

Vanishing viscosity limit for homogeneous axisymmetric no-swirl solutions of stationary Navier-Stokes equations

Li Li*, YanYan Li†, Xukai Yan‡

Abstract

(−1)-homogeneous axisymmetric no-swirl solutions of three dimensional incompressible stationary Navier-Stokes equations which are smooth on the unit sphere minus the north and south poles have been classified. In this paper we study the vanishing viscosity limit of sequences of these solutions. As the viscosity tends to zero, some sequences of solutions C_{loc}^m converge to solutions of Euler equations on the sphere minus the poles, while for other sequences of solutions, transition layer behaviors occur. For every latitude circle, there are sequences which C_{loc}^m converge respectively to different solutions of the Euler equations on the spherical caps above and below the latitude circle. We give detailed analysis of these convergence and transition layer behaviors.

1 Introduction

We consider (−1)-homogeneous solutions of incompressible stationary Navier-Stokes equations in \mathbb{R}^3 :

$$\begin{cases} -\nu\Delta u + u \cdot \nabla u + \nabla p = 0, \\ \operatorname{div} u = 0. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

The incompressible stationary Euler equations in \mathbb{R}^3 are given by:

$$\begin{cases} v \cdot \nabla v + \nabla q = 0, \\ \operatorname{div} v = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Equations (1) and (2) are invariant under the scaling $u(x) \rightarrow \lambda u(\lambda x)$ and $p(x) \rightarrow \lambda^2 p(\lambda x)$, $\lambda > 0$. We study solutions which are invariant under the scaling. For such solutions u is (−1)-homogeneous and p is (−2)-homogeneous. We call them (−1)-homogeneous solutions according to the homogeneity of u .

*Department of Mathematics, Harbin Institute of Technology, Harbin 150080, China. Email: lili-hit@126.com

†Department of Mathematics, Rutgers University, 110 Frelinghuysen Road, Piscataway, NJ 08854, USA. Email: yyli@math.rutgers.edu

‡School of Mathematics, Georgia Institute of Technology, 686 Cherry St NW, Atlanta, GA 30313, USA. Email: xukai.yan@math.gatech.edu

Landau discovered in [16] a three parameter family of explicit (-1) -homogeneous solutions of (1), which are axisymmetric with no swirl. Tian and Xin proved in [34] that all (-1) -homogeneous, axisymmetric nonzero solutions of (1) which are smooth on the unit sphere \mathbb{S}^2 are Landau solutions. They also gave in the paper explicit expressions of all (-1) -homogeneous axisymmetric solutions of (2). Šverák proved in [32] that all (-1) -homogeneous nonzero solutions which are smooth on \mathbb{S}^2 are Landau solutions. We studied in [17] and [18] (-1) -homogeneous axisymmetric solutions of (1) which are smooth on \mathbb{S}^2 minus the north and south poles. In particular, we classified in [18] all such solutions with no swirl. (-1) -homogeneous solutions of (1) and (2) have been studied in [3], [9], [13], [14], [15], [19], [22], [23], [24], [25], [28], [29], [30], [31], [35] and [37].

In spherical coordinates (r, θ, ϕ) , where r is the radial distance from the origin, θ is the angle between the radius vector and the positive x_3 -axis, and ϕ is the meridian angle about the x_3 -axis, a vector field u is written as

$$u = u_r \vec{e}_r + u_\theta \vec{e}_\theta + u_\phi \vec{e}_\phi,$$

where

$$\vec{e}_r = \begin{pmatrix} \sin \theta \cos \phi \\ \sin \theta \sin \phi \\ \cos \theta \end{pmatrix}, \quad \vec{e}_\theta = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta \cos \phi \\ \cos \theta \sin \phi \\ -\sin \theta \end{pmatrix}, \quad \vec{e}_\phi = \begin{pmatrix} -\sin \phi \\ \cos \phi \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We use N and S to denote respectively the north and south poles of \mathbb{S}^2 . A vector field u is called axisymmetric if u_r , u_θ and u_ϕ depend only on r and θ , and is called *no-swirl* if $u_\phi = 0$. For any (-1) -homogeneous axisymmetric no-swirl solution (u, p) of (1), u_r and p (modulo a constant) can be expressed by u_θ and its derivatives as follows

$$\begin{aligned} u_r &= -\frac{du_\theta}{d\theta} - \cot \theta u_\theta, \\ 2p &= -\frac{d^2 u_r}{d\theta^2} - (\cot \theta - u_\theta) \frac{du_r}{d\theta} - u_r^2 - u_\theta^2. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Similarly, for any (-1) -homogeneous axisymmetric no-swirl solution (v, q) of (2), v_r and q can be expressed by v_θ and its derivatives as follows

$$v_r = -\frac{dv_\theta}{d\theta} - \cot \theta v_\theta, \quad 2q = v_\theta \frac{dv_r}{d\theta} - v_r^2 - v_\theta^2. \tag{4}$$

In this paper, we analyze the behavior of any sequence of (-1) -homogeneous axisymmetric no-swirl solutions $\{(u_{\nu_k}, p_{\nu_k})\}$ of (1), with vanishing viscosity $\nu_k \rightarrow 0$. We will show that in some cases there are subsequences converging to solutions of (2) on \mathbb{S}^2 and in some other cases there are transition layer behaviors. There have been a large amount of research work on vanishing viscosity limit for incompressible Navier-Stokes equations. See for instance [1], [2], [4], [5], [6], [7], [10], [11], [12], [20], [21], [26], [27], [33] and [36].

Based on our result in [18], we have the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. (i) Let $0 < \nu < 1$, (u_ν, p_ν) be (-1) -homogeneous axisymmetric no-swirl solutions of (1) which are smooth on $\mathbb{S}^2 \setminus \{S, N\}$. Then for any $0 < \theta_1 < \theta_2 < \theta_3 < \theta_4 < \pi$, there exists some positive constant C , depending only on the $\{\theta_i\}$, such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^2 \cap \{\theta_1 < \theta < \theta_4\}} |u_{\nu, \theta}|^2 \leq C \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^2 \cap \{\theta_2 < \theta < \theta_3\}} |u_{\nu, \theta}|^2 + \nu^2 \right).$$

(ii) Let $\nu_k \rightarrow 0^+$, (u_{ν_k}, p_{ν_k}) be (-1) -homogeneous axisymmetric no-swirl solutions of (1) which are smooth on $\mathbb{S}^2 \setminus \{S, N\}$. If $\sup_k \nu_k^{-2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2 \cap \{a < \theta < b\}} |u_{\nu_k, \theta}|^2 < \infty$ for some $-1 < a < b < 1$, then there exists some solution (\tilde{u}, \tilde{p}) of (1) with $\nu = 1$ which is smooth on $\mathbb{S}^2 \setminus \{S, N\}$, such that, after passing to a subsequence, for any $\epsilon > 0$, and any integer m ,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \left(\frac{u_{\nu_k}}{\nu_k}, \frac{p_{\nu_k}}{\nu_k^2} \right) - (\tilde{u}, \tilde{p}) \right\|_{C^m(\mathbb{S}^2 \cap \{\epsilon < \theta < \pi - \epsilon\})} = 0.$$

As in [17] and [18], we work with variable $x := \cos \theta$ and vector $U := u \sin \theta$. We use " ' " to denote the derivative with respect to x .

For $\nu \geq 0$, let

$$\bar{c}_3(c_1, c_2; \nu) = -\frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{\nu^2 + c_1} + \sqrt{\nu^2 + c_2})(\sqrt{\nu^2 + c_1} + \sqrt{\nu^2 + c_2} + 2\nu), \quad (5)$$

and introduce

$$J_\nu := \{c \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid c = (c_1, c_2, c_3), c_1 \geq -\nu^2, c_2 \geq -\nu^2, c_3 \geq \bar{c}_3(c_1, c_2; \nu)\}.$$

It is easy to see that $J_{\nu'} \subset J_\nu$ for any $0 \leq \nu' \leq \nu$. We use \mathring{J}_ν to denote the interior of J_ν . For $\nu > 0$, it is known from Theorem 1.2 in [17] that all (-1) -homogeneous axisymmetric no-swirl solutions of (1) which are smooth in $\mathbb{S}^2 \setminus \{S, N\}$ are given by $u = U'_\theta(x)\vec{e}_r + \sin \theta U_\theta(x)\vec{e}_\theta$ where U_θ satisfies

$$\nu(1-x^2)U'_\theta + 2\nu x U_\theta + \frac{1}{2}U_\theta^2 = P_c(x) := c_1(1-x) + c_2(1+x) + c_3(1-x^2), \quad -1 < x < 1, \quad (6)$$

for some $c = (c_1, c_2, c_3) \in J_\nu$.

Let $\tilde{U}_\theta := \frac{U_\theta}{\nu}$, then U_θ is a solution of (6) if and only if \tilde{U}_θ is a solution of

$$(1-x^2)\tilde{U}'_\theta + 2x\tilde{U}_\theta + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{U}_\theta^2 = P_{\frac{c}{\nu^2}}(x), \quad -1 < x < 1. \quad (7)$$

Similar to the above, let $V = v \sin \theta$, then all (-1) -homogeneous axisymmetric solutions of Euler equations (2) are given by $v = V'_\theta \vec{e}_r + \sin \theta V_\theta \vec{e}_\theta + a \vec{e}_\phi$, where a is a constant and V_θ satisfies, for some c ,

$$\frac{1}{2}V_\theta^2 = P_c(x), \quad (8)$$

where $P_c(x)$ is the second order polynomial given in (6). Introduce a subset of ∂J_0 :

$$\partial' J_0 := \{(0, 0, c_3) \mid c_3 > 0\} \cup \{(c_1, 0, c_3) \mid c_1 > 0, c_3 \geq -\frac{1}{2}c_1\} \cup \{(0, c_2, c_3) \mid c_2 > 0, c_3 \geq -\frac{1}{2}c_2\}$$

By Lemma 8.1 in the Appendix, $P_c \geq 0$ on $[-1, 1]$ if and only if $c \in J_0$; $P_c > 0$ on $[-1, 1]$ if and only if $c \in \mathring{J}_0$; and $P_c > 0$ on $(-1, 1)$ if and only if $c \in \mathring{J}_0 \cup \partial' J_0$.

For $c \in J_0$, let $v_c^\pm = v_{c,r}^\pm \vec{e}_r + v_{c,\theta}^\pm \vec{e}_\theta$, where

$$v_{c,\theta}^\pm(r, \theta, \varphi) = \pm \frac{\sqrt{2P_c(\cos \theta)}}{r \sin \theta}, \quad v_{c,r}^\pm(r, \theta, \varphi) = \pm \frac{P'_c(\cos \theta)}{r \sqrt{2P_c(\cos \theta)}},$$

and

$$q_c(r, \theta, \varphi) = -\frac{1}{2r^2} \left(P''_c(\cos \theta) + \frac{2P_c(\cos \theta)}{\sin^2 \theta} \right).$$

It is easy to see from the above (see also [34]) that $\{(v_c^\pm, q_c) \mid c \in \mathring{J}_0 \cup \partial' J_0\}$ is the set of (-1) -homogeneous axisymmetric no-swirl solutions of (2) which are smooth in $\mathbb{S}^2 \setminus \{S, N\}$.

Next, we prove that if a sequence of (-1) -homogeneous axisymmetric no-swirl solutions $\{(u_{\nu_k}, p_{\nu_k})\}$ of (1) converges weakly in $L^2(\mathbb{S}^2 \cap \{\theta_1 < \theta < \theta_2\})$ to (v_c^+, q_c) or (v_c^-, q_c) for some $c \in \mathring{J}_0$, then the convergence is C_{loc}^m for any positive integer m . More precisely we have the following theorem.

Theorem 1.2. *For $0 < \theta_1 < \theta_2 < \pi$ and $\nu_k \rightarrow 0^+$, let $\{(u_{\nu_k}, p_{\nu_k})\}$ be smooth (-1) -homogeneous, axisymmetric, no-swirl solutions of (1) in the open cone in \mathbb{R}^3 generated by $\mathbb{S}^2 \cap \{\theta_1 < \theta < \theta_2\}$. Assume that $\{u_{\nu_k, \theta}\}$ weakly converges to $v = v_c^+$ or v_c^- in $L^2(\mathbb{S}^2 \cap \{\theta_1 < \theta < \theta_2\})$ for some $c \in \mathring{J}_0$. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$ and any positive integer m , there exists some constant C , depending only on $\theta_1, \theta_2, \epsilon, m$ and $\sup_{\nu_k} \|u_{\nu_k, \theta}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^2 \cap \{\theta_1 < \theta < \theta_2\})}$, such that*

$$\|(u_{\nu_k}, p_{\nu_k}) - (v, q_c)\|_{C^m(\mathbb{S}^2 \cap \{\theta_1 + \epsilon < \theta < \theta_2 - \epsilon\})} \leq C\nu_k.$$

In the above theorem we have only analyzed axisymmetric no-swirl solutions $\{u_\nu, p_\nu\}$. Concerning general solutions we raise the following

Question 1. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{S}^2$ be an open set, and let $\{(u_{\nu_k}, p_{\nu_k})\}$, $\nu_k \rightarrow 0^+$, and (v, q) be smooth (-1) -homogeneous solutions of (1) and (2) respectively in the open cone in \mathbb{R}^3 generated by Ω . Assume that u_{ν_k} weakly converges to v in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $\nu_k \rightarrow 0^+$. Is it true that for every non-negative integer m , $\{(u_{\nu_k}, p_{\nu_k})\}$ converges to (v, q) in $C_{loc}^m(\Omega)$?

Given part (ii) of Theorem 1.1, we will only consider below the behavior of (u_{ν_k}, p_{ν_k}) when $\nu_k^{-2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2 \cap \{\frac{\pi}{4} < \theta < \frac{\pi}{2}\}} |u_{\nu_k, \theta}|^2 \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. For instance, Theorem 1.3 below gives asymptotic profiles of $\{(u_{\nu_k}, p_{\nu_k})\}$ under the condition.

Theorem 1.3. *(i) There exist (-1) -homogeneous axisymmetric no-swirl solutions $\{(u_\nu^\pm(c), p_\nu^\pm(c))\}_{0 < \nu \leq 1}$ of (1), belonging to $C^0(\mathring{J}_\nu \times (0, 1], C^m(\mathbb{S}^2 \setminus (B_\epsilon(S) \cup B_\epsilon(N))))$ for every integer $m \geq 0$, such that for every compact subset $K \subset \mathring{J}_0$, and every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists some constant C depending only on ϵ, K and m , such that*

$$\|(u_\nu^\pm(c), p_\nu^\pm(c)) - (v_c^\pm, q_c)\|_{C^m(\mathbb{S}^2 \setminus \{B_\epsilon(S) \cup B_\epsilon(N)\})} \leq C\nu, \quad c \in K.$$

(ii) For every $0 < \theta_0 < \pi$, there exist (-1) -homogeneous axisymmetric no-swirl solutions $\{(u_\nu(c, \theta_0), p_\nu(c, \theta_0))\}_{0 < \nu \leq 1}$ of (1), belonging to $C^0(\mathring{J}_\nu \times (0, 1] \times (0, \pi), C^m(\mathbb{S}^2 \setminus$

$(B_\epsilon(S) \cup B_\epsilon(N))$) for every integer $m \geq 0$, such that for every compact subset $K \subset \mathring{J}_0$, and every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists some constant C depending on ϵ, K and m , such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \| (u_\nu(c, \theta_0), p_\nu(c, \theta_0)) - (v_c^+, q_c) \|_{C^m(\mathbb{S}^2 \cap \{\theta_0 + \epsilon < \theta < \pi - \epsilon\})} \\ & + \| (u_\nu(c, \theta_0), p_\nu(c, \theta_0)) - (v_c^-, q_c) \|_{C^m(\mathbb{S}^2 \cap \{\epsilon < \theta < \theta_0 - \epsilon\})} \leq C\nu, \quad c \in K. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that for every c in \mathring{J}_0 , $P_c > 0$ on $[-1, 1]$, and $v_c^+ \neq v_c^-$ on $\mathbb{S}^2 \cap \{\theta = \theta_0\}$. The limit functions in Theorem 1.3 (ii) have jump discontinuities across the circle $\{\theta = \theta_0\}$.

In the following we give more detailed study on the behaviors of $\{(u_{\nu_k}, p_{\nu_k})\}$ which include that in regions where limit functions are not smooth and transition layer behaviors occur.

Define, for $\nu > 0$ and $c \in J_\nu$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_1(\nu, c_1) &:= 2\nu - 2\sqrt{\nu^2 + c_1}, & \tau_2(\nu, c_1) &:= 2\nu + 2\sqrt{\nu^2 + c_1}, \\ \tau_1'(\nu, c_2) &:= -2\nu - 2\sqrt{\nu^2 + c_2}, & \tau_2'(\nu, c_2) &:= -2\nu + 2\sqrt{\nu^2 + c_2}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

By Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.3 in [18], using the scaling in (7), we have the following theorem.

Theorem A ([18]) *For each $\nu > 0$, there exist $U_{\nu, \theta}^+(c)(x) \in C^0(J_\nu \times [-1, 1])$ and $U_{\nu, \theta}^-(c)(x) \in C^0(J_\nu \times (-1, 1])$ such that for every $c \in J_\nu$, $U_{\nu, \theta}^\pm(c) \in C^\infty(-1, 1)$ satisfy (6) in $(-1, 1)$, and $U_{\nu, \theta}^-(c) \leq U_{\nu, \theta} \leq U_{\nu, \theta}^+(c)$ for any solution $U_{\nu, \theta}$ of (6) in $(-1, 1)$. If $c_3 > \bar{c}_3(c_1, c_2, \nu)$, then $U_{\nu, \theta}^-(c) < U_{\nu, \theta}^+(c)$ in $(-1, 1)$, and the graphs of all solutions of (6) foliate the region $\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid -1 \leq x \leq 1, U_{\nu, \theta}^-(c) \leq y \leq U_{\nu, \theta}^+(c)\}$. Moreover,*

$$\begin{aligned} U_{\nu, \theta}^+(-1) &= \tau_2(\nu, c_1), & U_{\nu, \theta}^+(1) &= \tau_2'(\nu, c_2), \\ U_{\nu, \theta}^-(-1) &= \tau_1(\nu, c_1), & U_{\nu, \theta}^-(1) &= \tau_1'(\nu, c_2), \end{aligned}$$

and if $U_{\nu, \theta}$ is a solution other than $U_{\nu, \theta}^\pm$, then

$$U_{\nu, \theta}(-1) = \tau_1(\nu, c_1), \quad U_{\nu, \theta}(1) = \tau_2'(\nu, c_2).$$

If $c_3 = \bar{c}_3(c_1, c_2, \nu)$, then

$$U_{\nu, \theta}^+(c) \equiv U_{\nu, \theta}^-(c) \equiv U_{\nu, \theta}^*(c_1, c_2) := (\nu + \sqrt{\nu^2 + c_1})(1 - x) + (-\nu - \sqrt{\nu^2 + c_2})(1 + x).$$

In particular, $U_{\nu, \theta}^*(c_1, c_2)(-1) = \tau_2(\nu, c_1)$ and $U_{\nu, \theta}^*(c_1, c_2)(1) = \tau_1'(\nu, c_2)$.

For $c_1, c_2 \geq 0$, $c_1 + c_2 > 0$, denote

$$c_3^*(c_1, c_2) = \bar{c}_3(c_1, c_2; 0) = -\frac{1}{2}(c_1 + 2\sqrt{c_1 c_2} + c_2) < 0,$$

$$P_{(c_1, c_2)}^*(x) := P_{(c_1, c_2, c_3^*(c_1, c_2))}(x) = -c_3^*(c_1, c_2) \left(x - \frac{\sqrt{c_1} - \sqrt{c_2}}{\sqrt{c_1} + \sqrt{c_2}} \right)^2. \quad (10)$$

Then

$$P_c(x) = P_{(c_1, c_2)}^*(x) + (c_3 - c_3^*(c_1, c_2))(1 - x^2). \quad (11)$$

Clearly, $c_3^*(c_1, c_2) = \min\{c_3 \in \mathbb{R} \mid P_c(x) \geq 0 \text{ on } [-1, 1]\}$.

In this paper we will call $U_{\nu,\theta}^+(c)$ and $U_{\nu,\theta}^-(c)$ the upper solution and lower solution of (6) respectively.

Consider sequences $\{(u_{\nu_k}, p_{\nu_k})\}$ satisfying (1) with $\nu_k \rightarrow 0^+$. Then $U_{\nu_k,\theta} = u_{\nu_k,\theta} \sin \theta$ satisfies (6) for some $P_{c_k}, c_k \in J_{\nu_k}$. As mentioned earlier, we only consider below the case when $\nu_k^{-2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2 \cap \{a < \theta < b\}} |u_{\nu_k,\theta}|^2 \rightarrow \infty$ for some $a, b \in (-1, 1)$. By Lemma 2.1, this is equivalent to the condition that $\nu_k^{-2} |c_k| \rightarrow \infty$. If $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \nu_k^{-2} |c_k| < \infty$, then $c_k \rightarrow 0$, and by Theorem 1.1 (ii), $u_{\nu_k} \rightarrow 0$ in $C_{loc}^m(\mathbb{S}^2 \setminus \{S, N\})$ for every m .

The behaviors of $\{U_{\nu_k,\theta}^\pm\}$ are different from other solutions. In most cases, $U_{\nu_k,\theta}^\pm$ converge to solutions of Euler equation (8) on all $[-1, 1]$, while for other solutions, boundary layer behavior occurs.

We first present the convergence results of $\{U_{\nu_k,\theta}^\pm\}$ on $[-1, 1]$. If $\min_{[-1,1]} P_c > 0$, we have, after passing to a subsequence, the convergence of $\{U_{\nu_k,\theta}^\pm(c_k)\}$, $c_k \rightarrow c$, to the solution of the Euler equation $\pm\sqrt{2P_c}$ on $[-1, 1]$.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $\nu_k \rightarrow 0^+$, $c_k \in J_{\nu_k}$, $\nu_k^{-2} |c_k| \rightarrow \infty$. Assume $\hat{c}_k := |c_k|^{-1} c_k \rightarrow \hat{c} \in \mathring{J}_0$. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$ and any positive integer m , there exists some constant C , depending only on ϵ, m and \hat{c} , such that for large k ,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|U_{\nu_k,\theta}^+(c_k) - \sqrt{2P_{c_k}}\|_{L^\infty(-1,1)} + \|U_{\nu_k,\theta}^-(c_k) + \sqrt{2P_{c_k}}\|_{L^\infty(-1,1)} \leq C\nu_k, \\ & \|U_{\nu_k,\theta}^+(c_k) - \sqrt{2P_{c_k}}\|_{C^m[-1,1-\epsilon]} + \|U_{\nu_k,\theta}^-(c_k) + \sqrt{2P_{c_k}}\|_{C^m[-1+\epsilon,1]} \leq C\nu_k. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Remark 1.1. *The constant C in Theorem 1.4 depends only on ϵ, m , and a positive lower bound of $\text{dist}(\hat{c}, \partial J_0)$. Similar statements can be made for Theorem 1.6, 1.7, 1.8 and 1.9.*

Remark 1.2. *In the second estimate in (12), the ϵ could not be taken as 0 in general.*

In Theorem 1.4, $\hat{c} \in \mathring{J}_0$, which is equivalent to $\min_{[-1,1]} P_{\hat{c}} > 0$. If $\min_{[-1,1]} P_{\hat{c}} = 0$, i.e. $c \in \partial J_0$, things are more delicate.

As pointed out later in Section 3, we only need to consider in Theorem 1.4 the special case when $\nu_k \rightarrow 0$, $c_k \rightarrow c \in \mathring{J}_0$. In the following, we will only state the results in the case $c_k \rightarrow c \neq 0$. The next two theorems are for $c_3 = c_3^*(c_1, c_2)$, i.e. $P_c = P_{(c_1, c_2)}^*$.

The following results are proved among other things. If $c_k \in J_0$, then $\{U_{\nu_k,\theta}^\pm(c_k)\}$ converge to the Euler equation solutions $\pm\sqrt{2P_c}$ in $L^\infty(-1, 1)$. If $\bar{x} := \frac{\sqrt{c_1} - \sqrt{c_2}}{\sqrt{c_1} + \sqrt{c_2}} = 1$, i.e. $c_2 = 0$, then $\{U_{\nu_k,\theta}^+(c_k)\}$ converges to the Euler equation solution $\sqrt{2P_c}$ in $L^\infty(-1, 1)$. On the other hand, if $\bar{x} \in [-1, 1)$, i.e. $c_2 > 0$, then there exist examples $\{U_{\nu_k,\theta}^+(c_k)\}$ having no convergent subsequence in $L^\infty(1 - \delta, 1)$ for any $\delta > 0$. In particular, it has no subsequence converging to a solution of the Euler equation in $L^\infty(-1, 1)$. Similar results are proved for $\{U_{\nu_k,\theta}^-(c_k)\}$. If $\bar{x} = -1$, i.e. $c_1 = 0$, then $\{U_{\nu_k,\theta}^-(c_k)\}$ converges to the Euler equation solution $-\sqrt{2P_c}$ in $L^\infty(-1, 1)$. On the other hand, if $\bar{x} \in (-1, 1]$, i.e. $c_1 > 0$, then there exist examples $\{U_{\nu_k,\theta}^-(c_k)\}$ having no convergent subsequence in $L^\infty(-1, -1 + \delta)$ for any $\delta > 0$. In particular, it has no subsequence converging to a solution of the Euler equation in $L^\infty(-1, 1)$.

