

RIGOROUS ANALYSIS OF THE INTERACTION PROBLEM OF SEA ICE WITH A RIGID BODY

TIM BINZ, FELIX BRANDT, AND MATTHIAS HIEBER

ABSTRACT. Consider the set of equations modeling the motion of a rigid body enclosed in sea ice. Using Hibler’s viscous-plastic model for describing sea ice, it is shown by a certain decoupling approach that this system admits a unique, local strong solution within the L^p -setting.

1. INTRODUCTION

It is a classical problem in fluid mechanics to study the movement of rigid or elastic bodies immersed in a fluid, see e.g. the works of Galdi [15], Hoffmann and Starovoitov [24], Desjardins and Esteban [10, 11], Gunzberger, Lee and Seregin [21], Feireisl, Hillairet and Necasova [13], Tucsnak, Cumsille and Takahashi [7, 8], Geissert, Götze and Hieber [18], Raymond, Maity, Roy and Vanninathan [32, 39], and the recent work of Ervedoza, Maity and Tucsnak [12]. We also refer to the survey article [16] by Galdi and Neustupa for the stationary case. The very recent article [12] by Ervedoza, Maity and Tucsnak discusses the long-time behaviour of a system accounting for the motion of a rigid body enclosed in a viscous incompressible fluid.

In this article, we investigate the problem of interaction of a rigid body in sea ice. Sea ice as a material exhibits a complex mechanical and thermodynamical behaviour. A composite of pure ice, liquid brine, air pockets and solid salt is formed by freezing sea water. As indicated in [14] or [19], the details of this formation depend on the laminar or turbulent environmental conditions. The response of this composite to heating, pressure or mechanical forces is for example different from the response of the (salt-free) glacial ice of ice sheets. For a recent survey in the Notices of the AMS, see [20].

We note that there is significant interest in understanding the interaction of ice and rigid structures. One particular application is e.g. the behaviour of a ship in sea ice. For numerical simulations of the movements of ships in an ice floe field, we refer e.g. to [46] or [26]; the article [45] provides a review of ice-structure interaction simulations.

It is the aim of this article to present for the first time a rigorous analytical study of the interaction of sea ice with rigid structures.

W.D. Hibler suggested in 1979 the governing equations of large-scale sea ice dynamics in a seminal article [22]. These equations form the basis of many sea ice models in climate science. Sea ice is here modeled as a material with a very specific constitutive law combined with viscous-plastic rheology.

During the last decades, various communities have been investigating this set of equations numerically, see e.g. [9, 27, 29, 34–36, 41]. Unlike the equations describing atmospheric or oceanic dynamics as e.g. the primitive equations, see [3], rigorous analysis of the sea ice equations started only very recently by the works of Brandt, Disser, Haller-Dintelmann, Hieber [2] and Liu, Thomas and Titi [30]. The underlying set of equations is a coupled degenerate quasilinear parabolic-hyperbolic system, whose analysis is delicate. In [2], it is shown by means of the theory of quasilinear evolution equations that a suitable regularization of Hibler’s model coupling velocity, thickness and compactness of sea ice is locally strongly well-posed and also globally strongly well-posed for initial data close to constant equilibria. The approach developed in [30] emphasizes the parabolic-hyperbolic character of Hibler’s model and proves also local strong well-posedness by means of a different regularization and by energy estimates.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35Q86, 35K59, 86A05, 86A10, 74F99.

Key words and phrases. Sea ice interacting with a rigid body, Hibler’s sea ice model, viscous-plastic stress tensor, coupled boundary conditions.

In this article, we develop an L^p -theory for strong solutions to the interaction problem of a rigid body trapped in sea ice in a bounded domain. We prove that the system (2.3) below, coupling the sea ice dynamics with the motion of the enclosed rigid body, admits a unique strong solution provided the initial data fulfill certain regularity assumptions and the rigid body does not collide with the outer boundary of sea ice within the time frame under consideration.

As the domain of the sea ice depends on the motion of the rigid body, we face a *moving domain problem*. It is thus important in our analysis to transform the original problem to a problem on a fixed domain. To this end, we employ a nonlinear, local change of coordinates onto Lagrangian coordinates, and this coordinate transform acts only on a neighborhood of the rigid body. The transformation was first introduced by Inoue and Wakimoto [25] and then used by Tucsnak, Cumsille and Takahashi [6–8, 42, 43] and San Martín, Scheid, Takahashi and Tucsnak [40] in the context of incompressible fluids, by Geissert, Götze and Hieber [18] in the situation of Newtonian and generalized Newtonian fluids, and by Hieber and Murata [23] in the context of compressible fluids. The above transform was the starting point in the cited articles to show the existence of a unique, local strong solution, or even a global solution in the case of small data, to the coupled system on bounded or unbounded fluid domains and in the situation of two or three space dimensions.

In the context of incompressible fluids, the above fluid-structure interaction problem was investigated by many other authors in the weak and strong setting by means of different types of transformations. The existence of local or global strong solutions has its roots in the works of Galdi [15], Galdi and Silvestre [17], Hoffmann and Starovoitov [24], Desjardins and Esteban [10, 11], Gunzberger, Lee and Seregin [21] as well as Feireisl, Hillairet and Necasova [13].

The approach in our article is “monolithic”, i.e., the equations of the solid and the fluid in the linearized problem under consideration are still coupled. This means that for u denoting the velocity of the sea ice and for z representing the angular and translational velocity of the rigid body, we study the operator with coupled boundary conditions of the form $Lu = Rz$, where L is the trace operator and R accounts for the motion of the rigid body. To be more precise, the operator in the coupled setting takes the shape

$$(1.1) \quad \mathcal{A} = \begin{pmatrix} A_m^H & B & 0 \\ 0 & D_{h,a} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad D(\mathcal{A}) = \{(u, b, z)^T \in D(A_m^H) \times D(D_{h,a}) \times \mathbb{C}^3 : Lu = Rz\}.$$

In the above, A_m^H denotes the maximal operator associated to the Hibler operator as discussed in Section 2, see also [2, Section 3], $D_{h,a} := (-d_h \Delta) \otimes (-d_a \Delta)$ with $D(D_{h,a}) := W_N^{2,q}(\mathcal{D}(\cdot))^2$, where $W_N^{2,q}(\mathcal{D}(\cdot)) := \{b \in W^{2,q}(\mathcal{D}(\cdot)) : \partial_\nu b = 0 \text{ on } \partial \mathcal{D}(\cdot)\}$ and $\mathcal{D}(\cdot)$ represents the time-dependent domain occupied by the sea ice, B are lower order perturbation terms, and $b = (h, a)^T$ consists of the mean ice thickness and the ice compactness as introduced in the next section.

In our concrete case, we use the aforementioned coordinate transform going back to Inoue and Wakimoto to transform the problem to a fixed domain. The key idea of our approach is to show maximal regularity of the transformed operator and to use the known properties of the associated operator and the right-hand side of the sea ice equations. We also introduce a new decoupling argument to handle the coupling in the boundary conditions. Employing a suitable similarity transform, see Section 5, we deduce from maximal regularity in the decoupled situation with diagonal domain that we also have maximal regularity in the coupled setting. This argument is based on properties of the maximal operator associated to the Hibler operator as introduced in [2].

More precisely, we combine our knowledge of the terms for fixed domains at some frozen time τ with the regularity of the coordinate transform. This allows us to verify Lipschitz properties of the quasilinear matrix system as well as of the nonlinear right-hand side in the framework of the transformed equations. The nonlinear right-hand side in the equations for the rigid body is coupled with the sea ice via the viscous-plastic stress tensor, see (2.3). We emphasize that in contrast to the Navier-Stokes equations, where the underlying stress tensor is linear, the stress tensor in the context of the Hibler sea ice model is *quasilinear*. In order to obtain estimates for the resulting quasilinear term in the surface integral, we rely on a nonlinear complex interpolation result, which is a variant of a result due to Bergh [1].

As mentioned above, the coordinate transform and a decoupling argument are used to deduce maximal regularity of the transformed operator. The coordinate transform yields that the resulting quasilinear evolution equation on the fixed domain is non-autonomous. Moreover, we consider the initial data and the solution to be in an open subset of the trace space to guarantee that the sea ice equations are well-defined. Results on the local existence and uniqueness of strong solutions to quasilinear evolution equations are of course well-known. Making use of the Lipschitz properties and the maximal regularity, we establish the local existence and uniqueness of a strong solution to the transformed interaction problem on the fixed domain in the L^p -setting. The solution to the initial problem is finally obtained by performing the corresponding backwards coordinate transform.

This article is organized as follows. In [Section 2](#), we introduce the interaction problem, recall the sea ice equations, and we will state the main result on uniqueness and existence of a strong solution. [Section 3](#) is then devoted to the presentation of the coordinate transform and the computation of the transformed terms. We provide two auxiliary results concerning non-autonomous quasilinear evolution equations and nonlinear complex interpolation, respectively, in [Section 4](#). In the last part, [Section 5](#), we show the required properties of the coordinate transform, deduce maximal regularity of the transformed operator by a decoupling argument and verify the Lipschitz estimates of the operator matrix and the right-hand side. This results in the proof of the main theorem.

2. SEA ICE INTERACTION WITH A RIGID BODY AND MAIN RESULT

The present sea ice model is a 2D model, and we consider a bounded domain $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ of class C^2 . We denote the time-dependent bounded domain occupied by the rigid body by $\mathcal{B}(t)$ and the remaining part of the domain filled by sea ice by $\mathcal{D}(t) = \mathcal{O} \setminus \overline{\mathcal{B}(t)}$. Moreover, the interface between the body and the sea ice is denoted by $\Gamma(t)$. To simplify the notation, we introduce $\mathcal{D} := \mathcal{D}(0)$, $\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{B}(0)$ as well as $\Gamma := \Gamma(0)$. The outer normal at $\Gamma(t)$ is denoted by $n(t)$, and the sets $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{D}}$ and \mathcal{Q}_{Γ} consist of all points in spacetime where the spatial component is in $\mathcal{D}(t)$ and $\Gamma(t)$, respectively, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{D}} := \{(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : t \in [0, T], x \in \mathcal{D}(t)\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{Q}_{\Gamma} := \{(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : t \in [0, T], x \in \Gamma(t)\}.$$

Note that

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{D}} = \bigcup_{t \in [0, T]} \{t\} \times \mathcal{D}(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{Q}_{\Gamma} = \bigcup_{t \in [0, T]} \{t\} \times \Gamma(t).$$

The system of equations accounting for the dynamics of the sea ice is here given by

$$(2.1) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} m(u_t + u \cdot \nabla u) = \operatorname{div} \sigma_{\delta} + f_1(u), & \text{in } \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{D}}, \\ h_t + \operatorname{div}(uh) = S_h(h, a) + d_h \Delta h, & \text{in } \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{D}}, \\ a_t + \operatorname{div}(ua) = S_a(h, a) + d_a \Delta a, & \text{in } \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{D}}, \\ u = u_{\mathcal{B}}, & \text{on } \mathcal{Q}_{\Gamma}, \\ \frac{\partial h}{\partial \nu} = \frac{\partial a}{\partial \nu} = 0, & \text{on } \mathcal{Q}_{\Gamma}, \\ u = 0, \frac{\partial h}{\partial \nu} = \frac{\partial a}{\partial \nu} = 0, & \text{on } \partial \mathcal{O}, \\ u(0) = u_0, h(0) = h_0, a(0) = a_0, & \text{in } \mathcal{D}. \end{array} \right.$$

In the above, u and $u_{\mathcal{B}}$ are the horizontal velocities of the sea ice and the rigid body, respectively, while h denotes the mean ice thickness, and the variable a represents the ice compactness. In addition, m is the ice mass per unit area. It takes the shape $m = \rho_{\text{ice}} h$, where $\rho_{\text{ice}} > 0$ is constant. The term f_1 accounts for the external forcing terms in the momentum equation for sea ice, while S_h and S_a are thermodynamic terms. They are made precise at a later stage.

In the present 2D case, for $v = (u, h, a)^T$ denoting the principle variable of the sea ice equations, the balance equations for the momentum and the angular momentum of the rigid body are

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{cases} m_{\text{B}}\eta'(t) + \int_{\Gamma(t)} \sigma_{\delta}(v)(t, x)n(t, x) \, dS = F(t), & t \in \mathbb{R}_+, \\ J\omega'(t) + \int_{\Gamma(t)} (x - x_c(t))^{\perp} \sigma_{\delta}(v)(t, x)n(t, x) \, dS = N(t), & t \in \mathbb{R}_+, \\ \eta(0) = \eta_0, \quad \omega(0) = \omega_0. \end{cases}$$

The constants m_{B} and J represent the body's mass and inertia tensor, x_c describes the position of the body's center of gravity, where $x_c(0) = 0$ for convenience, and η as well as ω denote its translational and angular velocity. For $y = (y_1, y_2)^T \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we write $y^{\perp} = (y_2, -y_1)^T$. The full velocity of the rigid body is then given by

$$u_{\text{B}}(t, x) := \eta(t) + \omega(t)(x - x_c(t))^{\perp}.$$

We rewrite (2.1) and (2.2) into one system of equations in the unknowns u, h, a, η and ω . This system takes the shape

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{cases} m(u_t + u \cdot \nabla u) = \operatorname{div} \sigma_{\delta} + f_1(u), & \text{in } \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{D}}, \\ h_t + \operatorname{div}(uh) = S_h(h, a) + d_h \Delta h, & \text{in } \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{D}}, \\ a_t + \operatorname{div}(ua) = S_a(h, a) + d_a \Delta a, & \text{in } \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{D}}, \\ u(t, x) = \eta(t) + \omega(t)(x - x_c(t))^{\perp}, & \text{on } \mathcal{Q}_{\Gamma}, \\ \frac{\partial h}{\partial \nu} = \frac{\partial a}{\partial \nu} = 0, & \text{on } \mathcal{Q}_{\Gamma}, \\ u = 0, \quad \frac{\partial h}{\partial \nu} = \frac{\partial a}{\partial \nu} = 0, & \text{on } \partial \mathcal{O}, \\ u(0) = u_0, \quad h(0) = h_0, \quad a(0) = a_0, & \text{in } \mathcal{D}. \\ m_{\text{B}}\eta'(t) = - \int_{\Gamma(t)} \sigma_{\delta}(v)(t, x)n(t, x) \, dS + F(t), & t \in \mathbb{R}_+, \\ J\omega'(t) = - \int_{\Gamma(t)} (x - x_c(t))^{\perp} \sigma_{\delta}(v)(t, x)n(t, x) \, dS + N(t), & t \in \mathbb{R}_+, \\ \eta(0) = \eta_0, \quad \omega(0) = \omega_0. \end{cases}$$

