

On the boundary layer arising from fast internal waves dynamics

Rupert Klein* Xin Liu†

January 1, 2024

Abstract

In this paper, we investigate the boundary layer arising from the fast internal waves in the Boussinesq equations with the Brunt-Vaisälä frequency of order $\mathcal{O}(1/\varepsilon)$. For the homogeneous-in-height stratification, previous work by *Desjardins, Lannes, Saut, 3(1):153–192, Water Waves, 2021* establishes uniform-in- ε estimates locally in time, with additional constraints on the boundary data initially, which essentially restricts the dynamics in the spatially periodic domain. Removing such constraints, our goal is to investigate the general near-boundary behavior. We observe that the fast internal waves will give rise to large growth of the spatial derivatives in the normal direction of the solutions in the vicinity of the boundary. To capture this phenomenon, we introduce an inviscid boundary layer using a natural scaling. In addition, we investigate the well-posedness of such a boundary layer system in the space of analytic functions.

Keywords: Internal waves, Low stratification, Boundary layer.

MSC2020 Classification: 76B55, 76B70, 86A99

Contents

1 Internal waves and the Boussinesq equations 2

*Institut für Mathematik, Freie Universität Berlin, Berlin, 14195, Germany, rupert.klein@math.fu-berlin.de.

†Department of Mathematics, Texas A&M University, College Station, 77843, Texas, U.S., xliu23@tamu.edu, stleonliu@gmail.com.

2	Motivation and linear analysis	5
2.1	Linear system and motivation	5
2.2	Linear boundary layer equations	7
2.3	Some physical remarks	10
3	Boundary layer expansion: Formulation of nonlinear equations	11
4	Well-posedness theory of the boundary layer equations, i.e., (3.4)	12
4.1	The ι -approximating system with frozen transport speed and uniform-in- ι estimates	14
4.2	The contraction mapping	19
4.2.1	Preliminaries and the main theorem	19
4.2.2	Boundedness estimate	21
4.2.3	Contracting and the fixed point	29

1 Internal waves and the Boussinesq equations

The propagation of internal waves in the ocean and atmosphere is affected by the stratification, which itself is the consequence of salinity, temperature, and moisture gradients ([23, 24, 36]). There has been important progress in theoretical and experimental studies of internal waves. See, for instance, [5, 18, 43, 44, 47]. We refer to [27] for a review.

Using two-layer flow models, Barros and Choi [1, 2] studied the free surface separating two flow layers, and showed the onset of Kelvin-Helmholtz instability for large internal waves. See also [20], where the Rayleigh-Taylor instability was also discussed. A regularized model was proposed by Barros and Choi as well. In a systematic way, Bona, Lannes, and Saut [6] derived some new models with non-local operators for the two-layer flow interface. Bresch and Renardy [9] studied the well-posedness of a model of two-layer flows, extending the result of Guyenne, Lannes, and Saut [26]. For more results, we refer readers to [15, 28, 30, 33, 39, 40]. For the investigation of compressible two-layer flows, we refer to [25, 31, 32, 45, 46].

The study of continuously strongly stratified models, on the other hand, is quite limited. The local well-posedness of the Cauchy problem for density dependent Euler flows was investigated by Danchin [16]. For the two dimensional Boussinesq equations, the local well-posedness theory was developed by Chae and Nam [10]. In [29], Inci showed that the solution map of the inviscid Boussinesq equations is nowhere uniformly continuous. Danchin and Paicu [17] studied global solutions with Yudovich’s type data with heat conductivity. See also [41, 42] for flows with anisotropic viscosity, and [38] for a recent study of viscous flows. In addition, the shear-buoyancy instability

has recently been investigated by Bedrossian, Bianchini, Coti Zelati, and Dolce [3]. In particular, [3], together with [4], provides evidence of an instability caused by internal gravity waves. All these studies are in the setting with a fixed Brunt-Vaisälä frequency of order unity, i.e., with slow internal waves. In [19], Desjardin et al. study flows with nonhomogeneous and homogeneous stratifications, and the fast internal waves are investigated in terms of normal modes. See [11–13] for the study of dispersion of the quasi-geostrophic approximation in \mathbb{R}^3 and [7] for a study of the planetary geostrophic approximation.

On the other hand, the Boussinesq/pseudo-incompressible/anelastic models in general provide a good approximation to the full compressible flow in the low Mach number regime, even with fast internal waves. See [21, 22, 34–36]. In particular, our previous work [8] shows that for a simplified, ideal, and weakly stratified system, the fast acoustic waves can be filtered out for low Mach number flows, and the incompressible model with fast internal waves provides a solid approximation to the original full compressible model/flow. Our result essentially considers these systems of equations on spatially periodic domains, including, in particular, periodicity in the vertical direction, to avoid handling the boundary behavior of the flow. To go beyond this, a better understanding of the dynamics of the flows near rigid boundaries is necessary, even for the incompressible model. This is the main goal and motivation of the present work.

To be more precise, consider in $\Omega := \mathbb{T}^2 \times (0, 1)$ the Boussinesq equations with fast internal waves, i.e.,

$$\partial_t v + v \cdot \nabla_h v + w \partial_z v + \frac{\nabla_h p}{\varepsilon} = 0, \quad (1.1a)$$

$$\partial_t w + v \cdot \nabla_h w + w \partial_z w + \frac{\partial_z p}{\varepsilon} - \frac{\theta}{\varepsilon} = 0, \quad (1.1b)$$

$$\partial_t \theta + v \cdot \nabla_h \theta + w \partial_z \theta + \frac{w}{\varepsilon} = 0, \quad (1.1c)$$

$$\operatorname{div}_h v + \partial_z w = 0. \quad (1.1d)$$

In addition, on the boundary $\{z = 0, 1\}$, we impose the condition of impermeability, i.e.,

$$w|_{z=0,1} = 0. \quad (1.1e)$$

Here, $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$, for $\varepsilon \ll 1$, is the Brunt-Vaisälä frequency of the internal waves, which we assume to be constant throughout the present analysis.

In [19, Theorem 2], under the assumption that

$$\partial_z^{2k} \theta = \partial_z^{2k} w = \partial_z^{2k+1} v = 0, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \text{on} \quad \{z = 0, 1\}, \quad (1.2)$$

a property that is invariant for the regular solutions, a uniform-in- ε well-posedness result of system (1.1) is established. Our goal of this paper to investigate system (1.1) without the assumption (1.2). This will inform us about

- how assumption (1.2) affects the solutions or, equivalently, what is the benefit of (1.2) in the previous study;
- the general dynamics, in particular the boundary effect of solutions to system (1.1).

In particular, we will investigate the dynamics of solutions near the boundary, and introduce a boundary layer expansion. Our main theorem can be stated informally as follows:

Theorem 1.1. *As $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$, there exists a boundary layer dynamics of system (1.1) for general initial data without the assumption of (1.2) on the slow time scale, i.e., for $t = O(1)$. Under the requirement that the boundary layer flow has no feedback to the internal flow, the boundary layer system is well-posed in the space of analytic functions.*

The main theorem will be stated in section 4.2.1 in full detail (thm. 4.1). A multiple times scale analysis that simultaneously addresses the fast internal waves and the slow evolution of the boundary layer structure is deferred to future work.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In section 2, by studying a linear system, we point out the ‘noise’ arising from the boundary without the assumption (1.2), which is the motivation for introducing the boundary layer. In particular, the linear boundary layer is discussed in section 2.2. We refer readers to some physical remark about this boundary layer in section 2.3. In section 3, we introduce the nonlinear boundary layer expansion. Section 4 is devoted to investigating the well-posedness theory of the boundary layer. A linear system is introduced in section 4.1, by which the problem of possible overdetermination is overcome. A contraction mapping argument is established in section 4.2, leading to the well-posedness of the boundary layer equations.

We emphasize that the boundary layer we introduce and construct is really confined near the boundary, and has no feedback to the internal flows. This, on the one hand, brings the possible overdetermination in our analysis (see section 4), and on the other hand, might not enjoy the most physical generality. The latter problem, and in particular a study of multiple-scales

interactions between fast internal waves in the bulk of the atmosphere with slow boundary layer dynamics near the ground, will be left for future studies.

2 Motivation and linear analysis

2.1 Linear system and motivation

Consider firstly the following linear system:

$$\partial_t v_l + \frac{\nabla_h p_l}{\varepsilon} = 0, \quad (2.1a)$$

$$\partial_t w_l + \frac{\partial_z p_l}{\varepsilon} - \frac{\theta_l}{\varepsilon} = 0, \quad (2.1b)$$

$$\partial_t \theta_l + \frac{w_l}{\varepsilon} = 0, \quad (2.1c)$$

$$\operatorname{div}_h v_l + \partial_z w_l = 0, \quad (2.1d)$$

$$w_l|_{z=0,1} = 0. \quad (2.1e)$$

Assume for the moment that solutions exist and are smooth enough so that the following calculation makes sense. We would like to demonstrate the growth of $(\partial_z^2 w_l)|_{z=0,1}$ and $(\partial_z^2 \theta_l)|_{z=0,1}$. Indeed, taking div_h of (2.1a) and ∂_z of (2.1b) and summing up the resultants, thanks to (2.1d), lead to

$$(\Delta_h + \partial_{zz})p_l - \partial_z \theta_l = 0. \quad (2.2)$$

Meanwhile, taking ∂_z^2 of (2.1b) yields

$$\partial_t \partial_z^2 w_l + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \partial_z (\partial_{zz} p_l - \partial_z \theta_l) = \partial_t \partial_{zz} w_l - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \partial_z \Delta_h p_l = 0. \quad (2.3)$$

After replacing $\partial_z p_l$ using (2.1b) in the second equality of (2.3), we arrive at

$$\partial_t \partial_z^2 w_l + \partial_t \Delta_h w_l - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \Delta_h \theta_l = 0. \quad (2.4)$$

Taking the trace of (2.4) to the boundary $\{z = 0, 1\}$, thanks to (2.1e), leads to

$$\partial_t (\partial_z^2 w_l)|_{z=0,1} - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (\Delta_h \theta_l)|_{z=0,1} = 0. \quad (2.5)$$

To calculate $(\Delta_h \theta_l)|_{z=0,1}$, notice that (2.1c) and (2.1e) imply that

$$(\Delta_h \theta_l)|_{z=0,1}(t) \equiv (\Delta_h \theta_l)|_{z=0,1}(t=0) = (\Delta_h \theta_{l,\text{in}})|_{z=0,1}. \quad (2.6)$$

Hereafter, $(\cdot)_{\text{in}}$ denotes the initial data (value at $t = 0$) of the corresponding quantity. Therefore, from (2.5), one can evaluate that

$$(\partial_z^2 w_l)|_{z=0,1}(t) = (\partial_z^2 w_{l,\text{in}})|_{z=0,1} + \frac{t}{\varepsilon}(\Delta_h \theta_{l,\text{in}})|_{z=0,1}. \quad (2.7)$$

On the other hand, applying ∂_z^2 to (2.1c) directly implies

$$\partial_t \partial_z^2 \theta_l = -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \partial_z^2 w_l, \quad (2.8)$$

from which one can calculate that

$$(\partial_z^2 \theta_l)|_{z=0,1}(t) = (\partial_z^2 \theta_{l,\text{in}})|_{z=0,1} - \frac{t}{\varepsilon} (\partial_z^2 w_{l,\text{in}})|_{z=0,1} - \frac{t^2}{2\varepsilon^2} (\Delta_h \theta_{l,\text{in}})|_{z=0,1}. \quad (2.9)$$

From $(\partial_z^2 w_l)|_{z=0,1}$ and $(\partial_z^2 \theta_l)|_{z=0,1}$ as in (2.7) and (2.9), one observes that, near the boundary, the following scaling arises after initial time,

$$\partial_z^2 w_l \simeq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_z^2 \theta_l \simeq \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}. \quad (2.10)$$

As a remark, similar growth of $(\partial_z v_l)|_{z=0,1}$ can be observed. Indeed, taking the z -derivative of (2.1a) and subtracting the result with the horizontal gradient of (2.1b) lead to

$$\partial_t (\partial_z v_l - \nabla_h w_l) = -\frac{\nabla_h \theta_l}{\varepsilon}. \quad (2.11)$$

Taking the trace of the equation above to the boundary yields

$$\partial_t (\partial_z v_l)|_{z=0,1} = -\frac{(\nabla_h \theta_l)|_{z=0,1}}{\varepsilon}, \quad (2.12)$$

which implies that after initial time,

$$(\partial_z v_l)|_{z=0,1} \simeq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}, \quad (2.13)$$

thanks to the fact that $\partial_t (\nabla_h \theta_l)|_{z=0,1} = 0$ (or equivalently, $(\nabla_h \theta_l)|_{z=0,1}(t) \equiv (\nabla_h \theta_{l,\text{in}})|_{z=0,1}$).

