
A PARADIFFERENTIAL REDUCTION FOR THE GRAVITY-CAPILLARY WAVES SYSTEM AT LOW REGULARITY AND APPLICATIONS

Thibault de Poyferré & Quang-Huy Nguyen

Abstract. — We consider in this article the system of gravity-capillary waves (in any dimension) under the Zakharov/Craig-Sulem formulation. Using a paradifferential approach introduced by Alazard-Burq-Zuily we symmetrize this system into a quasilinear equation whose principal term is of order $3/2$. The main novelty compare to earlier studies is that this reduction is performed at the Sobolev regularity of quasilinear pdes: $H^s(\mathbf{R}^d)$ with $s > 3/2 + d/2$ (d is the horizontal dimension). From this reduction, we deduce a blow-up criterion and then an a priori estimate for the solution and the Lipschitz continuity of the flow map in terms of the Sobolev norm and the Strichartz norm.

Contents

1. Introduction.....	2
Acknowledgment.....	7
2. Elliptic estimates and the Dirichlet-Neumann operator....	7
3. Paralinearization and symmetrization of the system.....	20
4. Blow-up criterion and a priori estimate.....	30
5. Contraction estimates.....	37
6. Appendix: Paradifferential Calculus and technical results..	49
References.....	53

Key words and phrases. — gravity-capillary waves, paradifferential approach, blow-up criterion, a priori estimate, contraction estimate.

1. Introduction

We consider the system of gravity-capillary waves describing the motion of a fluid interface under the effect of gravity and surface tension. From the well-posedness result in Sobolev spaces Yosihara [54] (see also Wu [50, 51] for pure gravity waves) it is known that the system is quasilinear in nature. In a more recent work [1] Alazard-Burq-Zuily showed explicitly this quasilinearity by using a paradifferential approach (see Appendix 6) to symmetrize the system into the following paradifferential equation

$$(1.1) \quad (\partial_t + T_{V(t,x)} \cdot \nabla + iT_{\gamma(t,x,\xi)})u(t,x) = f(t,x)$$

where V is the horizontal component of the trace of the velocity field on the free surface, γ is a paradifferential symbol of order $3/2$, depending on the solution. This reduction has many consequences, among them are the local well-posedness and smoothing effect in [1], Strichartz estimates in [2] for $u \in L_t^\infty H_x^s(\mathbf{R}^d)$ with $s > 2 + d/2$. As remarked in [1] $s > 2 + d/2$ is the minimal Sobolev index (in term of Sobolev's embedding) to ensure that the velocity field is Lipschitz up to the boundary, without taking into account the dispersive property. From the works of Alazard-Burq-Zuily [3, 5], Hunter-Ifrim-Tataru [30] for pure gravity waves it seems natural to assume that the gradient of the velocity is Lipschitz so that the particles flow is well-defined. On the other hand, from the standard theory of quasilinear pdes, it is natural to ask if the reduction (1.1) holds at the Sobolev threshold $s > 3/2 + d/2$ and then, if a local-wellposedness theory holds at the same level of regularity? The two observations above motivate us to study the gravity-capillary system at the following regularity level:

$$(1.2) \quad u \in \mathcal{X} := L_t^\infty H_x^s \cap L_t^p W_x^{r,\infty} \quad \text{with } s > \frac{3}{2} + \frac{d}{2}, \quad r > 2,$$

which exhibits a gap of $1/2$ derivatives that may be filled up by Strichartz estimates. One of our main results will be a blow-up criterion at this scaling with $p = 1$ (i.e. merely integrable in time), which states that the solution can be prolonged as long as the \mathcal{X} -norm of u remained bounded (at least in the case of infinite depth). To derive our criterion, the main difficulty compare to the reduction in [1] is that we have to keep all the estimates in the analysis to be *tame*, i.e., linear with respect to the highest norm—the Hölder norm $W^{r,\infty}$.

First of all, let us recall the Zakharov/Craig-Sulem formulation of water waves.

1.1. The Zakharov/Craig-Sulem formulation. — We consider an incompressible inviscid fluid with unit density moving in a time-dependent domain

$$\Omega = \{(t, x, y) \in [0, T] \times \mathbf{R}^d \times \mathbf{R} : (x, y) \in \Omega_t\}$$

where each Ω_t is a domain located underneath a free surface

$$\Sigma_t = \{(x, y) \times \mathbf{R}^d \times \mathbf{R} : y = \eta(t, x)\}$$

and above a fixed bottom $\Gamma = \partial\Omega_t \setminus \Sigma_t$. We make the following separation assumption (H_t) on the domain at time t :

Ω_t is the intersection of the half space

$$\Omega_{1,t} = \{(x, y) \times \mathbf{R}^d \times \mathbf{R} : y = \eta(t, x)\}$$

and an open connected set \mathcal{O} containing a fixed strip around Σ_t , i.e., there exists $h > 0$ such that

$$(1.3) \quad \{(x, y) \times \mathbf{R}^d \times \mathbf{R} : \eta(x) - h \leq y \leq \eta(t, x)\} \subset \mathcal{O}.$$

Assume that the velocity field v admits a potential $\phi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, i.e, $v = \nabla\phi$. Using the idea of Zakharov, we introduce the trace of ϕ on the free surface

$$\psi(t, x) = \phi(t, x, \eta(t, x)).$$

Then $\phi(t, x, y)$ is the unique variational solution of

$$(1.4) \quad \Delta\phi = 0 \text{ in } \Omega_t, \quad \phi(t, x, \eta(t, x)) = \psi(t, x).$$

The Dirichlet-Neumann operator is then defined by

$$\begin{aligned} G(\eta)\psi &= \sqrt{1 + |\nabla_x \eta|^2} \left(\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial n} \Big|_{\Sigma} \right) \\ &= (\partial_y \phi)(t, x, \eta(t, x)) - \nabla_x \eta(t, x) \cdot (\nabla_x \phi)(t, x, \eta(t, x)). \end{aligned}$$

The gravity-capillary water waves problem with surface tension consists in solving the following so-called Zakharov-Craig-Sulem system on η, ψ :

$$(1.5) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t \eta = G(\eta)\psi, \\ \partial_t \psi + g\eta - H(\eta) + \frac{1}{2} |\nabla_x \psi|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{(\nabla_x \eta \cdot \nabla_x \psi + G(\eta)\psi)^2}{1 + |\nabla_x \eta|^2} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Here, $H(\eta)$ is the mean curvature of the free surface:

$$H(\eta) = \operatorname{div} \left(\frac{\nabla \eta}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla \eta|^2}} \right).$$

It is important to introduce the vertical and horizontal components of the velocity on Σ , which can be expressed in terms of η and ψ :

$$(1.6) \quad B = (v_y)|_{\Sigma} = \frac{\nabla_x \eta \cdot \nabla_x \psi + G(\eta)\psi}{1 + |\nabla_x \eta|^2}, \quad V = (v_x)|_{\Sigma} = \nabla_x \psi - B \nabla_x \eta.$$

1.2. Main results. — The Cauchy problem has been extensively studied, for example in Nalimov [40], Yosihara [54], Coutand- Shkoller [21], Craig [22], Shatah-Zeng [41, 42, 43], Ming-Zhang [39], Lannes [36]: for sufficiently smooth solutions and Alazard-Burq-Zuily [1] for solutions at the energy threshold. See also Craig [22], Wu [50, 51], Lannes [35] for the studies on gravity waves. Observe that the linearized system of (1.5) about the rest state ($\eta = 0, \psi = 0$) when $g = 0$ reads

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \eta - |D_x| \psi = 0, \\ \partial_t \psi - \Delta \eta = 0 \end{cases}$$

which becomes

$$(1.7) \quad \partial_t \Phi + i|D_x|^{\frac{3}{2}} \Phi = 0, \quad \text{with } \Phi = |D_x|^{\frac{1}{2}} \eta + i\psi.$$

Therefore, it is natural to study (1.5) at the following algebraic scaling

$$(\eta, \psi) \in H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{R}^d) \times H^s(\mathbf{R}^d).$$

From the formula (1.6) for the trace of velocity on the surface, we have that the Lipschitz threshold in [1] corresponds to $s > 2 + d/2$. On the other hand, the threshold $s > 3/2 + d/2$ suggested by the quasilinear nature (1.1) is also the minimal Sobolev index to ensure that the mean curvature $H(\eta)$ is bounded. The question we are concerned with is:

(Q) If the Cauchy problem for (1.5) is solvable for initial data

$$(1.8) \quad (\eta_0, \psi_0) \in H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s, \quad s > \frac{3}{2} + \frac{d}{2}.$$

Assume now that

$$(1.9) \quad (\eta, \psi) \in L^\infty \left([0, T]; H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s \right) \cap L^p \left([0, T]; W^{r+\frac{1}{2}, \infty} \times W^{r, \infty} \right)$$

with

$$(1.10) \quad s > \frac{3}{2} + \frac{d}{2}, \quad 2 < r < s + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{d}{2}, \quad p \geq 1.$$

is a solution whose data is (1.8). We shall prove in Proposition 4.1 that the quasilinear reduction (1.1) of system (1.5) still holds with the right-hand-side term $f(t, x)$ satisfying a tame estimate. To be concise in the following statements let us define the quantities that control the system:

Sobolev norms : $M_{\sigma, T} = \|(\eta, \psi)\|_{L^\infty([0, T]; H^{\sigma+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^\sigma)}$, $M_{\sigma, 0} = \|(\eta_0, \psi_0)\|_{H^{\sigma+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^\sigma}$,

Blow-up norm : $N_{\sigma, T} = \|(\eta, \psi)\|_{L^1([0, T]; W^{\sigma+\frac{1}{2}, \infty} \times W^{\sigma, \infty})}$,

Strichartz norm : $Z_{\sigma, T} = \|(\eta, \psi)\|_{L^p([0, T]; W^{\sigma+\frac{1}{2}, \infty} \times W^{\sigma, \infty})}$.

Our first result concerns an a priori estimate for the Sobolev norm $M_{s, T}$ in terms of itself and the Strichartz norm $Z_{r, T}$.

Theorem 1.1. — *Let $d \geq 1$, $h > 0$, $p > 1$. Then there exists a non-negative, non-decreasing function \mathcal{F} such that: for all $T \in (0, 1]$ and all (η, ψ) solution to (1.5) on $[0, T]$ with regularity (1.10) and initial data (1.8) and satisfies $\inf_{t \in [0, T]} \text{dist}(\eta(t), \Gamma) > h$, there holds*

$$M_{s, T} \leq \mathcal{F}(M_{s, 0} + T\mathcal{F}(M_{s, T} + Z_{r, T})).$$

As a consequence, when $s > 2 + d/2$ one retrieves by Sobolev embeddings the a priori estimate in [1].

Our second result provides a blow-up criterion for solutions of (1.5).

Theorem 1.2. — *Let $d \geq 1$, $h > 0$ and indices*

$$\frac{3}{2} + \frac{d}{2} < s_0 < s - \frac{1}{2}, \quad 2 < r < s_0 + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{d}{2}.$$

Let $T^ = T^*(\eta_0, \psi_0, h)$ be the maximal time of existence defined by (4.17) and*

$$(\eta, \psi) \in L^\infty\left([0, T^*); H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s\right)$$

be the maximal solution of (1.5) with prescribed data (η_0, ψ_0) satisfying $\text{dist}(\eta_0, \Gamma) > h$. Then if T^ is finite, we have*

$$\limsup_{T \rightarrow T^*} \left(M_{s_0, T} + N_{r, T} + \frac{1}{h(T)} \right) = +\infty,$$

where $h(T)$ is the distance from the surface η to the bottom Γ over the time interval $[0, T]$.

Remark that the Sobolev regularity in the above criterion is exactly the one given in question (Q). In contrast, for pure gravity waves in which the surface tension is neglected, it was shown in [25] and [30] that boundedness of the curvature is irrelevant: that $\int_0^T \|\nabla \eta(t)\|_{W^{1/2}} dt < +\infty$ is enough.

In the survey paper [24] Craig-Wayne posed (see Problem 3) the following questions on *How do solutions break down?*:

(Q1) *For which α is it true that, if one knows a priori that $\sup_{[-T, T]} \|(\eta, \psi)\|_{C^\alpha} < +\infty$ then C^∞ data (η_0, ψ_0) implies that the solution is C^∞ over the time interval $[-T, T]$?*

(Q2) *It would be more satisfying to say that the solution fails to exist because the "curvature of the surface has diverged at some point", or a related geometrical and/or physical statement.*

Theorem 1.2 gives a partial answer to (Q2): our criteria on $M_{s_0, T}$ and $N_{r, T}$ are directly imposed on the regularity of the solution yet they correspond to the following geometrical and physical statements:

- $\|\eta\|_{L^\infty([0, T^*); H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}})} = +\infty$ is the minimal Sobolev-based criterion to say that the curvature explodes,

- $N_{r,T^*} = +\infty$ corresponds to the condition that the (slightly above) Lipschitz norm of the trace of velocity on the surface fail to be intergable in time,
- $h(T^*) = 0$ means that the bottom rises to the surface.

Concerning question **(Q1)** we have by virtue of Theorem 1.2 the following result on persistence of Sobolev regularity.

Corollary 1.3. — *Let $T \in (0, +\infty)$ and (η, ψ) be a distributional solution to system (1.5) on the time interval $[0, T]$ such that $\inf_{[0, T]} \text{dist}(\eta(t), \Gamma) > 0$. Then the following property holds: if one knows a priori that*

$$(1.11) \quad \sup_{[0, T]} \|(\eta(t), \psi(t))\|_{H^{2+\frac{d}{2}+} \times H^{\frac{3}{2}+\frac{d}{2}+}} + \int_0^T \|(\eta(t), \psi(t))\|_{C^{\frac{5}{2}+} \times C^{2+}} dt < +\infty$$

then $(\eta(0), \psi(0)) \in H^\infty(\mathbf{R}^d)^2$ implies that $(\eta, \psi) \in L^\infty([0, T]; H^\infty(\mathbf{R}^d))^2$.

As a consequence, by Sobolev's embedding one can replace (1.11) by a stronger condition involving only Sobolev regularity

$$\sup_{[0, T]} \|(\eta(t), \psi(t))\|_{H^{\frac{5}{2}+\frac{d}{2}+} \times H^{2+\frac{d}{2}+}} < +\infty$$

and thus obtain an answer for the Sobolev version of **(Q1)**.

Finally, we observe that the relation (1.10) exhibits a gap of 1/2 derivative from H^s to $W^{r, \infty}$ in term of Sobolev embedding. To fill up this gap we need to take into account the dispersive property of water waves to prove a Strichartz estimate with a gain of 1/2 derivative. As remarked in [26] this gain can be achieved for the 3D linearized system (i.e. $d = 2$) and corresponds to the *semiclassical Strichartz estimate*. By virtue of Theorems 1.1, 1.2 and Theorem 5.9 on the Lipschitz continuity of the solution map one would end up with an affirmative answer for **(Q)**. Therefore, the problem boils down to studying Strichartz estimates for (1.5). As a first effort in this direction, we prove in the companion paper [26] Strichartz estimates with an intermediate gain $0 < \mu < 1/2$ which will yield a Cauchy theory (see also [26]) in which the initial velocity may fail to be Lipschitz (up to the boundary) but becomes Lipschitz at almost all later time; this is an analogue of the result in [5] for pure gravity waves.

The article is organized as follows. Section 2 is devoted for the elliptic estimates needed to study the Dirichlet-Neumann operator: bound estimates and paralinrizations. Next, in Section 3 we adapt the method in [1] to paralinrize and then symmetrize system (1.5) at our level of regularity (1.10). Having this reduction, we use the energy method to derive a blow-up criterion and then an a priori estimate in Section 4. Section 5 is devoted for contraction estimates, more precisely we establish the Lipschitz continuity of the flow map in spaces of 1-derivative less. Finally, we gather some basic features of the

paradifferential calculus theory and technical results in Appendix 6, most of which comes from [3, 5].

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to sincerely thank T.Alazard, N.Burq and C.Zuily for many fruitful discussions, suggestions when this work was preparing, as well as their helpful comments at the final stage of the work. Quang Huy Nguyen was partially supported by the labex LMH through the grant no ANR-11-LABX-0056-LMH in the "Programme des Investissements d'Avenir".

2. Elliptic estimates and the Dirichlet-Neumann operator

Notation 2.1. — Throughout this article, for spatial regularity we shall denote for simplicity the Zygmund spaces $C_*^\sigma(\mathbf{R}^d)$ ($\sigma \in \mathbf{R}$) by C^σ ; while for temporal variable, C^k ($k \in \mathbf{N}$) are the usual spaces of functions having continuous derivatives up to order k .

2.1. The elliptic problem. — Let $\eta \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ and $f \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{R}^d)$. It was proved in [3] that there exists a unique variational solution ϕ to the boundary value problem

$$(2.1) \quad \Delta_{x,y}\phi = 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \quad \phi|_\Sigma = f, \quad \partial_n\phi|_\Gamma = 0.$$

Define

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{cases} \Omega_1 := \{(x, y) : x \in \mathbf{R}^d, \eta(x) - h < y < \eta(x)\}, \\ \Omega_2 := \{(x, y) \in \mathcal{O} : y \leq \eta(x) - h\}, \\ \Omega := \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2, \end{cases}$$

and

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{cases} \tilde{\Omega}_1 := \{(x, z) : x \in \mathbf{R}^d, z \in I\}, \quad I = (-1, 0), \\ \tilde{\Omega}_2 := \{(x, z) \in \mathbf{R}^d \times (-\infty, -1] : (x, z + 1 + \eta(x) - h) \in \Omega_2\}, \\ \tilde{\Omega} := \tilde{\Omega}_1 \cup \tilde{\Omega}_2. \end{cases}$$

To study the regularity of ϕ , we follow [35], [3] straighten out the fluid domain using the map $(x, z) \mapsto \rho(x, z)$ from $\tilde{\Omega}$ to Ω , defined as

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{cases} \rho(x, z) := (1+z)e^{\delta z \langle D_x \rangle} \eta(x) - z \left\{ e^{-(1+z)\delta \langle D_x \rangle} \eta(x) - h \right\} & \text{if } (x, z) \in \tilde{\Omega}_1, \\ \rho(x, z) := z + 1 + \eta(x) - h & \text{if } (x, z) \in \tilde{\Omega}_2, \end{cases}$$

with $\delta > 0$. It has been proven in [3] that if $\eta \in W^{1,\infty}$, for $\delta = \delta(\|\eta\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbf{R}^d)})$ small enough, the map $(x, z) \mapsto (x, \rho(x, z))$ is a Lipschitz diffeomorphism from $\tilde{\Omega}_1$ to Ω_1 .

Introduce for $\mu \in \mathbf{R}$ and $J \subset \mathbf{R}$ the interpolation spaces

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} X^\mu(I) &= C_z^0(I; H^\mu(\mathbf{R}^d)) \cap L_z^2(I; H^{\mu+\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{R}^d)), \\ Y^\mu(I) &= L_z^1(I; H^\mu(\mathbf{R}^d)) + L_z^2(I; H^{\mu-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{R}^d)). \end{aligned}$$

Remark that $\|\cdot\|_{Y^\mu} \leq \|\cdot\|_{X^{\mu-1}}$ for any $\mu \in \mathbf{R}$. In these spaces, we have from [3] and some easy computations

Lemma 2.2. — *If $s > \frac{1}{2} + \frac{d}{2}$, there exists a positive function \mathcal{F} such that for every $\eta \in H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ there holds*

$$(2.6) \quad \begin{cases} \|\partial_z \rho - h\|_{X^{s-\frac{1}{2}}(I)} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbf{R}^d)} \right) \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{R}^d)}, \\ \|\partial_z^2 \rho\|_{X^{s-\frac{3}{2}}(I)} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbf{R}^d)} \right) \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{R}^d)}, \\ \|\partial_z^3 \rho\|_{X^{s-\frac{5}{2}}(I)} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbf{R}^d)} \right) \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{R}^d)}, \\ \|\nabla_x \rho\|_{X^{s-\frac{1}{2}}(I)} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbf{R}^d)} \right) \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{R}^d)}. \end{cases}$$

Then if we take

$$(2.7) \quad v(x, z) = \phi(x, \rho(x, z)), \forall (x, z) \in \tilde{\Omega},$$

the pullback of ϕ by this diffeomorphism, it solves

$$(2.8) \quad (\partial_z^2 + \alpha \Delta_x + \beta \cdot \nabla_x \partial_z - \gamma \partial_z) v = 0,$$

where

$$(2.9) \quad \alpha := \frac{(\partial_z \rho)^2}{1 + |\nabla_x \rho|^2}, \quad \beta := -2 \frac{\partial_z \rho \nabla_x \rho}{1 + |\nabla_x \rho|^2}, \quad \gamma := \frac{1}{\partial_z \rho} (\partial_z^2 \rho + \alpha \Delta_x \rho + \beta \cdot \nabla_x \partial_z \rho).$$

We have the following control on those coefficients :

Lemma 2.3. — Assume $s \geq s_0 > 3/2 + d/2$. Then for $\eta \in H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}$, there holds with $X^\mu = X^\mu(I)$:

(2.10)

$$\|\alpha - h^2\|_{X^{s-\frac{1}{2}}} + \|\beta\|_{X^{s-\frac{1}{2}}} + \|\gamma\|_{X^{s-\frac{3}{2}}} \leq \mathcal{F}\left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}\right) \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}},$$

(2.11)

$$\|\alpha\|_{C^0(I; C^{r-\frac{1}{2}})} + \|\beta\|_{C^0(I; C^{r-\frac{1}{2}})} + \|\gamma\|_{C^0(I; C^{r-\frac{3}{2}})} \leq \mathcal{F}\left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}\right) \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}},$$

(2.12)

$$\|\partial_z \alpha\|_{X^{s-\frac{3}{2}}} + \|\partial_z \beta\|_{X^{s-\frac{3}{2}}} + \|\partial_z \gamma\|_{X^{s-\frac{5}{2}}} \leq \mathcal{F}\left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}\right) \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Those are all consequences of the product rules and nonlinear estimates of Proposition 6.8. Now a consequence of Proposition 3.16 and the estimate (3.5) of [3] is that our solution v satisfies

Proposition 2.4. — Let $d \geq 1$,

$$s_0 > 1/2 + d/2, \quad -1/2 \leq \sigma \leq s_0 - 1/2$$

and $\eta \in H^{s_0+1/2}$. If $f \in H^{\sigma+1}$, then for any $z_0 \in (-1, 0)$, $\nabla_{x,z} v \in X^\sigma([z_0, 0])$, and

$$(2.13) \quad \|\nabla_{x,z} v\|_{X^\sigma([z_0, 0])} \leq \mathcal{F}\left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}\right) \|f\|_{H^{\sigma+1}},$$

for some non-decreasing positive function \mathcal{F} depending only on s_0 and σ .