Theorem 1.5. For any $c \in \partial J_0$ with $c_3 = c_3^*(c_1, c_2)$ and $c_2 > 0$, there exist some sequences $c_k \in J_{\nu_k}$, $c_k \rightarrow c$, $\nu_k \rightarrow 0^+$, such that for any $\epsilon > 0$, $\inf_k \|\frac{1}{2}(U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+(c_k))^2 - P_{c_k}\|_{L^\infty(1-\epsilon, 1)} > 0$. Similarly, for any $c \in \partial J_0$ with $c_3 = c_3^*(c_1, c_2)$ and $c_1 > 0$, there exist some sequences $c_k \in J_{\nu_k}$, $c_k \rightarrow c$, and $\nu_k \rightarrow 0^+$, such that for any $\epsilon > 0$, $\inf_k \|\frac{1}{2}(U_{\nu_k, \theta}^-(c_k))^2 - P_{c_k}\|_{L^\infty(-1, -1+\epsilon)} > 0$.

Remark 1.3. It is easy to see that the $\{U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+\}$ constructed in Theorem 1.5 satisfies $\inf_k \|U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+(c_k) - \sqrt{2P_{c_k}}\|_{L^\infty(1-\epsilon, 1)} > 0$, and $\{U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+(c_k)\}$ has no convergent subsequence in $L^\infty(1-\epsilon, 1)$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. Similar statements apply to $\{U_{\nu_k, \theta}^-(c_k)\}$.

Theorem 1.6. Let $\nu_k \rightarrow 0^+$, $c_k \in J_{\nu_k}$, $c_k \rightarrow c \neq 0$ and $c_3 = c_3^*(c_1, c_2)$.

(i) If $c_k \in J_0$, then $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|U_{\nu_k, \theta}^\pm(c_k) \mp \sqrt{2P_{c_k}}\|_{L^\infty(-1, 1)} = 0$, and for any $0 < \beta < 2/3$, there exists some constant C , depending only on c , ϵ and β , such that for large k ,

$$\|\frac{1}{2}(U_{\nu_k, \theta}^\pm(c_k))^2 - P_{c_k}\|_{L^\infty(-1, 1)} + \nu_k^\beta \|\frac{1}{2}(U_{\nu_k, \theta}^\pm(c_k))^2 - P_{c_k}\|_{C^\beta(-1+\epsilon, 1-\epsilon)} \leq C\nu_k^{2/3}.$$

Moreover, $\bar{x} := \frac{\sqrt{c_1} - \sqrt{c_2}}{\sqrt{c_1} + \sqrt{c_2}} \in [-1, 1]$, and for any $\epsilon > 0$ and integer $m \geq 0$, there exists some constant C , depending only on c , m and ϵ , such that for large k ,

$$\|U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+(c_k) - \sqrt{2P_{c_k}}\|_{C^m([-1, 1-\epsilon] \setminus [\bar{x}-\epsilon, \bar{x}+\epsilon])} + \|U_{\nu_k, \theta}^-(c_k) + \sqrt{2P_{c_k}}\|_{C^m([-1+\epsilon, 1] \setminus [\bar{x}-\epsilon, \bar{x}+\epsilon])} \leq C\nu_k.$$

(ii) If $c_2 = 0$, then $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+(c_k) - \sqrt{2P_{c_k}}\|_{L^\infty(-1, 1)} = 0$, and there exists some constant C , depending only on c , such that for large k ,

$$\|\frac{1}{2}(U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+(c_k))^2 - P_{c_k}\|_{L^\infty(-1, 1)} \leq C(|c_{k2}| + |2c_{k3} + c_{k1}|^2 + \nu_k^{2/3}) = o(1). \quad (13)$$

(iii) If $c_1 = 0$, then $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|U_{\nu_k, \theta}^-(c_k) + \sqrt{2P_{c_k}}\|_{L^\infty(-1, 1)} = 0$, and there exists some constant C , depending only on c , such that for large k ,

$$\|\frac{1}{2}(U_{\nu_k, \theta}^-(c_k))^2 - P_{c_k}\|_{L^\infty(-1, 1)} \leq C(|c_{k1}| + |2c_{k3} + c_{k2}|^2 + \nu_k^{2/3}) = o(1).$$

Next, we discuss the remaining cases when $\min_{[-1, 1]} P_c = 0 = P_c(-1)$ and $P_c'(-1) > 0$ or $\min_{[-1, 1]} P_c = 0 = P_c(1)$ and $P_c'(1) < 0$. This is equivalent to $c_1 = 0$ and $c_3 > c_3^*(c_1, c_2)$ or $c_2 = 0$ and $c_3 > c_3^*(c_1, c_2)$. In this case, $U_{\nu_k, \theta}^\pm(c_k)$ converge respectively to the Euler equation solutions $\pm\sqrt{2P_c}$ in $L^\infty(-1, 1)$.

Theorem 1.7. Let $\nu_k \rightarrow 0^+$, $c_k \in J_{\nu_k}$, $c_k \rightarrow c \neq 0$, $c_1 c_2 = 0$ and $c_3 > c_3^*(c_1, c_2)$. Then

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|U_{\nu_k, \theta}^\pm(c_k) \mp \sqrt{2P_c}\|_{L^\infty(-1, 1)} = 0.$$

Moreover, for any $\epsilon > 0$ and integer $m \geq 0$, there exists some constant $C > 0$, depending only on ϵ , β , and c , such that for large k ,

$$\nu_k^{1/2} \|\frac{1}{2}(U_{\nu_k, \theta}^\pm(c_k))^2 - P_{c_k}\|_{L^\infty(-1, 1)} + \|U_{\nu_k, \theta}^\pm(c_k) \mp \sqrt{2P_c}\|_{C^m(-1+\epsilon, 1-\epsilon)} \leq C\nu_k.$$

Table 1: Summary of convergent results for $U_{\nu_k, \theta}^\pm$

Conditions		Conclusions (True/False)	
		$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \ U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+(c_k) - \sqrt{2P_c}\ _{L^\infty(-1,1)} = 0$	$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \ U_{\nu_k, \theta}^-(c_k) + \sqrt{2P_c}\ _{L^\infty(-1,1)} = 0$
$c \in \mathring{J}_0$		True	True
$c_3 = c_3^*$	$c_2 > 0$	False: $\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists$ non-convergent sequence $\{U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+\}$ in $(1 - \epsilon, 1)$.	
	$c_1 > 0$		False: $\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists$ non-convergent sequence $\{U_{\nu_k, \theta}^-\}$ in $(-1, -1 + \epsilon)$.
	$c_k \in J_0$	True	True
	$c_2 = 0$	True	
	$c_1 = 0$		True
$c_3 > c_3^*, c_1 c_2 = 0$		True	True

Theorem 1.4 - Theorem 1.7 present some convergent results of U_θ^\pm . To help the readers to have a general picture of these results, we summarize the L^∞ convergent results of $U_{\nu_k, \theta}^\pm$ in Table 1, where we always assume that $\nu_k \rightarrow 0^+, c_k \in J_{\nu_k}, c_k \rightarrow c \neq 0$.

We now present results for solutions $U_{\nu_k, \theta}$ of (6) other than $U_{\nu_k, \theta}^\pm(c_k)$.

For $c \in J_0 \setminus \{0\}$, define

$$\alpha(c) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } c_1, c_2 > 0, c_3 > c_3^*(c_1, c_2), \\ \frac{2}{3}, & \text{if } c_3 = c_3^*(c_1, c_2) < 0, \\ \frac{1}{2}, & \text{if } c_1 c_2 = 0, c_3 > c_3^*(c_1, c_2). \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

Theorem 1.8. *Let $\nu_k \rightarrow 0^+, c_k \in J_0, c_k \rightarrow c \neq 0$. Assume $U_{\nu_k, \theta}(c_k) \in C^1(-1, 1)$ is a solution of (6) with ν_k and c_k , other than $U_{\nu_k, \theta}^\pm(c_k)$. Then there exists at most one $-1 < x_k < 1$ such that $U_{\nu_k, \theta}(x_k) = 0$, and such x_k must exist if $c_1, c_2 > 0$.*

(i) *If $U_{\nu_k, \theta}(x_k) = 0$ for some $x_k \in (-1, 1)$, then for any $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\|U_{\nu_k, \theta} + \sqrt{2P_c}\|_{L^\infty(-1, x_k - \epsilon)} + \|U_{\nu_k, \theta} - \sqrt{2P_c}\|_{L^\infty(x_k + \epsilon, 1)} \right) = 0, \quad (15)$$

and for any $0 < \beta < \alpha(c)$, there exists some constant $C > 0$, depending only on c, ϵ and β , such that for large k ,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{2} U_{\nu_k, \theta}^2 - P_{c_k} \right\|_{L^\infty((-1, x_k - \epsilon) \cup (x_k + \epsilon, 1))} + \nu_k^\beta \left\| \frac{1}{2} U_{\nu_k, \theta}^2 - P_{c_k} \right\|_{C^\beta((-1 + \epsilon, x_k - \epsilon) \cup (x_k + \epsilon, 1 - \epsilon))} \leq C \nu_k^{\alpha(c)}.$$

(ii) *If $U_{\nu_k, \theta}(x_k) = 0$ for some $x_k \in (-1, 1)$ satisfying $x_k \rightarrow -1$ and $c_1 = 0$, or $U_{\nu_k, \theta} \neq 0$ on $(-1, 1)$ and $c_2 > 0 = c_1$, then*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|U_{\nu_k, \theta} - \sqrt{2P_c}\|_{L^\infty(-1, 1)} = 0. \quad (16)$$

If $U_{\nu_k, \theta}(x_k) = 0$ for some $x_k \in (-1, 1)$ satisfying $x_k \rightarrow 1$ and $c_2 = 0$, or $U_{\nu_k, \theta} \neq 0$ on $(-1, 1)$ and $c_1 > 0 = c_2$, then

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|U_{\nu_k, \theta} + \sqrt{2P_c}\|_{L^\infty(-1, 1)} = 0. \quad (17)$$

If $U_{\nu_k, \theta} \neq 0$ on $(-1, 1)$ and $c_1 = c_2 = 0$, then, after passing to a subsequence, either (16) or (17) occurs.

(iii) If $c \in \mathring{J}_0$, then $U_{\nu_k, \theta}(x_k) = 0$ for some $x_k \in (-1, 1)$ and for any $\epsilon > 0$ and any positive integer m , there exists some constant $C > 0$, depending only on ϵ , m and c , such that for large k ,

$$\|U_{\nu_k, \theta} + \sqrt{2P_{c_k}}\|_{L^\infty(-1, x_k - \epsilon)} + \|U_{\nu_k, \theta} - \sqrt{2P_{c_k}}\|_{L^\infty(x_k + \epsilon, 1)} \leq C\nu_k, \quad (18)$$

$$\|U_{\nu_k, \theta} + \sqrt{2P_{c_k}}\|_{C^m(-1 + \epsilon, x_k - \epsilon)} + \|U_{\nu_k, \theta} - \sqrt{2P_{c_k}}\|_{C^m(x_k + \epsilon, 1 - \epsilon)} \leq C\nu_k. \quad (19)$$

Remark 1.4. For any $c \in J_0$ with $c_1, c_2 > 0$, $0 < \nu < 1$, and $-1 \leq \hat{x} \leq 1$, there exists some solution U_θ of (6), other than $U_{\nu, \theta}^\pm(c)$, such that $U_\theta(\hat{x}) = 0$. This can be seen from Theorem A, which asserts that the graphs of all solutions of (6) foliate the region $\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid -1 \leq x \leq 1, U_{\nu, \theta}^-(c) \leq y \leq U_{\nu, \theta}^+(c)\}$ in \mathbb{R}^2 .

The above theorem indicates the formation of boundary layers (if we view $x = \pm 1$ as boundaries) and interior layers. We give descriptions of boundary layers and interior layers in the following theorem.

For $c \in J_0$, define

$$\kappa(c) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } c_1, c_2 > 0, c_3 > c_3^*(c_1, c_2), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $-1 < x < 1$, $K > 0$, define

$$\tilde{U}_{\theta, x_k}(x) = \begin{cases} -\sqrt{2P_{c_k}(x)}, & -1 \leq x < x_k - K\nu_k |\ln \nu_k| (1 - x_k^2), \\ \sqrt{2P_{c_k}(x_k)} \tanh\left(\frac{\sqrt{2P_{c_k}(x_k)}(x - x_k)}{2(1 - x_k^2)\nu_k}\right), & |x - x_k| \leq K\nu_k |\ln \nu_k| (1 - x_k^2), \\ \sqrt{2P_{c_k}(x)}, & x_k + K\nu_k |\ln \nu_k| (1 - x_k^2) < x \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 1.9. Let $\nu_k \rightarrow 0^+$, $c_k \in J_0$, $c_k \rightarrow c \neq 0$. Assume $U_{\nu_k, \theta} \in C^1(-1, 1)$ is a solution of (6) with ν_k and c_k , other than $U_{\nu_k, \theta}^\pm$. In addition, assume that there exists $x_k \in (-1, 1)$ such that $U_{\nu_k, \theta}(x_k) = 0$ and $x_k \rightarrow \hat{x} \in [-1, 1]$, $P_c(\hat{x}) \neq 0$. Then $\{U_{\nu_k, \theta}\}$ develops a layer near x_k . Moreover, there exist some positive constants K and C , depending only on c , such that for large k ,

$$\|U_{\nu_k, \theta} - \tilde{U}_{\theta, x_k}\|_{L^\infty(-1, 1)} \leq C\nu_k^{\alpha(c)} |\ln \nu_k|^{2\kappa(c)}. \quad (20)$$

Remark 1.5. The solutions $U_{\nu_k, \theta}$ of (6) with ν_k asymptotically behave like \tilde{U}_{θ, x_k} as $\nu_k \rightarrow 0^+$. Hence an interior layer appears when $\hat{x} \in (-1, 1)$, and a boundary layer appears when $\hat{x} = \pm 1$ if we view $x = \pm 1$ as boundaries.

Remark 1.6. The length scale of the transition layers is ν_k for interior layers, and is $o(\nu_k)$ for boundary layers. Moreover, for any $\epsilon_k = o(\nu_k)$, there exists $\{U_{\nu_k, \theta}\}$ having boundary layer length scale as ϵ_k .

The organization of the paper is as follows. Theorem 1.1 is proved at the beginning of Section 2. In the remaining part of Section 2 we present some preliminary results and prove Theorem 1.2 at the end of Section 2. In Section 3 we prove Theorem 1.4 and Theorem 1.8 (iii). In Section 4 we prove Theorem 1.5 and Theorem 1.6. In Section 5 we prove Theorem 1.7. Theorem 1.8 (i) and (ii) are proved at the end of Section 4 and the end of Section 5. Theorem 1.3 is proved at the end of Section 5. In Section 6 we prove Theorem 1.9. In Section 7 we give illustrations on transition layer behaviors. In the appendix, we present some elementary properties of second order polynomials which we have used.

Acknowledgment. The work of the first named author is partially supported by NSFC grants No. 11871177. The work of the second named author is partially supported by NSF grants DMS-1501004. The work of the third named author is partially supported by AMS-Simons Travel Grant and AWM-NSF Travel Grant.

2 Preliminary

We first prove Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 2.1. *For $0 < \nu \leq 1$, let $U_{\nu,\theta}$ satisfies (6) in $(-1, 1)$ for some $c \in J_\nu$. Then there exists some universal constant $C > 0$, such that for any $-1 < r < s < 1$,*

$$((s-r)^4|c| - (s-r)\nu^2)/C \leq \int_r^s U_{\nu,\theta}^2 \leq C(|c| + \nu^2 / \min\{1-s, 1+r\}). \quad (21)$$

Proof. Throughout the proof, C denotes some universal constant which may change value from line to line.

For all $0 < r < s < 1$, there exist $a \in [-s, -r]$ and $b \in [r, s]$ such that

$$|U_{\nu,\theta}(a)| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{s-r}} \left(\int_{-s}^{-r} U_{\nu,\theta}^2 \right)^{1/2}, \quad |U_{\nu,\theta}(b)| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{s-r}} \left(\int_r^s U_{\nu,\theta}^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

By (6) and the above,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-r}^r U_{\nu,\theta}^2 &\leq \int_a^b U_{\nu,\theta}^2 = 2 \int_a^b (P_c - \nu(1-x^2)U'_{\nu,\theta} - 2\nu x U_{\nu,\theta}) dx \\ &\leq C|c| + C\nu(|U_{\nu,\theta}(a)| + |U_{\nu,\theta}(b)|) + C\nu^2 + \frac{1}{4} \int_a^b U_{\nu,\theta}^2(x) dx \\ &\leq C(|c| + \nu^2/(s-r)) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{-s}^s U_{\nu,\theta}^2. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 1 in [8],

$$\int_{-r}^r U_{\nu,\theta}^2 \leq C(|c| + \nu^2/(s-r)), \quad \forall 0 < r < s < 1.$$

The second inequality in (21) follows from the above.

Next, we prove the first inequality in (21). Rewrite $P_c = \hat{c}_1 + \hat{c}_2 x + \hat{c}_3 x^2$. Then $|c| \leq C|\hat{c}|$ where $\hat{c} = (\hat{c}_1, \hat{c}_2, \hat{c}_3)$. For $-1 < r < s < 1$, let $\delta = (s - r)/9$. Then there exist $a \in [r, r + \delta]$ and $b_i \in [r + 2i\delta, r + (2i + 1)\delta]$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, such that

$$|U_{\nu, \theta}(a)| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta}} \left(\int_r^{r+\delta} U_{\nu, \theta}^2 \right)^{1/2}, \quad |U_{\nu, \theta}(b_i)| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta}} \left(\int_{r+2i\delta}^{r+(2i+1)\delta} U_{\nu, \theta}^2 \right)^{1/2}. \quad (22)$$

For each $i = 1, 2, 3$, we have

$$\int_a^{b_i} P_c(x) dx = \int_a^{b_i} \left(\nu(1 - x^2)U'_\theta + 2\nu x U_\theta + \frac{1}{2}U_\theta^2 \right) =: \beta_i.$$

Let $\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3)$, write the above as $A\hat{c}^t = \beta^t$, where \hat{c}^t and β^t denote the transpose of \hat{c} and β respectively, and

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} b_1 - a & (b_1^2 - a^2)/2 & (b_1^3 - a^3)/3 \\ b_2 - a & (b_2^2 - a^2)/2 & (b_2^3 - a^3)/3 \\ b_3 - a & (b_3^2 - a^2)/2 & (b_3^3 - a^3)/3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

By (22), we have, after an integration by parts,

$$|\beta_i| \leq C\nu (|U_{\nu, \theta}(a)| + |U_{\nu, \theta}(b_i)|) + C\nu^2 + C \int_a^{b_i} U_{\nu, \theta}^2 dx \leq C\nu^2 + \frac{C}{\delta} \int_r^s U_{\nu, \theta}^2. \quad (23)$$

By computation, we have that A is invertible and

$$A^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{2a^2+ab_3+ab_2-b_2b_3}{(b_1-a)(b_2-b_1)(b_3-b_1)} & \frac{2a^2+ab_1+ab_3-b_1b_3}{(b_2-a)(b_2-b_1)(b_3-b_2)} & -\frac{2a^2+ab_1+ab_2-b_1b_2}{(b_3-a)(b_3-b_1)(b_3-b_2)} \\ -\frac{2(b_2+b_3+a)}{(b_1-a)(b_2-b_1)(b_3-b_1)} & \frac{2(b_1+b_3+a)}{(b_2-a)(b_2-b_1)(b_3-b_2)} & -\frac{2(b_1+b_2+a)}{(b_3-a)(b_3-b_1)(b_3-b_2)} \\ \frac{3}{(b_1-a)(b_2-b_1)(b_3-b_1)} & -\frac{3}{(b_2-a)(b_2-b_1)(b_3-b_2)} & \frac{3}{(b_3-a)(b_3-b_1)(b_3-b_2)} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Clearly, $\delta \leq b_i - a, b_j - b_i \leq 9\delta$ for every $i < j$. So we have $\|A^{-1}\| \leq C\delta^{-3}$. Then, using (23), we have

$$|c| \leq C|\hat{c}| = C\|A^{-1}\beta\| \leq \|A^{-1}\| \|\beta\| \leq C\delta^{-3} \left(\nu^2 + \frac{1}{\delta} \int_r^s U_{\nu, \theta}^2 \right).$$

The first inequality of (21) follows from the above. The lemma is proved. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1: (i) We use C to denote a positive constant depending only on $\{\theta_i\}$, which may vary from line to line. Let $r_i = \cos \theta_i$, $1 \leq i \leq 4$, $x = \cos \theta$, $U_{\nu, \theta} = u_{\nu, \theta} \sin \theta$. Then $U_{\nu, \theta}$ satisfies (6) on (r_4, r_1) for some $c \in J_\nu$. By Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2 \cap \{\theta_1 < \theta < \theta_4\}} |u_{\nu, \theta}|^2 &\leq C \int_{r_4}^{r_1} U_{\nu, \theta}^2(x) dx \leq C(|c| + \nu^2) \\ &\leq C \left(\int_{r_3}^{r_2} U_{\nu, \theta}^2(x) dx + \nu^2 \right) \leq C \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^2 \cap \{\theta_2 < \theta < \theta_3\}} |u_{\nu, \theta}|^2 + \nu^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Part (i) is proved.

(ii) Let $U_{\nu_k, \theta} = u_{\nu_k, \theta} \sin \theta$, $r = \cos(\pi - \epsilon)$, $s = \cos \epsilon$. Since (u_{ν_k}, p_{ν_k}) are (-1) -homogeneous axisymmetric no-swirl solutions of (1) on $\mathbb{S}^2 \setminus \{S, N\}$, there exists $c_k \in J_{\nu_k}$, such that $U_{\nu_k, \theta}$ satisfies (6) with the right hand side to be P_{c_k} . By Lemma 2.1, using the boundedness of $\nu_k^{-2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2 \cap \{a < \theta < b\}} |u_{\nu_k, \theta}|^2$, $\{\nu_k^{-2} |c_k|\}$ is bounded for some $a, b \in (-1, 1)$. Notice that $\tilde{U}_{\theta, k} := U_{\nu_k, \theta}(c_k)/\nu_k$ is a solution to (7) with $P_{c_k \nu_k^{-2}}$, and after passing to a subsequence, $\tilde{c}_k := c_k \nu_k^{-2} \rightarrow \tilde{c}$ for some \tilde{c} . By Lemma 2.2 in [18], $\{|\tilde{U}_{\theta, k}|_{L^\infty(-1, 1)}\}$ is bounded. It follows from standard ODE theories that there exists some smooth solution \tilde{U}_θ of (7) with $c\nu^{-2} = \tilde{c}$ that $\tilde{U}_{\theta, k} \rightarrow \tilde{U}_\theta$ in $C^m([-1 + \epsilon, 1 - \epsilon])$ for any $\epsilon > 0$ and any positive integer m . Part (ii) is proved with $\tilde{u}_\theta = \tilde{U}_\theta/\sin \theta$ together with (3). \square

Let $\nu > 0$, $c \in \mathbb{R}^3$, and f_ν be a solution of the equation

$$\nu(1 - x^2)f'_\nu + 2\nu x f_\nu + \frac{1}{2}f_\nu^2 = P_c(x). \quad (25)$$

Lemma 2.2. *For $0 < \nu \leq 1$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}^3$, let f_ν be a solution of (25) in $C^1(-1, 1)$. Then $|f_\nu| \leq 5\sqrt{1 + |c|}$ in $(-1, 1)$.*

Proof. By Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3 in [18], we have $c \in J_\nu$, $f_\nu(-1) = \tau_1$ or τ_2 , and $f_\nu(1) = \tau'_1$ or τ'_2 , where τ_1, τ_2, τ'_1 and τ'_2 are defined as in (9). Thus $|f(\pm 1)| < 5\sqrt{1 + |c|}$.

Suppose that there exists a point $x_0 \in (-1, 1)$ such that $f_\nu(x_0) > 5\sqrt{1 + |c|}$, then by (25),

$$\nu(1 - x_0^2)f'_\nu(x_0) \leq 6|c| - \frac{1}{2}f_\nu^2(x_0) + 2\nu f_\nu(x_0) \leq 6|c| + 4\nu^2 - \frac{1}{4}f_\nu^2(x_0) < 0.$$

So $f'_\nu(x_0) < 0$. It follows that $f_\nu(x) > 5\sqrt{1 + |c|}$ for any $-1 < x < x_0$. This contradicts the fact that $f_\nu(-1) < 5\sqrt{1 + |c|}$. We have proved that $f_\nu \leq 5\sqrt{1 + |c|}$ on $(-1, 1)$. Similarly, we can prove that $f_\nu \geq -5\sqrt{1 + |c|}$ on $(-1, 1)$. \square

Lemma 2.3. *Let $0 < \nu \leq 1$, $-1 \leq a < b \leq 1$, $f_\nu \in C^1(a, b)$ be a solution of (25) in (a, b) and $|f_\nu| \leq M$ on (a, b) for some constant $M > 0$. Then*

$$\inf_{(a, b)} \left| \frac{1}{2}f_\nu^2 - P_c \right| < 10M\nu/(b - a). \quad (26)$$

Moreover, if $0 \leq a < b \leq 1$, we have

$$\inf_{(a, b)} \left| \frac{1}{2}f_\nu^2 - P_c \right| \leq 8M\nu(1 - a)/(b - a), \quad (27)$$

and if $-1 \leq a < b \leq 0$, we have

$$\inf_{(a, b)} \left| \frac{1}{2}f_\nu^2 - P_c \right| \leq 8M\nu(b + 1)/(b - a). \quad (28)$$

Proof. Shrinking (a, b) slightly, we may assume without loss of generality that f_ν is also in $C^0[a, b]$. For convenience we write $h_\nu = \frac{1}{2}f_\nu^2 - P_c$, and we only need to consider

that h_ν does not change sign on (a, b) . Integrating (25) over (a, b) , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_a^b |h_\nu(x)| dx &= \left| \int_a^b (\nu(1-x^2)f'_\nu(x) + 2\nu x f_\nu(x)) dx \right| \\ &= \nu \left| (1-b^2)f_\nu(b) - (1-a^2)f_\nu(a) + \int_a^b 4x f_\nu \right| \leq 10M\nu. \end{aligned}$$

This implies (26).

