THE THREE LIMITS OF THE HYDROSTATIC APPROXIMATION

KEN FURUKAWA, YOSHIKAZU GIGA, MATTHIAS HIEBER, AMRU HUSSEIN, TAKAHITO KASHIWABARA, AND MARC WRONA

ABSTRACT. The primitive equations are derived from the 3D-Navier-Stokes equations by the hydrostatic approximation. Formally, assuming an ε -thin domain and anisotropic viscosities with vertical viscosity $\nu_z = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{\gamma})$ where $\gamma = 2$, one obtains the primitive equations with full viscosity as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Here, we take two more limit equations into consideration: For $\gamma < 2$ the 2D-Navier-Stokes equations are obtained. For $\gamma > 2$ the primitive equations with only horizontal viscosity $-\Delta_H$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Thus, there are three possible limits of the hydrostatic approximation depending on the assumption on the vertical viscosity. The latter convergence has been proven recently by Li, Titi, and Yuan using energy estimates. Here, we consider more generally $\nu_z = \varepsilon^2 \delta$ and show how maximal regularity methods and quadratic inequalities can be an efficient approach to the same end for $\varepsilon, \delta \to 0$. The flexibility of our methods is also illustrated by the convergence for $\delta \to \infty$ and $\varepsilon \to 0$ to the 2D-Navier-Stokes equations.

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Rescaling procedure and the formal limit equations	5
3.	Function spaces	9
4.	Main results	11
5.	Anisotropic linear estimates	14
6.	Non-linear estimates	18
7.	Additional regularity	21
8.	Quadratic inequalities and proof of the convergences	23
References		28

1. INTRODUCTION

The hydrostatic approximation of the Navier-Stokes equations is used in meteorological models, cf. e.g. [40, 44, 60, 61]. Formally, it consists in replacing the equation for the vertical velocity of the fluid by the assumption that the pressure is determined by the surface pressure. It appears already in the pioneering work of Richardson originally dating back to 1922, see [55] for a recent edition, and it can be justified on physical grounds by a scale analysis. Mathematically, it can be justified by a rescaling of Navier-Stokes equations with anisotropic viscosities. That is, one considers on a vertically ε -thin domain

$$\Omega_{\varepsilon} := G \times (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon), \quad \text{where} \quad G := (-1, 1) \times (-1, 1), \quad \varepsilon > 0,$$

²⁰¹⁰ Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 35Q35; Secondary: 47D06, 86A05.

Key words and phrases. hydrostatic approximation, primitive equations with horizontal viscosity, scaled Navier-Stokes equations, strong convergence .

Yoshikazu Giga was partly supported by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Sciences (JSPS) through grants Kakenhi: Nos.20K20342, 19H00639, 18H05323, and by Arithmer Inc., Daikin Industries, Ltd. and Ebara Corporation through collaborative grants. Takahito Kashiwabara was supported by JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Early-Career Scientists No. 20K14357. Matthias Hieber gratefully acknowledges the support by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) through the Research Unit 5528. Amru Hussein has been generously supported by DFG – project number 508634462 and by MathApp – Mathematics Applied to Real-World Problems – part of the Research Initiative of the Federal State of Rhineland-Palatinate, Germany.

the Navier-Stokes equations

(NS^{$$\Omega_{\varepsilon}$$})
$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u + u \cdot \nabla u - \Delta_H u - \nu_z(\varepsilon) \partial_z^2 u + \nabla p = 0 & \text{in } (0,T) \times \Omega_{\varepsilon}, \\ \text{div } u = 0 & \text{in } (0,T) \times \Omega_{\varepsilon}, \\ u(0) = u_0 & \text{in } \Omega_{\varepsilon}, \end{cases}$$

where the vertical viscosity coefficient $\nu_z(\varepsilon)$ is ε dependent with $\nu_z(\varepsilon) \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Rescaling the velocity u = (v, w) with horizontal components $v = (v_1, v_2)$ vertical component w, and the pressure p by

$$v_{\varepsilon,\delta}(x,y,z):=v(x,y,\varepsilon z), \quad w_{\varepsilon,\delta}(x,y,z):=\tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}w(x,y,\varepsilon z), \quad \text{and} \quad p_{\varepsilon,\delta}(x,y,z):=p(x,y,\varepsilon z),$$

equation $(NS^{\Omega_{\varepsilon}})$ transforms to the rescaled anisotropic Navier-Stokes equations on the ε -independent domain $\Omega := \Omega_1$

$$(\mathrm{NS}_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \begin{cases} \partial_t v_{\varepsilon,\delta} + u_{\varepsilon,\delta} \cdot \nabla v_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \Delta_H v_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \frac{\nu_z(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^2} \partial_z^2 v_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \nabla_H p_{\varepsilon,\delta} = 0 & \text{in } (0,T) \times \Omega, \\ \varepsilon^2 \left(\partial_t w_{\varepsilon,\delta} + u_{\varepsilon,\delta} \cdot \nabla w_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \Delta_H w_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \frac{\nu_z(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^2} \partial_z^2 w_{\varepsilon,\delta} \right) + \partial_z p_{\varepsilon,\delta} = 0 & \text{in } (0,T) \times \Omega, \\ \mathrm{div} \, u_{\varepsilon,\delta} = 0 & \text{in } (0,T) \times \Omega, \\ u_{\varepsilon,\delta}(0) = (u_0)_{\varepsilon,\delta} & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

where the w-equation has been multiplied by ε^2 . This recaling procedure goes back at least to [2,5]. In meteorological modeling anisotropic and partial viscosities appear naturally, cf. e.g. [15], since the viscosity is largely an eddy viscosity, cf. e.g. [45,61].

The formal limit equation for $\varepsilon \to 0$ now depends crucially on the behaviour of the term $\frac{\nu_z(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^2}$. More generally, we consider

(1.1)
$$\nu_z = \varepsilon^2 \delta \quad \text{for} \quad \varepsilon, \delta > 0, \quad \text{that is} \quad \frac{\nu_z(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^2} = \delta.$$

For $\varepsilon \to 0$ one hence has three cases: For $\delta > 0$ constant setting for simplicity $\delta = 1$, one has formally the primitive equations with full viscosity as $\frac{\nu_z(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^2} = 1$, compare [2, 19, 34]. If $\delta \to 0$, one obtains the primitive equations with only horizontal viscosity as in $(NS_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ also the term $\frac{\nu_z(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^2} \partial_z^2 v_{\varepsilon} \to 0$ for $\delta \to 0$. The case $\delta \to \infty$ is not that straight forward. A first indication is the energy equality obtained by testing $(NS_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ with $(v_{\varepsilon}, w_{\varepsilon})$

$$\|(v_{\varepsilon}(t),\varepsilon w_{\varepsilon})\|_{L^{2}}^{2} + \int_{0}^{t} \|\nabla_{H}(v_{\varepsilon}(s),\varepsilon w_{\varepsilon})\|_{L^{2}}^{2} + \delta \|\partial_{z}(v_{\varepsilon}(s),\varepsilon w_{\varepsilon})\|_{L^{2}}^{2} ds = \|((v_{0})_{\varepsilon},(\varepsilon w_{0})_{\varepsilon})\|_{L^{2}}^{2}, \quad t > 0.$$

This implies that $\partial_z v_{\varepsilon} \to 0$ in $L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$ as $\delta \to \infty$, that is, heuristically in the limit only the horizontal directions are relevant for the horizontal velocity. To understand the limit behaviour, one splits the anisotropic Navier-Stokes equations into barotropic and baroclinic modes, respectively, i.e.,

$$u_{\varepsilon,\delta} = \overline{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \tilde{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \quad \text{where} \quad \overline{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} := \overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} := (\tilde{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, w_{\varepsilon,\delta})$$

with

$$\overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} := \frac{1}{2} \int_{-1}^{+1} v_{\varepsilon,\delta}(\cdot,\cdot,\xi) d\xi \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} := v_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta}.$$

Then one obtains for $\overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ the 2D-Navier-Stokes equations with forcing

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \cdot \nabla \overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \Delta_H \overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \nabla_H \overline{p}_{\varepsilon,\delta} = & -\frac{1}{2} \int_{-1}^{+1} \tilde{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \cdot \nabla \tilde{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} & \text{ in } (0,T) \times G, \\ & \text{ div}_H \overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} = & 0 & \text{ in } (0,T) \times G, \\ & \overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta}(0) = & (\overline{v}_0)_{\varepsilon,\delta} & \text{ in } G, \end{cases}$$

where using that div $\tilde{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} = 0$ and assuming $\tilde{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ to be even with respect to the vertical direction one writes

$$-\frac{1}{2}\int_{-1}^{+1} \tilde{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \cdot \nabla \tilde{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} = -\frac{1}{2}\int_{-1}^{+1} \tilde{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \cdot \nabla_H \tilde{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} - w_{\varepsilon,\delta} \partial_z \tilde{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} = \frac{1}{2}\int_{-1}^{+1} -\tilde{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \cdot \nabla_H \tilde{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \operatorname{div}_H \tilde{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \cdot \tilde{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta}.$$

Here, by the Poincaré inequality $\partial_z \tilde{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \to 0$ implies formally $\tilde{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \to 0$ as $\delta \to \infty$. Therefore – assuming that $\nabla_H \tilde{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ remains bounded – the forcing term vanishes leaving on a formal level the 2D-Navier-Stokes equations as limit equations as $\delta \to \infty$.

This formal reasoning will be made rigorous in Section 8. Here, we study these three limits as sketched in Figure 1, see also Remark 4.7 below. The full set of equations discussed is given in detail in Section 2.

Depending on the assumptions on the scaling of the vertical viscosity, there can also be other limit equations as in the case of the great lake equation with only vertical viscosity in the limit as discussed by Bresch, Lemoine and Simon in [7]. There, isotropic ε -independent viscosities are assumed and a different re-scaling is applied. Another setting is where the 3D-Navier-Stokes equations on a thin domain Ω_{ε} are considered, however with constant ε -independent viscosity. On such domains comparisons to 2D-Navier-Stokes-type equations can be shown, and thereby – under certain assumptions on the data – the global well-posedness of the 3D-Navier-Stokes equations on such thin domains follows, see e.g. [28, 30, 43, 52–54] and the references therein. The main difference to our approach is that we consider anisotropic viscosities and therefore rescaled rather than actual 3D Navier-Stokes equations as limiting equations. In particular, we do not have to restrict the class of the data. Indeed as pointed out in [2, 1. Introduction], the anisotropic viscosity hypothesis is fundamental for the derivation of the primitive equations. For an illustrative overview on the model hierarchy and the various approximations for geophysical models see [39, Figure 1.1].

Instead of the general assumption (1.1) on ν_z in (NS_{ε,δ}), one can consider more concretely

$$\nu_z(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon^{\gamma}$$
 for $\gamma > 0$, that is $\delta_{\varepsilon} = \varepsilon^{\gamma-2}$.

This has been studied recently by Li, Titi and Yuan in [35] for $\gamma > 2$ which corresponds to the case $\delta \to 0$ here. A comparison between the results obtained in [35] and here is given in Remark 4.4 below. One conclusion from the above considerations – summarized in Figure 1 – is that if there is now some uncertainty as to how to model the parameter γ , then the case where the limit is the primitive equations with full viscosity is only a borderline case. The more stable limits under variation of γ are in fact the primitive equations with only horizontal viscosity and the 2D-Navier-Stokes equations. This is summarized in Figure 2, and it is one motivation to prove norm convergence results for these three cases in appropriate norms as elaborated in this note.

$$(NS_{\varepsilon,\delta})$$

$$\varepsilon \to 0$$

$$\delta \to \infty$$

$$2D-(NS) \underbrace{\leftarrow \delta}_{\infty \leftarrow \delta} (PE_{\delta}) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \to 0} (PE_{H})$$

FIGURE 1. Convergences schematically



FIGURE 2. Convergences schematically for $\nu_z = \varepsilon^{\gamma}$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$

1.1. Literature on the limit equations. For the three limit equations in Figure 1 global strong well-posedness is known. For the 2D-Navier-Stokes equations the global well-posedness for initial data in L^2 is known since the early works by Leray, see [32] and also e.g. [57, Chapter V] and the references therein.

The mathematical analysis of the primitive equations with full viscosity started much later, and it has been initiated in a series of papers by Lions, Temam and Wang [36–38]. There the primitive equations

have been derived formally from the Navier-Stokes equations, and the existence of global weak solutions has been proven for initial data in L^2 . A breakthrough result in the analysis of these equations has been the work by Cao and Titi, cf. [14], who proved the global strong well-posedness for initial data in H^1 . Since then there has been some refinements of this result enlarging the set of possible initial values, compare e.g. [23, 24, 31, 33], while the question of global well-posedness for initial data in L^2 remains open, see also [6] for recent developments in this direction.

The primitive equations with only horizontal viscosity has been studied by Cao, Li and Titi [12,13], see also [29] for an adaptation thereof, proving that this equations are globally strongly well-posed. This can be contrasted with results on the ill-posedness and blow-ups for the inviscid primitive equations, cf. e.g. [9,25] and the references therein, and also [56] for very weak viscosity terms which still guarantee at least local well-posedness. The primitive equations with only horizontal viscosity are part of a range of problems. When taking the temperature into account different types of anisotropic and partial viscosity and diffusivity can be imposed, see [10, 11, 13]. Here, we neglect the temperature and focus on the mathematically most challenging part which is the velocity equations.

For the 3D-Navier-Stokes equations the problem of the global well-posedness remains open, and there has been recent developments hinting towards blow ups, see [1,41,42], and non-uniqueness, see [8]. As a side effect of our convergence results, it turns out that the anisotropic 3D-Navier-Stokes become globally well-posed when its solutions approaches one of the globally well-posed limit equations.

1.2. Literature on the hydrostatic approximation and our approach to it. The scaling procedure outlined above had already been used by Besson, Laydi and Touzani in [4] for the stationary linear case and then by Besson and Laydi in [5] for the stationary non-linear case. The question of the convergence of the scaled Navier-Stokes equations to the primitive equations with full viscosity has been addressed first by Azérad and Guillén in [2] using compactness arguments and therefore without explicit convergence rate, where the linear time dependent problem has been studied before in [3]. In the work by Li and Titi [34] for the first time strong convergence was proven with convergence rate of order $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ based on energy estimates. Later and taking a different approach by using maximal $L_t^q - L_x^p$ -regularity methods and quadratic estimates, we proved in [19] norm convergence of the same order for a large set of $p, q \in (1, \infty)$, see also [20] for the more difficult case of Dirichlet boundary conditions. Non-periodic domains are included also in [17]. The cases of the scaled Boussinesq equations is considered in [50, 51], the case of the compressible primitive equations is discussed in [21] and the inviscid case in [58].

Here, we aim to adapt the methods developed in [19] to prove, depending on the scaling of the vertical viscosity, convergence of the anisotropic Navier-Stokes equations to the primitive equations with only horizontal viscosity and to the 2D-Navier Stokes equations, respectively. The problem of the convergence of the scaled Navier-Stokes equations to the primitive equations with only horizontal viscosity has been discussed recently by Li, Titi, and Yuan in [35]. The result obtained for $\nu_z = \varepsilon^{\gamma}$ for $\gamma > 2$ there rely on energy methods, and they give convergence in the weak and strong sense with explicit convergence rates. The results are quite close to the results obtained here as discussed in Remark 4.4 below.

The strength of the approach presented here is that it is easily adaptable which we show by including general $\nu_z = \varepsilon^2 \cdot \delta$ instead of only $\delta_{\varepsilon} = \varepsilon^{\gamma-2}$ and by including the convergences $\varepsilon, \delta \to 0$ and $\varepsilon \to 0, \delta \to \infty$. On a technical level the starting point is – as e.g. in [19, 20, 34, 35] – to consider the difference of the approximating and the limit equations. The main idea of our strategy is then to prove quadratic like inequalities for certain norms. These quadratic like inequalities are reminiscent to the approach by Fujita and Kato for the Navier-Stokes equations in [18]. There smallness of the data or the existence time implies contraction properties. Here, smallness enters the inequalities in terms of the parameters ε, δ , and the quadratic inequalities imply uniform estimates with respect to these parameters, see Section 8 for a detailed discussion.

Originally, we developed this approach for the case of the hydrostatic approximation for the primitive equations with full viscosity in [19]. To adapt the approach to the situation here, we have to make some adjustments reflecting the parabolic-hyperbolic character of the primitive equations with only horizontal viscosity. First, in order to obtain quadratic inequalities in maximal L^2 -regularity norms and to compare this to $(NS_{\varepsilon,\delta})$, we add the missing term $\delta \partial_z^2 v$ to both sides of the primitive equations with only horizontal viscosity given in Subsection 2.3 below. To continue with our strategy we then have to prove uniform

estimates on $\delta \partial_z^2 v$ to estimate the right hand side. Second, to control the vanishing vertical viscosity on the left hand side, we linearise the difference equation as a diffusion-transport equation with parabolic properties in horizontal directions and transport features in the vertical direction. Thereby we can prove that the vertical regularity of solutions is preserved and that it can be estimated in terms of the right hand side entering our quadratic like inequality.

The convergence of the anisotropic Navier-Stokes equations for $\varepsilon \to 0$ and $\delta \to \infty$ can be proven following a similar overall strategy which is actually closer to [19] and needs less adjustments. That all three limits of the hydrostatic approximation can be treated by this same general strategy illustrates that this is indeed a very flexible tool to prove norm convergences. The hydrostatic approximation is just one of the mechanisms in the derivation of models in fluid mechanics, see [39, Figure 1.1] for an illustration, and the methods presented here might be helpful to prove relevant convergences for other models.

1.3. **Outline.** We start by discussing in the subsequent Section 2 the rescaled Navier-Stokes equations, its limit equations, and the equations satisfied by their differences. These difference equations are the main object studied here. In Section 3 the framework of function spaces used here is introduced. In Section 4 we present our main convergence results Theorems 4.3 and 4.6 summarized in Remark 4.7. Their proof is subdivided into several steps: In Section 5, we study linearisation for the difference equations, and in Section 6 non-linear estimates are derived. This is used in Section 7 to show that assuming more regularity on the data, then the solution to the primitive equations with horizontal viscosity has additional regularity properties. In Section 8 we give a general scheme to conclude form quadratic inequalities uniform norm estimates. The results form the previous sections are then put together to apply this to the situation here and to prove Theorems 4.3 and 4.6.

2. Rescaling procedure and the formal limit equations

In this section we introduce the precise setting for the limit and limiting equations treated, and for the relevant differences of the approximating and the limit equations.

2.1. Rescaled 3D Navier-Stokes equations. Consider the cylindrical ε -thin domain

(2.1)
$$\Omega_{\varepsilon} := G \times (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon), \quad \text{where} \quad G := (-1, 1) \times (-1, 1), \quad \varepsilon > 0,$$

setting

 $\Omega := \Omega_1.$

The horizontal coordinates are denoted by $(x, y) \in (-1, 1) \times (-1, 1)$, the vertical coordinate by $z \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$, and a finite time interval (0, T) is given with $T \in (0, \infty)$. Then, one considers the Navier-Stokes equations on Ω_{ε} with anisotropic viscosity given in terms of the horizontal viscosity constant $\nu_H > 0$ and vertical viscosity constant $\nu_z > 0$, and subject to periodic boundary conditions along with some parity in vertical direction, i.e., the velocity $u = (v, w): \Omega_{\varepsilon} \times (0, T) \to \mathbb{R}^3$ with $v = (v_1, v_2)$ and the pressure $p: \Omega_{\varepsilon} \times (0, T) \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy

$$(\mathrm{NS}^{\Omega_{\varepsilon}}) \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \partial_{t}u + u \cdot \nabla u - \nu_{H} \Delta_{H}u - \nu_{z} \partial_{z}^{2}u + \nabla p = & 0 & \text{ in } (0,T) \times \Omega_{\varepsilon}, \\ & \mathrm{div} \, u = & 0 & \mathrm{in } (0,T) \times \Omega_{\varepsilon}, \\ & u(0) = & u_{0} & \mathrm{in } \Omega_{\varepsilon}, \\ & p, v, w \text{ periodic in } x, y, z, \\ & v, p \text{ even in } z, \\ & w \text{ odd in } z. \end{array} \right.$$

Here, we assume that $\nu_H = \mathcal{O}(1)$ and that $\nu_z = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2 \delta)$, and for simplicity we set with $\varepsilon > 0$ as in (2.1)

$$\nu_H = 1$$
 and $\nu_z = \varepsilon^2 \cdot \delta$ for $\delta > 0$.