It was deduced from the preceding Proposition the following Sobolev estimate for the Dirichlet-Neumann operator (see Theorem 3.12, [3])

Theorem 2.5. — Let $d \geq 1$, $s_0 > \frac{1}{2} + \frac{d}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2} \leq \sigma \leq s_0 + \frac{1}{2}$. Then there exists a non-decreasing function $\mathcal{F}: \mathbf{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbf{R}_+$ such that, for all $\eta \in H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ and all $f \in H^\sigma(\mathbf{R}^d)$, we have

$$(2.14) \quad \|G(\eta)f\|_{H^{\sigma-1}(\mathbf{R}^d)} \leq \mathcal{F}\left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{R}^d)}\right) \|f\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbf{R}^d)}.$$

Since we authorize the control on our quantities to depend non-linearly on the H^{s_0} norms and only want linearity in the higher order H^s norm, this means we can use Proposition 2.4 as a base case for a bootstrap to control the H^s and C^r norms. We want to prove the following proposition :

Proposition 2.6. — Let

$$s \geq s_0 > \frac{3}{2} + \frac{d}{2},$$

$f \in H^s$ and $\eta \in H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}$. Then for any $z_0 \in (-1, 0)$, $\nabla_{x,z}v \in X^{s-1}([z_0, 0])$ and

$$\|\nabla_{x,z}v\|_{X^{s-1}([z_0, 0])} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|f\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[\|f\|_{H^{s_0}} + \|f\|_{H^s} + \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \right].$$

for some non-decreasing positive function \mathcal{F} depending only on s_0 and s .

The proof will be a simple bootstrap procedure on s . Calling \mathcal{H}_s the proposition for s , Proposition 2.4 applied with $\sigma = s_0 - 1$ tells us that \mathcal{H}_{s_0} is true. We will show that if \mathcal{H}_s is true, then so is $\mathcal{H}_{s+\varepsilon}$ with

$$0 < \varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad \varepsilon < s_0 - \frac{3}{2} - \frac{d}{2}.$$

First we parilinearize equation (2.8) of v :

Lemma 2.7. — *There is a function \mathcal{F} such that for all $I \subset [-1, 0]$, v satisfies*

$$\partial_z^2 v + T_\alpha \Delta_x v + T_\beta \cdot \nabla_x \partial_z v = F := \gamma \partial_z v + (T_\alpha - \alpha) \Delta_x v + (T_\beta - \beta) \cdot \nabla \partial_z v,$$

$$\|F\|_{Y^{s-1+\varepsilon}(I)} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|f\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[\|f\|_{H^{s_0}} + \|\nabla_{x,z}v\|_{X^{s-1}(I)} + \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \right].$$

Proof. — The above expression of F follows directly from equation (2.8) satisfied by v . Now, using (6.20) and Hölder inequality in z we have

$$\|\gamma \partial_z v\|_{L^2(I; H^{s-\frac{3}{2}+\varepsilon})} \lesssim \|\gamma\|_{L^2(I; H^{s_0-1})} \|\partial_z v\|_{L^\infty(I; H^{s-1})} + \|\partial_z v\|_{L^\infty(I; H^{s_0-1})} \|\gamma\|_{L^2(I; H^{s-1})},$$

so that using (2.10) to control γ and Proposition 2.4 to control $\|\partial_z v\|_{L^\infty(I; H^{s_0-1})}$ gives

$$\|\gamma \partial_z v\|_{L^2(I; H^{s-\frac{3}{2}+\varepsilon})} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|f\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[\|\nabla_{x,z}v\|_{X^{s-1}(I)} + \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \right].$$

Next by (6.15) we have

$$\|(T_\alpha - \alpha) \Delta_x v\|_{L^1(I; H^{s-1+\varepsilon})} \lesssim \|\Delta_x v\|_{L^2(I; H^{s_0-\frac{3}{2}})} \left[1 + \|\alpha - h^2\|_{L^2(I; H^s)} \right],$$

so that again we can conclude using (2.10) and Proposition 2.4. The last remainder term can be controlled identically. \square

We then decouple the equation into a forward and a backward parabolic equation :

Lemma 2.8. — *There exist two symbols $a^{(1)}, A^{(1)} \in \Gamma_\varepsilon^1([-1, 0])$ satisfying*

$$\mathcal{M}_{1+\varepsilon}^1(a^{(1)}) + \mathcal{M}_{1+\varepsilon}^1(A^{(1)}) \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}} \right), \quad \Re(-a^{(1)}) + \Re(A^{(1)}) \geq c|\xi|$$

for some constant $c = c(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}) > 0$, such that

$$\partial_z^2 + T_\alpha \Delta_x + T_\beta \cdot \nabla_x \partial_z = (\partial_z - T_{a^{(1)}})(\partial_z - T_{A^{(1)}}) + R,$$

where R is of order 1 (see Definition 6.3) having its norm bounded by $\mathcal{F}(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}})$. In particular,

$$(2.15) \quad \|Rv\|_{Y^{s-1+\varepsilon}(I)} \leq \mathcal{F}\left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}\right) \|\nabla_{x,z}v\|_{X^{s-1}(I)}.$$

Proof. — Take

$$(2.16) \quad \begin{aligned} a^{(1)} &= \frac{1}{2} \left(-i\beta \cdot \xi - \sqrt{4\alpha|\xi|^2 - (\beta \cdot \xi)^2} \right), \\ A^{(1)} &= \frac{1}{2} \left(-i\beta \cdot \xi + \sqrt{4\alpha|\xi|^2 - (\beta \cdot \xi)^2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

so that $a^{(1)} + A^{(1)} = -i\beta \cdot \xi$, $a^{(1)}A^{(1)} = -\alpha|\xi|^2$.

Then the control of the semi-norm of $a^{(1)}$ and $A^{(1)}$ is a consequence of the boundedness of the coefficients α, β from (2.10). From the expressions of α and β , and the fact that $|\partial_z \rho| \geq c_0 > 0$, we get

$$\exists c > 0, \sqrt{4\alpha|\xi|^2 - (\beta \cdot \xi)^2} \geq c|\xi|,$$

which gives the ellipticity. At last, $R = (T_{a^{(1)}}T_{A^{(1)}} - T_\alpha \Delta_x) - T_{\partial_z A^{(1)}}$. The first difference is of order $2 - (1 + \varepsilon) = 1 - \varepsilon$ by Theorem 6.4 (ii), and the second term $\partial_z A^{(1)} \in \Gamma_\varepsilon^1$ by (2.12). Consequently, the remainder R has order 1 and (2.15) follows. Here, we can replace $\|v\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}}$ by $\|\nabla v\|_{H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}}$ since the paradifferential operator T_p can be replaced by $T_p(1 - \Psi(D_x))$, for a low frequency cutoff Ψ , at no cost. \square

To conclude the proof of Proposition 2.6, we want to apply Theorem 6.10 two times. Take $0 > z_1 > z_0 > -1$. Since \mathcal{H}_s is true, there holds

$$\|\nabla_{x,z}v\|_{X^{s-1}([z_0,0])} \leq \mathcal{F}\left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|f\|_{H^{s_0}}\right) \left[\|f\|_{H^{s_0}} + \|f\|_{H^s} + \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \right].$$

We will prove

$$\|\nabla_{x,z}v\|_{X^{s-1+\varepsilon}([z_1,0])} \leq \mathcal{F}\left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|f\|_{H^{s_0}}\right) \left[\|f\|_{H^{s_0}} + \|f\|_{H^{s+\varepsilon}} + \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}} \right].$$

Since z_0 and z_1 are arbitrary, this will complete the proof.

We now introduce a cutoff χ satisfying $\chi|_{z < z_0} = 0$, $\chi|_{z > z_1} = 1$, and set $w = \chi(z)(\partial_z - T_{A^{(1)}})v$. From Lemma 2.8 we have $\partial_z w - T_{a^{(1)}}w = F'$, with

$$(2.17) \quad F' = \chi(z)(F + Rv) + \chi'(z)(\partial_z - T_{A^{(1)}})v.$$

We have the trivial estimate

$$\|\chi'(z)(\partial_z - T_A)v\|_{Y^{s-1+\varepsilon}([z_0,0])} \leq \mathcal{F}\left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}\right) \|\nabla_{x,z}v\|_{X^{s-1}([z_0,0])}.$$

Together with the preceding lemmas, we obtain that

$$\|F'\|_{Y^{s-1+\varepsilon}([z_0,0])} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|f\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[\|f\|_{H^{s_0}} + \|f\|_{H^s} + \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \right].$$

Since $w(z_0) = 0$ and $\Re(-a) \geq c|\xi|$, Theorem 6.10 implies
(2.18)

$$\|w\|_{X^{s-1+\varepsilon}([z_0,0])} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|f\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[\|f\|_{H^{s_0}} + \|f\|_{H^s} + \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \right].$$

Consequently,

$$\|w\|_{Y^{s+\varepsilon}([z_0,0])} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|f\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[\|f\|_{H^{s_0}} + \|f\|_{H^s} + \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \right].$$

Then because $\chi = 1$ on $[z_1, 0]$, $\partial_z v - T_{A(1)}v = w$ for $z \in [z_1, 0]$. At last, applying again Theorem 6.10 with $v(0) = f$, after inverting z into $-z$, we obtain

$$\|v\|_{X^{s+\varepsilon}([z_1,0])} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|f\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[\|f\|_{H^{s_0}} + \|f\|_{H^{s+\varepsilon}} + \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}} \right].$$

Using the relation $\partial_z v = T_{A(1)}v + w$ and take into account the estimate (2.18) we can finally estimate $\nabla_{x,z}v$ as claimed.

Next, we prove a Hölder estimate for $\nabla_{x,z}v$.

Proposition 2.9. — *Let*

$$s_0 > \frac{3}{2} + \frac{d}{2}, \quad r < s_0 - \frac{d}{2} + \frac{1}{2}, \quad 1 \leq \mu \leq \frac{5}{2},$$

and $f \in H^{s_0} \cap C^r$, $\eta \in H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}} \cap C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}$. Then for any $z_0 \in (-1, 0)$, we have

$$\|\nabla_{x,z}v\|_{C^0([z_0,0];C^{r-\mu})} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|f\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) (\|f\|_{H^{s_0-\mu+1}} + \|f\|_{C^{r-\mu+1}}).$$

for some non-decreasing positive function \mathcal{F} depending only on s_0 and r .

Proof. — Similar to the proof above, we take $-1 < z_0 < z_1 < 0$, introduce a cutoff χ satisfying $\chi|_{z < z_0} = 0$, $\chi|_{z > z_1} = 1$ and set $w = \chi(z)(\partial_z - T_{A(1)})v$. We use the estimate (3.56) in [3]: for

$$0 \leq \varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad \varepsilon < s_0 - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{d}{2}, \quad -\frac{1}{2} \leq \sigma \leq s_0 - \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon$$

it holds that

$$\|w\|_{X^{\sigma+\varepsilon}([z_0,0])} \leq \mathcal{F}(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}) \|\nabla_{x,z}v\|_{X^\sigma([z_0,0])}.$$

Then, applying this inequality with $\varepsilon = 1/2$, $\sigma = s_0 - \mu$ gives

$$\|w\|_{X^{s_0-\mu+\frac{1}{2}}([z_0,0])} \leq \mathcal{F}(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}) \|\nabla_{x,z}v\|_{X^{s_0-\mu}([z_0,0])}.$$

On the other hand, it follows from Proposition 2.4 that

$$(2.19) \quad \|\nabla_{x,z}v\|_{X^{s_0-\mu}([z_0,0])} \leq \mathcal{F}(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}) \|f\|_{H^{s_0-\mu+1}};$$

consequently,

$$(2.20) \quad \|w\|_{X^{s_0-\mu+\frac{1}{2}}([z_0,0])} \leq \mathcal{F}(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}) \|f\|_{H^{s_0-\mu+1}}.$$

Now, on $[z_1, 0]$ $(\partial_z - T_{A(1)})v = w$ so after inverting z to $-z$ one can apply Theorem 6.11 with $r_1 = r - \mu + 1$, $r_0 < r_1$, $q = \infty$ to get with $J = [z_1, 0]$

$$\|v\|_{C(J; C^{r-\mu+1})} \leq \mathcal{F}(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}) \left(\|f\|_{C^{r-\mu+1}} + \|w\|_{L^\infty(J; C^{r-\mu+\delta})} + \|v\|_{L^\infty(J; C^{r_0})} \right).$$

Using (2.20), Sobolev's embedding and the relation between r and s_0 , one deduces

$$\|w\|_{L^\infty(J; C^{r-\mu+\delta})} \lesssim \|w\|_{L^\infty(J; H^{s_0-\mu+\frac{1}{2}})} \leq \mathcal{F}(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}) \|f\|_{H^{s_0-\mu+1}},$$

where we have taken $0 < \delta < s_0 + 1/2 - d/2 - r$. Finally, for the last term on the right-hand side, one chooses r_0 small enough so that the desired estimate can be deduced from (2.19) via Sobolev embeddings. \square

2.2. Dirichlet-Neumann operator. — We now apply the elliptic estimates in the previous paragraph to derive estimates for the Dirichlet-Neumann operator.

Proposition 2.10. — *Let $d \geq 1$, and*

$$s \geq s_0 > \frac{3}{2} + \frac{d}{2}, \quad 1 \leq \mu \leq \frac{5}{2}, \quad \frac{\mu+1}{2} < r < s_0 - \frac{d}{2} + \frac{1}{2}.$$

Then there exists a positive nondecreasing function \mathcal{F} such that

$$(2.21) \quad \|G(\eta)f\|_{H^{s-1}} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|f\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[\|f\|_{H^{s_0}} + \|f\|_{H^s} + \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \right],$$

$$(2.22) \quad \|G(\eta)f\|_{C^{r-\mu}} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \left[\|f\|_{H^{s_0-\mu+1}} + \|f\|_{C^{r-\mu+1}} \right].$$

Proof. — By definition the Dirichlet-Neumann operator is given by

$$G(\eta)f = \frac{1 + |\nabla_x \rho|^2}{\partial_z \rho} \partial_z v - \nabla_x \rho \cdot \nabla_x v|_{z=0}.$$

Thus the result is a consequence of Propositions 2.6, 2.9, of the estimations on ρ of Lemma 2.2, and of the product and nonlinear estimates of Proposition 6.8. Here, we need to take some care for the second estimate.

1. If $r - \mu \geq 0$, the rule (6.21) implies at $z = 0$

$$\|\nabla_x \rho \cdot \nabla_x v\|_{C^{r-\mu}} \leq \|\nabla_x \rho\|_{C^{r-\mu}} \|\nabla_x v\|_{C^{r-\mu}} \leq \|\nabla_x \rho\|_{H^{s_0-\mu+\frac{1}{2}}} \|\nabla_x v\|_{C^{r-\mu}}$$

Then since $s_0 - \mu + 1/2 \leq s_0 - 1/2$ and

$$\|\nabla_x \rho\|_{H^{s_0-\frac{1}{2}}} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}} \right)$$

the right-hand side is bounded as claimed by virtue of Proposition 2.9.

2. If $r - \mu < 0$ one applies (6.22) with $\alpha := \mu - r < \beta := r - 1$ to get (at $z = 0$)

$$\|\nabla_x \rho \cdot \nabla_x v\|_{C^{r-\mu}} \leq \|\nabla_x \rho\|_{C^{r-1}} \|\nabla_x v\|_{C^{r-\mu}} \leq \|\nabla_x \rho\|_{H^{s_0 - \frac{1}{2}}} \|\nabla_x v\|_{C^{r-\mu}}$$

from which (2.22) follows.

The first term in the expression of $G(\eta)f$ is treated in the same way by writing

$$\frac{1 + |\nabla_x \rho|^2}{\partial_z \rho} \partial_z v = \left(\frac{1 + |\nabla_x \rho|^2}{\partial_z \rho} - \frac{1}{h} \right) \partial_z v + \frac{1}{h} \partial_z v.$$

□

Recall the expression of the trace of the velocity at the free surface

$$B = \frac{\nabla \eta \cdot \nabla \psi + G(\eta)\psi}{1 + |\nabla \eta|^2}, \quad V = \nabla \psi - B \nabla \eta.$$

As a consequence, we have the following estimates on V and B .

Corollary 2.11. — *Let $d \geq 1$, and*

$$s \geq s_0 > \frac{3}{2} + \frac{d}{2}, \quad 2 < r < s_0 - \frac{d}{2} + \frac{1}{2}.$$

Then there exists a positive nondecreasing function \mathcal{F} such that

(2.23)

$$\|(B, V)\|_{H^{s_0-1} \times H^{s_0-1}} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right),$$

(2.24)

$$\|(B, V)\|_{H^{s-1} \times H^{s-1}} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{H^s} + \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \right],$$

(2.25)

$$\|(B, V)\|_{C^{r-1} \times C^{r-1}} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{C^r} + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} \right].$$

Proof. — We only need to prove estimates for B , then those for V will follow immediately. This is done by decomposing B as

$$(2.26) \quad B = \frac{\nabla \eta}{1 + |\nabla \eta|^2} \cdot \nabla \psi + \frac{1}{1 + |\nabla \eta|^2} G(\eta)\psi =: K(\nabla \eta) \cdot \nabla \psi + L(\nabla \eta)G(\eta)\psi,$$

with K and L smooth. The first estimate is a consequence of Theorem 2.5 and the fact that H^{s_0-1} is an algebra since $s_0 > \frac{3}{2} + \frac{d}{2}$.

For the second and the third, we use estimates (6.24), (6.23), (6.21), (6.21), and Proposition 2.10. □

We also prove, following [6], that the Dirichlet-Neumann operator can be par-linearized. We show that it is possible to obtain tame estimates on the remainder. Define

$$(2.27) \quad \lambda := \lambda^{(1)} + \lambda^{(0)}$$

a symbol with an order one part

$$(2.28) \quad \lambda^{(1)} := \sqrt{(1 + |\nabla\eta|^2)|\xi|^2 - (\nabla\eta \cdot \xi)^2},$$

and an order zero part

$$(2.29) \quad \lambda^{(0)} := \frac{1 + |\nabla\eta|^2}{2\lambda^{(1)}} \left[\operatorname{div}(\alpha^{(1)}\nabla\eta) + i\partial_\xi\lambda^{(1)} \cdot \nabla\alpha^{(1)} \right], \quad \alpha^{(1)} := \frac{1}{1 + |\nabla\eta|^2}(\lambda^{(1)} + i\nabla\eta \cdot \xi).$$

Proposition 2.12. — *Let $d \geq 1$, and*

$$s \geq s_0 > \frac{3}{2} + \frac{d}{2}, \quad r > 2.$$

Then there exists a positive nondecreasing function \mathcal{F} such that for

$$(\eta, \psi) \in \left(H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s \right) \cap \left(C^{r+\frac{1}{2}} \times C^r \right),$$

there holds

$$G(\eta)\psi = T_\lambda(\psi - T_B\eta) - T_V \cdot \nabla\eta + f(\eta, \psi),$$

with

$$(2.30) \quad \|f(\eta, \psi)\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{C^r} + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} \right] \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{H^s} + \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \right].$$

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of this Proposition. Recall that in the preceding section we have straightened the domain using the diffeomorphism ρ to obtain from ϕ (the potential velocity) a new unknown v satisfying

$$(\partial_z^2 + \alpha\Delta_x + \beta \cdot \nabla_x \partial_z - \gamma\partial_z)v = 0.$$

We then established in Proposition 2.6 that

$$\|\nabla_{x,z}v\|_{X^{s-1}([z_0,0])} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{H^s} + \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \right].$$

Now using the above equation on v , the estimates on its coefficients and their z -derivatives from Lemma 2.3 one gets

$$\|\partial_z^2 v\|_{X^{s-2}([z_0,0])} + \|\partial_z^3 v\|_{X^{s-3}([z_0,0])} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{H^s} + \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \right].$$

On the other hand, by Proposition 2.9 we have

$$\|\nabla_{x,z}v\|_{C^0([z_0,0];C^{r-1})} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{C^r} + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} \right],$$

and again with product rules,

$$\|\partial_z^2 v\|_{C^0([z_0,0];C^{r-2})} + \|\partial_z^3 v\|_{C^0([z_0,0];C^{r-3})} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{C^r} + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} \right].$$

The result we want to prove is linked to the so-called good unknown of Alinhac (cf [7, 8]): we introduce

$$(2.31) \quad b := \frac{\partial_z v}{\partial_z \rho}, \quad \text{and } u := v - T_b \rho,$$

so that

$$b|_{z=0} = B, \quad u|_{z=0} = \psi - T_B \eta.$$

The interest of the good unknown is that we expect it to satisfy a better paradifferential equation than v itself. Indeed, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 2.13. — *The good unknown $u = v - T_b \rho$ satisfies the equation*

$$(2.32) \quad \partial_z^2 u + T_\alpha \Delta_x u + T_\beta \cdot \nabla_x \partial_z u - T_\gamma \partial_z u = f,$$

$$\|f\|_{Y^{s+\frac{1}{2}}([-1,0])} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{C^r} + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} \right] \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{H^s} + \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \right].$$

Proof. — To simplify the proof, we will write $f_1 \sim f_2$ iff $\|f_1 - f_2\|_{Y^{s+\frac{1}{2}}([-1,0])}$ is bounded by the right-hand side of (2.32). In particular, $f_1 \sim f_2$ if $\|f_1 - f_2\|_{X^{s-\frac{1}{2}}([-1,0])}$ is bounded by the right-hand side of (2.32). Introduce

$$E := \partial_z^2 + \alpha \Delta + \beta \cdot \nabla \partial_z - \gamma \partial_z, \quad P := \partial_z^2 + T_\alpha \Delta + T_\beta \cdot \nabla \partial_z - T_\gamma \partial_z.$$

We have $Ev = 0$. By decomposing each term in Ev with the Bony decomposition, using the estimates (6.4), (6.12), the previous estimates on $\partial_z v$, $\partial_z^2 v$, and the estimates on the coefficients (2.10) we obtain

$$0 = Ev \sim Pv - T_{\partial_z v} \gamma,$$

which gives since $v = u + T_b \rho$ that

$$Pu + PT_b \rho - T_{\partial_z v} \gamma \sim 0.$$

The proof then boils down to showing that

$$(2.33) \quad PT_b \rho - T_{\partial_z v} \gamma \sim 0.$$

Now

$$PT_b \rho = \partial_z^2 T_b \rho + T_\alpha \Delta T_b \rho + T_\beta \cdot \nabla \partial_z T_b \rho - T_\gamma \partial_z T_b \rho.$$

Using Leibniz rule for the z -derivatives and neglecting the terms ~ 0 it holds that

$$PT_b \rho \sim T_b \partial_z^2 \rho + T_\alpha T_b \Delta \rho + T_\beta \cdot T_b \nabla \partial_z \rho.$$

To suppress the terms in γ , we use $T_b E \rho = T_b 0 = 0$, which implies

$$T_b \partial_z^2 \rho + T_b T_\alpha \Delta \rho + T_b T_\beta \cdot \nabla \partial_z \rho - T_b T_{\partial_z \rho} \gamma \sim 0.$$

Now again by the symbolic calculus, we get

$$[T_b, T_\alpha]\Delta\rho + [T_b, T_\beta] \cdot \nabla\partial_z\rho \sim 0$$

and $T_{\partial_z v}\gamma = T_b\partial_z\rho\gamma \sim T_bT_{\partial_z\rho}\gamma$, hence we obtain (2.33). \square

The next step of the proof is again to decouple between a forward and a backward parabolic equations, using a refinement of Lemma 2.8.