Therefore, in order to capture the profiles of solutions near the boundary $\{z = 0\}$, it is natural to consider the following ansatz,

$$w_l = \varepsilon W_l, \quad z = \varepsilon \eta, \quad (2.14)$$

with $W_l = \mathcal{O}(1)$. It is easy to verify that, in view of (2.10), that

$$\partial_\eta^2 W_l = \varepsilon \partial_z^2 w_l = \mathcal{O}(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_\eta^2 \theta_l = \varepsilon^2 \partial_z^2 \theta_l = \mathcal{O}(1). \quad (2.15)$$

Moreover, let

$$q_l := \frac{1}{\varepsilon} p_l. \quad (2.16)$$

Then, in terms of $(v_l, W_l, \theta_l, q_l)$ and (x, y, η, t) , one can derive from system (2.1) that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t v_l + \nabla_h q_l &= 0, & \varepsilon^2 \partial_t W_l + \partial_\eta q_l - \theta_l &= 0, \\ \partial_t \theta_l + W_l &= 0, \\ \operatorname{div}_h v_l + \partial_\eta W_l &= 0, & W_l|_{z=0} &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

2.2 Linear boundary layer equations

Motivated by the structure above, we propose the following boundary layer equation near $\{z = 0\}$:

$$\partial_t v_{b,l} + \nabla_h q_{b,l} = 0, \quad (2.17a)$$

$$\partial_\eta q_{b,l} - \theta_{b,l} = 0, \quad (2.17b)$$

$$\partial_t \theta_{b,l} + W_{b,l} = 0, \quad (2.17c)$$

$$\operatorname{div}_h v_{b,l} + \partial_\eta W_{b,l} = 0, \quad (2.17d)$$

$$W_{b,l}|_{\eta=0} = 0. \quad (2.17e)$$

In addition, the matching condition at $\eta = \infty$ is

$$v_{b,l}, \theta_{b,l} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \eta \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.17f)$$

Furthermore, let

$$\pi_{b,l}(x, y) := q_{b,l}(x, y, \eta) - \int_0^\eta \theta_{b,l}(x, y, s) ds, \quad (2.18)$$

which is independent of the η -variable, thanks to (2.17b). Then (2.17a) can be written as

$$\partial_t v_{b,l} + \nabla_h \pi_{b,l} + \int_0^\eta \nabla_h \theta_{b,l}(s) ds = 0, \quad (2.17a')$$

with

$$\partial_\eta \pi_{b,l} = 0. \quad (2.17b')$$

Remark 1. A few remarks about the matching condition (2.17f). Suppose, in general, that the far fields for $v_{b,l}$ and $\theta_{b,l}$ at $\eta = \infty$ are given by

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow \infty} v_{b,l}(x, \eta, t) = v_{b,l,\infty}(x, t) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\eta \rightarrow \infty} \theta_{b,l}(x, \eta, t) = \theta_{b,l,\infty}(x, t). \quad (2.19)$$

Similarly, let the far fields of $W_{b,l}$ and $q_{b,l}$ be

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow \infty} W_{b,l}(x, \eta, t) = W_{b,l,\infty}(x, t) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\eta \rightarrow \infty} q_{b,l}(x, \eta, t) = q_{b,l,\infty}(x, t). \quad (2.20)$$

Then, (2.17b) implies that

$$q_{b,l}(x, \eta, t) = - \int_{\eta}^{\infty} \theta_{b,l}(x, \iota, t) d\iota + q_{b,l,\infty}(x, t). \quad (2.21)$$

Therefore, in order to have a meaningful integration, one requires that

$$\theta_{b,l,\infty}(x, t) = \lim_{\eta \rightarrow \infty} \theta_{b,l}(x, \eta, t) = 0. \quad (2.22)$$

On the other hand, thanks to (2.17d) and (2.17e), one has

$$W_{b,l,\infty}(x, t) = - \int_0^{\infty} \operatorname{div}_h v_{b,l}(x, \iota, t) d\iota, \quad (2.23)$$

which, as before, requires that

$$\operatorname{div}_h v_{b,l,\infty}(x, t) = \lim_{\eta \rightarrow \infty} \operatorname{div}_h v_{b,l}(x, \eta, t) = 0. \quad (2.24)$$

Meanwhile, (2.17a) implies that

$$\partial_t v_{b,l,\infty} + \nabla_h q_{b,l,\infty} = 0. \quad (2.25)$$

Consequently, $v'_{b,l} := v_{b,l} - v_{b,l,\infty}$, $W'_{b,l} := W_{b,l} - W_{b,l,\infty}$, $\theta'_{b,l} := \theta_{b,l} - \theta_{b,l,\infty}$, and $q'_{b,l} := q_{b,l} - q_{b,l,\infty}$ satisfy the same system of equations as $v_{b,l}$, $W_{b,l}$, $\theta_{b,l}$, and $q_{b,l}$, and satisfying the far field conditions (2.17f).

Notice that, the matching condition of $\theta_{b,l}$ at $\eta \rightarrow \infty$ implicitly implies that

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow \infty} W_{b,l} = 0, \quad (2.26)$$

thanks to (2.17c). Therefore, the well-posedness of system (2.17), even though it is linear, is not clear. This is due to the possible overdetermination of the far field condition (2.17f) (and (2.26)).

To resolve this problem, at the linear level, one should consider the following ι -approximating system:

$$\partial_t v_{b,l,\iota} + \nabla_h \pi_{b,l,\iota} + \int_0^\eta \nabla_h \theta_{b,l,\iota}(s) ds = 0, \quad (2.27a)$$

$$\partial_\eta \pi_{b,l,\iota} = 0, \quad (2.27b)$$

$$\partial_t \theta_{b,l,\iota} + W_{b,l,\iota} = 0, \quad (2.27c)$$

$$\operatorname{div}_h v_{b,l,\iota} + \partial_\eta W_{b,l,\iota} = 0, \quad (2.27d)$$

$$W_{b,l,\iota}|_{\eta=0,\iota} = 0, \quad (2.27e)$$

$$\text{in } \Omega_\iota := \mathbb{T}^2 \times (0, \iota). \quad (2.27f)$$

In particular, the approximating system (2.27) replaces the domain of system (2.17) with a compact channel Ω_ι and the far field condition (2.17f) with $W_{b,l,\iota}|_{\eta=\iota} = 0$. The well-posedness theory of system (2.27) is now classical. One can obtain proper uniform-in- ι estimates in some Sobolev space, H^k for instance. Then after sending $\iota \rightarrow \infty$, one can obtain the solution to system (2.17). We remark that the far field condition (2.17f) is recovered thanks to the decay-in- η property of H^k functions.

Nevertheless, we assume for the moment that system (2.17) is well-posed. Then sending $\eta \rightarrow \infty$ in (2.17a') and substituting (2.17f) yields that

$$\nabla_h \pi_{b,l} = - \int_0^\infty \nabla_h \theta_{b,l}(s) ds. \quad (2.28)$$

Therefore, (2.17a') can be reduced to

$$\partial_t v_{b,l} - \nabla_h \int_\eta^\infty \theta_{b,l}(s) ds = 0. \quad (2.17a')$$

Meanwhile, thanks to (2.17d) and (2.17e), (2.17c) can be written as

$$\partial_t \theta_{b,l} - \int_0^\eta \operatorname{div}_h v_{b,l}(s) ds = 0. \quad (2.17c')$$

It is easy to obtain the L^2 estimates of horizontal and time derivatives, i.e., for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\sum_{\partial \in \{\partial_x, \partial_y, \partial_t\}} \|\partial^k v_{b,l}, \partial^k \theta_{b,l}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2 \times (0, \infty))} \leq C_k$, for some $C_k \in (0, \infty)$, depending only on the initial data. On the other hand, after applying ∂_η^k to (2.17a') and (2.17c') and taking the L^2 -inner product of the

resultants with $2\partial_\eta^k v_{b,l}$ and $2\partial_\eta^k \theta_{b,l}$, respectively, summing up the estimates yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{dt} \|\partial_\eta^k v_{b,l}, \partial_\eta^k \theta_{b,l}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2 \times (0, \infty))}^2 \\
&= \int (-\nabla_h \partial_\eta^{k-1} \theta_{b,l} \cdot \partial_\eta^k v_{b,l} + \operatorname{div}_h \partial_\eta^{k-1} v_{b,l} \partial_\eta^k \theta_{b,l}) dx dy d\eta \\
&= \int \partial_\eta (\partial_\eta^{k-1} \theta_{b,l} \operatorname{div}_h \partial_\eta^{k-1} v_{b,l}) dx dy d\eta \tag{2.29} \\
&= - \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (\partial_\eta^{k-1} \theta_{b,l} \operatorname{div}_h \partial_\eta^{k-1} v_{b,l})|_{\eta=0} dx dy \\
&\leq \|\partial_\eta^{k-1} \theta_{b,l}|_{\eta=0}\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{T}^2)} \|\partial_\eta^{k-1} v_{b,l}|_{\eta=0}\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{T}^2)} \\
&\lesssim \|\theta_{b,l}\|_{H^k(\mathbb{T}^2 \times (0, \infty))} \|v_{b,l}\|_{H^k(\mathbb{T}^2 \times (0, \infty))}.
\end{aligned}$$

All other mixed-derivatives can be estimated in a similar way. The estimates of $W_{b,l}$ follows from (2.17c) and (2.17d). In conclusion, one can establish, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{n+m=k} \|\partial_t^m v_{b,l}(t), \partial_t^m \theta_{b,l}(t)\|_{H^n(\mathbb{T}^2 \times (0, \infty))} \\
&+ \sum_{n+m=k-1} \|\partial_t^m W_{b,l}(t), \partial_t^m \partial_\eta W_{b,l}(t)\|_{H^n(\mathbb{T}^2 \times (0, \infty))} \tag{2.30} \\
&\leq e^{C_k t} \sum_{n+m=k} \|\partial_t^m v_{b,l,\text{in}}, \partial_t^m \theta_{b,l,\text{in}}\|_{H^n(\mathbb{T}^2 \times (0, \infty))},
\end{aligned}$$

for some generic constant $C_k \in (0, \infty)$, depending only on k . Notice that, similarly to the Prandtl equations and the Hydrostatic Euler equations, (2.30) implies a loss of regularity of $W_{b,l}$ in the horizontal derivatives. This indicates that one should consider analytic initial data in the corresponding nonlinear problem.