Here and in the following, we use the notations

$$\Delta_{\delta} = \Delta_{H} + \delta \partial_{z}^{2}, \quad \Delta_{H} = \partial_{x}^{2} + \partial_{y}^{2}, \quad \nabla_{H} = \begin{bmatrix} \partial_{x} \\ \partial_{y} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \operatorname{div}_{H} = \begin{bmatrix} \partial_{x} & \partial_{y} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then, one introduces the rescaled functions $u_{\varepsilon,\delta} := (v_{\varepsilon,\delta}, w_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ and $p_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ with

$$v_{\varepsilon,\delta}(x,y,z) := v(x,y,\varepsilon z), \quad w_{\varepsilon,\delta}(x,y,z) := \frac{1}{\varepsilon}w(x,y,\varepsilon z), \quad \text{and} \quad p_{\varepsilon,\delta}(x,y,z) := p(x,y,\varepsilon z),$$

and thereby equation $(NS^{\Omega_{\varepsilon}})$ transforms to the rescaled anisotropic Navier-Stokes equations on $\Omega = \Omega_1$

$$(\mathrm{NS}_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \begin{cases} \partial_t v_{\varepsilon,\delta} + u_{\varepsilon,\delta} \cdot \nabla v_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \Delta_{\delta} v_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \nabla_H p_{\varepsilon,\delta} = & 0 & \text{in } (0,T) \times \Omega, \\ \partial_t w_{\varepsilon,\delta} + u_{\varepsilon,\delta} \cdot \nabla w_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \Delta_{\delta} w_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \partial_z p_{\varepsilon,\delta} = & 0 & \text{in } (0,T) \times \Omega, \\ \mathrm{div} \, u_{\varepsilon,\delta} = & 0 & \mathrm{in } (0,T) \times \Omega, \\ u_{\varepsilon,\delta}(0) = & (u_0)_{\varepsilon,\delta} & \mathrm{in } \Omega, \\ p_{\varepsilon,\delta}, v_{\varepsilon,\delta}, w_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \text{ periodic in } x, y, z, \\ p_{\varepsilon,\delta}, v_{\varepsilon,\delta} \text{ even in } z, \\ w_{\varepsilon,\delta} \text{ odd in } z. \end{cases}$$

The even and odd parity conditions together with the periodicity imply the boundary conditions

$$\partial_z v_{\varepsilon,\delta}(\cdot,\cdot,\pm\varepsilon) = 0, \quad \partial_z v_{\varepsilon,\delta}(\cdot,\cdot,0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad w_{\varepsilon,\delta}(\cdot,\cdot,\pm\varepsilon) = 0, \quad w_{\varepsilon,\delta}(\cdot,\cdot,0) = 0$$

2.2. The anisotropic primitive equations. Now, multiplying the equation for $w_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ in $(NS_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ by ε^2 , the anisotropic primitive equations are obtained by taking the formal limit of $(NS_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$ while fixing $\delta > 0$. This means we search for functions $u_{0,\delta} = (v_{0,\delta}, w_{0,\delta})$ and $p_{0,\delta}$ satisfying

$$(\mathrm{PE}_{\delta}) \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \partial_{t} v_{0,\delta} + u_{0,\delta} \cdot \nabla v_{0,\delta} - \Delta_{\delta} v_{0,\delta} + \nabla_{H} p_{0,\delta} = & 0 & \text{ in } (0,T) \times \Omega \\ & \partial_{z} p_{0,\delta} = & 0 & \text{ in } (0,T) \times \Omega \\ & \text{ div } u_{0,\delta} = & 0 & \text{ in } (0,T) \times \Omega \\ & v_{0,\delta}(0) = & (v_{0,\delta})_{0} & \text{ in } \Omega, \\ & p_{0,\delta}, v_{0,\delta}, w_{0,\delta} \text{ periodic in } x, y, z, \\ & v_{0,\delta} \text{ even in } z, \\ & w_{0,\delta} \text{ odd in } z. \end{array} \right.$$

The main difference in the structure of (PE_{δ}) as compared to $(NS_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ is that there is no evolution equations for the vertical velocity. Instead it can be recovered from the divergence free condition and the parity conditions as

(2.2)
$$w_{0,\delta} = w_{0,\delta}(v_{0,\delta}) \quad \text{with} \quad w_{0,\delta}(x,y,z) = -\int_{-1}^{z} \operatorname{div}_{H} v_{0,\delta}(x,y,\xi) d\xi$$

and therefrom the parity conditions on $w_{0,\delta}$ imply that the condition div $u_{0,\delta}$ can be substituted by

(2.3)
$$\operatorname{div}_{H} \int_{-1}^{1} v_{0,\delta} = 0$$

compare e.g. [27] for a detailed discussion.

2.3. The primitive equations with only horizontal viscosity. Multiplying in $(NS_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ the equation for $w_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ by ε^2 , one can take the formal limit of $(NS_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ as both $\varepsilon \to 0$ and $\delta \to 0$. Or, one takes the limit $\delta \to 0$ in (PE_{δ}) . This results in the primitive equations with only horizontal viscosity, i.e., functions $u_{0,0} = (v_{0,0}, w_{0,0})$ and $p_{0,0}$ satisfying

$$(PE_{H}) \begin{cases} \partial_{t} v_{0,0} + u_{0,0} \cdot \nabla v_{0,0} - \Delta_{H} v_{0,0} + \nabla_{H} p_{0,0} = 0 & \text{in } (0,T) \times \Omega, \\ \partial_{z} p_{0,0} = 0 & \text{in } (0,T) \times \Omega, \\ \text{div } u_{0,0} = 0 & \text{in } (0,T) \times \Omega, \\ v_{0,0}(0) = (v_{0,0})_{0} & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \\ p_{0,0}, v_{0,0}, w_{0,0} \text{ periodic in } x, y, z, \\ v_{0,0}, \text{ even in } z, \\ w_{0,0} \text{ odd in } z. \end{cases}$$

Here, the only formal difference to (PE_{δ}) is that Δ_{δ} is substituted by Δ_{H} . This has some severe implication for its analysis, because while (PE_{δ}) is a parabolic equation (PE_{H}) has parabolic diffusion features with respect to the horizontal variables while it has hyperbolic transport-like behaviour with respect to the vertical variable. The relations (2.2) and (2.3) carry over to the case $\delta = 0$. 2.4. Difference equations for $\varepsilon \to 0$ and $\delta \to 0$. Let $u_{\varepsilon,\delta} = (v_{\varepsilon,\delta}, w_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ and $p_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ be the solution to $(NS_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ and $v = v_{0,0}$ and $p = p_{0,0}$ be the solution to (PE_H) with $w = w(v) = w_{0,0}$, where we omit the subscripts to simplify the notation. Then multiplying the equations in $(NS_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ and (PE_H) for the vertical components $w_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ and w of the velocity by ε , respectively, one considers the differences

(2.4)
$$V_{\varepsilon,\delta} := v_{\varepsilon,\delta} - v, \quad W_{\varepsilon,\delta} = \varepsilon (w_{\varepsilon,\delta} - w), \quad \text{and} \quad P_{\varepsilon,\delta} := p_{\varepsilon,\delta} - p$$

setting $U_{\varepsilon,\delta} = (V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta})$, and one introduces the scaled gradient and divergence

$$\nabla_{\varepsilon} = \begin{bmatrix} \partial_x \\ \partial_y \\ \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \partial_z \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{div}_{\varepsilon} = \begin{bmatrix} \partial_x & \partial_y & \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \partial_z \end{bmatrix}.$$

The functions $U_{\varepsilon,\delta} = (V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ and $P_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ satisfy the following anisotropic Navier-Stokes-type equations

$$(\operatorname{Diff}_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \partial_t V_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \Delta_{\delta} V_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \nabla_H P_{\varepsilon,\delta} = & F_{\varepsilon,\delta}^H(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) & \text{ in } (0,T) \times \Omega, \\ \partial_t W_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \Delta_{\delta} W_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \partial_z P_{\varepsilon,\delta} = & F_{\varepsilon,\delta}^z(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) & \text{ in } (0,T) \times \Omega, \\ & \operatorname{div}_{\varepsilon} U_{\varepsilon,\delta} = & 0 & \operatorname{in } (0,T) \times \Omega, \\ & U_{\varepsilon,\delta}(0) = & 0 & \operatorname{in } \Omega, \\ P_{\varepsilon,\delta}, V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta} \text{ periodic in } x, y, z, \\ & V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, P_{\varepsilon,\delta} \text{ even in } z, \\ & W_{\varepsilon,\delta} \text{ odd in } z, \end{array} \right.$$

where similarly as in [19, Equation (3.1)]

$$F_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{H}(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) := -(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \nabla v - u \cdot \nabla V_{\varepsilon,\delta} - (V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \nabla V_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \delta \partial_{z}^{2} v,$$

$$(2.5) \qquad F_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{z}(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) := -(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \nabla \varepsilon w - u \cdot \nabla W_{\varepsilon,\delta} - (V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \nabla W_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \varepsilon (\partial_{t}w + u \cdot \nabla w - \Delta_{\delta}w).$$

Notice that by the divergence free condition and the parity conditions on $W_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ one can rewrite

(2.6)
$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\partial_z W_{\varepsilon,\delta} = -\operatorname{div}_H V_{\varepsilon,\delta} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{\varepsilon}W_{\varepsilon,\delta} = -\int_{-1}^z \operatorname{div}_H V_{\varepsilon,\delta}$$

provided that $U_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ is regular enough. One can rewrite (2.5) – using div $(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) = 0$ and div(v, w) = 0 – to become

(2.7)
$$\begin{bmatrix} F_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{H}(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \\ F_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{Z}(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \end{bmatrix} = -\operatorname{div}\left((v, \varepsilon w) \otimes (V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \right) - \operatorname{div}\left((V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \otimes (v, w) \right) \\ -\operatorname{div}\left((V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \otimes (V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \right) + \begin{bmatrix} +\delta\partial_{z}^{2}v \\ -\varepsilon(\partial_{t}w + u \cdot \nabla w - \Delta_{\delta}w) \end{bmatrix}.$$

The terms $\delta \partial_z^2 v$ and $-\varepsilon (\partial_t w + u \cdot \nabla w - \Delta_\delta w)$ on the right hand side of $(\text{Diff}_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ have been added on both sides of the equation, and they act as forcing terms which vanish as $\delta \to 0$ and $\varepsilon \to 0$. This will provide us with the "smallness" needed to show convergence via quadratic inequalities in Section 8.

2.5. Rescaled 3D Navier-Stokes equations with 2D Navier-Stokes equations as subsystem. Consider now the limit $\delta \to \infty$ and $\varepsilon \to 0$. Equation $(NS_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ can equivalently be rewritten to contain the 2D Navier-Stokes equations as a subsystem. To this end, split solutions to $(NS_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ into the vertical average and the vertically average free part

$$\overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} := \frac{1}{2} \int_{-1}^{+1} v_{\varepsilon,\delta}(\cdot,\cdot,\xi) d\xi \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} := v_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta},$$
$$\overline{p}_{\varepsilon,\delta} := \frac{1}{2} \int_{-1}^{+1} p_{\varepsilon,\delta}(\cdot,\cdot,\xi) d\xi \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{p}_{\varepsilon,\delta} := p_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \overline{p}_{\varepsilon,\delta},$$

respectively. This induces a splitting into barotropic and baroclinic modes, respectively, i.e.,

$$u_{\varepsilon,\delta} = \overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \widetilde{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$$
 and $p_{\varepsilon,\delta} = \overline{p}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \widetilde{p}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$, where $\widetilde{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} := (\widetilde{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, w_{\varepsilon,\delta})$

Here, due to the parity condition $\int_{-1}^{+1} w_{\varepsilon,\delta}(\cdot,\cdot,\xi) d\xi = 0$, the vertical velocity $w_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ contributes to the baroclinic modes. Then $(NS_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ can be reformulated to become

$$(\mathrm{NS}_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{(2)}) \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \partial_t \overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \Delta_H \overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \nabla_H \overline{p}_{\varepsilon,\delta} = & \overline{F}(\tilde{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}) & \text{in } (0,T) \times G, \\ \partial_t \tilde{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \Delta_\delta \tilde{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \nabla_H \tilde{p}_{\varepsilon,\delta} = & \tilde{F}_1(\tilde{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta}) & \text{in } (0,T) \times \Omega, \\ \partial_t w_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \Delta_\delta w_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \partial_z \tilde{p}_{\varepsilon,\delta} = & \tilde{F}_2(\overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \tilde{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}) & \text{in } (0,T) \times \Omega, \\ \partial_t w_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \Delta_\delta w_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \partial_z \tilde{p}_{\varepsilon,\delta} = & 0 & \text{in } (0,T) \times \Omega, \\ \partial_t w_{\varepsilon,\delta} = & 0 & \text{in } (0,T) \times \Omega, \\ \mathrm{div}_H \overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} = & 0 & \mathrm{in } (0,T) \times \Omega, \\ \mathrm{div}_H \overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} = & 0 & \mathrm{in } (0,T) \times \Omega, \\ \tilde{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta}(0) = & (\tilde{u}_0)_{\varepsilon,\delta} & \mathrm{in } \Omega, \\ \tilde{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta}(0) = & (\overline{v}_0)_{\varepsilon,\delta} & \mathrm{in } G, \\ \int_{-1}^{-1} \tilde{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} = 0, & \int_{-1}^{1} \tilde{p}_{\varepsilon,\delta} = & 0 & \mathrm{in } G, \\ \tilde{p}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, w_{\varepsilon,\delta} \text{ periodic in } x, y, z, \\ \tilde{p}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \tilde{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, w_{\varepsilon,\delta} \text{ even in } z, \\ w_{\varepsilon,\delta} \text{ odd in } z, \end{array} \right\}$$

where

$$\overline{F}(\tilde{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}) := -\frac{1}{2} \int_{-1}^{+1} \tilde{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \cdot \nabla \tilde{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta},$$
$$\tilde{F}_1(\overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \tilde{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}) := -\tilde{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \cdot \nabla_H \overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \cdot \nabla_H \tilde{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \tilde{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \cdot \nabla \tilde{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \frac{1}{2} \int_{-1}^{+1} \tilde{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \cdot \nabla \tilde{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta},$$
$$\tilde{F}_2(\overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \tilde{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}) := -\overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \cdot \nabla_H w_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \tilde{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \cdot \nabla w_{\varepsilon,\delta}.$$

A similar splitting holds for the primitive equations, compare e.g. [14] where it plays an important role in the derivation of global *a priori* bounds.

2.6. Anisotropic 3D Stokes and anisotropic 2D Navier-Stokes equations. The system $(NS_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{(2)})$ can be compared to the following decoupled 2D-Navier-Stokes and average free 3D-Stokes equations, i.e., for functions $\overline{v}_{0,\infty}, \overline{p}_{0,\infty} \tilde{v}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}, w_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}$ and $\tilde{p}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}$ with $\tilde{u}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta} = (\tilde{v}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}, w_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta})$

2.7. Difference equation for $\varepsilon \to 0$ and $\delta \to \infty$. Consider now the difference of solutions to $(NS^{(2)}_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ and $(NS^{(2D)}_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ after multiplying the *w*-equations by ε . Let

(2.8)
$$\begin{split} \bar{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} &:= \bar{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \bar{v}_{0,\infty}, \quad \tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} := \tilde{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \tilde{v}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}, \quad W_{\varepsilon,\delta} := \varepsilon (w_{\varepsilon,\delta} - w_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}), \quad \text{and} \\ \tilde{U}_{\varepsilon,\delta} &:= (\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}), \quad \overline{P}_{\varepsilon,\delta} := \overline{p}_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \overline{p}_{0,\infty}, \quad \tilde{P}_{\varepsilon,\delta} := \tilde{p}_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \tilde{p}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}, \end{split}$$

and set

$$(2.9) U_{\varepsilon,\delta} := (\overline{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}), \quad \tilde{u}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta} = (\tilde{v}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}, w_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}), \quad \text{and} \quad u_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta} = (\overline{v}_{0,\infty} + \tilde{v}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}, w_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}).$$

This solves

$$(\mathrm{Diff}_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{(2)}) \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \partial_t \overline{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \Delta_H \overline{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \nabla_H \overline{P}_{\varepsilon,\delta} = & \overline{F}_{\varepsilon,\delta}^H & \mathrm{in} \ (0,T) \times G, \\ \partial_t \tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \Delta_\delta \tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \nabla_H \tilde{P}_{\varepsilon,\delta} = & \tilde{F}_{\varepsilon,\delta}^H & \mathrm{in} \ (0,T) \times \Omega, \\ \partial_t W_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \Delta_\delta W_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \partial_z \tilde{p}_{\varepsilon,\delta} = & \tilde{F}_{\varepsilon,\delta}^w & \mathrm{in} \ (0,T) \times \Omega, \\ \mathrm{div}_H \, \overline{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} = & 0 & \mathrm{in} \ (0,T) \times G, \\ \mathrm{div}_E \, \tilde{U}_{\varepsilon,\delta} = & 0 & \mathrm{in} \ (0,T) \times \Omega, \\ \mathrm{div}_{\varepsilon,\delta} (0) = & 0 & \mathrm{in} \ \Omega, \\ \overline{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} (0) = & 0 & \mathrm{in} \ G, \\ \int_{-1}^1 \tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} = 0, \quad \int_{-1}^1 \tilde{P}_{\varepsilon,\delta} = & 0 & \mathrm{in} \ G, \\ \overline{P}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \overline{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \mathrm{periodic} \ \mathrm{in} \ x, y, \\ \tilde{P}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta} \mathrm{periodic} \ \mathrm{in} \ x, y, z, \\ \tilde{P}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \mathrm{odd} \ \mathrm{in} \ z, \end{array} \right.$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{F}_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{H} &:= \overline{F}(\tilde{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}) - \overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \nabla_{H} \overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \overline{v}_{0,\infty} \nabla_{H} \overline{v}_{0,\infty}, \\ \tilde{F}_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{H} &:= \tilde{F}_{1}(\tilde{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta}), \\ \tilde{F}_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{w} &:= \varepsilon \tilde{F}_{2}(\overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \tilde{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}). \end{aligned}$$

Inserting the relations from (2.8) this can be expressed as

$$\overline{F}_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{H} = -\overline{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \cdot \nabla_{H} \overline{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \overline{v}_{0,\infty} \cdot \nabla_{H} \overline{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \overline{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \cdot \nabla_{H} \overline{v}_{0,\infty} \\
- \frac{1}{2} \int_{-1}^{+1} (\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \tilde{v}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \nabla_{H} (\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \tilde{v}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}) + (\frac{1}{\varepsilon} W_{\varepsilon,\delta} + w_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \partial_{z} (\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \tilde{v}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}), \\
\widetilde{F}_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{H} = - (\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \tilde{v}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \nabla_{H} (\overline{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \overline{v}_{0,\infty}) - (\overline{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \overline{v}_{0,\infty}) \cdot \nabla_{H} (\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \tilde{v}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}) \\
- (\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \tilde{v}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \nabla_{H} (\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \tilde{v}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}) - (\frac{1}{\varepsilon} W_{\varepsilon,\delta} + w_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \partial_{z} (\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \tilde{v}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}), \\
+ \frac{1}{2} \int_{-1}^{+1} (\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \tilde{v}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \nabla_{H} (\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \tilde{v}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}) + (\frac{1}{\varepsilon} W_{\varepsilon,\delta} + w_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \partial_{z} (\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \tilde{v}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}), \\
\widetilde{F}_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{w} = - (\overline{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \overline{v}_{0,\infty}) \cdot \nabla_{H} (W_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \varepsilon w_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}) \\
- (\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \tilde{v}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \nabla_{H} (W_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \varepsilon w_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta})) - (\frac{1}{\varepsilon} W_{\varepsilon,\delta} + w_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \partial_{z} (W_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \varepsilon w_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}).$$

Here again by (2.6) the terms with $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$ can be rewritten. We will see that $\tilde{u}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta} \to 0$ in suitable norms as $\delta \to \infty$ uniformly for $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$ which will give a diminishing right hand side in $(\text{Diff}_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{(2)})$.

