

HIGHER-ORDER ERROR ESTIMATES FOR PHYSICS-INFORMED NEURAL NETWORKS APPROXIMATING THE PRIMITIVE EQUATIONS

RUIMENG HU, QUYUAN LIN*, ALAN RAYDAN, AND SUI TANG

ABSTRACT. Large scale dynamics of the oceans and the atmosphere are governed by the primitive equations (PEs). Due to the nonlinearity and nonlocality, the numerical study of the PEs is in general a hard task. Neural network has been shown a promising machine learning tool to tackle this challenge. In this work, we employ the physics-informed neural networks (PINNs) to approximate the solutions to the PEs and study the error estimates. We first establish the higher-order regularity for the global solutions to the PEs with either full viscosity and diffusivity, or with only the horizontal ones. Such higher-order regularity results are new and required in the analysis under the PINNs framework. Then we prove the existence of two layer tanh PINNs of which the corresponding training error can be arbitrarily small by taking the width of PINNs to be sufficiently wide, and the error between the true solution and the approximation can be arbitrarily small provided that the training error is small enough and the sample set is large enough. In particular, our analysis includes higher-order (in spatial Sobolev norm) error estimates, and improves existing results in PINNs' literature which concerns only the L^2 error. Numerical results on prototype systems are presented for further illustrating the advantage of using H^s norm during the training.

MSC(2020): 35A35, 35Q35, 35Q86, 65M15

Keywords: primitive equations, hydrostatic Navier-Stokes equations, physics-informed neural networks, higher-order error estimates, numerical analysis

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. The Primitive Equations. The study of the global weather prediction and climate dynamics is largely dependent on the atmosphere and oceans. Ocean currents transport warm water from low latitudes to higher latitudes, where the heat can be released to the atmosphere to balance the earth's temperature. A widely accepted model to describe the motion and state of the atmosphere and ocean is the Boussinesq system, a combination of the Navier–Stokes equations (NSE) with rotation and a heat (or salinity) transport equation. As a result of the extraordinary organization and complexity of the flow in the atmosphere and ocean, the full governing equations appear to be difficult to analyze, at least for the foreseeable future. In particular, the global existence and uniqueness of smooth solution to the 3D NSE is one of the most challenging mathematical problems.

Fortunately, when studying oceanic and atmospheric dynamics at the planetary scale, the vertical scale (a few kilometers for the ocean, 10-20 kilometers for the atmosphere) is much smaller than the horizontal scale (many thousands of kilometers). Accordingly, the large-scale ocean and atmosphere satisfy the hydrostatic balance based on scale analysis, meteorological observations, and historical data. By virtue of this, the primitive equations (PEs, also called the hydrostatic Navier-Stokes equations) are derived as the asymptotic limit of the small aspect ratio between the vertical and horizontal length scales from the Boussinesq system [2, 27, 53, 54]. Because of the impressive accuracy, the following 3D viscous PEs is a

Date: September 27, 2022.

*Corresponding author. Department of Mathematics, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA. E-mail address: quyuan.lin@ucsb.edu.

widely used model in geophysics (see, e.g., [4, 30, 31, 36, 39, 50, 63, 67] and references therein):

$$\partial_t V + V \cdot \nabla_h V + w \partial_z V - \nu_h \Delta_h V - \nu_z \partial_{zz} V + f_0 V^\perp + \nabla_h p = 0, \quad (1.1a)$$

$$\partial_z p + T = 0, \quad (1.1b)$$

$$\nabla_h \cdot V + \partial_z w = 0, \quad (1.1c)$$

$$\partial_t T + V \cdot \nabla_h T + w \partial_z T - \kappa_h \Delta_h T - \kappa_z \partial_{zz} T = Q. \quad (1.1d)$$

Here the horizontal velocity $V = (u, v)$, vertical velocity w , the pressure p , and the temperature T are the unknown quantities which are functions of the time and space variables (t, x, y, z) . The $2D$ horizontal gradient and Laplacian are denoted by $\nabla_h = (\partial_x, \partial_y)$ and $\Delta_h = \partial_{xx} + \partial_{yy}$, respectively. The nonnegative constants ν_h, ν_z, κ_h and κ_z are the horizontal viscosity, the vertical viscosity, the horizontal diffusivity and the vertical diffusivity coefficients, respectively. The parameter $f_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ stands for the Coriolis parameter, Q is a given heat source, and the notation $V^\perp = (-v, u)$ is used.

According to whether the system has horizontal or vertical viscosity, there are mainly four different models considered in the literature (some works also consider the anisotropic diffusivity).

Case 1 PEs with full viscosity, i.e., $\nu_h > 0, \nu_z > 0$: The global well-posedness of strong solutions in Sobolev spaces was first established in [14], and later in [44]; see also the subsequent articles [49] for different boundary conditions, as well as [38] for some progress towards relaxing the smoothness on the initial data by using the semigroup method.

Case 2 PEs with only horizontal viscosity, i.e., $\nu_h > 0, \nu_z = 0$: [10–12] consider horizontally viscous PEs with anisotropic diffusivity and establish global well-posedness.

Case 3 PEs with only vertical viscosity, i.e., $\nu_h = 0, \nu_z > 0$: Without the horizontal viscosity, PEs are shown to be ill-posed in Sobolev spaces [66]. In order to get well-posedness, one can consider some additional weak dissipation [13], or assume the initial data have Gevrey regularity and be convex [28], or be analytic in the horizontal direction [55, 61]. It is worth mentioning that whether smooth solutions exist globally or form singularity in finite time is still open.

Case 4 Inviscid PEs, i.e., $\nu_h = 0, \nu_z = 0$: The inviscid PEs are ill-posed in Sobolev spaces [35, 41, 66]. Moreover, smooth solutions of the inviscid PEs can form singularity in finite time [9, 18, 41, 76]. On the other hand, with either some special structures (local Rayleigh condition) on the initial data in $2D$, or real analyticity in all directions for general initial data in both $2D$ and $3D$, the local well-posedness can be achieved [6, 7, 29, 34, 47, 48, 58].

Others also consider stochastic PEs, that is, the system (1.1) with additional random external forcing terms (usually characterized by generalized Wiener processes on a Hilbert space). For existence and uniqueness of solutions to those systems, see [8, 24, 25, 32, 33, 37, 40, 68, 72].

In this paper, we focus on **Case 1** and **Case 2** in which the well-posedness is established in Sobolev spaces. **Case 1** is also assumed to have full diffusivity, while **Case 2** is considered to have only horizontal diffusivity. The analysis of the **Case 3** and **Case 4** requires rather different techniques as those models are ill-posed in Sobolev spaces for general initial data, and are left for future work.

System (1.1) has been studied under some proper boundary conditions. For example, as introduced in [10, 29], we consider the domain to be $\mathcal{D} := \mathcal{M} \times (0, 1)$ with $\mathcal{M} := (0, 1) \times (0, 1)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} V, w, p, T \text{ are periodic in } (x, y, z) \text{ with period } 1, \\ V \text{ and } p \text{ are even in } z, \text{ and } w \text{ and } T \text{ are odd in } z. \end{aligned} \quad (1.2)$$

Note that the space of periodic functions with such symmetry condition is invariant under the dynamics of system (1.1), provided that Q is periodic in (x, y, z) and odd in z . When system (1.1) is considered in $2D$ space, the system will be independent of y variable. In addition to the boundary condition, one needs

to impose the initial condition

$$(V, T)|_{t=0} = (V_0, T_0). \quad (1.3)$$

We point out that there is no initial condition for w since w is a diagnostic variables and it can be written in terms of V (see (2.1)). This is different from the Navier-Stokes equations and Boussinesq system.

1.2. PINNs. Due to the nonlinearity and nonlocality of many PDEs (including PEs), the numerical study for them is in general a hard task. A non-exhaustive list of the numerical study of PEs includes [5, 15–17, 45, 46, 56, 62, 69, 70, 73] and references therein. In the past few years, deep neural network has emerged as a promising alternative, but it requires an abundance of data that cannot always be found in scientific research. Instead, such networks can be trained from additional information obtained by enforcing the physical laws. Physics-informed machine learning integrates seamlessly data and mathematical physics models, even in partially understood, uncertain and high-dimensional contexts [42].

Recently, physics-informed neural networks (PINNs) have been shown as a efficient tool in scientific computing and in solving challenging PDEs. PINNs, which approximate solutions to PDEs by training neural networks to minimize the residuals coming from the initial conditions, the boundary conditions, and the PDE operators, have gained a lot of attention and been studied intensively. The study of PINNs can be retrived back to the 90s [26, 51, 52]. Very recently, [64, 65] introduced and illustrated the PINNs approach for solving nonlinear PDEs, which can handle both forward problems and inverse problems. For a much more complete list of recent advances in the study of PINNs, we refer the readers to [19, 42] and references therein. We also remark that the deep Galerkin method [71] share a similar spirit with PINNs.

In addition to investigating the efficiency and accuracy of PINNs in solving PDEs numerically, researchers are also interested in rigorously evaluating the error estimates. In a series of works [20, 22, 59, 60], the authors studied the error analysis of PINNs for approximating several different type of PDEs. It is worth mentioning that, recently, there is a result on generic bounds for PINNs established in [23]. We remark that our work are devoted to establish higher-order error estimates based on the higher-order regularity of the solutions to the PEs. The analysis requires nontrivial efforts and techniques due to the special characteristics of the PEs, and these results are not trivially followed from [23].

To set up the PINNs framework for our problem, we fix the following notations. For some positive time $\mathcal{T} > 0$ we seek deep neural networks $(V_\theta, w_\theta, p_\theta, T_\theta) : \mathcal{D} \times [0, \mathcal{T}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ with $d \in \{2, 3\}$ which approximate the solution (V, w, p, T) of system (1.1). As an optimization problem, we try to minimize the residuals from the PDE operators (defined in (2.4)), the residuals from the initial conditions (defined in (2.5)), and the residuals from the boundary conditions (defined in (2.6)). To be more precise, for some regularity constant $s \in \mathbb{N}$ we want to minimize the *generalization error* $\mathcal{E}_G[s; \theta]$ (defined in (2.7)). Notice that when $(V_\theta, w_\theta, p_\theta, T_\theta) = (V, w, p, T)$ is the exact solution, all the residuals will be zero and thus $\mathcal{E}_G[s; \theta] = 0$. However, in practice one can only approximate the integral appearing in $\mathcal{E}_G[s; \theta]$ by a suitable numerical quadrature, which results in minimizing the *training error* $\mathcal{E}_T[s; \theta; \mathcal{S}]$ (defined in (2.8)). The mechanism of PINNs is to achieve a small *total error* $\mathcal{E}[s; \theta]$ (defined in (2.10)) by minimizing the training error (2.8).

In this work, we mainly want to answer two crucial questions concerning the reliability of PINNs:

- Q1:** The existence of neural networks $(V_\theta, w_\theta, p_\theta, T_\theta)$ such that the training error $\mathcal{E}_T[s; \theta; \mathcal{S}] < \epsilon$ for arbitrary $\epsilon > 0$;
- Q2:** The control of total error $\mathcal{E}[s; \theta]$ by the training error with large enough sample set \mathcal{S} , i.e., $\mathcal{E}[s; \theta] \lesssim \mathcal{E}_T[s; \theta; \mathcal{S}] + C|\mathcal{S}|^{-\alpha}$ for some positive constant $\alpha > 0$.

An affirmative answer to **Q1** implies that the PINNs can be obtained so that the corresponding training error is arbitrarily small. An affirmative answer to **Q2** guarantees that $(V_\theta, w_\theta, p_\theta, T_\theta)$ can approximate the true solution arbitrarily well in some Sobolev norms as long as we can train the neural networks to

have small enough training error $\mathcal{E}_T[s; \theta; \mathcal{S}]$ with large enough sample set \mathcal{S} . As discussed in [20], in order to answer **Q1** and **Q2**, one can in turn consider the following three sub-questions:

SubQ1: The existence of neural networks $(V_\theta, w_\theta, p_\theta, T_\theta)$ such that the generalization error $\mathcal{E}_G[s; \theta]$ can be made arbitrary small, i.e., $\mathcal{E}_G[s; \theta] < \epsilon$ for arbitrary $\epsilon > 0$;

SubQ2: The control of total error by generalization error, i.e., $\mathcal{E}[s; \theta] \lesssim \mathcal{E}_G[s; \theta]$;

SubQ3: The difference between the generalization error and the training error can be made arbitrarily small, i.e., $|\mathcal{E}_G[s; \theta] - \mathcal{E}_T[s; \theta; \mathcal{S}]| < \epsilon$ for arbitrary $\epsilon > 0$.

Specifically, the answers of **SubQ1** and **SubQ3** lead to the positive answer of **Q1**, and the answers of **SubQ2** and **SubQ3** give the solution to **Q2**.

Our main contributions and results in this work are the followings:

- We establish the higher-order regularity result for the solutions to the PEs under **Case 1** and **Case 2**, see Theorem 3.4. Such result is new and necessary as the smoothness of the solutions is required in order to perform higher-order error analysis for PINNs.
- We answer **Q1** and **Q2** (and **SubQ1–SubQ3**) for the PINNs approximating the solutions to the PEs, which shows the PINNs is a reliable numerical method for solving PEs, see Theorems 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4.
- Rather than just consider L^2 norm in the errors [20, 60], i.e., $\mathcal{E}[s; \theta], \mathcal{E}_G[s; \theta], \mathcal{E}_T[s; \theta; \mathcal{S}]$ with $s = 0$, we use higher-order H^s norm in $\mathcal{E}[s; \theta], \mathcal{E}_G[s; \theta], \mathcal{E}_T[s; \theta; \mathcal{S}]$ for $s \in \mathbb{N}$. We prove that the usage of H^s norm in \mathcal{E}_T will yield more accurate approximations to the solutions in the sense that \mathcal{E} is smaller under H^s norm (indeed, \mathcal{E} is controlled by the corresponding \mathcal{E}_T , see also Remark 4). The numerical performance in Section 5 further verifies our theory. Such results are crucial, as some problems do require higher-order estimates, for example, the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation requires the L^p error estimate with p large enough in order to be stable, see [75]. We believe that the higher-order error estimates developed in this work can be readily applied to other PDEs, for example, the Euler equations, the Navier-Stokes equations, and the Boussinesq system.

The rest of the paper is organized as the following. In Section 2, we introduce the notation and collect some preliminary results that will be used in this paper. In Section 3, we prove the higher-order regularity of the solutions to the PEs under **Case 1** and **Case 2**. In Section 4, we establish the main results of this paper by answering **Q1** and **Q2** (through **SubQ1–SubQ3**) discussed above. At the end, we present some numerical experiments in Section 5 to support our theoretical results on the accuracy of the approximation under higher-order Sobolev norm.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we introduce the notation and collect some preliminary results that will be used in the rest of this paper. The universal constant C appears below may change from step to step, and we use the subscript to emphasize its dependence when necessary, e.g., C_r is a constant depending only on r .