If $0 \leq a < b \leq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_a^b |h_\nu(x)| dx &= \nu \left| (1-b^2)f_\nu(b) - (1-a^2)f_\nu(a) + \int_a^b 4x f_\nu \right| \\ &\leq M\nu(2(1-b) + 2(1-a) + 4(1-a)) \leq 8M\nu(1-a). \end{aligned}$$

This gives (27). Estimate (28) can be proved similarly. \square

Lemma 2.4. For $0 < \nu \leq 1$, $c \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $-1 \leq a < b \leq 1$, let $f_\nu \in C^1(a, b) \cap C^0[a, b]$ be a solution of (25) in (a, b) satisfying, for some positive constants μ and δ , that $f_\nu(a) \geq \mu$ and $P_c \geq \delta$ in (a, b) . Then for all $0 < \nu \leq 1$,

$$f_\nu(x) \geq \min\{\mu, \sqrt{\delta}, \delta/(4\nu)\}, \quad a \leq x \leq b.$$

Proof. If for some $0 < \lambda < \mu$, there exists some $x \in (a, b]$ such that $f_\nu(x) \leq \lambda$, then let x_ν be the first point greater than a such that $f_\nu(x_\nu) = \lambda$. Then $f'_\nu(x_\nu) \leq 0$. By equation (25) we have that

$$2\nu\lambda + \lambda^2/2 \geq 2\nu x_\nu \lambda + \lambda^2/2 \geq P_c(x_\nu) \geq \delta.$$

So either $4\nu\lambda \geq \delta$ or $\lambda^2 \geq \delta$. \square

Lemma 2.4'. For $0 < \nu \leq 1$, $c \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $-1 \leq a < b \leq 1$, let $f_\nu \in C^1(a, b) \cap C^0[a, b]$ be a solution of (25) in (a, b) , satisfying, for some positive constants μ and δ , that $f_\nu(b) \leq -\mu$ and $P_c \geq \delta$ in (a, b) . Then for all $0 < \nu \leq 1$,

$$f_\nu(x) \leq -\min\{\mu, \sqrt{\delta}, \delta/(4\nu)\}, \quad a \leq x \leq b.$$

Proof. Let $g_\nu(x) := -f_\nu(a+b-x)$ for $x \in [a, b]$. Then g_ν is a solution of (25) with the same P_c and $g_\nu(a) \geq \mu$. The lemma follows from Lemma 2.4, applied to g_ν . \square

Corollary 2.1. Let $0 < \nu \leq 1$, $c \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $-1 \leq a < b \leq 1$, $f_\nu \in C^1(a, b)$ be a solution of (25) in (a, b) satisfying $0 \leq f_\nu \leq M$ on the interval for some positive constant M . If $P_c \geq \delta > 0$ in (a, b) for some constant δ , then

$$f_\nu(x) \geq \min\{\sqrt{\delta}, \delta/(4\nu)\}, \quad x \in (a + \epsilon, b) \quad (29)$$

holds for any ϵ satisfying $20M\nu/\delta < \epsilon < b - a$. If we further assume that $-1 < a < -1/2$, then (29) holds for any $32M\nu(a+1)/\delta < \epsilon < \min\{a+1, b-a\}$.

Proof. Shrinking (a, b) slightly we may assume without loss of generality that f_ν is also in $C^0[a, b]$. By Lemma 2.3, there is some $x_\nu \in [a, a + \epsilon]$ such that

$$\left| \frac{1}{2} f_\nu^2(x_\nu) - P_c(x_\nu) \right| \leq 10M\nu/\epsilon.$$

For $20M\nu/\delta < \epsilon < b - a$, we have $f_\nu^2(x_\nu) \geq 2P_c(x_\nu) - 20M\nu/\epsilon \geq \delta$. So $f_\nu(x_\nu) \geq \sqrt{\delta}$. Then applying Lemma 2.4, we have (29) for any $20M\nu/\delta < \epsilon < b - a$, $0 < \nu \leq 1$.

If $-1 < a < -1/2$, then $2a + 1 < 0$. By Lemma 2.3 and (28), for any $0 < \epsilon < \min(a + 1, b - a)$, there exists $x_\nu \in (a, a + \epsilon)$ such that

$$\left| \frac{1}{2} f_\nu^2(x_\nu) - P_c(x_\nu) \right| \leq 8M\nu(a + \epsilon + 1)/\epsilon < 16M\nu(a + 1)/\epsilon.$$

For $32M\nu(a + 1)/\delta < \epsilon < \min(a + 1, b - a)$, we have $f_\nu^2(x_\nu) \geq 2P_c(x_\nu) - 32M\nu(a + 1)/\epsilon \geq \delta$. So $f_\nu(x_\nu) \geq \sqrt{\delta}$. By Lemma 2.4, (29) holds for any $32M\nu(a + 1)/\delta < \epsilon < \min(a + 1, b - a)$, $0 < \nu \leq 1$. \square

Corollary 2.1'. *Let $0 < \nu \leq 1$, $c \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $-1 \leq a < b \leq 1$, $f_\nu \in C^1(a, b)$ be a solution of (25) in (a, b) and $-M \leq f_\nu \leq 0$ for some positive constant M on (a, b) . If $P_c \geq \delta > 0$ in (a, b) , then*

$$f_\nu \leq -\min\{\sqrt{\delta}, \delta/(4\nu)\}, \quad x \in (a, b - \epsilon) \quad (30)$$

holds for any $20M\nu/\delta < \epsilon < b - a$. If we further assume that $1/2 < b < 1$, then (30) holds for any $32M\nu(1 - b)/\delta < \epsilon < \min(1 - b, b - a)$.

Remark 2.1. *Under the conditions of Corollary 2.1 (or Corollary 2.1'), for any small $\epsilon > 0$ fixed, there exists $\nu_0 > 0$, depending only on ϵ, M and δ , such that (29) (or (30)) holds for all $0 < \nu < \nu_0$.*

Lemma 2.5. *Let $0 < \nu \leq 1$, $-1 \leq a < b \leq 1$, $c \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\}$, suppose $f_\nu \in C^1(a, b) \cap C^0[a, b]$ is a solution of (25) in (a, b) , and $P_c \geq 0$ in (a, b) . Then there exists at most one $x_\nu \in (a, b)$ such that $f_\nu(x_\nu) = 0$. Moreover, if $f_\nu(a) > 0$, then $f_\nu > 0$ on (a, b) , and if $f_\nu(b) < 0$, then $f_\nu < 0$ on (a, b) .*

Proof. We first prove that there does not exist $\bar{x} \in (a, b)$ and $\epsilon > 0$ such that $f_\nu(\bar{x}) = 0$, $f'_\nu(\bar{x}) \leq 0$ and $f_\nu > 0$ in $(\bar{x} - \epsilon, \bar{x})$. If such \bar{x} and ϵ exist, then

$$0 \geq \nu(1 - \bar{x}^2)f'_\nu(\bar{x}) + 2\nu\bar{x}f_\nu(\bar{x}) + \frac{1}{2}f_\nu^2(\bar{x}) = P_c(\bar{x}) \geq 0.$$

So $P_c(\bar{x}) = 0$, and $f'_\nu(\bar{x}) = 0$. Since $c \neq 0$ and $P_c \geq 0$ in (a, b) , $P_c \equiv \lambda(x - \bar{x})^2$ for some $\lambda > 0$. So $P'_c(\bar{x}) = 0$ and $P''_c(\bar{x}) > 0$. It is easy to see that $f \in C^3(a, b)$. Take a derivative of equation (25) at \bar{x} , using the fact $f_\nu(\bar{x}) = f'_\nu(\bar{x}) = 0$, we have $\nu(1 - \bar{x}^2)f''_\nu(\bar{x}) = P'_c(\bar{x}) = 0$. So $f''_\nu(\bar{x}) = 0$. Now we have $f_\nu(\bar{x}) = f'_\nu(\bar{x}) = f''_\nu(\bar{x}) = 0$ and $f'''_\nu(\bar{x}) > 0$ which imply that $f_\nu(x) < 0$ for $x < \bar{x}$ and close to x_ν , violating $f_\nu > 0$ in $(\bar{x} - \epsilon, \bar{x})$, a contradiction. Similarly, there does not exist $\bar{x} \in (a, b)$ and $\epsilon > 0$ such that $f_\nu(\bar{x}) = 0$, $f'_\nu(\bar{x}) \leq 0$ and $f_\nu < 0$ in $(\bar{x}, \bar{x} + \epsilon)$.

Now we prove that there exists at most one $x_\nu \in (a, b)$ such that $f_\nu(x_\nu) = 0$. Clearly f_ν is not identically equal to zero on (a, b) . If f_ν has more than one zero point

in (a, b) , then there exist some $x_\nu < y_\nu$ in $(-1, 1)$ such that $f_\nu(x_\nu) = f_\nu(y_\nu) = 0$, and either $f_\nu < 0$ in (x_ν, y_ν) or $f_\nu > 0$ in (x_ν, y_ν) . If $f_\nu < 0$ in (x_ν, y_ν) , then $f'_\nu(x_\nu) = 0$ and $f'_\nu(x_\nu) \leq 0$. If $f_\nu > 0$ in (x_ν, y_ν) , then $f_\nu(y_\nu) = 0$ and $f'_\nu(y_\nu) \leq 0$. We have proved in the above that neither could occur, a contradiction.

Next, we prove that if $f_\nu(a) > 0$, then $f_\nu > 0$ on (a, b) . If f_ν is not positive on the whole interval (a, b) , then let $\bar{x} \in (a, b)$ be the first point greater than a such that $f_\nu(\bar{x}) = 0$. We have $f'_\nu(\bar{x}) \leq 0$, and $f_\nu > 0$ in (a, \bar{x}) , a contradiction. Similarly, we have that if $f_\nu(b) < 0$, then $f_\nu < 0$ on (a, b) . \square

Corollary 2.2. *Let $0 < \nu \leq 1$, $c \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\}$. Assume that $P_c \geq 0$ in $(-1, 1)$, then*

$$U_{\nu, \theta}^+(x) > 0, \quad U_{\nu, \theta}^-(x) < 0, \quad -1 < x < 1.$$

Proof. Since $U_{\nu, \theta}^+(-1) = 2\nu + 2\sqrt{\nu^2 + c_1} > 0$ and $U_{\nu, \theta}^-(-1) = -2\nu - 2\sqrt{\nu^2 + c_2} < 0$, the corollary follows from Lemma 2.5. \square

Lemma 2.6. *Let $0 < \nu \leq 1$, $c \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $-1 \leq a < b \leq 1$, $f_\nu \in C^1(a, b) \cap C^0[a, b]$ be a solution of (25) in (a, b) . If there exist some $m, M > 0$ such that*

$$m \leq |f_\nu(x)| \leq M, \quad \forall a \leq x \leq b,$$

then

$$\left\| \frac{1}{2}f_\nu^2 - P_c \right\|_{L^\infty(a, b)} \leq \max \left\{ \left(2M + \sqrt{6}|c|/m \right) \nu, \left| \frac{1}{2}f_\nu^2(a) - P_c(a) \right|, \left| \frac{1}{2}f_\nu^2(b) - P_c(b) \right| \right\}. \quad (31)$$

Moreover, for any $0 < \epsilon < (b - a)/2$,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{2}f_\nu^2 - P_c \right\|_{L^\infty(a+\epsilon, b-\epsilon)} \leq \nu \cdot \max \left\{ 2M + \sqrt{6}|c|/m, 10M/\epsilon \right\}. \quad (32)$$

Proof. We first prove (31). Since $\frac{1}{2}f_\nu^2 - P_c$ is continuous on $[a, b]$, there exists some $z_\nu \in [a, b]$, such that

$$\left| \frac{1}{2}f_\nu^2(z_\nu) - P_c(z_\nu) \right| = \max_{[a, b]} \left| \frac{1}{2}f_\nu^2 - P_c \right|.$$

If $z_\nu = a$ or b , then (31) is proved. Otherwise we have

$$f_\nu(z_\nu)f'_\nu(z_\nu) - P'_c(z_\nu) = 0.$$

Since $|f_\nu(z_\nu)| \geq m$, we have

$$|f'_\nu(z_\nu)| = |P'_c(z_\nu)|/|f_\nu(z_\nu)| \leq (|c_1| + |c_2| + 2|c_3|)/m \leq \sqrt{6}|c|/m.$$

Then by (25), we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{2}f_\nu^2(z_\nu) - P_c(z_\nu) \right| = \nu |(1 - z_\nu^2)f'_\nu(z_\nu) + 2z_\nu f_\nu(z_\nu)| \leq (2M + \sqrt{6}|c|/m) \nu.$$

So (31) is proved.

Next, we prove (32). By Lemma 2.3, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exist some $x_\nu \in [a, a + \epsilon]$, and $y_\nu \in [b - \epsilon, b]$, satisfying

$$\left| \frac{1}{2} f_\nu^2(x_\nu) - P_c(x_\nu) \right| \leq 10M\nu/\epsilon, \quad \left| \frac{1}{2} f_\nu^2(y_\nu) - P_c(y_\nu) \right| \leq 10M\nu/\epsilon.$$

Apply (31) on (x_ν, y_ν) , we have

$$\left\| \frac{1}{2} f_\nu^2 - P_c \right\|_{L^\infty(x_\nu, y_\nu)} \leq \max \left\{ \left(2M + \sqrt{6}|c|/m \right) \nu, 10M\nu/\epsilon \right\}.$$

Notice $(a + \epsilon, b - \epsilon) \subset (x_\nu, y_\nu)$, the lemma is proved. \square

Corollary 2.3. *Let $0 < \nu \leq 1$, $c \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $-1 \leq a < b \leq 1$, $P_c \geq 0$ in (a, b) , $f_\nu \in C^1(a, b) \cap C^0[a, b]$ be a solution of (25) in (a, b) . If there exist some $m, M > 0$ such that*

$$m \leq f_\nu(x) \leq M, \quad \forall a < x < b, \quad 0 < \nu \leq 1,$$

then there exists a universal constant $C > 0$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_\nu - \sqrt{2P_c}\|_{L^\infty(a, b)} \leq \frac{C}{m} \max \left\{ (M + |c|/m) \nu, (M + \sqrt{|c|})|f_\nu(a) - \sqrt{2P_c(a)}|, \right. \\ \left. (M + \sqrt{|c|})|f_\nu(b) - \sqrt{2P_c(b)}| \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for any $0 < \epsilon < (b - a)/2$,

$$\|f_\nu - \sqrt{2P_c}\|_{L^\infty(a+\epsilon, b-\epsilon)} \leq \frac{C\nu}{m} \max \{M + |c|/m, M/\epsilon\}.$$

Proof. Since $f_\nu \geq m > 0$ and $P_c \geq 0$ in (a, b) , we have $m \leq f_\nu + \sqrt{2P_c} \leq M + \sqrt{10|c|}$ in (a, b) . So the corollary follows from Lemma 2.6. \square

Corollary 2.3'. *Let $0 < \nu \leq 1$, $-1 \leq a < b \leq 1$, $P_c \geq 0$ in (a, b) , $f_\nu \in C^1(a, b) \cap C^0[a, b]$ be a solution of (25) in (a, b) . If there exist some $m, M > 0$ such that*

$$-M \leq f_\nu(x) \leq -m, \quad \forall a < x < b, \quad 0 < \nu \leq 1,$$

then there exists a universal constant $C > 0$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_\nu + \sqrt{2P_c}\|_{L^\infty(a, b)} \leq \frac{C}{m} \max \left\{ (M + |c|/m) \nu, (M + \sqrt{|c|})|f_\nu(a) + \sqrt{2P_c(a)}|, \right. \\ \left. (M + \sqrt{|c|})|f_\nu(b) + \sqrt{2P_c(b)}| \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for any $0 < \epsilon < (b - a)/2$, there exists a universal constant $C > 0$, such that

$$\|f_\nu + \sqrt{2P_c}\|_{L^\infty(a+\epsilon, b-\epsilon)} \leq \frac{C\nu}{m} \max \{M + |c|/m, M/\epsilon\}.$$

Lemma 2.7. *Let $0 < \nu \leq 1$, $c \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $-1 \leq a < b \leq 1$, $\alpha \geq 0$, $f_\nu \in C^1(a, b) \cap C^0[a, b]$ be a solution of (25) in (a, b) , satisfying $f_\nu(a) > 0$ or $f_\nu(b) < 0$. Suppose there exists some $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $P_c(\bar{x}) = \min_{[a, b]} P_c \geq -C_1(b-a)^\alpha$, $\text{dist}(\bar{x}, [a, b]) \leq C_1(b-a)$, and $P_c(x) \leq P_c(\bar{x}) + C_1|x - \bar{x}|^\alpha$ for $a \leq x \leq b$, and*

$$\left| \frac{1}{2}f_\nu^2(a) - P_c(a) \right| + \left| \frac{1}{2}f_\nu^2(b) - P_c(b) \right| \leq C_1(b-a)^\alpha,$$

for some positive constants C_1 . Then there exists some constant C , depending only on C_1 and an upper bound of $|c|$, such that for $\nu < \sqrt{2C_1}/4(b-a)^{\alpha/2}$,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{2}f_\nu^2 - P_c \right\|_{L^\infty(a, b)} \leq C(b-a)^\alpha + C\nu(b-a)^{-\alpha/2}.$$

Proof. We only prove for the case $f_\nu(a) > 0$, the case $f_\nu(b) < 0$ can be proved similarly. For convenience denote $h := \frac{1}{2}f_\nu^2 - P_c$ and $\delta = b - a$. Let C be a positive constant, depending only on C_1 and an upper bound of $|c|$, which may vary from line to line.

Suppose $\max_{[a, b]} |h| = |h(\tilde{z})|$ for some $\tilde{z} \in [a, b]$. If $\tilde{z} = a$ or b , then we are done. Suppose $\tilde{z} \in (a, b)$. Then $0 = h'(\tilde{z}) = f_\nu(\tilde{z})f'_\nu(\tilde{z}) - P'_c(\tilde{z})$. So

$$|f'_\nu(\tilde{z})| = |P'_c(\tilde{z})|/|f_\nu(\tilde{z})|. \quad (33)$$

If $P_c(\bar{x}) > 2C_1\delta^\alpha$, then since $|h(a)| \leq C_1\delta^\alpha$, we have

$$f_\nu^2(a) \geq 2P_c(a) - 2C_1\delta^\alpha \geq 2P_c(\bar{x}) - 2C_1\delta^\alpha \geq 2C_1\delta^\alpha.$$

Since $f_\nu(a) > 0$, we have $f_\nu(a) \geq \sqrt{2C_1}\delta^{\alpha/2}$. Then by Lemma 2.4, we have that for $\nu < \sqrt{2C_1}/4\delta^{\alpha/2}$,

$$f_\nu(x) \geq \min\{\sqrt{2C_1}\delta^{\alpha/2}, C_1\delta^\alpha/(2\nu)\} \geq \sqrt{2C_1}\delta^{\alpha/2}, \quad a < x < b.$$

With this, we deduce from (33) that

$$|f'_\nu(\tilde{z})| \leq C\delta^{-\alpha/2}. \quad (34)$$

By (25) and Lemma 2.2 we have the desired estimate

$$|h(\tilde{z})| \leq C\nu|f'_\nu(\tilde{z})| + C\nu|f_\nu(\tilde{z})| \leq C\nu\delta^{-\alpha/2}. \quad (35)$$

If $P_c(\bar{x}) \leq 2C_1\delta^\alpha$, then using the hypothesis $P_c(\bar{x}) \geq -C_1(b-a)^\alpha$, $\text{dist}(\bar{x}, [a, b]) \leq C_1(b-a)$, and $P_c(x) \leq P_c(\bar{x}) + C_1|x - \bar{x}|^\alpha$, we have

$$-C_1\delta^\alpha \leq P_c(\bar{x}) \leq P_c(\tilde{z}) \leq P_c(\bar{x}) + C|\tilde{z} - \bar{x}|^\alpha \leq C\delta^\alpha.$$

So

$$\frac{1}{2}f_\nu^2(\tilde{z}) \geq |h(\tilde{z})| - |P_c(\tilde{z})| \geq |h(\tilde{z})| - C\delta^\alpha.$$

If $|h(\tilde{z})| \leq 2C\delta^\alpha$, then we are done. Otherwise we have $|f_\nu(\tilde{z})| \geq \sqrt{2C}\delta^{\alpha/2}$. With this, we deduce (34) using (33), and obtain (35) as above. The lemma is proved. \square

Lemma 2.8. *Let $0 < \nu \leq 1$, $-1 \leq a < b \leq 1$, $c \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $k \geq 0$ be an integer, assume $P_c \geq \delta > 0$ on (a, b) , $f_\nu \in C^k[a, b]$ is a solution to (25). Suppose there exists some $M > 0$ such that $f_\nu \leq M$ on (a, b) , and*

$$\left| \frac{d^i}{dx^i}(f_\nu - \sqrt{2P_c})(a) \right| + \left| \frac{d^i}{dx^i}(f_\nu - \sqrt{2P_c})(b) \right| \leq M\nu, \quad \forall 0 \leq i \leq k. \quad (36)$$

Then there exists some $C > 0$, depending only on δ , k , M and an upper bound of $|c|$, such that

$$\|f_\nu - \sqrt{2P_c}\|_{C^k(a,b)} \leq C\nu. \quad (37)$$

Proof. Throughout the proof, C and ν_0 denote various positive constants, depending only on δ , k , M and an upper bound of $|c|$. C will be chosen first and will be large, and ν_0 will be small, and its choice may depend on the largeness of C . We will only need to prove (37) for $\nu < \nu_0$, since it is obvious for $\nu \geq \nu_0$.

For convenience, write $Q = \sqrt{2P_c}$. Denote

$$h_0(x) := \frac{1}{\nu}(f_\nu(x) - Q(x)), \quad h_i(x) := \frac{d^i}{dx^i}h_0(x), \quad \forall i \geq 1. \quad (38)$$

Rewrite (25) as

$$\nu h'_0(x) = \frac{1}{1-x^2}F(x, h_0(x)), \quad (39)$$

where

$$F(x, h_0) := -\{2x\nu h_0 + \frac{1}{2}\nu h_0^2 + (1-x^2)Q'(x) + 2xQ(x) + h_0Q(x)\}.$$

Claim: For all $n \geq 2$, and for $x \in [a, b]$,

$$\nu h_n(x) = \frac{1}{1-x^2}[2(n-1)\nu x + F_{h_0}(x, h_0)]h_{n-1} + \frac{1}{1-x^2}F_n(x, h_0, \dots, h_{n-2}), \quad (40)$$

where $F_n(x, h_0, h_1, \dots, h_{n-2})$ satisfies that for any compact subset $K \subset [a, b] \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and for any integer $m \geq 0$

$$\|F_n\|_{C^m(K)} \leq C',$$

for some C' depending only on n , m and K .

Proof of the Claim: We prove it by induction. Differentiating (39) leads to (40) for $n = 2$, with $F_2(x, h_0) = F_x(x, h_0)$. Now suppose that (40) is true for some $n \geq 2$, and we will prove (40) for $n + 1$. Differentiating (40), we have

$$\nu h_{n+1} = \frac{1}{1-x^2}(2n\nu x + F_{h_0})h_n + \frac{1}{1-x^2}F_{n+1}(x, h_0, \dots, h_{n-1}),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} F_{n+1}(x, h_0, \dots, h_{n-1}) &:= 2(n-1)\nu + F_{h_0 h_0}(x, h_0) + F_{x h_0}(x, h_0) + \partial_x F_n(x, h_0, \dots, h_{n-2}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} \partial_{h_i} F_n(x, h_0, \dots, h_{n-2}) h_{i+1}. \end{aligned}$$

The claim is proved.

We prove the lemma by induction on k . By (36) with $i = 0$, $f_\nu(a) \geq \sqrt{2P_c(a)} - M\nu \geq \sqrt{2\delta} - M\nu \geq \sqrt{\delta}$ for $\nu \leq \nu_0$. By Lemma 2.4, $f_\nu \geq \sqrt{\delta}$ in (a, b) for $\nu \leq \nu_0$ on $[a, b]$. Then by Corollary 2.3, we have $|h_0| \leq C$ in $[a, b]$. Let $z_\nu \in [a, b]$ such that $|h_1(z_\nu)| = \max_{[a, b]} |h_1|$. By (36), $|h_1(a)|, |h_1(b)| \leq M$. If $z_\nu = a$ or b , the lemma holds for $k = 1$. If $z_\nu \neq a$ or b , then by (40),

$$0 = \nu h_1'(z_\nu) = \nu h_2(z_\nu) = \frac{1}{1 - z_\nu^2} \{[2\nu z_\nu + F_{h_0}(z_\nu, h_0(z_\nu))]h_1(z_\nu) + F_2(z_\nu, h_0(z_\nu))\} = 0,$$

and, by the boundedness of h_0 and the property of F_2 , $|F_2(x, h_0(x))| \leq C$ on $[a, b]$. Since $|h_0| \leq C$ and $Q = \sqrt{2P_c} \geq \sqrt{2\delta}$, we have, for $\nu \leq \nu_0$, that

$$|2\nu x + F_{h_0}(x, h_0(x))| = |\nu h_0(x) + Q(x) + 4\nu x| \geq Q - C\nu \geq \sqrt{\delta} > 0, \quad a < x < b.$$

So we have

$$\max_{[a, b]} |h_1| = |h_1(z_\nu)| = \frac{|F_2(z_\nu, h_0(z_\nu))|}{|2\nu z_\nu + F_{h_0}(z_\nu, h_0(z_\nu))|} \leq C,$$

and the lemma holds for $k = 1$.

