

On Global Classical Solutions to 1D Compressible Navier-Stokes Equations with Density-Dependent Viscosity and Vacuum*

Boqiang Lü[†] Yixuan Wang[‡] Yuhang Wu[§]

Abstract

For the initial boundary value problem of compressible barotropic Navier-Stokes equations in one-dimensional bounded domains with general density-dependent viscosity and large external force, we prove that there exists a unique global classical solution with large initial data containing vacuum. Furthermore, we show that the density is bounded from above independently of time which in particular yields the large time behavior of the solution as time tends to infinity: the density and the velocity converge to the steady states in L^p and in $W^{1,p}$ ($1 \leq p < +\infty$) respectively. Moreover, the decay rate in time of the solution is shown to be exponential. Finally, we also prove that the spatial gradient of the density will blow up as time tends to infinity when vacuum states appear initially even at one point.

Keywords: compressible Navier-Stokes equations; density-dependent viscosity; vacuum; global classical solution; large-time behavior.

1 Introduction and main results

We consider the one-dimensional compressible Navier-Stokes equations which read as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \rho_t + (\rho u)_x = 0, \\ (\rho u)_t + (\rho u^2)_x + [P(\rho)]_x - [\mu(\rho)u_x]_x = \rho f. \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

Here $t \geq 0$ is time, $x \in \Omega = (0, 1)$ is the spatial coordinate, ρ and u represent respectively the fluid density and velocity. The pressure P is given by

$$P(\rho) = A\rho^\gamma \quad (A > 0, \gamma > 1). \quad (1.2)$$

In the sequel, without loss of generality, we set $A = 1$. The viscosity $\mu(\rho)$ satisfies

$$0 < \bar{\mu} \leq \mu(\rho), \quad \forall \rho \geq 0, \quad (1.3)$$

*B. Lü is supported by NNSFC (Nos. 11601218 & 11771382), Science and Technology Project of Jiangxi Provincial Education Department (No. GJJ160719).

[†]College of Mathematics and Information Science, Nanchang Hangkong University, Nanchang 330063, P. R. China (lvbq86@163.com).

[‡]Institute of Applied Mathematics, AMSS, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, P. R. China (wangyixuan_14@163.com).

[§]Department of Physics, Beijing Normal University, Beijing, 100875, P. R. China (1095986995@qq.com).

where $\bar{\mu}$ is a given positive constant. The function $f = f(x)$ is the external force. We look for the solutions, $(\rho(x, t), u(x, t))$, to the initial-boundary-value problem with the boundary conditions:

$$u(0, t) = u(1, t) = 0, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (1.4)$$

and the initial ones:

$$(\rho, \rho u)(x, 0) = (\rho_0, \rho_0 u_0)(x). \quad (1.5)$$

There is huge literature on the studies of the global existence and large time behavior of solutions to the compressible Navier-Stokes equations. For the initial density away from vacuum, there are many results concerning the global existence and large-time dynamics of solutions to the one-dimensional(1D) problem, see [2, 7, 9, 17, 22–25] and the reference therein. For the case of density-dependent viscosity, Liu-Xin-Yang [19] obtains that the viscosity of a gas depends on the temperature for the non-isentropic case, and thus on the density for the isentropic case. For $\mu(\rho) = \rho^\theta$, under different restrictions on the index θ and the regularities of initial data, the global existence of solutions to 1D compressible Navier-Stokes equations is investigated in [5, 6, 13, 20, 21, 26, 27] and the references therein. When $\mu(\rho)$ admits a positive constant lower bound, the global well-posedness of solutions without initial vacuum to 1D problem is discussed extensively (see [1, 2, 8, 24, 25] and the references therein). Recently, in addition to (1.3), under some additional stringent condition on $\mu \in C^2[0, \infty)$:

$$\mu(\rho) \leq C(1 + P(\rho)) \quad \forall \rho \geq 0, \quad (1.6)$$

Ding-Wen-Zhu [4] proves the global existence of classical large solutions to (1.1)-(1.2) with vacuum. However, since the upper bound of the density obtained in [4] depends crucially on time, nothing is known concerning the large-time behavior of the solutions in [4]. For the initial density away from vacuum, Straškraba-Zlotnik [24, 25] proves the large time behavior of the solution (ρ, u) to (1.1). More precisely, they show that the solution (ρ, u) tends to the stationary case $(\rho_s, 0)$ as time tends to infinity. Here, the stationary density ρ_s is a solution to the stationary problem:

$$\begin{cases} [P(\rho_s)]_x = \rho_s f, & x \in (0, 1), \\ \int_0^1 \rho_s dx = \int_0^1 \rho_0 dx. \end{cases} \quad (1.7)$$

In this paper, we will study the global existence and large-time behavior of strong and classical solutions to (1.1)-(1.5) not only for general density-dependent viscosity (1.5) which is independent of $P(\rho)$ but also for the density containing vacuum initially.

Before stating the main results, we first explain the notations and conventions used throughout this paper. For $1 \leq r \leq \infty, k \geq 1$,

$$L^r = L^r(0, 1), \quad W^{k,r} = W^{k,r}(0, 1), \quad H^k = W^{k,2}(0, 1).$$

Moreover, without loss of generality, assume that the initial density ρ_0 satisfies

$$\int_0^1 \rho_0 dx = 1. \quad (1.8)$$

Our first result concerns the global existence of strong solutions with large initial data.

Theorem 1.1 Suppose that $f \in H^1$, $\mu \in C^1[0, \infty)$, and the initial data (ρ_0, u_0) satisfy

$$0 \leq \rho_0 \in H^1, \quad u_0 \in H_0^1. \quad (1.9)$$

Then, there exists a unique strong solution (ρ, u) to the problem (1.1)-(1.5) satisfying for any $0 < T < \infty$,

$$\begin{cases} \rho \in C([0, T]; H^1) \cap H^1(0, T; L^2), \\ u \in L^\infty(0, T; H_0^1) \cap L^2(0, T; H^2), \\ t^{1/2}u \in L^\infty(0, T; H^2), \quad t^{1/2}u_t \in L^2(0, T; H_0^1). \end{cases} \quad (1.10)$$

Moreover, the density remains uniformly bounded for all time, that is,

$$\sup_{0 \leq t < \infty} \|\rho(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty} < \infty, \quad (1.11)$$

and the following large-time behavior holds:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{W^{1,p}} = 0, \quad \forall p \in [1, \infty). \quad (1.12)$$

Then the following result shows that the strong solutions obtain by Theorem 1.1 become classical provided initial data (ρ_0, u_0) satisfy some additional conditions.

Theorem 1.2 In addition to (1.9), suppose that $f \in H^1$, $\mu \in C^2[0, \infty)$, and the initial data (ρ_0, u_0) satisfy

$$\rho_0 \in H^2, \quad P(\rho_0) \in H^2, \quad u_0 \in H^2 \cap H_0^1, \quad (1.13)$$

and the following compatibility condition:

$$[\mu(\rho_0)u_{0x}]_x - [P(\rho_0)]_x = \rho_0^{1/2}g, \quad (1.14)$$

for some $g \in L^2$. Then, the strong solution (ρ, u) obtained by Theorem 1.1 becomes classical and satisfies for any $0 < T < \infty$,

$$\begin{cases} \rho, P(\rho) \in C([0, T]; H^2), \\ u \in C([0, T]; H^2) \cap L^2(0, T; H^3), \\ u_t \in L^2(0, T; H_0^1), \quad t^{1/2}u \in L^\infty(0, T; H^3), \\ t^{1/2}u_t \in L^\infty(0, T; H^1) \cap L^2(0, T; H^2), \quad t^{1/2}\rho^{1/2}u_{tt} \in L^2(0, T; L^2). \end{cases} \quad (1.15)$$

For further studying the large-time behavior of the strong solutions, we first state some known results about the existence and uniqueness of positive solutions to the stationary problem (1.7), which has been discussed extensively under different conditions (see for example [24, 25, 28, 29]).

Lemma 1.1 ([29]) If $f \in L^\infty$ satisfies

$$\int_0^1 (1 - \gamma^{-1})^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} \left(\int_0^x f(y)dy - \min_{[0,1]} \int_0^x f(y)dy \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} dx < \int_0^1 \rho_0 dx, \quad (1.16)$$

there exists a unique positive solution ρ_s to (1.7) which satisfies

$$\rho_s \in W^{1,\infty}, \quad 0 < K_1 \leq \rho_s \leq K_2, \quad (1.17)$$

where K_1 and K_2 are positive constants depending on $\|f\|_{L^\infty}$.

Then, we have the following result concerning the large time asymptotic behavior of strong solutions.