2.1. Functional Settings. We use the notation $\mathbf{x} := (\mathbf{x}', z) = (x, y, z) \in \mathcal{D}$, where \mathbf{x}' and z represent the horizontal and vertical variables, respectively, and for a positive time $\mathcal{T} > 0$ we denote by

$$\Omega = [0, \mathcal{T}] \times \mathcal{D}.$$

Let $\nabla = (\partial_x, \partial_y, \partial_z)$ and $\Delta = \partial_{xx} + \partial_{yy} + \partial_{zz}$ be the three dimensional gradient and Laplacian, and $\nabla_h = (\partial_x, \partial_y)$ and $\Delta_h = \partial_{xx} + \partial_{yy}$ be the horizontal ones. Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n$ be mult-indices. We say $\alpha \leq \beta$ if

and only if $\alpha_i \leq \beta_i$ for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. The notation

$$|\alpha| = \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j, \quad \alpha! = \prod_{j=1}^n \alpha_j!, \quad \binom{\alpha}{\beta} = \frac{\alpha!}{\beta!(\alpha - \beta)!}$$

will be used throughout the paper. Let $P_{m,n} = \{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n, |\alpha| = m\}$, and denote by $|P_{m,n}|$ the cardinality of $P_{m,n}$, which is given by $|P_{m,n}| = \binom{m+n-1}{m}$. For a function f defined on an open subset $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in U$, we denote the partial derivative of f with multi-index α by $D^\alpha f = \frac{\partial^{|\alpha|} f}{\partial x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots \partial x_n^{\alpha_n}}$. Let

$$L^2(U) = \left\{ f : \int_U |f(x)|^2 dx < \infty \right\}$$

be the usual L^2 space associated with the Lebesgue measure restricted on U , endowed with the norm $\|f\|_{L^2(U)} = (\int_U |f|^2 dx)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, coming from the inner product $\langle f, g \rangle = \int_U f(x)g(x) dx$ for $f, g \in L^2(U)$. For $r \in \mathbb{N}$, denote by $H^r(U)$ the Sobolev spaces:

$$H^r(U) = \{f \in L^2(U) : \|D^\alpha f\|_{L^2(U)} < \infty \text{ for } |\alpha| \leq r\},$$

endowed with the norm $\|f\|_{H^r(U)} = (\sum_{|\alpha| \leq r} \int_U |D^\alpha f|^2 dx)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. For more details about the Sobolev spaces, we refer the readers to [1]. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{V}_e &:= \left\{ \varphi \in C^\infty(\mathcal{D}) : \varphi \text{ is periodic in } (x, y, z) \text{ and even in } z, \int_0^1 \nabla_h \cdot \varphi(\mathbf{x}', z) dz = 0 \right\}, \\ \tilde{V}_o &:= \{ \varphi \in C^\infty(\mathcal{D}) : \varphi \text{ is periodic in } (x, y, z) \text{ and odd in } z \}, \end{aligned}$$

and denote by $H_e^r(\mathcal{D})$ and $H_o^r(\mathcal{D})$ the closure spaces of \tilde{V}_e and \tilde{V}_o , respectively, under the H^r -topology. When $r = 0$, $H_e^r(\mathcal{D}) = L_e^2(\mathcal{D})$ and $H_o^r(\mathcal{D}) = L_o^2(\mathcal{D})$. Note that in the $2D$ case, all notations need to be adapted accordingly by letting $\mathcal{M} = (0, 1)$. When the functional space and the norm are defined in the spatial domain \mathcal{D} , we frequently write L^2 , H^r , $\|\cdot\|_{L^2}$, and $\|\cdot\|_{H^r}$ by omitting \mathcal{D} when there is no confusion.

By virtue of (1.1c) and the boundary condition (1.2), one can rewrite w as

$$w(\mathbf{x}', z) = - \int_0^z \nabla_h \cdot V(\mathbf{x}', \tilde{z}) d\tilde{z}. \quad (2.1)$$

Notice that since $w(z = 1) = 0$, V satisfies the compatibility condition

$$\int_0^1 \nabla_h \cdot V(\mathbf{x}', \tilde{z}) d\tilde{z} = 0. \quad (2.2)$$

By Cauchy–Schwarz inequality,

$$\|w\|_{H^r(\mathcal{D})}^2 = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq r} \int_{\mathcal{D}} \left| D^\alpha \int_0^z \nabla_h \cdot V(\mathbf{x}', \tilde{z}) d\tilde{z} \right|^2 d\mathbf{x} \leq C \|\nabla_h V\|_{H^r(\mathcal{D})}^2. \quad (2.3)$$

2.2. PINNs Settings. We define the following residuals from the PDE system (1.1):

$$\text{(PDE residuals)} \quad \begin{cases} \mathcal{R}_{i,V}[\theta] := \partial_t V_\theta + V_\theta \cdot \nabla_h V_\theta + w_\theta \partial_z V_\theta + f_0 V_\theta^\perp - \nu_h \Delta_h V_\theta - \nu_z \partial_{zz} V_\theta + \nabla_h p_\theta, \\ \mathcal{R}_{i,p}[\theta] := \partial_z p_\theta + T_\theta, \\ \mathcal{R}_{i,T}[\theta] := \partial_t T_\theta + V_\theta \cdot \nabla_h T_\theta + w_\theta \partial_z T_\theta - \kappa_h \Delta_h T_\theta - \kappa_z \partial_{zz} T_\theta - Q, \\ \mathcal{R}_{i,div}[\theta] := \nabla_h \cdot V_\theta + \partial_z w_\theta, \end{cases} \quad (2.4)$$

the residuals from the initial conditions (1.3):

$$\text{(initial residuals)} \quad \begin{cases} \mathcal{R}_{t,V}[\theta] := V_\theta(t=0) - V_0, \\ \mathcal{R}_{t,T}[\theta] := T_\theta(t=0) - T_0, \end{cases} \quad (2.5)$$

and for $s \in \mathbb{N}$, the residuals from the boundary conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(boundary residuals)} \quad \mathcal{R}_b[s; \theta] := & \left\{ \sum_{\varphi \in \{V_\theta, w_\theta, p_\theta, T_\theta\}} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s} \left[\left(D^\alpha \varphi(x=1, y, z) - D^\alpha \varphi(x=0, y, z) \right)^2 \right. \right. \\ & + \left(D^\alpha \varphi(x, y=1, z) - D^\alpha \varphi(x, y=0, z) \right)^2 \\ & + \left. \left(D^\alpha \varphi(x, y, z=1) - D^\alpha \varphi(x, y, z=0) \right)^2 \right] \\ & + \left. \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s, \alpha_3=0} \left[\left(D^\alpha w_\theta(x, y, z=1) \right)^2 + \left(D^\alpha w_\theta(x, y, z=0) \right)^2 \right] \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

For $s \in \mathbb{N}$, the generalization error is defined by

$$\text{(generalization error)} \quad \mathcal{E}_G[s; \theta] := \left(\mathcal{E}_G^i[s; \theta]^2 + \mathcal{E}_G^t[s; \theta]^2 + \mathcal{E}_G^b[s; \theta]^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (2.7)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_G^i[s; \theta]^2 &:= \int_0^T \left(\|\mathcal{R}_{i,V}[\theta]\|_{H^s(\mathcal{D})}^2 + \|\mathcal{R}_{i,p}[\theta]\|_{H^s(\mathcal{D})}^2 + \|\mathcal{R}_{i,T}[\theta]\|_{H^s(\mathcal{D})}^2 + \|\mathcal{R}_{i,div}[\theta]\|_{H^s(\mathcal{D})}^2 \right) dt, \\ \mathcal{E}_G^t[s; \theta]^2 &:= \|\mathcal{R}_{t,V}[\theta]\|_{H^s(\mathcal{D})}^2 + \|\mathcal{R}_{t,T}[\theta]\|_{H^s(\mathcal{D})}^2, \\ \mathcal{E}_G^b[s; \theta]^2 &:= \int_0^T \|\mathcal{R}_b[s; \theta]\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{D})}^2 dt, \end{aligned}$$

and the training error is defined by

$$\text{(training error)} \quad \mathcal{E}_T[s; \theta; \mathcal{S}] := \left(\mathcal{E}_T^i[s; \theta; \mathcal{S}_i]^2 + \mathcal{E}_T^t[s; \theta; \mathcal{S}_t]^2 + \mathcal{E}_T^b[s; \theta; \mathcal{S}_b]^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (2.8)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_T^i[s; \theta; \mathcal{S}_i]^2 &:= \sum_{(t_n, x_n, y_n, z_n) \in \mathcal{S}_i} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s} w_n^i \left[\left(D^\alpha \mathcal{R}_{i,V}[\theta](t_n, x_n, y_n, z_n) \right)^2 + \left(D^\alpha \mathcal{R}_{i,p}[\theta](t_n, x_n, y_n, z_n) \right)^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \left(D^\alpha \mathcal{R}_{i,T}[\theta](t_n, x_n, y_n, z_n) \right)^2 + \left(D^\alpha \mathcal{R}_{i,div}[\theta](t_n, x_n, y_n, z_n) \right)^2 \right], \\ \mathcal{E}_T^t[s; \theta; \mathcal{S}_t]^2 &:= \sum_{(x_n, y_n, z_n) \in \mathcal{S}_t} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s} w_n^t \left[\left(D^\alpha \mathcal{R}_{t,V}[\theta](x_n, y_n, z_n) \right)^2 + \left(D^\alpha \mathcal{R}_{t,T}[\theta](x_n, y_n, z_n) \right)^2 \right], \\ \mathcal{E}_T^b[s; \theta; \mathcal{S}_b]^2 &:= \sum_{(t_n, x_n, y_n, z_n) \in \mathcal{S}_b} w_n^b \left(\mathcal{R}_b[s; \theta](t_n, x_n, y_n, z_n) \right)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

with quadrature points in space-time constituting data sets $\mathcal{S} = (\mathcal{S}_i, \mathcal{S}_t, \mathcal{S}_b)$ with $\mathcal{S}_i \subseteq [0, T] \times \mathcal{D}$, $\mathcal{S}_t \subseteq \mathcal{D}$, $\mathcal{S}_b \subseteq [0, T] \times \partial\mathcal{D}$ and (w_n^i, w_n^t, w_n^b) being the quadrature weights, defined in (4.21) and (4.22), respectively. Finally, for $s \in \mathbb{N}$, the total error is defined as

$$\text{(total error)} \quad \mathcal{E}[s; \theta] := \left(\int_0^T (\|V - V_\theta\|_{H^s}^2 + \|T - T_\theta\|_{H^s}^2) dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (2.10)$$

Remark 1. In our setting, we impose periodic boundary conditions, (V, p) to be even in z , and (w, T) to be odd in z . The assumption of evenness and oddness is to allow us to perform the periodic extension in the z direction. This can be ignored when one wants to control the total error from the generalization

error. We also want to emphasize that, the boundary conditions $w|_{z=0,1} = 0$ and $D^\alpha w|_{z=0,1} = 0$ with $\alpha_3 = 0$ have physical meanings, and are essential in the error estimate. Therefore they are included in the boundary residuals $\mathcal{R}_b[s; \theta]$.

3. REGULARITY OF SOLUTIONS TO THE PRIMITIVE EQUATIONS

We first give the definition of strong solutions to system (1.1) under **Case 1**. The following definition is similar to the ones appearing in [10, 14].

Definition 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{T} > 0$ and let $V_0 \in H_e^2(\mathcal{D})$ and $T_0 \in H_o^2(\mathcal{D})$. A couple (V, T) is called a strong solution to system (1.1) on $\Omega = [0, \mathcal{T}] \times \mathcal{D}$ if*

(i) *V and T have the regularities*

$$\begin{aligned} V &\in L^\infty(0, \mathcal{T}; H_e^2(\mathcal{D})) \cap C([0, \mathcal{T}]; H_e^1(\mathcal{D})), & T &\in L^\infty(0, \mathcal{T}; H_o^2(\mathcal{D})) \cap C([0, \mathcal{T}]; H_o^1(\mathcal{D})) \\ (\nabla_h V, \nu_z V_z) &\in L^2(0, \mathcal{T}; H^2(\mathcal{D})), & (\nabla_h T, \kappa_z T_z) &\in L^2(0, \mathcal{T}; H^2(\mathcal{D})) \\ \partial_t V &\in L^2(0, \mathcal{T}; H^1(\mathcal{D})), & \partial_t T &\in L^2(0, \mathcal{T}; H^1(\mathcal{D})); \end{aligned}$$

(ii) *V and T satisfy system (1.1) a.e. in $\Omega = [0, \mathcal{T}] \times \mathcal{D}$ and the initial condition (1.3).*

Definition 3.2. *A couple (V, T) is called a global strong solution to system (1.1) if it is a strong solution on $\Omega = [0, \mathcal{T}] \times \mathcal{D}$ for any $\mathcal{T} > 0$.*

The theorem below is from [10] and concerns the global well-posedness of system (1.1) under **Case 2**.

Theorem 3.3 ([10, Theorem 1.3]). *Suppose that $Q = 0$, $V_0 \in H_e^2(\mathcal{D})$ and $T_0 \in H_o^2(\mathcal{D})$. Then system (1.1) has a unique global strong solution (V, T) , which is continuously dependent on the initial data.*

Remark 2. Theorem 3.3 works for **Case 2**. It can be easily extended to **Case 1**, i.e., $\nu_h, \kappa_h, \nu_z, \kappa_z > 0$ (see [10, Proposition 2.6]). Moreover, under **Case 1**, the solution (V, T) satisfies that $V \in L^2(0, \mathcal{T}; H_e^3(\mathcal{D}))$ and $T \in L^2(0, \mathcal{T}; H_o^3(\mathcal{D}))$ as indicated in Definition 3.1. Theorem 3.3 is proved in [10] with $d = 3$, but it also holds when $d = 2$. The requirement $Q = 0$ can be replaced with Q being regular enough, for example, $Q \in L^\infty(0, \mathcal{T}; H_o^2(\mathcal{D}))$ for arbitrary $\mathcal{T} > 0$.

In order to perform the error analysis for PINNs, we need to establish a higher-order regularity for the solution (V, T) , in particular, the continuity in both spatial and temporal variables. This is summarized in the theorem below.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $k, r \in \mathbb{N}$, $d \in \{2, 3\}$, $r > \frac{d}{2} + 2k$, $\mathcal{T} > 0$, and denote by $\Omega = [0, \mathcal{T}] \times \mathcal{D}$. Suppose that $V_0 \in H_e^r(\mathcal{D})$, $T_0 \in H_o^r(\mathcal{D})$, and $Q \in C^{k-1}([0, \mathcal{T}]; H_o^r(\mathcal{D}))$. Then system (1.1) has a unique global strong solution (V, T) , which depends continuously on the initial data. Moreover, we have*

$$(V, T) \in L^\infty(0, \mathcal{T}; H^r(\mathcal{D})) \cap C([0, \mathcal{T}]; H^{r-1}(\mathcal{D})), \quad (3.1a)$$

$$(\nabla_h V, \nu_z V_z, \nabla_h T, \kappa_z T_z) \in L^2(0, \mathcal{T}; H^r(\mathcal{D})) \cap C([0, \mathcal{T}]; H^{r-1}(\mathcal{D})), \quad (3.1b)$$

$$(\partial_t V, \partial_t T) \in L^2(0, \mathcal{T}; H^{r-1}(\mathcal{D})), \quad (3.1c)$$

and

$$(V, T) \in C^k(\Omega), \quad (w, \nabla p) \in C^{k-1}(\Omega). \quad (3.2)$$

To prove Theorem 3.4, we shall need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.5 ([43, Lemma A.1], see also [3]). *Let $s \geq 1$, and suppose that $f, g \in H^s(\mathcal{D})$. Let α be a multi-index such that $|\alpha| \leq s$. Then*

$$\|D^\alpha(fg) - fD^\alpha g\|_{L^2} \leq C_s (\|f\|_{H^s} \|g\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla f\|_{L^\infty} \|g\|_{H^{s-1}}).$$

Proof of Theorem 3.4. We perform the proof when $d = 3$. The case of $d = 2$ follows similarly. Notice that in our setting $r > 3$. Let's first consider **Case 1**.

Case 1: full viscosity.

