

Linearized Analysis of Adiabatic Oscillations of Rotating Gaseous Stars

Tetu Makino *

November 7, 2023

Abstract

We study adiabatic oscillations of rotating self-gravitating gaseous stars in mathematically rigorous manner. The internal motion of the star is supposed to be governed by the Euler-Poisson equations with rotation of constant angular velocity under the equation of state of the ideal gas. The motion is supposed to be adiabatic, but not to be barotropic in general. This causes a free boundary problem to gas-vacuum interface. Existence of solutions to the linearized equation in the Lagrangean coordinates of the perturbations around a fixed stationary solution, the eigenvalue problem with concept of quadratic pencil of operators, and the stability problem with a new concept of stability introduced in this article are discussed.

Key Words and Phrases. Gaseous star, adiabatic oscillation, Euler-Poisson equations, Hille-Yoshida theory, quadratic pencil, stability

2020 Mathematical Subject Classification Numbers. 3610, 35Q65, 35P05, 35R35, 35B35, 47N20, 76N15, 76U05, 85A30.

1 Introduction

We consider the motion of a rotating gaseous star governed by the Euler-Poisson equation:

$$\frac{D\rho}{Dt} + \rho \operatorname{div}_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{v} = 0, \quad (1.1a)$$

$$\rho \left[\frac{D\mathbf{v}}{Dt} + 2\boldsymbol{\Omega} \times \mathbf{v} \right] + \operatorname{grad}_{\mathbf{x}} P + \rho \operatorname{grad}_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\Phi - \frac{1}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\Omega} \times \mathbf{x}\|^2 \right] = 0, \quad (1.1b)$$

$$\rho \frac{DS}{Dt} = 0, \quad (1.1c)$$

$$\Delta \Phi = 4\pi G \rho \quad (1.1d)$$

*Professor Emeritus at Yamaguchi University, Japan; E-mail: makino@yamaguchi-u.ac.jp

on $(t, \mathbf{x}) = (t, x^1, x^2, x^3) \in [0, +\infty[\times \mathbb{R}^3$. We are denoting

$$\frac{D}{Dt} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \sum_{k=1}^3 v^k \frac{\partial}{\partial x^k}, \quad \Delta = \sum_{k=1}^3 \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^k} \right)^2. \quad (1.2)$$

The unknown variables $\rho, P, S, \mathbf{v} = (v^1, v^2, v^3)^\top$ are density, the pressure, the specific entropy, and the velocity field, while

$$\mathbf{\Omega} = \Omega \frac{\partial}{\partial x^3}, \quad (1.3)$$

Ω being a constant, the angular velocity of the rotation around the x^3 -axis. Hereafter we denote

$$B = 2\Omega \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (1.4)$$

so that

$$B\mathbf{v} = 2\mathbf{\Omega} \times \mathbf{v} = 2\Omega \begin{bmatrix} -v^2 \\ v^1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (1.5)$$

On the other hand Φ is the gravitational potential and G is a positive constant, while we suppose that the support of $\rho(t, \cdot)$ is compact for $\forall t$ and replace the Poisson equation (1.1d) by the Newton potential

$$\Phi(t, \mathbf{x}) = -4\pi G \mathcal{K}[\rho(t, \cdot)](\mathbf{x}), \quad (1.6)$$

where

$$\mathcal{K}[f](\mathbf{x}) := \frac{1}{4\pi} \int \frac{f(\mathbf{x}')}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|} d\mathbf{x}'. \quad (1.7)$$

The pressure P is supposed to be a prescribed function of ρ, S . But for the sake of simplicity, we assume the equation of state of the ideal fluid, that is, we assume

Assumption 1 P is the function of $(\rho, S) \in [0, +\infty[\times \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$P = \rho^\gamma \exp\left(\frac{S}{C_V}\right), \quad (1.8)$$

where γ and C_V are positive constants such that

$$1 < \gamma < 2. \quad (1.9)$$

We consider the initial data $\rho^0, S^0, \mathbf{v}^0$ for which the motion enjoys

$$\rho(0, \mathbf{x}) = \rho^0(\mathbf{x}), \quad S(0, \mathbf{x}) = S^0(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{v}(0, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{v}^0(\mathbf{x}). \quad (1.10)$$

We denote

$$P^0(\mathbf{x}) = \rho^0(\mathbf{x})^\gamma \exp\left(\frac{S^0(\mathbf{x})}{C_V}\right), \quad \Phi^0(\mathbf{x}) = -4\pi G \mathcal{K}[\rho^0](\mathbf{x}). \quad (1.11)$$

We suppose that there is fixed an axially symmetric stationary solution $(\rho, S, \mathbf{v}) = (\rho_b(\mathbf{x}), S_b(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{v}_b(\mathbf{x}))$, which satisfy (1.1a), (1.1b), (1.1c), (1.6), such that $\mathfrak{R}_b = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3 | \rho_b(\mathbf{x}) > 0\}$ is a bounded domain. The existence of stationary solutions is discussed in Section 2.

We consider small perturbations at this fixed stationary solution. The linearized equation which governs the perturbations turns out to be

$$\frac{\partial^2 \boldsymbol{\xi}}{\partial t^2} + B \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\xi}}{\partial t} + \mathcal{L} \boldsymbol{\xi} = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad [0, +\infty[\times \mathfrak{R}_b, \quad (1.12)$$

where

$$\mathcal{L} \boldsymbol{\xi} = \frac{1}{\rho_b} \text{grad} \delta P - \frac{\delta \rho}{\rho_b^2} \text{grad} P_b + \text{grad} \delta \Phi. \quad (1.13)$$

Here we substitute

$$\delta \rho = -\text{div}(\rho_b \boldsymbol{\xi}), \quad (1.14a)$$

$$\delta \Phi = -4\pi \text{GK}[\delta \rho], \quad (1.14b)$$

$$\delta P = \frac{\gamma P_b}{\rho_b} \delta \rho + \gamma P_b(\boldsymbol{\xi} | \mathbf{a}_b), \quad (1.14c)$$

$$\mathbf{a}_b := -\frac{1}{\gamma C_V} \text{grad} S_b = \frac{1}{\rho_b} \text{grad} \rho_b - \frac{1}{\gamma P_b} \text{grad} P_b, \quad (1.14d)$$

or, equivalently,

$$\delta \rho = -\text{div}(\rho_b \boldsymbol{\xi}), \quad (1.15a)$$

$$\delta \Phi = -4\pi \text{GK}[\delta \rho], \quad (1.15b)$$

$$\delta S = -(\boldsymbol{\xi} | \text{grad} S_b), \quad (1.15c)$$

$$\delta P = \frac{\gamma P_b}{\rho_b} \delta \rho + \frac{P_b}{C_V} \delta S. \quad (1.15d)$$

The unknown variable $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ means

$$\boldsymbol{\xi}(t, \mathbf{x}) = \boldsymbol{\varphi}(t, \mathbf{x}) - \boldsymbol{\varphi}_b(t, \mathbf{x}) + \boldsymbol{\xi}^0 \quad (1.16)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\xi}^0$ is a given vector field on \mathfrak{R}_b and $\boldsymbol{\varphi}(t, \mathbf{x})$ is the solution of

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \boldsymbol{\varphi}(t, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{v}(t, \boldsymbol{\varphi}(t, \mathbf{x})), \quad \boldsymbol{\varphi}(0, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}, \quad (1.17)$$

while $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_b(t, \mathbf{x})$ is the solution of

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \boldsymbol{\varphi}_b(t, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{v}_b(\boldsymbol{\varphi}_b(t, \mathbf{x})), \quad \boldsymbol{\varphi}_b(0, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}. \quad (1.18)$$

Here we suppose

$$\{\mathbf{x} \mid \rho^0(\mathbf{x}) > 0\} = \mathfrak{R}_b \quad (1.19)$$

and ξ^0 enjoys

$$\rho^0(\mathbf{x}) - \rho_b(\mathbf{x}) = -\operatorname{div}\left(\rho_b(\mathbf{x})\xi^0(\mathbf{x})\right), \quad (1.20a)$$

$$S^0(\mathbf{x}) - S_b(\mathbf{x}) = -\left(\xi^0(\mathbf{x})\Big|_{\operatorname{grad}S_b(\mathbf{x})}\right). \quad (1.20b)$$

The equation (1.12) is considered with the initial condition

$$\xi|_{t=0} = \xi^0, \quad \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial t}\Big|_{t=0} = \mathbf{v}^0 \quad \text{on } \mathfrak{R}_b. \quad (1.21)$$

Derivation of this linearized equation for perturbations is given in Section 3.

In Section 4 we give the basic existence result to the initial value problem (1.12), (1.21), by realizing the integrodifferential operator \mathcal{L} as a selfadjoint operator \mathbf{L} in the Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H} = L^2(\rho_b d\mathbf{x}, \mathfrak{R}_b)$. This is done by applying the Hille-Yosida theory. The applied theorem is formulated and proved in Appendix for the sake of selfcontainedness.

In Section 5 we discuss about the eigenvalue problem to the equation (1.12). The ‘eigenvalue’ of (1.12) is the square of the usual eigenvalue of $-\mathbf{L}$ only when $\Omega = 0, B = O$, But, when $\Omega \neq 0$, we need the concept ‘quadratic pencil’ (after Bognar [3]) and its ‘spectrum’. The result of the structure of the ‘spectrum’ of the quadratic pencil by J. Dyson and B. F. Schultz [6] is justified.

In Section 6 we discuss about the stability of solutions of (1.12)(1.21). We propose a new concept of stability based on seminorms on the space of the values $\xi(t, \cdot)$ of the solution at instant t , taking into account that the magnitude of $\xi(t, \cdot)$ itself is not essential but the magnitude of the perturbation $\delta\rho = -\operatorname{div}(\rho_b \xi), \mathbf{v} = \partial \xi / \partial t$ is essential in the discussion of stability. Examples of the seminorms are presented with an open question.

2 Existence of stationary solutions

In this section we establish the existence of stationary solutions which enjoy good properties used in the following consideration.

Let us put the following

Definition 1 *A triple of t -independent axially symmetric functions $(\rho_b, S_b, \mathbf{v}_b) \in C_0^1(\mathbb{R}^3; [0, +\infty]) \times C^1(\mathbb{R}^3; \mathbb{R}) \times C^1(\mathbb{R}^3; \mathbb{R}^3)$ which satisfies (1.1a)(1.1b)(1.1c) with $\Phi = \Phi_b, P = P_b$ determined by (1.6) (1.8) with $\rho = \rho_b, S = S_b$ is called an admissible stationary solution, if there is a bounded C^∞ -domain \mathfrak{R}_b such that*

0) there is a smooth function ω_b such that

$$\mathbf{v}_b(\mathbf{x}) = \omega_b(\varpi) \frac{\partial}{\partial x^3} \times \mathbf{x} = \omega_b(\varpi) \begin{bmatrix} -x^2 \\ x^1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (2.1)$$

where

$$\varpi = \sqrt{(x^1)^2 + (x^2)^2}; \quad (2.2)$$

1) $\rho_b(\mathbf{x}), S_b(\mathbf{x})$ are functions of (r, ζ) , and $\mathfrak{R}_b = \{\mathbf{x} | \rho_b(\mathbf{x}) > 0\}$ is of the form $\{\mathbf{x} | r < R_b(\zeta)\}$, where

$$r = \|\mathbf{x}\| = \sqrt{(x^1)^2 + (x^2)^2 + (x^3)^2}, \quad \zeta = \frac{x^3}{r}, \quad (2.3)$$

and $R_b(\zeta)$ is a smooth function of $\zeta \in [-1, 1]$ such that $R_b(\zeta) > 0 \forall \zeta \in [-1, 1]$;

2) $\rho_b^{\gamma-1}, S_b, \Phi_b = -4\pi\text{GK}[\rho_b] \in C^\infty(\mathfrak{R}_b) \cap C^{3,\alpha}(\mathfrak{R}_b \cup \partial\mathfrak{R}_b)$, α being a positive number such that $0 < \alpha < \left(\frac{1}{\gamma-1} - 1\right) \wedge 1 \left(:= \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\gamma-1} - 1, 1 \right\} \right)$;

3) $\frac{\partial \rho_b}{\partial r}, \frac{\partial P_b}{\partial r} < 0$ in \mathfrak{R}_b and

$$\frac{\partial \rho_b}{\partial r} \leq -\frac{r}{C}, \quad \frac{\partial P}{\partial r} \leq -\frac{r}{C}; \quad (2.4)$$

4) The boundary $\partial\mathfrak{R}_b$, on which $\rho_b = 0$, is a physical vacuum boundary, that is,

$$0 < \frac{\partial \rho_b^{\gamma-1}}{\partial \mathbf{n}} < +\infty \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\mathfrak{R}_b, \quad (2.5)$$

where \mathbf{n} stands for the unit normal vector at the boundary point directed inward to \mathfrak{R}_b . which means

$$0 < \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{n}} \sqrt{\frac{\gamma P_b}{\rho_b}} < \infty \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\mathfrak{R}_b.$$

Here $\gamma P/\rho = (\partial P/\partial \rho)_{S=\text{Const}}$ is the square of the sound speed.

Definition 2 The admissible stationary solution (ρ_b, S_b) is said to be barotropic, if

5) There is a function $\Pi \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ such that

$$P_b(\mathbf{x}) = \Pi(\rho_b(\mathbf{x})^{\gamma-1}) \quad \text{for} \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathfrak{R}_b. \quad (2.6)$$

If the admissible stationary solution is barotropic, then there is a scalar field $\mathcal{A}_b \in C^{1,\alpha}(\mathfrak{R}_b \cup \partial\mathfrak{R}_b)$ such that

$$\mathbf{a}_b \left(:= -\frac{1}{\gamma C_V} \text{grad} S_b \right) = -\mathcal{A}_b \mathbf{n} \quad \text{in} \quad \mathfrak{R}_b \quad (2.7)$$

where

$$\mathbf{n} = \frac{\text{grad}\rho_b}{\|\text{grad}\rho_b\|}. \quad (2.8)$$

Remark 1 When the stationary solution is barotropic, this does not mean that the perturbed motion to be considered should be barotropic. The perturbed state $\rho = \rho_b + \delta\rho, P = P_b + \delta P$ is approximately $\rho = \rho_b - \text{div}(\rho_b \boldsymbol{\xi}), P = P_b + \frac{\gamma P_b}{\rho_b}(-\text{div}(\rho_b \boldsymbol{\xi})) + \frac{P_b}{c_V}(-\boldsymbol{\xi}|\text{grad}S_b)$, and $\text{grad}\rho, \text{grad}P$ are not necessarily parallel.

Remark 2 After [6] we can call \mathbf{a}_b the “vector Schwarzschild discriminens”, and \mathcal{A}_b the “generalized Schwarzschild discriminant”. But, in spite of the definition [6, (3.7)], we would like to define the square of the “generalized Brunt-Väisälä frequency (local bouyancy frequency)” \mathcal{N}^2 by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}^2 &:= \mathcal{A}_b(\text{grad}\Phi_b|\mathbf{n}) \\ &= -\mathcal{A}_b\left(\frac{1}{\rho_b}\text{grad}P_b|\mathbf{n}\right) = -\mathcal{A}_b\frac{(\text{grad}P_b|\text{grad}\rho_b)}{\rho_b\|\text{grad}\rho_b\|}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

Then $\mathcal{N}^2 \in C^{1,\alpha}(\mathfrak{R}_b \cup \partial\mathfrak{R}_b)$, and $\mathcal{N}_b(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}$ if and only if $\mathcal{A}_b(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0$. It seems curious that the perturbation $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ is involved in the definition [6, (3.7)]. Anyway, if $\Omega = \omega_b = 0$ and the background is spherically symmetric, then it turns out to be $\mathbf{n} = -\mathbf{e}_r = -\frac{\mathbf{x}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|}$ and the definitions (2.7), (2.9) of $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{N}^2$ coincide with those [16, (1.11), (1.12)]. In **Appendix B** we derive the definition (2.9) of the Brunt-Väisälä frequency \mathcal{N} here by generalizing that found in meteorological texts, e.g. [5, Chapter II, Section 21], [8, Chapter 2, Section 2.7.3].

We are going to construct an admissible stationary solution $(\rho_b(\mathbf{x}), S_b(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{v}_b(\mathbf{x}))$. Suppose

$$\mathbf{v}_b(\mathbf{x}) = \omega_b(\varpi) \frac{\partial}{\partial x^3} \times \mathbf{x} = \omega_b(\varpi) \begin{bmatrix} -x^2 \\ x^1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (2.10)$$

where $\omega_b \in C^1([0, +\infty[)$.

The equation (1.1a) is reduced to

$$(\mathbf{v}_b|\text{grad}\rho_b) + \rho_b \text{div}\mathbf{v}_b = 0. \quad (2.11)$$

But

$$(\mathbf{v}_b|\text{grad}\rho_b) = \omega(\varpi) \left(-x^2 \frac{\partial \rho_b}{\partial x^1} + x^1 \frac{\partial \rho_b}{\partial x^2} \right) = \omega(\varpi) \frac{\partial \rho_b}{\partial \phi} = 0,$$

if ρ_b is axisymmetric. Moreover we have $\text{div}\mathbf{v}_b = 0$ for (2.10). Thus (2.11) holds for axisymmetric ρ_b .

The equation (1.1c) is reduced to

$$(\mathbf{v}_b|\text{grad}S_b) = 0. \quad (2.12)$$

This holds provided (2.10) and axisymmetry of ρ_b .

Thus the equations are reduced to

$$(\mathbf{v}_b | \text{grad}) \mathbf{v}_b + 2\boldsymbol{\Omega} \times \mathbf{v}_b + \frac{1}{\rho_b} \text{grad} P_b + \text{grad} \left[\Phi_b - \frac{1}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\Omega} \times \mathbf{x}\|^2 \right] = 0 \quad (2.13)$$

with

$$\Phi_b = -4\pi \mathbf{G} \mathcal{K}[\rho_b], \quad P_b = \rho_b^\gamma \exp\left(\frac{S_b}{C_V}\right).$$

We claim

Theorem 1 *Let a smooth function ω_b on $[0, +\infty[$, a smooth function Σ on \mathbb{R} such that*

$$\gamma + \frac{\gamma-1}{C_V} v \frac{d}{dv} \Sigma(v) > 0 \quad \text{for } v > 0 \quad (2.14)$$

and a positive number ρ_O be given. If $\frac{6}{5} < \gamma < 2$, and $\frac{1}{\rho_O} \|\boldsymbol{\Omega} + \omega_b\|_{L^\infty}^2$ is sufficiently small, then there exists an admissible barotropic stationary solution $(\rho_b, S_b, \mathbf{v}_b)$ such that $S_b = \Sigma(\rho_b^{\gamma-1})$, $\rho_b(O) = \rho_O$, and $\mathbf{v}_b = \omega_b(\varpi) \frac{\partial}{\partial x^3} \times \mathbf{x}$.

Proof. Consider the functions $f^P, f^\mathcal{Y}$ defined by

$$f^P(\rho) := \rho^\gamma \exp\left[\frac{\Sigma(\rho^{\gamma-1})}{C_V}\right], \quad (2.15)$$

$$f^\mathcal{Y}(\rho) := \int_0^\rho \frac{Df^P(\rho')}{\rho'} d\rho' \quad (2.16)$$

for $\rho > 0$. Thanks to the assumption (2.14) we have

$$Df^P(\rho) = \left[\gamma + \frac{\gamma-1}{C_V} v \frac{d\Sigma}{dv} \right]_{v=\rho^{\gamma-1}} \frac{f^P(\rho)}{\rho} > 0$$

for $\rho > 0$, and there exists a smooth function Λ on \mathbb{R} such that $\Lambda(0) = 0$ and

$$f^P(\rho) = \mathbf{A} \rho^\gamma (1 + \Lambda(\rho^{\gamma-1})) \quad (2.17)$$

for $\rho > 0$. Here $\mathbf{A} := \exp(\Sigma(0)/C_V)$ is a positive constant. Then we have

$$\mathcal{Y} = f^\mathcal{Y}(\rho) = \frac{\gamma \mathbf{A}}{\gamma-1} \rho^{\gamma-1} (1 + \Lambda_1(\rho^{\gamma-1})) \quad (2.18)$$

for $\rho > 0$, where Λ_1 is a smooth function on \mathbb{R} such that $\Lambda_1(0) = 0$, and the inverse function f^ρ of $f^\mathcal{Y}$

$$f^\rho(\mathcal{Y}) = \left(\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma \mathbf{A}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} (\mathcal{Y} \vee 0)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} (1 + \Lambda_2(\mathcal{Y})) \quad (2.19)$$

is given so that $\rho = f^\rho(\Upsilon) \Leftrightarrow \Upsilon = \overline{f^\Upsilon(\rho)}$ for $\Upsilon > 0 (\rho > 0)$. Here $\Upsilon \vee 0$ stands for $\max(\Upsilon, 0)$ and Λ_2 is a smooth functions on \mathbb{R} such that $\Lambda_2(0) = 0$.

As shown in [10] with the inertial coordinate system, the problem is reduced to :

$$\Upsilon_b(\mathbf{x}) + \Phi_b(\mathbf{x}) - \mathfrak{B}(\varpi) = \Upsilon_O + \Phi_b(O) \quad \text{on } \mathfrak{D}_0 \quad (2.20)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_b(\mathbf{x}) &= -4\pi\mathsf{G}\mathcal{K}[\rho_b], \\ \rho_b(\mathbf{x}) &= f^\rho(\Upsilon_b(\mathbf{x})) = \left(\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma\mathsf{A}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} (\Upsilon_b(\mathbf{x}) \vee 0)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} (1 + \Lambda_2(\Upsilon_b(\mathbf{x}))). \end{aligned} \quad (2.21)$$

and

$$\mathfrak{B}(\varpi) := \int_0^\varpi (\Omega + \omega_b(\varpi'))^2 \varpi' d\varpi'. \quad (2.22)$$

Here \mathfrak{D}_0 is a domain such that $\Upsilon_b \in C^{2,\alpha}(\mathfrak{D}_0 \cup \partial\mathfrak{D}_0)$ and $\{\Upsilon_b \geq 0\} \subset \mathfrak{D}_0$.