3. FUNCTION SPACES

3.1. Isotropic function spaces on the torus. For $\Omega = \Omega_1$, cf. (2.1), the periodic Bessel potential and Besov spaces will be needed. For $p, q \in (1, \infty)$ and $s \in [0, \infty)$ these are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} H^{s,p}_{per}(\Omega) &= \overline{C^{\infty}_{per}(\overline{\Omega})}^{\|\cdot\|_{H^{s,p}}} \quad \text{and} \quad B^{s}_{p,q,per}(\Omega) = \overline{C^{\infty}_{per}(\overline{\Omega})}^{\|\cdot\|_{B^{s,q}_{p,q}}}, \\ H^{s,p}_{per}(G) &= \overline{C^{\infty}_{per}(\overline{G})}^{\|\cdot\|_{H^{s,p}}} \quad \text{and} \quad B^{s}_{p,q,per}(G) = \overline{C^{\infty}_{per}(\overline{G})}^{\|\cdot\|_{B^{s,q}_{p,q}}}, \end{aligned}$$

respectively. Here, $C_{per}^{\infty}(\overline{\Omega})$ and $C_{per}^{\infty}(\overline{G})$ denote the space of smooth functions that are periodic of any order (cf. [27, Section 2]) in all directions. The spaces $H^{s,p}$ denote the Bessel potential spaces of order s, with norm $\|\cdot\|_{H^{s,p}}$ defined via the restriction of the corresponding space defined on the whole space (cf. [59, Definition 3.2.2.]). Analogously, $B_{p,q}^{s}$ denote the Bessov spaces which are defined by restrictions of functions on the whole space, see e.g. [59, Definition 3.2.2.]. Note that $L^{p} = H_{per}^{0,p}$, and one sets $H^{s} := H^{s,2}$. Periodic Bessel potential and Besov spaces can equivalently be defined via Fourier series, cf. [59, Chapter 9]. The divergence free conditions in the above sets of equations can be encoded into spaces of solenoidal functions for $p \in (1, \infty)$ where we include the parity conditions

$$\begin{split} L^p_{\sigma,\varepsilon}(\Omega) &= \overline{\{u = (v,w) \in C^\infty_{per}(\overline{\Omega})^3 \colon \operatorname{div}_H v + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \partial_z w = 0, v \text{ even in } z \text{ and } w \text{ odd in } z\}}^{\|\cdot\|_{L^p}}, \quad \varepsilon > 0, \\ L^p_{\overline{\sigma}}(\Omega) &= \overline{\{v \in C^\infty_{per}(\overline{\Omega})^2 \colon \operatorname{div}_H \overline{v} = 0, v \text{ even in } z\}}^{\|\cdot\|_{L^p}}, \\ L^p_{\sigma}(G) &= \overline{\{\overline{v} \in C^\infty_{per}(\overline{G})^2 \colon \operatorname{div}_H \overline{v} = 0\}}^{\|\cdot\|_{L^p}}, \end{split}$$

setting for brevity $L^p_{\sigma}(\Omega) := L^p_{\sigma,1}(\Omega)$. Consider also the scaled Helmholtz projection

$$\mathbb{P}_{\varepsilon} \colon \{ u = (v, w) \in L^{p}(\Omega)^{3} \colon v \text{ even in } z \text{ and } w \text{ odd in } z \} \to L^{p}_{\sigma, \varepsilon}(\Omega), \quad \varepsilon > 0,$$

where we set $\mathbb{P} := \mathbb{P}_1$, the hydrostatic and the 2D-Helmholtz projections

 $\mathbb{P}_{\overline{\sigma}} \colon \{ v \in L^p(\Omega)^2 \colon v \text{ even in } z \text{ and } w \text{ odd in } z \} \to L^p_{\overline{\sigma}}(\Omega),$ $\mathbb{P}_G \colon L^p(G)^2 \to L^p_{\sigma}(G).$

3.2. Maximal L_t^2 - L_x^2 -regularity spaces. We set

$$\begin{aligned} X_0 &:= L^2(\Omega), \qquad X_1 := H^2_{per}(\Omega), \\ X_0^v &:= L^2_{\overline{\sigma}}(\Omega), \qquad X_1^v := H^2_{per}(\Omega)^2 \cap L^2_{\overline{\sigma}}(\Omega), \\ X_{0,\varepsilon}^u &:= L^2_{\sigma,\varepsilon}(\Omega), \qquad X_{1,\varepsilon}^u := H^2_{per}(\Omega)^3 \cap L^2_{\sigma,\varepsilon}(\Omega), \quad \varepsilon > 0 \end{aligned}$$

where we use in the case $\varepsilon = 1$ the short hand notations X_0^u and X_1^u . For $t, T \in [0, \infty]$ we also define the maximal regularity spaces

$$\mathbb{E}_0(t,T) := L^2(t,T;X_0), \quad \mathbb{E}_1(t,T) := L^2(t,T;X_1) \cap H^1(t,T;X_0),$$

and analogously $\mathbb{E}_{i}^{v}(t,T)$ and $\mathbb{E}_{i}^{u}(t,T)$ with respect to X_{i}^{v} and X_{i}^{u} , respectively (i = 0, 1). To describe the regularity of the pressure, we introduce

$$\mathbb{E}_1^p(t,T) := \{ p \in L^2(t,T; H^1_{per}(\Omega)) \colon \int_{\Omega} p(s) \, dx = 0 \text{ for a.e. } s \in (t,T), \quad p \text{ even in } z \}$$

To simplify our notation, we sometimes write only $\mathbb{E}_i(t,T)$ without superscripts and $\mathbb{E}_i(T)$ when t = 0. To consider δ -dependent norms, we set

$$\mathbb{E}_{H,\delta}(t,T) := \mathbb{E}_1(t,T) \quad \text{with} \quad \|u\|_{\mathbb{E}_{H,\delta}} := \|u\|_{\mathbb{E}_0} + \|\partial_t u\|_{\mathbb{E}_0} + \|\Delta_\delta u\|_{\mathbb{E}_0}, \quad \delta > 0.$$

Then, consider the traces spaces given by the real interpolation functor $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\theta,q}$ as

$$X_{\gamma} := (X_0, X_1)_{1/2, 2}, \quad X_{\gamma}^u := (X_{0, \varepsilon}^u, X_{1, \varepsilon}^u)_{1/2, 2}, \quad \text{and} \quad X_{\gamma}^v := (X_0^v, X_1^v)_{1/2, 2},$$

where when there is no ambiguity we use the short hand notation X_{γ} for each of the three. Following the lines of [26, Section 4] and [22] the trace or initial value spaces can be characterized as follows, where one uses that $B_{2,2}^s = H^s$.

Lemma 3.1 (Characterization of the initial value spaces). Let $p, q \in (1, \infty)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Then

$$X_{\gamma} = H^1_{per}(\Omega), \quad X^u_{\gamma} = H^1_{per}(\Omega)^3 \cap L^2_{\sigma,\varepsilon}(\Omega), \quad and \quad X^v_{\gamma} = H^1_{per}(\Omega)^2 \cap L^2_{\overline{\sigma}}(\Omega).$$

3.3. Anisotropic function spaces. The anisotropic structure of the primitive equations motivates the definition of the anisotropic Bessel potential spaces for $r, s \ge 0$ and $q, p \in [1, \infty]$

$$H_{z}^{r,q}H_{xy}^{s,p} := H^{r,q}(-1,1;H_{per}^{s,p}(G)), \text{ where } H_{xy}^{s,p} := H_{per}^{s,p}(G), \quad H_{z}^{r,q} := H^{r,q}(-1,1),$$

with the norms

$$\|v\|_{H^{r,q}_{z}H^{s,p}_{xy}} = \left\| \|v(\cdot,\cdot,z)\|_{H^{s,p}_{xy}} \right\|_{H^{r,q}_{z}}.$$

For these spaces there is an anisotropic Hölder's inequality, that is, for $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ and $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2}$ (3.1) $\|vu\|_{L^q_z L^p_{xy}} \le \|\|v(\cdot, \cdot, z)\|_{L^{p_1}_{xy}} \|u(\cdot, \cdot, z)\|_{L^{p_2}_{xy}} \|_{L^{r,q}_z} = \|v\|_{L^{q_1}_z L^{p_1}_{xy}} \|u\|_{L^{q_2}_z L^{p_2}_{xy}}.$ Also the two-dimensional Ladzhenskaya inequality carries over to

(3.2)
$$\|v\|_{L^2_z L^4_{xy}}^2 \le \int_{-1}^1 \|v(\cdot, \cdot, z)\|_{L^2_{xy}} \|v(\cdot, \cdot, z)\|_{H^1_{xy}} \, dz \le \|v\|_{L^2_z L^2_{xy}} \|v\|_{L^2_z H^1_{xy}} \, .$$

To account for the anisotropic time-space setting, consider

$$\mathbb{E}_{H}(t,T) := L^{2}(t,T;L_{z}^{2}H_{xy}^{2}) \cap H^{1}(0,T;L^{2}(\Omega)),$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{z}(t,T) := L^{2}(t,T;H_{z}^{1}H_{xy}^{1}) \cap L^{\infty}(0,T;H_{z}^{1}L_{xy}^{2}),$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{z,H}(t,T) := \mathbb{E}_{z}(t,T) \cap \mathbb{E}_{H}(t,T)$$

with δ -independent norms. For $\delta > 0$ set $\mathbb{E}_{H,\delta}(t,T) := \mathbb{E}_1(t,T)$ with δ -dependent norm

$$\|u\|_{\mathbb{E}_{H,\delta}(t,T)} := \|u\|_{L^2(t,T;L^2(\Omega))} + \|\partial_t u\|_{L^2(t,T;L^2(\Omega))} + \|\Delta_\delta u\|_{L^2(t,T;L^2(\Omega))}$$

Note that

(3.3)
$$\|u\|_{\mathbb{E}_{H}(t,T)} \leq \|u\|_{\mathbb{E}_{H,\delta}(t,T)} \quad \text{for all } \delta > 0 \text{ and } u \in \mathbb{E}_{H,\delta}(t,T).$$

Motivated by the anisotropic diffusion and transport behaviour of the primitive equations with horizontal viscosity, cf. [12,29], and one sets for $\eta > 0$

(3.4)
$$\begin{aligned} H^{1}_{\bar{\sigma},\eta}(\Omega) &:= \{ v \in H^{1}(\Omega)^{2} \cap L^{2}_{\bar{\sigma}}(\Omega) \cap L^{\infty}(\Omega) \colon \|v\|_{H^{1}} + \|v\|_{L^{\infty}} + \|\partial_{z}v\|_{L^{2+\eta}} < \infty \} \quad \text{with} \\ \|v\|_{H^{1}_{\bar{\sigma},\eta}} &:= \|v\|_{H^{1}} + \|v\|_{L^{\infty}} + \|\partial_{z}v\|_{L^{2+\eta}} \,. \end{aligned}$$

4. Main results

In the following we state our main results on strong solutions and their convergence under the hydrostatic approximation. We say that $u_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ is a strong solution to the scaled anisotropic Navier-Stokes equations $(NS_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ for $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$ on (0,T) in the $L^2 - L^2$ -setting, if $u_{\varepsilon,\delta} \in \mathbb{E}_1^u(T)$ and there exists $p_{\varepsilon,\delta} \in \mathbb{E}_1^p(T)$ such that $(NS_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ holds almost everywhere.

Proposition 4.1 (Local existence for $(NS_{\varepsilon,\delta})$). Let $T \in (0,\infty)$,

$$\varepsilon, \delta > 0, \quad and \quad (u_{\varepsilon,\delta})_0 \in H^1_{per}(\Omega)^3 \cap L^2_{\sigma}(\Omega).$$

Then there exists a maximal existence time $T_{\varepsilon,\delta} = T_{\varepsilon,\delta}((u_{\varepsilon,\delta})_0) \in (0,T]$ such that there exists a unique strong solution $u_{\varepsilon,\delta} \in \mathbb{E}_1^u(T_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ to $(NS_{\varepsilon,\delta})$.

The proof of this local well-posedness result follows e.g. with Lemma 6.1 below. Of course, there are much more refined results on the Navier-Stokes equations in $L_t^q - L_x^p$ -spaces, cf. e.g. [47–49], however, Proposition 4.1 is sufficient for our comparison arguments.

We say that u = (v, w) is a strong solution to the primitive equations with horizontal viscosity (PE_H) on (0,T) if there is $v \in \mathbb{E}_z(T) \cap \mathbb{E}_H(T)$ and there exists $p \in \mathbb{E}_1^p(T)$ such that (PE_H) holds almost everywhere. The existence of such global strong solutions to (PE_H) has been proven by Li and Titi in [12], compare also [29] for a slightly different setting. The higher regularity of these solutions and the proofs of the following results are discussed in Section 7.

Proposition 4.2 (Global existence for (PE_H) and higher regularity). Let $T \in (0, \infty)$ and $\eta > 0$. (a) If $v_0 \in H^1_{\bar{\sigma},n}(\Omega)$, then there exists a unique strong solution to (PE_H) with

$$v \in \mathbb{E}_H(T) \cap \mathbb{E}_z(T).$$

(b) If in addition to the conditions in (a) one has $\partial_z^2 v_0 \in L^2(\Omega)^2$ and $w_0 = w(v_0) \in H^1(\Omega)$, then $v \in \mathbb{R}^v(T) \cap L^\infty(0, T; H^2L^2)$ and $w(v) \in \mathbb{R}_+(T)$

$$v \in \mathbb{E}_1^v(T) \cap L^\infty(0,T; H_z^2 L_{xy}^2)$$
 and $w(v) \in \mathbb{E}_1(T)$

(c) If in addition to the conditions in (a) one has $\partial_z v_0 \in H^1(\Omega)^2$, then

$$v \in L^4(0,T; H^1_z H^{1,4}_{xy})$$

(d) If in addition to the conditions in (a) one has $\partial_z^3 v_0 \in L^2(\Omega)^2$, then

$$v \in L^{\infty}(0,T; H_z^3 L_{xy}^2) \cap L^2(0,T; H_z^3 H_{xy}^1)$$

Note that $v_0, \partial_z v_0 \in H^1(\Omega)^2 \cap L^{\infty}(\Omega)$ implies already $v_0 \in H^1_{\bar{\sigma},\eta}(\Omega)$ for some $\eta > 0$, cf. (3.4) for the definition of this space. Considering the difference $(\text{Diff}_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ between $(\text{NS}_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ and (PE_H) , we can state our first main result the proof of which is given in Section 8.

Theorem 4.3 (Convergence for $\varepsilon \to 0$ and $\delta \to 0$). Let $T \in (0, \infty)$ and

$$u_0 = (v_0, w_0) \in H^1(\Omega) \cap L^2_{\sigma}(\Omega) \quad with \quad v_0 \in L^{\infty}(\Omega), \quad \partial_z v_0 \in H^1(\Omega)^2, \quad \partial_z^2 v_0, \partial_z^3 v_0 \in L^2(\Omega)^2$$

(1) Let u = (v, w) be the solution to (PE_H) referred to in Proposition 4.2, and

(2) for $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$ let $u_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ be the solution to $(NS_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ referred to in Proposition 4.1.

(a) there exists a constant c > 0 such that one has for the existence time $T_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ of $u_{\varepsilon,\delta}$

$$T_{\varepsilon,\delta} = T \quad for \quad \varepsilon, \delta < c$$

(b) there exist constants C, c > 0 independent of ε, δ such that for $\varepsilon, \delta < c$

$$\|(v_{\varepsilon,\delta} - v, \varepsilon(w_{\varepsilon,\delta} - w))\|_{\mathbb{E}_{H,\delta}(T)} + \|(v_{\varepsilon,\delta} - v, \varepsilon(w_{\varepsilon,\delta} - w))\|_{\mathbb{E}_{z}(T)} \le C(\varepsilon + \delta).$$

In particular from (b) and (3.3) convergence in $\mathbb{E}_H(T) \cap \mathbb{E}_z(T)$ follows as $\varepsilon \to 0$ and $\delta \to 0$. Recall that these norms have been introduced in Subsection 3.3. Part (a) implies global strong well-posedness of $(NS_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ for ε, δ sufficiently small.

Remark 4.4 (Comparison to the results in [35] by Li, Titi and Yuan). The result obtained in [35] deals with the case $\nu_z = \varepsilon^{\gamma}$ for $\gamma > 2$ and convergence in the weak and strong sense in ε -dependent energy norms. For $\delta = \delta_{\varepsilon} := \varepsilon^{\gamma-2}$, they estimate in [35, Theorem 1.1] and [35, Theorem 1.2]

$$\| (V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \|_{L^{\infty}(0,T;L^{2}(\Omega))} + \| \nabla_{H}(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \|_{L^{2}(0,T;L^{2}(\Omega))} + \delta_{\varepsilon}^{1/2} \| \partial_{z}(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \|_{L^{2}(0,T;L^{2}(\Omega))} = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon + \delta_{\varepsilon}^{1/2}), \\ \| (V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \|_{L^{\infty}(0,T;H^{1}(\Omega))} + \| \nabla_{H}(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \|_{L^{2}(0,T;H^{1}(\Omega))} + \delta_{\varepsilon}^{1/2} \| \partial_{z}(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \|_{L^{2}(0,T;H^{1}(\Omega))} = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon + \delta_{\varepsilon}^{1/2}),$$

respectively, where we have translated their result to our convention (2.4). The convergence rate is in both cases of order

$$\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon + \delta_{\varepsilon}^{1/2}) = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{\beta_1}) \text{ with } \beta_1 = \min\{\gamma/2 - 1, 1\}.$$

Here, we estimate slightly differently scaled norms where we have orders δ instead of $\delta^{1/2}$ on both the left and the right hand side. More concretely, Theorem 4.3 says that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta})\|_{H^1(0,T;L^2(\Omega))} + \|\Delta_H(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta})\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))} + \delta \|\partial_z^2(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta})\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))} \\ + \|\partial_z(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta})\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))} + \|\partial_z\nabla_H(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta})\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))} &= \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon + \delta), \end{aligned}$$

where the convergence rate in Theorem 4.3 with $\delta = \delta_{\varepsilon} = \varepsilon^{\gamma-2}$ becomes

$$\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon + \delta_{\varepsilon}) = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{\beta_2}) \text{ with } \beta_2 = \min\{\gamma - 2, 1\} \ge \beta_1.$$

On the one hand, this means that the convergence rate improves here slightly in particular for the terms $\|(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta})\|_{H^1(0,T;L^2(\Omega))}$ and $\|\Delta_H(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta})\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))}$. Here, more generally we include the limit $\delta \to 0$ independent of ε . On the other hand, we prove only convergence in the strong sense, and we have to impose stronger regularity assumptions on the initial data as compared to $v_0 \in H^1$ and $v_0 \in H^2$ with $\partial_z v_0 \in L^p(\Omega)$ for p > 2 in Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 in [35], respectively.

