

FROM BGK-ALIGNMENT MODEL TO THE PRESSURED EULER-ALIGNMENT SYSTEM WITH SINGULAR COMMUNICATION WEIGHTS

YOUNG-PIL CHOI AND BYUNG-HOON HWANG

ABSTRACT. This paper is devoted to a rigorous derivation of the isentropic Euler-alignment system with singular communication weights $\phi_\alpha(x) = |x|^{-\alpha}$ for some $\alpha > 0$. We consider a kinetic BGK-alignment model consisting of a kinetic BGK-type equation with a singular Cucker-Smale alignment force. By taking into account a small relaxation parameter, which corresponds to the asymptotic regime of a strong effect from BGK operator, we quantitatively derive the isentropic Euler-alignment system with pressure $p(\rho) = \rho^\gamma$, $\gamma = 1 + \frac{2}{d}$ from that kinetic equation.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Derivation of EAS from mesoscopic descriptions	2
1.2. Outline of methodology	4
1.3. Main results	6
1.4. Remarks	7
1.5. Organization of the paper	8
2. Preliminaries	8
2.1. Uniform kinetic energy estimate on f^ε	8
2.2. Lower bound estimate on $\mathcal{H}(\bar{\rho} \rho)$	8
3. Hydrodynamic limit from the BGK-alignment model to isentropic EAS	10
3.1. Relative entropy estimate	10
3.2. Proof of Theorem 1.2	11
4. Global existence of weak solutions to the BGK-alignment model	17
4.1. Regularized and linearized BGK-alignment model	18
4.2. Cauchy estimates	23
4.3. Existence of weak solutions to the regularized equation	24
4.4. Proof of Theorem 1.1	27
Acknowledgments	29
References	29

1. INTRODUCTION

The main purpose of this work is to rigorously and quantitatively derive the following isentropic Euler equations with nonlocal velocity alignment forces, often referred to as the isentropic Euler-alignment system (in short, EAS):

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \rho + \nabla_x \cdot (\rho u) &= 0, \quad (x, t) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\ \partial_t (\rho u) + \nabla_x \cdot (\rho u \otimes u + \rho^\gamma \mathbb{I}_d) &= -\rho \int_{\Omega} \phi_\alpha(x-y)(u(x) - u(y))\rho(y) dy, \end{aligned} \quad (1.1)$$

Date: March 22, 2023.

Key words and phrases. Isentropic Euler-alignment system, Cucker-Smale model, BGK model, hydrodynamic limit, relative entropy, singular communication weight.

subject to the smooth initial data

$$(\rho(x, t), u(x, t))|_{t=0} =: (\rho_0(x), u_0(x)), \quad x \in \Omega,$$

where Ω is a spatial domain, either \mathbb{T}^d or \mathbb{R}^d with the space dimension $d \geq 1$, and $\gamma = 1 + \frac{2}{d}$. Here $\rho = \rho(x, t)$ represents the density and $u = u(x, t)$ is the velocity at position $x \in \Omega$ and time $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. The right-hand side of the momentum equation in (1.1) is the velocity alignment force, where $\phi_\alpha : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is called the communication weight function. Throughout this paper, we assumed that ϕ is radially symmetric, i.e., $\phi(x) = \hat{\phi}(|x|)$ for some $\hat{\phi} : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$. By abuse of notation, we use $\phi(r) := \hat{\phi}(r)$ for simplicity. In the current work, we deal with the singular communication weight function which has the form of

$$\phi_\alpha(r) = \frac{1}{r^\alpha}, \quad \alpha > 0. \quad (1.2)$$

Note that when $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^d$, the singular communication weight $\phi_\alpha : [0, 2\pi) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ can be chosen as

$$\phi_\alpha(r) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{r^\alpha} & \text{if } r \in (0, \pi] \\ \frac{1}{(2\pi - r)^\alpha} & \text{if } r \in (\pi, 2\pi) \\ 0 & \text{if } r = 0 \end{cases}. \quad (1.3)$$

The EAS arises as a macroscopic description of the celebrated Cucker-Smale model [22] which is a Newton-type microscopic model for an interacting many-body system exhibiting a flocking phenomenon. For that reason, EAS is also often called the hydrodynamic Cucker-Smale model. In [22], the regular function which has the form of

$$\phi_\alpha(r) = \frac{1}{(1 + r^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}, \quad \alpha > 0.$$

is considered, and sufficient conditions for initial data and $\alpha > 0$ leading to the velocity alignment behavior of solutions are analyzed. Later, collision avoidance behaviors of solutions for the Cucker-Smale model with singular weights are discussed in [1, 9, 34, 37]. In particular, it is observed that the Cucker-Smale flocking particles avoid collisions regardless of the initial data when $\alpha \geq 1$. We refer to [10, 12, 15, 30, 31, 34, 40, 41] and references therein for the flocking estimates of solutions to particle, kinetic, and hydrodynamic descriptions of Cucker-Smale model and its variants.

1.1. Derivation of EAS from mesoscopic descriptions. The mesoscopic description of Cucker-Smale model is given by the following Vlasov-type equation:

$$\partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f + \nabla_v \cdot (F_{\phi_\alpha}[f]f) = 0, \quad (1.4)$$

where $f = f(x, v, t)$ stands for the one-particle distribution function at $(x, v) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and time $t > 0$. Here F_{ϕ_α} represents the velocity alignment force field:

$$F_{\phi_\alpha}[f](x, v) := \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} \phi_\alpha(x - y)(w - v)f(y, w) dy dw.$$

For the kinetic Cucker-Smale model (1.4) with the singular communication weight (1.2), the global-in-time existence of measure-valued solutions is studied in [36] when $\alpha < \frac{1}{2}$, and the local-in-time existence and uniqueness of L^p solutions are obtained in [8] when $\alpha < d - 1$. The uniform-in-time mean-field limit from particle systems in one dimension is recently discussed in [20] when $\alpha < 1$.

Formally, by introducing the macroscopic density $\rho_f(x, t)$ and bulk velocity $u_f(x, t)$ as

$$\rho_f(x, t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x, v, t) dv \quad \text{and} \quad u_f(x, t) := \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v f(x, v, t) dv}{\rho_f(x, t)},$$

respectively, we derive from (1.4) that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \rho_f + \nabla_x \cdot (\rho_f u_f) &= 0, \\ \partial_t (\rho_f u_f) + \nabla_x \cdot (\rho_f u_f \otimes u_f) + \nabla_x \cdot \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (v - u_f) \otimes (v - u_f) f dv \right) \\ &= -\rho_f \int_{\Omega} \phi_\alpha(x - y)(u_f(x) - u_f(y)) \rho_f(y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

There are several formal ways of closing the momentum equations above.

1.1.1. *Pressureless EAS.* Taking into account the mono-kinetic ansatz $f(x, v) = \rho_f(x)\delta_{u_f}(v)$ leads to

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (v - u_f) \otimes (v - u_f) f dv = 0.$$

Thus, this closure assumption results in the following pressureless EAS:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \rho_f + \nabla_x \cdot (\rho_f u_f) &= 0, \\ \partial_t (\rho_f u_f) + \nabla_x \cdot (\rho_f u_f \otimes u_f) &= -\rho_f \int_{\Omega} \phi_{\alpha}(x - y)(u_f(x) - u_f(y)) \rho_f(y) dy. \end{aligned} \quad (1.5)$$

In [7, 29], the strong local alignment forces are considered in the kinetic equation (1.4), i.e., $\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \nabla_v \cdot ((v - u)f)$ on the right hand side of (1.4), and it is found that the pressureless EAS (1.5) can be rigorously derived when $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Recently, the rigorous derivation of the pressureless EAS directly from the particle Cucker-Smale model, not via its kinetic formulation, by means of mean-field limit is investigated in [6]. In those works, the communication weight function is assumed to be regular enough, for instance $\phi_{\alpha} \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. For the system (1.5) with regular communication weight functions, the critical threshold phenomenon is first proved in [41], and later a sharp dichotomy of initial configurations, either subcritical initial data which evolve into global strong solutions, or supercritical initial data which will blow up in finite time, is analyzed in [11]. The critical thresholds phenomena in (1.5) with the singular communication weights are studied in [42]. We also refer to [26, 27, 28] for the global well-posedness theory and long-time dynamics of solutions to the pressureless EAS (1.5).

1.1.2. *Pressured EAS.* In order to have the pressure term in the momentum equations, at the formal level, we can deal with the following three different closure assumptions on f depending on $\gamma \in [1, 1 + \frac{2}{d}]$. More precisely, it follows from [3, 4] that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (v - u_f) \otimes (v - u_f) f dv = \rho_f^{\gamma} \mathbb{I}_d, \quad \gamma \in \left[1, 1 + \frac{2}{d}\right],$$

where

$$f = \begin{cases} \frac{\rho_f}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{|u_f - v|^2}{2}\right) & \text{for } \gamma = 1 \\ c_{\gamma,d} \left(\frac{2\gamma}{\gamma-1} \rho_f^{\gamma-1} - |v - u_f|^2\right)_+^{n/2} & \text{for } \gamma \in (1, 1 + \frac{2}{d}) \\ \mathbb{1}_{|u_f - v|^d \leq c_d \rho_f} & \text{for } \gamma = 1 + \frac{2}{d} \end{cases} \quad (1.6)$$

with

$$n = \frac{2}{\gamma-1} - d, \quad c_d = \frac{d}{|\mathbb{S}_d|}, \quad \text{and} \quad c_{\gamma,d} = \left(\frac{2\gamma}{\gamma-1}\right)^{-1/(\gamma-1)} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}\right)}{\pi^{d/2} \Gamma(n/2 + 1)}. \quad (1.7)$$

Note that the uniform distribution-type closure assumption, which corresponds to the case $\gamma = 1 + \frac{2}{d}$, in (1.6) gives the pressure term in our main system (1.1).

The local Maxwellian-type closure assumption can be justified by considering the nonlinear Fokker-Planck term on the right hand side of (1.4). More precisely, when the communication weight ϕ_{α} is bounded, the isothermal EAS, i.e. (1.1) with $\gamma = 1$, is rigorously derived in [33] (see also [7]) from the following kinetic Fokker-Planck-alignment model:

$$\partial_t f^{\varepsilon} + v \cdot \nabla_x f^{\varepsilon} + \nabla_v \cdot (F_{\phi_{\alpha}}[f^{\varepsilon}] f^{\varepsilon}) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{N}_{\text{FP}}[f^{\varepsilon}], \quad (1.8)$$

where \mathcal{N}_{FP} denotes the nonlinear Fokker-Planck operator [43] given by

$$\mathcal{N}_{\text{FP}}[f](x, v) := \nabla_v \cdot ((v - u_f) f + \nabla_v f).$$

Note that the asymptotic regime for (1.8) corresponds to a strong effect from the nonlinear Fokker-Planck term. Note that we expect $f^{\varepsilon} \sim \frac{\rho_{f^{\varepsilon}}}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{|u_{f^{\varepsilon}} - v|^2}{2}\right)$ for $\varepsilon \gg 1$, thus if $\rho_{f^{\varepsilon}} \rightarrow \rho$ and $u_{f^{\varepsilon}} \rightarrow u$ in some

sense as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, then we find

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (v - u_{f^\varepsilon}) \otimes (v - u_{f^\varepsilon}) f^\varepsilon dv \rightarrow \rho \mathbb{I}_d \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

In [7, 33], the almost everywhere convergences of ρ_{f^ε} , $\rho_{f^\varepsilon} u_{f^\varepsilon}$, and f^ε toward ρ , ρu , and $M_{\rho, u}$, respectively, are obtained as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. More recently, the singular communication weight case with $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ is also covered in [19] by using the relative entropy method with careful analyses of singular integrals.

1.2. Outline of methodology. In order to derive the isentropic EAS (1.1) from kinetic descriptions, motivated from [2, 19], we shall need to consider the following kinetic BGK-alignment model:

$$\partial_t f^\varepsilon + v \cdot \nabla_x f^\varepsilon + \nabla_v \cdot (F_{\phi_\alpha^\varepsilon} [f^\varepsilon] f^\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} Q[f^\varepsilon], \quad (1.9)$$

subject to the initial data:

$$f^\varepsilon(x, v, t)|_{t=0} =: f_0^\varepsilon(x, v), \quad (x, v) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Here $\phi_\alpha^\varepsilon : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a regularized communication weight function defined as

$$\phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(r) = \phi_\alpha(\sqrt{\varepsilon^\beta + r^2}) \quad \text{with } \alpha > 0, \quad \beta > 0 \quad (1.10)$$

and $Q[f] = Q[f](x, v, t)$ denotes the BGK-type relaxation operator given by

$$Q[f] := M[f] - f, \quad \text{where } M[f] = \mathbb{1}_{|u-v|^d \leq c_d \rho}.$$

It is clear that at the formal level, $\phi_\alpha^\varepsilon \rightarrow \phi_\alpha$ and $Q[f^\varepsilon] = M[f^\varepsilon] - f^\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, thus if $\rho_{f^\varepsilon} \rightarrow \rho$, $u_{f^\varepsilon} \rightarrow u$, and $f^\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathbb{1}_{|u-v|^d \leq c_d \rho}$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, then by the discussion above we have that ρ and u satisfy our main system, isentropic EAS (1.1). We notice that a similar scaling for the weight function ϕ_α (1.10) is also dealt with in [38] to study hyperbolic limits of kinetic Cucker-Smale model with singular weights. Throughout this paper, we assume that f^ε is a probability density, i.e., $\|f^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, t)\|_{L^1} = 1$ for $t \geq 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, since the total mass is preserved in time.

To the authors' best knowledge, a rigorous derivation of the isentropic EAS, even with the regular communication weights, has not been established yet. For that reason, the main purpose of this work is to study the derivation of the isentropic EAS rigorously and quantitatively. We would like to stress that our argument can be directly applied to the case with regular communication weights. We also remark that the hydrodynamic limit is studied in [3] when the force field is a given function as $F = F(x)$ with $F \in L^\infty(\Omega)$.

