

GLOBAL SPHERICALLY SYMMETRIC SOLUTIONS OF THE MULTIDIMENSIONAL FULL COMPRESSIBLE NAVIER-STOKES EQUATIONS WITH LARGE DATA

GUI-QIANG G. CHEN, YUCONG HUANG, AND SHENGGUO ZHU

ABSTRACT. We establish the global-in-time existence of solutions of the Cauchy problem for the full Navier-Stokes equations for compressible heat-conducting flow in multidimensions with initial data that are large, discontinuous, spherically symmetric, and away from the vacuum. The solutions obtained here are of global finite total relative-energy including the origin, while cavitation may occur as balls centred at the origin of symmetry for which the interfaces between the fluid and the vacuum must be upper semi-continuous in space-time in the Eulerian coordinates. On any region strictly away from the possible vacuum, the velocity and specific internal energy are Hölder continuous, and the density has a uniform upper bound. To achieve these, our main strategy is to regard the Cauchy problem as the limit of a series of carefully designed initial-boundary value problems that are formulated in finite annular regions. For such approximation problems, we can derive uniform *a-priori* estimates that are independent of both the inner and outer radii of the annuli considered in the spherically symmetric Lagrangian coordinates. The entropy inequality is recovered after taking the limit of the outer radius to infinity by using Mazur's lemma and the convexity of the entropy function, which is required for the limit of the inner radius tending to zero. Then the global weak solutions of the original problem are attained via careful compactness arguments applied to the approximate solutions in the Eulerian coordinates.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Global Solutions and Main Theorem	5
3. Main Strategy and Reformulation	8
3.1. Main strategy	8
3.2. Mollification of the initial data in the Eulerian domain	11
3.3. The approximation problem in the exterior Eulerian domain	13
3.4. Truncation of the initial data in the exterior Eulerian domain	16
3.5. Reformulation in the bounded Lagrangian domain	17
4. The A-Priori Estimates	19
4.1. Entropy estimate	20
4.2. Upper and lower bounds of the density	20
4.3. Exterior $L^\infty(0, T; L^2)$ -estimates	23
4.4. Exterior $L^\infty(0, T; H^1)$ -estimates of the velocity and internal energy	29
4.5. Lower bound of the internal energy	37
5. Global Weak Solutions of the Exterior Problem in the Eulerian Coordinates	38
5.1. Coordinate transformation and the Jacobian	38
5.2. Extension in the Eulerian domain	38
5.3. Construction of the particle path function	42
5.4. Compactness results	44
5.5. Entropy estimate for the limit solution	52
5.6. Weak forms of the exterior problem	54
5.7. Estimates away from the origin, independent of the particle path function	58

Date: August 11, 2022.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35Q30, 35A01, 35D30, 76N10.

Key words and phrases. Compressible Navier-Stokes equations, multidimension, spherical symmetry, large data, non-isentropic flow, global weak solutions, global-in-time existence.

6.	Global Weak Solutions including the Origin	60
6.1.	Uniform inequalities from the entropy estimates	60
6.2.	Existence of particle paths and vacuum interfaces	61
6.3.	Compactness results in the exterior domain	63
6.4.	Weak forms away from the vacuum	71
Appendix A.	Some Variants of the Arzelà-Ascoli Theorem	77
Appendix B.	Some Properties of Convex Functions	81
References		84

1. INTRODUCTION

The motion of a compressible viscous, heat-conductive, and Newtonian polytropic fluid occupying a spatial domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ for $n \geq 2$ is governed by the following full compressible Navier-Stokes system (CNS) in the Eulerian coordinates:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho + \operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{U}) = 0, \\ \partial_t(\rho \mathbf{U}) + \operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{U} \otimes \mathbf{U}) + \nabla P = \operatorname{div} \mathbb{S}, \\ \partial_t(\rho E) + \operatorname{div}(\rho E \mathbf{U} + P \mathbf{U}) = \operatorname{div}(\mathbf{U} \mathbb{S}) + \operatorname{div}(\kappa \nabla e). \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

Here and throughout the paper, $\rho \geq 0$ denotes the mass density, $\mathbf{U} = (U^1, \dots, U^n)^\top$ the fluid velocity, P the pressure of the fluid, $E = e + \frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{U}|^2$ the specific total energy, e the specific internal energy, $\mathbf{x} = (x^1, \dots, x^n)^\top \in \Omega$ the Eulerian spatial coordinates, and $t \geq 0$ the time coordinate. The equations of state for polytropic fluids are

$$P = R\rho\theta = (\gamma - 1)\rho e, \quad e = c_v\theta, \quad c_v = \frac{R}{\gamma - 1}, \quad (1.2)$$

where R is the gas constant, θ the absolute temperature, c_v the specific heat at constant volume, and $\gamma > 1$ the adiabatic exponent. The viscosity stress tensor \mathbb{S} is given by

$$\mathbb{S} = 2\mu D(\mathbf{U}) + \lambda \operatorname{div} \mathbf{U} \mathbb{I}_n, \quad (1.3)$$

where $D(\mathbf{U}) = \frac{\nabla \mathbf{U} + (\nabla \mathbf{U})^\top}{2}$ is the deformation tensor, \mathbb{I}_n the $n \times n$ identity matrix, μ the shear viscosity coefficient, and $\lambda + \frac{2}{n}\mu$ the bulk viscosity coefficient. The constant, κ , in the energy equation is defined by $\kappa := \frac{\kappa_Q}{c_V}$, where $\kappa_Q \geq 0$ is the coefficient of thermal conductivity. Furthermore, (μ, λ, κ) satisfies the following physical condition:

$$\mu > 0, \quad \lambda + \frac{2}{n}\mu \geq 0, \quad \kappa > 0. \quad (1.4)$$

In this paper, we are concerned with global spherically symmetric solutions of the form:

$$(\rho, \mathbf{U}, e)(\mathbf{x}, t) = (\rho(|\mathbf{x}|, t), u(|\mathbf{x}|, t) \frac{\mathbf{x}}{|\mathbf{x}|}, e(|\mathbf{x}|, t))$$

of system (1.1)–(1.4) in domain $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n$ with Cauchy data:

$$(\rho, \mathbf{U}, e)(\mathbf{x}, 0) = (\rho_0, \mathbf{U}_0, e_0)(\mathbf{x}) = (\rho_0(|\mathbf{x}|), u_0(|\mathbf{x}|) \frac{\mathbf{x}}{|\mathbf{x}|}, e_0(|\mathbf{x}|)) \quad \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (1.5)$$

Therefore, for the spherically symmetric case with the radial coordinate variable $r = |\mathbf{x}|$, problem (1.1)–(1.5) can be reformulated as:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho + \partial_r(\rho u) + m \frac{\rho u}{r} = 0, \\ \rho \partial_t u + \rho u \partial_r u + \partial_r P(\rho, e) = (2\mu + \lambda) \partial_r (\partial_r u + m \frac{u}{r}), \\ \rho \partial_t e + \rho u \partial_r e + P(\rho, e) (\partial_r u + m \frac{u}{r}) = 2\mu (|\partial_r u|^2 + m \frac{u^2}{r^2}) + \lambda (\partial_r u + m \frac{u}{r})^2 + \kappa (\partial_r^2 e + m \frac{\partial_r e}{r}) \end{cases} \quad (1.6)$$

in $\Omega_T := [0, \infty) \times [0, T]$ with $m \equiv n - 1$, and

$$u(0, t) = 0, \quad \partial_r e(0, t) = 0 \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T], \quad (1.7)$$

$$(\rho, u, e)(r, 0) = (\rho_0, u_0, e_0)(r) \quad \text{for } r \in [0, \infty). \quad (1.8)$$

The boundary conditions (1.7) is derived from the continuity of $\mathbf{x} \mapsto (\mathbf{U}, \nabla e)(\mathbf{x}, t)$ at $|\mathbf{x}| = 0$.

There is a large literature regarding the full **CNS**. For the general three-dimensional (3-D) flow, in the absence of vacuum (*i.e.*, $\inf_{\mathbf{x}} \rho_0(\mathbf{x}) > 0$), the local well-posedness of classical solutions of the Cauchy problem for (1.1) follows from the standard symmetric hyperbolic-parabolic structure satisfying the well-known Kawashima's condition (*cf.* [21, 22, 28, 36–38]), which was extended to the global one by Matsumura-Nishida [34] for the initial data close to a non-vacuum equilibrium in some Sobolev space $H^s(\mathbb{R}^3)$ for $s > \frac{5}{2}$. For both isentropic and non-isentropic flow, we also refer the reader to Danchin [7, 8] for strong solutions with small data in Besov spaces of \mathbb{R}^n for $n \geq 2$, and Hoff [16, 17] for weak solutions with small and discontinuous data in some Sobolev spaces of \mathbb{R}^n for $n = 2$ or 3. Considering the global well-posedness of classical or weak solutions with arbitrarily large initial data, a subtle issue is whether, in the absence of smallness conditions, cavitation may occur in solutions of (1.1) for barotropic and/or full CNS, which has no clear answer yet so far, except the one-dimensional (1-D) case. Specifically, for the 1-D flow, the unique global classical solution was obtained by Kazhikhov-Shelukhin [30] for large initial data in a bounded interval with $\inf_{\mathbf{x}} \rho_0(\mathbf{x}) > 0$, and this theory was then extended to the unbounded domains in Kawashima-Nishida in [29]. The key estimate developed in [29, 30] is the pointwise upper and lower bounds of the density, which have led to many notable results for the problems concerning 1-D flow (*e.g.*, [4, 14]). The global existence and stability of 1-D weak solutions with large and discontinuous initial data can be found in Chen-Hoff-Trivisa [4], Jiang-Zlotnik [27], Zlotnik-Amosov [44, 45], and the references cited therein. Furthermore, it was proved in Hoff-Smoller [19] that the weak solutions of the 1-D **CNS** do not develop vacuum regions, as long as no vacuum states are present initially. While the multidimensional (M-D) case is much more complicated: up to now, very few solid progress is known on the problems of well-posedness or vacuum formation with large data.

It is worth pointing out that the approaches used in the references mentioned above do not work directly when initial vacuum appears (*i.e.*, $\inf_{\mathbf{x}} \rho_0(\mathbf{x}) = 0$), which occurs when some physical requirements are imposed, such as finite total initial mass and energy in the whole space. One of the main issues in the presence of vacuum is the degeneracy of the time evolution operator, which makes it difficult to understand the behavior of the velocity field near the vacuum. In the terms of structures, system (1.1) is a hyperbolic-parabolic coupled system in the fluids region, but degenerates to a hyperbolic-elliptic one near the vacuum region. By imposing initially some compatibility conditions, Cho-Kim in [6] firstly established the local well-posedness of 3-D strong solutions with vacuum in terms of (ρ, u, θ) in some homogeneous Sobolev spaces, which has been extended recently to be global ones with small energy but large oscillations by Huang-Li [20], Wen-Zhu [40], and the references cited therein.

The first global existence of M-D weak solutions of finite energy for the isentropic **CNS** with generic data and vacuum was established in Lions [33], especially for $\gamma \geq \frac{9}{5}$ when $n = 3$; see also Feireisl-Novotný-Petzeltová [9] for $\gamma > \frac{3}{2}$ when $n = 3$. Moreover, this theory has been partially extended to the non-isentropic compressible flow with (μ, λ, κ) depending on the temperature by Feireisl in [10, 11], where the thermal energy equation holds as an inequality in the sense of distributions. However, the uniqueness problem of these weak solutions is widely open due to their fairly low regularity. Also see [1, 2, 31, 32, 39] and the references cited therein.

For the M-D spherically symmetric flow, some favourable regularity properties may be expected, since the equations exhibit largely 1-D behaviour when the flow is away from both the origin and the far-field. However, compared with the 1-D case, in order to establish the existences of M-D spherically symmetric classical or weak solutions with arbitrarily large initial data of (1.6), some essential difficulties are encountered including the coordinate singularity at the origin, indicated by the singular factor $\frac{1}{r}$ in system (1.6) and infinite initial total mass/energy from the far field; also see [15, 18, 24–26, 35].

To circumvent these issues, it is customary to consider instead the initial-boundary value problem posed in some annular domains

$$\{(\mathbf{x}, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, \infty) : a \leq |\mathbf{x}| \leq b\}$$

with proper boundary conditions, where $a > 0$ and $b > 0$ are both finite constants. The global well-posedness of 3-D strong solutions with cylindrical symmetry and strictly positive initial density to the full **CNS** has been given by Frid-Shelukhin [12] in an infinite cylinder of finite radius parallel to and centered along the x^3 -axis in \mathbb{R}^3 . In the domain between a static solid core and a free boundary connected to a surrounding vacuum state, Yashima-Benabidallah in [43] first established the global existence of spherically symmetric weak solutions with large and discontinuous initial data to the full **CNS** with boundary data prescribed so that the uniform boundedness of the total energy of solutions is direct to achieve, and later Chen-Kratka in [5] constructed the global large solutions in a more regular space with free normal stress on the free boundary which is a natural physical situation for the fluids with the surrounding vacuum state. Under the assumption that $0 < \inf_{\mathbf{x}} \rho_0(\mathbf{x}) < \sup_{\mathbf{x}} \rho_0(\mathbf{x}) < \infty$, based on an elaborate truncation procedure on the initial data, Jiang in [23] proved the global existence of spherically symmetric smooth solutions for (large) initial data in the domain exterior to a ball

$$\{(\mathbf{x}, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, \infty) : r = |\mathbf{x}| \geq a\} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \text{ for } n = 2 \text{ or } 3$$

with the following boundary condition and the far-field behavior:

$$\begin{cases} u(a, t) = 0, & \partial_r e(a, t) = 0 & \text{for } t \in [0, T], \\ \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} (\rho, u, e, \partial_r e)(r, t) = (1, 0, 1, 0). \end{cases}$$

A further natural question is whether the uniform estimates in $a > 0$ could be obtained so that the region containing the origin can be included as $a \searrow 0$. In the absence of the vacuum, Hoff [15] first constructed the global spherically symmetric weak solutions of the Cauchy problem for the isothermal flow with large data and strictly positive initial density via the limit process as $a \searrow 0$ in \mathbb{R}^n for $n \geq 2$; see also Haspot [13] for the case of isentropic flow with degenerate viscosity. For the initial data with finite total initial mass and energy in the whole space, Jiang-Zhang [24–26] proved the global existence of spherically symmetric weak solutions of the Cauchy problem for the isentropic flow in \mathbb{R}^n for $n = 2, 3$ when $\gamma > 1$. Also see Xin-Yuan [41] for some analysis on the vacuum formation problems of these weak solutions. Later, when $\inf_{\mathbf{x}} \rho_0(\mathbf{x}) > 0$, Hoff-Jenssen in [18] proved the global existence of spherically symmetric weak solutions of the initial-boundary value problems of the non-isentropic flow in a finite ball in \mathbb{R}^3 , which also works for the cylindrically symmetric case. However, the carefully designed energy estimates and pointwise estimates applied in [18] depends strictly on the boundedness of the domain under the consideration, which seems difficult to adapt the arguments to the corresponding Cauchy problem. In fact, this Cauchy problem is highly nontrivial due to the strong coupling between the velocity and temperature, the coordinate singularity at the origin, and infinite initial total mass and energy from the far field. To the best of our knowledge, in the existing literature, there have been no such results in this direction for the non-isentropic compressible flow with infinite energy. The main aim of this paper is to establish the global-in-time existence of weak solutions of the Cauchy problem for the full Navier-Stokes equations for M-D compressible heat-conducting flow in \mathbb{R}^n for $n \geq 2$, with initial data that are large, discontinuous, spherically symmetric, and away from the vacuum, and to analyze the underlying properties of these weak solutions.

To achieve these, our main strategy is to regard the Cauchy problem as the limit of a series of initial-boundary value problems (IBVPs) that are formulated in finite annular regions and, as the key argument, to establish a set of *a-priori* estimates that are uniform with respect to both the inner and outer radii of the annuli considered in the spherically symmetric Lagrangian coordinates. One of the first obstacles in deriving such estimates is the possible degeneracy or singularity of the temporal derivative operators $\rho \partial_t u$ and $\rho \partial_t e$, which are influenced by the behavior of the density. This observation motivates the estimate of pointwise upper and lower bounds of the density; if it can be achieved, then the dissipation structure of the momentum and energy equations can be utilized to gain further information on the solutions. Such density bounds are derived by exploiting the underlying structure of the continuity and momentum equations, and the regional parameters in the derivation must be given careful consideration in order to obtain the density bounds uniformly with respect to the size of domain. For this, we face two major difficulties: The first is to ensure that such bounds are independent of the inner radius $a \in (0, 1)$ of the annular region. To deal with this, we use the crucial observation that the density bounds can

actually be expressed explicitly in terms of the coordinate variables so that, using this explicit formula, the dependence on $a \in (0, 1)$ can be circumvented by restricting to the spatial regions bounded away from the inner boundary. The second difficulty is to show that the density bounds are also uniform over the outer radius of the annular region, which is resolved by taking the advantages of the specific form of the entropy inequality for the solutions in the Lagrangian coordinates. This is the main motivation for our proof to start by constructing approximate solutions under the Lagrangian formulation of system (1.6), rather than their Eulerian form. Once the uniform pointwise bounds of the density are established, it can be used to derive further estimates stemming from the parabolic structure of the momentum and energy equations. However, suitable spatial cut-off functions have to be introduced in their derivations, due to the fact that the density bounds described above are restricted on the domain bounded away from the inner boundary. This leads to certain problematic integrals near the boundary that cannot be estimated with the standard parabolic argument; we resolve this issue by incorporating the dissipation terms in the entropy inequality. By overcoming all these difficulties, we obtain the desired domain-independent *a-priori* estimates, which then allow us to construct a global weak solution of the Cauchy problem via the compactness argument.

We now outline the organization of the rest of this paper. In §2, we first introduce the definition of weak solutions of the Cauchy problem (1.1)–(1.5) and then state our main results. In §3, the main strategy and the overall scheme of the proof are described. The Cauchy problem considered can be regarded as the limit of a series of initial-boundary value problems that are formulated in finite annular regions. For such approximation problems, in §4, we derive some *a-priori* estimates that are independent of both the inner and outer radii of the annuli considered in the spherically symmetric Lagrangian coordinates. In §5, we establish the existence of weak solutions of some exterior problems in the Eulerian coordinates. Finally, in §6, the weak solutions of the original problem are attained via careful compactness arguments applied to this set of approximate solutions in the Eulerian coordinates.

2. GLOBAL SOLUTIONS AND MAIN THEOREM

In this section, we present the main theorem of this paper. For this purpose, we first introduce the following definition of global weak solutions of the Cauchy problem (1.1)–(1.5).

Definition 2.1 (Weak Solutions). *The vector function $(\rho, \mathbf{U}, e)(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is called to be a weak solution of the Cauchy problem (1.1)–(1.5) in $\mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T]$ if it satisfies the following:*

- (i) *There exists a upper semi-continuous function $\underline{r}(t) : [0, T] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ and a constant $C_0 = C_0(\rho_0, \mathbf{U}_0, e_0, \gamma, \mu, \lambda, \kappa, n) > 0$ such that*

$$\lim_{t \searrow 0} \underline{r}(t) = 0, \quad 0 \leq \underline{r}(t) \leq C_0 \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T].$$

With this, define $\mathcal{F} := \{(\mathbf{x}, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T] : |\mathbf{x}| > \underline{r}(t) \text{ for } t \in [0, T]\}$ as the fluid region.

- (ii) *$\rho \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathcal{F})$, $\rho(\mathbf{x}, t) = 0$ for $(\mathbf{x}, t) \in (\mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T]) \setminus \mathcal{F}$ almost everywhere, $(\mathbf{U}, e)(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is locally Hölder continuous in \mathcal{F} , and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} := \mathcal{F} \cap \{0 < t < T\}$ is an open set.*
- (iii) *For each $\Phi \in C^1([0, T]; C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^n))$,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho(\mathbf{x}, t) \Phi(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho_0(\mathbf{x}) \Phi(\mathbf{x}, 0) \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\rho \partial_t \Phi + \rho \mathbf{U} \cdot \nabla \Phi) \, d\mathbf{x} \, ds.$$

- (iv) *$\nabla \mathbf{U} \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathcal{F})$. Moreover, for any $\Psi \in C^1([0, T]; C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^n))$ with $\text{supp}(\Psi) \Subset \mathcal{F}$ (i.e., $\text{supp}(\Psi)$ is a compact subset of \mathcal{F}),*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\rho U^i)(\mathbf{x}, t) \Psi(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\rho_0 U_0^i)(\mathbf{x}) \Psi(\mathbf{x}, 0) \, d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\rho U^i \partial_t \Psi + \rho U^i (\mathbf{U} \cdot \nabla) \Psi + (\gamma - 1) \rho e \partial_{x^i} \Psi) \, d\mathbf{x} \, ds \\ & \quad - \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\mu \nabla \Psi \cdot \nabla U^i + (\mu + \lambda) \partial_{x^i} \Psi \text{div } \mathbf{U}) \, d\mathbf{x} \, ds \quad \text{for each } i = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned}$$

(v) $\nabla e \in L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{F})$. Moreover, for any $\Phi \in C^1([0, T]; C^1_c(\mathbb{R}^n))$ with $\text{supp}(\Phi) \Subset \mathcal{F}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\rho E)(\mathbf{x}, t) \Phi(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\rho_0 E_0)(\mathbf{x}) \Phi(\mathbf{x}, 0) \, d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\rho E \partial_t \Phi + (\rho E + P)(\mathbf{U} \cdot \nabla) \Phi) \, d\mathbf{x} \, ds \\ & \quad - \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(\kappa \nabla e + \frac{\mu}{2} \nabla |\mathbf{U}|^2 + \lambda \mathbf{U} \operatorname{div} \mathbf{U} + \mu (\nabla \mathbf{U}) \cdot \mathbf{U} \right) \cdot \nabla \Phi \, d\mathbf{x} \, ds. \end{aligned}$$

The main theorem provided below states the global-in-time existence and properties of weak solutions in \mathbb{R}^n for $n \geq 2$.

Theorem 2.1 (Main Theorem). *Let $(\rho_0, \mathbf{U}_0, e_0)(\mathbf{x}) = (\rho_0(r), u_0(r) \frac{\mathbf{x}}{r}, e_0(r))$, $r := |\mathbf{x}|$, be spherically symmetric initial data defined in $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} e_0(r) &\geq C_*^{-1}, \quad C_*^{-1} \leq \rho_0(r) \leq C_* \quad \text{for all } r \in [0, \infty), \\ \int_0^\infty \left(\rho_0 \left(\frac{1}{2} |u_0|^2 + \psi(e_0) \right) + (\gamma - 1) G(\rho_0) + |(\rho_0 - 1, u_0^2, e_0 - 1)|^2 \right) (r) r^m \, dr &\leq C_*, \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

for some given constant $C_* > 0$, where $G(\zeta) = 1 - \zeta + \zeta \log \zeta$ and $\psi(\zeta) = \zeta - 1 - \log \zeta$. Then, for each $T > 0$, there exists a global spherically symmetric weak solution $(\rho, \mathbf{U}, e)(\mathbf{x}, t)$ of the Cauchy problem (1.1)–(1.5) in the sense of Definition 2.1 such that the following statements hold:

(i) *There exists a continuous increasing function $g : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ with $g(y) \searrow 0$ as $y \searrow 0$ such that, for each bounded measurable set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$,*

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(\frac{1}{2} \rho |\mathbf{U}|^2 + G(\rho) \right) (\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x} \leq C(T), \quad \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in [0, T]} \int_E (\rho e)(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x} \leq C(T) (1 + g(|E|)),$$

where $|E|$ denotes the Lebesgue measure of E and $C(T) = C(T, C_*, \gamma, \mu, \lambda, \kappa, n) > 1$ is a constant depending on $T > 0$. Moreover, for $\eta \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \sup_{|\mathbf{x}| \geq \underline{r}(t) + \eta} \frac{|\mathbf{U}|}{\sqrt{e}}(\mathbf{x}, t) \, dt &\leq C(T) (\eta^{\frac{2-n}{2}} + \eta^{2-n}) && \text{if } n = 2, 3, \\ \int_0^T \sup_{|\mathbf{x}| \geq \underline{r}(t) + \eta} \log(\max\{1, e(\mathbf{x}, t)\}) \, dt &\leq C(T) (1 + \sqrt{|\log \eta|}) && \text{if } n = 2, \\ \int_0^T \sup_{|\mathbf{x}| \geq \underline{r}(t) + \eta} \log(\max\{1, e^{\pm 1}(\mathbf{x}, t)\}) \, dt &\leq C(T) \eta^{2-n} && \text{if } n = 3. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) *There exists a continuous function $(y, t) \mapsto \tilde{r}(y, t) : [0, \infty) \times [0, T] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that $y \mapsto \tilde{r}(y, t)$ is strictly increasing, and $\underline{r}(t) = \lim_{y \searrow 0} \tilde{r}(y, t)$ for $t \in [0, T]$. Moreover, there exists a constant $C_0 = C_0(C_*, \gamma, \mu, \lambda, \kappa, n) > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{cases} \int_{\{\underline{r}(t) < |\mathbf{x}| < \tilde{r}(y, t)\}} \rho(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x} = y & \text{for a.e. } (y, t) \in [0, \infty) \times [0, T], \\ \tilde{r}(y, t) = \tilde{r}_0(y) + \int_0^t u(\tilde{r}(y, s), s) \, ds & \text{for a.e. } (y, t) \in (0, \infty) \times [0, T], \\ n y \psi^{-1}\left(\frac{C_0}{y}\right) \leq \tilde{r}^n(y, t) \leq C_0(1 + y) & \text{for all } (y, t) \in (0, \infty) \times [0, T], \end{cases}$$

where $u(|\mathbf{x}|, t) := \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}, t) \cdot \frac{\mathbf{x}}{|\mathbf{x}|}$, ψ^{-1} is the left inverse of $\psi(\zeta) = \zeta - 1 - \log \zeta$, and the function $y \mapsto \tilde{r}_0(y) : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is implicitly defined as

$$y = \int_0^{\tilde{r}_0(y)} \rho_0(r) r^m \, dr \quad \text{for each } y \in [0, \infty).$$

(iii) For $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, there exists a constant $C(\varepsilon) = C(\varepsilon, T, C_*, \gamma, \mu, \lambda, \kappa, n) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{cases} |\tilde{r}(y_1, t) - \tilde{r}(y_2, t)| \leq C(\varepsilon)|y_1 - y_2| & \text{for all } (y_1, y_2, t) \in [\varepsilon, \infty)^2 \times [0, T], \\ |\tilde{r}(y, t_1) - \tilde{r}(y, t_2)| \leq C(\varepsilon)|t_1^{\frac{3}{4}} - t_2^{\frac{3}{4}}| & \text{for all } (y, t_1, t_2) \in [\varepsilon, \infty) \times [0, T]^2. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, let $\sigma(t) := \min\{1, t\}$ and $B^c(r) := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\mathbf{x}| \geq r\}$. Then

$$C^{-1}(\varepsilon) \leq \rho(\mathbf{x}, t) \leq C(\varepsilon), \quad |\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}, t)| \leq C(\varepsilon)\sigma^{-\frac{1}{4}}(t), \quad 0 < e(\mathbf{x}, t) \leq C(\varepsilon)\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t)$$

for a.e. (\mathbf{x}, t) such that $t \in [0, T]$ and $\mathbf{x} \in B^c(\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t))$, and

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int_{B^c(\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t))} |(\rho - 1, |\mathbf{U}|^2, e - 1, \sqrt{\sigma} \nabla \mathbf{U}, \sigma \nabla e)|^2(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x} \\ & + \int_0^T \int_{B^c(\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t))} |(\nabla \mathbf{U}, (\mathbf{U} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{U}, \nabla e, \sqrt{\sigma} \partial_t \mathbf{U}, \sigma \partial_t e)|^2(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x} dt \leq C(\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

In addition, for all $t \in (0, T]$ and $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in B^c(\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t))$,

$$\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(t) |\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}, t) - \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{y}, t)| + \sigma(t) |e(\mathbf{x}, t) - e(\mathbf{y}, t)| \leq C(\varepsilon) |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and, for all $0 < t_1 < t_2 \leq T$ and $|\mathbf{x}| \geq \sup_{t_1 \leq t \leq t_2} \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)$,

$$\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(t_1) |\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}, t_1) - \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}, t_2)| + \sigma(t_1) |e(\mathbf{x}, t_1) - e(\mathbf{x}, t_2)| \leq C(\varepsilon) |t_2 - t_1|^{\frac{1}{4}}.$$

Furthermore, defining $\rho^{(\varepsilon)}(\mathbf{x}, t) := \rho(\mathbf{x}, t) \chi_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}, t)$ with

$$\chi_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}, t) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t \in [0, T] \text{ and } \mathbf{x} \in B^c(\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

then, for all $L \in \mathbb{N}$, $\rho^{(\varepsilon)}(\mathbf{x}, t) \in C^0([0, T]; H^{-1}(B_L))$ and

$$\|\rho^{(\varepsilon)}(\cdot, t_1) - \rho^{(\varepsilon)}(\cdot, t_2)\|_{H^{-1}(B_L)} \leq C(\varepsilon) |t_1 - t_2| \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq T,$$

where $C(\varepsilon)$ is independent of $L \in \mathbb{N}$ as before and $B_L := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\mathbf{x}| < L\}$.

Remark 2.1. The domain for which the momentum equations hold weakly can be extended to the entire space-time domain. However, the viscosity term may be present in the weak form as a non-standard limit distribution of approximate solutions. More specifically, let $(\rho, \mathbf{U}, e)(\mathbf{x}, t)$ be a weak solution with initial data $(\rho_0, \mathbf{U}_0, e_0)(\mathbf{x})$ obtained in Theorem 2.1. Let $\xi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a fixed increasing C^1 -function with $\xi \equiv 0$ on $[0, 1]$ and $\xi \equiv 1$ on $[2, \infty)$, and set $\xi^R(r) := \xi(\frac{r}{R})$. Then there exists a sequence of vector valued functions $\{\mathbf{U}_\alpha(\mathbf{x}, t)\}_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\mathbf{U}_\alpha^i \in L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T])$ for each $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i = 1, \dots, n$. Moreover, for each $i = 1, \dots, n$ and each $\Psi \in C^2([0, T]; C_c^2(\mathbb{R}^n))$ with $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, defining the distribution $\mathbb{M}(\cdot, t) \in (C^2([0, T]; C_c^2(\mathbb{R}^n)))^*$ by

$$\mathbb{M}^i(\Psi, t) := \lim_{R \searrow 0} \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t \int_{\{|\mathbf{x}| \geq \alpha^{-1}\}} \{(\mu + \lambda)(\mathbf{U}_\alpha \cdot \nabla) \partial_i \Psi^R + \mu \mathbf{U}_\alpha^i \Delta \Psi^R\} \, d\mathbf{x} ds,$$

with $\Psi^R(\mathbf{x}, t) := \xi^R(|\mathbf{x}|) \Psi(\mathbf{x}, t)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\rho U^i)(\mathbf{x}, t) \Psi(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\rho_0 U_0^i)(\mathbf{x}) \Psi(\mathbf{x}, 0) \, d\mathbf{x} \\ & = \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\rho U^i \partial_t \Psi + \rho U^i (\mathbf{U} \cdot \nabla) \Psi + (\gamma - 1) \rho e \partial_{\mathbf{x}^i} \Psi)(\mathbf{x}, s) \, d\mathbf{x} ds + \mathbb{M}^i(\Psi, t) \quad \text{for each } i = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned}$$

In fact, $\mathbf{U}_\alpha(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is the velocity of solution to the exterior sphere problem, which satisfies the auxiliary boundary condition:

$$\mathbf{U}_\alpha(\mathbf{x}, t) = 0, \quad \nabla e_\alpha(\mathbf{x}, t) = 0 \quad \text{for } |\mathbf{x}| = \alpha^{-1} \text{ and } t \in [0, T].$$

The existence of such solution $(\rho_\alpha, \mathbf{U}_\alpha, e_\alpha)$ is stated in Theorem 3.1 in §3.3.

The derivation of the above result is obtained by using the uniform entropy estimates on the approximate solutions $(\rho_\alpha, \mathbf{U}_\alpha, e_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}}$ (cf. Theorem 3.1(i); also see [18]). An important followup is whether the following equality hold:

$$\mathbb{M}^i(\Psi, t) \stackrel{?}{=} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \{(\mu + \lambda) \operatorname{div} \mathbf{U} \partial_i \Psi + \mu \nabla \mathbf{U}^i \nabla \Psi\} d\mathbf{x} ds,$$

which is beyond the scope of this paper and will further be addressed in a separate paper.

3. MAIN STRATEGY AND REFORMULATION

Throughout this paper, we use the following notation for five types of generic constants that are all larger than 1 and may be different at different occurrence (without loss of generality) to indicate their specific dependence on various parameters:

$$\begin{aligned} C &\equiv C(\gamma, \mu, \lambda, \kappa, n), & C_0 &\equiv C_0(C, C_*), & C(T) &\equiv C(T, C_0), \\ C(a) &\equiv C(a, T, C_0), & C(\varepsilon) &\equiv C(\varepsilon, T, C_0) & \text{for each } a \in (0, 1) \text{ and } \varepsilon \in (0, 1], \end{aligned}$$

where $C_* = C_*(\rho_0, u_0, e_0) > 1$ depends only on the initial data as in (2.1) of Theorem 2.1. We also denote $\beta := 2\mu + \lambda$.

3.1. Main strategy. Our approach for proving Theorem 2.1 is to split the original problem (1.6) into the following two parts:

- (I) For any fixed $a \in (0, 1)$ and $T > 0$, we prove the global-in-time existence of a weak solution $(\rho_a, u_a, e_a)(r, t)$ of the initial-boundary value problem (IBVP) of system (1.6) in the exterior domain $(r, t) \in [a, \infty) \times [0, T]$ with the following initial-boundary conditions:

$$\begin{cases} (\rho_a, u_a, e_a)(r, 0) = (\rho_a^0, u_a^0, e_a^0)(r) & \text{for } r \in [a, \infty), \\ u(a, t) = \partial_r e(a, t) = 0 & \text{for } t \in [0, T], \end{cases}$$

where (ρ_a^0, u_a^0, e_a^0) is the approximate initial data constructed from the initial data (ρ_0, u_0, e_0) given in Theorem 2.1. The detailed construction can be found in §3.2, and (ρ_a^0, u_a^0, e_a^0) is shown to satisfy the initial condition (2.1) with a constant $C_0 > 0$ independent of $a \in (0, 1)$ in Propositions 3.1. Notice that the corresponding solutions $\{(\rho_a, u_a, e_a)(r, t)\}_{a \in (0, 1)}$ satisfy certain high-order estimates uniformly in $a \in (0, 1)$ (see Theorem 3.1 in §3.3).

- (II) We employ the uniform estimates, independent of a obtained in (I), and make careful compactness arguments to prove that there is a subsequence $a_j \searrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ such that the corresponding limit triple (ρ, u, e) is a global weak solution described in Theorem 2.1.

Part (I) of our approach will be achieved via the following six steps:

- (I.1) We modify the original initial data (ρ_0, u_0, e_0) into $(\rho_a^0, u_a^0, e_a^0)(r)$ in the Eulerian coordinates, as constructed in §3.2.
- (I.2) The solution, (ρ_a, u_a, e_a) , in (I) is obtained as the limit of solutions of the approximate problems posed in bounded annular domains. For this purpose, we apply a truncation procedure on the mollified initial data (ρ_a^0, u_a^0, e_a^0) in the Eulerian coordinates near the far field region (*i.e.*, $r \rightarrow \infty$), which is parameterized by integer $k \in \mathbb{N}$.
- (I.3) We transform the IBVP in the exterior domain $(r, t) \in [a, \infty) \times [0, T]$ stated in (I) into a set of IBVPs shown in (3.15)–(3.16) in the Lagrangian coordinates in the spatial interval $[0, k]$. Indeed, the main point of the above reduction and modification of the initial data is to ensure that, for each $T > 0$, there exists a unique global-in-time smooth solution of the approximate IBVP (3.15)–(3.16) in $(x, t) \in [0, k] \times [0, T]$.
- (I.4) We derive the entropy inequalities on these solutions. Consequently, we obtain the upper and lower bounds of the density. These density bounds are independent of the approximation parameter $k \in \mathbb{N}$; in addition, they are independent of $a \in (0, 1)$ on the regions away from the origin in the Lagrangian coordinates.

- (I.5) Based on the bounds of the density obtained in (I.4), we seek for a set of high-order estimates on the regions away from the origin, $x = 0$, in the Lagrangian coordinates, which is independent of the approximate parameter $a \in (0, 1)$. In fact, these estimates can be obtained by introducing a set of C^1 cut-off functions $g_\varepsilon(x)$, for each $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, away from the origin (see (4.21)–(4.23)). However, the inclusion of these cut-off functions leads to the difficulties in estimating certain integral terms near the boundary: $x = \varepsilon$, which is described in the proof of Lemma 4.4. In order to overcome these difficulties, we make full use of the dissipation terms in the entropy estimates from Step (I.4), which can be found in Lemma 4.3.
- (I.6) Finally, we denote $(\tilde{v}_{a,k}, \tilde{u}_{a,k}, \tilde{e}_{a,k})(x, s)$ (with the specific volume $\tilde{v}_{a,k} := (\tilde{\rho}_{a,k})^{-1}$) as the approximate solution of problem (3.15)–(3.16) in the Lagrangian domain $(x, s) \in [0, k] \times [0, T]$, and

$$\tilde{r}_{a,k}(x, s) = \left(a^n + n \int_0^x \tilde{v}_{a,k}(y, s) dy \right)^{\frac{1}{n}}$$

as the corresponding particle path function. For each $(a, k) \in (0, 1) \times \mathbb{N}$, we formulate the coordinate transformation $(r, t) = \mathcal{T}_{a,k}(x, s) = (\mathcal{T}_{a,k}^{(1)}, \mathcal{T}_{a,k}^{(2)})(x, s)$ as

$$\mathcal{T}_{a,k}^{(1)}(x, s) = \tilde{r}_{a,k}(x, s), \quad \mathcal{T}_{a,k}^{(2)}(x, s) = s \quad \text{for } (x, s) \in [0, k] \times [0, T].$$

Owing to the density bounds from Step (I.4), the inverse function $\mathcal{T}_{a,k}^{-1}$ exists. By these coordinate transformations, we define

$$(\bar{v}_{a,k}, \bar{u}_{a,k}, \bar{e}_{a,k})(r, t) := (\tilde{v}_{a,k}, \tilde{u}_{a,k}, \tilde{e}_{a,k})(\mathcal{T}_{a,k}^{-1}(r, t)) \quad \text{for } (r, t) \in R_{a,k},$$

where $R_{a,k} := \mathcal{T}_{a,k}([0, k] \times [0, T]) = \{(r, t) : t \in [0, T], r \in [a, \tilde{r}_{a,k}(k, t)]\}$. We then extend these functions into the entire exterior Eulerian domain $(r, t) \in [a, \infty) \times [0, T]$ by introducing the following test functions: Let $\xi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a function with $\xi \in C^\infty$ such that $\xi(\zeta) = 1$ if $\zeta \leq 0$, $\xi(\zeta) = 0$ if $\zeta \geq 1$, and $|\xi'(\zeta)| \leq 2$ for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$. With this, we define the following cut-off functions:

$$\varphi_{a,k}(r, t) = \xi\left(\frac{2r - \tilde{r}_{a,k}(k, t)}{\tilde{r}_{a,k}(k, t)}\right).$$

It is shown in §5.2 that $\text{supp}(\varphi_{a,k}) \subseteq R_{a,k}$ so that the approximate solutions in the Eulerian coordinates can be extended to domain $[a, \infty) \times [0, T]$:

$$(\rho_{a,k}, u_{a,k}, e_{a,k})(r, t) = (1, 0, 1) + \begin{cases} \varphi_{a,k}(\bar{v}_{a,k}^{-1} - 1, \bar{u}_{a,k}, \bar{e}_{a,k} - 1)(r, t) & \text{for } (r, t) \in R_{a,k}, \\ (0, 0, 0) & \text{for } (r, t) \in [a, \infty) \times [0, T] \setminus R_{a,k}, \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

With the uniform *a-priori* estimates derived in Steps (I.4)–(I.5), there exists a subsequence $(\rho_{a,k_j}, u_{a,k_j}, e_{a,k_j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that its limit function (ρ_a, u_a, e_a) is a weak solution of the exterior problem stated in (I). Furthermore, it can also be shown that such solutions continue to enjoy the uniform regularity estimates in $a \in (0, 1)$ attained in Steps (I.4)–(I.5). The detailed analysis of this procedure can be found in §5.

Part (II) of our approach can be achieved via the following four steps:

- (II.1) For given approximate initial data (ρ_a^0, u_a^0, e_a^0) in Part (I), denote

$$\{(\rho_a, u_a, e_a)(r, t) : [a, \infty) \times [0, T] \rightarrow [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty)\}_{a \in (0, 1)}$$

as the global weak solutions of the exterior problem obtained in Part (I). Based on the entropy estimate, we prove the uniform integrability of the approximate solutions $(\rho_a, u_a, e_a)_{a \in (0, 1)}$ with respect to the approximate parameter $a \in (0, 1)$ in §6.1, which plays key roles in proving that the limit vector function of these approximate solutions are indeed a weak solution of the original problem (see Lemmas 6.8–6.9).

(II.2) The particle path functions $\tilde{r}_a(x, t) : [0, \infty) \times [0, T] \rightarrow [a, \infty)$ associated with the approximate density ρ_a for each $a \in (0, 1)$ are defined to be the functions satisfying

$$x = \int_a^{\tilde{r}_a(x, t)} \rho_a(r, t) r^m dr \quad \text{for a.e. } (x, t) \in [0, \infty) \times [0, T],$$

which can be found in Lemma 5.3 in §5.3. Then, by the estimates obtained in Step (II.1) and compactness arguments, we show in §6.2 that there exists a function $\tilde{r}(x, t) : [0, \infty) \times [0, T] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ that is the limit function of sequence $\{\tilde{r}_a(x, t)\}_{a \in (0, 1)}$ when $a \searrow 0$. Moreover, we show that, for $t \in [0, T]$, $\lim_{x \searrow 0} \tilde{r}(x, t)$ does not necessarily equal to zero, but a function of t instead in general: $\underline{r}(t) : [0, T] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$. In fact, $\tilde{r}(x, t)$ is the particle path of our original problem (1.6), and $\underline{r}(t)$ is the vacuum interface in (1.6) that separates the fluid region and the possible vacuum, which can be verified later. Furthermore, it is shown in Lemma 6.2(iii) that, for each $x > 0$, there exists $\delta(x) > 0$ depending only on $x > 0$ such that

$$\inf_{t \in [0, T]} \tilde{r}(x, t) \geq \delta(x) > 0. \quad (3.2)$$

This is crucial for the next step where the limit, $a \searrow 0$, is taken in $\{(\rho_a, u_a, e_a)\}_{a \in (0, 1)}$.

(II.3) Next, for each $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, we fix a domain away from the origin by

$$\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon := \{(r, t) \in [0, \infty) \times [0, T] : r \in [\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t), \infty)\}, \quad (3.3)$$

where $\tilde{r}(x, t)$ is obtained in Step (II.2). Moreover, we set

$$\mathcal{F} := \{(r, t) \in [0, \infty) \times [0, T] : r > \underline{r}(t)\}.$$

By the high-order estimates derived in Step (I.5), a limit function $(\rho, u, e)(r, t) : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty)$ is constructed in §6.3 as follows: By an application of the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem, we first obtain $(\rho_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon, e_\varepsilon)(r, t)$ defined in domain \mathcal{F}_ε for each $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, then construct the vector function (ρ, u, e) by extending $(\rho_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon, e_\varepsilon)$ with

$$(\rho_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon, e_\varepsilon)(r, t) := \begin{cases} (0, 0, 0) & \text{if } (r, t) \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon, \\ (\rho_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon, e_\varepsilon)(r, t) & \text{if } (r, t) \in \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon, \end{cases}$$

and finally glue $\{(\rho_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon, e_\varepsilon)(r, t)\}_{\varepsilon \in (0, 1]}$ together over parameter $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ by the telescoping sum:

$$f = f_{\varepsilon_1} + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (f_{\varepsilon_{i+1}} - f_{\varepsilon_i}),$$

for $f = \rho, u, e$, respectively, and $\varepsilon_i \equiv \frac{1}{i}$. The detail of this procedure is given in Propositions A.1–A.2 in Appendix A. In addition, it is also shown in Lemma 6.4 that

$$x = \int_{\underline{r}(t)}^{\tilde{r}(x, t)} \rho(r, t) r^m dr \quad \text{for a.e. } (x, t) \in [0, \infty) \times [0, T],$$

which justifies that $\underline{r}(t)$ obtained in Step (II.2) is the vacuum interface curve of our original problem (1.6).

(II.4) Finally, by the estimates obtained in Step (II.1) and the convergences in Steps (II.2)–(II.3), we prove the weak forms of solutions listed in Theorem 2.1. The weak forms of solutions in the Eulerian coordinates $(\mathbf{x}, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T]$ are shown in §6.4.

Remark 3.1. *Before proceeding, we first give the following remarks:*

- (a) *In Steps (I.1)–(I.2), it is important to show that the modified initial data sequence satisfies the entropy estimates uniformly with respect to $(a, k) \in (0, 1) \times \mathbb{N}$ and strongly converges to the original initial data $(\rho_0, u_0, e_0)(r)$ in proper functional spaces. These results will be needed later in the compactness arguments in Step (I.6), which is detailed in §5.*

- (b) *The main purpose of the reformulation from the Eulerian to the Lagrangian coordinates in Step (I.3) is to obtain the crucial upper and lower bounds of the density (see statement (ii) of Theorem 4.1 in §4), which are independent of $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that these bounds of the density are an improvement on the result of Jiang [23].*
- (c) *As mentioned in Step (I.5), the introduction of C^1 cut-off functions away from the origin leads to several hurdles in the estimates, and these issues have also been encountered in Hoff-Jenssen [18]. In this paper, we resolve these issues by making use of the dissipation terms that are present in the entropy estimate. This is detailed in Lemma 4.3 in §4.3.*
- (d) *The purpose of the coordinate transformation back into the Eulerian domain, introduced in Step (I.6) is due to the following consideration: As $k \rightarrow \infty$, a difficulty arises due to the nonlinear second-order spatial differential operators in the Lagrangian forms of the momentum and internal energy equations. Since these operators are linear in the Eulerian coordinates, this difficulty is resolved by converting the approximate solutions, originally obtained in the Lagrangian coordinates, into the functions in the Eulerian domain. This allows us to take limit $k \rightarrow \infty$ and obtain the desired weak forms in the Eulerian coordinates.*
- (e) *In Step (I.6), after taking limit $k \rightarrow \infty$, it requires to show that the limit solution still satisfies the entropy inequality, since it will be required in Step (II.1). This is achieved by an application of Mazur's lemma (Lemma 5.9) in §5.5 and Proposition B.2.*
- (f) *In order to apply the compactness arguments from the high-order estimates obtained in (I.5), it is crucial that \mathcal{F}_ε defined in (3.3) is a set strictly bounded away from the origin, $r = 0$, for each $\varepsilon > 0$. We obtain this by assertion (3.2) in Step (II.2).*

The rest of this section is organized as follows: In §3.3, we show our main existence results for weak solutions with large data of the exterior problem mentioned in Part (I). In §3.2– §3.4, we describe the detailed procedures for the modification and truncation of the initial data listed in Steps (I.2)– (I.3) above. Finally, in §3.5, we reformulate the exterior problem in the Eulerian coordinates into the approximate Lagrangian problems in domain $(x, t) \in [0, k] \times [0, T]$ as described in Step (I.4), and establish the corresponding global-in-time well-posedness of the unique strong solution with regular initial data.

3.2. Mollification of the initial data in the Eulerian domain. Let $(\rho_0, u_0, e_0)(r)$, $r \in [0, \infty)$, be the initial data in Theorem 2.1. First, we extend the initial data to \mathbb{R} by

$$(\hat{\rho}_0, \hat{u}_0, \hat{e}_0)(\zeta) := \begin{cases} (\rho_0(\zeta), u_0(\zeta), e_0(\zeta)) & \text{if } \zeta \in [0, \infty), \\ (\rho_0(-\zeta), -u_0(-\zeta), e_0(-\zeta)) & \text{if } \zeta \in (-\infty, 0). \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

Then, for each $a \in (0, 1)$, let $j_a \in C_c^\infty([-1, 1])$ be the standard 1-D mollifiers such that $\text{supp}(j_a) \subseteq [-\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2}]$. We define

$$(\hat{\rho}_a^0, \hat{u}_a^0, \hat{e}_a^0) := (\hat{\rho}_0 * j_a, \hat{u}_0 * j_a, \hat{e}_0 * j_a).$$

It follows that, for some $C_* > 0$, independent of $a \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{\rho}_a^0, \hat{u}_a^0, \hat{e}_a^0) &\in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}), \\ \hat{e}_a^0(\zeta) &\geq C_*^{-1}, \quad C_*^{-1} \leq \hat{\rho}_a^0(\zeta) \leq C_* \quad \text{for a.e. } \zeta \in \mathbb{R}, \\ (\hat{\rho}_a^0, \hat{u}_a^0, \hat{e}_a^0)(\zeta) &\rightarrow (\rho_0, u_0, e_0)(r) \quad \text{as } a \searrow 0 \text{ for a.e. } \zeta \in (0, \infty). \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

Next, let $\chi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be such that $\chi \in C^\infty$, $\chi(\zeta) = 0$ if $\zeta \leq 1$, and $\chi(\zeta) = 1$ if $\zeta \geq 2$. Set the cut-off functions:

$$\chi_a(r) = \chi\left(\frac{r}{a}\right) \quad \text{for each } a \in (0, 1).$$

It follows that $\chi_a(r) = 0$ for $r \leq a$ and $\chi_a(r) = 1$ for $r \geq 2a$. With this, we define the approximate exterior initial data:

$$(\rho_a^0, u_a^0, e_a^0)(r) := ((\hat{\rho}_a^0 - 1)\chi_a + 1, \hat{u}_a^0\chi_a, (\hat{e}_a^0 - 1)\chi_a + 1)(r) \quad \text{for all } r \in (0, \infty). \quad (3.6)$$

Proposition 3.1. *The approximate exterior initial data $(\rho_a^0, u_a^0, e_a^0)(r)$ satisfy*

- (i) $(\rho_a^0, u_a^0, e_a^0) \in C^\infty([0, \infty))$ and $u_a^0(a) = \partial_r e_a^0(a) = 0$.

(ii) As $a \searrow 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\rho_a^0 - 1, |u_a^0|^2, e_a^0 - 1) - (\rho_0 - 1, |u_0|^2, e_0 - 1)\|_{L^2([0, \infty), r^m dr)} \rightarrow 0, \\ & (\rho_a^0, u_a^0, e_a^0)(r) \rightarrow (\rho_0, u_0, e_0)(r) \quad \text{for a.e. } r \in [0, \infty). \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

(iii) There exists some constant $C_0 > 0$ independent of $a \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} e_a^0(r) & \geq C_0^{-1}, \quad C_0^{-1} \leq \rho_a^0(r) \leq C_0 \quad \text{for all } (a, r) \in (0, 1) \times [0, \infty), \\ \sup_{a \in (0, 1)} \int_a^\infty & \left(\rho_a^0 \left(\frac{1}{2} |u_a^0|^2 + \psi(e_a^0) \right) + G(\rho_a^0) + |(\rho_a^0 - 1, |u_a^0|^2, e_a^0 - 1)|^2 \right) (r) r^m dr \leq C_0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

Proof. Statements (i) and $C_*^{-1} \leq \rho_a^0(r) \leq C_*$ for all $r \in [0, \infty)$ follow immediately from construction (3.6), while the almost everywhere convergence (3.7)₂ follows from (3.5).