Next, assume the lemma holds for all $1 \leq k \leq n$ for some n , and we prove it for $k = n + 1$. By the induction hypothesis, $|h_k| \leq C$ in $[a, b]$, for all $1 \leq k \leq n$. Let $z_\nu \in [a, b]$ such that $|h_{n+1}(z_\nu)| = \max_{[a, b]} |h_{n+1}|$. By (36), $|h_{n+1}(a)|, |h_{n+1}(b)| \leq M$. If $z_\nu = a$ or b , the lemma holds for $k = n + 1$. Otherwise by (40),

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \nu h_{n+1}'(z_\nu) = \nu h_{n+2}(z_\nu, n) \\ &= \frac{1}{1 - z_{\nu, n}^2} \{[2(n+1)\nu z_{\nu, n} + F_{h_0}(z_\nu, h_0(z_\nu))]h_{n+1}(z_\nu) + F_{n+2}(z_\nu, h_0(z_\nu), \dots, h_n(z_\nu))\}, \end{aligned}$$

and, by the induction hypothesis and the property of F_{n+2} , $|F_{n+2}(x, h_0, \dots, h_n)| \leq C$ on $[a, b]$. As above, for $\nu \leq \nu_0$,

$$|2(n+1)\nu z_\nu + F_{h_0}(z_\nu, h_0(z_\nu))| > \sqrt{\delta}, \quad a < x < b,$$

and therefore

$$\max_{[a, b]} |h_{n+1}| = |h_{n+1}(z_\nu)| = \frac{|F_{n+2}(z_\nu)|}{|2(n+1)\nu z_\nu + F_{h_0}(z_\nu)|} \leq C.$$

So the lemma holds for $k = n + 1$. The lemma is proved. \square

Lemma 2.8'. *Let $0 < \nu \leq 1$, $-1 \leq a < b \leq 1$, $c \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $k \geq 0$ be an integer, assume $P_c \geq \delta > 0$ on (a, b) , $f_\nu \in C^k[a, b]$ is a solution to (25). Suppose there exists some $M > 0$ such that $f_\nu > -M$ on (a, b) , and*

$$\left| \frac{d^i}{dx^i}(f_\nu + \sqrt{2P_c})(a) \right| + \left| \frac{d^i}{dx^i}(f_\nu + \sqrt{2P_c})(b) \right| \leq M\nu, \quad \forall 0 \leq i \leq k.$$

Then there exist some $C > 0$ and $\nu_0 > 0$, depending only on δ , k , M and an upper bound of $|c|$, such that

$$\|f_\nu + \sqrt{2P_c}\|_{C^k(a, b)} \leq C\nu, \quad \forall 0 < \nu < \nu_0.$$

Lemma 2.9. *Let $0 < \nu \leq 1$, $-1 \leq a < b \leq 1$, $c \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $k \geq 0$ be an integer, assume $P_c \geq \delta > 0$ on $[a, b]$, $f_\nu \in C^k[a, b]$ is a solution to (25), $f_\nu(a) > 0$, and there exists some $M > 0$ such that $f_\nu \leq M$ in $[a, b]$. Then $f_\nu > 0$ in $[a, b]$. Moreover, for any $0 < \epsilon < (b-a)/2$, there exists some $C > 0$, depending only on ϵ, δ, M, k and an upper bound of $|c|$, such that*

$$\|f_\nu - \sqrt{2P_c}\|_{C^k(a+\epsilon, b-\epsilon)} \leq C\nu. \quad (41)$$

Proof. Let C be a constant, depending only on ϵ, δ, k, M and an upper bound of $|c|$, which may vary from line to line.

Since $P_c \geq \delta > 0$ on $[a, b]$ and $f_\nu(a) > 0$, we have $f_\nu(x) \geq \min\{f_\nu(a), \sqrt{\delta}, \delta/(4\nu)\} > 0$ in $[a, b]$ by Lemma 2.4. The positivity of f_ν on $[a, b]$ can also be deduced from Lemma 2.5. Applying Lemma 2.3 on $[a, a + \epsilon/2]$ and $[b - \epsilon/2, b]$ respectively, there exist some $x_\nu \in [a, a + \epsilon/2]$ and $y_\nu \in [b - \epsilon/2, b]$, such that $|\frac{1}{2}f_\nu^2(x_\nu) - P_c(x_\nu)| + |\frac{1}{2}f_\nu^2(y_\nu) - P_c(y_\nu)| \leq C\nu$. Using $f_\nu > 0$ and $P_c \geq \delta$, we have

$$\left|f_\nu(x_\nu) - \sqrt{2P_c(x_\nu)}\right| + \left|f_\nu(y_\nu) - \sqrt{2P_c(y_\nu)}\right| \leq C\nu.$$

Since $P_c \geq \delta$, there exists $\nu_0 > 0$, depending only on ϵ, δ, M and c , such that $f_\nu(x_\nu) \geq \sqrt{2P_c(x_\nu)} - C\nu \geq \sqrt{2\delta} - C\nu \geq \sqrt{\delta}$ for $\nu \leq \nu_0$. Note that for $\nu \geq \nu_0$, (41) is obvious. So we only need to consider $\nu \leq \nu_0$. Applying Lemma 2.4 on $[x_\nu, y_\nu]$, we have $f_\nu \geq 1/C$ on $[x_\nu, y_\nu]$. Since we also have $f_\nu \leq M$ on $[x_\nu, y_\nu]$, by Corollary 2.3, we have that

$$\|f_\nu - \sqrt{2P_c}\|_{L^\infty(a+\epsilon/2, b-\epsilon/2)} \leq \|f_\nu - \sqrt{2P_c}\|_{L^\infty(x_\nu, y_\nu)} \leq C\nu.$$

For convenience, denote $h_i, i \geq 0$, as in (38). We have proved that $|h_0| \leq C$ in $[a + \epsilon/2, b - \epsilon/2]$. So for any $0 < \epsilon < (b-a)/2$,

$$\left|\int_{a+\epsilon/2}^{a+\epsilon} h_1(x)dx\right| \leq C, \quad \left|\int_{b-\epsilon}^{b-\epsilon/2} h_1(x)dx\right| \leq C.$$

Thus there exist some $x_\nu \in [a+\epsilon/2, a+\epsilon]$, and $y_\nu \in [b-\epsilon, b-\epsilon/2]$, such that $|h_1(x_\nu)| \leq C$, $|h_1(y_\nu)| \leq C$. Apply Lemma 2.8 on $[x_\nu, y_\nu]$, we have $|h_1(x)| \leq C$, $x_\nu < x < y_\nu$. So the lemma holds for $k = 1$.

Next, assume the lemma holds for all $1 \leq k \leq n$ for some n , and we prove it for $k = n + 1$. By the induction hypothesis, for any $\epsilon > 0$, $|h_k| \leq C$ in $(a + \epsilon/2, b - \epsilon/2)$ for all $1 \leq k \leq n$. It follows that

$$\left|\int_{a+\epsilon/2}^{a+\epsilon} h_{n+1}(x)dx\right| \leq C, \quad \left|\int_{b-\epsilon}^{b-\epsilon/2} h_{n+1}(x)dx\right| \leq C.$$

So there exist some $x_\nu \in [a+\epsilon/2, a+\epsilon]$, and $y_\nu \in [b-\epsilon, b-\epsilon/2]$, such that $|h_{n+1}(x_\nu)| \leq C$, $|h_{n+1}(y_\nu)| \leq C$. Apply Lemma 2.8 on $[x_\nu, y_\nu]$, we have $|h_{n+1}(x)| \leq C$, $x_\nu < x < y_\nu$. The lemma holds for $k = n + 1$. The lemma is proved. \square

Lemma 2.9'. *Let $0 < \nu \leq 1$, $-1 \leq a < b \leq 1$, $c \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $k \geq 0$ be an integer, assume $P_c \geq \delta > 0$ on $[a, b]$, $f_\nu \in C^k[a, b]$ is a solution to (25), $f_\nu(b) < 0$, and there exists some $M > 0$ such that $f_\nu \geq -M$ in $[a, b]$. Then $f_\nu < 0$ in $[a, b]$. Moreover, for any $0 < \epsilon < \frac{b-a}{2}$, there exists some $C > 0$, depending only on ϵ, δ, k and an upper bound of $|c|$, such that*

$$\|f_\nu + \sqrt{2P_c}\|_{C^k(a+\epsilon, b-\epsilon)} \leq C\nu.$$

Proof of Theorem 1.2:

Writing $U_{\nu_k, \theta} = u_{\nu_k, \theta} \sin \theta$, $V_\theta = v_\theta \sin \theta$ and $x = \cos \theta$ as usual. Then $U_{\nu_k, \theta}$ satisfies the equation

$$\nu_k(1-x^2)U'_{\nu_k, \theta} + 2\nu_k x U_{\nu_k, \theta} + \frac{1}{2}U_{\nu_k, \theta}^2 = P_{c_k}(x), \text{ in } (r, s), \quad (42)$$

and $U_{\nu_k, \theta} \rightharpoonup V_\theta$ in $L^2(r, s)$, where $r = \cos \theta_2$ and $s = \cos \theta_1$. We know that $-1 < r < s < 1$. For any $\epsilon > 0$ and any positive integer m , let C denote some positive constant depending only on $\theta_1, \theta_2, \epsilon, m$ and $\sup_{\nu_k} \|u_{\nu_k, \theta}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^2 \cap \{\theta_1 < \theta < \theta_2\})}$ whose value may vary from line to line.

As in the proof of Lemma 2.1, with $\delta := (s-r)/9$, for each k there exist $a_k \in [r, r+\delta]$, and $b_{ki} \in [r+2i\delta, r+(2i+1)\delta]$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, such that

$$|U_{\nu_k, \theta}(a_k)| + \sum_{i=1}^3 |U_{\nu_k, \theta}(b_{ki})| \leq C.$$

Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 2.1, we have, for $i = 1, 2, 3$, that $\left| \int_{a_k}^{b_{ki}} P_{c_k} \right| \leq C$, and in turn

$$|c_k| \leq C. \quad (43)$$

Passing to a subsequence, $c_k \rightarrow c$, we have $\frac{1}{2}V_\theta^2 = P_c$ on (r, s) . Since $c \in \mathring{J}_0$, we have $P_c > 0$ on (r, s) . So there exists some $\delta > 0$, such that for large k ,

$$P_{c_k} \geq 1/C \text{ on } [r+\delta/8, s-\delta/8]. \quad (44)$$

Next, since $\int_r^s |U_{\nu_k, \theta}|^2 \leq C$, there exists some $a_k \in [r+\epsilon/16, r+\epsilon/4]$ and $b_k \in [s-\epsilon/4, s-\epsilon/8]$, such that $|U_{\nu_k, \theta}(a_k)| + |U_{\nu_k, \theta}(b_k)| \leq C$. If $|U_{\nu_k, \theta}(\alpha_k)| = \max_{[a_k, b_k]} |U_{\nu_k, \theta}| > \max\{|U_{\nu_k, \theta}(a_k)|, |U_{\nu_k, \theta}(b_k)|\}$ for some $\alpha_k \in (a_k, b_k)$, then $U'_{\nu_k, \theta}(\alpha_k) = 0$ and, by (42) and (43), we have

$$\frac{1}{2}U_{\nu_k, \theta}^2(\alpha_k) \leq |P_{c_k}(\alpha_k)| + |2\nu_k \alpha_k U_{\nu_k, \theta}(\alpha_k)| \leq C + C|U_{\nu_k, \theta}(\alpha_k)|.$$

It follows that $|U_{\nu_k, \theta}(\alpha_k)| \leq C$. Hence

$$|U_{\nu_k, \theta}| \leq C \text{ on } [r+\delta/4, s-\delta/4]. \quad (45)$$

We know that either $V_\theta = \sqrt{2P_c}$ on (r, s) or $V_\theta = -\sqrt{2P_c}$ on (r, s) .

Claim: If $V_\theta = \sqrt{2P_c}$, then $U_{\nu_k, \theta} \geq 1/C$ on $[r+\epsilon/4, s-\epsilon/4]$. If $V_\theta = -\sqrt{2P_c}$, then $U_{\nu_k, \theta} \leq -1/C$ on $[r+\epsilon/4, s-\epsilon/4]$.

Proof of the Claim: We only treat the case when $V_\theta = \sqrt{2P_c}$. The other case can be treated similarly. By (43), (44), and the weak convergence of $U_{\nu_k, \theta}$ to V_θ , we have

$$\int_{r+\epsilon/8}^{r+\epsilon/4} U_{\nu_k, \theta} V_\theta \rightarrow \int_{r+\epsilon/8}^{r+\epsilon/4} V_\theta^2 = \int_{r+\epsilon/8}^{r+\epsilon/4} 2P_c \geq 1/C.$$

So there exists some $a_k \in [r+\epsilon/8, r+\epsilon/4]$, such that $U_{\nu_k, \theta}(a_k) \geq 1/C$. Applying Lemma 2.4 on $[a_k, s-\epsilon/8]$, we have $U_{\nu_k, \theta} \geq 1/C$ on $[a_k, s-\epsilon/8]$. Thus $U_{\nu_k, \theta} \geq 1/C$ on

$[r + \epsilon/4, s - \epsilon/4]$. Note that if $V_\theta = -\sqrt{2P_c}$, we will argue similarly and use Lemma 2.4' instead of Lemma 2.4. The claim is proved.

By the claim and (45), we either have $1/C \leq U_{\nu_k, \theta} \leq C$ on $[r + \epsilon/4, s - \epsilon/4]$, or $-C \leq U_{\nu_k, \theta} \leq -1/C$ on $[r + \epsilon/4, s - \epsilon/4]$. We can, in view of (44), apply Lemma 2.9 and Lemma 2.9', to obtain

$$\|U_{\nu_k, \theta} - V_\theta\|_{C^m([r+\epsilon, s-\epsilon])} \leq C\nu_k.$$

Notice $x = \cos \theta$, $u_{\nu_k, \theta} = U_{\nu_k, \theta} / \sin \theta$ and $v_\theta = V_\theta / \sin \theta$, we have proved that

$$\|u_{\nu_k, \theta} - v_\theta\|_{C^m(\mathbb{S}^2 \cap \{\theta_1 + \epsilon < \theta < \theta_2 - \epsilon\})} \leq C\nu_k.$$

The conclusion of the theorem then follows from the above, in view of formulas (3) and (4). The theorem is proved. \square

3 $c \in \mathring{J}_0$

Proof of Theorem 1.4:

We only need to prove the theorem in the special case that $c_k \rightarrow c \neq 0$ and $\nu_k \rightarrow 0$, where $c_1, c_2 > 0, c_3 > c_3^*(c_1, c_2)$, which is equivalent to $\min_{[-1,1]} P_c > 0$. Indeed, let $\hat{\nu}_k = \nu_k / \sqrt{|c_k|}$. By the assumption $\hat{\nu}_k \rightarrow 0, \hat{c}_k \rightarrow \hat{c} \neq 0$. It is easy to see that $U_{\theta, \hat{\nu}_k}^+(\hat{c}_k) = U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+(c_k) / \sqrt{|c_k|}$. The desired estimate (12) for $U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+(c_k)$ can be easily deduced from the estimate of $U_{\theta, \hat{\nu}_k}^+(\hat{c}_k)$.

We prove the estimates in (12) for $\{U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+\}$, the proof for $\{U_{\nu_k, \theta}^-\}$ is similar. In the following, C denotes various constant depending only on c . By Lemma 2.2, $\|U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+\|_{L^\infty(-1,1)} \leq C$ for all k . By Theorem A, the convergence of $\{c_k\}$ to c and the fact that $\min_{[-1,1]} P_c > 0$ and $c_1, c_2 > 0$, we have, for large k , $\min_{[-1,1]} P_{c_k} \geq \frac{1}{2} \min_{[-1,1]} P_c > 0$, $U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+(-1) = \tau_2(\nu_k, (c_k)_1) \geq \sqrt{2(c_k)_1} \geq \sqrt{c_1} > 0$, and $\left| U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+(\pm 1) - \sqrt{2P_{c_k}(\pm 1)} \right| \leq C\nu_k$. An application of Lemma 2.4 gives, for large k , that $U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+ \geq 1/C$ on $[-1, 1]$. The first estimate (12) then follows from Corollary 2.3.

To prove the second estimate in (12), we first prove the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $0 < \nu \leq 1, c \in \mathbb{R}^3, U_{\nu, \theta}^+$ be the upper solution of (25). If $P_c(-1) = 2c_1 \geq \delta > 0$, then for each non-negative integer m , there exists some constant C depending only on δ, m and an upper bound of $|c|$, such that*

$$\left| \frac{d^m}{dx^m} (U_{\nu, \theta}^+ - \sqrt{2P_c})(-1) \right| \leq C\nu.$$

Proof. Denote C to be a constant, depending only on δ, m and an upper bound of $|c|$, which may vary from line to line. We first prove that for every $m \geq 0$,

$$\left| \frac{d^m}{dx^m} U_{\nu, \theta}^+(-1) \right| \leq C. \quad (46)$$

It can be checked that $U_{\nu,\theta}^+$ is a solution of (25) if and only if $\nu U_{\nu,\theta}^+$ is a solution of (7). Then by Lemma 2.3 in [18], we have that $U_{\nu,\theta}^+ \in C^\infty[-1, 0]$. For $m \geq 0$, differentiating (25) $(m+1)$ times and sending x to -1 lead to

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \binom{m+1}{i} \frac{d^i}{dx^i} (1-x^2) \frac{d^{m+2-i}}{dx^{m+2-i}} U_{\nu,\theta}^+(x) + 2\nu \sum_{i=0}^1 \binom{m+1}{i} \frac{d^i}{dx^i} (x) \frac{d^{m+1-i}}{dx^{m+1-i}} U_{\nu,\theta}^+(x) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=0}^{m+1} \binom{m+1}{i} \frac{d^i}{dx^i} U_{\nu,\theta}^+(x) \frac{d^{m+1-i}}{dx^{m+2-i}} U_{\nu,\theta}^+(x) = \frac{d^{m+1}}{dx^{m+1}} P_c(x), \quad \text{at } x = -1. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the $i = 1$ term in the first sum and the $i = 0$ term in the second sum cancel out, we rewrite the above equation as

$$\begin{aligned} U_{\nu,\theta}^+(x) \frac{d^{m+1}}{dx^{m+1}} U_{\nu,\theta}^+(x) &= \frac{d^{m+1}}{dx^{m+1}} P_c(x) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m \binom{m+1}{i} \frac{d^i}{dx^i} U_{\nu,\theta}^+(x) \frac{d^{m+1-i}}{dx^{m+2-i}} U_{\nu,\theta}^+(x) \\ &- \nu \sum_{i=2}^{m+1} \binom{m+1}{i} \frac{d^i}{dx^i} (1-x^2) \frac{d^{m+2-i}}{dx^{m+2-i}} U_{\nu,\theta}^+(x) - 2\nu(m+1) \frac{d^m}{dx^m} U_{\nu,\theta}^+(x), \quad \text{at } x = -1. \end{aligned}$$

Since $2c_1 = P_c(-1) \geq \delta > 0$ and $U_{\nu,\theta}^+(-1) = 2\nu + 2\sqrt{\nu^2 + c_1}$, we have $1/C \leq U_{\nu,\theta}^+(-1) \leq C$. Using this and the fact that the right hand side of the above equation involves only $\left\{ \frac{d^i}{dx^i} U_{\nu,\theta}^+(-1) \right\}_{0 \leq i \leq m}$, we can easily prove (46) by induction. By (46) and the fact that $1/C \leq U_{\nu,\theta}^+(-1) \leq C$, take m -th derivatives of (25), we have that

$$\left| \frac{d^m}{dx^m} \left(\frac{1}{2} (U_{\nu,\theta}^+)^2 - P_c \right) (-1) \right| = \nu \left| \frac{d^m}{dx^m} \left((1-x^2) (U_{\nu,\theta}^+)' + 2x U_{\nu,\theta}^+ \right) \right|_{x=-1} \leq C\nu. \quad (47)$$

Since $U_{\nu,\theta}^+ - \sqrt{2P_c} = \frac{2}{U_{\nu,\theta}^+ + \sqrt{2P_c}} \left[\frac{1}{2} (U_{\nu,\theta}^+)^2 - P_c \right]$, $1/C \leq U_{\nu,\theta}^+(-1) \leq C$, and $P_c(-1) \geq 1/C$, the lemma follows from (46) and (47). \square

Now we continue to prove Theorem 1.4. Apply Lemma 2.9 with $a = -3/4$ and $b = 1$, we have, for all $m \geq 0$,

$$\left\| \frac{d^m}{dx^m} (U_{\nu_k,\theta}^+ - \sqrt{2P_{c_k}}) \right\|_{L^\infty(-\frac{1}{2}, 1-\epsilon)} \leq C\nu_k.$$

By Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 2.8 with $a = -1$, $b = -1/2$, we have

$$\left\| \frac{d^m}{dx^m} (U_{\nu_k,\theta}^+ - \sqrt{2P_{c_k}}) \right\|_{L^\infty(-1, -\frac{1}{2})} \leq C\nu_k,$$

for some C depending only on δ , m and an upper bound of $|c|$. Theorem 1.4 is proved. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.8 Started: In this part, we prove the first paragraph of Theorem 1.8 and part (iii). Let C denote a positive constant, having the same dependence as specified in the theorem, which may vary from line to line. By Lemma 2.2,

$$|U_{\nu_k,\theta}| \leq C. \quad (48)$$

Since $U_{\nu_k, \theta}$ is not $U_{\nu_k, \theta}^\pm$, we know from Theorem A that $U_{\nu_k, \theta}(-1) = \tau_1(\nu_k, c_{k1})$ and $U_{\nu_k, \theta}(1) = \tau_2'(\nu_k, c_{k2})$. Since $c_k \in J_0 \setminus \{0\}$, we have $P_c \geq 0$ on $[-1, 1]$. By Lemma 2.5, there exists at most one x_k in $(-1, 1)$ such that $U_{\nu_k, \theta}(x_k) = 0$.

Now we prove part (iii). Since $c \in \overset{\circ}{J}_0$, we have $c_1, c_2 > 0$ and $\min_{[-1, 1]} P_c > 0$. By the convergence of $\{c_k\}$ to c , we deduce, using (9), that

$$U_{\nu_k, \theta}(-1) \leq -1/C, \quad U_{\nu_k, \theta}(1) \geq 1/C, \quad \min_{[-1, 1]} P_{c_k} \geq 1/C, \quad (49)$$

and

$$|U_{\nu_k, \theta}(-1) + \sqrt{2P_{c_k}(-1)}| + |U_{\nu_k, \theta}(1) - \sqrt{2P_{c_k}(1)}| \leq C\nu_k. \quad (50)$$

Clearly there exists $x_k \in (-1, 1)$ such that $U_{\nu_k, \theta}(x_k) = 0$. By Lemma 2.5 and (49),

$$U_{\nu_k, \theta}(x) < 0, -1 \leq x < x_k, \quad \text{and} \quad U_{\nu_k, \theta}(x) > 0, x_k < x \leq 1. \quad (51)$$

By Corollary 2.1 and Corollary 2.1', using (48) and (51), we have that

$$-C \leq U_{\nu_k, \theta}(x) \leq -1/C, x \in (-1, x_k - \epsilon/2), \quad \text{and} \quad 1/C \leq U_{\nu_k, \theta} \leq C, x \in (x_k + \epsilon/2, 1). \quad (52)$$

With (52) we deduce (19) by applying Lemma 2.9 and Lemma 2.9'. With (50), (52) and (19), we deduce (18) by applying Corollary 2.3 and Corollary 2.3'. \square

4 $c \in \partial J_0 \setminus \{0\}$ and $c_3 = c_3^*(c_1, c_2)$

In this section, we study a sequence of solutions $U_{\nu_k, \theta}$ of (6) with $c_k \rightarrow c$ and $\nu_k \rightarrow 0$, where $c \in \partial J_0 \setminus \{0\}$ and $c_3 = c_3^*(c_1, c_2)$. We first study the behaviors of $U_{\nu_k, \theta}^\pm$.

Proof of Theorem 1.5:

Let C denote a constant depending only on c which may vary from line to line. We only prove the result for the case $c_3 = c_3^*(c_1, c_2)$ and $c_2 > 0$. The result for the case $c_3 = c_3^*(c_1, c_2)$ and $c_1 > 0$ can be proved similarly.

