

# LIMITING BEHAVIOR OF QUASILINEAR WAVE EQUATIONS WITH FRACTIONAL-TYPE DISSIPATION

BARBARA KALTENBACHER, MOSTAFA MELIANI, AND VANJA NIKOLIĆ

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we investigate a general class of quasilinear wave equations with nonlocal dissipation. We first motivate these in the context of nonlinear acoustics using heat flux laws of Gurtin–Pipkin type within the system of governing equations of sound propagation, as these are known to have finite propagation speeds. Two families of models are obtained, which can be identified with the classical Kuznetsov and Blackstock wave equations (the former containing the Westervelt equation as a particular case) with dissipation of fractional-derivative type. With minimal assumptions on the involved memory kernels – which we allow to be weakly singular – we study the well-posedness of such wave equations in a general theoretical framework. We then analyze the behavior of the solutions as the damping parameter vanishes, thus relating the equations to their inviscid counterparts. For memory kernels that depend on the relaxation time of the heat flux, we furthermore analyze the conditions under which a limit of the vanishing relaxation time exists and discuss the different ensuing cases.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The classical theory of second-order models of nonlinear sound propagation is based on employing the Fourier law of heat conduction within the system of governing equations. Using this law has drawbacks as it exhibits the following unpleasant feature: “a disturbance at any point in the body is felt instantly at every other point” [21]. This is often referred to as the paradox of infinite speed of propagation. In this paper we therefore investigate acoustic models based on the use of the general heat-flux framework developed by Gurtin and Pipkin in [21]:

$$(1.1) \quad \mathbf{q}(t) = -\kappa \int_0^t \mathcal{K}(t-s) \nabla \theta(s) \, ds.$$

Here  $\mathbf{q}$  denotes the flux vector,  $\theta$  the absolute temperature, and  $\kappa$  is the thermal conductivity. Such heat flux laws are called of Gurtin–Pipkin type hereafter. As will be discussed in detail in Section 2, many heat-flux laws in the literature can be written in the Gurtin–Pipkin framework with a particular choice of the kernel  $\mathcal{K}$ , including the Compté–Metzler laws [8], the Maxwell–Cattaneo law [5], and fractional integrals found in, e.g., [22, 38, 39].

The corresponding acoustic wave equations will be shown to have the form

$$(1.2) \quad \mathbf{a}(\psi_t) \psi_{tt} - c^2 \mathbf{b}(\psi_t) \Delta \psi - \delta \int_0^t \mathcal{K}(t-s) \Delta \psi_t(s) \, ds + f(\nabla \psi, \nabla \psi_t) = 0,$$

where  $c > 0$  is the speed of sound and  $\delta \ll 1$  denotes the sound diffusivity. We refer to the corresponding  $\delta$ –damping term as dissipation of Djrbashian–Caputo derivative type [4, 12]. Additionally, and depending on the choice of the flux law rewritten in form of (1.1), kernel  $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}_\tau$  may depend on the relaxation time  $\tau \ll 1$  of the heat flux. This

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35L05, 35L72.

*Key words and phrases.* quasilinear wave equations, fractional dissipation, Gurtin–Pipkin law, well-posedness, singular limits.

work aims to analyze wave equations (1.2), under minimal assumptions on the memory kernel, in terms of their unique solvability and to relate them to the classical models of nonlinear acoustics via a singular limit analysis with respect to  $\delta$  and  $\tau$ .

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first rigorous work dealing with general Džrbashian–Caputo-derivative type dissipation for quasilinear wave equations. Their analysis is highly challenging because of the combination of the quasilinear evolution with the minimally restrictive assumptions imposed on the memory kernel. In particular, unlike available results in the literature for the analysis of nonlinear wave equations with memory (see, e.g., [9, 33]), we do not require the kernel to be smooth on  $[0, \infty)$  or nonnegative. This relaxation is necessary for studying wave equations based on certain Compté–Metzler flux laws written in form of (1.1).

We obtain the well-posedness of the resulting acoustic equations on smooth bounded domains and small enough final time by carefully devising energy arguments for suitable linearizations and then combining them with a contraction principle for sufficiently smooth and small initial data. The smallness assumption on data is imposed in a lower topology (namely,  $H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$ ) than the one of their regularity, as relevant when modeling various applications of sound waves at high frequencies and intensities.

After establishing uniform well-posedness, we study the limiting behavior of these acoustic equations with respect to the damping parameter  $\delta$ , thus relating them to their inviscid counterparts ( $\delta = 0$ ). In particular, we obtain strong convergence of solutions in the standard energy norm to the solution of the inviscid models at a linear rate. For cases when kernel  $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}_\tau$  depends on the relaxation time of the heat flux, we investigate the limiting behavior of the acoustic equations in the vanishing limit of  $\tau$  as well. Remarkably, because of the general nature of the considered kernels, the limiting dissipation does not always converge to the classical Dirac mass, but rather produces a richer family of limiting equations, as we rigorously discuss in Section 6.

In terms of the related results, we note that the well-posedness analysis of the Westervelt equation in pressure form with fractional dissipation (which can be regarded as a simplification of (1.2) with a particular choice of kernel  $\mathcal{K}$ ) can be found in [30]. The local-in-time counterparts of the acoustic models considered in the present work are by now well-studied; we refer to, e.g., [11, 13, 16, 26, 27, 34–36, 40, 41] and the references contained therein. We also point out the singular limit analysis for a class of nonlocal differential equations in [9, 10], from which we adopt certain ideas in the vanishing relaxation time analysis; see Remark 2 below.

The present paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we motivate this study by deriving two families of models, which can be identified with the classical Kuznetsov and Blackstock equations of nonlinear acoustics and also contain the Westervelt equation as a special case, with dissipation of Džrbashian–Caputo-derivative type. In Section 3, we state the assumptions of the developed framework and verify them for relevant memory kernels. In Section 4, we provide a uniform-in- $\delta$  wellposedness result for a general linearized acoustic equation with Džrbashian–Caputo-derivative dissipation. Section 5 tackles the question of the uniform well-posedness of the nonlinear model (1.2) as well as its limiting behavior as the sound diffusivity vanishes; see Theorem 5.3. The vanishing relaxation time limit and different ensuing cases are discussed in Section 6. The main results of this section are contained in Theorems 6.1 and 6.2.

## 2. WAVE EQUATIONS IN NONLINEAR ACOUSTICS BASED ON THE GURTIN–PIPKIN FLUX LAW

In this section, we motivate the theoretical considerations by discussing weakly nonlinear acoustic modeling that incorporates general nonlocal heat flux laws of Gurtin–Pipkin type (1.1). As established by Povstenko in [38], with particular choices of the kernel  $\mathcal{K}$ , many different variants of the flux law in the literature can be covered. For example, one can have fractional integrals

$$(2.1) \quad \mathbf{q}(t) = -\kappa\tau_\theta^{-\alpha} \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-s)^{\alpha-1} \nabla\theta(s) ds, \quad 0 < \alpha \leq 1;$$

see [39, Eq. (2.17)] and [22, Eq. (B.65)]. Flux laws involving short-tail memory with an exponential kernel [39, Eq. (2.21)] given by

$$(2.2) \quad \mathbf{q}(t) = -\kappa \int_0^t \frac{1}{\tau} \exp\left(-\frac{t-s}{\tau}\right) \nabla\theta ds$$

can be seen as the solution to the well-known Maxwell–Cattaneo law

$$\mathbf{q} + \tau\mathbf{q}_t = -\kappa\nabla\theta,$$

where  $\tau \ll 1$  is the intrinsic relaxation time of the heat flux [6]. The constant  $\tau_\theta > 0$  in (2.1) is a relaxation time, added to serve as a scaling factor to adjust for the dimensional inhomogeneity introduced by the fractional integral in the way done in [22, Appendix B.4.1.2]. Note that some references account for this by changing the units of the thermal conductivity  $\kappa$ .

**2.1. Gurtin–Pipkin form of the Compte–Metzler fractional equations.** As also discussed in [38], the four fractional generalization of the flux law proposed by Compte and Metzler [8] can also be obtained from (1.1) with kernels being functions of Mittag-Leffler type. These laws are given by general flux equations:

$$\text{(GFE I)} \quad (1 + \tau^\alpha D_t^\alpha)\mathbf{q}(t) = -\kappa\tau_\theta^{1-\alpha} D_t^{1-\alpha}\nabla\theta;$$

$$\text{(GFE II)} \quad (1 + \tau^\alpha D_t^\alpha)\mathbf{q}(t) = -\kappa\tau_\theta^{\alpha-1} D_t^{\alpha-1}\nabla\theta;$$

$$\text{(GFE III)} \quad (1 + \tau\partial_t)\mathbf{q}(t) = -\kappa\tau_\theta^{1-\alpha} D_t^{1-\alpha}\nabla\theta;$$

$$\text{(GFE)} \quad (1 + \tau^\alpha D_t^\alpha)\mathbf{q}(t) = -\kappa\nabla\theta.$$

Note that [8] introduces the scaling  $\tau^\alpha$  on the left-hand side to ensure the dimensional homogeneity of the equation without doing so for the right-hand-side terms. The coefficient  $\kappa$  in laws GFE I, GFE II, and GFE III would then not have the usual dimension of the thermal conductivity. Instead, as in (2.1), we add a relaxation time  $\tau_\theta > 0$  to avoid the issue. To recover the original Compte–Metzler law, one can simply set  $\tau_\theta = 1$  with a suitable unit; i.e., [unit of time] $^{\pm(1-\alpha)}$ .

Throughout this work,  $D_t^\eta$  denotes the Djrbashian–Caputo fractional derivative, which is for  $w \in W^{1,1}(0, t)$  defined by

$$D_t^\eta w(t) = \frac{1}{\Gamma([\eta] - \eta)} \int_0^t (t-s)^{[\eta]-\eta-1} D_t^{[\eta]} w(s) ds, \quad -1 < \eta < 1, \eta \neq 0;$$

see, for example, [31, §1] and [37, §2.4.1]. Here  $n = [\eta]$ ,  $n \in \{0, 1\}$  is the integer obtained by rounding up  $\eta$  and  $D_t^n$  is the zeroth or first derivative operator.

When discussing modeling below, we assume  $\mathbf{q}(0) = 0$  and  $\nabla\theta(0) = 0$ . With this assumption, the Riemann–Liouville and the Djrbashian–Caputo definitions of fractional derivatives of  $\mathbf{q}$  as well as of  $\nabla\theta$  are equivalent. We note that using the Compte–Metzler flux laws stated as fractional ODEs given above in the derivation of acoustic equations leads to higher-order in time fractional acoustic models; see [28] for their derivation and the well-posedness analysis. Here we will instead restate the Compte–Metzler laws in the Gurtin–Pipkin form and so the resulting equations will be of second order in time. The Gurtin–Pipkin law

$$(GPL I) \quad \mathbf{q}(t) = -\kappa \left(\frac{\tau_\theta}{\tau}\right)^{1-\alpha} \int_0^t \frac{1}{\tau^{2\alpha-1}} (t-s)^{2\alpha-2} E_{\alpha,2\alpha-1} \left[ -\left(\frac{t-s}{\tau}\right)^\alpha \right] \nabla\theta(s) \, ds,$$

$$1/2 < \alpha < 1$$

with  $E_{\alpha,\beta}$  being the generalized Mittag-Leffler function in two parameters [31, Ch. 2], corresponds to law GFE I written as

$$D_t^{\alpha-1} \mathbf{q} + \tau^\alpha D_t^{2\alpha-1} \mathbf{q} = -\kappa \tau_\theta^{1-\alpha} \nabla\theta, \quad 1/2 < \alpha < 1.$$

Similarly,

$$(GPL II) \quad \mathbf{q}(t) = -\kappa \left(\frac{\tau_\theta}{\tau}\right)^{\alpha-1} \int_0^t \frac{1}{\tau} E_{\alpha,1} \left[ -\left(\frac{t-s}{\tau}\right)^\alpha \right] \nabla\theta(s) \, ds,$$

$$0 < \alpha < 1$$

corresponds to law GFE II rewritten as

$$D_t^{1-\alpha} \mathbf{q} + \tau^\alpha \mathbf{q}_t = -\kappa \tau_\theta^{\alpha-1} \nabla\theta, \quad 0 < \alpha < 1.$$

Furthermore,

$$(GPL III) \quad \mathbf{q}(t) = -\kappa \left(\frac{\tau_\theta}{\tau}\right)^{1-\alpha} \int_0^t \frac{1}{\tau^\alpha} (t-s)^{\alpha-1} E_{1,\alpha} \left[ -\frac{t-s}{\tau} \right] \nabla\theta(s) \, ds,$$

$$0 < \alpha < 1$$

corresponds to law GFE III written as

$$D_t^{\alpha-1} \mathbf{q} + \tau D_t^\alpha \mathbf{q} = -\kappa \tau_\theta^{1-\alpha} \nabla\theta, \quad 0 < \alpha < 1.$$

Finally,

$$(GPL) \quad \mathbf{q}(t) = -\kappa \int_0^t \frac{1}{\tau^\alpha} (t-s)^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha,\alpha} \left[ -\left(\frac{t-s}{\tau}\right)^\alpha \right] \nabla\theta(s) \, ds,$$

$$0 < \alpha < 1$$

corresponds to the GFE law. Note that the above-mentioned Gurtin–Pipkin laws can also be defined with  $\alpha = 1$ , in which case they reduce to law (2.2) with the exponential kernel.

We mention in passing that

$$(2.3) \quad \mathbf{q}(t) = -\tau_\theta^{1-\alpha} \frac{\kappa}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-s)^{\alpha-1} \nabla\theta_t(s) \, ds, \quad 0 < \alpha < 1$$

also fits into the Gurtin–Pipkin framework (1.1) with

$$\mathcal{K}(t) = \tau_\theta^{1-\alpha} \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha-1)} t^{\alpha-2},$$

however this kernel is not absolutely integrable on  $(0, T)$  and will thus not be covered by the upcoming analysis.

**Remark 1** (Integrability of kernels). *The fact that the kernel resulting from (2.3) is not in  $L^1(0, T)$  comes from the fact we forced it to have a Gurtin–Pipkin form by integrating by parts. If one decides to keep the original form of (2.3), then the resulting wave equation would not fit the framework of this paper as the dissipation term would have one order higher derivative.*

*Note that flux law (2.3) can also be obtained by formally setting  $\tau$  to 0 in GFE I and GFE III. The fact that the limiting kernel is not in  $L^1(0, T)$  hints that the discussion of the vanishing relaxation time limits for the Gurtin–Pipkin laws GPL I and GPL III will require special attention; see Section 6.1 below for details.*

**Remark 2** (Scaling properties of the Mittag-Leffler-type kernels). *The ratio  $\tau_\theta/\tau$  will be important throughout the paper, in particular when taking the vanishing relaxation time limit. Notice that if the ratio  $\tau_\theta/\tau$  as a function of  $\tau$  is constant, then the kernels in GPL I, GPL II, GPL III, and GPL can be written as*

$$\mathcal{K}_\tau(t) = \frac{1}{\tau} \mathcal{K}_1\left(\frac{t}{\tau}\right),$$

where  $\mathcal{K}_1$  does not depend on  $\tau$ . This kernel form matches the one assumed in [9], where the limiting behavior of a class of semilinear wave equations with memory is analyzed. In particular, it implies

$$\int_0^T \mathcal{K}_\tau(t) dt = \int_0^{T/\tau} \mathcal{K}_1(t) dt \quad \text{for all } \tau > 0,$$

and if  $\mathcal{K}_1 \in L^1(0, \infty)$ , then:  $\|\mathcal{K}_\tau\|_{L^1(0, \infty)} = \|\mathcal{K}_1\|_{L^1(0, \infty)}$ .

**2.2. Acoustic modeling with the Gurtin–Pipkin law.** The derivation of nonlinear acoustic equations based on the flux laws discussed above follows the steps taken in [24, §4] with now (1.1) in place of the Maxwell–Cattaneo law. This derivation employs a weakly-nonlinear approximation, meaning that we assume

$$\epsilon \ll 1, \quad \theta = O(\epsilon), \quad \tilde{K} = O(\epsilon), \quad |\mathfrak{e}| = O(\epsilon^2).$$

Here  $\epsilon$  is the Mach number,  $\tilde{K}$  is the dimensionless thermal diffusivity, and  $\mathfrak{e}$  the dimensionless entropy. Starting from a one-dimensional setting, the governing system is first approximated by

$$\psi_{tt} + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon\partial_t(\psi_x)^2 - (1 + (\gamma - 2)s)[\psi_x s_x + (1 + s)\psi_{xx}] = -\epsilon^{-1}\mathfrak{e}_t,$$

where  $\psi$  is the acoustic velocity potential,  $\gamma$  the adiabatic index, and  $s$  is known as the condensation; see [24, Eqs. (44)–(49) and Eq. (53)]. Upon employing  $s \approx -\epsilon\psi_t$ , one arrives at

$$(2.4) \quad \psi_{tt} + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon\partial_t(\psi_x)^2 - (1 - (\gamma - 2)\epsilon\psi_t)[- \epsilon\psi_x\psi_{tx} + (1 - \epsilon\psi_t)\psi_{xx}] = -\epsilon^{-1}\mathfrak{e}_t;$$

cf. [24, Eq. (49)]. From the entropy production law

$$\tilde{\kappa}\mathfrak{e}_t = -\tilde{K}\mathbf{q}_x,$$

with  $\tilde{\kappa}$  being the dimensionless thermal conductivity, and the general heat flux law (1.1) in a dimensionless version

$$\mathbf{q}(t) = -\tilde{\kappa} \int_0^t \mathcal{K}(t-s)\theta_x(s) ds,$$

we have the following entropy equation:

$$\mathbf{e}_t = \tilde{K} \int_0^t \mathcal{K}(t-s)\theta_{xx}(s) ds.$$

After using  $\theta \approx -\epsilon(\gamma-1)\psi_t$ , we can rewrite it as

$$(2.5) \quad \mathbf{e}_t = -\epsilon\tilde{K}(\gamma-1) \int_0^t \mathcal{K}(t-s)\psi_{txx}(s) ds;$$

cf. [23, Eqs. (57) and (58)]. Using (2.5) to eliminate  $\mathbf{e}_t$  in (2.4) then leads to

$$(2.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \psi_{tt} + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon\partial_t(\psi_x)^2 - (1 - (\gamma-2)\epsilon\psi_t)[- \epsilon\psi_x\psi_{tx} + (1 - \epsilon\psi_t)\psi_{xx}] \\ = \tilde{K}(\gamma-1) \int_0^t \mathcal{K}(t-s)\psi_{txx}(s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Extrapolating to a mathematically generalized 3D equation results in a nonlocal wave equation of Blackstock type [3, p. 20]:

$$(2.7) \quad \psi_{tt} - c^2(1 + 2\tilde{k}\psi_t)\Delta\psi - \delta \int_0^t \mathcal{K}(t-s)\Delta\psi_t(s) ds + \tilde{\ell}\partial_t|\nabla\psi|^2 = 0$$

with  $\tilde{k}, \tilde{\ell} \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\delta \geq 0$ . Instead, we can divide (2.6) by  $(1 - \epsilon(\gamma-1)\psi_t)$ , using  $(1 - \epsilon(\gamma-1)\psi_t)^{-1} \approx 1 + \epsilon(\gamma-1)\psi_t$  for  $\epsilon \ll 1$ . Neglecting all  $O(\epsilon^2)$  terms yields

$$(1 + \epsilon(\gamma-1)\psi_t)\psi_{tt} - \psi_{xx} - \tilde{K}(\gamma-1) \int_0^t \mathcal{K}(t-s)\psi_{txx}(s) ds + \epsilon\partial_t(\psi_x)^2 = 0.$$

Extrapolating to a dimensionalized 3D model in a mathematically general form gives a nonlocal version of the classical Kuznetsov equation [32]:

$$(2.8) \quad (1 + 2\tilde{k}\psi_t)\psi_{tt} - c^2\Delta\psi - \delta \int_0^t \mathcal{K}(t-s)\Delta\psi_t(s) ds + \tilde{\ell}\partial_t|\nabla\psi|^2 = 0.$$

	<b>Nonlinear acoustic equations with nonlocal dissipation</b>
Blackstock's equation	$\psi_{tt} - c^2(1 - 2\tilde{k}\psi_t)\Delta\psi - \delta \int_0^t \mathcal{K}(t-s)\Delta\psi_t(s) ds + \tilde{\ell}\partial_t \nabla\psi ^2 = 0$
Kuznetsov's equation	$(1 + 2\tilde{k}\psi_t)\psi_{tt} - c^2\Delta\psi - \delta \int_0^t \mathcal{K}(t-s)\Delta\psi_t(s) ds + \tilde{\ell}\partial_t \nabla\psi ^2 = 0$

TABLE 1. Nonlocal wave equations of Blackstock and Kuznetsov type considered in this work. Relevant kernels are listed in Table 2.