Following [22], the constitutive law for the ice stress is given by

$$\sigma = 2\eta(\varepsilon, P)\varepsilon + [\zeta(\varepsilon, P) - \eta(\varepsilon, P)]\operatorname{tr}(\varepsilon)I - \frac{P}{2}I,$$

where $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(u) = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla u + (\nabla u)^T)$ is the deformation tensor, P represents the ice pressure and is defined by

$$P = P(h, a) = p^* h e^{-c(1-a)},$$

for given constants $p^* > 0$ and $c > 0$, and ζ and η are bulk and shear viscosities. The latter ones are given by

$$\zeta(\varepsilon, P) = \frac{P}{2\Delta(\varepsilon)} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta(\varepsilon, P) = e^{-2}\zeta(\varepsilon, P),$$

with

$$\Delta^2(\varepsilon) := (\varepsilon_{11}^2 + \varepsilon_{22}^2) \left(1 + \frac{1}{e^2}\right) + \frac{4}{e^2} \varepsilon_{12}^2 + 2\varepsilon_{11}\varepsilon_{22} \left(1 - \frac{1}{e^2}\right),$$

and $e > 1$ is the ratio of major to minor axes of the elliptical yield curve on which the principal components of the stress lie. Even though the above law describes an idealized viscous-plastic material, its viscosities become singular if Δ tends to zero. Following [2] and [35], see also [28], we consider for $\delta > 0$ the regularization

$$\Delta_{\delta}(\varepsilon) := \sqrt{\delta + \Delta^2(\varepsilon)}.$$

Thus, setting $\zeta_{\delta} = \frac{P}{2\Delta_{\delta}(\varepsilon)}$ and $\eta_{\delta} = e^{-2}\zeta_{\delta}$, we obtain the regularized internal ice stress

$$(2.4) \quad \sigma_{\delta} := 2\eta_{\delta}\varepsilon + [\zeta_{\delta} - \eta_{\delta}]\operatorname{tr}(\varepsilon)I - \frac{P}{2}I.$$

We define Hibler's operator by

$$A^H u := -\operatorname{div} S_\delta(u).$$

Following [2], A^H is given by

$$(A^H u)_i = \sum_{j,k,l=1}^2 \frac{P}{2} \frac{1}{\Delta_\delta(\varepsilon)} \left(\mathbb{S}_{ij}^{kl} - \frac{1}{\Delta_\delta^2(\varepsilon)} (\mathbb{S}\varepsilon)_{ik} (\mathbb{S}\varepsilon)_{jl} \right) D_k D_l u_j - \frac{1}{2\Delta_\delta(\varepsilon)} \sum_{j=1}^2 (\partial_j P) (\mathbb{S}\varepsilon)_{ij}$$

for $i = 1, 2$ and $D_m = -i\partial_m$. Denote the coefficients of the principal part of A^H by

$$(2.5) \quad a_{ij}^{kl}(\nabla u, P) := \frac{P}{2} \frac{1}{\Delta_\delta(\varepsilon)} \left(\mathbb{S}_{ij}^{kl} - \frac{1}{\Delta_\delta^2(\varepsilon)} (\mathbb{S}\varepsilon)_{ik} (\mathbb{S}\varepsilon)_{jl} \right).$$

Then for sufficiently smooth initial data, its linearization is given by

$$[A^H(v_0)u]_i = \sum_{j,k,l=1}^2 a_{ij}^{kl}(\nabla u_0, P(h_0, a_0)) D_k D_l u_j - \frac{1}{2\Delta_\delta(\varepsilon(u_0))} \sum_{j=1}^2 (\partial_j P(h_0, a_0)) (\mathbb{S}\varepsilon(u))_{ij}.$$

The nonlinear right-hand side $f_1(u)$ is of the form

$$(2.6) \quad f_1 = -mc_{\text{cor}} n \times u - mg\nabla H + \tau_{\text{atm}} + \tau_{\text{ocean}}(u),$$

where $-mc_{\text{cor}} n \times u$ is the Coriolis force with Coriolis parameter $c_{\text{cor}} > 0$ and unit vector $n: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ normal to the surface, whereas $-mg\nabla H$ represents the force due to changing sea surface tilt with sea surface dynamic height $H: \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ and gravity g . The atmospheric wind and oceanic forces are described by the terms τ_{atm} and $\tau_{\text{ocean}}(u)$, respectively, and they take the shape

$$\tau_{\text{atm}} = \rho_{\text{atm}} C_{\text{atm}} |U_{\text{atm}}| R_{\text{atm}} U_{\text{atm}} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_{\text{ocean}}(u) = \rho_{\text{ocean}} C_{\text{ocean}} |U_{\text{ocean}} - u| R_{\text{ocean}} (U_{\text{ocean}} - u),$$

where U_{atm} and U_{ocean} are the velocity of the surface winds and current, respectively. Furthermore, C_{atm} and C_{ocean} denote air and ocean drag coefficients, ρ_{atm} and ρ_{ocean} represent the densities for air and sea water, and R_{atm} and R_{ocean} are rotation matrices acting on wind and current vectors.

Concerning the mean ice thickness, we impose the constraint that $h \geq \kappa$ for some small parameter $\kappa > 0$ which indicates the transition to open water. More precisely, a value of $h(t, x)$ less than κ means that at $(t, x) \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{D}}$, there is open water. In addition, we suppose that $a \geq \alpha$ holds for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Besides, Δ denotes the Laplacian, and $d_h > 0$ as well as $d_a > 0$ represent constants.

The thermodynamic terms in the balance laws are given by

$$(2.7) \quad S_h = f \left(\frac{h}{a} \right) a + (1 - a)f(0)$$

and

$$(2.8) \quad S_a = \begin{cases} \frac{f(0)}{\kappa}(1 - a), & \text{if } f(0) > 0, \\ 0, & \text{if } f(0) < 0, \end{cases} + \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } S_h > 0, \\ \frac{a}{2h} S_h, & \text{if } S_h < 0. \end{cases}$$

As in [8], we observe that in the present 2D case, the inertia tensor is given by

$$J = \int_{\mathcal{B}(t)} \rho_{\mathcal{B}} |x - x_c(t)|^2 dx = \int_{\mathcal{B}(0)} \rho_{\mathcal{B}} |y|^2 dy,$$

so J is not time-dependent and $(J\omega)'(t) = J\omega'(t)$. The functions F and N represent external forces and torques.

We rewrite (2.3) before presenting the main result in the context of the fluid-rigid body interaction. As above, the principle variable of the sea ice equations will be denoted by v . Denoting the principle variable of the coupled system by $w = (u, h, a, \eta, \omega)^T$, we infer that the complete system of equations is given by

$$(2.9) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t w + \mathcal{A}(w)w = \mathcal{G}(t, w), & \text{in } (0, T), \\ w(0) = w_0, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}(w) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\rho_{\text{ice}} h} A_m^H(v) & B(v) & 0 \\ 0 & D_{h,a} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

In the above, $B(v) = (B_1(v), B_2(v)) = (\frac{\partial_h P(h,a)}{2\rho_{\text{ice}} h} \nabla, \frac{\partial_a P(h,a)}{2\rho_{\text{ice}} h} \nabla)$ are lower order terms, and $D_{h,a}$ is the block containing the Neumann Laplacian operators, i.e., $D_{h,a} := (-d_h \Delta) \otimes (-d_a \Delta)$ with $D(D_{h,a}) := W_N^{2,q}(\mathcal{D}(\cdot))^2$, where $W_N^{2,q}(\mathcal{D}(\cdot)) := \{b \in W^{2,q}(\mathcal{D}(\cdot)) : \partial_\nu b = 0 \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{D}(\cdot)\}$. The operator $A_m^H(v)$ formally coincides with Hibler's operator as made precise above or in [2, Section 3], but we observe that it is the maximal operator associated to Hibler's operator. As indicated above, maximal means that it has a maximal domain in the sense that no boundary conditions are imposed. To complete the reformulation of (2.3) in terms of an evolution equation, it is necessary to invoke the boundary conditions, which especially includes the coupling on the boundary. More precisely, on the interior boundary $\Gamma(t)$, the ice velocity of the sea ice has to be equal to the velocity of the rigid body. This is incorporated into the domain of the (linearized) operator matrix. For fixed w_0 the domain of the above operator matrix is given by

$$D(\mathcal{A}(w_0)) = \{w \in W^{2,q}(\mathcal{D}(\cdot); \mathbb{R}^2) \times W^{2,q}(\mathcal{D}(\cdot))^2 \times \mathbb{C}^3 : u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{O}, \\ u = \eta + \omega(x - x_c(\cdot))^\perp \text{ on } \Gamma(\cdot) \text{ and } \partial_\nu h = \partial_\nu a = 0 \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{D}(\cdot)\}.$$

Moreover, the right-hand side is given by

$$\mathcal{G}(t, w) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{G}_1(t, w) \\ \mathcal{G}_2(t, w) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -u \cdot \nabla u - \frac{1}{\rho_{\text{ice}} h} f_1(u) \\ -\text{div}(uh) + S_h(h, a) \\ -\text{div}(ua) + S_a(h, a) \\ -\frac{1}{\mathfrak{m}_B} \int_{\Gamma(t)} \sigma_\delta(v)(t, x) n(t, x) \, dS + \frac{1}{\mathfrak{m}_B} F(t) \\ -J^{-1} \int_{\Gamma(t)} (x - x_c(t))^\perp \sigma_\delta(v)(t, x) n(t, x) \, dS + J^{-1} N(t) \end{pmatrix},$$

where \mathcal{G}_1 corresponds to the right-hand side of the sea ice equations, and \mathcal{G}_2 is related to the motion of the rigid body.

For fixed $\tau \in [0, T]$, we make the ground space as well as the maximal regularity space more precise. The ground space takes the shape

$$(2.10) \quad \mathcal{X}_0(\tau, z) = X_0(\tau) \times \mathbb{C}^3 = X_0^u(\tau) \times X_0^b(\tau) \times \mathbb{C}^3 = L^q(\mathcal{D}(\tau); \mathbb{R}^2) \times L^q(\mathcal{D}(\tau))^2 \times \mathbb{C}^3.$$

The notation takes into account that the concrete spaces depend on the translational and angular velocity $z = (\eta, \omega)$. In the present section, we omit including the explicit dependence in the spaces for the sake of simplicity, but we will employ this notation in Section 5 when verifying the Lipschitz estimates.

The regularity space incorporates the boundary conditions, i.e.,

$$(2.11) \quad \mathcal{X}_1(\tau) = \{w \in W^{2,q}(\mathcal{D}(\tau); \mathbb{R}^2) \times W^{2,q}(\mathcal{D}(\tau))^2 \times \mathbb{C}^3 : u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{O}, \\ u = \eta + \omega(x - x_c(\tau))^\perp \text{ on } \Gamma(\tau) \text{ and } \partial_\nu h = \partial_\nu a = 0 \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{D}(\tau)\}.$$

Accordingly, we define the ground space and regularity space in the decoupled setting by $\mathcal{Y}_0(\tau) = \mathcal{X}_0(\tau)$ and

$$(2.12) \quad \mathcal{Y}_1(\tau) = \{w \in W^{2,q}(\mathcal{D}(\tau); \mathbb{R}^2) \times W^{2,q}(\mathcal{D}(\tau))^2 \times \mathbb{C}^3 : \\ u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{D}(\tau) \text{ and } \partial_\nu h = \partial_\nu a = 0 \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{D}(\tau)\}.$$

As we use results from [2], the condition $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} < \frac{1}{2}$ is imposed. It then follows by [44, Theorem 4.3.3] that $\mathcal{Y}_\gamma(\tau) = (\mathcal{Y}_0(\tau), \mathcal{Y}_1(\tau))_{1-1/p, p}$ takes the shape

$$\mathcal{Y}_\gamma(\tau) = \{w \in B_{qp}^{2-2/p}(\mathcal{D}(\tau); \mathbb{R}^2) \times B_{qp}^{2-2/p}(\mathcal{D}(\tau))^2 \times \mathbb{C}^3 : u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{D}(\tau) \text{ and } \partial_\nu h = \partial_\nu a = 0 \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{D}(\tau)\}.$$

We also consider the trace space $\mathcal{X}_\gamma(\tau)$ in the coupled setting. In Lemma 5.2, it is shown that

$$\mathcal{X}_\gamma(\tau) = \mathcal{S}^{-1}(\mathcal{Y}_\gamma(\tau)),$$

where \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{S}^{-1} are the matrices relating the coupled and the decoupled setting, and their shape is made precise in (5.1). The latter observation and the above condition $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} < \frac{1}{2}$ then imply that the elements $w \in \mathcal{X}_\gamma(\tau)$ are characterized by $w \in \mathbb{B}_{qp}^{2-2/p}(\mathcal{D}(\tau); \mathbb{R}^2) \times \mathbb{B}_{qp}^{2-2/p}(\mathcal{D}(\tau))^2 \times \mathbb{C}^3$ such that

$$u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{O}, \quad u = \eta + \omega(x - x_c(\tau))^\perp \text{ on } \Gamma(\tau) \text{ and } \partial_\nu h = \partial_\nu a = 0 \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{D}(\tau).$$

We observe that it is in particular valid that

$$(2.13) \quad \mathcal{X}_\gamma(\tau) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{B}_{qp}^{2-2/p}(\mathcal{D}(\tau))^4 \times \mathbb{C}^3 \hookrightarrow C^1(\overline{\mathcal{D}(\tau)})^4 \times \mathbb{C}^3.$$

The above considerations remain valid when looking at the domain at time 0, and $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma = \mathcal{X}_\gamma(0)$ is especially defined as above. We finish the description of the setting by defining the open set $V \subset \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma$ by

$$w_0 \in V \text{ implies that } h_0 \geq \kappa, \quad a_0 \in [\delta, 1 - \delta] \text{ for } \delta > 0 \text{ small, and } (\eta_0, \omega_0) \in \tilde{K},$$

where $\kappa > 0$ sufficiently small is as above and $\tilde{K} \subset \mathbb{C}^3$ is compact and nonempty.

