Small-time global approximate controllability for incompressible MHD with coupled Navier slip boundary conditions

Manuel Rissel * Ya-Guang Wang †

Abstract

We study the small-time global approximate controllability for incompressible magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) flows in smoothly bounded two- or three-dimensional domains. The controls act on arbitrary open portions of each connected boundary component, while linearly coupled Navier slip-with-friction conditions are imposed along the uncontrolled parts of the boundary. Certain choices for the friction operators at the boundary give rise to interacting velocity and magnetic field boundary layers. We achieve sufficient dissipation properties for these layers by a detailed analysis of the corresponding asymptotic expansions. It is important that the boundary controls are compatible with the equation for the magnetic field, otherwise a bulk pressure gradient appears in the induction equation. Our results avoid such a gradient term for all uncoupled and many coupled Navier slip-with-friction conditions.
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1 Introduction

Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$ be any bounded domain of dimension $N \in \{2, 3\}$ with $\Gamma := \partial \Omega$ being smooth and $n$ denoting the outward unit normal to $\Omega$ along $\Gamma$. The task considered in this article is to steer incompressible magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) flows from a prescribed initial state towards any neighborhood of a desired terminal state, without placing restrictions on the control time. This is accomplished by acting on the system via boundary controls within a small open subset $\Gamma_c \subseteq \Gamma$ which non-trivially intersects all connected components of $\Gamma$.
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When it comes to nonlinear evolution equations with controls localized in arbitrary open subsets of the boundary or an interior sub-domain, establishing global approximate controllability usually constitutes a challenging task and few methods for tackling such questions are available. In the context of fluid dynamics, but not limited to, one successful approach is known as the return method, which has first been introduced by Coron in \[12\] for the stabilization of certain mechanical systems and shall also be employed here. An introduction to the return method and its applications to nonlinear partial differential equations may be found in \[15\], Part 2, Chapter 6. In contrast to the Navier-Stokes equations, for which global approximate controllability has been actively investigated in the past, nothing seems to be known regarding similar questions for viscous MHD in the presence of boundaries.

In this article, we focus on incompressible flows of viscosity \(\nu_1 > 0\) and resistivity \(\nu_2 > 0\), for which the velocity \(u \in \mathbb{R}^N\), the magnetic field \(B \in \mathbb{R}^N\) and the total pressure \(p \in \mathbb{R}\) are described until a given terminal time \(T_{ctrl} > 0\) as a weak solution to the initial boundary value problem

\[
\begin{aligned}
\partial_t u - \nu_1 \Delta u + (u \cdot \nabla) u - \mu (B \cdot \nabla) B + \nabla p &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T_{ctrl}), \\
\partial_t B - \nu_2 \Delta B + (u \cdot \nabla) B - (B \cdot \nabla) u &= \mathbf{0} \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T_{ctrl}), \\
\nabla \cdot u &= \mathbf{0} \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T_{ctrl}), \\
u \cdot n &= B \cdot n = 0 \quad \text{on } (\Gamma \setminus \Gamma_c) \times (0, T_{ctrl}), \\
\mathbf{N}_1(u, B) &= \mathbf{N}_2(u, B) = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{on } (\Gamma \setminus \Gamma_c) \times (0, T_{ctrl}), \\
\mathbf{u}(\cdot, 0) &= u_0, \quad \mathbf{B}(\cdot, 0) = B_0 \quad \text{in } \Omega,
\end{aligned}
\tag{1.1}
\]

while the underlying state space for both velocity and magnetic field is taken as

\[
L^2_c(\Omega) := \left\{ f \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2) \mid \nabla \cdot f = 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \ f \cdot n = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma \setminus \Gamma_c \right\}.
\]

In \eqref{1.1}, the vector fields \(u_0 \in L^2_c(\Omega)\) and \(B_0 \in L^2_c(\Omega)\) represent the given initial data. The parameter \(\mu > 0\) stands for the magnetic permeability. No boundary conditions are prescribed along the controlled boundary \(\Gamma_c\), which leaves \eqref{1.1} underdetermined as explained in Remark 1.5 below. The boundary operators \(\mathbf{N}_1\) and \(\mathbf{N}_2\) acting along \(\Gamma \setminus \Gamma_c\) are described in what follows.

Let \(\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N\) be a general smoothly bounded domain with outward unit normal vector \(n_\mathcal{D} : \partial \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N\), and denote by \(T_x\) the tangent space of \(\partial \mathcal{D}\) at \(x\). At each \(x \in \partial \mathcal{D}\), the Weingarten map \(W_\mathcal{D}(x) : T_x \rightarrow T_x\) is defined by \(\tau \mapsto W_\mathcal{D}(x) \tau := \nabla_\tau n_\mathcal{D}\). Then, for \(h_1, h_2 : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N\) and friction matrices

\[
L_1, L_2, M_1, M_2 \in C^\infty(\Gamma \setminus \Gamma_c; \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}),
\]

the linearly coupled Navier slip-with-friction operators in \eqref{1.1} are introduced via

\[
\mathbf{N}_i(h_1, h_2) := [\mathbf{D}(h_i)n(x) + W_\Omega h_i + M_i(x)h_1 + L_ih_2]_{\text{tan}}, \quad i = 1, 2, \tag{1.2}
\]

wherein the tangential part and the symmetrized gradient are respectively denoted by

\[
[h]_{\text{tan}} := h - (h \cdot n) \ n, \quad \mathbf{D}(h) := 2^{-1}[\nabla h + (\nabla h)^\top].
\]
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In order to facilitate a unified presentation, the notations for the case $N = 3$ are employed throughout. Thus, if $N = 2$, subsequently $\nabla \times h$ stands for $\nabla \wedge h := \partial_1 h_2 - \partial_2 h_1$, the curl of a scalar functions $h$ refers to $\nabla^h := [\partial_2 h, -\partial_1 h]^\top$ and the cross product $h \times g$ becomes $h \wedge g := h_1 g_2 - g_2 h_1$. As a result, when $N = 2$, some objects denoted here as vectors are in fact scalars and $(\nabla \times h) \times n_D$ means $(\nabla \wedge h)[n_D,2,-n_D,1]^\top$.

Referring to [16, Lemma 1], see also [10, 22], the Weingarten map $W_D$ is smooth and when $h$ is tangential to $\partial D$ one has the relation

$$ [D(h(x,t))n_D(x) + W_D(x)h(x,t)]_{\text{tan}} = \frac{1}{2} (\nabla \times h(x,t)) \times n_D(x). \quad (1.3) $$

As a consequence of (1.3), the boundary conditions in (1.1) are along $(\Gamma \setminus \Gamma_c) \times (0, T_{\text{curl}})$ equivalent to

$$ (\nabla \times u) \times n = \rho_1(u, B) := -2 [M_1(x)u + L_1(x)B]_{\text{tan}}, \quad u \cdot n = 0, $$

$$ (\nabla \times B) \times n = \rho_2(u, B) := -2 [M_2(x)u + L_2(x)B]_{\text{tan}}, \quad B \cdot n = 0. \quad (1.4) $$

**Example 1.1.** If $M_1 = M_2 = L_1 = L_2 = 0$ in (1.2), then by means of (1.4) one arrives at a Navier slip condition without friction as studied for MHD in [42] in terms of the vanishing viscosity limit. One the other hand, if only $M_2 = L_1 = 0$, then one is in the situation of uncoupled Navier slip-with-friction conditions as considered for instance in [26, 35], again from the vanishing viscosity limit point of view.

Navier slip-with-friction boundary conditions, as already proposed by Navier [36] two centuries ago, are relevant to a range of applications, thus have been studied in the context of the Navier-Stokes equations from various points of view. For instance, inviscid limit problems are treated in [10, 29, 30], regularity questions are investigated in [1–3, 38, 39] and control problems are tackled in [16, 25, 33]. Concerning MHD, several singular limit problems have been studied under Navier slip-with-friction boundary conditions in [26, 35, 42]. Compared with the above mentioned references, the here employed boundary conditions are more general in that the shear stresses of the velocity and the magnetic field at the boundary are linearly coupled with tangential velocity and magnetic field contributions. While (1.4) includes the classical Navier slip conditions studied before, also more complex interactions can be captured.

From the global approximate controllability point of view, several difficulties appear however when the magnetic shear stress is coupled with the tangential velocity: a magnetic field boundary layer potentially enters the analysis of Section 3. This in turn challenges the construction of magnetic field boundary controls without generating a pressure gradient like term in the induction equation.

### 1.1 Statement of the main results

Let $\Gamma^1, \ldots, \Gamma^{K(\Omega)}$ be the connected components of $\Gamma$ and denote by $\Gamma^1_c, \ldots, \Gamma^{K(\Omega)}_c$ the respective intersections of $\Gamma^1 \cap \Gamma_c, \ldots, \Gamma^{K(\Omega)} \cap \Gamma_c$, hence

$$ \Gamma = \bigcup_{i \in \{1, \ldots, K(\Omega)\}} \Gamma^i, \quad \Gamma^i_c = \bigcup_{i \in \{1, \ldots, K(\Omega)\}} \Gamma^i_c. $$
For simplifying the exposition\(^1\), the imposed initial data along the controlled boundary \(\Gamma_\text{c}\) will be chosen to obey

\[
\forall i \in \{1, \ldots, K(\Omega)\}: \quad \langle u_0 \cdot n, 1 \rangle_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma^0_\text{c}), H^{1/2}(\Gamma^0_\text{c})} = \langle B_0 \cdot n, 1 \rangle_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma^0_\text{c}), H^{1/2}(\Gamma^0_\text{c})} = 0, \quad (1.5)
\]

which means that boundary controls act along \(\Gamma_\text{c}\) already at time \(t = 0\). If \(\partial \Omega\) has only one connected component, then (1.5) is automatically satisfied.

We state now our main results, while denoting for \(r > 0\) the disc \(D_r := \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid |x| < r \}\) and by \(I \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}\) the identity matrix. At this point, the notion of a weak controlled trajectory from Section 2.4 is anticipated.

**Theorem 1.2.** Assume one of the following configurations (as sketched in Figure 1):

a) The domain \(\Omega\) and controlled boundary \(\Gamma_\text{c}\) are general, as introduced in the beginning of Section 1. The boundary operators in (1.2) satisfy \(M_2 = 0\) while \(M_1, L_1, L_2 \in C^\infty(\Gamma \setminus \Gamma_\text{c}; \mathbb{R}^{N \times N})\) are arbitrary.

b) For \(r_2 > r_1 > 0\) the domain \(\Omega \subseteq A^r_{\text{c}} := D_{r_2} \setminus \overline{D_{r_1}}\) is simply connected and bounded by a closed Lipschitz curve \(\Gamma\), while the controlled part is \(\Gamma_\text{c} := \Gamma \setminus \partial A^r_{\text{c}}\). The friction operators \(M_1, L_1, L_2 \in C^\infty(\Gamma \setminus \Gamma_\text{c}; \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})\) are arbitrary and \(M_2 := \rho I\) for a fixed \(\rho \in \mathbb{R}\).

Then, given any fixed initial states \(u_0, B_0 \in L^2_c(\Omega)\) satisfying (1.5), target states \(u_1, B_1 \in L^2_c(\Omega), T_\text{ctrl} > 0\) and \(\delta > 0\), there exists at least one weak controlled trajectory

\[
(u, B) \in \left[ C^0_w([0, T_\text{ctrl}]; L^2_c(\Omega)) \cap L^2((0, T_\text{ctrl}); H^1(\Omega)) \right]^2,
\]

to the MHD equations (1.1) which obeys the terminal condition

\[
\|u(\cdot, T_\text{ctrl}) - u_1\|_{L^2_c(\Omega)} + \|B(\cdot, T_\text{ctrl}) - B_1\|_{L^2_c(\Omega)} < \delta. \quad (1.6)
\]

---

\(1\)The assumption on \(u_0\) in (1.5) is made without loss of generality as explained in Remark 5.2.

---

Figure 1: Two examples for domains \(\Omega\) that are covered by Theorem 1.2. The controls act along the dashed boundaries which represent \(\Gamma_\text{c}\).
Remark 1.3. The assumption $M_2 = 0$ in the case a) of Theorem 1.2 rules out certain coupled boundary conditions, all of which would lead to magnetic field boundary layers in the analysis of Section 3. Demanding $M_2 = 0$ in Theorem 1.2 is not sharp: in Lemma 3.10 more precise conditions are stated and possible improvements are left as an open question.

The next theorem is more general than Theorem 1.2, in the sense that it holds for all $L_1, L_2, M_1, M_2 \in C^\infty(\Gamma \setminus \Gamma_c; \mathbb{R}^{N \times N})$ in (1.2). Its drawback is the possible appearance of a pressure gradient term $\nabla q$ in the induction equation when $M_2 \neq 0$.

Theorem 1.4. Given any fixed initial states $u_0, B_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$ satisfying (1.5), target states $u_1, B_1 \in L^2(\Omega), T_{ctrl} > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, the MHD type system

\[
\begin{aligned}
\partial_t u - \nu_1 \Delta u + (u \cdot \nabla)u - \mu (B \cdot \nabla)B + \nabla p &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T_{ctrl}), \\
\partial_t B - \nu_2 \Delta B + (u \cdot \nabla)B - (B \cdot \nabla)u + \nabla q &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T_{ctrl}), \\
\nabla \cdot u &= \nabla \cdot B = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T_{ctrl}), \\
u \cdot n &= B \cdot n = 0 \quad \text{on } (\Gamma \setminus \Gamma_c) \times (0, T_{ctrl}), \\
N_1(u, B) &= N_2(u, B) = 0 \quad \text{on } (\Gamma \setminus \Gamma_c) \times (0, T_{ctrl}), \\
u(\cdot, 0) &= u_0, B(\cdot, 0) = B_0 \quad \text{in } \Omega.
\end{aligned}
\]

admits at least one weak controlled trajectory

\[(u, B) \in \left[ C^0_0([0, T_{ctrl}]; L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^2((0, T_{ctrl}); H^1(\Omega)) \right]^2,\]

which obeys the terminal condition

\[\|u(\cdot, T_{ctrl}) - u_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|B(\cdot, T_{ctrl}) - B_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} < \delta.\]

Remark 1.5. The systems (1.1) and (1.7) are under-determined since no boundary condition is prescribed along $\Gamma_c$. Once a weak controlled trajectory is found via Theorem 1.2 or 1.4, one obtains explicit boundary controls by taking traces along $\Gamma_c$, see also [14, 16, 20, 24].

Remark 1.6. Since the proofs for Theorems 1.2 and 1.4 will be carried out in a certain extended domain, one can also allow $\Omega$ to be Lipschitz regular along the controlled boundary.

1.2 Related literature and organization of the article

Global controllability for viscous- and resistive MHD in non-periodic domains has to our knowledge not been studied, neither for incompressible- nor for compressible models. Therefore, the present work constitutes a first step in this direction. As a possible continuation, it would be interesting to generalize Theorem 1.2 such that arbitrary $M_2 \in C^\infty(\Gamma \setminus \Gamma_c; \mathbb{R}^{N \times N})$ are allowed without introducing a bulk pressure gradient in the induction equation. Also, the topic of global exact controllability to zero or towards trajectories is widely open.

Concerning local exact controllability for MHD, where the initial state lies in the vicinity of the target trajectory, there have been some interesting works when the velocity satisfies the no-slip boundary condition. For incompressible viscous MHD, Badra obtained in [6] the local exact controllability to trajectories, while maintaining truly localized and solenoidal interior controls. However, since the boundary conditions studied in [6] are different from
those employed here, one cannot deduce the small-time global exact controllability towards trajectories by combining the approaches given in [6] with our global approximate results. A variety of previous local exact controllability results may also be found in [7] by Barbu et al. and in [27, 28] by Havârneanu et al., while approximate interior controllability for certain toroidal configurations without boundary has been investigated by Galan in [21]. Moreover, Anh and Toi studied in [5] the local exact controllability to trajectories for magneto-micropolar fluids, while Tao considered the local exact controllability for planar compressible MHD in the recent work [40].

Recently, we have studied the global exact controllability for the ideal incompressible MHD in [37], in which the small-time global exact controllability in rectangular channels is obtained in the presence of a harmonic unknown like \( u_1 \) in (1.7). Subsequently, Kukavica et al. demonstrated in [31], likewise restricted to a rectangular domain, how to find boundary controls such that \( \nabla u_1 \) either vanishes or is explicitly characterized.

The approach of this paper will be based on a combination of the return method and the well-prepared dissipation method as laid out in [16] by Coron et al., where the small-time global exact controllability to trajectories has been studied for incompressible Navier-Stokes equations in general smooth two- and three-dimensional domains under Navier slip-with-friction conditions along the uncontrolled boundaries. Meanwhile, we shall also extend the asymptotic expansions obtained by Iftimie and Sueur in [29] for the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations to the system of MHD. When it comes to MHD, the return method needs to be carefully applied in order to avoid generating the gradient of a pressure-like unknown in the induction equation. To this end, there seem to be at least two options:

1) Modifying the return method trajectory from [16] to be everywhere divergence-free, but not everywhere curl-free.

2) Modifying the definition for weak controlled trajectories, compared to our choice in Section 2.4, in order to maintain a divergence free magnetic field in the extended domain from Section 2.1 while employing the same return method trajectory as in [16].

In this article we choose the first approach for the following reasons. First, this seems to be a new approach which has not been discussed in previous literature. In particular, using an everywhere solenoidal return method profile might be useful for further studies on the controllability of the ideal MHD equations. Second, such a return method profile appears to be a natural choice for MHD and allows to reduce technicalities related to the definition of weak controlled trajectories, which would rather distract from the controllability topic than contributing new insights.

Let us also mention other recent works treating global controllability problems in fluid dynamics by means of the return- and well-prepared dissipation methods. For instance, an incompressible Boussinesq system with Navier slip-with-friction boundary conditions on the velocity is considered by Chaves-Silva et al. in [9]. Moreover, smooth controllability for the Navier-Stokes equations with Navier slip-with-friction boundary conditions is investigated in [32]. Further, Coron et al. obtain in [17] global exact controllability results for the Navier-Stokes equations under the no-slip condition in a rectangular domain.

The remainder of this article is organized as follows. In Section 2, several preliminaries are collected. In Section 3, the global approximate controllability from regular initial data
towards an arbitrarily smooth state is shown. In Section 4, a particular class of planar domains is discussed. Subsequently, the main theorems are concluded in Section 5. In addition, higher order boundary layer estimates are presented in Appendix A and a regularization effect is demonstrated in Appendix B.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we shall present certain preliminaries, which will be used later. A domain extension is introduced in Section 2.1, several function spaces and norms are defined in Section 2.2, initial data extensions are discussed in Section 2.3, a notion for weak controlled trajectories is presented in Section 2.4 and Section 2.5 contains supplementary explanations.

Throughout the whole article, if not indicated otherwise, constants of the form $C > 0$ are generic and can change from line to line during the estimates.

2.1 Domain extensions

Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$ be a smoothly bounded domain, which is an extension of $\Omega$ as shown in Figure 2, with $\Gamma_c \cap E \neq \emptyset$ and $\Gamma \setminus \Gamma_c \subseteq \partial E$. Such an extension exists by the requirements on $\Omega$ and, without loss of generality, we can assume that each connected component of the attached part $E \setminus \Omega$ is simply connected. Further, the outward unit normal field to $E$ along $\partial E$ is denoted by $n_{\partial E}$, or simply by $n$ if no confusion can arise.

When $\Omega$ is multiply-connected, there is a number $L(\Omega) \in \mathbb{N}$ of smooth $(N - 1)$-dimensional and mutually disjoint cuts $\Sigma_1, \ldots, \Sigma_{L(\Omega)} \subseteq \Omega$, which meet $\partial E \setminus \Gamma_c$ transversely, such that the domain

$$\hat{E} := E \setminus (\Sigma_1 \cup \cdots \cup \Sigma_{L(\Omega)})$$

is simply-connected. Additional details may for instance be found in [41, Appendix I]. In what follows, for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, L(\Omega)\}$, a unit normal field to $\Sigma_i$ is denoted by $\hat{n}^i$. If $\Omega$ is simply-connected, then $L(\Omega) := 0$ is defined.
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Figure 2: A multiply-connected domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ with two controlled boundary components and extension $\hat{E}$. The dashed lines mark the controlled boundary parts.

The following inequality shall be frequently employed.
**Lemma 2.1.** There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $h \in H^1(E)$, one has the estimate

$$\|h\|_{H^1(E)} \leq C \left( \|\nabla \cdot h\|_{L^2(E)} + \|\nabla \times h\|_{L^2(E)} + \|h \cdot n\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial E)} + \sum_{i=1}^{L(\Omega)} \left| \int_{\Sigma_i} h \cdot \vec{n}^i \, d\Sigma_i \right| \right).$$

(2.1)

**Proof.** The estimate (2.1) can for instance be derived from the exposition in [41, Appendix I]. Here, for the sake of brevity we directly resort to [4] where it is shown that all $f \in H^1(E)$ with $f \cdot n = 0$ along $\partial E$ obeys

$$\|f\|_{H^1(E)} \leq C \left( \|\nabla \cdot f\|_{L^2(E)} + \|\nabla \times f\|_{L^2(E)} + \sum_{i=1}^{L(\Omega)} \left| \int_{\Sigma_i} f \cdot \vec{n}^i \, d\Sigma_i \right| \right).$$

(2.2)

In order to utilize this estimate, as explained in [41, Appendix I] (in particular see [41, Appendix I, Remark 1.3]) a function $g \in H^1(E)$ is chosen with

$$\nabla \cdot g = \nabla \cdot h, \quad \nabla \times g = \nabla \times h, \quad g \cdot n = h \cdot n, \quad \sum_{i=1}^{L(\Omega)} \left| \int_{\Sigma_i} g \cdot \vec{n}^i \, d\Sigma_i \right| = 0.$$

Since $\hat{E}$ is simply connected, a classical elliptic estimate (see for instance [8, Theorem IV.4.12]) provides

$$\|g\|_{H^1(E)} \leq C \left( \|\nabla \cdot g\|_{L^2(E)} + \|\nabla \times g\|_{L^2(E)} + \|g \cdot n\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial E)} \right).$$

(2.3)

Thus, by invoking (2.2) and (2.3) while noting that the $N$-dimensional Lebesgue measure of $E \setminus \hat{E}$ is zero, the inequality (2.1) follows with $f := h - g$ from

$$\|h\|_{H^1(E)} \leq \|f\|_{H^1(E)} + \|g\|_{H^1(E)} = \|f\|_{H^1(E)} + \|g\|_{H^1(E)}.$$

$\square$

Let $d > 0$ be sufficiently small so that $V := \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^N | \text{dist}(x, \partial E) < d \}$ denotes a thin tubular neighborhood in $\mathbb{R}^N$ of the boundary $\partial E$. Further, let $\varphi_E \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N; \mathbb{R})$ satisfy $|\nabla \varphi_E(x)| = 1$ for all $x \in V$ and

$$E \cap V = \{ \varphi_E > 0 \} \cap V, \quad E^c \cap V = \{ \varphi_E < 0 \} \cap V, \quad \partial E = \{ \varphi_E = 0 \}.$$

This implies $\varphi_E(x) = \text{dist}(x, \partial E)$ for all $x \in V$ and a smooth extension of $n_{\partial E}$ to $\overline{E}$ is provided by

$$n(x) = n_E(x) := \begin{cases} n_{\partial E}(x) & \text{if } x \in \partial E, \\ -\nabla \varphi_E(x) & \text{if } x \in E. \end{cases}$$

In this sense, the tangential part $[h]_{\text{tan}} = h - (h \cdot n) n$ of $h: \overline{E} \to \mathbb{R}^N$ is now defined everywhere in $\overline{E}$. Moreover, without changing the notations, the Weingarten map $W_E$ and the general friction matrices $M_1, M_2, L_1, L_2$ are smoothly continued to $\overline{E}$ such that

$$W_E, M^1, M^2, L^1, L^2, \in C^\infty(\overline{E}, \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}).$$
For describing boundary layers in the vicinity of $\partial \mathcal{E}$, when a parameter $\epsilon > 0$ is assumed small, some functions will depend on a slow variable $x \in \overline{\mathcal{E}}$, the time $t \geq 0$ and a fast variable $z = \varphi_\mathcal{E}(x)/\sqrt{\epsilon}$ in $\mathbb{R}_+$. In this case, for a map $(x, t, z) \mapsto h(x, t, z)$ we denote

$$\|h\|_\epsilon(x, t) := h(x, t, \varphi_\mathcal{E}(x)/\sqrt{\epsilon}).$$

By convention, differential operators are always taken with respect to $x \in \overline{\mathcal{E}}$ only, if not indicated otherwise by the notation. Therefore, as also remarked in [16, 29], one has the commutation formulas

$$\begin{align*}
\nabla \cdot (\|h\|_\epsilon) &= \nabla \cdot h - n \cdot \nabla_\mathcal{E} h / \sqrt{\epsilon}, \\
\nabla (\|h\|_\epsilon) &= \nabla h + \|\partial_\mathcal{E} h\|_\epsilon n^T / \sqrt{\epsilon}, \\
|\mathbf{D}(\|h\|_\epsilon) n|_{\text{tan}} &= |\mathbf{D}(h) n|_{\text{tan}} - \|\partial_\mathcal{E} h\|_\epsilon / \sqrt{4\epsilon}, \\
\epsilon \Delta \|h\|_\epsilon &= \epsilon \Delta h + \sqrt{\epsilon \varphi_\mathcal{E}} \|\partial_\mathcal{E} h\|_\epsilon - 2\sqrt{\epsilon} \|n \cdot \nabla\|\partial_\mathcal{E} h\|_\epsilon + |n|^2 \|\partial_\mathcal{E} h\|_\epsilon,
\end{align*}$$

(2.4)

and consequently

$$\mathcal{N}_i (\|h_1\|_\epsilon, \|h_2\|_\epsilon) = \mathcal{N}_i (h_1, h_2) - \|\partial_\mathcal{E} h_1\|_{\text{tan}} / \sqrt{4\epsilon}, \quad i \in \{1, 2\}.$$

### 2.2 Function spaces and norms

The following Hilbert spaces of divergence-free and tangential vector fields are defined by means of

$$\begin{align*}
\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{E}) &:= \text{clos}_{L^2(\mathcal{E})} \left( \left\{ f \in C^1(\overline{\mathcal{E}}) \mid \nabla \cdot f = 0 \text{ in } \mathcal{E}, f \cdot n = 0 \text{ on } \partial \mathcal{E} \right\} \right), \\
\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{E}) &:= \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{E}) \cap H^1(\mathcal{E}),
\end{align*}$$

where $\text{clos}_{L^2(\mathcal{E})}$ denotes the closure in $L^2(\mathcal{E})$. In addition, for any fixed $T > 0$, denote by $C^0_0([0, T]; \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{E}))$ the space of weakly continuous functions from $[0, T]$ to $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{E})$, $\mathcal{X}_T$ the solution space and $\mathcal{U}_T$ the control space being given by

$$\begin{align*}
\mathcal{X}_T &:= C^0_0([0, T]; \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{E})) \cap L^2((0, T); \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{E})), \\
\mathcal{U}_T &:= C^1([0, T]; \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{E})) \cap C^0([0, T]; H^2(\mathcal{E})),
\end{align*}$$

respectively. Moreover, for $m, p, k, s \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we employ the weighted Sobolev spaces

$$\begin{align*}
\mathcal{H}^{k,m,p}_\mathcal{E} &:= \left\{ f \in L^2(\mathcal{E} \times \mathbb{R}_+) \mid \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^{k,m,p}_\mathcal{E}} := \left( \sum_{r=0}^p |f|_{k,m,r,\mathcal{E}}^2 \right)^{1/2} < +\infty \right\}, \\
\overline{\mathcal{H}}^{k,s}(\mathbb{R}) &:= \left\{ f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}) \mid \|f\|_{\overline{\mathcal{H}}^{k,s}(\mathbb{R})} := \left( \sum_{l=0}^s \int_\mathbb{R} (1 + z^{2k}) |\partial_z^l f(z)|^2 \mathrm{d}z \right)^{1/2} < +\infty \right\},
\end{align*}$$

where $|f|_{k,m,r,\mathcal{E}}$ denotes for functions $(x, z) \mapsto f(x, z)$ the seminorm

$$|f|_{k,m,r,\mathcal{E}} := \left( \sum_{|\beta| \leq m} \int_\mathcal{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} (1 + z^{2k}) |\partial_x^\beta \partial_z^r f|^2 \mathrm{d}z \mathrm{d}x \right)^{1/2}.$$
2.3 Initial data extensions

In view of (1.5), the initial states \((u_0, B_0)\) chosen in Theorems 1.2 and 1.4 are extended to functions \(u_0, B_0 \in H(E)\) while keeping the original notations. Such extensions are provided by the following lemma, which is a special case of [9, Proposition 2.1].