If we assume that local nonlinear effects on sound propagation can be neglected so that

$$|\nabla\psi|^2 \approx c^{-2}\psi_t^2,$$

we obtain a nonlocal version of the Westervelt equation [42] in potential form:

$$(2.9) \quad (1 + 2k\psi_t)\psi_{tt} - c^2\Delta\psi - \delta \int_0^t \mathcal{K}(t-s)\Delta\psi_t(s) ds = 0.$$

This equation can be tackled mathematically as a particular case of (2.8) with  $\tilde{\ell} = 0$  and  $k = \tilde{k} + c^{-2}\tilde{\ell}$ .

**Remark 3** (More general kernels). *As our analysis adopts an abstract framework, we can allow for even more general kernels than the one discussed above. These can be motivated, e.g., by combining the fractional effects of viscosity with that of the heat law, as done in the case of the following Westervelt equation solved for the acoustic pressure  $p$ :*

$$(2.10) \quad (1 + 2\bar{k}p)p_{tt} - c^2\Delta p - \delta \left( \tau_v^{\alpha-1} D_t^\alpha + \tau^{1-\beta} D_t^{2-\beta} \right) \Delta p = 2\bar{k}p_t^2;$$

see [22, Eq. (7.7)]. Here  $0 < \alpha < 1$  and  $1 < \beta < 2$ ,  $\bar{k} = k/\rho$ , where  $\rho$  is the mass density of the medium. The coefficient  $\tau_v$  is the characteristic viscous relaxation time constant. Mathematically, equation (2.10) can be obtained from (2.9) if  $p(0) = 0$  using the relation  $p = \rho\psi_t$ , differentiating with respect to time, and setting the kernel to

$$\mathcal{K}(t) = \tau_v^{\alpha-1} \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} t^{-\alpha} + \tau^{1-\beta} \frac{1}{\Gamma(\beta-1)} t^{\beta-2}.$$

Kernels of this type can be captured by an extension of (2.1) to a multi-term setting

$$\mathcal{K}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^M \tau_i^{-\alpha_i} \frac{a_i}{\Gamma(\alpha_i)} t^{\alpha_i-1}$$

with  $M \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $a_i > 0$ , and  $0 < \alpha_i < 1$ . The theoretical framework of this paper can be extended to such a multi-term kernel setting in a straightforward way; see Remark 5.

**Remark 4** (More general heat flux laws). *There exist, naturally, also heat laws that cannot be written in a Gurtin–Pipkin form. An interesting example of these are Jeffreys-type (fractional) laws [2, Chapter 7] and the more general Coleman–Gurtin laws [7], which can be viewed as an averaging between a Fourier law and a Gurtin–Pipkin law. The resulting acoustic equations would have dissipation in the form of*

$$-\tilde{\delta}\Delta\psi_t - \delta \int_0^t \mathcal{K}(t-s)\Delta\psi_t(s) ds,$$

where  $\mathcal{K}$  has the dimension [unit of time] $^{-1}$  to ensure the dimensional homogeneity of the resulting equation.

Although nonlinear equations with such dissipation are not strictly covered by the present framework, we expect the results of this paper to extend to them in a straightforward way using the approach of [27] for treating the additional  $\tilde{\delta}$  term coming from the contribution of the Fourier law.

**Notation and preliminaries.** Below we often use the notation  $A \lesssim B$  for  $A \leq CB$  with a constant  $C > 0$  that only depends on the spatial domain  $\Omega$ , on which we make the following assumption throughout this work:

$$\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n, \text{ where } n \in \{1, 2, 3\}, \text{ is a bounded and } C^4 \text{ regular domain.}$$

We denote by

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\diamond}^2(\Omega) &= H_0^1(\Omega) \cap H^2(\Omega), \quad H_{\diamond}^3(\Omega) = \{u \in H^3(\Omega) : \text{tr}_{\partial\Omega} u = 0, \text{tr}_{\partial\Omega} \Delta u = 0\}, \\ H_{\diamond}^4(\Omega) &= \{u \in H^4(\Omega) : \text{tr}_{\partial\Omega} u = 0, \text{tr}_{\partial\Omega} \Delta u = 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

the spaces of functions  $H_0^2(\Omega) \subset H_{\diamond}^2(\Omega) \subset H^2(\Omega)$ ,  $H_0^3(\Omega) \subset H_{\diamond}^3(\Omega) \subset H^3(\Omega)$ , and  $H_0^4(\Omega) \subset H_{\diamond}^4(\Omega) \subset H^4(\Omega)$  satisfying boundary conditions given above. Given final time  $T > 0$  and  $p, q \in [1, \infty]$ , we use  $\|\cdot\|_{L^p(0, T; L^q(\Omega))}$  to denote the norm on  $L^p(0, T; L^q(\Omega))$  and  $\|\cdot\|_{L_t^p(L^q)}$  to denote the norm on  $L^p(0, t; L^q(\Omega))$  for  $t \in (0, T)$ .

We denote by  $*$  the Laplace convolution

$$(f * g)(t) = \int_0^t f(t-s)g(s) \, ds.$$

We assume throughout this work that the medium coefficients satisfy the following:

$$c > 0, \quad k, \tilde{k}, \tilde{\ell} \in \mathbb{R}.$$

### 3. ASSUMPTIONS ON THE MEMORY KERNEL

To motivate the necessity of certain sign conditions on the kernel, we consider the respective constant coefficient linear versions of the equations given in Table 1:

$$(3.1) \quad \psi_{tt} - c^2 \Delta \psi - \delta \int_0^t \mathcal{K}(t-s) \Delta \psi_t(s) \, ds = f.$$

The canonical test functions for (3.1) are of the form  $(-\Delta)^\nu \psi_t$ . Using them, we formally obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{\nu}{2}} \psi_t\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \Big|_0^t + \frac{c^2}{2} \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{\nu+1}{2}} \psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \Big|_0^t \\ & + \delta \int_0^t \underbrace{(\mathcal{K} * (-\Delta)^{\frac{\nu+1}{2}} \psi_t, (-\Delta)^{\frac{\nu+1}{2}} \psi_t)_{L^2(\Omega)}}_{L^2(\Omega)} \, ds = \int_0^t ((-\Delta)^{\frac{\nu}{2}} f, (-\Delta)^{\frac{\nu}{2}} \psi_t)_{L^2(\Omega)} \, ds. \end{aligned}$$

Since the space derivatives in the underlined term are too high to be dominated by the other left-hand side terms, we have to assume nonnegativity of this term, leading to the following sign condition on the kernel:

$$(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_1) \quad \int_0^t ((\mathcal{K} * y)(s), y(s))_{L^2(\Omega)} \, ds \geq 0, \quad y \in L^2(0, t; L^2(\Omega)), \quad t \in (0, T).$$

Condition  $(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_1)$  is satisfied for all examples in Table 2; see (3.2) and the discussion below it. In the well-posedness analysis of Kuznetsov-type nonlinear equations, we will need a stronger assumption (see (4.13) below). In order to achieve some damping from the  $\delta$  term, we require the following coercivity condition to hold: there exists  $\check{c}_0 > 0$ , such that

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{A}_1) \quad \Phi(y) &:= \int_0^t ((\mathcal{K} * y)(s), y(s))_{L^2(\Omega)} \, ds \\ &\geq \check{c}_0 \left( \int_0^t |(\mathcal{K} * y)(s)|_{L^2(\Omega)} \, ds \right)^2, \quad y \in L^2(0, t; L^2(\Omega)) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $t \in (0, T)$ . Note that strict positivity of  $\check{c}_0$  in  $(\mathbf{A}_1)$  is not needed for Blackstock-type equations; cf. Table 1. In that case, the weaker  $(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_1)$  (which can be understood as  $(\mathbf{A}_1)$  with  $\check{c}_0 = 0$ ) suffices.



We will additionally need the following assumption on the kernel in the course of the energy analysis of Blackstock-type equations:

$$(\mathbf{A}_2) \quad \int_0^t ((\mathcal{K} * y_t)(s), y(s))_{L^2(\Omega)} ds \geq 0, \quad y \in W^{1,1}(0, t; L^2(\Omega)), \quad t \in (0, T);$$

see (4.12) and subsequent estimates below.

**Remark 5** (Multi-term kernel setting). *As stated in Remark 3, the dissipation term might have a finite-multi-term kernel structure if, e.g., the fractional dissipation has multiple origins. In this case,  $\mathcal{K}$  can be written as*

$$\mathcal{K}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^M \mathcal{K}_i(t).$$

If for all  $1 \leq i \leq M$ ,  $\mathcal{K}_i$  verifies  $(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_1)$  then so does  $\mathcal{K}$ . The same holds for  $(\mathbf{A}_1)$  and  $(\mathbf{A}_2)$ . Specifically for  $(\mathbf{A}_1)$ , if we denote by  $\check{c}_i > 0$  the coercivity constant of  $\mathcal{K}_i$ , then a valid coercivity constant is of the form

$$\check{c}_0 = \frac{1}{M} \inf_{1 \leq i \leq M} \check{c}_i.$$

If the sum has countably many terms, then we can only ascertain that  $\mathcal{K}$  verifies  $(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_1)$  and  $(\mathbf{A}_2)$ .

**3.1. Verifying properties of kernels in relevant examples.** For different kernels  $\mathcal{K}$  discussed in Section 2, properties  $(\mathbf{A}_1)$  and  $(\mathbf{A}_2)$  (and weaker  $(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_1)$ ) can be checked by means of analysis similar to that in [14, Lemma 2.3]; see also [25, Lemma B.2]. Taking Laplace transform  $\mathcal{L}(v) =: \hat{v}$  in the Gurtin–Pipkin law and recalling that  $\mathbf{q}(0) = 0$  and  $\nabla\theta(0) = 0$ , we obtain by the convolution theorem for the Laplace transform

$$\mathbf{q} = -\kappa\mathcal{K} * \nabla\theta, \quad \hat{\mathbf{q}}(z) = -\kappa\hat{\mathcal{K}}(z)\nabla\hat{\theta}(z).$$

Denoting

$$g_\alpha(t) := \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} t^{\alpha-1},$$

and using

$$\mathcal{L}[g_\alpha](z) = z^{-\alpha}, \quad \mathcal{L}[x^{b-1}E_{a,b}(\lambda x^a)](z) = \frac{z^{a-b}}{z^a - \lambda},$$

we arrive at Laplace transforms of the kernels discussed in Section 2, which we summarize in Table 2.

Using the inverse kernel  $\check{\mathcal{K}}$ , formally defined by  $\mathcal{L}\check{\mathcal{K}}(z) = 1/\mathcal{L}\mathcal{K}(z)$ , we can rewrite assumption  $(\mathbf{A}_1)$  as

$$\int_0^t ((\check{\mathcal{K}} * y)(s) ds, y(s))_{L^2(\Omega)} ds \geq \check{c}_0 \|y\|_{L^1(0,t;L^2(\Omega))}^2, \quad y \in L^2(0, t; L^2(\Omega))$$

for all  $t \in (0, T)$ . We denote by  $\overline{f}^t$  the extension of a function  $f$  by zero outside  $\mathbb{R} \setminus (0, t)$ . Further, we denote by  $\star$  the Fourier convolution

$$(f \star g)(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(t-s)g(s) ds,$$

Flux law	$\mathcal{K}(t)$	$\mathcal{L}\mathcal{K}(z)$	$\mathcal{L}\check{\mathcal{K}}(z) := 1/\mathcal{L}\mathcal{K}(z)$
(2.1)	$\tau_\theta^{-\alpha} g_\alpha$	$(\tau_\theta z)^{-\alpha}$	$(\tau_\theta z)^\alpha$
(2.2)	$\frac{1}{\tau} \exp(-\frac{t}{\tau})$	$\frac{1}{\tau z + 1}$	$\tau z + 1$
GPL I	$(\frac{\tau_\theta}{\tau})^{1-\alpha} \frac{1}{\tau^{2\alpha-1}} t^{2\alpha-2} E_{\alpha, 2\alpha-1}(-(\frac{t}{\tau})^\alpha)$	$(\frac{\tau_\theta}{\tau})^{1-\alpha} \frac{(\tau z)^{1-\alpha}}{(\tau z)^{\alpha+1}}$	$(\frac{\tau_\theta}{\tau})^{\alpha-1} [(\tau z)^{2\alpha-1} + (\tau z)^{\alpha-1}]$
GPL II	$(\frac{\tau_\theta}{\tau})^{\alpha-1} \frac{1}{\tau} E_{\alpha, 1}(-(\frac{t}{\tau})^\alpha)$	$(\frac{\tau_\theta}{\tau})^{\alpha-1} \frac{(\tau z)^{\alpha-1}}{(\tau z)^{\alpha+1}}$	$(\frac{\tau_\theta}{\tau})^{1-\alpha} [\tau z + (\tau z)^{1-\alpha}]$
GPL III	$(\frac{\tau_\theta}{\tau})^{1-\alpha} \frac{1}{\tau^\alpha} t^{\alpha-1} E_{1, \alpha}(-(\frac{t}{\tau})^\alpha)$	$(\frac{\tau_\theta}{\tau})^{1-\alpha} \frac{(\tau z)^{1-\alpha}}{\tau z + 1}$	$(\frac{\tau_\theta}{\tau})^{\alpha-1} [(\tau z)^\alpha + (\tau z)^{\alpha-1}]$
GPL	$\frac{1}{\tau^\alpha} t^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha, \alpha}(-(\frac{t}{\tau})^\alpha)$	$\frac{1}{(\tau z)^{\alpha+1}}$	$(\tau z)^\alpha + 1$

TABLE 2. Kernels and their Laplace and inverse Laplace transforms for different examples of flux laws discussed in Section 2

by an overline complex conjugation, by  $\Re$  the real part, and by  $\mathcal{F}$  the Fourier transform. With this notation, we have for  $(\mathbf{A}_1)$ , using Plancherel's theorem and the Fourier convolution theorem, see, e.g. [15, Theorems 1,2, Section 4.3],

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.2) \quad \int_0^t \left( (\check{\mathcal{K}} * y)(s), y(s) \right)_{L^2(\Omega)} ds &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( (\overline{\check{\mathcal{K}}^\infty} \star \overline{y^t})(s), \overline{y^t}(s) \right)_{L^2(\Omega)} ds \\
&= \sqrt{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( (\mathcal{F}\overline{\check{\mathcal{K}}^\infty})(\omega), (\mathcal{F}\overline{y^t})(\omega), \overline{(\mathcal{F}\overline{y^t})(\omega)} \right)_{L^2(\Omega)} d\omega \\
&= \sqrt{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \Re(\mathcal{F}\overline{\check{\mathcal{K}}^\infty})(\omega) \left\| (\mathcal{F}\overline{y^t})(\omega) \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 d\omega,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have also used the fact that the left-hand side of the identity is real valued. Thus, using that the real part of the Fourier transform of a real-valued function is even, if

$$(3.3) \quad \Re(\mathcal{F}\overline{\check{\mathcal{K}}^\infty})(\omega) \geq \frac{\tilde{c}_0}{\sqrt{2\pi}}, \quad \omega \in (0, \infty),$$

by Plancherel's theorem and the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\int_0^t \left( (\check{\mathcal{K}} * y)(s), y(s) \right)_{L^2(\Omega)} ds \geq \tilde{c}_0 \|y\|_{L^2(0,t;L^2(\Omega))}^2 \geq \frac{\tilde{c}_0}{t} \|y\|_{L^1(0,t;L^2(\Omega))}^2, \quad \forall t \in (0, T).$$

Therefore, condition (3.3) implies that  $(\mathbf{A}_1)$  holds with

$$\check{c}_0 = \frac{\tilde{c}_0}{T}.$$

An inspection of the  $\mathcal{L}\check{\mathcal{K}}$  column in Table 2, where we replace  $z$  by  $i\omega = \exp(i\pi/2)\omega$  to go from the Laplace to the Fourier transform and use

$$\Re((i\omega)^a) = \cos(a\pi/2)\omega^a \quad \forall \omega \geq 0,$$

shows that condition (3.3) is satisfied for the kernels corresponding to laws (2.2), GPL I, GPL III, and GPL. Indeed, using a change of variables, we find

$$\inf_{\omega \in (0, \infty)} \Re(\mathcal{F}\overline{\check{\mathcal{K}}^\infty})(\omega) = \left(\frac{\tau_\theta}{\tau}\right)^{b-a} \inf_{\omega \in (0, \infty)} \Re((i\omega)^b + (i\omega)^{b-a}) = \left(\frac{\tau_\theta}{\tau}\right)^{b-a} \tilde{C}_0,$$

with  $a$  and  $b$  defined in Table 3. The minimum is attained and is bounded away from 0 since for the above-mentioned kernels  $b > 0$  and  $b - a \leq 0$ . This is due to the fact that