Concerning the main result given below, we remark that a strong solution is defined as follows in the present situation: We first get a strong solution to the problem on a fixed domain, which results from transformation by a suitable diffeomorphism introduced in the next section. The strong solution to the original problem is then obtained by performing the corresponding backward transform from the fixed to the moving domain.

The main theorem of this section then reads as follows.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $p, q \in (1, \infty)$ be such that $\frac{2}{p} + \frac{3}{q} < 1$, let $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a bounded domain of class C^2 , and consider the domains of the rigid body and the fluid at time zero, \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{D} , respectively. Moreover, let $w_0 \in V$ and suppose that $F \in L^p(0, T; \mathbb{C}^2)$ as well as $N \in L^p(0, T)$. If for some $d > 0$ it holds that $\text{dist}(\mathcal{B}, \partial\mathcal{O}) > d$, then there exists $T' \in (0, T]$ such that (2.9) has a unique strong solution*

$$w \in L^p(0, T'; \mathcal{X}_1(\cdot)) \cap W^{1,p}(0, T'; \mathcal{X}_0(\cdot)).$$

In particular, this is a strong solution to the coupled sea ice-rigid body system as seen in (2.3).

The proof of Theorem 2.1 is given in the subsequent sections. Section 3 and Section 4 are dedicated to the introduction of the transformed equations and the auxiliary results, respectively. In Section 5, we establish maximal regularity of the transformed operator matrix by using a decoupling argument. Moreover, employing the regularity of the transform again in conjunction with results from [2] applicable for domains with fixed time τ , we verify that the transformed operator matrix and the transformed right-hand side satisfy certain measurability and continuity assumptions as well as Lipschitz estimates. For the stress tensor appearing in the motion of the rigid body, it is also necessary to invoke the nonlinear complex interpolation result, Proposition 4.3, to estimate the highly nonlinear stress tensor. We complete the proof of Theorem 2.1 by an application of the quasilinear existence result, Proposition 4.2.

3. COORDINATE TRANSFORM

We present the diffeomorphism accounting for the transform from the moving on the fixed domain in this section, and we also compute the transformed system of equations. To begin, for a matrix

$$m(t) = \omega(t) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

satisfying $m(t)x = \omega(t)x^\perp$, we take the differential equation

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t Z_0(t, y) &= m(t)(Z_0(t, y) - x_c(t)) + \eta(t), & (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^2, \\ Z_0(0, y) &= y, & y \in \mathbb{R}^2, \end{cases}$$

into account. We remark that the coordinates are chosen such that the center of gravity of the rigid body at time 0 is the origin, i.e., $x_c(0) = 0$. The corresponding solution then takes the shape $Z_0(t, y) = Q(t)y + x_c(t)$, where $Q(t) \in \text{SO}(2)$ and $Q \in W^{2,p}(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})$ provided $\eta, \omega \in W^{1,p}(0, T)$. The inverse $Y_0(t)$ of $Z_0(t)$ is given by

$$Y_0(t, x) = Q^T(t)(x - x_c(t)),$$

and it satisfies the differential equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t Y_0(t, x) &= -\tilde{m}(t)Y_0(t, x) - \xi(t), & (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^2, \\ Y_0(0, x) &= x, & x \in \mathbb{R}^2, \end{cases}$$

with

$$\tilde{m}(t) := Q^T(t)m(t)Q(t), \quad \xi(t) := Q^T(t)\eta(t).$$

The next step is to modify the diffeomorphisms Z_0, Y_0 of $\mathcal{D}(t)$ and $\mathcal{B}(t)$ such that they rotate space only in an appropriate open neighborhood of the rotating and translating body, and they must not rotate or translate the outer boundary $\partial\mathcal{O}$. This new diffeomorphism is now defined implicitly, using an ODE of the form (3.1), namely

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t Z(t, y) &= b(t, Z(t, y)), & (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^2, \\ Z(0, y) &= y, & y \in \mathbb{R}^2. \end{cases}$$

The right-hand side b in (3.2) determines the modified velocity of the change of coordinates. Close to the rigid body, b should be equal to the velocity of the body, while it is supposed to be zero further away. Additionally, considering that the rigid body starts from a position with some distance from the boundary of the sea ice domain and moves with a continuous velocity, we restrict the solution to a time that guarantees that a small distance remains. More precisely, we assume that $\text{dist}(\mathcal{B}, \partial\mathcal{O}) > d$, and we set b such that a distance of $\frac{d}{2}$ between the body and the outer boundary is maintained. It is also important that b is smooth in the space variables. To obtain these properties, we define a cut-off function $\chi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2; [0, 1])$ by

$$\chi(y) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \text{dist}(y, \partial\mathcal{O}) \geq d, \\ 0, & \text{if } \text{dist}(y, \partial\mathcal{O}) \leq \frac{d}{2}, \end{cases}$$

and a time-dependent vector field $b: [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ by

$$b(t, x) := \chi(x - x_c(t))[m(t)(x - x_c(t)) + \eta(t)].$$

We observe that $b \in W^{1,p}(0, T; C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2))$ and $b|_\Gamma = m(x - x_c) + \eta = \omega(x - x_c)^\perp + \eta$ by construction. For $\eta, \omega \in W^{1,p}(0, T)$ the Picard-Lindelöf theorem implies that the equation (3.2) admits a unique solution $Z \in C^1(0, T; C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2))$. Besides, the solution has continuous mixed partial derivatives $\frac{\partial^{|\alpha|+1} Z}{\partial t (\partial y_j)^\alpha}$ and $\frac{\partial^{|\alpha|} Z}{(\partial y_j)^\alpha}$, where $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^2$ is a multi-index.

The elements of the Jacobi matrix J_Z of the diffeomorphism are of the form

$$(J_Z)_{ij} = \partial_j Z_i = \delta_{ij} + \int_0^t \frac{\partial b_i}{\partial y_j} ds.$$

A proof of the following lemma can be found in [23, Section 2].

Lemma 3.1. *If either $T_0 \in (0, T]$ is small enough or $\|\nabla_y b\|_{L^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2)} < c$ for some sufficiently small constant $c > 0$, then $J_Z(t, \cdot)$ is invertible for every $t \in (0, T_0)$ or even for every $t \in (0, T)$ in the second case.*

The inverse transform Y of Z satisfies the equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t Y(t, x) &= b^{(Y)}(t, Y(t, x)), & (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^2, \\ Y(0, x) &= x, & x \in \mathbb{R}^2, \end{cases}$$

where

$$b^{(Y)}(t, y) := -J_Z^{-1}(t, y)b(t, Z(t, y)),$$

which is well-defined for $t \leq T_0$ in view of Lemma 3.1. By construction of the above transforms Z and Y , we get the following regularity result.

Lemma 3.2. For $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ the maps

$$\begin{aligned} (\tau, \eta, \omega) &\mapsto \nabla^k Z(\tau) & \text{and} & & (\tau, \eta, \omega) &\mapsto \dot{Z}(\tau) \\ (\tau, \eta, \omega) &\mapsto \nabla^k Y(\tau) & \text{and} & & (\tau, \eta, \omega) &\mapsto \dot{Y}(\tau) \end{aligned}$$

are smooth.

We emphasize that the diffeomorphism Z accounts for the transform from the moving domain to the fixed domain, and we observe that Z and Y coincide with Z_0 and Y_0 provided the rigid body is sufficiently far away from the boundary of the sea ice domain, while it holds that $\partial_t Z(t, y) = \partial_t Y(t, x) = 0$ if the rigid body comes close to the boundary.

For $(t, y) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^2$, Z as in (3.2) and Q as introduced at the beginning of this section, we now define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u}(t, y) &:= u(t, Z(t, y)), \\ \tilde{h}(t, y) &:= h(t, Z(t, y)), \\ \tilde{a}(t, y) &:= a(t, Z(t, y)), \\ \xi(t) &:= Q^T(t)\eta(t), \\ \Omega(t) &:= \omega(t), \\ \tilde{F}(t) &:= Q^T(t)F(t), \\ \tilde{N}(t) &:= N(t), \\ \mathcal{T}_\delta(\tilde{u}(t, y), \tilde{h}(t, y), \tilde{a}(t, y)) &:= Q^T(t)\sigma_\delta(\tilde{u}(t, y), \tilde{h}(t, y), \tilde{a}(t, y))Q(t), \\ I &:= J, \\ \tilde{n} &:= Q^T(t)n(t). \end{aligned}$$

In total, by $\tilde{v} = (\tilde{u}, \tilde{h}, \tilde{a})^T$ we denote the principle variable of the transformed sea ice problem, and we use $\tilde{w} = (\tilde{u}, \tilde{h}, \tilde{a}, \xi, \Omega)^T$ to denote the principle variable of the complete transformed coupled system. Using that $Q(t) \in \text{SO}(2)$ as well as $\Omega(t) = \omega(t)$, we infer that

$$\tilde{m}(t)x = Q^T(t)m(t)Q(t)x = \omega(t) \det(Q(t)) \begin{pmatrix} x_2 \\ -x_1 \end{pmatrix} = \Omega(t)x^\perp.$$

The inertia tensor remains unchanged, so time-independence is also preserved for I . We remark that \tilde{n} represents the outer normal at \mathcal{B} . Moreover, we compute that

$$\int_{\Gamma(t)} \sigma_\delta(v)n(t) \, dS = Q \int_{\Gamma} \mathcal{T}_\delta(\tilde{v})\tilde{n} \, dS \quad \text{as well as} \quad \int_{\Gamma(t)} (x - x_c(t))^\perp \sigma_\delta(v)n(t) \, dS = \int_{\Gamma} y^\perp \mathcal{T}_\delta(\tilde{v})\tilde{n} \, dS,$$

where we made use of $Q(t) \in \text{SO}(2)$ to establish that $y^\perp Qz = (Q^T y^\perp)z$ holds true for all $y, z \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

On the cylindrical domain $(0, T) \times \mathcal{D}$, we then obtain

$$(3.3) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \tilde{v}_t + \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\text{SI}}(t, \tilde{v})\tilde{v} &= \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_1(t, \tilde{v}) - M\tilde{v}, & \text{in } (0, T) \times \mathcal{D}, \\ \begin{pmatrix} \xi' \\ \Omega' \end{pmatrix} &= \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_2(t, \tilde{v}) - \begin{pmatrix} \Omega\xi^\perp \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \text{in } (0, T) \times \mathbb{C}^3, \\ \tilde{u}(t, y) &= \Omega(t)y^\perp + \xi(t), & \text{on } (0, T) \times \Gamma, \\ \tilde{v}(0) &= v_0, & \text{in } \mathcal{D}, \\ \begin{pmatrix} \xi(0) \\ \Omega(0) \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} \eta_0 \\ \omega_0 \end{pmatrix}, & \text{in } \mathbb{C}^3, \end{array} \right.$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\text{SI}}(t, \tilde{v})$, $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_1(t, \tilde{v})$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_2(t, \tilde{v})$ represent the transformed versions of the operator matrix corresponding to the sea ice equations and the components of the right-hand sides \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 , respectively. By M , we denote the terms resulting from the transformation of the time derivative.

Below, we define the transformed symmetric part of the gradient. Calculations involving the chain rule reveal that

$$2\tilde{\varepsilon}_{ij}^{(\tilde{u})}(t, y) := \sum_{k=1}^2 (\partial_i Y_k)(t, Z(t, y)) \partial_k \tilde{u}_j(t, y) + (\partial_j Y_k)(t, Z(t, y)) \partial_k \tilde{u}_i(t, y) = 2\varepsilon_{ij}^{(u)}(t, x).$$

The map $\mathbb{S}: \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ is defined in such a way that for $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon)_{ij}$, we have

$$\mathbb{S}\varepsilon = \begin{pmatrix} (1 + \frac{1}{e^2})\varepsilon_{11} + (1 - \frac{1}{e^2})\varepsilon_{22} & \frac{1}{e^2}(\varepsilon_{12} + \varepsilon_{21}) \\ \frac{1}{e^2}(\varepsilon_{12} + \varepsilon_{21}) & (1 - \frac{1}{e^2})\varepsilon_{11} + (1 + \frac{1}{e^2})\varepsilon_{22} \end{pmatrix},$$

and we recall the coefficients of the principal part of Hibler's operator from (2.5) as

$$a_{ij}^{kl}(\varepsilon, P(h, a)) = \frac{P(h, a)}{2} \frac{1}{\Delta_\delta(\varepsilon)} \left(\mathbb{S}_{ij}^{kl} - \frac{1}{\Delta_\delta^2(\varepsilon)} (\mathbb{S}\varepsilon)_{ik} (\mathbb{S}\varepsilon)_{jl} \right).$$

Proceeding similarly as above, we calculate that the transformed Hibler operator is given by

$$(3.4) \quad \tilde{A}_m^H(t, \tilde{v}) \tilde{u} = \sum_{j,k,l,m=1}^2 a_{ij}^{klm}(\tilde{\varepsilon}, P(\tilde{h}, \tilde{a})) \partial_m \tilde{\varepsilon}_{jl} - \frac{1}{2\Delta_\delta(\tilde{\varepsilon})} p^* e^{-c(1-\tilde{a})} \sum_{j,k=1}^2 \partial_j Y_k (\partial_k \tilde{h} + c\partial_k \tilde{a}) (\mathbb{S}\tilde{\varepsilon})_{ij},$$

where

$$a_{ij}^{klm}(\tilde{\varepsilon}, P(\tilde{h}, \tilde{a})) = (\partial_k Y_m) a_{ij}^{kl}(\tilde{\varepsilon}, P(\tilde{h}, \tilde{a})), \quad \text{and} \\ \partial_m \tilde{\varepsilon}_{jl} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^2 ((\partial_m \partial_j Y_n) \partial_n \tilde{u}_l + (\partial_j Y_n) \partial_m \partial_n \tilde{u}_l + (\partial_m \partial_l Y_n) \partial_n \tilde{u}_j + (\partial_l Y_n) \partial_m \partial_n \tilde{u}_j).$$

Additionally, we get

$$\tilde{B}_1(t, \tilde{v}) \tilde{h} = \frac{p^* e^{-c(1-\tilde{a})}}{2\rho_{\text{ice}} \tilde{h}} \sum_{j=1}^2 (\partial_i Y_j) \partial_j \tilde{h} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{B}_2(t, \tilde{v}) \tilde{a} = \frac{cp^* \tilde{h} e^{-c(1-\tilde{a})}}{2\rho_{\text{ice}} \tilde{h}} \sum_{j=1}^2 (\partial_i Y_j) \partial_j \tilde{a}.$$

By \tilde{B} , we denote again the transformed lower order terms of the momentum equation on the fixed domain, i.e., $\tilde{B}(t, \tilde{v}) = (\tilde{B}_1(t, \tilde{v}), \tilde{B}_2(t, \tilde{v}))$.