2.3 Some physical remarks

The flow regime considered here corresponds to strongly stably stratified flow with stratification strength of the same order of magnitude throughout the troposphere. This is a typical situation found during night time under clear skies in the middle latitudes or even during the day in the polar regions. In the bulk of the troposphere, such stratification supports fast internal waves as discussed in the context of (1.1) above. In contrast, in the boundary layer it gives rise to slow gravity currents as described by the present boundary layer analysis.

A fully consistent solution of the bulk and boundary layer flows on the longer of the two time scales will require a systematic multiple time scale analysis, which we defer to future work. Nevertheless, we learn already from the present boundary layer equations that local heating from the ground – corresponding to non-homogeneous $\theta|_{z=0}$ – will not necessarily generate fast internal waves, but may merely induce slow near-ground motions if imposed on sufficiently slow time scales.

Note also that the present boundary layer regime is decidedly different from the recent triple-deck boundary layer extension of quasi-geostrophic / Ekman layer theory in [37]. The latter study addresses the coupling of quasi-geostrophic flow to boundary layers with arbitrary stratification (including neutral) as they arise, e.g., in the morning at mid-latitudes when thermal convection tends to dissolve stable stratifications that may have developed over night.

3 Boundary layer expansion: Formulation of non-linear equations

We return to system (1.1). In particular, we consider solutions to system (1.1) that consist of two parts: the internal bulk part and the boundary layer near $z = 0$. That is, we assume the following ansatz,

$$(v, w, \theta) = (v_p, w_p, \theta_p)(x, y, z, t) + (v_b, \varepsilon W_b, \theta_b)(x, y, \frac{z}{\varepsilon}, t) + \text{Err}, \quad (3.1)$$

with the following assumptions

H1) (v_p, w_p, θ_p) satisfies (1.2);

H2) $\lim_{\eta \rightarrow +\infty} (v_b, \theta_b)(x, y, \eta, t) = 0$;

H3) $\text{Err} \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$.

Meanwhile, we denote by

$$p = p_p(x, y, z, t) + \varepsilon p_b(x, y, \frac{z}{\varepsilon}, t). \quad (3.2)$$

We remark that **H1)–H3)** are important assumptions to formally derive the boundary layer equations. To justify (3.1), one need to prove **H3)**. However, for the moment, we leave such issues for later. Also, we will not present the boundary layer near $z = 1$, which has the same structure as the one near $z = 0$ and is omitted for the sake of presentation.

Then, the internal bulk system reads, in Ω ,

$$\partial_t v_p + v_p \cdot \nabla_h v_p + w_p \partial_z v_p + \frac{\nabla_h p_p}{\varepsilon} = 0, \quad (3.3a)$$

$$\partial_t w_p + v_p \cdot \nabla_h w_p + w_p \partial_z w_p + \frac{\partial_z p_p}{\varepsilon} - \frac{\theta_p}{\varepsilon} = 0, \quad (3.3b)$$

$$\partial_t \theta_p + v_p \cdot \nabla_h \theta_p + w_p \partial_z \theta_p + \frac{w_p}{\varepsilon} = 0, \quad (3.3c)$$

$$\operatorname{div}_h v_p + \partial_z w_p = 0, \quad (3.3d)$$

with

$$\partial_z^{2k} \theta_p = \partial_z^{2k} w_p = \partial_z^{2k+1} v_p = 0, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \text{on} \quad \{z = 0, 1\}, \quad (3.3e)$$

We remind readers that the boundary condition of system (3.3) is the same as in (1.1e), and (3.3e) is invariant as proved in [19].

Meanwhile, to obtain the boundary layer equations, after substituting (3.1) and (3.2) in system (1.1), one can write down the equations in the coordinate $(x, y, \eta := \frac{z}{\varepsilon}, t) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \times [0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)$. That is,

$$\partial_t v_b + (v_p|_{z=0} + v_b) \cdot \nabla_h v_b + v_b \cdot \nabla_h v_p|_{z=0} + W_b \partial_\eta v_b + \nabla_h p_b = 0, \quad (3.4a)$$

$$\partial_\eta p_b - \theta_b = 0, \quad (3.4b)$$

$$\partial_t \theta_b + (v_p|_{z=0} + v_b) \cdot \nabla_h \theta_b + W_b \partial_\eta \theta_b + W_b = 0, \quad (3.4c)$$

$$\operatorname{div}_h v_b + \partial_\eta W_b = 0, \quad (3.4d)$$

where the bulk variables are valued at the boundary, i.e., $z = 0$, the trace of system (3.3) at $z = 0$ is used, and the Err and $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ terms are omitted.

The main goal of this paper is to investigate the well-posedness of the boundary layer system 3.4. This will be done in the next section.

4 Well-posedness theory of the boundary layer equations, i.e., (3.4)

In this section, we will investigate the well-posedness of the boundary layer equations, i.e., (3.4), arising from the boundary layer expansion in section 3. For this purpose, throughout this section, we assume that $v_p|_{z=0}$ is given, bounded in X^{s+1} , $s \geq 3$, defined in (4.9), below.

To simplify the notation, by denoting

$$v = v_b, \quad w = W_b, \quad p = p_b, \quad \theta = \theta_b, \quad \text{and} \quad V = v_p|_{z=0}, \quad (4.1)$$

we rewrite system (3.4) as

$$\partial_t v + (V + v) \cdot \nabla_h v + w \partial_\eta v + v \cdot \nabla_h V + \nabla_h p = 0, \quad (4.2a)$$

$$\partial_\eta p - \theta = 0, \quad (4.2b)$$

$$\partial_t \theta + (V + v) \cdot \nabla_h \theta + w \partial_\eta \theta + w = 0, \quad (4.2c)$$

$$\operatorname{div}_h v + \partial_\eta w = 0, \quad (4.2d)$$

with

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow \infty} (v, \theta)(x, y, \eta, t) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad w|_{\eta=0} = 0. \quad (4.2e)$$

Before we continue, we would like to point out the difficulty of studying the well-posedness of solutions to system (4.2). First, the same difficulty as the linear system (2.17) as discussed in section 2.2 is still present in the nonlinear system (4.2). That is, the possible overdetermination of $\lim_{\eta \rightarrow \infty} w = 0$ due to (4.2e) and (4.2c). As in system (2.27), this should be resolved by introducing an ι -approximating, hydrostatic system in domain with finite depth. Then similar to (2.29) and (2.30), this shall enable uniform-in- ι H^s estimates for some $s \in \mathbb{Z}$. However, due to the nonlinearity, in particular, the vertical transport terms $w \partial_\eta v$ and $w \partial_\eta \theta$, two problems may arise:

1. Loss of horizontal regularity;
2. Loss of boundedness of w .

Both these problems are due to the fact that the vertical velocity w is recovered through integral in the η -variable of the incompressible condition (4.2d), i.e., $w = -\int_0^\eta \operatorname{div}_h v(s) ds$. While the first problem can be resolved by considering analytic-in- $\vec{x}_h = (x, y)$ regularity of the solutions, the second problem is usually overcome by introducing decay in η , or equivalently, a η -weighted norm of the solutions. One can observe that, from the linear structure (2.17a') and (2.17c'), any algebraic decay in η cannot be balanced in the equations thanks to the non-local internal wave terms, i.e., $\nabla_h \int_\eta^\infty \theta_{b,l}(s) ds$ and $\int_0^\eta \operatorname{div}_h v_{b,l}(s) ds$. Therefore a natural strategy is to consider exponential decay in η . However, one can at most obtain algebraic decay in ι of the pressure $\pi_{b,l,\iota}$ in the ι -approximating system (2.27) (similarly in the corresponding nonlinear system). This is thanks to (2.27a), (2.27a), (2.27d), and (2.27e), that

$$\Delta_h \pi_{b,l,\iota} = -\frac{1}{\iota} \int_0^\iota \int_0^\eta \Delta_h \theta_{b,l,\iota}(s) ds d\eta. \quad (4.3)$$

This makes it almost impossible to obtain uniform-in- ι estimates of solutions with exponential decay in η to the ι -approximating system.

To circumvent these problems, our strategy is the following:

- Step 1. Introducing an ι -approximating, hydrostatic system with frozen transport speed, and obtaining the uniform-in- ι H^s estimates;
- Step 2. Sending $\iota \rightarrow \infty$, and obtaining a solution to the system in Ω^+ without the pressure term;
- Step 3. Using fixed point arguments in functional space with analyticity and exponential decay in η to obtain solutions to system (4.2).

We would like to point out that 1. the same difficulties do not exist in the study of the Prandtl equations, since there is no possible overdetermination as in (2.26) in the Prandtl equations; 2. thanks to the study of Euler equations in the Eulerian and Lagrangian coordinates in [14], even though the loss of regularity only appears in the horizontal variables, it is unlikely to obtain well-posedness in the anisotropic analytic space.

4.1 The ι -approximating system with frozen transport speed and uniform-in- ι estimates

As mentioned before, we shall introduce the ι -approximating system with frozen transport speed in this section. Similar to system (2.27), we consider the following system of equations: in $\Omega_\iota \times \{t \geq 0\}$ with $\Omega_\iota := \mathbb{T}^2 \times (0, \iota) = \{(\vec{x}_h, \eta) | \vec{x}_h = (x, y) \in \mathbb{T}^2, \eta \in (0, \iota)\}$ and $\iota > 0$,

$$\partial_t v_\iota + (V + v_\iota^\circ) \cdot \nabla_h v_\iota + w_\iota^\circ \partial_\eta v_\iota + v_\iota \cdot \nabla_h V + \nabla_h p_\iota = 0, \quad (4.4a)$$

$$\partial_\eta p_\iota - \theta_\iota = 0, \quad (4.4b)$$

$$\partial_t \theta_\iota + (V + v_\iota^\circ) \cdot \nabla_h \theta_\iota + w_\iota^\circ \partial_\eta \theta_\iota + w_\iota = 0, \quad (4.4c)$$

$$\operatorname{div}_h v_\iota + \partial_\eta w_\iota = 0, \quad (4.4d)$$

with

$$w_\iota|_{\eta=0, \iota} = 0. \quad (4.4e)$$

Here, $(v_\iota^\circ, w_\iota^\circ)$ is given and satisfies

$$\operatorname{div}_h v_\iota^\circ + \partial_\eta w_\iota^\circ = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad w_\iota^\circ|_{\eta=0, \iota} = 0. \quad (4.5)$$

We remind readers that $V = V(x, y, t)$ is the trace of the internal bulk flow and is assumed to be given.