$0 < \alpha < 1$  for all kernels except for GPL I, for which we have  $1/2 < \alpha < 1$ . For GPL and law (2.2):

$$\tilde{C}_0 = \inf_{\omega \in (0, \infty)} \Re((i\omega)^b + (i\omega)^{b-a}) = 1,$$

while for GPL I and GPL III, we find

$$\tilde{C}_0 = \inf_{\omega \in (0, \infty)} \Re((i\omega)^b + (i\omega)^{b-a}) = \cos((b-a)\pi/2) \frac{a}{b} \left( \frac{(a-b) \cos((b-a)\pi/2)}{b \cos(b\pi/2)} \right)^{\frac{b-a}{b}}.$$

For the weaker coercivity condition  $(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_1)$ , we can reason analogously to (3.2) to conclude that it suffices to have  $\Re(\mathcal{F}\overline{\mathcal{K}}^\infty)(\omega) \geq 0$ . For the examples from Table 2, the expressions, up to the factor  $\sqrt{2\pi}$ , are of the form

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{F}\overline{\mathcal{K}}^\infty)(\omega) &= \left( \left( \frac{\tau_\theta}{\tau} \right)^{b-a} (i\tau\omega)^{b-a} (\check{c}_b (i\tau\omega)^a + 1) \right)^{-1} \\ &= \left( \frac{\tau_\theta}{\tau} \right)^{a-b} \left( \check{c}_b \tau^b \exp(ib\pi/2) \omega^b + \tau^{b-a} \exp(i(b-a)\pi/2) \omega^{b-a} \right)^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

with

	$a$	$b$	$\check{c}_b$
(2.1)	0	$\alpha$	0
(2.2)	1	1	1
GPL I	$\alpha$	$2\alpha - 1$	1
GPL II	$\alpha$	1	1
GPL III	1	$\alpha$	1
GPL	$\alpha$	$\alpha$	1

TABLE 3. Unified kernel parameters

so that

$$\Re(\mathcal{F}\overline{\mathcal{K}}^\infty)(\omega) = \left( \frac{\tau_\theta}{\tau} \right)^{a-b} A/B^2$$

with

$$A = \check{c}_b \tau^b \cos(b\pi/2) \omega^b + \tau^{b-a} \cos((b-a)\pi/2) \omega^{b-a},$$

and

$$B^2 = \left| \check{c}_b \tau^b \exp(ib\pi/2) \omega^b + \tau^{b-a} \exp(i(b-a)\pi/2) \omega^{b-a} \right|^2.$$

Thus the sufficient condition  $\Re(\mathcal{F}\overline{\mathcal{K}}^\infty)(\omega) \geq 0$  for  $(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_1)$  holds for all examples in Table 2. Note that  $a, b-a \in [-1, 1]$  in all cases, so that  $\cos(b\pi/2) \geq 0$  and  $\cos((b-a)\pi/2) \geq 0$ .

Condition  $(\mathbf{A}_2)$  can be checked by means of [25, Lemma B.1], which states that, given a Hilbert space  $H$  and  $w \in H^1(0, T; H)$ , it holds

$$\int_0^T (w(t), \mathcal{K} * w_t(t))_H dt \geq \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{K} * \|w\|_H^2)(T) - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \mathcal{K}(t) dt \|w(0)\|_H^2$$

for any kernel  $\mathcal{K} \in L^p(0, T; H)$  with some  $p > 1$  and such that, for all  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\mathcal{K} \in W^{1,1}(\epsilon, T; H)$  and  $\mathcal{K}'|_{[\epsilon, T]} \leq 0$  a.e. These assumptions are satisfied for all kernels given in Table 2.

For convenience of the reader, we compile in Table 4 all the results of the verification of the assumptions needed for the rest of the paper.

	$L^1(0, t)$	$(\mathbf{A}_1)$	$\tilde{c}_0/\tilde{C}_0$	$(\mathbf{A}_2)$	$(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_1)$
(2.1)	✓	✗	-	✓	✓
(2.2)	✓	✓	1	✓	✓
GPL I	✓	✓	$(\frac{\tau_\theta}{\tau})^{\alpha-1}$	✓	✓
GPL II	✓	✗	-	✓	✓
GPL III	✓	✓	$(\frac{\tau_\theta}{\tau})^{\alpha-1}$	✓	✓
GPL	✓	✓	1	✓	✓

TABLE 4. Assumptions verified by the considered kernels

The column  $\tilde{c}_0/\tilde{C}_0$  in Table 4 gives information on how the coercivity constant  $\tilde{c}_0 = \tilde{c}_0/T$  in assumption  $(\mathbf{A}_1)$  depends on  $\tau$  and consequently on the behavior of the equation as the relaxation time vanishes; see Section 6. If one is only interested in the inviscid limit  $\delta \searrow 0$ , one only needs that  $\tilde{c}_0$  is independent of  $\delta$ , which is the case of all the kernels which verify  $(\mathbf{A}_1)$ .

Our framework covers natively kernels in laws (2.1) and GPL II in the case of Blackstock-type equations (Table 1); see Corollaries 5.2 and 5.4.

**Remark 6** (Dimensionality of  $\tilde{c}_0/\tilde{C}_0$ ). *Table 4 provides an additional argument in favor of introducing the scaling  $\tau_\theta$  in the Compte–Metzler laws. Indeed without this scaling, we would have*

$$\tilde{c}_0/\tilde{C}_0 \sim \tau^{1-\alpha}$$

for GPL I and GPL III. In case of these laws, the constant  $\tilde{c}_0/\tilde{C}_0$  would compensate for the dimensional homogeneity loss. By scaling by  $\tau_\theta$ , this constant is dimensionless, which matches what we have with GPL and the classical exponential kernel in (2.2).

#### 4. UNIFORM WELL-POSEDNESS OF LINEARIZED MODELS

Equipped with the kernel assumptions from the previous section, we next study the following linear equation with variable coefficients:

$$(4.1a) \quad \mathbf{a}(x, t)\psi_{tt} - c^2\mathbf{b}(x, t)\Delta\psi - \delta \int_0^t \mathcal{K}(t-s)\Delta\psi_t(s) ds + \nabla\mathbf{l}(x, t) \cdot \nabla\psi_t = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T),$$

supplemented by the boundary and initial conditions:

$$(4.1b) \quad \begin{aligned} \psi &= 0 && \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T), \\ (\psi, \psi_t) &= (\psi_0, \psi_1) && \text{in } \Omega \times \{0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Equation (4.1a) can be understood as a linearization of wave equations given in Table 1, where we have in mind

$$\mathbf{l} = 2\tilde{\ell}\phi$$

and either

$$(a) \quad \mathbf{a} = 1 + 2\tilde{k}\phi_t, \quad \mathbf{b} = 1 \quad \text{in the nonlocal Kuznetsov case (2.8), or}$$

(b)  $\mathbf{a} = 1$ ,  $\mathbf{b} = 1 - 2\tilde{k}\phi_t$  in the nonlocal Blackstock case (2.7),

with  $\phi$  being the predecessor of  $\psi$  in a fixed-point iteration. As a by-product of the analysis, by setting  $\mathfrak{l}$  to zero, we then directly obtain the well-posedness of the linearized nonlocal Westervelt equation (2.9) as well.

We next need to set the assumptions on the involved coefficients. In particular, we need to assume that  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $\mathbf{b}$  do not degenerate and that all the variable coefficients are sufficiently smooth. To this end, we introduce the spaces

$$X_{\mathbf{a}} = \{\mathbf{a} \in L^\infty(0, T; L^\infty(\Omega)) : \nabla \mathbf{a}, \Delta \mathbf{a} \in L^\infty(0, T; L^3(\Omega)), \mathbf{a}_t \in L^1(0, T; L^\infty(\Omega)), \\ \nabla \mathbf{a}_t \in L^1(0, T; L^3(\Omega)), \Delta \mathbf{a}_t \in L^1(0, T; L^2(\Omega))\}$$

and

$$X_{\mathbf{b}} = \{\mathbf{b} \in L^\infty(0, T; L^\infty(\Omega)) : \nabla \mathbf{b} \in L^\infty(0, T; L^\infty(\Omega)), \mathbf{b}_t \in L^2(0, T; L^\infty(\Omega)), \\ \Delta \mathbf{b} \in L^1(0, T; L^\infty(\Omega)) \cap L^\infty(0, T; L^3(\Omega)), \\ \nabla \mathbf{b}_t \in L^1(0, T; L^3(\Omega)), \Delta \mathbf{b}_t \in L^1(0, T; L^3(\Omega))\}$$

and make the following assumptions:

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{cases} \mathbf{a} \in X_{\mathbf{a}}, \mathbf{b} \in X_{\mathbf{b}} \text{ and there exist } \bar{\mathbf{a}}, \underline{\mathbf{a}} \text{ and } \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \underline{\mathbf{b}}, \text{ independent of } \delta, \text{ such that} \\ \bar{\mathbf{a}} \geq \mathbf{a} \geq \underline{\mathbf{a}} > 0, \quad \bar{\mathbf{b}} \geq \mathbf{b} \geq \underline{\mathbf{b}} > 0, \\ \mathfrak{l} \in X_{\mathfrak{l}} = \{\mathfrak{l} \in L^\infty(0, T; H^4(\Omega)) : \mathfrak{l}_t \in L^1(0, T; H^3(\Omega))\}. \end{cases}$$

To state the upcoming result, we also introduce a combined quantity for these coefficients, which we will assume is small enough:

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \Xi(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathfrak{l}) &= \|\mathbf{a}_t\|_{L^1(L^\infty)}^2 + \|\Delta \mathbf{a}_t\|_{L^1(L^2)}^2 + \|\nabla \mathbf{a}_t\|_{L^1(L^2)}^2 \\ &\quad + \|\mathbf{b}_t\|_{L^2(L^\infty)}^2 + \|\mathbf{b}_t\|_{L^1(L^\infty)}^2 + \|\nabla \mathbf{b}\|_{L^1(L^\infty)}^2 \\ &\quad + \|\Delta \mathbf{b}\|_{L^1(L^3)}^2 + \|\nabla \mathbf{b}_t\|_{L^1(L^3)}^2 + \|\nabla \Delta \mathfrak{l}\|_{L^1(L^3)}^2 + \|\nabla \Delta \mathfrak{l}_t\|_{L^1(L^2)}^2 \\ &\quad + \|D^2 \mathfrak{l}\|_{L^1(L^\infty)}^2 + \|D^2 \mathfrak{l}_t\|_{L^1(L^3)}^2 + \|\nabla \mathfrak{l}_t\|_{L^1(L^\infty)}^2 + \|\nabla \mathfrak{l}\|_{L^1(L^\infty)}^2 + \|\Delta \mathfrak{l}\|_{L^1(L^\infty)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

In case of constant coefficients, we would just have  $\Xi(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathfrak{l}) \equiv 0$  and the smallness condition would trivially hold. To facilitate the analysis, we define the energy of the solution at time  $t \in (0, T)$  as

$$\mathcal{E}(t) = \|\Delta^2 \psi(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \Delta \psi_t(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Delta \psi_{tt}(t)\|_{L^2}^2.$$

The solution space for the acoustic velocity potential will be

$$(4.4) \quad X_\psi = W^{3,1}(0, T; H_0^1(\Omega)) \cap W^{2,\infty}(0, T; H_\diamond^2(\Omega)) \cap W^{1,\infty}(0, T; H_\diamond^3(\Omega)) \\ \cap L^\infty(0, T; H_\diamond^4(\Omega))$$

with the corresponding norm  $\|\cdot\|_{X_\psi}$ . Observe that there exist  $C_1, C_2 > 0$ , such that

$$C_1 \|\psi\|_{X_\psi}^2 \leq \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in (0, T)} \mathcal{E}[\psi](t) + \int_0^t \|\nabla \psi_{ttt}(s)\|_{L^2} ds \leq C_2 \|\psi\|_{X_\psi}^2.$$

Since we eventually wish to study the limiting behavior of the nonlinear models as  $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$ , we may focus our attention in the upcoming analysis on an interval  $[0, \bar{\delta})$  for some  $\bar{\delta} > 0$  without loss of generality.

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $\delta \in [0, \bar{\delta}]$ . Given  $T > 0$ , let the assumptions on the coefficients  $\mathbf{a}$ ,  $\mathbf{b}$ , and  $\mathbf{l}$  stated in (4.2) hold. Let  $\mathcal{K} \in L^1(0, T)$  and the following hold:*

- (a) *if  $\nabla \mathbf{a} \neq 0$ , we assume  $(\mathbf{A}_1)$  holds with the coercivity constant  $\check{c}_0 > 0$ ;*
- (b) *if  $\nabla \mathbf{a} = 0$ , we assume  $(\mathbf{A}_1)$  holds with  $\check{c}_0 = 0$  (that is,  $(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_1)$ );*
- (c) *if  $\mathbf{b}_t \neq 0$ , we assume  $(\mathbf{A}_2)$  holds.*

Furthermore, assume that the initial conditions satisfy

$$(\psi_0, \psi_1) \in \begin{cases} H_{\diamond}^4(\Omega) \times H_{\diamond}^4(\Omega) & \text{if } \delta > 0, \\ H_{\diamond}^4(\Omega) \times H_{\diamond}^3(\Omega) & \text{if } \delta = 0. \end{cases}$$

Then for any  $\tilde{M} > 0$ , there exist  $m = m(\underline{\mathbf{a}}, \underline{\mathbf{b}}, \Omega, \tilde{M}) > 0$  and  $\check{m} = \check{m}(\underline{\mathbf{a}}, \underline{\mathbf{b}}, \Omega, \tilde{M}) > 0$ , independent of  $\delta$  and  $\check{c}_0$ , such that if  $\|\mathbf{a}\|_{X_{\mathbf{a}}}^2 + \|\mathbf{b}\|_{X_{\mathbf{b}}}^2 \leq \tilde{M}^2$  and

$$(4.5) \quad \Xi(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{l}) \leq m^2, \quad \Theta(\nabla \mathbf{a})\delta \leq \check{m}\check{c}_0,$$

where  $\Xi$  is defined in (4.3) and  $\Theta(\vec{v}) = \|\nabla \cdot \vec{v}\|_{L^\infty(L^3)} + \|\vec{v}\|_{L^\infty(L^\infty)}$ , then there is a unique solution  $\psi$  of (4.1a), (4.1b) in  $X_\psi$ . This solution satisfies the estimate

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in (0, T)} \mathcal{E}[\psi](t) + \int_0^T \|\nabla \psi_{ttt}(s)\|_{L^2} ds + \delta \Phi(\nabla \Delta \psi_{tt}) \\ & \leq C_{\text{lin}} \left( \|\psi_0\|_{H^4}^2 + (1 + \|\mathcal{K}\|_{L^1(0, T)}^2) \|\psi_1\|_{H^3}^2 + \delta^2 \|\mathcal{K}\|_{L^1(0, T)}^2 \|\Delta^2 \psi_1\|_{L^2}^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where  $C_{\text{lin}} = C_{\text{lin}}(\underline{\mathbf{a}}, \bar{\mathbf{a}}, \underline{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \Omega, \tilde{M}, \check{c}_0)$  does not depend on the parameter  $\delta$  nor on  $T$  (except, eventually, through  $\check{c}_0$ , see Corollary 5.2) and the functional  $\Phi$  is defined in  $(\mathbf{A}_1)$ .

*Proof.* We perform the analysis using a Galerkin semi-discretization in space [15, §7]; see [27, Sec. 3] for a uniform in  $\delta$  analysis of a linearization of classical local-in-time Westervelt and Kuznetsov equations. We focus here on the differences in the analysis needed to accommodate the nonlocal damping with a general kernel. The existence of a unique approximate solution follows by reducing the semi-discrete problem to a system of Volterra integral equations of the second kind, employing usual arguments; cf. [28]. We thus postpone these to Appendix A.

**Uniform bounds for the semi-discrete problem.** For notational simplicity, we drop the superscript  $n$  when denoting the approximate solution.

