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Abstract

We study the unsteady incompressible Navier Stokes equations in three dimensions interacting with a non-linear flexible shell of Koiter Type. The latter one constitutes a moving part of the boundary of the physical domain of the fluid. This leads to a coupled system of non-linear PDEs where the moving part of the boundary is an unknown of the problem. We study weak solutions to the corresponding fluid-structure interaction (FSI) problem. The known existence theory for weak solutions is extended to non-linear Koiter shell models. This is achieved by introducing new methods that allow us to prove higher regularity estimates for the shell by transferring damping effects from the fluid dissipation. The regularity result depends on the geometric constitution alone and is independent of the approximation procedure; hence it holds for arbitrary weak solutions.

1 Introduction

Fluid-structure interactions (FSI) are everyday phenomena with many applications, for example in aeroelasticity [14] and biomedicine [4]. Mathematically, the FSI problems are described by coupling the Navier-Stokes equations with the elasticity equations. The analysis of the FSI problems is challenging and attractive mainly due to the following properties. First, the resulting system of non-linear PDEs is of hyperbolic-parabolic type with the coupling taking place at the fluid-structure interface. Second, the fluid domain is an unknown of the problem, i.e. the resulting problem is a moving boundary problem. In this paper we study the coupling of the 3d incompressible Navier-Stokes equations with the evolution of the non-linear Koiter shell equation. Our main result is that any finite-energy weak solution to the considered FSI problem satisfies an additional regularity property on its interval of existence. More precisely, the elastic displacement belongs to the following Bochner space \(L^2_t(H^{2+s}_x) \cap H^1_t(H^s_x)\) for all \(s < \frac{1}{2}\). Here \(H^s\) denotes the standard fractional Sobolev space. In particular, due to respective embedding theorems the elastic displacement is Lipschitz continuous in the space variable for almost every time instant. We use this result to show the existence of weak solutions to a fluid-non-linear Koiter shell interaction problem. Since the non-linear Kotier shell equations are quasi-linear with non-linear coefficients depending on the terms of leading order in the energy, the additional structure regularity estimate is crucial for the compactness argument in the construction of a
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\(^1\) For a precise definition of the fractional Sobolev space see Subsection 2.3
weak solution. The main idea behind the regularity theorem is to use the fluid dissipation and the
coupling conditions to prove the additional regularity estimate for the structure displacement.
The realization of this idea is quite involving. It includes the development of a comprehensive
analysis to construct a solenoidal extension and smooth approximations for the time-changing
domain with clear (local) dependence on the regularity of the boundary values and the boundary
itself. The approach is quite general and thus seems suitable for further applications related to
the analysis of variable geometries.

Fluid-structure interaction has been an increasingly active area of research in mathematics
in the last 20 years. Due to the overwhelming number of contributions in the area we just
mention analytic results that are most relevant for our work in this brief literature review. The
existence results for weak solutions for the FSI problems where the incompressible Navier-Stokes
equations are coupled with a lower-dimensional elasticity model (e.g. plate or shell laws) have
been obtained in [7, 20, 32, 30, 23, 33]. The corresponding existence result for the compressible
fluid flow was proved in [6]. All the mentioned results on the existence of weak solutions are
valid up to the time of possible self-intersection of the domain. Up to our knowledge the number
of regularity estimates for long time solutions are rather limited. Recently some significant
results on strong solutions have been shown, see [21, 22] for large initial data and a 1D solid. For a three dimensional fluid interacting with a three dimensional elastic body see [24, 25] for global results with small initial data and structural damping. The theory of local-in-time strong solutions for 3D-3D FSI problems is rather well developed, see recent results in [5, 28, 36] and references within. We wish to emphasize that in all these works the structure equations were linear. For the FSI problem with non-linear structure the theory is
far less developed. The existence of weak solution to the FSI problem with a Koiter membrane
energy that includes non-linearities of lower order but a leading order linear regularizing term
was proved in [34]. Short time or small data existence result in the context of strong solutions
for various non-linear fluid structure models have been obtained in [8, 9, 13, 37]. Finally we
wish to mention some results in the static case that can be found here [16, 19].

The role of the fluid dissipation on the qualitative properties of the solution is one of the
central questions in the area of fluid-structure interactions and related systems, and has been
studied by many authors, see e.g. [3, 18, 39] and references within. We present here a new
technique that allows to transfer dissipation features from the fluid equation to the non-linear
hyperbolic elastic displacement. We wish to point out that the regularity can not be expected
for a non-linear hyperbolic PDE with arbitrary smooth right hand sides and initial data. It is
the coupling with a dissipative equation only that allows for this better regularity.

1.1 The coupled PDE

We first discuss the Koiter shell model (see e.g. [11, 27]) which describes the evolution of the
elastic boundary of the fluid domain. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be a domain such that its boundary $\Gamma = \partial \Omega$
is parametrized by a $C^3$ injective mapping $\varphi : \omega \to \mathbb{R}^3$, where $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. To simplify notation we
assume in this paper that the boundary of $\Omega$ can be parametrized by a flat torus $\omega = \mathbb{R}^2 / \mathbb{Z}^2$ which
corresponds to the assumption of periodic boundary conditions for the structure displacement.
We consider the periodic boundary conditions just to avoid unnecessary technical complications
(see Remark 1.3).

In the following we denote the tangential vectors at any point $\varphi(y)$ in the following way:
$$a_\alpha(y) = \partial_\alpha \varphi(y), \quad \alpha = 1, 2, \quad y \in \omega.$$  

The unit normal vector is given by $n(y) = \frac{a_1(y) \times a_2(y)}{|a_1(y) \times a_2(y)|}$. The surface area element of $\partial \Omega$
is given by $dS = |a_1(y) \times a_2(y)|dy$. We assume that the domain deforms only in normal direction
and denote by \( \eta(t,y) \) the magnitude of the displacement. This reflects the case when the fluid pressure is the dominant force acting on the structure in which case it is reasonable to assume that the shell is deforming in normal direction. In this case the deformed boundary can be parametrized by the following coordinates:

\[
\varphi_\eta(t,y) = \varphi(y) + \eta(t,y)n(y), \quad t \in (0,T), \quad y \in \omega.
\] (1.1)

We wish to emphasize that this restriction is standard in the majority of mathematical works on the analysis of weak solutions–mainly due to severe technical difficulties associated with the analysis of the case where the full displacement is taken into account. The deformed boundary is denoted by \( \Gamma_\eta(t) = \varphi_\eta(t,\omega) \). It is a well known fact from differential geometry (see e.g. [29]) that there exist \( \alpha(\partial \Omega), \beta(\Omega) > 0 \) such that for \( \eta(y) \in (\alpha(\Omega), \beta(\Omega)) \), \( \varphi_\eta(t,.) \) is a bijective parametrization of the surface \( \Gamma_\eta(t) \) and it defines a domain \( \Omega_\eta(t) \) in its interior such that \( \partial \Omega_\eta(t) = \Gamma_\eta(t) \). Moreover, there exists a bijective transformation \( \psi_\eta(t,.) : \Omega \to \Omega_\eta(t) \). For more details on the geometry see Section 2.1 and Definition 2.1.

We denote the moving domain in the following way:

\[
(0,T) \times \Omega_\eta(t) := \bigcup_{t \in (0,T)} \{t\} \times \Omega_\eta(t).
\]

The non-linear Koiter model is given in terms of the differences of the first and the second fundamental forms of \( \Gamma_\eta(t) \) and \( \Gamma \) which represent membrane forces and bending forces respectively. These forces are sub-summarized in its potential the Koiter energy \( \mathcal{E}_K(t,\eta) \). The definition of the potential is taken from [10, Section 4]. For a precise definition and the derivation of the energy for our coordinates see (2.7) below. Let \( \mathcal{L}_K \eta \) be the \( L^2 \)-gradient of the Koiter energy \( \mathcal{E}_K(t,\eta) \), \( h \) be the (constant) thickness of the shell and \( \rho_s \) the (constant) density of the shell. Then the respective momentum equation for the shell reads

\[
\rho_s h \partial_t^2 \eta + \mathcal{L}_K \eta = g,
\] (1.2)

where \( g \) are the momentum forces of the fluid acting on the shell.
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**Figure 1**: An example of the deformed cylindrical domain.
The fluid flow is governed by the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations:

\[
\rho_f (\partial_t \mathbf{u} + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}) = \text{div} \, \sigma(\mathbf{u}, p) \quad \text{in} \ (0, T) \times \Omega_{\eta}(t),
\]

\[
\text{div} \mathbf{u} = 0 \quad \text{in} \ (0, T) \times \Omega_{\eta}(t),
\]

where \(\sigma(\mathbf{u}, p) = -p \mathbb{I} + 2\mu \text{sym} \nabla \mathbf{u}\) is the fluid stress tensor and \(\rho_f\) the (constant) density of the fluid.

The fluid and the structure are coupled via kinematic and dynamic coupling conditions. We prescribe the no-slip kinematic coupling condition which means that the fluid and the structure velocities are equal on the elastic boundary:

\[
\mathbf{u}(t, \varphi_{\eta}(t, y)) = \partial_t \eta(t, y) \mathbf{n}(y), \quad y \in \omega.
\]

The dynamic boundary condition states that the total force in the normal direction on the boundary is zero:

\[
g(t, y) = -\sigma(\mathbf{u}, p)(t, \varphi_{\eta}(t, y)) \mathbf{n}(\eta(t, y)) \cdot \mathbf{n}, \quad y \in \omega,
\]

where \(\mathbf{n}(\eta(t, y)) = \partial_1 \varphi_{\eta}(t, y) \times \partial_2 \varphi_{\eta}(t, y)\) is the outer normal to the deformed domain at point \(\varphi_{\eta}(t, y)\). Notice that the Jacobian of the change of variables from Eulerian to Lagrangian coordinates is included in the term \(\mathbf{n}(\eta)\) since the normal is not of unit length. To summarize, we state the full fluid-structure interaction problem in differential form:

Find \((\mathbf{u}, \eta)\) such that

\[
\rho_f (\partial_t \mathbf{u} + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}) = \text{div} \, \sigma(\mathbf{u}, p) \quad \text{in} \ (0, T) \times \Omega_{\eta}(t),
\]

\[
\text{div} \mathbf{u} = 0 \quad \text{in} \ (0, T) \times \Omega_{\eta}(t),
\]

\[
\rho_s \partial^2_t \eta + \mathcal{L}_K \eta = -\sigma(\mathbf{u}, p) \circ \varphi_{\eta} \mathbf{n}(\eta) \cdot \mathbf{n} \quad \text{in} \ (0, T) \times \omega
\]

\[
\mathbf{u} \circ \varphi_{\eta} = \partial_t \eta \mathbf{n} \quad \text{in} \ (0, T) \times \omega
\]

\[
\mathbf{u}(0, \cdot) = \mathbf{u}_0 \quad \text{in} \ \Omega_{\eta}(0),
\]

\[
\eta(0) = \eta_0, \ \partial_t \eta(0) = \eta_t \quad \text{in} \ \omega.
\]

Associated to the above coupled system is the following energy that formally reads:

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \left( \frac{\rho_f}{2} \| \mathbf{u}(t) \|_{L^2(\Omega_{\eta}(t))}^2 + \frac{h \rho_s}{2} \| \partial_t \eta(t) \|_{L^2(\omega)}^2 + \mathcal{E}_K(t, \eta) \right) \leq -2\mu \int_{\Omega_{\eta}(t)} |\text{sym} \nabla \mathbf{u}|^2
\]

Due to the fact that the Koiter energy is non-linear—more precisely since the curvature change is measured w.r.t. the deformed geometry—the \(H^2\)-coercivity of the Koiter energy can become degenerate. This is quantified by the estimate that is shown in Lemma 4.3 below. At such a degenerate instant the given existence and regularity proofs break down. This is a phenomenon purely due to the non-linearity of the Koiter energy. Indeed, in case the elastic energy is linear w.r.t the leading order this loss of coercivity is excluded a-priori.

1.2 Main results

Let us now state the main theorems of the paper. The first main theorem is the existence of solutions to the non-linear Koiter shell model.

**Theorem 1.1.** Assume that \(\partial \Omega \in C^3, \eta_0 \in H^2(\omega), \eta_t \in L^2(\omega)\) and \(\mathbf{u}_0 \in L^2(\Omega_{\eta_0})\), and \(\eta_0\) is such that \(\Gamma_{\eta_0}\) has no self-intersection and \(\gamma(\eta_0) \neq 0\). Moreover, we assume that the compatibility
condition \( u_0 |_{\gamma_0} = \eta_1 n \) is satisfied. Then there exists a weak solution \((u, \eta)\) on the time interval \((0, T)\) in the sense of Definition 2.3.

The number \( T \) is restricted only in case that either a self-intersection is approached or in case the \( H^2 \)-coercivity degenerates; i.e. as long as \( \gamma(\eta) \neq 0 \), where \( \gamma \) is defined in Definition 2.1 below.

The second main theorem says that all possible solutions in the natural existence class satisfy better structural regularity properties.

**Theorem 1.2.** Let \((u, \eta)\) be a weak solution in the sense of Definition 2.3. Then the solution has the additional regularity property\(^2\) that \( \eta \in L^2(0, T; H^{2+s}(\omega)) \) and \( \partial_t \eta \in L^2(0, T; H^s(\omega)) \) for \( s \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \). Moreover, it satisfies the following regularity estimate

\[
\|\eta\|_{L^2(0, T; H^{2+s}(\omega))} + \|\partial_t \eta\|_{L^2(0, T; H^s(\omega))} \leq C_1
\]

with \( C_1 \) depending on \( \partial \Omega \), \( C_0 \) and the \( H^2 \)-coercivity size \( \gamma(\eta) \).

**Remark 1.3.** Since here \( \partial \Omega \) is assumed to be a manifold without boundary there is no boundary condition for \( \eta \). We restrict ourselves to this case just for technical simplicity. The proof for the case where just a part of the boundary is elastic (see e.g. [6, 30]) with the appropriate Dirichlet boundary conditions is completely analogue. In particular the regularity estimate Theorem 1.2 is valid for the case of non-periodic shells and the proof can be adapted without any further complication.

**Remark 1.4.** In the proof of Theorem 1.2 we use the no-slip coupling condition (1.5) to transfer the fluid regularity to the structure. Here the exact form of the structure equation (1.2) is not essential. Therefore the proof can be easily adapted to different structure models as long as we have that the corresponding structure energy is coercive in the \( H^2 \) norm. In particular, our result implies respective estimates for weak solutions to several FSI problems that were already studied in the literature and mentioned in the Introduction, e.g. [7, 20, 30, 32, 34]. The geometric condition \( \gamma(\eta) \neq 0 \) is needed for the \( H^2 \)-coercivity only which is satisfied automatically once the leading order term is linear. Hence in case the leading order term is linear the estimates hold until a self-intersection is approached.

### 1.3 Novelty & Significance

The main novelty is the improved regularity of the elastic displacement that allows in particular to cross over the border between Lipschitz domains and non-Lipschitz domains. This critical step has caused a significant amount of effort in previous works. This includes in particular the \( L^2 \)-compactness of the velocity which is the key issue in order to pass to the limit in the convective term [7, 20, 30, 32, 34]. In Lemma 5.3 we provide a new version of this Aubin-Lions type argument. It generalizes the argument of previous attempts by the direct use of solenoidal extension-operators. We wish to remark that the analysis does not make use of the fact that the boundary is Lipschitz continuous (even so the refined a-priori estimates provide these bounds).

The power of the newly introduced method to gain higher regularity for the structure is exploited by proving the existence of weak solutions for non-linear Koiter shells. These more physical models have not been in reach for the theory of weak solutions that may exists for arbitrary long times. In fact even for the non-linear Koiter energy it is possible to give accurate minimal time intervals of existence in dependence of the reference geometry alone. This is made explicit for two popular reference geometries in Subsection 2.1 namely the case when \( \partial \Omega \) is a
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sphere or a cylinder. In spite of the fact that for three space dimensions, long times, big initial data and large Reynolds numbers the regularity of solutions to Navier Stokes equations is rather restricted and that the structure displacement as governed by a hyperbolic PDE, the regularity achieved for the structure in this work is in some sense optimal with respect to the state of the art. In two space dimensions however the method inherits great potential to improve the regularity theory for FSI significantly. Possible other future applications for FSI problems are in the field of membrane energies, compressible fluids, tangential displacements, uniqueness issues and/or numerical analysis.

The structure of the paper: The next section first derives the Koiter energy w.r.t to our chosen coordinates, gives two explicit examples of Koiter energies with respective geometric restrictions on α(Ω), β(Ω), γ(η) and introduces the definition of a weak solution in this setting. Section 3 is the technical heart of the paper since there the solenoidal extension and approximation operators are introduced. In Section 4 we give the proof of Theorem 1.2 and in Section 5 the proof of Theorem 1.1.

2 Weak solutions

2.1 The elastic energy

Coordinates.
Here we follow the strategy of [30, Section 2] by introducing the following coordinates attached to the reference geometry Ω which are well defined in the tubular neighborhood of ∂Ω (see e.g. [29, Section 10] and Figure 2 for an illustration).

Figure 2: Cross section of cylindrical domain, its deformation and corresponding coordinate system.

Definition 2.1. Let x be a point in the neighborhood of ∂Ω. We define the distance parameter with respect to the reference point

\[ s(x) = \min_{y \in \omega} |x - \varphi(y)|, \quad y(x) = \arg \min_{y \in \omega} |x - \varphi(y)| \]

and the projection \( p(x) = \varphi(y(x)) \).