Moreover, by writing

$$\pi_\iota(\vec{x}_h) := p_\iota(\vec{x}_h, \eta) - \int_0^\eta \theta_\iota(\vec{x}_h, s) ds, \quad (4.6)$$

(4.4a) and (4.4b) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t v_\iota + (V + v_\iota^\circ) \cdot \nabla_h v_\iota + w_\iota^\circ \partial_\eta v_\iota + v_\iota \cdot \nabla_h V + \nabla_h \pi_\iota \\ + \int_0^\eta \nabla_h \theta_\iota(s) ds = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (4.4a')$$

$$\text{and} \quad \partial_\eta \pi_\iota = 0. \quad (4.4b')$$

In addition, (4.4e) and (4.4d) imply that

$$w_\iota(\eta) = - \int_0^\eta \operatorname{div}_h v_\iota(s) ds = \int_\eta^\iota \operatorname{div}_h v_\iota(s) ds, \quad (4.7)$$

and

$$\int_0^\iota \operatorname{div}_h v_\iota(s) ds = 0. \quad (4.8)$$

Next, we shall obtain the uniform-in- ι estimates of solutions to system (4.4). Let $s \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ be any positive integer, and consider the functional space

$$X^s = X_t^s := \{f = f(x, y, \eta, t) | f \in H^s(\Omega_\iota), \partial_t f \in H^{s-1}(\Omega_\iota)\} \quad (4.9)$$

and the associated X^s norm

$$\|f(t)\|_{X^s} := \sqrt{\|f(t)\|_{H^s(\Omega_\iota)}^2 + \|\partial_t f(t)\|_{H^{s-1}(\Omega_\iota)}^2}. \quad (4.10)$$

Let $\partial_h \in \{\partial_x, \partial_y\}$ and $\partial \in \{\partial_t, \partial_x, \partial_y, \partial_\eta\}$. For any multi-index $\mathbf{s} = (s_0, s_1, s_2)$ with $s_0 \in \{0, 1\}$, $s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, and $|\mathbf{s}| = s_0 + s_1 + s_2 \leq s$, denote by

$$\partial^{\mathbf{s}} := \partial_\eta^{s_2} \partial_h^{s_1} \partial_t^{s_0}. \quad (4.11)$$

In addition, we also denote the L^2 -inner product by

$$\langle f, g \rangle := \int_{\Omega_\iota} f \cdot g dx dy d\eta. \quad (4.12)$$

Then after applying ∂^s to (4.4a') and (4.4c) and taking the L^2 -inner product of the resultant equations with $2\partial^s v_\iota$ and $2\partial^s \theta_\iota$, thanks to (4.5), one arrives at

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt} \|\partial^s v_\iota, \partial^s \theta_\iota\|_{L^2(\Omega_\iota)}^2 &= \underbrace{2\langle \partial^s \pi_\iota, \operatorname{div}_h \partial^s v_\iota \rangle}_{=:I_1} \\
&\quad - \underbrace{2\langle \partial^s \int_0^\eta \nabla_h \theta_\iota(s) ds, \partial^s v_\iota \rangle - 2\langle \partial^s w_\iota, \partial^s \theta_\iota \rangle}_{=:I_2} \\
&\quad - \underbrace{\sum_{f \in \{v_\iota, \theta_\iota\}} 2\langle \partial^s [(V + v_\iota^\circ) \cdot \nabla_h f] - (V + v_\iota^\circ) \cdot \nabla_h \partial^s f, \partial^s f \rangle}_{=:I_3} \\
&\quad - \underbrace{\sum_{f \in \{v_\iota, \theta_\iota\}} 2\langle \partial^s (w_\iota^\circ \partial_\eta f) - w_\iota^\circ \partial_\eta \partial^s f, \partial^s f \rangle}_{=:I_4} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\int \operatorname{div}_h V |\partial^s v_\iota|^2 dx dy d\eta - 2\langle \partial^s (v_\iota \cdot \nabla_h V), \partial^s v_\iota \rangle}_{=:I_5}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

Now we estimate the right hand side of (4.13). For I_1 , thanks to (4.4b'), $I_1 = 0$ if $s_2 > 0$. Otherwise, substituting (4.8) yields $I_1 = 0$.

To calculate I_2 , when $s_2 = 0$, applying integration by parts yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &= 2\langle \int_0^\eta \partial^s \theta_\iota(s) ds, \partial^s \operatorname{div}_h v_\iota \rangle - 2\langle \partial^s w_\iota, \partial^s \theta_\iota \rangle \\
&= -2\langle \int_0^\eta \partial^s \theta_\iota(s) ds, \partial^s \partial_\eta w_\iota \rangle - 2\langle \partial^s w_\iota, \partial^s \theta_\iota \rangle \\
&= 2\langle \partial^s \theta_\iota, \partial^s w_\iota \rangle - 2\langle \partial^s w_\iota, \partial^s \theta_\iota \rangle = 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

thanks to (4.4d) and (4.4e). Otherwise, when $s_2 > 0$, one has that

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &= -2\langle \nabla_h \partial_\eta^{s_2-1} \partial_h^{s_1} \partial_t^{s_0} \theta_\iota, \partial^s v_\iota \rangle - 2\langle \partial_\eta^{s_2-1} \partial_h^{s_1} \partial_t^{s_0} \partial_\eta w_\iota, \partial^s \theta_\iota \rangle \\
&= 2\langle \partial_\eta^{s_2-1} \partial_h^{s_1} \partial_t^{s_0} \theta_\iota, \partial^s \operatorname{div}_h v_\iota \rangle + 2\langle \partial_\eta^{s_2-1} \partial_h^{s_1} \partial_t^{s_0} \operatorname{div}_h v_\iota, \partial^s \theta_\iota \rangle \\
&= 2 \int_{\Omega_\iota} \partial_\eta (\partial_\eta^{s_2-1} \partial_h^{s_1} \partial_t^{s_0} \theta_\iota \cdot \partial_\eta^{s_2-1} \partial_h^{s_1} \partial_t^{s_0} \operatorname{div}_h v_\iota) dx dy d\eta \\
&= 2 \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (\partial_\eta^{s_2-1} \partial_h^{s_1} \partial_t^{s_0} \theta_\iota \cdot \partial_\eta^{s_2-1} \partial_h^{s_1} \partial_t^{s_0} \operatorname{div}_h v_\iota)(\eta) \Big|_0^\iota dx dy \\
&\lesssim \sum_{\eta=0,\iota} \|\partial_\eta^{s_2-1} \partial_h^{s_1} \partial_t^{s_0} \theta_\iota(\eta)\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{T}^2)} \|\partial_\eta^{s_2-1} \partial_h^{s_1} \partial_t^{s_0} v_\iota(\eta)\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{T}^2)} \\
&\lesssim \|\theta_\iota\|_{X^s} \|v_\iota\|_{X^s}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

Applying Leibniz's rule to I_3 and I_4 implies

$$\begin{aligned}
I_3 + I_4 &\lesssim \left\{ \sum_{f \in \{v_\iota, \theta_\iota\}} \|\partial V, \partial v_\iota^\circ, \partial w_\iota^\circ\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_\iota)} \|\partial^{s-1} \nabla_h f, \partial^{s-1} \partial_\eta f\|_{L^2(\Omega_\iota)} \right. \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{f \in \{v_\iota, \theta_\iota\} \\ 2 \leq l \leq s-1}} \|\partial^l V, \partial^l v_\iota^\circ, \partial^l w_\iota^\circ\|_{L^4(\Omega_\iota)} \|\partial^{s-l} \nabla_h f, \partial^{s-l} \partial_\eta f\|_{L^4(\Omega_\iota)} \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{f \in \{v_\iota, \theta_\iota\}} \|\partial^s V, \partial^s v_\iota^\circ, \partial^s w_\iota^\circ\|_{L^2(\Omega_\iota)} \|\nabla_h f, \partial_\eta f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_\iota)} \right\} \\
&\quad \times \|\partial^s v_\iota, \partial^s \theta_\iota\|_{L^2(\Omega_\iota)} \lesssim \|V, v_\iota^\circ, w_\iota^\circ\|_{X^s} \|v_\iota, \theta_\iota\|_{X^s}^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

provided $s \geq 3$.

Last but not least, directly calculation shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
I_5 &\lesssim \|\nabla_h V\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_\iota)} \|\partial^s v_\iota\|_{L^2(\Omega_\iota)}^2 \\
&\quad + \sum_{1 \leq l \leq s-1} \|\partial^{s-l} v_\iota\|_{L^4(\Omega_\iota)} \|\nabla_h \partial^l V\|_{L^4(\Omega_\iota)} \|\partial^s v_\iota\|_{L^2(\Omega_\iota)} \\
&\quad + \|v_\iota\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_\iota)} \|\nabla_h \partial^s V\|_{L^2(\Omega_\iota)} \|\partial^s v_\iota\|_{L^2(\Omega_\iota)} \\
&\lesssim \|V\|_{X^{s+1}} \|v_\iota\|_{X^s}^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

provided $s \geq 2$.

In summary, from (4.13), one can conclude from the estimates above that, for any $s \geq 3$,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|v_\iota, \theta_\iota\|_{X^s}^2 \leq C_s (1 + \|V\|_{X^{s+1}} + \|v_\iota^\circ, w_\iota^\circ\|_{X^s}) \times \|v_\iota, \theta_\iota\|_{X^s}^2, \tag{4.18}$$

with some constant $C_s \in (0, \infty)$ independent of ι .

To finish this subsection, let $\Omega^+ := \mathbb{T}^2 \times (0, \infty)$. For f defined in Ω_ι , we trivially extend f to Ω_+ by zero in Ω^+/Ω_ι . Using such notations, we choose v_ι° and w_ι° such that,

$$\begin{aligned}
v_\iota^\circ &\rightarrow v^\circ \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0, \infty; H^s(\Omega_+)) \cap H^1(0, \infty; H^{s-1}(\Omega_+)), \\
\text{and } w_\iota^\circ &\rightarrow w^\circ \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0, \infty; H^s(\Omega_+)) \cap H^1(0, \infty; H^{s-1}(\Omega_+)),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

for some $v^\circ, w^\circ \in L^\infty(0, \infty; H^s(\Omega_+)) \cap H^1(0, \infty; H^{s-1}(\Omega_+))$, and

$$\sup_{0 \leq t < \infty} \left(\|v_\iota^\circ(t), w_\iota^\circ(t)\|_{H^s(\Omega_+)} + \|\partial_t v_\iota^\circ(t), \partial_t w_\iota^\circ(t)\|_{H^{s-1}(\Omega_+)} \right) \leq C \tag{4.20}$$

for some constant $C \in (0, \infty)$, independent of ι . Then from (4.18), one can conclude that

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|v_\iota, \theta_\iota\|_{X^s}^2 \leq e^{Cs(1+\|V\|_{X^{s+1}+C})T} \times \|v_{\iota, \text{in}}, \theta_{\iota, \text{in}}\|_{X^s}^2, \quad (4.21)$$

for any $T \in (0, \infty)$ and C independent of ι , where $v_{\iota, \text{in}}$ and $\theta_{\iota, \text{in}}$ are the initial data for v_ι and θ_ι , respectively. Therefore, consider the initial data such that

$$\begin{aligned} (v_{\iota, \text{in}}, \theta_{\iota, \text{in}}) &\rightarrow (v_{\text{in}}, \theta_{\text{in}}) \quad \text{in } H^s(\Omega_+) \\ \text{and } (\partial_t v_{\iota, \text{in}}, \partial_t \theta_{\iota, \text{in}}) &\rightarrow (v_{\text{in}, 1}, \theta_{\text{in}, 1}) \quad \text{in } H^{s-1}(\Omega_+), \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

where $\partial_t v_{\iota, \text{in}}$ and $\partial_t \theta_{\iota, \text{in}}$ are defined by the equations (4.4a') and (4.4c), respectively, for some $v_{\text{in}}, \theta_{\text{in}} \in H^s(\Omega_+)$ and $v_{\text{in}, 1}, \theta_{\text{in}, 1} \in H^{s-1}(\Omega_+)$. Then similar bound as in (4.20) holds for $v_{\text{in}}, \theta_{\text{in}}, v_{\text{in}, 1}, \theta_{\text{in}, 1}$. In addition, $v^\circ, w^\circ, v_{\iota, \text{in}}$ satisfy the compatibility condition

$$\begin{aligned} \text{div}_h v^\circ + \partial_\eta w^\circ &= 0, \quad \int_0^\infty \text{div}_h v^\circ(\eta) d\eta = \int_0^\infty \text{div}_h v_{\iota, \text{in}}(\eta) d\eta = 0, \\ \text{and } w^\circ|_{\eta=0} &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

Therefore, we obtain a sequence of solutions (v_ι, θ_ι) to system (4.4) with uniform bounds in $L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(0, \infty; H^s(\Omega_+)) \cap H_{\text{loc}}^1(0, \infty; H^{s-1}(\Omega_+))$.