Lemma 2.14. — *For $0 \leq \varepsilon < \min(r - 2, \frac{1}{2})$, there exist two symbols a and A satisfying*

$$\Re(-a) + \Re(A) \geq c|\xi|$$

for a constant $c(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}) > 0$, such that

$$\partial_z^2 + T_\alpha\Delta_x + T_\beta \cdot \nabla_x\partial_z - T_\gamma\partial_z = (\partial_z - T_a)(\partial_z - T_A) + R,$$

where R is of order $1/2 - \varepsilon$. In particular, for any $z_0 \in (-1, 0)$ we have

$$\|Ru\|_{Y^{s+\frac{1}{2}}([z_0, 0])} \leq \mathcal{F}\left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}}\right) \left[1 + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}}\right] \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{H^s} + \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}}\right].$$

Proof. — We look for symbols of the following form:

$$a = a^{(1)} + a^{(0)} \in \dot{\Gamma}_{\frac{3}{2}+\varepsilon}^1 + \dot{\Gamma}_{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}^0, \quad A = A^{(1)} + A^{(0)} \in \dot{\Gamma}_{\frac{3}{2}+\varepsilon}^1 + \dot{\Gamma}_{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}^0.$$

We already found

$$\begin{aligned} a^{(1)} &= \frac{1}{2} \left(-i\beta \cdot \xi - \sqrt{4\alpha|\xi|^2 - (\beta \cdot \xi)^2} \right), \\ A^{(1)} &= \frac{1}{2} \left(-i\beta \cdot \xi + \sqrt{4\alpha|\xi|^2 - (\beta \cdot \xi)^2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\frac{3}{2}+\varepsilon}^1 \left(A^{(1)}(z) \right) + M_{\frac{3}{2}+\varepsilon}^1 \left(A^{(1)}(z) \right) &\leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \left[1 + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} \right], \\ M_0^1 \left(A^{(1)}(z) \right) + M_0^1 \left(A^{(1)}(z) \right) &\leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then we take

$$\begin{aligned} a^{(0)} &= \frac{1}{A^{(1)} - a^{(1)}} \left(i\partial_\xi a^{(1)} \partial_x A^{(1)} - \gamma a^{(1)} \right), \\ A^{(0)} &= \frac{1}{a^{(1)} - A^{(1)}} \left(i\partial_\xi a^{(1)} \partial_x A^{(1)} - \gamma A^{(1)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$a^{(1)}A^{(1)} + \frac{1}{i}\partial_\xi a^{(1)} \cdot \partial_x A^{(1)} + a^{(1)}A^{(0)} + a^{(0)}A^{(1)} = -\alpha|\xi|^2, \quad a + A = -i\beta \cdot \xi + \gamma.$$

We can easily verify that

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}^0 \left(A^{(0)}(z) \right) + M_{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}^1 \left(A^{(0)}(z) \right) &\leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \left[1 + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} \right], \\ M_0^0 \left(A^{(0)}(z) \right) + M_0^0 \left(A^{(0)}(z) \right) &\leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The remainder will be

$$R = (T_a T_A - T_\alpha \Delta) + ((T_a + T_A) + (T_\beta \cdot \nabla - T_\gamma)) \partial_z = T_a T_A - T_\alpha \Delta.$$

Using the symbolic calculus we obtain that R is of order $\frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon$, hence by virtue of Proposition 2.6 we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \|Ru\|_{Y^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} &\lesssim \|Ru\|_{L^2 H^s} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \left[1 + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} \right] \|\nabla u\|_{L^2 H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}} \\ &\leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|f\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} \right] \left[1 + \|f\|_{H^s} + \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Proposition 2.12.

For the sake of conciseness we denote in this proof by Ξ the right-hand side of (2.30). Again we introduce $w := \chi(z)(\partial_z - T_A)u$ with χ satisfying $\chi|_{z < z_0} = 0$ and $\chi|_{z > z_1} = 1$, for $-1 < z_0 < z_1 < 0$. Then

$$\partial_z w - T_a w = \chi(z)Ru + \chi'(z)(\partial_z - T_A)u,$$

with $\|Ru\|_{Y^{s+\frac{1}{2}}([z_0, 0])} \leq \Xi$. We turn to estimate $\omega := \chi'(z)(\partial_z - T_A)u$ in $Y^{s+\frac{1}{2}}$, it is non-zero only on (z_0, z_1) and satisfies

$$\partial_z \omega - T_a \omega = \chi'(z)Ru + \chi''(z)\omega := f_0.$$

We have trivially

$$\|(\partial_z - T_A)u\|_{Y^s([z_0, 0])} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \|\nabla_{x,z} u\|_{X^{s-1}([-1, 0])}.$$

From the study of v and the expression $u = v - T_b \rho$, it holds that $\|\nabla_{x,z} u\|_{X^{s-1}([z_0, 0])} \leq \Xi$. Consequently, $\|\omega\|_{Y^s} \leq \Xi$ and $\|f_0\|_{Y^s} \leq \Xi$. Applying Theorem 6.10 with the boundary condition $\omega(z_1) = 0$ gives $\|\omega\|_{X^s([z_1, 0])} \leq \Xi$. Since $X^s \subset Y^{s+\frac{1}{2}}$, we have proved that $\partial_z w - T_a w = f$ with $\|f\|_{Y^{s+\frac{1}{2}}([z_1, 0])} \leq \Xi$.

Then using Theorem 6.10 once again gives

$$(2.34) \quad \|\partial_z u - T_A u\|_{X^{s+\frac{1}{2}}([z_1, 0])} \leq \Xi.$$

To finish the proof of Proposition 2.12, we recall that by definition

$$G(\eta)f = \frac{1 + |\nabla \rho|^2}{\partial_z \rho} \partial_z v|_{z=0} - \nabla \rho \cdot \nabla v|_{z=0}.$$

We will say $f_1 \sim f_2$ if $\|f_1 - f_2\|_{X^{s+\frac{1}{2}}([z_1, 0])} \leq \Xi$. By parilinearizing we have

$$\frac{1 + |\nabla\rho|^2}{\partial_z \rho} \partial_z v - \nabla\rho \cdot \nabla v \sim T_{\frac{1+|\nabla\rho|^2}{\partial_z \rho}} \partial_z v + 2T_{b\nabla\rho} \cdot \nabla\rho - T_{b\frac{1+|\nabla\rho|^2}{\partial_z \rho}} \partial_z \rho - T_{\nabla\rho} \cdot \nabla v - T_{\nabla v} \cdot \nabla\rho.$$

Then replacing v with $u + T_b \rho$ we have after some computations

$$\frac{1 + |\nabla\rho|^2}{\partial_z \rho} \partial_z v - \nabla\rho \cdot \nabla v \sim T_{\frac{1+|\nabla\rho|^2}{\partial_z \rho}} \partial_z u - T_{\nabla\rho} \cdot \nabla u + T_{b\nabla\rho - \nabla v} \cdot \nabla\rho.$$

Lemma 2.34 gives

$$T_{\frac{1+|\nabla\rho|^2}{\partial_z \rho}} \partial_z u - T_{\nabla\rho} \cdot \nabla u \sim T_\Lambda u,$$

with $\Lambda|_{z=0} = \lambda$ as announced. Now at $z = 0$, $\nabla\rho|_{z=0} = \nabla\eta$, $u|_{z=0} = \psi - T_B \eta$, $\nabla v - b\nabla\rho|_{z=0} = V$, so

$$G(\eta)\psi \sim T_\lambda(\psi - T_B \eta) - T_V \nabla\eta$$

as claimed. The proof of Proposition 2.12 is complete.

Now, we want a parilinearization result for $G(\eta)f$ in term of the principle symbol $\lambda^{(1)}$ only, with a remainder of order 0.

Proposition 2.15. — *Let $d \geq 1$ and $s > 3/2 + d/2$. Let $1/2 \leq \mu \leq s - 1$ then there exists a non-decreasing function F such that for any $f \in H^\mu$ there hold*

$$G(\eta)f = T_{\lambda^{(1)}} f + F(\eta, f), \quad \|F(\eta, f)\|_{H^\mu} \leq F(\|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}}) \|f\|_{H^\mu}.$$

Remark 2.16. — The same result was proved in [1] when $s > 2 + d/2$.

Proof. — *Step 1.* Again, with v a solution to (2.8), Proposition 2.6 gives with $I = [-1, 0]$

$$(2.35) \quad \|\nabla_{x,z} v\|_{X^{\mu-1}(I)} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \|f\|_{H^\mu}.$$

According to Lemma 2.7 we have the parilinearization of (2.8)

$$(2.36) \quad \partial_z^2 v + T_\alpha \Delta_x v + T_\beta \cdot \nabla_x \partial_z v = F_0 := \gamma \partial_z v + (T_\alpha - \alpha) \Delta_x v + (T_\beta - \beta) \cdot \nabla \partial_z v.$$

We claim that

$$(2.37) \quad \|F_0\|_{Y^\mu} \leq F(\|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}}) \|\nabla_{x,z} v\|_{H^{\mu-1}}.$$

Indeed, for the first term one estimates using the product rule (6.14) with $s_0 = \mu - 1/2$, $s_1 = s - 3/2$, $s_2 = \mu - 1/2$ to get

$$\|\gamma \partial_z v\|_{L^2 H^{\mu-\frac{1}{2}}} \lesssim \|\gamma\|_{L^\infty H^{s-\frac{3}{2}}} \|\partial_z v\|_{L^2 H^{\mu-\frac{1}{2}}} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \|\nabla_{x,z} v\|_{X^{\mu-1}}.$$

For the second term, the rule (6.15) yields

$$\|(T_\alpha - \alpha) \Delta_x v\|_{H^{\mu-\frac{1}{2}}} \lesssim \|\alpha\|_{L^\infty H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}} \|\Delta v\|_{L^2 H^{\mu-\frac{3}{2}}} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \|\nabla_{x,z} v\|_{X^{\mu-1}}.$$

The last term is estimated identically, we thus obtain (2.37).

Step 2. Next, according to Lemma 2.8

$$\partial_z^2 + T_\alpha \Delta_x + T_\beta \cdot \nabla_x \partial_z = (\partial_z - T_{a(1)})(\partial_z - T_{A(1)}) + R,$$

with R is of order 1 and thus $\|Rv\|_{Y^\mu} \leq \mathcal{F}(\|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}}) \|\nabla_{x,z} v\|_{X^{\mu-1}}$. In view of (2.35) there holds

$$(\partial_z - T_{a(1)})[(\partial_z - T_{A(1)})v] = F_1, \quad \|F_1\|_{Y^\mu} \leq \mathcal{F}(\|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}}) \|f\|_{H^\mu}.$$

By virtue of Theorem 6.10 we can obtain as before

$$(2.38) \quad \|(\partial_z - T_{A(1)})v\|_{X^\mu([z_1, 0])} \leq \mathcal{F}(\|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}}) \|f\|_{H^\mu}.$$

Step 4. Writing $f_1 \sim f_2$ iff the $X^\mu([z_1, 0])$ -norm of $f_1 - f_2$ is bounded by the right-hand side of (2.38), we have (notice that $A^{(1)} \in \Gamma_1^1$ with semi-norms bounded by $\mathcal{F}(\|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}})$)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1 + |\nabla \rho|^2}{\partial_z \rho} \partial_z v - \nabla \rho \cdot \nabla v &\sim T_{\frac{1+|\nabla \rho|^2}{\partial_z \rho}} \partial_z v - T_{\nabla \rho} \nabla v \\ &\sim T_{\frac{1+|\nabla \rho|^2}{\partial_z \rho}} T_{A(1)} v - T_{\nabla \rho} \nabla v \sim T_{\frac{1+|\nabla \rho|^2}{\partial_z \rho}} A^{(1)} v - T_{\nabla \rho} \nabla v \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof since at $z = 0$, $\frac{1+|\nabla \rho|^2}{\partial_z \rho} A^{(1)} - i \nabla \rho \cdot \xi = \lambda^{(1)}$. \square

To conclude this section, let us recall the following result on the *shape derivative* of the Dirichlet-Neumann operator.

Theorem 2.17 ([36, Theorem 3.21]). — *Let $\psi \in H^{\frac{3}{2}}$ and $s > 1/2 + d/2$, $d \geq 1$. Then the map*

$$G(\cdot)\psi : H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow H^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

is differentiable and

$$d_\eta G(\eta)\psi \cdot f = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \{G(\eta + \varepsilon f)\psi - G(\eta)f\} = -G(\eta)(Bf) - \operatorname{div}(Vf)$$

where B and V are functions of (η, ψ) as in (1.6).

3. Parilinearization and symmetrization of the system

3.1. Parilinearization of the system. — We want to replace all the nonlinear terms in the Zakharov-Craig-Sulem system (1.5) with paradifferential expressions. We have already parilinearized the Dirichlet-Neumann map, so we need to transform the nonlinear terms appearing in the second equation.

Throughout this paragraph, we fix $d \geq 1$, $p \in [1, +\infty]$, $I = [0, T]$ and (η, ψ) be a solution to system (1.5) such that

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{cases} s \geq s_0 > \frac{3}{2} + \frac{d}{2}, & 2 < r < s_0 - \frac{d}{2} + \frac{1}{2}, \\ \psi \in L^\infty(I; H^s) \cap L^p(I; W^{r, \infty}), \\ \eta \in L^\infty(I; H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}) \cap L^p(I; W^{r+\frac{1}{2}, \infty}), & \inf_{t \in I} \text{dist}(\eta(t), \Gamma) \geq h > 0. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 3.1. — *There exists a nondecreasing function \mathcal{F} such that*

$$H(\eta) = -T_l \eta + f,$$

where $l = l^{(2)} + l^{(1)}$ with

$$(3.2) \quad l^{(2)} = \left(1 + |\nabla \eta|^2\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(|\xi|^2 - \frac{(\nabla \eta \cdot \xi)^2}{1 + |\nabla \eta|^2}\right), \quad l^{(1)} = -\frac{i}{2}(\partial_x \cdot \partial_\xi)l^{(2)},$$

and $f \in H^{s+r-2}$ satisfying

$$\|f\|_{H^{s+r-2}} \leq \mathcal{F}\left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}\right) \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Proof. — Applying Theorem 6.9 with $u = \nabla \eta$, $\mu = s - \frac{1}{2}$ and $\rho = r - \frac{1}{2}$ we obtain

$$\frac{\nabla \eta}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla \eta|^2}} = T_p \nabla \eta + f_1, \quad p = \frac{1}{(1 + |\nabla \eta|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} I - \frac{\nabla \eta \otimes \nabla \eta}{(1 + |\nabla \eta|^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}}$$

and f_1 satisfies

$$\|f_1\|_{H^{s+r-1}} \leq \mathcal{F}(\|\nabla \eta\|_{L^\infty}) \|\nabla \eta\|_{C^{r-\frac{1}{2}}} \|\nabla \eta\|_{H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Since $s_0 > \frac{3}{2} + \frac{d}{2}$, this yields

$$(3.3) \quad \|f_1\|_{H^{s+r-1}} \leq \mathcal{F}\left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}\right) \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Hence,

$$H(\eta) = \text{div}(T_p \nabla \eta + f_1) = T_{-p\xi \cdot \xi + i \text{div } p\xi} \eta + \text{div } f_1.$$

This gives the conclusion with $l^{(2)} = p\xi \cdot \xi$, $l^{(1)} = -i \text{div } p\xi$, $f = \text{div } f_1$. \square

We next tackle the other nonlinear terms. Recall the notations

$$B = \frac{\nabla \eta \cdot \nabla \psi + G(\eta)\psi}{1 + |\nabla \eta|^2}, \quad V = \nabla \psi - B \nabla \eta.$$

Lemma 3.2. — *There exists a nondecreasing function \mathcal{F} such that*

$$\frac{1}{2} |\nabla\psi|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{(\nabla\eta \cdot \nabla\psi - G(\eta)\psi)^2}{1 + |\nabla\eta|^2} = T_V \cdot \nabla\psi - T_V T_B \cdot \nabla\eta - T_B G(\eta)\psi + f,$$

with $f \in H^{s+r-2}$ and

$$\|f\|_{H^{s+r-2}} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{C^r} + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} \right] \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{H^s} + \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \right].$$

Proof. — Consider

$$F(a, b, c) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{(ab + c)^2}{1 + |a|^2}, \quad (a, b, c) \in \mathbf{R}^d \times \mathbf{R}^d \times \mathbf{R}.$$

We compute

$$\partial_a F = \frac{(ab + c)}{1 + |a|^2} \left(b - \frac{(ab + c)}{1 + |a|^2} a \right), \quad \partial_b F = \frac{(ab + c)}{1 + |a|^2} a, \quad \partial_c F = \frac{(ab + c)}{1 + |a|^2}.$$

Now we take $a = \nabla\eta$, $b = \nabla\psi$, and $c = G(\eta)\psi$. Using Proposition 2.10 and the hypothesis $s_0 > \frac{3}{2} + \frac{d}{2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(a, b, c)\|_{L^\infty} &\leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right), \\ \|(a, b, c)\|_{H^{s-1}} &\leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{H^s} + \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \right], \\ \|(a, b, c)\|_{C^{r-1}} &\leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{C^r} + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Then combining this with Theorem 6.9 gives

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{(\nabla\eta \cdot \nabla\psi - G(\eta)\psi)^2}{1 + |\nabla\eta|^2} = T_{VB} \cdot \nabla\eta + T_{B\nabla\eta} \cdot \nabla\psi + T_B G(\eta)\psi + f_1,$$

with

$$\|f_1\|_{H^{s+r-2}} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{C^r} + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} \right] \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{H^s} + \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \right].$$

By the same theorem, there holds

$$\frac{1}{2} |\nabla\psi|^2 = T_{\nabla\psi} \cdot \nabla\psi + f_2, \quad \|f_2\|_{H^{s+r-2}} \leq \mathcal{F} (\|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}}) \|\psi\|_{C^r} \|\psi\|_{H^s}.$$

At last, we deduce from (6.5) and the estimates on (B, V) from Corollary 2.11 that

$$\|(T_{BV} - T_V T_B) \cdot \nabla\eta\|_{H^{s+r-2}} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \|\nabla\eta\|_{H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}},$$

from which we can conclude the proposition. \square

To replace the original unknown with the new good unknown, we will need an estimate on $T_{\partial_t B}\eta$. This is contained in the following lemma.

