

# Long-time behavior of the Stokes-transport system in a channel

Anne-Laure Dalibard<sup>1,2</sup>   Julien Guillod<sup>1</sup>   Antoine Leblond<sup>1</sup>

June 1, 2023

## Abstract

The coupling between the transport equation for the density and the Stokes equation is considered in a periodic channel. More precisely, the density is advected by pure transport by a velocity field given by the Stokes equation with source force coming from the gravity due to differences in the density. Dirichlet boundary conditions are taken for the velocity field on the bottom and top of the channel, and periodic conditions in the horizontal variable. We prove that the affine stratified density profile is stable under small perturbations in Sobolev spaces and prove convergence of the density to another limiting stratified density profile for large time with an explicit algebraic decay rate. Moreover, we are able to precisely identify the limiting profile as the decreasing vertical rearrangement of the initial density. Finally, we study boundary layers formation to precisely characterize the long-time behavior beyond the constant limiting profile and enlighten the optimal decay rate.

**Keywords** Stokes-transport, channel, stability, affine profile, decreasing vertical rearrangement, long-time behavior, boundary layers

**MSC classes** 35B35, 35B40, 35M13, 35D35, 35Q49, 76D07, 76D10

---

<sup>1</sup>Sorbonne Université, CNRS, Université Paris Cité, Inria, Laboratoire Jacques-Louis Lions (LJLL), F-75005 Paris, France

<sup>2</sup>École Normale Supérieure, Université PSL, Département de Mathématiques et applications, F-75005, Paris, France

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Long time stability of stratified profiles: proof of Theorem 1.1</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1	Vanishing traces for $\theta'$ and $\partial_n \theta'$	10
2.2	Study of the linearized system	12
2.3	Bootstrap argument	15
2.4	Convergence as $t \rightarrow \infty$ and identification of the asymptotic profile	24
<b>3</b>	<b>Formation of linear boundary layers for large times: proof of Theorem 1.2</b>	<b>26</b>
3.1	Preliminary observations and Ansatz	26
3.2	Construction of the main profiles	28
3.3	Construction of an approximate solution	30
3.4	Estimate of the remainder and conclusion	35
<b>4</b>	<b>Nonlinear boundary layers: proof of Theorem 1.3</b>	<b>37</b>
4.1	General strategy	37
4.2	High regularity bounds under the bootstrap assumption	38
4.3	Decomposition of the traces of $\Delta^2 \theta'$ and $\partial_z \Delta^2 \theta'$	41
4.4	Iterative construction of the boundary layer profile	46
4.5	Bootstrap argument for $\theta^{\text{int}}$	57
<b>A</b>	<b>Well-posedness of the Stokes-transport equation in Sobolev spaces</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>About the bilaplacian equation</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>Proof of Lemma 3.1</b>	<b>64</b>

# 1 Introduction

The Stokes-transport equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \rho = 0 \\ -\Delta \mathbf{u} + \nabla p = -\rho \mathbf{e}_z \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0 \\ \rho|_{t=0} = \rho_0 \end{cases} \quad (1.1a)$$

models the evolution of an incompressible inhomogeneous fluid with density  $\rho$ , velocity and pressure fields  $(\mathbf{u}, p)$ . Since the density can be shifted by a constant, we assume for simplicity that the initial density  $\rho_0$  is non-negative. This equation will be studied in a two-dimensional periodic strip, namely  $\Omega = \mathbf{T} \times (0, 1)$  with variables  $(x, z) \in \Omega$  and with Dirichlet boundary condition of the velocity field:

$$\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega. \quad (1.1b)$$

It consists in a coupling of the transport equation for the density of the fluid, with a velocity field satisfying for all time the Stokes equation with gravity forcing  $-\rho \mathbf{e}_z$  where  $\mathbf{e}_z$  is the unitary vertical vector. This equation has been studied in particular in the works of [Hö18] and [Mec21] showing that (1.1) is a model obtained as the homogenization limit of inertialess particles in a fluid satisfying Stokes equation. A more recent paper by [II22] shows that this system is obtained as a formal limit where the Prandtl number is infinite. In this paper, the domain is chosen as  $\Omega = \mathbf{T} \times (0, 1)$  since it describe a physically meaningful situation which include Dirichlet boundary conditions.

**Well-posedness.** The well-posedness of this system has been shown in [Leb22] in bounded two-dimensional and three-dimensional domains as well as in the infinite strip  $\mathbb{R} \times (0, 1)$  with  $\rho \in L^\infty(\mathbf{R}_+; L^\infty)$  and  $\mathbf{u} \in L^\infty(\mathbf{R}_+; W^{1,\infty})$ ; the well-posedness in  $\Omega = \mathbb{T} \times (0, 1)$  being a direct consequence. Well-posedness in Sobolev spaces are required for our results. Since this result does not seem to appear in the literature, we provide a concise proof of the global well-posedness of this problem in Appendix A for sake of completeness. More precisely, for any  $\rho_0 \in H^m$  with  $m \geq 3$ , there exists a unique strong solution  $(\rho, \mathbf{u})$  of (1.1) with  $\rho \in C(\mathbf{R}_+; H^m(\Omega))$  and  $\mathbf{u} \in C(\mathbf{R}_+; H^{m+2}(\Omega))$ .

Well-posedness in other domains and spaces has also been proven, see for example the recent results [MS22, Inv23].

**Steady states.** Before going further let us observe that the stationary states, *i.e.* states such that  $\partial_t \rho = 0$ , of this system are precisely the *stratified* density profiles, which mean in this paper density profiles depending only on the vertical variable  $z$ . Indeed, for such a map  $\Theta = \Theta(z)$ ,

$$(\rho, \mathbf{u}, p) = \left( \Theta, \mathbf{0}, -\int^z \Theta(z') dz' \right). \quad (1.2)$$

is a solution of (1.1). To show the converse, let us introduce the potential energy associated to a density profile  $\rho$ ,

$$E(\rho) := \int_{\Omega} z \rho dx dz. \quad (1.3)$$

so the energy balance is

$$\frac{d}{dt} E(\rho) = \int_{\Omega} z \partial_t \rho = - \int_{\Omega} z \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \rho = \int_{\Omega} u_2 \rho = -\|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2}^2, \quad (1.4)$$

where the divergence-free and the Dirichlet boundary conditions on  $\mathbf{u}$  are used in the integration by parts. The last equality is simply the basic estimate of the Stokes equation. The potential energy dissipates exactly through the viscosity effects. From this observation we see that the whole evolution is non-reversible; the fluid only rearrange in states of lower potential energy. Moreover, a stationary state is exactly a state for which  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$ , therefore it means that the density  $\rho$  and the pressure  $p$  must satisfy

$$\nabla p = -\rho \mathbf{e}_z, \quad (1.5)$$

so that the pressure is independent of the  $x$  variable, implying  $\rho$  to depend only on the  $z$  variable.

**Main stability result.** The aim of this paper is to study the long-time asymptotic behavior of perturbation of stratified initial data with lighted fluid on top and lower fluid on the bottom, *i.e.* such that the profile  $\Theta$  depends only on  $z$  and is strictly decreasing. For simplicity and for the rest of this paper, we consider perturbations of the affine profile  $\Theta(z) = 1 - z$ . Our main stability result for perturbations vanishing on the boundary is the following:

**Theorem 1.1.** *There exists  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  small such that for any  $\rho_0 \in H^6(\Omega)$  satisfying  $\|\rho_0 - \Theta\|_{H^6} \leq \varepsilon_0$  and  $\rho_0 - \Theta \in H_0^2(\Omega)$ , the solution  $\rho$  of (1.1) satisfies:*

$$\|\rho - \rho_\infty\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0}{1+t}, \quad \|\rho - \rho_\infty\|_{H^4(\Omega)} \lesssim \varepsilon_0,$$

where  $\rho_\infty$  is given by the decreasing vertical rearrangement of  $\rho_0$ :

$$\rho_\infty(z) := \int_0^\infty \mathbf{1}_{0 \leq z \leq |\{\rho_0 > \lambda\}|} d\lambda.$$

Note that the condition on  $H_0^2(\Omega)$  is equivalent to the following requirements, discussed in the following paragraphs:

$$\rho_0|_\Omega = \Theta|_\Omega, \quad \partial_n \rho_0|_\Omega = \partial_n \Theta|_\Omega.$$

This theorem will be proven in Section 2.

**Remarks on the main stability result.** Since the set of steady-states is not discrete, it is expected that  $\Theta$  is not asymptotically stable, and that the long-time behavior is given by a slightly modified density profile. In general, this asymptotic profile is constructed through the entire nonlinear dynamics in a very non-explicit way. However the transport equation is remarkable since it preserves the measure of the level sets. This property combined with the fact that the asymptotic profile is strictly decreasing (as a perturbation of  $\Theta$ ) allows us to identify the asymptotic profile as the decreasing vertical rearrangement of  $\rho_0$ , which can be computed directly from  $\rho_0$  without dependence on the full non-linear dynamics. See Section 2.4 for details.

This result proves the stability of the particular state  $\Theta(z) = 1 - z$ . The result generalizes and our proofs adapt to the case of stratified  $\Theta$  satisfying

$$\sup_{(0,1)} \partial_z \Theta < 0, \quad \|\partial_z^2 \Theta\|_{H^s} \lesssim -\sup_{(0,1)} \partial_z \Theta,$$

for  $s$  large enough. These conditions mean that  $\Theta$  is strictly decreasing and presents sufficiently mild variations. This remark is detailed at the end of Section 2.2. We note that without monotony assumption, lighter fluid might be below heavy one, and physically instabilities are expected to develop. Some weak convergence up to extraction toward a stationary state could be proven, but

the limit might be a non-trivial  $\omega$ -limit set in general. Anyway, this is not clear if convergence to the rearranging steady-state is expected to hold.

The results of [KY23] about the instability of the incompressible porous media equation being essentially geometric, they can be adapted to the Stokes-transport system (see the thesis of Antoine Leblond for details). The result is the same: there exists smooth perturbation small in  $H^{2-}(\Omega)$ -norm such that  $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|\rho(t) - \Theta\|_{H^s(\Omega)} = \infty$  for any  $s > 1$ . Therefore, this enlightens the existence of a regularity threshold between  $H^2(\Omega)$  and  $H^6(\Omega)$  between stability and instability.

In [GGBS02] the interface problem for (1.1) is considered also in the domain  $\Omega = \mathbf{T} \times (0, 1)$ . The interface problem treats the case where the density is equal to two different constant below and above an interface  $\Gamma(t) \subset \Omega$ . The question is about the regularity of the interface, the well-posedness for  $L^\infty$  densities being established in [Leb22]. More precisely, the authors prove local well-posedness for the interface in  $C^{1,\gamma}$  for  $0 < \gamma < 1$  as well as the global well-posedness and decay of small perturbation in  $H^3(\mathbf{T})$  of the flat interface with lighter fluid on top. The proof is very different than our as it uses a contour dynamics equation, but the spirit of the stability result is pretty similar.

Finally, an interesting question is about the optimality of the  $(1+t)^{-1}$  decay in (1). The dynamics of the equation preserve the fact that the perturbation and its normal derivative are vanishing on  $\partial\Omega$  *i.e.*  $\rho - \Theta \in H_0^2(\Omega)$ . For higher normal derivatives this property is not preserved, and this is the main reason why the time-decay is limited. This is one of the main motivation to study boundary layers formations in this system, together with the possibility to allow non-vanishing perturbations on  $\partial\Omega$ .

**Linear asymptotic expansion for non-vanishing perturbation on  $\partial\Omega$ .** The previous result is only valid under the assumption that the perturbation and its normal derivative are vanishing on  $\partial\Omega$  *i.e.* when  $\rho_0 - \Theta \in H_0^2(\Omega)$ . If the perturbation does not vanish on the boundary, this question is non trivial even for the linearized equations around  $\Theta = 1 - z$ :

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \theta - \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{e}_z = 0 \\ -\Delta \mathbf{u} + \nabla p = -\theta \mathbf{e}_z \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0 \\ \theta|_{t=0} = \theta_0 \end{cases} \quad (1.6)$$

It turns out that  $\theta$  vanishes as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  but with a much slower rate than in the case when  $\theta_0 = \partial_n \theta_0 = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$ . This is due to the formation of boundary layers of typical size  $t^{-1/4}$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , in the vicinity of  $z = 0$  and  $z = 1$ . More precisely, we will prove the following result in Section 3:

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $\theta_0 \in H^s(\Omega)$  for some  $s$  sufficiently large. Then the solution of (1.6) satisfies:*

$$\theta = \bar{\theta}_0 + \theta^{\text{BL}} + O(t^{-1}) \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega) \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty, \quad (1.7)$$

where  $\bar{\theta}_0(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \theta_0(x, z) dx$  is the horizontal average of the initial data and  $\theta^{\text{BL}}$  is the boundary layer part whose leading terms are:

$$\theta^{\text{BL}} = \Theta_{\text{top}}^0(x, t^{1/4}(1-z)) + \Theta_{\text{bot}}^0(x, t^{1/4}z) + l.o.t \quad (1.8)$$

with  $\Theta_{\text{top}}^0$  and  $\Theta_{\text{bot}}^1$  decaying exponentially as  $Z = t^{1/4}z \rightarrow \infty$ . Note that  $\|\theta^{\text{BL}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim (1+t)^{-1/8}$ .

**Non-linear asymptotic expansion.** For the nonlinear problem, more complex boundary layers seems to develop when the perturbation is non-zero on  $\partial\Omega$ . To avoid such complications, we go back to the case where  $\rho_0 - \Theta \in H_0^2(\Omega)$ . The previous results will then allow us to derive uniform bounds in  $H^8(\Omega)$ , modulo some boundary layer terms:

**Theorem 1.3.** *There exists  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  small such that for any  $\rho_0 \in H^{14}(\Omega)$  satisfying  $\|\rho_0 - \Theta\|_{H^{14}} \leq \varepsilon_0$  and  $\rho_0 - \Theta \in H_0^2(\Omega)$ , then the solution  $\rho$  of (1.1) satisfies:*

$$\rho = \rho_\infty + \rho_{\text{BL}} + O(t^{-2}) \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega) \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty, \quad (1.9)$$

where  $\rho_{\text{BL}}$  is the boundary layer part:

$$\rho_{\text{BL}} = \frac{1}{t} \Theta_{\text{top}}(x, t^{1/4}(1-z)) + \frac{1}{t} \Theta_{\text{bot}}(x, t^{1/4}z) + l.o.t. \quad (1.10)$$

with  $\Theta_{\text{top}}$  and  $\Theta_{\text{bot}}$  decaying exponentially as  $Z = t^{1/4}z \rightarrow \infty$ .

We note that  $\|\rho_{\text{BL}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim (1+t)^{-9/8}$  so this result strongly suggests that the optimal decay of  $\rho - \rho_\infty$  is like  $t^{-9/8}$  in  $L^2(\Omega)$ , which is close to the rate  $t^{-1}$  obtained in Theorem 1.1. Indeed, it would be very surprising but not excluded that the non-linear dynamics drive the system to the case where these boundary layers terms always vanish.

It seems there is no major obstacles in obtaining a similar non-linear result when the perturbation do not vanish on the boundary, except technicalities due to the fact that boundary layer equations will be non-linear. The present result proved in Section 4 requires only linear boundary layer and is already quite technical.

**Comparison with incompressible porous media.** We compare the results and properties of the Stokes-transport equation and of the incompressible porous medium equation, namely (1.1) where the Stokes equation is replaced by Darcy law,

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \rho = 0 \\ \mathbf{u} + \nabla p = -\rho \mathbf{e}_z \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0 \\ \rho|_{t=0} = \rho_0. \end{cases} \quad (1.11)$$

This equation has been intensively studied and we only cite comparable results. The question of well-posedness is way more difficult than for the Stokes-transport equation. In particular global well-posedness like Theorem A.1 seems to remain an open question. Local in time well-posedness has been shown in [CGO07, Xue09, YH14, CVW15] whereas some ill-posedness through non-uniqueness in some spaces has been shown in [CFG10, Shv11, IV15].

Concerning classical global solutions, the only known results has been proven for initial data close enough in Sobolev space to the stratified initial data  $\Theta(z) = 1 - z$  by [Elg17] in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  and  $\mathbb{T}^2$  and later improved in [CCL19] to the domain  $\mathbb{T} \times (0, 1)$ . More precisely, these results prove that the profile  $\Theta(z) = 1 - z$  is asymptotically stable under small perturbation in  $H^m$  for some  $m$ .

In  $\mathbb{T} \times (0, 1)$ , the boundary conditions used by [CCL19] somehow ensure that everything works more or less as in the periodic or whole space case, in particular integration by parts of high order derivatives are possible to obtain uniform bounds in high enough Sobolev spaces. By using similar boundary conditions for Stokes-transport in  $\mathbb{T}^2 \times (0, 1)$ , the results of [CCL19] can be adapted in a straightforward way. In our situation, the presence of the Dirichlet boundary condition is the major obstacle, in particular because uniform bounds in height Sobolev spaces

are no more valid. This is due to the presence of boundary layers as explained above and more detailed are provided below in the Scheme of the proof.

In the previous results of [Elg17, CCL19], the existence of the limiting profile was obtained through a fixed point argument. One contribution of the present paper is to precisely identify the long-time asymptotic profile as the decreasing vertical rearrangement of  $\rho_0$ .

## Scheme of the proof

Here we explain the main steps and difficulties of the proof of Theorem 1.1. The proofs of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 are way more technical, but in some sense the general strategy is more straightforward, therefore the explanations are postponed in the beginning of Sections 3 and 4 respectively.

**Rewriting of the equation.** Since perturbations of  $\Theta(z) = 1 - z$  are considered, it is natural to introduce the perturbation  $\theta$  as

$$\rho = \Theta + \theta \tag{1.12}$$

with initial perturbation  $\theta_0 = \rho_0 - \Theta$ . Substituting this expression in (1.1) and recalling that stratified states do not contribute to the velocity field in the Stokes equation, we obtain the following equation of the perturbation  $\theta$ :

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \theta + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \theta = u_2 \\ -\Delta \mathbf{u} + \nabla p = -\theta \mathbf{e}_z \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0 \\ \theta|_{t=0} = \theta_0. \end{cases} \tag{1.13}$$

The Stokes equation can be simplified by introducing the stream function of the divergence-free velocity field  $\mathbf{u}$  through  $\mathbf{u} = \nabla^\perp \psi = (-\partial_z \psi, \partial_x \psi)$ . Substituting it in the Stokes equation and considering the rotational of this equation, we get

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \theta + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \theta = u_2 \\ \Delta^2 \psi = \partial_x \theta \\ \mathbf{u} = \nabla^\perp \psi \\ \psi|_{\partial\Omega} = \partial_{\mathbf{n}} \psi|_{\partial\Omega} = 0. \end{cases} \tag{1.14}$$

Notice that this writing is consistent with the previous observation that any  $z$  dependant perturbation of the density does not affect the velocity field.

Once the steady states of (1.1) are identified as the stratified density profiles, *i.e.* functions depending only on  $z$ , it is natural to decompose the perturbation  $\theta(t, x, z)$  as its horizontal average  $\bar{\theta}(t, z)$  and as its complementary  $\theta'(t, x, z)$  with zero horizontal average, following [Elg17] and others:

$$\theta(t, x, z) = \bar{\theta}(t, z) + \theta'(t, x, z) \qquad \bar{\theta}(t, z) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \theta(t, x, z) \, dx.$$

We note that contrary to [Elg17, CCL19], the average is denoted by  $\bar{\theta}$  and not its complement as this seems a more natural notation for the average.

This decomposition is actually orthogonal in any Sobolev space  $H^m$  and one can project the transport equation onto the two appropriate complementary subspaces, leading to

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \theta' + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \theta')' = (1 - \partial_z \bar{\theta}) u_2 & \theta'|_{t=0} = \theta'_0 \\ \partial_t \bar{\theta} + \overline{\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \theta'} = 0 & \bar{\theta}|_{t=0} = \bar{\theta}_0 \\ \Delta^2 \psi = \partial_x \theta' & \psi|_{\partial\Omega} = 0 \\ \mathbf{u} = \nabla^\perp \psi & \partial_n \psi|_{\partial\Omega} = 0. \end{cases} \quad (1.15)$$

Although more complicated at first sight, this equation allows us to distinguish the evolution of  $\theta'$  and of the average perturbation  $\bar{\theta}$ ; this is needed since the whole perturbation can not be expected to decay in Sobolev spaces due to its pure transport, only the average-free part  $\theta'$ .

**Toy problem on the torus.** In order to intuit the decay of  $\|\theta'\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$  and to highlight the specific difficulties of our work, we will first explain the strategy in the case when the problem is set on the torus. More precisely, we consider the following linear problem for  $\theta'$  on the torus  $\mathbf{T}^2$ :

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \theta' = (1 - G) \partial_x \psi + S \\ \Delta^2 \psi = \partial_x \theta' \\ \theta'|_{t=0} = \theta'_0. \end{cases} \quad (1.16)$$

where  $G$  is a given small function of  $t$  and  $z$ , whose finality is to be replaced by  $\partial_z \bar{\theta}$ . A source term is needed but we omit it here for simplicity. Note that (1.16) differs from our original system through the periodic boundary conditions on  $\psi$  in the vertical variable. The choice of periodic boundary conditions simplifies the analysis in several ways, which we will detail below.

The first step is to consider (1.16) for  $G = 0$ . In this case the system has constant coefficients and since it is set within the torus, its solution is explicit and can be represented in terms of Fourier modes:

$$\theta'(t, x, z) = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbf{Z}^2 \\ k_x \neq 0}} \hat{\theta}_{\mathbf{k}}(0) \exp\left(-\frac{k_x^2}{|\mathbf{k}|^4} t\right) \exp(i\mathbf{k} \cdot (x, z)),$$

where the summation is done on  $\mathbf{k} = (k_x, k_z) \in \mathbf{Z}^2$  except  $k_x \neq 0$  since  $\theta'$  has vanishing horizontal averages. In particular, all  $H^s$  norms of the solution of (1.16) for  $G = S = 0$  are decreasing (provided  $\theta_0 \in H^s(\mathbf{T}^2)$ ) and furthermore, for any  $\alpha \in \mathbf{N}$ ,  $s \in \mathbf{R}$ , and  $t > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta^{s/2} \theta'(t)\|_{L^2}^2 &= \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbf{Z}^2 \\ k_x \neq 0}} |\mathbf{k}|^{2s} \exp\left(-2\frac{k_x^2}{|\mathbf{k}|^4} t\right) |\hat{\theta}_{\mathbf{k}}(0)|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbf{Z}^2 \\ k_x \neq 0}} |\mathbf{k}|^{2s+4\alpha} t^{-\alpha} |k_x|^{-2\alpha} |\hat{\theta}_{\mathbf{k}}(0)|^2 \\ &\leq t^{-\alpha} \|\Delta^{s/2+\alpha} \partial_x^{-\alpha} \theta'_0\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (1.17)$$

where  $\partial_x^{-1} f$  denotes the anti-derivative of  $f$  with null horizontal average. Hence if the initial datum is sufficiently smooth,  $\theta'$  decays algebraically and the rate of decay can be as large as desired, the cost being the regularity required on  $\theta'_0$ .



When  $G$  is nonzero and for any  $s \geq 0$  even, applying  $\Delta^{s/2}$  to the first equation of (1.16) and projecting on  $\Delta^{s/2}\theta'$ , we obtain, after several integrations by parts in the right-hand side,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\Delta^{s/2}\theta'\|_{L^2}^2 &= - \int_{\mathbf{T}^2} \Delta^{s/2}((1-G)\psi)\Delta^{s/2+2}\psi \\ &= - \int_{\mathbf{T}^2} \Delta^{s/2+1}((1-G)\psi)\Delta^{s/2+1}\psi \\ &\leq -(1-\bar{C}\|G\|_{H^{s+2}})\|\Delta^{s/2+1}\psi\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.18)$$

where  $\bar{C}$  is a universal constant. As a consequence, if  $\bar{C}\|G(t)\|_{H^{s+2}} < 1$ , then the  $H^s$  norm of  $\theta'$  is non-increasing, and whence uniformly bounded.

Then, the decay of  $\|\theta'(t)\|_{L^2}$  is deduced by using the following Gagliardo–Nirenberg interpolation inequality:

$$\|\Delta^2\psi\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{K}\|\Delta\psi\|_{L^2}^2 + K^2\|\Delta^4\psi\|_{L^2}^2 \quad (1.19)$$

which is valid for any  $K > 0$ . More precisely, combining (1.18) with  $s = 0$  and (1.19) lead to:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\theta'\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim -\|\Delta\psi\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim K^3\|\Delta^4\psi\|_{L^2}^2 - K\|\Delta^2\psi\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim K^3\|\Delta^2\partial_x\theta'\|_{L^2}^2 - K\|\theta'\|_{L^2}^2$$

remaining that  $\Delta^2\psi = \partial_x\theta'$ . Taking  $K \simeq (1+t)^{-1}$  we deduce:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\theta'\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{3}{1+t}\|\theta'\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{(1+t)^3}\|\Delta^2\partial_x\theta'\|_{L^2}^2$$

and since  $\partial_x\theta'$  is uniformly bounded in  $H^4(\mathbf{T}^2)$  by  $\|\partial_x\theta'_0\|_{H^4}$ , this integrate into

$$\|\theta'\|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{\|\partial_x\theta'_0\|_{H^4}}{1+t}. \quad (1.20)$$

**Difficulties with Dirichlet boundary conditions.** Let us now explain the main differences between (1.16) on  $\mathbf{T}^2$  and the original system (1.15) on  $\Omega = \mathbf{T} \times (0, 1)$ . The strategy will be identical, the first step is to deduce uniform bound for  $\theta'$  in  $H^4(\Omega)$  and then use interpolation inequalities together with the energy estimate to obtain the decay estimate (1.20), but their derivation will be substantially more involved.

Since the equation is no longer set on the torus, but rather in the domain  $\Omega = \mathbf{T} \times (0, 1)$  endowed with boundary conditions, we can no longer perform a (discrete) Fourier transform in the vertical variable. However it is possible to analyze explicitly the eigenfunctions of the operator

$$L : \theta \in L^2 \mapsto \partial_x\psi \in L^2, \quad \text{where } \Delta^2\psi = \partial_x\theta, \quad \psi|_{\partial\Omega} = \partial_n\psi|_{\partial\Omega} = 0.$$

and show that the eigenvalues  $(\lambda_{\mathbf{k}})_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbf{Z}^2}$  of the operator  $L$  behave asymptotically as  $k_x^2/|\mathbf{k}|^4$  (see Lemma B.2), so that the estimate (1.20) remains true. Details on the spectral analysis are presented in the PhD thesis of Antoine Leblond.

However, we are able to prove uniform  $H^4(\Omega)$  bound for  $\theta'$  directly from the equation without spectral analysis. More precisely, the estimate (1.18) remains valid for  $s = 0$  since  $\psi|_{\partial\Omega} = \partial_n\psi|_{\partial\Omega}$ . Higher order uniform estimates in  $H^s(\Omega)$  fails in general due to non-vanishing terms on the boundary. The question is therefore when the integration by parts done in (1.18) can be performed. The traces of  $\theta'$  and  $\partial_n\theta'$  being zero, the traces of  $\Delta^2\psi$  and  $\partial_n\Delta^2\psi$  are also vanishing (see Section 2.1) so integrations by parts in (1.18) can be done for  $s = 4$  provided  $G = 0$ . Therefore a uniform  $H^4$  bound can be deduced when  $G = 0$ . When  $G$  is nonzero,

some traces are not vanishing anymore. The strategy will be to treat them perturbatively, *i.e.* not performing integration by parts on  $\Delta^2(G\psi)\Delta^3\psi$ .

A similar interpolation argument (Lemma 2.7) allow us to then deduce the analogue of (1.20) *i.e.* that  $\|\theta'\|_{L^2}$  is bounded by  $(1+t)^{-1}$ .

**Bootstrap.** The last step of the proof consists in bringing the previous linear analysis into the full nonlinear system. Intuitively, the strategy is the following: denote by  $(0, T^*)$  the maximal time interval over which  $\|\theta'\|_{L^2} \leq B(1+t)^{-1}$  and  $\|\theta'\|_{H^4} \leq B$  are valid with a constant  $B$ . In fact more estimates need to be included in the bootstrap argument for technical reasons, see (2.15). On this time interval, the quadratic terms can be treated perturbatively, provided  $\|\theta_0\|_{H^4}$  is sufficiently small. Hence the bootstrap estimates hold with a constant which is better than  $B$ , and thus  $T^* = \infty$ . It follows that  $\theta'$  converges towards zero in  $L^2$ , and that the time derivative of  $\bar{\theta}$  is integrable. Hence  $\bar{\theta}$  has a limit in  $L^2$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . This is the main part of the proof which is detailed in Section 2.3.

**Identification of the limit.** Since  $\theta'$  converges to zero in any  $H^m$  for  $m < 4$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\bar{\theta}$  has a limit in  $L^2$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , the whole density  $\rho = \Theta + \theta = \Theta + \bar{\theta} + \theta'$  converges to some limit  $\rho_\infty$  in  $L^2$  and  $\rho_\infty$  depends only on  $z$ . Since  $\theta$  is small compared to  $\Theta$ ,  $\partial_z\theta$  is small, hence  $\rho_\infty$  is strictly decreasing with respect to  $z$  as is  $\Theta$ . The transport of the density by the divergence-free field  $\mathbf{u}$  ensures that the level sets of  $\rho$  are preserved by the time evolution, and by strong convergence this is also the case for the limit  $\rho_\infty$ . According to rearrangement theory,  $\rho_\infty$  is therefore a rearrangement of  $\rho_0$ . One can show that there exists a unique decreasing vertical rearrangement of  $\rho_0$ , hence  $\rho_\infty$  is uniquely determined. This part of the proof is detailed in Section 2.4.

## 2 Long time stability of stratified profiles: proof of Theorem 1.1

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.1. The scheme of proof follows the steps highlighted in the introduction: we decompose  $\theta$  into  $\theta = \bar{\theta} + \theta'$ , and we prove that  $\theta'$  vanishes in  $L^2$  with algebraic decay, while  $\bar{\theta}$  converges in  $L^2$  towards a profile  $\bar{\theta}_\infty(z)$ . To that end, we first study the linearized Stokes-transport system around a solution  $\theta$  close to an affine profile. Thanks to a crucial interpolation inequality (see Lemma 2.7), which somehow replaces the spectral decomposition in the periodic setting, we quantify the  $L^2$  decay of solutions of the linearized equation with a source term (see Proposition 2.6). We then use a bootstrap argument to show that the decay predicted by the linear analysis persists for the nonlinear evolution. This allows us to prove that  $\theta'(t) \rightarrow 0$  and that  $\bar{\theta} \rightarrow \bar{\theta}_\infty$  in  $H^s(\Omega)$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , for all  $s < 4$ . Eventually, we identify the asymptotic profile  $\bar{\theta}_\infty$  in terms of the initial data.

The organization of this section is the following. We start in Section 2.1 with some preliminary remarks concerning the traces of  $\theta$  and  $\partial_n\theta$ . We then turn towards the analysis of the linearized system in Section 2.2. The bootstrap argument is presented in Section 2.3. Eventually, we prove in Section 2.4 that  $\rho_\infty$  is the rearrangement of the initial data  $\rho_0$ .

### 2.1 Vanishing traces for $\theta'$ and $\partial_n\theta'$

We prove here the following preliminary result:

**Lemma 2.1.** Let  $\theta_0 \in H^m(\Omega)$  with  $m \geq 3$ , and let  $\theta \in L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbf{R}_+, H^m)$  be the solution of (1.15). Assume that  $\theta_0 = \partial_{\mathbf{n}}\theta_0 = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$ , and that  $\partial_z^2\bar{\theta}_0|_\Omega = 0$ .

Then for all  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$\theta(t)|_\Omega = \partial_{\mathbf{n}}\theta(t)|_\Omega = 0, \quad \partial_z^2\bar{\theta}(t)|_\Omega = 0.$$

**Remark 2.2.** If  $\rho_0 \in H_0^m(\Omega)$  then the solution  $\rho(t)$  of (1.1) belongs to  $H_0^m(\Omega)$  for all times. Indeed, the solution of the transport equation writes

$$\rho(t) = \rho_0(\mathbf{X}(t)^{-1}),$$

where  $\mathbf{X} : \mathbf{R}_+ \times \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  is the characteristic function associated to  $\mathbf{u}$ , defined as the solution of the ordinary differential equation

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt}\mathbf{X}(t) = \mathbf{u}(t, \mathbf{X}(t)), \\ \mathbf{X}(0) = \text{Id}_\Omega. \end{cases}$$

We recall that  $\mathbf{X}(t)$  is a diffeomorphism of  $\Omega$  for all time  $t \in \mathbf{R}_+$ . Since  $\mathbf{u}(t) \in H_0^1(\Omega)$  due to the homogeneous Dirichlet condition, the boundary  $\partial\Omega$  is stable for characteristic function at all time  $t$ , namely  $\mathbf{X}(t)|_{\partial\Omega} = \text{Id}_{\partial\Omega}$ , so is its inverse,  $\mathbf{X}(t)^{-1}|_{\partial\Omega}$ . It follows that if  $\rho_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ ,  $\rho(t)|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . The claim for higher values of  $m$  follows easily by induction.

Note that the assumptions of Lemma 2.1 are different since  $\rho_0 = -z + \theta_0$  does not vanish on the boundary.

*Proof.* Formally,

$$\partial_t\theta|_{\partial\Omega} + \mathbf{u}|_{\partial\Omega} \cdot \nabla\theta'|_{\partial\Omega} = u_2|_{\partial\Omega},$$

where  $\mathbf{u}|_{\partial\Omega} = \mathbf{0}$ , hence  $\partial_t\theta|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$  and the trace of  $\theta$  is constant in time, equal to 0. Since horizontal derivatives preserve this property, we have even  $\partial_x^\ell\theta|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$  for any  $\ell$ . Now consider one vertical derivative applied to the equation,

$$\partial_t\partial_z\theta + \partial_z\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla\theta + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla\partial_z\theta = \partial_z u_2$$

where

$$\partial_z\mathbf{u}|_{\partial\Omega} \cdot \nabla\theta|_{\partial\Omega} = \partial_z u_1|_{\partial\Omega}\partial_x\theta|_{\partial\Omega} + \partial_z u_2|_{\partial\Omega}\partial_z\theta|_{\partial\Omega},$$

and we know that  $\partial_x\theta|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$  and we use the divergence free condition to observe  $\partial_z u_2|_{\partial\Omega} = -\partial_x u_1|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ . In the end we get  $\partial_z\theta|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$  for all time, hence  $\theta \in H_0^2(\Omega)$ . Trying to go further, applying the same ideas, we get

$$\partial_t\partial_z^2\theta|_{\partial\Omega} = \partial_z^2 u_2|_{\partial\Omega}, \tag{2.1}$$

where we can not ensure anything on  $\partial_z^2 u_2$ . Hence we can not suppose  $\partial_z^2\theta = 0$ . Nevertheless, we get

$$\partial_t\partial_z^2\bar{\theta}|_{\partial\Omega} = \int_{\mathbf{T}} \partial_z^2 u_2|_{\partial\Omega} = - \int_{\mathbf{T}} \partial_x\partial_z u_1|_{\partial\Omega} = 0. \tag{2.2}$$

Note that for higher orders of derivation, we cannot infer any cancellation in general.  $\square$

**Definition 2.3.** In the rest of the paper, we will set

$$G(t, z) = \partial_z\bar{\theta}(t, z).$$

The above Lemma ensures that if  $\theta_0$  satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 2.1,  $G|_{\partial\Omega} = \partial_z G|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ .

## 2.2 Study of the linearized system

This subsection is concerned with the study of the linear system

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \theta' = (1 - G) \partial_x \psi + S \\ \Delta^2 \psi = \partial_x \theta' \\ \psi|_{\partial\Omega} = \partial_n \psi|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \theta'|_{t=0} = \theta'_0. \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

which is satisfied by  $\theta'$  and  $\psi$  in the first place, with  $G = \partial_z \bar{\theta}$  and  $S = -(\nabla^\perp \psi \cdot \nabla \theta)'$ . It will also be satisfied for various derivatives of  $\theta'$  and  $\psi$  with different  $S$ . The term  $G$  will always be  $\partial_z \bar{\theta}$ .

Our goal is to analyze the long time behavior of  $\theta'$ , under suitable decay assumptions on  $S$ . For later purposes, we have decomposed our results into several separate statements, whose proof is postponed to the end of the section. The first one is a uniform  $L^2$  bound on the solutions when the source term is time integrable:

**Lemma 2.4** (Uniform  $L^2$  bound on solutions of the linearized system). *Let  $G \in L^\infty(\mathbf{R}_+, H^2)$ ,  $S \in L^\infty(\mathbf{R}_+, L^2)$ , and  $\theta'_0 \in L^2$ . Let  $\theta' \in L^\infty(\mathbf{R}_+, L^2)$  be the unique solution of (2.3).*

*Assume that  $S$  can be decomposed as  $S = S_\perp + S_\parallel$  satisfying for some  $\sigma, \delta > 0$ ,*

$$\int_\Omega S_\perp \theta' = 0, \quad \|S_\parallel\|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{\sigma}{(1+t)^{1+\delta}}. \quad (2.4)$$

*There exists a universal constant  $\gamma_0 \in (0, 1)$  such that if*

$$\|G\|_{H^2} \leq \gamma_0, \quad (2.5)$$

*then*

$$\|\theta'\|_{L^2} \leq \|\theta'_0\|_{L^2} + C_\delta \sigma. \quad (2.6)$$

**Remark 2.5.** *The term  $S_\perp$  will often have the structure  $S_\perp = \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \theta'$ : indeed, provided  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\theta'$  have sufficient regularity, the divergence free condition and the non-penetration condition ensure that*

$$\int_\Omega (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \theta') \theta' = \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla |\theta'|^2 = -\frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \underbrace{\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}}_{=0} |\theta'|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial\Omega} \underbrace{\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}}_{=0} |\theta'|^2 = 0.$$

Our second result, which is at the core of Theorem 1.1, gives a quantitative algebraic decay on  $\theta'$ :

**Proposition 2.6.** *Assume that the hypotheses of Lemma 2.4 are satisfied. There exists a universal constant  $\gamma_0 \in (0, 1)$  such that the following result holds. Assume moreover that  $\theta'$  and  $\partial_n \theta'$  vanish on the boundaries of  $\Omega$ , and that  $S$  decomposes into  $S = S_\perp + S_\parallel + S_\Delta$  with for some  $\sigma, \delta > 0$ ,*

$$\int_\Omega S_\perp \theta' = 0, \quad \|S_\parallel\|_{L^2} \leq \frac{\sigma}{(1+t)^{1+\delta}}, \quad \|S_\Delta\|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{\gamma_0^{1/2} \|\Delta \psi\|_{L^2}}{(1+t)^{1/2}}. \quad (2.7)$$

*Assume that  $G$  satisfies (2.5), and that there exists  $A, \alpha \geq 0$  such that*

$$\|\Delta^2 \partial_x^{-2} \theta'\|_{L^2} \leq \frac{A}{(1+t)^\alpha}. \quad (2.8)$$

*Then*

$$\|\theta'\|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{\|\theta'_0\|_{L^2} + A + \sigma}{(1+t)^{\min(1+\alpha, \delta)}}.$$

In order to prove this quantitative decay, we shall need to analyze the structure of the dissipation term

$$- \int_{\Omega} \partial_x \psi \theta' = \int_{\Omega} (\Delta \psi)^2.$$

In previous works for different but related models [CCL19], at this stage, an explicit spectral decomposition of the solution was used, relying on Fourier series. Note that such a spectral decomposition is also available for the operator  $\Delta^{-2} \partial_x^2$  (see Lemma B.2). However, since we cannot interpolate for an arbitrary regularity, we choose here to use a different approach. We replace this spectral analysis with the following result, which can be seen as an interpolation Lemma. It is noteworthy that in spite of its deceitfully simple form (and proof), this Lemma provides the correct scaling for the solutions.

**Lemma 2.7.** *For any  $\alpha \geq 0$ , and for all  $\psi \in H^{8+\alpha-2}(\Omega)$  satisfying*

$$\Delta^2 \psi|_{\partial\Omega} = \partial_n \Delta^2 \psi|_{\partial\Omega} = 0,$$

*we have for all  $K > 0$*

$$\|\partial_x^{\alpha-1} \Delta^2 \psi\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{K} \|\partial_x^{\alpha} \Delta \psi\|_{L^2}^2 + K^2 \|\partial_x^{\alpha-3} \Delta^4 \psi\|_{L^2}^2.$$

*Proof.* Since  $\Delta^2 \psi$  and  $\partial_n \Delta^2 \psi$  vanish on the boundary  $\partial\Omega$ , we have after two integrations by parts

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_x^{\alpha-1} \Delta^2 \psi\|_{L^2}^2 &= - \int_{\Omega} \partial_x^{\alpha} \Delta^2 \psi \partial_x^{\alpha-2} \Delta^2 \psi = - \int_{\Omega} \nabla \partial_x^{\alpha} \Delta \psi \cdot \nabla \partial_x^{\alpha-2} \Delta^2 \psi \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \partial_x^{\alpha} \Delta \psi \partial_x^{\alpha-2} \Delta^3 \psi \leq \|\partial_x^{\alpha} \Delta \psi\|_{L^2} \|\partial_x^{\alpha-2} \Delta^3 \psi\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

On another hand, we have also by integrations by parts

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_x^{\alpha-2} \Delta^3 \psi\|_{L^2}^2 &= - \int_{\Omega} \partial_x^{\alpha-1} \Delta^3 \psi \partial_x^{\alpha-3} \Delta^3 \psi = - \int_{\Omega} \nabla \partial_x^{\alpha-1} \Delta^2 \psi \cdot \nabla \partial_x^{\alpha-3} \Delta^3 \psi \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \partial_x^{\alpha-1} \Delta^2 \psi \partial_x^{\alpha-3} \Delta^4 \psi \leq \|\partial_x^{\alpha-1} \Delta^2 \psi\|_{L^2} \|\partial_x^{\alpha-3} \Delta^4 \psi\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

hence, together with the previous bound, we obtain

$$\|\partial_x^{\alpha-1} \Delta^2 \psi\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|\partial_x^{\alpha} \Delta \psi\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4}{3}} \|\partial_x^{\alpha-3} \Delta^2 \psi\|_{H^4}^{\frac{2}{3}} \lesssim \frac{1}{K} \|\partial_x^{\alpha} \Delta \psi\|_{L^2}^2 + K^2 \|\partial_x^{\alpha-3} \Delta^4 \psi\|_{L^2}^2,$$

where Young's inequality is used for the last step.  $\square$

Let us now turn towards the proof of Lemma 2.4 and Proposition 2.6.

*Proof of Lemma 2.4.* The energy estimate in (2.3) writes

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\theta'\|_{L^2}^2 = \int_{\Omega} (1-G) \partial_x \psi \theta' + \int_{\Omega} S_{\parallel} \theta'.$$

A few integrations by parts provide

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} (1-G) \partial_x \psi \theta' &= - \int_{\Omega} (1-G) \psi \Delta^2 \psi \\ &= - \int_{\Omega} \Delta((1-G)\psi) \Delta \psi \\ &\leq -(1-C\|G\|_{H^2}) \|\Delta \psi\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

Since  $\psi$  belongs in particular to  $H_0^2(\Omega)$ , the boundary integrals vanish. At this point we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\theta'\|_{L^2}^2 \leq -(1 - C\gamma_0) \|\Delta\psi\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_{\Omega} S_{\parallel} \theta'. \quad (2.10)$$

Therefore if  $\gamma_0$  is small enough, in a universal way, the first right-hand side term is non-positive. Therefore

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\theta'\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|S_{\parallel}\|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{\sigma}{(1+t)^{1+\delta}}$$

and since  $\delta > 0$  this inequality integrates as

$$\|\theta'\|_{L^2} \leq \|\theta'_0\|_{L^2} + C_{\delta}\sigma.$$

□

*Proof of Proposition 2.6.* Back to (2.10) and plugging the decomposition of  $S$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \|\theta'\|_{L^2}^2 &\lesssim -(1 - C\gamma_0) \|\Delta\psi\|_{L^2}^2 + (\|S_{\parallel}\|_{L^2} + \|S_{\Delta}\|_{L^2}) \|\theta'\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim -(1 - C\gamma_0) \|\Delta\psi\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{(1+t)^{1+2\delta}} + \frac{1}{1+t} \|\theta'\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where Young inequality allows in particular to gather the dissipative terms  $\gamma_0 \|\Delta\psi\|^2$ . Hence if  $\gamma_0$  is small enough, we have for some  $c_0 \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\theta'\|_{L^2}^2 + c_0 \|\Delta\psi\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \frac{\sigma^2}{(1+t)^{1+2\delta}} + \frac{1}{1+t} \|\theta'\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Interpolation Lemma 2.7 yields, since  $\Delta^2\psi = \partial_x\theta' = 0$  and  $\partial_n\Delta^2\psi = \partial_n\partial_x\theta' = 0$  on the boundary, and making the choice  $K \simeq \kappa/c_0(1+t)^{-1}$  with  $\kappa > 0$  arbitrary large independently of the data,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\theta'\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\kappa}{1+t} \|\theta'\|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{\|\Delta^2\partial_x^{-2}\theta'\|_{L^2}^2}{(1+t)^3} + \frac{\sigma^2}{(1+t)^{1+2\delta}}. \quad (2.11)$$

Plugging assumption (2.8) provides

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\theta'\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\kappa}{1+t} \|\theta'\|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{(A + \sigma)^2}{(1+t)^{\min(3+2\alpha, 1+2\delta)}}$$

which integrates into

$$\|\theta'\|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{\|\theta'_0\|_{L^2} + A + \sigma}{(1+t)^{\min(1+\alpha, \delta)}}.$$

□

**Stability for more general stationary profiles.** This is a remark about generalising our stability result to some other stationary profiles than  $1 - z$ . We find sufficient conditions on general stratified  $\Theta$  ensuring so. Basically it is sufficient for  $\Theta$  to be sufficiently close to an affine function. We illustrate how the computations adapt in this case. For instance, the linear evolution equation on  $\theta'$  for a general background profile  $\Theta$  writes

$$\partial_t\theta' = -\partial_z\Theta\partial_x\psi, \quad (2.12)$$

and the computation (2.9) writes in this case

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\theta'\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \int_{\Omega} \partial_z \Theta |\Delta \psi|^2 + \int_{\Omega} [\Delta, \partial_z \Theta] \psi \Delta \psi.$$

The approach in our work consists in obtaining a negative sign for the main dissipative term  $\int_{\Omega} \partial_z \Theta |\Delta \psi|^2$ . This property is ensured for the sufficient condition

$$\sup_{(0,1)} \partial_z \Theta < 0,$$

Now, a bound on the commutator provides

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\theta'\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \left( \sup_{(0,1)} \partial_z \Theta + C \|\partial_z^2 \Theta\|_{H^1} \right) \|\Delta \psi\|_{L^2}^2.$$

To stick to the proof developed in this paper, meaning to obtain a negative right handside in the above, it is necessary to have small enough derivatives of  $\partial_z \Theta$  regarding the minimal slope of  $\Theta$ . For the full system we obtain, instead of (2.9), an estimate of the form

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\theta'\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \left( \sup_{(0,1)} \partial_z \Theta + C (\|G\|_{H^2} + \|\partial_z^2 \Theta\|_{H^1}) \right) \|\Delta \psi\|_{L^2}^2,$$

and the smallness condition (2.5) on  $G$  becomes

$$\|G\|_{H^2} + \|\partial_z^2 \Theta\|_{H^1} \lesssim - \sup_{(0,1)} \partial_z \Theta.$$

This condition might appear at different steps of our demonstration, and require having higher order derivatives of  $\Theta$  small in  $L^2$ . By adjusting this assumption, the system remains stable in the sense of Theorem 1.1. Our demonstration only tackles the linear case for sake of simplicity.

### 2.3 Bootstrap argument

The purpose of this paragraph is to prove, thanks to a bootstrap argument, that under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, the solution  $\theta'$  of (1.15) enjoys the same decay rates as the ones predicted by the linear analysis (see Proposition 2.6). More precisely, we shall prove the following result:

**Proposition 2.8.** *Let  $\theta_0 \in H^6(\Omega)$  such that  $\theta_0|_{\partial\Omega} = \partial_n \theta_0|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ ,  $\partial_z^2 \bar{\theta}_0|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ .*

*There exists  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  such that if  $\|\theta_0\|_{H^6} \leq \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$  the solution of (1.15) satisfies*

$$\|\partial_x^3 \theta'(t)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{1+t}, \quad \|\partial_x \theta'(t)\|_{H^4} \lesssim \varepsilon, \quad \|\bar{\theta}(t)\|_{H^5} \lesssim \varepsilon, \quad \forall t > 0. \quad (2.13)$$

**Remark 2.9.** *The interplay between horizontal derivatives of  $\theta$  and the considered regularities is consistent with the operator  $\Delta^{-2} \partial_x^2$  from the linearized system*

$$\partial_t \theta' = \partial_x \psi = \Delta^{-2} \partial_x^2 \theta'. \quad (2.14)$$

*Note that  $\Delta^{-2}$  denotes the operator solving the bilaplacian  $\Delta^2 \psi = f$  equation endowed with the boundary condition  $\psi = \partial_z \psi = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$ .*

A demonstration of the decays validity is provided in the rest of this Section. Remarks motivating the necessity of the bootstrap hypothesis and the method in general are included along the demonstration. We also develop our understanding of the obstacle to the iteration of this method to higher regularity on the perturbation.

**Bootstrap assumption and general argument.** Let  $0 < B < 1$  and  $C_0 > 1$  constants to adjust. Let  $\theta_0 \in H_0^2 \cap H^6$  such that  $\|\theta_0\|_{H^6} \leq B/C_0$ . In particular  $\|\partial_x^3 \theta_0\|_{L^2} \leq B/C_0$  and  $\|\partial_x \theta_0\|_{H^4} \leq B/C_0$ . If  $C_0$  is large enough, independently of the data, we also have

$$\|\psi_0\|_{H^4} \leq C \|\partial_x \theta'\|_{L^2} \leq CB/C_0,$$

and therefore

$$\|\partial_t \partial_x \theta'|_{t=0}\|_{L^2} \leq \|1 - \partial_z \bar{\theta}_0\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_x^2 \psi_0\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x(\mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \nabla \theta'_0)\|_{L^2} \leq C(B/C_0)^2 \leq B.$$

By continuity of the Sobolev norms of  $\theta$ , ensured by Theorem A.1, there exists a maximal time  $T^* \in \mathbf{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\}$  such that the following inequalities are satisfied on  $[0, T^*)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_x^3 \theta'\|_{L^2} &\leq \frac{B}{1+t}, & \|\partial_x \theta'\|_{H^4} &\leq B, \\ \|G\|_{H^2} &\leq B, & \|\partial_t \partial_x \theta'\|_{L^2} &\leq \frac{B}{(1+t)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

We recall that these decay rates follow the behavior of the linearized system, see Proposition 2.6.

Let us assume by contradiction that  $T^* < +\infty$ . We show below by a bootstrap argument that hypothesis (2.15), combined with Lemma 2.4 and Proposition 2.6, actually leads to an improvement of the inequalities, satisfied with some new constant  $0 < \underline{B} < B$  which contradicts with the maximality of  $T^*$ . Whence  $T^* = +\infty$  and inequalities (2.15) hold for all time.

**Preliminary bounds.** All along the proof we require estimates on  $\theta'$  and  $\psi$  derived from the bootstrap hypothesis (2.15). For the sake of readability, we introduce the following notation:

$$\underbrace{\|f\| \|g\|}_{r+r'} \quad \text{when} \quad \|f\| \lesssim \frac{B}{(1+t)^r} \quad \text{and} \quad \|g\| \lesssim \frac{B}{(1+t)^{r'}}.$$

First, from an integration by parts

$$\|\partial_x^2 \theta'\|_{H^2}^2 = \int_{\Omega} \partial_x^2 \Delta \theta' \partial_x^2 \Delta \theta' = - \int_{\Omega} \partial_x^3 \theta' \partial_x \Delta^2 \theta' \leq \|\partial_x^3 \theta'\|_{L^2} \|\partial_x \theta'\|_{H^4}, \quad (2.16)$$

we deduce, by assumption (2.15), for all  $t \in (0, T^*)$

$$\|\partial_x^2 \theta'\|_{H^2} \lesssim \|\partial_x^3 \theta'\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\partial_x \theta'\|_{H^4}^{1/2} \lesssim \frac{B}{1+t}. \quad (2.17)$$

We get by interpolation for any  $0 \leq m \leq 4$ , for all  $t \in (0, T^*)$

$$\|\partial_x \theta'\|_{H^m} \lesssim \|\partial_x \theta'\|_{L^2}^{1-m/4} \|\partial_x \theta'\|_{H^4}^{m/4} \lesssim \frac{B}{(1+t)^{1-m/4}}.$$

We will frequently use *Agmon's inequality* in dimension 2, namely

$$\forall f \in H_0^1 \cap H^2(\Omega), \quad \|f\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|f\|_{H^2}^{1/2}, \quad (2.18)$$

together with the following direct consequence

$$\forall f \in H_0^2 \cap H^4(\Omega), \quad \|\nabla f\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|f\|_{H^4}^{1/2}. \quad (2.19)$$



We infer in particular, for all  $t \in (0, T^*)$

$$\begin{aligned}\|\partial_x^2 \theta'\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim \|\partial_x^2 \theta'\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\partial_x^2 \theta'\|_{H^2}^{1/2} \lesssim \frac{B}{(1+t)^{3/4}}, \\ \|\nabla \partial_x \theta'\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim \|\partial_x \theta'\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\partial_x \theta'\|_{H^4}^{1/2} \lesssim \frac{B}{(1+t)^{1/2}}.\end{aligned}$$

We also need estimates on  $\psi$ . Any Sobolev norm of order larger than 4 inherits decays from  $\theta'$  thanks to Lemma B.1, providing, for  $t \in (0, T^*)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\partial_x^2 \psi\|_{H^4} &\lesssim \|\partial_x^3 \theta'\|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{B}{1+t}, \\ \|\partial_x \psi\|_{H^6} &\lesssim \|\partial_x^2 \theta'\|_{H^2} \lesssim \frac{B}{(1+t)^{1/2}}.\end{aligned}$$

We also need higher order decays on  $\partial_x \psi$  in  $L^2(\Omega)$ . We access this quantity thanks to the control of  $\partial_t \theta'$  by rewriting

$$\partial_x \psi = \frac{\partial_t \theta' + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \theta)'}{1 - G}.$$

We know that  $\|G\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|G\|_{H^2} \leq B$  so it is enough to ask  $B$  to be smaller than 1 to ensure that the inverse of  $(1 - G)$  is well-defined. It allows to estimate  $\partial_x \psi$  and  $\partial_x^2 \psi$  in  $L^2$ . We illustrate the computation for  $\partial_x \psi$  since the same reasoning applies for  $\partial_x^2 \psi$  with a few extra terms.

$$\begin{aligned}\|\partial_x \psi\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \|\partial_t \theta'\|_{L^2} + \|\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \theta'\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \|\partial_t \theta'\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_z \psi\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_x \theta'\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x \psi\|_{L^2} \|\partial_z \theta'\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim \underbrace{\|\partial_t \theta'\|_{L^2}}_2 + \underbrace{\|\partial_x \theta'\|_{L^2}^2}_{2 \times 2} + \|\partial_x \psi\|_{L^2} \frac{B}{(1+t)^{1/2}}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence for  $B > 0$  small enough once again we get

$$\|\partial_x^2 \psi\|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{B}{(1+t)^2}.$$

By interpolation and Agmon inequalities we deduce, in the same fashion as above, the following decay estimates, with the latest valid for  $0 \leq m \leq 4$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\partial_x^2 \psi\|_{H^2} &\lesssim \frac{B}{(1+t)^{3/2}}, & \|\partial_x^2 \psi\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim \frac{B}{(1+t)^{7/4}}, & \|\nabla \partial_x^2 \psi\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim \frac{B}{(1+t)^{3/2}}, \\ \|\nabla^2 \psi\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim \frac{B}{(1+t)^{5/4}}, & \|\partial_x \psi\|_{H^m} &\lesssim \|\partial_x \psi\|_{L^2}^{1-m/4} \|\partial_x \psi\|_{H^4}^{m/4} & \lesssim \frac{B}{(1+t)^{2-m/4}}.\end{aligned}$$

**$H^6$  bound on the solution and  $H^4$  bound on  $G$ .** In our nonlinear bootstrap argument, we shall need some high Sobolev bound on the solution. In order to lighten the proof of the bootstrap as much as possible, we isolate in the present paragraph this technical step.

**Lemma 2.10.** *Let  $\theta_0 \in H^6(\Omega)$  such that  $\theta_0|_{\partial\Omega} = \partial_{\mathbf{n}} \theta_0|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ ,  $\partial_z^2 \bar{\theta}_0|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ . Let  $T^*$  be the maximal time on which the assumptions (2.15) are satisfied. Then for all  $t \in (0, T^*)$ ,*

$$\|\theta'(t)\|_{H^6} \lesssim B(1+t)^{1/2}, \quad \|G(t)\|_{H^4} \leq \frac{B}{C_0} + CB^2, \quad \|\partial_t G(t)\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \frac{B^2}{(1+t)^2}.$$

*Proof.* We can not estimate  $\theta'$  in  $H^6$  directly from its evolution equation since it requires an assumption on  $G = \partial_z \bar{\theta} \in H^6(\Omega)$ , therefore on  $\theta$  in  $H^7(\Omega)$ . To get around this, we directly perform an estimate from the whole perturbed evolution equation, namely

$$\partial_t \theta + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \theta = u_2$$

for any derivative of order 6 (and less) as follows,

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\partial^6 \theta\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_{\Omega} [\partial^6, \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla] \theta \partial^6 \theta = \int_{\Omega} \partial^6 \partial_x \psi \partial^6 \theta, \quad (2.20)$$

where the commutator comes from the incompressibility assumption. Hence we get

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\theta\|_{H^6} \lesssim \|\partial_x \psi\|_{H^6} + \|[\partial^6, \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla] \theta'\|_{L^2}.$$

On the one hand, the first term is dealt with thanks to the bilaplacian regularization,

$$\|\partial_x \psi\|_{H^6} \lesssim \|\partial_x^2 \theta'\|_{H^2} \lesssim \frac{B}{(1+t)^{1/2}}.$$

Notice that this 1/2-algebraic decay, issued from the linear system, is critical to prove the 1/2-algebraic growth control of  $\theta$  in  $H^6(\Omega)$ . Any smaller decay would not be sufficient to get so. Since the bilaplacian regularization can not provide better, that  $\|\partial_x^3 \theta'\|_{L^2}$  decays as  $(1+t)^{-1}$  and  $\|\partial_x \theta'\|_{H^4} \leq \underline{B}$ . This can be seen by interpolation or with the computation (2.16).

Concerning the nonlinear term, we rely on the following *tame estimate*, valid for any  $m \in \mathbf{N}$ ,

$$\forall f, g \in H^m \cap L^\infty(\Omega), \quad \|fg\|_{H^m} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^\infty} \|g\|_{H^m} + \|f\|_{H^m} \|g\|_{L^\infty}, \quad (2.21)$$

which leads to

$$\forall f \in H^m \cap W^{1,\infty}(\Omega), g \in H^{m-1} \cap L^\infty(\Omega), \quad \|[D^m, f]g\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\nabla f\|_{L^\infty} \|g\|_{H^{m-1}} + \|f\|_{H^m} \|g\|_{L^\infty}. \quad (2.22)$$

Hence we decompose the nonlinear commutator into

$$[\partial^6, \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla] \theta = -[\partial^6, \partial_z \psi \partial_x] \theta + [\partial^6, \partial_x \psi \partial_z] \theta.$$

Each part estimates thanks to (2.22) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \|[\partial^6, \partial_z \psi] \partial_x \theta\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \|\nabla \partial_z \psi\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_x \theta\|_{H^5} + \|\partial_z \psi\|_{H^6} \|\partial_x \theta\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim \underbrace{\|\nabla^2 \psi\|_{L^\infty}}_{5/4} \|\theta\|_{H^6} + \underbrace{\|\partial_x \theta'\|_{H^3} \|\partial_x \theta'\|_{L^\infty}}_{1/4+3/4} \\ &\lesssim \frac{B}{(1+t)^{5/4}} \|\theta\|_{H^6} + \frac{B^2}{1+t}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|[\partial^6, \partial_x \psi] \partial_z \theta'\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \|\nabla \partial_x \psi\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_z \theta'\|_{H^5} + \|\partial_x \psi\|_{H^6} \|\partial_z \theta'\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim \underbrace{\|\nabla \partial_x \psi\|_{L^\infty}}_{3/2} \|\theta\|_{H^6} + \underbrace{\|\partial_x^2 \theta'\|_{H^2}}_{1/2} \|\nabla \theta'\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim \frac{B}{(1+t)^{7/4}} \|\theta\|_{H^6} + \frac{B^2}{1+t} + \frac{B^2}{(1+t)^{1/2}} \end{aligned}$$

where we observed in particular that

$$\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|\nabla\theta'\|_{L^\infty} + \|G\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \frac{B}{(1+t)^{1/2}} + B. \quad (2.23)$$

In the end, gathering and summing up all these bounds provides

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\theta\|_{H^6} \lesssim \frac{B}{(1+t)^{5/4}}\|\theta\|_{H^6} + \frac{B^2}{(1+t)^{1/2}}, \quad (2.24)$$

and we get, for some universal constant  $C$ ,

$$\|\theta\|_{H^6} \leq \|\theta_0\|_{H^6} + CB(1+t)^{1/2} \lesssim B(1+t)^{1/2}. \quad (2.25)$$

Eventually, let us prove decaying bounds on  $\partial_t G$  and uniform bounds on  $G$ . We recall that  $G = \partial_z \bar{\theta}$  depends only on the variables  $t$  and  $z$ . From the evolution equation and one integration by parts we observe

$$\partial_t \bar{\theta} = -\overline{\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \theta'} = \int_{\mathbf{T}} \partial_z \psi \partial_x \theta' - \partial_x \psi \partial_z \theta' = -\partial_z \int_{\mathbf{T}} \partial_x \psi \theta',$$

so we can write

$$\partial_t G = -\partial_z^2 \int_{\mathbf{T}} \partial_x \psi \theta'.$$

The same arguments as above lead to

$$\|\partial_t G\|_{L^2(0,1)} \lesssim \underbrace{\|\partial_x \psi\|_{L^\infty} \|\theta'\|_{H^2}}_{7/4+1/2} + \underbrace{\|\partial_x \psi\|_{H^2} \|\theta'\|_{L^\infty}}_{3/2+3/4} \lesssim \frac{B^2}{(1+t)^{2+1/4}}. \quad (2.26)$$

Using the  $H^6$  estimate, we also have

$$\|\partial_t G\|_{H^4(0,1)} \lesssim \underbrace{\|\partial_x \psi\|_{L^\infty} \|\theta'\|_{H^6}}_{7/4-1/2} + \underbrace{\|\partial_x \psi\|_{H^6} \|\theta'\|_{L^\infty}}_{1/2+3/4} \lesssim \frac{B^2}{(1+t)^{1+1/4}}. \quad (2.27)$$

Since the right-hand side of the above inequality is time-integrable, we infer that

$$\|G\|_{H^4(0,1)} \leq \|\partial_z \theta_0\|_{H^4} + \int_0^t \|\partial_t G\|_{H^4(0,1)} \leq B/C_0 + CB^2.$$

Hence  $\|G\|_{H^4(0,1)}$  is as small as necessary for  $B > 0$  small enough. Moreover, for all  $t \in (0, T^*)$ ,

$$\|\partial_t G\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \underbrace{\|\partial_t G\|_{L^2}^{3/4} \|\partial_t G\|_{H^4}^{1/4}}_{3/4 \times 9/4 + 1/4 \times 5/4} \lesssim \frac{B^2}{(1+t)^2}. \quad (2.28)$$

□

**Remark 2.11.** *It would be tempting to proceed to the same computations as in (2.9) in order to get a signed term in our estimate, which would allow to simply forget about its contribution,*

as for lower order derivatives. Doing so requires to control the boundary integrals, which do not vanish a priori in this case,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} D^6 \partial_x \psi D^6 \theta &= - \int_{\Omega} D^6 \psi \Delta^2 D^6 \psi \\ &= - \|\Delta D^6 \psi\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_{\partial\Omega} (\partial_{\mathbf{n}} D^6 \psi \Delta D^6 \psi - D^6 \psi \partial_{\mathbf{n}} D^6 \Delta \psi). \end{aligned}$$

For instance, trying to bound the integral comprising the higher order of  $z$ -derivatives on  $\psi$  provides at best

$$\left| \int_{\partial\Omega} D^6 \psi \partial_z \Delta D^6 \psi \right| \lesssim \|\partial_x \psi\|_{H^7} \|\partial_x^{-1} \psi\|_{H^{10}} \lesssim B^2 (1+t)^{1/4}.$$

This estimate ensures no better growth control than  $\|\theta'\|_{H^6} \lesssim (1+t)^{3/4}$ , which is not enough to close the bootstrap and get the control by  $(1+t)^{1/2}$ .

**Improvements of the bootstrap bounds.** We now improve the uniform bound on  $\theta'$  and  $\partial_x \theta'$  in  $H^4(\Omega)$ , relying on the linear analysis from Section 2.2. Since  $\|\theta'\|_{H^4} \leq \|\partial_x \theta'\|_{H^4}$ , it is enough to treat  $\partial_x \theta'$ . Also we have according to Lemma B.1 the inequality

$$\|\partial_x \theta'\|_{H^4} \lesssim \|\Delta^2 \partial_x \theta'\|_{L^2}$$

since  $\partial_x \theta'$  belongs in particular to  $H_0^2 \cap H^4(\Omega)$  as detailed in Paragraph 2.1, so it is enough to deal with  $\partial_x \Delta^2 \theta'$  in  $L^2(\Omega)$ .

**Lemma 2.12.** *As long as the bootstrap hypothesis (2.15) holds we have*

$$\|\partial_x \Delta^2 \theta'\|_{L^2} \leq \|\partial_x \Delta^2 \theta'_0\|_{L^2} + CB^2. \quad (2.29)$$

*Proof.* In view of the application of Proposition 2.6 to  $\Delta^2 \partial_x \theta'$ , we observe that its evolution is governed by the equation

$$\partial_t \Delta^2 \partial_x \theta' = (1-G) \partial_x \Delta^2 \partial_x \psi - [\Delta^2 \partial_x, G] \partial_x \psi + \Delta^2 \partial_x (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \theta'),$$

which is of the form (2.3) with  $\Delta^2 \partial_x \psi = \partial_x^2 \theta'$  and  $\partial_z \Delta^2 \partial_x \psi = \partial_z \partial_x^2 \theta'$  vanishing on the boundary  $\partial\Omega$  and

$$S = - \underbrace{[\Delta^2 \partial_x, G] \partial_x \psi}_{S_{\parallel}} - \underbrace{[\Delta^2 \partial_x, \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla] \theta' + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \Delta^2 \partial_x \theta'}_{S_{\perp}}.$$

We already know that  $\|G\|_{H^2}$  satisfies the smallness assumption (2.15) for  $B > 0$  small enough. We show that  $S_{\parallel}$  presents an algebraic decay strictly larger than 1, as in (2.4). To do so we apply the tame estimates (2.21) to the two commutator terms, using the inequality

Let us emphasize that we need to be thorough by substituting  $\mathbf{u} = \nabla^{\perp} \psi$  such that the transport operator writes

$$\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \cdot = -\partial_z \psi \partial_x \cdot + \partial_x \psi \partial_z \cdot.$$

Hence the nonlinear term only presents formally a vertical derivative of order 1. This makes a difference in the estimates and allows to reach more optimal decay rates.

On the one hand we get for the perturbation due to  $G$ ,

$$\|[\Delta^2, G] \partial_x^2 \psi\|_{L^2} \leq \|G\|_{H^4} \underbrace{\|\partial_x^2 \psi\|_{L^\infty}}_{7/4-3/32} + \|\nabla G\|_{L^\infty} \underbrace{\|\partial_x^2 \psi\|_{H^3}}_{5/4-2/32} \lesssim \frac{B^2}{(1+t)^{1+1/8}},$$

where the algebraic decay exponent is not optimal but enough and easier to read than  $1 + 5/32$ . Note that we used here the uniform  $H^4$  bound on  $G$  from Lemma 2.10. On the other hand the contribution of  $[\Delta^2 \partial_x, \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla] \theta'$  splits into four terms as follows

$$\begin{aligned} [\Delta^2 \partial_x, \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla] \theta' &= -\Delta^2 (\partial_x \partial_z \psi \partial_x \theta') + \Delta^2 (\partial_x^2 \psi \partial_z \theta') \\ &\quad - [\Delta^2, \partial_z \psi] \partial_x \theta' + [\Delta^2, \partial_x \psi] \partial_z \theta'. \end{aligned}$$

Each term estimates accordingly. The limiting decay comes from

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta^2 (\partial_x^2 \psi \partial_z \theta')\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \|\partial_x^2 \psi\|_{H^4} \|\partial_z \theta'\|_{L^\infty} + \|\partial_x^2 \psi\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_z \theta'\|_{H^4} \\ &\lesssim \underbrace{\|\partial_x^3 \theta'\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \theta'\|_{L^\infty}}_{1+1/2} + \underbrace{\|\partial_x^2 \psi\|_{L^\infty} \|\theta'\|_{H^5}}_{7/4-1/4} \lesssim \frac{B^2}{(1+t)^{1+1/4}}. \end{aligned}$$

The other term admit the bound  $B^2(1+t)^{-1/2}$ , such as

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta^2 (\partial_x \partial_z \psi \partial_x \theta')\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \|\partial_x \partial_z \psi\|_{H^4} \|\partial_x \theta'\|_{L^\infty} + \|\partial_x \partial_z \psi\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_x \theta'\|_{H^4} \\ &\lesssim \underbrace{\|\partial_x \psi\|_{H^5} \|\partial_x \theta'\|_{L^\infty}}_{3/4+3/4} + \underbrace{\|\nabla \partial_x \psi\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_x \theta'\|_{H^4}}_{3/2+0} \lesssim \frac{B^2}{(1+t)^{1+1/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Gathering these estimates provides

$$\|S_{\parallel}\|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{B^2}{(1+t)^{1+1/8}},$$

and Lemma 2.4 applies, ensuring

$$\|\Delta^2 \partial_x \theta'\|_{L^2} \leq \|\Delta^2 \partial_x \theta'_0\|_{L^2} + CB^2.$$

□

**Lemma 2.13.** *As long as the bootstrap hypothesis (2.15) holds, we have*

$$\|\partial_x^3 \theta'\|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{\|\theta'_0\|_{H^5} + B^2}{1+t}. \quad (2.30)$$

*Proof.* Note that  $\partial_x^3 \theta'$  satisfies (2.3) with the source term

$$S = S_{\parallel} = -\partial_x^3 (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \theta').$$

We can bound the whole term  $S = S_{\parallel}$  as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \|S\|_{L^2} &\leq \|\partial_x^3 (\partial_z \psi \partial_x \theta')\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x^3 (\partial_x \psi \partial_z \theta')\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \|\partial_x^3 \partial_z \psi\|_{L^2} \|\partial_x \theta'\|_{L^\infty} + \|\partial_z \psi\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_x^4 \theta'\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + \|\partial_x^4 \psi\|_{L^2} \|\partial_z \theta'\|_{L^\infty} + \|\partial_x \psi\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_x^3 \partial_z \theta'\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \underbrace{\|\partial_x^2 \psi\|_{H^2} \|\partial_x \theta'\|_{L^\infty}}_{2+3/4>2} + \underbrace{\|\nabla \psi\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_x^2 \theta'\|_{H^2}}_{3/2+1/2=2} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\|\partial_x^2 \psi\|_{H^2} \|\nabla \theta'\|_{L^\infty}}_{3/2+3/4>2} + \underbrace{\|\partial_x \psi\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_x^2 \theta'\|_{H^2}}_{7/4+1/2>2} \lesssim \frac{B^2}{(1+t)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.31)$$

Assumption (2.7) is satisfied with  $\delta = 1$ . Besides, the norm of  $(\Delta^2 \partial_x^{-2}) \partial_x^3 \theta' = \Delta^2 \partial_x \theta'$  is bounded according to (2.29), so assumption (2.8) is satisfied with  $A = \|\Delta^2 \partial_x \theta'_0\|_{L^2} + CB^2$  and  $\alpha = 0$ . Moreover, the traces of  $\partial_x^3 \theta'$  and  $\partial_n \partial_x^3 \theta'$  vanish as a direct consequence of Lemma 2.1. Therefore  $\min(1 + \alpha, \delta) = 1$  and Proposition 2.6 provides

$$\|\partial_x^3 \theta'\|_{L^2} \leq (\|\partial_x^3 \theta'_0\|_{L^2} + C\|\Delta^2 \partial_x \theta'\|_{L^\infty((0,t),H^4)} + B^2) \frac{1}{1+t}. \quad (2.32)$$

Using Eq. (2.29), we obtain the desired estimate.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.14.** *Under assumptions (2.15) we have*

$$\|\partial_t \partial_x \theta'\|_{L^2} \leq \frac{\|\partial_x \theta'_0\|_{H^4} + CB^2}{(1+t)^2}. \quad (2.33)$$

*Proof.* Taking  $\partial_t \partial_x \theta' \rightsquigarrow \theta'$ , equation (2.3) is satisfied with

$$\partial_t \partial_x \psi \rightsquigarrow \psi, \quad S = -\partial_t G \partial_x^2 \psi - \partial_t \partial_x (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \theta').$$

Note that  $\partial_t \partial_x \theta'$  and  $\partial_n \partial_t \partial_x \theta'$  vanish on the boundary, from Lemma 2.1. We have to bound  $(\Delta^2 \partial_x^{-2}) \partial_t \partial_x \theta'$  in  $L^2(\Omega)$ . This is done by applying the convenient operator to the equation

$$\Delta^2 \partial_x^{-1} \partial_t \theta' = \Delta^2 ((1-G) \partial_x^{-1} \psi) - \Delta^2 \partial_x^{-1} (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \theta'),$$

the norm of which bounds as

$$\|\Delta^2 \partial_x^{-1} \partial_t \theta'\|_{L^2} \leq (1 + \|G\|_{H^4}) \|\Delta^2 \partial_x^{-1} \psi\|_{L^2} + \|\Delta^2 \partial_x^{-1} (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \theta')\|_{L^2}$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \theta'\|_{H^4} &\lesssim \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^4} \|\nabla \theta'\|_{L^\infty} + \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty} \|\theta'\|_{H^5} \\ &\lesssim \underbrace{\|\psi\|_{H^5} \|\nabla \theta'\|_{L^\infty}}_{3/4+1/2} + \underbrace{\|\nabla \psi\|_{L^\infty} \|\theta'\|_{H^5}}_{3/2-1/4} \lesssim \frac{B^2}{1+t}. \end{aligned}$$

satisfying assumption (2.8) with  $\alpha = 1$ .

