

PERSISTENCE OF THE STEADY PLANAR NORMAL SHOCK STRUCTURE IN 3-D UNSTEADY POTENTIAL FLOWS

BEIXIANG FANG, FEIMIN HUANG, WEI XIANG, AND FENG XIAO

ABSTRACT. This paper concerns the dynamic stability of the steady 3-D wave structure of a planar normal shock front intersecting perpendicularly to a planar solid wall for unsteady potential flows. The stability problem can be formulated as a free boundary problem of a quasi-linear hyperbolic equation of second order in a dihedral-space domain between the shock front and the solid wall. The key difficulty is brought by the edge singularity of the space domain, the intersection curve between the shock front and the solid wall. Different from the 2-D case, for which the singular part of the boundary is only a point, it is a curve for the 3-D case in this paper. This difference brings new difficulties to the mathematical analysis of the stability problem. A modified partial hodograph transformation is introduced such that the extension technique developed for the 2-D case can be employed to establish the well-posed theory for the initial-boundary value problem of the linearized hyperbolic equation of second order in a dihedral-space domain. Moreover, the extension technique is improved in this paper such that loss of regularity in the a priori estimates on the shock front does not occur. Thus the classical nonlinear iteration scheme can be constructed to prove the existence of the solution to the stability problem, which shows the dynamic stability of the steady planar normal shock without applying the Nash-Moser iteration method.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Description of the problem. This paper concerns the dynamic stability of the steady 3-D wave structure of a planar normal shock front intersecting perpendicularly to a planar solid wall (see Figure 1.1) for unsteady potential flows. As stated by Courant-Friedrichs in [30, page 375], “*Whether or not a flow compatible with the boundary condition occurs depends moreover on its stability*”, it is important and necessary to study the stability of the normal shock structure, namely, whether or not the shock structure will basically maintain as the parameters of the flow fields are slightly perturbed. For steady flows, for which the parameters (density, velocity, pressure, etc.) do not depend on the time variable, there have been plenty of works on the existence and stability of transonic shocks, for instance, see [6, 11–14, 22, 23, 34–36, 38, 46, 47, 50, 61–63] and the references cited therein. As pointed out by von Karman in the discussion chaired by von Neumann and recorded in [60], a steady motion “*can occur only as a limiting case*” of a physical process. Therefore, it is necessary to investigate the unsteady motions associated with the steady planar normal shocks and study their dynamic stability under unsteady perturbations. It has been

Date: August 23, 2021.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35L65, 35L67, 35M10, 35B35, 76H05, 76N10.

Key words and phrases. Dynamic stability; Unsteady Perturbation; Planar Normal Shocks; Artificial Perturbation; Potential Flow Equations; Dihedral Singularity; Hyperbolic Equations.

established the stability of normal shocks, which are far away from physical boundaries, in [52, 53] by Majda for Euler flows, and in [54] by Majda and Thomann for potential flows. See also, for instance, [8, 55] and references therein for further studies. However, in practice, shocks often appear together with physical boundaries such as solid walls, wedges, wings, etc.. Therefore, it is important and necessary to further study the stability of shocks involving physical boundaries. In this paper, we are going to study the dynamic stability of the steady 3-D wave structure of a planar normal shock front intersecting perpendicularly to a planar solid wall (see Figure 1.1), namely, whether the structure will maintain, at least in a short time, under unsteady perturbations of the flow parameters. In this paper the flows are governed by the unsteady potential flow equations, which read

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho + \nabla \cdot (\rho \nabla \Phi) = 0, \\ \partial_t \Phi + \frac{1}{2} |\nabla \Phi|^2 + \iota(\rho) = B_0, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where $\nabla := (\partial_{x_1}, \partial_{x_2}, \partial_{x_3})^\top$ is the gradient operator with respect to the space variables $\mathbf{x} := (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $t > 0$ is the time variable. $\iota(\rho) := \frac{\rho^{\gamma-1}-1}{\gamma-1}$ is the specific enthalpy, Φ the velocity potential, ρ the density, B_0 the Bernoulli constant, and $\gamma > 1$ the adiabatic exponent. The importance of the potential flow equations is first observed by Jacques Hadamard in [42] for the unsteady Euler equations with weak shocks. Since then, the potential flow equations have been studied by mathematicians steadily, for instance, see Bers [9], Courant-Friedrichs [30], Majda-Thomann [54] and Morawetz [57].

By the second equation of (1.1), one can express the density ρ as a function with respect to $D\Phi := (\partial_t \Phi, \nabla \Phi)$, B_0 and γ , i.e.,

$$\rho = \mathfrak{h}(D\Phi; B_0, \gamma) := \left((\gamma - 1)(B_0 - \partial_t \Phi - \frac{1}{2} |\nabla \Phi|^2) + 1 \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}. \quad (1.2)$$

Replacing ρ in the first equation of (1.1) by $\mathfrak{h}(D\Phi; B_0, \gamma)$, one deduces that Φ satisfies a hyperbolic equation of second order:

$$\partial_{tt} \Phi + 2 \sum_{i=1}^3 \partial_{x_i} \Phi \partial_{t x_i} \Phi - \sum_{i,j=1}^3 (\delta_{ij} c^2 - \partial_{x_i} \Phi \partial_{x_j} \Phi) \partial_{x_i x_j} \Phi = 0, \quad (1.3)$$

where $c = \sqrt{\rho^{\gamma-1}}$ is the sonic speed and

$$\delta_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = j, \\ 0 & \text{if } i \neq j. \end{cases}$$

Let $\Gamma_{\text{shock}} := \{(t, \mathbf{x}) : x_1 = \mathcal{X}(t, x_2, x_3)\}$ be a smooth shock front in the flow field. Then on Γ_{shock} , the velocity potential Φ has to satisfy the following Rankine-Hugoniot conditions:

$$[\Phi] = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_t \mathcal{X}[\rho] - [\rho \partial_{x_1} \Phi] + \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{X}[\rho \partial_{x_2} \Phi] + \partial_{x_3} \mathcal{X}[\rho \partial_{x_3} \Phi] = 0, \quad (1.4)$$

where the square bracket $[m]$ stands for the jump of the quantity m across the shock front Γ_{shock} ; that is, assuming

$$\mathbb{R}_\pm := \{(t, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^3 : x_1 \gtrless \mathcal{X}(t, x_2, x_3)\} \quad (1.5)$$

and

$$\mathbf{n}_s := -\frac{(\partial_t \mathcal{X}, -1, \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{X}, \partial_{x_3} \mathcal{X})}{\sqrt{1 + |\partial_t \mathcal{X}|^2 + |\partial_{x_2} \mathcal{X}|^2 + |\partial_{x_3} \mathcal{X}|^2}},$$

for every $(t, \mathbf{x}) \in \Gamma_{\text{shock}}$, there exists $\tilde{\alpha} > 0$ such that $(t, \mathbf{x}) \pm \tau \mathbf{n}_s \in \mathcal{R}_{\pm}$ for any $\tau \in (0, \tilde{\alpha})$, define

$$[m](t, \mathbf{x}) := \lim_{\substack{(\tilde{t}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \rightarrow (t, \mathbf{x}) \\ (\tilde{t}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \in \mathcal{R}_+}} m(\tilde{t}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}) - \lim_{\substack{(\tilde{t}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \rightarrow (t, \mathbf{x}) \\ (\tilde{t}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \in \mathcal{R}_-}} m(\tilde{t}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}). \quad (1.6)$$

It is easy to verify that the Rankine-Hugoniot conditions are equivalent to the following free boundary conditions for Φ :

$$[\Phi] = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad [\rho][\partial_t \Phi] + [\partial_{x_1} \Phi][\rho \partial_{x_1} \Phi] + [\partial_{x_2} \Phi][\rho \partial_{x_2} \Phi] + [\partial_{x_3} \Phi][\rho \partial_{x_3} \Phi] = 0. \quad (1.7)$$

The Steady Planar Normal Shock Structure.

A steady planar normal shock solution (see Figure 1.1) to the potential flow equations (1.1), satisfying the Rankine-Hugoniot conditions (1.4) on the planar shock front, can be easily constructed, which is the reference state in this paper.




FIGURE 1.1. The steady planar normal shock structure.

In Figure 1.1, the red rectangle stands for a steady planar normal shock front $\{x_1 = 0\}$ intersecting the solid wall $\{x_3 = 0\}$ at the edge $\{x_1 = 0\} \cap \{x_3 = 0\}$. Constants ρ_{\pm} represent the density of the fluid behind and ahead of the steady planar normal shock, respectively, and $(q_{\pm}, 0, 0)$ are the constant velocities of the flow fields behind and ahead of the steady planar normal shock, respectively.

Now we give a mathematical definition to this steady planar normal shock structure. Denote by $\bar{\Gamma}_0 := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_3 = 0\}$ the flat solid wall and let $\bar{\Gamma}_{\text{shock}} := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_1 = \bar{\mathcal{X}}(t, x_2, x_3) \equiv 0\}$ be the position of the steady planar normal shock. The flow field is divided by the normal shock front $\bar{\Gamma}_{\text{shock}}$ into two parts $\bar{\mathcal{D}}_-$ and $\bar{\mathcal{D}}_+$, which are the regions ahead of and behind the steady shock front $\bar{\Gamma}_{\text{shock}}$, respectively, i.e.,

$$\bar{\mathcal{D}}_{\pm} := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_1 \gtrless \bar{\mathcal{X}}(t, x_2, x_3), x_2 \in \mathbb{R}, x_3 > 0\}.$$

The constant densities and velocities of the fluid in $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_{\pm}$ are given by $(\rho_{\pm}, (q_{\pm}, 0, 0))$, respectively. Then ρ_{\pm} are determined by q_{\pm} via (1.2), *i.e.*,

$$\rho_{\pm} = \mathfrak{h}((0, q_{\pm}, 0, 0); B_0, \gamma) = \left((\gamma - 1) \left(B_0 - \frac{1}{2} q_{\pm}^2 \right) + 1 \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}. \quad (1.8)$$

Let $\overline{\Phi}(t, \mathbf{x})$ be defined as

$$\overline{\Phi}(t, \mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \overline{\Phi}_-(t, \mathbf{x}) := q_- \cdot x_1 & \text{for } (t, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \overline{\mathcal{D}}_-, \\ \overline{\Phi}_+(t, \mathbf{x}) := q_+ \cdot x_1 & \text{for } (t, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \overline{\mathcal{D}}_+. \end{cases} \quad (1.9)$$

Then it is easy to see that $\overline{\Phi}(t, \mathbf{x})$ satisfies (1.3) in the two regions $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_-$ and $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_+$. Moreover, it satisfies

$$\nabla \overline{\Phi}(t, \mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} (q_-, 0, 0) & \text{for } (t, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \overline{\mathcal{D}}_-, \\ (q_+, 0, 0) & \text{for } (t, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \overline{\mathcal{D}}_+. \end{cases} \quad (1.10)$$

Thus $\overline{\Phi}(t, \mathbf{x})$ is a velocity potential of the flow field above the solid wall $\overline{\Gamma}_0$. Due to the Rankine-Hugoniot conditions (1.4) (or equivalently (1.7)) and the entropy condition, constants $(\rho_-, \rho_+, q_-, q_+)$ must satisfy

$$\rho_- < \rho_+, \quad \rho_- q_- = \rho_+ q_+, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{q_-^2}{2} + \iota(\rho_-) = \frac{q_+^2}{2} + \iota(\rho_+). \quad (1.11)$$

The steady planar normal shock $\overline{\Gamma}_{\text{shock}}$ is a transonic shock: ahead of the shock front $\overline{\Gamma}_{\text{shock}}$, the uniform coming flow $(\rho_-, (q_-, 0, 0))$ is supersonic and behind the shock front $\overline{\Gamma}_{\text{shock}}$, the flow $(\rho_+, (q_+, 0, 0))$ is subsonic, *i.e.*,

$$q_-^2 > c_-^2 = \rho_-^{\gamma-1} \quad \text{and} \quad q_+^2 < c_+^2 = \rho_+^{\gamma-1}. \quad (1.12)$$

Then the triplet $(\overline{\Phi}(t, \mathbf{x}), \overline{\Gamma}_{\text{shock}}, \overline{\Gamma}_0)$ is called the steady planar normal shock structure, which will be the reference state investigated in this paper. The steady planar normal shock structure can be observed in many situations. For example, if a normal shock appears in a nozzle with flat boundary (for instance the nozzle with rectangular cross-section), then this kind of normal shock coincides locally with the steady planar normal shock structure in Figure 1.1.

1.2. Mathematical formulation. The theme of this paper is to study the dynamic stability of the steady planar normal shock structure $(\overline{\Phi}(t, \mathbf{x}), \overline{\Gamma}_{\text{shock}}, \overline{\Gamma}_0)$, in the framework of unsteady potential flow equation (1.3). We want to know whether or not the steady planar normal shock structure persists, at least for a short time, when the uniform supersonic coming flow $(\rho_-, (q_-, 0, 0))$ is perturbed a little unsteadily and the flat solid wall $\overline{\Gamma}_0$ becomes slightly curved. Let $\mathcal{W}(x_1, x_2)$ be a smooth function. We denote by $\Gamma_0 := \{(t, \mathbf{x}) : x_3 = \mathcal{W}(x_1, x_2)\}$ an impermeable solid boundary of the flow field. Then the whole flow field is

$$\mathcal{D} := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_3 > \mathcal{W}(x_1, x_2)\}.$$

Φ satisfies the slip boundary condition $\nabla\Phi \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0$ on Γ_0 , where \mathbf{n} is the unit exterior normal vector of Γ_0 , *i.e.*,

$$-\partial_{x_1}\Phi\partial_{x_1}\mathcal{W} - \partial_{x_2}\Phi\partial_{x_2}\mathcal{W} + \partial_{x_3}\Phi = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_0. \quad (1.13)$$

Moreover, let the initial states of the fluid be also slightly perturbed such that the initial conditions for Φ are given as:

$$\Phi(0, \mathbf{x}) = \Phi_0(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_t\Phi(0, \mathbf{x}) = \Phi_1(\mathbf{x}), \quad (1.14)$$

where for $i = 0, 1$,

$$\Phi_i(\mathbf{x}) := \begin{cases} \Phi_i^+(\mathbf{x}) & \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}_+^0 := \{x_1 > \mathcal{X}(0, x_2, x_3)\} \cap \mathcal{D}, \\ \Phi_i^-(\mathbf{x}) & \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}_-^0 := \{x_1 < \mathcal{X}(0, x_2, x_3)\} \cap \mathcal{D}. \end{cases} \quad (1.15)$$

Here the initial position $\mathcal{X}(0, x_2, x_3)$ of the perturbed shock front Γ_{shock} is a small perturbation of the reference shock front $\bar{\Gamma}_{\text{shock}}$.

Now the dynamic stability problem (see Figure 1.2) can be precisely reformulated as following problem:

Problem 1: Suppose Γ_0 is a small perturbation of $\bar{\Gamma}_0$, *i.e.*, \mathcal{W} is close to zero and the initial data (Φ_0, Φ_1) are small perturbations of $\bar{\Phi}(0, \mathbf{x})$, *i.e.*, Φ_0 is close to $\bar{\Phi}(0, x)$ and $\Phi_1(\mathbf{x})$ is close to zero. One looks for a unique local piece-wise smooth solution $(\Phi(t, \mathbf{x}), \mathcal{X}(t, x_2, x_3))$ to equation (1.3) in the flow field $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_3 > \mathcal{W}(x_1, x_3)\}$ such that:

- (i). The shock front is given by

$$\Gamma_{\text{shock}} := \{(t, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^3 : x_1 = \mathcal{X}(t, x_2, x_3)\},$$

which divides the flow field into $\mathcal{D}_+ := \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{R}_+$ and $\mathcal{D}_- := \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{R}_-$, where \mathcal{R}_\pm are defined in (1.5).

- (ii). $\Phi(t, \mathbf{x})$ is smooth up to either sides of Γ_{shock} such that

$$\Phi(t, \mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \Phi^+(t, \mathbf{x}) & \text{for } (t, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{D}_+, \\ \Phi^-(t, \mathbf{x}) & \text{for } (t, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{D}_-, \end{cases}$$

and $\Phi^\pm(t, \mathbf{x})$ satisfy equation (1.3) in \mathcal{D}_\pm , respectively.

- (iii). $\Phi^\pm(t, \mathbf{x})$ satisfy the slip boundary condition (1.13), respectively, *i.e.*,

$$-\partial_{x_1}\Phi^\pm\partial_{x_1}\mathcal{W} - \partial_{x_2}\Phi^\pm\partial_{x_2}\mathcal{W} + \partial_{x_3}\Phi^\pm = 0 \quad \text{for } (t, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \Gamma_0.$$

- (iv). $\Phi^\pm(t, \mathbf{x})$ satisfy the initial conditions (1.14)-(1.15), respectively, *i.e.*,

$$\Phi^\pm(t, \mathbf{x})|_{t=0} = \Phi_0^\pm(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}_\pm^0 \cap \mathcal{D},$$

and

$$\partial_t\Phi^\pm(t, \mathbf{x})|_{t=0} = \Phi_1^\pm(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}_\pm^0 \cap \mathcal{D},$$

where \mathcal{R}_\pm^0 are the ones defined in (1.15).

- (v). $(\Phi^+(t, \mathbf{x}), \Phi^-(t, \mathbf{x}), \mathcal{X}(t, x_2, x_3))$ satisfy the Rankine-Hugoniot conditions in (1.4).

- (vi). $(\Phi(t, \mathbf{x}), \mathcal{X}(t, x_2, x_3))$ is close to the steady normal shock solution $(\bar{\Phi}, \bar{\mathcal{X}})$, *i.e.*, $\Phi^\pm(t, \mathbf{x})$ is close to $\bar{\Phi}_\pm(t, \mathbf{x})$ in \mathcal{D}_\pm , respectively, and $\mathcal{X}(t, x_2, x_3)$ is close to $\bar{\mathcal{X}}(t, x_2, x_3)$.




FIGURE 1.2. Persistence of the steady planar normal shock under perturbation.

Remark 1.1. Thanks to the property of the finite speed of propagation of hyperbolic equations and the well-established mathematical theory for initial boundary value problems for hyperbolic equations with smooth boundaries (for instance, see [8]), one can assume that, without loss of generality, the perturbation only occurs near the intersection curve, where the shock front intersects the solid wall $x_3 = \mathcal{W}(x_1, x_2)$. Therefore, this paper only solves the stability problem near the edge of the dihedral-space domain, and in a short time.

The initial boundary value problem (1.3), (1.7), and (1.13)-(1.15) is a free boundary problem in a dihedral-space domain between two surfaces, the shock front Γ_{shock} and the perturbed solid wall Γ_0 . The key difficulty in the mathematical analysis of the problem comes from the singularity of the boundary of the space domain, which is not smooth along the edge of the dihedral-space domain, especially as it couples with other difficulties such as nonlinearity, free boundaries, etc. In fact, Osher has given examples in [58, 59] showing that hyperbolic equations in cornered space domain may be ill-posed. On the other hand, for the well-posedness problem of hyperbolic equations in space-domains with non-smooth boundaries, there are also positive results, for instance, see [39–41, 63]. In particular, under certain symmetry assumptions, Gazzola-Secchi [39] studied the inflow-outflow problem in a bounded cylinder. Then Yuan [63] studied the dynamic stability of normal shock in a duct with flat boundaries in two space dimensions. In both works, the symmetry assumptions play an essential role in the analysis, under which the extension techniques can be employed such that the non-smooth domain is reduced into a smooth domain. Such symmetry assumptions fail to be valid in the problem (1.3), (1.7), and (1.13)-(1.15) studied in this paper, since the solid wall Γ_0 is a curved surface. Hence the methods developed in [39, 63] are not applicable. Nevertheless, the assumption that Γ_0 is

a slightly perturbed surface from a flat one implies that there may hold some symmetry properties under certain transformation. Recently in [37], the authors develop an extension technique successfully to deal with the difficulty in a 2-D cornered-space domain. However, the technique cannot be directly applied to the problem in this paper because the singular set of the boundary is no longer a single point, but a curve, which is the edge. Therefore, new methods should be developed and more careful analysis are needed to establish the well-posedness of the solutions in the dihedral-space domain.

Motivated by the extension techniques developed in [37] for 2-D case, we shall look for an appropriate transformation, under which it is possible to extend the linearized initial-boundary value problem in the dihedral-space domain into an initial-boundary value problem in the half-space domain. To make it, a modified partial hodograph transformation (see (2.5) for details), different from the transformation employed for the 2-D case, is introduced. Then the problem in the dihedral-space domain will be extended into a problem in a half-space domain, and the unique existence of a H_η^2 -solution (a weighted Sobolev space) can be established by employing the classical theory for initial-boundary value problems of hyperbolic equations (see [8], for instance). Similar to the 2-D case, the H_η^2 regularity is not sufficient to close the nonlinear iteration. Therefore, *a priori* estimates for higher order derivatives are required, which should be established directly in the dihedral-space domain, since the extended coefficients are of low regularity. Moreover, as the space dimension increases, the analysis needed for the *a priori* estimates for higher order derivatives is more complicated than the 2-D case and it should be dealt with more carefully. Finally, it is worth mentioning that a transformation (see section 4) is introduced to reformulate the nonlinear problem, which helps to improve the extension argument develop in [37], such that the loss-of-regularity for the *a priori* estimates on the shock-front will not occur. Hence instead of the Nash-Moser iteration scheme employed in [37], a classical nonlinear iteration scheme is sufficient to prove the existence of the solutions to the nonlinear problem.

Up to now, much great progress has been made in the study of weak solutions of multi-dimensional unsteady compressible Euler equations. For instance, see [26, 27, 44, 45, 52–56] for the study of shock waves, [1, 2, 10] for rarefaction waves, [18, 19, 28, 29] for contact discontinuities, [4, 5, 15–17, 21, 33, 48, 49] for self-similar solutions, and [3, 7, 24, 25, 31, 32, 43, 51] for the non-uniqueness of weak solutions.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2, a modified partial hodograph transformation is introduced to fix the free boundary and flat the curved solid wall. Then the dynamic stability problem is reformulated as the well-posedness problem of an initial boundary value problem for a nonlinear hyperbolic equation of second order, in a dihedral-space domain with fixed boundaries. Finally, the main theorem, theorem 2.1, is presented at the end of this section. In section 3, we obtain the well-posedness of a general initial boundary value problem for a linear hyperbolic equation of second order in the dihedral-space domain. In section 4, the nonlinear problem (NLP) is reformulated. In section 4.2, an iteration scheme is introduced to solve the reformulated nonlinear problem.

Then one proves the main theorem by showing that the iteration scheme provides a sequence of functions which converges to the desired solution, and hence prove the dynamic stability of the steady planar normal shock structure.

2. PARTIAL HODOGRAPH TRANSFORMATION AND MAIN RESULT

In this section, we introduce a modified partial hodograph transformation, which is used to fix the free boundary Γ_{shock} and straighten the perturbed solid wall Γ_0 . With the aid of this transformation, the previous initial boundary value problem (1.3), (1.7), and (1.13)-(1.15) is mapped to an initial boundary value problem in a dihedral-space domain with fixed boundaries in the new coordinate system. Then Problem 1 is converted to Problem 2 and solving Problem 1 is equivalent to solve Problem 2. Finally, at the end of this section, we present our main result.

2.1. Partial hodograph transformation. Let Φ^- be the potential for the flow field ahead of the shock-front and Φ the one behind the shock-front. Extend Φ^- by solving the equation (1.3) with the boundary condition (1.13) into the domain ahead of the shock-front, which is at least C^1 across the shock-front. More precisely, first we extend $\Phi_0^-(\mathbf{x})$ and $\Phi_1^-(\mathbf{x})$ smoothly into the whole domain \mathbb{R}^3 . Then solve the initial boundary value problem (1.3), (1.13), and (1.14), where $\Phi_i(\mathbf{x})$ in (1.14) is replaced by $\Phi_i^-(\mathbf{x})$. Obviously, such solution exists locally (this is reasonable, one can see [20] for the case of compressible Euler equations, which includes the case of potential flows) and is a solution of Problem 1 when $x_1 < \mathcal{X}(t, x_2, x_3)$. Denote by $\Phi^-(t, \mathbf{x})$ this smooth solution and define

$$\phi(t, \mathbf{x}) := \Phi^-(t, \mathbf{x}) - \Phi(t, \mathbf{x}). \quad (2.1)$$

Then the potential equation (1.3) for Φ is reformulated as a second order equation for ϕ :

$$\sum_{i,j=0}^3 a_{ij}(\mathbf{D}\phi; \mathbf{D}\Phi^-) \partial_{x_i x_j} \phi = \sum_{i,j=0}^3 a_{ij}(\mathbf{D}\phi; \mathbf{D}\Phi^-) \partial_{x_i x_j} \Phi^-, \quad (2.2)$$

where

$$a_{00} = 1, \quad a_{0j} = a_{j0} := \partial_{x_j} \Phi^- - \partial_{x_j} \phi = \partial_{x_j} \Phi, \quad (2.3)$$

and

$$a_{ij} = a_{ji} := -c^2 \delta_{ij} + (\partial_{x_i} \Phi^- - \partial_{x_i} \phi)(\partial_{x_j} \Phi^- - \partial_{x_j} \phi) = -c^2 \delta_{ij} + \partial_{x_i} \Phi \partial_{x_j} \Phi \quad (2.4)$$

for $i, j = 1, 2, 3$.

