

Regularisation and separation for evolving surface Cahn-Hilliard equations

Diogo Caetano* Charles M. Elliott* Maurizio Grasselli† Andrea Poiatti†

May 23, 2022

Abstract

We consider the Cahn-Hilliard equation with constant mobility and logarithmic potential on a two-dimensional evolving closed surface embedded in \mathbb{R}^3 , as well as a related weighted model. The well-posedness of weak solutions for the corresponding initial value problems on a given time interval $[0, T]$ have already been established by the first two authors. Here we first prove some regularisation properties of weak solutions in finite time. Then, we show the validity of the strict separation property for both the problems. This means that the solutions stay uniformly away from the pure phases ± 1 from any positive time on. This property plays an essential role to achieve higher-order regularity for the solutions. Also, it is a rigorous validation of the standard double-well approximation. The present results are a twofold extension of the well-known ones for the classical equation in planar domains.

1 Introduction

The Cahn-Hilliard equation in an evolving surface setting has recently been studied in [8]. More precisely, having fixed $T > 0$, considering a family of closed, connected, oriented surfaces in \mathbb{R}^3 such that its evolution is given a priori as a flow determined by the (sufficiently smooth) velocity field \mathbf{V} , the evolving surface Cahn-Hilliard equation reads

$$\dot{u} + u\nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V} - \nabla_\Gamma \cdot (u\mathbf{V}_a^\tau) + \Delta_\Gamma^2 u - \Delta_\Gamma F'(u) = 0, \quad (1.1)$$

in $\mathcal{G}_T := \bigcup_{t \in [0, T]} \{t\} \times \Gamma(t)$. Here \mathbf{V}_a^τ corresponds to the difference between the tangential component of \mathbf{V} and an advective velocity on the surface. In the same contribution, the following related weighted Cahn-Hilliard system has also been analysed

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\rho} + \rho\nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V} = 0, & \text{in } \mathcal{G}_T, \\ \rho\dot{c} - \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \left(\rho\nabla_\Gamma \left(-\frac{1}{\rho}\Delta_\Gamma c + F'(c) \right) \right) - \nabla_\Gamma \cdot (\rho c\mathbf{V}_a^\tau) = 0, & \text{in } \mathcal{G}_T, \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

where ρ is a suitable weight function transported by the surface evolution.

In the equations above, equipped with suitable initial conditions, ∇_Γ denotes the tangential gradient on the surface $\Gamma(\cdot)$, Δ_Γ is the Laplace-Beltrami operator and \dot{u} denotes the material time derivative of u (see Section 2 for more details). The functional framework in this work is the same as in [8].

This work aims at proving that weak solutions to the above equations regularise in finite time and enjoy the instantaneous strict separation property from the pure phases, i.e., for each $\tau > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ depending on τ , T and the data such that

$$\|u(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma(t))} \leq 1 - \delta, \quad \text{for a.a. } t \in [\tau, T]. \quad (1.3)$$

The present results answer to some regularity issues left open (see [8, 5.1.3]).

The classical Cahn-Hilliard equation was introduced in [10] (see also [9]) for the study of spinodal decomposition in binary alloys. More precisely, it models the phenomenon of phase separation of an alloy of two components when the temperature of the system is quenched to a critical temperature, resulting on a spatially separated two-phase structure. On a smooth bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, where $d = 1, 2, 3$, it reads as

$$\begin{cases} \dot{u} = \Delta w, & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \\ w = -\Delta u + F'(u) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \end{cases} \quad (1.4)$$

*Mathematics Institute, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, United Kingdom (Diogo.Caetano@warwick.ac.uk, C.M.Elliott@warwick.ac.uk)

†Dipartimento di Matematica, Politecnico di Milano, Milano, 20133, Italy (maurizio.grasselli@polimi.it, andrea.poiatti@polimi.it)

where w is the so called chemical potential and is complemented with the (no-flux) boundary and initial conditions

$$\partial_n u = \partial_n w = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T) \quad \text{and} \quad u(0) = u_0 \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Note that we have assumed constant mobility and set it equal to 1. It has since then inspired numerous works in other areas of science; to name a few, versions of the Cahn-Hilliard equation have been used to study population dynamics [11], tumor growth models [27] and they have been exploited in image processing analysis [6, 7] (see also the recent book [28] for other examples). It is also worth recalling that phase separation has recently become a paradigm in Cell Biology (see, for instance, [13]).

In the equation above, u is to be thought of as the difference between the concentrations of the two components in the alloys. The nonlinearity F , also referred to as the homogeneous free energy (potential) of the system, is defined as

$$F(r) = \frac{\theta}{2} ((1+r) \ln(1+r) + (1-r) \ln(1-r)) - \frac{\theta_0}{2} r^2, \quad r \in [-1, 1], \quad (1.5)$$

where θ, θ_0 are absolute temperatures and satisfy $0 < \theta < \theta_0$. This ensures that F has a double-well shape. From the modelling point of view, the logarithmic terms are related to the entropy of the system, while the quadratic term accounts for demixing effects. It is the competition between the two terms that gives rise to the spatially distributed phase separation. The potential defined in this way is called *singular*, whereas many authors considered a proper approximation, which avoids the fact that F' is unbounded at the pure phases ± 1 . The most common choice is a polynomial of fourth degree, typically of the form $F(r) = \frac{1}{4}(r^2 - u_\theta^2)^2$, where $u_\theta > 0$ and $-u_\theta < 0$ are the minima of (1.5); this guarantees that F has a symmetric double-well shape also with minima at $\pm u_\theta$. This is usually referred as a regular potential. This case was also taken into account in [8]. However, the polynomial approximation does not ensure the existence of physical solutions, that is, solutions whose values are in $[-1, 1]$, due to the lack of comparison principles for the Cahn-Hilliard equation. We refer to the original proof of well-posedness with (1.5) in [18], as well as the survey articles [17, 30] and the recent book [28] for an overview of the mathematical results for (1.4).

As far as the evolving surface version is concerned, both systems (1.1) and (1.2) are treated in [8], where the authors establish existence, uniqueness and stability of solutions for the different cases where F is a smooth, logarithmic or double obstacle potential, respectively. Some regularity results are also proved. We refer also to [19, 31, 34] for different derivations of the equation and some numerical results, and to [35] for a rigorous modelling source for the weighted system (1.2). Interest in this equation is part of the more general problem of considering partial differential equations on domains or surfaces that evolve in time which is presently being vastly studied, since these have been seen to provide more realistic models for physical and biological phenomena. Some examples are [5, 16, 21, 22, 25, 33]. Not only are these relevant for applications, but they also raise interesting modelling, numerical and computational questions, as well as challenging problems from the point of view of mathematical analysis. We refer in particular to [20] for a detailed exposition of the numerical analysis of such problems and to [2–4] for an abstract functional framework well-suited for the treatment of such problems.

The importance of establishing the strict separation property is twofold.

- First it is essential when one considers higher-order regularity of weak solutions, due to the behaviour of F and its derivatives close to ± 1 . Indeed, note that

$$F'(r) = \frac{\theta}{2} \ln \frac{1+r}{1-r} - \theta_0 r \quad \text{and} \quad F''(r) = \frac{\theta}{2} \left(\frac{1}{1+r} + \frac{1}{1-r} \right) - \theta_0$$

are both singular when $r \rightarrow \pm 1$, and even though the structure of F' can be exploited in order to obtain some estimates, it is more challenging to do so for F'' . As noted in, e.g., [26], we have

$$F''(r) \leq C e^{C|F'(r)|}, \quad (1.6)$$

which precludes us from controlling F'' in L^p -spaces in terms of the L^p -norms of F' . It is then important to study conditions that ensure integrability of F'' . It is clear that establishing strict separation from the pure phases as in (1.3) is crucial to achieve this. Furthermore, the strict separation property is a fundamental ingredient in the study of longtime behavior of solutions (see [26, 29]).

- Secondly, if the strict separation property holds then, being the solution away from ± 1 , the logarithmic potential F is smooth and can be dominated by a polynomial. Therefore, this result can be viewed as a rigorous justification of the usual aforementioned polynomial double-well approximation.

Separation from the pure phases for dimensions $d \geq 3$ is unknown even in the fixed domain setting, in the case of constant mobility. This apparently technical restriction is related to the growth condition (1.6) (see [24]

for a detailed analysis). As a consequence, our results are restricted to two-dimensional surfaces. The strict separation for $d = 2$ was first established for (1.1) in [29]. Then, a more general argument was introduced in [26]. For an up-to-date picture of the state-of-the-art, the reader is referred to [24], where new proofs and further generalizations are given.

Here, not only we extend the result for two-dimensional planar domains for equation (1.1), but we also prove the first separation result for the weighted model (1.2).

This article on one hand complements [8] by proving instantaneous regularisation of the weak solutions and on the other hand extends the validity of the strict separation property for the local Cahn-Hilliard equation with constant mobility to the setting of evolving surfaces in \mathbb{R}^3 in two cases. It is also worth observing that our approach to the estimates for solutions to the approximate problems allows us to forgo some of the assumptions made in [8] (see, e.g., [8, Assumption A_P]), generalising the results therein. For the sake of completeness, here we also include the proof of continuous dependence on the initial data, entailing uniqueness for the general system (1.2), which was omitted in [8].

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we briefly recall the setting from [8] on the evolution of the surfaces and state some additional regularity assumptions. Section 3 is devoted to the analysis of the first system (1.1) and we establish higher-order regularity for the solution u and prove that it satisfies the strict separation property. Finally, in Section 4 we introduce a better suited Galerkin approximation for the alternative weighted model (1.2) and prove analogous regularity results as well as the strict separation property. We also include three appendices for the sake of completeness: in Appendix A we present the proofs of some propositions which are only stated in the main body of the paper. Appendix B collects some preliminary results essential to obtain the control of higher-order derivatives of the logarithmic potential (in particular, we report a Moser-Trudinger type inequality valid on compact Riemannian manifolds and a generalized Young's inequality), whereas in Appendix C we show the validity of a well-known embedding result for Bochner spaces also in the evolving space setting.

2 Surface motion: assumptions

We refer to the setting and the notation of [14]. To be more precise, we consider $T > 0$ and a C^2 -evolving surface $\{\Gamma(t)\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ in \mathbb{R}^3 , i.e. a closed, connected, orientable C^2 -surface Γ_0 in \mathbb{R}^3 together with a smooth *flow map*

$$\Phi: [0, T] \times \Gamma_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$$

such that

- (i) denoting $\Gamma(t) := \Phi_t^0(\Gamma_0)$, the map

$$\Phi_t^0 := \Phi(t, \cdot): \Gamma_0 \rightarrow \Gamma(t)$$

is a C^2 -diffeomorphism, with inverse map

$$\Phi_0^t: \Gamma(t) \rightarrow \Gamma_0;$$

- (ii) $\Phi_0^0 = \text{id}_{\Gamma_0}$.

It follows from the definition above that, for each $t \in [0, T]$, $\Gamma(t)$ is also a closed, connected, orientable C^2 -surface. In addition to the assumptions on the surface motion, we also suppose that there exists a velocity field $\mathbf{V}: [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ such that:

- for any $t \in [0, T]$ and every $x \in \Gamma_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \Phi_t^0(x) &= \mathbf{V}(t, \Phi_t^0(x)), \quad \text{in } [0, T] \\ \Phi_0^0(x) &= x; \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

- regularity of \mathbf{V}

$$\mathbf{V} \in C^1([0, T]; C^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)); \tag{2.2}$$

- regularity of the advective tangential velocity \mathbf{V}_a

$$\mathbf{V}_a \in C^1([0, T]; C^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)). \tag{2.3}$$

Notice that the above assumptions require more regularity in time for Φ than [8, \mathbf{A}_Φ]. Denoting by \mathbf{V}_τ and \mathbf{V}_ν the tangential and normal components of \mathbf{V} , respectively, this implies in particular, for $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{V}_\tau(t)\|_{C^2(\Gamma(t))}, \|\mathbf{V}_\nu(t)\|_{C^2(\Gamma(t))} &\leq \|\mathbf{V}(t)\|_{C^2(\Gamma(t))} \leq C_{\mathbf{V}}, \\ \|\mathbf{V}_a(t)\|_{C^0(\Gamma(t))} &\leq C_{\mathbf{V}}, \\ \|\partial^\bullet \mathbf{V}_a^T(t)\|_{C^0(\Gamma(t))} &\leq C_{\mathbf{V}},\end{aligned}$$

for $t \in [0, T]$ and for some $C_{\mathbf{V}} > 0$ independent of time, where (see [8]) $\mathbf{V}_a^T := \mathbf{V}_\tau - \mathbf{V}_a$. In this setting we can define the normal material time derivative of a scalar quantity u on $\Gamma(t)$ by

$$\partial^\circ u := \tilde{u}_t + \nabla \tilde{u} \cdot \mathbf{V}_\nu,$$

where \tilde{u} denotes any extension of u to a (space-time) neighbourhood of $\Gamma(t)$, and its full material time derivative, or strong time derivative, as

$$\partial^\bullet u := \partial^\circ u + \nabla_{\Gamma} u \cdot \mathbf{V}_\tau = \tilde{u}_t + \nabla \tilde{u} \cdot \mathbf{V}, \quad (2.4)$$

These definitions take into account not only the evolution of the quantity u but also the movement of points in the surface. The definition in (2.4) can be abstracted to a weaker sense as follows. Let $u \in L^2_{H^1}$. A functional $v \in L^2_{H^{-1}}$ is said to be the weak time derivative of u , and we write $v = \partial^\bullet u$, if, for any $\eta \in \mathcal{D}_{H^1}(0, T)$, we have

$$\int_0^T \langle v(t), \eta(t) \rangle_{H^{-1} \times H^1} = - \int_0^T (u(t), \partial^\bullet \eta(t))_{L^2} - \int_0^T \int_{\Gamma(t)} u(t) \eta(t) \nabla_{\Gamma(t)} \cdot \mathbf{V}(t). \quad (2.5)$$

Observe that $\partial^\bullet \eta$ is the strong material derivative of η . We will use $\partial^\bullet u$ for both the strong and weak material derivatives.

Thanks to [15, Lemma 2.6], we observe that, for a sufficiently regular vector field \mathbf{f} , there holds

$$\partial^\bullet (\nabla_{\Gamma} \cdot \mathbf{f}) = \partial^\bullet \underline{D}_i^{\Gamma(t)} \mathbf{f}_i = \underline{D}_i^{\Gamma(t)} \partial^\bullet \mathbf{f}_i - A_{lr}(\mathbf{V}) \underline{D}_r^{\Gamma(t)} \mathbf{f}_l, \quad l, r = 1, 2, 3.$$

Here $\underline{D}_i^{\Gamma(t)}$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, is the i^{th} component of the tangential gradient and

$$A_{lr}(\mathbf{V}) = \underline{D}_i^{\Gamma(t)} \mathbf{V}_r - \nu_s \nu_l \underline{D}_r^{\Gamma(t)} \mathbf{V}_s, \quad s = 1, 2, 3,$$

with ν standing for the normal vector field to the surface. Therefore, by (2.2) we can set $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{V}$ in the previous equality and deduce that, due to the regularity of $\Gamma(t)$, we also have

$$\|\partial^\bullet \nabla_{\Gamma} \cdot \mathbf{V}(t)\|_{C^0(\Gamma(t))} \leq C_{\mathbf{V}} \quad \forall t \in [0, T]. \quad (2.6)$$

Moreover, denoting by J_t^0 and J_t^t , the change of area element from Γ_0 to $\Gamma(t)$ and the one from $\Gamma(t)$ to Γ_0 , respectively, we have, for any $\eta : \Gamma(t) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\int_{\Gamma(t)} \eta d\Gamma = \int_{\Gamma_0} \tilde{\eta} J_t^0 d\Gamma_0,$$

with $\tilde{\eta}(p) = \eta(\Phi_t^0(p))$, for any $p \in \Gamma_0$. Note that $J_t^0(\cdot) = \det D_{\Gamma_0} \Phi_t^0(\cdot)$. Then, due to the previous assumptions, we deduce

$$\frac{1}{C_J} \leq \|J_t^0\|_{C^0(\Gamma(t))} \leq C_J, \quad \text{for any } t \in [0, T], \quad (2.7)$$

where C_J can be chosen to be independent of t . This also implies that there exists a constant $C_{\Gamma} > 0$, independent of t , such that

$$\frac{|\Gamma_0|}{C_{\Gamma}} \leq |\Gamma(t)| \leq C_{\Gamma} |\Gamma_0|, \quad (2.8)$$

for any $t \in [0, T]$. Here $|\Gamma_0|$ stands for the Lebesgue surface measure. For any integrable function v over a surface Γ of positive measure, we set

$$(v)_{\Gamma} = \frac{\int_{\Gamma} v}{|\Gamma|}.$$

General agreement. The symbol $C > 0$ will denote a generic constant, depending only on the structural parameters of the problem and T , but independent of time t and of the approximating indices δ, M (unless otherwise specified).

3 The first model

In this section we consider system (1.1), which is a model proposed in [8, Problem 4.1]. We start by briefly recalling its derivation.

3.1 Derivation

Fix $t \in [0, T]$, let u represent a scalar quantity on $\Gamma(t)$ and let q be a surface flux for u . Standard calculations for a balance law on an evolving surface as in [8] lead to

$$\partial^\circ u + u \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V}_\nu + \nabla_\Gamma \cdot q = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma(t). \quad (3.1)$$

To obtain the Cahn-Hilliard system we now choose the surface flux q to be the sum of an advective term $q_a = u \mathbf{V}_a$, where \mathbf{V}_a is a tangential velocity, and a diffusive term of the form $q_d = -\nabla_\Gamma w$, where the chemical potential w is defined by

$$w = -\Delta_\Gamma u + F'(u), \quad (3.2)$$

with F as in (1.5). Substituting $q = q_a + q_d$ in (3.1) leads to

$$\partial^\circ u + u \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V}_\nu + \nabla_\Gamma \cdot (u \mathbf{V}_a) = \Delta_\Gamma (-\Delta_\Gamma u + F'(u)), \quad (3.3)$$

which we rewrite adding the terms involving the tangential velocity \mathbf{V}_τ as

$$\partial^\bullet u + u \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V} - \nabla_\Gamma \cdot (u(\mathbf{V}_\tau - \mathbf{V}_a)) = \Delta_\Gamma (-\Delta_\Gamma u + F'(u)), \quad (3.4)$$

or equivalently the system

$$\begin{aligned} \partial^\bullet u + u \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V} - \nabla_\Gamma \cdot (u \mathbf{V}_a^\tau) &= \Delta_\Gamma w, \\ -\Delta_\Gamma u + F'(u) &= w, \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

on $\Gamma(t)$.

3.2 Weak formulation

In order to introduce the variational formulation of the Cahn-Hilliard systems we need to introduce the abstract framework of [2, 3] for the definition of the time-dependent function spaces. We do it in a summarised way and refer the reader to [2, 3] for a more rigorous and detailed explanation of how these are constructed and how they can be abstracted to a more generalised setting.

We use the flow map Φ_t^0 to define pullback and pushforward operators

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{-t} u &= u \circ \Phi_t^0: \Gamma_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \quad \text{for } u: \Gamma(t) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \\ \phi_t v &= v \circ \Phi_0^t: \Gamma(t) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \quad \text{for } v: \Gamma_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

and suppose, for $t \in [0, T]$, $X(t)$ to be a Banach space of functions over $\Gamma(t)$; typically $L^2(\Gamma(t))$ or some higher-order Sobolev space $H^k(\Gamma(t))$, but also other $L^p(\Gamma(t))$ or even the dual space $H^{-1}(\Gamma(t)) := (H^1(\Gamma(t)))^*$. We consider functions of the form

$$u: [0, T] \rightarrow \bigcup_{t \in [0, T]} X(t) \times \{t\}, \quad t \mapsto (\bar{u}(t), t)$$

and identify $u(t) \equiv \bar{u}(t)$; in practice, we want to see $u(t)$ as an element of the space $X(t)$. The function spaces are defined as follows.

- (i) For $p \in [1, \infty]$, $u \in L_X^p$ if $t \mapsto \phi_{-(\cdot)} \bar{u}(\cdot) \in L^p(0, T; X_0)$ with the norm

$$\|u\|_{L_X^p} := \begin{cases} \left(\int_0^T \|u(t)\|_{X(t)}^p \right)^{1/p} & \text{if } p < \infty; \\ \text{ess sup}_{t \in [0, T]} \|u(t)\|_{X(t)} & \text{if } p = \infty \end{cases}$$

if $X(t) = H(t)$ are Hilbert spaces, then so is L_H^2 with the inner product

$$(u, v)_{L_H^2} := \int_0^T (u(t), v(t))_{H(t)}.$$

- (ii) For $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, $u \in C_X^k$ if $t \mapsto \phi_{-t} u(t) \in C^k([0, T]; X_0)$ and we define its time derivatives as

$$\partial^{\bullet, s} u(t) = \phi_t \frac{d^s}{dt^s} \phi_{-t} u(t), \quad s = 1, \dots, k.$$

We will denote $\partial^{\bullet, 1} = \partial^\bullet$; it is easy to see that the latter produces the same definition as in (2.4). These spaces are endowed with the norm

$$\|u\|_{C_X^k} := \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u(t)\|_{X(t)} + \sum_{s=1}^k \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\partial^{\bullet, s} u(t)\|_{X(t)}.$$

(iii) A test function $u \in \mathcal{D}_X(0, T)$ if $t \mapsto \phi_{-t}u(t) \in C_c^\infty((0, T); X_0)$.

(iv) We define the Banach space

$$H_{H^{-1}}^1 := \{u \in L_{H^1}^2 : \partial^\bullet u \in L_{H^{-1}}^2\} \quad \text{with} \quad \|u\|_{H_{H^{-1}}^1} := \|u\|_{L_{H^1}^2} + \|\partial^\bullet u\|_{L_{H^{-1}}^2}.$$

(v) Similarly, $H_{L^2}^1$ denotes the space of those $u \in L_{H^1}^2$ which have a more regular weak time derivative $\partial^\bullet u \in L_{L^2}^2$.