Our strategy is based on the relative entropy method, also often referred to as modulated energy method, which relies on the weak-strong uniqueness principle for systems of conservation laws [23, 24]. Later, it has been successfully applied to various hydrodynamic limit problems [3, 4, 5, 7, 17, 35, 39, 44], etc. To make use of relative entropy method, we rewrite the pressured EAS (1.1) as a conservative form:

$$\partial_t U + \nabla \cdot A(U) = F(U),$$

where

$$U := \begin{pmatrix} \rho \\ m \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{with } m := \rho u, \quad A(U) := \begin{pmatrix} m \\ \frac{m \otimes m}{\rho} + \rho^\gamma \mathbb{I}_d \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$F(U) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \rho \int_\Omega \phi_\alpha(x-y)(u(y) - u(x)) \rho(y) dy \end{pmatrix}.$$

The free energy of the above system is given by

$$E(U) := \frac{|m|^2}{2\rho} + \frac{1}{\gamma-1} \rho^\gamma.$$

We then define the relative entropy functional \mathcal{E} between two states of the system U and \bar{U} as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(\bar{U}|U) &:= E(\bar{U}) - E(U) - DE(U)(\bar{U} - U) \quad \text{with} \quad \bar{U} := \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\rho} \\ \bar{m} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \bar{m} = \bar{\rho}\bar{u}, \\ &= \frac{\bar{\rho}}{2}|\bar{u} - u|^2 + \mathcal{H}(\bar{\rho}|\rho), \end{aligned} \quad (1.11)$$

where $DE(U)$ denotes the derivative of E with respect to U , and

$$\mathcal{H}(\bar{\rho}|\rho) := \frac{1}{\gamma - 1}(\bar{\rho}^\gamma - \rho^\gamma + \gamma(\rho - \bar{\rho})\rho^{\gamma-1}). \quad (1.12)$$

We now let $U^\varepsilon = (\rho^\varepsilon, m^\varepsilon = \rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon)$ be the macroscopic quantity corresponding to a solution of the BGK-alignment model (1.9) and estimate a quantitative bound on

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{E}(U^\varepsilon|U) dx,$$

where

$$\rho^\varepsilon := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f^\varepsilon dv \quad \text{and} \quad \rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v f^\varepsilon dv.$$

It follows from (1.9) that $U^\varepsilon = (\rho^\varepsilon, m^\varepsilon = \rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon)$ satisfies

$$\partial_t U^\varepsilon + \nabla \cdot A(U^\varepsilon) - F^\varepsilon(U^\varepsilon) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \nabla \cdot \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (u^\varepsilon \otimes u^\varepsilon - v \otimes v) f^\varepsilon dv + C_d(\rho^\varepsilon)^\gamma \mathbb{I}_d \right) \end{pmatrix},$$

where C_d is given by

$$C_d := \frac{|\mathbb{S}_{d-1}|}{d(d+2)} \left(\frac{d}{|\mathbb{S}_{d-1}|} \right)^{\frac{d+2}{d}}. \quad (1.13)$$

Here the source term $F^\varepsilon = F^\varepsilon(U^\varepsilon)$ is given as

$$F^\varepsilon(U^\varepsilon) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \rho^\varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(x-y)(u^\varepsilon(y) - u^\varepsilon(x)) \rho^\varepsilon(y) dy \end{pmatrix}.$$

Obviously, the main difficulty in estimating the relative entropy arises from the singular communication weight ϕ_α . As mentioned above, for $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, the isothermal EAS is rigorously derived from the kinetic Fokker-Planck-alignment model (1.8) recently in [19]. In that work, the bound estimate $\phi_\alpha(x-y)|u(x) - u(y)| \leq \text{Lip}(u)|x-y|^{1-\alpha} \lesssim 1$ for $|x-y| \lesssim 1$ is heavily used, thus it seems hard to extend to the case with $\alpha > 1$. We mainly follow the argument used in [19], however, to cover the more singular regime $\alpha > 1$, we consider the BGK-alignment model (1.4) and have a better control of $\rho^\varepsilon - \rho$ from the relative entropy functional $\mathcal{H}(\rho^\varepsilon|\rho)$ appeared in (1.12). This together with a careful analysis of singular integrals enables us to close the relative entropy estimate, and the almost everywhere convergences of ρ^ε and $\rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon$ to ρ and ρu are obtained, respectively.

As stated above, we employ the relative entropy argument, and this requires the existence of weak solutions to the equation (1.9) and regular solutions to the limiting system (1.1). Since local existence theories for Euler-type equations have been well developed, we omit the details of proof for the uniqueness and existence of regular solutions to the system (1.1) and prove the existence of $L^1_+ \cap L^\infty$ -solutions to the BGK-alignment model (1.9). Indeed, when $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^d$, the local-in-time well-posedness for the isentropic EAS (1.1) can be obtained by using a similar argument as in [13], see also [14, 21]. In the whole space case, we can use almost the same argument as in [19] to establish the local well-posedness.

Concerning the existence of weak solutions to (1.9), in the one dimensional case, the global existence of L^1_+ -solutions to the equation (1.9) when $F \equiv 0$ and $M[f]$ is given as the positive function in (1.6), see (1.15) below, is established in [2]. In a recent work [16], global existence of $L^1_+ \cap L^\infty$ -solutions to the equation (1.9) is obtained in dimension $d \geq 1$ when $F \equiv 0$. In that work, the positive function in (1.6) is also dealt with. In our case, even though the force field $F_{\phi_\alpha^\varepsilon}$ is not singular for $\varepsilon > 0$, it produces new difficulties that are not observed in previous literature due to its nonlinearity and nonlocality. To overcome that difficulties, inspired

by [16], we regularize the macroscopic observables ρ and u in $M[f]$, and we further regularize $M[f]$ itself to remove its discontinuity. We then linearize that regularized equation. For that regularized and linearized equation, we provide some uniform bound estimates and Cauchy estimate for approximate solutions. In order to show the Cauchy estimate, we use a velocity-weighted L^1 space which enables us to obtain an appropriate information from the support of $M[f]$. However, our force field $F_{\phi_\alpha} = \phi_\alpha * (\rho_f u_f) - v(\phi_\alpha * \rho_f)$ has a linear growth with respect to v , and this causes a growth of v -weight for f . To control the velocity growth of f , motivated from [18], we estimate the approximate solutions in a weighted L^∞ space by exponential velocity-weight. By combining this and extracting a proper dissipative effect from the force field, we are able to close the Cauchy estimate. This gives the existence of solutions to the regularized equation. We then finally use weak and strong compactness theorems to pass to the limit in the regularized equation.

1.3. Main results. We first introduce our notion of weak solutions to equation (1.9) and then state the existence theorem.

Definition 1.1. *For a given $T > 0$, we say that f^ε is a weak solution to (1.9) if the following conditions are satisfied:*

- (i) $f^\varepsilon \in L^\infty(0, T; L^1_+ \cap L^\infty(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d))$ and
- (ii) for all $\eta \in \mathcal{C}_c^1(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T])$ with $\eta(x, v, T) = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & - \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} f_0^\varepsilon \eta(x, v, 0) dx dv - \int_0^T \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} f^\varepsilon (\partial_t \eta + v \cdot \nabla_x \eta + F_{\phi_\alpha}^\varepsilon[f^\varepsilon] \cdot \nabla_v \eta) dx dv dt \\ & = \int_0^T \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} (M[f^\varepsilon] - f^\varepsilon) \eta dx dv dt. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 1.1 (Existence of $L^1_+ \cap L^\infty$ -solutions f^ε). *Let $T > 0$. Suppose that f_0^ε satisfies*

$$f_0^\varepsilon \in L^1_+ \cap L^\infty(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d) \quad \text{and} \quad |v|^2 f_0^\varepsilon \in L^1(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d).$$

Then there exists a weak solution to (4.1) in the sense of Definition 1.1 satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f^\varepsilon dx dv + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \int_0^t \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 (f^\varepsilon - M[f^\varepsilon]) dx dv ds \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} \phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(x-y) |u^\varepsilon(x) - u^\varepsilon(y)|^2 \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) dx dy ds \leq \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f_0^\varepsilon dx dv. \end{aligned} \tag{1.14}$$

We now present our result on the quantified hydrodynamic limit from the BGK-alignment model (1.9) to the isentropic EAS (1.1).

Theorem 1.2 (Quantified hydrodynamic limit). *Let $T > 0$ and f^ε be a weak solution to the BGK-alignment model (1.9) obtained in Theorem 1.1. Let (ρ, u) be the unique local-in-time classical solution to the isentropic EAS (1.1) subject to the initial data (ρ_0, u_0) satisfying $\rho \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; L^1_+ \cap L^\infty(\Omega))$ and $u \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2 \cap W^{1,\infty}(\Omega))$. Suppose that the initial data satisfy the well-prepared conditions:*

(H1)

$$\iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|v|^2}{2} f_0^\varepsilon dx dv - \int_\Omega \rho_0^\varepsilon \left(\frac{(\rho_0^\varepsilon)^{\gamma-1}}{\gamma-1} + \frac{|u_0^\varepsilon|^2}{2} \right) dx \leq C\sqrt{\varepsilon}.$$

(H2)

$$\int_\Omega \mathcal{E}(U_0^\varepsilon | U_0) dx \leq C\sqrt{\varepsilon}.$$

Moreover, depending on the spatial domain, we assume

- Periodic domain case ($\Omega = \mathbb{T}^d$): $d \geq 1$ and $\alpha \in (0, \min\{2, 1 + \frac{d}{2}\})$.
- Whole space case ($\Omega = \mathbb{R}^d$): $d \geq 2$ and $\alpha \in (1, 2)$.

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \rho^\varepsilon \rightarrow \rho \quad \text{a.e. and in } L^\infty(0, T; L^p(\Omega)) \quad \text{with } p \in (1, \gamma), \\ & \rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon \rightarrow \rho u \quad \text{a.e. and in } L^\infty(0, T; L^q(\Omega)) \quad \text{with } q \in [1, \frac{d+2}{d+1}), \quad \text{and} \\ & \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v \otimes v f^\varepsilon dv \rightarrow \rho u \otimes u + \rho^\gamma \mathbb{I}_d \quad \text{a.e. and in } L^1(\Omega \times (0, T)) \end{aligned}$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. In fact, there exists a positive constant C , which is independent of ε such that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{\Omega} (\rho^\varepsilon |u^\varepsilon - u|^2 + \mathcal{H}(\rho^\varepsilon | \rho)) dx \leq C\varepsilon^\lambda,$$

where $\lambda := \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2}, \frac{\beta}{2}, \frac{\alpha\beta}{4}, \frac{\alpha\beta}{2(\alpha+2)} \right\}$.

1.4. Remarks. We give several remarks on Theorem 1.2.

(i) Noticing from (1.3), we assume

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |x|^r \phi_\alpha(x) dx < \infty \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \alpha - r < d.$$

(ii) Since $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, if we choose $\beta = \frac{2}{\alpha}$, then

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{\Omega} (\rho^\varepsilon |u^\varepsilon - u|^2 + \mathcal{H}(\rho^\varepsilon | \rho)) dx \leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\alpha+2}}.$$

(iii) When $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^d$, by monotonicity of L^p -norm, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^\varepsilon &\rightarrow \rho \quad \text{a.e. and in } L^\infty(0, T; L^p(\Omega)) \quad \text{with } p \in [1, \gamma) \quad \text{and} \\ \rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon &\rightarrow \rho u \quad \text{a.e. and in } L^\infty(0, T; L^q(\Omega)) \quad \text{with } q \in [1, \frac{d+2}{d+1}) \end{aligned}$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

(iv) We summarize the current state of the hydrodynamic limit for the BGK-alignment model (1.9) toward the isentropic EAS (1.1).

	$d = 1$	$d \geq 2$
$\Omega = \mathbb{T}^d$	$\alpha \in (0, \frac{3}{2})$	$\alpha \in (0, 2)$
$\Omega = \mathbb{R}^d$		$\alpha \in (1, 2)$

Note that for $d \geq 2$, $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, and $\tilde{\alpha} \in (1, 2)$, if we consider a communication weight function $\phi \in \mathcal{C}^1(0, \infty)$ satisfying

$$\phi(r) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{r^\alpha} & \text{if } r \in (0, R) \\ \frac{1}{r^{\tilde{\alpha}}} & \text{if } r > 2R \end{cases}$$

for some $R > 0$, then our main theorem can be directly applied to the above case.

At this moment, we were not able to resolve the case $d = 1$ and $\Omega = \mathbb{R}$. The main difficulty arises from the lower bound estimate on the relative entropy in the one-dimensional case, see Lemma 2.1 and Remark 2.1 for more detailed discussions.

(v) Currently, we were unable to cover the pressure law $p(\rho) = \rho^\gamma$ with $\gamma \in (1, 1 + \frac{2}{d})$. One could consider

$$\partial_t f^\varepsilon + v \cdot \nabla_x f^\varepsilon + \nabla_v \cdot (F_{\phi_\alpha^\varepsilon}[f^\varepsilon] f^\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} Q[f^\varepsilon], \quad (1.15)$$

where $Q[f] = M[f] - f$ with

$$M[f] = c_{\gamma, d} \left(\frac{2\gamma}{\gamma-1} \rho_f^{\gamma-1} - |v - u_f|^2 \right)_+^{n/2}, \quad \gamma \in (1, 1 + \frac{2}{d})$$

and pass to the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ to have the isentropic EAS with $\gamma \in (1, 1 + \frac{2}{d})$. Following [4], in this case, the kinetic entropy for the above kinetic equation would be defined by

$$H(f) = \frac{|v|^2}{2} f + \frac{1}{2c_{\gamma, d}^{2/n}} \frac{f^{1+2/n}}{1+2/n},$$

where $c_{\gamma, d}$ and n are given as in (1.7). Then we get from [4] that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} H(M[f]) dv \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} H(f) dv,$$

and this gives some dissipation from the BGK operator Q . However, in this approach, we could not find an appropriate way of having non-increasing of $\iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} H(f^\varepsilon) dx dv$ due to the present of the non-local alignment force $F[f]$ even with regular communication weights.

1.5. Organization of the paper. The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we provide a uniform-in- ε bound estimate on the kinetic energy with appropriate dissipations. We also present lower bound estimates on $\mathcal{H}(\bar{\rho}|\rho)$. Those two estimates will be significantly used in the relative entropy estimates later. In order to emphasize our main result on the derivation of (1.1) from (1.9), we give the details of the proof of Theorem 1.2 in Section 3. Finally, in Section 4, we construct the global-in-time weak solutions to the BGK-alignment model (1.9) satisfying the required entropy inequality (1.14).

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Uniform kinetic energy estimate on f^ε . In this subsection, we provide the uniform-in- ε bound estimate on the kinetic energy for (1.9). For this, we consider the kinetic energy:

$$H(f) = \frac{|v|^2}{2} f.$$

Multiplying (1.9) by $|v|^2$ and integrating over x and v , we get

$$\frac{d}{dt} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|v|^2}{2} f^\varepsilon dx dv = \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} v \cdot (F_{\phi_\varepsilon}[f^\varepsilon] f^\varepsilon) dx dv + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|v|^2}{2} (M[f^\varepsilon] - f^\varepsilon) dx dv. \quad (2.1)$$

Here we use the same argument as in [19] to get

$$\iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} (v \cdot F_{\phi_\varepsilon}[f^\varepsilon]) f^\varepsilon dx dv \leq -\frac{1}{2} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(x-y) |u^\varepsilon(x) - u^\varepsilon(y)|^2 \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) dx dy.$$

This combined with (2.1) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f^\varepsilon dx dv + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_0^t \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 (f^\varepsilon - M[f^\varepsilon]) dx dv ds \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(x-y) |u^\varepsilon(x) - u^\varepsilon(y)|^2 \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) dx dy ds \leq \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f_0^\varepsilon dx dv. \end{aligned}$$

Note from [4] that for any f satisfying

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f + H(f) dv < \infty,$$

the minimization principle holds true:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} H(M[f]) dv \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} H(f) dv. \quad (2.2)$$

This together with (2.1) gives the bound of kinetic entropy:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f^\varepsilon dx dv + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(x-y) |u^\varepsilon(x) - u^\varepsilon(y)|^2 \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) dx dy ds \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f_0^\varepsilon dx dv. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

2.2. Lower bound estimate on $\mathcal{H}(\bar{\rho}|\rho)$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{H}(\bar{\rho}|\rho)$ be given as (1.12). Suppose that*

$$\int_{\Omega} \bar{\rho} dx = \int_{\Omega} \rho dx = 1.$$

Then there exists $C > 0$ independent of $\bar{\rho}$ and ρ such that

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{H}(\bar{\rho}|\rho) dx \geq C \begin{cases} \|\bar{\rho} - \rho\|_{L^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}}^2 & \text{if } d \geq 2 \\ \|\bar{\rho} - \rho\|_{L^2(\rho)}^2 & \text{if } d = 1 \end{cases}.$$

In particular, if $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^d$, $d = 1$, and $\rho \geq \rho_m > 0$ for some constant ρ_m , then

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{H}(\bar{\rho}|\rho) dx \geq C \rho_m \|\bar{\rho} - \rho\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Proof. Note that if $d \geq 2$, then $\gamma = 1 + \frac{2}{d} \leq 2$, and in this case, by Taylor's theorem, we readily see

$$\mathcal{H}(\bar{\rho}|\rho) \geq \frac{\gamma}{2} \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\bar{\rho}^{2-\gamma}}, \frac{1}{\rho^{2-\gamma}} \right\} (\rho - \bar{\rho})^2,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |\rho^\varepsilon - \rho|^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}} dx &= \int_{\Omega} \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\bar{\rho}^{2-\gamma}}, \frac{1}{\rho^{2-\gamma}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{3-\gamma}} \max \{ \bar{\rho}^{2-\gamma}, \rho^{2-\gamma} \}^{\frac{1}{3-\gamma}} |\rho^\varepsilon - \rho|^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}} dx \\ &\leq \left(\int_{\Omega} \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\bar{\rho}^{2-\gamma}}, \frac{1}{\rho^{2-\gamma}} \right\} |\rho - \bar{\rho}|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{3-\gamma}} \left(\int_{\Omega} \max \{ \bar{\rho}, \rho \} dx \right)^{\frac{2-\gamma}{3-\gamma}}. \end{aligned}$$

This yields

$$\|\bar{\rho} - \rho\|_{L^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}}^2 \leq C \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{H}(\bar{\rho}|\rho) dx$$

for some $C > 0$.