We introduce the following partial hodograph transformation:

$$\mathcal{P} : \begin{cases} y_0 = t \\ y_1 = \phi(t, \mathbf{x}) \\ y_2 = x_2 + p(\mathbf{x}) \\ y_3 = x_3 - \mathcal{W}(x_1, x_2) \end{cases} \quad (2.5)$$

where

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W}}{1 + |\partial_{x_1} \mathcal{W}|^2 + |\partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W}|^2} (x_3 - \mathcal{W}(x_1, x_2)). \quad (2.6)$$

Here $p(\mathbf{x})$ is introduced to balance the perturbation on the x_2 -direction.

Remark 2.1. In [37], $p(\mathbf{x})$ does not appear in the partial hodograph transformation. While in this paper, $p(\mathbf{x})$ plays an essential role, as it is used to match the perturbations on the x_2 -direction and x_3 -direction. As one will see from the proof of lemma 4.1, the appearance of $p(\mathbf{x})$ guarantees the vanishing property of \tilde{a}_{23} and \tilde{a}_{32} on $\{y_3 = 0\}$, which is necessary to the application of the extension technique and crucial to the solvability of the linearized problem in the dihedral-space domain.

The inverse of \mathcal{P} is

$$\mathcal{P}^{-1} : t = y_0, \quad x_1 = u(y_0, \mathbf{y}), \quad x_2 = x_2(y_0, \mathbf{y}), \quad x_3 = y_3 + \mathcal{W}(u(y_0, \mathbf{y}), x_2(y_0, \mathbf{y})), \quad (2.7)$$

where $(y_0, \mathbf{y}) := (y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3)$ are the time-spatial variables in the new coordinate and $u(y_0, \mathbf{y})$ is the new unknown function. Taking the partial derivatives to the equation $y_1 = \phi \circ \mathcal{P}^{-1}(y_0, \mathbf{y})$ with respect to y_j ($j = 0, 1, 2, 3$), we obtain a linear system with respect to $D_{t, \mathbf{x}}\phi := (\partial_t\phi, \nabla\phi)$. By solving this system, one can express $D_{t, \mathbf{x}}\phi$ in terms of $Du := (\partial_{y_0}u, \partial_{y_1}u, \partial_{y_2}u, \partial_{y_3}u)$,

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t\phi = -\frac{\partial_{y_0}u}{\partial_{y_1}u}, \\ \partial_{x_1}\phi = -\frac{\partial_{x_1}p\partial_{y_2}u - \partial_{x_1}\mathcal{W}\partial_{y_3}u - 1}{\partial_{y_1}u}, \\ \partial_{x_2}\phi = \frac{\partial_{x_3}p\partial_{x_2}\mathcal{W}\partial_{y_2}u + \partial_{x_2}\mathcal{W}\partial_{y_3}u - \partial_{y_2}u}{\partial_{y_1}u}, \\ \partial_{x_3}\phi = -\frac{\partial_{x_3}p\partial_{y_2}u + \partial_{y_3}u}{\partial_{y_1}u}. \end{cases} \quad (2.8)$$

The Jacobi matrix of \mathcal{P} is

$$\frac{\partial(y_0, \mathbf{y})}{\partial(t, \mathbf{x})} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \partial_t\phi & \partial_{x_1}\phi & \partial_{x_2}\phi & \partial_{x_3}\phi \\ 0 & \partial_{x_1}p & 1 + \partial_{x_2}p & \partial_{x_3}p \\ 0 & -\partial_{x_1}\mathcal{W} & -\partial_{x_2}\mathcal{W} & 1 \end{bmatrix} := \frac{1}{\partial_{y_1}u} \mathbf{J}^\top,$$

where

$$\mathbf{J} := \begin{bmatrix} \partial_{y_1}u & -\partial_{y_0}u & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \partial_{x_1}\mathcal{W}\partial_{y_3}u - \partial_{x_1}p\partial_{y_2}u + 1 & \partial_{x_1}p\partial_{y_1}u & -\partial_{x_1}\mathcal{W}\partial_{y_1}u \\ 0 & (\partial_{x_3}p\partial_{x_2}\mathcal{W} - 1)\partial_{y_2}u + \partial_{y_3}u\partial_{x_2}\mathcal{W} & (\partial_{x_2}p + 1)\partial_{y_1}u & -\partial_{x_2}\mathcal{W}\partial_{y_1}u \\ 0 & -\partial_{x_3}p\partial_{y_2}u - \partial_{y_3}u & \partial_{x_3}p\partial_{y_1}u & \partial_{y_1}u \end{bmatrix}.$$

2.2. Formulation in new coordinate. In the remaining part of this paper, time t may be denoted by y_0 and vice versa. After a direct computation, we also obtain

$$\frac{\partial(D\phi)}{\partial(Du)} = -\frac{1}{(\partial_{y_1}u)^2} \mathbf{J}.$$

Denote by $D^2\phi$ the Hessian matrix of ϕ , i.e.,

$$D^2\phi = \frac{\partial(D\phi)}{\partial(t, \mathbf{x})}.$$

With the help of (2.8), by simple calculation, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
D^2\phi &= \frac{\partial(D\phi)}{\partial(Du)} \left[\partial_{y_i y_j} u \right]_{4 \times 4} \frac{\partial(y_0, \mathbf{y})}{\partial(t, \mathbf{x})} + \frac{(-\partial_{x_1 x_1} p \partial_{y_2} u + \partial_{x_1 x_1} \mathcal{W} \partial_{y_3} u) \mathbf{I}_{11}}{\partial_{y_1} u} \\
&\quad + \frac{(-\partial_{x_1 x_2} p \partial_{y_2} u + \partial_{x_1 x_2} \mathcal{W} \partial_{y_3} u) \mathbf{I}_{12}}{\partial_{y_1} u} - \frac{\partial_{x_1 x_3} p \partial_{y_2} u \mathbf{I}_{13}}{\partial_{y_1} u} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\partial_{y_1} u} ((\partial_{x_1 x_3} p \partial_{y_2} u \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W} + \partial_{x_3} p \partial_{y_2} u \partial_{x_1 x_2} \mathcal{W} + \partial_{x_1 x_2} \mathcal{W} \partial_{y_3} u) \mathbf{I}_{21}) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\partial_{y_1} u} ((\partial_{x_2 x_3} p \partial_{y_2} u \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W} + \partial_{x_3} p \partial_{y_2} u \partial_{x_2 x_2} \mathcal{W} + \partial_{x_2 x_2} \mathcal{W} \partial_{y_3} u) \mathbf{I}_{22}) \\
&\quad + \frac{\partial_{y_2} u}{\partial_{y_1} u} (-\partial_{x_1 x_3} p \mathbf{I}_{31} - \partial_{x_2 x_3} p \mathbf{I}_{32} - \partial_{x_3 x_3} p \mathbf{I}_{33} + \partial_{x_3 x_3} p \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W} \mathbf{I}_{23}),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{I}_{ij} := e_i^\top e_j \in \mathbb{R}^{4 \times 4}$ with $\{e_i\}_{i=0}^3$ being the canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^4 . Then we have

$$\sum_{i,j=0}^3 a_{ij} \partial_{x_i x_j} \phi = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}^\top D^2\phi) = -\frac{1}{(\partial_{y_1} u)^3} \sum_{i,j=0}^3 \tilde{a}_{ij} \partial_{y_i y_j} u + \sum_{i=1}^4 S_i, \quad (2.9)$$

where $\mathbf{A} := [a_{ij}]_{4 \times 4}$ with a_{ij} being defined in (2.3)-(2.4) and $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{M})$ means the trace of the square matrix \mathbf{M} . The coefficients $\tilde{a}_{ij} = \tilde{a}_{ij}(\partial_{x_1} \mathcal{W}, \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W}, Du; D\Phi^-)$ satisfy that

$$[\tilde{a}_{ij}]_{4 \times 4} := \mathbf{J}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{J} = \tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \tilde{\mathbf{A}}^\top,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
S_1 &= a_{11} (-\partial_{x_1 x_1} p \frac{\partial_{y_2} u}{\partial_{y_1} u} + \partial_{x_1 x_1} \mathcal{W} \frac{\partial_{y_3} u}{\partial_{y_1} u}), \\
S_2 &= \frac{1}{\partial_{y_1} u} (-a_{13} \partial_{x_1 x_3} p \partial_{y_2} u + a_{21} (\partial_{x_1 x_3} p \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W} \partial_{y_2} u + \partial_{x_3} p \partial_{x_1 x_2} \mathcal{W} \partial_{y_2} u + \partial_{x_1 x_2} \mathcal{W} \partial_{y_3} u)), \\
S_3 &= \frac{1}{\partial_{y_1} u} (a_{22} (\partial_{x_3 x_3} p \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W} \partial_{y_2} u + \partial_{x_3} p \partial_{x_2 x_2} \mathcal{W} \partial_{y_2} u + \partial_{x_2 x_2} \mathcal{W} \partial_{y_3} u) + a_{23} \partial_{x_3 x_3} p \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W} \partial_{y_2} u), \\
S_4 &= -\frac{\partial_{y_2} u}{\partial_{y_1} u} (a_{31} \partial_{x_1 x_3} p + a_{32} \partial_{x_2 x_3} p + a_{33} \partial_{x_3 x_3} p).
\end{aligned}$$

By simple calculation, especially, one has

$$\tilde{a}_{03} = \tilde{a}_{30} = (\partial_{y_1} u)^2 \cdot d, \quad (2.10)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{a}_{13} = \tilde{a}_{31} &= -(\partial_{y_1} u)^2 \cdot d + \partial_{y_1} u (\partial_{x_1} \mathcal{W} \partial_{y_3} u - \partial_{x_1} p \partial_{y_2} u + 1) \cdot d + c^2 \partial_{x_1} \mathcal{W} \\
&\quad - (\partial_{x_3} p \partial_{y_2} u + \partial_{y_3} u) \partial_{y_1} u (\partial_{x_3} \Phi \cdot d - c^2), \quad (2.11)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{a}_{23} = \tilde{a}_{32} &= \partial_{x_1} p (\partial_{y_1} u)^2 (\partial_{x_1} \Phi \cdot d + c^2 \partial_{x_1} \mathcal{W}) + (\partial_{x_2} p + 1) (\partial_{y_1} u)^2 (\partial_{x_2} \Phi \cdot d + c^2 \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W}) \\
&\quad + ((\partial_{x_3} p \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W} - 1) \partial_{y_2} u + \partial_{y_3} u \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W}) \partial_{y_1} u (\partial_{x_2} \Phi \cdot d + c^2 \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W}) \\
&\quad + \partial_{x_3} p (\partial_{y_1} u)^2 (\partial_{x_3} \Phi \cdot d - c^2), \quad (2.12)
\end{aligned}$$

where $d = \partial_{x_3} \Phi - \partial_{x_1} \Phi \partial_{x_1} \mathcal{W} - \partial_{x_2} \Phi \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W}$.

For the other coefficients, because we do not need the properties of their trace on the boundary, they are listed in the appendix.

From (2.2) and (2.9), we deduce that u satisfies following equation

$$\sum_{i,j=0}^3 \tilde{a}_{ij} \partial_{y_i y_j} u + \tilde{a}_2 \partial_{y_2} u + \tilde{a}_3 \partial_{y_3} u + a_{12} \partial_{x_1 x_2} p (\partial_{y_1} u)^3 = -(\partial_{y_1} u)^3 \sum_{i,j=0}^3 a_{ij} \partial_{x_i x_j} \Phi^-, \quad (2.13)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{a}_2 = & (\partial_{y_1} u)^2 (a_{11} p_{x_1 x_1} + a_{13} \partial_{x_1 x_3} p - a_{21} (\partial_{x_2 x_3} p \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W} + \partial_{x_3} p \partial_{x_1 x_2} \mathcal{W})) \\ & + (\partial_{y_1} u)^2 (a_{12} \partial_{x_1 x_2} p + a_{31} \partial_{x_1 x_3} p + a_{32} \partial_{x_2 x_3} p - a_{22} \partial_{x_3} p \partial_{x_2 x_2} \mathcal{W}), \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

$$\tilde{a}_3 = (\partial_{y_1} u)^2 (-a_{11} \partial_{x_1 x_1} \mathcal{W} - a_{12} \partial_{x_1 x_2} \mathcal{W} - a_{21} \partial_{x_1 x_2} \mathcal{W} - a_{22} \partial_{x_2 x_2} \mathcal{W} + a_{12} \partial_{x_1 x_2} p). \quad (2.15)$$

Assume

$$\partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W}(x_1, 0) = 0. \quad (2.16)$$

Then the partial hodograph transformation \mathcal{P} maps the axis $x_2 = 0$ in (t, \mathbf{x}) -coordinate to the axis $y_2 = 0$ in (y_0, \mathbf{y}) -coordinate. Moreover the perturbed solid wall Γ_0 and the shock front Γ_{shock} in (t, \mathbf{x}) -coordinate are mapped to

$$\Gamma_w := \{y_0 > 0, y_1 > 0, y_3 = 0\} \quad (2.17)$$

and

$$\Gamma_s := \{y_0 > 0, y_1 = 0, y_3 > 0\}, \quad (2.18)$$

respectively. Substituting the expressions of $D_{t, \mathbf{x}} \phi$ and $p(\mathbf{x})$ into (1.13), we find that u satisfies

$$\partial_{y_3} u = -\frac{\partial_{x_1} \mathcal{W}}{1 + |\partial_{x_1} \mathcal{W}|^2 + |\partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W}|^2} \quad \text{on } \Gamma_w. \quad (2.19)$$

Substituting (2.8) into (1.7), we obtain the Rankine-Hugoniot condition in the new coordinate variables:

$$G(u, Du; D\Phi^-) = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_s, \quad (2.20)$$

where

$$G(u, Du; D\Phi^-) := [\rho][\Phi_t] + [\partial_{x_1} \Phi][\rho \partial_{x_1} \Phi] + [\partial_{x_2} \Phi][\rho \partial_{x_2} \Phi] + [\partial_{x_3} \Phi][\rho \partial_{x_3} \Phi], \quad (2.21)$$

where $D\Phi$ should be replaced by $D\Phi^- - D_{t, \mathbf{x}} \phi$ and $D_{t, \mathbf{x}} \phi$ should be replaced by Du via (2.8). For the initial conditions, we assume

$$u(y_0, \mathbf{y})|_{y_0} := u_0(\mathbf{y}) \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_{y_0} u(y_0, \mathbf{y})|_{y_0=0} := u_1(\mathbf{y}),$$

where u_0 and u_1 are some given functions.

For notational simplicity, one defines Lu by

$$Lu := \sum_{i,j=0}^3 \tilde{a}_{ij} \partial_{y_i y_j} u + \tilde{a}_2 \partial_{y_2} u + \tilde{a}_3 \partial_{y_3} u + a_{12} \partial_{x_1 x_2} p (\partial_{y_1} u)^3 + (\partial_{y_1} u)^3 \sum_{i,j=0}^3 a_{ij} \partial_{x_i x_j} \Phi^-,$$

where the coefficients depend on $u(y_0, \mathbf{y})$ and its first order derivatives, as well as $\mathcal{W}(x_1, x_2)$ and its derivatives up to third order. Gathering (2.13), (2.19)-(2.20), and the initial conditions of u , we get the initial boundary value problem concerned in this paper:

$$\begin{cases} Lu = 0 & \text{in } \Omega_T, \\ G(\mathcal{W}'(u), Du; D\Phi^-) = 0 & \text{on } \{y_1 = 0\}, \\ G_1 := (1 + |\partial_{x_1}\mathcal{W}|^2 + |\partial_{x_2}\mathcal{W}|^2)\partial_{y_3}u + \partial_{x_1}\mathcal{W} = 0 & \text{on } \{y_3 = 0\}, \\ u(y_0, \mathbf{y}) = u_0(\mathbf{y}), \quad u(y_0, \mathbf{y}) = u_1(\mathbf{y}) & \text{on } \{y_0 = 0\}. \end{cases} \quad (\text{NLP})$$

Here $\Omega_T := [0, T] \times \Omega$ and $\Omega := \mathbb{R}_{y_1}^+ \times \mathbb{R}_{y_2} \times \mathbb{R}_{y_3}^+$, where $\mathbb{R}^+ = (0, +\infty)$ and \mathbb{R} is the set of real numbers. Here and after, denote this initial boundary value problem by (NLP).

In the (t, \mathbf{x}) -coordinate, the background state for ϕ is

$$\bar{\phi}(t, \mathbf{x}) := \bar{\Phi}_-(t, \mathbf{x}) - \bar{\Phi}_+(t, \mathbf{x}) = (q_- - q_+)x_1.$$

Then the corresponding partial hodograph transformation is

$$y_0 = t, \quad y_1 = \bar{\phi}(t, \mathbf{x}), \quad y_2 = x_2, \quad y_3 = x_3, \quad (2.22)$$

and its inverse transformation is

$$t = y_0, \quad x_1 = u_b(\mathbf{y}), \quad x_2 = y_2, \quad x_3 = y_3. \quad (2.23)$$

It is clear that

$$x_1 = \frac{1}{q_- - q_+} \bar{\phi}(t, \mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{q_- - q_+} y_1.$$

Hence we have

$$u_b(\mathbf{y}) = \frac{1}{q_- - q_+} y_1. \quad (2.24)$$

At the background state, i.e., the state that $u = u_b$, $\mathcal{W}(x_1, x_2) \equiv 0$, $\nabla\Phi(t, \mathbf{x}) \equiv (q_+, 0, 0)$ and $\nabla\Phi^-(t, \mathbf{x}) \equiv (q_-, 0, 0)$, one has

$$\tilde{a}_{00} = \frac{1}{(q_- - q_+)^2} > 0, \quad \tilde{a}_{01} = \tilde{a}_{10} = \frac{q_+}{q_- - q_+} > 0, \quad \tilde{a}_{02} = \tilde{a}_{20} = 0, \quad (2.25)$$

$$\tilde{a}_{11} = q_+^2 - c_+^2 < 0, \quad \tilde{a}_{03} = \tilde{a}_{30} = 0, \quad \tilde{a}_{13} = \tilde{a}_{31} = 0, \quad (2.26)$$

$$\tilde{a}_{22} = \frac{-c_+^2}{(q_- - q_+)^2} < 0, \quad \tilde{a}_{21} = \tilde{a}_{12} = 0, \quad \tilde{a}_{23} = \tilde{a}_{32} = 0, \quad (2.27)$$

$$\tilde{a}_{33} = \frac{-c_+^2}{(q_- - q_+)^2} < 0. \quad (2.28)$$

In \mathbf{y} -coordinates, the dynamic stability problem is rewritten as the following problem:

Problem 2. Suppose the initial data (u_0, u_1) and \mathcal{W} are small perturbations of the background state u_b and zero, respectively and $\nabla\Phi^-$ is close to $(q_-, 0, 0)$. Can we show the local existence and uniqueness of smooth solutions to (NLP), such that the unique solution is still close to u_b ?

The remaining part of this paper is devoted to solving this problem. It is shown that one can indeed find a unique smooth solution to (NLP) near u_b , if the following condition:

$$q_- \rho_+ - q_+ \rho_- - \rho_+ > 0 \quad (2.29)$$

holds for the constants $(\rho_-, q_-, \rho_+, q_+)$.

Remark 2.2. *It should be noted that, as one will see from the proof of lemma 4.1, the condition (2.29) is employed to guarantee that the steady normal shock solution satisfies the stability conditions, which are defined in (\mathbf{H}_4) below in the beginning of section 3. However, the conditions (1.11) and (1.12) are not sufficient to yield (2.29). For example, for any $1 < \lambda < \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$, choose $(q_-, \rho_-, q_+, \rho_+)$ as follows:*

$$q_- = \lambda, \quad q_+ = 1, \quad \rho_- = \left(\frac{(\gamma - 1)(\lambda^2 - 1)}{2(\lambda^{\gamma-1} - 1)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_+ = \lambda \rho_-. \quad (2.30)$$

Then it can be easily verified that (1.11) and (1.12) are valid, but (2.29) fails:

$$q_- \rho_+ - q_+ \rho_- - \rho_+ = (\lambda^2 - \lambda - 1) \rho_- < 0. \quad (2.31)$$

Remark 2.3. *It is worth pointing out that, since the solid boundary is perturbed and no longer flat, the symmetry assumptions proposed in [39, 63] fail to be valid in this problem. Therefore, new ideas and methods must be developed to deal with the dihedral singularity, which is also completely different from the one caused by the corner singularity in [37]. These are the main new ingredients of this paper.*

Now, we are ready to state our main result as following theorem:

Theorem 2.1. *For each integer $s_0 \geq 3$, suppose the initial-boundary data of (NLP) satisfy the compatibility condition up to order $s_0 + 1$. If conditions (1.11), (1.12), (2.16) and (2.29) hold, then there exist three constants $\eta_0 > 1$, $T_0 > 0$ and $\tilde{\epsilon} > 0$ such that if*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u_0 - u_b\|_{H^{s_0+1}(\Omega)} + \|u_1\|_{H^{s_0}(\Omega)} + \|\mathcal{W}\|_{W^{s_0+2,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^2)} \\ & + \|e^{-\eta t}(\mathbf{D}\Phi^- - (q_-, 0, 0))\|_{H^{s_0}([0,T] \times \{x_3 > \mathcal{W}(x_1, x_2)\})} \leq \epsilon \end{aligned} \quad (2.32)$$

is satisfied for $0 < T \leq T_0$, $\eta \geq \eta_0$ and $\epsilon \leq \tilde{\epsilon}$, where $\|\cdot\|_{H^k}$ stands for the standard Sobolev norm. Then (NLP) admits a unique solution $u \in H^{s_0+1}(\Omega_T)$ satisfying

$$\|e^{-\eta t}(u - u_b)\|_{H^{s_0+1}(\Omega_T)} \leq C\epsilon, \quad (2.33)$$

where C is a positive constant depending on $(q_-, q_+, \rho_-, \rho_+, T_0, \eta_0)$.

Remark 2.4. *The compatibility conditions mentioned in Theorem 2.1 come from the requirement that the initial-boundary data of (NLP) should be consistent. More precisely, by initial conditions in (NLP) and the first equation of (NLP), we know that at $y_0 = 0$,*

$$\mathbf{D}^\beta u = \mathbf{D}^\beta u_0, \quad \partial_{y_0} \mathbf{D}^\beta u = \mathbf{D}^\beta u_1$$

and

$$\partial_{y_0}^2 \mathbf{D}^\beta u = \mathbf{D}^\beta \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{a}_{00}} (\tilde{f} - \sum_{(i,j) \neq (0,0)}^2 \tilde{a}_{ij} \partial_{y_i y_j} u) \right),$$

where $\mathbf{D}^\beta = \partial_{y_1}^{\beta_1} \partial_{y_2}^{\beta_2} \partial_{y_3}^{\beta_3}$ is the spatial derivatives and $\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3)$ is the multi-index corresponds to spatial derivative and

$$\tilde{f} = (\partial_{y_1} u)^3 \sum_{i,j=0}^3 a_{ij} \partial_{x_i x_j} \Phi^- + \tilde{a}_2 \partial_{y_2} u + \tilde{a}_3 \partial_{y_3} u + a_{12} \partial_{x_1 x_2} p(\partial_{y_1} u)^3.$$

Then by induction on k (i.e., assume we have already known the expression of $\partial_{y_0}^{m+1} D^\beta u$ at $y_0 = 0$ for all $m \leq k$.) and by taking derivative $D^\beta \partial_{y_0}^k$ on equation (NLP)₁, we will have the expression of $\partial_{y_0}^{k+2} D^\beta u$ at $y_0 = 0$. We omit the details for the shortness. Then we have the expression of $D^\alpha u$ at $y_0 = 0$ for all $\alpha = (\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$. Let

$$u_\alpha := D^\alpha u|_{y_0=0}. \quad (2.34)$$

On the other hand, we have two boundary conditions in (NLP). So for any $(k_0, k_1, k_2, k_3) \in \mathbb{N}^4$, we have

$$D^{(k_0, k_1, k_2, 0)} G = 0 \quad \text{on } \{y_3 = 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad D^{(k_0, 0, k_2, k_3)} G_1 = 0 \quad \text{on } \{y_1 = 0\}.$$

Let $U := (u, Du)$, then by the Faà di Bruno's formula and the Leibniz rule, we know there exist $c_{l_1 \dots l_m l'_1 \dots l'_m l''_1 \dots l''_m}(U)$ and $c'_{l_1 \dots l_m l'_1 \dots l'_m l''_1 \dots l''_m}(U)$ such that

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\max(k_0, k_1, k_2)} \sum_{\substack{l_1 + \dots + l_m = k_0 \\ l'_1 + \dots + l'_m = k_1 \\ l''_1 + \dots + l''_m = k_2}} c_{l_1 \dots l_m l'_1 \dots l'_m l''_1 \dots l''_m}(U) \cdot (D^{(l_1, l'_1, l''_1, 0)} U, \dots, D^{(l_m, l'_m, l''_m, 0)} U) = 0 \quad \text{on } \{y_3 = 0\}$$

and

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\max(k_0, k_2, k_3)} \sum_{\substack{l_1 + \dots + l_m = k_0 \\ l'_1 + \dots + l'_m = k_2 \\ l''_1 + \dots + l''_m = k_3}} c'_{l_1 \dots l_m l'_1 \dots l'_m l''_1 \dots l''_m}(U) \cdot (D^{(l_1, 0, l'_1, l''_1)} U, \dots, D^{(l_m, 0, l'_m, l''_m)} U) = 0 \quad \text{on } \{y_1 = 0\}.$$

Here integers l_m , l'_m and l''_m can be zero. Let $y_0 = 0$ and plug (2.34) into the two identities above for all integers $k_0 + k_1 + k_2 \leq s_0 + 1$ and $k_0 + k_2 + k_3 \leq s_0 + 1$. Then we can obtain the identities that the initial and boundary data must satisfy for all integers $k_0 + k_1 + k_2 \leq s_0 + 1$ and $k_0 + k_2 + k_3 \leq s_0 + 1$. These identities are called the compatibility conditions up to order $s_0 + 1$.