Theorem 1.3 *Under the same conditions as in Theorem 1.1, for f satisfying (1.16), there are positive constants α and C depending only on the initial data and $\|f\|_{H^1}$ such that for any $p \in [1, \infty)$ and any $t > 1$,*

$$\|\rho(\cdot, t) - \rho_s(\cdot)\|_{L^p} + \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{W^{1,p}} \leq Ce^{-\frac{\alpha}{p}t}. \quad (1.18)$$

Moreover, if there exists some point $x_0 \in [0, 1]$ such that $\rho_0(x_0) = 0$, then the spatial gradient of the density the unique strong solution (ρ, u) to the problem (1.1)-(1.5) has to blow up as $t \rightarrow \infty$ in the following sense,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|\rho_x(\cdot, t)\|_{L^r} = \infty, \quad \forall r \in (1, \infty). \quad (1.19)$$

A few remarks are in order:

Remark 1.1 *It should be noted here that the solution (ρ, u) obtained in Theorem 1.2 is actually a classical one to (1.1)-(1.5). Indeed, by the Sobolev embedding theorems, we have*

$$H^k(0, 1) \hookrightarrow C^{k-\frac{1}{2}}[0, 1], \quad \text{for } k = 1, \dots, 3,$$

which together with (1.15) gives

$$(\rho, P, u) \in C([0, T]; C^{1+\frac{1}{2}}[0, 1]), \quad \rho_t \in C([0, T]; C^{\frac{1}{2}}[0, 1]). \quad (1.20)$$

Furthermore, one can deduce from (1.15) that for any $0 < \tau < T$,

$$u \in L^\infty(\tau, T; H^3), \quad u_t \in L^\infty(\tau, T; H^1) \cap L^2(\tau, T; H^2),$$

which yields that for $0 < \alpha < 1/2$,

$$u \in C([\tau, T]; C^{2,\alpha}[0, 1]), \quad u_t \in C([\tau, T]; C^\alpha[0, 1]). \quad (1.21)$$

Hence, it follows from (1.20) and (1.21) that (ρ, u) is a classical solution to (1.1)-(1.5).

Remark 1.2 *To obtain the global existence of strong solutions in Theorem 1.1, we do not need the additional compatibility condition (1.14). Indeed, we only need the initial data satisfying the compatibility condition (1.14) for some $g \in L^2$ in proving the global well-posedness of classical solution in our Theorem 1.2, which is in sharp contrast to [4] where they need $g \in H^1$. Therefore, our theorems essentially weaken those assumptions on the compatibility condition in [4].*

Remark 1.3 *In our result, the only restriction on $\mu \in C^2[0, \infty)$ is (1.3), which is much more general than those in [4] where in addition to (1.3), they need an additional stringent condition (1.6) which plays a crucial role in the analysis of [4].*

Remark 1.4 *In Theorem 1.1, we obtain the time-independent upper bound of the density in (1.11) and the large-time behavior of the velocity (1.12), which are in sharp contrast to [4] where the corresponding a priori ones depend on time. Moreover, these results also generalized the similar ones in [24, 25] where they need initial density strictly away from vacuum to the case that the density allows vacuum intially.*

Remark 1.5 *In contrast to the results in [24, 25], where the spatial L^2 -norm ρ_x is proved to be bounded independently of time provided the density strictly away from vacuum, our Theorem 1.3 shows that the spatial L^r -norm ($r > 1$) of ρ_x will blow up when time goes to infinity provided vacuum appears initially.*

We now make some comments on the analysis of this paper. We begin with the local existence theorem (see [3] or Lemma 2.1 below) of classical solutions to problem (1.1)-(1.5) with the initial density strictly away from vacuum. Then, we prove that the local strong (classical) solution with vacuum also exists and thus extend the local existence time to be global. Hence, we need some global a priori estimates which are independent of the lower bound of density. It turns out that the key issue is to derive both the time-independent lower order estimates and the time-dependent higher order ones (see Section 2). It should be noted that the methods used in Ding-Wen-Zhu [4] can not be adapted here. Indeed, on the one hand, the analysis in [4] relies heavily on the special assumption on viscosity $\mu(\rho)$ (see (1.6)), that is $\mu(\rho)$ should be bounded by $P(\rho)$ pointwisely. On the other hand, it seems difficult to study the large-time behavior of solutions since the a priori estimates obtained in [4] are all time-depending. To overcome these difficulties, motivated by Li-Xin [14, 15], we succeed in obtaining the key uniform upper bound of the density by making full use of Zlotnik inequality (see Lemma 2.3), and bounding the L^2 -norm of u_x according to the material derivative \dot{u} (see Lemma 2.4). The time-dependent higher order estimates of (ρ, u) are derived by some standard arguments and the time-weighted estimates due to [10] (see also [12, 15, 18]). Next, with both the uniform upper bound of the density and the time-independent lower order estimates at hand, we use the methods owing to Straškraba-Zlotnik [24, 25] and thus prove the following large-time behavior

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{W^{1,p}} + \|\rho - \rho_s\|_{L^p}) = 0, \quad \forall p \in [1, \infty).$$

Finally, using a key testing function $\rho_s^{-1} \int_0^x (\rho - \rho_s) dy$ motivated by Huang-Li-Xin [11] and Li-Zhang-Zhao [18], we derive the desired exponential decay rate estimate (1.18) in Theorem 1.3 (see Section 4).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we will derive the necessary a priori estimates on smooth solutions. The main results, Theorems 1.1–1.2 and 1.3, are proved in Sections 3 and 4 respectively.

2 A priori estimates

In this section, we will establish some necessary a priori bounds for smooth solutions to the problem (1.1)-(1.5) to extend the local classical solution guaranteed by following Lemma 2.1, whose proof can be completed by similar arguments as in [?, 3].

Lemma 2.1 *Assume that $f \in H^2$ and the initial data (ρ_0, u_0) satisfies*

$$0 < \delta \leq \rho_0, \quad \rho_0 \in H^3, \quad P(\rho_0) \in H^3, \quad u_0 \in H^3 \cap H_0^1.$$

Then, there exists a small time $T_0 > 0$ and a unique classical solution (ρ, u) to the problem (1.1)-(1.5) on $(0, 1) \times (0, T_0]$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \rho, P(\rho) \in C([0, T_0]; H^3), \\ u \in C([0, T_0]; H^3 \cap H_0^1) \cap L^2(0, T_0; H^4), \\ \rho_t \in C([0, T_0]; H^2), \quad u_t \in C([0, T_0]; H_0^1) \cap L^2(0, T_0; H^2). \end{cases}$$

Let $T > 0$ be a fixed time and (ρ, u) be the smooth solution to problem (1.1)-(1.5) with the initial data (ρ_0, u_0) satisfying the assumptions in Lemma 2.1.

2.1 A priori estimates(I): lower order estimates

This subsection is concerned with the time-independent lower order estimates of the solution (ρ, u) . In this subsection, we will use the convention that C denotes a generic positive constant depending on $\gamma, \bar{\mu}, \|\rho_0\|_{H^1}, \|u_0\|_{H^1}$, and $\|f\|_{H^1}$ but independent of T , and use $C(a)$ to emphasize that C depends on a .

First, we state the following Zlotnik inequality, whose proof can be found in [28], will be used to get the uniform (in time) upper bound of the density.

Lemma 2.2 ([28]) *Let the function y satisfy*

$$y'(t) \leq g(y) + b'(t) \text{ on } [0, T], \quad y(0) = y^0,$$

with $g \in C(\mathbb{R})$ and $y, b \in W^{1,1}(0, T)$. If $g(\infty) = -\infty$ and

$$b(t_2) - b(t_1) \leq N_0 + N_1(t_2 - t_1)$$

for all $0 \leq t_1 < t_2 \leq T$ with some $N_0 \geq 0$ and $N_1 \geq 0$, then

$$y(t) \leq \max \{y^0, \bar{\zeta}\} + N_0 < \infty \text{ on } [0, T],$$

where $\bar{\zeta}$ is a constant such that

$$g(\zeta) \leq -N_1 \quad \text{for} \quad \zeta \geq \bar{\zeta}.$$

Then, we will give the key time-independent upper bound for the density as follows.

Lemma 2.3 *There is a positive constant C such that for any $(x, t) \in [0, 1] \times [0, T]$,*

$$0 \leq \rho(x, t) \leq C. \tag{2.1}$$

Proof. First, standard energy estimate leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int_0^1 \left(\frac{1}{2} \rho u^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma - 1} P \right) dx + \int_0^T \int_0^1 \mu(\rho) u_x^2 dx ds \\ & \leq C + \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int_0^1 \rho \int_0^x f dy dx \\ & \leq C + \|f\|_{L^\infty} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int_0^1 \rho dx \\ & \leq C, \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

where in the last inequality one has used the following fact:

$$\int_0^1 \rho dx = \int_0^1 \rho_0 dx = 1 \tag{2.3}$$

owing to (1.8) and (1.1)₁.

Next, integrating (1.1)₂ over $(0, x)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} -\mu(\rho)u_x &= -P(\rho) + \int_0^x \rho f dy - \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int_0^x \rho u dy - \rho u^2 \\ &\quad + (P(\rho) + \rho u^2 - \mu(\rho)u_x)(0, t), \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

which in particular implies

$$\begin{aligned} &(P(\rho) + \rho u^2 - \mu(\rho)u_x)(0, t) \\ &= -\int_0^1 \mu(\rho)u_x dx + \int_0^1 P(\rho) dx - \int_0^1 \int_0^x \rho f dy dx \\ &\quad + \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^1 \int_0^x \rho u dy dx + \int_0^1 \rho u^2 dx. \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

Combining this with (2.4) shows that for $D_t \triangleq \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial}{\partial x}$

$$\begin{aligned} &-\mu(\rho)u_x + P(\rho) \\ &= \int_0^x \rho f dy - \int_0^1 \int_0^x \rho f dy dx + \int_0^1 \rho u^2 dx + \int_0^1 P(\rho) dx \\ &\quad + D_t \left(\int_0^1 \rho \int_2^\rho \mu(s) s^{-2} ds dx + \int_0^1 \int_0^x \rho u dy dx - \int_0^x \rho u dy \right) \\ &\leq C + D_t (b_1(t) + b_2(t) + b_3(t)), \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

where one has used (2.2) and the following fact

$$-\int_0^1 \mu(\rho)u_x dx = D_t \int_0^1 \rho \int_2^\rho \mu(s) s^{-2} ds dx$$

due to (1.1)₁.