Lemma 3.3. — *We have*

$$\|T_{\partial_t B}\eta\|_{H^s} \leq \mathcal{F}\left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}}\right) \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{C^r} + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}}\right] \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Proof. — First, using the equations (1.5), the product and nonlinear estimates, and the estimates on $G(\eta)\psi$ of Proposition 2.10, we have

$$\|\partial_t \eta\|_{H^{s_0-1}} + \|\partial_t \psi\|_{H^{s_0-\frac{3}{2}}} \leq \mathcal{F}\left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}}\right),$$

$$\|\partial_t \eta\|_{C^{r-1}} + \|\partial_t \psi\|_{C^{r-\frac{3}{2}}} \leq \mathcal{F}\left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}}\right) \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{C^r} + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}}\right].$$

Then using Theorem 2.17 for the shape derivative of the Dirichlet-Neumann, we have

$$\partial_t [G(\eta)\psi] = G(\eta)(\partial_t \psi - B\partial_t \eta) - \operatorname{div}(V\partial_t \eta).$$

Then using the preceding estimates and the estimate on B from Corollary 2.11,

$$\|\partial_t \psi - B\partial_t \eta\|_{H^{s_0-\frac{3}{2}}} \leq \mathcal{F}\left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}}\right),$$

$$\|\partial_t \psi - B\partial_t \eta\|_{C^{r-\frac{3}{2}}} \leq \mathcal{F}\left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}}\right) \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{C^r} + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}}\right].$$

Thus the last estimates of Proposition 2.10 give

$$\|G(\eta)(\partial_t \psi - B\partial_t \eta)\|_{C^{r-\frac{5}{2}}} \leq \mathcal{F}\left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}}\right) \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{C^r} + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}}\right].$$

There also holds

$$\|\operatorname{div}(V\partial_t \eta)\|_{C^{r-\frac{5}{2}}} \leq \|V\partial_t \eta\|_{C^{r-\frac{3}{2}}} \leq \mathcal{F}\left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}}\right) \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{C^r} + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}}\right],$$

so that

$$\|\partial_t G(\eta)\psi\|_{C^{r-\frac{5}{2}}} \leq \mathcal{F}\left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}}\right) \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{C^r} + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}}\right].$$

At last, as in (2.26),

$$B = K(\nabla \eta) \cdot \nabla \psi + L(\nabla \eta)G(\eta)\psi.$$

Differentiating this expression and using the preceding estimates on the time derivatives, we have

$$\|\partial_t B\|_{C^{r-\frac{5}{2}}} \leq \mathcal{F}\left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}}\right) \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{C^r} + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}}\right],$$

from which the lemma follows immediately by (6.16) and the fact that $r - \frac{5}{2} > -\frac{1}{2}$. \square

We now have all the ingredients needed to parilinearize the equations. Recall that λ has been defined in (2.27), and l in (3.2).

Proposition 3.4. — *There exists a nondecreasing function \mathcal{F} such that with $U := \psi - T_B\eta$ there holds*

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t \eta + T_V \cdot \nabla \eta - T_\lambda U = f_1, \\ \partial_t U + T_V \cdot \nabla U - T_l \eta = f_2, \end{cases}$$

with (f_1, f_2) satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \|(f_1, f_2)\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s} &\leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{C^r} + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} \right] \times \\ &\quad \times \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{H^s} + \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. — The first equation is just Proposition 2.12. For the second one, we use the equation satisfied by ψ and Lemmas 3.1–3.2 to see that

$$\partial_t \psi + T_l \eta + T_V \cdot \nabla \psi - T_V T_B \cdot \nabla \eta - T_B G(\eta) \psi = R$$

with

$$\|R\|_{H^s} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{C^r} + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} \right] \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{H^s} + \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \right],$$

and since

$$\partial_t U = \partial_t \psi - T_B \partial_t \eta - T_{\partial_t B} \eta,$$

we can use Lemma 3.3, the fact that $\partial_t \eta = G(\eta)\psi$, and

$$T_V \cdot \nabla \psi - T_V T_B \cdot \nabla \eta = T_V \cdot \nabla U + R'$$

with

$$\|R'\|_{H^s} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{H^s} + \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \right]$$

to conclude. \square

3.2. Symmetrization of the system. — As in [1] we shall deal with a class of symbols having special structure that we recall here for the reader's convenience.

Definition 3.5. — *Given $m \in \mathbf{R}$, Σ^m denotes the class of symbols a of the form*

$$a = a^{(m)} + a^{(m-1)}$$

with

$$a^{(m)}(x, \xi) = F(\nabla \eta(x), \xi), \quad a^{(m-1)}(x, \xi) = \sum_{|\alpha|=2} F_\alpha(\nabla \eta(x), \xi) \partial_x^\alpha \eta(x)$$

such that

1. T_a maps real-valued functions to real-valued functions;

2. F is a C^∞ real-valued function of $(\zeta, \xi) \in \mathbf{R}^d \times \mathbf{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$, homogeneous of order m in ξ , and there exists a function $K = K(\zeta) > 0$ such that

$$F(\zeta, \xi) \geq K(\zeta)|\xi|^m, \quad \forall (\zeta, \xi) \in \mathbf{R}^d \times \mathbf{R}^d \setminus \{0\};$$

3. the F_α s are complex-valued functions of $(\zeta, \xi) \in \mathbf{R}^d \times \mathbf{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$, homogeneous of order $m - 1$ in ξ .

In the sequel, we often need an estimate for u from $T_a u$. For this purpose, we prove

Proposition 3.6. — Let $m, \mu \in \mathbf{R}$, and $s_0 > \frac{3}{2} + \frac{d}{2}$. Then there exists a function \mathcal{F} such that for all $\eta \in H^{s_0 - \frac{1}{2}}$, for all $a \in \Sigma^m$, we have

$$(3.5) \quad \|u\|_{H^{\mu+m}} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0 - \frac{1}{2}}} \right) (\|T_a u\|_{H^\mu} + \|u\|_{L^2}),$$

$$(3.6) \quad \|u\|_{C_*^{\mu+m}} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0 - \frac{1}{2}}} \right) (\|T_a u\|_{C_*^\mu} + \|u\|_{C_*^0}).$$

Remark 3.7. — 1. The same result was proved in Proposition 4.6 of [1] where the constant in the right hand side is $\mathcal{F}(\|\eta(t)\|_{H^{s-1}})$. Here, for less regular η we prove a worse estimate. However, it turns out that (3.5) is sufficient to obtain a priori bounds.

2. In (3.5) (resp. (3.6)) one can freely replace $\|u\|_{L^2}$ (reps. $\|u\|_{C_*^0}$) by any lower order Sobolev (resp. Hölder) norm.

Proof. — We give the proof for (3.5), the one of (3.6) follows identically. We write $a = a^{(m)} + a^{(m-1)}$. Introduce $b = \frac{1}{a^{(m)}}$ and

$$0 < \varepsilon < \min \left\{ 1, s_0 - \frac{3}{2} - \frac{d}{2} \right\}.$$

Applying Theorem 6.4 (ii) with $\rho = \varepsilon$ gives $T_b T_{a^{(m)}} = I + r$ where r is of order $-\varepsilon$ and

$$(3.7) \quad \|ru\|_{H^{\mu+\varepsilon}} \leq \mathcal{F}(\|\nabla\eta\|_{C^\varepsilon}) \|u\|_{H^\mu} \leq \mathcal{F}(\|\eta\|_{C^{1+\varepsilon}}) \|u\|_{H^\mu} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0 - \frac{1}{2}}} \right) \|u\|_{H^\mu}.$$

Then, setting $R = -r - T_b T_{a^{(m-1)}}$ we have

$$(I - R)u = T_b T_a u.$$

Let us consider the symbol $a^{(m-1)}$. For any $\alpha \in \mathbf{N}^d$ with $|\alpha| = 2$ and fixed ξ , since $s_0 > \frac{3}{2} + \frac{d}{3}$, Sobolev embedding and estimates (6.19), (6.23) give

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_\alpha(\nabla\eta, \xi) \partial_x^\alpha \eta\|_{C_*^{-1+\varepsilon}} &\leq \|F_\alpha(\nabla\eta, \xi) \partial_x^\alpha \eta\|_{H^{-1+\varepsilon+\frac{d}{2}}} \leq \|F_\alpha(\nabla\eta, \xi)\|_{H^{s_0 - \frac{3}{2}}} \|\partial_x^\alpha \eta\|_{H^{s_0 - \frac{5}{2}}} \\ &\leq \mathcal{F}(\|\nabla\eta\|_{L^\infty}) \|\eta\|_{H^{s_0 - \frac{1}{2}}}^2 \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0 - \frac{1}{2}}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, one deduces $a^{(m-1)} \in \dot{\Gamma}_{-1+\varepsilon}^{m-1}$ and thus by Proposition 6.6,

$$\|T_{a^{(m-1)}}u\|_{H^{\mu-m+\varepsilon}} \leq \mathcal{F}\left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0-\frac{1}{2}}}\right) \|u\|_{H^\mu}.$$

Because $b \in \Gamma_0^{-m}$ with semi-norm bounded by $\mathcal{F}(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0-\frac{1}{2}}})$ we get

$$(3.8) \quad \|T_b T_{a^{(m-1)}}u\|_{H^{\mu+\varepsilon}} \leq \mathcal{F}\left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0-\frac{1}{2}}}\right) \|u\|_{H^\mu}.$$

Combining (3.7) with (3.8) yields

$$\|Ru\|_{H^{\mu+\varepsilon}} \leq \mathcal{F}\left(\|\eta(t)\|_{H^{s_0-\frac{1}{2}}}\right) \|u\|_{H^\mu}.$$

The rest of the proof is identical to that of Proposition 4.6 in [1]. \square

For the sake of conciseness, we give the following definition.

Definition 3.8. — Let $m \in \mathbf{R}$ and consider two families of operators of order m ,

$$\{A(t) : t \in [0, T]\}, \quad \{B(t) : t \in [0, T]\}.$$

Let $s_0 > \frac{3}{2} + \frac{d}{2}$ and $2 < r \leq s_0 + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{d}{2}$.

We write $A \sim B$ if $A - B$ is of order $m - \frac{3}{2}$ and the following condition is fulfilled: for all $\mu \in \mathbf{R}$, there exists a nondecreasing function \mathcal{F} such that for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\|A(t) - B(t)\|_{H^\mu \rightarrow H^{\mu-m+\frac{3}{2}}} \leq \mathcal{F}\left(\|\eta(t)\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}\right) \left(1 + \|\eta(t)\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}}\right).$$

Remark 3.9. — Let $a = a^{(m)} + a^{(m-1)} \in \Sigma^m$. We make the following remarks.

(i) Because the principal symbol $a^{(m)}(t)$ contains only the first derivative $\nabla\eta \in C^{r-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{R}^d) \cap H^{s_0-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ with $r - \frac{1}{2} > \frac{3}{2}$, $s_0 - \frac{1}{2} > 1 + \frac{d}{2}$, applying the nonlinear estimate (6.23) we obtain

$$M_{\frac{3}{2}}^m(a^{(m)}(t)) \leq \mathcal{F}\left(\|\eta(t)\|_{H^{s_0-\frac{1}{2}}}\right) \|\eta(t)\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

On the other hand,

$$M_0^m(a^{(m)}(t)) \leq \mathcal{F}\left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0-\frac{1}{2}}}\right).$$

(ii) The subprincipal symbol $a^{(m-1)}(t)$ depends on $\partial^\alpha\eta$, $|\alpha| = 2$ which belongs to $C^{r-\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbf{R}^d) \hookrightarrow C^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{R}^d)$. Hence, $a^{(m-1)} \in \Gamma_{1/2}^{m-1}$ and by (6.21) and (6.23) we

have uniformly for $|\xi| = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|F_\alpha(\nabla\eta(t, x), \xi)\partial_x^\alpha\eta(t, x)\|_{C^{\frac{1}{2}}} \\ & \leq \| [F_\alpha(\nabla\eta(t, \cdot), \xi) - F_\alpha(0, \xi)]\partial_x^\alpha\eta(t, \cdot)\|_{C^{\frac{1}{2}}} + |F_\alpha(0, \xi)| \|\partial_x^\alpha\eta(t, \cdot)\|_{C^{\frac{1}{2}}} \\ & \leq \mathcal{F}(\|\nabla\eta(t)\|_{L^\infty}) \|\nabla\eta(t)\|_{C^{\frac{1}{2}}} \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} + |F_\alpha(0, \xi)| \|\eta(t)\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} \\ & \leq \mathcal{F}(\|\nabla\eta(t)\|_{L^\infty}) \|\eta(t)\|_{H^{s_0}} \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} + |F_\alpha(0, \xi)| \|\eta(t)\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}}. \end{aligned}$$

The same estimates hold when one takes derivatives in ξ , consequently

$$M_{\frac{1}{2}}^{m-1}(a^{(m-1)}(t)) \leq \mathcal{F}(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0}}) \|\eta(t)\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

On the other hand, due to the fact that $s_0 > \frac{3}{2} + \frac{d}{2}$ we have

$$M_0^{m-1}(a^{(m-1)}(t)) \leq \mathcal{F}(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0-\frac{1}{2}}}) \|\eta\|_{C^2} \leq \mathcal{F}(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}).$$

From (i) and (ii) we observe that when one applies the symbolic calculus Theorem 6.4, the operator-norm estimates are always linear in the highest norm of η , namely $\|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}}$.

Using this remark, one can verify easily that Proposition 4.3 in [1] is still valid and hence so is Proposition 4.8, [1]:

Proposition 3.10. — *Let $q \in \Sigma^0$, $p \in \Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}$, $\gamma \in \Sigma^{\frac{3}{2}}$ defined by*

$$\begin{aligned} q &= (1 + |\partial_x\eta|^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \\ p &= (1 + |\partial_x\eta|^2)^{-\frac{5}{4}} \sqrt{\lambda^{(1)}} + p^{(-1/2)}, \\ \gamma &= \sqrt{\ell^{(2)}\lambda^{(1)}} + \sqrt{\frac{\ell^{(2)}}{\lambda^{(1)}} \frac{\Re\lambda^{(0)}}{2}} - \frac{i}{2}(\partial_\xi \cdot \partial_x) \sqrt{\ell^{(2)}\lambda^{(1)}}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$p^{(-1/2)} = \frac{1}{\gamma^{(3/2)}} \left\{ q^{(0)}\ell^{(1)} - \gamma^{(1/2)}p^{(1/2)} + i\partial_\xi\gamma^{(3/2)}\partial_x p^{(1/2)} \right\}.$$

Then, it holds that

$$T_p T_\lambda \sim T_\gamma T_q, \quad T_q T_\ell \sim T_\gamma T_p, \quad T_\gamma \sim (T_\gamma)^*.$$

Using this Proposition, we now perform the symmetrization of the system (3.4). Remark that in [2], for $s > 2 + \frac{1}{2}$, this is achieved by using a technical result in Lemma 4.4, [2]: for any $m, \mu \in \mathbf{R}$ there exists a function C such that for all $a \in \Sigma^m$ and $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\|T_{a(t)}u\|_{H^{\mu-m}} \leq C(\|\eta(t)\|_{H^{s-1}})\|u\|_{H^\mu}$$

which says that the operator norm of $T_{a(t)}$ depends only on $\|\eta(t)\|_{H^{s-1}}$ instead of $\|\eta(t)\|_{H^s}$ when one applies Theorem 6.4 (i). In our situation, we shall use Proposition 6.6 to handle symbols with negative regularity.

Proposition 3.11. — *Introduce two new unknowns*

$$\Phi_1 = T_p \eta, \quad \Phi_2 = T_q U.$$

Then $\Phi_1, \Phi_2 \in C^0([0, T], H^s(\mathbf{R}))$ and satisfy

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t \Phi_1 + T_V \cdot \nabla \Phi_1 - T_\gamma \Phi_2 = F_1, \\ \partial_t \Phi_2 + T_V \cdot \nabla \Phi_2 + T_\gamma \Phi_2 = F_2, \end{cases}$$

and there exists a nondecreasing function \mathcal{F} independent of η, ψ such that for each $t \in [0, T]$, there holds

$$(3.10) \quad \|(F_1, F_2)\|_{H^s \times H^s} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0 + \frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left(1 + \|\eta\|_{C^{r + \frac{1}{2}}} + \|\psi\|_{C^r} \right) \left(1 + \|\eta\|_{H^{s + \frac{1}{2}}} + \|\psi\|_{H^s} \right).$$

Proof. — It follows directly from the parlinearized system (3.4) and Proposition 3.10 that Φ_1, Φ_2 satisfy

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t \Phi_1 + T_V \cdot \nabla \Phi_1 - T_\gamma \Phi_2 = T_p f_1 + T_{\partial_t p} \eta + [T_V \cdot \nabla, T_p] \eta, \\ \partial_t \Phi_2 + T_V \cdot \nabla \Phi_2 + T_\gamma \Phi_2 = T_q f_2 + T_{\partial_t q} U + [T_V \cdot \nabla, T_q] U. \end{cases}$$

For simplicity in notation, we denote the right-hand side of (3.10) by RHS. First, Remark 3.9 and the symbolic calculus from Theorem 6.4 (ii) applied with $\rho = 1$ gives

$$\|[T_V \cdot \nabla, T_p] \eta\|_{H^s} + \|[T_V \cdot \nabla, T_q] U\|_{H^s} \leq \text{RHS}.$$

It remains to estimate

$$\|T_{\partial_t p}\|_{H^{s + \frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow H^s}, \quad \|T_{\partial_t q}\|_{H^s \rightarrow H^s}.$$

Recall that we have from the estimates on the Dirichlet-Neumann in Proposition 2.10

$$\|\partial_t \nabla \eta\|_{H^{s_0 - 2}} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0 + \frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right),$$

and

$$(3.12) \quad \|\partial_t \nabla \eta\|_{C^{r-2}} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0 + \frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\eta\|_{C^{r + \frac{1}{2}}} + \|\psi\|_{C^r} \right].$$

We thus get by Theorem 6.4 (i) that

$$\|T_{\partial_t p}^{(1/2)}\|_{H^{s + \frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow H^s} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0 + \frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\eta\|_{C^{r + \frac{1}{2}}} + \|\psi\|_{C^r} \right].$$

Thus, we are left with the estimate of $\left\|T_{\partial_t p^{(-1/2)}}\right\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow H^s}$. Recall that $p^{(-1/2)}$ is of the form

$$p^{(-1/2)} = \sum_{|\alpha|=2} F_\alpha(\nabla\eta, \xi) \partial_x^\alpha \eta,$$

where the F_α s are smooth functions of ξ and homogeneous of order $-\frac{1}{2}$. Hence,

$$\partial_t p^{(-1/2)} = \sum_{|\alpha|=2} [\partial_t F_\alpha(\nabla\eta, \xi)] \partial_x^\alpha \eta + \sum_{|\alpha|=2} F_\alpha(\nabla\eta, \xi) \partial_t \partial_x^\alpha \eta.$$

(i) Since $s_0 > \frac{3}{2} + \frac{d}{2}$, we have for all $|\alpha| = 2$

$$\|\partial_x^\alpha \eta\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|\partial_x^\alpha \eta\|_{H^{s_0 - \frac{3}{2}}} \leq \|\eta\|_{H^{s_0 + \frac{1}{2}}}.$$

This estimate together with (3.12) implies that $(\partial_t F_\alpha(\nabla\eta, \xi)) \partial_x^\alpha \eta \in \Gamma_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and

$$M_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([\partial_t F_\alpha(\nabla\eta, \xi)] \partial_x^\alpha \eta) \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0 + \frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} + \|\psi\|_{C^r} \right].$$

Theorem 6.4 (i) then yields

$$\left\|T_{[\partial_t F_\alpha(\nabla\eta, \xi)] \partial_x^\alpha \eta}\right\|_{H^s} \leq M_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([\partial_t F_\alpha(\nabla\eta, \xi)] \partial_x^\alpha \eta) \|\eta\|_{H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}} \leq \text{RHS}.$$

(ii) Let G be an arbitrary smooth function of $\nabla\eta$. For any $|\alpha| = 2$, we apply (6.22) with $1 < s_0 - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{d}{2}$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} \|G(\nabla\eta) \partial_t \partial_x^\alpha \eta\|_{C^{-1}} &\leq \|G(\nabla\eta)\|_{C^{s_0 - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{d}{2}}} \|\partial_t \partial_x^\alpha \eta\|_{C^{-1}} \\ &\leq \left(\|G(\nabla\eta) - G(0)\|_{H^{s_0 - \frac{1}{2}}} + |G(0)| \right) \|\partial_t \partial_x^\alpha \eta\|_{C^{-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly,

$$\|G(\nabla\eta) - G(0)\|_{H^{s_0 - \frac{1}{2}}} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0 + \frac{1}{2}}} \right).$$

On the other hand, by virtue of Proposition 2.9,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t \partial_x^\alpha \eta\|_{C^{-1}} &\leq \|G(\eta)\psi\|_{C^1} \leq \|G(\eta)\psi\|_{C^{r-1}} \\ &\leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0 + \frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} + \|\psi\|_{C^r} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\|G(\nabla\eta) \partial_t \partial_x^\alpha \eta\|_{C^{-1}} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0 + \frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} + \|\psi\|_{C^r} \right].$$

Therefore, according to Definition 6.5, $F_\alpha(\nabla\eta, \xi) \partial_t \partial_x^\alpha \eta \in \Gamma_{-1}^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ with semi-norm

$$M_{-1}^{-\frac{1}{2}} (F_\alpha(\nabla\eta, \xi) \partial_t \partial_x^\alpha \eta) \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0 + \frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} + \|\psi\|_{C^r} \right].$$

We then obtain by virtue of Proposition 6.6

$$\left\|T_{F_\alpha(\nabla\eta, \xi) \partial_t \partial_x^\alpha \eta}\right\|_{H^s} \leq \text{RHS}.$$

For $\partial_t q$, the proof is the same as for the principal part of $\partial_t p$, and we only need to remark that

$$(3.13) \quad \|U\|_{H^s} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[\|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} + \|\psi\|_{H^s} \right].$$

This concludes the proof of the Proposition. \square

4. Blow-up criterion and a priori estimate

First of all, it follows straightforwardly from Proposition 3.11, that one can reduce the water waves system to a single equation of a complex-valued unknown:

Proposition 4.1. — *Assume that (3.1) holds and let Φ_1, Φ_2 be as in Proposition 3.11 then*

$$\Phi := \Phi_1 + i\Phi_2 = T_p \eta + iT_q U$$

satisfies

$$(4.1) \quad (\partial_t + T_V \cdot \nabla + iT_\gamma) \Phi = F,$$

(4.2)

$$\|F(t)\|_{H^s} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} + \|\psi\|_{C^r} \right] \left[1 + \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} + \|\psi\|_{H^s} \right].$$

To obtain estimates in Sobolev spaces, we shall commute equation (4.1) with an elliptic operator \wp of order s and then perform an L^2 -energy estimate. Since $\gamma^{(3/2)}$ is of order $3/2 > 1$ we need to choose \wp function of $\gamma^{(3/2)}$ as in [1]:

$$(4.3) \quad \wp := (\gamma^{(3/2)})^{2s/3},$$

and take $\varphi = T_\wp \Phi$. Since we want to obtain energy estimates in terms of the original variables η and ψ , we have to link them with this new variable φ .