We define the numbers α(Ω), β(Ω) as the maximal numbers, such that \( s(x), p(x), y(x) \) are uniquely defined for all \( x \in (\alpha(\Omega), \beta(\Omega)) \times \partial \Omega := \{ \varphi(y) + sn : y \in \omega, s \in (\alpha(\Omega), \beta(\Omega)) \} \).
For $\kappa > 0$ we introduce the indicator mapping $\sigma_\kappa \in C_0^\infty((\alpha(\Omega), \beta(\Omega)))$, such that

$$\sigma_\kappa(s) = 1 \text{ for } s \in (\alpha(\Omega) + \kappa, \beta(\Omega) - \kappa), \sigma_\kappa(s) = 0 \text{ for } s < \alpha(\Omega) + \frac{\kappa}{2} \text{ and } \sigma'_\kappa \geq 0.$$

We set

$$S_\kappa = (\alpha(\Omega) + \kappa, \beta(\Omega) - \kappa) \times \partial \Omega, \quad Q^\kappa = S_\kappa \cup \Omega \text{ and } Q_\kappa = \Omega \setminus S_\kappa.$$

In particular we have a clear information on the support of the derivative: $A_\kappa := S_\kappa \cup Q_\kappa \supset \text{supp}(\sigma'_\kappa(s(\cdot)))$.

For $\eta(y) \in (\alpha(\Omega) + \kappa, \beta(\Omega) - \kappa)$, this allows to introduce the mapping $\psi_\eta(t, \cdot) : \Omega \to \Omega_{\eta(t)}$ by

$$z \mapsto (1 - \sigma_\kappa(s(z)))z + \sigma_\kappa(s(z))(\mathbf{p}(z) + (\eta(y(z)) - s(z))\mathbf{n}(y(z)).$$

and $\psi^{-1}_\eta(t, \cdot) : \Omega_{\eta(t)} \to \Omega$.

Moreover we define

$$\Phi : (\alpha(\Omega) + \kappa, \beta(\Omega) - \kappa) \times \omega \to S_\kappa, \quad \Phi(s, y) = (s, \varphi(y)).$$

The function is smooth in dependence of $\varphi$ and $\kappa$.

Finally, we define the following geometric quantity depending on $\partial \Omega$ and $\eta$:

$$\gamma(\eta) = \frac{1}{|a_1 \times a_2|} \left( |a_1 \times a_2| + \eta(\mathbf{n} \cdot (a_1 \times \partial_2 \mathbf{n} + \partial_1 \mathbf{n} \times a_2)) + \eta^2 \mathbf{n} \cdot (\partial_1 \mathbf{n} \times \partial_2 \mathbf{n}) \right).$$

**Remark 2.2.** The number $\alpha(\Omega), \beta(\Omega)$ need not to be small. For example, if $\Omega$ is a ball or a cylinder with radius $R$, then $(\alpha(\Omega), \beta(\Omega)) = (-R, \infty)$. The geometric quantity $\gamma(\eta)$ is connected to the $H^2$-coercivity of the non-linear structure energy and its meaning is clarified in Lemma 4.3 and Remark 4.4.

**Derivation of the elastic energy.**

The non-linear Kotier model is given in terms of the differences of the first and the second fundamental forms of $\Gamma_\eta(t)$ and $\Gamma$. The tangent vectors to the deformed boundary are given by:

$$a_\alpha(\eta) = \partial_\alpha \varphi_\eta = a_\alpha + \partial_\alpha \eta \mathbf{n} + \eta \partial_\alpha \mathbf{n}, \; \alpha = 1, 2. \quad (2.1)$$

Therefore the components of the first fundamental form of the deformed configuration are given by:

$$a_{\alpha \beta}(\eta) = a_\alpha(\eta) \cdot a_\beta(\eta) = a_{\alpha \beta} + \partial_\alpha \eta \partial_\beta \eta + \eta(a_\alpha \cdot \partial_\beta \mathbf{n} + a_\beta \cdot \partial_\alpha \mathbf{n}) + \eta^2 \partial_\alpha \mathbf{n} \cdot \partial_\beta \mathbf{n}. \quad (2.2)$$

We define the change of metric tensor $G(\eta)$:

$$G_{\alpha \beta}(\eta) = a_{\alpha \beta}(\eta) - a_{\alpha \beta} = \partial_\alpha \eta \partial_\beta \eta + \eta(a_\alpha \cdot \partial_\beta \mathbf{n} + a_\beta \cdot \partial_\alpha \mathbf{n}) + \eta^2 \partial_\alpha \mathbf{n} \cdot \partial_\beta \mathbf{n}. \quad (2.3)$$

The normal vector to the deformed configuration is given by:

$$\mathbf{n}(\eta) = a_1(\eta) \times a_2(\eta) = |a_1 \times a_2| \mathbf{n} + \partial_2 \eta(a_1 \times \mathbf{n} + \eta \partial_1 \mathbf{n} \times \mathbf{n})$$

$$+ \partial_1 \eta(\mathbf{n} \times a_2 + \eta \mathbf{n} \times \partial_2 \mathbf{n}) + \eta(a_1 \times \partial_2 \mathbf{n} + \partial_1 \mathbf{n} \times a_2) + \eta^2 (\partial_1 \mathbf{n} \times \partial_2 \mathbf{n}). \quad (2.4)$$
Notice that $n(\eta)$ is not a unit vector. We follow our reference literature \cite{10} and use the following tensor $R$ (denoted by $R^\#$ in \cite{10} Section 4) which is some non-normalized variant of the second fundamental form to measure the change of curvature:

$$R_{\alpha,\beta}(\eta) = \frac{1}{|a_1 \times a_2|} \partial_\alpha a_\beta(\eta) \cdot n(\eta) - \partial_\alpha a_\beta \cdot n, \ \alpha, \beta = 1, 2. \quad (2.5)$$

Finally, we define the elasticity tensor in the classical way \cite{10} Theorem 3.2:

$$\mathcal{A}E = \frac{4\lambda \mu}{\lambda + 2\mu} (A : E) A + 4\mu \mathcal{A}E A, \ E \in \text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}). \quad (2.6)$$

Here $A$ is the contravariant metric tensor associated with $\partial \Omega$ (see e.g. \cite{10} Section 2) for the precise definition of $A$), and $\lambda > 0, \mu > 0$ are the Lamé constants. The Koiter energy of the shell is given by:

$$\mathcal{E}_K(t, \eta) = \frac{h}{4} \int_\omega \mathcal{A}G(\eta(t, .)) : G(\eta(t, .)) dy + \frac{h^3}{48} \int_\omega \mathcal{A}R(\eta(t, .)) : R(\eta(t, .)) dy, \quad (2.7)$$

where $h$ is the thickness of the shell. In order to simplify the notation we introduce the following forms connected to the membrane and bending effects in the variational formulation:

$$a_m(t, \eta, \xi) = \frac{h}{2} \int_\omega \mathcal{A}G(\eta(t, .)) : G'(\eta(t, .)) \xi dy, \quad (2.8)$$

$$a_b(t, \eta, \xi) = \frac{h^3}{24} \int_\omega \mathcal{A}R(\eta(t, .)) : R'(\eta(t, .)) \xi dy, \quad (2.9)$$

where $G'$ and $R'$ denote the Frechet derivatives of $G$ and $R$ respectively. Therefore the elastodynamics of the shell is given by the following variational formulation:

$$h \partial_s \frac{d}{dt} \int_\omega \partial_t \eta(t, .) \xi dy + a_m(t, \eta, \xi) + a_b(t, \eta, \xi) = \int_\omega g \xi dy \text{ on } (0, T), \ \xi \in W^{2,p}(\omega), \quad (2.10)$$

where $g_s$ is the structure density, $g$ is the density of area force acting on the structure, and $p > 2$. We denote the elasticity operator by $L_K$ which is formally given by

$$\langle L_K \eta, \xi \rangle = a_m(t, \eta, \xi) + a_b(t, \eta, \xi), \ \xi \in W^{2,p}(\omega). \quad (2.11)$$

Next we give some concrete examples for which we can calculate our restrictive numbers $\alpha(\Omega), \beta(\Omega)$ and $\gamma(\eta)$.

**Example 1: Cylindrical Koiter shell**

The parameterization of the reference cylinder is given by $\varphi(\theta, z) = (R \cos \theta, R \sin \theta, z), \ (\theta, z) \in \omega = (0, 2\pi) \times (0, 1)$, where $R > 0$ is the radius of the cylinder. We compute

$$a_1(\theta, z) = (-R \sin \theta, R \cos \theta, 0), \ a_2(\theta, z) = (0, 0, 1), \ n(\theta, z) = (\cos \theta, \sin \theta, 0).$$

The corresponding contravariant metric tensor is given by $A = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{R} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. The deformation of the cylindrical boundary is given by:

$$\varphi_\eta(\theta, z) = (R \cos \theta + \eta(\theta, z) \cos \theta, R \sin \theta + \eta(\theta, z) \sin \theta, z).$$

Straightforward calculation yields:

$$a_1(\eta) = (1 + \frac{1}{R}) a_1 + \eta n, \ a_2(\eta) = a_2 + \eta n a_3,$$
\[ n(\eta) = (R + \eta)n - \eta_z(R + \eta)a_2 + \frac{\eta_\theta}{R}a_1. \]

Therefore the change of metric tensor is given by
\[ G(\eta) = \begin{pmatrix} (R + \eta)^2 + \eta_\theta^2 - R^2 & \eta_\theta \eta_z \\ \eta_\theta \eta_z & 1 + \eta_z^2 \end{pmatrix}. \]

And the change of curvature tensor:
\[ R(\eta) = \begin{pmatrix} (1 + \frac{\eta}{R})\eta_\theta^2 - \frac{1}{R}(\eta + R)^2 - 2\eta_\phi^2 + R \frac{1}{R} \eta_\theta \eta_z \\ (1 + \frac{\eta}{R})\eta_\theta \eta_z + R \frac{1}{R} \eta_\theta \eta_z \\ (1 + \frac{\eta}{R})\eta_\theta \eta_z - \frac{1}{R} \eta_\theta \eta_z \end{pmatrix}. \]

Here \((\alpha(\Omega), \beta(\Omega)) = (-R, \infty)\) and \(\gamma(\eta) = 1 + \frac{\eta}{R}^2\).

**Example 2: Spherical shell**

Strictly speaking, the sphere does not fit in our framework since it does not have a global parametrization. However, this assumption was introduced just for technical simplicity and can be easily removed by working with local coordinates. In this example we consider an elastic sphere with holes around north and south poles. On this holes we prescribe the boundary condition for the fluid flow, e.g. inflow/outflow or Dirichlet. The shell is clamped on the boundary of the holes (see Figure 1 for an illustration). More precisely, the parametrization is given by
\[ \varphi(\theta, \phi) = R(\cos \theta \sin \phi, \sin \theta \sin \phi, \cos \phi), \quad (\theta, \phi) \in w = (0, 2\pi) \times (a, \pi - a), \]

where \(R > 0\) is the radius of the sphere, and \(a > 0\) is the parameter determining the size of the holes. We compute the tangent and normal vectors to the reference configuration
\[ \mathbf{a}_1 = -R(\sin \theta \sin \phi, \cos \theta \sin \phi, 0), \quad \mathbf{a}_2 = R(\cos \theta \cos \phi, \sin \theta \cos \phi, -\sin \pi), \]
\[ \mathbf{n} = -(\cos \theta \sin \phi, \sin \theta \sin \phi, \cos \phi). \]

The contravariant metric tensor is given by \(A = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{R^2 \sin \phi} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{R^2} \end{pmatrix}\), and the deformation of the cylindrical boundary by
\[ \varphi_\eta(\theta, \phi) = (R - \eta(\theta, \phi))(\cos \theta \sin \phi, \sin \theta \sin \phi, \cos \phi). \]

We calculate the tangent and normal vectors to the deformed configuration:
\[ \mathbf{a}_1(\eta) = (1 - \frac{\eta}{R})a_1 + \eta_\phi \mathbf{n}, \quad \mathbf{a}_2(\eta) = (1 - \frac{\eta}{R})a_2 + \eta_\phi \mathbf{n}, \]
\[ \mathbf{n}(\eta) = (R - \eta)^2 \sin \phi \mathbf{n} - (1 - \frac{\eta}{R}) \left( \frac{\eta_\theta}{\sin \phi} \mathbf{a}_1 + \eta_\phi \sin \phi \mathbf{a}_2 \right). \]

The change of the metric tensor is given by
\[ G(\eta) = \begin{pmatrix} \eta_\theta^2 + (\sin \phi)^2 \eta(\eta - 2R) \\ \eta_\theta \eta_\phi \\ \eta_\phi^2 + (\eta - 2R)^2 - R^2 \end{pmatrix}. \]

Finally, the components of the change of curvature tensor are given by
\[ R_{11}(\eta) = \frac{1}{2R^2} \left( -2\eta^3 \sin^2 \phi + \eta^2 (6R \sin^2 \phi + \eta_\phi \sin 2\phi + 2\eta_\theta) \\
-2\eta^2 (3R^2 \sin^2 \phi + R\eta_\phi \sin 2\phi + 2\eta_\phi^2 + 2R\eta_\theta) + R(R\eta_\phi \sin 2\phi + 4\eta_\phi^2 + 2R\eta_\theta) \right) \]
\[ R_{12}(\eta) = R_{21}(\eta) = \frac{\eta - R}{R^2} \left( \eta \theta (R \cot \phi - \eta \cot \phi - 2\eta_\phi) + \eta \phi (\eta - R) \right) \]
\[ R_{22}(\eta) = \frac{1}{R^2} \left( -\eta^3 + \eta^2 (3R + \eta \phi) + 2\eta \phi^2 + R (3R + 2\eta \phi) - \eta (2\eta \phi^2 + 3R + 2\eta \phi) \right). \]

The clamped boundary conditions are \( \eta = \partial_x \eta \big|_{\Omega} = 0, \phi = a, \pi - a. \) Since we will take finite differences of order less than 1, we can extend \( \eta \) by zero (over the poles) and complete all estimates related to the regularity. Here \((\alpha(\Omega), \beta(\Omega)) = (-\infty, R) \) and \( \gamma(\eta) = \frac{(\eta - R)^2}{R^2}. \)

### 2.2 Weak coupled solutions

We use here the standard notation of Bochner spaces related to Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces. We will use bold letters for vector valued functions with three dimensions. Usually we take \( y \in \omega \) to be a two dimensional variable and \( x \) as a three dimensional variable. In order to define weak solutions, let us first define the appropriate function spaces:

- \( \mathcal{V}_\eta(t) = \{ \mathbf{u} \in H^1(\Omega_\eta(t)) : \text{div} \mathbf{u} = 0 \} \),
- \( \mathcal{V}_F = L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega_\eta(t))) \cap L^2(0, T; \mathcal{V}_\eta(t)), \)
- \( \mathcal{V}_K = L^\infty(0, T; H^2(\omega)) \cap W^{1,\infty}(0, T; L^2(\omega)), \)
- \( \mathcal{V}_S = \{ (\mathbf{u}, \eta) \in \mathcal{V}_F \times \mathcal{V}_K : \mathbf{u}(t, \varphi_\eta(t, \cdot)) = \partial_t \eta(t, \cdot) \mathbf{n}(\eta(t, \cdot)) \}, \)
- \( \mathcal{V}_T = \{ (\mathbf{q}, \xi) \in \mathcal{V}_F \times \mathcal{V}_K : \mathbf{q}(t, \varphi_\eta(t, \cdot)) = \xi(t, \cdot) \mathbf{n}(\eta(t, \cdot)), \partial_t \mathbf{q} \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\Omega_\eta(t))) \}. \)

Here \( \mathcal{V}_S \) and \( \mathcal{V}_F \) are solution and test space respectively. Even though for \( \eta \in \mathcal{V}_K, \Omega_\eta(t) \) is not necessary a Lipschitz domain, the traces used in definitions 2.12 and 3.3 are well defined, see Corollary 2.9. from [30] (see also [7] [31]). We introduce the concept of solution which we will consider here. Observe, that from this point on we normalize all physical constants \( \rho_s = \rho_f = h = \mu = \lambda = 1 \) for notational simplicity since the proofs require just positivity of these constants. We emphasize that the restrictions on existence and regularity are only of geometrical nature. It can be quantified by \( \alpha(\Omega) \) and \( \beta(\Omega) \) depending only on the reference geometry, and \( \gamma(\eta) \) depending on the reference geometry and on the particular magnitude and direction of the displacement, but not on the above physical constants.

**Definition 2.3 (Weak solution).** We call \( (\mathbf{u}, \eta) \in \mathcal{V}_S \) a weak solution of problem 1.7 if it satisfies the inequality energy 2.14 and for every \( (\mathbf{q}, \xi) \in \mathcal{V}_T \) the following equality holds in \( D'(0, T) \)

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega_\eta(t)} \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{q} \, dx + \int_{\Omega_\eta(t)} \left( -\mathbf{u} \cdot \partial_t \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u} : \nabla \mathbf{q} + 2 \text{sym} \nabla \mathbf{u} : \text{sym} \nabla \mathbf{q} \right) \, dx + \int_\omega \partial_t \eta \xi \, dy - \int_\omega \partial_t \eta \partial_t \xi + a_m(t, \eta, \xi) + a_b(t, \eta, \xi) \, dy = 0. \]

Furthermore, the initial values \( \eta_0, \eta_1, \mathbf{u}_0 \) are attained in the respective weakly continuous sense.