We start by showing that, for arbitrary fixed $\mathcal{T} > 0$, we have

$$(V, T) \in C([0, \mathcal{T}]; H^3(\mathcal{D})) \cap L^2(0, \mathcal{T}; H^4(\mathcal{D})), \quad \text{and} \quad (\partial_t V, \partial_t T) \in L^2(0, \mathcal{T}; H^2(\mathcal{D})).$$

Let $|\alpha| \leq 3$ be a multi-index. Taking D^α derivative on the system (1.1), and then taking the inner product of (1.1a) with $D^\alpha V$ and (1.1d) with $D^\alpha T$, by summing over all $|\alpha| \leq 3$. One has

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (\|V\|_{H^3}^2 + \|T\|_{H^3}^2) + \nu_h \|\nabla_h V\|_{H^3}^2 + \nu_z \|\partial_z V\|_{H^3}^2 + \kappa_h \|\nabla_h T\|_{H^3}^2 + \kappa_z \|\partial_z T\|_{H^3}^2 \\ &= \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 3} \left(-\langle D^\alpha(V \cdot \nabla_h V + wV_z), D^\alpha V \rangle - \langle D^\alpha(V \cdot \nabla_h T + wT_z), D^\alpha T \rangle \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \langle D^\alpha \nabla_h p, D^\alpha V \rangle + \langle D^\alpha Q, D^\alpha T \rangle \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

By integration by parts, thanks to (1.2), (1.1b) and (1.1c), using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, Young's inequality and (2.3), one arrives at the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle D^\alpha \nabla_h p, D^\alpha V \rangle &= -\langle D^\alpha p, D^\alpha \nabla_h \cdot V \rangle = \langle D^\alpha p, D^\alpha \partial_z w \rangle = -\langle D^\alpha \partial_z p, D^\alpha w \rangle = \langle D^\alpha T, D^\alpha w \rangle \\ &\leq \|T\|_{H^3} \|w\|_{H^3} \leq \|T\|_{H^3} \|\nabla_h V\|_{H^3} \leq \frac{1}{4} \nu_h \|\nabla_h V\|_{H^3}^2 + C_{\nu_h} \|T\|_{H^3}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Young's inequality, one deduces

$$\langle D^\alpha Q, D^\alpha T \rangle \leq \|Q\|_{H^3} \|T\|_{H^3} \leq \frac{1}{2} \|Q\|_{H^3}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|T\|_{H^3}^2. \quad (3.5)$$

Using Lemma 3.5, integration by parts, and the boundary condition and (1.1c), from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, Young's inequality and the Sobolev inequality, for all $|\alpha| \leq 3$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle D^\alpha(V \cdot \nabla_h V + wV_z), D^\alpha V \rangle + \langle D^\alpha(V \cdot \nabla_h T + wT_z), D^\alpha T \rangle \\ &= \langle D^\alpha(V \cdot \nabla_h V) - V \cdot D^\alpha \nabla_h V + D^\alpha(wV_z) - wD^\alpha V_z, D^\alpha V \rangle \\ & \quad + \langle D^\alpha(V \cdot \nabla_h T) - V \cdot D^\alpha \nabla_h T + D^\alpha(wT_z) - wD^\alpha T_z, D^\alpha T \rangle \\ & \quad + \underbrace{\langle V \cdot D^\alpha \nabla_h V + wD^\alpha V_z, D^\alpha V \rangle}_{=0} + \underbrace{\langle V \cdot D^\alpha \nabla_h T + wD^\alpha T_z, D^\alpha T \rangle}_{=0} \\ &\leq C \left(\|V\|_{H^3} \|\nabla_h V\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla V\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla_h V\|_{H^2} + \|w\|_{H^3} \|V_z\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla w\|_{L^\infty} \|V_z\|_{H^2} \right) \|V\|_{H^3} \\ & \quad + C \left(\|V\|_{H^3} \|\nabla_h T\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla V\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla_h T\|_{H^2} + \|w\|_{H^3} \|T_z\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla w\|_{L^\infty} \|T_z\|_{H^2} \right) \|T\|_{H^3} \\ &\leq C \|V\|_{H^3}^2 \|\nabla_h V\|_{H^3} + C \|V\|_{H^3} \|T\|_{H^3}^2 + C \|T\|_{H^3}^2 \|\nabla_h V\|_{H^3} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} \nu_h \|\nabla_h V\|_{H^3}^2 + C_{\nu_h} (1 + \|V\|_{H^3}^2 + \|T\|_{H^3}^2) (\|V\|_{H^3}^2 + \|T\|_{H^3}^2). \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Combine the estimates (3.3)–(3.6), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} (\|V\|_{H^3}^2 + \|T\|_{H^3}^2) + \nu_h \|\nabla_h V\|_{H^3}^2 + \nu_z \|\partial_z V\|_{H^3}^2 + \kappa_h \|\nabla_h T\|_{H^3}^2 + \kappa_z \|\partial_z T\|_{H^3}^2 \\ &\leq C_{\nu_h} (1 + \|V\|_{H^3}^2 + \|T\|_{H^3}^2) (\|V\|_{H^3}^2 + \|T\|_{H^3}^2) + C \|Q\|_{H^3}^2. \end{aligned}$$

From Theorem 3.3 we know that $V, T \in L^2(0, \mathcal{T}; H^3(\mathcal{D}))$ for arbitrary $\mathcal{T} > 0$. By Gronwall inequality, for any $t \in [0, \mathcal{T}]$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|V(t)\|_{H^3}^2 + \|T(t)\|_{H^3}^2 + \int_0^t (\nu_h \|\nabla_h V(\tilde{t})\|_{H^3}^2 + \nu_z \|\partial_z V(\tilde{t})\|_{H^3}^2 + \kappa_h \|\nabla_h T(\tilde{t})\|_{H^3}^2 + \kappa_z \|\partial_z T(\tilde{t})\|_{H^3}^2) d\tilde{t} \\ & \leq \left(\|V_0\|_{H^3}^2 + \|T_0\|_{H^3}^2 + C \int_0^{\mathcal{T}} \|Q(\tilde{t})\|_{H^3}^2 d\tilde{t} \right) \exp \left(\int_0^{\mathcal{T}} C_{\nu_h} (1 + \|V(\tilde{t})\|_{H^3}^2 + \|T(\tilde{t})\|_{H^3}^2) d\tilde{t} \right) < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we get

$$(V, T) \in L^\infty(0, \mathcal{T}; H^3(\mathcal{D})) \cap L^2(0, \mathcal{T}; H^4(\mathcal{D})).$$

Now for any $|\alpha| \leq 2$, taking D^α derivative on system (1.1) and then taking the inner product of (1.1a) and (1.1b) with $\varphi \in \{f \in L^2(\mathcal{D}) : \nabla \cdot f = 0\}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \langle D^\alpha \partial_t V, \varphi \rangle &= - \langle D^\alpha (V \cdot \nabla_h V), \varphi \rangle - \langle D^\alpha (w \partial_z V), \varphi \rangle + \nu_h \langle D^\alpha \Delta_h V, \varphi \rangle + \nu_z \langle D^\alpha \partial_{zz} V, \varphi \rangle - f_0 \langle D^\alpha V^\perp, \varphi \rangle \\ &\quad - \langle D^\alpha \nabla_h p, \varphi \rangle - \langle D^\alpha p_z, \varphi \rangle - \langle D^\alpha T, \varphi \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, recalling that H^s is a Banach algebra when $s > \frac{d}{2}$, we have

$$|\langle D^\alpha \partial_t V, \varphi \rangle| \leq (C \|V\|_{H^3}^2 + C_{\nu_h, \nu_z, f_0} \|V\|_{H^4} + \|T\|_{H^2}) \|\varphi\|_{L^2},$$

where we have consecutively used integration by parts and $\nabla \cdot \varphi = 0$ to get $\langle D^\alpha \nabla_h p, \varphi \rangle + \langle D^\alpha p_z, \varphi \rangle = 0$. Since the inequality above is true for any $|\alpha| \leq 2$, and the space $\{f \in L^2(\mathcal{D}) : \nabla \cdot f = 0\}$ is dense in $L^2(\mathcal{D})$, from the regularity of V and T , one deduces

$$\partial_t V \in L^2(0, \mathcal{T}; H^2(\mathcal{D})).$$

A similar argument yields

$$\partial_t T \in L^2(0, \mathcal{T}; H^2(\mathcal{D})).$$

Applying the Lions-Magenes theorem (see *e.g.* [74, Chapter 3, Lemma 1.2]), together with the regularity of $V, T, \partial_t V, \partial_t T$, we obtain

$$(V, T) \in C([0, \mathcal{T}]; H^3(\mathcal{D})).$$

This complete the proof of (3.1) with $r = 3$. The proof of $r = 4$ and all subsequent r is then obtained by repeating the same argument. Therefore under **Case 1**, we achieve (3.1) and moreover, $(V, T) \in C([0, \mathcal{T}]; H^r(\mathcal{D}))$.

Next we show (3.2). Taking the horizontal divergence on equation (1.1a), integrating with respect to z from 0 to 1, and taking the vertical derivative on equation (1.1b) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta p(\mathbf{x}) &= - \int_0^1 \nabla_h \cdot (V \cdot \nabla_h V + w \partial_z V - \nu_h \Delta_h V - \nu_z \partial_{zz} V + f_0 V^\perp)(\mathbf{x}', z) dz - T_z(\mathbf{x}) \\ &= - \int_0^1 \nabla_h \cdot (V \cdot \nabla_h V + w \partial_z V + f_0 V^\perp)(\mathbf{x}', z) dz - T_z(\mathbf{x}), \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

where the viscosity terms disappear due to (1.2) and (2.2). We first consider $k = 1$. Since $r > \frac{d}{2} + 2k$, we know H^{r-2} is a Banach algebra. Since $(V, T) \in C([0, \mathcal{T}]; H^r(\mathcal{D}))$, one has $\Delta p \in C([0, \mathcal{T}]; H^{r-2}(\mathcal{D}))$, and thus $\nabla p \in C([0, \mathcal{T}]; H^{r-1}(\mathcal{D}))$. This implies that $\partial_t V \in C([0, \mathcal{T}]; H^{r-2}(\mathcal{D}))$ and therefore, $V \in C^1([0, \mathcal{T}]; H^{r-2}(\mathcal{D}))$ and $w \in C^1([0, \mathcal{T}]; H^{r-3}(\mathcal{D}))$. Moreover, since $Q \in C^{k-1}([0, \mathcal{T}]; H^r(\mathcal{D}))$, one has $\partial_t T \in C([0, \mathcal{T}]; H^{r-2}(\mathcal{D}))$, consequently $T \in C^1([0, \mathcal{T}]; H^{r-2}(\mathcal{D}))$.

When $k = 2$, since H^{r-4} is a Banach algebra, we can take time derivative on equation (3.7) and get that $\Delta p_t \in C([0, \mathcal{T}]; H^{r-4}(\mathcal{D}))$, and therefore $\nabla p \in C^1([0, \mathcal{T}]; H^{r-3}(\mathcal{D}))$. This implies $\partial_t V \in C^1([0, \mathcal{T}]; H^{r-4}(\mathcal{D}))$

and therefore $V \in C^2([0, \mathcal{T}]; H^{r-4}(\mathcal{D}))$. One can also get $w \in C^2([0, \mathcal{T}]; H^{r-5}(\mathcal{D}))$ and $T \in C^2([0, \mathcal{T}]; H^{r-4}(\mathcal{D}))$. By repeating the above procedure, one will obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (V, T) &\in \cap_{l=0}^k C^l([0, \mathcal{T}]; H^{r-2l}(\mathcal{D})), \\ w &\in \cap_{l=0}^k C^l([0, \mathcal{T}]; H^{r-2l-1}(\mathcal{D})), \\ \nabla p &\in \cap_{l=0}^{k-1} C^l([0, \mathcal{T}]; H^{r-2l-1}(\mathcal{D})). \end{aligned}$$

Then by the Sobolev embedding theorem and $r > \frac{d}{2} + 2k$, we know that $H^{r-2l}(\mathcal{D}) \subset C^{2k-2l}(\mathcal{D})$ for $0 \leq l \leq k$ and $H^{r-2l-1}(\mathcal{D}) \subset C^{2k-2l-1}(\mathcal{D})$ for $0 \leq l \leq k-1$. Therefore,

$$(V, T) \in C^k(\Omega), \quad (w, \nabla p) \in C^{k-1}(\Omega).$$

Case 2: only horizontal viscosity.

Under **Case 2**, the proof of (3.1) when $r = 3$ is more technically involved. The key difference is in the estimate of the nonlinear term.

When $D^\alpha = \partial_z^3$, integration by parts yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \partial_z^3(V \cdot \nabla_h V + wV_z), \partial_z^3 V \rangle + \langle \partial_z^3(V \cdot \nabla_h T + wT_z), \partial_z^3 T \rangle \\ &= \langle \partial_z^3(V \cdot \nabla_h V) - V \cdot \partial_z^3 \nabla_h V + \partial_z^3(wV_z) - w\partial_z^3 V_z, \partial_z^3 V \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle \partial_z^3(V \cdot \nabla_h T) - V \cdot \partial_z^3 \nabla_h T + \partial_z^3(wT_z) - w\partial_z^3 T_z, \partial_z^3 T \rangle \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\langle V \cdot \partial_z^3 \nabla_h V + w\partial_z^3 V_z, \partial_z^3 V \rangle}_{=0} + \underbrace{\langle V \cdot \partial_z^3 \nabla_h T + w\partial_z^3 T_z, \partial_z^3 T \rangle}_{=0} \\ &= \langle \partial_z^3(V \cdot \nabla_h V) - V \cdot \partial_z^3 \nabla_h V, \partial_z^3 V \rangle + \langle \partial_z^3(V \cdot \nabla_h T) - V \cdot \partial_z^3 \nabla_h T, \partial_z^3 T \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle \partial_z^3(wV_z) - w\partial_z^3 V_z, \partial_z^3 V \rangle + \langle \partial_z^3(wT_z) - w\partial_z^3 T_z, \partial_z^3 T \rangle \\ &:= I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4. \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

Using Lemma 3.5, together with the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, Young's inequality and the Sobolev inequality, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 + I_2 &= \langle \partial_z^3(V \cdot \nabla_h V) - V \cdot \partial_z^3 \nabla_h V, \partial_z^3 V \rangle + \langle \partial_z^3(V \cdot \nabla_h T) - V \cdot \partial_z^3 \nabla_h T, \partial_z^3 T \rangle \\ &\leq C \left(\|V\|_{H^3} \|\nabla_h V\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla V\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla_h V\|_{H^2} \right) \|V\|_{H^3} \\ &\quad + C \left(\|V\|_{H^3} \|\nabla_h T\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla V\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla_h T\|_{H^2} \right) \|T\|_{H^3} \\ &\leq C \left(\|\nabla_h V\|_{H^2} + \|\nabla_h T\|_{H^2} \right) \left(\|V\|_{H^3}^2 + \|T\|_{H^3}^2 \right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

For the estimates of I_3 , we use (1.1c), Young's inequality, the Hölder inequality and the Sobolev inequality, to achieve

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 &= \langle \partial_z^3(wV_z) - w\partial_z^3 V_z, \partial_z^3 V \rangle \\ &\leq C \left| \left\langle \underbrace{(\nabla_h \cdot V)}_{L^\infty} \underbrace{\partial_z^3 V}_{L^2}, \underbrace{\partial_z^3 V}_{L^2} \right\rangle \right| + C \left| \left\langle \underbrace{(\nabla_h \cdot V_z)}_{L^6} \underbrace{\partial_z^2 V}_{L^3}, \underbrace{\partial_z^3 V}_{L^2} \right\rangle \right| + C \left| \left\langle \underbrace{(\nabla_h \cdot \partial_z^2 V)}_{L^2} \underbrace{V_z}_{L^\infty}, \underbrace{\partial_z^3 V}_{L^2} \right\rangle \right| \\ &\leq C \|\nabla_h V\|_{H^2} \|V\|_{H^3}^2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Similarly, one can deduces that

$$I_4 = \langle \partial_z^3(wT_z) - w\partial_z^3 T_z, \partial_z^3 T \rangle \leq C \|\nabla_h V\|_{H^2} \|T\|_{H^3}^2. \tag{3.11}$$

Combining (3.8)–(3.11) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \partial_z^3(V \cdot \nabla_h V + wV_z), \partial_z^3 V \rangle + \langle \partial_z^3(V \cdot \nabla_h T + wT_z), \partial_z^3 T \rangle \\ & \leq C (\|\nabla_h V\|_{H^2} + \|\nabla_h T\|_{H^2}) (\|V\|_{H^3}^2 + \|T\|_{H^3}^2). \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

When $|\alpha| \leq 3$ and $\alpha \neq (0, 0, 3)$, one has $\|D^\alpha V\|_{L^2} \leq \|\nabla_h V\|_{H^2} + \|V\|_{H^2}$, $\|D^\alpha T\|_{L^2} \leq \|\nabla_h T\|_{H^2} + \|T\|_{H^2}$. Therefore, an estimate to replace (3.6) for **Case 2** is

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle D^\alpha(V \cdot \nabla_h V + wV_z), D^\alpha V \rangle + \langle D^\alpha(V \cdot \nabla_h T + wT_z), D^\alpha T \rangle \\ & \leq C \left(\|V\|_{H^3} \|\nabla_h V\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla V\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla_h V\|_{H^2} + \|w\|_{H^3} \|V_z\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla w\|_{L^\infty} \|V_z\|_{H^2} \right) (\|\nabla_h V\|_{H^2} + \|V\|_{H^2}) \\ & \quad + C \left(\|V\|_{H^3} \|\nabla_h T\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla V\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla_h T\|_{H^2} + \|w\|_{H^3} \|T_z\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla w\|_{L^\infty} \|T_z\|_{H^2} \right) (\|\nabla_h T\|_{H^2} + \|T\|_{H^2}) \\ & \leq C \|V\|_{H^3}^2 \|\nabla_h V\|_{H^2} + C \|\nabla_h V\|_{H^3} \|V\|_{H^3} (\|\nabla_h V\|_{H^2} + \|V\|_{H^2}) \\ & \quad + C \|V\|_{H^3} \|T\|_{H^3} \|\nabla_h T\|_{H^2} + C \|\nabla_h V\|_{H^3} \|T\|_{H^3} (\|\nabla_h T\|_{H^2} + \|T\|_{H^2}) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{4} \nu_h \|\nabla_h V\|_{H^3}^2 + C_{\nu_h} (1 + \|V\|_{H^2}^2 + \|T\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\nabla_h V\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\nabla_h T\|_{H^2}^2) (\|V\|_{H^3}^2 + \|T\|_{H^3}^2). \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Combining (3.12), (3.13), (3.3)–(3.5) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} (\|V\|_{H^3}^2 + \|T\|_{H^3}^2) + \nu_h \|\nabla_h V\|_{H^3}^2 + \kappa_h \|\nabla_h T\|_{H^3}^2 \\ & \leq C_{\nu_h} (1 + \|V\|_{H^2}^2 + \|T\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\nabla_h V\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\nabla_h T\|_{H^2}^2) (\|V\|_{H^3}^2 + \|T\|_{H^3}^2) + C \|Q\|_{H^3}^2. \end{aligned}$$