**Lemma 2.2.** Assume that \(h \in L^2_c(\Omega)\) obeys along \(\Gamma_c\) the conditions

\[
\forall i \in \{1, \ldots, K(\Omega)\}: \quad \langle h \cdot n, 1 \rangle_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma^c_2), H^{1/2}(\Gamma^c_1)} = 0.
\] (2.5)

Then, there exists \(h^\# \in H(E)\) with \(h^\#|_{\partial \Omega} = h\) and \(\|h^\#\|_{L^2(E)} \leq C\|h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\) for a constant \(C > 0\) which is independent of \(h\).

**Proof.** In order to avoid ambiguity, let \(n\) denote the outward unit normal to \(\Gamma\) and \(n_{\partial E}\) the outward unit normal to \(\partial E\). It is known, see for instance [8, Chapter IV, Section 3.2], that there exists a continuous trace operator \(\gamma_n: L^2_c(\Omega) \rightarrow H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)\) with \(\gamma_n(w) = w \cdot n\) for all \(w \in C^\infty_0(\overline{\Omega})\). Thus, if \(\gamma_D: W(\Omega) \rightarrow H^{1/2}(\Gamma)\) denotes the Dirichlet trace, one has for all \(h \in L^2_c(\Omega)\) and \(g \in \tilde{W}(\Omega)\) the identity

\[
\int_\Omega (\nabla \cdot f) g \; dx = - \int_\Omega f \cdot \nabla g \; dx + \langle \gamma_n(f) \cdot n, \gamma_D(g) \rangle_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma^c_2), H^{1/2}(\Gamma^c_1)}.
\]

Now, denote for \(i \in \{1, \ldots, K(\Omega)\}\) by \(\Omega^i\) the corresponding extension of \(\Omega\) at \(\Gamma^c_i\), namely the (simply-) connected component of \(E \setminus \overline{\Omega}\) with \(\partial \Omega^i \cap \Gamma \subseteq \Gamma^c_i\). Then, thanks to the assumption (2.5), one can solve weak formulations for the elliptic problems

\[
\begin{cases}
-\Delta \varphi^i = 0 & \text{in } \Omega^i, \\
\nabla \varphi^i \cdot n = \gamma_n(h) & \text{on } \Gamma^i, \\
\nabla \varphi^i \cdot n_{\partial E} = 0 & \text{in } \partial \Omega^i \setminus \Gamma^c_i.
\end{cases}
\] (2.6)

Accordingly, if \(\varphi^i \subseteq H^1(\Omega^i)\) are for \(i \in \{1, \ldots, K(\Omega)\}\) the weak solutions to (2.6), then the proof is complete after defining \(h^\# := h\) in \(\Omega\) and \(h^\# := \nabla \varphi^i\) in \(\Omega^i\).

\[\square\]

2.4 Weak controlled trajectories

For \(T > 0\) let \(E_T := E \times (0, T)\) and \(\Sigma_T := \partial E \times (0, T)\). Moreover, assume that arbitrary initial data \(u_0, B_0 \in \Gamma_c(\Omega)\) obeying (1.5) are fixed and forces \(\xi, \eta \in H(E)\) with

\[
\bigcup_{t \in [0, T]} (\text{supp}(\xi(\cdot, t)) \cup \text{supp}(\eta(\cdot, t))) \subseteq \overline{E} \setminus \overline{\Omega}
\]

are prescribed. Then, a weak controlled trajectory for (1.1) or (1.7) is understood as any pair

\[(u, B) \in \left[ C^0_w([0, T]; L^2_c(\Omega)) \cap L^2((0, T); H^1(\Omega)) \right]^2,
\]

which is for \(\kappa = 0\) or \(\kappa = 1\) the restriction \((\tilde{u}, \tilde{B})|_{\Omega}, \tilde{B}|_{\Omega}\) of a weak Leray-Hopf solution \((\tilde{u}, \tilde{B})\) to the viscous and resistive incompressible MHD system

\[
\begin{align*}
\partial_t u - v_1 \Delta u + (u \cdot \nabla) u - \mu (B \cdot \nabla) B + \nabla p &= \xi & \text{in } & E_T, \\
\partial_t B - v_2 \Delta B + (u \cdot \nabla) B - (B \cdot \nabla) u + \kappa \nabla q &= \eta & \text{in } & E_T, \\
\nabla \cdot u &= \nabla \cdot B = 0 & \text{in } & E_T, \\
u \cdot n = B \cdot n &= 0 & \text{on } & \Sigma_T, \\
N_1(u, B) &= N_2(u, B) = 0 & \text{on } & \Sigma_T, \\
u(\cdot, 0) &= u_0, B(\cdot, 0) &= B_0 & \text{in } & E.
\end{align*}
\] (2.7)
Hereby, two functions \( u, B \in \mathcal{X}_T \) are called a weak Leray-Hopf solution to (2.7) if they satisfy for all \( \varphi, \psi \in C^\infty_0([0, T) \times \overline{\mathcal{E}}) \cap C^\infty([0, T]; H(\mathcal{E})) \) the variational formulation

\[
\int_0^T \int_E (\partial_t u \cdot \varphi + \partial_t B \cdot \psi) \, dx \, dt + v_1 \int_0^T \int_E (\nabla \times u) \cdot (\nabla \times \varphi) \, dx \, dt \\
+ v_2 \int_0^T \int_E (\nabla \times B) \cdot (\nabla \times \psi) \, dx \, dt + \int_0^T \int_E ((u \cdot \nabla)u - \mu(B \cdot \nabla)B) \cdot \varphi \, dx \, dt \\
+ \int_0^T \int_{\partial \mathcal{E}} ((u \cdot \nabla)B - (B \cdot \nabla)u) \cdot \psi \, dx \, dt - v_1 \int_0^T \int_{\partial \mathcal{E}} \rho_1(u, B) \cdot \varphi \, dS \, dt \\
- v_2 \int_0^T \int_{\partial \mathcal{E}} \rho_2(u, B) \cdot \psi \, dS \, dt = \int_0^T \int_E (\xi \cdot \varphi + \eta \cdot \psi) \, dx \, dt,
\]

(2.8)
together with the following strong energy inequality for all \( 0 \leq s \leq t \leq T \):

\[
\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})}^2 + \mu\|B(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})}^2 + 2 \int_s^t \int_E \left( v_1|\nabla \times u|^2 + v_2\mu|\nabla \times B|^2 \right) \, dx \, dt \\
\leq \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})}^2 + \mu\|B_0\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})}^2 + 2 \int_s^t \int_E \xi \cdot u \, dx \, dt + 2\mu \int_s^t \int_E \eta \cdot B \, dx \, dt \\
+ 2v_1 \int_s^t \int_{\partial \mathcal{E}} \rho_1(u, B) \cdot u \, dS \, dt + 2v_2\mu \int_s^t \int_{\partial \mathcal{E}} \rho_2(u, B) \cdot B \, dS \, dt.
\]

(2.9)

For deriving the weak form (2.8), it is used that the assumption \( \nabla \cdot u = \nabla \cdot B = 0 \) provides \( \Delta u = -\nabla \times (\nabla \times u) \) and \( \Delta B = -\nabla \times (\nabla \times B) \). Moreover, by writing \( S = \partial \mathcal{E} \) and denoting \( dS \) for the induced surface measure, the divergence theorem is employed in the form

\[
\int_E g \cdot (\nabla \times h) \, dx = \int_E (\nabla \times g) \cdot h \, dx - \int_{\partial \mathcal{E}} (g \times h) \cdot n \, dS,
\]

combined with the vector calculus identities

\[
(g \times h) \cdot n = (h \times n) \cdot g = -(g \times n) \cdot h.
\]

It is essential for any weak formulation that weak solutions which are sufficiently regular verify the corresponding classical problem. Here, on the one hand, if \( (u, B) \) possesses the necessary regularity and satisfies (2.8), then \( (u, B) \) also obeys (2.7) with \( \kappa = 1 \) in the classical sense. On the other hand, because the test function \( \psi \) in (2.8) is divergence-free and tangential, one cannot immediately conclude that such \( (u, B) \) satisfies (2.7) classically with \( \kappa = 0 \). However, assuming enough regularity, one may take the \( L^2 \) inner product of the induction equation in (2.7) with \( \nabla q \) and also with arbitrary \( \psi = \nabla \overline{\psi} \) for any \( \overline{\psi} \in C^\infty_0([0, T) \times \overline{\mathcal{E}}) \), in order to obtain a priori that

\[
(\nabla \cdot \eta = 0 \text{ in } \mathcal{E} \land \eta \cdot n = 0 \text{ on } \partial \mathcal{E}) \iff \kappa\|\nabla q\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})}^2 = 0.
\]

(2.10)

In conclusion, one has to guarantee \( \nabla \cdot \eta = 0 \text{ in } \mathcal{E} \) and \( \eta \cdot n = 0 \text{ on } \partial \mathcal{E} \) in order that (2.8) is a reasonable weak formulation for (2.7) in the case \( \kappa = 0 \).

**Remark 2.3.** The forces \( \xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{E}) \) in (2.7) will later play the role of interior controls, which correspond, due to the requirement

\[
\bigcup_{t \in [0, T]} \text{(supp}(\xi(\cdot, t)) \cup \text{supp}(\eta(\cdot, t))) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{E}} \setminus \overline{\Omega},
\]

to boundary controls for (1.1) or (1.7) in the original domain \( \Omega \).
The existence of weak Leray-Hopf solutions \((\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{B}) \in \mathcal{X}^2_T\) satisfying (2.8) and (2.9) can be obtained by analysis similar to the Navier-Stokes equations, for instance via the Galerkin method explained in [41, Chapter 3]. Regarding the strong energy inequality (2.9), we refer to [29, Section 3] for a strategy that carries over to the present MHD model. Let us briefly mention why the boundary integrals in (2.8) and (2.9) do not cause additional difficulties compared to the references mentioned above. Indeed, assume that \(M \in L^{\infty}(\overline{\mathcal{E}}; \mathbb{R}^{N \times N})\), \(h \in L^2((0, T); W(\mathcal{E}))\) and \(g \in L^2((0, T); H(\mathcal{E}))\). Then, for any \(\eta \in (0, 1)\) and a constant \(C(\eta) = C(\eta, \mathcal{E}, \|M\|_{L^\infty}) > 0\) one has

\[
\left| \int_0^t \int_{\partial \mathcal{E}} [M(x) \mathbf{h}]_{\text{tan}} \cdot \mathbf{g} \, dS \, dr \right| \leq C\|M\|_{L^\infty} \int_0^t \|g(\cdot, r)\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial \mathcal{E})} \|\mathbf{h}(\cdot, r)\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial \mathcal{E})} \, dr \\
\leq C(\eta) \int_0^t \|g(\cdot, r)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})}^2 \, dr + \eta \int_0^t \|\mathbf{h}(\cdot, r)\|_{H^1(\mathcal{E})}^2 \, dr.
\]

(2.11)

Combined with the estimate (2.1), this argument allows to employ the Galerkin approach described in [41, Chapter 3] for the construction of approximate solutions \((\mathbf{u}^k, \mathbf{B}^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}\) to (2.8) bounded in \(L^2((0, T); H^1(\mathcal{E}))\), satisfying a discrete version of (2.9) and converging to a weak Leray-Hopf solution \((\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{B}) \in \mathcal{X}^2_T\) as \(k \to +\infty\). For passing the limit \(k \to +\infty\) in the discrete version of the energy inequality (2.9), one needs to show as \(k \to +\infty\) that

\[
v_1 \int_0^t \int_{\partial \mathcal{E}} \rho_1(\mathbf{u}^k, \mathbf{B}^k) \cdot \mathbf{u}^k \, dS \, dt + v_2 \mu \int_0^t \int_{\partial \mathcal{E}} \rho_2(\mathbf{u}^k, \mathbf{B}^k) \cdot \mathbf{B}^k \, dS \, dt \\
\to v_1 \int_0^t \int_{\partial \mathcal{E}} \rho_1(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{B}) \cdot \mathbf{u} \, dS \, dt + v_2 \mu \int_0^t \int_{\partial \mathcal{E}} \rho_2(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{B}) \cdot \mathbf{B} \, dS \, dt.
\]

(2.12)

Hereto, if \(h^k\) denotes either \(u^k\) or \(B^k\), by trace theorems one has

\[
\|h^k - h\|_{L^2((0, T); L^2(\partial \mathcal{E}))}^2 \leq \|h^k - h\|_{L^2((0, T); L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|h^k - h\|_{L^2((0, T); H^1(\mathcal{E}))} \\
\leq C\|h^k - h\|_{L^2((0, T); L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \to 0, \quad k \to +\infty.
\]

(2.13)

Then, by combining (2.11) and (2.13) one observes

\[
\int_0^t \int_{\partial \mathcal{E}} |[M_1 \mathbf{u}^k + L_1 \mathbf{B}^k]_{\text{tan}} \cdot \mathbf{u}^k - [M_1 \mathbf{u} + L_1 \mathbf{B}]_{\text{tan}} \cdot \mathbf{u}| \, dS \, dr \\
= \int_0^t \int_{\partial \mathcal{E}} |(M_1(\mathbf{u}^k - \mathbf{u}) + L_1(\mathbf{B}^k - \mathbf{B}))_{\text{tan}} \cdot \mathbf{u}^k - [M_1 \mathbf{u} + L_1 \mathbf{B}]_{\text{tan}} \cdot (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^k)| \, dS \, dr \\
\to 0, \quad k \to +\infty
\]

and

\[
\int_0^t \int_{\partial \mathcal{E}} |[M_2 \mathbf{u}^k + L_2 \mathbf{B}^k]_{\text{tan}} \cdot \mathbf{B}^k - [M_2 \mathbf{u} + L_2 \mathbf{B}]_{\text{tan}} \cdot \mathbf{B}| \, dS \, dr \\
= \int_0^t \int_{\partial \mathcal{E}} |(M_2(\mathbf{u}^k - \mathbf{u}) + L_2(\mathbf{B}^k - \mathbf{B}))_{\text{tan}} \cdot \mathbf{B}^k - [M_2 \mathbf{u} + L_2 \mathbf{B}]_{\text{tan}} \cdot (\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{B}^k)| \, dS \, dr \\
\to 0, \quad k \to +\infty.
\]
2.4.1 Change of unknowns

A few exceptions aside, the subsequent analysis can be streamlined significantly by introducing the symmetrized notations

\[ z^\pm := u \pm \sqrt{\mu} B, \quad p^\pm := p \pm \kappa \sqrt{\mu} q, \quad \xi^\pm := \xi \pm \sqrt{\mu} \eta, \quad \lambda^\pm := \frac{\nu_1 \pm \nu_2}{2}, \quad z_0^\pm := u_0 \pm \sqrt{\mu} B_0, \]

as well as

\[ N^\pm(h^+, h^-) := [D(h^\pm)n(x) + W_E h^\pm + M^\pm(x)h^+ + L^\pm h^-]_{\text{tan}} \]

and

\[ \rho^\pm(h^+, h^-) := -2 [M^\pm(x)h^+ + L^\pm(x)h^-]_{\text{tan}}, \]

wherein

\[ M^\pm := \frac{\sqrt{\mu} M_1 \pm \mu M_2 + L_1 \pm \sqrt{\mu} L_2}{2\sqrt{\mu}}, \quad L^\pm := \frac{\sqrt{\mu} M_1 \pm \mu M_2 - L_1 \mp \sqrt{\mu} L_2}{2\sqrt{\mu}}. \]

By utilizing the inner product structure of \( L^2(E) \) one obtains for the energy

\[ E(t) := ||u(\cdot, t)||_{L^2(E)}^2 + \mu||B(\cdot, t)||_{L^2(E)}^2 + 2 \int_{s}^{t} \int_{E} \left( \nu_1 |\nabla \times u|^2 + \nu_2 |\nabla \times B|^2 \right) \, dx \, dt \]

that

\[ E(t) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\Delta \in \{+,-\}} ||z^\Delta(\cdot, t)||_{L^2(E)}^2 + \lambda^+ \sum_{\Delta \in \{+,-\}} \int_{0}^{t} \int_{E} \nabla \times z^\Delta \cdot \nabla \times z^\Delta \, dx \, ds 
+ \lambda^- \sum_{(\Delta, \sigma) \in \{(+,-), (-,+), (-,-), (+,+), (+,0), (0,+)\}} \int_{0}^{t} \int_{E} \nabla \times z^\sigma \cdot \nabla \times z^\Delta \, dx \, ds. \tag{2.14} \]

Therefore, if \((u, B) \in X_t^2\) is a weak Leray-Hopf solution to (2.7), combining (2.14) with (2.9) yields for all \(0 \leq s \leq t \leq T\) the strong energy inequality

\[ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\Delta \in \{+,-\}} ||z^\Delta(\cdot, t)||_{L^2(E)}^2 + \lambda^+ \sum_{\Delta \in \{+,-\}} \int_{s}^{t} \int_{E} \nabla \times z^\Delta \cdot \nabla \times z^\Delta \, dx \, dr 
+ \lambda^- \sum_{(\Delta, \sigma) \in \{(+,-), (-,+), (-,-), (+,+), (+,0), (0,+)\}} \int_{s}^{t} \int_{E} \nabla \times z^\sigma \cdot \nabla \times z^\Delta \, dx \, dr \]

\[ \leq \sum_{\Delta \in \{+,-\}} \left( \frac{1}{2} ||z^\Delta(\cdot, s)||_{L^2(E)}^2 + \int_{s}^{t} \int_{E} \xi^\Delta \cdot z^\Delta \, dx \, dr + \lambda^+ \int_{s}^{t} \int_{\partial E} \rho^\Delta(z^\Delta + z^-) \cdot z^\Delta \, dS \, dr \right) 
+ \lambda^- \sum_{(\Delta, \sigma) \in \{(+,-), (-,+), (-,-), (+,+), (+,0), (0,+)\}} \int_{s}^{t} \int_{\partial E} \rho^\Delta(z^\Delta + z^-) \cdot z^\sigma \, dS \, dr. \tag{2.15} \]
2.5 Preliminary description of the strategy

More clarifications on the strategy for showing Theorems 1.2 and 1.4 seem appropriate before entering the proofs. The interval $[0, T_{\text{ctrl}}]$ will be subdivided into the two parts $[0, T_{\text{reg}}]$ and $(T_{\text{reg}}, T_{\text{ctrl}}]$, while two key stages are distinguished:

Stage 1) Within $[0, T_{\text{reg}}]$ no controls are applied and $0 < T_{\text{reg}} < T_{\text{ctrl}}$ is selected such that a weak Leray-Hopf solution to (2.7) with $\xi = \eta = 0$ belongs to $H^3(E)$ at $t = T_{\text{reg}}$. This allows to fix new initial data in $H^3(E) \cap H(E)$ which can be reached from the original initial data by means of a weak Leray-Hopf solution to (2.7).

Stage 2) During $(T_{\text{reg}}, T_{\text{ctrl}}]$, appropriate forces $\xi, \eta$ are applied in $\overline{E} \setminus \Omega$ such that each weak Leray-Hopf solution to (2.7), starting from a chosen regularized state at $t = T_{\text{reg}}$, will approach the final state in $L^2(E)$ at $t = T$.

During Section 3 below, the forces $\xi$ and $\eta$ will be chosen during the control stage $(T_{\text{reg}}, T_{\text{ctrl}}]$ such that each weak Leray-Hopf solution to (2.7), corresponding to the fixed data at $t = T_{\text{reg}}$, is near to the final state $L^2(E)$ at $t = T_{\text{ctrl}}$. Hereby, the key points are:

- The constructions and estimates in Section 3 are of a priori type.
- The choice for $\xi$ and $\eta$ will only depend on the regularized initial data, the terminal time, the final state and the fixed geometry.

As a consequence of the remarks in Section 2.4, for proving Theorem 1.2 one should guarantee that the force $\eta$ determined in Section 3 is admissible for the induction equation of (2.7) in the sense that

$$\nabla \cdot \eta = 0 \text{ in } E, \quad \eta \cdot n = 0 \text{ on } \partial E.$$

(2.16)

Further explanations are provided later in Section 5, where the proofs for Theorems 1.2 are concluded. As already mentioned, our arguments are inspired by the Navier-Stokes case treated in [16], where additional details for the situation without magnetic field may be found.

3 Approximate controllability between regular states

Let a time $T > 0$, a small constant $\delta > 0$, initial data $u_0, B_0 \in H^3(E) \cap H(E)$ and forces $(\xi, \eta) \in \mathcal{U}_T \times \mathcal{U}_T$ be arbitrary. Then, fix any weak Leray-Hopf solution $(u, B) \in \mathcal{X}_T \times \mathcal{X}_T$ to (2.7) corresponding to the data $(u_0, B_0, \xi, \eta)$. In this section, we show that if $(\xi, \eta)$ are of a certain form, then $(u, B)$ obeys

$$\|u(\cdot, T)\|_{L^2(E)} + \|B(\cdot, T)\|_{L^2(E)} < \delta.$$  

(3.1)

If alternatively $\overline{u}_1, \overline{B}_1 \in C_0^\infty(\overline{E}) \cap H(E)$ are arbitrarily fixed, then Section 3.6 demonstrates how $(\xi, \eta)$ can be found such that

$$\|u(\cdot, T) - \overline{u}_1\|_{L^2(E)} + \|B(\cdot, T) - \overline{B}_1\|_{L^2(E)} < \delta.$$  

(3.2)
3.1 Asymptotic expansions

The original MHD equations are now reformulated as a small-dissipation perturbation of an ideal MHD system in the variables \((z^+, z^-)\). Here, the notations from Section 2.4.1 are employed and for any small \(\epsilon \in (0, 1)\) the following scaling is performed

\[
z^{\pm, \epsilon}(x, t) := \epsilon z^{\pm}(x, \epsilon t), \quad \xi^{\pm, \epsilon}(x, t) := \epsilon^2 \xi^{\pm}(x, \epsilon t), \quad p^{\pm, \epsilon}(x, t) := \epsilon^2 p^{\pm}(x, \epsilon t). \quad (3.3)
\]

As a result, the functions \(z^{\pm, \epsilon}\) are seen to satisfy a weak formulation and strong energy inequality, in the sense induced by (2.7) and (2.15), for the Elsasser system

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial z^{\pm, \epsilon}}{\partial \tau} - \epsilon \Delta (\lambda^{\pm} z^{\pm, \epsilon} + \lambda^{\mp} z^{-, \epsilon}) + (z^{\pm, \epsilon} \cdot \nabla) z^{\pm, \epsilon} + \nabla p^{\pm, \epsilon} &= \xi^{\pm, \epsilon} &\text{in } E_T/\epsilon, \\
\nabla \cdot z^{\pm, \epsilon} &= 0 &\text{in } E_T/\epsilon, \\
\xi^{\pm, \epsilon} \cdot n &= 0 &\text{on } \Sigma_T/\epsilon, \\
\mathcal{N}^{\pm}(z^{\pm, \epsilon}, z^{-, \epsilon}) &= 0 &\text{on } \partial E_T/\epsilon, \\
z^{\pm, \epsilon}(\cdot, 0) &= \epsilon z_0 &\text{in } E.
\end{align*}
\]

(3.4)

In order to achieve the desired estimate (3.1), we shall verify that, for \(\xi^{\pm, \epsilon}\) being of a specific form, all solutions \((z^+, z^-) \in \mathcal{X}_T \times \mathcal{X}_T\) to (3.4) obey

\[
\|z^{\pm, \epsilon}(\cdot, T/\epsilon)\|_{L^2(E)} = O(\epsilon^{9/8}). \quad (3.5)
\]

Then, as \((u, B) \in \mathcal{X}_T \times \mathcal{X}_T\) is a fixed weak Leray-Hopf solution to (2.7), by means of \(u = 2^{-1}(z^+ + z^-)\) and \(B = (2\sqrt{\mu})^{-1}(z^+ - z^-)\), the estimate (3.1) follows from (3.5) after choosing \(\epsilon = \epsilon(\delta) > 0\) sufficiently small.

For the purpose of establishing (3.5), we make an ansatz of the form

\[
\begin{align*}
z^{\pm, \epsilon} &= z^0 + \sqrt{\epsilon} \left[ \|v^\pm\| \right]_\epsilon + \epsilon \|\theta^\pm, \epsilon\| + \epsilon \|w^\pm\|_\epsilon + \epsilon E^{\pm, \epsilon}, \\
\xi^{\pm, \epsilon} &= \xi^0 + \sqrt{\epsilon} \left[ \|\mu^\pm\| \right]_\epsilon + \epsilon \|\Sigma^\pm, \epsilon\|, \\
p^{\pm, \epsilon} &= p^0 + \epsilon \|q^\pm\|_\epsilon + \epsilon \|\theta^\pm, \epsilon\| + \epsilon \|\pi^\pm, \epsilon\|.
\end{align*}
\]

(3.6)

All terms in (3.6) will be defined in the course of Section 3. Briefly speaking, \((z^0, p^0, \xi^0, \sigma^0)\) correspond to a return method trajectory as specified in Lemma 3.2, while the initial data correctors \(z^{\pm, 1}\) are defined via Lemma 3.3 as solutions to (3.12), together with associated pressure terms \(p^{\pm, 1}\) and interior controls \(\xi^{\pm, 1}\). The vector field \(z^0\) fails in general to obey \(\mathcal{N}^+(z^0, z^0) = 0\) along \(\partial E\), which gives rise to weak amplitude boundary layers in the zero dissipation limit \(\epsilon \rightarrow 0\). In the particular case \(\mathcal{N}^+(z^0, z^0) \neq \mathcal{N}^-(z^0, z^0)\), there appears not only a velocity boundary layer but also one for the magnetic field. The profiles in (3.6) which are related to such boundary layers will be described in Section 3.4.

\[\text{**Footnotes:**}

\[1\text{The here considered limit equations correspond in fact to an incompressible Euler system.}

\[2\text{Systems of this form have been derived by Elsasser in [19].}\]
3.2 A return method trajectory

The zero order profiles \((z^0, p^0, \xi^0)\) are selected as a special solution to the controlled incompressible Euler system

\[
\begin{align*}
\partial_t z^0 + (z^0 \cdot \nabla) z^0 + \nabla p^0 &= \xi^0 \quad \text{in } E \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\
\nabla \cdot z^0 &= 0 \quad \text{in } E \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\
\zeta^0 \cdot n &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial E \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\
\zeta^0(\cdot, 0) &= 0 \quad \text{in } E, \\
\zeta^0(\cdot, T) &= 0 \quad \text{in } E.
\end{align*}
\] (3.7)

On the time interval \([0, T]\) these profiles will be fixed below via Lemma 3.2, while for \(t > T\) and all \(x \in E\) we directly define

\(z^0(t, x) := 0, \quad \xi^0(t, x) := 0, \quad p^0(t, x) := 0.\)

Assuming that a smooth vector field \(z^0\) is at hand, let \(Z^0(x, s, t)\) denote for \((x, s, t) \in \overline{E} \times [0, T] \times [0, T]\) the unique flow which solves the ordinary differential equation

\[
\frac{d}{dt} Z^0(x, s, t) = z^0(Z^0(x, s, t), t), \quad Z^0(x, s, s) = x.
\] (3.8)

A good choice for \((z^0, p^0, \xi^0)\) is at the heart of the overall approach and the ansatz (3.6) is based on the idea that \((z^{\pm e}, p^{\pm e}, \xi^{\pm e})\) should be near to the return method profiles \((z^0, p^0, \xi^0)\), which start from \((0, 0, 0)\) at \(t = 0\) and return back to \((0, 0, 0)\) at time \(t = T\).