Put

$$\Upsilon_O := f^\Upsilon(\rho_O) = \frac{\gamma\mathsf{A}}{\gamma-1} \rho_O^{\gamma-1} (1 + \Lambda_1(\rho_O^{\gamma-1})) \quad (2.23)$$

by the given ρ_O , and put

$$\mathbf{a} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi\mathsf{G}}} \left(\frac{\mathsf{A}\gamma}{\gamma-1}\right)^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}} \Upsilon_O^{-\frac{2-\gamma}{2(\gamma-1)}}, \quad (2.24)$$

$$\mathbf{b}(\varpi) = \Upsilon_O^{-1} \mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{a}\varpi). \quad (2.25)$$

We put

$$\|\mathbf{b}\|_1 = \sup_{\varpi \leq r_\infty} |\mathbf{b}| + \sup_{\varpi \leq r_\infty} \left| \frac{d\mathbf{b}}{d\varpi} \right|,$$

where $\mathfrak{D}_0 \subset \{\|\mathbf{x}\| \leq r_\infty\}$, and note

$$\|\mathbf{b}\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{4\pi\mathsf{G}} \left(\frac{\mathsf{A}\gamma}{\gamma-1}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} \Upsilon_O^{-\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} \|\Omega + \omega_b\|_{L^\infty(0, ar_\infty)} \left(\frac{r_\infty^2}{2} + r_\infty\right).$$

We suppose

Assumption 2 $\frac{6}{5} < \gamma < 2$, and \mathbf{b} is sufficiently small, say, $\|\mathbf{b}\|_1 \leq \beta^0$, β^0 being a positive number depending on γ, A .

Then we put

$$\rho_b(\mathbf{x}) = f^\rho(\mathcal{Y}_O\Theta) = \left(\frac{\gamma-1}{A\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} (\mathcal{Y}_O\Theta \vee 0)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} (1 + \Lambda_2(\mathcal{Y}_O\Theta))$$

with

$$\Theta = \Theta\left(\frac{r}{a}, \zeta; \frac{1}{\gamma-1}, \mathbf{b}\right),$$

and

$$S_b(\mathbf{x}) = \Sigma(\rho_b(\mathbf{x})^{\gamma-1}). \quad (2.26)$$

Here $\Theta(\xi, \zeta; \frac{1}{\gamma-1}, \mathbf{b})$ is the "distorted Lane-Emden function", which is the solution of the integral equation

$$\Theta(r, \zeta) = 1 + \mathbf{b}(r\sqrt{1-\zeta^2}) + \mathcal{K}g(r, \zeta) - \mathcal{K}g(0, 0)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}g(r, \zeta) &= \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{-1}^1 \int_0^{+\infty} K(r, \zeta, r', \zeta') g(r', \zeta') r'^2 dr' d\zeta', \\ K(r, \zeta, r', \zeta') &= \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\phi}{\sqrt{r^2 + r'^2 - 2rr'(\sqrt{1-\zeta^2}\sqrt{1-\zeta'^2}\cos\phi + \zeta\zeta')}}}, \\ g(r, \zeta) &= (\Theta(r, \zeta) \vee 0)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} (1 + \Lambda_2(\mathcal{Y}_O\Theta(r, \zeta))), \end{aligned}$$

and enjoys the following properties:

1) The function $\xi \mapsto \Theta(\|\xi\|, \frac{\xi^3}{\|\xi\|}; \frac{1}{\gamma-1}, \mathbf{b})$ belongs to $C^{2,\alpha}(\{\|\xi\| \leq \Xi_0\})$ with $0 < \alpha < (\frac{1}{\gamma-1} - 1) \wedge 1$, $\Xi_0 = 4\xi_1(\frac{1}{\gamma-1})$, $\xi_1(\frac{1}{\gamma-1})$ being the zero of the Lane-Emden function $\theta(\xi; \frac{1}{\gamma-1})$ of the index $\frac{1}{\gamma-1}$, that is, the solution of

$$-\frac{1}{\xi^2} \frac{d}{d\xi} \xi^2 \frac{d\theta}{d\xi} = (\theta \vee 0)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}, \quad \theta|_{\xi=0} = 1.$$

2) $\Theta(0, \zeta; \frac{1}{\gamma-1}, \mathbf{b}) = 1$ and there is a curve $\zeta \in [-1, 1] \mapsto \Xi_1(\zeta; \frac{1}{\gamma-1}, \mathbf{b})$ such that

$$\xi_1\left(\frac{1}{\gamma-1}\right) \leq \Xi_1\left(\zeta; \frac{1}{\gamma-1}, \mathbf{b}\right) < \frac{1}{2}\Xi_0 = 2\xi_1\left(\frac{1}{\gamma-1}\right)$$

and, for $0 \leq \xi < \Xi_0$,

$$0 < \Theta(\xi, \zeta; \frac{1}{\gamma-1}, \mathbf{b}) \Leftrightarrow 0 \leq \xi < \Xi_1\left(\zeta; \frac{1}{\gamma-1}, \mathbf{b}\right). \quad (2.27)$$

3) $\frac{\partial\Theta}{\partial\xi} \leq -\frac{\xi}{C}$ with a positive number $C = C(\frac{1}{\gamma-1}, \mathbf{b})$.

For proof of the existence of the distorted Lane-Emden function Θ , see [10].

For the sake of simplicity we consider $\Theta(\xi, \zeta) < 0$ for $\xi \geq \Xi_0$ by modifying the values of Θ on $\xi > \Xi_0$, so that (2.27) is valid for $0 \leq \xi < \infty, |\zeta| \leq 1$. Let us denote

$$\mathfrak{D}_0 = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid \|\mathbf{x}\| < R_{b0}\}, \quad R_{b0} = \mathbf{a}\Xi_0 = 4\mathbf{a}\xi_1\left(\frac{1}{\gamma-1}\right). \quad (2.28)$$

Then

$$\Upsilon_b(\mathbf{x}) = \Upsilon_O\Theta\left(\frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|}{\mathbf{a}}, \frac{x^3}{\|\mathbf{x}\|}; \frac{1}{\gamma-1}, \mathbf{b}\right), \quad (2.29)$$

which belongs to $C^{2,\alpha}(\mathfrak{D}_0 \cup \partial\mathfrak{D}_0)$, satisfies

$$\Upsilon_b(\mathbf{x}) + \Phi_b(\mathbf{x}) - \mathfrak{B}(\varpi) = \Upsilon_O + \Phi_b(O) \quad \text{on } \mathfrak{D}_0. \quad (2.30)$$

We denote

$$\mathfrak{R}_b = \{\rho_b > 0\} = \{\Theta > 0\} = \{r < R_{1b}(\zeta)\}, \quad (2.31a)$$

$$\partial\mathfrak{R}_b = \{\Theta = 0\} = \{r = R_{1b}(\zeta)\}, \quad (2.31b)$$

where we put $R_{1b}(\zeta) = \mathbf{a}\Xi_1(\zeta)$.

Since

$$P_b = \Pi(\rho_b^{\gamma-1}), \quad (2.32)$$

where

$$\Pi(v) = (v \vee 0)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} \exp\left(\frac{\Sigma(v)}{\mathbf{C}_V}\right),$$

the stationary solution is barotropic. Here $\Pi \in C^2$ for $\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1} > 1$.

As for $\mathbf{a}_b = -\frac{1}{\gamma\mathbf{C}_V}\text{grad}S_b$, since $S_b \in C^{2,\alpha}(\mathfrak{R} \cup \partial\mathfrak{R})$, we have $\mathbf{a}_b = O(r)$.

Moreover, since $S_b = \Sigma(\rho_b^{\gamma-1})$ with $\Sigma \in C^\infty$, we see

$$\mathbf{a}_b = -\frac{1}{\gamma\mathbf{C}_V}\text{grad}S_b = -\frac{1}{\gamma\mathbf{C}_V}\frac{d\Sigma}{dv}\text{grad}v\Big|_{v=\rho_b^{\gamma-1}},$$

and

$$\mathcal{A}_b = \frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma\mathbf{C}_V}v\frac{d\Sigma}{dv}\|\text{grad}v\|\Big|_{v=\rho_b^{\gamma-1}}.$$

Since $\rho_b^{\gamma-1} \in C^{2,\alpha}(\mathfrak{R}_b \cup \partial\mathfrak{R}_b)$, we have $\mathcal{A}_b \in C^{1,\alpha}(\mathfrak{R}_b \cup \partial\mathfrak{R}_b)$.

Summing up, we get an admissible barotropic stationary solution $(\rho_b, S_b, \mathbf{v}_b)$.

□

Remark 3 *Let us note that*

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{d\Upsilon}{d\rho}\right)_b &= Df^\Upsilon(\rho_b) = \frac{\gamma P_b}{\rho_b^2} \left(1 + \frac{\gamma-1}{C_V} v \frac{d\Sigma}{dv}\right)_{v=\rho_b^{\gamma-1}} \\ &= \left(\frac{\gamma P}{\rho^2}\right)_b \left(1 + \mathcal{A}_b \frac{\rho_b^{2-\gamma}}{(\gamma-1)\|\text{grad}\rho_b\|}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if $\frac{d\Sigma}{dv} = 0 \quad \forall v$, that is, Σ is constant, then $\mathcal{A}_b = 0$ and it holds

$$\left(\frac{d\Upsilon}{d\rho}\right)_b = \left(\frac{\gamma P}{\rho^2}\right)_b. \quad (2.33)$$

We shall say that the background is ‘isentropic’ in this case. Then

$$P = A\rho^\gamma, \quad \Upsilon = \frac{\gamma A}{\gamma-1} \rho^{\gamma-1}; \quad S = C_V \log A.$$

3 Derivatin of the linearized equation for perturbations

Let us fix an admissible stationary solution $(\rho_b, S_b, \mathbf{v}_b)$ with $\mathbf{v}_b(\mathbf{x}) = \omega_b(\varpi) \frac{\partial}{\partial x^3} \times \mathbf{x}$. In order to investigate solutions (ρ, S, \mathbf{v}) near the fixed stationary solution, for which the domain $\mathfrak{R}(t) = \{\mathbf{x} \mid \rho(t, \mathbf{x}) > 0\}$ should move with the free boundary $\Sigma(t) = \partial\mathfrak{R}(t)$, we introduce the Lagrangian co-ordinate to describe the equations.

Let us look at a solution (ρ, S, \mathbf{v}) which belongs to $C^1([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3)$ with $\mathfrak{R}(t) = \{\mathbf{x} \mid \rho(t, \mathbf{x}) > 0\}$, provided that it exists. Suppose that $(\mathfrak{R}(t), \partial\mathfrak{R}(t))$ is diffeomorphic onto $(\mathfrak{R}_b, \partial\mathfrak{R}_b)$. Let us suppose

$$\mathfrak{R}(0) = \{\mathbf{x} \mid \rho(0, \mathbf{x}) > 0\} = \mathfrak{R}_b. \quad (3.1)$$

However we do not suppose that $\rho(0, \cdot) = \rho_b$.

We can consider the flow mapping $\varphi \in C^1([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3)$ defined by

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \varphi(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \mathbf{v}(t, \varphi(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}})), \quad \varphi(0, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \bar{\mathbf{x}}. \quad (3.2)$$

Note that $\varphi_b(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}})$ defined by (1.18), say,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \varphi_b(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \mathbf{v}_b(\varphi_b(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}})), \quad \varphi_b(0, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \bar{\mathbf{x}}, \quad (3.3)$$

can be written explicitly as

$$\varphi_b(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\omega_b t) & -\sin(\omega_b t) & 0 \\ \sin(\omega_b t) & \cos(\omega_b t) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \bar{\mathbf{x}}, \quad (3.4)$$

where $\omega_b = \omega_b(\bar{\omega})$, $\bar{\omega} = \sqrt{(\bar{x}^1)^2 + (\bar{x}^2)^2}$.

Through the mapping $\mathbf{x} = \boldsymbol{\varphi}(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}})$ the equations on (t, \mathbf{x}) can be written as equations on $(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}})$. This is the Lagrangian description.

Hereafter we denote

$$(D_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}\mathbf{x})(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) = D\boldsymbol{\varphi}(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}^\alpha} \left(\boldsymbol{\varphi}(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) \right)^j \right)_{j,\alpha}. \quad (3.5)$$

Then it hold that $D_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}\mathbf{x}(0, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) = I$ and

$$D_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}\mathbf{x}(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) = D\boldsymbol{\varphi}(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \exp \left[\int_0^t (D_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{v})(t', \boldsymbol{\varphi}(t', \bar{\mathbf{x}})) dt' \right] \quad (3.6)$$

Here $D_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{v}$ stands for the matrix field $\left(\frac{\partial v^k}{\partial x^j} \right)_{k,j}$.

Let us denote

$$\rho^0(\mathbf{x}) = \rho(0, \mathbf{x}), \quad P^0(\mathbf{x}) = P(0, \mathbf{x}), \quad S^0(\mathbf{x}) = S(0, \mathbf{x}). \quad (3.7)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^L(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) &= \rho(t, \boldsymbol{\varphi}(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}})), & P^L(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) &= P(t, \boldsymbol{\varphi}(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}})), \\ S^L(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) &= S(t, \boldsymbol{\varphi}(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}})), & \mathbf{v}^L(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) &= \mathbf{v}(t, \boldsymbol{\varphi}(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}})) \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

for $(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) \in [0, +\infty[\times \mathfrak{R}_b$.

The equations (1.1a), (1.1b), (1.1c) read

$$\frac{\partial \rho^L}{\partial t} + (\operatorname{div}_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{v})(t, \boldsymbol{\varphi}(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}})) = 0, \quad (3.9a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\mathbf{v}^L - \mathbf{v}_b^L) + B(\mathbf{v}^L - \mathbf{v}_b^L) + \left(\frac{1}{\rho} (\operatorname{grad}_{\mathbf{x}} P) - \frac{1}{\rho_b} (\operatorname{grad}_{\mathbf{x}} P_b) + \right. \\ \left. + (\operatorname{grad}_{\mathbf{x}}(\Phi - \Phi_b)) \right)^L = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.9b)$$

$$\frac{\partial S^L}{\partial t} = 0. \quad (3.9c)$$

Here, for function $Q(t, \mathbf{x})$, we denote $Q^L(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) = Q(t, \boldsymbol{\varphi}(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}))$ in general.

Integrating (3.9c), we have

$$S^L(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) = S^0(\bar{\mathbf{x}}). \quad (3.10)$$

Integrating (3.9a), we have

$$\rho^L(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \rho^0(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \exp \left[- \int_0^t (\operatorname{div}_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{v})(s, \boldsymbol{\varphi}(s, \bar{\mathbf{x}})) ds \right] \quad (3.11)$$

for $(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) \in [0, +\infty[\times \mathfrak{R}_b$.

Let us denote

$$\delta\rho(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \rho^L(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) - \rho_b^L(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \rho(t, \varphi(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}})) - \rho_b(\varphi(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}})), \quad (3.12a)$$

$$\delta P(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) = P^L(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) - P_b^L(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) = P(t, \varphi(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}})) - P_b(\varphi(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}})), \quad (3.12b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta S(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) &= S^L(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) - S_b^L(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) = S(t, \varphi(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}})) - S_b(\varphi(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}})) = \\ &= S^0(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) - S_b(\varphi(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}})), \end{aligned} \quad (3.12c)$$

$$\delta\Phi(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \Phi^L(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) - \Phi_b^L(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \Phi(t, \varphi(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}})) - \Phi_b(\varphi(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}})), \quad (3.12d)$$

$$\delta\mathbf{v}(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \mathbf{v}^L(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) - \mathbf{v}_b^L(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}), \quad (3.12e)$$

and

$$\underline{\delta}\rho(t, \mathbf{x}) = \rho(t, \mathbf{x}) - \rho_b(t, \mathbf{x}), \quad (3.13a)$$

$$\underline{\delta}P(t, \mathbf{x}) = P(t, \mathbf{x}) - P_b(t, \mathbf{x}), \quad (3.13b)$$

$$\underline{\delta}S(t, \mathbf{x}) = S(t, \mathbf{x}) - S_b(t, \mathbf{x}), \quad (3.13c)$$

$$\underline{\delta}\Phi(t, \mathbf{x}) = \Phi(t, \mathbf{x}) - \Phi_b(t, \mathbf{x}), \quad (3.13d)$$

$$\underline{\delta}\mathbf{v}(t, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{v}(t, \mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{v}_b(t, \mathbf{x}). \quad (3.13e)$$

Then the equations (3.9b) and (2.13) read

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\delta\mathbf{v} + 2\boldsymbol{\Omega} \times \delta\mathbf{v} + \\ &+ \left(\frac{1}{\rho_b} \text{grad}_{\mathbf{x}} P - \frac{1}{\rho_b} \text{grad}_{\mathbf{x}} P_b + \text{grad}_{\mathbf{x}}(\Phi - \Phi_b) \right)^L = - \left((\underline{\delta}\mathbf{v} | \text{grad}_{\mathbf{x}}) \mathbf{v}_b \right)^L. \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

• Now let us derive the linearized approximation of (3.11), (3.14). Considering small ε , a quantity Q will be denoted by $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ if Q and its derivatives are of order $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ uniformly on $t \in [0, T]$ for \forall fixed T .

We assume that $\rho - \rho_b, S - S_b, \mathbf{v}_b, \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_b$ are of $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$.

First of all we note that (3.6) shows

$$D_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}\mathbf{x}(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) = I + \int_0^t (D_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{v})(s, \varphi(s, \bar{\mathbf{x}})) ds + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2) \quad (3.15)$$

$$= I + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon), \quad (3.16)$$

since we are assuming $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_b + (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_b) = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$. Of course

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) &= \bar{\mathbf{x}} + \int_0^t \mathbf{v}(s, \varphi(s, \bar{\mathbf{x}})) ds \\ &= \bar{\mathbf{x}} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon). \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

Therefore, if $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{Q}(t, \mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$, then

$$\operatorname{div}_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{Q}(t, \mathbf{x}) = \operatorname{div}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} \mathbf{Q}^L(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2), \quad (3.18)$$

and, if $Q = Q(t, \mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$, then

$$\operatorname{grad}_{\mathbf{x}} Q(t, \mathbf{x}) = \operatorname{grad}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} Q^L(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2), \quad (3.19)$$

while $\mathbf{x} = \boldsymbol{\varphi}(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}})$. In other words

$$\left(\operatorname{div}_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{Q} \right)^L = \operatorname{div}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} \mathbf{Q}^L + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2), \quad (3.20)$$

$$\left(\operatorname{grad}_{\mathbf{x}} Q \right)^L = \operatorname{grad}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} Q^L + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2). \quad (3.21)$$

Remark 4 *If we assume only $\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_b = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$, but do not assume $\mathbf{v}_b = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$, then (3.16) can be not the case, but we have*

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} \boldsymbol{\varphi}(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) &= D_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} \boldsymbol{\varphi}_b(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon), \\ D_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} \boldsymbol{\varphi}_b(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) &= \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\omega_b t) & -\sin(\omega_b t) & 0 \\ \sin(\omega_b t) & \cos(\omega_b t) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} + \omega_b^D t \begin{bmatrix} -x^2 \bar{x}^1 & -x^1 \bar{x}^2 & 0 \\ x^1 \bar{x}^1 & x^1 \bar{x}^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{x} = \boldsymbol{\varphi}(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}})$, $\omega_b = \omega_b(\bar{\omega}) = \omega_b(\varpi)$, $\varpi = \sqrt{(x^1)^2 + (\bar{x}^2)^2}$, $\bar{\omega} = \sqrt{(\bar{x}^1)^2 + (\bar{x}^2)^2}$, $\omega_b^D = \frac{1}{\varpi} \frac{d\omega_b}{d\varpi}$. Thus, when $\omega_b \neq 0$, we have $D_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} \boldsymbol{\varphi} \neq I + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$, and the formulae (3.20), (3.21) do not work.

Let us look at (3.11), which can be written as

$$\rho(t, \boldsymbol{\varphi}(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}})) = \rho^0(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \exp \left[- \int_0^t (\operatorname{div}_{\mathbf{x}} \underline{\boldsymbol{\nu}})(s, \boldsymbol{\varphi}(s, \bar{\mathbf{x}})) ds \right]. \quad (3.22)$$

Let us verify it. Look at

$$\begin{aligned} &\exp \left[- \int_0^t (\operatorname{div}_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{v})(s, \boldsymbol{\varphi}(s, \bar{\mathbf{x}})) ds \right] = \\ &= \exp \left[- \int_0^t (\operatorname{div}_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{v}_b)(s, \boldsymbol{\varphi}(s, \bar{\mathbf{x}})) ds \right] \cdot \exp \left[- \int_0^t (\operatorname{div}_{\mathbf{x}} \underline{\boldsymbol{\nu}})(s, \boldsymbol{\varphi}(s, \bar{\mathbf{x}})) ds \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\mathbf{v}_b(\mathbf{x}) = \omega_b(\varpi) \begin{bmatrix} -x^2 \\ x^1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

we see $\operatorname{div}_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{v}_b = 0$. Therefore

$$\exp \left[- \int_0^t (\operatorname{div}_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{v}_b)(s, \boldsymbol{\varphi}(s, \bar{\mathbf{x}})) ds \right] = I$$

and (3.22) follows.