With such uniform bound, by choosing subsequences if necessary, we obtain a solution to the following system: in $\Omega_+ \times \{t \geq 0\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t v + (V + v^\circ) \cdot \nabla_h v + w^\circ \partial_\eta v + v \cdot \nabla_h V + \nabla_h \pi \\ + \int_0^\eta \nabla_h \theta(s) ds &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (4.24a)$$

$$\partial_\eta \pi = 0, \quad (4.24b)$$

$$\partial_t \theta + (V + v^\circ) \cdot \nabla_h \theta + w^\circ \partial_\eta \theta + w = 0, \quad (4.24c)$$

$$\text{div}_h v + \partial_\eta w = 0, \quad (4.24d)$$

with

$$w|_{\eta=0} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_0^\infty \text{div}_h v(\eta) d\eta = 0. \quad (4.24e)$$

Moreover, (v, θ) satisfies, for any $s \geq 3$,

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left(\|v(t), \theta(t)\|_{H^s(\Omega_+)} + \|\partial_t v(t), \partial_t \theta(t)\|_{H^{s-1}(\Omega_+)} \right) \leq C_T, \quad (4.25)$$

for some C_T depending only on T, v^o, w^o, V , and the initial data. Consequently, one has that

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow \infty} (v, \theta) = 0. \quad (4.26)$$

It is easy to verify that, from (4.24a) and (4.24b),

$$\nabla_h \pi = - \int_0^1 \left(\partial_t v + (V + v^o) \cdot \nabla_h v + w^o \partial_\eta v + v \cdot \nabla_h V + \int_0^\eta \nabla_h \theta(s) ds \right) d\eta \quad (4.27)$$

is bounded in $H^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}^2)$ for a.e. $t \in (0, T)$. Therefore, one can send $\eta \rightarrow \infty$ in (4.24a), and conclude that

$$\int_0^\infty \nabla_h \theta(s) ds \in H^{s-3/2}(\mathbb{T}^2), \quad a.e. t \in (0, T). \quad (4.28)$$

After applying dominate convergence theorem to $h_\eta(x, y) := \nabla_h \pi(x, y) + \int_0^\eta \nabla_h \theta(x, y, s) ds$ as $\eta \rightarrow \infty$, one can obtain that

$$\nabla_h \pi = - \int_0^\infty \nabla_h \theta(s) ds \quad (4.29)$$

and therefore (4.24a) can be written as

$$\partial_t v + (V + v^o) \cdot \nabla_h v + w^o \partial_\eta v + v \cdot \nabla_h V - \int_\eta^\infty \nabla_h \theta(s) ds = 0. \quad (4.24a')$$

Now we have obtained an iteration scheme, i.e., (4.24), from which we shall construct a contraction mapping from (v^o, θ^o) to (v, θ) in the next subsection. The fixed point obtained by such an iteration will be the unique solution to the boundary layer system (4.2).

4.2 The contraction mapping

For the sake of clear presentation, we will assume $V \equiv 0$ in this section. The general case when $V \neq 0$ follows easily with proper modification.

4.2.1 Preliminaries and the main theorem

As mentioned before, due to the loss of regularity in the horizontal directions, we shall consider solutions to system (4.2), and system (4.24) in the analytic functional space. Our choice of the analytic norm should capture the following two characteristics of the systems:

1. the boundedness of w and w^o ;
2. the boundedness of $\int_{\eta}^{\infty} \nabla_h \theta(s) ds$.

A natural candidate is to consider (v, θ) such that $(v(\eta), \theta(\eta)) \simeq e^{-\beta\eta}$ for any $\beta > 0$, i.e., exponential decay in the η -variable. Under this assumption, one will have that $e^{\beta\eta} \int_{\eta}^{\infty} \nabla_h \theta(s) ds$ is uniformly bounded with respect to the η -variable.

Owing to the observation above, we consider the following analytic norm: For any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $d > 0$, denote by

$$|g|_{d,m} := \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \sup_{\eta \geq 0} e^{d\eta} \|\partial^{\alpha} g(\eta)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} = \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \|e^{d\eta} \partial^{\alpha} g\|_{L_{\eta}^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^+, L_{x,y}^2(\mathbb{T}^2))} \quad (4.30)$$

for multi-index $\alpha := (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$. Here

$$\partial^{\alpha} g = \partial_x^{\alpha_1} \partial_y^{\alpha_2} \partial_{\eta}^{\alpha_3} g. \quad (4.31)$$

Then for $r \geq 0$ and $\tau > 0$, we define the space of real-analytic functions as

$$X_{\tau} := \left\{ v, \theta \in C^{\infty}(\Omega) : \int_0^{\infty} \operatorname{div}_h v(\eta) d\eta = 0, \|v, \theta\|_{X_{\tau}} < \infty \right\}, \quad (4.32)$$

where

$$\|v, \theta\|_{X_{\tau}} := \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} |v, \theta|_{d,m} \frac{(m+1)^r \tau^m}{m!}. \quad (4.33)$$

We have used and will use the notations $\|v, \theta\|_X = \|v\|_X + \|\theta\|_X$ and $|v, \theta|_X = |v|_X + |\theta|_X$ to denote semi-norms and norms of many functions. similarly, denote by

$$Y_{\tau} := \left\{ v, \theta \in X_{\tau}(\Omega) : \|v, \theta\|_{Y_{\tau}} < \infty \right\}, \quad (4.34)$$

where

$$\|v, \theta\|_{Y_{\tau}} := \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} |v, \theta|_{d,m} \frac{(m+1)^r \tau^{m-1}}{(m-1)!}. \quad (4.35)$$

With the notations above, we can now state the main theorem of this paper in full details as follows:

Theorem 4.1. *For $r \geq 2$, there exists a unique solution $(v, \theta) \in L^{\infty}(0, T; X_{\tau(t)}) \cap L^1(0, T; Y_{\tau(t)})$ to the boundary layer system (4.2), with τ determined by (4.63) and $\tau(t=0) = \tau_0 > 0$. Here $T > 0$ depends on $\tau_0 > 0$ and $\|v_{\text{in}}, \theta_{\text{in}}\|_{X_{\tau_0}}$. See (4.67) for the precise estimates.*

Here, $r \geq 2$ is to ensure the inequalities (4.43), (4.47), (4.54), and (4.57), below, hold.

4.2.2 Boundedness estimate

After applying ∂^α to (4.24a') and (4.24c) and taking the L^2 -inner product in the horizontal variables (x, y) with $\partial^\alpha v$ and $\partial^\alpha \theta$, respectively, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\partial^\alpha v(\eta), \partial^\alpha \theta(\eta)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)}^2 &= - \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \partial^\alpha (v^\circ \cdot \nabla_h v + w^\circ \partial_\eta v) \cdot \partial^\alpha v \, dx dy \\
&\quad - \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \partial^\alpha (v^\circ \cdot \nabla_h \theta + w^\circ \partial_\eta \theta) \times \partial^\alpha \theta \, dx dy \\
&\quad + \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \left(\partial^\alpha \int_\eta^\infty \nabla_h \theta(s) \, ds \cdot \partial^\alpha v - \partial^\alpha w \times \partial^\alpha \theta \right) \, dx dy \\
&\leq \sum_{f=v, \theta} \|\partial^\alpha (v^\circ \cdot \nabla_h f + w^\circ \partial_\eta f)(\eta)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \times \|\partial^\alpha v(\eta), \partial^\alpha \theta(\eta)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \\
&\quad + \|\partial^\alpha \int_\eta^\infty \nabla_h \theta(s) \, ds, \partial^\alpha w(\eta)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \times \|\partial^\alpha v(\eta), \partial^\alpha \theta(\eta)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.36}$$

Therefore, one can write down, from (4.30), (4.33), and (4.35), that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt} \|v, \theta\|_{X_\tau} &\leq \dot{\tau} \|v, \theta\|_{Y_\tau} + \sum_{f=v, \theta} \left(\|v^\circ \cdot \nabla_h f\|_{X_\tau} + \|w^\circ \partial_\eta f\|_{X_\tau} \right) \\
&\quad + \left\| \int_\eta^\infty \nabla_h \theta(s) \, ds, w \right\|_{X_\tau}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.37}$$

Now we estimate the right hand side of (4.37).

Estimate of $\|v^\circ \cdot \nabla_h f\|_{X_\tau}$ Applying Leibniz's rule and triangle inequality of the $L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)$ -norm, one has that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|v^\circ \cdot \nabla_h f\|_{X_\tau} &\leq \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{\beta \leq \alpha \\ |\alpha|=m}} \binom{\alpha}{\beta} \sup_{\eta \geq 0} e^{d\eta} \|\partial^\beta v^\circ \cdot \nabla_h \partial^{\alpha-\beta} f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \frac{(m+1)^r \tau^m}{m!} \\
&= \underbrace{\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{[m/2]} \sum_{\substack{\beta \leq \alpha, |\beta|=j \\ |\alpha|=m}} \binom{\alpha}{\beta} \sup_{\eta \geq 0} e^{d\eta} \|\partial^\beta v^\circ \cdot \nabla_h \partial^{\alpha-\beta} f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \frac{(m+1)^r \tau^m}{m!}}_{=: \mathcal{U}_{\text{low}}} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=[m/2]+1}^m \sum_{\substack{\beta \leq \alpha, |\beta|=j \\ |\alpha|=m}} \binom{\alpha}{\beta} \sup_{\eta \geq 0} e^{d\eta} \|\partial^\beta v^\circ \cdot \nabla_h \partial^{\alpha-\beta} f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \frac{(m+1)^r \tau^m}{m!}}_{=: \mathcal{U}_{\text{high}}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.38}$$

In the case when $0 \leq |\beta| \leq |\alpha - \beta|$, applying the two-dimensional Agmon inequality leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\partial^\beta v^\circ \cdot \nabla_h \partial^{\alpha-\beta} f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} &\leq C \|\partial^\beta v^\circ\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^2)} \|\nabla_h \partial^{\alpha-\beta} f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \\
&\leq C \|\partial^\beta v^\circ\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)}^{1/2} \|\Delta_h \partial^\beta v^\circ\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)}^{1/2} \|\nabla_h \partial^{\alpha-\beta} f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \\
&\quad + C \|\partial^\beta v^\circ\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \|\nabla_h \partial^{\alpha-\beta} f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.39}$$