Next, by the Minkowski inequality and (3.6), we have

$$\|u_a^0\|_{L^4([0, \infty), r^m dr)} \leq \int_{-\frac{a}{2}}^{\frac{a}{2}} \left(\int_0^\infty |\chi_a(r) \hat{u}_0(r - \zeta) j_a(\zeta)|^4 r^m dr \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} d\zeta \leq \int_{-\frac{a}{2}}^{\frac{a}{2}} j_a(\zeta) \left(\int_a^\infty |u_0(r - \zeta)|^4 r^m dr \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} d\zeta.$$

Let $\xi \equiv r - \zeta$. Then $0 \leq 1 + \frac{\zeta}{\xi} \leq 2$ for all $(\zeta, \xi) \in [-\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2}] \times [\frac{a}{2}, \infty)$. It follows that

$$\|u_a^0\|_{L^4([0, \infty), r^m dr)} \leq \int_{-\frac{a}{2}}^{\frac{a}{2}} j_a(\zeta) \left(\int_{a-\zeta}^\infty |u_0(\xi)|^4 \xi^m \left(1 + \frac{\zeta}{\xi}\right)^m d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} d\zeta \leq 2^{\frac{m}{4}} C_* \int_{-\frac{a}{2}}^{\frac{a}{2}} j_a(\zeta) d\zeta = 2^{\frac{m}{4}} C_*.$$

Applying the same argument to $(\rho_a^0 - 1, e_a^0 - 1)$ yields the third term of (3.8)₂.

Next, by the Hölder inequality,

$$\||u_a^0|^2 - |u_0|^2\|_{L^2([0, \infty), r^m dr)} \leq (1 + 2^{\frac{m}{4}}) C_* \|u_a^0 - u_0\|_{L^4([0, \infty), r^m dr)}.$$

From this, we now show $\|u_a^0 - u_0\|_{L^4([0, \infty), r^m dr)} \rightarrow 0$ as $a \searrow 0$. By construction (3.6),

$$\|u_a^0 - u_0\|_{L^4([0, \infty), r^m dr)} \leq \|\chi_a(\hat{u}_a^0 - u_0)\|_{L^4([0, \infty), r^m dr)} + \left(\int_0^{2a} (1 - \chi_a)^4 |u_0|^4(r) r^m dr \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}.$$

Using the fact that $\|u_0\|_{L^4([0, \infty), r^m dr)} \leq C_*$, $\chi_a \rightarrow 1$ as $a \searrow 0$ almost everywhere, $0 \leq \chi_a \leq 1$, and the dominated convergence theorem, we have

$$\lim_{a \searrow 0} \int_0^{2a} (1 - \chi_a)^4 |u_0|^4(r) r^m dr = 0.$$

Thus, we conclude that

$$\lim_{a \searrow 0} \||u_a^0|^2 - |u_0|^2\|_{L^2([0, \infty), r^m dr)} \leq (1 + 2^{\frac{m}{4}}) C_* \lim_{a \searrow 0} \|\chi_a(\hat{u}_a^0 - u_0)\|_{L^4([0, \infty), r^m dr)}.$$

Therefore, it is left to prove the limit: $\|\chi_a(\hat{u}_a^0 - u_0)\|_{L^4([0, \infty), r^m dr)} \rightarrow 0$ as $a \searrow 0$. To show this, it follows from the Minkowski inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\chi_a(\hat{u}_a^0 - u_0)\|_{L^4([0, \infty), r^m dr)} & \leq \int_{-\frac{a}{2}}^{\frac{a}{2}} j_a(\zeta) \left(\int_a^\infty |u_0(r - \zeta) - u_0(r)|^4 r^m dr \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} d\zeta \\ & \leq 2^{\frac{m}{4}} \int_{-\frac{a}{2}}^{\frac{a}{2}} j_a(\zeta) \left(\int_{a-\zeta}^\infty |u_0(\xi) - u_0(\xi + \zeta)|^4 \xi^m d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} d\zeta, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $0 \leq 1 + \frac{\zeta}{\xi} \leq 2$ if $\zeta \in [-\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2}]$ and $\xi \geq a - \zeta$. Now, by the separability of space $L^4([0, \infty), r^m dr)$, for each $\delta > 0$, there exists $h_\delta \in C_c^\infty([0, \infty))$ such that $\|h_\delta - \hat{u}_0\|_{L^4([0, \infty), r^m dr)} \leq 3^{-\frac{m}{4}} \frac{\delta}{4}$.

By the triangle inequality, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{-\frac{m}{4}} \|\chi_a(\hat{u}_a^0 - u_0)\|_{L^4([0,\infty),r^m dr)} &\leq \int_{-\frac{a}{2}}^{\frac{a}{2}} j_a(\zeta) \left(\int_{\frac{a}{2}}^{\infty} |u_0(\xi) - h_\delta(\xi)|^4 \xi^m d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} d\zeta \\ &\quad + \int_{-\frac{a}{2}}^{\frac{a}{2}} j_a(\zeta) \left(\int_{\frac{a}{2}}^{\infty} |h_\delta(\xi) - h_\delta(\xi + \zeta)|^4 \xi^m d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} d\zeta \\ &\quad + \int_{-\frac{a}{2}}^{\frac{a}{2}} j_a(\zeta) \left(\int_{a-\zeta}^{\infty} |h_\delta(\xi + \zeta) - u_0(\xi + \zeta)|^4 \xi^m d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} d\zeta \\ &=: \sum_{i=1}^3 I_i. \end{aligned}$$

First, I_1 and I_3 are estimated as:

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &:= \int_{-\frac{a}{2}}^{\frac{a}{2}} j_a(\zeta) \left(\int_{\frac{a}{2}}^{\infty} |u_0(\xi) - h_\delta(\xi)|^4 \xi^m d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} d\zeta \leq \frac{\delta}{4} \int_{-\frac{a}{2}}^{\frac{a}{2}} j_a(\zeta) d\zeta = \frac{\delta}{4}, \\ I_3 &\leq 3^{\frac{m}{4}} \int_{-\frac{a}{2}}^{\frac{a}{2}} j_a(\zeta) \left(\int_a^{\infty} |h_\delta(r) - u_0(r)|^4 r^m dr \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} d\zeta \leq \frac{\delta}{4} \int_{-\frac{a}{2}}^{\frac{a}{2}} j_a(\zeta) d\zeta = \frac{\delta}{4}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that $\frac{1}{2} \leq 1 - \frac{\zeta}{r} \leq \frac{3}{2}$ for all $(\zeta, r) \in [-\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2}] \times [a, \infty)$. Since h_δ is compactly supported for each $\delta > 0$, there exists $a_\delta \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$I_2 := \int_{-\frac{a}{2}}^{\frac{a}{2}} j_a(\zeta) \left(\int_{\frac{a}{2}}^{\infty} |h_\delta(\xi) - h_\delta(\xi + \zeta)|^4 \xi^m d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} d\zeta \leq \frac{\delta}{2} \int_{-\frac{a}{2}}^{\frac{a}{2}} j_a d\zeta = \frac{\delta}{2} \quad \text{if } a \in (0, a_\delta).$$

Thus, for given $\delta > 0$, there exists $a_\delta \in (0, 1)$ such that $2^{-\frac{m}{4}} \|\chi_a(\hat{u}_a^0 - u_0)\|_{L^4([0,\infty),r^m dr)} \leq \delta$ for all $a \in (0, a_\delta)$. This implies that $\lim_{a \searrow 0} \| |u_a^0|^2 - |u_0|^2 \|_{L^2([0,\infty),r^m dr)} = 0$. The proof for ρ_a^0 and e_a^0 follows from the same argument.

Next, by the Jensen inequality and the fact that $G(\zeta)$, $\psi(\zeta)$, and $|\zeta|^2$ are convex functions of ζ , it follows that $G(\rho_a^0) \leq G(\hat{\rho}_0) * j_a$, $\psi(e_a^0) \leq \psi(\hat{e}_0) * j_a$, and $|u_a^0| \leq |\hat{u}_0|^2 * j_a$ for $r \in (0, \infty)$. Using Fubini-Tonelli's theorem, it follows that

$$\int_a^\infty G(\rho_a^0)(r) r^m dr = \int_{-\frac{a}{2}}^{\frac{a}{2}} \left(\int_{a-\zeta}^\infty G(\rho_0)(\xi) (\zeta + \xi)^m d\xi \right) j_a(\zeta) d\zeta \leq 2^m \int_{-\frac{a}{2}}^{\frac{a}{2}} C_* j_a(\zeta) d\zeta = 2^m C_*,$$

where we have used the initial condition (2.1)₂. In a similar way, we have

$$\int_a^\infty \rho_a^0 \psi(e_a^0)(r) r^m dr \leq 2^m C_* \int_{-\frac{a}{2}}^{\frac{a}{2}} \left(\int_0^\infty \rho_0 \psi(e_0)(\xi) \xi^m d\xi \right) j_a(\zeta) d\zeta \leq 2^m C_*^3.$$

Similarly, we also obtain

$$\|\rho_a^0 |u_a^0|^2\|_{L^1([0,\infty),r^m dr)} \leq 2^m C_*^3.$$

Setting $C_0 = 2^m C_*^3$, we complete the proof. \square

3.3. The approximation problem in the exterior Eulerian domain. To resolve the coordinate singularity at the origin, which poses a significant difficulty for the existence of solutions, we first consider the approximation problem in the exterior domain: $\Omega_{a,T} := [a, \infty) \times [0, T]$ for fixed $a \in (0, 1)$, and find a solution (ρ_a, u_a, e_a) of the exterior problem for system (1.6) over domain $\Omega_{a,T}$ with the following initial-boundary conditions:

$$\begin{cases} u_a(a, t) = 0, & \partial_r e_a(a, t) = 0 & \text{for } t \in [0, T], \\ (\rho_a, u_a, e_a)(r, 0) = (\rho_a^0, u_a^0, e_a^0)(r) & \text{for } r \in [a, \infty). \end{cases} \quad (3.9)$$

Now the boundary conditions in (3.9) can be interpreted physically as the presence of an insulating ball at the origin, with no slip-boundary condition for the velocity field and gradient field of the internal energy. Moreover, the initial data are given by $(\rho_a^0, u_a^0, e_a^0)(r)$ constructed in §3.2 above.

To prove Theorem 2.1, the existence of weak solutions of the exterior problem (1.6) and (3.9) for each $a \in (0, 1)$ is first obtained so that some compactness arguments can be applied when $a \searrow 0$.

Definition 3.1 (Spherically Symmetric Weak Solutions in the Exterior Domain). *Let*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}^a &:= \{ \phi \in C^\infty([a, \infty) \times [0, T]) : \exists N > a \text{ such that } \phi(r, t) = 0 \text{ for } r \geq N \}, \\ \mathcal{D}_0^a &:= \{ \phi \in \mathcal{D}^a : \phi(a, t) = 0 \text{ for all } t \in [0, T] \}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $(\rho_a, u_a, e_a)(r, t)$ is a weak solution of problem (1.6) and (3.9), provided that

(i) For each $\phi \in \mathcal{D}^a$,

$$\int_a^\infty \rho_a(r, t) \phi(r, t) r^m dr - \int_a^\infty \rho_a^0(r) \phi(r, 0) r^m dr = \int_0^t \int_a^\infty (\rho_a \partial_t \phi + \rho_a u_a \partial_r \phi) r^m dr ds.$$

(ii) For each $\phi \in \mathcal{D}_0^a$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_a^\infty (\rho_a u_a) \phi(r, t) r^m dr - \int_a^\infty (\rho_a^0 u_a^0)(r) \phi(r, 0) r^m dr - \int_0^t \int_a^\infty \rho_a u_a (\partial_t \phi + u_a \partial_r \phi) r^m dr ds \\ &= \int_0^t \int_a^\infty \left(P_a - \beta (\partial_r u_a + m \frac{u_a}{r}) \right) (\partial_r \phi + m \frac{\phi}{r}) r^m dr ds, \end{aligned}$$

where $\beta := 2\mu + \lambda$.

(iii) For each $\phi \in \mathcal{D}^a$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_a^\infty (\rho_a E_a)(r, t) \phi(r, t) r^m dr - \int_a^\infty (\rho_a^0 E_a^0)(r) \phi(r, 0) r^m dr \\ &= \int_0^t \int_a^\infty \{ \rho_a E_a \partial_t \phi + (\rho_a E_a + P_a) u_a \partial_r \phi \} r^m dr ds \\ & \quad - \int_0^t \int_a^\infty \left\{ 2\mu u_a \partial_r u_a + \lambda u_a (\partial_r u_a + m \frac{u_a}{r}) + \kappa \partial_r e_a \right\} \partial_r \phi r^m dr ds, \end{aligned}$$

where $P_a := (\gamma - 1)\rho_a e_a$, $E_a := \frac{1}{2}|u_a|^2 + e_a$, and $E_a^0 := \frac{1}{2}|u_a^0|^2 + e_a^0$.

From now on, we denote $\sigma = \sigma(t) := \min\{1, t\}$. Moreover, for any function $y(t) : [0, T] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, we denote

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}[\rho, u, e; y](T) &:= \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{y(t)}^\infty |(\rho - 1, u^2, e - 1, \sqrt{\sigma} \partial_r u, \sigma \partial_r e)|^2(r, t) r^m dr \\ & \quad + \int_0^T \int_{y(t)}^\infty |(\partial_r u, \partial_r e, u \partial_r u, \sqrt{\sigma} \partial_t u, \sigma \partial_t e)|^2 r^m dr dt. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 3.1. *For fixed $a \in (0, 1)$, let $(\rho_a^0, u_a^0, e_a^0)(r)$ be the initial data constructed in Proposition 3.1. Then, for each $T > 0$, there exists a weak solution $(\rho_a, u_a, e_a)(r, t)$ of the exterior problem (1.6) and (3.9). Moreover, the weak solution $(\rho_a, u_a, e_a)(r, t)$ satisfies the following properties:*

(i) *The entropy inequality holds:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in [0, T]} \int_a^\infty \left(\rho_a \left(\frac{1}{2} |u_a|^2 + \psi(e_a) \right) + (\gamma - 1) G(\rho_a) \right) (r, t) r^m dr + \kappa \int_0^T \int_a^\infty \frac{|\partial_r e_a|^2}{e_a^2} r^m dr dt \\ & \quad + \int_0^T \int_a^\infty \left\{ \left(\frac{2\mu}{n} + \lambda \right) \frac{|\partial_r u_a + m \frac{u_a}{r}|^2}{e_a} + \frac{2m\mu}{n} \frac{|\partial_r u_a - \frac{u_a}{r}|^2}{e_a} \right\} r^m dr dt \leq C(T). \end{aligned}$$

(ii) $\mathcal{E}[\rho_a, u_a, e_a; a](T) \leq C(a)$ and, for a.e. $(r, t) \in [a, \infty) \times [0, T]$,

$$C^{-1}(a) \leq \rho_a(r, t) \leq C(a), \quad |u_a(r, t)| \leq C(a) \sigma^{-\frac{1}{4}}(t), \quad C^{-1}(a) \leq e_a(r, t) \leq C(a) \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t).$$

- (iii) *There exists a continuous function $(x, t) \mapsto \tilde{r}_a(x, t) : [0, \infty) \times [0, T] \rightarrow [a, \infty)$ such that $x \mapsto \tilde{r}_a(x, t)$ is strictly increasing for each $t \in [0, T]$ and*

$$\begin{cases} \int_a^{\tilde{r}_a(x, t)} \rho_a(r, t) r^m dr = x & \text{for a.e. } (x, t) \in [0, \infty) \times [0, T], \\ \tilde{r}_a(x, t) = \tilde{r}_a^0(x) + \int_0^t u_a(\tilde{r}_a(x, s), s) ds & \text{for all } (x, t) \in [0, \infty) \times [0, T], \\ nx\psi_-^{-1}\left(\frac{C_0}{x}\right) \leq (\tilde{r}_a)^n(x, t) \leq C_0(1+x) & \text{for all } (x, t) \in [0, \infty) \times [0, T], \end{cases}$$

where the function $x \mapsto \tilde{r}_a^0(x) : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [a, \infty)$ is implicitly defined as

$$x = \int_a^{\tilde{r}_a^0(x)} \rho_a^0(r) r^m dr \quad \text{for each } x \in [0, \infty).$$

- (iv) *For each $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, $\mathcal{E}[\rho_a, u_a, e_a; \tilde{r}_a(\varepsilon, \cdot)](T) \leq C(\varepsilon)$ and*

$$\begin{cases} |\tilde{r}_a(x_1, t) - \tilde{r}_a(x_2, t)| \leq C(\varepsilon)|x_1 - x_2| & \text{for } (x_1, x_2, t) \in [\varepsilon, \infty)^2 \times [0, T], \\ |\tilde{r}_a(x, t_1) - \tilde{r}_a(x, t_2)| \leq C(\varepsilon)|t_1^{\frac{3}{4}} - t_2^{\frac{3}{4}}| & \text{for } (x, t_1, t_2) \in [\varepsilon, \infty) \times [0, T]^2. \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, for a.e. (r, t) such that $t \in [0, T]$ and $r \in [\tilde{r}_a(\varepsilon, t), \infty)$:

$$C^{-1}(\varepsilon) \leq \rho_a(r, t) \leq C(\varepsilon), \quad |u_a(r, t)| \leq C(\varepsilon)\sigma^{-\frac{1}{4}}(t), \quad e_a(r, t) \leq C(\varepsilon)\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t).$$

In addition, for all $r_1, r_2 \in [\tilde{r}_a(\varepsilon, t), \infty)$ and $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(t)|u_a(r_1, t) - u_a(r_2, t)| + \sigma(t)|e_a(r_1, t) - e_a(r_2, t)| \leq C(\varepsilon)|r_1 - r_2|^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and, for all (r, t_1, t_2) such that $0 < t_1 < t_2 \leq T$ and $r \geq \sup_{t_1 \leq t \leq t_2} \tilde{r}_a(\varepsilon, t)$,

$$\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(t_1)|u_a(r, t_1) - u_a(r, t_2)| + \sigma(t_1)|e_a(r, t_1) - e_a(r, t_2)| \leq C(\varepsilon)|t_2 - t_1|^{\frac{1}{4}}.$$

- (v) *For each connected interval $I \subseteq [0, \infty)$, denote $\tilde{H}_0^1(I, r^m dr)$ as the closure of*

$$\mathcal{D}_0(I) := \{\phi \in C^\infty(I) : \exists N > 0 \text{ such that } [0, N] \subset I \text{ and } \phi(r) = 0 \text{ for } r \in I \cap [N, \infty)\}$$

via the $H^1(I, r^m dr)$ -norm, and denote its dual space as $\tilde{H}^{-1}(I, r^m dr)$. For each $\varepsilon > 0$, define $\rho_a^{(\varepsilon)}(r, t) := \rho_a(r, t)\chi_\varepsilon^a(r, t)$ with the indicator function $\chi_\varepsilon^a(r, t)$:

$$\chi_\varepsilon^a(r, t) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t \in [0, T] \text{ and } r \in [\tilde{r}_a(\varepsilon, t), \infty), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, for all $L \in \mathbb{N}$, $\rho_a^{(\varepsilon)} \in C^0([0, T]; \tilde{H}^{-1}([0, L], r^m dr))$ and

$$\|\rho_a^{(\varepsilon)}(\cdot, t_1) - \rho_a^{(\varepsilon)}(\cdot, t_2)\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}([0, L], r^m dr)} \leq C(\varepsilon)|t_1 - t_2| \quad \text{for all } t_1, t_2 \in [0, T].$$

- (vi) *For each $\eta \in (a, 1)$, the following estimates hold:*

$$\begin{cases} \int_0^T \sup_{r \geq \eta} \frac{|u_a|}{\sqrt{e_a}}(r, t) dt \leq C(T)(\eta^{\frac{2-n}{2}} + \eta^{2-n}) & \text{if } n = 2, 3, \\ \int_0^T \sup_{r \geq \eta} \log(\max\{1, e_a(r, t)\}) dt \leq C(T)(1 + \sqrt{|\log \eta|}) & \text{if } n = 2, \\ \int_0^T \sup_{r \geq \eta} \log(\max\{1, e_a^{\pm 1}(r, t)\}) dt \leq C(T)\eta^{2-n} & \text{if } n = 3. \end{cases}$$

Remark 3.2. *For the smooth initial data (ρ_a^0, u_a^0, e_a^0) constructed in §3.2, it can be shown that there exists a unique global-in-time classical solution of problem (1.6) and (3.9) (see [23]). In this paper, since the higher regularity estimates for establishing classical solutions will not be needed for the proof of the main theorem, we omit them for simplicity.*

3.4. Truncation of the initial data in the exterior Eulerian domain. Since (ρ_a, u_a, e_a) in Theorem 3.1 is obtained as the limit of solutions of the approximate problems posed in bounded annular domains, we need to construct the corresponding approximate initial data, which is the main purpose of this subsection. In particular, we construct $(\rho_{a,k}^0, u_{a,k}^0, e_{a,k}^0)$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ by truncating (ρ_a^0, u_a^0, e_a^0) with suitable cut-off functions $\varphi_{a,k}^0$.

We first consider the function: $r \mapsto \int_a^r \rho_a^0(\zeta) \zeta^m d\zeta$, which is a strictly increasing continuous function since $C_0^{-1} \leq \rho_a^0(r) \leq C_0$. Hence, the inverse function $\tilde{r}_a^0(x) : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [a, \infty)$ exists so that

$$x = \int_a^{\tilde{r}_a^0(x)} \rho_a^0(r) r^m dr \quad \text{for each } x \in [0, \infty). \quad (3.10)$$

Moreover, due to the regularity of ρ_a^0 , it follows from the inverse function theorem that $\tilde{r}_a^0(x) : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [a, \infty)$ is a smooth, bijective, strictly increasing map.

From now on, we use D_x to represent the derivative with respect to $x \in [0, \infty)$.

Proposition 3.2. *For all $x \in [0, \infty)$,*

$$D_x \tilde{r}_a^0(x) = \frac{1}{(\tilde{r}_a^0(x))^m \rho_a^0(\tilde{r}_a^0(x))}, \quad \tilde{r}_a^0(x) = \left(a^n + n \int_0^x \frac{1}{\rho_a^0(\tilde{r}_a^0(y))} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{n}}. \quad (3.11)$$

Proof. Since $\rho_a^0(r) \in C^\infty$ and $C_0^{-1} \leq \rho_a^0(r) \leq C_0$ by construction (3.6), it follows that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \tilde{r}_a^0(x)} \frac{1}{r - \tilde{r}_a^0(x)} \int_{\tilde{r}_a^0(x)}^r \rho_a^0(\zeta) \zeta^m d\zeta = (\tilde{r}_a^0(x))^m \rho_a^0(\tilde{r}_a^0(x)) \quad \text{for each } x \in [0, \infty).$$

Since $y \mapsto \tilde{r}_a^0(y)$ is continuous, then, for all $x \in [0, \infty)$,

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow x} \frac{1}{\tilde{r}_a^0(y) - \tilde{r}_a^0(x)} \int_{\tilde{r}_a^0(x)}^{\tilde{r}_a^0(y)} \rho_a^0(\zeta) \zeta^m d\zeta = (\tilde{r}_a^0(x))^m \rho_a^0(\tilde{r}_a^0(x)).$$

Notice that, by (3.10),

$$\frac{\tilde{r}_a^0(y) - \tilde{r}_a^0(x)}{y - x} \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{r}_a^0(y) - \tilde{r}_a^0(x)} \int_{\tilde{r}_a^0(x)}^{\tilde{r}_a^0(y)} \rho_a^0(r) r^m dr \right) = \frac{1}{y - x} \int_{\tilde{r}_a^0(x)}^{\tilde{r}_a^0(y)} \rho_a^0(r) r^m dr = 1.$$

Then, using the fact that $0 < C_0^{-1} a^m \leq \rho_0(\tilde{r}_0(y)) \tilde{r}_0^m(y) \leq C_0 \tilde{r}_0^m(y) < \infty$ for all $y \in [0, \infty)$, it follows that, for all $x \in [0, \infty)$,

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow x} \frac{\tilde{r}_a^0(y) - \tilde{r}_a^0(x)}{y - x} = \lim_{y \rightarrow x} \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{r}_a^0(y) - \tilde{r}_a^0(x)} \int_{\tilde{r}_a^0(x)}^{\tilde{r}_a^0(y)} \rho_a^0(r) r^m dr \right)^{-1} = \frac{1}{(\tilde{r}_a^0(x))^m \rho_a^0(\tilde{r}_a^0(x))}.$$

Thus, the derivative of $\tilde{r}_a^0(x)$ exists and (3.11)₁ holds.

Next, it follows by the chain rule that

$$\frac{1}{n} D_x (\tilde{r}_a^0)^n(x) = (\tilde{r}_a^0(x))^m D_x \tilde{r}_a^0(x) = \frac{1}{\rho_a^0(\tilde{r}_a^0(x))} \quad \text{for } x \in [0, \infty).$$

Integrating in $y \in [0, x]$ and using $\tilde{r}_a^0(0) = a$, we obtain (3.11)₂. The proof is complete. \square

Now, let $\chi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be such that $\chi \in C^\infty$, $\chi(\zeta) = 1$ if $\zeta \leq 0$, $\chi(\zeta) = 0$ if $\zeta \geq 1$, and $|\chi'(\zeta)| \leq 2$ for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$. With this, the cut-off functions $\varphi_{a,k}^0$ are defined as

$$\varphi_{a,k}^0(r) = \chi\left(\frac{2r - \tilde{r}_a^0(k)}{\tilde{r}_a^0(k)}\right) \quad \text{for each } (a, k) \in (0, 1) \times \mathbb{N}.$$

It follows that $\varphi_{a,k}^0(r) \in C^\infty([a, \infty))$ and

$$\varphi_{a,k}^0(r) = 1 \quad \text{for } r \in [a, \frac{\tilde{r}_a^0(k)}{2}], \quad \varphi_{a,k}^0(r) = 0 \quad \text{for } r \in [\tilde{r}_a^0(k), \infty).$$

Using this, we define the truncated initial data:

$$(\rho_{a,k}^0, u_{a,k}^0, e_{a,k}^0)(r) := ((\rho_a^0 - 1)\varphi_{a,k}^0 + 1, u_a^0 \varphi_{a,k}^0, (e_a^0 - 1)\varphi_{a,k}^0 + 1)(r) \quad \text{for } r \in [a, \infty). \quad (3.12)$$

With above construction, it can be verified that

$$\begin{aligned} (\rho_{a,k}^0, u_{a,k}^0, e_{a,k}^0) &\in C^\infty([a, \infty)), \quad u_{a,k}^0(r) = \partial_r e_{a,k}^0(r) = 0 \quad \text{for } r \in [a, \tilde{r}_a^0(k)], \\ (\rho_{a,k}^0, u_{a,k}^0, e_{a,k}^0)(r) &= \begin{cases} (\rho_a^0, u_a^0, e_a^0)(r) & \text{for all } r \in [a, \frac{\tilde{r}_a^0(k)}{2}), \\ (1, 0, 1) & \text{for all } r \in [\frac{\tilde{r}_a^0(k)}{2}, \infty). \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Proposition 3.3. *For $G(z) = 1 - z + z \log z$ and $\psi(z) = z - 1 - \log z$, then following hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} C_0^{-1} \leq \rho_{a,k}^0(r) \leq C_0, \quad e_{a,k}^0(r) \geq C_0^{-1} \quad \text{for all } (r, k) \in [a, \infty) \times \mathbb{N} \text{ and } a \in (0, 1), \\ \sup_{\substack{a \in (0,1) \\ k \in \mathbb{N}}} \int_a^\infty \left\{ \rho_{a,k}^0 \left(\frac{1}{2} |u_{a,k}^0|^2 + \psi(e_{a,k}^0) \right) + G(\rho_{a,k}^0) + |(\rho_{a,k}^0 - 1, |u_{a,k}^0|^2, e_{a,k}^0 - 1)|^2 \right\} r^m dr \leq C_0. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Proposition 3.1, we see that

$$\int_a^\infty \left\{ |\rho_{a,k}^0 - 1|^2 + |u_{a,k}^0|^4 + |e_{a,k}^0 - 1|^2 \right\} r^m dr \leq \int_a^\infty \left\{ |\rho_a^0 - 1|^2 + |u_a^0|^4 + |e_a^0 - 1|^2 \right\} r^m dr \leq C_0,$$

and $C_0^{-1} \leq \rho_{a,k}^0(r) = \rho_a^0(r) \varphi_{a,k}^0(r) + 1 - \varphi_{a,k}^0(r) \leq C_0$ for all $r \in [a, \infty)$. By the same argument, we can show that $e_{a,k}^0(r) \geq C_0^{-1}$ for all $r \in [a, \infty)$.

Since G and ψ are convex, $G(1) = \psi(1) = 0$, and $0 \leq \varphi_{a,k}^0 \leq 1$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} G(\rho_{a,k}^0) &= G(\rho_a^0 \varphi_{a,k}^0 + 1 - \varphi_{a,k}^0) \leq \varphi_{a,k}^0 G(\rho_a^0) + (1 - \varphi_{a,k}^0) G(1) = \varphi_{a,k}^0 G(\rho_a^0), \\ \psi(e_{a,k}^0) &= \psi(e_a^0 \varphi_{a,k}^0 + 1 - \varphi_{a,k}^0) \leq \varphi_{a,k}^0 \psi(e_a^0) + (1 - \varphi_{a,k}^0) \psi(1) = \varphi_{a,k}^0 \psi(e_a^0). \end{aligned}$$

Then, using Proposition 3.1, we have

$$\int_a^\infty \left\{ \rho_{a,k}^0 \left(\frac{1}{2} |u_{a,k}^0|^2 + \psi(e_{a,k}^0) \right) + G(\rho_{a,k}^0) \right\} r^m dr \leq C_0 \int_a^\infty \left\{ \rho_a^0 \left(\frac{1}{2} |u_a^0|^2 + \psi(e_a^0) \right) + G(\rho_a^0) \right\} r^m dr \leq C_0.$$

This completes the proof. \square

3.5. Reformulation in the bounded Lagrangian domain. For each $(a, k) \in (0, 1) \times \mathbb{N}$, we transform $(\rho_{a,k}^0, u_{a,k}^0, e_{a,k}^0)(r)$ into the Lagrangian domain as

$$(\tilde{v}_{a,k}^0, \tilde{u}_{a,k}^0, \tilde{e}_{a,k}^0)(x) := ((\rho_{a,k}^0)^{-1}, u_{a,k}^0, e_{a,k}^0)(\tilde{r}_a^0(x)) \quad \text{for } x \in [0, \infty). \quad (3.14)$$

Since $\tilde{r}_a^0(x) \in C^\infty([0, \infty))$ due to $\rho_a^0 \in C^\infty([a, \infty))$, Proposition 3.2 and (3.13) imply that

$$(\tilde{v}_{a,k}^0, \tilde{u}_{a,k}^0, \tilde{e}_{a,k}^0) \in C^\infty([0, \infty)), \quad \tilde{u}_{a,k}^0(x)|_{x=0,k} = D_x \tilde{e}_{a,k}^0(x)|_{x=0,k} = 0 \quad \text{for } (a, k) \in (0, 1) \times \mathbb{N}.$$

Proposition 3.4. *The following uniform estimate holds:*

$$\sup_{a \in (0,1)} \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \int_0^k \left(\frac{1}{2} |\tilde{u}_{a,k}^0|^2 + \psi(\tilde{e}_{a,k}^0) + \psi(\tilde{v}_{a,k}^0) + |(\tilde{v}_{a,k}^0 - 1, |\tilde{u}_{a,k}^0|^2, \tilde{e}_{a,k}^0 - 1)|^2 \right)(x) dx \leq C_0.$$

Proof. First, it follows from Proposition 3.2 that the map: $x \mapsto \tilde{r}_a^0(x)$ satisfies

$$0 < C_0^{-1} (\tilde{r}_a^0)^{-m}(x) \leq |D_x \tilde{r}_a^0(x)| = (\tilde{r}_a^0)^{-m}(x) (\rho_a^0)^{-1}(\tilde{r}_a^0(x)) \leq C_0 a^{-m} < \infty \quad \text{for } x \in [0, \infty),$$

so that the Jacobian of transformation $r = \tilde{r}_a^0(x)$ is bounded. Then, for any function $f(r) : [a, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $f \in L_{\text{loc}}^1$, the following coordinate transformation is satisfied:

$$\int_a^{\tilde{r}_a^0(k)} f(r) \rho_a^0(r) r^m dr = \int_0^k f(\tilde{r}_a^0(x)) dx.$$

Using this, (3.13), and Propositions 3.1–3.3, it follows that, for each $(a, k) \in (0, 1) \times \mathbb{N}$,

$$\int_0^k |\tilde{v}_{a,k}^0 - 1|^2(x) dx = \int_0^k |1 - \rho_{a,k}^0(\tilde{r}_a^0(x))|^2 |\rho_{a,k}^0(\tilde{r}_a^0(x))|^{-2} dx \leq C_0 \int_a^\infty |\rho_a^0(r) - 1|^2 r^m dr \leq C_0.$$

By the same argument, $\|(|\tilde{u}_{a,k}^0|^2, \tilde{e}_{a,k}^0 - 1)\|_{L^2([a, \infty), r^m dr)} \leq C_0$.

Next, by Propositions 3.1–3.3 and the identity: $z\psi(z^{-1}) = 1 - z + z \log z = G(z)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^k \left(\frac{1}{2} |\tilde{u}_{a,k}^0|^2 + \psi(\tilde{e}_{a,k}^0) + (\gamma - 1)\psi(\tilde{v}_{a,k}^0) \right) (x) dx \\ &= \int_a^\infty \frac{\rho_a^0}{\rho_{a,k}^0} \left(\rho_{a,k}^0 \left(\frac{1}{2} |u_{a,k}^0|^2 + \psi(e_{a,k}^0) \right) + (\gamma - 1)G(\rho_{a,k}^0) \right) (r) r^m dr \leq C_0 \end{aligned}$$

for all $(a, k) \in (0, 1) \times \mathbb{N}$. This completes the proof. \square

The vector function $(\tilde{v}_{a,k}, \tilde{u}_{a,k}, \tilde{e}_{a,k})$ is called a solution of the (a, k) -approximate IBVP in the Lagrangian coordinates, provided that $(\tilde{v}_{a,k}, \tilde{u}_{a,k}, \tilde{e}_{a,k})$ satisfies the equations:

$$\begin{cases} D_t \tilde{v}_{a,k} - D_x(\tilde{r}_{a,k}^m \tilde{u}_{a,k}) = 0, \\ D_t \tilde{u}_{a,k} + \tilde{r}_{a,k}^m D_x p(\tilde{v}_{a,k}, \tilde{e}_{a,k}) = \beta \tilde{r}_{a,k}^m D_x \left(\frac{D_x(\tilde{r}_{a,k}^m \tilde{u}_{a,k})}{\tilde{v}_{a,k}} \right), \\ D_t \tilde{e}_{a,k} + p(\tilde{v}_{a,k}, \tilde{e}_{a,k}) D_x(\tilde{r}_{a,k}^m \tilde{u}_{a,k}) = \mathcal{G}_{a,k}, \\ \tilde{r}_{a,k}(x, t) = \left(a^n + n \int_0^x \tilde{v}_{a,k}(y, t) dy \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \end{cases} \quad (3.15)$$

in $[0, k] \times [0, T]$ with $p(v, e) := \frac{(\gamma-1)e}{v}$, $\beta := 2\mu + \lambda$, and

$$\mathcal{G}_{a,k} := \beta \frac{|D_x(\tilde{r}_{a,k}^m \tilde{u}_{a,k})|^2}{\tilde{v}_{a,k}} - 2m\mu D_x(\tilde{r}_{a,k}^{m-1} \tilde{u}_{a,k}^2) + \kappa D_x \left(\frac{r_{a,k}^{2m} D_x \tilde{e}_{a,k}}{\tilde{v}_{a,k}} \right),$$

and the initial-boundary conditions:

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{u}_{a,k}(x, t)|_{x=0, k} = D_x \tilde{e}_{a,k}(x, t)|_{x=0, k} = 0 & \text{for } t \in [0, T], \\ (\tilde{v}_{a,k}, \tilde{u}_{a,k}, \tilde{e}_{a,k})(x, 0) = (\tilde{v}_{a,k}^0, \tilde{u}_{a,k}^0, \tilde{e}_{a,k}^0)(x) & \text{for } x \in [0, k], \end{cases} \quad (3.16)$$

Remark 3.3. The equations in (3.15) are formally derived from system (1.6) and (3.9) as follows: for any smooth solution (ρ, u, e) of (1.6) and (3.9), the transformation from the Eulerian coordinates (r, t) to the Lagrangian coordinates (x, t) is defined as

$$x(r, t) := \int_a^r \rho(s, t) s^m ds, \quad t(r, t) := t \quad \text{for } (r, t) \in [a, \infty) \times [0, T]. \quad (3.17)$$

The continuity equation (1.6)₁ implies that $\partial_t x(r, t) = -\rho r^m$. In addition, by the implicit function theorem, on a neighbourhood where $\rho > 0$, there is a function $r(x, t)$ such that

$$\int_a^{r(x,t)} \rho(\zeta, t) \zeta^m d\zeta = x. \quad (3.18)$$

Denote $(v, u, e)(x, t) := (\rho^{-1}(r(x, t), t), u(r(x, t), t), e(r(x, t), t))$ and (D_t, D_x) as the derivative with respect to the Lagrangian coordinates. Then it follows by taking derivative D_t on (3.18) and the Leibniz theorem that $D_t r(x, t) = u(x, t)$. These relations can be summarized as

$$\frac{\partial(x, t)}{\partial(r, t)} = \begin{pmatrix} \rho r^m & -\rho r^m \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \frac{\partial(r, t)}{\partial(x, t)} = \begin{pmatrix} v r^{-m} & u \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.19)$$

Furthermore, from the continuity equation (1.6)₁,

$$r(x, t) = r_0(x) + \int_0^t u(x, \tau) d\tau, \quad r^n(x, t) = a^n + n \int_0^x v(y, t) dy, \quad (3.20)$$

where $r_0(x) := (a^n + n \int_0^x \rho_0^{-1}(r(y)) dy)^{\frac{1}{n}}$. Equations (3.15)₁–(3.15)₃ are then obtained by translating (1.6) using the coordinate transformation relations (3.19).

By virtue of the well-known global existence theorem for problem (3.15)–(3.16), the initial data constructed in (3.14) implies the following theorem (see [23, 42, 43]):

Theorem 3.2. *Given initial data $(\tilde{v}_{a,k}^0, \tilde{u}_{a,k}^0, \tilde{e}_{a,k}^0)(x)$ for $x \in [0, k]$, then there exists a unique classical solution $(v_{a,k}, u_{a,k}, e_{a,k})(x, t)$ of problem (3.15)–(3.16) in domain $(x, t) \in [0, k] \times [0, \infty)$ satisfying*

$$v_{a,k}(x, t) \in C^{1+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}([0, k] \times [0, \infty)), \quad (u_{a,k}, e_{a,k})(x, t) \in C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}([0, k] \times [0, \infty))$$

for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

By the above theorem, there exists a unique global classical solution of (3.15)–(3.16) for each fixed $(a, k) \in (0, 1) \times \mathbb{N}$. This allows us to derive the *a-priori* estimates in §4 below.

4. THE A-PRIORI ESTIMATES

This section is devoted to the derivation of the *a-priori* estimates for solutions of the approximation problem (3.15)–(3.16). For simplicity, we suppress the approximation parameters $(a, k) \in (0, 1) \times \mathbb{N}$ and denote $(v, u, e, r) \equiv (\tilde{v}_{a,k}, \tilde{u}_{a,k}, \tilde{e}_{a,k}, \tilde{r}_{a,k})$ as the solution obtained from Theorem 3.2 in $[0, k] \times [0, T]$ for each $T > 0$. First, we state the main theorem of this section.

Theorem 4.1. *The following estimates are satisfied:*

(i) *The entropy estimate holds with $\psi(\zeta) := \zeta - 1 - \log \zeta$:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^k \left(\frac{1}{2} |u|^2 + \psi(e) + (\gamma - 1) \psi(v) \right) (x, t) \, dx + \kappa \int_0^T \int_0^k \frac{r^{2m} |D_x e|^2}{v e^2} \, dx dt \\ & + \int_0^T \int_0^k \left\{ \left(\lambda + \frac{2\mu}{n} \right) \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v e} + 2m\mu \frac{v}{e} \left(\frac{D_x(r^m u)}{v\sqrt{n}} - \sqrt{n} \frac{u}{r} \right)^2 \right\} \, dx dt \leq C_0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

(ii) *For each given constant $\varepsilon \geq 0$,*

$$\underline{v}(\varepsilon, t, a) \leq v(x, t) \leq \bar{v}(\varepsilon, t, a) \quad \text{for all } (x, t) \in [\varepsilon, \infty) \times [0, T], \quad (4.2)$$

with $\bar{v} = \bar{v}(z, t, a)$ and $\underline{v} = \underline{v}(z, t, a)$ explicitly given by

$$\begin{cases} \bar{v} = C_0(1+t)^2 f(z, a) \exp \{ C_0 t f(z, a) + C_0(1+t) h(z, a) f(z, a) \exp \{ C_0 t f(z, a) \} \}, \\ \underline{v} = C_0(1+t)^{-1} f^{-1}(z, a) \exp \{ -t C_0 f^2(z, a) \} \Gamma(z, t, a), \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

where $h(z, a)$, $f(z, a)$, and $\Gamma(z, t, a)$ are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} h(z, a) &:= (a^n + n z \psi^{-1}(\frac{C_0}{z}))^{-\frac{2m}{n}}, \quad f(z, a) := \exp \{ C_0 h(z, a) \}, \\ \Gamma(z, t, a) &:= \exp \left\{ -\frac{m C_0 t}{\beta} h^{\frac{n}{2m}}(z, a) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

with $\psi^{-1}(y) : [0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, 1]$ as the left inverse of ψ . In particular, for each $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{cases} C^{-1}(T) \leq v(x, t) \leq C(T) & \text{for all } (x, t) \in [1, k] \times [0, T], \\ C^{-1}(\varepsilon) \leq v(x, t) \leq C(\varepsilon) & \text{for all } (x, t) \in [\varepsilon, k] \times [0, T], \\ C^{-1}(a) \leq v(x, t) \leq C(a) & \text{for all } (x, t) \in [0, k] \times [0, T]. \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$

(iii) *For each $a \in (0, 1)$, $\mathcal{L}_0[v, u, e](T) \leq C(a)$ and, for $(x, t) \in [0, k] \times [0, T]$,*

$$C^{-1}(a) \leq v(x, t) \leq C(a), \quad |u(x, t)| \leq C(a) \sigma^{-\frac{1}{4}}(t), \quad C^{-1}(a) \leq e(x, t) \leq C(a) \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t);$$

and, for each $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, $\mathcal{L}_y[v, u, e](T) \leq C(\varepsilon)$ and

$$C^{-1}(\varepsilon) \leq v(x, t) \leq C(\varepsilon), \quad \sigma(t)^{\frac{1}{4}} |u(x, t)| + \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(t) e(x, t) \leq C(\varepsilon) \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in [\varepsilon, k] \times [0, T],$$

where $\sigma(t) := \min\{1, t\}$ and, for $y \in [0, 1)$, $\mathcal{L}_y[v, u, e](T)$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_y[v, u, e](T) &:= \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_y^k |(v - 1, u^2, e - 1, \sqrt{\sigma} r^m D_x u, \sigma r^m D_x e)|^2 (x, t) \, dx \\ &+ \int_0^T \int_y^k |(r^m D_x u, r^m D_x e, r^m u D_x u, \sqrt{\sigma} D_t u, \sigma D_t e)|^2 \, dx dt. \end{aligned}$$

4.1. Entropy estimate. We now start the proof of Theorem 4.1 with the derivation of entropy estimate stated in (i), which is motivated from the second law of thermodynamics. It encapsulates the dissipative effect of viscosity and thermal diffusion.

Proof of (i) in Theorem 4.1. It follows from (3.15)₁–(3.15)₃ and direct calculations that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^k \left(\frac{1}{2}|u|^2 + \psi(e) + (\gamma - 1)\psi(v) \right) dx \\ &= -\beta \int_0^k \frac{|\mathbb{D}_x(r^m u)|^2}{ev} dx + 2m\mu \int_0^k \frac{1}{e} \mathbb{D}_x(r^{m-1} u^2) dx - \kappa \int_0^k \frac{r^{2m} |\mathbb{D}_x e|^2}{ve^2} dx. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

According to (3.15)₁ and (3.15)₄, we can obtain

$$2m\mu \frac{1}{e} \mathbb{D}_x(r^{m-1} u^2) - \beta \frac{|\mathbb{D}_x(r^m u)|^2}{ev} = -\left(\frac{2\mu}{n} + \lambda \right) \frac{|\mathbb{D}_x(r^m u)|^2}{ve} - 2m\mu \frac{v}{e} \left(\frac{\mathbb{D}_x(r^m u)}{v\sqrt{n}} - \frac{u\sqrt{n}}{r} \right)^2,$$

which, along with (4.6), yields (4.1). \square

4.2. Upper and lower bounds of the density. Now we aim to prove (4.2)–(4.5). By (4.1), we first obtain some upper and lower bounds of the particle path function $r(x, t)$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\psi_{-1}^{-1}(\cdot)$ be the left branch inverse of ψ . Then*

$$a^n + nx\psi_{-1}^{-1}\left(\frac{C_0}{x}\right) \leq r^n(x, t) \leq C_0(1+x) \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in [0, k] \times [0, \infty). \quad (4.7)$$

Proof. Since $\psi(\zeta) := \zeta - \log \zeta - 1$ is strictly convex in $(0, \infty)$ and $\psi(1) = 0$, then there exists the left inverse function $\psi_{-1}^{-1} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, 1]$ and the right inverse function $\psi_{+1}^{-1} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [1, \infty)$. In particular, it is direct to see that $y \mapsto \psi_{-1}^{-1}(y)$ is strictly decreasing ($\psi_{-1}^{-1}(0) = 1$ and $\psi_{-1}^{-1}(y) \rightarrow 0$ as $y \rightarrow \infty$), while $y \mapsto \psi_{+1}^{-1}(y)$ is strictly increasing ($\psi_{+1}^{-1}(0) = 1$ and $\psi_{+1}^{-1}(y) \rightarrow \infty$ as $y \rightarrow \infty$).

Now, from relation (3.20), Theorem 4.1(i), and the Jensen inequality, it follows that, for all $(x, t) \in [0, k] \times [0, \infty)$,

$$\psi\left(\frac{r^n(x, t) - a^n}{nx}\right) = \psi\left(\frac{1}{x} \int_0^x v(y, t) dy\right) \leq \frac{1}{x} \int_0^x \psi(v)(y, t) dy \leq \frac{C_0}{x}. \quad (4.8)$$

Next, the proof is divided into two cases: $0 < \frac{r^n - a^n}{nx} \leq 1$ and $\frac{r^n - a^n}{nx} \geq 1$.

Case 1: $0 < \frac{r^n - a^n}{nx} \leq 1$. Then $\frac{r^n - a^n}{nx} = \psi_{-1}^{-1}\left(\psi\left(\frac{r^n - a^n}{nx}\right)\right)$. Since $\psi_{-1}^{-1}(\cdot)$ is monotone decreasing, it follows from (4.8) that

$$\frac{r^n - a^n}{nx} = \psi_{-1}^{-1}\left(\psi\left(\frac{r^n - a^n}{nx}\right)\right) \geq \psi_{-1}^{-1}\left(\frac{C_0}{x}\right).$$

On the other hand, since $\frac{r^n - a^n}{nx} \leq 1$, it follows from $a < 1$ that

$$r^n(x, t) \leq a^n + nx \leq n(1+x).$$

Case 2: $\frac{r^n - a^n}{nx} \geq 1$. Then it follows from $\psi_{-1}^{-1}(y) \leq 1$ for all $y \in [0, \infty)$ that

$$r^n(x, t) \geq a^n + nx \geq a^n + nx\psi_{-1}^{-1}\left(\frac{C_0}{x}\right).$$

Moreover, $\frac{r^n - a^n}{nx} = \psi_{+1}^{-1}\left(\psi\left(\frac{r^n - a^n}{nx}\right)\right)$. Since $\psi_{+1}^{-1}(\cdot)$ is monotone increasing, it follows from (4.8) that

$$\frac{r^n - a^n}{nx} = \psi_{+1}^{-1}\left(\psi\left(\frac{r^n - a^n}{nx}\right)\right) \leq \psi_{+1}^{-1}\left(\frac{C_0}{x}\right).$$

It is verified in Proposition B.1 that $x \mapsto x\psi_{+1}^{-1}\left(\frac{C_0}{x}\right)$ is monotone increasing. If $x \leq 1$, then $r^n(x, t) \leq a^n + nx\psi_{+1}^{-1}\left(\frac{C_0}{x}\right) \leq 1 + n\psi_{+1}^{-1}(C_0) \leq C_0 + C_0x$. If $x > 1$, since $y \mapsto \psi_{+1}^{-1}(y)$ is monotone increasing, then $r^n(x, t) \leq a^n + nx\psi_{+1}^{-1}\left(\frac{C_0}{x}\right) \leq 1 + nx\psi_{+1}^{-1}(C_0) \leq C_0 + C_0x$. This concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.2. *Fix $t \in [0, T]$. For each $i = 1, \dots, k$, there exist $A_i(t), B_i(t) \in (i-1, i)$ so that*

$$C_0^{-1} \leq v(A_i(t), t), e(B_i(t), t) \leq C_0.$$

Proof. We give our proof only for $A_i(t)$, since the proof for $B_i(t)$ is the same. Fix an integer $i = 1, \dots, k$. Since $\psi(\cdot)$ is convex, it follows from Jensen's inequality and Theorem 4.1(i) that

$$\psi\left(\int_{i-1}^i v(x, t) dx\right) \leq \int_{i-1}^i \psi(v(x, t)) dx \leq \frac{C_0}{\gamma - 1}.$$

As in Lemma 4.1, denote $z \mapsto \psi_{\pm}^{-1}(z)$ to be the left and right branch of the convex function $\psi(\zeta)$. Since $\psi(1) = 0$, we have

$$0 < \psi_{-}^{-1}\left(\frac{C_0}{\gamma - 1}\right) \leq \int_{i-1}^i v(x, t) dx \leq \psi_{+}^{-1}\left(\frac{C_0}{\gamma - 1}\right) < \infty.$$

By the mean value theorem, there exists a point $A_i(t) \in (i - 1, i)$ such that

$$\psi_{-}^{-1}\left(\frac{C_0}{\gamma - 1}\right) \leq v(A_i(t), t) \leq \psi_{+}^{-1}\left(\frac{C_0}{\gamma - 1}\right).$$

Since $e(x, t)$ satisfies the same estimate that differs only by constant $\gamma - 1$ in Theorem 4.1(i), by the same argument, there also exists $B_i(t) \in (i - 1, i)$ such that $C_0^{-1} \leq e(B_i(t), t) \leq C_0$. \square

Using Lemmas 4.1–4.2 and Theorem 4.1(i), we are ready to prove Theorem 4.1(ii).