Recalling

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \varphi_b(t, \bar{x}) = \mathbf{v}_b(t, \varphi_b(t, \bar{x})), \quad \varphi_b(0, \bar{x}) = \bar{x},$$

we have

$$\varphi(t, \bar{x}) - \varphi_b(t, \bar{x}) = \int_0^t (\underline{\delta} \mathbf{v})(s, \varphi(s, \bar{x})) ds + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2), \quad (3.23)$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}(t, \varphi(t, \bar{x})) - \mathbf{v}_b(\varphi_b(t, \bar{x})) &= \\ &= (\underline{\delta} \mathbf{v})(t, \varphi(t, \bar{x})) + \left(\mathbf{v}_b(\varphi(t, \bar{x})) - \mathbf{v}_b(\varphi_b(t, \bar{x})) \right) \\ &= (\underline{\delta} \mathbf{v})(t, \varphi(t, \bar{x})) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2). \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div}_{\bar{x}}(\varphi(t, \bar{x}) - \varphi_b(t, \bar{x})) &= \int_0^t \operatorname{div}_{\bar{x}}(\underline{\delta} \mathbf{v}(s, \varphi(s, \bar{x}))) ds + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2) \\ &= \int_0^t \left(\operatorname{div}_{\mathbf{x}}(\underline{\delta} \mathbf{v}) \right)(s, \varphi(s, \bar{x})) ds + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2). \end{aligned}$$

Thus (3.22) reads

$$\rho(t, \varphi(t, \bar{x})) = \rho^0(\bar{x}) \exp \left[- \operatorname{div}_{\bar{x}}(\varphi(t, \bar{x}) - \varphi_b(t, \bar{x})) \right] + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2),$$

or we can claim

$$\rho(t, \varphi(t, \bar{x})) = \rho^0(\bar{x}) - \rho^0(\bar{x}) \operatorname{div}_{\bar{x}}(\varphi(t, \bar{x}) - \varphi_b(t, \bar{x})) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2). \quad (3.24)$$

Further we have, in modulo $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \rho(t, \bar{x}) &= \rho(t, \varphi(t, \bar{x})) - \rho_b(\varphi(t, \bar{x})) \\ &\equiv \rho^0(\bar{x}) - \rho_b(\varphi(t, \bar{x})) - \rho^0(\bar{x}) \operatorname{div}_{\bar{x}}(\varphi(t, \bar{x}) - \varphi_b(t, \bar{x})) \\ &\equiv \rho^0(\bar{x}) - \rho_b(\varphi_b(t, \bar{x})) - \left(\operatorname{grad} \rho_b(\varphi_b(t, \bar{x}) - \varphi_b(t, \bar{x})) \Big| \varphi(t, \bar{x}) \right) \\ &\quad - \operatorname{div}_{\bar{x}} \rho^0(\bar{x})(\varphi(t, \bar{x}) - \varphi_b(t, \bar{x})) + \left(\operatorname{grad} \rho^0(\bar{x}) \Big| \varphi(t, \bar{x}) - \varphi_b(t, \bar{x}) \right) \\ &= \rho^0(\bar{x}) - \rho_b(\varphi_b(t, \bar{x})) - \operatorname{div}_{\bar{x}} \left(\rho^0(\bar{x})(\varphi(t, \bar{x}) - \varphi_b(t, \bar{x})) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since it holds that

$$\rho_b(\varphi_b(t, \bar{x})) = \rho_b(\bar{x}), \quad (3.25)$$

we can claim

$$\delta \rho(t, \bar{x}) = \rho^0(\bar{x}) - \rho_b(\bar{x}) - \operatorname{div}_{\bar{x}} \left(\rho_b(\bar{x})(\varphi(t, \bar{x}) - \varphi_b(t, \bar{x})) \right) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2). \quad (3.26)$$

Here we assume that

$$\rho_b - \rho^0 = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon). \quad (3.27)$$

Now let us introduce ξ by

$$\xi(t, \bar{x}) = \varphi(t, \bar{x}) - \varphi_b(t, \bar{x}) + \xi^0(\bar{x}), \quad (3.28)$$

where $\xi^0 = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$. Then we can claim

$$\delta\rho(t, \bar{x}) = -\operatorname{div}_{\bar{x}}(\rho_b(\bar{x})\xi(t, \bar{x})) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2), \quad (3.29)$$

provided that

$$\rho^0(\bar{x}) - \rho_b(\bar{x}) = -\operatorname{div}_{\bar{x}}(\rho_b(\bar{x})\xi^0(\bar{x})). \quad (3.30)$$

We note that

$$\frac{\partial \xi}{\partial t}(t, \bar{x}) = \delta v(t, \bar{x}) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2), \quad (3.31)$$

where we recall $\delta v(t, \bar{x}) = (\underline{\delta v})(t, \varphi(t, \bar{x}))$ and $v(t, \varphi(t, \bar{x})) - v_b(\varphi_b(t, \bar{x})) = \delta v(t, \bar{x}) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)$.

Let us look at δS . We can claim

$$\delta S(t, \bar{x}) = -\left(\xi(t, \bar{x}) \Big| \operatorname{grad}_{\bar{x}} S_b(\bar{x})\right) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2), \quad (3.32)$$

provided that

$$S^0(\bar{x}) - S_b(\bar{x}) = -(\xi^0(\bar{x}) \Big| \operatorname{grad}_{\bar{x}} S_b(\bar{x})). \quad (3.33)$$

In fact, we see

$$\begin{aligned} \delta S(t, \bar{x}) &= S^0(\bar{x}) - S_b(\varphi(t, \bar{x})) \\ &= S^0(\bar{x}) - \left[S_b(\varphi_b(t, \bar{x})) + \left(\varphi(t, \bar{x}) - \varphi_b(t, \bar{x}) \Big| \operatorname{grad}_{\bar{x}} S_b(\varphi_b(t, \bar{x})) \right) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2) \right] \\ &= S^0(\bar{x}) - S_b(\bar{x}) - \left(\xi - \xi^0 \Big| \operatorname{grad}_{\bar{x}} S_b(\bar{x}) \right) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2) \\ &= -(\xi \Big| \operatorname{grad}_{\bar{x}} S_b(\bar{x})) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2), \end{aligned}$$

provided (3.33). Here we have used the identity

$$S_b(\varphi_b(t, \bar{x})) = S_b(\bar{x}). \quad (3.34)$$

Moreover we can replace (3.33) by

$$\rho^0(\bar{x})S^0(\bar{x}) - \rho_b(\bar{x})S_b(\bar{x}) = -\operatorname{div}_{\bar{x}}\left(\rho_b(\bar{x})S_b(\bar{x})\xi^0(\bar{x})\right) \quad (3.35)$$

in modulo $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)$, since

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^0 S^0 - \rho_b S_b + \operatorname{div}(\rho_b S_b \xi^0) &= \rho^0 \left(S^0 - S_b + (\xi^0 \Big| \operatorname{grad} S_b) \right) + \\ &+ S_b \operatorname{div} \left((\rho^0 - \rho_b) \xi^0 \right) + (\rho^0 - \rho_b)(S^0 - S_b), \end{aligned}$$

provided (3.30). Note that (3.30) and (3.35) imply

$$\int_{\mathfrak{R}_b} \rho^0(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\mathfrak{R}_b} \rho_b(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}, \quad (3.36)$$

$$\int_{\mathfrak{R}_b} \rho^0(\mathbf{x}) S^0(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\mathfrak{R}_b} \rho_b(\mathbf{x}) S_b(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}, \quad (3.37)$$

which mean that the total mass and the total entropy are the same for the perturbed configuration and the unperturbed background.

Let us look at δP . Since we are supposing $P = \rho^\gamma \exp(S/C_V)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta P(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) &= \left(\frac{\gamma P}{\rho} \right) \Big|_{(\rho, S) = (\rho_b^L, S_b^L)(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}})} \delta \rho(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) + \\ &+ \frac{1}{C_V} P_b^L(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) \delta S(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, supposing (3.33), we have

$$\delta P(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \left(\frac{\gamma P}{\rho} \right)_b(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \delta \rho(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) - \frac{P_b(\bar{\mathbf{x}})}{C_V} \left(\boldsymbol{\xi}(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) \Big| \text{grad}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} S_b(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \right) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2), \quad (3.38)$$

where

$$\left(\frac{\gamma P}{\rho} \right)_b(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \frac{\gamma P_b(\bar{\mathbf{x}})}{\rho_b(\bar{\mathbf{x}})},$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\gamma P}{\rho} \right) \Big|_{(\rho, S) = (\rho_b^L, S_b^L)(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}})} &= \left(\frac{\gamma P}{\rho} \right) \Big|_{(\rho, S) = (\rho_b, S_b)(\bar{\mathbf{x}})} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon), \\ P_b^L(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) &= P_b(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Since we have defined

$$\mathbf{a}_b := -\frac{1}{\gamma C_V} \text{grad} S_b = \frac{1}{\rho_b} \text{grad} \rho_b - \frac{1}{\gamma P_b} \text{grad} P_b, \quad (3.39)$$

we can write

$$\delta P = \left(\frac{\gamma P}{\rho} \right)_b \delta \rho + \gamma P_b(\boldsymbol{\xi} | \mathbf{a}_b) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2). \quad (3.40)$$

Let us note that we can write (3.40) as

$$\delta P = -\gamma P_b \text{div}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} \boldsymbol{\xi} - \left(\boldsymbol{\xi} \Big| \text{grad}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} P_b \right) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2), \quad (3.41)$$

by using (3.29), (3.39).

Let us look at

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(t, \mathbf{x}) - \Phi_b(\mathbf{x}) &= -\mathbb{G} \int \frac{\rho(t, \mathbf{x}') - \rho_b(\mathbf{x}')}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|} d\mathbf{x}' \\ &= -\mathbb{G} \int_{\mathfrak{R}_b} \frac{\delta\rho(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}')}{\|\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}'\|} d\bar{\mathbf{x}}' + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)\end{aligned}\quad (3.42)$$

In fact, applying the Gronwall argument to the identity

$$\varphi(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) - \varphi(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}') = \bar{\mathbf{x}} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}' + \int_0^t \left[\mathbf{v}(s, \varphi(s, \bar{\mathbf{x}})) - \mathbf{v}(s, \varphi(s, \bar{\mathbf{x}}')) \right] ds,$$

we can derive the estimate

$$\frac{1}{1 + C_1|\varepsilon|T} \|\varphi(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) - \varphi(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}')\| \leq \|\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}'\| \leq \frac{1}{1 - C_1|\varepsilon|T} \|\varphi(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) - \varphi(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}')\|$$

for $t \in [0, T]$, $\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{x}}' \in \mathfrak{R}_b$, provided that $C_1|\varepsilon|T < 1$, where

$$C_1 = \frac{1}{|\varepsilon|} \sup \left\{ \|D_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{v}(t, \mathbf{x})\| \mid 0 \leq t \leq T, \mathbf{x} \in \mathfrak{D}_0 \right\}$$

so that

$$\left| \int_0^t \left[\mathbf{v}(s, \varphi(s, \bar{\mathbf{x}})) - \mathbf{v}(s, \varphi(s, \bar{\mathbf{x}}')) \right] ds \right| \leq C_1|\varepsilon| \int_0^t \|\varphi(s, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) - \varphi(s, \bar{\mathbf{x}}')\| ds,$$

and we have

$$d\mathbf{x}' = \left| \det D_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}\mathbf{x}(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}') \right| d\bar{\mathbf{x}}' = (1 + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)) d\bar{\mathbf{x}}'.$$

Hence

$$\frac{\rho(t, \mathbf{x}') - \rho_b(\mathbf{x}')}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|} d\mathbf{x}' = \frac{\delta\rho(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}')}{\|\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}'\|} d\bar{\mathbf{x}}' + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)$$

For $\mathbf{x} = \varphi(1, \bar{\mathbf{x}})$, $\mathbf{x}' = \varphi(1, \bar{\mathbf{x}}')$, therefore (3.42) holds.

Combining (3.29) and (3.42), we see

$$\Phi(t, \mathbf{x}) - \Phi_b(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{G} \int_{\mathfrak{R}_b} \frac{\operatorname{div}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}(\rho_b \boldsymbol{\xi}(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}'))}{\|\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}'\|} d\bar{\mathbf{x}}' + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2).\quad (3.43)$$

We note

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{\rho} \operatorname{grad}_{\mathbf{x}} P - \frac{1}{\rho_b} \operatorname{grad}_{\mathbf{x}} P_b &= \frac{1}{\rho_b} \operatorname{grad}_{\mathbf{x}} (P - P_b) - \frac{\rho - \rho_b}{\rho_b^2} \operatorname{grad}_{\mathbf{x}} P_b \\ &= \frac{1}{\rho_b^L} \operatorname{grad}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}(\delta P) - \frac{\delta\rho}{(\rho_b^L)^2} \operatorname{grad}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} P_b^L + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)\end{aligned}\quad (3.44)$$

with $\mathbf{x} = \varphi(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}})$.

Summing up, we get the linearized approximation of (3.14):

$$\frac{\partial \delta \mathbf{v}}{\partial t} + B \delta \mathbf{v} + \mathcal{L} \boldsymbol{\xi} = 0, \quad (3.45)$$

with

$$\mathcal{L} \boldsymbol{\xi} = \frac{1}{\rho_b} \text{grad}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}(\delta P) - \frac{\text{grad}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} P_b}{(\rho_b)^2} \delta \rho + \text{grad}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} \left(4\pi \text{GK}[-\delta \rho] \right), \quad (3.46)$$

$$\delta \rho = -\text{div}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}(\rho_b \boldsymbol{\xi}), \quad (3.47)$$

$$\delta P = \frac{\gamma P_b}{\rho_b} \delta \rho - \gamma P_b (\boldsymbol{\xi} | \mathbf{a}_b), \quad (3.48a)$$

or

$$\delta P = -\gamma P_b \text{div}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} \boldsymbol{\xi} - \left(\boldsymbol{\xi} | \text{grad}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} P_b \right), \quad (3.48b)$$

where we read $\rho_b = \rho_b(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$, $P_b = P_b(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$.

Since $\delta \mathbf{v} = \partial \boldsymbol{\xi} / \partial t + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)$ ((3.31)), (3.45) reads

$$\frac{\partial^2 \boldsymbol{\xi}}{\partial t^2} + B \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\xi}}{\partial t} + \mathcal{L} \boldsymbol{\xi} = 0. \quad (3.49)$$

This equation (3.49) is the linearized equation for perturbations described by the Lagrangian coordinate to be analyzed.

Let us recall the assumptions supposed above which can be summarized as:

(DL) :

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mathbf{x} | \rho^0(\mathbf{x}) > 0\} &= \mathfrak{R}_b (= \{\mathbf{x} | \rho_b(\mathbf{x}) > 0\}), \\ \rho^0(\mathbf{x}) - \rho_b(\mathbf{x}) &= -\text{div} \left(\rho_b(\mathbf{x}) \boldsymbol{\xi}^0(\mathbf{x}) \right), \\ S^0(\mathbf{x}) - S_b(\mathbf{x}) &= - \left(\boldsymbol{\xi}^0(\mathbf{x}) | \text{grad} S_b(\mathbf{x}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 5 *Strictly speaking, we should introduce $(\delta \rho; \boldsymbol{\xi})$, $(\delta S; \boldsymbol{\xi})$, $(\delta P; \boldsymbol{\xi})$, $(\delta \Phi; \boldsymbol{\xi})$ by defining*

$$(\delta \rho; \boldsymbol{\xi})(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) = -\text{div}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}(\rho_b(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \boldsymbol{\xi}(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}})), \quad (3.50a)$$

$$(\delta S; \boldsymbol{\xi})(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) = -(\boldsymbol{\xi}(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) | \text{grad}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} S_b(\bar{\mathbf{x}})), \quad (3.50b)$$

$$(\delta P | \boldsymbol{\xi})(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \frac{\gamma P_b(\bar{\mathbf{x}})}{\rho_b(\bar{\mathbf{x}})} (\delta \rho; \boldsymbol{\xi}) - \gamma P_b(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) (\boldsymbol{\xi}(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) | \mathbf{a}_b(\bar{\mathbf{x}})) \quad (3.50c)$$

$$= -\gamma P_b(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \text{div}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} \boldsymbol{\xi}(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) - (\boldsymbol{\xi}(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) | \text{grad}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} P_b(\bar{\mathbf{x}})), \quad (3.50d)$$

$$(\delta \Phi; \boldsymbol{\xi})(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) = 4\pi \text{GK}[-(\delta \rho; \boldsymbol{\xi})](t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}). \quad (3.50e)$$

Then (3.46) should read

$$\mathbf{L}\boldsymbol{\xi} = \frac{1}{\rho_b} \text{grad}_{\mathbf{x}}(\delta P; \boldsymbol{\xi}) - \frac{\text{grad}_{\mathbf{x}} P_b}{(\rho_b)^2}(\delta \rho; \boldsymbol{\xi}) + \text{grad}_{\mathbf{x}}(\delta \Phi; \boldsymbol{\xi}), \quad (3.51)$$

while

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \rho &= (\delta \rho; \boldsymbol{\xi}) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2), \\ \delta S &= (\delta S; \boldsymbol{\xi}) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2), \\ \delta P &= (\delta P; \boldsymbol{\xi}) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2), \\ \delta \Phi &= (\delta \Phi; \boldsymbol{\xi}) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 6 *The derivation of the linearized approximation of the equations in Lagrangian co-ordinate system can be found [14, Sect. 56], [1, pp. 139-140.], [2, p.11, (A)], [15], [13, p.500, (1)] and so on. But there was considered only the case of $\rho^0 = \rho_b, S^0 = S_b$. In this case we can take $\boldsymbol{\xi}^0 = 0$. However this is not suitable to consider the eigenvalue problem. See Section 5. Moreover [15, (29), (30)], written by the symbols in this article, read*

$$\begin{aligned} B\dot{\boldsymbol{\xi}} &= 2\boldsymbol{\Omega} + \underline{(\mathbf{v}_b | \text{grad})\boldsymbol{\xi}}, \\ \mathcal{L}\boldsymbol{\xi} &= \underline{(\mathbf{v}_b | \text{grad})(\mathbf{v}_b | \text{grad})\boldsymbol{\xi}} + \underline{2\boldsymbol{\Omega} \times ((\mathbf{v}_b | \text{grad})\boldsymbol{\xi})} + \boldsymbol{\Omega} \times (\boldsymbol{\Omega} \times \boldsymbol{\xi}) + \text{etc.} \end{aligned}$$

But the underlined terms are of $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)$ when $\mathbf{v}_b = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$, so they should be neglected. Also [6] copies [15] without examination. In other words, we should take B and \mathcal{L} in the same form both for the case of $\omega_b = 0$ and for the case of $\omega_b \neq 0$, but $= \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$.

4 Basic existence theorem for the linearized equation of perturbations

We discuss on the existence of solutions to the linearized equation for perturbations, (3.49). We formulate the initial boundary value problem to be considered as:

$$\frac{\partial^2 \boldsymbol{\xi}}{\partial t^2} + B \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\xi}}{\partial t} + \mathcal{L}\boldsymbol{\xi} = \mathbf{f}(t, \mathbf{x}) \quad \text{on } [0, +\infty[\times \mathfrak{R}, \quad (4.1a)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\xi}|_{t=0} = \boldsymbol{\xi}^0, \quad \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\xi}}{\partial t} \Big|_{t=0} = \mathbf{v}^0 \quad \text{on } \mathfrak{R}, \quad (4.1b)$$

where

$$B = (B(\mathbf{x})_j^i)_{i,j}, \quad B_j^i \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3), \quad (4.2)$$

$$\mathcal{L}\mathbf{u} = \frac{1}{\rho} \text{grad} \delta P - \frac{\delta \rho}{\rho^2} \text{grad} P + \text{grad} \delta \Phi, \quad (4.3)$$

$$\delta \rho = -\text{div}(\rho \mathbf{u}), \quad (4.4)$$

$$\delta P = \frac{\gamma P}{\rho} \delta \rho + \gamma P(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{a}) = \frac{\gamma P}{\rho} \delta \rho + \frac{P}{C_V} \delta S, \quad (4.5)$$

$$\delta \Phi = 4\pi \text{GK}[-\delta \rho] = 4\pi \text{GK}[\text{div}(\rho \mathbf{u})], \quad (4.6)$$

$$\mathcal{K}[g] = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{\mathfrak{R}} \frac{g(\mathbf{x}')}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|} d\mathbf{x}', \quad (4.7)$$

and $\boldsymbol{\xi}^0, \mathbf{v}^0, \mathbf{f}$ are given data. We are denoting $\mathfrak{R}_b, \rho_b(\mathbf{x}), P_b(\mathbf{x}), S_b(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{a}_b, \mathcal{A}_b$ by $\mathfrak{R}, \rho(\mathbf{x}), P(\mathbf{x}), S(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{a}, \mathcal{A}$ for the sake of simplicity of symbols.

Let us consider the integro-differential operator \mathcal{L} in the Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H} = L^2(\rho d\mathbf{x}, \mathfrak{R}; \mathbb{C}^3)$ endowed with the inner product

$$(\mathbf{u}_1 | \mathbf{u}_2)_{\mathfrak{H}} = \int_{\mathfrak{R}} (\mathbf{u}_1(\mathbf{x}) | \mathbf{u}_2(\mathbf{x})) \rho(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}. \quad (4.8)$$

Of course

$$(\mathbf{u}_1(\mathbf{x}) | \mathbf{u}_2(\mathbf{x})) := \sum_k u_1^k(\mathbf{x}) u_2^k(\mathbf{x})^* \quad \text{for} \quad \mathbf{u}_\mu(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{bmatrix} u_\mu^1(\mathbf{x}) \\ u_\mu^2(\mathbf{x}) \\ u_\mu^3(\mathbf{x}) \end{bmatrix}, \mu = 1, 2.$$

Here and hereafter Z^* denotes the complex conjugate $X - iY$ of $Z = X + iY$, while i stands for the imaginary unit, $\sqrt{-1}$.