3. WELL-POSEDNESS OF THE LINEAR PROBLEM

In this section, we will establish the well-posedness theorem for an initial boundary value problem of a linear hyperbolic equation of second order in the dihedral-space domain. The linear theorem will be used to solve the (NLP) by introducing an iteration scheme in the next section.

In the following part of this section, we investigate the following initial boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} L'(u)w = f & \text{in } \Omega_T, \\ \mathcal{B}(u)w = g & \text{on } \Gamma_s, \\ \partial_{y_3} w = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_w, \\ (w, \partial_{y_0} w) = (0, 0) & \text{on } \Gamma_{in} := \{y_0 = 0\}, \end{cases} \quad (\text{LP})$$

where

$$L'(u) := \sum_{i,j=0}^3 r_{ij} \partial_{ij} + \sum_{i=0}^3 r_i \partial_i + r,$$

$$\mathcal{B}(u) := \sum_{i=0}^3 b_i \partial_i + b,$$

Ω_T is the time-spatial domain defined below (NLP) in section 2, Γ_w and Γ_s are defined by (2.17) and (2.18) respectively. We impose following hypothesis on the coefficients of the operators $L'(u)$ and $\mathcal{B}(u)$.

- (**H**₁) $L'(u)$ is a hyperbolic operator of second order. r_{ij} , r_i and r are smooth functions of $D\Phi^-$, Du and $\mathcal{W}(u, x_2(u, y_2, y_3))$. Moreover r_{32} , r_{31} , r_{30} and r_2 vanish on the flat boundary Γ_w . In particular, at the background solution u_b , which is given in (2.24), $r_{10} = r_{01} > 0$, $r_{12} = r_{21} = 0$, $r_{02} = r_{20} = 0$, $r_{33} = r_{22} < 0$, $r_{30} = r_{03} = r_{31} = r_{13} = r_{32} = r_{23} = 0$ and $r_{11} < 0$.
- (**H**₂) b_i and b are smooth functions depend on Du and $\mathcal{W}'(u)$ and $b_3|_{\Gamma_w} = 0$. Furthermore, $b = b_2 = b_3 = 0$ at the background solution u_b .
- (**H**₃) There exists an integer $n_0 \geq 1$ and $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{0 \leq y_0 \leq T} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq n_0 + 3} \|D^\alpha(u - u_b)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} < \delta.$$

- (**H**₄) At the background solution u_b , the following stability conditions hold for some constant $\gamma_0 > 0$:

$$|b_1| \geq \gamma_0, \quad \frac{\tilde{a}_{11} b_0}{b_1} - r_{01} \geq \gamma_0, \quad \sum_{i,j=0}^3 r^{ij} \left(\frac{r_{11} b_i}{b_1} - r_{i1} \right) \left(\frac{r_{11} b_j}{b_1} - r_{j1} \right) \geq \gamma_0.$$

Here r^{ij} is the (i, j) -th entry of the matrix $[r_{ij}]_{4 \times 4}^{-1}$, the inverse matrix of $[r_{ij}]_{4 \times 4}$.

Let us introduce some notations:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Omega} &:= \mathbb{R}_{y_1}^+ \times \mathbb{R}_{y_2} \times \mathbb{R}_{y_3}, & \omega &:= \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}_{y_2} \times \mathbb{R}_{y_3}, \\ \omega^\ell &:= \omega \cap \{y_3 > 0\}, & \omega^r &:= \mathbb{R}_{y_1}^+ \times \mathbb{R}_{y_2} \times \{0\}. \end{aligned}$$

And $\tilde{\Omega}_T := [0, T] \times \tilde{\Omega}$ is defined to be the right half time-spatial domain of $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3$. Let $\omega_T := [0, T] \times \omega$ and let $\omega_T^i := [0, T] \times \omega^i$ for $i = \ell$ and r .

For the linear problem (LP), we have the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose assumptions (**H**₁)-(**H**₄) are fulfilled and $\partial_t^k f|_{t=0} = 0$ for $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n_0 + 2$ with an integer $n_0 \geq 1$. Then there exists a smooth solution w to (LP). Moreover, there exists $\eta_0 \geq 1$ and $T_0 > 0$ such that for all $s \leq n_0 + 3$, the following estimate*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s} \eta \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|D^\alpha w(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\ & \lesssim \frac{1}{\eta} (e^{2\eta T} \|e^{-\eta t} u\|_{H^s(\Omega_T)}^2 \|e^{-\eta t} f\|_{H^3(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} f\|_{H^{s-1}(\Omega_T)}^2) + \|e^{-\eta t} g\|_{H^{s-1}(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

holds for all $\eta \geq \eta_0$ and $0 < T \leq T_0$.

We have used the notation \lesssim in (3.1). Hereafter $A \lesssim B$ means that $A \leq CB$ for some positive constant C . Before giving a proof to theorem 3.1, we define an auxiliary problem

(LPE). The coefficients of $L'(u)$, f , g and the coefficients of $\mathcal{B}(u)$ will be extended from Ω_T to $\tilde{\Omega}_T$ in the following way:

- (i) Extend $r_{03} = r_{30}$, $r_{13} = r_{31}$, $r_{23} = r_{32}$ and b_3 oddly with respect to $\{y_3 = 0\}$. To be precise, we take r_{03} for example. Extend r_{03} by letting $(Er_{03})(y_0, \mathbf{y}) := r_{03}(y_0, \mathbf{y})$ when $y_3 \geq 0$ and $(Er_{03})(y_0, \mathbf{y}) := -r_{03}(y_0, y_1, y_2, -y_3)$ when $y_3 < 0$. Coefficients other than r_{03} , r_{13} and r_{23} will be extend evenly with respect to $\{y_3 = 0\}$ by the same manner.
- (ii) Extend f and g evenly with respect to $\{y_3 = 0\}$.

For notational simplicity, we omit the “ E ” for all extended coefficients. The (LPE) is defined as follows

$$\begin{cases} L'(u)w = f & \text{in } \tilde{\Omega}_T \\ \mathcal{B}(u)w = g & \text{on } \omega_T \\ (w, \partial_{y_0} w) = (0, 0) & \text{on } \Gamma_{in} := \{y_0 = 0\} \end{cases}. \quad (\text{LPE})$$

Remark 3.1. *The compatibility conditions up to order $n_0 + 3$ for (LP) can be obtained by same arguments as Remark 2.4 away from the wedge $y_3 = 0$. Obviously, due to the regularity of the extended coefficients, (LPE) only satisfies the compatibility conditions as the one in Remark 2.4 on the wedge up to order 2. But it is enough for us to show the existence of solutions of the (LPE) in $H^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)$. Then the better regularity in Ω_T of such solutions can be obtained by further argument.*

By employing the idea said in Remark 3.1 above, we will consider the well-posedness of the (LP) in the next proposition, by considering the well-posedness of the (LPE), and proving that the unique solution to (LPE) is the unique solution to (LP) and it satisfies better estimate in Ω_T .

Proposition 3.1. *If hypothesis (\mathbf{H}_1) - (\mathbf{H}_4) hold, $\partial_t^k f|_{t=0} = 0$ for $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, s-1$, with $s \leq n_0 + 2$, then (LP) admits a smooth solution w . Moreover, there exists $\eta_0 \geq 1$ such that for $\eta \geq \eta_0$ and $T > 0$, it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s+1} \left(\eta \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|D^\alpha w|_{t=T}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha w|_{y_1=0}\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) \\ & \lesssim \frac{1}{\eta} \sum_{|\beta| \leq s} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(D^\beta w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B}(D^\beta w)|_{y_1=0}\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} g\|_{H^s(\Omega_T)}^2 \\ & + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s-1} \|D^\alpha f|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

Proof. In the proof of this proposition, $D^\ell v$ stands for the derivatives of function v of order no higher than ℓ and $|D^\ell v|^p := \sum_{|\alpha| \leq \ell} |D^\alpha v|^p$ for $p = 1, 2$. In what follows, the dependence of the operators L' and \mathcal{B} on u is omitted. For brevity, one uses the notation $\partial_{i_1 \dots i_\ell}$ to represent the partial derivative with respect to the variables $y_{i_1}, y_{i_2}, \dots, y_{i_\ell}$. Since the proof of this proposition is long, we divide it into five steps. In the first two steps, we will illustrate how to derive the energy estimate up to the second order and to show the existence and uniqueness of solutions to (LPE), which is indeed a solution to (LP), with

the aid of the property of the extension. It should be emphasized that the estimate of derivatives higher than second order cannot be derived in the half-space domain directly, due to the restriction of the regularity of the extended coefficients. Hence we are forced to establish higher order estimate in the dihedral-space domain in the remaining three steps. For this purpose, two multipliers are constructed to deal with the boundary terms (see lemma 3.2 and lemma 3.3). In the fifth step (the final step), we treat the energy estimates of even order and odd order separately, since we will meet different types of boundary conditions. The estimate in this step still relies on the multipliers constructed in lemma 3.2 and lemma 3.3. It is useful to point out the observation that both ∂_{y_0} and ∂_{y_2} are tangential to the boundaries Γ_s and Γ_w . Hence any established estimate of w can be directly applied to $\partial_{y_0} w$ and $\partial_{y_2} w$, which helps to simplify the higher order estimate.

By the Sobolev embedding theorem and assumption (\mathbf{H}_2) , one has

$$\sup_{(y_0, \mathbf{y}) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+^3} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq n_0} |D^\alpha(u - u_b)(y_0, \mathbf{y})| \leq C\delta.$$

Since $s \geq \lceil \frac{s+2}{2} \rceil$ if $s \geq 4$, we deduce that if $n_0 \geq 4$ then

$$\sup_{(y_0, \mathbf{y}) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+^3} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq \frac{n_0+2}{2}} |D^\alpha(u - u_b)(y_0, \mathbf{y})| \leq C\delta. \quad (3.3)$$

As a corollary of (3.3) and assumption (\mathbf{H}_1) , we have

$$\sup_{(y_0, \mathbf{y}) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+^3} |Dr_{ij}(y_0, \mathbf{y})| \leq C\delta. \quad (3.4)$$

Step 1: First order estimate of the solution to (LPE).

Multiplying $2e^{-2\eta t} \mathcal{Q}w$ on both sides of (LPE)₁, where $\mathcal{Q} := \sum_{\ell=0}^3 Q_\ell \partial_\ell$ will be chosen properly later. Then integrate by parts over $\tilde{\Omega}_T$ with respect to (y_0, \mathbf{y}) , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\tilde{\Omega}_T} e^{-2\eta y_0} (\mathcal{Q}wL'w + \mathcal{P}(w, Dw)) dy_0 d\mathbf{y} \\ &= \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} [e^{-2\eta y_0} H_0]_{t=0}^{t=T} d\mathbf{y} - \int_0^T e^{-2\eta y_0} H_1|_{y_1=0} dy_0 dy_2 dy_3 + 2\eta \int_{\tilde{\Omega}_T} e^{-2\eta y_0} H_0 dy_0 d\mathbf{y} \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

where

$$H_i(Dw; \mathcal{Q}) = 2 \sum_{j, \ell=0}^3 r_{ij} \partial_j w Q_\ell \partial_\ell w - Q_i \sum_{j, \ell=0}^3 r_{\ell j} \partial_\ell w \partial_j w \quad (i = 0, 1) \quad (3.6)$$

and $\mathcal{P}(w, Dw)$ is a quadratic polynomial in w and Dw with bounded coefficients. For later use, we also define H_3 by

$$H_3(Dw; \mathcal{Q}) := 2 \sum_{j, \ell=0}^3 r_{ij} \partial_j w Q_\ell \partial_\ell w - Q_3 \sum_{j, \ell=0}^3 r_{\ell j} \partial_\ell w \partial_j w. \quad (3.7)$$

It is easy to see

$$\mathcal{P} \leq C(w^2 + |Dw|^2).$$

Choosing \mathcal{Q} appropriately as

$$\mathcal{Q} = \tilde{B} + \nu(\tilde{B} - \mathcal{N}) + \left| \frac{\nu r_{01}}{\tilde{B}_0} \right| \tilde{B},$$

where $\tilde{B} = \frac{r_{11}}{b_1} \sum_{j=0}^3 b_j \partial_j - \sum_{j=0}^3 r_{j1} \partial_j$, $\mathcal{N} = -\sum_{j=0}^3 r_{j1} \partial_j$ and $\nu = \sum_{i,j=0}^3 r^{ij} \tilde{B}_i \tilde{B}_j$, where \tilde{B}_j is the coefficient in \tilde{B} in front of ∂_j . Then by simple calculation, we obtain

$$H_0(Dw) \geq C |Dw|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad -H_1(Dw) \geq C \left(|Dw|^2 + |w|^2 - |\mathcal{B}w|^2 \right). \quad (3.8)$$

In view of (3.5), (3.8), and the Cauchy inequality, one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta \|e^{-\eta t} Dw\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|Dw(T, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} Dw|_{y_1=0}\|_{L^2(\omega_T)}^2 \\ & \lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon \eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(u)w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + \varepsilon \eta \|e^{-\eta t} Dw\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} (\mathcal{B}w, w)\|_{L^2(\omega_T)}^2 \\ & \quad + \|(w, \partial_t w)|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

Set $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2C}$, then the second term on the right side is absorbed by the left hand-side term, hence we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta \|e^{-\eta t} Dw\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|Dw(T, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} Dw|_{y_1=0}\|_{L^2(\omega_T)}^2 \\ & \leq C \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(u)w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B}w\|_{L^2(\omega_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T)}^2 \right) \\ & \quad + C \|(w, \partial_t w)|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Apply (3.15) to the boundary term of w on the right hand-side of above inequality, then let η be properly large, so that $\|e^{-\eta t} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T)}^2$ be absorbed by the left hand-side terms. Then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} \left(\eta \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|D^\alpha w(T, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha w|_{y_1=0}\|_{L^2(\omega_T)}^2 \right) \\ & \leq C \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(u)w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B}w|_{y_1=0}\|_{L^2(\omega_T)}^2 + \|Dw|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

Step 2: In this step, we will establish the second order estimate and the well-posedness of (LPE). At the end of this step, we show that the unique solution to (LPE) is indeed a solution to (LP). Applying (3.10) to $\partial_{y_0} w$, $\partial_{y_2} w$ and $\partial_{y_3} w$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta \|e^{-\eta t} D \partial_{y_\ell} w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\partial_{y_\ell} w(T, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} D \partial_{y_\ell} w|_{y_1=0}\|_{L^2(\omega_T)}^2 \\ & \lesssim \frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L' \partial_{y_\ell} w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B} \partial_{y_\ell} w|_{y_1=0}\|_{L^2(\omega_T)}^2 + \|D \partial_{y_\ell} w|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

holds for $\ell = 0, 2, 3$. By (LPE)₁, one has

$$\partial_{y_1}^2 w = \frac{1}{r_{11}} \left(L'w - \sum_{(i,j) \neq (1,1)} r_{ij} \partial_{ij} w - \sum_{i=0}^2 r_i \partial_i w - rw \right). \quad (3.12)$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
& \eta \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{y_1}^2 w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\partial_{y_1}^2 w(T, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{y_1}^2 w|_{y_1=0}\|_{L^2(\omega_T)}^2 \\
& \lesssim \sum_{\ell=0,2,3} \eta \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D} \partial_{y_\ell} w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\mathbf{D} \partial_{y_\ell} w|_{t=T}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D} \partial_{y_\ell} w|_{y_1=0}\|_{L^2(\omega_T)}^2 \\
& + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} \eta \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D}^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\mathbf{D}^\alpha w|_{t=T}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D}^\alpha w|_{y_1=0}\|_{L^2(\omega_T)}^2 \\
& + \eta \|e^{-\eta t} L' w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|L' w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} L' w|_{y_1=0}\|_{L^2(\omega_T)}^2. \tag{3.13}
\end{aligned}$$

By (3.10), (3.11) and (3.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \eta \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{y_1}^2 w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\partial_{y_1}^2 w(T, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{y_1}^2 w|_{y_1=0}\|_{L^2(\omega_T)}^2 \\
& \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\mathbf{D}^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B} \mathbf{D}^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T)}^2 \right) + \sum_{\ell=0,2,3} \|\mathbf{D} \partial_{y_\ell} w|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2 \\
& + \eta \|e^{-\eta t} w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|w|_{t=T}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} w|_{y_1=0}\|_{L^2(\omega_T)}^2 \\
& + \eta \|e^{-\eta t} L' w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|L' w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} L' w|_{y_1=0}\|_{L^2(\omega_T)}^2. \tag{3.14}
\end{aligned}$$

By integration by parts with respect to t and the trace theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \eta \|e^{-\eta t} w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} w|_{y_1=0}\|_{L^2(\omega_T)}^2 \\
& \leq \frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_t w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + \|w|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2 + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D}^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2. \tag{3.15}
\end{aligned}$$

So by (3.15) and Cauchy inequality, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
& \eta \|e^{-\eta t} L' w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|L' w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} L' w|_{y_1=0}\|_{L^2(\omega_T)}^2 \\
& \lesssim \|L' w|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon \eta} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} (\|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D}^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\mathbf{D}^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2) \\
& + \varepsilon \eta \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D}^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2. \tag{3.16}
\end{aligned}$$

In light of (3.11), (3.13), (3.15) and (3.16), we obtain the estimate of $\partial_{y_1}^2 w$, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \eta \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{y_1}^2 w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\partial_{y_1}^2 w(T, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{y_1}^2 w|_{y_1=0}\|_{L^2(\omega_T)}^2 \\
& \lesssim \frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_t w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D}^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 \\
& + \|\mathbf{D} w|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2 + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\mathbf{D}^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B} \mathbf{D}^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T)}^2 \right) \\
& + \frac{1}{\varepsilon \eta} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} (\|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D}^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\mathbf{D}^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2) + \|L' w|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2 \\
& + \varepsilon \eta \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D}^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} \|\mathbf{D}^\alpha w|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2. \tag{3.17}
\end{aligned}$$

Add up (3.10), (3.11) for $\ell = 0, 2, 3$ and (3.17), then set ε and $\frac{1}{\eta}$ to be properly small, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} \eta \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D}^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\mathbf{D}^\alpha w(T, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})} + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D}^\alpha w|_{y_1=0}\|_{L^2(\omega_T)}^2 \\
& \lesssim \frac{1}{\eta} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\mathbf{D}^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + \|L'w|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B} \mathbf{D}^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T)}^2 \\
& \quad + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} \|\mathbf{D}^\alpha w|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2 \\
& \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} \frac{1}{\eta} \left(\|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D}^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D}^\alpha L'w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 \right) + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D}^\alpha g|_{y_1=0}\|_{L^2(\omega_T)}^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

Let η be properly large, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} \eta \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D}^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\mathbf{D}^\alpha w(T, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})} + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D}^\alpha w|_{y_1=0}\|_{L^2(\omega_T)}^2 \\
& \lesssim \frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} f\|_{H^1(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D}^\alpha g|_{y_1=0}\|_{L^2(\omega_T)}^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

Based on energy estimate (3.19), it is easy to obtain the existence of an $H^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)$ solution w of problem (LPE). In fact, the existence of (LPE) has been proved in [54, Theorem 3.3], when the coefficients and source terms belong to $H^s(\tilde{\Omega}_T)$ with $s > [\frac{N+1}{2}] + 1$, where N is the space dimension. Though the regularity of coefficients and source terms of (LPE) is not enough, we can still deduce the existence of (LPE). Firstly, one mollifies the coefficients and the source terms by the convolution of the classical Friedrichs mollifier ρ_ε , then by [54, Theorem 3.3], there exists a smooth solution w^ε to the regularized problem for each $\varepsilon > 0$. Thanks to our uniform $H_\eta^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)$ estimate (3.19), $\{w^\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon > 0}$ is strongly compact in $H_\eta^1(\tilde{\Omega}_T)$ and weakly compact in $H_\eta^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)$. Then passing the limit by letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ in the regularized equation, we obtain a H_η^2 -solution to the linear problem (LPE). If $f = g \equiv 0$, (3.19) implies $w \equiv 0$ in $\tilde{\Omega}_T$. This indicates that the solution to (LPE) is unique, since (LPE) is a linear problem. Due to our extension, it is easy to check that $w(y_0, y_1, y_2, -y_3)$ is also a solution to (LPE). By the uniqueness, we have $w(y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3) = w(y_0, y_1, y_2, -y_3)$ for all $(y_0, \mathbf{y}) \in \tilde{\Omega}_T$. Differentiating with respect to y_3 on both sides of this equality and letting $y_3 = 0$, one has

$$\partial_{y_3} w|_{y_3=0} = -\partial_{y_3} w|_{y_3=0},$$

which implies $\partial_{y_3} w|_{y_3=0} = 0$. From (3.19) and the trace theorem, we know $\partial_{y_3} w$ is a L^2 function on $\{y_3 = 0\}$, so above process makes sense. Therefore, we conclude that the unique solution to (LPE) is indeed the unique solution to (LP).