Proof of Theorem 4.1(ii). Fix $i = 1, \dots, k - 2$. Since we focus on obtaining an explicit bound for $v(x, t)$ near the origin $x = 0$, the case for $i \geq k - 1$ is not considered in the proof (but can be handled by repeating the same argument). We divide the proof into six steps.

1. Applying Lemma 4.2, it follows that, for each $(x, t) \in [i - 1, i + 1] \times [0, T]$, there exist $A_i(t) \in (x, x + 3)$ and $B_i(t) \in (i, i + 1)$ such that

$$C_0^{-1} \leq v(A_i(t), t), e(B_i(t), t) \leq C_0. \quad (4.9)$$

Now, from (3.15)₁–(3.15)₂,

$$D_t u + r^m D_x p = \beta r^m D_x D_t \log v. \quad (4.10)$$

Dividing both sides of (4.10) by βr^m and integrating over $[x, A_i(t)] \times [0, t]$ for some $(x, t) \in (i - 1, i + 1] \times [0, T]$, we have

$$\log \frac{v(A_i(t), t)v_0(x)}{v_0(A_i(t))v(x, t)} = \frac{1}{\beta} \int_x^{A_i(t)} \frac{u}{r^m} \Big|_0^t dy + \frac{m}{\beta} \int_x^{A_i(t)} \int_0^t \frac{u^2}{r^n} ds dy + \frac{1}{\beta} \int_0^t (p(A_i(t), s) - p(x, s)) ds,$$

where $p(x, s) := p(v(x, s), e(x, s))$. Taking the exponential on both sides yields

$$\frac{E(x, t)}{D(x, t)} Y(t) \frac{v_0(A_i(t))v(x, t)}{v(A_i(t), t)v_0(x)} = \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{\beta} \int_0^t p(x, s) ds \right\}, \quad (4.11)$$

where

$$E(x, t) := \exp \left\{ \frac{m}{\beta} \int_0^t \int_x^{A_i(t)} \frac{u^2}{r^n} dy ds \right\}, \quad Y(t) := \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{\beta} \int_0^t p(A_i(t), s) ds \right\},$$

$$D(x, t) := \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{\beta} \int_x^{A_i(t)} \left(\frac{u_0(y)}{r_0^m(y)} - \frac{u(y, t)}{r^m(y, t)} \right) dy \right\}.$$

Multiplying (4.11) with $\beta^{-1}p(x, t)$ and integrating in time, we have

$$1 + \frac{1}{\beta} \int_0^t \frac{E(x, s)}{D(x, s)} Y(s) p(x, s) \frac{v_0(A(x, s))v(x, s)}{v(A(x, s), s)v_0(x)} ds = \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{\beta} \int_0^t p(x, s) ds \right\}.$$

Substituting this back into (4.11), it follows that

$$\frac{E(x, t)}{D(x, t)} Y(t) \frac{v_0(A_i(t))v(x, t)}{v(A_i(t), t)v_0(x)} = 1 + \frac{1}{\beta} \int_0^t \frac{E(x, s)}{D(x, s)} Y(s) p(x, s) \frac{v_0(A(x, s))v(x, s)}{v(A(x, s), s)v_0(x)} ds. \quad (4.12)$$

2. First, for $D(x, t)$, it follows from Lemma 4.1–4.2 and Theorem 4.1(i) that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_x^{A_i(t)} \frac{u}{r^m}(y, t) dy \right| &\leq \left(\int_x^{A_i(t)} r^{-2m} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_x^{A_i(t)} |u|^2 dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \left(\int_x^{A_i(t)} \left(a^n + ny\psi_-^{-1}\left(\frac{C_0}{y}\right) \right)^{-\frac{2m}{n}} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} C_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C_0 + C_0 \left(a^n + nx\psi_-^{-1}\left(\frac{C_0}{x}\right) \right)^{-\frac{2m}{n}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, using the definition of $f(x, a)$ in (4.4) and Lemma 4.2, we have

$$(e^{C_0} f(x, a))^{-1} \leq D(x, t) \leq e^{C_0} f(x, a). \quad (4.13)$$

3. Now we estimate the terms: $Y(t)$ and $E(x, t)$. In view of the definition of $\Gamma(z, t, a)$ in (4.4), Theorem 4.1(i), and Lemma 4.1, we see that, for $t \geq s \geq 0$,

$$1 \leq E(x, t) \leq \Gamma^{-1}(x, t, a), \quad \Gamma(x, t - s, a) \leq \frac{E(x, s)}{E(x, t)} = \exp \left\{ \frac{m}{\beta} \int_s^t \int_{i-1}^i \frac{u^2}{r^n} dy d\tau \right\} \leq 1. \quad (4.14)$$

Combining (4.9) and (4.13)–(4.14) with (4.11) yields that, for all $(x, t) \in (i - 1, i + 1] \times [0, T)$,

$$v(x, t)Y(t) \leq C_0 f^2(x, a) \left\{ 1 + \int_0^t e(x, s)Y(s) ds \right\}. \quad (4.15)$$

Since the above argument is true for any $(x, t) \in (i - 1, i + 1] \times [0, T)$, for a fixed $x \in (i - 1, i]$, we can integrate both sides of the above equation in $y \in [x, x + 1] \subset (i - 1, i + 1]$. It then follows from the entropy inequality (4.1) and Jensen's inequality that

$$Y(t) \leq C_0 f^2(x, a) \left\{ 1 + \int_0^t Y(s) ds \right\} \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T),$$

where we have used that $x \mapsto f(x, a)$ is monotone decreasing. Thus, by Grönwall's inequality,

$$1 \leq Y(t) = C_0(1 + t)f^3(x, a) \exp \{C_0 t f^2(x, a)\} \quad \text{for each } t \in (0, T]. \quad (4.16)$$

4. Since $B_i(t) \in (i, i + 1)$ from (4.9), then $x < i < B_i(t)$ for all $t \in [0, T)$. Using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, Lemma 4.1, estimate (4.1), and Jensen's inequality, it follows that, for each $y \in [x, i + 1] \subseteq (i - 1, i + 1]$ and $s \in [0, T)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sqrt{e(B_i(s), s)} - \sqrt{e(y, s)} \right| &= \frac{1}{2} \left| \int_y^{B_i(s)} \frac{D_x e}{\sqrt{e}}(z, s) dz \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\int_0^k \frac{r^{2m} |D_x e|^2}{v e^2}(z, s) dz \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sup_{z \in [x, i+1]} \frac{v}{r^{2m}}(z, s) \int_{i-1}^{i+1} e(z, s) dz \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C_0 \left(a^n + nx\psi_-^{-1}\left(\frac{C_0}{x}\right) \right)^{-\frac{m}{n}} (Q(s)V(x, s))^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

where

$$V(x, s) := \sup_{z \in [x, i+1]} v(z, s), \quad Q(s) := \int_0^k \frac{r^{2m} |D_x e|^2}{v e^2}(z, s) dz, \quad (4.18)$$

and $Q(t) \in L^1(0, T)$ due to the entropy estimate (4.1). According to the definition of $h(z, a)$ in (4.4), the construction in (4.9) implies that, for all $y \in [x, i + 1] \subseteq (i - 1, i + 1]$,

$$e(y, t) \leq C_0 + C_0 h(x, a) Q(s) V(x, s) \quad \text{for all } (y, s) \in [x, i + 1] \times [0, T). \quad (4.19)$$

Substituting (4.19) and (4.16) into (4.15), it implies that, for all $y \in [x, i + 1] \subseteq (i - 1, i + 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} v(y, t) &\leq v(y, t)Y(t) \\ &\leq C_0(1 + t)f^5(x, a) \exp \{C_0 t f^2(x, a)\} \left\{ 1 + t + \int_0^t h(x, a) Q(s) V(x, s) ds \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $x \mapsto f(x, a)$ is decreasing. Taking the supremum over $y \in [x, i + 1]$, we have

$$V(x, t) \leq C_0(1+t)f^5(x, a) \exp \left\{ C_0 t f^2(x, a) \right\} \left\{ 1 + t + \int_0^t h(x, a) Q(s) V(x, s) ds \right\}. \quad (4.20)$$

Applying Grönwall's inequality to (4.20), we obtain that, for all $(x, t) \in [i - 1, i] \times [0, T]$,

$$v(x, t) \leq V(x, t) \leq C_0(1+t)^2 f^5(x, a) \exp \left\{ C_0 t f^2(x, a) + C_0(1+t)(f^5 h)(x, a) \exp \{ C_0 t f^2(x, a) \} \right\}.$$

In addition, for the lower bound of $v(x, t)$, it follows from (4.11) that

$$v(x, t) = \frac{D(x, t)}{Y(t)E(x, t)} \frac{v_0(x)v(A_i(t), t)}{v_0(A_i(t))} \exp \left\{ \int_0^t p(x, s) ds \right\} \geq C_0^{-1} \frac{D(x, t)}{Y(t)E(x, t)}.$$

By (4.9), (4.13)–(4.14), and estimates (4.16), we find that, for all $(x, t) \in [i - 1, i] \times [0, T]$,

$$v(x, t) \geq C_0 f^{-1} Y^{-1} E^{-1} \geq C_0(1+t)^{-1} f^{-4}(x, a) \exp \{ -C_0 t f^2(x, a) \} \Gamma(x, t, a).$$

Since this is true for each $i = 1, \dots, k - 2$, it follows that, for all $(x, t) \in [0, k - 2] \times [0, T]$,

$$\begin{cases} v(x, t) \leq C_0(1+t)^2 f^5(x, a) \exp \left\{ C_0 t f^2(x, a) + C_0(1+t)(f^5 h)(x, a) \exp \{ C_0 t f^2(x, a) \} \right\}, \\ v(x, t) \geq C_0 f^{-4} \exp \{ -C_0 t f^2 \} \Gamma(x, t, a). \end{cases}$$

5. From definition (4.4), it follows that, for all $x \in [1, k - 2]$,

$$f(x, a) \leq \exp \left\{ C_0 (n\psi_-^{-1}(C_0))^{-\frac{2m}{n}} \right\}, \quad h(x, a) \leq (n\psi_-^{-1}(C_0))^{-\frac{2m}{n}}, \quad \Gamma(x, t, a) \geq \exp \left\{ -\frac{mC_0 t}{n\beta\psi_-^{-1}(C_0)} \right\},$$

so that $C^{-1}(T) \leq v(x, t) \leq C(T)$ for all $(x, t) \in [1, k - 2] \times [0, T]$. Since $x \mapsto x\psi_-^{-1}(\frac{C_0}{x})$ is positive and monotone increasing, then, for all $x \in [\varepsilon, k - 2]$,

$$f(x, a) \leq \exp \left\{ C_0 (n\varepsilon\psi_-^{-1}(\frac{C_0}{\varepsilon}))^{-\frac{m}{n}} \right\}, \quad h(x, a) \leq (n\varepsilon\psi_-^{-1}(\frac{C_0}{\varepsilon}))^{-\frac{m}{n}}, \quad \Gamma(x, t, a) \geq \exp \left\{ -\frac{mC_0 t}{n\beta\varepsilon\psi_-^{-1}(\frac{C_0}{\varepsilon})} \right\},$$

which yield that, for each $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, $C^{-1}(\varepsilon) \leq v(x, t) \leq C(\varepsilon)$ for all $(x, t) \in [\varepsilon, k - 2] \times [0, T]$.

6. Finally, we remark that, for the case when $x \in (k - 2, k]$, we can choose $k \geq 3$ and $A_k(t), B_k(t) \in (k - 1, k)$ by Lemma 4.2, and then repeat the same argument presented above. From this, we conclude that $C^{-1}(T) \leq v(x, t) \leq C(T)$ for all $(x, t) \in (k - 2, k] \times [0, T]$. \square

4.3. Exterior $L^\infty(0, T; L^2)$ -estimates. To obtain the uniform estimates in $(a, k) \in (0, 1) \times \mathbb{N}$, the derivations are restricted to domain $[\varepsilon, k] \times [0, T]$. Thus, given fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, we introduce the spatial cut-off function $g_\varepsilon(x) \in C^1$:

$$g_\varepsilon(x) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \\ \frac{8}{\varepsilon^2} (x - \frac{\varepsilon}{2})^2 & \text{if } \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \leq x \leq \frac{3\varepsilon}{4}, \\ 1 - \frac{8}{\varepsilon^2} (x - \varepsilon)^2 & \text{if } \frac{3\varepsilon}{4} \leq x \leq \varepsilon, \\ 1 & \text{if } x \geq \varepsilon. \end{cases} \quad (4.21)$$

It can directly be verified that $g_\varepsilon(x)$ satisfies the following properties:

$$\text{supp}(g'_\varepsilon) = [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \varepsilon], \quad 0 \leq g_\varepsilon(x) \leq 1, \quad g'_\varepsilon(x) \geq 0, \quad |g'_\varepsilon(x)|^2 \leq \frac{32}{\varepsilon^2} g_\varepsilon(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in [0, \infty). \quad (4.22)$$

Moreover, it is crucial that the estimates are independent of the approximation parameters $(a, k) \in (0, 1) \times \mathbb{N}$. In order to achieve this, the upper and lower bounds of $r(x, t)$ must be given careful consideration. Recall that, from Lemma 4.1, $r(x, t)$ satisfies

$$n x \psi_-^{-1}(\frac{C_0}{x}) \leq r^n(x, t) \leq C_0(1+x) \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in [0, k] \times [0, T].$$

It follows that, for each $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$,

$$\sup_{x \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \varepsilon]} r(x, t) \leq C(\varepsilon), \quad \sup_{x \in [\varepsilon, k]} r^{-1}(x, t) \leq C(\varepsilon). \quad (4.23)$$

Using $g_\varepsilon(x)$ and Theorem 4.1(i)–(ii), our aim is to derive the $L^\infty(0, T; L^2)$ –estimates listed in Theorem 4.1(iii). In order to do this, we first prove the following lemma, which is necessary for resolving the problematic boundary integrals for $x \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \varepsilon]$.

Lemma 4.3 (Exterior $L^1(0, T; L^\infty)$ –Estimates of e and u^2). *For any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\int_0^T \sup_{y \in [\varepsilon, k]} (u^2 + e)(y, s) \, ds \leq C(\varepsilon). \quad (4.24)$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.2, for each $(y, s) \in [\varepsilon, k] \times [0, T]$, there exists $B_i(s) \in [0, k]$ such that $|y - B_i(s)| \leq 1$ and $C_0^{-1} \leq e(B_i(s), s) \leq C_0$. By the same calculation in (4.17), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\sqrt{e(y, s)} - \sqrt{e(B_i(s), s)}|^2 &\leq \frac{1}{4} \sup_{z \in [\varepsilon, k]} \frac{v}{r^{2m}}(z, s) \left| \int_{B_i(s)}^y e(x, s) \, dx \right| \left| \int_{B_i(s)}^y \frac{r^{2m} |D_x e|^2}{ve^2}(x, s) \, dx \right| \\ &\leq C(\varepsilon) \int_0^k \frac{r^{2m} |D_x e|^2}{ve^2}(x, s) \, dx, \end{aligned} \quad (4.25)$$

where we have used Theorem 4.1(ii), (4.21)–(4.23), and $\|\psi(e)\|_{L^1(0, k)} \leq C_0$ from Theorem 4.1(i) and Jensen's inequality. Taking the supremum over $y \in [\varepsilon, k]$ on the left-hand side of (4.25) and integrating in $t \in [0, T]$, it follows from Lemma 4.2 and Theorem 4.1(i) that

$$\int_0^T \sup_{y \in [\varepsilon, k]} e(y, s) \, ds \leq C_0 T + C(\varepsilon) \int_0^T \int_0^k \frac{r^{2m} |D_x e|^2}{ve^2} \, dx \, ds \leq C(\varepsilon). \quad (4.26)$$

Next, notice that

$$|uD_x u| = |r^{-m} u D_x(r^m u) - m r^{-n} v u^2| \leq 2r^{-2m} |D_x(r^m u)|^2 + 2m^2 r^{-2n} v^2 |u|^2.$$

Then, by the Sobolev embedding theorem: $W^{1,1}(\varepsilon, k) \hookrightarrow C^0(\varepsilon, k)$, and Theorem 4.1(i)–(ii),

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{y \in [\varepsilon, k]} u^2(y, t) &\leq C \int_\varepsilon^k u^2 \, dx + C \int_\varepsilon^k |uD_x u| \, dx \\ &\leq C_0 + C \sup_{y \in [\varepsilon, k]} \left(\frac{v}{r^{2m}} e + \frac{v}{r^n} \right)(y, s) \int_\varepsilon^k u^2(x, t) \, dx + C \int_\varepsilon^k \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{ve} \, dx \\ &\leq C(\varepsilon) + C(\varepsilon) \sup_{y \in [\varepsilon, k]} e(y, t) + C \int_0^k \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{ve} \, dx. \end{aligned} \quad (4.27)$$

(4.24)₂ follows from integrating the above in $[0, T]$ and then using (4.26) and Theorem 4.1(i). \square

Lemma 4.4 (Exterior $L^\infty(0, T; L^2)$ –Estimate of the Total Energy). *For any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_\varepsilon^k (|e - 1|^2 + u^4)(x, t) \, dx + \int_0^T \sup_{x \in [\varepsilon, k]} e^2(x, s) \, ds + \int_0^T \int_\varepsilon^k \frac{r^{2m}}{v} (|D_x e|^2 + |uD_x u|^2) \, dx \, ds \leq C(\varepsilon). \quad (4.28)$$

Proof. We divide the proof into four steps.

1. Denote the total energy density function $w := \frac{1}{2}u^2 + e - 1$. Then multiplying (3.15)₂ with u and adding it to (3.15)₃ yield

$$D_t w = D_x(r^m u \tilde{F}) - 2m\mu D_x(r^{m-1} u^2) + \kappa D_x \left(\frac{r^{2m}}{v} D_x e \right), \quad (4.29)$$

where $\tilde{F} := \beta v^{-1} D_x(r^m u) - p(v, e)$. Multiplying (4.29) with $g_\varepsilon w$ and then integrating in x , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^k g_\varepsilon w^2 dx &= - \int_0^k g_\varepsilon r^m u \tilde{F} D_x w dx + 2m\mu \int_0^k g_\varepsilon r^{m-1} u^2 D_x w dx - \kappa \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{r^{2m}}{v} D_x e D_x w dx \\ &\quad + \int_0^k g'_\varepsilon \left\{ -r^m u w \tilde{F} + 2m\mu r^{m-1} u^2 w - \kappa \frac{r^{2m}}{v} w D_x e \right\} dx \\ &=: \sum_{i=1}^4 I_i. \end{aligned}$$

2. The terms $I_j, j = 1, 2, 3$, can be estimated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= -\beta \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \left\{ \frac{r^{2m}}{v} u D_x u D_x e + m r^{m-1} u^3 D_x u + m r^{m-1} u^2 D_x e \right\} dx \\ &\quad + (\gamma - 1) \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{e}{v} r^m \{ u^2 D_x u + u D_x e \} dx - \beta \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |u D_x u|^2 dx \\ &\leq \left(\frac{5\beta^2}{2\kappa} - \frac{2\beta}{3} \right) \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{|r^m u D_x u|^2}{v} dx + \frac{3\kappa}{10} \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{|r^m D_x e|^2}{v} dx + C \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \left(\frac{v u^4}{r^2} + \frac{e^2 u^2}{v} \right) dx, \\ I_2 &= 2m\mu \int_0^k g_\varepsilon r^{m-1} (u^3 D_x u + u^2 D_x e) dx \\ &\leq \frac{\beta}{6} \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |u D_x u|^2 dx + \frac{\kappa}{10} \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |D_x e|^2 dx + C \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{v}{r^2} u^4 dx, \\ I_3 &= -\kappa \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{r^{2m}}{v} D_x e \{ D_x e + u D_x u \} dx \\ &\leq -\frac{9}{10} \kappa \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |D_x e|^2 dx + \frac{5\kappa}{2} \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |u D_x u|^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

Using (4.21)–(4.23) and Theorem 4.1(ii), we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_4 &= \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon g'_\varepsilon \left\{ -r^m u w \left(\beta \frac{r^m}{v} D_x u + \frac{m\beta}{r} u - (\gamma - 1) \frac{e}{v} \right) + 2m\mu r^{m-1} u^2 w - \kappa \frac{r^{2m}}{v} w D_x e \right\} dx \\ &\leq \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon \frac{\varepsilon^2 |g'_\varepsilon|^2 r^{2m}}{32 v} \left\{ \frac{\beta}{2} |u D_x u|^2 + \frac{\kappa}{4} |D_x e|^2 \right\} dx + C \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon \left\{ \frac{\varepsilon^2 |g'_\varepsilon|^2}{32} \left(\frac{v u^4}{r^2} + \frac{e^2 u^2}{v} \right) + \frac{32 r^{2m}}{\varepsilon^2 v} w^2 \right\} dx \\ &\leq \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{r^{2m}}{v} \left\{ \frac{\beta}{2} |u D_x u|^2 + \frac{\kappa}{4} |D_x e|^2 \right\} dx + C \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \left\{ \frac{v}{r^2} u^4 + \frac{e^2 u^2}{v} \right\} dx + C(\varepsilon) \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon w^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

Combining all the above estimates, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^k g_\varepsilon w^2 dx &\leq -\frac{\kappa}{4} \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |D_x e|^2 dx + \frac{5(\beta^2 + \kappa^2)}{2\kappa} \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |u D_x u|^2 dx \\ &\quad + C \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{v}{r^2} u^4 dx + C \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{e^2 u^2}{v} dx + C(\varepsilon) \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon(t), \end{aligned} \tag{4.30}$$

where $\mathcal{R}_\varepsilon(t)$ is the problematic boundary integral near the origin, given by

$$\mathcal{R}_\varepsilon(t) := \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon ((e - 1)^2 + u^4)(x, t) dx. \tag{4.31}$$

3. Multiplying $g_\varepsilon u^3$ to the momentum equation (3.15)₂ and integrating in $x \in [0, k]$, we obtain the following L^4 -estimate for u :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{4} \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^k g_\varepsilon |u|^4 dx &= -\beta \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{1}{v} D_x(r^m u) D_x(r^m u^3) dx + (\gamma - 1) \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{e}{v} D_x(r^m u^3) dx \\ &\quad + \int_0^k g'_\varepsilon \left\{ \frac{(\gamma - 1)e}{v} r^m u^3 - \frac{\beta}{v} D_x(r^m u) r^m u^3 \right\} dx \\ &=: \sum_{i=1}^3 J_i. \end{aligned}$$

The terms J_1 and J_2 can be estimated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &= -\beta \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \left(3 \frac{|r^m u D_x u|^2}{v} + 4m r^{m-1} u^3 D_x u + m^2 \frac{u^4 v}{r^2} \right) dx \\ &\leq -\beta \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |u D_x u|^2 dx + m^2 \beta \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{v}{r^2} u^4 dx, \\ J_2 &\leq \frac{\beta}{4} \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{|r^m u D_x u|^2}{v} dx + C \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \left(\frac{e^2 u^2}{v} + \frac{v u^4}{r^2} \right) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Using (4.21)–(4.23) and Theorem 4.1(ii), we have

$$\begin{aligned} J_3 &\leq \frac{\gamma - 1}{2} \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon \frac{\varepsilon^2}{32} |g'_\varepsilon|^2 \frac{e^2 u^2}{v} dx + \frac{\gamma - 1}{2} \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon \frac{32 r^{2m}}{\varepsilon^2} u^4 dx + C \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\varepsilon} r^{m-1} u^4 dx \\ &\quad + \frac{\beta}{4} \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon \frac{\varepsilon^2}{32} |g'_\varepsilon|^2 \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |u D_x u|^2 dx + \beta \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon \frac{32 r^{2m}}{\varepsilon^2} u^4 dx \\ &\leq \frac{\beta}{4} \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |u D_x u|^2 dx + \frac{\gamma - 1}{2} \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{e^2 u^2}{v} dx + C(\varepsilon) \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon u^4 dx. \end{aligned}$$

Combining all the above estimates, it follows that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{|u|^4}{4} dx \leq C \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \left(\frac{e^2 u^2}{v} + \frac{v u^4}{r^2} \right) dx - \frac{\beta}{2} \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{|r^m u D_x u|^2}{v} dx + C(\varepsilon) \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon(t). \quad (4.32)$$

4. Multiplying (4.32) by $4\tilde{C} \equiv \frac{10(\beta^2 + \kappa^2)}{\kappa\beta}$ and adding it to (4.30), it follows from (4.1) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{C} \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^k g_\varepsilon u^4 dx + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^k g_\varepsilon w^2 dx + \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{r^{2m}}{v} \left\{ \frac{\kappa}{4} |D_x e|^2 + \beta \tilde{C} |u D_x u|^2 \right\} dx \\ &\leq C(\varepsilon) \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon(t) + C \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \left(\frac{v}{r^2} u^4 + \frac{|ue|^2}{v} \right) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (4.33)$$

Using Theorem 4.1(i)–(ii) and (4.21)–(4.23), we have

$$\int_0^k g_\varepsilon \left(\frac{v}{r^2} u^4 + \frac{|ue|^2}{v} \right) dx \leq C(\varepsilon) \int_0^k g_\varepsilon u^4 dx + C(\varepsilon) \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]} (g_\varepsilon |e|^2)(y, t). \quad (4.34)$$

By Lemma 4.2, for each $(x, t) \in [0, k] \times [0, T]$, there exist both an integer $i \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$ and a point $B_i(t) \in [0, k]$ such that $x, B_i(t) \in [i, i+1]$ and $C_0^{-1} \leq e(B_i(t), t) \leq C_0$. Using Theorem 4.1(i),

$|x - B_i(t)| \leq 1$, and (4.21)–(4.23), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|(g_\varepsilon e)(x, t) - (g_\varepsilon e)(B_i(t), t)|^2 &= \left(\int_{B_i(t)}^x (g_\varepsilon D_x e + g'_\varepsilon e)(y, t) dy \right)^2 \\
&\leq 2 \left(\int_{B_i(t)}^x g_\varepsilon \frac{r^{2m}}{v} \frac{|D_x e|^2}{e^2} dy \right) \left(\int_{B_i(t)}^x g_\varepsilon \frac{v}{r^{2m}} e^2 dy \right) + C(\varepsilon) \left(\int_{B_i(t)}^x e(y, t) dy \right)^2 \\
&\leq 4 \left(\int_0^k \frac{r^{2m}}{v} \frac{|D_x e|^2}{e^2} dy \right) \left\{ \left| \int_{B_i(t)}^x g_\varepsilon \frac{v}{r^{2m}} |e - 1|^2 dy \right| + \left| \int_{B_i(t)}^x \frac{g_\varepsilon v}{r^{2m}} dy \right| \right\} + C(\varepsilon) \left(\int_i^{i+1} e dy \right)^2 \\
&= C(\varepsilon) \left\{ 1 + Q(t) \left(1 + \left| \int_{B_i(t)}^x g_\varepsilon |e - 1|^2 dy \right| \right) \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

where $Q(t)$ is defined in (4.18). Taking the supremum over $x \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]$, it follows from Theorem 4.1(ii) and (4.21)–(4.23) that

$$\sup_{x \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]} (g_\varepsilon |e|^2)(x, t) \leq C(\varepsilon) \left\{ 1 + Q(t) \left(1 + \int_0^k g_\varepsilon |e - 1|^2 dx \right) \right\}. \quad (4.35)$$

Substituting (4.35) into (4.34) yields

$$\int_0^k g_\varepsilon \left(\frac{v}{r^2} u^4 + \frac{|ue|^2}{v} \right) dx \leq C(\varepsilon) (1 + Q(t)) \left(1 + \int_0^k g_\varepsilon (u^4 + w^2) dx \right), \quad (4.36)$$

where we have used: $|u|^4 + w^2 \geq \frac{3}{4}|u|^4 + \frac{1}{2}(e - 1)^2$. Substituting (4.36) into (4.33), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt} \int_0^k g_\varepsilon (u^4 + w^2) dx + \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{r^{2m}}{v} (|D_x e|^2 |u D_x u|^2) dx \\
&\leq C(\varepsilon) (1 + Q(t)) \left(1 + \int_0^k g_\varepsilon (u^4 + w^2) dx \right) + C(\varepsilon) \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon(t).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, applying Grönwall's inequality and using $Q(t) \in L^1(0, T)$, we have

$$\int_0^k (|u|^4 + |e - 1|^2)(x, t) dx \leq C(\varepsilon) \left(1 + \int_0^k (u_0^4 + w_0^2) dx + \int_0^t \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon ds \right). \quad (4.37)$$

5. Using Lemma 4.3, we claim that $\mathcal{R}_\varepsilon(t)$ defined in (4.31) satisfies:

$$\int_0^t \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon(s) ds = \int_0^t \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon (|e - 1|^2 + |u|^4) dx ds \leq C(\varepsilon). \quad (4.38)$$

To show this claim, we first use Lemma 4.3 and Theorem 4.1(i) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^t \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon(s) ds &\leq C \int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \varepsilon]} |e - 1|(y, s) \left(\int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon (e + 1)(x, s) dx \right) ds + C \int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \varepsilon]} u^2(y, s) \left(\int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon u^2(x, s) dx \right) ds \\
&\leq C(\varepsilon) \left(1 + \int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \varepsilon]} e(y, s) \left(\int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon e(x, s) dx \right) ds \right).
\end{aligned}$$

It follows by Jensen's inequality and Theorem 4.1(i) that

$$\psi \left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon} \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon e(x, s) dx \right) \leq \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon \psi(e)(x, s) dx \leq \frac{2C_0}{\varepsilon},$$

so that

$$\int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon e(x, s) dx \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \psi_+^{-1} \left(\frac{2C_0}{\varepsilon} \right) \leq C(\varepsilon).$$

Substituting this back into the estimate of \mathcal{R}_ε and using Lemma 4.3, it follows that

$$\int_0^t \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon(s) ds \leq C(\varepsilon) \left(1 + \int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \varepsilon]} e(y, s) ds \right) \leq C(\varepsilon).$$

This prove the claim (4.38).

6. Using Grönwall's inequality and (4.37)–(4.38), we have

$$\int_0^k g_\varepsilon(x)(u^4 + w^2)(x, t) dx + \int_0^t \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |D_x e|^2 |uD_x u|^2 dx ds \leq \int_0^k (u_0^4 + w_0^2) dx + C(\varepsilon).$$

By the inequality: $|u|^4 + w^2 \geq \frac{3}{4}|u|^4 + \frac{1}{2}(e-1)^2$, we see that $\|(e-1, u^2)\|_{L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\varepsilon, k))} \leq C(\varepsilon)$.

Finally, substituting the above estimate into (4.35), we obtain

$$\int_0^T \sup_{x \in [\varepsilon, k]} e^2(x, t) dt \leq \int_0^T \sup_{x \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]} (g_\varepsilon e^2)(x, t) dt \leq C(\varepsilon).$$

This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.5 (Exterior $L^\infty(0, T; L^2)$ –Estimate of the Specific Volume). *For each $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_\varepsilon^k |v - 1|^2(x, t) dx \leq C(\varepsilon).$$

Proof. Multiplying (3.15)₁ with $g_\varepsilon(v-1)$ and integrating in $[0, k]$, then, by Theorem 4.1(ii),

$$\frac{1}{2} D_t \int_0^k g_\varepsilon (v-1)^2 dx = \int_0^k g_\varepsilon (v-1) D_x(r^m u) dx \leq C(\varepsilon) \int_0^k g_\varepsilon (v-1)^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} dx.$$

Applying Lemma 4.4 and Grönwall's inequality, the lemma is proved. \square

The following lemma is necessary for the high-order estimates of (u, e) in §4.4 below.

Lemma 4.6 (Exterior L^2 –estimate of $D_x u$). *For each $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\int_0^T \int_\varepsilon^k \left(\frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} + \frac{r^{2m} |D_x u|^2}{v} \right) dx ds \leq C(\varepsilon). \quad (4.39)$$

Proof. Multiplying (3.15)₁ by g_ε and integrating over $[0, k]$, we have

$$\int_0^k g_\varepsilon(x) D_t(v(x, t) - 1) dx = - \int_0^k g'_\varepsilon(x) (r^m u)(x, t) dx. \quad (4.40)$$

Multiplying (3.15)₂ by $g_\varepsilon u$ and integrating over $x \in [0, k]$, using Theorem 4.1(i)–(ii), Lemma 4.4, and (4.40), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^k g_\varepsilon |u|^2 dx + \beta \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} dx \\ &= (\gamma - 1) \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{D_x(r^m u)}{v} (e - 1) dx + (\gamma - 1) \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{D_t v}{v} dx + \int_0^k g'_\varepsilon(x) \frac{r^m u}{v} ((\gamma - 1)e - \beta D_x(r^m u)) dx \\ &=: \sum_{i=1}^3 I_i. \end{aligned} \quad (4.41)$$

The term I_1 is estimated by using Theorem 4.1(ii) and Lemma 4.4:

$$I_1 := (\gamma - 1) \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{D_x(r^m u)}{v} (e - 1) dx \leq \frac{\beta}{4} \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} dx + C(\varepsilon). \quad (4.42)$$

I_2 is estimated by using (3.15)₁, Theorem 4.1(i), and (4.21)–(4.23):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{I_2}{\gamma-1} &:= \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{D_t v}{v} dx = \int_0^k g_\varepsilon D_t (\log v - v + 1) dx - \int_0^k g'_\varepsilon r^m u dx \\ &\leq \int_0^k g_\varepsilon D_t (\log v - v + 1) dx + \left(\int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon r^{2m} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon u^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \int_0^k g_\varepsilon D_t (\log v - v + 1) dx + C(\varepsilon). \end{aligned} \quad (4.43)$$

I_3 is estimated by using Lemma 4.4 and (4.21)–(4.23):

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 &\leq \frac{(\gamma-1)^2}{2} \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \varepsilon]} (v^{-2} r^{2m})(y, t) \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon u^2 dx + (\gamma-1) \left(\int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon v^{-2} r^{2m} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon u^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon e^2 dx + \frac{\beta}{4} \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon \frac{\varepsilon^2}{32} |g'_\varepsilon(x)|^2 \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} dx + \frac{32\beta}{\varepsilon^2} \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \varepsilon]} \frac{r^{2m}}{v}(y, t) \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon u^2 dx \\ &\leq \frac{\beta}{4} \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} dx + C(\varepsilon). \end{aligned} \quad (4.44)$$

According to (4.41)–(4.44), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} \int_0^k g_\varepsilon(x) u^2(x, t) dx + \frac{\beta}{2} \int_0^t \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} dx ds \\ &\leq C(\varepsilon) + (\gamma-1) \int_0^k g_\varepsilon (\log v - v + 1) dx + (\gamma-1) \int_0^k g_\varepsilon (v_0 - \log v_0 - 1) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\log v - v + 1 \leq 0$ and $C_0 \leq v_0(x) \leq C_0^{-1}$, it implies from Taylor's theorem that

$$\frac{\beta}{2} \int_0^t \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} dx ds \leq C(\varepsilon) + (\gamma-1) C_0 \int_0^k (v_0 - 1)^2 dx \leq C(\varepsilon). \quad (4.45)$$

The other term in (4.39) is estimated by rewriting (4.45) and using Theorem 4.1(i)–(ii). \square

4.4. Exterior $L^\infty(0, T; H^1)$ –estimates of the velocity and internal energy. We now derive the high-regularity estimates for (u, e) in Theorem 4.1(iii). For simplicity, we define

$$\Lambda(v, e) \equiv (v-1)^2 + (e-1)^2, \quad \sigma(t) := \min\{1, t\}.$$

It follows from Lemma 4.4–4.5 that $\|\Lambda(v, e)\|_{L^\infty(0, T; L^1(\varepsilon, k))} \leq C(\varepsilon)$. Furthermore, we introduce the effective viscosity flux F , which is defined by

$$F := \beta \frac{D_x(r^m u)}{v} - p(v, e) + (\gamma-1) = \beta \frac{D_x(r^m u)}{v} - (\gamma-1) \frac{e-v}{v}.$$

Using Lemmas 4.4–4.6, we have the following observation on F :

Lemma 4.7 (Estimates on Effective Viscosity Flux).

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^k g_\varepsilon(x) F^2(x, t) dx \leq C(\varepsilon) \left(1 + \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} dx \right), \\ &\int_0^T \int_0^k g_\varepsilon(x) F^2(x, t) dx dt \leq C(\varepsilon), \\ &\int_0^T \int_0^k g_\varepsilon(x) (r^{2m} |D_x F|^2)(x, t) dx dt \leq \int_0^T \int_0^k g_\varepsilon(x) |D_t u|^2(x, t) dx dt. \end{aligned} \quad (4.46)$$

Proof. It follows from the definition of F and the momentum equation (3.15)₂ that

$$\begin{aligned} F &= \beta \frac{D_x(r^m u)}{v} - (\gamma - 1) \frac{e - 1}{v} + (\gamma - 1) \frac{v - 1}{v}, \\ D_t u &= \beta r^m D_x \left(\frac{D_x(r^m u)}{v} \right) - r^m D_x(p - (\gamma - 1)) = r^m D_x F, \end{aligned}$$

which, along with Theorem 4.1(ii) and Lemmas 4.4–4.6, yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^k g_\varepsilon(x) F^2(x, t) dx &\leq 2\beta^2 \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v^2} dx + 4(\gamma - 1)^2 \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{\Lambda(v, e)}{v^2} dx \\ &\leq C(\varepsilon) \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} dx + C(\varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

and (4.46)₂–(4.46)₃ obviously. \square

Lemma 4.8 (Intermediate Step).

$$\int_0^T \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon |D_t u|^2 dx ds + \sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} \int_0^k \left(\sigma g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} \right) (x, s) dx \leq C(\varepsilon) \left\{ 1 + \left(\int_0^T \int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 |D_t e|^2 dx ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}. \quad (4.47)$$

Proof. We divide the proof into six steps.

1. Multiplying equations (3.15)₂ with $g_\varepsilon \sigma D_t u$ and then integrating yield

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon |D_t u|^2 dx ds + \frac{\beta}{2} \int_0^k \left(\sigma g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} \right) (x, t) dx \\ &= \frac{\beta}{2} \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma' g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} dx ds + m\beta \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon D_x(r^{m-1} u^2) \frac{D_x(r^m u)}{v} dx ds \\ &\quad - \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon r^m D_t u D_x p dx ds + \frac{\beta}{2} \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon D_t(v^{-1}) |D_x(r^m u)|^2 dx ds \\ &\quad - \beta \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon' r^m D_t u \frac{D_x(r^m u)}{v} dx ds \\ &=: \sum_{i=1}^5 I_i. \end{aligned}$$

I_1 is estimated by using $\sigma(t) = \min\{1, t\}$ and Lemma 4.6 as

$$I_1 := \frac{\beta}{2} \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma' g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} dx ds \leq \frac{\beta}{2} \int_0^1 \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} dx ds \leq C(\varepsilon).$$

I_2 is estimated by using Lemmas 4.4–4.6, Theorem 4.1(ii), and (4.21)–(4.23) as

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= 2m\beta \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon r^{m-1} u D_x u \frac{D_x(r^m u)}{v} dx ds + m(m-1)\beta \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon \frac{v}{r^2} u^2 \frac{D_x(r^m u)}{v} dx ds \\ &\leq m\beta \int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]} r^{-2}(y, s) \left(\int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |u D_x u|^2 dx \right) ds + m\beta \int_0^t \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} dx ds \\ &\quad + \frac{m(m-1)\beta}{2} \left\{ \int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]} \frac{v}{r^4}(y, t) \left(\int_0^k g_\varepsilon u^4 dx \right) ds + \int_0^t \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} dx ds \right\} \leq C(\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

2. Using $p - \gamma + 1 = \frac{(\gamma-1)(e-v)}{v}$, the term I_3 is separated into six parts:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{I_3}{\gamma-1} &= \int_0^k \left(\sigma g_\varepsilon D_x(r^m u) \frac{e-v}{v} \right) (x, t) dx - \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma' g_\varepsilon D_x(r^m u) \frac{e-v}{v} dx ds \\ &\quad - \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon D_x(r^m u) D_t \left(\frac{e-v}{v} \right) dx ds - \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon D_x(r^{m-1} u^2) \frac{e-v}{v} dx ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g'_\varepsilon D_t(r^m u) \frac{e-v}{v} dx ds - \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g'_\varepsilon r^{m-1} u^2 \frac{e-v}{v} dx ds \\ &=: \sum_{i=1}^6 I_3^{(i)}. \end{aligned}$$

$I_3^{(1)}$ is estimated by using Theorem 4.1(ii) and Lemma 4.4–4.6:

$$\begin{aligned} I_3^{(1)} &:= \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon D_x(r^m u) \frac{e-v}{v} dx = \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon D_x(r^m u) \left(\frac{e-1}{v} + \frac{1-v}{v} \right) dx \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\beta} \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon \frac{\Lambda(v, e)}{v} dx + \frac{\beta}{4} \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} dx \\ &\leq C(\varepsilon) + \frac{\beta}{4} \int_0^k \left(\sigma g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} \right) (x, t) dx. \end{aligned}$$

$I_3^{(2)}$ is estimated by using the definition of σ , Theorem 4.1(ii), and Lemma 4.4–4.6:

$$\begin{aligned} I_3^{(2)} &:= - \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma' g_\varepsilon D_x(r^m u) \frac{e-v}{v} dx ds = - \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma' g_\varepsilon D_x(r^m u) \left(\frac{e-1}{v} + \frac{1-v}{v} \right) dx ds \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} dx ds + \frac{1}{4} \int_0^1 \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{\Lambda(v, e)}{v} dx ds \leq C(\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

$I_3^{(3)}$ is estimated by using Theorem 4.1(ii) and Lemma 4.6:

$$\begin{aligned} I_3^{(3)} &= - \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon D_x(r^m u) \left\{ \frac{D_t e}{v} - \frac{e}{v^2} D_x(r^m u) \right\} dx ds \\ &\leq C(\varepsilon) \left(\int_0^t \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^k \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} dx ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 |D_t e|^2 dx ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + C(\varepsilon) \int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]} e(y, s) \left(\int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} dx \right) ds \\ &\leq C(\varepsilon) \left(\int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 |D_t e|^2 dx ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C(\varepsilon) \int_0^t \left(\sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]} e(y, s) \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} dx \right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

$I_3^{(4)}$ is estimated by using Theorem 4.1(ii) and Lemmas 4.4–4.5:

$$\begin{aligned} I_3^{(4)} &= - \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon \left\{ 2r^{m-1} u D_x u + (n-2) \frac{v}{r^2} u^2 \right\} \left(\frac{e-1}{v} + \frac{1-v}{v} \right) dx ds \\ &\leq \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |u D_x u|^2 dx ds + C(\varepsilon) \int_0^t \int_0^k g_\varepsilon \{u^4 + \Lambda(v, e)\} dx ds \leq C(\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

For $I_3^{(5)}$, we use Theorem 4.1(ii), Lemmas 4.4–4.5, and (4.21)–(4.23) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_3^{(5)} &= \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g'_\varepsilon (mr^{m-1}u^2 + r^m D_t u) \left(\frac{e-1}{v} + \frac{1-v}{v} \right) dx ds \\ &\leq C \left(\int_0^t \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon \sigma \frac{\varepsilon^2}{32} |g'_\varepsilon|^2 |D_t u|^2 dx ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \varepsilon]} \frac{r^{2m}}{v^2}(y, s) \left(\int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon \frac{32}{\varepsilon^2} \Lambda(v, e) dx \right) ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + C \left(\int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \varepsilon]} r^{-2}(y, s) \left(\int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon u^4 dx \right) ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \varepsilon]} \frac{r^{2m}}{v^2}(y, s) \left(\int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon \Lambda(v, e) dx \right) ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{8} \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon |D_t u|^2 dx ds + C(\varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

and $I_3^{(5)}$ is estimated by using Theorem 4.1(ii), Lemma 4.4–4.5, and (4.21)–(4.23).

$$I_3^{(5)} \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \varepsilon]} \frac{r^{2(m-1)}}{v^2}(y, s) \left(\int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon |g'_\varepsilon| u^4 dx \right) ds + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon |g'_\varepsilon| \Lambda(v, e) dx ds \leq C(\varepsilon).$$

Combining the estimates of $I_3^{(1)}$ – $I_3^{(6)}$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 &\leq \frac{\beta}{4} \int_0^k \left(\sigma g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} \right) (x, t) dx + \frac{1}{8} \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon |D_t u|^2 dx ds + C(\varepsilon) \\ &\quad + C(\varepsilon) \left(\int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon^2 |D_t e|^2 dx ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C(\varepsilon) \int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]} e(y, s) \left(\int_0^k \left(\sigma g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} \right) (x, s) dx \right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

4. I_4 is rewritten into three parts by using the continuity equation (3.15)₁ and the definition of F :

$$\begin{aligned} I_4 &= -\frac{1}{2\beta} \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon F^2 D_x(r^m u) dx ds - \frac{\gamma-1}{\beta} \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon F \frac{e-v}{v} D_x(r^m u) dx ds \\ &\quad - \frac{(\gamma-1)^2}{2\beta} \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon \left(\frac{e-v}{v} \right)^2 D_x(r^m u) dx ds \\ &:= \sum_{i=1}^3 I_4^{(i)}. \end{aligned}$$

$I_4^{(1)}$ is estimated by using integration by parts, Lemma 4.7, and (4.21)–(4.23).

$$\begin{aligned} \beta I_4^{(1)} &= \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon u F r^m D_x F dx ds + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g'_\varepsilon F^2 r^m u dx ds \\ &\leq 2 \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon u^2 F^2 dx ds + \frac{1}{8} \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon r^{2m} |D_x F|^2 dx ds \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} \int_0^t \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon \sigma \frac{\varepsilon^2}{32} |g'_\varepsilon|^2 |u|^2 F^2 dx ds + \frac{1}{4} \int_0^t \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon \frac{32}{\varepsilon^2} r^{2m} F^2 dx ds \\ &\leq \frac{1}{8} \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon |D_t u|^2 dx ds + C(\varepsilon) + C(\varepsilon) \int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]} |u|^2(y, s) \left(\int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} dx \right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

$I_4^{(2)}$ is estimated by using Theorem 4.1(ii) and Lemmas 4.4–4.7:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\beta}{\gamma-1} I_4^{(2)} &\leq \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon F^2 dx ds + \int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]} \frac{(e-v)^2}{v} \left(\int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} dx \right) ds \\ &\leq C(\varepsilon) + C(\varepsilon) \int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]} |e(y, s)|^2 \left(\int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} dx \right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

$I_4^{(3)}$ is estimated by using Theorem 4.1(ii) and Lemma 4.4–4.6:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{2\beta}{(\gamma-1)^2} I_4^{(3)} &\leq 2 \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon \frac{\Lambda(v, e)}{v^2} |D_x(r^m u)| \, dx ds \\
&\leq \frac{(\gamma-1)^2}{2\beta} \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon \frac{\Lambda(v, e)^2}{v^3} \, dx ds + \frac{(\gamma-1)^2}{2\beta} \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} \, dx ds \\
&\leq C(\varepsilon) + C(\varepsilon) \int_0^t \left(\sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]} |e-1|^2(y, s) + 1 \right) \left(\int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon |e-1|^2 \, dx \right) ds \\
&\leq C(\varepsilon) + C(\varepsilon) \int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]} e^2(y, s) \, ds \leq C(\varepsilon).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the estimates for $I_4^{(1)}$ – $I_4^{(3)}$, it follows that

$$I_4 \leq \frac{1}{8} \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon |D_t u|^2 \, dx ds + C(\varepsilon) + C(\varepsilon) \int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\varepsilon/2, k]} (e^2 + u^2)(y, s) \left(\int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} \, dx \right) ds.$$

5. I_5 is estimated by using Theorem 4.1(ii), Lemmas 4.4–4.6, and (4.21)–(4.23):

$$\begin{aligned}
I_5 &\leq \beta^2 \int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \varepsilon]} \frac{r^{2m}}{v}(y, s) \left(\int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon \frac{32 |D_x(r^m u)|^2}{\varepsilon^2 v} \, dx \right) ds + \frac{1}{4} \int_0^t \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon \sigma \frac{\varepsilon^2}{32} |g'_\varepsilon|^2 |D_t u|^2 \, dx dt \\
&\leq \frac{1}{4} \int_0^t \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon \sigma g_\varepsilon |D_t u|^2 \, dx dt + C(\varepsilon).
\end{aligned}$$

6. Combining the estimates of I_1 – I_5 together, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon |D_t u|^2 \, dx ds + \frac{\beta}{4} \int_0^k \left(\sigma g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} \right) (x, t) \, dx \\
&\leq C(\varepsilon) + C(\varepsilon) \left(\int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 |D_t e|^2 \, dx ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad + C(\varepsilon) \int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]} (e + e^2 + u^2)(y, s) \left(\int_0^k \left(\sigma g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} \right) (x, s) \, dx \right) ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying Grönwall's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon |D_t u|^2 \, dx ds + \frac{\beta}{4} \int_0^k \left(\sigma g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} \right) (x, t) \, dx \\
&\leq C(\varepsilon) \left(1 + \left(\int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 |D_t e|^2 \, dx ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \left(1 + \left(\int_0^t h_\varepsilon(s) \, ds \right) \exp \left(\int_0^t h_\varepsilon(s) \, ds \right) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where $h_\varepsilon(s) := C(\varepsilon) \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]} (e + e^2 + u^2)(y, s)$. By Lemmas 4.3–4.4, we obtain (4.47). \square

Lemma 4.9 ($L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\varepsilon, k))$ –Estimates of $D_x u$ and $D_x e$). *For each $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\int_0^t \int_\varepsilon^k (\sigma^2 |D_t e|^2 + \sigma g_\varepsilon |D_t u|^2) \, dx ds + \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \int_\varepsilon^k \left(\sigma^2 \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |D_x e|^2 + \sigma \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} \right) (x, s) \, dx \leq C(\varepsilon). \tag{4.48}$$

Proof. We divide the proof into six steps.