Let us repeat [16, Lemma 2], which provides return method trajectories for the Euler equations and has been proved in [11, 13, 23, 24]. Hereto, we assume that \(\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n\) is a smoothly bounded domain with a distinguished boundary part \(\Gamma_c \subseteq \partial \mathcal{U}\), which is open and non-trivially intersects with all connected components of \(\partial \mathcal{U}\). Moreover, let \(\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n\) be any smoothly bounded domain such that \(\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{W}\) holds together with \(\Gamma_c \subseteq \mathcal{W}\) and \(\partial \mathcal{U} \setminus \Gamma_c \subseteq \partial \mathcal{W}\).

**Lemma 3.1** ([16, Lemma 2]). There is a solution \((v^0, r^0, \xi^0, \sigma^0)\) \(\in C^\infty(\overline{\mathcal{W}} \times [0, T]; \mathbb{R}^{2n+2})\) to the system

\[
\begin{align*}
\partial_t v^0 + (v^0 \cdot \nabla) v^0 + \nabla r^0 &= \xi^0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{W} \times (0, T), \\
\nabla \cdot v^0 &= \sigma^0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{W} \times (0, T), \\
v^0 \cdot n &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial \mathcal{W} \times (0, T), \\
v^0(\cdot, 0) &= 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{W}
\end{align*}
\] (3.9)

such that the flow \(\mathbf{v}^0\), obtained by replacing \(z^0\) with \(v^0\) and \(Z^0\) with \(\mathbf{v}^0\) in (3.8), satisfies

\[
\forall x \in \overline{\mathcal{W}}, \exists t_x \in (0, T): \mathbf{v}^0(x, 0, t_x) \notin \overline{\mathcal{U}}.
\]

Moreover, all functions \((v^0, r^0, \xi^0, \sigma^0)\) are compactly supported in the time interval \((0, T)\), the control \(\xi^0\) obeys

\[
\text{supp}(\xi^0) \subseteq (\overline{\mathcal{W}} \setminus \overline{\mathcal{U}}) \times (0, T)
\]

and \(v^0\) can be chosen with \(\nabla \cdot v^0 = 0\) in \(\overline{\mathcal{U}} \times [0, T]\) as well as \(\nabla \times v^0 = 0\) in \(\overline{\mathcal{W}} \times [0, T]\).
The next lemma specifies our choice for the zeroth order profiles \((z^0, p^0, \xi^0)\) in (3.6) and is a consequence of Lemma 3.1. Hereto, for \(i \in \{1, \ldots, K(\Omega)\}\) it is reminded that \(\Omega^i\) denotes the (simply-)connected part attached to \(\Omega\) along \(\Gamma_\epsilon^c\) as introduced in the proof for Lemma 2.2.

**Lemma 3.2.** For each \(i \in \{1, \ldots, K(\Omega)\}\), let an open ball \(B^i \subseteq \Omega^i\) with \(\text{dist}(\partial B^i, \partial \Omega^i) > 0\) be arbitrarily fixed. Then, there exist \((z^0, p^0, \xi^0) \in C^\infty(\overline{E} \times [0, T]; \mathbb{R}^{2N+1})\) which are compactly supported in \((0, T)\) with respect to the time variable, satisfy the equation (3.7) and obey

\[
\text{supp}(\xi^0) \subseteq (\overline{E} \setminus \overline{\Omega}) \times (0, T), \quad \text{supp}(\nabla \times z^0) \subseteq \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^{K(\Omega)} B^i \right) \times (0, T).
\]

Furthermore, the flow \(Z^0\), which is defined via (3.8) based on \(v^0\), has the flushing property

\[
\forall x \in \overline{E}, \exists t_x \in (0, T): Z^0(x, 0, t_x) \notin \overline{\Omega}.
\]  

**Proof.** For \(i \in \{1, \ldots, K(\Omega)\}\) denote \(\mathcal{E}^i := \Omega \cup \Omega^i\) and define \(\mathcal{U}^i := \mathcal{E}^i \setminus \overline{B^i}\). Accordingly, there exist smoothly bounded open extensions \(\mathcal{W}^i \subseteq \mathcal{U}\) for \(\mathcal{U}^i\) with \(\mathcal{U}^i \subseteq \mathcal{W}^i\), \(\partial B^i \subseteq \mathcal{W}^i\), \(\partial \mathcal{W}^i \cap (\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B^i) = \partial \mathcal{E}^i\).

Subsequently, as sketched in Figure 3, we define

\[
\mathcal{W} := \bigcup_{i=1}^{K(\Omega)} \mathcal{W}^i, \quad \mathcal{U} := \bigcup_{i=1}^{K(\Omega)} \mathcal{U}^i, \quad B = \bigcup_{i=1}^{K(\Omega)} B^i.
\]

Now, let the functions \((v^0, r^0, \xi^0) \in C^\infty(\overline{\mathcal{W}} \times [0, T]; \mathbb{R}^{2N+2})\) be obtained from Lemma 3.1. As a consequence of \(v^0\) being divergence-free in \(\overline{\mathcal{U}}\), there exists a smooth vector field \(\psi \in C^\infty(\overline{\mathcal{U}} \times [0, T]; \mathbb{R}^N)\) with

\[
v^0 = \nabla \times \psi \text{ in } \overline{\mathcal{U}} \times [0, T].
\]
We extend $\psi$ in an arbitrary but smooth way to a function $\phi \in C^\infty(\overline{E} \times [0,T]; \mathbb{R}^N)$ with $\phi(x,t) = \psi(x,t)$ for all $(x,t) \in \overline{U} \times [0,T]$. The desired vector field $z^0$ is then defined in $\overline{E} \times [0,T]$ via

$$z^0 := \nabla \times \phi.$$ 

Indeed, the property (3.10) is satisfied because $z^0 = v^0$ is valid in $\overline{U} \times [0,T]$ while $v^0$ obeys (3.1). Moreover, the properties $\nabla \cdot z^0 = 0$ in $\overline{E} \times [0,T]$ and $\text{supp}(\nabla \times z^0) \subseteq (\overline{E} \setminus \overline{\Omega}) \times (0,T)$ hold by construction. It remains to select appropriate extensions $\rho^0$ and $\xi^0$ to $E$ for the functions $\rho^0$ and $\xi^0$ such that (3.7) together with $\text{supp}(\xi^0) \subseteq (\overline{E} \setminus \overline{\Omega}) \times (0,T)$ are satisfied. \hfill \Box

3.2.1 A partition of unity related to the return method flow

Here we fix a partition of unity, which shall be subsequently employed for studying the controllability of several linear equations. This partition has been introduced in [16, Section A.1].

By means of Lemma 3.2, namely the regularity of $Z^0$ and (3.10), there exists a small number $b > 0$ such that

$$\forall x \in \overline{E}, \exists t_x \in (0,T): \text{dist}(Z^0(x,0,t_x), \overline{\Omega}) \geq b.$$ 

Hence, there is a smoothly bounded closed set $S \subseteq \overline{E}$ with $S \cap \overline{\Omega} = \emptyset$ and

$$\forall x \in \overline{E}, \exists t_x \in (0,T): Z^0(x,0,t_x) \in S.$$ 

Moreover, for some $L \in \mathbb{N}$ take a finite covering $c_1, \ldots, c_L$ of $S$ which consists of interior- and boundary cubes (squares if $N = 2$) in the following way:

- The boundary cubes (squares) are centered in points of $\partial E \cap S$, fully included inside $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \overline{\Omega}$, and one face (side) lies in the interior of $E$.
- The interior cubes (squares) are centered in points of $S \setminus \partial E$ and belong to $E \setminus \overline{\Omega}$.

Consequently, there exists $a > 0$ and a number $M \in \mathbb{N}$ of balls $B_1, \ldots, B_M$ which cover $\overline{E}$ such that for each $l \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$ one has

$$\exists t_l \in (a,T-a), \exists r_l \in \{1, \ldots, L\}, \forall t \in (t_l-a,t_l+a): Z^0(B_l,0,t) \in c_{r_l}.$$ 

(3.11)

With respect to the balls $B_1, \ldots, B_M$, let $(\mu_l)_{l=1,\ldots,M} \subseteq C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^N)$ be any fixed smooth partition of unity in the sense that

$$\forall l \in \{1, \ldots, M\}: \text{supp}(\mu_l) \subseteq B_l, \quad \forall x \in \overline{E}: \sum_{l=1}^{M} \mu_l(x) = 1.$$ 

In addition, $\beta: \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow [0,1]$ denotes a smooth function which satisfies

$$\beta(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t \in (-\infty,-a), \\ 0 & \text{if } t \in (a,\infty). \end{cases}$$
3.3 Flushing the initial data

Due to the scaling introduced in (3.3), the contributions of $z^\pm_0$ are at $O(\epsilon)$. Moreover, inserting the ansatz (3.6) into (3.4) motivates to seek $z^{\pm,1}$ as solutions to the linear systems

$$
\begin{align*}
\begin{cases}
\partial_t z^{\pm,1} + (z^{\pm,1} \cdot \nabla) z^0 + (z^0 \cdot \nabla) z^{\pm,1} + \nabla p^{\pm,1} = \xi^{\pm,1} + (\lambda^\pm + \lambda^\mp)^2dz^0 & \text{in } \mathcal{E}_T, \\
\nabla \cdot z^{\pm,1} = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{E}_T, \\
z^{\pm,1} \cdot n = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma_T, \\
z^{\pm,1}(\cdot, 0) = z^\pm_0 & \text{in } \mathcal{E}.
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
$$

(3.12)

For $t \geq T$ and all $x \in \mathcal{E}$, we already fix

$$
z^{\pm,1}(t, x) = \xi^{\pm,1}(t, x) = 0, \quad p^{\pm,1}(t, x) = 0.
$$

The goal is to determine the controls $\xi^{\pm,1}$ such that $z^{\pm,1}(\cdot, T) = 0$. This is done by the next lemma which is similar to [16, Lemma 3]. In contrast to the latter reference, here $\nabla \times z^0 \neq 0$ holds somewhere in $\mathcal{E} \setminus \overline{\Omega}$, which requires different considerations. Furthermore, in view of (2.16), we pay attention to maintaining the properties

$$
\begin{align}
\nabla \cdot (\xi^{+,1} - \xi^{-,1}) &= 0 \quad \text{in } \overline{\mathcal{E}} \times [0, T], \\
(\xi^{+,1} - \xi^{-,1}) \cdot n &= 0 \quad \text{along } \partial \mathcal{E} \times [0, T]. 
\end{align}
$$

(3.13)

**Lemma 3.3.** There exist controls $\xi^{\pm,1} \in \mathcal{U}_T$, satisfying (3.13) and $\text{supp}(\xi^{\pm,1}(\cdot, t)) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{E}} \setminus \overline{\Omega}$ for all $t \in (0, T)$, such that the corresponding solution $(z^{\pm,1}, z^{-,1})$ to (3.12) is bounded in $L^\infty((0, T); H^3(\mathcal{E}))$ and obeys $z^{\pm,1}(x, T) = 0$ for all $x \in \mathcal{E}$.

**Proof.** Step 1, preliminaries. By means of Lemma 3.2, it holds $\nabla \cdot z^0 = 0$ in $\overline{\mathcal{E}} \times [0, T]$. Thus, the smooth vector field

$$
(\lambda^+ + \lambda^-)dz^0 = -(\lambda^+ + \lambda^-)(\nabla \times (\nabla \times z^0))
$$

is supported in $\overline{\mathcal{E}} \setminus \overline{\Omega}$ and $dz^0$ can be moved into the control term

$$
f^\pm := \xi^{\pm,1} + (\lambda^\pm + \lambda^\mp)^2dz^0.
$$

Moreover, if $(z^{+,1}, z^{-,1})$ denotes the unique solution to (3.12) with fixed right hand sides $f^\pm \in \mathcal{U}_T$, then $z^{\pm,1}$ are bounded in $L^\infty((0, T); H^3(\mathcal{E}))$. For showing the remaining statements of Lemma 3.3, it is of advantage to employ the notations

$$
E^\pm := z^{+,1} \pm z^{-,1}, \quad F^\pm := f^+ \pm f^-.
$$

(3.14)

**Step 2.** Flushing the initial magnetic field. By means of (3.14), the vector field $E^-$ obeys together with $q^1 := p^{+,1} - p^{-,1}$ the linear system

$$
\begin{align*}
\begin{cases}
\partial_t E^- + (z^0 \cdot \nabla) E^- - (E^- \cdot \nabla) z^0 + \nabla q^1 = F^- = \xi^{+,1} - \xi^{-,1} & \text{in } \mathcal{E}_T, \\
\nabla \cdot E^- = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{E}_T, \\
E^- \cdot n = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma_T, \\
E^-(\cdot, 0) = z^+_0 - z^-_0 & \text{in } \mathcal{E}.
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
$$

(3.15)
By employing the notations and the partition of unity \((\mu_l)_{l \in \{1, \ldots, M\}}\) from Section 3.2.1, we first solve for \(l \in \{1, \ldots, M\}\) the homogeneous problems

\[
\begin{cases}
\partial_t E^-_l + (z^0 \cdot \nabla) E^-_l - (E^-_l \cdot \nabla) z^0 + \nabla q^l_1 = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{E}_T, \\
\nabla \cdot E^-_l = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{E}_T, \\
E^-_l \cdot n = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma_T, \\
E^-_l(\cdot, 0) = \mu_l(z^+_0 - z^-_0) & \text{in } \mathcal{E}.
\end{cases}
\tag{3.16}
\]

Concerning the pressure gradient, after multiplying in (3.16) with \(\nabla q^l_1\) and integrating by parts one finds

\[\|\nabla q^l_1\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})}^2 = \int_{\partial \mathcal{E}} \nabla q^l_1 \cdot \left[(z^0 \times E^-_l) \times n\right] \, dS = 0.\]

Finally, we construct a force \(F^- = \xi^{+1} - \xi^{-1} \in \mathcal{H}_T\) supported in \(\overline{\mathcal{E} \setminus \Omega}\), which satisfies (3.13) and guarantees that the corresponding unique solution \(E^-\) to (3.15) obeys \(E^-(\cdot, T) = 0\).

Indeed, such a couple \((E^-, F^-)\) may explicitly be defined via

\[E^-(x, t) := \sum_{l=1}^{M} \beta(t - t_l) E^-_l(x, t), \quad F^-(x, t) := \sum_{l=1}^{M} \frac{d\beta}{dt}(t - t_l) E^-_l(x, t). \tag{3.17}\]

**Step 3, flushing the initial velocity.** The vector field \(E^+\) obeys together with \(p^l := p^{+1} + p^{-1}\) the linear problem

\[
\begin{cases}
\partial_t E^+ + (z^0 \cdot \nabla) E^+ + (E^+ \cdot \nabla) z^0 + \nabla p^1 = F^+ & \text{in } \mathcal{E}_T, \\
\nabla \cdot E^+ = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{E}_T, \\
E^+ \cdot n = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma_T, \\
E^+(\cdot, 0) = z^+_0 + z^-_0 & \text{in } \mathcal{E}.
\end{cases}
\tag{3.18}
\]

The pressure gradient is eliminated by taking the curl in (3.18), which leads to a transport equation for \(\nabla \times E^+\). The goal is to determine \(F^- \in \mathcal{V}_T\) supported in \(\overline{\mathcal{E} \setminus \Omega}\), such that the corresponding solution \(E^+\) to (3.18) satisfies

\[
\begin{cases}
\nabla \times E^+(\cdot, T) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{E}, \\
\nabla \cdot E^+(\cdot, T) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{E}, \\
E^+(\cdot, T) \cdot n = 0 & \text{on } \partial \mathcal{E}.
\end{cases}
\tag{3.19}
\]

At this point, two situations have to be distinguished:

**S1** The domain \(\Omega\) is simply-connected. In this case, (3.19) implies by means of (2.1) that \(E^+(\cdot, T) = 0\) in \(\mathcal{E}\).

**S2** The domain \(\Omega\) is multiply-connected. In this case, the space \(H(\mathcal{E}) \cap \{\nabla \cdot h = 0\} \text{ in } \mathcal{E}\) is spanned by a finite number of functions \((\nabla q_j)_{j=1, \ldots, L(\Omega)}\), see also [41, Appendix I]. Hence, (3.19) only guarantees for some coefficients \((\alpha_j)_{j=1, \ldots, L(\Omega)} \subseteq \mathbb{R}\) that

\[E^+(\cdot, T) = \sum_{j=1}^{L(\Omega)} \alpha_j \nabla q_j.\]
However, the system (3.18) is of the same form as treated by [16, Lemma 3] in the context of the Navier-Stokes equations. Moreover, whether $z^0$ is obtained from Lemma 3.2 or from Lemma 3.1 only makes a difference inside $E \setminus \Omega$. Therefore, the multiply-connected situation is handled analogously to the Navier-Stokes case.

The only part where the arguments from [16, Lemma 3] are influenced by our modified choice for $z^0$, which has the property $\nabla \times z^0 \neq 0$ somewhere in $E \setminus \Omega$, is the construction of $F^-$ in order to have (3.19). The necessary adjustments are carried out in the next step.

**Step 4. Existence of suitable $F^-$ with (3.19).** After writing (3.18) in vorticity form with the unknown $\omega^+ := \nabla \times E^+$, and by employing the partition of unity $(\mu_l)_{l \in \{1, \ldots, M\}}$ from Section 3.2.1, we make the ansatz

$$\omega^+ = \sum_{i=1}^M \omega^+_i, \quad E^+ = \sum_{i=1}^M E^+_i, \quad F^+ = \sum_{i=1}^M F^+_i,$$

(3.20)

wherein the $\omega^+_i$ solve for each $l \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$ the problem

$$\begin{align*}
\partial_t \omega^+_i + \nabla \times (\omega^+_i \times z^0) &= \nabla \times F^+_i + \nabla \times (\widetilde{E}^+_i \times (\nabla \times z^0)) &\text{in } E_T, \\
\nabla \times \widetilde{E}^+_i &= \omega^+_i, &\text{in } E_T, \\
\nabla \cdot \widetilde{E}^+_i &= 0 &\text{in } E_T, \\
\widetilde{E}^+_i \cdot n &= 0 &\text{on } \Sigma_T, \\
\omega^+_i (\cdot, 0) &= \nabla \times (\eta_l(z^+_0 + z^-_0)) &\text{in } E, \\
\end{align*}$$

(3.21)

whereby for $N = 2$ the transport equation in (3.21) for $\omega^+_i$ is of the form$^4$

$$\partial_t \omega^+_i + (z^0 \cdot \nabla) \omega^+_i = \nabla \times F^+_i - (\nabla \times z^0)(\nabla \times z^0) \quad \text{in } E_T.$$

In contrast to [16, Equations A.6 and A.11], the system (3.21) contains the coupling of a transport equation with a Biot-Savart law. Nevertheless, since $\nabla \times z^0$ is supported inside $E \setminus \Omega$, one can decouple the transport problem from the div-curl system. Hereto, let $\overrightarrow{\omega}^+_i$ solve (3.21) with zero right hand side. For instance, in the case $N = 3$ each $\overrightarrow{\omega}^+_i$ obeys

$$\begin{align*}
\partial_t \overrightarrow{\omega}^+_i + \nabla \times (\overrightarrow{\omega}^+_i \times z^0) &= 0 &\text{in } E_T, \\
\overrightarrow{\omega}^+_i (\cdot, 0) &= \nabla \times (\eta_l(z^+_0 + z^-_0)) &\text{in } E. \\
\end{align*}$$

(3.22)

Subsequently, for each $l \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$ the vector field $\overrightarrow{E}^+_i$ is defined via

$$\begin{align*}
\nabla \times \overrightarrow{E}^+_i &= \beta(t - t_l)\overrightarrow{\omega}^+_i &\text{in } E_T, \\
\nabla \cdot \overrightarrow{E}^+_i &= 0 &\text{in } E_T, \\
\overrightarrow{E}^+_i \cdot n &= 0 &\text{on } \partial E \times (0, T). \\
\end{align*}$$

(3.23)

The system (3.23) is well-posed for $N = 3$, since $\nabla \cdot \overrightarrow{\omega}^+_i (\cdot, 0) = 0$ hold in $\overrightarrow{E}$ and this property is transported by the evolution of (3.22). Subsequently, utilizing the notations and the function $\beta$ from Section 3.2.1, we define

$$\omega^+_i := \beta(t - t_l)\overrightarrow{\omega}^+_i.$$

$^4$If $N = 2$, the functions $\omega^+_i$ are for each $l \in \{1, \ldots, L\}$ scalar valued. However, for a streamlined presentation the vectorial bold notation is used throughout.
As a consequence of this definition and (3.11), the functions $\omega_i^+$ possess for all $l \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$ the properties
\[
\forall x \in \overline{E} : \omega_i^+(x, T) = 0, \quad \forall t \in [0, T] : \text{supp}(\omega_i^+(\cdot, t)) \subseteq c_{r_i}.
\]
Furthermore, $\tilde{E}_i^+$ from (3.23) and $\omega_i^+$ solve (3.21) for each $l \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$, provided that each $F_i^+$ satisfies
\[
\nabla \times F_i^+ = \begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial t}(t - t_l)\omega_i^+ - (\tilde{E}_i^+ \cdot \nabla)(\nabla \times z^0) & \text{if } N = 2, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t}(t - t_l)\omega_i^+ + \nabla \times \left(\tilde{E}_i^+ \times (\nabla \times z^0)\right) & \text{if } N = 3. \end{cases} \tag{3.24}
\]
By appropriately selecting the sets $B^1, \ldots, B^K(\Omega)$ in the statement of Lemma 3.2, one may also assume that $\nabla \times z^0$, and hence the right hand side of (3.24), is supported in mutually disjoint interior cubes $(c_{r_i})_{i \in \{1, \ldots, K(\Omega)\}}$ with $c_{r_i} \subseteq \Omega'$ for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, K(\Omega)\}$.

It remains to construct for each $l \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$ a function $F_i^+ \in \mathcal{U}_T$ supported in $\overline{E} \setminus \Omega$ and obeying (3.24). For $N = 3$, this will be possible since the right hand side in (3.24) is divergence-free. For $N = 2$, one needs the right hand side in (3.24) to be of zero average on each interior cube. This is true because:

- For all $l \in \{1, \ldots, L\}$ with $B_l \subseteq \mathcal{E}$, the average of $\overline{\omega}_i^+$ on $B_l$ vanishes at $t = 0$ and is transported by the dynamics of the equation
  \[
  \partial_t \overline{\omega}_i^+ + (z^0 \cdot \nabla)\overline{\omega}_i^+ = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{E}_T.
  \]

- Take any $r \in \{1, \ldots, L\}$ such that $c_r$ from Section 3.2.1 is an interior cube. If the sets $B^1, \ldots, B^K(\Omega)$ in Lemma 3.2 are chosen small enough, then for all $l \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$ one has the vanishing averages
  \[
  \int_{c_r} (\tilde{E}_i^+ \cdot \nabla)(\nabla \times z^0) \, dx = \int_{c_r} \nabla \times \left[-\tilde{E}_{i,2}^+(\nabla \times z^0), \tilde{E}_{i,1}^+(\nabla \times z^0)\right]^\top dx = 0.
  \]

Now, $F_i^+ \in \mathcal{U}_T$ can be constructed exactly by the formulas provided in [16, Sections A.2 and A.3] and the proof for Lemma 3.3 is concluded by returning via (3.20) to (3.18).

### 3.4 Boundary layers and technical profiles

In this subsection, the boundary layers and related technical profiles from the ansatz (3.6) are described. In addition to $\mathcal{V}$ and $d > 0$ defined in Section 2.1, another tubular region is denoted by
\[
\mathcal{V}_{d^*} := \{x \in \overline{E}, \, \text{dist}(x, \partial \mathcal{E}) < d^* \} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \cap \overline{E},
\]
where $d^* \in (0, d)$ is a small number to be fixed later on with the help of Lemma 3.11. Moreover, for a function $\psi_{d^*} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}; [0, 1])$ which obeys
\[
\psi_{d^*}(s) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } s \leq d^*/2, \\ 0 & \text{for } s \geq 3d^*/2, \end{cases}
\]
a smooth cutoff $\chi_{\partial \mathcal{E}} \in C^\infty(\overline{E}; [0, 1])$ is introduced via
\[
\chi_{\partial \mathcal{E}}(x) := \psi_{d^*}(\varphi_{\mathcal{E}}(x)).
\]
By construction, $\chi_{\partial E} = 1$ holds in the vicinity of $\partial E$. Furthermore, one has the inclusion $\text{supp}(\chi_{\partial E}) \subseteq V_d$ and the gradient of $\chi_{\partial E}$ can be calculated as

$$\nabla \chi_{\partial E}(x) = \left( \frac{d}{ds} \psi_d \right) \left( \varphi_E(x) \right) \nabla \varphi_E(x) = - \left( \frac{d}{ds} \psi_d \right) \left( \varphi_E(x) \right) n(x). \quad (3.25)$$

**Remark 3.4.** The property (3.25) of $\chi_{\partial E}$ is employed later on for stating a condition under which the profiles $\mu^\pm$ in (3.6) can be chosen with $\nabla \cdot \mu^+ = \nabla \cdot \mu^-$.  

### 3.4.1 Boundary layer equations

After plugging (3.6) into (3.4), one may observe a term at order $O(1)$ which is not absorbed by (3.7). However, after using the idea from [29] to write

$$\parallel (z^0 \cdot n) \partial_z v^\pm \parallel_\epsilon = \sqrt{\epsilon} \parallel z^0 \cdot \frac{n}{\varphi_E} z \partial_z v^\pm \parallel_\epsilon,$$

this contribution moves to the order $O(\sqrt{\epsilon})$. In order to also offset the mismatching boundary values $N^\pm(0^0, z^0) \neq 0$, the boundary layer profiles $(v^+, v^-)$ in (3.6) are assumed to solve

$$\partial_t v^\pm - \partial_z (\lambda^+ v^+ + \lambda^- v^-) + \left[ (z^0 \cdot \nabla) v^\pm + (v^\pm \cdot \nabla) z^0 \right]_{\text{tan}} + f_z \partial_z v^\pm = \mu^\pm \quad \text{in } \overline{E} \times \mathbb{R} \times [0, T^*],$$

$$v^\pm(x, t, 0) = g^\pm(x, t), \quad \text{as } z \to +\infty,$$

$$v^\pm(x, 0, z) = 0, \quad \text{as } x \to -\infty.$$

Above, the functions $f$ and $g^\pm$ are for all $(x, t) \in \overline{E} \times \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$f(x, t) := -z^0(x, t) \cdot n(x) \overline{\varphi_E(x)}, \quad g^\pm(x, t) := 2 \chi_{\partial E}(x) N^\pm(z^0, z^0)(x, t), \quad (3.27)$$

and the arguments from [29, Lemma 4], combined with the properties of $z^0$ stated in Lemma 3.2, imply their smoothness.