Let us set  $S_\perp = \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \partial_t \partial_x \theta'$ , indeed orthogonal to  $\partial_t \partial_x \theta'$  in  $L^2(\Omega)$ . Therefore we have to consider

$$S_\parallel + S_\Delta = -\partial_t G \partial_x \psi - \partial_x \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \partial_t \theta' - \partial_t \partial_x \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \theta' - \partial_t \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \partial_x \theta',$$

and find how to decompose such that

$$\|S_\parallel\|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{B^2}{(1+t)^3}, \quad \|S_\Delta\|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{\gamma_0^{1/2} \|\Delta \partial_t \partial_x \psi\|_{L^2}}{(1+t)^{1/2}}.$$

The first term bounds directly as follows,

$$\|\partial_t G \partial_x^2 \psi\|_{L^2} \leq \underbrace{\|\partial_t G\|_{L^\infty}}_{2+2} \|\partial_x^2 \psi\|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{B^2}{(1+t)^4}.$$

The second requires for instance a bound on  $\partial_t \theta'$  in  $H^1(\Omega)$ , obtained directly from the evolution equation,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t \theta'\|_{H^1} &\lesssim (1 + \gamma_0) \|\partial_x \psi\|_{H^1} + \|\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \theta'\|_{H^1} \\ &\lesssim (1 + \gamma_0) \|\partial_x \psi\|_{H^1} + \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^1} \|\nabla \theta'\|_{L^\infty} + \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla \theta'\|_{H^1} \\ &\lesssim (1 + \gamma_0) \underbrace{\|\partial_x \psi\|_{H^1}}_{7/4} + \underbrace{\|\psi\|_{H^2} \|\nabla \theta'\|_{L^\infty}}_{3/2+1/2} + \underbrace{\|\nabla \psi\|_{L^\infty} \|\theta'\|_{H^2}}_{3/2+1/2} \lesssim \frac{B}{(1+t)^{7/4}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\|\partial_x \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \partial_t \theta'\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\partial_x \mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_t \theta'\|_{H^1} \lesssim \underbrace{\|\nabla \partial_x \psi\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_t \theta'\|_{H^1}}_{3/2+7/4} \lesssim \frac{B^2}{(1+t)^3},$$

and  $S_{\parallel} := -\partial_t G \partial_x^2 \psi - \partial_x \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \partial_t \theta'$  satisfies the assumption (2.7) with  $\sigma = CB^2$  and  $\delta = 2$ . Pursuing our computations,

$$\|\partial_t \partial_x \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \theta'\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\Delta \partial_t \partial_x \psi\|_{L^2} \underbrace{\|\nabla \theta'\|_{L^\infty}}_{1/2} \lesssim \frac{B \|\Delta \partial_t \partial_x \psi\|_{L^2}}{(1+t)^{1/2}},$$

and the same consideration applies for

$$\|\partial_t \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \partial_x \theta'\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\nabla \partial_t \psi\|_{L^2} \underbrace{\|\nabla \partial_x \theta'\|_{L^\infty}}_{1/2} \lesssim \frac{B \|\Delta \partial_t \partial_x \psi\|_{L^2}}{(1+t)^{1/2}}.$$

For  $B > 0$  small enough we have  $B \leq \gamma_0^{1/2}$ , so that

$$S_\Delta = \partial_t \partial_x \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \theta' - \partial_t \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \partial_x \theta'$$

indeed satisfies assumption (2.7). Finally Proposition 2.6 applies with  $\min(1 + \alpha, \delta) = 2$  and we obtain

$$\|\partial_t \partial_x \theta'\|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{B/C_0 + CB^2}{(1+t)^2}. \quad (2.34)$$

□

**Conclusion.** Let us close the bootstrap argument. Assuming  $\|\theta_0\|_{H^6} \leq B/C_0$ , we had, by continuity in time of the Sobolev norms of  $\theta$  ensured by Theorem A.1 - existence of a maximal time  $T^* \in \mathbf{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\}$  such that (2.15) is satisfied for any  $t \in [0, T^*)$ , reported here

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_x^3 \theta'\|_{L^2} &\leq \frac{B}{1+t}, & \|\partial_x \theta'\|_{H^4} &\leq B, \\ \|G\|_{H^2} &\leq B, & \|\partial_t \partial_x \theta'\|_{L^2} &\leq \frac{B}{(1+t)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.35)$$

These decay estimate induce, as shown in Lemmas 2.10 and 2.12 to 2.14 that (2.35) holds for another constant  $\underline{B}$  defined as

$$\underline{B} = \frac{CB}{C_0} + CB^2,$$

where  $C > 0$  is universal. By choosing  $B$  small and  $C_0$  large enough, we have  $\underline{B} < B$  and inequalities (2.35) are strictly satisfied for any  $t \in [0, T^*)$ . Therefore  $T^*$  must be  $+\infty$ , otherwise the continuity of  $t \mapsto \|\theta(t)\|_{H^6}$  would imply the existence of a larger validity time interval for (2.35). In the end, these bounds are valid for all time, and setting  $\varepsilon_0 = B/C_0$  closes demonstration of Proposition 2.8 .

**Remark 2.15** (Obstacle to a generalisation at any order). *Motivated by the fact that the following perturbed subproblem is stable under horizontal derivation*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \partial_x^\ell \theta' = (1 - G) \partial_x^{\ell+1} \psi \\ \Delta^2 \partial_x^{\ell-1} \psi = \partial_x^\ell \theta', \\ \partial_x^{\ell-1} \psi|_{\partial\Omega} = \partial_{\mathbf{n}} \partial_x^{\ell-1} \psi|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \end{cases}$$

*we could expect to propagate arbitrary high horizontal regularity on  $\theta'$ . Nevertheless, our proof relies on the control*

$$\|\theta\|_{H^6} \lesssim (1+t)^{1/2},$$

*that we can obtain thanks to the classical divergence free condition on  $\mathbf{u}$  cancelling the extra-derivative term. Trying to do the same on  $\partial_x^\alpha \theta$ , driven by*

$$\partial_t \partial_x^\alpha \theta + \sum_{\beta=0}^{\alpha-1} C_{\alpha,\beta} \partial_x^{\alpha-\beta} \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \partial_x^\beta \theta + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \partial_x^\alpha \theta = \partial_x^{\alpha+1} \psi,$$

*so that the following estimation does not close, even though one of its term does not contribute, just as in the initial equation*

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\partial_x^\alpha \theta\|_{H^6}^2 + \sum_{\beta=0}^{\alpha-1} C_{\alpha,\beta} \int_{\Omega} D^6 (\partial_x^{\alpha-\beta} \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \partial_x^\beta \theta) D^6 \partial_x^\alpha \theta + \frac{1}{2} \underbrace{\int_{\Omega} \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla |D^6 \partial_x^\alpha \theta|^2}_{=0} \leq \|\partial_x^\alpha \psi\|_{H^6} \|\partial_x^\alpha \theta\|_{H^6},$$

*since crossed derivatives integrands do not lead to a vanishing integral, such as*

$$\int_{\Omega} \partial_x^\alpha \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla D^6 \theta D^6 \partial_x^\alpha \theta.$$

## 2.4 Convergence as $t \rightarrow \infty$ and identification of the asymptotic profile

Regarding the asymptotic behavior of the density for the Stokes-transport system without any assumption on the type of initial data, we can only say that if  $\rho$  converges toward some  $\rho_\infty$  in  $H^{-1}$ , this limit profile is stratified. Indeed,, the energy balance (1.4) ensures that  $\mathbf{u} \in L^2(\mathbf{R}_+; H^1(\Omega))$ , and since  $\mathbf{u}$  is also  $\text{Lip}(\mathbf{R}_+; H^1(\Omega))$  by linearity of the Stokes system, we infer that  $\|\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{H^1} \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , but without any information about its decay rate. At least we have

$$\|\nabla p + \rho \mathbf{e}_z\|_{H^{-1}} \lesssim \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^1} \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow \infty]{} 0.$$

The  $H^{-1}$  convergence of  $\rho$  leads to the existence of  $p_\infty$  such that

$$\nabla p_\infty = -\rho_\infty \mathbf{e}_z,$$

so observing that  $\partial_x p_\infty = 0$  ensures that  $p_\infty$  and  $\rho_\infty$  are both independent of the horizontal coordinate  $x$ .

In the context of a small perturbation of the stationary profile  $\Theta(z) = 1 - z$  we obtained explicit decay rates for Sobolev norm of  $\mathbf{u}$ . We show that these decays are enough to ensure the strong convergence of  $\rho$  toward a limit profile  $\rho_\infty$ . Moreover, the smallness of the perturbation  $\theta$  does not affect the vertical monotonicity of the whole density  $\rho$ , from which we deduce that  $\rho_\infty$  is exactly the vertical rearrangement of  $\rho_0$ .

**Proposition 2.16.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, the whole density  $\rho$  converges in  $H^m, m < 4$ , toward its vertical decreasing rearrangement.*

*Proof.* The proof is divided in the following steps:



**Convergence.** It is enough to show that  $\partial_t \rho$  belongs to  $L^1(\mathbf{R}_+; H^m)$  for  $m < 4$ , which implies the strong convergence of  $\rho(t)$  in  $H^m$  and existence of a limit  $\rho_\infty$ . Let us estimate  $\partial_t \rho$  in  $H^m$  for any  $0 \leq m \leq 4$ , a range of indices for which the following bounds are valid,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t \rho\|_{H^m} &= \|\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \rho\|_{H^m} \leq \|\partial_z \psi \partial_x \rho\|_{H^m} + \|\partial_x \psi \partial_z \rho\|_{H^m} \\ &\lesssim \|\nabla \psi\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_x \rho\|_{H^m} + \|\psi\|_{H^{m+1}} \|\partial_x \rho\|_{L^\infty} + \|\partial_x \psi\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho\|_{H^{m+1}} + \|\partial_x \psi\|_{H^m} \|\partial_z \rho\|_{L^\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling that  $\partial_z \rho = -1 + G + \partial_z \theta'$  is bounded in  $H^5(\Omega)$ , that  $\partial_x \rho = \partial_x \theta'$  decays as  $(1+t)^{1-m/4}$  for  $m \leq 4$ , and the previous decay estimates, we find

$$\|\partial_t \rho\|_{H^m} \lesssim \frac{\|\rho_0\|_{H^6}^2}{(1+t)^{2-m/4}},$$

which is integrable for any  $m < 4$ , hence the convergence.

**Stratified limit.** Since  $\rho$  converges, so do  $\theta' = (\rho - \Theta)'$  and  $\bar{\theta} = \overline{\rho - \Theta}$ . We obtained in (2.13) that  $\theta'$  vanishes in  $H^m$  for  $m < 4$ . The limit  $\rho_\infty$  is stratified since  $\theta'$  vanishes in  $H^m(\Omega)$  for  $m < 4$ . Hence  $\rho_\infty$  writes as the sum of  $\Theta$  and the limit  $\bar{\theta}_\infty$  of  $\bar{\theta}$ . In view of (2.13) this limit satisfies in particular  $\|\partial_z \bar{\theta}_\infty\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\varepsilon$ . At least for  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $C\varepsilon < 1 = -\partial_z \Theta$ , we know that  $\sup_{(0,1)} \partial_z \rho_\infty < 0$ , which means that  $\rho_\infty$  is strictly decreasing with respect to  $z$ .

**Rearrangement.** The divergence free character of the velocity field  $\mathbf{u}$  ensures that all  $L^q$  norms and the cumulative distribution function of  $\rho(t)$  are preserved along time, in the sense

$$\forall \lambda \geq 0, \quad |\{\rho(t) > \lambda\}| = |\{\rho_0 > \lambda\}|. \quad (2.36)$$

This property transfers to the limit state  $\rho_\infty$  by  $L^q$  strong convergence of  $\rho$ . According to rearrangement theory such as developed in [LL01, Chapter 3] for instance, we say that two maps are rearrangement of each other if they have the same level sets, in the sense of (2.36). Adapting slightly the construction of [LL01], we know there exists a unique vertical decreasing rearrangement of  $\rho_0 : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}_+$ , which can be defined as

$$\rho_0^*(z) := \int_0^\infty \mathbf{1}_{0 \leq z \leq |\{\rho_0 > \lambda\}|} d\lambda.$$

In the end, we know that  $\rho_\infty$  is a decreasing rearrangement of  $\rho_0$ , therefore it is  $\rho_0^*$  by uniqueness.  $\square$

Notice that we actually have  $\|\partial_z \theta\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \varepsilon$  for all time, therefore the total density as a strictly negative vertical derivative, for all  $x \in \mathbf{T}$  and for all time  $t \in \mathbf{R}_+$ , since

$$\partial_z \rho(t, x, \cdot) = -1 + \partial_z \theta(t, x, z), \quad (2.37)$$

and the density reordering is essentially horizontal. This is a rare case in which we can describe the asymptotic profile. This intuition of having heavy fluids sinking under the lighter ones prompts to wonder if, at least in a weak sense, the density profile should always converge toward the vertical rearrangement of the initial datum, unless it is already stratified. This question remains open, either for the Stokes-transport equation as for the incompressible porous media.

### 3 Formation of linear boundary layers for large times: proof of Theorem 1.2

The purpose of this section is to prove Theorem 1.2. We consider the linear problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \theta' = \partial_x \psi & \text{in } (0, +\infty) \times \Omega, \\ \Delta^2 \psi = \partial_x \theta & \text{in } \Omega, \quad \psi|_{\partial\Omega} = \partial_{\mathbf{n}} \psi|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \\ \theta'(t=0) = \theta'_0, \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

with  $\theta'_0 \in H^4(\Omega)$  arbitrary. The difference with the linear analysis of Section 2.2, and in particular with Proposition 2.6, lies in the fact that we do not assume that  $\theta'_0$  and  $\partial_{\mathbf{n}} \theta'_0$  vanish on the boundary. As a consequence, boundary layers are created as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  close to  $z = 0$  and  $z = 1$ , and the purpose of this section is precisely to describe the mechanism driving the apparition of boundary layers. We will therefore decompose  $\theta'$  as the sum of an interior term decaying like  $t^{-1}$  in  $L^2$ , and some boundary layer terms which lift the traces of  $\theta'$  and  $\partial_z \theta'$  on the boundary. This will lead us to Theorem 1.2. We will then return to our nonlinear system (1.15) in Section 4.

The organization of this section is the following. We start with some preliminary observations explaining the reason why boundary layers are formed, and present our Ansatz. We then construct the boundary layer part of the solution, denoted by  $\theta^{\text{BL}}$ , and we establish some properties. Eventually, we prove that  $\theta' - \theta^{\text{BL}}$  satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 2.6, and we conclude.

#### 3.1 Preliminary observations and Ansatz

We start with rather simple observations:

- First, it follows from the equation that  $\partial_t \theta'|_{\partial\Omega} = \partial_t \partial_z \theta'|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ . Therefore, for all  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$\theta'_{|\partial\Omega}(t) = \theta'_{0|\partial\Omega} \quad \partial_z \theta'_{|\partial\Omega}(t) = \partial_z \theta'_{0|\partial\Omega}.$$

- Since  $(b_{\mathbf{k}})_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbf{Z} \times \mathbf{N}^*}$  is a hilbertian basis in  $L^2(\Omega)$ , we can always write

$$\theta'(t) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \widehat{\theta'_{\mathbf{k}}}(t) b_{\mathbf{k}},$$

with  $(\widehat{\theta'_{\mathbf{k}}})_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbf{Z} \times \mathbf{N}^*} \in \ell^2$ . Taking the scalar product of (3.1) with  $b_{\mathbf{k}}$ , we obtain, for any  $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbf{Z} \times \mathbf{N}^*$ ,  $t > 0$ ,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \widehat{\theta'_{\mathbf{k}}}(t) = -\lambda_{\mathbf{k}} \widehat{\theta'_{\mathbf{k}}}(t),$$

and thus  $\widehat{\theta'_{\mathbf{k}}}(t) = \exp(-\lambda_{\mathbf{k}} t) \widehat{\theta'_{\mathbf{k}}}(t=0)$ . It then follows from Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem that  $\theta(t) \rightarrow 0$  in  $L^2$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

Therefore  $\theta(t)$  vanishes in  $L^2$  while keeping a constant - and non-zero - value on the boundary. As a consequence, it is reasonable to expect that boundary layers are formed in the vicinity of  $z = 0$  and  $z = 1$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence we take an Ansatz of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \theta'(t) \simeq & \theta^{\text{int}} + \Theta_{\text{bot}}^0(x, (1+t)^\alpha z) + \Theta_{\text{top}}^0(x, (1+t)^\alpha(1-z)) \\ & + (1+t)^{-\alpha} \Theta_{\text{bot}}^1(x, (1+t)^\alpha z) + (1+t)^{-\alpha} \Theta_{\text{top}}^1(x, (1+t)^\alpha(1-z)) + \text{l.o.t.} \end{aligned}$$

for some  $\alpha > 0$  to be determined, where

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^{\text{int}}|_{\partial\Omega} &= \partial_z \theta^{\text{int}}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \\ \Theta_{\text{bot}}^j(x, Z) &\rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Theta_{\text{top}}^j(x, Z) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad Z \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

The role of  $\Theta_{\text{top}}^0$  (resp. of  $\Theta_{\text{bot}}^0$ ) is to lift the trace of  $\theta'_0$  at the top boundary  $z = 1$  (resp. at the bottom boundary  $z = 0$ ). Whence we take

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta_{\text{top}}^0(x, Z = 0) &= \theta'_0(x, z = 1), & \partial_Z \Theta_{\text{top}}^0(x, Z = 0) &= 0, \\ \Theta_{\text{bot}}^0(x, Z = 0) &= \theta'_0(x, z = 0), & \partial_Z \Theta_{\text{bot}}^0(x, Z = 0) &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

In a similar way, the next order boundary layer terms  $\Theta_{\text{top}}^1$  and  $\Theta_{\text{bot}}^1$  lift the traces of  $\partial_n \theta'_0$  on  $\partial\Omega$ , *i.e.*

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta_{\text{top}}^1(x, Z = 0) &= 0, & \partial_Z \Theta_{\text{top}}^0(x, Z = 0) &= -\partial_z \theta'_0(x, z = 1), \\ \Theta_{\text{bot}}^0(x, Z = 0) &= 0, & \partial_Z \Theta_{\text{bot}}^0(x, Z = 0) &= \partial_z \theta'_0(x, z = 0).\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we assume that

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(t) &\simeq \psi^{\text{int}} + (1+t)^{-4\alpha} \Psi_{\text{bot}}^0(x, (1+t)^\alpha z) + (1+t)^{-4\alpha} \Psi_{\text{top}}^0(x, (1+t)^\alpha(1-z)) \\ &\quad + (1+t)^{-5\alpha} \Psi_{\text{bot}}^1(x, (1+t)^\alpha z) + (1+t)^{-5\alpha} \Psi_{\text{bot}}^1(x, (1+t)^\alpha(1-z)) + \text{l.o.t.}\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\partial_Z^4 \Psi_a^j = \partial_x \Theta_a^j, \quad \text{with } \Psi_a^j = \partial_Z \Psi_a^j = 0 \text{ on } Z = 0, \text{ and } \Psi_a^j \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } Z \rightarrow \infty, \quad a \in \{\text{top, bot}\}.$$

Plugging these Ansatz into equation (3.1), we find that at main order

$$\alpha(1+t)^{-1} Z \partial_Z \Theta_a^0 = (1+t)^{-4\alpha} \partial_x \Psi_a^0.$$

Consequently, identifying the powers of  $(1+t)$ , we take  $\alpha = 1/4$ . Hence the equation for  $\Psi_a^0$ ,  $a \in \{\text{top, bot}\}$  becomes

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{4} Z \partial_Z^5 \Psi_a^0 = \partial_x^2 \Psi_a^0 & \text{in } \mathbf{T} \times (0, +\infty), \\ \Psi_{a|Z=0}^0 = \partial_Z \Psi_{a|Z=0}^0 = 0, \\ \partial_Z^4 \Psi_{a|Z=0}^0 = \gamma_a^0(x), \quad \partial_Z^5 \Psi_{a|Z=0}^0 = 0, \\ \lim_{Z \rightarrow \infty} \Psi_a^0(x, Z) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

where  $\gamma_{\text{bot}}^0(x) = \partial_x \theta'_0(x, z = 0)$ ,  $\gamma_{\text{top}}^0(x) = \partial_x \theta'_0(x, z = 1)$ . Note that the above boundary conditions are redundant: indeed, if  $\partial_Z \Psi_{a|Z=0}^0 = 0$ , then it follows from the equation (after one differentiation with respect to  $Z$ ) that  $\partial_Z^5 \Psi_{a|Z=0}^0 = 0$ . Hence in the following paragraph we will drop the condition  $\partial_Z^5 \Psi_{a|Z=0}^0 = 0$ .

In a similar fashion, the equation for  $\Psi_a^1$ ,  $a \in \{\text{top, bot}\}$  is

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_Z^4 \Psi_a^1 + Z \partial_Z^5 \Psi_a^1 = 4 \partial_x^2 \Psi_a^1 & \text{in } \mathbf{T} \times (0, +\infty) \\ \Psi_{a|Z=0}^1 = \partial_Z \Psi_{a|Z=0}^1 = 0, \\ \partial_Z^4 \Psi_{a|Z=0}^1 = 0, \quad \partial_Z^5 \Psi_{a|Z=0}^1 = \gamma_a^1(x), \\ \lim_{Z \rightarrow \infty} \Psi_a^1(x, Z) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

where  $\gamma_{\text{bot}}^1(x) = \partial_x \partial_z \theta'_0(x, z = 0)$ ,  $\gamma_{\text{top}}^1(x) = -\partial_x \partial_z \theta'_0(x, z = 1)$ . Once again, the condition  $\partial_Z^4 \Psi_{a|Z=0}^1 = 0$  is redundant and is automatically satisfied when one takes the trace of the equation at  $Z = 0$ , using the other boundary conditions. We now turn towards the well-posedness of (3.2) and (3.3).

### 3.2 Construction of the main profiles

The well-posedness of equations (3.2) and (3.3) stems from the following result:

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $m \geq m_0 > 0$  and let  $S \in C([0, +\infty))$ ,  $\delta > 0$  such that*

$$\|S\|^2 := \int_0^1 \frac{S(Z)^2}{Z^2} dZ + \int_0^\infty S(Z)^2 e^{\delta Z^{4/5}} dZ < +\infty$$

Consider the ODE

$$Z\Psi^{(5)}(Z) = -m\Psi(Z) + S(z) \quad \text{in } (0, +\infty), \quad \lim_{Z \rightarrow \infty} \Psi(Z) = 0, \quad (3.4)$$

endowed with one of the four following boundary conditions:

- (i)  $\Psi(0) = \Psi'(0) = \Psi^{(4)}(0) = 0$ ;
- (ii) or  $\Psi(0) = \Psi^{(3)}(0) = \Psi^{(4)}(0) = 0$ ;
- (iii) or  $\Psi(0) = \Psi''(0) = \Psi^{(3)}(0) = 0$ ;
- (iv) or  $\Psi(0) = \Psi'(0) = \Psi''(0) = 0$ .

Then there exists a constant  $c > 0$  depending only on  $m_0$  and  $\delta$  such that equation (3.4) endowed with one of the four previous conditions has a unique solution  $\Psi \in H_{loc}^5(\mathbf{R}_+)$  such that for all  $k \in \{0, \dots, 5\}$ ,

$$\int_0^\infty |\Psi^{(k)}(Z)|^2 \exp(cZ^{4/5}) dZ \leq C\|S\|^2 < +\infty.$$

As a consequence, for  $k \leq 4$ , there exists a constant  $C$  such that

$$|\Psi^{(k)}(Z)| \leq C\|S\| \exp\left(-\frac{c}{4}Z^{4/5}\right) \quad \forall Z > 0.$$

The proof of Lemma 3.1 is postponed to the Appendix, and relies on the use of the Lax-Milgram Lemma in weighted Sobolev spaces. As a corollary, we have the following result:

**Corollary 3.2.** *For all  $j \in \{0, 1\}$ , there exists a unique solution  $\chi_j \in C^\infty(0, +\infty)$  of the ODE*

$$Z\chi_j^{(5)} - j\chi_j^{(4)} + 4\chi_j = 0 \quad \text{on } (0, +\infty),$$

endowed with the following boundary conditions:

- $\chi_0(0) = \chi_0'(0) = 0, \chi_0^{(4)}(0) = 1$ ;
- $\chi_1'(0) = \chi_1^{(4)}(0) = 0, \chi_1^{(5)}(0) = 1$ ,

and such that for  $j = 0, 1, 0 \leq k \leq 4$ ,

$$\int_0^\infty |\chi_j^{(k)}(Z)| \exp(cZ^{4/5}) dZ < +\infty.$$

Furthermore,  $\chi_0^{(5)}(0) = \chi_1(0) = 0$ .

*Proof.* Let us start with  $\chi_0$ . Let  $\eta \in C_c^\infty(\mathbf{R})$  such that  $\eta \equiv 1$  in a neighborhood of zero. Then  $\chi_0 - Z^4 \eta$  satisfies (3.4) with the boundary conditions (i) and with a  $C^\infty$  and compactly supported source term. Hence the result follows from Lemma 3.1. The  $C^\infty$  regularity of  $\chi_0$  follows easily from the ODE (3.4) and from an induction argument. Differentiating the ODE and taking the trace at  $Z = 0$ , we obtain  $\chi_0^{(5)}(0) = -4\chi_0'(0) = 0$ .

Concerning  $\chi_1$ , we first consider the solution of the ODE

$$\begin{aligned} Z\phi^{(5)} + 4\phi &= 0 \quad \text{on } (0, +\infty), \\ \phi(0) = \phi^{(3)}(0) &= 0, \quad \phi^{(4)}(0) = 1, \quad \phi(+\infty) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The existence, uniqueness, and exponential decay of  $\phi$  follows from Lemma 3.1 and from a lifting argument. We then set  $\chi_1(Z) = -\int_Z^\infty \phi$ , and we observe that  $\partial_Z(Z\chi_1^{(5)} - \chi_1^{(4)} + 4\chi_1) = 0$ . As a consequence,  $Z\chi_1^{(5)}(Z) - \chi_1^{(4)}(Z) + 4\chi_1(Z) = \text{cst.} = 0$  on  $(0, +\infty)$ , thanks to the decay properties of  $\phi$  at infinity. Hence the existence, uniqueness and decay of  $\chi_1$  follow. Taking the trace of the equation at  $Z = 0$ , we find that  $\chi_1(0) = 0$ . □

Let us now explain how we construct  $\Psi_a^j$  for  $a \in \{\text{top, bot}\}$  and  $j = 0, 1$ . Taking the Fourier transform of (3.2) with respect to  $x$  and dropping the index  $a$ , we infer that  $\widehat{\Psi}_k^0$  satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{4}Z\partial_Z^5 \widehat{\Psi}_k^0 &= -k^2 \widehat{\Psi}_k^0, \\ \partial_Z^4 \widehat{\Psi}_k^0|_{Z=0} &= \widehat{\gamma}_{a,k}^0, \quad \widehat{\Psi}_k^0|_{Z=0} = \partial_Z \widehat{\Psi}_k^0|_{Z=0} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Considering the function  $\chi_0$  defined in Corollary 3.2, it is then easily checked that

$$\widehat{\Psi}_k^0 = |k|^{-2} \widehat{\gamma}_k^0 \chi_0(|k|^{1/2} Z)$$

is a solution of the problem. We infer that

$$\Psi_a^0 := \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z} \setminus \{0\}} |k|^{-2} \widehat{\gamma}_{a,k}^0 \chi_0(|k|^{1/2} Z) e^{ikx} \quad (3.5)$$

is a solution of (3.2). In a similar way,

$$\Psi_a^1 := \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z} \setminus \{0\}} |k|^{-5/2} \widehat{\gamma}_{a,k}^1 \chi_1(|k|^{1/2} Z) e^{ikx} \quad (3.6)$$

satisfies (3.3).

As a consequence, we have the following estimates, which follow easily from the formulas (3.5) and (3.6):

**Corollary 3.3.** *Let  $\gamma_a^0 \in L^2(\mathbf{T})$ ,  $\gamma_a^1 \in L^2(\mathbf{T})$ . Then equation (3.2) (resp. equation (3.3)) has a unique solution  $\Psi_a^0 \in H_x^{9/4} L_Z^2 \cap L_x^2 H_Z^{9/2}$  (resp.  $\Psi_a^1 \in H_x^{11/4} L_Z^2 \cap L_x^2 H_Z^{11/2}$ ). Furthermore, for all  $m \in \mathbf{N}$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Psi_a^0\|_{H_x^m L_z^2} &\lesssim \|\gamma_a^0\|_{H^{m-\frac{9}{4}}} \lesssim \|\theta'_0\|_{H^{m-\frac{1}{4}}(\Omega)}, & \|\Psi_a^0\|_{L_x^2 H_z^m} &\lesssim \|\gamma_a^0\|_{H^{\frac{m}{2}-\frac{9}{4}}} \lesssim \|\theta'_0\|_{H^{\frac{m}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}(\Omega)}, \\ \|\Psi_a^1\|_{H_x^m L_z^2} &\lesssim \|\gamma_a^1\|_{H^{m-\frac{11}{4}}} \lesssim \|\theta'_0\|_{H^{m+\frac{1}{4}}(\Omega)}, & \|\Psi_a^1\|_{L_x^2 H_z^m} &\lesssim \|\gamma_a^1\|_{H^{\frac{m}{2}-\frac{11}{4}}} \lesssim \|\theta'_0\|_{H^{\frac{m}{2}+\frac{1}{4}}(\Omega)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

Additionally, the profiles  $\Psi_a^0$  and  $\Psi_a^1$  have exponential decay: for any  $Z_0 \geq 1$ , for any  $m \in \mathbf{N}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Psi_a^0\|_{H^m(\mathbf{T} \times (Z_0, +\infty))} &\lesssim \|\theta'_0\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \exp(-\bar{c} Z_0^{4/5}), \\ \|\Psi_a^1\|_{H^m(\mathbf{T} \times (Z_0, +\infty))} &\lesssim \|\theta'_0\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \exp(-\bar{c} Z_0^{4/5}). \end{aligned}$$

### 3.3 Construction of an approximate solution

The idea is now to find a decomposition of  $\theta'$  as  $\theta' = \theta^{\text{BL}} + \theta^{\text{int}}$ , where  $\theta^{\text{BL}}$  is a solution of

$$\partial_t \theta^{\text{BL}} = \partial_x^2 \Delta^{-2} \theta^{\text{BL}} + S_r,$$

with a source term  $S_r$  such that, for some  $\delta > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} S_r(t) &= O((1+t)^{-2}) \text{ in } L^2(\Omega), & S_r(t) &= O((1+t)^{-1-\delta}) \text{ in } H^4(\Omega), \\ \partial_t S_r(t) &= O((1+t)^{-3}) \text{ in } L^2(\Omega), \end{aligned}$$

and a boundary layer profile  $\theta^{\text{BL}}$  such that  $\theta^{\text{BL}}|_{\partial\Omega}(t=0) = \theta'_0|_{\partial\Omega}$ ,  $\partial_n \theta^{\text{BL}}|_{\partial\Omega} = \partial_n \theta'_0|_{\partial\Omega}$ . Note that the operator  $\Delta^{-2}$  is endowed with homogeneous conditions for the trace and the normal derivative on the boundary of  $\partial\Omega$ . In the assumptions on the source term  $S$  above, we omitted the  $x$  derivatives. Actually, we will construct a source term  $S$  such that  $\partial_x^k S$  satisfies the above assumptions for some  $k \geq 3$ . Note that in this case the assumptions of Proposition 2.6 are satisfied.

As a consequence, the interior part  $\theta^{\text{int}}$  satisfies

$$\partial_t \theta^{\text{int}} = \partial_x^2 \Delta^{-2} \theta^{\text{int}} - S_r$$

and the trace of  $\theta^{\text{int}}$  vanishes on  $\partial\Omega$ , together with its normal derivative. Thus we may apply Proposition 2.6, and we obtain  $\|\theta^{\text{int}}\|_{L^2} = O((1+t)^{-1})$ , which will complete the proof of Theorem 1.2.