From Theorem 3.3, we know that $(V, T) \in L^\infty(0, \mathcal{T}; H^2(\mathcal{D}))$, $(\nabla_h V, \nabla_h T) \in L^2(0, \mathcal{T}; H^2(\mathcal{D}))$ for arbitrary $\mathcal{T} > 0$. Thanks to Gronwall inequality, for any $t \in [0, \mathcal{T}]$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|V(t)\|_{H^3}^2 + \|T(t)\|_{H^3}^2 + \int_0^t (\nu_h \|\nabla_h V(\tilde{t})\|_{H^3}^2 + \kappa_h \|\nabla_h T(\tilde{t})\|_{H^3}^2) d\tilde{t} \\ & \leq \left(\|V_0\|_{H^3}^2 + \|T_0\|_{H^3}^2 + C \int_0^{\mathcal{T}} \|Q(\tilde{t})\|_{H^3}^2 d\tilde{t} \right) \\ & \quad \times \exp \left(\int_0^{\mathcal{T}} C_{\nu_h} (1 + \|V(\tilde{t})\|_{H^2}^2 + \|T(\tilde{t})\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\nabla_h V(\tilde{t})\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\nabla_h T(\tilde{t})\|_{H^2}^2) d\tilde{t} \right) < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$(V, T) \in L^\infty(0, \mathcal{T}; H^3(\mathcal{D})), \quad (\nabla_h V, \nabla_h T) \in L^2(0, \mathcal{T}; H^3(\mathcal{D})).$$

Now following a similar argument as in **Case 1**, and using the Lions-Magenes theorem, we obtain.

$$(V, T, \nabla_h V, \nabla_h T) \in C([0, \mathcal{T}]; H^2(\mathcal{D})), \quad (\partial_t V, \partial_t T) \in L^2(0, \mathcal{T}; H^2(\mathcal{D})).$$

Notice that we cannot achieve $(V, T) \in C([0, \mathcal{T}]; H^3(\mathcal{D}))$ since $(V, T) \notin L^2(0, \mathcal{T}; H^4(\mathcal{D}))$. The proof of (3.1) for $r = 4$ follows the same argument as in **Case 1**. By repeating this procedure one can eventually have (3.1) for **Case 2**.

Finally, as $(V, \nabla_h V, T, \nabla_h T) \in C([0, \mathcal{T}]; H^{r-1}(\mathcal{D}))$, one can repeat the argument as in **Case 1** and gets

$$\begin{aligned} & (V, T) \in C([0, \mathcal{T}]; H^{r-1}(\mathcal{D})) \cap_{l=1}^k C^l([0, \mathcal{T}]; H^{r-2l}(\mathcal{D})), \\ & w \in \cap_{l=0}^k C^l([0, \mathcal{T}]; H^{r-2l-1}(\mathcal{D})), \\ & \nabla p \in \cap_{l=0}^{k-1} C^l([0, \mathcal{T}]; H^{r-2l-1}(\mathcal{D})). \end{aligned}$$

This conclude the proof of (3.2). \square

4. ERROR ESTIMATES FOR PINNS

4.1. Generalization Error Estimates. In this section, we answer the question **SubQ1** raised in the introduction: given $\varepsilon > 0$, does there exist a neural network $(V_\theta, w_\theta, p_\theta, T_\theta)$ such that the corresponding generalization error $\mathcal{E}_G[s; \theta]$ defined in (2.7) satisfies $\mathcal{E}_G[s; \theta] < \varepsilon$? We have the following result.

Theorem 4.1 (Answer of **SubQ1**). *Let $d \in \{2, 3\}$, $k \geq 3$, $r > \frac{d}{2} + 2k$, $\delta > 0$, $\mathcal{T} > 0$, and $R > 0$ be such that $|\tanh^{(m)}(x)|$ is decreasing on $[R, \infty)$ for every $1 \leq m \leq k$. Suppose that $V_0 \in H_e^r(\mathcal{D})$, $T_0 \in H_o^r(\mathcal{D})$, and $Q \in C^{k-1}([0, \mathcal{T}]; H_o^r(\mathcal{D}))$. Then for every integer $N > \frac{3(d+1)}{2}$, there exist tanh neural networks $\widehat{V}_i := (V_i^N)_\theta$, $\widehat{w} := w_\theta^N$, $\widehat{p} := p_\theta^N$, and $\widehat{T} := T_\theta^N$, with $i = 1, \dots, d-1$, each with two hidden layers, of widths at most $3 \lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil |P_{k-1, d+2}| + (d+1)(N-1)$ and $3 \lceil \frac{d+3}{2} \rceil |P_{d+2, d+2}| N^{d+1}$ such that for each $0 \leq \ell \leq k-3$ the generalization error satisfies:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_G^i[\ell; \theta] &\leq C_{\nu_h, \nu_z, \kappa_h, \kappa_z, \mathcal{T}, C_{V_1}, C_{V_2}, C_p, C_w, C_T} (1 + \|V\|_{C^k(\Omega)} + \|\widehat{V}\|_{C^k(\Omega)} + \|T\|_{C^k(\Omega)} + \|\widehat{w}\|_{C^k(\Omega)}) \frac{\ln^{\ell+2} N}{N^{k-\ell-2}}, \\ \mathcal{E}_G^\ell[\ell; \theta] &\leq (C_{V_1} + C_{V_2} + C_T) \frac{\ln^{\ell+1} N}{N^{k-\ell-1}}, \\ \mathcal{E}_G^b[\ell; \theta] &= \|\mathcal{R}_b[\ell]\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{D})} \leq (C_{V_1} + C_{V_2} + C_w + C_p + C_T) \frac{\ln^{\ell+1} N}{N^{k-\ell-2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the constants $C_{V_1}, C_{V_2}, C_w, C_p$ and C_T are defined according to Lemma A.1. In particular, N can be chosen large enough so that $\mathcal{E}_G[\ell; \theta] \leq \varepsilon$, for arbitrarily small ε .

Proof. For simplicity, we treat the case of $d = 3$. The proof of $d = 2$ follows in a similar way.

From Theorem 3.4, we know that system (1.1) has a unique global strong solution (V, T) and

$$\begin{aligned} (V, T) &\in C^k(\Omega) \subset W^{k, \infty}(\Omega), \\ (w, p, \nabla p) &\in C^{k-1}(\Omega) \subset W^{k-1, \infty}(\Omega). \end{aligned}$$

By applying Lemma A.1, for fixed $N > \frac{3(d+1)}{2} = 6$, there exist tanh neural networks $\widehat{V}_1, \widehat{V}_2, \widehat{w}, \widehat{p}$, and \widehat{T} , each with two hidden layers, of widths at most $3 \lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil |P_{k-1, 5}| + 4(N-1)$ and $9|P_{5, 5}| N^4$ such that for every $1 \leq s \leq k-1$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \|V_i - \widehat{V}_i\|_{H^s(\Omega)} &\leq C_{\mathcal{T}} \|V_i - \widehat{V}_i\|_{W^{s, \infty}(\Omega)} \leq C(d, s, k, V_i, \mathcal{T}, R, \delta, \|V_i\|_{W^{k, \infty}(\Omega)}) \frac{\ln^s N}{N^{k-s}} := C_{V_i} \frac{\ln^s N}{N^{k-s}}, \\ \|w - \widehat{w}\|_{H^{s-1}(\Omega)} &\leq C_{\mathcal{T}} \|w - \widehat{w}\|_{W^{s-1, \infty}(\Omega)} \leq C(d, s, k, w, \mathcal{T}, R, \delta, \|w\|_{W^{k-1, \infty}(\Omega)}) \frac{\ln^{s-1} N}{N^{k-s}} := C_w \frac{\ln^{s-1} N}{N^{k-s}}, \\ \|p - \widehat{p}\|_{H^{s-1}(\Omega)} &\leq C_{\mathcal{T}} \|p - \widehat{p}\|_{W^{s-1, \infty}(\Omega)} \leq C(d, s, k, p, \mathcal{T}, R, \delta, \|p\|_{W^{k-1, \infty}(\Omega)}) \frac{\ln^{s-1} N}{N^{k-s}} := C_p \frac{\ln^{s-1} N}{N^{k-s}}, \\ \|T - \widehat{T}\|_{H^s(\Omega)} &\leq C_{\mathcal{T}} \|T - \widehat{T}\|_{W^{s, \infty}(\Omega)} \leq C(d, s, k, T, \mathcal{T}, R, \delta, \|T\|_{W^{k, \infty}(\Omega)}) \frac{\ln^s N}{N^{k-s}} := C_T \frac{\ln^s N}{N^{k-s}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the constants C_{V_i}, C_w, C_p and C_T are defined according to Lemma A.1. Denote by $\widehat{V} = (\widehat{V}_1, \widehat{V}_2)$ and $(\partial_1, \partial_2) = (\partial_x, \partial_y)$. For $0 \leq \ell \leq k-3$ and $i = 1, 2$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_i V_i - \partial_i \widehat{V}_i\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} &\leq \|V_i - \widehat{V}_i\|_{H^{\ell+1}(\Omega)} \leq C_{V_i} \frac{\ln^{\ell+1} N}{N^{k-\ell-1}}, \\ \|\partial_i p - \partial_i \widehat{p}\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)}, \|\partial_z p - \partial_z \widehat{p}\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} &\leq \|p - \widehat{p}\|_{H^{\ell+1}(\Omega)} \leq C_p \frac{\ln^{\ell+1} N}{N^{k-\ell-2}}, \\ \|\Delta_h V_i - \Delta_h \widehat{V}_i\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)}, \|\partial_{zz} V_i - \partial_{zz} \widehat{V}_i\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} &\leq \|V_i - \widehat{V}_i\|_{H^{\ell+2}(\Omega)} \leq C_{V_i} \frac{\ln^{\ell+2} N}{N^{k-\ell-2}}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla_h \cdot V + \partial_z w - (\nabla_h \cdot \widehat{V} + \partial_z \widehat{w})\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} &\leq \sum_{i=1}^2 \|V_i - \widehat{V}_i\|_{H^{\ell+1}(\Omega)} + \|w - \widehat{w}\|_{H^{\ell+1}(\Omega)} \\
&\leq (C_{V_1} + C_{V_2} + C_w) \frac{\ln^{\ell+1} N}{N^{k-\ell-2}}, \\
\|\partial_t T - \partial_t \widehat{T}\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} &\leq \|T - \widehat{T}\|_{H^{\ell+1}(\Omega)} \leq C_T \frac{\ln^{\ell+1} N}{N^{k-\ell-1}}, \\
\|\Delta_h T - \Delta_h \widehat{T}\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)}, \|\partial_{zz} T - \partial_{zz} \widehat{T}\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} &\leq \|T - \widehat{T}\|_{H^{\ell+2}(\Omega)} \leq C_T \frac{\ln^{\ell+2} N}{N^{k-\ell-2}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

For the nonlinear terms, by the Sobolev inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|V \cdot \nabla_h V_i - \widehat{V} \cdot \nabla_h \widehat{V}_i\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} &\leq \|(V - \widehat{V}) \cdot \nabla_h V_i\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} + \|\widehat{V} \cdot \nabla_h (V_i - \widehat{V}_i)\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} \\
&\leq C \|V_i\|_{C^k(\Omega)} \max_i \|V_i - \widehat{V}_i\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} + C \|\widehat{V}\|_{C^k(\Omega)} \|V_i - \widehat{V}_i\|_{H^{\ell+1}(\Omega)} \\
&\leq C \left(\|V_i\|_{C^k(\Omega)} + \|\widehat{V}\|_{C^k(\Omega)} \right) (C_{V_1} + C_{V_2}) \frac{\ln^{\ell+1} N}{N^{k-\ell-1}}, \\
\|w \partial_z V_i - \widehat{w} \partial_z \widehat{V}_i\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} &\leq \|(w - \widehat{w}) \partial_z V_i\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} + \|\widehat{w} \partial_z (V_i - \widehat{V}_i)\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} \\
&\leq C \|V_i\|_{C^k(\Omega)} \|w - \widehat{w}\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} + C \|\widehat{w}\|_{C^{k-1}(\Omega)} \|V_i - \widehat{V}_i\|_{H^{\ell+1}(\Omega)} \\
&\leq C \left(\|V_i\|_{C^k(\Omega)} + \|\widehat{w}\|_{C^{k-1}(\Omega)} \right) (C_w + C_{V_i}) \frac{\ln^{\ell+1} N}{N^{k-\ell-1}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

A similar calculation of (4.2) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\|V \cdot \nabla_h T - \widehat{V} \cdot \nabla_h \widehat{T}\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} &\leq C \left(\|T\|_{C^k(\Omega)} + \|\widehat{V}\|_{C^k(\Omega)} \right) (C_{V_1} + C_{V_2} + C_T) \frac{\ln^{\ell+1} N}{N^{k-\ell-1}}, \\
\|w \partial_z T - \widehat{w} \partial_z \widehat{T}\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} &\leq C \left(\|T\|_{C^k(\Omega)} + \|\widehat{w}\|_{C^{k-1}(\Omega)} \right) (C_w + C_T) \frac{\ln^{\ell+1} N}{N^{k-\ell-1}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

Combining (4.1)–(4.3) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \partial_t \widehat{V} + \widehat{V} \cdot \nabla_h \widehat{V} + \widehat{w} \partial_z \widehat{V} + \nabla_h \widehat{p} + f_0 \widehat{V}^\perp - \nu_h \Delta_h \widehat{V} - \nu_z \partial_{zz} \widehat{V} \right\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} \\
&= \left\| \left(\partial_t \widehat{V} + \widehat{V} \cdot \nabla_h \widehat{V} + \widehat{w} \partial_z \widehat{V} + \nabla_h \widehat{p} + f_0 \widehat{V}^\perp - \nu_h \Delta_h \widehat{V} - \nu_z \partial_{zz} \widehat{V} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \underbrace{\left(\partial_t V + V \cdot \nabla_h V + w \partial_z V + \nabla_h p + f_0 V^\perp - \nu_h \Delta_h V - \nu_z \partial_{zz} V \right)}_{=0} \right\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} \\
&\leq \|\partial_t \widehat{V} - \partial_t V\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} + \|\widehat{V} \cdot \nabla_h \widehat{V} - V \cdot \nabla_h V\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} + \|\widehat{w} \partial_z \widehat{V} - w \partial_z V\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} + f_0 \|\widehat{V} - V\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} \\
&\quad + \|\nabla_h \widehat{p} - \nabla_h p\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} + \nu_h \|\Delta_h \widehat{V} - \Delta_h V\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} + \nu_z \|\partial_{zz} \widehat{V} - \partial_{zz} V\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} \\
&\leq C_{\nu_h, \nu_z, C_{V_1}, C_{V_2}, C_p, C_w, C_T} (1 + \|V\|_{C^k(\Omega)} + \|\widehat{V}\|_{C^k(\Omega)} + \|T\|_{C^k(\Omega)} + \|\widehat{w}\|_{C^k(\Omega)}) \frac{\ln^{\ell+2} N}{N^{k-\ell-2}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