Introducing the metric contravariant tensor

$$g^{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^2 (\partial_k Y_i) (\partial_k Y_j),$$

we determine the transformed Laplacian operators to be given by

$$\mathcal{L}\tilde{h} = \sum_{j=1}^2 (\Delta Y_j) \partial_j \tilde{h} + \sum_{j,k=1}^2 g^{jk} \partial_k \partial_j \tilde{h} \quad \text{as well as} \quad \mathcal{L}\tilde{a} = \sum_{j=1}^2 (\Delta Y_j) \partial_j \tilde{a} + \sum_{j,k=1}^2 g^{jk} \partial_k \partial_j \tilde{a},$$

and we denote by $\tilde{D}_{h,a}(t) := (-d_h \mathcal{L}) \otimes (-d_a \mathcal{L})$. Summarizing the previous computations and making use of (3.4), we obtain

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(t, \tilde{v}) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\rho_{\text{ice}} \tilde{h}} \tilde{A}_m^H(t, \tilde{v}) & \tilde{B}(t, \tilde{v}) & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{D}_{h,a}(t) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We continue by transforming the right-hand side. To this end, we calculate

$$((u \cdot \nabla)u)_i = \sum_{j,k=1}^2 \tilde{u}_j (\partial_j Y_k) \partial_k \tilde{u}_i \quad \text{and} \quad \text{div}(uh) = \sum_{i,j,k=1}^2 (\partial_i Y_j) (\tilde{u}_i \partial_j \tilde{h} + \tilde{h} \partial_j \tilde{u}_i).$$

With f_1 is as in (2.6), S_h as in (2.7) and S_a as in (2.8), we then infer that

$$(3.5) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_1(t, \tilde{v}) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\rho_{\text{ice}} \tilde{h}} f_1(\tilde{u}) - \sum_{j,k=1}^2 \tilde{u}_j (\partial_j Y_k) \partial_k \tilde{u}_i \\ S_h(\tilde{h}, \tilde{a}) - \sum_{i,j=1}^2 (\partial_i Y_j) (\tilde{u}_i \partial_j \tilde{h} + \tilde{h} \partial_j \tilde{u}_i) \\ S_a(\tilde{h}, \tilde{a}) - \sum_{i,j=1}^2 (\partial_i Y_j) (\tilde{u}_i \partial_j \tilde{a} + \tilde{a} \partial_j \tilde{u}_i) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Next, we determine

$$(3.6) \quad M\tilde{v} = \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{j=1}^2 \dot{Y}_j \partial_j \tilde{u}_i \\ \sum_{i=1}^2 \dot{Y}_i \partial_i \tilde{h} \\ \sum_{i=1}^2 \dot{Y}_i \partial_i \tilde{a} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The above calculations finally result in

$$(3.7) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_2(t, \tilde{v}) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{m}_B} \tilde{F} - \frac{1}{\mathfrak{m}_B} \int_{\Gamma} \mathcal{T}_\delta(\tilde{v}) \tilde{n} \, dS \\ I^{-1} \tilde{N} - I^{-1} \int_{\Gamma} y^\perp \mathcal{T}_\delta(\tilde{v}) \tilde{n} \, dS \end{pmatrix}.$$

Introducing the notation $\mathcal{M} := \begin{pmatrix} M \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $\tilde{\mathcal{G}} := \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_1 \\ \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_2 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tilde{w}) := (0, 0, 0, \Omega \xi^\perp, 0)^T$, we write (3.3) as a quasilinear abstract Cauchy problem

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t \tilde{w} + \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(t, \tilde{w}) \tilde{w} &= \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(t, \tilde{w}) - \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tilde{w}) - \mathcal{M} \tilde{w}, & \text{in } (0, T), \\ \tilde{w}(0) &= w_0, \end{cases}$$

on $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0 = L^q(\mathcal{D}; \mathbb{R}^2) \times L^q(\mathcal{D})^2 \times \mathbb{C}^3 = \tilde{X}_0^u \times \tilde{X}_0^b \times \mathbb{C}^3 = \tilde{X}_0 \times \mathbb{C}^3$. Here, $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(t, \tilde{w}_0): D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(t, \tilde{w}_0)) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0 \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0$ denotes the operator matrices

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(t, \tilde{w}_0) := \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\rho_{\text{ice}} \tilde{h}_0} \tilde{A}_m^H(t, \tilde{v}_0) & \tilde{B}(t, \tilde{v}_0) & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{D}_{h,a}(t) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

with domain

$$\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1 := D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(t, \tilde{v}_0)) := \left\{ \tilde{w} \in D(\tilde{A}_m^H(t, \tilde{v}_0)) \times D(\tilde{D}_{h,a}(t)) \times \mathbb{C}^3 : L\tilde{u} = R \begin{pmatrix} \xi \\ \Omega \end{pmatrix} \right\},$$

where $L = \gamma$ denotes the trace operator and

$$R: \mathbb{C}^3 \rightarrow W^{2-1/q, q}(\partial\mathcal{D}; \mathbb{R}^2): \begin{pmatrix} \xi \\ \Omega \end{pmatrix} \mapsto (\Omega y^\perp + \xi) \mathbb{1}_\Gamma$$

the coupling operator. To obtain a more compact representation of the right-hand side, we set $\tilde{\mathcal{H}} := \tilde{\mathcal{G}} - \tilde{\mathcal{F}} - \mathcal{M}$.

As in Section 2, we also introduce the decoupled analogues of $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1$, namely $\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_0 = \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0$ and

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_1 = (W^{2, q}(\mathcal{D}; \mathbb{R}^2) \cap W_0^{1, q}(\mathcal{D}; \mathbb{R}^2)) \times W_N^{2, q}(\mathcal{D})^2 \times \mathbb{C}^3.$$

It holds that $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma = \mathcal{S}^{-1}(\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_\gamma)$ by virtue of Lemma 5.2, and we observe that $\tilde{w} \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma$ holds if and only if

$$\tilde{w} \in B_{qp}^{2-2/p}(\mathcal{D}; \mathbb{R}^2) \times B_{qp}^{2-2/p}(\mathcal{D})^2 \times \mathbb{C}^3 : \tilde{u} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{O}, \quad \tilde{u} = \xi + \Omega(x - x_c)^\perp \text{ on } \Gamma \text{ and } \partial_\nu \tilde{h} = \partial_\nu \tilde{a} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{D}.$$

4. AUXILIARY RESULTS

We now present the tools needed for the proof of our main result, namely the local existence theorem and the variant of a nonlinear complex interpolation result due to Bergh.

4.1. A local well-posedness result for non-autonomous quasilinear evolution equations.

Throughout this subsection, we denote by A the quasilinear operator, by F the nonlinear right-hand side and by u the principle variable of the evolution equation. The abstract Cauchy problem takes the shape

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{cases} u_t + A(t, u)u = F(t, u), & t \in [0, T], \\ u(0) = u_0. \end{cases}$$

By X_0 and X_1 , we denote the ground space and the regularity space, respectively, and we assume that $X_1 \hookrightarrow X_0$ is dense, $\mathbb{F}_T := L^p(0, T; X_0)$ is the data space, while $\mathbb{E}_T := L^p(0, T; X_1) \cap W^{1,p}(0, T; X_0)$ is the maximal regularity space. Moreover, we denote by X_γ the trace space, and it is well-known that $X_\gamma = (X_0, X_1)_{1-1/p, p}$. The set V represents an open subset of X_γ . Additionally, we assume the following structure conditions on the nonlinearities as well as on the linearized operator.

Assumption 4.1. (A1) We have $A \in C([0, T] \times V, \mathcal{L}(X_1, X_0))$. Given $u_0 \in V$, there is $R_0 > 0$ such that $\overline{B}_{X_\gamma}(u_0, R_0) \subset V$, and for all $R \in (0, R_0)$, there exists a Lipschitz constant $L(R) > 0$ with

$$\|A(\tau, u_1)v - A(\tau, u_2)v\|_{X_0} \leq L(R)\|u_1 - u_2\|_{X_\gamma} \cdot \|v\|_{X_1}$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$, $v \in X_1$ and all $u_1, u_2 \in X_\gamma$ with $\|u_i - u_0\|_{X_\gamma} \leq R$, $i = 1, 2$.

(A2) For the mapping $F: [0, T] \times X_\gamma \rightarrow X_0$, we assume

- (i) $F(\cdot, u)$ is measurable for every $u \in V$,
- (ii) $F(t, \cdot) \in C(V, X_0)$ for almost all $t \in [0, T]$,
- (iii) $F(\cdot, u) \in \mathbb{F}_T$ holds for every $u \in V$,
- (iv) given $u_0 \in V$, for every $R > 0$ such that $\overline{B}_{X_\gamma}(u_0, R) \subset V$, there exists $\varphi_R \in L^p(0, T)$ with

$$\|F(\tau, u_1) - F(\tau, u_2)\|_{X_0} \leq \varphi_R(\tau) \cdot \|u_1 - u_2\|_{X_\gamma}$$

for almost all $\tau \in [0, T]$ and all $u_1, u_2 \in X_\gamma$ with $\|u_i - u_0\|_{X_\gamma} \leq R$, $i = 1, 2$.

(A3) The operator $A(0, u_0)$ has maximal regularity on X_0 for every $u_0 \in V$.

The following proposition yields local existence of a unique strong solution to the above evolution equation (4.1) under the assumptions presented in Assumption 4.1. We remark that a result of this type is well-known in the autonomous case, see e.g. [38, Theorem 5.1.1], and the non-autonomous case also follows by mimicking and slightly adjusting the arguments therein. We refer to [37, Section 2] and [5, Section 3] for a discussion of the non-autonomous case.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $p \in (1, \infty)$, assume that $u_0 \in V$, and make Assumption 4.1. Then there exists $T' \in (0, T]$ such that (4.1) has a unique solution $u \in \mathbb{E}_{T'}$ in $(0, T')$.*

4.2. A variant of a nonlinear complex interpolation result.

This subsection is dedicated to stating a variant of a nonlinear complex interpolation result due to Bergh [1], and we first recall the underlying setting. Let (E_0, E_1) be a couple of complex Banach spaces that are both embedded in a common Hausdorff topological vector space. By Σ_E , we denote the sum of the Banach spaces E_0 and E_1 , i.e., $\Sigma_E = E_0 + E_1$, and by $\mathcal{F}(E_0, E_1)$, we denote the Banach space of all functions f defined on the strip $0 \leq \operatorname{Re} z \leq 1$ in the complex plane such that

- $f(z) \in \Sigma_E$ and f is continuous in Σ_E on $0 \leq \operatorname{Re} z \leq 1$,
- $f(j + it) \in E_j$, $j = 0, 1$, and $f(j + i \cdot)$ is continuous in E_j with $\lim_{|t| \rightarrow \infty} f(j + it) = 0$ in E_j ,
- f is analytic in Σ_E on $0 < \operatorname{Re} z < 1$, and
- $\|f\|_{\mathcal{F}} := \max_{j=0,1} (\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|f(j + it)\|_{E_j})$.

The complex interpolation space E_θ is the Banach space of all $f(\theta)$ with $f \in \mathcal{F}(E_0, E_1)$, where we have chosen $0 < \theta < 1$, and the norm of $a \in E_\theta$ is $\|a\|_\theta := \inf \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}$, where $f(\theta) = a$.

A slight modification of the standard arguments in [1] then yields the following result.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $E^1 = (E_0^1, E_1^1)$, $E^2 = (E_0^2, E_1^2)$ and $F = (F_0, F_1)$ be three couples of complex Banach spaces. Assume in addition that the (not necessarily linear) operator N fulfills*

- $f_k \in \mathcal{F}(E_0^k, E_1^k)$ implies $Nf = N(f_1, f_2) \in \mathcal{F}(F_0, F_1)$, and
- $\|N(a_1, a_2)\|_{F_j} \leq \omega(\|a_1\|_{E_j^1}, \|a_2\|_{E_j^2})$, $a_1 \in E_j^1$, $a_2 \in E_j^2$, $j = 0, 1$,

where ω is continuous and positive on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and it additionally satisfies the following monotonicity property

$$\omega(x \cdot y) \leq \omega(\tilde{x}, y) \text{ and } \omega(x, y) \leq \omega(x, \tilde{y}) \text{ for all } x, y, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \text{ such that } x \leq \tilde{x} \text{ and } y \leq \tilde{y}.$$

Then, $a = (a_1, a_2) \in E_\theta^1 \times E_\theta^2$ implies that $N(a_1, a_2) \in F_\theta$, and it is valid that

$$\|N(a_1, a_2)\|_{F_\theta} \leq \omega(\|a_1\|_{E_\theta^1}, \|a_2\|_{E_\theta^2}).$$

5. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULT

We verify the aspects of [Assumption 4.1](#) for the transformed system corresponding to the interaction problem in this section in order to apply [Proposition 4.2](#). We start by checking that the transformed operator has the property of maximal L^p -regularity in [Subsection 5.1](#), for which we use decoupling techniques to account for the coupling condition on the interface. Besides, employing the structure and regularity of the coordinate transform, we establish Lipschitz estimates for the transformed operator in [Subsection 5.2](#) and for the transformed right-hand side in [Subsection 5.3](#). The latter aspect relies on an application of [Proposition 4.3](#). The main result finally follows by an application of the above [Proposition 4.2](#), and the proof of the main result is presented in [Subsection 5.4](#).