**Remark 3.5.** It would be sufficient to define $v^\pm$ only for $t \in [0, T^*/\epsilon]$. By stating (3.26) for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, it is emphasized that $v^\pm$ are independent of $\epsilon$.

Now, several properties of the solutions to (3.26) are summarized.

**Lemma 3.6.** Assume that $\mu^\pm : E \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^N$ are smooth and satisfy $\mu^\pm \cdot n = 0$. Then, there exists a unique solution $(v^+, v^-)$ to (3.26) which possesses for all $k, l, r, s \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $T^* > 0$ the regularity

$$\partial_t^s v^\pm \in L^\infty((0, T^*); H^{k,l,r}_E) \cap L^2((0, T^*); H^{k,l,r+1}_E). \quad (3.28)$$

In addition, for each $(x, t, z) \in \overline{E} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ the profiles $v^\pm$ verify the orthogonality relation

$$v^\pm(x, t, z) \cdot n(x) = 0. \quad (3.29)$$

**Proof.** Well-posedness of the linear equations (3.26) is inferred from *a priori* estimates of the type (3.28). Since $\mu^\pm$ are assumed smooth, the regularity stated in (3.28) is obtained from Lemma A.1, while (3.29) corresponds to multiplying the equations satisfied by $v^\pm + v^-$ derived from (3.26) with $n$ and establishing energy estimates similar to [29, Section 5]. \(\square\)
For the sake of having \( \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 \) in \( \mathcal{E} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \), the normal contributions of \((z^0 \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{v}^+ + (\mathbf{v}^+ \cdot \nabla)z^0\), which appear at \( O(\sqrt{\varepsilon}) \), have been omitted in (3.26). This and the commutation formula

\[
\nabla \[ q^\pm \]_\varepsilon = \| \nabla q^\pm \|_\varepsilon - \varepsilon^{-1/2} \| \partial_z q^\pm \|_\varepsilon \mathbf{n}
\]

motivate introducing the profiles \( q^\pm \) in (3.6) as the solutions to

\[
\begin{cases}
\partial_z q^\pm = \left[ (z^0 \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{v}^+ + (\mathbf{v}^+ \cdot \nabla)z^0 \right] \cdot \mathbf{n} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{E} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\
\lim_{z \to \pm \infty} q^\pm(x, t, z) = 0, \quad x \in \mathcal{E}, t \in (0, T).
\end{cases}
\tag{3.30}
\]

Next, the second boundary layer correctors \( \mathbf{w}^\pm \) are defined. The normal parts of \( \mathbf{w}^\pm \) will compensate for the non-vanishing divergence of \( \mathbf{v}^\pm \), while their tangential parts constitute a lifting for \( \mathcal{N}^\pm(\mathbf{v}^+, \mathbf{v}^-)(x, t, 0) \) and later on enable sufficient remainder estimates. Namely,

\[
\mathbf{w}^\pm(x, t, z) := \overline{\mathbf{w}}^\pm(x, t, z) \mathbf{n}(x) - 2e^{-z} \mathcal{N}^\pm(\mathbf{v}^+, \mathbf{v}^-)(x, t, 0), \quad x \in \mathcal{E}, t \in \mathbb{R}_+, z \in \mathbb{R}_+,
\]

\[
\overline{\mathbf{w}}^\pm(x, t, z) := -\int_z^{+\infty} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}^\pm(x, t, s) \, ds,
\]

\[
\mathbf{w}^\pm(x, t, z) := \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}^\pm(x, t, s) \, ds,
\tag{3.31}
\]

noting that \( \mathbf{w}^\pm \) satisfy on \( \text{supp}(\mathbf{v}^\pm(\cdot, t, z)) \cap \text{supp}(\mathbf{n}) \) the relations

\[
\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}^\pm = \mathbf{n} \cdot \partial_z \mathbf{w}^\pm \quad \text{in } \mathcal{E} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+,
\]

\[
\mathcal{N}^\pm(\mathbf{v}^+, \mathbf{v}^-)(x, t, 0) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \partial_z \mathbf{w}^\pm \right]_{\tan} (x, t, 0), \quad x \in \mathcal{E}, t \in (0, T),
\tag{3.32}
\]

\[
\lim_{z \to \pm \infty} \mathbf{w}^\pm(x, t, z) = 0, \quad x \in \mathcal{E}, t \in (0, T).
\]

**Remark 3.7.** The constructions in (3.31) only serve their purpose if \( \mathbf{n} \) is nonzero in the \( x \)-support of \( \mathbf{v}^\pm \), which will be ensured by Lemma 3.11. Otherwise, when determining \( \nabla \cdot \mathbf{r}^\pm_{\varepsilon} \) in Lemma 3.17 below, one could not cancel \( \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}^\pm \) with \( -\mathbf{n} \cdot \partial_z \mathbf{w}^\pm \).

For balancing nonzero normal fluxes generated by \( \mathbf{w}^\pm \), the divergence correctors \( \theta^\pm_{\varepsilon} \) are introduced as solutions to

\[
\begin{cases}
\Delta \theta^\pm_{\varepsilon} = -\| \nabla \cdot \mathbf{w}^\pm \|_\varepsilon \quad \text{in } \mathcal{E} \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\
\partial_n \theta^\pm_{\varepsilon} = -\mathbf{w}^\pm(x, t, 0) \cdot \mathbf{n}, \quad x \in \partial \mathcal{E} \times \mathbb{R}_+.
\end{cases}
\tag{3.33}
\]

These are well-posed Neumann problems, as stated in Lemma 3.16. In order to cancel the terms \( \partial_t \nabla \theta^\pm_{\varepsilon} \) and \((z^0 \cdot \nabla)\nabla \theta^\pm_{\varepsilon} + (\nabla \theta^\pm_{\varepsilon} \cdot \nabla)z^0\) which appear among others when inserting the ansatz (3.6) into (3.4), the correctors \( \theta^\pm_{\varepsilon} \) are chosen as

\[
\theta^\pm_{\varepsilon} := -\partial_t \theta^\pm_{\varepsilon} - z^0 \cdot \nabla \theta^\pm_{\varepsilon}.
\]

In this way, the terms \((\nabla (\theta^\pm_{\varepsilon} - \theta^\pm_{\varepsilon}) \cdot \nabla)z^0\) still enter the remainder estimates because

\[
(z^0 \cdot \nabla)\nabla \theta^\pm_{\varepsilon} + (\nabla \theta^\pm_{\varepsilon} \cdot \nabla)z^0 = (z^0 \cdot \nabla)\nabla \theta^\pm_{\varepsilon} + (\nabla \theta^\pm_{\varepsilon} \cdot \nabla)z^0 + (\nabla (\theta^\pm_{\varepsilon} - \theta^\pm_{\varepsilon}) \cdot \nabla)z^0.
\]

The motivation for at least eliminating the first two terms of this decomposition by using \( \theta \) is that the second part \((\nabla (\theta^\pm_{\varepsilon} - \theta^\pm_{\varepsilon}) \cdot \nabla)z^0\) only contains first order derivatives of \( \theta^\pm_{\varepsilon} \), which can be handled later on by using (3.62).
3.4.2 Boundary layer dissipation via vanishing moment conditions

The boundary layer controls $\mu^\pm$ appearing in (3.26) are now determined. For large times $t \geq T$, we define

$$\mu^\pm(x, t, z) := 0, \quad (x, t, z) \in \overline{E} \times [T, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}_+.$$ 

For $t \in (0, T)$ the controls $\mu^\pm$ will be chosen such that $v^\pm$ obey improved decay rates as $t \to +\infty$. This is part of the well-prepared dissipation method, described in [16] for the Navier-Stokes equations and previously in [34] for a viscous Burgers’ equation. The following lemma is a modification of [16, Lemma 6].

**Lemma 3.8.** Let $s, r \in \mathbb{N}$ and suppose that $f_0^\pm \in H^{r+s}(\mathbb{R})$ satisfy for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \cap [0, r)$ the vanishing moment conditions

$$\int_\mathbb{R} z^k f_0^\pm \, dz = 0. \tag{3.34}$$

Furthermore, assume that $(z, t) \mapsto f^\pm(z, t)$ solve the coupled parabolic system

$$\begin{cases}
\partial_t f^\pm - \partial_{zz}(\lambda^\pm f^+ + \lambda^{-}\lambda^-) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+ , \\
f^\pm(\cdot, 0) = f_0^\pm & \text{in } \mathbb{R} .
\end{cases}$$

Then, for a constant $C = C(s, r)$, which is independent of $t \geq 0$ and the initial data $f_0^\pm$, one has for all $k \in \{0, \ldots, r\}$ the decay rate

$$\|f^\pm(\cdot, t)\|_{H^{r-s}} \leq C \max_{\lambda, \bar{\lambda} \in \{+, -\}} \|f_0^\Lambda\|_{H^{r+s}} \frac{\ln(2 + (\lambda^+ \square \lambda^-) t)}{2 + (\lambda^+ \square \lambda^-) t} \left[\frac{1}{t + \frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{t^2}\right] . \tag{3.35}$$

**Proof.** We define the functions $F^\pm := f^+ \pm f^-$ and introduce the scaled versions $F^+_\Lambda(z, t) := F^\pm(z, (\lambda^+ \pm \lambda^-)^{-1} t)$, which obey for the initial data $F_0^\pm := f_0^+ \pm f_0^-$ the uncoupled heat equations

$$\begin{cases}
\partial_t F^\pm_\Lambda - \partial_{zz} F^\pm_\Lambda = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+ , \\
F^\pm_\Lambda(\cdot, 0) = F_0^\pm & \text{in } \mathbb{R} .
\end{cases} \tag{3.36}$$

By applying [16, Lemma 6] to (3.36), the bound (3.35) follows first for $F^\pm$ and then by the triangle inequality also for $f^\pm$. \qed

The following result is a direct consequence of [16, Lemma 7].

**Lemma 3.9.** For any $r \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist controls $\mu^\pm \in C^\infty(\overline{E} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ ; \mathbb{R}^N)$ satisfying

$$\forall (x, t, z) \in \mathbb{E} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ : \mu^\pm(x, t, z) \cdot n(x) = 0,$$

$$\forall z \in \mathbb{R}_+ : \text{supp}(\mu^\pm(\cdot, \cdot, z)) \subseteq (\overline{E} \setminus \overline{\Omega}) \times (0, T)$$

such that $v^\pm$ obey the decay rate

$$\|v^\pm(\cdot, t, \cdot)\|^2_{H^{r-p,s}_E} \leq C \max_{\lambda, \bar{\lambda} \in \{+, -\}} \left[\frac{\ln(2 + (\lambda^+ \square \lambda^-) t)}{2 + (\lambda^+ \square \lambda^-) t} \right] \left[\frac{1}{t + \frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{t^2}\right] , \tag{3.37}$$

for all $0 \leq k \leq r$ and $s, p, k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, with a $t$-independent constant $C = C(s, r, p, k) > 0$. 
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Proof. Consider the even extensions of \( v^\pm \) to \( \overline{\mathcal{E}} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R} \) defined via
\[
V^\pm(x, t, z) := v^\pm(x, t, |z|) + g^\pm(x, t) e^{-|z|}, \quad (x, t, z) \in \overline{\mathcal{E}} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}.
\] (3.38)
For \( t \geq T \), one has \( z^0(\cdot, t) = 0 \) and \( \mu^\pm(\cdot, t, \cdot) = 0 \) by construction. Thus, \( V^\pm \) are governed by the parabolic equations
\[
\partial_t V^\pm - \partial_{\xi}^2 (\lambda^\pm V^\pm + \lambda^3 V^-) = 0 \quad \text{in} \ \overline{\mathcal{E}} \times [T, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R},
\] (3.39)
where \( x \in \overline{\mathcal{E}} \) is a parameter. Therefore, in view of Lemma 3.8 and (3.38), the decay estimate (3.37) follows if enough vanishing moment conditions of the type (3.34) are satisfied. Hereby, the proof for [16, Lemma 7] can directly and without changes be applied individually to the equations satisfied by \( V^+ + V^- \) and \( V^+ - V^- \). This provides controls \( \mu^+ \pm \mu^- \) such that for each \( k \in \{1, \ldots, r-1\} \) the Fourier transforms \( \hat{V}^\pm(\cdot, \zeta) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} V^\pm(\cdot, \cdot, z) e^{-i\zeta z} \, dz \) obey
\[
\partial^k_{\zeta} \hat{V}^+(\cdot, T, \zeta)|_{\zeta=0} \pm \partial^k_{\zeta} \hat{V}^-(\cdot, T, \zeta)|_{\zeta=0} = 0.
\] (3.40)
Since (3.40) implies sufficient vanishing moment conditions and (3.37) provides uniform bounds for \( v^\pm \) on the time interval \([0, T]\), the proof is complete. \( \square \)

In view of (2.16), we are now concerned with the possibility of obtaining magnetic field boundary layer controls which are not only tangential but also divergence-free.

Lemma 3.10. Let \( r \in \mathbb{N} \) and assume at least one of the following two conditions:

1. \( \mathcal{N}^+(z^0, z^0)(x, t) = \mathcal{N}^-(z^0, z^0)(x, t) \) for all \( (x, t) \in \text{supp}(\chi_{\partial\mathcal{E}}) \times \mathbb{R}_+ \).

2. The boundary operators \( \mathcal{N}^\pm \), the tubular neighborhood \( \mathcal{V} \) and the profile \( z^0 \) are chosen such that for all \( (x, t) \in (\mathcal{V} \cap \overline{\mathcal{E}}) \times \mathbb{R}_+ \) it holds
\[
\nabla \cdot (\mathcal{N}^+(z^0, z^0) - \mathcal{N}^-(z^0, z^0))(x, t) = 0, \quad z^0(x, t) \cdot n(x) = 0.
\] (3.41)
If the number \( d^* \in (0, d) \) from the definition of \( \chi_{\partial\mathcal{E}} \) is sufficiently small, then the controls \( \mu^\pm \) from Lemma 3.9 can be chosen such that
\[
\nabla \cdot (\mu^+ - \mu^-) = 0, \quad (x, t, z) \in \mathcal{E} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+.
\] (3.42)
Proof. If the first condition holds, one may take \( \mu^+ - \mu^- = 0 \). Since \( v^+ - v^- \) solves in this case a well-posed linear problem with zero data, one has \( v^+ - v^- = 0 \) in \( \overline{\mathcal{E}} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \). If only the second condition is valid, then we first apply exactly the arguments from [16, Lemma 7] for determining of which form \( \mu^+ + \mu^- \) must be such that
\[
\partial^k_{\zeta} \hat{V}^+(\cdot, T, \zeta)|_{\zeta=0} \pm \partial^k_{\zeta} \hat{V}^-(\cdot, T, \zeta)|_{\zeta=0} = 0, \quad k \in \{1, \ldots, r-1\}.
\]
Thus, in order to fully obtain \( \mu^+ \) and \( \mu^- \) individually, it remains to identify a suitable choice for the control \( \mu^+ - \mu^- \) acting in the equation satisfied by \( v^+ - v^- \) in a way that
\[
\partial^k_{\zeta} \hat{V}^+(\cdot, T, \zeta)|_{\zeta=0} - \partial^k_{\zeta} \hat{V}^-(\cdot, T, \zeta)|_{\zeta=0} = 0, \quad k \in \{1, \ldots, r-1\}.
\]

\(^3\)Repeating the proof for [16, Lemma 7] is avoided here. However, the arguments presented below for showing Lemma 3.10 also contain a complete version of the ideas from [16, Lemma 7] applied to a different equation.
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We shall achieve this by adapting the proof for [16, Lemma 7], while guaranteeing (3.42).

**Step 1, preliminaries.** In view of (3.38), the vector field $W := V^+ - V^-$ can with $g := g^+ - g^-$ be written as

$$W(x, t, z) = v^+(x, t, |z|) - v^-(x, t, |z|) + g(x, t) e^{-|z|}.$$  

(3.43)

Under the a priori assumption $\mu^+ \cdot n = 0$, and since $g^+ \cdot n = 0$ is true by construction, it follows from (3.29) together with (3.38) that $W \cdot n = 0$. Also, (3.25) and (3.41) imply $\nabla \cdot g = 0$ by means of

$$\nabla \cdot (g^+ - g^-) = 2\chi_{\partial \mathcal{E}} \nabla \cdot \left( \mathcal{N}^+(z^0, z^0) - \mathcal{N}^-(z^0, z^0) \right) - 2 \left[ \left( \frac{d}{ds} \psi_{\mathcal{E}} \right) \circ \varphi_{\mathcal{E}} \right] n \cdot \left( \mathcal{N}^+(z^0, z^0) - \mathcal{N}^-(z^0, z^0) \right)$$

$$= 2\chi_{\partial \mathcal{E}} \nabla \cdot \left( \mathcal{N}^+(z^0, z^0) - \mathcal{N}^-(z^0, z^0) \right) = 0.$$  

(3.44)

Even more, $n = -\nabla\varphi_{\mathcal{E}}$ being a gradient, hence $\nabla \times n = 0$, ensures for two vector fields $h_1$ and $h_2$ on $\mathcal{E}$ that

$$(h_1 \cdot n = 0 \text{ and } h_2 \cdot n = 0) \implies ((h_1 \cdot \nabla) h_2 - (h_2 \cdot \nabla) h_1) \cdot n = 0,$$

which guarantees together with (3.41) that

$$\left[ (z^0 \cdot \nabla)(v^+ - v^-) - ((v^+ - v^-) \cdot \nabla) z^0 \right] \mid_{\tan} = (z^0 \cdot \nabla)(v^+ - v^-) - ((v^+ - v^-) \cdot \nabla) z^0.$$  

Next, while from (3.41) one can only infer that $\hat{f} = 0$ in $(\mathcal{V} \cap \overline{\mathcal{E}}) \times \mathbb{R}_+$, we temporarily guarantee that $\hat{f} = 0$ in all of $\overline{\mathcal{E}} \times \mathbb{R}_+$ by means of the artificially strong assumption\footnote{This assumption will be removed in the last step by choosing $d^* \in (0, d)$ sufficiently small. Despite that, in this article, all cases for which Lemma 3.10 is employed together with (3.41) would also satisfy (3.45). Therefore, the step 3) of the proof for Lemma 3.10 is for the sake of generality but optional.}

$$z^0(x, t) \cdot n(x) = 0 \text{ in } \overline{\mathcal{E}} \times \mathbb{R}_+.$$  

(3.45)

As a result of the foregoing considerations, the function $W$ must satisfy the evolutionary equation

$$\begin{cases}
\partial_t W - \partial_{zz} (\lambda^+ - \lambda^-) W + (z^0 \cdot \nabla) W - (W \cdot \nabla) z^0 = \mathcal{G} e^{-|z|} + \eta & \text{in } \overline{\mathcal{E}} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}, \\
W(\cdot, 0, \cdot) = 0 & \text{in } \overline{\mathcal{E}} \times \mathbb{R},
\end{cases}$$  

(3.46)

with

$$\mathcal{G} := \partial_t g - (\lambda^+ - \lambda^-) g + (z^0 \cdot \nabla) g - (g \cdot \nabla) z^0, \quad \eta := \mu^+ - \mu^-.$$  

Consequently, the Fourier transform

$$\tilde{W}(x, t, \zeta) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} W(x, t, z) e^{-i\zeta z} \, dz$$

obeys the system

$$\begin{cases}
\partial_t \tilde{W} + \zeta^2 (\lambda^+ - \lambda^-) \tilde{W} + (z^0 \cdot \nabla) \tilde{W} - (\tilde{W} \cdot \nabla) z^0 = \frac{2}{1 + \zeta^2} \mathcal{G} + \tilde{\eta} & \text{in } \mathcal{E} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}, \\
\tilde{W}(\cdot, 0, \cdot) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{E} \times \mathbb{R}.
\end{cases}$$  

(3.47)
Therefore, during the time interval $[0, T]$, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ the evolution of the evaluated derivatives

$$Q^k(x, t) := \partial^k_x \tilde{W}(x, t, \xi)|_{\xi=0}$$

is governed by the transport equation

$$
\begin{cases}
\partial_t Q^k + (z^0 \cdot \nabla) Q^k - (Q^k \cdot \nabla) z^0 = P^k & \text{in } \mathcal{E}_T, \\
Q^k(\cdot, 0) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{E},
\end{cases}
$$

(3.48)

which contains the source term

$$P^k := \partial^k_x \left( \tilde{\eta} + \frac{2\mathcal{G}}{1 + \zeta^2} \right) \bigg|_{\xi=0} - k(k-1)(\lambda^+ - \lambda^-)Q^{\text{max}(0,k-2)}.$$  

(3.49)

**Step 2. determining** $\mu^+ - \mu^-$. Let $\tilde{r} \in \mathbb{N}$ denote the integer part of $(r-1)/2$. Since the function $W$ is symmetric about the $z = 0$ axis, it remains to steer for $l \in \{0, \ldots, \tilde{r}\}$ the even moments $Q^{2l}$ to zero. Hereto, we make for $\eta$ the ansatz

$$\eta(x, t, z) = \sum_{i=0}^{\tilde{r}} \eta^i(x, t) \phi_i(z),$$

(3.50)

wherein the even functions $(\phi_j)_{j \in \{0, \ldots, \tilde{r}\}} \subset C^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R})$ are chosen such that their Fourier transforms $\tilde{\phi}_j(\xi) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_R \phi_j(z) e^{-iz\xi} \, dz$ obey for all $l \in \{0, \ldots, \tilde{r}\}$ the relations

$$\partial^2l_{\xi} \tilde{\phi}_j(0) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } j = l, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}.\end{cases}$$

For instance, for any even smooth cutoff $\tilde{\varphi} \in C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R})$ with $\tilde{\varphi} = 1$ in a neighborhood of the origin one may take as $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_\tilde{r}$ the even Fourier transforms of the functions

$$\tilde{\varphi}, \frac{1}{2} \zeta^2 \tilde{\varphi}, \ldots, \frac{1}{(2\tilde{r})!} \zeta^{2\tilde{r}} \tilde{\varphi}.$$

Subsequently, inserting the ansatz (3.50) for each even choice $k \in \{1, \ldots, r-1\}$ into (3.48) provides the cascade system of transport equations

$$
\begin{cases}
\partial_t Q^0 + (z^0 \cdot \nabla) Q^0 - (Q^0 \cdot \nabla) z^0 = \eta^0 + 2\mathcal{G}, \\
\partial_t Q^2 + (z^0 \cdot \nabla) Q^2 - (Q^2 \cdot \nabla) z^0 = \eta^1 - 4\mathcal{G} - 2(\lambda^+ - \lambda^-)Q^0, \\
\vdots \\
\partial_t Q^{2\tilde{r}} + (z^0 \cdot \nabla) Q^{2\tilde{r}} - (Q^{2\tilde{r}} \cdot \nabla) z^0 = \eta^{\tilde{r}} + \frac{2(2\tilde{r})!}{(-1)^{\tilde{r}}} \mathcal{G} - (4\tilde{r}^2 - 2\tilde{r})(\lambda^+ - \lambda^-)Q^{2\tilde{r}-2}
\end{cases}
$$

(3.51)

with zero initial conditions

$$Q^0(\cdot, 0) = Q^2(\cdot, 0) = \cdots = Q^{2\tilde{r}}(\cdot, 0) = 0.$$
Since $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{G} = 0$ holds in $\mathcal{E}_T$ by (3.44) and $\mathbf{G} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0$ is true in $\mathcal{E}_T$ as well, one can observe for all $(x, t) \in \mathcal{E}_T$ that
\[ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{Q}^0(x, t) = 0, \quad \mathbf{Q}^0(x, t) \cdot \mathbf{n}(x) = 0. \]

Furthermore, noting that $-z^0$ satisfies the properties of Lemma 3.2 as well, let $\mathbf{Q}^0$ be the unique solution to
\[
\begin{aligned}
\begin{cases}
\partial_t \mathbf{Q}^0 - (z^0 \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{Q}^0 + (\mathbf{Q}^0 \cdot \nabla) z^0 = \eta^0 & \text{in } \mathcal{E}_T, \\
\mathbf{Q}^0(\cdot, 0) = \mathbf{Q}^0(\cdot, T) & \text{in } \mathcal{E}.
\end{cases}
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.53}
\]
with control $\eta^0 \in C^0(\overline{\mathcal{E}} \times [0, T]; \mathbb{R}^N)$ chosen such that
\[ \mathbf{Q}^0(\cdot, T) = 0, \]
while ensuring the properties
\[ \forall (x, t) \in \mathcal{E}_T : \nabla \cdot \mathbf{Q}^0(x, t) = 0, \quad \forall (x, t) \in \Sigma_T : \mathbf{Q}^0(x, t) \cdot \mathbf{n}(x) = 0 \]
together with
\[ \forall (x, t) \in \mathcal{E}_T : \nabla \cdot \eta^0(x, t) = 0, \quad \forall (x, t) \in \Sigma_T : \eta^0(x, t) \cdot \mathbf{n}(x) = 0. \]

Finding $\eta^0$ is done analogously to controlling (3.15) in the proof for Lemma 3.3, noting that (3.53) and (3.15) are in principle the same equation. As a result, we can define in $\mathcal{E}_T$ the vector field
\[ \mathbf{Q}^0(x, t) := \mathbf{Q}^0(x, t) - \mathbf{Q}^0(x, T - t), \]
which solves the first equation in (3.51) with control $\eta^0$. In particular, one has the desired initial and terminal conditions
\[ \mathbf{Q}^0(\cdot, 0) = 0, \quad \mathbf{Q}^0(\cdot, T) = 0. \]

The next task consists of determining $\eta^1$. Here, one may repeat the same arguments as for finding $\eta^0$, but now with the known source term $-4\mathbf{G} - 2(\lambda^+ - \lambda^-)\mathbf{Q}^0$. Due to the cascade structure of (3.51), in this way all controls $(\eta^j)_{j \in \{1, \ldots, 7\}}$ are obtained as desired. Finally, $\eta = \mu^+ - \mu^-$ is constructed via (3.50) and obeys (3.42).