By formally multiplying 1.71 by \( \mathbf{u} \) and 1.72 by \( \partial_t \eta \), integrating over \( \Omega_\eta(t) \) and \( \omega \) respectively, integration by parts and using the coupling conditions 1.74, we obtain the energy inequality (see e.g. [7] [32] for details of the computations related to the change of the domain and the convective term):

\[
\frac{1}{2} \| \mathbf{u}(t) \|_{L^2(\Omega_\eta(t))}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \| \partial_t \eta(t) \|_{L^2(\omega)}^2 + \mathcal{E}_K(t, \eta) + 2 \int_0^t \int_{\Omega_\eta(t)} |\text{sym} \nabla \mathbf{u}|^2 \, dx \, dt \leq \frac{1}{2} \| \mathbf{u}_0 \|_{L^2(\Omega_\eta_0)}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \| \eta_1 \|_{L^2(\omega)}^2 + \mathcal{E}_K(0, \eta_0) =: C_0. \]
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2.3 Fractional spaces

In the paper we use the standard definitions of Bochner spaces related to Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces. In particular we consider fractional Sobolev spaces and Nikolskij spaces. We recall their definitions here.

For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ (the order of derivative) and $q \in [1, \infty)$ (the exponent of integrability) we say that $g \in W^{\alpha,q}(A)$, for a domain $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ if its norm

$$\|g\|_{W^{\alpha,q}(A)} := \left( \int_A \int_A |g(x) - g(y)|^q \frac{1}{|x-y|^{n+\alpha q}} \frac{1}{x-y} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} + \left( \int_A |g(x)|^q dx \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}$$

is finite. For the particular case that $q = 2$ we use the abbreviation

$$H^s(A) \equiv W^{s,2}(A)$$

for $s \in [0, \infty)$. And we say that $g \in \mathcal{N}^{\alpha,q}(A)$ if its norm

$$\|g\|_{\mathcal{N}^{\alpha,q}(A)} := \sup_{i \in \{1, \ldots, d\}} \sup_{|h| > 0} \left( \int_{A_h} \frac{|g(x + h e_i) - g(x)|^q}{h^\alpha} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} + \left( \int_A |g(x)|^q dx \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}$$

where $e_i$ is the $i$-th’s unit vector and $A_h = \{ x \in A : \text{dist}(x, \partial A) > h \}$ is finite. Nikolskij spaces are closely related to fractional Sobolev spaces $W^{\alpha,q}(A)$. Let us just mention that $0 < \alpha < \beta < 1$ for a bounded domain $A$ we find

$$W^{\beta,q}(A) \subset \mathcal{N}^{\beta,q}(A) \subset W^{\alpha,q}(A).$$

Recall also that for fractional Sobolev spaces an embedding theorem is available for a Lipschitz domain $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $g \in \mathcal{N}^{\beta,q}(A)$ and $0 < \alpha < \beta < 1$ we have for $\alpha q < n$ that

$$\|g\|_{L^{\frac{nq}{n-\alpha q}}(A)} \leq c_1 \|g\|_{W^{\alpha,q}(A)} \leq c_2 \|g\|_{\mathcal{N}^{\alpha,q}(A)}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.15)

and for $\alpha q > n$

$$\|g\|_{C^{\alpha - \frac{n}{q}}(A)} \leq c_1 \|g\|_{W^{\alpha,q}(A)} \leq c_2 \|g\|_{\mathcal{N}^{\alpha,q}(A)}. \hspace{1cm} (2.16)$$

For the above estimates and a more detailed study on the given function spaces we refer to [1, Chapter 7] and [38]. The Nikolskij spaces are very popular in the analysis of PDE which is due to the fact that they are defined via difference quotients that often commute with (non-linear) expressions in PDE. Namely we introduce for $q : \omega \to \mathbb{R}$

$$D_h^s(q)(y) = \frac{q(y + h e) - q(y)}{h^s}$$

for any (unit) vector $e \in \mathbb{R}^2$. In the following we will omit mentioning the direction $e$ since it is never of relevance and write

$$D_h^s(q)(y) := D_h^s(q)(y)$$

for an arbitrary direction $e$. At this point we just wish to mention that these expressions satisfy an integration by parts formula, once we assume periodicity of $\omega$.

3 Solenoidal extensions and smooth approximations

In this section we construct a divergence free extension operator from $(0, T) \times \partial \Omega$ to $(0, T) \times \Omega(t)$. The construction is based on the ideas of the construction in [30, Prop. 2.11]. In contrast to the approach there we will use the celebrated Bogovskij theorem in place of the steady Stokes operator. We use the following theorem that can be found in [17, Section 3.3], and in [15, Appendix 10.5].
Theorem 3.1. Let $\Omega$ be uniformly Lipschitz. There exists a linear operator $\text{Bog} : \hat{C}_0^\infty(\Omega) \to C_0^\infty(\Omega)^d$ which extends from $\hat{W}_0^{k-1,p}(\Omega) \to W_0^{k,p}(\Omega)$ for $1 < p < \infty$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, such that
\begin{equation}
\| \text{Bog}(f) \|_{W^{k,p}(\Omega)} \leq C \| f \|_{\hat{W}_0^{k-1,p}(\Omega)}, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z},
\end{equation}
where $C$ is an absolute constant depending only on the Lipschitz constant. Here we use the notation $\hat{C}_0^\infty(\Omega) = \{ f \in C_0^\infty(\Omega) : \int_\Omega f = 0 \}$, and for $l \geq 0$, $\hat{W}_0^{l,p}(\Omega) = \{ f \in W_0^{l,p} : \int_\Omega f = 0 \}$, $\hat{W}_0^{-l,p}(\Omega) = \{ f \in W^{-l,p} : (f, 1) = 0 \}$, where $W^{-l,p}$ is defined via the norm
\begin{equation}
\| f \|_{W^{-l,p}(\Omega)} = \sup_{\{\phi \in W^{l',p'}(\Omega) : \| \phi \|_{W^{l',p'}(\Omega)} = 1\}} \langle f, \phi \rangle.
\end{equation}

Within this section we assume that $\eta : [0, T] \times \omega \to \mathbb{R}$, such that
\begin{equation}
\alpha(\Omega) + \kappa \leq \alpha_\eta \leq \eta(t,y) \leq \beta_\eta \leq \beta(\Omega) - \kappa \text{ uniformly in } (t,y) \in [0,T] \times \omega.
\end{equation}
Moreover, in this Section we use $c$ or $C$ as generic constants which may change its size from instant to instant. Here we are only interested on their dependence on the geometry which is explicitly stated in the statements of the results. Before introducing our extension we need to introduce the following corrector mapping that will be used in the solenoidal extension to be well posed. We use the coordinates introduced in Definition 2.1. For a better readability, we introduce
\[ \tilde{\xi} : \partial \Omega \to \mathbb{R} \text{ with } \tilde{\xi}(p(x)) := \xi(y(x)). \]
Eventually for our solenoidal extension the Bogovskij theorem will be applied to the support of the function $\sigma'_\kappa$ from Definition 2.1 which is a $C^2$ domain which does not depend on time:
\[ S_{\kappa} \setminus S_{\kappa} =: \mathcal{A}_\kappa. \]
In order to make the divergence mean value free on this set (which allows to use the Bogovskij correction), we introduce the following weighted mean value over that set. Let $\lambda \in L^\infty(\mathcal{A}_\kappa), \lambda \geq 0, \text{ and } \int_{\mathcal{A}_\kappa} \lambda(x) \, dx > 0$ be a given weight. Then
\[ \langle \psi \rangle_\lambda := \frac{\int_{\mathcal{A}_\kappa} \psi(x) \lambda(x) \, dx}{\int_{\mathcal{A}_\kappa} \lambda(x) \, dx} \text{ for } \psi \in L^1(\mathcal{A}_\kappa). \]
We will denote
\begin{equation}
\lambda_\eta(x) := e^{(s(x) - \eta(t,y(x)) \cdot \text{div}(n(p(x))))} \sigma'_\kappa(s(x)) \geq 0,
\end{equation}
which has compact support in $\mathcal{A}_\kappa$ and satisfies (uniformly in $t$)
\[ c_1 \leq \| \lambda_\eta \|_{L^1(\mathcal{A}_\kappa)} \leq c_2 \| \lambda_\eta \|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{A}_\kappa)} \leq c_3 \]
for some positive constants $c_1 \leq c_2 \leq c_3$ just depending on $\kappa$ and the upper and lower bounds on $\eta$.

Corollary 3.2 (Corrector). Let (3.2) be satisfied. Then the corrector map
\[ K_\eta : L^1(\omega) \to \mathbb{R}, \quad \xi \mapsto K_\eta(\xi) = \langle \tilde{\xi}_\lambda \rangle_\eta = \frac{\int_{\mathcal{A}_\kappa} \tilde{\xi}(p(x)) \lambda_\eta(x) \, dx}{\int_{\mathcal{A}_\kappa} \lambda_\eta(x) \, dx}
\]
satisfy the following estimates for $q \in [1, \infty]$:
\begin{align}
\| K_\eta(\xi) \|_{L^q(0,T)} &\leq C \| \xi \|_{L^q(0,T;L^1(\omega))} \\
\| \partial_t K_\eta(\xi) \|_{L^q(0,T)} &\leq C \left( \| \partial_t \xi \|_{L^q(0,T;L^1(\omega))} + \| \xi \partial_\eta \|_{L^q(0,T;L^1(\omega))} \right),
\end{align}
whenever the right hand side is finite. Here $C$ depends only on $\alpha_\eta, \beta_\eta, \kappa$. 12
Proof. The estimates in $L^q((0, T))$ are immediate by the uniform bounds of $\lambda_\eta$ and $\sigma$. In order to estimate the time-derivative, we use the calculation

$$\partial_t \langle \xi(t) \rangle_{\lambda_\eta(t)} = -\frac{1}{\|\lambda_\eta(t)\|^2_{L^1}} \int_{A_n} \partial_t \lambda_\eta(t) \, dx \int_{A_n} \tilde{\xi}(t) \lambda_\eta(t) \, dx + \frac{1}{\|\lambda_\eta(t)\|_{L^1}} \int_{A_n} \partial_t \tilde{\xi}(t) \lambda_\eta(t) \, dx$$

$$+ \frac{1}{\|\lambda_\eta(t)\|_{L^1}} \int_{A_n} \tilde{\xi}(t) \partial_t \lambda_\eta(t) \, dx.$$

The estimate now follows using $\partial_t \lambda_\eta = -\partial_t \eta \lambda_\eta$ and by the uniform bounds of $\lambda_\eta$ and $\sigma$. \qed

**Proposition 3.3 (Solenoidal extension).** Let $\eta \in L^\infty(0, T; W^{1,2}(\omega))$. Then there exists a linear solenoidal extension operator

$$\text{Test}_\eta : \{ \xi \in L^1(0, T; W^{1,1}(\omega)) : \mathcal{K}_\eta(\xi) \equiv 0 \} \to L^1(0, T; W^{1,1}_{\text{div}}(Q_\tilde{\omega}))$$

such that $(\text{Test}_\eta(\xi - \mathcal{K}_\eta(\xi)), \xi - \mathcal{K}_\eta(\xi)) \in \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{T}$ for $\xi \in \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{K}$.

Moreover, $\text{Test}_\eta(\xi - \mathcal{K}_\eta(\xi))(t, x) = 0$ for $(t, x) \in (0, T) \times Q_\tilde{\omega}$ and it satisfies the following estimates for $s \in (0, 1)$, $q \in [1, \infty]$, $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $l \in \mathbb{N}$.

$$\left\| \text{Test}_\eta(\xi - \mathcal{K}_\eta(\xi)) \right\|_{L^q(0, T; W^{1,p}(Q_\tilde{\omega}))} \leq C \left( \|\xi\|_{L^q(0, T; W^{1,p}(\omega))} + \|\xi \nabla \eta\|_{L^q(0, T; L^p(\omega))} \right),$$

(3.6)

$$\left\| \partial_t \text{Test}_\eta(\xi - \mathcal{K}_\eta(\xi)) \right\|_{L^q(0, T; L^p(\omega))} \leq C \left( \|\partial_t \xi\|_{L^q(0, T; L^p(\omega))} + \|\partial_t \eta \nabla \eta\|_{L^q(0, T; L^p(\omega))} \right),$$

(3.7)

$$\left\| \nabla^2 \text{Test}_\eta(\xi - \mathcal{K}_\eta(\xi)) \right\|_{L^q(0, T; L^p(\omega))} \leq C \left( \|\nabla^2 \xi\|_{L^q(0, T; L^p(\omega))} + \|\xi \nabla^2 \eta\|_{L^q(0, T; L^p(\omega))} \right)$$

$$+ C \left( \|\nabla \xi\|_{L^q(0, T; L^p(\omega))} + \|\xi \nabla \eta\|_{L^q(0, T; L^p(\omega))} \right),$$

(3.8)

$$\left\| \partial^l \nabla \text{Test}_\eta(\xi - \mathcal{K}_\eta(\xi)) \right\|_{L^q(0, T; W^{1,p}(Q_\tilde{\omega}))} \leq C \left\| \text{Test}_\eta(\xi) \right\|_{L^q(0, T; W^{1,p}(Q_\tilde{\omega}))}$$

whenever the right hand side is finite. Here $C$ depends only on $\alpha_\eta, \beta_\eta,$ and $\kappa$.

**Proof.** Construction:

The construction relies exclusively on the reference geometry. Namely on $S_* \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ defined in Definition 2.1. Hence to keep the notation compact we will omit the dependence on the time variable $t$. Moreover, we assume here, that $\mathcal{K}_\eta(\xi) = 0$. This is without loss of generality since otherwise we replace $\xi \equiv \xi - \mathcal{K}_\eta(\xi)$, for which we know that

$$\mathcal{K}_\eta(\xi - \mathcal{K}_\eta(\xi)) = \frac{\int_{A_n} (\xi - \mathcal{K}_\eta(\xi)) \lambda_\eta \, dx}{\int_{A_n} \lambda_\eta \, dx} = \frac{\int_{A_n} \tilde{\xi} \lambda_\eta \, dx}{\int_{A_n} \lambda_\eta \, dx} - \mathcal{K}_\eta(\xi) = 0.$$

Hence, once the estimates are valid for $\xi_1$, such that $\mathcal{K}_\eta(\xi_1) = 0$ the estimates follow by Corollary 3.2 also for the case $\mathcal{K}_\eta(\xi) \neq 0$.

First observe, that for the coordinates $s(x), p(x)$ introduced in Definition 2.1 we find

$$\nabla s(x) = \partial_n s(x) n \text{ and } \nabla p(x) = (\partial_{\tau_i(p(x))} p(x))_{i=1,\ldots,d-1}$$

And (independent of $s(x)$)

$$\text{div}(n(p)) = \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} \partial_{\tau_i(p)} n(p) \cdot \tau_i(p).$$
Obviously we also find by the definition that \( y(x) = y(y) \) if and only if \( p(x) = \varphi(y) \) and so (wherever well defined)

\[
\nabla_n(p) y(x) = 0 \quad \text{and so} \quad \nabla_n(p) \xi(y(x)) = 0.
\]

Next we introduce the operator:

\[
\text{Test}_\eta(\xi)(x) := e^{(s(x) - \eta(y(x))) \cdot \nabla(p)} \tilde{\xi}(p(x)) \sigma_\kappa(s(x)) n(p(x)).
\]

Observe, that for \( x \in \Omega_\eta \cap S_\kappa \), we find

\[
\text{Test}_\eta(\xi)(x) = e^{(s(x) - \eta(y(x))) \cdot \nabla(p)} \tilde{\xi}(p(x)) n(p(x))
\]

and so for \( x \in \partial \Omega_\eta \), we find \( s(x) = \eta(y(x)) \) and hence

\[
\text{Test}_\eta(\xi)(x) = n(p(x)) \xi(y(x))
\]

in this set. Using that \( \partial_n(p(x)) \equiv -\partial_n \) we find for \( x \in Q^\frac{2}{n} \cap S_\kappa \)

\[
\text{div}(\text{Test}_\eta(\xi)(x)) = \nabla \left( e^{(s(x) - \eta(y(x))) \cdot \nabla(p)} \tilde{\xi}(p(x)) \right) \cdot n(p(x))
\]
\[
+ e^{(s(x) - \eta(t,y(x))) \cdot \nabla(p)} \tilde{\xi}(p(x)) \text{div}(n(p(x)))
\]
\[
= -\partial_n \left( e^{(s(x) - \eta(t,y(x))) \cdot \nabla(p)} \tilde{\xi}(p(x)) \right)
\]
\[
+ e^{(s(x) - \eta(y(x))) \cdot \nabla(p)} \tilde{\xi}(p(x)) \text{div}(n(p(x)))
\]
\[
= 0.
\]

On \( A_\kappa \) we find (by the same calculations) that

\[
\text{div}(\text{Test}_\eta(\xi)(x)) = -e^{(s(x) - \eta(t,y(x))) \cdot \nabla(p)} \tilde{\xi}(p(x)) \sigma'_\kappa(s(x))
\]

which has compact support in \( A_\kappa \). Moreover,

\[
\int_{A_\kappa} \text{div}(\text{Test}_\eta(\xi)(x)) \, dx = -\int_{A_\kappa} \lambda_\eta(x) \tilde{\xi}(p(x)) \, dx = 0.
\]

Since \( A_\kappa \) is by assumption a uniform \( C^2 \) domain we can apply the Bogovskij operator on this domain which we denote by \( \text{Bog}_\kappa \). We define

\[
\text{Test}_\eta(\xi)(x) := \text{Test}_\eta(\xi)(x) - \text{Bog}_\kappa(\text{div}(\text{Test}_\eta(\xi)))(x).
\]

**Estimates:**

The estimates are quite standard relaying on the regularity of \( \varphi \), namely on the \( C^2 \)-regularity of \( \partial \Omega \). We give some detail on the estimate in order to have provide a clear dependence on \( \eta \).