On the other hand, if $d = 1$, then $\gamma = 3$, and by Taylor's theorem we find

$$\mathcal{H}(\bar{\rho}|\rho) = \frac{3}{2} \int_0^1 (1-\theta)(\rho + \theta(\bar{\rho} - \rho))(\bar{\rho} - \rho)^2 d\theta.$$

In particular, this implies

$$\mathcal{H}(\bar{\rho}|\rho) \geq \frac{3}{2} \rho (\bar{\rho} - \rho)^2 \int_0^1 (1-\theta)^2 d\theta = \frac{1}{2} \rho (\bar{\rho} - \rho)^2.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Remark 2.1. For the one-dimensional case, we obtain

$$\|\bar{\rho} - \rho\|_{L^3}^2 \leq C \left(\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{H}(\bar{\rho}|\rho) dx \right)^{\frac{2}{3}}$$

for some $C > 0$. Indeed, if $\bar{\rho} \geq \rho$, then

$$\int_0^1 (1-\theta)(\rho + \theta(\bar{\rho} - \rho))(\bar{\rho} - \rho)^2 d\theta \geq (\bar{\rho} - \rho)^3 \int_0^1 (1-\theta)\theta d\theta = \frac{(\bar{\rho} - \rho)^3}{6}.$$

On the other hand, if $\bar{\rho} \leq \rho$, then

$$\int_0^1 (1-\theta)(\rho + \theta(\bar{\rho} - \rho))(\bar{\rho} - \rho)^2 d\theta \geq \rho (\bar{\rho} - \rho)^2 \int_0^1 (1-\theta)^2 d\theta = \frac{\rho (\bar{\rho} - \rho)^2}{3}.$$

Thus we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |\bar{\rho} - \rho|^3 dx &= \int_{\bar{\rho} \geq \rho} |\bar{\rho} - \rho|^2 (\bar{\rho} - \rho) dx + \int_{\bar{\rho} \leq \rho} |\bar{\rho} - \rho|^2 (\rho - \bar{\rho}) dx \\ &\leq \int_{\bar{\rho} \geq \rho} |\bar{\rho} - \rho|^2 (\bar{\rho} - \rho) dx + \int_{\bar{\rho} \leq \rho} |\bar{\rho} - \rho|^2 \rho dx \\ &\leq C \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{H}(\bar{\rho}|\rho) dx \end{aligned}$$

for some $C > 0$.

It is worth noticing that in the estimates of relative entropy, it is required to obtain

$$\|\bar{\rho} - \rho\|_{L^p}^2 \leq C \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{H}(\bar{\rho}|\rho) dx \tag{2.4}$$

for some $p \in [1, \gamma]$. As stated in Lemma 2.1, we have the above estimate with $p = 2$ when $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^d$ by assuming that $\rho \geq \rho_m > 0$. However, in the case $\Omega = \mathbb{R}$, we cannot assume that ρ has a positive bound due

to $\rho \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$. This causes a great difficulty in having (2.4) and this is the main reason why we could not handle the case $\Omega = \mathbb{R}$.

3. HYDRODYNAMIC LIMIT FROM THE BGK-ALIGNMENT MODEL TO ISENTROPIC EAS

3.1. Relative entropy estimate. We now provide the estimate of the relative entropy functional $\mathcal{E}(U^\varepsilon|U)$.

Lemma 3.1. *The relative entropy $\mathcal{E}(U^\varepsilon|U)$ defined in (1.11) satisfies the following estimate:*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{E}(U^\varepsilon|U) dx \\
& \leq \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{E}(U_0^\varepsilon|U_0) dx + \int_{\Omega} E(U^\varepsilon) - E(U_0^\varepsilon) dx \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) \phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(x-y) |u^\varepsilon(x) - u^\varepsilon(y)|^2 dx dy ds \\
& \quad - \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} \nabla(DE(U)) : A(U^\varepsilon|U) dx ds - \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} DE(U) \cdot (\partial_t U^\varepsilon + \nabla \cdot A(U^\varepsilon) - F^\varepsilon(U^\varepsilon)) dx ds \\
& \quad + \int_0^t \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \rho^\varepsilon(x) (\rho(y) - \rho^\varepsilon(y)) \phi_\alpha(x-y) (u^\varepsilon(x) - u(x)) \cdot (u(y) - u(x)) dx dy ds \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} (\phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(x-y) - \phi_\alpha(x-y)) (u(x) - u(y)) \cdot (u^\varepsilon(y) - u^\varepsilon(x)) \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) dx dy ds,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

where $A : B := \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} b_{ij}$ for $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $A(U^\varepsilon|U)$ is the relative flux functional given by

$$A(U^\varepsilon|U) := A(U^\varepsilon) - A(U) - DA(U)(U^\varepsilon - U).$$

Proof. It follows from the definition of relative entropy functional (1.11), [33, Lemma 4.1], and [33, Proof of Proposition 4.2] that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{E}(U^\varepsilon|U) dx &= \int_{\Omega} \partial_t E(U^\varepsilon) dx - \int_{\Omega} DE(U) \cdot (\partial_t U^\varepsilon + \nabla \cdot A(U^\varepsilon) - F^\varepsilon(U^\varepsilon)) dx \\
&\quad - \underbrace{\int_{\Omega} \nabla(DE(U)) : A(U^\varepsilon|U) dx - \int_{\Omega} D^2 E(U) F(U) (U^\varepsilon - U) + DE(U) \cdot F^\varepsilon(U^\varepsilon) dx}_{=: I}.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, straightforward computation gives

$$\begin{aligned}
& D^2 E(U) F(U) (U^\varepsilon - U) \\
&= \rho^\varepsilon(x) (u^\varepsilon(x) - u(x)) \cdot \left(\int_{\Omega} \phi_\alpha(x-y) (u(y) - u(x)) \rho(y) dy \right)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$DE(U) \cdot F^\varepsilon(U^\varepsilon) = \rho^\varepsilon u \cdot \left(\int_{\Omega} \phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(x-y) (u^\varepsilon(y) - u^\varepsilon(x)) \rho^\varepsilon(y) dy \right).$$

We then use the same argument as in [19] to have

$$\begin{aligned}
I &= \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) \phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(x-y) |u^\varepsilon(x) - u^\varepsilon(y)|^2 dx dy \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) \phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(x-y) |(u^\varepsilon(x) - u(x)) - (u^\varepsilon(y) - u(y))|^2 dx dy \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} (\phi_\alpha(x-y) - \phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(x-y)) |u(x) - u(y)|^2 \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) dx dy ds \\
&\quad + \int_0^t \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \rho^\varepsilon(x) (\rho(y) - \rho^\varepsilon(y)) \phi_\alpha(x-y) (u^\varepsilon(x) - u(x)) \cdot (u(y) - u(x)) dx dy \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} (\phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(x-y) - \phi_\alpha(x-y)) (u(x) - u(y)) \cdot (u^\varepsilon(y) - u^\varepsilon(x)) \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) dx dy
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) \phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(x-y) |u^\varepsilon(x) - u^\varepsilon(y)|^2 dx dy \\
&\quad + \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \rho^\varepsilon(x) (\rho(y) - \rho^\varepsilon(y)) \phi_\alpha(x-y) (u^\varepsilon(x) - u(x)) \cdot (u(y) - u(x)) dx dy \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} (\phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(x-y) - \phi_\alpha(x-y)) (u(x) - u(y)) \cdot (u^\varepsilon(y) - u^\varepsilon(x)) \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) dx dy,
\end{aligned}$$

due to $\phi_\alpha \geq \phi_\alpha^\varepsilon \geq 0$. This together with integrating the resulting inequality with respect to time concludes the desired result. \square

3.2. Proof of Theorem 1.2. We first recall from [19] an auxiliary lemma which gives the error bound on $\phi_\alpha - \phi_\alpha^\varepsilon$.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 2)$. Then*

$$\phi_\alpha(x) - \phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(x) \leq \frac{\alpha \varepsilon^\beta}{2} \frac{\phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(x)}{|x|^2} \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}.$$

We next estimate the each term on the right hand side of (3.1). Let us set each term $I_i, i = 1, \dots, 7$, i.e.,

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{E}(U^\varepsilon | U) dx \leq \sum_{i=1}^7 I_i.$$

Estimate of I_1 : It follows from the well-prepared initial data assumption **(H2)** that

$$I_1 \leq C\sqrt{\varepsilon}.$$

Estimate of $I_2 + I_3$: Note from [4] that for any f satisfying

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f + H(f) dv < \infty,$$

a compatibility between the entropy E and the kinetic entropy H is satisfied as

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} H(M[f]) dv = E(U).$$

This, combined with (2.2) yields

$$\int_{\Omega} E(U^\varepsilon) dx = \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} H(M[f^\varepsilon]) dx dv \leq \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} H(f^\varepsilon) dx dv = \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f^\varepsilon dx dv.$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&I_2 + I_3 \\
&= \int_{\Omega} E(U^\varepsilon) dx - \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} H(f^\varepsilon) dx dv \\
&\quad + \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} H(f^\varepsilon) dx dv + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) \phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(x-y) |u^\varepsilon(x) - u^\varepsilon(y)|^2 dx dy ds - \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} H(f_0^\varepsilon) dx dv \\
&\quad + \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} H(f_0^\varepsilon) dx dv - \int_{\Omega} E(U_0^\varepsilon) dx \\
&\leq C\sqrt{\varepsilon},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the estimate of kinetic entropy (2.3) and the well-prepared initial data assumption **(H1)** in the last inequality.

Estimate of I_4 : It follows from [33, Lemma 4.3] that

$$A(U^\varepsilon | U) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \rho^\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon - u) \otimes (u^\varepsilon - u) + (\gamma - 1)\mathcal{H}(\rho^\varepsilon | \rho) \mathbb{I}_d \end{pmatrix}.$$

This yields

$$\begin{aligned} |I_4| &= \left| \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} \nabla u : (\rho^\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon - u) \otimes (u^\varepsilon - u) + \frac{2}{d} \mathcal{H}(\rho^\varepsilon | \rho) \mathbb{I}_d) dx ds \right| \\ &\leq \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{E}(U^\varepsilon | U) dx ds. \end{aligned}$$

Estimate of I_5 : We first record that the Maxwellian distribution satisfies (see [4, 16])

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} M(f^\varepsilon) dv = \rho^\varepsilon, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v M(f^\varepsilon) dv = \rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon, \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v \otimes v M(f^\varepsilon) dv = \rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon \otimes u^\varepsilon + C_d(\rho^\varepsilon)^\gamma \mathbb{I}_d,$$

where C_d is appeared in (1.13). By using the above, we find

$$\partial_t U^\varepsilon + \partial_x A(U^\varepsilon) - F^\varepsilon(U^\varepsilon) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \nabla \cdot \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (u^\varepsilon \otimes u^\varepsilon - v \otimes v) f^\varepsilon dv + C_d(\rho^\varepsilon)^\gamma \mathbb{I}_d \right) \end{pmatrix},$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} I_5 &= \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} (\nabla u) : \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (u^\varepsilon \otimes u^\varepsilon - v \otimes v) f^\varepsilon dv + C_d(\rho^\varepsilon)^\gamma \mathbb{I}_d \right) dx ds \\ &\leq C \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v \otimes v (M[f^\varepsilon] - f^\varepsilon) dv \right| dx ds. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.3. [3, Proposition 4.1] *Let f^ε be a solution to the BGK equation with initial value f_0^ε bounded in $L^1(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ verifying*

$$\iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f_0^\varepsilon(x, v) dx dv \leq C^0 < \infty,$$

and with $\gamma = 1 + \frac{2}{d}$. Then there exists $C > 0$ such that for every $\varepsilon < 1$, we have

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v \otimes v (M[f^\varepsilon] - f^\varepsilon) dv \right| dx dt \leq C\sqrt{\varepsilon}.$$

Thus we get

$$I_5 \leq C\sqrt{\varepsilon}.$$

Estimate of I_6 : We estimate I_6 by dividing two cases $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^d$ and $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^d$.

- **Case A** ($\Omega = \mathbb{T}^d$): We deal with the cases $d = 1$ and $d \geq 2$, separately.
- **Case A.1** ($d = 1$): In this case, $\gamma = 3$ and ρ has a strict positive lower bound $\rho_m > 0$. Since

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} (\rho^\varepsilon - \rho)^2 dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{2}{\rho} \mathcal{H}(\rho^\varepsilon | \rho) dx \leq \frac{2}{\rho_m} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \mathcal{H}(\rho^\varepsilon | \rho) dx,$$

we get

$$\|\rho^\varepsilon - \rho\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \int_{\mathbb{T}} \mathcal{H}(\rho^\varepsilon | \rho) dx \tag{3.2}$$

for some $C > 0$ independent of $\varepsilon > 0$.