**Step 3, removing the assumption (3.45).** Without assuming (3.45), the equation (3.46) for $\mathbf{W}$ might not be correct in $(\overline{\mathcal{E}} \setminus \mathcal{V}) \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}$, since (3.26) contains the terms $\int_\mathcal{Z} \partial_2 v^\pm$. However, for small $d^+ \in (0, d)$ it can be shown that the control $\eta$ obtained during the previous step already provides
\[ \mathbf{v} = 0 \text{ in } (\overline{\mathcal{E}} \setminus \mathcal{V}) \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+. \]

for the solution to
\[
\begin{aligned}
\begin{cases}
\partial_t \mathbf{v} - \nu_2 \partial_{zz} \mathbf{v} + \left[(z^0 \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{v} - (\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla) z^0\right]_{\text{tan}} = \eta & \text{in } \overline{\mathcal{E}} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\
\partial_z \mathbf{v}(x, t, 0) = \mathbf{g}(x, t), & x \in \overline{\mathcal{E}}, t \in \mathbb{R}_+, \\
\mathbf{v}(x, t, z) \to 0, \text{ as } z \to +\infty, & x \in \overline{\mathcal{E}}, t \in \mathbb{R}_+, \\
\mathbf{v}(x, 0, z) = 0, & x \in \overline{\mathcal{E}}, z \in \mathbb{R}_+.
\end{cases}
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.55}
\]
Because (3.41) and (3.54) imply together that \( \int z \partial_z \bar{\theta} = 0 \) in \( \overline{E} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \), one knows that \( \bar{\theta} \) in fact satisfies a version of (3.55) where the first line is replaced by

\[
\partial_t \bar{\theta} - v_2 \partial_{z^2} \bar{\theta} + [ (z^0 \cdot \nabla) \bar{\theta} - (\bar{\theta} \cdot \nabla) z^0 ]_{\text{tan}} + \int z \partial_z \bar{\theta} = \eta \quad \text{in} \quad \overline{E} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+,
\]

which exactly corresponds to the equation for \( \theta^+ - \theta^- \) derived from (3.26). As a result, after verifying (3.54) for some \( d^* \in (0, d) \), we know in retrospect that the equation (3.46) for \( W \) is correct even without (3.45).

In order to show (3.54), we utilize the ideas from [16, Section 3.4]. For any \( \varrho \in (0, d) \), consider the tube \( \overline{V}_\varrho \equiv \{ 0 \leq \varphi_\varrho \leq \varrho \} \) and define its maximal distance of influence during the time interval \( [0, T] \) under the flow \( \varrho^0 \) by

\[
J(\varrho) := \max_{x, t \in [0, T]} \varphi_\varrho \left( \varrho^0(x, s, t) \right).
\]

From this definition, one has \( J(\varrho) \geq \varrho \) and \( \varphi_\varrho \circ \varrho^0 \geq 0 \) holds since \( \varrho^0 \) is tangential to \( \partial E \). The reason why \( \bar{\theta} \) might be supported outside of \( \mathcal{V} \) lies in the presence of the control \( \eta \), as otherwise one could apply the arguments from [29, Page 160] to show that the \( x \)-support of \( \bar{\theta} \) is contained in \( \mathcal{V} \). In fact, \( \eta \) is only required when \( \Theta \neq 0 \), as otherwise the zero initial data for \( Q^k \) would be preserved by the transport system (3.48) with zero control \( \hat{\eta} = 0 \).

Furthermore, we observe:

- The controls \( \mu^k \) in (3.51) only need to act at places to where pollution caused by \( \Theta, \eta \) or \( Q^{2l-2} \) for some \( l < k \) is transported via the flow \( \varrho^0 \). The control \( \eta^0 \) in (3.51) may be supported in \( \overline{V}_{J(\varrho)} \) and its action at most travels into \( \overline{V}_{J(\varrho(\varrho^0))} \). Consequently, the influence of \( \eta^0 \) is transported at most to \( \overline{V}_{J(\varrho^0)} \).

- The \( x \)-support of \( \Theta \) is contained in \( \mathcal{V}_{d^*} \) by means of the definition for \( \chi_{\partial \varrho} \).

In view of the representation (3.43), maintaining the \( x \)-support of \( \bar{\theta} \) within \( \mathcal{V} \) can thus be achieved by adjusting the support of \( \chi_{\partial \varrho} \). Indeed, \( J \) is continuous and one has \( J(0) = 0 \) because \( \varrho^0 \) is tangential to \( \partial E \), which together yield the existence of \( d_0^* \in (0, d) \) with \( J(\varrho^0) < d^* \). Then, every choice \( d^* \in (0, d_0^*) \) is suitable. \( \square \)

One can specify \( d^* \in (0, d) \) in the definition of \( \chi_{\partial \varrho} \) such that \( |n| = 1 \) in the whole \( x \)-supports of \( \theta^\pm \). This is summarized by the following lemma, the proof of which can be found in [16, Section 3.4]7.

**Lemma 3.11.** Let \( \mu^\pm \) be obtained by Lemma 3.9 or Lemma 3.10. There exists \( d_0 \in (0, d) \) for which any choice \( d^* \in (0, d_0) \) guarantees that the \( x \)-supports of \( \theta^\pm \) are included in \( \mathcal{V} \).

Now, on the unbounded time interval \( t \geq T \) we employ either Lemma 3.9 or Lemma 3.10 with \( k = 4, p = 5, s = 3 \) and \( r = 6 \) in order to fix \( \mu^\pm \). Moreover, we once and for all select \( d^* \in (0, \min\{d_0, d_0^*\}) \), where \( d_0 \) and \( d_0^* \) are the numbers from Lemma 3.11 and the proof for Lemma 3.10 respectively.

**Remark 3.12.** If \( M_2 = 0 \) in (1.2), as assumed in case a) of Theorem 1.2, then the first condition of Lemma 3.10 is verified. The assumptions of case b) in Theorem 1.2 allow the verification of the second condition in Lemma 3.10, as explained later on in Section 4.

7The step 3) of the proof for Lemma 3.10 contains a version of this argument.
3.4.3 Properties of the boundary layers and technical profiles

We proceed with collecting several properties of the boundary layers and related technical profiles from (3.6). Due to the fast variable scaling for the boundary layer profiles \( v^\pm, w^\pm \) and \( q^\pm \), several estimates will profit from a gain of order \( O(e^{1/4}) \) as stated below.

Lemma 3.13 ([29, Lemma 3]). There exists a constant \( C > 0 \) such that, for all \( \epsilon > 0 \) and functions \( h = h(x, z) \) in \( L_\infty^2(\mathbb{R}_z^+; H_1^1(E)) \) with \( \cup_{z \in \mathbb{R}_z^+} \text{supp}(h(\cdot, z)) \subseteq \mathcal{V} \), it holds

\[
\| h \left( \cdot, \frac{\varphi_E(\cdot)}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \right) \|_{L_2(E)} \leq C \epsilon^{1/2} \| h\|_{L_2^2(\mathbb{R}_z^+; H_1^1(E))}.
\]

We proceed with collecting several properties of the boundary layers and related technical profiles.

Lemma 3.14. The functions \( q^\pm \) from (3.30) satisfy \( \text{supp}(q^\pm(\cdot, \cdot, z)) \subseteq \text{supp}(z^0) \) for all \( z \in \mathbb{R}_z^+ \). In addition, for \( C > 0 \) independent of \( \epsilon > 0 \), one has the bound

\[
\| \| \nabla q^\pm \|_e \|_{L_2^2(E)} \leq \epsilon^{1/2} C \sum_{\alpha \in \{+, -\}} \| q^\alpha \|_{H_{1,0}^2}.
\]

Proof. One utilizes the properties of \( q^\pm \) observed from (3.30), the fast variable scaling from Lemma 3.13 and integration by parts. Indeed, for \( C > 0 \) and small \( \eta \in (0, 1) \), both independent of \( \epsilon > 0 \), one has

\[
\| \| \nabla q^\pm \|_e \|_{L_2^2(E)} \leq \epsilon^{1/2} C \sum_{\alpha \in \{+, -\}} \| q^\alpha \|_{H_{1,0}^2}.
\]

Moreover, for some \( \widetilde{C} > 1 \) depending on \( \eta \) one has

\[
\| \nabla q^\pm \|_{L_2^2(R_z^+, H_1^1(E))} \leq \widetilde{C} (1 - \eta) \| \nabla q^\pm \|_{L_2^2(R_z^+, H_1^1(E))}.
\]

Thus, by utilizing (3.30) and possibly increasing \( \widetilde{C} \) during the estimates, it follows

\[
\| \| \nabla q^\pm \|_e \|_{L_2^2(E)} \leq \epsilon^{1/2} C \widetilde{C} (1 - \eta) \| \nabla q^\pm \|_{L_2^2(R_z^+, H_1^1(E))} \leq \epsilon^{1/2} C \widetilde{C} (1 - \eta) \sum_{\alpha \in \{+, -\}} \| q^\alpha \|_{H_{1,0}^2}.
\]

Lemma 3.15. For all \( k, m, s \in \mathbb{N} \), the profiles \( w^\pm \) satisfy

\[
\| w^\pm \|_{H_{k,m,s}^1} \leq C \sum_{\alpha \in \{+, -\}} \| q^\alpha \|_{H_{1,0}^2}^{1,1,\alpha,1,\max}\{1, s-1\},
\]

\[
\| \partial_z^k w^\pm \|_e \|_{L_2^2(E)} \leq \epsilon^{1/2} C \sum_{\alpha \in \{+, -\}} \| q^\alpha \|_{H_{1,0}^2}^{1,1,1},
\]

\[
\| \partial_t w^\pm \|_e \|_{L_2^2(E)} \leq \epsilon^{1/2} C \sum_{\alpha \in \{+, -\}} \| q^\alpha \|_{H_{1,0}^2}^{1,2,1} + C \| \mu^\pm \|_{H_{1,2}^1}.
\]
Proof. One can show (3.58) by separately estimating the tangential- and normal parts
\[
\mathbf{w}_T^\pm(x, t, z) := -2e^{-z}N^\pm(v^+, v^-)(x, t, 0), \quad \mathbf{w}_N^\pm(x, t, z) := -\mathbf{n}(x) \int_z^{+\infty} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^\pm(x, t, s) \, ds.
\]

For instance, integration by parts yields for arbitrary \(\eta > 0\) that
\[
\left\| \mathbf{w}_N^\pm(\cdot, t, z) \right\|_{H_{E, m, 0}^k}^2 \leq C \sum_{|\beta| \leq m} \int_E \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} \partial_z(z + z^{2k+1}) \left| \int_z^{+\infty} \partial_s^\beta (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^\pm)(x, t, s) \, ds \right|^2 \, dz \, dx
\]
\[
\leq C \sum_{|\beta| \leq m} \int_E \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} \left| \partial_s^\beta (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^\pm)(x, t, z) \right|^2 \, dz \, dx
\]
\[
\leq C(\eta) \sum_{|\beta| \leq m+1} \int_E \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} \left( 1 + z^{2k+2} \right) \left| \partial_s^\beta (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^\pm)(x, t, z) \right|^2 \, dz \, dx
\]
\[
+ \eta \sum_{|\beta| \leq m} \int_E \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} \partial_z(z + z^{2k+1}) \left| \int_z^{+\infty} \partial_s^\beta (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^\pm)(x, t, s) \, ds \right|^2 \, dz \, dx.
\]

Thus, by an argument similar to the proof for Lemma 3.14, one obtains with small \(\eta > 0\) and new constant \(C = C(\eta) > 0\) the bound
\[
\left\| \mathbf{w}_N^\pm(\cdot, t) \right\|_{H_{E, m, 0}^k} \leq C \left\| \mathbf{v}^\pm(\cdot, t, \cdot) \right\|_{H_{E}^{k+1, m+1, 0}}.
\]
The other aspects of (3.58) are along the same lines, noting that estimating \(\mathbf{w}_T^\pm\) costs one regularity level in \(z\) due the application of a trace theorem. The estimate (3.59) follows from a combination of Lemma 3.13, the above idea for showing (3.58) and the identity
\[
\partial_z^2 \mathbf{w}^\pm = (\nabla \cdot \partial_z \mathbf{u}^\pm) \mathbf{n} - 2e^{-z} \left[ N^\pm(v^+, v^-) \right]_{z=0}.
\]
Regarding (3.60), the starting point is to derive from (3.31) the representation
\[
\partial_t \mathbf{w}^\pm = \partial_t \mathbf{w}^\pm - 2e^{-z} \left[ N^\pm(\partial_t v^+, \partial_t v^-) \right]_{z=0},
\]
into which one can subsequently insert the equation (3.26) and proceed as before. \(\square\)

Lemma 3.16. The Neumann problems (3.33) are well-posed and for \(l \in \{0, 1, 2\}\) it holds
\[
\left\| \theta^{\pm, \epsilon}(\cdot, t) \right\|_{H^{0,l}(\mathcal{E})} \leq e^{\frac{1}{16}C} \left\| \mathbf{w}^\pm(\cdot, t, \cdot) \right\|_{H^{0,2+l, 0, l}} + C \sum_{\mathbf{d} \in \{+,-\}} \left\| \mathbf{v}^\mathbf{d}(\cdot, t, \cdot) \right\|_{H^{1,1+l, 0, l}}, \quad (3.61)
\]
\[
\left\| \theta^{\pm, \epsilon}(\cdot, t) \right\|_{H^{l}(\mathcal{E})} \leq e^{\frac{1}{12}C} \sum_{\mathbf{d} \in \{+,-\}} \left\| \mathbf{v}^\mathbf{d}(\cdot, t, \cdot) \right\|_{H^{1,3, l}}, \quad (3.62)
\]
Furthermore, for all \(t \in [0, T/\epsilon]\), one has
\[
\left\| \Delta \nabla \theta^{\pm, \epsilon}(\cdot, t) \right\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})} \leq e^{-\frac{1}{16}C} \sum_{\mathbf{d} \in \{+,-\}} \left\| \mathbf{v}^\mathbf{d}(\cdot, t, \cdot) \right\|_{H^{2,2+l, 0, l}}, \quad (3.63)
\]
Proof. In (3.33), there is no coupling between + and \(-\) superscribed functions. Thus, well-posedness for (3.33) together with (3.61) and (3.63) are established by analysis similar to [16, Equations (4.29), (4.31)–(4.33) and (4.58)]. In particular, by employing (2.4),(2.29) and (3.31), one can verify the necessary compatibility conditions for (3.33) via

\[
\int_{\partial \mathcal{E}} \mathbf{w}^\pm(x, 0, t) \cdot \mathbf{n}(x) \, dS(x) = \int_{\partial \mathcal{E}} \left[\nabla \cdot \mathbf{w}^\pm\right]_\varepsilon(x, t) \cdot \mathbf{n}(x) \, dS(x) = \int_{\mathcal{E}} \left[\nabla \cdot \mathbf{w}^\pm\right]_\varepsilon(x, t) \, dx
\]

It remains to show the estimate (3.62), which is not required for the Navier-Stokes case, thus does not appear in the aforementioned references. By elliptic regularity for weak solutions to the Laplace equation (3.33) and trace estimates, one has

\[
\|\mathbf{w}^\pm, (\cdot, t)\|_{H^1(\mathcal{E})} \leq C \left[\|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{w}^\pm, (\cdot, t, \cdot)\|_{H^1(\mathcal{E})} + C \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{w}^\pm(\cdot, 0)\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial \mathcal{E})}\right]
\]

In conclusion, Lemma 3.13 and (3.58) imply

\[
\|\mathbf{w}^\pm, (\cdot, t)\|_{H^1(\mathcal{E})} \leq \varepsilon^{1/2} C \left(\|\mathbf{w}^\pm\|_{H^{2,0,0}} + \|\mathbf{w}^\pm\|_{H^{0,1,0}}\right) \leq \varepsilon^{1/2} C \sum_{\circ \in \{+, -\}} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{H^{1,3,1}}.
\]

Finally, several properties of the remainder terms \(r^{\pm, \varepsilon}\) in the ansatz (3.6) are stated.

Lemma 3.17. The remainder terms \(r^{\pm, \varepsilon}\) obtained from (3.6) satisfy the conditions

\[
\begin{align*}
r^{\pm, \varepsilon}(\cdot, 0) &= 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{E}, \\
\nabla \cdot r^{\pm, \varepsilon} &= 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{E} \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\
r^{\pm, \varepsilon} \cdot \mathbf{n} &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial \mathcal{E} \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\
N^\pm(r^{\pm, \varepsilon}, r^{-\varepsilon}) &= g^{\pm, \varepsilon} \quad \text{on } \partial \mathcal{E} \times \mathbb{R}_+,
\end{align*}
\]

wherein

\[
g^{\pm, \varepsilon} := -N^\pm(z^{+, 1}, z^{-, 1}) - N^\pm(\nabla \theta^{+, \varepsilon}, \nabla \theta^{-, \varepsilon}) - N^\pm(w^+, w^-)|_{z=0}.
\]

Moreover, for a constant \(C > 0\) independent of \(\varepsilon > 0\), the boundary data \(g^{\pm, \varepsilon}\) can be estimated by

\[
\|g^{\pm, \varepsilon}\|_{L^2((0, T); H^1(\mathcal{E}))}^2 \leq C \sum_{\circ \in \{+, -\}} \left[\|z^{\pm, 1}\|_{L^2((0, T); H^2(\mathcal{E})))}^2 + \varepsilon^{1/2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^2((0, T); H^{3,4,2})}^2\right].
\]

Proof. The assertions in (3.64) are a consequence of the definitions for the functions in the ansatz (3.6) made during Subsections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4. Particularly, in view of Remark 3.7, Lemma 3.11 and the boundary condition in (3.26) one has

\[
2N^\pm(z_0, z_0)|_{z=0}, \quad 2N^\pm(v^+, v^-)|_{z=0} = \left[\partial_z w^\pm\right]_{\text{tan}}|_{z=0}.
\]
3.5 Remainder estimates

In this subsection, it is shown that \( \| z^{±, ε}(t, T_0)t \|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})} = O(ε^{9/8}) \) as \( ε \to 0 \). Hereto, many estimates are similar to the Navier-Stokes case in [16]. Therefore, emphasis is put on the parts that are specific for MHD or not readily available in the here employed form.

3.5.1 Equations satisfied by the remainders

In order to determine evolution equations satisfied by the remainders \( r^{±, ε} \), the definitions of \( q^{±} \) in (3.30) are employed for rewriting (3.26) in the form

\[
\partial_t v^± - \partial _c (\lambda ^± v^± + \lambda ^± v^-) + (z^0 \cdot \nabla ) v^± + (v^± \cdot \nabla ) z^0 + \partial _c v^± - n \partial _c q^± = \mu ^±. \tag{3.66}
\]

Then, (3.6) is inserted into (3.4) while using (2.4), (3.66) and Lemma 3.17. Since the terms \( \| (v^± \cdot n) \partial _c v^± \|_ε \) and \( \| (v^± \cdot n) \partial _c w^± \|_ε \) vanish, the remainders \( r^{±, ε} \) are seen to obey

\[
\begin{align*}
\partial _c r^{±, ε} - ε \Delta (\lambda ^± r^{±, ε} + \lambda ^± r^-) + (z^±, ε \cdot \nabla ) r^{±, ε} + \nabla \pi ^±, ε &=\left[ h^{±, ε} - A^{±, ε} r^{±, ε} \right]_ε \text{ in } Ε_T, \\
\nabla \cdot r^{±, ε} &= 0 \text{ in } Ε_T, \\
r^{±, ε} \cdot n &= 0 \text{ on } Σ_T, \\
N^2 (r^{±, ε}, r^-) &= g^{±, ε} \text{ on } Σ_T, \\
r^{±, ε}(1) &= 0 \text{ in } Ε. 
\end{align*}
\tag{3.67}
\]

with the amplification terms

\[
\begin{align*}
A^{±, ε} r^{±, ε} &:= \left( r^{±, ε} \cdot \nabla \right) \left( z^0 + \sqrt{ε} v^± + ε z_{±, 1} + ε \nabla \theta^{±, ε} + ε w^± \right) - \left( r^{±, ε} \cdot n \right) \left( \partial_c v^± + \sqrt{ε} \partial_c w^± \right),
\end{align*}
\]

and the other remaining terms

\[
\begin{align*}
h^{±, ε} &:= \lambda ^± h^{±, ε, 1} + \lambda ^± h_{-}^{±, ε, 1} + h^{±, ε, 2} - \partial _c w^± - \nabla q^±,
\end{align*}
\]

which contain

\[
\begin{align*}
h^{±, ε, 1} &:= \left( \partial _c w^± + \Delta ϕ _c \partial _c v^± - 2 (n \cdot \nabla ) \partial _c v^± + (\Delta w^± + Δ z_{±, 1} + Δ \nabla \theta^{±, ε} ) \\
&+ \sqrt{ε} (Δ w^± + Δ ϕ _c \partial _c w^± - 2 (n \cdot \nabla ) \partial _c w^± ) \right),
\end{align*}
\]

as well as

\[
\begin{align*}
h^{±, ε, 2} &:= \left[ \sqrt{ε} \left( w^± + z_{±, 1} + \nabla \theta^{±, ε} \right) \cdot \nabla \right] \left[ \sqrt{ε} \left( w^± + z_{±, 1} + \nabla \theta^{±, ε} \right) \cdot \nabla \right] \\
&- \left( z^0 \cdot \nabla \right) w^± - (v^± \cdot \nabla ) z^0 + \left[ (w^± + z_{±, 1} + \nabla \theta^{±, ε} ) \cdot n \right] \partial _c \left( v^± + \sqrt{ε} w^± \right) \\
&- \left( \nabla (\theta^{±, ε} - \theta^{±, ε} ) \cdot \nabla \right) z^0 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{ε}} \left( z^0 \cdot n \right) \partial _c w^±.
\end{align*}
\tag{3.68}
\]

Before deriving energy estimates for \( r^{±, ε} \), several asymptotic properties of the right hand side terms in (3.67) are summarized.

Lemma 3.18. For all \( t ∈ [0, T/ε] \) one has

\[
\| \| A^{±, ε} r^{±, ε} \cdot r^{±, ε} \|_ε \|_{L^1(Ε \times (0,t))} \leq C \left( \| r^{±, ε} \|_{L^2(Ε \times (0,t))} + \| r^- \|_{L^2(Ε \times (0,t))} \right)
\]

with a constant \( C > 0 \) which is independent of \( t, ε \) and \( r^{±, ε} \). Furthermore, in the limit \( ε \to 0 \) one has

\[
\| g^{±, ε} \|_{L^2(0,T/ε; H^1(Ε))} = O(ε^{-1/2}), \quad \| h^{±, ε} \|_{L^1((0,T/ε); L^2(Ε))} = O(ε^{1/4}).
\tag{3.70}
\]
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Proof. Throughout, it will be used that $\mu^\pm$ have been fixed in Section 3.4.2 either by Lemma 3.9 (or Lemma 3.10) applied with $k = 4$, $p = 5$, $s = 3$ and $r = 6$. This provides bounds for $v^\pm$ in $L^1((0, T); H^{k,p,\pm}_E)$ which are uniform in $\varepsilon$, since for $\lambda > 0$ and $a \in (1, +\infty)$ one has the convergence of the integral

$$\int_0^\infty \left( \frac{\ln(2 + \lambda s)}{2 + \lambda s} \right)^a \mathrm{d}s \leq C = C(\lambda, a) < +\infty.$$  

In order to show (3.69), let $A^{\pm,\varepsilon}$ denote the functions

$$A^{\pm,\varepsilon} = \nabla \left( \varepsilon^0 + \sqrt{\varepsilon} v^\pm + \varepsilon \varepsilon^\pm,1 + \varepsilon \nabla \theta^\pm,\varepsilon + \varepsilon w^\pm \right) - (\partial_x v^\pm + \sqrt{\varepsilon} \partial_x w^\pm) n^\top.$$  

From Lemma 3.3 one knows that $z^{\pm,1}$ are bounded in $L^\infty((0, T); H^3(E))$ as long as the initial data satisfy $z^0_0 \in H^3(E) \cap H(E)$. Hence, combining Sobolev embeddings with Lemma 3.16 allows to infer

$$\left\| A^{\pm,\varepsilon} \right\|_{L^\infty(E \times (0, T/\varepsilon))} \leq C \sum_{\mathcal{D} \in \{+,-\}} \left( \left\| z^0 \right\|_{L^\infty((0, T); H^4(E))} + \varepsilon^{3/4} \left\| z^{\pm,1} \right\|_{L^\infty((0, T); H^3(E))} + \left\| v^0 \right\|_{L^\infty((0, T); H^{2,5,3}_E)} \right).$$  

Moreover, by Lemma 3.9 or Lemma 3.10 one finds a constant $C > 0$ independent of $\varepsilon$ with

$$\left\| v^\pm \right\|_{L^\infty((0, T); H^{2,5,3}_E)} \leq C,$$

which eventually implies (3.69).

The bounds for $g^{\pm,\varepsilon}$ in (3.70) follow from (3.65) and Lemma 3.9 (or Lemma 3.9) such that it remains to establish the estimates for $h^{\pm,\varepsilon}$ in (3.70). We begin with the terms

$$\left( \nabla (\theta^\pm,\varepsilon - \theta^\pm,\varepsilon) \cdot \nabla \right) z^0,$$

which vanish for $t \geq T$ due to the properties of $z^0$. Hence, (3.62) implies

$$\left\| (\nabla (\theta^\pm,\varepsilon - \theta^\pm,\varepsilon) \cdot \nabla \right) z^0 \right\|_{L^1((0, T/\varepsilon); L^2(E))} \leq e^3 C \sum_{\mathcal{D} \in \{+,-\}} \left\| v^0 \right\|_{L^1((0, T); H^{1,3,1}_E)}$$

and an invocation of Lemma 3.9 or Lemma 3.10 yields

$$\left\| (\nabla (\theta^\pm,\varepsilon - \theta^\pm,\varepsilon) \cdot \nabla \right) z^0 \right\|_{L^1((0, T/\varepsilon); L^2(E))} = O(e^{\varepsilon^\frac{3}{4}}).$$

In order to treat the term which appears with a factor $\varepsilon^{-1/2}$ in (3.68), we resort to a trick similar to [29, Equation (69)]. Indeed, the definitions for $w^\pm$ in (3.31) provide

$$\left\| \frac{(z^0 \cdot n)}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \partial_x w^\pm \right\|_{L^1((0, T/\varepsilon); L^2(E))} = - \left\| \varepsilon \left( \nabla \cdot v^\pm \right) n + 2 e^{-\varepsilon} (N^\pm(v^+, v^-)) \right\|_{L^1((0, T/\varepsilon); L^2(E))}$$

which due to $\varepsilon$ being bounded leads to

$$\left\| \frac{(z^0 \cdot n)}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \partial_x w^\pm \right\|_{L^1((0, T/\varepsilon); L^2(E))} \leq C \left\| \varepsilon \left( \nabla \cdot v^\pm \right) n + 2 e^{-\varepsilon} (N^\pm(v^+, v^-)) \right\|_{L^1((0, T/\varepsilon); L^2(E))} \leq A_1 + 2 A_2,$$
Proof. Let us sketch the details. First, multiplying the equations satisfied by \( \rho \) for Lemma 3.13 can be applied to \( A_1 \) and, by similar analysis for \( A_2 \), there exists a constant \( C > 0 \) independent of \( \epsilon \) such that

\[
A_1 + A_2 \leq \epsilon^p C \sum_{\Box \in \{\pm\}} \|\vec{v}^\Box\|_{L^1((0,T/\epsilon);H^1_\sigma(\mathcal{E}))}.
\]

As a result, Lemma 3.9 (respectively Lemma 3.10) allows to infer

\[
\|\left(\frac{\rho^0 \cdot \vec{n}}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}\right) \partial_t \vec{w}^\pm \|_{L^1((0,T/\epsilon);L^2(\mathcal{E}))} = O(\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}).
\]

The remaining terms contained in \( h^{\pm,\epsilon} \) and \( h^{-,\epsilon} \) behave as in the Navier-Stokes case treated in [16, Section 4.4]. Carrying out these details particularly involves the estimates (3.56), (3.59), (3.60) and (3.63).

3.5.2 Energy estimates

In this subsection, the bound (3.5) is obtained as a consequence of the next proposition.