Since $c_3 = c_3^*(c_1, c_2)$ and $c_2 > 0$, we have $c_3 < 0$ and $P_c = -c_3(x - \bar{x})^2$ with $\bar{x} := \frac{\sqrt{c_1 - \sqrt{c_2}}}{\sqrt{c_1 + \sqrt{c_2}}} \in [-1, 1)$. Then for any $\epsilon < (1 - \bar{x})/8$, we have

$$P_c(x) \geq 2P_c(1)/3 = 4c_2/3 > 0, \quad 1 - 2\epsilon \leq x \leq 1. \quad (53)$$

Choose sequences $c_{k1} \rightarrow c_1$, $c_{k2} \rightarrow c_2$, let, as in (5),

$$\bar{c}_{k3} := \bar{c}_3(c_{k1}, c_{k2}; \nu_k) = -\frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{\nu_k^2 + c_{k1}} + \sqrt{\nu_k^2 + c_{k2}})(\sqrt{\nu_k^2 + c_{k1}} + \sqrt{\nu_k^2 + c_{k2}} + 2\nu_k).$$

Let $c_k = (c_{k1}, c_{k2}, c_{k3})$, where $c_{k3} > \bar{c}_{k3}$ will be chosen later. It is easy to see that $c_k \in J_{\nu_k}$. Let $U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+$ be the solution of (25) with the right hand side P_{c_k} . For convenience, write $f_k = U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+$, $P_k = P_{c_k}$, and $h_k := \frac{1}{2}f_k^2 - P_k$. Let $\bar{P}_k := P_{(c_{k1}, c_{k2}, \bar{c}_{k3})}$. By Theorem A, there exists a unique solution \bar{f}_k of (25) with the right hand side \bar{P}_k , and

$$\bar{f}_k(x) = (\nu_k + \sqrt{\nu_k^2 + c_{k1}})(1 - x) - (\nu_k + \sqrt{\nu_k^2 + c_{k2}})(1 + x). \quad (54)$$

By Theorem A again, for any integer $i > 0$, there exists $\delta_{ik} > 0$, $\delta_{ik} \rightarrow 0$, such that for $|c_{k3} - \bar{c}_{k3}| \leq \delta_{ik}$, we have $\|f_k - \bar{f}_k\|_{L^\infty(-1, 1-1/i)} < 1/i$. Choose $c_{k3} = \bar{c}_{k3} + \delta_{kk}$. Then $\|f_k - \bar{f}_k\|_{L^\infty(-1, 1-1/k)} < 1/k$. By computation, for any $\epsilon > 0$, $\bar{f}_k(1 - \epsilon) = \epsilon\sqrt{c_1} - (2 - \epsilon)\sqrt{c_2} + o(1)$, where $o(1) \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Since $c_2 > 0$, we have that for $k > 1/\epsilon$, $f_k(1 - \epsilon) < 0$.

On the other hand, by Theorem A, using $c_{k3} > \bar{c}_{k3}$, we have $f_k(1) = -2\nu_k + 2\sqrt{\nu_k^2 + c_{k2}} \geq \sqrt{c_2} > 0$ for sufficiently large k . So there is some $x_k \in (1 - \epsilon, 1)$ such that $f_k(x_k) = 0$. By (53), $P_k(x_k) \geq P_c(x_k) + o(1) \geq c_2 > 0$ for large k . So we have $|\frac{1}{2}f_k^2(x_k) - P_k(x_k)| \geq c_2$ for large k . Theorem 1.5 is proved. \square

Remark 4.1. If $c_k \in J_0$, i.e. $P_{c_k} \geq 0$ on $[-1, 1]$, then we have, by Theorem 1.6, that $\|\frac{1}{2}(U_{\nu_k, \theta}^\pm(c_k))^2 - P_{c_k}\|_{L^\infty[-1, 1]} \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow 0$. So the $\{P_{c_k}\}$ constructed in Theorem 1.5 has the property that $\min_{[-1, 1]} P_{c_k} < 0$ for large k .

Proof of Theorem 1.6:

Let C denote a positive constant depending only on c which may vary from line to line. For convenience, write $f_k = U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+(c_k)$, $P_k = P_{c_k}$, and $h_k := \frac{1}{2}f_k^2 - P_k$. In the following we always assume that k is large.

(i) We only prove the results for $U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+$, the proof for $U_{\nu_k, \theta}^-$ is similar. Since $P_k \geq 0$ in $[-1, 1]$ and $f_k(-1) = \tau_2(\nu_k, c_{k1}) > 0$, we have, by Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.5,

$$0 < f_k(x) \leq C, \quad -1 \leq x < 1. \quad (55)$$

By (10), $P_c(x) = -c_3(x - \bar{x})^2$ with $\bar{x} = \frac{\sqrt{c_1 - \sqrt{c_2}}}{\sqrt{c_1 + \sqrt{c_2}}} \in [-1, 1]$. Since $c_k \rightarrow c$ and $c_3 < 0$, we know $c_{k3} < \frac{1}{2}c_3 < 0$ for large k . Let \bar{x}_k be the unique minimum point of P_k , then $\bar{x}_k \rightarrow \bar{x}$,

$$P_k(x) = P_k(\bar{x}_k) - c_{k3}(x - \bar{x}_k)^2,$$

and for large k , that

$$\frac{|c_3|}{2}(x - \bar{x}_k)^2 \leq P_k(x) - P_k(\bar{x}_k) \leq 2|c_3|(x - \bar{x}_k)^2, \quad -1 \leq x \leq 1. \quad (56)$$

We first prove

$$\|\frac{1}{2}(U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+)^2 - P_{c_k}\|_{L^\infty(-1, 1)} \leq C\nu_k^{2/3}. \quad (57)$$

Case 1: $c_1, c_2 > 0$.

In this case $\bar{x} \in (-1, 1)$. Let $a_k = \nu_k^{1/3}/\alpha$ for some positive k -independent constant α to be determined. By Lemma 2.3, there exists some $x_k \in (\bar{x}_k + a_k, \bar{x}_k + 2a_k)$, such that $|h_k(x_k)| \leq C\nu_k/a_k = C\alpha^3 a_k^2$. It follows from (56), using the fact that $P_k(\bar{x}_k) \geq 0$, that

$$P_c(x) \geq |c_3|a_k^2/2, \quad \forall \bar{x}_k + a_k \leq x \leq 1. \quad (58)$$

Thus $f_k^2(x_k)/2 \geq P_k(x_k) - |h_k(x_k)| \geq (|c_3|/2 - C\alpha^3)a_k^2$. Fix $\alpha^3 = |c_3|/(4C)$. By (55) we have $f_k(x_k) \geq a_k/C$. Applying Lemma 2.4 on $[x_k, 1]$, using (58), we have $f_k \geq a_k/C$ on $[x_k, 1]$. Since $|h_k(x_k)| \leq C\nu_k^{2/3}$ and $|h_k(1)| = |\frac{1}{2}f_k^2(1) - P_k(1)| = |\frac{1}{2}(\tau_2'(\nu, c_{k2}))^2 - 2c_2| \leq C\nu_k$, we have, by applying Lemma 2.6 on $[x_k, 1]$, that

$$\max_{[\bar{x}_k + 2a_k, 1]} |h_k| \leq \max_{[x_k, 1]} |h_k| \leq C\nu_k^{2/3}.$$

Similarly, by Lemma 2.3, there exists some $x'_k \in [\bar{x}_k - 2a_k, \bar{x}_k - a_k]$, such that $|h_k(x'_k)| \leq C\nu_k^{2/3}$. We also have $|h_k(-1)| = |\frac{1}{2}f_k^2(-1) - P_k(-1)| = |\frac{1}{2}(\tau_2(\nu, c_{k1}))^2 - 2c_1| \leq C\nu_k$. Similar to (58), we have $P_k(x) \geq a_k/C^2$ for $x \in [-1, x'_k]$. Recall that $f_k(-1) \geq \sqrt{c_1}$. Using Lemma 2.4 we have $f_k \geq a_k/C$ on $[-1, x'_k]$. Then by similar arguments as on $[\bar{x}_k + 2a_k, 1]$, we have

$$\max_{[-1, \bar{x}_k - 2a_k]} |h_k| \leq C\nu_k^{2/3}.$$

Now we have that $|h_k(\bar{x}_k - 2a_k)| \leq Ca_k^2$ and $|h_k(\bar{x}_k + 2a_k)| \leq Ca_k^2$. Notice that $f_k > 0$ on $(-1, 1)$, $P_k \geq 0$ in $(-1, 1)$, using (56) we have $P_k(x) \leq P_k(\bar{x}_k) + 2|c_3|(x - \bar{x}_k)^2$ on $[-1, 1]$. Applying Lemma 2.7 on $[\bar{x}_k - 2a_k, \bar{x}_k + 2a_k]$ with $\alpha = 2$ and $\bar{x} = \bar{x}_k$, there we have that

$$\max_{[\bar{x}_k - 2a_k, \bar{x}_k + 2a_k]} |h_k| \leq Ca_k^2 + C\nu_k/a_k \leq C\nu_k^{2/3}.$$

Estimate (57) is proved in this case.

Case 2: $c_1 = 0$ and $c_2 > 0$.

In this case $P_c(x) = \frac{1}{2}c_2(x+1)^2$, $\bar{x}_k \rightarrow -1$. Let $a_k = \nu_k^{1/3}/\alpha$ for some $\alpha > 0$ to be determined. Let $b_k = \max\{-1, \bar{x}_k - 2a_k\}$ and $d_k = \max\{-1 + 2a_k, \bar{x}_k + 2a_k\}$. It is clear that $-1 \leq b_k < d_k < 1$. We prove estimate (57) separately on $[d_k, 1]$, $[-1, b_k]$ and $[b_k, d_k]$.

We first prove the estimate on $[d_k, 1]$. Since $d_k - 2a_k \geq \bar{x}_k$, we have $x - \bar{x}_k \geq a_k$ for x in $[d_k - a_k, d_k]$. By (56), we have $P_k \geq \frac{1}{2}|c_3|a_k^2$ in $[d_k - a_k, d_k]$. We also have $[d_k - a_k, d_k] \subset [-1, 1]$. Applying Lemma 2.3 on $[d_k - a_k, d_k]$, using (55), there exists some $x_k \in [d_k - a_k, d_k]$, such that $|h_k(x_k)| \leq C\nu_k/a_k = C\alpha^3 a_k^2$. Thus $\frac{1}{2}f_k^2(x_k) \geq P_k(x_k) - |h_k(x_k)| \geq (\frac{1}{2}|c_3| - C\alpha^3)a_k^2$. Fix $\alpha^3 = |c_3|/(4C)$. By (55) we have $f_k(x_k) \geq a_k/C$. Applying Lemma 2.4 on $[x_k, 1]$, and using $P_k \geq \frac{1}{2}|c_3|a_k^2$ on the interval, we have $f_k(x) \geq a_k/C$ on $[x_k, 1]$. Since $|h_k(x_k)| \leq Ca_k^2$ and $|h_k(1)| = |\frac{1}{2}f_k^2(1) - P_k(1)| = |\frac{1}{2}(\tau_2'(\nu, c_{k2}))^2 - 2c_2| \leq C\nu_k$, notice $x_k \leq d_k$, we have, by applying Lemma 2.6 on $[x_k, 1]$, that

$$\max_{[d_k, 1]} |h_k| \leq \max_{[x_k, 1]} |h_k| \leq C\nu_k^{2/3}. \quad (59)$$

Next, we prove the estimate on $[-1, b_k]$. If $\bar{x}_k - 2a_k > -1$, by (56) we have $P_k \geq \frac{1}{2}|c_3|a_k^2$ on $[-1, \bar{x}_k - a_k]$. In particular, $2c_{k1} = P_k(-1) \geq \frac{1}{2}|c_3|a_k^2$. So $c_{k1} \geq \frac{1}{4}|c_3|a_k^2$, and consequently $f_k(-1) = \tau_2(\nu, c_{k1}) \geq \sqrt{c_{k1}} \geq \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{|c_3|}a_k$. Applying Lemma 2.4 on $[-1, \bar{x}_k - a_k]$, and using $P_k \geq \frac{1}{2}|c_3|a_k^2$ on the interval, we have $f_k(x) \geq a_k/C$ on $[-1, \bar{x}_k - a_k]$. Applying Lemma 2.3 on $[\bar{x}_k - 2a_k, \bar{x}_k - a_k]$, using (55), there exists some $y_k \in [\bar{x}_k - 2a_k, \bar{x}_k - a_k]$, such that $|h_k(y_k)| \leq C\nu_k/a_k = C\alpha^3 a_k^2$. We also have $|h_k(-1)| \leq C\nu_k$. Notice $b_k = \bar{x}_k - 2a_k \leq y_k \leq \bar{x}_k - a_k$, applying Lemma 2.6 on $[-1, y_k]$, we have that

$$\max_{[-1, b_k]} |h_k| \leq \max_{[-1, y_k]} |h_k| \leq C\nu_k^{2/3}. \quad (60)$$

If $\bar{x}_k - 2a_k \leq -1$, $b_k = -1$, $\max_{[-1, b_k]} |h_k| = |h_k(-1)| \leq C\nu_k \leq C\nu_k^{2/3}$.

Now we prove the estimate on $[b_k, d_k]$. We have proved in the above that $|h_k(b_k)| \leq Ca_k^2$ and $|h_k(d_k)| \leq Ca_k^2$. If $\bar{x}_k < -1 - a_k$, then $[b_k, d_k] = [-1, -1 + 2a_k]$, and for any $x \in [-1, -1 + 2a_k]$, $x - \bar{x}_k \geq -1 - \bar{x}_k > a_k$. By (56), we have $P_k \geq a_k^2/C$ on $[-1, -1 + 2a_k]$. In particular, $2c_{k1} = P_k(-1) \geq \frac{1}{2}|c_3|a_k^2$. So $c_{k1} \geq \frac{1}{4}|c_3|a_k^2$, and

consequently $f_k(-1) = \tau_2(\nu_k, c_{k1}) \geq \sqrt{c_{k1}} \geq \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{|c_3|}a_k$. Applying Lemma 2.4 on $[-1, -1 + 2a_k]$, we have $f_k \geq a_k/C$ on $[-1, -1 + 2a_k]$. Notice we also know $|h_k(-1)| \leq Ca_k^2$ and $|h_k(-1 + 2a_k)| \leq Ca_k^2$. Applying Lemma 2.6 on $[b_k, d_k] = [-1, -1 + 2a_k]$, we have that in this case

$$\max_{[b_k, d_k]} |h_k| \leq Ca_k^2. \quad (61)$$

Next, we consider the case $\bar{x}_k \geq -1 - a_k$. If $\bar{x}_k - 2a_k \geq -1$, then $[b_k, d_k] = [\bar{x}_k - 2a_k, \bar{x}_k + 2a_k]$. If $\bar{x}_k - 2a_k < -1$, then $[b_k, d_k] = [-1, -1 + 2a_k]$ when $\bar{x}_k < -1$, and $[b_k, d_k] = [-1, \bar{x}_k + 2a_k]$ when $\bar{x}_k \geq -1$. So we have $\text{dist}(\bar{x}_k, [b_k, d_k]) \leq Ca_k$, and $2a_k \leq d_k - b_k \leq 4a_k$. Notice that $|h_k(b_k)| \leq Ca_k^2$, $|h_k(d_k)| \leq Ca_k^2$, $f_k > 0$ on $(-1, 1)$ and $P_k \geq 0$ in $(-1, 1)$, and using (56), $P_k(x) \leq P_k(\bar{x}_k) + 2|c_3|(x - \bar{x}_k)^2$ on $[-1, 1]$. Applying Lemma 2.7 on $[b_k, d_k]$ with $\alpha = 2$, we have that

$$\max_{[b_k, d_k]} |h_k| \leq Ca_k^2 + C\nu_k/a_k \leq C\nu_k^{2/3}. \quad (62)$$

By (59), (60), (61) and (62), we have $\max_{[-1, 1]} |h_k| \leq C\nu_k^{2/3}$. So estimate (57) is proved in Case 2.

Case 3: $c_2 = 0, c_1 > 0$. The proof of (57) is similar to that of Case 2.

We have by now proved (57). By (57), we have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \| |f_k| - \sqrt{2P_c} \|_{L^\infty(-1, 1)} = 0$. Using this and (55), we have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \| U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+ - \sqrt{2P_c} \|_{L^\infty(-1, 1)} = 0$. Next, we prove

$$\| U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+ - \sqrt{2P_{c_k}} \|_{C^m([-1, 1 - \epsilon] \setminus [\bar{x} - \epsilon, \bar{x} + \epsilon])} \leq C\nu_k, \quad (63)$$

If $\bar{x} = -1$, then by (56) and the fact that $\bar{x}_k \rightarrow \bar{x}$, we have $P_k \geq \epsilon^2/C$ on $[-1 + \epsilon/2, 1 - \epsilon/2]$ for large k . Applying Lemma 2.9 on $[-1 + \epsilon/2, 1 - \epsilon/2]$, using (55), we have (63) in this case.

If $\bar{x} > -1$, without loss of generality we assume ϵ is small such that $\bar{x} - 2\epsilon > -1$. In this case, by (56) and the fact that $\bar{x}_k \rightarrow \bar{x}$, we have $P_k \geq \epsilon^2/C$ on $[-1, 1 - \epsilon/2] \setminus [\bar{x} - \epsilon/2, \bar{x} + \epsilon/2]$ for large k . Applying Lemma 2.9 on $[-1 + \epsilon/2, \bar{x} - \epsilon/2]$ and $[\bar{x} + \epsilon/2, 1 - \epsilon/2]$ separately, we have

$$\| f_k - \sqrt{2P_k} \|_{C^m([-1 + \epsilon, \bar{x} - \epsilon] \cup [\bar{x} + \epsilon, 1 - \epsilon])} \leq C\nu_k, \quad (64)$$

for some constant C depending only on ϵ, m and an upper bound of $|c|$. By Lemma 3.1 and (64), we have $\left| \frac{d^i}{dx^i} (f_k - \sqrt{2P_k})(-1) \right| \leq C\nu_k$ and $\left| \frac{d^i}{dx^i} (f_k - \sqrt{2P_k})(\bar{x} - \epsilon) \right| \leq C\nu_k$, $0 \leq i \leq m$, where C depending only on m and an upper bound of $|c|$. Applying Lemma 2.8 on $[-1, \bar{x} - \epsilon]$, using (55), we have

$$\| f_k - \sqrt{2P_k} \|_{C^m([-1, \bar{x} - \epsilon])} \leq C\nu_k. \quad (65)$$

Estimate (63) in this case follows from (64) and (65).

Next, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists some constant $C > 0$, depending only on ϵ and an upper bound of $|c|$, such that $|f'_k| \leq C\nu_k^{-1/3}$ on $[-1 + \epsilon, 1 - \epsilon]$, so $|h'_k| = |f_k f'_k - P'_k| \leq C\nu_k^{-1/3}$. By interpolation for any $x, y \in (-1 + \epsilon, 1 - \epsilon)$ and $0 < \beta < 1$,

$$\frac{|h_k(x) - h_k(y)|}{|x - y|^\beta} \leq 2 \| h_k \|_{L^\infty(-1 + \epsilon, 1 - \epsilon)}^{1 - \beta} \| h'_k \|_{L^\infty(-1 + \epsilon, 1 - \epsilon)}^\beta \leq C\nu_k^{2(1 - \beta)/3} \nu_k^{-\beta/3} \leq C\nu_k^{\frac{2}{3} - \beta}.$$

So we have

$$\left\| \frac{1}{2}(U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+)^2 - P_{c_k} \right\|_{C^\beta(-1+\epsilon, 1-\epsilon)} \leq C\nu_k^{\frac{2}{3}-\beta}, \quad (66)$$

Part (i) follows from (57), (63) and (66).

(ii) If $P_k \geq 0$ on $[-1, 1]$, then the conclusion of the lemma follows from part(i). So below we assume that $\min_{[-1, 1]} P_k(x) < 0$. Let $\min_{[-1, 1]} P_k(x) = P_k(\bar{x}_k)$. Since $P_k(x) = c_{k1}(1-x) + c_{k2}(1+x) + c_{k3}(1-x^2)$, we have $\bar{x}_k = \frac{c_{k2}-c_{k1}}{2c_{k3}}$, and

$$P_k(x) = P_k(\bar{x}_k) - c_{k3}(x - \bar{x}_k)^2. \quad (67)$$

Then

$$1 - \bar{x}_k = \frac{-c_{k2} + 2c_{k3} + c_{k1}}{2c_{k3}} \leq C(|c_{k2}| + |2c_{k3} + c_{k1}|). \quad (68)$$

By Lemma 8.2 and the assumption that $\min_{[-1, 1]} P_k(x) < 0$, we have

$$-C\nu_k \leq P_k(\bar{x}_k) < 0. \quad (69)$$

Let $\bar{P}_k := P_{(c_{k1}, c_{k2}, \bar{c}_{k3})}$ and \bar{f}_k be the same as in (54). Denote

$$\tilde{x}_k = \frac{\sqrt{\nu_k^2 + c_{k1}} - \sqrt{\nu_k^2 + c_{k2}}}{2\nu_k + \sqrt{\nu_k^2 + c_{k1}} + \sqrt{\nu_k^2 + c_{k2}}} \in (-1, 1).$$

By (54) we have that

$$\bar{f}_k(\tilde{x}_k) = 0, \quad \bar{f}_k > 0, \quad -1 \leq x < \tilde{x}_k, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{f}_k < 0, \quad \tilde{x}_k < x \leq 1. \quad (70)$$

By computation

$$1 - \tilde{x}_k = \frac{2\nu_k + 2\sqrt{\nu_k^2 + c_{k2}}}{2\nu_k + \sqrt{\nu_k^2 + c_{k1}} + \sqrt{\nu_k^2 + c_{k2}}} \leq C(\nu_k + \sqrt{|c_{k2}|}). \quad (71)$$

Since $2c_3 = -c_1$, by (68) and (71) we see that $\bar{x}_k \rightarrow 1$ and $\tilde{x}_k \rightarrow 1$. Notice that $P_k \geq \bar{P}_k$ and $f_k(-1) = \bar{f}_k(-1) > 2\nu_k$. By Lemma 2.4 in [18], we have

$$f_k \geq \bar{f}_k, \quad -1 < x < 1. \quad (72)$$

Let $y_k = \min\{\bar{x}_k, \tilde{x}_k\} \rightarrow 1$. By (70) and (72) we have $f_k > 0$ for $-1 \leq x < y_k$. As in Case 3 in the proof of part (i), we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|f_k - \sqrt{2P_c}\|_{L^\infty(-1, y_k - 2a_k)} = 0, \quad (73)$$

and that there is some $a_k = \nu_k^{1/3}/\alpha$ with $\alpha > 0$ fixed, such that

$$\max_{[-1, y_k - 2a_k]} |h_k| \leq C\nu_k^{2/3}. \quad (74)$$

By (71) and (68) and the fact $a_k = \nu_k^{1/3}/\alpha$ we have

$$|y_k - 2a_k - 1| \leq C(\sqrt{|c_{k2}|} + |2c_{k3} + c_{k1}| + \nu_k^{1/3}). \quad (75)$$

On the interval $[y_k - 2a_k, 1]$, by (75), (67), (69) and the fact $\bar{x}_k \in [y_k - 2a_k, 1]$, we have that for large k ,

$$|P_k(x)| \leq C(|c_{k2}| + |2c_{k3} + c_{k1}|^2 + \nu_k^{2/3}), \quad y_k - 2a_k \leq x \leq 1,$$

and

$$P_k(x) \geq -C\nu_k + |c_3|a_k^2/2 > 0, \quad -1 \leq x < y_k - 2a_k.$$

Let $\hat{P}_k(x) = P_{\hat{c}_k}(x) := P_k(x) + C\nu_k(1+x)$. It can be seen that the corresponding \hat{c}_k belongs to J_{ν_k} . We have $\hat{P}_k \geq P_k > 0$ for $-1 \leq x < y_k - 2a_k$. By (69), $\hat{P}_k > 0$ for $y_k - 2a_k \leq x \leq 1$. So $\hat{P}_k > 0$ on $[-1, 1]$. Let \hat{f}_k be the upper solution of (25) with the right hand side to be \hat{P}_k . Then by part (i), we have $\|\frac{1}{2}\hat{f}_k^2 - \hat{P}_k\|_{L^\infty(-1,1)} \leq C\nu_k^{2/3}$. Notice that

$$|\hat{P}_k| \leq C(|c_{k2}| + |2c_{k3} + c_{k1}|^2 + \nu_k^{2/3}), \quad y_k - 2a_k < x < 1.$$

So

$$\hat{f}_k^2 < C(|c_{k2}| + |2c_{k3} + c_{k1}|^2 + \nu_k^{2/3}), \quad y_k - 2a_k < x < 1. \quad (76)$$

Since $\hat{c}_{k1} = c_{k1}$, we have $f_k(-1) = \hat{f}_k(-1) > 2\nu_k$. Using this and the fact $\hat{P}_k \geq P_k$, by Lemma 2.4 in [18], we have $f_k \leq \hat{f}_k$ on $(-1, 1)$. So on the interval $[y_k - 2a_k, 1]$, we have $\bar{f}_k \leq f_k \leq \hat{f}_k$. Using the expression of \bar{f}_k , (54) and (75), we have

$$|\bar{f}_k| \leq C(\sqrt{|c_{k2}|} + |2c_{k3} + c_{k1}| + a_k), \quad y_k - 2a_k < x < 1.$$

By this estimate and (76), we have

$$|f_k| \leq C(\sqrt{|c_{k2}|} + |2c_{k3} + c_{k1}| + \nu_k^{1/3}), \quad y_k - 2a_k < x < 1. \quad (77)$$

So we have

$$\left|\frac{1}{2}f_k^2 - P_k\right| \leq C(|c_{k2}| + |2c_{k3} + c_{k1}|^2 + \nu_k^{2/3}), \quad y_k - 2a_k < x < 1.$$

By this and (74) we have (13). Moreover, by (75) and (77), we have

$$|f_k(x) - \sqrt{2P_c(x)}| \leq |f_k| + |c_3||y_k - 2a_k - 1| \leq C(\sqrt{|c_{k2}|} + |2c_{k3} + c_{k1}| + \nu_k^{1/3}), \quad y_k - 2a_k < x < 1.$$

By this and (73), we have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+ - \sqrt{2P_c}\|_{L^\infty(-1,1)} = 0$. Part (ii) is proved.