Step 3: In the remaining steps, we will improve the regularity of the unique solution by deriving higher order estimate in the dihedral-space domain. In this step, we will consider the third order estimate. Since both ∂_{y_0} and ∂_{y_2} are tangential to both the solid wall Γ_w and shock front Γ_s and all the coefficients are smooth in the directions of y_0 and y_2 . We

can apply the first inequality of (3.18) to $\partial_{y_0}w$ and $\partial_{y_2}w$ respectively, to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D}^\alpha \partial_{y_i} w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\mathbf{D}^\alpha \partial_{y_i} w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D}^\alpha \partial_{y_i} w|_{y_1=0}\|_{L^2(\omega_T)}^2 \\ & \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\mathbf{D}^\alpha \partial_{y_i} w)\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B} \mathbf{D}^\alpha \partial_{y_i} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T)}^2 \right) \\ & \quad + \|\mathbf{D}f|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

for $i = 0, 2$. Here we use the fact that $\sum_{|\alpha| \leq 3} \|\mathbf{D}^\alpha w|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2 \lesssim \sum_{j=0}^1 \|\mathbf{D}f|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2$, which comes from the equation and the initial data. In the coming steps, the estimate we obtained in each step will be applied to $\partial_{y_0}w$ and $\partial_{y_2}w$ in the next step, because of the same reason as stated above. To control all other derivatives of third order, we need to estimate derivatives in the form of $\partial_{y_1}^{k_1} \partial_{y_2}^{k_2} w$ with $k_1 + k_2 = 3$. Due to the limit of the regularity of the extended coefficients, we cannot obtain higher order estimate in $\tilde{\Omega}_T$ directly. In the following steps, all estimates are restricted to the cornered time spatial domain Ω_T . Before going on, we present the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *Let H_m be defined as in (3.6) and (3.7). For any given r_{ij} satisfying assumptions (\mathbf{H}_1) - (\mathbf{H}_4) , we can find a multiplier $\mathcal{Q}^d = \sum_{i=0}^3 Q_i^d$ such that*

$$H_0(\mathbf{D}w; \mathcal{Q}^d) \geq C_1 |\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} w|^2 - C_2 |\partial_{y_0} w|^2, \quad (3.21)$$

$$-H_1(\mathbf{D}w; \mathcal{Q}^d) \geq C_1 |\partial_{y_1} w|^2 - C_2 (|\partial_{y_0} w|^2 + |\partial_{y_2} w|^2 + |\partial_{y_3} w|^2), \quad (3.22)$$

where $\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} := (\partial_{y_1}, \partial_{y_2}, \partial_{y_3})$. Moreover, if $w = 0$ on $\{y_3 = 0\}$, then

$$-H_3(\mathbf{D}w; \mathcal{Q}^d) \geq C |\partial_{y_3} w|^2 \quad \text{on } \{y_3 = 0\}. \quad (3.23)$$

Proof. It is convenient to denote $\partial_{y_i} w$ by ξ_i for $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$. At the background solution, by simple calculation, one has

$$\begin{aligned} -H_1(\mathbf{D}w; \mathcal{Q}^d) &= (-2r_{10}Q_0^d + r_{00}Q_1^d)\xi_0^2 + Q_1^d(-r_{11}\xi_1^2 + r_{22}\xi_2^2 + r_{33}\xi_3^2) \\ &\quad - 2r_{11}Q_0^d\xi_0\xi_1 - 2r_{10}\xi_0\xi_2 + 2Q_3^d r_{10}\xi_0\xi_3 - 2r_{11}Q_2^d\xi_1\xi_2 \\ &\quad - 2r_{11}Q_3^d\xi_1\xi_3. \end{aligned} \quad (3.24)$$

Choosing Q_1^d such that $-Q_1^d r_{11} > 0$, then (3.22) follows easily. At the background solution u_b , we know $r_{11} = -\frac{c_+^2}{(q_- - q_+)^2} < 0$. So one just needs to let $Q_1^d > 0$. For $H_0(\mathbf{D}w; \mathcal{Q}^d)$, at the background solution one has

$$\begin{aligned} H_0(\mathbf{D}w; \mathcal{Q}^d) &= 2r_{10}\xi_1(Q_0^d\xi_0 + Q_1^d\xi_1 + Q_2^d\xi_2 + Q_3^d\xi_3) \\ &\quad - Q_0^d(r_{00}\xi_0^2 + r_{11}\xi_1^2 + r_{22}\xi_2^2 + r_{33}\xi_3^2 + 2r_{10}\xi_0\xi_1). \end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$

If we can let the coefficient before ξ_1^2 be positive, then (3.22) follows immediately. In fact, it suffices to let $2r_{10}Q_1^d - Q_0^d r_{11} > 0$. Since Q_1^d has been set to be positive, $r_{10} > 0$, and $r_{11} < 0$ at the background solution, it is sufficient to let Q_0^d be positive. At the background solution, one has

$$-H_3(\mathbf{D}w; \mathcal{Q}^d) = -r_{33}Q_3^d\xi_3^2. \quad (3.26)$$

Hence (3.23) follows if we let $Q_3^d > 0$, since $r_{33} < 0$ at the background solution. \square

Armed with lemma 3.2, we can obtain the first order estimate of $\partial_{y_1 y_3} w$. In fact, $\partial_{y_1 y_3} w$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} L'(\partial_{y_1 y_3} w) = \partial_{y_1 y_3} f - [\partial_{y_1 y_3}, L']w & \text{in } \Omega_T, \\ \partial_{y_1 y_3} w = 0, & \text{on } \omega_T^r, \\ \partial_{y_1 y_3} w = \Lambda, & \text{on } \omega_T^\ell, \\ (\partial_{y_0}(\partial_{y_1 y_3} w), \partial_{y_1 y_3} w) = (0, 0) & \text{on } \Gamma_{in}. \end{cases} \quad (3.27)$$

where

$$\Lambda = \frac{1}{b_1} (\mathcal{B}(\partial_{y_3} w) - b_0 \partial_{y_0 y_3} w - b_2 \partial_{y_2 y_3} w - b_3 \partial_{y_3 y_3} w - b \partial_{y_3} w). \quad (3.28)$$

Problem (3.27) is an initial boundary value problem in a dihedral space-domain with two Dirichlet boundary conditions. Multiplying (3.27)₁ by $2e^{-2\eta t} Q^d(\partial_{y_1 y_3} w)$, where Q^d is given in lemma 3.2. Then integrating on both sides with respect to (y_0, \mathbf{y}) over Ω_T and by using Cauchy inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta \int_{\Omega_T} e^{-2\eta t} H_0 dy_0 d\mathbf{y} + e^{-2\eta T} \int_{\Omega} H_0|_{t=T} d\mathbf{y} - \int_{\omega_T^\ell} e^{-2\eta t} H_1 dy_0 d\mathbf{y} - \int_{\omega_T^r} e^{-2\eta t} H_3 dy_0 d\mathbf{y} \\ & \lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon \eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{y_1 y_3} w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + (\varepsilon \eta + 1) \|e^{-\eta t} D \partial_{y_1 y_3} w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.29)$$

By lemma 3.2, one knows that

$$-H_3 \geq C |\partial_{y_3}(\partial_{y_1 y_3} w)|^2, \quad (3.30)$$

$$-H_1 \geq C_1 |\partial_{y_1}(\partial_{y_1 y_3} w)|^2 - C_2 (|\partial_{y_0} \Lambda|^2 + |\partial_{y_2} \Lambda|^2 + |\partial_{y_3} \Lambda|^2), \quad (3.31)$$

$$H_0 \geq C_1 |\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \partial_{y_1 y_3} w|^2 - C_2 |\partial_{y_0}(\partial_{y_1 y_3} w)|^2. \quad (3.32)$$

From (3.29)-(3.32) and letting ε be properly small, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta \|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \partial_{13} w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \partial_{13} w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{113} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{313} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^r)}^2 \\ & \lesssim \frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{13} w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \eta \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_0 \partial_{13} w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\partial_0 \partial_{13} w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ & \quad + \|e^{-\eta t} (\partial_{y_0} \Lambda, \partial_{y_2} \Lambda, \partial_{y_3} \Lambda)\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

From (3.28), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\partial_{y_0} \Lambda| + |\partial_{y_2} \Lambda| + |\partial_{y_3} \Lambda| \\ & \lesssim \sum_{j \neq 1} |\mathcal{B} \partial_{3j} w| + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} (|D^\alpha \partial_{y_0} w| + |D^\alpha w|) \\ & \quad + \|b_2\|_{L^\infty} (|\partial_{223} w| + |\partial_{233} w|) + \|b_3\|_{L^\infty} |\partial_{333} w|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.34)$$

Combining (3.19), (3.33) and (3.34) and the second order estimate, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta \|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \partial_{13} w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \partial_{13} w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{113} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{313} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^r)}^2 \\ & \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(D^\alpha \partial_{y_0} w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B} D^\alpha \partial_{y_0} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{1}{\eta} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(D^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B}D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{13} w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 \\
& + \|b_2\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_T)}^2 \cdot \|(e^{-\eta t} \partial_{223} w, e^{-\eta t} \partial_{233} w)\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \sum_{|j \neq 1|} \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B} \partial_{3j} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\
& + \|b_3\|_{L^\infty(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \cdot \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{333} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \|Df|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2 \\
\lesssim & \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(D^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B}D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) \\
& + \|b_2\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_T)}^2 \cdot (\|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{223} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{233} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2) \\
& + \|b_3\|_{L^\infty(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \cdot \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{333} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \|Df|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2. \tag{3.35}
\end{aligned}$$

But (3.34) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{213} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{313} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\
& \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(D^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B}D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) \\
& + \|b_2\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_T)}^2 \cdot (\|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{223} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{233} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2) \\
& + \|b_3\|_{L^\infty(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \cdot \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{333} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \|Df|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2. \tag{3.36}
\end{aligned}$$

Then the sum of (3.35) and (3.36) indicates that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \eta \|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \partial_{13} w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \partial_{13} w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \partial_{13} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{313} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\
& \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(D^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B}D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) \\
& + \|b_2\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_T)}^2 \cdot (\|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{223} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{233} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2) \\
& + \|b_3\|_{L^\infty(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \cdot \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{333} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \|Df|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2. \tag{3.37}
\end{aligned}$$

By (\mathbf{H}_2) and (\mathbf{H}_3) , we know that $\|b_2\|_{L^\infty}$ and $\|b_3\|_{L^\infty}$ are small, provided the δ in (\mathbf{H}_3) is set to be sufficiently small. It will be shown later that the third order derivatives on the right hand-side of (3.37) can be absorbed by the left hand-side terms.

Armed with the second order estimate of $\partial_{y_0} w$ and $\partial_{y_2} w$ and the estimate of $\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \partial_{13} w$, one can deduce the estimate of other third order derivatives. It is easy to see

$$\partial_{111} w = \frac{1}{r_{11}} \left(L'(\partial_{y_1} w) - \sum_{(i,j) \neq (1,1)} r_{ij} \partial_{ij} \partial_{y_1} w - \sum_{j=0}^3 r_j \partial_j \partial_{y_1} w - r \partial_{y_1} w \right). \tag{3.38}$$

Hence one has

$$|\partial_{111} w| \lesssim |L'(\partial_{y_1} w)| + |\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \partial_{13} w| + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} (|D^\alpha \partial_{y_0} w| + |D^\alpha \partial_{y_2} w| + |D^\alpha w|). \tag{3.39}$$

This leads to the estimate of $\partial_{111}w$ in terms of the controlled terms on the right hand-side of (3.38). In fact, one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{111}w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\partial_{111}w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{111}w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\ & \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(D^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B}D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) \\ & \quad + \|b_2\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_T)}^2 \cdot (\|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{223}w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{233}w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2) \\ & \quad + \|b_3\|_{L^\infty(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \cdot \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{333}w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \|Df|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.40)$$

For $\partial_{333}w$, we have

$$\partial_{333}w = \frac{1}{r_{33}} \left(L'(\partial_{y_3}w) - \sum_{(i,j) \neq (3,3)} r_{ij} \partial_{ij} \partial_{y_3}w - \sum_{j=0}^3 r_j \partial_j \partial_{y_3}w - r \partial_{y_3}w \right). \quad (3.41)$$

It is clear that $\partial_{333}w$ is the finite combination of $D^2\partial_{y_0}w$, $D^2\partial_{y_2}w$, $\nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\partial_{13}w$ and lower order terms, whose estimate has been established. Hence we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{333}w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\partial_{333}w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{333}w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\ & \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(D^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B}D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) \\ & \quad + \|b_2\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_T)}^2 \cdot (\|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{223}w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{233}w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2) \\ & \quad + \|b_3\|_{L^\infty(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \cdot \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{333}w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \|Df|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.42)$$

It is easy to see that $D^2\partial_{y_0}w$, $D^2\partial_{y_2}w$, $\nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\partial_{13}w$, $\partial_{111}w$, and $\partial_{333}w$ cover all third order derivatives of w . Thus by adding (3.20) for $i = 0, 2$, (3.37), (3.38) and (3.42) together, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 3} \eta \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\ & \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(D^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B}D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) \\ & \quad + \|b_2\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_T)}^2 \cdot (\|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{223}w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{233}w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2) \\ & \quad + \|b_3\|_{L^\infty(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \cdot \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{333}w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \|Df|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.43)$$

As stated before, let the δ in (\mathbf{H}_3) be properly small, such that the boundary integrals on ω_T^ℓ on the right hand-side of (3.43) be absorbed by the left hand-side terms. Then we conclude the third order estimate as follows

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 3} \eta \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\ & \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(D^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B}D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) + \|Df|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.44)$$

Step 4: In this step, we will establish the fourth order estimate in the dihedral-space domain. Applying (3.43) to functions $\partial_{y_0}w$ and $\partial_{y_2}w$, respectively, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=0,2} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 3} \eta \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D}^\alpha \partial_{y_i} w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\mathbf{D}^\alpha \partial_{y_i} w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D}^\alpha \partial_{y_i} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\ & \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 3} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\mathbf{D}^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B} \mathbf{D}^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) + \|\mathbf{D}^2 f|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.45)$$

Before going on, we first prove the following lemma, which is crucial to the fourth order estimate.

Lemma 3.3. *Let H_m be defined as in (3.6) and (3.7). For any given r_{ij} satisfying assumptions (\mathbf{H}_1) - (\mathbf{H}_4) , we can find a multiplier $\mathcal{Q}^e = \sum_{i=0}^3 Q_i^e$ such that*

$$H_0(\mathbf{D}w; \mathcal{Q}^e) \geq C_1 |\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} w|^2 - C_2 |\partial_{y_0} w|^2, \quad (3.46)$$

$$-H_1(\mathbf{D}w; \mathcal{Q}^e) \geq C_1 |\partial_{y_3} w|^2 - C_2 (|\partial_{y_0} w|^2 + |\partial_{y_1} w|^2 + |\partial_{y_2} w|^2), \quad (3.47)$$

where $\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} := (\partial_{y_1}, \partial_{y_2}, \partial_{y_3})$. Moreover, if $w = 0$ on $\{y_2 = 0\}$, then

$$-H_3(\mathbf{D}w; \mathcal{Q}^e) \geq C |\partial_{y_3} w|^2 \quad \text{on } \{y_3 = 0\}. \quad (3.48)$$

Proof. For the ease of presentation, in the proof of this lemma, denote $\mathbf{D}w$ by $(\xi_0, \xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3)$. Then at the background solution u_b , we have

$$\begin{aligned} -H_1(\mathbf{D}w; \mathcal{Q}^e) &= (-2r_{10}Q_0^e + r_{00}Q_1^e)\xi_0^2 + Q_1^e(-r_{11}\xi_1^2 + r_{22}\xi_2^2 + r_{33}\xi_3^2) \\ &\quad - 2r_{11}Q_0^e\xi_0\xi_1 - 2r_{10}Q_2^e\xi_0\xi_2 + 2r_{10}Q_3^e\xi_0\xi_3 - 2r_{11}Q_2^e\xi_1\xi_2 \\ &\quad - 2r_{11}Q_3^e\xi_1\xi_3. \end{aligned} \quad (3.49)$$

Choose Q_1^e such that

$$r_{33}Q_1^e > 0, \quad (3.50)$$

then (3.47) follows easily. We know that $r_{33} = -\frac{c_+^2}{(q_- - q_+)^2} < 0$ at the background solution u_b . So we just need to let

$$Q_1^e < 0. \quad (3.51)$$

Next, since at the background solution, we have

$$-H_3(\mathbf{D}w; \mathcal{Q}^e) = -r_{33}Q_3^e |\partial_{y_3} w|^2, \quad (3.52)$$

(3.48) follows if we let $Q_3^e > 0$. Finally, for (3.46), at the background solution u_b , we know

$$\begin{aligned} H_0(\mathbf{D}w; \mathcal{Q}^e) &= 2r_{10}\xi_1(Q_0^e\xi_0 + Q_1^e\xi_1 + Q_2^e\xi_2 + Q_3^e\xi_3) \\ &\quad - Q_0^e(r_{00}\xi_0^2 + r_{11}\xi_1^2 + r_{22}\xi_2^2 + r_{33}\xi_3^2 + 2r_{10}\xi_0\xi_1) \\ &= (2r_{10}Q_1^e - r_{11}Q_0^e)\xi_1^2 - Q_0^e(r_{22}\xi_2^2 + r_{33}\xi_3^2) \\ &\quad + 2r_{10}\xi_1(Q_0^e\xi_0 + Q_2^e\xi_2 + Q_3^e\xi_3) - Q_0^e(r_{00}\xi_0^2 + 2r_{10}\xi_0\xi_1) \\ &\geq (2r_{10}Q_1^e - r_{11}Q_0^e - r_{10}|Q_2^e| - r_{10}Q_3^e)\xi_1^2 + (-Q_0^er_{22} - r_{10}|Q_2^e|)\xi_2^2 \\ &\quad + (-Q_0^er_{33} - r_{10}Q_3^e)\xi_3^2 - Q_0^er_{00}\xi_0^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.53)$$

Because r_{11} , r_{22} and r_{33} are negative, we may let

$$Q_0^e > \max \left\{ \frac{-2r_{10}Q_1^e + r_{10}|Q_2^e| + r_{10}Q_3^e}{-r_{11}}, \frac{r_{10}|Q_2^e|}{-r_{22}}, \frac{r_{10}Q_3^e}{-r_{33}} \right\} > 0, \quad (3.54)$$

then (3.46) follows. \square

With the help of this lemma, we are able to derive the first order estimate of $\partial_{113}w$. Firstly we notice that $\partial_{113}w$ satisfies

$$L'(\partial_{113}w) = \partial_{113}f - [\partial_{113}, L']w \quad \text{in } \Omega_T, \quad (3.55)$$

$$\partial_{113}w = 0 \quad \text{on } \omega^r, \quad (3.56)$$

$$(\partial_{113}w, \partial_{y_0}(\partial_{113}w)) = (0, 0) \quad \text{on } \Gamma_{in}. \quad (3.57)$$

Next we need to deduce the boundary condition that $\partial_{113}w$ satisfies on the vertical boundary ω^ℓ . Let

$$L_2 = 2r_{12}\partial_{12} + r_{22}\partial_{22} + 2r_{23}\partial_{32},$$

$$L_1 = r_{11}\partial_{11} + 2r_{13}\partial_{13} + r_{33}\partial_{33},$$

$$L_0 = L' - L_1 - L_2.$$

So we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (r_{11}\partial_{y_1}\partial_{113} + 2r_{13}\partial_{y_3}\partial_{113})w \\ &= L_1\partial_{13}w - r_{33}\partial_{1333}w \\ &= (L' - L_0 - L_2)(\partial_{13}w) - r_{33}\partial_{1333}w. \end{aligned} \quad (3.58)$$

For the terms on the right hand-side of above equality, only $r_{33}\partial_{1333}w$ has not been controlled yet. Indeed, $L'(\partial_{13}w)$ is what we need in the estimate and $L_0(\partial_{13}w)$ and $L_2(\partial_{13}w)$ have been controlled by (3.45). But by the boundary condition of w on ω^ℓ , we notice that

$$\partial_{1333}w = \frac{1}{b_1}(\mathcal{B}(\partial_{333}w) - b_0\partial_{y_0}\partial_{333}w - b_2\partial_{y_2}\partial_{333}w - b_3\partial_{y_3}\partial_{333}w).$$

Therefore we deduce that

$$|\partial_{1333}w| \lesssim |\mathcal{B}(\partial_{333}w)| + |D^3\partial_{y_0}w| + |D^3\partial_{y_2}w| + \|b_3\|_{L^\infty} \cdot |\partial_{3333}w|. \quad (3.59)$$

On the right hand-side of (3.59), the first term is what we need, the second and the third terms are controlled by (3.45). For the last term, by (\mathbf{H}_2) and (\mathbf{H}_3) , we know that $\|b_3\|_{L^\infty}$ is small, provided the δ in (\mathbf{H}_3) is appropriately small. Hence it can be absorbed by the left hand-side of the estimate coming later, which will cover all fourth order derivatives. On the boundary ω^ℓ , combining (3.58) and (3.59), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_{1113}w| &\lesssim |L'(\partial_{13}w)| + |\mathcal{B}(\partial_{333}w)| + |D^3\partial_{y_0}w| + |D^3\partial_{y_2}w| \\ &\quad + \|b_3\|_{L^\infty} \cdot |\partial_{3333}w| + \|r_{13}\|_{L^\infty} \cdot |\partial_{1133}w|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.60)$$

Multiplying $2e^{-2nt}Q^e(\partial_{113}w)$, where Q^e is given in lemma 3.3, on both sides of (3.55), integration by parts over Ω_T and by the use of Cauchy inequality, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2\eta \int_{\Omega_T} e^{-2\eta t} H_0(\mathbf{D}\partial_{113}w; \mathcal{Q}^e) d\mathbf{y}dy_0 + e^{-2\eta T} \int_{\Omega} e^{-2\eta t} H_0(\mathbf{D}\partial_{113}w; \mathcal{Q}^e) d\mathbf{y}|_{t=T} \\
& - \int_{\omega_T^\ell} e^{-2\eta t} H_1(\mathbf{D}\partial_{113}w; \mathcal{Q}^e) d\mathbf{y}dy_0 - \int_{\omega_T^r} e^{-2\eta t} H_3(\mathbf{D}\partial_{113}w; \mathcal{Q}^e) d\mathbf{y}dy_0 \\
& \lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{113}w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + (\varepsilon_1\eta + 1) \|\mathbf{D}\partial_{113}w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 \\
& + \int_{\Omega} H_0(\mathbf{D}\partial_{113}w; \mathcal{Q}^e) d\mathbf{y}|_{t=0}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.61}$$

By (3.46), (3.47) and (3.48) together with the fact

$$H_0(\mathbf{D}\partial_{113}w; \mathcal{Q}^e) \lesssim |\mathbf{D}\partial_{113}w|^2,$$

we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \eta \|e^{-\eta t} \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \partial_{113}w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \partial_{113}w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{y_3} \partial_{113}w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\
& + \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{y_3} \partial_{113}w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^r)}^2 \\
& \lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{113}w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + (\varepsilon_1\eta + 1) \|\mathbf{D}\partial_{113}w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 \\
& + \eta \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{y_0} \partial_{113}w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\partial_{y_0} \partial_{113}w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
& + \sum_{i=0}^2 \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{y_i} \partial_{113}w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \|\mathbf{D}^2 f|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.62}$$

Recalling (3.45) and (3.60), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \eta \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D}\partial_{113}w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\mathbf{D}\partial_{113}w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D}\partial_{113}w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\
& + \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{y_3} \partial_{113}w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^r)}^2 \\
& \lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{113}w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + (\varepsilon_1\eta + 1) \|\mathbf{D}\partial_{113}w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 \\
& + \sum_{|\alpha|\leq 3} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\mathbf{D}^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B}\mathbf{D}^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) \\
& + \|b_3\|_{L^\infty}^2 \cdot \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{3333}w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \|r_{13}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \cdot \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{1133}w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\
& + \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{13}w)\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \|\mathbf{D}^2 f|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.63}$$

With (3.45) and (3.63) in hand, we can deduce the estimate of the left derivatives of fourth order, i.e., $\partial_{1111}w$, $\partial_{3333}w$ and $\partial_{1333}w$. It is clear that

$$\partial_{1111}w = \frac{1}{r_{11}} ((L' - L_0 - L_2)\partial_{11}w - 2r_{13}\partial_{1113}w - r_{33}\partial_{1133}w). \tag{3.64}$$

Hence one has

$$\begin{aligned}
& \eta \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{1111}w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\partial_{1111}w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{1111}w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\
& \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha|\leq 3} \left(\eta \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D}^\alpha \partial_{y_0} w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\mathbf{D}^\alpha \partial_{y_0} w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D}^\alpha \partial_{y_0} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 3} \left(\eta \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha \partial_{y_2} w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|D^\alpha \partial_{y_2} w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha \partial_{y_2} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) \\
& + \eta \|e^{-\eta t} D \partial_{113} w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|D \partial_{113} w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} D \partial_{113} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\
& + \eta \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{11} w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|L'(\partial_{11} w)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{11} w)\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2. \quad (3.65)
\end{aligned}$$

For $\partial_{3333} w$ and $\partial_{1333} w$, it is easy to check that

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_{1333} w &= \frac{1}{r_{33}} \left((L' - L_0 - L_2) \partial_{13} w - r_{11} \partial_{1113} w - 2r_{13} \partial_{1133} w \right), \\
\partial_{3333} w &= \frac{1}{r_{33}} \left((L' - L_0 - L_2) \partial_{33} w - 2r_{13} \partial_{1333} w - r_{11} \partial_{1133} w \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus both $\partial_{3333} w$ and $\partial_{1333} w$ can be controlled by estimated terms. In fact, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1,3} \left(\eta \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{i333} w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\partial_{i333} w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{i333} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) \\
& \lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1 \eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{113} w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + (\varepsilon_1 \eta + 1) \|D \partial_{113} w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|D^2 f|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
& + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 3} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(D^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B} D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) + \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{13} w)\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\
& + \|b_3\|_{L^\infty}^2 \cdot \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{3333} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \|r_{13}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \cdot \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{1133} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\
& + \eta \|e^{-\eta t} D \partial_{113} w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|D \partial_{113} w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} D \partial_{113} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\
& + \sum_{i=1,3} \left(\eta \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{1i} w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|L'(\partial_{1i} w)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{1i} w)\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) \\
& + \eta \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{33} w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|L'(\partial_{33} w)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{33} w)\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2. \quad (3.66)
\end{aligned}$$

It is not difficult to see that $D^3 \partial_{y_0} w$, $D^3 \partial_{y_2} w$, $D \partial_{113} w$, $\partial_{1111} w$, $\partial_{1333} w$ and $\partial_{3333} w$ cover all derivatives of fourth order of w . We add (3.45), (3.63), (3.65) and (3.66) up, let the ε_1 in (3.63) and δ be properly small and let η be properly large, such that the terms with smallness be absorbed by the corresponding left hand-side terms. Then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 4} \eta \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\
& \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 3} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(D^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B} D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) + \|D^2 f|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
& + \eta \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{11} w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|L'(\partial_{11} w)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{11} w)\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\
& + \eta \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{13} w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|L'(\partial_{13} w)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{13} w)\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\
& + \eta \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{33} w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|L'(\partial_{33} w)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{33} w)\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2. \quad (3.67)
\end{aligned}$$

