w_i\|_{H^3} \leq C_k.$$

since $2(k-i-1) + 1 \geq 3$ for $0 \leq i < k-1$.

Therefore, by combining the above estimates with formula (4.10), we have

$$(4.11) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_k|^2 dx + \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} |\Delta w_k|^2 dx \leq C(\|u_0\|_{H^{2k-1}(\Omega)})(1 + \|w_k\|_{H^1}^2)$$

where C does not depend on $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$.

To end this section, we combine the inequalities (4.7) with (4.11) to get the following uniform estimates of solution u_ε with respect to ε .

Proposition 4.7. *Suppose that $u_0 \in H^{2k+1}(\Omega, \mathbb{S}^2)$ with $k \geq 2$, which satisfies the $(k-1)$ -order compatibility condition defined in (2.6). Let u_ε and $T_\varepsilon > 0$ are the same as that in Theorem 3.1, $0 < T_1 < T_\varepsilon$ be the positive time obtained in Theorem 3.3. Then there exists constant C_k independent of ε such that for any $0 \leq i \leq k$, we have*

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq T_1} \|\partial_t^i u_\varepsilon\|_{H^{2(k-i)+1}} \leq C_k.$$

Proof. Our proof is divided into three steps.

Step 1: Estimates of w_k .

By combining Inequalities (4.7) with (4.11), we can show

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int_{\Omega} (|w_k|^2 + |\nabla w_k|^2) dx \leq C_k (1 + \int_{\Omega} (|w_k|^2 + |\nabla w_k|^2) dx),$$

for $0 \leq t \leq T_1$. Then, Gronwall inequality implies

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq T_1} \int_{\Omega} (|w_k|^2 + |\nabla w_k|^2) dx \leq e^{C_k T_1} (\|W_k(u_0)\|_{H^1}^2 + 1).$$

Here $W_k(u_0)$ is defined in Remark 2.7, and hence we have

$$\|W_k\|_{H^1}^2 \leq C(\|u_0\|_{H^{2k+1}}).$$

Step 2: Estimates of w_i for $1 \leq i < k$.

We show the estimates of w_i with $0 \leq i \leq k$ by applying the method of induction on $n = k - i$. Since the desire estimates of w_k have been obtained in above, that is the case of $n = 0$, we assume that the result been established for $n \leq j \leq k - 2$. Then, in the case of $n = j + 1$, a simple calculation shows

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta w_{k-j-1} &= \frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon^2} (\varepsilon w_{k-j} - u_\varepsilon \times w_{k-j} - w_{k-j-1} \times w_1) \\ &\quad - 2 \nabla w_{k-j-1} \# \nabla u_\varepsilon \# u_\varepsilon - |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 w_{k-j-1} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon^2} \sum_{l+s=k-j-1, l, s < k-j-1} w_l \times w_{s+1} \\ &\quad - \sum_{l+s+m=k-j-1, l, s, m < k-j-1} \nabla w_l \# \nabla w_s \# w_m \\ &= K_1 + K_2 + K_3. \end{aligned}$$

Here,

$$K_1 = \frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon^2} (\varepsilon w_{k-j} - u_\varepsilon \times w_{k-j} - w_{k-j-1} \times w_1) - 2 \nabla w_{k-j-1} \# \nabla u_\varepsilon \# u_\varepsilon - |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 w_{k-j-1}.$$

Next we estimate the three terms K_1 , K_2 and K_3 in the above respectively.

- (1) For the term K_1 , since $2(k - (k - j - 1) - 1) + 1 = 2j + 1$ with $0 \leq j \leq k - 2$ and $k \geq 3$, by using the estimates (4.2), we have

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq T_1} (\|w_{k-j-1}\|_{H^{2j+1}} + \|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^{2k-1}} + \|w_1\|_{H^{2(k-2)+1}}) \leq C_k.$$

On the other hand, by using the assumption of induction, there holds true

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq T_1} \|w_{k-j}\|_{H^{2j+1}} \leq C_k.$$

Therefore, Lemma 4.4 implies

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq T_1} \|a\|_{H^{2j}} \leq C_k.$$

- (2) For the term

$$K_2 = \frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon^2} \sum_{l+s=k-j-1, l, s < k-j-1} w_l \times w_{s+1},$$

since there holds

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq T_1} (\|w_l\|_{H^{2(j+1)+1}} + \|w_{s+1}\|_{H^{2j+1}}) \leq C_k$$

for $s, l \leq k - j - 2$, Lemma 4.4 yields

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq T_1} \|b\|_{H^{2j+1}} \leq C_k.$$

(3) For the third term

$$K_3 = \sum_{l+s+m=k-j-1, l, s, m < k-j-1} \nabla w_l \# \nabla w_s \# w_m,$$

a similar argument as for the term K_2 , we can show

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq T_1} \|c\|_{H^{2(j+1)}} \leq C_k$$

by using Lemma 4.4 again.