We briefly study essential properties of the coordinate transform before proceeding. Therefore, we introduce

$$T_{Z_{z_0}(\tau, \cdot)}: X_0(\tau, z_0) \rightarrow \tilde{X}_0, \quad v \mapsto v \circ Z_{z_0}(\tau, \cdot)$$

and

$$\mathcal{T}(\tau, z_0): \mathcal{X}_0(\tau, z_0) \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0, \quad \begin{pmatrix} v \\ \eta \\ \omega \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} T_{Z_{z_0}(\tau, \cdot)} v \\ Q_{z_0}(\tau)^T \eta \\ \omega \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{v} \\ \xi \\ \Omega \end{pmatrix},$$

where $z_0 = (\eta_0, \omega_0)$ and $Z = Z_{z_0}$ and $Q = Q_{z_0}$ are the diffeomorphism for the transformation to the fixed domain and the coordinate transform as discussed in [Section 3](#). We take into account that they depend on $z_0 = (\eta_0, \omega_0) \in \mathbb{C}^3$, and we recall that $X_i(\tau, z_0)$, $i = 0, \gamma, 1$, are the spaces associated to the sets $\mathcal{D}(\tau, z_0) := Y_{z_0}(\tau, \cdot)\mathcal{D}$. We then infer the following properties by employing [Lemma 3.1](#) and [Lemma 3.2](#) and by making use of the continuity of the transform as well as of an interpolation theoretic argument.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $z_0 \in K$, where $K \subset \mathbb{C}^3$ is a compact subset, and $\tau \in [0, T]$. The operators $T_{Z_{z_0}(\tau, \cdot)}$, $T_{Z_{z_0}(\tau, \cdot)}|_{X_1(\tau, z_0)}$ and $T_{Z_{z_0}(\tau, \cdot)}|_{X_\gamma(\tau, z_0)}$ are Banach space isomorphisms between $X_0(\tau, z_0)$ as well as \tilde{X}_0 , $X_1(\tau, z_0)$ as well as \tilde{X}_1 and $X_\gamma(\tau, z_0)$ as well as \tilde{X}_γ , respectively. Consequently, there are constants $\tilde{C}_0, \tilde{c}_0, \tilde{C}_1, \tilde{c}_1, \tilde{C}_\gamma, \tilde{c}_\gamma > 0$, which we can choose independent of $\tau \in [0, T]$ and $z_0 \in K$, such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_{Z_{z_0}(\tau, \cdot)}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_0(\tau, z_0), \tilde{X}_0)} &\leq \tilde{C}_0, & \|T_{Z_{z_0}(\tau, \cdot)}^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\tilde{X}_0, X_0(\tau, z_0))} &\leq \tilde{c}_0, \\ \|T_{Z_{z_0}(\tau, \cdot)}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_1(\tau, z_0), \tilde{X}_1)} &\leq \tilde{C}_1, & \|T_{Z_{z_0}(\tau, \cdot)}^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\tilde{X}_1, X_1(\tau, z_0))} &\leq \tilde{c}_1, \\ \|T_{Z_{z_0}(\tau, \cdot)}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_\gamma(\tau, z_0), \tilde{X}_\gamma)} &\leq \tilde{C}_\gamma, & \|T_{Z_{z_0}(\tau, \cdot)}^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\tilde{X}_\gamma, X_\gamma(\tau, z_0))} &\leq \tilde{c}_\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for $i \in \{0, \gamma, 1\}$, the operators $\mathcal{T}(\tau, z_0)$ are Banach space isomorphisms between $\mathcal{X}_i(\tau, z_0)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_i$ with inverse $\mathcal{T}(\tau, z_0)^{-1}$, and there exist constants $C_i, c_i > 0$, which can also be chosen independent of τ and z_0 , such that

$$\|\mathcal{T}(\tau, z_0)\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_i(\tau, z_0), \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_i)} \leq C_i, \quad \|\mathcal{T}(\tau, z_0)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_i, \mathcal{X}_i(\tau, z_0))} \leq c_i.$$

Proof. Using the transformation theorem, we obtain

$$\|T_{Z_{z_0}(\tau, \cdot)} f\|_{\tilde{X}_0} \leq \|\det JZ_{z_0}(\tau, \cdot)\|_{\infty}^{-1/q} \cdot \|f\|_{X_0(\tau, z_0)}.$$

Thanks to [Lemma 3.1](#) and [Lemma 3.2](#), the map $(\tau, z_0) \mapsto \|\det JZ_{z_0}(\tau, \cdot)\|_{\infty}^{-1/q}$ is well-defined and continuous. Since $[0, T] \times K \subset \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{C}^3$ is compact, the aforementioned map admits its maximum $\tilde{C}_0 > 0$, and we can choose the bound \tilde{C}_0 independent of τ and z_0 . Similarly as above, this time employing the product rule and the chain rule in order to compute the respective derivatives of $T_{Z_{z_0}(\tau, \cdot)}$, we argue that

$$\|T_{Z_0(\tau,\cdot)}f\|_{\tilde{X}_1} \leq \tilde{C}_1(\|\nabla Z_0(\tau,\cdot)\|_\infty, \|\nabla^2 Z_0(\tau,\cdot)\|_\infty) \cdot \|f\|_{X_1(\tau,z_0)},$$

where \tilde{C}_1 depends continuously on $(\|\nabla Z_0(\tau,\cdot)\|_\infty, \|\nabla^2 Z_0(\tau,\cdot)\|_\infty)$. Lemma 3.2 and the compactness of $[0, T] \times K$ guarantee that $\tilde{C}_1(\cdot)$ admits its maximum \tilde{C}_1 on K , so we can choose the bound $\tilde{C}_1 > 0$ independent of τ and z_0 . The bound \tilde{C}_γ between $X_\gamma(\tau, z_0)$ and \tilde{X}_γ follows by interpolation. Replacing Z by Y , we derive the bounds for $T_{Z_0(\tau,\cdot)}^{-1} = T_{Y_0(\tau,\cdot)}$ in a similar way. The assertions concerning $\mathcal{T}(\tau, z_0)$ and $\mathcal{T}(\tau, z_0)^{-1}$ also follow by analogous arguments. \square

5.1. Maximal regularity of the linearized operator matrix.

In this subsection, we give an abstract tool to verify the assumption that for $w_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma$ fixed, $\mathcal{A}(0, w_0)$ admits maximal L^p -regularity on $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0 = L^q(\mathcal{D}; \mathbb{R}^2) \times L^q(\mathcal{D})^2 \times \mathbb{C}^3$. From the maximal regularity of $\mathcal{A}(0, w_0)$, we directly conclude the maximal regularity of $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(0, \tilde{w}_0)$, as for time 0, the transform in time is just the identity by construction. To simplify the notation, we omit the entries 0 and w_0 , since they are fixed. We also omit $(\rho_{icc}h_0)^{-1}$ in the first entry for the same reason. Throughout this subsection, we employ the notation $b = (h, a)^T$, $z = (\eta, \omega)^T$ and $\tilde{z} = (\xi, \Omega)^T$. We recall from (1.1) that the operator matrix \mathcal{A} with non-diagonal domain is given by

$$\mathcal{A} = \begin{pmatrix} A_m^H & B & 0 \\ 0 & D_{h,a} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad D(\mathcal{A}) = \{(u, b, z)^T \in D(A_m^H) \times D(D_{h,a}) \times \mathbb{C}^3 : Lu = Rz\},$$

where L is the trace operator mapping defined on $W^{2,q}(\mathcal{D}; \mathbb{R}^2)$ with values in $W^{2-1/q,q}(\partial\mathcal{D}; \mathbb{R}^2)$, R satisfies $Rz = 0$ on $\partial\mathcal{O}$ as well as $Rz = \eta + \omega(x - x_c(0))^\perp$ on Γ , and A_m^H is the maximal operator associated to the Hilber operator. It has the maximal domain $D(A_m^H) = W^{2,q}(\mathcal{D}; \mathbb{R}^2)$, as no boundary conditions are imposed. We point out that the operator \mathcal{A} is precisely the linearized operator from (2.9), and this is guaranteed in view of the boundary conditions described in the domain.

Next, we introduce the *decoupled* operator matrix $\mathcal{A}_0: D(\mathcal{A}_0) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0 \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0$ given by

$$\mathcal{A}_0 := \begin{pmatrix} A_D^H & B & 0 \\ 0 & D_{h,a} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad D(\mathcal{A}_0) := D(A_D^H) \times D(D_{h,a}) \times \mathbb{C}^3,$$

where $A_D^H: D(A_D^H) \subset \tilde{X}_0^u \rightarrow \tilde{X}_0^u$ denotes the linearized Hilber operator with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions as investigated in [2, Section 4], and in the present framework, it is given by

$$A_D^H f := A_m^H f, \quad D(A_D^H) := \ker(L) = W^{2,q}(\mathcal{D}; \mathbb{R}^2) \cap W_0^{1,q}(\mathcal{D}; \mathbb{R}^2).$$

By [2, Theorem 4.4], there is $\omega_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for all $\omega > \omega_0$ it holds that $A_D^H + \omega$ has the property of maximal L^p -regularity, and it follows that $A_D^H + \omega$ then is also invertible. Therefore, for such ω , we introduce the translated versions of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{A}_0 as

$$\mathcal{A}_\omega := \begin{pmatrix} A_m^H + \omega & B & 0 \\ 0 & D_{h,a} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A}_{0,\omega} := \begin{pmatrix} A_D^H + \omega & B & 0 \\ 0 & D_{h,a} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

which does not affect the domains of the operators, i.e., $D(\mathcal{A}_\omega) := D(\mathcal{A})$ and $D(\mathcal{A}_{0,\omega}) := D(\mathcal{A}_0)$. The aim now is to show that \mathcal{A}_ω admits maximal L^p -regularity on $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0$ by invoking the maximal regularity of $A_D^H + \omega$ and exploiting the upper triangular structure of the operator matrix.

To this end, we use a method of decoupling, and we first argue that

$$L_0 = (L|_{\ker(A_m^H + \omega)})^{-1}$$

exists and is continuous. We make use of [44, Theorem 4.7.1] to deduce that L is a retraction from $W^{2,q}(\mathcal{D}; \mathbb{R}^2)$ onto $W^{2-1/q,q}(\partial\mathcal{D}; \mathbb{R}^2)$, so it is in particular surjective and continuous. The closed graph theorem yields that the graph norm of A_m^H is equivalent to the $W^{2,q}$ -norm, and closedness of A_m^H follows by the fact that it is an elliptic differential operator of second order. In particular, we have argued that $L \in \mathcal{L}(W^{2,q}(\mathcal{D}; \mathbb{R}^2), W^{2-1/q,q}(\mathcal{D}; \mathbb{R}^2))$. The latter observation and closedness of A_m^H imply that $\begin{pmatrix} A_m^H \\ L \end{pmatrix}: D(A_m^H) \rightarrow$

$L^q(\mathcal{D}; \mathbb{R}^2) \times W^{2-1/q, q}(\partial\mathcal{D}; \mathbb{R}^2)$ is closed. The invertibility of $A_D^H + \omega$ yields the existence and continuity of the above L_0 in view of [4, Lemma 2.2].

The shape of R reveals that it is especially bounded and $\text{Im}(R) \subset W^{2-1/q, q}(\partial\mathcal{D}; \mathbb{R}^2)$, so it follows that L_0R is bounded as the product of two bounded operators. Consequently, the operator

$$(5.1) \quad \mathcal{S} = \begin{pmatrix} \text{Id} & 0 & -L_0R \\ 0 & \text{Id} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{is bounded with inverse} \quad \mathcal{S}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \text{Id} & 0 & L_0R \\ 0 & \text{Id} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The specific shape of L_0R implies that $\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{L}(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0, \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_0)$ as well as $\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{L}(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1, \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_1)$, with respective inverse \mathcal{S}^{-1} as in (5.1). An interpolation theoretical argument then yields that \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{S}^{-1} are also well-defined on the trace space $\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_\gamma$ in the decoupled setting.

We next verify that the trace space in the coupled setting can be represented in terms of the matrix \mathcal{S}^{-1} and the trace space $\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_\gamma$ in the decoupled setting. In addition, we remark that the result also holds true for the respective spaces for fixed time $\tau \in [0, T]$.

Lemma 5.2. *For \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{S}^{-1} as in (5.1), $\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_0 = \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0$, $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_1$ as in (2.10), (2.11) and (2.12), respectively, it holds that*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma = \mathcal{S}^{-1}(\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_\gamma).$$

Proof. We recall from the above arguments that \mathcal{A}_0 generates an analytic semigroup $T_{\mathcal{A}_0}$ on $\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_0$ and \mathcal{A} generates an analytic semigroup $T_{\mathcal{A}}$ on $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0$. Moreover, we have seen that $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{S}^{-1}\mathcal{A}_0\mathcal{S}$, and it also follows that $T_{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{S}^{-1}T_{\mathcal{A}_0}\mathcal{S}$. By definition of the trace space, an insertion of the relation of the operators and semigroups and using $x = \mathcal{S}^{-1}y$ for some $y \in \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_0$ in conjunction with easy functional analytic arguments involving the boundedness of \mathcal{S} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma &= \left\{ x \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0 : [x]_{1-1/p, p} := \left(\int_0^\infty \|t^{1/p} \mathcal{A} T_{\mathcal{A}} x\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0}^p dt/t \right)^{1/p} < \infty \right\} \\ &= \left\{ \mathcal{S}^{-1}y \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0 : [\mathcal{S}^{-1}y]_{1-1/p, p} := \left(\int_0^\infty \|t^{1/p} \mathcal{S}^{-1} \mathcal{A}_0 T_{\mathcal{A}_0} y\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0}^p dt/t \right)^{1/p} < \infty \right\} \\ &= \mathcal{S}^{-1}(\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_\gamma), \end{aligned}$$

completing the proof. \square

The following result establishes maximal regularity in the coupled setting.