Exploiting integration by parts to $\int_{\Omega_T} e^{-2\eta t} \xi^2 dy dy_0$ with respect to t , we can derive following inequality

$$\eta \int_{\Omega_T} e^{-2\eta t} |\xi|^2 dy dy_0 + e^{-2\eta T} \int_{\Omega} |\xi|^2 dy \leq \frac{1}{\eta} \int_{\Omega_T} e^{-2\eta t} |\partial_t \xi|^2 dy dy_0 + \int_{\Omega} |\xi(0)|^2 dy. \quad (3.68)$$

Hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \eta \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{ij} w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|L'(\partial_{ij} w)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
& \leq \frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_t L'(\partial_{ij} w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|L'(\partial_{ij} w)|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
& \lesssim \frac{1}{\eta} \left(\sum_{|\alpha| \leq 4} \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_t \partial_{ij} w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 \right) + \|D^2 f|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \quad (3.69)
\end{aligned}$$

By Gauss theorem, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{ij} w)\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\
& = \int_{\Omega_T} -\partial_{y_1} (e^{-2\eta t} |L'(\partial_{ij} w)|^2) dy dy_0 \\
& \leq \int_{\Omega_T} e^{-2\eta t} 2|L'(\partial_{ij} w)| \cdot |\partial_{y_1} L'(\partial_{ij} w)| dy dy_0 \\
& \leq \int_{\Omega_T} e^{-2\eta t} \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon \eta} |\partial_{y_1} L'(\partial_{ij} w)|^2 + \varepsilon \eta |L'(\partial_{ij} w)|^2 \right) dy dy_0 \\
& \leq \int_{\Omega_T} e^{-2\eta t} \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon \eta} \left(2|[\partial_{y_1}, L'] \partial_{ij} w|^2 + 2|L'(\partial_{y_1} \partial_{ij} w)|^2 \right) + \varepsilon \eta |L'(\partial_{ij} w)|^2 \right) dy dy_0 \\
& \lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon \eta} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 3} \left(\|e^{-\eta t} D D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} L'(D^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 \right) \\
& \quad + \varepsilon \eta \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 4} \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2. \quad (3.70)
\end{aligned}$$

Substitute (3.69) and (3.70) into (3.67), let the ε in (3.70) be properly small and then let η be appropriately large, we conclude the fourth order estimate as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 4} \eta \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\
& \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 3} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(D^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B} D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) + \|D^2 f|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \quad (3.71)
\end{aligned}$$

Step 5: Higher order estimate. In this step we will prove higher order estimate by the induction method. Assume the estimate of $2k$ -th order has been established, i.e., we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k} \eta \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\
& \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k-1} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(D^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B} D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) + \|D^{2k-2} f|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \quad (3.72)
\end{aligned}$$

Then one proceeds to establish the estimate of $(2k+1)$ -th order and $(2k+2)$ -th order on the basis of the estimate of $(2k)$ -th order. In what follows, we deal with the estimate of $(2k)$ -th order first. Since both ∂_{y_0} and ∂_{y_2} are tangential to the boundaries Γ_s and Γ_w , the

application of (3.72) to $\partial_{y_0}w$ and $\partial_{y_2}w$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=0,2} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k} \eta \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha \partial_{y_i} w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|D^\alpha \partial_{y_i} w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha \partial_{y_i} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\ & \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(D^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B} D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) \\ & \quad + \|D^{2k-2} f|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.73)$$

Analogous to the estimate of third order, one tries to derive the first order estimate of $\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1} \partial_{y_3} w$. It is clear that

$$L'(\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1} \partial_{y_3} w) = \partial_{y_1}^{2k-1} \partial_{y_3} f - [\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1} \partial_{y_3}, L']w \quad \text{in } \Omega_T, \quad (3.74)$$

$$\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1} \partial_{y_3} w = 0 \quad \text{on } \omega^r, \quad (3.75)$$

$$(\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1} \partial_{y_3} w, \partial_{y_0}(\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1} \partial_{y_3} w)) = (0, 0) \quad \text{on } \Gamma_{in}. \quad (3.76)$$

Next we need to deduce the boundary condition on ω^ℓ for $\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1} \partial_{y_3} w$. It is not difficult to check that

$$\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1} \partial_{y_3} w = (L' - L_0 - L_2 - 2r_{13}\partial_{13} - r_{33}\partial_{33})\partial_{y_1}^{2k-3} \partial_{y_3} w. \quad (3.77)$$

It follows from (3.77) that

$$\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1} \partial_{y_3} w = \Lambda_1 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_s. \quad (3.78)$$

Moreover, from (3.77), one has

$$\begin{aligned} & |\partial_{y_0} \Lambda_1| + |\partial_{y_2} \Lambda_1| + |\partial_{y_3} \Lambda_1| \\ & \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k} (|D^\alpha \partial_{y_0} w| + |D^\alpha w| + |D^\alpha \partial_{y_2} w|) + \delta |D^{2k+1} w| \\ & \quad + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k-1} |L'(D^\alpha w)| + \left| \partial_{y_1}^{2k-3} \partial_{y_3}^4 w \right|, \end{aligned} \quad (3.79)$$

where the δ before $|D^{2k+1} w|$ comes from the smallness of r_{13} due to (\mathbf{H}_1) and (\mathbf{H}_3) . So we have to estimate $|\partial_{y_1}^{2k-3} \partial_{y_3}^4 w|$. We already know $\mathcal{B}w = g$ on ω^ℓ , then it is easy to verify that

$$\partial_{y_1} \partial_{y_3}^{2k} w = \frac{1}{b_1} (\mathcal{B} \partial_{y_3}^{2k} w - (b_0 \partial_{y_0} + b_2 \partial_{y_2} + b_3 \partial_{y_3} + b) \partial_{y_3}^{2k} w). \quad (3.80)$$

Remembering that $\partial_{y_0} \partial_{y_3}^{2k} w$, $\partial_{y_2} \partial_{y_3}^{2k} w$ and $\partial_{y_3}^{2k} w$ have been controlled by (3.73) and $\|b_3\|_{L^\infty}$ is close to zero, so $\partial_{y_1} \partial_{y_3}^{2k} w$ can be regarded as known function on ω^ℓ . Furthermore, from (3.80), we have

$$\left| \partial_{y_1} \partial_{y_3}^{2k} w \right| \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k} (|D^\alpha \partial_{y_0} w| + |D^\alpha w| + |D^\alpha \partial_{y_2} w| + |\mathcal{B}(D^\alpha w)|) + \delta |D^{2k+1} w|. \quad (3.81)$$

It is easy to check that

$$\partial_{y_1}^{2k-2j-1} \partial_{y_3}^{2j+2} w = \frac{1}{r_{33}} (L' - L_0 - L_2 - 2r_{13}\partial_{13} - r_{11}\partial_{11}) \partial_{y_1}^{2k-2j-1} \partial_{y_3}^{2j} w. \quad (3.82)$$

For the ease of presentation, let

$$\beta_j := \partial_{y_1}^{2k-2j+1} \partial_{y_3}^{2j} w, \quad (3.83)$$

$$A_j := (L' - L_0 - L_2 - 2r_{13}\partial_{13}) \partial_{y_1}^{2k-2j-1} \partial_{y_3}^{2j} w \quad (3.84)$$

for $j = 2, 3, \dots, k$. Then it is clear that

$$|A_j| \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k} (|D^\alpha \partial_{y_0} w| + |D^\alpha w| + |D^\alpha \partial_{y_2} w|) + \delta |D^{2k+1} w| + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k-1} |L'(D^\alpha w)|. \quad (3.85)$$

From (3.82)-(3.84), we obtain

$$\beta_{j+1} = \frac{1}{r_{33}} (A_j - r_{11} \beta_j), \quad (3.86)$$

which implies

$$\beta_j = \frac{A_j - r_{33} \beta_{j+1}}{r_{11}}. \quad (3.87)$$

Gathering (3.81), (3.84), and (3.87), one derives a sequence $\{\beta_j\}_{j=2}^k$ that satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \beta_k \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k} (|D^\alpha \partial_{y_0} w| + |D^\alpha w| + |\mathcal{B}(D^\alpha w)| + |D^\alpha \partial_{y_2} w|) + \delta |D^{2k+1} w|, \\ \beta_j = \frac{A_j - r_{33} \beta_{j+1}}{r_{11}}, \quad j = k-1, k-2, \dots, 3, 2. \\ |A_j| \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k} (|D^\alpha \partial_{y_0} w| + |D^\alpha w| + \delta |D^{2k+1} w|) + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k-1} |L'(D^\alpha w)|. \end{cases} \quad (3.88)$$

For $j = 2, 3, \dots, k$, we claim that β_j satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} |\beta_j| &\lesssim \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k} (|D^\alpha \partial_{y_0} w| + |D^\alpha w| + |\mathcal{B}(D^\alpha w)| + |D^\alpha \partial_{y_2} w|) \\ &\quad + \delta |D^{2k+1} w| + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k-1} |L'(D^\alpha w)|, \end{aligned} \quad (3.89)$$

and hence so does $\partial_{y_1}^{2k-3} \partial_{y_3}^4 w := \beta_2$. Indeed, from (3.81) it is clear to see that β_k satisfies (3.89). Assume β_ℓ satisfies (3.89) for some $\ell \leq k$, then by (3.85) and (3.88)₂, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\beta_{\ell-1}| &\lesssim |A_{\ell-1}| + |\beta_\ell| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k} (|D^\alpha \partial_{y_0} w| + |D^\alpha w| + |\mathcal{B}(D^\alpha w)| + |D^\alpha \partial_{y_2} w|) \\ &\quad + \delta |D^{2k+1} w| + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k-1} |L'(D^\alpha w)|, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $\beta_{\ell-1}$ also satisfies (3.89). Hence our claim holds. Therefore one can deduce from (3.79) that

$$\begin{aligned} &|(\partial_{y_0} \Lambda_1 + \partial_{y_2} \Lambda_1 + \partial_{y_3} \Lambda_1)| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k} (|D^\alpha \partial_{y_0} w| + |D^\alpha w| + |\mathcal{B}(D^\alpha w)| + \delta |D^{2k+1} w|) \\ &\quad + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k-1} |L'(D^\alpha w)|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.90)$$

With the help of lemma 3.2 and (3.90), we are able to obtain the first order estimate of $\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1}\partial_{y_3}w$. Multiplying $2e^{-2\eta t}\mathcal{Q}^d(\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1}\partial_{y_3}w)$ on both sides of (3.74), integrating by parts over Ω_T and then apply (3.21)-(3.23) in lemma 3.2, one deduces that

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta\|e^{-\eta t}\nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1}\partial_{y_3}w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T}\|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1}\partial_{y_3}w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t}\partial_{y_1}^{2k}\partial_{y_3}w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\ & \quad + \|e^{-\eta t}\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1}\partial_{y_3}^2w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\ & \lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon\eta}\|e^{-\eta t}L'(\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1}\partial_{y_3}w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + (1+\varepsilon\eta)\|e^{-\eta t}\mathbf{D}\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1}\partial_{y_3}w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 \\ & \quad + \|e^{-\eta t}\partial_{y_0}\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1}\partial_{y_3}w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \sum_{i \neq 1} \|e^{-\eta t}\partial_{y_i}\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1}\partial_{y_3}w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.91)$$

In light of (3.73), (3.90) and (3.91), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta\|e^{-\eta t}\mathbf{D}\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1}\partial_{y_3}w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T}\|\mathbf{D}\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1}\partial_{y_3}w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t}\mathbf{D}\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1}\partial_{y_3}w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\ & \lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon\eta}\|e^{-\eta t}L'(\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1}\partial_{y_3}w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + (1+\varepsilon\eta)\|e^{-\eta t}\mathbf{D}\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1}\partial_{y_3}w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 \\ & \quad + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k} \left(\frac{1}{\eta}\|e^{-\eta t}L'(\mathbf{D}^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t}\mathcal{B}\mathbf{D}^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) + \|\mathbf{D}^{2k-2}f|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 \\ & \quad + \delta\|e^{-\eta t}\mathbf{D}^{2k+1}w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k-1} \|e^{-\eta t}L'(\mathbf{D}^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.92)$$

Now one turns to the estimate of derivatives other than $\mathbf{D}^{2k}\partial_{y_0}w$, $\mathbf{D}^{2k}\partial_{y_2}w$ and $\mathbf{D}\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1}\partial_{y_3}w$, i.e., the estimate of $\partial_{y_1}^{2k+1}w$ and the estimate of derivatives in the form of $\partial_{y_1}^{2k-j+1}\partial_{y_3}^jw$ with $3 \leq j \leq 2k+1$. For $\partial_{y_1}^{2k+1}w$, it is easy to check that

$$\partial_{y_1}^{2k+1}w = \frac{1}{r_{11}}(L' - L_0 - L_2 - 2r_{13}\partial_{13} - r_{33}\partial_{33})\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1}w. \quad (3.93)$$

Hence $\partial_{y_1}^{2k+1}w$ can be controlled by estimated terms. In fact, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta\|e^{-\eta t}\partial_{y_1}^{2k+1}w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T}\|\partial_{y_1}^{2k+1}w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t}\partial_{y_1}^{2k+1}w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\ & \lesssim \eta\|e^{-\eta t}\mathbf{D}^{2k}\partial_{y_0}w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T}\|\mathbf{D}^{2k}\partial_{y_0}w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t}\mathbf{D}^{2k}\partial_{y_0}w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\ & \quad + \eta\|e^{-\eta t}\mathbf{D}^{2k}\partial_{y_2}w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T}\|\mathbf{D}^{2k}\partial_{y_2}w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t}\mathbf{D}^{2k}\partial_{y_2}w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\ & \quad + \eta\|e^{-\eta t}\mathbf{D}\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1}\partial_{y_3}w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T}\|\mathbf{D}\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1}\partial_{y_3}w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t}\mathbf{D}\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1}\partial_{y_3}w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\ & \quad + \eta\|e^{-\eta t}L'(\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1}w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T}\|L'(\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1}w)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t}L'(\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1}w)\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\ & \lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon\eta}\|e^{-\eta t}L'(\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1}\partial_{y_3}w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + (1+\varepsilon\eta)\|e^{-\eta t}\mathbf{D}\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1}\partial_{y_3}w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 \\ & \quad + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k} \left(\frac{1}{\eta}\|e^{-\eta t}L'(\mathbf{D}^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t}\mathcal{B}\mathbf{D}^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) + \|\mathbf{D}^{2k-2}f|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 \\ & \quad + \delta\|e^{-\eta t}\mathbf{D}^{2k+1}w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \eta\|e^{-\eta t}L'(\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1}w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T}\|L'(\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1}w)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ & \quad + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k-1} \|e^{-\eta t}L'(\mathbf{D}^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.94)$$

We remark that the last three terms in (3.94) can be estimated by same argument as (3.69) and (3.70). For all $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, 2k + 1$ we claim that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \eta \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{y_1}^{2k-j+1} \partial_{y_3}^j w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\partial_{y_1}^{2k-j+1} \partial_{y_3}^j w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{y_1}^{2k-j+1} \partial_{y_3}^j w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\
& \lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon \eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1} \partial_{y_3} w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + (1 + \varepsilon \eta) \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D} \partial_{y_1}^{2k-1} \partial_{y_3} w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 \\
& + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\mathbf{D}^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B} \mathbf{D}^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) + \|\mathbf{D}^{2k-2} f|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 \\
& + \delta \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D}^{2k+1} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k-1} \eta \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\mathbf{D}^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|L'(\mathbf{D}^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
& + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k-1} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\mathbf{D}^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2. \tag{3.95}
\end{aligned}$$

Indeed, from (3.92) and (3.94), we know (3.95) is valid for $j = 0, 1, 2$. Suppose (3.95) holds for all $j \leq \ell$. We proceed to show (3.95) also holds for $j = \ell + 1$. In fact, one has

$$\partial_{y_1}^{2k-\ell} \partial_{y_3}^{\ell+1} w = \frac{1}{r_{33}} (L' - L_0 - L_2 - 2r_{13} \partial_{13} - r_{11} \partial_{11}) \partial_{y_1}^{2k-\ell} \partial_{y_3}^{\ell-1} w. \tag{3.96}$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \eta \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{y_1}^{2k-\ell} \partial_{y_3}^{\ell+1} w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\partial_{y_1}^{2k-\ell} \partial_{y_3}^{\ell+1} w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{y_1}^{2k-\ell} \partial_{y_3}^{\ell+1} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\
& \lesssim \eta \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{y_1}^{2k-\ell} \partial_{y_3}^{\ell-1} w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|L'(\partial_{y_1}^{2k-\ell} \partial_{y_3}^{\ell-1} w)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
& \quad + \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{y_1}^{2k-\ell} \partial_{y_3}^{\ell-1} w)\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\
& + \eta \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D}^{2k} \partial_{y_0} w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\mathbf{D}^{2k} \partial_{y_0} w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D}^{2k} \partial_{y_0} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\
& + \eta \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D}^{2k} \partial_{y_2} w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\mathbf{D}^{2k} \partial_{y_2} w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D}^{2k} \partial_{y_2} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\
& + \eta \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{y_1}^{2k-\ell+2} \partial_{y_3}^{\ell-1} w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\partial_{y_1}^{2k-\ell+2} \partial_{y_3}^{\ell-1} w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
& \quad + \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{y_1}^{2k-\ell+2} \partial_{y_3}^{\ell-1} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\
& + \eta \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{y_1}^{2k-\ell+1} \partial_{y_3}^\ell w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\partial_{y_1}^{2k-\ell+1} \partial_{y_3}^\ell w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
& \quad + \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{y_1}^{2k-\ell+1} \partial_{y_3}^\ell w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2. \tag{3.97}
\end{aligned}$$

By our induction assumption that (3.95) is valid for $j \leq \ell$ and (3.73), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \eta \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{y_1}^{2k-\ell} \partial_{y_3}^{\ell+1} w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\partial_{y_1}^{2k-\ell} \partial_{y_3}^{\ell+1} w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{y_1}^{2k-\ell} \partial_{y_3}^{\ell+1} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\
& \lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon \eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1} \partial_{y_3} w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + (1 + \varepsilon \eta) \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D} \partial_{y_1}^{2k-1} \partial_{y_3} w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 \\
& + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\mathbf{D}^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B} \mathbf{D}^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) + \|\mathbf{D}^{2k-2} f|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 \\
& + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k-1} \left(\|e^{-\eta t} L'(\mathbf{D}^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \eta \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\mathbf{D}^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|L'(\mathbf{D}^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) \\
& + \delta \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D}^{2k+1} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2, \tag{3.98}
\end{aligned}$$

which implies (3.95) holds for $j = \ell + 1$ and this completes the induction. Now we are able to conclude the estimate of $(2k + 1)$ -th order. Since $D^{2k}\partial_{y_0}w$, $D^{2k}\partial_{y_2}w$, $D\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1}\partial_{y_3}w$, $\partial_{y_1}^{2k}\partial_{y_3}w$ and $\partial_{y_1}^{2k-j+1}\partial_{y_3}^jw$ ($0 \leq j \leq 2k + 1$) cover all derivatives of $(2k + 1)$ -th order, the sum of (3.73) and (3.95) for $0 \leq j \leq 2k + 1$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k+1} \left(\eta \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) \\ & \lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon \eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1} \partial_{y_3} w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + (1 + \varepsilon \eta) \|e^{-\eta t} D \partial_{y_1}^{2k-1} \partial_{y_3} w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 \\ & \quad + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(D^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B} D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) \\ & \quad + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k-1} \left(\|e^{-\eta t} L'(D^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \eta \|e^{-\eta t} L'(D^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + e^{-2\eta T} \|L'(D^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) + \delta \|e^{-\eta t} D^{2k+1} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \|D^{2k-2} f|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.99)$$

Let δ and ε be appropriately small and estimate the terms on the second last line of (3.99) by same arguments as (3.69) and (3.70), then let η be properly large, we are led to

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k+1} \left(\eta \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) \\ & \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(D^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B} D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) + \|D^{2k-2} f|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.100)$$

which is nothing but the estimate of $(2k + 1)$ -th order.

Next, we continue to derive the estimate of $(2k + 2)$ -th order, on the basis of the estimate of $(2k + 1)$ -th order. Apply (3.100) to $\partial_{y_0}w$ and $\partial_{y_2}w$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k+1} \left(\eta \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha \partial_{y_0} w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|D^\alpha \partial_{y_0} w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha \partial_{y_0} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) \\ & \quad + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k+1} \left(\eta \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha \partial_{y_2} w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|D^\alpha \partial_{y_2} w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha \partial_{y_2} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) \\ & \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k+1} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(D^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B} D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) + \|D^{2k} f|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.101)$$

Then we will firstly establish the first order derivative of $\partial_{y_1}^{2k}\partial_{y_3}w$. It is clear that

$$L'(\partial_{y_1}^{2k}\partial_{y_3}w) = \partial_{y_1}^{2k}\partial_{y_3}f - [\partial_{y_1}^{2k}\partial_{y_3}, L']w \quad \text{in } \Omega_T, \quad (3.102)$$

$$\partial_{y_1}^{2k}\partial_{y_3}w = 0 \quad \text{on } \omega_T^r, \quad (3.103)$$

$$(\partial_{y_1}^{2k}\partial_{y_3}w, \partial_{y_0}(\partial_{y_1}^{2k}\partial_{y_3}w)) = (0, 0) \quad \text{on } \Gamma_{in}. \quad (3.104)$$

We have to deduce the boundary condition on ω^ℓ for $\partial_{y_1}^{2k}\partial_{y_3}w$. By the definitions of L' , L_0 and L_2 , it is clear that

$$\partial_{y_1}(\partial_{y_1}^{2k}\partial_{y_3}w) = (L' - L_0 - L_2 - 2r_{13}\partial_{13} - r_{33}\partial_{33})\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1}\partial_{y_3}w. \quad (3.105)$$

Hence, we need to determine $\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1}\partial_{y_3}^3 w$ on ω^ℓ . From the boundary condition $\mathcal{B}w = g$ on w^ℓ , we notice that

$$\partial_{y_1}\partial_{y_3}^{2k+1}w = (\mathcal{B} - b_0\partial_{y_0} - \partial_{y_2}\partial_{y_2} - b_3\partial_{y_3})\partial_{y_1}^{2k+1}w.$$

Thus we have

$$\left|\partial_{y_1}\partial_{y_3}^{2k+1}w\right| \lesssim \mathcal{B}\partial_{y_1}^{2k+1}w + \left|D^{2k+1}\partial_{y_0}w\right| + \left|D^{2k+1}\partial_{y_2}w\right| + \delta \left|D^{2k+2}w\right|. \quad (3.106)$$

Again by the definitions of L' , L_0 and L_2 , we can further deduce

$$\partial_{y_1}^{2k-2j-1}\partial_{y_3}^{2j+3}w = \frac{1}{r_{33}}(L' - L_0 - L_2 - 2r_{13} - r_{11}\partial_{11})\partial_{y_1}^{2k-2j-1}\partial_{y_3}^{2j+1}w. \quad (3.107)$$

For $1 \leq j \leq k$, let

$$\alpha_j := \partial_{y_1}^{2k-2j+1}\partial_{y_3}^{2j+1}w, \quad (3.108)$$

$$B_j := \frac{1}{r_{33}}(L' - L_0 - L_2 - 2r_{13})\partial_{y_1}^{2k-2j-1}\partial_{y_3}^{2j+1}w. \quad (3.109)$$

From (3.106)-(3.109), we obtain a finite sequence $\{\alpha_j\}_{j=1}^k$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_k \lesssim \left|\mathcal{B}\partial_{y_1}^{2k+1}w\right| + \left|D^{2k+1}\partial_{y_0}w\right| + \left|D^{2k+1}\partial_{y_2}w\right| + \delta \left|D^{2k+2}w\right|, \\ \alpha_{j+1} = B_j - \frac{r_{11}}{r_{33}}\alpha_j \quad (j = 1, 2, \dots, k), \\ |B_j| \lesssim \left|L'(\partial_{y_1}^{2k-2j-1}\partial_{y_3}^{2j+1}w)\right| + \left|D^{2k+1}\partial_{y_0}w\right| + \left|D^{2k+1}\partial_{y_2}w\right| + \delta \left|D^{2k+2}w\right|. \end{cases}$$

Analogous to the sequence $\{\beta_j\}$, by induction on j , one can deduce that α_j ($1 \leq j \leq k$) satisfies

$$|\alpha_j| \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k} |L'(D^\alpha w)| + \left|D^{2k+1}\partial_{y_0}w\right| + \left|D^{2k+1}\partial_{y_2}w\right| + \delta \left|D^{2k+2}w\right| + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k+1} |\mathcal{B}D^\alpha w|,$$

and so does $\alpha_1 = \partial_{y_1}^{2k-1}\partial_{y_3}^3 w$. Armed with this estimate for $\partial_{y_1}^{2k-1}\partial_{y_3}^3 w$, we obtain from (3.105) that