The proof in [35] relies on sophisticated energy estimates and the factor $\delta_{\varepsilon}^{1/2}$ in the scaled norms seems to originate from testing with unscaled functions. In contrast the proof given here is based on quadratic norm inequalities discussed in Section 8, and therefore the factor δ in the scaled norms appears naturally considering the difference equation (Diff_{ε,δ}). The results in [35] and the ones presented here have been obtained independently, and parts of the results given here are included in [62, Chapter 5].

We say that $\overline{v}_{0,\infty}$ is a strong solution to the 2D-Navier-Stokes equations and $\tilde{u}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}$ a solution of the scaled Stokes equations on (0,T) in the L^2 - L^2 -setting, if $\overline{v}_{0,\infty} \in \mathbb{E}_1(T)$, $\tilde{u}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta} \in \mathbb{E}_1(T)$, and there exists $\overline{p}_{0,\infty} \in \mathbb{E}_1^p(T)$ and $\tilde{p}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta} \in \mathbb{E}_1^p(T)$ such that $(\mathrm{NS}_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{(2D)})$ holds almost everywhere.

Proposition 4.5 (Global existence for the 2D Navier-Stokes equations). Let $T \in (0, \infty)$, $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$

$$\overline{v}_0 \in H^1(G)^2 \cap L^2_{\sigma}(G) \quad and \quad \tilde{u}_0 \in H^1(\Omega) \cap L^2_{\sigma}(\Omega) \quad with \quad \int_{-1}^1 \tilde{u}_0(\cdot, \cdot, \xi) d\xi = 0.$$

Then there exists a unique strong solution to $(NS^{(2D)}_{\varepsilon \delta})$

$$\overline{v}_{0,\infty} \in \mathbb{E}_1(T)$$
 and $\widetilde{u}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta} \in \mathbb{E}_1(T)$.

Theorem 4.6 (Convergence for $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$ and $\delta \to \infty$). Let $T \in (0, \infty)$ and $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$

$$\overline{v}_0 \in H^1(G)^2 \cap L^2_{\sigma}(G) \quad and \quad \tilde{u}_0 \in H^{3/2}(\Omega) \cap L^2_{\sigma}(\Omega) \quad with \quad \int_{-1}^1 \tilde{u}_0(\cdot, \cdot, \xi) d\xi = 0.$$

(1) Let $\overline{v}_{0,\infty}, \tilde{u}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}$ be the solution to $(NS_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{(2D)})$ referred to in Proposition 4.5; (2) let $u_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ be the solution to $(NS_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ referred to in Proposition 4.1 which decomposes into $u_{\varepsilon,\delta} =$ $\overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \widetilde{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}.$

Then,

(a) there exists a constant c > 0 such that one has for the existence time $T_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ of $u_{\varepsilon,\delta}$

$$T_{\varepsilon,\delta} = T \quad for \quad \varepsilon, \frac{1}{\delta} < c$$

(b) there exist constants C, c > 0 independent of ε, δ such that for all $\delta > 0$ with $\frac{1}{\delta} < c$

$$\sup_{\varepsilon \in (0,1]} \left(\left\| \overline{v}_{0,\infty} - \overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_1} + \left\| \widetilde{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \right\|_{L^4(0,T;H^{3/2}(\Omega))} \right) \le \frac{C}{\delta^{1/4}}.$$

This implies in particular the convergence of $\overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ to $\overline{v}_{0,\infty}$ in $\mathbb{E}_1(T)$ as $\delta \to \infty$ uniformly in $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$.

Remark 4.7 (Further convergences). Theorem 4.3 discusses the case $\varepsilon \to 0$ and $\delta \to 0$, Theorem 4.6 deals with the case when $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$ and $\delta \to \infty$. Further cases are depicted in Figure 1 and behave as follows:

- (1) In the case when $\varepsilon \to 0$ and $\delta > 0$ is constant the solution of $(NS_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ converges to the solution of the anisotropic primitive equations (PE_{δ}) with rate $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$. The sense and the norm of the convergence are given in [34] for L^2 - L^2 -spaces, in [19] for L^p - L^q -spaces for certain $p, q \in (1, \infty)$ and in [20] for Dirichlet boundary conditions.
- (2) In the case when $\varepsilon > 0$ is constant and $\delta \to 0$ the solution of $(NS_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ converges to the solution of the Navier-Stokes equations with only horizontal viscosity, compare e.g. [16] for the full space case, where the arguments there can be transferred to the torus.
- (3) The primitive equations with only horizontal viscosity are also obtained from the anisotropic primitive equations when $\delta \to 0$. This limit is proven in [12] as a part of the analysis for the primitive equations with horizontal viscosity.
- (4) The convergence of the anisotropic primitive equations (PE_{δ}) for $\delta \to \infty$ to the 2D-Navier-Stokes equations follows from Theorem 4.6 since

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \left(\left\| \overline{v}_{0,\infty} - \overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_1} + \left\| \widetilde{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \right\|_{L^4(0,T;H^{3/2}(\Omega))} \right) = \left(\left\| \overline{v}_{0,\infty} - \overline{v}_{0,\delta} \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_1} + \left\| \widetilde{u}_{0,\delta} \right\|_{L^4(0,T;H^{3/2}(\Omega))} \right) \le \frac{C}{\delta^{1/4}}.$$

Here $u_{0,\delta} = \overline{v}_{0,\infty} + \tilde{u}_{0,\delta}$ solves the anisotropic primitive equations (PE_{δ}) for $\delta > 0$ where one used for $\varepsilon \to 0$ the convergence from part (1) of this remark.

Thus, all the convergences from Figure 1 can be made rigorous.

Remark 4.8 (Boundary conditions). The Neumann boundary conditions on top and bottom chosen here are essential for the proof of Theorem 4.3, because it allows one to reduce the problem by symmetries to a periodic setting and thereby to avoid boundaries in this direction at all. A similar setting has been considered in the case of the primitive equations with full viscosity in [34] and [19], while in [20] Dirichlet boundary conditions lead to technical challenges which in the end can be overcome to give the analogous convergence result.

Here in Theorem 4.3 however, the limit equation, that is, the primitive equations with only horizontal viscosity, is well-posed even without any boundary conditions in vertical direction, see e.g. [29]. This contrasts with the limiting equations, that is the rescaled Navier-Stokes equations, and therefore a boundary layer formation can be expected similar to the case of the limit from Navier-Stokes to Euler equations.

In Theorem 4.6, this problem does not occur since the comparison takes place essentially in the horizontal variables, and therefore also other boundary conditions in the limiting equations could be included.

5. Anisotropic linear estimates

5.1. Uniform maximal regularity estimates for the scaled Stokes equations. The linearization of the difference equation $(\text{Diff}_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ around the zero solution are the anisotropic scaled Stokes equations

(5.1)
$$\begin{cases} \partial_t U - \Delta_\delta U + \nabla_\varepsilon P = F & \text{in } (0, T) \times \Omega \\ \text{div}_\varepsilon U = 0 & \text{in } (0, T) \times \Omega, \\ U(0) = U_0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ P \text{ periodic in } x, y, z & \text{even} & \text{in } z, \\ V, W \text{ periodic in } x, y, z, & \text{even and odd} & \text{in } z, \text{ respectively} \end{cases}$$

Proposition 5.1. Let T > 0 and $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$, then there exist a constant C > 0 independent of ε and δ such that for all $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$, and for all

$$U_0 \in \mathbf{X}^u_{\gamma} \quad and \quad F \in \mathbb{E}^u_0(T)$$

there is a unique solution $U \in \mathbb{E}_1^u(T)$ and $P \in \mathbb{E}_1^p(T)$ to (5.1) satisfying

$$\|\partial_t U\|_{\mathbb{E}_0} + \|\Delta_\delta U\|_{\mathbb{E}_0} + \|\nabla_\varepsilon P\|_{\mathbb{E}_0} \le C(\|F\|_{\mathbb{E}_0} + \|U_0\|_{X^u_{\alpha}}).$$

Proof. The statement has been proven in [19, Proposition 5.1] for $\delta = 1$, and the proof carries over to any $\delta > 0$ since one estimates $\nabla_{\varepsilon} P$ by F.

5.2. The scaled Stokes equation and the 2D-Navier-Stokes equations.

Proposition 5.2. Let $T \in (0, \infty)$, $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$, and

$$(\overline{v}_0)_{0,\infty} \in H^1(G)^2 \cap L^2_{\sigma}(G), \quad (\tilde{u}_0)_{0,\infty} \in H^{3/2}(\Omega)^3 \cap L^2_{\sigma}(\Omega) \quad with \quad \int_{-1}^1 (\tilde{u}_0)_{0,\infty}(\cdot, \cdot, z) dz = 0.$$

Then there exists a unique solution to $(NS_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{(2D)})$

$$\overline{v}_{0,\infty} \in \mathbb{E}_1(T) \quad and \quad \tilde{u}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta} = (\tilde{v}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}, w_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}) \in \mathbb{E}_1(T),$$

and moreover there is a constant C>0 independent of ε and δ such that for $\delta\geq 1$

$$\sup_{\varepsilon \in (0,1]} \left\| \left(\tilde{v}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}, \varepsilon w_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta} \right) \right\|_{L^4(0,T;H^{3/2}(\Omega))} \le \frac{C}{\delta^{1/4}} \left\| \left((\tilde{v}_0)_{0,\infty}, (w_0)_{0,\infty} \right) \right\|_{H^{3/2}(\Omega)}.$$

Proof. The global well-posedness of the 2D-Navier-Stokes equations in maximal L^2 -regularity spaces is well-known and not proven here. It follows by standard regularity theory from the global well-posedness in the Leray-Hopf class.

Concerning the scaled Stokes equations, we consider (5.1) with

$$F = 0$$
 and $(U_0)_{\varepsilon} = ((\tilde{v}_0)_{0,\infty}, \varepsilon(w_0)_{0,\infty})$ for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$.

Using that Δ_H and ∂_z^2 are resolvent commuting, and that Δ_δ and \mathbb{P}_{ε} commute, one has that

$$U_{\varepsilon,\delta}(t) = e^{\mathbb{P}_{\varepsilon}\Delta_{\delta}t}(U_{0})_{\varepsilon} = e^{\Delta_{\delta}t}(U_{0})_{\varepsilon} = (e^{\Delta_{\delta}t}(\tilde{v}_{0})_{0,\infty}, \varepsilon e^{\Delta_{\delta}t}(w_{0})_{0,\infty}) =: (\tilde{v}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}, \varepsilon w_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta})$$

solves (5.1), and hence the existence of a unique solution in $\mathbb{E}_1(T)$ to $(NS^{(2D)}_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ follows.

One has using that Δ_H and ∂_z^2 are resolvent commuting and that Δ and \mathbb{P}_{ε} commute that

$$(-\Delta)^{3/4} U_{\varepsilon,\delta}(t) = \Delta e^{\mathbb{P}_{\varepsilon} \Delta_{\delta} t} (U_0)_{\varepsilon} = (-\Delta)^{3/4} e^{\delta \partial_z^2 t} e^{\Delta_H t} (U_0)_{\varepsilon} = e^{(\delta-1)\partial_z^2 t} e^{\Delta t} (-\Delta)^{3/4} (U_0)_{\varepsilon}$$

for $\delta \geq 1$ and t > 0. Then using that $e^{\delta \partial_z^2 t}$ is exponentially decaying on the vertically average free functions and that the decay bound $\omega > 0$ is the spectral bound for analytic semigroups, one estimates for $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $T \in (0, \infty]$

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| (-\Delta)^{3/4} U_{\varepsilon,\delta} \right\|_{L^{p}(0,T;L^{2}(\Omega))} &= \left\| e^{(\delta-1)\partial_{z}^{2}t} e^{\Delta t} (-\Delta)^{3/4} (U_{0})_{\varepsilon} \right\|_{L^{p}(0,T;L^{2}(\Omega))} \\ &\leq C \left\| e^{-\omega(\delta-1)t} \right\|_{L^{p}(0,T)} \left\| e^{\partial_{z}^{2}t} e^{\Delta_{H}^{2}t} (-\Delta)^{3/4} (U_{0})_{\varepsilon} \right\|_{L^{\infty}(0,T;L^{2}(\Omega))} \\ &\leq \frac{C}{(\omega(\delta-1)p)^{1/p}} \left\| (U_{0})_{\varepsilon} \right\|_{H^{3/2}(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum over $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ and p = 4 concludes the proof using that $-\Delta$ is boundedly invertible on the periodic and vertically average free functions.

5.3. **Preservation of vertical regularity.** Instead of the scaled Stokes equations (5.1) one can also consider the following linearization of $(\text{Diff}_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ of diffusion-transport type. For given functions ν, ω, f, U_0 , consider

$$U = (U_1, U_2, U_3) \colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^3, \quad P \colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R},$$

satisfying for fixed $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$

$$(5.2) \qquad \begin{cases} \partial_t U - \Delta_\delta U + \partial_z (\omega U) + \partial_z (\frac{1}{\varepsilon} U_3 \nu) + \nabla_\varepsilon P = & f & \text{in } (0, T) \times \Omega, \\ & \text{div}_\varepsilon U = & 0 & \text{in } (0, T) \times \Omega, \\ & U(0) = & U_0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ & P \text{ periodic in } x, y, z & \text{even} & \text{in } z, \\ & (U_1, U_2), U_3 \text{ periodic in } x, y, z, & \text{even and odd} & \text{in } z, \text{ respectively.} \end{cases}$$

To re-obtain $(\text{Diff}_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ later in Proposition 6.6, we will insert in (5.2)

(5.3)
$$U = (V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}), \quad \nu = (v, \varepsilon w), \quad \omega = w + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} W_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \quad \text{and} \quad f = f_{\varepsilon,\delta}$$

with

(5.4)
$$f_{\varepsilon,\delta} = \operatorname{div}_H \left((v, \varepsilon w) \otimes V_{\varepsilon,\delta} + (V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \otimes (v + V_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \right) + (\delta \partial_z^2 v, \varepsilon (\partial_t w - \Delta_\delta w + u \cdot \nabla w))^T.$$

Here, using the representation (2.7)

$$\begin{bmatrix} F_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{H}(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \\ F_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{z}(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \end{bmatrix} = -\operatorname{div}_{H}\left((v, \varepsilon w) \otimes V_{\varepsilon,\delta} \right) - \operatorname{div}_{H}\left((V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \otimes (v + V_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \right) \\ - \partial_{z} \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} W_{\varepsilon,\delta}(v, \varepsilon w) \right) - \partial_{z} \left((w + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) (V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \right) + \begin{bmatrix} -\delta \partial_{z}^{2} v \\ \varepsilon (\partial_{t} w + u \cdot \nabla w - \Delta_{\delta} w) \end{bmatrix},$$

where the ∂_z -terms are incorporated into the left hand side of (5.2) while the remainder becomes the right hand side (5.4) of (5.2).

We will interpret equation (5.2) in the triple of spaces induced by the Gelfand-triple in xy-variables

- $V = \{U \in H_z^1 H_{xy}^1 : (U_1, U_2) \text{ periodic and even and } U_3 \text{ periodic and odd in } z\},\$
- $H = \{ U \in H_z^1 L_{xy}^2 \colon (U_1, U_2) \text{ periodic and even and } U_3 \text{ periodic and odd in } z \}, \text{ and } U_2 \in U_1, U_2 \}$

$$V' = \{ U \in H_z^1 H_{xy}^{-1} : (U_1, U_2) \text{ periodic and even and } U_3 \text{ periodic and odd in } z \},\$$

where we consider here only real-valued functions.

Proposition 5.3. Let

$$U_0 \in H$$
, $f \in L^2(0,T;V')$, $\partial_z \omega \in L^2(0,T;H)$, and $\nu \in L^4(0,T;H_z^2L_{xy}^4)$

Then there exists a constant C > 0 depending only on Ω and independent of ε, δ and the given data, such that if $U \in \mathbb{E}_1(T)$ is a solution to (5.2), then

$$\|U\|_{L^{\infty}(0,T;H)}^{2} + \|U\|_{L^{2}(0,T;V)}^{2} \leq C(\|U_{0}\|_{H}^{2} + \|f\|_{L^{2}(0,T;V)}^{2})e^{C(T+\|\partial_{z}\omega\|_{L^{2}(0,T;H)}^{2} + \|\nu\|_{L^{4}(0,T;H_{z}^{2}L_{xy}^{4})}^{4})}.$$

Proof. Step 1 (L²-estimate): Multiplying the first equation in (5.2) by U and integrating over Ω gives

(5.5)
$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt} \left\|U\right\|_{L^2}^2 + \left\|\nabla_{\delta}U\right\|_{L^2}^2 = \langle f, U \rangle_{L^2} - \langle \partial_z(\omega U), U \rangle_{L^2} - \langle \partial_z(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}U_3\nu), U \rangle_{L^2},$$

where we integrated by parts and by the duality pairing in $L_z^2 H_{xy}^1$ and Young's inequality

$$\langle f, U \rangle_{L^2} \le \|f\|_{L^2_z H^{-1}_{xy}} \|U\|_{L^2_z H^1_{xy}} \le \frac{1}{12} (\|U\|^2_{L^2} + \|\nabla_H U\|^2_{L^2}) + 3 \|f\|^2_{L^2_z H^{-1}_{xy}}.$$

Integration by parts, anisotropic Hölder's inequalities (3.1), the 2-dimensional Ladyzhenskaya's inequality (3.2), and Young's inequality yield

.