Remark 3.1. We point out that in order to define the spaces L_X^p we are implicitly assuming that the family $(\phi_t, X(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$ is compatible in the sense of [8, Assumption 3.1]. Moreover, in the cases where $X(t)$ is a space of functions with some regularity, it is also assumed that the differentiation makes sense on $\Gamma(t)$. In our setting, these assumptions require appropriate regularity of the flow map Φ and the velocity field \mathbf{V} . More precisely, if for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\Phi_{(\cdot), \cdot}^0, \Phi_0^{(\cdot)} \in C^1([0, T]; C^k(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{V} \in C^0([0, T]; C^k(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)),$$

then:

- (i) $\Gamma(t)$ is a C^k -surface, and it makes sense to define strong and weak derivatives up to order k for functions on $\Gamma(t)$ (in our case we have $k = 2$);
- (ii) the pair $(\phi_t, X(t))_t$ is compatible where $X = L^p, C^0, H^{-1}, W^{r,p}, C^r$ for $p \in [1, \infty]$ and $1 \leq r \leq k$ (see e.g. [8, Section 7] for examples).

Notice that the assumptions in Sec.2 are enough to guarantee that all the function spaces involved are well defined, as well as to ensure compatibility with the evolution.

Let us now explicitly recall some notation introduced in [8, Section 3.2]. In particular, for $t \in [0, T]$, we define the following bilinear forms:

1. for $\eta, \phi \in L^2(\Gamma(t))$, the zero order terms

$$m(t; \eta, \phi) := \int_{\Gamma(t)} \eta \phi, \quad g(t; \eta, \phi) := \int_{\Gamma(t)} \eta \phi \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V}(t);$$

2. for $\eta \in L^2(\Gamma(t)), \phi \in H^1(\Gamma(t))$, the first order term

$$a_N(t; \eta, \phi) := \int_{\Gamma(t)} \eta \mathbf{V}_a^\tau(t) \cdot \nabla_\Gamma \phi;$$

3. for $\eta, \phi \in H^1(\Gamma(t))$, the second order terms

$$a_S(t; \eta, \phi) := \int_{\Gamma(t)} \nabla_\Gamma \eta \cdot \nabla_\Gamma \phi, \quad b(t; \eta, \phi) := \int_{\Gamma(t)} B(\mathbf{V}(t)) \nabla_\Gamma \eta \cdot \nabla_\Gamma \phi,$$

with $B(\mathbf{V}) = (\nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V})\mathbf{I} - 2\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{V})$, where $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{V})$ stands for the symmetrized rate tensor;

4. for $\eta \in H^{-1}(\Gamma(t)), \phi \in H^1(\Gamma(t))$, the duality pairing

$$m_\star(t; \eta, \phi) := \langle \eta, \phi \rangle_{H^{-1}(\Gamma(t)), H^1(\Gamma(t))}.$$

For the sake of simplicity, from now on we will omit the explicit dependence on time and we will denote $\|\cdot\|_{L^2(\Gamma(t))}$ only by $\|\cdot\|$. In conclusion, we recall [8, Prop.2.8], see also [14, Sec.8.2]) in

Proposition 3.2. The following transport formulas hold:

(a) For $\eta, \phi \in H_{H^{-1}}^1$,

$$\frac{d}{dt} m(\eta, \phi) = m_\star(\partial^\bullet \eta, \phi) + m_\star(\partial^\bullet \phi, \eta) + g(\eta, \phi).$$

(b) If additionally $\nabla_\Gamma \partial^\bullet \eta, \nabla_\Gamma \partial^\bullet \phi \in L_{L^2}^2$, then

$$\frac{d}{dt} a_S(\eta, \phi) = a_S(\partial^\bullet \eta, \phi) + a_S(\eta, \partial^\bullet \phi) + b(\eta, \phi).$$

(c) For $\eta, \phi \in H_{L^2}^1$, with $\nabla_\Gamma \partial^\bullet \phi \in L_{L^2}^2$, the following identity holds

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} a_N(\eta, \phi) &= a_N(\partial^\bullet \eta, \phi) + a_N(\eta, \partial^\bullet \phi) \\ &\quad + \int_{\Gamma(t)} B_{adv}(\mathbf{V}_a^\tau(t), \mathbf{V}(t)) \eta \cdot \nabla_\Gamma \phi, \end{aligned}$$

for almost any $t \in [0, T]$, where B_{adv} is a vector field given by

$$B_{adv}(\mathbf{V}_a^\tau, \mathbf{V})_i := (\partial^\bullet \mathbf{V}_a^\tau)_i + (\nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V})(\mathbf{V}_a^\tau)_i - \sum_{j=1}^3 (\mathbf{V}_a^\tau)_j \underline{D}_j^{\Gamma(t)} \mathbf{V}_i, \quad i = 1, 2, 3.$$

In the above we use the same notation as in [20]. We postpone the proof of this result to Appendix A.

Let us recall now the compatibility condition on $\Gamma(t)$ in order to obtain a solution to the Cahn-Hilliard equation with logarithmic potential. Setting $m_\eta(t) := \frac{1}{|\Gamma(t)|} \left| \int_{\Gamma_0} \eta \right|$, we require that the initial datum u_0 satisfies $m_{u_0}(t) < 1$ for every $t \in [0, T]$. This means that

$$\frac{|\Gamma_0|}{|\Gamma(t)|} \left| \frac{\int_{\Gamma_0} u_0}{|\Gamma_0|} \right| < 1.$$

Therefore, since for $t = 0$ we suppose $\left| \frac{\int_{\Gamma_0} u_0}{|\Gamma_0|} \right| < 1$ as it is usually done, the above condition represents a physical constraint on the evolution of $\Gamma(t)$, namely, $\Gamma(t)$ cannot shrink too much in time. Moreover, since the total mass is preserved then we have $\int_{\Gamma(t)} u(t) \equiv \int_{\Gamma_0} u_0$ for any $t \in [0, T]$. Thus we can write

$$|(u(t))_{\Gamma(t)}| = m_{u_0}(t)$$

and the condition $m_{u_0}(t) < 1$ for every $t \in [0, T]$ is the dynamic counterpart of

$$|(u(t))_\Omega| = \frac{|\int_\Omega u(t) dx|}{|\Omega|} = \frac{|\int_\Omega u_0 dx|}{|\Omega|} = |(u_0)_\Omega| < 1$$

which holds in the case of a static bounded domain Ω .

For future use, let us then define the set \mathcal{I}_0 of admissible initial conditions

$$\mathcal{I}_0 := \left\{ \eta \in H^1(\Gamma_0) : |\eta| \leq 1 \text{ a.e. on } \Gamma_0, m_{\eta(t)} < 1 \text{ for any } t \in [0, T] \right\}.$$

We recall that the free energy is given by

$$E^{CH}[u] = \int_{\Gamma(t)} \left(\frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2} + F(u) \right),$$

with F logarithmic potential. Note that, if $u_0 \in \mathcal{I}_0$, then u_0 has finite energy. Indeed $\|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma_0)} \leq 1$ implies $F(u_0) \in L^1(\Gamma_0)$. We can now recall the result obtained in [8, Theorems 5.14, 5.15] for

$$F(s) = \frac{\theta}{2} ((1+r) \ln(1+r) + (1-r) \ln(1-r)) + \frac{1-r^2}{2}, \quad r \in (-1, 1), \quad (3.7)$$

where $0 < \theta < 1$ (F is extended by continuity at $r = \pm 1$). We set $F_{ln}(r) := (1+r) \ln(1+r) + (1-r) \ln(1-r)$ for the sake of simplicity and denote $\varphi(s) = F'_{ln}(s)$. Note that this choice corresponds to the singular potential (1.5) with $\theta_0 = 1$, up to a translation to get directly $F_{ln} \geq 0$ in $[-1, 1]$.

Remark 3.3. Concerning the logarithmic potential, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\frac{\theta}{2} \varphi'(s) \leq e^{C|\frac{\theta}{2}\varphi(s)|+C}, \quad \forall s \in (-1, 1). \quad (3.8)$$

Assuming [8, A_Φ], we have

Theorem 3.4. Let $u_0 \in \mathcal{I}_0$ and $F : [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be given by (3.7). Then there exists a unique pair (u, w) with

$$u \in L_{H^1}^\infty \cap H_{H^{-1}}^1 \quad \text{and} \quad w \in L_{H^1}^2,$$

such that, for almost any $t \in (0, T]$, $|u(t)| < 1$ almost everywhere on $\Gamma(t)$ and u satisfies, for all $\eta \in L^2_{H^1}$ and almost any $t \in [0, T]$,

$$m_\star(\partial^\bullet u, \eta) + g(u, \eta) + a_N(u, \eta) + a_S(w, \eta) = 0, \quad (3.9)$$

$$a_S(u, \eta) + \frac{\theta}{2}m(\varphi(u), \eta) - m(u, \eta) - m(w, \eta) = 0, \quad (3.10)$$

where $u(0) = u_0$ almost everywhere in Γ_0 . The solution u also satisfies the additional regularity

$$u \in C^0_{L^2} \cap L^\infty_{L^p} \cap L^2_{H^2},$$

for all $p \in [1, +\infty)$. Furthermore, if $u_0, v_0 \in \mathcal{I}_0$ are such that $(u_0)_{\Gamma_0} = (v_0)_{\Gamma_0}$, and u, v are the solutions of the system with $u(0) = u_0$ and $v(0) = v_0$, then there exists a constant $C > 0$ independent of t , such that, for almost any $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\|u(t) - v(t)\|_{H^{-1}(\Gamma(t))} \leq e^{Ct} \|u_0 - v_0\|_{H^{-1}(\Gamma_0)}.$$

Remark 3.5. We notice that the regularity stated in Theorem 3.4 can be slightly improved. In particular, since $u \in L^2_{H^2}$ solves the problem, for almost all $t \in [0, T]$,

$$-\Delta_\Gamma u(t) = w(t) - F'(u(t)) \in L^2(\Gamma(t)),$$

we are allowed to multiply by $-\Delta_\Gamma u \in L^2(\Gamma(t))$ for almost any $t \in [0, T]$. Recalling that $\varphi' > 0$, after an integration by parts, being $\Gamma(t)$ closed and $u \in L^\infty_{H^1}$, we obtain

$$\|\Delta_\Gamma u\|^2 \leq \|\Delta_\Gamma u\|^2 + \frac{\theta}{2}m(\varphi'(u), |\nabla_\Gamma u|^2) \leq \|\nabla_\Gamma w\| \|\nabla_\Gamma u\| + \|\nabla_\Gamma u\|^2 \leq C(1 + \|\nabla_\Gamma w\|),$$

and knowing that $w \in L^2_{H^1}$, we infer $u \in L^4_{H^2}$.

3.3 Regularisation and strict separation property

In this subsection we need the additional assumptions on the surface motion stated in Section 2. We first show that the approximating solution given by the Galerkin scheme is consequently more regular. This allows us to perform higher-order regularisation estimates and to establish the strict separation property.

3.3.1 Galerkin approximation

Motivated by the approach in [8], we start by considering the Galerkin approximation with the approximated potential $F^\delta \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ defined by

$$F^\delta_{ln}(r) = \frac{\theta}{2} \begin{cases} (1-r) \ln(\delta) + (1+r) \ln(2-\delta) + \frac{(1-r)^2}{2\delta} + \frac{(1+r)^2}{2(2-\delta)} - 1, & r \geq 1-\delta \\ (1+r) \ln(1+r) + (1-r) \ln(1-r), & |r| \leq 1-\delta \\ (1+r) \ln(\delta) + (1-r) \ln(2-\delta) + \frac{(1+r)^2}{2\delta} + \frac{(1-r)^2}{2(2-\delta)} - 1, & r \leq -1+\delta \end{cases}$$

and denote $\varphi^\delta = (F^\delta_{ln})'$. Let us recall [8, Sec.4.1] and consider a basis $\{\chi_j^0 : j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ orthonormal in $L^2(\Gamma_0)$ and orthogonal in $H^1(\Gamma_0)$ consisting of smooth functions such that χ_1^0 is constant (for example consider the eigenfunctions of the Laplace-Beltrami operator). We then transport this basis using the flow map. This gives $\{\chi_j^t := \phi_t(\chi_j^0) : j \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset H^1(\Gamma(t))$ and we define the finite-dimensional spaces $V_M(t) := \{\chi_j^t : j = 1, \dots, M\}$. The goal in this section is to find an approximating solution pair (u^M, w^M) in these spaces; more precisely, for each $M \in \mathbb{N}$, we aim to find functions $u^M, w^M \in L^2_{V_M}$ with $\partial^\bullet u^M \in L^2_{V_M}$ such that, for any $\eta \in L^2_{V_M}$ and all $t \in [0, T]$,

$$m(\partial^\bullet u^M, \eta) + g(h_\delta(u^M), \eta) + a_N(u^M, \eta) + a_S(w^M, \eta) = 0, \quad (3.11)$$

$$a_S(u^M, \eta) + m((F^\delta)'(u^M), \eta) - m(w^M, \eta) = 0, \quad (3.12)$$

and $u^M(0) = P_M^0 u_0$ almost everywhere in Γ_0 (P_M^0 is the L^2 orthogonal projector operator at $t = 0$ (see [8, Sec.4.1]), where $h_\delta \in C^{1,1}(\mathbb{R})$ is defined as follows

$$h_\delta(s) := \begin{cases} 1 + \frac{\delta}{2}, & s \geq 1 + \delta, \\ -\frac{1}{2\delta}s^2 + (1 + \frac{1}{\delta})s - \frac{1}{2\delta}, & s \in (1, 1 + \delta), \\ s, & s \in [-1, 1], \\ \frac{1}{2\delta}s^2 + (1 + \frac{1}{\delta})s + \frac{1}{2\delta}, & s \in (-1 - \delta, -1), \\ -1 - \frac{\delta}{2}, & s \leq -1 - \delta. \end{cases}$$

Notice that $h_\delta \rightarrow h$ uniformly in \mathbb{R} as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, where

$$h(s) = \begin{cases} -1, & s < -1, \\ s, & s \in [-1, 1], \\ 1, & s > 1 \end{cases}$$

so that, in the limit as $M \rightarrow \infty$ and $\delta \rightarrow 0$, we find $h(u) = u$ since for almost all $t \in [0, T]$ we have $|u(t)| < 1$ almost everywhere in $\Gamma(t)$. Moreover, for $\delta < 1$, we have

$$|h_\delta(s)| \leq 1 + \frac{\delta}{2} \leq \frac{3}{2}, \quad |h'_\delta(s)| \leq 1, \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (3.13)$$

We first prove a refinement of [8, Prop.4.4], namely,

Proposition 3.6. *Let (2.2) and (2.3) hold. Then there exists a unique local solution pair to (3.11)-(3.12). In particular there exist functions (u^M, w^M) satisfying (3.11)-(3.12) on an interval $[0, t^*]$, $0 \leq t^* \leq T$, together with the initial condition $u^M(0) = P_M^0 u_0$. The functions are of the form*

$$u^M(t) = \sum_{i=1}^M u_i^M(t) \chi_i^t, \quad w^M(t) = \sum_{i=1}^M w_i^M(t) \chi_i^t, \quad t \in [0, t^*],$$

with $u_i^M \in C^2([0, t^*])$ and $w_i^M \in C^2([0, t^*])$, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$.

Proof. We consider the matrix form of the equations, where we denote $\mathbf{u}^M(t) = (u_1^M(t), \dots, u_M^M(t))$ and $\mathbf{w}^M(t) = (w_1^M(t), \dots, w_M^M(t))$,

$$\begin{aligned} M(t) \dot{\mathbf{u}}^M(t) + \mathbf{G}(t)(\mathbf{u}^M(t)) + A_N(t) \mathbf{u}^M(t) + A_S(t) \mathbf{w}^M(t) &= 0, \\ A_S(t) \mathbf{u}^M(t) + (\mathbf{F}^\delta)'(\mathbf{u}^M(t)) - M(t) \mathbf{w}^M(t) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here

$$\begin{aligned} (M(t))_{ij} &= m(t; \chi_i^t, \chi_j^t), & \mathbf{G}(t)(\mathbf{u}^M(t))_j &= g(t; h_\delta(u^M(t)), \chi_j^t), \\ (A_S(t))_{ij} &= a_S(t; \chi_i^t, \chi_j^t), & (A_N(t))_{ij} &= a_N(t; \chi_j^t, \chi_i^t), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(\mathbf{F}^\delta)'(\mathbf{u}^M(t))_j = m(t; (F^\delta)'(u^M(t)), \chi_j^t).$$

We now observe that actually these matrices enjoy more regularity than noted in [8]. Indeed, let us consider for example M_{ij} . By [8, Prop. 2.8], recalling that $\partial^\bullet \chi_i^t \equiv 0$ for any $i = 1, \dots, M$, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} M_{ij} = g(\chi_i^t, \chi_j^t) \in C^0([0, T]),$$

due to the regularity assumptions on $\Gamma(t)$, on the corresponding flow map and on the velocity field. We also have

$$\frac{d}{dt} (M^{-1})_{ij} = - \left(M^{-1} \left(\frac{d}{dt} M \right) M^{-1} \right)_{ij} \in C^0([0, T]).$$

Similarly, we get

$$\frac{d}{dt} (A_S(t))_{ij} = b(\chi_i^t, \chi_j^t) \in C^0([0, T]),$$

and, by (3.7),

$$\frac{d}{dt} (A_N(t))_{ij} = \int_{\Gamma(t)} B_{adv}(\mathbf{V}_a^r(t), \mathbf{V}(t)) \chi_j^t \cdot \nabla_\Gamma \chi_i^t \in C^0([0, T]).$$

Then we find, for any $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^M$,

$$\frac{d}{dt} (\mathbf{G}(t)(\mathbf{y}))_j = m \left(h_\delta \left(\sum_{i=1}^M y_i \chi_i^t \right) \partial^\bullet (\nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V}), \chi_j^t \right) + g \left(h_\delta \left(\sum_{i=1}^M y_i \chi_i^t \right) \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V}, \chi_j^t \right) \in C^0([0, T]),$$

thanks to (2.6). Similarly, we get

$$\frac{d}{dt} (\mathbf{F}^\delta)'(\mathbf{y})_j = g \left((F^\delta)' \left(\sum_{i=1}^M y_i \chi_i^t \right), \chi_j^t \right) \in C^0([0, T]).$$

Recalling then that $(F^\delta)'$ and h_δ are $C^{1,1}(\mathbb{R})$, ensuring the spatial $C^{1,1}$ -continuity of the \mathbf{y} -Jacobians of $\mathbf{y} \mapsto \mathbf{G}(\cdot)(\mathbf{y})$ and $\mathbf{y} \mapsto (\mathbf{F}^\delta)'(\mathbf{y})$, the result follows from the general theory of ODEs. \square

We now obtain the energy estimate for the Galerkin approximation. Thanks to the cutoff function h_δ , we show below that an energy estimate can be retrieved in the context of the Galerkin approximation, without letting $M \rightarrow \infty$ (cf. [8]). This is essential in order to maintain the necessary regularity to perform higher-order estimates.

Proposition 3.7. *Denoting by (u_δ^M, w_δ^M) the solution pair to (3.11)-(3.12), we have the energy estimate*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \tilde{E}^{CH}[t; u_\delta^M(t)] + \int_0^T \|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\|^2 dt \leq C, \quad (3.14)$$

where $\tilde{E}^{CH} := E^{CH} + \tilde{C}$ for some $\tilde{C} > 0$ chosen so that $\tilde{E}^{CH} \geq 0$.

Remark 3.8. *We observe that, even though the energy E^{CH} is not necessarily nonnegative, it is bounded from below. Indeed, there exists $C = C(\theta)$ such that $F \geq C(\theta)$, and therefore*

$$E^{CH}[u] \geq C(\theta)|\Gamma(t)| \geq \frac{C(\theta)}{C_\Gamma}|\Gamma_0|. \quad (3.15)$$

Note that \tilde{C} (see the previous statement) depends on T , Γ_0 and θ , as well as on an upper bound for the C^1 -norm of the flow map Φ .

Proof. Keep M, δ fixed. We consider the Galerkin approximation and the results given by Proposition 3.6. Here we denote the solution by (u_δ^M, w_δ^M) to emphasize the dependence on δ . We then recall that the total mass of u_M is still preserved in time, since $\eta \equiv 1 \in V_M$ for any $M \in \mathbb{N}$. We then come back to the energy estimate as in the proof of [8, Prop.5.7, a)]:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \tilde{E}^{CH}[u_\delta^M] + \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\|^2 \leq -g(h_\delta(u_\delta^M), w_\delta^M) + C_0 + C_1 \tilde{E}^{CH}[u_\delta^M],$$

where $\tilde{E}_{CH} := E_{CH} + \tilde{C}$, with $\tilde{C} > 0$ a suitable constant so that $\tilde{E}_{CH} \geq 0$. Thanks to (3.13) and the bound on \mathbf{V} , by Poincaré's inequality we have

$$-g(h_\delta(u_\delta^M), w_\delta^M) \leq C \|h_\delta(u_\delta^M)\| \|w_\delta^M\| \leq C \|w_\delta^M\| \leq C(|m(w_\delta^M, 1)| + \|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\|).$$

Using known arguments (see also the proof of [8, Prop.5.7, a)], which are still valid in the Galerkin setting, we deduce, from [8, (5.1.7)],

$$|m(w_\delta^M, u_\delta^M)| \leq \frac{1-\alpha}{8\tilde{C}} \|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\|^2 + C \|\nabla_\Gamma u_\delta^M\|^2 + \alpha |m(w_\delta^M, 1)|, \quad (3.16)$$

where $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ is a constant such that $0 \leq m_{u_0}(t) \leq \alpha < 1$ for any $t \in [0, T]$, whose existence is guaranteed by the continuity of m_{u_0} . Now, from [8, (5.1.5)],

$$|m(w_\delta^M, 1)| \leq C(1 + \|\nabla_\Gamma u_\delta^M\|^2) + |m(w_\delta^M, u_\delta^M)|, \quad (3.17)$$

thus by (3.16) we infer

$$|m(w_\delta^M, 1)| \leq C(1 + \|\nabla_\Gamma u_\delta^M\|^2) + \frac{1}{8\tilde{C}} \|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\|^2, \quad (3.18)$$

and, by Young's inequality, we find

$$-g(h_\delta(u_\delta^M), w_\delta^M) \leq C(1 + \|\nabla_\Gamma u_\delta^M\|^2) + \frac{3}{8} \|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\|^2,$$

so that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \tilde{E}^{CH}[u_\delta^M] + \frac{1}{8} \|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\|^2 \leq C \tilde{E}^{CH}[u_\delta^M] + C,$$

therefore Gronwall's Lemma and [8, Lemma 5.6] give

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \tilde{E}^{CH}[t; u_\delta^M(t)] + \int_0^T \|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\|^2 dt \leq C, \quad (3.19)$$

independently of M and δ . □

3.3.2 Regularisation and strict separation property

The main result of this section is the following.