Notice that, for $\beta \leq \alpha$, it holds $|\alpha - \beta| = |\alpha| - |\beta|$, and

$$\binom{\alpha}{\beta} \leq \binom{|\alpha|}{|\beta|} \quad \text{as well as} \quad \sum_{\substack{\beta \leq \alpha, |\beta|=j \\ |\alpha|=m}} a_\beta b_{\alpha-\beta} = \sum_{|\beta|=j} a_\beta \times \sum_{|\gamma|=m-j} b_\gamma. \tag{4.40}$$

Therefore, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{U}_{\text{low}} &\leq C \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{[m/2]} \sum_{\substack{\beta \leq \alpha, |\beta|=j \\ |\alpha|=m}} \sup_{\eta \geq 0} e^{d\eta} \left\{ \binom{\alpha}{\beta} \|\partial^\beta v^\circ\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)}^{1/2} \|\Delta_h \partial^\beta v^\circ\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)}^{1/2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \|\nabla_h \partial^{\alpha-\beta} f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \frac{(m+1)^r \tau^m}{m!} \right\} \\
&\quad + C \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{[m/2]} \sum_{\substack{\beta \leq \alpha, |\beta|=j \\ |\alpha|=m}} \sup_{\eta \geq 0} e^{d\eta} \left\{ \binom{\alpha}{\beta} \|\partial^\beta v^\circ\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \|\nabla_h \partial^{\alpha-\beta} f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \frac{(m+1)^r \tau^m}{m!} \right\} \\
&\leq C \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{[m/2]} |v^\circ|_{d,j}^{1/2} |v^\circ|_{d,j+2}^{1/2} |f|_{d,m-j+1} \binom{m}{j} \frac{(m+1)^r \tau^m}{m!} \\
&\quad + C \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{[m/2]} |v^\circ|_{d,j} |f|_{d,m-j+1} \binom{m}{j} \frac{(m+1)^r \tau^m}{m!},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.41}$$

where we have applied, thanks to (4.40) and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\substack{\beta \leq \alpha, |\beta|=j \\ |\alpha|=m}} \binom{\alpha}{\beta} \|\partial^\beta v^\circ\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)}^{1/2} \|\Delta_h \partial^\beta v^\circ\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)}^{1/2} \|\nabla_h \partial^{\alpha-\beta} f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \\
\leq & \binom{m}{j} \left(\sum_{|\beta|=j} \|\partial^\beta v^\circ\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{|\beta|=j} \|\Delta_h \partial^\beta v^\circ\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \right)^{1/2} \sum_{|\gamma|=m-j} \|\nabla_h \partial^\gamma f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)}, \\
& \text{and} \\
& \sum_{\substack{\beta \leq \alpha, |\beta|=j \\ |\alpha|=m}} \binom{\alpha}{\beta} \|\partial^\beta v^\circ\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \|\nabla_h \partial^{\alpha-\beta} f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \\
\leq & \binom{m}{j} \sum_{|\beta|=j} \|\partial^\beta v^\circ\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \times \sum_{|\beta|=m-j} \|\nabla_h \partial^\beta f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)}. \tag{4.42}
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, for $m \geq 0, 0 \leq j \leq [m/2], r \geq 1$, one can verify the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \binom{m}{j} \frac{(m+1)^r}{m!} \frac{(m-j)!}{(m-j+2)^r} \frac{j^{1/2}(j+2)!^{1/2}}{(j+1)^{r/2}(j+3)^{r/2}} \\
& = \frac{(m+1)^r}{(m-j+2)^r} \frac{(j+1)^{1/2}(j+2)^{1/2}}{(j+1)^{r/2}(j+3)^{r/2}} \leq C, \tag{4.43}
\end{aligned}$$

for some constant C independent of m, j, r . Thus \mathcal{U}_{low} from (4.41) can be further estimated as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{U}_{\text{low}} & \leq C \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{[m/2]} \left(|v^\circ|_{d,j} \frac{(j+1)^r \tau^j}{j!} \right)^{1/2} \left(|v^\circ|_{d,j+2} \frac{(j+3)^r \tau^{j+2}}{(j+2)!} \right)^{1/2} \\
& \quad \times \left(|f|_{d,m-j+1} \frac{(m-j+2)^r \tau^{m-j}}{(m-j)!} \right) \tau^{-1} \\
& \quad + C \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{[m/2]} \left(|v^\circ|_{d,j} \frac{(j+1)^r \tau^j}{j!} \right) \left(|f|_{d,m-j+1} \frac{(m-j+2)^r \tau^{m-j}}{(m-j)!} \right) \\
& \leq C(1 + \tau^{-1}) \|v^\circ\|_{X_\tau} \|f\|_{Y_\tau}, \tag{4.44}
\end{aligned}$$

where we apply the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality in the last inequality.

On the other hand, in the case when $|\alpha - \beta| < |\beta| \leq |\alpha|$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial^\beta v^\circ \cdot \nabla_h \partial^{\alpha-\beta} f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} &\leq C \|\partial^\beta v^\circ\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \|\nabla_h \partial^{\alpha-\beta} f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^2)} \\ &\leq C \|\partial^\beta v^\circ\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \|\nabla_h \partial^{\alpha-\beta} f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)}^{1/2} \|\Delta_h \nabla_h \partial^{\alpha-\beta} f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)}^{1/2} \\ &\quad + C \|\partial^\beta v^\circ\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \|\nabla_h \partial^{\alpha-\beta} f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.45)$$

Then following similar arguments as above yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_{\text{high}} &\leq C \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=[m/2]+1}^m |v^\circ|_{d,j} |f|_{d,m-j+1}^{1/2} |f|_{d,m-j+3}^{1/2} \binom{m}{j} \frac{(m+1)^r \tau^m}{m!} \\ &\quad + C \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=[m/2]+1}^m |v^\circ|_{d,j} |f|_{d,m-j+1} \binom{m}{j} \frac{(m+1)^r \tau^m}{m!} \\ &\leq C(1 + \tau^{-1}) \|v^\circ\|_{X_\tau} \|f\|_{Y_\tau}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.46)$$

where the following inequality is applied:

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{m}{j} \frac{(m+1)^r}{m!} \frac{j!}{(j+1)^r} \frac{(m-j)!^{1/2} (m-j+2)!^{1/2}}{(m-j+2)^{r/2} (m-j+4)^{r/2}} \\ = \frac{(m+1)^r}{(j+1)^r} \frac{(m-j+1)^{1/2} (m-j+2)^{1/2}}{(m-j+2)^{r/2} (m-j+4)^{r/2}} \leq C, \end{aligned} \quad (4.47)$$

for $m \geq 0$, $[m/2] + 1 \leq j \leq m$, $r \geq 1$.

In summary, (4.44) and (4.46) yields

$$\sum_{f=v,\theta} \|v^\circ \cdot \nabla_h f\|_{X_\tau} \leq C(1 + \tau^{-1}) \|v^\circ\|_{X_\tau} \|v, \theta\|_{Y_\tau}. \quad (4.48)$$

Estimate of $\|w^\circ \partial_\eta f\|_{X_\tau}$ As before, applying Leibniz's rule and triangle

inequality of the $L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)$ -norm, one has that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|w^\circ \partial_\eta f\|_{X_\tau} &\leq \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{\beta \leq \alpha \\ |\alpha|=m}} \binom{\alpha}{\beta} \sup_{\eta \geq 0} e^{d\eta} \|w^\circ \partial_\eta f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \frac{(m+1)^r \tau^m}{m!} \\
&= \underbrace{\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor m/2 \rfloor} \sum_{\substack{\beta \leq \alpha, |\beta|=j \\ |\alpha|=m}} \binom{\alpha}{\beta} \sup_{\eta \geq 0} e^{d\eta} \|w^\circ \partial_\eta f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \frac{(m+1)^r \tau^m}{m!}}_{=: \mathcal{V}_{\text{low}}} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=\lfloor m/2 \rfloor + 1}^m \sum_{\substack{\beta \leq \alpha, |\beta|=j \\ |\alpha|=m}} \binom{\alpha}{\beta} \sup_{\eta \geq 0} e^{d\eta} \|w^\circ \partial_\eta f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \frac{(m+1)^r \tau^m}{m!}}_{=: \mathcal{V}_{\text{high}}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.49}$$

To handle w° , we need to capture the decay-in- η of v° . Indeed, thanks to (4.23), one can write

$$w^\circ(\eta) = \int_0^\eta \partial_\eta w^\circ(s) ds = - \int_0^\eta \operatorname{div}_h v^\circ(s) ds = \int_\eta^\infty \operatorname{div}_h v^\circ(s) ds. \tag{4.50}$$

Therefore, for $\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2, 0)$, one has

$$\|\partial^\beta w^\circ(\eta)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \leq \frac{e^{-d\eta}}{d} \sup_{s \geq 0} e^{ds} \|\partial^\beta \operatorname{div}_h v^\circ(s)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)}, \tag{4.51}$$

and for $\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3)$ with $\beta_3 \geq 1$, it follows

$$\|\partial^\beta w^\circ(\eta)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} = \|\partial^{\beta - (0,0,1)} \operatorname{div}_h v^\circ(\eta)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)}. \tag{4.52}$$

Thus repeating the previous arguments on \mathcal{U}_{low} implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{V}_{\text{low}} &\leq C \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{[m/2]} \sum_{\substack{\beta \leq \alpha, |\beta|=j \\ |\alpha|=m}} \sup_{\eta \geq 0} e^{d\eta} \left\{ \binom{\alpha}{\beta} \|\partial^\beta w^\circ\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)}^{1/2} \|\Delta_h \partial^\beta w^\circ\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)}^{1/2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \|\partial_\eta \partial^{\alpha-\beta} f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \frac{(m+1)^r \tau^m}{m!} \right\} \\
&\quad + C \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{[m/2]} \sum_{\substack{\beta \leq \alpha, |\beta|=j \\ |\alpha|=m}} \sup_{\eta \geq 0} e^{d\eta} \left\{ \binom{\alpha}{\beta} \|\partial^\beta w^\circ\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \|\partial_\eta \partial^{\alpha-\beta} f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \frac{(m+1)^r \tau^m}{m!} \right\} \\
&\leq C_d \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{[m/2]} (|v^\circ|_{d,j}^{1/2} + |v^\circ|_{d,j+1}^{1/2}) (|v^\circ|_{d,j+2}^{1/2} + |v^\circ|_{d,j+3}^{1/2}) |f|_{d,m-j+1} \\
&\quad \times \binom{m}{j} \frac{(m+1)^r \tau^m}{m!} \\
&\quad + C_d \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{[m/2]} (|v^\circ|_{d,j} + |v^\circ|_{d,j+1}) |f|_{d,m-j+1} \binom{m}{j} \frac{(m+1)^r \tau^m}{m!},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.53}$$

where we have applied (4.51) and (4.52). Furthermore, for $m \geq 0, 0 \leq j \leq [m/2], r \geq 2$, the following inequality holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\binom{m}{j} \frac{(m+1)^r}{m!} \frac{(m-j)!}{(m-j+2)^r} \frac{(j+1)!^{1/2} (j+3)!^{1/2}}{(j+2)^{r/2} (j+4)^{r/2}} \\
&= \frac{(m+1)^r}{(m-j+2)^r} \frac{(j+1)(j+2)^{1/2} (j+3)^{1/2}}{(j+2)^{r/2} (j+4)^{r/2}} \leq C.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.54}$$

Therefore, one can obtain from (4.53), (4.33), and (4.35), that

$$\mathcal{V}_{\text{low}} \leq C_d (1 + \tau^{-2}) \|v^\circ\|_{X_\tau} \|f\|_{Y_\tau}. \tag{4.55}$$