• *Testing the time-differentiated PDE with  $(-\Delta)^2 \psi_{tt}$ .* We follow the approach of [27] in terms of the general testing strategy. Setting  $p = \psi_t$ , the time-differentiated (semi-discrete) equation is

$$(4.7) \quad \mathbf{a} p_{tt} - c^2 \mathbf{b} \Delta p - \delta \int_0^t \mathcal{K}(t-s) \Delta p_t(s) ds = \tilde{f}$$

with the right-hand side

$$\tilde{f}(t) = -\nabla \mathbf{l}_t \cdot \nabla p - \nabla \mathbf{l} \cdot \nabla p_t - \mathbf{a}_t p_t - c^2 \mathbf{b}_t \Delta \psi + \delta \mathcal{K}(t) \Delta p(0).$$

We will multiply this equation with  $(-\Delta)^2 p_t$  and integrate over space and  $(0, t)$ . When integrating by parts in estimates below, we will repeatedly rely on the fact that  $p_{tt} =$

$\Delta\psi = \Delta p = \Delta p_t = 0$  on the boundary for sufficiently smooth Galerkin approximations. We first note that

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{a}p_{tt}, (-\Delta)^2 p_t)_{L^2} &= (\Delta(\mathbf{a}p_{tt}), \Delta p_t)_{L^2} \\ &= (\mathbf{a}\Delta p_{tt}, \Delta p_t)_{L^2} + (p_{tt} \Delta \mathbf{a} + 2\nabla p_{tt} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{a}, \Delta p_t)_{L^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (\mathbf{a}\Delta p_t, \Delta p_t)_{L^2} - \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{a}_t \Delta p_t, \Delta p_t)_{L^2} + (p_{tt} \Delta \mathbf{a} + 2\nabla p_{tt} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{a}, \Delta p_t)_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Additionally,

$$\begin{aligned} &-c^2 (\mathbf{b}\Delta p, (-\Delta)^2 p_t)_{L^2} \\ &= c^2 (\mathbf{b}\nabla\Delta p + \Delta p\nabla\mathbf{b}, \nabla\Delta p_t)_{L^2} \\ &= \frac{c^2}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (\mathbf{b}\nabla\Delta p, \nabla\Delta p)_{L^2} - \frac{c^2}{2} (\mathbf{b}_t \nabla\Delta p, \nabla\Delta p)_{L^2} - c^2 (\nabla\Delta p \cdot \nabla\mathbf{b} + \Delta p\Delta\mathbf{b}, \Delta p_t)_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

By the time-differentiated semi-discrete PDE (4.7), we have  $\tilde{f} = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$  and thus

$$(\tilde{f}, (-\Delta)^2 p_t)_{L^2} = (\Delta\tilde{f}, \Delta p_t)_{L^2}.$$

Testing (4.7) with  $(-\Delta)^2 p_t$  therefore yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} \|\sqrt{\mathbf{a}}\Delta p_t\|_{L^2}^2|_0^t + \frac{c^2}{2} \|\sqrt{\mathbf{b}}\nabla\Delta p\|_{L^2}^2|_0^t + \delta\Phi(\nabla\Delta p_t) \\ (4.8) \quad &\leq \int_0^t \left( \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{a}_t \Delta p_t, \Delta p_t)_{L^2} - (p_{tt} \Delta \mathbf{a} + 2\nabla p_{tt} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{a}, \Delta p_t)_{L^2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{c^2}{2} (\mathbf{b}_t \nabla\Delta p, \nabla\Delta p)_{L^2} + (c^2 \nabla\Delta p \cdot \nabla\mathbf{b} + c^2 \Delta p \Delta\mathbf{b} + \Delta\tilde{f}, \Delta p_t)_{L^2} \right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

The terms on the right-hand side of (4.8) can be estimated as follows. We first have

$$\int_0^t \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{a}_t \Delta p_t, \Delta p_t)_{L^2} ds \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{a}_t\|_{L^1(L^\infty)} \|\Delta p_t\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)}^2 \lesssim m \|\Delta p_t\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)}^2.$$

Secondly, by Hölder and Poincaré–Friedrichs as well as Young’s inequalities, and the embedding  $H^1(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^6(\Omega)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^t -(p_{tt} \Delta \mathbf{a} + \nabla p_{tt} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{a}, \Delta p_t)_{L^2} ds \\ (4.9) \quad &\lesssim (\|\Delta \mathbf{a}\|_{L^\infty(L^3)} + \|\nabla \mathbf{a}\|_{L^\infty(L^\infty)}) \left( \|\nabla p_{tt}\|_{L_t^1(L^2)}^2 + \|\Delta p_t\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)}^2 \right) \\ &\lesssim \Theta(\nabla \mathbf{a}) \left( \|\nabla p_{tt}\|_{L_t^1(L^2)}^2 + \|\Delta p_t\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Next,

$$\int_0^t \frac{c^2}{2} (\mathbf{b}_t \nabla\Delta p, \nabla\Delta p)_{L^2} ds \leq \frac{c^2}{2} \|\mathbf{b}_t\|_{L^1(L^\infty)} \|\nabla\Delta p\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)}^2 \lesssim m \|\nabla\Delta p\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)}^2.$$

Additionally,

$$\int_0^t (c^2 \nabla\Delta p \cdot \nabla\mathbf{b} + c^2 \Delta p \Delta\mathbf{b}, \Delta p_t)_{L^2} ds \leq c^2 \|\nabla\Delta p \cdot \nabla\mathbf{b} + \Delta p \Delta\mathbf{b}\|_{L^1(L^2)} \|\Delta p_t\|_{L^\infty(0,t;L^2)}.$$

The first term on the right in the above bound can be further estimated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla\Delta p \cdot \nabla\mathbf{b} + \Delta p \Delta\mathbf{b}\|_{L^1(L^2)} &\lesssim \|\nabla\Delta p\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)}\|\nabla\mathbf{b}\|_{L^1(L^\infty)} + \|\nabla\Delta p\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)}\|\Delta\mathbf{b}\|_{L^1(L^3)} \\ &\lesssim m(\|\nabla\Delta p\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)} + \|\nabla\Delta p\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)}) \end{aligned}$$

since  $\Delta p = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$ . Furthermore,

$$\int_0^t (\Delta\tilde{f}, \Delta p_t)_{L^2} ds \leq \|\Delta\tilde{f}\|_{L^1(L^2)}\|\Delta p_t\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)}.$$

To further estimate the  $\Delta\tilde{f}$  term, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\tilde{f} &= -\Delta\mathbf{a}_t p_t - 2\nabla\mathbf{a}_t \cdot \nabla p_t - \mathbf{a}_t \Delta p_t - c^2 \Delta\mathbf{b}_t \Delta\psi - 2c^2 \nabla\mathbf{b}_t \cdot \nabla\Delta\psi \\ &\quad - c^2 \mathbf{b}_t \Delta^2\psi + \Delta(-\nabla\mathfrak{l}_t \cdot \nabla p - \nabla\mathfrak{l} \cdot \nabla p_t) + \delta\mathcal{K}(s)\Delta^2 p(0). \end{aligned}$$

In addition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\Delta(-\nabla\mathfrak{l}_t \cdot \nabla p - \nabla\mathfrak{l} \cdot \nabla p_t) \\ &= -\nabla\Delta\mathfrak{l}_t \cdot \nabla p - 2D^2\mathfrak{l}_t : D^2 p - \nabla\mathfrak{l}_t \cdot \nabla\Delta p - \nabla\Delta\mathfrak{l} \cdot \nabla p_t - 2D^2\mathfrak{l} : D^2 p_t - \nabla\mathfrak{l} \cdot \nabla\Delta p_t, \end{aligned}$$

where  $D^2v = (\partial_{x_i}\partial_{x_j}v)_{ij}$  denotes the Hessian. Since the last term on the right-hand side is problematic to estimate in the  $L^1(0, t; L^2(\Omega))$  norm, given the regularity we can expect from  $\nabla\Delta p_t$  based on the left side of (4.8), we split it off in the following manner:

$$\int_0^t (\Delta\tilde{f}, \Delta p_t)_{L^2} ds \leq \|\Delta\tilde{f} + g\|_{L^1(L^2)}\|\Delta p_t\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)} + \left| \int_0^t (g, \Delta p_t)_{L^2} ds \right|,$$

where  $g = \nabla\mathfrak{l} \cdot \nabla\Delta p_t$ . Then, since  $\Delta p_t = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_0^t (g, \Delta p_t)_{L^2} ds \right| &= \frac{1}{2} \left| \int_0^t (\nabla\mathfrak{l}, \nabla(\Delta p_t)^2)_{L^2} ds \right| = \frac{1}{2} \left| \int_0^t (\Delta\mathfrak{l}, (\Delta p_t)^2)_{L^2} ds \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|\Delta\mathfrak{l}\|_{L^1(L^\infty)}\|\Delta p_t\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)}^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} m \|\Delta p_t\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

We further have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\Delta\tilde{f} + g\|_{L^1(L^2)} \\ &\lesssim \|\Delta\mathbf{a}_t\|_{L^1(L^2)}\|p_t\|_{L_t^\infty(L^\infty)} + \|\nabla\mathbf{a}_t\|_{L^1(L^3)}\|\nabla p_t\|_{L_t^\infty(L^6)} \\ &\quad + \|\mathbf{a}_t\|_{L^1(L^\infty)}\|\Delta p_t\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)} + \|\Delta\mathbf{b}_t\|_{L^1(L^2)}\|\Delta\psi\|_{L_t^\infty(L^\infty)} \\ (4.10) \quad &\quad + \|\nabla\mathbf{b}_t\|_{L^1(L^3)}\|\nabla\Delta\psi\|_{L_t^\infty(L^6)} + \|\mathbf{b}_t\|_{L^2(L^\infty)}\|\Delta^2\psi\|_{L^2(L^2)} \\ &\quad + \|\nabla\Delta\mathfrak{l}_t \cdot \nabla p\|_{L^1(L^2)} + \|\nabla\mathfrak{l}_t \cdot \nabla\Delta p\|_{L_t^1(L^2)} + \|D^2\mathfrak{l}_t : D^2 p\|_{L_t^1(L^2)} \\ &\quad + \|\nabla\Delta\mathfrak{l} \cdot \nabla p_t\|_{L_t^1(L^2)} + \|D^2\mathfrak{l} : D^2 p_t\|_{L_t^1(L^2)} + \delta\|\mathcal{K}\|_{L^1(0,t)}\|\Delta^2\psi_1\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

We next estimate the  $\mathfrak{l}$  terms above:

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\nabla\Delta\mathfrak{l}_t \cdot \nabla p\|_{L_t^1(L^2)} + \|\nabla\mathfrak{l}_t \cdot \nabla\Delta p\|_{L_t^1(L^2)} + \|\nabla\Delta\mathfrak{l} \cdot \nabla p_t\|_{L_t^1(L^2)} \\ &\lesssim \|\nabla\Delta\mathfrak{l}_t\|_{L^1(L^2)} + \|\nabla\mathfrak{l}_t\|_{L^1(L^\infty)}\|\nabla p\|_{L_t^\infty(H^2)} + \|\nabla\Delta\mathfrak{l}\|_{L^1(L^3)}\|\Delta p_t\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)} \\ &\lesssim m(\|\nabla p\|_{L_t^\infty(H^2)} + \|\Delta p_t\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)}). \end{aligned}$$

By elliptic regularity, the Hessian satisfies

$$\|D^2v\|_{L^p} \leq C_H \|\Delta v\|_{L^p} \quad \text{for all } v \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap W^{2,p}(\Omega) \quad p \in (1, 6];$$



see, e.g., [20, Theorem 2.4.2.5]. Therefore, together with the embedding  $H^1(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^6(\Omega)$  and Poincaré–Friedrichs inequality, we have the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \|D^2\mathfrak{l}_t : D^2p\|_{L^1(L^2)} &\lesssim \|D^2\mathfrak{l}_t\|_{L^1(L^3)} \|D^2p\|_{L_t^\infty(L^6)} \lesssim \|D^2\mathfrak{l}_t\|_{L^1(L^3)} \|\Delta p\|_{L_t^\infty(L^6)} \\ &\lesssim m \|\nabla \Delta p\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)} \end{aligned}$$

and, similarly,

$$\|D^2\mathfrak{l} : D^2p_t\|_{L^1(L^2)} \lesssim \|D^2\mathfrak{l}\|_{L^1(L^\infty)} \|\Delta p_t\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)} \lesssim m \|\Delta p_t\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)}.$$

Thus, so far we have

$$(4.11) \quad \int_0^t (\Delta \tilde{f}, \Delta p_t)_{L^2} ds \lesssim m \left( \|\Delta p_t\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)}^2 + \|\nabla p\|_{L_t^\infty(H^2)}^2 + \|\nabla \Delta p\|_{L_t^\infty(H^2)}^2 \right) \\ + \|\mathfrak{b}_t\|_{L^2(L^\infty)} \|\Delta^2 \psi\|_{L^2(L^2)} + \delta \|\mathcal{K}\|_{L^1(0,t)} \|\Delta^2 \psi_1\|_{L^2}.$$

• *Additional estimates if  $\mathfrak{b}_t \neq 0$ .* If  $\mathfrak{b}$  is not constant in time, we have to estimate the  $\Delta^2 \psi$  term in (4.11). To this end, we can employ the additional regularity to be achieved by estimating  $\|\Delta^2 \psi\|_{L^2(L^2)}$  via a bootstrap argument analogously to [27, p. 22]. Multiplying the identity

$$(4.12) \quad [\delta \mathcal{K} * \partial_t + \mathfrak{b} c^2] \Delta \psi = r := \mathfrak{a} p_t - \nabla \mathfrak{l} \cdot \nabla p$$

with  $\Delta^3 \psi$  and integrating by parts, due to assumption  $(\mathbf{A}_2)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} c^2 \|\sqrt{\mathfrak{b}} \Delta^2 \psi\|_{L_t^2(L^2)}^2 &\leq \int_0^t \left\{ (\Delta r, \Delta^2 \psi)_{L^2} + c^2 (\mathfrak{b} \Delta^2 \psi - \Delta [\mathfrak{b} \Delta \psi], \Delta^2 \psi)_{L^2} \right\} ds \\ &\leq \|\Delta^2 \psi\|_{L_t^2(L^2)} \left\| \Delta [\mathfrak{a} p_t - \nabla \mathfrak{l} \cdot \nabla p] - c^2 \Delta \mathfrak{b} \Delta \psi - c^2 \nabla \mathfrak{b} \nabla \Delta \psi \right\|_{L_t^2(L^2)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that  $r$  and  $\Delta^2 \psi$  vanish on the boundary. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta^2 \psi\|_{L_t^2(L^2(\Omega))} &\leq \frac{1}{c^2 \underline{\mathfrak{b}}} \left( \|\Delta \mathfrak{a}\|_{L^2(L^2)} \|\Delta p_t\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)} + \|\nabla \mathfrak{a}\|_{L^2(L^3)} \|\nabla p_t\|_{L_t^\infty(L^6)} \right. \\ &\quad + \|\mathfrak{a}\|_{L^2(L^\infty)} \|\Delta p_t\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)} + \|\Delta(\nabla \mathfrak{l} \cdot \nabla p)\|_{L_t^2(L^2)} \\ &\quad \left. + c^2 \|\Delta \mathfrak{b}\|_{L^2(L^3)} \|\Delta \psi\|_{L_t^\infty(L^6)} + c^2 \|\nabla \mathfrak{b}\|_{L^2(L^\infty)} \|\nabla \Delta \psi\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

As this term is weighted by  $c^2 \|\mathfrak{b}_t\|_{L^2(L^\infty)} \lesssim m$  in estimate (4.10), we can absorb the arising terms by relying on the smallness of  $m$ .

• *Additional estimates if  $\nabla \mathfrak{a} \neq 0$ .* If  $\mathfrak{a}$  is not constant in space (which happens in the linearized nonlocal Kuznetsov equation), it remains to estimate  $\Theta(\nabla \mathfrak{a}) \|\nabla p_{tt}\|_{L_t^2(L^2)}$  in (4.9). To this end, we use the PDE identity

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla p_{tt} &= -\frac{1}{\mathfrak{a}^2} \nabla \mathfrak{a} \left( c^2 \mathfrak{b} \Delta p + \delta \int_0^t \mathcal{K}(t-s) \Delta p_t(s) ds + \tilde{f} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\mathfrak{a}} \left( c^2 \nabla \mathfrak{b} \Delta p + c^2 \mathfrak{b} \nabla \Delta p + \delta \int_0^t \mathcal{K}(t-s) \nabla \Delta p_t(s) ds + \nabla \tilde{f} \right). \end{aligned}$$

From here, by relying on the  $m$ -assumption in (4.5), we arrive at

$$(4.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\nabla p_{tt}\|_{L^1(L^2)} &\lesssim m\|\Delta p\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)} + \delta\|\nabla \mathbf{a}\|_{L^\infty(L^\infty)}\|\mathcal{K} * \Delta p_t\|_{L^1(L^2)} \\ &\quad + \|\nabla \mathbf{a}\|_{L^\infty(L^\infty)}\|\tilde{f}\|_{L^1(L^2)} + m\|\Delta p\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)} \\ &\quad + \delta\|\mathcal{K} * \nabla \Delta p_t(s)\|_{L^1(L^2)} + \|\nabla \tilde{f}\|_{L^1(L^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

We can estimate the  $\tilde{f}$  terms further using Hölder's inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{f}\|_{L_t^1(L^2)} &\lesssim \|\nabla \tilde{f}\|_{L_t^1(L^2)} \\ &\lesssim (\|D^2 \mathfrak{t}\|_{L^1(L^3)} + \|\nabla \mathfrak{t}\|_{L^1(L^3)})\|\nabla \Delta p\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)} \\ &\quad + (\|D^2 \mathfrak{t}\|_{L^1(L^\infty)} + \|\nabla \mathfrak{t}\|_{L^1(L^\infty)})\|\Delta p_t\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)} \\ &\quad + \|\nabla \mathbf{a}_t\|_{L^1(L^2)}\|p_t\|_{L_t^\infty(H^2)} + \|\mathbf{a}_t\|_{L^1(L^\infty)}\|\nabla p_t\|_{L^\infty(L^2)} \\ &\quad + \|\nabla \mathbf{b}_t\|_{L^1(L^3)}\|\Delta \psi\|_{L^\infty(L^6)} + \|\mathbf{b}_t\|_{L^2(L^\infty)}\|\nabla \Delta \psi\|_{L^2(L^2)} + \delta\|\mathcal{K}\|_{L^1(0,t)}\|\nabla \Delta \psi_1\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

From here we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \tilde{f}\|_{L_t^1(L^2)} &\lesssim m \left\{ \|\nabla \Delta p\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)} + \|\Delta p_t\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)} + \|p_t\|_{L_t^\infty(H^2)} + \|\nabla p_t\|_{L^\infty(L^2)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|\nabla \Delta \psi\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)} + \|\nabla \Delta \psi\|_{L_t^2(L^2)} \right\} + \delta\|\mathcal{K}\|_{L^1(0,t)}\|\nabla \Delta \psi_1\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that in view of (4.9), we need an estimate of  $\Theta(\nabla \mathbf{a})\|\nabla p_{tt}\|_{L^1(L^2)}^2$ . Thus, after squaring (4.13), it remains to prove that the corresponding kernel terms can be absorbed by the left-hand side of (4.8). Here we need to rely on the factor  $\delta^2\Theta(\nabla \mathbf{a})$  in front of them. Using assumption  $(\mathbf{A}_1)$ , we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} &\delta^2\Theta(\nabla \mathbf{a}) \left( \|\nabla \mathbf{a}\|_{L^\infty(L^\infty)}^2\|\mathcal{K} * \Delta p_t\|_{L^1(L^2)}^2 + \|\mathcal{K} * \nabla \Delta p_t\|_{L^1(L^2)}^2 \right) \\ &\lesssim \Theta(\nabla \mathbf{a})\delta^2(1 + \|\nabla \mathbf{a}\|_{L^\infty(L^\infty)}^2)\|\mathcal{K} * \nabla \Delta p_t\|_{L^1(L^2)}^2 \\ &\lesssim \Theta(\nabla \mathbf{a})\frac{\delta}{\check{c}_0}\delta\Phi(\nabla \Delta p_t)(1 + \|\nabla \mathbf{a}\|_{L^\infty(L^\infty)}^2) \\ &\lesssim \Theta(\nabla \mathbf{a})\check{m}\delta\Phi(\nabla \Delta p_t)(1 + \|\nabla \mathbf{a}\|_{L^\infty(L^\infty)}^2). \end{aligned}$$

In the last line, we have relied on assumption (4.5); that is,  $\Theta(\nabla \mathbf{a})\frac{\delta}{\check{c}_0} \leq \check{m}$ . With a sufficiently small constant  $\check{m}$ , this term can be dominated by the  $\delta$  term on the left-hand side of (4.8).