Next, it follows from (1.1)₁ that

$$-\mu(\rho)u_x = D_t \int_1^\rho \mu(s) s^{-1} ds,$$

which together with (2.6) gives

$$D_t \int_1^\rho \mu(s) s^{-1} ds \leq -P(\rho) + C + D_t (b_1(t) + b_2(t) + b_3(t)). \quad (2.7)$$

Then, on the one hand, we have

$$b_1(t) \leq 2^{-1} \int_1^{\max\{\sup_{\Omega_T} \rho, 2\}} \mu(s) s^{-1} ds, \quad (2.8)$$

where $\Omega_T = [0, 1] \times [0, T]$. On the other hand, one deduces from (2.2) that

$$|b_2(t)| + |b_3(t)| \leq C \int_0^1 \int_0^x \rho dy \int_0^x \rho u^2 dy dx + \int_0^1 \rho u^2 dx \int_0^1 \rho dx \leq C. \quad (2.9)$$

Finally, applying the Zlotnik inequality (Lemma 2.2) to (2.7), we get after using (2.8) and (2.9) that

$$\int_1^\rho \mu(s) s^{-1} ds \leq C + 2^{-1} \int_1^{\max\{\sup_{\Omega_T} \rho, 2\}} \mu(s) s^{-1} ds,$$

which together with (1.3) implies (2.1) and completes the proof of Lemma 2.3. \square

Lemma 2.4 *Let (ρ, u) be a smooth solution of (1.1)-(1.5) on $[0, 1] \times [0, T]$. Then*

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|u\|_{H^1}^2 + \int_0^T \|\rho^{1/2} \dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 dt \leq C, \quad (2.10)$$

where and in what follows, we denote $\dot{u} \triangleq u_t + uu_x$.

Proof. First, multiplying (1.3)₂ by \dot{u} and integrating the resulting equation by parts yield

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^1 \mu(\rho) u_x^2 dx + \int_0^1 \rho \dot{u}^2 dx \\ &= \frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_0^1 P(\rho) u_x dx + \int_0^1 \rho f u dx \right) \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 [\mu(\rho) - \mu'(\rho)\rho] u_x^3 dx + \gamma \int_0^1 P(\rho) u_x^2 dx - \int_0^1 \rho u^2 f_x dx \\ & \leq \frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_0^1 P(\rho) u_x dx + \int_0^1 \rho f u dx \right) \\ & \quad + C \|u_x\|_{L^3}^3 + C \|u_x\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|u\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|f_x\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq \frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_0^1 P(\rho) u_x dx + \int_0^1 \rho f u dx \right) + C \|u_x\|_{L^\infty} \|u_x\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|u_x\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

where one has used (2.1) and the following fact:

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty} \leq C \|u\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|u_x\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \leq C \|u_x\|_{L^2}. \quad (2.12)$$

Then, using (1.1)₂, (1.3), (2.2), and (2.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_x\|_{L^\infty} & \leq C \|\mu(\rho) u_x - P(\rho)\|_{L^\infty} + C \|P(\rho)\|_{L^\infty} \\ & \leq C \|\mu(\rho) u_x - P(\rho)\|_{L^1} + C \|(\mu(\rho) u_x - P(\rho))_x\|_{L^1} + C \\ & \leq C \|\mu(\rho) u_x\|_{L^1} + C \|P(\rho)\|_{L^1} + C \|\rho \dot{u}\|_{L^1} + C \|\rho f\|_{L^1} + C \\ & \leq C \int_0^1 \mu(\rho) u_x^2 dx + C \|\rho^{1/2} \dot{u}\|_{L^2} + C, \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

which together with (2.11) and Young's inequality gives

$$\frac{d}{dt} B(t) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \rho \dot{u}^2 dx \leq C \left(\int_0^1 \mu(\rho) u_x^2 dx \right)^2 + C \int_0^1 \mu(\rho) u_x^2 dx, \quad (2.14)$$

where

$$B(t) \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \mu(\rho) u_x^2 dx - \int_0^1 P(\rho) u_x dx - \int_0^1 \rho f u dx$$

satisfies

$$\frac{1}{4} \|\sqrt{\mu(\rho)} u_x\|_{L^2}^2 - C \leq B(t) \leq C \|\sqrt{\mu(\rho)} u_x\|_{L^2}^2 + C \quad (2.15)$$

owing to the following estimate:

$$\int_0^1 P(\rho) u_x dx + \int_0^1 \rho f u dx \leq \frac{1}{4} \int_0^1 \mu(\rho) u_x^2 dx + C,$$

due to (1.3), (2.2), and (2.1).

Hence, Gronwall's inequality together with (2.14), (2.15), and (2.2) implies (2.10) and thus finishes the proof of Lemma 2.4. \square

Lemma 2.5 *Let (ρ, u) be a smooth solution of (1.1)-(1.5) on $(0, 1) \times [0, T]$. Then*

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \sigma \left(\|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}}^2 + \|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 \right) + \int_0^T \sigma \|\dot{u}_x\|_{L^2}^2 dt \leq C, \quad (2.16)$$

where and in what follows, $\sigma(t) \triangleq \min\{1, t\}$.

Proof. First, operating $\partial_t + (u \cdot \cdot)_x$ to (1.1)₂ yields that

$$\rho \dot{u}_t + \rho u \dot{u}_x - [\mu(\rho) \dot{u}_x]_x = -\gamma [P(\rho) u_x]_x - [(\mu(\rho) + \mu'(\rho)\rho) u_x^2]_x + \rho u f_x, \quad (2.17)$$

which multiplied by \dot{u} gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^1 \rho |\dot{u}|^2 dx + \int_0^1 \mu(\rho) |\dot{u}_x|^2 dx \\ &= \gamma \int_0^1 P(\rho) u_x \dot{u}_x dx + \int_0^1 (\mu(\rho) + \mu'(\rho)\rho) u_x^2 \dot{u}_x dx + \int_0^1 \rho u f_x \dot{u} dx \\ &\leq C \|u_x\|_{L^2} \|\dot{u}_x\|_{L^2} (1 + \|u_x\|_{L^\infty}) + C \|u\|_{L^\infty} \|f_x\|_{L^2} \|\rho^{1/2} \dot{u}\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \|u_x\|_{L^2} \|\dot{u}_x\|_{L^2} (1 + \|\rho^{1/2} \dot{u}\|_{L^2}) + C \|u_x\|_{L^2} \|\rho^{1/2} \dot{u}\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \varepsilon \|\dot{u}_x\|_{L^2}^2 + C(\varepsilon) \|u_x\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\rho^{1/2} \dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

due to (2.13) and (2.10).

Then, multiplying (2.18) by σ and integrating the resultant inequality over $(0, T)$, we obtain after choosing ε suitably small and using (2.10) and (2.2) that

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \sigma \int_0^1 \rho |\dot{u}|^2 dx + \int_0^T \sigma \int_0^1 \mu(\rho) |\dot{u}_x|^2 dx dt \leq C, \quad (2.19)$$

which together with (2.12), (2.13), and (2.10) leads to

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \sigma \|u_x\|_{L^\infty}^2 \leq C.$$

Combining this with (2.19) gives (2.16). The proof of Lemma 2.5 is finished. \square

2.2 A priori estimates(II): higher order estimates

In this subsection, we prove the higher-order estimates of the smooth solution (ρ, u) to the problem (1.1)-(1.5).

Lemma 2.6 *For any given $T > 0$, there exists a positive constant C depending on T , $\gamma, \bar{\mu}, \|\rho_0\|_{H^1}, \|u_0\|_{H^1}$, and $\|f\|_{H^1}$ such that*

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} (\|\rho_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\rho_t\|_{L^2}^2) \leq C, \quad (2.20)$$

and

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left(\sigma \|\rho^{1/2} u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \sigma \|u_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2 \right) + \int_0^T (\|u_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2 + \sigma \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2) dt \leq C. \quad (2.21)$$

Proof. First, differentiating (1.1)₁ with respect to x gives

$$\rho_{xt} + \rho_{xx}u + 2\rho_x u_x + \rho u_{xx} = 0. \quad (2.22)$$

Multiplying (2.22) by ρ_x and integrating the resulting equation by parts yield that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\rho_x\|_{L^2} \leq C \|u_x\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho_x\|_{L^2} + C \|u_{xx}\|_{L^2} \quad (2.23)$$

due to (2.1).