1. Rewriting the energy equation (3.15)₃ in terms of the effective viscosity flux F , then multiplying both sides by $\sigma^2(t)g_\varepsilon^2 D_t e$, and integrating by parts, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 |D_t e|^2 dx ds + \frac{\kappa}{2} \int_0^k \left(\sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |D_x e|^2 \right) (x, t) dx \\
&= \kappa \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma \sigma'(s) g_\varepsilon^2 \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |D_x e|^2 dx ds + m\kappa \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 \frac{r^{2m-1} u}{v} |D_x e|^2 dx ds \\
&\quad + \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 \mathcal{A} D_t e dx ds - \frac{\kappa}{2} \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 \frac{r^{2m}}{v^2} D_x(r^m u) |D_x e|^2 dx ds \\
&\quad + \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 F D_x(r^m u) D_t e dx ds - \kappa \int_0^t \int_0^k 2\sigma^2 g_\varepsilon g_\varepsilon' \frac{r^{2m}}{v} D_t e D_x e dx ds \\
&:= \sum_{i=1}^6 I_i,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{A} := -(\gamma - 1)D_x(r^m u) - 4m\mu \frac{u}{r} D_x(r^m u) + 2mn\mu \frac{v}{r^2} u^2$. By Lemma 4.4, we have

$$I_1 := \kappa \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma \sigma'(s) g_\varepsilon^2 \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |D_x e|^2 dx ds \leq \kappa \int_0^1 \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^k \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |D_x e|^2 dx ds \leq C(\varepsilon).$$

I_2 is estimated by using (4.21)–(4.23) and Lemma 4.4:

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &\leq 2m\kappa \int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]} \frac{u}{r}(y, s) \left(\int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |D_x e|^2 dx \right) ds \\
&\leq C(\varepsilon) + C(\varepsilon) \int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]} u^2(y, s) \left(\int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |D_x e|^2 dx \right) ds.
\end{aligned}$$

2. I_3 is estimated by using Theorem 4.1(ii) and Lemmas 4.4–4.6:

$$\begin{aligned}
I_3 &= \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 \left\{ -(\gamma - 1)D_x(r^m u) - 4m\mu \frac{u}{r} D_x(r^m u) + 2mn\mu \frac{v}{r^2} u^2 \right\} D_t e dx ds \\
&\leq \frac{1}{16} \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 |D_t e|^2 dx ds + C(\varepsilon) \int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]} (1 + u^2)(y, s) \int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} dx ds \\
&\quad + C(\varepsilon) \int_0^T \int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 u^4 dx dt \\
&\leq \frac{1}{16} \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 |D_t e|^2 dx dt + C(\varepsilon) \left(1 + \int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]} u^2(y, s) \left(\int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} dx \right) ds \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.49}$$

In fact, by Lemmas 4.3 and 4.8, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]} u^2(y, s) \left(\int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} dx \right) ds &\leq \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \int_0^k \left(\sigma g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} \right) (x, s) dx \int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]} u^2(y, \tilde{t}) d\tilde{t} \\
&\leq C(\varepsilon) + C(\varepsilon) \left(\int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 |D_t e|^2 dx ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{16} \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 |D_t e|^2 dx ds + C(\varepsilon).
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting the above estimate into (4.49) leads to

$$I_3 \leq \frac{1}{8} \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 |D_t e|^2 dx ds + C(\varepsilon).$$

3. I_4 is first rewritten in terms of F and then estimated by using Theorem 4.1(ii):

$$\begin{aligned} I_4 &:= -\frac{\kappa}{2\beta} \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 \left(F + (\gamma - 1) \frac{e - v}{v} \right) \frac{|r^m D_x e|^2}{v} dx ds \\ &\leq \frac{\kappa}{2\beta} \int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]} |\sqrt{g_\varepsilon} F|(y, s) \left(\int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |D_x e|^2 dx \right) ds + C(\varepsilon) \\ &\quad + C(\varepsilon) \int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]} e(y, s) \left(\int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |D_x e|^2 dx \right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.7 and the Sobolev embedding theorem: $W^{1,1}(\varepsilon, k) \hookrightarrow C^0(\varepsilon, k)$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]} |\sqrt{g_\varepsilon} F|^2(y, s) &\leq C \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^k (g_\varepsilon F^2 + 2g_\varepsilon |F D_x F| + 2g'_\varepsilon F^2)(x, s) dx \\ &\leq \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^k (C(\varepsilon) F^2 + g_\varepsilon r^{2m} |D_x F|^2) dx \\ &\leq \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^k \left(C(\varepsilon) \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} + g_\varepsilon |D_t u|^2 \right) dx + C(\varepsilon), \end{aligned} \tag{4.50}$$

so that, using Lemma 4.6 and the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\kappa}{\beta} \int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]} |g_\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} F|(y, s) \left(\int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |D_x e|^2 dx \right) ds \\ &\leq C(\varepsilon) \int_0^t \left\{ \sigma^2 + \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^k \sigma^2 \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} dx + \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon |D_t u|^2 dx \right\} ds \\ &\quad + C(\varepsilon) \int_0^t \sigma^2 \left(\int_0^k g_\varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |D_x e|^2 dx \right)^2 ds \\ &\leq \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon |D_t u|^2 dx ds + C(\varepsilon) + C(\varepsilon) \int_0^t \left(\int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |D_x e|^2 dx \right) \left(\int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |D_x e|^2 dx \right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Using the above estimate, Lemma 4.8, and the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, one has

$$\begin{aligned} I_4 &\leq C(\varepsilon) + \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon |D_t u|^2 dx ds + C(\varepsilon) \int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]} e(y, s) \left(\int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |D_x e|^2 dx \right) ds \\ &\quad + C(\varepsilon) \int_0^t \left(\int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |D_x e|^2 dx \right) \left(\int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |D_x e|^2 dx \right) ds, \\ &\leq \frac{1}{8} \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 |D_t e|^2 dx ds + C(\varepsilon) + C(\varepsilon) \int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]} e(y, s) \left(\int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |D_x e|^2 dx \right) ds \\ &\quad + C(\varepsilon) \int_0^t \left(\int_0^k g_\varepsilon \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |D_x e|^2 dx \right) \left(\int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |D_x e|^2 dx \right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

4. I_5 is first estimated as follows:

$$I_5 \leq 4 \int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]} (g_\varepsilon v |F|^2)(y, s) \left(\int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} dx \right) ds + \frac{1}{16} \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 |D_t e|^2 dx ds. \tag{4.51}$$

By the same argument as (4.50), we have

$$\sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]} (g_\varepsilon |F|^2)(y, s) \leq C(\varepsilon) + C(\varepsilon) \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^k \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} dx + C(\varepsilon) \left(\int_0^k g_\varepsilon F^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^k g_\varepsilon |D_t u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

which, along with Theorem 4.1(ii) and Lemma 4.6, implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & 4 \int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]} (g_\varepsilon v |F|^2)(y, s) \left(\int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} dx \right) ds \\ & \leq C(\varepsilon) + C(\varepsilon) \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \int_0^k \left(\sigma g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} \right)(x, s) dx \\ & \quad + C(\varepsilon) \left(\int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon F^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma g_\varepsilon |D_t u|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \int_0^k \left(\sigma g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} \right)(x, s) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Then applying Lemmas 4.7–4.8 on the above and using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality yield

$$\begin{aligned} & 4 \int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]} (g_\varepsilon v |F|^2)(y, s) \left(\int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v} dx \right) ds \\ & \leq C(\varepsilon) + C(\varepsilon) \left\{ 1 + \left(\int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 |D_t e|^2 dx ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\{ 1 + \left(\int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 |D_t e|^2 dx ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{16} \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 |D_t e|^2 dx ds + C(\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Substituting the above into (4.51), we obtain

$$I_5 \leq \frac{1}{8} \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 |D_t e|^2 dx ds + C(\varepsilon).$$

5. I_6 is estimated by using Theorem 4.1(ii), Lemma 4.4, and (4.21)–(4.23):

$$\begin{aligned} I_6 & \leq \frac{1}{8} \int_0^t \int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 |D_t e|^2 dx ds + 8\kappa^2 \int_0^t \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \varepsilon]} \frac{r^{2m}}{v}(y, s) \left(\int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^\varepsilon \sigma^2 |g'_\varepsilon|^2 \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |D_x e|^2 dx \right) ds \\ & \leq \frac{1}{8} \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 |D_t e|^2 dx ds + C(\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

6. Combining the estimates for I_1 – I_6 together, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 |D_t e|^2 dx ds + \frac{\kappa}{2} \int_0^k \left(\sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |D_x e|^2 \right)(x, t) dx \\ & \leq C(\varepsilon) + C(\varepsilon) \int_0^t \tilde{h}_\varepsilon(s) \left(\int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |D_x e|^2 dx \right) ds, \end{aligned} \tag{4.52}$$

where $\tilde{h}_\varepsilon(s) := \int_0^k \left(g_\varepsilon \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |D_x e|^2 \right)(x, s) dx + \sup_{y \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, k]} (u^2 + e)(y, s)$. Then it follows from Lemmas 4.3–4.4 and the Grönwall inequality that

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \int_0^k \sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 |D_t e|^2 dx ds + \frac{\kappa}{2} \int_0^k \left(\sigma^2 g_\varepsilon^2 \frac{r^{2m}}{v} |D_x e|^2 \right)(x, t) dx \leq C(\varepsilon),$$

which, along with Lemma 4.8, yields (4.48). This completes the proof. \square

Corollary 4.1. For all $(x, t) \in [\varepsilon, k] \times [0, T]$,

$$\sigma^{\frac{1}{4}}(t) |u(x, t)| + \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(t) e(x, t) \leq C(\varepsilon). \tag{4.53}$$

Proof. First, repeating the same calculation (4.27) in the proof of Lemma 4.3, one has

$$\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(t) \sup_{y \in [\varepsilon, k]} u^2(y, t) \leq C(\varepsilon) \int_\varepsilon^k u^2(x, t) dx + C \int_\varepsilon^k \sigma(t) \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{v}(x, t) dx \leq C(\varepsilon),$$

where we have used Lemma 4.9. Then, by the Sobolev embedding theorem, Theorem 4.1(ii), Lemmas 4.4 and 4.9, and (4.21)–(4.23), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(t) \sup_{y \in [\varepsilon, k]} (e-1)^2(y, t) &\leq C \int_{\varepsilon}^k \sigma(t) (e-1)^2(x, t) dx + C \int_{\varepsilon}^k \sigma(t) (|e-1| |D_x e|)(x, t) dx \\ &\leq C \sup_{y \in [\varepsilon, k]} \left(\sigma(t) + \frac{v}{r^{2m}}(y, t) \right) \int_{\varepsilon}^k (e-1)^2(x, t) dx \\ &\quad + \int_{\varepsilon}^k \sigma^2(t) \left(\frac{r^{2m}}{v} |D_x e|^2 \right)(x, t) dx \leq C(\varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

which implies (4.53)₂. □

4.5. Lower bound of the internal energy. We now estimate the lower bound of e .

Lemma 4.10 (Lower Bound of the Internal Energy e). *There exists $C(a) > 0$ such that*

$$e(x, t) \geq C(a)^{-1} \quad \text{for all } (x, t) \in [0, \infty) \times [0, T]. \quad (4.54)$$

Proof. Multiplying equation (3.15)₃ with $-e^{-2}$ to obtain

$$D_t e^{-1} = (\gamma - 1) \frac{D_x(r^m u)}{ev} - \kappa e^{-2} D_x \left(\frac{r^{2m} D_x e}{v} \right) + \frac{2\mu m}{e^2} D_x(r^{m-1} u^2) - \beta \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{e^2 v}, \quad (4.55)$$

where $\beta := 2\mu + \lambda$. To further reduce the equation, we write

$$-\kappa e^{-2} D_x \left(\frac{r^{2m} D_x e}{v} \right) = \kappa D_x \left(\frac{r^{2m} D_x e^{-1}}{v} \right) - 2\kappa \frac{r^{2m} |D_x e|^2}{v e^3}.$$

Moreover, using the relation $D_x(r^{m-1} u^2) = \frac{2u}{r} D_x(r^m u) - n \frac{v u^2}{r^2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\beta \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{e^2 v} + \frac{2\mu m}{e^2} D_x(r^{m-1} u^2) &= -\left(\frac{2\mu}{n} + \lambda \right) \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{e^2 v} - 2m\mu \frac{v}{e^2} \left(\frac{D_x(r^m u)}{\sqrt{nv}} - \sqrt{n} \frac{u}{r} \right)^2 \\ &\leq -\left(\frac{2\mu}{n} + \lambda \right) \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{e^2 v}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using the above two inequalities, (4.55) can be reduced to the inequality:

$$D_t e^{-1} + 2\kappa \frac{r^{2m} |D_x e|^2}{v e^3} + \left(\frac{2\mu}{n} + \lambda \right) \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{e^2 v} \leq \frac{(\gamma - 1) D_x(r^m u)}{ev} + \kappa D_x \left(\frac{r^{2m} D_x e^{-1}}{v} \right). \quad (4.56)$$

Multiplying (4.56) by $j e^{-j+1}$ for $j \geq 2$ integers and integrating in $x \in [0, k]$ yield

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^k e^{-j} dx + j \left(\frac{2\mu}{n} + \lambda \right) \int_0^k \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{e^{j+1} v} dx + 2j\kappa \int_0^k \frac{r^{2m} |D_x e|^2}{v e^{j+2}} dx \\ \leq j(\gamma - 1) \int_0^k e^{-j} \frac{D_x(r^m u)}{v} dx - j(j-1)\kappa \int_0^k \frac{r^{2m} |D_x e^{-1}|^2}{v e^{j-2}} dx \\ \leq C \int_0^k v^{-1} e^{1-j} dx + \frac{j}{2} \left(\frac{2\mu}{n} + \lambda \right) \int_0^k \frac{|D_x(r^m u)|^2}{e^{j+1} v} dx - j(j-1)\kappa \int_0^k \frac{r^{2m} |D_x e^{-1}|^2}{v e^{j-2}} dx. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging the above and using Lemma 4.1 and Theorem 4.1(ii), we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_0^k e^{-j} dx \leq C \int_0^k e^{-j} \frac{e}{v} dx \leq C(a) \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t) \int_0^k e^{-j} dx.$$

Integrating the above inequality in time, it follows that

$$\int_0^k e^{-j}(x, t) dx \leq \|e_0^{-1}\|_{L^j(0, k)}^j + C(a) \int_0^t \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\tau) \left(\int_0^k e^{-j} dx \right) d\tau.$$

Thus, by the Grönwall inequality, we obtain that, for each integer $j \geq 2$,

$$\|e^{-1}(\cdot, t)\|_{L^j(0, k)}^j \leq C(a) \|e_0^{-1}\|_{L^j(0, k)}^j + C(a) \left(\int_0^t \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\tau) d\tau \right) \exp \left\{ C(a) \int_0^t \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\tau) d\tau \right\} \leq C(a).$$

Letting $j \rightarrow \infty$ in the above inequality, we conclude that $\|e^{-1}(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C(a)\|e_0^{-1}\|_{L^\infty}$. \square

5. GLOBAL WEAK SOLUTIONS OF THE EXTERIOR PROBLEM IN THE EULERIAN COORDINATES

In this section, the approximate Lagrangian solutions are converted into the approximate solutions in the Eulerian coordinates by constructing a set of coordinate transformations. Then these functions are extended into the entire domain $(r, t) \in [a, \infty) \times [0, T]$ by using a set of smooth cut-off functions. Finally, a global weak solution of problem (1.6) and (3.9) is obtained via the limit: $k \rightarrow \infty$.

5.1. Coordinate transformation and the Jacobian. Let $\{(\tilde{v}_{a,k}, \tilde{u}_{a,k}, \tilde{e}_{a,k}, \tilde{r}_{a,k})(x, s)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the solutions obtained in the bounded Lagrangian domain for $(x, s) \in [0, k] \times [0, T]$. For each fixed $(a, k) \in (0, 1) \times \mathbb{N}$, the coordinate transformation $(r, t) = \mathcal{T}_{a,k}(x, s)$ is defined as

$$r = \mathcal{T}_{a,k}^{(1)}(x, s) = \tilde{r}_{a,k}(x, s), \quad t = \mathcal{T}_{a,k}^{(2)}(x, s) = s \quad \text{for } (x, s) \in [0, k] \times [0, T]. \quad (5.1)$$

Then we see that $\mathcal{T}_{a,k}$ has the image:

$$\mathcal{T}_{a,k}([0, k] \times [0, T]) = R_{a,k} := \{(r, t) : t \in [0, T], r \in [a, \tilde{r}_{a,k}(k, t)]\}.$$

Moreover, it follows from a direct calculation that

$$J := \det(D_x \mathcal{T}_{a,k} \ D_s \mathcal{T}_{a,k}) = \tilde{v}_{a,k}(\tilde{r}_{a,k})^{-m},$$

which, along with Theorem 4.1 and Lemma 4.1, yields that

$$C^{-1}(a)(a^n + C(a)x)^{-\frac{m}{n}} \leq J(x, t) \leq a^{-m}C(a) \quad \text{for all } (x, t) \in [0, k] \times [0, T]. \quad (5.2)$$

Thus, the map $\mathcal{T}_{a,k} : [0, k] \times [0, T] \rightarrow R_{a,k}$ is a diffeomorphism so that the inverse map $\mathcal{T}_{a,k}^{-1}$ exists. Define $(x_{a,k}, s_{a,k})(r, t) := \mathcal{T}_{a,k}^{-1}(r, t)$. Then

$$\tilde{r}_{a,k}(x_{a,k}(r, t), t) = r, \quad s_{a,k}(r, t) = t \quad \text{for all } (r, t) \in R_{a,k}.$$

Let $\tilde{\theta}(x, t) : [0, k] \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be such that $\tilde{\theta} \in C^1$. Define $\theta(r, t) := \tilde{\theta}(x_{a,k}(r, t), t)$ for each $(r, t) \in R_{a,k}$. Then, by the inverse function theorem, its Eulerian derivative can be computed:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_r \theta(r, t) = \frac{(\tilde{r}_{a,k})^m(x_{a,k}(r, t), t)}{\tilde{v}_{a,k}(x_{a,k}(r, t), t)} D_x \tilde{\theta}(x_{a,k}(r, t), t) = r^m \frac{D_x \tilde{\theta}}{\tilde{v}_{a,k}}(x_{a,k}(r, t), t), \\ \partial_t \theta(r, t) = D_t \tilde{\theta}(x_{a,k}(r, t), t) - r^m \left(\frac{\tilde{u}_{a,k}}{\tilde{v}_{a,k}} D_x \tilde{\theta} \right)(x_{a,k}(r, t), t), \end{cases} \quad (5.3)$$

for each $(r, t) \in R_{a,k}$. Now, for each (a, k) , solution $(\tilde{v}_{a,k}, \tilde{u}_{a,k}, \tilde{e}_{a,k})(x, s)$ in $(x, t) \in [0, k] \times [0, T]$ is pulled back to $R_{a,k}$ as:

$$(\bar{v}_{a,k}, \bar{u}_{a,k}, \bar{e}_{a,k})(r, t) := (\tilde{v}_{a,k}, \tilde{u}_{a,k}, \tilde{e}_{a,k})(x_{a,k}(r, t), t) \quad \text{for } (r, t) \in R_{a,k}. \quad (5.4)$$

5.2. Extension in the Eulerian domain. We now extend $(\bar{v}_{a,k}, \bar{u}_{a,k}, \bar{e}_{a,k})$ into the whole Eulerian domain $[a, \infty) \times [0, T]$. First, let $\chi \in C^\infty : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be such that $\chi(\zeta) = 1$ if $\zeta \leq 0$, $\chi(\zeta) = 0$ if $\zeta \geq 1$, and $|\chi'| \leq 2$ in \mathbb{R} . With this, the following cut-off functions are defined:

$$\varphi_{a,k}(r, t) := \chi\left(\frac{2r - \tilde{r}_{a,k}(k, t)}{\tilde{r}_{a,k}(k, t)}\right). \quad (5.5)$$

Since $\tilde{u}_{a,k}(k, t) = 0$ for all $t \in [0, T]$, it follows that, for all $(r, t) \in [a, \infty) \times [0, T]$,

$$\partial_r \varphi_{a,k}(r, t) = \frac{2}{\tilde{r}_{a,k}(k, t)} \chi'\left(\frac{2r - \tilde{r}_{a,k}(k, t)}{\tilde{r}_{a,k}(k, t)}\right), \quad \partial_t \varphi_{a,k}(r, t) = 0. \quad (5.6)$$

Then $\varphi_{a,k} \in C^\infty([0, \infty) \times [0, T])$. Moreover, by construction,

$$\varphi_{a,k}(r, t) = 1 \quad \text{if } r \in [0, \frac{\tilde{r}_{a,k}(k, t)}{2}], \quad \varphi_{a,k}(r, t) = 0 \quad \text{if } r \in [\tilde{r}_{a,k}(k, t), \infty).$$

Now, by Theorem 4.1(ii),

$$\tilde{r}_{a,k}(k, t) = \left(a^n + n \int_0^k v_{a,k}(y, t) dy \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \geq \left(n \int_{\frac{1}{2}}^k v_{a,k}(y, t) dy \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \geq \left(\frac{n}{C(T)} \int_{\frac{1}{2}}^k dy \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \geq \frac{1}{C(T)},$$

where the universal constant $C(T) > 0$ depends only on T and n . It also follows from Theorem 4.1 that

$$\tilde{r}_{a,k}(k, t) = \left(a^n + n \int_0^k v_{a,k}(y, t) dy \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \geq \frac{k^{\frac{1}{n}}}{C(a)},$$

so that, by (5.6),

$$|\partial_r \varphi_{a,k}(r, t)| \leq \min\{C(T), C(a)k^{-\frac{1}{n}}\}, \quad \partial_t \varphi_{a,k}(r, t) = 0 \quad \text{for all } (r, t) \in [a, \infty) \times [0, T]. \quad (5.7)$$

Using (5.1)–(5.5), the extended approximate functions $(\rho_{a,k}, u_{a,k}, e_{a,k})(r, t)$ in the entire Eulerian domain $(r, t) \in [a, \infty) \times [0, T]$ are defined by (3.1) in §3.1.

The following lemmas show that the extended functions inherit the *a-priori* estimates derived in §4. As before, we still denote $\sigma := \min\{1, t\}$.

Lemma 5.1. *There exists an integer $N(a) = N(a, T, C_0) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for all $k \geq N(a)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_a^\infty \left\{ \rho_{a,k} \left(\frac{1}{2} |u_{a,k}|^2 + \psi(e_{a,k}) \right) + G(\rho_{a,k}) \right\} r^m dr + \kappa \int_0^T \int_a^\infty \frac{|\partial_r e_{a,k}|^2}{e_{a,k}^2} r^m dr dt \\ & + \int_0^T \int_a^\infty \left\{ \left(\frac{2\mu}{n} + \lambda \right) \frac{|\partial_r u_{a,k} + m \frac{u_{a,k}}{r}|^2}{e_{a,k}} + \frac{2m\mu}{n} \frac{|\partial_r u_{a,k} - \frac{u_{a,k}}{r}|^2}{e_{a,k}} \right\} r^m dr dt \leq C(T). \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

Proof. Throughout the proof, we suppress (a, k) for simplicity and denote:

$$\begin{aligned} (\rho, u, e, \varphi)(r, t) &\equiv (\rho_{a,k}, u_{a,k}, e_{a,k}, \varphi_{a,k})(r, t) \quad \text{for } (r, t) \in [a, \infty) \times [0, T], \\ (\bar{v}, \bar{u}, \bar{e})(r, t) &\equiv (\bar{v}_{a,k}, \bar{u}_{a,k}, \bar{e}_{a,k})(r, t) \quad \text{for } (r, t) \in R_{a,k}, \\ (\tilde{v}, \tilde{u}, \tilde{e}, \tilde{r})(x, t) &\equiv (\tilde{v}_{a,k}, \tilde{u}_{a,k}, \tilde{e}_{a,k}, \tilde{r}_{a,k})(x, t) \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in [0, k] \times [0, T]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

Since $G(\cdot)$ and $\psi(\cdot)$ are convex, and $0 \leq \varphi \leq 1$, it follows that $G(\rho) \leq \varphi G(\bar{v}^{-1})$ and $\psi(e) \leq \varphi \psi(\bar{e})$. Using these and the fact that the Jacobian is bounded from (5.2), one can convert the integral in the Eulerian coordinates into the Lagrangian coordinates:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_a^\infty \left(\rho \left(\frac{1}{2} |u|^2 + \psi(e) \right) + G(\rho) \right) (r, t) r^m dr \\ & \leq \int_a^{\tilde{r}(k, t)} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\bar{u}|^2 + \psi(\bar{e}) + \bar{v} G(\bar{v}^{-1}) \right) \bar{v}^{-1} r^m dr + \int_a^{\tilde{r}(k, t)} (1 - \varphi) \left(\frac{1}{2} |\bar{u}|^2 + \psi(\bar{e}) \right) r^m dr \\ & = \int_0^k \left(\frac{1}{2} |\tilde{u}|^2 + \psi(\tilde{e}) + \psi(\tilde{v}) \right) (x, t) dx + \int_0^k (1 - \varphi(\tilde{r}(x, t), t)) \left(\frac{1}{2} \tilde{v} |\tilde{u}|^2 + \tilde{v} \psi(\tilde{e}) \right) (x, t) dx, \end{aligned}$$

where $zG(z^{-1}) = \psi(z)$ has been used. By Theorem 4.1(i), the first term of the right-hand side is bounded by $C_0 > 0$. By the definition of $\tilde{r}(x, t)$,

$$\left(a^n + \frac{n}{C(a)} x \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \leq \tilde{r}(x, t) = \left(a^n + n \int_0^x \tilde{v}(y, t) dy \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \leq \left(a^n + nC(a)x \right)^{\frac{1}{n}}.$$

Thus, for fixed $a > 0$, if $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is such that $k \geq M(a) := \frac{2^n - 1}{n} a^n C(a) + 2^n C(a)^2$, then

$$\tilde{r}(k, t) \geq 2\tilde{r}(1, t). \quad (5.10)$$

Using this and the support of the cut-off function φ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^k (1 - \varphi(\tilde{r}(x, t), t)) \left(\frac{1}{2} \tilde{v} |\tilde{u}|^2 + \tilde{v} \psi(\tilde{e}) \right) (x, t) dx \\ &= \int_a^{\tilde{r}(k, t)} (1 - \varphi(r, t)) \left(\frac{1}{2} |\bar{u}|^2 + \psi(\bar{e}) \right) (r, t) r^m dr \leq \int_{\tilde{r}(1, t)}^{\tilde{r}(k, t)} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\bar{u}|^2 + \psi(\bar{e}) \right) (r, t) r^m dr \\ &= \int_1^k \tilde{v}(x, t) \left(\frac{1}{2} |\tilde{u}|^2 + \psi(\tilde{e}) \right) (x, t) dx \leq \sup_{y \in [1, k]} \tilde{v}(y, t) \int_1^k \left(\frac{1}{2} |\tilde{u}|^2 + \psi(\tilde{e}) \right) (x, t) dx \leq C(T) C_0, \end{aligned}$$

where Theorem 4.1(i)–(ii) has been used.

Next, the dissipation terms in (5.8) are considered. Using (3.1) and the fact that $z \mapsto z^{-2}$ is convex in $z \in (0, \infty)$ yield

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|\partial_r e|^2}{2|e|^2} &= \frac{|\varphi \partial_r \bar{e} + (\bar{e} - 1) \partial_r \varphi|^2}{2|\varphi \bar{e} + (1 - \varphi)|^2} \leq 2^{-1} (\varphi \bar{e}^{-2} + (1 - \varphi)) |\varphi \partial_r \bar{e} + (\bar{e} - 1) \partial_r \varphi|^2 \\ &\leq \varphi^2 \frac{|\partial_r \bar{e}|^2}{\bar{e}^2} + \frac{|\bar{e} - 1|^2}{\bar{e}^2} \varphi |\partial_r \varphi|^2 + (1 - \varphi) \varphi^2 |\partial_r \bar{e}|^2 + (1 - \varphi) |\partial_r \varphi|^2 |\bar{e} - 1|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying both sides by r^m and integrating in $[a, \infty) \times [0, T]$, it follows from (5.7) and (5.10) that, if $k \geq M(a)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_a^\infty \frac{|\partial_r e|^2}{e^2} r^m dr dt \\ &\leq \int_0^T \int_a^\infty \left\{ \varphi^2 \frac{|\partial_r \bar{e}|^2}{\bar{e}^2} + \frac{|\bar{e} - 1|^2}{\bar{e}^2} \varphi |\partial_r \varphi|^2 + (1 - \varphi) \left(\varphi^2 |\partial_r \bar{e}|^2 + |\partial_r \varphi|^2 |\bar{e} - 1|^2 \right) \right\} r^m dr dt \\ &\leq \int_0^T \int_a^{\tilde{r}(k, t)} \frac{|\partial_r \bar{e}|^2}{\bar{e}^2} r^m dr dt + \int_0^T \int_{\tilde{r}(1, t)}^{\tilde{r}(k, t)} \left\{ |\partial_r \bar{e}|^2 + C(T) |\bar{e} - 1|^2 + C(a) k^{-\frac{2}{n}} \frac{|\bar{e} - 1|^2}{\bar{e}^2} \right\} r^m dr dt. \end{aligned}$$

If $k \geq \max\{C^{\frac{n}{2}}(a)C^{\frac{n}{2}}(T), M(a)\}$, then translating the above integral into the Lagrangian coordinates and using (5.3) and Theorem 4.1 yield

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \int_a^\infty \frac{|\partial_r e|^2}{e^2} r^m dr dt \\ &\leq \int_0^T \int_0^k \frac{\tilde{r}^{2m}}{\tilde{v}} \frac{|\mathbb{D}_x \tilde{e}|^2}{\tilde{e}^2} dx dt + \int_0^T \int_1^k \left\{ \frac{\tilde{r}^{2m}}{\tilde{v}} |\mathbb{D}_x \tilde{e}|^2 + C(T) \tilde{v} |\tilde{e} - 1|^2 + \frac{C(a)}{k^{\frac{2}{n}}} \frac{\tilde{v} |\tilde{e} - 1|^2}{\tilde{e}^2} \right\} dx dt \\ &\leq C(T) \left(1 + \sup \left\{ (\tilde{v} + k^{-\frac{2}{n}} \frac{\tilde{v}}{\tilde{e}^2})(y, s) : (y, s) \in [1, k] \times [0, T] \right\} \right) \leq C(T), \end{aligned}$$

Since $z \rightarrow z^{-1}$ is convex in $z \in (0, \infty)$ and $\partial_r u + m \frac{u}{r} = r^{-m} \partial_r (r^m u)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|\partial_r u + m \frac{u}{r}|^2}{2e} &\leq \frac{1}{2} (\varphi \bar{e}^{-1} + (1 - \varphi)) |\varphi \partial_r \bar{u} + \bar{u} \partial_r \varphi + m \varphi \frac{\bar{u}}{r}|^2 \\ &\leq \varphi^3 \bar{e}^{-1} |r^{-m} \partial_r (r^m \bar{u})|^2 + \varphi |\partial_r \varphi|^2 \bar{e}^{-1} |\bar{u}|^2 + (1 - \varphi) (\varphi^2 |r^{-m} \partial_r (r^m \bar{u})|^2 + |\bar{u} \partial_r \varphi|^2). \end{aligned}$$

By similar arguments as above, we see that, for all $k \geq \max\{C^{\frac{n}{2}}(a)C^{\frac{n}{2}}(T), M(a)\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_a^\infty \frac{|r^{-m} \partial_r(r^m \bar{u})|^2}{e} r^m dr dt \\ & \leq \int_0^T \int_a^{\tilde{r}(k,t)} \frac{|r^{-m} \partial_r(r^m \bar{u})|^2}{\bar{e}} r^m dr dt + \frac{C(a)}{k^{\frac{2}{n}}} \int_0^T \int_a^{\tilde{r}(k,t)} \frac{|\bar{u}|^2}{\bar{e}} r^m dr dt \\ & \quad + \int_0^T \int_{\tilde{r}(1,t)}^{\tilde{r}(k,t)} \{ |r^{-m} \partial_r(r^m \bar{u})|^2 + C(T) \bar{u}^2 \} r^m dr dt \\ & = \int_0^T \int_0^k \left\{ \frac{|\mathbb{D}_x(\tilde{r}^m \tilde{u})|^2}{\tilde{v} \bar{e}} + \frac{C(a)}{k^{\frac{2}{n}}} \frac{\tilde{v}}{\bar{e}} |\tilde{u}|^2 \right\} dx dt + \int_0^T \int_1^k \left\{ \frac{|\mathbb{D}_x(\tilde{r}^m \tilde{u})|^2}{\tilde{v}} + C(T) \tilde{v} |\tilde{u}|^2 \right\} dx dt \leq C(T), \end{aligned}$$

By the same analysis, we also see that, for all $k \geq \max\{C^{\frac{n}{2}}(a)C^{\frac{n}{2}}(T), M(a)\}$,

$$\int_0^T \int_a^\infty \frac{1}{e} \left| \partial_r u - \frac{u}{r} \right|^2 r^m dr dt \leq C(T).$$

Set $N(a) := \lceil \max\{C^{\frac{n}{2}}(a)C^{\frac{n}{2}}(T), M(a)\} \rceil \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ is the ceiling function. Then the proof is completed. \square

Lemma 5.2. *For each $a \in (0, 1)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int_a^\infty \left\{ |(\rho_{a,k} - 1, u_{a,k}^2, e_{a,k} - 1, \sqrt{\sigma} \partial_r u_{a,k}, \sigma \partial_r e_{a,k})|^2 \right\} (r, t) r^m dr \\ & \quad + \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \int_0^T \int_a^\infty \left\{ |(\partial_r u_{a,k}, \partial_r e_{a,k}, u_{a,k} \partial_r u_{a,k}, \sqrt{\sigma} \partial_t u_{a,k}, \sigma \partial_t e_{a,k})|^2 \right\} r^m dr dt \leq C(a), \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

and, for all $(k, r, t) \in \mathbb{N} \times [a, \infty) \times [0, T]$,

$$C^{-1}(a) \leq \rho_{a,k}(r, t) \leq C(a), \quad e_{a,k}(r, t) \geq C^{-1}(a), \quad \sigma^{\frac{1}{4}}(t) |u_{a,k}(r, t)| + \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(t) e_{a,k}(r, t) \leq C(a). \quad (5.12)$$

Moreover, for fixed $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\substack{k \in \mathbb{N} \\ a \in (0, 1)}} \left\{ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int_{\tilde{r}_{a,k}(\varepsilon, t)}^\infty \left\{ |(\rho_{a,k} - 1, u_{a,k}^2, e_{a,k} - 1, \sqrt{\sigma} \partial_r u_{a,k}, \sigma \partial_r e_{a,k})|^2 \right\} (r, t) r^m dr \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \int_0^T \int_{\tilde{r}_{a,k}(\varepsilon, t)}^\infty \left\{ |(\partial_r u_{a,k}, \partial_r e_{a,k}, u_{a,k} \partial_r u_{a,k}, \sqrt{\sigma} \partial_t u_{a,k}, \sigma \partial_t e_{a,k})|^2 \right\} r^m dr dt \right\} \leq C(\varepsilon), \end{aligned} \quad (5.13)$$

and, for any $(r, t) \in [\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t), \infty) \times [0, T]$ and $(a, k) \in (0, 1) \times \mathbb{N}$,

$$C^{-1}(\varepsilon) \leq \rho_{a,k}(r, t) \leq C(\varepsilon), \quad \sigma^{\frac{1}{4}}(t) |u_{a,k}(r, t)| + \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(t) e_{a,k}(r, t) \leq C(\varepsilon). \quad (5.14)$$

Proof. As before, we suppress (a, k) for simplicity and use the notation in (5.9). Only (5.13)–(5.14) are shown, since (5.11)–(5.12) follow in the same manner.

First, using the fact that the Jacobian is bounded from (5.2) and construction (5.5), the integration in the Eulerian coordinates is converted to the following in the Lagrangian coordinates:

$$\int_{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)}^\infty |\rho - 1|^2 r^m dr \leq \int_{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)}^{\tilde{r}(k, t)} |\bar{v}^{-1} - 1|^2 r^m dr = \int_\varepsilon^k \frac{|\tilde{v} - 1|^2}{\tilde{v}} dx \leq C(\varepsilon),$$

where Theorem 4.1 has been used in the last inequality. By the same method, one can also obtain the corresponding estimates for $|e - 1|^2$ and $|u|^4$ in (5.13)₁.

Now, using (5.3), (5.7), and Theorem 4.1, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon,t)}^{\infty} \sigma(t) |\partial_r u|^2 r^m dr &= \int_{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon,t)}^{\infty} \sigma(t) |\varphi \partial_r \bar{u} + \bar{u} \partial_r \varphi|^2 r^m dr \\ &\leq \int_{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon,t)}^{\tilde{r}(k,t)} \sigma(t) |\partial_r \bar{u}| r^m dr + C \int_{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon,t)}^{\tilde{r}(k,t)} |\bar{u}|^2 r^m dr \\ &= \int_{\varepsilon}^k \sigma \frac{\tilde{r}^{2m}}{\tilde{v}} |D_x \tilde{u}|^2 dx + \int_{\varepsilon}^k \tilde{v} |\tilde{u}|^2 dx \leq C(\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

In the same way, we can also obtain the estimates for $\sigma^2 |\partial_r e|^2$ and $|(\partial_r u, \partial_r e, u \partial_r u)|^2$ in (5.13).

By (5.3) and Theorem 4.1, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \int_{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon,t)}^{\infty} \sigma^2(t) |\partial_t e|^2(r,t) r^m dr dt &= \int_0^T \int_{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon,t)}^{\infty} \sigma^2(t) \varphi^2(r,t) |\partial_t \bar{e}|^2(r,t) r^m dr dt \\ &\leq \int_0^T \int_{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon,t)}^{\tilde{r}(k,t)} \sigma^2(t) |\partial_t \bar{e}|^2(r,t) r^m dr dt = \int_0^T \int_{\varepsilon}^k \sigma^2(t) \tilde{v}(x,t) \left| D_t \tilde{e} - \tilde{r}^m \frac{\tilde{u}}{\tilde{v}} D_x \tilde{e} \right|^2(x,t) dx dt \\ &\leq \int_0^T \int_{\varepsilon}^k \sigma^2 \tilde{v} |D_t \tilde{e}|^2 dx dt + \int_0^T \int_{\varepsilon}^k \sigma^{\frac{3}{2}} |\sigma^{\frac{1}{4}} \tilde{u}|^2 \frac{\tilde{r}^{2m}}{\tilde{v}} |D_x \tilde{e}|^2 dx dt \leq C(\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

By the same argument, one can also obtain the estimate for $\sigma |\partial_t u|^2$ in (5.13).

Next, for (r,t) such that $t \in [0, T]$ and $r \in [\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t), \infty) \cap R_{a,k}$, there exists $(x, s) \in [\varepsilon, k] \times [0, T]$ such that $(r, t) = (\tilde{r}(x, s), s)$ and the following estimates hold for $(r, t) \in R_{a,k}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(r, t) &= \varphi(\tilde{r}(x, t), t) \tilde{v}^{-1}(x, t) + 1 - \varphi(\tilde{r}(x, t), t) \leq C(\varepsilon) \varphi(\tilde{r}(x, t), t) + 1 - \varphi(\tilde{r}(x, t), t) \leq C(\varepsilon), \\ \rho(r, t) &\geq C(\varepsilon)^{-1} \varphi(\tilde{r}(x, t), t) + 1 - \varphi(\tilde{r}(x, t), t) \geq C(\varepsilon)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

For (r, t) such that $t \in [0, T]$ and $r \in [\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t), \infty) \times [0, T] \setminus R_{a,k}$, then $r > \tilde{r}(k, t)$ so that $\varphi(r, t) = 0$ and $\rho(r, t) = \bar{v}^{-1}(r, t) \varphi(r, t) - \varphi(r, t) + 1 = 1$, which leads to the upper and lower bounds of the extended density. In a similar manner, we can also obtain the bounds for (u, e) listed in (5.14). \square

Throughout §5.3–§5.7, we will suppress parameter $a \in (0, 1)$ and denote

$$\begin{aligned} (\rho_k, u_k, e_k, \varphi_k) &\equiv (\rho_{a,k}, u_{a,k}, e_{a,k}, \varphi_{a,k}), \quad (\bar{v}_k, \bar{u}_k, \bar{e}_k) \equiv (\bar{v}_{a,k}, \bar{u}_{a,k}, \bar{e}_{a,k}), \\ (\tilde{v}_k, \tilde{u}_k, \tilde{e}_k, \tilde{r}_k) &\equiv (\tilde{v}_{a,k}, \tilde{u}_{a,k}, \tilde{e}_{a,k}, \tilde{r}_{a,k}) \end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

Note that the main aim of these subsections is to prove Theorem 3.1 via the limit: $k \rightarrow \infty$.

5.3. Construction of the particle path function. In this section, we construct the particle path function $\tilde{r}(x, t)$.

Lemma 5.3. *There exist both a continuous function $\tilde{r}(x, t) : [0, \infty) \times [0, T] \rightarrow [a, \infty)$ and a subsequence $k \rightarrow \infty$ such that*

(i) *for any compact subset $K \Subset [0, \infty) \times [0, T]$,*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(x,t) \in K} |\bar{r}_k(x, t) - \tilde{r}(x, t)| = 0,$$

where $\bar{r}_k(x, t)$ is defined by

$$\bar{r}_k(x, t) = \begin{cases} \tilde{r}_k(x, t) & \text{if } (x, t) \in [0, k] \times [0, T], \\ x - k + \tilde{r}_k(k, t) & \text{if } (x, t) \in [k, \infty) \times [0, T]. \end{cases} \tag{5.16}$$

(ii) *for each $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{r}(x_1, t) - \tilde{r}(x_2, t)| &\leq C(\varepsilon) |x_1 - x_2| & \text{for all } (x_1, x_2, t) \in [\varepsilon, \infty)^2 \times [0, T], \\ |\tilde{r}(x, t_1) - \tilde{r}(x, t_2)| &\leq C(\varepsilon) |t_1^{\frac{3}{4}} - t_2^{\frac{3}{4}}| & \text{for all } (x, t_1, t_2) \in [\varepsilon, \infty) \times [0, T]^2. \end{aligned}$$

(iii) for each $t \in [0, T]$, the function $x \mapsto \tilde{r}(x, t)$ is strictly increasing and

$$nx\psi_-^{-1}\left(\frac{C_0}{x}\right) \leq \tilde{r}^n(x, t) \leq C_0(1+x) \quad \text{for all } (x, t) \in [0, \infty) \times [0, T].$$

Proof. For each integer $l \in \mathbb{N}$, let $S_l := [0, l] \times [0, T] \subset [0, \infty) \times [0, T]$. Set $x_1, x_2, x \in [0, l]$ and $t_1, t_2, t \in [0, T]$. We consider two cases: $k \geq l$ or $k < l$.

Case 1: $k \geq l$. Then $\bar{r}_k(x_i, t) = \tilde{r}_k(x_i, t)$ for $i = 1, 2$. It follows from Theorem 4.1 and the mean value theorem that

$$|\bar{r}_k(x_1, t) - \bar{r}_k(x_2, t)| \leq |x_1 - x_2| \sup_{x \in [0, k]} |D_x \tilde{r}_k(x, t)| \leq |x_1 - x_2| \sup_{x \in [0, k]} \left| \frac{\tilde{v}_k}{\tilde{r}_k^m} \right| \leq C(a)|x_1 - x_2|.$$

Case 2: $k < l$. For this case, we consider three sub-cases:

If $x_1, x_2 \in [0, k]$, the same inequality as Case 1 can be obtained by repeating the same argument.

If $x_1, x_2 \in [k, l]$, then, by (5.16), $|\bar{r}_k(x_1, t) - \bar{r}_k(x_2, t)| = |x_1 - x_2|$.

If $x_1 \in [0, k]$ and $x_2 \in [k, l]$, then, by (5.16),

$$|\bar{r}_k(x_1, t) - \bar{r}_k(x_2, t)| \leq |\tilde{r}_k(x_1, t) - \tilde{r}_k(k, t)| + |x_2 - k| \leq C(a)(k - x_1) + x_2 - k \leq C(a)|x_1 - x_2|.$$

In summary, for both cases,

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |\bar{r}_k(x_1, t) - \bar{r}_k(x_2, t)| \leq C^*(a)|x_1 - x_2|. \quad (5.17)$$

Moreover, for both cases $k \geq l$ and $k < l$, it can be shown that, if $t_* = \min\{1, t_1, t_2\}$, then

$$|\bar{r}_k(x, t_1) - \bar{r}_k(x, t_2)| = \left| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} u_k(x, s) ds \right| \leq C(a) \left| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} s^{-\frac{1}{4}} ds \right| \leq C(a)t_*^{-\frac{1}{4}}|t_1 - t_2|. \quad (5.18)$$

Similarly, by (5.16), Theorem 4.1, and Lemma 4.1, it can be shown that, for each $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |\bar{r}_k(x_1, t) - \bar{r}_k(x_2, t)| &\leq C(\varepsilon)|x_1 - x_2| \quad \text{for all } (x_1, x_2, t) \in [\varepsilon, l]^2 \times [0, T], \\ \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |\bar{r}_k(x, t_1) - \bar{r}_k(x, t_2)| &\leq C(\varepsilon) \left| t_1^{\frac{3}{4}} - t_2^{\frac{3}{4}} \right| \quad \text{for all } (x, t_1, t_2) \in [\varepsilon, l] \times [0, T]^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.19)$$

Furthermore, the following bound holds for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\sup_{(x, t) \in S_l} \bar{r}_k(x, t) = \sup_{(x, t) \in S_l} \left(a^n + n \int_0^x \tilde{v}_k(y, t) dy \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \leq (a^n + nC(a)l)^{\frac{1}{n}}. \quad (5.20)$$

By (5.17)–(5.18) and (5.20), one can apply Proposition A.1 to obtain a subsequence (still denoted) $k \rightarrow \infty$ and a continuous function $\tilde{r}(x, t) : [0, \infty) \times [0, T] \rightarrow [a, \infty)$ such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(x, t) \in K} |\tilde{r}(x, t) - \bar{r}_k(x, t)| = 0 \quad \text{for all } K \Subset [0, \infty) \times [0, T]. \quad (5.21)$$

Applying the strong convergence (5.21) for (5.19), one obtains Lemma 5.3(ii).

Next, let $0 < x_1 < x_2 < \infty$. For all $k \geq 2^n x_2 C^2(a) + \frac{2^n - 1}{n} C(a)$, one can verify $2\tilde{r}_k(x_1, t) \leq 2\tilde{r}_k(x_2, t) \leq \tilde{r}_k(k, t)$. It follows that

$$\int_{\tilde{r}_k(x_1, t)}^{\tilde{r}_k(x_2, t)} \rho_k(r, t) r^m dr = \int_{\tilde{r}_k(x_1, t)}^{\tilde{r}_k(x_2, t)} \bar{v}_k^{-1}(r, t) r^m dr = x_2 - x_1.$$

Since $\rho_k(r, t) \leq C(x_1)$ for $r \in [\tilde{r}_k(x_1, t), \infty)$ from Lemma 5.2,

$$x_2 - x_1 = \int_{\tilde{r}_k(x_1, t)}^{\tilde{r}_k(x_2, t)} \rho_k(r, t) r^m dr \leq \frac{C(x_1)}{n} (\tilde{r}_k^n(x_1, t) - \tilde{r}_k^n(x_2, t)).$$

Taking $k \rightarrow \infty$ on the above and using (5.21) yields

$$0 < x_2 - x_1 < \frac{C(x_1)}{n} (\tilde{r}^n(x_1, t) - \tilde{r}^n(x_2, t)).$$

This shows that $x \mapsto \tilde{r}(x, t)$ is strictly increasing for each $t \in [0, T]$.

For a fixed point $(x, t) \in [0, \infty) \times [0, T]$, it follows from Lemma 4.1 that

$$nx\psi^{-1}\left(\frac{C_0}{x}\right) \leq \tilde{r}_k^n(x, t) \leq C_0(1+x) \quad \text{for all } k \geq x.$$

Taking $k \rightarrow \infty$ and using (5.21), we conclude Lemma 5.3(iii). \square

5.4. Compactness results.

Lemma 5.4. *There exist both a continuous function $(u, e)(r, t) : [a, \infty) \times (0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty)$ and a subsequence (still denoted) $\{(u_k, e_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that, for each compact subset $K \Subset [a, \infty) \times [0, T]$,*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(r, t) \in K} |(u_k - u, e_k - e)(r, t)| = 0. \quad (5.22)$$

Moreover, for each fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, if $t \in [0, T]$ and $r_1, r_2 \geq \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)$, then

$$\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(t)|u(r_1, t) - u(r_2, t)| + \sigma(t)|e(r_1, t) - e(r_2, t)| \leq C(\varepsilon)|r_1 - r_2|^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (5.23)$$

and, if $0 < t_1 < t_2 \leq T$ and $r \geq \sup_{t_1 \leq t \leq t_2} \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)$, then

$$\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(t_1)|u(r, t_1) - u(r, t_2)| + \sigma(t_1)|e(r, t_1) - e(r, t_2)| \leq C(\varepsilon)|t_2 - t_1|^{\frac{1}{4}}. \quad (5.24)$$

In addition,

$$\begin{cases} |u(r, t)| \leq C(a)\sigma^{-\frac{1}{4}}(t), & C^{-1}(a) \leq e(r, t) \leq C(a)\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t) & \text{if } (r, t) \in [a, \infty) \times [0, T], \\ |u(r, t)| \leq C(\varepsilon)\sigma^{-\frac{1}{4}}(t), & e(r, t) \leq C(\varepsilon)\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t) & \text{if } t \in [0, T], r \geq \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t). \end{cases} \quad (5.25)$$

Proof. We give our proof only for $u(r, t)$, since the proof is the same for $e(r, t)$.

Let $(r_1, r_2, t) \in [a, \infty)^2 \times (0, T]$. By Lemma 5.2, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |u_k(r_2, t) - u_k(r_1, t)| &\leq (r_2 - r_1)^{\frac{1}{2}} r_1^{-\frac{m}{2}} \left(\int_{r_1}^{r_2} |\partial_r u_k|^2(r, t) r^m dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t) a^{-\frac{m}{2}} \left(\int_a^\infty \sigma(t) |\partial_r u_k|^2(r, t) r^m dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} |r_2 - r_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C(a)\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t) |r_2 - r_1|^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $r \in [a, \infty)$ and $0 < t_1 < t_2 \leq T$, and set $h := \sqrt{t_2 - t_1}$. By the mean value theorem,

$$\frac{1}{h} \int_r^{r+h} |u_k(\zeta, t_1) - u_k(\zeta, t_2)| d\zeta = |u_k(\xi, t_1) - u_k(\xi, t_2)| \quad \text{for some } \xi \in (r, r+h). \quad (5.26)$$

By the triangle inequality and the fundamental theorem of calculus, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |u_k(r, t_1) - u_k(r, t_2)| - |u_k(\xi, t_1) - u_k(\xi, t_2)| &\leq \left| \int_r^\xi (\partial_r u_k(\zeta, t_1) - \partial_r u_k(\zeta, t_2)) d\zeta \right| \\ &\leq |\xi - r|^{\frac{1}{2}} r^{-\frac{m}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^2 \left(\int_r^\xi |\partial_r u_k(\zeta, t_i)|^2 \zeta^m d\zeta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq a^{-\frac{m}{2}} \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t_1) \sqrt{h} \sum_{i=1}^2 \left(\int_a^\infty \sigma(t_i) |\partial_r u_k(\zeta, t_i)|^2 \zeta^m d\zeta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C(a)\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t_1) \sqrt{h}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, it follows from (5.26) that, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& |u_k(r, t_1) - u_k(r, t_2)| \\
& \leq C(a)\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t_1)\sqrt{h} + \frac{1}{h} \int_r^{r+h} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} |\partial_t u_k(\zeta, t)| \, dt d\zeta \\
& \leq C(a)\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t_1)\sqrt{h} + \frac{\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t_1)a^{-\frac{m}{2}}}{h} \left(\int_r^{r+h} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt d\zeta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_a^\infty \sigma(t) |\partial_t u_k|^2 \zeta^m d\zeta dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq C(a)\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t_1)\sqrt{h} + C(a)\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t_1)h^{-\frac{1}{2}}|t_2 - t_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C(a)\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t_1)|t_2 - t_1|^{\frac{1}{4}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{cases} \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |u_k(r_2, t) - u_k(r_1, t)| \leq C(a)\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t)|r_2 - r_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} & \text{if } (r_1, r_2, t) \in [a, \infty)^2 \times (0, T], \\ \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |u_k(r, t_2) - u_k(r, t_1)| \leq C(a)\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t_*)|t_2 - t_1|^{\frac{1}{4}} & \text{if } (r, t_1, t_2) \in [a, \infty) \times (0, T]^2, \end{cases} \quad (5.27)$$

where $t_* \equiv \min\{t_1, t_2\}$. Let $S_l = [0, \infty) \times [l^{-1}, T]$ for each $l \in \mathbb{N}$. Then we can apply Proposition A.1 with (5.27) and S_l to obtain a continuous function $u(r, t) : [a, \infty) \times (0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a subsequence (still denoted) $\{u_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that (5.22) holds.