Combining the derived bounds for sufficiently small  $m$  and  $\check{m}$  in (4.3), (4.5) allows us to absorb all right-hand side terms except for the initial time ones into the left-hand side of (4.8) and thus leads to (4.6), at first for the semi-discrete solution. Note that, to absorb the  $L^\infty(0, t)$  terms on the right-hand side even though the left-hand side only contains the energy value  $\frac{1}{2}\|\sqrt{\mathbf{a}}\Delta p_t(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{c^2}{2}\|\sqrt{\mathbf{b}}\nabla \Delta p(t)\|_{L^2}^2$  at a single time instance, we first need to take the essential supremum on both sides of (4.8).

We note that we have not relied on Gronwall's inequality and thus we have avoided the exponential dependence of the constant on the final time  $T$ .

• *Passing to the limit.* The bound transfers to the continuous setting through standard weak compactness arguments, analogously to [27, Proposition 3.1] so we omit these details

here. Concerning limits in the  $\Phi$  term, we can rely on the fact that

$$\|\psi\|^2 := \sup_{t \in (0, T)} \Phi(\nabla \Delta \psi_{tt}) + \|\psi\|_{L^2(0, T; H^3(\Omega))}^2$$

defines a Hilbert space norm and therefore weak compactness of bounded sets in this norm as well as weak lower semicontinuity of  $\|\cdot\|$  can be used.

We note that the initial conditions  $\psi_0$  and  $\psi_1$  are satisfied as equalities in  $C_w(0, T; H_\diamond^4(\Omega))$  and  $C_w([0, T]; H_\diamond^3(\Omega))$ , respectively.  $\square$

**Remark 7** (Higher regularity). *Some additional regularity can be obtained from the damping term if  $\delta > 0$  and the kernel exhibits some singularity that renders the memory term of (fractional) derivative type. Indeed, we have*

$$\delta(\mathcal{K} * \Delta \psi_t)(t) = \bar{f}(t) := \mathbf{a}\psi_{tt} - c^2 \mathbf{b} \Delta \psi + \nabla \mathbf{l} \cdot \nabla \psi_t.$$

From here,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{f}\|_{L^\infty(H^2)} &\lesssim \|\mathbf{a}\psi_{tt}\|_{L^\infty(H^2)} + \|\mathbf{b}\Delta\psi\|_{L^\infty(H^2)} + \|\nabla \mathbf{l} \cdot \nabla \psi_t\|_{L^\infty(H^2)} \\ &\lesssim \|\mathbf{a}\|_{L^\infty(H^2)} \|\psi_{tt}\|_{L^\infty(H^2)} + \|\mathbf{b}\|_{L^\infty(H^2)} \|\Delta\psi\|_{L^\infty(H^2)} \\ &\quad + \|\nabla \mathbf{l}\|_{L^\infty(H^2)} \|\nabla \psi_t\|_{L^\infty(H^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

If now  $\mathcal{K} \sim t^{-\beta}$  for some  $\beta \in (0, 1)$  as  $t \searrow 0$  with  $\mathcal{K}^\beta(t) := \mathcal{K}(t)t^\beta$  satisfying  $\mathcal{K}^\beta(0) \neq 0$ ,  $\mathcal{K}^\beta \in C[0, T] \cap W^{1, \infty}(0, T)$ , then from, e.g., [18, Theorem 1], we can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \|\psi\|_{H^\beta(0, T; H^4(\Omega))} &\lesssim \delta \|\mathcal{K} * \Delta \psi_t\|_{L^2(0, T; H^2(\Omega))} \lesssim \|\bar{f}\|_{L^2(H^2)} \\ &\lesssim \sqrt{T} (\|\mathbf{a}\|_{X_a} + \|\mathbf{b}\|_{X_b} + \|\mathbf{l}\|_{X_l}) \|\psi\|_{X_\psi}. \end{aligned}$$

Alternatively, if the kernel  $\mathcal{K} \in W^{1, 1}(0, T) \hookrightarrow C[0, T]$ , one may reduce the regularity assumption on  $\psi_1$  and only require it be in  $H_\diamond^3(\Omega)$ . This is, for example, the case with the exponential kernel in (2.2). To show this, notice that the culprit for the high regularity requirement is the term

$$\int_0^t (\mathcal{K}(s) \Delta^2 p(0), \Delta p_t) \, ds,$$

which can be rewritten as

$$\int_0^t (\mathcal{K}_t(s) \nabla \Delta p(0), \nabla \Delta p) \, ds - (\mathcal{K}(s) \nabla \Delta p(0), \nabla \Delta p(s)) \Big|_0^t.$$

**4.1. A lower-order estimate.** For the upcoming nonlinear analysis, it is helpful to also have a uniform lower-order bound for the solution of (4.1). This will allow us to impose the smallness assumption on the initial data in the nonlinear analysis in the  $H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$  topology. Under assumptions of Proposition 4.1, testing (4.1) with  $\psi_t$  and integrating over space and time yields, after usual manipulations,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} \left\{ \|\sqrt{\mathbf{a}(t)} \psi_t(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + c^2 \|\sqrt{\mathbf{b}} \nabla \psi(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \right\} \Big|_0^t + \delta \Phi(\nabla \Delta \psi_t) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{a}_t\|_{L^1(L^\infty)} \|\psi_t\|_{L^\infty(0, t; L^2)}^2 - c^2 \int_0^t (\psi \nabla \mathbf{b}, \nabla \psi_t)_{L^2} \, ds \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} c^2 \|\mathbf{b}_t\|_{L^\infty(L^\infty)} \|\nabla \psi\|_{L^2(0, t; L^2)}^2 - \int_0^t (\nabla \mathbf{l} \cdot \nabla \psi_t, \psi_t) \, ds. \end{aligned}$$

To bound the last term on the right, since  $\psi_t = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$ , we can rely on

$$\left| \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} (\nabla \mathbf{l} \cdot \nabla \psi_t) \psi_t \, dx ds \right| = \frac{1}{2} \left| \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} (-\Delta \mathbf{l}) \psi_t \psi_t \, dx ds \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\Delta \mathbf{l}\|_{L^1(L^\infty)} \|\psi_t\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)}^2.$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} & -c^2 \int_0^t (\psi \nabla \mathbf{b}, \nabla \psi_t)_{L^2} \, ds \\ &= -c^2 (\psi \nabla \mathbf{b}, \nabla \psi)_{L^2} \Big|_0^t + c^2 \int_0^t (\psi_t \nabla \mathbf{b}, \nabla \psi)_{L^2} \, ds + c^2 \int_0^t (\psi \nabla \mathbf{b}_t, \nabla \psi)_{L^2} \, ds \\ &\leq 2c^2 \|\psi\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)} \|\nabla \mathbf{b}\|_{L^\infty(L^\infty)} \|\nabla \psi\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)} + c^2 \|\psi_t\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)} \|\nabla \mathbf{b}\|_{L^1(L^\infty)} \|\nabla \psi\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)} \\ &\quad + c^2 \|\psi\|_{L_t^\infty(L^6)} \|\nabla \mathbf{b}_t\|_{L^1(L^3)} \|\nabla \psi\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, utilizing the above estimates and employing the Poincaré–Friedrichs and Young’s inequalities as well as the smallness of  $\Xi(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{l})$  according to condition (4.5), leads to

$$(4.14) \quad \|\psi\|_{\mathbb{E}}^2 \lesssim \|\psi_0\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\psi_1\|_{L^2}^2,$$

where the energy norm is given by

$$(4.15) \quad \|\psi\|_{\mathbb{E}}^2 = \sup_{t \in (0, T)} \|\psi_t(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \sup_{t \in (0, T)} \|\nabla \psi(t)\|_{L^2}^2.$$

## 5. UNIFORM EXISTENCE AND LIMITING BEHAVIOR OF NONLINEAR MODELS FOR THE VANISHING DAMPING PARAMETER

We next introduce the mapping

$$\mathcal{T} : \phi \mapsto \psi,$$

where  $\phi$  will belong to a ball in the space  $X_\psi$ , defined in (4.4), and  $\psi$  will solve the linearized problem (4.1) with

$$\mathbf{a} = 1 + 2\tilde{k}_1 \phi_t, \quad \mathbf{b} = 1 - 2\tilde{k}_2 \phi_t, \quad \mathbf{l} = 2\ell \phi,$$

and initial data  $(\psi(0), \psi_t(0)) = (\phi(0), \phi_t(0)) = (\psi_0, \psi_1)$ . To obtain the well-posedness of the nonlinear problem, we need to assume smallness of data; note, however, that the smallness condition can be imposed in a lower-order topology; namely,  $H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$ .

**Theorem 5.1.** *Let  $\tilde{k}_1, \tilde{k}_2, \ell \in \mathbb{R}$ . Furthermore, let*

$$\|\psi_0\|_{H^4}^2 + \|\psi_1\|_{H^4}^2 \leq r^2.$$

*Given  $T > 0$ , let  $\mathcal{K} \in L^1(0, T)$  and let the following assumptions on  $\mathcal{K}$  hold:*

- (a) *if  $\tilde{k}_1 \neq 0$ , we assume  $(\mathbf{A}_1)$  holds with the coercivity constant  $\check{c}_0 > 0$ ;*
- (b) *if  $\tilde{k}_1 = 0$ , we assume  $(\mathbf{A}_1)$  holds with  $\check{c}_0 = 0$  (that is,  $(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_1)$ );*
- (c) *if  $\tilde{k}_2 \neq 0$ , we assume  $(\mathbf{A}_2)$  holds.*

*There exist  $\bar{\delta} = \bar{\delta}(r)$  (with  $\tilde{k}_1 \bar{\delta}(r)$  small enough),  $\tilde{r} = \tilde{r}(r) > 0$  and final time  $\tilde{T} = \tilde{T}(r) \leq T$ , independent of  $\delta$ , such that if  $\delta \in [0, \bar{\delta})$  and*

$$(5.1) \quad \|\psi_0\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\psi_1\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \tilde{r}^2,$$

then there is a unique solution  $\psi \in X_\psi$  of

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{aligned} & (1 + 2\tilde{k}_1\psi_t)\psi_{tt} - c^2(1 - 2\tilde{k}_2\psi_t)\Delta\psi \\ & - \delta \int_0^t \mathcal{K}(t-s)\Delta\psi_t(s) \, ds + \tilde{\ell}\partial_t|\nabla\psi|^2 = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (0, \tilde{T}), \end{aligned}$$

with boundary and initial conditions (4.1b), which satisfies the following estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in (0, \tilde{T})} \mathcal{E}[\psi](t) + \int_0^{\tilde{T}} \|\nabla\psi_{ttt}(s)\|_{L^2} \, ds + \delta\Phi(\nabla\Delta\psi_{tt}) \\ & \leq C_{\text{nonlin}} \left( \|\psi_0\|_{H^4}^2 + (1 + \|\mathcal{K}\|_{L^1(0, T)}^2)\|\psi_1\|_{H^3}^2 + \delta^2\|\mathcal{K}\|_{L^1(0, T)}^2\|\Delta^2\psi_1\|_{L^2}^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where  $C_{\text{nonlin}} = C_{\text{nonlin}}(\Omega, \check{c}_0, \tilde{T})$  does not depend on the parameter  $\delta$ , and the functional  $\Phi$  is defined in  $(\mathbf{A}_1)$ .

*Proof.* The proof follows in the general spirit of the proof of [27, Theorem 6.1], which considers uniform in  $\delta$  analysis in a local-in-time setting. The mapping  $\mathcal{T} : \phi \mapsto \psi$  is introduced on

$$(5.3) \quad \mathcal{B} = \left\{ \begin{aligned} & \phi \in X_\psi : \phi(0) = \psi_0, \phi_t(0) = \psi_1, \Xi(1 + 2\tilde{k}_1\phi_t, 1 - 2\tilde{k}_2\phi_t, 2l\phi) \leq m^2, \\ & \Theta(2\tilde{k}_1\nabla\phi_t)\delta \leq \check{m}\check{c}_0, 4k\|\phi_t\|_{L^\infty(L^\infty)} \leq 1, \|\phi\|_{X_\psi} \leq R \end{aligned} \right\},$$

where  $k = \max\{|\tilde{k}_1|, |\tilde{k}_2|\}$ . The radius  $R > 0$  large enough as well as  $m > 0$  and  $\check{m} > 0$  small enough will be determined in the course of the proof. Note that the set  $\mathcal{B}$  is non-empty as the solution of the linear problem with  $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{l} = 1$  belongs to it if  $R$  is sufficiently large.

We first check that the assumptions of Proposition 4.1 are satisfied. It is clear that  $\mathbf{a} \in X_{\mathbf{a}}$ ,  $\mathbf{b} \in X_{\mathbf{b}}$ , and  $\mathbf{l} \in X_{\mathbf{l}}$  if we take  $\phi$  to be in  $\mathcal{B}$ . Furthermore, since  $4k\|\phi_t\|_{L^\infty(L^\infty)} \leq 1$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{2} = \underline{\mathbf{a}} \leq \mathbf{a} \leq \bar{\mathbf{a}} = \frac{3}{2}, \quad \frac{1}{2} = \underline{\mathbf{b}} \leq \mathbf{b} \leq \bar{\mathbf{b}} = \frac{3}{2}$$

and the non-degeneracy conditions in (4.2) are fulfilled. We also have the bound

$$\|\mathbf{a}\|_{X_{\mathbf{a}}}^2 + \|\mathbf{b}\|_{X_{\mathbf{b}}}^2 \leq C_1 + C_2R^2.$$

Conditions in (4.5) follow for  $\phi \in \mathcal{B}$  if we choose  $m$  and  $\check{m}$  relative to  $\tilde{M} := C_1 + C_2R^2$ ,  $\underline{\mathbf{a}}$ , and  $\underline{\mathbf{b}}$ , according to the assumptions of Proposition 4.1 .

• *The self-mapping property.* Applying Proposition 4.1 will allow us to prove that  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{B}) \subset \mathcal{B}$ . Indeed, employing this result to  $\psi = \mathcal{T}(\phi)$  yields

$$\|\psi\|_{X_\psi}^2 \leq C_{\text{lin}} \left( \|\psi_0\|_{H^4}^2 + (1 + \|\mathcal{K}\|_{L^1(0, T)}^2)\|\psi_1\|_{H^3}^2 + \delta^2\|\mathcal{K}\|_{L^1(0, T)}^2\|\Delta^2\psi_1\|_{L^2}^2 \right),$$

Provided that  $R$  is chosen large enough so that

$$C_{\text{lin}}(T)(\|\psi_0\|_{H^4}^2 + (1 + \|\mathcal{K}\|_{L^1(0, T)}^2)\|\psi_1\|_{H^3}^2 + \delta^2\|\mathcal{K}\|_{L^1(0, T)}^2\|\Delta^2\psi_1\|_{L^2}^2) \leq R^2,$$

the solution  $\psi$  satisfies the  $R$  bound in (5.3). Next, we have

$$\Xi(1 + 2\tilde{k}_1\psi_t, 1 - 2\tilde{k}_2\psi_t, 2l\psi) \leq C(\Omega)(T + T^2)R^2 + C(\Omega)RT,$$

thus, the condition will be fulfilled if we choose the final time  $T > 0$  small enough so that

$$C(\Omega)(T + T^2)R^2 + C(\Omega)RT \leq m^2(R).$$

Further, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta(2\tilde{k}_1 \nabla \psi_t) \delta &\leq C\tilde{k}_1 \|\psi\|_{X_\psi} \bar{\delta} \\ &\leq C\tilde{k}_1 C_{\text{lin}}(T) (\|\psi_0\|_{H^4}^2 + (1 + \|\mathcal{K}\|_{L^1(0,T)}^2) \|\psi_1\|_{H^3}^2 + \bar{\delta}^2 \|\mathcal{K}\|_{L^1(0,t)}^2 \|\Delta^2 \psi_1\|_{L^2}^2) \bar{\delta} \\ &\leq \check{m}(R) \check{c}_0, \end{aligned}$$

where for the last inequality to hold, we have relied on the assumption of smallness of  $\tilde{k}_1 \bar{\delta}$ .

To prove the self-mapping property, it remains to show that the  $1/(4k)$  bound in (5.3) holds. To this end, we will rely on Agmon's interpolation inequality [1, Ch. 13]:

$$\|\psi_t(t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C_A \|\psi_t(t)\|_{L^2}^{n/4} \|\psi_t(t)\|_{H^2}^{1-n/4}.$$

combined with the lower-order estimate (4.14) for the linearized problem. This approach yields

$$(5.4) \quad \|\psi_t\|_{L^\infty(L^\infty)} \leq C_A \{C_3(1+r)(\|\psi_0\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\psi_1\|_{L^2}^2)\}^{n/8} R^{1-n/4}.$$

We choose  $\tilde{r} > 0$  in (5.1) small enough, so that

$$4kC_A C_3(1+r)^{n/8} \tilde{r}^{n/4} R^{1-n/4} \leq 1.$$

In other words, we assume

$$4k\tilde{r}^{n/4} \leq \left\{ C_A C_3(1+r)^{n/8} R^{1-n/4} \right\}^{-1},$$

which via (5.4) implies  $4k\|\psi_t\|_{L^\infty(L^\infty)} \leq 1$ . Altogether, we conclude that  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{B}) \subset \mathcal{B}$ .