Next, it is easy to deduce from (1.1)₂ that

$$\mu(\rho)u_{xx} = \rho\dot{u} + P_x - \rho f - \mu'(\rho)\rho_x u_x, \quad (2.24)$$

which together with (1.5), (2.1), (2.10), and (2.16) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_{xx}\|_{L^2} &\leq C \|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2} + C \|\rho_x\|_{L^2} (\|u_x\|_{L^\infty} + 1) + C \\ &\leq C \sigma^{-1/2} (1 + \|\rho_x\|_{L^2}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.25)$$

Submitting (2.25) into (2.23) and using Gronwall's inequality, one gets

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\rho_x\|_{L^2} \leq C, \quad (2.26)$$

which along with (1.1)₁ and (2.10) leads to

$$\|\rho_t\|_{L^2} \leq \|u\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho_x\|_{L^2} + C \|u_x\|_{L^2} \leq C. \quad (2.27)$$

The combination of (2.26) with (2.27) leads to (2.20).

Now, it follows from (2.1), (2.13), (2.10), (2.25), and (2.20) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq \|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\rho^{1/2}uu_x\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq \|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + \bar{\rho} \|u\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|u_x\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + C, \\ \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2 &= \|(\dot{u} - uu_x)_x\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|\dot{u}_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \|u_x^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|uu_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq \|\dot{u}_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \|u_x\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|u_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \|u\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|u_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq \|\dot{u}_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + C. \end{aligned} \quad (2.28)$$

Hence, (2.21) is a direct consequence of (2.28), (2.16), (2.25), and (2.10). We complete the proof of Lemma 2.6. \square

From now on, assume that (ρ, u) is a smooth solution of the problem (1.1)-(1.5) with the smooth initial data satisfying the condition in Theorem 1.2 and $\mu(\cdot) \in C^2[0, \infty)$. In the following of this subsection, the general constant C may depend on $T, \gamma, \bar{\mu}, \|\rho_0\|_{H^2}, \|P(\rho_0)\|_{H^2}, \|u_0\|_{H^2}, \|f\|_{H^1}$, and $\|g\|_{L^2}$ with g as in (1.14).

Lemma 2.7 *For any given $T > 0$, there exists a positive constant C such that*

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left(\|u_{xx}\|_{L^2} + \|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}} + \|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^2}^2 \right) + \int_0^T \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2 dt \leq C. \quad (2.29)$$

Proof. It follows from the compatibility condition (1.14) that we can set

$$\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}(x, t = 0) = g + \rho_0^{1/2}f \in L^2.$$

Integrating (2.18) over $(0, T)$, we obtain after using (2.10) and (2.2) that

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int_0^1 \rho |\dot{u}|^2 dx + \int_0^T \int_0^1 \mu(\rho) |\dot{u}_x|^2 dx dt \leq C,$$

which together with (2.28), (2.12), (2.13), and (2.10) gives (2.29) and completes the proof of Lemma 2.7. \square

The following higher order estimates of the solutions are used to guarantee the extension of local classical solution to be a global one, whose proof are similar to those in [4], see also [12, 15, 18] considering the high dimensional case. And, we also sketch them here for completeness.

Lemma 2.8 *For any given $T > 0$, there exists a positive constant C such that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} (\|\rho_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|P_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\rho_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|P_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2) \\ & + \int_0^T (\|u_{xxx}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\rho_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|P_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2) dt \leq C. \end{aligned} \quad (2.30)$$

Proof. Differentiating (2.22) with respect to x gives

$$(\rho_{xx})_t + \rho_{xxx}u + 3\rho_{xx}u_x + 3\rho_x u_{xx} + \rho u_{xxx} = 0. \quad (2.31)$$

Multiplying (2.31) by ρ_{xx} and integrating the resulting equation by parts, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\rho_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2 &= -\frac{5}{2} \int_0^1 \rho_{xx}^2 u_x dx - 3 \int_0^1 \rho_x \rho_{xx} u_{xx} dx - \int_0^1 \rho \rho_{xx} u_{xxx} dx \\ &\leq C \|u_x\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\rho_x\|_{L^\infty} \|u_{xx}\|_{L^2} \|\rho_{xx}\|_{L^2} + C \|u_{xxx}\|_{L^2} \|\rho_{xx}\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \|\rho_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|u_{xxx}\|_{L^2}^2 + C, \end{aligned} \quad (2.32)$$

where in the last inequality one has used (2.29), (2.20), and the following estimate:

$$\|\rho_x\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|\rho_x\|_{L^1} + \|\rho_{xx}\|_{L^1} \leq C + C \|\rho_{xx}\|_{L^2}. \quad (2.33)$$

Since $P(\rho)$ satisfies

$$P_t + P_x u + \gamma P u_x = 0, \quad (2.34)$$

following the same arguments as (2.32), one has

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|P_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \|P_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|u_{xxx}\|_{L^2}^2 + C. \quad (2.35)$$

Hence, the combination of (2.35) with (2.32) implies that

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (\|\rho_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|P_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2) \leq C (\|\rho_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|P_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2) + C + C \|u_{xxx}\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (2.36)$$

In order to estimate $\|u_{xxx}\|_{L^2}^2$, differentiating (2.24) with respect to x gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\rho)u_{xxx} &= \rho_x u_t + \rho_x u u_x + \rho u_{xt} + \rho u_x^2 + \rho u u_{xx} + P_{xx} \\ &\quad - \rho_x f - \rho f_x - \mu''(\rho) \rho_x^2 u_x - \mu'(\rho) \rho_{xx} u_x - 2\mu'(\rho) \rho_x u_{xx}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.37)$$

Similar to (2.12), we also have

$$\|u_t\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}, \quad (2.38)$$

which along with (2.37), (1.5), (2.1), (2.20), (2.33), and (2.29) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_{xxx}\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq C\|\rho_x\|_{L^2}^2\|u_t\|_{L^\infty}^2 + C\|\rho_x\|_{L^2}^2\|u\|_{L^\infty}^2\|u_x\|_{L^\infty}^2 + C\|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|u_x\|_{L^4}^4 \\ &\quad + C\|u\|_{L^\infty}^2\|u_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|P_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|\rho_x\|_{L^2}^2\|f\|_{L^\infty}^2 + C\|f_x\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\quad + C\|\rho_x\|_{L^\infty}^2\|\rho_x\|_{L^2}^2\|u_x\|_{L^\infty}^2 + C\|u_x\|_{L^\infty}^2\|\rho_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|\rho_x\|_{L^\infty}^2\|u_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq C(1 + \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\rho_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|P_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2). \end{aligned} \quad (2.39)$$

Submitting (2.39) into (2.36), one obtains after using Gronwall's inequality and (2.29) that

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} (\|\rho_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|P_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2) \leq C. \quad (2.40)$$

This together with (2.22), (2.29), and (2.20) implies that

$$\|\rho_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|\rho_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2\|u\|_{L^\infty}^2 + C\|\rho_x\|_{L^2}^2\|u_x\|_{L^\infty}^2 + C\|u_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C. \quad (2.41)$$

Differentiating (1.1)₁ with respect to t gives

$$\rho_{tt} = -\rho_{xt}u - \rho_x u_t - \rho_t u_x - \rho u_{xt}$$

which combined with (2.41), (2.20), (2.38), and (2.29) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \|\rho_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 dt &\leq \int_0^T (\|\rho_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2\|u\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|\rho_x\|_{L^2}^2\|u_t\|_{L^\infty}^2) dt \\ &\quad + C \int_0^T (\|\rho_t\|_{L^2}^2\|u_x\|_{L^\infty}^2 + C\|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2) dt \\ &\leq C \int_0^T (1 + \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2) dt \leq C. \end{aligned} \quad (2.42)$$

Similarly, one can get

$$\|P_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^T \|P_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 dt \leq C,$$

which together with (2.39), (2.29), (2.40), (2.41), and (2.42) implies (2.30). The proof of Lemma 2.8 is completed. \square

Lemma 2.9 *For any given $T > 0$, there exists a positive constant C such that*

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} (t\|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2 + t\|u_{xxx}\|_{L^2}^2) + \int_0^T (t\|\rho^{1/2}u_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 + t\|u_{xxt}\|_{L^2}^2) dt \leq C. \quad (2.43)$$

Proof. Differentiating (1.1)₂ with respect to t gives

$$\rho u_{tt} + \rho u u_{xt} - [\mu(\rho)u_x]_{xt} = -\rho_t(u_t + u u_x) - \rho u_t u_x - P_{xt} + \rho_t f. \quad (2.44)$$

Multiplying (2.44) by u_{tt} and integrating the resulting equation by parts lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^1 \mu u_{xt}^2 dx + \|\rho^{1/2} u_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \mu_t u_{xt}^2 dx - \int_0^1 \mu_t u_x u_{xtt} dx + \int_0^1 \rho_t f u_{tt} dx - \int_0^1 \rho_t \dot{u} u_{tt} dx \\
&\quad - \int_0^1 \rho u_t u_x u_{tt} dx - \int_0^1 \rho u u_{xt} u_{tt} dx - \int_0^1 P_{xt} u_{tt} dx \\
&\triangleq \sum_{i=1}^7 J_i.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.45}$$

The term J_i on the right hand of (2.45) can be estimated as follows.

