

FLOW-INDUCED OSCILLATIONS VIA HOPF BIFURCATION IN A FLUID-SOLID INTERACTION PROBLEM

DENIS BONHEURE, GIOVANNI P. GALDI, AND FILIPPO GAZZOLA

ABSTRACT. We furnish necessary and sufficient conditions for the occurrence of a Hopf bifurcation in a particularly significant fluid-structure problem, where a Navier-Stokes liquid interacts with a rigid body that is subject to an undamped elastic restoring force. The motion of the coupled system is driven by a uniform flow at spatial infinity, with constant dimensionless velocity $\lambda > 0$. In particular, if the relevant linearized operator meets suitable spectral properties, there exists a threshold $\lambda_o > 0$ above which a bifurcating time-periodic branch stems out of the branch of steady-state solutions. The most remarkable feature of our result is that no restriction is imposed on the frequency ω of the bifurcating solution, which may thus coincide with one of the natural structural frequencies ω_n of the body. Therefore, resonance cannot occur as a result of this bifurcation. However, when $\omega \rightarrow \omega_n$, the amplitude of oscillations may become very large when the fluid density is negligible compared to the mass of the body. To our knowledge, our result is the first *rigorous* investigation of the existence of a Hopf bifurcation in a fluid-structure interaction problem.

Keywords. Navier-Stokes equations for incompressible viscous fluids, Fluid-solid interactions, Stability, Hopf Bifurcation

Primary AMS code. 76D05, 74F10, 35B32, 35Q35, 76D03, 35B10

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| 2. Formulation of the Problem | 4 |
| 3. Functional Background | 5 |
| 4. A General Approach to Time-Periodic Bifurcation | 7 |
| 5. Analysis of the linearized operators | 10 |
| 5.1. Spectral Properties | 10 |
| 5.2. The Linearized Time-Periodic Operator | 14 |
| 6. The Bifurcation Result | 21 |
| 6.1. Reformulation of the Problem in Banach Spaces | 21 |
| 6.2. Appropriate Formulation of the Assumptions | 22 |
| 6.3. Necessary and Sufficient Conditions for a Time-Periodic Bifurcation | 23 |
| Appendix A. Proof of Theorem 1 | 24 |
| Acknowledgments | 28 |
| Declarations | 28 |
| References | 28 |

1. INTRODUCTION

The flow of a viscous fluid around structures is a fundamental problem that lies at the heart of the broad research area of Fluid-Structure-Interactions (FSI). A main feature of this problem regards the study of the oscillations (vibrations) induced by the fluid on the structure, an astounding real-life example of Hopf bifurcation. Such oscillations may lead either to useful and pleasant motions, like ringing wind chimes or Aeolian harps, or else destructive consequences, as damage or even collapse of the structure. In regards to the latter, of particular significance is the phenomenon of forced oscillation of suspension bridges, induced by the vortex shedding of the fluid (air), which reflects into an oscillatory regime of the wake. When the frequency of the wake approaches one of

Date: April 5, 2024.

the natural structural frequencies of the bridge, the so-called lock-in [14], a parametric resonance may occur and lead to a structural failure. A well known and infamous example of this phenomenon is the collapse of the Tacoma Narrows Bridge [1, 33].

In view of its fundamental importance in many practical situations, the problem of flow-induced oscillations of structures has received a rather large contribution by the engineering community. The list of the most relevant articles is too long to be included here, and we direct the reader to the books [8, 15, 30], the review article [34] and the references therein. The structure model commonly employed is a rigid body (in most cases, a circular cylinder) subject to a linear restoring elastic force, while the fluid is modeled by the Navier-Stokes equations [8]. In this regard, particularly remarkable is the detailed study by Blackburn and Henderson [7] of the wake structures and flow dynamics associated with simulated two-dimensional flows past a circular cylinder, either stationary or in simple harmonic cross-flow oscillation, in a range of frequencies near the natural shedding frequency of the fixed cylinder.

However, flow-induced oscillation problems have not yet received a similar attention from the mathematical community. Actually, it is our belief that a *rigorous* mathematical approach to the problem could lead, on the one hand, to a deeper understanding of the underlying physics of the phenomenon, suggesting possible solutions to improve stability of the structure, and, on the other hand, propose new interesting and challenging questions that might be of interest to both mathematicians and engineers.

For this reason, a few years ago we began a rigorous and systematic investigation of flow-induced oscillations. Precisely, in [10, 6] we introduced the simple, but significant, model problem in which a two-dimensional rectangular structure is subjected to a unidirectional elastic restoring force, while immersed in two-dimensional channel flow of a Navier-Stokes liquid, driven by a time-independent Poiseuille flow. The main focus of these articles is rather fundamental and concerns the existence of possible equilibrium configurations of the structure, at least for "small" data. Further relevant properties of this model have been recently studied, such as explicit thresholds for the uniqueness of the equilibrium configuration [26, 27], well-posedness of the related initial boundary value problem [31], large-time behavior [12] and existence of a global attractor [25]. It should be underlined that the model used in all the works just cited presents two simplifying characteristics. First of all, it is two-dimensional, thus limiting the number of phenomena that can occur. Furthermore, it includes boundary walls whose presence can influence the interaction of the fluid with the structure, which is in fact the only fundamental question we are interested in investigating flow-induced vibrations.

Due to this, very recently [11], we introduced a different model –inspired by [8]– where the structure, \mathcal{S} , is a three-dimensional sufficiently smooth body, \mathcal{B} , of arbitrary shape subject to a (possibly anisotropic) undamped linear⁽¹⁾ restoring force, and the Navier-Stokes liquid, \mathcal{L} , fills the whole space outside \mathcal{B} . The motion of the coupled system, $\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{L}$, is driven by a uniform flow at spatial infinity, characterized by a constant dimensionless velocity $\lambda > 0$. In [11] we carried out a preliminary study devoted to the existence, stability and steady-state bifurcation of equilibria, where \mathcal{B} is in a fixed configuration and \mathcal{L} performs a steady-state flow. In particular, we showed the existence of some "critical" $\lambda_s > 0$ such that if $\lambda < \lambda_s$ the equilibrium is unique, stable and no oscillatory motion can occur.

The objective of this article is to continue the investigation begun in [11] and get to the heart of the issue of flow-induced vibrations, i.e., the relationship between the onset of time-periodic (Hopf) bifurcation and the resonance phenomenon. To our knowledge, ours is the first study addressing this type of problems in a rigorous fashion.

We shall now describe our main results along with the corresponding difficulties in proving them. Let $\lambda_o > 0$ and denote by $(\lambda, \mathfrak{s}(\lambda))$, $\lambda \in U(\lambda_o)$ a family of smooth equilibria in the neighborhood U of λ_o . We thus aim at finding necessary and sufficient conditions on $(\lambda_o, \mathfrak{s}(\lambda_o))$ ensuring that a time-periodic branch does exist in a neighborhood of $(\lambda_o, \mathfrak{s}(\lambda_o))$. This question is investigated in the framework of a general time-periodic bifurcation theory introduced in [22], which, for completeness, we recall in Section 4, with full details presented in the Appendix. Unlike classical approaches [13], [36, Theorem 79.F], ours is able to handle flows in unbounded regions and, in particular, overcome the notorious issue of 0 being in the essential spectrum of the linearized operator [4, 5, 16, 32]. The pivotal point of our method is to find functional frameworks (possibly distinct) where the linearized

⁽¹⁾See, however, Remark 1.

operators around $(\lambda_o, \mathfrak{s}(\lambda_o))$ for the averaged (over a period) and “purely oscillatory” components of the relevant fields are both Fredholm of index 0. Searching for the “right” functional setting is exactly what makes the application of the main theorem of [22] to the case in question anything but simple. Such a study is carried out in Sections 5.1 and 5.2. The *crucial* result established in Section 5.2 (see Theorem 9) is that the “purely oscillatory” linear operator is Fredholm of index 0, *whatever* the (finite) value of the material constants. In other words, the Fredholm property holds also in case of “resonance”, namely, when the frequency of the oscillation coincides with the natural frequency of \mathcal{B} or a multiple of it (for suspension bridges, this is the so-called lock-in effect [14], leading to vortex induced vibrations of the structure). We also show that this important property no longer holds in the limit situation when the ratio of the density of \mathcal{L} to that of \mathcal{B} tends to 0, as somehow expected on physical ground. That the model here employed does not seem to be well suited to predict resonance is also confirmed by the recent work [9] where it is proved that, whatever its frequency, a time-periodic velocity field \mathbf{V} far from the body always generates at least one periodic oscillation.

With these preparatory results in hand, we are able to reformulate the bifurcation problem in a suitable functional setting (Section 6.1), and, with the help of the theory given in [22], to show our main finding, collected in Section 6.2 (see Theorem 12). In a nutshell, the latter states that, under certain conditions ensuring the existence of an analytic steady-state branch in the neighborhood of $(\lambda_o, \mathfrak{s}(\lambda_o))$ proved in [11, Lemma 15], there is an analytic family of time-periodic solutions emanating from $(\lambda_o, \mathfrak{s}(\lambda_o))$, provided the linearized operator at $(\lambda_o, \mathfrak{s}(\lambda_o))$ has a “non-resonant” simple, purely imaginary eigenvalue crossing the imaginary axis at non-zero speed, when λ crosses λ_o . Also, as expected, the bifurcation is supercritical. It is worth emphasizing that, because of the range of validity of the Fredholm property mentioned above, no restriction is imposed on the frequency of the bifurcating branch, thus ruling out the occurrence of “disruptive” resonance.

As a final comment, we recall that, due to the intrinsic complexity of the nondegeneracy conditions arising in the mathematical treatment of bifurcation, our analytic findings must be complemented or supported by numerical tests. For instance, the numerical computation in [17, 18] illustrate the required nondegeneracy conditions given in [23]. We also mention a recent research line based on fully rigorous computer assisted proofs [2, 3].

Of course, the analysis performed here is by no means exhaustive and leaves out a number of fundamental questions. First and foremost, the stability properties of the bifurcating solution. On physical ground, it is expected that the time-periodic bifurcating branch becomes stable, while the equilibrium loses its stability. However, with our current knowledge, a rigorous proof of this assertion remains out of our reach and will be the object of future thoughts.

The article is divided into several sections, each one regarding different aspects of the problem. Specifically, in Section 2 we present the relevant equations and furnish the mathematical formulation of the problem. Moreover, after recalling some notation, we introduce the appropriate function spaces and collect some of their important characteristics in Section 3. In Section 4 we set up an abstract approach to time-periodic bifurcation for general dynamical systems. Section 5 is devoted to finding necessary and sufficient conditions for time-periodic bifurcation. As previously mentioned, this is done via the general abstract approach introduced in [22] and presented here in full details. This approach requires, among other things, a careful analysis of the properties of the relevant linear operators. Specifically, in Subsection 5.1 we show that, given $\lambda_o > 0$, the intersection of the spectrum of the (time-independent) linearization at $(\lambda_o, \mathfrak{s}(\lambda_o))$ with the imaginary axis is constituted (at most) by a bounded sequence of eigenvalues of finite algebraic multiplicity that can cluster only at 0. Such a result is crucial, in that it makes plausible the basic requirement for a Hopf-like bifurcation, namely, the existence of an imaginary eigenvalue of algebraic multiplicity 1. In Subsection 5.2 we show that the linearized “purely oscillatory” operator, suitably defined, is Fredholm of index 0, whatever the value of the physical parameters. With all the above results in hand, in Subsection 6.1 we then formulate the bifurcation problem in a functional setting that fits the requirement of the general theory previously presented. In the final Subsection 6.2, we prove necessary and sufficient conditions for bifurcation, with the latter ensuring the existence of a (subcritical or supercritical) family of time-periodic solutions in the neighborhood of $(\lambda_o, \mathfrak{s}(\lambda_o))$, stemming out of the analytic branch of equilibria.

2. FORMULATION OF THE PROBLEM

Let \mathcal{B} be a rigid body moving in a Navier-Stokes liquid that fills the region $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ outside \mathcal{B} and whose flow becomes uniform at “large” distances from \mathcal{B} , characterized by a constant velocity $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^3$. We denote by Ω_0 the volume occupied by \mathcal{B} , which we assume throughout to be the closure of a bounded domain of class C^2 . An elastic restoring force \mathbf{F} acts on \mathcal{B} , applied to its center of mass G , while a suitable active couple prevents its rotation. Therefore, the motion of \mathcal{B} is translatory. In this situation, the governing equations of motion of the coupled system body-liquid when referred to a body-fixed frame $\mathcal{F} \equiv \{G, \mathbf{e}_i\}$ are given by [19, Section 1]

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \partial_t \mathbf{v} - \nu \Delta \mathbf{v} + \nabla p + (\mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v} &= 0 \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v} &= 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \text{ in } \Omega \times (0, \infty),$$

$$\mathbf{v}(x, t) = \boldsymbol{\gamma}(t), \quad (x, t) \in \partial\Omega \times (0, \infty); \quad \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{v}(x, t) = \mathbf{V}, \quad t \in (0, \infty), \quad (2.1)$$

$$M \dot{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} + \rho \int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbb{T}(\mathbf{v}, p) \cdot \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{F} \text{ in } (0, \infty).$$

In (2.1), \mathbf{v} and p represent velocity and pressure fields of the liquid, ρ and ν its density and kinematic viscosity, while M and $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = \boldsymbol{\gamma}(t)$ denote mass of \mathcal{B} and velocity of G , respectively. Moreover, we consider the Cauchy stress tensor

$$\mathbb{T}_\nu(\mathbf{z}, \psi) := 2\nu \mathbb{D}(\mathbf{z}) - \psi \mathbb{I}, \quad \mathbb{D}(\mathbf{z}) := \frac{1}{2} (\nabla \mathbf{z} + (\nabla \mathbf{z})^\top),$$

where \mathbb{I} is the 3×3 identity matrix and \mathbf{n} is the unit outer normal at $\partial\Omega$, i.e. directed inside \mathcal{B} .

We assume that \mathbf{F} depends linearly on the displacement $\boldsymbol{\chi}(t) := \int \boldsymbol{\gamma}(s) ds = G\vec{O}$, with O fixed point, namely

$$\mathbf{F}(t) = -\mathbb{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\chi}(t), \quad t \geq 0, \quad (2.2)$$

where \mathbb{B} is a symmetric, positive definite matrix (stiffness matrix). Without loss of generality we take $\mathbf{V} = -V \mathbf{e}_1$, $V > 0$.

Remark 1. *The choice of a linear restoring force in the constitutive equation (2.2) is made just for simplicity of presentation. A careful reading of the proofs shows that one can deal similarly with a nonlinear restoring force of the type $\mathbf{F} = \mathbb{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\chi} + \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\chi})$, where $\mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\chi})$ is sufficiently smooth and $|\mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\chi})| = o(|\boldsymbol{\chi}|)$ as $|\boldsymbol{\chi}| \rightarrow 0$.*

Writing all the involved quantities in a non-dimensional form, and setting $\mathbf{u} := \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{e}_1$, we may rewrite (2.1) in the following form

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \partial_t \mathbf{u} - \Delta \mathbf{u} + \nabla p &= \lambda [\partial_1 \mathbf{u} + (\dot{\boldsymbol{\chi}} - \mathbf{u}) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}] \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} &= 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \text{ in } \Omega \times (0, \infty),$$

$$\mathbf{u}(x, t) = \dot{\boldsymbol{\chi}}(t) + \mathbf{e}_1, \quad (x, t) \in \partial\Omega \times (0, \infty); \quad \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{u}(x, t) = \mathbf{0}, \quad t \in (0, \infty), \quad (2.3)$$

$$\ddot{\boldsymbol{\chi}} + \mathbb{A} \cdot \boldsymbol{\chi} + \varpi \int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbb{T}_1(\mathbf{u}, p) \cdot \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{0} \text{ in } (0, \infty),$$

with

$$\mathbb{A} := \frac{L^4}{M\nu^2} \mathbb{B}, \quad \varpi := \frac{\rho L^3}{M}, \quad \lambda := \frac{VL}{\nu},$$

In the sequel, we just write \mathbb{T} instead of \mathbb{T}_1 . Since \mathbb{A} is positive definite, \mathbb{A} is invertible and there exists $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} > 0$ such that for every $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{C}^3$,

$$\mathbf{a} \|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|^2 \leq \boldsymbol{\alpha}^* \cdot \mathbb{A} \cdot \boldsymbol{\alpha} \leq \mathbf{b} \|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|^2.$$

As it will be clear in the proofs, when we indicate that a constant in the estimates depends on \mathbb{A} , the dependence is obviously limited to the extremal eigenvalues of \mathbb{A} (as it is symmetric), i.e. either on \mathbf{a} or \mathbf{b} , or both.

We are interested in the existence of solutions $(\mathbf{u}, p, \boldsymbol{\chi})$ to (2.3) bifurcating from a branch of equilibrium configurations. In order to make this statement more precise, let $\mathbf{s}_0 = (\mathbf{u}_0, p_0, \boldsymbol{\chi}_0)$ be

an equilibrium solution to (2.3) corresponding to a given λ , namely,

$$\left. \begin{aligned} -\Delta \mathbf{u}_0 + \nabla p_0 &= \lambda (\partial_1 \mathbf{u}_0 - \mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_0) \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_0 &= 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \text{ in } \Omega, \quad (2.4)$$

$$\mathbf{u}_0(x) = \mathbf{e}_1, \quad x \in \partial\Omega; \quad \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{u}_0(x) = \mathbf{0},$$

$$\mathbb{A} \cdot \boldsymbol{\chi}_0 + \varpi \int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbb{T}(\mathbf{u}_0, p_0) \cdot \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{0}.$$

From the physical viewpoint, $\boldsymbol{\chi}_0$ represents the (non-dimensional and rescaled) elongation of the spring necessary to keep \mathcal{B} in place.