• *Contractivity.* We next prove that  $\mathcal{T}$  is strictly contractive with respect to the energy norm (4.15). Take  $\phi^{(1)}$  and  $\phi^{(2)}$  in  $\mathcal{B}$ , and denote their difference by  $\bar{\phi} = \phi^{(1)} - \phi^{(2)}$ . Let  $\psi^{(1)} = \mathcal{T}(\phi^{(1)})$  and  $\psi^{(2)} = \mathcal{T}(\phi^{(2)})$ . Their difference  $\bar{\psi} = \psi^{(1)} - \psi^{(2)} \in \mathcal{B}$  then solves

$$\begin{aligned} (1 + 2\tilde{k}_1 \phi_t^{(1)}) \bar{\psi}_{tt} - c^2(1 - 2\tilde{k}_2 \phi_t^{(1)}) \Delta \bar{\psi} - \delta \mathcal{K} * \Delta \bar{\psi}_t + 2\ell \nabla \phi^{(1)} \cdot \nabla \bar{\psi}_t \\ = -2\tilde{k}_1 \bar{\phi}_t \psi_{tt}^{(2)} - 2c^2 \tilde{k}_2 \bar{\phi}_t \Delta \psi^{(2)} - 2\ell \nabla \bar{\phi} \cdot \nabla \psi_t^{(2)}, \end{aligned}$$

with zero initial and boundary data. We will next test this equation with  $\bar{\psi}_t$  and integrate over space and time. As we are in a similar setting to when deriving the lower-order bound in Section 4.1 with now

$$\mathbf{a} = 1 + 2\tilde{k}_1 \phi_t^{(1)}, \quad \mathbf{b} = 1 - 2\tilde{k}_2 \phi_t^{(1)}$$

and a non-zero source term, we only discuss how to estimate the terms resulting from the right-hand side contributions. The resulting  $\tilde{k}_1$  term can be estimated as follows:

$$\left| -2\tilde{k}_1 \int_0^t \int_\Omega \bar{\phi}_t \psi_{tt}^{(2)} \bar{\psi}_t \, dx ds \right| \lesssim \|\psi_{tt}^{(2)}\|_{L^1(L^\infty)} (\|\bar{\psi}_t\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)}^2 + \|\bar{\phi}_t\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)}^2).$$

We can estimate the  $\tilde{k}_2$  and  $\ell$  terms similarly:

$$\left| -2c^2 \tilde{k}_2 \int_0^t \int_\Omega \bar{\phi}_t \Delta \psi^{(2)} \bar{\psi}_t \, dx ds \right| \lesssim \|\Delta \psi^{(2)}\|_{L^1(L^\infty)} (\|\bar{\psi}_t\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)}^2 + \|\bar{\phi}_t\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)}^2),$$

$$\left| -2\ell \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} \nabla \bar{\phi} \cdot \nabla \psi_t^{(2)} \bar{\psi}_t \, dx ds \right| \lesssim \|\nabla \psi_t^{(2)}\|_{L^1(L^\infty)} (\|\bar{\psi}_t\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)}^2 + \|\nabla \bar{\phi}\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)}^2).$$

Thus using  $\|\psi^{(1),(2)}\|_{X_\psi}$ ,  $\|\phi^{(1),(2)}\|_{X_\psi} \leq R$ , and otherwise proceeding as in Section 4.1, we obtain

$$\|\psi\|_{\mathbb{E}}^2 \lesssim C(\Omega)TR (\|\psi\|_{\mathbb{E}}^2 + \|\phi\|_{\mathbb{E}}^2).$$

Therefore by reducing  $T$  if needed (independently of  $\delta$ ), we can absorb the energy term  $\|\psi\|_{\mathbb{E}}^2$  on the right-hand-side of the inequality and ensure that the mapping  $\mathcal{T}$  is strictly contractive with respect to the energy norm (4.15). The arguments showing that  $\mathcal{B}$  is closed with respect to this norm are analogous to those of [27, Theorem 4.1]. By the Banach fixed-point theorem, we therefore obtain a unique fixed-point  $\psi = \mathcal{T}(\psi)$  in  $\mathcal{B}$ , which solves (5.2).  $\square$

Having in mind particular kernels arising in nonlocal flux laws discussed in Section 2, we arrive at the following statement.

**Corollary 5.2.** *Given  $\bar{\tau} > 0$ , under the assumptions of Theorem 5.1, there exist  $\tilde{r} = \tilde{r}(r) > 0$  and a final time  $\tilde{T} = \tilde{T}(r) \leq T$ , such that if (5.1) holds, then there exists a unique solution  $\psi \in X_\psi$  of (5.2) with boundary and initial conditions (4.1b), where*

- (a)  $\mathcal{K}$  is defined by (2.2), GPL I, GPL III, or GPL if  $\tilde{k}_1 \neq 0$ ,
- (b)  $\mathcal{K}$  is defined by (2.1), (2.2), GPL I, GPL II, GPL III, or GPL if  $\tilde{k}_1 = 0$

with  $\tau \in (0, \bar{\tau}]$  and  $\psi$  satisfies estimate (4.6).

We note that as a by-product of the previous analysis, we obtain the local well-posedness of the following quasilinear acoustic equation by setting  $\delta = 0$ :

$$(1 + 2\tilde{k}_1\psi_t)\psi_{tt} - c^2(1 - 2\tilde{k}_2\psi_t)\Delta\psi + \tilde{\ell}\partial_t|\nabla\psi|^2 = 0$$

as well as the following fractionally damped nonlinear equation:

$$\psi_{tt} - c^2(1 - 2\tilde{k}_2\psi_t)\Delta\psi - \delta\tau_\theta^{-\alpha}\Delta D_t^{1-\alpha}\psi + \tilde{\ell}\partial_t|\nabla\psi|^2 = 0, \quad \alpha \in (0, 1)$$

with boundary and initial conditions (4.1b).

**5.1. The inviscid limit of nonlinear models.** We next wish to establish the convergence rate for solutions of (5.2) as  $\delta \searrow 0$ .

**Theorem 5.3.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 5.1, the family of solutions  $\{\psi^{(\delta)}\}_{\delta \in [0, \bar{\delta})}$  of (5.2), (4.1b) converges in the energy norm to the solution  $\psi$  of the inviscid problem ( $\delta = 0$ ) at a linear rate. In other words,*

$$(5.5) \quad \|\psi^{(\delta)} - \psi\|_{\mathbb{E}} \lesssim \delta \quad \text{as } \delta \searrow 0,$$

with  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{E}}$  defined in (4.15) with  $T = \tilde{T}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\delta, \delta' \in [0, \bar{\delta})$  with the bound  $\bar{\delta}$  determined by Theorem 5.1. The difference  $\bar{\psi} = \psi^{(\delta)} - \psi^{(\delta')}$  solves the equation

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 + 2\tilde{k}_1\psi_t^{(\delta)})\bar{\psi}_{tt} - c^2(1 - 2\tilde{k}_2\psi_t^{(\delta)})\Delta\bar{\psi} - \delta\mathcal{K} * \Delta\bar{\psi}_t \\ & + 2\tilde{k}_1\bar{\psi}_t\psi_{tt}^{(\delta')} + 2c^2\tilde{k}_2\bar{\psi}_t\Delta\psi^{(\delta')} + 2\ell\nabla\psi^{(\delta)} \cdot \nabla\bar{\psi}_t + 2\ell\nabla\bar{\psi} \cdot \nabla\psi_t^{(\delta')} \\ & = (\delta - \delta')\mathcal{K} * \Delta\psi_t^{(\delta')}, \end{aligned}$$

and has zero initial and boundary conditions. We next test this equation with  $\bar{\psi}_t$  and proceed similarly to the proof of contractivity with now

$$\mathbf{a}(t) = 1 + 2\tilde{k}_1\psi_t^{(\delta)}, \quad \mathbf{b} = 1 - 2\tilde{k}_2\psi_t^{(\delta)}.$$

The new convolution term can be estimated using Young's convolution inequality:

$$(5.6) \quad \left| (\delta - \delta') \int_0^t (\mathcal{K} * \Delta\psi_t^{(\delta')}, \bar{\psi}_t)_{L^2} ds \right| \\ \leq |\delta - \delta'| \|\mathcal{K}\|_{L^1(0,T)} \|\Delta\psi_t^{(\delta')}\|_{L^1(L^2)} \|\bar{\psi}_t\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)}.$$

Thus, employing this bound and otherwise proceeding similarly to the proof of contractivity in Theorem 5.1, leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \underline{\mathbf{a}} \sup_{\sigma \in (0,t)} \|\bar{\psi}_t(\sigma)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{c^2}{2} \underline{\mathbf{b}} \sup_{\sigma \in (0,t)} \|\nabla \bar{\psi}(\sigma)\|_{L^2}^2 + \delta \Phi(\nabla \bar{\psi}_t) \\ & \lesssim \left( \|\psi_{tt}^{(\delta)}\|_{L^1(L^\infty)} + \|\psi_{tt}^{(\delta')}\|_{L^1(L^\infty)} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|\Delta\psi^{(\delta)}\|_{L^1(L^\infty)} + \|\Delta\psi^{(\delta')}\|_{L^1(L^\infty)} + \|\Delta\psi_t^{(\delta')}\|_{L^1(0,t;L^2)} \right) \|\bar{\psi}_t\|_{L^\infty(0,t;L^2)}^2 \\ & \quad + \left( \|\nabla\psi_t^{(\delta)}\|_{L^1(L^\infty)} + \|\psi_{tt}^{(\delta')}\|_{L^1(L^\infty)} \right) \|\nabla \bar{\psi}\|_{L^\infty(0,t;L^2)}^2 \\ & \quad + (\delta - \delta')^2 \|\mathcal{K}\|_{L^1(0,T)}^2 \|\Delta\psi_t^{(\delta')}\|_{L^1(L^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

In the proof of Theorem 5.1 we have shown that  $\psi^{(\delta)}, \psi^{(\delta')} \in \mathcal{B}$  as defined in (5.3). Therefore, we can use the properties of  $\mathcal{B}$  to get the following estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \underline{\mathbf{a}} \sup_{\sigma \in (0,t)} \|\bar{\psi}_t(\sigma)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{c^2}{2} \underline{\mathbf{b}} \sup_{\sigma \in (0,t)} \|\nabla \bar{\psi}(\sigma)\|_{L^2}^2 + \delta \Phi(\nabla \bar{\psi}_t) \\ & \lesssim C(\Omega)TR \left( \|\bar{\psi}_t\|_{L^\infty(0,t;L^2)}^2 + \|\nabla \bar{\psi}\|_{L^\infty(0,t;L^2)}^2 \right) + TR(\delta - \delta')^2 \|\mathcal{K}\|_{L^1(0,T)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

Thus by reducing the final time  $T$  if needed (independently of  $\delta$ ), we can absorb the energy term on the right-hand-side of the inequality. Setting  $\delta' = 0$  leads to the desired estimate.  $\square$

With particular kernels appearing in the nonlocal flux laws discussed in Section 2, we have the following statement.

**Corollary 5.4.** *Under the assumptions of Corollary 5.2, with*

(a)  $\mathcal{K}$  defined by laws (2.2), GPL I, GPL III, or GPL if  $\tilde{k}_1 \neq 0$ ;

(b)  $\mathcal{K}$  defined by laws (2.1), (2.2), GPL I, GPL II, GPL III, or GPL if  $\tilde{k}_1 = 0$ ,

the family of solutions  $\{\psi^{(\delta)}\}_{\delta \in [0, \bar{\delta}]}$  of (5.2) with boundary and initial conditions (4.1b), converges in the energy norm to a solution  $\psi$  of the inviscid problem ( $\delta = 0$ ) at a linear rate (5.5).

## 6. THE VANISHING RELAXATION TIME LIMIT

While the parameter  $\delta$  whose limiting behavior we have investigated in the previous section, appears as a factor of the memory/damping term in our general model, the particular examples (2.2), GPL I, GPL II, GPL III, and GPL also exhibit dependence of another parameter, the relaxation time  $\tau$ , due to the fact that their kernels depend on  $\tau$  (while being



independent of  $\delta$ ). It is this  $\tau$  dependence and in particular, the limit  $\tau \searrow 0$  for fixed positive  $\delta > 0$  that we wish to study now.

We indicate dependence of the above-mentioned kernels on the relaxation time  $\tau$  by a subscript  $\mathcal{K}_\tau$  and consider convergence as  $\tau \searrow 0$  of solutions  $\psi^{(\tau)}$  of

$$(6.1) \quad \begin{aligned} & (1 + 2\tilde{k}_1\psi_t^{(\tau)})\psi_{tt}^{(\tau)} - c^2(1 - 2\tilde{k}_2\psi_t^{(\tau)})\Delta\psi^{(\tau)} \\ & - \delta \int_0^t \mathcal{K}_\tau(t-s)\Delta\psi_t^{(\tau)}(s) \, ds + \tilde{\ell}\partial_t|\nabla\psi^{(\tau)}|^2 = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \end{aligned}$$

with boundary and initial conditions (4.1b). We consider the following  $\tau$ -dependent kernels:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_\tau(t) &= \left(\frac{\tau\theta}{\tau}\right)^{a-b} \frac{1}{\tau^b} t^{b-1} E_{a,b} \left( - \left(\frac{t}{\tau}\right)^a \right), \\ \mathcal{L}\mathcal{K}_\tau(z) &= \left(\frac{\tau\theta}{\tau}\right)^{a-b} \frac{(\tau z)^{a-b}}{(\tau z)^a + 1} \rightarrow (\tau\theta z)^{a-b} \text{ as } \tau \searrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

with parameters  $a$  and  $b$  given in Table 3.

**6.1. Necessity of uniform  $L^1$ -bounds.** In the upcoming proofs of Theorems 6.1 and 6.2, we will rely on the uniform boundedness of  $\|\mathcal{K}_\tau\|_{L^1(0,T)}$  as  $\tau \searrow 0$ . Following the idea of Remark 2, but no longer assuming  $\tau\theta/\tau$  to be constant, we obtain

$$\|\mathcal{K}_\tau\|_{L^1(0,T)} = \left(\frac{\tau\theta}{\tau}\right)^{a-b} \|\mathcal{K}_1\|_{L^1(0,T/\tau)},$$

given  $T > 0$ .

An important thing to notice is that if  $a - b > 0$  (case of GPL I and GPL III) and  $\tau\theta > 0$  fixed, then inevitably

$$\|\mathcal{K}_\tau\|_{L^1(0,T)} \rightarrow +\infty \text{ as } \tau \searrow 0$$

(except in the trivial case  $\mathcal{K}_1 = 0$  a.e.). This means we would fail to obtain a uniform bound on  $\|\mathcal{K}_\tau\|_{L^1(0,T)}$  for any  $T > 0$ .

If  $a - b = 0$  (case of exponential kernel (2.2) and GPL) or if the ratio  $\frac{\tau\theta}{\tau}$  is forced to be constant then

$$\|\mathcal{K}_\tau\|_{L^1(0,T)} = C\|\mathcal{K}_1\|_{L^1(0,T/\tau)},$$

where  $C$  is a constant. In particular, as  $\tau \searrow 0$ , we need to require  $\mathcal{K}_1 \in L^1(0, \infty)$  (implying through Remark 2 that we would also have  $\mathcal{K}_\tau \in L^1(0, \infty)$ ).

Interestingly, if  $a - b < 0$  (e.g., law GPL II) and  $\tau\theta$  is fixed, we do not necessarily need  $\mathcal{K}_1 \in L^1(0, \infty)$ . Instead,  $(\frac{1}{\tau})^{a-b}$  is used to “compensate” for  $\|\mathcal{K}_1\|_{L^1(0,T/\tau)}$  as  $\tau \searrow 0$ .

The uniform  $L^1(0, T)$  estimate is satisfied for laws (2.2), GPL, and GPL II, where

$$\mathcal{K}_1(t) = t^{b-1} E_{a,b}(-t^a),$$

which can be seen as follows. In case of laws GPL and GPL II with  $b \geq a$ , the Mittag-Leffler function is completely monotone and therefore, in particular, nonnegative. Moreover, we have the identity

$$t^{b-1} E_{a,b}(-t^a) = \frac{d}{dt} \left( t^b E_{a,b+1}(-t^a) \right),$$

which for  $b > 0$  implies

$$\|\mathcal{K}_1\|_{L^1(0,r)} = \int_0^r \frac{d}{dt} \left( t^b E_{a,b+1}(-t^a) \right) dt = r^b E_{a,b+1}(-r^a).$$

With the Laplace transform

$$\mathcal{L}(t^b E_{a,b+1}(-t^a))(s) = \frac{s^{a-b-1}}{1+s^a} \sim s^{a-b-1} \text{ as } s \rightarrow 0.$$

By a Tauberian Theorem, we obtain

$$t^b E_{a,b+1}(-t^a) \sim \frac{1}{\Gamma(b+1-a)} t^{b-a} \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

This implies that  $\|\mathcal{K}_1\|_{L^1(0,\infty)}$  is finite for GPL (with  $a = b$ ) but infinite for GPL II (with  $a < b$ ). However, note that for  $\tau_\theta$  fixed, we are able to obtain uniform  $L^1(0, T)$  estimates for GPL II on account of

$$\|\mathcal{K}_\tau\|_{L^1(0,T)} = \left(\frac{\tau_\theta}{\tau}\right)^{a-b} \|\mathcal{K}_1\|_{L^1(0,T/\tau)} \sim \frac{1}{\Gamma(b+1-a)} \left(\frac{T}{\tau_\theta}\right)^{b-a} \text{ as } \tau \searrow 0.$$

In case of laws GPL I and GPL III with  $a > b$ , we can make direct use of the asymptotics

$$E_{a,b}(-x) \sim \frac{1}{\Gamma(b-a)x} \text{ as } x \rightarrow \infty$$

see, e.g., [17, equation (56)], from which we conclude

$$\mathcal{K}_1 \sim \frac{1}{\Gamma(b-a)} t^{b-1-a} \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

Thus,  $\|\mathcal{K}_1\|_{L^1(0,\infty)} < \infty$ .

As a consequence, we will treat the cases

- laws (2.2), GPL, and GPL II (that is,  $a - b \leq 0$ ) with  $\tau \searrow 0$ ,  $\tau_\theta > 0$  fixed;
- laws GPL I, GPL III (that is,  $a - b > 0$ ) with  $\tau \searrow 0$ ,  $\frac{\tau_\theta}{\tau} =: \rho > 0$  fixed

separately in Sections 6.2 and 6.3.

**6.2. Limiting behavior of equations based on laws (2.2), GPL, and GPL II.** In what follows and in Theorem 6.1, we take the limit  $\tau \searrow 0$ , while keeping  $\tau_\theta > 0$  fixed.