(iii) The proof is similar as that of part (ii). Theorem 1.6 is proved. \square

Now we study sequence of solutions $U_{\nu_k, \theta}$ of (6) with ν_k and c_k other than $U_{\nu_k, \theta}^\pm$.
Proof of Theorem 1.8 continued:

We will prove Theorem 1.8 (i) and (ii) in the case $c_3 = c_3^*(c_1, c_2)$. Let C denote a positive constant, having the same dependence as specified in the theorem, which may

vary from line to line. For convenience write $f_k = U_{\nu_k, \theta}$, $P_k = P_{c_k}$ and $h_k = \frac{1}{2}f_k^2 - P_k$. Throughout the proof k is large. Let $\bar{x} = \frac{\sqrt{c_1} - \sqrt{c_2}}{\sqrt{c_1} + \sqrt{c_2}}$. By the assumption, $c_1, c_2 \geq 0$, $c_3 = c_3^*(c_1, c_2) = -\frac{1}{2}(c_1 + 2\sqrt{c_1 c_2} + c_2) < 0$, $-1 \leq \bar{x} \leq 1$, and $P_c(x) = -c_3(x - \bar{x})^2$.

Since $c_k \in J_0$, we have $P_k \geq 0$ on $[-1, 1]$. By Lemma 2.5, there exists at most one $x_k \in (-1, 1)$ such that $f_k(x_k) = 0$, and if such x_k exists we have

$$f_k(x) < 0, -1 < x < x_k, \text{ and } f_k(x) > 0, x_k < x < 1. \quad (78)$$

Since $c_k \rightarrow c$ and $c_3 < 0$, we know $c_{k3} < \frac{1}{2}c_3 < 0$ for large k . Let \bar{x}_k be the unique minimum point of P_k , then $\bar{x}_k \rightarrow \bar{x}$, $P_k(x) = P_k(\bar{x}_k) - c_{k3}(x - \bar{x}_k)^2$, and for large k ,

$$\frac{1}{2}|c_3|(x - \bar{x}_k)^2 \leq P_k(x) - P_k(\bar{x}_k) \leq 2|c_3|(x - \bar{x}_k)^2, \quad -1 \leq x \leq 1. \quad (79)$$

By Lemma 2.2,

$$|f_k| \leq C. \quad (80)$$

Since $P_c(x) = -c_3(x - \bar{x})^2$, we have, for every $\epsilon > 0$, $\min_{[-1, 1] \setminus (\bar{x} - \epsilon/2, \bar{x} + \epsilon/2)} P_c > 0$. By the convergence of $\{c_k\}$ to c , we deduce that

$$\min_{[-1, 1] \setminus (\bar{x} - \epsilon/2, \bar{x} + \epsilon/2)} P_k \geq 1/C. \quad (81)$$

Using (78) and (81), by applying Lemma 2.9 and Lemma 2.9' on each interval of $[-1, x_k - \epsilon/2] \setminus (\bar{x} - \epsilon/2, \bar{x} + \epsilon/2)$ and $[x_k + \epsilon/2, 1] \setminus (\bar{x} - \epsilon/2, \bar{x} + \epsilon/2)$ separately, we have

$$\|U_{\nu_k, \theta} + \sqrt{2P_{c_k}}\|_{C^m([-1 + \epsilon, x_k - \epsilon] \setminus [\bar{x} - \epsilon, \bar{x} + \epsilon])} + \|U_{\nu_k, \theta} - \sqrt{2P_{c_k}}\|_{C^m([x_k + \epsilon, 1 - \epsilon] \setminus [\bar{x} - \epsilon, \bar{x} + \epsilon])} \leq C\nu_k,$$

Next, we prove

$$\left\| \frac{1}{2}U_{\nu_k, \theta}^2 - P_{c_k} \right\|_{L^\infty((-1, x_k - \epsilon) \cup (x_k + \epsilon, 1))} \leq C\nu_k^{2/3}. \quad (82)$$

Suppose $x_k \rightarrow \hat{x} \in [-1, 1]$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Since f_k is not $U_{\nu_k, \theta}^\pm$, we know from Theorem A that $f_k(-1) = \tau_1(\nu_k, c_{k1})$, $f_k(1) = \tau_2'(\nu_k, c_{k2})$. and therefore, in view of (9), we have

$$|f_k(-1) + \sqrt{2P_k(-1)}| + |f_k(1) - \sqrt{2P_k(1)}| \leq C\nu_k. \quad (83)$$

We have $\min_{[-1, 1]} P_c = P_c(\bar{x})$. Assume $\min_{[-1, 1]} P_k = P_k(\bar{x}_k)$. Then $\bar{x} \in [-1, 1]$ and $\bar{x}_k \rightarrow \bar{x}$. We also have P_k satisfy (56) for large k .

Case 1: $c_1 > 0$, $c_2 > 0$, $c_3 = c_3^*(c_1, c_2) < 0$.

In this case $\bar{x} \in (-1, 1)$. We discuss the cases when $|x_k - \bar{x}_k| \geq \epsilon/4$ and $|x_k - \bar{x}_k| < \epsilon/4$ separately.

If $|x_k - \bar{x}_k| \geq \epsilon/4$, we prove the case when $x_k \geq \bar{x}_k + \epsilon/4$, the other case can be proved similarly. In view of (9), we have $f_k(-1) \leq -1/C$ and $f_k(1) \geq 1/C$. We first estimate $|h_k|$ on $[x_k + \epsilon, 1]$. We have $P_k \geq 1/C$ on $[x_k + \epsilon/2, 1]$ for large k . By Corollary 2.1 and Corollary 2.1', using (80) and (78), we have that

$$1/C \leq f_k \leq C, x \in (x_k + \epsilon/2, 1). \quad (84)$$

Using (83) and (84), applying Lemma 2.6 on $(x_k + \epsilon/2, 1)$, we have

$$\max_{[x_k + \epsilon, 1]} |h_k| \leq C\nu_k. \quad (85)$$

Next, we prove estimate (82) on $[-1, x_k - \epsilon]$. The proof is similar to Case 1 in the proof of Theorem 1.6 (i). Let $a_k = \nu_k^{1/3}/\alpha$ for some positive constant α to be determined. Since $P_k(\bar{x}_k) \geq 0$, it follows from (79) that

$$P_k(x) \geq |c_3|a_k^2/2, \quad \forall x \in [-1, \bar{x}_k - a_k] \cup [\bar{x}_k + a_k, 1]. \quad (86)$$

By Lemma 2.3, there exists some $y_k \in (\bar{x}_k - 2a_k, \bar{x}_k - a_k)$, $s_k \in (\bar{x}_k + a_k, \bar{x}_k + 2a_k)$ and $t_k \in (x_k - \epsilon/8, x_k - \epsilon/16)$, such that $|h_k(y_k)| + |h_k(s_k)| \leq C\nu_k/a_k = C\alpha^3 a_k^2$ and $|h_k(t_k)| \leq C\nu_k$. It follows from (86) that

$$f_k^2(y_k)/2 \geq P_{c_k}(y_k) - |h_k(y_k)| \geq (|c_3|/2 - C\alpha^3) a_k^2.$$

Fix $\alpha^3 = \frac{|c_3|}{4C}$. We have $f_k(y_k) < -a_k/\sqrt{C}$. Similarly we have $f_k(t_k) < -a_k/\sqrt{C}$. Using (78), applying Lemma 2.4' on $[-1, y_k]$ and $[s_k, t_k]$ separately, we have $f_k(x) \leq -a_k/C$ on $[-1, y_k]$ and $[s_k, t_k]$. Since $|h_k(y_k)| \leq C\nu_k^{2/3}$, $|h_k(-1)| \leq C\nu_k$, $|h_k(s_k)| \leq C\nu_k^{2/3}$ and $|h_k(t_k)| \leq C\nu_k$, applying Lemma 2.6 on $[-1, y_k]$ and $[s_k, t_k]$ separately, we have

$$\max_{[-1, \bar{x}_k - 2a_k]} |h_k| \leq \max_{[-1, y_k]} |h_k| \leq C\nu_k^{2/3}, \quad (87)$$

and

$$\max_{[\bar{x}_k + 2a_k, x_k - \epsilon]} |h_k| \leq \max_{[s_k, t_k]} |h_k| \leq C\nu_k^{2/3}. \quad (88)$$

Now we have that $h_k(\bar{x}_k - 2a_k) \leq Ca_k^2$ and $h_k(\bar{x}_k + 2a_k) \leq Ca_k^2$. Notice that $f_k < 0$ on $[\bar{x}_k - 2a_k, \bar{x}_k + 2a_k]$, $P_k(\bar{x}_k) \geq 0$ and $P_k(x) = P_k(\bar{x}_k) - c_{k3}(x - \bar{x}_k)^2$. Applying Lemma 2.7 on $[\bar{x}_k - 2a_k, \bar{x}_k + 2a_k]$ with $\alpha = 2$, we have that

$$\max_{[\bar{x}_k - 2a_k, \bar{x}_k + 2a_k]} |h_k| \leq Ca_k^2 + C\nu_k/a_k \leq C\nu_k^{2/3}. \quad (89)$$

By (85), (87), (88) and (89), we have proved (82) when $x_k \geq \bar{x}_k + \epsilon/4$.

Next, if $|x_k - \bar{x}_k| < \epsilon/4$, similar as (84) we have

$$-C \leq f_k \leq -1/C, x \in (-1, x_k - \epsilon/2), \text{ and } 1/C \leq f_k \leq C, x \in (x_k + \epsilon/2, 1).$$

Using this and (83), applying Lemma 2.6 on $(-1, x_k - \epsilon/2)$ and $(x_k + \epsilon/2, 1)$, (82) is proved.

Case 2: $c_1 = 0$, $c_2 > 0$, $c_3 = c_3^*(c_1, c_2) = -c_2/2 < 0$.

In this case $P_c(x) = \frac{1}{2}c_2(x+1)^2$, $\bar{x}_k \rightarrow -1$. we have the estimate (86). We discuss the cases when $x_k - \bar{x}_k \geq \epsilon/4$ and $x_k - \bar{x}_k < \epsilon/4$ separately.

If $x_k - \bar{x}_k \geq \epsilon/4$, in view of (9), we have $f_k(1) \geq 1/C$. We first estimate $|h_k|$ on $[x_k + \epsilon, 1]$. We have $P_k \geq 1/C$ on $[x_k + \epsilon/2, 1]$ for large k . By Corollary 2.1 and Corollary 2.1', using (80) and (78), we have (84). Using (83) and (84), applying Lemma 2.6 on $(x_k + \epsilon/2, 1)$, we have

$$\max_{[x_k + \epsilon, 1]} |h_k| \leq C\nu_k.$$

Next, we prove the estimate (82) on $[-1, x_k - \epsilon]$. The proof is similar to Case 2 in the proof of Theorem 1.6(ii). Let $a_k = \nu_k^{1/3}/\alpha$ for some $\alpha > 0$ to be determined, $b_k = \max\{-1, \bar{x}_k - 2a_k\}$ and $d_k = \max\{-1 + 2a_k, \bar{x}_k + 2a_k\}$. It is clear that $-1 \leq b_k < d_k < 1$. We prove estimate (82) separately on $[d_k, x_k - \epsilon]$, $[-1, b_k]$ and $[b_k, d_k]$.

We first prove the estimate on $[d_k, x_k - \epsilon]$. Since $d_k - 2a_k \geq \bar{x}_k$, we have $x - \bar{x}_k \geq a_k$ for x in $[d_k - a_k, d_k]$. Applying Lemma 2.3 on $[d_k - a_k, d_k]$, using (80), there exists some $s_k \in (d_k - a_k, d_k)$ and $t_k \in (x_k - \epsilon/8, x_k - \epsilon/16)$, such that $|h_k(s_k)| \leq C\nu_k/a_k = C\alpha^3 a_k^2$ and $|h_k(t_k)| \leq C\nu_k$. Thus

$$\frac{1}{2}f_k^2(t_k) \geq P_k(t_k) - |h_k(t_k)| \geq \frac{1}{2}|c_3|a_k^2 - C\nu_k.$$

By (78) and (86), we have $f_k(t_k) \leq -a_k/C$. Applying Lemma 2.4' on $[s_k, t_k]$, and using $P_k \geq \frac{1}{2}|c_3|a_k^2$ on the interval, we have

$$f_k(x) \leq -a_k/C, \quad s_k \leq x \leq t_k. \quad (90)$$

Notice $s_k \leq d_k$ and $|h_k(s_k)| + |h_k(t_k)| \leq C\alpha^3 a_k^2$, applying Lemma 2.6 on $[s_k, t_k]$, we have

$$\max_{[d_k, x_k - \epsilon]} |h_k| \leq \max_{[s_k, t_k]} |h_k| \leq C\nu_k^{2/3}. \quad (91)$$

Next, we prove the estimate on $[-1, b_k]$. If $\bar{x}_k - 2a_k > -1$, applying Lemma 2.3 on $[b_k, b_k + a_k]$, using (80), there exists some $y_k \in (b_k, b_k + a_k)$, such that $|h_k(y_k)| \leq C\nu_k/a_k = C\alpha^3 a_k^2$. Thus

$$\frac{1}{2}f_k^2(y_k) \geq P_k(y_k) - |h_k(y_k)| \geq \left(\frac{1}{2}|c_3| - C\alpha^3\right) a_k^2.$$

Fix $\alpha^3 = |c_3|/(4C)$. By (78) and (86), we have $f_k(y_k) \leq -a_k/C$. Applying Lemma 2.4' on $[-1, y_k]$, we have $f_k(x) \leq -a_k/C$ on $(-1, y_k)$. Using $|h_k(y_k)| \leq C\nu_k^{2/3}$ and $|h_k(-1)| \leq C\nu_k$, applying Lemma 2.6 on $[-1, y_k]$, we have

$$\max_{[-1, b_k]} |h_k| \leq \max_{[-1, y_k]} |h_k| \leq C\nu_k^{2/3}. \quad (92)$$

If $\bar{x}_k - 2a_k \leq -1$, $b_k = -1$, $\max_{[-1, b_k]} |h_k| = |h_k(-1)| \leq C\nu_k \leq C\nu_k^{2/3}$.

Now we prove the estimate on $[b_k, d_k]$. We have proved in the above that $|h_k(b_k)| \leq Ca_k^2$ and $|h_k(d_k)| \leq Ca_k^2$. If $\bar{x}_k < -1 - a_k$, then $[b_k, d_k] = [-1, -1 + 2a_k]$, and for any $x \in [-1, -1 + 2a_k]$, $x - \bar{x}_k \geq -1 - \bar{x}_k > a_k$. By (86), we have $P_k \geq a_k^2/C$ on $[-1, -1 + 2a_k]$. By (90), $f_k(d_k) \leq -a_k/C$. Applying Lemma 2.4' on $[-1, -1 + 2a_k]$, we have $f_k \leq -a_k/C$ on $[-1, -1 + 2a_k]$. Notice we also know $|h_k(-1)| \leq Ca_k^2$ and $|h_k(-1 + 2a_k)| \leq Ca_k^2$. Applying Lemma 2.6 on $[b_k, d_k] = [-1, -1 + 2a_k]$, we have that in this case

$$\max_{[b_k, d_k]} |h_k| \leq Ca_k^2. \quad (93)$$

Next, we consider the case $\bar{x}_k \geq -1 - a_k$. If $\bar{x}_k - 2a_k \geq -1$, then $[b_k, d_k] = [\bar{x}_k - 2a_k, \bar{x}_k + 2a_k]$. If $\bar{x}_k - 2a_k < -1$, then $[b_k, d_k] = [-1, -1 + 2a_k]$ when $\bar{x}_k < -1$, and $[b_k, d_k] = [-1, \bar{x}_k + 2a_k]$ when $\bar{x}_k \geq -1$. So we have $\text{dist}(\bar{x}_k, [b_k, d_k]) \leq Ca_k$, and

$2a_k \leq d_k - b_k \leq 4a_k$. Notice that $|h_k(b_k)| \leq Ca_k^2$, $|h_k(d_k)| \leq Ca_k^2$, $f_k < 0$ on $[b_k, d_k]$ and $P_k \geq 0$ in $(-1, 1)$, and using (79), $P_k(x) \leq P_k(\bar{x}_k) + 2|c_3|(x - \bar{x}_k)^2$ on $[-1, 1]$. Applying Lemma 2.7 on $[b_k, d_k]$ with $\alpha = 2$, we have that

$$\max_{[b_k, d_k]} |h_k| \leq Ca_k^2 + C\nu_k/a_k \leq C\nu_k^{2/3}. \quad (94)$$

By (91), (92), (93) and (94), we have $\max_{[-1, 1]} |h_k| \leq C\nu_k^{2/3}$. So estimate (82) is proved when $x_k - \bar{x}_k \geq \epsilon/4$.

Next, if $x_k - \bar{x}_k < \epsilon/4$. Since $x_k > -1$ and $\bar{x}_k \rightarrow -1$, we have $x_k + \epsilon/2 > \bar{x}_k + \epsilon/4$, and therefore we have $P_k \geq 1/C$ on $[x_k + \epsilon/2, 1]$. similar as (84) we have

$$1/C \leq f_k \leq C \text{ on } (x_k + \epsilon/2, 1).$$

Using this and (83), applying Lemma 2.6 on $(x_k + \epsilon/2, 1)$, (82) is proved.

Case 3: $c_2 = 0, c_1 > 0, c_3 = c_3^*(c_1, c_2)$. The proof of (82) is similar to that of Case 2. We have by now proved (82).

By (82) and (25), for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists some constant $C > 0$, depending only on ϵ and an upper bound of $|c|$, such that $|f'_k| \leq C\nu_k^{-1/3}$ on $[-1 + \epsilon, x_k - \epsilon] \cup [x_k + \epsilon, 1 - \epsilon]$, so $|h'_k| = |f_k f'_k - P'_k| \leq C\nu_k^{-1/3}$. So we have

$$\|\frac{1}{2}U_{\nu_k, \theta}^2 - P_{c_k}\|_{C^1([-1 + \epsilon, x_k - \epsilon] \cup [x_k + \epsilon, 1 - \epsilon]) \cap [\bar{x} - \epsilon, \bar{x} + \epsilon]} \leq C\nu_k^{-1/3},$$

By interpolation for any $x, y \in (-1 + \epsilon, 1 - \epsilon)$ and $0 < \beta < 1$,

$$\frac{|h_k(x) - h_k(y)|}{|x - y|^\beta} \leq 2\|h_k\|_{L^\infty(-1 + \epsilon, 1 - \epsilon)}^{1-\beta} \|h'_k\|_{L^\infty(-1 + \epsilon, 1 - \epsilon)}^\beta \leq C\nu_k^{2(1-\beta)/3} \nu_k^{-\beta/3} \leq C\nu_k^{2/3-\beta}.$$

We have

$$\|\frac{1}{2}U_{\nu_k, \theta}^2 - P_{c_k}\|_{C^\beta([-1 + \epsilon, x_k - \epsilon] \cup [x_k + \epsilon, 1 - \epsilon])} \leq C\nu_k^{2/3-\beta}. \quad (95)$$

Using (78), (81) and (82), we have (15) in this case. Part (i) in this case follows from (15), (82) and (95).

Next, we prove part (ii) in this case. Notice that in this case $c_3 = c_3^*(c_1, c_2)$, c_1, c_2 cannot both be zero. We first prove that if such x_k exists and $x_k \rightarrow -1$ with $c_1 = 0$ or such x_k does not exist with $c_2 > 0 = c_1$, then

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|f_k - \sqrt{2P_k}\|_{L^\infty(-1, 1)} = 0. \quad (96)$$

In this case $P_c(x) = -\frac{1}{2}c_2(x+1)^2$ where $c_2 > 0$. By Theorem 1.6(i), we have

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|U_{\nu_k, \theta}^\pm \mp \sqrt{2P_k}\|_{L^\infty(-1, 1)} = 0.$$

So for any $\epsilon_0 > 0$, there exists some $\epsilon > 0$, such that $\|P_k\|_{L^\infty L^\infty(-1, -1+2\epsilon)} < \epsilon_0$, and $\|U_{\nu_k, \theta}^\pm\|_{L^\infty(-1, -1+2\epsilon)} < \epsilon_0$ for large k . Notice $U_{\nu_k, \theta}^- \leq f_k \leq U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+$, we then have $\|f_k - \sqrt{2P_k}\|_{L^\infty(-1, -1+2\epsilon)} < 2\epsilon_0$. Since $P_c(x) = -\frac{1}{2}c_2(x+1)^2$ we also have that $P_c \geq 1/C$ on $[-1 + \epsilon, 1]$. Moreover, if such x_k does not exist, then since $f_k(1) = \tau'_2(\nu_k, c_{k2}) > 0$,

we have $f_k > 0$ on $(-1, 1]$. If such x_k exists and $x_k \rightarrow -1$, then for k large we have $-1 < x_k < -1 + \epsilon$. By (78), we also have $f_k > 0$ on $[-1 + \epsilon, 1]$. Then by Corollary 2.1, we have $f_k \geq 1/C$ on $[-1 + 2\epsilon, 1]$. Notice $|f_k(1) - \sqrt{2P_c(-1)}| \leq C\nu_k$ and $|f_k(-1 + 2\epsilon) - \sqrt{2P_c(-1 + 2\epsilon)}| \leq 2\epsilon_0$, by Corollary 2.3 we have $\|f_k - \sqrt{2P_c}\|_{L^\infty(-1+2\epsilon, 1)} < C\epsilon_0$. So (96) is proved.

Similarly, if such x_k exists and $x_k \rightarrow 1$ with $c_2 = 0$ or such x_k does not exist with $c_1 > 0 = c_2$, we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|U_{\nu_k, \theta} + \sqrt{2P_{c_k}}\|_{L^\infty(-1, 1)} = 0.$$

□

5 $c \in \partial J_0$ and $c_3 > c_3^*(c_1, c_2)$

Lemma 5.1. *Let $-1 \leq a < b \leq 1$, $\nu_k \rightarrow 0^+$, $c_k \in J_{\nu_k}$, $c_1 c_2 = 0$, $c_3 > c_3^*(c_1, c_2)$, and $c_k \rightarrow c$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Then*

$$\min_{[a, b]} P_{c_k} = \min\{P_{c_k}(a), P_{c_k}(b)\},$$

for sufficiently large k .

Proof. When $c_3 > 0$, we have $P_{c_k}''(x) = -2c_k c_3 < 0$ for large k . Thus P_{c_k} is concave down, $\min_{[a, b]} P_{c_k} = \min\{P_{c_k}(a), P_{c_k}(b)\}$. When $c_3 \leq 0$, we distinguish to two cases. Case 1 is $c_1 = 0$ and Case 2 is $c_2 = 0$. If $c_1 = 0$, then $P_c'(x) = c_2 - 2c_3 x \geq c_2 + 2c_3 > 0$ in $[-1, 1]$. So $P_k' > 0$ in $[-1, 1]$ for large k . Thus $\min_{[a, b]} P_{c_k} = P_{c_k}(a)$. If $c_2 = 0$, then $P_c'(x) = -c_1 - 2c_3 x \leq -c_1 - 2c_3 < 0$ in $[-1, 1]$. So $P_k' < 0$ in $[-1, 1]$ for large k . Thus $\min_{[a, b]} P_{c_k} = P_{c_k}(b)$. □

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\nu_k \rightarrow 0^+$, $c_k \in J_{\nu_k}$, $-1 < b \leq 1$, $c_1 c_2 = 0$, $c_3 > c_3^*(c_1, c_2)$, and $c_k \rightarrow c$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. If $P_c(b) > 0$, then $U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+ > 0$ on $[-1, b]$ for sufficiently large k .*

Proof. For convenience denote $f_k = U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+$, and $P_k = P_{c_k}$. If $c_{k1} \geq 0$, we have $P_k(-1) = 2c_{k1} \geq 0$ for large k . Since $P_c(b) > 0$, we also have $P_k(b) > 0$. By Lemma 5.1 we have $P_k(x) \geq \min\{P_k(-1), P_k(b)\} > 0$. Using this and the fact that $f_k(-1) = \tau_2(c_{k1}, \nu_k) > 0$, by Lemma 2.5 we have $f_k > 0$ on $[-1, b]$.

If $c_{k1} < 0$, since $c_{k1} \rightarrow c_1 \geq 0$, we must have $c_1 = 0$, and then $c_3 > -c_2/2$ and $P_c(x) = c_2(1+x) + c_3(1-x^2)$. So $P_c(-1) = 0$ and $P_c'(-1) = c_2 + 2c_3 > 0$. Since $c_k \rightarrow c$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, there exists some $C_0 > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, such that

$$C_0(1+x) \leq P_k(x) - P_k(-1) \leq 2C_0(1+x), \quad -1 < x < -1 + \delta \quad (97)$$

for k sufficiently large. Notice $P_k(-1) = 2c_{k1} \geq -2\nu_k^2$. Since $c_{k1} < 0$, then since $P_k(-1) = 2c_{k1} \geq -2\nu_k^2$, by (97), we have $P_k(-1 + 2\nu_k^2/C_0) \geq 0$. So by Lemma 5.1, we have $P_k \geq \min\{P_k(-1 + 2\nu_k^2/C_0), P_k(b)\} \geq 0$ on $[-1 + 2\nu_k^2/C_0, b]$.