Then, for $\alpha \in (0, \frac{3}{2})$, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} I_6 &\leq \text{Lip}(u) \int_0^t \iint_{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}} \rho^\varepsilon(x) |x - y| \phi_\alpha(x - y) |\rho(y) - \rho^\varepsilon(y)| |u^\varepsilon(x) - u(x)| dx dy ds \\ &\leq \text{Lip}(u) \int_0^t \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}} \rho^\varepsilon(x) |u^\varepsilon(x) - u(x)|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad \times \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}} \rho^\varepsilon(x) |x - y|^{2\phi_{2\alpha}} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} |\rho(y) - \rho^\varepsilon(y)| dy ds \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}} \rho^\varepsilon(x) |x-y|^2 \phi_{2\alpha}(x-y) dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} |\rho(y) - \rho^\varepsilon(y)| dy \\ & \leq \left(\iint_{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}} \rho^\varepsilon(x) |x-y|^2 \phi_{2\alpha}(x-y) dx dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\rho - \rho^\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq C \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}} \mathcal{H}(\rho^\varepsilon | \rho) dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used (3.2) and

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} |x-y|^2 \phi_{2\alpha}(x-y) dy < \infty$$

due to $\alpha < \frac{3}{2}$. This implies

$$I_6 \leq C \int_0^t \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}} \rho^\varepsilon(x) |u^\varepsilon(x) - u(x)|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}} \mathcal{H}(\rho^\varepsilon | \rho) dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} ds \leq C \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}} \mathcal{E}(U^\varepsilon | U) dx ds,$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of $\varepsilon > 0$.

• **Case A.2** ($d \geq 2$): In this case, we notice that $\gamma \leq 2$ and

$$\|\rho^\varepsilon - \rho\|_{L^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}}^2 \leq C \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{H}(\rho^\varepsilon | \rho) dx$$

for some $C > 0$ independent of $\varepsilon > 0$. We use a similar argument as in **Case A.1** to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_6 & \leq \text{Lip}(u) \int_0^t \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho^\varepsilon(x) |u^\varepsilon(x) - u(x)|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \quad \times \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho^\varepsilon(x) |x-y|^2 \phi_{2\alpha}(x-y) dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} |\rho(y) - \rho^\varepsilon(y)| dy ds \end{aligned}$$

Applying Hölder's inequality and Minkowski's inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho^\varepsilon(x) |x-y|^2 \phi_{2\alpha}(x-y) dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} |\rho(y) - \rho^\varepsilon(y)| dy \\ & \leq \|\rho(y) - \rho^\varepsilon(y)\|_{L^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho^\varepsilon(x) |x-y|^2 \phi_{2\alpha}(x-y) dx \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} dy \right)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{2}} \\ & \leq \|\rho(y) - \rho^\varepsilon(y)\|_{L^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho^\varepsilon(x) \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |x-y|^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}} \phi_{\frac{2\alpha}{\gamma-1}}(x-y) dy \right)^{\gamma-1} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\frac{2}{\gamma-1} = d$ and

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |x-y|^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}} \phi_{\frac{2\alpha}{\gamma-1}}(x-y) dy < \infty$$

since

$$\frac{2}{\gamma-1}(\alpha-1) < d \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \alpha < 2.$$

Hence,

$$I_6 \leq C \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \mathcal{E}(U^\varepsilon | U) dx ds,$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of $\varepsilon > 0$.

• **Case B** ($\Omega = \mathbb{R}^d$): In this case, we only consider $d \geq 2$ and $\alpha \in (1, 2)$, and this subsequently implies $\gamma \leq 2$. Analogously as the above, we deduce

$$I_6 \leq \int_0^t \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho^\varepsilon(x) |u^\varepsilon(x) - u(x)|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \times \|\rho(y) - \rho^\varepsilon(y)\|_{L^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho^\varepsilon(x) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u(x) - u(y)|^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}} \phi_{\frac{2\alpha}{\gamma-1}}(x-y) dy \right)^{\gamma-1} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} ds$$

We then estimate

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u(x) - u(y)|^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}} \phi_{\frac{2\alpha}{\gamma-1}}(x-y) dy \\ = \int_{|x-y| < R} |u(x) - u(y)|^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}} \phi_{\frac{2\alpha}{\gamma-1}}(x-y) dy + \int_{|x-y| \geq R} |u(x) - u(y)|^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}} \phi_{\frac{2\alpha}{\gamma-1}}(x-y) dy \\ \leq \text{Lip}(u) \int_{|x-y| < R} |x-y|^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}} \phi_{\frac{2\alpha}{\gamma-1}}(x-y) dy + \|u\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}} \int_{|x-y| \geq R} \phi_{\frac{2\alpha}{\gamma-1}}(x-y) dy,$$

where the first integral on the right hand is finite due to $\alpha < 2$, and the second integral is also finite since

$$\frac{2}{\gamma-1}\alpha > d \iff \alpha > 1.$$

Thus, we have

$$I_6 \leq C \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{E}(U^\varepsilon|U) dx ds.$$

Estimate of I_7 : We first estimate I_7 as

$$I_7 \leq \frac{\text{Lip}(u)}{2} \int_0^t \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} (\phi_\alpha(x-y) - \phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(x-y)) |x-y| |u^\varepsilon(y) - u^\varepsilon(x)| \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) dx dy ds \\ = \frac{\text{Lip}(u)}{2} \int_0^t (I_{71} + I_{72}) ds,$$

where

$$I_{7i} := \iint_{A_i} (\phi_\alpha(x-y) - \phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(x-y)) |x-y| |u^\varepsilon(y) - u^\varepsilon(x)| \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) dx dy, \quad i = 1, 2,$$

with $A_1 = \{(x, y) \in \Omega \times \Omega : |x-y| > \delta\}$ and $A_2 = \{(x, y) \in \Omega \times \Omega : |x-y| \leq \delta\}$. Here $\delta \in (0, 1)$ will be chosen appropriately later.

For I_{71} , we use Lemma 3.2 and almost the same argument as in [19] to get

$$I_{71} \leq \frac{\alpha \varepsilon^\beta}{2} \iint_{|x-y| > \delta} \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) \frac{\phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(x-y)}{|x-y|} |u^\varepsilon(x) - u^\varepsilon(y)| dx dy \\ \leq C \frac{\varepsilon^\beta}{\delta} \left(\iint_{|x-y| > \delta} \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) \phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(x-y) dx dy \right)^{1/2} \\ \times \left(\iint_{|x-y| > \delta} \phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(x-y) \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) |u^\varepsilon(x) - u^\varepsilon(y)|^2 dx dy \right)^{1/2} \\ \leq C \frac{\varepsilon^\beta}{\delta^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \left(\iint_{|x-y| > \delta} \phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(x-y) \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) |u^\varepsilon(x) - u^\varepsilon(y)|^2 dx dy \right)^{1/2}$$

due to

$$\iint_{|x-y| > \delta} \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) \phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(x-y) dx dy \leq \iint_{|x-y| > \delta} \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) |x-y|^{-\alpha} dx dy \leq \delta^{-\alpha}.$$

For the estimate of I_{72} , we obtain

$$I_{72} \leq \iint_{|x-y| < \delta} \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) \phi_\alpha(x-y) |x-y| |u^\varepsilon(x) - u^\varepsilon(y)| dx dy$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \iint_{|x-y|<\delta} \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) |x-y|^{1-\alpha} |u^\varepsilon(x) - u^\varepsilon(y)| \, dx dy \\
&\leq \left(\iint_{|x-y|<\delta} \frac{\rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y)}{|x-y|^{2(\alpha-1)}} \, dx dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\iint_{|x-y|<\delta} \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) |u^\varepsilon(x) - u^\varepsilon(y)|^2 \, dx dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq (\varepsilon^\beta + \delta^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} \left(\iint_{|x-y|<\delta} \frac{\rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y)}{|x-y|^{2(\alpha-1)}} \, dx dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad \times \left(\iint_{|x-y|<\delta} \phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(x-y) \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) |u^\varepsilon(x) - u^\varepsilon(y)|^2 \, dx dy \right)^{1/2},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used $1 \leq \phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(x-y)(\varepsilon^\beta + \delta^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ for $|x| < \delta$.

We then consider two cases $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $\alpha \in (1, \min\{2, d + \frac{1}{2}\})$. When $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, we get

$$\left(\iint_{|x-y|<\delta} \frac{\rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y)}{|x-y|^{2(\alpha-1)}} \, dx dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \delta^{1-\alpha} \left(\iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) \, dx dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \delta^{1-\alpha}.$$

Thus,

$$I_{72} \leq \delta^{1-\alpha} (\varepsilon^\beta + \delta^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} \left(\iint_{|x-y|<\delta} \phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(x-y) \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) |u^\varepsilon(x) - u^\varepsilon(y)|^2 \, dx dy \right)^{1/2}.$$

In order to handle the case $\alpha \in (1, \min\{2, d + \frac{1}{2}\})$, we recall the classical Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality:

$$\left| \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \mu(x) |x-y|^{-\lambda} \nu(y) \, dx dy \right| \leq C \|\mu\|_{L^p} \|\nu\|_{L^q}$$

for $\mu \in L^p(\Omega)$, $\nu \in L^q(\Omega)$, $1 < p, q < \infty$, $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} + \frac{\lambda}{d} = 2$, and $0 < \lambda < d$.

For $d \geq 2$, we find $2(\alpha-1) < d$ due to $\alpha \in (1, 2)$. Thus we use the above Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality with $\lambda = 2(\alpha-1)$ and $p = q$ to obtain

$$\iint_{|x-y|<\delta} \frac{\rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y)}{|x-y|^{2(\alpha-1)}} \, dx dy \leq C \|\rho^\varepsilon\|_{L^p}^2$$

for $d \geq 2$. Here p is given by

$$1 < p = \frac{d}{d+1-\alpha} < \frac{d}{d-1} \leq 1 + \frac{2}{d} = \gamma.$$

Since

$$\int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon |u^\varepsilon|^2 + d C_d (\rho^\varepsilon)^\gamma \, dx = \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 M(f^\varepsilon) \, dx dv \leq \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f^\varepsilon \, dx dv \leq \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f_0^\varepsilon \, dx dv,$$

we get

$$\|\rho^\varepsilon\|_{L^1 \cap L^\gamma} \leq C$$

for some $C > 0$ independent of ε , and subsequently by L^p interpolation inequality,

$$\iint_{|x-y|<\delta} \frac{\rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y)}{|x-y|^{2(\alpha-1)}} \, dx dy \leq C$$

for $d \geq 2$.

When $d = 1$, we consider $\alpha \in (0, \frac{3}{2})$ and this gives $2(\alpha-1) < 1$. Then analogously as above,

$$\iint_{|x-y|<\delta} \frac{\rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y)}{|x-y|^{2(\alpha-1)}} \, dx dy \leq C \|\rho^\varepsilon\|_{L^p}^2,$$

where

$$1 < p = \frac{1}{2-\alpha} < 2 < 3 = \gamma.$$

Thus we also have the uniform-in- ε bound on $\|\rho^\varepsilon\|_{L^p}$ in the one-dimensional case.

Thus, for $\alpha \in (1, \min\{2, d + \frac{1}{2}\})$,

$$I_{72} \leq (\varepsilon^\beta + \delta^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} \left(\iint_{|x-y|<\delta} \phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(x-y) \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) |u^\varepsilon(x) - u^\varepsilon(y)|^2 dx dy \right)^{1/2}.$$

Since $\delta < 1$, for $\alpha \in (0, \min\{2, d + \frac{1}{2}\})$, and hence

$$I_{72} \leq (\varepsilon^{\frac{\alpha\beta}{4}} + \delta^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}) \left(\iint_{|x-y|<\delta} \phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(x-y) \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) |u^\varepsilon(x) - u^\varepsilon(y)|^2 dx dy \right)^{1/2}.$$

We then choose $\delta = \varepsilon^{\frac{\beta}{2+\alpha}} < 1$ to have

$$\begin{aligned} I_7 &\leq C \left(\varepsilon^{\frac{\beta}{2}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{\alpha\beta}{4}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{\alpha\beta}{2(2+\alpha)}} \right) \left(\int_0^t \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(x-y) \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) |u^\varepsilon(x) - u^\varepsilon(y)|^2 dx dy ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C \left(\varepsilon^{\frac{\beta}{2}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{\alpha\beta}{4}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{\alpha\beta}{2(2+\alpha)}} \right) H(f_0^\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

due to (2.3).

Combining all of the above estimates yields

$$\int_\Omega \mathcal{E}(U^\varepsilon | U) dx \leq C \left(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{\beta}{2}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{\alpha\beta}{4}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{\alpha\beta}{2(2+\alpha)}} \right) + C \int_0^t \int_\Omega \mathcal{E}(U^\varepsilon | U) dx ds$$

for some $C > 0$ independent of $\varepsilon > 0$, and applying Grönwall's inequality concludes

$$\int_\Omega \mathcal{E}(U^\varepsilon | U) dx \leq C \left(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{\beta}{2}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{\alpha\beta}{4}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{\alpha\beta}{2(2+\alpha)}} \right).$$

Proof of Theorem 1.2. The above estimate gives

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_\Omega (\rho^\varepsilon |u^\varepsilon - u|^2 + \mathcal{H}(\rho^\varepsilon | \rho)) dx \leq C \varepsilon^\lambda,$$

where $\lambda := \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2}, \frac{\beta}{2}, \frac{\alpha\beta}{4}, \frac{\alpha\beta}{2(\alpha+2)} \right\}$. To show the strong convergence of ρ^ε and $\rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon$, we observe from Lemma 2.1 that

$$\rho^\varepsilon \rightarrow \rho \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0, T; L^r(\Omega)) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0,$$

where r is given by

$$r = \begin{cases} \frac{2}{3-\gamma} & \text{if } d \geq 2 \\ 2 & \text{if } d = 1 \end{cases}.$$

Note that $\frac{2}{3-\gamma} \leq \gamma$ for $d \geq 2$ and ρ^ε is uniformly bounded in $L^1 \cap L^\gamma(\Omega)$. Thus the classical L^p interpolation inequality yields

$$\rho^\varepsilon \rightarrow \rho \quad \text{a.e. and in } L^\infty(0, T; L^p(\Omega)) \quad \text{with } p \in (1, \gamma).$$

For $r \in [1, \frac{d+2}{d+1})$, we get

$$r < \gamma \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{r}{2-r} \in [1, \gamma).$$

This together with applying Hölder's inequality gives

$$\|\rho^\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon - u)\|_{L^r} \leq \left(\int_\Omega (\rho^\varepsilon)^{\frac{r}{2-r}} dx \right)^{\frac{2-r}{2}} \left(\int_\Omega \rho^\varepsilon |u^\varepsilon - u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{r}{2}} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

We also find that for $r \in (1, \frac{d+2}{d+1})$

$$\|(\rho^\varepsilon - \rho)u\|_{L^r} \leq \|\rho^\varepsilon - \rho\|_{L^r} \|u\|_{L^\infty} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0$$

and

$$\|(\rho^\varepsilon - \rho)u\|_{L^1} \leq \|\rho^\varepsilon - \rho\|_{L^p} \|u\|_{L^{p'}} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0,$$

where p is chosen such that

$$p \in (1, \gamma) \quad \text{and} \quad p' = \frac{p}{p-1} \in (\max\{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}, 2\}, \infty). \quad (3.3)$$

Combining the above two convergence estimates implies

$$\|\rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon - \rho u\|_{L^r} \leq \|\rho^\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon - u)\|_{L^r} + \|(\rho^\varepsilon - \rho)u\|_{L^r} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0$$

for $r \in [1, \frac{d+2}{d+1})$.