Meanwhile, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{V}_{\text{high}} &\leq C_d \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=[m/2]+1}^m (|v^{\circ}|_{d,j} + |v^{\circ}|_{d,j+1}) |f|_{d,m-j+1}^{1/2} |f|_{d,m-j+3}^{1/2} \\
&\quad \times \binom{m}{j} \frac{(m+1)^r \tau^m}{m!} \\
&\quad + C_d \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=[m/2]+1}^m (|v^{\circ}|_{d,j} + |v^{\circ}|_{d,j+1}) |f|_{d,m-j+1} \\
&\quad \times \binom{m}{j} \frac{(m+1)^r \tau^m}{m!}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.56}$$

The one containing $|v^{\circ}|_{d,j}$ on the right hand side of (4.56) can be estimated by $C_d(1 + \tau^{-1}) \|v^{\circ}\|_{X_\tau} \|f\|_{Y_\tau}$, similar to $\mathcal{U}_{\text{high}}$. The one containing $|v^{\circ}|_{d,j}$, on the other hand, can be estimated by $C_d(\tau^{-1} + \tau^{-2}) \|v^{\circ}\|_{Y_\tau} \|f\|_{X_\tau}$ thanks to the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\binom{m}{j} \frac{(m+1)^r}{m!} \frac{j!}{(j+2)^r} \frac{(m-j+1)!^{1/2} (m-j+3)!^{1/2}}{(m-j+2)^{r/2} (m-j+4)^{r/2}} \\
&= \frac{(m+1)^r}{(j+2)^r} \frac{(m-j+1)(m-j+2)^{1/2} (m-j+3)^{1/2}}{(m-j+2)^{r/2} (m-j+4)^{r/2}} \leq C
\end{aligned} \tag{4.57}$$

for $m \geq 0, [m/2] + 1 \leq j \leq m, r \geq 2$.

In summary, from (4.55) and (4.56), we have shown

$$\sum_{f=v,\theta} \|w^{\circ} \partial_\eta f\|_{X_\tau} \leq C_d(1 + \tau^{-1}) \|v^{\circ}\|_{X_\tau} \|v, \theta\|_{Y_\tau} + C_d(\tau^{-1} + \tau^{-2}) \|v^{\circ}\|_{Y_\tau} \|v, \theta\|_{X_\tau}. \tag{4.58}$$

Estimate of $\|\int_\eta^\infty \nabla_h \theta(s) ds, w\|_{X_\tau}$ Similar to the estimates (4.51) and (4.52), one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{\eta \geq 0} e^{d\eta} \|\partial^\beta \int_\eta^\infty \nabla_h \theta(s) ds, \partial^\beta w(\eta)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \\
&\leq \begin{cases} d^{-1} \sup_{s \geq 0} e^{ds} \|\partial^\beta \operatorname{div}_h v(s), \partial^\beta \nabla_h \theta(s)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} & \text{if } \beta_3 = 0 \\ \sup_{s \geq 0} e^{ds} \|\partial^{\beta-(0,0,1)} \operatorname{div}_h v(s), \partial^{\beta-(0,0,1)} \nabla_h \theta(s)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} & \text{if } \beta_3 \geq 1. \end{cases}
\end{aligned} \tag{4.59}$$

Therefore, we have that

$$\left\| \int_\eta^\infty \nabla_h \theta(s) ds, w \right\|_{X_\tau} \leq \|v, \theta\|_{X_\tau} + d^{-1} \|v, \theta\|_{Y_\tau}. \tag{4.60}$$

Summary From (4.48), (4.58), and (4.60), one can conclude from (4.37) that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \|v, \theta\|_{X_\tau} &\leq [\dot{\tau} + C_d(1 + \tau^{-1})\|v^\circ\|_{X_\tau} + d^{-1}] \|v, \theta\|_{Y_\tau} \\ &+ [1 + C_d(\tau^{-1} + \tau^{-2})\|v^\circ\|_{Y_\tau}] \|v, \theta\|_{X_\tau}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.61)$$

Consider $M := \|v_{\text{in}}, \theta_{\text{in}}\|_{X_{\tau_0}}$, where

$$(v, \theta)|_{t=0} = (v_{\text{in}}, \theta_{\text{in}}) \in X_{\tau_0} \quad (4.62)$$

with $\tau_0 > 0$. Let τ satisfy $\tau(t = 0) = \tau_0$ and

$$\dot{\tau}(t) + 2C_d(1 + \tau^{-1})M + d^{-1} + 4C_d(2\tau_0^{-1} + 4\tau_0^{-2})M = -4C_d(1 + 2\tau_0^{-1})M. \quad (4.63)$$

Then τ decreases in t , and for $T < 1/4$ small enough, depending on M and τ_0 , we have that, for $0 \leq t \leq T$,

$$\tau_0/2 \leq \tau(t) \leq \tau_0. \quad (4.64)$$

Then integrating (4.61) implies

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|v(t), \theta(t)\|_{X_{\tau(t)}} + \left(4C_d(2\tau_0^{-1} + 4\tau_0^{-2})M + 4C_d(1 + 2\tau_0^{-1})M \right) \\ &\quad \times \int_0^T \|v(t), \theta(t)\|_{Y_{\tau(t)}} dt \\ &\leq M + C_d(1 + 2\tau_0^{-1}) \left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|v^\circ(t)\|_{X_{\tau(t)}} - 2M \right) \int_0^T \|v(t), \theta(t)\|_{Y_{\tau(t)}} dt \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{1}{4} + C_d(2\tau_0^{-1} + 4\tau_0^{-2}) \int_0^T \|v^\circ(t)\|_{Y_{\tau(t)}} dt \right) \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|v(t), \theta(t)\|_{X_{\tau(t)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.65)$$

Therefore, with τ given by (4.63) and T as above, the following mapping

$$\mathfrak{M} : (v^\circ, \theta^\circ) \mapsto (v, \theta) \quad (4.66)$$

is bounded in

$$\begin{aligned} X_{M,T} &:= \left\{ v, \theta \in L^\infty(0, T; X_\tau) \cap L^1(0, T; Y_\tau) : \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|v(t), \theta(t)\|_{X_{\tau(t)}} \right. \\ &+ (8C_d(2\tau_0^{-1} + 4\tau_0^{-2})M + 8C_d(1 + 2\tau_0^{-1})M) \int_0^T \|v(t), \theta(t)\|_{Y_{\tau(t)}} dt \leq 2M, \\ &\left. (v, \theta)|_{t=0} = (v_{\text{in}}, \theta_{\text{in}}), \|v_{\text{in}}, \theta_{\text{in}}\|_{X_{\tau_0}} = M, \int_0^\infty \operatorname{div}_h v(s) ds = 0 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.67)$$

4.2.3 Contracting and the fixed point

Thanks to the boundedness estimate from section 4.2.2, to obtain a fixed point of \mathcal{M} in (4.66), it suffices to show that \mathcal{M} is contracting in $L^\infty(0, T; X_\tau) \cap L^1(0, T; Y_\tau)$. Let $(v_i, \theta_i) = \mathcal{M}(v_i^\circ, \theta_i^\circ)$, $i = 1, 2$, and $\delta\psi = \psi_1 - \psi_2$ for $\psi \in \{v, \theta, v^\circ, \theta^\circ\}$. Then one has, from (4.24)

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \delta v + v_1^\circ \cdot \nabla_h \delta v + w_1^\circ \partial_\eta \delta v + \delta v^\circ \cdot \nabla_h v_2 + \delta w^\circ \partial_\eta v_2 \\ - \int_\eta^\infty \nabla_h \delta \theta(s) ds = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (4.68a)$$

$$\partial_t \delta \theta + v_1^\circ \cdot \nabla_h \delta \theta + w_1^\circ \partial_\eta \delta \theta + \delta v^\circ \cdot \nabla_h \theta_2 + \delta w^\circ \partial_\eta \theta_2 + \delta w = 0. \quad (4.68b)$$

Here $w_i, w_i^\circ, \delta w, \delta w^\circ$ are defined similar as w, w° using the boundary condition and the incompressible condition as before. Then repeating the same arguments as in section 4.2.2 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \|\delta v, \delta \theta\|_{X_\tau} &\leq [\dot{\tau} + C_d(1 + \tau^{-1}) \|v_1^\circ\|_{X_\tau} + d^{-1}] \|\delta v, \delta \theta\|_{Y_\tau} \\ &+ [1 + C_d(\tau^{-1} + \tau^{-2}) \|v_1^\circ\|_{Y_\tau}] \|\delta v, \delta \theta\|_{X_\tau} \\ &+ C_d(1 + \tau^{-1}) \|\delta v^\circ\|_{X_\tau} \|v_2, \theta_2\|_{Y_\tau} \\ &+ C_d(\tau^{-1} + \tau^{-2}) \|\delta v^\circ\|_{Y_\tau} \|v_2, \theta_2\|_{X_\tau}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.69)$$

Then integrating in time of (4.69) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\delta v(t), \delta \theta(t)\|_{X_{\tau(t)}} &+ \left(4C_d(2\tau_0^{-1} + 4\tau_0^{-2})M + 4C_d(1 + 2\tau_0^{-1})M \right) \\ &\times \int_0^T \|\delta v(t), \delta \theta(t)\|_{Y_{\tau(t)}} dt \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{4} + C_d(2\tau_0^{-1} + 4\tau_0^{-2}) \int_0^T \|v_1^\circ(t)\|_{Y_{\tau(t)}} dt \right) \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\delta v(t), \delta \theta(t)\|_{X_{\tau(t)}} \\ &+ C_d(1 + 2\tau_0^{-1}) \int_0^T \|v_2(t), \theta_2(t)\|_{Y_{\tau(t)}} dt \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\delta v^\circ(t)\|_{X_{\tau(t)}} \\ &+ C_d(2\tau_0^{-1} + 4\tau_0^{-2}) \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|v_2(t), \theta_2(t)\|_{X_{\tau(t)}} \int_0^T \|\delta v^\circ\|_{Y_{\tau(t)}} dt \end{aligned} \quad (4.70)$$

and therefore, substituting the boundedness estimate in (4.67) yield

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\delta v(t), \delta \theta(t)\|_{X_{\tau(t)}} + \left(4C_d(2\tau_0^{-1} + 4\tau_0^{-2})M + 4C_d(1 + 2\tau_0^{-1})M \right) \\
& \quad \times \int_0^T \|\delta v(t), \delta \theta(t)\|_{Y_{\tau(t)}} dt \\
& \leq \frac{1}{4} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\delta v^\circ(t)\|_{X_{\tau(t)}} + 2C_d(2\tau_0^{-1} + 4\tau_0^{-2})M \int_0^T \|\delta v^\circ(t), \delta \theta^\circ(t)\|_{Y_{\tau(t)}} dt.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.71}$$

Consequently, \mathfrak{M} in (4.66) is contracting with respect to \mathfrak{E} defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{E}(v, \theta) & := \frac{1}{2} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|v(t), \theta(t)\|_{X_{\tau(t)}} \\
& + 4C_d(2\tau_0^{-1} + 4\tau_0^{-2})M \int_0^T \|v(t), \theta(t)\|_{Y_{\tau(t)}} dt,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.72}$$

and there is a fixed point of \mathfrak{M} , which is the solution in $X_{M,T}$ (defined in (4.67)) to the following system

$$\partial_t v + v \cdot \nabla_h v + w \partial_\eta v - \int_\eta^\infty \nabla_h \theta(s) ds = 0, \tag{4.73a}$$

$$\partial_t \theta + v \cdot \nabla_h \theta + w \partial_\eta \theta + w = 0, \tag{4.73b}$$

$$\operatorname{div}_h v + \partial_\eta w = 0, \tag{4.73c}$$

with

$$w|_{\eta=0} \quad \text{and} \quad \int_0^\infty \operatorname{div}_h v(\eta) d\eta = 0. \tag{4.73d}$$

This finishes the proof of theorem 4.1 for $V \equiv 0$. For $V \in L^\infty(0, T; X_{\tau_0/2}) \cap L^1(0, T; Y_{\tau_0/2})$, repeating the above arguments yields the solution to (4.2). This finishes the proof of theorem 1.1.