Theorem 3.9. *Let the assumptions of Theorem 3.4 and assume the hypotheses of Section 2 on the surface motion. Denote by (u, w) the (unique) weak solution with $u(0) = u_0$.*

(i) *There exists a constant $C = C(T, E^{CH}(u_0)) > 0$ such that, for almost any $t \in [0, T]$,*

$$t\|w\|_{H^1(\Gamma(t))}^2 + \int_0^t s\|\partial^\bullet u\|_{H^1(\Gamma(s))}^2 ds \leq C(T, E^{CH}(u_0)). \quad (3.20)$$

(ii) *For any $0 < \tau \leq T$, there exist constants $C = C(T, \tau, E^{CH}(u_0)) > 0$ and $C_p = C_p(T, \tau, p, E^{CH}(u_0)) > 0$ such that, for almost any $t \in [\tau, T]$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|w\|_{H^1(\Gamma(t))} &\leq C(T, \tau, E^{CH}(u_0)), \\ \|\varphi(u)\|_{L^p(\Gamma(t))} + \|\varphi'(u)\|_{L^p(\Gamma(t))} &\leq C_p(T, \tau, p, E^{CH}(u_0)), \quad \forall p \in [2, \infty), \\ \|u\|_{H^2(\Gamma(t))} &\leq C(T, \tau, E^{CH}(u_0)). \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

(iii) *There exists $\xi = \xi(T, \tau, E^{CH}(u_0)) > 0$ such that*

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma(t))} \leq 1 - \xi, \quad \text{for a.a. } t \in [\tau, T].$$

Remark 3.10. *Notice that actually we could say more about the separation property, if we assume the regularity on the flow map and the velocity field as in Lemma C.1. Indeed, for any $\tau > 0$, we have $u \in L^\infty_{H^2}(\tau, T)$ and $\partial^\bullet u \in L^2_{H^1}(\tau, T)$ (we use the symbol $L^q_X(\tau, T)$ to mean that the set of times is $[\tau, T]$ instead of $[0, T]$, typical of L^q_X). By the embedding result shown in Appendix C, we infer that $u \in C^0_{H^{3/2}}(\tau, T)$, thus by the embedding $H^{3/2}(\Gamma(t)) \hookrightarrow C^0(\Gamma(t))$, $u \in C^0_{C^0}(\tau, T)$, implying*

$$\sup_{t \in [\tau, T]} \|u\|_{C^0(\Gamma(t))} \leq 1 - \xi.$$

Proof. From now on, we will omit the dependence on $E^{CH}(u_0)$, since it is considered understood due to Prop. 3.7.

Part (i). We test (3.11) with $\eta = \partial^\bullet w_\delta^M \in L^2_{V_M}$, obtaining

$$m(\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M, \partial^\bullet w_\delta^M) + g(h_\delta(u_\delta^M), \partial^\bullet w_\delta^M) + a_N(u_\delta^M, \partial^\bullet w_\delta^M) + a_S(w_\delta^M, \partial^\bullet w_\delta^M) = 0. \quad (3.22)$$

Observe now that, by Proposition 3.2, for $\eta \in L^2_{V_M}$ such that $\partial^\bullet \eta \in L^2_{V_M}$, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} m(w_\delta^M, \eta) = m(\partial^\bullet w_\delta^M, \eta) + m(w_\delta^M, \partial^\bullet \eta) + g(w_\delta^M, \eta), \quad (3.23)$$

but also (see (3.12))

$$\frac{d}{dt} m(w_\delta^M, \eta) = \frac{d}{dt} (a_S(u_\delta^M, \eta) + m((F^\delta)'(u_\delta^M), \eta)) \quad (3.24)$$

Moreover, again by Proposition 3.2, we infer

$$\frac{d}{dt} a_S(u_\delta^M, \eta) = a_S(\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M, \eta) + a_S(u_\delta^M, \partial^\bullet \eta) + b(u_\delta^M, \eta).$$

On the other hand, exploiting the chain rule, we get

$$\frac{d}{dt} m((F^\delta)'(u_\delta^M), \eta) = m((F^\delta)''(u_\delta^M) \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M, \eta) + m((F^\delta)'(u_\delta^M), \partial^\bullet \eta) + g((F^\delta)'(u_\delta^M), \eta).$$

Therefore, comparing (3.23) with (3.24), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} m(\partial^\bullet w_\delta^M, \eta) + m(w_\delta^M, \partial^\bullet \eta) + g(w_\delta^M, \eta) &= m((F^\delta)''(u_\delta^M) \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M, \eta) \\ &\quad + m((F^\delta)'(u_\delta^M), \partial^\bullet \eta) + g((F^\delta)'(u_\delta^M), \eta) + a_S(\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M, \eta) + a_S(u_\delta^M, \partial^\bullet \eta) + b(u_\delta^M, \eta), \end{aligned}$$

but since $\partial^\bullet \eta$ is still an admissible function in (3.12), we infer

$$m(\partial^\bullet w_\delta^M, \eta) = -g(w_\delta^M, \eta) + m((F^\delta)''(u_\delta^M) \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M, \eta) + g((F^\delta)'(u_\delta^M), \eta) + a_S(\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M, \eta) + b(u_\delta^M, \eta).$$

Thus, setting $\eta = \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M \in L^2_{V_M}$ (note that $\partial^{\bullet 2} u_\delta^M \in L^2_{V_M}$ by Proposition 3.6), we get

$$\begin{aligned} m(\partial^\bullet w_\delta^M, \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M) &= -g(w_\delta^M, \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M) + m((F^\delta)''(u_\delta^M) \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M, \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M) \\ &\quad + g((F^\delta)'(u_\delta^M), \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M) + a_S(\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M, \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M) + b(u_\delta^M, \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M). \end{aligned}$$

Using once more Proposition 3.2, on account of the regularity given by Proposition 3.6, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\|^2 = a_S(w_\delta^M, \partial^\bullet w_\delta^M) + \frac{1}{2} b(w_\delta^M, w_\delta^M). \quad (3.25)$$

Furthermore, consider the term g in (3.22). By Proposition 3.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} g(h_\delta(u_\delta^M), w_\delta^M) &= g(h_\delta(u_\delta^M), \partial^\bullet w_\delta^M) + m(\partial^\bullet(h_\delta(u_\delta^M) \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V}), w_\delta^M) + g(h_\delta(u_\delta^M) \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V}, w_\delta^M) \\ &= g(h_\delta(u_\delta^M), \partial^\bullet w_\delta^M) + m(h'_\delta(u_\delta^M) \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V}, w_\delta^M) \\ &\quad + m(h_\delta(u_\delta^M) \partial^\bullet \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V}, w_\delta^M) + g(h_\delta(u_\delta^M) \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V}, w_\delta^M). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we get

$$\begin{aligned} g(h_\delta(u_\delta^M), \partial^\bullet w_\delta^M) &= \frac{d}{dt} g(h_\delta(u_\delta^M), w_\delta^M) - m(h'_\delta(u_\delta^M) \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V}, w_\delta^M) \\ &\quad - m(h_\delta(u_\delta^M) \partial^\bullet \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V}, w_\delta^M) - g(h_\delta(u_\delta^M) \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V}, w_\delta^M). \end{aligned}$$

Recalling (3.7), we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} a_N(u_\delta^M, w_\delta^M) = a_N(\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M, w_\delta^M) + a_N(u_\delta^M, \partial^\bullet w_\delta^M) + \int_{\Gamma(t)} B_{adv}(\mathbf{V}_a^\tau(t), \mathbf{V}(t)) u_\delta^M \cdot \nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M,$$

that is,

$$a_N(u_\delta^M, \partial^\bullet w_\delta^M) = \frac{d}{dt} a_N(u_\delta^M, w_\delta^M) - a_N(\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M, w_\delta^M) - \int_{\Gamma(t)} B_{adv}(\mathbf{V}_a^\tau(t), \mathbf{V}(t)) u_\delta^M \cdot \nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M. \quad (3.26)$$

Thanks to Proposition 3.2, we deduce

$$\frac{d}{dt} \frac{\theta}{2} g(F_{ln}^\delta(u_\delta^M), 1) = \frac{\theta}{2} g(\varphi_\delta(u_\delta^M), \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M) + \frac{\theta}{2} \int_{\Gamma(t)} F_{ln}^\delta(u_\delta^M) \partial^\bullet \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V} + \frac{\theta}{2} g(F_{ln}^\delta(u_\delta^M), \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V}).$$

This last equality is necessary, since in the Galerkin setting we are not able to retrieve a uniform estimate for $\|\varphi_\delta(u_\delta^M)\|_{L^2_{L^2}}$ but only for its L^2 -orthogonal projection over $V_M(t)$, whereas, thanks to (3.19), we are able to uniformly estimate $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|F_{ln}^\delta(u_\delta^M)\|_{L^1(\Gamma(t))}$. Collecting (3.22)-(3.26), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{1}{2} \|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\|^2 + a_N(u_\delta^M, w_\delta^M) + g(h_\delta(u_\delta^M), w_\delta^M) \right) + \|\nabla_\Gamma \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M\|^2 + m((F^\delta)''(u_\delta^M) \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M, \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M) \\ &= g(w_\delta^M, \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M) - g((F^\delta)'(u_\delta^M), \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M) - b(u_\delta^M, \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M) + \frac{1}{2} b(w_\delta^M, w_\delta^M) \\ &\quad + m(h'_\delta(u_\delta^M) \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V}, w_\delta^M) + m(h_\delta(u_\delta^M) \partial^\bullet \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V}, w_\delta^M) \\ &\quad + g(h_\delta(u_\delta^M) \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V}, w_\delta^M) + a_N(\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M, w_\delta^M) + \int_{\Gamma(t)} B_{adv}(\mathbf{V}_a^\tau(t), \mathbf{V}(t)) u_\delta^M \cdot \nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, substituting the explicit value of F^δ , setting $\varphi_\delta := (F_{ln}^\delta)'$, and exploiting (3.27), we find

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{1}{2} \|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\|^2 + a_N(u_\delta^M, w_\delta^M) + g(u_\delta^M, w_\delta^M) + \frac{\theta}{2} g(F_{ln}^\delta(u_\delta^M), 1) \right) \\ &+ \|\nabla_\Gamma \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M\|^2 + \frac{\theta}{2} m(\varphi'_\delta(u_\delta^M) \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M, \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M) \\ &= g(w_\delta^M, \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M) + m(\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M, \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M) + g(u_\delta^M, \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M) - b(u_\delta^M, \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} b(w_\delta^M, w_\delta^M) + m(h'_\delta(u_\delta^M) \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V}, w_\delta^M) + m(h_\delta(u_\delta^M) \partial^\bullet \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V}, w_\delta^M) \\ &+ g(h_\delta(u_\delta^M) \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V}, w_\delta^M) + a_N(\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M, w_\delta^M) + \int_{\Gamma(t)} B_{adv}(\mathbf{V}_a^\tau(t), \mathbf{V}(t)) u_\delta^M \cdot \nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \frac{\theta}{2} \int_{\Gamma(t)} F_{ln}^\delta(u_\delta^M) \partial^\bullet \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V} + \frac{\theta}{2} g(F_{ln}^\delta(u_\delta^M), \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V}).$$

Recalling that $\varphi'_\delta = (F_{ln}^\delta)'' \geq 0$, we have $\frac{\theta}{2} m(\varphi'_\delta(u_\delta^M) \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M, \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M) \geq 0$. Therefore, setting

$$\mathcal{Q}_\delta^M := \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\|^2 + a_N(u_\delta^M, w_\delta^M) + g(h_\delta(u_\delta^M), w_\delta^M) + \frac{\theta}{2} g(F_{ln}^\delta(u_\delta^M), 1),$$

and multiplying by $t \in (0, T]$ the above inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} t \mathcal{Q}_\delta^M(t) + t \|\nabla_\Gamma \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M\|^2 + t \frac{\theta}{2} m(\varphi'_\delta(u_\delta^M) \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M, \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M) \\ &= \mathcal{Q}_\delta^M(t) + g(w_\delta^M, t \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M) + t m(\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M, \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M) \\ &+ g(u_\delta^M, t \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M) - b(u_\delta^M, t \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M) + \frac{t}{2} b(w_\delta^M, w_\delta^M) \\ &+ m(h'_\delta(u_\delta^M) \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V}, t w_\delta^M) + m(h_\delta(u_\delta^M) \partial^\bullet \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V}, t w_\delta^M) \\ &+ g(h_\delta(u_\delta^M) \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V}, t w_\delta^M) + a_N(\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M, t w_\delta^M) + t \int_{\Gamma(t)} B_{adv}(\mathbf{V}_a^\tau(t), \mathbf{V}(t)) u_\delta^M \cdot \nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M \\ &+ \frac{\theta t}{2} \int_{\Gamma(t)} F_{ln}^\delta(u_\delta^M) \partial^\bullet \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V} + \frac{\theta t}{2} g(F_{ln}^\delta(u_\delta^M), \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V}). \end{aligned}$$

First observe that we can deduce a better estimate of $|m(w_\delta^M, u_\delta^M)|$. In particular, from [8, (5.1.6)], (3.19) and the conservation of mass, by Poincaré's inequality we infer

$$\begin{aligned} |m(w_\delta^M, u_\delta^M)| &\leq C \|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\| \|u_\delta^M - (u_\delta^M)_{\Gamma(t)}\| + m_{u_0}(t) |m(w_\delta^M, 1)| \\ &\leq C \|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\| + \alpha |m(w_\delta^M, 1)|, \end{aligned}$$

for α already defined. Therefore, on account of the total mass conservation (see also [8, (5.1.5)] and (3.19)) we have $\|u_\delta^M\|_{L^2(\Gamma(t))} \leq C(\|\nabla_\Gamma u_\delta^M\| + |m_{u_0}(t)|) \leq C$ for almost any $t \in [0, T]$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} |m(w_\delta^M, 1)| &\leq C + \|u_\delta^M\|^2 - \|\nabla_\Gamma u_\delta^M\|^2 + |m(w_\delta^M, u_\delta^M)| \\ &\leq C(1 + \|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\|) + \alpha |m(w_\delta^M, 1)|, \end{aligned}$$

which implies, being $\alpha < 1$, by Poincaré's inequality,

$$\|w_\delta^M\| \leq C(1 + \|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\|). \quad (3.27)$$

Then, on account of (2.2) and using Hölder's and Young's inequalities, recalling again that $\|u_\delta^M\|_{L^2(\Gamma(t))} \leq C$ for almost any $t \in [0, T]$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & g(w_\delta^M, t \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M) + m(\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M, t \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M) + g(u_\delta^M, t \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M) - b(u_\delta^M, t \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M) + \frac{t}{2} b(w_\delta^M, w_\delta^M) \\ &+ \frac{\theta t}{2} \int_{\Gamma(t)} F_{ln}^\delta(u_\delta^M) \partial^\bullet \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V} + \frac{\theta t}{2} g(F_{ln}^\delta(u_\delta^M), \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V}) \\ &\leq Ct \|w_\delta^M\| \|\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M\| + t \|\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M\|^2 + Ct \|\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M\| + Ct \|\nabla_\Gamma u_\delta^M\| \|\nabla_\Gamma \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M\| + Ct \|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\|^2 \\ &+ Ct \|F_{ln}^\delta(u_\delta^M)\|_{L^1(\Gamma(t))} + Ct \|F_{ln}^\delta(u_\delta^M)\|_{L^1(\Gamma(t))} \\ &\leq Ct \|\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M\|^2 + Ct \|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\|^2 + \frac{t}{2} \|\nabla_\Gamma \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M\|^2 + Ct, \end{aligned}$$

where we exploited (3.19), being $F_{ln}^\delta(\cdot) \geq 0$, but also (2.6) and (3.27).

Analogously, recalling (2.4), (2.6), (3.13), (3.19) and (3.27), thanks to the Cauchy-Schwarz and Young's inequalities, we find

$$\begin{aligned} & m(h'_\delta(u_\delta^M) \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V}, t w_\delta^M) + m(h_\delta(u_\delta^M) \partial^\bullet \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V}, t w_\delta^M) \\ &+ g(h_\delta(u_\delta^M) \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V}, t w_\delta^M) + a_N(\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M, t w_\delta^M) + t \int_{\Gamma(t)} B_{adv}(\mathbf{V}_a^\tau(t), \mathbf{V}(t)) u_\delta^M \cdot \nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M \\ &\leq Ct \|\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M\| (1 + \|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\|) + Ct (1 + \|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\|) \\ &+ Ct (1 + \|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\|) + Ct \|\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M\| \|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\| + Ct \|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\| \\ &\leq Ct \|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\|^2 + Ct (\|\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M\|^2 + 1). \end{aligned}$$

Collecting the above inequalities, we eventually obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}t\mathcal{Q}_\delta^M(t) + \frac{t}{2}\|\nabla_\Gamma\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M\|^2 \leq \mathcal{Q}_\delta^M(t) + Ct\|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\|^2 + Ct(\|\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M\|^2 + 1).$$

Observe now that, being as before $\|u_\delta^M\|_{L^2(\Gamma(t))} \leq C$,

$$|a_N(u_\delta^M, w_\delta^M)| \leq C\|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\| \leq C + \frac{1}{8}\|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\|^2,$$

and (see (3.27))

$$|g(u_\delta^M, w_\delta^M)| \leq C(1 + \|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\|) \leq C + \frac{1}{8}\|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\|^2.$$

Moreover, owing to (3.19), we have

$$\frac{\theta}{2}|g(F_{ln}^\delta(u_\delta^M), 1)| \leq C\|F_{ln}^\delta(u_\delta^M)\|_{L^1(\Gamma(t))} \leq C,$$

implying that there exists $\widehat{C} > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{4}\|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\|^2 - \widehat{C} \leq \mathcal{Q}_\delta^M(t) \leq C(1 + \|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\|^2), \quad \forall t \in [0, T].$$

Note that, due to the energy estimate (3.19), we have that \mathcal{Q}_δ^M is uniformly bounded in $L^1(0, T)$. Thus, defining $\widetilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\delta^M := \mathcal{Q}_\delta^M + \widehat{C} \geq 0$, we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}t\widetilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\delta^M(t) + \frac{t}{2}\|\nabla_\Gamma\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M\|^2 \leq \widetilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\delta^M(t) + Ct\widetilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\delta^M(t) + Kt(\|\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M\|^2 + 1), \quad \forall t \in [0, T], \quad (3.28)$$

where we explicitly denoted by $K > 0$, for further use, the constant in front of $\|\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M\|$, which has to be controlled in a uniform way. Since in the Galerkin setting we are not able to find a uniform estimate for $\|\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M\|_{L^2_{H^{-1}}}$, we cannot exploit the classical interpolation inequality $\|\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M\| \leq C\|\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M\|_{H^{-1}(\Gamma(t))}^{1/2}\|\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M\|_{H^1(\Gamma(t))}^{1/2}$ as in the case of nonevolving surfaces. Therefore, we test (3.11) with $\eta = t\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M \in L^2_{V_M}$, obtaining

$$t\|\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M\|^2 + tg(h_\delta(u_\delta^M), \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M) + ta_N(u_\delta^M, \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M) + ta_S(w_\delta^M, \partial^\bullet u_\delta^M) = 0,$$

from which, by standard estimates, for some κ sufficiently small to be chosen later on, we obtain

$$t\|\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M\|^2 \leq \frac{t}{2}\|\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M\|^2 + t\kappa\|\nabla_\Gamma\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M\|^2 + Ct\|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\|^2 + Ct,$$

that is,

$$\frac{t}{2}\|\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M\|^2 \leq t\kappa\|\nabla_\Gamma\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M\|^2 + Ct\|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\|^2 + Ct.$$

We can now add this inequality multiplied by $\omega = 4K$ to (3.28), choosing $\kappa = \frac{1}{16K}$. This gives, for all $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\frac{d}{dt}t\widetilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\delta^M(t) + Kt\|\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M\|^2 + \frac{t}{4}\|\nabla_\Gamma\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M\|^2 \leq \widetilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\delta^M(t) + Ct\widetilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\delta^M(t) + Ct. \quad (3.29)$$

Therefore, by Gronwall's Lemma applied to $y(t) = t\widetilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\delta^M(t)$, recalling that $\widetilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\delta^M$ is uniformly bounded in $L^1(0, T)$, we infer

$$t\widetilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\delta^M(t) \leq C(T), \quad \forall t \in [0, T],$$

entailing, recalling (3.27),

$$t\|w_\delta^M\|_{H^1(\Gamma(t))}^2 + \int_0^t s\|\partial^\bullet u_\delta^M\|_{H^1(\Gamma(s))}^2 ds \leq C(T), \quad \forall t \in [0, T]. \quad (3.30)$$

By standard compactness arguments, arguing as in [8, Sec.4.2], [8, Propositions 5.8-5.10] and [8, Lemma 5.11], recalling that $h_\delta \rightarrow h$ uniformly in \mathbb{R} as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, we can pass to the limit firstly as $M \rightarrow \infty$ and then as $\delta \rightarrow 0$ also in the estimate above, obtaining a weak solution with the same properties as the one of Theorem 3.4. Therefore, this solution coincides with the one of Theorem 3.4 by uniqueness, and it also enjoys (3.20) and (3.21). This concludes the first part of the proof.