We look for a value $\lambda_o > 0$ at which a time-periodic motion may branch out of $\mathbf{s}_0(\lambda_o)$. Writing

$$\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_0(\lambda) + \mathbf{w}(t; \lambda), \quad p = p_0(\lambda) + p(t; \lambda), \quad \boldsymbol{\chi} = \boldsymbol{\chi}_0(\lambda) + \boldsymbol{\eta}(t; \lambda),$$

equations (2.3) yields the first-order in time system

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \partial_t \mathbf{w} - \Delta \mathbf{w} + \nabla p &= \lambda [\partial_1 \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \nabla \mathbf{w} + (\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \mathbf{w}) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_0 - (\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \mathbf{w}) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{w}] \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{w} &= 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \text{ in } \Omega \times (0, \infty),$$

$$\mathbf{w}(x, t) = \boldsymbol{\sigma}(t), \quad (x, t) \in \partial\Omega \times (0, \infty); \quad \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{w}(x, t) = \mathbf{0}, \quad t \in (0, \infty),$$

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} + \mathbb{A} \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta} + \varpi \int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbb{T}(\mathbf{w}, p) \cdot \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{0}; \quad \dot{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(t) = \boldsymbol{\sigma}(t) \quad \text{in } (0, \infty), \quad (2.5)$$

where $(\mathbf{w}, p, \boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3$ are the four unknowns.

Our goal is to determine sufficient conditions on $\mathbf{s}_0(\lambda_o)$, for the existence of a non-trivial family of time-periodic solutions to (5.5), $(\mathbf{w}(\lambda), p(\lambda), \boldsymbol{\eta}(\lambda), \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\lambda))$, $\lambda \in U(\lambda_o)$, of (unknown) frequency $\zeta = \zeta(\lambda)$, such that $(\mathbf{w}(\lambda), p(\lambda), \boldsymbol{\eta}(\lambda), \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\lambda)) \rightarrow (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0})$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_o$. We will achieve this objective by employing the general approach to time-periodic bifurcation presented in Section 4. The implementation of this approach to the case at hand requires a detailed study of the properties of several linearized problems associated to (5.5), which will be established in Section 5.

3. FUNCTIONAL BACKGROUND

This section is dedicated to introduce the relevant functional spaces we need. With the origin of coordinates in the interior of Ω_0 , we set

$$B_R := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |x| < R\}, \quad \Omega_R := \Omega \cap B_R, \quad \Omega^R := \Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega_R} \quad \forall R > R_* := \operatorname{diam} \Omega_0.$$

For a domain $A \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, we use the following standard notations :

- $L^q = L^q(A)$ is the Lebesgue space with norm $\|\cdot\|_{q,A}$ and scalar product $(\cdot, \cdot)_A$ for $q = 2$;
- $W^{m,2} = W^{m,2}(A)$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$ is the classical Sobolev space of order m with norm $\|\cdot\|_{m,2,A}$;
- $D^{m,q} = D^{m,q}(A)$ is the homogeneous Sobolev space with semi-norm $\sum_{|l|=m} \|D^l u\|_{q,A}$;
- $D_0^{1,2} = D_0^{1,2}(A)$ is the completion of $C_0^\infty(A)$ in the norm $\|\nabla(\cdot)\|_{2,A}$.

We will usually omit the subscript ‘‘A’’ in the norms, unless confusion arises.

We first recall the relevant function spaces for the steady part of the solution, see also [11]. We start with

$$\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^3) := \{\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3) : \exists \widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}} \in \mathbb{R}^3 \text{ s.t. } \boldsymbol{\varphi}(x) \equiv \widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}} \text{ in a neighborhood of } \Omega_0\}$$

that we endow with the scalar product

$$\langle \boldsymbol{\varphi}, \boldsymbol{\psi} \rangle := \varpi^{-1} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}} \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} + (\boldsymbol{\varphi}, \boldsymbol{\psi})_\Omega, \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\varphi}, \boldsymbol{\psi} \in \mathcal{K}. \quad (3.1)$$

This scalar product induces the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{K}}$. We then introduce

- $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^3) := \{\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^3) : \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\varphi} = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^3\}$;
- $\mathcal{C}_0 = \mathcal{C}_0(\Omega) := \{\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^3) : \widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}} = \mathbf{0}\}$.

The closure of $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{K}}$ will be denoted by

$$\mathcal{L}^2 = \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^3) := \overline{\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{K}}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{R}^3) := \overline{\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{K}}},$$

whereas the closure of $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $\mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$ with respect to the norm $\|\mathbb{D}(\cdot)\|_2$ will be denoted by

$$\mathcal{D}^{1,2} = \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3) := \overline{\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{\|\mathbb{D}(\cdot)\|_2} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}_0^{1,2} = \mathcal{D}_0^{1,2}(\Omega) := \overline{\mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)}^{\|\mathbb{D}(\cdot)\|_2}.$$

With these notations at hand, we set

$$\mathcal{Z}^{2,2} := W^{2,2}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3). \quad (3.2)$$

Obviously, $\mathcal{D}_0^{1,2}(\Omega) \subset \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Denoting the dual space of $\mathcal{D}_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ by $\mathcal{D}_0^{-1,2}(\Omega)$, endowed with the norm

$$|\mathbf{f}|_{-1,2} = \sup_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in \mathcal{C}_0(\Omega) \\ \|\nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}\|_2 = 1}} |(\mathbf{f}, \boldsymbol{\varphi})|,$$

we define the spaces

$$\mathcal{Y} := \mathcal{D}_0^{-1,2}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{R}^3), \quad \mathcal{Y} := \mathcal{D}_0^{-1,2}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^3), \quad (3.3)$$

with associated norms

$$\|\mathbf{g}\|_{\mathcal{Y}} = \|\mathbf{g}\|_{\mathcal{Y}} := \|\mathbf{g}\|_2 + |\mathbf{g}|_{-1,2} + |\widehat{\mathbf{g}}|,$$

and in turn

$$\begin{aligned} X &= X(\Omega) := \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{D}_0^{1,2}(\Omega) : \partial_1 \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{D}_0^{-1,2}(\Omega)\}, \\ X^2 &= X^2(\Omega) := \{\mathbf{u} \in X(\Omega) : D^2 \mathbf{u} \in L^2(\Omega)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

Both X and X^2 are (reflexive, separable) Banach spaces when equipped with the norms⁽²⁾

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_X := \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_2 + |\partial_1 \mathbf{u}|_{-1,2}, \quad \|\mathbf{u}\|_{X^2} := \|\mathbf{u}\|_X + \|D^2 \mathbf{u}\|_2,$$

see for instance [21, Proposition 65].

We next introduce spaces of time-periodic functions. A function $\mathbf{w} : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^3$ is 2π -periodic, if for a.e. $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbf{w}(\cdot, t + 2\pi) = \mathbf{w}(\cdot, t)$, and we use the standard notation for its average

$$\overline{\mathbf{w}}(\cdot) := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \mathbf{w}(\cdot, t) dt, \quad (3.5)$$

whenever the integral is defined. If B is a function space with seminorm $\|\cdot\|_B$, we denote by $L^2(0, 2\pi; B)$ the class of functions $u : (0, 2\pi) \rightarrow B$ such that

$$\|u\|_{L^2(B)} := \left(\int_0^{2\pi} \|u(t)\|_B^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty$$

and similarly, we set

$$W^{1,2}(0, 2\pi; B) = \left\{ u \in L^2(0, 2\pi; B) : \partial_t u \in L^2(0, 2\pi; B) \right\}.$$

We will typically shortcut those notations, writing $L^2(B)$ instead of $L^2(0, 2\pi; B)$, etc. Next, we define the Banach spaces

- $L_{\sharp}^q := \{\boldsymbol{\xi} \in L^q(0, 2\pi) : \boldsymbol{\xi} \text{ is } 2\pi\text{-periodic with } \overline{\boldsymbol{\xi}} = \mathbf{0}\}$, for $q \in [1, \infty]$ with its associated norm

$$\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{L_{\sharp}^q} := \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{L^q(0, 2\pi)};$$

- $W_{\sharp}^k := \{\boldsymbol{\xi} \in L_{\sharp}^2(0, 2\pi) : d^l \boldsymbol{\xi} / dt^l \in L^2(0, 2\pi), \quad l = 1, \dots, k\}$ with its associated norm

$$\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{W_{\sharp}^k} := \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{W^{k,2}(0, 2\pi)};$$

- $\mathcal{L}_{\sharp}^2 := \{\mathbf{w} \in L^2(L^2(\Omega)) : \mathbf{w} \text{ is } 2\pi\text{-periodic, with } \overline{\mathbf{w}} = \mathbf{0}\}$ with its associated norm

$$\|\mathbf{w}\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\sharp}^2} := \|\mathbf{w}\|_{L^2(L^2(\Omega))};$$

- $\mathcal{W}_{\sharp}^2 := \{\mathbf{w} \in W^{1,2}(L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^2(W^{2,2}(\Omega)) : \mathbf{w} \text{ is } 2\pi\text{-periodic, with } \overline{\mathbf{w}} = \mathbf{0}\}$ with its associated norm

$$\|\mathbf{w}\|_{\mathcal{W}_{\sharp}^2} := \|\mathbf{w}\|_{W^{1,2}(L^2(\Omega))} + \|\mathbf{w}\|_{L^2(W^{2,2}(\Omega))}.$$

⁽²⁾the norms $\|\nabla(\cdot)\|_2$ and $\|\mathbb{D}(\cdot)\|_2$ are equivalent in $\mathcal{D}_0^{1,2}$, see e.g. [11, Lemma 3].

The function spaces

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_{\sharp}^2 &:= \left\{ \mathbf{w} \in L^2(Z^{2,2}) \cap W^{1,2}(\mathcal{H}) : \mathbf{w} \text{ is } 2\pi\text{-periodic, with } \overline{\mathbf{w}}|_{\Omega_0} = \overline{\mathbf{w}} = \mathbf{0} \right\}, \\ \mathcal{L}_{\sharp}^2 &:= \left\{ \mathbf{w} \in L^2(\mathcal{H}) : \mathbf{w} \text{ is } 2\pi\text{-periodic, with } \overline{\mathbf{w}}|_{\Omega_0} = \overline{\mathbf{w}} = \mathbf{0} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

are Banach spaces with their corresponding norms

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{w}\|_{\mathcal{W}_{\sharp}^2} &:= \|\partial_t \mathbf{w}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{w}\|_{L^2(W^{2,2}(\Omega))} + \|\widehat{\mathbf{w}}\|_{W_{\sharp}^1}, \\ \|\mathbf{w}\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\sharp}^2} &:= \|\mathbf{w}\|_{L^2(L^2(\Omega))} + \|\widehat{\mathbf{w}}\|_{L_{\sharp}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, the natural space for the oscillatory contribution to the pressure is

$$\mathcal{P}_{\sharp}^{1,2} := \left\{ \mathbf{p} \in L^2(D^{1,2}) \text{ with } \overline{\mathbf{p}} = 0 \right\},$$

with associated norm

$$\|\mathbf{p}\|_{\mathcal{P}_{\sharp}^{1,2}} := \|\mathbf{p}\|_{L^2(D^{1,2})}.$$

4. A GENERAL APPROACH TO TIME-PERIODIC BIFURCATION

Consider an abstract evolution problem described by the equation

$$v_t = M(v, \lambda), \quad (4.1)$$

where λ is a positive real parameter and M is a nonlinear operator. Suppose that in a neighborhood of λ_o (> 0), say $I(\lambda_o)$, there exists a branch of steady-state solutions $v_0 = v_0(\lambda)$ to (4.1), namely, for all $\lambda \in I(\lambda_o)$, $v_0(\lambda)$ satisfies

$$M(v_0, \lambda) = 0.$$

The time-periodic bifurcation problem consists then in finding sufficient conditions on $(v(\lambda_o), \lambda_o)$ guaranteeing the existence of a family of time-periodic solutions around (v_0, λ_o) that converges to (v_0, λ_o) as $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_o$.

This problem can be equivalently reformulated in the following, more familiar way. We set

$$u = u(\lambda) = v - v_0(\lambda), \quad \mu = \mu(\lambda) = \lambda - \lambda_o \in I(0).$$

It follows from (4.1) that (u, μ) must solve

$$u_t + L(u) = N(u, \mu), \quad (4.2)$$

where L is the linearization of M at (v_0, λ_o) and N is a nonlinear operator depending on the parameter $\mu \in I(0)$, such that $N(0, \mu) = D_u N(0, \mu) = 0$ for all such μ . Therefore, the bifurcation problem at $(v_0(\lambda_o), \lambda_o)$, corresponding to $(u, \mu) = (0, 0)$, is equivalent to show that, in addition to the trivial solution $(u, \mu) = (0, 0)$, there exists a family of non-trivial T -periodic solutions, say $u = u(\mu; t)$, to (4.2) in a neighborhood of $\mu = 0$, where the period $T = T(\mu)$ is part of the unknowns, and such that $(u(\mu; t), \mu) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ as $\mu \rightarrow 0$.

Setting $\tau := 2\pi t/T \equiv \zeta t$, (4.2) becomes

$$\zeta u_{\tau} + L(u) = N(u, \mu) \quad (4.3)$$

and the problem reduces to find a family of 2π -periodic solutions to (4.3) with the above properties. If we write $u = \overline{u} + (u - \overline{u}) := v + w$, where the bar denotes again the average over a 2π -period, it follows that (4.3) is formally equivalent to the following couple system of equations

$$\begin{aligned} L(v) &= \overline{N(v+w, \mu)} := N_1(v, w, \mu), \\ \zeta w_{\tau} + L(w) &= N(v+w, \mu) - \overline{N(v+w, \mu)} := N_2(v, w, \mu). \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

We are thus led to solve the nonlinear ‘‘elliptic-parabolic’’ system (4.4). It turns out that, in many circumstances, the elliptic ‘‘steady-state’’ problem is better investigated in function spaces with quite less regularity⁽³⁾ than the space where the parabolic ‘‘oscillatory’’ problem should be studied. This especially occurs when the physical system evolves in an *unbounded spatial region*, in which case the natural framework for the study of (4.4)₁ is a *homogeneous* Sobolev space, whereas that of (4.4)₂ is a classical Sobolev space [23, 24]. This suggests that, in general, it is more appropriate to study the two equations in (4.4) in two *distinct* classes of functions. As a

⁽³⁾Here ‘regularity’ is meant in the sense of behavior at large spatial distances.

consequence, even though being *formally* the same operator, the operator L in $(4.4)_1$ acts on and ranges into spaces different than those where the operator L in $(4.4)_2$ acts and ranges.

With this in mind, (4.4) becomes

$$L_1(v) = N_1(v, w, \mu), \quad \zeta w_\tau + L_2(w) = N_2(v, w, \mu). \quad (4.5)$$

The general theory proposed in [22], and that we are about to recall in its main aspects, takes its cue exactly from these considerations.

In the sequel, we will denote by $D[M] \subseteq X$ and $R[M] \subseteq Y$, the domain and the range of a map M between two Banach spaces X and Y . We write $N[M] := \{x \in X : M(x) = 0\}$ to denote its null space.

For a real Banach space B , we denote by $B_{\mathbb{C}} := B + iB$ its complexification. If L is a linear operator on B , we continue to denote by L its extension to a linear operator on $X_{\mathbb{C}}$, while $N_{\mathbb{C}}[L]$ and $R_{\mathbb{C}}[L]$ stand for the null space and range in $B_{\mathbb{C}}$. The spectrum, $\sigma(L)$, is computed with respect to $B_{\mathbb{C}}$, so $\nu \in \sigma(L)$ if and only if its complex conjugate, ν^* , is in $\sigma(L)$.

Let \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} , be real Banach spaces with norms $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{U}}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{V}}$, respectively, and let \mathcal{Z} be a real Hilbert space with norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Z}}$. Moreover, let

$$L_1 : \mathcal{U} \mapsto \mathcal{V}$$

be a bounded linear operator, and let

$$L_2 : D[L_2] \subset \mathcal{Z} \mapsto \mathcal{Z},$$

be a densely defined, closed linear operator, with a non-empty resolvent set $P(L_2)$. For a fixed (once and for all) $\theta \in P(L_2)$ we denote by \mathcal{W} the linear subspace of \mathcal{Z} closed under the (graph) norm $\|w\|_{\mathcal{W}} := \|(L_2 + \theta I)w\|_{\mathcal{Z}}$, where I stands for the identity operator in \mathcal{Z} .

We also define the following spaces

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}_{2\pi,0} &:= \left\{ w : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}, \text{ } 2\pi\text{-periodic with } \overline{w} = 0, \text{ and } \int_0^{2\pi} \|w(s)\|_{\mathcal{Z}}^2 ds < \infty \right\} \\ \mathcal{W}_{2\pi,0} &:= \left\{ w \in \mathcal{Z}_{2\pi,0} : \|w\|_{\mathcal{W}_{2\pi,0}} := \left(\int_0^{2\pi} (\|w_t(s)\|_{\mathcal{Z}}^2 + \|w(s)\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2) ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty \right\} \end{aligned}$$

and we consider a (nonlinear) map

$$N : \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{W}_{2\pi,0} \times \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathcal{V} \oplus \mathcal{Z}_{2\pi,0}$$

satisfying the following properties:

$$\begin{aligned} N_1 &: (v, w, \mu) \in \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{W}_{2\pi,0} \times \mathbb{R} \mapsto \overline{N(v, w, \mu)} \in \mathcal{V} \\ N_2 &:= N - N_1 : \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{W}_{2\pi,0} \times \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathcal{Z}_{2\pi,0}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

The Bifurcation Problem is then formulated as follows.