Therefore, we has obtained

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq T_1} \|\Delta w_{k-j-1}\|_{H^{2j}} \leq C_k.$$

The classical L^2 -estimates and Lemma 2.1 shows

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq T_1} \|w_{k-j-1}\|_{H^{2(j+1)}} \leq C_k.$$

Once we improved the regularity of w_{k-j-1} , there is an improved bound of K_1 :

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq T_1} \|a\|_{H^{2j+1}} \leq C_k.$$

And hence, it follows

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq T_1} \|\Delta w_{k-j-1}\|_{H^{2j+1}} \leq C_k.$$

Again the classical L^2 -estimates and Lemma 2.1 implies

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq T_1} \|w_{k-j-1}\|_{H^{2(j+1)+1}} \leq C_k.$$

Step 3: Estimates of u_ε .

In the above step 2, we have gotten a bound of w_1 as

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq T_1} \|w_1\|_{H^{2k-1}} \leq C_k.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\Delta u_\varepsilon = \frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon^2} (\varepsilon w_1 - u_\varepsilon \times w_1) - |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 u_\varepsilon.$$

Since $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^{2k-1}} \leq C_k$, by the above equation and Lemma 4.4, it is not difficult to verify the following

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq T_1} \|\Delta u_\varepsilon\|_{H^{2k-2}} \leq C_k.$$

Immediately, it follows from the classical L^2 -estimates theory that

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq T_1} \|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^{2k}} \leq C_k.$$

Hence, by using L^2 -theory again we can improve the estimate of Δu_ε to achieve

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq T_1} \|\Delta u_\varepsilon\|_{H^{2k-1}} \leq C_k.$$

This leads to

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq T_1} \|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^{2k+1}} \leq C_k.$$

□

4.4. **The proof of Theorem 4.1.** In this subsection, we show the proof of Theorem 4.1.

The proof of Theorem 4.1. Proposition 4.7 gives a uniform bound of u_ε as

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq T_1} \|\partial_t^i u_\varepsilon\|_{H^{2(k-i)+1}} \leq C_k,$$

for any $0 \leq i \leq k$. Hence, an argument of convergence shows that there exists a limiting map $u \in L^\infty([0, T], H^{2k+1}(\Omega))$ solving (1.3). Moreover, the lower semicontinuity of weak convergence implies u also satisfies

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq T_1} \|\partial_t^i u\|_{H^{2(k-i)+1}} \leq C_k,$$

for any $0 \leq i \leq k$. Thus, the proof is completed. □

5. SOME RELATED PROBLEMS AND COMMENTS

We also recall that the Landau-Lifshitz equation with non-local term

$$(5.1) \quad \partial_t u = u \times h$$

where the local field h of $\mathcal{E}(u)$ can be derived as

$$h := \frac{\delta \mathcal{E}(u)}{\delta u} = \Delta u + h_d.$$

and $h_d(u)$ is the demagnetizing field, which has the following form

$$h_d(u)(x) = -\nabla \int_{\Omega} \nabla N(x-y) u(y) dy,$$

where

$$N(x) = -\frac{1}{4\pi|x|}$$

is the Newtonian potential in \mathbb{R}^3 . The local existence of very regular solution to the following initial-Neumann boundary value problem can also be established

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u = u \times (\Delta u + h_d), & (x, t) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0, & (x, t) \in \partial\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0 : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2, \end{cases}$$

if u_0 belongs to some suitable Sobolev space and satisfies the same compatibility conditions as Schrödinger flow into \mathbb{S}^2 .