Using (2.20) and (2.30), it holds

$$\|\rho_t\|_{L^\infty} \leq C \|\rho_t\|_{L^2} + C \|\rho_{xt}\|_{L^2} \leq C, \tag{2.46}$$

which implies that

$$J_1 \leq C \|\mu_t\|_{L^\infty} \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \|\rho_t\|_{L^\infty} \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2. \tag{2.47}$$

It deduces from (2.1), (2.20), and (2.46) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mu_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq \|\mu''(\rho) \rho_t^2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\mu'(\rho) \rho_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\leq C \|\rho_t\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\rho_t\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\rho_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\leq C + C \|\rho_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which along with (2.29) and (2.46) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
J_2 &= -\frac{d}{dt} \int_0^1 \mu_t u_x u_{xt} dx + \int_0^1 \mu_{tt} u_x u_{xt} dx + \int_0^1 \mu_t u_{xt}^2 dx \\
&\leq -\frac{d}{dt} \int_0^1 \mu_t u_x u_{xt} dx + C \|u_x\|_{L^\infty} \|\mu_{tt}\|_{L^2} \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2} + C \|\mu_t\|_{L^\infty} \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\leq -\frac{d}{dt} \int_0^1 \mu_t u_x u_{xt} dx + C \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2 + C + C \|\rho_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.48}$$

Next, it is easy to derive from (2.38) that

$$\begin{aligned}
J_3 &= \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^1 \rho_t f u_t dx - \int_0^1 \rho_{tt} f u_t dx \\
&\leq \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^1 \rho_t f u_t dx + C \|u_t\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho_{tt}\|_{L^2} \|f\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^1 \rho_t f u_t dx + C \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\rho_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.49}$$

For the term J_4 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
J_4 &= \int_0^1 (\rho u)_x \dot{u} u_{tt} dx = - \int_0^1 \rho \dot{u} u_{xtt} dx - \int_0^1 \rho \dot{u}_x u_{tt} dx \\
&= -\frac{d}{dt} \int_0^1 \rho \dot{u} u_{xt} dx + \int_0^1 (\rho u)_t \dot{u} u_{xt} dx + \int_0^1 \rho \dot{u}_t u_{xt} dx - \int_0^1 \rho \dot{u}_x u_{tt} dx \\
&\triangleq -\frac{d}{dt} \int_0^1 \rho \dot{u} u_{xt} dx + J_{4,1} + J_{4,2} + J_{4,3}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.50}$$

One deduces from (2.29), (2.20), and (2.38) that

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{4,1} &= \int_0^1 \rho_t u u_{xt} dx + \int_0^1 \rho u_t u_{xt} dx \\
&\leq C (\|u_t\|_{L^\infty} + \|u u_x\|_{L^\infty}) \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2} \|u\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho_t\|_{L^2} + C \|\rho^{1/2} \dot{u}\|_{L^2} \|u_t\|_{L^\infty} \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq C + C \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2, \\
J_{4,2} &= \int_0^1 \rho u u_{tt} u_{xt} dx + \int_0^1 \rho u u_t u_x u_{xt} dx + \int_0^1 \rho u^2 u_{xt}^2 dx \\
&\leq C \|\rho^{1/2} u\|_{L^\infty} \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2} \|\rho^{1/2} u_{tt}\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad + C \|\rho u\|_{L^\infty} \|u_t\|_{L^\infty} \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2} \|u_x\|_{L^2} + C \|\rho u^2\|_{L^\infty} \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\leq \varepsilon \|\rho^{1/2} u_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2, \\
J_{4,3} &\leq C \|\rho^{1/2} u\|_{L^\infty} \|\dot{u}_x\|_{L^2} \|\rho^{1/2} u_{tt}\|_{L^2} \leq \varepsilon \|\rho^{1/2} u_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2 + C.
\end{aligned}$$

This combined with (2.50) yields

$$J_4 \leq -\frac{d}{dt} \int_0^1 \rho u u_{xt} dx + \varepsilon \|\rho^{1/2} u_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2 + C. \quad (2.51)$$

Moreover, by virtue of (2.29), it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
J_5 + J_6 &\leq C \|u_x\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho^{1/2} u_{tt}\|_{L^2} \|\rho^{1/2} u_t\|_{L^2} + C \|\rho^{1/2} u\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho^{1/2} u_{tt}\|_{L^2} \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq \varepsilon \|\rho^{1/2} u_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2 + C.
\end{aligned} \quad (2.52)$$

Finally, we can estimate J_7 as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}
J_7 &= \int_0^1 P_t u_{xt} dx = \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^1 P_t u_{xt} dx - \int_0^1 P_{tt} u_{xt} dx \\
&\leq \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^1 P_t u_{xt} dx + C \|P_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2.
\end{aligned} \quad (2.53)$$

Submitting (2.47)-(2.53) into (2.45) and choosing ε suitably small, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \Pi(t) + \|\rho^{1/2} u_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2 + C + C \|\rho_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|P_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (2.54)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi(t) &\triangleq \int_0^1 \mu u_{xt}^2 dx + \int_0^1 \mu_t u_x u_{xt} dx + \int_0^1 \rho u u_{xt} dx \\
&\quad - \int_0^1 P_t u_{xt} dx - \int_0^1 \rho_t f u_t dx
\end{aligned}$$

satisfies

$$\frac{\bar{\mu}}{2} \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2 - C \leq \Pi(t) \leq C \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2 + C \quad (2.55)$$

owing to the following estimates:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \int_0^1 \mu_t u_x u_{xt} dx + \int_0^1 \rho u u_{xt} dx - \int_0^1 P_t u_{xt} dx - \int_0^1 \rho_t f u_t dx \right| \\
&\leq C \|\rho_t\|_{L^2} \|u_x\|_{L^\infty} \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2} + C \|\rho^{1/2} u\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho^{1/2} \dot{u}\|_{L^2} \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad + C \|P_t\|_{L^2} \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2} + C \|u_t\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho_t\|_{L^2} \|f\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq \frac{\bar{\mu}}{2} \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2 + C,
\end{aligned}$$

where one has used (2.29), (2.20), and (2.38).

Hence, the Gronwall's inequality together with (2.54), (2.55), (2.29), and (2.30) gives

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} t \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^T t \|\rho^{1/2} u_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 dt \leq C, \quad (2.56)$$

which along with (2.39) and (2.30) implies

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} t \|u_{xxx}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C. \quad (2.57)$$

Next, it follows from (2.44) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\rho) u_{xxt} &= \rho u_{tt} + \rho_t \dot{u} + \rho u_t u_x + \rho u u_{xt} + P_{xt} - \rho_t f \\ &\quad - \mu''(\rho) \rho_t \rho_x u_x - \mu'(\rho) \rho_{xt} u_x - \mu'(\rho) \rho_x u_{xt} - \mu'(\rho) \rho_t u_{xx}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (2.38), (2.20), (2.29), (2.30), and (2.46) yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_{xxt}\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq C \|\rho^{1/2} u_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\dot{u}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\rho_t\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|u_x\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\rho^{1/2} u_t\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\quad + C \|\rho u\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|P_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|f\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\rho_t\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\rho_t\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|u_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\quad + C \|u_x\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\rho_t\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\rho_x\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|u_x\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\rho_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\rho_x\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq C \|\rho^{1/2} u_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2 + C, \end{aligned}$$

which along with (2.56) implies that

$$\int_0^T t \|u_{xxt}\|_{L^2}^2 dt \leq C. \quad (2.58)$$

The combination of (2.56)–(2.57) with (2.58) yields (2.43) and completes the proof of Lemma 2.9. \square

3 Proof of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2

Proof of Theorem 1.1. With all the a priori estimates obtained in section 2 at hand, we will divide the proof into three steps.

Step 1. We prove the local existence and uniqueness of the strong solution when the initial density contains vacuum. That is, Theorem 1.1 holds for some $T_0 > 0$.

Let (ρ_0, u_0, f) be as in Theorem 1.1, we construct

$$\rho_0^\delta = \hat{\rho}_0^\delta + \delta, \quad u_0^\delta = u_0 * j_\delta, \quad f^\delta = f * j_\delta, \quad (3.1)$$

where j_δ is the standard mollifying kernel of width δ and $0 \leq \hat{\rho}_0^\delta \in C_0^\infty(0, 1)$ satisfies

$$\hat{\rho}_0^\delta \rightarrow \rho_0 \quad \text{in } H^1, \quad \text{as } \delta \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.2)$$

Thus, we have

$$\rho_0^\delta \rightarrow \rho_0, \quad u_0^\delta \rightarrow u_0, \quad f^\delta \rightarrow f, \quad \text{in } H^1, \quad \text{as } \delta \rightarrow 0, \quad (3.3)$$

and

$$\|\rho_0^\delta\|_{H^1} \leq C + C \|\rho_0\|_{H^1}, \quad \|u_0^\delta\|_{H^1} \leq C \|u_0\|_{H^1}, \quad \|f^\delta\|_{H^1} \leq C \|f\|_{H^1}. \quad (3.4)$$

By virtue of Lemma 2.1, the initial boundary problem (1.1)-(1.5) with the initial data $(\rho_0^\delta, u_0^\delta)$ has a classical solution (ρ^δ, u^δ) on $(0, 1) \times [0, T_0]$. Furthermore, the estimates obtained in Lemmas 2.3-2.6 show that the solution (ρ^δ, u^δ) satisfies for any $0 < T < +\infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left(\|(\rho^\delta, \mu(\rho^\delta), P(\rho^\delta))\|_{H^1} + \|\rho_t^\delta\|_{L^2} + \|\rho^\delta u^\delta\|_{L^2} + \|u^\delta\|_{H^1} \right. \\ & \left. + \sqrt{t} \|\sqrt{\rho^\delta} u_t^\delta\|_{L^2} + \sqrt{t} \|u_{xx}^\delta\|_{L^2} \right) + \int_0^T \left(\|u^\delta\|_{H^2}^2 + t \|u_{xt}^\delta\|_{L^2}^2 \right) dt \leq \bar{C}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

where \bar{C} is independent of δ . With all the estimate (3.5) at hand, we find that the sequence (ρ^δ, u^δ) converges, up to the extraction of subsequences, to some limit (ρ, u) in the obvious weak sense. Then letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$, we deduce from (3.5) that (ρ, u) is a strong solution of (1.1)-(1.5) on $(0, 1) \times (0, T_0]$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \rho \in L^\infty(0, T_0; H^1), & \rho_t \in L^\infty(0, T_0; L^2), \\ u \in L^\infty(0, T_0; H_0^1) \cap L^2(0, T_0; H^2) \\ t^{1/2} u \in L^\infty(0, T_0; H^2), & t^{1/2} u_t \in L^2(0, T_0; H^1), \\ t^{1/2} \rho^{1/2} u_t \in L^2(0, T_0; L^2). \end{cases} \quad (3.6)$$

Then, the uniqueness of the strong solution (ρ, u) is guaranteed by the regularities (3.6). For the detailed proof, please see [3, 16].