Solutions  $\psi^{(\tau)}$  of (6.1), (4.1b) formally converge to a solution of the zero relaxation time problem ( $\tau = 0$ ). The limiting problem is given by the fractional Kuznetsov equation

$$(6.2) \quad \begin{aligned} (1 + 2\tilde{k}_1\psi_t)\psi_{tt} - c^2(1 - 2\tilde{k}_2\psi_t)\Delta\psi \\ - \delta\tau_\theta^{a-b} D_t^{a-b+1}\Delta\psi + \tilde{\ell}\partial_t|\nabla\psi|^2 = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \end{aligned}$$

supplemented by the boundary and initial conditions (4.1b). To be able to take the limits in weaker spaces, we will study the problem in the following weaker variational sense:

$$(6.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_0^T \int_\Omega \left( -(1 + \tilde{k}_1\psi_t)\psi_t v_t + c^2(1 - 2\tilde{k}_2\psi_t)\nabla\psi \cdot \nabla v - \delta(\mathcal{K}_0 * \nabla\psi)(t) \cdot \nabla v_t \right. \\ \left. - (\tilde{\ell} - c^2\tilde{k}_2)|\nabla\psi|^2 v_t \right) dx dt \\ = \int_\Omega \left( (1 + \tilde{k}_1\psi_1)\psi_1 + (\tilde{\ell} - c^2\tilde{k}_2)|\nabla\psi_0|^2 \right) v(0) dx + \delta \int_0^T \int_\Omega \mathcal{K}_0(t)\nabla\psi_0 \cdot \nabla v(t) dx dt \end{aligned}$$

for all  $v \in \{w \in W^{1,1}(0, T; H_0^1(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)) : w(T) = 0\}$ .

To be convinced that (6.3) is indeed the weak form of (6.2) it suffices to see that for GPL II with  $\mathcal{K}_0 = \tau_\theta^{\alpha-1} g_{1-\alpha}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \int_\Omega \left( (\mathcal{K}_0 * \nabla \psi_t)(t) \cdot \nabla v(t) + (\mathcal{K}_0 * \nabla \psi)(t) \cdot \nabla v_t(t) \right) dx dt \\ &= - \int_0^T \int_\Omega \mathcal{K}_0(t) \nabla \psi_0 \cdot \nabla v(t) dx dt - \int_\Omega (\mathcal{K}_0 * \nabla \psi)(0) \cdot \nabla v(0) dx \\ &= - \int_0^T \int_\Omega \mathcal{K}_0(t) \nabla \psi_0 \cdot \nabla v(t) dx dt, \end{aligned}$$

due to the fact that in this case  $\mathcal{K}_0 \in L^1(0, T)$ , which yields

$$\left| \int_\Omega (\mathcal{K}_0 * \nabla \psi)(s) \cdot \nabla v(s) dx \right| \leq \|\mathcal{K}_0\|_{L^1(0,s)} \|\nabla \psi\|_{L^\infty(L^2)} \|\nabla v\|_{L^\infty(L^2)} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } s \rightarrow 0.$$

On the other hand, if  $\mathcal{K}_0 = \delta_0$  (case of laws (2.2) and GPL), then

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \int_\Omega \left( (\mathcal{K}_0 * \nabla \psi_t)(t) \cdot \nabla v(t) + (\mathcal{K}_0 * \nabla \psi)(t) \cdot \nabla v_t(t) \right) dx dt \\ &= - \int_\Omega (\mathcal{K}_0 * \nabla \psi)(0) \cdot \nabla v(0) dx = - \int_\Omega \nabla \psi(0) \cdot \nabla v(0) dx \\ &= - \int_0^T \int_\Omega \mathcal{K}_0(t) \nabla \psi_0 \cdot \nabla v(t) dx dt. \end{aligned}$$

In both cases we retrieve the same expression which allows us to conclude that (6.3) is indeed the weak form of (6.2) in all considered kernels in this section.

The proof of existence and uniqueness of a solution to (6.2) can be found in the literature for particular choices of  $\tilde{k}_i$  and  $\ell$  when  $a = b$  and thus the order in the damping term is  $a - b + 1 = 1$ . It is covered by [29, Theorem 7.1] for the Westervelt equation ( $\tilde{k}_2 = \ell = 0$ ), [36, Theorem 4.3] for the Kuznetsov ( $\tilde{k}_2 = 0$ ), and [16, Theorem 4.1] for the Blackstock equation ( $\tilde{k}_1 = 0$ ). The aforementioned references prescribe smallness in a higher order norm than the one used in Theorem 5.1. We nevertheless expect that one should be able to obtain well-posedness of (6.2) in the same setting as this paper. For  $a < b$ , the well-posedness follows by Corollary 5.2 with (2.1) if  $\tilde{k}_1 = 0$ .

**Theorem 6.1.** *Under the assumptions of Corollary 5.2, the family of solutions  $\{\psi^{(\tau)}\}_{\tau \in (0, \bar{\tau}]}$  of (5.2), (4.1b) with  $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}_\tau$  defined by:*

- law (2.2), or
- GPL, or
- GPL II if  $\tilde{k}_1 = 0$

*converges to a solution  $\psi \in X_E = W^{1,\infty}(0, T; L^2(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(0, T; H_0^1(\Omega)))$  of the zero relaxation time problem (6.3) with  $\mathcal{K}_0 = \delta_0$  (the delta distribution centered at zero) in case of laws (2.2) or GPL and  $\mathcal{K}_0 = \tau_\theta^{\alpha-1} g_{1-\alpha}$  in case of GPL II in the following sense:*

$$\|\psi^{(\tau)} - \psi\|_E \lesssim \|(\mathcal{K}_\tau - \mathcal{K}_0) * 1\|_{L^1(0,T)} \sim \tau^a \quad \text{as } \tau \searrow 0,$$

*with  $a = 1$  in case of law (2.2) and  $a = \alpha$  in case of GPL and GPL II; see Table 3.*

It is noteworthy that the convergence of  $\psi^\tau$  in the statement of Theorem 6.1 follows from the convergence of  $\mathcal{K}_\tau * 1$ . This convergence requirement is weaker than requiring  $\|\mathcal{K}_\tau - \mathcal{K}_0\|_{L^1(0,T)} \xrightarrow{\tau \rightarrow 0^+} 0$  as can be easily seen using Young's convolution inequality.  $\mathcal{K}_\tau * 1$  is also a more natural quantity to look at since it describes how  $\mathcal{K}_\tau$  acts on a function. One may indeed readily show that if  $\|(\mathcal{K}_\tau - \mathcal{K}_0) * 1\|_{L^1(0,T)} \xrightarrow{\tau \rightarrow 0^+} 0$ , so does  $\|(\mathcal{K}_\tau - \mathcal{K}_0) * f\|_{L^1(0,T)}$  for an arbitrary function  $f \in W^{1,1}(0,T)$ .

*Proof.* We intend to first prove that the family of solutions  $\{\psi^{(\tau)}\}_{\tau \in (0, \bar{\tau}]}$  of (5.2) with boundary and initial conditions (4.1b) forms a Cauchy sequence in  $X_E$ . Let  $\tau, \tau' \in (0, \bar{\tau}]$ . We note that the difference  $\bar{\psi} = \psi^{(\tau)} - \psi^{(\tau')}$  solves the equation

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 + 2\tilde{k}_1\psi_t^{(\tau)})\bar{\psi}_{tt} - c^2\nabla \cdot \left( (1 - 2\tilde{k}_2\psi_t^{(\tau)})\nabla\bar{\psi} \right) - \delta\mathcal{K}_\tau * \Delta\bar{\psi}_t \\ &= -2\tilde{k}_1\bar{\psi}_t\psi_{tt}^{(\tau')} - 2c^2\tilde{k}_2\nabla \cdot \left( \bar{\psi}_t\nabla\psi^{\tau'} \right) - 2(\tilde{\ell} - c^2\tilde{k}_2) \left( \nabla\psi^{(\tau)} \cdot \nabla\bar{\psi}_t + \nabla\bar{\psi} \cdot \nabla\psi_t^{(\tau')} \right) \\ & \qquad \qquad \qquad + \delta(\mathcal{K}_\tau - \mathcal{K}_{\tau'}) * \Delta\psi_t^{(\tau')} \end{aligned}$$

with zero initial conditions, where we have used that

$$(1 - 2\tilde{k}_2\psi_t^{(\tau)})\Delta\psi^{(\tau)} = \nabla \cdot \left( (1 - 2\tilde{k}_2\psi_t^{(\tau)})\nabla\psi^{(\tau)} \right) + 2\tilde{k}_2\nabla\psi_t^{(\tau)} \cdot \nabla\psi^{(\tau)}.$$

Analogously to the proof of Theorem 5.3, just replacing (5.6) by

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \delta \int_0^t ((\mathcal{K}_\tau - \mathcal{K}_{\tau'}) * \Delta\psi_t^{(\tau')})(s), \bar{\psi}_t(s) \right|_{L^2} ds \\ &= \left| \delta \int_0^t ((1 * (\mathcal{K}_\tau - \mathcal{K}_{\tau'}) * \Delta\psi_{tt}^{(\tau')})(s) + (1 * (\mathcal{K}_\tau - \mathcal{K}_{\tau'}))(s)\Delta\psi_1, \bar{\psi}_t(s)) \right|_{L^2} ds \\ &\leq \delta \|(\mathcal{K}_\tau - \mathcal{K}_{\tau'}) * 1\|_{L^1(0,T)} \|\Delta\psi_{tt}^{(\tau')}\|_{L^1(0,t;L^2)} \|\bar{\psi}_t\|_{L^\infty(0,t;L^2)} \\ & \quad + \delta \|(\mathcal{K}_\tau - \mathcal{K}_{\tau'}) * 1\|_{L^1(0,T)} \|\Delta\psi_1\|_{L^2} \|\bar{\psi}_t\|_{L^\infty(0,t;L^2)} \end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$(6.4) \quad \|\psi^{(\tau)} - \psi^{(\tau')}\|_E \leq C\delta \|(\mathcal{K}_\tau - \mathcal{K}_{\tau'}) * 1\|_{L^1(0,T)}$$

with some constant  $C$  that is independent of  $\tau$  (and of  $\delta$ ). We next employ the triangle inequality by involving  $\mathcal{K}_0 * 1$  to further estimate the right-hand side of (6.4). Without loss of generality, we may assume  $\tau_\theta = 1$  in what follows. Considering Laplace transforms and the identity

$$\mathcal{L}((\mathcal{K}_\tau - \mathcal{K}_0) * 1)(z) = \frac{1}{z} \left( \frac{z^{a-b}}{(\tau z)^a + 1} - z^{a-b} \right) = -\tau^a \frac{z^{a-(1+b-a)}}{(\tau z)^a + 1},$$

we have

$$-((\mathcal{K}_\tau - \mathcal{K}_0) * 1)(t) = t^{b-a} E_{a,1+b-a} \left( -\left(\frac{t}{\tau}\right)^a \right).$$

On account of complete monotonicity of the function  $t \mapsto E_{a,1+b-a} \left(-\left(\frac{t}{\tau}\right)^a\right)$ , which ensures nonnegativity, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\mathcal{K}_\tau - \mathcal{K}_0) * 1\|_{L^1(0,T)} &= \int_0^T t^{b-a} E_{a,1+b-a} \left(-\left(\frac{t}{\tau}\right)^a\right) dt \\ &= T^{1+b-a} E_{a,2+b-a} \left(-\left(\frac{T}{\tau}\right)^a\right) \sim \frac{T^{1+b-a}}{\Gamma(2+b-2a)} \left(\frac{T}{\tau}\right)^{-a} \quad \text{as } \frac{T}{\tau} \rightarrow \infty \end{aligned}$$

by a Tauberian Theorem. Using the triangle inequality and a Cauchy sequence argument, we can therefore conclude from (6.4) that  $\psi^{(\tau)}$  converges to some  $\psi^{(0)}$  and this happens at the rate  $O(\tau^a)$  with respect to the  $\|\cdot\|_E$  norm.

To show that  $\psi^{(0)}$  satisfies the limiting equation (6.3), we test (6.1) with smooth functions  $v \in \{w \in C^\infty(0,T; C_c^\infty(\Omega)) : w(T) = 0\}$  and take limits as allowed by the just established  $\|\cdot\|_E$  convergence:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \lim_{\tau \searrow 0} 0 &= \lim_{\tau \searrow 0} \left\{ \int_0^T \int_\Omega \left( -(1 + \tilde{k}_1 \psi_t^{(\tau)}) \psi_t^{(\tau)} v_t + c^2 (1 - 2\tilde{k}_2 \psi_t) \nabla \psi^{(\tau)} \cdot \nabla v \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \delta(\mathcal{K}_\tau * \nabla \psi^{(\tau)})(t) \cdot \nabla v_t - (\tilde{\ell} - c^2 \tilde{k}_2) |\nabla \psi^{(\tau)}|^2 v_t \right) dx dt \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \int_\Omega \left( (1 + \tilde{k}_1 \psi_1) \psi_1 + (\tilde{\ell} - c^2 \tilde{k}_2) |\nabla \psi_0|^2 \right) v(0) dx \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \delta \int_0^T \int_\Omega \mathcal{K}_\tau(t) \nabla \psi_0 \cdot \nabla v(t) dx dt \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used integration by parts and the identities

$$(1 + 2\tilde{k}_1 \psi_t^{(\tau)}) \psi_{tt}^{(\tau)} = \frac{d}{dt} \left[ (1 + \tilde{k}_1 \psi_t^{(\tau)}) \psi_t^{(\tau)} \right],$$

$(\mathcal{K}_\tau * \nabla \psi^{(\tau)})(t) - (\mathcal{K}_0 * \nabla \psi^{(0)})(t) = (\mathcal{K}_\tau * \nabla(\psi^{(\tau)} - \psi^{(0)}))(t) + ((\mathcal{K}_\tau - \mathcal{K}_0) * \nabla \psi^{(0)})(t)$ , as well as

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^T \int_\Omega \left( (\mathcal{K}_\tau * \nabla \psi_t^{(\tau)})(t) \cdot \nabla v(t) + (\mathcal{K}_\tau * \nabla \psi^{(\tau)})(t) \cdot \nabla v_t(t) \right) dx dt \\ &= - \int_0^T \int_\Omega \mathcal{K}_\tau(t) \nabla \psi_0 \cdot \nabla v(t) dx dt - \int_\Omega (\mathcal{K}_\tau * \nabla \psi^{(\tau)})(0) \cdot \nabla v(0) dx. \end{aligned}$$

In the last identity, note that  $\int_\Omega (\mathcal{K}_\tau * \nabla \psi^{(\tau)})(0) \cdot \nabla v(0) dx = 0$  on account of the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{K}_\tau * \nabla \psi^{(\tau)})(t) &= (\mathcal{K}_\tau * (1 * \nabla \psi_t^{(\tau)} + \nabla \psi_0))(t) \\ &= \int_0^t (\mathcal{K}_\tau * \nabla \psi_s^{(\tau)})(s) ds + \int_0^t (\mathcal{K}_\tau \nabla \psi_0)(s) ds, \end{aligned}$$

$\mathcal{K}_\tau * \nabla \psi_t^{(\tau)}$ , and  $\mathcal{K}_\tau$  being  $L^1(0,T)$ , their integral over a set of measure 0 is 0, which yields that  $(\mathcal{K}_\tau * \nabla \psi^{(\tau)})(0) = 0$ .

Note also that, by setting  $v(t) = \tilde{v}(T-t)$ , one may write

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \int_\Omega \mathcal{K}_\tau(t) \nabla \psi_0 \cdot \nabla v(t) dx dt &= \int_\Omega (\mathcal{K}_\tau * \nabla \tilde{v}) \cdot \nabla \psi_0 dx \\ &= \int_\Omega (\mathcal{K}_\tau * (1 * \nabla \tilde{v} + \nabla \tilde{v}(0))) \cdot \nabla \psi_0 dx \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int_{\Omega} (\mathcal{K}_{\tau} * 1 * \nabla \tilde{v}_t) \cdot \nabla \psi_0 \, dx \\
&\xrightarrow{\tau \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\Omega} (\mathcal{K}_0 * 1 * \nabla \tilde{v}_t) \cdot \nabla \psi_0 \, dx = \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{K}_0(t) \nabla \psi_0 \cdot \nabla v(t) \, dx \, dt,
\end{aligned}$$

given  $\tilde{v}(0) = v(T) = 0$  due to the choice of space of test functions.

Additionally, we have relied on the convergence of  $(\psi_t^{(\tau)})^2$  and of  $|\nabla \psi^{(\tau)}|^2$  in  $L^\infty(0, T; L^1(\Omega))$ , and uniform boundedness of  $\|\mathcal{K}_{\tau}\|_{L^1(0, T)}$ ; see Section 6.1 for the latter. This reasoning, first of all, yields (6.3) with  $C^\infty(0, T; C_c^\infty(\Omega))$  in place of  $W^{1,1}(0, T; H_0^1(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega))$ . By a density argument, we then conclude that (6.3) itself holds.  $\square$

**6.3. Limiting behavior of equations based on GPL I and GPL III.** To take the limit  $\tau \searrow 0$  for equations based on GPL I and GPL III, we need the following additional assumption on  $\tau_\theta$ :

$$(\mathbf{A}_3) \quad \tau_\theta = \tau_\theta(\tau) \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\frac{\tau_\theta}{\tau}\right)^{a-b} = \rho^{a-b} = \text{constant},$$

suggested by the discussion of Section 6.1.

Note that in the case  $a = b$  (laws (2.2) and GPL), the assumption is naturally verified. However, the vanishing time limit discussion is then already covered by Theorem 6.1. The case  $a < b$  was also discussed there. We can then in this section restrict ourselves to the case  $a > b$ . In this case,  $\mathcal{K}_0 = 0$  and the limiting problem is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.5) \quad &\int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \left( -(1 + \tilde{k}_1 \psi_t) \psi_t v_t + c^2 (1 - 2\tilde{k}_2 \psi_t) \nabla \psi \cdot \nabla v - (\tilde{\ell} - c^2 \tilde{k}_2) |\nabla \psi|^2 v_t \right) \, dx \, dt \\
&= \int_{\Omega} \left( (1 + \tilde{k}_1 \psi_1) \psi_1 + (\tilde{\ell} - c^2 \tilde{k}_2) |\nabla \psi_0|^2 \right) v(0) \, dx
\end{aligned}$$

for all  $v \in \{w \in W^{1,1}(0, T; H_0^1(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)) : w(T) = 0\}$ .