On the other hand, Chern et al [16] described recently a new approach for the purely Eulerian simulation of incompressible fluids. In it, the fluid state is represented by a \mathbb{C}^2 -valued wave function evolving under the Schrödinger equation subject to incompressibility constraints. The underlying dynamical system is Hamiltonian and governed by the kinetic energy of the fluid together with an energy of Landau-Lifshitz type. They deduced the following

$$\partial_t u + \mathcal{L}_v u = \tilde{\alpha}(u \times \Delta u),$$

where $\tilde{\alpha}$ is a real number, $s : \Omega \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ and \mathcal{L}_v is the Lie derivative with respect to the field v on Ω with $\operatorname{div}(v) \equiv 0$. They called this dynamical system as incompressible Schrödinger flow.

If $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is a smooth bounded domain, \mathcal{L}_v is just the ∇_v , and hence the above can be written as

$$\partial_t u + \nabla_v u = \tilde{\alpha}(u \times \Delta u),$$

with $\operatorname{div}(v) \equiv 0$ on Ω and $\langle v|_{\partial\Omega}, \nu \rangle = 0$.

From the viewpoint of mathematics, we may consider the following initial-Neumann boundary value problem of incompressible Schrödinger flow

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t u + \nabla_v u = u \times (\Delta u + h_d), & (x,t) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0, & (x,t) \in \partial\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ u(x,0) = u_0 : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2, \quad \frac{\partial u_0}{\partial \nu}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Here we always suppose that the vector field v on Ω is smooth enough, $\operatorname{div}(v) \equiv 0$ on Ω and $\langle v|_{\partial\Omega}, \nu \rangle \equiv 0$.

Similarly, we can address the local existence of regular solutions to the above system, if u_0 belongs to some suitable Sobolev space and satisfies the same compatibility conditions as Schrödinger flow into \mathbb{S}^2 . But it is worthy to point out that one needs to adopt the following approximate equation:

$$(5.3) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t u + \nabla_v u = -\varepsilon u \times (u \times (\Delta u + h_d) - \nabla_v u) + u \times (\Delta u + h_d), & (x,t) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0, & (x,t) \in \partial\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ u(x,0) = u_0 : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2, \quad \frac{\partial u_0}{\partial \nu}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Finally, we would like to mention the so called magneto-elastic equation defined on a smooth bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ($d = 2, 3$). The model [2] is phrased in Eulerian coordinates and consists in particular of (i) a Navier-Stokes equation that involves magnetic and elastic terms in the stress tensor, of (ii) a regularized transport equation for the deformation gradient, and of (iii) the Landau-Lifshitz-Gilbert equation for the dynamics of the magnetization.

More concretely, let $v : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, $F : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $M : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ are unknown maps, let H_{ext} denotes the external magnetic field. The magneto-elastic equation reads

$$(5.4) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t v + v \cdot \nabla v + \nabla P = \mu \Delta v - \nabla \cdot (2A \nabla M \odot \nabla M - W'(F)F^\top) + \mu_0 (\nabla H_{ext})^\top M, \\ \nabla \cdot v = 0, \\ \partial_t F + v \cdot \nabla F - \nabla v F = \kappa \Delta F, \\ \partial_t M + v \cdot \nabla M = -\gamma M \times (2A \Delta M + \mu_0 H_{ext}) - \lambda M \times M \times (2A \Delta M + \mu_0 H_{ext}) \end{cases}$$

in $\Omega \times (0, T)$, where μ , μ_0 , A and κ are some constants, accompanied by the following initial conditions

$$(5.5) \quad v(x,0) = v_0, \quad \nabla \cdot v_0(x) = 0,$$

$$(5.6) \quad F(x,0) = F_0(x),$$

$$(5.7) \quad M(x,0) = M_0(x), \quad |M_0| = 1,$$

$$(5.8) \quad v = 0, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T),$$

$$(5.9) \quad F = F_{min}, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T),$$

$$(5.10) \quad \frac{\partial M}{\partial \nu} = 0, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T),$$

where ν denotes the outer normal to the boundary of Ω . Here,

$$(\nabla M \odot \nabla M)_{ij} = \sum_k \nabla_i M_k \nabla_j M_k,$$

W is the elastic energy which must be independent of the observer; that is, it has to satisfy $W(RS) = W(S)$ for all $R \in \mathbb{SO}(d)$ (and thus $W'(RS) = RW'(S)$) for all matrices $S \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, $F_{min} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is a matrix for which $W'(F_{min}) = 0$. For more details we refer to [2, 30] and the references therein.

As the main result of [2], the authors discussed the existence of weak solutions to the above system (5.4)-(5.10). First their scope was restricted to $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and in this setting they obtained a weak solution globally in time. If $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, their proof remains valid up to small modifications but only to obtain short-time existence of solutions(also see [30]).