Find a neighborhood $U(0, 0, 0) \subset \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{W}_{2\pi,0} \times \mathbb{R}$ of the origin such that the equations

$$\begin{aligned} L_1(v) &= N_1(v, w, \mu) \text{ in } \mathcal{V}, \\ \zeta w_\tau + L_2(w) &= N_2(v, w, \mu) \text{ in } \mathcal{Z}_{2\pi,0}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

possess there a family of non-trivial 2π -periodic solutions $(v(\mu), w(\mu; \tau))$ for some $\zeta = \zeta(\mu) > 0$, such that $(v(\mu), w(\mu; \cdot)) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ in $\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{W}_{2\pi,0}$ as $\mu \rightarrow 0$.

Whenever the Bifurcation Problem is solvable, we call $(\mu = 0, u = 0)$ a *bifurcation point*. Moreover, the bifurcation is called *supercritical* [resp. *subcritical*] if the family of solutions $(v(\mu), w(\mu; \tau))$ exists only for $\mu > 0$ [resp. $\mu < 0$]. It is called *transcritical* otherwise.

In order to provide sufficient conditions for the resolution of the above Bifurcation Problem, we introduce the following assumptions (H1)–(H4) on the involved operators.

(H1) L_1 is a homeomorphism;

(H2) There exists $\nu_0 := i\zeta_0$, $\zeta_0 > 0$ such that

- (i) $L_2 - \nu_0 I$ is Fredholm of index 0, $\dim N_{\mathbb{C}}[L_2 - \nu_0 I] = 1$ with $N_{\mathbb{C}}[L_2 - \nu_0 I] \cap R_{\mathbb{C}}[L_2 - \nu_0 I] = \{0\}$. Namely, ν_0 is a simple eigenvalue of L_2 .
- (ii) For every $k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1\}$, $k\nu_0$ is in the resolvent set $P(L_2)$ of L_2 .

(H3) The operator $Q : \mathcal{W}_{2\pi,0} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_{2\pi,0}$ defined by

$$Q : w \mapsto \zeta_0 w_\tau + L_2(w),$$

is Fredholm of index 0 ;

(H4) (i) The operators N_1, N_2 are analytic in the neighborhood $U_1(0,0,0) \subset \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{W}_{2\pi,0} \times \mathbb{R}$, i.e. there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for all $(v, w, \mu) \in U_1$ with $\|v\|_{\mathcal{U}} + \|w\|_{\mathcal{W}_{2\pi,0}} + |\mu| < \delta$, the Taylor series

$$N_1(v, w, \mu) = \sum_{k,l,m=0}^{\infty} R_{klm} v^k w^l \mu^m,$$

$$N_2(v, w, \mu) = \sum_{k,l,m=0}^{\infty} S_{klm} v^k w^l \mu^m,$$

are absolutely convergent in \mathcal{V} and $\mathcal{Z}_{2\pi,0}$, respectively.

(ii) The multi-linear operators R_{klm} and S_{klm} satisfy

$$R_{klm} = S_{klm} = 0, \quad \text{whenever } k + l + m \leq 1,$$

$$R_{011} = R_{00m} = S_{00m} = 0, \quad \text{for all } m \geq 2.$$

We next define the operator

$$L_2(\mu) := L_2 + \mu S_{011}, \tag{4.8}$$

and observe that assumption (i) in (H2) implies that

$$\nu_0 \text{ is a simple eigenvalue of } L_2(0) \equiv L_2.$$

Under this assumption, denoting the eigenvalues of $L_2(\mu)$ by $\nu(\mu)$, it follows (see e.g. [36, Proposition 79.15 and Corollary 79.16]) that the map $\mu \mapsto \nu(\mu)$ is well defined and of class C^∞ in a neighborhood of $\mu = 0$.

In the sequel, for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$, we set:

$$\Re[z] \text{ its real part, } \Im[z] \text{ its imaginary part, } z^* \text{ its conjugate.}$$

We may now state the following bifurcation result which will be the key to formulate Theorem 12 for problem (5.5).

Theorem 1. *Suppose (H1)–(H4) hold and, in addition,*

$$\Re[\nu'(0)] \neq 0. \tag{4.9}^{(4)}$$

Moreover, let

- v_0 be a normalized eigenvector of L_2 corresponding to the eigenvalue ν_0 ,
- $v_1 := \Re[v_0 e^{-i\tau}]$.

Then, the following properties are valid.

(a) Existence. *There is a neighborhood $\mathcal{I}(0)$ of $0 \in \mathbb{R}$, there are analytic families*

$$(v(\varepsilon), w(\varepsilon), \zeta(\varepsilon), \mu(\varepsilon)) \in \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{W}_{2\pi,0} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R} \tag{4.10}$$

satisfying (4.7), for all $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{I}(0)$, and such that

$$(v(\varepsilon), w(\varepsilon) - \varepsilon v_1, \zeta(\varepsilon), \mu(\varepsilon)) \rightarrow (0, 0, \zeta_0, 0) \text{ as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0. \tag{4.11}$$

(b) Uniqueness. *There is a neighborhood*

$$U(0, 0, \zeta_0, 0) \subset \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{W}_{2\pi,0} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}$$

such that every (nontrivial) 2π -periodic solution to (4.7), lying in U must coincide, up to a phase shift, with a member of the family (4.10).

(c) Parity. *The functions $\zeta(\varepsilon)$ and $\mu(\varepsilon)$ are even:*

$$\zeta(\varepsilon) = \zeta(-\varepsilon), \quad \mu(\varepsilon) = \mu(-\varepsilon), \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon \in \mathcal{I}(0).$$

⁽⁴⁾This is the usual transversality condition : the eigenvalue $\nu(\mu)$ crosses the imaginary axis with “non-zero speed.”

As a consequence of (c), the bifurcation due to these solutions is either subcritical or supercritical, a two-sided bifurcation being excluded, unless $\mu \equiv 0$. Theorem 1 was shown in [22] but, for completeness and reader's sake, we deem it appropriate to present a proof in the Appendix.

5. ANALYSIS OF THE LINEARIZED OPERATORS

The existence of a branch of equilibria of (2.3) in a class of homogeneous Sobolev spaces, for arbitrary values of the Reynolds number $\lambda (> 0)$ follows easily from classical results regarding steady-state Navier-Stokes problems in exterior domains. Indeed, we know from [20, Theorem X.6.4] that for any $\lambda > 0$ problem (2.4)₁₋₄ has one corresponding solution (\mathbf{u}_0, p_0) in the class (5.2) recalled below. We then set

$$\boldsymbol{\chi}_0 := -\varpi \mathbb{A}^{-1} \int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbb{T}(\mathbf{u}_0, p_0) \cdot \mathbf{n}, \quad (5.1)$$

which is well defined by standard trace theorems. This yields

Theorem 2. *For any $\lambda > 0$, problem (2.4) has at least one solution*

$$\mathbf{s}_0(\lambda) := (\mathbf{u}_0(\lambda), p_0(\lambda), \boldsymbol{\chi}_0(\lambda))$$

such that

$$\mathbf{s}_0(\lambda) \in [L^q(\Omega) \cap D^{1,r}(\Omega) \cap D^{2,s}(\Omega)] \times [L^\sigma(\Omega) \cap D^{1,s}(\Omega)] \times \mathbb{R}^3, \quad (5.2)$$

for all $q \in (2, \infty]$, $r \in (\frac{4}{3}, \infty]$, $s \in (\frac{3}{2}, \infty]$, $\sigma \in (1, \infty)$.

More properties on equilibrium configurations, such as uniqueness and stability, are studied in [11]. In a nutshell, it is proved therein that for small values of λ , the equilibrium is unique, locally stable and an oscillatory motion does not exist.

5.1. Spectral Properties. We look, from now on, for solutions $(\mathbf{u}, p, \boldsymbol{\chi})$ to the problem (2.3), that we recall here for convenience

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \partial_t \mathbf{u} - \Delta \mathbf{u} + \nabla p &= \lambda [\partial_1 \mathbf{u} + (\dot{\boldsymbol{\chi}} - \mathbf{u}) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}] \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} &= 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \text{ in } \Omega \times (0, \infty),$$

$$\mathbf{u}(x, t) = \dot{\boldsymbol{\chi}}(t) + \mathbf{e}_1, \quad (x, t) \in \partial\Omega \times (0, \infty); \quad \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{u}(x, t) = \mathbf{0}, \quad t \in (0, \infty), \quad (5.3)$$

$$\ddot{\boldsymbol{\chi}} + \mathbb{A} \cdot \boldsymbol{\chi} + \varpi \int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbb{T}(\mathbf{u}, p) \cdot \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{in } (0, \infty),$$

bifurcating from a branch of equilibria $\mathbf{s}_0(\lambda) = (\mathbf{u}_0(\lambda), p_0(\lambda), \boldsymbol{\chi}_0(\lambda))$ of (5.3), i.e. a branch of solutions of

$$\left. \begin{aligned} -\Delta \mathbf{u}_0 + \nabla p_0 &= \lambda (\partial_1 \mathbf{u}_0 - \mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_0) \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_0 &= 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \text{ in } \Omega,$$

$$\mathbf{u}_0(x) = \mathbf{e}_1, \quad x \in \partial\Omega; \quad \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{u}_0(x) = \mathbf{0}, \quad (5.4)$$

$$\mathbb{A} \cdot \boldsymbol{\chi}_0 + \varpi \int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbb{T}(\mathbf{u}_0, p_0) \cdot \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{0}.$$

Writing

$$\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_0(\lambda) + \mathbf{w}(t; \lambda), \quad p = p_0(\lambda) + \mathbf{p}(t; \lambda), \quad \boldsymbol{\chi} = \boldsymbol{\chi}_0(\lambda) + \boldsymbol{\eta}(t; \lambda),$$

equations (5.3) yield the first-order in time system with respect to the four unknowns $(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{p}, \boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \partial_t \mathbf{w} + \lambda [-\partial_1 \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \nabla \mathbf{w} + (\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \mathbf{w}) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_0 + (\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \mathbf{w}) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{w}] &= \Delta \mathbf{w} - \nabla \mathbf{p} \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{w} &= 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \text{ in } \Omega \times (0, \infty),$$

$$\mathbf{w}(x, t) = \boldsymbol{\sigma}(t), \quad (x, t) \in \partial\Omega \times (0, \infty); \quad \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{w}(x, t) = \mathbf{0}, \quad t \in (0, \infty),$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \dot{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} + \mathbb{A} \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta} + \varpi \int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbb{T}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{p}) \cdot \mathbf{n} &= \mathbf{0} \\ \dot{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(t) &= \boldsymbol{\sigma}(t) \end{aligned} \right\} \text{ in } (0, \infty).$$

(5.5)

We aim to reformulate this bifurcation problem in a suitable functional setting, which will eventually allow us to apply the theory presented in Section 4. The major challenge in reaching this goal is the choice of the *right setting*, where the involved operators possess the properties required by Theorem 1. This will require a careful study of appropriate linearized problems obtained from (5.4) and (5.5) that will be performed in the present and following subsections.

Here we secure some relevant spectral properties of the operator obtained by linearizing (5.5) around the trivial solution

$$(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{p}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\eta}) \equiv (\mathbf{0}, 0, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}).$$

In this regard, we begin to define the maps

$$\tilde{\Delta} : (\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\eta}) \in Z^{2,2} \times \mathbb{R}^3 \mapsto \tilde{\Delta}(\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\eta}) \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^3),$$

where $Z^{2,2}$ was introduced in (3.2),

$$\tilde{\Delta}(\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\eta}) = \begin{cases} -\Delta \mathbf{w} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathbb{A} \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta} + 2\varpi \int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbb{D}(\mathbf{w}) \cdot \mathbf{n} & \text{in } \Omega_0, \end{cases} \quad (5.6)$$

and

$$\tilde{\partial}_1 : \mathbf{w} \in Z^{2,2} \mapsto \tilde{\partial}_1(\mathbf{w}) \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{R}^3),$$

where

$$\tilde{\partial}_1(\mathbf{w}) = \begin{cases} -\partial_1 \mathbf{w} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathbf{0} & \text{in } \Omega_0. \end{cases} \quad (5.7)$$

One can readily check that $\tilde{\partial}_1(\mathbf{w}) \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Set

$$\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{P} \tilde{\Delta}, \quad \mathbf{W} := (\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\eta}), \quad \boldsymbol{\sigma} := \mathbf{w}|_{\Omega_0}, \quad (5.8)$$

where \mathcal{P} is the orthogonal projection of $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ onto $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, see e.g. [11, Lemma 2]. Then we consider the operator defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_0 : Z^{2,2} \times \mathbb{R}^3 \subset \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{R}^3) \times \mathbb{R}^3 &\rightarrow \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{R}^3) \times \mathbb{R}^3 \\ \mathbf{W} &\mapsto (\lambda_o \tilde{\partial}_1 \mathbf{w} + \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\eta}), -\boldsymbol{\sigma}). \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

In the sequel, \mathcal{I} denotes the identity in $\mathcal{H}_c(\mathbb{R}^3) \times \mathbb{C}^3$. The following result holds.

Lemma 3. *Let $\zeta \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. Then, the operator $\mathcal{L}_0 - i\zeta\mathcal{I}$ is a homeomorphism from $Z_c^{2,2} \times \mathbb{C}^3$ onto $\mathcal{H}_c(\mathbb{R}^3) \times \mathbb{C}^3$. Moreover, if $|\zeta| \geq 1$, there exists $c = c(\Omega_0, \mathbb{A}, \varpi, \lambda_o) > 0$, such that*

$$\|D^2 \mathbf{w}\|_2 + |\zeta|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_2 + |\zeta|(\|\mathbf{w}\|_2 + |\boldsymbol{\sigma}| + |\boldsymbol{\eta}|) \leq c \|(\mathcal{L}_0 - i\zeta\mathcal{I})(\mathbf{W})\|_2. \quad (5.10)$$

Proof. By the orthogonal decomposition given in [11, Lemma 2], (5.6) and (5.7), we infer that, given $\mathcal{F} := ((\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{F}), \mathbf{G}) \in \mathcal{H}_c(\mathbb{R}^3) \times \mathbb{C}^3$, the equation

$$(\mathcal{L}_0 - i\zeta\mathcal{I})(\mathbf{W}) = \mathcal{F}$$

is equivalent to the following set of equations

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \begin{aligned} \Delta \mathbf{w} + \lambda_o \partial_1 \mathbf{w} - \nabla \mathbf{p} &= -i\zeta \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{f} \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{w} &= 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathbf{w} &= \boldsymbol{\sigma} \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \\ -i\zeta \boldsymbol{\sigma} + \mathbb{A} \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta} + \varpi \int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbb{T}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{p}) \cdot \mathbf{n} &= \mathbf{F}, \\ \boldsymbol{\sigma} &= -i\zeta \boldsymbol{\eta} - \mathbf{G}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

Therefore, the homeomorphism property follows if, for any given $((\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{F}), \mathbf{G})$ specified above, problem (5.11) has one and only one solution $(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{p}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\eta}) \in W_c^{2,2}(\Omega) \times D_c^{1,2}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{C}^3 \times \mathbb{C}^3$. We begin to establish some formal estimates, holding for all $\zeta \neq 0$. In this regards, we recall that, by [19, Lemmas 9–11],

$$|\boldsymbol{\sigma}| \leq c_0 \|\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{w})\|_2 \quad (5.12)$$

with $c_0 = c_0(\Omega_0) > 0$. Dot-multiplying both sides of (5.11)₁ by \mathbf{w}^* and integrating by parts over Ω , taking account of (5.11)_{2–5}, we infer

$$\begin{aligned} 2\|\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{w})\|_2^2 - i\zeta \left(\|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{\varpi}|\boldsymbol{\sigma}|^2 - \frac{1}{\varpi}\boldsymbol{\eta}^* \cdot \mathbb{A} \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta} \right) - \lambda_o(\partial_1 \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}^*) \\ = (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{w}^*) + \frac{1}{\varpi} \mathbf{F} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}^* + \frac{1}{\varpi} \mathbf{G}^* \cdot \mathbb{A} \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.13)$$

Taking the real part of (5.13), using Korn identity, Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, and the fact that $\Re(\partial_1 \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}^*) = 0$, we deduce

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_2^2 \leq c_1 (\|\mathbf{f}\|_2 \|\mathbf{w}\|_2 + |\mathbf{F}| |\boldsymbol{\sigma}| + |\mathbf{G}| |\boldsymbol{\eta}|), \quad (5.14)$$

where, here and in the rest of the proof, c_1 denotes a positive constant depending, at most, on Ω_0 , \mathbb{A} , λ_o , and ϖ .