Proposition 5.3. *Let $p, q \in (1, \infty)$ be such that $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} < \frac{1}{2}$. Then for $w_0 = \tilde{w}_0 \in V$, the operator matrices $\mathcal{A}_\omega(0, w_0)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_\omega(0, \tilde{w}_0)$ admit maximal L^p -regularity on $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0$.*

Proof. Using $\text{Im}(L_0) \subset D(A_m^H)$, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} SD(\mathcal{A}) &= \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} u - L_0Rz \\ b \\ z \end{pmatrix} : u \in D(A_m^H), b \in W^{2, q}(\mathcal{D})^2, z \in \mathbb{C}^3, Lu = Rz \right\} \\ &= \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \hat{u} \\ b \\ z \end{pmatrix} : \hat{u} \in D(A_m^H), b \in W^{2, q}(\mathcal{D})^2, z \in \mathbb{C}^3, L\hat{u} = 0 \right\} \\ &= D(A_D^H) \times W^{2, q}(\mathcal{D})^2 \times \mathbb{C}^3. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, employing that $\text{Im}(L_0) \subset \ker(A_m^H + \omega)$, we deduce that

$$S\mathcal{A}_\omega\mathcal{S}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} A_m^H + \omega & B & (A_m^H + \omega)L_0R \\ 0 & D_{h,a} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A_m^H + \omega & B & 0 \\ 0 & D_{h,a} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

which then yields $\mathcal{A}_{0, \omega}$ when considering the above domain. As a result, \mathcal{A}_ω admits maximal L^p -regularity on $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0$ if and only if $\mathcal{A}_{0, \omega}$ has this property. The upper triangular structure of $\mathcal{A}_{0, \omega}$, the well-known

fact that the Neumann Laplacian operator on $L^q(\mathcal{D})$ has the property of maximal L^p -regularity and the aforementioned result from [2] imply that $\mathcal{A}_{0,\omega}$ admits maximal L^p -regularity. The fact that the transform acts as the identity for time equal to 0 yields that maximal L^p -regularity also follows for $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_\omega(0, \tilde{w}_0)$. \square

5.2. Lipschitz estimates of the operator matrix.

We check the aspect (A1) of [Assumption 4.1](#) for $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ in this subsection. Throughout this subsection, we also denote the principle variable of the complete system by u or \tilde{u} .

Since the diffeomorphism Y is smooth, in particular $\partial_i \partial_j Y$ is continuous in time, and we also note that a_{ij}^{klm} is regular enough. It follows that $(t, \tilde{w}_0) \mapsto \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(t, \tilde{w}_0)$ is continuous.

Now, we fix $\tau \in [0, T]$ and establish the following Lipschitz estimate for fixed time. For $\tau \in [0, T]$ and $z \in \mathbb{C}^3$ fixed, we define the open set $V_{\tau,z} \subset \mathcal{X}_\gamma(\tau, z)$ by $V_{\tau,z} := \mathcal{T}(\tau, z)^{-1}(V)$. By virtue of [Lemma 5.1](#), a continuity argument yields that for sufficiently small time

$$(5.2) \quad w_0 \in V_{\tau,z} \text{ implies that } h_0 \geq \tilde{\kappa}, \quad a_0 \in [0, 1] \text{ and } (\eta_0, \omega_0) \in K,$$

for $\tilde{\kappa} > 0$ small and $K \subset \mathbb{C}^3$ compact.

With $\tilde{w}_0 \in V$ fixed and $\tilde{w}_i = (\tilde{v}_i, \tilde{z}_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, such that $\|\tilde{w}_i - \tilde{w}_0\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma} \leq R$ for $R > 0$, we get

$$(5.3) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\tau, \tilde{v}_1, \tilde{z}_1)\tilde{u} - \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\tau, \tilde{v}_2, \tilde{z}_2)\tilde{u}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0} \\ & \leq \|\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\tau, \tilde{v}_1, \tilde{z}_1)\tilde{u} - \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\tau, \tilde{v}_1, \tilde{z}_2)\tilde{u}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0} + \|\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\tau, \tilde{v}_1, \tilde{z}_2)\tilde{u} - \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\tau, \tilde{v}_2, \tilde{z}_2)\tilde{u}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0} \end{aligned}$$

for $\tilde{u} \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1$. Consequently, we can show the Lipschitz continuity with respect to \tilde{v} and \tilde{z} separately if we ensure that the respective Lipschitz constants are uniform. We start by treating the second addend in (5.3), and we need the following result from Section 6 of [2].

Lemma 5.4. *Let $p, q \in (1, \infty)$ be such that $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} < \frac{1}{2}$, and consider $z \in \mathbb{C}^3$ and $w_0 \in V_{\tau,z}$ fixed, where τ is sufficiently small such that (5.2) is satisfied. Then there exists $R_0 > 0$ and a constant $L > 0$ such that $\|w - w_0\|_{\mathcal{X}_\gamma(\tau,z)} \leq R_0$ implies that $w \in V_{\tau,z}$, and*

$$\|\mathcal{A}(\tau, v_1, z)u - \mathcal{A}(\tau, v_2, z)u\|_{\mathcal{X}_0(\tau,z)} \leq L\|v_1 - v_2\|_{\mathcal{X}_\gamma(\tau,z)}\|u\|_{\mathcal{X}_1(\tau,z)}$$

holds for all $u \in \mathcal{X}_1(\tau, z)$ and for all $w_1 = (v_1, z), w_2 = (v_2, z) \in \mathcal{X}_\gamma(\tau, z)$ with $\|w_i - w_0\|_{\mathcal{X}_\gamma(\tau,z)} \leq R_0$, $i = 1, 2$.

Proof. Choose $R_0 > 0$ sufficiently small such that $\|w - w_0\|_{\mathcal{X}_\gamma(\tau,z)} \leq R_0$ implies that $w \in V_{\tau,z}$, which is possible in view of $V_{\tau,z}$ being open. We make use of (2.13) in conjunction with the embedding $\mathcal{X}_1(\tau, z) \hookrightarrow W^{2,q}(\mathcal{D}(\tau))^4 \times \mathbb{C}^3$ and use (5.2) to argue as in Section 6 of [2], so we infer that

$$\|\mathcal{A}(\tau, v_1, z)u - \mathcal{A}(\tau, v_2, z)u\|_{\mathcal{X}_0(\tau,z)} \leq L\|v_1 - v_2\|_{\mathcal{X}_\gamma(\tau,z)}\|u\|_{\mathcal{X}_1(\tau,z)}$$

is valid for all $u \in \mathcal{X}_1(\tau, z)$ and for all $w_1 = (v_1, z), w_2 = (v_2, z) \in \mathcal{X}_\gamma(\tau, z)$ with $\|w_i - w_0\|_{\mathcal{X}_\gamma(\tau,z)} \leq R_0$. \square

For $\tilde{w}_i = (\tilde{v}_i, \tilde{z}_i)$, it holds that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\tau, \tilde{v}_i, \tilde{z}_i) = \mathcal{T}(\tau, z)\mathcal{A}(\tau, \mathcal{T}(\tau, z)^{-1}\tilde{w}_i)\mathcal{T}(\tau, z)^{-1}$$

by construction. We conclude the following result.

Corollary 5.5. *Let $p, q \in (1, \infty)$ be such that $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} < \frac{1}{2}$, and consider $\tilde{w}_0 \in V$ fixed. Then there exists $\tilde{R}_0 > 0$ and a constant $\tilde{L} > 0$ independent of \tilde{z}_2 such that $\|\tilde{w} - \tilde{w}_0\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma} \leq \tilde{R}_0$ implies that $\tilde{w} \in V$, and*

$$\|\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\tau, \tilde{v}_1, \tilde{z}_2)\tilde{u} - \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\tau, \tilde{v}_2, \tilde{z}_2)\tilde{u}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0} \leq \tilde{L}\|\tilde{v}_1 - \tilde{v}_2\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma}\|\tilde{u}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1}$$

holds for all $\tilde{u} \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1$, for all $(\tilde{v}_1, \tilde{z}_2), (\tilde{v}_2, \tilde{z}_2) \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma$ with $\|(\tilde{v}_i, \tilde{z}_2) - \tilde{w}_0\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma} \leq \tilde{R}_0$, $i = 1, 2$, and for τ sufficiently small.

Proof. We set $z_2 = (Q(\tau)\xi, \omega)$ for $\tilde{z}_2 = (\xi, \omega)$. Furthermore, we set $w_i := \mathcal{T}(\tau, z_2)^{-1}(\tilde{v}_i, \tilde{z}_2) \in \mathcal{X}_\gamma(\tau, z_2)$ and $u := \mathcal{T}(\tau, z_2)^{-1}\tilde{u} \in \mathcal{X}_1(\tau, z_2)$. Note that $w_i = (v_i, z_2)$. By construction, we have $w_0 = \mathcal{T}(\tau, z_2)^{-1}\tilde{w}_0 \in V_{\tau, z_2}$ in view of $\tilde{w}_0 \in V$, and we consider sufficiently small time τ such that (5.2) is fulfilled. From $(\tilde{v}_i, \tilde{z}_2) \in V$, we deduce that $(v_i, z_2) \in V_{\tau, z_2}$, so (5.2) yields that $z_2 \in K$ for $K \subset \mathbb{C}^3$ compact. Thus, it follows by Lemma 5.1 that $\mathcal{T}(\tau, z_2): \mathcal{X}_\gamma(\tau, z_2) \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma$ and its inverse are uniformly bounded in τ and z_2 , and

$$\|w_i - w_0\|_{\mathcal{X}_\gamma(\tau, z_2)} \leq C_\gamma \cdot \|\tilde{w}_i - \tilde{w}_0\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma} \leq C_\gamma \tilde{R}_0 = R_0$$

for $\tilde{R}_0 := \frac{R_0}{C_\gamma}$. Now, Lemma 5.4 as well as Lemma 5.1 imply

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\tau, \tilde{v}_1, \tilde{z}_2)\tilde{u} - \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\tau, \tilde{v}_2, \tilde{z}_2)\tilde{u}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0} &\leq C_0 \cdot \|\mathcal{A}(\tau, w_1)u - \mathcal{A}(\tau, w_2)u\|_{\mathcal{X}_0(\tau, z_2)} \\ &\leq C_0 \cdot L \cdot \|w_1 - w_2\|_{\mathcal{X}_\gamma(\tau, z_2)} \cdot \|u\|_{\mathcal{X}_1(\tau, z_2)} \\ &\leq C_0 \cdot L \cdot c_\gamma \cdot c_1 \cdot \|\tilde{v}_1 - \tilde{v}_2\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma} \cdot \|\tilde{u}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1} \\ &=: \tilde{L} \cdot \|\tilde{v}_1 - \tilde{v}_2\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma} \cdot \|\tilde{u}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1} \end{aligned}$$

for all $\tilde{u} \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1$ and for all $\tilde{w}_i = (\tilde{v}_i, \tilde{z}_2) \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma$, $i = 1, 2$, with $\|\tilde{w}_i - \tilde{w}_0\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma} \leq \tilde{R}_0$. \square

Next, we deal with the Lipschitz continuity of $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ with respect to the ODE variable z .

Lemma 5.6. *Let $p, q \in (1, \infty)$ be such that $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} < \frac{1}{2}$, and consider $\tilde{w}_0 \in V$ fixed. Then there exists $\tilde{R}_0 > 0$ and a constant $\tilde{L} > 0$ independent of \tilde{v}_1 such that $\|\tilde{w} - \tilde{w}_0\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma} \leq \tilde{R}_0$ implies that $\tilde{w} \in V$, and*

$$\|\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\tau, \tilde{v}_1, \tilde{z}_1)\tilde{u} - \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\tau, \tilde{v}_1, \tilde{z}_2)\tilde{u}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0} \leq \tilde{L} \|\tilde{z}_1 - \tilde{z}_2\|_{\mathbb{C}^3} \|\tilde{u}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1}$$

holds for all $\tilde{u} \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1$, for all $(\tilde{v}_1, \tilde{z}_1), (\tilde{v}_1, \tilde{z}_2) \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma$ with $\|(\tilde{v}_1, \tilde{z}_i) - \tilde{w}_0\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma} \leq \tilde{R}_0$, $i = 1, 2$, and for τ sufficiently small.

Proof. Note that \tilde{v}_1 is fixed. Using the regularity of the coefficients we obtain that they can be bounded uniformly in \tilde{v} for $\tilde{v} \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma$ such that $\|\tilde{v} - \tilde{v}_0\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma} \leq \tilde{R}_0$. Further, it follows from Lemma 3.2 and $\|z_i\|_{\mathbb{C}^3} \leq \|z_0\|_{\mathbb{C}^3} + R_0$ that $\|\nabla^k Y_{z_i}(\tau, \cdot)\|_\infty \leq C$ for $k, i = 1, 2$. Now from (3.4) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\tau, \tilde{v}_1, \tilde{z}_1)\tilde{w} - \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\tau, \tilde{v}_1, \tilde{z}_2)\tilde{w}\|_{L^q(\mathcal{D})} \\ &\leq C \cdot (\|\nabla(Y_{z_1}(\tau, \cdot) - Y_{z_2}(\tau, \cdot))\|_\infty + \|\nabla^2(Y_{z_1}(\tau, \cdot) - Y_{z_2}(\tau, \cdot))\|_\infty) \cdot \|\tilde{w}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1}. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 3.2 it follows that

$$\|\nabla^k(Y_{z_1}(\tau, \cdot) - Y_{z_2}(\tau, \cdot))\|_\infty \leq C \|z_1 - z_2\|_{\mathbb{C}^3}$$

for $k = 1, 2$, and $\|z_1 - z_2\|_{\mathbb{C}^3} \leq R_0$ sufficient small. Finally, the map $\tilde{z} = (\xi, \Omega) \mapsto (Q_\Omega(\tau)\xi, \Omega) = (\eta, \omega) = z$ is smooth and hence locally Lipschitz continuous. The claim thus follows. \square

A concatenation of (5.3) with Corollary 5.5 and Lemma 5.6 yields the following result.