Similarly to (4.4), one can calculate that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\partial_z \widehat{p} + \widehat{T}\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} &\leq \|\partial_z \widehat{p} - \partial_z p\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} + \|T - \widehat{T}\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} \leq (C_p + C_T) \frac{\ln^{\ell+1} N}{N^{k-\ell-2}}, \\
\|\nabla_h \cdot \widehat{V} + \partial_z \widehat{w}\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} &\leq \|V - \widehat{V}\|_{H^{\ell+1}(\Omega)} + \|w - \widehat{w}\|_{H^{\ell+1}(\Omega)} \leq (C_{V_1} + C_{V_i} + C_w) \frac{\ln^{\ell+1} N}{N^{k-\ell-2}},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \partial_t \widehat{T} + \widehat{V} \cdot \nabla_h \widehat{T} + \widehat{w} \partial_z \widehat{T} - \kappa_h \Delta_h \widehat{T} - \kappa_z \partial_{zz} \widehat{T} - Q \right\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} \\
& \leq \|\partial_t \widehat{T} - \partial_t T\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} + \|\widehat{V} \cdot \nabla_h \widehat{T} - V \cdot \nabla_h T\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} + \|\widehat{w} \partial_z \widehat{T} - w \partial_z T\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} \\
& \quad + \kappa_h \|\Delta_h \widehat{T} - \Delta_h T\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} + \kappa_z \|\partial_{zz} \widehat{T} - \partial_{zz} T\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} \\
& \leq C_{\kappa_h, \kappa_z, C_{V_1}, C_{V_2}, C_w, C_T} (1 + \|V\|_{C^k(\Omega)} + \|\widehat{V}\|_{C^k(\Omega)} + \|T\|_{C^k(\Omega)} + \|\widehat{w}\|_{C^k(\Omega)}) \frac{\ln^{\ell+2} N}{N^{k-\ell-2}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

The combination of (4.4)–(4.6) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_G^i[\ell; \theta] &= \left[\int_0^T \left(\|\mathcal{R}_{i,V}[\theta]\|_{H^\ell(\mathcal{D})}^2 + \|\mathcal{R}_{i,P}[\theta]\|_{H^\ell(\mathcal{D})}^2 + \|\mathcal{R}_{i,T}[\theta]\|_{H^\ell(\mathcal{D})}^2 + \|\mathcal{R}_{i,div}[\theta]\|_{H^\ell(\mathcal{D})}^2 \right) dt \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C_{\nu_h, \nu_z, \kappa_h, \kappa_z, \mathcal{T}, C_{V_1}, C_{V_2}, C_p, C_w, C_T} (1 + \|V\|_{C^k(\Omega)} + \|\widehat{V}\|_{C^k(\Omega)} + \|T\|_{C^k(\Omega)} + \|\widehat{w}\|_{C^k(\Omega)}) \frac{\ln^{\ell+2} N}{N^{k-\ell-2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Next we derive the estimate for $\mathcal{E}_G^t[\ell; \theta]$. Note that $(V, T, \widehat{V}, \widehat{T}) \in C^k(\Omega)$ and $(w, p, \widehat{w}, \widehat{p}) \in C^{k-1}(\Omega)$. By applying the trace theorem and the fact that Ω is a Lipschitz domain, for $0 \leq \ell \leq k-3$ and $|\alpha| \leq \ell$, we have for $\varphi \in \{V_1, V_2, w, T, p\}$:

$$\|D^\alpha \varphi - D^\alpha \widehat{\varphi}\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)} \leq C \|D^\alpha \varphi - D^\alpha \widehat{\varphi}\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq C \|\varphi - \widehat{\varphi}\|_{W^{\ell+1,\infty}(\Omega)}.$$

Therefore, for $0 \leq \ell \leq k-3$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_G^t[\ell; \theta] &\leq \sum_{i=1}^2 \|(V_0)_i - \widehat{V}_i(t=0)\|_{H^\ell(\mathcal{D})} + \|T_0 - \widehat{T}(t=0)\|_{H^\ell(\mathcal{D})} \\
&\leq C \sum_{|\alpha| \leq \ell} \left(\sum_{i=1}^2 \|D^\alpha V_i - D^\alpha \widehat{V}_i\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)} + \|D^\alpha T - D^\alpha \widehat{T}\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)} \right) \\
&\leq C \left(\sum_{i=1}^2 \|V_i - \widehat{V}_i\|_{W^{\ell+1,\infty}(\Omega)} + \|T - \widehat{T}\|_{W^{\ell+1,\infty}(\Omega)} \right) \leq (C_{V_1} + C_{V_2} + C_T) \frac{\ln^{\ell+1} N}{N^{k-\ell-1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Regarding the estimate for $\mathcal{E}_G^b[\ell; \theta]$, for $|\alpha| \leq \ell$, thanks to the boundary condition (1.2),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| D^\alpha \widehat{V}_i(x=1, y, z) - D^\alpha \widehat{V}_i(x=0, y, z) \right| \\
& \leq \left| D^\alpha \widehat{V}_i(x=1, y, z) - D^\alpha V_i(x=1, y, z) \right| + \left| D^\alpha \widehat{V}_i(x=0, y, z) - D^\alpha V_i(x=0, y, z) \right| \\
& \quad + \underbrace{\left| D^\alpha V_i(x=1, y, z) - D^\alpha V_i(x=0, y, z) \right|}_{=0},
\end{aligned}$$

and therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\int_0^T \left| D^\alpha \widehat{V}_i(x=1, y, z) - D^\alpha \widehat{V}_i(x=0, y, z) \right|^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} &\leq C \|D^\alpha V_i - D^\alpha \widehat{V}_i\|_{L^2(0,T;L^\infty(\partial\mathcal{D}))} \\
&\leq C_{\mathcal{T}} \|V_i - \widehat{V}_i\|_{W^{\ell+1,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq C_{V_i} \frac{\ln^{\ell+1} N}{N^{k-\ell-1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

One can bound other terms similarly, and finally get

$$\mathcal{E}_G^b[\ell; \theta] = \left(\int_0^{\mathcal{T}} \|\mathcal{R}_b[\ell; \theta]\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{D})}^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq (C_{V_1} + C_{V_2} + C_w + C_p + C_T) \frac{\ln^{\ell+1} N}{N^{k-\ell-2}}.$$

□

4.2. Total Error Estimates. This section is dedicated to answer **SubQ2** raised in the introduction: given PINNs $(\widehat{V}, \widehat{w}, \widehat{p}, \widehat{T}) := (V_\theta, w_\theta, p_\theta, T_\theta)$ with a small generalization error $\mathcal{E}_G[s; \theta]$, is the corresponding total error $\mathcal{E}[s; \theta]$ also small?

In this section, we only consider **Case 2**: $\nu_z = 0$ and $\kappa_z = 0$. The proof of **Case 1** is similar and simpler. To simplify the notation, we drop the θ dependence in the residuals, for example, writing $\mathcal{R}_{i,V}$ instead of $\mathcal{R}_{i,V}[\theta]$, when there is no confusion.

Theorem 4.2 (Answer of **SubQ2**). *Let $d \in \{2, 3\}$, $\mathcal{T} > 0$, $k \geq 1$ and $r > k + \frac{d}{2}$. Suppose that $V_0 \in H_e^r(\mathcal{D})$, $T_0 \in H_o^r(\mathcal{D})$, and $Q \in C^{k-1}([0, \mathcal{T}]; H_o^r(\mathcal{D}))$, and let (V, w, p, T) be the unique strong solution to system (1.1). Let $(\widehat{V}, \widehat{w}, \widehat{p}, \widehat{T})$ be tanh neural networks that approximating (V, w, p, T) . Denote by $(V^*, w^*, p^*, T^*) = (V - \widehat{V}, w - \widehat{w}, p - \widehat{p}, T - \widehat{T})$. Then for any positive time $\mathcal{T} > 0$ and $0 \leq s \leq k - 1$, the total error satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}[s; \theta]^2 &:= \int_0^{\mathcal{T}} (\|V^*(t)\|_{H^s}^2 + \|T^*(t)\|_{H^s}^2) dt \\ &\leq C_{\mathcal{T}} \left(\int_0^{\mathcal{T}} \mathcal{E}_G^t[s; \theta](t)^2 dt + \int_0^{\mathcal{T}} C_2(t) (\mathcal{E}_G^i[s; \theta] + \mathcal{E}_G^b[s; \theta])(t) dt \right) \exp \left(\int_0^{\mathcal{T}} C_1(t) dt \right), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} C_1 &= C_{\nu_h, \kappa_h} \left(1 + \|V^*\|_{W^{k, \infty}}^4 + \|T^*\|_{W^{k, \infty}}^4 + \|\widehat{T}\|_{W^{k, \infty}}^4 + \|\widehat{V}\|_{W^{k, \infty}}^4 + \|w\|_{W^{k, \infty}} \right), \\ C_2 &= C_{\nu_h} \left(\|\mathcal{R}_{i, div}\|_{H^s} + \|\mathcal{R}_b[s]\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{D})} + \|\mathcal{R}_{i,p}\|_{H^s} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|p^*\|_{W^{k, \infty}} + \|V^*\|_{W^{k, \infty}} + \|w^*\|_{W^{k, \infty}} + \|T^*\|_{W^{k, \infty}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3. In the above estimate, thanks to the global existence of strong solutions to the PEs with horizontal viscosity, the functions $C_1(t)$ and $C_2(t)$ never blows up for any $t > 0$. This is in contrast to the analysis for the 3D Navier-Stokes equations [20], where the existence of the global strong solutions is still unknown, and therefore the total error may become very large at some finite time $\mathcal{T} > 0$ even if the generalization error is arbitrary small.

We also remark that, compared to some previous works [20, 60] where only the L^2 total error is considered, here we have higher-order total error estimate $\int_0^{\mathcal{T}} (\|V^*(t)\|_{H^s}^2 + \|T^*(t)\|_{H^s}^2) dt$. In order to get such an estimate, one has to control the residuals in some corresponding higher-order Sobolev norms.

Proof of Theorem 4.2. Let $\mathcal{T} > 0$ be arbitrary but fixed. Since (V, w, p, T) is the unique strong solution to system (1.1), from (2.4) one has

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t V^* + V^* \cdot \nabla_h V^* + V^* \cdot \nabla_h \widehat{V} + \widehat{V} \cdot \nabla_h V^* + w^* \partial_z V^* + w^* \partial_z \widehat{V} + \widehat{w} \partial_z V^* \\ + f_0 V^{*\perp} - \nu_h \Delta_h V^* + \nabla_h p^* = -\mathcal{R}_{i,V}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.7a)$$

$$\partial_z p^* + T^* = -\mathcal{R}_{i,p}, \quad (4.7b)$$

$$\nabla_h \cdot V^* + \partial_z w^* = -\mathcal{R}_{i, div}, \quad (4.7c)$$

$$\partial_t T^* + V^* \cdot \nabla_h T^* + V^* \cdot \nabla_h \widehat{T} + \widehat{V} \cdot \nabla_h T^* + w^* \partial_z T^* + w^* \partial_z \widehat{T} + \widehat{w} \partial_z T^* = -\mathcal{R}_{i,T}. \quad (4.7d)$$

Moreover, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} (V^*, V, \widehat{V}, T^*, T, \widehat{T}) &\in L^\infty(0, \mathcal{T}; H^r(\mathcal{D})) \subset L^\infty(0, \mathcal{T}; W^{k,\infty}(\mathcal{D})), \\ (\nabla_h V^*, \nabla_h V, \nabla_h \widehat{V}, \nabla_h T^*, \nabla_h T, \nabla_h \widehat{T}, w^*, w, \widehat{w}) &\in L^2(0, \mathcal{T}; H^r(\mathcal{D})) \subset L^2(0, \mathcal{T}; W^{k,\infty}(\mathcal{D})), \end{aligned}$$

and from (3.7),

$$(p^*, p, \widehat{p}) \in L^\infty(0, \mathcal{T}; H^r(\mathcal{D})) \subset L^\infty(0, \mathcal{T}; W^{k,\infty}(\mathcal{D})).$$

Using equation (2.1), we can rewrite w^* as,

$$w^* = -\widehat{w}(z=0) - \int_0^z \nabla_h \cdot V^*(\mathbf{x}', \tilde{z}) d\tilde{z} - \int_0^z (\nabla_h \cdot \widehat{V} + \partial_z \widehat{w})(\mathbf{x}', \tilde{z}) d\tilde{z}.$$

Since \widehat{w} is smooth enough, one has

$$\|w^*\|_{H^s} \leq C(\|\mathcal{R}_b[s]\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{D})} + \|\nabla_h V^*\|_{H^s} + \|\mathcal{R}_{i,div}\|_{H^s}). \quad (4.8)$$

For each fixed $0 \leq s \leq k-1$, let $|\alpha| \leq s$ a multi-index. Taking D^α derivative on system (4.7), taking the inner product of (4.7a) with $D^\alpha V^*$ and (4.7d) with $D^\alpha T^*$, then summing over all $|\alpha| \leq s$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (\|V^*\|_{H^s}^2 + \|T^*\|_{H^s}^2) + \nu_h \|\nabla_h V^*\|_{H^s}^2 + \kappa_h \|\nabla_h T^*\|_{H^s}^2 \\ &= - \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s} \left(\left\langle D^\alpha (V^* \cdot \nabla_h V^* + V^* \cdot \nabla_h \widehat{V} + \widehat{V} \cdot \nabla_h V^* + w^* \partial_z V^* + w^* \partial_z \widehat{V} + \widehat{w} \partial_z V^*), D^\alpha V^* \right\rangle \right. \\ &\quad - \left\langle D^\alpha (V^* \cdot \nabla_h T^* + V^* \cdot \nabla_h \widehat{T} + \widehat{V} \cdot \nabla_h T^* + w^* \partial_z T^* + w^* \partial_z \widehat{T} + \widehat{w} \partial_z T^*), D^\alpha T^* \right\rangle \\ &\quad \left. + \langle D^\alpha \nabla_h p^*, D^\alpha V^* \rangle + \langle D^\alpha \mathcal{R}_{i,V}, D^\alpha V^* \rangle + \langle D^\alpha \mathcal{R}_{i,T}, D^\alpha T^* \rangle \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

We first estimate the nonlinear terms. Applying the Sobolev inequality, the Hölder inequality, and Young's inequality, and combining with (4.8), one has

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \left\langle D^\alpha (V^* \cdot \nabla_h V^* + w^* \partial_z \widehat{V} + V^* \cdot \nabla_h \widehat{V} + \widehat{V} \cdot \nabla_h V^*), D^\alpha V^* \right\rangle \right| \\ &\leq C \left(\|V^*\|_{H^s} \|\nabla_h V^*\|_{W^{s,\infty}} + \|w^*\|_{H^s} \|\partial_z \widehat{V}\|_{W^{s,\infty}} + \|V^*\|_{H^s} \|\nabla_h \widehat{V}\|_{W^{s,\infty}} + \|\nabla_h V^*\|_{H^s} \|\widehat{V}\|_{W^{s,\infty}} \right) \|V^*\|_{H^s} \\ &\leq C \left(1 + \|V^*\|_{W^{k,\infty}}^2 + \|\widehat{V}\|_{W^{k,\infty}}^2 \right) \|V^*\|_{H^s} (\|V^*\|_{H^s} + \|\nabla_h V^*\|_{H^s}) + C \|\mathcal{R}_b[s]\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{D})}^2 + C \|\mathcal{R}_{i,div}\|_{H^s}^2 \\ &\leq C_{\nu_h, \kappa_h} \left(1 + \|V^*\|_{W^{k,\infty}}^4 + \|\widehat{V}\|_{W^{k,\infty}}^4 \right) \|V^*\|_{H^s}^2 + \frac{\nu_h}{6} \|\nabla_h V^*\|_{H^s}^2 + C \|\mathcal{R}_b[s]\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{D})}^2 + C \|\mathcal{R}_{i,div}\|_{H^s}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

Similarly for T , one can deduce

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \left\langle D^\alpha (V^* \cdot \nabla_h T^* + w^* \partial_z \widehat{T} + V^* \cdot \nabla_h \widehat{T} + \widehat{V} \cdot \nabla_h T^*), D^\alpha T^* \right\rangle \right| \\ &\leq C \left(\|V^*\|_{H^s} \|\nabla_h T^*\|_{W^{s,\infty}} + \|w^*\|_{H^s} \|\partial_z \widehat{T}\|_{W^{s,\infty}} + \|V^*\|_{H^s} \|\nabla_h \widehat{T}\|_{W^{s,\infty}} + \|\nabla_h T^*\|_{H^s} \|\widehat{V}\|_{W^{s,\infty}} \right) \|T^*\|_{H^s} \\ &\leq C_{\nu_h, \kappa_h} \left(1 + \|T^*\|_{W^{k,\infty}}^4 + \|\widehat{T}\|_{W^{k,\infty}}^4 + \|\widehat{V}\|_{W^{k,\infty}}^4 \right) (\|V^*\|_{H^s}^2 + \|T^*\|_{H^s}^2) \\ &\quad + \frac{\nu_h}{6} \|\nabla_h V^*\|_{H^s}^2 + \frac{\kappa_h}{2} \|\nabla_h T^*\|_{H^s}^2 + C \|\mathcal{R}_b[s]\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{D})}^2 + C \|\mathcal{R}_{i,div}\|_{H^s}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