We start with the estimates of the time derivative of \( \text{Test}_\eta(\xi) \). We calculate

\[
\partial_t \text{Test}_\eta(\xi) = \partial_t \text{Test}_\eta(\xi) - \text{Bog}_\kappa(\partial_t \text{div} \text{Test}_\eta(\xi)).
\]

The Bogovskij operator is well defined due to the fact, that (formally)

\[
\int_{\Omega_{\eta(t)}} \partial_t \text{div}(\text{Test}_\eta(\xi)) \, dx = \int_{A_\kappa} \partial_t \text{div}(\text{Test}_\eta(\xi)) \, dx = \partial_t \left( \int_{A_\kappa} \text{div}(\text{Test}_\eta(\xi)) \, dx \right) = 0.
\]
We calculate further
\[
\partial_t \text{Test}_\eta(\xi)(t, x) = e^{(s(x)-\eta(t,y(x)))\div(n(p(x)))} \partial_t \xi(t, y(x)) n(p(x)) \\
- \div(n(p(x))) \partial_\eta \eta(t, y(x)) e^{(s(x)-\eta(t,y(x)))\div(n(p(x)))} \xi(t, y(x)) n(p(x)),
\]
Which implies the pointwise estimates for \( \partial_t \text{Test}_\eta(\xi) \):
\[
|\partial_t \text{Test}_\eta(\xi)(t, x)| \leq c(|\partial_t \xi(t, p(x))| + |\partial_\eta \eta(t, p(x))| |\xi(t, p(x))|),
\]
where the constant only depends on \( \kappa, \alpha_\eta, \beta_\eta \) and the \( C^2 \)-regularity of \( \partial \Omega \). For the sake of better understanding we demonstrate that the assumption \( K_\eta(\xi) = 0 \) is indeed without loss of generality. We estimate
\[
|\partial_t \text{Test}_\eta(\xi - K_\eta(\xi))(t, x)| \\
\leq c(|\partial_t \xi(t, p(x))| + |\partial_\eta \eta(t, p(x))| |\xi(t, p(x))| + |\xi(t)|_{L^1}) + |\partial_\eta \eta(t, t)(t)|_{L^1}.
\]
In order to estimate the Bogovskij part we find by Theorem 3.1 (with a constant just depending on the Lipschitz constant of \( A_\alpha \)) that
\[
\| \text{Bog}_{\alpha_\eta}(\partial_t \div(\text{Test}_\eta(\xi - K_\eta(\xi)))) \|_{L^p(\Omega_{\eta})} = \| \text{Bog}_{\alpha_\eta}(\partial_t \div(\text{Test}_\eta(\xi - K_\eta(\xi)))) \|_{L^p(A_\alpha)} \\
\leq c \| \div(\partial_t \text{Test}_\eta(\xi - K_\eta(\xi))) \|_{W^{-1,p}(A_\alpha)} \\
= c \| \partial_t \text{Test}_\eta(\xi - K_\eta(\xi)) \|_{L^p(A_\alpha)},
\]
and so the estimate on \( \partial_t \text{Test}_\eta(\xi - K_\eta(\xi)) \) follows by (3.10).

The estimates on \( \nabla \text{Test}_\eta(\xi - K_\eta(\xi)), \nabla^2 \text{Test}_\eta(\xi - K_\eta(\xi)), \partial_\nabla \text{Test}_\eta(\xi - K_\eta(\xi)) \), are analogous and we skip the details here. Just observe, that due to the compact support of \( \div(\text{Test}_\eta(\xi - K_\eta(\xi))) \) we find by Gauss theorem that
\[
\int_{\Omega_{\eta}(t)} \nabla^l \div(\text{Test}_\eta(\xi - K_\eta(\xi))) \, dx = 0 = \int_{\Omega_{\eta}(t)} \partial_t \nabla^l \div(\text{Test}_\eta(\xi - K_\eta(\xi))) \, dx;
\]
hence \( \text{Bog}_{\alpha_\eta} \) is always well defined.

Clearly the normal derivatives of the constructed function \( \text{Test}_\eta(\xi - K_\eta(\xi)) \) are depending on the estimates of the derivatives of \( \sigma_\eta \) and not on the regularity of the derivatives of \( \eta \). Since the Bogovskij theorem transfers the regularity to \( \text{Test}_\eta(\xi - K_\eta(\xi)) \) with no further loss (3.8) follows with according dependences on the higher order derivatives of \( \sigma_\eta \).

We include the following technical lemma, that will be necessary for the regularity result.

**Lemma 3.4.** Let \( p, \tilde{\alpha} \in (1, \infty) \) such that \( p' < \tilde{\alpha} = \frac{dp}{d-p} \) if \( p' < d \) and \( p' < \tilde{\alpha} < \infty \) otherwise and the assumptions of Proposition 3.3 be satisfied. Assume additionally that \( \eta \in C^{0,\tilde{\theta}}(\omega) \cap W^{1,\frac{\tilde{\alpha}}{d-p-\tilde{\alpha}-p}}(\omega) \) and \( u \in W^{1,p'}(\Omega_{\eta}) \) then the above constructed testfunction satisfies
\[
\left|\int_{\Omega_{\eta}} u \cdot \text{Test}_\eta(D_{h,\epsilon}^s \xi - K_\eta(D_{h,\epsilon}^s \xi)) \, dx \right| \leq c(h^{\tilde{\theta}-s} + \|D_{h,\epsilon}^s \eta\|_{W^{1,\frac{\tilde{\alpha}}{d-p-\tilde{\alpha}-p}}(\omega)}) \|u\|_{W^{1,p'}(\Omega_{\eta})} \|\xi\|_{L^p(\omega)}
\]
and in case \( \partial_\xi \in L^p(\omega) \)
\[
\left|\int_{\Omega_{\eta}} u \cdot \partial_\xi \text{Test}_\eta(D_{h,\epsilon}^s \xi - K_\eta(D_{h,\epsilon}^s \xi)) \, dx \right| \leq c \left( h^{\tilde{\theta}-s} + \|D_{h,\epsilon}^s \eta\|_{W^{1,\frac{\tilde{\alpha}}{d-p-\tilde{\alpha}-p}}(\omega)} \right) \|\partial_\xi \xi\|_{L^p(\omega)} \|u\|_{W^{1,p'}(\Omega_{\eta})} + \|D_{h,\epsilon}^s \xi \partial_\xi \eta\|_{L^{p'}(\omega)} \|u\|_{W^{1,p'}(\Omega_{\eta})}.
\]
The constants are only depending on $\alpha, \beta, \kappa$ and (linearly) on $\|\eta\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\omega)}$.

Proof. In the following we use the abbreviation $\delta_i f(y) = (f(y + e_i h) - f(y))$ for $i = 1, 2$. Moreover, since all estimates are done point-wisely in time we omit the dependence on $t$ of $\eta$ and $\Omega$. First, since the support of $\text{Test}_\eta(\delta_1 \xi - K_\eta(\delta_1 \xi))$ is $S'_2$ we can use the coordinates $(p, s)$ on the full support of $\text{Test}_\eta(\delta_1 \xi - K_\eta(\delta_1 \xi))$. We will use the following change of coordinates $\psi_\eta \circ \Phi : \omega \times (\alpha + \kappa/2, 0] \rightarrow \Omega$ in order to be able to make integration by parts. Hence

$$\int_{\Omega} u \cdot \text{Test}_\eta(\delta_1 \xi - K_\eta(\delta_1 \xi)) \, dx \leq \int_{\alpha + \kappa/2}^{0} \int_{\omega} (u \circ \psi_\eta \circ \Phi \cdot \delta_1 \text{Test}_\eta(\xi - K_\eta(\xi)) \circ \psi_\eta \circ \Phi) \, dy \, ds$$

We will use the following abbreviations for the sake of a better overview.

$$\alpha = \alpha(\Omega), \quad \gamma(s, y) := |\det(\nabla (\psi_\eta \circ \Phi)(s, y)| \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_\eta(s, y) := e^{(s-\eta(y) \cdot \nabla z(\eta))} \sigma_\kappa(s) \gamma(s, y).$$

Hence we calculate

$$\|\lambda_\eta\|_{L^1(A_\kappa)} \mathcal{K}_\eta(\delta_1 \xi) = \int_{\alpha + \kappa/2}^{0} \int_{\omega} \lambda_\eta \circ \psi_\eta \circ \Phi \delta_1 \xi \, dy \, ds = \int_{\alpha + \kappa/2}^{0} \int_{\omega} \delta_1 \xi(y) \lambda_\eta(y) \, dy \, ds$$

where we Therefore

$$\delta_1 \xi - K_\eta(\delta_1 \xi) = \delta_1 (\xi - K_\eta(\xi)) + \frac{\int_{\alpha + \kappa/2}^{0} \int_{\omega} \delta_1(\lambda_\eta(y)) \, dy \, ds}{\|\lambda_\eta\|_{L^1(A_\kappa)}}$$

And so

$$\text{Test}_\eta(\delta_1 \xi - K_\eta(\delta_1 \xi)) \circ \psi_\eta \circ \Phi(s, y) = \delta_1 (\text{Test}_\eta(\xi - K_\eta(\xi)) \circ \psi_\eta \circ \Phi(s, y))$$

$$- \delta_1 (e^{(s-\eta(y) \cdot \nabla z(\eta))} \sigma_\kappa(s) \left( \xi - \langle \xi \rangle \lambda_\eta \right) n(y))$$

$$- e^{(s-\eta(y) \cdot \nabla z(\eta))} \sigma_\kappa(s) \left( \xi - \langle \xi \rangle \lambda_\eta \right) \delta_1(n(y))$$

$$+ e^{(s-\eta(y) \cdot \nabla z(\eta))} \sigma_\kappa(s) \int_{\alpha + \kappa/2}^{0} \int_{\omega} \xi(y) \delta_1(\lambda_\eta(y)) \, dy \, ds$$

This implies by partial summation and Hölder’s inequality that

$$\left| \int_{\Omega} u \cdot \text{Test}_\eta(\delta_1 \xi - K_\eta(\delta_1 \xi)) \, dx \right| \leq \left| \int_{\alpha + \kappa/2}^{0} \int_{\omega} (u \circ \psi_\eta \circ \Phi \cdot \delta_1 \text{Test}_\eta(\xi - K_\eta(\xi)) \circ \psi_\eta \circ \Phi) \, dy \, ds \right|$$

$$+ \left| \int_{\alpha + \kappa/2}^{0} \int_{\omega} (u \circ \psi_\eta \circ \Phi \cdot (T_1 + T_2 + T_3)) \, dy \, ds \right|$$

$$+ \left| \int_{\Omega} u \cdot \text{Bog}_\kappa(\text{Test}_\eta(\delta_1 \xi - K_\eta(\delta_1 \xi)) \, dx \right| = (I) + (II) + (III).$$
Recall, that \( p' < \tilde{a} \leq \frac{dp'}{d-p'} \) (if \( p < d \) and no upper bound otherwise). Observe, that

\[
|\delta_{h} \eta| \leq c h^{\theta}, \quad |\gamma| + |\nabla (\psi_{\eta} \circ \Phi)| \leq c (1 + |\nabla \eta|) \quad \text{and} \quad |\delta_{h} \tilde{\gamma}| \leq c |\delta_{h} \nabla \eta|
\]

and

\[
|\delta_{h} u \circ \psi_{\eta} \circ \Phi| \leq \frac{|u(\psi_{\eta} \circ \Phi(x + h)) - u(\psi_{\eta} \circ \Phi(x))|}{\psi_{\eta} \circ \Phi(x + h) - \psi_{\eta} \circ \Phi(x)}|\psi_{\eta} \circ \Phi(x + h) - \psi_{\eta} \circ \Phi(x)| = \frac{c h^{\theta}}{\psi_{\eta} \circ \Phi(x)} \int_{\psi_{\eta} \circ \Phi(x)} |\nabla u| \, ds
\]

We estimate using partial integration, the above, Hölder’s inequality for \( \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{\tilde{a}} + \frac{ap - p - \tilde{a}}{ap} = 1 \) and Sobolev embedding

\[
(I) = \int_{0}^{1} \int_{\alpha + \kappa / 2} (\delta_{h} (u \circ \psi_{\eta} \circ \Phi)) \cdot \overline{\text{Test}_{\eta} (\xi - K_{\eta}(\xi)) \circ \psi_{\eta} \circ \Phi} \\tilde{\gamma} dy \, ds
\]

\[
+ (u \circ \psi_{\eta} \circ \Phi) \cdot \overline{\text{Test}_{\eta} (\xi - K_{\eta}(\xi)) \circ \psi_{\eta} \circ \Phi} \delta_{h} \tilde{\gamma} dy \, ds
\]

\[
\leq c h^{\theta} \|u\|_{W^{1,p'}(\Omega)} \|\xi\|_{L^{p}(\omega)} + c \|u\|_{L^{p}(\Omega)} \|\xi\|_{L^{p}(\omega)} \|h_{\eta}\|_{W^{1,\tilde{a}}(\omega)} \leq c (h^{\theta} + \|h_{\eta}\|_{W^{1,\tilde{a}}(\omega)}) \|u\|_{W^{1,p'}}(\Omega) \|\xi\|_{L^{p}(\omega)}
\]

This implies

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{2} \int_{0}^{1} \int_{\alpha + \kappa / 2} |T_{i} \tilde{\gamma}|^{p} \, dy \, ds \leq c h^{\theta p} \|\xi\|_{L^{p}(\omega)}^{p} \left(1 + \frac{\|L_{\eta}\|_{L^{1}(A_{\kappa})}}{\|\lambda_{\eta}\|_{L^{1}(A_{\kappa})}}\right)
\]

\[
\int_{0}^{1} \int_{\alpha + \kappa / 2} |T_{3} \tilde{\gamma}|^{p} \, dy \, ds \leq \frac{\|L_{\eta}\|_{L^{p}[\alpha + \kappa / 2, \infty)}^{p}}{\|\lambda_{\eta}\|_{L^{1}(A_{\kappa})}} \|\xi\|_{L^{p}(\omega)}^{p} \|h_{\eta}\|_{W^{1,p'}(\omega)}
\]

Hence we find by Hölder’s inequality and Poincaré’s inequality that

\[
(II) \leq c \|u\|_{L^{p'}(\Omega_{\eta})} \sum_{i=1}^{3} \|T_{i} \tilde{\gamma}\|_{L^{p}(\alpha + \kappa / 2, \infty)} \leq c (h^{\theta} + \|h_{\eta}\|_{W^{1,p'}(\omega)}) \|\xi\|_{L^{p}(\omega)} \|u\|_{W^{1,p'}(\Omega_{\eta})}.
\] (3.15)

The estimates on (I) and (II) allow to estimate the Bogovkij term (III). This is possible since due to Theorem [3.1] and due to the compact support of \( \sigma' \) in \( A_{\kappa} \) we find

\[
(III) = |\{u, \text{Bog}_{\sigma}(\text{div}(\text{Test}_{\eta}(\delta_{h} \xi - K_{\eta}(\delta_{h} \xi)))\})|
\]

\[
\leq |\{u\}|_{W^{1,p'}(A_{\kappa})} \|\text{Bog}_{\sigma}(\text{div}(\text{Test}_{\eta}(\delta_{h} \xi - K_{\eta}(\delta_{h} \xi))))\|_{W^{-1,p'}(A_{\kappa})}
\]

\[
\leq c |\{u\}|_{W^{1,p'}(A_{\kappa})} \|\text{div}(\text{Test}_{\eta}(\delta_{h} \xi - K_{\eta}(\delta_{h} \xi)))\|_{W^{-2,p'}(A_{\kappa})}
\]

\[
\leq c |\{u\}|_{W^{1,p'}(A_{\kappa})} \|\text{Test}_{\eta}(\delta_{h} \xi - K_{\eta}(\delta_{h} \xi))\|_{W^{-1,p'}(A_{\kappa})}.
\]
Now take $q \in W_0^{1,p}(\mathbb{A}_n)$, with $\|q\|_{W_0^{1,p}(\mathbb{A}_n)} \leq 1$ arbitrary. From the calculations above, i.e. by replacing $u$ by $q$ in (3.14) and (3.15) we find

$$
\langle \text{Test}_\eta(\delta h_\xi - \mathcal{K}_\eta(\delta h_\xi)), q \rangle
$$

$$
= \int_0^{\alpha + \kappa/2} \int_\omega (\delta h_\eta(\text{Test}_\eta(\xi - \mathcal{K}_\eta(\xi)))) \cdot q \psi_\eta \circ \Phi_\gamma dy \, ds + \sum_{i=1}^{3} \int_0^{\alpha + \kappa/2} \int_\omega T_i \cdot q \psi_\eta \circ \Phi_\gamma dy \, ds
$$

$$
= \int_0^{\alpha + \kappa/2} \int_\omega (\text{Test}_\eta(\xi - \mathcal{K}_\eta(\delta h_\xi))) \cdot q \psi_\eta \circ \Phi \cdot \delta h_\xi \psi_\eta \circ \Phi_\gamma dy \, ds
$$

$$
+ \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha + \kappa} \int_0^{\alpha + \kappa} \int_\omega T_i \cdot q \psi_\eta \circ \Phi_\gamma dy \, ds \leq c(h^\theta + \|\delta h_\eta\|_{W_0^{1,1}(\omega)} \|q\|_{L^p(\omega)}).
$$