Part (ii). Let us fix $\tau > 0$. We clearly have that $\|w\|_{H^1(\Gamma(t))} \leq C$ for almost any $t \geq \tau$. Let then introduce the cutoff function

$$h_k(r) = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{1}{k}, & r > 1 - \frac{1}{k}, \\ r, & -1 + \frac{1}{k} \leq r \leq 1 - \frac{1}{k}, \\ -1 + \frac{1}{k}, & r < -1 + \frac{1}{k}, \end{cases} \quad (3.31)$$

which is Lipschitz continuous. Then we set $u_k = h_k(u)$. Being u in $L^\infty_{H^1}$, we have that the chain rule holds giving

$$\nabla_\Gamma u_k = \chi_{[-1+\frac{1}{k}, 1-\frac{1}{k}]}(u) \nabla_\Gamma u.$$

Accordingly, for any $k > 1$ and $p \geq 2$, $f_k = \left| \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi(u_k) \right|^{p-2} \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi(u_k)$ is well defined and belongs to $L^\infty_{H^1}$ and satisfies

$$\nabla_\Gamma \left(\left| \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi(u_k) \right|^{p-2} \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi(u_k) \right) = (p-1) \left| \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi(u_k) \right|^{p-2} \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi'(u_k) \nabla_\Gamma u_k.$$

If we now set $\eta = f_k$ in (3.10), we infer that

$$(p-1) \int_{\Gamma(t)} \left| \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi(u_k) \right|^{p-2} \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi'(u_k) \nabla_\Gamma u \cdot \nabla_\Gamma u_k + \int_{\Gamma(t)} \left| \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi(u_k) \right|^{p-2} \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi(u_k) \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi(u) = \int_{\Gamma(t)} \widehat{w} \left| \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi(u_k) \right|^{p-2} \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi(u_k),$$

where $\widehat{w} = w + u$. Being F_{ln} strictly convex, the first term in the left-hand side is nonnegative. Moreover, since φ is increasing, by the definition of u_k , we immediately infer

$$\varphi(u_k)^2 \leq \varphi(u) \varphi(u_k), \quad \forall k > 1 \quad (3.32)$$

and thus for the second term we have

$$\int_{\Gamma(t)} \left| \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi(u_k) \right|^{p-2} \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi(u_k) \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi(u) \geq \int_{\Gamma(t)} \left| \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi(u_k) \right|^p$$

Regarding the right-hand side, we easily get, by the Sobolev embedding $H^1(\Gamma(t)) \hookrightarrow L^p(\Gamma(t))$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Gamma(t)} \widehat{w} \left| \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi(u_k) \right|^{p-2} \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi(u_k) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left\| \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi(u_k) \right\|_{L^p(\Gamma(t))}^p + C \|\widehat{w}\|_{L^p(\Gamma(t))}^p \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left\| \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi(u_k) \right\|_{L^p(\Gamma(t))}^p + C_p \|\widehat{w}\|_{H^1(\Gamma(t))}^p, \end{aligned}$$

with $C_p > 0$ depending on p . Collecting the above estimates, being $u \in L^\infty_{H^1}$ and $\|w\|_{H^1(\Gamma(t))} \leq C$ for almost any $t \geq \tau$, we immediately deduce

$$\|\varphi(u_k)\|_{L^p(\Gamma(t))} \leq C_p(T, \tau, p), \quad \forall p \in [2, \infty), \quad (3.33)$$

for almost any $t \in [\tau, T]$. Therefore, there exists $\zeta \in L^\infty_{L^p}(\tau, T)$ such that, up to subsequences $\varphi(u_k) \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \zeta$ in $L^\infty_{L^p}(\tau, T)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Now observe that, being $|u| < 1$ almost everywhere on $\Gamma(t)$ (for almost any $t \in (0, T)$), and since, for almost any $t \in (0, T)$, $u_k \rightarrow u$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ almost everywhere on $\Gamma(t)$, we get $\varphi(u_k) \rightarrow \varphi(u)$ almost everywhere. It is now immediate to deduce by (3.33) that, for $p = 2$, $\|\varphi(u_k)\|_{L^2_{L^2}} \leq C(\tau, T)$, therefore we can apply [8, Thm.B.2] on $[\tau, T]$ to infer $\varphi(u_k) \rightharpoonup \varphi(u)$ in $L^2_{L^2}(\tau, T)$. By uniqueness of the weak limit we therefore infer $\zeta = \varphi(u)$. Then, by weak* sequential lower semicontinuity we get

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in [\tau, T]} \|\varphi(u)\|_{L^p(\Gamma(t))} \leq C_p(T, \tau, p), \quad \forall p \in [2, \infty). \quad (3.34)$$

Concerning φ' , we consider $g_k = \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi(u_k) e^{L \frac{\theta}{2} |\varphi(u_k)|} \in L^\infty_{H^1}$, for some arbitrary $L > 0$, and we observe that

$$\nabla_\Gamma \left(\frac{\theta}{2} \varphi(u_k) e^{L \frac{\theta}{2} |\varphi(u_k)|} \right) = \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi'(u_k) \left(1 + L \frac{\theta}{2} |\varphi(u_k)| \right) e^{L \frac{\theta}{2} |\varphi(u_k)|} \nabla_\Gamma u_k.$$

Therefore, considering again (3.10) with $\eta = g_k$, we get

$$\int_{\Gamma(t)} \nabla_\Gamma u \cdot \nabla_\Gamma u_k \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi'(u_k) \left(1 + L \frac{\theta}{2} |\varphi(u_k)| \right) e^{L \frac{\theta}{2} |\varphi(u_k)|} + \int_{\Gamma(t)} \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi(u) \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi(u_k) e^{L \frac{\theta}{2} |\varphi(u_k)|} = \int_{\Gamma(t)} \widehat{w} \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi(u_k) e^{L \frac{\theta}{2} |\varphi(u_k)|}.$$

Again the first term in the left-hand side is nonnegative, whereas, exploiting again (3.32), we obtain in the end

$$\int_{\Gamma(t)} \left(\frac{\theta}{2} \varphi(u_k) \right)^2 e^{L \frac{\theta}{2} |\varphi(u_k)|} \leq \int_{\Gamma(t)} \widehat{w} \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi(u_k) e^{L \frac{\theta}{2} |\varphi(u_k)|}$$

By Lemma B.4, we get

$$\int_{\Gamma(t)} |\widehat{w}| \left| \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi(u_k) \right| e^{L \frac{\theta}{2} |\varphi(u_k)|} \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Gamma(t)} \left| \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi(u_k) \right|^2 e^{L \frac{\theta}{2} |\varphi(u_k)|} + \int_{\Gamma(t)} e^{N|\widehat{w}|}, \quad (3.35)$$

implying

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Gamma(t)} \left| \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi(u_k) \right|^2 e^{L \frac{\theta}{2} |\varphi(u_k)|} \leq \int_{\Gamma(t)} e^{N|\widehat{w}|} \quad (3.36)$$

for any $L > 0$ and some $N = N(L)$. Now we exploit (2.7), and then apply Lemma B.3 with $u = N\widetilde{w}$ and the manifold $\mathcal{M} = \Gamma_0$ (with the corresponding metric) to infer

$$\int_{\Gamma(t)} e^{N|\widehat{w}|} = \int_{\Gamma_0} e^{N|\widetilde{w}|} J_t^0 d\Gamma_0 \leq C \int_{\Gamma_0} e^{N|\widetilde{w}|} d\Gamma_0 \leq C e^{CN^2 \|\widetilde{w}\|_{H^1(\Gamma_0)}^2} \leq C e^{CN^2 \|\widehat{w}\|_{H^1(\Gamma(t))}^2},$$

where in the last estimate we exploited the property that $(H^1(\Gamma(t)), \phi_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is a compatible space, where $\phi_{-t}v = \widetilde{v}$. Recalling now property (3.8), we infer that, for some $\widetilde{C} > 0$ sufficiently large,

$$\left(\frac{\theta}{2} \varphi'(s) \right)^p \leq e^{pC} \left(\widetilde{C} + \left| \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi(s) \right|^2 e^{pC \left| \frac{\theta}{2} \varphi(s) \right|} \right), \quad \forall s \in (-1, 1), \quad (3.37)$$

thus, taking $L = pC$ in (3.36) and recalling that $\|\widehat{w}\|_{H^1(\Gamma(t))} \leq C$ for almost any $t \geq \tau$, we end up with

$$\|\varphi'(u_k)\|_{L^p(\Gamma(t))} \leq C_p(T, \tau, p),$$

implying, by the same arguments used for $\varphi(u_k)$, applied in this case to $\varphi'(u_k)$, that

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in [\tau, T]} \|\varphi'(u)\|_{L^p(\Gamma(t))} \leq C_p(T, \tau, p), \quad \forall p \in [2, \infty). \quad (3.38)$$

Therefore, exploiting elliptic regularity and recalling that $u \in L_{H^1}^\infty$, we obtain

$$\|u\|_{H^2(\Gamma(t))} \leq (C + \|\Delta_{\Gamma(t)} u\|) \leq C(1 + \|w\| + \|\varphi(u)\|) \leq C(T, \tau),$$

for almost any $t \in [\tau, T]$.

Part (iii). If we now apply the chain rule to $\varphi(u)$ (which is possible, e.g., by approximation with the truncated functions u_k and then passing to the limit as $k \rightarrow \infty$) we obtain

$$\nabla_{\Gamma} \varphi(u) = \varphi'(u) \nabla_{\Gamma} u, \quad \text{for a.a. } t \in [\tau, T].$$

Then, for almost any $t \in [\tau, T]$, we have that

$$\|\nabla_{\Gamma} \varphi(u)\|_{L^p(\Gamma(t))} \leq \|\varphi'(u)\|_{L^{2p}(\Gamma(t))} \|\nabla_{\Gamma} u\|_{L^{2p}(\Gamma(t))} \leq C_p(T, \tau, p),$$

by the Sobolev embedding $H^2(\Gamma(t)) \hookrightarrow W^{1, q}(\Gamma(t))$ for every $q \geq 2$. Therefore we get

$$\|\varphi(u)\|_{W^{1, p}(\Gamma(t))} \leq C_p(T, \tau, p),$$

for every $p \geq 2$. This implies, choosing, e.g., $p = 3$, that

$$\|\varphi(u)\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma(t))} \leq C(T, \tau), \quad \text{for a.a. } t \in [\tau, T], \quad (3.39)$$

by the embedding $W^{1, 3}(\Gamma(t)) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\Gamma(t))$. Therefore, being $u(t) \in H^2(\Gamma(t)) \hookrightarrow C^0(\Gamma(t))$ for almost any $t \in [0, T]$, it follows from the singularities of φ at ± 1 and the estimate (3.39) that we can find $\xi = \xi(T, \tau) > 0$ such that

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma(t))} \leq 1 - \xi, \quad \text{for a.a. } t \in [\tau, T],$$

that is, the strict separation property holds. This concludes the proof. \square

4 The second model

We now consider the alternative weighted model (1.2), which is analyzed in [8, Sec.6] (and references therein).

4.1 Weak formulation

Let (\mathbf{A}_Φ) hold. Then the problem reads: find a pair (c, w) such that, for all $\eta \in L^2_{H^1}$,

$$m_\star(\rho \partial^\bullet c, \eta) + \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \nabla_\Gamma w \cdot \nabla_\Gamma \eta + \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho c \mathbf{V}_a^\tau \cdot \nabla_\Gamma \eta = 0, \quad (4.1)$$

$$\int_{\Gamma(t)} \nabla_\Gamma c \cdot \nabla_\Gamma \eta + \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho F'(c) \eta = \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho w \eta, \quad (4.2)$$

$$c(0) = c_0, \quad \text{a.e. on } \Gamma_0. \quad (4.3)$$

Here the weight function ρ is determined by the transport equation

$$\partial^\bullet \rho + \rho \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V} = 0, \quad (4.4)$$

with $\rho(0) \equiv 1$ on Γ_0 . As noticed in [8, (6.1.4)], we have an interesting characterization of ρ :

$$\rho(t, \Phi(t, p)) = (J_t^0(p))^{-1}, \quad \forall p \in \Gamma_0. \quad (4.5)$$

In particular, we also have the bounds

$$0 < \frac{1}{C_\rho} \leq \rho \leq C_\rho, \quad |\nabla_\Gamma \rho| \leq C_\rho, \quad (4.6)$$

with $C_\rho > 1$. Again, the system above can be obtained from balance laws by suitably defining the chemical potential w (see [8]), which in this case is related to the functional derivative of the energy

$$E_{CH}^\rho(c) := \int_{\Gamma(t)} \left(\frac{|\nabla_\Gamma c|^2}{2} + \rho F(c) \right).$$

We recall the following result (see [8, Thm.6.2]), which is obtained for the case $\mathbf{V}_a = \mathbf{V}_\tau \equiv \mathbf{0}$, but it can be easily extended to the case when the tangential velocities are nonzero. The statement below and its proof involve the *weighted inverse Laplacian*, which we define, for any

$$f \in H^{-1}(\Gamma(t)) \quad \text{such that} \quad \langle \rho f, 1 \rangle_{H^{-1}(\Gamma(t)), H^1(\Gamma(t))} = 0,$$

as the unique solution $\zeta := (\Delta_{\Gamma, \rho})^{-1} f \in H^1(\Gamma(t))$ to the problem

$$\int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \nabla_\Gamma \zeta \cdot \nabla_\Gamma \eta = \langle \rho f, \eta \rangle \quad \text{with} \quad \int_{\Gamma(t)} \zeta = 0. \quad (4.7)$$

We define also, for such elements f , the weighted norm

$$\|f\|_{\rho, -1} := \|\sqrt{\rho} \nabla_\Gamma \zeta\| = \langle \rho f, \zeta \rangle. \quad (4.8)$$

Note that there exist $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that $C_1 \|\nabla_\Gamma \zeta\| \leq \|f\|_{\rho, -1} \leq C_2 \|\nabla_\Gamma \zeta\|$.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $c_0 \in H^1(\Gamma_0)$, $|c_0| \leq 1$, $|(c_0)_{\Gamma_0}| < 1$ and $F : [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be given by (3.7). Then there exists a unique pair (c, w) with*

$$c \in L^\infty_{H^1} \cap H^1_{H^{-1}}, \quad w \in L^2_{H^1},$$

such that, for almost any $t \in [0, T]$, $|c(t)| < 1$ almost everywhere in $\Gamma(t)$ and (c, w) satisfies, for almost any $t \in [0, T]$, (4.1)-(4.2), with $c(0) = c_0$ almost everywhere in Γ_0 . The solution c also satisfies the additional regularity

$$c \in C^0_{L^2} \cap L^\infty_{L^p} \cap L^2_{H^2},$$

for all $p \in [1, +\infty)$. Furthermore, if $c_{0,1}, c_{0,2} \in H^1(\Gamma_0)$, satisfying the existence assumptions, are such that $(c_{0,1})_{\Gamma_0} = (c_{0,2})_{\Gamma_0}$, and c_1, c_2 are the solutions of the system with $c_1(0) = c_{0,1}$ and $c_2(0) = c_{0,2}$, then there exists a constant $C > 0$ independent of t , such that, for almost any $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\|c_1(t) - c_2(t)\|_{\rho, -1} \leq e^{Ct} \|c_{0,1} - c_{0,2}\|_{\rho, -1}, \quad (4.9)$$

The proof of existence follows from the uniform estimates obtained in the proof of Theorem 4.5 below. For completeness, we now include a proof of continuous dependence on the initial data, entailing uniqueness, which was omitted in [8].

Proof. (Stability of weak solutions to (4.1)-(4.3)) The density ρ is determined by a single ordinary differential equation which can be solved explicitly, and it is thus unique. Now suppose (c_1, w_1) and (c_2, w_2) both solve (4.1), (4.2), with initial conditions $c_1(0) = c_{0,1}$ and $c_2(0) = c_{0,2}$, such that $(c_{0,1})_{\Gamma_0} = (c_{0,2})_{\Gamma_0}$. Denote $\xi^c = c_1 - c_2$, $\xi^w = w_1 - w_2$. Subtracting the corresponding equations leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \rho \partial^\bullet \xi^c, \eta \rangle + \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \nabla_\Gamma \xi^w \cdot \nabla_\Gamma \eta + \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \xi^c \mathbf{V}_a^\tau \cdot \nabla_\Gamma \eta &= 0 \\ \int_{\Gamma(t)} \nabla_\Gamma \xi^c \cdot \nabla_\Gamma \eta + \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho (F'(c_1) - F'(c_2)) \eta &= \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \xi^w \eta. \end{aligned}$$

Using the ODE (4.4) for ρ and (4.1), noting that $\xi^c(0) = c_{0,1} - c_{0,2}$, we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \xi^c = \langle \rho \partial^\bullet \xi^c, 1 \rangle = 0 \implies \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \xi^c = \int_{\Gamma_0} c_{0,1} - c_{0,2} \equiv 0.$$

Therefore the weighted inverse Laplacian $(\Delta_{\Gamma, \rho}^{-1}) \xi^c$ is well defined, and taking $\eta = (\Delta_{\Gamma, \rho}^{-1}) \xi^c$ in (4.1) we get

$$\langle \rho \partial^\bullet \xi^c, (\Delta_{\Gamma, \rho}^{-1}) \xi^c \rangle + \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \nabla_\Gamma \xi^w \cdot \nabla_\Gamma (\Delta_{\Gamma, \rho}^{-1}) \xi^c + \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \xi^c \mathbf{V}_a^\tau \cdot \nabla_\Gamma (\Delta_{\Gamma, \rho}^{-1}) \xi^c = 0. \quad (4.10)$$

Now note:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \rho \partial^\bullet \xi^c, (\Delta_{\Gamma, \rho}^{-1}) \xi^c \rangle &= \frac{d}{dt} \left[\int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \xi^c (\Delta_{\Gamma, \rho}^{-1}) \xi^c \right] - \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \xi^c \partial^\bullet (\Delta_{\Gamma, \rho}^{-1}) \xi^c \\ &= \frac{d}{dt} \left[\int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho |\nabla_\Gamma (\Delta_{\Gamma, \rho}^{-1}) \xi^c|^2 \right] - \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \nabla_\Gamma (\Delta_{\Gamma, \rho}^{-1}) \xi^c \cdot \nabla_\Gamma \partial^\bullet (\Delta_{\Gamma, \rho}^{-1}) \xi^c \\ &= \frac{d}{dt} \|\xi^c\|_{\rho, -1}^2 - \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \nabla_\Gamma (\Delta_{\Gamma, \rho}^{-1}) \xi^c \cdot \nabla_\Gamma \partial^\bullet (\Delta_{\Gamma, \rho}^{-1}) \xi^c \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \nabla_\Gamma \xi^w \cdot \nabla_\Gamma (\Delta_{\Gamma, \rho}^{-1}) \xi^c = \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \xi^w \xi^c$$

so that (4.10) becomes

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\xi^c\|_{\rho, -1}^2 + \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \xi^c \mathbf{V}_a^\tau \cdot \nabla_\Gamma (\Delta_{\Gamma, \rho}^{-1}) \xi^c + \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \xi^w \xi^c = \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \nabla_\Gamma (\Delta_{\Gamma, \rho}^{-1}) \xi^c \cdot \nabla_\Gamma \partial^\bullet (\Delta_{\Gamma, \rho}^{-1}) \xi^c.$$

We now also test (4.2), written for the difference of the two solutions, with $\eta = \xi^c$ to obtain

$$\|\nabla_\Gamma \xi^c\|^2 + \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho (F'(c_1) - F'(c_2)) \xi^c = \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \xi^w \xi^c. \quad (4.11)$$

Due to the structure of the logarithmic potential F , being F_{ln} strictly convex, we have the estimate

$$\int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho (F'(c_1) - F'(c_2)) \xi^c \geq -C \|\xi^c\|$$

from where (4.11) becomes

$$\|\nabla_\Gamma \xi^c\|^2 \leq \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \xi^w \xi^c + C \|\xi^c\|^2. \quad (4.12)$$

Adding (4.11) and (4.12) the terms involving the product $\xi^w \xi^c$ cancel out and we are led to

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\xi^c\|_{\rho, -1}^2 + \|\nabla_\Gamma \xi^c\|^2 \leq C \|\xi^c\|^2 + \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \nabla_\Gamma (\Delta_{\Gamma, \rho}^{-1}) \xi^c \cdot \nabla_\Gamma \partial^\bullet (\Delta_{\Gamma, \rho}^{-1}) \xi^c - \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \xi^c \mathbf{V}_a^\tau \cdot \nabla_\Gamma (\Delta_{\Gamma, \rho}^{-1}) \xi^c.$$

We now estimate the first term on the right-hand side as

$$C \|\xi^c\|^2 \leq C \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho |\xi^c|^2 = C \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \nabla_\Gamma \xi^c \cdot \nabla_\Gamma (\Delta_{\Gamma, \rho}^{-1}) \xi^c \leq \frac{1}{4} \|\nabla_\Gamma \xi^c\|^2 + C \|\xi^c\|_{\rho, -1}^2.$$

For the second term, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \nabla_{\Gamma}(\Delta_{\Gamma, \rho}^{-1}) \xi^c \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} \partial^{\bullet}(\Delta_{\Gamma, \rho}^{-1}) \xi^c &\leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho |\nabla_{\Gamma}(\Delta_{\Gamma, \rho}^{-1}) \xi^c|^2 + C \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho |\nabla_{\Gamma}(\Delta_{\Gamma, \rho}^{-1}) \xi^c|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\xi^c\|_{\rho, -1}^2 + C \|\xi^c\|_{\rho, -1}^2 \end{aligned}$$

and finally, for the last term and reusing the estimate for the first,

$$\left| \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \xi^c \mathbf{V}_a^{\tau} \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma}(\Delta_{\Gamma, \rho}^{-1}) \xi^c \right| \leq C_1 \|\xi^c\|^2 + C_2 \|\xi^c\|_{\rho, -1}^2 \leq \frac{1}{4} \|\nabla_{\Gamma} \xi^c\|^2 + C \|\xi^c\|_{\rho, -1}^2.$$

All in all, we obtain from (4.13) the estimate

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\xi^c\|_{\rho, -1}^2 + \|\nabla_{\Gamma} \xi^c\|^2 \leq C \|\xi^c\|_{\rho, -1}^2,$$

and an application of Gronwall's inequality implies the continuous dependence estimate stated in (4.9). Then uniqueness follows by setting $c_{0,1} \equiv c_{0,2}$. \square

Remark 4.2. Notice that the regularity stated in Theorem 4.1 can be slightly improved as in the case of the first model (see Remark 3.5). In particular, since $c \in L^2_{H^2}$ solves the problem, for almost all $t \in [0, T]$,

$$-\frac{1}{\rho} \Delta_{\Gamma} c(t) = w(t) - F'(c(t)) \in L^2(\Gamma(t)),$$

we are allowed to multiply by $-\Delta_{\Gamma} c \in L^2(\Gamma(t))$ for almost any $t \in [0, T]$. Recalling that $\varphi' > 0$, after an integration by parts, being $\Gamma(t)$ closed and $c \in L^{\infty}_{H^1}$, we obtain, by (4.6),

$$\begin{aligned} C \|\Delta_{\Gamma} c\|^2 &\leq m\left(\frac{1}{\rho} \Delta_{\Gamma} c, \Delta_{\Gamma} c\right) + \frac{\theta}{2} m(\varphi'(c), |\nabla_{\Gamma} c|^2) \\ &\leq \|\nabla_{\Gamma} w\| \|\nabla_{\Gamma} c\| + \|\nabla_{\Gamma} c\|^2 \leq C(1 + \|\nabla_{\Gamma} w\|), \end{aligned}$$

and knowing that $w \in L^2_{H^1}$, we infer $c \in L^4_{H^2}$.