Corollary 5.7. *Let $p, q \in (1, \infty)$ be such that $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} < \frac{1}{2}$, and consider $\tilde{w}_0 \in V$ fixed. Then there exists $\tilde{R}_0 > 0$ and a constant $\tilde{L} > 0$ such that $\|\tilde{w} - \tilde{w}_0\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma} \leq \tilde{R}_0$ implies that $\tilde{w} \in V$, and*

$$\|\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\tau, \tilde{w}_1)\tilde{u} - \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\tau, \tilde{w}_2)\tilde{u}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0} \leq \tilde{L} \|\tilde{w}_1 - \tilde{w}_2\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma} \|\tilde{u}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1}$$

holds for all $\tilde{u} \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1$, for all $\tilde{w}_1, \tilde{w}_2 \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma$ with $\|\tilde{w}_i - \tilde{w}_0\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma} \leq \tilde{R}_0$, $i = 1, 2$, and for τ sufficiently small.

5.3. Lipschitz properties of the right-hand side.

This subsection is dedicated to studying properties of the right-hand $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ side as introduced in [Section 3](#).

Lemma 5.8. *Let $p, q \in (1, \infty)$ be such that $\frac{2}{p} + \frac{3}{q} < 1$. Then for $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$, the following properties are satisfied:*

- (i) $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\cdot, \tilde{w})$ is measurable for every $\tilde{w} \in V$,
- (ii) $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\tau, \cdot) \in C(V, \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0)$ holds for almost all $\tau \in [0, T]$,
- (iii) $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\cdot, \tilde{w}) \in L^p(0, T; \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0)$ is valid for every $\tilde{w} \in V$, and
- (iv) for $\tilde{w}_0 \in V$ and for every $R > 0$ such that $\overline{\mathcal{B}}(\tilde{w}, R) \subset V$, there exists $\varphi_R \in L^p(0, T)$ with

$$\|\tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\tau, \tilde{w}_1) - \tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\tau, \tilde{w}_2)\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0} \leq \varphi_R(\tau) \|\tilde{w}_1 - \tilde{w}_2\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma}$$

for almost all $\tau \in [0, T]$ and all $\tilde{w}_1, \tilde{w}_2 \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma$ with $\|\tilde{w}_i - \tilde{w}_0\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma} \leq R$.

Proof. The assumption $\tilde{w} \in V \subset \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma$ ensures that the terms involved are well-defined. From [\(3.5\)](#), [\(3.6\)](#) and [\(3.7\)](#) in conjunction with the regularity of the coordinate transform in time and space as well as with the measurability of the initial objects on the moving sea ice domain, we deduce that (i) is satisfied.

The condition $\frac{2}{p} + \frac{3}{q} < 1$ implies in particular that $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} < \frac{1}{2}$, so it follows that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma \hookrightarrow C^1(\overline{\mathcal{D}})^4.$$

Together with [Lemma 3.2](#), the last embedding yields that $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\tau, \cdot)$ as defined in [Section 3](#) is indeed continuous as a map from $V \subset \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma$ to $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0$ for almost every $\tau \in [0, T]$, so (ii) is also valid. Property (iii) follows by similar arguments as (i), and in particular, we take the assumptions concerning F and N from [Theorem 2.1](#) into account and observe the way they are transformed.

It thus remains to verify (iv). To this end, let $\tilde{w}_0 \in V$ and consider $R > 0$ arbitrary such that $\overline{\mathcal{B}}(\tilde{w}_0, R) \subset V$. Moreover, we take $\tilde{w}_1, \tilde{w}_2 \in V$ with $\|\tilde{w}_i - \tilde{w}_0\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma} \leq R$ into account. First, simple calculations reveal that

$$(5.4) \quad |\Omega_1 \xi_1^\perp - \Omega_2 \xi_2^\perp| \leq C(R + |\xi_0| + |\Omega_0|) \left| \begin{pmatrix} \xi_1 \\ \Omega_1 \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \xi_2 \\ \Omega_2 \end{pmatrix} \right|.$$

Using the shape of M from [\(3.6\)](#), smoothness of the transform as seen in [Lemma 3.2](#) as well as the above embedding $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma \hookrightarrow C^1(\overline{\mathcal{D}})^4$, we argue that

$$(5.5) \quad \|M_{z_1} \tilde{v}_1 - M_{z_2} \tilde{v}_2\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0} \leq C \|\tilde{v}_1 - \tilde{v}_2\|_{W^{1,q}(\mathcal{D})^4} \leq C \|\tilde{w}_1 - \tilde{w}_2\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma}.$$

On the other hand, from [\(3.6\)](#) we conclude by [Lemma 3.2](#) that

$$(5.6) \quad \|M_{z_1} \tilde{v}_2 - M_{z_2} \tilde{v}_2\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0} \leq \|\dot{Y}_{z_1} - \dot{Y}_{z_2}\|_\infty \cdot \|\nabla \tilde{v}_2\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0} \leq C \cdot \|z_1 - z_2\|_{\mathbb{C}^3}$$

where we used $\|\nabla \tilde{v}_2\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0} \leq C \|\tilde{v}_2\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma} \leq \|\tilde{v}_0\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma} + R_0 =: C$.

For $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ as in [Section 3](#), we use a similar strategy as for the quasilinear operator above, i.e., we note that

$$\|\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\tau, \tilde{v}_1, \tilde{z}_1) - \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\tau, \tilde{v}_2, \tilde{z}_2)\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0} \leq \|\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\tau, \tilde{v}_1, \tilde{z}_1) - \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\tau, \tilde{v}_2, \tilde{z}_1)\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0} + \|\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\tau, \tilde{v}_2, \tilde{z}_1) - \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\tau, \tilde{v}_2, \tilde{z}_2)\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0},$$

so we treat differences in \tilde{v} and differences in \tilde{z} separately. We start with Lipschitz estimates of the first term. The Lipschitz estimates of the transformed terms, whose treatment reduces to the study of the initial terms on the domain for some fixed time τ and fixed \tilde{z}_1 by virtue of the continuity and invertibility of the transform as seen in [Lemma 5.1](#). Indeed, by construction, it holds that $w_j := \mathcal{T}(\tau, z_1)^{-1} \tilde{w}_j \in V_{\tau, z_1}$ for $\tilde{w}_j \in V$, and for sufficiently small $T > 0$, the properties from [\(5.2\)](#) are satisfied for all $\tau \in [0, T]$. Additionally, it follows by [Lemma 5.1](#) that

$$\|w_i - w_0\|_{\mathcal{X}_\gamma(\tau, z_1)} \leq c_\gamma \|\tilde{w}_i - \tilde{w}_0\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma} \leq c_\gamma R.$$

As in the previous subsection an application of [Lemma 5.1](#) and of results from [\[2, Section 6\]](#) then yields that

$$(5.7) \quad \|\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_1(\tau, \tilde{v}_1, \tilde{z}_1) - \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_1(\tau, \tilde{v}_2, \tilde{z}_1)\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0} \leq C_0 \|\mathcal{G}_1(\tau, w_1) - \mathcal{G}_1(\tau, w_2)\|_{X_0(\tau, z_1)} \leq LC_0 c_\gamma \|\tilde{w}_1 - \tilde{w}_2\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma}.$$

The verification of the Lipschitz continuity of $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_2$ is more involved, relying on nonlinear complex interpolation, see [Section 4](#) and [\[1\]](#). First, to simplify notation, we define the operator

$$\mathcal{J}: W_{\text{loc}}^{\varepsilon+1/q, q}(\mathcal{D}(\tau); \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3, \quad g \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\text{m}_B} \int_{\Gamma(\tau)} gn(\tau, x) \, dS \\ J^{-1} \int_{\Gamma(\tau)} y^\perp gn(\tau, x) \, dS \end{pmatrix},$$

for $0 < \varepsilon < 1 - \frac{1}{q}$. The boundedness of the trace operator $\gamma: W_{\text{loc}}^{\varepsilon/2+1/q, q}(\mathcal{D}(\tau)) \rightarrow L^q(\partial\mathcal{D}(\tau))$ yields that

$$(5.8) \quad |\mathcal{J}(g)| \leq C \|g\|_{W^{\varepsilon+1/q, q}(\mathcal{D}(\tau); \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})}, \quad g \in W^{\varepsilon+1/q, q}(\mathcal{D}(\tau); \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}).$$

For $p, q \in (1, \infty)$ with $\frac{2}{p} + \frac{3}{q} < 1 - \varepsilon$, we consider $s \in (1, 2)$ with $s > \frac{2}{q} + 1$, and the resulting embedding

$$B_{qp}^s(\mathcal{D}(\tau)) \hookrightarrow C^1(\overline{\mathcal{D}(\tau)}) \hookrightarrow W^{1, q}(\mathcal{D}(\tau))$$

yields that

$$(5.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\sigma_\delta(v_1) - \sigma_\delta(v_2)\|_{L^q(\mathcal{D}(\tau); \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})} &\leq C(1 + \|v_1\|_{W^{1, q}(\mathcal{D}(\tau))^4} + \|v_2\|_{C^1(\mathcal{D}(\tau))^4}) \|v_1 - v_2\|_{C^1(\mathcal{D}(\tau))^4} \\ &\leq C(1 + \|v_1\|_{B_{qp}^s(\mathcal{D}(\tau))^4} + \|v_2\|_{B_{qp}^s(\mathcal{D}(\tau))^4}) \|v_1 - v_2\|_{B_{qp}^s(\mathcal{D}(\tau))^4}. \end{aligned}$$

An analogous argument shows that

$$(5.10) \quad \|\sigma_\delta(v_1) - \sigma_\delta(v_2)\|_{W^{1, q}(\mathcal{D}(\tau); \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})} \leq C(1 + \|v_1\|_{B_{qp}^{s+1}(\mathcal{D}(\tau))^4} + \|v_2\|_{B_{qp}^{s+1}(\mathcal{D}(\tau))^4}) \|v_1 - v_2\|_{B_{qp}^{s+1}(\mathcal{D}(\tau))^4}.$$

We define $S(v_1, v_2) := \sigma_\delta(v_1 + v_2) - \sigma_\delta(v_2)$, and we set $F_0 = L^q(\mathcal{D}(\tau); \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})$, $F_1 = W^{1, q}(\mathcal{D}(\tau); \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})$, $E_0 = B_{qp}^s(\mathcal{D}(\tau))^4$ and $E_1 = B_{qp}^{s+1}(\mathcal{D}(\tau))^4$ for suitable $s \in (1, 2)$ with $s > \frac{2}{q} + 1$. Making use of [\(5.9\)](#) and [\(5.10\)](#), we infer that for $v_1, v_2 \in E_j$ it holds that

$$\|S(v_1, v_2)\|_{F_j} = \|\sigma_\delta(v_1 + v_2) - \sigma_\delta(v_2)\|_{F_j} \leq C(1 + \|v_1\|_{E_j} + \|v_2\|_{E_j}) \|v_1\|_{E_j},$$

so $\omega(\|v_1\|_{E_j}, \|v_2\|_{E_j}) = C(1 + \|v_1\|_{E_j} + \|v_2\|_{E_j}) \|v_1\|_{E_j}$. The shape of ω in this case yields directly that it is continuous and positive on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and that it satisfies the monotonicity property from [Proposition 4.3](#), so it lies within the scope of the latter proposition.

In order to apply this proposition, it remains to verify that $S(v_1, v_2) \in \mathcal{F}(F_0, F_1)$ holds for $v_1, v_2 \in \mathcal{F}(E_0, E_1)$. If S would only depend on one variable, then it would suffice to show that S is Fréchet-differentiable from E_0 to F_0 and continuous from E_1 to F_1 by virtue of $E_1 \hookrightarrow E_0$ and $F_1 \hookrightarrow F_0$, see [\[33, Section 2\]](#). The latter embeddings also result in $\Sigma_E = E_0 + E_1 = E_0$ as well as $\Sigma_F = F_0 + F_1 = F_0$, where the norm of the respective sums are equivalent to the norm of E_0 and F_0 , respectively.

Let now $v_1, v_2 \in \mathcal{F}(E_0, E_1)$. Similarly as in [Sections 6 and 7 of \[2\]](#), and observing that σ_δ is well-defined on the whole of E_0 in view of [\(2.4\)](#), we argue that σ_δ is Fréchet-differentiable from E_0 to F_0 . It readily follows that S is Fréchet-differentiable from $\tilde{E}_0 := E_0 \times E_0$ to F_0 provided \tilde{E}_0 is equipped with a suitable norm. A simple argument also reveals that $v = (v_1, v_2)^T$ is holomorphic in \tilde{E}_0 on $0 < \text{Re } z < 1$. As the composition of a holomorphic function and a Fréchet-differentiable operator is holomorphic, we deduce that $S(v_1, v_2)$ is holomorphic in F_0 on $0 < \text{Re } z < 1$. Likewise, one can verify the other aspects of $S(v_1, v_2) \in \mathcal{F}(F_0, F_1)$.