From (5.11)₅ and (5.12) we deduce

$$|\boldsymbol{\eta}| \leq c_1 |\zeta|^{-1} (|\mathbf{G}| + \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_2), \quad (5.15)$$

so that employing in (5.14) the latter, (5.12), Korn identity and Cauchy–Schwarz inequality we show

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_2^2 \leq c_1 [(|\zeta|^{-1} + |\zeta|^{-2}) |\mathbf{G}|^2 + \|\mathbf{f}\|_2 \|\mathbf{w}\|_2 + |\mathbf{F}| |\boldsymbol{\sigma}|].$$

If we apply Cauchy inequality on the last two terms on the right-hand side of this inequality, we may deduce, on the one hand,

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_2^2 \leq c_1 [|\zeta|^{-1} (|\mathbf{F}|^2 + |\mathbf{G}|^2 + \|\mathbf{f}\|_2^2) + |\zeta|^{-2} |\mathbf{G}|^2] + |\zeta| (|\boldsymbol{\sigma}|^2 + \|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2) \quad (5.16)$$

and, on the other hand,

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_2^2 \leq c_1 [|\zeta|^{-1} |\mathbf{G}|^2 + |\zeta|^{-2} (|\mathbf{F}|^2 + |\mathbf{G}|^2 + \|\mathbf{f}\|_2^2)] + \varepsilon |\zeta|^2 (|\boldsymbol{\sigma}|^2 + \|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2). \quad (5.17)$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrarily fixed and c_1 depends also on ε .

We now take the imaginary part of (5.13) and use Cauchy–Schwarz inequality to get

$$|\zeta| (|\boldsymbol{\sigma}|^2 + \|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2) \leq c_1 [|\zeta| |\boldsymbol{\eta}|^2 + \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_2 \|\mathbf{w}\|_2 + \|\mathbf{f}\|_2 \|\mathbf{w}\|_2 + |\mathbf{G}| |\boldsymbol{\eta}| + |\mathbf{F}| |\boldsymbol{\sigma}|].$$

By utilizing, on the right-hand side of the latter, (5.15) and Cauchy inequality we obtain

$$|\zeta| (|\boldsymbol{\sigma}|^2 + \|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2) \leq c_1 |\zeta|^{-1} [\|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_2^2 + |\mathbf{G}|^2 + |\mathbf{F}|^2 + \|\mathbf{f}\|_2^2]. \quad (5.18)$$

Thus, combining (5.17) and (5.18), and taking ε suitably small we deduce

$$|\zeta|^2 (|\boldsymbol{\sigma}|^2 + \|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2) \leq c_1 (1 + |\zeta|^{-1} + |\zeta|^{-2}) (|\mathbf{G}|^2 + |\mathbf{F}|^2 + \|\mathbf{f}\|_2^2), \quad (5.19)$$

which, in turn, once replaced in (5.16), delivers

$$|\zeta| \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_2^2 \leq c_1 (1 + |\zeta|^{-1} + |\zeta|^{-2}) (|\mathbf{G}|^2 + |\mathbf{F}|^2 + \|\mathbf{f}\|_2^2). \quad (5.20)$$

Finally, from (5.15) and (5.20) we conclude

$$|\zeta|^2 |\boldsymbol{\eta}|^2 \leq c_1 (1 + |\zeta|^{-1} + |\zeta|^{-2} + |\zeta|^{-3}) (|\mathbf{G}|^2 + |\mathbf{F}|^2 + \|\mathbf{f}\|_2^2). \quad (5.21)$$

By combining estimates (5.19)–(5.21) with the classical Galerkin method, one obtains that for any given $((\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{F}), \mathbf{G})$ in the specified class and $\zeta \neq 0$, there exists a (unique, weak) solution to (5.11) such that

$$(\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\eta}) \in [\mathcal{D}_c^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3) \cap \mathcal{L}_c^2(\mathbb{R}^3)] \times \mathbb{C}^3,$$

satisfying (5.19)–(5.21). We next write (5.11)_{1–3} in the following Stokes–problem form

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \Delta \mathbf{w} &= \nabla \mathbf{p} + \mathcal{G} \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{w} &= 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathbf{w} &= \boldsymbol{\sigma} \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega$$

where

$$\mathcal{G} := -\lambda_o \partial_1 \mathbf{w} + i\zeta \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{f}.$$

Since $\mathcal{G} \in L_c^2(\Omega)$ and $\mathbf{u} \in W_c^{1,2}(\Omega)$, from classical results [20, Theorems IV.5.1 and V.5.3] it follows that $D^2 \mathbf{w} \in L^2(\Omega)$, thus completing the existence (and uniqueness) proof.

Furthermore, by [20, Lemmas IV.1.1 and V.4.3] we get

$$\|D^2\mathbf{w}\|_2 \leq c \left[\|\mathbf{f}\|_2 + (\lambda_o + 1)\|\nabla\mathbf{w}\|_2 + (|\zeta| + 1)\|\mathbf{w}\|_2 + |\boldsymbol{\sigma}| \right]. \quad (5.22)$$

As a result, if $|\zeta| \geq 1$, the inequality in (5.10) is a consequence of (5.19)–(5.22), and the proof of the lemma is completed. \square

Let $\mathbf{u}_0 \in X^2(\Omega)$ and consider the operator

$$\widehat{\mathcal{K}} : \mathbf{W} := (\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\eta}) \in Z^{2,2} \times \mathbb{R}^3 \mapsto \widehat{\mathcal{K}}(\mathbf{W}) \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \quad (5.23)$$

where, recalling also (5.8),

$$\widehat{\mathcal{K}}(\mathbf{W}) = \begin{cases} \lambda_o(\mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \nabla\mathbf{w} + (\mathbf{w} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}) \cdot \nabla\mathbf{u}_0) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathbf{0} & \text{in } \Omega_0. \end{cases} \quad (5.24)$$

Recall that the space $X(\Omega)$ is continuously embedded in $L^4(\Omega)$, see e.g. [11, Proposition 5]. Then, classical results imply

$$\mathbf{u}_0 \in L^4(\Omega) \cap D^{1,2}(\Omega), \quad W^{2,2}(\Omega) \subset L^\infty(\Omega) \cap W^{1,4}(\Omega), \quad (5.25)$$

so that the operator \mathcal{K} is well defined. Next, let

$$\mathcal{K} : \mathbf{W} := (\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\eta}) \in Z^{2,2} \times \mathbb{R}^3 \mapsto (\mathcal{P}\widehat{\mathcal{K}}, \mathbf{0}) \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{R}^3) \times \mathbb{R}^3, \quad (5.26)$$

and define $\mathcal{L}_2 : Z^{2,2} \times \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{R}^3) \times \mathbb{R}^3$ by

$$\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbf{W}) := \mathcal{L}_0(\mathbf{W}) + \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{W}). \quad (5.27)$$

The main result of this subsection reads as follows.

Theorem 4. *For all $\zeta \neq 0$, the operator $\mathcal{L}_2 - i\zeta\mathcal{I}$ is Fredholm of index 0. Moreover, denoting by $\sigma(\mathcal{L}_2)$ the spectrum of \mathcal{L}_2 , we have that*

- $\sigma(\mathcal{L}_2) \cap \{i\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}\}$ consists of an at most finite or countable number of eigenvalues, each of which is isolated and of finite (algebraic) multiplicity;
- $\sigma(\mathcal{L}_2) \cap \{i\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}\}$ has 0 as only cluster point.

Proof. We begin to prove that the operator $\widehat{\mathcal{K}}$ defined in (5.23)–(5.24) is compact. Let $(\mathbf{W}_k)_k$ be a sequence bounded in $Z^{2,2} \times \mathbb{R}^3$. This implies, in particular, that there is $M > 0$ independent of k such that

$$\|\mathbf{w}_k\|_{2,2} + |\boldsymbol{\sigma}_k| \leq M. \quad (5.28)$$

Then, the compact embedding $W^{2,2}(\Omega) \subset W^{1,4}(\Omega_R) \cap L^\infty(\Omega_R)$, for all $R > 1$, ensures the existence of $(\mathbf{w}_*, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_*) \in W^{2,2}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{R}^3$ and subsequences, again denoted by $(\mathbf{w}_k, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_k)_k$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{w}_k &\rightarrow \mathbf{w}_* \text{ strongly in } W^{1,4}(\Omega_R) \cap L^\infty(\Omega_R), \text{ for all } R > 1; \\ \boldsymbol{\sigma}_k &\rightarrow \boldsymbol{\sigma}_* \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^3. \end{aligned} \quad (5.29)$$

In view of the linearity of $\widehat{\mathcal{K}}$, we may assume, without loss of generality, $\mathbf{w}_* \equiv \boldsymbol{\sigma}_* \equiv \mathbf{0}$. By Hölder inequality, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{\mathcal{K}}(\mathbf{W}_k)\|_2 &\leq \lambda_o \left[\|\mathbf{u}_0\|_4 \|\mathbf{w}_k\|_{1,4,\Omega_R} + \|\mathbf{u}_0\|_{4,\Omega^R} \|\mathbf{w}_k\|_{1,4} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|\nabla\mathbf{u}_0\|_2 (\|\mathbf{w}_k\|_{\infty,\Omega_R} + |\boldsymbol{\sigma}_k|) + \|\nabla\mathbf{u}_0\|_{2,\Omega^R} \|\mathbf{w}_k\|_{\infty} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ in this inequality, and using (5.25), (5.28), and (5.29), we infer, with a positive constant C independent of R , that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\widehat{\mathcal{K}}(\mathbf{W}_k)\|_2 \leq C \left(\|\mathbf{u}_0\|_{4,\Omega^R} + \|\nabla\mathbf{u}_0\|_{2,\Omega^R} \right).$$

This, in turn, again by (5.25) and the arbitrariness of $R > 1$ shows the desired property. The compactness of $\widehat{\mathcal{K}}$ and Lemma 3 then imply that the operator

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta := \mathcal{L}_2 - i\zeta\mathcal{I}$$

is Fredholm of index 0, for all $\zeta \neq 0$. The theorem is then a consequence of well-known results (e.g. [28, Theorem XVII.4.3]) provided we show that the null space of $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta$ is trivial, for all sufficiently

large $|\zeta|$. To this end, we observe that $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta(\mathbf{W}) = 0$ means $\mathcal{L}_0(\mathbf{W}) - i\zeta \mathbf{W} = -\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{W})$. Applying (5.10) and recalling (5.26), we thus get

$$|\zeta|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_2 + |\zeta| (\|\mathbf{w}\|_2 + |\boldsymbol{\sigma}|) \leq c \|\widehat{\mathcal{K}}(\mathbf{W})\|_2, \quad \text{for all } |\zeta| \geq 1,$$

where c is independent of ζ . Also, from (5.24) and Hölder inequality, we deduce

$$\|\widehat{\mathcal{K}}(\mathbf{W})\|_2 \leq \lambda_o \|\mathbf{u}_0\|_{1,\infty} (\|\mathbf{w}\|_{1,2} + |\boldsymbol{\sigma}|).$$

combining the last two inequalities, and since Theorem 2 implies $\|\mathbf{u}_0\|_{1,\infty} < \infty$, we conclude that $\mathbf{w} \equiv \mathbf{0}$ when $|\zeta|$ is larger than a suitable positive constant. This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

5.2. The Linearized Time-Periodic Operator. Objective of this subsection is to show that Assumption (H3) of Theorem 1 holds in our setting. This will be the content of Theorem 9.

To this end, we begin to demonstrate some fundamental functional properties of the linear operator obtained by formally setting $(\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \mathbf{w}) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{w} \equiv \mathbf{0}$ in equations (5.5), in the class of periodic solutions with zero average. To do this, we need to investigate the more special linear problem to which (5.5) reduces by taking $(\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \mathbf{w}) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{w} \equiv \mathbf{u}_0 \equiv \mathbf{0}$, that is,

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \partial_t \mathbf{w} - \lambda \partial_1 \mathbf{w} &= \Delta \mathbf{w} - \nabla \mathfrak{p} \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{w} &= 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \text{ in } \Omega \times (0, \infty),$$

$$\mathbf{w}(x, t) = \boldsymbol{\sigma}(t), \quad (x, t) \in \partial\Omega \times (0, \infty); \quad \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{w}(x, t) = \mathbf{0}, \quad t \in (0, \infty), \quad (5.30)$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \dot{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} + \mathbb{A} \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta} + \varpi \int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbb{T}(\mathbf{w}, \mathfrak{p}) \cdot \mathbf{n} &= \mathbf{0} \\ \dot{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(t) &= \boldsymbol{\sigma}(t) \end{aligned} \right\} \text{ in } (0, \infty).$$

To reach our goal, we begin to prove some crucial properties of the associated family of boundary-value problems for Fourier modes. Precisely, for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $m \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, we introduce the pair of fields $(\mathbf{h}_k^{(m)}, p_k^{(m)})$, such that $(\mathbf{h}_0^{(m)}, p_0^{(m)}) \equiv (\mathbf{0}, 0)$ and, for $k \neq 0$,

$$\left. \begin{aligned} ik \zeta_0 \mathbf{h}_k^{(m)} - \lambda_o \partial_1 \mathbf{h}_k^{(m)} &= \Delta \mathbf{h}_k^{(m)} - \nabla p_k^{(m)} \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{h}_k^{(m)} &= 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \text{ in } \Omega \quad (5.31)$$

$$\mathbf{h}_k^{(m)} = \zeta_0 \mathbf{e}_m \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega,$$

with $\zeta_0 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ and $\lambda_o \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, for a fixed k , we denote by \mathbb{K} the matrix whose components are given by

$$(\mathbb{K})_{\ell m} = \left(\int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbb{T}(\mathbf{h}_k^{(m)}, p_k^{(m)}) \cdot \mathbf{n} \right)_\ell, \quad \ell, m = 1, 2, 3. \quad (5.32)$$

Unless otherwise stated, throughout the rest of this subsection we shall use summation convention over repeated indices.

The following result plays a key role in our analysis.

Lemma 5. *Let $\zeta_0 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, $\lambda_o > 0$.⁽⁵⁾ For every $m \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and every $k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$, (5.31) has a unique solution $(\mathbf{h}_k^{(m)}, p_k^{(m)}) \in W^{2,2}(\Omega) \times D^{1,2}(\Omega)$ which, moreover, satisfies the estimates*

$$\left\| \mathbf{h}_k^{(m)} \right\|_2 \leq C \left\| \nabla \mathbf{h}_k^{(m)} \right\|_2 \leq C (|k| + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \left\| D^2 \mathbf{h}_k^{(m)} \right\|_2 \leq C (|k| + 1), \quad (5.33)$$

where C is a constant independent of k . In addition, the following properties hold :

- (i) \mathbb{K} is invertible and $\mathbb{A} - k^2 \zeta_0^2 \mathbb{I} + ik \varpi \mathbb{K}$ is invertible for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$;
- (ii) for every $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{C}^3$, we have

$$ik \zeta_0 \|\mathbf{h}_k\|_2^2 + 2 \|\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{h}_k)\|_2^2 - \lambda_o (\partial_1 \mathbf{h}_k, \mathbf{h}_k^*) = \zeta_0^2 \boldsymbol{\alpha}^* \cdot \mathbb{K} \cdot \boldsymbol{\alpha} \quad (5.34)$$

where $\mathbf{h}_k := \alpha_m \mathbf{h}_k^{(m)}$.

⁽⁵⁾In fact, the lemma continues to hold for any $\lambda_o \in \mathbb{R}$, but this is irrelevant to our aims.

Proof. Since the proof is the same for $m = 1, 2, 3$, we pick $m = 1$ and will omit the superscript. Let

$$\mathbf{e}(x) := \zeta_0 \operatorname{curl}(x_2 \phi(|x|) \mathbf{e}_3) \quad (5.35)$$

where $\phi = \phi(|x|)$ is a smooth ‘‘cut-off’’ function that is 1 in Ω_{ρ_1} and 0 in $\overline{\Omega^{\rho_2}}$, $R_* < \rho_1 < \rho_2$. Clearly, \mathbf{e} is smooth in Ω , with bounded support and, in addition, $\mathbf{e}(x) = \zeta_0 \mathbf{e}_1$ in a neighborhood of $\partial\Omega$ and $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{e} = 0$ in Ω . From (5.31) we then deduce that $\mathbf{v}_k := \mathbf{h}_k - \mathbf{e}$ solves the following boundary-value problem (for all $|k| \geq 1$):

$$\left. \begin{aligned} ik \zeta_0 \mathbf{v}_k - \lambda_o \partial_1 \mathbf{v}_k &= \Delta \mathbf{v}_k - \nabla p_k + \lambda_o \partial_1 \mathbf{e} - ik \zeta_0 \mathbf{e} + \Delta \mathbf{e} \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_k &= 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \text{ in } \Omega \quad (5.36)$$

$$\mathbf{v}_k = \mathbf{0} \text{ on } \partial\Omega.$$

We shall next show a number of a priori estimates for solutions (\mathbf{v}_k, p_k) to (5.36) in their stated function class that once combined, for instance, with the classical Galerkin method, will produce the desired existence result. Uniqueness will also be an obvious consequence of these estimates. For this, we dot-multiply both sides of (5.36)₁ by \mathbf{v}_k^* , and integrate by parts to get

$$ik \zeta_0 \|\mathbf{v}_k\|_2^2 - \lambda_o (\partial_1 \mathbf{v}_k, \mathbf{v}_k^*) + \|\nabla \mathbf{v}_k\|_2^2 = (\mathcal{F}_k, \mathbf{v}_k^*), \quad (5.37)$$

where $\mathcal{F}_k := \lambda_o \partial_1 \mathbf{e} - ik \zeta_0 \mathbf{e} + \Delta \mathbf{e}$. By the properties of \mathbf{e} ,

$$\|\mathcal{F}_k\|_2 \leq c(|k| + 1) \quad (5.38)$$

where, here and in the rest of the proof, c denotes a generic (positive) constant depending, at most, on ζ_0, λ_o and Ω , but *not* on k . Since

$$\Re(\partial_1 \mathbf{v}_k, \mathbf{v}_k^*) = 0, \quad (5.39)$$

by taking the real part of (5.37) and using (5.38) we infer

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{v}_k\|_2^2 \leq c(|k| + 1) \|\mathbf{v}_k\|_2. \quad (5.40)$$

Considering the imaginary part of (5.37) and employing (5.38)–(5.40) along with Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$|k| \|\mathbf{v}_k\|_2 \leq c(\|\nabla \mathbf{v}_k\|_2 + |k| + 1) \leq c(|k| + 1) \|\mathbf{v}_k\|_2^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

which gives the uniform bound, independent of k ,

$$\|\mathbf{v}_k\|_2 \leq c. \quad (5.41)$$

Taking into account that $\mathbf{h}_k = \mathbf{e} + \mathbf{v}_k$, (5.41) proves (5.33)₁. Inequality (5.33)₂ then follows by using (5.41) into (5.40).