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \partial_{z}(\omega U), U \rangle_{L^{2}} &= \langle (\partial_{z}\omega)U, U \rangle_{L^{2}} + \frac{1}{2} \langle \omega, \partial_{z} | U |^{2} \rangle_{L^{2}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \langle (\partial_{z}\omega), |U|^{2} \rangle_{L^{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \| \partial_{z}\omega \|_{L^{\infty}_{z}L^{2}_{xy}} \| U \|_{L^{2}_{z}L^{4}_{xy}} \\ &\leq C \| \partial_{z}\omega \|_{L^{\infty}_{z}L^{2}_{xy}} \| U \|_{L^{2}_{z}L^{2}_{xy}} \| U \|_{L^{2}_{z}H^{1}_{xy}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{12} \| \nabla_{H}U \|_{L^{2}}^{2} + (\frac{1}{12} + 3C^{2} \| \partial_{z}\omega \|_{L^{\infty}_{z}L^{2}_{xy}}^{2}) \| U \|_{L^{2}_{z}L^{2}_{xy}}. \end{aligned}$$

For the term $\partial_z(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}U_3\nu)$, one has by $\operatorname{div}_{\varepsilon}U = 0$ and the parity conditions for U that

$$\partial_z \frac{1}{\varepsilon} U_3 = -\operatorname{div}_H(U_1, U_2) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{\varepsilon} U_3(x, y, z) = -\int_{-1}^z \operatorname{div}_H(U_1, U_2)(x, y, \xi) d\xi, \quad (x, y, z) \in \Omega,$$

which implies

$$\langle \partial_z (\frac{1}{\varepsilon} U_3 \nu), U \rangle_{L^2} = \langle (\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \partial_z U_3) \nu, U \rangle_{L^2} + \langle \frac{1}{\varepsilon} U_3 \partial_z \nu, U \rangle_{L^2}$$

= $- \langle \nu \operatorname{div}_H (U_1, U_2), U \rangle_{L^2} - \langle \partial_z \nu \int_{-1}^z \operatorname{div}_H (U_1, U_2) (\cdot, \cdot, \xi) d\xi, U \rangle_{L^2}.$

One estimates similar to the above using in addition the one-dimensional Sobolev embedding $H_z^1 \hookrightarrow L_z^\infty$

$$\begin{split} |\langle \nu \operatorname{div}_{H}(U_{1}, U_{2}), U \rangle_{L^{2}}| &\leq \|\nabla_{H}U\|_{L^{2}_{z}L^{2}_{xy}} \|\nu\|_{L^{\infty}_{z}L^{4}_{xy}} \|U\|_{L^{2}_{z}L^{4}_{xy}} \\ &\leq C \|\nabla_{H}U\|_{L^{2}} \|\nu\|_{H^{1}_{z}L^{4}_{xy}} \|U\|^{1/2}_{L^{2}} \|U\|^{1/2}_{L^{2}_{z}H^{1}_{xy}}, \\ &= C \|\nu\|_{H^{1}_{z}L^{4}_{xy}} \left(\|U\|^{4}_{L^{2}} \|\nabla_{H}U\|^{4}_{L^{2}} + \|U\|^{2}_{L^{2}} \|\nabla_{H}U\|^{6}_{L^{2}}\right)^{1/4}, \\ |\langle \partial_{z}\nu \int_{-1}^{z} \operatorname{div}_{H}(U_{1}, U_{2})(\cdot, \cdot, \xi) d\xi, U \rangle_{L^{2}}| &\leq \left\|\int_{-1}^{z} \operatorname{div}_{H}(U_{1}, U_{2})(x, y, \xi) d\xi\right\|_{L^{\infty}_{z}L^{2}_{xy}} \|\partial_{z}\nu\|_{L^{2}_{z}L^{4}_{xy}} \|U\|_{L^{2}_{z}L^{4}_{xy}} \|U\|_{L^{2}_{z}L^{4}_{xy}} \\ &\leq C \|\nabla_{H}U\|_{L^{2}_{z}L^{2}_{xy}} \|\partial_{z}\nu\|_{L^{2}_{z}L^{4}_{xy}} \|U\|^{1/2}_{L^{2}} \|U\|^{1/2}_{L^{2}_{z}H^{1}_{xy}} \\ &= C \|\nu\|_{H^{1}_{z}L^{4}_{xy}} \left(\|U\|^{4}_{L^{2}} \|\nabla_{H}U\|^{4}_{L^{2}} + \|U\|^{2}_{L^{2}} \|\nabla_{H}U\|^{6}_{L^{2}}\right)^{1/4}, \end{split}$$

and hence by Young's inequality for a constant C > 0

. .

$$|\langle \partial_z(\varepsilon^{-1}U_3\nu), U \rangle_{L^2}| \le \frac{1}{12} \|\nabla_H U\|_{L^2}^2 + C(1 + \|\nu\|_{H_z^1 L_{xy}^4}^4) \|U\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Applying the above estimates to the right hand side in (5.5) and absorbing the terms with $\|\nabla_H U\|_{L^2}^2$ into the left hand side gives for a constant C > 0

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\left\|U\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} + \frac{3}{4}\left\|\nabla_{\delta}U\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} \le C\left\|f\right\|_{L^{2}_{z}H^{-1}_{xy}}^{2} + C(1 + \|\nu\|_{H^{1}_{z}L^{4}_{xy}}^{4} + \|\omega_{z}\|_{L^{\infty}_{z}L^{4}_{xy}}^{2})\left\|U\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}.$$

Step 2 (H-estimate): Differentiating equation (5.2) with respect to z, multiplying the resulting equation by $\partial_z U$ and integrating over Ω gives

(5.6)
$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\left\|U\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}+\left\|\nabla_{\delta}\partial_{z}U\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}=\langle\partial_{z}f,\partial_{z}U\rangle_{L^{2}}-\langle\partial_{z}^{2}(\omega U),\partial_{z}U\rangle_{L^{2}}-\langle\partial_{z}^{2}(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}U_{3}\nu),\partial_{z}U\rangle_{L^{2}}.$$

The first term can be estimated by the duality pairing in $L_z^2 H_{xy}^1$ and Young's inequality by

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \partial_z f, \partial_z U \rangle_{L^2} &\leq \|\partial_z f\|_{L^2_z H^{-1}_{xy}} \|\partial_z U\|_{L^2_z H^1_{xy}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{12} \|\nabla_H U\|_{H^1_z L^2_{xy}}^2 + \frac{1}{12} \|U\|_{H^1_z L^2_{xy}}^2 + C \|\partial_z f\|_{L^2_z H^{-1}_{xy}}^2 \end{aligned}$$

for some C > 0. For the second term note that $\partial_z^2(\omega U) = (\partial_z^2 \omega)U + 2(\partial_z \omega)(\partial_z U) + \omega(\partial_z^2 U)$, then by the anisotropic Hölder's and Ladyzhenskaya inequalities (3.1) and (3.2), respectively, and $H_z^1 \hookrightarrow L_z^\infty$

$$\begin{split} \langle (\partial_z^2 \omega) U, \partial_z U \rangle_{L^2} &\leq \left\| \partial_z^2 \omega \right\|_{L^2_z L^2_{xy}} \| U \|_{L^\infty_z L^4_{xy}} \| \partial_z U \|_{L^2_z L^4_{xy}} \\ &\leq \left\| \partial_z^2 \omega \right\|_{L^2_z L^2_{xy}} \| U \|_{H^1_z L^2_{xy}} \| U \|_{H^1_z H^1_{xy}} \,. \end{split}$$

Then, using integration by parts

$$\begin{split} \langle 2(\partial_z \omega)(\partial_z U) + \omega(\partial_z^2 U), \partial_z U \rangle_{L^2} &= 2 \langle (\partial_z \omega)(\partial_z U), \partial_z U \rangle + \langle \omega, \frac{1}{2} \partial_z |\partial_z U|^2 \rangle_{L^2} \\ &= \frac{3}{2} \langle \partial_z \omega \partial_z U, \partial_z U \rangle_{L^2} \\ &\leq \frac{3}{2} \|\partial_z \omega\|_{L^\infty_z L^2_{xy}} \|\partial_z U\|^2_{L^2_z L^4_{xy}} \\ &\leq C \|\partial_z \omega\|_{H^1_z L^2_{xy}} \|U\|_{H^1_z L^2_{xy}} \|U\|_{H^1_z H^1_{xy}} \,. \end{split}$$

Hence,

$$\langle \partial_z^2(\omega U), \partial_z U \rangle_{L^2} \le \frac{1}{12} \|\nabla_H U\|_H^2 + C(1 + \|\partial_z \omega\|_{H_z^1 L_{xy}^2}^2) \|U\|_V \|U\|_H^2$$

Now, in the third term using the product rule and the condition $\operatorname{div}_{\varepsilon} U = 0$

$$\partial_z^2(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}U_3\nu) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon}U_3\partial_z^2\nu + \frac{2}{\varepsilon}\partial_z U_3\partial_z\nu + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}(\partial_z^2U_3)\nu$$
$$= -\int_{-1}^z \operatorname{div}_H(U_1, U_2)(\cdot, \cdot, \xi)d\xi\partial_z^2\nu - 2\operatorname{div}_H(U_1, U_2)\partial_z\nu - \partial_z\operatorname{div}_H(U_1, U_2)\nu.$$

Then, the third term can be estimated similarly as above using the embedding $H^1_z \hookrightarrow L^\infty_z$ by

$$\begin{split} \langle \frac{1}{\varepsilon} U_3 \partial_z^2 \nu, \partial_z U \rangle_{L^2} &\leq C \, \| \nabla_H U \|_{L_z^2 L_{xy}^2} \, \| \nu \|_{H_z^2 L_{xy}^4} \, \| \partial_z U \|_{L_z^2 L_{xy}^4} \, ,\\ \langle \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \partial_z U_3 \partial_z \nu, \partial_z U \rangle_{L^2} &\leq 2 \, \| \nabla_H U \|_{L_x^\infty L_{xy}^2} \, \| \partial_z \nu \|_{L_z^2 L_{xy}^4} \, \| \partial_z U \|_{L_z^2 L_{xy}^4} \\ &\leq C \, \| \nabla_H U \|_{H_z^1 L_{xy}^2} \, \| \nu \|_{H_z^1 L_{xy}^4} \, \| U \|_{H_z^1 L_{xy}^2}^{1/2} \, \| U \|_{H_z^1 H_{xy}^1}^{1/2} \, ,\\ \langle \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (\partial_z^2 U_3) \nu, \partial_z U \rangle_{L^2} &\leq \| \partial_z \operatorname{div}_H U \|_{L_z^2 L_{xy}^2} \, \| \nu \|_{L_x^\infty L_{xy}^4} \, \| \partial_z U \|_{L_z^2 L_{xy}^4} \\ &\leq C \, \| \partial_z \nabla_H U \|_{L^2} \, \| \nu \|_{H_z^1 L_{xy}^4} \, \| U \|_{H_z^1 L_{xy}^2}^{1/2} \, \| U \|_{H_z^1 H_{xy}^1}^{1/2} \, . \end{split}$$

Together with Young's inequality

$$\langle \partial_z^2 (\frac{1}{\varepsilon} U_3 \nu), \partial_z U \rangle_{L^2} \leq \frac{1}{12} \left\| \nabla_H U \right\|_{H^1_z L^2_{xy}}^2 + C(1 + \left\| \nu \right\|_{H^1_z L^4_{xy}}^4) \left\| U \right\|_{H^1_z L^2_{xy}}^2,$$

and adding all three terms and compensating the terms with $\|\nabla_H U\|^2_{H^1_z L^2_{xy}}$ into the left hand side of (5.6) gives

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\left\|\partial_z U\right\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{3}{4}\left\|\nabla_\delta \partial_z U\right\|_{L^2}^2 \le C(1 + \|\nu\|_{H^2_z L^4_{xy}}^4 + \|\partial_z \omega\|_{H^1_z L^2_{xy}}^2)\left\|U\right\|_{H^1_z L^2_{xy}}^2 + C\left\|\partial_z f\right\|_{L^2_z H^{-1}_{xy}}$$

which implies together with the L^2 -estimate the claim via Grönwall's inequality.

5.4. Embeddings for space-time-spaces.

Lemma 5.4. Let T > 0, then there exists a constant C > 0 such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\|_{L^4(0,T;H^1_z L^4_{xy})} &\leq C \, \|v\|_{\mathbb{E}_1(T)} \quad \text{for all } v \in \mathbb{E}_1(T), \\ \|v\|_{L^4(0,T;H^1_z L^4_{xy})} &\leq C \, \|v\|_{\mathbb{E}_z(T)} \quad \text{for all } v \in \mathbb{E}_z(T). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The claim for $v \in \mathbb{E}_1(T)$ follows from the mixed derivative theorem, cf. e.g. [46, Corollary 4.5.10], with $\theta = 1/4$ in the maximal L^2 -regularity space and with $\theta = 2/3$ to show that $H^{3/2}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow H_z^1 H_{xy}^{1/2}$, and Sobolev embeddings which gives the continuous embeddings

$$\mathbb{E}_1(T) \hookrightarrow H^{1/4}(0,T;H^{3/2}(\Omega)) \hookrightarrow H^{1/4}(0,T;H^1_z H^{1/2}_{xy}) \hookrightarrow H^{1/4}(0,T;H^1_z L^4_{xy})$$

Applying Ladyzhenskaya's inequality (3.2) with respect to the xy-variables, implies

$$\int_0^1 \|v(t)\|_{H^1_z L^4_{xy}}^4 dt \le C \int_0^1 \|v(t)\|_{H^1_z H^1_{xy}}^2 \|v(t)\|_{H^1_z L^2_{xy}}^2 dt$$
$$\le C \|v(t)\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1_z H^1_{xy})}^2 \|v(t)\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^1_z L^2_{xy})}^2,$$

and then taking the forth root and using Young's inequality gives the claim for $v \in \mathbb{E}_z(T)$.

6. Non-linear estimates

6.1. **Bi-linear estimates for the Navier-Stokes and primitive equations.** The non-linearities of the Navier-Stokes, the primitive and the difference equations involve bilinear terms of the types discussed in the following lemmata.

Lemma 6.1 (cf. Lemma 4.2 in [19]). Let $T \in (0, \infty)$, then there is a constant C > 0 such that for all $v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{E}_1(T)$

 $\|v_1 \partial_i v_2\|_{\mathbb{E}_0} \le C \|v_1\|_{\mathbb{E}_1(T)} \|v_2\|_{\mathbb{E}_1(T)}, \quad \text{where } i \in \{x, y, z\}.$

Sketch of the proof of Proposition 4.1. Lemma 6.1 implies together with Proposition 5.1 by the contraction mapping principle the local existence and uniqueness of solutions to $(NS_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ in maximal L^2-L^2 -regularity spaces.

Sketch of the proof of Proposition 4.5. Similarly to the above, the local existence and uniqueness of solutions to $(NS_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{(2D)})$ in maximal L^2 - L^2 -regularity spaces follows. Using the energy equality and weak-strong-uniqueness results, this solution can be extended to a global one. The statement for the scaled Stokes equations follows from Proposition 5.2.

Lemma 6.2. Let T > 0, then there exists a constant C > 0 such that

$$\|\operatorname{div}_{H}(v_{1}v_{2})\|_{L^{2}(0,T;H^{1}_{z}H^{-1}_{xy})} \leq \|v_{1}\|_{L^{4}(0,T;H^{1}_{z}L^{4}_{xy})} \|v_{2}\|_{L^{4}(0,T;H^{1}_{z}L^{4}_{xy})}$$

for all $v_1 \in L^4(0,T; H^1_z L^4_{xy})$ and $v_2 \in L^4(0,T; H^1_z L^4_{xy})^2$

Proof. One estimates using that H_z^1 is an algebra

$$\|\operatorname{div}_{H}(v_{1}v_{2})\|_{L^{2}(0,T;H^{1}_{z}H^{-1}_{xy})} \leq \|v_{1}v_{2}\|_{L^{2}(0,T;H^{1}_{z}L^{2}_{xy})} \leq \|v_{1}\|_{L^{4}(0,T;H^{1}_{z}L^{4}_{xy})} \|v_{2}\|_{L^{4}(0,T;H^{1}_{z}L^{4}_{xy})}. \quad \Box$$

Recall that $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}w(v)$ is given by (2.6) for $v \in \mathbb{E}_H(T), \mathbb{E}_z(T), \mathbb{E}_1(T)$ since with this regularity $\operatorname{div}_H v$ is integrable with respect to the z-variable for almost all $t \in 0, T$ and $(x, y) \in G$.

Lemma 6.3. Let T > 0 and $\varepsilon > 0$, then there exists a constant C > 0 such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_{1} \cdot \nabla_{H} v_{2}\|_{\mathbb{E}_{0}(T)} &\leq C \|v_{1}\|_{\mathbb{E}_{H}(T)} \|v_{2}\|_{\mathbb{E}_{z}(T)} & \text{for all } v_{1} \in \mathbb{E}_{H}, v_{2} \in \mathbb{E}_{z}(T), \\ \|\frac{1}{\varepsilon} w(v_{1}) \cdot \partial_{z} v_{2}\|_{\mathbb{E}_{0}(T)} &\leq C \|v_{1}\|_{\mathbb{E}_{H}(T)} \|v_{2}\|_{\mathbb{E}_{z}(T)} & \text{for all } v_{1} \in \mathbb{E}_{H}, v_{2} \in \mathbb{E}_{z}(T), \\ \|v_{1} \cdot \nabla_{H} v_{2}\|_{\mathbb{E}_{0}(T)} &\leq C \|v_{1}\|_{\mathbb{E}_{H}(T)} \|v_{2}\|_{\mathbb{E}_{1}(T)} & \text{for all } v_{1} \in \mathbb{E}_{H}, v_{2} \in \mathbb{E}_{1}(T), \\ \|\frac{1}{\varepsilon} w(v_{1}) \cdot \partial_{z} v_{2}\|_{\mathbb{E}_{0}(T)} &\leq C \|v_{1}\|_{\mathbb{E}_{H}(T)} \|v_{2}\|_{\mathbb{E}_{1}(T)} & \text{for all } v_{1} \in \mathbb{E}_{H}, v_{2} \in \mathbb{E}_{1}(T). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By anisotropic Hölder's inequality in time and space, the embedding $H_z^1 \hookrightarrow L_z^\infty$, the Poincaré inequality for $w(v_1)$, and (2.6)

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_1 \cdot \nabla_H v_2\|_{\mathbb{E}_0(T)} &\leq \|v_1\|_{L^4(0,T;L^\infty_z L^4_{xy})} \|\nabla_H v_2\|_{L^4(0,T;L^2_z L^4_{xy})}, \quad \text{and} \\ \|\frac{1}{\varepsilon} w(v_1) \cdot \partial_z v_2\|_{\mathbb{E}_0(T)} &\leq \|\frac{1}{\varepsilon} w(v_1)\|_{L^4(0,T;L^\infty_z L^4_{xy})} \|\partial_z v_2\|_{L^4(0,T;L^2_z L^4_{xy})} \\ &\leq \|\nabla_H v_1\|_{L^4(0,T;L^2_z L^4_{xy})} \|\partial_z v_2\|_{L^4(0,T;L^2_z L^4_{xy})}. \end{aligned}$$

Now the remaining estimates follow by the mixed derivative theorem and Sobolev embeddings

(6.1)
$$\mathbb{E}_{H}(T) \hookrightarrow H^{1/4}(0,T;L_{z}^{2}H_{xy}^{3/2}) \hookrightarrow L^{4}(0,T;L_{z}^{2}H_{xy}^{1,4}),$$

and Lemma 5.4.

Lemma 6.4. Let $u = (v, w(v)) \in \mathbb{E}_1(T)$, then there is a constant C > 0 such that

$$\|u \cdot \nabla w(v)\|_{L^{2}(0,T;H^{1}_{z}H^{-1}_{xy})} \leq C \|u\|_{L^{\infty}(0,T;H^{1}(\Omega))} \|u\|_{L^{2}(0,T;H^{2}(\Omega))}.$$

Proof. Note that using that $\partial_z w = -\operatorname{div}_H v$ one obtains

$$u \cdot \nabla w = v_1 \cdot \partial_x w + v_2 \cdot \partial_y w + w \cdot \partial_z w = \operatorname{div}_H(wv) - w \operatorname{div}_H v + \frac{1}{2} \partial_z w^2 = \operatorname{div}_H(wv) + \partial_z w^2.$$

Next, one estimates each term separately, first

$$\begin{aligned} \|\operatorname{div}_{H}(wv)\|_{L^{2}(0,T;H_{z}^{1}H_{xy}^{-1})} &\leq C \|\partial_{z}(wv)\|_{L^{2}(0,T;L_{z}^{2}L_{xy}^{2})} \\ &\leq C \|v\operatorname{div}_{H}v\|_{L^{2}(0,T;L_{z}^{2}L_{xy}^{2})} + C \|w\partial_{z}v\|_{L^{2}(0,T;L_{z}^{2}L_{xy}^{2})} \\ &\leq C \|v\|_{L^{2}(0,T;L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \|\nabla_{H}v\|_{L^{\infty}(0,T;L^{2}(\Omega))} + C \|w\|_{L^{2}(0,T;L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \|v\|_{L^{\infty}(0,T;H^{1}(\Omega))} \\ &\leq C \|u\|_{L^{\infty}(0,T;H^{1}(\Omega))} \|v\|_{L^{2}(0,T;H^{2}(\Omega))}, \end{aligned}$$

where one uses the definition of the H_{xy}^{-1} -norm, Poincaré's inequality for $\partial_z(wv)$, Hölder's inequality and Sobolev embeddings. Second, using again Poincaré's inequality now applied to $\partial_z w^2 = 2w\partial_z w$ and the embedding $H_{xy}^{-1} \hookrightarrow L_{xy}^{6/5}$ one obtains

$$\begin{split} \left\| \partial_z w^2 \right\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1_z H^{-1}_{xy})} &\leq C \left\| \partial_z^2 w^2 \right\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2_z L^{6/5}_{xy})} \\ &\leq C \left\| (\partial_z w)^2 \right\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2_z L^{6/5}_{xy})} + C \left\| w \partial_z^2 w \right\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2_z L^{6/5}_{xy})} \\ &\leq C \left\| \partial_z w \right\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2_z L^2_{xy})} \left\| \partial_z w \right\|_{L^2(0,T;L^\infty_z L^3_{xy})} + C \left\| w \right\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^\infty_z L^3_{xy})} \left\| \partial_z^2 w \right\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2_z L^2_{xy})} \\ &\leq C \left\| v \right\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^1(\Omega))} \left\| u \right\|_{L^2(0,T;H^2(\Omega))} + C \left\| u \right\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^1(\Omega))} \left\| v \right\|_{L^2(0,T;H^2(\Omega))}, \end{split}$$

where one uses Hölder's inequality, the emdeddings $H^1(\Omega) \hookrightarrow H_z^{2/3} H_{xy}^{1/3} \hookrightarrow L_z^{\infty} L_{xy}^3$, and $\partial_z w = -\operatorname{div}_H v$. Combining the above inequalities the claim follows.