For the rest of the nonlinear terms, we provide the details for $s \geq 1$. The case of $s = 0$ follows easily. By the triangle inequality, one has

$$\begin{aligned} & |\langle D^\alpha(\widehat{w}\partial_z V^* + w^*\partial_z V^*), D^\alpha V^* \rangle| = |\langle D^\alpha(w\partial_z V^*), D^\alpha V^* \rangle| \\ & \leq |\langle D^\alpha(w\partial_z V^*) - w\partial_z D^\alpha V^*, D^\alpha V^* \rangle| + |\langle w\partial_z D^\alpha V^*, D^\alpha V^* \rangle| := |I_1| + |I_2|. \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

Using the Hölder inequality, one has

$$|I_1| = \left| \int_{\mathcal{D}} \sum_{|\beta|=0, \beta < \alpha}^{s-1} \binom{\alpha}{\beta} D^{\alpha-\beta} w D^\beta \partial_z V^* \cdot D^\alpha V^* d\mathbf{x} \right| \leq C \|w\|_{W^{k,\infty}} \|V^*\|_{H^s}^2. \quad (4.13)$$

By integration by parts and thanks to the boundary condition of w , we have

$$I_2 = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{D}} |D^\alpha V^*|^2 \partial_z w d\mathbf{x} \leq C \|w\|_{W^{k,\infty}} \|V^*\|_{H^s}^2. \quad (4.14)$$

A similar calculation for T yields

$$|\langle D^\alpha(\widehat{w}\partial_z T^* + w^*\partial_z T^*), D^\alpha T^* \rangle| \leq C \|w\|_{W^{k,\infty}} \|T^*\|_{H^s}^2. \quad (4.15)$$

Next, by integration by parts, and using (1.1b) and (1.1c), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle D^\alpha \nabla_h p^*, D^\alpha V^* \rangle &= \int_0^1 \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} D^\alpha p^* D^\alpha V^* \cdot \vec{n} d\sigma(\partial\mathcal{M}) dz - \int_{\mathcal{D}} D^\alpha p^* D^\alpha \nabla_h \cdot V^* d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \int_0^1 \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} D^\alpha p^* D^\alpha V^* \cdot \vec{n} d\sigma(\partial\mathcal{M}) dz + \int_{\mathcal{D}} D^\alpha p^* D^\alpha (\partial_z w^* + \mathcal{R}_{i,div}) d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \int_{\partial\mathcal{D}} D^\alpha p^* (D^\alpha V^*, D^\alpha w^*)^\top \cdot \vec{n} d\sigma(\partial\mathcal{D}) + \int_{\mathcal{D}} D^\alpha p^* D^\alpha \mathcal{R}_{i,div} d\mathbf{x} - \int_{\mathcal{D}} D^\alpha \partial_z p^* D^\alpha w^* d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \int_{\partial\mathcal{D}} D^\alpha p^* (D^\alpha V^*, D^\alpha w^*)^\top \cdot \vec{n} d\sigma(\partial\mathcal{D}) + \int_{\mathcal{D}} D^\alpha p^* D^\alpha \mathcal{R}_{i,div} d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\mathcal{D}} D^\alpha (T^* + \mathcal{R}_{i,p}) D^\alpha w^* d\mathbf{x} \\ &:= I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \end{aligned}$$

Since the domain $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{M} \times (0, 1)$ is Lipschitz and $(D^\alpha p^*, D^\alpha V^*, D^\alpha w^*) \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathcal{D})$, the trace theorem and the Hölder inequality yield

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &\leq C (\|D^\alpha p^*\|_{L^\infty(\partial\mathcal{D})} + \|D^\alpha V^*\|_{L^\infty(\partial\mathcal{D})} + \|D^\alpha w^*\|_{L^\infty(\partial\mathcal{D})}) \|\mathcal{R}_b[s]\|_{L^1(\partial\mathcal{D})} \\ &\leq C (\|D^\alpha p^*\|_{W^{1,\infty}} + \|D^\alpha V^*\|_{W^{1,\infty}} + \|D^\alpha w^*\|_{W^{1,\infty}}) \|\mathcal{R}_b[s]\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{D})} \\ &\leq C (\|p^*\|_{W^{k,\infty}} + \|V^*\|_{W^{k,\infty}} + \|w^*\|_{W^{k,\infty}}) \|\mathcal{R}_b[s]\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{D})}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

By the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we have

$$I_2 \leq C \|p^*\|_{H^s} \|\mathcal{R}_{i,div}\|_{H^s}. \quad (4.17)$$

Thanks to (4.8), by the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and Young’s inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 &\leq \|w^*\|_{H^s} \|\mathcal{R}_{i,p}\|_{H^s} + \|T^*\|_{H^s} (\|\mathcal{R}_b[s]\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{D})} + \|\nabla V^*\|_{H^s} + \|\mathcal{R}_{i,div}\|_{H^s}) \\ &\leq \|w^*\|_{H^s} \|\mathcal{R}_{i,p}\|_{H^s} + \|T^*\|_{H^s} (\|\mathcal{R}_b[s]\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{D})} + \|\mathcal{R}_{i,div}\|_{H^s}) + C_{\nu_h} \|T^*\|_{H^s}^2 + \frac{\nu_h}{6} \|\nabla V^*\|_{H^s}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

For the rest two terms in (4.9), applying the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned} \langle D^\alpha \mathcal{R}_{i,V}, D^\alpha V^* \rangle + \langle D^\alpha \mathcal{R}_{i,T}, D^\alpha T^* \rangle &\leq \|\mathcal{R}_{i,V}\|_{H^s} \|V^*\|_{H^s} + \|\mathcal{R}_{i,T}\|_{H^s} \|T^*\|_{H^s} \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{R}_{i,V}\|_{H^s} \|V^*\|_{W^{k,\infty}} + \|\mathcal{R}_{i,T}\|_{H^s} \|T^*\|_{W^{k,\infty}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

Combining the estimates (4.9)–(4.19), one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{dt} (\|V^*\|_{H^s}^2 + \|T^*\|_{H^s}^2) + \nu_h \|\nabla_h V^*\|_{H^s}^2 + \kappa_h \|\nabla_h T^*\|_{H^s}^2 \\
& \leq C_{\nu_h, \kappa_h} \left(1 + \|V^*\|_{W^{k, \infty}}^4 + \|T^*\|_{W^{k, \infty}}^4 + \|\widehat{T}\|_{W^{k, \infty}}^4 + \|\widehat{V}\|_{W^{k, \infty}}^4 + \|w\|_{W^{k, \infty}} \right) (\|V^*\|_{H^s}^2 + \|T^*\|_{H^s}^2) \\
& \quad + C_{\nu_h} \left(\|\mathcal{R}_{i, \text{div}}\|_{H^s} + \|\mathcal{R}_b[s]\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{D})} + \|\mathcal{R}_{i, p}\|_{H^s} + \|p^*\|_{W^{k, \infty}} + \|V^*\|_{W^{k, \infty}} + \|w^*\|_{W^{k, \infty}} + \|T^*\|_{W^{k, \infty}} \right) \\
& \quad \times \left(\|\mathcal{R}_b[s]\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{D})} + \|\mathcal{R}_{i, \text{div}}\|_{H^s} + \|\mathcal{R}_{i, V}\|_{H^s} + \|\mathcal{R}_{i, T}\|_{H^s} + \|\mathcal{R}_{i, p}\|_{H^s} \right) \\
& := C_1 (\|V^*\|_{H^s}^2 + \|T^*\|_{H^s}^2) + C_2 (\|\mathcal{R}_b[s]\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{D})} + \|\mathcal{R}_{i, \text{div}}\|_{H^s} + \|\mathcal{R}_{i, V}\|_{H^s} + \|\mathcal{R}_{i, T}\|_{H^s} + \|\mathcal{R}_{i, p}\|_{H^s}).
\end{aligned}$$

Thanks to Gronwall inequality, we obtain that, for any $t \in [0, \mathcal{T}]$

$$\|V^*(t)\|_{H^s}^2 + \|T^*(t)\|_{H^s}^2 \leq \left(\mathcal{E}_G^t[s; \theta](t)^2 + \int_0^t C_2(\tilde{t})(\mathcal{E}_G^i[s; \theta] + \mathcal{E}_G^b[s; \theta])(\tilde{t})d\tilde{t} \right) \exp \left(\int_0^t C_1(\tilde{t})d\tilde{t} \right).$$

Finally by integrating t over $[0, \mathcal{T}]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^{\mathcal{T}} (\|V^*(t)\|_{H^s}^2 + \|T^*(t)\|_{H^s}^2) dt \\
& \leq C_{\mathcal{T}} \left(\int_0^{\mathcal{T}} \mathcal{E}_G^t[s; \theta](t)^2 dt + \int_0^{\mathcal{T}} C_2(t)(\mathcal{E}_G^i[s; \theta] + \mathcal{E}_G^b[s; \theta])(t)dt \right) \exp \left(\int_0^{\mathcal{T}} C_1(t)dt \right).
\end{aligned}$$

□

4.3. Controlling the Difference between Generalization Error and Training Error. In this section, we will answer question **SubQ3**: given PINNs $(\widehat{V}, \widehat{w}, \widehat{p}, \widehat{T}) := (V_\theta, w_\theta, p_\theta, T_\theta)$, can the difference between the corresponding generalization error and the training error be made arbitrarily small?

This question can be answered by the well-established results on numerical quadrature rules. Given $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and $f \in L^1(\Lambda)$, choose some quadrature points $x_m \in \Lambda$ for $1 \leq m \leq M$, and quadrature weights $w_m > 0$ for $1 \leq m \leq M$, and consider the approximation $\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M w_m f(x_m) \approx \int_\Lambda f(x)dx$. The accuracy of this approximation depends on the chosen quadrature rule, the number of quadrature points M and the regularity of f . In the PEs case, the problem is low-dimensional $d \leq 4$, and allows using standard deterministic numerical quadrature points. As in [20], we consider the midpoint rule: for $l > 0$, we partition Λ into $M \sim (\frac{1}{l})^d$ cubes of edge length l and we denote by $\{x_m\}_{m=1}^M$ the midpoints of these cubes. The formula and accuracy of the midpoint rule \mathcal{Q}_M^Λ are then given by,

$$\mathcal{Q}_M^\Lambda[f] := \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M f(y_m), \quad \left| \int_\Lambda f(y)dy - \mathcal{Q}_M^\Lambda[f] \right| \leq C_f M^{-2/d} \leq C_f l^2, \quad (4.20)$$

where $C_f \leq C\|f\|_{C^2}$. We remark that for high dimensional PDEs, one will need mesh free methods to sample points in Λ , such as Monte Carlo, to avoid the curse of dimensionality, for instance, see [71].

Let us fix the sample sets $\mathcal{S} = (\mathcal{S}_i, \mathcal{S}_t, \mathcal{S}_b)$ appearing in (2.9) as the midpoints in each corresponding domain, that is,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{S}_i & := \{(t_n, x_n, y_n, z_n) : (t_n, x_n, y_n, z_n) \text{ are midpoints of cubes of edge length } l_i \text{ in } [0, \mathcal{T}] \times \mathcal{D}\}, \\
\mathcal{S}_t & := \{(x_n, y_n, z_n) : (x_n, y_n, z_n) \text{ are midpoints of cubes of edge length } l_t \text{ in } \mathcal{D}\}, \\
\mathcal{S}_b & := \{(t_n, x_n, y_n, z_n) : (t_n, x_n, y_n, z_n) \text{ are midpoints of cubes of edge length } l_b \text{ in } [0, \mathcal{T}] \times \partial\mathcal{D}\},
\end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

and the edge lengths and quadrature weights satisfy

$$l_i \sim |\mathcal{S}_i|^{-\frac{1}{d+1}}, \quad l_t \sim |\mathcal{S}_t|^{-\frac{1}{d}}, \quad l_b \sim |\mathcal{S}_b|^{-\frac{1}{d}}, \quad w_n^i = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}_i|}, \quad w_n^t = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}_t|}, \quad w_n^b = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}_b|}. \quad (4.22)$$

Based on the estimate (4.20), we have the following theorem concerning the control of the generalization error from the training error.

Theorem 4.3 (Answer of **SubQ3**). *Given PINNs $(V_\theta, w_\theta, p_\theta, T_\theta)$ with the generalization error $\mathcal{E}_G[s; \theta]$ and the training error $\mathcal{E}_T[s; \theta; \mathcal{S}]$, then their difference depends on the size of \mathcal{S} through the length $l = (l_i, l_t, l_b)$:*

$$\left| \mathcal{E}_G[s; \theta]^2 - \mathcal{E}_T[s; \theta; \mathcal{S}]^2 \right| \leq C_{\theta, i} l_i^2 + C_{\theta, t} l_t^2 + C_{\theta, b} l_b^2,$$

where

$$C_{\theta, i} = \sum_{\varphi \in \{V, p, T, div\}} \|\mathcal{R}_{i, \varphi}[\theta]\|_{C^2([0, \mathcal{T}]; C^{s+2}(\mathcal{D}))}^2$$

$$C_{\theta, t} = \sum_{\varphi \in \{V, T\}} \|\mathcal{R}_{t, \varphi}[\theta]\|_{C^{s+2}(\mathcal{D})}^2, \quad C_{\theta, b} = \|\mathcal{R}_b[s; \theta]\|_{C^2([0, \mathcal{T}]; C^{s+2}(\partial \mathcal{D}))}^2.$$

Proof. Following from (4.20) and the fact that $(V_\theta, w_\theta, p_\theta, T_\theta)$ are smooth functions, one obtains the estimate

$$\left| \int_0^{\mathcal{T}} \|\mathcal{R}_{i, V}[\theta]\|_{H^s}^2 dt - \sum_{(t_n, x_n, y_n, z_n) \in \mathcal{S}_i} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s} w_n^i |D^\alpha \mathcal{R}_{i, V}[\theta](t_n, x_n, y_n, z_n)|^2 \right|$$

$$\leq \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s} \left| \|D^\alpha \mathcal{R}_{i, V}[\theta]\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \sum_{(t_n, x_n, y_n, z_n) \in \mathcal{S}_i} w_n^i |D^\alpha \mathcal{R}_{i, V}[\theta](t_n, x_n, y_n, z_n)|^2 \right|$$

$$\leq C \|\mathcal{R}_{i, V}[\theta]\|_{C^2([0, \mathcal{T}]; C^{s+2}(\mathcal{D}))}^2 l_i^2.$$

Other terms can be bounded similarly and we obtain

$$\left| \mathcal{E}_G^i[s; \theta]^2 - \mathcal{E}_T^i[s; \theta; \mathcal{S}_i]^2 \right| \leq C \sum_{\varphi \in \{V, p, T, div\}} \|\mathcal{R}_{i, \varphi}[\theta]\|_{C^2([0, \mathcal{T}]; C^{s+2}(\mathcal{D}))}^2 l_i^2,$$

$$\left| \mathcal{E}_G^t[s; \theta]^2 - \mathcal{E}_T^t[s; \theta; \mathcal{S}_t]^2 \right| \leq C \sum_{\varphi \in \{V, T\}} \|\mathcal{R}_{t, \varphi}[\theta]\|_{C^{s+2}(\mathcal{D})}^2 l_t^2,$$

$$\left| \mathcal{E}_G^b[s; \theta]^2 - \mathcal{E}_T^b[s; \theta; \mathcal{S}_b]^2 \right| \leq C \|\mathcal{R}_b[s; \theta]\|_{C^2([0, \mathcal{T}]; C^{s+2}(\partial \mathcal{D}))}^2 l_b^2,$$

and this leads to the desired result. \square

4.4. Answers to Q1 and Q2. Combining the answers to **SubQ1–SubQ3**, i.e., Theorem 4.1–4.3, we have the following theorem which answers **Q1** and **Q2**.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $d \in \{2, 3\}$, $\mathcal{T} > 0$, $k \geq 3$, $r > \frac{d}{2} + 2k$, and assume that $V_0 \in H_c^r(\mathcal{D})$, $T_0 \in H_o^r(\mathcal{D})$, and $Q \in C^{k-1}([0, \mathcal{T}]; H_o^r(\mathcal{D}))$. Let (V, w, p, T) be the unique strong solution to system (1.1).*

- (answer of **Q1**) For every $N > \frac{3(d+1)}{2}$, there exist tanh neural networks $(V_\theta, w_\theta, p_\theta, T_\theta)$ with two hidden layers, of widths at most $3 \lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil |P_{k-1, d+2}| + (d+1)(N-1)$ and $3 \lceil \frac{d+3}{2} \rceil |P_{d+2, d+2}| N^{d+1}$ such that for every $0 \leq s \leq k-3$,

$$\mathcal{E}_T[s; \theta; \mathcal{S}]^2 \leq C \left(\frac{(\ln^{s+2} N)^2}{N^{2k-2s-4}} + l_i^2 + l_t^2 + l_b^2 \right)$$

where the constant C is defined based on the constants appearing in Theorems 4.1 and 4.3, and $l_i \sim |\mathcal{S}_i|^{-\frac{1}{d+1}}$, $l_t \sim |\mathcal{S}_t|^{-\frac{1}{d}}$, $l_b \sim |\mathcal{S}_b|^{-\frac{1}{d}}$ are the edge lengths of cubes in the partition corresponding to \mathcal{S} . In particular, one can choose N large enough and l_i, l_t, l_b small enough, such that the training error $\mathcal{E}_T[s; \theta; \mathcal{S}]$ is sufficiently small.