The main order part of  $\theta^{\text{BL}}$  will be given by the profiles  $\Theta_a^j$ ,  $j = 0, 1$ ,  $a \in \{\text{top}, \text{bot}\}$  constructed in Corollary 3.3. However, a few adjustments must be made in order to have a suitable decomposition:

- First, the profiles  $\Theta_a^j$  must be truncated away from  $z = 0$  and  $z = 1$ , so that their (exponentially small) trace does not pollute the opposite boundary. Since  $\Theta_a^j$  have exponential decay, this introduces a remainder of order  $\exp(-ct^{1/5})$ , which will be included in  $S_r$ . More precisely, the error terms generated by this truncation will be dealt with thanks to the following Lemma, whose proof is left to the reader:

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $\Psi \in L^2(\mathbf{T} \times (0, +\infty))$  such that there exists  $c, C > 0$  such that*

$$\int_{\mathbf{T}} \int_0^\infty |\Psi(x, Z)|^2 \exp(cZ^{4/5}) dZ \leq C < +\infty.$$

*Let  $\zeta \in L^\infty(0, 1)$  such that  $\text{Supp } \zeta \subset (1/4, 1)$ . Then*

$$\left\| \Psi(x, (1+t)^{1/4} z) \zeta(z) \right\|_{L^2(\mathbf{T})} \lesssim C \|\zeta\|_\infty \exp(-c'(1+t)^{1/5}),$$

*where  $c'$  depends only on  $c$ .*

- More importantly, the main order profiles  $(\Theta_a^j, \Psi_a^j)$  do not satisfy exactly

$$\Delta^2 \left( (1+t)^{-1} \Psi_{\text{bot}}^j(x, (1+t)^{1/4} z) \right) = \Theta_{\text{bot}}^j(x, (1+t)^{1/4} z).$$

Indeed, when constructing  $\Psi_a^0$ , we only kept the main order terms in  $\Delta^2$ , *i.e.* the  $z$  derivatives. It turns out that the term  $2\partial_x^2 \partial_z^2$  in the bilaplacian generates an error term in the equation which is not  $O((1+t)^{-2})$ . As a consequence, we introduce lower order correctors,

whose purpose is precisely to cancel this error term. We emphasize that the construction of such additional correctors is quite classical in multiscale problems. In order to determine the order at which the expansion can be stopped, we will rely on the following Lemma, whose proof is postponed to the end of this section:

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $f \in H^4(\mathbf{T}, L^2(\mathbf{R}_+))$  such that there exist constants  $c, C > 0$  such that*

$$|\partial_x^k f(x, Z)| \leq C \exp(-cZ^{4/5}) \quad \forall k \in \{0, \dots, 4\}, \quad \forall (x, Z) \in \mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{R}_+.$$

Then

$$\left\| \Delta^{-2} \left( f(x, (1+t)^{1/4}z) \chi(z) \right) \right\|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{1}{(1+t)^{3/4}}.$$

Furthermore, if

$$\int_0^\infty Z^2 f(x, Z) dZ = \int_0^\infty Z^3 f(x, Z) dZ = 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathbf{T},$$

this estimate becomes

$$\left\| \Delta^{-2} \left( f(x, (1+t)^{1/4}z) \chi(z) \right) \right\|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{1}{1+t}.$$

With the two above Lemmas in mind, we define  $\theta^{\text{BL}}$  in the following way. Let  $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbf{R})$  be a cut-off function such that  $\chi \equiv 1$  on  $(-1/4, 1/4)$ , and  $\text{Supp } \chi \subset (-1/2, 1/2)$ . We look for  $\theta^{\text{BL}}$  in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^{\text{BL}}(t, x, z) &:= \sum_{j=0}^4 (1+t)^{-j/4} \Theta_{\text{bot}}^j(x, (1+t)^{1/4}z) \chi(z) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=0}^4 (1+t)^{-j/4} \Theta_{\text{top}}^j(x, (1+t)^{1/4}(1-z)) \chi(z-1) \\ &=: \theta_{\text{bot}}^{\text{BL}} + \theta_{\text{top}}^{\text{BL}} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \psi^{\text{BL}}(t, x, z) &:= \sum_{j=0}^4 (1+t)^{-1-\frac{j}{4}} \Psi_{\text{bot}}^j(x, (1+t)^{1/4}z) \chi(z) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=0}^4 (1+t)^{-1-\frac{j}{4}} \Psi_{\text{top}}^j(x, (1+t)^{1/4}(1-z)) \chi(z-1) \\ &=: \psi_{\text{bot}}^{\text{BL}} + \psi_{\text{top}}^{\text{BL}}. \end{aligned}$$

The profiles  $\Theta_a^j, \Psi_a^j$  for  $j = 0, 1$  and  $a \in \{\text{bot}, \text{top}\}$  were defined in the previous paragraph, and we now proceed to define  $\Theta_a^j, \Psi_a^j$  for  $j \geq 2$ . The reason why we stop the expansion at  $j = 4$  follows from Lemma 3.5, as we will see shortly.

We focus on the part near  $z = 0$ , since the part near  $z = 1$  works identically. Setting  $Z = (1+t)^{1/4}z$ , we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \theta_{\text{bot}}^{\text{BL}} = (1+t)^{-1} \sum_{j=0}^4 (1+t)^{-j/4} \left[ -\frac{j}{4} \Theta_{\text{bot}}^j(x, Z) + \frac{1}{4} Z \partial_Z \Theta_{\text{bot}}^j(x, Z) \right] \chi(z)$$

For  $j = 0, 1$ , the bracketed term in the right-hand side is simply  $\partial_x \Psi_{\text{bot}}^j(x, (1+t)^{1/4}z)$ . Similarly, we choose  $\Psi_a^j$  for  $j = 2, 3, 4$  and  $a \in \{\text{bot}, \text{top}\}$  so that

$$\partial_x \Psi_a^j = -\frac{j}{4}\Theta_a^j + \frac{1}{4}Z\partial_Z\Theta_a^j. \quad (3.8)$$

With this choice, we have

$$\partial_t \theta^{\text{BL}} = \partial_x \psi^{\text{BL}}.$$

There remains to choose  $\Theta_a^j$  so that  $\partial_x \psi^{\text{BL}} = \Delta^{-2} \partial_x^2 \theta^{\text{BL}} + O((1+t)^{-2})$  in  $L^2$ . To that end, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^2 \psi_{\text{bot}}^{\text{BL}} &= \sum_{j=0}^4 (1+t)^{-\frac{j}{4}} \partial_Z^4 \Psi_{\text{bot}}^j(x, Z) \chi(z) + 2 \sum_{j=0}^4 (1+t)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{j}{4}} \partial_x^2 \partial_Z^2 \Psi_{\text{bot}}^j(x, Z) \chi(z) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=0}^4 (1+t)^{-1-\frac{j}{4}} \partial_x^4 \Psi_{\text{bot}}^j(x, Z) \chi(z) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=0}^4 \sum_{k=0}^3 \binom{k}{4} (1+t)^{-1+\frac{k-j}{4}} \partial_Z^k \Psi_{\text{bot}}^j(x, Z) \chi^{(4-k)}(z) \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_{j=0}^4 \sum_{k=0}^1 \binom{k}{2} (1+t)^{-1+\frac{k-j}{4}} \partial_x^2 \partial_Z^2 \Psi_{\text{bot}}^j(x, Z) \chi^{(2-k)}(z). \end{aligned}$$

The last two terms are handled by Lemma 3.4 (anticipating that  $\Psi_a^j$  will have exponential decay for  $j = 2, 3, 4$ ).

We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^2 \psi_{\text{bot}}^{\text{BL}} &= \partial_x \theta_{\text{bot}}^{\text{BL}} + O(\exp(-c(1+t)^{1/5})) \\ &\quad + (1+t)^{-1/2} [-\partial_x \Theta_{\text{bot}}^2 + \partial_Z^4 \Psi_{\text{bot}}^2 + 2\partial_x^2 \partial_Z^2 \Psi_{\text{bot}}^0] (x, Z) \chi(z) \\ &\quad + (1+t)^{-3/4} [-\partial_x \Theta_{\text{bot}}^3 + \partial_Z^4 \Psi_{\text{bot}}^3 + 2\partial_x^2 \partial_Z^2 \Psi_{\text{bot}}^1] (x, Z) \chi(z) \\ &\quad + (1+t)^{-1} [-\partial_x \Theta_{\text{bot}}^4 + \partial_Z^4 \Psi_{\text{bot}}^4 + 2\partial_x^2 \partial_Z^2 \Psi_{\text{bot}}^2 + \partial_x^4 \Psi_{\text{bot}}^0] (x, Z) \chi(z) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j \geq 5} (1+t)^{-j/4} \Phi_{\text{bot}}^j(x, Z) \chi(z), \end{aligned}$$

for some functions  $\Phi_{\text{bot}}^j$  depending on the profiles  $\Psi_{\text{bot}}^j$  (for instance  $\Phi^5 = 2\partial_x^2 \partial_Z^2 \Psi_{\text{bot}}^3 + \partial_x^4 \Psi_{\text{bot}}^1$ ). Thanks to Lemma 3.5, the inverse bilaplacian of the last term has a size of order  $(1+t)^{-2}$  in  $L^2$ . Hence it will be included in the remainder  $S_r$ . Note that the reason why we need to stop the expansion in  $\theta^{\text{BL}}$  at  $j = 4$  is dictated by the above formula and by Lemma 3.5. If we stop the expansion for a lower  $j$ , then the remainder may be greater than  $(1+t)^{-2}$  in  $L^2$ .

Therefore we focus on the terms of order  $(1+t)^{-j/4}$  with  $j = 2, 3, 4$ . We treat the cases  $j = 2$  and  $j = 3$  simultaneously, and we will focus on the case  $j = 4$  later.

• **Construction of  $\Psi_a^j$  for  $j = 2, 3$ :**

Remembering (3.8), we choose  $\Theta_a^j$  and  $\Psi_a^j$  for  $a \in \{\text{bot}, \text{top}\}$  and  $j = 2, 3$  so that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_x \Psi_a^j &= -\frac{j}{4}\Theta_a^j + \frac{1}{4}Z\partial_Z\Theta_a^j, \\ -\partial_x \Theta_a^j + \partial_Z^4 \Psi_a^j + 2\partial_x^2 \partial_Z^2 \Psi_a^{j-2} &= 0, \\ \lim_{Z \rightarrow \infty} \Psi_a^j &= 0, \\ \Psi_a^j(Z=0) = \partial_Z \Psi_a^j(Z=0) &= 0, \\ \Theta_a^j(Z=0) = \partial_Z \Theta_a^j(Z=0) &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$



As before, we note that the boundary conditions at  $Z = 0$  are redundant. Eliminating  $\Theta_a^j$  from the equation, we find that  $\Psi_a^j$  satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} Z\partial_Z^5\Psi_a^j - j\partial_Z^4\Psi_a^j &= 4\partial_x^2\Psi_a^j + S_a^j, \\ \Psi_a^j(Z=0) &= \partial_Z\Psi_a^j(Z=0) = 0, \\ \partial_Z^4\Psi_a^j &= -2\partial_x^2\partial_Z^2\Psi_a^{j-2} = -\frac{1}{j}S_a^j \quad \text{at } Z=0, \\ \partial_Z^5\Psi_a^j &= -2\partial_x^2\partial_Z^3\Psi_a^{j-2} = -\frac{1}{j-1}\partial_Z S_a^j \quad \text{at } Z=0, \\ \lim_{Z\rightarrow\infty}\Psi_a^j &= 0, \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

where  $S_a^j = -2(Z\partial_Z - j)\partial_x^2\partial_Z^2\Psi_a^{j-2}$ . Therefore  $\partial_Z^j S_a^j = -2Z\partial_Z^{j+3}\partial_x^2\Psi_a^{j-2} = -8\partial_x^4\partial_Z^{j-2}\Psi_a^{j-2}$ .

As a consequence, we find that  $\partial_Z^j\Psi_a^j$  satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} Z\partial_Z^5\partial_Z^j\Psi_a^j &= 4\partial_x^2\partial_Z^j\Psi_a^j - 8\partial_x^4\partial_Z^{j-2}\Psi_a^{j-2}, \\ \partial_Z^j\Psi_a^j &= 0 \quad \text{at } Z=0, \\ \partial_Z^4\partial_Z^j\Psi_a^j &= -\frac{1}{j}S_a^j, \quad \partial_Z^5\partial_Z^j\Psi_a^j = -\frac{1}{j-1}\partial_Z S_a^j \quad \text{at } Z=0, \\ \lim_{Z\rightarrow\infty}\partial_Z^j\Psi_a^j &= 0, \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Note that the boundary condition  $\partial_Z^j\widetilde{\Psi}_a^j(Z=0) = 0$  follows from the identity

$$\partial_x\partial_Z^j\Psi_a^j = \frac{1}{4}Z\partial_Z^{j+1}\Theta_a^j.$$

Taking the Fourier transform with respect to  $x$ , we observe that  $\widehat{\partial_Z^j\Psi_a^j}(k)$  satisfies (3.4) with nonhomogeneous boundary conditions of type (iii) (for  $j = 2$ ) or (iv) (for  $j = 3$ ). Using the Fourier representations (3.5) and (3.6) for  $\Psi^0$  and  $\Psi^1$ , we anticipate that  $\Psi_a^2$  and  $\Psi_a^3$  can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_a^2(x, Z) &= \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z} \setminus \{0\}} |k|^{-1} \widehat{\gamma_{a,k}^0} \chi_2(|k|^{1/2}Z) e^{ikx}, \\ \Psi_a^3(x, Z) &= \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z} \setminus \{0\}} |k|^{-3/2} \widehat{\gamma_{a,k}^1} \chi_3(|k|^{1/2}Z) e^{ikx}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

with  $\chi_2, \chi_3 \in C^\infty((0, +\infty))$  decaying like  $\exp(-\bar{c}Z^{4/5})$ . The precise construction of  $\chi_2$  and  $\chi_3$  will be performed below. We obtain the following result:

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $a \in \{\text{top}, \text{bot}\}$  and  $\gamma_a^0, \gamma_a^1 \in L^2(\mathbf{T})$ . Consider the solutions  $\Psi_a^0, \Psi_a^1$  of (3.2), (3.3) given by Corollary 3.3.*

*Then there exist unique solutions  $\Psi_a^2 \in H_x^{5/4}L_Z^2 \cap L_x^2H_Z^{5/2}$ ,  $\Psi_a^3 \in H_x^{7/4}L_Z^2 \cap L_x^2H_Z^{7/2}$  of (3.10). Furthermore, for any  $m \in \mathbf{N}$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Psi_a^2\|_{H_x^m L_z^2} &\lesssim \|\theta'_0\|_{H^{m+\frac{3}{4}}(\Omega)}, \quad \|\Psi_a^2\|_{L_x^2 H_z^m} \lesssim \|\theta'_0\|_{H^{\frac{m}{2}+\frac{3}{4}}(\Omega)}, \\ \|\Psi_a^1\|_{H_x^m L_z^2} &\lesssim \|\theta'_0\|_{H^{m+\frac{5}{4}}(\Omega)}, \quad \|\Psi_a^1\|_{L_x^2 H_z^m} \lesssim \|\theta'_0\|_{H^{\frac{m}{2}+\frac{5}{4}}(\Omega)}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

*Additionally, the profiles  $\Psi_a^2$  and  $\Psi_a^3$  have exponential decay: for any  $Z_0 \geq 1$ , for any  $m \in \mathbf{N}$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Psi_a^2\|_{H^m(\mathbf{T} \times (Z_0, +\infty))} &\lesssim \|\theta'_0\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \exp(-\bar{c}Z_0^{4/5}), \\ \|\Psi_a^3\|_{H^m(\mathbf{T} \times (Z_0, +\infty))} &\lesssim \|\theta'_0\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \exp(-\bar{c}Z_0^{4/5}). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* In view of (3.12), it is sufficient to construct  $\chi_2$  and  $\chi_3$ . We first construct the solution of

$$\begin{aligned} Z\partial_Z^5\phi_j(Z) &= -4\phi_j(Z) - 8\partial_Z^{j-2}\chi_{j-2}, \\ \phi^j(0) = 0, \quad \partial_Z^{4-j}\phi_j(0) &= -2\chi_{j-2}''(0), \quad \partial_Z^{5-j}\phi_j(0) = -2\chi_{j-2}^{(3)}(0), \\ \lim_{Z \rightarrow \infty} \phi_j(Z) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Note that after a suitable lifting,  $\phi_j$  satisfies (3.4) with the boundary conditions (iii) from Lemma 3.1 (for  $j = 2$ ) or (iv) (for  $j = 3$ ). Hence the existence and uniqueness of  $\phi_j$  (and its exponential decay) follow from Lemma 3.1. Now, define  $\chi_j$  as

$$\partial_Z^j\chi_j = \phi_j, \quad \partial_Z^k\chi_j(+\infty) = 0 \text{ for } 0 \leq k \leq j-1.$$

It follows that  $\chi_j$  decays like  $\exp(-\bar{c}Z^{4/5})$ . Furthermore, by construction

$$\partial_Z^j [Z\partial_Z^5\chi_j - j\partial_Z^4\chi_j + 4\chi_j + 2(Z\partial_Z - j)\chi_{j-2}''] = 0.$$

It follows that  $Z\partial_Z^5\chi_j - j\partial_Z^4\chi_j + 4\chi_j + 2(Z\partial_Z - j)\chi_{j-2}''$  is a polynomial of order at most  $j-1$ , which has exponential decay at infinity. We infer that

$$Z\partial_Z^5\chi_j - j\partial_Z^4\chi_j + 4\chi_j + 2(Z\partial_Z - j)\chi_{j-2}'' = 0.$$

Taking the trace of the above identity at  $Z = 0$ , we infer that  $\chi_j(0) = 0$ . In a similar way, we also find that  $\chi_j'(0) = 0$ . Now, defining  $\Psi_a^j$  by (3.12), we obtain that  $\Psi_a^j$  satisfies (3.10). The Sobolev estimates are then a consequence of the Fourier representation formula.  $\square$

• **Construction of  $\Psi_a^4$ :**

The definition of  $\Psi_a^4$  and  $\Theta_a^4$  is similar. We have

$$\begin{aligned} Z\partial_Z^5\Psi_a^4 - 4\partial_Z^4\Psi_a^4 &= 4\partial_x^2\Psi_a^4 + S_a^4, \\ \Psi_a^4(Z=0) = \partial_Z\Psi_a^4(Z=0) &= 0, \\ \partial_Z^4\Psi_a^4 &= -\frac{1}{4}S_a^4 \quad \text{at } Z=0, \\ \partial_Z^5\Psi_a^4 &= -\frac{1}{3}\partial_Z S_a^4 \quad \text{at } Z=0, \\ \lim_{Z \rightarrow \infty} \Psi_a^4 &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$S_a^4 = -(Z\partial_Z - 4)(2\partial_x^2\partial_Z^2\Psi_a^2 + \partial_x^4\Psi_a^0).$$

Therefore the Fourier transform of  $\partial_Z^4\Psi_a^4$ , after a suitable lifting, is a solution of (3.4). The main difference with the construction of  $\Psi_a^j$  for  $j \leq 3$  lies in the fact that  $\partial_Z^4\Psi_a^4$  is not fully determined. Indeed, we lack a boundary condition on  $\partial_Z^k\Psi_a^4$  for some  $k \geq 6$ . Once again, this phenomenon (a high order corrector is under-determined) is quite common in multiscale problems. In fact it turns out that  $\Psi_a^4$  could be determined in a unique fashion if we were looking for a higher order expansion (see Remark 3.7). In this case, we should choose  $\Psi_{\text{bot}}^4$  so that  $\partial_Z^4\Theta_{\text{bot}|Z=0}^4$  lifts the trace of  $\Delta^2\theta'|_{z=0}$ . In the present case, since we merely wish to close the first order expansion, we simply further require that  $\partial_Z^8\Psi_a^4|_{Z=0} = 0$ , so that the lifted Fourier transform of  $\partial_Z^4\Psi_a^4$  satisfies the boundary conditions (i) of Lemma 3.1. We conclude that  $\Psi_a^4$  is well-defined and satisfies the same estimates as  $\Psi_a^j$  for  $j \leq 3$ . The details of the proof are left to the reader.

### 3.4 Estimate of the remainder and conclusion

At this stage, we have constructed  $\theta^{\text{BL}}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned}\theta^{\text{BL}}|_{\partial\Omega} &= \theta'_{\partial\Omega} = \theta'_0|_{\partial\Omega}, \\ \partial_{\mathbf{n}}\theta^{\text{BL}}|_{\partial\Omega} &= \partial_{\mathbf{n}}\theta'_{\partial\Omega} = \partial_{\mathbf{n}}\theta'_0|_{\partial\Omega},\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\partial_t\theta^{\text{BL}} = \Delta^{-2}\partial_x^2\theta^{\text{BL}} + \Delta^{-2}\partial_x T_r + O(\exp(-c(1+t)^{1/5})) \quad \text{in } L^2,$$

where  $T_r = T_{\text{top}} + T_{\text{bot}}$  and

$$T_{\text{bot}} := \left[ \sum_{j \geq 5} (1+t)^{-j/4} \Phi_{\text{bot}}^j(x, (1+t)^{1/4}z) \chi(z) \right],$$

with a similar expression for  $T_{\text{top}}$ . According to Lemma 3.5,

$$\|\Delta^{-2}\partial_x T_r\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\theta'_0\|_{H^s} (1+t)^{-2}, \quad \|\partial_t \Delta^{-2}\partial_x T_r\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\theta'_0\|_{H^s} (1+t)^{-3}.$$

Furthermore,

$$\|\Delta^{-2}\partial_x T_r\|_{H^4} = \|\partial_x T_r\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\theta'_0\|_{H^s} (1+t)^{-5/4}.$$

Therefore  $\theta^{\text{int}} = \theta' - \theta^{\text{BL}}$  solves

$$\partial_t\theta^{\text{int}} = \partial_x^2\Delta^{-2}\theta^{\text{int}} - \Delta^{-2}\partial_x T_r + O(\exp(-c(1+t)^{1/5})),$$

and  $\theta^{\text{int}} = \partial_{\mathbf{n}}\theta^{\text{int}} = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$ . According to Proposition 2.6,  $\|\theta^{\text{int}}\|_{L^2} = O((1+t)^{-1})$ , which completes the proof of Theorem 1.2.

**Remark 3.7** (Construction of an approximation at any order). *Since  $\Delta^2\theta'$  solves the same equation as  $\theta'$ , one can easily iterate this construction. More precisely, if  $\theta'_0 \in H^{4k}$  it can be proved that there exist sequences of profiles  $(\Theta_{\text{bot}}^j, \Theta_{\text{top}}^j)_{0 \leq j \leq 4k}$  such that the following result holds:*

$$\theta'(t, x) = \sum_{j=1}^{4k} (1+t)^{-j/4} \left[ \Theta_{\text{bot}}^j(x, (1+t)^{1/4}z) \chi(z) + \Theta_{\text{top}}^j(x, (1+t)^{1/4}(1-z)) \chi(z-1) \right] + \theta_{\text{rem}}^j(t),$$

and

$$\|\theta_{\text{rem}}^j(t)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{1}{(1+t)^k}, \quad \|\theta_{\text{rem}}^j(t)\|_{H^{4k}} \lesssim 1.$$

For instance, the role of  $\Theta_{\text{bot}}^{4j}$  is to lift the trace of  $\Delta^{2j}\theta'$  at  $z=0$ , the one of  $\Theta_{\text{top}}^{4j+1}$  to lift the one of  $\partial_z\Delta^{2j}\theta'$  at  $z=1$ , etc.

The details of the construction are very similar to the ones of the profiles  $\Theta_a^j$  for  $0 \leq j \leq 3$  above and are left to the reader.

*Proof of Lemma 3.5.* We first define a function  $f_1$  such that

$$\partial_Z^4 f_1 = f,$$

and  $\partial_Z^k f_1(+\infty) = 0$  for  $0 \leq k \leq 3$ . Note that the exponential decay assumption on  $f$  ensures that  $f_1$  exists, and  $f_1 \in W^{4,\infty} \cap H^4$ . Moreover, for  $0 \leq m_1, m_2 \leq 4$ ,

$$|\partial_x^{m_1} \partial_Z^{m_2} f_1(x, Z)| \leq C \exp(-cZ^{1/5}),$$

with possibly different constants  $C$  and  $c$ . Setting  $Z = (1+t)^{1/4}z$ , we infer that

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta^2 \left( (1+t)^{-1} f_1(x, Z) \chi(z) \right) &= f(x, Z) \chi(z) \\ &\quad + 2(1+t)^{-1/2} \partial_x^2 \partial_Z^2 f_1(x, Z) \chi(z) \\ &\quad + (1+t)^{-1} \partial_x^4 f_1(x, Z) \chi(z) + O(e^{-ct^{1/5}}) \text{ in } L^2,\end{aligned}$$

where the term  $O(e^{-ct^{1/5}})$  stems from the commutator involving derivatives of  $\chi$ . Note that  $\partial_x^2 \partial_Z^2 f_1$  satisfies the same decay assumptions as  $f$ , and therefore we can lift it by another corrector  $f_2$  such that

$$\partial_Z^4 f_2 = -2 \partial_x^2 \partial_Z^2 f_1,$$

i.e.  $\partial_Z^2 f_2 = -2 \partial_x^2 f_1$ . Therefore

$$\Delta^2 \left( \left( (1+t)^{-1} f_1(x, Z) + (1+t)^{-3/2} f_2(x, Z) \right) \chi(z) \right) = f(x, Z) \chi(z) + O((1+t)^{-1}) \text{ in } H^{-2}.$$

The only remaining issue lies in the fact that  $f_1, f_2$  and their normal derivatives do not vanish on the boundary. Hence we set  $a_i(x) = f_i(x, 0)$ ,  $b_i(x) = \partial_Z f_i(x, 0)$ , and we add a corrector

$$f_3(t, x, z) := - \sum_{i=1,2} (1+t)^{-\frac{i-1}{2}} (a_i(x) + z(1+t)^{1/4} b_i(x)) \chi(z).$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta^2 \left( \left( (1+t)^{-1} f_1(x, Z) + (1+t)^{-3/2} f_2(x, Z) \right) \chi(z) + (1+t)^{-1} f_3 \right) \\ = f(x, Z) \chi(z) + O((1+t)^{-3/4}) \text{ in } H^{-2},\end{aligned}$$

and for  $k = 0, 1$

$$\partial_z^k \left( \left( (1+t)^{-1} f_1(x, Z) + (1+t)^{-3/2} f_2(x, Z) \right) \chi(z) + (1+t)^{-1} f_3 \right) |_{\partial\Omega} = 0.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\left( (1+t)^{-1} f_1(x, Z) + (1+t)^{-3/2} f_2(x, Z) \right) \chi(z) + (1+t)^{-1} f_3 \\ = \Delta^{-2} (f(x, Z) \chi(z)) + O((1+t)^{-3/4}) \text{ in } H^2.\end{aligned}$$

Let us now prove that when  $\int_0^\infty Z^2 f(\cdot, Z) dZ = \int_0^\infty Z^3 f(\cdot, Z) dZ = 0$ , we gain an additional factor  $(1+t)^{-1/4}$ . It can be easily checked that

$$f_1|_{Z=0} = \frac{1}{6} \int_0^\infty Z^3 f(\cdot, Z) dZ = 0, \quad \partial_Z f_1|_{Z=0} = -\frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty Z^2 f(\cdot, Z) dZ = 0.$$

Hence, with the notation above,  $a_1 = b_1 = 0$  and therefore  $f_3 = O((1+t)^{-1/4})$ . With the same arguments, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned}\left( (1+t)^{-1} f_1(x, Z) + (1+t)^{-3/2} f_2(x, Z) \right) \chi(z) + (1+t)^{-1} f_3 \\ = \Delta^{-2} (f(x, Z) \chi(z)) + O((1+t)^{-1}) \text{ in } H^2.\end{aligned}$$

□

## 4 Nonlinear boundary layers: proof of Theorem 1.3

We now go back to the long time analysis of (1.15) when  $\theta'_0 = \partial_n \theta'_0 = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$ . We recall (see Theorem 1.1) that in this case,  $\theta'(t)$  converges towards zero in  $H^s$  for all  $s < 4$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . This result follows from a uniform bound on the  $H^4$  norm of the solution and from an interpolation inequality applied to the dissipation term.

A natural question is to investigate whether the algebraic decay rate provided by Theorem 1.1 can be improved, possibly at the cost of a stronger regularity requirement on the initial data. In other words, if we assume that  $\theta'_0 \in H^s$  with  $s$  large, can we prove a uniform  $H^s$  bound on a solution, and thereby a higher decay estimate on  $\theta'$ ?

As explained in the Introduction, such a result does not follow immediately from an induction argument. Indeed, the traces of  $\Delta^2 \theta'$  and of  $\partial_z \Delta^2 \theta'$  do not vanish on the boundary (even when the traces of  $\Delta^2 \theta'_0$  and of  $\partial_z \Delta^2 \theta'_0$  do), and therefore we cannot apply Proposition 2.6 to  $\Delta^2 \theta'$ .

However, it turns out that we can use (a variant of) the linear analysis of section 3 to analyze the long time behavior of  $\Delta^2 \theta'$ , and more generally, of  $\Delta^{2k} \theta'$  for  $k \geq 1$ . In other words, in this case, there are boundary layers in the vicinity of the boundary, but they are driven by a linear mechanism. Theorem 1.3 will follow.

To that end, the strategy is to consider the equation satisfied by  $\Delta^2 \theta'$ . As we have seen previously, the structure of the equation is overall the same. The main difference lies in the fact that the traces of  $\Delta^2 \theta'$  and  $\partial_z \Delta^2 \theta'$  do not vanish on the boundary. However, following the methodology of the previous section, we may lift them thanks to a corrector which remains linear at main order. Modifying slightly our bootstrap argument in order to account for these boundary layers, we eventually prove Theorem 1.3.

### 4.1 General strategy

Following the same strategy as in Section 3, we look for an Ansatz for  $\theta'$  as a sum of a boundary layer part  $\theta^{\text{BL}}$ , whose role is to lift the trace of  $\Delta^2 \theta'$  and  $\partial_z \Delta^2 \theta'$  on the boundary, and an interior part  $\theta^{\text{int}}$ , which vanishes at a high order on the boundary, and for which we will therefore be able to prove better decay estimates. Let us give a few additional details on these two parts:

- As in the previous section, the boundary layer term will be defined as an asymptotic expansion in powers of  $(1+t)^{-1/4}$ , and the size of the boundary layers will also be  $(1+t)^{1/4}$ . The different terms of the expansion will be constructed recursively: the main order terms will lift the traces of  $\Delta^2 \theta'$  and  $\partial_z \Delta^2 \theta'$  (or rather, their limits as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ ), and the next order terms will correct error terms generated by the first order ones. The precise construction of the boundary layer is the purpose of Section 4.4 below.
- Thanks to the design of the boundary layer, the remaining part  $\theta^{\text{int}}$  is such that

$$\theta^{\text{int}} = \partial_z \theta^{\text{int}} = \Delta^2 \theta^{\text{int}} = \partial_z \Delta^2 \theta^{\text{int}} = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega.$$

As a consequence,  $\Delta^2 \theta^{\text{int}}$  satisfies assumptions that are similar to those of Proposition 2.6, and it is reasonable to expect that  $\|\Delta^2 \theta^{\text{int}}\|_{L^2} = O((1+t)^{-1})$ . Using once again Proposition 2.6, we then infer that  $\|\theta^{\text{int}}\|_{L^2} = O((1+t)^2)$ . We will use a bootstrap argument to propagate these bounds; the corresponding argument is described in Section 4.5.

Before constructing  $\theta^{\text{BL}}$  and proving the decay estimates on  $\theta^{\text{int}}$ , some preliminary (and somewhat technical) steps are in order. The traces of  $\Delta^2 \theta'$  and  $\partial_z \Delta^2 \theta'$  need to be decomposed as an asymptotic expansion in powers of  $(1+t)^{-1/4}$ , in order to identify the relevant boundary conditions for the terms in the expansion of  $\theta^{\text{BL}}$ . This is performed in Lemma 4.5 below, whose

proof involves some high regularity bounds on  $\theta$ . As a consequence, the organisation of the rest of this section is the following. In Section 4.2, we prove some quantitative  $H^{10}$  and  $H^{12}$  bounds on  $\theta'$  under our bootstrap assumption. In Section 4.3, we provide a decomposition of  $\Delta^2\theta'$  and  $\partial_z\Delta^2\theta'$  under the bootstrap assumption. The main results of each section are given in the beginning of the section. The reader wishing to avoid the technicalities may jump to Section 4.4, in which we construct the boundary layer, using the decomposition of Section 4.3. Eventually, we close the bootstrap argument in Section 4.5.

Let us now introduce the bootstrap assumption that will be used throughout this section. As mentioned before, we shall decompose  $\theta'$  as  $\theta' = \theta^{\text{BL}} + \theta^{\text{int}}$ . The term  $\theta^{\text{BL}}$  will take the form

$$\theta^{\text{BL}} = \frac{1}{1+t}\Theta_{\text{top}}(x, (1+t)^{1/4}(1-z)) + \frac{1}{1+t}\Theta_{\text{bot}}(x, (1+t)^{1/4}z) + \text{l.o.t.} \quad (4.1)$$

with boundary layer profiles  $\Theta_{\text{top}}, \Theta_{\text{bot}}$  such that

$$\|\Theta_a\|_{H^9(\mathbf{T}\times\mathbf{R}_+)} \leq B \quad (4.2)$$

for some constant  $B > 0$ , while

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t\in[0,T]} (1+t)^2 \|\partial_x^4 \theta^{\text{int}}(t)\|_{L^2} + \|\Delta^4 \theta^{\text{int}}(t)\|_{L^2} &\leq B, \\ \sup_{t\in[0,T]} (1+t)^3 \|\partial_t \partial_x^4 \theta^{\text{int}}(t)\|_{L^2} + (1+t)^3 \|\partial_x^5 \psi^{\text{int}}\|_{L^2} &\leq B, \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

where  $\psi^{\text{int}} = \Delta^{-2}\partial_x \theta^{\text{int}}$ .

As a consequence, our bootstrap assumptions on  $\theta'$  read as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall t \in (0, T), \quad \forall k \in \{4, \dots, 8\}, \quad \|\partial_x^k \theta'\|_{L^2} &\leq B(1+t)^{-9/8} + B(1+t)^{\frac{k-8}{2}}, \\ \forall t \in (0, T), \quad \forall k \in \{0, \dots, 8\}, \quad \|\partial_z^k \theta'\|_{L^2} &\leq B(1+t)^{-\frac{9}{8} + \frac{k}{4}}, \\ \forall t \in (0, T), \quad \|\partial_x^5 \psi(t)\|_{L^2} &\leq B(1+t)^{-17/8}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

Note that these assumptions imply in particular that

$$\|\psi\|_{W^{3,\infty}} \lesssim B(1+t)^{-9/8} \quad \forall t \in [0, T]. \quad (4.5)$$

Indeed, by the Agmon inequality,

$$\|\psi\|_{W^{3,\infty}} \lesssim \|\psi\|_{H^3}^{1/2} \|\psi\|_{H^5}^{1/2} \lesssim \|\psi\|_{L^2}^{1/5} \|\psi\|_{H^5}^{4/5}.$$

By (4.4),  $\|\psi\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\partial_x^5 \psi\|_{L^2} \lesssim B(1+t)^{-17/8}$ , while

$$\|\partial_z^5 \psi\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\partial_z \partial_x \theta'\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\partial_x^2 \theta'\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\partial_z^2 \theta'\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \lesssim B(1+t)^{-7/8}.$$

Estimate (4.5) follows.