N. Jiang, H. Liu and Y.-L. Luo [29] studied the problem defined in $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^+$ ($d = 2, 3$) and proved the local-in-time existence of the evolutionary model for magnetoelasticity with finite initial energy by employing the nonlinear iterative, and then reformulate the evolutionary model for magnetoelasticity with vanishing external magnetic field H_{ext} and justified the global well-posedness to the evolutionary model for magnetoelasticity with zero external magnetic field under small size of initial data. Very recently, G.-W. Wang and Y.-D. Wang have considered the initial value problem of the above system (5.4) defined in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^+$ and showed that the existence of a global smooth solution provided the the initial datum are small with respect to the norms of some Sobolev spaces.

It is a natural problem whether or not the following problem defined on $\Omega \times (0, T)$ admits a global weak solution or a smooth local in time solution

$$(5.11) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t v + v \cdot \nabla v + \nabla P = \mu \Delta v - \nabla \cdot (2A \nabla M \odot \nabla M - W'(F)F^\top) + \mu_0 (\nabla H_{ext})^\top M, \\ \nabla \cdot v = 0, \\ \partial_t F + v \cdot \nabla F - \nabla v F = \kappa \Delta F, \\ \partial_t M + v \cdot \nabla M = -\gamma M \times (2A \Delta M + \mu_0 H_{ext}), \end{cases}$$

accompanied by the following initial conditions:

$$(5.12) \quad v(x, 0) = v_0, \quad \nabla \cdot v_0(x) = 0,$$

$$(5.13) \quad F(x, 0) = F_0(x),$$

$$(5.14) \quad M(x, 0) = M_0(x), \quad |M_0| = 1,$$

$$(5.15) \quad v = 0, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T),$$

$$(5.16) \quad F = F_{min}, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T),$$

$$(5.17) \quad \frac{\partial M}{\partial \nu} = 0, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T).$$

No doubt, the problem deserves studying. It seems that the method employed in this paper is also effective on the above Neumann-initial value problem. In a forthcoming paper we will study the problem.

Acknowledgements: The authors are supported partially by NSFC (Grant No.11731001). The author Y. Wang is supported partially by NSFC (Grant No.11971400), and Guangdong Basic and Applied Basic Research Foundation (Grant No. 2020A1515011019).

REFERENCES

- [1] F. Alouges and A. Soyeur, On global weak solutions for Landau-Lifshitz equations: existence and nonuniqueness. *Nonlinear Anal.*, **18** (1992), no. 11, 1071-1084.
- [2] B. Benešová, J. Forster, C. Liu, A. Schlömerkemper, Existence of weak solutions to an evolutionary model for magnetoelasticity, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, **50** (2018), no. 1, 1200-1236.
- [3] I. Bejenaru, On Schrödinger maps, *Amer. J. Math.*, **130** (2008), no. 4, 1033-1065.
- [4] I. Bejenaru, Global results for Schrödinger maps in dimensions $n \geq 3$, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, **33**(2008), 451-477.
- [5] I. Bejenaru, A.D. Ionescu and C.E. Kenig, Global existence and uniqueness of Schrödinger maps in dimensions $n \geq 4$, *Adv. Math.*, **215**(2007), no. 1, 263-291.
- [6] I. Bejenaru, A.D. Ionescu, C.E. Kenig and D. Tataru, Global Schrödinger maps in dimensions $n \geq 2$: small data in the critical Sobolev spaces, *Ann. of Math.*, (2) **173** (2011), no. 3, 1443-1506.