Lemma 4.2. — *For $s \geq s_0 > \frac{3}{2} + \frac{d}{2}$, there is a function \mathcal{F} such that there holds*

$$(4.4) \quad \|\varphi\|_{L^2} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \left[\|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} + \|\psi\|_{H^s} \right]$$

$$(4.5) \quad \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} + \|\psi\|_{H^s} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) [1 + \|\varphi\|_{L^2}].$$

Proof. — Recall that $p \in \Sigma^s$, $q \in \Sigma^0$, and $\wp \in \Sigma^s$ since $\gamma^{(3/2)} \in \Sigma^{\frac{3}{2}}$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi\|_{L^2} &\leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \|\Phi\|_{H^s} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \left[\|U\|_{H^s} + \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \right] \\ &\leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \left[\|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} + \|\psi\|_{H^s} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (3.13) to estimate U . To prove (4.5) we apply Proposition 3.6 two times to get

$$(4.6) \quad \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0-\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \left[\|T_\varphi T_p \eta\|_{L^2} + \|\eta\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right],$$

$$(4.7) \quad \|\psi\|_{H^s} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0-\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \left[\|T_\varphi T_q \psi\|_{L^2} + \|\psi\|_{L^2} \right].$$

Clearly, $\|T_\varphi T_p \eta\|_{L^2} \leq \|\varphi\|_{L^2}$. On the other hand,

$$(4.8) \quad \|T_\varphi T_q \psi\|_{L^2} \leq \|T_\varphi T_q U\|_{L^2} + \|T_\varphi T_q T_B \eta\|_{L^2}$$

and

$$(4.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \|T_\varphi T_q T_B \eta\|_{L^2} &\leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \\ &\leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[\|T_\varphi T_p \eta\|_{L^2} + 1 \right], \end{aligned}$$

using (4.6). Putting together these estimates proves the proposition. \square

For the blow-up criterion and energy estimate below, we recall the following quantities controlling the system (1.5).

Notation 4.3. — The Sobolev norm, blow-up norm and Strichartz norm for (η, ψ) are denoted by $M_{s,T}$, $N_{r,T}$, $Z_{r,T}$ respectively:

$$(4.10) \quad M_{s,T} = \|(\eta, \psi)\|_{L^\infty([0,T]; H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s)}, \quad M_{s,0} = \|(\eta, \psi)|_{t=0}\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s},$$

$$(4.11) \quad N_{r,T} = \|(\eta, \psi)\|_{L^1([0,T]; W^{r+\frac{1}{2}, \infty} \times W^{r, \infty})},$$

$$(4.12) \quad Z_{r,T} = \|(\eta, \psi)\|_{L^p([0,T]; W^{r+\frac{1}{2}, \infty} \times W^{r, \infty})}.$$

Proposition 4.4. — Let $d \geq 1$, $h > 0$, and indices

$$\frac{3}{2} + \frac{d}{2} < s_0 \leq s, \quad 2 < r < s_0 + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{d}{2}.$$

Then there exists a non-negative, non-decreasing function \mathcal{F}_h such that for all $T \geq 0$ and

$$(\eta, \psi) \in L^\infty \left([0, T]; H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s \right) \cap L^1 \left([0, T]; W^{r+\frac{1}{2}, \infty} \times W^{r, \infty} \right)$$

solution of the Zacharov-Craig-Sulem system (1.5) satisfying condition (1.3), there holds

$$\|\varphi\|_{L^\infty([0,T]; L^2)} \leq \mathcal{F}_h (M_{s,0} + \mathcal{F} (M_{s_0,T}) [T + N_{r,T}]).$$

Remark 4.5. — In general, \mathcal{F}_h depends also on d , s , r , s_0 .

Proof. — Using Grönwall lemma and the fact that $\|\varphi(0)\|_{L^2} \leq \mathcal{F}(M_{s,0})$, we see that the Proposition will be a consequence of the following estimate for φ :
(4.13)

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} + \|\psi\|_{C^r} \right] \left[1 + \|\varphi\|_{L^2} \right] \|\varphi\|_{L^2}.$$

To prove this estimate, we see from (4.1) that φ solves the equation

$$(4.14) \quad (\partial_t + T_V \cdot \nabla + iT_\gamma) \varphi = T_\varphi F + G$$

where

$$G = T_{\partial_t \varphi} \Phi + [T_V \cdot \nabla, T_\varphi] \Phi + i[T_\gamma, T_\varphi] \Phi.$$

First, remark that since $\partial_\xi \varphi \cdot \partial_x \gamma^{(3/2)} = \partial_\xi \gamma^{(3/2)} \cdot \partial_x \varphi$ we can apply Theorem 6.4 (ii) with $m = s$, $m' = \frac{3}{2}$, $\rho = \frac{3}{2}$ to find (keep in mind Remark 3.9)

$$\|[T_\varphi, T_\gamma]\|_{H^s \rightarrow L^2} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{C^r} + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} \right].$$

The same theorem (applied with $m = 1$, $m' = s$, $\rho = 1$) also gives

$$\|[T_V \cdot \nabla, T_\varphi]\|_{H^s \rightarrow L^2} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{C^r} + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} \right].$$

Finally, one can write $\partial_t \varphi = L(\nabla \eta, \partial_t \nabla \eta, \xi)$ for some smooth function L homogeneous of order s in ξ , so that

$$\|T_{\partial_t \varphi}\|_{H^s \rightarrow L^2} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{C^r} + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} \right].$$

The estimates above imply

$$\|G\|_{L^2} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{C^r} + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} \right] \|\Phi\|_{H^s}.$$

On the other hand, Proposition 3.6 applied to $u = \Phi$, $a = \varphi \in \Sigma^s$ yields

$$\|\Phi\|_{H^s} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) [\|\varphi\|_{L^2} + 1].$$

Therefore,

$$\|G\|_{L^2} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{C^r} + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} \right] [1 + \|\varphi\|_{L^2}].$$

On the other hand, we see from (4.2) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_\varphi F\|_{L^2} &\leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{C^r} + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} \right] \times \\ &\quad \times \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{H^s} + \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \right], \end{aligned}$$

so that thanks to Lemma 4.2 we have

$$\|T_\varphi F\|_{L^2} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{C^r} + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} \right] [1 + \|\varphi\|_{L^2}].$$

Now, using Theorem 6.4 (iii) we see easily that

$$(4.15) \quad \|(T_V \cdot \nabla) + (T_V \cdot \nabla)^*\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0 + \frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{C^r} + \|\eta\|_{C^{r + \frac{1}{2}}} \right]$$

and

$$(4.16) \quad \|(T_\gamma) + (T_\gamma)^*\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s_0 + \frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^{s_0}} \right) \left[1 + \|\psi\|_{C^r} + \|\eta\|_{C^{r + \frac{1}{2}}} \right].$$

Then using equation (4.14) we conclude the proof of (4.13) and thus of the Proposition. \square

Now, taking $s > 2 + \frac{d}{2}$ and

$$(\eta_0, \psi_0) \in H^{s + \frac{1}{2}} \times H^s$$

such that $\text{dist}(\eta_0, \Gamma) > h > 0$, we know from Theorem 1.1, [1] that there exists a time $T \in (0, \infty)$ such that the Cauchy problem for system (1.5) with initial condition (η_0, ψ_0) has a unique solution

$$(\eta, \psi) \in C \left([0, T]; H^{s + \frac{1}{2}} \times H^s \right)$$

The maximal time of existence $T^* > 0$ then can be defined as

$$(4.17) \quad T^* = T^*(\eta_0, \psi_0, h) := \sup \left\{ T' > 0 : \begin{array}{l} \text{the Cauchy problem for (1.5) with data} \\ (\eta_0, \psi_0) \text{ has a solution } (\eta, \psi) \in C([0, T']; H^{s + \frac{1}{2}} \times H^s) \\ \text{satisfying } \inf_{[0, T']} \text{dist}(\eta(t), \Gamma) > 0 \end{array} \right\}.$$

By the uniqueness statement of Proposition 6.4, [1] (it is because of this Proposition that we require the separation condition in the definition (4.17)) the solution (η, ψ) is defined for all $t < T^*$ and

$$(\eta, \psi) \in C \left([0, T^*]; H^{s + \frac{1}{2}} \times H^s \right),$$

which will be called the maximal solution.

Theorem 4.6. — *Let $d \geq 1$, $h > 0$ and indices*

$$\frac{3}{2} + \frac{d}{2} < s_0 < s - \frac{1}{2}, \quad 2 < r < s_0 + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{d}{2}.$$

Let $T^ = T^*(\eta_0, \psi_0, h)$ be the maximal time of existence defined by (4.17) and*

$$(4.18) \quad (\eta, \psi) \in L^\infty \left([0, T^*]; H^{s + \frac{1}{2}} \times H^s \right)$$

be the maximal solution of (1.5) with prescribed data (η_0, ψ_0) satisfying $\text{dist}(\eta_0, \Gamma) > h$. Then if T^* is finite, it holds that

$$\limsup_{T \rightarrow T^*} \left(M_{s_0, T} + N_{r, T} + \frac{1}{h(T)} \right) = +\infty,$$

where $h(T)$ is the distance from the surface η to the bottom Γ over the time interval $[0, T]$.

Proof. — Suppose that $T^* < +\infty$ and

$$K := \limsup_{T \rightarrow T^*} \left(M_{s_0, T} + N_{r, T} + \frac{1}{h(T)} \right) < +\infty.$$

Let $T \in [0, T^*)$ arbitrary then $h(T) > 1/K > 0$. It follows from Proposition 4.4 and the estimate (4.5) that

$$(4.19) \quad M_{s, T} \leq \mathcal{F}_{1/K}(T, M_{s, 0}, M_{s_0, T}, N_{r, T}) \leq L$$

for some function $\mathcal{F}_{1/K}$ increasing in each argument and $L = L(K, M_{s, 0}, T^*)$. On the other hand, from the a priori estimate in Proposition 5.2, [1] we deduce that the existence time for local solutions can be chosen uniformly for data lying in a bounded subset of $H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s$ and satisfy uniformly the separation condition (H_0) . In particular, call T_1 be the time of existence for data in the ball $B(0, L)$ of $H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s$ whose surface is away from the bottom a distance (at least) $1/K$. Choosing $\eta(T^* - \frac{T_1}{2})$ as such a datum we can prolong the solution up to the time $T^* + \frac{T_1}{2}$ which contradicts the maximality of T^* , the theorem is proved. \square

The preceding result means that one can continue a solution satisfying the separation condition (H_t) as long as the Sobolev norm M_{s_0} for any index $s_0 > \frac{3}{2} + \frac{d}{2}$ stays bounded, and the time integral of the Hölder norms at regularity $r = 2 + \varepsilon$, N_r , is finite.

Now we give the proof of Corollary 1.3 which is stated again for reader's convenience.

Corollary 4.7. — *Let $T \in (0, +\infty)$ and (η, ψ) be a distributional solution to system (1.5) on the time interval $[0, T]$ such that $\inf_{[0, T]} \text{dist}(\eta(t), \Gamma) > 0$. Then the following property holds: if one knows a priori that*

$$(4.20) \quad \sup_{[0, T]} \|(\eta(t), \psi(t))\|_{H^{2+\frac{d}{2}} \times H^{\frac{3}{2}+\frac{d}{2}}} + \int_0^T \|(\eta(t), \psi(t))\|_{C^{\frac{5}{2}+} \times C^{2+}} dt < +\infty$$

then $(\eta(0), \psi(0)) \in H^\infty(\mathbf{R}^d)^2$ implies that $(\eta, \psi) \in L^\infty([0, T]; H^\infty(\mathbf{R}^d))^2$.

Proof. — From condition (4.20) one can find s_0 , r verifying

$$\frac{3}{2} + \frac{d}{2} < s_0, \quad 2 < r < s_0 + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{d}{2}$$

such that

$$(4.21) \quad M_{s_0, T} + N_{r, T} < \infty.$$

Take $s > s_0 + \frac{1}{2}$ arbitrary, it suffices to prove that if $(\eta(0), \psi(0)) \in H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s$ then $(\eta, \psi) \in L^\infty([0, T]; H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s)$. Since $s > 2 + \frac{d}{2}$, according to the Cauchy theory in [1] one has a maximal solution

$$(\eta, \psi) \in L^\infty([0, T_s]; H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s).$$

By uniqueness, we only need to show that $T_s \geq T$. Suppose that $T_s < T < +\infty$ we get by applying Theorem 4.6

$$\limsup_{T' \rightarrow T_s} \left(M_{s_0, T'} + N_{r, T'} + \frac{1}{h(T')} \right) = +\infty.$$

By our assumption, $h(T') \geq h(T_s) > 0$, hence

$$\limsup_{T' \rightarrow T_s} \left(M_{s_0, T'} + N_{r, T'} \right) = +\infty$$

which contradicts (4.21). \square

Remark 4.8. — In fact, the proof of Corollary 4.7 above shows a stronger regularity result: under condition (4.20), for any $s > 2 + \frac{d}{2} +$ we have $(\eta(0), \psi(0)) \in H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s$ implies $(\eta, \psi) \in L^\infty([0, T]; H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s)$. The value of this result over the Cauchy theory in [1] is that here the existence time T is given and is independent of the Sobolev index s .

We next derive from Proposition 4.4 an a priori estimate for the Sobolev norm $M_{s, T}$ by means of itself and the Strichartz norm $Z_{r, T}$.

Theorem 4.9. — Let $d \geq 1$, $h > 0$, $p > 1$, and indices

$$s > \frac{3}{2} + \frac{d}{2}, \quad 2 < r < s + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{d}{2}.$$

Then there exists a non-negative, non-decreasing function \mathcal{F}_h such that for all $T \in [0, 1)$ and

$$(\eta, \psi) \in L^\infty \left([0, T]; H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s \right) \cap L^p \left([0, T]; W^{r+\frac{1}{2}, \infty} \times W^{r, \infty} \right)$$

solution of the Zacharov-Craig-Sulem system (1.5) satisfying $\inf_{t \in [0, T]} \text{dist}(\eta(t), \Gamma) > h$ we have

$$(4.22) \quad M_{s, T} \leq \mathcal{F}_h \left(M_{s, 0} + T^\delta \mathcal{F} (M_{s, T} + Z_{r, T}) \right),$$

where $\delta = \min\{1 - \frac{1}{p}, \frac{1}{2}\}$.

Proof. — First, by Hölder inequality we have $N_{r,T} \leq T^{1-\frac{1}{p}} Z_{r,T}$ and thus Proposition 4.4 applied with $s_0 = s$ implies that

$$(4.23) \quad \|T_\varphi T_p \eta\|_{L^\infty([0,T];L^2)} + \|T_\varphi T_q U\|_{L^\infty([0,T];L^2)} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(M_{s,0} + T^{1-\frac{1}{p}} \mathcal{F}(M_{s,T} + Z_{r,T}) \right).$$

We denote by Ξ the right-hand side of the preceding inequality, where \mathcal{F} may change from line to line. Using the estimate for the Dirichlet-Neumann operator in Proposition 2.10 we get

$$(4.24) \quad \|\eta(t) - \eta(0)\|_{H^{s-1}} \leq \int_0^t \|\partial_t \eta(m)\|_{H^{s-1}} dm = \int_0^t \|G(\eta)\psi(m)\|_{H^{s-1}} dm \leq T \mathcal{F}(M_{s,T}).$$

Consequently,

$$(4.25) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\eta(t)\|_{H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}} &\leq \|\eta(0)\|_{H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}} + \|\eta(t) - \eta(0)\|_{H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}} \\ &\leq \|\eta(0)\|_{H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}} + \|\eta(t) - \eta(0)\|_{H^{s-1}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\eta(t) - \eta(0)\|_{H^s}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq M_{s,0} + T^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{F}(M_s(T)). \end{aligned}$$

The estimates (4.6), (4.23) and (4.25) then give

$$(4.26) \quad \|\eta\|_{L^\infty H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \leq \Xi.$$

We turn to estimate $\|\psi\|_{L^\infty H^s}$, for which we use the second equation in (1.5) to get

$$\|\psi(t) - \psi(0)\|_{H^{s-\frac{3}{2}}} \leq T \mathcal{F}(M_{s,T}).$$

By interpolation as in (4.24), there holds

$$(4.27) \quad \|\psi(t)\|_{H^{s-1}} \leq \|\psi(0)\|_{H^{s-1}} + \sqrt{T} \mathcal{F}(M_{s,T}).$$

Then, in views of (4.7) and (4.25) it remains to estimate $\|T_\varphi T_q \psi\|_{L^\infty([0,T],L^2)}$. To do this, one writes by definition of U

$$\|T_\varphi T_q \psi\|_{L^\infty([0,T],L^2)} \leq \|T_\varphi T_q U\|_{L^\infty([0,T],L^2)} + \|T_\varphi T_q T_B \eta\|_{L^\infty([0,T],L^2)}.$$

The second term on the right-hand side is bounded by (4.23). For the second term, one uses (4.26) to have

$$\|T_\varphi T_q T_B \eta\|_{L^\infty([0,T],L^2)} \leq \Xi \|T_B \eta\|_{L^\infty H^s} \leq \Xi \|B\|_{L^\infty C^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \|\eta\|_{L^\infty H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Thus, to complete the proof we are left with $\|B\|_{L^\infty C^{-\frac{1}{2}}}$, for which we use again the decomposition (2.26) for B :

$$B = K(\nabla \eta) \cdot \nabla \psi + L(\nabla \eta) G(\eta) \psi.$$

Then by (6.22) and the estimate for $G(\eta)\psi$ in Theorem 2.5, there hold

$$\begin{aligned} \|B\|_{C^{-\frac{1}{2}}} &\leq \|K(\nabla\eta)\|_{C^1} \|\nabla\psi\|_{C^{-\frac{1}{2}}} + \|L(\nabla\eta)\|_{C^1} \|G(\eta)\psi\|_{C^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \\ &\leq \mathcal{F}\left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}}\right) (\|\nabla\psi\|_{H^{s-2}} + \|G(\eta)\psi\|_{H^{s-2}}) \leq \mathcal{F}\left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}}\right) \|\psi\|_{H^{s-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

The estimates (4.26) and (4.27) then conclude the proof. \square

5. Contraction estimates

Our goal in this section is to prove a contraction estimate for two solutions to (1.5) in weaker norms. This will be used in the proof of the convergence of the scheme and in establishing uniqueness for the Cauchy theory in our companion paper [26]. To get started, we have by straightforward computations the following assertion: (η, ψ) is a solution to system (1.5) if and only if

$$(\partial_t + T_V \cdot \nabla + \mathcal{L}) \begin{pmatrix} \eta \\ \psi \end{pmatrix} = f(\eta, \psi)$$

with

$$(5.1) \quad \mathcal{L} := \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ T_B & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -T_\lambda \\ T_l & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ -T_B & I \end{pmatrix}, \quad f(\eta, \psi) := \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ T_B & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} f^1 \\ f^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

where

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{aligned} f^1(\eta, \psi) &= G(\eta)\psi - (T_\lambda(\psi - T_B\eta) - T_V \cdot \nabla\eta), \\ f^2(\eta, \psi) &= -\frac{1}{2}|\nabla\psi|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{(\nabla\eta \cdot \nabla\psi + G(\eta)\psi)^2}{1 + |\nabla\eta|^2} \\ &\quad + T_V \cdot \nabla\psi - T_B T_V \cdot \nabla\eta - T_B G(\eta)\psi + H(\eta) + T_l \eta - g\eta. \end{aligned}$$

We consider (η, ψ) at the following regularity level

$$(\eta, \psi) \in L^\infty\left([0, T]; H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s\right) \cap L^p\left([0, T]; W^{r+\frac{1}{2}, \infty} \times W^{r, \infty}\right),$$

with

$$s > \frac{3}{2} + \frac{d}{2}, \quad 2 < r < s - \frac{d}{2} + \frac{1}{2}.$$

Now, let (η_1, ψ_1) and (η_2, ψ_2) be two solutions of system (1.5) on $[0, T]$. Set

$$\delta\eta = \eta_1 - \eta_2, \quad \delta\psi = \psi_1 - \psi_2, \quad \delta B = B_1 - B_2, \quad \delta V = V_1 - V_2.$$

Define the following quantities

$$(5.3) \quad \begin{aligned} P_S(t) &= \|\delta\eta(t)\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\delta\psi(t)\|_{H^{s-\frac{3}{2}}}, \quad P_H(t) = \|\delta\eta(t)\|_{C^{r-1}} + \|\delta\psi(t)\|_{C^{r-\frac{3}{2}}}, \\ P_{S,T} &= \|P_S\|_{L^\infty([0, T])}, \quad P_{H,T} = \|P_H\|_{L^p([0, T])}, \\ P(t) &= P_S(t) + P_H(t), \quad P_T = P_{S,T} + P_{H,T}. \end{aligned}$$

Notation 5.1. — Throughout this section, we write $A \lesssim B$ if there exists a non-decreasing function $\mathcal{F} : \mathbf{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^+$ such that $A \leq \mathcal{F}(M_{s,T}^1, M_{s,T}^2)B$, where $M_{s,T}^j$ is defined by (4.10): $M_{s,T}^j = \|(\eta_j, \psi_j)\|_{L^\infty([0,T]; H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s)}$.