We next estimate

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v \otimes v f^\varepsilon dv - \rho u \otimes u - \rho^\gamma \mathbb{I}_d \right| \leq \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v \otimes v (f^\varepsilon - M[f^\varepsilon]) dv \right| + |\rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon \otimes u^\varepsilon - \rho u \otimes u| + |(\rho^\varepsilon)^\gamma - \rho^\gamma|, \quad (3.4)$$

where the first term on the right hand side strongly converges in $L^1(\Omega \times (0, T))$ due to Lemma 3.3. On the other hand,

$$|\rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon \otimes u^\varepsilon - \rho u \otimes u| = |\rho^\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon - u) \otimes u^\varepsilon + \rho^\varepsilon u \otimes (u^\varepsilon - u) + (\rho^\varepsilon - \rho)u \otimes u|,$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} |\rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon \otimes u^\varepsilon - \rho u \otimes u| dx \\ & \leq \left(\int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon |u^\varepsilon - u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\left(\int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon |u^\varepsilon|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left(\int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon |u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) + \int_{\Omega} |\rho^\varepsilon - \rho| |u|^2 dx \\ & \leq \left(\int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon |u^\varepsilon - u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\left(\iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f_0^\varepsilon dx dv \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|u\|_{L^\infty} \right) + \|u\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho^\varepsilon - \rho\|_{L^p} \|u\|_{L^{p'}} \\ & \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we used (1.14), p and p' are selected as in (3.3). For the convergence of the last term on the right hand side of (3.4), we observe

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |(\rho^\varepsilon)^\gamma - \rho^\gamma| dx &= \int_{\rho^\varepsilon \geq \rho} ((\rho^\varepsilon)^\gamma - \rho^\gamma) dx + \int_{\rho^\varepsilon \leq \rho} (\rho^\gamma - (\rho^\varepsilon)^\gamma) dx \\ &= (\gamma - 1) \int_{\rho^\varepsilon \geq \rho} \mathcal{H}(\rho^\varepsilon | \rho) dx + \gamma \int_{\Omega} |\rho^\varepsilon - \rho| \rho^{\gamma-1} dx, \end{aligned}$$

where we used (1.12). It is clear that the first term on the right hand side of the above converges to 0 as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. For the second term, we use the similar argument as the above together with $\rho \in L^1 \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ to get

$$\int_{\Omega} |\rho^\varepsilon - \rho| \rho^{\gamma-1} dx \leq \|\rho^\varepsilon - \rho\|_{L^p} \|\rho^{\gamma-1}\|_{L^{p'}} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Hence we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v \otimes v f^\varepsilon dv \rightarrow \rho u \otimes u + \rho^\gamma \mathbb{I}_d \quad \text{a.e. and in } L^1(\Omega \times (0, T))$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. This completes the proof. \square

4. GLOBAL EXISTENCE OF WEAK SOLUTIONS TO THE BGK-ALIGNMENT MODEL

In this section, we present the global existence of weak solutions to the BGK-alignment model (1.9). Note that the parameter $\varepsilon > 0$ does not play any roles in estimating the existence theory, thus for notational simplicity, we set $\varepsilon = 1$, and we consider

$$\partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f + \nabla_v \cdot (F_\phi[f] f) = M[f] - f, \quad (4.1)$$

where $M[f] = \mathbb{1}_{|u_f - v|^d \leq c_d \rho_f}$ and

$$\phi \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega) \text{ satisfying } |(\nabla \phi)(x)| \leq c_\phi \phi(x) \text{ for all } x \in \Omega \quad (4.2)$$

for some $c_\phi > 0$. We only consider the whole domain, i.e. $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^d$ in order to avoid the repetition. In fact, the case $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^d$ is easier than the whole space one.

4.1. Regularized and linearized BGK-alignment model. For the existence theory, we first regularize the equation (4.1) as

$$\partial_t f^\kappa + v \cdot \nabla_x f^\kappa + \nabla_v \cdot (F_\phi[f^\kappa] f^\kappa) = M_\kappa[f^\kappa] * \varphi_\kappa - f^\kappa, \quad (4.3)$$

subject to regularized initial data:

$$f^\kappa(x, v, t)|_{t=0} =: f_0^\kappa(x, v), \quad (x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where

$$F_\phi[f^\kappa] := \phi * (\rho_{f^\kappa} u_{f^\kappa}) - v \phi * \rho_{f^\kappa}$$

and

$$M_\kappa[f^\kappa] := \mathbb{1}_{|u_{f^\kappa}^\kappa - v|^d \leq c_d \rho_{f^\kappa}^\kappa}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{f^\kappa}^\kappa &:= \frac{\rho_{f^\kappa} * \theta_\kappa}{1 + \kappa^{d+1} \rho_{f^\kappa} * \theta_\kappa}, \quad u_{f^\kappa}^\kappa := \frac{(\rho_{f^\kappa} u_{f^\kappa}) * \theta_\kappa}{\rho_{f^\kappa} * \theta_\kappa + \kappa^{2d+1} (1 + |(\rho_{f^\kappa} u_{f^\kappa}) * \theta_\kappa|^2)}, \\ \rho_{f^\kappa} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f^\kappa dv, \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_{f^\kappa} u_{f^\kappa} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v f^\kappa dv. \end{aligned}$$

Here $\varphi_\kappa = \varphi_\kappa(x, v) = \theta_\kappa(x) \theta_\kappa(v)$ and θ_κ is defined by means of the standard mollifier $\theta \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty$ as $\theta_\kappa(x) = \kappa^{-d} \theta(x/\kappa)$, so $\|\theta_\kappa\|_{L^1} = 1$. The regularized initial data f_0^κ is defined by

$$f_0^\kappa = f_0 * \varphi_\kappa + \kappa \frac{e^{-|v|^2}}{1 + |x|^q}, \quad \text{with } q > d.$$

Note that in the case $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^d$ the second term on the right hand side of the above is unnecessary.

Throughout this section, the regularization parameter κ is assumed to be less than 1. We construct the solution f^κ to the regularized equation (4.3) by considering the approximation sequence $f^{\kappa, n}$ given as solutions of the following equation:

$$\partial_t f^{\kappa, n+1} + v \cdot \nabla_x f^{\kappa, n+1} + \nabla_v \cdot (F_\phi[f^{\kappa, n}] f^{\kappa, n+1}) = M_\kappa[f^{\kappa, n}] * \varphi_\kappa - f^{\kappa, n+1}, \quad (4.4)$$

with the initial data and first iteration step:

$$f^{\kappa, n}(x, v, t)|_{t=0} = f_0^\kappa(x, v) \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad f^{\kappa, 0}(x, v, t) = f_0^\kappa(x, v) \quad \text{for } (x, v, t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, T).$$

Here

$$F_\phi[f^{\kappa, n}] := \phi * (\rho_{f^{\kappa, n}} u_{f^{\kappa, n}}) - v \phi * \rho_{f^{\kappa, n}}$$

and

$$M_\kappa[f^{\kappa, n}] := \mathbb{1}_{|u_{f^{\kappa, n}}^\kappa - v|^d \leq c_d \rho_{f^{\kappa, n}}^\kappa}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{f^{\kappa, n}}^\kappa &= \frac{\rho_{f^{\kappa, n}} * \theta_\kappa}{1 + \kappa^{d+1} \rho_{f^{\kappa, n}} * \theta_\kappa}, \quad u_{f^{\kappa, n}}^\kappa = \frac{(\rho_{f^{\kappa, n}} u_{f^{\kappa, n}}) * \theta_\kappa}{\rho_{f^{\kappa, n}} * \theta_\kappa + \kappa^{2d+1} (1 + |(\rho_{f^{\kappa, n}} u_{f^{\kappa, n}}) * \theta_\kappa|^2)}, \\ \rho_{f^{\kappa, n}} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f^{\kappa, n} dv, \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_{f^{\kappa, n}} u_{f^{\kappa, n}} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v f^{\kappa, n} dv. \end{aligned}$$

In the following, for the sake of notational simplicity, we omit κ -dependence in $f^{\kappa, n}$, i.e., $f^n = f^{\kappa, n}$. In order to study the convergence of approximations f^n , motivated from [18], we introduce a weighted L^∞ -norm:

$$\|f\|_{L_\ell^\infty} := \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{(x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} e^{\langle v \rangle^\ell} |f(x, v)|$$

with $\ell > 0$, where $\langle v \rangle := (1 + |v|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Naturally, $L_\ell^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ denotes the space of functions with finite norms. For $s \in \mathbb{N}$, $W_\ell^{s, \infty} = W_\ell^{s, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ stands for L_ℓ^∞ Sobolev space of s -th order equipped with the norm:

$$\|f\|_{W_\ell^{s, \infty}} := \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{(x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \sum_{|\alpha| + |\beta| \leq s} e^{\langle v \rangle^\ell} |\partial_x^\alpha \partial_v^\beta f(x, v)|.$$

For the regularized and linearized equation (4.4), we show the global existence and uniqueness of solutions and uniform-in- n bound estimates.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $T > 0$ and $\ell \in (1, 2)$. Assume that f_0 satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1.1. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a unique solution $f^n \in L^\infty(0, T; W_\ell^{1, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d))$ of the equation (4.4) satisfying*

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|f^n(\cdot, \cdot, t)\|_{L^1 \cap L^\infty} \leq C(\|f_0^\kappa\|_{L^1 \cap L^\infty} + 1), \quad \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \inf_{(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, T)} \rho_{f^n}(x, t) \geq c_\kappa$$

and

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|f^n(\cdot, \cdot, t)\|_{W_\ell^{1, \infty}} \leq C_\kappa,$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of both κ and n , and c_κ and $C_\kappa > 0$ depend on κ , but independent of n . Moreover, we have

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f^n dx dv \leq C_{T, f_0},$$

which is indeed the uniform-in- κ estimate on the kinetic energy.

Proof. We first readily check the existence and uniqueness of solution $f^n \in L^\infty(0, T; W_\ell^{1, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d))$ to the regularized and linearized equation (4.4) by the standard existence theory for transport equations, see [31] for instance. Thus, we only provide the bound estimates on $\|f^n\|_{L^1 \cap L^\infty}$ and $\|f^n\|_{W_\ell^{1, \infty}}$.

• ($\|f^{n+1}\|_{L^1 \cap L^\infty}$ estimate): We begin with the estimate of $\|f^{n+1}\|_{L^1}$. Since

$$\iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} M_\kappa[f^n] * \varphi_\kappa dx dv = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_{f^n}^\kappa dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_{f^n} * \theta_\kappa dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_{f^n} dx,$$

we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} f^{n+1} dx dv \leq \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} f^n dx dv - \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} f^{n+1} dx dv.$$

This implies $\|f^n(t)\|_{L^1} \leq \|f_0^\kappa\|_{L^1}$ for all $n \geq 0$ and $t \in [0, T]$.

For the estimate of L^∞ -norm of f^n , we introduce the following backward characteristics:

$$Z^{n+1}(s) := (X^{n+1}(s), V^{n+1}(s)) := (X^{n+1}(s; t, x, v), V^{n+1}(s; t, x, v)),$$

which solves

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{ds} X^{n+1}(s) &= V^{n+1}(s), \\ \frac{d}{ds} V^{n+1}(s) &= F_\phi[f^n](Z^{n+1}(s), s) \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

with the terminal data:

$$Z^{n+1}(t) = (x, v).$$

Note that the above characteristics is well-defined due to $\phi \in W^{1, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Along that characteristics, we have

$$\frac{d}{ds} f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(s), s) = (d(\phi * \rho_{f^n})(X^{n+1}(s), s) - 1) f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(s), s) + (M_\kappa[f^n] * \varphi_\kappa)(Z^{n+1}(s), s). \tag{4.6}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} f^{n+1}(x, v, t) &= f_0^\kappa(Z^{n+1}(0)) \exp \left(- \int_0^t (d(\phi * \rho_{f^n})(X^{n+1}(s), s) - 1) ds \right) \\ &\quad + \int_0^t (M_\kappa[f^n] * \varphi_\kappa)(Z^{n+1}(s), s) \exp \left(- \int_s^t (d(\phi * \rho_{f^n})(X^{n+1}(\tau), \tau) - 1) d\tau \right) ds. \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

Since $0 \leq M_\kappa[f^n] \leq 1$ and $\|f^n(t)\|_{L^1} \leq \|f_0^\kappa\|_{L^1}$, we obtain $f^{n+1} \geq 0$ and

$$f^{n+1}(x, v, t) \leq f_0^\kappa(Z^{n+1}(0)) e^{d\|\phi\|_{L^\infty} \|f_0^\kappa\|_{L^1} T} + T e^{d\|\phi\|_{L^\infty} \|f_0^\kappa\|_{L^1} T}.$$

Thus $\|f^{n+1}(t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C(\|f_0^\kappa\|_{L^\infty} + 1)$ for some $C > 0$ independent of n and κ .

• (Kinetic energy estimate): Note that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f^{n+1} dx dv + \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f^{n+1} dx dv \\ &= \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} v \cdot F_\phi[f^n] f^{n+1} dx dv + \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 (M_\kappa[f^n] * \varphi_\kappa) dx dv \end{aligned}$$

$$=: I_1 + I_2,$$

where I_1 can be estimated as

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} v \cdot \phi * (\rho_{f^n} u_{f^n}) f^{n+1} dx dv - \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 \phi * \rho_{f^n} f^{n+1} dx dv \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \phi * (\rho_{f^n} |u_{f^n}|^2) f^{n+1} dx dv - \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 \phi * \rho_{f^n} f^{n+1} dx dv \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|\phi * (\rho_{f^n} |u_{f^n}|^2)\|_{L^\infty} \|f^{n+1}\|_{L^1} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|\phi\|_{L^\infty} \|f_0^\kappa\|_{L^1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_{f^n} |u_{f^n}|^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

For I_2 , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\leq \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 M_\kappa[f^n] dx dv + \kappa^2 \|f^n\|_{L^1} \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_{f^n}^\kappa |u_{f^n}^\kappa|^2 + (\rho_{f^n}^\kappa)^\gamma dx + \|f_0^\kappa\|_{L^1} \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_{f^n} |u_{f^n}|^2 + (\rho_{f^n})^\gamma dx + \|f_0^\kappa\|_{L^1}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_{f^n}^\kappa |u_{f^n}^\kappa|^2 dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|(\rho_{f^n} u_{f^n}) * \theta_\kappa|^2}{\rho_{f^n} * \theta_\kappa} dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_{f^n} |u_{f^n}|^2 dx$$

and

$$\|\rho_{f^n}^\kappa\|_{L^\gamma} \leq \|\rho_{f^n} * \theta_\kappa\|_{L^\gamma} \leq \|\rho_{f^n}\|_{L^\gamma}.$$

Combining the estimates for I_1 and I_2 with (2.2), we obtain

$$I_1 + I_2 \leq C \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_{f^n} |u_{f^n}|^2 + (\rho_{f^n})^\gamma dx + \|f_0^\kappa\|_{L^1} \right) \leq C \left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f^n dx dv + \|f_0^\kappa\|_{L^1} \right)$$

with $\gamma = 1 + \frac{2}{d}$. Therefore, we conclude that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f^{n+1} dx dv + \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f^{n+1} dx dv \leq C \left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f^n dx dv + \|f_0^\kappa\|_{L^1} \right),$$

and subsequently, solving the above yields the uniform bound estimate on the kinetic energy of f^{n+1} .