Next, let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$. Since $x \rightarrow \tilde{r}(x, t)$ is strictly increasing and $(x, t) \mapsto \tilde{r}(x, t)$ is continuous, it follows that $d := \inf_{t \in [0, T]} \{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t) - \tilde{r}(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, t)\} > 0$. By Lemma 5.3, there exists $N_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\tilde{r}_k(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, t) - \tilde{r}(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, t)| \leq \frac{d}{2}$ if $k \geq N_\varepsilon$, which implies that

$$\tilde{r}_k(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, t) < \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t) \quad \text{for each } t \in [0, T] \text{ and } k \geq N_\varepsilon. \quad (5.28)$$

Let (r_1, r_2, t) be a triplet such that $t \in (0, T]$ and $r_1, r_2 \in [\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t), \infty)$. Then (5.28) implies that $r_1, r_2 > \tilde{r}_k(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, t)$ if $k \geq N_\varepsilon$. By Lemma 5.2, it follows that, for all $k \geq N_\varepsilon$,

$$|u_k(r_2, t) - u_k(r_1, t)| \leq \frac{\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t)}{\tilde{r}_k^{\frac{m}{2}}(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, t)} \left(\int_{\tilde{r}_k(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, t)}^\infty \sigma(t) |\partial_r u_k|^2(r, t) r^m dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} |r_2 - r_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C(\varepsilon)\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t)|r_2 - r_1|^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Moreover, let $(r, t_1, t_2) \in [a, \infty) \times (0, T]^2$ be a triplet such that $0 < t_1 < t_2 \leq T$ and $r \geq \sup_{t_1 \leq t \leq t_2} \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)$. Then, by (5.28), $r > \tilde{r}_k(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, t) \geq C^{-1}(\varepsilon)$ for all $t \in [0, T]$ if $k \geq N_\varepsilon$. Set $h := \sqrt{t_2 - t_1}$. Then, by the mean value theorem,

$$\frac{1}{h} \int_r^{r+h} |u_k(\zeta, t_1) - u_k(\zeta, t_2)| \, d\zeta = |u_k(\xi, t_1) - u_k(\xi, t_2)| \quad \text{for some } \xi \in (r, r+h).$$

By the triangle inequality, for all $k \geq N_\varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& |u_k(r, t_1) - u_k(r, t_2)| - |u_k(\xi, t_1) - u_k(\xi, t_2)| \\
& \leq \sqrt{|\xi - r|} r^{-\frac{m}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^2 \left(\int_r^\xi |\partial_r u_k(\zeta, t_i)|^2 \zeta^m d\zeta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq C(\varepsilon)\sqrt{h}\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t_1) \sum_{i=1}^2 \left(\int_{\tilde{r}_k(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, t_i)}^\infty \sigma(t_i) |\partial_r u_k(\zeta, t_i)|^2 \zeta^m d\zeta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C(\varepsilon)\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t_1)\sqrt{h}
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that, for all $k \geq N_\varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned} & |u_k(r, t_1) - u_k(r, t_2)| \\ & \leq C(\varepsilon)\sqrt{h}\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t_1) + \frac{1}{h} \int_r^{r+h} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} |\partial_t u_k(\zeta, t)| dt d\zeta \\ & \leq C(\varepsilon)\sqrt{h}\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t_1) + \frac{\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t_1)r^{-\frac{m}{2}}}{h} \left(\int_r^{r+h} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt d\zeta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\tilde{r}_k(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, t)}^\infty \sigma |\partial_t u_k|^2 \zeta^m d\zeta dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq C(\varepsilon)\sqrt{h}\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t_1) + C(\varepsilon)h^{-\frac{1}{2}}|t_2 - t_1|^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t_1) \leq C(\varepsilon)\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t_1)|t_2 - t_1|^{\frac{1}{4}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{cases} \sup_{k \geq N_\varepsilon} |u_k(r_2, t) - u_k(r_1, t)| \leq C(\varepsilon)t^{-\frac{1}{2}}|r_2 - r_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} & \text{if } t \in (0, T], r_1, r_2 \geq \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t), \\ \sup_{k \geq N_\varepsilon} |u_k(r, t_2) - u_k(r, t_1)| \leq C(\varepsilon)\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t_*)|t_2 - t_1|^{\frac{1}{4}} & \text{if } 0 < t_1 < t_2 \leq T, r \geq R(\varepsilon, t_1, t_2), \end{cases}$$

where $R(\varepsilon, t_1, t_2) := \sup_{t_1 \leq t \leq t_2} \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)$. Taking $k \rightarrow \infty$ and using (5.22), we obtain the continuity estimates for u in (5.23)–(5.24).

Finally, Lemma 5.2 and (5.22) lead to (5.25)₁. In addition, for each $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, (5.28) implies that $r \geq \tilde{r}_k(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, t)$ if $r \geq \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)$ and $k \geq N_\varepsilon$. Hence, $|u_k(r, t)| \leq C(\varepsilon)\sigma^{-\frac{1}{4}}(t)$ for all (r, t, k) such that $k \geq N_\varepsilon$, $t \in [0, T]$, and $r \geq \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)$. Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ and using (5.22), we obtain (5.25)₂. \square

Proposition 5.1. *Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, and let $(r, t) \in [a, \infty) \times (0, T]$ be such that $r > \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)$. Denote $D_\delta(r, t) := \{(\zeta, s) : \sqrt{(\zeta - r)^2 + (s - t)^2} < \delta\}$. Then there exist $N(\varepsilon, r, t) \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\delta(\varepsilon, r, t) > 0$ such that, for all $\delta \in (0, \delta(\varepsilon, r, t))$ and $k \geq N(\varepsilon, r, t)$,*

$$D_\delta(r, t) \subset \{(\zeta, s) \in [a, \infty) \times [0, T] : \zeta > \tilde{r}_k(\varepsilon, s)\}.$$

Proof. Let $\eta := r - \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t) > 0$. Since $(\zeta, s) \mapsto \zeta - \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, s)$ is continuous, there exists $\delta(\varepsilon, r, t) > 0$ such that, for all $\delta \leq \delta(\varepsilon, r, t)$, if $(\zeta, s) \in D_\delta(r, t)$, then $|\zeta - \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, s) - r + \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)| < \frac{\eta}{2}$ which implies that $\zeta > \frac{\eta}{2} + \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, s)$. Therefore,

$$D_\delta(r, t) \subset \{(\zeta, s) \in [a, \infty) \times [0, T] : \zeta > \frac{\eta}{2} + \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, s)\}. \quad (5.29)$$

By Lemma 5.3, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{s \in [0, T]} |\tilde{r}_k(\varepsilon, s) - \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, s)| = 0$. Thus, there exists $N(\varepsilon, r, t) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, s) + \frac{\eta}{4} > \tilde{r}_k(\varepsilon, s)$ for all $s \in [0, T]$ and $k \geq N(\varepsilon, r, t)$. If (ζ, s) is such that $\zeta > \frac{\eta}{2} + \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, s)$, then $\zeta > \frac{\eta}{4} + \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, s) > \tilde{r}_k(\varepsilon, s)$ for all $k \geq N(\varepsilon, r, t)$. We combining this with (5.29) to conclude the proof. \square

Lemma 5.5. *There exist $\rho \geq 0$ and a subsequence (still denoted) $\{\rho_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that*

$$(\rho_k - 1) \xrightarrow{*} (\rho - 1) \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0, T; L^2([a, \infty), r^m dr)). \quad (5.30)$$

Moreover, for each $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{cases} C^{-1}(\varepsilon) \leq \rho(r, t) \leq C(\varepsilon) & \text{for a.e. } (r, t) \in \{(\zeta, s) \in [a, \infty) \times [0, T] : \zeta \geq \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)\}, \\ C^{-1}(a) \leq \rho(r, t) \leq C(a) & \text{for a.e. } (r, t) \in [a, \infty) \times [0, T]. \end{cases} \quad (5.31)$$

Proof. From Lemma 5.2,

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int_a^\infty |\rho_k - 1|^2(r, t) dr dt \leq a^{-m} \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int_a^\infty |\rho_k - 1|^2(r, t) r^m dr dt \leq C(a). \quad (5.32)$$

Thus there exist $(f, \rho - 1) \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2([a, \infty), dr))$ and a subsequence (still denoted) $\{\rho_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that, as $k \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\rho_k - 1 \xrightarrow{*} (\rho - 1), \quad r^{\frac{m}{2}}(\rho_k - 1) \xrightarrow{*} f \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0, T; L^2([a, \infty), dr)). \quad (5.33)$$

Let $\phi \in C_c^\infty([a, \infty) \times [0, T])$. It follows from (5.33) that, as $k \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\int_0^T \int_a^\infty f \phi dr dt \leftarrow \int_0^T \int_a^\infty r^{\frac{m}{2}}(\rho_k - 1)\phi dr dt \rightarrow \int_0^T \int_a^\infty (\rho - 1)r^{\frac{m}{2}}\phi dr dt.$$

By the fundamental lemma of calculus, $f(r, t) = r^{\frac{m}{2}}(\rho(r, t) - 1)$ for *a.e.* $(r, t) \in [a, \infty) \times [0, T]$. By (5.33) again, the weak-star convergence (5.30) is obtained.

Next, fix $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ and a point $(r, t) \in [a, \infty) \times (0, T]$ such that $r > \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)$. Let $\delta(\varepsilon, r, t) > 0$ and $N(\varepsilon, r, t) \in \mathbb{N}$ be obtained in Proposition 5.1. For $0 < \delta \leq \delta(\varepsilon, r, t)$, set

$$\phi_\delta^{(r,t)}(\zeta, s) := \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_\delta(r,t)}(\zeta, s)}{|D_\delta(r,t)|} = \begin{cases} |D_\delta(r,t)|^{-1} & \text{if } (\zeta, s) \in D_\delta(r,t), \\ 0 & \text{if } (\zeta, s) \in [a, \infty) \times [0, T] \setminus D_\delta(r,t), \end{cases} \quad (5.34)$$

where $D_\delta(r, t)$ is defined in Proposition 5.1. It follows that $\phi_\delta^{(r,t)} \in L^1(0, T; L^2([a, \infty), dr))$. Moreover, by Proposition 5.1, for all $k \geq N(\varepsilon, r, t)$ and $\delta \leq \delta(\varepsilon, r, t)$,

$$\text{supp}(\phi_\delta^{(r,t)}) \subset \{(\zeta, s) \in [a, \infty) \times (0, T] : \zeta > \tilde{r}_k(\varepsilon, s)\}. \quad (5.35)$$

For $0 < \delta \leq \delta(\varepsilon, r, t)$ and $\eta > 0$, there exists $N_{\eta, \delta} \in \mathbb{N}$ by (5.33) such that, for all $k \geq N_{\eta, \delta}$,

$$-\eta + \int_0^T \int_a^\infty \rho_k \phi_\delta^{(r,t)} d\zeta ds \leq \int_0^T \int_a^\infty \rho \phi_\delta^{(r,t)} d\zeta ds \leq \eta + \int_0^T \int_a^\infty \rho_k \phi_\delta^{(r,t)} d\zeta dt. \quad (5.36)$$

Let $N_1 := \max\{N_{\eta, \delta}, N(\varepsilon, r, t)\}$. Then, by (5.35) and Lemma 5.2, it follows that, for all $k \geq N_1$, $C^{-1}(\varepsilon) \leq \rho_k(\zeta, s) \leq C(\varepsilon)$ if $(\zeta, s) \in \text{supp}(\phi_\delta^{(r,t)})$. Using this in (5.36) yields

$$C^{-1}(\varepsilon) - \eta \leq \frac{1}{|D_\delta(r, t)|} \iint_{D_\delta(r, t)} \rho(\zeta, s) d\zeta ds \leq C(\varepsilon) + \eta \quad \text{for } \eta > 0 \text{ and } \delta \in (0, \delta(\varepsilon, r, t)].$$

By the Lebesgue differentiation theorem over δ and the fact that $\eta > 0$ is arbitrarily chosen, (5.31)₁ is proved.

Finally, we consider the proof for (5.31)₂. For $(r, t) \in [a, \infty) \times [0, T]$ and $\delta > 0$, we use $\phi_\delta^{(r,t)}$ defined in (5.34). Then (5.31)₂ can be proved by repeating the same argument as before and using $C^{-1}(a) \leq \rho_k(r, t) \leq C(a)$ for all $(k, r, t) \in \mathbb{N} \times [a, \infty) \times [0, T]$ from Lemma 5.2. \square

We now introduce the following function spaces: for each connected interval $I \subseteq [0, \infty)$, define the space $\tilde{H}_0^1(I, r^m dr)$ to be the closure of

$$\mathcal{D}_0(I) := \{\phi \in C^\infty(I) : \exists N > 0 \text{ such that } [0, N] \subset I \text{ and } \phi(r) = 0 \text{ for } r \in I \cap [N, \infty)\} \quad (5.37)$$

via the $H^1(I, r^m dr)$ -norm. We also denote $\tilde{H}^{-1}(I, r^m dr)$ as its dual space.

Lemma 5.6. *Let (ρ, u, e) be the limit function obtained in Lemma 5.4–5.5. Then*

- (i) *For all $L \in \mathbb{N}$, $\rho \in C^0([0, T]; \tilde{H}^{-1}([a, L], r^m dr))$ and there exists a further subsequence (still denoted) $\rho_k(r, t)$ such that*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\rho_k(\cdot, t) - \rho(\cdot, t)\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}([a, L], r^m dr)} = 0.$$

- (ii) *For each $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, define $\rho^{(\varepsilon)}(r, t) := \rho(r, t)\chi_\varepsilon(r, t)$ with $\chi_\varepsilon(r, t)$ given by*

$$\chi_\varepsilon(r, t) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t \in [0, T] \text{ and } r \in [\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t), \infty), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (5.38)$$

Then, for all $L \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{cases} \rho^{(\varepsilon)} \in C^0([0, T]; \tilde{H}^{-1}([0, L], r^m dr)), \\ \|\rho^{(\varepsilon)}(\cdot, t_1) - \rho^{(\varepsilon)}(\cdot, t_2)\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}([0, L], r^m dr)} \leq C(\varepsilon)|t_1 - t_2| \quad \text{for } t_1, t_2 \in [0, T]. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Let $\phi \in \tilde{H}_0^1([a, \infty), r^m dr)$. Then, by (3.1) and (5.3)–(5.7),

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_a^\infty \{\rho_k(r, t_2) - \rho_k(r, t_1)\} \phi(r) r^m dr = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_a^\infty \partial_t \rho_k(r, t) \phi(r) r^m dr dt \\ & = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_a^\infty (\varphi_k \partial_t \bar{v}_k^{-1})(r, t) \phi(r) r^m dr dt = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_a^{\tilde{r}_k^{(k, t)}} (\varphi_k \partial_t \bar{v}_k^{-1})(r, t) \phi(r) r^m dr dt \\ & = - \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_0^k (\varphi_k \phi)(\tilde{r}_k(x, t), t) (\tilde{v}_k^{-1} D_t \tilde{v}_k + \tilde{r}_k^m \tilde{u}_k D_x \tilde{v}_k^{-1})(x, t) dx dt. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating by parts and applying the continuity equation (3.15)₁, the boundary condition $\tilde{u}_k(0, t) = \tilde{u}_k(k, t)$, and Theorem 4.1(i)–(ii), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_a^\infty (\rho_k(r, t_2) - \rho_k(r, t_1)) \phi(r) r^m dr \\ & = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_0^k \tilde{u}_k(x, t) (\partial_r \varphi_k \phi + \partial_r \phi \varphi_k)(\tilde{r}_k(x, t), t) dx dt \\ & \leq C \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \left(\int_0^k \frac{|\tilde{u}_k|^2}{\tilde{v}_k} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^k \tilde{v}_k(x, t) (|\phi|^2 + |\partial_r \phi|^2)(\tilde{r}_k(x, t)) dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dt \\ & \leq C(a) \|\phi(\cdot)\|_{H^1([a, \infty), r^m dr)} |t_2 - t_1|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the following equicontinuity inequality holds:

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|\rho_k(\cdot, t_2) - \rho_k(\cdot, t_1)\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}([a, \infty), r^m dr)} \leq C(a) |t_2 - t_1|.$$

By the same calculation, $\rho_k \in L^\infty(0, T; \tilde{H}^{-1}([a, L], r^m dr))$ for all $(k, L) \in \mathbb{N}^2$. In addition, it follows from Lemma 5.2 that

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_a^\infty |\rho_k - 1|^2(r, t) r^m dr \leq C(a).$$

Then we can apply Proposition A.2 to obtain f such that, for all $L \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{cases} f \in C^0([0, T]; \tilde{H}^{-1}([a, L], r^m dr)), & f - 1 \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2([a, \infty), r^m dr)), \\ \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\rho_k(\cdot, t) - f(\cdot, t)\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}([a, L], r^m dr)} = 0, \\ \|f(\cdot, t_1) - f(\cdot, t_2)\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}([a, L], r^m dr)} \leq C(a) |t_1 - t_2| & \text{for all } t_1, t_2 \in [0, T]. \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 5.5 and the fundamental lemma of calculus, we see that $\rho = f$ for *a.e.* $(r, t) \in [a, \infty) \times [0, T]$. This completes the proof of (i).

For each $\varepsilon > 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, define $\rho_k^{(\varepsilon)}(r, t) := \rho_k(r, t) \chi_\varepsilon^k(r, t)$ with

$$\chi_\varepsilon^k(r, t) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t \in [0, T] \text{ and } r \in [\tilde{r}_k(\varepsilon, t), \infty), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (5.39)$$

If $k \geq M(\varepsilon, a) := \varepsilon C^2(a) + \frac{2^n - 1}{n} a^n C(a) > 0$, then it follows from construction (5.5) that $\varphi_k(\tilde{r}_k(\varepsilon, t), t) = 1$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. Thus, by (3.1) and (5.4),

$$(\rho_k, u_k, e_k)(\tilde{r}_k(\varepsilon, t), t) = (\bar{v}_k^{-1}, \bar{u}_k, \bar{e}_k)(\tilde{r}_k(\varepsilon, t), t) = (\tilde{v}_k^{-1}, \tilde{u}_k, \tilde{e}_k)(\varepsilon, t). \quad (5.40)$$

Let $\phi \in \tilde{H}_0^1([0, \infty), r^m dr)$. Then, by (5.40) and the Leibniz rule, for all $k \geq M(\varepsilon, a)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty (\rho_k^{(\varepsilon)}(r, t_2) - \rho_k^{(\varepsilon)}(r, t_1)) \phi(r) r^m dr \\ & = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\tilde{r}_k(\varepsilon, t)}^\infty \phi \partial_t \rho_k r^m dr dt - \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \tilde{r}_k^m(\varepsilon, t) \phi(\tilde{r}_k(\varepsilon, t)) \tilde{u}_k(\varepsilon, t) \tilde{v}_k^{-1}(\varepsilon, t) dt \\ & =: I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.41)$$

Using (3.1) and (5.3)–(5.4), I_1 can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\tilde{r}_k(\varepsilon, t)}^{\tilde{r}_k(k, t)} \varphi_k \partial_t \bar{v}_k^{-1}(r, t) \phi(r) r^m dr dt \\ &= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\varepsilon}^k (\varphi_k \phi)(\tilde{r}_k(x, t), t) \{ \tilde{v}_k D_t \tilde{v}_k^{-1} - \tilde{r}_k^m \tilde{u}_k D_x \tilde{v}_k^{-1} \}(x, t) dx dt. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating by parts and using the boundary condition $\tilde{u}_k(k, t) = 0$, the continuity equation (3.15)₁, and Theorem 4.1(i)–(ii), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\varepsilon}^k (\varphi_k \cdot \phi)(\tilde{r}_k(x, t), t) \{ -\tilde{v}_k^{-1} D_x(\tilde{r}_k^m \tilde{u}_k) - \tilde{r}_k^m \tilde{u}_k D_x \tilde{v}_k^{-1} \} dx dt \\ &= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \phi(\tilde{r}_k(\varepsilon, t)) (\tilde{r}_k^m \tilde{u}_k \tilde{v}_k^{-1})(\varepsilon, t) dt + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\varepsilon}^k \tilde{u}_k(x, t) (\partial_r \varphi_k \phi + \partial_r \phi \varphi_k)(\tilde{r}_k(x, t), t) dx dt \\ &\leq -I_2 + C \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \left(\int_{\varepsilon}^k \frac{|\tilde{u}_k|^2}{\tilde{v}_k} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\varepsilon}^k \tilde{v}_k(x, t) (|\phi|^2 + |\partial \phi|^2)(\tilde{r}_k(x, t)) dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dt \\ &\leq -I_2 + C(\varepsilon) \|\phi\|_{H^1([0, \infty), r^m dr)} |t_2 - t_1|. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting this back into (5.41), it follows that the following equicontinuity inequality holds:

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|\rho_k^{(\varepsilon)}(\cdot, t_2) - \rho_k^{(\varepsilon)}(\cdot, t_1)\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}([0, \infty), r^m dr)} \leq C(\varepsilon) |t_2 - t_1|. \quad (5.42)$$

Let $L \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $\tilde{r}_k(1, t) < L$ for all $(k, t) \in \mathbb{N} \times [0, T]$. By the same derivation, $\rho_k^{(\varepsilon)} \in L^\infty(0, T; \tilde{H}^{-1}([0, L], r^m dr))$ for all $(k, L) \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, set $r_\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2} \inf_{t \in [0, T]} \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t) > 0$. Then, by Lemma 5.3, there exists $N_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $r_\varepsilon < \tilde{r}_k(\varepsilon, t)$ for all $k \geq N_\varepsilon$ and $t \in [0, T]$. From (5.42) and Lemma 5.2, it follows that

$$\begin{cases} \sup_{k \geq N_\varepsilon} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{r_\varepsilon}^{\infty} |\rho_k^{(\varepsilon)} - 1|^2(r, t) r^m dr \leq C(\varepsilon), \\ \sup_{k \geq N_\varepsilon} \|\rho_k^{(\varepsilon)}(\cdot, t_2) - \rho_k^{(\varepsilon)}(\cdot, t_1)\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}([r_\varepsilon, L], r^m dr)} \leq C(\varepsilon) |t_2 - t_1|. \end{cases}$$

Thus, we can apply Proposition A.2 to obtain f_ε such that, for all $L \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{cases} f_\varepsilon \in C^0([0, T]; \tilde{H}^{-1}([r_\varepsilon, L], r^m dr)), \quad f_\varepsilon - 1 \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2([r_\varepsilon, \infty), r^m dr)), \\ \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\rho_k^{(\varepsilon)}(\cdot, t) - f_\varepsilon(\cdot, t)\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}([r_\varepsilon, L], r^m dr)} = 0, \\ \|f_\varepsilon(\cdot, t_1) - f_\varepsilon(\cdot, t_2)\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}([r_\varepsilon, L], r^m dr)} \leq C(\varepsilon) |t_1 - t_2| \quad \text{for all } t_1, t_2 \in [0, T]. \end{cases} \quad (5.43)$$

Let $\phi \in C_c^\infty([a, \infty) \times [0, T])$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^T \int_{r_\varepsilon}^{\infty} \phi(\rho^{(\varepsilon)} - f_\varepsilon) dr dt \\ &= \int_0^T \int_{r_\varepsilon}^{\infty} \phi \chi_\varepsilon(\rho - \rho_k) dr dt + \int_0^T \int_{r_\varepsilon}^{\infty} \phi \rho_k (\chi_\varepsilon - \chi_\varepsilon^k) dr dt + \int_0^T \int_{r_\varepsilon}^{\infty} \phi(\rho_k^{(\varepsilon)} - f_\varepsilon) dr dt \\ &=: \sum_{i=1}^3 \Pi_i^k. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 5.5, $\Pi_1^k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. By (5.38)–(5.39) and Lemma 5.3, $\chi_\varepsilon^k \rightarrow \chi_\varepsilon$ a.e. as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Since $\rho_k \leq C(a)$ from Lemma 5.2, by the dominated convergence theorem, $\Pi_2^k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Finally, $\Pi_3^k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ by (5.43). Therefore, $\rho^{(\varepsilon)} = f_\varepsilon$ for a.e. $(r, t) \in [r_\varepsilon, \infty) \times [0, T]$. Since $\rho^{(\varepsilon)} = \rho_k^{(\varepsilon)} = 0$ for $r \in [0, r_\varepsilon]$ and $k \geq N_\varepsilon$, Lemma 5.6(ii) is proved. \square

Lemma 5.7. *The following relations hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} x &= \int_a^{\tilde{r}(x,t)} \rho(r,t) r^m dr && \text{for a.e. } t \in [0, T] \text{ and for each } x > 0, \\ \tilde{r}(x,t) &= \tilde{r}_a^0(x) + \int_0^t u(\tilde{r}(x,s), s) ds && \text{for all } (x,t) \in [0, \infty) \times [0, T], \end{aligned} \quad (5.44)$$

where the initial data $\tilde{r}_a^0(x)$ is the function constructed in §3.4, which satisfies

$$x = \int_a^{\tilde{r}_a^0(x)} \rho_a^0(r) r^m dr \quad \text{for all } x \in [0, \infty).$$

Proof. Let $(x,t) \in [0, \infty) \times [0, T]$. Then, for $k \geq M(a, x) := \frac{2^n-1}{n}C(a)a^n + 2^nC(a)^2x$, $2\tilde{r}_k(x,t) \leq \tilde{r}_k(k,t)$. Thus, by (3.1), if $k \geq M(a, x)$ and $r \in [a, \tilde{r}_k(x,t)]$, then $\rho_k(r,t) = \varphi_k \bar{v}_k^{-1}(r,t) + (1 - \varphi_k(r,t)) = \bar{v}_k^{-1}(r,t)$. Using this and (5.2)–(5.4), we have

$$\int_a^{\tilde{r}_k(x,t)} \rho_k(r,t) r^m dr = \int_a^{\tilde{r}_k(x,t)} \bar{v}_k^{-1}(r,t) r^m dr = \int_0^x \tilde{v}_k^{-1}(y,t) \tilde{v}_k(y,t) dy = x.$$

Using the above identity leads to

$$x - \int_a^{\tilde{r}(x,t)} \rho(r,t) r^m dr = \int_{\tilde{r}(x,t)}^{\tilde{r}_k(x,t)} \rho_k(r,t) r^m dr + \int_a^{\tilde{r}(x,t)} (\rho_k - \rho)(r,t) r^m dr.$$

Let $\chi(t) \in C_c^\infty([0, T])$. Multiplying it to the above and integrating in time, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \left(x - \int_a^{\tilde{r}(x,t)} \rho(r,t) r^m dr \right) \chi(t) dt \\ &= \int_0^T \int_{\tilde{r}(x,t)}^{\tilde{r}_k(x,t)} \rho_k(r,t) \chi(t) r^m dr dt + \int_0^T \int_a^{\tilde{r}(x,t)} (\rho_k - \rho)(r,t) \chi(t) r^m dr dt \\ &=: I_k^{(1)} + I_k^{(2)}. \end{aligned}$$

$I_k^{(1)}$ is estimated by using Lemma 5.3 and the upper bound $\rho_k \leq C(a)$ from Lemma 5.2:

$$|I_k^{(1)}| \leq \frac{C(a)T}{n} \|\chi(\cdot)\|_{L^\infty} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\tilde{r}_k^n(x,t) - \tilde{r}^n(x,t)| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

For $I_k^{(2)}$, observe that $\chi(t)r^m \mathbb{1}_{[a, \tilde{r}(x,t)]}(r) \in L^1(0, T; L^2([a, \infty), dr))$, where $\mathbb{1}_E(r)$ denotes the indicator function for spatial set $E \subset [a, \infty)$. By Lemma 5.5, it follows that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} I_k^{(2)} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T \int_a^\infty (\rho_k - \rho)(r,t) \chi(t) \mathbb{1}_{[a, \tilde{r}(x,t)]}(r) r^m dr dt = 0.$$

Since $|I_k^{(1)}| + |I_k^{(2)}| \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$\int_0^T \left(x - \int_a^{\tilde{r}(x,t)} \rho(r,t) r^m dr \right) \chi(t) dt = 0 \quad \text{for each } \chi(t) \in C_c^\infty([0, T])$$

so that (5.44)₁ follows.

Next, by (3.15)₁ and (3.15)₄, $\tilde{r}_k(x,t)$ satisfies

$$\tilde{r}_k(x,t) = \tilde{r}_k(x,0) + \int_0^t \tilde{u}_k(x,s) ds \quad \text{for } (x,t) \in [0, k] \times [0, T],$$

where, from (3.15)₄ and §3.4, $\tilde{r}_k(x,0)$ is given by

$$\tilde{r}_k(x,0) = \left(a^n + n \int_0^x \tilde{v}_{a,k}^0(y) dy \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} = \left(a^n + n \int_0^x \frac{1}{\rho_{a,k}^0(\tilde{r}_a^0(y))} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{n}}.$$

Fix $(x, t) \in [0, \infty) \times [0, T]$. If $k \geq M(a, x)$, then, by (3.1), $u_k(\tilde{r}_k(x, t), t) = \tilde{u}_k(x, t)$ and

$$\tilde{r}_k(x, t) = \tilde{r}_k(x, 0) + \int_0^t u_k(\tilde{r}_k(x, s), s) ds. \quad (5.45)$$

Moreover, by Proposition 3.2 in §3.4, if $k \geq N(x) := \frac{2^n - 1}{n} C_0 a^n + 2^n C_0^2 x$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \tilde{r}_a^0(k) &= \frac{1}{2} \left(a^n + n \int_0^k \frac{1}{\rho_{a,k}^0(\tilde{r}_a^0(y))} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \geq \frac{1}{2} (a^n + n C_0^{-1} k)^{\frac{1}{n}} \\ &\geq (a^n + n C_0 x)^{\frac{1}{n}} \geq \left(a^n + n \int_0^x \frac{1}{\rho_a^0(\tilde{r}_a^0(y))} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} = \tilde{r}_a^0(x). \end{aligned}$$

By the construction of $\rho_k^0(r)$ in (3.12), it follows that, if $k \geq N(x)$, then

$$\tilde{v}_{a,k}^0(x) = \frac{1}{\rho_{a,k}^0(\tilde{r}_a^0(x))} = \left(\rho_a^0(\tilde{r}_a^0(x)) \varphi_{a,k}^0(\tilde{r}_a^0(x)) + 1 - \varphi_{a,k}^0(\tilde{r}_a^0(x)) \right)^{-1} = \frac{1}{\rho_a^0(\tilde{r}_a^0(x))}.$$

Thus, by Proposition 3.2, for all $k \geq N(x)$,

$$\tilde{r}_k(x, 0) = \left(a^n + n \int_0^x \frac{1}{\rho_{a,k}^0(\tilde{r}_a^0(y))} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} = \left(a^n + n \int_0^x \frac{1}{\rho_a^0(\tilde{r}_a^0(y))} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} = \tilde{r}_a^0(x).$$

This shows that, for each $x \in [0, \infty)$, $\tilde{r}_k(x, 0) \rightarrow \tilde{r}_a^0(x)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, by Lemma 5.3 and inequality (5.27) obtained in Lemma 5.4, it follows that, for all $(x, s) \in [0, \infty) \times [0, T]$,

$$|u_k(\tilde{r}_k(x, s), s) - u_k(\tilde{r}(x, s), s)| \leq C(a) |\tilde{r}_k(x, s) - \tilde{r}(x, s)| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

By Lemma 5.4, $|u_k(\tilde{r}(x, s), s) - u(\tilde{r}(x, s), s)| \rightarrow 0$ for all $(x, s) \in [0, \infty) \times [0, T]$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Combining these limits in (5.45), (5.44)₂ is shown by the dominated convergence theorem. \square

Lemma 5.8. *There exists a subsequence (still denoted) $(\rho_k, u_k, e_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that, as $k \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\begin{cases} (\sqrt{\sigma} \partial_r u_k, \sigma \partial_r e_k) \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} (\sqrt{\sigma} \partial_r u, \sigma \partial_r e) & \text{in } L^\infty(0, T; L^2([a, \infty), r^m dr)), \\ (\partial_r u_k, \partial_r e_k, \sqrt{\sigma} \partial_t u_k, \sigma \partial_t e_k) \rightharpoonup (\partial_r u, \partial_r e, \sqrt{\sigma} \partial_t u, \sigma \partial_t e) & \text{in } L^2(0, T; L^2([a, \infty), r^m dr)), \end{cases}$$

where $\sigma = \min\{1, t\}$. In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_a^\infty ((\rho - 1)^2 + u^4 + (e - 1)^2 + \sigma |\partial_r u|^2 + \sigma^2 |\partial_r e|^2)(r, t) r^m dr \\ &+ \int_0^T \int_a^\infty \left\{ |\partial_r u|^2 + |u \partial_r u|^2 + |\partial_r e|^2 + \sigma |\partial_t u|^2 + \sigma^2 |\partial_t e|^2 \right\} r^m dr dt \leq C(a). \end{aligned} \quad (5.46)$$

Furthermore, for each $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int_{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)}^\infty ((\rho - 1)^2 + u^4 + (e - 1)^2 + \sigma |\partial_r u|^2 + \sigma^2 |\partial_r e|^2)(r, t) r^m dr \\ &+ \int_0^T \int_{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)}^\infty \left\{ |\partial_r u|^2 + |u \partial_r u|^2 + |\partial_r e|^2 + \sigma |\partial_t u|^2 + \sigma^2 |\partial_t e|^2 \right\} r^m dr dt \leq C(\varepsilon). \end{aligned} \quad (5.47)$$

Proof. The proof only for $\sqrt{\sigma} \partial_r u_k \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \sqrt{\sigma} \partial_r u$ is presented, since the other limits can be shown via the same argument.

By Lemma 5.2,

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_a^\infty (\sigma |\partial_r u_k|^2)(r, t) dr \leq a^{-m} \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_a^\infty (\sigma |\partial_r u_k|^2)(r, t) r^m dr \leq a^{-m} C(a).$$

Thus, there exists a subsequence (still denoted) $\{\partial_r u_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$(\sqrt{\sigma} \partial_r u_k, r^{\frac{m}{2}} \sqrt{\sigma} \partial_r u_k) \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} (w_1, w_2) \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0, T; L^2([a, \infty), dr)). \quad (5.48)$$

By (5.48), Lemma 5.4, and the dominated convergence theorem, we see that the spatial weak derivative of $\sqrt{\sigma} u$ exists and $w_1 = \sqrt{\sigma} \partial_r u$. As a result, by (5.48) and the fundamental lemma of calculus,

$w_2 = r^{\frac{m}{2}} \sqrt{\sigma} \partial_r u$ for *a.e.* $(r, t) \in [a, \infty) \times [0, T]$. Then (5.48) implies that $\sqrt{\sigma} \partial_r u_k \xrightarrow{*} \sqrt{\sigma} \partial_r u$ in $L^\infty(0, T; L^2([a, \infty), r^m dr))$. By the weak-star lower semi-continuity of the Sobolev norm,

$$\|\sqrt{\sigma} \partial_r u\|_{L^\infty(0, T; L^2([a, \infty), r^m dr))} \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\sqrt{\sigma} \partial_r u_k\|_{L^\infty(0, T; L^2([a, \infty), r^m dr))} \leq C(a).$$

The other terms in (5.46) can be proved by the same argument.

Next, we show (5.47). Only the proof for $\sqrt{\sigma} \partial_r u$ is provided, since the other terms in (5.47) can be obtained in the same way. Let $\phi \in L^1(0, T; L^2([a, \infty), r^m dr))$. Then, by Lemma 5.2,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_0^T \int_{\tilde{r}_k(\varepsilon, t)}^\infty \sqrt{\sigma} \partial_r u_k \phi r^m dr dt - \int_0^T \int_{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)}^\infty \sqrt{\sigma} \partial_r u \phi r^m dr dt \right| \\ & \leq \left| \int_0^T \int_{\tilde{r}_k(\varepsilon, t)}^{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)} \sqrt{\sigma} \partial_r u_k \phi r^m dr dt \right| + \left| \int_0^T \int_{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)}^\infty \sqrt{\sigma} (\partial_r u_k - \partial_r u) \phi r^m dr dt \right| \\ & \leq C(a) \int_0^T \left(\int_{\tilde{r}_k(\varepsilon, t)}^{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)} |\phi|^2 r^m dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dt + \left| \int_0^T \int_{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)}^\infty \sqrt{\sigma} (\partial_r u_k - \partial_r u) \phi r^m dr dt \right| \\ & =: I_k^{(1)} + I_k^{(2)}. \end{aligned}$$

$I_k^{(2)} \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ by (5.48). For $I_k^{(1)}$, define

$$\chi^{(k, \varepsilon)}(r, t) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } r \in [\tilde{r}_k(\varepsilon, t), \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)] \text{ or } r \in [\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t), \tilde{r}_k(\varepsilon, t)], \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 5.3, for each fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, $\chi^{(k, \varepsilon)}(r, t) \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ for *a.e.* $(r, t) \in [a, \infty) \times [0, T]$. Moreover, since $|\chi^{(k, \varepsilon)} \phi| \leq |\phi|$, by the dominated convergence theorem, as $k \rightarrow \infty$,

$$I_k^{(1)} := C(a) \int_0^T \left(\int_{\tilde{r}_k(\varepsilon, t)}^{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)} |\phi|^2 r^m dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dt = C(a) \int_0^T \left(\int_a^\infty \chi^{(\varepsilon, k)} |\phi|^2 r^m dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dt \rightarrow 0.$$

Let χ_ε and χ_ε^k be defined in (5.38)–(5.39). Then the limits: $I_k^{(1)}, I_k^{(2)} \rightarrow 0$ imply the weak-star convergence: $\chi_\varepsilon^k \sqrt{\sigma} \partial_r u_k \xrightarrow{*} \chi_\varepsilon \sqrt{\sigma} \partial_r u$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ in $L^\infty(0, T; L^2([a, \infty), r^m dr))$. By the weak-star lower semi-continuity of the Sobolev norm, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)}^\infty (\sigma |\partial_r u|^2)(r, t) r^m dr &= \|\chi_\varepsilon \sqrt{\sigma} \partial_r u\|_{L^\infty(0, T; L^2([a, \infty), r^m dr))} \\ &\leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\chi_\varepsilon^k \sqrt{\sigma} \partial_r u_k\|_{L^\infty(0, T; L^2([a, \infty), r^m dr))} \\ &= \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{\tilde{r}_k(\varepsilon, t)}^\infty \sigma |\partial_r u_k|^2(r, t) r^m dr \leq C(\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

□

In §5.5–§5.7 below, we denote $(\rho, u, e)(r, t)$ in $[a, \infty) \times [0, T]$ as the limit functions obtained in Lemma 5.4–5.5 and keep the simplified notation (5.15) as in §5.4.

5.5. Entropy estimate for the limit solution.

Lemma 5.9. *There exists $C(T) > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in [0, T]} \int_a^\infty \left(\rho \left(\frac{1}{2} |u|^2 + \psi(e) \right) + G(\rho) \right) (r, t) r^m dr + \kappa \int_0^T \int_a^\infty \frac{|\partial_r e|^2}{e^2} r^m dr dt \\ & + \int_0^T \int_a^\infty \left\{ \left(\frac{2\mu}{n} + \lambda \right) \frac{1}{e} \left| \partial_r u + m \frac{u}{r} \right|^2 + \frac{2m\mu}{n} \frac{1}{e} \left| \partial_r u - \frac{u}{r} \right|^2 \right\} r^m dr dt \leq C(T). \end{aligned} \quad (5.49)$$

Proof. We divide the proof into four steps.

1. For each integer $L \geq 2$, let $\phi_L \in C^\infty([a, \infty))$ be such that $\phi_L(r) = 1$ if $r \in [a, L-1]$ and $\phi_L(r) = 0$ if $r \in [L, \infty)$. Then $\phi_L \in \tilde{H}_0^1([a, L], r^m dr)$, where \tilde{H}_0^1 is the Sobolev space defined in (5.37). Moreover, $\partial_r \psi(e_k) = \frac{e_k - 1}{e_k} \partial_r e_k$. Thus, for each fixed $t \in (0, T]$, $(\psi(e_k) \phi_L)(\cdot, t) \in \tilde{H}_0^1([a, L], r^m dr)$ for all $(k, t) \in \mathbb{N} \times (0, T]$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_a^\infty \rho_k \psi(e_k) \phi_L r^m dr - \int_a^\infty \rho \psi(e) \phi_L r^m dr &\leq \int_a^L (\rho_k - \rho) \psi(e_k) \phi_L r^m dr + \int_a^\infty \rho (\psi(e_k) - \psi(e)) \phi_L r^m dr \\ &=: I_k^{(1)} + I_k^{(2)}. \end{aligned}$$

For all $t \in (0, T]$, $I_k^{(1)}$ is estimated by using Lemmas 5.2 and 5.6 as

$$\begin{aligned} I_k^{(1)} &\leq \|\rho_k - \rho\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}([a, L], r^m dr)} \|\psi(e_k) \phi_L\|_{H^1([a, L], r^m dr)} \\ &= \|\rho_k - \rho\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}} \left\{ \|\phi_L\|_{H^1} \|\psi(e_k)\|_{L^\infty} + \sigma^{-1}(t) \left\| \frac{e_k - 1}{e_k} \phi_L \right\|_\infty \|\sigma \partial_r e_k\|_{L^2} \right\} \\ &\leq \|\rho_k - \rho\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}} \{C(a) \|\phi_L\|_{H^1} + C(a) \sigma^{-1}(t)\} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 5.4,

$$e_k(r, t) \rightarrow e(r, t) \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty \text{ for } (r, t) \in [a, \infty) \times [0, T],$$

and, from Lemmas 5.4–5.5,

$$C^{-1}(a) \leq \rho(r, t) \leq C(a), \quad C^{-1}(a) \leq e_k(r, t), \quad e(r, t) \leq C(a) \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t)$$

for *a.e.* $(r, t) \in [a, \infty) \times (0, T]$. Using these and the dominated convergence theorem, it follows that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} I_k^{(2)} := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^\infty \rho \phi_n (\psi(e_k) - \psi(e))(r, t) r^m dr = 0 \quad \text{for each } t \in (0, T].$$

Using Lemma 5.1, the limits: $I_k^{(1)}, I_k^{(2)} \rightarrow 0$ then imply that, for each $t > 0$,

$$\int_a^\infty \phi_L(r, t) (\rho \psi(e))(r, t) r^m dr = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^\infty \phi_L(r, t) (\rho_k \psi(e_k))(r, t) r^m dr \leq C(T).$$

Now, by construction, $\phi_L(r) \rightarrow 1$ for all $r \in [a, \infty)$ as $L \rightarrow \infty$. Since $\rho \psi(e) > 0$, we apply the monotone convergence theorem to obtain

$$\int_a^\infty (\rho \psi(e))(r, t) r^m dr = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^\infty \phi_L(r, t) (\rho \psi(e))(r, t) r^m dr \leq C(T) \quad \text{for each } t \in (0, T].$$

2. From Lemma 5.2, $u_k^2 \in L^2([a, \infty), r^m dr)$ and, for all $(k, t) \in \mathbb{N} \times (0, T]$,

$$\|\partial_r u_k^2(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2([a, \infty), r^m dr)} = \|u_k\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_r u_k(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2([a, \infty), r^m dr)} \leq \sigma^{-\frac{3}{4}}(t) C(a).$$

From these, $u_k \phi_L \in \tilde{H}_0^1([a, L], r^m dr)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int_a^\infty \rho_k u_k^2 \phi_L r^m dr - \int_a^\infty \phi_L \rho u^2 r^m dr \right| \\ &\leq \|\rho_k - \rho\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}([a, L], r^m dr)} \|u_k^2 \phi_L\|_{H^1([a, L], r^m dr)} + \int_a^\infty \rho (u_k^2 - u^2) \phi_L r^m dr \\ &\leq \int_a^\infty \phi_L \rho (u_k^2 - u^2) r^m dr + C(a) (1 + \sigma^{-\frac{3}{4}}(t)) \|\rho_k - \rho\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}([a, L], r^m dr)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $u_k(r, t) \rightarrow u(r, t)$ from Lemma 5.4, $|u_k(r, t)| + |u(r, t)| \leq C(a) \sigma^{-\frac{1}{4}}(t)$ from Lemmas 5.2 and 5.4, and $\rho_k \rightarrow \rho$ strongly in \tilde{H}^{-1} from Lemma 5.6, then, by the dominated convergence theorem,

$$\int_a^\infty \rho u^2 \phi_L r^m dr = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^\infty \rho_k u_k^2 \phi_L r^m dr \leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^\infty \rho_k u_k^2 r^m dr \leq C(T).$$

Then $\|(\rho u^2)(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1([a, \infty), r^m dr)} \leq C(T)$ follows from the monotone convergence theorem for $L \rightarrow \infty$.

3. Let $\phi \in L^2(0, T; L^2([a, \infty), r^m dr))$. By Lemma 5.2,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_0^T \int_a^\infty \frac{\partial_r e_k}{e_k} \phi r^m dr dt - \int_0^T \int_a^\infty \frac{\partial_r e}{e} \phi r^m dr dt \right| \\ & \leq C(a) \left(\int_0^T \int_a^\infty (e_k^{-1} - e^{-1})^2 |\phi|^2 r^m dr dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left| \int_0^T \int_a^\infty (\partial_r e_k - \partial_r e) \frac{\phi}{e} r^m dr dt \right| \\ & =: \Pi_k^{(1)} + \Pi_k^{(2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Using $e_k \rightarrow e$ from Lemma 5.4, and the estimates: $C(a) \leq e_k(r, t)$, $e(r, t) \leq C(a)\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t)$ from Lemmas 5.2 and 5.4, we use the dominated convergence theorem to obtain

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Pi_k^{(1)} := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} C(a) \left(\int_0^T \int_a^\infty (e_k^{-1} - e^{-1})^2 |\phi|^2 r^m dr dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = 0.$$

For $\Pi_k^{(2)}$, since $e(r, t) \geq C^{-1}(a)$ and $\partial_r e_k \rightarrow \partial_r e$ in Lemma 5.8, we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Pi_k^{(2)} := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_0^T \int_a^\infty (\partial_r e_k - \partial_r e) \frac{\phi}{e}(r, t) r^m dr dt \right| = 0.$$

The above limits imply that $\frac{\partial_r e_k}{e_k} \rightharpoonup \frac{\partial_r e}{e}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ weakly in $L^2(0, T; L^2([a, \infty), r^m dr))$. By Lemma 5.1 and the weak-star lower semi-continuity of the Sobolev norm, it follows that

$$\int_0^T \int_a^\infty \frac{|\partial_r e|^2}{e^2} r^m dr dt \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T \int_a^\infty \frac{|\partial_r e_k|^2}{e_k^2} r^m dr dt \leq C(T).$$

By the same argument, we can also obtain the estimates for $\|(\partial_r u + m\frac{u}{r})e^{-1}\|_{L^2}$ and $\|(\partial_r u - \frac{u}{r})e^{-1}\|_{L^2}$ in (5.49).

4. From Lemmas 5.1–5.2 and 5.5, we have

$$\begin{cases} \rho_k \rightharpoonup \rho \text{ weakly in } L^2(0, T; L^2([a, \infty), r^m dr)) & \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty. \\ \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in [0, T]} \int_a^\infty G(\rho_k)(r, t) r^m dr \leq C(T), \\ C^{-1}(a) \leq \rho_k(r, t) \leq C(a) & \text{for a.e. } (r, t) \in [a, \infty) \times [0, T] \text{ and for each } k \in \mathbb{N}. \end{cases} \quad (5.50)$$

By Proposition B.2, $\|G(\rho)(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1([a, \infty), r^m dr)} \leq C(T)$ for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$. \square

5.6. Weak forms of the exterior problem. We now show that (ρ, u, e) is indeed a weak solution of problem (1.6) and (3.9).

Lemma 5.10. *Let $(\rho, u, e)(r, t)$ be the limit function obtained in Lemmas 5.4–5.5. Then $(\rho, u, e)(r, t)$ is a weak solution of problem (1.6) and (3.9) as stated in Definition 3.1.*

Proof. We divide the proof into three steps.