But so

$$
(III) \leq c\|u\|_{W_0^{1,p}(\mathbb{A}_n)} \|\text{Test}_\eta(\delta h_\xi - \mathcal{K}_\eta(\delta h_\xi))\|_{W_0^{1,p}(\mathbb{A}_n)}
$$

$$
\leq c\|u\|_{W_0^{1,p}(\mathbb{A}_n)} \left( h^\theta + \|\delta h_\eta\|_{W_0^{1,1}(\omega)} \right) \|\xi\|_{L^p(\omega)}.
$$

This finishes the proof of (3.11). For the time derivative we use the fact that

$$
\partial_t (\delta h_\xi - \mathcal{K}_\eta(\delta h_\xi)) = (\delta h_\partial_t \xi - \mathcal{K}_\eta(\delta h_\partial_t \xi)) - \frac{\langle \delta h_\xi(t) \cdot \lambda_\eta \rangle}{\|\lambda_\eta(t)\|_{L^1}} \int_{\mathbb{A}_n} \partial_t \lambda_\eta(t) \, dx
$$

$$
+ \frac{1}{\|\lambda_\eta(t)\|_{L^1}} \int_{\mathbb{A}_n} \delta h_\xi(t) \partial_t \lambda_\eta(t) \, dx =: \mathcal{K}_\eta(\delta h_\partial_t \xi) + K(t)
$$

and hence

$$
\partial_t \text{Test}_\eta(\delta h_\xi - \mathcal{K}_\eta(\delta h_\xi))(t, x)
$$

$$
= \sigma(s(x))e^{(s(x) - \eta(t,y(x))) \text{div}(n(p(x)))} (\delta h_\xi(\partial_t \xi) - \mathcal{K}_\eta(\delta h_\partial_t \xi))(t, y(x))n(p(x))
$$

$$
- \sigma(s(x)) \text{div}(n(p(x))) \partial_t \eta(t, y(x)) e^{(s(x) - \eta(t,y(x))) \text{div}(n(p(x)))} (\delta h_\xi - \mathcal{K}_\eta(\delta h_\xi))(t, y(x))n(p(x))
$$

$$
- \sigma(s(x)) \text{div}(n(p(x))) e^{(s(x) - \eta(t,y(x))) \text{div}(n(p(x)))} K(t)n(p(x))
$$

$$
= (A) + (B) + (C)
$$

The estimates on (A) follows by (3.11). We proceed with the straight forward estimates

$$
|\langle (B) \rangle| \leq c \|\partial_t \eta(t, y(x))\| \|\delta h_\xi(t, y(x))\| \|\delta h_\xi(t)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{A}_n)}
$$

and

$$
|\langle (C) \rangle| \leq c \|\delta h_\xi(t) \partial_t \eta(t)\|_{L^1(\omega)}
$$

Hence we find by (3.11) the estimates on (B) and (C), Hölders inequality and Sobolev embedding that

$$
\left| \int_{\Omega_n} u \cdot \partial_t \text{Test}_\eta(\delta h_\xi - \mathcal{K}_\eta(\delta h_\xi)) \, dx \right|
$$

$$
\leq \left( h^\theta + \|\delta h_\eta\|_{W_0^{1,1}(\omega)} \|u\|_{L^1(\Omega_n)} + c\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega_n)} \|\delta h_\xi \partial_t \eta\|_{L^2(\omega)} \right)
$$

$$
\leq c \left( h^\theta + \|\delta h_\eta\|_{W_0^{1,1}(\omega)} \|u\|_{L^1(\omega)} + \|\delta h_\xi \partial_t \eta\|_{L^2(\omega)} \right) \|u\|_{W_0^{1,1}(\omega)}.
$$
The Bogovskij part will be estimated once more in form of negative norms. Using that
\[
\sup_{\|q\|_{W^{1,r}(\Omega)}} \langle \partial_T \text{Test}_\eta(\delta_h \xi - K_\eta(\delta_h \xi)) \rangle, q \rangle
\leq c \left( (\hat{h}^\theta + \|\delta_h \eta\|_{W^1, \frac{s}{s+1} r}(\omega)) \|\partial_t \xi\|_{L^p(\omega)} + \|\delta_h \xi \partial_t \eta\|_{L^s'(\omega)} \right),
\]
which finishes the proof. \(\Box\)

**Proposition 3.5 (Smooth Solenoidal Extension).** Let \(a, r, \sigma \in [2, \infty], p, q \in (1, \infty)\) and \(s \in (0, 1]\). Assume that \(\eta \in L^r([0, T]; W^{\sigma, a}(\omega)) \cap W^{1, r}([0, T]; L^a(\omega))\), such that \(\alpha(\Omega) + \kappa \leq \alpha_\eta \leq \beta_\eta \leq \beta(\Omega) - \kappa\). Let \(\phi \in L^q([0, T]; W^{1, p}(\Omega(t)))\) and \(b \in L^q([0, T], W^{s, p}(\omega))\) such that \(\phi(t, \eta(t, y)) = b(t, y)\) in the (weak) sense of traces. Then there exists a solenoidal mollifying extension operator

\[ ((\phi)_\delta, b_\delta) \in (C^\infty([\delta, T - \delta] \times \Omega^c) \cap L^r([\delta, T - \delta], W^{2, n} (Q^c))) \times W^{1, r}([\delta, T - \delta]; \Omega), \]

such that for \(\delta \in (0, \kappa)\) and for a.e. \(t \in [\delta, T - \delta]\)

(i) \((\phi)_\delta(t, \eta(t)) = b_\delta(t, y)\) (in the sense of traces)

(ii) \(\|\partial_t (\phi)_\delta\|_{W^{m, \tilde{r}}(Q^c)} \leq C(\delta) \|\phi\|_{L^1([0, T] \times \Omega_\eta)} + \|b\|_{L^1([0, T] \times \omega)}, \) for all \(l, m \in \mathbb{N}\) and \(\tilde{r} \in [1, \infty]\).

(iii) we find

\[
\|b \tilde{\delta}_{t_0}(t)\|_{W^{\sigma, a}(\omega)} \leq c(\delta) \|b\|_{L^1([0, T] \times \omega)} + \|\phi\|_{L^1([0, T] \times \Omega_\eta)} (\|\eta(t)\|_{W^{\sigma, a}(\omega)} + 1) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\partial_t (b \tilde{\delta}_{t_0}(t))\|_{L^p(\omega)} \leq c(\delta) \|b\|_{L^1([0, T] \times \omega)} + \|\phi\|_{L^1([0, T] \times \Omega_\eta)} (\|\partial_t \eta(t)\|_{L^r(\omega)} + 1)
\]

(iv) The limit of \((\phi(t))_\delta\) with \(\delta \to 0\) is an extension of \(\phi(t)\) to \(Q^c\) where \(E_{\eta(t)}(\phi(t)) \in L^q([0, T]; W^{s, p}(Q^c))\), such that

\[
\|E_{\eta(t)}(\phi(t))\|_{W^{s, p}(Q^c)} \leq c\|b(t)\|_{W^{s, p}(\omega)} + c\|\nabla \eta(t)\|_{W^{s, p}(\omega)} + c\|\phi(t)\|_{W^{1, r}(\Omega_\eta)}
\]

(v) We find for \(1 \geq s > s_1 > \frac{1}{p}\)

\[
\|((\phi)_\delta(t) - E_{\eta(t)}(\phi(t)))\|_{W^{s, p}(Q^c)} \leq c\delta^{s - s_1} \left( \|b(t)\|_{W^{s, p}(\omega)} + \|\nabla \eta(t)\|_{W^{s, p}(\omega)} + \|\phi(t)\|_{W^{1, r}(\Omega_\eta)} \right),
\]

\[
\|((b \tilde{\delta}_{t_0}(t)) - b(t))\|_{L^p(\omega)} \leq c\delta^{s - s_1} \left( \|b(t)\|_{W^{s, p}(\omega)} + \|\nabla \eta(t)\|_{W^{s, p}(\omega)} + \|\phi(t)\|_{W^{1, r}(\Omega_\eta)} \right),
\]

with constant \(c\) just depending on the domain via \(\alpha(\Omega), \beta(\Omega), \kappa\). The constant \(c_1\) depends additionally on \(\|\eta(t)\|_{H^2(\omega)}\).

**Proof.** In the following we omit writing the letter \(t\), since all arguments are pointwise in time. Observe, that since \(\text{div} \phi = 0\) and \(\phi(x) = b(y(x))n(p(x))\), we find that

\[
0 = \int_{\partial \Omega_\eta} \tilde{b}(p(x)) \, dx.
\]
Moreover, since $\text{div} \, \text{Test}_{\eta}(b - \mathcal{K}_{\eta}(b)) = 0$ we find that
\[
|\partial \Omega_{\eta}| \mathcal{K}_{\eta}(b) = \int_{\partial \Omega_{\eta}} \tilde{b}(p(x)) \, dx = 0.
\]
Hence we can extend $\phi$ to $Q^s$ by taking
\[
E_{\eta}(\phi)(x) = \phi(x) \text{ for } x \in \Omega_{\eta} \text{ and } E_{\eta}(\phi)(x) = \text{Test}_{\eta}(b)(x) \text{ for } x \in \Omega_{\eta}^c.
\]
Here we have the global estimate from Proposition 3.3
\[
\|E_{\eta}(\phi)\|_{L^p(Q^s)} \leq c \|\text{Test}_{\eta}(b)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + c \|\phi\|_{L^p(\Omega_{\eta})} \leq c \|b\|_{L^p(\omega)} + c \|\phi\|_{L^p(\Omega_{\eta})}
\]
\[
\|E_{\eta}(\phi)\|_{W^{s,p}(Q^s)} \leq c \|\text{Test}_{\eta}(b)\|_{W^{s,p}(Q^s)} + c \|\phi\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega_{\eta})}
\]
\[
\leq c \|b\|_{W^{s,p}(\omega)} + c \|\nabla \eta\|_{L^p(\omega)} + c \|\phi\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega_{\eta})}.
\]
Next we define
\[
(\phi)_{\delta}(x) = E_{\eta}(\phi) * \xi_{\delta}(t, x)
\]
which is a divergence free function that is smooth. And (ii) and (iv) are satisfied by standard estimates of the mollifier. We define
\[
(b)_{\delta,t_0}(y) = (\phi)_{\delta}(\eta(y)),
\]
which implies (i). Moreover, by chain-rule we find the following estimate
\[
\|(b)_{\delta,t_0}\|_{W^{s,p}(\omega)} \leq c \|(\phi)_{\delta}\|_{W^{s,p}(Q^s)} \|\eta\|_{W^{s,q}(\omega)}.
\]
The estimate for the time derivative is analogous hence (iii) is established. Most important are the estimates that are uniform in $\delta$: First, observe that by the classical estimates on convolutions and Proposition 3.3 for $1 \geq s > s_1 > 0$ we find
\[
\|(\phi)_{\delta} - E_{\eta}(\phi)\|_{W^{1,p}(Q^s)}
\]
\[
\leq c \delta^{s-s_1} \|E_{\eta}(\phi)\|_{W^{s,p}(Q^s)} \leq c \delta^{s-s_1} \left( c \|b\|_{W^{s,p}(\omega)} + \|\nabla \eta\|_{L^p(\omega)} + c \|\phi\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega_{\eta})} \right).
\]
Next we use the trace-theorem, w.r.t. $\partial \Omega$ and [30, Lemma 2.6] to find for every $s > s_1 > s_2 > \frac{1}{p}$ that
\[
\|(b)_{\delta,t_0} - b\|_{L^p(\omega)} = \|(\phi)_{\delta} - E_{\eta}(\phi))\|_{L^p(\omega)} = \|(\phi)_{\delta} - E_{\eta}(\phi))\|_{L^p(\omega)}
\]
\[
\leq c \|\xi(\Omega_{\eta})\|_{W^{s,2}(\omega)} \|\phi\|_{W^{2,p}(\omega)}
\]
\[
\leq c \|\eta\|_{H^2(\omega)} \|\phi\|_{W^{s,2}(\omega)}
\]
\[
\leq c \|\eta\|_{H^2(\omega)} \delta^{s-s_1} \left( c \|b\|_{W^{s,p}(\omega)} + \|\nabla \eta\|_{L^p(\omega)} + c \|\phi\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega_{\eta})} \right).
\]
This finishes the estimate (v).

We include the following corollary that will be necessary for our compactness result.

**Corollary 3.6 (Smooth Extension in time-space).** Let $I \subset [\delta, T - \delta]$ be a time interval and $t_0 \in I$. Let $\alpha, r, \sigma \in [2, \infty]$, $p, q \in (1, \infty)$ and $s \in (0, 1]$. Assume that $\eta \in L^r(I; W^{\alpha,\sigma}(\omega)) \cap W^{1,r}(I; L^p(\omega))$, such that $\alpha(\Omega) + \kappa \leq \alpha_{\eta} \leq \beta_{\eta} \leq \beta(\Omega) - \kappa$. Let $\phi \in W^{1,p}_{\text{div}}(\Omega(t_0))$ and $b \in W^{s,p}(\omega)$ such that $\phi(\eta(t_0, y)) = b(y)$ in the (weak) sense of traces. Then there exists a solenoidal mollifying extension operator
\[
((\phi)_{\delta,t_0}, (b)_{\delta,t_0}) \in \left( C^\infty(I, C^\infty_{\text{div}}(Q^\kappa)) \times W^{1,r}(I; L^r(\omega)) \right),
\]
such that for $\delta \in (0, \kappa)$ and for a.e. $t \in I$
The constant \(c\) just depends on the domain via \(\alpha(\Omega), \beta(\Omega), \kappa\), the constant \(c_1\) depends additionally on the \(\|\eta(t)\|_{H^2(\omega)}\).

Proof. The proof is analogous to Proposition 3.5. First we extend \(\phi\) to \(Q^c\), by taking

\[E_{\eta(t_0)}(\phi)(x) = \phi(x) \text{ for } x \in \Omega_{\eta(t_0)} \text{ and } E_{\eta}(\phi)(x) = \text{Test}_\eta(b)(x) \text{ for } x \in \Omega_{\eta(t_0)}^c.\]

this establishes (iv) by the last proposition. Then we define \(\phi_\delta\) to \(Q^c\) by the constant in time function

\[(\phi_\delta)(t, x) = E_{\eta(t_0)}(\phi) * \xi_\delta(t, x) = \int_{Q^c+\delta} \xi_\delta(x-z)E_{\eta(t_0)}(\phi)(z) \, dz\]

which is a divergence free function that is smooth and (ii) is satisfied by the standard estimates of the mollifier. We define

\[(b)_\delta(t, y) = (\phi_\delta)(\eta(t, y)),\]

which implies (i). All other estimate follow in the same way as in Proposition 3.5 since there where done pointwisely in time.

\[\square\]

4 The regularity result

4.1 Estimates for the structure

In this section we explore the consequences of the energy inequality [1,8].

Lemma 4.1 (Uniform Korn’s inequality). For every \(u \in V_F\) such that \(u(t, \varphi_\eta(t, .)) = \xi n\) the following Korn’s equality holds:

\[\|\nabla u\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_\eta(t))} = 2\|\text{sym}\nabla u\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_\eta(t))}.\]

(4.1)
Lemma follows by Poincare inequality also in this case.

\[ \int_{\Omega_{\eta(t)}} |\text{sym} \nabla u|^2 \, dx = \frac{1}{2} \left( \int_{\Omega_{\eta(t)}} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx + \int_{\Omega_{\eta(t)}} \nabla^T u : \nabla u \, dx \right). \]

Therefore it remains to show that the second term is zero:

\[ \int_{\Omega_{\eta(t)}} \nabla^T u : \nabla u \, dx = \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \int_{\Omega_{\eta(t)}} \partial_j u_i \partial_i u_j \, dx \]

\[ = -\sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \int_{\Omega_{\eta(t)}} \partial_j \partial_i u_i u_j \, dx + \int_{\partial \Omega_{\eta(t)}} \partial_j u_i n_i u_j dS. = \int_{\partial \Omega_{\eta(t)}} (\nabla u) n \cdot udS \]

Now using the no-slip condition (1.5) and the incompressibility condition we deduce

\[ \int_{\partial \Omega_{\eta(t)}} (\nabla u) n \cdot udS = 0 \] (see [30, Lemma A.5]) and therefore the Korn’s equality holds.

In the following we exploit the energy estimate (2.14). In particular, the number \( C_0 \), which depends only on the initial conditions, always refers to this energy bound.

\textbf{Lemma 4.2.} Let \((u, \eta)\) be such that energy inequality (2.14) is satisfied. Then \( \eta \in L^\infty(0, T; W^{1,4}(\omega)) \) and \( \|\eta\|_{L^\infty-W^{1,4}} \leq cC_0, \) where \( c \) depends only on \( \varphi \).