Proposition 3.19. The functions \( r^{\pm,\epsilon} \) determined from the ansatz (3.6) by means of Subsections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 satisfy

\[
\|r^{\pm,\epsilon}\|_{L^\infty((0,T/\epsilon);L^2(\mathcal{E}))} + \epsilon \|r^{\pm,\epsilon}\|_{L^2((0,T/\epsilon);H^1(\mathcal{E}))} = O(\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}).
\]  

Proof. The idea is to multiply the first line in (3.67) by \( r^{\pm,\epsilon} \) respectively and to integrate over \( \mathcal{E} \times (0,t) \) for \( t \in (0, T/\epsilon) \), which however is not justified. Indeed, the regularity provided by \( r^{\pm,\epsilon} \in \mathcal{X}_{T/\epsilon} \) does not guarantee the convergence of the integrals

\[
\int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{E}} \rho^{\pm,\epsilon} (\vec{x}, s) \cdot \nabla r^{\pm,\epsilon} (\vec{x}, s) \cdot r^{\pm,\epsilon} (\vec{x}, s) \, d\vec{x} \, ds.
\]

Since via (3.6) one has \( r^{\pm,\epsilon} = \rho^{\pm,\epsilon} + s^{\pm,\epsilon} \) with \( s^{\pm,\epsilon} \) being bounded in \( L^\infty((0,T/\epsilon);H^3(\mathcal{E})) \), this issue can be overcome as explained in [29, Page 167-168]. For the sake of completeness, let us sketch the details. First, multiplying the equations satisfied by \( s^{\pm,\epsilon} \) with \( z^{\pm,\epsilon} + s^{\pm,\epsilon} \) leads to

\[
\sum_{\Box \in \{\pm\}} \left( \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{E}} \partial_t s^{\square,\epsilon} \cdot (z^{\square,\epsilon} + s^{\square,\epsilon}) \, d\vec{x} \, dr + \epsilon \lambda^+ \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{E}} \nabla \times s^{\square,\epsilon} \cdot \nabla \times (z^{\square,\epsilon} + s^{\square,\epsilon}) \, d\vec{x} \, dr \right)
\]

\[
+ \epsilon \lambda^- \sum_{\Delta, \Box \in \{\pm\}, \{\pm\}} \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{E}} \nabla \times s^{\square,\epsilon} \cdot \nabla \times (z^{\square,\epsilon} + s^{\square,\epsilon}) \, d\vec{x} \, dr
\]

\[
+ \sum_{\Delta, \Box \in \{\pm\}, \{\pm\}} \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{E}} (z^{\square,\epsilon} \cdot \nabla)s^{\square,\epsilon} \cdot z^{\square,\epsilon} \, d\vec{x} \, dr
\]
Moreover, because the vector fields $r^{\pm,e}$ are tangential to $\partial E$, the representation (1.3) implies along $\partial E$ for all $\sq, \triangle \in \{+, -\}$ the relations
\[
(r^{\sq,e} \times (\nabla \times r^{\triangle,e})) \cdot n = [(\nabla \times r^{\triangle,e}) \times n] \cdot r^{\sq,e}
\]
\[
= \left[ 2N^\triangle(r^{+,e}, r^{-e}) - 2\left( M^\triangle r^{+,e} + L^\triangle r^{-e} \right)_{\text{tan}} \right] \cdot r^{\sq,e}
\]
\[
= (2g^{\triangle,e} - 2\left( M^\triangle r^{+,e} + L^\triangle r^{-e} \right)) \cdot r^{\sq,e} = J^{\sq,e}.
\]
In total, by adding (3.72)–(3.74), while considering for \((\Delta, \circ) \in \{(+, -), (-, +)\}\) the identity
\[
\int_0^t \int_{\partial E} (\mathbf{z} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{z} \, dx 
= - \int_0^t \int_{\partial E} (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{z}) \mathbf{z} \, dx 
\]
each arrives at the inequality
\[
\frac{1}{2} \sum_{(\Delta, \circ) \in \{(+, -), (-, +)\}} \| r^{\Delta, \circ} (\cdot, t) \|_{L^2(\partial E)}^2 
+ \varepsilon \lambda^+ \sum_{(\Delta, \circ) \in \{(+, -), (-, +)\}} \left( \int_0^t \int_{\partial E} \nabla \cdot r^{\Delta, \circ} \cdot \nabla \cdot r^{\Delta, \circ} \, dx + \varepsilon \lambda^- \sum_{(\Delta, \circ) \in \{(+, -), (-, +)\}} \left( \int_0^t \int_{\partial E} \mathbf{J}^{\Delta, \circ} \cdot dS \right) \right.
\]

Since \(\nabla \cdot r^{\pm, \circ} = 0\) in \(E\) and \(r^{\pm, \circ} \cdot n = 0\) on \(\partial E\), the bound (2.1) provides
\[
\| r^{\pm, \circ} \|_{H^1(\partial E)} \leq C \left( \| \nabla \times r^{\pm, \circ} \|_{L^2(\partial E)} + \| r^{\pm, \circ} \|_{L^2(\partial E)} \right),
\]
which in turn yields
\[
\frac{1}{2} \sum_{(\Delta, \circ) \in \{(+, -), (-, +)\}} \| r^{\Delta, \circ} (\cdot, t) \|_{L^2(E)}^2 
+ \varepsilon \lambda^+ \sum_{(\Delta, \circ) \in \{(+, -), (-, +)\}} \int_0^t \left( \frac{(\lambda^+ \Delta \lambda^-)}{2} \int_0^t \left( \int_{\partial E} \mathbf{J}^{\Delta, \circ} \cdot dS \right) \right. 
\]

The boundary integrals over \(\mathbf{J}^{\Delta, \circ}\) are treated by applying for \(h \in L^2(\partial E)\) and \(f \in H^1(\partial E)\) the duality estimate
\[
\left| \int_{\partial E} h \cdot f \, dS \right| \leq C \| h \|_{H^\frac{1}{2}(\partial E)} \| f \|_{H^\frac{1}{2}(\partial E)}
\]
together with
\[
\| h \|_{H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\partial E)} \| f \|_{H^\frac{1}{2}(\partial E)} \leq C \| h \|_{L^2(\partial E)} \| f \|_{H^1(\partial E)},
\]
which results from trace inequalities. Thus, for \( t \in [0, T/\epsilon] \) and arbitrary \( \eta > 0 \) one has
\[
\left| \int_{\partial \mathcal{E}} J^{\Delta, \epsilon}(x, t) \, dS(x) \right| \leq C \| \mathbf{g}^{\Delta, \epsilon}(\cdot, t) \|_{H^1(\mathcal{E})} \| \mathbf{r}^{\Delta, \epsilon}(\cdot, t) \|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})}
\]
\[
+ C \left( \| \mathbf{r}^{+\epsilon}(\cdot, t) \|_{H^1(\mathcal{E})} + \| \mathbf{r}^{-\epsilon}(\cdot, t) \|_{H^1(\mathcal{E})} \right) \| \mathbf{r}^{\Delta, \epsilon}(\cdot, t) \|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})}
\]
\[
\leq \eta \left( \| \mathbf{g}^{\Delta, \epsilon}(\cdot, t) \|^2_{H^1(\mathcal{E})} + \| \mathbf{r}^{+\epsilon}(\cdot, t) \|^2_{H^1(\mathcal{E})} + \| \mathbf{r}^{-\epsilon}(\cdot, t) \|^2_{H^1(\mathcal{E})} \right)
\]
\[
+ C(\eta) \left( \| \mathbf{r}^{+\epsilon}(\cdot, t) \|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{E})} + \| \mathbf{r}^{-\epsilon}(\cdot, t) \|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{E})} \right).
\]

Consequently, by selecting \( \eta > 0 \) small, employing Lemma 3.18 and applying Grönwall’s inequality in (3.75), one arrives at (3.71). \( \square \)

**Corollary 3.20.** The functions \( z^{\pm, \epsilon} \) fixed in the beginning of Section 3 satisfy
\[
\| z^{\pm, \epsilon}(\cdot, T/\epsilon) \|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})} = O(\epsilon^{\frac{9}{2}}).
\]

**Proof.** We again use that \( \mu^* \) has been fixed via Lemma 3.9 (or Lemma 3.10) with \( r = 6 \) and at most \( k = 4 \), while noting that \( \lim_{a \to +\infty} a^{-1/2} \log(a) = 0 \). Therefore, by combining (3.71) with (3.6), Lemma 3.13 and Lemma 3.15, one arrives at
\[
\| z^{\pm, \epsilon}(\cdot, T/\epsilon) \|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})} \leq \sqrt{\epsilon} \| \mathbf{v}^{\pm, \epsilon} \|_{E}(\cdot, T/\epsilon) \|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})} + \epsilon \| \mathbf{w}^{\pm, \epsilon} \|_{E}(\cdot, T/\epsilon) \|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})}
\]
\[
+ \epsilon \| \mathbf{r}^{\pm, \epsilon}(\cdot, T/\epsilon) \|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})}
\]
\[
= O(\epsilon^{\frac{9}{2}}).
\]

\( \square \)

### 3.6 Controlling towards arbitrary smooth states

Let \( \mathbf{z}_1^* \in C_0^\infty(\overline{\mathcal{E}}) \cap \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{E}) \) be arbitrarily fixed. The foregoing arguments for reaching towards the zero state can be modified in order to approach \( \mathbf{z}_1^* \) approximately. The idea is similar to that for controlling towards smooth trajectories as described in [16, Section 5] for the Navier-Stokes equations. First, the ansatz (3.6) is modified in that for \( z^{\pm, \epsilon} \) on the time interval \([0, T]\) one chooses an expansion of the form
\[
z^{\pm, \epsilon} = z^0 + \sqrt{\epsilon} \| \mathbf{v} \|_{E} + \epsilon \mathbf{z}^{+1} + \epsilon \nabla \theta^{\pm, \epsilon} + \epsilon \| \mathbf{w} \|_{E}, \quad (3.76)
\]
while on \([T, T/\epsilon]\) it is assumed that
\[
z^{\pm, \epsilon} = \sqrt{\epsilon} \| \mathbf{v} \|_{E} + \epsilon \mathbf{z}^{+1} + \epsilon \nabla \theta^{\pm, \epsilon} + \epsilon \| \mathbf{w} \|_{E} + \epsilon r^{\pm, \epsilon}. \quad (3.77)
\]

In (3.76), the profiles \( \mathbf{z}^{+1} \) are bounded in \( L^\infty((0, T); \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{E})) \) and resolve together with controls \( \mathbf{z}^{\pm, \epsilon} \in \mathcal{U}_T \), which obey for all \( t \in (0, T) \) the conditions
\[
\text{supp}(\mathbf{z}^{\pm, \epsilon}(\cdot, t)) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{E}} \setminus \overline{\Omega},
\]
the linear controllability problem
\[
\begin{align*}
\partial_t \mathbf{z}^{+1} + (\mathbf{z}^{+1} \cdot \nabla)z^0 + (z^0 \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{z}^{+1} + \nabla p^{\pm, 1} = \mathbf{z}^{\pm, 1} + (\lambda^{\pm} + \lambda^0)\Delta z^0 & \quad \text{in } \mathcal{E}_T, \\
\nabla \cdot \mathbf{z}^{+1} = 0 & \quad \text{in } \mathcal{E}_T, \\
\mathbf{z}^{+1} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 & \quad \text{on } \Sigma_T, \\
z^{\pm, 1}(\cdot, 0) = z^0 & \quad \text{in } \mathcal{E}, \\
z^{\pm, 1}(\cdot, T) = \mathbf{z}^{+1}_1 & \quad \text{in } \mathcal{E}.
\end{align*}
\]
Such controls $\xi^{\pm,1}$ can be constructed as in Lemma 3.3, see also step 2) in the proof of Lemma 3.10. In particular, all bounds for $\tau^{\pm,1}$ and $\xi^{\pm,1}$ are independent of $\epsilon > 0$, since this parameter does not appear in (3.78).

Because $\xi^{\pm}$ are smooth and independent of time, by analysis similar to Section 3.5 one can infer the remainder estimates

$$\|r^{\pm,\epsilon}(\cdot, T/\epsilon)\| = O(\epsilon^{\frac{1}{4}}).$$

As a result, the rescaled functions $z^{\pm,\epsilon}(x, t) := \epsilon^{-1} z^{\pm,\epsilon}(x, \epsilon^{-1} t)$ satisfy

$$\|z^{\pm,\epsilon}(x, T) - \xi^{\epsilon}(\cdot, T)\|_{L^2(E)} = O(\epsilon^{\frac{1}{4}}).$$

4 Domains which are part of an annulus

![Figure 4](image_url)

(a) An annulus divided into a physical sector $\Omega$ and a control sector $E \setminus \Omega$. The arrow indicates the behavior of $Z^0$.

(b) An example where the curve $\Gamma_A$ does not touch $\partial D_{r_1}$ such that the uncontrolled boundary belongs to $\partial D_{r_2}$.

Figure 4: Two examples for $\Omega$ and $\Gamma_c$ in the case b) of Theorem 1.2. The left picture also shows the domain extension $E$. The controlled boundaries are indicated by a line with additional dashes.

This section provides the details for the case b) of Theorem 1.2. Namely, we consider domains which allow verifying (3.41) with the choice $M_2 = \rho I$ in (1.2) for all $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$. As in Theorem 1.2, denote for $r_2 > r_1 > 0$ the annulus $A := A_{r_2}^{r_1} = D_{r_2} \setminus D_{r_1}$. Moreover, let a Lipschitz curve $\Gamma_A \subseteq A_{r_1}^{r_2}$ be parametrized by a map $c_A$ with

$$c_A : [0, 1] \longrightarrow \overline{A_{r_1}^{r_2}}, \quad c_A(s_1) = c_A(s_2) \iff s_1 = s_2,$$

while assuming that there are two Lipschitz domains $O_1, O_2 \subseteq A_{r_1}^{r_2}$ satisfying

$$A_{r_1}^{r_2} \setminus \Gamma_A = O_1 \cup O_2, \quad O_1 \cap O_2 = \emptyset, \quad D_{r_1} \in (D_{r_2} \setminus \overline{O_1}).$$

The physical domain $\Omega$ and the controlled boundary $\Gamma_c$ are then chosen as

$$\Omega := O_1, \quad \Gamma_c := \partial O_1 \setminus \partial A_{r_1}^{r_2}.$$

This is an example where the physical domain $\Omega$ is not required to be smooth along the controlled boundary. As sketched in Figure 4a, a smooth extension for $\Omega$ in the sense of
Section 2.1 is given by $\mathcal{E} := A_{t_1}^{T_2}$. Here, $\mathcal{E}$ is multiply-connected while $\Omega$ is simply-connected. Such a situation has not explicitly been mentioned in Section 2.1 explicitly, but by choosing a suitable smooth cut $\Sigma_1$ the extension $\mathcal{E}$ has all the required properties.

For the purpose of building a return method trajectory, we define

$$\tilde{\varphi} : \overline{\mathcal{E}} \to \mathbb{R}_+, \quad x \mapsto \tilde{\varphi}(x) := \log |x|$$

and choose for $M > 0$ a smooth function $\gamma_M \in C_0^\infty((0, 1); \mathbb{R}_+)$ satisfying $\gamma_M(t) \geq M$ for all $t \in (T/8, 7T/8)$. Then, in $\overline{\mathcal{E}} \times [0, T]$ we denote the vector field

$$y^*(x, t) := \gamma_M(t) \begin{bmatrix} -\partial_2 \tilde{\varphi}(x) \\ \partial_1 \tilde{\varphi}(x) \end{bmatrix},$$

which possesses in all of $\overline{\mathcal{E}} \times [0, T]$ the properties

$$\nabla \cdot y^* = 0, \quad \partial_1 y_1^* - \partial_2 y_2^* = 0, \quad y^* \cdot n = 0.$$

Moreover, if $\mathcal{V}$ is tubular neighborhood as introduced in Section 2.1 and $n$ the extended normal vector as explained there, then in all of $\mathcal{V} \times [0, T]$ it holds

$$y^* \cdot n = 0.$$

Now, by selecting $M > 0$ sufficiently large, one obtains profiles $(z^0, p^0, \xi^0)$ in the sense of Lemma 3.2 by means of

$$z^0 := y^*, \quad \text{in } \overline{\mathcal{E}} \times [0, T],$$

$$p^0 := -\partial_2 y^* - \frac{1}{2}|y^*|^2 \text{ in } \overline{\mathcal{E}} \times [0, T],$$

$$\xi^0 := 0 \quad \text{ in } \overline{\mathcal{E}} \times [0, T].$$

Finally, fix $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$ and set $M_2 = \rho I$ together with general friction operators $M_1, L_1, L_2 \in C^\infty(\Gamma \setminus \Gamma_c; \mathbb{R}^{N \times N})$ in (1.2). This construction ensures that the conditions in (3.41) are met. Thus, by proceeding as described in Section 5 below, one has small-time global approximate controllability results for (1.1) with $M_2 = \rho I$ and $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$.

## 5 Conclusion of the main results

In this section, Theorems 1.2 and 1.4 are concluded based on the elaborations of Sections 3 and 4. In order to relax the assumption $u_0, B_0 \in H^3(\mathcal{E}) \cap H(\mathcal{E})$, which is required during Section 3, the following regularization effect is employed. For completeness a proof is sketched in Appendix B.

**Lemma 5.1.** Let $T^* > 0$ and $u_0, B_0 \in H(\mathcal{E})$ be fixed. Then, there exists $C_{T^*} > 0$ such that every weak Leray-Hopf solution $(u, B) \in \mathcal{Z}^2_T$, to (2.7) obeys for a time $t_{\text{reg}} \in [0, T^*)$ the estimate

$$\|u(\cdot, t_{\text{reg}})\|_{H^1(\mathcal{E})} + \|B(\cdot, t_{\text{reg}})\|_{H^1(\mathcal{E})} \leq C_{T^*} \left( \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})} + \|B_0\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})} \right).$$

Let $T_{\text{ctrl}} > 0$, $u_0, B_0 \in L^2_\mathcal{E}(\Omega)$ satisfying (1.5), $u_1, B_1 \in L^2_\mathcal{E}(\Omega)$ and any $\delta > 0$ be arbitrarily fixed. The main Theorems 1.2 and 1.4 are now obtained by carrying out the following steps:
1) Extend $\Omega$ to $\mathcal{E}$ as explained in Section 2.

2) By Lemma 5.1, there exists $T_t \in (0, T_{\text{ctrl}}/4)$ such that a weak Leray-Hopf solution $(u, B)$ to (2.7), initial data $(u_0, B_0)$, zero forces $\xi = \eta = 0$ and terminal time $T = T_t$ obeys $u(\cdot, T_t), B(\cdot, T_t) \in H^3(\mathcal{E}) \cap H(\mathcal{E})$.

3) By a density argument, select arbitrary $\overline{u_1}, \overline{B_1} \in C_0^\infty(\overline{\mathcal{E}}; \mathbb{R}^N) \cap H(\mathcal{E})$ with

$$\|\overline{u_1} - u_1\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})} + \|\overline{B_1} - B_1\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})} < \delta/2.$$

4) Carry out Section 3 with $T = T_{\text{ctrl}} - T_t$, initial data $u(\cdot, T_t), B(\cdot, T_t)$ and target states $\overline{u_1}, \overline{B_1}$. This provides controls $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{U}_T$ such that all weak Leray-Hopf solutions $(\overline{u}, \overline{B})$ to (2.7) with initial data $u(\cdot, T_t)$ and $B(\cdot, T_t)$ satisfy

$$\|\overline{u}(\cdot, T_{\text{ctrl}} - T_t) - \overline{u_1}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})} + \|\overline{B}(\cdot, T_{\text{ctrl}} - T_t) - \overline{B_1}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})} < \delta/2.$$

5) Glue at $t = T_t$ a weak Leray-Hopf solution $(\overline{u}, \overline{B})$ chosen via step 4 to a weak Leray-Hopf solution $(u, B)$ from step 2. After renaming, one obtains a weak Leray-Hopf solution $(u, B)$ to (2.7) on the whole time interval $[0, T_{\text{ctrl}}]$, starting from the initial data $(u_0, B_0)$ and satisfying

$$\|u(\cdot, T_{\text{ctrl}}) - u_1\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})} + \|B(\cdot, T_{\text{ctrl}}) - B_1\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})} < \delta.$$

**Remark 5.2.** If $u_0 \in L^2_c(\Omega)$ fails to obey (1.5), then for any extension $u_0 \in L^2(\mathcal{E})$ which satisfies $u_0 \cdot n = 0$ along $\partial\mathcal{E}$ it holds $\nabla \cdot u_0 \neq 0$ somewhere in $\mathcal{E} \setminus \overline{\Omega}$. In this case, one can define $\sigma(x, t) := \beta(t)(\nabla \cdot u_0)(x)$ with $\beta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ being chosen such that $\beta(0) = 1$ and $\beta(t) = 0$ for all $t \geq \widehat{T} := T_{\text{ctrl}}/8$. Subsequently, instead of (2.7) one solves first on $[0, \widehat{T}]$ the alternative system

\[
\begin{align*}
\partial_t u - v_1 \Delta u + (u \cdot \nabla) u - \mu(B \cdot \nabla) B + \nabla p &= 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{E}_{\widehat{T}}, \\
\partial_t B - v_2 \Delta B + \nabla \times (B \times u) &= 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{E}_{\widehat{T}}, \\
\nabla \cdot u &= \sigma, \quad \nabla \cdot B = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{E}_{\widehat{T}} \\
u \cdot n &= B \cdot n = 0, \quad N_1(u, B) = N_2(u, B) = 0 \quad \text{on } \Sigma_T, \\
u(\cdot, 0) &= u_0, \quad B(\cdot, 0) = B_0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{E}.
\end{align*}
\]  

Then, starting from $t = \widehat{T}$ with new initial data $u(\cdot, \widehat{T})|_{\Omega}, B(\cdot, \widehat{T})|_{\Omega} \in L^2(\Omega)$, the above steps 1-4 are applied. Here, one has to introduce a suitable notion for weak solutions to (5.1) similarly as in [9, 16].

**Remark 5.3.** If $B_0 \in L^2_c(\Omega)$ fails to obey (1.5), then one can technically adhere to a similar strategy as explained in Remark 5.2. However, violating $\nabla \cdot B = 0$ in $\mathcal{E} \setminus \overline{\Omega}$ allows magnetic monopoles inside the control apparatus attached to $\Gamma_c$, which is a topic that can be avoided by demanding (1.5) for $B_0$. 
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A Higher order estimates for the boundary layer profiles

In this appendix, the a priori estimates for the proof of Lemma 3.6 are outlined. Since a more general context will not influence the subsequent arguments, we take arbitrary \( z^\pm,0 \in C^\infty(\overline{E} \times [0,T] ; \mathbb{R}^N) \) with \( z^\pm,0 \cdot n = 0 \) along \( \partial E \). Then, for \( T > 0 \) we consider in \( E \times (0,T) \times \mathbb{R}_+ \) the equations

\[
\partial_t v^\pm - \partial_z z^\pm v^\pm + \lambda^\pm v^\pm + \left[ (z^\pm,0 \cdot \nabla) v^\pm + (v^\mp \cdot \nabla) z^\pm,0 \right] \tan + \tau^\pm \partial_z v^\pm = 0 \quad (A.1)
\]

together with the initial and boundary conditions

\[
\begin{align*}
\partial_z v^\pm(x,t,0) - [\partial_z v^\pm(x,t,0) \cdot n(x)] n(x) &= g^\pm(x,t), \quad x \in \overline{E}, t \in (0,T), \\
v^\pm(x,t,0) \cdot n(x) &= 0, \quad x \in \overline{E}, t \in (0,T), \\
v^\pm(x,t,z) &\to 0, \text{ as } z \to +\infty, \quad x \in \overline{E}, t \in \mathbb{R}_+, \\
v^\pm(x,0,z) &= 0, \quad x \in \overline{E}, z > 0.
\end{align*}
\quad (A.2)
\]

Hereby, we take \( \chi_{\partial E} \) from Section 3 and denote for \( (x,t) \in E \times (0,T) \) the functions

\[
f^\pm(x,t) = -\frac{z^{\pm,0}(x,t) \cdot n(x)}{\phi_E(x)}, \quad g^\pm(x,t) = 2\chi_{\partial E} N^\pm(z^{+,0},z^{-,0})(x,t).
\]

Multiplying in (A.1) with \( n \), one may similarly to [29, Section 5] establish energy estimates which imply for all \( (x,t,z) \in \overline{E} \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}_+ \) that

\[
\left[ v^+(x,t,z) \pm v^-(x,t,z) \right] \cdot n(x) = 0.
\]

The remainder of this section is devoted to the verification of the following lemma.

Lemma A.1. For any choice of \( k, m_1, m_2, m_3 \in \mathbb{N}_0 \), there exists a constant

\[
C = C(E, \lambda^\pm, k, m_1, m_2, m_3, T, z^{\pm,0}, \rho^\pm) > 0 \quad (A.3)
\]

such that every solution to (A.1) and (A.2) obeys

\[
\|v^\pm\|_{W^{m_2, \infty}((0,T); H^{k,m_1,m_3}_E)} + \|v^\pm\|_{H^{m_2, ((0,T); H^{k,m_1,m_3+1}_E)}} \leq C. \quad (A.4)
\]

The proof for Lemma A.1 consists of two main steps and involves several inductive arguments. The principal strategy is to first assume all functions as being smooth and then to obtain bounds for all Sobolev norms in terms of right hand sides which are by induction finite for every weak solution to (A.1) and (A.2). Hereby, all generic constants will be of the type (A.3) without further mentioning.