First we observe \mathcal{L} restricted on $C_0^\infty(\mathfrak{R}, \mathbb{C}^3)$. Let us decompose \mathcal{L} as

$$\mathcal{L}\mathbf{u} = \mathcal{L}_0\mathbf{u} + 4\pi \text{GK}\mathcal{L}_1, \quad (4.9)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_0\mathbf{u} = & \text{grad} \left(-\frac{\gamma P}{\rho^2} \text{div}(\rho \mathbf{u}) + \frac{\gamma P}{\rho} (\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{a}) \right) + \\ & + \frac{\gamma P}{\rho} \left(-\mathbf{a} \text{div}(\rho \mathbf{u}) + (\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{a}) \text{grad} \rho \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_1\mathbf{u} = \text{grad} \mathcal{K}(\text{div}(\rho \mathbf{u})). \quad (4.11)$$

Using this expression for $\mathbf{u} \in C_0^\infty(\mathfrak{R}), \mu = 1, 2$, we have the following formula

by integration by parts:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathcal{L}_0 \mathbf{u}_1 | \mathbf{u}_2) &= \int \frac{\gamma P}{\rho^2} \operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u}_1) \operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u}_2)^* + \\
&+ \int \frac{\gamma P}{\rho} \left(-(\mathbf{u}_1 | \mathbf{a}) \operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u}_2)^* - \operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u}_1) (\mathbf{u}_2^* | \mathbf{a}) \right) + \\
&+ \int \frac{\gamma P}{\rho} (\mathbf{u}_1 | \mathbf{a}) (\operatorname{grad} \rho | \mathbf{u}_2) \\
&= \int \frac{\gamma P}{\rho^2} \operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u}_1) \operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u}_2)^* + \\
&+ 2\Re \left[\int \frac{\gamma P \mathcal{A}}{\rho} (\mathbf{u}_1 | \mathbf{n}) \operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u}_2)^* \right] \\
&- \int \frac{\gamma P \mathcal{A}}{\rho} \|\operatorname{grad} \rho\|^2 (\mathbf{u}_1 | \mathbf{n}) (\mathbf{u}_2 | \mathbf{n})^*,
\end{aligned}$$

where we recall

$$\mathbf{a} = -\mathcal{A} \mathbf{n}, \quad \mathbf{n} = \frac{\operatorname{grad} \rho}{\|\operatorname{grad} \rho\|}, \quad (4.12)$$

and

$$(\mathcal{L}_1 \mathbf{u}_1 | \mathbf{u}_2) = - \int \mathcal{K}[\operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u}_1)] \operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u}_2)^*. \quad (4.13)$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathcal{L} \mathbf{u}_1 | \mathbf{u}_2) &= \int \frac{\gamma P}{\rho^2} \operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u}_1) \operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u}_2)^* + 2\Re \left[\int \frac{\gamma P \mathcal{A}}{\rho} (\mathbf{u}_1 | \mathbf{n}) \operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u}_2)^* \right] \\
&- \int \frac{\gamma P \mathcal{A}}{\rho} \|\operatorname{grad} \rho\|^2 (\mathbf{u}_1 | \mathbf{n}) (\mathbf{u}_2 | \mathbf{n})^* + \\
&- 4\pi G \int \mathcal{K}[\operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u}_1)] \operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u}_2)^*. \quad (4.14)
\end{aligned}$$

Then it is clear that

$$(\mathcal{L} \mathbf{u}_1 | \mathbf{u}_2) = (\mathbf{u}_1 | \mathcal{L} \mathbf{u}_2) \quad \text{for } \forall \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2 \in C_0^\infty(\mathfrak{X}), \quad (4.15)$$

that is, \mathcal{L} restricted on $C_0^\infty(\mathfrak{X})$ is a symmetric operator.

Moreover we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathcal{L}_0 \mathbf{u} | \mathbf{u}) &= \int \frac{\gamma P}{\rho^2} |\operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u})|^2 dx + 2\Re \left[\int \frac{\gamma P \mathcal{A}}{\rho} (u | \mathbf{n}) \operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u})^* \right] + \\
&- \int \frac{\gamma P \mathcal{A}}{\rho} |(u | \mathbf{n})|^2 \|\operatorname{grad} \rho\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathcal{A} \in C^{1,\alpha}(\mathfrak{X} \cup \partial \mathfrak{X})$, we have

$$\kappa_1 := \sup_{\mathfrak{X}} \left\{ |\mathcal{A}| \sqrt{\frac{\gamma P}{\rho}} \right\} < \infty. \quad (4.16)$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int \frac{\gamma^P \mathcal{A}}{\rho} (\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{n}) \operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u})^* \right| &\leq \frac{\kappa_1}{2} \left[\frac{1}{\epsilon} \int |(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{n})|^2 \rho d\mathbf{x} + \epsilon \int \frac{\gamma^P}{\rho^2} |\operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u})|^2 d\mathbf{x} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{\kappa_1}{2} \left[\frac{1}{\epsilon} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2 + \epsilon \int \frac{\gamma^P}{\rho^2} |\operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u})|^2 d\mathbf{x} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\kappa_2 := \sup_{\mathfrak{R}^3} \left\{ \frac{\gamma^P |\mathcal{A}|}{\rho^2} \|\operatorname{grad} \rho\| \right\} < \infty. \quad (4.17)$$

Then

$$\left| \int \frac{\gamma^P \mathcal{A}}{\rho} |(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{n})|^2 \|\operatorname{grad} \rho\| \right| \leq \kappa_2 \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2.$$

Taking $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2\kappa_1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{\gamma^P}{\rho^2} |\operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u})|^2 d\mathbf{x} - (2\kappa_1^2 + \kappa_2) \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2 &\leq (\mathcal{L}_0 \mathbf{u}|\mathbf{u}) \leq \\ &\leq \frac{3}{2} \int \frac{\gamma^P}{\rho^2} |\operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u})|^2 d\mathbf{x} + (2\kappa_1^2 + \kappa_2) \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

and, taking $\epsilon = \frac{2}{\kappa_1}$, we have

$$-\left(\frac{\kappa_1^2}{4} + \kappa_2\right) \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2 \leq (\mathcal{L}_0 \mathbf{u}|\mathbf{u}) \leq 2 \int \frac{\gamma^P}{\rho^2} |\operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u})|^2 d\mathbf{x} + \left(\frac{\kappa_1^2}{4} + \kappa_2\right) \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2. \quad (4.19)$$

As for \mathcal{L}_1 , on the other hand, we have

Proposition 1 *It holds that*

$$-\rho_O \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2 \leq (\mathcal{L}_1 \mathbf{u}|\mathbf{u})_{\mathfrak{H}} \leq 0. \quad (4.20)$$

Proof. Look at

$$\Psi := -\mathcal{K}[g], \quad \mathbf{C} := \rho \mathbf{u} - \operatorname{grad} \Psi. \quad (4.21)$$

Since $\Delta \Psi = g$, we have

$$\operatorname{div} \mathbf{C} = 0.$$

Keeping in mind that $\Psi = O(\frac{1}{r})$, $\operatorname{grad} \Psi$, $\mathbf{C} = O(\frac{1}{r^2})$ as $r \rightarrow +\infty$, we derive from this that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\operatorname{grad} \Psi | \mathbf{C}) d\mathbf{x} = 0 \quad (4.22)$$

Then we see

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathfrak{R}} \mathcal{K}[g]g^* d\mathbf{x} &= \int_{\mathfrak{R}} (\text{grad}\Psi|\rho\mathbf{u}) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\text{grad}\Psi|\mathbf{C} + \text{grad}\Psi) d\mathbf{x} \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \|\text{grad}\Psi\|^2 d\mathbf{x} \quad (\text{by (4.22)}) \\
&= \int_{\mathfrak{R}} \|\rho\mathbf{u}\|^2 d\mathbf{x} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \|\mathbf{C}\|^2 d\mathbf{x} \quad (\text{again by (4.22)}) \\
&\leq \int_{\mathfrak{R}} \|\rho\mathbf{u}\|^2 d\mathbf{x} \\
&\leq \rho_O \int_{\mathfrak{R}} \|u\|^2 \rho d\mathbf{x} = \rho_O \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\int_{\mathfrak{R}} \mathcal{K}[g]g^* d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \|\text{grad}\Psi\|^2 d\mathbf{x} \geq 0.$$

□

This proof is due to Juhi Jang. See [11, Proposition 2].

Summing up, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2} \int \frac{\gamma P}{\rho^2} |\text{div}(\rho\mathbf{u})|^2 d\mathbf{x} - (2\kappa_1^2 + \kappa_2 + 4\pi\mathsf{G}\rho_O) \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2 &\leq (\mathcal{L}\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{u}) \leq \\
\leq \frac{3}{2} \int \frac{\gamma P}{\rho^2} |\text{div}(\rho\mathbf{u})|^2 d\mathbf{x} + (2\kappa_1^2 + \kappa_2) \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2. &\quad (4.23)
\end{aligned}$$

and, on the other hand, thanks to (4.19), we have

$$-\left(\frac{\kappa_1^2}{4} + \kappa_2 + 4\pi\mathsf{G}\rho_O\right) \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2 \leq (\mathcal{L}\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{u}) \leq 2 \int \frac{\gamma P}{\rho^2} |\text{div}(\rho\mathbf{u})|^2 d\mathbf{x} + \left(\frac{\kappa_1^2}{4} + \kappa_2\right) \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2. \quad (4.24)$$

Therefore the operator \mathcal{L} restricted on $C_0^\infty(\mathfrak{R})$ is a symmetric, bounded from below operator in \mathfrak{H} . Applying the Friedrichs theory, see e.g., [12, Chapter VI, Section 2.3], we can claim:

Theorem 2 $\mathcal{L} \upharpoonright C_0^\infty(\mathfrak{R})$ admits the Friedrichs extension \mathbf{L} , which is a self-adjoint operator in \mathfrak{H} , whose domain is

$$\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{L}) = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathfrak{G}_0 \mid \mathcal{L}\mathbf{u} \in \mathfrak{H}\}. \quad (4.25)$$

Here \mathfrak{G} is the Hilbert space of all $\mathbf{u} \in \mathfrak{H}$ such that $\int_{\mathfrak{R}} \frac{\gamma P}{\rho^2} |\text{div}(\rho\mathbf{u})|^2 d\mathbf{x} < \infty$ endowed with the inner product

$$(\mathbf{u}_1|\mathbf{u}_2)_{\mathfrak{G}} = (\mathbf{u}_1|\mathbf{u}_2)_{\mathfrak{H}} + \int_{\mathfrak{R}} \frac{\gamma P}{\rho^2} (\text{div}(\rho\mathbf{u}_1)(\text{div}(\rho\mathbf{u}_2))^* d\mathbf{x}, \quad (4.26)$$

and \mathfrak{G}_0 is the closure of $C_0^\infty(\mathfrak{R})$ in \mathfrak{G} .

In fact, we define the quadratic form Q_0 by

$$\begin{aligned} Q_0[\mathbf{u}] = Q_0(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}) &= \int \frac{\gamma P}{\rho^2} |\operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u})|^2 dx + 2\Re \mathfrak{e} \left[\int \frac{\gamma P \mathcal{A}}{\rho} (\mathbf{u} | \mathbf{n}) \operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u})^* dx \right] + \\ &\quad - \int \frac{\gamma P \mathcal{A}}{\rho} |(\mathbf{u} | \mathbf{n})|^2 \|\operatorname{grad} \rho\| dx - 4\pi G \int \mathcal{K}[\operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u})] \operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u})^* dx. \end{aligned} \quad (4.27)$$

Then it holds that

$$(\mathcal{L} \mathbf{u}_1 | \mathbf{u}_2)_{\mathfrak{S}} = Q_0(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2) \quad (4.28)$$

for $\forall \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2 \in C_0^\infty(\mathfrak{R})$. We define

$$Q_a(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2) = Q_0(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2) + a(\mathbf{u}_1 | \mathbf{u}_2)_{\mathfrak{S}} \quad (4.29)$$

with

$$a := 2\kappa_1^2 + \kappa_2 + 4\pi G \rho_O. \quad (4.30)$$

Since

$$\frac{1}{2} \int \frac{\gamma P}{\rho^2} |\operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u})|^2 dx \leq Q_a[\mathbf{u}] \leq \frac{3}{2} \int \frac{\gamma P}{\rho^2} |\operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u})|^2 dx + (2\kappa_1^2 + \kappa_2 + a) \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathfrak{S}}^2, \quad (4.31)$$

we have

$$0 \leq Q_a[\mathbf{u}] \quad \text{for } \mathbf{u} \in \mathfrak{G}. \quad (4.32)$$

Since

$$\frac{1}{2} \int \frac{\gamma P}{\rho^2} |\operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u})|^2 dx \leq Q_a[\mathbf{u}] \leq \frac{3}{2} \int \frac{\gamma P}{\rho^2} |\operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u})|^2 dx + (2\kappa_1^2 + \kappa_2 + a) \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathfrak{S}}^2 \quad (4.33)$$

for $\mathbf{u} \in \mathfrak{G}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{C} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathfrak{G}} \leq [|\mathbf{u}|] \leq C \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathfrak{G}}, \quad (4.34)$$

where

$$[|\mathbf{u}|] := \left[\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathfrak{S}}^2 + Q_a[\mathbf{u}] \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (4.35)$$

Thus the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{G}}$ can be replaced by $[|\cdot|]$ equivalently. We have

$$((\mathbf{L} + a) \mathbf{u}_1 | \mathbf{u}_2)_{\mathfrak{S}} = Q_a(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2) \quad (4.36)$$

for $\forall \mathbf{u}_1 \in \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{L}), \forall \mathbf{u}_2 \in \mathfrak{G}_0$.

In this situation we can apply the Hille-Yosida theory, as described in **Appendix**. The conclusion is:

Theorem 3 Suppose $\xi^0 \in \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{L})$, $\mathbf{v}^0 \in \mathfrak{G}_0$ and $\mathbf{f} \in C([0, +\infty[; \mathfrak{H})$. Then the initial-boundary value problem (4.1a) (4.1b) admits a unique solution

$$\xi \in C^2([0, +\infty[, \mathfrak{H}) \cap C^1([0, +\infty[, \mathfrak{G}_0) \cap C([0, +\infty[, \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{L}))$$

and the energy

$$\begin{aligned} E(t, \mathbf{u}) &:= \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 + \left\| \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} \right\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2 \\ &= \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2 + Q_a[\mathbf{u}] + \left\| \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} \right\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2 = (1+a)\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2 + Q_0[\mathbf{u}] + \left\| \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} \right\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (4.37)$$

enjoys the estimate

$$\sqrt{E(t, \xi)} \leq e^{\kappa t} \sqrt{E(0, \xi)} + \int_0^t e^{\kappa(t-s)} \|\mathbf{f}(s)\|_{\mathfrak{H}} ds \quad (4.38)$$

for

$$\kappa = 1 + a + \max_{i,j} \|B_j^i\|_{L^\infty(\mathfrak{X})}.$$

Let us claim the following

Theorem 4 0 is an eigenvalue of \mathbf{L} and $\dim \text{Ker}[\mathbf{L}] = \infty$.

Proof. 1) Suppose $\mathcal{A} \neq 0$, that is, $\text{grad}S_b(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0$ for $\exists \mathbf{x} \in \mathfrak{X}$. Then

$$\xi^0(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\rho_b(\mathbf{x})} \text{grad}S_b(\mathbf{x}) \times \text{grad}\alpha(\mathbf{x}), \quad (4.39)$$

where $\alpha \in C_0^\infty(\mathfrak{X}; \mathbb{R})$ is arbitrary, enjoys

$$\begin{aligned} (\delta\rho; \xi^0) &= -\text{div}(\rho_b \xi^0) = 0, \\ (\delta S; \xi^0) &= -(\xi^0 | \text{grad}S_b) = 0, \\ (\delta P; \xi^0) &= -\frac{\gamma P_b}{\rho_b} (\delta\rho; \xi^0) + \frac{P_b}{C_V} (\delta S; \xi^0) = 0, \\ (\delta\Phi; \xi^0) &= -4\pi \text{GK}[(\delta\rho; \xi^0)] = 0, \end{aligned}$$

therefore $\mathbf{L}\xi^0 = \mathbf{0}$. (Recall the notations of Remark 5.) If $\text{grad}\alpha(\mathbf{x}_1) \neq 0$ and $\text{grad}S_b(\mathbf{x}_1) \neq \mathbf{0}$ at $\exists \mathbf{x}_1 \in \mathfrak{X}$, then $\xi^0 \neq 0$ and ξ^0 is an eigenvector of the eigenvalue 0.

2) Suppose $\mathcal{A} = 0$, that is, $\text{grad}S_b(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ for $\forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathfrak{X}$, or, the background is isentropic. Then, for any vector field $\mathbf{a} \in C_0^\infty(\mathfrak{X}; \mathbb{R}^3)$, the vector field ξ^0 defined by

$$\xi^0(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\rho_b(\mathbf{x})} \text{rota}(\mathbf{x}) \quad (4.40)$$

enjoys $\delta\rho = 0, \delta S = 0, \delta P = 0, \delta\Phi = 0$, so that $\mathbf{L}\xi^0 = \mathbf{0}$. If $\text{rota} \neq \mathbf{0}$ somewhere, then $\xi^0 \neq \mathbf{0}$ and it is an eigenvector. \square

The solution $\boldsymbol{\xi}(t, \mathbf{x}) = \boldsymbol{\xi}^0(\mathbf{x})$ with $L\boldsymbol{\xi}^0 = \mathbf{0}$ may be called a ‘trivial perturbation’ after [7].

Roughly or formally speaking, the boundary condition for $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in D(L)$ is:

$$\operatorname{div}(\rho\boldsymbol{\xi}) = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\mathfrak{A},$$

or

$$(\mathbf{n}|\boldsymbol{\xi}) = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\mathfrak{A},$$

since, formally,

$$\operatorname{div}(\rho\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \rho\operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\xi} + (\operatorname{grad}\rho|\boldsymbol{\xi})$$

with $\rho = 0$ and $\mathbf{n} = \operatorname{grad}\rho/\|\operatorname{grad}\rho\|$ on the boundary.

5 Eigenvalue problem

We are considering the equation

$$\frac{\partial^2 \boldsymbol{\xi}}{\partial t^2} + \mathbf{B} \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\xi}}{\partial t} + L\boldsymbol{\xi} = 0. \quad (5.1)$$

Keeping in mind $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{v} = 2\Omega \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}$, we suppose that \mathbf{B} is a skew symmetric bounded linear operator in $\mathfrak{B}(\mathfrak{H})$. Therefore $(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{v}|\mathbf{v}) = -(\mathbf{v}|\mathbf{B}\mathbf{v})$ and $\Re[(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{v}|\mathbf{v})] = 0 \quad \forall \mathbf{v}$. Put

$$\beta := \|\mathbf{B}\|_{\mathfrak{B}(\mathfrak{H})} = \sup \frac{\|\mathbf{B}\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathfrak{H}}}{\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathfrak{H}}}. \quad (5.2)$$

L is a self-adjoint operator in \mathfrak{H} and

$$(\mathbf{L}\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{u})_{\mathfrak{H}} \geq -m_* \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2 \quad \forall \mathbf{u} \in D(L), \quad (5.3)$$

m_* being a nonnegative number, say,

$$m_* = (-\mu_*) \vee 0, \quad (5.4)$$

where

$$\mu_* := \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in D(L)} \frac{(\mathbf{L}\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{u})_{\mathfrak{H}}}{\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2}. \quad (5.5)$$

We know

$$m_* \leq \frac{\kappa_1^2}{4} + \kappa_2 + 4\pi G\rho_0$$

by (4.24).

Now we look for nontrivial solution of (5.1) of the form $\boldsymbol{\xi}(t, \mathbf{x}) = e^{\lambda t} \boldsymbol{\xi}^0(\mathbf{x})$, where $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, $\boldsymbol{\xi}^0 \in D(L)$. Namely

Definition 3 *If there is a $\xi^0 \in D(L)$ such that $\xi^0 \neq \mathbf{0}$, and*

$$\left[\lambda^2 + \lambda B + L \right] \xi^0 = \mathbf{0} \quad (5.6)$$

holds, then λ is called an eigenvalue of (5.1) and ξ^0 is called an eigenvector associated with the eigenvalue λ .

If λ is an eigenvalue of (5.1) and ξ^0 is an associated eigenvector, then

1) $\xi : (t, \mathbf{x}) \mapsto e^{\lambda t} \xi^0(\mathbf{x})$ is a solution of (5.1) with the initial condition

$$\xi|_{t=0} = \xi^0(\mathbf{x}), \quad \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial t} \Big|_{t=0} = \lambda \xi^0(\mathbf{x}), \quad (5.7)$$

2) $\xi^{\Re} : (t, \mathbf{x}) \mapsto \Re[e^{\lambda t} \xi^0(\mathbf{x})]$ is a solution of (5.1) with the initial condition

$$\xi^{\Re}|_{t=0} = \Re[\xi^0(\mathbf{x})], \quad \frac{\partial \xi^{\Re}}{\partial t} \Big|_{t=0} = \Re[\lambda] \Re[\xi^0(\mathbf{x})] - \Im[\lambda] \Im[\xi^0(\mathbf{x})], \quad (5.8)$$

3) λ satisfies the quadratic equation

$$a\lambda^2 + ib\lambda + c = 0 \quad (5.9)$$

where the coefficients a, b, c are given by

$$a = \|\xi^0\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2, \quad b = -i(B\xi^0|\xi^0)_{\mathfrak{H}}, \quad c = (L\xi^0|\xi^0)_{\mathfrak{H}}, \quad (5.10)$$

and a, b, c are real numbers.