- [7] I. Bejenaru and D. Tataru, Global wellposedness in the energy space for the Maxwell-Schrödinger system, *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **288** (2009), 145-198.
- [8] G. Bonithon, *Landau-Lifschitz-Gilbert equation with applied electric current*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. 2007, Dynamical Systems and Differential Equations, Proceedings of the 6th AIMS International Conference, suppl., 138-144.
- [9] F. Boyer and P. Fabrie, *Mathematical tools for the study of the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations and related models*, Springer New York Heidelberg Dordrecht London, 2013.
- [10] Y.-Z. Chen, *Second order parabolic differential equations*, Peking University Press, Beijing, 2003.
- [11] G. Carbou and P. Fabrie, Regular solutions for Landau-Lifschitz equation in a bounded domain, *Differential Integral Equations*, **14** (2001), no. 2, 213-229.
- [12] G. Carbou and R. Jizzini, Very regular solutions for the Landau-Lifschitz equation with electric current, *Chin. Ann. Math. Ser. B*, **39** (2018), no. 5, 889-916.
- [13] Q. Chen, J. Jost and G. Wang, The maximum principle and the Dirichlet problem for Dirac-harmonic maps, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, **47** (2013), no. 1-2, 87-116.
- [14] B. Chen and Y.D. Wang, Very regular solution to Landau-Lifshitz system with spin-polarized transport, preprint.
- [15] B. Chen and Y.-D. Wang, Existence and uniqueness of local regular solution to the Schrödinger flow from a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^3 into \mathbb{S}^2 , preprint.
- [16] A. Chern, F. Knöppel and U. Pinkall, P. Schröder and S. Weißmann, Schrödinger's Smoke. *ACM Trans. Graph.*, **35**, 4, Article 77 (July 2016), 13 pages.
- [17] W.-Y. Ding, H.-Y. Tang and C.-C. Zeng, Self-similar solutions of Schrödinger flows. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* **34** (2009), no. 2, 267-277.
- [18] W.-Y. Ding and Y.-D. Wang, Local Schrödinger flow into Kähler manifolds, *Sci. China Ser. A*, **44** (2001), no. 11, 1446-1464.
- [19] W.-Y. Ding and Y.-D. Wang, Schrödinger flow of maps into symplectic manifolds, *Sci. China, Ser. A*, **41** (1998), no. 7.
- [20] S.-J. Ding and C.-Y. Wang, Finite times singularity of the Landau-Lifshitz-Gilbert equation, *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (2007).
- [21] W.-Y. Ding, H.-Y. Wang and Y.-D. Wang, Schrödinger flows on compact Hermitian symmetric spaces and related problems, *Acta Math. Sin. (Engl. Ser.)*, **19** (2003), no. 2, 303-312.
- [22] P. Germain, J. Shatah and C.-C. Zeng, Self-similar solutions for the Schrödinger map equation. *Math. Z.* **264** (2010), no. 3, 697-707.
- [23] T.L. Gilbert, A Lagrangian formulation of gyromagnetic equation of the magnetization field, *Phys. Rev.*, **100** (1955), 1243-1255.
- [24] A. Huber, Boundary regularity for minimizers of the micromagnetic energy functional, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, **43** (2012), 1-23.
- [25] A.D. Ionescu and C.E. Kenig, Low-regularity Schrödinger maps. II. Global well-posedness in dimensions $d \geq 3$, *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **271** (2007), 523-559.
- [26] W. Jäger and H. Kaul, Uniqueness of harmonic mappings and of solution of elliptic equations on Riemannian manifolds, *Math. Ann.*, **240** (1979), 231-250.
- [27] Z.-L. Jia and Y.-D. Wang, Global weak solutions to Landau-Lifshitz equations into compact Lie algebras, *Front. Math. China*, **14**(2019), no. 6, 1163-1196.
- [28] Z.-L. Jia and Y.-D. Wang, Global Weak Solutions to Landau-Lifshitz Systems with Spin-Polarized Transport, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, **40**(2020) no. 3, 1903-1935.
- [29] N. Jiang, H. Liu and Y.-L. Luo, Global classical solutions to an evolutionary model for magnetoelasticity, *arXiv:1904.09531*
- [30] M. Kalousek, J. Kortum, A. Schlömerkemper, Mathematical analysis of weak and strong solutions to an evolutionary model for magnetoviscoelasticity, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. S*, **14** (2021), no. 1, 17-39.
- [31] S. Kobayashi and K. Nomizu, *Foundational of differential geometry, Vol. II*, Interscience Tracts in Pure and Applied Mathematics, No. 15, Vol. II., Interscience Publishers John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York-London-Sydney(1969).
- [32] L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshitz, On the theory of dispersion of magnetic permeability in ferromagnetic bodies, *Phys. Z. Soviet.*, **8** (1935), 153-169.
- [33] Z. Li, Global Schrödinger map flows to Kähler manifolds with small data in critical Sobolev spaces: high dimensions, *J. Funct. Anal.* **281** (2021), no. 6, Paper No.109093, 76 pp.
- [34] Z. Li, Global Schrödinger map flows to Kähler manifolds with small data in critical Sobolev spaces: energy critical case. Preprint.
- [35] F. Lin and J. Wei Traveling wave solutions of the Schrödinger map equation. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **63** (2010), no. 12, 1585-1621.