We make use of the following weighted L^2 and H^1 products, whose induced norms are equivalent norms on $L^2(\Gamma(t))$ and $H^1(\Gamma(t))$, respectively:

$$(f, g)_{\rho} := m(\rho f, g), \quad (f, g)_{1, \rho} := (f, g)_{\rho} + \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \nabla_{\Gamma} f \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} g. \quad (4.13)$$

Notice that for $t = 0$ these definitions coincide with the natural norms on these spaces, being $\rho(0, x) \equiv 1$ for any $x \in \Gamma_0$. We now give an extension of Proposition 3.2, whose proof is shown in Appendix A:

Proposition 4.3. For $\eta, \phi \in H^1_{L^2}$, with $\nabla_{\Gamma} \partial^{\bullet} \phi \in L^2_{L^2}$ and $\nabla_{\Gamma} \partial^{\bullet} \eta \in L^2_{L^2}$, the following identity holds

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} (\nabla_{\Gamma} \eta, \nabla_{\Gamma} \phi)_{\rho} &= m(\partial^{\bullet} \rho \nabla_{\Gamma} \eta, \nabla_{\Gamma} \phi) + (\nabla_{\Gamma} \partial^{\bullet} \eta, \nabla_{\Gamma} \phi)_{\rho} + (\nabla_{\Gamma} \eta, \nabla_{\Gamma} \partial^{\bullet} \phi)_{\rho} + \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho B(\mathbf{V}) \nabla_{\Gamma} \eta \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} \phi \\ &= (\nabla_{\Gamma} \partial^{\bullet} \eta, \nabla_{\Gamma} \phi)_{\rho} + (\nabla_{\Gamma} \eta, \nabla_{\Gamma} \partial^{\bullet} \phi)_{\rho} + \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \tilde{B}(\mathbf{V}) \nabla_{\Gamma} \eta \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} \phi, \end{aligned}$$

for almost any $t \in [0, T]$, where B is the vector field given in Section 3.2 and $\tilde{B}(\mathbf{V}) := -2\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{V})$.

With an analogous proof, we can extend Proposition 3.2 as follows (assuming \mathbf{V}_a^{τ} is sufficiently regular)

Proposition 4.4. For $\eta, \phi \in H^1_{L^2}$, with $\nabla_{\Gamma} \partial^{\bullet} \phi \in L^2_{L^2}$, the following identity holds

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \eta \mathbf{V}_a^{\tau} \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} \phi = \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \partial^{\bullet} \eta \mathbf{V}_a^{\tau} \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} \phi + \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \eta \mathbf{V}_a^{\tau} \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} \partial^{\bullet} \phi + \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \tilde{B}_{adv}(\mathbf{V}_a^{\tau}(t), \mathbf{V}(t)) \eta \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} \phi,$$

for almost any $t \in [0, T]$, where \tilde{B}_{adv} is a vector field given by

$$\tilde{B}_{adv}(\mathbf{V}_a^{\tau}, \mathbf{V})_i := (\partial^{\bullet} \mathbf{V}_a^{\tau})_i - \sum_{j=1}^3 (\mathbf{V}_a^{\tau})_j \underline{D}_j^{\Gamma(t)} \mathbf{V}_i, \quad i = 1, 2, 3.$$

In conclusion, being $\partial^{\bullet} \rho = -\rho \nabla_{\Gamma} \cdot \mathbf{V}$, we infer by Proposition 3.2

$$\frac{d}{dt} (\eta, \phi)_{\rho} = (\partial^{\bullet} \eta, \phi)_{\rho} + (\eta, \partial^{\bullet} \phi)_{\rho}, \quad \forall \eta, \phi \in H^1_{L^2}, \quad (4.14)$$

retrieving the classical integration by parts formula as in the case of a fixed manifold. This is not surprising, in the sense that the term ρ accounts for local stretching or compressing of the surfaces and somehow annihilates the effects of the evolving surface.

4.2 Regularisation and strict separation property

Also for this model, additionally to (\mathbf{A}_Φ) , we assume the hypotheses of Section 2. Our main result is the following

Theorem 4.5. *Let the assumptions of Theorem 4.1 hold and assume the hypotheses of Section 2 on the surface motion. Denote by (c, w) the (unique) weak solution to (4.1)-(4.2).*

(i) *There exists a constant $C = C(T, E_{CH}^\rho(u_0)) > 0$ such that, for almost any $t \in [0, T]$,*

$$t\|w\|_{H^1(\Gamma(t))}^2 + \int_0^t s\|\partial^\bullet c\|_{H^1(\Gamma(s))}^2 ds \leq C(T, E_{CH}^\rho(u_0)). \quad (4.15)$$

(ii) *For any $0 < \tau \leq T$, there exist constants $C = C(T, \tau, E_{CH}^\rho(u_0)) > 0$ and $C_p = C_p(T, \tau, p, E_{CH}^\rho(u_0)) > 0$ such that, for almost any $t \in [\tau, T]$*

$$\begin{aligned} \|w\|_{H^1(\Gamma(t))} &\leq C(T, \tau, E_{CH}^\rho(u_0)), \\ \|\varphi(c)\|_{L^p(\Gamma(t))} + \|\varphi'(c)\|_{L^p(\Gamma(t))} &\leq C_p(T, \tau, p, E_{CH}^\rho(u_0)), \quad \forall p \in [2, \infty), \\ \|c\|_{H^2(\Gamma(t))} &\leq C(T, \tau, E_{CH}^\rho(u_0)). \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

(iii) *There exists $\xi = \xi(T, \tau, E_{CH}^\rho(u_0)) > 0$, such that*

$$\|c\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma(t))} \leq 1 - \xi, \quad \text{for almost any } t \in [\tau, T].$$

Remark 4.6. *Actually, the only assumption additional to [8, \mathbf{A}_Φ] is that (2.4) holds. Indeed, due to the presence of ρ we do not need, e.g. (2.6). In particular, if $\mathbf{V}_a^\tau \equiv \mathbf{0}$, we only need [8, \mathbf{A}_Φ] instead of the more restrictive assumptions used in the analysis of the first model. For this reason, we think that the second model seems more natural in the context of evolving surfaces with only normal component of the motion velocity.*

Remark 4.7. *As in Remark 3.10, assuming the regularity stated in Lemma C.1, also in this case we actually obtain that, for any $\tau > 0$, $c \in C_{C^0}^0(\tau, T)$ and thus*

$$\sup_{t \in [\tau, T]} \|c\|_{C^0(\Gamma(t))} \leq 1 - \xi.$$

4.2.1 Galerkin approximation

We need a slight revision of the Galerkin approximation scheme. Let us recall [8, Sec.4.1] and consider a basis $\{\chi_j^0 : j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ orthonormal in $L^2(\Gamma_0)$ and orthogonal in $H^1(\Gamma_0)$ consisting of smooth functions such that χ_1^0 is constant (for example consider the eigenfunctions of the Laplace-Beltrami operator). We then transport this basis using the flow map. This gives $\{\chi_j^t := \phi_t(\chi_j^0) : j \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset H^1(\Gamma(t))$. Observe that this basis is still an orthonormal basis in $L^2(\Gamma(t))$ endowed with the norm induced by (4.13). Indeed, thanks to (4.5), we have

$$(\chi_i^t, \chi_j^t)_\rho = m(\rho \chi_i^t, \chi_j^t) = \int_{\Gamma_0} \chi_i^0 \chi_j^0 = \delta_{ij}, \quad \forall i, j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Notice that the same basis is such that $\overline{\text{span}\{\chi_j^t : j \in \mathbb{N}\}}^{H^1(\Gamma(t))} = H^1(\Gamma(t))$, but we are not able to show any orthogonality property in this space, even endowing the space with the norm induced by (4.13). We can then introduce the finite dimensional spaces

$$V_M(t) = \text{span}\{\chi_j^t : 1 \leq j \leq M\} \subset H^1(\Gamma(t)),$$

and, exploiting the orthogonality with respect to the equivalent L^2 inner product (4.13)₁, we can give an explicit expression to the L^2 -orthogonal projector $P_M^\rho(t) : L^2(\Gamma(t)) \rightarrow V_M(t)$ as

$$P_M^\rho(t)f := \sum_{j=1}^M (f, \chi_j^t)_\rho \chi_j^t = \sum_{j=1}^M \left(\int_{\Gamma_0} \tilde{f} \chi_j^0 \right) \chi_j^t = \phi_t(P_M^0 \tilde{f}),$$

where $P_M^0 = P_M^\rho(0)$ is the orthogonal projector over $V_M(0)$ (endowed with the canonical L^2 -norm). Clearly this implies $\|P_M^\rho(t)f\|_\rho \leq \|f\|_\rho$ uniformly in M , for any $t > 0$. Following [2, Sec.7], we now introduce the matrix

$$\mathbf{A}_t^0 := (D\Phi_t^0)^T D\Phi_t^0 + \nu_0 \otimes \nu_0,$$

where ν_0 is the normal to Γ_0 . This matrix is invertible in \mathbb{R}^3 thanks to the extension in the normal direction. We then have that (see [2, (7.5)])

$$\phi_{-t}(\nabla_\Gamma h) = D\Phi_t^0(\mathbf{A}_t^0)^{-1}\nabla_{\Gamma_0}(\phi_{-t}(h)) = D\Phi_t^0(\mathbf{A}_t^0)^{-1}\nabla_{\Gamma_0}\tilde{h}. \quad (4.17)$$

Therefore, again by (4.5), the properties of the orthogonal basis $\{\chi_j^0 : j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ in $H^1(\Gamma_0)$, and the compatibility of the space $(H^1(\Gamma(t)), \phi_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \nabla_\Gamma w \cdot \nabla_\Gamma P_M^\rho(t) f &= \int_{\Gamma_0} \nabla_{\Gamma_0} \tilde{w} (D\Phi_t^0)^T (\mathbf{A}_t^0)^{-T} D\Phi_t^0 (\mathbf{A}_t^0)^{-1} \nabla_{\Gamma_0} P_M^0 \tilde{f} \\ &\leq C \|\nabla_{\Gamma_0} \tilde{w}\|_{L^2(\Gamma_0)} \|\nabla_{\Gamma_0} P_M^0 \tilde{f}\|_{L^2(\Gamma_0)} \\ &\leq C \|\nabla_{\Gamma_0} \tilde{w}\|_{L^2(\Gamma_0)} \|\nabla_{\Gamma_0} \tilde{f}\|_{L^2(\Gamma_0)} \\ &\leq C \|\nabla_\Gamma w\| \|\nabla_\Gamma f\|, \end{aligned}$$

for any $w, f \in H^1(\Gamma(t))$. Then similarly, we also get

$$\int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \mathbf{w} \cdot \nabla_\Gamma P_M^\rho(t) f \leq C \|\mathbf{w}\| \|\nabla_\Gamma f\|, \quad (4.18)$$

for any vector $\mathbf{w} \in [L^2(\Gamma(t))]^3$ and $f \in H^1(\Gamma(t))$. We can also prove that the time derivative ∂^\bullet commutes with the projector $P_M^\rho(t)$. Indeed, since $\partial^\bullet \chi_j^t \equiv 0$ for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial^\bullet(P_M^\rho(t)f) &= \sum_{i=1}^M \partial^\bullet(f, \chi_i^t) \rho \chi_i^t \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^M ((\partial^\bullet f, \chi_i^t)_\rho + m(f \partial^\bullet \rho, \chi_i^t) + g(\rho f, \chi_i^t)) \chi_i^t \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^M (\partial^\bullet f, \chi_i^t)_\rho \chi_i^t \\ &= P_M^\rho(t) \partial^\bullet f, \quad \forall f \in H_{L^2}^1, \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

where we exploited the fact that $\partial^\bullet \rho = -\rho \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V}$.

We then consider the Galerkin approximation with the approximated potential F^δ ($\varphi^\delta = (F_{ln}^\delta)'$) of the original problem. More precisely, given the spaces V_M as in [8], for each $M \in \mathbb{N}$, find functions $c_\delta^M, w_\delta^M \in L_{V_M}^2$ with $\partial^\bullet c_\delta^M \in L_{V_M}^2$ such that, for any $\eta \in L_{V_M}^2$ and all $t \in [0, T]$,

$$(\partial^\bullet c_\delta^M, \eta)_\rho + (\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M, \nabla_\Gamma \eta)_\rho + (c_\delta^M \mathbf{V}_a^T, \nabla_\Gamma \eta)_\rho = 0, \quad (4.20)$$

$$w_\delta^M = P_M^\rho(t) \left(-\frac{1}{\rho} \Delta_{\Gamma(t)} c_\delta^M + (F^\delta)'(c_\delta^M) \right), \quad (4.21)$$

$$c_\delta^M(0) = P_M^0 c_0, \quad \text{a.e. on } \Gamma_0. \quad (4.22)$$

Notice that this formulation, written with respect to the ρ inner product, is very similar the classical weak formulation of CH equation in bounded domains of \mathbb{R}^2 (or \mathbb{R}^3). For this problem we then have

Proposition 4.8. *There exists a unique local solution (c_δ^M, w_δ^M) to (4.20)-(4.22). In particular there exist functions (c^M, w^M) satisfying (4.20)-(4.21) on an interval $[0, t^*)$, $0 \leq t^* \leq T$, together with (4.22). The functions are of the form (omitting for simplicity the dependence on δ)*

$$c_\delta^M(t) = \sum_{i=1}^M c_i^M(t) \chi_i^t, \quad w_\delta^M(t) = \sum_{i=1}^M w_i^M(t) \chi_i^t, \quad t \in [0, t^*),$$

with $c_i^M \in C^2([0, t^*))$ and $w_i^M \in C^2([0, t^*))$, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$.

Proof. We consider the matrix form of the equations, where, as before, we set $\mathbf{c}^M(t) = (c_1^M(t), \dots, c_M^M(t))$ and $\mathbf{w}^M(t) = (w_1^M(t), \dots, w_M^M(t))$,

$$\begin{aligned} M^\rho(t) \dot{\mathbf{c}}^M(t) + A_S^\rho(t) \mathbf{w}^M(t) + A_N^\rho(t) \mathbf{c}^M(t) &= 0, \\ A_S(t) \mathbf{c}^M(t) + (\mathbf{F}_\rho^\delta)'(\mathbf{c}^M(t)) - M^\rho(t) \mathbf{w}^M(t) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here

$$\begin{aligned}
(M^\rho(t))_{ij} &= (\chi_i^t, \chi_j^t)_\rho = \delta_{ij}, \\
(A_S(t))_{ij} &= a_S(t; \chi_i^t, \chi_j^t), \\
(A_S^\rho(t))_{ij} &= (\nabla_\Gamma \chi_i^t, \nabla_\Gamma \chi_j^t)_\rho, \\
(A_N^\rho(t))_{ij} &= (\chi_j^t \mathbf{V}_a^\tau, \nabla_\Gamma \chi_i^t)_\rho, \\
(\mathbf{F}_\rho^\delta)'(\mathbf{c}^M(t))_j &= ((F^\delta)'(c^M(t)), \chi_j^t)_\rho.
\end{aligned}$$

We now observe that again these matrices are more regular. Indeed, M_{ij}^ρ is actually the identity matrix. Similarly, we get

$$\frac{d}{dt}(A_S(t))_{ij} = b(\chi_i^t, \chi_j^t) \in C^0([0, T]),$$

and the same goes for A_S^ρ , by (4.14), and for A_N^ρ , by (4.14). Recalling then that $(F^\delta)'$ is $C^{1,1}(\mathbb{R})$, the result follows from the general theory of ODEs. \square

We establish some a priori estimates for the solutions of the Galerkin approximation.

Proposition 4.9. *For the approximating solution pair (u_δ^M, w_δ^M) we have:*

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \tilde{E}_{CH}^\rho(c_\delta^M) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\Gamma(t)} |\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M|^2 dt &\leq C(T) \\
\|\partial^\bullet c_\delta^M\|_{L^2_{H^{-1}}} &\leq C(T), \quad \text{and} \quad \|w_\delta^M\|_{L^2_{H^1}} \leq C_\delta,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.23}$$

where as before $\tilde{E}_{CH}^\rho := E_{CH}^\rho + \tilde{C}$ for some $\tilde{C} > 0$ chosen so that $\tilde{E}_{CH}^\rho \geq 0$.

Proof. We consider the Galerkin approximation of Proposition 4.8. First notice that we have the conservation of the total mass, by choosing $\eta \equiv 1$:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho c_\delta^M = \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \partial^\bullet c_\delta^M \equiv 0.$$

Arguing as in [8, (6.2.1)] we can obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} E_{CH}^\rho(c_\delta^M) + \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho |\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M|^2 dt = -(c_\delta^M \mathbf{V}_a^\tau, \nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M)_\rho + b(c_\delta^M, c_\delta^M). \tag{4.24}$$

Now observe that, by the conservation of total mass,

$$(\tilde{c}_\delta^M)_{\Gamma_0} \equiv \frac{\int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho c_\delta^M}{|\Gamma_0|} \equiv (c_0)_{\Gamma_0},$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}
-(c_\delta^M \mathbf{V}_a^\tau, \nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M)_\rho &= - \int_{\Gamma_0} \tilde{c}_\delta^M \tilde{\mathbf{V}}_a^\tau \cdot D\Phi_t^0(\mathbf{A}_t^0)^{-1} \nabla_{\Gamma_0} \tilde{w}_\delta^M \\
&= - \int_{\Gamma_0} (\tilde{c}_\delta^M - (\tilde{c}_\delta^M)_{\Gamma_0}) \tilde{\mathbf{V}}_a^\tau \cdot D\Phi_t^0(\mathbf{A}_t^0)^{-1} \nabla_{\Gamma_0} \tilde{w}_\delta^M - (\tilde{c}_\delta^M)_{\Gamma_0} \int_{\Gamma_0} \tilde{\mathbf{V}}_a^\tau \cdot D\Phi_t^0(\mathbf{A}_t^0)^{-1} \nabla_{\Gamma_0} \tilde{w}_\delta^M \\
&\leq C \|\tilde{c}_\delta^M - (\tilde{c}_\delta^M)_{\Gamma_0}\|_{L^2(\Gamma_0)} \|\nabla_{\Gamma_0} \tilde{w}_\delta^M\|_{L^2(\Gamma_0)} + C \|\nabla_{\Gamma_0} \tilde{w}_\delta^M\|_{L^2(\Gamma_0)} \\
&\leq C \|\nabla_{\Gamma_0} \tilde{c}_\delta^M\|_{L^2(\Gamma_0)} \|\nabla_{\Gamma_0} \tilde{w}_\delta^M\|_{L^2(\Gamma_0)} + C \|\nabla_{\Gamma_0} \tilde{w}_\delta^M\|_{L^2(\Gamma_0)} \\
&\leq C \|\nabla_\Gamma c_\delta^M\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\sqrt{\rho} \nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\|^2 + C,
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last steps we have exploited Poincaré's and Young's inequalities, the regularity (4.6) and the compatibility of $(H^1(\Gamma(t)), \phi_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$. Therefore, being also

$$b(c_\delta^M, c_\delta^M) \leq C \|\nabla_\Gamma c_\delta^M\|^2,$$

we end up with

$$\frac{d}{dt} \tilde{E}_{CH}^\rho(c_\delta^M) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho |\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M|^2 dt \leq C \tilde{E}_{CH}^\rho(c_\delta^M), \tag{4.25}$$

where $\tilde{E}_{CH}^\rho(c_\delta^M) := E_{CH}^\rho(c_\delta^M) + C$, so that $\tilde{E}_{CH}^\rho(c_\delta^M) \geq 0$. Therefore, an application of Gronwall's Lemma gives

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \tilde{E}_{CH}^\rho(c_\delta^M) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\Gamma(t)} |\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M|^2 dt \leq C(T) \tilde{E}_{CH}^\rho(P_M^0 c_0), \quad (4.26)$$

and, recalling the properties of P_M^0 (see, e.g., [8, Lemma 5.6]), we have

$$\tilde{E}_{CH}^\rho(P_M^0 c_0) \leq CT.$$

This clearly allows us to extend the maximal time from t^* to T . Concerning the estimate of the mean value of c , since in this model this quantity is not conserved, being conserved the product ρc , we can observe, as in [8], that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Gamma(t)} c_\delta^M = \int_{\Gamma(t)} \partial^\bullet c_\delta^M + \int_{\Gamma(t)} c_\delta^M \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V}.$$