## 4.2 High regularity bounds under the bootstrap assumption

The purpose of this subsection is to prove the following bounds:

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $\theta = \theta' + \bar{\theta}$  be a solution of (1.15), and assume that  $\theta_0 \in H^{14}$ . Let  $T > 0$  be such that the bounds (4.4) hold on  $(0, T)$  for some constant  $B \in (0, 1)$ . Assume furthermore that  $\|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} \leq B$ . Then for all  $t \in [0, T]$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{\theta}(t)\|_{H^6} &\lesssim B, \quad \|\theta\|_{H^{14}} \lesssim B(1+t)^{5/2}, \quad \|\partial_x^8 \Delta^2 \theta'\|_{L^2} \lesssim B, \\ \|\partial_x^{10} \theta'\|_{L^2} &\lesssim B(1+t)^{-1}, \quad \|\partial_x^{10} \psi\|_{L^2} \lesssim B(1+t)^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* First, recalling that

$$\partial_t \bar{\theta} = -\overline{\nabla^\perp \psi \cdot \nabla \theta'}$$

and using the bootstrap assumptions (4.4), we infer that

$$\|\partial_t \partial_z^6 \bar{\theta}\|_{L^2} \lesssim B^2 (1+t)^{-5/4},$$

and thus  $\|\bar{\theta}(t)\|_{H^6} \lesssim \|\theta_0\|_{H^6} + B^2 \lesssim B$ . A similar argument also shows that  $\|\bar{\theta}(t)\|_{H^7} \lesssim B + B^2 \ln(1+t)$ .

Let us then compute the equation satisfied by  $D^{10}\theta$ , where  $D = \partial_x$  or  $\partial_z$ . We have

$$\partial_t D^{10}\theta + u \cdot \nabla D^{10}\theta = D^{10}\partial_x \psi - [D^{10}, u \cdot \nabla] \theta.$$

Mutlplying by  $D^{10}\theta$  and integrating by parts, we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|D^{10}\theta\|_{L^2} \leq 2\|D^{10}\partial_x \psi\|_{L^2} + 2\|[D^{10}, u \cdot \nabla] \theta\|_{L^2}.$$

Using the bootstrap assumptions (4.4), we have

$$\|D^{10}\partial_x \psi\|_{L^2} \lesssim B(1+t)^{3/8} \quad \forall t \in [0, T].$$

As for the commutator term, using the Leibniz formula, we write

$$[D^{10}, u \cdot \nabla] \theta = \sum_{k=0}^9 \binom{10}{k} \nabla^\perp D^{10-k} \psi \cdot \nabla D^k \theta.$$

For  $k \geq 8$ , we simply write

$$\|\nabla^\perp D^{10-k} \psi \cdot \nabla D^k \theta\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\psi\|_{W^{3,\infty}} \|\theta\|_{H^{10}} \lesssim B(1+t)^{-9/8} \|\theta\|_{H^{10}}.$$

For  $k \leq 7$ , the bootstrap assumptions together with the preliminary bounds on  $\bar{\theta}$  ensure that

$$\|\nabla^\perp D^{10-k} \psi \cdot \nabla D^k \theta\|_{L^2} \lesssim B^2 (1+t)^{3/8} + B(1+t)^{-9/8} \|\theta\|_{H^{10}}.$$

Therefore, assuming that  $B < 1$ , we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|D^{10}\theta\|_{L^2} \lesssim B(1+t)^{3/8} + B(1+t)^{-9/8} \|\theta\|_{H^{10}}.$$

Of course the same computation can be performed for any derivative of the type  $\partial_x^k \partial_z^{10-k} \theta$ , and we infer

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\theta\|_{H^{10}} \lesssim B(1+t)^{3/8} + B(1+t)^{-9/8} \|\theta\|_{H^{10}}.$$

The Gronwall Lemma then ensures that

$$\|\theta(t)\|_{H^{10}} \lesssim \|\theta_0\|_{H^{10}} + B(1+t)^{11/8} \lesssim B(1+t)^{11/8}.$$

We then use the same strategy to estimate  $\|\partial_x^2 \Delta^4 \theta\|_{L^2}$ . The linear term in the right-hand side is now

$$\partial_x^3 \Delta^4 \psi = \partial_x^4 \Delta^2 \theta' = O(1) \quad \text{in } L^2.$$

The only difference in the treatment of the commutator term lies in the bound of terms of the form  $\partial_z^2 \psi \partial_x^3 \partial_z^7 \theta'$ . For those, we use our first estimate on  $\|\theta\|_{H^{10}}$  together with the bootstrap assumptions, and we obtain

$$\|\partial_z^2 \psi \partial_x^3 \partial_z^7 \theta'\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\partial_z^2 \psi\|_\infty \|\theta'\|_{H^{10}} \lesssim B^2 (1+t)^{-\frac{11}{8} + \frac{11}{8}} \lesssim B^2.$$

It follows that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\partial_x^2 \Delta^4 \theta\|_{L^2} \lesssim B + B(1+t)^{-9/8} \|\partial_x^2 \Delta^4 \theta\|_{L^2},$$

and therefore  $\|\partial_x^2 \Delta^4 \theta\|_{L^2} \lesssim B(1+t)$ . The next step is to prove that  $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\partial_x^6 \Delta^2 \theta'\|_{L^2} \lesssim B$ . To that end, we check that  $\partial_x^6 \Delta^2 \theta'$  satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 2.4. The source term is  $S = u \cdot \nabla \partial_x^6 \Delta^2 \theta' + [\partial_x^6 \Delta^2, u \cdot \nabla] \theta$ . Classically, the first term is orthogonal to  $\theta'$ . It is therefore sufficient to bound the commutator. The terms involving  $\bar{\theta}$  can be treated as perturbations of the dissipation term  $\|\partial_x^7 \Delta \theta'\|_{L^2}^2$ , and therefore we focus on  $[\partial_x^6 \Delta^2, u \cdot \nabla] \theta'$ . First, note that

$$\|(\nabla^\perp \partial_x^6 \Delta^2 \psi) \cdot \nabla \theta'\|_{L^2} \leq \|\nabla \theta'\|_\infty \|\nabla \partial_x^7 \theta'\|_{L^2} \lesssim B(1+t)^{-3/4} \|\partial_x^7 \Delta \theta'\|_{L^2}$$

The other terms can be estimated thanks to the bootstrap assumptions together with the preliminary bounds on  $\|\theta\|_{H^{10}}$  and  $\|\partial_x^2 \Delta^4 \theta\|_{L^2}$ . We obtain

$$\|[\partial_x^6 \Delta^2, u \cdot \nabla] \theta\|_{L^2} \lesssim B(1+t)^{-1-\delta} \|\partial_x^6 \Delta^2 \theta'\|_{L^2} + B^2(1+t)^{-1-\delta} + B(1+t)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\delta} \|\partial_x^7 \Delta \theta'\|_{L^2}$$

for some  $\delta > 0$ . The details are left to the reader. Using a Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, it follows that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\partial_x^6 \Delta^2 \theta'\|_{L^2}^2 + c \|\partial_x^7 \Delta \theta'\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim B^2(1+t)^{-1-\delta} + B(1+t)^{-1-\delta} \|\partial_x^6 \Delta^2 \theta'\|_{L^2}^2.$$

The Gronwall Lemma then implies that  $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\partial_x^6 \Delta^2 \theta'\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\theta_0\|_{H^{10}} + B^2 \lesssim B$ .

We then follow the same strategy to obtain bounds on  $\|\theta\|_{H^{12}}$ ,  $\|\partial_x^4 \Delta^4 \theta\|_{L^2}$  and  $\|\partial_x^8 \Delta^2 \theta\|_{L^2}$ . We have

$$\partial_t \|\theta\|_{H^{12}} \lesssim \|\partial_x^2 \theta'\|_{H^8} + \sum_{k \leq 11, D \in \{\partial_x, \partial_z\}} \|\nabla^{12-k} \psi \cdot \nabla D^{12} \theta\|_{L^2}.$$

The first term in the right-hand side is bounded by  $B(1+t)$ . We estimate the quadratic term thanks to the bootstrap assumptions and our preliminary bounds on derivatives up to order 10. We obtain  $\|\theta(t)\|_{H^{12}} \lesssim B(1+t)^2$ . We then write

$$\partial_t \partial_x^4 \Delta^4 \theta' + u \cdot \nabla \partial_x^4 \Delta^4 \theta' = \partial_x^6 \Delta^2 \theta' - [\partial_x^4 \Delta^4, u \cdot \nabla] \theta.$$

The first term in the right-hand side is bounded by  $CB$ . We then check that the nonlinear term can be treated perturbatively, using the bounds on  $\theta'$  obtained so far, and we infer that  $\|\partial_x^4 \Delta^4 \theta'(t)\|_{L^2} \lesssim B(1+t)$ . Once again, we then use Lemma 2.4 in order to prove that  $\|\partial_x^8 \Delta^2 \theta'(t)\|_{L^2} \lesssim B$ , and that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\theta(t)\|_{H^{14}} \lesssim B(1+t)^{-1-\delta} \|\theta(t)\|_{H^{14}} + B(1+t)^{3/2}.$$

The computations are very similar to the ones above and left to the reader, and lead to the estimate of  $\|\theta(t)\|_{H^{14}}$ .

The last step is to prove additional decay on  $\|\partial_x^{10} \theta'\|_{L^2}$  and  $\|\partial_x^{11} \psi\|_{L^2}$ . Setting  $S = -\partial_x^{10}(u \cdot \nabla \theta')$ , we can decompose  $S$  into  $S = S_\parallel + S_\perp + S_\Delta$ , with  $S_\perp = u \cdot \nabla \partial_x^{10} \theta'$ , and

$$\|S_\parallel\|_{L^2} \lesssim B^2(1+t)^{-2}, \quad \|S_\Delta\|_{L^2} \lesssim B(1+t)^{-1/2} \|\partial_x^{10} \Delta \psi\|_{L^2}.$$

Hence for  $B$  sufficiently small,  $S$  satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 2.6, and we obtain

$$\|\partial_x^{10} \theta'(t)\|_{L^2} \lesssim B(1+t)^{-1}.$$



Differentiating the equation on  $\partial_x^9 \theta$  with respect to time, we get

$$\partial_t \partial_x^9 \theta' = (1 - G) \partial_t \partial_x^{10} \psi - \partial_t \partial_x^9 (u \cdot \nabla) \theta' - \partial_t G \partial_x^{10} \psi.$$

Estimating the norm of each term in the right-hand side and using Proposition 2.6, we obtain, for some large fixed constant  $\kappa$ ,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\partial_t \partial_x^9 \theta'\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\kappa}{1+t} \|\partial_t \partial_x^9 \theta'\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \frac{\|\partial_t \partial_x^7 \Delta^2 \theta'\|_{L^2}^2}{(1+t)^3} + B^2 \frac{1}{(1+t)^5}.$$

Writing

$$\partial_t \partial_x^7 \Delta^2 \theta' = \partial_x^9 \theta' - \partial_x^7 \Delta^2 (u \cdot \nabla \theta),$$

we find that  $\|\partial_t \partial_x^7 \Delta^2 \theta'\|_{L^2} \lesssim B(1+t)^{-1}$ , and thus  $\|\partial_t \partial_x^9 \theta'\|_{L^2} \lesssim B(1+t)^{-2}$ . Going back to the equation on  $\partial_x^9 \theta'$ , we find eventually that

$$\partial_x^{10} \psi = \partial_t \partial_x^9 \theta' + \partial_x^9 (\nabla^\perp \psi \cdot \nabla \theta) = O((1+t)^{-2}) \quad \text{in } L^2.$$

This concludes the proof of the Lemma.  $\square$

Let us now prove a useful result concerning the trace of  $\partial_z^3 \theta'$ :

**Corollary 4.2.** *Under the assumptions of Lemma 4.1,*

$$\|\partial_z^3 \theta'|_{z=0}\|_{H^{33/4}(\mathbf{T})} \lesssim B(1+t)^{-1/8}.$$

*Proof.* Using Theorem 3.1 in Chapter 1 of [LM68],

$$\|\partial_z^3 \theta'|_{z=0}\|_{H^s(\mathbf{T})} \lesssim \|\theta'\|_{H_x^\beta L_z^2}^{1/8} \|\partial_z^4 \theta'\|_{H_x^\gamma L_z^2}^{7/8},$$

where  $\frac{1}{8}\beta + \frac{7}{8}\gamma = s$ . Taking  $\beta = 10$  and  $\gamma = 8$  and using the bounds of Lemma 4.1, we obtain the desired result.  $\square$

### 4.3 Decomposition of the traces of $\Delta^2 \theta'$ and $\partial_z \Delta^2 \theta'$

The first result of this section concerns the long time behavior of  $\Delta^2 \theta'|_{\partial\Omega}$  and  $\partial_z \Delta^2 \theta'|_{\partial\Omega}$ :

**Lemma 4.3** (Long-time behavior of  $\partial_z^k \Delta^2 \theta'|_{\partial\Omega}$  and of  $\partial_z^{2+k} G(t)|_{\partial\Omega}$ ,  $k = 0, 1$ ). *For  $k = 0, 1$ , let*

$$\gamma_{\text{top}}^k(t, x) := \partial_z^k \Delta^2 \theta'(t, x, z = 1), \quad \gamma_{\text{bot}}^k(t, x) := \partial_z^k \Delta^2 \theta'(t, x, z = 0). \quad (4.6)$$

*Assume that  $\theta_0 \in H^{14}(\Omega)$  and  $\theta'_0 = \partial_z \theta'_0 = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$ . Let  $T > 0$ ,  $B \in (0, 1)$  such that the bootstrap assumptions (4.4) hold on  $[0, T]$ . Assume furthermore that  $\|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} \leq B$ . Then there exists universal constant  $B_0, \delta > 0$  and functions  $\gamma_{a,T}^0 \in H^s(\mathbf{T})$ ,  $\gamma_{a,T}^1 \in H^{s-1}$  for all  $s < 8 + \frac{5}{8}$ , such that if  $B \leq B_0$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\gamma_{a,T}^0\|_{H^s(\mathbf{T})} &\lesssim_s \|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\gamma_a^0(t) - \gamma_{a,T}^0\|_{H^s(\mathbf{T})} \lesssim_s B^2 \frac{1}{(1+t)^\delta} \quad \forall t \in [0, T], \\ \|\gamma_{a,T}^1\|_{H^{s-1}(\mathbf{T})} &\lesssim_s \|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\gamma_a^1(t) - \gamma_{a,T}^1\|_{H^{s-1}(\mathbf{T})} \lesssim_s B^2 \frac{1}{(1+t)^\delta} \quad \forall t \in [0, T]. \end{aligned}$$

*In a similar fashion, for  $k = 2, 3$*

$$|\partial_t \partial_z^k G(t)|_{\partial\Omega} \lesssim B^2 (1+t)^{-3 + \frac{k+3}{4}},$$

and therefore there exists  $g_{a,\infty}^k \in \mathbf{R}$  such that, for  $k = 2, 3$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |g_{a,\infty}^k| &\lesssim \|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2, \\ \partial_z^k G(t, 0) &\rightarrow g_{\text{bot},\infty}^k, \quad \partial_z^k G(t, 1) \rightarrow g_{\text{top},\infty}^k \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of Lemma 4.3 is postponed to the end of this section.

The second intermediate result of this section pushes further the decomposition of  $\gamma_a^k(t)$ . It holds under additional structural assumptions on  $\theta^{\text{BL}}$  and  $\theta^{\text{rem}} = \theta' - \theta^{\text{BL}}$ . More precisely, let us assume that

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^{\text{BL}}(t, x, z) &= \sum_{j=0}^4 (1+t)^{-1-\frac{j}{4}} \left( \Theta_{\text{bot}}^j(x, (1+t)^{1/4}z) + \Theta_{\text{top}}^j(x, (1+t)^{1/4}(1-z)) \right) + \theta_c, \\ \psi^{\text{BL}}(t, x, z) &= \sum_{j=0}^4 (1+t)^{-2-\frac{j}{4}} \left( \Psi_{\text{bot}}^j(x, (1+t)^{1/4}z) + \Psi_{\text{top}}^j(x, (1+t)^{1/4}(1-z)) \right) + \psi_c \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Theta_a^j\|_{H^s(\mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{R}_+)} &\lesssim \|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2, \quad \|\Psi_a^j\|_{H^{11}(\mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{R}_+)} \lesssim \|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2, \\ \|\theta_c\|_{H_x^m H_z^k} &\lesssim (\|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2)(1+t)^{-2-\frac{1}{8}+\frac{k}{4}} \text{ for } 0 \leq k+m \leq 8, \\ \|\psi_c\|_{H_x^m H_z^k} &\lesssim (\|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2)(1+t)^{-3-\frac{1}{8}+\frac{k}{4}} \text{ for } 0 \leq k+m \leq 11. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

In the course of the proof, we shall also need the following assumption:

$$\partial_Z^2 \Theta_a^j|_{Z=0} \in H^7(\mathbf{T}), \quad \partial_Z^3 \Theta_a^j|_{Z=0} \in H^{15/2}(\mathbf{T}). \quad (4.9)$$

**Remark 4.4.** Note that we have slightly changed our notation: we now set  $\theta^{\text{rem}} = \theta' - \theta^{\text{BL}}$ . This is linked to our bootstrap assumptions, and to the fact that the traces of  $\Delta^2 \theta^{\text{rem}}$  and  $\partial_z \Delta^2 \theta^{\text{rem}}$  do not vanish. We refer to the next subsection (see Lemma 4.10) for more details.

**Lemma 4.5** (Decomposition of  $\gamma_a^k$ ). Assume that  $\theta_0 \in H^{14}(\Omega)$  and  $\theta'_0 = \partial_z \theta'_0 = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$ . Let  $T > 0$ ,  $\|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}(\Omega)} < B < 1$  such that the bootstrap assumptions (4.4) hold on  $[0, T]$ . Assume furthermore that  $\theta^{\text{BL}}, \psi^{\text{BL}}$  can be decomposed as (4.7), where the profiles  $\Theta_a^j, \Psi_a^j$  and  $\theta_c, \psi_c$  satisfy (4.8) and (4.9), and that  $\theta^{\text{rem}} = \theta' - \theta^{\text{BL}}$  satisfies (4.3).

Then for  $j = 0, 1$ ,  $a \in \{\text{top}, \text{bot}\}$ , there exists  $\gamma_{a,k}^j \in L^2(\mathbf{T})$ ,  $\Gamma_{a,T}^j \in W^{1,\infty}((0, T); L^2(\mathbf{T}))$  such that for all  $t \in [0, T]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_a^0(t) &= \gamma_{a,T}^0 + \gamma_{a,2}^0(1+t)^{-1/2} + \gamma_{a,3}^0(1+t)^{-3/4} \\ &\quad + \Gamma_{a,T}^0(t) - \gamma_{a,2}^0(1+T)^{-1/2} - \gamma_{a,3}^0(1+T)^{-3/4}, \\ \gamma_a^1(t) &= \gamma_{a,T}^1 + \gamma_{a,1}^1(1+t)^{-1/4} + \gamma_{a,2}^1(1+t)^{-1/2} \\ &\quad + \Gamma_{a,T}^1(t) - \gamma_{a,1}^1(1+T)^{-1/4} + \gamma_{a,2}^1(1+T)^{-1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\|\gamma_{a,k}^j\|_{L^2(\mathbf{T})} \lesssim B^2$  and for all  $t \in [0, T]$ , for  $j = 0, 1$ ,  $l = 0, 1, 2$ ,

$$\left\| \partial_t^l \Gamma_{a,T}^j(t) \right\|_{L^2(\mathbf{T})} \lesssim B^2 (1+t)^{-1-l+\frac{j}{4}}, \quad \left\| \Gamma_{a,T}^j(t) \right\|_{H^4(\mathbf{T})} \lesssim B^2 (1+t)^{-\frac{33}{4}+\frac{j}{4}}.$$

Furthermore,  $\gamma_{a,k}^j$  can be written explicitly in terms of  $\Psi_a^0, \Psi_a^1$  and  $\Theta_a^0$ .

**Remark 4.6.** Note that in the above decomposition, the coefficients  $\gamma_{a,k}^j$  do not depend on time.

**Remark 4.7.** As mentioned in Lemma 4.5,  $\gamma_{a,k}^j$  can be written explicitly in terms of the main order boundary layer profiles. More precisely, taking  $\eta_{\text{bot}} = 1$  and  $\eta_{\text{top}} = -1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_{a,2}^0 &= 12g_{a,\infty}^2 \partial_x \partial_Z^2 \Psi_a^0|_{Z=0}, \\
\gamma_{a,3}^0 &= 8g_{a,\infty}^2 \partial_x \partial_Z^2 \Psi_a^1|_{Z=0} - \frac{4\eta_a}{3} \left[ \partial_Z^4 \{ \Psi_a^0, \Theta_a^0 \}_{x,Z} \right]' |_{z=0}, \\
\gamma_{a,1}^1 &= 40\eta_a g_{a,\infty}^2 \partial_x \partial_Z^3 \Psi_a^0|_{Z=0} \\
\gamma_{a,2}^1 &= 20 \left( \eta_a g_{a,\infty}^2 \partial_x \partial_Z^3 \Psi_a^1|_{Z=0} + g_{a,\infty}^3 \partial_x \partial_Z^2 \Psi_a^0|_{Z=0} \right) \\
&\quad + 2 \left[ \partial_Z^5 \{ \Psi_a^0, \Theta_a^0 \}_{x,Z} \right]' |_{z=0}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

where  $\{\cdot, \cdot\}_{x,Z}$  denotes the Poisson bracket

$$\{f, g\}_{x,Z} = \partial_x f \partial_Z g - \partial_Z f \partial_x g.$$

Let us now prove the two previous Lemmas:

*Proof of Lemma 4.3.* We have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Delta^2 \theta' = (1-G) \partial_x^2 \theta' - 4 \partial_z G \partial_z \partial_x^3 \psi - 2 \partial_z^2 G \partial_x^3 \psi - \sum_{k=1}^4 \binom{4}{k} \partial_z^k G \partial_x \partial_z^{4-k} \psi \tag{4.11}$$

$$+ \Delta^2 (\partial_z \psi \partial_x \theta')' - \Delta^2 (\partial_x \psi \partial_z \theta')'. \tag{4.12}$$

We now take the trace of the above equation at  $z = 0$ , recalling that  $G(z = 0) = \partial_z G(z = 0) = 0$ ,  $\psi|_{z=0} = \partial_z \psi|_{z=0} = 0$ , and  $\theta'|_{z=0} = \partial_z \theta'|_{z=0} = 0$ . We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt} \gamma_{\text{bot}}^0 &= -6 \partial_z^2 G|_{z=0} \partial_x \partial_z^2 \psi|_{z=0} \\
&\quad + 6 (\partial_z^3 \psi|_{z=0} \partial_x \partial_z^2 \theta'|_{z=0})' + 4 (\partial_z^2 \psi|_{z=0} \partial_x \partial_z^3 \theta'|_{z=0})' \\
&\quad - 6 (\partial_x \partial_z^2 \psi|_{z=0} \partial_z^3 \theta'|_{z=0})' - 4 (\partial_x \partial_z^3 \psi|_{z=0} \partial_z^2 \theta'|_{z=0})'.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

We then estimate each term in the right-hand side using Lemma 4.1. Note that  $\partial_z^2 G|_{z=0}$  is bounded in  $L^\infty(\mathbf{R}_+ \times (0, 1))$ . We focus on the first term, which has the smallest decay. Using Theorem 3.1 in Chapter 1 of [LM68], we infer that for any  $s > 0$ ,

$$\|\partial_x \partial_z^2 \psi|_{z=0}\|_{H^s} \leq \|\partial_z^2 \psi|_{z=0}\|_{H^{s+1}} \lesssim \|\psi\|_{L_x^2 H_x^\beta}^{3/8} \|\partial_z^4 \psi\|_{L_x^2 H_x^\gamma}^{5/8},$$

where  $\beta, \gamma$  are such that  $\frac{3}{8}\beta + \frac{5}{8}\gamma = s + 1$ . In view of Lemma 4.1, we take  $\beta = 10$ . As for the other term, we have, if  $\gamma \in (9, 11)$

$$\|\partial_z^4 \psi\|_{L_x^2 H_x^\gamma} \lesssim \|\theta\|_{H_x^{\gamma+1} L_x^2} \lesssim \|\partial_x^{10} \theta\|_{L_x^2}^{\frac{11-\gamma}{2}} \|\partial_x^{12} \theta\|_{L_x^2}^{\frac{\gamma-9}{2}} \lesssim B(1+t)^{-\frac{11-\gamma}{2} + 2\frac{\gamma-9}{2}} \lesssim B(1+t)^{\frac{3\gamma-29}{2}}.$$

We infer that

$$\|\partial_x \partial_z^2 \psi|_{z=0}\|_{H^s} \lesssim B(1+t)^{-\frac{3}{4} + \frac{5}{16}(3\gamma-29)}.$$

We then choose  $s$  so that the exponent of  $(1+t)$  in the right-hand side is strictly less than  $-1$ , which leads to  $\gamma < 47/5$ , and thus  $s < 69/8$ .

The quadratic terms, involving traces of derivatives of  $\psi$  and of  $\theta'$ , have a higher decay. Let us estimate for instance  $\partial_z^3 \psi \partial_x \partial_z^2 \theta'$  at  $z = 0$ . We have, for any  $s > 1/2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_z^3 \psi|_{z=0} \partial_x \partial_z^2 \theta'|_{z=0}\|_{H^s(\mathbf{T})} &\lesssim \|\partial_z^3 \psi|_{z=0}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbf{T})} \|\partial_x \partial_z^2 \theta'|_{z=0}\|_{H^s(\mathbf{T})} \\ &\quad + \|\partial_z^3 \psi|_{z=0}\|_{H^s(\mathbf{T})} \|\partial_x \partial_z^2 \theta'|_{z=0}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbf{T})}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the bootstrap assumptions (4.4) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_z^3 \psi\|_\infty &\lesssim \|\partial_z^4 \partial_x \psi\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\partial_x^2 \theta'\|_{L^2} \lesssim B(1+t)^{-9/8}, \\ \|\partial_x \partial_z^2 \theta'\|_{L^\infty(\mathbf{T})} &\lesssim B(1+t)^{-1/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

Using once again Theorem 3.1 in Chapter 1 of [LM68], we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_x \partial_z^2 \theta'|_{z=0}\|_{H^{19/2}(\mathbf{T})} &\lesssim \|\theta'\|_{H_x^{12} L_z^2}^{3/8} \|\partial_z^4 \theta'\|_{H_x^8 L_z^2}^{5/8} \\ &\lesssim \|\partial_x^8 \Delta^2 \theta'\|_{L^2} \lesssim B, \end{aligned}$$

while

$$\|\partial_z^3 \psi|_{z=0}\|_{H^s(\mathbf{T})} \lesssim \|\psi\|_{L_z^2 H_x^\beta}^{1/8} \|\partial_z^4 \psi\|_{L_z^2 H_x^\gamma}^{7/8} \lesssim \|\psi\|_{L_z^2 H_x^\beta}^{1/8} \|\theta'\|_{L_z^2 H_x^{\gamma+1}}^{7/8},$$

with  $\frac{1}{8}\beta + \frac{7}{8}\gamma = s$ . Taking  $\beta = 10$  and  $\gamma = 9$ , we obtain, for some  $s > 9$ ,

$$\|\partial_z^3 \psi|_{z=0} \partial_x \partial_z^2 \theta'|_{z=0}\|_{H^s(\mathbf{T})} \lesssim B^2(1+t)^{-9/8}.$$

The other terms are treated in a similar fashion. The estimate on  $\gamma_a^0$  follows.

The estimate for  $\gamma_a^1$  follows from a similar argument. Taking the vertical derivative of (4.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \partial_z \Delta^2 \theta' &= (1-G) \partial_z \partial_x^2 \theta' - \sum_{k=1}^3 \binom{3}{k} \partial_z^k G \partial_z^{3-k} \partial_x^3 \psi - \sum_{k=1}^5 \binom{5}{k} \partial_z^k G \partial_x \partial_z^{5-k} \psi \tag{4.15} \\ &\quad + \partial_z \Delta^2 (\partial_z \psi \partial_x \theta')' - \Delta^2 (\partial_x \psi \partial_z \theta')'. \end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

Taking the trace of the above equation at  $z = 0$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \gamma_{\text{bot}}^1 &= -10 \partial_z^2 G|_{z=0} \partial_x \partial_z^3 \psi|_{z=0} - 10 \partial_z^3 G|_{z=0} \partial_x \partial_z^2 \psi|_{z=0} \\ &\quad + 6 \partial_x^2 (\partial_z^2 \psi|_{z=0} \partial_x \partial_z^2 \theta'|_{z=0} - \partial_x \partial_z^2 \psi|_{z=0} \partial_z^2 \theta'|_{z=0}) \\ &\quad + 10 (\partial_z^3 \psi|_{z=0} \partial_x \partial_z^3 \theta'|_{z=0} + \partial_z^4 \psi|_{z=0} \partial_x \partial_z^2 \theta'|_{z=0})' + 5 (\partial_z^2 \psi|_{z=0} \partial_x \partial_z^4 \theta'|_{z=0})' \\ &\quad - 10 (\partial_x \partial_z^3 \psi|_{z=0} \partial_z^3 \theta'|_{z=0} + \partial_x \partial_z^4 \psi|_{z=0} \partial_z^2 \theta'|_{z=0})' - 5 (\partial_x \partial_z^2 \psi|_{z=0} \partial_z^4 \theta'|_{z=0})'. \end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

The highest order term is the first one. We recall that  $\partial_z^2$  and  $\partial_z^3 G$  are uniformly bounded in  $L^\infty$ , and that the trace of  $\partial_z^3 \psi$  in  $H^s$  is evaluated thanks to (4.14). Following the same argument as above, we find that

$$\|\partial_x \partial_z^3 \psi|_{z=0}\|_{H^s} \lesssim B(1+t)^{-\frac{1}{4} + \frac{7(3\gamma-29)}{16}},$$

where  $\gamma$  is such that  $\frac{1}{8}10 + \frac{7}{8}\gamma = s + 1$ . Hence the exponent of  $(1+t)$  is strictly less than  $-1$  if and only if  $s < 8 + \frac{5}{24}$ . Once again, the quadratic terms have a higher decay and can be handled as perturbations. The trace of  $\partial_z^4 \theta'|_{z=0}$  can be estimated thanks to  $\gamma_{\text{bot}}^0$ . We then obtain the desired estimate for  $\gamma_a^1$ .

Let us now address the convergence of  $\partial_z^k G(t)|_{\partial\Omega}$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . We recall that

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t \partial_z^k G(t, z=0) &= -\partial_z^{k+1} \overline{\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \theta'}|_{z=0} \\ &= \overline{\partial_z^{k+1} \partial_z \psi \partial_x \theta' - \partial_x \psi \partial_z^2 \theta'}|_{z=0}.\end{aligned}$$

Since  $\psi|_{z=0} = \partial_z \psi|_{z=0} = 0$ , and  $\theta'|_{z=0} = \partial_z \theta'|_{z=0} = 0$ , we have

$$\partial_t \partial_z^2 G(t, z=0) = \overline{3\partial_z^2 \psi|_{z=0} \partial_x \partial_z^2 \theta'|_{z=0} - \partial_x \partial_z^2 \psi|_{z=0} \partial_z^2 \theta'|_{z=0}}.$$

As above,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\partial_z^2 \psi|_{z=0} \partial_x \partial_z^2 \theta'|_{z=0}\|_{L^1(\mathbf{T})} &\leq \|\partial_z^2 \psi|_{z=0}\|_{L^2(\mathbf{T})} \|\partial_x \partial_z^2 \theta'|_{z=0}\|_{L^2(\mathbf{T})} \\ &\lesssim \|\partial_z^2 \psi\|_{H^{1/2}(\Omega)} \|\partial_x \partial_z^2 \theta'\|_{H^{1/2}(\Omega)} \\ &\lesssim \|\partial_x^2 \theta'_0\|_{H^4(\Omega)} (1+t)^{-7/4}.\end{aligned}$$

The estimate on  $\partial_t \partial_z^3 G(t, z=0)$  is similar and left to the reader.  $\square$

We now turn towards the decomposition of  $\gamma_a^0$  and  $\gamma_a^1$  for  $a \in \{\text{top}, \text{bot}\}$ :

*Proof of Lemma 4.5.* We focus on  $a = \text{bot}$  by symmetry, and we start with the decomposition of  $\gamma_{\text{bot}}^0$ . Let us go back to (4.13). The main term in the right-hand side is  $-6\partial_z^2 G|_{z=0} \partial_x \partial_z^2 \psi|_{z=0}$ . Following Lemma 4.3 and using the decomposition  $\theta' = \theta^{\text{BL}} + \theta^{\text{int}}$ , we write

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_z^2 G|_{z=0} \partial_x \partial_z^2 \psi|_{z=0} &= (1+t)^{-3/2} g_{\text{bot}, \infty}^2 \partial_x \partial_z^2 \Psi_{\text{bot}|Z=0}^0 + (1+t)^{-7/4} g_{\text{bot}, \infty}^2 \partial_x \partial_z^2 \Psi_{\text{bot}|Z=0}^1 \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=2,3} (1+t)^{-\frac{3}{2}-\frac{j}{4}} \partial_z^2 G|_{z=0} \partial_x \partial_z^2 \Psi_{\text{bot}|Z=0}^j \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=0,1} (1+t)^{-\frac{3}{2}-\frac{j}{4}} (\partial_z^2 G|_{z=0} - g_{\text{bot}, \infty}^2) \partial_x \partial_z^2 \Psi_{\text{bot}|Z=0}^j \\ &\quad + \partial_z^2 G|_{z=0} \partial_x \partial_z^2 \psi^{\text{int}}|_{z=0}.\end{aligned}$$

The assumptions of the Lemma ensures that for all  $t \in [0, T]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\left| \sum_{j=2,3} (1+t)^{-\frac{3}{2}-\frac{j}{4}} \partial_z^2 G|_{z=0} \partial_x \partial_z^2 \Psi_{\text{bot}|Z=0}^j \right| &\lesssim B \|\partial_z^2 G\|_{\infty} (1+t)^{-2}, \\ \|\partial_z^2 G|_{z=0} \partial_x \partial_z^2 \psi^{\text{int}}|_{z=0}\|_{L^2(\mathbf{T})} &\lesssim \|\partial_z^2 G\|_{\infty} B (1+t)^{-3+\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{8}} \lesssim B \|\partial_z^2 G\|_{\infty} (1+t)^{-2}.\end{aligned}$$

Recalling that  $\|\partial_z^2 G\|_{\infty} \lesssim \|\theta_0\|_{H^8} \lesssim B$ , the two terms in the right-hand side are bounded by  $B^2(1+t)^{-2}$ . Furthermore, Lemma 4.3 ensures that

$$|\partial_z^2 G|_{z=0} - g_{\text{bot}, \infty}^2| \lesssim B(1+t)^{-3/4},$$

and therefore

$$\left\| \sum_{j=0,1} (1+t)^{-\frac{3}{2}-\frac{j}{4}} (\partial_z^2 G|_{z=0} - g_{\text{bot}, \infty}^2) \partial_x \partial_z^2 \Psi_{\text{bot}|Z=0}^j \right\|_{L^2(\mathbf{T})} \lesssim B^2(1+t)^{-9/4}.$$

We now address the quadratic terms in (4.13), namely

$$\mathcal{B}(\psi, \theta') := 6 \{ \partial_z^2 \psi|_{z=0}, \partial_z^2 \theta' \}' + 4(\partial_z^2 \psi \partial_x \partial_z^3 \theta' - \partial_x \partial_z^3 \psi \partial_z^2 \theta')'|_{z=0}.$$

Decomposing  $\psi$  and  $\theta'$  into their boundary layer and their interior part, we find that the main order quadratic term is

$$(1+t)^{-7/4} [6\partial_Z^3 \Psi_{\text{bot}}^0 \partial_x \partial_Z^2 \Theta_{\text{bot}}^0 + 4\partial_Z^2 \Psi_{\text{bot}}^0 \partial_x \partial_Z^3 \Theta_{\text{bot}}^0 - 6\partial_x \partial_Z^2 \Psi_{\text{bot}}^0 \partial_Z^3 \Theta_{\text{bot}}^0 - 4\partial_x \partial_Z^3 \Psi_{\text{bot}}^0 \partial_Z^2 \Theta_{\text{bot}}^0]' |_{z=0} \\ =: (1+t)^{-7/4} \gamma_{\text{bot},NL}^0,$$

while all the other terms are bounded in  $L^2(\mathbf{T})$  by  $CB^2(1+t)^{-2}$ .