- [36] H. McGahgan, An approximation scheme for Schrödinger maps, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, **32** (2007), no. 1-3, 375-400.
- [37] F. Merle, P. Raphaël and I. Rodnianski, Blowup dynamics for smooth data equivariant solutions to the critical Schrödinger map problem. *Invent. Math.* **193** (2013), no. 2, 249-365.
- [38] W.L. Miranker and B.E. Willner, Global analysis of magnetic domains. *Quart. Appl. Math.*, **37**(1979), 219-238.
- [39] A. Nahmod, A. Stefanov and K. Uhlenbeck, On Schrödinger maps. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **56** (2003), no. 1, 114-151.
- [40] Peter Y. H. Pang, H.-Y. Wang, Y.-D. Wang, Schrödinger flow on Hermitian locally symmetric spaces. *Comm. Anal. Geom.* **10** (2002), no. 4, 653-681.
- [41] I. Rodnianski, Y. Rubinstein and G. Staffilani, On the global well-posedness of the one-dimensional Schrödinger map flow. *Anal. PDE* **2** (2009), no. 2, 187-209.
- [42] K. Santugini-Repiquet, *Solutions to the Landau-Lifshitz system with nonhomogenous Neumann boundary conditions arising from surface anisotropy and super-exchange interactions in a ferromagnetic media. Nonlinear Anal.*, **65** (2006), no. 1, 129-158.
- [43] J. Simon, Compact sets in the space $L^p([0, T]; B)$, *Ann. Math. Pura. Appl.*, **4** (1987), 146, 65-96.
- [44] J.C. Slonczewski, Force, momentum and topology of a moving magnetic domain. *J. Magn. Magn. Mat.*, **12** (1979), 108-122.
- [45] C. Song and J. Sun, Skew mean curvature flow, *Commun. Contemp. Math.* **21** (2019), no. 1, 1750090, 29 pp.
- [46] R.L. Jerrard, Vortex filament dynamics for Gross-Pitaevsky type equations. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci.* **5**(2002), 1(4), 733-768.
- [47] B. Khesin, Symplectic structures and dynamics on vortex membranes, *Mosc. Math. J.*, **12**(2012), no. 2, 413-434, 461-462.
- [48] B.N. Shashikanth, Vortex dynamics in \mathbb{R}^4 , *J. Math. Phys.*, **53**(2012), no. 1, 013103, 21.
- [49] C. Song and Y.-D. Wang, Uniqueness of Schrödinger flow on manifolds, *Comm. Anal. Geom.* , **26** (2018), no. 1, 217-235.
- [50] P.L. Sulem, C. Sulem and C. Bardos, On the continuous limit for a system of classical spins, *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **107** (1986), no. 3, 431-454.
- [51] M. Tilioua, Current-induced magnetization dynamics. Global existence of weak solutions, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **373** (2011), no. 2, 635-642.
- [52] C.L. Termg, K. Uhlenbeck, Schrödinger flows on Grassmannians, in Integrable Systems, *Geometry and Topology*, 235-256, AMS/IP Stud. Adv. Math., **36**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2006.
- [53] A. Visintin, On Landau-Lifshitz equations for ferromagnetism. *Japan J. Appl. Math.*, **2**(1985), no. 1, 69-84.
- [54] Y.-D. Wang, Heisenberg chain systems from compact manifolds into S^2 , *J. Math. of Physics*, **39** (1998), no.1, 363-371.
- [55] K. Wehrheim, *Uhlenbeck Compactness*, EMS Series of Lectures in Mathematics.
- [56] J. Wei and J. Yang, Traveling vortex helices for Schrödinger map equations. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **368** (2016), no. 4, 2589-2622.
- [57] Y. Zhou, B. Guo, and S.-B. Tan, Existence and uniqueness of smooth solution for system of ferro-magnetic chain, *Sci. China Ser. A*, **34** (1991), no.3, 257-266.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, TSINGHUA UNIVERSITY, BEIJING, 100084, CHINA
 Email address: chenbo@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn

1. SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATION SCIENCES, GUANGZHOU UNIVERSITY; 2. HUA LOO-KENG KEY LABORATORY OF MATHEMATICS, INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, AMSS, AND SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UCAS, BEIJING 100190, CHINA.
 Email address: wyd@math.ac.cn