• (Lower bound on $\rho_{f^{n+1}}$): Since $M_\kappa * \phi_\kappa$ is positive, it can be easily obtained from (4.7) that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{f^{n+1}}(x, t) &\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_0^\kappa(Z^{n+1}(0)) \exp \left(- \int_0^t (d(\phi * \rho_{f^n})(X^{n+1}(s), s) - 1) ds \right) dv \\ &\geq e^{-(d\|\phi\|_{L^\infty} \|f_0^\kappa\|_{L^1} + 1)T} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_0^\kappa(Z^{n+1}(0)) dv \\ &\geq e^{-(d\|\phi\|_{L^\infty} \|f_0^\kappa\|_{L^1} + 1)T} \kappa \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{e^{-|V^{n+1}(0)|^2}}{1 + |X^{n+1}(0)|^q} dv. \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

On the other hand, solving (4.5) gives

$$\begin{aligned} V^{n+1}(s) &= \exp \left(\int_s^t (\phi * \rho_{f^n})(X^{n+1}(\sigma), \sigma) d\sigma \right) V^{n+1}(t) \\ &\quad - \int_s^t \exp \left(\int_s^\tau (\phi * \rho_{f^n})(X^{n+1}(\sigma), \sigma) d\sigma \right) (\phi * \rho_{f^n} u_{f^n})(X^{n+1}(\tau), \tau) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Using the boundedness of ϕ and the uniform kinetic energy estimate of f^n , we find

$$|V^{n+1}(s)| \leq e^{\|\phi\|_{L^\infty} \|f_0^\kappa\|_{L^1} T} |v| + C_{T, f_0} e^{\|\phi\|_{L^\infty} \|f_0^\kappa\|_{L^1} T} \|\phi\|_{L^\infty},$$

and hence

$$e^{-|V^{n+1}(0)|^2} \geq C e^{-C|v|^2}.$$

Also, we get

$$|X^{n+1}(s)| \leq |x| + \int_s^t |V^{n+1}(\tau)| d\tau \leq C(1 + |x| + |v|),$$

yielding

$$\frac{1}{1 + |X^{n+1}(0)|^q} \geq \frac{C}{(1 + |x|^q)(1 + |v|^q)}.$$

Therefore, going back to (4.8), we conclude that

$$\rho_{f^{n+1}}(x, t) \geq \frac{C\kappa}{1 + |x|^q}.$$

• ($\|f^{n+1}\|_{W_\ell^{1,\infty}}$ estimate): We use the characteristics defined in (4.5). First, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left| e^{\langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^\ell} f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t) \right|^2 &= \ell e^{2\langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^\ell} (f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t))^2 \langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^{\ell-2} V^{n+1}(t) \cdot \frac{dV^{n+1}(t)}{dt} \\ &\quad + e^{2\langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^\ell} (f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t)) \frac{d}{dt} (f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t)) \\ &=: J_1 + J_2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$v \cdot F_\phi[f^n] = v \cdot \phi * (\rho_{f^n} u_{f^n}) - |v|^2 \phi * \rho_{f^n} \leq \frac{1}{2} \phi * (\rho_{f^n} |u_{f^n}|^2) - \frac{|v|^2}{2} \phi * \rho_{f^n}.$$

Then, it follows from (2.2) and the L^1 -estimate of $(1 + |v|^2)f^n$ that

$$v \cdot F_\phi[f^n] \leq \|\phi\|_{L^\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_{f^n} |u_{f^n}|^2 dx - \frac{|v|^2}{2} \phi * \rho_{f^n} \leq C - \frac{|v|^2}{2} \phi * \rho_{f^n}.$$

This gives

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &= \ell e^{2\langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^\ell} (f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t))^2 \langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^{\ell-2} V^{n+1}(t) \cdot F_\phi[f^n](Z^{n+1}(t), t) \\ &\leq C_\kappa e^{2\langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^\ell} (f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t))^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{\ell}{2} e^{2\langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^\ell} (f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t))^2 \phi * \rho_{f^n}(X^{n+1}(t), t) \langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^{\ell-2} |V^{n+1}(t)|^2. \end{aligned}$$

For the estimate of J_2 , we notice that

$$|e^{\langle v \rangle^\ell} M_\kappa[f^n](x, v)| \leq C_\kappa$$

for some $C_\kappa > 0$ independent of n , due to $\|\rho_{f^n}^\kappa\|_{L^\infty}, \|u_{f^n}^\kappa\|_{L^\infty} \leq C_\kappa$. This further implies

$$|e^{\langle v \rangle^\ell} M_\kappa[f^n] * \varphi_\kappa| \leq C_\kappa \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} e^{\langle v-w \rangle^\ell} M_\kappa[f^n](x-y, v-w) \varphi_\kappa(y, w) dy dw \leq C_\kappa.$$

This together with (4.6) yields

$$\begin{aligned} J_2 &= e^{2\langle v \rangle^\ell} (f^{n+1}(z, t)) \left((d\phi * \rho_{f^n}(x) - 1) f^{n+1}(z, t) + M_\kappa[f^n] * \varphi(z) \right) \Big|_{(z=Z^{n+1}(t))} \\ &\leq C e^{2\langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^\ell} (f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t))^2 + C_\kappa e^{\langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^\ell} (f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t)) \\ &\leq C_\kappa \left(e^{2\langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^\ell} (f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t))^2 + 1 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left| e^{\langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^\ell} f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t) \right|^2 \leq C_\kappa \left(\left| e^{\langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^\ell} f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t) \right|^2 + 1 \right)$$

and applying the Grönwall's lemma to the above concludes

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|f^{n+1}(\cdot, t)\|_{L_\ell^\infty} \leq C_\kappa \|f_0^\kappa\|_{L_\ell^\infty} + C_\kappa, \quad (4.9)$$

where $C_\kappa > 0$ is independent of n .

We next estimate the first-order derivative of f^{n+1} in our weighted space. Note that $\partial_x f^{n+1}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_t \partial_x f^{n+1} + v \cdot \nabla_x \partial_x f^{n+1} + F_\phi[f^n] \cdot \nabla_v \partial_x f^{n+1} \\ &= d(\partial_x \phi * \rho_{f^n}) f^{n+1} + (d\phi * \rho_{f^n} - 1) \partial_x f^{n+1} - \partial_x F_\phi[f^n] \cdot \nabla_v f^{n+1} + M_\kappa[f^n] * \partial_x \varphi_\kappa. \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

Then similarly as before, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left| e^{\langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^\ell} \partial_x f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t) \right|^2 \right| \\ &= \ell e^{2\langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^\ell} |\partial_x f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t)|^2 \langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^{\ell-2} V^{n+1}(t) \cdot \frac{dV^{n+1}(t)}{dt} \\ &\quad + e^{2\langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^\ell} (\partial_x f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t)) \frac{d}{dt} (\partial_x f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t)) \\ &=: K_1 + K_2, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} K_1 &\leq C_\kappa e^{2\langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^\ell} |\partial_x f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t)|^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{\ell}{2} e^{2\langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^\ell} |\partial_x f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t)|^2 \phi * \rho_{f^n}(X^{n+1}(t), t) \langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^{\ell-2} |V^{n+1}(t)|^2. \end{aligned}$$

For K_2 , we observe that the first three terms on the right hand side of (4.10) can be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} |d(\partial_x \phi * \rho_{f^n}) f^{n+1}| &\leq d \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^\infty} \|f_0^\kappa\|_{L^1} \|f^{n+1}\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leq C(\|f_0\|_{L^1} + 1), \\ |(d\phi * \rho_{f^n} - 1) \partial_x f^{n+1}| &\leq (d \|\phi\|_{L^\infty} \|f_0^\kappa\|_{L^1} + 1) |\partial_x f^{n+1}| \\ &\leq C |\partial_x f^{n+1}|, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_x F_\phi[f^n] \cdot \nabla_v f^{n+1}| &\leq (\|\nabla \phi\|_{L^\infty} \|(1 + |v|^2) f^n\|_{L^1} + c_\phi |v| |\phi * \rho_{f^n}|) |\nabla_v f^{n+1}| \\ &\leq (C + c_\phi |v| |\phi * \rho_{f^n}|) |\nabla_v f^{n+1}|, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the assumption on ϕ in (4.2). Then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} K_2 &\leq C_\kappa \left(e^{2\langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^\ell} |\partial_x f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t)|^2 + 1 \right) \\ &\quad + c_\phi e^{2\langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^\ell} \phi * \rho_{f^n}(X^{n+1}(t), t) |\partial_x f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t)| |V^{n+1}(t)| |\nabla_v f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t)|. \end{aligned}$$

In order to handle the second term, we use

$$2^{\frac{\ell-2}{2}} |v|^\ell \leq \langle v \rangle^{\ell-2} |v|^2, \quad \text{for } |v| \geq 1 \quad \text{and } \ell \in (1, 2),$$

to get

$$\begin{aligned} \phi * \rho_{f^n} |\partial_x f^{n+1}| |v| |\nabla_v f^{n+1}| &\leq (\phi * \rho_{f^n}) |\partial_x f^{n+1}| |\nabla_v f^{n+1}| \mathbf{1}_{\{|v| \leq 1\}} \\ &\quad + \delta \left((\phi * \rho_{f^n})^{\frac{1}{\ell}} |\partial_x f^{n+1}| |v| |\nabla_v f^{n+1}|^{\frac{2}{\ell}-1} \right)^\ell \mathbf{1}_{\{|v| \geq 1\}} \\ &\quad + \delta \left((\phi * \rho_{f^n})^{1-\frac{1}{\ell}} |\nabla_v f^{n+1}|^{2-\frac{2}{\ell}} \right)^{\frac{\ell}{\ell-1}} \mathbf{1}_{\{|v| \geq 1\}} \\ &\leq C_\kappa (|\partial_x f^{n+1}|^2 + |\nabla_v f^{n+1}|^2) \\ &\quad + \delta (\phi * \rho_{f^n}) \langle v \rangle^{\ell-2} |v|^2 \left(\frac{\ell}{2^{\frac{\ell}{2}}} |\partial_x f^{n+1}|^2 + \frac{2-\ell}{2^{\frac{\ell}{2}}} |\nabla_v f^{n+1}|^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta > 0$ will be determined later. This together with (4.9) yields

$$\begin{aligned} K_2 &\leq C_\kappa e^{2\langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^\ell} (|\partial_x f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t)|^2 + |\nabla_v f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t)|^2) + C_\kappa \\ &\quad + c_\phi \delta e^{2\langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^\ell} \phi * \rho_{f^n}(X^{n+1}(t), t) \langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^{\ell-2} |V^{n+1}(t)|^2 \\ &\quad \times \left(\frac{\ell}{2^{\frac{\ell}{2}}} |\partial_x f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t)|^2 + \frac{2-\ell}{2^{\frac{\ell}{2}}} |\nabla_v f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t)|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left| e^{\langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^\ell} \partial_x f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t) \right|^2 \\
& + \frac{\ell}{2} \left(1 - \delta c_\phi 2^{1-\frac{\ell}{2}} \right) e^{2\langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^\ell} |\partial_x f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t)|^2 \phi * \rho_{f^n}(X^{n+1}(t), t) \langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^{\ell-2} |V^{n+1}(t)|^2 \\
& \leq C_\kappa e^{2\langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^\ell} (|\partial_x f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t)|^2 + |\nabla_v f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t)|^2) + C_\kappa \\
& + \delta c_\phi \frac{2-\ell}{2^{\frac{\ell}{2}}} e^{2\langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^\ell} \phi * \rho_{f^n}(X^{n+1}(t), t) \langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^{\ell-2} |V^{n+1}(t)|^2 |\nabla_v f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t)|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

For the estimate of $\|\partial_v f^{n+1}\|_{L^\infty_\ell}$, we notice that $\partial_v f^{n+1}$ satisfies

$$\partial_t \partial_v f^{n+1} + v \cdot \nabla_v \partial_x f^{n+1} + F_\phi[f^n] \cdot \nabla_v \partial_v f^{n+1} = -\partial_x f^{n+1} + ((d+1)\phi * \rho_{f^n} - 1)\partial_v f^{n+1} + M_\kappa[f^n] * \partial_v \varphi_\kappa$$

and by using a similar argument as above, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left| e^{\langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^\ell} \partial_v f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t) \right|^2 \\
& + \frac{\ell}{2} e^{2\langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^\ell} |\partial_v f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t)|^2 \phi * \rho_{f^n}(X^{n+1}(t), t) \langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^{\ell-2} |V^{n+1}(t)|^2 \\
& \leq C_\kappa e^{2\langle V^{n+1}(t) \rangle^\ell} (|\partial_x f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t)|^2 + |\partial_v f^{n+1}(Z^{n+1}(t), t)|^2) + C_\kappa.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

We now combine (4.11) and (4.12) and choose $\delta > 0$ small enough to have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|f^{n+1}(\cdot, \cdot, t)\|_{W_\ell^{1,\infty}}^2 \leq C_\kappa \|f^{n+1}(\cdot, \cdot, t)\|_{W_\ell^{1,\infty}}^2 + C_\kappa$$

and hence

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|f^{n+1}(\cdot, \cdot, t)\|_{W_\ell^{1,\infty}} \leq C_\kappa \|f_0^\kappa\|_{W_\ell^{1,\infty}} + C_\kappa.$$

□

4.2. Cauchy estimates. Next, we show that $\langle v \rangle^2 f^n$, where f^n is the solution of (4.4), is Cauchy in $L^\infty(0, T; L^1(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d))$. For this, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{dt} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \langle v \rangle^2 |f^{n+1} - f^n| dx dv + \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \langle v \rangle^2 |f^{n+1} - f^n| dx dv \\
& = - \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \langle v \rangle^2 \text{sgn}(f^{n+1} - f^n) \nabla_v \cdot (F_\phi[f^n] f^{n+1} - F_\phi[f^{n-1}] f^n) dx dv \\
& + \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \langle v \rangle^2 \text{sgn}(f^{n+1} - f^n) (M_\kappa[f^n] - M_\kappa[f^{n-1}]) * \varphi_\kappa dx dv \\
& =: I_1 + I_2.
\end{aligned}$$

For the estimate of I_1 , we divide it into three terms:

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 & = - \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \langle v \rangle^2 \text{sgn}(f^{n+1} - f^n) \nabla_v \cdot ((F_\phi[f^n] - F_\phi[f^{n-1}]) f^{n+1}) dx dv \\
& + 2 \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (v \cdot F_\phi[f^{n-1}]) |f^{n+1} - f^n| dx dv \\
& = d \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \langle v \rangle^2 \text{sgn}(f^{n+1} - f^n) (\phi * (\rho_{f^n} - \rho_{f^{n-1}})) f^{n+1} dx dv \\
& - \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \langle v \rangle^2 \text{sgn}(f^{n+1} - f^n) (F_\phi[f^n] - F_\phi[f^{n-1}]) \cdot \nabla_v f^{n+1} dx dv \\
& + 2 \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (v \cdot \phi * (\rho_{f^n} u_{f^n}) - |v|^2 \phi * \rho_{f^n}) |f^{n+1} - f^n| dx dv \\
& =: I_1^1 + I_1^2 + I_1^3,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1^1 &\leq d\|\phi\|_{L^\infty}\|\rho_{f^n} - \rho_{f^{n-1}}\|_{L^1} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \langle v \rangle^2 f^{n+1} dx dv \leq C_\kappa \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |f^n - f^{n-1}| dx dv, \\
I_1^2 &\leq \|\phi * (\rho_{f^n} u_{f^n} - \rho_{f^{n-1}} u_{f^{n-1}})\|_{L^\infty} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \langle v \rangle^2 |\nabla_v f^{n+1}| dx dv \\
&\quad + \|\phi * (\rho_{f^n} - \rho_{f^{n-1}})\|_{L^\infty} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \langle v \rangle^3 |\nabla_v f^{n+1}| dx dv \\
&\leq C \left(\|\rho_{f^n} u_{f^n} - \rho_{f^{n-1}} u_{f^{n-1}}\|_{L^1} + \|\rho_{f^n} - \rho_{f^{n-1}}\|_{L^1} \right) \\
&\leq C \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \langle v \rangle^2 |f^n - f^{n-1}| dx dv
\end{aligned}$$

due to Proposition 4.1, and

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1^3 &\leq 2(\|\phi * (\rho_{f^n} u_{f^n})\|_{L^\infty} + \|\phi * \rho_{f^n}\|_{L^\infty}) \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \langle v \rangle^2 |f^{n+1} - f^n| dx dv \\
&\leq C \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \langle v \rangle^2 |f^{n+1} - f^n| dx dv.
\end{aligned}$$