If L is the operator defined by Theorem 2, it follows from Theorem 4 that 0 is an eigenvalue of (5.1) and the multiplicity is infinite. The solution $\xi(t, \mathbf{x}) = \xi^0(\mathbf{x})$ with $L\xi^0 = \mathbf{0}$ may be called a ‘trivial perturbation’ after [7].

Let us recall the operator A in $\mathfrak{E} = \mathfrak{G}_0 \times \mathfrak{H}$ defined by

$$AU = \begin{bmatrix} O & -I \\ L & B \end{bmatrix} U, \quad D(A) = D(L) \times \mathfrak{G}_0, \quad (5.11)$$

by which the equation (5.1) reads

$$\frac{dU}{dt} + AU = \mathbf{0}$$

with $U = (\xi, \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial t})^\top$.

Proposition 2 *$\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ is an eigenvalue of (5.1) if and only if λ is an eigenvalue of the operator $-A$.*

Following [6], we use

Definition 4 The family of operators $\mathfrak{L} = (\mathfrak{L}(\lambda))_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}}$, where

$$\mathfrak{L}(\lambda) = \lambda^2 + \lambda \mathbf{B} + \mathbf{L}, \quad (5.12)$$

is called the ‘quadratic pencil’ of the equation (5.1).

The resolvent set $\mathbf{P}(\mathfrak{L})$ is the set of $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\mathfrak{L}(\lambda)$ has the bounded inverse in $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})$. $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbf{P}(\mathfrak{L})$ is the spectrum of \mathfrak{L} , and is denoted by $\Sigma(\mathfrak{L})$. The set of all eigenvalues of (5.1) is denoted by $\Sigma_p(\mathfrak{L})$.

If λ is an eigenvalue of (5.1), then it belongs to the spectrum of \mathfrak{L} , that is, $\Sigma_p(\mathfrak{L}) \subset \Sigma(\mathfrak{L})$. However we cannot say that any $\lambda \in \Sigma(\mathfrak{L})$ is an eigenvalue of (5.1), that is, $\Sigma_p(\mathfrak{L}) = \Sigma(\mathfrak{L})$, a priori. We study the structure of $\Sigma(\mathfrak{L})$.

Proposition 3 $\mathbf{P}(\mathfrak{L})$ is an open subset of \mathbb{C} and $\Sigma(\mathfrak{L})$ is closed .

Proof. Let us consider $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}(\mathfrak{L})$. Then

$$\mathfrak{L}(\lambda + \Delta\lambda) = \mathfrak{L}(\lambda) \left[I + \mathfrak{L}(\lambda)^{-1}(\Delta\lambda(2\lambda + \mathbf{B} + \Delta\lambda)) \right]$$

admits the bounded inverse and $\lambda + \Delta\lambda \in \mathbf{P}(\mathfrak{L})$, if

$$\| \mathfrak{L}(\lambda)^{-1} \Delta\lambda(2\lambda + \mathbf{B} + \Delta\lambda) \|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})} < 1.$$

For this inequality, it is sufficient that

$$\| \mathfrak{L}(\lambda)^{-1} \|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})} \cdot |\Delta\lambda| \cdot (2|\lambda| + \beta + |\Delta\lambda|) < 1,$$

or

$$|\Delta\lambda| < -\left(|\lambda| + \frac{\beta}{2}\right) + \sqrt{\left(|\lambda| + \frac{\beta}{2}\right)^2 + \frac{1}{\| \mathfrak{L}(\lambda)^{-1} \|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})}}}$$

This means $\mathbf{P}(\mathfrak{L})$ is open. \square

Proposition 4 $\mathbf{P}(\mathfrak{L})$ and $\Sigma(\mathfrak{L})$ are symmetric about the imaginary axis $i\mathbb{R}$.

In fact we see $\mathfrak{L}(\lambda)^* = \mathfrak{L}(-\lambda^*)$.

Proposition 5 It hold

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathfrak{L}) = \mathbf{P}(-\mathbf{A}), \quad \Sigma(\mathfrak{L}) = \Sigma(-\mathbf{A}), \quad \Sigma_p(\mathfrak{L}) \subset \Sigma_p(-\mathbf{A}).$$

Here $\mathbf{P}(-\mathbf{A}), \Sigma(-\mathbf{A}), \Sigma_p(-\mathbf{A})$ stand for the usual resolvent set, spectrum, point spectrum (the set of all eigenvalues) of the operator $-\mathbf{A}$ in $\mathfrak{G}_0 \times \mathfrak{H}$.

Proof. Let $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}(\mathfrak{L})$. Consider the equation

$$\mathbf{A}U + \lambda U = F = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{g} \\ \mathbf{f} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathfrak{G}_0 \times \mathfrak{H},$$

or,

$$\begin{cases} -\mathbf{v} + \lambda \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{g} \\ \mathbf{L}\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u} + \lambda \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{f} \end{cases}$$

This system of equations can be solved as

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{u} = \mathfrak{L}(\lambda)^{-1}(\mathbf{f} + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{g} - \lambda \mathbf{f}) \\ \mathbf{v} = \lambda \mathfrak{L}(\lambda)^{-1}(\mathbf{f} + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{g} - \lambda \mathbf{f}) - \mathbf{f} \end{cases}$$

since $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}(\mathfrak{L})$, while $F \mapsto U$ is continuous. Therefore $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}(-\mathbf{A})$.

Inversely let $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}(-\mathbf{A})$. Consider the equation

$$(\lambda^2 + \lambda \mathbf{B} + \mathbf{L})\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{f} \in \mathfrak{H},$$

which is equivalent to the system of equations

$$\begin{cases} \lambda \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{L}\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{f}, \\ \mathbf{v} = \lambda \mathbf{u} \end{cases}$$

But this is nothing but

$$\mathbf{A}U + \lambda U = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{f} \end{bmatrix}$$

for $U = (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})^\top$. Since $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}(-\mathbf{A})$ is supposed, this admits the solution

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{v} \end{bmatrix} = (\mathbf{A} + \lambda)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{f} \end{bmatrix},$$

and $\mathbf{f} \mapsto \mathbf{u}$ is continuous, that is, $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}(\mathfrak{L})$. \square

Let us consider the case of $\mathbf{B} = O$, or $\Omega = 0$. Then

$$\Sigma(\mathfrak{L}) = \left\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \mid -\lambda^2 \in \Sigma(\mathbf{L}) \right\},$$

where $\Sigma(\mathbf{L})$ is the spectrum of the operator \mathbf{L} in \mathfrak{H} . We know $\Sigma(\mathbf{L}) \subset [-m_*, +\infty[$. Therefore we see

$$\Sigma(\mathfrak{L}) \subset i\mathbb{R} \cup [-\sqrt{m_*}, \sqrt{m_*}].$$

But, when $\mathbf{B} \neq 0, \Omega \neq 0$, the situation is not so simple. Note that, when $\mathbf{B} \neq 0, \Omega \neq 0$, \mathbf{A} is not self-adjoint, since

$$(\mathbf{A}U|U)_{\mathfrak{E}} - (U|\mathbf{A}U)_{\mathfrak{E}} = (\mathbf{B}\mathbf{v}|\mathbf{v})_{\mathfrak{H}} - (\mathbf{v}|\mathbf{B}\mathbf{v})_{\mathfrak{H}} = 2(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{v}|\mathbf{v})_{\mathfrak{H}} \quad \text{for } U = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{v} \end{bmatrix}.$$

At least we can claim

Proposition 6 *It holds*

$$]-\infty, -A[\cup]A, +\infty[\subset \mathbf{P}(\mathfrak{L}) = \mathbf{P}(-\mathbf{A}) \quad (5.13)$$

$$\text{with } A = \frac{\beta}{2} + \sqrt{\frac{\beta^2}{4} + m_*}.$$

For proof see Proposition **A2** of **Appendix**.

Proposition 7 *For $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}(\mathfrak{L})$, we have*

$$\|\mathfrak{L}(\lambda)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})} \geq \frac{1}{d(2|\lambda| + \beta + d)} \quad (5.14)$$

where $d := \text{dist.}(\lambda, \Sigma(\mathfrak{L}))$.

Proof. Let $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}(\mathfrak{L})$. Then, for $\Delta\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, the operator

$$\mathfrak{L}(\lambda + \Delta\lambda) = \mathfrak{L}(\lambda) \left[I + \mathfrak{L}(\lambda)^{-1} \Delta\lambda (2\lambda + \mathbf{B} + \Delta\lambda) \right]$$

admits the bounded inverse in $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})$ and $\lambda + \Delta\lambda \in \mathbf{P}(\mathfrak{L})(\mathfrak{L})$, if

$$\|\mathfrak{L}(\lambda)^{-1} \Delta\lambda (2\lambda + \mathbf{B} + \Delta\lambda)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})} < 1.$$

For this inequality, it is sufficient that

$$\|\mathfrak{L}(\lambda)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})} \cdot |\Delta\lambda| \cdot (2|\lambda| + \beta + |\Delta\lambda|) < 1.$$

In other words, if $\lambda + \Delta\lambda \in \Sigma(\mathfrak{L})$, then it should hold

$$\|\mathfrak{L}(\lambda)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})} \cdot |\Delta\lambda| \cdot (2|\lambda| + \beta + |\Delta\lambda|) \geq 1.$$

If $d < +\infty$, then there is a sequence $\lambda + (\Delta\lambda)_n \in \Sigma(\mathfrak{L})$ such that $|(\Delta\lambda)_n| \rightarrow d$, and the assertion follows. \square

Theorem 5 ([6, Theorem 1]) $\Sigma(\mathfrak{L})$ is a subset of

$$S := i\mathbb{R} \cup \left\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \mid |\lambda| \leq \sqrt{m_*}, \quad |\Im\mathfrak{m}[\lambda]| \leq \frac{\beta}{2} \right\}. \quad (5.15)$$

Proof. First we consider $\lambda_\infty \in \partial\Sigma(\mathcal{L})$.

Let us take a sequence $(\lambda_n)_n$ such that $\lambda_n \in \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{L})$ and $\lambda_n \rightarrow \lambda_\infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. By Proposition 7 we have $\|(\mathcal{L}(\lambda_n))^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})} \rightarrow +\infty$, therefore there are $\mathbf{f}_n \in \mathfrak{H}$ such that $\|\mathbf{f}_n\|_{\mathfrak{H}} = 1$ and $\|\mathcal{L}(\lambda_n))^{-1}\mathbf{f}_n\|_{\mathfrak{H}} \rightarrow +\infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Put $\boldsymbol{\xi}_n = \mathcal{L}(\lambda_n)^{-1}\mathbf{f}_n (\in \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{L}))$ and $\mathbf{u}_n = \boldsymbol{\xi}_n / \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_n\|_{\mathfrak{H}}$. Then $\|\mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathfrak{H}} = 1$ and

$$\left| (\mathcal{L}(\lambda_n)\mathbf{u}_n | \mathbf{u}_n)_{\mathfrak{H}} \right| = \left| \frac{1}{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_n\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2} (\mathbf{f}_n | \boldsymbol{\xi}_n)_{\mathfrak{H}} \right| \leq \frac{1}{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_n\|_{\mathfrak{H}}} \rightarrow 0.$$

But we see

$$(\mathcal{L}(\lambda_n)\mathbf{u}_n | \mathbf{u}_n)_{\mathfrak{H}} = \lambda_n^2 + i\lambda_n b_n + c_n,$$

where

$$b_n := -i(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{u} | \mathbf{u})_{\mathfrak{H}}, \quad c_n = (\mathbf{L}\mathbf{u}_n | \mathbf{u}_n)_{\mathfrak{H}}.$$

Here $b_n, c_n \in \mathbb{R}$ and $|b_n| \leq \beta, c_n \geq -m_*$. Hence, by taking a subsequence if necessary, we can suppose that b_n tends to a limit b_∞ such that $b_\infty \in \mathbb{R}, |b_\infty| \leq \beta$. Put $c_\infty := -\lambda_\infty^2 - i\lambda_\infty b_\infty$. Then we see $c_n \rightarrow c_\infty$. Hence $c_\infty \in \mathbb{R}$ and $c_\infty \geq -m_*$, and λ_∞ turns out to enjoy the quadratic equation

$$\lambda_\infty^2 + ib_\infty \lambda_\infty + c_\infty = 0.$$

Consequently,

$$\lambda_\infty = i \left[-\frac{b_\infty}{2} \pm \sqrt{\frac{b_\infty^2}{4} + c_\infty} \right].$$

If $\frac{b_\infty^2}{4} + c_\infty \geq 0$, then $\lambda_\infty \in i\mathbb{R}$. If $\frac{b_\infty^2}{4} + c_\infty \leq 0$, then $|\lambda_\infty|^2 = -c_\infty \leq m_*$ and $|\Im[\lambda_\infty]| = \left| -\frac{b_\infty}{2} \right| \leq \frac{\beta}{2}$. Hence $\lambda_\infty \in S$.

Let us consider $\lambda_0 \in \Sigma(\mathcal{L})$. We claim $\lambda_0 \in S$. Suppose $\lambda_0 \notin S$. By the symmetricity, we suppose $\Re[\lambda_0] > 0$. Then there would exist a curve $\Gamma : t \in [0, 1] \mapsto \lambda(t) \in \mathbb{C} \setminus S$ such that $\lambda(0) = \lambda_0$ and $\lambda(1) \in \left] \frac{\beta}{2} + \sqrt{\frac{\beta^2}{4} + m_*}, +\infty \right[$. Recall $\lambda(1) \in \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{L})$ by Proposition 6. The time

$$\bar{t} = \sup \left\{ t \in [0, 1] \mid \lambda(t) \in \Sigma(\mathcal{L}) \right\}$$

would enjoy $\bar{t} \in [0, 1[, \lambda(\bar{t}) \in \partial\Sigma(\mathcal{L}), \lambda(\bar{t}) \notin S$, a contradiction to $\partial\Sigma(\mathcal{L}) \subset S$. Therefore we can claim $\lambda_0 \in S$. \square

We want to clarify the structure of $\Sigma(\mathcal{L})$ more concretely. In [6, p.405] J. Dyson and B. F. Schutz say that the following assumption about $\Sigma(\mathcal{L})$ is very reasonable and provable:

Assumption 3 Let $S = S_{(i)} \cup S_{(ii)} \cup S_{(iii)}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} S_{(i)} &= \{ \lambda \in i\mathbb{R} \mid |\Im[\lambda]| > \frac{\beta}{2} \} \\ S_{(ii)} &= \{ \lambda \in S \mid \lambda \notin i\mathbb{R} \}, \\ S_{(iii)} &= \{ \lambda \in i\mathbb{R} \mid |\Im[\lambda]| \leq \frac{\beta}{2} \}. \end{aligned}$$

Then

- (i) $\Sigma(\mathcal{L}) \cap S_{(i)} \subset \Sigma_p(\mathcal{L})$,
- (ii) $\Sigma(\mathcal{L}) \cap S_{(ii)} \subset \Sigma_p(\mathcal{L})$, and $\partial(\Sigma_p(\mathcal{L}) \cap S_{(ii)}) \cap (i\mathbb{R}) = \emptyset$,
- (iii) $(\Sigma(\mathcal{L}) \cap S_{(iii)}) \setminus \Sigma_p(\mathcal{L}) \neq \emptyset$.

However it seems that this assumption has not yet been justified mathematically. Note that the Assumption 3 implies that, when $\Omega = 0$, it holds that $\Sigma(\mathcal{L}) = \Sigma_p(\mathcal{L})$ and that, when $\Omega \neq 0$, it holds that $\Sigma(\mathcal{L}) \setminus \Sigma_p(\mathcal{L}) \neq \emptyset$.

6 Stability problem

Let us discuss on the stability problem.

D. Lynden-Bell and J. P. Ostriker, [15, p.301, line 18], say:

Equation (36) shows that the system is stable if c is positive for each eigen ξ [read ξ^0]. This assured if \mathbf{C} [read \mathbf{L}] is positive definite. Thus:

A sufficient condition for stability is that \mathbf{C} [read \mathbf{L}] is positive definite. This is *the* condition for secular stability.

We should careful to understand the meaning of the saying ‘the system is stable’ and ‘ \mathbf{L} is positive definite’. As for ‘stability’ C. Hunter [9] says:

A general system is said to be ordinarily or dynamically unstable if the amplitude of some mode grows exponentially in time, but ordinarily stable if every mode is oscillatory in time. An ordinarily stable system can be said to be secularly unstable if small additional dissipative forces can cause some perturbation to grow. Otherwise, the system is said to be secularly stable.

So ‘(ordinary) stability’ means the condition:

(ST.1) For any eigenvalue $\lambda \in \Sigma_p(\mathcal{L})$ of (5.1) and its associated solution $\xi(t, \mathbf{x}) = e^{\lambda t} \xi^0(\mathbf{x})$, $\xi^0 \in D(\mathbf{L})$, $\xi^0 \neq \mathbf{0}$, it holds

$$\|\Xi(t, \cdot)\|_{\mathfrak{H} \times \mathfrak{H}} \leq C \quad \text{for } \forall t \in [0, +\infty[, \quad (6.1)$$

Here and hereafter

$$\Xi = \begin{bmatrix} \xi \\ \dot{\xi} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \dot{\xi} = \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial t}. \quad (6.2)$$

Since

$$\|\boldsymbol{\xi}(t, \cdot)\|_{\mathfrak{H}} = e^{\Re[\lambda]t} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}^0\|_{\mathfrak{H}}, \quad \|\dot{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(t, \cdot)\|_{\mathfrak{H}} = |\lambda| e^{\Re[\lambda]t} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}^0\|_{\mathfrak{H}},$$

the following condition is necessary and sufficient for the stability in the sense of **(ST.1)**:

(*) For any eigenvalue $\lambda \in \Sigma_p(\mathfrak{L})$ it holds that $\Re[\lambda] = 0$, that is, $\Sigma_p(\mathfrak{L}) \subset i\mathbb{R}$.

On the other hand, any $\lambda \in \Sigma_p(\mathfrak{L})$ satisfies the quadratic equation

$$\lambda^2 + ib\lambda + c = 0 \tag{6.3}$$

where the coefficients b, c are given by

$$b = -i(B\boldsymbol{\xi}^0|\boldsymbol{\xi}^0)_{\mathfrak{H}}, \quad c = (L\boldsymbol{\xi}^0|\boldsymbol{\xi}^0)_{\mathfrak{H}}, \tag{6.4}$$

$\boldsymbol{\xi}^0$ being an associated eigen vector such that $\|\boldsymbol{\xi}^0\|_{\mathfrak{H}} = 1$, and b, c being real numbers, therefore

$$\lambda = i \left[\frac{b}{2} \pm \sqrt{\frac{b^2}{4} + c} \right]. \tag{6.5}$$

Hence

$$\Re[\lambda] = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \frac{b^2}{4} + c \geq 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad c \geq 0. \tag{6.6}$$

Therefore, considering the condition

(PD.1): It holds

$$(L\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{u})_{\mathfrak{H}} \geq 0 \quad \forall \mathbf{u} \in D(L), \tag{6.7}$$

we can claim

Proposition 8 If L is ‘positive definite’ in the sense of **(PD.1)**, then the background $(\rho, S, \mathbf{v}) = (\rho_b, S_b, \mathbf{v}_b)$ is ‘stable’ in the sense of **(ST.1)**.

The saying of [15] can be interpreted as this Proposition.

Note that **(PD.1)** implies

$$\mu_* = \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in D(L)} \frac{(L\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{u})_{\mathfrak{H}}}{\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2} \geq 0,$$

$m_* = (-\mu_*) \vee 0 = 0$, and $\Sigma(\mathfrak{L}) \subset i\mathbb{R}$ by Theorem 5.

The concept of ‘stability’ in the sense of **(ST.1)** is concerned with only ‘every modes’, say, waves associated with eigenvalues. We may consider all solutions

ξ of (5.1) and the wider stability concept:

(ST.2) : For all solution $\xi \in C^2([0, +\infty[, \mathfrak{H}) \cap C^1([0, +\infty[; \mathfrak{G}_0) \cap C([0, +\infty[; \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{L}))$ of (5.1) it holds

$$\|\Xi(t, \cdot)\|_{\mathfrak{H} \times \mathfrak{H}} \leq C \quad \text{for } \forall t \in [0, +\infty[. \quad (6.8)$$

There is a gap between **(ST.1)** and **(ST.2)**. Of course **(ST.2)** \Rightarrow **(ST.1)**, but the inverse is not obvious, since we do not have an answer to the question:

Question 1 *Is the set of all eigenvectors of (5.1) dense in \mathfrak{H} ?*

or

Question 2 *Is $\Sigma_p(\mathcal{L}) = \Sigma(\mathcal{L})$?*

Let us note that, if $\Omega = \omega_b = 0$ and the background is spherically symmetric, then it holds that $\Sigma(\mathbf{L}^G) = \Sigma_p(\mathbf{L}^G)$, where \mathbf{L}^G is the Friedrichs extension of $\mathcal{L} \upharpoonright C_0^\infty$ in the Hilbert space $\mathfrak{G} = \left\{ \mathbf{u} \in \mathfrak{H} \mid \operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u}) \in L^2\left(\frac{\gamma P}{\rho^2} d\mathbf{x}\right) \right\}$. See [11]. But, even in this non-rotating case, we do not know whether $\Sigma(\mathbf{L}) = \Sigma_p(\mathbf{L})$ or not, \mathbf{L} being the Friedrichs extension in \mathfrak{H} . Moreover, when $\Omega \neq 0$, B is not a bounded linear operator in \mathfrak{G} so that the application of Hille-Yosida theory for the basic existence proof in Section 4 does not work if we take \mathfrak{G} as the basic space instead of \mathfrak{H} .