Moreover, from classical estimates on the Stokes problem, see e.g. [29, Lemma 1], we infer that

$$\|D^2 \mathbf{v}_k\|_2 \leq c(\|\partial_1 \mathbf{v}_k\|_2 + \|\mathcal{F}_k\|_2 + \|\nabla \mathbf{v}_k\|_2)$$

and so, recalling that $|k| \geq 1$, from the latter inequality, (5.38), (5.40) and (5.41) we show (5.33)₃.

Let $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{C}^3$, and, for fixed $k \neq 0$, set

$$\mathbf{h}_k := \alpha_m \mathbf{h}_k^{(m)}, \quad p_k := \alpha_m p_k^{(m)}.$$

From (5.31) we then find

$$\left. \begin{aligned} ik \zeta_0 \mathbf{h}_k - \lambda_o \partial_1 \mathbf{h}_k &= \operatorname{div} \mathbb{T}(\mathbf{h}_k, p_k) \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{h}_k &= 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \text{ in } \Omega \quad (5.42)$$

$$\mathbf{h}_k = \zeta_0 \boldsymbol{\alpha} \text{ on } \partial\Omega.$$

Dot-multiplying both sides of (5.42)₁ by \mathbf{h}_k^* and integrating by parts over Ω we deduce

$$ik \zeta_0 \|\mathbf{h}_k\|_2^2 + \|\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{h}_k)\|_2^2 - \lambda_o (\partial_1 \mathbf{h}_k, \mathbf{h}_k^*) = \zeta_0^2 \boldsymbol{\alpha}^* \cdot \mathbb{K} \cdot \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \quad (5.43)$$

that is, (5.34).

Now, suppose that there exists $\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \in \mathbb{C}^3$ such that

$$\mathbb{A} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} - k^2 \zeta_0^2 \hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} + ik \varpi \mathbb{K} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = 0.$$

This implies that either $k = 0$ in which case $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = 0$ because \mathbb{A} is invertible, or

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^* \cdot \mathbb{K} \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = -i \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^* \cdot \mathbb{L} \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}},$$

for some real valued matrix \mathbb{L} . Then from (5.43), we infer that

$$i \left(k \zeta_0 \|\widehat{\mathbf{h}}_k\|_2^2 + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^* \cdot \mathbb{L} \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \right) - \lambda_o (\partial_1 \widehat{\mathbf{h}}_k, \widehat{\mathbf{h}}_k^*) = 2 \|\mathbb{D}(\widehat{\mathbf{h}}_k)\|_2^2,$$

which, in turn, recalling that

$$\Re(\partial_1 \widehat{\mathbf{h}}_k, \widehat{\mathbf{h}}_k^*) = 0, \quad (5.44)$$

allows us to deduce $\widehat{\mathbf{h}}_k = \mathbf{0}$ in $W^{2,2}(\Omega)$. The latter implies $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \mathbf{0}$ and thus shows the desired property for \mathbb{K} when $\mathbb{L} = 0$ and for $\mathbb{A} - k^2 \zeta_0^2 \mathbb{I} + i k \varpi \mathbb{K}$ otherwise. The proof of the lemma is completed. \square

With the help of Lemma 5, we deduce the following statement.

Corollary 6. *Let $\zeta_0 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, $\lambda_o > 0$, and $\varpi \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. Then, for any $\mathbf{F} \in L_{\sharp}^2$, the problem*

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \zeta_0 \partial_\tau \mathbf{w} - \lambda_o \partial_1 \mathbf{w} &= \Delta \mathbf{w} - \nabla \mathbf{q} \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{w} &= 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \text{in } \Omega \times [0, 2\pi],$$

$$\mathbf{w} = \zeta_0 \dot{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \text{ on } \partial\Omega \times [0, 2\pi], \quad (5.45)$$

$$\zeta_0^2 \ddot{\boldsymbol{\xi}} + \mathbb{A} \cdot \boldsymbol{\xi} + \varpi \int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbb{T}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}) \cdot \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{F}, \text{ in } [0, 2\pi],$$

has one and only one solution $(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) \in \mathcal{W}_{\sharp}^2 \times \mathcal{P}_{\sharp}^{1,2} \times W_{\sharp}^2$. Moreover, we have the estimate

$$\|\mathbf{w}\|_{\mathcal{W}_{\sharp}^2} + \|\mathbf{q}\|_{\mathcal{P}_{\sharp}^{1,2}} + \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{W_{\sharp}^2} \leq C \|\mathbf{F}\|_{L_{\sharp}^2}, \quad (5.46)$$

for some $C = C(\Omega, \lambda_o, \mathbb{A}, \zeta_0) > 0$.

Proof. We formally expand \mathbf{w} , \mathbf{q} , and $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ in Fourier series as follows:

$$\mathbf{w}(x, t) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbf{w}_k(x) e^{ik t}, \quad \mathbf{q}(x, t) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbf{q}_k(x) e^{ik t}, \quad \boldsymbol{\xi}(t) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \boldsymbol{\xi}_k e^{ik t}, \quad (5.47)$$

where $\mathbf{w}_0 \equiv \nabla \mathbf{q}_0 \equiv \boldsymbol{\xi}_0 \equiv \mathbf{0}$ and for $k \neq 0$, $(\mathbf{w}_k, \mathbf{q}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k)$ solve the problem

$$\left. \begin{aligned} i k \zeta_0 \mathbf{w}_k - \lambda_o \partial_1 \mathbf{w}_k &= \Delta \mathbf{w}_k - \nabla \mathbf{q}_k \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{w}_k &= 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \text{in } \Omega$$

$$\mathbf{w}_k|_{\partial\Omega} = \zeta_0 i k \boldsymbol{\xi}_k, \quad (5.48)$$

with the further condition

$$(-k^2 \zeta_0^2 \mathbb{I} + \mathbb{A}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\xi}_k + \varpi \int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbb{T}(\mathbf{w}_k, \mathbf{q}_k) \cdot \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{F}_k, \quad (5.49)$$

where $(\mathbf{F}_k)_k$ are Fourier coefficients of \mathbf{F} (so that also $\mathbf{F}_0 \equiv \mathbf{0}$). For each fixed $k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$, a solution to (5.48)–(5.49) is given by⁽⁶⁾

$$\mathbf{w}_k = \sum_{\ell=1}^3 i k \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k\ell} \mathbf{h}_k^{(m)}, \quad \mathbf{q}_k = \sum_{\ell=1}^3 i k \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k\ell} p_k^{(m)}, \quad (5.50)$$

with $(\mathbf{h}_k^{(m)}, p_k^{(m)})$ given in Lemma 5, and where $\boldsymbol{\xi}_k$ solve the equations

$$(-k^2 \zeta_0^2 \mathbb{I} + \mathbb{A}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\xi}_k + \sum_{\ell=1}^3 i k \varpi \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k\ell} \left(\int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbb{T}(\mathbf{h}_k^{(m)}, p_k^{(m)}) \cdot \mathbf{n} \right)_{\ell} = \mathbf{F}_k, \quad (5.51)$$

which, with the notation (5.32), can be equivalently rewritten as

$$\mathbb{M} \cdot \boldsymbol{\xi}_k = \mathbf{F}_k, \quad \mathbb{M} := (-k^2 \zeta_0^2 \mathbb{I} + \mathbb{A}) + i k \varpi \mathbb{K}. \quad (5.52)$$

⁽⁶⁾No summation over k here!

By Lemma 5–(i), the matrix \mathbb{M} is invertible for all $k \neq 0$. As a result, for the given \mathbf{F}_k , equation (5.52) has one and only one solution $\boldsymbol{\xi}_k$. If we now dot-multiply both sides of (5.52) by $\boldsymbol{\xi}_k^*$ and use (5.34), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & -k^2 \zeta_0^2 |\boldsymbol{\xi}_k|^2 + \boldsymbol{\xi}_k^* \cdot \mathbb{A} \cdot \boldsymbol{\xi}_k - \zeta_0^{-2} \left[k^2 \zeta_0 \varpi \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{km} \mathbf{h}_k^{(m)}\|_2^2 \right. \\ & \left. + i \lambda_o \varpi (\partial_1 (\boldsymbol{\xi}_{km} \mathbf{h}_k^{(m)}), (\boldsymbol{\xi}_{km} \mathbf{h}_k^{(m)})^*) - 2i k \varpi \|\mathbb{D}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{km} \mathbf{h}_k^{(m)})\|_2^2 \right] = (\mathbf{F}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k^*), \end{aligned}$$

which, in view of (5.44), furnishes

$$2k \zeta_0^{-2} \varpi \|\mathbb{D}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{km} \mathbf{h}_k^{(m)})\|_2^2 = \Im(\mathbf{F}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k^*) \quad (5.53)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & -k^2 \zeta_0^2 |\boldsymbol{\xi}_k|^2 + \boldsymbol{\xi}_k^* \cdot \mathbb{A} \cdot \boldsymbol{\xi}_k - \zeta_0^{-2} \left[k^2 \zeta_0 \varpi \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{km} \mathbf{h}_k^{(m)}\|_2^2 + \right. \\ & \left. i \lambda_o \varpi (\partial_1 (\boldsymbol{\xi}_{km} \mathbf{h}_k^{(m)}), (\boldsymbol{\xi}_{km} \mathbf{h}_k^{(m)})^*) \right] = \Re(\mathbf{F}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k^*). \end{aligned} \quad (5.54)$$

Recalling that $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{km} \mathbf{h}_k^{(m)}|_{\partial\Omega} = \boldsymbol{\xi}_k$, by (5.53), Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and trace inequality, we obtain the crucial estimate

$$|\boldsymbol{\xi}_k| + \|\nabla(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{km} \mathbf{h}_k^{(m)})\|_2 \leq c |k|^{-1} |\mathbf{F}_k|, \quad |k| \geq 1, \quad (5.55)$$

where, here and in the following, c denotes a generic positive constant independent of k . Again by Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, from (5.54) we get

$$k^2 (|\boldsymbol{\xi}_k|^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{km} \mathbf{h}_k^{(m)}\|_2^2) \leq c \left(|\boldsymbol{\xi}_k|^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{km} \mathbf{h}_k^{(m)}\|_2 \|\nabla(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{km} \mathbf{h}_k^{(m)})\|_2 + |\mathbf{F}_k| |\boldsymbol{\xi}_k| \right)$$

from which, using (5.55) and Cauchy inequality we deduce

$$k^2 (|\boldsymbol{\xi}_k|^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{km} \mathbf{h}_k^{(m)}\|_2^2) \leq c |k|^{-2} |\mathbf{F}_k|^2, \quad |k| \geq 1,$$

that allows us to conclude

$$k^4 |\boldsymbol{\xi}_k| \leq c |\mathbf{F}_k|^2, \quad |k| \geq 1.$$

It immediately follows that

$$\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{W_{\sharp}^2}^2 = \sum_{|k| \geq 1} (|k|^4 + |k|^2 + 1) |\boldsymbol{\xi}_k|^2 \leq c \sum_{|k| \geq 1} |\mathbf{F}_k|^2 = c \|\mathbf{F}\|_{L_{\sharp}^2}^2. \quad (5.56)$$

Moreover, we infer from (5.50), (5.56) and (5.33) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{w}\|_{\mathcal{W}_{\sharp}^2}^2 &= \sum_{|k| \geq 1} [(|k|^2 + 1) \|\mathbf{w}_k\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \mathbf{w}_k\|_2^2 + \|D^2 \mathbf{w}_k\|_2^2] \\ &\leq c \sum_{|k| \geq 1} (|k|^4 + |k|^2 + 1) |\boldsymbol{\sigma}_k|^2 \leq c \|\mathbf{F}\|_{L_{\sharp}^2}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.57)$$

so that, combining (5.56), (5.57), and (5.60)₁, we obtain

$$\|\mathbf{w}\|_{\mathcal{W}_{\sharp}^2} + \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{W_{\sharp}^2} + \|\mathbf{q}\|_{P_{\sharp}^{1,2}} \leq c \|\mathbf{F}\|_{L_{\sharp}^2}. \quad (5.58)$$

and the proof of existence is completed.

The uniqueness property amounts to show that the problem

$$\begin{aligned} & \left. \begin{aligned} \zeta_0 \partial_{\tau} \mathbf{w} - \lambda_o \partial_1 \mathbf{w} &= \Delta \mathbf{w} - \nabla \mathbf{q} \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{w} &= 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \text{ in } \Omega \times [0, 2\pi] \\ & \mathbf{w}|_{\partial\Omega} = \dot{\boldsymbol{\eta}}; \\ & \zeta_0^2 \ddot{\boldsymbol{\eta}} + \mathbb{A} \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta} + \varpi \int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbb{T}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}) \cdot \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{0} \end{aligned} \quad (5.59)$$

has only the zero solution in the specified function class. If we dot-multiply (5.59)₁ by \mathbf{w} , integrate by parts over Ω and use (5.59)₃, we get

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (\zeta_0 \|\mathbf{w}(t)\|_2^2 + \zeta_0^2 |\dot{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(t)|^2 + \boldsymbol{\eta}(t) \cdot \mathbb{A} \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta}(t)^2) + 2 \|\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{w}(t))\|_2^2 = 0.$$

Integrating both sides of this equation from 0 to 2π and employing the 2π -periodicity of the solution, we easily obtain $\|\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{w}(t))\|_2 \equiv 0$ which in turn immediately furnishes⁽⁷⁾ $\mathbf{w} \equiv \nabla \mathbf{q} \equiv \mathbf{0}$. The proof of the corollary is completed. \square

Remark 2. *The invertibility of the matrix \mathbb{M} , defined in (5.52), is crucial to the resolution of (5.51) and, therefore, to the result stated in the corollary above. The remarkable fact is that this property holds for all values of $\zeta_0 > 0$ and $|k| \geq 1$, independently of the eigenvalues of the matrix \mathbb{A} . In physical terms, this means that the possibility of a “disruptive” resonance is always ruled out. However, observe that if there is some \bar{k} such that $\bar{k}^2 \zeta_0 = \omega_n^2$, where ω_n^2 is an eigenvalue of \mathbb{A} , then the invertibility of \mathbb{M} obviously degenerates in the limit $\varpi \rightarrow 0$. To simplify the discussion, assume for instance that $\mathbb{A} = \omega_n^2 \mathbb{I}$. Then it follows from (5.52) that the corresponding amplitude $|\xi_{\bar{k}}|$ satisfies*

$$|\xi_{\bar{k}}| = \frac{\sqrt{\zeta_0}}{\omega_n \varpi} |\mathbb{K}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{F}_{\bar{k}}|,$$

which may become increasingly large when $\varpi \rightarrow 0$, namely, when the mass of the liquid volume occupied by \mathcal{B} is vanishingly small compared to that of \mathcal{B} .

The next lemma proves well-posedness of the linear problem (5.30), in the class of 2π -periodic solutions with zero average. The crucial aspect of this result is that there is no need to impose restrictions on ζ_0 with respect to the natural frequencies of the restoring force.

Lemma 7. *Let $\lambda_o, \zeta_0, \varpi \in (0, \infty)$.⁽⁸⁾ Then, for any $(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{G}) \in \mathcal{L}_{\sharp}^2 \times L_{\sharp}^2 \times W_{\sharp}^1$, the problem*

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \zeta_0 \partial_{\tau} \mathbf{w} - \lambda_o \partial_1 \mathbf{w} &= \Delta \mathbf{w} - \nabla p + \mathbf{f} \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{w} &= 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \text{ in } \Omega \times [0, 2\pi],$$

$$\mathbf{w} = \zeta_0 \dot{\xi} - \mathbf{G} \text{ on } \partial\Omega \times [0, 2\pi], \quad (5.60)$$

$$\zeta_0^2 \ddot{\xi} + \mathbb{A} \cdot \xi + \varpi \int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbb{T}(\mathbf{w}, p) \cdot \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{F}, \text{ in } [0, 2\pi],$$

has one and only one solution $(\mathbf{w}, p, \xi) \in \mathcal{W}_{\sharp}^2 \times P_{\sharp}^{1,2} \times W_{\sharp}^{2,2}$. This solution satisfies the estimate

$$\|\mathbf{w}\|_{\mathcal{W}_{\sharp}^2} + \|p\|_{P_{\sharp}^{1,2}} + \|\xi\|_{W_{\sharp}^{2,2}} \leq C \left(\|\mathbf{f}\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\sharp}^2} + \|\mathbf{F}\|_{L_{\sharp}^2} + \|\mathbf{G}\|_{W_{\sharp}^1} \right), \quad (5.61)$$

where $C = C(\Omega, \lambda_o, \zeta_0, \mathbb{A}, \varpi)$.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{u}$ where \mathbf{z} and \mathbf{u} satisfy the following problems

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \zeta_0 \partial_{\tau} \mathbf{z} - \lambda_o \partial_1 \mathbf{z} &= \Delta \mathbf{z} - \nabla r + \mathbf{f} \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{z} &= 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \text{ in } \Omega \times [0, 2\pi]$$

$$\mathbf{z}|_{\partial\Omega} = -\mathbf{G} \quad (5.62)$$

and

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \zeta_0^2 \partial_{\tau} \mathbf{u} - \lambda_o \partial_1 \mathbf{u} &= \Delta \mathbf{u} - \nabla \mathbf{q} \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} &= 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \text{ in } \Omega \times [0, 2\pi]$$

$$\mathbf{u}|_{\partial\Omega} = \zeta_0 \dot{\xi}; \quad (5.63)$$

$$\zeta_0^2 \ddot{\xi} + \mathbb{A} \cdot \xi + \varpi \int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbb{T}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{q}) \cdot \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{F} - \varpi \int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbb{T}(\mathbf{z}, r) \cdot \mathbf{n} := \mathbf{F}, \text{ in } [0, 2\pi].$$

Set

$$\mathbf{W}(x, t) := x_3 G_2(t) \mathbf{e}_1 + x_1 G_3(t) \mathbf{e}_2 + x_2 G_1(t) \mathbf{e}_3, \quad (5.64)$$

so that

$$\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{W} = \mathbf{G}(t). \quad (5.65)$$

Let $\phi(x)$ be the “cut-off” function defined in the beginning of the proof of Lemma 5, and define

$$\mathbf{w}(x, t) := \operatorname{curl} (\phi(x) \mathbf{W}(x, t)).$$

⁽⁷⁾Recall that $\mathbf{w}(t) \in L^2(\Omega)$.