Step 1: Estimates for \( \partial_{\alpha}^x \partial_{\gamma}^t v^\pm \)

We take in (A.1) the derivatives \( \partial_{\alpha}^x \partial_{\gamma}^t \) for \( \gamma \in \mathbb{N}_0 := \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \) and \( \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N \). As a result,

\[
\partial_t (\partial_{\alpha}^x \partial_{\gamma}^t v^\pm) = \partial_{zz} \partial_{\alpha}^x \partial_{\gamma}^t (\lambda^\pm v^\pm + \lambda^\mp v^\mp) - z \partial_{\alpha}^x \sum_{l=0}^{\gamma} \binom{\gamma}{l} \partial_{l}^z \partial_{\gamma-l}^t \partial_z v^\pm
\]

\[
- \partial_{\alpha}^x \sum_{l=0}^{\gamma} \binom{\gamma}{l} \left[ (\partial_{l}^z z^{\pm,0} \cdot \nabla) \partial_{\gamma-l}^t v^\pm + (\partial_{l}^z v^\mp \cdot \nabla) \partial_{\gamma-l}^t z^{\pm,0} \right] \tan. \quad (A.5)
\]
Furthermore, multiplying \((A.5)\) for arbitrary \(k \in \mathbb{N}\) with \((1 + z^{2k})\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \mathbf{v}^\pm\) and integrating in \((x, z)\) over \(\mathcal{E} \times \mathbb{R}^+\) yields

\[
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{E}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} (1 + z^{2k})|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \mathbf{v}^\pm(x, t, z)|^2 \, dz \, dx = I_1^\pm(t) - I_2^\pm(t) - I_3^{\pm, a}(t) - I_3^{\pm, b}(t)
\]

with the right hand side being given by

\[
I_1^\pm := \int_{\mathcal{E}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} (1 + z^{2k}) \partial_x^\alpha \partial_x^\beta \partial_t^\gamma \mathbf{v}^\pm(\lambda^\pm \mathbf{v}^+ + \lambda^\mp \mathbf{v}^-) \cdot \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \mathbf{v}^\pm \, dz \, dx,
\]

\[
I_2^\pm := \int_{\mathcal{E}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} (z + z^{2k+1}) \partial_x^\alpha \sum_{l=0}^\gamma \left( \frac{\gamma}{l} \right) \partial_x^\gamma \partial_t^{\gamma-l} \partial_z \mathbf{v}^\pm \cdot \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \mathbf{v}^\pm \, dz \, dx,
\]

\[
I_3^{\pm, a} := \int_{\mathcal{E}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} (1 + z^{2k}) \partial_x^\alpha \sum_{l=0}^\gamma \left( \frac{\gamma}{l} \right) (\partial_t^l z^{\pm, l} \cdot \nabla) \partial_t^{\gamma-l} \mathbf{v}^\pm \, dz \, dx,
\]

\[
I_3^{\pm, b} := \int_{\mathcal{E}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} (1 + z^{2k}) \partial_x^\alpha \sum_{l=0}^\gamma \left( \frac{\gamma}{l} \right) (\partial_t^l \mathbf{v}^\pm \cdot \nabla) \partial_t^{\gamma-l} \mathbf{z}^{\pm, l} \, dz \, dx.
\]

We focus now on the situations where \(\gamma > 0\) and \(|\alpha| > 0\), since the other cases \(\gamma = 0\) or \(|\alpha| = 0\) are similar but less demanding. For the terms \(I_1^\pm\), integration by parts in \(z\) leads to

\[
I_1^\pm = -\int_{\mathcal{E}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} (1 + z^{2k}) \left( \lambda^\pm \partial_z \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \mathbf{v}^+ + \lambda^\mp \partial_z \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \mathbf{v}^- \right) \cdot \partial_z \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \mathbf{v}^\pm \, dz \, dx
\]

\[
-2k \int_{\mathcal{E}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} z^{2k-1} \left( \lambda^\pm \partial_z \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \mathbf{v}^+ + \lambda^\mp \partial_z \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \mathbf{v}^- \right) \cdot \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \mathbf{v}^\pm \, dz \, dx
\]

\[
= -\int_{\mathcal{E}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} (1 + z^{2k}) \left( \lambda^\pm \partial_z \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \mathbf{v}^+ + \lambda^\mp \partial_z \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \mathbf{v}^- \right) \cdot \partial_z \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \mathbf{v}^\pm \, dz \, dx - I_{11}^\pm - I_{12}^\pm.
\]

By means of Young’s inequality and the identities \(2\mathbf{v}^\pm = (\mathbf{v}^+ + \mathbf{v}^-) \pm (\mathbf{v}^+ - \mathbf{v}^-)\) one obtains

\[
|I_1^\pm| \leq \sum_{\mathbb{D} \in \{+, -\}} \frac{\lambda^\pm \cdot \lambda^-}{8} \int_{\mathcal{E}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} (1 + z^{2k})|\partial_z \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma (\mathbf{v}^+ \square \mathbf{v}^-)|^2 \, dz \, dx
\]

\[
+C \int_{\mathcal{E}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} (1 + z^{2k})|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \mathbf{v}^\pm|^2 \, dz \, dx, \quad (A.8)
\]

while \(f^\pm\) and \(g^\pm\) being fixed smooth functions allows to infer

\[
|I_{12}^\pm| \leq \int_{\mathcal{E}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} \left| \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma (\lambda^\pm \mathbf{g}^+ + \lambda^\mp \mathbf{g}^-)(x, t) \right| \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} \partial_z \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \mathbf{v}^\pm(x, t, z) \, dz \right| \, dx
\]

\[
\leq \int_{\mathcal{E}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} \left| (1 + z^{2k})^{-1} \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma (\lambda^\pm \mathbf{g}^+ + \lambda^\mp \mathbf{g}^-)(x, t) \cdot (1 + z^{2k})^{\frac{1}{2}} \partial_z \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \mathbf{v}^\pm(x, t, z) \right| \, dz \, dx
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{\mathbb{D} \in \{+, -\}} \frac{\lambda^\pm \cdot \lambda^-}{8} \int_{\mathcal{E}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} (1 + z^{2k})|\partial_z \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma (\mathbf{v}^+ \square \mathbf{v}^-)|^2 \, dz \, dx + C.
\]

(A.9)
Thus, after collecting (A.7)–(A.9), one obtains the bound

\[
\sum_{\alpha \in \{+, -\}} \left( |I_{1\alpha}^0| + \frac{\lambda^+ \lambda^-}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (1 + z^{2k}) |\partial_x \partial_x^\alpha \partial_x^\gamma (v^+ - v^-)|^2 \, dz \, dx \right) \leq C \sum_{\alpha \in \{+, -\}} \|\partial_x^\gamma v^\pm\|_{k, |\alpha|, 0, E}^2 + C. \tag{A.10}
\]

Concerning \( I_{2\alpha}^\pm \), expanding the derivatives leads to

\[
|I_{2\alpha}^\pm| \leq \left| \sum_{l=0}^{\gamma} \sum_{0 < \kappa \leq |\alpha|} \left( \frac{\alpha}{\kappa} \right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (z + z^{2k+1}) |\partial_x^\kappa \partial_x^l \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma - \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma | \, dz \, dx \right|
+ \sum_{l=0}^{\gamma} \left( \frac{\alpha}{l} \right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (z + z^{2k+1}) |\partial_x^\kappa \partial_x^l \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma | \, dz \, dx
\]

which implies together with Hölder’s inequality and integration by parts in \( z \) that

\[
|I_{2\alpha}^\pm| \leq C \sum_{l=0}^{\gamma} \sum_{0 < \kappa \leq |\alpha|} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (z + z^{2k+1}) \|\partial_x^\kappa \partial_x^l \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \|_{L^1(E)} \|\partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \|_{L^1(E)} \|\partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \|_{L^2(E)} \, dz
+ C \sum_{l=1}^{\gamma} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (z + z^{2k+1}) \|\partial_x^\kappa \partial_x^l \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \|_{L^1(E)} \|\partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \|_{L^2(E)} \, dz
+ C \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (1 + z^{2k+1}) \|\partial_x^\kappa \partial_x^l \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \|_{L^2(E)}^2 \, dz. \tag{A.11}
\]

Hence, by utilizing the special case \( \|\cdot\|_{L^1(E)} \leq C \|\cdot\|_{L^2(E)} \|\cdot\|_{H^1(E)} \) of the Gagliardo–Nirenberg interpolation inequality, together with Hölder’s and Young’s inequalities, (A.11) yields for arbitrary \( \eta > 0 \) that

\[
|I_{2\alpha}^\pm| \leq C \sum_{l=0}^{\gamma} \sum_{0 < \kappa \leq |\alpha|} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \|\partial_x^\kappa \partial_x^l \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \|_{L^2(E)} \|1 + z^{2k+1}\|\partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \|_{L^2(E)}^2 \right\} \, dz
\]

\[
+ \eta \sum_{l=1}^{\gamma} \|\partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \|_{L^2(E)}^2 + C(\eta) \|\partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \|_{L^2(E)}^2 + C \|\partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \|_{L^2(E)}^2
\]

\[
\leq C \sum_{l=0}^{\gamma} \sum_{0 < \kappa \leq |\alpha|} \|\partial_x^\kappa \partial_x^l \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \|_{L^2(E)} \|\partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \|_{L^2(E)} \|\partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \|_{L^2(E)}
\]

\[
+ \eta \sum_{l=1}^{\gamma} \|\partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \|_{L^2(E)}^2 + C(\eta) \|\partial_x^\gamma \partial_x^\gamma \|_{L^2(E)}^2. \tag{A.12}
\]

Above in (A.12), we used the elementary inequality \( z + z^{2k+1} \leq (1 + z^k)(1 + z^k) \).
Now, the bounds for $I_2^\pm$ are concluded by

\[
|I_2^\pm| \leq \sum_{l=0}^{\gamma} \sum_{0 < \kappa \leq \alpha} \left[ C(\eta) \| \partial_\beta^{\gamma-l} v^\pm \|_{L^2_{k+2,|\alpha-\kappa|,1,\mathcal{E}}} + C(\eta) \| \partial_\beta^{\gamma-l} v^\pm \|_{L^2_{k,|\alpha-\kappa|+1,\mathcal{E}}} \right] + \eta \sum_{l=0}^{\gamma} \| \partial_\beta^{\gamma-l} v^\pm \|_{L^2_{k+1,|\alpha|,1,\mathcal{E}}} + C(\eta) \| \partial_\beta^{\gamma-l} v^\pm \|_{L^2_{k,|\alpha|,0,\mathcal{E}}}.
\]

(A.13)

It is left to treat $I_3^{\pm,a}$ and $I_3^{\pm,b}$. For a vector field $\vec{z}$ on $E$, we denote by $D^m(\vec{z})$ arbitrary linear combinations of components of $\vec{z}$ and derivatives of such, which are taken in $x$ and are of order $\leq m$ while the coefficients depend on $n$. As an example from [29, Equation (47)], for a multi-index $\vec{\alpha} \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ and a vector $e \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with $|e| = 1$, the product $\partial^{\vec{\alpha}}[\vec{z}]_E \cdot e$ is of the form

\[
\partial^{\vec{\alpha}}[\vec{z}]_E = [\partial^{\vec{\alpha}} \vec{z}]_E \cdot e + D^{[\vec{\alpha}]^{-1}}(\vec{z}) \cdot e.
\]

(A.14)

In particular, if $|\vec{\alpha}| = \vec{m} \in \mathbb{N}$, then $n \cdot v^\pm = 0$ implies that

\[
n \cdot \partial_\beta^{\gamma-l} v^\pm = D^{\vec{m}-1}(\partial_\beta^{\gamma-l} v^\pm) = \partial_\beta^{\gamma-l} D^{\vec{m}-1}(v^\pm).
\]

(A.15)

Thus, in view of (A.14),(A.15) and the definition of the tangential part $[\cdot]_\tan$, one may write

\[
I_3^{\pm,a} = \sum_{l=0}^{\gamma} \left( \gamma \right) \int_E \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (1 + z^{2k}) D^{[\vec{\alpha}]}(\partial_\beta^{\gamma-l} v^\pm) D^{[\vec{\alpha}]}(\partial_\beta^{\gamma-l} v^\pm) \, dz \, dx
\]

\[
+ \sum_{l=0}^{\gamma} \left( \gamma \right) \int_E \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (1 + z^{2k}) (\partial_\beta^{\gamma-l} z^{0} \cdot \nabla) \partial^{\vec{\alpha}} \partial_\beta^{\gamma-l} v^\pm \cdot n \) D^{[\vec{\alpha}]^{-1}}(\partial_\beta^{\gamma-l} v^\pm) \, dz \, dx
\]

\[
+ \sum_{l=0}^{\gamma} \left( \gamma \right) \int_E \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (1 + z^{2k}) (\partial_\beta^{\gamma-l} z^{0} \cdot \nabla) \partial^{\vec{\alpha}} \partial_\beta^{\gamma-l} v^\pm \cdot \partial^{\vec{\alpha}} \partial_\beta^{\gamma-l} v^\pm \, dz \, dx,
\]

wherein the second line is after integration by parts of the same type as the first line, hence

\[
I_3^{\pm,a} = \sum_{l=0}^{\gamma} \left( \gamma \right) \int_E \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (1 + z^{2k}) D^{[\vec{\alpha}]}(\partial_\beta^{\gamma-l} z^{0}) D^{[\vec{\alpha}]}(\partial_\beta^{\gamma-l} v^\pm) \, dz \, dx
\]

\[
+ \sum_{l=1}^{\gamma} \left( \gamma \right) \int_E \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (1 + z^{2k}) (\partial_\beta^{\gamma-l} z^{0} \cdot \nabla) \partial^{\vec{\alpha}} \partial_\beta^{\gamma-l} v^\pm \cdot \partial^{\vec{\alpha}} \partial_\beta^{\gamma-l} v^\pm \, dz \, dx
\]

(A.16)

\[
+ \int_E \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (1 + z^{2k}) (z^{0} \cdot \nabla) \partial^{\vec{\alpha}} \partial_\beta^{\gamma-l} v^\pm \cdot \partial^{\vec{\alpha}} \partial_\beta^{\gamma-l} v^\pm \, dz \, dx.
\]

Due to $z^{0} \cdot n = 0$ on $\partial E$, the last integral in (A.16) reads

\[
\int_E \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (1 + z^{2k}) (z^{0} \cdot \nabla) \partial^{\vec{\alpha}} \partial_\beta^{\gamma-l} v^\pm \cdot \partial^{\vec{\alpha}} \partial_\beta^{\gamma-l} v^\pm \, dz \, dx = -\frac{1}{2} \int_E \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (1 + z^{2k}) |\partial^{\vec{\alpha}} \partial_\beta^{\gamma-l} v^\pm|^2 (\nabla \cdot z^{0}) \, dz \, dx
\]

such that (A.16) eventually implies the bound

\[
|I_3^{\pm,a}| \leq C \left( \sum_{l=1}^{\gamma} \| \partial_\beta^{\gamma-l} v^\pm \|_{L^2_{k,|\alpha|+1,0,\mathcal{E}}} + C \| \partial_\beta^{\gamma-l} v^\pm \|^2_{L^2_{k,|\alpha|,0,\mathcal{E}}} + C \| \partial_\beta^{\gamma-l} v^\pm \|^2_{L^2_{k,|\alpha|,0,\mathcal{E}}} \right).
\]

(A.17)
When it comes to \( I_{3}^{x,b} \), the corresponding estimates are less demanding compared to those for \( I_{3}^{x,a} \) and one finds

\[
|I_{3}^{x,a}| + |I_{3}^{x,b}| \leq C \sum_{l=0}^{\gamma} \left[ \| \partial_{l}^{\gamma} \phi^{\pm} \|_{k_{l}}^{2} + \| \partial_{l}^{\gamma} \omega^{\pm} \|_{k_{l}}^{2} \right] 
+ C \sum_{l=0}^{\gamma-1} \left[ \| \partial_{l}^{\gamma} \phi^{\pm} \|_{k_{l}+1}^{2} + \| \partial_{l}^{\gamma} \omega^{\pm} \|_{k_{l}}^{2} \right] .
\]  

(A.18)

Now, for fixed \( m_{1}, m_{2} \in \mathbb{N}_{0} \), we sum in (A.10), (A.13), (A.17) and (A.18) over all \( |\alpha| \leq m_{1} \) and \( \gamma \leq m_{2} \). Moreover, we denote

\[
\Phi^{\pm} := C(\eta) \sum_{\gamma=0}^{m_{2}} \delta_{0,m_{1}}^{\gamma} \| \partial_{l}^{\gamma} \phi^{\pm} \|_{H_{2}^{k+2,m_{1}};t}^{2} + \| \partial_{l}^{\gamma} \omega^{\pm} \|_{H_{2}^{k+1,m_{1}};t}^{2} + \eta \sum_{\gamma=0}^{m_{2}} \| \partial_{l}^{\gamma} \phi^{\pm} \|_{H_{2}^{k,m_{1}+1}}^{2} 
+ C(\eta) \sum_{\gamma=0}^{m_{2}} \delta_{0,m_{1}}^{\gamma} \left( \| \partial_{l}^{\gamma} \phi^{\pm} \|_{H_{2}^{k+1,m_{1}+1}}^{2} + \| \partial_{l}^{\gamma} \omega^{\pm} \|_{H_{2}^{k,m_{1}+1}}^{2} \right) + C,
\]

wherein

\[
\delta_{0,m_{1}}^{\gamma} := \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } a = b, \\
1 & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\]

As a result, one obtains the estimate

\[
\sum_{\square \in \{+, -\}} \left( \partial_{l} \sum_{\gamma=0}^{m_{2}} \| \partial_{l}^{\gamma} \phi^{\pm} \|_{H_{2}^{k,m_{1}}}^{2} + \sum_{\gamma=0}^{m_{2}} \frac{\lambda^{\pm} \lambda^{-}}{2} \| \partial_{l}^{\gamma} (\mathbf{v}^{\pm} \square \mathbf{v}^{-}) \|_{H_{2}^{k,m_{1}+1}}^{2} \right) \leq 2 (\Phi^{+} + \Phi^{-}).
\]  

(A.19)

In the right hand side of (A.19), all terms containing the norm of \( H_{E}^{k+2,m_{1}-1,0} \) disappear for \( m_{1} = 0 \), while those with the norms of \( H_{E}^{k+1,m_{1}+1} \) and \( H_{E}^{k,m_{1}+1,1} \) disappear when \( m_{2} = 0 \) is considered. Thus, such terms are uniformly bounded by inductive considerations.

In conclusion, after selecting \( \eta > 0 \) sufficiently small and invoking a Grönwall argument for (A.19), one arrives for all \( \gamma \in \{0, \ldots, m_{2}\} \) at a priori bounds corresponding to the regularity

\[
\partial_{l}^{\gamma} \phi^{\pm} \in L^{\infty}((0, T); H_{E}^{k,m_{1}+1,0}) \cap L^{2}((0, T); H_{E}^{k,m_{1}+1,1}).
\]

(A.20)

**Step 2: Estimates for** \( \partial_{x}^{a} \partial_{l}^{\gamma} \partial_{c}^{b} \phi^{\pm} \)

We proceed by showing a priori estimates of the type

\[
\mathbf{v}^{\pm} \in W^{m_{2}, \infty}((0, T); H_{E}^{k,m_{1},m_{2}}) \cap H^{m_{2}}((0, T); H_{E}^{k,m_{1},m_{2}+1}).
\]

(A.21)

Hereto, for \( r \in \mathbb{N}_{0} \) the boundary data \( g^{\pm,r}(x, t) := \partial_{x}^{a} \partial_{l}^{\gamma} \partial_{c}^{b} \partial_{c}^{\pm} \mathbf{v}^{\pm} \) is denoted. Similarly to the approach described in [29], one can find uniform bounds for \( \partial_{x}^{a} \partial_{l}^{\gamma} \partial_{c}^{b} \partial_{c}^{\pm} \mathbf{v}^{\pm} \). On the other hand, if \( r \geq 1 \), one may obtain estimates for \( \partial_{x}^{a} \partial_{l}^{\gamma} (g^{\pm,r} \pm g^{-r}) \) after taking \( \partial_{c}^{-2} \) in (A.5), which
yields the expressions

\[
\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \partial_z^\delta (\lambda^\pm v^+ + \lambda^\mp v^-) = \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^{\gamma+1} \partial_z^{-2} v^+ + z \partial_x^\alpha \sum_{l=0}^{\gamma} \left( \frac{\gamma}{l} \right) \partial_t^{\gamma+1} \partial_t^{\gamma-l} \partial_z^{-2} v^+
\]

\[
+ \partial_x^\alpha \sum_{l=0}^{\gamma} \left( \frac{\gamma}{l} \right) \partial_z^{-2} \left[ (\partial_t^{\gamma} z^{\pm,0} \cdot \nabla) \partial_t^{\gamma-l} v^+ + (\partial_t^{\gamma} v^{\mp} \cdot \nabla) \partial_t^{\gamma-l} z^{\pm,0} \right]_{\text{tan}}
\]

\[
+ \partial_x^\alpha \sum_{l=0}^{\gamma} \left( \frac{\gamma}{l} \right) (r-2) \partial_t^{\gamma+1} \partial_t^{\gamma-l} \partial_z^{-2} v^+.
\]

(A.22)

Below in (A.27), we need \(L^\infty((0,T); L^2(E))\) bounds for \(\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma g^{\pm, r}\) and therefore verify (A.21) via induction in powers of \(\partial_z\), starting from the base case (A.20). This means, for given \(k \in \mathbb{N}_0, \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N, \gamma \in \mathbb{N}_0\) and \(\beta \in \mathbb{N}\), we assume now to know the estimate

\[
\sum_{l=0}^{\gamma+2} \left( \|\partial_t^l v^\pm\|_{L^\infty((0,T); H^k(E))} + \|\partial_t^l v^\pm\|_{L^2((0,T); H^k(E))} \right)
\]

\[
\leq C = C(E, \lambda^\pm, k, m_1, m_2, m_3, T, z^{\pm,0}, \rho^\pm), \quad (A.23)
\]

which allows via Sobolev embeddings to evaluate (A.22) for \(r = \beta + 1\) at \(z = 0\) pointwise in \((x, t)\). This induction assumption is justified since (A.20) remains valid also for \(m_1\) and \(m_2\) being replaced by \(m_1 + 2\) and \(m_2 + 2\) respectively.

After taking \(\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \partial_z^\delta \) in (A.1), followed by multiplying for \(k \in \mathbb{N}\) the resulting equations with \((1 + z^{2k}) \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \partial_z^\delta\), one obtains the relations

\[
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_E \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} (1 + z^{2k}) |\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \partial_z^\delta v^+(x, t, z)|^2 \, dz \, dx = I_1^x(t) - I_2^{x,a}(t) - I_2^{x,b}(t) - I_3^x(t),
\]

wherein

\[
I_1^x := \int_E \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} (1 + z^{2k}) \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \partial_z^\delta \partial^\pm (\lambda^\pm v^+ + \lambda^\mp v^-) \cdot \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \partial_z^\delta v^+ \, dz \, dx,
\]

\[
I_2^{a} := \int_E \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left( z + z^{2k+1} \right) \partial_x^\alpha \sum_{l=0}^{\gamma} \left( \frac{\gamma}{l} \right) \partial_t^{\gamma+1} \partial_t^{\gamma-l} \partial_z^{-2} v^+ \cdot \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^{\gamma+1} \partial_t^{\gamma-l} \partial_z^{-2} v^+ \, dz \, dx,
\]

\[
I_2^{b} := \int_E \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left( 1 + z^{2k} \right) \beta \partial_x^\alpha \sum_{l=0}^{\gamma} \left( \frac{\gamma}{l} \right) \partial_t^{\gamma+1} \partial_t^{\gamma-l} \partial_z^{-2} v^+ \cdot \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^{\gamma+1} \partial_t^{\gamma-l} \partial_z^{-2} v^+ \, dz \, dx,
\]

(A.24)

\[
I_3^{a} := \int_E \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left( 1 + z^{2k} \right) \partial_x^\alpha \sum_{l=0}^{\gamma} \left( \frac{\gamma}{l} \right) \left[ (\partial_t^{\gamma} z^{\pm,0} \cdot \nabla) \partial_t^{\gamma-l} \partial_z^{-2} v^+ \right]_{\text{tan}} \cdot \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^{\gamma+1} \partial_t^{\gamma-l} \partial_z^{-2} v^+ \, dz \, dx,
\]

\[
I_3^{b} := \int_E \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left( 1 + z^{2k} \right) \partial_x^\alpha \sum_{l=0}^{\gamma} \left( \frac{\gamma}{l} \right) \left[ (\partial_t^{\gamma} v^{\mp} \cdot \nabla) \partial_t^{\gamma-l} z^{\pm,0} \right]_{\text{tan}} \cdot \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^{\gamma+1} \partial_t^{\gamma-l} \partial_z^{-2} v^+ \, dz \, dx.
\]
To begin with, integration by parts in \( x \) leads for \( I_1^\pm \) to

\[
I_1^\pm = -\int_E \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} (1 + z^{2k}) \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \partial_z^{\beta+1} (\lambda^{\pm} v^+ + \lambda^{\mp} v^-) \cdot \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \partial_z^{\beta+1} v^\pm \, dz \, dx
- 2k \int_E \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} z^{2k-1} \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \partial_z^{\beta+1} (\lambda^{\pm} v^+ + \lambda^{\mp} v^-) \cdot \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \partial_z^{\beta+1} v^+ \, dz \, dx
- \int \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \partial_z^{\beta+1} (\lambda^{\pm} v^+ + \lambda^{\mp} v^-)(x, t, 0) \cdot \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \partial_z^{\beta+1} v^+(x, t, 0) \, dx
= -\int_E \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} (1 + z^{2k}) \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \partial_z^{\beta+1} (\lambda^{\pm} v^+ + \lambda^{\mp} v^-) \cdot \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \partial_z^{\beta+1} v^\pm \, dz \, dx - I_{11}^\pm - I_{12}^\pm,
\]

in which the integrals \( I_{11}^\pm \) are bounded by

\[
|I_{11}^\pm| \leq \sum_{\delta \in \{+, -\}} \frac{\lambda^{\pm} \square - \lambda^-}{8} \int_E \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} (1 + z^{2k}) |\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \partial_z^{\beta+1} (v^\pm \square v^-)|^2 \, dz \, dx + C \int_E \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} (1 + z^{2k}) |\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \partial_z^{\beta} v^\pm|^2 \, dz \, dx.
\]

Since \( L^\infty((0, T); L^2(\mathbb{E})) \) bounds for \( \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma g^{\pm, \beta+1}(x, t) \) are ensured through (A.22) with \( z = 0 \) and the induction assumption (A.23), one can infer

\[
|I_{12}^\pm| = \left| \int_E \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma (\lambda^{\pm} g^+ + \lambda^{\mp} g^- + \beta+1)(x, t) \cdot \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \partial_z^{\beta+1} v^\pm (x, t, z) \, dz \, dx \right|
\leq \|(1 + z^{2k})^{1/2} \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \partial_z^{\beta+1} v^\pm \|_{L^2(\mathbb{E} \times \mathbb{R}_+)} \| \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma (\lambda^{\pm} g^+ + \lambda^{\mp} g^- + \beta+1) \|_{L^2(\mathbb{E})}
\times \|(1 + z^{2k+1})^{1/2} \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+)}
\leq \sum_{\delta \in \{+, -\}} \frac{\lambda^{\pm} \square - \lambda^-}{8} \int_E \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} (1 + z^{2k}) |\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \partial_z^{\beta+1} (v^\pm \square v^-)|^2 \, dz \, dx + C.
\]

As a result of (A.25)–(A.27), one may then conclude

\[
\sum_{\delta \in \{+, -\}} \left( |I_{10}^\pm| + \frac{\lambda^{\pm} \square - \lambda^-}{4} \int_E \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} (1 + z^{2k}) |\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\gamma \partial_z^{\beta+1} (v^\pm \square v^-)|^2 \, dz \, dx \right)
\leq \lambda^\infty v^\pm \|_{k, |\alpha|, |\beta|, \delta} + C.
\]

Regarding \( I_2^{\pm, a} \), since the case \( \beta = 0 \) was treated in detail, we briefly write

\[
I_2^{\pm, a} = \sum_{l=0}^{\gamma} \left( \gamma \right)^l \int_E \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} (z + z^{2k+1})^l \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^{\gamma l} \partial_z^{\beta l} v^\pm \cdot \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^{\gamma l} \partial_z^{\beta l} v^\pm \, dz \, dx
+ \sum_{l=0}^{\gamma} \left( \gamma \right)^l \int_E \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} (z + z^{2k+1})^l \partial_t^{\gamma l} \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^{\gamma l} \partial_z^{\beta l} v^\pm \cdot \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^{\gamma l} \partial_z^{\beta l} v^\pm \, dz \, dx
+ \sum_{l=0}^{\gamma} \left( \gamma \right)^l \int_E \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} (z + z^{2k+1})^l \partial_t^{\gamma l} \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^{\gamma l} \partial_z^{\beta l} v^\pm \cdot \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^{\gamma l} \partial_z^{\beta l} v^\pm \, dz \, dx
= I_{21}^{\pm, a} + I_{22}^{\pm, a} + I_{23}^{\pm, a},
\]
while \( I_2^{±,b} \) is decomposed into

\[
I_2^{±,b} = \beta \sum_{l=0}^{γ} \left( \gamma \right) \int_{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left( 1 + z^{2k} \right) \partial_x^α \partial_t^{l+1} \partial_x^β v^± \cdot \partial_x^α \partial_y^γ \partial_x^β v^± \, dz \, dx
\]

\[
+ \beta \sum_{l=0}^{γ} \left( \gamma \right) \int_{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left( 1 + z^{2k} \right) \partial_t^{l+1} \partial_x^α \partial_y^γ \partial_x^β \partial_x^γ \partial_x^β v^± \, dz \, dx
\]

\[
+ \beta \sum_{l=0}^{γ} \left( \gamma \right) \int_{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left( 1 + z^{2k} \right) D^{α|l}(\partial_x^γ \partial_x^β v^±) D^{|l}(\partial_x^α \partial_y^γ \partial_x^β v^±) \cdot \partial_x^α \partial_y^γ \partial_x^β v^± \, dz \, dx.
\]