5.1. Contraction estimate for f^2 . — Recall that we consider B, V as functions of (η, ψ) defined by (1.6).

Lemma 5.2. — We have for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$

$$\|\delta B(t)\|_{C^{-\frac{1}{2}}} + \|\delta V(t)\|_{C^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \lesssim P(t).$$

Proof. — Assume that the estimate for δB is proved, we have

$$\delta V = \nabla \delta \psi - \delta B \nabla \eta_1 - B_2 \nabla \delta \eta.$$

Obviously,

$$\|\nabla \delta \psi(t)\|_{C^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \leq \|\delta \psi(t)\|_{C^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq \|\delta \psi(t)\|_{C^{r-\frac{1}{2}}} \leq P_H(t).$$

On the other hand,

$$\|B_2 \nabla \delta \eta(t)\|_{C^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \leq \|B_2 \nabla \delta \eta(t)\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|\delta \eta(t)\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \leq P_H(t)$$

and from the product rule (6.22) for negative Hölder indices there holds

$$\|\delta B \nabla \eta_1(t)\|_{C^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \lesssim \|\delta B(t)\|_{C^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \|\nabla \eta_1(t)\|_{C^{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}} \lesssim P(t)$$

since for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough $\|\nabla \eta_1(t)\|_{C^{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}} \lesssim \|\nabla \eta_1(t)\|_{H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}}$. Therefore, we are left with the estimate for δB , for which we use again the formula (2.26)

$$B = K(\nabla \eta) \cdot \nabla \psi + L(\nabla \eta) G(\eta) \psi,$$

with K and L smooth. Observe that $G(\eta)$ has order 1, hence these two terms are at the same regularity structure. We give the proof for the second one since it involves the Dirichlet-Neumann operator:

$$\begin{aligned} L(\nabla \eta_1) G(\eta_1) \psi_1 - L(\nabla \eta_2) G(\eta_2) \psi_2 &= [L(\nabla \eta_1) - L(\nabla \eta_2)] G(\eta_1) \psi_1 \\ &\quad + L(\nabla \eta_2) [G(\eta_1) \psi_1 - G(\eta_2) \psi_2]. \end{aligned}$$

From this expression and the product rule (6.22) we only need to estimate the $C^{-1/2}$ norm of

$$G(\eta_1) \psi_1 - G(\eta_2) \psi_2 = G(\eta_1) \delta \psi - [G(\eta_1) - G(\eta_2)] \psi_2,$$

where the Hölder estimate (2.22) applied with $\mu = 5/2$ gives $\|G(\eta_1) \delta \psi\|_{C^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \lesssim P(t)$. For the second term on the right-hand side, we apply for example, Theorem 5.3, [3] on the contraction estimate for the Dirichlet-Neumann operator to get (since $s - 1/2 > 1 + d/2$)

$$\|[G(\eta_1) - G(\eta_2)] \psi_2\|_{H^{s-2}} \lesssim \|\delta \eta\|_{H^{s-1}}.$$

Then the embedding $H^{s-2} \hookrightarrow C^{-1/2}$ concludes the proof. \square

We introduce the following notation.

Notation 5.3. — Let $f : \mathbf{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^d$ be a function of u , we set

$$d_u f(u) \dot{u} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \{f(u + \varepsilon \dot{u}) - f(u)\}.$$

Proposition 5.4. — With f^2 defined in (5.2), it holds for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$ that

$$\|f^2(\eta_1, \psi_1)(t) - f^2(\eta_2, \psi_2)(t)\|_{H^{s-\frac{3}{2}}} \lesssim P(t).$$

Proof. — It suffices to prove that

$$(5.4) \quad \left\| d_\eta f^2(\eta, \psi) \dot{\eta} + d_\psi f^2(\eta, \psi) \dot{\psi} \right\|_{H^{s-\frac{3}{2}}} \lesssim \|\dot{\eta}\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\dot{\eta}\|_{C^{r-1}} + \|\dot{\psi}\|_{H^{s-\frac{3}{2}}} + \|\dot{\psi}\|_{C^{r-\frac{3}{2}}}.$$

We have $f^2(\eta, \psi) = I_1 + I_2 + I_3$ with

$$I_1 := H(\eta) + T_l \eta,$$

$$I_2 := -\frac{1}{2} |\nabla \psi|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{(\nabla \eta \cdot \nabla \psi + G(\eta) \psi)^2}{1 + |\nabla \eta|^2} + T_V \cdot \nabla \psi - T_B T_V \cdot \nabla \eta - T_B G(\eta) \psi,$$

$$I_3 := -g\eta.$$

Observe that $d_\psi I_1 = d_\psi I_3 = 0$. The estimate for $d_\eta I_3 \dot{\eta} = -g \dot{\eta}$ is obvious. Observe that I_1 and I_2 are the remainder of the parilinearization in Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2, respectively. Putting $f(x) = -x(1 + |x|^2)^{-1/2}$, $x \in \mathbf{R}^d$, we have $H(\eta) = \operatorname{div} f(\nabla \eta)$. Since

$$d_\eta f(\nabla \eta) \dot{\eta} = f'(\nabla \eta) \nabla \dot{\eta},$$

it follows that

$$d_\eta H(\eta) \dot{\eta} = \operatorname{div}(f'(\nabla \eta) \nabla) \dot{\eta} + f'(\nabla \eta) \nabla \cdot \nabla \dot{\eta}.$$

Then using the Bony decomposition we get

$$d_\eta H(\eta) \dot{\eta} = T_{i \operatorname{div}(f'(\nabla \eta) \xi)} \dot{\eta} + T_{-f'(\nabla \eta) \xi} \dot{\eta} + R = T_{-l} \dot{\eta} + R$$

with $\|R\|_{H^{s-3/2}} \lesssim \|\dot{\eta}\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\dot{\eta}\|_{C^{r-1}}$. Then by Leibnitz rule

$$d_\eta I_1(\eta) \dot{\eta} = T_l \dot{\eta} + R$$

where $\dot{l} := d_\eta l \dot{\eta}$, so we only need to show that $\|T_l \dot{\eta}\|_{H^{s-3/2}} \lesssim \|\dot{\eta}\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\dot{\eta}\|_{C^{r-1}}$.

Indeed, observe that \dot{l} is of the form

$$\dot{l} = F_1(\nabla \eta, \xi) \nabla \dot{\eta} + F_2(\nabla \eta, \xi) \nabla^2 \dot{\eta} + F_3(\nabla \eta, \xi) \nabla \dot{\eta} \nabla^2 \eta =: \sum_{j=1}^3 G_j(x, \xi),$$

where F_j , $j = 1, 2, 3$ are smooth in $\mathbf{R}^d \times \mathbf{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$; F_1 is homogeneous of order 2 in ξ , F_2 , F_3 are homogeneous of order 1 in ξ . By virtue of Theorem 6.4 (i)

and Proposition 6.6 we see that to obtain the desired bound for $\|T_j \eta\|_{H^{s-3/2}}$ it suffices to prove

$$\sup_{|\xi|=1} \|\partial_\xi^\alpha G_1(\cdot, \xi)\|_{L^\infty} + \sup_{|\xi|=1} \|\partial_\xi^\alpha G_j(\cdot, \xi)\|_{C^{-1}} \lesssim C_\alpha \|\dot{\eta}\|_{C^{r-1}}, \quad \forall \alpha \in \mathbf{N}^d, j = 2, 3.$$

This is true because (assuming without loss of generality that $F_j(0, \xi) = 0$, for all ξ) uniformly in $|\xi| = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_1(\nabla \eta) \nabla \dot{\eta}\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim \|\dot{\eta}\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \lesssim \|\dot{\eta}\|_{C^{r-1}}, \\ \|F_2(\nabla \eta) \nabla^2 \dot{\eta}\|_{C^{-1}} &\lesssim \|F_2(\nabla \eta)\|_{C^{1+\varepsilon}} \|\nabla^2 \dot{\eta}\|_{C^{-1}} \lesssim \|\dot{\eta}\|_{C^{r-1}}, \\ \|F_3(\nabla \eta) \nabla \dot{\eta} \nabla^2 \eta\|_{C^{-1}} &\lesssim \|F_3(\nabla \eta) \nabla \dot{\eta} \nabla^2 \eta\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|\dot{\eta}\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \lesssim \|\dot{\eta}\|_{C^{r-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

(here, we chose $0 < \varepsilon < s - 3/2 - d/2$).

We have shown the desired estimate for I_1 . By inspecting the proof of Lemma 3.2, the estimate for $H^{s-3/2}$ norm of $d_\eta I_2 \dot{\eta} + d_\psi I_2 \dot{\psi}$ can be obtained in the same way. \square

5.2. Contraction estimate for f^1 . — Our goal in this paragraph is to derive the following estimate.

Proposition 5.5. — *With f^1 defined in (5.2), it holds for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$ that*

$$\|f^1(\eta_1, \psi_1)(t) - f^1(\eta_2, \psi_2)(t)\|_{H^{s-1}} \lesssim P_H(t) + P_S(t)Q(t)$$

with

$$(5.5) \quad Q(t) := 1 + \sum_{j=1}^2 \|\eta_j(t)\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} + \sum_{j=1}^2 \|\psi_j(t)\|_{C^r}.$$

Proposition 5.5 will be a consequence of the following estimates:

(5.6)

$$\|d_\eta f^1(\eta, \psi) \dot{\eta}\|_{H^{s-1}} \lesssim \|\dot{\eta}\|_{H^{s-1}} \left(1 + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} + \|\psi\|_{C^r}\right) + \|\dot{\eta}\|_{C^{r-1}}, \quad \forall \dot{\eta} \in H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \cap C^{r+\frac{1}{2}},$$

(5.7)

$$\|d_\psi f^1(\eta, \psi) \dot{\psi}\|_{H^{s-1}} \lesssim \|\dot{\psi}\|_{H^{s-\frac{3}{2}}} + \|\dot{\psi}\|_{C^{r-\frac{3}{2}}}, \quad \forall \dot{\psi} \in H^s \cap C^r.$$

Lemma 5.6. — *The estimate (5.6) holds.*

Proof. — From the definition of f^1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{d}_\eta f^1(\eta, \psi)\dot{\eta} &= -G(B\dot{\eta}) - \operatorname{div}(V\dot{\eta}) \\ &\quad - \{T_{\dot{\lambda}}(\psi - T_B\eta) - T_\lambda T_{\dot{B}}\eta - T_\lambda T_B\dot{\eta} - T_{\dot{V}}\nabla\eta - T_V\nabla\dot{\eta}\} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^5 I_j, \end{aligned}$$

where $\dot{B} := d_\eta B(\eta, \psi)\dot{\eta}$ and similarly for \dot{V} , $\dot{\lambda}$; and

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &:= T_{\dot{V}}\eta, \quad I_2 := -V\nabla\dot{\eta} + T_V\nabla\dot{\eta}, \quad I_3 := -T_{\dot{\lambda}}(\psi - T_B\eta), \\ I_4 &:= T_\lambda T_{\dot{B}}\eta, \quad I_5 := -G(B\dot{\eta}) - (\operatorname{div} V)\dot{\eta} + T_\lambda T_B\dot{\eta}. \end{aligned}$$

1. For I_2 we write $I_2 = -T_{\nabla\dot{\eta}}V - R(\nabla\dot{\eta}, V)$ and use (6.11), (6.18) to estimate

$$\|I_2\|_{H^{s-1}} \lesssim \|V\|_{H^{s-1}} \|\nabla\dot{\eta}\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|\dot{\eta}\|_{C^{r-1}}.$$

2. To estimate the other terms, we need to study \dot{B} and \dot{V} . For the former, the only nontrivial point is $\mathfrak{d}_\eta[G(\eta)\psi]\dot{\eta}$:

$$(5.8) \quad \mathfrak{d}_\eta[G(\eta)\psi]\dot{\eta} = -G(\eta)(B\dot{\eta}) - \operatorname{div}(V\dot{\eta}).$$

Consequently,

$$\|\mathfrak{d}_\eta[G(\eta)\psi]\dot{\eta}\|_{H^{s-2}} \lesssim \|\dot{\eta}\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|V\dot{\eta}\|_{H^{s-1}} \lesssim \|\dot{\eta}\|_{H^{s-1}}.$$

Therefore, $\|\dot{B}\|_{H^{s-2}} \lesssim \|\dot{\eta}\|_{H^{s-1}}$. This together with the relation $V = \nabla\psi - B\nabla\eta$ imply that

$$\|\dot{B}\|_{H^{s-2}} + \|\dot{V}\|_{H^{s-2}} \lesssim \|\dot{\eta}\|_{H^{s-1}}.$$

A consequence, the paraproduct rule (6.14) gives with $s - 3/2 > d/2$

$$\|I_1\|_{H^{s-1}} \lesssim \|\dot{V}\|_{H^{s-2}} \|\nabla\eta\|_{H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}} \lesssim \|\dot{\eta}\|_{H^{s-1}}.$$

Similarly,

$$\|I_4\|_{H^{s-1}} \lesssim \|T_{\dot{B}}\eta\|_{H^s} \lesssim \|\dot{B}\|_{H^{s-2}} \|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \lesssim \|\dot{\eta}\|_{H^{s-1}}.$$

3. For I_3 one estimates $\dot{\lambda}$ exactly as for \dot{l} in the proof of Proposition 5.4.

4. For I_5 we follow [1] using a key cancellation in Lemma 2.12, [1] whose proof applies also at our regularity level:

$$G(\eta)B = -\operatorname{div} V + R, \quad \|R\|_{H^{s-1}} \lesssim 1.$$

On the other hand, it follows from Proposition 2.15 that

$$G(\eta)(B\dot{\eta}) = T_{\lambda(1)}B\dot{\eta} + F(\eta, B\dot{\eta}), \quad G(\eta)(B) = T_{\lambda(1)}B + F(\eta, B)$$

with

$$\|F(\eta, B\dot{\eta})\|_{H^{s-1}} \lesssim \|\dot{\eta}\|_{H^{s-1}}, \quad \|F(\eta, B)\|_{H^{s-1}} \lesssim 1.$$

Then plugging these parilinearizations into the expression of I_5 gives $I_5 = J_1 + J_2$ with

$$J_1 = -T_{\lambda^{(1)}}(B\dot{\eta} - T_B\dot{\eta} - T_{\dot{\eta}}B),$$

$$J_2 = T_{\lambda^{(0)}}T_B\dot{\eta} + [T_{\dot{\eta}}, T_{\lambda^{(1)}}]B + T_{\dot{\eta}}F(\eta, B) + (\dot{\eta} - T_{\dot{\eta}})\operatorname{div} V - F(\eta, B\dot{\eta}) - T_{\dot{\eta}}R.$$

For J_1 one applies (6.12) to have

$$\|J_1\|_{H^{s-1}} \lesssim \|R(B, \dot{\eta})\|_{H^s} \lesssim \|\dot{\eta}\|_{H^{s-1}} \|B\|_{C^1} \lesssim \|\dot{\eta}\|_{H^{s-1}} \left(1 + \|\eta\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} + \|\psi\|_{C^r}\right).$$

For J_2 we only need to take care of the commutator $[T_{\dot{\eta}}, T_{\lambda^{(1)}}]B$. Since $\|B\|_{H^{s-1}} \lesssim 1$ it suffices to prove that $[T_{\dot{\eta}}, T_{\lambda^{(1)}}]$ has order 0 with norm from $H^{s-1} \rightarrow H^{s-1}$ bounded by the right hand side of (5.6). This is in turn a consequence of Theorem 6.4 (ii) and the fact that $r - 1 > 1$. This concludes the proof. \square

Finally, we prove

Lemma 5.7. — *The estimate (5.7) holds.*

Writing $B = B(\eta, \psi)$, $V = V(\eta, \psi)$ we have since f^1 is linear with respect to ψ that

$$d_\psi f^1(\eta, \psi)\dot{\psi} = G(\eta)\dot{\psi} - T_\lambda(\dot{\psi} - T_{B(\eta, \psi)}\eta) - T_{V(\eta, \psi)} \cdot \nabla \eta =: R(\eta, \dot{\psi}).$$

Estimate (5.7) means that R is of order $-1/2$ in $\dot{\psi}$ and acts from $H^{s-3/2}$ to H^{s-1} . In fact, we have proved in Proposition 2.12 that R is of order $-1/2$ and acts from H^s to $H^{s+1/2}$. Here, we shall follow the proof of Proposition 2.12 except that we do not need to use the good unknown u in (2.31) and we do not need to track the lower Sobolev index s_0 . Lemma 5.7 is a consequence of the following.

Lemma 5.8. — *Let $d \geq 1$, $h > 0$ and*

$$s > \frac{3}{2} + \frac{d}{2}, \quad 2 < r < s + \frac{d}{2} + \frac{1}{2}.$$

Then there exist a non-decreasing function $\mathcal{F} : \mathbf{R}^+ \times \mathbf{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^+$ such that for any $\eta \in H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}$ satisfying $\operatorname{dist}(\eta, \Gamma) \geq h > 0$ and $\psi \in H^s \cap C^r$, we have

$$(5.9) \quad \|G(\eta)\psi - T_\lambda(\psi - T_B\eta) - T_V \cdot \nabla \eta\|_{H^{s-1}} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^s} \right) \times \\ \times \left(\|\psi\|_{H^{s-\frac{3}{2}}} + \|\psi\|_{C^{r-\frac{3}{2}}} \right).$$

Proof. — We first remark that

$$\|T_\lambda T_B \eta\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|T_V \cdot \nabla \eta\|_{H^{s-1}} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^s} \right) \left(\|B\|_{C^{-\frac{1}{2}}} + \|V\|_{C^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \right).$$

On the other hand, (2.22) implies

$$\|B\|_{C^{-\frac{1}{2}}} + \|V\|_{C^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \left(\|\psi\|_{H^{s-\frac{3}{2}}} + \|\psi\|_{C^{r-\frac{3}{2}}} \right).$$

Therefore, the proof of (5.9) reduces to showing that

$$(5.10) \quad \|G(\eta)\psi - T_\lambda\psi\|_{H^{s-1}} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^s} \right) \left(\|\psi\|_{H^{s-\frac{3}{2}}} + \|\psi\|_{C^{r-\frac{3}{2}}} \right).$$

Step 1 (Estimates for v .) First, let v be as in (2.7), which satisfies equation (2.8). Let $z_0 \in (-1, 0)$ and set $J = [z_0, 0]$. Proposition 2.4 applied with $\sigma = s - 5/2 \geq -1/2$ gives the Sobolev estimates

$$(5.11) \quad \|\nabla_{x,z}v\|_{X^{s-\frac{5}{2}}(J)} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \|\psi\|_{H^{s-\frac{3}{2}}}.$$

Then from equation (2.8) itself and the product rule (6.15) we obtain

$$(5.12) \quad \|\partial_z^2 v\|_{X^{s-\frac{7}{2}}(J)} \leq \|\nabla_{x,z}v\|_{X^{s-\frac{5}{2}}(J)} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \|\psi\|_{H^{s-\frac{3}{2}}}.$$

Proposition 2.9 applied with $\mu = 5/2$ on the other hand, implies the following Hölder estimate

$$(5.13) \quad \|\nabla_{x,z}v\|_{C(J; C^{r-\frac{5}{2}})} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^s} \right) \left(\|\psi\|_{H^{r-\frac{3}{2}}} + \|\psi\|_{C^{r-\frac{3}{2}}} \right).$$

Again, we shall use (2.8) to derive a bound for $\partial_z^2 v$ in $C(J; C_*^{-3/2})$, for which we use the Bony decomposition

$$\alpha \Delta_x v = T_\alpha \Delta_x v + T_{\Delta_x v} \alpha + R(\alpha, \Delta_x v)$$

where the paraproduct terms are estimated using (6.18), (6.17) together with (5.13) for $\Delta_x v$; (2.10) and Sobolev embedding for α . For the remainder term one uses (6.13) as follows:

$$\|R(\alpha, \Delta_x v)\|_{L^\infty C^{-\frac{3}{2}}} \lesssim \|R(\alpha, \Delta_x v)\|_{L^\infty H^{-\frac{3}{2}+d-\frac{d}{2}}} \lesssim \|\alpha\|_{L^\infty H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}} \|\Delta_x v\|_{L^\infty H^{s-\frac{7}{2}}},$$

noticing that $s > 3/2 + d/2$, hence $s - 7/2 + s - 1/2 > \max\{0, -3/2 + d\}$. The term $\beta \nabla_x \partial_z v$ is treated identically, so we are left with $\gamma \partial_z v$:

$$\|\gamma \partial_z v\|_{L^\infty C^{-\frac{3}{2}}} \lesssim \|\gamma \partial_z v\|_{L^\infty H^{-\frac{3}{2}+\frac{d}{2}}} \lesssim \|\gamma\|_{L^\infty H^{s-\frac{3}{2}}} \|\partial_z v\|_{L^\infty H^{s-\frac{5}{2}}},$$

where we have applied (6.19). Therefore, we obtain

$$(5.14) \quad \|\partial_z^2 v\|_{C(J; C^{-\frac{3}{2}})} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}}, \|\psi\|_{H^s} \right) \left(\|\psi\|_{H^{s-\frac{3}{2}}} + \|\psi\|_{C^{r-\frac{3}{2}}} \right).$$

Step 2. To simplify notations, we shall write $g_1 \sim_E g_2$ iff the E -norm of $g_1 - g_2$ is bounded by the right-hand side of (5.10), which shall be denoted by r.h.s. As in Proposition 2.13, set

$$P := \partial_z^2 + T_\alpha \Delta_x + T_\beta \cdot \nabla_x \partial_z - T_\gamma \partial_z.$$

From equation (2.8) there holds

$$0 = (\partial_z^2 + \alpha \Delta_x + \beta \cdot \nabla_x \partial_z - \gamma \partial_z)v = Pv + Qv$$

with

$$Qv := [T_{\Delta v} \alpha + R(\Delta v, \alpha)] + [T_{\nabla \partial_z v} \beta + R(\nabla \partial_z v, \beta)] - [T_{\partial_z v} \gamma + R(\partial_z v, \gamma)].$$

For the first bracket, we have according to (6.16), (6.12) and (5.11), (5.13)

$$\|T_{\Delta v} \alpha\|_{L^2 H^{s-\frac{3}{2}}} + \|R(\Delta v, \alpha)\|_{L^2 H^{s-\frac{3}{2}}} \lesssim \|\Delta v\|_{L^\infty C^{-\frac{3}{2}}} (\|\alpha - h^2\|_{L^2 H^s} + 1) \lesssim r.h.s.$$