Acknowledgement

R.K. thanks Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft for funding under grant CRC 1114 ‘‘Scaling Cascades in Complex Systems’’, Project No. 235221301, Project (C06) ‘‘Multi-scale structure of atmospheric vortices’’, and under grant FOR 5528 ‘‘Mathematical Study of Geophysical Flow Models: Analysis and Computation’’, Project No. 500072446, Project TP2 ‘‘Scale Analysis and Asymptotic Reduced Models for the Atmosphere’’.

References

- [1] Ricardo Barros and Wooyoung Choi. Inhibiting shear instability induced by large amplitude internal solitary waves in two-layer flows with a free surface. *Studies in Applied Mathematics*, 122(3):325–346, 2009. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9590.2009.00436.x
- [2] Ricardo Barros and Wooyoung Choi. On regularizing the strongly nonlinear model for two-dimensional internal waves. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 264:27–34, 2013. DOI: 10.1016/j.physd.2013.08.010
- [3] Jacob Bedrossian, Roberta Bianchini, Michele Coti Zelati, and Michele Dolce. Nonlinear inviscid damping and shear-buoyancy instability in the two-dimensional Boussinesq equations, 2021, available at arXiv:2103.13713.
- [4] Jacob Bedrossian and Nader Masmoudi. Inviscid damping and the asymptotic stability of planar shear flows in the 2D Euler equations. *Publications mathématiques de l’IHÉS*, 122(1):195–300, 2015. DOI: 10.1007/s10240-015-0070-4
- [5] T. Brooke Benjamin. Internal waves of permanent form in fluids of great depth. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 29(3):559–592, 1967. DOI: 10.1017/S002211206700103X
- [6] J. L. Bona, D. Lannes, and J. C. Saut. Asymptotic models for internal waves. *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées*, 89(6):538–566, 2008. DOI: 10.1016/j.matpur.2008.02.003
- [7] Didier Bresch, David Gérard-Varet, Emmanuel Grenier. Derivation of the planetary geostrophic equations. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 182:387–413, 2006. DOI: 10.1007/s00205-006-0008-6
- [8] Didier Bresch, Rupert Klein, and Xin Liu. The soundproof model of an acoustic–internal waves system with low stratification. *Journal of Mathematical Fluid Mechanics*, 24(4):95, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/s00021-022-00712-4
- [9] Didier Bresch and Michael Renardy. Well-posedness of two-layer shallow-water flow between two horizontal rigid plates. *Nonlinearity*, 24(4):1081, 2011. DOI: 10.1088/0951-7715/24/4/004

- [10] Dongho Chae and Hee-Seok Nam. Local existence and blow-up criterion for the Boussinesq equations. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh Section A: Mathematics*, 127(5):935–946, 1997. DOI: 10.1017/S0308210500026810
- [11] Frédéric Charve. Enhanced convergence rates and asymptotics for a dispersive Boussinesq–type system with large ill-prepared data. *Pure Appl. Anal.*, 2(2):477–517, 2020. 10.2140/paa.2020.2.477
- [12] Frédéric Charve. Sharper dispersive estimates and asymptotics for a Boussinesq–type system with larger ill-prepared initial data. 2020. ArXiv:2011.09711v1
- [13] Frédéric Charve. Asymptotics for the rotating fluids and primitive systems with large ill-prepared initial data in critical spaces. 2022. ArXiv:2204.05563
- [14] Peter Constantin, Igor Kukavica, and Vlad Vicol. Contrast between Lagrangian and Eulerian analytic regularity properties of Euler equations. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré C, Analyse non linéaire*, 33(6):1569–1588, 2016. DOI: 10.1016/j.anihpc.2015.07.002
- [15] Walter Craig, Philippe Guyenne, and Henrik Kalisch. Hamiltonian long-wave expansions for free surfaces and interfaces. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 58(12):1587–1641, 2005. DOI: 10.1002/cpa.20098
- [16] Raphaël Danchin. On the well-posedness of the incompressible density-dependent Euler equations in the L^p framework. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 248(8):2130–2170, 2010. DOI: 10.1016/j.jde.2009.09.007
- [17] Raphaël Danchin and Marius Paicu. Global well-posedness issues for the inviscid Boussinesq system with Yudovich’s type data. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 290(1):1–14, 2009. DOI: 10.1007/s00220-009-0821-5
- [18] Russ E. Davis and Andreas Acrivos. Solitary internal waves in deep water. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 29(3):593–607, 1967. DOI: 10.1017/S0022112067001041
- [19] Benoît Desjardins, David Lannes, and Jean-Claude Saut. Normal mode decomposition and dispersive and nonlinear mixing in stratified fluids. *Water Waves*, 3(1):153–192, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s42286-020-00041-x

- [20] David G. Ebin. Ill-posedness of the Rayleigh–Taylor and Helmholtz problems for incompressible fluids. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 13(10):1265–1295, 1988. DOI: 10.1080/03605308808820576
- [21] Eduard Feireisl and Antonín Novotný. The low Mach number limit for the full Navier–Stokes–Fourier system. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 186(1):77–107, 2007. DOI: 10.1007/s00205-007-0066-4
- [22] Eduard Feireisl and Antonín Novotný. *Singular Limits in Thermodynamics of Viscous Fluids*. Advances in Mathematical Fluid Mechanics. Springer International Publishing, 2017. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-63781-5
- [23] Yizhak Feliks, Michael Ghil, and Eric Simonnet. Low-frequency variability in the midlatitude atmosphere induced by an oceanic thermal front. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 61(9):961–981, 2004. DOI: 10.1175/JAS3780.1
- [24] Glenn R. Flierl. Models of vertical structure and the calibration of two-layer models. *Dynamics of Atmospheres and Oceans*, 2(4):341–381, 1978. DOI: 10.1016/0377-0265(78)90002-7
- [25] Yan Guo and Ian Tice. Compressible, inviscid Rayleigh–Taylor instability. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal*, 60(2):677–711, 2011.
- [26] Philippe Guyenne, David Lannes, and Jean-Claude Saut. Well-posedness of the Cauchy problem for models of large amplitude internal waves. *Nonlinearity*, 23(2):237, 2010. DOI: 10.1088/0951-7715/23/2/003
- [27] Karl R. Helfrich and W. Kendall Melville. Long nonlinear internal waves. *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics*, 38(1):395–425, 2006. DOI: 10.1146/annurev.fluid.38.050304.092129
- [28] Tatsuo Iguchi, Naoto Tanaka, and Atusi Tani. On the two-phase free boundary problem for two-dimensional water waves. *Mathematische Annalen*, 309(2):199–223, 1997. DOI: 10.1007/s002080050110
- [29] Hasan Inci. On the well-posedness of the inviscid 2D Boussinesq equation. *Zeitschrift für angewandte Mathematik und Physik*, 69(4):103, 2018. DOI: 10.1007/s00033-018-0998-6

- [30] Guillaume James. Internal travelling waves in the limit of a discontinuously stratified fluid. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 160(1):41–90, 2001. DOI: 10.1007/s002050100160
- [31] Juhı Jang, Ian Tice, and Yanjin Wang. The compressible viscous surface-internal wave problem: Local well-posedness. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 48(4):2602–2673, 2016. DOI: 10.1137/15M1036026
- [32] Juhı Jang, Ian Tice, and Yanjin Wang. The compressible viscous surface-internal wave problem: Stability and vanishing surface tension limit. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 343(3):1039–1113, 2016. DOI: 10.1007/s00220-016-2603-1
- [33] V. Kamotski and G. Lebeau. On 2D Rayleigh–Taylor instabilities. *Asymptotic Analysis*, 42(1-2):1–27, 2005.
- [34] Rupert Klein. Multiple spatial scales in engineering and atmospheric low Mach number flows. *ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis*, 39(3):537–559, 2005. DOI: 10.1051/m2an:2005022
- [35] Rupert Klein. Asymptotics, structure, and integration of sound-proof atmospheric flow equations. *Theoretical and Computational Fluid Dynamics*, 23(3):161–195, 2009. DOI: 10.1007/s00162-009-0104-y
- [36] Rupert Klein, Ulrich Achatz, Didier Bresch, Omar M. Knio, and Piotr K. Smolarkiewicz. Regime of validity of soundproof atmospheric flow models. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 67(10):3226–3237, 2010. DOI: 10.1175/2010JAS3490.1
- [37] Klein R., Schielicke L., Pfahl S., Khouider B., QG-DL-Ekman: Dynamics of a diabatic layer in the quasi-geostrophic framework, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 79(3):887–905, 2022. DOI: 10.1175/JAS-D-21-0110.1
- [38] Igor Kukavica and Weinan Wang. Long time behavior of solutions to the 2D Boussinesq equations with zero diffusivity. *Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations*, 32(4):2061–2077, 2020. DOI: 10.1007/s10884-019-09802-w
- [39] David Lannes. *The Water Waves Problem: Mathematical Analysis and Asymptotics*. Number volume 188 in Mathematical Surveys and Monographs. American Mathematical Society, 2013.

- [40] David Lannes. A stability criterion for two-fluid interfaces and applications. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 208(2):481–567, 2013. DOI: 10.1007/s00205-012-0604-6
- [41] Adam Larios, Evelyn Lunasin, and Edriss S. Titi. Global well-posedness for the 2D Boussinesq system without heat diffusion and with either anisotropic viscosity or inviscid Voigt- α regularization, 2010, available at arXiv:1010.5024
- [42] Adam Larios, Evelyn Lunasin, and Edriss S. Titi. Global well-posedness for the 2D Boussinesq system with anisotropic viscosity and without heat diffusion. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 255(9):2636–2654, 2013. DOI: 10.1016/j.jde.2013.07.011
- [43] Robert L. Long. On the Boussinesq approximation and its role in the theory of internal waves. *Tellus*, 17(1):46–52, 1965. DOI: 10.3402/tellusa.v17i1.9016
- [44] Hiroaki Ono. Algebraic solitary waves in stratified fluids. *Journal of the Physical Society of Japan*, 39(4):1082–1091, 1975. DOI: 10.1143/JPSJ.39.1082
- [45] Yanjin Wang and Ian Tice. The viscous surface-internal wave problem: Nonlinear Rayleigh–Taylor instability. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 37(11):1967–2028, 2012. DOI: 10.1080/03605302.2012.699498
- [46] Yanjin Wang, Ian Tice, and Chanwoo Kim. The viscous surface-internal wave problem: Global well-posedness and decay. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 212(1):1–92, 2014. DOI: 10.1007/s00205-013-0700-2
- [47] Chia-Shun Yih. Exact solutions for steady two-dimensional flow of a stratified fluid. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 9(2):161–174, 1960. DOI: 10.1017/S0022112060001018