Integration by parts with respect to \( z \) in \( I_{21}^{±,a} \), combined with the bound

\[
|I_{21}^{±,a}| \leq \sum_{l=0}^{γ} \left( \gamma \right) \int_{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left( 1 + z^{2k+1} \right) \||\partial_x^α \partial_t^{l+2} \partial_x^β v^±\||_{L^2(E)} \||\partial_x^α \partial_y^γ \partial_x^β v^±\||_{L^2(E)} \, dz \, dx
\]

\[
\leq C \sum_{l=0}^{γ} \int_{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left\{ \left( ||(1 + z^{2k+1}) \partial_x^α \partial_t^{l+2} \partial_x^β v^±\||_{L^2(E)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( ||(1 + z^{2k+1}) \partial_x^α \partial_t^{l+2} \partial_x^β v^±\||_{H^1(E)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} dz \, dx,
\]

implies for any small \( η > 0 \) that

\[
|I_2^{±,a}| + |I_2^{±,b}| \leq C(η) \||\partial_x^γ v^±\||_{k,|α|,|β|,E}^2 + η \sum_{l=0}^{γ} \left( \left\| \partial_x^α \partial_t^{l+2} \partial_x^β v^± \right\|_{k+2,|α|−1,|β|+1,E} + \left\| \partial_x^α \partial_t^{l+2} \partial_x^β v^± \right\|_{k,|α|,|β|+1,E} \right)
\]

\[
+ η \sum_{l=1}^{γ} \left\| \partial_x^α \partial_t^{l+2} \partial_x^β v^± \right\|_{k+2,|α|,|β|+1,E}.
\]

(A.29)

It remains to estimate \( I_3^{±,a} \) and \( I_3^{±,b} \), whereby the terms \( I_3^{±,a} \) are more difficult. However, comparing (A.24) with (A.6), and taking into account that

\( n \cdot \partial_x^α \partial_t^{l+2} \partial_x^β v^± = D^{α|l}(\partial_x^α \partial_x^β v^±) \),

one observes that \( I_3^{±,a} \) may be brought into a similar form as (A.16), namely

\[
I_3^{±,a} = \sum_{l=0}^{γ} \left( \gamma \right) \int_{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left( 1 + z^{2k} \right) D^{α|l}(\partial_x^α \partial_x^γ v^±) D^{α|l}(\partial_x^α \partial_x^γ v^±) \, dz \, dx
\]

\[
+ \sum_{l=1}^{γ} \left( \gamma \right) \int_{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left( 1 + z^{2k} \right) (\partial_x^α \partial_x^γ v^± \cdot \nabla) \partial_x^α \partial_x^γ v^± \cdot \partial_x^α \partial_x^γ v^± \, dz \, dx
\]

\[
+ \int_{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left( 1 + z^{2k} \right) (\nabla \cdot \nabla) \partial_x^α \partial_x^γ v^± \cdot \partial_x^α \partial_x^γ v^± \, dz \, dx.
\]

(A.30)

Thus, like in (A.18) one has

\[
|I_3^{±,a}| + |I_3^{±,b}| \leq C \sum_{l=1}^{γ} \left( \left\| \partial_x^α \partial_t^{l+2} \partial_x^β v^± \right\|_{k,|α|+1,|β|,E} + \left\| \partial_x^α \partial_t^{l+2} \partial_x^β v^± \right\|_{k,|α|,|β|,E} + \left\| \partial_x^α \partial_t^{l+2} \partial_x^β v^± \right\|_{k,|α|,|β|,E} \right)
\]

\[
+ C \left( \left\| \partial_x^α \partial_t^{l+2} \partial_x^β v^± \right\|_{k,|α|,|β|,E} + \left\| \partial_x^α \partial_t^{l+2} \partial_x^β v^± \right\|_{k,|α|,|β|,E} \right).
\]

(A.31)
As a consequence of (A.28), (A.29) and (A.31), for \( k, m_1, m_2, m_3 \in \mathbb{N}_0 \), after summing over \( |\alpha| \leq m_1, |\gamma| \leq m_2 \) and \( \beta \leq m_3 \), one has with

\[
\Psi^\pm := C(\eta) \sum_{\gamma=0}^{m_2} \left( \delta_{0,m_1}^\gamma \| \partial_t^\gamma v^\pm \|_{H^{k+2,m_1-1,m_3+1}_E}^2 + \| \partial_t^\gamma v^\pm \|_{H^{k,m_1,m_3}_E}^2 + \delta_{0,m_1}^\gamma \| \partial_t^\gamma v^{-1} \|_{H^{k+2,m_1+1,m_3}_E}^2 \right)
+ \eta \sum_{\gamma=0}^{m_2} \left( \| \partial_t^\gamma v^\pm \|_{H^{k+2,m_1+1,m_3}_E}^2 + \delta_{0,m_1}^\gamma \| \partial_t^\gamma v^{-1} \|_{H^{k+2,m_1,m_3}_E}^2 \right) + C
\]

the estimate

\[
\partial_t \sum_{\gamma=0}^{m_2} \sum_{\lambda \in \{+,-\}} \| \partial_t^\gamma \varphi \|^2_{H^{k,m_1,m_3}_E} + \sum_{\gamma=0}^{m_2} \sum_{\lambda \in \{+,-\}} \frac{\lambda \Box \lambda^2}{2} \| \partial_t^\gamma \varphi \|^2_{H^{k+2,m_1,m_3+1}_E} = 2(\Psi^+ + \Psi^-). \tag{A.32}
\]

Hereby, one knows for the base cases \( m_1 = 0 \) or \( m_2 = 0 \) that the respective norms of the types \( H^{k+2,m_1-1,m_3+1}_E \), \( H^{k+2,m_1,m_3+1}_E \) or \( H^{k+2,m_1+1,m_3}_E \) in (A.32) disappear. Thus, inductively one already has uniform bounds for

\[
\sum_{\gamma=0}^{m_2} \left( \delta_{0,m_1}^\gamma \| \partial_t^\gamma v^\pm \|_{H^{k+2,m_1-1,m_3+1}_E}^2 + \delta_{0,m_1}^\gamma \| \partial_t^\gamma v^{-1} \|_{H^{k+2,m_1+1,m_3}_E}^2 \right).
\]

In conclusion, by choosing \( \eta > 0 \) small and utilizing a Grönwall argument for (A.32), one arrives at (A.21).

### B Regularization effect

In this appendix a proof for Lemma 5.1 is outlined. The argument is carried out by means of a priori estimates and we proceed along the lines of [16, Lemma 9] and [9, Lemma 2.1] where Navier-Stokes and Boussinesq systems have been considered respectively.

In order to write down the estimates for \( u \) and \( B \) simultaneously, the symmetric notations from Section 2.4.1 are employed. Thus, if \( (u, B) \in \mathcal{X}_T \times \mathcal{X}_T \) is a weak Leray-Hopf solution to (2.7), then the functions \( z^\pm = u \pm \sqrt{\mu}B \) obey likewise an induced weak formulation for the Elsasser system

\[
\begin{align*}
\partial_t z^\pm - \Delta (\lambda^z z^\pm + \lambda^z z^-) + (z^+ \cdot \nabla) z^\pm + \nabla p^\pm &= 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{E}_T, \\
\nabla \cdot z^\pm &= 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{E}_T, \\
\nabla \cdot n &= 0 & \text{on } \Sigma_T, \\
(z^\pm \times n) \times n &= \rho^\pm (z^+, z^-) & \text{on } \Sigma_T, \\
z^\pm (\cdot, 0) &= z^\pm_0 & \text{in } \mathcal{E}. 
\end{align*}
\]  

\tag{B.1}

It therefore suffices to establish the statement of Lemma 5.1 for weak solutions \((z^+, z^-) \in \mathcal{X}_T^2 \) to (B.1).

To begin with, we collect a priori estimates for a stationary problem.
Lemma B.1. Let \( k \in \mathbb{N}_0, f^\pm \in H^k(\mathcal{E}), b^\pm \in H^{k+1/2}(\partial \mathcal{E}) \) and \( M^\pm, L^\pm \in C^\infty(\partial \mathcal{E}; \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}) \) be arbitrarily fixed. Then, every solution \((Z^+, Z^-, P^+, P^-)\) to the coupled Stokes type system

\[
\begin{aligned}
-\Delta (\lambda^\pm Z^+ + \lambda^- Z^-) + \nabla P^\pm &= f^\pm \quad \text{in } \mathcal{E}_T, \\
\nabla \cdot Z^\pm &= 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{E}_T, \\
Z^\pm \cdot n &= 0 \quad \text{on } \Sigma_T, \\
(\nabla \times Z^\pm) \times n + [M^\pm Z^+ + L^\pm Z^-]_{\text{tan}} &= b^\pm \quad \text{on } \Sigma_T 
\end{aligned}
\]

obeys the estimate

\[
\sum_{\Delta \in \{+, -\}} \left( \|Z^\Delta\|_{H^{k+1}(\mathcal{E})} + \|P^\Delta\|_{H^{k+1}(\mathcal{E})} \right) \leq C \sum_{\Delta \in \{+, -\}} \left( \|f^\Delta\|_{H^k(\mathcal{E})} + \|b^\Delta\|_{H^{k+1/2}(\partial \mathcal{E})} \right). \tag{B.3}
\]

Proof. The proof is reduced to known results for Stokes equations under Navier slip-with-friction boundary conditions. Indeed, if we first assume the uncoupled boundary conditions where \( M^- = L^+ = 0 \), then \( U := Z^+ + Z^- \) and \( V := Z^+ - Z^- \) both obey independent Stokes problems under Navier slip-with-friction boundary conditions. Thus, from [25, Pages 90-94] one has for each \( k \geq 0 \) the estimates

\[
\begin{align*}
\|U\|_{H^{k+1}(\mathcal{E})} + \|P^+ + P^-\|_{H^{k+1}(\mathcal{E})} &\leq C \left( \|f^+ + f^-\|_{H^k(\mathcal{E})} + \|b^+ + b^-\|_{H^{k+1/2}(\partial \mathcal{E})} \right), \\
\|V\|_{H^{k+1}(\mathcal{E})} + \|P^+ - P^-\|_{H^{k+1}(\mathcal{E})} &\leq C \left( \|f^+ - f^-\|_{H^k(\mathcal{E})} + \|b^+ - b^-\|_{H^{k+1/2}(\partial \mathcal{E})} \right),
\end{align*}
\]

which imply (B.3) by means of the triangle inequality.

For obtaining the general case, where \( M^- \neq 0 \neq L^+ \) is possible, we start with \( k = 0 \) and observe that every solution \((Z^+, Z^-, P^+, P^-)\) to (B.2) satisfies

\[
\begin{aligned}
-\Delta (\lambda^\pm Z^+ + \lambda^- Z^-) + \nabla P^\pm &= f^\pm \quad \text{in } \mathcal{E}_T, \\
\nabla \cdot Z^\pm &= 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{E}_T, \\
Z^\pm \cdot n &= 0 \quad \text{on } \Sigma_T, \\
(\nabla \times Z^\pm) \times n + [\tilde{\rho}^+(Z^\pm)]_{\text{tan}} &= \tilde{b}^\pm \quad \text{on } \Sigma_T,
\end{aligned}
\]

wherein

\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{\rho}^+(Z^+) &:= M^+ Z^+, \quad \tilde{b}^+ := b^+ - \left[ L^+ Z^- \right]_{\text{tan}}, \\
\tilde{\rho}^-(Z^-) &:= L^- Z^-, \quad \tilde{b}^- := b^- - \left[ M^- Z^+ \right]_{\text{tan}}.
\end{align*}
\]

Hereby, one has \( \tilde{b}^\pm \in H^{1/2}(\partial \mathcal{E}) \) because the trace operator \( H^1(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow H^{1/2}(\partial \mathcal{E}) \) is bounded (see for instance [18]) and a priori \( L^2(\mathcal{E}) \) energy estimates for (B.2) guarantee

\[
\sum_{\Delta \in \{+, -\}} \|Z^\Delta\|_{H^1(\mathcal{E})} \leq C \sum_{\Delta \in \{+, -\}} \left( \|f^\Delta\|_{W(\mathcal{E})'} + \|b^\Delta\|_{H^{-1/2}(\mathcal{E})} \right).
\]

Therefore, applying to (B.4) the result for uncoupled boundary conditions explained above, one finds

\[
\sum_{\Delta \in \{+, -\}} \left( \|Z^\Delta\|_{H^1(\mathcal{E})} + \|P^\Delta\|_{H^1(\mathcal{E})} \right) \leq C \sum_{\Delta \in \{+, -\}} \left( \|f^\Delta\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})} + \|b^\Delta\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial \mathcal{E})} \right).
\]

Then, if (B.3) is assumed to be true for any fixed \( k \in \mathbb{N} \), one has \( \tilde{b}^\pm \in H^{k+1/2}(\partial \mathcal{E}) \). Consequently, the known estimates for (B.4) lead to (B.3) with \( k \) replaced by \( k + 1 \). \( \square \)
In what follows, the operator $\mathbb{P}$ denotes the Leray projector in $L^2(\mathcal{E})$ onto $H(\mathcal{E})$ and thus, for any selection $\mathbf{h}^+, \mathbf{h}^- \in H(\mathcal{E}) \cap H^2(\mathcal{E})$ with $N^\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{h}^+, \mathbf{h}^-) = 0$, Lemma B.1 provides
\[
\|\mathbf{h}^+\|_{H^2(\mathcal{E})}^2 \leq C \sum_{\triangle \in \{+,-\}} \|\mathbb{P}\Delta(\lambda^+ \mathbf{h}^+ + \lambda^- \mathbf{h}^-)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})}^2.
\] (B.5)

**Step 1, weak estimates in $[0, T/3]$.** We introduce for a positive parameter $\kappa > 0$ the quantity
\[
F^\kappa(t) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\triangle \in \{+,-\}} \left( \frac{d}{dt} \|z^\triangle(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})}^2 + \kappa (\lambda^+ \bigtriangleup \lambda^-) \|\nabla \times (z^+ \bigtriangleup z^-)(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})}^2 \right).
\]

Then, the strong energy inequality (2.15) with $\xi^\pm = 0$ provides
\[
\int_0^t F^1(s) \, ds \leq \sum_{(\triangle, \sigma) \in \{(+, \sigma), (-, \sigma)\}} \int_0^t \int_{\partial \mathcal{E}} (\lambda^+ \rho^\sigma(z^+, z^-) + \lambda^- \rho^\sigma(z^+, z^-)) \cdot z^\sigma \, dS \, ds.
\]

Furthermore, by (2.1) and trace estimates, together with $\rho^\pm \in C^\infty(\partial \mathcal{E}; \mathbb{R}^{N \times 2N})$ being fixed, one has for small $\eta > 0$ and $\square, \triangle \in \{+,-\}$ the bound
\[
\int_{\partial \mathcal{E}} \rho^\square(z^+, z^-) \cdot z^\triangle \, dS \leq C \sum_{\sigma, \triangle \in \{+,-\}} \|z^\triangle\|_{H^1(\mathcal{E})} \|z^\sigma\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})}
\leq \sum_{\sigma, \triangle \in \{+,-\}} \left( \eta \|\nabla \times z^\sigma\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})}^2 + C(\eta) \|z^\sigma\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})}^2 \right).
\]

Thus, for $\eta > 0$ sufficiently small it follows
\[
\int_0^t F^{1/2}(s) \, ds \leq C(\eta) \int_0^t \left( \|z^+(\cdot, s)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})}^2 + \|z^-(\cdot, s)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})}^2 \right) \, ds.
\]

As a result, by employing (2.1) similarly as in Section 3.5.2 and further utilizing Grönwall’s inequality, one obtains for $t \in (0, T)$ the energy estimate
\[
\sum_{\triangle \in \{+,-\}} \left( \|z^\triangle(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})}^2 + \frac{\lambda^+ \bigtriangleup \lambda^-}{2} \int_0^t \|z^+ \bigtriangleup z^-(\cdot, s)\|_{H^1(\mathcal{E})}^2 \, ds \right) \leq C \sum_{\triangle \in \{+,-\}} \|z^\triangle_0\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})}^2,
\]
which provides a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that
\[
\frac{T}{3} \min_{s \in [0, T/3]} \left\{ \|z^+(\cdot, s)\|_{H^1(\mathcal{E})}^2 + \|z^-(\cdot, s)\|_{H^1(\mathcal{E})}^2 \right\} \leq C_1 \left( \|z^+_0\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})}^2 + \|z^-_0\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})}^2 \right).
\]

Therefore, there exists a possibly small instance $t_1 \in [0, T/3]$ for which
\[
\|z^+(\cdot, t_1)\|_{H^1(\mathcal{E})} \leq \sqrt{\frac{3C_1}{T}} \left( \|z^+_0\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})}^2 + \|z^-_0\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E})}^2 \right).
\]

**Step 2, strong estimates in $(t_1, 2T/3)$.** We apply the Leray projector $\mathbb{P}$ in (B.1), followed by multiplying the result with $\mathbb{P}\Delta z^\pm$. In parallel, (B.1) is multiplied with $\partial_t z^\pm$. Subsequently, the results are added up and integrated over $\mathcal{E}$. In this process, the appearing boundary integrals
are estimated using (2.11) and (2.1). Accordingly, by means of denoting for \(\sigma, \delta > 0\) the functional

\[
G^{\sigma, \delta}(t) := \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \sum_{\Delta \in \{+1\}} \|\nabla \times z^\Delta(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(E)}^2 + \sigma \sum_{\Delta \in \{+1\}} \|\partial_t z^\Delta(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(E)}^2
\]

\[
+ \frac{\delta}{2} \sum_{\Delta \in \{+1\}} (A^+ \nabla A^-) \|\Delta(z^+ \nabla z^-)(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(E)},
\]

it follows for some \(C = C(E, \|M^\pm\|_{L^\infty(E)}, \|L^\pm\|_{L^\infty(E)}) > 0\) that

\[
G^{\pm, 1/2, 1/2} \leq J^\pm + C \sum_{\Delta \in \{+1\}} \left( \|z^\Delta\|_{L^2(E)}^2 + \|
abla \times z^\Delta\|_{L^2(E)}^2 \right),
\]

where

\[
J^\pm := \int_E \left( \|\nabla \cdot z^\pm \|_{L^2(E)} \right) \cdot \Delta z^\pm \right) \, dx + \int_E \left( \|\nabla \cdot z^\pm \|_{L^2(E)} \right) \cdot \partial_z z^\pm \, dx.
\]

Applying inequalities of Hölder, Gagliardo–Nirenberg and Young, one obtains for a small constant \(\eta > 0\) the bound

\[
J^\pm \leq \|z^\pm \cdot \nabla\|_{L^2(E)} \left( \|\nabla z^\pm\|_{L^2(E)} + \|\partial_t z^\pm\|_{L^2(E)} \right)
\]

\[
\leq C \|z^\pm\|_{H^1(E)}^2 \|\nabla z^\pm\|_{L^2(E)} \left( \|\Delta z^\pm\|_{L^2(E)} + \|\partial_t z^\pm\|_{L^2(E)} \right)
\]

\[
\leq C(\eta) \|z^\pm\|_{H^1(E)} \|z^\pm\|_{H^1(E)} \|\nabla z^\pm\|_{L^2(E)} + \eta \|z^\pm\|_{H^1(E)} \|\nabla z^\pm\|_{L^2(E)} + \eta \|\Delta z^\pm\|_{L^2(E)} + \|\partial_t z^\pm\|_{L^2(E)} \right),
\]

Moreover, (2.1) and Young’s inequality with \(1/3 + 4/6 = 1\) provide

\[
\|z^\pm\|_{H^1(E)} \|z^\pm\|_{H^1(E)} \leq C \sum_{\Delta \in \{\pm\}} \left( \|z^\pm\|_{L^2(E)} + \|\nabla \times z^\pm\|_{L^2(E)} \right)^6,
\]

while (B.5) allows to infer

\[
\eta \|z^\pm\|_{H^1(E)}^2 \leq \eta C \sum_{\Delta \in \{\pm\}} \|\Delta z^\pm\|_{L^2(E)}^2.
\]

Thus, combining (B.6)–(B.8) results in

\[
G^{\pm, 1/2, 1/2} \leq C(\eta) \sum_{\Delta \in \{\pm\}} \left( \|z^\pm\|_{L^2(E)} + \|\nabla \times z^\pm\|_{L^2(E)} \right)^6 + \eta C \sum_{\Delta \in \{\pm\}} \|\Delta z^\pm\|_{L^2(E)}^2
\]

\[
+ \eta \|\partial_t z^\pm\|_{L^2(E)}^2 + C \sum_{\Delta \in \{\pm\}} \left( \|z^\pm\|_{L^2(E)}^2 + \|\nabla \times z^\pm\|_{L^2(E)}^2 \right)
\]

such that after choosing sufficiently small parameters \(\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3 \in (0, 1)\) one arrives at

\[
F^{\delta_1}(t) + G^{\delta_2, \delta_3}(t) \leq C \sum_{\Delta \in \{\pm\}} \left( \|z^\pm\|_{L^2(E)} + \|\nabla \times z^\pm\|_{L^2(E)} \right)^6.
\]
Let us gather the above estimates. Due to the elementary inequality

\[ \sum_{\partial \in \{+, -\}} \left( \| z^\partial(\cdot, t) \|_{L^2(E)} + \| \nabla \times z^\partial(\cdot, t) \|_{L^2(E)} \right)^2 \leq 2 \sum_{\partial \in \{+, -\}} \left( \| z^\partial(\cdot, t) \|_{L^2(E)}^2 + \| \nabla \times z^\partial(\cdot, t) \|_{L^2(E)}^2 \right), \]

applying Grönwall’s lemma in (B.9) provides for \( t > t_1 \) and sufficiently small \( c_1 > 0 \) that

\[ \sum_{\partial \in \{+, -\}} \left( \| z^\partial(\cdot, t) \|_{L^2(E)} + \| \nabla \times z^\partial(\cdot, t) \|_{L^2(E)} \right)^2 \]

\[ + c_1 \sum_{\partial \in \{+, -\}} \int_{t_1}^t \left( \| z^\partial(\cdot, s) \|_{H^2(E)}^2 + \| \partial_\lambda z^\partial(\cdot, s) \|_{L^2(E)}^2 \right) \, ds \]

\[ \leq C \sum_{\partial \in \{+, -\}} \| z^\partial \|_{H^2(E)}^2(t_1) + C \sum_{\partial \in \{+, -\}} \int_{t_1}^t \left( \| z^\partial(\cdot, s) \|_{L^2(E)} + \| \nabla \times z^\partial(\cdot, s) \|_{L^2(E)} \right)^6 \, ds. \]

Thus, by defining the function

\[ \Phi(t) := C \sum_{\partial \in \{+, -\}} \| z^\partial \|_{H^2(E)}^2(t_1) + C \sum_{\partial \in \{+, -\}} \int_{t_1}^t \left( \| z^\partial(\cdot, s) \|_{L^2(E)} + \| \nabla \times z^\partial(\cdot, s) \|_{L^2(E)} \right)^6 \, ds, \]

and denoting \( \Phi = \frac{d\Phi}{dt} \) one obtains \( \Phi^3 \leq C \). Taking \( s_1 > 0 \) small enough and integrating the latter differential inequality leads for \( t \in [t_1, t_1 + s_1] \) to

\[ \Phi(t)^2 \leq \frac{C^2 \left( \sum_{\partial \in \{+, -\}} \| z^\partial \|_{H^2(E)}^2(t_1) \right)^2}{1 - 2(t - t_1)C^3 \left( \sum_{\partial \in \{+, -\}} \| z^\partial \|_{H^2(E)}^2(t_1) \right)^2}. \]

Consequently, for some constant \( C_2 > 0 \) and all \( t \in [t_1, t_1 + s_1] \) one has the estimate

\[ \sum_{\partial \in \{+, -\}} \left( \| z^\partial(\cdot, t) \|_{H^2(E)}^2 + c_1 \int_{t_1}^t \left( \| z^\partial(\cdot, s) \|_{H^2(E)}^2 + \| \partial_\lambda z^\partial(\cdot, s) \|_{L^2(E)}^2 \right) \, ds \right) \]

\[ \leq C_2 \sum_{\partial \in \{+, -\}} \| z^\partial \|_{H^2(E)}^2(t_1). \]

Therefore, there exists \( t_2 \in (t_1, 2T/3) \) such that

\[ \| z^\pm \|_{H^2(E)}^2(t_2) \, ds \leq \sqrt{\frac{C_2}{s_1}} \left[ \| z^+ \|_{H^2(E)}^2(t_1) + \| z^- \|_{H^2(E)}^2(t_1) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \]

**Step 3. Additional estimates for \( \partial_\lambda z^\pm \) in \( (t_2, T) \).** Taking the derivative \( \partial_\lambda \) in (B.1), followed by multiplications with \( \partial_\lambda z^\pm \) respectively, provides for

\[ H(t) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\partial \in \{+, -\}} \left( \frac{d}{dt} \| \partial_\lambda z^\partial(\cdot, t) \|_{L^2(E)}^2 + (\lambda^+ - \lambda^-) \| \nabla \times (\partial_\lambda z^+ \partial_\lambda z^-)(\cdot, t) \|_{L^2(E)}^2 \right) \]
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\[ H \leq -\int_E (\partial_t z^- \cdot \nabla) z^+ \cdot \partial_t z^+ \, dx - \int_E (\partial_t z^+ \cdot \nabla) z^- \cdot \partial_t z^- \, dx + \sum_{(\Delta, \phi) \in \{(+,-),(-,+),(-,-),(+,+)\}} \int_{\partial E} (\lambda^+ \rho^+ (\partial_t z^+, \partial_t z^-)) + \lambda^- \rho^- (\partial_t z^+, \partial_t z^-)) \cdot \partial_t z^\phi \, dS. \]

Therefore, considerations similar to the previous steps lead for some constants \( C_3 > 0 \), \( c_2 \in (0, 1) \), a possibly small time \( s_2 \in (0, T/3) \) and all \( t \in [t_2, t_2 + s_2] \) to

\[ \| \partial_t z^\pm (\cdot, t) \|_{L^2(E)} + c_2 \int_{t_2}^t \| \partial_t z^\pm (\cdot, s) \|_{H^1(\Omega)} \, ds \leq \sqrt{\frac{C_3}{s_2}} \sum_{\phi \in \{+,-\}} \| \partial_t z^\phi (\cdot, t_2) \|_{L^2(E)}^2. \]

**Step 4. conclusions.** After shifting the time derivative and the nonlinear terms in (B.1) to the right hand side, thus regarding (B.1) as a family of Stokes type problems, one can apply Lemma B.1. As a result, one obtains \( L^\infty([0, T]; H^2(E)) \) bounds for \( z^\pm \) which allow to conceptually repeat the above steps until Lemma 5.1 is verified.
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