Also let us note that, if $\Omega = 0$, $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{0}$, when (5.1) reduces

$$\frac{\partial^2 \xi}{\partial t^2} + \mathbf{L}\xi = 0, \quad (6.9)$$

(PD.1) implies that

$$\xi = \int_0^{+\infty} \cos(\sqrt{\sigma}t) dE(\sigma) \mathbf{a} + \int_0^{+\infty} \sin(\sqrt{\sigma}t) dE(\sigma) \mathbf{b} \quad (6.10)$$

solves (6.9) with $\xi^0 = \mathbf{a}$, $\mathbf{v}^0 = \sqrt{\mathbf{L}}\mathbf{b}$, provided that $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{L})$. Here $(E(\sigma))_{\sigma \in \mathbb{R}}$ is the spectral decomposition of the self-adjoint operator \mathbf{L} , which enjoys $E(-0) = 0$ thanks to **(PD.1)**. In this case we have

$$\|\Xi\|_{\mathfrak{H} \times \mathfrak{H}} \leq C \left(\|\mathbf{a}\|_{\mathbf{D}(\sqrt{\mathbf{L}})} + \|\mathbf{b}\|_{\mathbf{D}(\sqrt{\mathbf{L}})} \right).$$

Here

$$\sqrt{\mathbf{L}} = \int_0^{+\infty} \sqrt{\sigma} dE(\sigma)$$

so that $(\sqrt{\mathbf{L}})^2 = \mathbf{L}$ and

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{D}(\sqrt{\mathbf{L}})} = \left[\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2 + \|\sqrt{\mathbf{L}}\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

• Now let us introduce more general concepts of stability. Namely, let \mathfrak{N} be a semi-norm on $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{L}) \times \mathfrak{G}_0$, and consider the condition:

(ST.3): For any solution ξ of (5.1) it holds

$$\mathfrak{N}(\Xi(t, \cdot)) \leq C \quad \text{for } \forall t \in [0, +\infty[. \quad (6.11)$$

Here C is a bounce depending on $\Xi^0 = \Xi(0, \cdot) = (\xi^0, \mathbf{v}^0)^\top$.

Recall

$$\mathfrak{N}_0(\Xi(t, \cdot)) \leq e^{\Lambda t} \mathfrak{N}_0(\Xi^0)$$

for

$$\mathfrak{N}_0(U) := \|U\|_{\mathfrak{E}} = \left[\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathfrak{G}}^2 + \|\dot{\mathbf{u}}\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{for } U = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u} \\ \dot{\mathbf{u}} \end{bmatrix}$$

Here $\Lambda = 1 + m_* + \beta \geq 1$ so this does not give the stability **(ST.3)**. We are keeping in mind the following situation.

Suppose a seminorm \mathfrak{n} on $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{L})$ satisfy

(PD.2): There is a positive number δ such that

$$(\mathbf{L}\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{u}) \geq \delta \mathfrak{n}(\mathbf{u})^2 \quad \forall \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{L}). \quad (6.12)$$

Put

$$\mathfrak{N}(U) := \left[\delta \mathfrak{n}(\mathbf{u})^2 + \|\dot{\mathbf{u}}\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (6.13)$$

Then **(ST.3)** holds with

$$C = \left[\|\mathbf{v}^0\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2 + (\mathbf{L}\xi^0|\xi^0)_{\mathfrak{H}} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

In fact, multiplying (5.1) by $\dot{\xi}$ by the \mathfrak{H} -inner product, taking the real part, using $\Re[(B\dot{\xi}|\dot{\xi})_{\mathfrak{H}}] = 0$, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left[\|\dot{\xi}\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2 + (\mathbf{L}\xi|\xi)_{\mathfrak{H}} \right] = 0.$$

Of course **(PD.2)** implies **(PD.1)** but is much stronger concept of ‘positive definiteness’.

Now we are going to find a seminorm \mathfrak{n} which enjoys **(PD.2)**, under the following situation:

Situation 1 $\Omega = \omega_b = 0$ and the background $(\rho, S, \mathbf{0})$ is spherically symmetric, 2) and is isentropic, that is, $S = S_0$, S_0 being a constant, and 3) $\frac{4}{3} < \gamma < 2$.

Then $\Upsilon = \Upsilon_O \theta\left(\frac{r}{a}; \frac{1}{\gamma-1}\right)$ and $\mathfrak{R} = \{\mathbf{x} | r = \|\mathbf{x}\| < R\}$ with $R := a\xi_1\left(\frac{1}{\gamma-1}\right)$.

It holds

$$P = A\rho^\gamma, \quad \Upsilon = \frac{A\gamma}{\gamma-1}\rho^{\gamma-1}, \quad \frac{\gamma P}{\rho^2} = \frac{d\Upsilon}{d\rho} = A\rho^{-(2-\gamma)},$$

and

$$(\mathbf{L}\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{u})_{\mathfrak{S}} = \int_{\mathfrak{R}} \left(\frac{d\Upsilon}{d\rho} |g|^2 - 4\pi \mathbf{G}\mathcal{K}[g]g^* \right) d\mathbf{x}, \quad (6.14)$$

with $g = \operatorname{div}(\rho\mathbf{u})$. (Recall Remark 3.)

Denote

$$\mathfrak{g}_L := \left\{ g \in L^2\left(\frac{d\Upsilon}{d\rho} d\mathbf{x}\right) \mid \exists \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{L}) : g = \operatorname{div}(\rho\mathbf{u}) \right\}, \quad (6.15)$$

and put

$$\Psi = -\mathcal{K}[g] \quad (6.16)$$

for $g \in \mathfrak{g}_L$. Then, for $g \in \mathfrak{g}_L$, $g \in C(\mathfrak{R})$, $\Psi \in C(\mathbb{R}^3)$, and the expansion with respect to spherical harmonics

$$g(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{0 \leq \ell, |m| \leq \ell} g_{\ell m}(r) Y_{\ell m}(\vartheta, \phi), \quad (6.17a)$$

$$\Psi(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{0 \leq \ell, |m| \leq \ell} \Psi_{\ell m}(r) Y_{\ell m}(\vartheta, \phi) \quad (6.17b)$$

can be used. Here

$$\mathbf{x} = r \sin \vartheta \cos \phi \frac{\partial}{\partial x^1} + r \sin \vartheta \sin \phi \frac{\partial}{\partial x^2} + r \cos \vartheta \frac{\partial}{\partial x^3}$$

and

$$Y_{\ell m}(\vartheta, \phi) = \sqrt{\frac{2\ell+1}{4\pi} \frac{(\ell-m)!}{(\ell+m)!}} P_\ell^m(\cos \vartheta) e^{im\phi},$$

$$Y_{\ell, -m} = (-1)^m Y_{\ell m}^* \quad (0 \leq m \leq \ell), \quad (6.18)$$

$$g_{\ell m}(r) = \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^\pi g(\mathbf{x}) Y_{\ell m}(\vartheta, \phi)^* \sin \vartheta d\vartheta d\phi, \quad (6.19)$$

$$\Psi_{\ell m}(r) = \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^\pi \Psi(\mathbf{x}) Y_{\ell m}(\vartheta, \phi)^* \sin \vartheta d\vartheta d\phi. \quad (6.20)$$

See [11, Lemma 5]. Note that

$$\Delta^{(\ell)}\Psi_{\ell m} = g_{\ell m}, \quad \Psi_{\ell m} = -\mathcal{H}_\ell[g_{\ell m}], \quad (6.21)$$

where

$$\Delta^{(\ell)}w = \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{d}{dr} r^2 \frac{dw}{dr} - \frac{\ell(\ell+1)}{r^2} w, \quad (6.22)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_\ell[\check{g}](r) = \frac{1}{2\ell+1} \left[\int_0^r \check{g}(s) \left(\frac{r}{s}\right)^{-\ell-1} s ds + \int_r^{+\infty} \check{g}(s) \left(\frac{r}{s}\right)^\ell s ds \right], \quad (6.23)$$

and

$$\|\text{grad}\Psi\|^2 = \sum_{\ell m} \|\nabla^{(\ell)}\Psi_{\ell m}\|^2, \quad (6.24)$$

where

$$\|\nabla^{(\ell)}w\|^2 = \left| \frac{dw}{dr} \right|^2 + \frac{\ell(\ell+1)}{r^2} |w|^2. \quad (6.25)$$

We are observing

$$(\mathbf{L}\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{u})_{\mathfrak{S}} = 4\pi \sum_{\ell, m} Q_{\ell m}, \quad (6.26)$$

where

$$Q_{\ell m} = \int_0^{+\infty} \left(\frac{d\Upsilon}{d\rho} |\Delta^{(\ell)}\Psi_{\ell m}|^2 - 4\pi \mathbf{G} \|\nabla^{(\ell)}\Psi_{\ell m}\|^2 \right) r^2 dr. \quad (6.27)$$

First we consider $\ell = 0$. Then we have

$$Q_{00} = \int_0^R (\mathcal{L}^{\text{ss}}y)y^* \rho r^4 dr, \quad (6.28)$$

where

$$y = -\frac{1}{r\rho} \frac{d}{dr} \Psi_{00}, \quad g_{00} = \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{d}{dr} (r^3 \rho y), \quad (6.29)$$

$$\mathcal{L}^{\text{ss}}y = -\frac{1}{\rho r^4} \frac{d}{dr} \left(\gamma r^4 \rho \frac{dy}{dr} \right) - (3\gamma - 4) \frac{1}{r} \frac{d\Upsilon}{dr} y, \quad (6.30)$$

$$\int_0^R (\mathcal{L}^{\text{ss}}y)y^* \rho r^4 dr = \int_0^R \left(\gamma \left| \frac{dy}{dr} \right|^2 - (3\gamma - 4) \frac{1}{r} \frac{d\Upsilon}{dr} |y|^2 \right) \rho r^4 dr. \quad (6.31)$$

Since we are supposing $\frac{4}{3} < \gamma$, we have

$$\delta_* := \inf_{0 < r < R} - (3\gamma - 4) \frac{1}{r} \frac{d\Upsilon}{dr} > 0, \quad (6.32)$$

and

$$Q_{00} \geq \delta_* \int_0^R |y|^2 \rho r^4 dr = \delta_* \int_0^R \frac{1}{\rho} \left| \frac{d\Psi_{00}}{dr} \right|^2 r^2 dr. \quad (6.33)$$

But

$$\frac{d\Psi_{00}}{dr} = \frac{1}{r^2} \int_0^r g_{00}(s) s^2 ds = 0 \quad \text{for } r > R,$$

since $g_{00} = 0$ on $]R, +\infty[$ and

$$\int_0^R g_{00}(r) r^2 dr = \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi}} \int_{\mathfrak{R}^3} g(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = 0$$

for $g \in \mathfrak{g}_L$. On the other hand,

$$\frac{1}{\rho} \left| \frac{d\Psi_{00}}{dr} \right|^2 \in L^\infty(0, R),$$

since

$$\frac{d\Psi_{00}}{dr} = -\frac{1}{r^2} \int_r^R g_{00}(s) s^2 ds \quad \text{for } 0 < r < R$$

enjoys

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{d\Psi_{00}}{dr} \right| &\leq \frac{1}{r^2} \sqrt{\int_r^R \frac{d\rho}{dY} s^2 ds} \sqrt{\int_0^R \frac{dY}{d\rho} |g_{00}(s)|^2 s^2 ds} \\ &\leq C(R-r)^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}} \quad \text{for } \frac{R}{2} \leq r < R, \end{aligned}$$

for $\frac{d\rho}{dY} = O((R-r)^{\frac{2-\tilde{\gamma}}{\gamma-1}})$.

Therefore, under the convention that $\frac{1}{\rho} \left| \frac{d\Psi_{00}}{dr} \right|^2$ means 0 for $r > R$, we can write

$$Q_{00} \geq \delta_* \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{1}{\rho} \left| \frac{d\Psi_{00}}{dr} \right|^2 r^2 dr. \quad (6.34)$$

In other words, if we adopt the decomposition

$$u^r(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\ell m} u_{\ell m}^r(r) Y_{\ell m}(\vartheta, \phi), \quad (6.35)$$

$$u_{\ell m}^r(r) = \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^\pi u^r(\mathbf{x}) Y_{\ell m}(\vartheta, \phi)^* \sin \vartheta d\vartheta d\phi, \quad (6.36)$$

while

$$\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}) = u^r(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{e}_r + u^\vartheta(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{e}_\vartheta + u^\phi(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{e}_\phi, \quad (6.37)$$

where

$$\mathbf{e}_r = \frac{\partial}{\partial r}, \quad \mathbf{e}_\vartheta = \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial \vartheta}, \quad \mathbf{e}_\phi = \frac{1}{r \sin \vartheta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}. \quad (6.38)$$

we see

$$\frac{1}{r^2} \frac{d}{dr} (r^2 \rho u_{00}^r) = \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{d}{dr} (r^2 g_{00}), \quad (6.39)$$

for

$$g = \operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u}) = \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} (r^2 \rho u^r) + \frac{1}{r \sin \vartheta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \vartheta} (\sin \vartheta u^\vartheta) + \frac{1}{r \sin \vartheta} \frac{\partial u^\phi}{\partial \phi}.$$

Hence we have

$$\rho(r) u_{00}^r(r) = \int_0^r g_{00}(s) s^2 ds = -\frac{d}{dr} \Psi_{00}(r) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq r < R,$$

therefore we can write

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \frac{1}{\rho} \left| \frac{d\Psi_{00}}{dr} \right|^2 r^2 dr = \int_0^{+\infty} |u_{00}^r|^2 \rho(r) r^2 dr.$$

Thus

$$Q_{00} \geq \delta_* \int_0^{+\infty} |u_{00}^r|^2 \rho(r) r^2 dr. \quad (6.40)$$

Moreover there is a positive number μ_0 such that

$$\int_0^R \frac{1}{\rho} \left| \frac{d\Psi_{00}}{dr} \right|^2 r^2 dr \geq \mu_0 \int_0^R |\Psi_{00}(r)|^2 r^2 dr. \quad (6.41)$$

Proof. Looking at

$$\mu := \inf_{\psi \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{\int_0^R \frac{1}{\rho} \left| \frac{d\Psi_{00}}{dr} \right|^2 r^2 dr}{\int_0^R |\Psi_{00}(r)|^2 r^2 dr}, \quad (6.42)$$

where

$$\mathcal{F} = \left\{ \psi \in C^1[0, R] \mid \psi(R) = 0, |\psi(r)| \leq \|\Psi_{00}\|_{L^\infty} \right\},$$

we prove $\mu > 0$.

Suppose $\mu = 0$ for reductio ad absurdum. Then there is a sequence $(\psi_n)_{n=1,2,\dots}$, in \mathcal{F} such that $\int_0^R |\psi_n|^2 r^2 dr = 1$ and

$$M_n = \int_0^R \frac{1}{\rho} \left| \frac{d\psi_n}{dr} \right|^2 r^2 dr \searrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

For $0 < r \leq r' \leq R$ it hold

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_n(r)| &= \left| - \int_r^R D\psi_n(s) ds \right| \\ &\leq \sqrt{\int_r^R \frac{\rho(s)}{s^2} ds} \sqrt{\int_r^R \frac{1}{\rho(s)} |D\psi_n(s)|^2 s^2 ds} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\rho_O} \sqrt{\frac{R-r}{Rr}} M_n \leq \frac{\sqrt{\rho_O}}{r} M_1, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$|\psi_n(r') - \psi_n(r)| \leq \sqrt{\rho_O} \sqrt{\frac{r'-r}{r'r}} M_n \leq \sqrt{\rho_O} \sqrt{\frac{r'-r}{r'r}} M_1.$$

Therefore by Ascoli-Arzela theorem we can suppose ψ_n tends to a limit ψ_∞ uniformly on any compact subinterval of $]0, R]$, by taking a subsequence. Since $M_n \rightarrow 0$, we have $\psi_\infty = 0$. For any $0 < r_* \ll 1$ we have

$$\int_0^{r_*} |\psi_n(r)|^2 r^2 dr \leq \|\Psi_{00}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \frac{r_*^3}{3}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \int_0^R |\psi_n(r)|^2 r^2 dr \\ &\leq \|\Psi_{00}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \frac{r_*^3}{3} + \int_{r_*}^R |\psi_n(r)|^2 r^2 dr \\ &\rightarrow \|\Psi_{00}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \frac{r_*^3}{3} + \int_{r_*}^R |\psi_\infty(r)|^2 r^2 dr \\ &= \|\Psi_{00}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \frac{r_*^3}{3}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking r_* so small that $\|\Psi_{00}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \frac{r_*^3}{3} < 1$, we see a contradiction. \square

Next we consider $\ell \geq 1$. We claim

$$Q_{\ell m} \geq 4\pi\mathbf{G} \int_0^{+\infty} \left(\|\nabla^{(\ell)} \Psi_{\ell m}\|^2 - 4\pi\mathbf{G} \frac{d\rho}{d\Upsilon} |\Psi_{\ell m}|^2 \right) r^2 dr. \quad (6.43)$$

For $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$, we put $\left(\frac{d\Upsilon}{d\rho}\right)_\epsilon = \gamma A(\rho + \epsilon)^{\gamma-2}$. Then, as $\epsilon \searrow +0$, $\left(\frac{d\Upsilon}{d\rho}\right)_\epsilon \nearrow \frac{d\Upsilon}{d\rho}$ on $0 < r < R$, and

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^{+\infty} \left(\left(\frac{d\Upsilon}{d\rho}\right)_\epsilon |g_{\ell m}|^2 - 4\pi\mathbf{G} \|\nabla^{(\ell)} \Psi_{\ell m}\|^2 \right) r^2 dr \\ \nearrow &Q_{\ell m} = \int_0^{+\infty} \left(\left(\frac{d\Upsilon}{d\rho}\right) |g_{\ell m}|^2 - 4\pi\mathbf{G} \|\nabla^{(\ell)} \Psi_{\ell m}\|^2 \right) r^2 dr. \end{aligned}$$

But we see

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^{+\infty} \left(\left(\frac{d\mathcal{Y}}{d\rho} \right)_\epsilon |g_{\ell m}|^2 - 4\pi\mathbf{G} \|\nabla^{(\ell)} \Psi_{\ell m}\|^2 \right) r^2 dr \\
&= \int_0^{+\infty} \left| \sqrt{\left(\frac{d\mathcal{Y}}{d\rho} \right)_\epsilon} \Delta^{(\ell)} \Psi_{\ell m} + 4\pi\mathbf{G} \sqrt{\left(\left(\frac{d\mathcal{Y}}{d\rho} \right)_\epsilon \right)^{-1}} \Psi_{\ell m} \right|^2 r^2 dr \\
&- 4\pi\mathbf{G} \int_0^{+\infty} 2\Re \mathfrak{c}[(\Delta^{(\ell)} \Psi_{\ell m}) \Psi_{\ell m}^*] + \|\nabla^{(\ell)} \Psi_{\ell m}\|^2 + 4\pi\mathbf{G} \left(\left(\frac{d\mathcal{Y}}{d\rho} \right)_\epsilon \right)^{-1} |\Psi_{\ell m}|^2 r^2 dr \\
&\geq 4\pi\mathbf{G} \int_0^{+\infty} \left(\|\nabla^{(\ell)} \Psi_{\ell m}\|^2 - 4\pi\mathbf{G} \left(\left(\frac{d\mathcal{Y}}{d\rho} \right)_\epsilon \right)^{-1} |\Psi_{\ell m}|^2 \right) r^2 dr,
\end{aligned}$$

for

$$\int_0^{+\infty} (\Delta^{(\ell)} \Psi_{\ell m}) \Psi_{\ell m}^* r^2 dr = - \int_0^{+\infty} \|\nabla^{(\ell)} \Psi_{\ell m}\|^2 r^2 dr,$$

since $r^2 \frac{d\Psi_{\ell m}}{dr} \Psi_{\ell m}^* = O\left(\frac{1}{r}\right)$ as $r \rightarrow +\infty$. Since $\left(\left(\frac{d\mathcal{Y}}{d\rho} \right)_\epsilon \right)^{-1} = \frac{(\rho + \epsilon)^{2-\gamma}}{\gamma\mathbf{A}} \searrow$
 $\frac{d\rho}{d\mathcal{Y}} = \frac{\rho^{2-\gamma}}{\gamma\mathbf{A}}$ as $\epsilon \searrow 0$, we have (6.43).

Let us show that

$$\mathcal{Q}_1[w] := \int_0^{+\infty} \left(\|\nabla^{(1)} w\|^2 - 4\pi\mathbf{G} \frac{d\rho}{d\mathcal{Y}} |w|^2 \right) r^2 dr \geq 0 \quad (6.44)$$

for $w = \Psi_{\ell m}$.

Fixing $S \geq R$, put

$$\mathcal{Q}_1^S[w] := \int_0^S \left(\|\nabla^{(1)} w\|^2 - 4\pi\mathbf{G} \frac{d\rho}{d\mathcal{Y}} |w|^2 \right) r^2 dr. \quad (6.45)$$

This is the quadratic form associated with the operator

$$\mathcal{P}w = \left[-\Delta^{(1)} - 4\pi\mathbf{G} \frac{d\rho}{d\mathcal{Y}} \right] w. \quad (6.46)$$

We consider \mathcal{P} in $\mathfrak{X}_0^S = L^2([0, S]; r^2 dr)$. We have the Friedrichs extension \mathbf{P}^S of $\mathcal{P} \upharpoonright C_0^\infty([0, S])$, keeping in mind that

$$4\pi\mathbf{G} \frac{d\rho}{d\mathcal{Y}} \leq \frac{4\pi\mathbf{G}}{\gamma\mathbf{A}} \rho_O^{2-\gamma}.$$

We see that \mathbf{P}^S is of the Sturm-Liouville type. the boundary condition at $r = S$ is the Dirichlet boundary condition $w|_{r=S} = 0$.