1. We start with the *continuity equation*. For any $\phi \in \mathcal{D}^a$, then there exists an integer $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\phi(r, t) = 0$ for $r \geq N$ and $t \in [0, T]$. Take $k \in \mathbb{N}$ to be $k \geq M(\phi, a) := 2^n N^n \max\{C_0, C(a)\}$. Then, for all $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{r}_k(k, t) &= \left(a^n + \int_0^k \tilde{v}_k(x, t) dx \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \geq \left(a^n + \frac{k}{C(a)} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \geq (a^n + 2^n N^n)^{\frac{1}{n}} > 2N, \\ \tilde{r}_a^0(k) &= \left(a^n + \int_0^k \frac{1}{\rho_a^0(\tilde{r}_a^0(x))} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \geq \left(a^n + \frac{k}{C_0} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \geq (a^n + 2^n N^n)^{\frac{1}{n}} > 2N. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, it follows by construction that, if $(r, t) \in \operatorname{supp}(\phi)$ and $k \geq M(\phi, a)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_k(r, t) &= \bar{v}_k^{-1} \varphi_k(r, t) + 1 - \varphi_k(r, t) = \bar{v}_k^{-1}(r, t), \quad u_k(r, t) = \bar{u}_k \varphi_k(r, t) = \bar{u}_k(r, t), \\ e_k(r, t) &= \bar{e}_k \varphi_k(r, t) + 1 - \varphi_k(r, t) = \bar{e}_k(r, t). \end{aligned} \quad (5.51)$$

Moreover, using that $\tilde{r}_a^0(k) > 2N$ for $k \geq M(\phi, a) := 2^n N^n \max\{C_0, C(a)\}$, we see from construction (3.12) in §3.4 that, if $r \in \text{supp}(\phi(\cdot, 0))$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{a,k}^0(r) &= \rho_a^0(r)\varphi_{a,k}^0(r) + 1 - \varphi_{a,k}^0(r) = \rho_a^0(r), \quad u_{a,k}^0(r) = u_a^0(r)\varphi_{a,k}^0(r) = u_a^0(r), \\ e_{a,k}^0(r) &= e_a^0(r)\varphi_{a,k}^0(r) + 1 - \varphi_{a,k}^0(r) = e_a^0(r). \end{aligned} \quad (5.52)$$

With this, if $x \in [0, \infty)$ is such that $\tilde{r}_a^0(x) \in \text{supp}(\phi(\cdot, 0))$, then it follows from Proposition 3.2 that, for all $k \geq M(\phi, a)$,

$$\tilde{r}_a^0(x) = \left(a^n + n \int_0^x \frac{1}{\rho_a^0(\tilde{r}_a^0(y))} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} = \left(a^n + n \int_0^x \tilde{v}_{a,k}^0(y) dy \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} = \tilde{r}_k(x, 0). \quad (5.53)$$

Thus, from the coordinate transformation (5.3) and the continuity equation for which the approximate Lagrangian functions satisfy, we obtain that, for all $k \geq M(\phi, a)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_a^\infty \left\{ \rho_k(r, t)\phi(r, t) - \rho_a^0(r)\phi(r, 0) \right\} r^m dr \\ &= \int_a^{\tilde{r}_k(k, t)} \bar{v}_k^{-1} \phi(r, t) r^m dr - \int_a^{\tilde{r}_a^0(k)} \phi(r, 0) \rho_a^0(r) r^m dr \\ &= \int_0^k \phi(\tilde{r}_k(x, t), t) dx - \int_0^k \phi(\tilde{r}_k(x, 0), 0) dx \\ &= \int_0^t \int_0^k (\tilde{u}_k \partial_r \phi + \partial_t \phi)(\tilde{r}_k(x, s), s) dx ds \\ &= \int_0^t \int_a^{\tilde{r}_k(k, t)} (\bar{v}_k^{-1} \bar{u}_k \partial_r \phi + \tilde{v}_k^{-1} \partial_t \phi)(r, t) r^m dr ds \\ &= \int_0^t \int_a^\infty (\rho_k u_k \partial_r \phi + \rho_k \partial_t \phi)(r, t) r^m dr ds, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used $\tilde{r}_k(k, t) \geq 2N$ and (5.51) in the last equality. Also, by Lemma 5.4–5.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\rho_k(\cdot, t) - \rho(\cdot, t)\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}([a, L], r^m dr)} &= 0 \quad \text{for all } L \in \mathbb{N}, \\ \rho_k - 1 &\xrightarrow{*} \rho - 1 \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0, T; L^2([a, \infty), r^m dr)), \\ u_k(r, t) &\rightarrow u(r, t) \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_k(r, t), \rho(r, t) \leq C(a) \quad \text{for a.e. } (r, t) \in [a, \infty) \times [0, T]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.54)$$

Using these, we can apply the dominated convergence theorem to obtain

$$\int_a^\infty \rho(r, t)\phi(r, t) r^m dr - \int_a^\infty \rho_a^0(r)\phi(r, 0) r^m dr = \int_0^t \int_a^\infty (\rho u \partial_r \phi + \rho \partial_t \phi) r^m dr ds.$$

2. We show the weak form for the *momentum equation*. Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}_0^q$. Then there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\varphi(r, t) = 0$ for $r \geq N$ and $t \in [0, T]$. If $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is such that $k \geq M(\varphi, a)$, then, as previously shown, $\tilde{r}_k(k, t) > 2N$ for all $t \in [0, T]$, and $\tilde{r}_a^0(k) > 2N$. By construction, if $(r, t) \in \text{supp}(\varphi)$ and $r \in \text{supp}(\varphi(\cdot, 0))$, then (5.51)–(5.52) hold so that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_a^\infty (\rho_k u_k)(r, t)\varphi(r, t) r^m dr - \int_a^\infty (\rho_a^0 u_a^0)(r)\varphi(r, 0) r^m dr \\ &= \int_a^{\tilde{r}_k(k, t)} (\bar{v}_k^{-1} \bar{u}_k)(r, t)\varphi(r, t) r^m dr - \int_a^{\tilde{r}_a^0(k)} u_{a,k}^0(r)\varphi(r, 0)\rho_a^0(r) r^m dr \\ &= \int_0^k \tilde{u}_k(x, t)\varphi(\tilde{r}_k(x, t), t) dx - \int_0^k \tilde{u}_{a,k}^0(x)\varphi(\tilde{r}_k(x, 0), 0) dx \\ &= \int_0^t \int_0^k (\varphi(\tilde{r}_k(x, s), s) \text{D}_t \tilde{u}_k + \partial_t \varphi(\tilde{r}_k(x, s), s) \tilde{u}_k + \partial_r \varphi(\tilde{r}_k(x, s), s) \tilde{u}_k^2) dx ds. \end{aligned}$$

By (3.15)₂ and the boundary condition: $\varphi(a, t) = 0$, $\tilde{u}_k(k, t) = 0$ for $t \in [0, T]$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_a^\infty (\rho_k u_k)(r, t) \varphi(r, t) r^m dr - \int_a^\infty (\rho_a^0 u_a^0)(r) \varphi(r, 0) r^m dr \\
&= \int_0^t \int_0^k (\varphi(\tilde{r}_k(x, s), s) \mathbf{D}_t \tilde{u}_k + \partial_t \varphi(\tilde{r}_k(x, s), s) \tilde{u}_k + \partial_r \varphi(\tilde{r}_k(x, s), s) \tilde{u}_k^2) dx ds \\
&= \int_0^t \int_0^k (\tilde{u}_k(x, s) \partial_t \varphi(\tilde{r}_k(x, s), s) + \tilde{u}_k^2(x, s) \partial_r \varphi(\tilde{r}_k(x, s), s)) dx ds \\
&\quad + \int_0^t \int_0^k \tilde{r}_k^m(x, s) \varphi(\tilde{r}_k(x, s), s) \mathbf{D}_x \left(\beta \frac{\mathbf{D}_x(\tilde{r}_k^m \tilde{u}_k)}{\tilde{v}_k} - (\gamma - 1) \frac{\tilde{e}_k}{\tilde{v}_k} \right) dx ds \\
&= \int_0^t \int_0^k (\tilde{u}_k^2(x, s) \partial_r \varphi(\tilde{r}_k(x, s), s) + \tilde{u}_k(x, s) \partial_t \varphi(\tilde{r}_k(x, s), s)) dx ds \\
&\quad + \int_0^t \int_0^k \left((\gamma - 1) \tilde{e}_k - \beta \tilde{r}_k^m \mathbf{D}_x \tilde{u}_k - m \beta \frac{\tilde{v}_k \tilde{u}_k}{\tilde{r}_k} \right) \left(m \frac{\varphi(\tilde{r}_k(x, s), s)}{\tilde{r}_k(x, s)} + \partial_r \varphi(\tilde{r}_k(x, s), s) \right) dx ds \\
&= \int_0^t \int_a^{\tilde{r}_k(k, t)} (\bar{v}_k^{-1} \bar{u}_k^2 \partial_r \varphi + \bar{v}_k^{-1} \bar{u}_k \partial_t \varphi) r^m dr ds \\
&\quad + \int_0^t \int_a^{\tilde{r}_k(k, t)} \left((\gamma - 1) \bar{v}_k^{-1} \bar{e}_k - \beta \partial_r \bar{u}_k - m \beta \frac{\bar{u}_k}{r} \right) \left(\partial_r \varphi + m \frac{\varphi}{r} \right) r^m dr ds \\
&= \int_0^t \int_a^\infty (\rho_k u_k^2 \partial_r \varphi + \rho_k u_k \partial_t \varphi) r^m dr ds \\
&\quad + \int_0^t \int_a^\infty \left((\gamma - 1) \rho_k e_k - \beta \partial_r u_k - m \beta \frac{u_k}{r} \right) \left(\partial_r \varphi + m \frac{\varphi}{r} \right) r^m dr ds.
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, from Lemmas 5.2 and 5.4–5.8, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_r u_k &\rightharpoonup \partial_r u && \text{in } L^2(0, T; L^2([a, \infty), r^m dr)), \\
e_k(r, t) &\rightarrow e(r, t) && \text{for } (r, t) \in [a, \infty) \times [0, T], \\
\sigma^{-\frac{1}{4}}(t) |u(r, t)| + \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t) e(r, t) &\leq C(a) && \text{for } (r, t) \in [a, \infty) \times [0, T], \\
\sigma^{-\frac{1}{4}}(t) |u_k(r, t)| + \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t) e_k(r, t) &\leq C(a) && \text{for } (k, r, t) \in \mathbb{N} \times [a, \infty) \times [0, T].
\end{aligned} \tag{5.55}$$

Using (5.54) and (5.55), we conclude Definition 3.1(ii).

3. We now show the *energy equation*. Let $\phi \in \mathcal{D}^a$. Then, for $k \geq M(\phi, a)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_a^\infty (\rho_k e_k)(r, t) \phi(r, t) r^m dr - \int_a^\infty (\rho_a^0 e_a^0)(r) \phi(r, 0) r^m dr \\
&= \int_0^k \tilde{e}_k(x, t) \phi(\tilde{r}_k(x, t), t) dx - \int_0^k \tilde{e}_{a, k}^0(x) \phi(\tilde{r}_k(x, 0), 0) dx \\
&= \int_0^t \int_0^k \left\{ \phi(\tilde{r}_k(x, s), s) \mathbf{D}_t \tilde{e}_k(x, s) + \tilde{e}_k(x, s) (\partial_t \phi + \tilde{u}_k(x, s) \partial_r \phi)(\tilde{r}_k(x, s), s) \right\} dx ds \\
&= \int_0^t \int_0^k \phi(\tilde{r}_k(x, s), s) \mathbf{D}_t \tilde{e}_k dx ds + \int_0^t \int_a^\infty \rho_k e_k (\partial_t \phi + u_k \partial_r \phi) r^m dr ds \\
&=: I_1 + I_2.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.56}$$

Denote $\tilde{F}_k := \beta \tilde{v}_k^{-1} \mathbf{D}_x(\tilde{r}_k^m \tilde{u}_k) - (\gamma - 1) \tilde{v}_k^{-1} \tilde{e}_k$. It follows from the momentum equation that $\mathbf{D}_t \tilde{u}_k = \tilde{r}_k^m \mathbf{D}_x \tilde{F}_k$. Then substituting this into (3.15)₃ yields

$$\mathbf{D}_t \tilde{e}_k = \mathbf{D}_x(\tilde{r}_k^m \tilde{u}_k \tilde{F}_k) - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{D}_t |\tilde{u}_k|^2 - 2m\mu \mathbf{D}_x(\tilde{r}_k^{m-1} \tilde{u}_k^2) + \kappa \mathbf{D}_x \left(\frac{\tilde{r}_k^{2m}}{\tilde{v}_k} \mathbf{D}_x \tilde{e}_k \right)$$

for I_1 which, along with $D_x \tilde{e}_k(0, t) = D_x \tilde{e}_k(k, t) = 0$ for all $t \in [0, T]$, leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &= \int_0^t \int_0^k \phi(\tilde{r}_k(x, s), s) \left\{ D_x(\tilde{r}_k^m \tilde{u}_k \tilde{F}_k) - \frac{1}{2} D_t |\tilde{u}_k|^2 \right\} dx ds \\
&\quad + \int_0^t \int_0^k \phi(\tilde{r}_k(x, s), s) \left\{ -2m\mu D_x(\tilde{r}_k^{m-1} \tilde{u}_k^2) + \kappa D_x \left(\frac{\tilde{r}_k^{2m}}{\tilde{v}_k} D_x \tilde{e}_k \right) \right\} dx ds \\
&= \int_0^t \int_0^k \left\{ -m\beta \tilde{r}_k^{-1} \tilde{v}_k |\tilde{u}_k|^2 - \beta \tilde{r}_k^m \tilde{u}_k D_x \tilde{u}_k + (\gamma - 1) \tilde{u}_k \tilde{e}_k \right\} \partial_r \phi(\tilde{r}_k(x, s), s) dx ds \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \int_0^k |\tilde{u}_k|^2 \left\{ \partial_t \phi(\tilde{r}_k(x, s), s) + \tilde{u}_k(x, s) \partial_r \phi(\tilde{r}_k(x, s), s) \right\} dx ds \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^k |\tilde{u}_k|^2(x, t) \phi(\tilde{r}_k(x, t), t) dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^k |\tilde{u}_{a,k}^0|^2 \phi(\tilde{r}_k(x, 0), 0) dx \\
&\quad + \int_0^t \int_0^k \left\{ 2m\mu \tilde{r}_k^{-1} \tilde{v}_k |\tilde{u}_k|^2 \partial_r \phi(\tilde{r}_k(x, s), s) - \kappa \tilde{r}_k^m D_x \tilde{e}_k \partial_r \phi(\tilde{r}_k(x, s), s) \right\} dx ds.
\end{aligned}$$

From (5.53), $\tilde{r}_k(x, 0) = \tilde{r}_a^0(x)$ if $\tilde{r}_a^0(x) \in \text{supp}(\phi(\cdot, 0))$ and $k \geq M(\phi, a)$. By the coordinate transformation (5.1)–(5.3), and (5.51)–(5.52), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &= \int_0^t \int_a^{\tilde{r}_k(k,t)} \left\{ m(2\mu - \beta) \frac{|\bar{u}_k|^2}{r} - \beta \bar{u}_k \partial_r \bar{u}_k + (\gamma - 1) \bar{u}_k \bar{v}_k^{-1} \bar{e}_k - \kappa \partial_r \bar{e}_k \right\} \partial_r \phi r^m dr ds \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \int_a^{\tilde{r}_k(k,t)} \bar{v}_k^{-1} |\bar{u}_k|^2 \left\{ \partial_t \phi + \bar{u}_k \partial_r \phi \right\} r^m dr ds \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_a^{\tilde{r}_k(k,t)} (\bar{v}_k^{-1} |\bar{u}_k|^2)(r, t) \phi(r, t) r^m dr + \frac{1}{2} \int_a^{\tilde{r}_a^0(k)} (\rho_a^0 |u_a^0|^2)(r) \phi(r, 0) r^m dr \\
&= \int_0^t \int_a^\infty \left\{ -m\lambda \frac{|u_k|^2}{r} - \beta u_k \partial_r u_k + (\gamma - 1) \rho_k u_k e_k - \kappa \partial_r e_k \right\} \partial_r \phi r^m dr ds \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \int_a^\infty \rho_k |u_k|^2 \left\{ \partial_t \phi + u_k \partial_r \phi \right\} r^m dr ds \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_a^\infty (\rho_k |u_k|^2)(r, t) \phi(r, t) r^m dr + \frac{1}{2} \int_a^\infty (\rho_a^0 |u_a^0|^2)(r) \phi(r, 0) r^m dr.
\end{aligned}$$

Define $E_k(r, t) := (\frac{1}{2}|u_k|^2 + e_k)(r, t)$. Then the above identity becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &= \int_0^t \int_a^\infty \left\{ -m\lambda \frac{|u_k|^2}{r} - \beta u_k \partial_r u_k + (\gamma - 1) \rho_k u_k e_k - \kappa \partial_r e_k \right\} \partial_r \phi r^m dr ds \\
&\quad + \int_0^t \int_a^\infty \left\{ \rho_k E_k (\partial_t \phi + u_k \partial_r \phi) - \rho_k e_k (\partial_t \phi + u_k \partial_r \phi) \right\} r^m dr ds \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_a^\infty (\rho_k |u_k|^2)(r, t) \phi(r, t) r^m dr + \frac{1}{2} \int_a^\infty (\rho_a^0 |u_a^0|^2)(r) \phi(r, 0) r^m dr.
\end{aligned}$$

Denote $P_k := (\gamma - 1) \rho_k e_k$ and $E_a^0 := \frac{1}{2} |u_a^0|^2 + e_a^0$. Substituting I_1 into (5.56), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_a^\infty (\rho_k E_k)(r, t) \phi(r, t) r^m dr - \int_a^\infty (\rho_a^0 E_a^0)(r) \phi(r, 0) r^m dr \\
&= \int_0^t \int_a^\infty \left\{ \left((\rho_k E_k + P_k) u_k - m\lambda \frac{|u_k|^2}{r} - \beta u_k \partial_r u_k - \kappa \partial_r e_k \right) \partial_r \phi + \rho_k E_k \partial_t \phi \right\} r^m dr ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.57}$$

In addition to (5.55), we also uses the weak convergence from Lemma 5.8 that $\partial_r e_k \rightharpoonup \partial_r e$ in $L^2(0, T; L^2([a, \infty), r^m dr))$. Then (5.57) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_a^\infty (\rho E)(r, t) \phi(r, t) r^m dr - \int_a^\infty (\rho_a^0 E_a^0)(r) \phi(r, 0) r^m dr \\ &= \int_0^t \int_a^\infty \left\{ \left((\rho E + P)u - m\lambda \frac{|u|^2}{r} - \beta u \partial_r u - \kappa \partial_r e \right) \partial_r \phi + \rho E \partial_t \phi \right\} r^m dr ds, \end{aligned}$$

where $P := (\gamma - 1)\rho e$ and $E := \frac{1}{2}|u|^2 + e$. □

5.7. Estimates away from the origin, independent of the particle path function. The main aim of this subsection is to obtain the uniform estimates, independent of $a \in (0, 1)$, which do not involve the particle path function $\tilde{r}(x, t)$.

Lemma 5.11. *For each $\eta \in (a, 1)$,*

$$\begin{cases} \int_0^T \sup_{r \geq \eta} \frac{|u|}{\sqrt{e}}(r, t) dt \leq C(T)(\eta^{\frac{2-n}{2}} + \eta^{2-n}) & \text{if } n = 2, 3, \\ \int_0^T \sup_{r \geq \eta} \log(\max\{1, e^{\pm 1}(r, t)\}) dt \leq C(T)\eta^{2-n} & \text{if } n = 3, \\ \int_0^T \sup_{r \geq \eta} \log(\max\{1, e(r, t)\}) dt \leq C(T)(1 + \sqrt{|\log \eta|}) & \text{if } n = 2. \end{cases} \quad (5.58)$$

Proof. We divide the proof into three steps.

1. Fix a point $r \in [\eta, \infty)$ and a small constant $0 < \delta < 1$. Since $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} u_k(r, t) = 0$ and $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} e_k(r, t) = 1$ for each $t \in [0, T]$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{u_k}{r^\delta \sqrt{e_k}}(r, t) &= \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{u_k}{r^\delta \sqrt{e_k}}(r, t) - \int_r^\infty \left\{ \zeta^{-\delta} \frac{\partial_r u_k}{\sqrt{e_k}} - \delta \zeta^{-\delta-1} \frac{u_k}{\sqrt{e_k}} - \frac{1}{2} \zeta^{-\delta} u_k e_k^{-\frac{3}{2}} \partial_r e_k \right\}(\zeta, t) d\zeta \\ &\leq \left(\int_r^\infty \zeta^{-2\delta-m} d\zeta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\{ \delta \left(\int_r^\infty \frac{|u_k|^2}{\zeta^2 e_k} \zeta^m d\zeta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left(\int_r^\infty \frac{|\partial_r u_k|^2}{e_k} \zeta^m d\zeta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left(\int_r^\infty \frac{|u_k|^2}{\zeta^2 e_k} \zeta^{-\delta+1} d\zeta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_r^\infty \frac{|\partial_r e_k|^2}{e_k^2} \zeta^{-\delta+1} d\zeta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{r^{-\delta} \eta^{\frac{1-m}{2}}}{\sqrt{2\delta+m-1}} \left\{ \delta \left(\int_\eta^\infty \frac{|u_k|^2}{\zeta^2 e_k}(\zeta, t) \zeta^m d\zeta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left(\int_\eta^\infty \frac{|\partial_r u_k|^2}{e_k} \zeta^m d\zeta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} r^{-\delta} \eta^{1-m} \left(\int_\eta^\infty \frac{|u_k|^2}{\zeta^2 e_k} \zeta^m d\zeta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_\eta^\infty \frac{|\partial_r e_k|^2}{e_k^2} \zeta^m d\zeta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} =: r^{-\delta} g_k(\eta, t), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that $-2\delta - m + 1 < 0$ and $-\delta + 1 - m < 0$ for $n = 2, 3$ since $0 < \delta < 1$. Multiplying both sides of the above inequality by r^δ and taking the limit inferior over $k \rightarrow \infty$, it follows by Lemma 5.4 that

$$\frac{|u|}{\sqrt{e}}(r, t) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} g_k(\eta, t) \quad \text{for all } (r, t) \in [\eta, \infty) \times [0, T].$$

Taking the supremum in $r \in [\eta, \infty)$ and integrating in $t \in [0, T]$, we obtain

$$\int_0^T \sup_{r \geq \eta} \frac{|u|}{\sqrt{e}}(r, t) dt \leq \int_0^T \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} g_k(\eta, t) dt \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T g_k(\eta, t) dt, \quad (5.59)$$

where we have used Fatou's lemma since $g_k(\eta, t) > 0$. By definition of $g_k(\eta, t)$ and Lemma 5.1, we obtain that, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T g_k(\eta, t) dt &\leq C\eta^{\frac{1-m}{2}} \left\{ \int_0^T \left(\int_\eta^\infty \frac{|u|_k^2}{\zeta^2 e_k} \zeta^m d\zeta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dt + \int_0^T \left(\int_\eta^\infty \frac{|\partial_r u_k|^2}{e_k} \zeta^m d\zeta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dt \right\} \\ &\quad + C\eta^{1-m} \int_0^T \left(\int_\eta^\infty \frac{|u_k|^2}{\zeta^2 e_k} \zeta^m d\zeta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_\eta^\infty \frac{|\partial_r e_k|^2}{e_k^2} \zeta^m d\zeta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dt \\ &\leq C\eta^{\frac{1-m}{2}} T^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\{ \left(\int_0^T \int_\eta^\infty \frac{|u|_k^2}{\zeta^2 e_k} \zeta^m d\zeta dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left(\int_0^T \int_\eta^\infty \frac{|\partial_r u_k|^2}{e_k} \zeta^m d\zeta dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} \\ &\quad + C\eta^{1-m} \left(\int_0^T \int_\eta^\infty \frac{|u_k|^2}{\zeta^2 e_k} \zeta^m d\zeta dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^T \int_\eta^\infty \frac{|\partial_r e_k|^2}{e_k^2} \zeta^m d\zeta dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C(T) (\eta^{\frac{1-m}{2}} + \eta^{1-m}), \end{aligned}$$

which, together with (5.59), leads to (5.58)₁.

2. Consider the case: $n = 3$. Let $(r, t) \in [\eta, \infty) \times [0, T]$. By $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} e_k(r, t) = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \log e_k(r, t) &= - \int_r^\infty \frac{\partial_r e_k}{e_k}(\zeta, t) dr \leq \left(\int_r^\infty \zeta^{-m} d\zeta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_r^\infty \frac{|\partial_r e_k|^2}{e_k^2}(\zeta, t) \zeta^m d\zeta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{\eta^{2-n}}{\sqrt{n-2}} \left(\int_\eta^\infty \frac{|\partial_r e_k|^2}{e_k^2}(\zeta, t) \zeta^m d\zeta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} =: h_k(\eta, t). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $0 \leq \log(\max\{1, e_k\})(r, t) \leq h_k(\eta, t)$ for all $(r, t) \in [\eta, \infty) \times [0, T]$. Replacing the term $e_k(r, t)$ with $e_k^{-1}(r, t)$ in the above derivation, then $0 \leq \log(\max\{1, e_k^{-1}\})(r, t) \leq h_k(\eta, t)$ for all $(r, t) \in [\eta, \infty) \times [0, T]$. Taking the limit inferior over $k \rightarrow \infty$ on both sides of these inequalities, it follows from Lemma 5.4 that

$$\log(\max\{1, e^{\pm 1}\})(r, t) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} h_k(\eta, t) \quad \text{for all } (r, t) \in [\eta, \infty) \times [0, T].$$

Taking the supremum in $r \geq \eta$ on the above inequality and integrating in $t \in [0, T]$, we have

$$\int_0^T \sup_{r \geq \eta} \log(\max\{1, e^{\pm 1}(r, t)\}) dt \leq \int_0^T \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} h_k(\eta, t) dt \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T h_k(\eta, t) dt, \quad (5.60)$$

where we have used Fatou's lemma since $h_k(\eta, t) > 0$. By Lemma 5.1, we obtain that, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\int_0^T h_k(\eta, t) dt \leq C\eta^{2-n} \sqrt{T} \left(\int_0^T \int_\eta^\infty \frac{|\partial_r e_k|^2}{e_k^2} \zeta^m d\zeta dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C(T)\eta^{2-n},$$

which, together with (5.60), proves (5.58)₂.

3. We consider the case: $n = 2$. Set $M := \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \tilde{r}_k(1, t)$ so that, by Lemma 4.1, $M \leq (2C_0)^{\frac{1}{n}}$. If $r \geq M$, then $r > \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \tilde{r}_k(1, t)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. By Lemma 5.2, $e_k(r, t) \leq C(\varepsilon)\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t)$ for all $t \in [0, T]$ and $r \in [\tilde{r}_k(\varepsilon, t), \infty)$. It follows that there exists a constant $C(T) > 1$ such that

$$\log(\max\{1, e_k(r, t)\}) \leq \log(C(T)\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t)) \quad \text{for all } (r, t) \in [M, \infty) \times [0, T]. \quad (5.61)$$

By (5.61), for all $r \in [\eta, M)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \log e_k(r, t) &= \log e_k(2M, t) - \int_r^{2M} \frac{\partial_r e_k}{e_k}(\zeta, t) d\zeta \\ &\leq \log(\max\{1, e_k(2M, t)\}) + \left(\int_r^{2M} \zeta^{-1} d\zeta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_r^{2M} \frac{|\partial_r e_k|^2}{e_k^2}(\zeta, t) \zeta d\zeta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \log(C(T)\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t)) + \sqrt{\log(C(T)/\eta)} \left(\int_\eta^\infty \frac{|\partial_r e_k|^2}{e_k^2}(\zeta, t) \zeta d\zeta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.62)$$

Finally, in a similar way to that for the case $n = 3$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \sup_{r \geq \eta} \log(\max\{1, e(r, t)\}) dt &\leq \frac{C^2(T)}{2} + \int_0^T \sup_{r \in [\eta, M]} \log(\max\{1, e(r, t)\}) dt \\ &\leq C(T) + \sqrt{T \log(C(T)/\eta)} \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \left(\int_0^T \int_{\eta}^{\infty} \frac{|\partial_r e_k|^2}{e_k^2} \zeta^m d\zeta dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C(T) (1 + \sqrt{|\log \eta|}). \end{aligned}$$

□

6. GLOBAL WEAK SOLUTIONS INCLUDING THE ORIGIN

We denote $(\rho_a, u_a, e_a)(r, t)$ in $[a, \infty) \times [0, T]$ as the solution of problem (1.6) and (3.9), which is guaranteed by Theorem 3.1, with the modified initial data $(\rho_a^0, u_a^0, e_a^0)(r)$ constructed in §3.2 for each $a \in (0, 1)$. We also denote $\tilde{r}_a(x, t)$ as the particle path function associated with ρ_a , which satisfies

$$x = \int_a^{\tilde{r}_a(x, t)} \rho_a(y, t) r^m dr \quad \text{for a.e. } (x, t) \in [0, \infty) \times [0, T].$$

The main aim of this section is to take the limit: $a \searrow 0$ of the solution sequence $(\rho_a, u_a, e_a)(r, t)$ of problems (1.6) and (3.9) to obtain a global spherically symmetric weak solution of the original Cauchy problem (1.1)–(1.5).

6.1. Uniform inequalities from the entropy estimates. We obtain a set of inequalities involving measurable subsets of $[a, \infty)$, which are uniform in $a \in (0, 1)$. In this section, we denote

$$G(\zeta) := 1 - \zeta + \zeta \log \zeta, \quad \psi(\zeta) := \zeta - 1 - \log \zeta, \quad H(\zeta) := \zeta \log \zeta, \quad (6.1)$$

which are all convex functions. Let G_+^{-1} , ψ_+^{-1} , and H_+^{-1} be the right branch inverses of G , ψ , and H , respectively. Then, by Proposition B.1, the following functions are well defined for $(y, z) \in (0, \infty)^2$:

$$f_1(y; z) := y G_+^{-1}\left(\frac{z}{y}\right), \quad f_2(y; z) := y \psi_+^{-1}\left(\frac{z}{y}\right) - z, \quad f_3(y; z) := y H_+^{-1}\left(\frac{z}{y}\right). \quad (6.2)$$

Some further properties of $(y, z) \mapsto f_i(y; z)$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ can be found in Proposition B.1.

Lemma 6.1. *For any measurable set $E \subset [a, \infty)$ and each $t \in [0, T]$,*

$$\sup_{a \in (0, 1)} \int_E \rho_a(r, t) r^m dr \leq \omega_1(E; C(T)), \quad (6.3)$$

$$\sup_{a \in (0, 1)} \int_E (\rho_a e_a)(r, t) r^m dr \leq C(T) + \omega_2(E; C(T)), \quad (6.4)$$

where $\omega_1(E; z) := f_1(\int_E r^m dr; z)$ and $\omega_2(E; z) := f_2(\omega_1(E; z); z) = f_2(f_1(\int_E r^m dr; z); z)$ for $z > 0$.

Proof. Denote $\mathcal{L}_n(E) := \int_E r^m dr$ for each $E \subseteq [a, \infty)$. By Jensen's inequality and Theorem 3.1(i), it follows that

$$G\left(\frac{1}{\mathcal{L}_n(E)} \int_E \rho_a(r, t) r^m dr\right) \leq \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}_n(E)} \int_E G(\rho_a(r, t)) r^m dr \leq \frac{C(T)}{\mathcal{L}_n(E)}.$$

Taking the right branch inverse $G_+^{-1}(z)$ on both sides of the above and using the fact that $z \mapsto G_+^{-1}(z)$ is monotone increasing, it follows that, for all $a \in (0, 1)$,

$$\int_E \rho_a(r, t) r^m dr \leq \mathcal{L}_n(E) G_+^{-1}\left(\frac{C(T)}{\mathcal{L}_n(E)}\right) = f_1(\mathcal{L}_n(E); C(T)) =: \omega_1(E; C(T)).$$

Now, fix $t \in [0, T]$ and set $m_{a,t}(E) := \int_E \rho_a(r, t) r^m dr$. By Jensen's inequality and Theorem 3.1(i), it follows that

$$\psi\left(\frac{1}{m_{a,t}(E)} \int_E (\rho_a e_a)(r, t) r^m dr\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_{a,t}(E)} \int_E (\rho_a \psi(e_a))(r, t) r^m dr \leq \frac{C(T)}{m_{a,t}(E)}.$$

Taking $\psi_+^{-1}(\cdot)$ on both sides of the above, it follows that

$$\int_E (\rho_a e_a)(r, t) r^m dr \leq m_{a,t}(E) \psi_+^{-1}\left(\frac{C(T)}{m_{a,t}(E)}\right) = f_2(m_{a,t}(E); C(T)) + C(T).$$

Using (6.3), $m_{a,t}(E) \leq \omega_1(E; C(T))$. Since $y \mapsto f_2(y; z)$ is increasing in y for fixed $z > 0$ from Proposition B.1, it follows that, for all $a \in (0, 1)$,

$$\int_E (\rho_a e_a)(r, t) r^m dr \leq C(T) + f_2(\omega_1(E; C(T)); C(T)) =: C(T) + \omega_2(E; C(T)).$$

□

6.2. Existence of particle paths and vacuum interfaces.

Lemma 6.2. *There exist both a subsequence $\{a_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $a_j \searrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ and a continuous function $\tilde{r}(x, t) : [0, \infty) \times [0, T] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that*

(i) *for each compact subset $K \Subset (0, \infty) \times [0, T]$,*

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(x,t) \in K} |\tilde{r}_{a_j}(x, t) - \tilde{r}(x, t)| = 0.$$

(ii) *for each fixed $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{r}(x_1, t) - \tilde{r}(x_2, t)| &\leq C(\varepsilon) |x_1 - x_2| \quad \text{for all } (x_1, x_2, t) \in [\varepsilon, \infty)^2 \times [0, T], \\ |\tilde{r}(x, t_1) - \tilde{r}(x, t_2)| &\leq C(\varepsilon) |t_1^{\frac{3}{4}} - t_2^{\frac{3}{4}}| \quad \text{for all } (x, t_1, t_2) \in [\varepsilon, \infty) \times [0, T]^2. \end{aligned}$$

(iii) *for all $t \in [0, T]$, the function: $x \mapsto \tilde{r}(x, t)$ is strictly increasing so that $\underline{r}(t) := \lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} \tilde{r}(x, t)$ exists for all $t \in [0, T]$ and*

$$\lim_{t \searrow 0} \underline{r}(t) = 0, \quad t \mapsto \underline{r}(t) \text{ is upper semi-continuous.}$$

In addition, $\mathring{F} := \{(r, t) \in (0, \infty) \times (0, T) : \underline{r}(t) < r\}$ is an open set.

(iv) *$\tilde{r}(x, t)$ satisfies the pointwise bound:*

$$nx \psi_-^{-1}\left(\frac{C_0}{x}\right) \leq r^n(x, t) \leq C_0(1+x) \quad \text{for all } (x, t) \in [0, \infty) \times [0, T].$$

(v) *if $\underline{r}(t) > 0$ for some $t \in (0, T]$, then*

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{a_j}^{\underline{r}(t)} \rho_{a_j}(r, t) r^m dr = 0.$$

In particular, for such $t \in (0, T]$,

$$\liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{a_j}(r, t) = 0 \quad \text{for a.e. } r \in (0, \underline{r}(t)).$$

Proof. We divide the proof into six steps.

1. For each integer $i \in \mathbb{N}$, let $S_i := [i^{-1}, i] \times [0, T]$. From Theorem 3.1(iii)–(iv), it follows that, for all $(x, t) \in S_i$,

$$\tilde{r}_a(x, t) = \tilde{r}_a^0(x) + \int_0^t u_a(\tilde{r}(x, s), s) ds \leq \tilde{r}_a^0(x) + C(i) \int_0^T \sigma^{-\frac{1}{4}}(s) ds \leq C(i)(1+T), \quad (6.5)$$

with $C(i) > 0$ a constant independent of $a \in (0, 1)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{r}_a(x_1, t) - \tilde{r}_a(x_2, t)| &\leq C(i) |x_1 - x_2| \quad \text{for all } (x_1, x_2, t) \in [i^{-1}, i]^2 \times [0, T], \\ |\tilde{r}_a(x, t_1) - \tilde{r}_a(x, t_2)| &\leq C(i) |t_1^{\frac{3}{4}} - t_2^{\frac{3}{4}}| \quad \text{for all } (x, t_1, t_2) \in [i^{-1}, i] \times [0, T]^2. \end{aligned} \quad (6.6)$$

In addition, $S_i \subset S_{i+1}$, $\text{Int}(S_i) \neq \emptyset$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and $(0, \infty) \times [0, T] = \cup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} S_i$. Thus, by Proposition A.1, it follows that there exists a continuous function $\tilde{r}(x, t) : (0, \infty) \times [0, T] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that, for all compact subset $K \Subset (0, \infty) \times [0, T]$,

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(x,t) \in K} |\tilde{r}_{a_j}(x, t) - \tilde{r}(x, t)| = 0, \quad (6.7)$$

which, along with (6.6) and Theorem 3.1(iv), implies Lemma 6.2(ii).

2. Let $0 < x_1 < x_2 < \infty$. It follows from Theorem 3.1(iii)–(iv) that, for *a.e.* $t \in [0, T]$,

$$x_2 - x_1 = \int_{\tilde{r}_a(x_1, t)}^{\tilde{r}_a(x_2, t)} \rho_a(r, t) r^m dr \leq C(x_1) \int_{\tilde{r}_a(x_1, t)}^{\tilde{r}_a(x_2, t)} r^m dr = \frac{C(x_1)}{n} (\tilde{r}_a^n(x_2, t) - \tilde{r}_a^n(x_1, t)),$$

where we have used that $\rho_a(r, t) \leq C(x_1)$ for *a.e.* (r, t) such that $r \geq \tilde{r}_a(x_1, t)$. Taking $j \rightarrow \infty$ and using (6.7) yield

$$0 < x_2 - x_1 \leq \frac{C(x_1)}{n} (\tilde{r}^n(x_2, t) - \tilde{r}^n(x_1, t)).$$

This shows that $x \mapsto \tilde{r}(x, t)$ is strictly increasing for *a.e.* $t \in [0, T]$. Since $(x, t) \mapsto \tilde{r}(x, t)$ is continuous, then $x \mapsto \tilde{r}(x, t)$ is strictly increasing for all $t \in [0, T]$. Since $\tilde{r}(x, t) \geq 0$,

$$\underline{r}(t) := \lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} \tilde{r}(x, t) \quad \text{exists for all } t \in [0, T]. \quad (6.8)$$

From Theorem 3.1(iii), it follows that $\tilde{r}_a(x, 0) = \tilde{r}_a^0(x)$ for each $a \in (0, 1)$ and $x \in [0, \infty)$, where $\tilde{r}_a^0(x)$ is the function constructed in §3.4, satisfying

$$x = \int_a^{\tilde{r}_a^0(x)} \rho_a^0(r) r^m dr \quad \text{for all } x \in [0, \infty].$$

Then, by the uniform convergence (6.7) and Proposition 3.1 in §3.2, we have

$$x = \int_0^{\tilde{r}(x, 0)} \rho_0(r) r^m dr \geq \frac{\tilde{r}^n(x, 0)}{C_0 n} \quad \text{for all } x > 0.$$

This implies the inequality: $\tilde{r}(x, 0) \leq (nC_0 x)^{\frac{1}{n}}$. Given $\delta > 0$, let $x_\delta > 0$ be such that $\tilde{r}(x_\delta, 0) \leq (nC_0 x_\delta)^{\frac{1}{n}} \leq \frac{\delta}{2}$. Since $t \mapsto \tilde{r}(x_\delta, t)$ is continuous in $[0, T]$, there exists $t_\delta > 0$ such that, if $t \in (0, t_\delta)$, then $\tilde{r}(x_\delta, t) < \tilde{r}(x_\delta, 0) + \frac{\delta}{2} \leq \delta$. By (6.8), $\underline{r}(t) = \inf\{\tilde{r}(x, t) : x > 0\}$ for each $t \in [0, T]$. It follows that $\underline{r}(t) \leq \tilde{r}(x_\delta, t) < \delta$ if $t \in (0, t_\delta)$. This shows that $\lim_{t \searrow 0} \underline{r}(t) = 0$.

3. We now show that $t \mapsto \underline{r}(t)$ is upper semi-continuous. To start with, a function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is upper semi-continuous if and only if the set $\{x \in \mathbb{R} : f(x) < y\}$ is open for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$. Define the sets:

$$\begin{aligned} U_\zeta &:= \{s \in (0, T) : \underline{r}(s) < \zeta\} && \text{for each } \zeta \in (0, \infty), \\ U_\zeta^x &:= \{s \in (0, T) : \tilde{r}(x, s) < \zeta\} && \text{for each } (x, \zeta) \in (0, \infty)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that $t \in U_\zeta$. Since $\underline{r}(t) = \inf_{x>0} \tilde{r}(x, t)$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\zeta > \tilde{r}(\delta, t) \geq \underline{r}(t)$. Thus, $t \in U_\zeta^\delta \subseteq \cup_{x>0} U_\zeta^x$, which implies that $U_\zeta \subseteq \cup_{x>0} U_\zeta^x$. On the other hand, if $t \in U_\zeta^\delta$ for some $\delta > 0$, then $\zeta > \tilde{r}(\delta, t) \geq \underline{r}(t)$ so that $t \in U_\zeta$, which implies that $U_\zeta = \cup_{x>0} U_\zeta^x$. Since $t \mapsto \tilde{r}(x, t)$ is continuous, U_ζ^x is an open set for each $x > 0$. Therefore, U_ζ is also an open set as it is the union of open sets. Since this is true for arbitrary $\zeta > 0$, and $\{s \in [0, T] : \underline{r}(s) < \zeta\} = \emptyset$ for $\zeta \leq 0$, $t \mapsto \underline{r}(t)$ is upper semi-continuous.

4. For each $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, define $\mathring{F}_\varepsilon := \{(r, t) \in (0, \infty) \times (0, T) : \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t) < r\}$. Then \mathring{F}_ε is an open set, since $t \mapsto \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)$ is continuous in $t \in [0, T]$. Since $\underline{r}(t) = \inf_{x>0} \tilde{r}(x, t)$ for all $t \in [0, T]$, it follows that $\mathring{F}_\varepsilon \subset \mathring{F}$ for each $\varepsilon > 0$. Furthermore, if $(r, t) \in \mathring{F}$, then there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\underline{r}(t) \leq \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t) < r$, which implies $(r, t) \in \mathring{F}_\varepsilon$ so that $\mathring{F} = \cup_{\varepsilon>0} \mathring{F}_\varepsilon$. Thus, \mathring{F} is open as it is a union of open sets. This concludes the proof for Lemma 6.2(iii).

5. We show the upper and lower bounds of $\tilde{r}(x, t)$. From Theorem 3.1(iii), we have

$$nx\psi_-^{-1}\left(\frac{C_0}{x}\right) \leq \tilde{r}_a^n(x, t) \leq C_0(1+x) \quad \text{for all } (a, x, t) \in (0, 1) \times [0, \infty) \times [0, T],$$

which, along with the uniform convergence in (6.7), implies Lemma 6.2(iv).

6. We now prove Lemma 6.2(v). If $\underline{r}(t) > 0$ for some $t \in (0, T]$, then, for each $a \in (0, \underline{r}(t))$, Theorem 3.1(iii) and (6.3) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_a^{\underline{r}(t)} \rho_a(r, t) r^m dr \right| &\leq \left| \int_a^{\tilde{r}_a(x, t)} \rho_a(r, t) r^m dr \right| + \left| \int_{\tilde{r}_a(x, t)}^{\tilde{r}(x, t)} \rho_a(r, t) r^m dr \right| + \left| \int_{\tilde{r}(x, t)}^{\tilde{r}(t)} \rho_a(r, t) r^m dr \right| \\ &\leq x + \omega_1([\tilde{r}(x, t), \tilde{r}_a(x, t)]; C(T)) + \omega_1([\underline{r}(t), \tilde{r}(x, t)]; C(T)), \end{aligned}$$

where $\omega_1(E; C) := f_1(\int_E r^m dr; C)$ with $f_1(y; C) := yG_+^{-1}(\frac{C}{y})$. By Proposition B.1, for each fixed $C > 0$, $y \mapsto f_1(y; C)$ is a positive, monotone increasing, continuous function with $\lim_{y \searrow 0} f_1(y; C) = 0$. Hence, given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta' > 0$ such that

$$f_1\left(\frac{|\tilde{r}^n(x, t) - \underline{r}^n(t)|}{n}; C\right) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \quad \text{for } x \in (0, \delta').$$

Let $\delta := \min\{\delta', \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\}$. We have

$$\int_a^{\underline{r}(t)} \rho_a(r, t) r^m dr \leq \varepsilon + f_1\left(\frac{\tilde{r}_a^n(x, t) - \tilde{r}^n(x, t)}{n}; C(T)\right) \quad \text{if } x \in (0, \delta).$$

Now, fix $x \in (0, \delta)$. It follows from (6.7) and $\lim_{y \searrow 0} f_1(y; C) = 0$ that

$$\limsup_{a_j \searrow 0} \int_{a_j}^{\underline{r}(t)} \rho_{a_j}(r, t) r^m dr = \varepsilon + \lim_{a_j \searrow 0} f_1\left(\frac{(\tilde{r}_{a_j}(x, t))^n - (\tilde{r}(x, t))^n}{n}; C(T)\right) = \varepsilon.$$

Since this is true for arbitrarily small $\varepsilon > 0$, taking $\varepsilon \searrow 0$ yields

$$\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{a_j}^{\underline{r}(t)} \rho_{a_j}(r, t) r^m dr = 0. \quad (6.9)$$

Since $\rho_a(r, t) \geq C^{-1}(a)$ for *a.e.* $(r, t) \in [a, \infty) \times [0, T]$ from Theorem 3.1(ii),

$$\int_a^{\underline{r}(t)} \rho_a(r, t) r^m dr \geq \frac{1}{C(a)} \int_a^{\underline{r}(t)} r^m dr > 0 \quad \text{for all } a \in (0, \underline{r}(t)),$$

which, together with (6.9), implies the first statement of Lemma 6.2(v). Since $\rho_a(r, t) > 0$ for each $a \in (0, 1)$, by Fatou's lemma,

$$\int_0^\infty \liminf_{a_j \searrow 0} \rho_{a_j}(r, t) \mathbb{1}_{(a_j, \underline{r}(t))}(r) r^m dr \leq \liminf_{a_j \searrow 0} \int_{a_j}^{\underline{r}(t)} \rho_{a_j}(r, t) r^m dr = 0.$$

Thus, $\liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{a_j}(r, t) \mathbb{1}_{(a_j, \underline{r}(t))}(r) = 0$ for *a.e.* $r \in (0, \underline{r}(t))$. Now fix such $r \in (0, \underline{r}(t))$. It follows that $\rho_{a_j}(r, t) = \rho_{a_j}(r, t) \mathbb{1}_{(a_j, \underline{r}(t))}(r)$ for all $a_j \in (0, r)$. Taking the limit inferior as $j \rightarrow \infty$ on both sides, we obtain the second statement of Lemma 6.2(v). \square

In what follows, we denote the fluid region F as the set:

$$F := \{(r, t) \in (0, \infty) \times [0, T] : r > \underline{r}(t)\}.$$

6.3. Compactness results in the exterior domain. In this subsection, we show the convergence of the approximate solutions in the exterior domain and obtain several properties of the limit solutions.

Lemma 6.3. *There exist both a subsequence $a_j \searrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ and Hölder continuous functions $(u, e) : F \setminus \{t = 0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty)$ such that, for any compact subset $K \Subset F \setminus \{t = 0\}$,*

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(r, t) \in K} |(u_{a_j} - u, e_{a_j} - e)(r, t)| = 0.$$

Moreover, for each $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $C(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that

(i) *If $t \in [0, T]$ and $r \in [\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t), \infty)$,*

$$\sigma^{\frac{1}{4}}(t)|u(r, t)| + \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(t)e(r, t) \leq C(\varepsilon); \quad (6.10)$$

(ii) If $t \in (0, T]$ and $r_1, r_2 \geq \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)$,

$$\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(t)|u(r_1, t) - u(r_2, t)| + \sigma(t)|e(r_1, t) - e(r_2, t)| \leq C(\varepsilon)|r_1 - r_2|^{\frac{1}{2}}; \quad (6.11)$$

(iii) If $0 < t_1 < t_2 \leq T$ and $r \geq \sup_{t_1 \leq t \leq t_2} \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)$,

$$\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(t_1)|u(r, t_1) - u(r, t_2)| + \sigma(t_1)|e(r, t_1) - e(r, t_2)| \leq C(\varepsilon)|t_2 - t_1|^{\frac{1}{4}}. \quad (6.12)$$

(iv) $(u, e)(r, t)$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int_{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)}^{\infty} (|(u, e - 1)|^2 + |(\sqrt{\sigma} \partial_r u, \sigma \partial_r e)|^2)(r, t) r^m dr \\ & + \int_0^T \int_{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)}^{\infty} (|\partial_r u, \partial_r e, u \partial_r u|^2 + |(\sqrt{\sigma} \partial_t u, \sigma \partial_t e)|^2) r^m dr dt \leq C(\varepsilon). \end{aligned} \quad (6.13)$$

Proof. We present the proof only for $u(r, t)$, since the case for $e(r, t)$ follows in the same way.

First, fix $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and define the domain:

$$F_\varepsilon := \{(r, t) \in (0, \infty) \times [0, T] : t \in [\varepsilon, T], \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t) \leq r \leq \varepsilon^{-1}\}.$$

By Lemma 6.2(iv), there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that $\text{Int}(F_\varepsilon) \neq \emptyset$ for each $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$. Since $x \mapsto \tilde{r}(x, t)$ is strictly increasing, then $F_{\varepsilon_1} \subset F_{\varepsilon_2}$ if $\varepsilon_1 > \varepsilon_2$.

We claim:

$$F \setminus \{t = 0\} = \bigcup_{0 < \varepsilon < 1} F_\varepsilon. \quad (6.14)$$

This can be seen as follows: If $(r, t) \in F_\varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, then $r > \underline{r}(t)$ since $\tilde{r}(x, t) \searrow \underline{r}(t)$ as $x \searrow 0$ for each $t \in [0, T]$, which implies that $(r, t) \in F$. On the other hand, if $(r, t) \in F \setminus \{t = 0\}$, then $\underline{r}(t) < r$ and there exists $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ such that $t > \varepsilon_1$. Since $\lim_{x \searrow 0} \tilde{r}(x, t) = \underline{r}(t)$ for all $t \in [0, T]$, there exists $\varepsilon_2 \in (0, 1)$ such that $\underline{r}(t) \leq \tilde{r}(\varepsilon_2, t) \leq r$. Thus, $(r, t) \in F_\varepsilon$ for $\varepsilon := \min\{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2\}$. Then (6.14) follows.

Next, since $x \mapsto \tilde{r}(x, t)$ is strictly increasing for each $t \in [0, T]$, and $(x, t) \mapsto \tilde{r}(x, t)$ is continuous, then $D_\varepsilon := \inf_{t \in [0, T]} \{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t) - \tilde{r}(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, t)\} > 0$ by the compactness of $[0, T]$. By Lemma 6.2, there exists $N_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\tilde{r}_{a_j}(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, t) - \tilde{r}(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, t)| \leq \frac{D_\varepsilon}{2}$ for all $j \geq N_\varepsilon$. Hence, $\tilde{r}_{a_j}(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, t) < \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)$ for all $j \geq N_\varepsilon$ and $t \in [0, T]$, which implies that, if $(r, t) \in F_\varepsilon$, then $\tilde{r}_{a_j}(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, t) < r$ for all $j \geq N_\varepsilon$. Combining this with Theorem 3.1(iv), we have

$$\begin{cases} \sup_{j \geq N_\varepsilon} |u_{a_j}(r_1, t) - u_{a_j}(r_2, t)| \leq C(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}) \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t) |r_1 - r_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} & \text{for all } (r_1, t), (r_2, t) \in F_\varepsilon, \\ \sup_{j \geq N_\varepsilon} |u_{a_j}(r, t_1) - u_{a_j}(r, t_2)| \leq C(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}) \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t_1) |t_2 - t_1|^{\frac{1}{4}} & \text{for all } (r, t_1), (r, t_2) \in F_\varepsilon. \end{cases} \quad (6.15)$$

In addition, it also follows from Theorem 3.1(iv) that

$$\sup_{j \geq N_\varepsilon} |u_{a_j}(r, t)| \leq C(\varepsilon) \sigma^{-\frac{1}{4}}(t) \leq \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{4}} C(\varepsilon) \quad \text{for all } (r, t) \in F_\varepsilon. \quad (6.16)$$

In light of (6.14)–(6.16), we can apply Proposition A.1 to obtain a further subsequence (still denoted) a_j and a continuous function $u(r, t) : F \setminus \{t = 0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(r, t) \in K} |u_{a_j}(r, t) - u(r, t)| = 0 \quad \text{for all compact subset } K \Subset F \setminus \{t = 0\}, \quad (6.17)$$

which together with Theorem 3.1(iv) implies (6.10)–(6.12).

Similarly, we can establish similar estimates for $e(r, t)$ in the same way.