Next, let

$$g_k(x) := f_k(-1) - \frac{C_0}{8\nu_k}(1+x)$$

Since $f_k(-1) \geq 2\nu_k$, it can be checked that $g_k > 0$ on $[-1, -1 + 2\nu_k^2/C_0]$. By computation, using the facts that $\frac{1}{2}f_k^2(-1) - 2\nu_k f_k(-1) = 2c_{k1}$ and $f_k(-1) \geq 2\nu_k$, we have that for $-1 \leq x \leq -1 + 2\nu_k^2/C_0$ and k sufficiently large,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_k &:= \nu_k(1-x^2)g'_k + 2\nu_k x g_k + \frac{1}{2}g_k^2 \\ &= \left(\left[\frac{C_0^2}{128\nu_k^2} - \frac{C_0}{8} \right] (1+x) + (2\nu_k - \frac{C_0}{8\nu_k}) f_k(-1) \right) (1+x) + \frac{1}{2} f_k^2(-1) - 2\nu_k f_k(-1) \\ &\leq \left(\left[\frac{C_0^2}{128\nu_k^2} - \frac{C_0}{8} \right] \frac{2\nu_k^2}{C_0} + 4\nu_k^2 - \frac{C_0}{4} \right) (1+x) + 2c_{k1} \\ &\leq 2c_{k1} < P_k(x). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.3 in [18], we have $\limsup_{x \rightarrow -1^+} |x+1|^{-1} |f_k(x) - f_k(-1)| < \infty$. So we have $g_k(-1) = f_k(-1) > 2\nu_k$ or $f_k(-1) = g_k(-1) = 2\nu_k$ with $\limsup_{x \rightarrow -1^+} \int_{-1+2\nu_k^2/C_0}^x (1-s^2)^{-1} (-2\nu_k + f_k(s)) ds < \infty$. It can be checked that f_k is a solution of (25) if and only if $\nu_k f_k$ is a solution of (7). Similarly, $\nu_k g_k$ is a solution of (7) with the right hand side to be Q_k/ν_k^2 . Notice that $Q_k < P_k$, applying Lemma 2.4 in [18], we have $f_k \geq g_k > 0$ on $(-1, -1 + 2\nu_k^2/C_0]$. Since $P_k \geq 0$ on $[-1 + 2\nu_k^2/C_0, b]$ and $f_k(-1 + 2\nu_k^2/C_0) > 0$, we have, by Lemma 2.5, that $f_k > 0$ on $[-1 + 2\nu_k^2/C_0, b]$. So $f_k > 0$ in $[-1, b]$, the lemma is proved. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.7:

We only prove the results for $U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+$, the proof of the results for $U_{\nu_k, \theta}^-$ is similar. Let C be a positive constant depending only on c which may vary from line to line. For convenience, write $f_k = U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+$, $P_k = P_{c_k}$, and let $h_k := \frac{1}{2}f_k^2 - P_k$. In the following we always assume that k is large.

Since $c_k \rightarrow c$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, by Lemma 2.2, we have $f_k \leq C$ in $[-1, 1]$. We first prove

$$\left\| \frac{1}{2}(U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+)^2 - P_{c_k} \right\|_{L^\infty(-1,1)} \leq C\nu_k^{1/2}. \quad (98)$$

Case 1: $c_1 = 0$, $c_2 > 0$, $c_3 > -c_2/2$.

In this case, $P_c(x) = c_2(1+x) + c_3(1-x^2)$ in $(-1, 1)$. So $P_c(-1) = 2c_1 = 0$, and $P'_c(-1) = c_2 + 2c_3 > 0$. Since $c_k \rightarrow c$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, there exists some $\delta > 0$, such that for large k ,

$$\frac{1}{2}P'_c(-1)(1+x) \leq P_k(x) - P_k(-1) \leq 2P'_c(-1)(1+x), \quad -1 < x < -1 + \delta. \quad (99)$$

Let $a_k = \nu_k^{1/2}/\alpha$ for some positive constant α to be determined. Then by Lemma 2.3, there exists some $x_k \in (-1 + a_k, -1 + 2a_k)$, such that $|h_k(x_k)| \leq \frac{C\nu_k}{a_k} = C\alpha^2 a_k$. It follows from (99) and the fact that $P_k(-1) = 2c_{k1} \geq -\nu_k^2$ and $P'_c(-1) > 0$, that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}f_k^2(x_k) &\geq P_k(x_k) - |h_k(x_k)| \geq P_k(-1) + \frac{1}{2}P'_c(-1)(x_k + 1) - |h_k(x_k)| \\ &\geq -2\nu_k^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2}P'_c(-1) - C\alpha^2 \right) a_k \geq \left(\frac{1}{4}P'_c(-1) - C\alpha^2 \right) a_k. \end{aligned}$$

Fix $\alpha^2 = P'_c(-1)/(8C)$. By (99) $P_c(x_k) - 2\nu_k^2 + \frac{1}{2}P'_c(-1)a_k > 0$, by Lemma 5.2, we have $f_k > 0$ on $[-1, x_k]$. So $f_k(x_k) \geq \sqrt{a_k/C}$. Since $P_k(1) > \frac{1}{2}P_c(1) > 0$ for large k , by (99) we have

$$P_k(-1 + a_k) \geq 2c_{k1} + a_k/C \geq -2\nu_k^2 + a_k/C \geq a_k/C.$$

Then by Lemma 5.1, we have $P_k(x) \geq a_k/C$ in $[-1 + a_k, 1]$ for k large. Applying Lemma 2.4 on $[x_k, 1]$, we have $f_k(x) \geq \sqrt{a_k/C}$ on $[x_k, 1]$. We also have $|h_k(x_k)| \leq C\nu_k^{1/2}$, $|h_k(1)| = |\frac{1}{2}f_k^2(1) - P_k(1)| = |\frac{1}{2}(\tau'_2(\nu, c_{k2}))^2 - 2c_{k2}| \leq C\nu_k$. So by applying Lemma 2.6 on $[x_k, 1]$,

$$\max_{[-1+2a_k, 1]} |h_k| \leq \max_{[x_k, 1]} |h_k| \leq C\nu_k^{1/2}.$$

Now we have $h_k(-1 + 2a_k) \leq Ca_k$ and $|h_k(-1)| = |\frac{1}{2}f_k^2(-1) - P_k(-1)| = |\frac{1}{2}(\tau_2(\nu, c_{k1}))^2 - 2c_{k1}| \leq C\nu_k$. By (99) we have $P_k(x) \geq P_k(-1) = 2c_{k1} \geq -2\nu_k^2 \geq -Ca_k$ in $[-1, -1 + 2a_k]$ for k large. By (99) we also have that $P_k(x) \leq P_k(-1) + C(1 + x)$. Notice $f_k(-1) = 2\nu_k + 2\sqrt{\nu_k^2 + c_{k1}} > 0$, applying Lemma 2.7 on $[-1, -1 + 2a_k]$ with $\alpha = 1$ and $\bar{x}_k = -1$ there, we have that

$$\max_{(-1, -1+2a_k)} |h_k| \leq Ca_k + C\nu_k/\sqrt{a_k} \leq C\nu_k^{1/2}.$$

Estimate (98) is proved in this case.

Case 2: $c_1 > 0$, $c_2 = 0$, $c_3 > -\frac{1}{2}c_1$.

In this case, $P_c(x) = c_1(1 - x) + c_3(1 - x^2)$. So $P_c(1) = 0$ and $P'_c(1) = -c_1 - 2c_3 < 0$. Since $c_k \rightarrow c$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, there exists some $\delta > 0$, such that

$$-\frac{1}{2}P'_c(1)(1 - x) < P_k(x) - P_k(1) < -2P'_c(1)(1 - x), \quad 1 - \delta < x < 1, \quad (100)$$

for large k . Let $a_k = \nu_k^{\frac{1}{2}}$. By Lemma 2.3, there exists some $x_k \in (1 - 2a_k, 1 - a_k)$, such that $|h_k(x_k)| \leq C\nu_k/a_k = Ca_k$. Since $P_c(-1) = 2c_1 > 0$, we have $P_k(-1) > \frac{1}{2}P_c(-1) > 0$ for large k . By (100) we have

$$P_k(1 - a_k) \geq 2c_{k2} + a_k/C \geq -2\nu_k^2 + a_k/C \geq a_k/C.$$

Then by Lemma 5.1, we have $P_k(x) \geq a_k/C$ in $[-1, 1 - a_k]$ for k large. Notice $f_k(-1) = \tau_2(\nu_k, c_{k1}) \geq \sqrt{c_1} > 0$ for large k . Applying Lemma 2.4 on $[-1, 1 - a_k]$, we have $f_k(x) \geq \sqrt{a_k/C}$ on $[-1, 1 - a_k]$. We also have $|h_k(x_k)| \leq C\nu_k^{1/2}$, $|h_k(-1)| = |\frac{1}{2}f_k^2(-1) - P_k(-1)| = |\frac{1}{2}(\tau_2(\nu, c_{k1}))^2 - 2c_{k1}| \leq C\nu_k$. So by applying Lemma 2.6 on $[-1, x_k]$,

$$\max_{[-1, 1-2a_k]} |h_k| \leq \max_{[-1, x_k]} |h_k| \leq C\nu_k^{1/2}.$$

Now we have $h_k(1 - 2a_k) \leq Ca_k$ and $|h_k(1)| = |\frac{1}{2}f_k^2(1) - P_k(1)| = |\frac{1}{2}(\tau'_2(\nu, c_{k2}))^2 - 2c_{k2}| \leq C\nu_k$. By (100) we have $P_k(x) \geq P_k(1) = 2c_{k1} \geq -2\nu_k^2 \geq -Ca_k$ in $[1 - 2a_k, 1]$ for k large. By (100) we also have that $P_k(x) \leq P_k(1) + C(1 - x)$. Notice $f_k(1 - 2a_k) \geq \sqrt{a_k/C} > 0$, applying Lemma 2.7 on $[1 - 2a_k, 1]$ with $\alpha = 1$ and $\bar{x}_k = 1$ there, we have that

$$\max_{[1-2a_k, 1]} |h_k| \leq Ca_k + C\nu_k/\sqrt{a_k} \leq C\nu_k^{1/2}.$$

Estimate (98) is proved in this case.

Case 3: $c_1 = c_2 = 0$, $c_3 > 0$.

In this case, $P_c(x) = c_3(1 - x^2)$ in $(-1, 1)$. So $P_c(\pm 1) = 0$, $P'_c(-1) = 2c_3 > 0$ and $P'_c(1) = -2c_3 < 0$. Since $c_k \rightarrow c$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, there exists some $\delta > 0$, such that for large k , (99) and (100) are true. Let $a_k = \nu_k^{1/2}/\alpha$ for some positive constant α to be determined. Then by Lemma 2.3, there exists some $x_k \in (-1 + a_k, -1 + 2a_k)$ and $y_k \in (1 - 2a_k, 1 - a_k)$, such that $|h_k(x_k)| + |h_k(y_k)| \leq C\nu_k/a_k = C\alpha^2 a_k$. Similar as Case 1, we have $f_k(x_k) \geq \sqrt{a_k/C}$. By (99), (100), and Lemma 5.1, we have $P_k(x) \geq a_k/C$ in $[x_k, y_k]$ for k large. Applying Lemma 2.4 on $[x_k, y_k]$, we have $f_k(x) \geq \sqrt{a_k/C}$ on $[x_k, y_k]$. We also have $|h_k(x_k)| \leq C\nu_k^{1/2}$, $|h_k(y_k)| \leq C\nu_k^{1/2}$. So by applying Lemma 2.6 on $[x_k, y_k]$,

$$\max_{[-1+2a_k, 1-2a_k]} |h_k| \leq \max_{[x_k, y_k]} |h_k| \leq C\nu_k^{1/2}.$$

As in Case 1 and Case 2, we have

$$\max_{[-1, -1+2a_k]} |h_k| + \max_{[1-2a_k, 1]} |h_k| \leq C\nu_k^{1/2}.$$

By the above, estimate (98) is proved in this case.

From (98) we have $\lim_{k \rightarrow 0} \| |f_k| - \sqrt{2P_c} \|_{L^\infty(-1,1)} = 0$. By Lemma 5.2 we have $f_k > 0$ on $[-1, 1 - 2a_k]$. Using this and the fact $\max_{[1-2a_k, 1]} |P_k| \leq Ca_k$, we have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \| |U_{\nu_k, \theta}^- + \sqrt{2P_c} \|_{L^\infty(-1,1)} = 0$.

Next, let $\epsilon > 0$ be any fixed positive small constant. If $c_1 = 0$, by (99) we have that $P_k(-1 + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon) \geq \epsilon c_3$. If $c_1 > 0$, $P_k(-1) \geq \sqrt{c_1}$. Similarly, if $c_2 = 0$, by (100), $P_k(1 - \epsilon/2) \geq \epsilon/C$. If $c_2 > 0$, $P_k(1) \geq \sqrt{c_2} > 0$. By Lemma 5.1 we have $P_k \geq \epsilon/C$ on $[-1 + \epsilon/2, 1 - \epsilon/2]$. As proved above, we also have $f_k > 0$ on $[-1 + \epsilon/2, 1 - \epsilon/2]$ for large k . Applying Lemma 2.7 on $[-1 + \epsilon/2, 1 - \epsilon/2]$, we obtain

$$\| |U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+ - \sqrt{2P_{c_k}} \|_{C^m([-1+\epsilon, 1-\epsilon])} \leq C\nu_k.$$

The proof is finished. \square

Remark 5.1. *The assumption of c in Theorem 1.7 is equivalent to $P_c(1)P_c(-1) = 0$, $P_c^2(1) + (P'_c(1))^2 \neq 0$ and $P_c^2(-1) + (P'_c(-1))^2 \neq 0$.*

Next, we study solutions of (6) which are not $U_{\nu_k, \theta}^\pm$.

Proof of Theorem 1.8 completed:

We will prove Theorem 1.8 (i) and (ii) in the case $c_1 c_2 = 0$ and $c_3 > c_3^*(c_1, c_2)$. Let C be a positive constant, having the same dependence as specified in the theorem, which may vary from line to line. For convenience write $f_k = U_{\nu_k, \theta}$, $P_k = P_{c_k}$ and $h_k = \frac{1}{2}f_k^2 - P_k$. Throughout the proof k is large.

We first prove part (i) in this case. Since $P_k \in J_0$, we have $P_k \geq 0$ on $[-1, 1]$. By Lemma 2.5, there exists at most one $x_k \in (-1, 1)$ such that $f_k(x_k) = 0$. Moreover, if x_k exists, then we have

$$f_k(x) < 0 \text{ for } -1 < x < x_k, \quad \text{and } f_k(x) > 0 \text{ for } x_k < x < 1. \quad (101)$$

By Lemma 2.2,

$$|f_k| \leq C. \quad (102)$$

Since $c_1, c_2 \geq 0$, $c_1 c_2 = 0$, $c_3 > c_3^*(c_1, c_2)$, we have $\min_{[-1+\epsilon/2, 1-\epsilon/2]} P_c > 0$. By the convergence of $\{c_k\}$ to c ,

$$\min_{[-1+\epsilon/2, 1-\epsilon/2]} P_k \geq 1/C. \quad (103)$$

Using (101) and (103), by applying Lemma 2.9 and Lemma 2.9' on each interval of $[-1 + \epsilon/2, x_k - \epsilon/2]$ and $[x_k + \epsilon/2, 1 - \epsilon/2]$ separately, we deduce

$$\|U_{\nu_k, \theta} + \sqrt{2P_{c_k}}\|_{C^m([-1+\epsilon, x_k-\epsilon])} + \|U_{\nu_k, \theta} - \sqrt{2P_{c_k}}\|_{C^m([x_k+\epsilon, 1-\epsilon])} \leq C\nu_k.$$

Next, we prove

$$\left\| \frac{1}{2} U_{\nu_k, \theta}^2 - P_{c_k} \right\|_{L^\infty((-1, x_k - \epsilon) \cup (x_k + \epsilon, 1))} \leq C\nu_k^{1/2}. \quad (104)$$

Since f_k is not $U_{\nu_k, \theta}^\pm$, we know from Theorem A that $f_k(-1) = \tau_1(\nu_k, c_{k1})$ and $f_k(1) = \tau_2'(\nu_k, c_{k2})$. In view of (9), we have

$$|f_k(-1) + \sqrt{2P_k(-1)}| + |f_k(1) - \sqrt{2P_k(1)}| \leq C\nu_k. \quad (105)$$

Case 1: $c_1 = 0$, $c_2 > 0$, $c_3 > -\frac{1}{2}c_2$.

In this case $P_c(x) = c_2(1+x) + c_3(1-x^2)$ in $(-1, 1)$. So $P_c(-1) = 0$, $P_c(1) = 2c_2 > 0$, and $P_c'(-1) = c_2 + 2c_3 > 0$. Since $c_k \rightarrow c$, there exists some $\delta > 0$, such that

$$\frac{1}{2} P_c'(-1)(1+x) \leq P_k(x) - P_k(-1) \leq 2P_c'(-1)(1+x), \quad -1 < x < -1 + \delta. \quad (106)$$

So $P_k(-1 + \epsilon/2) > 1/C$ and $P_k(1) > 1/C$. By Lemma 5.1, we have

$$P_k(x) \geq 1/C, \quad -1 + \epsilon/4 \leq x \leq 1. \quad (107)$$

We discuss the cases when $x_k + 1 \geq \epsilon/4$ and $x_k + 1 < \epsilon/4$ separately.

We first discuss the case when $x_k + 1 \geq \epsilon/4$. We have $P_k \geq 1/C$ on $[x_k + \epsilon/4, 1]$ for large k . Applying Corollary 2.1 on $[x_k + \epsilon/4, 1]$, using (101), (102) and (107), we have that

$$1/C \leq f_k \leq C \text{ on } (x_k + \epsilon/2, 1). \quad (108)$$

Using (108), applying Lemma 2.6 on $(x_k + \epsilon/2, 1)$, we have

$$\max_{[x_k+\epsilon, 1]} |h_k| \leq C\nu_k \quad (109)$$

Next, let $a_k = \nu_k^{1/2}/\alpha$ for some positive constant α to be determined. Since $P_k(-1) \geq 0$, it follows from (106) and (107) that $P_k(x) \geq a_k/C$ for x in $[-1 + a_k, 1]$. By Lemma 2.3, there exists some $s_k \in (-1 + a_k, -1 + 2a_k)$ and $t_k \in (x_k - \epsilon, x_k - \epsilon/2)$, such that $|h_k(s_k)| \leq C\nu_k/a_k = C\alpha^2 a_k$ and $|h_k(t_k)| \leq C\nu_k$. It follows from (86) that

$$\frac{1}{2} f_k^2(t_k) \geq P_{c_k}(t_k) - |h_k(t_k)| \geq 1/C\alpha^2 a_k - C\nu_k$$

By (101), we have $f_k(t_k) < -\sqrt{a_k}/C$. Using (102), applying Lemma 2.4' on $[s_k, t_k]$, we have $f_k(x) \leq -\sqrt{a_k}/C$ on $[s_k, t_k]$. Using $|h_k(s_k)| \leq C\nu_k^{1/2}$ and $|h_k(t_k)| \leq C\nu_k$, applying Lemma 2.6 on $[s_k, t_k]$, we have

$$\max_{[-1+2a_k, x_k-\epsilon]} |h_k| \leq \max_{[s_k, t_k]} |h_k| \leq C\nu_k^{1/2}. \quad (110)$$

Now we have that $|h_k(-1+2a_k)| \leq Ca_k$ and $|h_k(-1)| = |\frac{1}{2}\tau_1^2(\nu_k, c_{k1}) - 2c_{k1}| \leq Ca_k$. Notice that $f_k < 0$ on $[-1, -1+2a_k]$, $P_k(-1) \geq 0$. Using (106), applying Lemma 2.7 on $[-1, -1+2a_k]$ with $\alpha = 1$, we have that

$$\max_{[-1, -1+2a_k]} |h_k| \leq Ca_k + C\nu_k/a_k \leq C\nu_k^{1/2}. \quad (111)$$

By (109), (110) and (111), we have proved (104) when $\hat{x} > -1$.

Next, if $x_k + 1 < \epsilon/4$, similar as (108) we have $1/C \leq f_k \leq C$ on $(x_k + \epsilon/2, 1)$. Using this and (105), applying Lemma 2.6 on $(x_k + \epsilon/2, 1)$, (104) is proved.

Case 2: $c_1 > 0$, $c_2 = 0$, $c_3 > -\frac{1}{2}c_1$. The proof is similar as Case 1.

Case 3: $c_1 = c_2 = 0$, $c_3 > 0$. Similar as Case 1 we have $|h_k| \leq C\nu_k^{1/2}$ on $[-1, 0] \setminus [x_k - \epsilon, x_k + \epsilon]$, and similar as Case 2 we have $|h_k| \leq C\nu_k^{1/2}$ on $[0, 1] \setminus [x_k - \epsilon, x_k + \epsilon]$. We have by now proved (104).

By (104) and (25), for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists some constant $C > 0$, depending only on ϵ and an upper bound of $|c|$, such that $|f'_k| \leq C\nu_k^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ on $[-1+\epsilon, x_k-\epsilon] \cup [x_k+\epsilon, 1-\epsilon]$, so $|h'_k| = |f_k f'_k - P'_k| \leq C\nu_k^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. So we have

$$\|\frac{1}{2}U_{\nu_k, \theta}^2 - P_{c_k}\|_{C^1([-1+\epsilon, x_k-\epsilon] \cup [x_k+\epsilon, 1-\epsilon])} \leq C\nu_k^{-\frac{1}{2}},$$

By interpolation for any $x, y \in (-1+\epsilon, 1-\epsilon)$ and $0 < \beta < 1$,

$$\frac{|h_k(x) - h_k(y)|}{|x - y|^\beta} \leq 2\|h_k\|_{L^\infty(-1+\epsilon, 1-\epsilon)}^{1-\beta} \|h'_k\|_{L^\infty(-1+\epsilon, 1-\epsilon)}^\beta \leq C\nu_k^{\frac{1}{2}(1-\beta)} \nu_k^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta} \leq C\nu_k^{\frac{1}{2}-\beta}.$$

We have

$$\|\frac{1}{2}U_{\nu_k, \theta}^2 - P_{c_k}\|_{C^\beta([-1+\epsilon, x_k-\epsilon] \cup [x_k+\epsilon, 1-\epsilon])} \leq C\nu_k^{\frac{1}{2}-\beta}. \quad (112)$$

Next, using (101), (103) and (104), we then have (15). Part (i) in this case follows in view of (104) and (112).

Now we prove part (ii) in this case. If such x_k exists and $x_k \rightarrow -1$ with $c_1 = 0$, or such x_k does not exist with $c_2 > 0 = c_1$, we can prove (16) using similar arguments as that for part (ii) in "Proof of Theorem 1.8 continued" in Section 4. If such x_k exists and $x_k \rightarrow 1$ with $c_2 = 0$, or such x_k does not exist with $c_1 > 0 = c_2$, we can prove similarly (17). If such x_k does not exist with $c_1 = c_2 = 0$, we prove either (16) or (17).

In this case, f_k does not change sign on $(-1, 1)$ and $P_c(-1) = P_c(1) = 0$. If $f_k > 0$ on $(-1, 1)$ after passing to a subsequence, we have, by Theorem 1.7, $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\frac{1}{2}(U_{\nu_k, \theta}^\pm)^2 - P_k\|_{L^\infty(-1, 1)} = 0$. So for any $\epsilon_0 > 0$, there exists some $\epsilon > 0$, such that $\|P_k\|_{L^\infty(-1, -1+2\epsilon)} + \|P_k\|_{L^\infty[1-2\epsilon, 1]} < \epsilon_0$, and $\|(U_{\nu_k, \theta}^\pm)^2\|_{L^\infty(-1, -1+2\epsilon)} + \|(U_{\nu_k, \theta}^\pm)^2\|_{L^\infty[1-2\epsilon, 1]} < \epsilon_0$. Notice

$U_{\nu_k, \theta}^- \leq f_k \leq U_{\nu_k, \theta}^+$, we then have $\|f_k - \sqrt{2P_k}\|_{L^\infty(-1, -1+2\epsilon)} + \|f_k - \sqrt{2P_k}\|_{L^\infty[1-2\epsilon, 1]} < 2\epsilon_0$. We also have $P_c \geq 1/C$ on $[-1+\epsilon, 1-\epsilon]$ and $f_k > 0$ on $[-1+\epsilon, 1-\epsilon]$. By Corollary 2.1, we have $f_k \geq 1/C$ on $[-1+2\epsilon, 1-2\epsilon]$. Notice $|f_k(-1+2\epsilon) - \sqrt{2P_k(-1+2\epsilon)}| + |f_k(1-\epsilon) - \sqrt{2P_k(1-2\epsilon)}| \leq 2\epsilon_0$, by Corollary 2.3 we have $\|f_k - \sqrt{2P_k}\|_{L^\infty[-1+2\epsilon, 1-2\epsilon]} < C\epsilon_0$.