6.2. Estimates for right hand side of the difference equations $(\text{Diff}_{\varepsilon,\delta})$. For given $U_{\varepsilon,\delta} = (V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ and u = (v, w) consider the term $f_{\varepsilon,\delta}$. This term appeared in (5.4) when linearizing the difference equation $(\text{Diff}_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ as a diffusion-transport type equation in Subsection 5.3. Recall that

$$f_{\varepsilon,\delta} = \operatorname{div}_H \left((v, \varepsilon w) \otimes V_{\varepsilon,\delta} + U_{\varepsilon,\delta} \otimes (v + V_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \right) + (\delta \partial_z^2 v, \varepsilon (\partial_t w - \Delta_\delta w + u \cdot \nabla w)).$$

Proposition 6.5. Let T > 0, $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, $\delta > 0$, then there exists a constant C > 0 independent of $U_{\varepsilon,\delta}$, u, δ and ε such that for $f_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ given in (5.4)

$$\|f_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^{2}(0,T;V')} \leq C\left(\|U_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{\mathbb{E}_{z}(T)}^{2} + \|u\|_{\mathbb{E}_{1}(T)} \|U_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{\mathbb{E}_{z}(T)} + \delta \|v\|_{L^{2}(0,T;H^{3}_{z}L^{2}_{xy})} + \varepsilon(\|u\|_{\mathbb{E}_{1}(T)} + \|u\|_{\mathbb{E}_{1}(T)}^{2})\right)$$

Proof. The div_H-terms can be estimated using Lemma 6.2 and Lemma 5.4 to obtain

$$\left\|\operatorname{div}_{H}((v,\varepsilon w)\otimes V_{\varepsilon,\delta}+U_{\varepsilon,\delta}\otimes (v+V_{\varepsilon,\delta}))\right\|_{L^{2}(0,T;V')} \leq C(\left\|U_{\varepsilon,\delta}\right\|_{\mathbb{E}_{z}(T)}^{2}+\left\|u\right\|_{\mathbb{E}_{1}(T)}\left\|U_{\varepsilon,\delta}\right\|_{\mathbb{E}_{z}(T)}).$$

For the remaining terms recall that it follows from the representation (2.6) and the Poincaré inequality for w(v) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t w(v)\|_{V'} &\leq C \,\|\partial_z w(\partial_t v)\|_{L^2_z H^{-1}_{xy}} \leq C \,\|\partial_t v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \,, \\ \|\partial_z^2 w(v)\|_{V'} &\leq C \,\|\partial_z^2 \operatorname{div}_H v\|_{L^2_z H^{-1}_{xy}} \leq C \,\|\partial_z^2 v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \,, \quad \text{and} \\ \|\Delta_H w(v)\|_{V'} &\leq C \,\|\partial_z w(\Delta_H v)\|_{L^2 H^{-1}_{xy}} \leq C \,\|\Delta_H v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \,. \end{aligned}$$

Thereby, we estimate

$$\|\partial_t w - \Delta_\delta w\|_{L^2(0,T;V')} \le C \|v\|_{\mathbb{E}_1(T)}$$

The non-linear term is estimated by Lemma 6.4, that is, there is some C > 0 such that

$$\|u \cdot \nabla w\|_{L^{2}(0,T;H_{z}^{1}H_{xy}^{-1})} \leq C \|u\|_{L^{\infty}(0,T;H^{1}(\Omega))} \|u\|_{L^{2}(0,T;H^{2}(\Omega))} \leq C \|u\|_{\mathbb{E}_{1}(T)}^{2},$$

where in the last step we used the trace embedding $\mathbb{E}_1(T) \hookrightarrow L^{\infty}(0,T;H^1(\Omega))$. Eventually, since $L^2_{xy} \hookrightarrow H^{-1}_{xy}$ one has $\|v\|_{L^2(0,T;V')} \leq C \|v\|_{L^2(0,T;H^3_*L^2_{xy})}$ for some C > 0.

Eventually, combining the previous estimates, we obtain estimates on F_H and F_z appearing as right hand sides (2.5) in the difference equation $(\text{Diff}_{\varepsilon,\delta})$. Recall that

$$F_{H}(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) = -(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \nabla v - u \cdot \nabla V_{\varepsilon,\delta} - (V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \nabla V_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \delta\partial_{z}^{2}v,$$

$$F_{z}(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) = -(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \nabla \varepsilon w - u \cdot \nabla W_{\varepsilon,\delta} - (V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \nabla W_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \varepsilon(\partial_{t}w + u \cdot \nabla w - \Delta_{\delta}w)$$

Proposition 6.6. Let T > 0, $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, $\delta > 0$ and

$$U_{\varepsilon,\delta} = (V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \in \mathbb{E}_{H,z}(T) := \mathbb{E}_z(T) \cap \mathbb{E}_H(T), \quad and \quad u = (v, w(v)) \in \mathbb{E}_1(T).$$

Then there is a C > 0 independent of ε , δ , u, and $U_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(F_H, F_z)\|_{\mathbb{E}_0(T)} &\leq C\Big(\|(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta})\|_{\mathbb{E}_{H,z}(T)}^2 + \|(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta})\|_{\mathbb{E}_{H,z}(T)} \|(v, w(v))\|_{\mathbb{E}_1(T)} \\ &+ \varepsilon (\|w\|_{\mathbb{E}_1(T)} + \|w\|_{\mathbb{E}_1(T)}^2) \Big) + \delta \|v\|_{\mathbb{E}_1(T)} .\end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Lemma 6.3

$$\|F_H\|_{\mathbb{E}_0(T)} \le C \left(\|V_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{\mathbb{E}_H(T)} \|v\|_{\mathbb{E}_1(T)} + \|v\|_{\mathbb{E}_1(T)} \|V_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{\mathbb{E}_z(T)} + \|V_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{\mathbb{E}_H(T)} \|V_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{\mathbb{E}_z(T)} \right) + \delta \|v\|_{\mathbb{E}_1(T)}$$

Similarly, by Lemma 6.3 and Lemma 6.1

$$\|F_{z}\|_{\mathbb{E}_{0}(T)} \leq C\{\|V_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{\mathbb{E}_{H}(T)} \|w\|_{\mathbb{E}_{1}(T)} + \|u\|_{\mathbb{E}_{1}(T)} \|W_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{\mathbb{E}_{z}(T)} + \|W_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{\mathbb{E}_{H}(T)} \|V_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{\mathbb{E}_{z}(T)} + \varepsilon(\|w\|_{\mathbb{E}_{1}(T)} + \|w\|_{\mathbb{E}_{1}(T)} + \|u\|_{\mathbb{E}_{1}(T)}^{2})\}$$

and combining both estimates gives the assertion.

6.3. Estimates for the right hand side of the difference equations (2.10). Recall that the right hand side of $(\text{Diff}_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{(2)})$ is given by (2.10) using the notations (2.8) and (2.9), that is,

$$\begin{split} \overline{F}_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{H} &= -\overline{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \cdot \nabla_{H} \overline{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \overline{v}_{0,\infty} \cdot \nabla_{H} \overline{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \overline{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \cdot \nabla_{H} \overline{v}_{0,\infty} \\ &\quad -\frac{1}{2} \int_{-1}^{+1} (\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \tilde{v}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \nabla_{H} (\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \tilde{v}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}) + (\frac{1}{\varepsilon} W_{\varepsilon,\delta} + w_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \partial_{z} (\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \tilde{v}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}), \\ \tilde{F}_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{H} &= - (\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \tilde{v}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \nabla_{H} (\overline{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \overline{v}_{0,\infty}) - (\overline{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \overline{v}_{0,\infty}) \cdot \nabla_{H} (\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \tilde{v}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}) \\ &\quad - (\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \tilde{v}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \nabla_{H} (\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \tilde{v}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}) - (\frac{1}{\varepsilon} W_{\varepsilon,\delta} + w_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \partial_{z} (\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \tilde{v}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_{-1}^{+1} (\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \tilde{v}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \nabla_{H} (\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \tilde{v}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}) + (\frac{1}{\varepsilon} W_{\varepsilon,\delta} + w_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \partial_{z} (\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \tilde{v}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}), \\ \tilde{F}_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{w} &= - (\overline{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \overline{v}_{0,\infty}) \cdot \nabla_{H} (W_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \varepsilon w_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}) \\ &\quad - (\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \tilde{v}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \nabla_{H} (W_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \varepsilon w_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}) - (\frac{1}{\varepsilon} W_{\varepsilon,\delta} + w_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \partial_{z} (W_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \varepsilon w_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta}). \end{split}$$

Lemma 6.7. Let T > 0, $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$, q = 2 and p = 2, then there exists a constant C > 0 such that for all $v_1, v_2 \in L^4(0,T; H^{3/2}(\Omega) \cap L^2_{\sigma,\varepsilon}(\Omega))$

$$\|v_1 \cdot \nabla_H v_2\|_{\mathbb{E}_0(T)} \le C \|v_1\|_{L^4(0,T;H^{3/2})} \|v_2\|_{L^4(0,T;H^{3/2})}, \|\frac{1}{\varepsilon} w(v_1) \cdot \partial_z v_2\|_{\mathbb{E}_0(T)} \le C \|v_1\|_{L^4(0,T;H^{3/2})} \|v_2\|_{L^4(0,T;H^{3/2})},$$

and there exists a constant C > 0 such that

 $\|v\|_{L^4(0,T;H^{3/2})} \le C \|v\|_{\mathbb{E}_1(T)}$ for all $v \in \mathbb{E}_1(T)$.

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 6.3

$$\|v_1 \cdot \nabla_H v_2\|_{\mathbb{E}_0(T)} \le \|v_1\|_{L^4(0,T;L^\infty_z L^4_{xy})} \|v_2\|_{L^4(0,T;L^2_z L^4_{xy})}, \quad \text{and} \|\frac{1}{\varepsilon} w(v_1) \cdot \partial_z v_2\|_{\mathbb{E}_0(T)} \le \|\nabla_H v_1\|_{L^4(0,T;L^2_z L^4_{xy})} \|\partial_z v_2\|_{L^4(0,T;L^2_z L^4_{xy})}.$$

Then one uses the Sobolev embeddings and the mixed derivative theorem to obtain

$$H^{3/2}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^2_z H^{3/2}_{xy} \hookrightarrow L^2_z H^{1,4}_{xy} \quad \text{and} \quad H^{3/2}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow H^1_z H^{1/2}_{xy} \hookrightarrow H^1_z L^4_{xy}$$

Also, by the mixed derivative theorem and Sobolev embeddings

 $\mathbb{E}_1(T) \hookrightarrow H^{1/4}(0,T;H^{3/2}(\Omega)) \hookrightarrow L^4(0,T;H^{3/2}(\Omega)). \quad \Box$

Proposition 6.8. Let T > 0 and $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$, $\delta > 0$, then there exists a constant C > 0 independent of ε, δ such that

$$\begin{split} \left\| \overline{F}_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{H} \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_{0}(T)} &\leq C \big(\left\| U_{\varepsilon,\delta} \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_{1}(T)}^{2} + \left\| U_{\varepsilon,\delta} \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_{1}(T)} \left\| u_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta} \right\|_{L^{4}(0,T;H^{3/2})} + \left\| \widetilde{u}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta} \right\|_{L^{4}(0,T;H^{3/2})} \big), \\ \left\| \widetilde{F}_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{H} \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_{0}(T)} &\leq C \big(\left\| U_{\varepsilon,\delta} \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_{1}(T)}^{2} + \left\| U_{\varepsilon,\delta} \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_{1}(T)} \left\| u_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta} \right\|_{L^{4}(0,T;H^{3/2})} + \left\| u_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta} \right\|_{L^{4}(0,T;H^{3/2})} \big\| \widetilde{u}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta} \right\|_{L^{4}(0,T;H^{3/2})} \big), \\ \left\| \widetilde{F}_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{w} \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_{0}(T)} &\leq C \big(\left\| U_{\varepsilon,\delta} \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_{1}(T)}^{2} + \left\| U_{\varepsilon,\delta} \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_{1}(T)} \left\| u_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta} \right\|_{L^{4}(0,T;H^{3/2})} + \left\| \widetilde{u}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta} \right\|_{L^{4}(0,T;H^{3/2})} \big). \end{split}$$

Proof. The terms without prefactor $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$ and ε can be estimated directly by Lemma 6.1 and Lemma 6.7. The terms with prefactor $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$ are of the form $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}W_{\varepsilon,\delta}\partial_z \tilde{V}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ and $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}W_{\varepsilon,\delta}\partial_z W_{\varepsilon,\delta}$. These can be estimated by Lemmas 6.3 and 6.7. This concludes the proof.

7. Additional regularity

In this section we discuss the proof of Proposition 4.2. As a first step we state the following additional regularity results on the solution of (PE_H) dealing with the preservation of regularity in the vertical directions. Their proofs rely on energy estimates and are not given here but are elaborated in detail in [62].

Proposition 7.1 (Proposition 4.3.26 in [62]). Let

$$N \in \mathbb{N}$$
, and $v_0 \in H_z^N L_{xy}^2 \cap H_{\overline{\sigma}, \eta}^1(\Omega)$ for $\eta > 0$.

Then the strong solution v to (PE_H) has the additional regularity

$$v \in L^{\infty}(0,T; H_z^N L_{xy}^2)$$
 and $\nabla_H v \in L^2(0,T; H_z^N L_{xy}^2).$

Sketch of the proof. Applying ∂_z^r to the velocity equation (PE_H) for $r \leq N$ and testing with $\partial_z^r v$ gives

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left\| \partial_z^r v \right\|_{L^2}^2 + 2 \left\| \partial_z^r \nabla_H v \right\|_{L^2}^2 = -2 \langle \partial_z^r (v \cdot \nabla_H v + w \partial_z v), \partial_z^r v \rangle_{L^2}$$

This can be estimated as in [62, Proposition 4.3.7.] for some constant $C_r > 0$ by

 $\frac{d}{dt} \|\partial_{z}^{r}v\|_{L^{2}}^{2} + 2 \|\partial_{z}^{r}\nabla_{H}v\|_{L^{2}}^{2} \leq C_{r}(1 + \|v\|_{H^{r-1}_{z}H^{1}_{xy}}^{2} \|v\|_{H^{r-1}_{z}L^{2}_{xy}}^{2}) - \langle \partial_{z}^{r}(v \cdot \nabla_{H}v + w\partial_{z}v) \|\partial_{z}^{r}v\|_{L^{2}}^{2}, \partial_{z}^{r}v\rangle_{L^{2}}.$ Then the claim follows by Grönwall's inequality.

Proposition 7.2 (Proposition 4.3.27 in [62]). Let

$$v_0 \in H^1_{\overline{\sigma},\eta}(\Omega) \quad for \quad \eta > 0 \quad with \quad \partial_z v_0 \in H^1(\Omega).$$

Then the strong solution v to (PE_H) has the additional regularity

$$v \in L^{\infty}(0,T; H_{z}^{1}H_{xy}^{1})$$
 and $\nabla_{H}v \in L^{2}(0,T; H_{z}^{1}H_{xy}^{1})$

In particular $v \in L^4(0,T; H_z^1 H_{xy}^{1,4}).$

Sketch of the proof. Applying ∂_z to the velocity equation (PE_H) and testing with $\partial_z \Delta_H v$ gives

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left\| \partial_z \nabla_H v \right\|_{L^2}^2 + 2 \left\| \Delta_H v \right\|_{L^2}^2 = -2 \langle \partial_z (v \cdot \nabla_H v + w \partial_z v), \partial_z \Delta_H v \rangle_{L^2}$$

This can be estimated by

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left\| \partial_z \nabla_H v \right\|_{L^2}^2 + \left\| \partial_z \Delta_H v \right\|_{L^2}^2 \le C \left\| v \right\|_{H^1} \left(1 + \left\| v \right\|_{H^1} + \left\| \Delta_H v \right\|_{L^2} \right) \left\| \nabla_H v \right\|_{H}^2 \\ + \left\| \nabla_H \partial_z^2 v \right\|_{L^2}^2 + \left\| \partial_z^2 v \right\|_{L^2}^2 \left\| \nabla_H v \right\|_{L^2}^2 \left(\left\| \nabla_H v \right\|_{L^2} + \left\| \Delta_H v \right\|_{L^2} \right)^2.$$

By the estimates on $\|\nabla_H v\|_{L^2}$ and $\|\Delta_H^2 v\|_{L^2}$ in [29, Proposition 5.8] as well as Proposition 7.1 with N = 2 the relevant terms on the left hand side are integrable. Hence, the claim follows by Grönwall's inequality.

To derive additional regularity on w(v), let v be a solutions to the primitive equations with horizontal viscosity (PE_H) and p the associated pressure. Then one can apply $\int_{-1}^{z} -\operatorname{div}_{H} \cdot$ to (PE_H) and consider w = w(v) which solves adding on both side of (PE_H) the term $-\partial_{z}^{2}w = \partial_{z}\operatorname{div}_{H} v$

$$\partial_t w - \Delta w = \int_{-1}^z \operatorname{div}_H (\nabla_H p + (v, w) \cdot \nabla v) + \partial_z \operatorname{div}_H v, \quad w(0) = w_0.$$

This equation allows us to derive maximal regularity estimates for w provided v is sufficiently regular. Consider for given v, p and ω_0

(7.1)
$$\partial_t \omega - \Delta \omega = \int_{-1}^z \operatorname{div}_H (\nabla_H p + (v, \omega) \cdot \nabla v) + \partial_z \operatorname{div}_H v, \quad \omega(0) = \omega_0$$

Lemma 7.3. Let $v \in \mathbb{E}_1^v(T)$, $p \in \mathbb{E}_0^p(T)$, and $\omega_0 \in H^1(\Omega)$, then there is a unique solution $\omega \in \mathbb{E}_1(T)$ to the equation (7.1).

Proof. The equation (7.1) can be rewritten as

$$\partial_t \omega - \Delta \omega - B(v,\omega) = f(v) + \partial_z \operatorname{div}_H v, \quad \omega(0) = w_0, \quad \text{where } B(v,\omega) = -\int_{-1}^z \operatorname{div}_H[(v,\omega) \cdot \nabla v]$$

and applying $\operatorname{div}_H \cdot \operatorname{to}(\operatorname{PE}_H)$ it follows that

$$-\Delta_H p = \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{div}_H \int_{-1}^{1} [(v, w(v)) \cdot \nabla v] \quad \text{and hence} \quad f(v) = \frac{z+1}{2} \int_{-1}^{1} \operatorname{div}_H [(v, w(v)) \cdot \nabla v].$$

Since $v \in \mathbb{E}_1(T)$, one estimates

$$\left\|\partial_z \operatorname{div}_H v\right\|_{\mathbb{E}_0} \le \left\|v\right\|_{\mathbb{E}_1}.$$

The remaining terms can be estimated exactly as done in the proof of [19, Proposition 4.5] which gives the claim. \Box

Proof of Proposition 4.2. The existence and uniqueness statement in part (a) is taken from [12].