If we now take $\eta = P_M^\rho(t) \frac{1}{\rho}$ in (4.20), we have, being $\partial^\bullet c_\delta^M \in L_{V_M}^2$ and $P_M^\rho(t)$ self-adjoint,

$$\left(\partial^\bullet c_\delta^M, P_M^\rho(t) \frac{1}{\rho} \right)_\rho = m(\partial^\bullet c_\delta^M, 1) = -(\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M, \nabla_\Gamma P_M^\rho(t) \frac{1}{\rho})_\rho - (c_\delta^M \mathbf{V}_a^\tau, \nabla_\Gamma P_M^\rho(t) \frac{1}{\rho})_\rho.$$

Therefore, integrating by parts $\int_{\Gamma(t)} c_\delta^M \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \mathbf{V}$, recalling that $\Gamma(t)$ is closed, we get

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Gamma(t)} c_\delta^M = -(\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M, \nabla_\Gamma P_M^\rho(t) \frac{1}{\rho})_\rho - (c_\delta^M \mathbf{V}_a^\tau, \nabla_\Gamma P_M^\rho(t) \frac{1}{\rho})_\rho - \int_{\Gamma(t)} \nabla_\Gamma c_\delta^M \cdot \mathbf{V},$$

so that

$$\int_{\Gamma(t)} c_\delta^M = \int_{\Gamma_0} P_M^0 c_0 - \int_0^t (\nabla_{\Gamma(s)} w_\delta^M, \nabla_{\Gamma(s)} P_M^\rho(s) \frac{1}{\rho})_\rho ds - \int_0^t (c_\delta^M \mathbf{V}_a^\tau, \nabla_{\Gamma(s)} P_M^\rho(s) \frac{1}{\rho})_\rho ds - \int_0^t \int_{\Gamma(s)} \nabla_\Gamma c_\delta^M \cdot \mathbf{V} ds.$$

Similarly as before, considering the pullback of the integral on Γ_0 , the properties of the projector P_M^0 and standard inequalities, we reach

$$\begin{aligned} -(c_\delta^M \mathbf{V}_a^\tau, \nabla_\Gamma P_M^\rho(t) \frac{1}{\rho})_\rho &= - \int_{\Gamma_0} \tilde{c}_\delta^M \tilde{\mathbf{V}}_a^\tau \cdot D\Phi_t^0(\mathbf{A}_t^0)^{-1} \nabla_{\Gamma_0} P_M^0 \left(\frac{1}{\rho} \right) \\ &= - \int_{\Gamma_0} (\tilde{c}_\delta^M - (\tilde{c}_\delta^M)_{\Gamma_0}) \tilde{\mathbf{V}}_a^\tau \cdot D\Phi_t^0(\mathbf{A}_t^0)^{-1} \nabla_{\Gamma_0} P_M^0 \left(\frac{1}{\rho} \right) \\ &\quad - (\tilde{c}_\delta^M)_{\Gamma_0} \int_{\Gamma_0} \tilde{\mathbf{V}}_a^\tau \cdot D\Phi_t^0(\mathbf{A}_t^0)^{-1} \nabla_{\Gamma_0} P_M^0 \left(\frac{1}{\rho} \right) \\ &\leq C(1 + \|\nabla_{\Gamma_0} c_\delta^M\|_{L^2(\Gamma_0)}) \left\| \nabla_{\Gamma_0} \left(\frac{1}{\rho} \right) \right\|_{L^2(\Gamma_0)} \\ &\leq C(1 + \|\nabla_\Gamma c_\delta^M\|) \left\| \nabla_\Gamma \frac{1}{\rho} \right\| \leq C(T), \end{aligned}$$

by (4.26).

Thus, by (4.6), the properties of P_M^0 , and (4.18), we deduce

$$\left| \int_{\Gamma(t)} c_\delta^M \right| \leq C + C \int_0^t \|\nabla_{\Gamma(s)} w_\delta^M\| \left\| \nabla_{\Gamma(s)} \frac{1}{\rho} \right\| ds + C(T) \leq C \left(1 + \int_0^t \|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\| ds \right) + C(T) \leq C(T).$$

Combining this result with (4.26) and Poincaré's inequality, we infer that

$$\|c_\delta^M\|_{L_{H^1}^\infty} \leq C(T), \quad (4.27)$$

independently of M and δ . Observe now that, by (4.18), we can find a uniform estimate for $\partial^\bullet c_\delta^M$. Indeed we can write, for any $\eta \in L_{H^1}^2$, being $P_M^\rho(t)$ self-adjoint (with respect to (4.13)₁), and by (4.18)-(4.18),

$$\langle \partial^\bullet c_\delta^M, \eta \rangle_{H^{-1}(\Gamma(t)), H^1(\Gamma(t))} = (P_M^\rho(t) \partial^\bullet c_\delta^M, \eta) = (P_M^\rho(t) \partial^\bullet c_\delta^M, \frac{1}{\rho} \eta)_\rho$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= (\partial^\bullet c_\delta^M, P_M^\rho(t) \frac{1}{\rho} \eta)_\rho = -(\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M, \nabla_\Gamma P_M^\rho(t) \frac{\eta}{\rho})_\rho - (c_\delta^M \mathbf{V}_a^\tau, \nabla_\Gamma P_M^\rho(t) \frac{\eta}{\rho})_\rho \\
&\leq C \|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\| \|\nabla_\Gamma \frac{\eta}{\rho}\| + C \|c_\delta^M\| \|\nabla_\Gamma \frac{\eta}{\rho}\| \leq C \|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\| \|\eta\|_{H^1(\Gamma(t))},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies, by (4.26),

$$\|\partial^\bullet c_\delta^M\|_{L^2_{H^{-1}}} \leq C(T), \quad (4.28)$$

independently of M and δ . We now need a control over the mean value of w_δ^M . This can be obtained by testing (4.21) with $\eta = P_M^\rho(t) \frac{1}{\rho}$ being $w \in L^2_{V_M}$. On account of (4.18), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(w_\delta^M, \frac{1}{\rho}\right)_\rho &= \left(w_\delta^M, P_M^\rho(t) \frac{1}{\rho}\right)_\rho = \left(-\frac{1}{\rho} \Delta c_\delta^M, P_M^\rho(t) \frac{1}{\rho}\right)_\rho + \left(F'_\delta(c_\delta^M), P_M^\rho(t) \frac{1}{\rho}\right)_\rho \\
&= m \left(\nabla_\Gamma c_\delta^M, \nabla_\Gamma P_M^\rho(t) \frac{1}{\rho}\right) + \left(F'_\delta(c_\delta^M), P_M^\rho(t) \frac{1}{\rho}\right)_\rho \\
&\leq C \|\nabla_\Gamma c_\delta^M\| \left\| \nabla_\Gamma \left(P_M^\rho(t) \frac{1}{\rho}\right) \right\| + C \|F'_\delta(c_\delta^M)\| \left\| P_M^\rho(t) \frac{1}{\rho} \right\| \\
&\leq C \|\nabla_\Gamma c_\delta^M\| \left\| \nabla_\Gamma \frac{1}{\rho} \right\| + C_\delta \|c_\delta^M\| \leq C_\delta,
\end{aligned}$$

by (4.6) and (4.26). Here we have also used the fact that $|F'_\delta(c_\delta^M)| \leq C_\delta |c_\delta^M|$, being $F''_\delta \leq C_\delta$ and $F'_\delta(0) = F''(0) = 0$. In the Galerkin scheme we are not able to retrieve a uniform-in- δ estimate for the mean value of w_δ^M . Indeed, we should be able to control the $L^\infty(\Gamma(t))$ norm of $\rho P_M^\rho(t) \frac{1}{\rho}$ and then control $\int_{\Gamma(t)} |F'_\delta(c_\delta^M)|$, but this does not seem feasible. Therefore, we will need to pass to the limit in M first. Then this control will be obtained independently of δ . The above bound entails, thanks to Poincaré's inequality combined with (4.23),

$$\|w_\delta^M\|_{L^2_{H^1}} \leq C_\delta. \quad (4.29)$$

□

4.2.2 Proof of Theorem 4.5

Part (i). We now need to find higher-order estimates. In particular, we set $\eta = \partial^\bullet w_\delta^M \in L^2_{V_M}$ in (4.20), to get

$$(\partial^\bullet c_\delta^M, \partial^\bullet w_\delta^M)_\rho + (\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M, \nabla_\Gamma \partial^\bullet w_\delta^M)_\rho + (c_\delta^M \mathbf{V}_a^\tau, \nabla_\Gamma \partial^\bullet w_\delta^M)_\rho = 0. \quad (4.30)$$

Observe that, by (4.14),

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M, \nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M)_\rho = (\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M, \nabla_\Gamma \partial^\bullet w_\delta^M)_\rho + \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \tilde{B}(\mathbf{V}) \nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M \cdot \nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M. \quad (4.31)$$

On the other hand, by Proposition 3.2, we have, for any $\eta \in L^2_{V_M}$ such that $\partial^\bullet \eta \in L^2_{V_M}$,

$$\frac{d}{dt} m(\nabla_\Gamma c_\delta^M, \nabla_\Gamma \eta) = m(\nabla_\Gamma \partial^\bullet c_\delta^M, \nabla_\Gamma \eta) + m(\nabla_\Gamma c_\delta^M, \nabla_\Gamma \partial^\bullet \eta) + \int_{\Gamma(t)} B(\mathbf{V}) \nabla_\Gamma c_\delta^M \cdot \nabla_\Gamma \eta$$

and, by (4.14),

$$\frac{d}{dt} (w_\delta^M, \eta)_\rho = (\partial^\bullet w_\delta^M, \eta)_\rho + (w, \partial^\bullet \eta)_\rho.$$

Furthermore, we have, using again (4.14),

$$\frac{d}{dt} (F'_\delta(c_\delta^M), \eta)_\rho = (F''_\delta(c_\delta^M), \partial^\bullet c_\delta^M \eta)_\rho + (F'_\delta(c_\delta^M), \partial^\bullet \eta)_\rho.$$

We now recall that

$$\frac{d}{dt} (w_\delta^M, \eta)_\rho = \frac{d}{dt} m(\nabla_\Gamma c_\delta^M, \nabla_\Gamma \eta) + \frac{d}{dt} (F'_\delta(c_\delta^M), \eta)_\rho,$$

thus

$$(\partial^\bullet w_\delta^M, \eta)_\rho + (w, \partial^\bullet \eta)_\rho = m(\nabla_\Gamma \partial^\bullet c_\delta^M, \nabla_\Gamma \eta) + m(\nabla_\Gamma c_\delta^M, \nabla_\Gamma \partial^\bullet \eta)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \int_{\Gamma(t)} B(\mathbf{V}) \nabla_{\Gamma} c_{\delta}^M \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} \eta \\
& + (F_{\delta}''(c_{\delta}^M), \partial^{\bullet} c_{\delta}^M \eta)_{\rho} + (F_{\delta}'(c_{\delta}^M), \partial^{\bullet} \eta)_{\rho}.
\end{aligned}$$

By noticing that, being $\partial^{\bullet} \eta \in L_{V_M}^2$,

$$(w, \partial^{\bullet} \eta)_{\rho} = m(\nabla_{\Gamma} c_{\delta}^M, \nabla_{\Gamma} \partial^{\bullet} \eta) + (F_{\delta}'(c_{\delta}^M), \partial^{\bullet} \eta)_{\rho},$$

we infer, choosing $\eta = \partial^{\bullet} c_{\delta}^M$ (which is sufficiently regular thanks to Proposition 4.8),

$$(\partial^{\bullet} c_{\delta}^M, \partial^{\bullet} w_{\delta}^M)_{\rho} = (F_{\delta}''(c_{\delta}^M) \partial^{\bullet} c_{\delta}^M, \partial^{\bullet} c_{\delta}^M)_{\rho} + \|\nabla_{\Gamma} \partial^{\bullet} c_{\delta}^M\|^2 + b(\mathbf{V}; c_{\delta}^M, \partial^{\bullet} c_{\delta}^M)$$

Moreover, by Proposition 4.4,

$$\frac{d}{dt} (c_{\delta}^M \mathbf{V}_a^{\tau}, \nabla_{\Gamma} w_{\delta}^M)_{\rho} = (\partial^{\bullet} c_{\delta}^M \mathbf{V}_a^{\tau}, \nabla_{\Gamma} w_{\delta}^M)_{\rho} + (c_{\delta}^M \mathbf{V}_a^{\tau}, \nabla_{\Gamma} \partial^{\bullet} w_{\delta}^M)_{\rho} + \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \tilde{B}_{adv}(\mathbf{V}_a^{\tau}, \mathbf{V}) c_{\delta}^M \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} w_{\delta}^M.$$

From these results, together with (4.30) and (4.31), we eventually get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{dt} (c_{\delta}^M \mathbf{V}_a^{\tau}, \nabla_{\Gamma} w_{\delta}^M)_{\rho} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (\nabla_{\Gamma} w_{\delta}^M, \nabla_{\Gamma} w_{\delta}^M)_{\rho} + (F_{\delta}''(c_{\delta}^M) \partial^{\bullet} c_{\delta}^M, \partial^{\bullet} c_{\delta}^M)_{\rho} + \|\nabla_{\Gamma} \partial^{\bullet} c_{\delta}^M\|^2 \\
& = - \int_{\Gamma(t)} B(\mathbf{V}) \nabla_{\Gamma} c_{\delta}^M \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} \partial^{\bullet} c_{\delta}^M + \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \tilde{B}(\mathbf{V}) \nabla_{\Gamma} w_{\delta}^M \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} w_{\delta}^M \\
& + (\partial^{\bullet} c_{\delta}^M \mathbf{V}_a^{\tau}, \nabla_{\Gamma} w_{\delta}^M)_{\rho} + \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \tilde{B}_{adv}(\mathbf{V}_a^{\tau}, \mathbf{V}) c_{\delta}^M \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} w_{\delta}^M,
\end{aligned}$$

and, recalling the definition of F_{δ}' and $\varphi_{\delta}' \geq 0$, we infer

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{dt} (c_{\delta}^M \mathbf{V}_a^{\tau}, \nabla_{\Gamma} w_{\delta}^M)_{\rho} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (\nabla_{\Gamma} w_{\delta}^M, \nabla_{\Gamma} w_{\delta}^M)_{\rho} + \|\nabla_{\Gamma} \partial^{\bullet} c_{\delta}^M\|^2 \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (\nabla_{\Gamma} w_{\delta}^M, \nabla_{\Gamma} w_{\delta}^M)_{\rho} + \frac{\theta}{2} (\varphi_{\delta}'(c_{\delta}^M), \partial^{\bullet} c_{\delta}^M \partial^{\bullet} c_{\delta}^M)_{\rho} + \|\nabla_{\Gamma} \partial^{\bullet} c_{\delta}^M\|^2 \\
& = (\partial^{\bullet} c_{\delta}^M, \partial^{\bullet} c_{\delta}^M)_{\rho} - \int_{\Gamma(t)} B(\mathbf{V}) \nabla_{\Gamma} c_{\delta}^M \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} \partial^{\bullet} c_{\delta}^M \\
& + \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \tilde{B}(\mathbf{V}) \nabla_{\Gamma} w_{\delta}^M \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} w_{\delta}^M \\
& + (\partial^{\bullet} c_{\delta}^M \mathbf{V}_a^{\tau}, \nabla_{\Gamma} w_{\delta}^M)_{\rho} + \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \tilde{B}_{adv}(\mathbf{V}_a^{\tau}, \mathbf{V}) c_{\delta}^M \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} w_{\delta}^M.
\end{aligned}$$

By (4.6), (4.26), interpolation and standard inequalities, we then have

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\partial^{\bullet} c_{\delta}^M, \partial^{\bullet} c_{\delta}^M)_{\rho} - \int_{\Gamma(t)} B(\mathbf{V}) \nabla_{\Gamma} c_{\delta}^M \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} \partial^{\bullet} c_{\delta}^M + \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \tilde{B}(\mathbf{V}) \nabla_{\Gamma} w_{\delta}^M \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} w_{\delta}^M \\
& + (\partial^{\bullet} c_{\delta}^M \mathbf{V}_a^{\tau}, \nabla_{\Gamma} w_{\delta}^M)_{\rho} + \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \tilde{B}_{adv}(\mathbf{V}_a^{\tau}, \mathbf{V}) c_{\delta}^M \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} w_{\delta}^M \\
& \leq C_1 \|\partial^{\bullet} c_{\delta}^M\|^2 + C + \frac{1}{4} \|\nabla_{\Gamma} \partial^{\bullet} c_{\delta}^M\|^2 + C \|\nabla_{\Gamma} w_{\delta}^M\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that we have exploited (2.4), which is the only extra regularity to be assumed with respect to [8, \mathbf{A}_{Φ}] (see also Remark 4.6). We now test (4.20) by $\eta = \partial^{\bullet} c_{\delta}^M$, obtaining, for κ suitably small to be chosen later on,

$$C_2 \|\partial^{\bullet} c_{\delta}^M\|^2 \leq \kappa \|\nabla_{\Gamma} \partial^{\bullet} c_{\delta}^M\|^2 + C(1 + \|\nabla_{\Gamma} w_{\delta}^M\|^2).$$

Adding this inequality, multiplied by $\omega = 2\frac{C_1}{C_2}$, and (4.32) together, choosing $\kappa = \frac{C_2}{8C_1}$, and recalling (4.6), we find

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{Q}_{\rho} + \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla_{\Gamma} \partial^{\bullet} c_{\delta}^M\|^2 + C_1 \|\partial^{\bullet} c_{\delta}^M\|^2 \leq C(1 + (\nabla_{\Gamma} w_{\delta}^M, \nabla_{\Gamma} w_{\delta}^M)_{\rho}),$$

where C and C_1 in this estimate do not depend on δ (they rely only on (4.26)), and

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\rho} := (c_{\delta}^M \mathbf{V}_a^{\tau}, \nabla_{\Gamma} w_{\delta}^M)_{\rho} + \frac{1}{2} (\nabla_{\Gamma} w_{\delta}^M, \nabla_{\Gamma} w_{\delta}^M)_{\rho}.$$

We remark that, by (4.26),

$$|(c_\delta^M \mathbf{V}_a^\tau, \nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M)_\rho| \leq C_3 + \frac{1}{4} \|\sqrt{\rho} \nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\|^2,$$

and thus

$$\frac{1}{4} (\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M, \nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M)_\rho - C_3 \leq Q_\rho \leq C(1 + \|\nabla w_\delta^M\|^2). \quad (4.32)$$

We then substitute Q_ρ with $\tilde{Q}_\rho := Q_\rho + C_3 \geq 0$ in (4.32) and multiply the result by t . This gives

$$\frac{d}{dt} t \tilde{Q}_\rho + \frac{t}{2} \|\nabla_\Gamma \partial^\bullet c_\delta^M\|^2 + C_1 t \|\partial^\bullet c_\delta^M\|^2 \leq C(t + t \tilde{Q}_\rho(t)) + \tilde{Q}_\rho(t).$$

Then, thanks to (4.26) and (4.32), we have $\tilde{Q}_\rho \in L^1(0, T)$, so that we can apply Gronwall's Lemma and infer

$$\|\sqrt{t} \nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M\|_{L_{L^2}^\infty} + \|\sqrt{t} \partial^\bullet c_\delta^M\|_{L_{H^1}^2} \leq C(T). \quad (4.33)$$

It is crucial to stress again that also the above constant does not depend on δ .