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\partial_{y_1}(\partial_{y_1}^{2k}\partial_{y_3}w)\right| &\lesssim \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k} |L'(D^\alpha w)| + \left|D^{2k+1}\partial_{y_0}w\right| + \left|D^{2k+1}\partial_{y_2}w\right| \\ &\quad + \delta \left|D^{2k+2}w\right| + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k+1} |\mathcal{B}D^\alpha w|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.110)$$

Thanks to lemma 3.3, we are able to derive the first order estimate of $\partial_{y_1}^{2k}\partial_{y_3}w$. Multiplying $2e^{-2\eta t}Q^e(\partial_{y_1}^{2k}\partial_{y_3}w)$ on both sides of (3.102), integration by parts over Ω_T , applying lemma 3.3 and Cauchy inequality, one has

$$\begin{aligned} &\eta \|e^{-\eta t}\nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\partial_{y_1}^{2k}\partial_{y_3}w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T}\|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\partial_{y_1}^{2k}\partial_{y_3}w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ &+ \|e^{-\eta t}\partial_{y_3}\partial_{y_1}^{2k}\partial_{y_3}w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t}\partial_{y_3}\partial_{y_1}^{2k}\partial_{y_3}w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^r)}^2 \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon\eta}\|e^{-\eta t}L'(\partial_{y_1}^{2k}\partial_{y_3}w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + (1 + \varepsilon\eta)\|e^{-\eta t}D\partial_{y_1}^{2k}\partial_{y_3}w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 \\ &\quad + \eta\|e^{-\eta t}\partial_{y_0}\partial_{y_1}^{2k}\partial_{y_3}w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T}\|\partial_{y_0}\partial_{y_1}^{2k}\partial_{y_3}w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \sum_{i=0}^2 \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{y_i} \partial_{y_1}^{2k} \partial_{y_3} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2.$$

In view of (3.101) and (3.110), we obtain from above inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbb{D} \partial_{y_1}^{2k} \partial_{y_3} w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\mathbb{D} \partial_{y_1}^{2k} \partial_{y_3} w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ & + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbb{D} \partial_{y_1}^{2k} \partial_{y_3} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{y_3} \partial_{y_1}^{2k} \partial_{y_3} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\ & \lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon \eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{y_1}^{2k} \partial_{y_3} w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + (1 + \varepsilon \eta) \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbb{D} \partial_{y_1}^{2k} \partial_{y_3} w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 \\ & + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k+1} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\mathbb{D}^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B} \mathbb{D}^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) + \|\mathbb{D}^{2k} f|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 \\ & + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\mathbb{D}^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \delta \|\mathbb{D}^{2k+2} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.111)$$

Now we turn to the estimate of $\partial_{y_1}^{2k+2} w$ and the estimate of the derivatives in the form of $\partial_{y_1}^{2k-j+2} \partial_{y_3}^j w$ with $3 \leq j \leq 2k+2$. By the definitions of L' , L_0 and L_2 , one has

$$\partial_{y_1}^{2k+2} w = \frac{1}{r_{11}} (L' - L_0 - L_2 - 2r_{13} \partial_{13} - r_{33} \partial_{33}) \partial_{y_1}^{2k} w. \quad (3.112)$$

So $\partial_{y_1}^{2k+2} w$ can be estimated by controlled terms, i.e.,

$$\left| \partial_{y_1}^{2k+2} w \right| \lesssim \left| L'(\partial_{y_1}^{2k} w) \right| + \left| \mathbb{D}^{2k+1} \partial_{y_0} w \right| + \left| \mathbb{D}^{2k+1} \partial_{y_2} w \right| + \left| \mathbb{D} \partial_{y_1}^{2k} \partial_{y_3} w \right|. \quad (3.113)$$

This together with (3.101) and (3.111) imply

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{y_1}^{2k+2} w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\partial_{y_1}^{2k+2} w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{y_1}^{2k+2} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\ & \lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon \eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{y_1}^{2k} \partial_{y_3} w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + (1 + \varepsilon \eta) \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbb{D} \partial_{y_1}^{2k} \partial_{y_3} w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 \\ & + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k+1} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\mathbb{D}^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B} \mathbb{D}^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) + \|\mathbb{D}^{2k} f|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 \\ & + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\mathbb{D}^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \delta \|\mathbb{D}^{2k+2} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \eta \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{y_1}^{2k} w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 \\ & + e^{-2\eta T} \|L'(\partial_{y_1}^{2k} w)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{y_1}^{2k} w)\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.114)$$

Then by simple induction argument as we use in (3.95)-(3.98), one deduces for all $3 \leq j \leq 2k+2$ that

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{y_1}^{2k-j+2} \partial_{y_3}^j w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\partial_{y_1}^{2k-j+2} \partial_{y_3}^j w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \partial_{y_1}^{2k-j+2} \partial_{y_3}^j w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\ & \lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon \eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\partial_{y_1}^{2k} \partial_{y_3} w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + (1 + \varepsilon \eta) \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbb{D} \partial_{y_1}^{2k} \partial_{y_3} w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 \\ & + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k+1} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\mathbb{D}^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B} \mathbb{D}^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) + \|\mathbb{D}^{2k} f|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 \\ & + \delta \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbb{D}^{2k+1} w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k} \eta \|e^{-\eta t} L'(\mathbb{D}^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|L'(\mathbb{D}^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(D^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2. \quad (3.115)$$

To this end, adding (3.101), (3.111) and (3.115) for all $3 \leq j \leq 2k+2$ together, then let ε, δ be properly small and η be appropriately large, one concludes that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k+2} \left(\eta \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) \\ & \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2k+1} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \|e^{-\eta t} L'(D^\alpha w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B} D^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \right) \\ & \quad + \|D^{2k} f|_{t=0}\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.116)$$

This completes the induction process from the estimate of $2k$ -th order to $(2k+2)$ -th order and hence finishes our proof of proposition 3.1. \square

3.1. Proof of theorem 3.1. Based on proposition (3.1), we are able to prove theorem 3.1 by carefully estimating $L'(D^\alpha w)$ for $|\alpha| \leq s \leq n_0 + 2$.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. It is clear that the estimate in Proposition 3.1 holds for all $T \geq 0$. Hence, in order to prove theorem 3.1, we just need to estimate $L'(D^\alpha w)$ and $\mathcal{B}(D^\alpha w)$. First, for $L'(D^\alpha w)$, actually

$$\begin{aligned} L'(D^\alpha w) &= -[D^\alpha, L']w + D^\alpha(L'w) \\ &= -[D^\alpha, L']w + D^\alpha f. \end{aligned} \quad (3.117)$$

Then we need to estimate the commutator $[D^\alpha, L']w$. By definition

$$[D^\alpha, L']w = D^\alpha(r_{ij}\partial_{ij}w) - r_{ij}D^\alpha\partial_{ij}w + D^\alpha(r_i\partial_iw_1) - a_iD^\alpha(\partial_iw) + D^\alpha(rw) - rD^\alpha w.$$

For the commutator, we claim:

$$\begin{aligned} & [D^\alpha, L']w \text{ is a linear combination of finitely many terms, and each} \\ & \text{term is a product of derivatives of } u \text{ and } w, \text{ in which at most one factor} \\ & \text{has } u \text{ and } w \text{ differentiated more than } \frac{|\alpha|+2}{2} \text{ times.} \end{aligned} \quad (3.118)$$

To show claim (3.118), we observe that $D^\alpha(r_{ij}\partial_{ij}w) - r_{ij}D^\alpha\partial_{ij}w$ is a linear combination of the terms of the following form:

$$p_{ij}(\nabla \mathcal{W}(u), Du)\partial^{\mu_1} \nabla \mathcal{W} \partial^{\mu_2} \nabla \mathcal{W} \dots \partial^{\mu_l} \nabla \mathcal{W} \partial^{\gamma_1} Du \partial^{\gamma_2} Du \dots \partial^{\gamma_k} Du \partial^\sigma \partial_{ij}w$$

in which $|\mu_1| + |\mu_2| + \dots + |\mu_l| + |\gamma_1| + |\gamma_2| + \dots + |\gamma_k| + |\sigma| = |\alpha|$ and $|\sigma| \leq |\alpha| - 1$.

Case 1: If $|\sigma| \geq \frac{|\alpha|-2}{2}$, then $|\mu_1| + |\mu_2| + \dots + |\mu_l| + |\gamma_1| + |\gamma_2| + \dots + |\gamma_k| \leq \frac{(|\alpha|+2)}{2}$. So $|\mu_j| \leq \frac{(|\alpha|+2)}{2}$ and $|\gamma_j| \leq \frac{(|\alpha|+2)}{2}$ and they cannot achieve $\frac{|\alpha|+2}{2}$ at the same time.

Case 2: If $|\sigma| < \frac{|\alpha|-2}{2}$, then $|\mu_1| + |\mu_2| + \dots + |\mu_l| + |\gamma_1| + |\gamma_2| + \dots + |\gamma_k| \leq |\alpha|$. So there is at most one index among $\{\mu_1, \dots, \gamma_k\}$ whose value is larger than $\frac{|\alpha|}{2}$. Because $|\alpha| \leq s-1$, we have $\frac{(|\alpha|+2)}{2} \leq s$. Similar argument to $D^\alpha(r_i\partial_iw) - r_iD^\alpha(\partial_iw_1)$ and $D^\alpha(r\partial_iw) - rD^\alpha(\partial_iw)$ implies both of them have similar forms as the one for $D^\alpha(r_{ij}\partial_{ij}w) - r_{ij}D^\alpha\partial_{ij}w$. Therefore,

claim (3.118) holds. Based on (\mathbf{H}_3) , equation (3.3), and the claim (3.118), we have

$$|[\mathbf{D}^\alpha, L']w| \leq C_\delta \left(\sum_{\substack{1 \leq |\gamma| \leq |\alpha| \\ 1 \leq \sigma \leq \frac{|\alpha|-2}{2}}} |\mathbf{D}^\gamma u| \|\mathbf{D}^\sigma \partial_{ij} w\|_{L^\infty} + \sum_{|\gamma|=|\alpha|+1} |\mathbf{D}^\gamma u| |\partial_{ij} w| + \sum_{2 \leq |\gamma| \leq |\alpha|+1} |\mathbf{D}^\gamma w| \right).$$

Note that $|\alpha| \leq s-1$. So if $7 \leq s \leq n_0+3$, then the Sobolev embedding theorem indicates $\|\mathbf{D}^\sigma \partial_{ij} w\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|w\|_{H^s}$. Therefore,

$$\sum_{|\alpha| \leq s-1} \|L'(\mathbf{D}^\alpha w)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|w\|_{H^s} + \|f\|_{H^{s-1}} + \delta \|\mathbf{D}^2 w\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|u\|_{H^s}. \quad (3.119)$$

Then by choosing η be large and δ be small, it follows from Proposition 3.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s} \eta \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D}^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 + e^{-2\eta T} \|\mathbf{D}^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \mathbf{D}^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\ & \lesssim \frac{1}{\eta} \left(\|e^{-\eta t} u\|_{H^s(\Omega_T)}^2 \cdot \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|w(t, \cdot)\|_{H^4(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} f\|_{H^{s-1}(\Omega_T)}^2 \right) \\ & \quad + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s-1} \|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B} \mathbf{D}^\alpha w\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.120)$$

where constant C does not depend on u and we choose y_0 sufficiently small.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{D}^\alpha w) &= -[\mathbf{D}^\alpha, \mathcal{B}]w + \mathbf{D}^\alpha(\mathcal{B}w) \\ &= -[\mathbf{D}^\alpha, \mathcal{B}]w + \mathbf{D}^\alpha g. \end{aligned} \quad (3.121)$$

Similar to claim (3.118), $[\mathbf{D}^\alpha, \mathcal{B}]w$ is a linear combination of finitely many terms, and each term is a product of derivatives of u and w , in which at most one factor has u and w differentiated more than $\frac{(|\alpha|+1)}{2}$ times.

Therefore, by the trace theorem, one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s-1} \int_0^{y_0} e^{-2\eta t} \|\mathcal{B} \mathbf{D}^\alpha w(t, 0, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+)}^2 dt \\ & \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s-1} \int_0^{y_0} e^{-2\eta t} (\delta \|\mathbf{D}^\alpha w(t, 0, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+)}^2 + \|\mathbf{D}^\alpha g(t, 0, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+)}^2) dt \\ & \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s} \delta \int_0^{y_0} e^{-2\eta t} \|\mathbf{D}^\alpha w(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 dt + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s-1} \int_0^{y_0} e^{-2\eta t} \|\mathbf{D}^\alpha g(t, 0, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+)}^2 dt. \end{aligned} \quad (3.122)$$

Substitute (3.122) into (3.120), let $s = 4$ in (3.120) and repeat above process, then let δ , T and $\frac{1}{\eta}$ be small, one can deduce that solution w of problem (LP) satisfies the estimate (3.1). This completes the proof of this theorem. \square

4. WELL-POSEDNESS OF THE NON-LINEAR PROBLEM

4.1. Reformulation of the non-linear problem. We firstly reformulate the non-linear problem (NLP). Let

$$\bar{u} := u + y_3 \frac{\partial_{x_1} \mathcal{W}}{1 + |\partial_{x_1} \mathcal{W}|^2 + |\partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W}|^2},$$

where u is the solution to the (NLP). Since

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial u} &= 1 + y_3 \left(\frac{\partial_{x_1 x_1} \mathcal{W} + \partial_{x_1 x_2} \mathcal{W} \frac{\partial x_2}{\partial u}}{1 + |\partial_{x_1} \mathcal{W}|^2 + |\partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W}|^2} \right) \left(-\frac{1 - |\partial_{x_1} \mathcal{W}|^2 + |\partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W}|^2}{1 + |\partial_{x_1} \mathcal{W}|^2 + |\partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W}|^2} \right) \\ &\quad - y_3 \frac{2\partial_{x_1} \mathcal{W} \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W}}{(1 + |\partial_{x_1} \mathcal{W}|^2 + |\partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W}|^2)^2} \left(\partial_{x_1 x_2} \mathcal{W} + \partial_{x_2 x_2} \mathcal{W} \frac{\partial x_2}{\partial u} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

one has $\frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial u} > 0$, when y_3 and $\|\mathcal{W}\|_{W^{2,\infty}}$ is sufficiently small. Then by the implicit function theorem, u can be expressed as a function with respect to \bar{u} , y_2 and y_3 . We assume $u = \kappa(\bar{u}, y_2, y_3)$ for some smooth function κ . By the property of our background solution, i.e., the nozzle wall Γ_0 is flat at the background solution, we have $\bar{u} = u_b$, if $u = u_b$. That is to say $\kappa(u_b, y_2, y_3) = u_b$. For notational simplicity, let

$$N(x_1, x_2) = \left(\frac{\partial_{x_1} \mathcal{W}}{1 + |\partial_{x_1} \mathcal{W}|^2 + |\partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W}|^2} \right) (x_1, x_2).$$

Then by direct computation, one has

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{\bar{u}} \kappa = \frac{1 + y_3 \partial_{x_2} N}{1 + y_3 (\partial_{x_1} N + \partial_{x_2} N)}, \\ \partial_{y_2} \kappa = -\frac{y_3 \partial_{x_2} N}{1 + y_3 (\partial_{x_1} N + \partial_{x_2} N)}, \\ \partial_{y_3} \kappa = -\frac{N}{1 + y_3 (\partial_{x_1} N + \partial_{x_2} N)}. \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

It is easy to see that $\partial_{\bar{u}} \kappa$ is close to one and $\partial_{\bar{u}} \kappa|_{\omega^r} \equiv 1$, while $\partial_{y_2} \kappa$ and $\partial_{y_3} \kappa$ are close to zero. The second order derivatives of κ with respect to \bar{u} , y_2 , y_3 is listed in the appendix. From (2.13)-(2.15) we deduce that \bar{u} satisfies

$$\partial_{\bar{u}} \kappa \sum_{i,j=0}^3 \tilde{a}_{ij} \partial_{ij} \bar{u} = F(\bar{u}, D\bar{u}), \quad (4.3)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} F(\bar{u}, D\bar{u}) &= \partial_{\bar{u}\bar{u}} \kappa \tilde{a}_{ij} \partial_i \bar{u} \partial_j \bar{u} + 2 \sum_{j=0}^3 \kappa_{\bar{u}y_2} \tilde{a}_{2j} \partial_j \bar{u} + 2 \sum_{j=0}^3 \kappa_{\bar{u}y_3} \tilde{a}_{3j} \partial_j \bar{u} \\ &\quad + \tilde{a}_{22} \partial_{y_2 y_2} \kappa + 2\tilde{a}_{23} \partial_{y_2 y_3} \kappa + \tilde{a}_{33} \partial_{y_3 y_3} \kappa - (\tilde{a}_2 \partial_{y_2} u + \tilde{a}_3 \partial_{y_3} u) \\ &\quad - (a_{12} \partial_{x_1 x_2} p(\partial_{y_1} u)^3 + (\partial_{y_1} u)^3 \sum_{i,j=0}^3 a_{ij} \partial_{x_i x_j} \Phi^-), \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

where $\partial_{y_i} u$ can be replaced by $\partial_{\bar{u}} \kappa \partial_{y_i} \bar{u} + \partial_{y_2} \kappa \delta_{i2} + \partial_{y_3} \kappa \delta_{i3}$.

The initial conditions for \bar{u} now become

$$\bar{u}|_{y_0=0} = u_0 + y_3 N(u_0, x_2(u_0, y_2, y_3)), \quad (4.5)$$

$$\partial_{y_0} \bar{u}|_{y_0=0} = u_1 \cdot \left(1 + y_3 \partial_{x_1} \left(\frac{\partial_{x_1} N}{1 + y_3 \partial_{x_2} N} \right) \right) (u_0, x_2(u_0, y_2, y_3)). \quad (4.6)$$

The boundary conditions for \bar{u} are

$$\partial_{y_3}\bar{u} = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \omega_T^r, \quad (4.7)$$

$$G(\kappa(\bar{u}, y_2, y_3), Du) = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \omega_T^\ell, \quad (4.8)$$

where $\partial_{y_i}u$ should be replaced by $\partial_{\bar{u}}\kappa\partial_{y_i}\bar{u} + \partial_{y_2}\kappa\delta_{i2} + \partial_{y_3}\kappa\delta_{i3}$.

Let $\bar{u}_j(\mathbf{y}) := \partial_{y_0}^j\bar{u}(y_0, \mathbf{y})|_{y_0=0}$, which can be derived by differentiating (4.3) with respect to y_0 . Obviously, \bar{u}_0 and \bar{u}_1 are give by (4.5) and (4.6) respectively. Let

$$\psi(y_0, \mathbf{y}) := \bar{u}_0 + \bar{u}_1 y_0 + \frac{\bar{u}_2}{2!} y_0^2 + \cdots + \frac{\bar{u}_{s_0}}{s_0!} y_0^{s_0}.$$

We introduce a new unknown $\tilde{u} := \bar{u} - \psi$ and define $\tilde{u}_b := u_b - \psi$. Then \tilde{u} satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{\bar{u}}\kappa \sum_{i,j=0}^3 \tilde{a}_{ij}\partial_{ij}\tilde{u} = F(\tilde{u} + \psi, D(\tilde{u} + \psi)) - \partial_{\bar{u}}\kappa \sum_{i,j=0}^3 \tilde{a}_{ij}\partial_{ij}\psi & \text{in} \quad \Omega_T, \\ G(\kappa(\tilde{u} + \psi, y_2, y_3), D(\kappa(\tilde{u} + \psi, y_2, y_3))) = 0 & \text{on} \quad \omega_T^\ell, \\ \partial_{y_3}\tilde{u} = 0 & \text{on} \quad \omega_T^r, \\ (\tilde{u}, \partial_{y_0}\tilde{u})|_{y_0=0} = (0, 0) & \text{on} \quad \Gamma_{in}. \end{cases} \quad (4.9)$$

If we can solve this problem for \tilde{u} , then clearly $\tilde{u} + \psi$ is the desired solution to the non-linear problem (NLP).

4.2. Proof of theorem 2.1. In this section, we introduce a iterative scheme to deduce the existence of smooth solution to the non-linear problem (4.9). Let $\tilde{u}_0 := 0$ and \tilde{u}_{m+1} ($m \geq 0$) is defined as the solution to the following initial boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{\bar{u}}\kappa \sum_{i,j=0}^3 \tilde{a}_{ij}^m \partial_{ij}\tilde{u}_{m+1} = F_m - \partial_{\bar{u}}\kappa \tilde{a}_{ij}^m \partial_{ij}\psi & \text{in} \quad \Omega_T, \\ \mathcal{B}\tilde{u}_{m+1} = \mathcal{B}\tilde{u}_m - G_m & \text{on} \quad \omega_T^\ell, \\ \partial_{y_3}\tilde{u}_{m+1} = 0 & \text{on} \quad \omega_T^r, \\ (\tilde{u}_{m+1}, \partial_{y_0}\tilde{u}_{m+1})|_{y_0=0} = (0, 0) & \text{on} \quad \Gamma_{in}, \end{cases} \quad (4.10)$$

where $\tilde{a}_{ij}^m = \tilde{a}_{ij}|_{u=\kappa(\tilde{u}_m+\psi, y_2, y_3)}$, $F_m := F(\tilde{u}_m + \psi, D(\tilde{u}_m + \psi))$, $G_m := G|_{u=\kappa(\tilde{u}_m+\psi, y_2, y_3)}$ and

$$\mathcal{B} = \partial_{\bar{u}}\kappa \sum_{i=0}^3 \frac{\partial G}{\partial u y_i} \Big|_{u=u_b} \cdot \partial_{y_i} + \partial_{\bar{u}}\kappa \frac{\partial G}{\partial u} \Big|_{u=u_b}$$

and $G = G(u, Du)$ is defined in (2.21).

Before proving the convergence of above iterative scheme, we have to verify hypothesis (\mathbf{H}_1) - (\mathbf{H}_4) . Actually we have following lemma:

Lemma 4.1. $(\tilde{a}_{ij})_{0 \leq i, j \leq 3}$ and \mathcal{B} satisfy all assumptions (\mathbf{H}_1) - (\mathbf{H}_4) .

Proof. It is clear that \tilde{a}_{ij} are smooth functions depending on u and Du . As a direct consequence of (1.13) and (2.10), \tilde{a}_{03} vanishes on Γ_w . In view of the slip boundary condition (1.13) and (2.11), it is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{a}_{13}|_{\Gamma_w} &= c^2 \partial_{y_1} u (\partial_{x_1} \mathcal{W} (\partial_{x_1} \mathcal{W} \partial_{y_3} u - \partial_{x_1} p \partial_{y_2} u + 1)) \\ &\quad + c^2 \partial_{y_1} u (\partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W} (\partial_{x_3} p \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W} \partial_{y_2} u + \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W} \partial_{y_3} u - \partial_{y_2} u) + \partial_{x_3} p \partial_{y_2} u + \partial_{y_3} u) \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

But (1.13) implies

$$-\partial_{x_1}\mathcal{W}(\Phi^- - \phi)_{x_1} - \partial_{x_2}\mathcal{W}(\Phi^- - \phi)_{x_2} + (\Phi^- - \phi)_{x_3} = 0$$

on Γ_0 , so by the slip boundary condition of Φ^- and the expressions of ϕ_{x_i} ($i = 1, 2, 3$) given by (2.8), it is equivalent to say that

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_{x_1}\mathcal{W}(\partial_{x_1}\mathcal{W}\partial_{y_3}u - \partial_{x_1}p\partial_{y_2}u + 1) \\ & + \partial_{x_2}\mathcal{W}(\partial_{x_3}p\partial_{x_2}\mathcal{W}\partial_{y_2}u + \partial_{x_2}\mathcal{W}\partial_{y_3}u - \partial_{y_2}u) \\ & + \partial_{x_3}p\partial_{y_2}u + \partial_{y_3}u = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_w. \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

Thus, independent of the choice of $p(\mathbf{x})$, one deduces that \tilde{a}_{13} vanishes on Γ_w . Also by the slip boundary condition (1.13), we deduce that

$$\tilde{a}_{23}|_{\Gamma_w} = c^2(\partial_{y_1}u)^2(\partial_{x_1}\mathcal{W}\partial_{x_1}p + \partial_{x_2}\mathcal{W}(\partial_{x_2}p + 1) - \partial_{x_3}p). \quad (4.13)$$

So requiring $\tilde{a}_{23} = 0$ on Γ_w is equivalent to require

$$\partial_{x_1}\mathcal{W}\partial_{x_1}p + \partial_{x_2}\mathcal{W}(\partial_{x_2}p + 1) - \partial_{x_3}p = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_w. \quad (4.14)$$

With G given in (2.21), by simple calculation, we have

$$G = (\rho^+ - \rho^-)(\phi_t + \nabla\phi \cdot \nabla\Phi^-) - |\nabla\phi|^2\rho^+,$$

where $\rho^\pm = ((\gamma - 1)(B_0 - \Phi_t^\pm - \frac{1}{2}|\nabla\Phi^\pm|^2) + 1)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}$ and $\Phi^+ := \Phi$ is the velocity potential ahead of the shock front. Replacing $D\phi$ in G by Du via (2.8), then differentiate G with respect to u and u_{y_j} , respectively, one can obtain the expressions of b and b_j ($j = 0, 1, 2, 3$).