Let v_0 be as in Proposition 4.2 (b) and $v \in \mathbb{E}_H(T) \cap \mathbb{E}_z(T)$ be the solution to (PE_H) with initial condition v_0 from Proposition 4.2 (a). Then by Proposition 7.1

(7.2)
$$v \in \mathbb{E}_H(T) \cap \mathbb{E}_z(T) \cap L^2(0,T; H_z^2 H_{xy}^1) \cap L^\infty(0,T; H_z^2 L_{xy}^2) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{E}_1(T) \cap L^\infty(0,T; H_z^2 L_{xy}^2).$$

Thereby, Lemma 7.3 is applicable, and there is a unique solution $\omega \in \mathbb{E}_1(T)$ to (7.1). Now, we have to show that indeed $\omega = w(v)$. Integrating over the first equation in (PE_H) with respect to the z-variable and testing the resulting equation with $\nabla_H(w(v) - \omega)$ we find

$$\begin{split} \langle \int_{-1}^{z} \partial_{t} v, \nabla_{H}(w(v) - \omega) \rangle_{L^{2}} + \langle \nabla w, \nabla(w(v) - \omega) \rangle_{L^{2}} \\ &= \langle \int_{-1}^{z} (v, w(v)) \cdot \nabla v + \nabla_{H} p - \partial_{z}^{2} v, \nabla_{H}(w(v) - \omega) \rangle_{L^{2}}. \end{split}$$

Similarly, testing now (7.1) with $w(v) - \omega$ gives

$$\langle \partial_t \omega, w(v) - \omega \rangle_{L^2} + \langle \nabla \omega, \nabla (w(v) - \omega) \rangle_{L^2} = \langle \operatorname{div}_H \int_{-1}^{z} (v, \omega) \cdot \nabla v + \nabla_H p - \partial_z^2 v, w(v) - \omega \rangle_{L^2}.$$

Integrating by parts and taking the difference gives

$$\begin{split} \frac{1}{2}\partial_t \|w - \omega\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla(w - \omega)\|_{L^2}^2 &= \langle (w(v) - \omega)\partial_z v, \nabla_H(w(v) - \omega) \rangle_{L^2} \\ &\leq \|(w(v) - \omega)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|(w(v) - \omega)\|_{L^2zH_{1y}^1}^{1/2} \|\partial_z v\|_{L^2zH_{1y}^1}^{1/2} \|\partial_z v\|_{H^1zL^2_{xy}}^{1/2} \|\nabla_H(w(v) - \omega)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \|(w(v) - \omega)\|_{L^2}^2 C(1 + \|\partial_z v\|_{L^2zH_{1y}^1}^2 \|\partial_z v\|_{H^1zL^2_{xy}}^2) + \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla_H(w(v) - \omega)\|_{L^2}^2 \,, \end{split}$$

where we used [29, Lemma 6.2 b)] and Young's inequality. By (7.2)

$$\|\partial_z v\|_{L^2_z H^1_{xy}}^2 \|\partial_z v\|_{H^1_z L^2_{xy}}^2 \in L^\infty(0,T) \subset L^1(0,T),$$

and hence by Grönwall's inequality $w(v) = \omega \in \mathbb{E}_1(T)$ by Lemma 7.3.

Part (c) of Proposition 4.2 follows directly from Proposition 7.2, and part (d) from Proposition 7.1. \Box

Remark 7.4 (Regularity assumptions in Propositions 5.3 and 6.6). To apply Proposition 5.3 to the situation of $(\text{Diff}_{\varepsilon,\delta})$, we choose as indicated in (5.3) and (5.4) the functions

$$\nu = (v, \varepsilon w), \quad \omega = w + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} W_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \quad \text{and} \quad f = f_{\varepsilon,\delta}.$$

Moreover, we need some regularity results on u = (v, w(v)) to estimate Proposition 6.6.

- (a) To apply Proposition 6.5, we need $u \in \mathbb{E}_1(T)$ which holds by Proposition 4.2 (b). To control the term $\delta \|v\|_{L^2(0,T;H^3_x L^2_{xy})}$ in Proposition 6.5, we need Proposition 4.2 (d).
- (b) The regularity assumption on ν in Proposition 5.3 follows from Proposition 4.2 (c) using (2.6). For the choice (5.3) by (2.6) $\partial \omega = -\operatorname{div}_H v \operatorname{div}_H V_{\varepsilon,\delta}$.
- (c) By Proposition 4.2 (a) $v \in \mathbb{E}_1(T)$, assuming $V_{\varepsilon,\delta} \in \mathbb{E}_1(T)$, and by the mixed derivative theorem $\mathbb{E}_1(T) \hookrightarrow L^2(0,T; H_z^1 H_{xy}^1)$, then the regularity of $\partial_z \omega$ in Proposition 5.3 is assured.
- (d) Proposition 4.2 (b) allows us also to control $||u||_{\mathbb{E}_1(T)}$ on the right hand side of the estimate in Proposition 6.6.

8. QUADRATIC INEQUALITIES AND PROOF OF THE CONVERGENCES

8.1. Boundedness by quadratic inequalities and maximal existence intervals.

Lemma 8.1. For $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ with a < b let $X \in C([a, b); [0, \infty))$. If there exists a constant C > 0 such that for $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{16C}$ the function X satisfies

$$X(t) \leq CX^{2}(t) + \frac{1}{2}X(t) + \varepsilon \quad for \ all \ t \in [a,b), \quad and \quad X(a) \leq \frac{1}{4C},$$

then

$$\sup_{t\in[a,b)}X(t)\leq 4\varepsilon$$

Proof. From the assumption it follows that

$$0 \le X^2(t) - \frac{1}{2C}X(t) + \frac{\varepsilon}{C}, \quad t \in [a, b),$$

and since $\frac{1}{(4C)^2} - \frac{\varepsilon}{C} > 0$ due to the assumption $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{16C}$ the solution to this quadratic inequality is for $t \in [a, b)$ either

$$X(t) \leq \frac{1}{4C} - \left(\frac{1}{(4C)^2} - \frac{\varepsilon}{C}\right)^{1/2} = \frac{\varepsilon}{C} \left(\frac{1}{4C} + \left(\frac{1}{(4C)^2} - \frac{\varepsilon}{C}\right)^{1/2}\right)^{-1} \leq 4\varepsilon \quad \text{or}$$
$$X(t) \geq \frac{1}{4C} + \left(\frac{1}{(4C)^2} - \frac{\varepsilon}{C}\right)^{1/2}.$$

Due to the continuity of X the set $X([a,b)) \subset [0,\infty)$ is connected, and hence only one of the two possibilities can occur, and since $X(a) \leq \frac{1}{4C}$, the first inequality holds for all $t \in [a,b)$.

Lemma 8.2. For $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ with a < b let $X \in C([a, b); [0, \infty))$. If there exist constants C, K > 0 such that for $0 < \varepsilon < \min\{\frac{1}{64C}, \frac{\ln(3/2)}{8K}\}$ the function X satisfies

$$X(t) \le \left(CX^{2}(t) + \frac{1}{4}X(t) + \varepsilon \right) e^{KX(t)} \quad for \ all \ t \in [a, b), \quad and \quad X(a) \le \min\{\frac{1}{8C}, \frac{\ln(3/2)}{K}\},$$

then

$$\sup_{t\in[a,b)}X(t)\leq 8\varepsilon.$$

Proof. Consider

$$t^* := \sup\{t \in [a, b] : X(s) \le \frac{\ln(2)}{K} \text{ for all } s \in [a, t]\},\$$

where, because of $X(a) \leq \frac{\ln(3/2)}{K} < \frac{\ln(2)}{K}$ and the continuity of X, one has $t^* > a$. Assume now that $t^* < b$, then by continuity of X and the assumptions on X it follows that $X(t^*) = \frac{\ln(2)}{K}$ and

(8.1)
$$X(t) \le 2CX^2(t) + \frac{1}{2}X(t) + 2\varepsilon \quad \text{for all } t \in [a, t^*).$$

Applying now Lemma 8.1 on $[a, t^*)$, one concludes that

$$X(t) \leq \sup_{t \in [a,t^*)} X(t) \leq 8\varepsilon \leq \frac{\ln(3/2)}{K} < \frac{\ln(2)}{K}$$

which is a contradiction to $X(t^*) = \frac{\ln(2)}{K}$. Hence $t^* = b$, and (8.1) holds on [a, b) which by Lemma 8.1 implies that $\sup_{t \in [a,b]} X(t) \leq 8\varepsilon$.

Proposition 8.3. Let T > 0 be a finite time, and

$$(X_{\eta})_{\eta \in (0,1)}, \quad X_{\eta} \colon [0,T] \to [0,\infty] \quad with \quad X_{\eta}(0) = 0$$

be a family of increasing functions. Assume that

(a) $(X_{\eta})_{\eta \in (0,1)}$ has the following local existence property

(LE)
$$\begin{cases} For each \eta \in (0,1) \text{ there exists } s_{\eta}^* \in (0,T] \text{ such that} \\ X_{\eta} \in C([0,s_{\eta}^*);[0,\infty)), \end{cases}$$

(b) $(X_{\eta})_{\eta \in (0,1)}$ has the following maximal existence property

(ME)
$$\begin{cases} If t_{\eta}^* := \sup\{t \in [0,T] : X_{\eta} \in C([0,t];[0,\infty))\} < T, \\ then \ \sup_{t \in [0,t_{\eta}^*)} X_{\eta} = \infty, \end{cases}$$

(c) there are increasing functions

a decreasing function $f \in C((0,T];[0,\infty))$ and constants k, K > 0 such that $(X_{\eta})_{\eta \in (0,1)}$ satisfies the following quadratic inequality

$$(\text{QI}) \quad \begin{cases} \quad If \, X_{\eta} \in C([0, t_2); [0, \infty)) \text{ for } t_2 \in (0, T], \text{ then for } t_1 \in [0, t_2) \text{ and} \\ X_{\eta}^{t_1}(t) := X_{\eta}(t) - X_{\eta}(t_1) \text{ one has for } t \in (t_1, t_2) \\ X_{\eta}^{t_1}(t) \le \left(k X_{\eta}^{t_1}(t)^2 + g_2(t, t_1) X_{\eta}^{t_1}(t) + \eta g_3(t, t_1) + f(t - t_1) X_{\eta}(t_1)\right) e^{K X_{\eta}^{t_1}(t) + g_1(t, t_1)}. \end{cases}$$

If these assumptions hold, then there exists $\eta^* = \eta^*(T, g_1, g_2, g_3, k) \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$X_{\eta}(t) \in C([0,T];[0,\infty))$$
 and $\max_{t \in [0,T]} X_{\eta}(t) \le C^* \eta$ for all $\eta \in (0,\eta^*)$,

where the constant $C^* > 0$ is independent of η .

Proof. First note that since the functions G_i , i = 1, 2, 3, are uniformly continuous, there exists a T^* such that

(8.2)
$$g_1(t+T^*,t) \le \ln(2), \quad g_2(t+T^*,t) \le \frac{1}{8}, \text{ and } g_3(t+T^*,t) \le \frac{1}{2} \text{ for all } t \in [0,T-T^*].$$

Now, set

$$N := \left\lceil \frac{T}{T^*/2} \right\rceil \quad \text{and} \quad T_n := \begin{cases} n(T^*/2) & \text{if } n < N, \\ T & \text{if } n = N, \end{cases} \quad \text{for } n = 1, \dots, N.$$

Then the following inductive statement will be proven for n = 1, ..., N

$$(A_n) \qquad \left\{ \begin{array}{cc} X_\eta \in C([0,T_n];[0,\infty)) & \text{and there are constants } C_n > 0 \text{ and } \eta_n \in (0,1) \text{ such that} \\ & \sup_{t \in [0,T_n]} X_\eta(t) \le C_n \eta & \text{for } \eta \in (0,\eta_n). \end{array} \right.$$

To prove the induction basis (A_1) recall that $X_{\eta}(0) = 0$ and by (LE) there exists $s_{\eta}^* > 0$ such that $X_{\eta} \in C([0, s_{\eta}^*); [0, \infty))$, in particular

$$t_{\eta}^* = \sup\{t \in [0,T] \colon X_{\eta} \in C([0,t];[0,\infty))\} > 0.$$

Now, applying (QI) with $t_1 = 0$ and $t_2 = \min\{t_n^*, T_1\}$ it follows using (8.2) that

$$X_{\eta}(t) \le \left(2kX_{\eta}(t)^{2} + \frac{1}{4}X_{\eta}(t) + \eta\right)e^{KX_{\eta}(t)} \quad \text{for } t \in (0, \min\{t_{\eta}^{*}, T_{1}\}).$$

Therefore applying Lemma 8.2 with $0 = X_{\eta}(0) \leq \min\{\frac{1}{16k}, \frac{\ln(3/2)}{K}\}$ implies that

(8.3)
$$\sup_{t \in [0,\min\{t_{\eta}^*, T_1\})} X_{\eta}(t) \le C_1 \eta \quad \text{for } \eta \in (0, \eta_1), \text{ where } C_1 = 8 \text{ and } \eta_1 = \min\{\frac{1}{128k}, \frac{\ln(3/2)}{8K}\}.$$

Assume now that $t_{\eta}^* \leq T_1 < T$, then

$$\sup_{t \in [0,t_{\eta}^*)} X_{\eta}(t) \le C_1 \eta_1 < \infty \quad \text{for } \eta \in (0,\eta_1)$$

which is a contradiction to assumption (ME). If already $T_1 = T$ and $t_{\eta}^* < T_1 = T$, then the same argument given before leads to a contradiction, and if $t_{\eta}^* = T_1 = T$ then $\sup_{t \in [0,T)} X_{\eta}(t) < \infty$, and since X_{η} is increasing, it has a continuous extension to [0,T]. Hence $X_{\eta} \in C([0,T_1];[0,\infty))$ for all $\eta \in (0,\eta_1)$. Then, by continuity the supremum in (8.3) can be taken in fact over $t \in [0,T_1]$ and hence (A_1) holds.

For the induction step, assume that (A_n) holds for n < N. First, one notices that by (A_n) one has

$$\sup_{\in [0,T_n]} X_{\eta}(t) \le C_n \eta_n < \infty \quad \text{for } \eta \in (0,\eta_n),$$

and hence by (ME) it follows that $t_{\eta}^* > T_n$ for $\eta \in (0, \eta_n)$.

Next, apply the quadratic inequality (QI) with $t_2 = \min\{t_{\eta}^*, T_{n+1}\}$ and $t_1 = T_{n-1}$ to obtain

$$X_{\eta}^{t_1}(t) \le \left(2kX_{\eta}^{t_1}(t)^2 + \frac{1}{4}X_{\eta}^{t_1}(t) + \eta(1 + C_n f(t - t_1))e^{KX_{\eta}^{t_1}(t)} \text{ for } t \in (t_1, t_2).$$

Observe that by the definition of $X_{\eta}^{t_1}$ and the induction hypothesis (A_n)

$$X_{\eta}^{t_1}(T_n) \le X_{\eta}(T_n) \le \min\{\frac{1}{16k}, \frac{\ln(3/2)}{K}\} \quad \text{for } \eta < \eta_n^1 := \min\{\eta_n, \frac{1}{16kC_n}, \frac{\ln(3/2)}{KC_n}\}.$$

Hence, applying Lemma 8.2 on $[T_n, t_2)$, one finds that

(8.4)
$$X_{\eta}^{t_1}(t) \le C_{n+1}\eta \quad \text{for } \eta \in (0, \eta_{n+1}) \text{ and } t \in [T_n, t_2)$$

with $\eta_{n+1} := \min\{\eta_{n+1}^1, \eta_{n+1}^2\},\$

$$\eta_{n+1}^2 := \frac{1}{1 + C_n f(T^*/2)} \min\{\frac{1}{128k}, \frac{\ln(3/2)}{K}\}, \text{ and } C_{n+1} = 8(1 + C_n f(T^*/2)),$$

where one uses that f is decreasing hence and $f(t - T_{n-1}) \leq f(T^*/2)$ for all $t \in [T_n, t_2]$.

Assume now if n + 1 < N that $t_{\eta}^* \leq T_{n+1}$ for $\eta \in (0, \eta_{n+1})$, then by (8.4) one obtains a contradiction to (ME), and hence $t_{\eta}^* > T_{n+1}$ and $X_{\eta} \in C([0, T_{n+1}]; [0, \infty))$ for $\eta \in (0, \eta_{n+1})$. If n + 1 = N, then $t_{\eta}^* < T_{n+1} = T$ for $\eta \in (0, \eta_{n+1})$ leads again to a contradiction, and if $t_{\eta}^* = T_{n+1} = T$ for $\eta \in (0, \eta_{n+1})$ one concludes using the bound from (8.4) and the fact that X_{η} is increasing that $X_{\eta} \in C([0, T_{n+1}]; [0, \infty))$. Hence (A_{n+1}) follows.

The claim now follows from (A_N) with $\eta^* = \eta_N$ and $C^* = C_N$.

8.2. Convergence for $\varepsilon \to 0$ and $\delta \to 0$.

Proof of Theorem 4.3. Let $(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ be the solution of the difference equation $\text{Diff}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ solved by (2.4). Then, we set

(8.5)
$$X_{\varepsilon,\delta}(t) := \| (V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \|_{\mathbb{E}_{H,\delta}(t)}^2 + \| (V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \|_{\mathbb{E}_z(t)}^2, \quad \varepsilon, \delta > 0$$

and verify that this satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 8.3.

Step 1: By the local well-posedness of the scaled Navier-Stokes equations, cf. Proposition 4.1, and the global well-posedness of the primitive equations with horizontal viscosity, cf. Proposition 4.2 (a)–(b), one has property (LE), that is, for each $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$ there is a $T^*_{\varepsilon, \delta}$ such that

$$X_{\varepsilon,\delta}(T^*_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \in C([0,T^*_{\varepsilon,\delta});[0,\infty)).$$

Step 2: By blow-up criteria for the semi-linear equation $\text{Diff}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$, one has that also (ME) holds. Step 3: The property (QI) can be derived from the linear and non-linear estimates derived in Sections 5 and 6, respectively. Let $t_2 \in (0, T]$, $t_1 \in [0, t_2)$, and, $t \in [0, t_2 - t_1)$, then consider the shifted quantities

$$(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1})(t) := (V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta})(t+t_1),$$
$$(v^{t_1}, w^{t_1}(t) := (v, w)(t+t_1).$$

Note that by the definition of $X_{\varepsilon,\delta}(t)$ in (8.5), one has for the quantity $X_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}(t)$ from (QI) that for $t + t_1 \in (t_1, t_2)$

$$\begin{aligned} X_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}(t) &= X_{\varepsilon,\delta}(t+t_1) - X_{\varepsilon,\delta}(t_1) \\ &= \left\| (V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_{H,\delta}(t)}^2 + \left\| (V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_{z}(t)}^2 - \left\| (V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_{H,\delta}(t_1)}^2 - \left\| (V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_{z}(t_1)}^2 \\ &= \left\| (V_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}) \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_{H,\delta}(t)}^2 + \left\| (V_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}) \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_{z}(t)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the norms in the preultimate line are taken on (0, t) and $(0, t_1)$, respectively, and in the last equation norms for the shifted functions $(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1})$ are on the interval (0, t) which corresponds to norms of $(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ on $(t_1, t + t_1)$.