Step 2. We will extend the local existence time T_0 of strong solution to be infinity and thus prove the global existence result.

Let T^* be the maximal time of existence for the strong solution. Then, $T^* \geq T_0$. For any $0 < \tau < T \leq T^*$ with T finite, one deduce from

$$u \in L^\infty(0, T; H_0^1) \cap L^2(0, T; H^2), \quad u_t \in L^2(\tau, T; H^1),$$

that

$$u \in C([\tau, T]; H_0^1). \quad (3.7)$$

Furthermore, it follows from

$$\rho \in L^\infty(0, T; H^1), \quad \rho_t \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2)$$

that

$$\rho \in C([0, T]; H^1). \quad (3.8)$$

Defining

$$(\rho^*, u^*) \triangleq (\rho, u)(x, T^*) = \lim_{t \rightarrow T^*} (\rho, u)(x, t),$$

we derive from (3.7) and (3.8) that (ρ^*, u^*) satisfies the initial condition (1.9) at $t = T^*$.

Hence, we take (ρ^*, u^*) as the initial data at $t = T^*$ and then use the local existence theory to extend the strong solution beyond the maximum existence time T^* . This contradicts the assumption on T^* . We finally show that T^* could be infinity and prove the global existence of the strong solution.

Step 3. It remains to prove (1.12). Direct calculations lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \frac{d}{dt} \|u_x\|_{L^2}^2 \right| &= \left| 2 \int_0^1 u_x u_{xt} dx \right| \\
&= \left| 2 \int_0^1 u_x (\dot{u}_x - (uu_x)_x) dx \right| \\
&= \left| 2 \int_0^1 u_x \dot{u}_x dx - \int_0^1 u_x^3 dx \right| \\
&\leq C \|\dot{u}_x\|_{L^2}^2 + C(1 + \|u_x\|_{L^\infty}) \|u_x\|_{L^2}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which together with (2.2) and (2.16) yields

$$\int_1^\infty \left(\|u_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \left| \frac{d}{dt} \|u_x\|_{L^2}^2 \right| \right) dt \leq C.$$

Thus,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|u_x\|_{L^2}^2(t) = 0,$$

which combined with (2.16) gives

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|u\|_{W^{1,p}} = 0, \quad \forall p \in [1, \infty). \quad (3.9)$$

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is finished. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2. With the higher-order estimates in Lemmas 2.7–2.9 at hand, the proof of Theorem 1.2 is similar to those of Theorem 1.1 and is omitted here for simplicity. \square

4 Proof of Theorem 1.3

The proof of Theorem 1.3 is divided into two steps as follows.

Step 1. We will prove

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \|\rho(\cdot, t) - \rho_s(\cdot)\|_{L^p} \rightarrow 0, \quad \forall p \in [1, \infty). \quad (4.1)$$

Considering the function

$$\mathcal{P}(t) = \int_0^1 [P(\rho) - \tilde{P}(\rho)]^2 dx$$

with

$$\tilde{P}(\rho) = \tilde{P}(\rho(x, t)) \triangleq \int_0^1 P(\rho) dx + \int_0^x \rho f dy - \int_0^1 \int_0^x \rho f dy dx,$$

we claim that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_{t-1}^t \left(\mathcal{P}(\tau) + \left| \frac{d}{d\tau} \mathcal{P}(\tau) \right| \right) d\tau = 0. \quad (4.2)$$

With (4.2) at hand, one can derive the desired (4.1) with the same arguments as those in [24,25]. For reader's convenience, we sketch them here for completeness. Indeed, for any $t > 1$ and $s \in (t-1, t)$, it holds

$$\mathcal{P}(t) \leq \int_{t-1}^t \left(\mathcal{P}(s) + \left| \frac{d}{d\tau} \mathcal{P} \right| \right) d\tau,$$

which together with (4.2) implies that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{P}(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|P(\rho(\cdot, t)) - \tilde{P}(\rho(\cdot, t))\|_{L^2}^2 = 0. \quad (4.3)$$

Let $t_n \rightarrow \infty$ be an arbitrary sequence, the uniform upper bound of the density (2.1) implies that there exist a function $\tilde{\rho} \in L^\infty$ and a positive constant P_c such that for some subsequence $\{t'_n\} \subset \{t_n\}$,

$$\rho(\cdot, t'_n) \rightarrow \tilde{\rho}(\cdot) \text{ weakly } * \text{ in } L^\infty, \quad \int_0^1 P(\rho(\cdot, t'_n)) dx \rightarrow P_c. \quad (4.4)$$

Clearly, $0 \leq \tilde{\rho} \leq C$. The standard compactness argument together with (4.4) yields

$$\tilde{P}(\rho(\cdot, t'_n)) \rightarrow P_s(\cdot) \triangleq P_c + \int_0^x \tilde{\rho} f dx - \int_0^1 \int_0^x \tilde{\rho} f dy dx \quad \text{in } C([0, 1]), \quad (4.5)$$

which along with (4.3) leads to

$$P(\rho(\cdot, t'_n)) \rightarrow P_s(\cdot) \quad \text{in } L^2.$$

Consequently, it holds that for some subsequence $\{t''_n\} \subset \{t'_n\}$,

$$P(\rho(x, t''_n)) \rightarrow P_s(x) \quad \text{a.e. in } (0, 1).$$

The continuity and monotonicity of $P(\cdot)$ deduce that the inverse function of P , denoted by P^{-1} , is continuous, and then

$$\rho(x, t''_n) \rightarrow \rho_s(x) \triangleq P^{-1}(P_s(x)) \quad \text{a.e. in } (0, 1),$$

where $\rho_s \in C([0, 1])$ and $\rho_s > 0$. This together with Lebesgue dominated theorem and (2.1) implies that

$$\rho(\cdot, t''_n) \rightarrow \rho_s(\cdot), \quad \text{in } L^p, \quad \forall p \in [1, \infty), \quad (4.6)$$

which along with (4.4) yields

$$\rho_s = \tilde{\rho}.$$

According to the definition of P_s in (4.5), it holds

$$P(\rho_s) = P_s = P_c + \int_0^x \rho_s f dx - \int_0^1 \int_0^x \rho_s f dy dx,$$

which together with (4.6) and (2.3) yields that

$$[P(\rho_s)]_x = \rho_s f, \quad \int_0^1 \rho_s dx = 1.$$

Hence, we show that ρ_s is indeed the solution to the stationary problem (1.7) due to Lemma 1.1. And, (4.1) is a direct consequence of (4.6).

Now, it remains to prove (4.2). Denoting

$$\Psi = \int_0^x (P(\rho) - \tilde{P}(\rho)) dx,$$

which satisfies $\Psi(0, t) = \Psi(1, t) = 0$, after using integration by parts and (1.1)₂, we rewrite $\mathcal{P}(t)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}(t) &= \int_0^1 (P(\rho) - \tilde{P}(\rho)) d\Psi = - \int_0^1 (P(\rho) - \tilde{P}(\rho))_x \Psi dx \\ &= \int_0^1 ((\rho u)_t + (\rho u^2)_x - [\mu(\rho)u_x]_x) \Psi dx \\ &= \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^1 \rho u \Psi dx - \int_0^1 \rho u \Psi_t dx - \int_0^1 (\rho u^2 - \mu(\rho)u_x) \Psi_x dx. \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

It follows from (2.2) and (2.1) that

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi| + |\Psi_x| &= \left| \int_0^x \left(P(\rho) - \int_0^1 P(\rho) dy - \int_0^x \rho f dy + \int_0^1 \int_0^\xi \rho f dy d\xi \right) dx \right| \\ &\quad + \left| P(\rho) - \int_0^1 P(\rho) dx - \int_0^x \rho f dy + \int_0^1 \int_0^x \rho f dy dx \right| \leq C, \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

and thus

$$\left| - \int_0^1 (\rho u^2 - \mu(\rho)u_x) \Psi_x dx \right| \leq C \|u_x\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|u_x\|_{L^2}. \quad (4.9)$$