Therefore, we set

$$\gamma_{a,2}^0 := 12g_{a,\infty}^2 \partial_x \partial_Z^2 \Psi_a^0 |_{Z=0}, \quad \gamma_{a,3}^0 := 8g_{a,\infty}^2 \partial_x \partial_Z^2 \Psi_a^1 |_{Z=0} - \frac{4}{3} \gamma_{a,NL}^0.$$

Now, define  $\Gamma_{\text{bot},T}^0$  by

$$\Gamma_{\text{bot},T}^0(t) = 6 \int_t^T \sum_{j=2,3} (1+s)^{-\frac{3}{2}-\frac{j}{4}} \partial_Z^2 G(s) |_{z=0} \partial_x \partial_Z^2 \Psi_{\text{bot}|Z=0}^j ds \\ + 6 \int_t^T \sum_{j=0,1} (1+s)^{-\frac{3}{2}-\frac{j}{4}} (\partial_Z^2 G(s) |_{z=0} - g_{\text{bot},\infty}^2) \partial_x \partial_Z^2 \Psi_{\text{bot}|Z=0}^j ds \\ + \int_t^T \mathcal{B} \left( \sum_{j=1}^3 (1+s)^{-2-\frac{j}{4}} \Psi_{\text{bot}}^j(x, (1+s)^{1/4}) + \psi^{\text{rem}}, \theta'(s) \right) ds \\ + \int_t^T \mathcal{B} \left( (1+s)^{-2} \Psi_{\text{bot}}^0(x, (1+s)^{1/4}), \sum_{j=1}^3 (1+s)^{-1-\frac{j}{4}} \Theta_{\text{bot}}^j(x, (1+s)^{1/4}) + \theta^{\text{rem}} \right) ds.$$

Note that the assumptions (4.3) on  $\theta^{\text{int}}$  ensure that

$$\|\partial_z^3 \theta^{\text{rem}} |_{z=0}\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\theta^{\text{rem}}\|_{L^2}^{1/8} \|\partial_z^4 \theta^{\text{rem}}\|_{L^2}^{7/8} \lesssim B(1+t)^{-1/4}.$$

Recalling Corollary 4.2 and using the assumption  $\partial_Z^3 \Theta_a^j |_{Z=0} \in H^{15/2}(\mathbf{T})$  (see (4.9)), we also infer that

$$\|\partial_z^3 \theta^{\text{rem}} |_{z=0}\|_{H^{15/2}} \lesssim B(1+t)^{-1/8}.$$

Interpolating between these two estimates, we find in particular that

$$\|\partial_z^3 \theta^{\text{rem}} |_{z=0}\|_{H^5} \lesssim B(1+t) - 11/24.$$

The above estimates ensure that for  $k = 0, 1$

$$\|\partial_t^k \Gamma_{\text{bot},T}^0(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbf{T})} \lesssim B^2(1+t)^{-k-1}, \\ \|\Gamma_{\text{bot},T}^0(t)\|_{H^4(\mathbf{T})} \lesssim B^2(1+t)^{-23/24}.$$

Therefore we obtain the decomposition announced in the Lemma for  $\gamma_a^0$ .

The decomposition of  $\gamma_a^1$  follows from similar arguments and is left to the reader.  $\square$

#### 4.4 Iterative construction of the boundary layer profile

Let us now turn towards the construction of the boundary layer profile, and more generally, of an approximate solution. The purpose of this subsection is to prove the two following Lemmas. Our first result, which is truly the core of the construction, is valid under the bootstrap assumption (4.4) on  $\theta'$ :

**Lemma 4.8.** Let  $\theta_0 \in H^{14}(\Omega)$  such that  $\|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} \leq B < 1$ . Let  $\theta = \theta' + \bar{\theta}$  be a solution of (1.15), and assume that the bounds (4.4) hold on  $(0, T)$ . Let  $\gamma_{a,T}^0, \gamma_{a,T}^1$  be defined by Lemma 4.3.

Then there exist profiles  $\Theta_a^j \in H^8(\mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{R}_+)$ ,  $\Psi_a^j \in H^9(\mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{R}_+)$ ,  $j \in \{0, \dots, 4\}$  and  $\theta_c \in H^9(\Omega)$ , depending only on  $\gamma_{a,T}^0, \gamma_{a,T}^1, g_{a,\infty}^2$  and  $g_{a,\infty}^3$ , such that, defining  $\theta^{\text{BL}}$  by (4.7), the following properties hold:

1. Bounds on the profiles:  $\Theta_a^j, \Psi_a^j, \theta_c^{\text{lin}}, \psi_c^{\text{lin}} = \Delta^{-2} \partial_x \theta_c$  satisfy (4.8);
2. Traces at the top and bottom: at  $z = 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^2 \theta^{\text{BL}}|_{z=0} &= \gamma_{\text{bot},T}^0 + \gamma_{\text{bot},2}^0 (1+t)^{-1/2} + \gamma_{\text{bot},3}^0 (1+t)^{-3/4} \\ &\quad - \gamma_{\text{bot},2}^0 (1+T)^{-1/2} - \gamma_{\text{bot},3}^0 (1+T)^{-3/4}, \\ \partial_z \Delta^2 \theta^{\text{BL}}|_{z=0} &= \gamma_{\text{bot},T}^1 + \gamma_{\text{bot},1}^1 (1+t)^{-1/4} + \gamma_{\text{bot},2}^1 (1+t)^{-1/2} \\ &\quad - \gamma_{\text{bot},1}^1 (1+T)^{-1/4} - \gamma_{\text{bot},2}^1 (1+T)^{-1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\gamma_{a,k}^j$  are defined in (4.10). Similar formulas hold at  $z = 1$ .

3. Evolution equation:  $\theta^{\text{BL}}$  satisfies

$$\partial_t \theta^{\text{BL}} = (1-G) \partial_x^2 \Delta^{-2} \theta^{\text{BL}} - (\nabla^\perp \Delta^{-2} \partial_x \theta^{\text{BL}} \cdot \nabla \theta^{\text{BL}})' + R^{\text{BL}},$$

and the remainder  $R^{\text{BL}}$  is such that for all  $k, m \geq 0$  with  $k + m \leq 8$ ,

$$\|R^{\text{BL}}\|_{H_x^m H_z^k} \lesssim B^2 (1+t)^{-3+\frac{k}{4}-\frac{1}{8}}.$$

**Remark 4.9.** Actually, all profiles  $\Theta_a^j, \Psi_a^j$ , and therefore  $\theta^{\text{BL}}, \psi^{\text{BL}}$  depend on  $T$  through  $\gamma_{a,T}^0, \gamma_{a,T}^1$ . However, in order not to burden unnecessarily the notation, we will omit this dependency.

Once the boundary layer part is constructed, under an additional bootstrap assumption on the remainder, we can define a nonlinear corrector:

**Lemma 4.10.** Let  $\theta_0 \in H^{14}(\Omega)$  such that  $\|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} \leq B < 1$ . Let  $\theta = \theta' + \bar{\theta}$  be a solution of (1.15), and assume that the bounds (4.4) hold on  $(0, T)$ .

Let  $\theta^{\text{BL}}, \psi^{\text{BL}}$  be given by Lemma 4.8, and let  $\theta^{\text{rem}} = \theta' - \theta^{\text{BL}}$ . Assume that (4.3) holds on  $(0, T)$ , and define  $\Gamma_{a,T}^j$  as in Lemma 4.5.

Then there exists  $\theta_c^{\text{NL}} \in H^8(\Omega)$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^2 \sigma_{\text{lift}}^{\text{NL}}|_{z=0} &= \Gamma_{\text{bot},T}^0, & \partial_z \Delta^2 \sigma_{\text{lift}}^{\text{NL}}|_{z=0} &= \Gamma_{\text{bot},T}^1, \\ \Delta^2 \sigma_{\text{lift}}^{\text{NL}}|_{z=1} &= \Gamma_{\text{top},T}^0, & \partial_z \Delta^2 \sigma_{\text{lift}}^{\text{NL}}|_{z=1} &= \Gamma_{\text{top},T}^1 \end{aligned}$$

and for all  $k, m \geq 0$  with  $k + m \leq 8$

$$\|\sigma_{\text{lift}}^{\text{NL}}\|_{H_x^m H_z^k} \lesssim B^2 (1+t)^{-2+\frac{k}{4}-\frac{1}{8}}.$$

As a consequence, setting  $\theta^{\text{app}} := \theta^{\text{BL}} + \sigma_{\text{lift}}^{\text{NL}}$ , we have

$$\Delta^2 \theta^{\text{app}} = \Delta^2 \theta', \quad \partial_z \Delta^2 \theta^{\text{app}} = \partial_z \Delta^2 \theta' \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega,$$

and  $\theta^{\text{app}}$  is a solution of

$$\partial_t \theta^{\text{app}} = (1-G) \partial_x^2 \Delta^{-2} \theta^{\text{app}} - (\nabla^\perp \Delta^{-2} \partial_x \theta^{\text{app}} \cdot \nabla \theta^{\text{app}})' + S_{\text{rem}},$$

and the remainder  $S_{\text{rem}}$  is such that for all  $k, m \geq 0$  with  $k + m \leq 8$ ,

$$\|S_{\text{rem}}\|_{H_x^m H_z^k} \lesssim B^2 (1+t)^{-3+\frac{k}{4}-\frac{1}{8}}.$$

The main part of this section will be devoted to the proof of Lemma 4.8. The strategy will be very similar to the one of Section 3, and we will often refer the reader to the computations therein. We begin with the construction of the profiles  $\Theta_a^j, \Psi_a^j$ . To that end, we plug the Ansatz (4.7) into equation (1.15) and identify the powers of  $1+t$  in the vicinity of  $z=0$  or  $z=1$ . Note that for  $z \ll 1$ , setting  $Z = (1+t)^{1/4}z$  and using Lemma 4.3,

$$\begin{aligned} G(t, z) &= \frac{1}{2} \partial_z^2 G(t, 0) z^2 + \frac{1}{6} \partial_z^3 G(t, 0) z^3 + O(z^4) \\ &= (1+t)^{-1/2} \frac{g_{\text{bot}, \infty}^2}{2} Z^2 + (1+t)^{-3/4} \frac{g_{\text{bot}, \infty}^3}{6} Z^3 \\ &\quad + O((1+t)^{-1} Z^4 + (1+t)^{-5/4} (Z^2 + Z^3)). \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

A similar expansion holds in the vicinity of  $z=1$ . Furthermore, in the vicinity of  $z=0$ , setting  $S = -(\nabla^\perp \psi \cdot \nabla \theta)'$ ,

$$S = \sum_{0 \leq i, j \leq 4} (1+t)^{-3 - \frac{i+j-1}{4}} \left( \partial_Z \Psi_{\text{bot}}^i \partial_x \Theta_{\text{bot}}^j - \partial_x \Psi_{\text{bot}}^i \partial_Z \Theta_{\text{bot}}^j \right)' + O((1+t)^{-15/4}). \quad (4.19)$$

Following the computations of the previous section and identifying the coefficient of  $(1+t)^{-2 - \frac{j}{4}}$ , we obtain (compare with (3.8))

$$-\left(1 + \frac{j}{4}\right) \Theta_a^j + \frac{1}{4} Z \partial_Z \Theta_a^j = \partial_x \Psi_a^j + S_a^j, \quad (4.20)$$

where the source terms  $S_a^j$  are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} S_a^0 &= S_a^1 = 0, \\ S_a^2 &= -\frac{g_{a, \infty}^2}{2} Z^2 \partial_x \Psi_a^0, \\ S_a^3 &= -\frac{g_{a, \infty}^2}{2} Z^2 \partial_x \Psi_a^1 - \eta_a \frac{g_{a, \infty}^3}{6} Z^3 \partial_x \Psi_a^0 + \eta_a \left( \partial_Z \Psi_a^0 \partial_x \Theta_a^0 - \partial_x \Psi_a^0 \partial_Z \Theta_a^0 \right)', \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

with  $\eta_{\text{bot}} = 1, \eta_{\text{top}} = -1$ .

Let us now proceed to define recursively the profiles  $\Theta_a^j, \Psi_a^j$ .

**Main order boundary layer terms:**  $\Theta_a^0$  and  $\Theta_a^1$ . The roles of the boundary layer profiles  $\Theta_a^j$  for  $j=0, 1$  is to correct the traces of  $\Delta^2 \theta'$  and  $\partial_z \Delta^2 \theta'$  on  $\partial\Omega$  at main order, i.e.  $\gamma_{a, T}^j$  (see Lemma 4.5). Choosing  $S_a^j = 0$  and  $\Psi_a^j$  such that  $\partial_Z^4 \Psi_a^j = \partial_x \Theta_a^j$  and recalling (4.20), we are led to

$$\begin{cases} Z \partial_Z^5 \Theta_a^0 = 4 \partial_x^2 \Theta_a^0 & \text{in } \mathbf{T} \times (0, +\infty) \\ \partial_Z^4 \Theta_a^0|_{Z=0} = \gamma_{a, T}^0, & \partial_Z^5 \Theta_a^0|_{Z=0} = 0, \\ \Theta_a^0|_{Z=0} = 0, & \partial_Z \Theta_a^0|_{Z=0} = 0, \quad \lim_{Z \rightarrow \infty} \Theta_a^0 = 0, \end{cases} \quad (4.22)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} Z \partial_Z^6 \Theta_a^1 = 4 \partial_x^2 \partial_Z \Theta_a^1 & \text{in } \mathbf{T} \times (0, +\infty) \\ \partial_Z^4 \Theta_a^1|_{Z=0} = 0, & \partial_Z^5 \Theta_a^1|_{Z=0} = \eta_a \gamma_{a, T}^1, \\ \Theta_a^1|_{Z=0} = 0, & \partial_Z \Theta_a^1|_{Z=0} = 0, \quad \lim_{Z \rightarrow \infty} \Theta_a^1 = 0. \end{cases} \quad (4.23)$$



Note that these systems are identical to (3.2) and (3.3) respectively. As a consequence, as in the previous section, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta_a^0(x, Z) &= \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z} \setminus \{0\}} |k|^{-2} \widehat{\gamma_{a,T}^0}(k) \chi_0(|k|^{1/2} Z) e^{ikx}, \\ \Psi_a^0(x, Z) &= \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{1}{ik|k|^2} \widehat{\gamma_{a,T}^0}(k) \left[ \frac{1}{4} |k|^{1/2} Z \chi_0'(|k|^{1/2} Z) - \chi_0(|k|^{1/2} Z) \right] e^{ikx},\end{aligned}\tag{4.24}$$

where  $\chi_0$  is defined in Corollary 3.2. Since  $\|\gamma_{a,T}^0\|_{H^s} \lesssim \|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2$  for all  $s < 69/8$ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Theta_a^0\|_{H_x^{10+\frac{3}{4}} L_Z^2} + \|\Theta_a^0\|_{L_x^2 H_Z^{20+\frac{3}{2}}} &\lesssim \|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2, \\ \|\Psi_a^0\|_{H_x^{11+\frac{3}{4}} L_Z^2} + \|\Psi_a^0\|_{L_x^2 H_Z^{22+\frac{3}{2}}} &\lesssim \|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2.\end{aligned}$$

In a similar fashion, recalling the definition of  $\chi_1$  from Corollary 3.2,

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta_a^1(x, Z) &= \eta_a \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z} \setminus \{0\}} |k|^{-5/2} \widehat{\gamma_{a,T}^1}(k) \chi_1(|k|^{1/2} Z) e^{ikx}, \\ \Psi_a^1(x, Z) &= \eta_a \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{1}{ik|k|^{5/2}} \widehat{\gamma_{a,T}^1}(k) \left[ \frac{1}{4} |k|^{1/2} Z \chi_1'(|k|^{1/2} Z) - \chi_1(|k|^{1/2} Z) \right] e^{ikx}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.25}$$

Since  $\|\gamma_{a,T}^1\|_{H^{15/2}} \lesssim \|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2$ , we also have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Theta_a^1\|_{H_x^{10+\frac{1}{4}} L_Z^2} + \|\Theta_a^1\|_{L_x^2 H_Z^{20+\frac{1}{2}}} &\lesssim \|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2, \\ \|\Psi_a^1\|_{H_x^{11+\frac{1}{4}} L_Z^2} + \|\Psi_a^1\|_{L_x^2 H_Z^{22+\frac{1}{2}}} &\lesssim \|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2.\end{aligned}$$

Let us now define the boundary terms  $\gamma_{a,j}^0$  and  $\gamma_{a,j}^1$  by Eq. (4.10). It follows from the above expressions for  $\Psi_a^j$  and  $\Theta_a^j$  and from the boundary conditions  $\chi_0(0) = \chi_0'(0) = 0$  that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\gamma_{a,2}^0\|_{H^9(\mathbf{T})} &\lesssim B^2, \quad \|\gamma_{a,3}^0\|_{H^{15/2}(\mathbf{T})} \lesssim B^2, \\ \|\gamma_{a,1}^1\|_{H^{17/2}(T)} &\lesssim B^2, \quad \|\gamma_{a,2}^1\|_{H^7(\mathbf{T})} \lesssim B^2.\end{aligned}\tag{4.26}$$

In a similar fashion, defining the source terms  $S_a^2, S_a^3$  by (4.21), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|S_a^2\|_{H_x^{11+\frac{1}{4}} L_Z^2} + \|S_a^2\|_{L_x^2 H_Z^{22+\frac{1}{2}}} &\lesssim B^2, \\ \|S_a^3\|_{H_x^{9+\frac{3}{4}} L_Z^2} + \|S_a^3\|_{L_x^2 H_Z^{18+\frac{3}{2}}} &\lesssim B^2.\end{aligned}\tag{4.27}$$

Note however that because of the quadratic term  $\{\Psi_a^0, \Theta_a^0\}_{x,Z}$ ,  $S_a^3$  does not have the same self-similar structure as  $\Psi_a^j, \Theta_a^j$  for  $j = 0, 1$ , which is also shared by  $S_a^2$ .

**Correctors  $\Theta_{c,a}^0$  and  $\Theta_{c,a}^1$ .** We recall that the coefficients  $\gamma_{a,k}^j$  are defined by (4.10), and are estimated in (4.26) above. The terms  $\gamma_{a,2}^0(1+T)^{-1/2}$  and  $\gamma_{a,3}^0(1+T)^{-3/4}$  in Lemma 4.5 are constant in time, but smaller (for  $T \gg 1$ ) than  $\gamma_{a,T}^0$ . Hence they give rise to a profile  $\Theta_{c,a}^0$  whose construction is very similar to the one of  $\Theta_a^0$ , but whose size is much smaller. More precisely, we

set

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta_{c,a}^0(x, Z) &= \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z} \setminus \{0\}} |k|^{-2} \left[ \widehat{\gamma_{a,2}^0}(k)(1+T)^{-1/2} + \widehat{\gamma_{a,3}^0}(k)(1+T)^{-3/4} \right] \chi_0(|k|^{1/2} Z) e^{ikx}, \\ \Theta_{c,a}^1(x, Z) &= \eta_a \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z} \setminus \{0\}} |k|^{-5/2} \left[ \widehat{\gamma_{a,1}^1}(k)(1+T)^{-1/4} + \widehat{\gamma_{a,2}^1}(k)(1+T)^{-1/2} \right] \chi_1(|k|^{1/2} Z) e^{ikx}.\end{aligned}$$

Remembering (4.26), we have, for  $j = 0, 1$

$$\|\Theta_{c,a}^j\|_{H^{9+\frac{3}{4}}_x L^2_Z} + \|\Theta_{c,a}^j\|_{L^2_x H^{18+\frac{3}{2}}_Z} \lesssim B^2(1+T)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{j}{4}},$$

and

$$\|\partial_Z^2 \Theta_{c,a}^j|_{Z=0}\|_{H^{17/2}(\mathbf{T})} \lesssim B^2(1+T)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{j}{4}}.$$

Analogously to  $\Psi_a^0$  and  $\Psi_a^1$ , we also define

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_{c,a}^0 &= \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{1}{ik|k|^2} \left[ \widehat{\gamma_{a,2}^0}(k)(1+T)^{-1/2} + \widehat{\gamma_{a,3}^0}(k)(1+T)^{-3/4} \right] \left( \frac{1}{4} \xi \chi'_0(\xi) - \chi_0(\xi) \right) \Big|_{\xi=|k|^{1/2} Z} e^{ikx}, \\ \Psi_{c,a}^1 &= \eta_a \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{1}{ik|k|^{5/2}} \left[ \widehat{\gamma_{a,1}^1}(k)(1+T)^{-1/4} + \widehat{\gamma_{a,2}^1}(k)(1+T)^{-1/2} \right] \left( \frac{1}{4} \xi \chi'_1(\xi) - \chi_1(\xi) \right) \Big|_{\xi=|k|^{1/2} Z} e^{ikx},\end{aligned}$$

so that  $\partial_Z^4 \Psi_{c,a}^j = \partial_x \Theta_{c,a}^j$ , and we have

$$\|\Psi_{c,a}^j\|_{H^{10+\frac{3}{4}}_x L^2_Z} + \|\Psi_{c,a}^j\|_{L^2_x H^{20+\frac{3}{2}}_Z} \lesssim B^2(1+T)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{j}{4}}.$$

**Lower order boundary layer terms:  $\Theta_a^2$ ,  $\Theta_a^3$  and  $\Theta_{c,a}^2$ .** We recall that  $\Theta_a^j$ ,  $\Psi_a^j$  must satisfy (4.20), where the source term  $S_a^j$  is given by (4.21). Note that since  $\Psi_a^0$ ,  $\Psi_a^1$  and  $\Theta_a^0$  have been constructed in the previous step, the source terms  $S_a^2$  and  $S_a^3$  are defined unequivocally and have exponential decay. Moreover, following Lemma 4.5 and noting that

$$\Delta^2 \theta^{\text{BL}}|_{z=0} = \sum_{j=0}^3 (1+t)^{-j/4} \partial_Z^4 \Theta_{\text{bot}|Z=0}^j + 2 \sum_{j=0}^3 (1+t)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{j}{4}} \partial_x^2 \partial_Z^2 \Theta_{\text{bot}|Z=0}^j + O((1+t)^{-1}),$$

we enforce the following boundary conditions:

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_Z^4 \Theta_{a|Z=0}^2 &= \gamma_{a,2}^0 - 2\partial_x^2 \partial_Z^2 \Theta_{a|Z=0}^0, & \partial_Z^5 \Theta_{a|Z=0}^2 &= \eta_a \left( \gamma_{a,1}^1 - 2\partial_x^2 \partial_Z^3 \Theta_{a|Z=0}^0 \right), \\ \partial_Z^4 \Theta_{a|Z=0}^3 &= \gamma_{a,3}^0 - 2\partial_x^2 \partial_Z^2 \Theta_{a|Z=0}^1, & \partial_Z^5 \Theta_{a|Z=0}^3 &= \eta_a \left( \gamma_{a,2}^1 - 2\partial_x^2 \partial_Z^3 \Theta_{a|Z=0}^1 \right),\end{aligned}\tag{4.28}$$

where the coefficients  $\gamma_{a,k}^j$  are defined in (4.10) and estimated in (4.26). There remains to specify the relationship between  $\Psi_a^j$  and  $\Theta_a^j$ . In order that  $\Delta^2 \psi^{\text{BL}} = \partial_x \theta^{\text{BL}}$  at main order, following the computations of the previous section, we take, for  $j = 2, 3$

$$\partial_Z^4 \Psi_a^j + 2\partial_x^2 \partial_Z^2 \Psi_a^{j-2} = \partial_x \Theta_a^j.$$

Eliminating  $\Psi_a^2$  from the equation on  $\Theta_a^2$ , we find that the system satisfied by  $\Theta_a^2$  is

$$\begin{cases} Z \partial_Z^5 \Theta_a^2 - 2\partial_Z^4 \Theta_a^2 = 4\partial_x^2 \Theta_a^2 - 2g_{\text{bot},\infty}^2 \partial_Z^4 (Z^2 \partial_x \Psi_a^0) - 8\partial_x^3 \partial_Z^2 \Psi_a^0, \\ \Theta_{a|Z=0}^2 = \partial_Z \Theta_{a|Z=0}^2 = 0, \\ \Theta_a^2(Z) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } Z \rightarrow \infty, \end{cases}\tag{4.29}$$

together with (4.28). Note that  $2\partial_x\partial_Z^2\Psi_a^0|_{Z=0} = -\partial_Z^2\Theta_a^0|_{Z=0}$  and  $4\partial_x\partial_Z^3\Psi_a^0|_{Z=0} = \partial_Z^3\Theta_a^0|_{Z=0}$ , so that the boundary conditions are redundant. In other words, taking the trace of (4.29) at  $Z = 0$ , we find  $\partial_Z^4\Theta_a^2|_{Z=0} = \gamma_{a,2}^0 - 2\partial_x^2\partial_Z^2\Theta_a^0|_{Z=0}$ . Differentiating twice more with respect to  $Z$ , we find that the Fourier transform of  $\partial_Z^2\Theta_a^2$ , after a suitable lifting, satisfies an equation of the form (3.4) with boundary conditions of the type (iii) from Lemma 3.1. Using the explicit Fourier representation of  $\Psi_a^0$  and  $\Theta_a^0$  (4.24), we find that

$$\|\Theta_a^2\|_{H_x^{9+\frac{3}{4}}L_Z^2} + \|\Theta_a^2\|_{L_x^2H_Z^{19+\frac{3}{2}}} \lesssim B, \quad \|\Psi_a^2\|_{H_x^{10+\frac{3}{4}}L_Z^2} + \|\Psi_a^2\|_{L_x^2H_Z^{20+\frac{3}{2}}} \lesssim B. \quad (4.30)$$

In a similar fashion,  $\Theta_a^3$  satisfies the system

$$\begin{cases} Z\partial_Z^5\Theta_a^3 - 3\partial_Z^4\Theta_a^3 = 4\partial_x^2\Theta_a^3 + 4\partial_Z^4S_a^3 + 6\partial_x^2\partial_Z^2\Theta_a^1 - 2Z\partial_x^2\partial_Z^3\Theta_a^1, \\ \Theta_a^3|_{Z=0} = \partial_Z\Theta_a^3|_{Z=0} = 0, \\ \Theta_a^3(Z) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } Z \rightarrow \infty, \end{cases} \quad (4.31)$$

together with (4.28). Once again, we find that the lifted Fourier transform of  $\partial_Z^3\Theta_a^3$  satisfies an equation of the form (3.4) with boundary conditions of the type (iv) from Lemma 3.1. Using the explicit Fourier representation of  $\Theta_a^1$  (4.25) together with the estimates on  $S_a^3$  (4.27), we find that

$$\|\Theta_a^3\|_{H_x^{9+\frac{1}{4}}L_Z^2} + \|\Theta_a^3\|_{L_x^2H_Z^{19+\frac{1}{2}}} \lesssim \|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2, \quad \|\Psi_a^3\|_{H_x^{10+\frac{1}{4}}L_Z^2} + \|\Psi_a^3\|_{L_x^2H_Z^{20+\frac{1}{2}}} \lesssim \|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2. \quad (4.32)$$

Note that the Fourier representation of  $\Theta_a^2$  and of the linear part of  $\Theta_a^3$  also ensure that for  $j = 2, 3$ ,

$$\|\partial_Z^2\Theta_a^j|_{Z=0}\|_{H^s(\mathbf{T})} + \|\partial_Z^3\Theta_a^j|_{Z=0}\|_{H^{15/2}(\mathbf{T})} \lesssim \|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2. \quad (4.33)$$

Eventually, we define  $\Theta_{c,a}^2$  analogously to  $\Theta_a^2$  so that

$$\begin{cases} Z\partial_Z^5\Theta_{c,a}^2 - 2\partial_Z^4\Theta_{c,a}^2 = 4\partial_x^2\Theta_{c,a}^2 - 8\partial_x^3\partial_Z^2\Psi_{c,a}^0, \\ \Theta_{c,a}^2|_{Z=0} = \partial_Z\Theta_{c,a}^2|_{Z=0} = \partial_Z^2\Theta_{c,a}^2|_{Z=0} = 0, \\ \partial_Z^j\Theta_{c,a}^2|_{Z=0} = -2(-1)^j\partial_x^2\partial_Z^{j-2}\Theta_{c,a}^0|_{Z=0} \quad \forall j \in \{4, 5\}, \\ \Theta_{c,a}^2(x, Z) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } Z \rightarrow \infty. \end{cases}$$

Once again, note that the boundary conditions are redundant. We also define  $\Psi_{c,a}^2$  by  $\partial_Z^4\Psi_{c,a}^2 = \partial_x\Theta_{c,a}^2 - 2\partial_x^2\partial_Z^2\Psi_{c,a}^2$ , with homogeneous boundary conditions at  $Z = 0$ . We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Theta_{c,a}^2\|_{H_x^{8+\frac{3}{4}}L_Z^2} + \|\Theta_{c,a}^2\|_{L_x^2H_Z^{16+\frac{3}{2}}} + \|Z\Theta_{c,a}^2\|_{H_x^{9+\frac{1}{4}}L_Z^2} &\lesssim B^2(1+T)^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \\ \|\Psi_{c,a}^2\|_{H_x^{9+\frac{3}{4}}L_Z^2} + \|\Psi_{c,a}^2\|_{L_x^2H_Z^{18+\frac{3}{2}}} &\lesssim B^2(1+T)^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

**Boundary layer corrector  $\Theta_a^4$ .** As in the previous section, we need to define a higher order boundary layer corrector  $\Theta_a^4$ , whose role is to ensure that

$$\|\partial_x^2\Delta^{-2}\theta^{\text{BL}} - \partial_x\psi^{\text{BL}}\|_{L^2} \lesssim B(1+t)^{-3}.$$

To that end, we choose  $\Theta_a^4, \Psi_a^4$  so that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_Z^4\Psi_a^4 + 2\partial_x^2\partial_Z^2\Psi_a^2 + \partial_x^4\Psi_a^0 &= \partial_x\Theta_a^4, \\ Z\partial_Z\Theta_a^4 - 8\Theta_a^4 &= 4\partial_x\Psi_a^4. \end{aligned}$$

Eliminating  $\Psi_a^4$  from the equation, we find

$$Z\partial_Z^5\Theta_a^4 - 4\partial_Z^4\Theta_a^4 = 4\partial_x^2\Theta_a^4 - 8\partial_x^3\partial_Z^2\Psi_a^2 - 4\partial_x^5\Psi_a^2.$$

We enforce the following boundary conditions (which are redundant):

$$\Theta_a^4|_{Z=0} = \partial_Z\Theta_a^4|_{Z=0} = 0, \quad \partial_Z^4\Theta_a^4|_{Z=0} = \frac{1}{2}\partial_x^3\partial_Z^2\Psi_a^2|_{Z=0}, \quad \partial_Z^5\Theta_a^4|_{Z=0} = \frac{2}{3}\partial_x^3\partial_Z^3\Psi_a^2|_{Z=0},$$

together with a decay assumption at infinity. Looking at the equation satisfied by the Fourier transform and applying Lemma 3.1, we infer that there exists a (non unique) solution  $\Theta_a^4$  of this equation such that

$$\|\Theta_a^4\|_{H_x^{8+\frac{3}{4}}L_Z^2} + \|\Theta_a^4\|_{L_x^2H_Z^{16+\frac{3}{2}}} + \|Z\Theta_a^4\|_{H_x^{9+\frac{1}{4}}L_Z^2} \lesssim \|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2.$$

As in the previous section, non-uniqueness comes from the fact that the Fourier transform of  $\partial_Z^4\Theta_a^4$  satisfies an ODE of the form (3.4), with boundary conditions at  $Z = 0$  for  $\partial_Z^4\Theta_a^4$  and  $\partial_Z^5\Theta_a^4$ . However, the boundary conditions above do not prescribe any condition on  $\partial_Z^k\Theta_a^4$  for any  $k \geq 6$ . We lift this indetermination by requiring (somewhat arbitrarily) that  $\partial_Z^8\Theta_a^4|_{Z=0} = 0$ . The solution thus obtained satisfies the previous Sobolev estimates, and its trace satisfies

$$\|\partial_Z^2\Theta_a^4|_{Z=0}\|_{H^{15/2}(\mathbf{T})} + \|\partial_Z^3\Theta_a^4|_{Z=0}\|_{H^7(\mathbf{T})} \lesssim \|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2. \quad (4.34)$$

**Lift of the remaining traces of order  $B$ .** At this stage, we have defined  $\Theta_a^j, \Psi_a^j$  for  $0 \leq j \leq 4$  together with  $\Theta_{c,a}^j, \Psi_{c,a}^j$  for  $0 \leq j \leq 2$ . Let  $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbf{R})$  be a cut-off function such that  $\chi \equiv 1$  on  $(-1/4, 1/4)$  and  $\text{Supp}\chi \subset (-1/2, 1/2)$ . Setting  $\Theta_{c,a}^j = \Psi_{c,a}^j = 0$  for  $j \geq 3$ , the main boundary layer term is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{\text{main}}^{\text{BL}} &:= \sum_{j=0}^4 (1+t)^{-1-\frac{j}{4}} \left( \Theta_{\text{bot}}^j + \Theta_{c,\text{bot}}^j \right) (x, (1+t)^{1/4}z) \chi(z) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=0}^4 (1+t)^{-1-\frac{j}{4}} \left( \Theta_{\text{top}}^j + \Theta_{c,\text{top}}^j \right) (x, (1+t)^{1/4}(1-z)) \chi(1-z), \\ \psi_{\text{main}}^{\text{BL}} &:= \sum_{j=0}^4 (1+t)^{-2-\frac{j}{4}} \left( \Psi_{\text{bot}}^j + \Psi_{c,\text{bot}}^j \right) (x, (1+t)^{1/4}z) \chi(z) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=0}^4 (1+t)^{-2-\frac{j}{4}} \left( \Psi_{\text{top}}^j + \Psi_{c,\text{top}}^j \right) (x, (1+t)^{1/4}(1-z)) \chi(1-z), \end{aligned}$$

By construction, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^2\theta_{\text{main}}^{\text{BL}}|_{z=0} &= \gamma_{\text{bot},T}^0 + \gamma_{\text{bot},2}^0(1+t)^{-1/2} + \gamma_{\text{bot},3}^0(1+t)^{-3/4} \\ &\quad - \gamma_{\text{bot},2}^0(1+T)^{-1/2} - \gamma_{\text{bot},3}^0(1+T)^{-3/4} \\ &\quad + 2(1+t)^{-5/4}\partial_x^2\partial_Z^2\Theta_{\text{bot}}^3|_{Z=0} + 2(1+t)^{-3/2}\partial_x^2\partial_Z^2\Theta_{\text{bot}}^4|_{Z=0}, \\ \partial_z\Delta^2\theta_{\text{main}}^{\text{BL}}|_{z=0} &= \gamma_{\text{bot},T}^1 + \gamma_{\text{bot},1}^1(1+t)^{-1/4} + \gamma_{\text{bot},2}^1(1+t)^{-1/2} \\ &\quad - \gamma_{\text{bot},1}^1(1+T)^{-1/4} - \gamma_{\text{bot},2}^1(1+t)^{-1/2} \\ &\quad + 2(1+t)^{-1}\partial_x^2\partial_Z^3\Theta_{\text{bot}}^3|_{Z=0} + 2(1+t)^{-5/4}\partial_x^2\partial_Z^3\Theta_{\text{bot}}^4|_{Z=0}. \end{aligned}$$

Similar formulas hold at  $z = 1$ . We first lift the remaining traces thanks to a corrector  $\sigma_{\text{lift}}^{\text{lin}}$  which we define in Fourier in the following way. Let  $\zeta_4, \zeta_5 \in C_c^\infty(\mathbf{R})$  such that  $\zeta_j(Z) = Z^j/j!$  in a neighborhood of zero and such that  $\text{Supp } \zeta_j \subset (-1/4, 1/4)$ . In order to apply the last estimate of Lemma 3.5, we further choose  $\zeta_j$  so that

$$\int_0^\infty Z^k \zeta_j(Z) dZ = 0 \quad \forall k \in \{2, 3\}. \quad (4.35)$$

We then take

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\sigma}_{\text{lift}}^{\text{lin}}(t, k, z) &= 2 \sum_{l \geq 3, j=0,1} (1+t)^{-\frac{3}{2}-\frac{j+l}{4}} |k|^{-2-j} \widehat{\partial_Z^{2+j} \Theta_{\text{bot}}^l(k)}|_{Z=0} \zeta_{4+j}(|k|z(1+t)^{1/4}) \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_{l \geq 3, j=0,1} (1+t)^{-\frac{3}{2}-\frac{j+l}{4}} |k|^{-2-j} \widehat{\partial_Z^{2+j} \Theta_{\text{top}}^l(k)}|_{Z=0} \zeta_{4+j}(|k|(1-z)(1+t)^{1/4}) \end{aligned}$$

The estimates on the traces  $\Theta_a^j$  for  $j \geq 2$  (see (4.33), (4.34)) ensure that for all  $k, m \geq 0$  such that  $k + m \leq 10$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sigma_{\text{lift}}^{\text{lin}}\|_{H_x^m H_z^k} &\lesssim (\|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2)(1+t)^{-2-\frac{1}{8}+\frac{k}{4}}, \\ \|\partial_t \sigma_{\text{lift}}^{\text{lin}}\|_{H_x^m H_z^k} &\lesssim (\|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2)(1+t)^{-3-\frac{1}{8}+\frac{k}{4}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.36)$$

We define an associated corrector  $\phi_{\text{lift}}^{\text{lin}} = \Delta^{-2} \partial_x \sigma_{\text{lift}}^{\text{lin}}$ . According to Lemma 3.5 and using (4.35), we have, for all  $k, m \geq 0$  such that  $k + m \leq 13$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi_{\text{lift}}^{\text{lin}}\|_{H_x^m H_z^k} &\lesssim (\|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2)(1+t)^{-3-\frac{1}{8}+\frac{k}{4}} \\ \|\partial_t \phi_{\text{lift}}^{\text{lin}}\|_{H_x^m H_z^k} &\lesssim (\|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2)(1+t)^{-4-\frac{1}{8}+\frac{k}{4}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.37)$$

**Evaluation of the remainder.** Let us now focus on the different remainder terms in the equation satisfied by  $\theta_{\text{main}}^{\text{BL}}$ , in view of defining one last linear corrector.