⁽⁸⁾We could, more generally, assume $\zeta_0 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ which, again, would be immaterial; see [?, Lemma 1.1].

In view of (5.65) we deduce

$$\mathbf{w}(x, t) = \phi(x)\mathbf{G}(t) - \mathbf{W}(x, t) \times \nabla\phi(x) \quad (5.66)$$

so that \mathbf{w} is a 2π -periodic solenoidal vector function that is equal to $\mathbf{G}(t)$ for $|x| \leq \rho_1$ and equal to 0 for $|x| \geq \rho_2$. Therefore, from (5.62) we deduce that the field

$$\mathbf{z}(x, t) := \mathbf{z}(x, t) + \mathbf{w}(x, t), \quad (5.67)$$

obeys the following problem

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \zeta_0 \partial_\tau \mathbf{z} - \lambda_o \partial_1 \mathbf{z} &= \Delta \mathbf{z} - \nabla r + \mathbf{f} \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{z} &= 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \text{ in } \Omega \times [0, 2\pi] \quad (5.68)$$

$$\mathbf{z}|_{\partial\Omega} = \mathbf{0},$$

where

$$\mathbf{f} := \mathbf{f} - \zeta_0 \partial_\tau \mathbf{w} + \lambda_o \partial_1 \mathbf{w} - \Delta \mathbf{w}. \quad (5.69)$$

From (5.64)–(5.66), (5.69) and the assumption on \mathbf{G} it follows that $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{L}_\#^2$ and that

$$\|\mathbf{f}\|_{\mathcal{L}_\#^2} \leq c(\|\mathbf{f}\|_{\mathcal{L}_\#^2} + \|\mathbf{G}\|_{W_\#^2}). \quad (5.70)$$

Employing [24, Theorem 12], we then deduce that there exists a unique solution $(\mathbf{z}, r) \in \mathcal{W}_\#^2 \times \mathbf{P}_\#^1$ that, in addition, obeys the inequality

$$\|\mathbf{z}\|_{\mathcal{W}_\#^2} + \|r\|_{\mathbf{P}_\#^{1,2}} \leq c\|\mathbf{f}\|_{\mathcal{L}_\#^2}.$$

The latter, in combination with (5.70) and (5.67), allows us to conclude $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{W}_\#^2$ and

$$\|\mathbf{z}\|_{\mathcal{W}_\#^2} + \|r\|_{\mathbf{P}_\#^{1,2}} \leq c(\|\mathbf{f}\|_{\mathcal{L}_\#^2} + \|\mathbf{G}\|_{W_\#^2}). \quad (5.71)$$

Now, by the trace theorem⁽⁹⁾ and (5.71) we get

$$\left\| \int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbb{T}(\mathbf{z}, r) \cdot \mathbf{n} \right\|_{L^2} \leq c \left(\|\mathbf{z}\|_{\mathcal{W}_\#^2} + \|r\|_{\mathbf{P}_\#^{1,2}} \right) \leq c(\|\mathbf{f}\|_{\mathcal{L}_\#^2} + \|\mathbf{G}\|_{W_\#^2}),$$

so that \mathbf{F} belongs to $L_\#^2(0, 2\pi)$ and satisfies

$$\|\mathbf{F}\|_{L_\#^2} \leq c(\|\mathbf{f}\|_{\mathcal{L}_\#^2} + \|\mathbf{F}\|_{L_\#^2} + \|\mathbf{G}\|_{W_\#^2}). \quad (5.72)$$

Thus, from Corollary 6 it follows that there is one and only one solution $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) \in \mathcal{W}_\#^2 \times \mathbf{P}_\#^{1,2} \times W_\#^{2,2}$ to (5.63) that, in addition, satisfies the estimate

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathcal{W}_\#^2} + \|\mathbf{q}\|_{\mathbf{P}_\#^{1,2}} + \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{W_\#^{2,2}} \leq c\|\mathbf{F}\|_{L_\#^2}.$$

As a result, combining the latter with (5.72) and (5.71), we complete the existence proof.

The stated uniqueness property amounts to show that every solution $(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{p}, \boldsymbol{\xi})$ to (5.59) in the stated function class vanishes identically and this has been already shown at the end of the proof of Corollary 6. \square

As said at the beginning of this subsection, our ultimate aim is to show that, within our functional setting, Assumption (H3) is satisfied. For this purpose we define yet another suitable linearized operator that will allow us to formulate (5.60), with $\mathbf{F} := \mathbf{f}|_{\Omega_0}$, as the operator equation:

$$\mathcal{Q}_0(\mathbf{W}) = \mathbf{F}, \quad (5.73)$$

with $\mathbf{F} := (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{G}) \in \mathbf{L}_\#^2 \times W_\#^1$. This amounts to define $\mathcal{Q}_0 : W_\#^2 \times W_\#^2 \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_\#^2 \times W_\#^1$ by

$$\mathcal{Q}_0 : \mathbf{W} \mapsto \zeta_0 \partial_t \mathbf{W} + \mathcal{L}_0(\mathbf{W}),$$

where \mathcal{L}_0 is given by (5.9), i.e.

$$\mathcal{L}_0(\mathbf{W}) = (\lambda_o \tilde{\partial}_1 \mathbf{w} + \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\xi}), -\boldsymbol{\sigma}), \quad (5.74)$$

with $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \mathbf{w}|_{\Omega_0}$. We emphasize that, since

$$\mathcal{Q}_0(\mathbf{W}) = \zeta_0 \partial_t \mathbf{W} + \mathcal{L}_0(\mathbf{W}) \equiv (\zeta_0 \partial_t \mathbf{w} + \lambda_o \tilde{\partial}_1 \mathbf{w} + \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\xi}), \zeta_0 \dot{\boldsymbol{\xi}} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}),$$

⁽⁹⁾Possibly, by modifying r by adding to it a suitable function of time.

the second component of the equation

$$\mathcal{Q}_0(\mathbf{W}) = \mathbf{F},$$

gives the side condition $\zeta_0 \dot{\boldsymbol{\xi}} - \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{G}$ in $(5.60)_3$. Then, from Lemma 7 we infer the following important result.

Lemma 8. *For any given $\lambda_o, \zeta_0, \varpi \in (0, \infty)$, the operator*

$$\mathcal{Q}_0 : \mathbf{W}_{\sharp}^2 \times W_{\sharp}^2 \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_{\sharp}^2 \times W_{\sharp}^1$$

is a homeomorphism.

Next, define $\mathcal{Q} : \mathbf{W}_{\sharp}^2 \times W_{\sharp}^2 \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_{\sharp}^2 \times W_{\sharp}^1$ by

$$\mathcal{Q} : \mathbf{W} \mapsto \zeta_0 \partial_t \mathbf{W} + \mathcal{L}_2(\mathbf{W}),$$

where \mathcal{L}_2 has the form given in (5.27), i.e.

$$\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbf{W}) = \mathcal{L}_0(\mathbf{W}) + \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{W}), \quad (5.75)$$

where, we recall, $\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{W}) = (\mathcal{P}\widehat{\mathcal{K}}(\mathbf{W}), \mathbf{0})$, and

$$\widehat{\mathcal{K}}(\mathbf{W}) = \begin{cases} \lambda_o (\mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \nabla \mathbf{w} + (\mathbf{w} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_0) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathbf{0} & \text{in } \Omega_0, \end{cases} \quad (5.76)$$

with $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \mathbf{w}|_{\Omega_0}$.

Lemma 8 allows us to prove the main finding of this subsection, namely, that Assumption (H3) is satisfied. Precisely, we have the following result.

Theorem 9. *For any given $\lambda_o, \zeta_0, \varpi \in (0, \infty)$, the operator \mathcal{Q} is Fredholm of index 0.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}_0 + \mathcal{K}$, by Lemma 8 the stated property will follow provided we show that the map

$$\widehat{\mathcal{K}} : \mathbf{W} \in W_{\sharp}^2 \mapsto \widehat{\mathcal{K}}(\mathbf{W}) \in \mathbf{L}_{\sharp}^2$$

defined as in (5.76) is compact. Let $(\mathbf{W}_k)_k$ be a bounded sequence in W_{\sharp}^2 . This means that there is $M > 0$ independent of k such that

$$\|\mathbf{w}_k\|_{W_{\sharp}^2} + \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}_k\|_{W_{\sharp}^1} \leq M, \quad (5.77)$$

with $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_k := \mathbf{w}_k|_{\Omega_0}$. We may then select sequences (still denoted by $(\mathbf{w}_k, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_k)_k$) such that

$$\mathbf{w}_k \rightarrow \mathbf{w}_* \text{ weakly in } W_{\sharp}^2; \quad \boldsymbol{\sigma}_k \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\sigma}_* \text{ strongly in } L^\infty(0, 2\pi), \quad (5.78)$$

for some $(\mathbf{w}_*, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_*) \in W_{\sharp}^2 \times W_{\sharp}^{1,2}$. Due to the linearity of $\widehat{\mathcal{K}}$, without loss of generality we may take $\mathbf{w}_* \equiv \boldsymbol{\sigma}_* \equiv \mathbf{0}$, so that we must show that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{2\pi} \|\widehat{\mathcal{K}}(\mathbf{W}_k)\|_{2,\Omega}^2 = 0. \quad (5.79)$$

From (5.78), the compact embeddings $W^{2,2}(\Omega) \subset W^{1,4}(\Omega_R)$ for all $R > R_*$, and Lions-Aubin lemma we infer

$$\int_0^{2\pi} (\|\mathbf{w}_k(t)\|_{4,\Omega_R}^2 + \|\nabla \mathbf{w}_k(t)\|_{4,\Omega_R}^2) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty, \text{ for all } R > R_*. \quad (5.80)$$

Furthermore,

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \|\mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \nabla \mathbf{w}_k(t)\|_{2,\Omega}^2 \leq \|\mathbf{u}_0\|_4^2 \int_0^{2\pi} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}_k(t)\|_{4,\Omega_R}^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_0\|_{4,\Omega_R}^2 \int_0^{2\pi} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}_k(t)\|_{4,\Omega}^2,$$

which, by the embeddings $X(\Omega) \subset L^4(\Omega)$ and $W^{2,2}(\Omega) \subset W^{1,4}(\Omega)$, (5.77), (5.80) and the arbitrariness of R furnishes

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{2\pi} \|\mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \nabla \mathbf{w}_k(t)\|_2^2 = 0. \quad (5.81)$$

Likewise,

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \|\mathbf{w}_k(t) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_0\|_{2,\Omega}^2 \leq \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_0\|_4^2 \int_0^{2\pi} \|\mathbf{w}_k(t)\|_{4,\Omega_R}^2 + \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_0\|_{4,\Omega_R}^2 \int_0^{2\pi} \|\mathbf{w}_k(t)\|_{4,\Omega}^2,$$

so that, arguing as before,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{2\pi} \|\mathbf{w}_k(t) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_0\|_{2,\Omega}^2 = 0. \quad (5.82)$$

Finally,

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}_k(t) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_0\|_{2,\Omega}^2 \leq 2\pi \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}_k\|_{L^\infty(0,2\pi)}^2 \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_0\|_2^2,$$

so that (5.78)₂ yields

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{2\pi} \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}_k(t) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_0\|_{2,\Omega}^2 = 0 \quad (5.83)$$

Combining (5.81)–(5.83) we thus arrive at (5.79), which completes the proof of the theorem. \square

6. THE BIFURCATION RESULT

This section contains our main results, Theorem 11 and Theorem 12. We start by rewriting the bifurcation problem as a system of operator equations in an appropriate functional setting that, thanks to the results proved in the previous sections, will enable us to apply Theorem 1.

6.1. Reformulation of the Problem in Banach Spaces. The first step is to split (5.5) into its averaged and oscillatory components. Set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{w} &:= \overline{\mathbf{w}} + (\mathbf{w} - \overline{\mathbf{w}}) := \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{w}, & \boldsymbol{\eta} &:= \overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}} + (\boldsymbol{\eta} - \overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}}) := \overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}} + \boldsymbol{\xi}, \\ \mathbf{p} &:= \overline{\mathbf{p}} + (\mathbf{p} - \overline{\mathbf{p}}) := \overline{\mathbf{p}} + \mathbf{q}, & \mu &:= \lambda - \lambda_o, \\ \mathbf{u}_0 &:= \mathbf{u}_0(x; \lambda_o), & \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_0 &:= \mathbf{u}_0(x; \mu + \lambda_o) - \mathbf{u}_0. \end{aligned}$$

From (5.5) we thus get

$$\left. \begin{aligned} -\lambda_o(\partial_1 \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_0) - \Delta \mathbf{u} + \nabla \overline{\mathbf{p}} &= \mathbf{N}_1(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w}, \mu) \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} &= 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \text{ in } \Omega, \quad (6.1)$$

$$\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0} \text{ on } \partial\Omega,$$

$$\mathbb{A} \cdot \overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}} + \varpi \int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbb{T}(\mathbf{u}, \overline{\mathbf{p}}) \cdot \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{0},$$

where

$$\mathbf{N}_1 := \begin{cases} -\mu(\partial_1 \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_0) \\ -(\mu + \lambda_o) \left[\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_0 \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_0 + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} + \overline{(\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \mathbf{w}) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{w}} \right] \\ \mathbf{0} \text{ in } \Omega_0, \end{cases} \text{ in } \Omega \quad (6.2)$$

and, with the time-scaling $\tau := \zeta t$,

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \zeta \partial_\tau \mathbf{w} - \lambda_o(\partial_1 \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \nabla \mathbf{w} + (\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \mathbf{w}) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_0) - \Delta \mathbf{w} + \nabla \mathbf{q} &= \mathbf{N}_2(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w}, \mu) \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{w} &= 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \text{ in } \Omega \times [0, 2\pi]$$

$$\mathbf{w} = \boldsymbol{\sigma} \text{ on } \partial\Omega \times [0, 2\pi]$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \zeta \dot{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} + \mathbb{A} \cdot \boldsymbol{\xi} + \varpi \int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbb{T}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}) \cdot \mathbf{n} &= \mathbf{0} \\ \zeta \dot{\boldsymbol{\xi}} - \boldsymbol{\sigma} &= \mathbf{0} \end{aligned} \right\} \text{ in } (0, \infty). \quad (6.3)$$

where

$$\mathbf{N}_2 := \begin{cases} \mu(\partial_1 \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \nabla \mathbf{w} + (\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \mathbf{w}) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_0) \\ +(\mu + \lambda_o) \left[\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_0 \cdot \nabla \mathbf{w} + (\mathbf{w} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}) \cdot \nabla \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_0 + \overline{(\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \mathbf{w}) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{w}} \right] \\ +(\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \mathbf{w}) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{w} + (\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \mathbf{w}) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{0} \text{ in } \Omega_0. \end{cases} \text{ in } \Omega \quad (6.4)$$

We first determine the image of \mathbf{N}_1 and \mathbf{N}_2 .

Lemma 10. *Let $\mathbf{u}_0 = \mathbf{u}_0(\lambda)$ be the velocity field of the solution determined in Theorem 2, corresponding to $\lambda > 0$ and let $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w}, \mu) \in X^2(\Omega) \times W_{\sharp}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$. Then, the following properties hold:*

$$\mathbf{N}_1(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w}, \mu) \in \mathcal{Y}(\Omega); \quad \mathbf{N}_2(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w}, \mu) \in L_{\sharp}^2. \quad (6.5)$$

Proof. Taking into account (6.2) and arguing as in the proof of [11, Lemma 16], it is easy to verify that the first property in (6.5) holds if

$$\overline{(\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \mathbf{w}) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{w}} \in \mathcal{D}_0^{-1,2}(\Omega) \cap L^2(\Omega). \quad (6.6)$$

By Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, integration by parts and elementary embedding theorems we get, for arbitrary $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$,

$$|\langle \overline{(\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \mathbf{w}) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{w}}, \varphi \rangle| \leq (\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{L_{\sharp}^4} + \|\mathbf{w}\|_{L^4(L^4)}) \|\mathbf{w}\|_{L^4(L^4)} \|\nabla \varphi\|_2 \leq c \|\mathbf{w}\|_{W_{\sharp}^2}^2 \|\nabla \varphi\|_2.$$

By a similar argument,

$$\|\overline{(\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \mathbf{w}) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{w}}\|_2 \leq (\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{L_{\sharp}^4} + \|\mathbf{w}\|_{L^4(L^4)}) \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{L^4(L^4)} \leq c \|\mathbf{w}\|_{W_{\sharp}^2}^2,$$

which completes the proof of (6.6).