**Theorem 6.2.** *Let  $(\mathbf{A}_3)$  hold. Under the assumptions of Corollary 5.2, the family of solutions  $\{\psi^{(\tau)}\}_{\tau \in (0, \bar{\tau}]}$  of (5.2), (4.1b) with  $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}_{\tau}$  defined by GPL I or GPL III converges in the energy norm to a solution  $\psi \in X_E = W^{1,\infty}(0, T; L^2(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(0, T; H_0^1(\Omega)))$  of (6.5):*

$$\|\psi^{(\tau)} - \psi\|_E \lesssim \|\mathcal{K}_{\tau} * 1\|_{L^1(0, T)} \sim \tau^{a-b} = \tau^{1-\alpha} \quad \text{as } \tau \searrow 0.$$

The statement of Theorem 6.2 can seem at first inspection unintuitive. Indeed, with the ratio  $\tau_\theta/\tau$  constant, GPL I and GPL III take, as we mentioned in Remark 2, the form

$$\mathcal{K}_{\tau}(t) = \frac{1}{\tau} \mathcal{K}_1\left(\frac{t}{\tau}\right).$$

One would naively expect that as the rescaling parameter  $\tau \searrow 0$ , the kernel would converge in the sense of distributions to a Dirac mass at 0. Results exist in this sense; see [9, 10]. However, in our setting, we do not require  $\mathcal{K}_{\tau} \geq 0$  which allows for the kernel to converge to the zero function even if  $\mathcal{K}_{\tau} \neq 0$ .

*Proof.* Since we can proceed similarly to the proof of Theorem 6.1, we focus here on the key argument, which is to estimate  $\|(\mathcal{K}_{\tau} - \mathcal{K}_0) * 1\|_{L^1(0, T)} = \|\mathcal{K}_{\tau} * 1\|_{L^1(0, T)}$ . To this end, recall that

$$\mathcal{L}\mathcal{K}_{\tau}(z) = \left(\frac{\tau_\theta}{\tau}\right)^{a-b} \frac{(\tau z)^{a-b}}{(\tau z)^a + 1} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \tau \rightarrow 0$$

Considering the identity

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K}_\tau * 1)(z) = \rho^{a-b} \frac{1}{z} \frac{(\tau z)^{a-b}}{(\tau z)^a + 1} = \rho^{a-b} \tau \frac{(\tau z)^{a-(1+b)}}{(\tau z)^a + 1},$$

we have, using the scaling property of the Laplace transform

$$(\mathcal{K}_\tau * 1)(t) = \rho^{a-b} \left(\frac{t}{\tau}\right)^b E_{a,b+1} \left(-\left(\frac{t}{\tau}\right)^a\right).$$

Now, using a change of variable

$$\|\mathcal{K}_\tau * 1\|_{L^1(0,T)} = \tau \rho^{a-b} \int_0^{T/\tau} |t^b E_{a,b+1}(-t^a)| dt.$$

Since  $b + 1 \geq a$ , the Mittag-Leffler function is completely monotone and therefore, in particular, nonnegative. Moreover, we have the identity

$$t^b E_{a,b+1}(-t^a) = \frac{d}{dt} \left( t^{b+1} E_{a,b+2}(-t^a) \right),$$

which, since  $b + 1 > 0$ , yields

$$\begin{aligned} \tau \rho^{a-b} \int_0^{T/\tau} t^b E_{a,b+1}(-t^a) dt &= \tau \rho^{a-b} \left(\frac{T}{\tau}\right)^{b+1} E_{a,b+2} \left(-\left(\frac{T}{\tau}\right)^a\right) \\ &\sim \rho^{a-b} \frac{T^{1+b-a}}{\Gamma(b+2-a)} \tau^{a-b} \end{aligned}$$

by a Tauberian Theorem. Using the triangle inequality and a Cauchy sequence argument, we can therefore conclude from

$$\|\psi^{(\tau)} - \psi^{(\tau')}\|_E \leq C\delta \|\mathcal{K}_\tau * 1\|_{L^1(0,T)} + C\delta \|\mathcal{K}_{\tau'} * 1\|_{L^1(0,T)}$$

that  $\psi^{(\tau)}$  converges to some  $\psi^{(0)}$  and this happens at the rate  $O(\tau^{1-\alpha})$  with respect to the  $\|\cdot\|_E$  norm.  $\square$

## CONCLUSION

In this work, we have investigated a family of nonlinear acoustic equations with dissipation of Djrbashian–Caputo-derivative type. We rigorously studied them in terms of the local well-posedness and their limiting behavior with respect to the sound diffusivity as well as the relaxation time. Below we summarize the results of the limiting analysis in this work.

In comparing Blackstock-type models to the Kuznetsov ones, our work suggests that the former are more robust and allow using more general kernels. Indeed, for all considered kernels, we can show existence and uniqueness of solutions of the Blackstock-type equations. The same holds for the limiting analysis. When it comes to the Kuznetsov-type equations, stronger assumptions are needed and not all kernels could be covered.

	$\delta$ limit, Theorem 5.3	$\tau$ limit, Theorems 6.1 and 6.2
Blackstock's eq.	laws (2.1), (2.2), GPL I, GPL II, GPL III, GPL	laws (2.2), GPL; GPL I, GPL III, if $\tau_\theta/\tau = \text{const.}$ ; GPL II
Kuznetsov's eq.	law (2.2), GPL I, GPL III, GPL	laws (2.2), GPL; GPL I, GPL III, if $\tau_\theta/\tau = \text{const.}$

TABLE 5. Summary of the singular limit analysis

## A. UNIQUE SOLVABILITY OF THE SEMI-DISCRETE PROBLEM

We present here the proof of existence of a unique semi-discrete approximation of (4.1). As in [27], we may approximate the solution by

$$\psi^n(x, t) = \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i^n(t) \phi_i(x),$$

where  $\{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$  are smooth eigenfunctions of the Dirichlet-Laplacian operator.

With  $V_n = \text{span}\{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n\}$ , the semi-discrete problem is given by

$$(\mathbf{a}\psi_{tt}^n - c^2 \mathbf{b}\Delta\psi^n - \delta\mathcal{K} * \Delta\psi_t^n + \nabla\mathbf{l} \cdot \nabla\psi_t^n, \phi_j) = 0,$$

for all  $j = 1, \dots, n$ , with approximate initial conditions  $(\psi^n, \psi_t^n)|_{t=0} = (\psi_0^n, \psi_1^n)$  taken as  $L^2$  projections of  $(\psi_0, \psi_1)$  onto  $V_n$ ; that is,

$$\psi_0^n = \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{0,i}^n \phi_i(x), \quad \psi_1^n = \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{1,i}^n \phi_i(x)$$

with  $\xi_{0,i}^n = (\psi_0, \phi_i)_{L^2}$  and  $\xi_{1,i}^n = (\psi_1, \phi_i)_{L^2}$ . With  $\boldsymbol{\xi} = [\xi_1^n \ \xi_2^n \ \dots \ \xi_n^n]^T$ , the approximate problem can be rewritten in matrix form

$$\mathbb{M}_a(t)\boldsymbol{\xi}_{tt} + c^2\mathbb{D}_b(t)\boldsymbol{\xi} + \delta\mathbb{D}\mathcal{K} * \boldsymbol{\xi}_t + \mathbb{L}\boldsymbol{\xi}_t = 0$$

where the entries of matrices  $\mathbb{M}_a(t) = [\mathbb{M}_{a,ij}]$ ,  $\mathbb{D}_b(t) = [\mathbb{D}_{b,ij}(t)]$ ,  $\mathbb{D} = [\mathbb{D}_{ij}]$ , and  $\mathbb{L}_l(t) = [\mathbb{L}_{l,ij}]$  are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{M}_{a,ij}(t) &= (\mathbf{a}\phi_i, \phi_j)_{L^2}, & \mathbb{D}_{b,ij}(t) &= -(\mathbf{b}\Delta\phi_i, \phi_j)_{L^2}, & \mathbb{L}_{l,ij}(t) &= (\nabla\mathbf{l} \cdot \nabla\phi_i, \phi_j)_{L^2}, \\ \mathbb{D}_{ij} &= -(\Delta\phi_i, \phi_j)_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

If we introduce the vectors of coordinates of the approximate initial data in the basis:

$$\boldsymbol{\xi}_0 = [\xi_{0,1}^n \ \xi_{0,2}^n \ \dots \ \xi_{0,n}^n]^T, \quad \boldsymbol{\xi}_1 = [\xi_{1,1}^n \ \xi_{1,2}^n \ \dots \ \xi_{1,n}^n]^T,$$

then by setting  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \boldsymbol{\xi}_{tt}$ , we have

$$\boldsymbol{\xi}_t(t) = 1 * \boldsymbol{\mu} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \quad \boldsymbol{\xi}(t) = \boldsymbol{\xi}_0 + t\boldsymbol{\xi}_1 + 1 * 1 * \boldsymbol{\mu}.$$

Therefore, the semi-discrete problem can be rewritten as

$$\mathbb{M}_a(t)\boldsymbol{\mu} + c^2\mathbb{D}_b(t) (\boldsymbol{\xi}_0 + t\boldsymbol{\xi}_1 + 1 * 1 * \boldsymbol{\mu}) + \delta\mathbb{D}\mathcal{K} * (1 * \boldsymbol{\mu} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_1) + \mathbb{L}_l(t)(1 * \boldsymbol{\mu} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_1) = 0.$$



Since  $\mathbb{M}_a \in L^\infty(0, T)$  is positive definite, the semi-discrete problem can be seen as a system of Volterra integral equations

$$\boldsymbol{\mu} + \int_0^t \mathbf{K}(t, s) \boldsymbol{\mu}(s) ds = \mathbf{f}(t)$$

with

$$\mathbf{K}(t, s) = \mathbb{M}_a(t)^{-1} \{c^2 \mathbb{D}_b(t)(t-s) + \delta \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{K} * 1)(t-s) + \mathbb{L}_l(t)\},$$

and

$$\mathbf{f}(t) = \mathbb{M}_a(t)^{-1} \{-c^2 \mathbb{D}_b(t)(\boldsymbol{\xi}_0 + t\boldsymbol{\xi}_1) - \delta \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{K} * \boldsymbol{\xi}_1)(t) - \mathbb{L}_l(t)\boldsymbol{\xi}_1\}.$$

We have

$$\mathbf{K} \in L^\infty(D), \quad D = \{(t, s) : 0 \leq s \leq t \leq T\}, \quad \mathbf{f} \in L^\infty(0, T).$$

By the existence theory for systems of Volterra integral equations of the second kind [19, Ch. 2, Theorem 4.2], there is a unique  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in L^\infty(0, T)$ . Combined with initial data, from  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{tt} = \boldsymbol{\mu}$ , we can then conclude that there exists a unique  $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in W^{2,\infty}(0, T)$  and thus  $\psi^n \in W^{2,\infty}(0, T; V_n)$ . Owing to the higher regularity of the coefficients  $\mathbf{a}$ ,  $\mathbf{b}$ , and  $\mathbf{l}$  in time, we can employ an additional bootstrap argument to show that  $\psi^n \in W^{3,1}(0, T; V_n)$ .

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The work of the first author was supported by the Austrian Science Fund FWF under the grant DOC 78.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] S. AGMON, *Lectures on elliptic boundary value problems*, vol. 369, American Mathematical Soc., 2010.
- [2] T. ATANACKOVIĆ, S. PILIPOVIĆ, B. STANKOVIĆ, AND D. ZORICA, *Fractional calculus with applications in mechanics: vibrations and diffusion processes*, Wiley, 2014.
- [3] D. T. BLACKSTOCK, *Approximate equations governing finite-amplitude sound in thermoviscous fluids*, tech. rep., General Dynamics/Electronics Rochester NY, 1963.
- [4] M. CAPUTO, *Linear models of dissipation whose  $Q$  is almost frequency independent – II*, *Geophys. J. Int.*, 13 (1967), pp. 529–539.
- [5] C. CATTANEO, *Sulla Conduzione Del Calore*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2011, pp. 485–485.
- [6] B. D. COLEMAN, M. FABRIZIO, AND D. R. OWEN, *On the thermodynamics of second sound in dielectric crystals*, *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 80 (1982), pp. 135–158.
- [7] B. D. COLEMAN AND M. E. GURTIN, *Equipresence and constitutive equations for rigid heat conductors*, *Zeitschrift für angewandte Mathematik und Physik ZAMP*, 18 (1967), pp. 199–208.
- [8] A. COMPTE AND R. METZLER, *The generalized Cattaneo equation for the description of anomalous transport processes*, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 30 (1997), p. 7277.
- [9] M. CONTI, V. PATA, AND M. SQUASSINA, *Singular limit of dissipative hyperbolic equations with memory*, in *Conference Publications*, vol. 2005, American Institute of Mathematical Sciences, 2005, p. 200.
- [10] —, *Singular limit of differential systems with memory*, *Indiana University mathematics journal*, (2006), pp. 169–215.

- [11] A. DEKKERS AND A. ROZANOVA-PIERRAT, *Cauchy problem for the Kuznetsov equation*, Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems - A, 39 (2019), pp. 277–307.
- [12] M. M. DJRBASHIAN, *Integral Transformations and Representation of Functions in a Complex Domain [in Russian]*, Nauka, Moscow, 1966.
- [13] W. DÖRFLER, H. GERNER, AND R. SCHNAUBELT, *Local well-posedness of a quasilinear wave equation*, Applicable Analysis, 95 (2016), pp. 2110–2123.
- [14] P. P. B. EGGERMONT, *On Galerkin methods for Abel-type integral equations*, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, 25 (1987), pp. 1093–1117.
- [15] L. C. EVANS, *Partial Differential Equations*, vol. 2, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, AMS, 2010.
- [16] M. FRITZ, V. NIKOLIĆ, AND B. WOHLMUTH, *Well-posedness and numerical treatment of the Blackstock equation in nonlinear acoustics*, Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences, 28 (2018), pp. 2557–2597.
- [17] R. GORENFLO, F. MAINARDI, AND S. ROGOSIN, *Mittag-Leffler function: properties and applications*, Handbook of fractional calculus with applications, 1 (2019), pp. 269–296.
- [18] R. GORENFLO AND M. YAMAMOTO, *Operator theoretic treatment of linear Abel integral equations of first kind*, Japan journal of industrial and applied mathematics, 16 (1999), pp. 137–161.
- [19] G. GRIPENBERG, S.-O. LONDEN, AND O. STAFFANS, *Volterra integral and functional equations*, no. 34, Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- [20] P. GRISVARD, *Elliptic problems in nonsmooth domains*, SIAM, 2011.
- [21] M. E. GURTIN AND A. C. PIPKIN, *A general theory of heat conduction with finite wave speeds*, Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis, 31 (1968), pp. 113–126.
- [22] S. HOLM, *Waves with Power-Law Attenuation*, Springer, 2019.
- [23] P. M. JORDAN, *Nonlinear acoustic phenomena in viscous thermally relaxing fluids: Shock bifurcation and the emergence of diffusive solitons.*, The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 124 (2008), pp. 2491–2491.
- [24] ———, *Second-sound phenomena in inviscid, thermally relaxing gases*, Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems-B, 19 (2014), p. 2189.
- [25] B. KALTENBACHER, U. KHRISTENKO, V. NIKOLIĆ, M. L. RAJENDRAN, AND B. WOHLMUTH, *Determining kernels in linear viscoelasticity*, Journal of Computational Physics, (2022), p. 111331.
- [26] B. KALTENBACHER AND I. LASIECKA, *Global existence and exponential decay rates for the Westervelt equation*, Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems-S, 2 (2009), p. 503.
- [27] B. KALTENBACHER AND V. NIKOLIĆ, *Parabolic approximation of quasilinear wave equations with applications in nonlinear acoustics*, SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis, 54 (2022), pp. 1593–1622.
- [28] B. KALTENBACHER AND V. NIKOLIĆ, *Time-fractional Moore–Gibson–Thompson equations*, Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences, 32 (2022), pp. 965–1013.
- [29] B. KALTENBACHER, V. NIKOLIĆ, AND M. THALHAMMER, *Efficient time integration methods based on operator splitting and application to the Westervelt equation*, IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis, 35 (2015), pp. 1092–1124.
- [30] B. KALTENBACHER AND W. RUNDELL, *On an inverse problem of nonlinear imaging with fractional damping*, Mathematics of Computation, 91 (2022), pp. 245–276.

- [31] A. KUBICA, K. RYSZEWSKA, AND M. YAMAMOTO, *Time-fractional Differential Equations: A Theoretical Introduction*, Springer, 2020.
- [32] V. P. KUZNETSOV, *Equations of nonlinear acoustics*, Soviet Physics: Acoustics, 16 (1970), pp. 467–470.
- [33] I. LASIECKA, *Global solvability of Moore–Gibson–Thompson equation with memory arising in nonlinear acoustics*, Journal of Evolution Equations, 17 (2017), pp. 411–441.
- [34] S. MEYER AND M. WILKE, *Optimal regularity and long-time behavior of solutions for the Westervelt equation*, Applied Mathematics and Optimization, 64 (2011), pp. 257–271. Dedicated to Jan Prüss on the occasion of his 60th birthday.
- [35] ———, *Global well-posedness and exponential stability for Kuznetsov’s equation in  $L_p$ -spaces*, Evolution Equations & Control Theory, 2 (2013), pp. 365–378.
- [36] K. MIZOHATA AND S. UKAI, *The global existence of small amplitude solutions to the nonlinear acoustic wave equation*, Journal of Mathematics of Kyoto University, 33 (1993), pp. 505–522.
- [37] I. PODLUBNY, *Fractional differential equations: an introduction to fractional derivatives, fractional differential equations, to methods of their solution and some of their applications*, Elsevier, 1998.
- [38] Y. POVSTENKO, *Fractional Cattaneo-type equations and generalized thermoelasticity*, Journal of Thermal Stresses, 34 (2011), pp. 97–114.
- [39] Y. POVSTENKO, *Fractional thermoelasticity*, Springer, 2015.
- [40] G. SIMONETT AND M. WILKE, *Well-posedness and longtime behavior for the Westervelt equation with absorbing boundary conditions of order zero*, Journal of Evolution Equations, 17 (2017), pp. 551–571.
- [41] A. TANI, *Mathematical analysis in nonlinear acoustics*, in AIP Conference Proceedings, vol. 1907, AIP Publishing LLC, 2017, p. 020003.
- [42] P. J. WESTERVELT, *Parametric acoustic array*, The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 35 (1963), pp. 535–537.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ALPEN-ADRIA-UNIVERSITÄT KLAGENFURT, UNIVERSITÄTSSTRASSE  
65–67, A-9020 KLAGENFURT, AUSTRIA  
Email address: [barbara.kaltenbacher@aau.at](mailto:barbara.kaltenbacher@aau.at)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, RADBOUD UNIVERSITY, HEYENDAALSEWEG 135, 6525 AJ NIJMEGEN,  
THE NETHERLANDS  
Email address: [mostafa.meliani@ru.nl](mailto:mostafa.meliani@ru.nl)  
Email address: [vanja.nikolic@ru.nl](mailto:vanja.nikolic@ru.nl)