By simple calculation, one has

$$\begin{aligned} b_3 &= \frac{\partial\rho^+}{\partial(\partial_{y_3}u)}(\phi_t + \nabla\phi \cdot \nabla\Phi^-) + (\rho^+ - \rho^-)\frac{\partial}{\partial(\partial_{y_3}u)}(\phi_t + \nabla\phi \cdot \nabla\Phi^-) \\ &= \mathcal{E}_1 \cdot (\phi_t + \nabla\phi \cdot \nabla\Phi^-) + (\rho^+ - \rho^-) \cdot \mathcal{E}_2 \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_1 &= -\frac{(\partial_{x_3}p - \partial_{x_1}p\partial_{x_1}\mathcal{W} + \partial_{x_3}p|\partial_{x_2}\mathcal{W}|^2 - \partial_{x_2}\mathcal{W})\partial_{y_2}u}{(\rho^+)^{\gamma-2}(\partial_{y_1}u)^2} \\ &+ \frac{(1 + |\partial_{x_1}\mathcal{W}|^2 + |\partial_{x_2}\mathcal{W}|^2)\partial_{y_3}u + \partial_{x_1}\mathcal{W}}{(\rho^+)^{\gamma-2}(\partial_{y_1}u)^2} \\ &- \frac{\partial_{x_1}\mathcal{W}\partial_{x_1}\Phi^- + \partial_{x_2}\mathcal{W}\partial_{x_2}\Phi^- - \partial_{x_3}\Phi^-}{\partial_{y_1}u}, \\ \mathcal{E}_2 &= \frac{\partial_{x_1}\mathcal{W}\partial_{x_1}\Phi^- + \partial_{x_2}\mathcal{W}\partial_{x_2}\Phi^- - \partial_{x_3}\Phi^-}{\partial_{y_1}u}. \end{aligned}$$

Since Φ^- satisfies (1.13) on Γ_w (equivalently on $\{y_3 = 0\}$) and u satisfies (2.19) on $\{y_3 = 0\}$, in order to let $b_3|_{y_3=0} = 0$, it suffices to require

$$\partial_{x_3}p(1 + |\partial_{x_2}\mathcal{W}|^2) - \partial_{x_1}p\partial_{x_1}\mathcal{W} - \partial_{x_2}\mathcal{W} = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_w. \quad (4.16)$$

It is easy to verify that (4.14) and (4.16) are satisfied, if we let

$$p(x) := \frac{\partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W}}{1 + |\partial_{x_1} \mathcal{W}|^2 + |\partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W}|^2} (x_3 - \mathcal{W}). \quad (4.17)$$

With such $p(\mathbf{x})$, by calculating the Jacobian of \mathcal{P} , one can easily check that \mathcal{P} is indeed invertible, when u is close to u_b , $\partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W}$ is small, and x_3 is close to $\mathcal{W}(x_1, x_2)$ (this means y_3 is small in (y_0, \mathbf{y}) -coordinate). Here we do not need the exact expression of b_0 , b and b_j ($j = 0, 1, 2$). At the background solution $(u, \mathcal{W}) = (u_b, 0)$, one has

$$b_0 := \frac{\partial G}{\partial u_{y_0}} = (q_- - q_+) \left(-\frac{\rho_+ q_+}{c_+^2} (q_- - q_+) - (\rho_+ - \rho_-) \right) < 0, \quad (4.18)$$

$$b_1 := \frac{\partial G}{\partial (\partial_{y_1} u)} = (q_- - q_+)^2 \left(-\frac{q_+^2 \rho_+}{c_+^2} (q_- - q_+) + \rho_+ (q_- - q_+) \right) > 0, \quad (4.19)$$

and

$$b_2 := \frac{\partial G}{\partial (\partial_{y_2} u)} = 0, \quad b_3 := \frac{\partial G}{\partial (\partial_{y_3} u)} = 0, \quad b := \frac{\partial G}{\partial u} = 0.$$

Moreover, with the choice of $p(\mathbf{x})$, one can see that \tilde{a}_2 is zero at the background solution. Hence \tilde{a}_2 is close to zero near the background solution. This allows us to put the term $\tilde{a}_2 \partial_{y_2} u$ to the right side in the coming iteration scheme, so that the coefficient before $\partial_{y_2} u$ be zero. Then above computations together with (2.25)-(2.28) implies (\mathbf{H}_1) and (\mathbf{H}_2) are fulfilled. We still need to verify (\mathbf{H}_4) . It is clear that b_1 is bounded away from zero when u is sufficiently close to u_b . By simple calculation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\tilde{a}_{11}}{b_1} b_0 - \tilde{a}_{10} &= -\frac{q_+}{q_- - q_+} + \frac{(c_+^2 - q_+^2)(c_+^2(\rho_- - \rho_+) + q_+(q_+ - q_-)\rho_+)}{(q_- - q_+)\rho_+ q_+^2 - c_+^2(-2q_+\rho_+ + q_-(\rho_- + \rho_+))} \\ &= -\frac{q_+}{q_- - q_+} + \frac{(c_+^2 - q_+^2)(c_+^2(\rho_- - \rho_+) + q_+(q_+ - q_-)\rho_+)}{(q_+^2 - c_+^2)(q_- - q_+)\rho_+} \\ &= -\frac{q_+}{q_- - q_+} - \frac{c_+^2(\rho_- - \rho_+) + q_+(q_+ - q_-)\rho_+}{(q_- - q_+)\rho_+} \\ &= \frac{1}{(q_- - q_+)\rho_+} (-q_+\rho_+ - c_+^2(\rho_- - \rho_+) - q_+(q_+ - q_-)\rho_+) \\ &> \frac{1}{(q_- - q_+)\rho_+} (-\rho_+ q_+ - q_+^2(\rho_- - \rho_+) - q_+(q_+ - q_-)\rho_+) \\ &= \frac{q_+}{(q_- - q_+)\rho_+} (q_- \rho_+ - q_+ \rho_- - \rho_+) > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

Moreover, at the background solution we have

$$\sum_{i,j=0}^3 \tilde{a}^{ij} (\tilde{a}_{11} \frac{b_i}{b_1} - \tilde{a}_{i1}) (\tilde{a}_{11} \frac{b_j}{b_1} - \tilde{a}_{j1}) = \frac{(q_- - q_+)^2 (c_+^2 - q_+^2)}{c_+^2} (\frac{\tilde{a}_{11}}{b_1} b_0 - \tilde{a}_{10})^2 > 0.$$

So γ_0 exists and hence (\mathbf{H}_4) is satisfied. For (\mathbf{H}_3) , we can see from our proof of the convergence of the scheme that the solution $\tilde{u} + \psi$ is still close to u_b . \square

For $s \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$\eta \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s} \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha u\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 := \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}_\eta^s(\Omega_T)}^2$$

and denote by $\|u\|_{s,\eta,T}$ the usual Sobolev norm $\|e^{-\eta t}u\|_{H^s(\Omega_T)}$. Furthermore, for simplification, one may use $\|u|_{y_1=0}\|_{s,\eta,T}$ to represent the usual Sobolev norm on the boundary $\{y_1 = 0\}$.

Lemma 4.2. *For any smooth function u and any $\eta \geq 1$, we have*

$$\|e^{-\eta t}u\|_{H^s(\Omega_T)}^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{\eta} \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}_\eta^s(\Omega_T)}^2, \quad (4.21)$$

provided that $\partial_t^j u = 0$, $j = 0, 1, \dots, s-1$. Here $\|e^{-\eta t}u\|_{H^s(\Omega_T)}$ is the standard sobolev norm.

Proof. Let

$$A(y_0) = \int_0^{y_0} \int_{\Omega} e^{-2\eta t} |u|^2 dy dt$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} A(y_0) &= -\frac{1}{2\eta} \int_0^{y_0} \int_{\Omega} (e^{-2\eta t})_t |u|^2 dy dt \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\eta} \int_0^{y_0} \int_{\Omega} (e^{-2\eta t} |u|^2)_t - 2e^{-2\eta t} u \partial_t u dy dt \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\eta} \int_{\Omega} e^{-2\eta y_0} |u(y_0, \cdot)|^2 dy + \frac{1}{2\eta} \int_0^{y_0} \int_{\Omega} 2e^{-2\eta t} u \partial_t u dy dt \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{2\eta} \int_{\Omega} e^{-2\eta y_0} |u(y_0, \cdot)|^2 dy + \frac{1}{2\eta} \int_0^{y_0} \int_{\Omega} e^{-2\eta t} (\eta |u|^2 + \frac{1}{\eta} |\partial_t u|^2) dy dt \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\eta} \int_{\Omega} e^{-2\eta y_0} |u(y_0, \cdot)|^2 dy + \frac{1}{2} A(y_0) + \frac{1}{2\eta^2} \int_0^{y_0} \int_{\Omega} e^{-2\eta t} |\partial_t u|^2 dy dt. \end{aligned}$$

Here for the third identity, we have used the assumption that $u|_{t=0} = 0$. This implies

$$\eta A(y_0) + \int_{\Omega} e^{-2\eta y_0} |u(y_0, \cdot)|^2 dy \leq \frac{1}{\eta} \int_0^{y_0} \int_{\Omega} e^{-2\eta t} |\partial_t u|^2 dy dt. \quad (4.22)$$

In particular,

$$\eta^2 A(y_0) \leq \int_0^{y_0} \int_{\Omega} e^{-2\eta t} |\partial_t u|^2 dy dt \leq \int_0^{y_0} \int_{\Omega} e^{-2\eta t} |\mathbf{D}u|^2 dy dt. \quad (4.23)$$

It follows from (4.22) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^{y_0} \int_{\Omega} e^{-2\eta t} |\mathbf{D}u|^2 dy dt + \eta^2 \int_0^{y_0} \int_{\Omega} e^{-2\eta t} |u|^2 dy dt + \int_0^{y_0} \int_{\Omega} e^{-2\eta t} |u|^2 dy dt \\ &\lesssim \int_0^{y_0} e^{-2\eta t} (\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\mathbf{D}u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2) dt. \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

This implies that $\|u\|_{1,\eta,T}^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{\eta} \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}_\eta^1(\Omega_T)}^2$.

Now for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, assume

$$\|u\|_{k,\eta,T}^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{\eta} \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}_\eta^k(\Omega_T)}^2. \quad (4.25)$$

We are going to show

$$\|u\|_{k+1,\eta,T}^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{\eta} \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}_\eta^{k+1}(\Omega_T)}^2. \quad (4.26)$$

Repeating the process for estimate (4.23) above m times where $|u|^2$ in $A(y_0)$ is replaced by $|D^n u|^2$, we have

$$\int_0^{y_0} e^{-2\eta t} \|D^n u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 dt \leq \eta^{-2m} \int_0^{y_0} e^{-2\eta t} \|D^{m+n} u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 dt \quad (4.27)$$

provided that $\partial_t^l u|_{t=0} = 0$, $l = 0, 1, 2, \dots, m+n-1$.

Note that

$$\|u\|_{k+1, \eta, T}^2 = \|u\|_{k, \eta, T}^2 + \sum_{|\alpha|=k+1} \|D^\alpha (e^{-\eta t} u)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 \quad (4.28)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{|\alpha|=k+1} \|D^\alpha (e^{-\eta t} u)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 &= \sum_{l_1+l_2=k+1} \|(-\eta)^{l_1} e^{-\eta t} D^{l_2} u\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 \\ &= \sum_{l_1+l_2=k+1} (\eta)^{2l_1} \|e^{-\eta t} D^{l_2} u\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.29)$$

So by (4.27), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l_1+l_2=k+1} (\eta)^{2l_1} \|e^{-\eta t} D^{l_2} u\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 &\leq \sum_{l_1+l_2=k+1} \|e^{-\eta t} D^{l_1+l_2} u\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 \\ &= \sum_{|\alpha|=k+1} \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha u\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.30)$$

From (4.25), (4.28)–(4.30), we obtain (4.26). Therefore, we derive the estimate (4.21) for any $s \in \mathbb{N}$ by the induction method. \square

Lemma 4.3 (Boundedness in the norm of high regularity). *Under the assumption of theorem 2.1, there exists a large $\eta_* \geq 1$ and a small $T_* > 0$ and small $\epsilon_0 > 0$, such that for all $\eta \geq \eta_*$ and $T \leq T_*$, the following estimate*

$$\|\tilde{u}_m\|_{s, \eta, T}^2 + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|D^\alpha \tilde{u}_m(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s} \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha \tilde{u}_m\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \leq \epsilon_0^2 \quad (4.31)$$

holds for all $m \geq 0$.

Proof. We prove this lemma by induction. Suppose (4.31) holds for all $m \leq n$, we proceed to show it also holds true for $m = n+1$. In view of (4.10), in order to apply theorem 3.1 to \tilde{u}_{n+1} , we need to estimate the source terms. By the definition of F_n , we know that

$$\|F_n\|_{s-1, \eta, T}^2 \lesssim C' \epsilon_0^2 \|\tilde{u}_n\|_{s, \eta, T}^2. \quad (4.32)$$

Similarly, we have

$$\|\tilde{a}_{ij}^n \partial_{ij} \psi\|_{s-1, \eta, T}^2 \leq C'' \|\tilde{u}_n\|_{s, \eta, T}^2. \quad (4.33)$$

For the boundary term, noticing that $G(u_b, Du_b) = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}\tilde{u}_n - G_n &= \mathcal{B}\tilde{u}_n - (G(\tilde{u}_n + \psi, D(\tilde{u}_n + \psi)) - G(u_b, Du_b)) \\ &= \mathcal{B}\tilde{u}_n - \mathcal{B}(\tilde{u}_n + \psi - u_b) + A_n^\top D^2 G|_{u=u_b+\theta(\tilde{u}_n+\psi-u_b)} A_n \\ &= \mathcal{B}(u_b - \psi) + A_n^\top D^2 G|_{u=u_b+\theta(\tilde{u}_n+\psi-u_b)} A_n, \end{aligned} \quad (4.34)$$

where $A_n = (\tilde{u}_n + \psi - u_b, D(\tilde{u}_n + \psi - u_b))$. Hence we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s-1} \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha (\mathcal{B}\tilde{u}_n - G_n)\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 \\ & \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s} \|e^{-\eta t} D^\alpha (\psi - u_b)\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \tilde{u}_n|_{y_1=0}\|_{H^s(\omega_T^\ell)}^4. \end{aligned} \quad (4.35)$$

By theorem 3.1 and lemma 4.2 and in view of (4.32), (4.33), and (4.35), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\tilde{u}_{n+1}\|_{s,\eta,T}^2 + \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|D^\alpha \tilde{u}_{n+1}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} \tilde{u}_{n+1}|_{y_1=0}\|_{s,\eta,T}^2 \\ & \leq \frac{C}{\eta^2} e^{4\eta T} \|\tilde{u}_n + \psi\|_{s,\eta,T}^2 \cdot (\|F_n\|_{3,\eta,T}^2 + \|\tilde{a}_{ij}^n \partial_{ij} \psi\|_{3,\eta,T}^2) \\ & \quad + \frac{C}{\eta} e^{2\eta T} \|F_n\|_{s-1,\eta,T}^2 + e^{2\eta T} \|(\mathcal{B}\tilde{u}_n - G_n)|_{y_1=0}\|_{s-1,\eta,T}^2 \\ & \leq \frac{C}{\eta} e^{4\eta T} (\epsilon_0^2 + \|\psi\|_{s,\eta,T}^2) \cdot (C' \epsilon_0^4 + C'' \epsilon_0^2) \\ & \quad + \frac{C}{\eta} e^{2\eta T} \epsilon_0^2 + C e^{2\eta T} (\epsilon^2 + \epsilon_0^4). \end{aligned} \quad (4.36)$$

Now let η_* be properly large such that $\frac{C}{\eta_*}(C' + C'' + 1) < \frac{1}{16}$. Then let ϵ_0 be small such that $\epsilon_0^2 < \min(\frac{1}{2}, \sqrt{\frac{1}{8C}})$. Finally let T_* and the ϵ in theorem 2.1 be properly small such that $e^{4\eta_* T_*} < 2$ and $\|\psi\|_{s,\eta_*,T_*}^2 < \epsilon_0^2$ and $\epsilon \leq \min(\sqrt{\frac{1}{16C}} \epsilon_0, \epsilon_0)$. We obtain

$$\|\tilde{u}_{n+1}\|_{s,\eta_*,T_*}^2 + \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T_*} \|D^\alpha \tilde{u}_{n+1}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\tilde{u}_{n+1}|_{y_1=0}\|_{s,\eta_*,T_*}^2 < \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_0^2 + 2 \times \frac{1}{8} \epsilon_0^2 + \frac{1}{4} \epsilon_0^2 = \epsilon_0^2.$$

This implies (4.31) also holds for $m = n + 1$. It is clear that (4.31) holds for $m = 0$. This completes the proof of this lemma. \square

It is easy to check that $v_{m+1} := \tilde{u}_{m+1} - \tilde{u}_m$ satisfies following initial boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{\tilde{u}} \kappa \sum_{i,j=0}^3 \tilde{a}_{ij}^m \partial_{ij} v_{m+1} = F_m - F_{m-1} - \partial_{\tilde{u}} \kappa (\tilde{a}_{ij}^m - \tilde{a}_{ij}^{m-1}) \partial_{ij} (\tilde{u}_m + \psi) & \text{in } \Omega_T, \\ \mathcal{B}v_{m+1} = \mathcal{B}v_m - (G_m - G_{m-1}) & \text{on } \omega_T^\ell, \\ \partial_{y_3} v_{m+1} = 0 & \text{on } \omega_T^r, \\ (v_{m+1}, \partial_{y_0} v_{m+1})|_{y_0=0} = (0, 0) & \text{on } \Gamma_{in}. \end{cases} \quad (4.37)$$

For the sequence $\{v_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$, we have following lemma:

Lemma 4.4 (Contraction in the norm of low regularity). *Under the assumption of theorem 2.1 and suppose the ϵ in 2.1 is small enough, then there exist two constants $\eta_{**} \geq 1$ and $T_{**} > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|v_{m+1}\|_{1,\eta_{**},T_{**}}^2 + \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T_{**}} \|D^\alpha v_{m+1}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|v_{m+1}|_{y_1=0}\|_{1,\eta_{**},T_{**}}^2 \\ & \leq \sigma_0 \cdot (\|v_m\|_{1,\eta_{**},T_{**}}^2 + \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T_{**}} \|D^\alpha v_m(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|v_m|_{y_1=0}\|_{1,\eta_{**},T_{**}}^2) \end{aligned} \quad (4.38)$$

hold for all $m \geq 0$, where $0 < \sigma_0 < 1$ is a constant independent of m .

Proof. In order to apply theorem 3.1, we need to estimate the source terms. In fact, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_m - F_{m-1} &= \partial_{\tilde{u}} \kappa \left(\int_0^1 F(u, Du)|_{u=\tilde{u}_{m-1}+\theta v_m+\psi} d\theta \right) \cdot v_m \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=0}^3 \partial_{\tilde{u}} \kappa \left(\int_0^1 \partial_{u_i} F(u, Du)|_{u=\tilde{u}_{m-1}+\theta v_m+\psi} d\theta \right) \cdot \partial_i v_m. \end{aligned} \quad (4.39)$$

Hence we deduce that

$$\|F_m - F_{m-1}\|_{0,\eta,T} \lesssim \epsilon_0 \|v_m\|_{1,\eta,T}. \quad (4.40)$$

Similarly, one has

$$\|\partial_{\tilde{u}} \kappa(\tilde{a}_{ij}^m - \tilde{a}_{ij}^{m-1}) \partial_{ij}(\tilde{u}_m + \psi)\|_{0,\eta,T} \lesssim \|v_m\|_{1,\eta,T}. \quad (4.41)$$

For the boundary term, we have

$$\begin{aligned} G_m - G_{m-1} &= \partial_u G|_{\tilde{u}=\tilde{u}_{m-1}} v_m + \sum_{i=0}^3 \partial_{u_{y_i}} G|_{\tilde{u}=\tilde{u}_{m-1}} \partial_{y_i} v_m \\ &\quad + (v_m, Dv_m)^\top D^2 G|_{\tilde{u}=\tilde{u}_{m-1}+\theta v_m}(v_m, Dv_m), \end{aligned} \quad (4.42)$$

where $\theta \in (0, 1)$ and $D^2 G$ is the Hessian matrix of G with respect to (u, Du) . Hence one deduces that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}v_m - (G_m - G_{m-1}) &= (\partial_u G|_{\tilde{u}=\tilde{u}_b} - \partial_u G|_{\tilde{u}=\tilde{u}_{m-1}}) v_m + \sum_{i=0}^3 (\partial_{u_{y_i}} G|_{\tilde{u}=\tilde{u}_b} - \partial_{u_{y_i}} G|_{\tilde{u}=\tilde{u}_{m-1}}) \partial_{y_i} v_m \\ &\quad + (v_m, Dv_m)^\top D^2 G|_{\tilde{u}=\tilde{u}_{m-1}+\theta v_m}(v_m, Dv_m). \end{aligned} \quad (4.43)$$

By Taylor theorem, it is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} &(\partial_u G|_{\tilde{u}=\tilde{u}_b} - \partial_u G|_{\tilde{u}=\tilde{u}_{m-1}}) v_m \\ &= - \left(\partial_u^2 G|_{\tilde{u}=\tilde{u}_b} (\tilde{u}_{m-1} - \tilde{u}_b) + \sum_{i=0}^3 (\partial_{u_{y_i}^2} G)|_{\tilde{u}=\tilde{u}_b} \partial_{y_i} (\tilde{u}_{m-1} - \tilde{u}_b) \right) v_m \\ &\quad - \left(\mathbf{X}_{m-1}^\top (D^2 \partial_u G)|_{\tilde{u}=\tilde{u}_b+\theta_1 v_m} \mathbf{X}_{m-1} \right) v_m. \end{aligned} \quad (4.44)$$

where $\theta_1 \in (0, 1)$, $\mathbf{X}_{m-1} = (\tilde{u}_{m-1} - \tilde{u}_b, D(\tilde{u}_{m-1} - \tilde{u}_b))$, and $D^2 \partial_u G$ is the Hessian matrix of $\partial_u G$ with respect to (u, Du) .

Hence by lemma 4.3, one has

$$\|e^{-\eta t} (\partial_u G|_{\tilde{u}=\tilde{u}_b} - \partial_u G|_{\tilde{u}=\tilde{u}_{m-1}}) v_m\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)} \lesssim \epsilon_0 \|e^{-\eta t} v_m\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)}. \quad (4.45)$$

Similarly one deduces that

$$\|e^{-\eta t} (\partial_{u_{y_i}} G|_{\tilde{u}=\tilde{u}_b} - \partial_{u_{y_i}} G|_{\tilde{u}=\tilde{u}_{m-1}}) \partial_{y_i} v_m\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)} \lesssim \epsilon_0 \|e^{-\eta t} v_m\|_{H^1(\omega_T^\ell)}, \quad 0 \leq i \leq 3. \quad (4.46)$$

It is easy to see that

$$\|e^{-\eta t}(v_m, Dv_m)^\top D^2 G|_{\tilde{u}=\tilde{u}_{m-1}+\theta v_m}(v_m, Dv_m)\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)} \lesssim \epsilon_0 \|e^{-\eta t} v_m\|_{H^1(\omega_T^\ell)}. \quad (4.47)$$

By (4.43) and (4.45)-(4.47), we have

$$\|e^{-\eta t} \mathcal{B}v_{m+1}\|_{L^2(\omega_T^\ell)} \lesssim \epsilon_0 \|e^{-\eta t} v_m\|_{H^1(\omega_T^\ell)}. \quad (4.48)$$

Then by theorem 3.1, one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \|v_{m+1}\|_{1,\eta,T}^2 + \sum_{|\alpha|\leq 1} \sup_{0\leq t\leq T} \|D^\alpha v_{m+1}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|v_{m+1}|_{y_1=0}\|_{1,\eta,T}^2 \\ & \leq C \left(\frac{1}{\eta} + \epsilon_0^2 \right) (\|v_m\|_{1,\eta,T}^2 + \|v_m|_{y_1=0}\|_{1,\eta,T}^2). \end{aligned} \quad (4.49)$$

Above inequality holds for $\eta > \eta_*$ and $T < T_*$. From the proof of lemma 4.3, we can further require ϵ_0 small such that $C\epsilon_0 < \frac{1}{2}$. Then one selects $\eta_{**} > \eta_* \geq 1$ such that $\frac{C}{\eta_{**}} \leq \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_0$, then for properly small T_{**} ($T_{**} < T_*$), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|v_{m+1}\|_{1,\eta_{**},T_{**}}^2 + \sum_{|\alpha|\leq 1} \sup_{0\leq t\leq T_{**}} \|D^\alpha v_{m+1}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e^{-\eta t} v_{m+1}|_{y_1=0}\|_{1,\eta_{**},T_{**}}^2 \\ & \leq \epsilon_0 (\|v_m\|_{1,\eta_{**},T_{**}}^2 + \sum_{|\alpha|\leq 1} \sup_{0\leq t\leq T_{**}} \|D^\alpha v_m(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|v_m|_{y_1=0}\|_{1,\eta_{**},T_{**}}^2). \end{aligned} \quad (4.50)$$

Since $\epsilon_0 < 1$, we finish the proof of this lemma by letting $\sigma_0 = \epsilon_0$. \square

Proof of theorem 2.1. Armed with lemma 4.3 and lemma 4.4, we are able to prove theorem 2.1. In fact, lemma 4.4 implies that $\{\tilde{u}_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ is a Cauchy sequence in the norm of low regularity. Hence it converges strongly such that \tilde{u}_m converges to some function \tilde{u} , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} & (\|\tilde{u}_m - \tilde{u}\|_{1,\eta_{**},T_{**}} + \sum_{|\alpha|\leq 1} \sup_{0\leq t\leq T_{**}} \|D^\alpha(\tilde{u}_m - \tilde{u})(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ & + \|(\tilde{u}_m - \tilde{u})|_{y_1=0}\|_{1,\eta_{**},T_{**}}) \longrightarrow 0 \text{ as } m \text{ goes to infinity.} \end{aligned} \quad (4.51)$$

Limit (4.51) also means the coefficients in the equation and boundary conditions in (4.10), \tilde{a}_{ij}^m , F_m , G_m and $\mathcal{B}\tilde{u}_m$, converge to the corresponding quantities with \tilde{u}_m being replaced by \tilde{u} .