We then use [16, Lemma 2.1] to estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &\leq \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \langle v \rangle^2 |(M_\kappa[f^n] - M_\kappa[f^{n-1}]) * \varphi_\kappa| dx dv \\
&\leq C_\kappa \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \langle v \rangle^2 |M_\kappa[f^n] - M_\kappa[f^{n-1}]| dx dv \\
&\leq C_\kappa \left(\|\rho_{f^n}^\kappa - \rho_{f^{n-1}}^\kappa\|_{L^1} + \|u_{f^n}^\kappa - u_{f^{n-1}}^\kappa\|_{L^1} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Since the uniform-in- n boundedness of $\|f^n\|_{W_\ell^{1,\infty}}$ in Proposition 4.1 gives the boundedness of $\rho_{f^n} u_{f^n}$ uniformly in n , we can further estimate

$$|\rho_{f^n}^\kappa - \rho_{f^{n-1}}^\kappa| \leq C_\kappa |(\rho_{f^n} - \rho_{f^{n-1}}) * \theta_\kappa|$$

and

$$|u_{f^n}^\kappa - u_{f^{n-1}}^\kappa| \leq C_\kappa (|(\rho_{f^n} u_{f^n} - \rho_{f^{n-1}} u_{f^{n-1}}) * \theta_\kappa| + |(\rho_{f^n} - \rho_{f^{n-1}}) * \theta_\kappa|).$$

Thus, we obtain

$$I_2 \leq C_\kappa \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \langle v \rangle^2 |f^n - f^{n-1}| dx dv,$$

where $C_\kappa > 0$ is independent of n . Hence $\langle v \rangle^2 f^n$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^\infty(0, T; L^1(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d))$. Thus, for a fixed $\kappa > 0$ there exists a limiting function $\langle v \rangle^2 f \in L^\infty(0, T; L^1(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d))$ such that

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\langle v \rangle^2 (f^n - f)(\cdot, \cdot, t)\|_{L^1} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.13)$$

From this, one can deduce that

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} (\|(\rho_{f^n} - \rho_f)(\cdot, t)\|_{L^p} + \|(\rho_{f^n} u_{f^n} - \rho_f u_f)(\cdot, t)\|_{L^p}) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty \quad (4.14)$$

for any $p \in [1, \infty)$.

4.3. Existence of weak solutions to the regularized equation. In this subsection, we prove that the limiting function f is in fact the weak solution to the regularized equation (4.3) in the sense of Definition 1.1. We then provide the kinetic energy estimate:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f dx dv + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 (f - M_\kappa[f] * \varphi_\kappa) dx dv ds \\
&= \int_0^t \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} f v \cdot F_\phi[f] dx dv ds + \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f_0^\kappa dx dv.
\end{aligned}$$

We start with the weak formulation of (4.3) that for any $\eta \in \mathcal{C}_c^1(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T])$ with $\eta(x, v, T) = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & - \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} f_0^\kappa \eta(x, v, 0) dx dv - \int_0^T \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} f^{n+1} (\partial_t \eta + v \cdot \nabla_x \eta + F_\phi[f^n] \cdot \nabla_v \eta) dx dv dt \\ & = \int_0^T \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (M_\kappa[f^n] * \varphi_\kappa - f^{n+1}) \eta dx dv dt. \end{aligned}$$

Since the first three terms on the left hand side and the second term on the right hand side are linear, it suffices to deal with terms with the velocity alignment and the equilibrium function. We first observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |M_\kappa[f^n] * \varphi_\kappa \eta - M_\kappa[f] * \varphi_\kappa \eta| dx dv \\ & = \iiint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d} \times \mathbb{R}^{2d}} \{M_\kappa[f^n] - M_\kappa[f]\} (x - y, v - w) \varphi_\kappa(y, w) \eta(x, v) dx dy dv dw \\ & \leq \|\eta\|_{L^\infty} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |M_\kappa[f^n] - M_\kappa[f]| dx dv \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \varphi_\kappa(y, w) dy dw \\ & \leq C (\|\rho_{f^n}^\kappa - \rho_f^\kappa\|_{L^1} + \|u_{f^n}^\kappa - u_f^\kappa\|_{L^1}) \end{aligned}$$

where we used [16, Lemma 2.1]. This together with (4.14) gives the desired result. Now it only remains to show that

$$\int_0^T \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} f^{n+1} F_\phi[f^n] \cdot \nabla_v \eta dx dv dt \rightarrow \int_0^T \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} f F_\phi[f] \cdot \nabla_v \eta dx dv dt \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (f^{n+1} F_\phi[f^n] - f F_\phi[f]) \cdot \nabla_v \eta dx dv \\ & = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (f^{n+1} (\phi * (\rho_{f^n} u_{f^n}) - v \phi * \rho_{f^n}) - f (\phi * (\rho_u) - v \phi * \rho)) \cdot \nabla_v \eta dx dv \\ & = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} f^{n+1} \phi * (\rho_{f^n} u_{f^n} - \rho u) \cdot \nabla_v \eta dx dv + \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (f^{n+1} - f) \phi * (\rho u) \cdot \nabla_v \eta dx dv \\ & \quad - \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} v f^{n+1} \phi * (\rho_{f^n} - \rho) \cdot \nabla_v \eta dx dv - \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} v (f^{n+1} - f) \phi * \rho \cdot \nabla_v \eta dx dv. \end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

This yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (f^{n+1} F_\phi[f^n] - f F_\phi[f]) \cdot \nabla_v \eta dx dv \\ & \leq C_\kappa (\|\rho_{f^n} u_{f^n} - \rho_f u_f\|_{L^1} + \|\rho_{f^n} - \rho_f\|_{L^1} + \|\langle v \rangle^2 (f^{n+1} - f)\|_{L^1}). \end{aligned}$$

We now use (4.13) and (4.14) to obtain the desired result.

Next, we will prove the kinetic energy estimate. We see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f^{n+1}(x, v, t) dx dv + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f^{n+1} dx dv ds \\ & = \int_0^t \iint_{\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} v \cdot F_\phi[f^n] f^{n+1} dx dv ds + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 (M_\kappa[f^n] * \varphi_\kappa) dx dv ds \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f_0 dx dv, \end{aligned}$$

thus it suffices to deal with the first two terms on the right hand side. In the same manner as in (4.15), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} v \cdot (f^{n+1} F_\phi[f^n] - f F_\phi[f]) dx dv \\ & = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} f^{n+1} \phi * (\rho_{f^n} u_{f^n} - \rho u) \cdot v dx dv + \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (f^{n+1} - f) \phi * (\rho u) \cdot v dx dv \end{aligned}$$

$$- \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f^{n+1} \phi * (\rho_{f^n} - \rho) dx dv - \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 (f^{n+1} - f) \phi * \rho dx dv,$$

which, combined with Proposition 4.1, leads to

$$\iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} v \cdot f^{n+1} F_\phi[f^n] dx dv \rightarrow \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} v \cdot f F_\phi[f] dx dv \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

For the estimate of second term, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 ((M_\kappa[f^n] - M_\kappa[f]) * \varphi_\kappa) dx dv \\ &= \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d} \times \mathbb{R}^{2d}} |v|^2 (M_\kappa[f^n] - M_\kappa[f])(x - y, v - w) \varphi_\kappa(y, w) dy dx dw dv \\ &\leq \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d} \times \mathbb{R}^{2d}} |v - w|^2 |M_\kappa[f^n] - M_\kappa[f]|(x - y, v - w) \varphi_\kappa(y, w) dy dx dw dv \\ &\quad + \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d} \times \mathbb{R}^{2d}} |w|^2 |M_\kappa[f^n] - M_\kappa[f]|(x - y, v - w) \varphi_\kappa(y, w) dy dx dw dv \\ &\leq C_\kappa (\|\rho_{f^n}^\kappa - \rho_f^\kappa\|_{L^1} + \|u_{f^n}^\kappa - u_f^\kappa\|_{L^1}). \end{aligned}$$

In the last line, we used [16]. Thus we conclude that

$$\iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 M_\kappa[f^n] * \varphi_\kappa dx dv \rightarrow \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 M_\kappa[f] * \varphi_\kappa dx dv \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

which completes the proof.

Remark 4.1. Here we reveal the uniform-in- κ bound estimate on kinetic energy of the limiting function f^κ for clarity. Even though it can be directly obtained from Proposition 4.1, we revisit it once again to more clearly see the relevance to the initial data. For this, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f^\kappa dx dv + \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f^\kappa dx dv \\ &= \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} v \cdot F_\phi[f^\kappa] f^\kappa dx dv + \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 (M_\kappa[f^\kappa] * \varphi_\kappa) dx dv \\ &=: I_1 + I_2, \end{aligned}$$

where I_1 can be estimated as

$$I_1 = -\frac{1}{2} \iiint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d} \times \mathbb{R}^{2d}} \phi(x - y) |v - w|^2 f^\kappa(x, v) f^\kappa(y, w) dx dy dv dw \leq 0.$$

For I_2 , we notice from (2.2) that

$$\iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 M_\kappa[f^\kappa] dx dv = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_{f^\kappa}^\kappa |u_{f^\kappa}^\kappa|^2 + (\rho_{f^\kappa}^\kappa)^\gamma dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_{f^\kappa} |u_{f^\kappa}|^2 + (\rho_{f^\kappa})^\gamma dx \leq \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f^\kappa dx dv$$

with $\gamma = 1 + \frac{2}{d}$. This yields

$$I_2 \leq \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (|v|^2 M_\kappa[f^\kappa]) * \varphi_\kappa dx dv + \kappa^2 \leq \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f^\kappa dx dv + \kappa^2.$$

We then now combine all of the above estimates and apply the Grönwall's lemma to have

$$\iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f^\kappa dx dv \leq C \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f_0^\kappa dx dv + C\kappa^2$$

for all $0 \leq t \leq T$, where $C > 0$ is independent of $\kappa > 0$.

4.4. Proof of Theorem 1.1. We now pass to the limit $\kappa \rightarrow 0$ and show that $f := \lim_{\kappa \rightarrow 0} f^\kappa$ satisfies the equation (4.1) in the sense of Definition 1.1 and the kinetic energy inequality (1.14).

We first present a lemma, showing some relationship between the local density and the kinetic energy, which will be used to estimate the interaction energy. Since this lemma is by now classical [25], we skip its proof.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose $f \in L^1_+ \cap L^\infty(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $|v|^2 f \in L^1(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d)$. Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|\rho_f\|_{L^{\frac{d+2}{d}}} \leq C \|f\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{d+2}{2}} \left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f \, dx dv \right)^{\frac{d}{d+2}}$$

and

$$\|\rho_f u_f\|_{L^{\frac{d+2}{d+1}}} \leq C \|f\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{d+2}{2}} \left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f \, dx dv \right)^{\frac{d+1}{d+2}}.$$

Using the uniform bound estimates and Lemma 4.1, we obtain that there exists $f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, T))$ such that

$$f^\kappa \xrightarrow{*} f \quad \text{in } L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, T)), \quad \rho_{f^\kappa} \xrightarrow{*} \rho_f \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0, T; L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)) \quad \text{with } p \in \left[1, \frac{d+2}{d}\right],$$

and

$$\rho_{f^\kappa} u_{f^\kappa} \xrightarrow{*} \rho_f u_f \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0, T; L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)) \quad \text{with } q \in \left[1, \frac{d+2}{d+1}\right].$$

On the other hand, we know $M_\kappa[f^\kappa] \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, T))$, and thus $M_\kappa[f^\kappa] \in L^p_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, T))$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |x|^2 f^\kappa \, dx dv + \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |x|^2 f^\kappa \, dx dv \\ &= 2 \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} x \cdot v f^\kappa \, dx dv + \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |x|^2 M_\kappa[f^\kappa] * \varphi_\kappa \, dx dv \\ &\leq 3 \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |x|^2 f^\kappa \, dx dv + \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f^\kappa \, dx dv + 2\kappa, \end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

where we used

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |x|^2 M_\kappa[f^\kappa] * \varphi_\kappa \, dx dv &\leq (1 + \kappa^2) \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (1 + |x|^2) M_\kappa[f^\kappa] \, dx dv \\ &\leq 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 + |x|^2) \rho_{f^\kappa}^\kappa \, dx \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 + |x|^2) (\rho_{f^\kappa} * \theta_\kappa) \, dx \leq 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 + |x|^2) \rho_{f^\kappa} \, dx + 2\kappa. \end{aligned}$$

Since the kinetic energy is uniformly bounded in $\kappa > 0$, applying the Grönwall's lemma to (4.16) gives

$$\iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |x|^2 f^\kappa \, dx dv < \infty$$

uniformly in $\kappa > 0$. Then we now apply the strong compactness lemma [32, Lemma 2.6], based on the velocity averaging, to get

$$\rho_{f^\kappa} \rightarrow \rho_f \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0, T; L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)) \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_{f^\kappa} u_{f^\kappa} \rightarrow \rho_f u_f \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0, T; L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)) \tag{4.17}$$

for $p \in [1, \frac{d+2}{d+1}]$. On the other hand, it follows from (4.17) that

$$\|\rho_{f^\kappa} * \theta_\kappa - \rho_f\|_{L^1} \leq \|(\rho_{f^\kappa} - \rho_f) * \theta_\kappa\|_{L^1} + \|\rho_f * \theta_\kappa - \rho_f\|_{L^1} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \kappa \rightarrow 0, \tag{4.18}$$