Step 3a (\mathbb{E}_z -estimate): By Proposition 5.3 with

(8.6)
$$\omega = w^{t_1} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} W^{t_1}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \quad \text{and} \quad \nu = (v^{t_1}, \varepsilon w^{t_1}),$$

one obtains

$$\begin{split} \left\| (V_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}) \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_z(t)}^2 &\leq C \Big(\left\| f_{\varepsilon,\delta}(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}) \right\|_{L^2(0,t;V')}^2 \\ &+ \left\| (V_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}(0), W_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}(0)) \right\|_{H}^2 \Big) e^{C(t + \left\| V_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1} \right\|_{L^2(0,t;V)}^2 + \left\| (v^{t_1}, \partial_z v^{t_1} \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_1(t)}^2)}. \end{split}$$

Here, we have applied the higher regularity on v and w from Proposition 4.2. More precisely, by Proposition 4.2 (a) one has

$$\partial_z w^{t_1} = -\operatorname{div}_H v^{t_1} \in L^2(0,t; H_z^1 L_{xy}^2) \quad \text{since} \quad v \in \mathbb{E}_z \subset L^2(0,t; H_z^1 H_{xy}^1).$$

By Step 1, $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\partial_z W^{t_1}_{\varepsilon,\delta} = -\operatorname{div}_H V^{t_1}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \in L^2(0,t; H^1_z L^2_{xy})$, so that ω as in (8.6) fulfills the assumptions of Proposition 5.3, that is,

$$\partial_z \omega \in L^2(0,t;H) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\partial_z \omega\|_{L^2(0,t;H)} \le C \left(\|v\|_{\mathbb{E}_z(t)} + \left\|V_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}\right\|_{L^2(0,t;V)} \right).$$

By Proposition 4.2 (c) and (2.6), one finds writing

$$w(\cdot, \cdot, z) = -\int_{-1}^{z} \operatorname{div}_{H} v(\cdot, \cdot, \xi) d\xi \quad \text{for} \quad z \in (1, 1), \quad \text{that} \quad w \in L^{4}(0, t; H^{2}_{z}L^{4}_{xy}),$$

and by interpolation it follows from Proposition 4.2 (d) that also $v \in L^4(0,t; H_z^2 L_{xy}^4)$ and hence for ν as in (8.6)

$$\nu \in L^4(0,t; H_z^2 L_{xy}^4) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nu\|_{L^4(0,t; H_z^2 L_{xy}^4)} \le C\left(\|v\|_{L^4(0,t; H_z^2 L_{xy}^4)} + \|v\|_{L^4(0,t; H_z^1 H_{xy}^{1,4})}\right).$$

Moreover, by Proposition 6.5 one can estimate $f_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ to obtain

$$\begin{split} \left\| \left(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1} \right) \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_z(t)}^2 &\leq C \Big(\left\| V_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1} \right) \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_z(t))}^4 + \left\| (v^{t_1}, w^{t_1}) \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_1(t)}^2 \left\| V_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1} \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_z(t))}^2 \\ &+ \delta^2 \left\| v^{t_1} \right\|_{L^2(0,T;H_s^3 L_{xy}^2)}^2 + \varepsilon^2 \left\| u^{t_1} \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_1(T)}^4 \\ &+ \left\| \left(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}(0), W_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}(0) \right) \right\|_H^2 \right) e^{C(t + \left\| V_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1} \right\|_{L^2(0,t;V)}^2 + \left\| (v^{t_1}, \partial_z v^{t_1} \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_1(t)}^2)} \end{split}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{split} \left\| (V_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}, \varepsilon W_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}) \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_z(t)}^2 &\leq C \Big(X_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}(t)^2 + \left\| (v^{t_1}, w^{t_1}) \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_1(t)}^4 X_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}(t)^2 + \delta^2 \left\| v^{t_1} \right\|_{L^2(0,T;H^3_z L^2_{xy})}^2 \\ &+ \varepsilon^2 \left\| u^{t_1} \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_1(T)}^4 + X_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}(t) \Big) e^{t + X_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}(t) + \left\| (v^{t_1}, \partial_z v^{t_1} \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_1(t)}^2. \end{split}$$

Step 3b ($\mathbb{E}_{H,\delta}$ -estimate): By Proposition 6.6 and Proposition 5.1 one estimates

$$\begin{split} \left\| \left(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1} \right) \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_H(t)}^2 &\leq C \Big(\left\| F_H(\left(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1} \right)), F_z(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}) \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_0(t)}^2 + \left\| \left(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}(0), W_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}(0) \right) \right\|_{H^1}^2 \Big) \\ &\leq C \left\| \left(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta} \right) \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_{H,z}(T)}^4 + C \left\| \left(V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta} \right) \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_{H,z}(T)}^2 \left\| \left(v, w(v) \right) \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_1(T)}^2 \\ &+ \delta^2 \left\| v \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_1(T)}^2 + \varepsilon C (\left\| w \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_1(T)} + \left\| w \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_1(T)}^2)^2. \end{split}$$

Step 4: Step 3a and 3b together give

$$X_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}(t) \le \left(kX_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}(t)^2 + g_2(t,t_1)X_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}(t) + (\varepsilon+\delta)g_3(t,t_1) + f(t-t_1)X_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}(t)\right)e^{CX_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}(t) + g_1(t,t_1)},$$

where

$$g_i(t, t_1) = G_i(t) - G_i(t_1), \quad i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} G_1(t) &:= C(t + \|(v, \partial_z v)\|_{\mathbb{E}_1(t)}^2), \\ G_2(t) &:= C \|(v, w)\|_{\mathbb{E}_1(t)}^2, \\ G_3(t) &:= C(1 + \|v\|_{\mathbb{E}_z(t) \cap L^{\infty}(0, t; H^1)}^2 + \|w\|_{\mathbb{E}_1(t)}^2) \|(v, w)\|_{\mathbb{E}_1(t)}^2 + C \|(v, \partial_z v)\|_{\mathbb{E}_1(t)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence by Proposition 8.3 one has

$$\max_{t \in [0,T]} X_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{t_1}(t) \le C(\varepsilon + \delta).$$

8.3. Convergence for $\varepsilon \to 0$ and $\delta \to \infty$.

Proof of Theorem 4.6. Consider $(\text{Diff}_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{(2)})$ with (2.8), then set

$$X_{\varepsilon,\delta}(t) := \left\| (V_{\varepsilon,\delta}, W_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_{1,\delta}(t)}^2, \quad \varepsilon, \delta > 0,$$

Estimating the right hand side of $(\text{Diff}_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{(2)})$ by Proposition 6.8 and Proposition 5.2 one gets for $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$ and $\delta \ge 1$

$$X_{\varepsilon,\delta}(t) \le C \left(X_{\varepsilon,\delta}(t)^2 + X_{\varepsilon,\delta}(t) \left\| u_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta} \right\|_{L^4(0,t;H^{3/2}(\Omega))} + \left\| u_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta} \right\|_{L^4(0,t;H^{3/2}(\Omega))} \frac{1}{\delta^{1/4}} \right).$$

Setting

$$k = C, \quad K > 0, \quad f = 0, \quad G_1 = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad G_2(t) = G_3(t) = C \sup_{\varepsilon \in (0,1]} \left\| u_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta} \right\|_{L^4(0,t;H^{3/2}(\Omega))},$$

one can apply Proposition 8.3 for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, and hence using again Proposition 5.2 for δ sufficiently large

$$\sup_{\varepsilon \in (0,1]} \left(\left\| \overline{v} - \overline{v}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \right\|_{\mathbb{E}_1} + \left\| \widetilde{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \right\|_{L^4(0,T;H^{3/2}(\Omega))} \right) \le \left(\sup_{\varepsilon \in (0,1]} X_{\varepsilon,\delta}(T) + \left\| \widetilde{u}_{0,\infty}^{\varepsilon,\delta} \right\|_{L^4(0,T;H^{3/2}(\Omega))} \right) \le \frac{C}{\delta^{1/4}}.$$

Acknowledgment. We would like to thank anonymous referees for their helpful comments, references and suggestions.

Declarations: Funding and/or Conflicts of interests/Competing interests. None.

References

- D. Albritton, E. Brué, and M. Colombo. Non-uniqueness of Leray solutions of the forced Navier-Stokes equations. Ann. of Math. (2), 196(1):415-455, 2022.
- [2] P. Azérad and F. Guillén. Mathematical justification of the hydrostatic approximation in the primitive equations of geophysical fluid dynamics. SIAM J. Math. Anal., 33(4):847–859, 2001.
- [3] P. Azérad. Analyse des équations de Navier-Stokes en bassin peu profond et de l'équation de transport. PhD thesis, Université de Neuchêtel, Neuchêtel, Switzerland, 1996.
- [4] O. Besson, M. Laydi, and R. Touzani. Un modèle asymptotique en océanographie. C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math., 310(9):661–665, 1990.
- [5] O. Besson and M. R. Laydi. Some estimates for the anisotropic Navier-Stokes equations and for the hydrostatic approximation. RAIRO Modél. Math. Anal. Numér., 26(7):855–865, 1992.
- [6] D. W. Boutros, S. Markfelder, and E. S. Titi. Nonuniqueness of generalised weak solutions to the primitive and Prandtl equations, 2023.
- [7] D. Bresch, J. Lemoine, and J. Simon. A vertical diffusion model for lakes. SIAM J. Math. Anal., 30(3):603-622, 1999.
- [8] T. Buckmaster and V. Vicol. Nonuniqueness of weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equation. Ann. of Math. (2), 189(1):101-144, 2019.
- [9] C. Cao, S. Ibrahim, K. Nakanishi, and E. S. Titi. Finite-time blowup for the inviscid primitive equations of oceanic and atmospheric dynamics. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 337(2):473–482, 2015.
- [10] C. Cao, J. Li, and E. S. Titi. Global well-posedness of strong solutions to the 3D primitive equations with horizontal eddy diffusivity. J. Differential Equations, 257(11):4108–4132, 2014.
- [11] C. Cao, J. Li, and E. S. Titi. Local and global well-posedness of strong solutions to the 3D primitive equations with vertical eddy diffusivity. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 214(1):35–76, 2014.
- [12] C. Cao, J. Li, and E. S. Titi. Strong solutions to the 3D primitive equations with only horizontal dissipation: near H¹ initial data. J. Funct. Anal., 272(11):4606–4641, 2017.
- [13] C. Cao, J. Li, and E. S. Titi. Global well-posedness of the 3D primitive equations with horizontal viscosity and vertical diffusivity. *Phys. D*, 412:132606, 25, 2020.
- [14] C. Cao and E. S. Titi. Global well-posedness of the three-dimensional viscous primitive equations of large scale ocean and atmosphere dynamics. Ann. of Math. (2), 166(1):245–267, 2007.
- [15] J.-Y. Chemin, B. Desjardins, I. Gallagher, and E. Grenier. Mathematical geophysics, volume 32 of Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2006. An introduction to rotating fluids and the Navier-Stokes equations.
- [16] R. Danchin. Fourier analysis methods for compressible flows. In Topics on compressible Navier-Stokes equations, volume 50 of Panor. Synthèses, pages 43–106. Soc. Math. France, Paris, 2016.
- [17] D. Donatelli and N. Juhász. The primitive equations of the polluted atmosphere as a weak and strong limit of the 3D Navier-Stokes equations in downwind-matching coordinates. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 42(6):2859–2892, 2022.
- [18] H. Fujita and T. Kato. On the Navier-Stokes initial value problem. I. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., 16:269–315, 1964.
- [19] K. Furukawa, Y. Giga, M. Hieber, A. Hussein, T. Kashiwabara, and M. Wrona. Rigorous justification of the hydrostatic approximation for the primitive equations by scaled Navier-Stokes equations. *Nonlinearity*, 33(12):6502–6516, 2020.
- [20] K. Furukawa, Y. Giga, and T. Kashiwabara. The hydrostatic approximation for the primitive equations by the scaled Navier-Stokes equations under the no-slip boundary condition. J. Evol. Equ., 21(3):3331–3373, 2021.
- [21] H. Gao, v. Nečasová, and T. Tang. On the hydrostatic approximation of compressible anisotropic Navier-Stokes equations—rigorous justification. J. Math. Fluid Mech., 24(3):Paper No. 86, 17, 2022.
- [22] Y. Giga, M. Gries, M. Hieber, A. Hussein, and T. Kashiwabara. Bounded H[∞]-calculus for the hydrostatic Stokes operator on L^p-spaces and applications. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 145(9):3865–3876, 2017.
- [23] Y. Giga, M. Gries, M. Hieber, A. Hussein, and T. Kashiwabara. The hydrostatic Stokes semigroup and well-posedness of the primitive equations on spaces of bounded functions. J. Funct. Anal., 279(3):108561, 46, 2020.
- [24] Y. Giga, M. Gries, M. Hieber, A. Hussein, and T. Kashiwabara. The primitive equations in the scaling-invariant space L[∞](L¹). J. Evol. Equ., 21(4):4145–4169, 2021.
- [25] D. Han-Kwan and T. T. Nguyen. Ill-posedness of the hydrostatic Euler and singular Vlasov equations. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 221(3):1317–1344, 2016.

- [26] M. Hieber, A. Hussein, and T. Kashiwabara. Global strong L^p well-posedness of the 3D primitive equations with heat and salinity diffusion. J. Differential Equations, 261(12):6950–6981, 2016.
- [27] M. Hieber and T. Kashiwabara. Global strong well-posedness of the three dimensional primitive equations in L^pspaces. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 221(3):1077–1115, 2016.
- [28] C. Hu. Navier-Stokes equations in 3D thin domains with Navier friction boundary condition. J. Differential Equations, 236(1):133–163, 2007.
- [29] A. Hussein, M. Saal, and M. Wrona. Primitive equations with horizontal viscosity: the initial value and the timeperiodic problem for physical boundary conditions. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 41(7):3063–3092, 2021.
- [30] D. s. Iftimie, G. Raugel, and G. R. Sell. Navier-Stokes equations in thin 3D domains with Navier boundary conditions. Indiana Univ. Math. J., 56(3):1083–1156, 2007.
- [31] N. Ju. On H² solutions and z-weak solutions of the 3D primitive equations. Indiana Univ. Math. J., 66(3):973–996, 2017.
- [32] J. Leray. Sur le mouvement d'un liquide visqueux emplissant l'espace. Acta Math., 63(1):193-248, 1934.
- [33] J. Li and E. S. Titi. Existence and uniqueness of weak solutions to viscous primitive equations for a certain class of discontinuous initial data. SIAM J. Math. Anal., 49(1):1–28, 2017.
- [34] J. Li and E. S. Titi. The primitive equations as the small aspect ratio limit of the Navier-Stokes equations: rigorous justification of the hydrostatic approximation. J. Math. Pures Appl. (9), 124:30–58, 2019.
- [35] J. Li, E. S. Titi, and G. Yuan. The primitive equations approximation of the anisotropic horizontally viscous 3D Navier-Stokes equations. J. Differential Equations, 306:492–524, 2022.
- [36] J.-L. Lions, R. Temam, and S. Wang. Models for the coupled atmosphere and ocean. (CAO I,II). Comput. Mech. Adv., 1(1):120, 1993.
- [37] J.-L. Lions, R. Temam, and S. H. Wang. New formulations of the primitive equations of atmosphere and applications. *Nonlinearity*, 5(2):237–288, 1992.
- [38] J.-L. Lions, R. Temam, and S. H. Wang. On the equations of the large-scale ocean. Nonlinearity, 5(5):1007–1053, 1992.
- [39] E. Luesink. Stochastic geometric mechanics of thermal ocean dynamics. PhD thesis, Imperial College London, 2021.
- [40] A. Majda. Introduction to PDEs and Waves in Atmosphere and Ocean, volume 9. 01 2003.
- [41] F. Merle, P. Raphaël, I. Rodnianski, and J. Szeftel. On the implosion of a compressible fluid I: Smooth self-similar inviscid profiles. Ann. of Math. (2), 196(2):567–778, 2022.
- [42] F. Merle, P. Raphaël, I. Rodnianski, and J. Szeftel. On the implosion of a compressible fluid II: Singularity formation. Ann. of Math. (2), 196(2):779–889, 2022.
- [43] I. Moise, R. Temam, and M. Ziane. Asymptotic analysis of the Navier-Stokes equations in thin domains. volume 10, pages 249–282. 1997. Dedicated to Olga Ladyzhenskaya.
- [44] J. Pedlosky. Geophysical fluid dynamics. Springer, New York, 1979.
- [45] M. Petcu, R. M. Temam, and M. Ziane. Some mathematical problems in geophysical fluid dynamics. In Handbook of numerical analysis. Vol. XIV. Special volume: computational methods for the atmosphere and the oceans, volume 14 of Handb. Numer. Anal., pages 577–750. Elsevier/North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2009.
- [46] J. Prüss and G. Simonett. Moving interfaces and quasilinear parabolic evolution equations, volume 105 of Monographs in Mathematics. Birkhäuser/Springer, 2016.
- [47] J. Prüss, G. Simonett, and M. Wilke. Critical spaces for quasilinear parabolic evolution equations and applications. J. Differential Equations, 264(3):2028–2074, 2018.
- [48] J. Prüss and M. Wilke. Addendum to the paper "On quasilinear parabolic evolution equations in weighted L_p-spaces II" [MR3250797]. J. Evol. Equ., 17(4):1381–1388, 2017.
- [49] J. Prüss and M. Wilke. On critical spaces for the Navier-Stokes equations. J. Math. Fluid Mech., 20(2):733-755, 2018.
- [50] X. Pu and W. Zhou. On the rigorous mathematical derivation for the viscous primitive equations with density stratification. Acta Math. Sci. Ser. B (Engl. Ed.), 43(3):1081–1104, 2023.
- [51] X. Pu and W. Zhou. Rigorous derivation of the full primitive equations by the scaled Boussinesq equations with rotation. Bull. Malays. Math. Sci. Soc., 46(3):Paper No. 88, 23, 2023.
- [52] G. Raugel and G. R. Sell. Navier-Stokes equations in thin 3d domains. III. Existence of a global attractor. In *Turbulence in fluid flows*, volume 55 of *IMA Vol. Math. Appl.*, pages 137–163. Springer, New York, 1993.
- [53] G. Raugel and G. R. Sell. Navier-Stokes equations on thin 3d domains. I. Global attractors and global regularity of solutions. J. Amer. Math. Soc., 6(3):503–568, 1993.
- [54] G. Raugel and G. R. Sell. Navier-Stokes equations on thin 3d domains. II. Global regularity of spatially periodic solutions. In Nonlinear partial differential equations and their applications. Collège de France Seminar, Vol. XI (Paris, 1989–1991), volume 299 of Pitman Res. Notes Math. Ser., pages 205–247. Longman Sci. Tech., Harlow, 1994.
- [55] L. F. Richardson and P. Lynch. Weather Prediction by Numerical Process. Cambridge Mathematical Library. Cambridge University Press, 2 edition, 2007.
- [56] M. Saal. Primitive equations with half horizontal viscosity. arXiv:1807.05045, 2018.
- [57] H. Sohr. The Navier-Stokes equations. Birkhäuser Advanced Texts: Basler Lehrbücher. [Birkhäuser Advanced Texts: Basel Textbooks]. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2001. An elementary functional analytic approach.
- [58] T. Tang and v. Nečasová. Derivation of the inviscid compressible primitive equations. Appl. Math. Lett., 139:Paper No. 108534, 8, 2023.

- [59] H. Triebel. Theory of function spaces, volume 38 of Mathematik und ihre Anwendungen in Physik und Technik [Mathematics and its Applications in Physics and Technology]. Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Geest & Portig K.-G., Leipzig, 1983.
- [60] G. K. Vallis. Atmospheric and Oceanic Fluid Dynamics: Fundamentals and Large-Scale Circulation. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K., 2nd edition, 2017.
- [61] W. Washington and C. Parkinson. An Introduction to Three-Dimensional Climate Modeling / W.M. Washington, C.L. Parkinson. 02 1986.
- [62] M. Wrona. Liquid Crystals and the Primitive Equations: An Approach by Maximal Regularity. PhD thesis, Technische Universität Darmstadt, Darmstadt, Germany, 2020.

Faculty of Science, Academic Assembly, University of Toyama, Gofuku 3190, Toyama, 930-0887, Toyama, Japan

Email address: furukawa@sci.u-toyama.ac.jp

Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Tokyo, Komaba 3-8-1, Meguro-ku, Tokyo, 153-8914, Japan

Email address: labgiga@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp Email address: tkashiwa@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TU DARMSTADT, SCHLOSSGARTENSTR. 7, 64289 DARMSTADT, GERMANY Email address: hieber@mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de Email address: marc.p.wrona@gmail.com

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, RPTU KAISERSLAUTERN-LANDAU, PAUL-EHRLICH-STRASSE 31, 67663 KAISERSLAUTERN, GERMANY

Email address: hussein@mathematik.uni-kl.de