Having this uniform (in M) regularity, we can easily pass to the limit as $M \rightarrow \infty$ and obtain, by compactness arguments, the existence of a solution (c_δ, w_δ) such that, for any $\eta \in L_{H^1}^2$,

$$(\partial^\bullet c_\delta, \eta)_\rho + (\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta, \nabla_\Gamma \eta)_\rho + (c_\delta \mathbf{V}_a^\tau, \nabla_\Gamma \eta)_\rho = 0, \quad (4.34)$$

$$(w_\delta, \eta)_\rho = m(\nabla_\Gamma c_\delta, \nabla_\Gamma \eta) + ((F^\delta)')(c_\delta, \eta)_\rho, \quad (4.35)$$

and $c_\delta(0) = c_0$ almost everywhere in Γ_0 . In particular, we have the following convergences (see (4.26), (4.28), and (4.29))

$$\begin{aligned} c_\delta^M &\overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} c_\delta, & \text{in } L_{H^1}^\infty, \\ \partial^\bullet c_\delta^M &\rightharpoonup \partial^\bullet c_\delta, & \text{in } L_{H^{-1}}^2, \\ w_\delta^M &\rightharpoonup w_\delta, & \text{in } L_{H^1}^2, \end{aligned}$$

which also imply, by (4.33),

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{t} \partial^\bullet c_\delta^M &\rightharpoonup \sqrt{t} \partial^\bullet c_\delta, & \text{in } L_{H^1}^2, \\ \sqrt{t} \nabla_\Gamma w_\delta^M &\overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \sqrt{t} \nabla_\Gamma w_\delta, & \text{in } L_{L^2}^\infty. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, from (4.26), (4.27), (4.28), and (4.33) we can obtain the following bounds, which are still independent of δ ,

$$\|c_\delta\|_{L_{H^1}^\infty} + \|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta\|_{L_{L^2}^2} + \|\partial^\bullet c_\delta\|_{L_{H^{-1}}^2} + \|\sqrt{t} w_\delta\|_{L_{L^2}^\infty} + \|\sqrt{t} \partial^\bullet c_\delta\|_{L_{H^1}^2} \leq C(T). \quad (4.36)$$

We are left to find an estimate for $(w_\delta)_{\Gamma_0}$ which is independent of δ . Being now $\eta = \frac{1}{\rho} \in L_{H^1}^2$, we can use it as a test function in (4.34), to get

$$\int_{\Gamma(t)} w_\delta = \left(w_\delta, \frac{1}{\rho}\right)_\rho = \left(\nabla_\Gamma c_\delta, \nabla_\Gamma \frac{1}{\rho}\right) + \left(F'_\delta(c_\delta), \frac{1}{\rho}\right)_\rho.$$

At this point we can repeat word by word the proof in [8, Sec.1.6], exploiting the fact that $(\tilde{c})_{\Gamma_0} = (c_0)_{\Gamma_0}$ and $|(c_0)_{\Gamma_0}| < 1$, and obtaining

$$\left| \int_{\Gamma(t)} w_\delta \right| \leq C(1 + \|\nabla_\Gamma w_\delta\|).$$

This result finally allows, by Poincaré's inequality, to infer

$$\|w_\delta\|_{L_{H^1}^2} + \|\sqrt{t} w_\delta\|_{L_{H^1}^\infty} \leq C(T). \quad (4.37)$$

Therefore, we can pass to the limit with respect to δ . Again by standard compactness arguments, we obtain a solution (c, w) to (4.1)-(4.3). In particular, we can retrieve, exactly as done for the first model in the proof of [8, Thm.5.14], the bound $|c| < 1$ almost everywhere on $\Gamma(t)$, for almost any $t \in [0, T]$. Clearly, again by sequential lower semicontinuity, we have the following bounds on the final solution (which is also unique by Theorem 4.1):

$$\|c\|_{L_{H^1}^\infty} + \|w\|_{L_{H^1}^2} + \|\partial^\bullet c\|_{L_{H^{-1}}^2} + \|\sqrt{t} w\|_{L_{H^1}^\infty} + \|\sqrt{t} \partial^\bullet c\|_{L_{H^1}^2} \leq C(T). \quad (4.38)$$

Part (ii). Concerning the strict separation property, we use an argument similar to the one used in the proof of Theorem 3.9. Let us fix $\tau > 0$. We have that $\|w\|_{H^1(\Gamma(t))} \leq C$ for almost any $t \geq \tau$. Then we set $c_k = h_k(c)$, where h_k is defined in (3.31). Being c in $L^\infty_{H^1}$, we have

$$\nabla_\Gamma c_k = \chi_{[-1+\frac{1}{k}, 1-\frac{1}{k}]}(c) \nabla_\Gamma c.$$

Accordingly, for any $k > 1$ and $p \geq 2$, $f_k = \left|\frac{\theta}{2}\varphi(c_k)\right|^{p-2} \frac{\theta}{2}\varphi(c_k)$ is well defined and belongs to $L^\infty_{H^1}$ and satisfies

$$\nabla_\Gamma \left(\left|\frac{\theta}{2}\varphi(c_k)\right|^{p-2} \frac{\theta}{2}\varphi(c_k) \right) = (p-1) \left|\frac{\theta}{2}\varphi(c_k)\right|^{p-2} \frac{\theta}{2}\varphi'(c_k) \nabla_\Gamma c_k.$$

If we now set $\eta = \left|\frac{\theta}{2}\varphi(c_k)\right|^{p-2} \frac{\theta}{2}\varphi(c_k)$ in (4.2) then we infer that

$$(p-1) \int_{\Gamma(t)} \left|\frac{\theta}{2}\varphi(c_k)\right|^{p-2} \frac{\theta}{2}\varphi'(c_k) \nabla_\Gamma c \cdot \nabla_\Gamma c_k + \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \left|\frac{\theta}{2}\varphi(c_k)\right|^{p-2} \frac{\theta}{2}\varphi(c_k) \frac{\theta}{2}\varphi(c) = \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \widehat{w} \left|\frac{\theta}{2}\varphi(c_k)\right|^{p-2} \frac{\theta}{2}\varphi(c_k),$$

where $\widehat{w} = w + c$. Being F_{ln} strictly convex, the first term in the left-hand side is nonnegative. Since φ is increasing we infer

$$\varphi(c_k)^2 \leq \varphi(c)\varphi(c_k), \quad \forall k > 1. \quad (4.39)$$

Regarding the right-hand side, by the Sobolev embedding $H^1(\Gamma(t)) \hookrightarrow L^p(\Gamma(t))$ and (4.6), we easily get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \widehat{w} \left|\frac{\theta}{2}\varphi(c_k)\right|^{p-2} \frac{\theta}{2}\varphi(c_k) &\leq \frac{1}{2C_\rho} \left\| \frac{\theta}{2}\varphi(c_k) \right\|_{L^p(\Gamma(t))}^p + C \|\widehat{w}\|_{L^p(\Gamma(t))}^p \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2C_\rho} \left\| \frac{\theta}{2}\varphi(c_k) \right\|_{L^p(\Gamma(t))}^p + C_p \|\widehat{w}\|_{H^1(\Gamma(t))}^p, \end{aligned}$$

with $C_p > 0$ depending on p . Now, collecting the above estimates, being $c \in L^\infty_{H^1}$ and $\|w\|_{H^1(\Gamma(t))} \leq C$ for almost any $t \geq \tau$, and recalling, by (4.6), that $0 < \frac{1}{C_\rho} \leq \rho$, we immediately deduce (see (3.34))

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in [\tau, T]} \|\varphi(c)\|_{L^p(\Gamma(t))} \leq C_p(T, \tau, p), \quad \forall p \in [2, \infty). \quad (4.40)$$

Consider now $g_k = \frac{\theta}{2}\varphi(c_k) e^{L\frac{\theta}{2}|\varphi(c_k)|}$, for some arbitrary $L > 0$, and observe that

$$\nabla_\Gamma \left(\frac{\theta}{2}\varphi(c_k) e^{L\frac{\theta}{2}|\varphi(c_k)|} \right) = \frac{\theta}{2}\varphi'(c_k) \left(1 + L\frac{\theta}{2}|\varphi(c_k)| \right) e^{L\frac{\theta}{2}|\varphi(c_k)|} \nabla_\Gamma c_k.$$

Therefore, using (4.2) with $\eta = g_k$, we find

$$\int_{\Gamma(t)} \nabla_\Gamma c \cdot \nabla_\Gamma c_k \frac{\theta}{2}\varphi'(c_k) \left(1 + L\frac{\theta}{2}|\varphi(c_k)| \right) e^{L\frac{\theta}{2}|\varphi(c_k)|} + \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \frac{\theta}{2}\varphi(c) \frac{\theta}{2}\varphi(c_k) e^{L\frac{\theta}{2}|\varphi(c_k)|} = \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \widehat{w} \frac{\theta}{2}\varphi(c_k) e^{L\frac{\theta}{2}|\varphi(c_k)|}.$$

Observe that the first term on the left-hand side is nonnegative. Hence, exploiting again (4.39) and (4.6), we obtain in the end

$$\frac{1}{C_\rho} \int_{\Gamma(t)} \left(\frac{\theta}{2}\varphi(c_k) \right)^2 e^{L\frac{\theta}{2}|\varphi(c_k)|} \leq \int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho \widehat{w} \frac{\theta}{2}\varphi(c_k) e^{L\frac{\theta}{2}|\varphi(c_k)|}$$

By Lemma B.4, with $\rho_\star = \frac{1}{C_\rho}$, we get

$$\int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho |\widehat{w}| \left| \frac{\theta}{2}\varphi(c_k) \right| e^{L\frac{\theta}{2}|\varphi(c_k)|} \leq \frac{1}{2C_\rho} \int_{\Gamma(t)} \left| \frac{\theta}{2}\varphi(c_k) \right|^2 e^{L\frac{\theta}{2}|\varphi(c_k)|} + \int_{\Gamma(t)} e^{\rho N |\widehat{w}|}, \quad (4.41)$$

implying

$$\frac{1}{2C_\rho} \int_{\Gamma(t)} \left| \frac{\theta}{2}\varphi(c_k) \right|^2 e^{L\frac{\theta}{2}|\varphi(c_k)|} \leq \int_{\Gamma(t)} e^{\rho N |\widehat{w}|}, \quad (4.42)$$

for any $L > 0$ and some $N = N(L, C_\rho)$. Exploiting (4.6), the control over J_t^0 and then applying Lemma B.3 with $u = C_\rho N \widehat{w}$ and the manifold $\mathcal{M} = \Gamma_0$ (with the corresponding metric) we deduce

$$\int_{\Gamma(t)} e^{\rho N |\widehat{w}|} \leq \int_{\Gamma(t)} e^{C_\rho N |\widehat{w}|} = \int_{\Gamma_0} e^{C_\rho N |\widehat{w}|} J_t^0 d\Gamma_0$$

$$\leq C \int_{\Gamma_0} e^{C\rho N|\tilde{w}|} d\Gamma_0 \leq C e^{CN^2\|\tilde{w}\|_{H^1(\Gamma_0)}^2} \leq C e^{CN^2\|\tilde{w}\|_{H^1(\Gamma(t))}^2},$$

being $(H^1(\Gamma(t)), \phi_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ a compatible space. On account of (3.37), taking $L = pC$ in (4.42) and recalling that $\|\tilde{w}\|_{H^1(\Gamma(t))} \leq C$ for almost any $t \geq \tau$, we end up with

$$\|\varphi'(c_k)\|_{L^p(\Gamma(t))} \leq C_p(T, \tau, p),$$

which implies (see proof of Theorem 3.9)

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in [\tau, T]} \|\varphi'(c)\|_{L^p(\Gamma(t))} \leq C_p(T, \tau, p), \quad \forall p \in [2, \infty). \quad (4.43)$$

Therefore, thanks to elliptic regularity, being $c \in L^\infty_{H^1}$ we get (see also (4.6))

$$\|c\|_{H^2(\Gamma(t))} \leq (C + \|\Delta_{\Gamma(t)} c\|) \leq C(1 + \|w\| + \|\varphi(c)\|) \leq C(T, \tau),$$

for almost any $t \in [\tau, T]$.

Part (iii). If we now apply the chain rule to $\varphi(c)$ (again we can obtain this by a truncation argument) we obtain

$$\nabla_{\Gamma} \varphi(c) = \varphi'(c) \nabla_{\Gamma} c, \quad \text{for a.a. } t \in [\tau, T].$$

Then, for almost any $t \in [\tau, T]$, we have that

$$\|\nabla_{\Gamma} \varphi(c)\|_{L^p(\Gamma(t))} \leq \|\varphi'(c)\|_{L^{2p}(\Gamma(t))} \|\nabla_{\Gamma} c\|_{L^{2p}(\Gamma(t))} \leq C_p(T, \tau, p),$$

by the Sobolev embedding $H^2(\Gamma(t)) \hookrightarrow W^{1,q}(\Gamma(t))$ which holds for every $q \geq 2$. Therefore we infer

$$\|\varphi(c)\|_{W^{1,p}(\Gamma(t))} \leq C_p(T, \tau, p), \quad \forall p \geq 2,$$

so that, choosing, e.g. $p = 3$,

$$\|\varphi(c)\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma(t))} \leq C(T, \tau), \quad \text{for a.a. } t \in [\tau, T].$$

Therefore, being $c(t) \in H^2(\Gamma(t)) \hookrightarrow C^0(\Gamma(t))$ for almost any $t \in [0, T]$, we can find $\xi = \xi(T, \tau) > 0$ such that

$$\|c\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma(t))} \leq 1 - \xi, \quad \text{for a.a. } t \in [\tau, T],$$

that is, the strict separation property holds. This concludes the proof.

A Proofs of some technical results

In this Appendix, we present the proofs of some results which were only stated in the main body of the paper.

A.1 Proof of Proposition 3.2

Even though it is a straightforward result, we give here a short proof of the formula (3.7). We consider only sufficiently smooth functions η, ϕ , since the general result can be obtained by a density argument. It is enough to prove this relation locally. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be an open set and let $X = X(\theta, t)$, $\theta \in \Omega$, $X(\cdot, t) : \Omega \rightarrow U \cap \Gamma(t)$ be a local regular parametrization of the open set $U \cap \Gamma(t)$ (w.r.t. the induced metric) of the surface $\Gamma(t)$ which evolves so that $X_t = \mathbf{V}(X(\theta, t), t)$. The induced metric (g_{ij}) , $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, is given by $g_{ij} = X_{\theta_i} \cdot X_{\theta_j}$ with $g = \det(g_{ij})$. Note that, as usual, $g^{ij} = (g_{ij})^{-1}$. Define then $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{V}_a^\tau \eta$ and set

$$F(\theta, t) = \mathbf{f}(X(\theta, t), t), \quad \Phi(\theta, t) = \phi(X(\theta, t), t), \quad \mathcal{V}(\theta, t) = \mathbf{V}(X(\theta, t), t).$$

For the sake of simplicity we will omit the dependence on θ, t . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{U \cap \Gamma(t)} \mathbf{f} \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} \phi &= \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} F_l g^{ij} \Phi_{\theta_j} X_{\theta_i}^l \sqrt{g} d\theta \\ &= \int_{\Omega} F_{l,t} g^{ij} \Phi_{\theta_j} X_{\theta_i}^l \sqrt{g} d\theta + \int_{\Omega} F_l g_t^{ij} \Phi_{\theta_j} X_{\theta_i}^l \sqrt{g} d\theta \\ &+ \int_{\Omega} F_l g^{ij} \Phi_{\theta_j, t} X_{\theta_i}^l \sqrt{g} d\theta + \int_{\Omega} F_l g^{ij} \Phi_{\theta_j} \mathcal{V}_{\theta_i}^l \sqrt{g} d\theta \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \int_{\Omega} F_l g^{ij} \Phi_{\theta_j} X_{\theta_i}^l \partial_t \sqrt{g} d\theta.$$

Recalling that $g_t^{ij} = -g^{ik} g^{jl} (\mathcal{V}_{\theta_k} \cdot X_{\theta_i} + X_{\theta_k} \cdot \mathcal{V}_{\theta_i})$ and

$$\partial_t \sqrt{g} = \sqrt{g} g^{ij} X_{\theta_i} \cdot \mathcal{V}_{\theta_j},$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} F_l g_t^{ij} \Phi_{\theta_j} X_{\theta_i}^l \sqrt{g} &= - \int_{\Omega} F_l \Phi_{\theta_j} X_{\theta_i}^l g^{ik} g^{jl} \mathcal{V}_{\theta_k}^r X_{\theta_i}^r \sqrt{g} - \int_{\Omega} F_l \Phi_{\theta_j} X_{\theta_i}^l g^{ik} g^{jl} \mathcal{V}_{\theta_i}^r X_{\theta_k}^r \sqrt{g} \\ &= - \int_{\Omega} F_l (g^{ik} X_{\theta_i}^l \mathcal{V}_{\theta_k}^r) (g^{jl} X_{\theta_j}^r \Phi_{\theta_i}) \sqrt{g} - \int_{\Omega} F_l (g^{ik} X_{\theta_i}^l X_{\theta_k}^r) (g^{jl} \Phi_{\theta_j} \mathcal{V}_{\theta_i}^r) \sqrt{g} \\ &= - \int_{U \cap \Gamma(t)} \mathbf{f}_l \underline{D}_l^{\Gamma(t)} \mathbf{V}_r \underline{D}_r^{\Gamma(t)} \phi - \int_{U \cap \Gamma(t)} \mathbf{f}_l (\delta_{lr} - \nu_l \nu_r) \nabla_{\Gamma} \phi \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} \mathbf{V}_r, \end{aligned}$$

exploiting $\underline{D}_l^{\Gamma(t)} x^r = \delta_{lr} - \nu_l \nu_r$ and

$$g^{jl} \Phi_{\theta_j} \mathcal{V}_{\theta_i}^r = g^{jl} g_{jk} g^{km} \Phi_{\theta_m} \mathcal{V}_{\theta_i}^r = (g^{km} \Phi_{\theta_m} X_{\theta_k}^n) (g^{jl} \mathcal{V}_{\theta_i}^r X_{\theta_j}^n). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Then, on account of $g^{ij} X_{\theta_i} \cdot \mathcal{V}_{\theta_j} = (\nabla_{\Gamma} \cdot \mathbf{V})(X, \cdot)$, we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} F_l g^{ij} \Phi_{\theta_j} X_{\theta_i}^l \partial_t \sqrt{g} = \int_{U \cap \Gamma(t)} \mathbf{f} \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} \phi (\nabla_{\Gamma} \cdot \mathbf{V}).$$

Moreover, again by (A.1), we have

$$\int_{\Omega} F_l g^{ij} \Phi_{\theta_j} \mathcal{V}_{\theta_i}^l \sqrt{g} = \int_{U \cap \Gamma(t)} \mathbf{f}_l \nabla_{\Gamma} \phi \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} \mathbf{V}_l. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

In conclusion, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{U \cap \Gamma(t)} \mathbf{f} \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} \phi &= \int_{U \cap \Gamma(t)} \partial^{\bullet} \mathbf{f} \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} \phi + \int_{U \cap \Gamma(t)} \mathbf{f} \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} \partial^{\bullet} \phi \\ &+ \int_{U \cap \Gamma(t)} \mathbf{f} \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} \phi (\nabla_{\Gamma} \cdot \mathbf{V}) - \int_{U \cap \Gamma(t)} \mathbf{f}_l \underline{D}_l^{\Gamma(t)} \mathbf{V}_r \underline{D}_r^{\Gamma(t)} \phi, \end{aligned}$$

where we have exploited the fact that $\mathbf{f} \cdot \nu = 0$, being a tangential vector. Indeed, setting $\mathbf{G}_r := \nabla_{\Gamma} \phi \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} \mathbf{V}_r$, then $\mathbf{G}_{\tau, l} := (\delta_{lr} - \nu_l \nu_r) \mathbf{G}_r$ is the projection of \mathbf{G} on the tangent space to $\Gamma(t)$. This entails that $\mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{G} = \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{G}_{\tau}$. Therefore, we deduce

$$- \int_{U \cap \Gamma(t)} \mathbf{f}_l (\delta_{lr} - \nu_l \nu_r) \nabla_{\Gamma} \phi \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} \mathbf{V}_r = - \int_{U \cap \Gamma(t)} \mathbf{f}_l \nabla_{\Gamma} \phi \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} \mathbf{V}_l,$$

and this term simplifies with (A.2). To conclude the proof it suffices to note that

$$\partial^{\bullet} \mathbf{f} = \partial^{\bullet} \eta \mathbf{V}_a^{\tau} + \eta \partial^{\bullet} \mathbf{V}_a^{\tau}.$$

A.2 Proof of Proposition 4.3

Exploiting the same notation as in the proof of Proposition 3.7 (Section A.1) and considering, for simplicity, the case $\int_{\Gamma(t)} \rho |\nabla_{\Gamma} f|^2$, for f sufficiently regular, we can obtain

$$\hat{\rho} |\nabla F|^2 = \hat{\rho} g^{ij} F_{\theta_j} F_{\theta_i},$$

with $\hat{\rho}(\theta, t) = \rho(X(\theta, t), t)$. Therefore, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{U \cap \Gamma(t)} \rho |\nabla_{\Gamma} f|^2 &= \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \hat{\rho} F_l g^{ij} \Phi_{\theta_j} X_{\theta_i}^l \sqrt{g} d\theta \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \hat{\rho}_{,t} F_l g^{ij} \Phi_{\theta_j} X_{\theta_i}^l \sqrt{g} d\theta + \int_{\Omega} \hat{\rho} (F_l g^{ij} \Phi_{\theta_j} X_{\theta_i}^l \sqrt{g})_{,t} d\theta \\ &= \int_{U \cap \Gamma(t)} \partial^{\bullet} \rho |\nabla_{\Gamma} f|^2 + \int_{U \cap \Gamma(t)} \rho D_i \mathbf{V}_j D_i f D_j f \\ &+ 2 \int_{U \cap \Gamma(t)} \rho \nabla_{\Gamma} f \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} \partial^{\bullet} f + \int_{U \cap \Gamma(t)} \rho \nabla_{\Gamma} \cdot \mathbf{V} |\nabla_{\Gamma} f|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we have argued as in the proof of Proposition 3.2 (see, e.g., [14, Sec.5.1]). In conclusion, to obtain the last identity in (4.14), it is enough to recall that $\partial^{\bullet} \rho = -\rho \nabla_{\Gamma} \cdot \mathbf{V}$. The general case follows by polarization with respect to the inner product (4.13). The proof is ended.

B Two basic inequalities

B.1 Moser-Trudinger inequality

The Moser-Trudinger inequality for manifolds is given by (see [23])

Lemma B.1. *Let (\mathcal{M}, r) be a compact n -dimensional Riemannian manifold, with $n \geq 2$ and r as a metric. Then there exists a constant C depending only on (\mathcal{M}, r) and $\beta_0 = \beta_0(n) > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{\int_{\mathcal{M}} u dV = 0, \int_{\mathcal{M}} |\nabla_{\mathcal{M}} u|^n dV \leq 1} \int_{\mathcal{M}} e^{\beta_0 |u|^p} dV \leq C,$$

where $p = \frac{n}{n-1}$.

Remark B.2. *Notice that the constant C depends not only on the volume of \mathcal{M} , $\text{Vol}(\mathcal{M})$, but also on its metric r . Therefore, in the case of $\mathcal{M} = \Gamma(t)$ it does not seem easy to find a constant C independent of time.*

Adapting the proof proposed in [32], we can easily obtain the following

Lemma B.3. *Let (\mathcal{M}, r) be a compact n -dimensional Riemannian manifold with metric r and $n \geq 2$. Let $u \in W^{1,n}(\mathcal{M})$. Then*

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}} e^{|u|} dV \leq C_1 e^{C_2 \|u\|_{W^{1,n}(\mathcal{M})}^n},$$

where the constant $C_1 > 0$ does not depend on u , but depends on n and on (\mathcal{M}, r) , whereas $C_2 > 0$ depends only on n .