If $f_k < 0$ on $(-1, 1)$ after passing to a subsequence, similar as the above we have (17). Part (ii) in this case is proved. The proof of Theorem 1.8 is completed now. Part (iii) is proved in Section 3, part (i) and (ii) follows from (iii), "Proof of Theorem 1.8 continued" in Section 4, and the above. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3: For $0 < \nu \leq 1$ and $c \in \mathring{J}_\nu$, let

$$u_{\nu, \theta}^\pm(c) = \frac{1}{\sin \theta} U_{\nu, \theta}^\pm(c), \quad u_{\nu, r}^\pm(c) = -\frac{du_{\nu, \theta}^\pm}{d\theta} - u_{\nu, \theta}^\pm \cot \theta.$$

and

$$p_\nu^\pm(c) = -\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{d^2 u_{\nu, r}^\pm(c)}{d\theta^2} + (\cot \theta - u_{\nu, \theta}^\pm(c)) \frac{du_{\nu, r}^\pm(c)}{d\theta} + (u_{\nu, r}^\pm(c))^2 + (u_{\nu, \theta}^\pm(c))^2 \right).$$

By Theorem 1.1 of [18], $\{(u_\nu^\pm(c), p_\nu^\pm(c))\}_{0 < \nu \leq 1}$ belong to $C^0(\mathring{J}_\nu \times (0, 1], C^m(\mathbb{S}^2 \setminus (B_\epsilon(S) \cup B_\epsilon(N))))$ for every integer $m \geq 0$. By Theorem 1.4, there exists some constant C , which depends only on K, ϵ and m , such that

$$\|U_{\nu, \theta}^+ - \sqrt{2P_c}\|_{L^\infty(-1, 1)} + \|U_{\nu, \theta}^- + \sqrt{2P_c}\|_{L^\infty(-1, 1)} \leq C\nu,$$

and

$$\|U_{\nu, \theta}^+ - \sqrt{2P_c}\|_{C^m(-1, 1-\epsilon)} + \|U_{\nu, \theta}^- + \sqrt{2P_c}\|_{C^m(-1+\epsilon, 1)} \leq C\nu.$$

Theorem 1.3(i) follows from the above.

Now we prove part (ii). By Theorem A, there exist a unique $U_\theta := U_{\nu, \theta}(c, \theta_0)$ of (6) satisfying, with $x_0 = \cos \theta_0$, that

$$U_\theta(-1) = \tau_1(\nu, c_1) < 0, \quad U_\theta(1) = \tau_2(\nu, c_2) > 0, \quad U_\theta(x_0) = 0.$$

For every $\epsilon > 0$, we have, by Theorem 1.8, that

$$\|U_{\nu, \theta} - \sqrt{2P_c}\|_{C^m(x_0+\epsilon, 1-\epsilon)} + \|U_{\nu, \theta} + \sqrt{2P_c}\|_{C^m(-1+\epsilon, x_0-\epsilon)} \leq C\nu.$$

The estimate in part (ii) follows from the above. \square

6 Proof of Theorem 1.9

In this section, we give the

Proof of Theorem 1.9: Define

$$w_k(x) := \sqrt{2P_{c_k}(x_k)} \tanh \left(\frac{\sqrt{2P_{c_k}(x_k)} \cdot (x - x_k)}{2(1 - x_k^2)\nu_k} \right). \quad (113)$$

By computation, we know that $w_k(x_k) = 0$ and

$$\nu_k(1 - x_k^2)w_k' + \frac{1}{2}w_k^2 = P_k(x_k). \quad (114)$$

Step 1. We prove

$$|U_{\nu_k, \theta} - w_k| \leq C\nu_k |\ln \nu_k|^2, \quad x_k - K\nu_k |\ln \nu_k| (1 - x_k^2) < x < x_k + K\nu_k |\ln \nu_k| (1 - x_k^2). \quad (115)$$

Let C denote a constant depending only on c , K and \hat{x} which may vary from line to line. For convenience denote $f_k := U_{\nu_k, \theta}$ and $P_k := P_{c_k}$. By Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.5, we have that

$$0 < f_k < C, \text{ in } (x_k, 1), \text{ and } -C < f_k < 0, \text{ in } (-1, x_k). \quad (116)$$

Let

$$y := \frac{x - x_k}{\nu_k(1 - x_k^2)}, \quad \tilde{f}_k(y) := f_k(x), \quad \tilde{w}_k(y) := w_k(x). \quad (117)$$

Then for $x_k - K\nu_k |\ln \nu_k| (1 - x_k^2) \leq x \leq x_k + K\nu_k |\ln \nu_k| (1 - x_k^2)$, we have $-K |\ln \nu_k| \leq y \leq K |\ln \nu_k|$. By $f_k(x_k) = 0$ and (25), we know that $f_k(0) = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 - 2x_k \nu_k y - \nu_k^2 y^2 (1 - x_k^2)) \tilde{f}'_k(y) + 2\nu_k (x_k + y\nu_k(1 - x_k^2)) \tilde{f}_k(y) + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{f}_k^2(y) \\ & = P_{c_k} = P_{c_k}(x_k) + P'_{c_k}(x_k) \nu_k y (1 - x_k^2) + \frac{1}{2} P''_{c_k}(x_k) \nu_k^2 y^2 (1 - x_k^2)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (118)$$

By (113) and (114), we have $\tilde{w}(0) = 0$ and

$$\tilde{w}'_k(y) + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{w}_k^2(y) = P_{c_k}(x_k). \quad (119)$$

Set $g_k(y) := \tilde{f}_k(y) - \tilde{w}_k(y)$, then by (118) and (119), we have $g_k(0) = 0$ and

$$g'_k(y) + h_k(y)g_k(y) = H_k(y), \quad (120)$$

where $h_k(y) = \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{f}'_k(y) + \tilde{w}'_k(y))$ and

$$\begin{aligned} H_k(y) &= P'_{c_k}(x_k) \nu_k y + \frac{1}{2} P''_{c_k}(x_k) \nu_k^2 y^2 - 2\nu_k (x_k + y\nu_k(1 - x_k^2)) \tilde{f}_k(y) \\ &\quad + \tilde{f}'_k(y) (2x_k \nu_k y + \nu_k^2 y^2 (1 - x_k^2)). \end{aligned}$$

By (113) and (116), we have $|h_k(y)| \leq C$ for $|y| \leq K |\ln \nu_k|$. By (118) and (116), we have $|\tilde{f}'_k(y)| \leq C$ for $|y| \leq K |\ln \nu_k|$ and $k \gg 1$. So $|H_k| \leq C\nu_k |\ln \nu_k|$ for $|y| \leq K |\ln \nu_k|$ and $k \gg 1$. Hence, from the estimates of h_k , H_k , (120) and the fact that $g_k(0) = 0$, we have

$$|g_k(y)| = e^{-\int_0^y h(s) ds} \left| \int_0^y e^{\int_0^s h(t) dt} H(s) ds \right| \leq C\nu_k |\ln \nu_k|^2, \quad |y| \leq K |\ln \nu_k|.$$

Therefore, the estimate (115) is proved.

Step 2. We prove that there exists some $K > 0$ and small $\epsilon > 0$, independent of k , such that

$$|U_{\nu_k, \theta} + \sqrt{2P_{c_k}}| \leq C\nu_k^{\alpha(c)} |\ln \nu_k|^{2\kappa(c)}, \quad b_k \leq x \leq x_k - K\nu_k |\ln \nu_k| (1 - x_k^2), \quad (121)$$

$$|U_{\nu_k, \theta} - \sqrt{2P_{c_k}}| \leq C\nu_k^{\alpha(c)} |\ln \nu_k|^{2\kappa(c)}, \quad x_k + K\nu_k |\ln \nu_k| (1 - x_k^2) \leq x \leq d_k, \quad (122)$$

where $b_k = \max\{-1, x_k - \epsilon\}$ and $d_k = \min\{1, x_k + \epsilon\}$.

It is sufficient to prove (121) since the other estimate can be obtained similarly. We first prove that (121) holds at the endpoints $x = b_k$ and $x = b'_k := x_k - K\nu_k |\ln \nu_k| (1 - x_k^2)$. For convenience denote $f_k := U_{\nu_k, \theta}$, $P_k = P_{c_k}$ and $h_k = \frac{1}{2}f_k^2 - P_k$. Since $x_k \rightarrow \hat{x}$, $P_c(\hat{x}) > 0$, we can chose $\epsilon > 0$ small, such that

$$P_k \geq 1/C, \quad x \in (x_k - 2\epsilon, x_k + 2\epsilon). \quad (123)$$

By Theorem 1.8 (i), we have $|h_k| \leq C\nu_k^{\alpha(c)}$ for $-1 \leq x \leq x_k - \epsilon$ where $\alpha(c)$ is given by (14). Using this, (116) and (123), we have that

$$\left| f_k(b_k) + \sqrt{2P_k(b_k)} \right| \leq C\nu_k^{\alpha(c)}. \quad (124)$$

Let K be a positive constant to be determined later. It is easy to see that

$$|w_k(b'_k) + \sqrt{2P_k(x_k)}| \leq C e^{-K|\ln \nu_k| \frac{\sqrt{2P_k(x_k)}}{2}} = C\nu_k^{\frac{K}{2}} \sqrt{2P_k(x_k)} \leq C\nu_k,$$

as long as $K\sqrt{2P_k(x)} \geq 2$ for any $x \in [b_k, d_k]$ and k sufficiently large. Thus by Step 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| f_k(b'_k) + \sqrt{2P_k(b'_k)} \right| \\ & \leq |f_k(b'_k) - w_k(b'_k)| + |w_k(b'_k) + \sqrt{2P_k(x_k)}| + \left| \sqrt{2P_k(x_k)} - \sqrt{2P_k(b'_k)} \right| \\ & \leq C\nu_k |\ln \nu_k|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (125)$$

By (123) and (125), $f_k(b'_k) \geq 1/C$. Then using this, (123) and (116), applying Lemma 2.4' on $[b_k, b'_k]$, we have

$$-C \leq f_k \leq -1/C, \quad b_k \leq x \leq b'_k. \quad (126)$$

By (124), (125), (126), applying Corollary 2.3 on $[b_k, b'_k]$, we know that (121) holds on $[b_k, b'_k]$. Similar argument implies (122). Theorem 1.9 follows from the above two steps and Theorem 1.8. \square

7 Illustrations on the interior transition layer

Similar to Jeffery-Hamel flows, in the two-dimensional plane flows between two non-parallel walls, a boundary layer occurs if we impose no-slip boundary conditions in a nozzle.

For axisymmetric, (-1) -homogeneous solutions in three dimensional case, we consider a cone region $\Omega = \{(r, \theta, \phi) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times [0, \pi] \times [0, 2\pi) : 0 \leq \theta < \arccos x_0 < \pi\}$ for some $x_0 \in (-1, 1)$, then $\partial\Omega$ corresponds to $x = x_0$. We consider solutions in Ω and impose no-slip boundary conditions on $\partial\Omega$. Since we are considering a first order differential equation of U_θ , only one no-slip boundary condition can be imposed: $U_\theta|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$.




Figure 1: When $P_c = 2(x - 2/3)^2$, $U_\theta(0) = 0$, the graph of U_θ for $\nu = 1, 1/8, 1/20, 1/50$, respectively.

As shown in [18], there exist solutions $U = (U_{\theta,i}, 0)$ of the Navier-Stokes equations, with viscosity $\nu_i \rightarrow 0$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \nu_i(1-x^2)U'_\theta + 2\nu_ixU_\theta + \frac{1}{2}U_\theta^2 = P_c(x) = \mu(x-\xi)^2, \\ U_\theta(x_0) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (127)$$


where $P_c(x)$ represents a quadratic polynomial, and $\xi, x_0 \in (-1, 1)$ are given constants such that $P_c(\xi) = P'_c(\xi) = 0, \xi \neq x_0$.

To illustrate the behavior of homogeneous solutions, we set $P_c(x) = 2(x - 2/3)^2$, $x_0 = 0$, $\xi = 2/3$, and $\nu_i \rightarrow 0$, for example. Then $U_{\theta,i}$ are illustrated in Figure 1 for $\nu = 1, 1/8, 1/20, 1/50$, respectively. The boundary conditions in (127) and Theorem 1.8 implies that an interior layer happens in a neighborhood of x_0 . We can see in the figure that


$$U_\theta \rightarrow -\sqrt{2P_c(x)}, \quad x \in (-1, x_0 - \epsilon), \quad U_\theta \rightarrow +\sqrt{2P_c(x)}, \quad x \in (x_0 + \epsilon, 1). \quad (128)$$

Since $c_3 = c_3^*(c_1, c_2)$ in the example, we know by Theorem 1.8 that in a neighborhood of $x = \xi$, where P_c vanishes, the convergence rate $|U_{\theta,i} - \sqrt{2P_c}| \sim \nu_i^{2/3}$.


The streamlines of $U_{\theta,i}$ are illustrated in Figure 2 for $\nu = 1, 1/8, 1/20, 1/50$, respectively. By (128), $U_{\theta,i} \rightarrow \pm 2|x - 2/3| = V_\theta$, whose streamlines are illustrated in Figure 3. Notice that $\pm\sqrt{P_c(x)}$ are not smooth solutions of the Euler equations, since they are singular at $x = \xi$. On the other hand, $\pm 2(x - 2/3) \in C^\infty(-1, 1)$ are smooth solutions of the Euler equations, whose streamlines are illustrated in Figure 4.




(a) $\nu = 1$



(b) $\nu = 1/8$



(c) $\nu = 1/20$



(d) $\nu = 1/50$

Figure 2: The streamlines of solutions of Navier-Stokes equation for $\nu = 1, 1/8, 1/20, 1/50$, respectively.




Figure 3: The streamlines of $\pm\sqrt{P_c}$, the limit of $U_{\theta,i}$ as $\nu_i \rightarrow 0$.




Figure 4: The streamlines of the smooth solutions of Euler equation.

8 Appendix

Lemma 8.1. *Let $c \in \mathbb{R}^3$, then*

- (i) $P_c \geq 0$ on $[-1, 1]$ if and only if $c \in J_0$.
- (ii) $P_c > 0$ on $[-1, 1]$ if and only if $c \in \overset{\circ}{J}_0$.
- (iii) $\min_{[-1, 1]} P_c = 0$ if and only if $c \in \partial J_0$.
- (iv) $P_c > 0$ in $(-1, 1)$ if and only if $c \in \overset{\circ}{J}_0 \cup \partial' J_0$.

Proof. (i) For $c \in J_0$, we have $c_1, c_2 \geq 0$, $c_3 \geq c_3^*(c_1, c_2)$ and therefore using (10) and (11) $P_c \geq P_{(c_1, c_2)}^* \geq 0$ on $[-1, 1]$. On the other hand, if $P_c \geq 0$ on $[-1, 1]$, we have $c_1 = \frac{1}{2}P_c(-1) \geq 0$ and $c_2 = \frac{1}{2}P_c(1) \geq 0$. If $c_1, c_2 > 0$, then $\bar{x} := \frac{\sqrt{c_1} - \sqrt{c_2}}{\sqrt{c_1} + \sqrt{c_2}} \in (-1, 1)$ and, using (10), $0 \leq P_c(\bar{x}) = (c_3 - c_3^*(c_1, c_2))(1 - \bar{x}^2)$. Thus $c_3 \geq c_3^*(c_1, c_2)$ and $c \in J_0$. If $c_1 = 0$, then $P_c(-1) = 0$ and therefore $c_2 + 2c_3 = P_c'(-1) \geq 0$. So $c \in J_0$. If $c_2 = 0$, then $P_c(1) = 0$ and therefore $-c_1 - 2c_3 = P_c'(1) \leq 0$. So $c \in J_0$. Part (i) is proved.

(ii) If $c \in \overset{\circ}{J}_0$, then $c_1, c_2 > 0$, $c_3 > c_3^*(c_1, c_2)$, and $\bar{x} \in (-1, 1)$. The positivity of P_c on $[-1, 1]$ then follows from the expression (11). On the other hand, if $P_c > 0$ on $[-1, 1]$, then $c_1 = \frac{1}{2}P_c(-1) > 0$, $c_2 = \frac{1}{2}P_c(1) > 0$, and $\bar{x} \in (-1, 1)$. It follows, using (11), that $0 < P_c(\bar{x}) = (c_3 - c_3^*(c_1, c_2))(1 - \bar{x}^2)$ and therefore $c_3 - c_3^*(c_1, c_2) > 0$. We have proved that $c \in \overset{\circ}{J}_0$. Part (ii) is proved.

Part (iii) is a consequence of (i) and (ii).

(iv) If $c \in \overset{\circ}{J}_0$, then we know from (ii) that $P_c > 0$ on $[-1, 1]$. If $c_1 = c_2 = 0$, and $c_3 > 0$, then $P_c(x) = c_3(1 - x^2) > 0$ in $(-1, 1)$. If $c_1 > 0$, $c_2 = 0$, $c_3 \geq -c_1/2$, then $P_c(x) \geq c_1(1 - x) - \frac{1}{2}c_1(1 - x^2) = \frac{c_1}{2}(1 - x)^2 > 0$ in $(-1, 1)$. If $c_1 = 0$, $c_2 > 0$, $c_3 \geq -c_2/2$, then $P_c(x) \geq c_2(1 + x) - \frac{1}{2}c_2(1 - x^2) = \frac{c_2}{2}(1 + x)^2 > 0$ in $(-1, 1)$. On the other hand, if $P_c > 0$ in $(-1, 1)$, then $c \in J_0$ by part (i). We only need to prove that c does not belong to $\partial J_0 \setminus \partial' J_0$. Indeed, if $c \in \partial J_0 \setminus \partial' J_0$, then $c = 0$ or $c_1, c_2 > 0$ and $c_3 = c_3^*(c_1, c_2)$. Clearly c cannot be 0. For the latter, we know from (10) that $P_c = P_{(c_1, c_2)}^*$ has a zero point at $\bar{x} \in (-1, 1)$. We have proved (iv). \square

We then have

Lemma 8.2. *For any $0 < \nu \leq 1$ and $c \in J_\nu$, there exists some constant C , depending only on an upper bound of $|c|$, such that*

$$P_c(x) \geq -C\nu, \quad \forall -1 \leq x \leq 1.$$

Proof. For $c \in J_\nu$, we have $c_1 \geq -\nu^2$, $c_2 \geq -\nu^2$ and $c_3 \geq \bar{c}_3 := \bar{c}_3(c_1, c_2; \nu)$. Let $\tilde{c}_1 = c_1 + \nu^2$, $\tilde{c}_2 = c_2 + \nu^2$, and $\tilde{c}_3^* = -\frac{1}{2}(\tilde{c}_1 + 2\sqrt{\tilde{c}_1\tilde{c}_2} + \tilde{c}_2)$. By (10), $P_{(\tilde{c}_1, \tilde{c}_2, \tilde{c}_3^*)} \geq 0$ in $[-1, 1]$. Since $c_3 \geq \bar{c}_3 \geq \tilde{c}_3^* - C\nu$, we have

$$P_c \geq P_{(\tilde{c}_1, \tilde{c}_2, c_3)} - C\nu^2 \geq P_{(\tilde{c}_1, \tilde{c}_2, \tilde{c}_3^*)} - C\nu \geq -C\nu, \quad \text{in } [-1, 1].$$

\square

References

- [1] S. I. Chernyshenko, Asymptotics of a steady separated flow around a body with large Reynolds numbers. (Russian) Prikl. Mat. Mekh. 52 (1988), no. 6, 958-966; translation in J. Appl. Math. Mech. 52(1988), no. 6, 746-753 (1990).
- [2] S. I. Chernyshenko, Ian P. Castro, High-Reynolds-number weakly stratified flow past an obstacle. J. Fluid Mech. 317 (1996), 155-178.
- [3] M. Cannone and G. Karch, Smooth or singular solutions to the Navier-Stokes system, J. Differential Equations 197 (2004), 247-274.
- [4] P. Constantin and V. Vicol, Remarks on high Reynolds numbers hydrodynamics and the inviscid limit, J. Nonlinear Sci. 28 (2018), 711-724.
- [5] R. DiPerna and A. J. Majda, Oscillations and concentrations in weak solutions of the incompressible fluid equations, Comm. Math, Phys. 108 (1987), 667-689.
- [6] T. Drivas and H. Nguyen, Remarks on the emergence of weak Euler solutions in the vanishing viscosity limit, arXiv: 1808.01014[math.AP] 12 Oct 2018.
- [7] B. F'ornberg, A numerical study of steady viscous flow past a circular cylinder J. Fluid. Mech., 98 (4) (1980)
- [8] M. Giaquinta and E. Giusti, On the regularity of the minima of variational integrals, Acta Math. 148 (1982), 285-298.
- [9] M. A. Goldshtik, A paradoxical solution of the Navier-Stokes equations, Prikl. Mat. Mekh. 24 (1960) 610-621. Transl., J. Appl. Math. Mech. (USSR) 24 (1960) 913-929.
- [10] Y. Guo and T. Nguyen, Prandtl boundary layer expansions of steady Navier-Stokes flows over a moving plate, Ann. PDE 3 (2017), no. 1, Art. 10, 58 pp.
- [11] S. Iyer, Steady Prandtl boundary layer expansions over a rotating disk, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 224 (2017), 421-469.
- [12] S. Iyer, Global steady Prantle expansion over a moving boundary, arXiv:1609.05397v1 [math.AP] 17 Sep 2016.
- [13] G. Karch and D. Pilarczyk, Asymptotic stability of Landau solutions to Navier-Stokes system, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 202 (2011), 115-131.
- [14] G. Karch, D. Pilarczyk and M.E. Schonbek, L^2 -asymptotic stability of singular solutions to the Navier-Stokes system of equations in \mathbb{R}^3 , J. Math. Pures Appl. 108 (2017), 14-40.
- [15] A. Korolev and V. Šverák, On the large-distance asymptotics of steady state solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations in 3D exterior domains, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire 28 (2011), 303-313.
- [16] L. Landau, A new exact solution of Navier-Stokes Equations, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR 43 (1944), 299-301.
- [17] L. Li, Y.Y. Li and X. Yan, Homogeneous solutions of stationary Navier-Stokes equations with isolated singularities on the unit sphere. I. One singularity, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 227 (2018), 1091-1163.

- [18] L. Li, Y.Y. Li and X. Yan, Homogeneous solutions of stationary Navier-Stokes equations with isolated singularities on the unit sphere. II. Classification of axisymmetric no-swirl solutions, *Journal of Differential Equations* 264 (2018), 6082-6108.
- [19] X. Luo and R. Shvydkoy, 2D homogeneous solutions to the Euler equation, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 40 (2015), 1666-1687.
- [20] Y. Maekawa, On the inviscid limit problem of the vorticity equations for viscous incompressible flows in the half-plane, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 67 (2014), 1045-1128.
- [21] N. Masmoudi, Remarks about the inviscid limit of the Navier-Stokes system, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 270 (2007), 777-788.
- [22] H. Miura, and T.-P. Tsai, Point singularities of 3D stationary Navier-Stokes flows, *J. Math. Fluid Mech.* 14 (2012), 33-41.
- [23] A. F. Pillow and R. Paull, Conically similar viscous flows. Part 1. Basic conservation principles and characterization of axial causes in swirl-free flow, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 155 (1985), 327-341.
- [24] A. F. Pillow and R. Paull, Conically similar viscous flows. Part 2. One-parameter swirl-free flows, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 155 (1985), 343-358.
- [25] A. F. Pillow and R. Paull, Conically similar viscous flows. Part 3. Characterization of axial causes in swirling flow and the one-parameter flow generated by a uniform half-line source of kinematic swirl angular momentum, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 155 (1985), 359-379.
- [26] M. Sammartino and R. Caffisch, Zero viscosity limit for analytic solutions, of the Navier-Stokes equation on a half-space. I. Existence for Euler and Prandtl equations, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 192 (1998), 433-461.
- [27] M. Sammartino and R. Caffisch, Zero viscosity limit for analytic solutions of the Navier-Stokes equation on a half-space. II. Construction of the Navier-Stokes solution, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 192 (1998), 463-491.
- [28] J. Serrin, The swirling vortex, *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A, Math. Phys. Sci.* 271 (1972), 325-360.
- [29] R. Shvydkoy, Homogeneous solutions to the 3D Euler system, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 370 (2018), 2517-2535.
- [30] N. A. Slezkin, On an exact solution of the equations of viscous flow, *Uch. zap. MGU*, no. 2, 89-90, 1934.
- [31] H. B. Squire, The round laminar jet, *Quart. J. Mech. Appl. Math.* 4 (1951), 321-329.
- [32] V. Šverák, On Landau's solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations, *Problems in mathematical analysis*. No. 61. *J. Math. Sci.* 179 (2011), 208-228. arXiv:math/0604550.

- [33] R. Temam and X. Wang, On the behavior of the solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations at vanishing viscosity, *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4)*, 25 (1997) , no. 3-4, 807-828 (1998).
- [34] G. Tian and Z.P. Xin, One-point singular solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations, *Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal.* 11 (1998), 135-145.
- [35] C. Y. Wang, Exact solutions of the steady state Navier-Stokes equation, *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.* 23 (1991), 159-177.
- [36] X. Wang, A Kato type theorem on zero viscosity limit of Navier-Stokes flows, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* 50 (2001), Special Issue, 223-241.
- [37] V. I. Yatsyev, On a class of exact solutions of the equations of motion of a viscous fluid, 1950.