- *Remainder stemming from the nonlinear term:* Using Lemma 3.4 together with the estimates on  $\Theta_a^j$ , we have, setting  $Z_{\text{bot}} = (1+t)^{1/4}z$ ,  $Z_{\text{top}} = (1+t)^{1/4}(1-z)$

$$\begin{aligned} &\nabla^\perp \psi_{\text{main}}^{\text{BL}} \cdot \nabla \theta_{\text{main}}^{\text{BL}} \\ &= \sum_{0 \leq j, k \leq 4} (1+t)^{-3-\frac{k+j-1}{4}} \left\{ \Psi_{\text{bot}}^j + \Psi_{c, \text{bot}}^j, \Theta_{\text{bot}}^k + \Theta_{c, \text{bot}}^k \right\}_{x, Z} (x, Z_{\text{bot}}) \chi(z) \\ &\quad - \sum_{0 \leq j, k \leq 4} (1+t)^{-3-\frac{k+j-1}{4}} \left\{ \Psi_{\text{top}}^j + \Psi_{c, \text{top}}^j, \Theta_{\text{top}}^k + \Theta_{c, \text{top}}^k \right\}_{x, Z} (x, Z_{\text{top}}) \chi(1-z) \\ &\quad + O(\exp(-c(1+t)^{1/5})) \quad \text{in } H^9(\Omega). \end{aligned}$$

In the above expansion, we put aside the terms corresponding to  $k = j = 0$ , which are part of  $S_a^3$  and are lifted by  $\Theta_a^3$ . If  $j + k \geq 1$ , we claim that for all  $s \leq 8$ ,

$$\left\| \left\{ \Psi_{\text{bot}}^j + \Psi_{c, \text{bot}}^j, \Theta_{\text{bot}}^k + \Theta_{c, \text{top}}^k \right\}_{x, Z} (x, (1+t)^{1/4}z) \chi(z) \right\|_{H^s} \lesssim B^2 (1+t)^{\frac{s}{4}-\frac{1}{8}},$$

and the same estimate holds for the top boundary layer. For  $s \leq 7$ , the above estimate follows simply from the estimates on  $\Psi_a^j, \Theta_a^j$ . For  $s = 8$ , there is a small difficulty rising from the fact that  $\Theta_a^4$  does not belong to  $H_x^9 L_Z^2$ . For this term, we write

$$\partial_Z \Psi_a^j \partial_x \Theta_a^4 = \frac{\partial_Z \Psi_a^j}{Z} Z \partial_x \Theta_a^4.$$

Since  $\partial_Z \Psi_a^j$  vanishes at  $Z = 0$ , both terms belong to  $H^8(\mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{R}_+)$ , and the  $H^8$  estimate follows. We infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^\perp \psi_{\text{main}}^{\text{BL}} \cdot \nabla \theta_{\text{main}}^{\text{BL}} &= (1+t)^{-11/4} \{\Psi_{\text{bot}}^0, \Theta_{\text{bot}}^0\}_{x,Z}(x, (1+t)^{1/4}z) \chi(z) \\ &\quad - (1+t)^{-11/4} \{\Psi_{\text{top}}^0, \Theta_{\text{top}}^0\}_{x,Z}(x, (1+t)^{1/4}(1-z)) \chi(1-z) \\ &\quad + R_{NL}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.38)$$

where for all  $s \in [0, 8]$ ,

$$\|R_{NL}\|_{H^s} \lesssim B^2(1+t)^{-3+\frac{s}{4}-\frac{1}{8}}. \quad (4.39)$$

- *Remainder stemming from the Taylor expansion of  $G$* : As explained in the construction of  $\Theta_a^2, \Theta_a^3$ , when defining the boundary layer term, we replaced  $G$  by its Taylor expansion in the vicinity of  $z = 0$  and  $z = 1$ . Recalling (4.18), we have, in the vicinity of  $z = 0$ , setting  $Z = (1+t)^{1/4}z$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} G \partial_x \psi_{\text{main}}^{\text{BL}} &= \frac{1}{2(1+t)^{1/2}} g_{\text{bot},\infty}^2 Z^2 \partial_x \psi_{\text{main}}^{\text{BL}} + \frac{1}{6(1+t)^{3/4}} g_{\text{bot},\infty}^3 Z^3 \partial_x \psi_{\text{main}}^{\text{BL}} \\ &\quad + O((1+t)^{-1}(Z^2 + Z^4) \partial_x \psi_{\text{main}}^{\text{BL}}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2(1+t)^{5/2}} g_{\text{bot},\infty}^2 Z^2 \partial_x \Psi_{\text{bot}}^0(x, Z) \chi(z) \\ &\quad + (1+t)^{-11/4} \left( \frac{g_{\text{bot},\infty}^2}{2} Z^2 \partial_x \Psi_{\text{bot}}^1(x, Z) + \frac{g_{\text{bot},\infty}^3}{6} Z^3 \partial_x \Psi_{\text{bot}}^0(x, Z) \right) \chi(z) \\ &\quad + R_G, \end{aligned}$$

where the first two terms enter the definition of  $\Theta_{\text{bot}}^2$  and  $\Theta_{\text{bot}}^3$  respectively, and the remainder term  $R_G$  satisfies

$$\|R_G\|_{H^s} \lesssim B^2(1+t)^{-3-\frac{1}{8}+\frac{s}{4}} \quad \forall s \in \{0, \dots, 8\}. \quad (4.40)$$

- *Remainder stemming from  $\psi^{\text{BL}} - \Delta^{-2} \partial_x \theta^{\text{BL}}$* : We now address the fact that  $\Delta^2 \psi_{\text{main}}^{\text{BL}}$  is not equal to  $\partial_x \theta_{\text{main}}^{\text{BL}}$ . More precisely, using the definition of  $\Psi_a^j$ , we have, in  $\Omega \cap \{z \leq 1/2\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^2 \psi_{\text{main}}^{\text{BL}} - \partial_x \theta_{\text{main}}^{\text{BL}} &= 2 \sum_{j=3,4} (1+t)^{-2-\frac{j-2}{4}} \partial_x^2 \partial_Z^2 \Psi_{\text{bot}}^j(x, (1+t)^{1/4}z) \chi(z) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j \geq 1} (1+t)^{-2-\frac{j}{4}} \partial_x^4 \Psi_{\text{bot}}^j(x, (1+t)^{1/4}z) \chi(z) \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_{j=1,2} (1+t)^{-2-\frac{j-2}{4}} \partial_x^2 \partial_Z^2 \Psi_{c,\text{bot}}^j(x, (1+t)^{1/4}z) \chi(z) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j \geq 0} (1+t)^{-2-\frac{j}{4}} \partial_x^4 \Psi_{c,\text{bot}}^j(x, (1+t)^{1/4}z) \chi(z) \\ &\quad + O(\exp(-c(1+t)^{1/5})) \quad \text{in } H^8(\Omega). \end{aligned}$$

A similar expression holds in  $\Omega \cap \{z \geq 1/2\}$ , replacing bot with top and  $z$  with  $1-z$ . The exponentially small remainder comes from the commutator of the bilaplacian with multiplication by  $\chi$  (see Lemma 3.4), and from the estimates on  $\Psi_a^j, \Psi_{c,a}^j$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_x \psi_{\text{main}}^{\text{BL}} - \Delta^{-2} \partial_x^2 \theta_{\text{main}}^{\text{BL}} &=: R_{\Delta^2}, \\ \text{with } \|R_{\Delta^2}\|_{H^s} &\lesssim (\|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2)(1+t)^{-3-\frac{1}{8}+\frac{s}{4}} \quad \forall s \in \{0, \dots, 9\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.41)$$

Note that the decay of this remainder is similar to the one of  $R_{NL}$  and  $R_G$ , but its order of magnitude is  $B$ . Hence we call it a “linear” remainder, and it cannot be included in a bootstrap argument. Therefore we will lift it thanks to another (linear) corrector.

- *Remainder stemming from  $\sigma_{\text{lift}}^{\text{lin}}$* : Recalling (4.36), (4.37), we have, setting  $R_{c,\text{lin}} = \partial_t \sigma_{\text{lift}}^{\text{lin}} - \Delta^{-2} \partial_x^2 \sigma_{\text{lift}}^{\text{lin}}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|R_{c,\text{lin}}\|_{H_x^m H_z^k} &\lesssim (\|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2)(1+t)^{-3+\frac{k}{4}-\frac{1}{8}}, \\ \|G\Delta^{-2}\partial_x^2\sigma_{\text{lift}}^{\text{lin}}\|_{H_x^m H_z^k} &\lesssim B^2(1+t)^{-3+\frac{k}{4}-\frac{1}{8}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.42)$$

Once again,  $R_{c,\text{lin}}$  is a linear remainder, and must be lifted before the bootstrap argument of the next subsection.

In the remainders above, all terms of order  $B^2(1+t)^{-3}$  in  $L^2$  will be included in the remainder for the interior part (see Section 4.5), while the terms of order  $B(1+t)^{-3}$  will be lifted thanks to a linear corrector  $\sigma^{\text{rem}}$ , which we now construct.

**Definition of  $\sigma^{\text{rem}}$ .** Let  $\sigma^{\text{rem}}$  be the solution of

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \sigma^{\text{rem}} &= \partial_x^2 \Delta^{-2} \sigma^{\text{rem}} - R_{\Delta^2} - R_{c,\text{lin}}, \\ \sigma^{\text{rem}}(t=0) &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.43)$$

Note that  $\partial_t \sigma^{\text{rem}}|_{\partial\Omega} = \partial_t \partial_n \sigma^{\text{rem}}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ , and therefore  $\sigma^{\text{rem}}|_{\partial\Omega} = \partial_n \sigma^{\text{rem}}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$  for all  $t > 0$ . Applying  $\Delta^2$  to the above equation and taking the trace at  $z = 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \Delta^2 \sigma^{\text{rem}}|_{z=0} &= -\Delta^2 (R_{\Delta^2} + R_{c,\text{lin}})|_{z=0} \\ &= -\partial_x \Delta^2 \psi_{\text{main}}^{\text{BL}}|_{z=0} - \partial_t \partial_z^4 \sigma_{\text{lift}}^{\text{lin}}|_{z=0} \\ &= -2 \sum_{j \geq 3} (1+t)^{-2-\frac{j-2}{4}} \partial_x^3 \partial_z^2 \Psi_{\text{bot}}^j|_{z=0} + 2 \sum_{j \geq 3} \frac{2+j}{4} (1+t)^{-2-\frac{j-2}{4}} \partial_x^2 \partial_z^2 \Theta_{\text{bot}}^j|_{z=0} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $\Delta^2 \sigma^{\text{rem}}|_{z=0} = 0$  for all  $t \in (0, T)$ . In a similar way,  $\partial_z \Delta^2 \sigma^{\text{rem}}|_{z=0} = 0$  for all  $t \in (0, T)$ , and the same properties hold at  $z = 1$ . Applying Proposition 2.6, (2.4), we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta^4 \sigma^{\text{rem}}\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2, \quad \|\partial_x^2 \Delta^2 \sigma^{\text{rem}}\|_{L^2} \lesssim (\|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2)(1+t)^{-1}, \\ \|\partial_x^4 \sigma^{\text{rem}}\|_{L^2} &\lesssim (\|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2)(1+t)^{-2}, \\ \|\partial_t \partial_x^4 \sigma^{\text{rem}}\|_{L^2} &\lesssim (\|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2)(1+t)^{-3}, \quad \|\partial_x^6 \Delta^{-2} \sigma^{\text{rem}}\|_{L^2} \lesssim (\|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2)(1+t)^{-3}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, looking at the expressions of  $R_{\Delta^2}$  and  $R_{c,\text{lin}}$  and recalling the estimates on  $\Psi_a^j$ , we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta^4 \sigma^{\text{rem}}\|_{H_x^{3/4} L_z^2} + \|\Delta^4 \sigma^{\text{rem}}\|_{L_x^2 H_z^1} &\lesssim \|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2, \\ \|z \Delta^4 \sigma^{\text{rem}}\|_{H_x^1 L_z^2(z \leq 1/2)} + \|(1-z) \Delta^4 \sigma^{\text{rem}}\|_{H_x^1 L_z^2(z \geq 1/2)} &\lesssim \|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2. \end{aligned}$$

**Conclusion.** Let

$$\theta^{\text{BL}} := \theta_{\text{main}}^{\text{BL}} + \sigma_{\text{lin}}^{\text{lift}} + \sigma^{\text{rem}}.$$

Then  $\theta^{\text{BL}}$  satisfies the boundary conditions stated in Lemma 4.8. Most of the remainder terms have already been evaluated. There only remains to evaluate the quadratic terms involving  $\sigma_{\text{lin}}^{\text{lift}}$  and  $\sigma^{\text{rem}}$ . We have for instance, for all  $s \leq 7$ ,

$$\|\nabla^\perp \psi_{\text{main}}^{\text{BL}} \cdot \nabla \sigma^{\text{rem}}\|_{H^s} \lesssim B^2(1+t)^{-2+\frac{1+s}{4}} (1+t)^{-2+\frac{1}{4}} \lesssim B^2(1+t)^{-\frac{7}{2}+\frac{s}{4}},$$

and for the  $H^8$  estimate, we write as before, for  $z \leq 1/2$ ,

$$\partial_x \psi_{\text{main}}^{\text{BL}} \partial_z \sigma^{\text{rem}} = \frac{\partial_x \psi_{\text{main}}^{\text{BL}}}{z} z \partial_z \sigma^{\text{rem}}.$$

Both terms in the right-hand side belong to  $H^8$ , and we infer

$$\|\nabla^\perp \psi_{\text{main}}^{\text{BL}} \cdot \nabla \sigma^{\text{rem}}\|_{H^8} \lesssim B^2(1+t)^{-5/4}.$$

The statement of Lemma 4.8 follows.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 4.10.* Assume that  $\theta^{\text{rem}} = \theta' - \theta^{\text{BL}}$  satisfies (4.3), and define  $\Gamma_{a,T}^j$  as in Lemma 4.5. According to Lemma 4.5,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Gamma_{a,T}^j(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbf{T})} &\lesssim B^2(1+t)^{-1+\frac{j}{4}}, \\ \|\partial_t \Gamma_{a,T}^j(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbf{T})} &\lesssim B^2(1+t)^{-2+\frac{j}{4}}, \\ \|\Gamma_{a,T}^j(t)\|_{H^4(\mathbf{T})} &\lesssim B^2(1+t)^{-\frac{23}{24}+\frac{j}{4}}. \end{aligned}$$

We now lift these traces thanks to a corrector  $\sigma_{\text{lift}}^{\text{NL}}$ , whose definition is similar to the one of  $\sigma_{\text{lift}}^{\text{lin}}$ , namely

$$\widehat{\sigma_{\text{lift}}^{\text{NL}}}(t, k, z) = \sum_{j=0,1} (1+t)^{-1-\frac{j}{4}} |k|^{-4-j} \widehat{\Gamma_{\text{bot},T}^j}(t, k) \zeta_{4+j}(|k|z(1+t)^{1/4}) \quad (4.44)$$

$$+ \sum_{j=0,1} (1+t)^{-1-\frac{j}{4}} |k|^{-4-j} \widehat{\Gamma_{\text{top},T}^j}(t, k) \zeta_{4+j}(|k|(1-z)(1+t)^{1/4}) \quad (4.45)$$

where we recall that  $\zeta_j \in C_c^\infty(\mathbf{R})$ ,  $\zeta(Z) = Z^j/j!$  in a neighborhood of zero, and  $\zeta_j$  satisfies (4.35). It follows from the above estimates and from the formulas that for  $l = 0, 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t^l \sigma_{\text{lift}}^{\text{NL}}\|_{H_x^m H_z^k} &\lesssim B^2(1+t)^{-2-l+\frac{k}{4}-\frac{1}{8}} \quad \text{if } k+m \leq 9/2, \\ \|\sigma_{\text{lift}}^{\text{NL}}\|_{H^{17/2}(\Omega)} &\lesssim B^2(1+t)^{-1/12}, \\ \|z \sigma_{\text{lift}}^{\text{NL}}\|_{H^{19/2}(\Omega \cap \{z \leq 1/2\})} + \|(1-z) \sigma_{\text{lift}}^{\text{NL}}\|_{H^{19/2}(\Omega \cap \{z \geq 1/2\})} &\lesssim B^2(1+t)^{-1/12}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.46)$$

Furthermore, the function  $\sigma_{\text{lift}}^{\text{NL}}$  has been designed so that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^2 \sigma_{\text{lift}}^{\text{NL}}|_{z=0} &= \Gamma_{\text{bot}}^0(t), & \partial_z \Delta^2 \sigma_{\text{lift}}^{\text{NL}}|_{z=0} &= \Gamma_{\text{bot}}^1(t), \\ \Delta^2 \sigma_{\text{lift}}^{\text{NL}}|_{z=1} &= \Gamma_{\text{top}}^0(t), & \partial_z \Delta^2 \sigma_{\text{lift}}^{\text{NL}}|_{z=1} &= \Gamma_{\text{top}}^1(t). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, according to Lemma 3.5 and using (4.35), we have, for all  $k, m \geq 0$  such that  $k+m \leq 12$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta^{-2} \sigma_{\text{lift}}^{\text{NL}}\|_{H_x^m H_z^k} &\lesssim B^2(1+t)^{-3-\frac{1}{8}+\frac{k}{4}} \\ \|\partial_t \Delta^{-2} \sigma_{\text{lift}}^{\text{NL}}\|_{H_x^m H_z^k} &\lesssim B^2(1+t)^{-4-\frac{1}{8}+\frac{k}{4}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.47)$$

The statement of Lemma 4.10 follows immediately from these estimates and from Lemmas 4.5 and 4.8.  $\square$



## 4.5 Bootstrap argument for $\theta^{\text{int}}$

In this subsection, we complete the proof of Theorem 1.3 thanks to a bootstrap argument. We start with an initial data  $\theta_0 \in H^{14}(\Omega)$ , with  $\|\theta_0\|_{H^s(\Omega)} \leq B$  and  $\theta_0 = \partial_n \theta_0 = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$ . We assume that  $B \leq B_0 < 1$ , where  $B_0$  is a small universal constant, so that Theorem 1.1 holds.

Let  $\bar{C} \geq 2$  be a universal constant to be determined. We define

$$T_1 = \sup \{T > 0, (4.4) \text{ holds on } (0, T) \text{ with } B = \bar{C}\|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}}\}. \quad (4.48)$$

By continuity,  $T_1 > 0$ . For any  $T \in (0, T_1)$ , we define an associated boundary layer profile  $\theta_T^{\text{BL}}$  (see Lemma 4.8 and Remark 4.9). We recall that there exists a universal constant  $C_1$  such that for all  $m, k \geq 0$  with  $k + m \leq 8$ , for all  $T \in (0, T_1)$ ,

$$\|\theta_T^{\text{BL}}\|_{H_x^m H_z^k} \leq C_1 \bar{C} \|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} (1+t)^{-1+\frac{k}{4}-\frac{1}{8}}.$$

We then introduce a new time

$$T_2 = \sup \{T \in (0, T_1), \theta^{\text{rem}} = \theta' - \theta_T^{\text{BL}} \text{ satisfies (4.3) on } (0, T) \text{ with } B = 2(1+C_1)\bar{C}\|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}}\}. \quad (4.49)$$

On  $(0, T_2)$ , according to Lemma 4.10, we construct an approximate solution  $\theta^{\text{app}}$ . We now set  $\theta^{\text{int}} = \theta' - \theta^{\text{app}} = \theta^{\text{rem}} - \sigma_{\text{lift}}^{\text{NL}}$ . Note that we can always choose  $\|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}}$  small enough so that for all  $t \in (0, T_2)$ , for  $0 \leq k + m \leq 8$ ,

$$\|\sigma_{\text{lift}}^{\text{NL}}\|_{H_x^m H_z^k} \leq \bar{C} \|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} (1+t)^{-2+\frac{k}{4}-\frac{1}{8}}.$$

Consequently,  $\theta^{\text{int}}$  satisfies (4.3) with  $B = (3 + 2C_1)\bar{C}\|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}}$  on  $(0, T_2)$ .

Our goal is now to prove that  $T_1 = T_2 = +\infty$  for a suitable choice of  $\bar{C}$ , provided  $\|\theta_0'\|_{H^{14}}$  is sufficiently small. To that end, we check that  $\Delta^2 \theta^{\text{int}}$  satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 2.6.

By construction (see Lemma 4.10),

$$\theta^{\text{int}} = \partial_n \theta^{\text{int}} = \Delta^2 \theta^{\text{int}} = \partial_n \Delta^2 \theta^{\text{int}} = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega.$$

Furthermore, defining the quadratic form

$$Q(f, g) = -(\nabla^\perp \Delta^{-2} \partial_x f \cdot \nabla g)',$$

we have, recalling Lemma 4.10,

$$\partial_t \theta^{\text{int}} = (1-G)\partial_x^2 \Delta^{-2} \theta^{\text{int}} + S_{\text{rem}}^1, \quad (4.50)$$

where

$$S_{\text{rem}}^1 = -S_{\text{rem}}^0 Q(\theta^{\text{app}} + \theta^{\text{int}}, \theta^{\text{int}}) + Q(\theta^{\text{int}}, \theta^{\text{app}}).$$

We claim that we have the following estimates on  $S_{\text{rem}}^1$ :

**Lemma 4.11** (Estimates on  $S_{\text{rem}}^1$ ). *Let  $T_2$  be defined by (4.49).*

- $L^2$  and  $H^4$  estimates: for  $0 \leq s \leq 4$ , for all  $t \in [0, T^*)$ ,

$$\|S_{\text{rem}}^1(t)\|_{H^s} \lesssim B^2 \frac{1}{(1+t)^{3-\frac{s}{4}}};$$

- $H^8$  estimate: there exists  $S_{\text{rem}}^2, S_{\perp}^2 \in L^\infty([0, T^*), L^2(\Omega))$  such that  $\Delta^4 S_{\text{rem}}^0(t) = S_{\text{rem}}^2 + S_{\perp}^2$ , with

$$\|S_{\text{rem}}^2(t)\|_{L^2} \lesssim B^2 \frac{1}{(1+t)^{9/8}} \quad \forall t \in [0, T^*) \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Omega} S_{\perp}^2(t) \Delta^4 \theta^{\text{rem}}(t) = 0.$$

- Estimates on the time derivative: for all  $t \in [0, T^*)$ ,

$$\|\partial_t S_{\text{rem}}^0(t)\|_{L^2} \lesssim B^2 \frac{1}{(1+t)^4}.$$

Furthermore, there exists  $S_{\text{rem}}^3, S_{\perp}^3 \in L^\infty([0, T^*), L^2(\Omega))$  such that  $\Delta^2 \partial_t S_{\text{rem}}^0(t) = S_{\text{rem}}^3 + S_{\perp}^3$ , with

$$\|S_{\text{rem}}^3(t)\|_{L^2} \lesssim B^2 \frac{1}{(1+t)^3} \quad \forall t \in [0, T^*) \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Omega} S_{\perp}^3(t) \Delta^2 \partial_t \theta^{\text{rem}}(t) = 0.$$

*Proof.* We estimate each term separately. The estimates on  $S_{\text{rem}}^0$  have already been proved in the previous paragraph. Therefore we focus on the quadratic terms. It follows from the estimates of Lemma 4.8, Lemma 4.10 and from the definition of  $\theta^{\text{app}}$  that for  $s \in \{0, \dots, 7\}$ ,

$$\|Q(\theta^{\text{app}} + \theta^{\text{int}}, \theta^{\text{int}})\|_{H^s} \lesssim B^2 (1+t)^{-4 + \frac{s+1}{4}}.$$

For  $s = 8$ , the situation is slightly different, because  $\Delta^4 Q(\theta^{\text{app}} + \theta^{\text{int}}, \theta^{\text{int}})$  involves derivatives of order 9 of  $\theta^{\text{int}}$ , for which we have no estimate. Therefore we decompose  $\Delta^4 Q(\theta^{\text{app}} + \theta^{\text{int}}, \theta^{\text{int}})$  into two parts, writing

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^4 Q(\theta^{\text{app}} + \theta^{\text{int}}, \theta^{\text{int}}) &= - (\nabla^{\perp} \Delta^{-2} \partial_x (\theta^{\text{app}} + \theta^{\text{int}})) \cdot \nabla \Delta^4 \theta^{\text{int}} \\ &\quad - \partial_z^8 \overline{\nabla^{\perp} \Delta^{-2} \partial_x (\theta^{\text{app}} + \theta^{\text{int}})} \cdot \theta^{\text{int}} \\ &\quad - [\Delta^4, \nabla^{\perp} \Delta^{-2} \partial_x (\theta^{\text{app}} + \theta^{\text{int}}) \cdot \nabla] \theta^{\text{int}}. \end{aligned}$$

It can be easily checked that the term  $[\Delta^4, \nabla^{\perp} \Delta^{-2} \partial_x (\theta^{\text{app}} + \theta^{\text{int}}) \cdot \nabla] \theta^{\text{int}}$  can be evaluated as above, and we have

$$\|[\Delta^4, \nabla^{\perp} \Delta^{-2} \partial_x (\theta^{\text{app}} + \theta^{\text{int}}) \cdot \nabla] \theta^{\text{int}}\|_{L^2} \lesssim B^2 (1+t)^{-2 + \frac{9}{4}} (1+t)^{-2 + \frac{1}{4}} \lesssim B^2 (1+t)^{-3/2}.$$

Furthermore, since  $\langle \Delta^4 \theta^{\text{int}}(t, \cdot, z) \rangle = 0$  for all  $t, z$ ,

$$\int_{\Omega} \partial_z^8 \overline{\nabla^{\perp} \Delta^{-2} \partial_x (\theta^{\text{app}} + \theta^{\text{int}})} \cdot \theta^{\text{int}} \Delta^4 \theta^{\text{int}} = 0.$$

Eventually, integrating by parts the remaining term,

$$- \int_{\Omega} ((\nabla^{\perp} \Delta^{-2} \partial_x (\theta^{\text{app}} + \theta^{\text{int}})) \cdot \nabla \Delta^4 \theta^{\text{int}}) \Delta^4 \theta^{\text{int}} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \nabla \cdot (\nabla^{\perp} \Delta^{-2} \partial_x (\theta^{\text{app}} + \theta^{\text{int}})) |\Delta^4 \theta^{\text{int}}|^2 = 0.$$

Therefore, setting

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\perp}^2 &= - \nabla^{\perp} \Delta^{-2} \partial_x (\theta^{\text{app}} + \theta^{\text{int}}) \cdot \nabla \Delta^4 \theta^{\text{int}} - \partial_z^8 \overline{\nabla^{\perp} \Delta^{-2} \partial_x (\theta^{\text{app}} + \theta^{\text{int}})} \cdot \theta^{\text{int}}, \\ S_{\text{rem}}^2 &= \Delta^4 Q(\theta^{\text{int}}, \theta^{\text{app}}) - [\Delta^4, \nabla^{\perp} \Delta^{-2} \partial_x (\theta^{\text{app}} + \theta^{\text{int}}) \cdot \nabla] \theta^{\text{int}}, \end{aligned}$$

we obtain the desired  $H^8$  estimates.

We now need to estimate the time derivative of  $S_{\text{rem}}^1$  in  $L^2$  and  $H^4$ . Note that the definition of  $T_2$  (see (4.49)) ensures that

$$\|\partial_t \theta^{\text{int}}(t)\|_{L^2} \leq B(1+t)^{-3}, \quad \|\partial_t \theta^{\text{int}}(t)\|_{H^4} \leq B(1+t)^{-2}.$$

Setting  $\psi^{\text{int}} = \Delta^{-2} \partial_x \theta^{\text{int}}$ , it follows that

$$\|\partial_t \psi^{\text{int}}\|_{H^3} \lesssim B(1+t)^{-3}, \quad \|\partial_t \psi^{\text{int}}\|_{H^7} \lesssim B(1+t)^{-2}.$$

From there, differentiating with respect to time  $S_{\text{rem}}^1$ , we obtain the desired estimate in  $L^2$ . The only problematic term is  $\partial_t \partial_x \psi^{\text{int}} \partial_z \theta^{\text{app}}$ , which we decompose as

$$\partial_t \partial_x \psi^{\text{int}} \partial_z \theta^{\text{app}} \chi(z) + \partial_t \partial_x \psi^{\text{int}} \partial_z \theta^{\text{app}} (1 - \chi(z)),$$

with  $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbf{R})$  such that  $\chi \equiv 1$  in a neighbourhood of zero and  $\chi(z) = 0$  for  $|z| \geq 1/2$ . Let us consider the first term. Recalling that  $\psi^{\text{int}}(z=0) = 0$ , we write, using the Hardy inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t \partial_x \psi^{\text{int}} \partial_z \theta^{\text{app}} \chi(z)\|_{L^2} &\leq \left\| \frac{1}{z} \partial_t \partial_x \psi^{\text{int}} \right\|_{L^2} \|z \partial_z \theta^{\text{app}} \chi(z)\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim \|\partial_t \partial_x \partial_z \psi^{\text{int}}\|_{L^2} \|z \partial_z \theta^{\text{app}} \chi(z)\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim B(1+t)^{-3} \times B(1+t)^{-1} \lesssim B^2(1+t)^{-4}. \end{aligned}$$

The term involving  $(1 - \chi(z))$  is treated similarly, exchanging the roles of  $z = 0$  and  $z = 1$ .

The decomposition of  $\Delta^2 \partial_t S_{\text{rem}}^1$  goes along the same lines as the one of  $\Delta^4 S_{\text{rem}}^1$  and is left to the reader. □

**Conclusion.** We apply the operator  $\Delta^2$  to equation (4.50). We recall that by construction,  $\Delta^2 \theta^{\text{int}} = \partial_n \Delta^2 \theta^{\text{int}} = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$ . We obtain

$$\partial_t \Delta^2 \theta^{\text{int}} = (1 - G) \partial_x \theta^{\text{int}} + \Delta^2 S_{\text{rem}}^1 - \sum_{k=1}^4 \binom{4}{k} \partial_z^k G \partial_z^{4-k} \partial_x \psi^{\text{int}} - 2 \sum_{k=1}^2 \binom{2}{k} \partial_z^k G \partial_z^{2-k} \partial_x^2 \psi^{\text{int}}.$$

Let us now check that the assumptions of Proposition 2.6 are satisfied. The decay assumptions on  $\Delta^2 S_{\text{rem}}^1$  follow from Lemma 4.11. Therefore it suffices to check that the decay of the two commutator terms (involving derivatives of  $G$ ) satisfy the desired bounds. We focus on the first term, which involves the largest number of  $z$ -derivatives. By definition of  $T_2$  and according to the bounds of  $G$  (see Lemma 4.1), we have, for all  $t \in (0, T_2)$ , for  $k \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_z^k G \partial_z^{4-k} \partial_x \psi^{\text{int}}(t)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim B^2(1+t)^{-2}, \\ \|\partial_z^k G \partial_z^{4-k} \partial_x \psi^{\text{int}}(t)\|_{H^4} &\lesssim B^2(1+t)^{\frac{9}{8}-3+\frac{1}{4}} + B^2(1+t)^{-5/4} \lesssim B^2(1+t)^{-5/4}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, for  $k \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$ ,

$$\|\partial_t \partial_z^k G \partial_z^{4-k} \partial_x \psi^{\text{int}}(t)\|_{L^2} \lesssim B^3(1+t)^{\frac{k+3}{4}-3-\frac{1}{8}-3+\frac{4-k}{4}} \lesssim B^2(1+t)^{-\frac{17}{4}-\frac{1}{8}}.$$

According to Proposition 2.6, there exists a universal constant  $C_2$  such that for all  $t \in (0, T^*)$ , setting  $B = (3 + 2C_1) \bar{C} \|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}}$  (see (4.49)),

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta^2 \theta^{\text{int}}(t)\|_{L^2} &\leq C_2 (\|\theta^{\text{rem}}(t=0)\|_{H^8} + B^2) (1+t)^{-1}, \\ \|\Delta^2 \theta^{\text{int}}(t)\|_{H^4} &\leq C_2 (\|\theta^{\text{rem}}(t=0)\|_{H^8} + B^2), \\ \|\partial_x \theta^{\text{int}}(t)\|_{L^2} &\leq C_2 (\|\theta^{\text{rem}}(t=0)\|_{H^8} + B^2) (1+t)^{-2}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.51}$$

There remains to bound  $\partial_t \theta^{\text{int}}$  and  $\psi^{\text{int}}$  in  $L^2$ . To that end, we differentiate (4.50) with respect to time, and we obtain

$$\partial_t \partial_t \theta^{\text{int}} = (1 - G) \partial_x \partial_t \psi^{\text{int}} + \partial_t S_{\text{rem}}^1 - \partial_t G \partial_x \psi^{\text{int}}.$$

The source term  $\partial_t S_{\text{rem}}^1$  is evaluated in Lemma 4.11. As for the commutator term, we have

$$\|\partial_t G \partial_x \psi^{\text{int}}\|_{L^2} \leq \|\partial_t G\|_{L^2} \|\partial_x \psi^{\text{int}}\|_{\infty} \lesssim B^3 (1+t)^{\frac{3}{8}-3-2} \lesssim B^3 (1+t)^{-4}.$$

Using Proposition 2.6, we find that for any  $t \in (0, T_2)$ ,

$$\|\partial_t \theta^{\text{int}}\|_{L^2} \leq C_2 (\|\theta^{\text{int}}(t=0)\|_{H^8} + B^2) \frac{1}{(1+t)^3}.$$

Using equation (4.50),

$$\|\partial_x \psi^{\text{int}}(t)\|_{L^2} \leq C_2 (\|\theta^{\text{int}}(t=0)\|_{H^8} + B^2) \frac{1}{(1+t)^3} \quad \forall t \in (0, T_2).$$

Grouping these estimates with the ones on  $\sigma_{\text{ift}}^{\text{NL}}$  from Lemma 4.10, we infer that up to a change of the constant  $C_2$ , for any  $t \in (0, T_2)$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\theta^{\text{rem}}(t)\|_{H^s} &\leq C_2 (\|\theta_0\|_{H^8} + B^2) (1+t)^{-2+\frac{s}{4}} \quad \forall s \in \{0, \dots, 8\}, \\ \|\psi^{\text{rem}}(t)\|_{H^s} &\leq C_2 (\|\theta_0\|_{H^8} + B^2) (1+t)^{-3+\frac{s}{4}} \quad \forall s \in \{0, \dots, 8\}, \\ \|\partial_t \theta^{\text{rem}}(t)\|_{H^s} &\leq C_2 (\|\theta_0\|_{H^8} + B^2) (1+t)^{-3+\frac{s}{4}} \quad \forall s \in \{0, \dots, 4\}. \end{aligned}$$

We now recall that  $B = (3 + 2C_1) \bar{C} \|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}}$  for some constant  $\bar{C}$  that remains to be chosen. We want to pick  $\bar{C}$  so that

$$C_2 (\|\theta_0\|_{H^8} + (3 + 2C_1)^2 \bar{C}^2 \|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}}^2) \leq (1 + C_1) \bar{C} \|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}}.$$

It is sufficient to take  $C_b$  such that  $2C_2 \leq (1 + C_1) \bar{C}$ , and  $\|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}}$  sufficiently small. We then infer that the bounds within (4.49) are satisfied with  $B$  replaced by  $B/2$ . It follows that  $T_2 = T_1$ . From there, recalling the estimates on  $\theta^{\text{BL}}$ , we deduce that there exists a universal constant  $C_3$  such that for all  $t \in (0, T_1)$ , for all  $k \in \{4, \dots, 8\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_x^k \theta'\|_{L^2} &\leq \|\partial_x^k \theta^{\text{BL}}\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x^k \theta^{\text{rem}}\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C_3 (\|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2) \left( (1+t)^{-9/8} + (1+t)^{\frac{k-8}{2}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Similar estimates hold for  $\partial_z^k \theta'$  and  $\partial_x^5 \psi$  in  $L^2$ . Hence we further choose the constant  $\bar{C}$  so that

$$2C_3 (\|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}} + B^2) \leq \bar{C} \|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}}$$

provided  $\|\theta_0\|_{H^{14}}$  is sufficiently small. We conclude that  $T_1 = +\infty$ . Theorem 1.3 follows.