- (answer of **Q2**) For $0 \leq s \leq 2k - 1$, the total error satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}[s; \theta]^2 &= \int_0^{\mathcal{T}} (\|V - V_\theta\|_{H^s}^2(t) + \|T - T_\theta\|_{H^s}^2(t)) dt \\ &\leq C_{\mathcal{T}} \left(\int_0^{\mathcal{T}} (\mathcal{E}_T[s; \theta; \mathcal{S}]^2(t) dt + C(l_i^2 + l_t^2 + l_b^2) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_0^{\mathcal{T}} C_2(t)(\mathcal{E}_T[s; \theta; \mathcal{S}](t) + C(l_i + l_t + l_b)) dt \right) \exp \left(\int_0^{\mathcal{T}} C_1(t) dt \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the constants are defined based on the constants appearing in Theorems 4.2 and 4.3. In particular when the training error is small enough and the l_i, l_t, l_b are small enough, the total error can be made arbitrarily small.

Remark 4. Theorem 4.4 implies that setting $s > 0$ in the training error (2.8) can guarantee the control of the total error (2.10) under H^s norm. However, it may be unnecessary to use $s > 0$ in (2.8) if one only needs to bound (2.10) under L^2 norm. See more details in the next section on the numerical experiments.

5. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

For the numerical experiments, we consider the 2D case and set $f_0 = 0$. System (1.1) reduces to

$$u_t + uu_x + wu_z - \nu_h u_{xx} - \nu_z u_{zz} + p_x = 0, \quad (5.1a)$$

$$\partial_z p + T = 0, \quad (5.1b)$$

$$u_x + w_z = 0, \quad (5.1c)$$

$$T_t + uT_x + wT_z - \kappa_h T_{xx} - \kappa_z T_{zz} = Q. \quad (5.1d)$$

We consider the following Taylor-Green vortex as the benchmark on the domain $(x, z) \in [0, 1]^2$ and $t \in [0, 1]$:

$$\begin{cases} u = -\sin(2\pi x) \cos(2\pi z) \exp(-4\pi^2(\nu_h + \nu_z)t) \\ w = \cos(2\pi x) \sin(2\pi z) \exp(-4\pi^2(\nu_h + \nu_z)t) \\ p = \frac{1}{4} \cos(4\pi x) \exp(-8\pi^2(\nu_h + \nu_z)t) + \frac{1}{2\pi} \cos(2\pi z) \exp(-4\pi^2\kappa_z t) \\ T = \sin(2\pi z) \exp(-4\pi^2\kappa_z t) \\ Q = \pi \cos(2\pi x) \sin(4\pi z) \exp(-4\pi^2(\nu_h + \nu_z + \kappa_z)t). \end{cases} \quad (5.2)$$

In this section we show the performance of PINNs approximating system (5.1) using the benchmark solution (5.2) with $\nu_z = \nu_h = \kappa_z = \kappa_h = 0.01$ (**Case 1**) and $\nu_z = \kappa_z = 0, \nu_h = \kappa_h = 0.01$ (**Case 2**). We will perform the result by setting $s = 0$ (L^2 residual) or $s = 1$ (H^1 residual) in the training error (2.8) during training, and compare their L^2 and H^1 total error (2.10).

For the PINNs architecture we make use of four fully-connected multilayer perceptrons (MLP), one for each of the unknown functions (u, w, p, T) , where each MLP consists of 2 hidden layers with 32 neurons per layer. In all cases, the quadrature for minimizing the training error was computed at equally spaced points using the midpoint rule and by taking 5751 points in the interior of the spatial domain, 1024 points at the initial time $t = 0$, and 544 points on the spatial boundary. Following from the midpoint rule, the quadrature weights in (2.9) are $w_n^i = 1/5751$, $w_n^t = 1/1024$, and $w_n^b = 1/544$ for all n . The learning rate is $1e-4$ while using the Adam algorithm for optimizing the training residuals, and the activation function used for all networks is the hyperbolic tangent function.

Figures 1 and 2 depict the L^2 and H^1 errors of the PINNs after being trained using the residuals in the cases $s = 0$ and $s = 1$. Since the pressure p is defined up to a constant term, we only plot the L^2 error of




FIGURE 1. L^2 and H^1 errors as a function of t between the PINN solutions and the Taylor-Green vortex benchmark (5.2) with $\nu_z = \nu_h = \kappa_z = \kappa_h = 0.01$ (Case 1). The notations $s = 0$ and $s = 1$ represents the L^2 residuals and H^1 residuals, respectively, in the training.

$\partial_x p_\theta$ and $\partial_z p_\theta$, rather than the L^2 or H^1 error of p_θ itself. Tables 1 and 2 give the absolute and relative total error $\mathcal{E}[s; \theta]$ defined in (2.10) with $s = 0$ or $s = 1$ trained using the L^2 residuals or H^1 residuals.

As shown in the figures and tables, the L^2 errors of the PINNs when trained with the H^1 residuals are not significantly improved compared to the ones trained with the L^2 residuals. We think this is due to the already-good learning of solutions under L^2 residuals, and that the L^2 residuals are sufficient to control the L^2 error. However, as expected from the analysis in the Section 4, we observe a noticeably smaller error in the H^1 norm (and in the L^2 norm for $\partial_x p_\theta$ and $\partial_z p_\theta$) when trained with the $s = 1$ residuals, indicating that the derivatives of the unknown functions are learned better under H^1 residuals.

The PINNs and loss functions for the training error were all implemented using the DeepXDE library [57]. The code for the results in this paper can be found at <https://github.com/alanraydan/PINN-PE>.




FIGURE 2. L^2 and H^1 errors as a function of t between the PINN solutions and the Taylor-Green vortex benchmark (5.2) with $\nu_z = \kappa_z = 0$, $\nu_h = \kappa_h = 0.01$ (Case 2). The notations $s = 0$ and $s = 1$ represents the L^2 residuals and H^1 residuals, respectively, in the training.

	$s = 0$		$s = 1$	
	$r = 0$	$r = 1$	$r = 0$	$r = 1$
absolute	2.075e-5	2.121e-5	6.957e-3	1.970e-3
relative	3.021e-5	3.089e-5	1.419e-3	4.017e-4

TABLE 1. **Case 1.** Absolute and relative total error $\mathcal{E}[s; \theta]$ for $s = 0, 1$ for the PINNs trained by minimizing the training error $\mathcal{E}_T[r; \theta; \mathcal{S}]$ for $r = 0, 1$.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Q.L. would like to thank Jinkai Li for interesting discussions on higher-order regularity results for the primitive equations, and is partially supported by Hellman Family Faculty Fellowship. A.R. would like to thank Lu Lu and the DeepXDE maintenance team for providing the PINN implementation library used in this paper. R.H. was partially supported by the NSF grant DMS-1953035, and the Faculty Career

	$s = 0$		$s = 1$	
	$r = 0$	$r = 1$	$r = 0$	$r = 1$
absolute	3.669e-5	1.222e-5	1.614e-2	9.022e-4
relative	4.473e-5	1.490e-5	2.765e-3	1.546e-4

TABLE 2. **Case 2.** Absolute and relative total error $\mathcal{E}[s; \theta]$ for $s = 0, 1$ for the PINNs trained by minimizing the training error $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}[r; \theta; \mathcal{S}]$ for $r = 0, 1$.

Development Award, the Research Assistance Program Award, the Early Career Faculty Acceleration funding and the Regents' Junior Faculty Fellowship at the University of California, Santa Barbara. S.T. was partially supported by Regents Junior Faculty fellowship, Faculty Early Career Acceleration grant and Hellman Family Faculty Fellowship sponsored by University of California Santa Barbara and the NSF under Award No. DMS-2111303.

Use was made of computational facilities purchased with funds from the National Science Foundation (CNS-1725797) and administered by the Center for Scientific Computing (CSC). The CSC is supported by the California NanoSystems Institute and the Materials Research Science and Engineering Center (MRSEC; NSF DMR 1720256) at UC Santa Barbara.

APPENDIX A. APPENDIX

Lemma A.1. *Let $d, k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\delta > 0$ and $f \in W^{k, \infty}(\Omega)$ with $\Omega = [0, \mathcal{T}] \times \mathcal{D}$. Consider the activation function $\sigma(x) = \tanh x$, and let $R > 0$ be such that $|\sigma^{(m)}(x)|$ is decreasing on $[R, \infty)$ for every $1 \leq m \leq k$. There exist constants $C(d, \mathcal{T})$, $C(d, s, k, f)$, $N_0(d) > 0$, such that for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$ with $N > N_0(d)$ there exists a tanh neural network \hat{f}^N with two hidden layers, one of width at most $3 \lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil |P_{k-1, d+2}| + (d+1)(N-1)$ and another of width at most $3 \lceil \frac{d+3}{2} \rceil |P_{d+2, d+2}| N^{d+1}$ such that,*

$$\|f - \hat{f}^N\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq (1 + \delta) \frac{C(d, 0, k, f)}{N^k},$$

and for $s = 1, \dots, k-1$,

$$\|f - \hat{f}^N\|_{W^{s, \infty}(\Omega)} \leq \frac{1 + \mathcal{T}^s}{\mathcal{T}^s} 3^{d+1} (1 + \delta) (2(s+1))^{3s} \max\{R^s, \ln^s(\beta N^{k+d+3})\} \frac{C(d, s, k, f)}{N^{k-s}},$$

where we define

$$\beta = \frac{s^3 2^{d+1} \sqrt{d+1} \max\{1, (1 + \mathcal{T}^{\frac{s}{2}})\|f\|_{W^{s, \infty}(\tilde{\Omega})}^{1/2}\}}{\delta \min\{1, \frac{\mathcal{T}^{\frac{k}{2}}}{1 + \mathcal{T}^k} \sqrt{C(d, s, k, f)}\}}.$$

If $f \in C^s(\Omega)$, then it holds that

$$C(d, s, k, f) = (1 + \mathcal{T}^k) \max_{0 \leq \ell \leq s} \frac{1}{(k - \ell)!} \left(\frac{3(d+1)}{2}\right)^{k-\ell} |f|_{W^{k, \infty}(\Omega)}, \quad N_0(d) = \frac{3(d+1)}{2},$$

and else it holds that

$$C(d, s, k, f) = (1 + \mathcal{T}^k) \max_{0 \leq \ell \leq s} \frac{\pi^{1/4} \sqrt{k}}{(k - \ell - 1)!} (5(d+1)^2)^{k-\ell} |f|_{W^{k, \infty}(\Omega)}, \quad N_0(d) = 5(d+1)^2,$$

where $|\cdot|_{W^{k, \infty}(\Omega)}$ is the homogeneous Sobolev seminorm.

Proof. The proof follows Theorem 5.1 in [21] together with change of variable. By setting $\tilde{t} = \frac{t}{\mathcal{T}}$, $\tilde{\Omega} = [0, 1] \times \mathcal{D}$, and $g(\tilde{t}, \mathbf{x}) = f(t, \mathbf{x})$, we know that $g \in W^{k, \infty}(\tilde{\Omega})$. According to Theorem 5.1 in [21], we know there exists

a tanh neural network $\widehat{g}^N(\tilde{t}, \mathbf{x})$ with two hidden layers, one of width at most $3 \lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil |P_{k-1, d+2}| + (d+1)(N-1)$ and another of width at most $3 \lceil \frac{d+3}{2} \rceil |P_{d+2, d+2}| N^{d+1}$ such that

$$\|g - \widehat{g}^N\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq (1 + \delta) \frac{C(d, 0, k, g)}{N^k},$$

and for $s = 1, \dots, k-1$,

$$\|g - \widehat{g}^N\|_{W^{s, \infty}(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq 3^{d+1} (1 + \delta) (2(s+1))^{3s} \max \left\{ R^s, \ln^s \left(\tilde{\beta} N^{k+d+3} \right) \right\} \frac{C(d, s, k, g)}{N^{k-s}},$$

where

$$\tilde{\beta} = \frac{s^3 2^{d+1} \sqrt{d+1} \max\{1, \|g\|_{W^{s, \infty}(\tilde{\Omega})}^{1/2}\}}{\delta \min\{1, \sqrt{C(d, s, k, g)}\}}.$$

If $g \in C^s(\tilde{\Omega})$, then it holds that

$$C(d, s, k, g) = \max_{0 \leq \ell \leq s} \frac{1}{(k-\ell)!} \left(\frac{3(d+1)}{2} \right)^{k-\ell} |g|_{W^{k, \infty}(\tilde{\Omega})}, \quad N_0(d) = \frac{3(d+1)}{2},$$

and else it holds that

$$C(d, s, k, g) = \max_{0 \leq \ell \leq s} \frac{\pi^{1/4} \sqrt{k}}{(k-\ell-1)!} (5(d+1)^2)^{k-\ell} |g|_{W^{k, \infty}(\tilde{\Omega})}, \quad N_0(d) = 5(d+1)^2.$$

Now denote a new neural network $\widehat{f}^N(t, \mathbf{x}) = \widehat{g}^N(\tilde{t}, \mathbf{x})$. Notice that $\partial_t^s f = (\frac{1}{\mathcal{T}})^s \partial_{\tilde{t}}^s g$, we have

$$\frac{\mathcal{T}^k}{1 + \mathcal{T}^k} |f|_{W^{k, \infty}(\Omega)} \leq |g|_{W^{k, \infty}(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq (1 + \mathcal{T}^k) |f|_{W^{k, \infty}(\Omega)},$$

and thus we can define

$$C(d, s, k, f) = (1 + \mathcal{T}^k) \max_{0 \leq \ell \leq s} \frac{1}{(k-\ell)!} \left(\frac{3(d+1)}{2} \right)^{k-\ell} |f|_{W^{k, \infty}(\Omega)}, \quad N_0(d) = \frac{3(d+1)}{2}, \quad \text{if } f \in C^s(\Omega),$$

and otherwise

$$C(d, s, k, f) = (1 + \mathcal{T}^k) \max_{0 \leq \ell \leq s} \frac{\pi^{1/4} \sqrt{k}}{(k-\ell-1)!} (5(d+1)^2)^{k-\ell} |f|_{W^{k, \infty}(\Omega)}, \quad N_0(d) = 5(d+1)^2.$$