Estimates for other terms follow along the same lines. We conclude that $Pv \sim 0$. Next, by virtue of Lemma 2.14,

$$(\partial_z - T_a)(\partial_z - T_A)v \sim_{Y^{s-1}} 0.$$

Then, following exactly the proof of Proposition 2.12, we obtain as in (2.34) that

$$\|\partial_z v - T_A v\|_{X^{s-1}} \lesssim r.h.s.$$

Consequently, we deduce by using again the Bony decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1 + |\nabla \rho|^2}{\partial_z \rho} \partial_z v - \nabla \rho \cdot \nabla v &\sim_{X^{s-1}} T_{\frac{1+|\nabla \rho|^2}{\partial_z \rho}} \partial_z v - T_{\nabla \rho} \nabla v \\ &\sim_{X^{s-1}} T_{\frac{1+|\nabla \rho|^2}{\partial_z \rho}} T_A v - T_{\nabla \rho} \nabla v \sim T_{\frac{1+|\nabla \rho|^2}{\partial_z \rho} A} v - T_{\nabla \rho} \nabla v \\ &\sim_{X^{s-1}} T_\Lambda v \end{aligned}$$

with $\Lambda = \frac{1+|\nabla \rho|^2}{\partial_z \rho} A - i \nabla \eta \cdot \xi$ satisfying $\Lambda|_{z=0} = \lambda$. The proof of (5.10) is complete. \square

5.3. Contraction estimate for solutions. — In views of notations (5.2), (5.3) and (5.5), we have proved in subsections 5.1, 5.2 the following result for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$.

$$\|f(\eta_1, \psi_1)(t) - f(\eta_2, \psi_2)(t)\|_{H^{s-1} \times H^{s-\frac{3}{2}}} \leq \mathcal{F}(M_{s,T}^1, M_{s,T}^2) (P_H(t) + P_S(t)Q(t)).$$

Consequently, this together with Lemma 5.2 implies that the difference of solutions satisfies

$$(5.15) \quad (\partial_t + T_{V_1} \cdot \nabla + \mathcal{L}_1) \begin{pmatrix} \delta \eta \\ \delta \psi \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} g_1 \\ g_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

where, again

$$(5.16) \quad \|(g_1(t), g_2(t))\|_{H^{s-1} \times H^{s-\frac{3}{2}}} \leq \mathcal{F}(M_{s,T}^1, M_{s,T}^2) (P_H(t) + P_S(t)Q(t)), \quad a.e. t \in [0, T].$$

5.3.1. *Symmetrization.* — Now, we symmetrize (5.15) using the symmetrizer

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} T_{p_1} & 0 \\ 0 & T_{q_1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ -T_{B_1} & I \end{pmatrix}.$$

The dispersive part \mathcal{L} . Recall Definition 3.8 on equivalence of two families of operators $A(t)$ and $B(t)$, $t \in [0, T]$:

$$\|A(t) - B(t)\|_{H^\mu \rightarrow H^{\mu-m+\frac{3}{2}}} \leq \mathcal{F} \left(\|\eta(t)\|_{H^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \left(1 + \|\eta(t)\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} \right).$$

By virtue of Proposition 3.10 we obtain (we skip the subscript 1 in the following computations)

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{pmatrix} T_p & 0 \\ 0 & T_q \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ -T_B & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ T_B & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -T_\lambda \\ T_l & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} T_p & 0 \\ 0 & T_q \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -T_\lambda \\ T_l & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -T_p T_\lambda \\ T_q T_l & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &\sim \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -T_\gamma T_q \\ T_\gamma T_p & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -T_\gamma \\ T_\gamma & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} T_p & 0 \\ 0 & T_q \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$S\mathcal{L}_1 \sim \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -T_{\gamma_1} \\ T_{\gamma_1} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} T_{p_1} & 0 \\ 0 & T_{q_1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ -T_{B_1} & I \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore, if we set

$$\Phi_1 := T_{p_1} \delta\eta, \quad \Phi_2 := T_{q_1} (\delta\psi - T_{B_1} \delta\eta),$$

then Φ_1, Φ_2 satisfy

$$S\mathcal{L}_1 \begin{pmatrix} \delta\eta \\ \delta\psi \end{pmatrix} \sim \begin{pmatrix} -T_{\gamma_1} \Phi_2 \\ T_{\gamma_1} \Phi_1 \end{pmatrix},$$

which means that

$$\left\| S\mathcal{L}_1 \begin{pmatrix} \delta\eta \\ \delta\psi \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} -T_{\gamma_1} \Phi_2 \\ T_{\gamma_1} \Phi_1 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{H^{s-\frac{3}{2}}} (t) \leq \mathcal{F} (M_{s,T}^1, M_{s,T}^2) \left(1 + \|\eta_1\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} \right) P_S(t).$$

The convection part $\partial_t + T_{V_1} \nabla$: one proceeds as in the proof Proposition 3.11 and get

$$S (\partial_t + T_{V_1} \cdot \nabla) \begin{pmatrix} \delta\eta \\ \delta\psi \end{pmatrix} = (\partial_t + T_{V_1} \cdot \nabla) S \begin{pmatrix} \delta\eta \\ \delta\psi \end{pmatrix} + R = (\partial_t + T_{V_1} \cdot \nabla) S \begin{pmatrix} \Phi_1 \\ \Phi_2 \end{pmatrix} + R$$

where the remainder R verifies

$$\|R(t)\|_{H^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \times H^{s-\frac{3}{2}}} \leq \mathcal{F} (M_{s,T}^1, M_{s,T}^2) \left(1 + \|\eta_1\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}} \right) P_S(t).$$

In conclusion, we have derived that

$$(5.17) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t \Phi_1 + T_{V_1} \cdot \nabla \Phi_1 - T_{\gamma_1} \Phi_2 = F_1 + G_1, \\ \partial_t \Phi_2 + T_{V_1} \cdot \nabla \Phi_2 + T_{\gamma_2} \Phi_2 = F_2 + G_2 \end{cases}$$

where for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$,

$$(5.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \|(F_1, F_2)\|_{H^{s-\frac{3}{2}} \times H^{s-\frac{3}{2}}} &\leq \mathcal{F}(M_{s,T}^1, M_{s,T}^2) \left(1 + \|\eta_1\|_{C^{r+\frac{1}{2}}}\right) P_S(t) \\ &\leq \mathcal{F}(M_{s,T}^1, M_{s,T}^2) (P_H(t) + P_S(t)Q(t)). \end{aligned}$$

and from (5.15)

$$\begin{pmatrix} G_1 \\ G_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} T_{p_1} g_1 \\ T_{q_1} (g_2 - T_{B_1} g_1) \end{pmatrix}.$$

It follows from (5.16) that (G_1, G_2) also satisfy

$$(5.19) \quad \|(G_1, G_2)\|_{H^{s-\frac{3}{2}} \times H^{s-\frac{3}{2}}} \leq \mathcal{F}(M_{s,T}^1, M_{s,T}^2) (P_H(t) + P_S(t)Q(t)).$$

5.3.2. *Contraction estimates.* — Put $\Phi := \Phi_1 + i\Phi_2$, then

$$(5.20) \quad \partial_t \Phi + T_{V_1} \cdot \nabla \Phi + iT_{\gamma_1} \Phi = F + G := (F_1 + iF_2) + (G_1 + iG_2).$$

We are now back to the situation of Proposition 4.1: we shall conjugate (5.20) with an operator of order $s - 3/2$ and then perform an L^2 -energy estimate. As in (4.3), we choose

$$\wp_1 = (\gamma_1^{(3/2)})^{2(s-\frac{3}{2})/3}, \quad \varphi = T_{\wp_1} \Phi.$$

After conjugating with T_{\wp_1} , one obtains

$$(5.21) \quad (\partial_t + T_{V_1} \cdot \nabla + iT_{\gamma_1}) \varphi = T_{\wp_1} (F + G) + H$$

with

$$H := T_{\partial_t \wp_1} \Phi + [T_{V_1} \cdot \nabla, T_{\wp_1}] \Phi + i[T_{\gamma_1}, T_{\wp_1}] \Phi.$$

It is easy to see as in the proof of Proposition 4.4 (using Lemma 3.6) that

$$(5.22) \quad \begin{aligned} \|H(t)\|_{H^{s-\frac{3}{2}}} &\leq \mathcal{F}(M_{s,T}^1, M_{s,T}^2) Q(t) \|\Phi(t)\|_{H^{s-\frac{3}{2}}} \\ &\leq \mathcal{F}(M_{s,T}^1, M_{s,T}^2) Q(t) [\|\Phi(t)\|_{L^2} + \|\varphi(t)\|_{L^2}]. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, from the estimates (5.18), (5.19) for F, G we get

$$(5.23) \quad \|T_{\wp_1} (F + G)\|_{L^2} \leq \mathcal{F}(M_{s,T}^1, M_{s,T}^2) (P_H(t) + P_S(t)Q(t)).$$

Now, using (5.22), (5.23) and (4.15), (4.16) we deduce from equation (5.21) that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \|\varphi(t)\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq \mathcal{F}(M_{s,T}^1, M_{s,T}^2) \{ [P_H(t) + Q(t)P_S(t) + Q(t) \|\Phi(t)\|_{L^2}] \|\varphi(t)\|_{L^2} + \\ &\quad 2Q(t) \|\varphi(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \}. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\|\Phi(t)\|_{L^2} \leq \mathcal{F}(M_{s,T}^1, M_{s,T}^2) P_S(t), \quad \int_0^T Q(t) dt \leq 1 + Z_{r,T}^1 + Z_{r,T}^2,$$

Grönwall inequality then gives (see Notations 4.10, 5.3)

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|\varphi(t)\|_{L^2} &\leq \mathcal{F}(\dots) \left(\|\varphi(0)\|_{L^2} + \int_0^t [Q(m)P_S(m) + P_H(m)] dm \right) \\
 (5.24) \quad &\leq \mathcal{F}(\dots) \left(\|\varphi(0)\|_{L^2} + T^{\frac{1}{p'}} [(1 + Z_{r,T}^1 + Z_{r,T}^2)P_{S,T} + P_{H,T}] \right) \\
 &\leq \mathcal{F}(\dots) \left(P_S(0) + T^{\frac{1}{p'}} P_T \right)
 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}(\dots) = \mathcal{F}(M_{s,T}^1, M_{s,T}^2, Z_{r,T}^1, Z_{r,T}^2), \quad \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1.$$

The next step is to go back from φ to $(\delta\eta, \delta\psi)$. To do this, one uses again Proposition 3.6 (and the Remark following it) to get

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|\delta\eta\|_{H^{s-1}} &\leq \mathcal{F}\left(\|\eta_1\|_{H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}}\right) \left[\|T_\varphi T_p \delta\eta\|_{L^2} + \|\delta\eta\|_{H^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \right], \\
 \|\delta\psi\|_{H^{s-\frac{3}{2}}} &\leq \mathcal{F}\left(\|\eta_1\|_{H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}}\right) \left[\|T_\varphi T_q \delta\psi\|_{L^2} + \|\delta\psi\|_{H^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \right].
 \end{aligned}$$

Then, in view of (5.24) it remains to estimate $\|\delta\eta\|_{H^{-\frac{1}{2}}}$ and $\|\delta\psi\|_{H^{-\frac{1}{2}}}$ by r.h.s. For η we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|\delta\eta(t)\|_{H^{-\frac{1}{2}}} &\leq \|\delta\eta(0)\|_{H^{-\frac{1}{2}}} + \|\delta\eta(t) - \delta\eta(0)\|_{H^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \\
 &\leq \|\delta\eta(0)\|_{H^{-\frac{1}{2}}} + \left\| \int_0^t \frac{d}{dt} \delta\eta(m) dm \right\|_{H^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \\
 &\leq \|\delta\eta(0)\|_{H^{-\frac{1}{2}}} + T \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| \frac{d}{dt} \delta\eta(t) \right\|_{H^{-\frac{1}{2}}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

The last term can be written as

$$\frac{d}{dt} \delta\eta(t) = G(\eta_1(t))\psi_1(t) - G(\eta_2(t))\psi_2(t) = G(\eta_1)\delta\psi + [G(\eta_1(t)) - G(\eta_2(t))]\psi_2(t).$$

The Sobolev estimate for the Ditchlet-Neumann operator in Theorem 2.5 applied with $\sigma = s - 3/2 > 1/2$ gives

$$\|G(\eta_1)\delta\psi\|_{H^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \lesssim \|G(\eta_1)\delta\psi\|_{H^{s-\frac{5}{2}}} \lesssim \|\delta\psi\|_{H^{s-\frac{3}{2}}}.$$

On the other hand, using the shape-derivative formula and Theorem 2.5 again, one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|[G(\eta_1(t)) - G(\eta_2(t))]\psi_2(t)\|_{L^2} &\leq \left\| \int_0^1 d_\eta [G((\eta_1(t) + m\delta\eta(t))\psi_2(t)) (\delta\eta(t))] dm \right\|_{L^2} \\
 &\leq \left\| \int_0^1 \left\{ G(\tilde{\eta}(m))(\tilde{B}\delta\eta(t)) + \operatorname{div}(\tilde{V}(m)\delta\eta(t)) \right\} dm \right\|_{H^{s-2}} \\
 &\leq \|\delta\eta\|_{H^{s-1}}
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\eta}(m) = \eta_1 + m\delta\eta$, $\tilde{B}(m) = B(\tilde{\eta}(m), \psi_2)$, $\tilde{V}(m) = V(\tilde{\eta}(m), \psi_2)$. Summing up, we obtain

$$\|\delta\eta(t)\|_{H^{s-1}} \leq \mathcal{F}(M_{s,T}^1, M_{s,T}^2, Z_{r,T}^1, Z_{r,T}^2) \left(P_S(0) + T^{\frac{1}{p'}} P(t) \right).$$

The quantity $\|\delta\psi\|_{H^{-\frac{1}{2}}}$ is treated in the same way using instead the second equation in (1.5). Therefore, we end up with the following estimate

$$\|(\delta\eta(t), \delta\psi(t))\|_{H^{s-1} \times H^{s-\frac{3}{2}}} \leq \mathcal{F}(M_{s,T}^1, M_{s,T}^2, Z_{r,T}^1, Z_{r,T}^2) \left(P_S(0) + T^{\frac{1}{p'}} P(t) \right),$$

which implies

$$(5.25) \quad P_{S,T} \leq \mathcal{F}(M_{s,T}^1, M_{s,T}^2, Z_{r,T}^1, Z_{r,T}^2) \left(P_H(0) + T^{\frac{1}{p'}} P_T \right).$$

Observe that (5.25) is an a priori estimate for the Sobolev norm of the difference of solutions. To close this estimate, we seek a similar estimate in Hölder norm. For this purpose we apply the Strichartz estimates in our companion paper [26] to the dispersive equation (5.20). According to this result, for

$$2 < r < r' < s - \frac{d}{2} + \mu,$$

and

$$(5.26) \quad \begin{cases} \mu = \frac{3}{20}, p = 4 & \text{when } d = 1, \\ \mu = \frac{3}{10}, p = 2 & \text{when } d \geq 2 \end{cases}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi\|_{L^p W^{r'-\frac{3}{2}}} &\leq C \|\Phi\|_{L^p W^{s-\frac{d}{2}-\frac{3}{2}+\mu}} \\ &\leq \mathcal{F}(M_{s,T}^1, Z_{r,T}^1) \left(\|F + G\|_{L^p H^{s-\frac{3}{2}}} + \|\Phi\|_{L^\infty H^{s-\frac{3}{2}}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which, combined with (5.18) and (5.19) implies

$$\|\Phi\|_{L^p W^{r'-\frac{3}{2}}} \leq \mathcal{F}(M_{s,T}^1, Z_{r,T}^1) \left(P_T + \|\Phi\|_{L^\infty H^{s-\frac{3}{2}}} \right) \leq \mathcal{F}(M_{s,T}^1, Z_{r,T}^1) P_T.$$

Then by interpolating between r , r' and using the symbolic calculus in Theorem 6.4 one obtains for some $\delta = \delta(r, s) > 0$:

$$(5.27) \quad P_{H,T} \leq \mathcal{F}(M_{s,T}^1, M_{s,T}^2, Z_{r,T}^1, Z_{r,T}^2) T^\delta P_T.$$

Combining (5.25) and (5.27) we end up with a closed a priori estimate for the difference of two solutions of (1.5) in terms of Sobolev norm and Strichartz norm:

$$P_T \leq \mathcal{F}(M_{s,T}^1, M_{s,T}^2, Z_{r,T}^1, Z_{r,T}^2) \left(P_S(0) + T^\delta P_T \right).$$

This implies $P_{T_1} \leq \mathcal{F}(\dots) P_S(0)$ for some $T_1 > 0$ small enough and depending only on $\mathcal{F}(\dots)$. Then iterating this estimate between $[T_1, 2T_1], \dots, [T - T_1, T]$ we obtain the following result.

Theorem 5.9. — Let (η_j, ψ_j) , $j = 1, 2$ be two solutions to (1.5) on $I = [0, T]$, $0 < T \leq 1$ such that

$$(\eta_j, \psi_j) \in L^\infty(I; H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{R}^d) \times H^s(\mathbf{R}^d)) \cap L^p(I; W^{r+\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{R}^d) \times W^{r,\infty}(\mathbf{R}^d))$$

with

$$s > \frac{3}{2} + \frac{d}{2}, \quad 2 < r < s - \frac{d}{2} + \mu;$$

where μ, p are given by (5.26) and such that $\inf_{t \in [0, T]} \text{dist}(\eta_j(t), \Gamma) > h > 0$. Set

$$M_{s,T}^j := \|(\eta_j, \psi_j)\|_{L^\infty([0, T]; H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s)}, \quad Z_{r,T}^j := \|(\eta_j, \psi_j)\|_{L^p([0, T]; W^{r+\frac{1}{2}} \times W^{r,\infty})}.$$

Consider the differences $\delta\eta := \eta_1 - \eta_2$, $\delta\psi := \psi_1 - \psi_2$ and their norms in Sobolev space and Hölder space:

$$P_T := \|(\delta\eta, \delta\psi)\|_{L^\infty(I; H^{s-1} \times H^{s-\frac{3}{2}})} + \|(\delta\eta, \delta\psi)\|_{L^p(I; W^{r-1,\infty} \times W^{r-\frac{3}{2},\infty})}.$$

Then there exists a non-decreasing function $\mathcal{F}_h : \mathbf{R}^+ \times \mathbf{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^+$ depending only on d, r, s, h such that

$$P_T \leq \mathcal{F}_h(M_{s,T}^1, M_{s,T}^2, Z_{r,T}^1, Z_{r,T}^2) \|(\delta\eta, \delta\psi)|_{t=0}\|_{H^{s-1} \times H^{s-\frac{3}{2}}}.$$

6. Appendix: Paradifferential Calculus and technical results

Definition 6.1. — 1. (Littlewood-Paley decomposition) Let $\kappa \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}^d)$ be such that

$$\kappa(\theta) = 1 \quad \text{for } |\theta| \leq 1.1, \quad \kappa(\theta) = 0 \quad \text{for } |\theta| \geq 1.9.$$

Then we define $\chi(\theta, \eta) = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \kappa_{k-3}(\theta) \varphi_k(\eta)$, where

$$\kappa_k(\theta) = \kappa(2^{-k}\theta) \quad \text{for } k \in \mathbf{Z}, \quad \varphi_0 = \kappa_0, \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_k = \kappa_k - \kappa_{k-1} \quad \text{for } k \geq 1.$$

Given a temperate distribution u and an integer k in \mathbf{N} we also introduce $S_k u$ and $\Delta_k u$ by $S_k u = \kappa_k(D_x)u$ and $\Delta_k u = S_k u - S_{k-1} u$ for $k \geq 1$ and $\Delta_0 u = S_0 u$. Then we have the formal decomposition

$$u = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \Delta_k u.$$

2. (Zygmund spaces) If s is any real number, we define the Zygmund class $C_*^s(\mathbf{R}^d)$ as the space of tempered distributions u such that

$$\|u\|_{C_*^s} := \sup_q 2^{qs} \|\Delta_q u\|_{L^\infty} < +\infty.$$

3. (Hölder spaces) For $k \in \mathbf{N}$, we denote by $W^{k,\infty}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ the usual Sobolev spaces. For $\rho = k + \sigma$, $k \in \mathbf{N}, \sigma \in (0, 1)$ denote by $W^{\rho,\infty}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ the space of

functions whose derivatives up to order k are bounded and uniformly Hölder continuous with exponent σ .

Let us review notations and results about Bony's paradifferential calculus (see [13, 27, 38]). Here we follow the presentation by Métivier in [38] and [3], [5].

Definition 6.2. — 1. (Symbols) Given $\rho \in [0, \infty)$ and $m \in \mathbf{R}$, $\Gamma_\rho^m(\mathbf{R}^d)$ denotes the space of locally bounded functions $a(x, \xi)$ on $\mathbf{R}^d \times (\mathbf{R}^d \setminus 0)$, which are C^∞ with respect to ξ for $\xi \neq 0$ and such that, for all $\alpha \in \mathbf{N}^d$ and all $\xi \neq 0$, the function $x \mapsto \partial_\xi^\alpha a(x, \xi)$ belongs to $W^{\rho, \infty}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ and there exists a constant C_α such that,

$$\forall |\xi| \geq \frac{1}{2}, \quad \|\partial_\xi^\alpha a(\cdot, \xi)\|_{W^{\rho, \infty}(\mathbf{R}^d)} \leq C_\alpha (1 + |\xi|)^{m - |\alpha|}.$$

Let $a \in \Gamma_\rho^m(\mathbf{R}^d)$, we define the semi-norm

$$(6.1) \quad M_\rho^m(a) = \sup_{|\alpha| \leq d/2 + 1 + \rho} \sup_{|\xi| \geq 1/2} \left\| (1 + |\xi|)^{|\alpha| - m} \partial_\xi^\alpha a(\cdot, \xi) \right\|_{W^{\rho, \infty}(\mathbf{R}^d)}.$$

2. (Paradifferential operators) Given a symbol a , we define the paradifferential operator T_a by

$$(6.2) \quad \widehat{T_a u}(\xi) = (2\pi)^{-d} \int \chi(\xi - \eta, \eta) \widehat{a}(\xi - \eta, \eta) \psi(\eta) \widehat{u}(\eta) d\eta,$$

where $\widehat{a}(\theta, \xi) = \int e^{-ix \cdot \theta} a(x, \xi) dx$ is the Fourier transform of a with respect to the first variable; χ and ψ are two fixed C^∞ functions such that:

$$(6.3) \quad \psi(\eta) = 0 \quad \text{for } |\eta| \leq \frac{1}{5}, \quad \psi(\eta) = 1 \quad \text{for } |\eta| \geq \frac{1}{4},$$

and $\chi(\theta, \eta)$ is defined by $\chi(\theta, \eta) = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \kappa_{k-3}(\theta) \varphi_k(\eta)$.