We next observe that, by Theorem 2 we have $\mathbf{u}_0, \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_0 \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$, whereas $\mathbf{u} \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, by the continuous embedding of X^2 into L^∞ . Thus, from (6.4) and also bearing in mind the proof of the first property in (6.5) just given, one realizes that in order to show the second property in (6.5), it is enough to prove $(\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \mathbf{w}) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} \in L^2(L^2)$. This, in turn, follows at once because $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in W_{\sharp}^1 \subset L^\infty(0, 2\pi)$, $\mathbf{w} \in L^2(W^{2,2}) \subset L^2(L^\infty)$ and $\mathbf{u} \in X^2(\Omega) \subset D^{1,2}(\Omega)$. \square

Set $\mathcal{N}_i := \mathcal{P}\mathbf{N}_i$, $i = 1, 2$, and define $\mathcal{L}_1 (\equiv \mathcal{L}_{\lambda_o})$ by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\lambda_o} : \mathbf{U} \in \mathcal{X} \mapsto \widehat{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{U}) + \lambda_o[\widehat{\partial}_1(\mathbf{U}) + \mathcal{P}\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{U})] \in \mathcal{Y}. \quad (6.7)$$

Recalling the definition of the operator \mathcal{L}_2 given in (5.75), we deduce that equations (6.1) and (6.3) can equivalently be rewritten as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_1(\mathbf{U}) &= \mathcal{N}_1(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}, \mu) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{Y} \\ \zeta \partial_\tau \mathbf{W} + \mathcal{L}_2(\mathbf{W}) &= \mathcal{N}_2(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}, \mu) \quad \text{in } L_{\sharp}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (6.8)$$

where $\mathbf{U} := (\mathbf{u}, \overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}}) \in X^2(\Omega) \times \mathbb{R}^3$ and $\mathbf{W} := (\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) \in W_{\sharp}^2 \times W_{\sharp}^1$.

6.2. Appropriate Formulation of the Assumptions. Our final goal is to describe necessary and sufficient conditions for time-periodic bifurcation. The latter means that problem (6.8) possesses a non-trivial family of solutions $(\mathbf{U}(\mu), \mathbf{W}(\mu), \zeta(\mu))$, μ in a neighborhood of 0, such that

- (i) $\mathbf{W}(\mu)$ is 2π -periodic;
- (ii) For some $\zeta_0 \neq 0$, $(\mathbf{U}(\mu), \mathbf{W}(\mu), \zeta(\mu)) \rightarrow (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}, \zeta_0)$, as $\mu \rightarrow 0$,
in the corresponding spaces.

To this end, we begin to consider, separately, the assumptions (H1)–(H4) made in Theorem 1 and to formulate them appropriately for the case at hand, namely

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_1(\mathbf{U}) &= \mathcal{N}_1(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}, \mu) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{Y} \\ \zeta \partial_\tau \mathbf{W} + \mathcal{L}_2(\mathbf{W}) &= \mathcal{N}_2(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}, \mu) \quad \text{in } L_{\sharp}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (6.10)$$

with $\mathbf{U} := (\mathbf{u}, \overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}}) \in X^2(\Omega) \times \mathbb{R}^3$ and $\mathbf{W} := (\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) \in W_{\sharp}^2 \times W_{\sharp}^1$.

Assumption (H1) requires \mathcal{L}_1 to be a homeomorphism. It is shown in [11, Lemma 15] that the operator \mathcal{L}_1 is Fredholm of index 0. Therefore, the assumption (H1) is satisfied if $\mathbf{N}[\mathcal{L}_1] = \{\mathbf{0}\}$, that is,

$$\mathcal{L}_1(\mathbf{U}) = \mathbf{0} \implies \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (\text{H1}')$$

By definition of \mathcal{L}_1 , (H1') is equivalent to the following request: If $(\mathbf{u}, r, \bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}) \in X^2(\Omega) \times D^{1,2}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{R}^3$ is a solution to the problem

$$\left. \begin{aligned} -\lambda_o(\partial_1 \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_0) - \Delta \mathbf{u} + \nabla r &= \mathbf{0} \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} &= 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \text{ in } \Omega,$$

$$\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0} \text{ on } \partial\Omega,$$

$$\mathbb{A} \cdot \bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}} + \varpi \int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbb{T}(\mathbf{u}, \bar{\mathbf{p}}) \cdot \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{0},$$

then, necessarily, $\mathbf{u} \equiv \nabla r \equiv \bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \equiv \mathbf{0}$. According to [11, Theorem 17], this implies that the equilibrium configuration $\mathbf{s}(\lambda)$ in (5.2) is unique for all $\lambda \in U(\lambda_o)$.

According to Theorem 4, the operator $\mathcal{L}_2 - i\zeta \mathcal{I}$ is Fredholm of index 0 and, moreover $\Sigma := \sigma(\mathcal{L}_2) \cap \{i\mathbb{R}\}$ is constituted only by eigenvalues of finite algebraic multiplicity (a.m.). Therefore, the assertions (i)–(ii) of Assumption (H2) can be formulated as follows:

$$(i) \text{ there is } \nu_0 := i\zeta_0 \in \Sigma \text{ with a.m. } 1; (ii) \ k\nu_0 \notin \Sigma, \text{ for all } |k| > 1. \quad (\text{H2}')$$

Taking into account the definition of \mathcal{L}_2 given in (5.27), we show that (H2') implies, in particular, that the eigenvalue problem

$$\left. \begin{aligned} -i\zeta_0 \mathbf{w} - \lambda_o [\partial_1 \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \nabla \mathbf{w} + (-i\zeta_0 \boldsymbol{\xi} - \mathbf{w}) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_0] &= \Delta \mathbf{w} - \nabla \mathbf{p} \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{w} &= 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \text{ in } \Omega,$$

$$\mathbf{w}(x) = -i\zeta_0 \boldsymbol{\xi}, \quad x \in \partial\Omega, \quad (6.11)$$

$$(-\zeta_0^2 + \mathbb{A} \cdot) \boldsymbol{\xi} + \varpi \int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbb{T}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{p}) \cdot \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{0},$$

has a corresponding one-dimensional eigenspace $(\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) \in Z^{2,2} \times \mathbb{R}^3$.

In view of Theorem 9, the operator

$$\mathcal{Q} : \mathbf{W} \mapsto \zeta_0 \partial_t \mathbf{W} + \mathcal{L}_2(\mathbf{W}),$$

is Fredholm of index 0 so that (H3) is automatically satisfied in our case.

As observed in the discussion of Assumption (H1), its formulation (H1') implies the uniqueness of the velocity field $\mathbf{u}_0(\mu + \lambda_o)$ of the solution determined in Theorem 2 and corresponding to $\mu + \lambda_o$. Even more, the assumption (H1') combined with [11, Theorem 17] entails that the map

$$\mu \in U(0) \subset \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbf{u}_0(\mu + \lambda_o) \in X^2(\Omega)$$

is analytic. In addition, the nonlinear operators \mathcal{N}_i , $i = 1, 2$, are (at most) quadratic in (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w}) and then, by Lemma 10, analytic in those variables. Therefore, we conclude that also assumption (H4) is satisfied in the case at hand.

Before stating the bifurcation theorems in the next subsection, our final comment regards the assumption (4.9) and its formulation in the context of our problem. To this end, we deduce from (6.4) that, in the case at hand, we have

$$S_{011} = \partial_1 \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \nabla \mathbf{w} + (\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \mathbf{w}) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_0 + \lambda_o \left[\tilde{\mathbf{u}}'_0(0) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{w} + (\mathbf{w} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}) \cdot \nabla \tilde{\mathbf{u}}'_0(0) \right]$$

where the prime denotes differentiation with respect to μ . Therefore, denoting by $\nu = \nu(\mu)$ the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{L}_2 + \mu S_{011}$, we may apply [36, Proposition 79.15 and Corollary 79.16] to show that the map

$$\mu \in U(0) \mapsto \nu(\mu) \in \mathbb{C}$$

is well defined and of class C^∞ .

6.3. Necessary and Sufficient Conditions for a Time-Periodic Bifurcation. We are now in a position to state our bifurcation results. We begin with a necessary condition.

Theorem 11. *Suppose there exists $(\lambda_o, \mathbf{u}_0)$ such that (H1') hold. Necessary condition for the occurrence of time-periodic bifurcation is that $i\zeta_0 \in \sigma(\mathcal{L}_2)$.*

Proof. Letting $\beta := \zeta_0 - \zeta$, (6.10) furnishes

$$\mathcal{L}_1(\mathbf{U}) = \mathcal{N}_1(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}, \mu) \text{ in } \mathcal{Y}, \quad \zeta_0 \partial_\tau \mathbf{W} + \mathcal{L}_2(\mathbf{W}) = \beta \partial_\tau \mathbf{W} + \mathcal{N}_2(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}, \mu) \text{ in } L^2_{\sharp}. \quad (6.12)$$

Clearly, $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{W} = \mathbf{0}$ is a solution to (6.12), for all $(\beta, \mu) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$. By (H1') \mathcal{L}_1 is a homeomorphism. Assume that $i\zeta_0 \notin \sigma(\mathcal{L}_2)$. Then, by Theorem 9 and Theorem 4, $\zeta_0 \partial_\tau + \mathcal{L}_2$ is a homeomorphism and, therefore, by the implicit function theorem, for (β, μ) in a neighborhood of $(0, 0)$, $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{W} = \mathbf{0}$ is the only solution, and bifurcation does not occur. \square

The following result provides sufficient conditions and is a direct consequence of Theorem 1.

Theorem 12. *Suppose there exists $(\lambda_o, \mathbf{u}_o, \zeta_o)$ such that assumptions (H1') and (H2') hold and, moreover,*

$$\Re[\nu'(0)] \neq 0.$$

Then, the following properties are valid.

(a) Existence. *There is an analytic family*

$$(\mathbf{u}(\varepsilon), \mathbf{w}(\varepsilon), \boldsymbol{\xi}(\varepsilon), \zeta(\varepsilon), \mu(\varepsilon)) \in X^2(\Omega) \times W_{\sharp}^2 \times W_{\sharp}^1 \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R} \quad (6.13)$$

of solutions to (6.1), (6.3), ε in a neighborhood $\mathcal{I}(0)$ of $0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, let $(\mathbf{w}_0, \boldsymbol{\xi}_0) \in Z_{\mathbb{C}}^{2,2} \times \mathbb{C}^3$ be a normalized eigenfunction of the operator \mathcal{L}_2 corresponding to the eigenvalue $i\zeta_0$, and set $(\mathbf{w}_1, \boldsymbol{\xi}_1) := \Re[(\mathbf{w}_0, \boldsymbol{\xi}_0) e^{-i\tau}]$. Then

$$(\mathbf{u}(\varepsilon), \mathbf{w}(\varepsilon) - \varepsilon \mathbf{w}_1, \boldsymbol{\xi}(\varepsilon) - \varepsilon \boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \zeta(\varepsilon), \mu(\varepsilon)) \rightarrow (0, 0, \zeta_0, 0) \text{ as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (6.14)$$

(b) Uniqueness. *There is a neighborhood*

$$\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}, \zeta_0, 0) \subset X^2(\Omega) \times W_{\sharp}^2 \times W_{\sharp}^1 \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}$$

such that every (nontrivial) 2π -periodic solution to (6.1), (6.2), lying in \mathcal{U} must coincide, up to a phase shift, with a member of the family (6.13).

(c) Parity. *The functions $\zeta(\varepsilon)$ and $\mu(\varepsilon)$ are even:*

$$\zeta(\varepsilon) = \zeta(-\varepsilon), \quad \mu(\varepsilon) = \mu(-\varepsilon), \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon \in \mathcal{I}(0).$$

The bifurcation due to these solutions is either subcritical or supercritical, a two-sided bifurcation being excluded by (c), unless $\mu \equiv 0$.

APPENDIX A. PROOF OF Theorem 1

We proceed in several steps, beginning with some preparatory results. Let v_0 be a normalized eigenvector of L_2 corresponding to the eigenvalue ν_0 , and set

$$v_1 := \Re[v_0 e^{-i\tau}], \quad v_2 := \Im[v_0 e^{-i\tau}]. \quad (A.1)$$

Then we prove:

Lemma 13. *Let Q be as in (H3). Under the assumption (H2), we have $\dim \mathbf{N}[Q] = 2$, and $\{v_1, v_2\}$ is a basis in $\mathbf{N}[Q]$.*

Proof. Clearly, $\mathcal{S} := \text{span}\{v_1, v_2\} \subseteq \mathbf{N}[Q]$. Conversely, take $w \in \mathbf{N}[Q]$, and expand it in Fourier series

$$w = \sum_{\ell=-\infty}^{\infty} w_{\ell} e^{-i\ell\tau}; \quad w_{\ell} := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} w(\tau) e^{i\ell\tau} d\tau, \quad w_0 \equiv \bar{w} = 0.$$

Obviously, $w_{\ell} \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathbb{C}} \equiv \mathbf{D}_{\mathbb{C}}[L_2]$. From $Q(w) = 0$ we deduce

$$-\ell \nu_0 w_{\ell} + L_2(w_{\ell}) = 0, \quad w_{\ell} \in \mathbf{D}_{\mathbb{C}}[L_2], \quad \ell \in \mathbb{Z},$$

which, by (H2) and the fact that $w_0 = 0$, implies $w_{\ell} = 0$ for all $\ell \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{\pm 1\}$. Thus, recalling that ν_0 is simple, we infer $w \in \mathcal{S}$ and the lemma follows. \square

Denote by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ the scalar product in \mathcal{Z} and set

$$(w_1|w_2) := \int_0^{2\pi} \langle w_1(s), w_2(s) \rangle ds, \quad w_1, w_2 \in \mathcal{Z}_{2\pi,0}.$$

Let L_2^\dagger be the adjoint of L_2 . Since ν_0 is simple and $L_2 - \nu_0 I$ is Fredholm of index 0 (by (H2)), from classical results (see e.g. [35, Section 8.4]), it follows that there exists at least one element $v_0^\dagger \in \mathbf{N}_{\mathbb{C}}[L_2^\dagger - \nu_0 I]$ such that $\langle v_0^\dagger, v_0 \rangle \neq 0$. Without loss, we may take

$$\langle v_0^\dagger, v_0 \rangle = \pi^{-1}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

We then define

$$v_1^\dagger := \Re[v_0^\dagger e^{i\tau}], \quad v_2^\dagger := \Im[v_0^\dagger e^{i\tau}],$$

and observe that, by (A.1) and (A.2),

$$(v_1|v_1^\dagger) = (v_2|v_2^\dagger) = 1, \quad (v_2|v_1^\dagger) = (v_1|v_2^\dagger) = 0, \quad ((v_1)_\tau|v_1^\dagger) = 0, \quad ((v_1)_\tau|v_2^\dagger) = -1. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Set

$$\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_{2\pi,0} = \{w \in \mathcal{Z}_{2\pi,0} : (w|v_1^\dagger) = (w|v_2^\dagger) = 0\}, \quad \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{2\pi,0} = \mathcal{W}_{2\pi,0} \cap \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_{2\pi,0}.$$

Let us now show that Q is a homeomorphism.