It is thus justified to employ [Proposition 4.3](#), and doing so, we infer that

$$\|S(v_1, v_2)\|_{F_\theta} \leq C(1 + \|v_1\|_{E_\theta} + \|v_2\|_{E_\theta}) \|v_1\|_{E_\theta}.$$

Reproducing the above estimate with $S(v_1 - v_2, v_2)$, we get

$$(5.11) \quad \|\sigma_\delta(v_1) - \sigma_\delta(v_2)\|_{F_\theta} = \|S(v_1 - v_2, v_2)\|_{F_\theta} \leq C(1 + \|v_1\|_{E_\theta} + \|v_2\|_{E_\theta}) \|v_1 - v_2\|_{E_\theta}.$$

Next, we observe that $F_\theta = H^{\theta, q}(\mathcal{D}(\tau); \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})$ and $E_\theta = B_{qp}^{s+\theta}(\mathcal{D}(\tau))^4$. The assumptions on p and q imply that $q > 2$, so it is also valid that $H^{\theta, q} \hookrightarrow W^{\theta, q}$, see e.g. [Example 2.18 in \[31\]](#) for the embedding on \mathbb{R}^n and use the boundary regularity to transfer this result to the present setting via an extension operator. Plugging $\theta = \varepsilon + \frac{1}{q}$ into [\(5.11\)](#), we infer that

$$(5.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\sigma_\delta(v_1) - \sigma_\delta(v_2)\|_{W^{\varepsilon+1/q, q}(\mathcal{D}(\tau); \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})} \\ \leq C(1 + \|v_1\|_{B_{qp}^{s+\varepsilon+1/q}(\mathcal{D}(\tau))^4} + \|v_2\|_{B_{qp}^{s+\varepsilon+1/q}(\mathcal{D}(\tau))^4}) \|v_1 - v_2\|_{B_{qp}^{s+\varepsilon+1/q}(\mathcal{D}(\tau))^4}. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to argue that

$$X_\gamma(\tau, z_1) \hookrightarrow B_{qp}^{2-2/p}(\mathcal{D}(\tau))^4 \hookrightarrow B_{qp}^{s+\varepsilon+1/q}(\mathcal{D}(\tau))^4.$$

In fact, the second embedding is implied provided $s \leq 2 - \frac{2}{p} - \frac{1}{q} - \varepsilon$. On the other hand, we recall that $s > 1 + \frac{2}{q}$ has to be ensured, so we can find such $s \in (1, 2)$ if

$$1 + \frac{2}{q} < 2 - \frac{2}{p} - \frac{1}{q} - \varepsilon, \text{ or, equivalently, } \frac{2}{p} + \frac{3}{q} < 1,$$

as ε is arbitrarily small. The above condition is guaranteed by assumption. The first embedding is valid in view of (2.13). Thus, we deduce from (5.12) that

$$(5.13) \quad \|\sigma_\delta(v_1) - \sigma_\delta(v_2)\|_{W^{\varepsilon+1/q, q}(\mathcal{D}(\tau); \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})} \leq C(1 + \|v_1\|_{X_\gamma(\tau)} + \|v_2\|_{X_\gamma(\tau)})\|v_1 - v_2\|_{X_\gamma(\tau)}.$$

Employing Lemma 5.1, (5.8) and (5.13), we then obtain

$$(5.14) \quad \begin{aligned} |\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_2(\tau, \tilde{v}_1, \tilde{z}_1) - \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_2(\tau, \tilde{v}_2, \tilde{z}_1)| &\leq C_0 |\mathcal{G}_2(\tau, w_1) - \mathcal{G}_2(\tau, w_2)| \\ &\leq C_0 C \|\sigma_\delta(v_1) - \sigma_\delta(v_2)\|_{W^{\varepsilon+1/q, q}(\mathcal{D}(\tau); \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})} \\ &\leq C_0 C (1 + \|v_1\|_{X_\gamma(\tau, z_1)} + \|v_2\|_{X_\gamma(\tau, z_1)}) \|v_1 - v_2\|_{X_\gamma(\tau, z_1)} \\ &\leq C_0 C c_\gamma (1 + R + \|\tilde{w}_0\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma}) \|\tilde{w}_1 - \tilde{w}_2\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we establish estimates for $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_1$, where \tilde{v}_2 is fixed. Using (3.5), we get

$$(5.15) \quad \|\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_1(\tau, \tilde{v}_2, \tilde{z}_1) - \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_1(\tau, \tilde{v}_2, \tilde{z}_2)\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0} \leq C \|\nabla(Y_{z_1}(\tau, \cdot) - Y_{z_2}(\tau, \cdot))\|_\infty$$

and we conclude the Lipschitz bound as in the proof of Lemma 5.6.

In total, concatenating (5.4), (5.5), (5.6), (5.7), (5.14) and (5.15), we derive that

$$(5.16) \quad \|\tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\tau, \tilde{v}_1, \tilde{z}_1) - \tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\tau, \tilde{v}_2, \tilde{z}_2)\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0} \leq C(1 + R + \|\tilde{w}_0\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma}) \|\tilde{w}_1 - \tilde{w}_2\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma},$$

where the constant $C > 0$ can be chosen independent of \tilde{v} , \tilde{z} and τ . From (5.16) we deduce that $\varphi_R := C(1 + R + \|\tilde{w}_0\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\gamma}) \in L^p(0, T)$, completing the proof of (iv). \square

5.4. Proof of Theorem 2.1.

The maximal regularity as established in Proposition 5.3 and the Lipschitz estimates of the operator matrix and the right-hand side as seen in Corollary 5.7 and Lemma 5.8, respectively, yield that the conditions from Assumption 4.1 are satisfied in the present setting. Proposition 4.2 then yields the existence and uniqueness of a local strong solution to (3.8) on the fixed domain. More precisely, the solution lies in the corresponding maximal regularity space, namely in $L^p(0, T; \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1) \cap W^{1,p}(0, T; \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0)$.

The solution to the original problem as in (2.3) or (2.9) then is obtained by performing the backward change of variables and coordinates given in Section 3. The solution must be unique as a consequence of the uniqueness implied by the quasilinear existence result.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Bergh, A non-linear complex interpolation result. In: *Interpolation Spaces and Allied Topics in Analysis: Proceedings of the Conference held in Lund, Sweden, August 29 - September 1, 1983*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg (1984), 45–47.
- [2] F. Brandt, K. Disser, R. Haller-Dintelmann, M. Hieber, Rigorous Analysis and Dynamics of Hibler's Sea Ice Model. *J. Nonlinear Sci.* **32**, (2022), paper No 50.
- [3] C. Cao, E.S. Titi, Global well-posedness of the three-dimensional viscous primitive equations of large scale ocean and atmosphere dynamics. *Ann. of Math.* **166** (2007), 245–267.
- [4] V. Casarino, K.J. Engel, R. Nagel, G. Nickel, A semigroup approach to boundary feedback systems. *Integral Equ. Oper. Theory* **47** (2003), 289–306.
- [5] P. Clément, S. Li, Abstract parabolic quasilinear equations and application to a groundwater flow problem. *Adv. Math. Sci. Appl.* **3** (1993/1994), 17–32.
- [6] C. Conca, J. San Martín, M. Tucsnak, Existence of solutions for equations modeling the motion of a rigid body in a viscous fluid. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **25** (2000), 1019–1042.
- [7] P. Cumsille, M. Tucsnak, Wellposedness for the Navier-Stokes flow in the exterior of a rotating obstacle. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.* **29** (2006), 595–623.
- [8] P. Cumsille, T. Takahashi, Wellposedness for the system modelling the motion of a rigid body of arbitrary form in an incompressible viscous fluid. *Czechoslovak Math. J.* **58** (2008), 961–992.

- [9] S. Danilov, Q. Wang, R. Timmermann, N. Iakovlev, M. Kimmritz, T. Jung, J. Schröter, Finite-Element Sea Ice Model (FESIM). *Geosci. Model Dev.* **8** (2015), 1747–1761.
- [10] B. Desjardins, M. Esteban, Existence of weak solutions for rigid bodies in a viscous fluid. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **146** (1999), 59–71.
- [11] B. Desjardins, M. Esteban, On weak solutions for fluid rigid structure interaction: Compressible and incompressible models. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **25** (2000), 1399–1413.
- [12] S. Ervedoza, D. Maity, M. Tucsnak, Large time behaviour for the motion of a solid in a viscous incompressible fluid. *Math. Ann.* (2022), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00208-021-02351-y>.
- [13] E. Feireisl, M. Hillairet, S. Necasova, On the motion of several rigid bodies in an incompressible non-Newtonian fluid. *Nonlinearity* **21** (2008), 1349–1366.
- [14] D.L. Feltham, Sea Ice Rheology. *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.* **40** (2008), 91–112.
- [15] G.P. Galdi, On the motion of a rigid body in a viscous liquid: A mathematical analysis with applications. In: *Handbook of Mathematical Fluid Dynamics. Vol. I*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2002, 653–791.
- [16] G.P. Galdi, J. Neustupa, Steady-state Navier-Stokes flow around a moving body. In: *Handbook of Mathematical Analysis in Mechanics of Viscous Fluids*, Y. Giga, A. Novotny (eds.), Springer, Cham, 2018, 341–417.
- [17] G.P. Galdi, A.L. Silvestre, Strong Solutions to the Problem of Motion of a Rigid Body in a Navier-Stokes Liquid under the Action of Prescribed Forces and Torques. In: *Nonlinear Problems in Mathematical Physics and Related Topics, I*, Int. Math. Ser. (N. Y.), 1, Kluwer, New York, 2002, 121–144.
- [18] M. Geissert, K. Götze, M. Hieber, L^p -theory for strong solutions to fluid-rigid body interaction in Newtonian and generalized Newtonian fluids. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **365** (2013), 1393–1439.
- [19] K. Golden, The mathematics of sea ice. In: *The Princeton Companion to Applied Mathematics*, N. Higham (ed.), 694–705, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2015.
- [20] K. Golden, L. Bennetts, E. Cherkaev, I. Eisenman, D. Feltham, C. Horvat, E. Hunke, C. Jones, D. Perovich, P. Pontecastaneda, C. Strong, D. Sulsky, A. Wells, Modeling Sea Ice. *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.*, **67** (10) (2020), 1535–1555.
- [21] M.D. Gunzburger, H.-C. Lee, G.A. Seregin, Global existence of weak solutions for viscous incompressible flows around a moving rigid body in three dimensions. *J. Math. Fluid Mech.* **2** (2000), 219–266.
- [22] W.D. Hibler, A Dynamic Thermodynamic Sea Ice Model. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.* **9** (1979), 815–846.
- [23] M. Hieber, M. Murata, The L^p -approach to the fluid rigid body interaction problem for compressible fluids. *Evol. Equ. Contr. Theory* **4** (2015), 69–87.
- [24] K.H. Hoffmann, V. Starovoitov, On a motion of a solid body in a viscous fluid. Two-dimensional case. *Adv. Math. Sci. Appl.* **9** (1999), 633–648.
- [25] A. Inoue, M. Wakimoto, On existence of solutions of the Navier-Stokes equation in a time dependent domain. *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math* **24** (1977), 303–319.
- [26] H. Kim, J. Sawamura, A simulation study on the turning ability of ice-going ship navigating in pack ice. In: *Proc. of 23rd IAHR Int. Symposium on Ice*, 18468, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA, 2016.
- [27] M. Kimmrich, S. Danilov, M. Lorsch, On the convergence of the modified elastic-viscous-plastic method for solving the sea ice momentum equation. *J. Comp. Physics* **296** (2015), 90–100.
- [28] M. Kreyscher, M. Harder, P. Lemke, G. Flato, M. Gregory, Results of the Sea Ice Model Intercomparison Project: Evaluation of sea ice rheology schemes for use in climate simulations. *J. Geophys. Res.* **105** (2000), 11299–11320.
- [29] J.-F. Lemieux, B. Tremblay, Numerical convergence of viscous-plastic sea ice models. *J. Geophys. Res.* **114** (2009), C05009.
- [30] X. Liu, M. Thomas, E.S. Titi, Well-Posedness of Hibler’s Dynamical Sea-Ice Model. *J. Nonlinear Sci.* **32** (2022), paper No 49.
- [31] A. Lunardi, *Interpolation Theory*. 3rd edn, Lecture Notes Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa (New Series) 16, Edizioni della Normale Pisa, 2018.
- [32] D. Maity, J.-P. Raymond, A. Roy, Maximal-in-time existence and uniqueness of strong solution of a 3D fluid-structure interaction model. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **52** (2020), 6338–6378.
- [33] L. Maligranda, On interpolation of nonlinear operators. *Comment. Math. Prace Mat.* **28** (1989), 253–275.
- [34] C. Mehlmann, S. Danilov, M. Losch, J.F. Lemieux, N. Hutter, T. Richter, P. Blain, E.C. Hunke, P. Korn, Simulating linear kinematic features in viscous-plastic sea ice models on quadrilateral and triangular grids with different variable staggering. *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.* **13** (2021), e2021MS002523.
- [35] C. Mehlmann, P. Korn, Sea-ice on triangular grids. *J. Comp. Physics* **428** (2021), 110086.
- [36] C. Mehlmann, T. Richter, A modified global Newton solver for viscous-plastic sea ice models. *Ocean Model.* **116** (2017), 96–117.
- [37] J. Prüss, Maximal regularity for evolution equations in L_p -spaces. *Conf. Semin. Mat. Univ. Bari* (2002), no. 285, 1–39 (2003).
- [38] J. Prüss, G. Simonett, *Moving Interfaces and Quasilinear Parabolic Evolution Equations*. Monographs in Mathematics, vol. 105, Birkhäuser, 2016.
- [39] J.-P. Raymond, M. Vanninathan, A fluid-structure model coupling the Navier-Stokes equations and the Lamé system. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **102** (2014), 546–596.
- [40] J. San Martín, J. Scheid, T. Takahashi, M. Tucsnak, An initial and boundary value problem modeling of fish-like swimming. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **188** (2008), 429–455.

- [41] C. Seinen, B. Khouider, Improving the Jacobian free Newton-Krylov method for the viscous-plastic sea ice momentum equation. *Physica D* **376–377** (2018), 78–93.
- [42] T. Takahashi, Analysis of strong solutions for equations modeling the motion of a rigid-fluid system in a bounded domain. *Adv. Differential Equations* **8** (2003), 1499–1532.
- [43] T. Takahashi, M. Tucsnak, Global strong solutions for the two-dimensional motion of an infinite cylinder in a viscous fluid. *J. Math. Fluid Mech.* **6** (2004), 53–77.
- [44] H. Triebel, *Interpolation Theory, Function Spaces, Differential Operators*. North-Holland, 1978.
- [45] J. Tuhkuri, A. Polojärvi, A review of discrete element simulation of ice-structure interaction. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A* **376** (2018), 20170335.
- [46] D. Zhan, D. Agar, M. He, D. Spenced, D. Molyneux, Numerical simulation of ship maneuvering in pack ice. In: *Proc. of the ASME 2010 29th Int. Conf. on Ocean, Offshore and Arctic Engineering, OMAE 2010, Shanghai, China*, vol. 4, 855–862, New York, NY, 2010.

TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT DARMSTADT, FACHBEREICH MATHEMATIK, SCHLOSSGARTENSTRASSE 7, 64289 DARMSTADT, GERMANY

Email address: `binz@mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de`

TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT DARMSTADT, FACHBEREICH MATHEMATIK, SCHLOSSGARTENSTRASSE 7, 64289 DARMSTADT, GERMANY

Email address: `brandt@mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de`

TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT DARMSTADT, FACHBEREICH MATHEMATIK, SCHLOSSGARTENSTRASSE 7, 64289 DARMSTADT, GERMANY

Email address: `hieber@mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de`