\textbf{Proof.} The boundedness of \( \|\eta\|_{L^\infty L^2} \) follows directly from the energy inequality (2.14). Now, we use [12] Theorem 3.3-2.1 to conclude that by the definition of \( \mathcal{A} \) and (2.14):

\[ \int_{\omega} [G(\eta(t,.))]|^2 \, dy \leq c \int_{\omega} \mathcal{A}G(\eta(t,.)) : G(\eta(t,.)) \, dy \leq cC_0, \]

here the constant \( c \) just depends on the Lamé constants and the geometry of \( \partial \Omega \). If \( \partial_\alpha n \neq 0 \) we may use the bound for \( \partial_\alpha G(\eta) \) and (2.3) to get the bounds for \( \|\partial_\alpha \eta(t)\|_{L^4(\omega)} \) and \( \|\eta(t)\|_{L^4(\omega)} \) uniform in \( t \). Using these bounds, again (2.3) and the bound for \( G_{\beta\eta}(\eta) \) above for \( \beta \neq \alpha \) we finish the proof.

If \( \partial_\alpha n = \partial_\beta n = 0 \), we get the bound for \( \|\nabla \eta\|_{L^4} \) directly from (2.3) and the boundedness of \( \int_{\omega} [G(\eta(t,.))]|^2 \). However, since \( \|\eta\|_{L^\infty L^2} \) is also bounded (using the bounds on \( \partial_\eta \eta \) in (1.8)), the Lemma follows by Poincare inequality also in this case.

\textbf{Lemma 4.3.} Let \((u, \eta)\) be such that energy inequality (2.14) is satisfied. Then if \( \gamma(\eta) \neq 0 \) we have \( \eta(t) \in H^2(\omega) \). Moreover,

\[ \sup_{t \in [0,T]} \int_{\omega} \gamma^2(\eta) |\nabla^2 \eta|^2 \, dy \leq cC_0, \]

where \( c \) depends only on \( \varphi \).

\textbf{Proof.} We can again use Theorem 3.3-2.1 from [12] and work with bounds on \( \mathbf{R} \). From (2.1) we compute:

\[ \partial_\alpha a_\alpha(\eta) = \partial_\alpha^2 \varphi + \partial_\beta^2 \eta n + \partial_\alpha \eta \partial_\alpha n + \partial_\beta \eta \partial_\beta n + \partial_\eta \partial_\alpha n, \text{ } \alpha, \beta = 1, 2. \]

(4.2)

Using (2.1), (2.4), (2.5) and the definition of \( \gamma \) from Definition 2.1 we have

\[ R_{\alpha\beta}(\eta) = \frac{1}{|a_1 \times a_2|} \partial_\alpha^2 \eta \left( \left| a_1 \times a_2 \right| + \eta(n \cdot (a_1 \times \partial_\alpha n + \partial_\beta n \times a_2)) + \eta^2 n \cdot (\partial_\alpha n \times \partial_\beta n) \right) \]

+ \gamma(\eta) \partial_\alpha^2 \eta n + P_0(\eta, \nabla \eta) =: \gamma(\eta) \partial_\alpha^2 \eta n + P_0(\eta, \nabla \eta), \]

(4.3)
where $P_0$ is a polynomial of order three in $\eta$ and $\nabla \eta$ such that all terms are at most quadratic in $\nabla \eta$, and the coefficients of $P_0$ depend on $\varphi$.

From Lemma 4.2 we gain in particular by Sobolev embedding that $\|\eta\|_{L^\infty_t L^\infty_x}$ and $\|\nabla \eta\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x}$ are bounded by the energy. Therefore

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_\omega \gamma^2(\eta)|\nabla^2 \eta|^2 \, dy \leq c(\|\mathcal{R}\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x} + \|P_0(\eta, \nabla \eta)\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x}) \leq cC_0.$$ 

\[\square\]

**Remark 4.4.** By definition we know that $\gamma > 0$, as long as

$$\eta(n \cdot (a_1 \times \partial_2 n + \partial_1 n \times a_2)) + \eta^2(n \cdot (\partial_1 n \times \partial_2 n) > -\frac{1}{|a_1 \times a_2|}. \quad (4.4)$$

Therefore it can be easily checked that there exists a $c_2$ (depending on $\varphi$ only) such that if $\|\eta\|_{L^\infty_t L^\infty_x} \leq c_2$, then (4.4) is satisfied and hence $\gamma(\eta) > 0$. Finally, the energy estimate allows to deduce, that in dependence of the initial configuration there is a minimal time interval $(0, T)$ for which $\|\eta\|_{L^\infty_t L^\infty_x} \leq c_2$ is always satisfied.

Similarly as in previous Lemma, let us write form $a_0$ defined by (2.8) as a sum of the bilinear form in second derivatives plus the reminder. We calculate the Frechet derivative of $\mathcal{R}$:

$$R_{\alpha \beta}(\eta)\xi = \gamma(\eta)\partial^2_{\alpha \beta} \xi + \gamma(\xi)\partial^2_{\alpha \beta} \eta + P_0(\eta, \nabla \eta)\xi.$$ 

Therefore we have

$$a_0(t, \eta, \xi) = \frac{h^3}{24} \int_\omega \left[ A(\gamma(\eta)\nabla^2 \eta) : (\gamma(\eta)\nabla^2 \xi) + A(\gamma(\xi)\nabla^2 \eta) : (\gamma(\xi)\nabla^2 \eta) 
+ (A(\gamma(\eta)\nabla^2 \eta) : P_0(\eta, \nabla \eta)\xi + A(P_0(\eta, \nabla \eta)) : (\gamma(\xi)\nabla^2 \eta)) 
+ A(P_0(\eta, \nabla \eta)) : (\gamma(\eta)\nabla^2 \xi) + A(P_0(\eta, \nabla \eta)) : P_0(\eta, \nabla \eta)\xi \right] \, dy \quad (4.5)$$

We take $\xi = D^s_{\varepsilon \alpha} D^\alpha_h \eta$, $0 < s < 1/2$, and obtain the following estimates.

**Lemma 4.5.** Let $\eta \in H^2(\omega)$ such that $\gamma(\eta) \neq 0$. Then for every $h > 0$, $0 < s < 1/2$ the following inequality holds:

$$a_0(t, \eta, D_h^{-s} D^\alpha_h \eta) \geq \|D^\alpha_h \nabla^2 \eta\|_{L^2(\omega)} - C(\|\eta\|_{H^2(\omega)}).$$ 

**Proof.** Since all estimates in this lemma are uniform in $t$ for simplicity of notation we omit the $t$ variable in this proof. First we use the fact that since $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ Sobolev embedding implies $\|D^s_h \eta\|_{L^\infty} \leq c\|\eta\|_{H^2(\omega)}$ and $\|D^s_h D^\alpha_h \eta\|_{L^\infty(\omega)} \leq c\|\eta\|_{H^2(\omega)}$. Due to Sobolev embedding the estimate is uniform in $h$ for all $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$. This and the integration by parts formula for the finite differences can be used to estimate $a_0^1$:

$$a^1_0(\eta; \nabla^2 \eta, \nabla^2 D^s_{\varepsilon \alpha} D^\alpha_h \eta) \geq C \int_\omega |D^\alpha_h \nabla^2 \eta|^2 \, dy - C \|D^\alpha_h \gamma(\eta)^2\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla^2 \eta\|_{L^2} \|D^\alpha_h \nabla^2 \eta\|_{L^2}$$ 
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\[ \geq \frac{C}{2} \| D_h^s \nabla^2 \eta \|^2_{L^2} - C \| D_h^s \gamma (\eta) \|^2_{L^\infty} \| \nabla^2 \eta \|^2_{L^2} \geq \frac{C}{2} \| D_h^s \nabla^2 \eta \|^2_{L^2} - C(\| \eta \|_{H^2(\omega)}) \]

Similarly, since \( \| D^s_{-h} D_h^s \eta \|_{L^\infty(\omega)} \leq \| \eta \|_{H^2(\omega)} \) uniformly, we estimate

\[ |a_h^3(\eta, \nabla^2 \eta, D^s_{-h} D_h^s \eta) | \leq C(\| \eta \|_{H^2(\omega)}) \]

To estimate \( a_h^4 \) we first notice that \( \| P_0(\eta, \nabla \eta) \|_{L^2} \leq C \| \eta \|_{L^\infty} \| \nabla \eta \|^2_{L^2} \leq C(\| \eta \|_{H^2(\omega)}) \) and \( \| P_0'(\eta, \nabla \eta) D_h^s \eta \|_{L^2} \leq C \| \eta \|_{H^2(\omega)} \) and \( \| \nabla D_h^s \eta \|_{L^1} \leq C(\| \eta \|_{H^2(\omega)}) \).

Now we can use integration by parts and Young’s inequality in the same way as in the estimate for \( a_h^1 \) to get

\[ \| D_h^s P_0(\eta, \nabla \eta) \|_{L^2} \leq \| \eta \|_{H^2(\omega)} \| \nabla \eta \|_{W^{1,4}} \| \nabla D_h^s \eta \|_{L^4} \leq C(\| \eta \|_{H^2(\omega)}) \]

Hence,

\[ |a_h^4(\eta, \nabla \eta; D^s_{-h} D_h^s \eta, \nabla D^s_{-h} D_h^s \eta) | \leq C \| D_h^s \nabla^2 \eta \|^2_{L^2} + C(\| \eta \|_{H^2(\omega)}) \]

Finally, the last term \( a_h^5 \) is a lower order term and is easily estimated using the same inequalities:

\[ |a_h^5(\eta, \nabla \eta, D^s_{-h} D_h^s \eta, \nabla D^s_{-h} D_h^s \eta) | \leq C(\| \eta \|_{H^2(\omega)}) \]

\[ \square \]

### 4.2 Closing the estimates–Proof of Theorem 1.2

In this section we finish the proof of Theorem 1.2. Please observe first, that due to the Sobolev embedding theorem and due to the trace theorem [6, Lemma 2.4] we find for all \( \theta \in (0, 1) \) and all \( s \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \)

\[ \| \eta \|_{L^\infty(0,T;C^{0,\theta}(\omega))} \leq C \| \eta \|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^2(\omega))} \]

Assume that \( s \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \) and take

\[ \left( \operatorname{Test}_\eta \left( D^s_{-h} D_h^s \eta - \mathcal{K}_\eta(D^s_{-h} D_h^s \eta) \right), D^s_{-h} D_h^s \eta - \mathcal{K}_\eta(D^s_{-h} D_h^s \eta) \right) \]

as a test function in (2.13) and integrate \( \int_0^T dt \). The test function is admissible by construction, see Proposition 3.3. The estimates on the forms \( a_m \) and \( a_h \) connected to the elastic energy follow directly by Lemma 1.5. Indeed, since \( \mathcal{K}_\eta(D^s_{-h} D_h^s \eta) \) is constant in space direction and hence does not change the estimate on the derivatives of \( \eta \) we find (using the uniform bounds on \( \lambda_\eta \)) that

\[ \inf_{\omega} \gamma^2(\eta) a_h(t, \eta, (D^s_{-h} D_h^s \eta - \mathcal{K}_\eta(D^s_{-h} D_h^s \eta)) \geq \| D_h^s \nabla^2 \eta \|^2_{L^2(\omega)} - C(\| \eta \|_{H^2(\omega)}) \]
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Hence we are left to estimate the term coming from the structure inertia: Using partial integration and Corollary 3.2 we find
\[
\int_0^T \left| \int_\omega \partial_t \eta \partial_t (D^s_{\alpha_h} D_h \eta - \mathcal{K}_\eta(D^s_{\alpha_h} D_h \eta)) \, dy \right| \, dt = \int_0^T \left| \int_\omega \partial_t \eta D^s_{\alpha_h} (\partial_t (D_h \eta) - \mathcal{K}_\eta(D_h \eta)) \, dy \right| \, dt
\]

\[
= \int_0^T \left| \int_\omega \frac{1}{2} (D^s_{\alpha_h} \partial_t \eta)^2 - D^s_{\alpha_h} \partial_t \eta \partial_t \mathcal{K}_\eta(D_h \eta) \, dy \right| \, dt
\]

\[
\leq c \| \partial_t \eta \|_{L^2(0,T; H^2(\omega))}^2 + \int_0^T \| \partial_t \eta \|_{W^1,\infty(\omega)} \| \partial_t \eta \|_{L^2(\omega)} \| \nabla \eta \|_{L^2(\omega)} \, dt
\]

\[
\leq c \| \partial_t \eta \|_{L^2(0,T; H^2(\omega))}^2 + c \| \partial_t \eta \|_{L^2(0,T; L^2(\omega))}^2 \| \nabla \eta \|_{L^2(\omega)}^2 \leq c C_0^2.
\]

Here in the last estimate we used the trace theorem [6] Lemma 2.4 and the coupling condition (1.5). Notice that this term cannot be estimated in a purely hyperbolic problem and that here it is essential to use the coupling and the fluid dissipation.

Let us next prove the estimates related to the fluid part. From Proposition 3.3 and the energy inequality (2.14) we have the following estimate

\[
\| \nabla \text{Test}_\eta (D^s_{\alpha_h} D^s_h \eta - \mathcal{K}_\eta(D^s_{\alpha_h} D^s_h \eta)) \|_{L^\infty(0,T; L^2(\Omega_\eta(t)))} \leq C \left( \| D^s_{\alpha_h} D^s_h \eta \|_{L^\infty(0,T; H^2(\omega))} + \| D^s_{\alpha_h} D^s_h \eta \|_{L^\infty(0,T; L^2(\omega))} \right)
\]

\[
\leq C \left( \| \nabla \eta \|_{L^\infty(0,T; H^2(\omega))} + \| D^s_{\alpha_h} D^s_h \eta \|_{L^\infty(0,T; L^2(\omega))} \right) \leq C(\| \nabla \eta \|_{L^\infty(0,T; H^2(\omega))} + \| \nabla \eta \|_{L^\infty(0,T; L^2(\omega))}^2) \leq C(C_0 + C_0^2).
\]

This allows to estimate the integrals:

\[
\left| \int_0^T \int_{\Omega_\eta(t)} (-u \otimes u : \nabla \text{Test}_\eta (D^s_{\alpha_h} D^s_h \eta - \mathcal{K}_\eta(D^s_{\alpha_h} D^s_h \eta)) + \text{sym} \nabla u : \text{sym} \nabla \text{Test}_\eta (D^s_{\alpha_h} D^s_h \eta)) \, dx \right|
\]

\[
\leq \| \nabla \text{Test}_\eta D^s_{\alpha_h} D^s_h \eta \|_{L^\infty(0,T; L^2(\Omega_\eta(t)))} \| \nabla \eta \|_{L^2(0,T; L^2(\Omega_\eta(t)))} + \| \nabla u \|_{L^2(0,T; L^2(\Omega_\eta(t)))} \leq C(C_0 + C_0^2)^2.
\]

The most difficult estimate is the estimate involving the distributional time-derivative of \( v \). It can be estimated using Lemma 3.4 indeed we get defining \( p = p' \) and \( \tilde{a} = 6 \) that \( \frac{ap}{ap - a - p} = 3 \). Hence using the fact that \( \frac{1}{3} + \frac{2}{3} = \frac{5}{6} \) and

\[
\frac{3}{2} - \frac{2}{3} = \frac{5}{6} < 1 = \frac{2}{2} \text{ and so } W^{\frac{3}{2},3}(\omega) \subset W^{2,2}(\omega)
\]

we find by Hölder’s inequality and Sobolev embedding that for every \( \theta \in (0,1) \) there is a constant \( c \), such that

\[
(I) = \left| \int_0^T \int_{\Omega_\eta(t)} u \cdot \partial_t \text{Test}_\eta(D^s_{\alpha_h} D^s_h \eta - \mathcal{K}_\eta(D^s_{\alpha_h} D^s_h \eta)) \, dx \right|
\]

\[
\leq c \left( h^{\theta - s} + \| D^s_h \eta \|_{L^\infty(0,T; W^{1,3}(\omega))} \| u \|_{L^2(0,T; W^{1,2}(\Omega_\eta(t)))} \| \partial_t D^s_h \eta \|_{L^2(0,T; L^2(\omega))} + c \| u \|_{L^2(0,T; W^{1,2}(\Omega_\eta(t)))} \| D^s_{\alpha_h} D^s_h \eta \|_{L^2(0,T; L^2(\omega))} \right).
\]
Hence choosing $\theta = s$, we find
\[
(I) \leq c \left(1 + \left\| \eta \right\|_{L^\infty(0,T;W^{3/2,3}(\omega))} \right) \left\| u \right\|_{L^2(0,T;W^{1,2}(\Omega_\eta(t)))} \left\| \partial_t D^s_h \eta \right\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\omega))} \\
+ c \left(1 + \left\| \eta \right\|_{L^\infty(0,T;W^{2,2}(\omega))} \right) \left\| u \right\|_{L^2(0,T;W^{1,2}(\Omega_\eta(t)))} \left\| \partial_t D^s_h \eta \right\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\omega))} \\
\leq c \left(1 + \left\| \eta \right\|_{L^\infty(0,T;W^{2,2}(\omega))} \right) \left\| u \right\|_{L^2(0,T;W^{1,2}(\Omega_\eta(t)))} \left\| \partial_t D^s_h \eta \right\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\omega))} \\
+ c \left\| u \right\|_{L^2(0,T;W^{1,2}(\Omega_\eta(t)))} \left\| \partial_t \eta \right\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\omega))} \left\| \eta \right\|_{L^2(0,T;W^{1,3}(\omega))} \\
\leq c C_0 (C_0 + C_0^2),
\]
and the estimate on the term of the time-derivative is complete. The result follows by combining the various estimates.