Similarly, $\|(\rho_{f^\kappa} u_{f^\kappa}) * \theta_\kappa - \rho_f u_f\|_{L^1} \rightarrow 0$ as $\kappa \rightarrow 0$. Thus combining that with

$$\kappa^{d+1} |\rho_{f^\kappa} * \theta_\kappa| \leq C\kappa \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa^{2d+1} |(\rho_{f^\kappa} u_{f^\kappa}) * \theta_\kappa|^2 \leq C\kappa$$

deduces that

$$\rho_{f^\kappa}^\kappa \rightarrow \rho_f \quad \text{and} \quad u_{f^\kappa}^\kappa \rightarrow u_f \quad \text{a.e. on } E \tag{4.19}$$

where $E := \{(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T] : \rho_f(x, t) > 0\}$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} |\rho_{f^\kappa}^\kappa - \rho_f| &= \left| \frac{\rho_{f^\kappa} * \theta_\kappa - (1 + \kappa^{d+1} \rho_{f^\kappa} * \theta_\kappa) \rho_f}{1 + \kappa^{d+1} \rho_{f^\kappa} * \theta_\kappa} \right| \\ &= \left| \frac{\rho_{f^\kappa} * \theta_\kappa - \rho_f - \kappa^{d+1} \rho_f (\rho_{f^\kappa} * \theta_\kappa)}{1 + \kappa^{d+1} (\rho_{f^\kappa} * \theta_\kappa)} \right| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{a.e. on } E \end{aligned}$$

due to (4.18). We now show that the limiting function f satisfies our main equation in the distributional sense. For this, it is sufficient to deal only with terms related to the equilibrium function and velocity alignment since the other terms are linear. We first observe that

$$\begin{aligned} M_\kappa[f^\kappa] * \varphi_\kappa - M[f] &= (M_\kappa[f^\kappa] - M[f]) * \varphi_\kappa + (M[f] * \varphi_\kappa - M[f]) \\ &=: I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $M[f] * \varphi_\kappa$ converges to $M[f]$ a.e. as $\kappa \rightarrow 0$, and for any $p \in (1, \infty)$,

$$\|M[f] * \varphi_\kappa\|_{L^p} \leq \|M[f]\|_{L^p} \|\varphi_\kappa\|_{L^1} = \|M[f]\|_{L^1}^{\frac{1}{p}} = \|f\|_{L^1}^{\frac{1}{p}} < C.$$

Thus one can see that $M[f] * \varphi_\kappa$ weakly converges to $M[f]$ in L^p , and this leads to

$$\iint_{E \times \mathbb{R}^d} I_2 \eta \, dx dv dt \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \kappa \rightarrow 0$$

for any test function $\eta \in C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T])$. For I_1 , set $D := B(0, 1) \cup \text{supp}(\eta)$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} &\iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \{(M_\kappa[f^\kappa] - M[f]) * \varphi_\kappa\} \eta \, dx dv \\ &= \iiint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d} \times \mathbb{R}^{2d}} (M_\kappa[f^\kappa] - M[f])(x - y, v - w) \varphi_\kappa(y, w) \eta(x, v) \, dx dy dv dw \\ &\leq \|\eta\|_{L^\infty} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |M_\kappa[f^\kappa] - M[f]|(x, v) \mathbf{1}_D \, dx dv. \end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

On the other hand, it follows from (4.19) that

$$(c_d \rho_{f^\kappa}^\kappa)^{\frac{1}{d}} \rightarrow (c_d \rho_f)^{\frac{1}{d}}, \quad u_{f^\kappa}^\kappa \rightarrow u_f \quad \text{a.e. on } E.$$

Recalling the definition of M :

$$M_\kappa[f^\kappa] = \mathbf{1}_{|u_{f^\kappa}^\kappa - v|^d \leq c_d \rho_{f^\kappa}^\kappa}, \quad M[f] = \mathbf{1}_{|u_f - v|^d \leq c_d \rho_f}.$$

this implies that for each v in the closure of $B(u_f, (c_d \rho_f)^{\frac{1}{d}})$,

$$M_\kappa[f^\kappa](v) \rightarrow 1, \quad \text{and otherwise } M_\kappa[f^\kappa](v) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{a.e. on } E \quad \text{as } \kappa \rightarrow 0,$$

i.e. $M_\kappa[f^\kappa](v)$ converges to $M[f]$ a.e. on $E \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Moreover, we have from the L^1 bound of f and f^κ that for any $p \in (1, \infty)$,

$$\|M_\kappa[f^\kappa] - M[f]\|_{L^p}^p \leq C \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} M_\kappa[f^\kappa] + M[f] \, dx dv \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_{f^\kappa} + \rho_f \, dx < C.$$

Thus we see that $|M_\kappa[f^\kappa] - M[f]|$ weakly converges to 0 in L^p , which combined with (4.20) gives

$$\iint_{E \times \mathbb{R}^d} I_1 \eta \, dx dv \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \kappa \rightarrow 0.$$

On the other hand, on $E^c \times \mathbb{R}^d$, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \lim_{\kappa \rightarrow 0} \iint_{E^c \times \mathbb{R}^d} (M_\kappa[f^\kappa] * \varphi_\kappa - M[f]) \eta \, dx dt dv \right| &\leq \|\eta\|_{L^\infty} \lim_{\kappa \rightarrow 0} \iint_{E^c \times \mathbb{R}^d} M_\kappa[f^\kappa] \, dx dt dv \\ &\leq \lim_{\kappa \rightarrow 0} \int_{E^c} \rho_{f^\kappa} \, dx dt \\ &= \int_{E^c} \rho_f \, dx dt \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{\kappa \rightarrow 0} \int_0^T \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (M_\kappa[f^\kappa] * \varphi_\kappa - M[f]) \eta \, dx dv dt \\
&= \lim_{\kappa \rightarrow 0} \iint_{E \times \mathbb{R}^d} \{(M_\kappa[f^\kappa] - M[f]) * \varphi_\kappa\} \eta \, dx dt dv + \lim_{\kappa \rightarrow 0} \iint_{E^c \times \mathbb{R}^d} \{(M_\kappa[f^\kappa] - M[f]) * \varphi_\kappa\} \eta \, dx dt dv \\
&= \iint_{E \times \mathbb{R}^d} (I_1 + I_2) \eta \, dx dt dv \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, it only remains to deal with the alignment term:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^T \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} f^\kappa F_\phi[f^\kappa] \cdot \nabla_v \eta \, dx dv dt \\
&= \int_0^T \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} f^\kappa \phi * (\rho_{f^\kappa} u_{f^\kappa}) \cdot \nabla_v \eta \, dx dv dt - \int_0^T \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} f^\kappa \phi * \rho_{f^\kappa} v \cdot \nabla_v \eta \, dx dv dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $f^\kappa \xrightarrow{*} f$ in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, T))$, we see that $f^\kappa \zeta$ converges weakly in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, T))$ to $f \zeta$ for any test function $\zeta \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, T))$. Also, we have from (4.17) that

$$\phi * \rho_{f^\kappa} u_{f^\kappa} \rightarrow \phi * \rho_f u_f \quad \text{and} \quad \phi * \rho_{f^\kappa} v \rightarrow \phi * \rho_f v \quad \text{a.e. on } \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, T),$$

and these are bounded uniformly in κ thanks to Proposition 4.1 and the kinetic energy estimate. Therefore, we conclude that

$$\int_0^T \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} f^\kappa F_\phi[f^\kappa] \cdot \nabla_v \eta \, dx dv dt \rightarrow \int_0^T \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} f F_\phi[f] \cdot \nabla_v \eta \, dx dv dt$$

as $\kappa \rightarrow 0$. This completes the proof.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Y.-P. Choi and B.-H. Hwang were supported by National Research Foundation of Korea(NRF) grant funded by the Korea government(MSIP) (No. 2022R1A2C1002820).

REFERENCES

- [1] S. M. Ahn, H. Choi, S.-Y. Ha, and H. Lee, On collision-avoiding initial configurations to Cucker-Smale type flocking models, *Commun. Math. Sci.*, 10, (2012), 625–643.
- [2] F. Berthelin and F. Bouchut, Solution with finite energy to a BGK system relaxing to isentropic gas dynamics, *Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math.* (6), 9, (2000), 605–630.
- [3] F. Berthelin and A. Vasseur, From kinetic equations to multidimensional isentropic gas dynamics before shocks, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 36, (2005), 1807–1835.
- [4] F. Bouchut, Construction of BGK models with a family of kinetic entropies for a given system of conservation laws, *J. Stat. Phys.*, 95, (1999), 113–170.
- [5] Y. Brenier, Convergence of the Vlasov-Poisson system to the incompressible Euler equations, *Commun. Partial Differ. Equ.*, 25, (2000), 737–754.
- [6] J. A. Carrillo and Y.-P. Choi, Mean-field limits: from particle descriptions to macroscopic equations, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 241, (2021), 1529–1573.
- [7] J. A. Carrillo, Y.-P. Choi, and J. Jung, Quantifying the hydrodynamic limit of Vlasov-type equations with alignment and nonlocal forces, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 31, (2021), 327–408.
- [8] J. A. Carrillo, Y.-P. Choi, and M. Hauray, Local well-posedness of the generalized Cucker-Smale model with singular kernels. *MMCS, Mathematical modelling of complex systems*, 17–35, ESAIM Proc. Surveys, 47, EDP Sci., Les Ulis, 2014.
- [9] J. A. Carrillo, Y.-P. Choi, P. B. Mucha, and J. Peszek, Sharp conditions to avoid collisions in singular Cucker-Smale interactions, *Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl.*, 37, (2017), 317–328.
- [10] J. A. Carrillo, Y.-P. Choi, and S. Pérez, A review on attractive-repulsive hydrodynamics for consensus in collective behavior. *Active particles. Vol. 1. Advances in theory, models, and applications*, 259–298, *Model. Simul. Sci. Eng. Technol.*, Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2017.
- [11] J. A. Carrillo, Y.-P. Choi, E. Tadmor, and C. Tan, Critical thresholds in 1D Euler equations with nonlocal forces, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 26, (2016), 185–206.
- [12] J. A. Carrillo, M. Fornasier, J. Rosado, and G. Toscani, Asymptotic flocking dynamics for the kinetic Cucker-Smale model, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 42, (2010), 218–236.
- [13] L. Chen, C. Tan, and L. Tong, On the global classical solution to compressible Euler system with singular velocity alignment, *Methods Appl. Anal.*, 28, (2021), 153–172.

- [14] Y.-P. Choi, The global Cauchy problem for compressible Euler equations with a nonlocal dissipation, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 29, (2019), 185–207.
- [15] Y.-P. Choi, S.-Y. Ha, and Z. Li, Emergent dynamics of the Cucker-Smale flocking model and its variants. *Active particles. Vol. 1. Advances in theory, models, and applications*, 299–331, *Model. Simul. Sci. Eng. Technol.*, Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2017.
- [16] Y.-P. Choi and B.-H. Hwang, Global existence of weak solutions to a BGK model relaxing to the barotropic Euler equations, preprint.
- [17] Y.-P. Choi and J. Jung, Asymptotic analysis for a Vlasov-Fokker-Planck/Navier-Stokes system in a bounded domain, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 31, (2021), 2213–2295.
- [18] Y.-P. Choi and J. Jung, Local well-posedness for the compressible Navier–Stokes–BGK model in Sobolev spaces with exponential weight, preprint.
- [19] Y.-P. Choi and J. Kim, Rigorous derivation of the Euler-alignment model with singular communication weights from a kinetic Fokker-Planck-alignment model, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 33, (2023), 31–65.
- [20] Y.-P. Choi and X. Zhang, One dimensional singular Cucker-Smale model: uniform-in-time mean-field limit and contractivity, *J. Differential Equations*, 287, (2021), 428–459.
- [21] P. Constantin, T. D. Drivas, and R. Shvydkoy, Entropy hierarchies for equations of compressible fluids and self-organized dynamics, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 52, (2020), 3073–3092.
- [22] F. Cucker and S. Smale, Emergent behavior in flocks, *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 52, (2007), 852–862.
- [23] C. Dafermos, The second law of thermodynamics and stability, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 70, (1979), 167–179.
- [24] R. DiPerna, Uniqueness of solutions to hyperbolic conservation laws, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 28, (1979), 137188.
- [25] F. Golse and L. Saint-Raymond, The Vlasov-Poisson system with strong magnetic field, *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 78, (1999), 791–817.
- [26] D. Lear and R. Shvydkoy, Unidirectional flocks in hydrodynamic Euler alignment system II: Singular models, *Commun. Math. Sci.*, 19, (2021), 807–828.
- [27] D. Lear and R. Shvydkoy, Existence and stability of unidirectional flocks in hydrodynamic Euler alignment systems, *Anal. PDE*, 15, (2022), 175–196.
- [28] T. M. Leslie and R. Shvydkoy, On the structure of limiting flocks in hydrodynamic Euler alignment models, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 29, (2019), 2419–2431.
- [29] A. Figalli and M.-J. Kang, A rigorous derivation from the kinetic Cucker-Smale model to the pressureless Euler system with nonlocal alignment, *Anal. PDE*, 12, (2019), 843–866.
- [30] S.-Y. Ha and J.-G. Liu, A simple proof of Cucker-Smale flocking dynamics and mean field limit, *Commun. Math. Sci.*, 7, (2009), 297–325.
- [31] S.-Y. Ha and E. Tadmor, From particle to kinetic and hydrodynamic description of flocking, *Kinet. Relat. Models*, 1, (2008), 415–435.
- [32] T. K. Karper, A. Mellet, and K. Trivisa, Existence of weak solutions to kinetic flocking models, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 45, (2013), 215–243.
- [33] T. K. Karper, A. Mellet, and K. Trivisa, Hydrodynamic limit of the kinetic Cucker-Smale flocking model, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 25, (2015), 131–163.
- [34] P. Minakowski, P. B. Mucha, J. Peszek, and E. Zatorska, Singular Cucker-Smale dynamics, *Active particles, Vol. 2.*, 201–243, *Model. Simul. Sci. Eng. Technol.*, Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2019.
- [35] A. Mellet and A. Vasseur, Asymptotic analysis for a Vlasov-Fokker-Planck/compressible Navier-Stokes system of equations, *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 281, (2008), 573–596.
- [36] P. B. Mucha and J. Peszek, The Cucker-Smale equation: singular communication weight, measure-valued solutions and weak-atomic uniqueness, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 227, (2018), 273–308.
- [37] J. Peszek, Existence of piecewise weak solutions of a discrete Cucker-Smale’s flocking model with a singular communication weight, *J. Differential Equations*, 257, (2014), 2900–2925.
- [38] D. Poyato and J. Soler, Euler-type equations and commutators in singular and hyperbolic limits of kinetic Cucker-Smale models, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 27, (2017), 1089–1152.
- [39] L. Saint-Raymond, *Hydrodynamic Limits of the Boltzmann Equation. Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, vol. 1971, Springer, Berlin, (2009).
- [40] R. Shvydkoy, Dynamics and analysis of alignment models of collective behavior, *Nečas Center Series. Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham*, 2021, xiv+208 pp.
- [41] E. Tadmor and C. Tan, Critical thresholds in flocking hydrodynamics with nonlocal alignment, *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. A, Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.*, 372, (2014), 20130401.
- [42] C. Tan, On the Euler-alignment system with weakly singular communication weights, *Nonlinearity*, 33, (2020), 1907–1924.
- [43] C. Villani, A review of mathematical topics in collisional kinetic theory, *Handbook Mathematical Fluid Dynamics*, 1, (2002), 71–305.
- [44] H.-T. Yau, Relative entropy and hydrodynamics of Ginzburg-Landau models, *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 22, (1991), 63–80.

(Young-Pil Choi)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

YONSEI UNIVERSITY, 50 YONSEI-RO, SEODAEMUN-GU, SEOUL 03722, REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Email address: ypchoi@yonsei.ac.kr

(Byung-Hoon Hwang)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS EDUCATION

SANGMYUNG UNIVERSITY, 20 HONGJIMUN 2-GIL, JONGNO-GU, SEOUL 03016, REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Email address: bhhwang@smu.ac.kr