Let μ_1 be the least eigenvalue of \mathbf{P}^S . We are going to show $\mu_1 \geq 0$. Let ϕ_1 be an eigenfunction. We can suppose $\phi_1(r) > 0$ for $0 < r < S$. Consider $\mathcal{Y}' := \frac{d\mathcal{Y}}{dr}$, which satisfies $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{Y}' = 0$ on $[0, +\infty[$. Here we consider

$$\mathcal{Y}(r) = -K \left(\frac{1}{R} - \frac{1}{r} \right), \quad \mathcal{Y}'(r) = -\frac{K}{r^2} \quad \text{for } R < r$$

with $K = -\left(r^2 \frac{d\mathcal{Y}}{dr}\right)_{r=R-0} (> 0)$. we look at

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= (\mathcal{P}\mathcal{Y}'|\phi_1)_{\mathfrak{X}_0^S} = (\mathcal{Y}'|\mathcal{P}\phi_1)_{\mathfrak{X}_0^S} + r^2\mathcal{Y}'\frac{d\phi_1}{dr}\Big|_{r=S-0} \\ &= \mu_1(\mathcal{Y}'|\phi_1) + r^2\mathcal{Y}'\frac{d\phi_1}{dr}\Big|_{r=S-0} \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathcal{Y}' < 0$ on $]0, S]$, we have $(\mathcal{Y}'|\phi_1)_{\mathfrak{X}_0^S} < 0$. But $r^2\mathcal{Y}'\frac{d\phi_1}{dr}\Big|_{r=S-0} \geq 0$, since $\frac{d\phi_1}{dr}\Big|_{r=S-0} \leq 0$. Consequently $\mu_1 \geq 0$ and

$$\mathcal{Q}_1^S[w] \geq 0 \quad \text{for } \forall w \in \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{P}^S).$$

Since we cannot say $w = \Psi_{\ell m} \in \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{P}^S)$, for maybe $\Psi_{\ell m}(S) \neq 0$, we decompose it as

$$w = \Psi_{\ell m} = W^S + \Pi^S, \quad (6.47)$$

where

$$\Pi^S = -C_{\ell m}S^{-\ell-1}\left(\frac{r}{S}\right)^\ell, \quad C_{\ell m} = \frac{1}{2\ell+1} \int_0^R g_{\ell m}(s)s^{\ell+2}ds. \quad (6.48)$$

Then

$$\Delta^{(\ell)}W^S = \Delta^{(\ell)}w, \quad W^S(S) = 0. \quad (6.49)$$

Note

$$\mathcal{P}W^S = -g_{\ell m} - \left(\frac{\ell(\ell+1)-2}{r^2} + 4\pi\mathbf{G}\frac{d\rho}{d\mathcal{Y}}\right)(w - \Pi^S) \in \mathfrak{X}_0^S,$$

since $g_{\ell m} \in C([0, R], w = \Psi_{\ell m} = O(r^2))$ for $\ell \geq 2$, $\Pi^S = O(r^\ell)$. Therefore $W^S \in \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{P}^S)$ and

$$\mathcal{Q}_1^S[W^S] \geq 0.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^{(1)}\Pi^S\|^2 &\leq 3C_{\ell m}S^{-2\ell-4}, \\ 4\pi\mathbf{G}\frac{d\rho}{d\mathcal{Y}}|\Pi^S|^2 &\leq 4\pi\mathbf{G}\frac{\rho_Q^{2-\gamma}}{\gamma\mathbf{A}}C_{\ell m}^2S^{-2\ell-2} \end{aligned}$$

on $[0, S]$, we see

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_1^S[w] &\geq \mathcal{Q}_1^S[W^S] + O(S^{-2\ell+1}) \\ &\geq O(S^{-2\ell+1}), \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit as $S \rightarrow +\infty$, we get (6.44) for $w = \Psi_{\ell m}$.

Now

$$Q_{\ell m} \geq 4\pi\mathbf{G}\mathcal{Q}_1[\Psi_{\ell m}] \geq 0, \quad (6.50)$$

and, for $\ell \geq 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{\ell m} &\geq 4\pi\mathbf{G} \int_0^{+\infty} \left(\|\nabla^{(\ell)}\Psi_{\ell m}\|^2 - 4\pi\mathbf{G} \frac{d\rho}{dY} |\Psi_{\ell m}|^2 \right) r^2 dr \\
&= 4\pi\mathbf{G} \left(\mathcal{Q}_1[\Psi_{\ell m}] + \int_0^{+\infty} (\ell(\ell+1) - 2) |\Psi_{\ell m}|^2 dr \right) \\
&\geq 4\pi\mathbf{G} \int_0^{+\infty} (\ell(\ell+1) - 2) |\Psi_{\ell m}|^2 dr.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.51}$$

Note that

$$(\ell(\ell+1) - 2) \int_0^{+\infty} |\Psi_{\ell m}(r)|^2 dr \geq \frac{4}{R^2} \int_0^R |\Psi_{\ell m}(r)|^2 r^2 dr \tag{6.52}$$

for $\ell \geq 2$.

Consequently

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbf{L}\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{u})_{\mathfrak{H}} &= 4\pi \sum_{0 \leq \ell, |m| \leq \ell} Q_{\ell m} \\
&\geq \delta \left(\int_0^{+\infty} \frac{1}{\rho} \left| \frac{d\Psi_{00}}{dr} \right|^2 r^2 dr + \sum_{2 \leq \ell, |m| \leq \ell} (\ell(\ell+1) - 2) \int_0^{+\infty} |\Psi_{\ell m}|^2 dr \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{6.53}$$

with $\delta := 4\pi(\delta_* \wedge \mathbf{G})$.

Therefore

Theorem 6 *Under the Situation 1, (PD.2) holds for $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_{10}, \mathbf{n}_1 \geq \mathbf{n}_{10}$, defined by*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{n}_1(\mathbf{u}) &= \left[\int_0^{+\infty} \frac{1}{\rho} \left| \frac{d\Psi_{00}}{dr} \right|^2 r^2 dr + \sum_{2 \leq \ell, |m| \leq \ell} (\ell(\ell+1) - 2) \int_0^{+\infty} |\Psi_{\ell m}|^2 dr \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= \left[\int_0^{+\infty} |u_{00}^r|^2 \rho(r) r^2 dr + \sum_{2 \leq \ell, |m| \leq \ell} (\ell(\ell+1) - 2) \int_0^{+\infty} |\Psi_{\ell m}|^2 dr \right]^{\frac{1}{2}},
\end{aligned} \tag{6.54a}$$

$$\mathbf{n}_{10}(\mathbf{u}) = \sqrt{\mu_1} \left[\int_0^R |\Psi_{00}(r)|^2 r^2 dr + \sum_{2 \leq \ell, |m| \leq \ell} \int_0^R |\Psi_{\ell m}(r)|^2 r^2 dr \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{6.54b}$$

$$\text{with } \mu_1 = \mu_0 \wedge \frac{4}{R^2}.$$

Here

$$\Psi_{\ell m}(r) = - \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^\pi \mathcal{K}[g](\mathbf{x}) Y_{\ell m}(\vartheta, \phi)^* \sin \vartheta d\vartheta d\phi, \tag{6.55}$$

$$u_{00}^r(r) = \sqrt{4\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^\pi \left(\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}) \Big|_{\frac{\mathbf{x}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|}} \right) \sin \vartheta d\vartheta d\phi, \tag{6.56}$$

in which

$$\mathbf{x} = r \sin \vartheta \cos \phi \frac{\partial}{\partial x^1} + r \sin \vartheta \sin \phi \frac{\partial}{\partial x^2} + r \cos \vartheta \frac{\partial}{\partial x^3}$$

and $g = \text{div}(\rho \mathbf{u})$.

Note that the seminorm $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_{10}$ and the associated \mathfrak{N} are not norm, that is, $\mathfrak{N}(U) = 0$ does not imply $U = \mathbf{0}$, say, does not imply $\mathbf{u} = 0$. But $\mathfrak{N}(\Xi)$ can control the amplitude of $\Psi = \mathcal{K}[\text{div}(\rho \xi)]$, except for the $\ell = 1$ components, and $\dot{\xi}$. Here $-4\pi \mathbf{G} \Psi = \delta \Phi = \Phi_{\rho_b + \delta \rho} - \Phi_b$, $\delta \rho = -\text{div}(\rho \xi)$ and $\mathbf{v} = \dot{\xi}$ are the quantities essential for the perturbation, and the control of the magnitude of $\xi = \varphi(t, \mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{x} + \xi^0$ itself is not essential in the discussion of the stability of the background. (Recall $\varphi_b(t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \bar{\mathbf{x}}$ for $\omega_b = 0$.) In fact $\mathbf{n}_1(\xi) = 0$ implies that $\Psi_{\ell m} = 0, g_{\ell m} = 0$ on $[0, +\infty[$ for $\ell \neq 1$, and $\mathbf{n}_{10}(\xi) = 0$ implies that $\Psi_{\ell m} = 0, g_{\ell m} = 0$ on $[0, +R]$ for $\ell \neq 1$, and

$$g(\mathbf{x}) = \sqrt{\frac{3}{4\pi}} g_{1,0}(r) \cos \vartheta - \sqrt{\frac{3}{8\pi}} g_{1,1}(r) \sin \vartheta e^{i\phi} + \sqrt{\frac{3}{8\pi}} g_{1,-1}(r) \sin \vartheta e^{-i\phi}.$$

Remark 7 *It seems impossible to control the magnitude of $\Psi_{1m}, m = 0, \pm 1$ by the following reason. The differential operator $\mathcal{P} \upharpoonright C_0^\infty(]0, +\infty[)$ admits the Friedrichs extension \mathbf{P} in $\mathfrak{X} = L^2([0, +\infty[, r^2 dr)$, and \mathcal{Q}_1 is the quadratic form associated with \mathbf{P} . But \mathbf{P} is not of the Sturm-Liouville type. In fact, let $\phi \in \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{P})$ and $\mathcal{P}\phi = \lambda\phi$ with $\lambda > 0$. Since $-\Delta^{(1)}\phi = 0$ on $]R, +\infty[$, there are constants C_\pm such that*

$$\phi = C_+ \phi_+ + C_- \phi_- \quad \text{on }]R, +\infty[,$$

where

$$\phi_\pm(r) = \sqrt{r} J_{\pm \frac{3}{2}}(\sqrt{\lambda} r), \quad J_{\pm \frac{3}{2}} \quad \text{being the Bessel function.}$$

Since

$$J_{\pm \frac{3}{2}}(r) \sim \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi r}} \cos\left(r \pm \frac{3\pi}{4} - \frac{\pi}{4}\right) \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow +\infty,$$

we see $\phi_\pm \notin L^2([R, +\infty[, r^2 dr)$, and $\phi \in L^2([R, +\infty[, r^2 dr)$ requires $C_\pm = 0$, $\phi = 0$ on $]R, +\infty[$. By the uniqueness of solutions of ODE, it follows that $\phi = 0$ on $[0, +\infty[$. In other words, any positive real number cannot be an eigenvalue of \mathbf{P} , so \mathbf{P} is not of the Sturm-Liouville type.

However, if we restrict ourselves to axially and equatorially symmetric perturbations, functions of $(r, |\zeta|)$, we have $\Psi_{\ell m} = 0$ for odd ℓ a priori, since $\int_0^{2\pi} e^{im\phi} d\phi = 0$ for $m \neq 0$ and $P_\ell^0(-\zeta) = -P_\ell^0(\zeta)$ for odd ℓ , we need not control the magnitudes of $\Psi_{1m}, m = 0, \pm 1$. In this situation $\mathbf{n}(\xi) = 0$ implies $\Psi = 0, g = 0$, or, $\delta \Phi = 0, \delta \rho = 0$, or, more precisely, we have

$$\mathbf{n}_{10}(\xi) \geq \sqrt{\frac{\mu_1}{4\pi}} \|\Psi\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{R})} = \sqrt{\frac{\mu_1}{4\pi}} \|\mathcal{K}[\delta \rho]\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{R})}, \quad (6.57)$$

since

$$\|\Psi\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{R})}^2 = 4\pi \sum_{\substack{\ell: \text{even} \\ |m| \leq \ell}} \|\Psi_{\ell m}\|_{L^2([0, R], r^2 dr)}^2$$

in this case.

- Now we are going to try to derive **(PD.2)** with another seminorm

$$\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{u}) := \|\operatorname{div}(\rho\mathbf{u})\|_{L^2\left(\frac{\gamma^P}{\rho^2}d\mathbf{x}\right)} = \left[\int_{\mathfrak{R}} \frac{\gamma^P}{\rho^2} |\operatorname{div}(\rho\mathbf{u})|^2 d\mathbf{x} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (6.58)$$

for

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{L}\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{u})_{\mathfrak{S}} &= \int_{\mathfrak{R}} \frac{\gamma^P}{\rho^2} |\operatorname{div}(\rho\mathbf{u})|^2 + 2\mathfrak{R}\mathfrak{e} \left[\int_{\mathfrak{R}} \frac{\gamma^P \mathcal{A}}{\rho} (\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{n}) \operatorname{div}(\rho\mathbf{u})^* \right] \\ &\quad - \int_{\mathfrak{R}} \frac{\gamma^P \mathcal{A}}{\rho} \|\operatorname{grad}\rho\|^2 |\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{n}|^2 + \\ &\quad - 4\pi\mathbf{G} \int_{\mathfrak{R}} \mathcal{K}[\operatorname{div}(\rho\mathbf{u})] \operatorname{div}(\rho\mathbf{u})^*. \end{aligned} \quad (6.59)$$

First we claim:

Proposition 9 *Let ε be a positive number. If*

$$-\varepsilon \frac{\|\operatorname{grad}\rho\|^2}{\rho} \leq \mathcal{A} \leq 0 \quad \text{on } \mathfrak{R}, \quad (6.60)$$

then

$$(\mathcal{L}\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{u}) \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \int_{\mathfrak{R}} \frac{\gamma^P}{\rho^2} |g|^2 d\mathbf{x} - 4\pi\mathbf{G} \int_{\mathfrak{R}} \mathcal{K}[g]g^* d\mathbf{x}. \quad (6.61)$$

Here $g = \operatorname{div}(\rho\mathbf{u})$.

Proof. We see

$$\begin{aligned} \left| 2\mathfrak{R}\mathfrak{e} \left[\int_{\mathfrak{R}} \frac{\gamma^P \mathcal{A}}{\rho} (\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{n})g^* d\mathbf{x} \right] \right| &\leq \varepsilon \int_{\mathfrak{R}} \int_{\mathfrak{R}} \frac{\gamma^P}{\rho^2} |g|^2 d\mathbf{x} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\mathfrak{R}} \gamma^P \mathcal{A}^2 |(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{n})|^2 d\mathbf{x} \\ &\leq \varepsilon \int_{\mathfrak{R}} \frac{\gamma^P |\mathcal{A}|}{\rho^2} |g|^2 d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\mathfrak{R}} \frac{\gamma^P \mathcal{A}}{\rho} \|\operatorname{grad}\rho\|^2 |(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{n})|^2 d\mathbf{x} \end{aligned}$$

by (6.60), where $g = \operatorname{div}(\rho\mathbf{u})$, since $-|\mathcal{A}| - \mathcal{A} = 0$ for $\mathcal{A} \leq 0$, we have (6.61).

□

Therefore, if we adopt the Cowling approximation, which neglect the perturbed self-gravitation term $-4\pi\mathbf{G} \int_{\mathfrak{R}} \mathcal{K}[g]g^* d\mathbf{x}$, we have **(PD.2)** with $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. Namely we consider the following

Situation 2 *Instead of \mathbf{L} , we consider \mathbf{L}_0 :*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{L}_0\mathbf{u} &= \operatorname{grad} \left(-\frac{\gamma^P}{\rho^2} \operatorname{div}(\rho\mathbf{u}) + \frac{\gamma^P}{\rho} (\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{a}) \right) + \\ &\quad + \frac{\gamma^P}{\rho} \left(-\mathbf{a} \operatorname{div}(\rho\mathbf{u}) + (\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{a}) \operatorname{grad}\rho \right). \end{aligned} \quad (6.62)$$

We can claim

Theorem 7 *Under the Situation 2 suppose (6.60) with $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. Put $\delta := 1 - \varepsilon$. Then (PD.2) holds for \mathbf{L} replaced by \mathbf{L}_0 with δ and $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{n}_2$ defined by*

$$\mathbf{n}_2(\mathbf{u}) = \left[\int_{\mathfrak{R}} \frac{\gamma P}{\rho^2} |\operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u})|^2 d\mathbf{x} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (6.63)$$

So let us look at the perturbed self-gravitation term in order to justify the Cowling approximation in this context.

Put

$$k^* := \sup_{g \in \mathfrak{g}_L} \frac{4\pi \mathbf{G} \int_{\mathfrak{R}} \mathcal{K}[g] g^* d\mathbf{x}}{\int_{\mathfrak{R}} \frac{\gamma P}{\rho^2} |g|^2 d\mathbf{x}}, \quad (6.64)$$

where

$$\mathfrak{g}_L := \left\{ g \in L^2 \left(\frac{\gamma P}{\rho^2} d\mathbf{x}, \mathfrak{R} \right) \mid g = \operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u}) \quad \text{for } \exists \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{L}) \right\}. \quad (6.65)$$

We can claim $k^* < \infty$ by the following

Proposition 10 *There exists a constant C such that*

$$0 \leq 4\pi \mathbf{G} \int_{\mathfrak{R}} \mathcal{K}[g] g^* d\mathbf{x} \leq C \int_{\mathfrak{R}} \frac{\gamma P}{\rho^2} |g|^2 d\mathbf{x}. \quad (6.66)$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{K}[g](\mathbf{x})| &\leq \frac{1}{4\pi} \sqrt{\int_{\mathfrak{R}} \frac{d\mathbf{x}'}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|}} \sqrt{\int_{\mathfrak{R}} |g|^2 d\mathbf{x}} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{R}{2\pi}} \|g\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{R})}, \end{aligned}$$

where $R := \sup\{\|\mathbf{x}\| \mid \mathbf{x} \in \mathfrak{R}\}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathfrak{R}} \mathcal{K}[g] g^* d\mathbf{x} &\leq \sqrt{\frac{R}{2\pi}} \|g\|_{L^2} \int_{\mathfrak{R}} |g| d\mathbf{x} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} R^2 \|g\|_{L^2}^2 \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\nu_* := \inf_{\mathfrak{R}} \frac{\gamma P}{\rho^2} > 0, \quad (6.67)$$

since

$$\frac{1}{C} d^{-\frac{2-\gamma}{\gamma-1}} \leq \frac{\gamma P}{\rho^2} \leq C d^{-\frac{2-\gamma}{\gamma-1}} \quad \text{on } \mathfrak{R},$$

where $\mathbf{d} := \text{dist}(\mathbf{x}, \partial\mathfrak{R})$ and $1 < \gamma < 2$. Then

$$\int_{\mathfrak{R}} |g|^2 d\mathbf{x} \leq \frac{1}{\nu_*} \int_{\mathfrak{R}} \frac{\gamma P}{\rho^2} |g|^2 d\mathbf{x},$$

therefore (6.66) holds with $C = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \frac{R^2}{\nu_*}$. \square

Consequently we can claim

Suppose $k^* < 1$ and let $0 < \varepsilon < 1 - k^*$ so that $\delta := 1 - \varepsilon - k^* > 0$. If (6.60) holds with ε , then **(PD.2)** holds with δ and

$$\mathfrak{n}(\mathbf{u}) := \|\text{div}(\rho\mathbf{u})\|_{L^2\left(\frac{\gamma P}{\rho^2} d\mathbf{x}\right)} = \left[\int_{\mathfrak{R}} \frac{\gamma P}{\rho^2} |\text{div}(\rho\mathbf{u})|^2 d\mathbf{x} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Thus we have the following question, which is still open:

Question 3 When the background realizes the condition $k^* < 1$?

Let us note the nondimensionalization of the estimate of k^* . We have

$$\frac{\gamma P}{\rho^2} = 4\pi \text{Ga}^2 (\gamma - 1) \Theta^{-\frac{2-\gamma}{\gamma-1}} (1 + \omega_1)(1 + \omega_2),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta &= \Theta\left(\frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|}{\mathbf{a}}, \frac{x^3}{\|\mathbf{x}\|}; \frac{1}{\gamma-1}, \mathbf{b}\right), \\ \omega_1 &= O(\mathcal{R}_O), \quad \omega_2 = O\left(\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma\mathbf{A}} \mathcal{R}_O\right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\int_{\mathfrak{R}} \frac{\gamma P}{\rho^2} |g|^2 d\mathbf{x} = 4\pi \text{Ga}^5 \int_{\mathfrak{R}_1} (\gamma - 1) \Theta^{-\frac{2-\gamma}{\gamma-1}} (1 + \omega_1)(1 + \omega_2) |\hat{g}(\underline{\mathbf{x}})|^2 d\underline{\mathbf{x}},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{R}_1 &= \left\{ \underline{\mathbf{x}} \mid \|\underline{\mathbf{x}}\| < \Xi_1 \left(\frac{x^3}{\|\underline{\mathbf{x}}\|} \right) \right\}, \\ \Theta &= \Theta\left(\|\underline{\mathbf{x}}\|, \frac{x^3}{\|\underline{\mathbf{x}}\|}; \frac{1}{\gamma-1}, \mathbf{b}\right), \quad \hat{g}(\underline{\mathbf{x}}) = g(\mathbf{a}\underline{\mathbf{x}}). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we see

$$4\pi \text{G} \int_{\mathfrak{R}} \mathcal{K}[g] g^* d\mathbf{x} = 4\pi \text{Ga}^5 \int_{\mathfrak{R}_1} \mathcal{K}[\hat{g}](\underline{\mathbf{x}}) \hat{g}^*(\underline{\mathbf{x}}) d\underline{\mathbf{x}}.$$

Therefore we have the reduction

$$k^* = \sup_{\hat{g}} \frac{\int_{\mathfrak{R}_1} \mathcal{K}[\hat{g}] \hat{g}^* d\mathbf{x}}{\int_{\mathfrak{R}_1} (\gamma - 1) \Theta^{-\frac{2-\gamma}{\gamma-1}} (1 + \omega_1)(1 + \omega_2) |\hat{g}|^2 d\mathbf{x}}. \quad (6.68)$$

If the background is isentropic, we have $\omega_1 = \omega_2 = 0$. If $\Omega = 0$ and the background is isentropic and spherically symmetric, then

$$k^* = \sup_{\hat{g}} \frac{\int_{\mathfrak{R}_1} \mathcal{K}[\hat{g}] \hat{g}^* d\mathbf{x}}{\int_{\mathfrak{R}_1} (\gamma - 1) \theta^{-\frac{2-\gamma}{\gamma-1}} |\hat{g}|^2 d\mathbf{x}}$$

where $\theta = \theta(\|\mathbf{x}\|, ; \frac{1}{\gamma-1})$ is the Lane-Emden function.