5 The existence result

5.1 The approximate system

In this section we construct approximate solutions $(u^\varepsilon, \eta^\varepsilon) \in V_S$, $\eta^\varepsilon \in L^\infty(0, T; H^3(\omega))$ which satisfy the following weak formulation:
\[
\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega_\eta(t)} u^\varepsilon \cdot q \, dx + \int_{\Omega_\eta(t)} \left( - u^\varepsilon \cdot \partial_t q - u^\varepsilon \otimes u^\varepsilon : \nabla q + \text{sym} \nabla u^\varepsilon : \text{sym} \nabla q \right) \, dx \\
+ \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \partial_t \eta^\varepsilon \xi \, dy - \int_{\Omega} \partial_t \eta^\varepsilon \partial_t \xi \, dy + a_m(t, \eta^\varepsilon, \xi) + a_b(t, \eta^\varepsilon, \xi) + \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \nabla^2 \eta^\varepsilon : \nabla^2 \xi \, dy = 0,
\]
where $\varepsilon > 0$ is a regularizing parameter and with initial conditions $\eta_0, \eta_1, u_0$. In this Section we prove the following Theorem:

**Theorem 5.1.** There exists a $T > 0$ just depending on $\partial \Omega$ and the initial data, such that for every $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ there exists a weak solution $(u^\varepsilon, \eta^\varepsilon)$ to the regularized problem. Moreover, the weak solution satisfies the following uniform in $\varepsilon$ estimate:
\[
\left\| u^\varepsilon \right\|_{V_F} + \left\| \eta^\varepsilon \right\|_{V_S} + \left\| \eta^\varepsilon \right\|_{L^2(0,T;N^{s,2}(\omega))} \leq C,
\]
for every (fixed) $s < \frac{5}{2}$, with $C$ just depends on $\partial \Omega$ and the initial conditions.

The existence of regularized solutions can be proved following the ideas and techniques introduced in [34]. The problem solved in [34] is actually very similar to the regularized system above since there the existence of a solution to a FSI problem with a structure being an elastic shell with a non-linear Koiter membrane energy without bending energy but with a (linear) regularization term of fourth order is shown. In order to be able to treat the non-linear bending energy in an analogous way we have to include a sixth order regularization term. Another difference comes from the fact that in [34] cylindrical geometry is considered. Nevertheless the introduced existence scheme does not depend on the geometry of the problem and more general geometries can be handled by combining the existence proof with the estimates in this paper and in [30]. To avoid lengthy repetitions of the arguments analogous to [34] here, we summarize the main steps of the construction of a weak solutions with emphasis on the differences coming from the non-linear bending term and the setting of more general geometries. The main steps of the construction are:

1. **Arbitrary Lagrangian-Eulerian (ALE) formulation.** We reformulate the problem in a fixed reference domain $\Omega$ using suitable change of variables. This approach is popular
in numerics and the change of variables is called Arbitrary Lagrangian-Eulerian (ALE) mapping. The formulation in the fixed reference domain is called ALE formulation of the FSI problem. We use the mapping $\psi_\eta$ (introduced in Definition 2.1) as an ALE mapping.

2. **Construction of the approximate solutions.** We construct the approximate solutions using time-discretizations and operator splitting methods. We use the Lie splitting strategy (also known as Machuk-Yanenko splitting) to decouple the FSI problem.

3. **Uniform estimates.** Let $\Delta t > 0$ be the time-discretization parameter. We show that the constructed approximate solutions satisfy uniform bounds w.r.t. $\Delta t$ (and $\varepsilon$) in the energy function spaces. We identify weak and weak* limits.

4. **Compactness** We prove that the set of approximate solutions is compact in suitable norms. By using the compactness we prove that a limit of the sequence of approximate solutions is a weak solution to the regularized FSI problem. Here we use a generalization of the Aubin-Lions-Simon lemma for discrete in time solutions adapted to the moving domain problems from [35].

Since a solution is constructed by decoupling the problem, the largest difference from [34] is in the second step where in the structure sub-problem we include also the non-linear bending energy. However, we will show that the bending term can be discretized in an analogous way as the membrane term. Other steps are analogous as in [34] using the sixth order regularization. For the convenience of the reader we will describe the details of the time-discretization of the structure sub-problem with the corresponding uniform estimates in the time-discretization parameter $\Delta t$.

We conclude this chapter with the description of the compactness step. Generally, for more details on the procedure we refer the reader to [34].

In the rest of the subsection we fix the regularizing parameter $\varepsilon$ and drop superscripts $\varepsilon$ in $(u^\varepsilon, \eta^\varepsilon)$ since there is no chance of confusion.

**Construction of discrete approximations**

The main problem in the construction of approximate solution is how to discretize the Frechet derivatives of $G$ and $R$ to obtain the discrete analogue of $R'(\eta)\partial_t \eta = \partial_t R(\eta)$. In [34] this was achieved by using the fact that the first fundamental form was polynomial of order two of $\eta$ and $\nabla \eta$ which was a consequence of the cylindrical geometry. Here we consider a more general geometry so we need to develop a more general approach.

For a given end-time $T$ we fix $\Delta t$ as the times step, such that $[0, T] = [0, N\Delta t]$ for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Now let $(\eta_n^h)_{n=1}^N$ be a given time-discrete solution and $\tilde{\eta}$ be the piece-wise linear function in time such that $\tilde{\eta}(n\Delta t) = \eta^n$. Then we have

$$R'(\tilde{\eta}) \frac{\eta^{n+1} - \eta^n}{\Delta t} = R'(\tilde{\eta}) \partial_t \tilde{\eta} = \partial_t R(\tilde{\eta}) \text{ on } [n\Delta t, (n + 1)\Delta t].$$

Notice that the expression $R'(\tilde{\eta}) \partial_t \tilde{\eta}$ is a third order polynomial in the $t$ variable so we can compute its integral $\int_{n\Delta t}^{(n + 1)\Delta t}$ by using Newton-Cotes formula. Hence, by defining $\overline{\eta}^{n+1} := \frac{\eta^{n+1} + \eta^n}{2}$ we find the approximation of $G'(\eta)\xi$ and $R'(\eta)\xi$ in the following way:

$$G'(\eta^{n+1}, \eta^n)\xi := \frac{1}{3} \left( G'(\eta^n) + 4G'(\overline{\eta}^{n+1}) + G^{n+1} \right) \xi \quad (5.3)$$

and

$$R'(\eta^{n+1}, \eta^n)\xi := \frac{1}{3} \left( R'(\eta^n) + 4R'(\overline{\eta}^{n+1}) + R^{n+1} \right) \xi. \quad (5.4)$$
By straightforward calculation it follows that
\[ G'(\eta^{n+\frac{1}{2}}, \eta^n) \frac{\eta^{n+\frac{1}{2}} - \eta^n}{\Delta t} = \Delta t \int_{n\Delta t}^{(n+1)\Delta t} \frac{d}{dt} G(\eta) \]
\[ = \frac{1}{\Delta t} (G(\eta^{n+\frac{1}{2}}) - G(\eta^n)) \]
which is the correct substitute for \( \partial_t G(\eta) = G'(\eta)\partial_t \eta \). Analogously we find as substitute for
\[ \partial_t R(\eta) = R'(\eta)\partial_t \eta \]
\[ R'(\eta^{n+\frac{1}{2}}, \eta^n) \frac{\eta^{n+\frac{1}{2}} - \eta^n}{\Delta t} = \frac{1}{\Delta t} (R(\eta^{n+\frac{1}{2}}) - R(\eta^n)). \]
These identities will be used to derive a semi-discrete uniform energy inequality. First we define
the sequence of approximate solutions by solving the following problems.

**Structure sub-problem:**
Find \((v^{n+\frac{1}{2}}, \eta^{n+\frac{1}{2}}) \in (H^2_0(\omega) \cap H^3(\omega))^2\) such that:
\[
\int_\omega \frac{\eta^{n+\frac{1}{2}} - \eta^n}{\Delta t} \phi \, dy = \int_\omega v^{n+\frac{1}{2}} \phi \, dy,
\]
\[
\int_\omega \frac{v^{n+\frac{1}{2}} - v^n}{\Delta t} \psi \, dy + \frac{1}{2} \int_\omega AG(\eta^{n+\frac{1}{2}}) : G'(\eta^{n+\frac{1}{2}}, \eta^n) \psi \, dy
\]
\[+ \frac{1}{24} \int_\omega AR(\eta^{n+\frac{1}{2}}) : R'(\eta^{n+\frac{1}{2}}, \eta^n) \psi \, dy + \varepsilon \int_\omega \nabla^3 \eta^{n+\frac{1}{2}} \nabla^3 \psi \, dy = 0, \tag{5.5} \]
for all \((\phi, \psi) \in L^2(\omega) \times (H^2_0(\omega) \cap H^3(\omega))\).

The existence of a solution to the above problem follows by Schaefer’s Fixed Point Theorem as it was demonstrated in \([34, \text{Proposition 4}]\).

**Fluid sub-problem**
The fluid problem stays the same as in \([34]\) (which is the advantage of the operator splitting method). Since the domain deformation is calculated in the structure sub-problem and does not change in the fluid sub-problem we set \(\eta^{n+1} = \eta^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\), and define \((u^{n+1}, v^{n+1}) \in V_F^n \times L^2(\omega)\) by requiring that for all \((q, \xi) \in V_F^n \times L^2(\omega)\) such that \(q|_\Gamma = \xi \mathbf{n}\), the following weak formulation holds:
\[
\int_\Omega J^n \left( \frac{u^{n+1} - u^n}{\Delta t} \cdot q + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (u^n - w^{n+\frac{1}{2}}) \cdot \nabla \eta^n \right] u^{n+1} \cdot q \right. \\
- \frac{1}{2} \left[ (u^n - w^{n+\frac{1}{2}}) \cdot \nabla \eta^n \right] q \cdot u^{n+1} \right) \, dx \\
+ \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega J^n u^{n+1} \cdot q \, dx + 2 \int_\Omega J^n D\eta^n(u) : D\eta^n(q) \, dy \\
+ \int_\omega \frac{v^{n+1} - v^{n+\frac{1}{2}}}{\Delta t} \xi \, dy = 0
\]
with \(\nabla \eta^n \cdot u^{n+1} = 0\), \(u^{n+1}|_\Gamma = v^{n+1} \mathbf{n}\).

Here \(\nabla^0\) is the transformed gradient, \(w^{n+1/2}\) is the ALE velocity (i.e. the time discretization of \(\partial_t \psi_{\eta^n}\) (see Definition \([2.1]\))), and \(J^n = \det \nabla \psi_{\eta^n}\) is the Jacobian of the transformation from \(\Omega_{\eta^n}\) to the reference configuration \(\Omega\). Please observe that the above system is a linear equation on
a fixed domain and it is solvable as long as $J^n > 0$ by the Lax Milgram Lemma. One can see that no self-intersection implies $J^n > 0$.

Now we define the approximate solutions as a piece-wise constant functions in time:

$$u_{\Delta t}(t, \cdot) = u_{\Delta t}^n, \; \eta_{\Delta t}(t, \cdot) = \eta_{\Delta t}^n, \; v_{\Delta t}(t, \cdot) = v_{\Delta t}^n, \; v_{\Delta t}^*(t, \cdot) = v_{\Delta t}^{n-\frac{1}{2}}$$ for $t \in [n\Delta t, (n+1)\Delta t]$. (5.6)

**Uniform estimates in $\Delta t$**

The following proposition gives use the uniform boundedness of the approximate solutions defined by (5.6). It is a consequence of [31] Lemma 8 combined with Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 4.3.

**Proposition 5.2.** Let $\Delta t > 0$. Then the approximate solutions defined by (5.6) satisfy the following estimate:

$$\|u_{\Delta t}\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x} + \|u_{\Delta t}\|_{L^2_t H^1_x} + \|\eta_{\Delta t}\|_{L^\infty_t H^2_x} + \|v_{\Delta t}\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x} + \|v_{\Delta t}^*\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x} + \sqrt{\varepsilon}\|\eta_{\Delta t}\|_{L^\infty_t H^3_x} \leq C,$$

(5.7)

where $C$ depends on the data only. Moreover, there exists a $T > 0$ independent of $\Delta t$ such that no self-intersection is approached.

**Proof.** The proof can be directly adapted from [31] Lemma 8 combined with Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 4.3. In particular, we find by the uniform $L^\infty_t H^2_x$ estimates on $\eta_{\Delta t}$ that $\|\eta_{\Delta t}\|_{L^\infty_t L^\infty_x}$ is uniformly bounded with constants just depending on $\partial \Omega$ and the initial condition. Moreover, since $v_{\Delta t}^*$ is bounded in $L^\infty_t L^2_x$ we can use the interpolation inequality for Sobolev spaces to show that there exists $T > 0$ such that $\eta_{\Delta t}$ satisfies (4.4) and $J_{\Delta t} > 0$ in $[0, T]$, uniformly in $\Delta t$ (and $\varepsilon$), cf. [31] Proposition 9. In particular $\partial \Omega, \eta_{\Delta t}$ has no self-intersection on $[0, T]$.

Let us denote by $u, \eta, v$ and $v^*$ the corresponding weak or weak* limits of $\Delta_{\Delta t} \to 0$. From [31] Lemma 11 it follows that $v = v^*$.

**Compactness for $\Delta t \to 0$**

First, we prove the strong convergence of the sequence $\eta_{\Delta t}$. This is a consequence of the uniform boundedness of the discrete time derivatives $\|\eta_{\Delta t+1} - \eta_{\Delta t}\|_{L^2(\omega)}$ and the boundedness of $\eta_{\Delta t}$ in $L^\infty(0, T; H^3(\omega))$. By using the classic Arzelà-Ascoli theorem for the peace-wise affine interpolation we get as in [32] Lemma 3 that

$$\eta_{\Delta t} \to \eta \text{ in } L^\infty(0, T; H^s(\omega)) \text{ for } s \in (0, 3).$$

This is enough to pass to the limit in the terms connected to the elastic energy. In order to pass to the limit in the convective term and the terms connected to the moving boundary we need strong $L^2$ convergence of $(u_{\Delta t}, v_{\Delta t})$. This is the most delicate part of the existence proof where one has to use the uniform convergence of $\eta_{\Delta t}$ and the fact that the fluid dissipates higher frequencies of the structure velocities.

In the current case this follows by a version of the Aubin-Lions-Simon lemma adapted for the problems with moving boundary [35] Theorem 3.1. and Section 4.2. Hence, by passing to the limit we find a $T > 0$ such that for every fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a weak solution to (5.1).

### 5.2 Proof of Theorem 1.1

In this subsection we first collect the necessary a-priori estimates (which essentially follow from the regularity theorem) and then second pass to the limit with $\varepsilon \to 0$. Here the establishment of the non-linearity in the convective term is (as usually) the most delicate part.

**Uniform estimates in $\varepsilon$**

We use the test function:

$$(q, \xi) = \left( \text{Test}_\eta(D^{s_h}_h D^s_h \eta^s - K_\eta(D^{s_h}_h D^s_h \eta^s)), D^{s_h}_h D^s_h \eta^s - K_\eta(D^{s_h}_h D^s_h \eta^s) \right) \text{ in (5.1)}$$

and in an
analogous way as in the proof of Theorem [1.2]. In combination with the energy estimates we obtain the following uniform regularity estimate for all (fixed) $s < 5/2$:

$$
\|\eta\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^\epsilon(\omega))} + \|\eta\|_{L^2(0,T;N^{s-2}(\omega))} \leq C.
$$

(5.8)

From the basic energy estimate it follows the following bound on time-derivative of the structure displacement:

$$
\|\partial_t \eta\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\omega))} \leq C_0.
$$

Passing with $\epsilon \to 0$

From the (classic) Aubin-Lions lemma we obtain

$$
\eta \to \eta \text{ in } L^2(0,T;H^s(\omega)) \cap L^\infty(0,T;H^{s-1/2}(\omega)) \text{ for } s < 5/2.
$$

(5.9)

In particular, $\eta \to \eta$ in $L^2(0,T;H^2(\omega)) \cap L^\infty(0,T;L^\infty(\omega))$ which is enough to pass to the limit in the elastic terms, see [4.5] for the highest order terms. The existence result is completed once we can show that (for a subsequence) $(\partial_t \eta^\epsilon, u^\epsilon) \to (\eta, u)$, since this allows to establish all non-linearities in the limit equation and the existence is complete.

The proof of the $L^2$ convergence of the velocities is known to be the most delicate part of the construction of weak solutions in the framework of FSI in the incompressible regime, see [20, 30, 35]. Here we present a more universal approach based on the reformulation of the Aubin-Lions lemma (Theorem [6.1]) combined with the extension operator presented in Corollary [3.6].

**Lemma 5.3.** There exists a strongly converging subsequence

$$(\partial_t \eta^\epsilon, u^\epsilon) \to (\eta, u)$$

in $L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega_\eta(t)) \times L^2(\omega))$.