This implies that $C(d, s, k, g) \leq C(d, s, k, f)$. By direct calculation one has

$$\|f - \widehat{f}^N\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = \|g - \widehat{g}^N\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq (1 + \delta) \frac{C(d, 0, k, g)}{N^k} \leq (1 + \delta) \frac{C(d, 0, k, f)}{N^k},$$

and for $s = 1, \dots, k-1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f - \widehat{f}^N\|_{W^{s, \infty}(\Omega)} &\leq \frac{1 + \mathcal{T}^s}{\mathcal{T}^s} \|g - \widehat{g}^N\|_{W^{s, \infty}(\tilde{\Omega})} \\ &\leq \frac{1 + \mathcal{T}^s}{\mathcal{T}^s} 3^{d+1} (1 + \delta) (2(s+1))^{3s} \max \left\{ R^s, \ln^s \left(\tilde{\beta} N^{k+d+3} \right) \right\} \frac{C(d, s, k, g)}{N^{k-s}} \\ &\leq \frac{1 + \mathcal{T}^s}{\mathcal{T}^s} 3^{d+1} (1 + \delta) (2(s+1))^{3s} \max \left\{ R^s, \ln^s \left(\beta N^{k+d+3} \right) \right\} \frac{C(d, s, k, f)}{N^{k-s}}, \end{aligned}$$

where β is defined as below

$$\beta = \frac{s^3 2^{d+1} \sqrt{d+1} \max\{1, (1 + \mathcal{T}^{\frac{s}{2}}) \|f\|_{W^{s, \infty}(\tilde{\Omega})}^{1/2}\}}{\delta \min\{1, \frac{\mathcal{T}^{\frac{s}{2}}}{1 + \mathcal{T}^k} \sqrt{C(d, s, k, f)}\}}$$

so that $\tilde{\beta} \leq \beta$. This finishes the proof. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Robert A Adams and John JF Fournier, *Sobolev spaces*, Elsevier, 2003.
- [2] Pascal Azérad and Francisco Guillén, *Mathematical justification of the hydrostatic approximation in the primitive equations of geophysical fluid dynamics*, SIAM journal on mathematical analysis **33** (2001), no. 4, 847–859.
- [3] J Thomas Beale, Tosio Kato, and Andrew Majda, *Remarks on the breakdown of smooth solutions for the 3-d euler equations*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **94** (1984), no. 1, 61–66.
- [4] William Blumen, *Geostrophic adjustment*, Reviews of Geophysics **10** (1972), no. 2, 485–528.
- [5] Arthur Bousquet, Youngjoon Hong, Roger Temam, and Joseph Tribbia, *Numerical simulations of the two-dimensional inviscid hydrostatic primitive equations with humidity and saturation*, Journal of Scientific Computing **83** (2020), no. 2, 1–24.
- [6] Yann Brenier, *Homogeneous hydrostatic flows with convex velocity profiles*, Nonlinearity **12** (1999), no. 3, 495.
- [7] ———, *Remarks on the derivation of the hydrostatic euler equations*, Bulletin des sciences mathématiques **127** (2003), no. 7, 585–595.
- [8] Zdzisław Brzeźniak and Jakub Slavík, *Well-posedness of the 3d stochastic primitive equations with multiplicative and transport noise*, Journal of Differential Equations **296** (2021), 617–676.
- [9] Chongsheng Cao, Slim Ibrahim, Kenji Nakanishi, and Edriss S Titi, *Finite-time blowup for the inviscid primitive equations of oceanic and atmospheric dynamics*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **337** (2015), no. 2, 473–482.
- [10] Chongsheng Cao, Jinkai Li, and Edriss S Titi, *Global well-posedness of the three-dimensional primitive equations with only horizontal viscosity and diffusion*, Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics **69** (2016), no. 8, 1492–1531.
- [11] ———, *Strong solutions to the 3d primitive equations with only horizontal dissipation: Near $h1$ initial data*, Journal of Functional Analysis **272** (2017), no. 11, 4606–4641.
- [12] ———, *Global well-posedness of the 3d primitive equations with horizontal viscosity and vertical diffusivity*, Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena **412** (2020), 132606.
- [13] Chongsheng Cao, Qu Yuan Lin, and Edriss S Titi, *On the well-posedness of reduced 3 d primitive geostrophic adjustment model with weak dissipation*, Journal of Mathematical Fluid Mechanics **22** (2020), 1–34.
- [14] Chongsheng Cao and Edriss S Titi, *Global well-posedness of the three-dimensional viscous primitive equations of large scale ocean and atmosphere dynamics*, Annals of Mathematics (2007), 245–267.
- [15] J Charney, *The use of the primitive equations of motion in numerical prediction*, Tellus **7** (1955), no. 1, 22–26.
- [16] Changsheng Chen, Hedong Liu, and Robert C Beardsley, *An unstructured grid, finite-volume, three-dimensional, primitive equations ocean model: application to coastal ocean and estuaries*, Journal of atmospheric and oceanic technology **20** (2003), no. 1, 159–186.
- [17] Qingshan Chen, Ming-Cheng Shiue, Roger Temam, and Joseph Tribbia, *Numerical approximation of the inviscid 3d primitive equations in a limited domain*, ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis **46** (2012), no. 3, 619–646.
- [18] Charles Collot, Slim Ibrahim, and Qu Yuan Lin, *Stable singularity formation for the inviscid primitive equations*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.09759 (2021).
- [19] Salvatore Cuomo, Vincenzo Schiano Di Cola, Fabio Giampaolo, Gianluigi Rozza, Maizar Raissi, and Francesco Piccialli, *Scientific machine learning through physics-informed neural networks: Where we are and what's next*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.05624 (2022).
- [20] Tim De Ryck, Ameya D Jagtap, and Siddhartha Mishra, *Error estimates for physics informed neural networks approximating the navier-stokes equations*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.09346 (2022).
- [21] Tim De Ryck, Samuel Lanthaler, and Siddhartha Mishra, *On the approximation of functions by tanh neural networks*, Neural Networks **143** (2021), 732–750.
- [22] Tim De Ryck and Siddhartha Mishra, *Error analysis for physics informed neural networks (pinns) approximating kolmogorov pdes*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.14473 (2021).
- [23] ———, *Generic bounds on the approximation error for physics-informed (and) operator learning*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.11393 (2022).
- [24] Arnaud Debussche, Nathan Glatt-Holtz, and Roger Temam, *Local martingale and pathwise solutions for an abstract fluids model*, Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena **240** (2011), no. 14–15, 1123–1144.
- [25] Arnaud Debussche, Nathan Glatt-Holtz, Roger Temam, and Mohammed Ziane, *Global existence and regularity for the 3d stochastic primitive equations of the ocean and atmosphere with multiplicative white noise*, Nonlinearity **25** (2012), no. 7, 2093.
- [26] MWGM Dissanayake and Nhan Phan-Thien, *Neural-network-based approximations for solving partial differential equations*, communications in Numerical Methods in Engineering **10** (1994), no. 3, 195–201.
- [27] Ken Furukawa, Yoshikazu Giga, Matthias Hieber, Amru Hussein, Takahito Kashiwabara, and Marc Wrona, *Rigorous justification of the hydrostatic approximation for the primitive equations by scaled navier–stokes equations*, Nonlinearity **33** (2020), no. 12, 6502.

- [28] David Gerard-Varet, Nader Masmoudi, and Vlad Vicol, *Well-posedness of the hydrostatic navier–stokes equations*, *Analysis & PDE* **13** (2020), no. 5, 1417–1455.
- [29] Tej Eddine Ghouil, Slim Ibrahim, Quyuan Lin, and Edriss S Titi, *On the effect of rotation on the life-span of analytic solutions to the 3d inviscid primitive equations*, *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis* (2022), 1–60.
- [30] Adrian E Gill and E Adrian, *Atmosphere-ocean dynamics*, Vol. 30, Academic press, 1982.
- [31] AE Gill, *Adjustment under gravity in a rotating channel*, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **77** (1976), no. 3, 603–621.
- [32] Nathan Glatt-Holtz and Roger Temam, *Pathwise solutions of the 2-d stochastic primitive equations*, *Applied Mathematics & Optimization* **63** (2011), no. 3, 401–433.
- [33] Nathan Glatt-Holtz and Mohammed Ziane, *The stochastic primitive equations in two space dimensions with multiplicative noise*, *Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems-B* **10** (2008), no. 4, 801.
- [34] Emmanuel Grenier, *On the derivation of homogeneous hydrostatic equations*, *ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis* **33** (1999), no. 5, 965–970.
- [35] Daniel Han-Kwan and Toan T Nguyen, *Ill-posedness of the hydrostatic euler and singular vlasov equations*, *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis* **221** (2016), no. 3, 1317–1344.
- [36] AJ Hermann and WB Owens, *Energetics of gravitational adjustment for mesoscale chimneys*, *Journal of Physical Oceanography* **23** (1993), no. 2, 346–371.
- [37] Matthias Hieber, Amru Hussein, and Martin Saal, *The primitive equations with stochastic wind driven boundary conditions: global strong well-posedness in critical spaces*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.09449 (2020).
- [38] Matthias Hieber and Takahito Kashiwabara, *Global strong well-posedness of the three dimensional primitive equations in L^p -spaces*, *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis* **221** (2016), no. 3, 1077–1115.
- [39] James R Holton, *An introduction to dynamic meteorology*, *American Journal of Physics* **41** (1973), no. 5, 752–754.
- [40] Ruimeng Hu and Quyuan Lin, *Local martingale solutions and pathwise uniqueness for the three-dimensional stochastic inviscid primitive equations*, *Stochastics and Partial Differential Equations: Analysis and Computations* (2022), 1–49.
- [41] Slim Ibrahim, Quyuan Lin, and Edriss S Titi, *Finite-time blowup and ill-posedness in sobolev spaces of the inviscid primitive equations with rotation*, *Journal of Differential Equations* **286** (2021), 557–577.
- [42] George Em Karniadakis, Ioannis G Kevrekidis, Lu Lu, Paris Perdikaris, Sifan Wang, and Liu Yang, *Physics-informed machine learning*, *Nature Reviews Physics* **3** (2021), no. 6, 422–440.
- [43] Sergiu Klainerman and Andrew Majda, *Singular limits of quasilinear hyperbolic systems with large parameters and the incompressible limit of compressible fluids*, *Communications on pure and applied Mathematics* **34** (1981), no. 4, 481–524.
- [44] Georgij M Kobelkov, *Existence of a solution ‘in the large’ for the 3d large-scale ocean dynamics equations*, *Comptes Rendus Mathématique* **343** (2006), no. 4, 283–286.
- [45] Peter Korn, *Strong solvability of a variational data assimilation problem for the primitive equations of large-scale atmosphere and ocean dynamics*, *Journal of Nonlinear Science* **31** (2021), no. 3, 1–53.
- [46] TN Krishnamurti and Lahouari Bounoua, *An introduction to numerical weather prediction techniques*, CRC press, 2018.
- [47] Igor Kukavica, Nader Masmoudi, Vlad Vicol, and Tak Kwong Wong, *On the local well-posedness of the prandtl and hydrostatic euler equations with multiple monotonicity regions*, *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* **46** (2014), no. 6, 3865–3890.
- [48] Igor Kukavica, Roger Temam, Vlad C Vicol, and Mohammed Ziane, *Local existence and uniqueness for the hydrostatic euler equations on a bounded domain*, *Journal of Differential Equations* **250** (2011), no. 3, 1719–1746.
- [49] Igor Kukavica and Mohammed Ziane, *On the regularity of the primitive equations of the ocean*, *Nonlinearity* **20** (2007), no. 12, 2739.
- [50] Allen C Kuo and Lorenzo M Polvani, *Time-dependent fully nonlinear geostrophic adjustment*, *Journal of physical oceanography* **27** (1997), no. 8, 1614–1634.
- [51] Isaac E Lagaris, Aristidis Likas, and Dimitrios I Fotiadis, *Artificial neural networks for solving ordinary and partial differential equations*, *IEEE transactions on neural networks* **9** (1998), no. 5, 987–1000.
- [52] Isaac E Lagaris, Aristidis C Likas, and Dimitris G Papageorgiou, *Neural-network methods for boundary value problems with irregular boundaries*, *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks* **11** (2000), no. 5, 1041–1049.
- [53] Jinkai Li and Edriss S Titi, *The primitive equations as the small aspect ratio limit of the navier–stokes equations: Rigorous justification of the hydrostatic approximation*, *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées* **124** (2019), 30–58.
- [54] Jinkai Li, Edriss S Titi, and Guozhi Yuan, *The primitive equations approximation of the anisotropic horizontally viscous 3d navier–stokes equations*, *Journal of Differential Equations* **306** (2022), 492–524.
- [55] Quyuan Lin, Xin Liu, and Edriss S Titi, *On the effect of fast rotation and vertical viscosity on the lifespan of the 3d primitive equations*, *Journal of Mathematical Fluid Mechanics* **24** (2022), 1–44.
- [56] Jian-Guo Liu and Cheng Wang, *A fourth order numerical method for the primitive equations formulated in mean vorticity*, *Commun. Comput. Phys.* **4** (2008), 26–55.
- [57] Lu Lu, Xuhui Meng, Zhiping Mao, and George Em Karniadakis, *DeepXDE: A deep learning library for solving differential equations*, *SIAM Review* **63** (2021), no. 1, 208–228.

- [58] Nader Masmoudi and Tak Kwong Wong, *On the h s theory of hydrostatic euler equations*, Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis **204** (2012), no. 1, 231–271.
- [59] Siddhartha Mishra and Roberto Molinaro, *Estimates on the generalization error of physics-informed neural networks for approximating a class of inverse problems for pdes*, IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis **42** (2022), no. 2, 981–1022.
- [60] ———, *Estimates on the generalization error of physics-informed neural networks for approximating pdes*, IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis (2022).
- [61] Marius Paicu, Ping Zhang, and Zhifei Zhang, *On the hydrostatic approximation of the navier-stokes equations in a thin strip*, Advances in Mathematics **372** (2020), 107293.
- [62] Yuan Pei, *Continuous data assimilation for the 3d primitive equations of the ocean*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.06007 (2018).
- [63] R Plougonven and V Zeitlin, *Lagrangian approach to geostrophic adjustment of frontal anomalies in a stratified fluid*, Geophysical & Astrophysical Fluid Dynamics **99** (2005), no. 2, 101–135.
- [64] Maziar Raissi and George Em Karniadakis, *Hidden physics models: Machine learning of nonlinear partial differential equations*, Journal of Computational Physics **357** (2018), 125–141.
- [65] Maziar Raissi, Paris Perdikaris, and George E Karniadakis, *Physics-informed neural networks: A deep learning framework for solving forward and inverse problems involving nonlinear partial differential equations*, Journal of Computational physics **378** (2019), 686–707.
- [66] Michael Renardy, *Ill-posedness of the hydrostatic euler and navier–stokes equations*, Archive for rational mechanics and analysis **194** (2009), no. 3, 877–886.
- [67] Carl-Gustav Rossby, *On the mutual adjustment of pressure and velocity distributions in certain simple current systems, ii*, J. mar. Res **1** (1938), no. 3, 239–263.
- [68] Martin Saal and Jakub Slavík, *Stochastic primitive equations with horizontal viscosity and diffusivity*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.14568 (2021).
- [69] Roger Samelson, Roger Temam, Cheng Wang, and Shouhong Wang, *Surface pressure poisson equation formulation of the primitive equations: numerical schemes*, SIAM journal on numerical analysis **41** (2003), no. 3, 1163–1194.
- [70] Jie Shen and Shouhong Wang, *A fast and accurate numerical scheme for the primitive equations of the atmosphere*, SIAM journal on numerical analysis **36** (1999), no. 3, 719–737.
- [71] Justin Sirignano and Konstantinos Spiliopoulos, *Dgm: A deep learning algorithm for solving partial differential equations*, Journal of computational physics **375** (2018), 1339–1364.
- [72] Jakub Slavík, *Large and moderate deviations principles and central limit theorem for the stochastic 3d primitive equations with gradient-dependent noise*, Journal of Theoretical Probability (2021), 1–46.
- [73] Joseph Smagorinsky, *General circulation experiments with the primitive equations: I. the basic experiment*, Monthly weather review **91** (1963), no. 3, 99–164.
- [74] Roger Temam, *Navier-stokes equations: theory and numerical analysis*, Vol. 343, American Mathematical Soc., 2001.
- [75] Chuwei Wang, Shanda Li, Di He, and Liwei Wang, *Is l^2 physics-informed loss always suitable for training physics-informed neural network?*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.02016 (2022).
- [76] Tak Kwong Wong, *Blowup of solutions of the hydrostatic euler equations*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society **143** (2015), no. 3, 1119–1125.

(R. Hu) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS AND APPLIED PROBABILITY, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA BARBARA, CA 93106, USA.

Email address: rhu@ucsb.edu

(Q. Lin) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA BARBARA, CA 93106, USA.

Email address: quyuan.lin@ucsb.edu

(A. Raydan) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA BARBARA, CA 93106, USA.

Email address: alanraydan@ucsb.edu

(S. Tang) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA BARBARA, CA 93106, USA.

Email address: suitang@ucsb.edu