Appendix

We consider the initial value problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2 \mathbf{u}}{dt^2} + \mathbf{B} \frac{d\mathbf{u}}{dt} + \mathbf{L} \mathbf{u} &= 0, \\ \mathbf{u}(0) &= \hat{\mathbf{u}}, \quad \frac{d\mathbf{u}}{dt}(0) = \hat{\mathbf{v}}. \end{aligned}$$

Here the unknown is a function $\mathbf{u} : t \mapsto \mathbf{u}(t) : [0, +\infty[\rightarrow \mathbf{X}$, \mathbf{X} being a Hilbert space endowed with an inner product $(\cdot | \cdot)_{\mathbf{X}}$.

We assume:

\mathbf{Y} is a Hilbert space endowed with an inner product $(\cdot | \cdot)_{\mathbf{Y}}$, which is continuously and densely imbedded in \mathbf{X} . \mathbf{Y}_0 is a closed subspace of \mathbf{Y} .

\mathbf{L} is a self-adjoint operator in \mathbf{X} whose domain $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{L})$ is included in \mathbf{Y}_0 .

There is a quadratic form Q in \mathbf{Y} such that

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{u}_1 | \mathbf{u}_2)_{\mathbf{Y}} &= (\mathbf{u}_1 | \mathbf{u}_2)_{\mathbf{X}} + Q(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2) \quad \text{for } \forall \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2 \in \mathbf{Y}, \\ Q[\mathbf{u}] &= Q(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}) \geq 0 \quad \text{for } \forall \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{Y}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(\mathbf{L} \mathbf{u}_1 | \mathbf{u}_2)_{\mathbf{X}} + a(\mathbf{u}_1 | \mathbf{u}_2)_{\mathbf{X}} = Q(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2) \quad \text{for } \forall \mathbf{u}_1 \in \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{L}), \forall \mathbf{u}_2 \in \mathbf{Y}_0.$$

Here a is a non-negative number.

\mathbf{B} is a bounded linear operator in \mathbf{X} such that $\|\mathbf{B}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{X})} \leq \beta$.

Proposition A1 *For any $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\lambda > a + |c|\beta$ the operator $\mathbf{L} + c\mathbf{B} + \lambda$ has the bounded linear inverse operator $(\mathbf{L} + c\mathbf{B} + \lambda)^{-1}$ defined on the whole space \mathbf{X} such that*

$$\|(\mathbf{L} + c\mathbf{B} + \lambda)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{X})} \leq \frac{1}{\lambda - a - |c|\beta}.$$

Proof. First we see $\mathbf{L} + c\mathbf{B} + \lambda$ is invertible. In fact, if

$$(\mathbf{L} + c\mathbf{B} + \lambda)\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{f}, \quad \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{L}), \quad \mathbf{f} \in \mathbf{X},$$

then we see

$$(\lambda - a - |c|\beta)\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{X}}^2 \leq Q[\mathbf{u}] + (\lambda - a)\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{X}} + (c\mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{u})_{\mathbf{X}} + \lambda\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{X}}^2 = (\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{f})_{\mathbf{X}} \leq \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{X}}\|\mathbf{f}\|_{\mathbf{X}},$$

therefore we have

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{X}} \leq \frac{1}{\lambda - a - |c|\beta}\|\mathbf{f}\|_{\mathbf{X}}.$$

We claim that the range $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{L} + c\mathbf{B} + \lambda)$ is dense in \mathbf{X} . In fact, suppose

$$((\mathbf{L} + c\mathbf{B} + \lambda)\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{f}) = 0 \quad \forall \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{L}).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{L}\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{f}) &= -((c\mathbf{B} + \lambda)\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{f}) \\ &= (\mathbf{u}|(-c\mathbf{B}^* - \lambda)\mathbf{f}) \end{aligned}$$

for $\forall \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{L})$. Hence $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{L}^*)$ and

$$\mathbf{L}^*\mathbf{f} = -c\mathbf{B}^* - \lambda\mathbf{f}.$$

Since $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{L}^*$, this means that $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{L})$ and

$$(\mathbf{L} + c\mathbf{B}^* + \lambda)\mathbf{f} = 0.$$

Since $\mathbf{L} + c\mathbf{B}^* + \lambda$ is invertible, for $\|\mathbf{B}^*\| = \|\mathbf{B}\| \leq \beta$, it follows that $\mathbf{f} = 0$. Summing up, we have the assertion. \square

We are going to apply the Hille-Yosida theory to the initial-boundary value problem (1) :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2\mathbf{u}}{dt^2} + \mathbf{B}\frac{d\mathbf{u}}{dt} + \mathbf{L}\mathbf{u} &= \mathbf{0}, \\ \mathbf{u}(t) &\in \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{L}) \quad \text{for } \forall t \geq 0, \\ \mathbf{u} &= \mathring{\mathbf{u}}, \quad \frac{d\mathbf{u}}{dt} = \mathring{\mathbf{v}} \quad \text{at } t = 0, \end{aligned}$$

We put

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u} \\ \dot{\mathbf{u}} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \dot{\mathbf{u}} = \frac{d\mathbf{u}}{dt},$$

$$\mathbf{A}U = \begin{bmatrix} O & -I \\ \mathbf{L} & \mathbf{B} \end{bmatrix} U = \begin{bmatrix} -\dot{\mathbf{u}} \\ \mathbf{B}\dot{\mathbf{u}} + \mathbf{L}\mathbf{u} \end{bmatrix},$$

$$Z = Y_0 \times X$$

with

$$(U_1|U_2)_Z = (\mathbf{u}_1|\mathbf{u}_2)_Y + (\dot{\mathbf{u}}_1|\dot{\mathbf{u}}_2)_X =$$

$$= Q(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2) + (\mathbf{u}_1|\mathbf{u}_2)_X + (\dot{\mathbf{u}}_1|\dot{\mathbf{u}}_2)_X,$$

$$D(\mathbf{A}) = D(\mathbf{L}) \times Y_0.$$

Then the initial-boundary value problem **(1)** can be written as the problem **(0)**:

$$\frac{dU}{dt} + \mathbf{A}U = \mathbf{0}, \quad U|_{t=0} = U_0,$$

where

$$U_0 = \begin{bmatrix} \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{u}} \\ \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{v}} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Applying [4, Theorem 7.4], we can claim

Proposition A2 *If $U_0 \in D(\mathbf{A})$, say, if $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{u}} \in D(\mathbf{L})$ and $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{v}} \in Y_0$, then there exists a unique solution $U \in C^1([0, +\infty[, Z) \cap C([0, +\infty[, D(\mathbf{A}))$ to the problem **(0)**. Moreover $E(t) = \|U(t)\|_Z^2$ enjoys*

$$\sqrt{E(t)} \leq e^{\Lambda t} \sqrt{E(0)},$$

where $\Lambda = 1 + a + \beta$.

Here we consider that $D(\mathbf{A})$ is equipped with the operator norm $(\|U\|_Z^2 + \|\mathbf{A}U\|_Z^2)^{1/2}$.

Proof of Proposition A2. Firstly $\mathbf{A} + 1 + a + \beta$ is monotone, that is, for

$\forall U \in \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{A})$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Re[(\mathbf{A}U|U)_{\mathbf{Z}}] + (1+a+\beta)\|U\|_{\mathbf{Z}}^2 &= \Re\left[-Q(\dot{\mathbf{u}}, \mathbf{u}) - (\dot{\mathbf{u}}|\mathbf{u})_{\mathbf{X}} + (\mathbf{L}\mathbf{u}|\dot{\mathbf{u}})_{\mathbf{X}} + (\mathbf{B}\dot{\mathbf{u}}|\dot{\mathbf{u}})_{\mathbf{X}}\right] + \\
&\quad + (1+a+\beta)(Q[\mathbf{u}] + \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{X}}^2 + \|\dot{\mathbf{u}}\|_{\mathbf{X}}^2) \\
&\quad \geq -(1+a)\Re[(\dot{\mathbf{u}}|\mathbf{u})_{\mathbf{X}}] - \beta\|\dot{\mathbf{u}}\|_{\mathbf{X}}^2 + \\
&\quad + (1+a+\beta)\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{X}}^2 + (1+a+\beta)\|\dot{\mathbf{u}}\|_{\mathbf{X}}^2 \\
&\quad \geq (1+a)\left[\|\dot{\mathbf{u}}\|_{\mathbf{X}}^2 - \Re[(\dot{\mathbf{u}}|\mathbf{u})_{\mathbf{X}}] + \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{X}}^2\right] \\
&\quad \geq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

since $((\mathbf{L}+a)\mathbf{u}|\dot{\mathbf{u}}) = Q(\mathbf{u}, \dot{\mathbf{u}}) = Q(\dot{\mathbf{u}}, \mathbf{u})^*$ and $|\Re[(\mathbf{B}\dot{\mathbf{u}}|\dot{\mathbf{u}})_{\mathbf{X}}]| \leq \beta\|\dot{\mathbf{u}}\|_{\mathbf{X}}^2$.

If $\Lambda > \frac{\beta}{2} + \sqrt{\frac{\beta^2}{4} + a}$, then the operator $\mathbf{A} + \Lambda$ has the bounded inverse defined on \mathbf{Z} . Actually the equation

$$\mathbf{A}U + \Lambda U = F = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{f} \\ \mathbf{g} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbf{Z}$$

means

$$\begin{cases} -\dot{\mathbf{u}} + \Lambda \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{f} \in \mathbf{Y}_0 \\ \mathbf{B}\dot{\mathbf{u}} + \mathbf{L}\mathbf{u} + \Lambda \dot{\mathbf{u}} = \mathbf{g} \in \mathbf{X}, \end{cases}$$

which can be solved as

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{u} = (\mathbf{L} + \Lambda \mathbf{B} + \Lambda^2)^{-1}(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{f} + \Lambda \mathbf{f} + \mathbf{g}) \in \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{L}), \\ \dot{\mathbf{u}} = (\mathbf{L} + \Lambda \mathbf{B} + \Lambda^2)^{-1}(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{f} + \Lambda \mathbf{f} + \mathbf{g}) - \mathbf{f} \in \mathbf{Y}_0, \end{cases}$$

thanks to Proposition A1, since $\Lambda^2 > a + |\Lambda|\beta$ holds for $\Lambda > \frac{\beta}{2} + \sqrt{\frac{\beta^2}{4} + a}$. \square

Therefore, considering the problem (1):

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d^2 \mathbf{u}}{dt^2} + \mathbf{B} \frac{d\mathbf{u}}{dt} + \mathbf{L}\mathbf{u} &= \mathbf{0}, \\
\mathbf{u}(t) &\in \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{L}) \quad \text{for } \forall t \geq 0, \\
\mathbf{u} = \mathring{\mathbf{u}}, \quad \frac{d\mathbf{u}}{dt} = \mathring{\mathbf{v}} &\quad \text{at } t = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

we can claim

Theorem A1 *Suppose $\mathring{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{L})$ and $\mathring{\mathbf{v}} \in \mathbf{Y}_0$. Then the initial-boundary value problem (1) admits a unique solution*

$$\mathbf{u} \in C^2([0, +\infty[, \mathbf{X}) \cap C^1([0, +\infty[, \mathbf{Y}_0) \cap C([0, +\infty[, \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{L}))$$

and the energy

$$\begin{aligned} E(t) &= \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathcal{Y}}^2 + \|\dot{\mathbf{u}}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \\ &= \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 + Q[\mathbf{u}] + \left\| \frac{d\mathbf{u}}{dt} \right\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \end{aligned}$$

enjoys the estimate

$$\sqrt{E(t)} \leq e^{\Lambda t} \cdot \sqrt{E(0)},$$

where $\Lambda = 1 + a + \beta$.

Here $D(\mathbf{L})$ is equipped with the norm $(\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathcal{Y}}^2 + \|\mathbf{L}\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2)^{1/2}$.

Correspondingly we may consider the inhomogeneous initial-boundary value problem **(2)**:

$$\frac{dU}{dt} + \mathbf{A}U = F(t), \quad U|_{t=0} = U_0.$$

We can claim

Proposition A3 *If $U_0 \in D(\mathbf{A})$ and $F \in C([0, +\infty[; \mathcal{Z})$, then there exists a unique solution*

$$U \in C^1([0, +\infty[; \mathcal{Z}) \cap C([0, +\infty[; D(\mathbf{A}))$$

to the problem **(2)**, and it enjoys the estimate

$$\|U(t)\|_{\mathcal{Z}} \leq e^{\Lambda t} \left(\|U_0\|_{\mathcal{Z}} + \int_0^t e^{-\Lambda s} \|F(s)\|_{\mathcal{Z}} ds \right),$$

where $\Lambda = 1 + a + \beta$.

Therefore, considering the problem **(3)**:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2 \mathbf{u}}{dt^2} + \mathbf{B} \frac{d\mathbf{u}}{dt} + \mathbf{L}\mathbf{u} &= \mathbf{f}(t, \mathbf{x}), \\ \mathbf{u} &= \mathring{\mathbf{u}}, \quad \frac{d\mathbf{u}}{dt} = \mathring{\mathbf{v}} \quad \text{at } t = 0, \\ \mathbf{u}(t) &\in D(\mathbf{L}) \quad \text{for } \forall t \geq 0., \end{aligned}$$

we can claim:

Theorem A2 *Suppose $\mathring{\mathbf{u}} \in D(\mathbf{L})$, $\mathring{\mathbf{v}} \in \mathcal{Y}_0$ and $\mathbf{f} \in C([0, +\infty[; \mathcal{X})$. Then the initial-boundary value problem **(3)** admits a unique solution*

$$\mathbf{u} \in C^2([0, +\infty[, \mathcal{X}) \cap C^1([0, +\infty[, \mathcal{Y}_0) \cap C([0, +\infty[, D(\mathbf{L}))$$

and the energy

$$\begin{aligned} E(t) = E(t, \mathbf{u}) &:= \|\mathbf{u}\|_Y^2 + \|\dot{\mathbf{u}}\|_X^2 \\ &= \|\mathbf{u}\|_X^2 + Q[\mathbf{u}] + \left\| \frac{d\mathbf{u}}{dt} \right\|_X^2 \end{aligned}$$

enjoys the estimate

$$\sqrt{E(t)} \leq e^{\Lambda t} \left(\sqrt{E(0)} + \int_0^t e^{-\Lambda s} \|\mathbf{f}(s)\|_X ds \right)$$

for $\Lambda = 1 + a + \beta$.

Appendix B

Let us imagine the motion $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_p(t)$, $\mathbf{x}_p(0) = \mathbf{x}_0$ of an infinitesimally small parcel in the background $(\rho_b, S_b, \mathbf{v}_b)$. The density $\rho_p(\mathbf{x}(t))$, pressure $P_p(\mathbf{x}(t))$, entropy density $S_p(\mathbf{x}(t))$ of the parcel obeys the same EOS: $P = \rho^\gamma \exp[S/C_V]$ as the background. Suppose $\rho_p(\mathbf{x}(t)) = \rho_p(\mathbf{x}_0) =: \rho_0 \quad \forall t$. The equation of motion of the parcel is

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_0 \frac{d^2 \mathbf{x}_p}{dt^2} &= -\text{grad}P_b - \rho_0 \text{grad}\Phi_b \\ &= (\rho_b - \rho_0) \text{grad}\Phi_b. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\text{grad}P_b, \text{grad}\Phi_b$ are parallel to \mathbf{n} and $\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}(t)) \cong \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}_0) =: \mathbf{n}_0$, we suppose $\mathbf{x}_p(t) = X(t)\mathbf{n}_0$. Then the equation of motion reads

$$\frac{d^2 X}{dt^2} = \left(\frac{\rho_b}{\rho_0} - 1 \right) (\text{grad}\Phi_b | \mathbf{n}_0) \Big|_{\mathbf{x}=X(t)\mathbf{n}_0}.$$

But

$$\frac{\rho_b}{\rho_0} = \left[\frac{P_b \exp\left(-\frac{S_b}{C_V}\right)}{P_0 \exp\left(-\frac{S_0}{C_V}\right)} \right]^{\frac{1}{\gamma}},$$

where $P_0 := P_p(\mathbf{x}_0), S_0 := S_p(\mathbf{x}_0)$. We suppose that $P_p(\mathbf{x}(t)) = P_b(\mathbf{x}(t)), S_p(\mathbf{x}(t)) = S_0 := S_p(\mathbf{x}_0) = S_b(\mathbf{x}_0) \quad \forall t$, namely, we suppose that the pressure of the parcel adjusts instantaneously to the background pressure during the motion, and that the parcel displacement is adiabatic.

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\rho_b}{\rho_0} - 1 &= \exp\left[-\frac{1}{\gamma C_V}(S_b - S_0)\right] - 1 \\ &\cong -\frac{1}{\gamma C_V} (\text{grad}S_b(\mathbf{x}_0) | \mathbf{x}(t) - \mathbf{x}_0) \\ &= -\mathcal{A}_b(\mathbf{x}_0)(X(t) - X(0)) \end{aligned}$$

by the definition

$$-\mathcal{A}_b = (\mathbf{a}_b | \mathbf{n}) = -\frac{1}{\gamma C_V} (\text{grad} S_b | \mathbf{n}).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2 X}{dt^2} &= -\mathcal{A}_b(\mathbf{x}_0) (\text{grad} \Phi_b(\mathbf{x}_0) | \mathbf{n}_0) (X(t) - X(0)) \\ &= -\mathcal{N}^2(\mathbf{x}_0) (X(t) - X(0)), \end{aligned} \quad (*)$$

if we define

$$\mathcal{N}^2 = \mathcal{A}_b(\text{grad} \Phi_b | \mathbf{n}) \quad (2.9).$$

The solution of (*) is

$$X(t) = X(0) + C_+ e^{iNt} + C_- e^{-iNt} \quad \text{where } N := \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_0).$$

Clearly $|X(t) - X(0)| = O(1)$ for non-trivial $X(t)$ if and only if $N \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore the definition (2.9) is justifiable.

Acknowledgment

To do this study has been caused by helpful discussions with Professors Akitaka Matsumura (Osaka University) and Masao Takata (the University of Tokyo), to whom sincere thanks are expressed. This work was supported by Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (KAKENHI) grant JP21K03311, and by the Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences, an International Joint Usage/Research Center located in Kyoto University.

The data availability statement

No new data were created or analyzed in this study.

References

- [1] G. K. Batchelor, An Introduction to Fluid Dynamics, Cambridge UP, 1967.
- [2] V. Bjerknes, Über die hydrodynamischen Gleichungen in Lagrangescher und Eulerscher Form und ihre Linearisierung für das Studium kleiner Störungen, Geof. Publ., 5(1929), 3-43.

- [3] J. Bogner, *Indefinite inner-product spaces*, Springer, Berlin-Hidelberg-New York, 1974.
- [4] H. Brezis, *Functional Analysis, Sobolev Spaces and Partial Differential Equations*, Springer, New York-Dordrecht-Heidelberg-London, 2011.
- [5] D. Brunt, *Physical and Dynamical Meteorology*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1934.
- [6] J. Dyson and B. F. Schutz, Perturbation and stability of rotating stars, I. Completeness of normal modes, *Proc. Roy. Soc. London, A* 368(1979), 389-410.
- [7] J. L. Friedman and B. F. Schutz, Lagrangian perturbation theory of non-relativistic fluids, *Astrophys. J.*, 221(1978), 937-957.
- [8] J. R. Holton, *An Introduction to Dynamical Meteorology*, 5th ed., Academic Press, 2013.
- [9] C. Hunter, On secular stability, secular instability, and points of bifurcation of rotating gaseous masses, *Astrophys. J.*, 213(1977), 497-517.
- [10] Juhi Jang and T. Makino, On rotating axisymmetric solutions of the Euler-Poisson equations, *J. Differential equations*, 266(2019), 3942-3972.
- [11] Juhi Jang and T. Makino, Linearized analysis of barotropic perturbations around spherically symmetric gaseous stars governed by the Euler-Poisson equations, *J. Math. Phys.*, 61(2020), 051508.
- [12] T. Kato, *Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators*, Springer, 1980.
- [13] N. R. Lebovitz, The virial tensor and its application to self-gravitating fluids, *Astrophys. J.*, 134(1961), 500-536.
- [14] P. Ledoux and Th. Walraven, Variable stars, in *Handbuch der Physik, Band LI : Sternaufbau*, Springer, Berlin, Göttingen, Heidelberg, 1958.
- [15] D. Lynden-Bell and J. P. Ostriker, On the stability of differentially rotating bodies, *Mon. Not. Astr. Soc.*, 136(1967), 293-310.
- [16] T. Makino, On linear adiabatic perturbations of spherically symmetric gaseous stars governed by the Euler-Poisson equations, *Kyoto J. Math.*, 63(2023), 353-420.