Since

$$P_t + (Pu)_x + (\gamma - 1)Pu_x = 0,$$

one deduces from integration by parts and (1.1)₁ that

$$\begin{aligned} &(P(\rho) - \tilde{P}(\rho))_t \\ &= -(Pu)_x - (\gamma - 1)Pu_x - \int_0^1 P_t dx - \int_0^x \rho_t f dy + \int_0^1 \int_0^x \rho_t f dy dx \\ &= -(Pu)_x - (\gamma - 1)Pu_x + (\gamma - 1) \int_0^1 Pu_x dx + \int_0^x (\rho u)_y f dy - \int_0^1 \int_0^x (\rho u)_y f dy dx \\ &= -(Pu)_x - (\gamma - 1)Pu_x + (\gamma - 1) \int_0^1 Pu_x dx \\ &\quad + \rho u f - \int_0^x \rho u f_y dy - \int_0^1 \rho u f dx + \int_0^1 \int_0^x \rho u f_y dy dx. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this, (2.1), and (2.12) gives

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_t| &= \left| \int_0^x (P(\rho) - \tilde{P}(\rho))_t dx \right| \\ &= \left| -\rho^\gamma u - (\gamma - 1) \int_0^x \rho^\gamma u_x dx + (\gamma - 1) \int_0^1 \rho^\gamma u_x dx \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_0^x \left(\rho u f - \int_0^x \rho u f_y dy - \int_0^1 \rho u f dx + \int_0^1 \int_0^x \rho u f_y dy dx \right) dx \right| \\ &\leq C(\bar{\rho}, \|f\|_{H^1}) \|u\|_{L^2} + C(\bar{\rho}) \|u\|_{L^\infty} + C(\bar{\rho}) \|u_x\|_{L^2} \leq C \|u_x\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

One thus gets

$$\int_0^1 \rho u \Psi_t dx \leq C \|u_x\|_{L^2} \|u\|_{L^\infty} \int_0^1 \rho dx \leq C \|u_x\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (4.11)$$

Hence, on the one hand, it follows from (4.8), (4.7), (4.9), and (4.11) that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{t-1}^t \mathcal{P}(\tau) d\tau &= \int_0^1 \rho u \Psi dx(t) - \int_0^1 \rho u \Psi dx(t-1) \\ &\quad - \int_{t-1}^t \int_0^1 \rho u \Psi_t dx d\tau - \int_{t-1}^t \int_0^1 (\rho u^2 - \mu(\rho) u_x) \Psi_x dx d\tau \\ &\leq C \|u\|_{L^2} + C \int_{t-1}^t (\|u_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \|u_x\|_{L^2}) d\tau \\ &\leq C \|u_x\|_{L^2} + C \int_{t-1}^t \|u_x\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau + C \left(\int_{t-1}^t \|u_x\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

On the other hand, it deduces from (4.8) and (4.10) that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{t-1}^t \left| \frac{d}{d\tau} \mathcal{P}(\tau) \right| d\tau &= 2 \int_{t-1}^t \left| \int_0^1 \Psi_x (P(\rho) - \tilde{P}(\rho))_\tau dx \right| d\tau \\ &\leq C \int_{t-1}^t \|u_x\|_{L^2} d\tau \leq C \left(\int_{t-1}^t \|u_x\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

Then, the desired (4.2) is deduced directly from (4.12), (4.13), (3.9), and (2.2).

Step 2. Now, we are in a position to prove (1.18). The method used here is motivated by Huang-Li-Xin [11] and Li-Zhang-Zhao [18].

Thanks to (1.7), the momentum equation (1.1)₂ can be rewritten as

$$\rho u_t + \rho u u_x + [P(\rho)]_x - \rho \rho_s^{-1} [P(\rho_s)]_x = [\mu(\rho) u_x]_x,$$

which multiplied by u , we obtain after using integration by parts and (1.1)₁ that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \rho u^2 dx + \int_0^1 G(\rho) dx \right) + \int_0^1 \mu(\rho) u_x^2 dx = 0, \quad (4.14)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} G(\rho) &\triangleq \int_{\rho_s}^\rho \int_{\rho_s}^r \frac{P'(\xi)}{\xi} d\xi dr = \rho \int_{\rho_s}^\rho \frac{P(\xi) - P(\rho_s)}{\xi^2} d\xi \\ &= \frac{1}{\gamma - 1} (P(\rho) - P(\rho_s) - P'(\rho_s)(\rho - \rho_s)). \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

Clearly, it follows from (2.1) and (1.17) that there are positive constants M_1 and M_2 depending only on γ , $\bar{\rho}$, K_1 , and K_2 such that

$$M_1(\rho - \rho_s)^2 \leq G(\rho) \leq M_2(\rho - \rho_s)^2. \quad (4.16)$$

Next, it follows from (1.1)₂ and (1.7) that

$$-[P(\rho) - P(\rho_s)]_x + \rho_s^{-1}(\rho - \rho_s) P'(\rho_s)(\rho_s)_x = (\rho u)_t + (\rho u^2)_x - [\mu(\rho) u_x]_x. \quad (4.17)$$

For $\Phi(x, t) \triangleq \int_0^x (\rho - \rho_s) dy$, it holds that

$$\Phi(0, t) = \Phi(1, t) = 0 \quad (4.18)$$

owing to (1.7) and (2.3). Multiplying (4.17) by $\rho_s^{-1}\Phi(x, t)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_0^1 [\rho_s^{-1}(P(\rho) - P(\rho_s))]_x \Phi dx \\ &= \int_0^1 \rho_s^{-2}(\rho_s)_x [P(\rho) - P(\rho_s) - P'(\rho_s)(\rho - \rho_s)] \Phi dx \\ &+ \int_0^1 \rho_s^{-1}(\rho u)_t \Phi dx + \int_0^1 \rho_s^{-1}(\rho u^2)_x \Phi dx - \int_0^1 \rho_s^{-1}[\mu(\rho)u_x]_x \Phi dx \\ &\triangleq \sum_{i=1}^4 \bar{J}_i. \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

First, integration by parts combined with (4.18) and (1.17) gives

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_0^1 [\rho_s^{-1}(P(\rho) - P(\rho_s))]_x \Phi dx &= \int_0^1 \rho_s^{-1} P'(\hat{\rho})(\rho - \rho_s)^2 dx \\ &\geq C_1 \|\rho - \rho_s\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

where $0 < \hat{\rho} \in (\min\{\rho, \rho_s\}, \max\{\rho, \rho_s\})$ and C_1 is a positive constant dependent of γ , $\bar{\rho}$, K_1 , and K_2 .

Next, the terms on the right hand of (4.19) can be estimated as follows. On the one hand, it follows from (4.1) that there is some $T^* > 1$ such that for $t > T^*$,

$$\|\rho - \rho_s\|_{L^2} \leq \frac{C_1}{4},$$

which along with (1.17) and (4.15) yields that

$$\bar{J}_1 \leq C \|\rho - \rho_s\|_{L^2} \|\rho - \rho_s\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \frac{C_1}{4} \|\rho - \rho_s\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (4.21)$$

On the other hand, the integration by parts together with (1.17) and (2.1) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{J}_2 &= \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^1 \rho_s^{-1}(\rho u) \int_0^x (\rho - \rho_s) dy dx - \int_0^1 \rho_s^{-1} \rho u \int_0^x \rho_t dy dx \\ &= \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^1 \rho_s^{-1}(\rho u) \int_0^x (\rho - \rho_s) dy dx + \int_0^1 \rho_s^{-1} \rho^2 u^2 dx \\ &\leq \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^1 \rho_s^{-1}(\rho u) \int_0^x (\rho - \rho_s) dy dx + C \|u_x\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{J}_3 + \bar{J}_4 &= \int_0^1 \rho_s^{-2}(\rho_s)_x \rho u^2 \int_0^x (\rho - \rho_s) dy dx - \int_0^1 \rho_s^{-1} \rho u^2 (\rho - \rho_s) dx \\ &+ \int_0^1 \rho_s^{-1} \mu(\rho) u_x (\rho - \rho_s) dx - \int_0^1 \rho_s^{-2}(\rho_s)_x \mu(\rho) u_x \int_0^x (\rho - \rho_s) dy dx \\ &\leq C \|u_x\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|u_x\|_{L^2} \|\rho - \rho_s\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \frac{C_1}{4} \|\rho - \rho_s\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|u_x\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

Substituting (4.20)–(4.23) into (4.19) derives

$$C_1 \|\rho - \rho_s\|_{L^2}^2 \leq 2 \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^1 \rho_s^{-1}(\rho u) \int_0^x (\rho - \rho_s) dy dx + C \|u_x\|_{L^2}^2, \quad (4.24)$$

Since

$$\left| 2 \int_0^1 \rho_s^{-1}(\rho u) \int_0^x (\rho - \rho_s) dy dx \right| \leq C \|\sqrt{\rho} u\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\rho - \rho_s\|_{L^2}^2,$$

adding (4.24) multiplied by some suitably small η to (4.14) gives

$$\frac{d}{dt} W(t) + \eta C_1 \|\rho - \rho_s\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \mu(\rho) u_x^2 dx \leq 0, \quad (4.25)$$

where

$$W(t) \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \rho u^2 dx + \int_0^1 G(\rho) dx - 2\eta \int_0^1 \rho_s^{-1}(\rho u) \int_0^x (\rho - \rho_s) dy dx$$

satisfies

$$\frac{1}{4} \int_0^1 \rho u^2 dx + \frac{M_1}{2} \|\rho - \rho_s\|_{L^2}^2 \leq W(t) \leq C \|\sqrt{\rho} u\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\rho - \rho_s\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (4.26)$$

Furthermore, one has

$$\int_0^1 \rho u^2 dx \leq C \|u\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \frac{C_2^{-1}}{2} \|\sqrt{\mu(\rho)} u_x\|_{L^2}^2, \quad (4.27)$$

where $C_2 > 0$ is a positive constant depending on $\bar{\mu}$.