Definition 6.3. — Let $m \in \mathbf{R}$. An operator T is said to be of order m if, for all $\mu \in \mathbf{R}$, it is bounded from H^μ to $H^{\mu-m}$.

Symbolic calculus for paradifferential operators is summarized in the following theorem.

Theorem 6.4. — (Symbolic calculus) Let $m \in \mathbf{R}$ and $\rho \in [0, \infty)$.

(i) If $a \in \Gamma_0^m(\mathbf{R}^d)$, then T_a is of order m . Moreover, for all $\mu \in \mathbf{R}$ there exists a constant K such that

$$(6.4) \quad \|T_a\|_{H^\mu \rightarrow H^{\mu-m}} \leq KM_0^m(a).$$

(ii) If $a \in \Gamma_\rho^m(\mathbf{R}^d)$, $b \in \Gamma_\rho^{m'}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ with $\rho > 0$. Then $T_a T_b - T_{a\sharp b}$ is of order $m + m' - \rho$ where

$$a\sharp b := \sum_{|\alpha| < \rho} \frac{(-i)^\alpha}{\alpha!} \partial_\xi^\alpha a(x, \xi) \partial_x^\alpha b(x, \xi).$$

Moreover, for all $\mu \in \mathbf{R}$ there exists a constant K such that

$$(6.5) \quad \|T_a T_b - T_{a\sharp b}\|_{H^\mu \rightarrow H^{\mu-m-m'+\rho}} \leq K M_\rho^m(a) M_0^{m'}(b) + K M_0^m(a) M_\rho^{m'}(b).$$

(iii) Let $a \in \Gamma_\rho^m(\mathbf{R}^d)$ with $\rho > 0$. Denote by $(T_a)^*$ the adjoint operator of T_a and by \bar{a} the complex conjugate of a . Then $(T_a)^* - T_{\bar{a}}$ is of order $m - \rho$ where

$$a^* = \sum_{|\alpha| < \rho} \frac{1}{i^{|\alpha|} \alpha!} \partial_\xi^\alpha \partial_x^\alpha \bar{a}.$$

Moreover, for all μ there exists a constant K such that

$$(6.6) \quad \|(T_a)^* - T_{\bar{a}}\|_{H^\mu \rightarrow H^{\mu-m+\rho}} \leq K M_\rho^m(a).$$

We also need the following definition for symbols with negative regularity.

Definition 6.5. — For $m \in \mathbf{R}$ and $\rho \in (-\infty, 0)$, $\Gamma_\rho^m(\mathbf{R}^d)$ denotes the space of distributions $a(x, \xi)$ on $\mathbf{R}^d \times (\mathbf{R}^d \setminus 0)$, which are C^∞ with respect to ξ and such that, for all $\alpha \in \mathbf{N}^d$ and all $\xi \neq 0$, the function $x \mapsto \partial_\xi^\alpha a(x, \xi)$ belongs to $C_*^\rho(\mathbf{R}^d)$ and there exists a constant C_α such that,

$$(6.7) \quad \forall |\xi| \geq \frac{1}{2}, \quad \|\partial_\xi^\alpha a(\cdot, \xi)\|_{C_*^\rho} \leq C_\alpha (1 + |\xi|)^{m-|\alpha|}.$$

For $a \in \Gamma_\rho^m$, we define

$$(6.8) \quad M_\rho^m(a) = \sup_{|\alpha| \leq 2(d+2)+|\rho|} \sup_{|\xi| \geq 1/2} \left\| (1 + |\xi|)^{|\alpha|-m} \partial_\xi^\alpha a(\cdot, \xi) \right\|_{C_*^\rho(\mathbf{R}^d)}.$$

Proposition 6.6. — Let $\rho < 0$, $m \in \mathbf{R}$ and $a \in \dot{\Gamma}_\rho^m$. Then the operator T_a is of order $m - \rho$:

$$(6.9) \quad \|T_a\|_{H^s \rightarrow H^{s-(m-\rho)}} \leq C M_\rho^m(a), \quad \|T_a\|_{C_*^s \rightarrow C_*^{s-(m-\rho)}} \leq C M_\rho^m(a).$$

Given two functions a, b defined on \mathbf{R}^d we define the remainder

$$(6.10) \quad R(a, u) = au - T_a u - T_u a.$$

We shall use frequently various estimates about paraproducts (see chapter 2 in [10], [9] and [3]) which are recalled here.

Theorem 6.7. — 1. Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbf{R}$. If $\alpha + \beta > 0$ then

$$(6.11) \quad \|R(a, u)\|_{H^{\alpha+\beta-\frac{d}{2}}(\mathbf{R}^d)} \leq K \|a\|_{H^\alpha(\mathbf{R}^d)} \|u\|_{H^\beta(\mathbf{R}^d)},$$

$$(6.12) \quad \|R(a, u)\|_{H^{\alpha+\beta}(\mathbf{R}^d)} \leq K \|a\|_{C_*^\alpha(\mathbf{R}^d)} \|u\|_{H^\beta(\mathbf{R}^d)},$$

$$(6.13) \quad \|R(a, u)\|_{C_*^{\alpha+\beta}(\mathbf{R}^d)} \leq K \|a\|_{C_*^\alpha(\mathbf{R}^d)} \|u\|_{C_*^\beta(\mathbf{R}^d)}.$$

2. Let s_0, s_1, s_2 be such that $s_0 \leq s_2$ and $s_0 < s_1 + s_2 - \frac{d}{2}$, then

$$(6.14) \quad \|T_a u\|_{H^{s_0}} \leq K \|a\|_{H^{s_1}} \|u\|_{H^{s_2}}.$$

If in addition to the conditions above, $s_1 + s_2 > 0$ then

$$(6.15) \quad \|au - T_u a\|_{H^{s_0}} \leq K \|a\|_{H^{s_1}} \|u\|_{H^{s_2}}.$$

3. Let $m > 0$ and $s \in \mathbf{R}$. Then

$$(6.16) \quad \|T_a u\|_{H^{s-m}} \leq K \|a\|_{C_*^{-m}} \|u\|_{H^s},$$

$$(6.17) \quad \|T_a u\|_{C_*^{s-m}} \leq K \|a\|_{C_*^{-m}} \|u\|_{C_*^s},$$

$$(6.18) \quad \|T_a u\|_{C_*^s} \leq K \|a\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_{C_*^s}.$$

Proposition 6.8. — 1. If $u_j \in H^{s_j}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ ($j = 1, 2$) with $s_1 + s_2 > 0$ then

$$(6.19) \quad \|u_1 u_2\|_{H^{s_0}} \leq K \|u_1\|_{H^{s_1}} \|u_2\|_{H^{s_2}},$$

if $s_0 \leq s_j$, $j = 1, 2$, and $s_0 < s_1 + s_2 - d/2$.

2. If $s \geq 0$ then

$$(6.20) \quad \|u_1 u_2\|_{H^s} \leq K (\|u_1\|_{H^s} \|u_2\|_{L^\infty} + \|u_2\|_{H^s} \|u_1\|_{L^\infty}).$$

3. If $s \geq 0$ then

$$(6.21) \quad \|u_1 u_2\|_{C_*^s} \leq K (\|u_1\|_{C_*^s} \|u_2\|_{L^\infty} + \|u_2\|_{C_*^s} \|u_1\|_{L^\infty}).$$

4. Let $\beta > \alpha > 0$. Then

$$(6.22) \quad \|u_1 u_2\|_{C_*^{-\alpha}} \leq K \|u_1\|_{C_*^\beta} \|u_2\|_{C_*^{-\alpha}}.$$

5. Let $s > d/2$ and consider $F \in C^\infty(\mathbf{C}^N)$ such that $F(0) = 0$. Then there exists a non-decreasing function $\mathcal{F}: \mathbf{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbf{R}_+$ such that, for any $U \in H^s(\mathbf{R}^d)^N$,

$$(6.23) \quad \|F(U)\|_{H^s} \leq \mathcal{F}(\|U\|_{L^\infty}) \|U\|_{H^s}.$$

6. Let $s \geq 0$ and consider $F \in C^\infty(\mathbf{C}^N)$ such that $F(0) = 0$. Then there exists a non-decreasing function $\mathcal{F}: \mathbf{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbf{R}_+$ such that, for any $U \in C_*^s(\mathbf{R}^d)^N$,

$$(6.24) \quad \|F(U)\|_{C_*^s} \leq \mathcal{F}(\|U\|_{L^\infty}) \|U\|_{C_*^s}.$$

At last, we need some technical results on parabolic regularity:

Theorem 6.9 ([10, Theorem 2.92]). — (Paralinearization) Let r, ρ be positive real numbers and F be a C^∞ function on \mathbf{R} such that $F(0) = 0$. Assume that ρ is not an integer. For any $u \in H^\mu(\mathbf{R}^d) \cap C_*^\rho(\mathbf{R}^d)$ we have

$$\|F(u) - T_{F'(u)}u\|_{H^{\mu+\rho}(\mathbf{R}^d)} \leq C(\|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbf{R}^d)}) \|u\|_{C_*^\rho(\mathbf{R}^d)} \|u\|_{H^\mu(\mathbf{R}^d)}.$$

Theorem 6.10 ([3, Proposition 2.18]). — Let $\rho \in (0, 1)$, $J = [z_0, z_1] \subset \mathbf{R}$, $p \in \Gamma_\rho^1(\mathbf{R}^d \times J)$, $q \in \Gamma_0^0(\mathbf{R}^d \times J)$ with the assumption that

$$\Re p(z; x, \xi) \geq c|\xi|,$$

for some constant $c > 0$. Assume that w solves

$$\partial_z w + T_p w = T_q w + f, \quad w|_{z=z_0} = w_0.$$

Then for any $r \in \mathbf{R}$, if $f \in Y^r(J)$ and $w_0 \in H^r$, we have $w \in X^r(J)$ and

$$\|w\|_{X^r(J)} \leq K \left\{ \|w_0\|_{H^r} + \|f\|_{Y^r(J)} \right\}.$$

for some constant K depending only on r, ρ, c , and $\mathcal{M}_\rho^1(p)$.

Theorem 6.11 ([5, Proposition 2.4]). — Let $\rho \in (0, 1)$, $J = [z_0, z_1] \subset \mathbf{R}$, $p \in \Gamma_\rho^1(\mathbf{R}^d \times J)$ with the assumption that

$$\Re p(z; x, \xi) \geq c|\xi|,$$

for some constant $c > 0$. Assume that w solves

$$\partial_z w + T_p w = F_1 + F_2, \quad w|_{z=z_0} = w_0.$$

Then for any $q \in [1, \infty]$, $(r_0, r_1) \in \mathbf{R}^2$ with $r_0 < r_1$, if

$$w \in L^\infty(J, C_*^{r_0}), \quad F_1 \in L^1(J, C_*^{r_1}), \quad F_2 \in L^q(J, C_*^{r_1-1+\frac{1}{q}+\delta}) \text{ with } \delta > 0.$$

and $w_0 \in C_*^{r_1}(\mathbf{R}^d)$, we have $w \in L^\infty(J, C_*^{r_1})$ and

$$\|w\|_{C^0(J, C_*^{r_1})} \leq K \left\{ \|w_0\|_{C_*^{r_1}} + \|F_1\|_{L^1(J, C_*^{r_1})} + \|F_2\|_{L^q(J, C_*^{r_1-1+\frac{1}{q}+\delta})} + \|w\|_{L^\infty(J, C_*^{r_0})} \right\}.$$

for some constant K depending only on $r_0, r_1, \rho, c, \delta, q$ and $\mathcal{M}_\rho^1(p)$.

References

- [1] Thomas Alazard, Nicolas Burq, and Claude Zuily. On the water waves equations with surface tension. *Duke Math. J.*, 158(3):413–499, 2011.
- [2] Thomas Alazard, Nicolas Burq, and Claude Zuily. Strichartz estimates for water waves. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 44(5):855–903, 2011.
- [3] Thomas Alazard, Nicolas Burq, and Claude Zuily. On the Cauchy problem for gravity water waves. *Invent. Math.*, 198(1): 71–163, 2014.

- [4] Thomas Alazard, Nicolas Burq and Claude Zuily. Cauchy theory for the gravity water waves system with nonlocalized initial data. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 2014.
- [5] Thomas Alazard, Nicolas Burq, and Claude Zuily. Strichartz estimate and the Cauchy problem for the gravity water waves equations. [arXiv:1404.4276](https://arxiv.org/abs/1404.4276), 2014.
- [6] Thomas Alazard and Guy Métivier. Paralinearization of the Dirichlet to Neumann operator, and regularity of three-dimensional water waves. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 34(10-12):1632–1704, 2009.
- [7] Serge Alinhac. Paracomposition et opérateurs paradifférentiels. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 11(1):87–121, 1986.
- [8] Serge Alinhac. Paracomposition et application aux équations non-linéaires. In *Bony-Sjöstrand-Meyer seminar, 1984–1985*, pages Exp. No. 11, 11. École Polytech., Palaiseau, 1985.
- [9] Hajer Bahouri and Jean-Yves Chemin. Équations d’ondes quasilineaires et estimations de Strichartz. *Amer. J. Math.*, 121(6):1337–1377, 1999.
- [10] Hajer Bahouri, Jean-Yves Chemin, and Raphaël Danchin. *Fourier analysis and nonlinear partial differential equations*, volume 343 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer, Heidelberg, 2011.
- [11] T. Brooke Benjamin and P. J. Olver. Hamiltonian structure, symmetries and conservation laws for water waves. *J. Fluid Mech.*, 125:137–185, 1982.
- [12] Matthew Blair. Strichartz estimates for wave equations with coefficients of Sobolev regularity. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 31(4-6):649–688, 2006.
- [13] Jean-Michel Bony. Calcul symbolique et propagation des singularités pour les équations aux dérivées partielles non linéaires. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 14(2):209–246, 1981.
- [14] Nicolas Burq, Patrick Gérard, and Nikolay Tzvetkov. Strichartz inequalities and the nonlinear Schrödinger equation on compact manifolds. *Amer. J. Math.*, 126(3):569–605, 2004.
- [15] Rémi Carles. Geometric optics and instability for semi-classical Schrödinger equations. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 183(3):525–553, 2007.
- [16] Michael Christ, James Colliander, et Terence Tao. Asymptotics, frequency modulation, and low regularity ill-posedness for canonical defocusing equations. *Amer. J. Math.*, 125(6):1235–1293, 2003.
- [17] Robin Ming Chen, Jeremy L. Marzuola, Daniel Sporn, and J. Douglas Wright. On the regularity of the flow map for the gravity-capillary equations. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 264(3):752–782, 2013.
- [18] Hans Christianson, Vera Mikyoung Hur, and Gigliola Staffilani. Strichartz estimates for the water-wave problem with surface tension. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 35(12):2195–2252, 2010.
- [19] Demetrios Christodoulou and Hans Lindblad. On the motion of the free surface of a liquid. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 53(12):1536–1602, 2000.

- [20] Antonio Córdoba, Diego Córdoba, and Francisco Gancedo. Interface evolution: water waves in 2-D. *Adv. Math.*, 223(1):120–173, 2010.
- [21] Daniel Coutand and Steve Shkoller. Well-posedness of the free-surface incompressible Euler equations with or without surface tension. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 20(3):829–930 (electronic), 2007.
- [22] Walter Craig. An existence theory for water waves and the Boussinesq and Korteweg-deVries scaling limits. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 10(8):787–1003, 1985.
- [23] Walter Craig and Catherine Sulem. Numerical simulation of gravity waves. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 108(1):73–83, 1993.
- [24] Walter Craig and C. Eugene Wayne. Mathematical aspects of surface waves on water. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk.*, 62(2007), 95–116.
- [25] Thibault de Poyferré. Blow-up conditions for gravity water-waves. [arXiv:1407.6881](https://arxiv.org/abs/1407.6881), 2014.
- [26] Thibault de Poyferre and Quang-Huy Nguyen. Strichartz estimates and local existence for the capillary water waves with non-Lipschitz initial velocity. [arXiv:1507.08918](https://arxiv.org/abs/1507.08918), 2015.
- [27] Lars Hörmander. *Lectures on nonlinear hyperbolic differential equations, Mathématiques & Applications (Berlin) [Mathematics & Applications]*, volume 26. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997.
- [28] Pierre Germain, Nader Masmoudi, and Jalal Shatah. Global solutions for the gravity water waves equation in dimension 3. *Annals of Mathematics*, 175(2):691–754, 2012.
- [29] Pierre Germain, Nader Masmoudi, and Jalal Shatah. Global existence for capillary water waves. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 68(4): 625–687, 2015.
- [30] John Hunter, Mihaela Ifrim, Daniel Tataru. Two dimensional water waves in holomorphic coordinates. [arXiv:1401.1252v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/1401.1252v2), 2014.
- [31] Mihaela Ifrim, Daniel Tataru. Two dimensional water waves in holomorphic coordinates II: global solutions. [arXiv:1404.7583](https://arxiv.org/abs/1404.7583), 2014.
- [32] Mihaela Ifrim, Daniel Tataru. The lifespan of small data solutions in two dimensional capillary water waves. [arXiv:1406.5471](https://arxiv.org/abs/1406.5471), 2014.
- [33] Alexandru D. Ionescu, Fabio Pusateri. Global solutions for the gravity water waves system in 2d. *Inventiones mathematicae*, Volume 199, Issue 3, pp 653–804, 2015.
- [34] Alexandru D. Ionescu, Fabio Pusateri. Global regularity for 2d water waves with surface tension . [arXiv:1408.4428](https://arxiv.org/abs/1408.4428), 2015.
- [35] David Lannes. Well-posedness of the water-waves equations. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 18(3):605–654 (electronic), 2005.
- [36] David Lannes. *Water waves: mathematical analysis and asymptotics*. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 188. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2013.

- [37] Hans Lindblad. Well-posedness for the motion of an incompressible liquid with free surface boundary. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 162(1):109–194, 2005.
- [38] Guy Métivier. *Para-differential calculus and applications to the Cauchy problem for nonlinear systems*, volume 5 of *Centro di Ricerca Matematica Ennio De Giorgi (CRM) Series*. Edizioni della Normale, Pisa, 2008.
- [39] Mei Ming and Zhifei Zhang. Well-posedness of the water-wave problem with surface tension. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* (9) 92, no. 5, 429–455, 2009.
- [40] V. I. Nalimov. The Cauchy-Poisson problem. *Dinamika Splošn. Sredy*, (Vyp. 18 Dinamika Zidkost. so Svobod. Granicami):104–210, 254, 1974.
- [41] Jalal Shatah and Chongchun Zeng. Geometry and a priori estimates for free boundary problems of the Euler equation. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 61(5):698–744, 2008.
- [42] Jalal Shatah and Chongchun Zeng. A priori estimates for fluid interface problems. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 61(6): 848–876, 2008.
- [43] Jalal Shatah and Chongchun Zeng. Local well-posedness for fluid interface problems. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 199(2): 653–705, 2011.
- [44] Hart F. Smith. A parametrix construction for wave equations with $C^{1,1}$ coefficients. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 48(3):797–835, 1998.
- [45] Gigliola Staffilani and Daniel Tataru. Strichartz estimates for a Schrödinger operator with nonsmooth coefficients. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 27(7-8):1337–1372, 2002.
- [46] Daniel Tataru. Strichartz estimates for operators with nonsmooth coefficients and the nonlinear wave equation. *Amer. J. Math.*, 122(2):349–376, 2000.
- [47] Daniel Tataru. Strichartz estimates for second order hyperbolic operators with nonsmooth coefficients. II. *Amer. J. Math.*, 123(3):385–423, 2001.
- [48] Michael E. Taylor. *pseudo-differential operators and nonlinear PDE*, volume 100 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 1991.
- [49] Chao Wang and Zhifei Zhang. Break-down criterion for the water-wave equation. [arXiv:1303.6029](https://arxiv.org/abs/1303.6029).
- [50] Sijue Wu. Well-posedness in Sobolev spaces of the full water wave problem in 2-D. *Invent. Math.*, 130(1):39–72, 1997.
- [51] Sijue Wu. Well-posedness in Sobolev spaces of the full water wave problem in 3-D. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 12(2):445–495, 1999.
- [52] Sijue Wu. Almost global wellposedness of the 2-D full water waves problem. *Invent. Math.*, 177(1):45–135, 2009.
- [53] Sijue Wu. Global wellposedness of the 3-D full water waves problem. *Invent. Math.*, 184(1):125–220, 2011.
- [54] Hideaki Yosihara. Gravity waves on the free surface of an incompressible perfect fluid of finite depth. *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.*, 18(1):49–96, 1982.
- [55] Vladimir E. Zakharov. Stability of periodic waves of finite amplitude on the surface of a deep fluid. *Journal of Applied Mechanics and Technical Physics*, 9(2):190–194, 1968.

THIBAUT DE POYFERRÉ, UMR 8553 du CNRS, Laboratoire de Mathématiques et
Applications de l'Ecole Normale Supérieure, 75005 Paris, France
E-mail : `tdepoyfe@dma.ens.fr`

QUANG-HUY NGUYEN, UMR 8628 du CNRS, Laboratoire
de Mathématiques d'Orsay, Université Paris-
Sud, 91405 Orsay Cedex, France
E-mail : `quang-huy.nguyen@math.u-psud.fr`