**Proof.** This is a consequence of Theorem [6.1] and Corollary [6.2]. We take $g^n = (\partial_t \eta^\epsilon, u^\epsilon \chi_{\Omega_\eta^\epsilon})$ and as $f_n = (\partial_t \eta^\epsilon, E_{\eta^\epsilon} u^\epsilon)$, where $E_{\eta^\epsilon}$ is defined via Proposition [3.5]. Observe, that once Theorem [6.1] implies (for a subsequence) $f_0^T(g^n, f^n) dt \to f_0^T(g, f) dt$, we find that

$$
\|\partial_t \eta^\epsilon\|_{L^2_tL^2_x} + \|u^\epsilon \chi_{\Omega_\eta^\epsilon}\|_{L^2_tL^2_x} \to \|\partial_t \eta\|_{L^2_tL^2_x} + \|u \chi_{\eta}\|_{L^2_tL^2_x},
$$

which implies by the uniform convexity of $L^2$ the strong convergence $(\partial_t \eta^\epsilon, u^\epsilon) \to (\eta, u)$ in $L^2$.

We apply Corollary [6.2] using the spaces $X = X' = L^2(\omega \times Q^\epsilon)$. The compactness space $Y = H^s(\omega \times Q^\epsilon)$ for some $s \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. The space on which the time derivative acts is $Z(t) = \{(\xi, \phi) \in (H^2 \cap \sqrt{\varepsilon_n} H^3)(\omega \times Q^\epsilon) : \phi \circ \varphi_{\eta(t)} = \xi\}$.

Let us briefly check the assumptions of Corollary [6.1]

1. follows from the uniform bounds and the respective weak compactness.
2. follows from the estimates of the extension in Corollary [3.6] and the a-priori estimate on $\partial_t \eta \in L^2_tH^s_x$ for $s > 0$ (by the trace theorem).
3. follows by using the smooth extension introduced in Corollary [3.6]
4. is a consequence of the equation in the weak formulation [5.4]. Recall that for each $t \equiv t_0$ we apply Corollary [3.6]. Then we find for $\sigma < t$ (using the solenoidal and the matching
of the extension) that
\[
\begin{align*}
&\left| \int \left( \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(t) \chi_{\Omega^\varepsilon(t)} - \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(\sigma) \chi_{\Omega^\varepsilon(\sigma)} \right) \cdot (\phi(t)) \, dt \right| \\
&\quad + \int_\Omega \left( \partial_t \eta^\varepsilon(t) - \partial_t \eta^\varepsilon(\sigma) \right) (\xi(t)) \, dy \\
&= \int_\sigma^t \int_{\Omega^\varepsilon} -\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(s) \cdot \partial_t (\phi(s)) + (\text{sym } \nabla \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(s)) - \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(s) \otimes \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(s) : \nabla (\phi(s)) \, ds \\
&\quad - \int_\Omega \partial_t \eta^\varepsilon(s) \partial_t (\xi(t)) + a_m(t, \eta^\varepsilon(s), (\xi(t))) + a_0(t, \eta^\varepsilon(s), (\xi(t))) \\
&\quad + \varepsilon_n \nabla^3 \eta^\varepsilon(s) : \nabla^3 (\xi(t)) \, dy \\
\end{align*}
\]

In the following we will show that for every \( \delta, \epsilon > 0 \) there exists a \( \tau_{\delta, \epsilon} > 0 \) such that for \( |t - \sigma| \leq \tau_{\delta, \epsilon} \) and \( (\xi, \phi) \in Y \)
\[
\int_\sigma^t \left| \int_{\Omega^\varepsilon} \left( \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(t) \chi_{\Omega^\varepsilon(t)} - \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(\sigma) \chi_{\Omega^\varepsilon(\sigma)} \right) \cdot (\phi(t)) \, dx \\
+ \int_\Omega \left( \partial_t \eta^\varepsilon(t) - \partial_t \eta^\varepsilon(\sigma) \right) (\xi(t)) \, dy \right| \, dt \leq c_\varepsilon (1 + \| (\xi, \phi) \|_{Y}^2)
\]

which is exactly 4. in Corollary 6.2

The fluid part is estimated using Corollary 3.6 the uniform a-priori estimates, Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and embedding theorems:
\[
\begin{align*}
&\left| \int_\sigma^t \int_{\Omega^\varepsilon} -\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(s) \cdot \partial_t (\phi(s)) + (\text{sym } \nabla \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(s)) - \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(s) \otimes \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(s) : \nabla (\phi(s)) \, ds \, ds \right| \\
&\leq (\| \partial_t (\phi) \|_{L^\infty(Q^\varepsilon)} + \| \nabla (\phi) \|_{L^\infty(Q^\varepsilon)}) \int_\sigma^t (\| \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(t) \|_{W^{1,2}} + \| \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(t) \|^2_{L^2}) \, dt \\
&\leq c(\delta)(\| \phi(t) \|_{L^1(Q^\varepsilon)} + \| \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(t) \|_{L^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)}) \\
&\leq c(\delta) \tau^{\frac{1}{2}} (\| \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(t) \|_{L^2_\omega(W^{1,2})} + \tau^{\frac{1}{2}} \| \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(t) \|^2_{L^2_\omega L^2}) \left( \int_\sigma^t (\| \phi(t) \|^2_{L^1(Q^\varepsilon)} + \| \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(t) \|^2_{L^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)}) \, dt \right)^\frac{1}{2} \\
&\leq c(\delta) \tau^{\frac{1}{2}} (\| (\xi, \phi) \|_{Y}).
\end{align*}
\]

The estimates on the shell are similar using the estimates on the extension and solution. We start with
\[
\varepsilon_n \left| \int_\sigma^t \int_\Omega \nabla^3 \eta^\varepsilon(s) : \nabla^3 (\xi(t)) \, dy \, ds \right| \leq c\varepsilon_n \| \nabla^3 \eta \|_{L^\infty L^2} \| \nabla^3 (\xi) \|_{L^\infty L^2} \\
\leq c\varepsilon_n (1 + \| \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(t) \|^2_{L^\infty(H^3)}) \| (\xi, \phi) \|_{Y}.
\]

Next we estimate
\[
\begin{align*}
&\left| \int_\sigma^t \int_\Omega \partial_t \eta^\varepsilon(s) : \partial_t (\xi(t)) \, dy \, ds \right| \leq c\tau \| \partial_t \eta \|_{L^\infty L^2} \| \partial_t (\xi(t)) \|_{L^\infty L^2} \\
&\leq c\tau (1 + \| \partial_t \eta \|^2_{L^\infty(L^2)}) \| (\xi, \phi) \|_{Y}.
\end{align*}
\]

The respective estimates on the non-linearities of the shell are analogous making use of the uniform estimates.

Clearly, the analogue estimate is also valid for \( t < \sigma \).
5. follows directly by the definition of the spaces (over steady domains).

End of the proof of Theorem 1.1
The a-priori estimates and the above compactness arguments guaranty that for given initial conditions there is a minimal time interval $T > 0$ for which a weak solution exists (see Remark 4.4). Once the solution is established we can repeat the argument (by using $\eta(T), \partial_t \eta(T), u(T)$ as initial conditions) until either a self-intersection is approached or a degeneracy of the $H^2$ coercivity is violated (namely if $\gamma(\eta(t,x)) \to 0$ for some $t \to T$).

6 Appendix: Compactness rewritten

We introduce the following version of the celebrated Aubin-Lions compactness lemma [2, 26].

Theorem 6.1. Let $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. And let $X,Y,Z$ be three Banach spaces, such that $Y \subset X$ and $X' \subset Z'$. Assume that $f_n : [0,T) \to Y$, such that $f_n \in L^p(0,T; X \cap Y)$ and $g_n : [0,T) \to X'$, such that $g_n \in L^\infty([0,T), Z')$. Moreover assume the following:

1. The weak convergence: for some $s \in [1, \infty]$ we have that $f_n \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} f$ in $L^s(X)$ and $g_n \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} g$ in $L^s'(X')$.

2. The uniform bound on one sequence $\sup_n \int_0^T \|f_n(s)\|_Y^p \, ds \leq C$, moreover we suppose that $f_n \to f$ in $L^p(0,T; X)$.

3. The approximability-condition is satisfied: For $\delta \in (0,1]$ and every $t \in [0,T]$ there exists a mollifying operator $\phi \mapsto (\phi)_{\delta,t} \ni Z$. Moreover, for every $\epsilon \in (0,1)$ and all $\phi \in Y$, we find a $\delta_\epsilon \in (0,1)$ just depending on $\epsilon$, such that (independent of $t$)

$$\|\phi - (\phi)_{\delta,t}\|_X \leq \epsilon(1 + \|\phi\|_Y^p) \text{ for all } \delta \in (0, \delta_\epsilon] \text{ and } \|(\phi)_{\delta,t}\|_Z \leq C(\delta)(1 + \|\phi\|_Y^p).$$

4. The equi-continuity of $g_n$ in $C^0([0,1], Z')$ (for large $n$); meaning for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exist a $n_\epsilon$ and a $\tau_\epsilon > 0$, such that

$$\sup_{n \geq n_\epsilon, |t-s| \leq \tau} \|g^n(t) - g^n(s)\|_Z' \leq \epsilon.$$

5. the compactness assumption is satisfied: $X' \hookrightarrow Z'$; this means that every uniformly bounded sequence in $X'$ has a strongly converging sub-sequence in $Z'$.

Then

$$\int_0^T \langle f^n, g^n \rangle_{X,X'} \, dt \to \int_0^T \langle f, g \rangle_{X,X'} \, dt$$

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$, we may choose $\delta_\epsilon$ in such a way, that for all $\delta \in (0, \delta_\epsilon)$,

$$\|\phi - (\phi)_{\delta,t}\|_X \leq \epsilon(1 + \|\phi\|_Y^p) \text{ and } \|(\phi)_{\delta,t}\|_Z \leq C(\delta)(1 + \|\phi\|_Y^p).$$

(6.1)
Next we fix $\tau_{\epsilon} > 0$ and $n_{\epsilon}$, such that for all $\tau \in (0, \tau_{\epsilon})$

$$\sup_{n \geq n_{\epsilon}, |s-t| \leq \tau} \|g^n(t) - g^n(s)\|_{Z'} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{C(\delta_{\epsilon})}.$$ 

Fix $\tau = \frac{T}{N}$. For $k \in \{0, \ldots, N - 1\}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we may choose $t^n_k \in [k\tau, (k + 1)\tau]$ such that

$$\|g_n(t^n_k)\|_{X'} \leq \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{k\tau}^{(k+1)\tau} \|g_n(s)\|_{X'} ds.$$ 

and so

$$\sup_{k,n} \|g_n(t^n_k)\|_{X'} \leq \frac{C}{\tau},$$

that implies, by the compactness assumption, that we find a subsequence for which for any $\epsilon_0$, $\tau$, there exists a $n_{\epsilon_0, \tau}$, such that

$$\sup_k \|g_n(t^n_k) - g_m(t^n_k)\|_{Z'} \leq \epsilon_0 \text{ for all } n, m > n_{\epsilon_0, \tau}, \quad (6.2)$$

in particular, by fixing $\tau = \tau_{\epsilon}$, we may choose

$$\epsilon_0 := \frac{\epsilon}{C(\delta_{\epsilon})}.$$ 

Finally, we increase $n_{\epsilon, \tau_{\epsilon}} \geq n_{\epsilon}$ such that for $n \geq n_{\epsilon, \tau_{\epsilon}}$

$$\left| \int_0^T (f_n(t) - f(t), g(t))_{X,X'} dt \right| \leq \epsilon.$$ 

Now fix (any) $n \geq n_{\epsilon, \tau}$, then we choose $m_{n, \epsilon} \geq n_{\epsilon, \tau}$, such that for all $m \geq m_{n, \epsilon}$

$$\left| \int_0^T (f_n(t), g_m(t) - g(t))_{X,X'} dt \right| \leq \epsilon.$$ 

Hence for all $n \geq n_{\epsilon}$ there exists a $m \geq n_{\epsilon}$, such that

$$\left| \int_0^T (f_n(t), g_n(t))_{X,X'} - (f(t), g(t))_{X,X'} dt \right|$$

$$= \left| \int_0^T (f_n(t), g_n(t) - g_n(t^n_k))_{X,X'} + (f_n(t^n_k), g_n(t^n_k) - g_m(t^n_k))_{X,X'} + (f_n(t) - f(t), g(t))_{X,X'} dt \right|$$

$$\leq \left| \int_0^T (f_n(t), g_n(t) - g_m(t))_{X,X'} \right| + 2\epsilon.$$ 

We estimate the left term for $t \in [\tau k, \tau(k + 1)]$

$$(I) = (f_n(t), g_n(t) - g_m(t))_{X,X'}$$

$$= (f_n(t), g_n(t) - g_n(t^n_k))_{X,X'} + (f_n(t^n_k), g_n(t^n_k) - g_m(t^n_k))_{X,X'} + (f_n(t) - f(t), g(t))_{X,X'}$$

$$= (II) + (III) + (IV) + (V)$$

Since $(f_n(t))_{\delta} \in Z$, we find by the continuity assumption, that

$$||(II)|| \leq ||(f_n(t))_{\delta}, g_n(t) - g_n(t^n_k))_{Z,Z'}|$$

$$\leq ||(f_n(t))_{\delta}||_{Z} ||g_n(t) - g_n(t^n_k)||_{Z'}$$

$$\leq C(\delta_{\epsilon})(1 + \|f_n\|^p_Y) \frac{\epsilon}{C(\delta_{\epsilon})} \leq \epsilon(1 + \|f_n\|^p_Y)$$
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The estimate on \((IV)\) is analogous:
\[
|(IV)| \leq \epsilon(1 + \|f_n\|^p_Y)
\]

We start by estimating the middle term. Here we use the compactness (6.2) of \(g_n(t^n_k)\) and the estimate (6.1) of \((f_n(t))\), to find that
\[
(III) = \langle (f_n(t))_\delta, g_n(t^n_k) - g_m(t^n_k) \rangle_{Z, Z'} \\
\leq \|(f_n(t))_\delta\|_Z \|g_n(t^n_k) - g_m(t^n_k)\|_{Z'} \\
\leq C(\delta) (1 + \|f_n\|^p_Y) \frac{\epsilon}{C(\delta)} \leq \epsilon(1 + \|f_n\|^p_Y)
\]

Now integrating over times implies that for all \(n \geq n_\epsilon\)
\[
\int_0^T \langle f_n(t), g_n(t) \rangle_{X, X'} - \langle f(t), g(t) \rangle_{X, X'} \, dt \leq \epsilon \left(2 + C \left(T + \int_0^T \|f_n\|^p_Y \, dt\right)\right) \leq C\epsilon.
\]

\[\square\]

Observe that in the proof of Theorem 6.1 besides 4. all of the above assumptions do not need a time-independent space \(Z\). But even 4. can be replaced accordingly, such that the very same convergence result follows also for variable \(Z\). This is the content of the following corollary:

**Corollary 6.2.** Let \(1 \leq p \leq \infty\), \(X, Y\) be two Banach spaces, such that \(Y \subset X\). For \(t \in [0, T]\) let \(Z(t)\) be a Banach space such that and \(X' \subset Z'(t)\) uniformly in \(t\). Assume that \(f_n : [0, T] \to Y\), such that \(f_n \in L^p(0, T; X \cap Y)\) and \(g_n : [0, T] \to X'\). Moreover assume the following:

1. The weak convergence: for some \(s \in [1, \infty]\) we have that \(f_n \rightharpoonup f\) in \(L^s(X)\) and \(g_n \rightharpoonup g\) in \(L^s(X')\).
2. The uniform bound on one sequence
\[
\sup_n \int_0^T \|f_n(s)\|^p_Y \, ds \leq C,
\]
moreover we suppose that \(f_n \rightharpoonup f\) in \(L^p(0, T; X)\).
3. The approximability-condition is satisfied: For \(\delta \in (0, 1]\) and every \(t \in [\delta, T - \delta]\) there exists a mollifying operator \(\phi \mapsto (\phi)_{\delta,t} \subset Z(t)\). Moreover, for every \(\epsilon \in (0, 1)\) and all \(\phi \in Y\), we find a \(\delta_\epsilon \in (0, 1)\) just depending on \(\epsilon\), such that
\[
\|\phi - (\phi)_{\delta,t}\|_X \leq \epsilon(1 + \|\phi\|^p_Y) \quad \text{for all } \delta \in (0, \delta_\epsilon] \text{ and } \|(\phi)_{\delta,t}\|_{Z(s)} \leq C(\delta)(1 + \|\phi\|^p_Y)
\]
independent of \(t\) and \(s \in (t - \delta, t + \delta)\).
4. The equi-continuity of \(g_n\) for large \(n\); meaning that for every \(\delta > 0\) and every \(\epsilon > 0\) there exist a \(\tau_{\epsilon,\delta} \in (0, \delta]\) and an \(n_{\epsilon}\), such that uniformly for all \(\psi \in L^p([0, T], Y)\) we find for \(|s - t| \leq \tau_{\epsilon,\delta}\)
\[
|\langle g^n(t) - g^n(s), (\psi)_{\delta,t}(t) \rangle| \leq \epsilon(1 + \|\psi\|^p_Y).
\]
for the respective mollifying operator \((\phi, \delta, t) \mapsto (\phi)_{\delta,t}\) introduced in 3. above.
5. the uniform compactness assumption is satisfied: \(X' \hookrightarrow Z(t)'\); this means that every uniformly bounded sequence in \(X'\) has a strongly converging sub-sequence in \(Z(t)\)' (for all \(t\)).
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Then
\[ \int_0^T \langle f^n, g^n \rangle_{X,X'} \, dt \to \int_0^T \langle f, g \rangle_{X,X'} \, dt \]

**Proof.** The proof is line by line that same by replacing the respective use of condition 4. in the estimates of \((II)\) and \((IV)\). \(\square\)
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