On the other hand, it follows from Lemma 4.3 that \tilde{u}_m converges to \tilde{u} weakly in the norm of high regularity such that \tilde{u} satisfies estimate (4.31).

Hence, by passing the limit in (4.10), it is easy to see that $\tilde{u} + \psi$ is the smooth solution of the non-linear problem (NLP) with estimate (4.31). By (4.31) and the assumption of theorem 2.1 one has

$$\|\tilde{u} + \psi - u_b\|_{s,\eta_{**},T_{**}} \leq \|\tilde{u}\|_{s,\eta_{**},T_{**}} + \|\psi - u_b\|_{s,\eta_{**},T_{**}} \leq C\epsilon_0. \quad (4.52)$$

This completes the proof of theorem 2.1.

5. APPENDIX

5.1. **Interior coefficients.** By direct computation, we can determine other coefficients.

$$\tilde{a}_{00} = (\partial_{y_1} u)^2. \quad (5.1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{a}_{01} = \tilde{a}_{10} = & \partial_{y_1} u(-\partial_{y_0} u + \partial_{x_1} \Phi(\partial_{x_1} \mathcal{W} \partial_{y_3} u - \partial_{x_1} p \partial_{y_2} u + 1)) \\ & + \partial_{y_1} u(\partial_{x_2} \Phi(\partial_{x_3} p \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W} \partial_{y_2} u + \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W} \partial_{y_2} u - \partial_{y_2} u) - \partial_{x_3} \Phi(\partial_{x_3} p \partial_{y_2} u + \partial_{y_3} u)). \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

$$\tilde{a}_{02} = \tilde{a}_{20} = (\partial_{y_1} u)^2(\partial_{x_1} \Phi \partial_{x_1} p + \partial_{x_2} \Phi(\partial_{x_2} p + 1) + \partial_{x_3} \Phi \partial_{x_3} p). \quad (5.3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{a}_{12} = \tilde{a}_{21} = & -\partial_{y_0} u(\partial_{x_1} \Phi \partial_{x_1} p \partial_{y_1} u + \partial_{x_2} \Phi(\partial_{x_2} p + 1) \partial_{y_1} u) \\ & + \partial_{y_1} u(\partial_{x_1} \mathcal{W} \partial_{y_3} u - \partial_{x_1} p \partial_{y_2} u + 1) \\ & \times (\partial_{x_1} p(-c^2 + |\partial_{x_1} \Phi|^2) + \partial_{x_1} \Phi \partial_{x_2} \Phi(\partial_{x_2} p + 1) + \partial_{x_1} \Phi \partial_{x_3} \Phi \partial_{x_3} p). \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{a}_{22} = & \partial_{x_1} p \partial_{y_1} u((-c^2 + |\partial_{x_1} \Phi|^2) \partial_{x_1} p \partial_{y_1} u + \partial_{x_1} \Phi \partial_{x_2} \Phi(\partial_{x_2} p + 1) \partial_{y_1} u) \\ & + (\partial_{y_1} u)^2(\partial_{x_2} p + 1)(\partial_{x_2} \Phi \partial_{x_1} \Phi \partial_{x_1} p + (-c^2 + |\partial_{x_2} \Phi|^2)(\partial_{x_2} p + 1) + \partial_{x_2} \Phi \partial_{x_3} \Phi \partial_{x_3} p) \\ & + \partial_{x_3} p(\partial_{y_1} u)^2(\partial_{x_3} \Phi \partial_{x_1} \Phi \partial_{x_1} p + \partial_{x_3} \Phi \partial_{x_2} \Phi(\partial_{x_2} p + 1) + (-c^2 + |\partial_{x_3} \Phi|^2) \partial_{x_3} p). \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{a}_{11} = & -\partial_{y_0} u(-\partial_{y_0} u + \partial_{x_1} \Phi(\partial_{x_1} \mathcal{W} \partial_{y_3} u - \partial_{x_1} p \partial_{y_2} u + 1)) \\ & + \partial_{x_2} \Phi((\partial_{x_3} p \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W} - 1) \partial_{y_2} u) + \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W} \partial_{y_3} u \\ & + (\partial_{x_1} \mathcal{W} \partial_{y_3} u - \partial_{x_1} p \partial_{y_2} u + 1) \\ & \quad \times (-\partial_{x_1} \Phi \partial_{y_0} u + (-c^2 + |\partial_{x_1} \Phi|^2)(\partial_{x_1} \mathcal{W} \partial_{y_3} u - \partial_{x_1} p \partial_{y_2} u + 1)) \\ & + \partial_{x_3} \Phi \partial_{y_0} u(\partial_{x_3} p \partial_{y_2} u + \partial_{y_3} u) + \partial_{x_1} \Phi \partial_{x_2} \Phi(\partial_{x_1} \mathcal{W} \partial_{y_3} u - \partial_{x_1} p \partial_{y_2} u + 1) \\ & \quad \times ((\partial_{x_3} p \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W} - 1) \partial_{y_2} u + \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W} \partial_{y_3} u) \\ & - (\partial_{x_1} \mathcal{W} \partial_{y_3} u - \partial_{x_1} p \partial_{y_2} u + 1) \partial_{x_1} \Phi \partial_{x_3} \Phi(\partial_{x_3} p \partial_{y_2} u + \partial_{y_3} u) \\ & + ((\partial_{x_3} p \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W} - 1) \partial_{y_2} u + \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W} \partial_{y_3} u) \\ & \quad \times (-\partial_{x_2} \Phi \partial_{y_0} u + \partial_{x_1} \Phi \partial_{x_2} \Phi(\partial_{x_1} \mathcal{W} \partial_{y_3} u - \partial_{x_1} p \partial_{y_2} u + 1)) \\ & + (-c^2 + |\partial_{x_2} \Phi|^2)((\partial_{x_3} p \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W} - 1) \partial_{y_2} u + 1)((\partial_{x_3} p \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W} - 1) \partial_{y_2} u + \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W} \partial_{y_3} u) \\ & - ((\partial_{x_3} p \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W} - 1) \partial_{y_2} u + \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W} \partial_{y_3} u) \partial_{x_2} \Phi \partial_{x_3} \Phi(\partial_{x_3} p \partial_{y_2} u + \partial_{y_3} u) \\ & - (\partial_{x_3} p \partial_{y_2} u + \partial_{y_3} u)(-\partial_{x_3} \Phi \partial_{y_0} u + \partial_{x_3} \Phi \partial_{x_1} \Phi(\partial_{x_1} \mathcal{W} \partial_{y_3} u - \partial_{x_1} p \partial_{y_2} u + 1)) \\ & - (\partial_{x_3} p \partial_{y_2} u + \partial_{y_3} u) \partial_{x_3} \Phi \partial_{x_2} \Phi((\partial_{x_3} p \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W} - 1) \partial_{y_2} u + \partial_{x_2} \mathcal{W} \partial_{y_3} u) \\ & + (\partial_{x_3} p \partial_{y_2} u + \partial_{y_3} u)^2(-c^2 + |\partial_{x_3} \Phi|^2). \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{a}_{33} = & \partial_{x_1} p(\partial_{y_1} u)^2((-c^2 + |\partial_{x_1} \Phi|^2) \partial_{x_1} p + \partial_{x_1} \Phi \partial_{x_2} \Phi(\partial_{x_2} p + 1) + \partial_{x_1} \Phi \partial_{x_3} \Phi \partial_{x_3} p) \\ & + (\partial_{x_2} p + 1)(\partial_{y_1} u)^2(\partial_{x_2} \Phi \partial_{x_1} \Phi \partial_{x_1} p + (-c^2 + |\partial_{x_2} \Phi|^2)(\partial_{x_2} p + 1) + \partial_{x_2} \Phi \partial_{x_3} \Phi \partial_{x_3} p) \\ & + \partial_{x_3} p(\partial_{y_1} u)^2(\partial_{x_3} \Phi \partial_{x_1} \Phi \partial_{x_1} p + \partial_{x_3} \Phi \partial_{x_2} \Phi(\partial_{x_2} p + 1) + (-c^2 + |\partial_{x_3} \Phi|^2) \partial_{x_3} p). \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

5.2. **Second order derivatives of κ .** The second order derivatives of κ can be computed via chain rule on the basis of the first order derivatives.

$$\partial_{\bar{u}\bar{u}} \kappa = \partial_{x_1}(\partial_{\bar{u}} \kappa) \frac{\partial x_1}{\partial u} \partial_{\bar{u}} \kappa + \partial_{x_2}(\partial_{\bar{u}} \kappa) \frac{\partial x_2}{\partial u} \partial_{\bar{u}} \kappa \quad (5.8)$$

$$\kappa_{\bar{u}y_2} = \partial_{x_1}(\partial_{\bar{u}}\kappa)\frac{\partial x_1}{\partial y_2} + \partial_{x_2}(\partial_{\bar{u}}\kappa)\frac{\partial x_2}{\partial y_2} \quad (5.9)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_{\bar{u}y_3} &= \frac{\partial_{x_2}N(1 + y_3(\partial_{x_1}N) + \partial_{x_2}N) + (\partial_{x_1}N + \partial_{x_2}N)(1 + y_3\partial_{x_2}N)}{(1 + y_3(\partial_{x_1}N + \partial_{x_2}N))^2} \\ &\quad + \partial_{x_1}(\partial_{\bar{u}}\kappa)\frac{\partial x_1}{\partial u} + \partial_{x_2}(\partial_{\bar{u}}\kappa)\frac{\partial x_2}{\partial u} \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

$$\partial_{y_2y_2}\kappa = \partial_{x_1}(\partial_{y_2}\kappa)\frac{\partial x_1}{\partial y_2} + \partial_{x_2}(\partial_{y_2}\kappa)\frac{\partial x_2}{\partial y_2} \quad (5.11)$$

$$\partial_{y_2y_3}\kappa = \partial_{x_1}\partial_{y_3}\kappa\frac{\partial x_1}{\partial y_2} + \partial_{x_2}\partial_{y_3}\kappa\frac{\partial x_2}{\partial y_2} \quad (5.12)$$

$$\partial_{y_3y_3}\kappa = \partial_{x_1}\partial_{y_3}\kappa\frac{\partial x_1}{\partial y_3} + \partial_{x_2}\partial_{y_3}\kappa\frac{\partial x_2}{\partial y_3} + \frac{N(\partial_{x_1}N + \partial_{x_2}N)}{(1 + y_3(\partial_{x_1}N + \partial_{x_2}N))^2} \quad (5.13)$$

where

$$\frac{\partial x_1}{\partial u} = 1 \quad (5.14)$$

$$\frac{\partial x_2}{\partial u} = -\frac{y_3\partial_{x_1}N}{1 + y_3\partial_{x_2}N} \quad (5.15)$$

By calculating the inverse of \mathbf{J} , one can derive $\frac{\partial x_1}{\partial y_i}$ ($i = 2, 3$) and $\frac{\partial x_2}{\partial y_i}$ ($i = 2, 3$). For example, one has

$$\frac{\partial x_2}{\partial y_2} = \frac{1}{1 + y_3\partial_{x_2}N}, \quad (5.16)$$

$$\frac{\partial x_2}{\partial y_3} = -\frac{N}{1 + y_3\partial_{x_2}N}. \quad (5.17)$$

And $\partial_{\bar{u}}\kappa$, $\partial_{y_2}\kappa$ and $\partial_{y_3}\kappa$ are given in (4.2).

Acknowledgements. The research of Beixiang Fang was supported in part by NSFC Grant Nos. 11971308 and 11631008. The research of Feimin Huang was supported in part by NSFC Grant No. 11688101. The research of Wei Xiang was supported in part by the Research Grants Council of the HKSAR, China (Project No. CityU 11303518, Project CityU 11304820 and Project CityU 11300021). The research of Feng Xiao was supported by the National Center for Mathematics and Interdisciplinary Sciences, CAS.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Alinhac, Unicité d'ondes de raréfaction pour des systèmes quasi-linéaires hyperboliques multidimensionnels. (French) [Uniqueness of rarefaction waves for multidimensional hyperbolic quasilinear systems] *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, **38** (1989), 345–363.
- [2] S. Alinhac, Existence d'ondes de raréfaction pour des systèmes quasi-linéaires hyperboliques multidimensionnels. (French) [Existence of rarefaction waves for multidimensional hyperbolic quasilinear systems] *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **14** (1989), 173–230.
- [3] H. Al Baba, C. Klingenberg, O. Kreml, V. Mácha, and S. Markfelder, Non-uniqueness of admissible weak solution to the Riemann problem for the full Euler system in 2D, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **52**(2020), 1729–1760.
- [4] M. Bae, G.-Q. Chen, and M. Feldman, Regularity of solutions to regular shock reflection for potential flow, *Invent. Math.* **175** (2009), 505–543.

- [5] M. Bae, G.-Q. Chen, and M. Feldman, Prandtl-Meyer Configurations, Transonic shocks, and Free boundary problems, *Accepted in Memoriam of the AMS, ArXiv:1901.05916*.
- [6] M. Bae, and W. Xiang, Detached shock past a blunt body. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.13281v2* (2020).
- [7] C. Bardos, L. Székelyhidi, and É. Wiedemann, Non-uniqueness for the Euler equations: the effect of the boundary, *Russian Math. Surveys* **69** (2014), 189–207.
- [8] S. Benzoni-Gavage, and D. Serre, *Multidimensional hyperbolic partial differential equations. First-order systems and applications*. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2007.
- [9] L. Bers, *Mathematical aspects of subsonic and transonic gas dynamics*. Courier Dover Publications, 2016.
- [10] G.-Q. Chen and J. Chen, Stability of rarefaction waves and vacuum states for the multidimensional Euler equations. *J. Hyperbolic Differ. Equ.* **4** (2007), 105–122.
- [11] G.-G. Chen, J. Chen and W. Xiang, Stability of attached transonic shocks in steady potential flow past three-dimensional wedges, *Comm. Math. Phys.* (2021), accepted at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-021-04168-x>.
- [12] G.-Q. Chen and B.-X. Fang, Stability of transonic shocks in steady supersonic flow past multidimensional wedges, *Adv. Math.* **314** (2017), 493–539.
- [13] G.-Q. Chen and M. Feldman, Multidimensional transonic shocks and free boundary problems for non-linear equations of mixed type, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **16** (2003), 461–494.
- [14] G.-Q. Chen and M. Feldman, Steady transonic shocks and free boundary problems for the Euler equations in infinite cylinders, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **57** (2004), 210–356.
- [15] G.-Q. Chen and M. Feldman, Global solutions of shock reflection by large-angle wedges for potential flow, *Ann. of Math.*, **171** (2010), 1067–1182.
- [16] G.-Q. Chen and M. Feldman, *The mathematics of shock reflection-diffraction and von Neumann's conjectures*. Annals of Mathematics Studies, 197. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2018.
- [17] G.-Q. Chen, M. Feldman and W. Xiang, Convexity of transonic shocks in self-similar coordinates, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **238** (2020), 47–124.
- [18] G.-Q. Chen, P. Secchi and T. Wang. Stability of Relativistic Vortex Sheets in Three-Dimensional Minkowski Spacetime. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **232** (2019), 591–695.
- [19] G.-Q. Chen, P. Secchi and T. Wang. Stability of Multidimensional Thermoelastic Contact Discontinuities. *Arch. Rational. Mech. Anal.* **237**(2020), 1271–1323.
- [20] S.-X. Chen, Initial boundary value problems for quasilinear symmetric hyperbolic systems with characteristic boundary. *Front. Math. China*, **1**, (2007), 87-102. Translated from *Chinese Ann. Math.*, **2** (1982), 222-232.
- [21] S.-X. Chen, Mach configuration in pseudo-stationary compressible flow, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **21** (2008), 63–100.
- [22] S.-X. Chen and B.-X. Fang, Stability of transonic shocks in supersonic flow past a wedge, *J. Differ. Eqs.* **233** (2007), 105–135.
- [23] S.-X. Chen and H.-R. Yuan, Transonic shocks in compressible flow passing a duct for three dimensional Euler system. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **187** (2008), 523–556.
- [24] E. Chiodaroli, C. De Lellis, and O. Kreml, Global ill-posedness of the isentropic system of gas dynamics, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **68** (2015), 1157-90.
- [25] E. Chiodaroli, O. Kreml, V. Mácha, and S. Schwarzacher, Non-uniqueness of admissible weak solutions to the compressible Euler equations with smooth initial data, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* (2019).
- [26] J.-F. Coulombel, Weak stability of nonuniformly stable multidimensional shocks. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, **34** (2002), 142–172.

- [27] J.-F. Coulombel, Weakly stable multidimensional shocks. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* **21** (2004), 401–443.
- [28] J.-F. Coulombel and P. Secchi, The stability of compressible vortex sheets in two space dimensions. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **53** (2004), 941–1012.
- [29] J.-F. Coulombel and P. Secchi, Non-linear compressible vortex sheets in two space dimensions, *Annales scientifiques de l'école Normale Supérieure, Série 4*, **41** (2008), 85–139.
- [30] R. Courant, K.O. Friedrichs, *Supersonic flow and shock waves*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1948.
- [31] C. De Lellis and L. Székelyhidi, The Euler equations as a differential inclusion, *Ann. Math.*, **170** (2009), 1417–1436.
- [32] C. De Lellis and L. Székelyhidi, On admissibility criteria for weak solutions of the Euler equations, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **195** (2010), 225–260.
- [33] V. Elling and T.-P. Liu, Supersonic flow onto a solid wedge, *Comm. Pure. Appl. Math.*, **61** (2008), 1347–1448.
- [34] B.-X. Fang, Stability of transonic shocks for the full Euler system in supersonic flow past a wedge, *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.* **29** (2006), 1–26.
- [35] B.-X. Fang, L. Liu, H.-R. Yuan, Global uniqueness of transonic shocks in two-dimensional steady compressible Euler flows. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **207** (2013), 317–345.
- [36] B.-X. Fang and W. Xiang, The uniqueness of transonic shocks in supersonic flow past a 2-d wedge, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **437** (2016), 194–213.
- [37] B.-X. Fang, W. Xiang, and F. Xiao, Persistence of the steady normal shock structure for the unsteady potential flow, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, **52** (2020), 6033–6104.
- [38] B.-X. Fang and Z.-P. Xin, On admissible locations of transonic shock fronts for steady Euler flows in an almost flat finite nozzle with prescribed receiver pressure, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **74** (2021), 1493–1544.
- [39] F. Gazzola and P. Secchi, Inflow-outflow problems for Euler equations in a rectangular cylinder, *NoDEA Non-linear Differ. Equ. Appl.*, **8** (2001), 195–217.
- [40] P. Godin, On the breakdown of 2D compressible Eulerian flows in bounded impermeable regions with corners. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **137** (2020), 178–212.
- [41] P. Godin, The 2D compressible Euler equations in bounded impermeable domains with corners. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **269** (2021), v+72 pp.
- [42] J. Hadamard. Leçons sur la propagation des ondes et les equations de l'hydrodynamique. *Monatsh. f. Mathematik und Physik*, **16** (1905), A59–A60.
- [43] C. Klingenberg and S. Markfelder, The Riemann problem for the multidimensional isentropic system of gas dynamics is ill-posed if it contains a shock, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **227** (2018), 967–994.
- [44] N.-A. Lai, W. Xiang, and Y. Zhou, Global instability of the multi-dimensional plane shocks for the isothermal flow, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.07386* (2018).
- [45] J. Li, I. Witt, and H.-C. Yin, Global multidimensional shock waves for 2-D and 3-D unsteady potential flow equations, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, **50** (2018), 933–1009.
- [46] J. Li, Z.-P. Xin, and H.-C. Yin, On transonic shocks in a nozzle with variable end pressures, *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **291** (2009), 111–150.
- [47] J. Li, Z.-P. Xin, and H.-C. Yin, Transonic shocks for the full compressible Euler system in a general two-dimensional de Laval nozzle, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **207** (2013), 533–581.
- [48] J.-Q. Li and Y.-X. Zheng, Interaction of rarefaction waves of the two-dimensional self-similar Euler equations, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **193** (2009), 623–657.
- [49] J.-Q. Li and Y.-X. Zheng, Interaction of four rarefaction waves in the bi-symmetric class of the two-dimensional Euler equations. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **296** (2010), 303–321.
- [50] L. Li, G. Xu, and H.-C. Yin, On the instability problem of a 3-D transonic oblique shock wave, *Adv. Math.*, **282** (2015), 443–515.

- [51] T.-W. Luo, C.-J. Xie, and Z.-P. Xin, Non-uniqueness of admissible weak solutions to compressible Euler systems with source terms, *Adv. Math.* **291** (2016), 542–583.
- [52] A. Majda, The existence of multidimensional shock fronts. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **43** (1983), 93.
- [53] A. Majda, The stability of multidimensional shock fronts. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **43** (1983), 93.
- [54] A. Majda and E. Thomann, Multidimensional shock fronts for second order wave equations, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, **12** (1987), 777–828.
- [55] G. Métivier, Stability of multi-dimensional weak shocks, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, **15** (1990), 983–1028.
- [56] G. Métivier, Stability of multidimensional shocks. In *Advances in the theory of shock waves, Progr. Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl.*, **47** (2001), 25–103, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 2001.
- [57] C. S. Morawetz. Potential theory for regular and mach reflection of a shock at a wedge. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **5** (1994), 593–624.
- [58] S. Osher, An ill posed problem for a hyperbolic equation near a corner, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **79** (1973), 1043–1044.
- [59] S. Osher, An ill-posed problem for a strictly hyperbolic equation in two unknowns near a corner, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **80** (1974), 705–708.
- [60] J. Von Neumann, Discussion on the existence and uniqueness or multiplicity of solutions of the aerodynamical equations. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **47** (2010), 145–154.
- [61] Z.-P. Xin and H.-C. Yin, Transonic shock in a nozzle. I. Two-dimensional case, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **58** (2005), 999–1050.
- [62] H.-C. Yin and C. Zhou, On global transonic shocks for the steady supersonic Euler flows past sharp 2-D wedges, *J. Differ. Equ.* **246** (2009), 4466–4496.
- [63] H.-R. Yuan, Persistence of shocks in ducts, *Non-linear Anal.* **75** (2012), 3874–3894.

BEIXIANG FANG: SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCE, MOE-LSC, AND SHL-MAC, SHANGHAI JIAO TONG UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI 200240, CHINA.

Email address: `bxfang@sjtu.edu.cn`

FEIMIN HUANG: ACADEMY OF MATHEMATICS AND SYSTEMS SCIENCE, CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCE, BEIJING 100190, CHINA; SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, BEIJING 100049, CHINA.

Email address: `fhuang@amt.ac.cn`

WEI XIANG: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CITY UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG, HONG KONG, CHINA.

Email address: `weixiang@cityu.edu.hk`

FENG XIAO: NCMIS, ACADEMY OF MATHEMATICS AND SYSTEMS SCIENCE, CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, BEIJING 100190, CHINA; INSTITUTE OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS, ACADEMY OF MATHEMATICS AND SYSTEMS SCIENCE, CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCE, BEIJING 100190, CHINA.

Email address: `xiaofeng@amss.ac.cn`