The combination of (4.25) with (4.27) gives

$$\frac{d}{dt} W(t) + \alpha \|\rho - \rho_s\|_{L^2}^2 + \alpha \int_0^1 \rho u^2 dx \leq 0, \quad (4.28)$$

where α is a positive constant depending on η , C_1 , and C_2 . Hence, Gronwall's inequality combined with (4.26) and (4.28) shows

$$\|\sqrt{\rho} u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\rho - \rho_s\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C e^{-\alpha t}, \quad \text{for } t > T^*. \quad (4.29)$$

In what follows, we will prove the exponential decay rate for the L^2 -norm of u_x . First, multiplying (4.14) by $e^{\frac{\alpha}{2}t}$, we get after using (4.16) and (4.29)

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \left(e^{\frac{\alpha}{2}t} \|\sqrt{\rho} u\|_{L^2}^2 + 2e^{\frac{\alpha}{2}t} \int_0^1 G(\rho) dx \right) + e^{\frac{\alpha}{2}t} \|u_x\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C e^{\frac{\alpha}{2}t} \|\sqrt{\rho} u\|_{L^2}^2 + C e^{\frac{\alpha}{2}t} \|\rho - \rho_s\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C e^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}t}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.30)$$

Integrating (4.30) over $[T^*, t]$ gives

$$e^{\alpha t} \|\sqrt{\rho} u\|_{L^2}^2 + e^{\alpha t} \|\rho - \rho_s\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_{T^*}^t e^{\frac{\alpha}{2}t} \|u_x\|_{L^2}^2 dt \leq C, \quad \text{for } t > T^*, \quad (4.31)$$

due to (4.29).

Next, multiplying (4.17) by \dot{u} and integrating the resulting equation by parts, it holds for $t > T^*$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{dt} \left(\|\sqrt{\mu(\rho)}u_x\|_{L^2}^2 \right) + \|\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&= -\frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 [\mu(\rho) - \mu'(\rho)\rho]u_x^3 dx + \int_0^1 [P(\rho) - P(\rho_s)]\dot{u}_x dx \\
&\quad + \int_0^1 \rho_s^{-1}(\rho - \rho_s)P'(\rho_s)(\rho_s)_x \dot{u} dx \\
&\leq C\|u_x\|_{L^\infty}\|u_x\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|\rho - \rho_s\|_{L^2}(\|\dot{u}\|_{L^2} + \|\dot{u}_x\|_{L^2}) \\
&\leq C\|u_x\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|\rho - \rho_s\|_{L^2}\|\dot{u}_x\|_{L^2},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.32}$$

where in the last inequality one has used (2.16) and Poincaré inequality. Integrating (4.32) multiplied by $e^{\frac{\alpha}{4}t}$ over $[T^*, t]$, we thus obtain after using (4.31) and (2.16) that

$$e^{\frac{\alpha}{4}t}\|u_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_{T^*}^t e^{\frac{\alpha}{4}t}\|\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 dt \leq C, \quad \text{for } t > T^*,$$

which together with (4.31), (3.9), and (4.1) gives (1.18).

Finally, the proof of (1.19) is similar as that of [14, Theorem 1.2](see also [11, 12]). The proof of Theorem 1.3 is completed. \square

References

- [1] A. A. Amosov, A. A. Zlotnik, Global generalized solutions of the equations of the one-dimensional motion of a viscous heat-conducting gas, *Soviet Math. Dokl.*, **38**(1989), 1-5.
- [2] H. Beirão da Veiga, Long time behavior for one-dimensional motion of a general barotropic viscous fluid, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **108**(1989), 141-160.
- [3] Y. Cho, H. Kim, On classical solutions of the compressible Navier-Stokes equations with nonnegative initial densities. *Manuscript Math.*, **120** (2006), 91-129.
- [4] S. J. Ding, H. Y. Wen, C. J. Zhu. Global classical large solutions of 1D compressible Navier-Stokes equations with density-dependent viscosity and vacuum, *J. Differ. Eqs.*, **221**(2011), 1696-1725.
- [5] D. Y. Fang, T. Zhang, Compressible Navier-Stokes equations with vacuum state in the case of general pressure law, *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, **29**(2006), 1081-1106
- [6] S. Jiang, Z. P. Xin, P. Zhang, Global weak solutions to 1D compressible isentropic Navier-Stokes equations with density-dependent viscosity, *Methods Appl. Anal.*, **12**(2005), 239-251.
- [7] Y. I. Kanel, On a model system of equations of one-dimensional gas motion. *Differential Equations*, 4 (1968), 374-380.
- [8] B. Kawohl, Global existence of large solutions to initial boundary value problems for a viscous, heat-conducting, one-dimensional real gas, *J. Differ. Eqs.*, **58**(1985), 76-103.

- [9] D. Hoff, Global existence for 1D, compressible, isentropic Navier-Stokes equations with large initial data. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **303** (1987), no. 1, 169–181.
- [10] D. Hoff, Global solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations for multidimensional compressible flow with discontinuous initial data. *J. Differ. Eqs.* **120**(1995), no. 1, 215–254.
- [11] F. M. Huang, J. Li, Z.P. Xin, Convergence to equilibria and blowup behavior of global strong solutions to the Stokes approximation equations for two-dimensional compressible flows with large data. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **(9)8**(2006), 471–491.
- [12] X. D. Huang; J. Li; Z. P. Xin, Global well-posedness of classical solutions with large oscillations and vacuum to the three-dimensional isentropic compressible Navier-Stokes equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **65**(2012), 549-585.
- [13] H. L. Li, J. Li, Z. P. Xin, Vanishing of vacuum states and blow-up phenomena of the compressible Navier-Stokes equations, *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **281**(2008), 401-444.
- [14] J. Li, Z. P. Xin, Some uniform estimates and blowup behavior of global strong solution to the Stokes approximation equations for two-dimensional compressible flows, *J. Differential Equations*, 221(2006), 275-308.
- [15] J. Li, Z. P. Xin, Global well-posedness and large time asymptotic behavior of classical solution to the compressible Navier-Stokes equations with vacuum, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1310.1673v1>.
- [16] J. Li, Z. L. Liang, On classical solutions to the Cauchy problem of the two-dimensional barotropic compressible Navier-Stokes equations with vacuum. *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, **102**(2014), 640-671.
- [17] J. Li, Z. L. Liang, Some uniform estimates and large-time behavior for one-dimensional compressible Navier-Stokes system in unbounded domains with large data. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **220**(2016), 1195-1208.
- [18] J. Li, J. W. Zhang, J. N. Zhao, On the global motion of viscous compressible barotropic flows subject to large external potential forces and vacuum. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **47**(2015), no. 2, 1121–1153.
- [19] T. P. Liu, Z. P. Xin, T. Yang, Vacuum states of compressible flow, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, **4**(1998), 1-32.
- [20] M. Okada, S. Matusu-Necasová, T. Makino, Free boundary problem for the equation of one-dimensional motion of compressible gas with density-dependent viscosity, *Ann. Univ. Ferrara Sez., VII (N.S.)*, **48**(2002), 1-20.
- [21] X. Qin, Z. A. Yao, H. Zhao, One dimensional compressible Navier-Stokes equations with density-dependent viscosity and free boundary, *Commun. Pure Appl. Anal.*, **7**(2008), 373-381.
- [22] D. Serre, Solutions faibles globales des equations de Navier-Stokes pour un fluide compressible. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sr. I Math.* **303**(13)(1986), 639-642.
- [23] D. Serre, On the one-dimensional equation of a viscous, compressible, heat-conducting fluid. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sr. I Math.* **303**(14)(1986), 703-706.

- [24] I. Straškraba, A. Zlotnik, On a decay rate for 1D-viscous compressible barotropic fluid equations, *J. Evolution Equations*, **2**(2002), 69-96.
- [25] I. Straškraba, A. Zlotnik, Global properties of solutions to 1D-viscous compressible barotropic fluid equations with density dependent viscosity, *Z. Angew. Math. Phys.*, **54**(2003), 593-607.
- [26] T. Yang, Z. A. Yao, C. J. Zhu, Compressible Navier-Stokes equations with density-dependent viscosity and vacuum, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, **26**(2001), 965-981.
- [27] T. Yang, C. J. Zhu, Compressible Navier-Stokes equations with degenerate viscosity coefficient and vacuum, *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **230**(2002), 329-363.
- [28] A. A. Zlotnik, Uniform estimates and stabilization of symmetric solutions of a system of quasilinear equations. *Diff. Eqs.*, **36**(2000), 701-716.
- [29] A. A. Zlotnik, Uniform estimates and stabilization of solutions to equations of one-dimensional motion of a multicomponent barotropic mixture. *Math. Notes*, **58**(1995), 885-889.