Proof. Let us first consider $u \in W^{1,n}(\mathcal{M})$ with $\int_{\mathcal{M}} u dV = 0$. We then define $v = \frac{u}{\|\nabla u\|_n}$. Clearly $\|\nabla v\|_n = 1$, therefore by Lemma B.1 we get, for $p = \frac{n}{n-1}$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}} e^{\beta_0 |v|^p} dV \leq C. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Now, recalling (B.1), by Young's inequality we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{M}} e^{|u|} dV &= \int_{\mathcal{M}} e^{(p\beta_0)^{1/p} |v| (p\beta_0)^{-1/p} \|\nabla u\|_n} dV \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{M}} e^{\beta_0 |v|^p + \frac{1}{n} (p\beta_0)^{-n/p} \|\nabla u\|_n^n} dV \\ &\leq C e^{\frac{1}{\beta_n} \|\nabla u\|_n^n}, \end{aligned}$$

having set $\beta_n = \left(\frac{1}{n} (p\beta_0)^{-n/p}\right)^{-1} = n \left(\frac{n\beta_0}{n-1}\right)^{(n-1)}$. To conclude the proof, let us fix $u \in W^{1,n}(\mathcal{M})$. Then, setting $w = u - (u)_{\mathcal{M}}$, so that $(w)_{\mathcal{M}} = 0$, we can apply the result we have just proved, to infer

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}} e^{|u|} dV \leq e^{|(u)_{\mathcal{M}}|} \int_{\mathcal{M}} e^{|w|} dV \leq C e^{|(u)_{\mathcal{M}}| + \frac{1}{\beta_n} \|\nabla u\|_n^n} \leq C_1 e^{C_2 \|u\|_{W^{1,n}(\mathcal{M})}^n},$$

concluding the proof. \square

B.2 Generalized Young's inequality

We will use the following version of Young's inequality (see [12, Appendix A] and [26]).

Lemma B.4. *Let $L > 0$ and $\rho_\star > 0$ be given. Then, there exists $N = N(L, \rho_\star) > 0$ such that*

$$xye^{Ly} \leq e^{Nx} + \frac{\rho_\star}{2} y^2 e^{Ly}, \quad \forall x, y \geq 0.$$

Proof. We recall the generalized Young's inequality (see, e.g., [1, Sec.8.2]): for any $a, b \geq 0$,

$$ab \leq \Phi(a) + \Psi(b),$$

with, given $s \geq 0$,

$$\Phi(s) = e^s - s - 1, \quad \Psi(s) = (1+s)\ln(1+s) - s.$$

Then, we choose $a = Nx$ and $b = N^{-1}ye^{Ly}$. We obtain, recalling that $\ln(1+s) \leq s$ for any $s \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} xye^{Ly} &\leq e^{Nx} - Nx - 1 + (1 + N^{-1}ye^{Ly})\ln(1 + N^{-1}ye^{Ly}) - N^{-1}ye^{Ly} \\ &= e^{Nx} - Nx - 1 + \ln(1 + N^{-1}ye^{Ly}) - N^{-1}ye^{Ly} + N^{-1}ye^{Ly}\ln(1 + N^{-1}ye^{Ly}) \\ &\leq e^{Nx} + N^{-1}ye^{Ly}[\ln(e^{Ly}) + \ln(e^{-Ly} + N^{-1}y)] \\ &\leq e^{Nx} + N^{-1}ye^{Ly}[Ly + \ln(1 + N^{-1}y)] \\ &\leq e^{Nx} + N^{-1}(L + N^{-1})y^2e^{Ly}, \end{aligned}$$

and if we choose $N = N(L, \rho_\star) > \frac{L + \sqrt{L^2 + 2\rho_\star}}{\rho_\star}$ we finally obtain

$$xye^{Ly} \leq e^{Nx} + \frac{\rho_\star}{2}y^2e^{Ly},$$

concluding the proof. \square

C The embedding $\mathbb{W}^{\infty,2}(H^2, H^1) \hookrightarrow C^0_{H^{3/2}}$

In this Appendix we aim to sketch a proof of the following result, which we make use of to obtain the extra regularity in Remark 3.10.

Lemma C.1. *Assuming the following extra regularity for \mathbf{V} and Φ (with respect to [8, \mathbf{A}_Φ])*

$$\mathbf{V} \in C^0([0, T]; C^3(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}, \mathbb{R}^{n+1})) \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_0^{(\cdot)} \in C^1([0, T]; C^3(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}, \mathbb{R}^{n+1})) :$$

- (i) *The families $(H^2(\Gamma(t)), \phi_t)_t$, $(H^1(\Gamma(t)), \phi_t)_t$ and $(H^{3/2}(\Gamma(t)), \phi_t)_t$ are compatible.*
- (ii) *The spaces $\mathbb{W}^{\infty,2}(H^2, H^1)$ and $\mathcal{W}^{\infty,2}(H^2(\Gamma_0), H^1(\Gamma_0))$ satisfy the evolving space equivalence.*
- (iii) *We have the embedding $\mathbb{W}^{\infty,2}(H^2, H^1) \hookrightarrow C^0_{H^{3/2}}$.*

Before showing the proof we briefly recall some definitions. We denote

$$H^{3/2}(\Gamma(t)) = \left\{ u \in H^1(\Gamma(t)) : \int_{\Gamma(t)} \int_{\Gamma(t)} \frac{\left(\underline{D}_i^{\Gamma(t)} u(x) - \underline{D}_i^{\Gamma(t)} u(y) \right)^2}{|x - y|^{n+1}} < \infty, \forall i \right\}$$

with the norm

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{H^{3/2}}^2 &= \|u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla_\Gamma u\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \int_{\Gamma(t)} \int_{\Gamma(t)} \frac{(\underline{D}_i u(x) - \underline{D}_i u(y))^2}{|x - y|^{n+1}} \\ &= \|u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla_\Gamma u\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_{\Gamma(t)} \int_{\Gamma(t)} \frac{|\nabla_\Gamma u(x)|^2 - 2\nabla_\Gamma u(x) \cdot \nabla_\Gamma u(y) + |\nabla_\Gamma u(y)|^2}{|x - y|^{n+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Denote

$$[u]_{3/2} := \int_{\Gamma(t)} \int_{\Gamma(t)} \frac{|\nabla_\Gamma u(x)|^2 - 2\nabla_\Gamma u(x) \cdot \nabla_\Gamma u(y) + |\nabla_\Gamma u(y)|^2}{|x - y|^{n+1}}.$$

Proof. (i). Compatibility of the first two pairs is established in [2, Lemmas 7.2, 7.5]. For the third pair, we need to show:

- a) $\phi_t: H^{3/2}(\Gamma_0) \rightarrow H^{3/2}(\Gamma(t))$ and its inverse $\phi_{-t}: H^{3/2}(\Gamma(t)) \rightarrow H^{3/2}(\Gamma_0)$ are linear maps satisfying $\phi_0 = \text{Id}$ and are also bounded: there exists a constant $C_X > 0$ s.t.

$$\|\phi_t u\|_{H^{3/2}} \leq C_X \|u\|_{H^{3/2}}, \quad \|\phi_{-t} u\|_{H^{3/2}} \leq C_X \|u\|_{H^{3/2}}.$$

Proof. Linearity and the initial condition $\phi_0 = \text{Id}$ are immediate. Let $u \in H^{3/2}(\Gamma_0)$, then since $u \in H^1(\Gamma_0)$ we have from [2, Lemma 7.2] that $\phi_t u \in H^1(\Gamma(t))$ as well as the bounds

$$\|\phi_t u\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \|u\|_{L^2}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\phi_t u\|_{H^1}^2 \leq C \|u\|_{H^1}^2$$

where the constant C depends only on an upper bound for the $C^1([0, T] \times \Gamma_0)$ -norm of $\Phi_0^{(\cdot)}$. Now we aim to estimate

$$[\phi_t u]_{3/2} = \int_{\Gamma(t)} \int_{\Gamma(t)} \frac{|\nabla_{\Gamma} \phi_t u(x)|^2 - 2\nabla_{\Gamma} \phi_t u(x) \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} \phi_t u(y) + |\nabla_{\Gamma} \phi_t u(y)|^2}{|x - y|^{n+1}}.$$

We treat each term separately. Below $M > 0$ is a general constant depending only on an upper bound on the $C^1([0, T] \times \Gamma_0)$ -norm of $\Phi_0^{(\cdot)}$. We have by (4.17)

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Gamma(t)} \int_{\Gamma(t)} \frac{|\nabla_{\Gamma} \phi_t u(x)|^2}{|x - y|^{n+1}} \\ &= \int_{\Gamma_0} \int_{\Gamma_0} \frac{|(\mathbf{D}_{\Gamma} \Phi_t^0)(p)(\mathbf{A}_t^0)^{-1}(p) \nabla_{\Gamma_0} u(p)|^2}{|\Phi_t^0(p) - \Phi_t^0(s)|^{n+1}} J_t^0(p) J_t^0(s) \\ &\leq M \int_{\Gamma_0} \int_{\Gamma_0} \frac{|\nabla_{\Gamma_0} u(p)|^2}{|p - s|^{n+1}}, \end{aligned}$$

in which we applied the bi-Lipschitz property of Φ_t^0 , which is ensured by its regularity, so that

$$|\Phi_t^0(p) - \Phi_t^0(s)| \geq C_L |p - s|, \quad (\text{C.1})$$

with $C_L > 0$ a constant independent of time. Similarly

$$\int_{\Gamma(t)} \int_{\Gamma(t)} \frac{|\nabla_{\Gamma} \phi_t u(y)|^2}{|x - y|^{n+1}} \leq M \int_{\Gamma_0} \int_{\Gamma_0} \frac{|\nabla_{\Gamma_0} u(s)|^2}{|p - s|^{n+1}},$$

and for the remaining term

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Gamma(t)} \int_{\Gamma(t)} \frac{\nabla_{\Gamma} \phi_t u(x) \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} \phi_t u(y)}{|x - y|^{n+1}} \\ &= \int_{\Gamma_0} \int_{\Gamma_0} \frac{(\mathbf{D}_{\Gamma} \Phi_t^0)(p)(\mathbf{A}_t^0)^{-1}(p) \nabla_{\Gamma_0} u(p) \cdot (\mathbf{D}_{\Gamma} \Phi_t^0)(s)(\mathbf{A}_t^0)^{-1}(s) \nabla_{\Gamma_0} u(s)}{|\Phi_t^0(p) - \Phi_t^0(s)|^{n+1}} J_t^0(p) J_t^0(s) \\ &\leq M \int_{\Gamma_0} \int_{\Gamma_0} \frac{|\nabla_{\Gamma_0} u(p)| |\nabla_{\Gamma_0} u(s)|}{|p - s|^{\frac{n+1}{2}} |p - s|^{\frac{n+1}{2}}} \\ &\leq \frac{M}{2} \int_{\Gamma_0} \int_{\Gamma_0} \frac{|\nabla_{\Gamma_0} u(p)|^2}{|p - s|^{n+1}} d\Gamma(p) d\Gamma(s) + \frac{M}{2} \int_{\Gamma_0} \int_{\Gamma_0} \frac{|\nabla_{\Gamma_0} u(s)|^2}{|p - s|^{n+1}} \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above leads to $[\phi_t u]_{3/2} \leq M[u]_{3/2}$, proving that ϕ_t indeed maps $H^{3/2}(\Gamma_0)$ into $H^{3/2}(\Gamma(t))$ and is bounded. The calculations for ϕ_{-t} are analogous, since all the properties exploited are shared by Φ_0^t as well.

b) for all $u \in H^{3/2}(\Gamma_0)$, the map $t \mapsto \|\phi_t u\|_{H^{3/2}}$ is measurable.

Proof. It remains to show that $t \mapsto [\phi_t u]_{H^{3/2}}$ is measurable. From the calculations above it follows that the seminorm $[\phi_t u]_{H^{3/2}}$ is the sum of three components:

- The first term is the integral of

$$g_1(t, p, s) := \frac{|(\mathbf{D}_{\Gamma} \Phi_t^0)(p)(\mathbf{A}_t^0)^{-1}(p) \nabla_{\Gamma_0} u(p)|^2}{|\Phi_t^0(p) - \Phi_t^0(s)|^{n+1}} J_t^0(p) J_t^0(s)$$

which is a continuous function of $t \in [0, T]$ for almost every $(p, s) \in \Gamma_0 \times \Gamma_0$ and can be (uniformly in time) dominated, thanks to (C.1), as

$$|g_1(t, p, s)| \leq M \frac{|\nabla_{\Gamma_0} u(p)|^2}{|p - s|^{n+1}} \in L^1(\Gamma_0 \times \Gamma_0).$$

Therefore, by Lebesgue's dominated convergence Theorem,

$$t \mapsto \int_{\Gamma_0} \int_{\Gamma_0} g_1(t, p, s)$$

is continuous and thus measurable.

- Similarly for the last term, the function

$$g_3(t, p, s) := \frac{|(\mathbf{D}_{\Gamma} \Phi_t^0)(p)(\mathbf{A}_t^0)^{-1}(p) \nabla_{\Gamma_0} u(s)|^2}{|\Phi_t^0(p) - \Phi_t^0(s)|^{n+1}} J_t^0(p) J_t^0(s)$$

is continuous for almost every $(p, s) \in \Gamma_0 \times \Gamma_0$ and can be (uniformly in time) dominated, thanks again to (C.1), as

$$|g_3(t, p, s)| \leq M \frac{|\nabla_{\Gamma_0} u(s)|^2}{|p - s|^{n+1}} \in L^1(\Gamma_0 \times \Gamma_0),$$

giving that

$$t \mapsto \int_{\Gamma_0} \int_{\Gamma_0} g_3(t, p, s)$$

is continuous and then measurable.

- Finally, the integrand in the middle term, say $g_2(t, p, s)$, is also a continuous function of $t \in [0, T]$ for almost every $(p, s) \in \Gamma_0 \times \Gamma_0$ and can now be (uniformly in time) dominated, again by (C.1), as

$$|g_2(t, p, s)| \leq \frac{M}{2} \left(\frac{|\nabla_{\Gamma_0} u(p)|^2}{|p-s|^{n+1}} + \frac{|\nabla_{\Gamma_0} u(s)|^2}{|p-s|^{n+1}} \right) \in L^1(\Gamma_0 \times \Gamma_0),$$

therefore

$$t \mapsto \int_{\Gamma_0} \int_{\Gamma_0} g_2(t, p, s)$$

is continuous and hence measurable.

This proves that also $(H^{3/2}(\Gamma(t)), \phi_t)_t$ is compatible.

(ii). The conditions verified in [2, Proposition 7.7] show that the improved result in [2, Theorem 5.10] holds true, giving the evolving space equivalence between the spaces $\mathbb{W}^{\infty,2}(H^2, H^1)$ and $\mathcal{W}^{\infty,2}(H^2(\Gamma_0), H^1(\Gamma_0))$.

(iii). This follows from the previous result together with the classical embedding

$$\mathcal{W}^{\infty,2}(H^2(\Gamma_0), H^1(\Gamma_0)) \hookrightarrow C^0([0, T]; H^{3/2}(\Gamma_0)).$$

Indeed, if $u \in \mathcal{W}^{\infty,2}(H^2, H^1)$, then by the evolving space equivalence in (ii) we obtain

$$\phi_{-(\cdot)} u \in \mathcal{W}^{\infty,2}(H^2(\Gamma_0), H^1(\Gamma_0)) \hookrightarrow C^0([0, T]; H^{3/2}(\Gamma_0)),$$

and since $(H^{3/2}(\Gamma(t)), \phi_t)_t$ is compatible we deduce by definition $u \in C^0_{H^{3/2}}$, which concludes the proof. \square

Acknowledgements. Maurizio Grasselli and Andrea Poiatti have been partially funded by MIUR-PRIN Grant 2020F3NCPX "Mathematics for Industry 4.0 (Math4I4)". Maurizio Grasselli is also a member of Gruppo Nazionale per l'Analisi Matematica, la Probabilità e le loro Applicazioni (GNAMPA), Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica (INdAM).

References

- [1] R. A. Adams and J. F. Fournier. *Sobolev Spaces*. Number 140 in Pure and Applied Mathematics Series. Elsevier, 2004.
- [2] A. Alphonse, D. Caetano, A. Djurdjevac, and C. M. Elliott. Function spaces, time derivatives and compactness for evolving families of Banach spaces with applications to PDEs. 2021.
- [3] A. Alphonse, C. M. Elliott, and B. Stinner. An abstract framework for parabolic PDEs on evolving spaces. *Port. Math.*, 71(1):1–46, 2015.
- [4] A. Alphonse, C. M. Elliott, and B. Stinner. On some linear parabolic PDEs on moving hypersurfaces. *Interfaces Free Bound.*, 17:157–187, 2015.
- [5] R. Barreira, C. M. Elliott, and A. Madzvamuse. The surface finite element method for pattern formation on evolving biological surfaces. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 63:1095–1119, 2011.
- [6] A. Bertozzi, S. Esedoglu, and A. Gillette. Analysis of a Two-Scale Cahn-Hilliard Model for Binary Image Inpainting. *Multiscale Model. Simul.*, 6:913–936, 2007.
- [7] A. Bertozzi, S. Esedoglu, and A. Gillette. Inpainting of Binary Images using the Cahn-Hilliard equation. *IEEE Trans. Image Proc.*, 16:285–291, 2007.
- [8] D. Caetano and C. M. Elliott. Cahn-Hilliard equations on an evolving surface. *European J. Appl. Math.*, 32(5):937–1000, 2021.
- [9] J. W. Cahn. On spinodal decomposition. *Acta Metall. Mater.*, 9:795–801, 1961.
- [10] J. W. Cahn and J. E. Hilliard. Free energy of a nonuniform system I. Interfacial free energy. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 28:258–267, 1958.

- [11] D. S. Cohen and J. D. Murray. A generalized diffusion model for growth and dispersal in a population. *J. Math. Biol.*, 12:237–249, 1981.
- [12] M. Conti and A. Giorgini. Well-posedness for the Brinkman–Cahn–Hilliard system with unmatched viscosities. *J Differ Equ.*, 268:6350–6384, 2020.
- [13] E. Dolgin. What lava lamps and vinaigrette can teach us about cell biology. *Nature*, 555:300–302, 2018.
- [14] G. Dziuk and C. M. Elliott. Finite element methods for surface partial differential equations. *Acta Numer.*, 22:289–396, 2013.
- [15] G. Dziuk, D. Kroner, and T. Muller. Scalar conservation laws on moving hypersurfaces. *Numer. Math.*, 15(2):203–236, 2013.
- [16] C. Eilks and C. M. Elliott. Numerical simulation of dealloying by surface dissolution via the evolving surface finite element method. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 227(23):9727–9741, 12 2008.
- [17] C. M. Elliott. *The Cahn-Hilliard Model for the Kinetics of Phase Separation*, pages 35–73. Number 88 in Internat. Ser. Numer. Math. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, Germany, 1989.
- [18] C. M. Elliott and S. Luckhaus. A generalised diffusion equation for phase separation of a multi-component mixture with interfacial free energy. *IMA Preprint Series*, (887), 1991.
- [19] C. M. Elliott and T. Ranner. Evolving surface finite element method for the Cahn–Hilliard equation. *Numer. Math.*, 129(3):483–534, Mar 2015.
- [20] C. M. Elliott and T. Ranner. A unified theory for continuous-in-time evolving finite element space approximations to partial differential equations in evolving domains. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 41:1696–1845, 2021.
- [21] C. M. Elliott, B. Stinner, and C. Venkataraman. Modelling cell motility and chemotaxis with evolving surface finite elements. *J. Roy. Soc. Interface*, 9(76):3027–3044, 2012.
- [22] J. Erlebacher, M. Aziz, A. Karma, N. Dimitrov, and K. Sieradzki. Evolution of nanoporosity in dealloying. *Nature*, 410:450–453, 2001.
- [23] L. Fontana. Sharp borderline Sobolev inequalities on compact Riemannian manifolds. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 68:415–454, 1993.
- [24] C. G. Gal, A. Giorgini, and M. Grasselli. The separation property for 2D Cahn-Hilliard equations: Local, nonlocal, and fractional energy cases. 01 2022.
- [25] H. Garcke, K. F. Lam, and B. Stinner. Diffuse interface modelling of soluble surfactants in two-phase flow. *Commun. Math. Sci.*, 12(8):1475–1522, 2014.
- [26] A. Giorgini, M. Grasselli, and A. Miranville. The Cahn–Hilliard–Oono equation with singular potential. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 27:2485–2510, 2017.
- [27] E. Khain and L. M. Sander. Generalized Cahn-Hilliard equation for biological applications. *Phys. Rev. E*, 77 5 Pt 1:051129, 2008.
- [28] A. Miranville. *The Cahn-Hilliard equation*, volume 95 of *CBMS-NSF Regional Conf. Ser. in Appl. Math.* SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 2019. Recent advances and applications.
- [29] A. Miranville and S. Zelik. Robust exponential attractors for Cahn-Hilliard type equations with singular potentials. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, 27:545–582, 2004.
- [30] A. Novick-Cohen and L. A. Segel. Nonlinear aspects of the Cahn-Hilliard equation. *Phys. D: Nonlinear Phenom.*, 10(3):277–298, 1984.
- [31] M. Olshanskii, X. Xu, and V. Yushutin. A finite element method for Allen-Cahn equation on deforming surface. *Comput. Math. Appl.*, 90:148–158, 2021.
- [32] T. S. T. Nagai and K. Yoshida. Application of the Trudinger-Moser inequality to a parabolic system of chemotaxis. *Funkcial. Ekvac.*, 40:411–433, 1997.
- [33] C. Venkataraman, T. Sekimura, E. A. Gaffney, P. K. Maini, and A. Madzvamuse. Modeling parr-mark pattern formation during the early development of Amago trout. *Phys. Rev. E*, 84:041923, Oct 2011.

- [34] V. Yushutin, A. Quaini, and M. Olshanskii. Numerical modelling of phase separation on dynamic surfaces. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 407:109126, 2020.
- [35] C. Zimmermann, D. Toshniwal, C. M. Landis, T. J. R. Hughes, K. K. Mandadapu, and R. A. Sauer. An isogeometric finite element formulation for phase transitions on deforming surfaces. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 351:441–477, 2019.