The proof for (6.13) follows the same as that of Lemma 5.8. \square

Lemma 6.4. For each $\varepsilon > 0$, define

$$\rho_a^{(\varepsilon)}(r, t) := \rho_a(r, t) \chi_\varepsilon^\alpha(r, t), \quad \rho^{(\varepsilon)}(r, t) := \rho(r, t) \chi_\varepsilon(r, t),$$

where χ_ε^a and χ_ε are the indicator functions defined as

$$\chi_\varepsilon(r, t) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } r \in [\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t), \infty), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \chi_\varepsilon^a(r, t) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } r \in [\tilde{r}_a(\varepsilon, t), \infty), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (6.18)$$

Then there exists $C(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that the following statements hold:

(i) There exist both a nonnegative function $\rho(r, t) \in L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{F}, r^m dr dt)$ and a subsequence $a_j \searrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ such that, for each $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{cases} \rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon)} - 1 \xrightarrow{*} \rho^{(\varepsilon)} - 1 & \text{in } L^\infty(0, T; L^2([0, \infty), r^m dr)) \text{ as } j \rightarrow \infty, \\ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)}^\infty |\rho^{(\varepsilon)} - 1|^2(r, t) r^m dr \leq C(\varepsilon). \end{cases}$$

(ii) For all $L \in \mathbb{N}$ with $X_L := \tilde{H}^{-1}([0, L], r^m dr)$,

$$\begin{cases} \rho^{(\varepsilon)} \in C^0([0, T]; X_L), & \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon)}(\cdot, t) - \rho^{(\varepsilon)}(\cdot, t)\|_{X_L} = 0, \\ \|\rho^{(\varepsilon)}(\cdot, t_1) - \rho^{(\varepsilon)}(\cdot, t_2)\|_{X_L} \leq C(\varepsilon)|t_1 - t_2| & \text{for all } t_1, t_2 \in [0, T]. \end{cases}$$

(iii) For all $x > 0$, $x = \int_{\underline{r}(t)}^{\tilde{r}(x, t)} \rho(r, t) r^m dr$ for $t \in [0, T]$ almost everywhere, where $\tilde{r}(x, t)$ and $\underline{r}(t)$ are the functions obtained in Lemma 6.2.

(iv) $C^{-1}(\varepsilon) \leq \rho(r, t) \leq C(\varepsilon)$ for almost every $t \in [0, T]$ and $r \in [\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t), \infty)$.

Proof. We divide the proof into four steps, showing Lemma 6.4(i)–(iv) in chronological order.

1. Proof of Lemma 6.4(i). From Theorem 3.1(iv), we obtain that, for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^\infty |\rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon)} - 1|^2 r^m dr \leq \frac{\tilde{r}_{a_j}^n(\varepsilon, t)}{n} + \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{\tilde{r}_{a_j}(\varepsilon, t)}^\infty |\rho_{a_j} - 1|^2 r^m dr \leq C(\varepsilon).$$

Then there exists $\tilde{w}_\varepsilon - 1 \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2([0, \infty), r^m dr))$ such that

$$\rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon)} - 1 \xrightarrow{*} \tilde{w}_\varepsilon - 1 \quad \text{weakly star in } L^\infty(0, T; L^2([0, \infty), r^m dr)) \text{ as } j \rightarrow \infty. \quad (6.19)$$

For each $l \in \mathbb{N}$, denote $\varepsilon_l := l^{-1}$ and $\tilde{w}^{(l)} := \tilde{w}_{\varepsilon_l}$. Fix $l, q \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $l < q$. Then $\tilde{r}_a(\varepsilon_q, t) < \tilde{r}_a(\varepsilon_l, t)$ for each $(a, t) \in (0, 1) \times [0, T]$. Thus, by construction, it follows that, for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $\chi_{\varepsilon_l}^{a_j}(r, t) = 1 = \chi_{\varepsilon_q}^{a_j}(r, t)$ if $r \in [\tilde{r}_{a_j}(\varepsilon_l, t), \infty)$ so that

$$\rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon_q)}(r, t) = \rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon_l)}(r, t) \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in [0, T], \quad r \in [\tilde{r}_{a_j}(\varepsilon_l, t), \infty) \text{ for each } j \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (6.20)$$

Let $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{F}^{(l)})$ for $\mathbb{F}^{(l)} := \{(r, t) : t \in [0, T], r \in [\tilde{r}(\varepsilon_l, t), \infty)\}$. Then it follows that $\phi \chi_{\varepsilon_l} \in L^1(0, T; L^2([0, \infty), r^m dr))$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \int_{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon_l, t)}^\infty \{\tilde{w}^{(q)} - \tilde{w}^{(l)}\} \phi r^m dr dt \\ &= \int_0^T \int_0^\infty \{\tilde{w}^{(q)} - \rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon_q)}\} \chi_{\varepsilon_l} \phi r^m dr dt + \int_0^T \int_{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon_l, t)}^{\tilde{r}_{a_j}(\varepsilon_l, t)} \{\rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon_q)} - \rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon_l)}\} \phi r^m dr dt \\ &+ \int_0^T \int_{\tilde{r}_{a_j}(\varepsilon_l, t)}^\infty \{\rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon_q)} - \rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon_l)}\} \phi r^m dr dt + \int_0^T \int_0^\infty \{\rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon_l)} - \tilde{w}^{(l)}\} \chi_{\varepsilon_l} \phi r^m dr dt \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^4 I_i^{(j)}. \end{aligned}$$

The limits of $I_1^{(j)}$ and $I_4^{(j)}$ are evaluated by the weak-star convergence (6.19). As $j \rightarrow \infty$,

$$I_1^{(j)} + I_4^{(j)} := \int_0^T \int_0^\infty \{\tilde{w}^{(q)} - \rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon_q)}\} \chi_{\varepsilon_l} \phi r^m dr dt + \int_0^T \int_0^\infty \{\rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon_l)} - \tilde{w}^{(l)}\} \chi_{\varepsilon_l} \phi r^m dr dt \rightarrow 0.$$

Using (6.20), we also see that

$$I_3^{(j)} := \int_0^T \int_{\tilde{r}_{a_j}(\varepsilon_l, t)}^\infty \{\rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon_q)} - \rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon_l)}\} \phi r^m dr dt = 0.$$

For $I_2^{(j)}$, observe that

$$|\chi_{\varepsilon_l}^{a_j} - \chi_{\varepsilon_l}|(r, t) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } r \in [\tilde{r}_{a_j}(\varepsilon_l, t), \tilde{r}(\varepsilon_l, t)] \text{ or } r \in [\tilde{r}(\varepsilon_l, t), \tilde{r}_{a_j}(\varepsilon_l, t)], \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By the uniform convergence from Lemma 6.2, it follows that $|\chi_{\varepsilon_l}^{a_j} - \chi_{\varepsilon_l}|(r, t) \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ for *a.e.* $(r, t) \in [0, \infty) \times [0, T]$. Using the estimates from Theorem 3.1(iv) and the dominated convergence theorem yield that, as $j \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} |I_2^{(j)}| &\leq \int_0^T \int_0^\infty |\chi_{\varepsilon_l}^{a_j} - \chi_{\varepsilon_l}| |\rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon_q)} - \rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon_l)}| |\phi| r^m dr dt \\ &\leq \int_0^T \left(\int_0^\infty |\chi_{\varepsilon_l}^{a_j} - \chi_{\varepsilon_l}|^2 |\phi|^2 r^m dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\|\rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon_q)}(\cdot, t) - 1\|_{L^2} + \|\rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon_l)}(\cdot, t) - 1\|_{L^2}) dt \\ &\leq (C(\varepsilon_l) + C(\varepsilon_q)) \int_0^T \left(\int_0^\infty |\chi_{\varepsilon_l}^{a_j} - \chi_{\varepsilon_l}|^2 |\phi|^2 r^m dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dt \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the convergence for $I_i^{(j)}$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, it follows that

$$\int_0^T \int_{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon_l, t)}^\infty \{\tilde{w}^{(q)} - \tilde{w}^{(l)}\} \phi r^m dr dt = 0 \quad \text{for all } \phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{F}^{(l)}).$$

It follows that, if $l \leq q \in \mathbb{N}$, then

$$\tilde{w}^{(q)}(r, t) = \tilde{w}^{(l)}(r, t) \quad \text{for almost every } t \in [0, T] \text{ and } r \in [\tilde{r}(\varepsilon_l, t), \infty). \quad (6.21)$$

In light of above, $\tilde{w}^{(q)}(r, t)$ is truncated in domain \mathbb{F} for each $q \in \mathbb{N}$ as

$$w^{(q)}(r, t) := \begin{cases} \tilde{w}^{(q)}(r, t) & \text{if } t \in [0, T] \text{ and } r \in [\tilde{r}(\varepsilon_q, t), \infty), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Using this, for each $N \in \mathbb{N}$, define

$$h_N(r, t) := w^{(1)}(r, t) + \sum_{i=1}^N \{w^{(i+1)}(r, t) - w^{(i)}(r, t)\} \quad \text{for } (r, t) \in \mathbb{F}.$$

Fix $(r, t) \in \mathbb{F}$. Lemma 6.2(iii)–(iv) imply that $\lim_{x \searrow 0} \tilde{r}(x, t) = \underline{r}(t)$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{r}(x, t) = \infty$. Since $\underline{r}(t) < r$, there exists $q \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\tilde{r}(\varepsilon_q, t) \leq r < \tilde{r}(\varepsilon_{q-1}, t)$. Then (6.21) implies

$$h_N(r, t) = w^{(1)}(r, t) + \sum_{i=1}^N \{w^{(i+1)}(r, t) - w^{(i)}(r, t)\} = w^{(q)}(r, t) = \tilde{w}^{(q)}(r, t) \quad \text{if } N \geq q + 1.$$

Thus, for *a.e.* $(r, t) \in \mathbb{F}$, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} h_N(r, t) = \tilde{w}^{(q)}(r, t)$ exists for some $q \in \mathbb{N}$, and the following function is well-defined almost everywhere in $(0, \infty) \times [0, T]$:

$$\rho(r, t) := \begin{cases} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} h_N(r, t) & \text{for a.e. } (r, t) \in \mathbb{F}, \\ 0 & \text{for } (r, t) \in (0, \infty) \times [0, T] \setminus \mathbb{F}. \end{cases}$$

Now let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there exists some integer $q \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\varepsilon_q \leq \varepsilon$ and

$$\rho^{(\varepsilon)}(r, t) = \chi_\varepsilon(r, t) \rho(r, t) = \chi_\varepsilon(r, t) \tilde{w}^{(q)}(r, t) \quad \text{for a.e. } (r, t) \in (0, \infty) \times [0, T],$$

from the above construction.

Let $\phi \in L^1(0, T; L^2([0, \infty); r^m dr))$. Using $\tilde{r}_{a_j}(\varepsilon_q, t) < \tilde{r}_{a_j}(\varepsilon, t)$ for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, one has

$$\chi_\varepsilon^{(a_j)} = \chi_{\varepsilon_q}^{(a_j)} \chi_\varepsilon^{(a_j)} \quad \text{for all } (r, t) \in [0, \infty) \times [0, T] \text{ and } j \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (6.22)$$

Using this, it then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \int_0^\infty \{\rho^{(\varepsilon)} - \rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon)}\} \phi r^m dr dt &= \int_0^T \int_0^\infty \chi_\varepsilon \phi \{\tilde{w}^{(q)} - \rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon_q)}\} r^m dr dt + \int_0^T \int_0^\infty \{\chi_\varepsilon - \chi_\varepsilon^{a_j}\} \rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon_q)} \phi r^m dr dt \\ &=: J_1^{(j)} + J_2^{(j)}. \end{aligned}$$

By the weak-star convergence for each $q \in \mathbb{N}$ in (6.19), $J_1^{(j)} \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. For $J_2^{(j)}$, one uses the pointwise bound of ρ_a from Theorem 3.1(iv) to obtain

$$|(\chi_\varepsilon - \chi_\varepsilon^{a_j}) \rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon_q)} \phi| \leq C(\varepsilon_q) |\phi| \in L^1(0, T; L^2([0, \infty), r^m dr)).$$

Moreover, due to the uniform convergence from Lemma 6.2, $(\chi_\varepsilon - \chi_\varepsilon^{(a_j)})(r, t) \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ for *a.e.* $(r, t) \in [0, \infty) \times [0, T]$. Hence, by the dominated convergence theorem,

$$J_2^{(j)} := \int_0^T \int_0^\infty (\chi_\varepsilon - \chi_\varepsilon^{a_j}) \rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon_q)} \phi r^m dr dt \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty.$$

Combining the limits of $J_1^{(j)}$ and $J_2^{(j)}$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$, it follows that there exists $\rho \in L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{F})$ such that, for each $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon)} \xrightarrow{*} \rho^{(\varepsilon)} \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0, T; L^2([0, \infty), r^m dr)) \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty. \quad (6.23)$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 6.4(i).

2. Proof of Lemma 6.4(ii). Define $r_\varepsilon := \frac{1}{2} \inf_{t \in [0, T]} \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)$. By Lemma 6.2, there exists $N_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $r_\varepsilon < \tilde{r}_{a_j}(\varepsilon, t)$ for all $j \geq N_\varepsilon$ and $t \in [0, T]$. By Theorem 3.1(v), we see that, for each $\varepsilon > 0$ and $t_1, t_2 \in [0, T]$,

$$\sup_{j \geq N_\varepsilon} \|\rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon)}(\cdot, t_1) - \rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon)}(\cdot, t_2)\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}([r_\varepsilon, L], r^m dr)} \leq C(\varepsilon) |t_1 - t_2| \quad \text{for all } L \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Moreover, it follows that, for all $j \geq N_\varepsilon$ and $L \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon)} \in C^0([0, T]; \tilde{H}^{-1}([r_\varepsilon, L], r^m dr)), \quad \sup_{j \geq N_\varepsilon} \|\rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon)} - 1\|_{L^\infty(0, T; L^2([r_\varepsilon, \infty), r^m dr))} \leq C(\varepsilon).$$

Therefore, by Proposition A.2, there exists \tilde{h}_ε such that, for all $L \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{h}_\varepsilon - 1 \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2([r_\varepsilon, \infty), r^m dr)), & \tilde{h}_\varepsilon \in C^0([0, T]; \tilde{H}^{-1}([r_\varepsilon, L], r^m dr)), \\ \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon)}(\cdot, t) - \tilde{h}_\varepsilon(\cdot, t)\|_{H^{-1}([r_\varepsilon, L], r^m dr)} = 0, \\ \|\tilde{h}_\varepsilon(\cdot, t_1) - \tilde{h}_\varepsilon(\cdot, t_2)\|_{H^{-1}([r_\varepsilon, L], r^m dr)} \leq C(\varepsilon) |t_1 - t_2| \quad \text{for each } t_1, t_2 \in [0, T]. \end{cases} \quad (6.24)$$

We claim that $\rho^{(\varepsilon)} = \tilde{h}_\varepsilon$ for *a.e.* $(r, t) \in [r_\varepsilon, \infty) \times [0, T]$. Let $\phi \in C_c^\infty([r_\varepsilon, \infty) \times [0, T])$. Then there exists $L \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\text{supp}(\phi) \subseteq [r_\varepsilon, L] \times [0, T]$. Using (6.23)–(6.24), we obtain that, as $j \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \int_{r_\varepsilon}^\infty (\rho^{(\varepsilon)} - \tilde{h}_\varepsilon) \phi r^m dr dt &= \int_0^T \int_{r_\varepsilon}^\infty (\rho^{(\varepsilon)} - \rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon)}) \phi r^m dr dt + \int_0^T \int_{r_\varepsilon}^L (\rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon)} - \tilde{h}_\varepsilon) \phi r^m dr dt \\ &\leq \int_0^T \int_{r_\varepsilon}^\infty \{\rho^{(\varepsilon)} - \rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon)}\} \phi r^m dr dt + \int_0^T \|\rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon)}(\cdot, t) - \tilde{h}_\varepsilon(\cdot, t)\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}} \|\phi\|_{H^1} dt \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\rho^{(\varepsilon)} = \tilde{h}_\varepsilon$ for *a.e.* $(r, t) \in [r_\varepsilon, \infty) \times [0, T]$. Lemma 6.4(ii) then follows since $\text{supp}(\rho^{(\varepsilon)}(\cdot, t)) = [\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t), \infty)$, and $r_\varepsilon < \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)$ for all $t \in [0, T]$.

3. Proof of Lemma 6.4(iii). Let $\xi \in C_c^\infty(0, T)$ and $0 < y < x$. By (6.23), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^T \xi(t) \left(\int_{\tilde{r}_{a_j}(y, t)}^{\tilde{r}(x, t)} \rho_{a_j}(r, t) r^m dr \right) dt - \int_0^T \xi(t) \left(\int_{\tilde{r}(y, t)}^{\tilde{r}(x, t)} \rho(r, t) r^m dr \right) dt \\ &= \int_0^T \int_0^{\tilde{r}(x, t)} \xi(\chi_y^{a_j} \rho_{a_j} - \chi_y \rho) r^m dr dt = \int_0^T \int_0^\infty (1 - \chi_x) \xi \{\rho_{a_j}^{(y)} - \rho^{(y)}\} r^m dr dt \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $j \rightarrow \infty$, where we have used the fact that $(1 - \chi_x)\xi \in L^1(0, T; L^2([0, \infty), r^m dr))$. Then

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T \int_{\tilde{r}_{a_j}(y, t)}^{\tilde{r}(x, t)} \xi(t) \rho_{a_j}(r, t) r^m dr dt = \int_0^T \xi(t) \left(\int_{\tilde{r}(y, t)}^{\tilde{r}(x, t)} \rho(r, t) r^m dr \right) dt. \quad (6.25)$$

Moreover, using (6.3), $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \tilde{r}(y, t) = \underline{r}(t)$, and the dominated convergence theorem,

$$\limsup_{y \searrow 0} \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \left| \int_0^T \int_{\underline{r}(t)}^{\tilde{r}(y, t)} \xi \rho_{a_j} r^m dr dt \right| \leq \lim_{y \searrow 0} \int_0^T \omega_1([\underline{r}(t), \tilde{r}(y, t)]; C(T)) |\xi(t)| dt = 0.$$

For a given $\delta > 0$, the above limit implies that there exists $z_\delta > 0$ such that, if $y \in (0, z_\delta)$, then

$$\sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \left| \int_0^T \int_{\underline{r}(t)}^{\tilde{r}(y, t)} \xi(t) \rho_{a_j}(r, t) r^m dr dt \right| \leq \delta. \quad (6.26)$$

Now fix $y \in (0, z_\delta)$. By Theorem 3.1(iii), for *a.e.* $t \in [0, T]$,

$$x = \int_{a_j}^{\tilde{r}_{a_j}(x, t)} \rho_{a_j}(r, t) r^m dr = \left(\int_{a_j}^{\underline{r}(t)} + \int_{\underline{r}(t)}^{\tilde{r}(y, t)} + \int_{\tilde{r}(y, t)}^{\tilde{r}_{a_j}(y, t)} + \int_{\tilde{r}_{a_j}(y, t)}^{\tilde{r}(x, t)} + \int_{\tilde{r}(x, t)}^{\tilde{r}_{a_j}(x, t)} \right) \rho_{a_j} r^m dr.$$

Multiplying the above equality with $\xi(t)$, then integrating in $t \in [0, T]$ and letting $j \rightarrow \infty$, it follows from (6.25)–(6.26) that

$$-\delta \leq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^3 \mathcal{I}_i^{(j)} + \int_0^T \xi(t) \left\{ -x + \int_{\tilde{r}(y, t)}^{\tilde{r}(x, t)} \rho(r, t) r^m dr \right\} dt \leq \delta. \quad (6.27)$$

Repeating the same proof for Lemma 6.2(v), we have

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} |\mathcal{I}_1^{(j)}| = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_0^T \xi(t) \left(\int_{a_j}^{\underline{r}(t)} \rho_{a_j}(r, t) r^m dr \right) dt \right| = 0.$$

Moreover, using (6.3), Lemma 6.2, and the dominated convergence theorem, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} |\mathcal{I}_2^{(j)}| + |\mathcal{I}_3^{(j)}| &\leq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T |\xi(t)| \left(\int_{\tilde{r}(y, t)}^{\tilde{r}_{a_j}(y, t)} + \int_{\tilde{r}(x, t)}^{\tilde{r}_{a_j}(x, t)} \right) \rho_{a_j}(r, t) r^m dr dt \\ &\leq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T |\xi(t)| \left\{ \omega_1([\tilde{r}(y, t), \tilde{r}_{a_j}(y, t)]; C(T)) + \omega_1([\tilde{r}(x, t), \tilde{r}_{a_j}(x, t)]; C(T)) \right\} dt = 0. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (6.27) that, for each $\delta > 0$, there exists $z_\delta > 0$ such that, if $y \in (0, z_\delta)$, then

$$-\delta \leq \int_0^T \xi(t) \left\{ -x + \int_{\tilde{r}(y, t)}^{\tilde{r}(x, t)} \rho(r, t) r^m dr \right\} dt \leq \delta.$$

Let $\{\xi_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in C_c^\infty(0, T)$ be such that $\xi_k \geq 0$, $\|\xi_k\|_{L^1([0, T])} = 1$, and $\{\xi_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of kernels approximating the Dirac measure. Then, for all $(k, y) \in \mathbb{N} \times (0, z_\delta)$,

$$-\delta \leq -x + \int_0^T \xi_k(t) \left(\int_{\tilde{r}(y, t)}^{\tilde{r}(x, t)} \rho(r, t) r^m dr \right) dt \leq \delta.$$

Since $\rho(r, t) \geq 0$, we apply the monotone convergence theorem for $y \searrow 0$ to obtain

$$-\delta \leq -x + \int_0^T \xi_k(t) \left(\int_{\underline{r}(t)}^{\tilde{r}(x, t)} \rho(r, t) r^m dr \right) dt \leq \delta.$$

Since this is true for arbitrarily small $\delta > 0$, it follows that

$$x = \int_0^T \xi_k(t) \left(\int_{\underline{r}(t)}^{\tilde{r}(x, t)} \rho(r, t) r^m dr \right) dt \quad \text{for each } i \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Finally, since ξ_k converges to the Dirac measure in the sense of distributions, we take $k \rightarrow \infty$ to conclude that

$$x = \int_{\underline{r}(t)}^{\tilde{r}(x,t)} \rho(r,t) r^m dr \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T] \text{ almost everywhere.}$$

4. The proof for (iv) is the same as that of Proposition 5.1 and Lemma 5.5. \square

In light of Lemmas 6.2(v) and 6.4(iii), we extend $\rho \in L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{F})$ obtained above by setting $\rho(r,t) = 0$ for $(r,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T] \setminus \mathbb{F}$.

Lemma 6.5. *Let $(\rho, u, e)(r, t)$ be the limit function obtained in Lemmas 6.3–6.4. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ess sup}_{t \in (0, T)} \int_0^\infty (\rho |u|^2 + G(\rho))(r, t) r^m dr &\leq C(T), \\ \text{ess sup}_{t \in [0, T]} \int_E (\rho e)(r, t) r^m dr &\leq C(T) + \omega_2(E; C(T)) \quad \text{for bounded measurable } E \subset [0, \infty), \end{aligned}$$

where $\omega_2(E, z)$ for $z > 0$ is the set function given in Lemma 6.1.

Proof. Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Denote $\rho^{(\varepsilon)}$ and $\rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon)}$ as in Lemma 6.4. Let $E \subset [0, \infty)$ be a bounded measurable set, and let $\mathbb{1}_E(r)$ be the indicator function. Since $x \rightarrow \tilde{r}(x, t)$ is strictly increasing and $(x, t) \mapsto \tilde{r}(x, t)$ is a continuous function from Lemma 6.2, combining with the fact that $[0, T]$ is a compact set yields that $D_\varepsilon =: 2 \inf_{t \in [0, T]} \{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t) - \tilde{r}(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, t)\} > 0$. By Lemma 6.2, there exists $N_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, if $j \geq N_\varepsilon$, $\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\tilde{r}_{a_j}(\varepsilon, t) - \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)| \leq \frac{D_\varepsilon}{2}$. Then

$$\tilde{r}_{a_j}(\varepsilon, t) > \tilde{r}(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, t) \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T] \text{ and } j \geq N_\varepsilon. \quad (6.28)$$

Let $[t_1, t_2] \subset (0, T]$. Then it follows from (6.28) that, as $j \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\tilde{r}_{a_j}(\varepsilon, t)}^\infty \rho_{a_j} |u_{a_j}|^2 \mathbb{1}_E(r) r^m dr dt - \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)}^\infty \rho |u|^2 \mathbb{1}_E(r) r^m dr dt \\ &= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\tilde{r}(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, t)}^\infty \rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon)} |u_{a_j}|^2 \mathbb{1}_E(r) r^m dr dt - \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\tilde{r}(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, t)}^\infty \rho^{(\varepsilon)} |u|^2 \mathbb{1}_E(r) r^m dr dt \\ &= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\tilde{r}(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, t)}^\infty \rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon)} \{|u_{a_j}|^2 - |u|^2\} \mathbb{1}_E(r) r^m dr dt + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\tilde{r}(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, t)}^\infty \mathbb{1}_E \{\rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon)} - \rho^{(\varepsilon)}\} |u|^2 \mathbb{1}_E(r) r^m dr dt \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the first-term convergence follows from the dominated convergence theorem, Lemma 6.3, and the pointwise bound for $|u_{a_j}|$ and $\rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon)}$ from Theorem 3.1(iv), while the second-term convergence follows from Lemma 6.4.

Let $L \in \mathbb{N}$ and set $E \equiv [0, L]$. By Theorem 3.1(i),

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)}^L \rho |u|^2 r^m dr dt &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\tilde{r}_{a_j}(\varepsilon, t)}^L \rho_{a_j} |u_{a_j}|^2 r^m dr dt \\ &\leq |t_2 - t_1| \text{ess sup}_{t \in (0, T)} \int_{a_j}^\infty \rho_{a_j} |u_{a_j}|^2(r, t) r^m dr = C(T) |t_2 - t_1|, \end{aligned}$$

where $C(T) = C(T, C_0)$ is independent of $a \in (0, 1)$, $\varepsilon > 0$, and $L \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, by the Lebesgue differentiation theorem, it follows that

$$\text{ess sup}_{t \in (0, T)} \int_{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)}^L (\rho |u|^2)(r, t) r^m dr \leq C(T).$$

Using the monotone convergence theorem with the consecutive limits $L \rightarrow \infty$ and then $\varepsilon \searrow 0$,

$$\text{ess sup}_{t \in (0, T)} \int_{\underline{r}(t)}^\infty (\rho |u|^2)(r, t) r^m dr = \lim_{\substack{L \rightarrow \infty \\ \varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+}} \text{ess sup}_{t \in (0, T)} \int_{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)}^L (\rho |u|^2)(r, t) r^m dr \leq C(T).$$

Next, let $[t_1, t_2] \subseteq (0, T]$, and let $E \subset [0, \infty)$ be a bounded measurable set. Using (6.28), the convergence results from Lemma 6.3–6.4, and the bound: $e(r, t) \leq C(\varepsilon)\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t)$ for $r \geq \tilde{r}(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, t)$ from Lemma 6.3, we see that, as $j \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\tilde{r}_{a_j}(\varepsilon, t)}^{\infty} \rho_{a_j} e_{a_j} \mathbb{1}_E(r) r^m dr dt - \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)}^{\infty} \rho e \mathbb{1}_E(r) r^m dr dt \\ &= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\tilde{r}(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, t)}^{\infty} \rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon)} e_{a_j} \mathbb{1}_E(r) r^m dr dt - \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\tilde{r}(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, t)}^{\infty} \rho^{(\varepsilon)} e \mathbb{1}_E(r) r^m dr dt \\ &= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\tilde{r}(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, t)}^{\infty} \rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon)} (e_{a_j} - e) \mathbb{1}_E(r) r^m dr dt + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\tilde{r}(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, t)}^{\infty} (\rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon)} - \rho^{(\varepsilon)}) e \mathbb{1}_E(r) r^m dr dt \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Let $E_j^\varepsilon(t) := E \cap [\tilde{r}_{a_j}(\varepsilon, t), \infty)$. Then, by (6.4),

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)}^{\infty} \rho e \mathbb{1}_E(r) r^m dr dt &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\tilde{r}_{a_j}(\varepsilon, t)}^{\infty} \rho_{a_j} e_{a_j} \mathbb{1}_E(r) r^m dr dt \\ &\leq \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{E_j^\varepsilon(t)} \rho_{a_j} e_{a_j} r^m dr dt \\ &\leq \int_{t_1}^{t_2} (C(T) + \omega_2(E_j^\varepsilon(t); C(T))) dt, \end{aligned}$$

where $\omega_2(E_j^\varepsilon(t); C(T)) = f_2(f_1(\int_{E_j^\varepsilon(t)} r^m dr; C(T)); C(T))$.

Since $E_j^\varepsilon(t) \subseteq E$ for all $(j, \varepsilon, t) \in \mathbb{N} \times (0, 1) \times [0, T]$, and $f_1(y; C)$ and $f_2(y; C)$ are monotone increasing functions in y (see Proposition B.1), then, for all $(j, \varepsilon, t) \in \mathbb{N} \times (0, 1) \times [0, T]$,

$$\omega_2(E_j^\varepsilon(t); C(T)) \leq f_2(f_1(\int_E r^m dr; C(T)); C(T)) = \omega_2(E; C(T)).$$

Using this, (6.29) becomes

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)}^{\infty} (\rho e)(r, t) \mathbb{1}_E(r) r^m dr dt \leq |t_2 - t_1| (C(T) + \omega_2(E; C(T))).$$

Thus, by the Lebesgue differentiation theorem, it follows that

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)}^{\infty} (\rho e)(r, t) \mathbb{1}_E(r) r^m dr \leq C(T) + \omega_2(E; C(T)).$$

Since $\rho = 0$ in $\{r < \underline{r}(t)\}$ and $\lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t) = \underline{r}(t)$, by the monotone convergence theorem,

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in [0, T]} \int_E (\rho e)(r, t) r^m dr \leq C(T) + \omega_2(E; C(T)).$$

Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ and $r_\varepsilon := \frac{1}{2} \inf_{t \in [0, T]} \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)$. By Lemma 6.2, there exists $M_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\inf_{t \in [0, T]} \tilde{r}_{a_j}(\varepsilon, t) > r_\varepsilon \quad \text{for all } j \geq M_\varepsilon. \quad (6.29)$$

Moreover, by Theorem 3.1(iii), $\tilde{r}_{a_j}(\varepsilon, t) \leq \tilde{r}_{a_j}(1, t) \leq C_0$ for all $(j, t) \in \mathbb{N} \times [0, T]$. By (6.29), Theorem 3.1(i), Lemma 6.4, and the fact that $G(0) = 1$, we have

$$\begin{cases} \rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon)} - 1 \rightharpoonup \rho^{(\varepsilon)} - 1 & \text{weakly in } L^2(0, T; L^2([r_\varepsilon, \infty), r^m dr)) \text{ as } j \rightarrow \infty, \\ \sup_{j \geq M_\varepsilon} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{r_\varepsilon}^{\infty} G(\rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon)})(r, t) r^m dr \leq C(T), \\ 0 \leq \rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon)}(r, t) \leq C(\varepsilon) & \text{for a.e. } (r, t) \in [r_\varepsilon, \infty) \times [0, T] \text{ and for each } j \in \mathbb{N}. \end{cases}$$

Thus, applying Proposition B.2, it follows that

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in (0, T)} \int_{r_\varepsilon}^{\infty} G(\rho^{(\varepsilon)})(r, t) r^m dr \leq C(T).$$

By Lemma 6.2(iv), $r_\varepsilon < \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t) \leq C_0(1 + \varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{n}} \leq 2^{\frac{1}{n}} C_0$ for $t \in [0, T]$. Since $G(\rho^{(\varepsilon)}) = G(0) = 1$ for $r \in [r_\varepsilon, \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)]$ and $\rho^{(\varepsilon)} = \rho$ for a.e. $r \in [\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t), \infty)$, then, for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\int_{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)}^{\infty} G(\rho)(r, t) r^m dr \leq \int_{r_\varepsilon}^{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)} r^m dr + \int_{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)}^{\infty} G(\rho)(r, t) r^m dr \leq C(T).$$

Since the above is true for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, using $\lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t) = \underline{r}(t)$, $\rho \equiv 0$ for $r < \underline{r}(t)$, and the monotone convergence Theorem, it follows that

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^{\infty} G(\rho)(r, t) r^m dr = \lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)}^{\infty} G(\rho)(r, t) r^m dr \leq C(T).$$

□

Lemma 6.6. *Let $(\rho, u, e)(r, t)$ be the limit function obtained in Lemmas 6.3–6.4. Then for $\eta > 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \sup_{r \geq \underline{r}(t) + \eta} \frac{|u|}{\sqrt{e}}(r, t) dt &\leq C(T) (\eta^{\frac{2-n}{2}} + \eta^{2-n}) && \text{if } n = 2, 3, \\ \int_0^T \sup_{r \geq \underline{r}(t) + \eta} \log(\max\{1, e(r, t)\}) dt &\leq C(T) (1 + \sqrt{|\log \eta|}) && \text{if } n = 2, \\ \int_0^T \sup_{r \geq \underline{r}(t) + \eta} \log(\max\{1, e^{\pm 1}(r, t)\}) dt &\leq C(T) \eta^{2-n} && \text{if } n = 3. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We will only prove the first estimate, as the other two statements follow the exact same proof. Fix $\eta > 0$. Since $a_j \searrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$, there exists $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\eta > a_j$ for $j \geq N_1$. Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$. It follows from Theorem 3.1(vi) that,

$$\int_0^T \sup_{r \geq \tilde{r}(2\varepsilon, t) + \eta} \frac{|u_{a_j}|}{\sqrt{e_{a_j}}}(r, t) dt \leq \int_0^T \sup_{r \geq \eta} \frac{|u_{a_j}|}{\sqrt{e_{a_j}}}(r, t) dt \leq C(T) (\eta^{\frac{2-n}{2}} + \eta^{2-n}) \quad \text{for all } j \geq N_1.$$

By Lemma 6.2(i) and the fact that $\varepsilon \mapsto \tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t)$ is increasing, there exists $N_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\tilde{r}(2\varepsilon, t) \geq \tilde{r}_{a_j}(\varepsilon, t)$ for all $j \geq N_2$. Thus, by the uniform convergence in Lemma 6.3 and Fatou's lemma, we have

$$\int_0^T \sup_{r \geq \tilde{r}(2\varepsilon, t) + \eta} \frac{|u|}{\sqrt{e}}(r, t) dt \leq C(T) (\eta^{\frac{2-n}{2}} + \eta^{2-n}).$$

Finally, since $\tilde{r}(\varepsilon, t) \searrow \underline{r}(t)$ as $\varepsilon \searrow 0$, the desired estimate is obtained by an application of Monotone Convergence theorem with the limit $\varepsilon \searrow 0$. □

6.4. Weak forms away from the vacuum. In this subsection, we denote $(\rho, u, e)(r, t)$ on F and $\tilde{r}(x, t)$ on $[0, \infty) \times [0, T]$ as the limit functions obtained in Lemmas 6.2–6.4. The main aim is to show that they satisfy the weak forms described in Definition 2.1. Moreover, we also define a class of test functions \mathcal{D}_T as

$$\mathcal{D}_T := \{\phi \in C^1([0, \infty) \times [0, T]) : \exists L \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } \phi(r, t) = 0 \text{ for } (r, t) \in [L, \infty) \times [0, T]\}.$$

Lemma 6.7. *Let $(\rho_0, u_0, e_0)(r)$ be the spherically symmetric initial data in Theorem 2.1, and let $(\rho_a^0, u_a^0, e_a^0)(r)$ be the modified initial data constructed in §3.2. Then, for all $\phi \in \mathcal{D}_T$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{a \searrow 0} \int_a^\infty \rho_a^0(r) \phi(r, 0) r^m dr &= \int_0^\infty \rho_0(r) \phi(r, 0) r^m dr, \\ \lim_{a \searrow 0} \int_a^\infty (\rho_a^0 u_a^0)(r) \phi(r, 0) r^m dr &= \int_0^\infty (\rho_0 u_0)(r) \phi(r, 0) r^m dr, \\ \lim_{a \searrow 0} \int_a^\infty \left(\frac{1}{2} \rho_a^0 |u_a^0|^2 + \rho_a^0 e_a^0 \right)(r) \phi(r, 0) r^m dr &= \int_0^\infty \left(\frac{1}{2} \rho_0 |u_0|^2 + \rho_0 e_0 \right)(r) \phi(r, 0) r^m dr. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By construction (3.6) in §3.2, $(\rho_a^0, u_a^0, e_a^0)(r) = (1, 0, 1)$ for $r \in [0, a]$. Then we use Proposition 3.1 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_a^\infty \rho_a^0(r) \phi(r, 0) r^m dr - \int_0^\infty \rho_0(r) \phi(r, 0) r^m dr \right| \\ & \leq \int_0^a |\phi(r, 0)| r^m dr + \|\phi(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2([0, \infty), r^m dr)} \|\rho_a^0 - \rho_0\|_{L^2([0, \infty), r^m dr)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } a \searrow 0, \\ & \left| \int_a^\infty (\rho_a^0 u_a^0)(r) \phi(r, 0) r^m dr - \int_0^\infty (\rho_0 u_0)(r) \phi(r, 0) r^m dr \right| \\ & \leq \|\rho_a^0\|_{L^\infty} \|\phi(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2([0, \infty), r^m dr)} \|u_a^0 - u_0\|_{L^2([0, \infty), r^m dr)} \\ & \quad + \|\phi(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^\infty} \|u_0\|_{L^2([0, \infty), r^m dr)} \|\rho_a^0 - \rho_0\|_{L^2([0, \infty), r^m dr)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } a \searrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, it follows from (3.6) and Proposition 3.1 that, as $a \searrow 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_a^\infty \rho_a^0 |u_a^0|^2(r) \phi(r, 0) r^m dr - \int_0^\infty \rho_0 |u_0|^2(r) \phi(r, 0) r^m dr \right| \\ & \leq \|\rho_a^0\|_{L^\infty} \|\phi(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2([0, \infty), r^m dr)} \| |u_a^0|^2 - |u_0|^2 \|_{L^2([0, \infty), r^m dr)} \\ & \quad + \|\phi(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^\infty} \|u_0\|_{L^4([0, \infty), r^m dr)}^2 \|\rho_a^0 - \rho_0\|_{L^2([0, \infty), r^m dr)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } a \searrow 0. \\ & \left| \int_a^\infty \rho_a^0 e_a^0(r) \phi(r, 0) r^m dr - \int_0^\infty \rho_0 e_0(r) \phi(r, 0) r^m dr \right| \\ & \leq \left| \int_0^a \phi(r, 0) r^m dr \right| + \left| \int_0^\infty \phi(r, 0) (\rho_a^0 (e_a^0 - e_0) + e_0 (\rho_a^0 - \rho_0)) r^m dr \right| \\ & \leq \|\phi(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^\infty} \frac{a^n}{n} + \|\rho_a^0\|_{L^\infty} \|\phi(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2([0, \infty), r^m dr)} \|e_a^0 - e_0\|_{L^2([0, \infty), r^m dr)} \\ & \quad + (\|\phi(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^\infty} \|e_0 - 1\|_{L^2([0, \infty), r^m dr)} + \|\phi(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2([0, \infty), r^m dr)}) \|\rho_a^0 - \rho_0\|_{L^2([0, \infty), r^m dr)} \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 6.8. For any $\phi \in \mathcal{D}_T$,

$$\int_0^\infty \rho(r, t) \phi(r, t) r^m dr - \int_0^\infty \rho_0(r) \phi(r, 0) r^m dr = \int_0^t \int_0^\infty (\rho \partial_t \phi + \rho u \partial_r \phi)(r, s) r^m dr ds.$$

Proof. First, from the continuity equation in Theorem 3.1, we obtain that, for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a_j \in (0, 1)$,

$$\int_{a_j}^\infty \rho_{a_j}(r, s) \phi(r, s) r^m dr \Big|_{s=0}^{s=t} = \int_0^t \int_{a_j}^\infty (\rho_{a_j} \partial_t \phi + \rho_{a_j} u_{a_j} \partial_r \phi)(r, t) r^m dr dt. \quad (6.30)$$

Since $\rho \equiv 0$ in $\{r < \underline{r}(t)\}$ by construction, it follows from Lemmas 6.1 and 6.4 that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_1^j & := \left| \int_{a_j}^\infty \rho_{a_j}(r, t) \phi(r, t) r^m dr - \int_{\underline{r}(t)}^\infty \rho(r, t) \phi(r, t) r^m dr \right| \\ & \leq \left| \int_{\tilde{r}_{a_j}(x, t)}^\infty \rho_{a_j}(r, t) \phi(r, t) r^m dr - \int_{\tilde{r}(x, t)}^\infty \rho(r, t) \phi(r, t) r^m dr \right| + \|\phi\|_\infty \int_{\underline{r}(t)}^{\tilde{r}(x, t)} \rho(r, t) r^m dr \\ & \quad + \|\phi\|_\infty \left(\int_{a_j}^{\underline{r}(t)} + \int_{\underline{r}(t)}^{\tilde{r}(x, t)} + \int_{\tilde{r}(x, t)}^{\tilde{r}_{a_j}(x, t)} \right) \rho_{a_j}(r, t) r^m dr \\ & \leq \left| \int_0^\infty (\rho_{a_j}^{(x)} - \rho^{(x)})(r, t) \phi(r, t) r^m dr \right| + \|\phi\|_\infty x + \|\phi\|_\infty \int_{a_j}^{\underline{r}(t)} \rho_{a_j}(r, t) r^m dr \\ & \quad + \|\phi\|_\infty \omega_1([\underline{r}(t), \tilde{r}(x, t)]; C) + \|\phi\|_\infty \omega_1([\tilde{r}(x, t), \tilde{r}_{a_j}(x, t)]; C). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\tilde{r}(x, t) \searrow \underline{r}(t)$ as $x \searrow 0$, for any $\delta > 0$, there exists $y \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\|\phi\|_\infty x + \|\phi\|_\infty \omega_1([\underline{r}(t), \tilde{r}(x, t)]; C) \leq \delta \quad \text{for all } 0 < x < y.$$

Then it follows that, for all $x \in (0, y)$,

$$\mathcal{I}_1^j \leq \delta + \left| \int_0^\infty \phi(r, t) (\rho_{a_j}^{(x)} - \rho^{(x)})(r, t) r^m dr \right| + \|\phi\|_\infty \int_{a_j}^{r(t)} \rho_{a_j}(r, t) r^m dr + \|\phi\|_\infty \omega_1([\tilde{r}(x, t), \tilde{r}_{a_j}(x, t)]; C).$$

Fix a point $x \in (0, y)$. Taking the limit $j \rightarrow \infty$ on the above inequality, then using Lemmas 6.4(i) and 6.2(v), we have

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_{a_j}^\infty \rho_{a_j}(r, t) \phi(r, t) r^m dr - \int_{r(t)}^\infty \rho(r, t) \phi(r, t) r^m dr \right| \leq \delta,$$

which implies that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{I}_1^j = 0$.

Next, for each $x > 0$, we rewrite the term:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_2^j &:= \left| \int_0^t \int_{a_j}^\infty \rho_{a_j} u_{a_j} \partial_r \phi(r, s) r^m dr ds - \int_0^t \int_{r(s)}^\infty \rho u \partial_r \phi(r, s) r^m dr ds \right| \\ &\leq \|\partial_r \phi\|_\infty \int_0^t \int_{a_j}^{\tilde{r}_{a_j}(x, s)} |\rho_{a_j} u_{a_j}| r^m dr ds + \|\partial_r \phi\|_\infty \int_0^t \int_{r(s)}^{\tilde{r}(x, s)} |\rho u| r^m dr ds \\ &\quad + \left| \int_0^t \int_{\tilde{r}_{a_j}(x, s)}^\infty \rho_{a_j} u_{a_j} \partial_r \phi r^m dr ds - \int_0^t \int_{\tilde{r}(x, s)}^\infty \rho u \partial_r \phi r^m dr ds \right| \\ &=: \mathcal{I}_{2,1}^j(x) + \mathcal{I}_{2,2}^j(x) + \mathcal{I}_{2,3}^j(x). \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 6.1, the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, and Theorem 3.1(iii), we have

$$\mathcal{I}_{2,1}^j(x) \leq \|\partial_r \phi\|_\infty \sqrt{x} \int_0^t \left(\int_{a_j}^{\tilde{r}_{a_j}(x, t)} \rho_{a_j} u_{a_j}^2 r^m dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} ds \leq \|\partial_r \phi\|_\infty C(T) t \sqrt{x}.$$

Moreover, using Lemmas 6.4(iii) and 6.5 leads to

$$\mathcal{I}_{2,2}^j(x) \leq \|\partial_r \phi\|_\infty \int_0^t \left(\int_{r(s)}^{\tilde{r}(x, s)} \rho |u|^2 r^m dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{r(s)}^{\tilde{r}(x, s)} \rho r^m dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} ds \leq \|\partial_r \phi\|_\infty C(T) t \sqrt{x}.$$

Thus, for any $\delta > 0$, there exists $y_\delta \in (0, 1)$ such that, if $x \in (0, y_\delta)$, then $\mathcal{I}_2^j(x) \leq \delta + \mathcal{I}_{2,3}^j(x)$. By Lemma 6.2, $x \rightarrow \tilde{r}(x, t)$ is increasing, and $(x, t) \mapsto \tilde{r}(x, t)$ is continuous. Since $[0, T]$ is compact, $d := \inf_{t \in [0, T]} \{\tilde{r}(x, t) - \tilde{r}(\frac{x}{2}, t)\} > 0$. By Lemma 6.2(i), there exists $N_x \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\tilde{r}_{a_j}(x, t) - \tilde{r}(x, t)| \leq \frac{d}{2}$ if $j \geq N_x$. Combining with the previous assertion, we have

$$\tilde{r}\left(\frac{x}{2}, t\right) < \tilde{r}_{a_j}(x, t) \quad \text{for each } t \in [0, T] \text{ and } j \geq N_x. \quad (6.31)$$

Then $\chi_x^{a_j} = \chi_{\frac{x}{2}} \chi_x^{a_j}$ for all $j \geq N_x$, where χ_ε and χ_ε^a are defined in (6.18). Thus, for all $j \geq N_x$,

$$\mathcal{I}_{2,3}^j(x) \leq \left| \int_0^t \int_{\tilde{r}(\frac{x}{2}, s)}^\infty \rho_{a_j}^{(x)} (u_{a_j} - u) \partial_r \phi r^m dr ds \right| + \left| \int_0^t \int_{\tilde{r}(\frac{x}{2}, s)}^\infty (\rho_{a_j}^{(x)} - \rho^{(x)}) u \partial_r \phi r^m dr ds \right|.$$

By the pointwise bound: $\rho_a^{(x)}(r, t) \leq C(x)$ from Theorem 3.1(iv), and the uniform convergence from Lemma 6.3, it follows that, as $j \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\left| \int_0^t \int_{\tilde{r}(\frac{x}{2}, s)}^\infty \rho_{a_j}^{(x)} (u_{a_j} - u) \partial_r \phi r^m dr ds \right| \leq C(x) \int_0^t \int_{\tilde{r}(\frac{x}{2}, s)}^\infty |u_{a_j} - u| \partial_r \phi r^m dr ds \rightarrow 0.$$

By Lemma 6.3, $\chi_{\frac{x}{2}} u \partial_r \phi \in L^1(0, T; L^2([0, \infty), r^m dr))$. Thus, by Lemma 6.4(i),

$$\left| \int_0^t \int_{\tilde{r}(\frac{x}{2}, s)}^\infty (\rho_{a_j}^{(x)} - \rho^{(x)}) u \partial_r \phi r^m dr ds \right| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty,$$

which implies that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{I}_{2,3}^j(x) = 0$ for each $x > 0$. Now, for any given $\delta > 0$, we fix $x \in (0, y_\delta)$. Then $\mathcal{I}_2^j = \mathcal{I}_{2,1}^j(x) + \mathcal{I}_{2,2}^j(x) + \mathcal{I}_{2,3}^j(x) \leq \delta + \mathcal{I}_{2,3}^j(x)$. Taking limit $j \rightarrow \infty$ on both sides of this, we see

that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{I}_2^j \leq \delta$. Since $\delta > 0$ is arbitrarily small, we conclude that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{I}_2^j = 0$. By the same argument, we can also show that

$$\mathcal{I}_3^j := \left| \int_0^t \int_{a_j}^\infty \rho_{a_j} \partial_t \phi r^m dr ds - \int_0^t \int_{\underline{r}(s)}^\infty \rho \partial_t \phi r^m dr ds \right| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty.$$

Lemma 6.8 is proved by substituting these limits in (6.30) and using Lemma 6.7. \square

Lemma 6.9. *Let $\phi \in \mathcal{D}_T \cap C^1$ be such that $\text{supp}(\phi) \Subset F$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty (\rho u)(r, t) \phi(r, t) r^m dr - \int_0^\infty \rho_0(r) u_0(r) \phi(r, 0) r^m dr \\ &= \int_0^t \int_0^\infty \left\{ \rho u \partial_t \phi + \rho u^2 \partial_r \phi + (P - \beta(\partial_r u + m \frac{u}{r})) (\partial_r \phi + m \frac{\phi}{r}) \right\} r^m dr ds, \end{aligned} \quad (6.32)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty (\rho E)(r, t) \phi(r, t) r^m dr - \int_0^\infty (\rho_0 E_0)(r) \phi(r, 0) r^m dr - \int_0^t \int_0^\infty \rho E \partial_t \phi r^m dr ds \\ &= \int_0^t \int_0^\infty \left\{ (\rho E + P)u - 2\mu u \partial_r u - \lambda u (\partial_r u + m \frac{u}{r}) - \kappa \partial_r e \right\} \partial_r \phi r^m dr ds. \end{aligned} \quad (6.33)$$

Proof. We give the proof only for (6.33), since (6.32) can be derived in the same way.