## A Well-posedness of the Stokes-transport equation in Sobolev spaces

The aim of this section is to prove the well-posedness of the Stokes-transport on the domain of interest of the present paper, namely  $\Omega = \mathbf{T} \times (0, 1)$ . The proof is also valid on any regular enough bounded domain of  $\mathbf{R}^d$  with  $d = 2$  or  $3$ .

**Theorem A.1.** *Let  $\Omega$  satisfy either*

1.  $\Omega = \mathbf{T} \times (0, 1)$ ;

2.  $\Omega$  is a simply connected compact subdomain of  $\mathbf{R}^d$ ,  $d = 2, 3$  regular enough.

Let  $m \geq 3$ ,  $\rho_0 \in H^m(\Omega)$  (and  $\Omega$  of regularity  $C^{m+2}$ ). The system

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \rho = 0 \\ -\Delta \mathbf{u} + \nabla p = -\rho \mathbf{e}_z \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0 \\ \mathbf{u}|_{\partial\Omega} = \mathbf{0} \\ \rho|_{t=0} = 0, \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

has a unique global solution for the present regularity

$$(\rho, \mathbf{u}) \in C(\mathbf{R}_+; H^m(\Omega)) \times C(\mathbf{R}_+; H^{m+2}(\Omega)).$$

Moreover, the solution obeys the following energy estimate

$$\|\rho(t)\|_{H^m} \leq \|\rho_0\|_{H^m} \exp\left(C \int_0^t \|\nabla \mathbf{u}(s)\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla \rho(s)\|_{L^\infty} ds\right). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

This result requires rather classical techniques. It also relies on a previous work of one of the author [Leb22], including in particular the well-posedness in a weak sense of the system (A.1).

**A priori estimate.** Formally, the energy estimate for any derivative of order  $m$  writes

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\partial^m \rho\|_{L^2}^2 = - \int_{\Omega} [\partial^m, \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla] \rho \partial^m \rho,$$

due to the divergence free condition satisfied by  $\mathbf{u}$ . We apply the tame estimate (2.22), together with the continuous Sobolev embedding of  $H^m(\Omega)$  in  $L^\infty(\Omega)$  and the Stokes equation regularization estimate to get

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\partial^m \rho\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim (\|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^\infty}) \|\rho\|_{H^m}^2. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

One therefore obtains the same inequality with the complete  $H^m$  norm on the left-hand-side, and the estimate (A.2) follows. This energy estimate tells us that  $\rho$  remains in  $H^m(\Omega)$  as long as  $\|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty}$  and  $\|\nabla \rho\|_{L^\infty}$  are integrable in time. Regarding the properties we know from [Leb22] about the solutions of this equation it is enough to prove that the solution exists globally, and is unique. Let us recall from [Gal11, Theorem IV.6.1] and [Leb22, Section 2.1] that the source term and the solution of the Stokes equation satisfy for all time

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^m} \lesssim \|\rho\|_{H^{m-2}}, \quad \|\mathbf{u}\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \lesssim \|\rho\|_{L^\infty}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Also, the uniform norm of  $\rho$  is constant by incompressibility condition. We also observe that

$$\|\nabla \rho\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|\nabla \rho_0\|_{L^\infty} \exp\left(C \int_0^t \|\nabla \mathbf{u}(s)\|_{L^\infty} ds\right) \leq \|\nabla \rho_0\|_{L^\infty} \exp(C \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} t). \quad (\text{A.5})$$

All these consideration put together lead to

$$\|\rho\|_{H^m} \leq \|\rho_0\|_{H^m} \exp\left(C \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} t + \frac{\|\nabla \rho_0\|_{L^\infty}}{\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}} (\exp(C \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} t) - 1)\right). \quad (\text{A.6})$$

This suggests that it is enough for  $\rho_0$  to belong to  $W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$  for the solution to exist globally in time, which is satisfied here since  $\rho_0 \in H^m(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$  for  $m$  large enough to ensure this embedding.

**Proof.** An iterative scheme allows to formalize the previous considerations. Let  $\rho^0 : t \mapsto \rho_0$  which belongs to  $C(\mathbf{R}_+; H^m(\Omega))$ . Now if  $\rho^N$  belongs to  $C(\mathbf{R}_+; H^m(\Omega))$ , which is true for  $N = 0$ , we know that the Stokes system

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta \mathbf{u}^N + \nabla p^N = -\rho^N \mathbf{e}_z \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}^N = 0 \\ \mathbf{u}^N|_{\partial\Omega} = \mathbf{0} \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

admits for any time a unique solution  $\mathbf{u}^N(t) \in H^{m+2}(\Omega)$  obeying inequalities (A.4). By linearity of the problem,  $\mathbf{u}^N$  in  $H^{m+2}(\Omega)$  inherits the continuity of  $\rho^N$  in  $H^m(\Omega)$ . Then since  $\mathbf{u}^N$  belongs in particular to  $C(\mathbf{R}_+; H^{m+2}(\Omega))$ , the transport equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho^{N+1} + \mathbf{u}^N \cdot \nabla \rho^{N+1} = 0 \\ \rho^{N+1}|_{t=0} = \rho_0, \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

has a unique strong solution  $\rho^{N+1} \in C(\mathbf{R}_+; H^k(\Omega))$ . This concludes the definition of a sequences  $(\rho^N)_N$  and  $(\mathbf{u}^N)_N$ . We thereafter show that for any  $T > 0$  the sequence  $(\rho^N)_N$  is bounded in  $L^\infty(0, T; H^m(\Omega))$  and equicontinuous in  $C(0, T; H^{m-1}(\Omega))$ , so it converges in  $C(0, T; H^{m-1}(\Omega))$  to a solution of the original system up to an extraction. Since this is true for any  $T > 0$  and by uniqueness of the weak solution ensured by [Leb22, Theorem 1.1 & 1.2], we get the well-posedness of the system and Proposition is proven.

**Boundedness.** Let us show that we have for any  $N \in \mathbf{N}$ ,

$$\|\rho^N\|_{H^m} \leq \|\rho_0\|_{H^m} \exp\left(C\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} t + \frac{\|\nabla \rho_0\|_{L^\infty}}{\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}} (\exp(C\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} t) - 1)\right) =: B_{\rho_0}(t). \quad (\text{A.9})$$

This inequality is immediately satisfied for  $N = 0$  since  $\rho^0$  is constant in time and equal to  $\rho_0$ . Let  $N \in \mathbf{N}$  such that (A.9) is satisfied. Then the tame estimate (2.21) provides here

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\rho^{N+1}(t)\|_{H^m}^2 \lesssim \|\nabla \mathbf{u}^N\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho^{N+1}\|_{H^m}^2 + \|\nabla \rho^{N+1}\|_{L^\infty} \|\mathbf{u}^N\|_{H^m} \|\rho^{N+1}\|_{H^m}. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

The considerations (A.4) and (A.5) applied to  $\rho^N, \rho^{N+1}$  and  $\mathbf{u}^N$  conduct here to

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\rho^{N+1}\|_{H^m} \lesssim \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho^{N+1}\|_{H^m} + \|\nabla \rho_0\|_{L^\infty} \exp(C\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} t) \|\rho^{N+1}\|_{H^m}. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

From here, we use Grönwall lemma to estimate  $\|\rho^{N+1}\|_{H^m}$ ,

$$\|\rho^{N+1}\|_{H^m} \leq \exp(C\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} t) \left( \|\rho_0\|_{H^m} + C\|\nabla \rho_0\|_{L^\infty} \int_0^t \|\rho^N(s)\|_{H^m} ds \right), \quad (\text{A.12})$$

then according to the assumption on  $\rho^N$ , observe

$$\begin{aligned} & C\|\nabla \rho_0\|_{L^\infty} \int_0^t \|\rho^N(s)\|_{H^m} ds \\ & \leq C\|\rho_0\|_{H^m} \|\nabla \rho_0\|_{L^\infty} \int_0^t \exp\left(C\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} s + \frac{\|\nabla \rho_0\|_{L^\infty}}{\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}} (e^{C\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} s} - 1)\right) ds \\ & \leq C\|\rho_0\|_{H^m} \|\nabla \rho_0\|_{L^\infty} \int_0^{e^{C\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} t} - 1} \exp\left(\frac{\|\nabla \rho_0\|_{L^\infty}}{\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}} r\right) \frac{dr}{C\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}} \\ & = \|\rho_0\|_{H^m} \left( \exp\left(\frac{\|\nabla \rho_0\|_{L^\infty}}{\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}} (\exp(C\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} t) - 1)\right) - 1 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.13})$$

The latter bound substituted in (A.12) yields exactly the result (A.9). Therefore, for any  $T > 0$  the sequence  $(\rho^N)_N$  is uniformly bounded in  $L^\infty(0, T; H^m(\Omega))$ .

**Equicontinuity.** We find a uniform bound on  $(\partial_t \rho^N)_N$  in  $H^{m-1}(\Omega)$  to show the equicontinuity of the sequence in  $C(0, T; H^{m-1}(\Omega))$ . This bound, uniform in  $N \in \mathbf{N}$  and  $t \in [0, T]$  is obtained thanks to the tame estimate, the bounds (A.4) and the uniform bound (A.9) on  $\rho^N$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t \rho^N\|_{H^{m-1}} &= \|\mathbf{u}^{N-1} \cdot \nabla \rho^N\|_{H^{m-1}} \\ &\lesssim \|\mathbf{u}^{N-1}\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla \rho^N\|_{H^{m-1}} + \|\rho^N\|_{L^\infty} \|\mathbf{u}^{N-1}\|_{H^{m-1}} \\ &\lesssim \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho^N\|_{H^m} + \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho^{N-1}\|_{H^m} \\ &\lesssim \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho_0\|_{H^m} \exp\left(C\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} t + \frac{\|\nabla \rho_0\|_{L^\infty}}{\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}} (\exp(C\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} t) - 1)\right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.14})$$

**Regularity.** Let us show that the limit  $\rho$  belongs to  $L^\infty(0, T; H^m(\Omega))$ . For any  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $(\rho^N(t))_N$  is uniformly bounded in  $H^m(\Omega)$  with respect to  $N$  and  $t$ , hence according to Banach–Alaoglu theorem, for any  $t$  the sequence is weakly compact in  $H^m(\Omega)$ . Hence up to an extraction,  $\rho^N(t)$  converges weakly toward a  $\bar{\rho}(t) \in H^m(\Omega)$ , and this limit satisfies

$$\|\bar{\rho}(t)\|_{H^m} \leq \liminf_N \|\rho^N(t)\|_{H^m}, \quad (\text{A.15})$$

where the right-hand-side is uniformly bounded since (A.9). As  $\rho^N$  already converges weakly in  $H^m(\Omega)$ , we can identify  $\bar{\rho}$  and  $\rho$ , which then belongs to  $L^\infty(0, T; H^m(\Omega))$ . Finally, to reach the regularity  $C(0, T; H^m(\Omega))$ . The [BF13, Lemma II.5.6] tells us that since in particular  $\rho \in L^\infty(0, T; H^m(\Omega)) \cap C_w^0(0, T; H^{m-1}(\Omega))$  then  $\rho \in C_w^0(0, T; H^m(\Omega))$ . Hence it is enough to show that  $t \mapsto \|\rho(t)\|_{H^m}$  is continuous to prove the strong continuity of  $\rho$  in  $H^m(\Omega)$ . By weak continuity, we have

$$\|\rho_0\|_{H^m} \leq \liminf_{t \searrow 0} \|\rho(t)\|_{H^m}. \quad (\text{A.16})$$

Also we have by weak convergence

$$\|\rho(t)\|_{H^m} \leq \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|\rho^N(t)\|_{H^m} \leq B_{\rho_0}(t), \quad (\text{A.17})$$

which proves by clamping that  $t \mapsto \|\rho(t)\|_{H^m}$  is continuous at  $t = 0$ . This can be performed for any  $t \in [0, T]$ , hence the continuity. Finally,  $\mathbf{u} \in C^0(0, T; H^{m+2}(\Omega))$  by (A.4) and linearity of the Stokes equation.

## B About the bilaplacian equation

We have the following classical regularity result:

**Lemma B.1** (Regularity). *Let  $f \in H^m(\Omega)$ ,  $m \geq -2$ . The problem*

$$\Delta^2 \psi = f, \quad \psi|_{\partial\Omega} = \partial_{\mathbf{n}} \psi|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

*admits a unique strong solution  $\psi \in H_0^2 \cap H^{m+4}(\Omega)$  such that*

$$\|\psi\|_{H^{m+4}} \lesssim \|f\|_{H^m}. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

The eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of the bilaplacian in a channel can be more or less explicitly computed (see the PhD thesis of Antoine Leblond for the details):

**Lemma B.2** (Spectrum of the bilaplacian). *The eigenvalues of the operator  $\Delta^2$  on  $H_0^2$  in  $\mathbf{T} \times (-1, 1)$  are the union, for all  $k \in \mathbf{Z}$ , of strictly increasing sequences  $(\lambda_{n,k})_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  such that*

$$\lambda_{n,k} \simeq (n^2 + k^2)^2$$

with associated (unnormalized) eigenfunctions:

$$b_{n,k} = e^{ikx} \begin{cases} \cos(\omega_{n,k}z) - \frac{\cos(\omega_{n,k})}{\cosh(r_{n,k})} \cosh(r_{n,k}z), & n \in 2\mathbf{N}, \\ \sin(\omega_{n,k}z) - \frac{\sin(\omega_{n,k})}{\sinh(r_{n,k})} \sinh(r_{n,k}z), & n \in 2\mathbf{N} + 1, \end{cases}$$

with  $\omega_{n,k} = (k^2 - \lambda_{n,k}^{1/2})^{1/2}$  and  $r_{n,k} = (k^2 + \lambda_{n,k}^{1/2})^{1/2}$ . Note that to simplify the calculations, the domain was chosen to be  $\mathbf{T} \times (-1, 1)$  and not  $\Omega = \mathbf{T} \times (0, 1)$ .

## C Proof of Lemma 3.1

The proof of the Lemma relies on energy estimates in weighted Sobolev spaces, with weights that grow like  $\exp(cZ^{4/5})$  for  $Z \gg 1$ . Unfortunately, we have not been able to treat all four cases for the boundary conditions simultaneously, but we will treat (i) and (iii) (resp. (ii) and (iv)) together. Note that when equation (3.4) is multiplied (formally) by  $\Psi w$  or by  $-\Psi' w$ , there are many commutator terms when we integrate by parts the fifth order derivative. The main idea is that if the weight is adequately chosen, all these commutators can be absorbed in the main order terms, which will be designed to have a positive sign. Hence we start with the following result, which will allow us to control the commutators:

**Lemma C.1.** *Let  $\Psi \in C_c^\infty([0, +\infty))$  such that  $\Psi(0) = 0$ , and let  $r > 0$ . Let  $W \in C^\infty([0, +\infty))$  such that  $W(Z) = \exp(Z^{4/5})$  for  $Z \geq 1$ , and  $W \geq 1$ ,  $W \equiv 1$  in a neighbourhood of zero.*

*Then for  $k \in \{1, 2\}$ , there exists a constant  $C_k$ , independent of  $r$ , such that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_0^\infty |\Psi^{(k)}(Z)|^2 \frac{|W^{(k)}(rZ)|^2}{W(rZ)} dZ \right| \\ & \leq C_k r^{-\frac{2}{3}(3-k)} \left[ \int_0^\infty |\Psi^{(3)}(Z)|^2 W(rZ) dZ + \int_0^\infty \Psi^2(Z) \left( \frac{W'(rZ)}{Z} + \frac{W(rZ)}{Z^2} \right) dZ \right]. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* For  $k = 0, \dots, 3$ , let us consider weights  $\omega_k \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,\infty}(\mathbf{R}_+)$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \forall k \in \{0, \dots, 3\}, \quad \forall Z \geq 1, \quad \omega_k(Z) &= e^{-1} Z^{-\frac{2}{3}(3-k)} \exp(Z^{4/5}), \\ \forall Z \in (0, 1), \quad \omega_1(Z) &= \omega_3(Z) = 1, \quad \omega_0(Z) = Z^{-2}, \quad \omega_2(Z) = Z^2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the weights  $\omega_k$  satisfy the following assumptions:

- For  $k \in \{1, 2\}$ ,  $\omega_k \leq \sqrt{\omega_{k-1}\omega_{k+1}}$ ;
- For  $k \in \{1, 2\}$ ,  $|\omega_k'| \leq C_k \sqrt{\omega_k \omega_{k-1}}$  for some constant  $C_k$ ;
- $\omega_2(0) = 0$ .

Let us now introduce, for  $k = 0, \dots, 3$

$$I_k := \int_0^\infty |\Psi^{(k)}(Z)|^2 \omega_k(rZ) dZ.$$



Then by definition of  $W$ ,  $\omega_0, \omega_3$ , there exists a constant  $C$  (independent of  $r > 0$ ) such that

$$r^2 I_0 + I_3 \leq C \int_0^\infty |\Psi^{(3)}(Z)|^2 W(rZ) dZ + \int_0^\infty \Psi^2(Z) \left( \frac{W'(rZ)}{Z} + \frac{W(rZ)}{Z^2} \right) dZ.$$

Let us set  $E = r^2 I_0 + I_3$ . For  $k = 1, 2$ , integrating by parts and using the conditions  $\Psi(0) = \omega_2(0) = 0$ , we have

$$I_k = - \int_0^\infty \Psi^{(k-1)}(Z) \Psi^{(k+1)}(Z) \omega_k(rZ) dZ - r \int_0^\infty \Psi^{(k-1)}(Z) \Psi^{(k)}(Z) \omega'_k(rZ) dZ.$$

Using the properties of  $\omega_k$ , we deduce that there exist constants  $C_k$  such that

$$I_k \leq C_k \left( \sqrt{I_{k-1} I_{k+1}} + r \sqrt{I_k I_{k-1}} \right).$$

Since  $r^2 I_0 \leq E$ , we deduce first that  $I_1 \lesssim E + r^{-1} \sqrt{I_2 E}$ , and plugging this inequality into the bound on  $I_2$ , we find

$$I_1 \lesssim r^{-4/3} E, \quad I_2 \lesssim r^{-2/3} E.$$

The result follows easily by noticing that

$$\left| \int_0^\infty |\Psi^{(k)}(Z)|^2 \frac{|W^{(k)}(rZ)|^2}{W(rZ)} dZ \right| \lesssim I_k.$$

□

We now turn towards the proof of Lemma 3.1. In both cases, we start with a formal *a priori* estimate, from which we deduce an appropriate notion of variational solution in a suitable Hilbert space. Existence and uniqueness then follow in a straightforward manner from the Lax-Milgram Lemma.

**First case: conditions (ii) and (iv):**

As explained above, we start with a formal *a priori* estimate. Let  $w \in C^\infty(\mathbf{R}_+)$  be an arbitrary weight function, and multiply (3.4) by  $(\Psi(Z)w(Z))'/Z$ . On the one hand,

$$\int_0^\infty \Psi^{(5)}(Z) (\Psi w)'(Z) dZ = \int_0^\infty \Psi^{(3)}(Z) (\Psi w)^{(3)}(Z) dZ - \Psi^{(4)}(0) (\Psi w)'(0) + \Psi^{(3)}(0) (\Psi w)''(0).$$

Note that the two boundary terms vanish in cases (ii) and (iv). We obtain

$$\int_0^\infty \Psi^{(5)}(Z) (\Psi w)'(Z) dZ = \int_0^\infty (\Psi^{(3)}(Z))^2 w(Z) dZ + \sum_{k=1}^3 (3k) \int_0^\infty \Psi^{(3)}(Z) \Psi^{(3-k)}(Z) w^{(k)}(Z) dZ.$$

On the other hand, since  $\Psi(0) = 0$ ,

$$\int_0^\infty \Psi(Z) (\Psi w)'(Z) \frac{dZ}{Z} = \int_0^\infty (\Psi w)(Z) (\Psi w)'(Z) \frac{dZ}{Z w(Z)} = -\frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty (\Psi w)^2(Z) \frac{d}{dZ} \left( \frac{1}{Z w(Z)} \right) dZ.$$

Choosing  $w$  such that  $w' > 0$ , the right-hand side has a positive sign. We then choose  $w(Z) = W(rZ)$  for some  $W \in C^\infty(\mathbf{R}_+)$  such that  $W(\xi) = \exp(\xi^{4/5})$  for  $\xi$  large enough,  $W(Z) = 1$  for  $Z \leq 1$ ,  $W' \geq 0$ , and  $r > 0$  small enough. With this choice, the positive terms in the energy are bounded from below by

$$\int_0^\infty (\Psi^{(3)}(Z))^2 W(rZ) dZ + \int_0^\infty \Psi^2(Z) \left( \frac{W(rZ)}{Z^2} + r \frac{W'(rZ)}{Z} \right) dZ.$$

Lemma C.1 then implies that there exists an explicit constant  $\delta > 0$  such that for  $k = 1, 2, 3$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_0^\infty \Psi^{(3)}(Z) \Psi^{(3-k)}(Z) w^{(k)}(Z) dZ \right| \\ & \leq r^\delta \int_0^\infty (\Psi^{(3)}(Z))^2 W(rZ) dZ + \int_0^\infty \Psi^2(Z) \left( \frac{W(rZ)}{Z^2} + r \frac{W'(rZ)}{Z} \right) dZ. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for  $r > 0$  sufficiently small, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty (\Psi^{(3)}(Z))^2 W(rZ) dZ + \int_0^\infty \Psi^2(Z) \left( \frac{W(rZ)}{Z^2} + r \frac{W'(rZ)}{Z} \right) dZ \\ & \lesssim \int_0^1 \frac{S(Z)^2}{Z^2} dZ + \int_0^\infty S(Z)^2 W(rZ) dZ. \end{aligned}$$

This leads us to the following formulation: let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H} := \{ \Psi \in H^3(\mathbf{R}_+), \Psi(0) = 0, & \int_0^\infty (\Psi^{(3)}(Z))^2 e^{(rZ)^{4/5}} dZ < +\infty \\ & \int_0^\infty \Psi(Z)^2 (Z^{-2} + Z^{-1/5}) e^{(rZ)^{4/5}} dZ < +\infty \}, \end{aligned}$$

and let  $\mathcal{H}_0 := \{ \Psi \in \mathcal{H}, \Psi'(0) = \Psi''(0) = 0 \}$ . We endow  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_0$  with the norm

$$\|\Psi\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 = \int_0^\infty (\Psi^{(3)}(Z))^2 W(rZ) dZ + \int_0^\infty \Psi^2(Z) \left( \frac{W(rZ)}{Z^2} + r \frac{W'(rZ)}{Z} \right) dZ,$$

where  $W$  is the previous weight. We say that  $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}$  is a solution of (3.4)-(ii) (resp.  $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}_0$  is a solution of (3.4)-(iv)) if and only if for all  $\Phi \in \mathcal{H}$  (resp.  $\Phi \in \mathcal{H}_0$ ),

$$\int_0^\infty \Psi^{(3)}(\Phi W(r\cdot))^{(3)} + \int_0^\infty \Psi(Z) \frac{(\Phi(Z)W(rZ))'}{Z} dZ = \int_0^\infty \frac{S(Z)}{Z} (\Phi(Z)W(rZ))' dZ.$$

Existence and uniqueness of solutions of (3.4)-(ii) (resp. of (3.4)-(iv)) in  $\mathcal{H}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{H}_0$ ) follow easily from the Lax-Milgram Lemma. Using the equation, we then infer that

$$\int_0^\infty (\Psi^{(5)}(Z))^2 e^{(rZ)^{4/5}} dZ < +\infty.$$

The result follows.

**Second case: conditions (i) and (iii):**

The estimates in the case of conditions (i) and (iii) are similar, but slightly less straightforward, since we shall need to combine two estimates.

We first multiply (3.4) by  $-\frac{\Psi^{(3)}(Z)w_1(Z)}{Z}$ . We obtain on the one hand

$$-\int_0^\infty \Psi^{(5)}(Z) \Psi^{(3)}(Z) w_1(Z) dZ = \int_0^\infty (\Psi^{(4)}(Z))^2 w_1(Z) + \int_0^\infty \Psi^{(4)}(Z) \Psi^{(3)}(Z) w_1'(Z) dZ.$$

The first term gives a positive contribution to the energy, and the second one will be treated with the help of Lemma C.1. On the other hand, we obtain for the zero-th order term, noticing that either  $\Psi''(0) = 0$  or  $(Z^{-1}\Psi(Z))|_{z=0} = \Psi'(0) = 0$ ,

$$-\int_0^\infty \frac{\Psi(Z)}{Z} \Psi^{(3)}(Z) w_1(Z) dZ = \int_0^\infty \Psi''(Z) \frac{d}{dZ} \left( \frac{\Psi(Z)}{Z} w_1(Z) \right) dZ.$$

Now, let us write  $\Psi''$  as

$$\Psi''(Z) = \left( \frac{\Psi(Z)}{Z} Z \right)'' = 2 \left( \frac{\Psi(Z)}{Z} \right)' + Z \left( \frac{\Psi(Z)}{Z} \right)''.$$

Performing integrations by parts and assuming that  $w_1'(0) = 0$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty \Psi''(Z) \frac{d}{dZ} \left( \frac{\Psi(Z)}{Z} w_1(Z) \right) dZ \\ &= \frac{3}{2} \int_0^\infty \left( \frac{d}{dZ} \frac{\Psi(Z)}{Z} \right)^2 (w_1 - Z w_1') + \frac{1}{2} \Psi(Z)^2 Z^{-1} w_1^{(3)}(Z) dZ. \end{aligned}$$

We choose  $w_2$  so that  $\partial_Z^3 w_2 > 0$ , so that the last term has a positive sign. However, for  $Z \gg 1$ ,  $w_1 - Z w_1' < 0$ , and therefore we add another term to the energy. More precisely, we now multiply (3.4) by  $-Z^{-1}((\Psi/Z)' w_2)'$ , with a weight  $w_2$  which vanishes identically in a neighborhood of zero. We obtain

$$- \int_0^\infty \frac{\Psi(Z)}{Z} \left( \frac{d}{dZ} \frac{\Psi(Z)}{Z} w_2 \right)' dZ = \int_0^\infty \left( \frac{d}{dZ} \frac{\Psi(Z)}{Z} \right)^2 w_2(Z) dZ.$$

We then take  $w_i(Z) = W_i(rZ)$ , with  $0 < r \ll 1$  and  $W_1, W_2$  such that  $W_2 + \frac{3}{2}(W_1 - ZW_1') \gtrsim \exp(Z^{4/5})$ . Our energy is then

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty (\Psi^{(4)}(Z))^2 W_1(rZ) dZ + \int_0^\infty \left( \frac{d}{dZ} \frac{\Psi(Z)}{Z} \right)^2 \left[ W_2 + \frac{3}{2}(W_1 - ZW_1') \right] (rZ) dZ \\ &+ \frac{r^3}{2} \int_0^\infty \Psi(Z)^2 Z^{-1} W_1^{(3)}(rZ) dZ \\ &\geq \int_0^\infty (\Psi^{(4)}(Z))^2 \exp((rZ)^{4/5}) dZ + \int_0^\infty \left( \frac{d}{dZ} \frac{\Psi(Z)}{Z} \right)^2 \exp((rZ)^{4/5}) dZ \\ &+ r^3 \int_0^\infty \Psi(Z)^2 Z^{-1} (1+rZ)^{-3/5} dZ \exp((rZ)^{4/5}) dZ. \end{aligned}$$

The commutator terms, namely

$$\begin{aligned} & r \int_0^\infty \Psi^{(4)}(Z) \Psi^{(3)}(Z) W_1'(rZ) dZ \\ \text{and} & \int_0^\infty \Psi^{(4)}(Z) \left( \frac{d}{dZ} \frac{\Psi(Z)}{Z} w_2 \right)'' dZ \end{aligned}$$

are treated perturbatively for  $r$  small enough, using Lemma C.1. As before, we find that the energy is controlled by

$$\int_0^1 \frac{S(Z)^2}{Z^2} dZ + \int_0^\infty S(Z)^2 \exp(rZ)^{4/5} dZ.$$

We conclude by a Lax-Milgram type argument. □

**Acknowledgments.** The authors thank Miguel Rodrigues for fruitful discussions especially for the identification of the limit profile. This work has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (Grant agreement No. [637653](#), project BLOC) and by the French National Research Agency (Grant [ANR-18-CE40-0027](#), project SingFlows). A.-L. Dalibard acknowledges the support of the Institut Universitaire de France. J. Guilloid acknowledges the support of the Initiative d’Excellence (Idex) of Sorbonne University through the Emergence program.

## References

- [BF13] Franck Boyer and Pierre Fabrie. *Mathematical Tools for the Study of the Incompressible Navier–Stokes Equations and Related Models*. Springer, 2013. [doi:10.1007/978-1-4614-5975-0](#).
- [CCL19] Ángel Castro, Diego Córdoba, and Daniel Lear. Global existence of quasi-stratified solutions for the confined IPM equation. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 232:437–471, 2019. [doi:10.1007/s00205-018-1324-3](#).
- [CFG10] Diego Cordoba, Daniel Faraco, and Francisco Gancedo. Lack of uniqueness for weak solutions of the incompressible porous media equation. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 200(3):725–746, 2010. [doi:10.1007/s00205-010-0365-z](#).
- [CGO07] Diego Córdoba, Francisco Gancedo, and Rafael Orive. Analytical behavior of two-dimensional incompressible flow in porous media. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 48(6), 2007. [doi:10.1063/1.2404593](#).
- [CVW15] Peter Constantin, Vlad Vicol, and Jiahong Wu. Analyticity of Lagrangian trajectories for well posed inviscid incompressible fluid models. *Advances in Mathematics*, 285:352–393, 2015. [doi:10.1016/j.aim.2015.05.019](#).
- [Elg17] Tarek M Elgindi. On the asymptotic stability of stationary solutions of the inviscid incompressible porous medium equation. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 225:573–599, 2017.
- [Gal11] Giovanni Galdi. *An Introduction to the Mathematical Theory of the Navier–Stokes Equations. Steady-State Problems*. Springer Verlag, 2011. [doi:10.1007/978-0-387-09620-9](#).
- [GGBS02] Francisco Gancedo, Rafael Granero-Belinchón, and Elena Salguero. Long time interface dynamics for gravity Stokes flow. [arXiv:2211.03437](#), 2002. [doi:10.48550/arXiv.2211.03437](#).
- [Hö18] Richard M Höfer. Sedimentation of inertialess particles in Stokes flows. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 360:55–101, 2018. [doi:10.1007/s00220-018-3131-y](#).
- [II22] Hezekiah Grayer II. Dynamics of density patches in infinite Prandtl number convection. [arXiv:2207.09738](#), 2022. [doi:10.48550/arXiv.2207.09738](#).
- [Inv23] Marco Inversi. Lagrangian solutions to the transport–Stokes system. [arXiv:2303.05797](#), 2023. [doi:10.48550/arXiv.2303.05797](#).
- [IV15] Philip Isett and Vlad Vicol. Hölder continuous solutions of active scalar equations. *Annals of PDE*, 1(1), 2015. [doi:10.1007/s40818-015-0002-0](#).

- [KY23] Alexander Kiselev and Yao Yao. Small scale formations in the incompressible porous media equation. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 247(1):1, 2023. doi:10.1007/s00205-022-01830-z.
- [Leb22] Antoine Leblond. Well-posedness of the Stokes-transport system in bounded domains and in the infinite strip. *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées*, 158:120–143, 2022. doi:10.1016/j.matpur.2021.10.006.
- [LL01] Elliott H Lieb and Michael Loss. *Analysis*, volume 14. American Mathematical Society, 2001. doi:10.1090/gsm/014.
- [LM68] Jacques-Louis Lions and Enrico Magenes. *Problèmes aux limites non homogènes I*. Dunod, 1968.
- [Mec21] Amina Mecherbet. On the sedimentation of a droplet in Stokes flow. *Communications in Mathematical Sciences*, 19(6):1627–1654, 2021. doi:10.4310/CMS.2021.v19.n6.a8.
- [MS22] Amina Mecherbet and Franck Sueur. A few remarks on the transport-Stokes system. arXiv:2209.11637, 2022. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2209.11637.
- [Shv11] R. Shvydkoy. Convex integration for a class of active scalar equations. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 24(4):1159–1174, 2011. doi:10.1090/s0894-0347-2011-00705-4.
- [Xue09] Liutang Xue. On the well-posedness of incompressible flow in porous media with supercritical diffusion. *Applicable Analysis*, 88(4):547–561, 2009. doi:10.1080/00036810902913821.
- [YH14] Wenxin Yu and Yigang He. On the well-posedness of the incompressible porous media equation in Triebel-Lizorkin spaces. *Boundary Value Problems*, 2014(1), 2014. doi:10.1186/1687-2770-2014-95.