First, from the energy equation in Theorem 3.1, we have the weak form:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{a_j}^\infty (\rho_{a_j} E_{a_j})(r, t) \phi(r, t) r^m dr - \int_{a_j}^\infty \left(\frac{1}{2} \rho_{a_j}^0 |u_{a_j}^0|^2 + \rho_{a_j}^0 e_{a_j}^0 \right) (r) \phi(r, 0) r^m dr \\ &= - \int_0^t \int_{a_j}^\infty \left\{ 2\mu u_{a_j} \partial_r u_{a_j} + \lambda u_{a_j} (\partial_r u_{a_j} + m \frac{u_{a_j}}{r}) + \kappa \partial_r e_{a_j} \right\} \partial_r \phi r^m dr ds \\ & \quad + \int_0^t \int_{a_j}^\infty \left\{ \rho_{a_j} E_{a_j} \partial_t \phi + (\rho_{a_j} E_{a_j} + P_{a_j}) u_{a_j} \partial_r \phi \right\} r^m dr ds, \end{aligned} \quad (6.34)$$

where $P_{a_j} := (\gamma - 1) \rho_{a_j} e_{a_j}$ and $E_{a_j} := \frac{1}{2} |u_{a_j}|^2 + e_{a_j}$. Now, for each $x \in (0, 1)$, we define

$$\tilde{F}_x := \{(r, t) : t \in [0, T], \tilde{r}(x, t) < r < x^{-1}\}.$$

Then $\tilde{F}_x \cap \{0 < t < T\}$ is open for each $x \in (0, 1)$, since $(x, t) \mapsto \tilde{r}(x, t)$ is continuous. Moreover, since $x \mapsto \tilde{r}(x, t)$ is strictly increasing for each $t \in [0, T]$, it follows that $\tilde{F}_x \subsetneq \tilde{F}_y$ if $y < x \in (0, 1)$. Using $\tilde{r}(x, t) \searrow \underline{r}(t)$ as $x \searrow 0$ for all $t \in [0, T]$, we see that $F = \cup_{x \in (0, 1)} \tilde{F}_x$, so that $\{\tilde{F}_x \cap \{0 < t < T\}\}_{x \in (0, 1)}$ is an open covering of $F \cap \{0 < t < T\}$. Since $\text{supp}(\phi) \Subset F$ is a compact subset, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\text{supp}(\phi) \subset \tilde{F}_{2\varepsilon}$. Defining $d := \inf_{t \in [0, T]} \tilde{r}(2\varepsilon, t)$, then $d > 0$ due to Lemma 6.2(iv), and there exists $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $a_j < d$ for $j \geq N_1$. This implies that $a_j < \tilde{r}(2\varepsilon, t)$ if $t \in [0, T]$ and $j \geq N_1$. In addition, by the same argument for (6.31) as in the proof of Lemma 6.8, there exists $N_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\tilde{r}_{a_j}(\varepsilon, t) < \tilde{r}(2\varepsilon, t)$ if $j \geq N_2$ and $t \in [0, T]$. Let $N := \max\{N_1, N_2\}$. Then, by Lemmas 6.3–6.4 and the dominated convergence theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{a_j}^\infty (\rho_{a_j} E_{a_j})(r, t) \phi(r, t) r^m dr - \int_{\underline{r}(t)}^\infty (\rho E)(r, t) \phi(r, t) r^m dr \right| \\ & \leq \int_{\tilde{r}(2\varepsilon, t)}^\infty \rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon)} \left(\frac{1}{2} |u_{a_j}^2 - u^2| + |e_{a_j} - e| \right) \phi r^m dr + \left| \int_{\tilde{r}(2\varepsilon, t)}^\infty (\rho_{a_j}^{(\varepsilon)} - \rho^{(\varepsilon)}) \left(\frac{1}{2} u^2 + e \right) \phi r^m dr \right| \\ & \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

By the same argument, we also obtain

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t \int_{a_j}^\infty \left\{ \rho_{a_j} E_{a_j} \partial_t \phi + (\rho_{a_j} E_{a_j} + P_{a_j}) u_{a_j} \partial_r \phi \right\} r^m dr ds = \int_0^t \int_{\underline{r}(s)}^\infty \left\{ \rho E \partial_t \phi + (\rho E + P) u \partial_r \phi \right\} r^m dr ds.$$

Next, integrating by parts and using Lemma 6.3, we obtain that, for all $j \geq N$,

$$\int_0^t \int_{a_j}^\infty u_{a_j} \partial_r u_{a_j} \partial_r \phi r^m dr ds = - \int_0^t \int_{\tilde{r}(2\varepsilon, s)}^\infty \frac{1}{2} |u_{a_j}|^2 \partial_r^2 \phi r^m dr ds \rightarrow - \int_0^t \int_{\tilde{r}(2\varepsilon, s)}^\infty \frac{1}{2} |u|^2 \partial_r^2 \phi r^m dr ds,$$

as $j \rightarrow \infty$. From (6.13), the spatial weak derivative of u exists with $\partial_r u \in L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{F})$ and $\partial_r u \in L^2(\tilde{\mathbb{F}}_\varepsilon)$ for each $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. It then follows that, as $j \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\int_0^t \int_{a_j}^\infty u_{a_j} \partial_r u_{a_j} \partial_r \phi r^m dr ds \rightarrow - \int_0^t \int_{\tilde{r}(2\varepsilon, s)}^\infty \frac{1}{2} |u|^2 \partial_r^2 \phi r^m dr ds = \int_0^t \int_{\underline{r}(s)}^\infty u \partial_r u \partial_r \phi r^m dr ds,$$

where we have used $\text{supp}(\phi) \Subset \mathbb{F}$. By the same argument, we also have

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t \int_{a_j}^\infty \left\{ m\lambda \frac{|u_{a_j}|^2}{r} + \kappa \partial_r e_{a_j} \right\} \partial_r \phi r^m dr ds = \int_0^t \int_{\underline{r}(s)}^\infty \left\{ m\lambda \frac{|u|^2}{r} + \kappa \partial_r e \right\} \partial_r \phi r^m dr ds.$$

Combining all the limits established above with (6.34), we obtain Lemma 6.9. \square

Finally, the weak forms obtained in Theorem 6.8–6.9 are translated into the Eulerian coordinates $(\mathbf{x}, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T]$. Let $\Phi \in C^1([0, T]; C^1_c(\mathbb{R}^n))$. Define

$$\rho(\mathbf{x}, t) := \rho(|\mathbf{x}|, t), \quad \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}, t) := u(|\mathbf{x}|, t) \frac{\mathbf{x}}{r}, \quad \phi(r, t) := \int_{S^{n-1}} \Phi(r\mathbf{y}, t) dS_{\mathbf{y}},$$

where S^{n-1} is the $(n-1)$ -dimensional sphere, and $dS_{\mathbf{y}}$ is the surface measure on S^{n-1} . Using this, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t \int_0^\infty (\rho u)(r, s) \partial_r \phi(r, s) r^m dr ds &= \int_0^t \int_0^\infty \int_{S^{n-1}} (\rho u)(r, s) \mathbf{y} \cdot \nabla \Phi(r\mathbf{y}, s) r^m dS_{\mathbf{y}} dr ds \\ &= \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\rho u)(|\mathbf{x}|, s) \frac{\mathbf{x}}{|\mathbf{x}|} \cdot \nabla \Phi(\mathbf{x}, s) d\mathbf{x} ds \\ &= \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho(\mathbf{x}, s) \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}, s) \cdot \nabla \Phi(\mathbf{x}, s) d\mathbf{x} ds. \end{aligned}$$

By the same way, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty \rho(r, s) \phi(r, s) r^m dr \Big|_{s=0}^{s=t} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho(\mathbf{x}, s) \Phi(\mathbf{x}, s) d\mathbf{x} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho_0(\mathbf{x}) \Phi(\mathbf{x}, 0) d\mathbf{x}, \\ \int_0^t \int_0^\infty \rho(r, s) \partial_t \phi(r, s) r^m dr ds &= \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho(\mathbf{x}, s) \partial_t \Phi(\mathbf{x}, s) d\mathbf{x} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\phi(r, t)$ satisfies the assumption in Lemma 6.8, using the above identities in Lemma 6.8, we obtain the weak form of the continuity equation.

Next, we show the momentum equations. Let $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be such that $\Psi \in C^2([0, T]; C^2_c(\mathbb{R}^n))$ and $\text{supp}(\Psi) \Subset \mathcal{F} := \{(\mathbf{x}, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T] : \underline{r}(t) < |\mathbf{x}|\}$. We define

$$\varphi^i(r, t) := \int_{S^{n-1}} \Psi(r\mathbf{y}, t) y^i dS_{\mathbf{y}} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (6.35)$$

It can be verified that φ^i satisfies the assumption for Lemma 6.9, hence (6.32) holds with φ^i . The derivations for the weak forms in Theorem 2.1 are similar to that occurring in the continuity equation, except for the term: $\iint \{P - \beta(\partial_r u + m \frac{u}{r})\} (\partial_r \varphi^i + m \frac{\varphi^i}{r}) r^m dr ds$. To deal with this, we use the following identity that can be verified with few lines of calculation on the spherical coordinate transformation:

$$\int_{|\mathbf{x}| \leq r} \partial_{x^i} f(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = \int_{|\mathbf{x}|=r} f(\mathbf{x}) \frac{x^i}{|\mathbf{x}|} dS_{\mathbf{x}} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n, \text{ for } r > 0.$$

Using this identity, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_r(r^m \varphi^i) &= \partial_r \left(\int_{S^{n-1}} y^i \Psi(r\mathbf{y}, t) r^m dS_{\mathbf{y}} \right) = \partial_r \left(\int_{|\mathbf{x}|=r} \frac{x^i}{|\mathbf{x}|} \Psi(\mathbf{x}, t) dS_{\mathbf{x}} \right) \\ &= \partial_r \left(\int_0^r \int_{S^{n-1}} \partial_{x^i} \Psi(\zeta \mathbf{y}, t) \zeta^m dS_{\mathbf{y}} d\zeta \right) = r^m \int_{S^{n-1}} \partial_{x^i} \Psi(r\mathbf{y}, t) dS_{\mathbf{y}}.\end{aligned}$$

Take the derivative on (6.35) to obtain that $\partial_r \varphi^i(r, t) = \int_{S^{n-1}} y^i y^j \partial_{x^j} \Psi(r\mathbf{y}, t) dS_{\mathbf{y}}$ so that

$$\int_0^t \int_0^\infty P(\partial_r \varphi^i + \frac{m}{r} \varphi^i) r^m dr ds = \int_0^t \int_0^\infty \int_{S^{n-1}} P \partial_{x^i} \Psi(r\mathbf{y}, s) r^m dS_{\mathbf{y}} dr ds = \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} P \partial_{x^i} \Psi(\mathbf{x}, s) d\mathbf{x} ds.$$

Moreover, integrating by parts yields

$$\int_0^T \int_0^\infty (\partial_r u + m \frac{u}{r}) (\partial_r \varphi^i + m \frac{\varphi^i}{r}) r^m dr dt = \int_0^T \int_0^\infty (\partial_r u \partial_r \varphi^i + m \frac{\varphi^i u}{r^2}) r^m dr dt.$$

Using the identity $\partial_{x^j} \mathbf{U}^i = \partial_r (\frac{u}{|\mathbf{x}|}) \frac{x^i x^j}{|\mathbf{x}|} + \frac{u}{|\mathbf{x}|} \delta^{ij}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \partial_{x^j} \mathbf{U}^i \partial_{x^j} \Psi d\mathbf{x} dt &= \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(\partial_r \left(\frac{u}{|\mathbf{x}|} \right) \frac{x^i x^j}{|\mathbf{x}|} + \frac{u}{|\mathbf{x}|} \delta^{ij} \right) \partial_{x^j} \Psi d\mathbf{x} dt \\ &= \int_0^T \int_0^\infty \int_{S^{n-1}} \left(r \partial_r \left(\frac{u}{r} \right) y^i y^j \partial_{x^j} \Psi(r\mathbf{y}, t) + \frac{u}{r} \partial_{x^i} \Psi(r\mathbf{y}, t) \right) dS_{\mathbf{y}} r^m dr dt \\ &= \int_0^T \int_0^\infty \left(r^{m+1} \partial_r \left(\frac{u}{r} \right) \partial_r \varphi^i + \frac{u}{r} \partial_r (r^m \varphi^i) \right) dr dt \\ &= \int_0^T \int_0^\infty (\partial_r u + m \frac{u}{r}) (\partial_r \varphi^i + m \frac{\varphi^i}{r}) r^m dr dt.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, since $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{U} = \partial_r u + m \frac{u}{r}$, we also have

$$\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \operatorname{div} \mathbf{U} \partial_{x^i} \Psi d\mathbf{x} dt = \int_0^T \int_0^\infty (\partial_r u + m \frac{u}{r}) (\partial_r \varphi^i + m \frac{\varphi^i}{r}) r^m dr dt.$$

Finally, we show the weak form of energy equation. Let $\Phi \in C^2([0, T]; C_c^2(\mathbb{R}^n))$ be a test function such that $\operatorname{supp}(\Phi) \Subset \mathcal{F} = \{(\mathbf{x}, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T] : |\mathbf{x}| > \underline{r}(t)\}$. Define

$$\phi(r, t) := \int_{S^{n-1}} \Phi(r\mathbf{y}, t) dS_{\mathbf{y}}.$$

It can be verified that ϕ satisfies the assumption of Lemma 6.9, so that (6.33) holds with ϕ . Most of the terms can be derived by the same procedure presented previously, except for the terms: $u \partial_r u$, $\frac{u^2}{r}$, and $\partial_r e$. Since $\operatorname{supp}(\phi) \Subset \{(r, t) : r > \underline{r}(t)\}$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^t \int_{\underline{r}(s)}^\infty u \partial_r u \partial_r \phi(r, s) r^m dr ds &= \int_0^t \int_{\underline{r}(s)}^\infty u \partial_r u \left(\int_{S^{n-1}} y^i \partial_{x^i} \Phi(r\mathbf{y}, s) dS_{\mathbf{y}} \right) r^m dr ds \\ &= \int_0^t \int_{|\mathbf{x}| > \underline{r}(s)} \partial_r \left(\frac{u^2}{2} \right) (|\mathbf{x}|, s) \frac{x^i}{|\mathbf{x}|} \partial_{x^i} \Phi(\mathbf{x}, s) d\mathbf{x} ds \\ &= \int_0^t \int_{|\mathbf{x}| > \underline{r}(s)} \partial_{x^i} \left(\frac{|\mathbf{U}|^2}{2} \right) \partial_{x^i} \Phi(\mathbf{x}, s) d\mathbf{x} ds \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \int_{|\mathbf{x}| > \underline{r}(s)} \nabla \Phi(\mathbf{x}, s) \cdot \nabla |\mathbf{U}|^2 d\mathbf{x} ds,\end{aligned}$$

and with several lines of derivations, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^t \int_{\underline{r}(s)}^\infty \left\{ \mu u \partial_r u + \lambda u \left(\partial_r u + m \frac{u}{r} \right) \right\} \partial_r \phi(r, s) r^m dr ds \\
&= \int_0^t \int_{\underline{r}(s)}^\infty \int_{S^{n-1}} \left\{ \mu u \partial_r u + \lambda u \left(\partial_r u + m \frac{u}{r} \right) \right\} y^i \partial_{x^i} \Phi(r \mathbf{y}, s) r^m dS_{\mathbf{y}} dr ds \\
&= \int_0^t \int_{|\mathbf{x}| > \underline{r}(s)} \left\{ \lambda (\operatorname{div} \mathbf{U}) \mathbf{U} + \mu (\nabla \mathbf{U}) \cdot \mathbf{U} \right\} \nabla \Phi(\mathbf{x}, s) d\mathbf{x} ds, \\
& \int_0^t \int_{\underline{r}(s)}^\infty \partial_r e \partial_r \phi(r, s) r^m dr ds = \int_0^t \int_{\underline{r}(s)}^\infty \int_{S^{n-1}} \partial_r e(r, s) y^i \partial_{x^i} \Phi(r \mathbf{y}, s) r^m dS_{\mathbf{y}} dr ds \\
&= \int_0^t \int_{|\mathbf{x}| > \underline{r}(s)} \nabla e \cdot \nabla \Phi d\mathbf{x} ds.
\end{aligned}$$

With these, we complete the proof of the weak form of the energy equation.

APPENDIX A. SOME VARIANTS OF THE ARZELÀ-ASCOLI THEOREM

This appendix is devoted to the proof of two variants of the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem, which are used in §5.3–§5.4 for the limit process as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and in §6.2–§6.3 for the limit process as $a \searrow 0$.

Proposition A.1. *Let $D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ be a domain with Lipschitz boundary such that $\operatorname{Int}(D) \neq \emptyset$, where $\operatorname{Int}(\cdot)$ denotes the set of interior points. Assume that $\{f_i : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a collection of functions, and $\{(D_\alpha, C_\alpha)\}_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a collection of compact subsets $D_\alpha \Subset D$ and constants $C_\alpha \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for each $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\begin{aligned}
D_\alpha &\subseteq D_{\alpha+1}, \quad \operatorname{Int}(D_\alpha) \neq \emptyset, \quad D = \cup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}} D_\alpha, \\
\sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{x \in D_\alpha} f_i(x) &\leq C_\alpha, \quad \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} |f_i(x) - f_i(y)| \leq C_\alpha |x - y| \quad \text{for all } x, y \in D_\alpha.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

Then there exist both a continuous function $f : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a subsequence $\{i_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $i_j \rightarrow \infty$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in K} |f_{i_j}(x) - f(x)| &= 0 \quad \text{for all compact subset } K \Subset D, \\
|f(x) - f(y)| &\leq C_\alpha |x - y| \quad \text{for all } x, y \in D_\alpha, \text{ for each } \alpha \in \mathbb{N}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We split the proof into three steps: the desired subsequence, the limit function, and the uniform convergence and continuity.

1. *The desired subsequence.* By the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem, it follows that, for each $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist both a continuous function $f^{(\alpha)}(x, t) : D_\alpha \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a subsequence $\{i_j^{(\alpha)}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $i_j^{(\alpha)} \rightarrow \infty$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$, and

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in D_\alpha} |f^{(\alpha)}(x) - f_{i_j^{(\alpha)}}(x)| = 0. \tag{A.2}$$

Based on (A.2), one can inductively construct a chain of subsequences $\{i_j^{(\alpha+1)}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \{i_j^{(\alpha)}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ for each $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$. Then taking the diagonal subsequence $i_j := i_j^{(j)}$ yields that, for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in D_\alpha} |f^{(\alpha)}(x) - f_{i_j}(x)| = 0. \tag{A.3}$$

If $x \in D_\alpha$ for some integer $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$, then, for any other integer $q \geq \alpha + 1$, we see that, for all $x \in D_\alpha$,

$$|f^{(\alpha)}(x) - f^{(q)}(x)| \leq |f^{(\alpha)}(x) - f_{i_j}(x)| + |f_{i_j}(x) - f^{(q)}(x)| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty.$$

Thus, if $q \geq \alpha$ are two integers, then

$$f^{(q)}(x) = f^{(\alpha)}(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in D_\alpha. \tag{A.4}$$

2. *The limit function.* For each $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$, $f^{(\alpha)}(x)$ is extended to D by

$$h^{(\alpha)}(x) := \begin{cases} f^{(\alpha)}(x) & \text{if } x \in D_\alpha, \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in D \setminus D_\alpha. \end{cases}$$

With this, we can define the following function $g_N(x)$ in D :

$$g_N(x) := h^{(1)}(x) + \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \{h^{(k+1)}(x) - h^{(k)}(x)\} \quad \text{for each } N \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } N \geq 2.$$

Then, for a fixed point $y \in D$, there exists $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $y \in D_\alpha$ and $y \notin D_{\alpha-1}$, with $D_0 := \emptyset$. By (A.4) and the assumption that $D_q \subseteq D_{q+1}$ for each $q \in \mathbb{N}$, it follows that $h^{(q)}(y) = 0$ if $q \leq \alpha - 1$, and $h^{(q)}(y) = h^{(\alpha)}(y)$ if $q \geq \alpha$. Hence, it follows that, for all $N \geq \alpha + 1$,

$$g_N(y) = h^{(1)}(y) + \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \{h^{(k+1)}(y) - h^{(k)}(y)\} = h^{(N)}(y) = h^{(\alpha)}(y) = f^{(\alpha)}(y).$$

Thus, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} g_N(y) = f^{(\alpha)}(y)$ for this point $y \in D$. Since this is true for any arbitrary point $x \in D$, we obtain that $f(x) : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, given by

$$f(x) := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} g_N(x),$$

is well-defined and, in particular, $f(x) = f^{(\alpha)}(x)$ if $x \in D_\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$. By the uniform convergence (A.3), it follows that, for each $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in D_\alpha} |f(x) - f_{i_j}(x)| = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in D_\alpha} |f^{(\alpha)}(x) - f_{i_j}(x)| = 0. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

3. *The uniform convergence and continuity.* Let $K \Subset D$ be any compact subset. Then $\{\text{Int}(D_\alpha)\}_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an open covering for K , so that there exists a finite subcovering $\{D_{\alpha_k}\}_{k=1}^N$ of K for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Notice that $D_q \subseteq D_{q+1}$ for each $q \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, there exists $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $K \subseteq D_\alpha$. Combining with (A.5), it follows that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in K} |f_{i_j}(x) - f(x)| = 0.$$

For the continuity of f , fixing a point $x \in D$, then there exists $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x \in D_\alpha$. Since $\text{Int}(D_\alpha) \neq \emptyset$, there exists $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ such that $B_{\varepsilon_1}(x) \subset D_\alpha$. According to (A.1),

$$\sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} |f_i(x) - f_i(y)| \leq C_\alpha |x - y| \quad \text{for all } y \in D_\alpha.$$

Applying the uniform convergence (A.5), it follows that $|f(x) - f(y)| \leq C_\alpha |x - y|$ for all $y \in D_\alpha$. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, define $\delta := \min\{\varepsilon_1, \frac{\varepsilon}{C_\alpha}\} > 0$. Then, for $y \in B_\delta(x) \subseteq B_{\varepsilon_1}(x) \subset D_\alpha$,

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \leq C_\alpha |x - y| \leq \varepsilon.$$

The continuity of $x \mapsto f(x)$ has been proved. \square

Before stating the next proposition, we define the functional space $\tilde{H}_0^1(I, r^m dr)$ for each connected interval $I \subseteq [0, \infty)$ as the closure of

$$\mathcal{D}_0(I) := \left\{ \phi \in C^\infty(I) : \exists N > a \text{ such that } [a, N] \subset I \text{ and } \phi(r) = 0 \text{ for } r \in I \cap [N, \infty) \right\}$$

via the $H^1(I, r^m dr)$ -norm. We also denote its dual space as $\tilde{H}^{-1}(I, r^m dr)$. Then it follows that $\tilde{H}^{-1}(I, r^m dr)$ endowed with the norm:

$$\|f\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}(I, r^m dr)} := \sup \left\{ \langle f, g \rangle_{\tilde{H}^{-1}, \tilde{H}_0^1} : \|g\|_{\tilde{H}_0^1(I, r^m dr)} \leq 1 \right\}$$

is a Banach space.

Proposition A.2. *Let $I = [a, b]$ be an interval for some $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, and let $D = [d, \infty)$ be an unbounded interval with some fixed $d \in (0, 1)$. Suppose that $\{f_i(r, t) : D \times I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a collection of functions satisfying $f_i(r, t) \in L^\infty(I; \tilde{H}^{-1}(D_L, r^m dr))$ for each $i, L \in \mathbb{N}$, where $D_L := D \cap [0, L] = [d, L]$. In addition, suppose that there exists a constant $C > 0$ for which the following bounds are satisfied: for all $t_1, t_2 \in I$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \|f_i(\cdot, t_2) - f_i(\cdot, t_1)\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}(D_L, r^m dr)} &\leq C|t_2 - t_1| \quad \text{for all } L \in \mathbb{N}, \\ \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{t \in I} \int_D |f_i - 1|^2(r, t) r^m dr &\leq C. \end{aligned} \tag{A.6}$$

Then there exist both a subsequence $\{i_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and a function f such that, for all $L \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} f - 1 &\in L^\infty(I; L^2(D, r^m dr)), \quad f \in C^0(I; \tilde{H}^{-1}(D_L, r^m dr)), \\ \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in I} \|f_{i_k}(\cdot, t) - f(\cdot, t)\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}(D_L, r^m dr)} &= 0, \\ \|f(\cdot, t_1) - f(\cdot, t_2)\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}(D_L, r^m dr)} &\leq C|t_1 - t_2| \quad \text{for all } t_1, t_2 \in I, \end{aligned} \tag{A.7}$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of $L \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. We divide the proof in four steps: the desired subsequence, the desired Cauchy sequence, the uniform convergence, and the independence of domain size.

1. *The desired subsequence.* Fix a large integer $L \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows that, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\int_{D_L} |f_i|^2 dr \leq 2d^{-m} \int_{D_L} |f_i - 1|^2 r^m dr + 2L \leq 2d^{-m}C + 2L < \infty.$$

Hence, the following uniform estimate hold:

$$\sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{t \in I} \int_{D_L} |f_i|^2(r, t) r^m dr \leq 2d^{-m}C + 2L < \infty. \tag{A.8}$$

Let $\{t_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset I$ be a countable dense subset. Then, from (A.8), for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist both a function $g_{j, L} \in L^2(D_L, dr)$ and a subsequence $\{i_k^{(j)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $f_{i_k^{(j)}}(\cdot, t_j) \rightharpoonup g_{j, L}(\cdot)$ weakly as $k \rightarrow \infty$ in $L^2(D_L, dr)$. Thus, one can inductively obtain a chain of subsequence $\{i_k^{(j+1)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \{i_k^{(j)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Taking the diagonal sequence $i_k := i_k^{(k)}$, then, for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$f_{i_k}(\cdot, t_j) \rightharpoonup g_{j, L}(\cdot) \quad \text{weakly as } k \rightarrow \infty \text{ in } L^2(D_L, dr). \tag{A.9}$$

2. *The desired Cauchy sequence.* Define

$$M^i(r, t) := \int_{D \cap [0, r]} f_i(\zeta, t) d\zeta \quad \text{for each } r \leq L.$$

Then it follows from (A.9) that, for each $(r, j) \in [0, L] \times \mathbb{N}$,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} M^{i_k}(r, t_j) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{D \cap [0, r]} f_{i_k}(\zeta, t_j) d\zeta \longrightarrow \int_{D \cap [0, r]} g_{j, L}(\zeta) d\zeta =: M_{j, L}(r). \tag{A.10}$$

For all $\phi \in \tilde{H}_0^1(D_L, r^m dr)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{D_L} (f_{i_k}(r, t_j) - g_j(r)) \phi(r) r^m dr \\ &= \int_{D_L} \partial_r (M^{i_k}(r, t_j) - M_{j, L}(r)) \phi(r) r^m dr \\ &= - \int_{D_L} (M^{i_k}(r, t_j) - M_{j, L}(r)) \left(\partial_r \phi + m \frac{\phi}{r} \right) r^m dr \\ &\leq \frac{C}{d} \|\phi\|_{H^1(D_L, r^m dr)} \left(\int_{D_L} |M^{i_k}(r, t_j) - M_{j, L}(r)|^2 r^m dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by (A.10) and the dominated convergence theorem, we see that, for $j \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\|f_{i_k}(\cdot, t_j) - g_j(\cdot)\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}(D_L, r^m dr)} \leq \frac{C}{d} \left(\int_{D_L} |M^{i_k}(r, t_j) - M_{j,L}(r)|^2 r^m dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

In particular, since $L \in \mathbb{N}$ can be arbitrarily chosen, the following statement holds:

$$\{f_{i_k}(\cdot, t_j)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ is a Cauchy sequence in } \tilde{H}^{-1}(D_L, r^m dr) \text{ for each } (j, L) \in \mathbb{N}^2. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

3. *The uniform convergence.* Given $\delta > 0$, define $I_j := (t_j - \frac{\delta}{3C}, t_j + \frac{\delta}{3C})$ for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $t_j \in I_j$ and

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|f_{i_k}(\cdot, t) - f_{i_k}(\cdot, t_j)\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}(D_L, r^m dr)} \leq C|t - t_j| \leq \frac{\delta}{3} \quad \text{for all } t \in I_j. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Since $\{t_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset I$ is dense, $\{I_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an open covering of $I = [a, b]$. It follows that there exists a finite subcovering $\{I_j\}_{j=1}^M$ for some $M \in \mathbb{N}$. Now, for each $j = 1, \dots, M$, it follows from (A.11) that there exists $N_j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\|f_{i_p}(\cdot, t_j) - f_{i_q}(\cdot, t_j)\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}(D_L, r^m dr)} \leq \frac{\delta}{3} \quad \text{for all } p, q \geq N_j. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

Set $N := \max\{N_j : j = 1, \dots, M\}$. Then, for all $t \in I$, there exists $j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ such that $t \in I_j$ so that, by (A.12)–(A.13), for all $p, q \geq N$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_{i_p}(\cdot, t) - f_{i_q}(\cdot, t)\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}(D_L, r^m dr)} &\leq \|f_{i_p}(\cdot, t) - f_{i_p}(\cdot, t_j)\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}(D_L, r^m dr)} + \|f_{i_p}(\cdot, t_j) - f_{i_q}(\cdot, t_j)\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}(D_L, r^m dr)} \\ &\quad + \|f_{i_q}(\cdot, t_j) - f_{i_q}(\cdot, t)\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}(D_L, r^m dr)} \leq \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Since this is true for any $t \in I$,

$$\sup_{t \in I} \|f_{i_p}(\cdot, t) - f_{i_q}(\cdot, t)\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}(D_L, r^m dr)} \leq \delta \quad \text{for all } p, q \geq N.$$

Therefore, $\{f_{i_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^\infty(I; \tilde{H}^{-1}(D_L, r^m dr))$, which is a Banach space. Then there exists $g_L \in L^\infty(I; \tilde{H}^{-1}(D_L, r^m dr))$ such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in I} \|f_{i_k}(\cdot, t) - g_L(\cdot, t)\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}(D_L, r^m dr)} = 0. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

It also follows from the Lipschitz continuity assumption and (A.14) that

$$\|g_L(\cdot, t_1) - g_L(\cdot, t_2)\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}(D_L, r^m dr)} \leq C|t_1 - t_2| \quad \text{for all } t_1, t_2 \in I,$$

which implies that $g_L \in C^0(I; \tilde{H}^{-1}(D_L, r^m dr))$.

4. *The independence of domain size.* We claim there exists $f - 1 \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2(D, r^m dr))$, independent of $L \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $f = g_L$ in $L^\infty(I, \tilde{H}^{-1}(D_L, r^m dr))$.

It follows from (A.6) that there exist both a function $f - 1 \in L^\infty(I; L^2(D, r^m dr))$ and a subsequence (still denoted) $\{f_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$f_i - 1 \xrightarrow{*} f - 1 \quad \text{in } L^\infty(I; L^2(D, r^m dr)) \quad \text{as } i \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Let $\varphi \in L^1(I, \tilde{H}_0^1(D_L, r^m dr))$, and let $\{i_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the subsequence in (A.14). Then, using (A.14)–(A.15), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_I \langle f - g_L, \varphi \rangle_{\tilde{H}^{-1}, \tilde{H}_0^1} dt \right| &\leq \left| \int_I \langle f - f_{i_k}, \varphi \rangle_{\tilde{H}^{-1}, \tilde{H}_0^1} dt \right| + \left| \int_I \langle f_{i_k} - g_L, \varphi \rangle_{\tilde{H}^{-1}, \tilde{H}_0^1} dt \right| \\ &\leq \left| \int_I \int_{D_L} (f - f_{i_k})(r, t) \varphi(r, t) r^m dr dt \right| + \int_I \|f_{i_k} - g_L\|_{\tilde{H}^{-1}} \|\varphi\|_{\tilde{H}_0^1} dt \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $f = g_L$ in $L^\infty(I, \tilde{H}^{-1}(D_L, r^m dr))$. Since f is independent of $L \in \mathbb{N}$, we conclude from (A.14) that (A.7) holds for all $L \in \mathbb{N}$. \square

APPENDIX B. SOME PROPERTIES OF CONVEX FUNCTIONS

This appendix is devoted to disclosing some properties of convex functions, which have been used in §5.5, §6.1, and §6.3.

Proposition B.1. *Let $G(\cdot)$, $\psi(\cdot)$, and $H(\cdot)$ be the convex functions defined in (6.1). If G_+^{-1} , ψ_+^{-1} , and H_+^{-1} are their corresponding right branch inverses, then they are concave, strictly increasing continuous functions defined on the domain:*

$$G_+^{-1} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [1, \infty), \quad \psi_+^{-1} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [1, \infty), \quad H_+^{-1} : [-e^{-1}, \infty) \rightarrow [e^{-1}, \infty).$$

Moreover, $(f_1, f_2, f_3)(y, z)$ given in (6.2) are well defined for $(y, z) \in (0, \infty)^2$ such that, for each fixed $z > 0$, $y \mapsto f_i(y; z)$ is positive monotone increasing for $i = 1, 2, 3$, and

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} f_i(y; z) = 0 \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, 3.$$

Proof. First, $G(\zeta)$ and $\psi(\zeta)$ are uniformly convex and achieve their minimum at $\zeta = 1$ with $G(1) = 0$. Hence, $G(\zeta)$ and $\psi(\zeta)$ are strictly increasing in $[1, \infty)$. Thus, the inverse functions $\psi_+^{-1}, G_+^{-1} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ exist and satisfy $G(G_+^{-1}(\xi)) = \psi(\psi_+^{-1}(\xi)) = \xi$ for all $\xi \in [0, \infty)$. In addition, $H(\zeta)$ is uniformly convex and achieves its minimum at $\zeta = e^{-1}$ with $H(e^{-1}) = -e^{-1}$. Hence, $H(\zeta)$ is strictly increasing in $[e^{-1}, \infty)$. Then the inverse function $H_+^{-1} : [e^{-1}, \infty) \rightarrow [-e^{-1}, \infty)$ exists and satisfies $H(H_+^{-1}(\xi)) = \xi$ for all $\xi \in [-e^{-1}, \infty)$. Since $H(1) = 0$, the restricted function $H_+^{-1} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ is monotone increasing with $H_+^{-1}(0) = 1$.

Next, by the inverse function theorem,

$$\frac{dG_+^{-1}}{d\xi}(\xi) = \left(\frac{dG}{d\zeta}(G_+^{-1}(\xi)) \right)^{-1} = \frac{1}{\log(G_+^{-1}(\xi))} \quad \text{for } \xi \in (0, \infty).$$

Since $\xi \mapsto G_+^{-1}(\xi)$ is a monotone increasing bijective map and $G_+^{-1}(\xi) \rightarrow \infty$ as $\xi \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\lim_{\xi \rightarrow \infty} \frac{dG_+^{-1}}{d\xi}(\xi) = \lim_{\xi \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\log(G_+^{-1}(\xi))} = 0,$$

which, along with the L'Hôpital rule, yields that

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} f_1(y; z) := \lim_{y \searrow 0} y G_+^{-1}\left(\frac{z}{y}\right) \stackrel{\text{H}}{=} z \lim_{y \searrow 0} \frac{dG_+^{-1}}{d\xi}\left(\frac{z}{y}\right) = 0.$$

In addition,

$$\frac{\partial f_1}{\partial y}(y; z) = G_+^{-1}(zy^{-1}) - \frac{zy^{-1}}{\log(G_+^{-1}(zy^{-1}))} \quad \text{for } (y, z) \in (0, \infty)^2,$$

where $G_+^{-1}(zy^{-1}) \in (1, \infty)$ for each $(y, z) \in (0, \infty)^2$. It follows from $G(\zeta) = 1 - \zeta + \zeta \log \zeta$ and the identity $G_+^{-1}(G(\zeta)) = \zeta$ that

$$\frac{\partial f_1}{\partial y}(y; z) = \frac{G_+^{-1}(zy^{-1}) - 1}{\log(G_+^{-1}(zy^{-1}))} > 0 \quad \text{for all } (y, z) \in (0, \infty)^2,$$

which implies that, for fixing $z > 0$, $f_1(y; z)$ is monotone increasing for $y \in (0, \infty)$.

Next, by the inverse function theorem, it follows that

$$\frac{d\psi_+^{-1}}{d\xi}(\xi) = \left(\frac{d\psi}{d\zeta}(\psi_+^{-1}(\xi)) \right)^{-1} = \left(1 - \frac{1}{\psi_+^{-1}(zy^{-1})} \right)^{-1} \quad \text{for } \xi \in (0, \infty).$$

Since $\psi_+^{-1}(\xi) \rightarrow \infty$ as $\xi \rightarrow \infty$, for each fixed $z > 0$, by the L'Hôpital rule, we have

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} y \psi_+^{-1}\left(\frac{z}{y}\right) \stackrel{\text{H}}{=} z \lim_{y \searrow 0} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\psi_+^{-1}(zy^{-1})} \right)^{-1} = z \quad \text{for } z > 0.$$

Thus, it follows that

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} f_2(y; z) = -z + \lim_{y \searrow 0} y \psi_+^{-1}\left(\frac{z}{y}\right) = 0.$$

Moreover, fixing $z > 0$ and taking the derivative of $y \mapsto f_2(y; z)$, one has

$$\frac{\partial f_2}{\partial y}(y; z) = \psi_+^{-1}\left(\frac{z}{y}\right) - \frac{z}{y^2} \frac{d\psi_+^{-1}}{d\xi}\left(\frac{z}{y}\right) = \frac{\psi_+^{-1}(zy^{-1}) \log(\psi_+^{-1}(zy^{-1}))}{\psi_+^{-1}(zy^{-1}) - 1} > 0 \quad \text{for } y \in (0, \infty),$$

which implies that $y \mapsto f_2(y; z)$ is increasing for each fixed $z > 0$.

Finally, by the inverse function theorem, it follows that

$$\frac{dH_+^{-1}}{d\xi}(\xi) = \left(\frac{dH}{d\zeta}(H_+^{-1}(\xi)) \right)^{-1} = \frac{1}{1 + \log(H_+^{-1}(\xi))} \quad \text{for } \xi \in [0, \infty).$$

Since $H_+^{-1}(\xi) \rightarrow \infty$ as $\xi \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\lim_{\xi \rightarrow \infty} \frac{dH_+^{-1}}{d\xi}(\xi) = \lim_{\xi \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{1 + \log(H_+^{-1}(\xi))} = 0,$$

which, along with the L'Hôpital rule, implies that

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} f_3(y; z) \stackrel{H}{=} \lim_{y \searrow 0} \frac{-zy^{-2}}{-y^{-2}} \frac{dH_+^{-1}}{d\xi}(zy^{-1}) = \lim_{y \searrow 0} \frac{dH_+^{-1}}{d\xi}(zy^{-1}) = 0.$$

Furthermore, for fixing $z > 0$, we see that, for all $y \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\frac{\partial f_3}{\partial y}(y; z) = H_+^{-1}(zy^{-1}) - \frac{z}{y} \frac{dH_+^{-1}}{d\xi}(zy^{-1}) = \frac{H_+^{-1}(zy^{-1})}{1 + \log H_+^{-1}(zy^{-1})} > 0.$$

Therefore, $y \mapsto f_3(y; z)$ is strictly increasing and positive for each fixed $z > 0$. \square

Before proving the next proposition, we state the so-called Mazur's Lemma:

Theorem B.1 (Mazur's Lemma). *Let $(B, \|\cdot\|_B)$ be a Banach space, and let $S \subseteq B$ be a convex subset. Then S is closed in the strong topology if and only if it is closed in the weak topology.*

For further detail, we refer the reader to Theorem 3.7 in Chapter 3.3 in [3].

Proposition B.2. *Let $d > 0$, $T > 0$, and $G(\zeta) := 1 - \zeta + \zeta \log \zeta$. Assume there exist constants $\tilde{C}_1, \tilde{C}_2 > 0$, $\tilde{\delta} \geq 0$, and a sequence $\{\theta_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset L^2(0, T; L^2([d, \infty), r^m dr))$ satisfying:*

$$\begin{cases} \theta_i - 1 \rightharpoonup \theta - 1 & \text{weakly in } L^2(0, T; L^2([d, \infty), r^m dr)), \\ \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ess sup}_{t \in [0, T]} \int_d^\infty G(\theta_i)(r, t) r^m dr \leq \tilde{C}_1, \\ \tilde{\delta} \leq \theta_i \leq \tilde{C}_2 & \text{for a.e. } (r, t) \in [d, \infty) \times [0, T] \text{ and for each } i \in \mathbb{N}. \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Then the limit function θ satisfies

$$\text{ess sup}_{t \in [0, T]} \int_d^\infty G(\theta)(r, t) r^m dr \leq \tilde{C}_1.$$

Proof. Fix an integer $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Denote $B_N := L^2(0, T; L^2([d, N], r^m dr))$. Then B_N is a Banach space. Set S_N to be the subset:

$$S_N := \left\{ w \in B_N : \text{ess sup}_{t \in [0, T]} \int_d^N G(w)(r, t) r^m dr \leq \tilde{C}_1, \tilde{\delta} \leq w(r, t) \leq \tilde{C}_2 \text{ a.e. } (r, t) \in [d, N] \times [0, T] \right\}.$$

First, we claim that S_N is a convex subset of B_N . Since $G(z) = 1 - z + z \log z$ is convex, it follows that, for each $w_1, w_2 \in S_N$ and $0 < \eta < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in [0, T]} \int_d^N G(\eta w_1 + (1 - \eta)w_2)(r, t) r^m dr \\ & \leq \eta \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in [0, T]} \int_d^N G(w_1)(r, t) r^m dr + (1 - \eta) \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in [0, T]} \int_d^N G(w_2)(r, t) r^m dr \leq \tilde{C}_1, \\ & \tilde{\delta} \leq (\eta w_1 + (1 - \eta)w_2)(r, t) \leq \tilde{C}_2 \quad \text{for a.e. } (r, t) \in [d, N] \times [0, T], \end{aligned}$$

which implies that S_N is indeed a convex subset of B_N .

We next show that, if $\{w_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset S_N$ is a sequence such that, for some $w \in B_N$,

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \|w_i - w\|_{B_N} = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T \int_d^N |w_i - w|^2(r, t) r^m dr dt = 0,$$

then $w \in S_N$.

Since $w_i \rightarrow w$ strongly in $L^2(0, T; L^2([d, N], r^m dr))$, there exists a subsequence (still denoted) $\{w_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$w_i(r, t) \rightarrow w(r, t) \quad \text{for a.e. } (r, t) \in [d, N] \times [0, T]. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Since $\{w_i\}_i \subset S_N$, the convergence in (B.2) implies that

$$\tilde{\delta} \leq w(r, t) \leq \tilde{C}_2 \quad \text{for a.e. } (r, t) \in [d, N] \times [0, T]. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Since $G(\cdot)$ is convex and achieves its minimum at $G(\zeta = 1) = 0$, and $G(\zeta = 0) = 1$, it follows that, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\tilde{\delta} \leq w_i \leq \tilde{C}_2$, $G(w_i(r, t)) \leq \max\{1, G(\tilde{\delta}), G(\tilde{C}_2)\}$. Moreover, since $G(\cdot)$ is continuous, it follows from (B.2) that $G(w_i(r, t)) \rightarrow G(w(r, t))$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ for a.e. $(r, t) \in [d, N] \times [0, T]$. By the dominated convergence theorem, we see that, for each $0 \leq t_1 < t_2 \leq T$,

$$\frac{1}{t_2 - t_1} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_d^N G(w)(r, t) r^m dr dt = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t_2 - t_1} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_d^N G(w_i)(r, t) r^m dr dt \leq \tilde{C}_1.$$

Since this is true for any interval $[t_1, t_2] \subseteq [0, T]$, then, by the Lebesgue differentiation theorem,

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in [0, T]} \int_d^N G(w)(r, t) r^m dr \leq \tilde{C}_1. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

It follows from (B.3)–(B.4) that $w \in S_N$, which, along with Theorem B.1, implies that

$$S_N \text{ is closed in the weak topology of } B_N := L^2(0, T; L^2([d, N], r^m dr)). \quad (\text{B.5})$$

By (B.2), it follows that $\{\theta_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset S_N$ and $\theta_i \rightarrow \theta$ in $B_N = L^2(0, T; L^2([d, N], r^m dr))$. Assertion (B.5) then implies that $\theta \in S_N$ and, in particular,

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in [0, T]} \int_d^N G(\theta)(r, t) r^m dr \leq \tilde{C}_1.$$

Now, since this is true for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$, and $G(\cdot)$ is non-negative, it follows from the monotone convergence theorem that

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in [0, T]} \int_d^\infty G(\theta)(r, t) r^m dr = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in [0, T]} \int_d^N G(\theta)(r, t) r^m dr \leq \tilde{C}_1.$$

□

Acknowledgements: The research of Gui-Qiang G. Chen was supported in part by the UK Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council Award EP/L015811/1, EP/V008854, and EP/V051121/1. The research of Yucong Huang was supported in part by the UK Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council Award EP/L015811/1. The research of Shengguo Zhu was also supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under the Grant 12101395, the Royal Society–Newton International Fellowships Alumni AL/201021 and AL/211005.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest. The authors also declare that this manuscript has not been previously published, and will not be submitted elsewhere before your decision.

Data availability: Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Bresch, A. Vasseur, and C. Yu, Global existence of entropy-weak solutions to the compressible Navier–Stokes equations with non-linear density dependent viscosities, *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* **24** (2022), 1791–1837.
- [2] D. Bresch and P. Jabin, Global existence of weak solutions for compressible Navier–Stokes equations: thermodynamically unstable pressure and anisotropic viscous stress tensor, *Ann. of Math.* **188** (2018), 77–684.
- [3] H. Brezis, *Functional Analysis, Sobolev Spaces and Partial Differential Equations*, Springer: New York, 2011.
- [4] G.-Q. Chen, D. Hoff, and K. Trivisa, Global solutions of the compressible Navier–Stokes equations with large discontinuous initial data, *Commun. Partial. Differ. Equ.* **25** (2000), 2233–2257.
- [5] G.-Q. Chen and M. Kratka, Global solutions to the Navier–Stokes equations for compressible heat-conducting flow with symmetry and free boundary, *Commun. Partial. Differ. Equ.* **27** (2002), 907–943.
- [6] Y. Cho and H. Kim, Existence results for viscous polytropic fluids with vacuum, *J. Differ. Equ.* **228** (2006), 377–411.
- [7] R. Danchin, Global existence in critical spaces for compressible Navier–Stokes equations, *Invent. Math.* **141** (2000), 579–614.
- [8] R. Danchin, Global existence in critical spaces for compressible viscous and heat conductive gases, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **160** (2001), 1–39.
- [9] E. Feireisl, A. Novotný and H. Petzeltová, On the existence of globally defined weak solutions to the Navier–Stokes equations, *J. Math. Fluid Mech.* **3** (2001), 358–392.
- [10] E. Feireisl, On the motion of a viscous, compressible, and heat conducting fluid, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **53** (2004), 1705–1738.
- [11] E. Feireisl, *Dynamics of Viscous Compressible Fluids*, Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2004.
- [12] H. Frid and V. Shelukhin, Vanishing shear viscosity in the equations of compressible fluids for the flows with the cylinder symmetry, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **31** (2000), 1144–1156.
- [13] B. Haspot, Global $bmo^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ radially symmetric solution for compressible Navier–Stokes equations with initial density in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$, arXiv: 1901.03143v1, 2019.
- [14] D. Hoff, Discontinuous solutions of the Navier–Stokes equations for compressible flow, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **114** (1991), 15–46.
- [15] D. Hoff, Spherically symmetric solutions of the Navier–Stokes equations for compressible, isothermal flow with large, discontinuous initial data, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **41** (1992), 1225–1302.
- [16] D. Hoff, Global solutions of the Navier–Stokes equations for multidimensional compressible flow with discontinuous initial data, *J. Diff. Equ.* **120** (1995), 215–254.
- [17] D. Hoff, Discontinuous solutions of the Navier–Stokes equations for multi-dimensional flows of heat-conducting fluids, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **139** (1997), 303–354.
- [18] D. Hoff and H. K. Jenssen, Symmetric nonbarotropic flows with large data and forces, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **173** (2004), 297–343.
- [19] D. Hoff and J. Smoller, Non-formation of vacuum states for compressible Navier–Stokes equations, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **216** (2001), 255–276.
- [20] X. Huang and J. Li, Global classical and weak solutions to the three-dimensional full compressible Navier–Stokes system with vacuum and large oscillations, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **227** (2018), 995–1059.
- [21] N. Itaya, The existence and uniqueness of the solution of the equations describing compressible viscous fluid flow, *Proc. Japan Acad.* **46** (1970), 379–382.
- [22] N. Itaya, On the Cauchy problem for the system of fundamental equations describing the movement of compressible viscous fluid, *Kōdai Math. Sem. Rep.* **23** (1971), 60–120.
- [23] S. Jiang, Global spherically symmetric solutions to the equations of a viscous polytropic ideal gas in an exterior domain, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **178** (1996), 339–374.
- [24] S. Jiang and P. Zhang, On spherically symmetric solutions of the compressible isentropic Navier–Stokes equations, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **215** (2001), 559–581.
- [25] S. Jiang and P. Zhang, Remarks on weak solutions to the Navier–Stokes equations for 2-D compressible isothermal fluids with spherically symmetric initial data. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **51** (2002), 345–355.
- [26] S. Jiang and P. Zhang, Axisymmetric solutions of the 3D Navier–Stokes equations for compressible isentropic fluids, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **82** (2003), 949–973.
- [27] S. Jiang and A. Zlotnik, Global well-posedness of the Cauchy problem for the equations of a one-dimensional viscous heat-conducting gas with Lebesgue initial data, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A* **134** (2004), 939–960.

- [28] S. Kawashima, Systems of A hyperbolic-parabolic composite type, with applications to the equations of magnetohydrodynamics, Ph.D Thesis, Kyoto University, DOI: 10.14989/doctor.k3193, 1983.
- [29] S. Kawashima and T. Nishida, Global solutions to the initial value problem for the equations of one-dimensional motion of viscous polytropic gases, *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.* **21** (1981), 825–837.
- [30] A. V. Kazhikhov and V. V. Shelukhin, Unique global solution with respect to time of initial-boundary value problems for one-dimensional equations of a viscous gas, *Prikl. Mat. Meh.* **41** (1977), 282–291.
- [31] J. Li and Z. Xin, Global existence of weak solutions to the barotropic compressible Navier-Stokes flows with degenerate viscosities, [arXiv:1504.06826](https://arxiv.org/abs/1504.06826), 2016.
- [32] P. L. Lions, Existence globale de solutions pour les équations de Navier-Stokes compressibles isentropiques, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.* **316** (1993), 1335–1340.
- [33] P. L. Lions, *Mathematical Topics in Fluid Mechanics. Vol. 2. Compressible Models*, Oxford University Press: New York, 1998.
- [34] A. Matsumura and T. Nishida, The initial value problem for the equations of motion of viscous and heat-conductive gases, *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.* **20** (1980), 67–104.
- [35] F. Merle, P. Raphael, I. Rodnianski, and J. Szeftel, On the implosion of a compressible fluid I: Smooth self-similar inviscid profiles, *Ann. Math.* **196** (2022), 567–778.
- [36] J. Nash, Le problème de Cauchy pour les équations différentielles d’un fluide général, *Bull. Soc. Math. Fr.* **90** (1962), 487–497.
- [37] J. Serrin, On the uniqueness of compressible fluid motion, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **3** (1959), 271–288.
- [38] A. Tani, On the first initial-boundary value problem of compressible viscous fluid motion, *Publ. RIMS, Kyoto Univ.* **13** (1977), 193–253.
- [39] A. F. Vasseur and C. Yu, Existence of global weak solutions for 3D degenerate compressible Navier-Stokes equations, *Invent. Math.* **206** (2016), 935–974.
- [40] H. Wen and C. Zhu, Global solutions to the three-dimensional full compressible Navier-Stokes equations with vacuum at infinity in some classes of large data, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **49** (2017), 162–221.
- [41] Z. Xin and H. Yuan, Vacuum state for spherically symmetric solutions of the compressible Navier-Stokes equations, *J. Hyperbolic Differ. Equ.* **3** (2006), 403–442.
- [42] H. F. Yashima and R. Benabidallah, Unicité de la solution de l’équation monodimensionnelle ou à symétrie sphérique d’un gaz visqueux et calorifère, *Rendiconti del Circolo Mat. di Palermo* **42** (1993), 195–218.
- [43] H. F. Yashima and R. Benabidallah, Equation à symétrie sphérique d’un gaz visqueux et calorifère avec la surface libre, *Ann. di Mat. Pura ed Appl.* **168** (1995), 75–117.
- [44] A. A. Zlotnik and A. A. Amosov, On the stability of generalized solutions of equations of one-dimensional motion of a viscous heat-conducting gas, *Sibirsk. Mat. Zh.* **38** (1997), 767–789.
- [45] A. A. Zlotnik and A. A. Amosov, Stability of generalized solutions of the one-dimensional motion of a viscous heat-conducting gas, *Mat. Zametki* **63** (1998), 835–846.

GUI-QIANG G. CHEN: MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, OXFORD, OX2 6GG, UK.
Email address: chengq@maths.ox.ac.uk

YUCONG HUANG: MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, OXFORD, OX2 6GG, UK.
Email address: yucong.huang@maths.ox.ac.uk

SHENGGUO ZHU: SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, CMA-SHANGHAI, AND MOE-LSC, SHANGHAI JIAO TONG UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI, 200240, CHINA.
Email address: zhushengguo@sjtu.edu.cn