Lemma 14. *Let (H2) and (H3) hold. Then, the operator Q maps $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{2\pi,0}$ onto $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{2\pi,0}$ homeomorphically.*

Proof. By (H3), Q is Fredholm of index 0, whereas, by Lemma 13, we know $\dim \mathbf{N}[Q] = 2$. From classical theory of Fredholm operators (e.g. [35, Proposition 8.14(4)]) it then follows that $\dim \mathbf{N}[Q^\dagger] = 2$ where

$$Q^\dagger = \zeta_0(\cdot)_\tau + L_2^\dagger$$

is the adjoint of Q . In view of the stated properties of v_0^\dagger , we infer $\text{span}\{v_1^\dagger, v_2^\dagger\} = \mathbf{N}[Q^\dagger]$, and the lemma follows from another classical result on Fredholm operators (e.g. [35, Proposition 8.14(2)]). \square

Let

$$L_2(\mu) := L_2 + \mu S_{011}.$$

since, by (H2), ν_0 is a simple eigenvalue of $L_2(0) \equiv L_2$, denoting by $\nu(\mu)$ the eigenvalues of $L_2(\mu)$, it follows (e.g. [36, Proposition 79.15 and Corollary 79.16]) that in a neighborhood of $\mu = 0$ the map $\mu \mapsto \nu(\mu)$ is well defined and of class C^∞ and, further,

$$\nu'(0) = \langle v_0^\dagger, S_{011}(v_0) \rangle.$$

Using the latter, by direct inspection we show

$$\Re[\nu'(0)] = \pi^{-1}(S_{011}(v_1)|v_1^\dagger). \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Proof of Assertion (a). In order to ensure that the solutions we are looking for are non-trivial, we endow (4.7) with the side condition

$$(w|v_1^\dagger) = \varepsilon, \quad (w|v_2^\dagger) = 0, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where ε is a real parameter ranging in a neighborhood, $\mathcal{I}(0)$, of 0. We next scale v and w by setting $v = \varepsilon \mathbf{v}$, $w = \varepsilon \mathbf{w}$, so that problem (4.7), (A.5) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} L_1(\mathbf{v}) &= \mathcal{N}_1(\varepsilon, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}, \mu), \quad \text{in } \mathcal{V}; \\ \zeta_0 \mathbf{w}_\tau + L_2(\mathbf{w}) &= \mathcal{N}_2(\varepsilon, \zeta, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}, \mu), \quad \text{in } \mathcal{Z}_{2\pi,0}, \quad (\mathbf{w}|v_1^\dagger) = 1, \quad (\mathbf{w}|v_2^\dagger) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_1(\varepsilon, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}, \mu) &:= (1/\varepsilon) N_1(\varepsilon \mathbf{v}, \varepsilon \mathbf{w}, \mu), \\ \mathcal{N}_2(\varepsilon, \zeta, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}, \mu) &:= (1/\varepsilon) N_2(\varepsilon \mathbf{v}, \varepsilon \mathbf{w}, \mu) + (\zeta_0 - \omega) \mathbf{w}_\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Set $\mathbf{U} := (\mu, \zeta, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w})$, and consider the map

$$\begin{aligned} F : \mathcal{I}(0) \times (U(0) \times V(\zeta_0) \times \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{W}_{2\pi,0}) &\rightarrow \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{Z}_{2\pi,0} \times \mathbb{R}^2, \\ (\varepsilon, \mathbf{U}) &\mapsto \left(L_1(\mathbf{v}) - \mathcal{N}_1(\varepsilon, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}, \mu), Q(\mathbf{w}) - \mathcal{N}_2(\varepsilon, \zeta, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}, \mu), (w|v_1^\dagger) - 1, (w|v_2^\dagger) \right), \end{aligned}$$

with $U(0)$ and $V(\zeta_0)$ neighborhoods of 0 and ζ_0 , respectively. Since, by (H4), we have in particular $\mathcal{N}_1(0, 0, v_1, 0) = \mathcal{N}_2(0, \zeta_0, v_1, 0) = 0$, using (A.3)₁ and Lemma 13 we deduce that, at $\varepsilon = 0$, the equation $F(\varepsilon, \mathbf{U}) = 0$ has the solution $\mathbf{U}_0 = (0, \zeta_0, 0, v_1)$. Therefore, since by (H4) we have that F is analytic at $(0, \mathbf{U}_0)$, by the analytic version of the Implicit Function Theorem (e.g. [35, Proposition 8.11]), to show the existence statement –including the validity of (4.11)– it suffices to show that the Fréchet derivative, $D_{\mathbf{U}}F(0, \mathbf{U}_0)$ is a bijection. Now, in view of the assumption (H4), one can easily check that the Fréchet derivative of \mathcal{N}_1 at $(\varepsilon = 0, \mathbf{v} = 0, \mathbf{w} = v_1, \mu = 0)$ is equal to 0, while that of \mathcal{N}_2 at $(\varepsilon = 0, \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{U}_0)$ is equal to $-\zeta(v_1)_\tau + \mu S_{011}(v_1)$. Therefore, $D_{\mathbf{U}}F(0, \mathbf{U}_0)$ is a bijection if we prove that for any $(\mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{f}_2, \mathbf{f}_3, \mathbf{f}_4) \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{Z}_{2\pi,0} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$, the following system of equations has one and only one solution $(\mu, \zeta, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{W}_{2\pi,0}$:

$$\begin{aligned} L_1(\mathbf{v}) &= \mathbf{f}_1 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{V} \\ Q(\mathbf{w}) &= -\zeta(v_1)_\tau + \mu S_{011}(v_1) + \mathbf{f}_2 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{Z}_{2\pi,0}, \\ (\mathbf{w}|v_1^\dagger) &= \mathbf{f}_3, \quad (\mathbf{w}|v_2^\dagger) = \mathbf{f}_4 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \end{aligned} \tag{A.7}$$

In view of (H1), for any given $\mathbf{f}_1 \in \mathcal{V}$, equation (A.7)₁ has one and only one solution $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{U}$. Therefore, it remains to prove the existence and uniqueness property only for the system of equations (A.7)_{2–4}. To this aim, we observe that, by Lemma 14, for a given $\mathbf{f}_2 \in \mathcal{Z}_{2\pi,0}$, equation (A.7)₂ possesses a unique solution $\mathbf{w}_1 \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{2\pi,0}$ if and only if its right-hand side is in $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_{2\pi,0}$, namely,

$$(-\zeta(v_1)_\tau + \mu S_{011}(v_1) + \mathbf{f}_2|v_1^\dagger) = (-\zeta(v_1)_\tau + \mu S_{011}(v_1) + \mathbf{f}_2|v_2^\dagger) = 0.$$

Taking into account (A.3)₂ the above conditions will be satisfied provided we can find μ and ζ satisfying the following algebraic system

$$\mu(S_{011}(v_1)|v_1^\dagger) = -(\mathbf{f}_2|v_1^\dagger), \quad \zeta + \mu(S_{011}(v_1)|v_2^\dagger) = -(\mathbf{f}_2|v_2^\dagger). \tag{A.8}$$

However, by virtue of (A.4), (4.9) this system possesses a uniquely determined solution (μ, ζ) , which ensures the existence of a unique solution $\mathbf{w}_1 \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{2\pi,0}$ to (A.7)₂ corresponding to the selected values of μ and ζ .

We now set

$$\mathbf{w} := \mathbf{w}_1 + \alpha v_1 + \beta v_2, \quad \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Clearly, by Lemma 13, \mathbf{w} is also a solution to (A.7)₂. We then choose α and β in such a way that \mathbf{w} satisfies both conditions (A.7)_{3,4} for any given $\mathbf{f}_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, 2$. This choice is made possible by virtue of (A.3)₁. We have thus shown that $D_{\mathbf{U}}F(0, \mathbf{U}_0)$ is surjective.

To show that it is also injective, set $\mathbf{f}_i = 0$ in (A.7)_{2–4}. From (A.8) and (A.4), (4.9) it then follows $\mu = \zeta = 0$ which in turn implies, by (A.7)₂ and Lemma 13, $\mathbf{w} = \gamma_1 v_1 + \gamma_2 v_2$, for some $\gamma_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, 2$. Replacing this information back in (A.7)_{3,4} with $\mathbf{f}_3 = \mathbf{f}_4 = 0$, and using (A.3)₁ we conclude $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 0$, which proves the claimed injectivity property. Thus, $D_{\mathbf{U}}F(0, \mathbf{U}_0)$ is a bijection, and the proof of the existence statement in (a) is completed. \square

Proof of Assertion (b). Let $(z, s) \in \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{W}_{2\pi,0}$ be a 2π -periodic solution to (4.7) with $\zeta \equiv \widetilde{\zeta}$ and $\mu \equiv \widetilde{\mu}$. By the uniqueness property associated with the implicit function theorem, the proof of the claimed uniqueness amounts to show that we can find a sufficiently small $\rho > 0$ such that if

$$\|z\|_{\mathcal{U}} + \|s\|_{\mathcal{W}_{2\pi,0}} + |\widetilde{\zeta} - \zeta_0| + |\widetilde{\mu}| < \rho, \tag{A.9}$$

then there exists a neighborhood of 0, $\mathcal{I}(0) \subset \mathbb{R}$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} s &= \eta v_1 + \eta s, \quad z = \eta z, \quad \text{for all } \eta \in \mathcal{I}(0), \\ |\widetilde{\zeta} - \zeta_0| + |\widetilde{\mu}| + \|z\|_{\mathcal{U}} + \|s\|_{\mathcal{W}_{2\pi,0}} &\rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \eta \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned} \tag{A.10}$$

To this end, we notice that, by (A.3)₁, we may write

$$s = \sigma + \widetilde{s} \tag{A.11}$$

where $\sigma = (s|v_1^\dagger)v_1 + (s|v_2^\dagger)v_2$ and

$$(\widetilde{s}|v_i^\dagger) = 0, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

We next make the simple but important observation that if we modify s by a constant phase shift in time, δ , namely, $s(\tau) \rightarrow s(\tau + \delta)$, the shifted function is still a 2π -periodic solution to (4.7)₂ and, moreover, by an appropriate choice of δ ,

$$\sigma = \eta v_1, \quad (\text{A.12})$$

with $\eta = \eta(\delta) \in \mathbb{R}$. (The proof of (A.12) is straightforward, once we take into account the definition of v_1 and v_2 .) Notice that from (A.9), (A.11)–(A.12) it follows that

$$|\eta| + \|\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}\|_{\mathcal{W}_{2\pi,0}} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \rho \rightarrow 0. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

From (5.36) we thus get

$$L_1(z) = N_1(z, \eta v_1 + \tilde{\mathfrak{S}}, \tilde{\mu}) \quad (\text{A.14})$$

and, recalling Lemma 13,

$$Q(\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}) = \eta(\zeta_0 - \zeta)(v_1)_\tau + (\zeta_0 - \zeta)\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_\tau + N_2(z, \eta v_1 + \tilde{\mathfrak{S}}, \tilde{\mu}). \quad (\text{A.15})$$

In view of (H4) and (A.9), we easily deduce

$$N_1(z, \eta v_1 + \tilde{\mathfrak{S}}, \tilde{\mu}) = R_{110}z(\eta v_1 + \tilde{\mathfrak{S}}) + R_{101}z\tilde{\mu} + R_{020}(\eta v_1 + \tilde{\mathfrak{S}})^2 + n_1(z, \eta, \tilde{\mathfrak{S}}, \tilde{\mu}),$$

where

$$\|n_1(z, \eta, \tilde{\mathfrak{S}}, \tilde{\mu})\|_{\mathcal{V}} \leq \epsilon(\rho) (\|z\|_{\mathcal{U}} + \|\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}\|_{\mathcal{W}_{2\pi,0}} + \eta^2), \quad \epsilon(\rho) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \rho \rightarrow 0,$$

so that, by (A.14) and (H1), by taking ρ sufficiently small we obtain

$$\|z\|_{\mathcal{U}} \leq c_1 (|\eta|^2 + \|\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}\|_{\mathcal{W}_{2\pi,0}}^2 + \epsilon(\rho)\|\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}\|_{\mathcal{W}_{2\pi,0}}). \quad (\text{A.16})$$

Likewise,

$$\begin{aligned} N_2(z, \eta v_1 + \tilde{\mathfrak{S}}, \tilde{\mu}) &= S_{011}(\eta v_1 + \tilde{\mathfrak{S}})\tilde{\mu} + S_{110}z(\eta v_1 + \tilde{\mathfrak{S}}) + S_{101}z\tilde{\mu} \\ &\quad + S_{200}z^2 + S_{020}(\eta v_1 + \tilde{\mathfrak{S}})^2 + n_2(z, \eta, \tilde{\mathfrak{S}}, \tilde{\mu}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.17})$$

where n_2 enjoys the same property as n_1 . From (A.15), (A.17) and (A.3)₁ we infer, according to Lemma 14, that the following (compatibility) conditions must be satisfied

$$\begin{aligned} -\eta\tilde{\mu}(S_{011}(v_1)|v_1^\dagger) &= ((\zeta_0 - \zeta)\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_\tau + S_{011}\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}\tilde{\mu} + S_{110}z(\eta v_1 + \tilde{\mathfrak{S}})|v_1^\dagger) \\ &\quad + (S_{200}z^2 + S_{020}(\eta v_1 + \tilde{\mathfrak{S}})^2|v_1^\dagger) + (n_2|v_1^\dagger) \\ \eta(\zeta - \zeta_0) &= ((\zeta_0 - \zeta)\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_\tau + S_{011}\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}\tilde{\mu} + S_{110}z(\eta v_1 + \tilde{\mathfrak{S}})|v_2^\dagger) \\ &\quad + (S_{200}z^2 + S_{020}(\eta v_2 + \tilde{\mathfrak{S}})^2|v_2^\dagger) + (n_2|v_2^\dagger), \end{aligned}$$

so that, from (5.40) and the property of n_2 we show

$$\begin{aligned} |\eta| (|\tilde{\mu}| + |\zeta - \zeta_0|) &\leq c_2 (|\zeta - \zeta_0| + |\tilde{\mu}|) \|\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}\|_{\mathcal{W}_{2\pi,0}} + |\eta| \|z\|_{\mathcal{U}} + \|z\|_{\mathcal{U}}^2 \\ &\quad + \|\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}\|_{\mathcal{W}_{2\pi,0}}^2 + \eta^2) + \epsilon(\rho) (\|z\|_{\mathcal{U}} + \|\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}\|_{\mathcal{W}_{2\pi,0}}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.18})$$

Finally, applying Lemma 14 to (A.15) and using (A.17), (A.9) with ρ sufficiently small we get

$$\|\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}\|_{\mathcal{W}_{2\pi,0}} \leq c_3 (|\eta| (|\tilde{\mu}| + |\zeta - \zeta_0|) + (|\eta| + |\tilde{\mu}| + \epsilon(\rho)) \|z\|_{\mathcal{U}} + \|z\|_{\mathcal{U}}^2 + \eta^2). \quad (\text{A.19})$$

Summing side by side (A.16), (A.18) and $(1/(2c_3)) \times (\text{A.19})$, and taking again ρ small enough, we thus arrive at

$$|\eta| (|\tilde{\mu}| + |\zeta - \zeta_0|) + \|z\|_{\mathcal{U}} + \|\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}\|_{\mathcal{W}_{2\pi,0}} \leq c_4 \eta^2,$$

from which we infer the validity of (A.10)₂, thus proving the uniqueness property (b). \square

Proof of Assertion (c). We notice that if $(v(-\varepsilon), w(-\varepsilon; \tau))$ is the solution corresponding to $-\varepsilon$, we have $(w(-\varepsilon; \tau + \pi)|v_1^\dagger) = \varepsilon v_1$, which, by part (b), implies that $(v(-\varepsilon), w(-\varepsilon; \tau)) = (v(\varepsilon), w(\varepsilon; \tau))$ up to a phase shift. This, in turn, furnishes $\zeta(-\varepsilon) = \zeta(\varepsilon)$ and $\mu(-\varepsilon) = \mu(\varepsilon)$. From the latter and the analyticity of μ we then obtain that either $\mu \equiv 0$ or else there is an integer $k \geq 1$ and corresponding $\mu_k \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, such that

$$\mu(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon^{2k} \mu_k + O(\varepsilon^{2k+2}).$$

Thus, $\mu(\varepsilon) < 0$ or $\mu(\varepsilon) > 0$, according to whether μ_k is negative or positive. The theorem is completely proved. \square

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Denis Bonheure is supported by the ARC Advanced 2020-25 “PDEs in interaction” and by the Francqui Foundation as Francqui Research Professor 2021-24. Giovanni P. Galdi is partially supported by the National Science Foundation Grant DMS-2307811. Filippo Gazzola is supported by Dipartimento di Eccellenza 2023-27 of MUR (Italy), PRIN project *Partial differential equations and related geometric-functional inequalities*, and by INdAM.

DECLARATIONS

- The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.
- The authors have no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.
- Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ammann, O.H., von Kármán, T., Woodruff, G.B., *The failure of the Tacoma Narrows Bridge*, Technical Report, Federal Works Agency, Washington D.C. (1941) pages
- [2] Arioli, G., Gazzola, F., Koch, H., Uniqueness and bifurcation branches for planar steady Navier-Stokes equations under Navier boundary conditions, *J. Math. Fluid. Mech.* **23**, No.3, Paper No. 49, 20 pp. (2021) pages
- [3] Arioli, G., Koch, H., A Hopf bifurcation in the planar Navier-Stokes equations, *J. Math. Fluid Mech.* **23**, No.3, Paper No. 70, 14 pp. (2021) pages
- [4] Babenko, K.I., On the spectrum of a linearized problem on the flow of a viscous incompressible fluid around a body (Russian). *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, **262**, 64-68 (1982) pages
- [5] Babenko, K.I., Periodic solutions of a problem of the flow of a viscous fluid around a body, *Soviet Math. Dokl.* **25**, 211-216 (1982) pages
- [6] Berchio, E., Bonheure, D., Galdi, G.P., Gazzola, F., Perotto, S., Equilibrium configurations of a symmetric body immersed in a stationary Navier-Stokes flow in a planar channel, to appear in *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* pages
- [7] Blackburn, H.M., Henderson, R.D., A study of two-dimensional flow past an oscillating cylinder, *J. Fluid Mech.* **385**, 255-286 (1999) pages
- [8] Blevins R.D., *Flow induced vibrations*, Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., New York (1990) pages
- [9] Bonheure, D., Galdi, G.P., Global Weak Solutions to a Time-Periodic Body-Liquid Interaction Problem, submitted (2023) pages
- [10] Bonheure, D., Galdi, G.P., Gazzola, F., Equilibrium configuration of a rectangular obstacle immersed in a channel flow. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* **358**, 887-896 (2020); updated version in arXiv:2004.10062v2 (2021) pages
- [11] Bonheure, D., Galdi, G.P., Gazzola, F., Stability of equilibria and bifurcations for a fluid-solid interaction problem (2024), preprint. pages
- [12] Bonheure, D., Hillairet, M., Patriarca, C., and Sperone, G., Long-time behavior of an anisotropic rigid body interacting with a Poiseuille flow in an unbounded channel, submitted (2023) pages
- [13] Crandall, M.G., Rabinowitz, P.H., The Hopf bifurcation theorem in infinite dimensions, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **67**, 53-72 (1977) pages
- [14] Diana, G., Resta, F., Belloli, M., Rocchi, D., On the vortex shedding forcing on suspension bridge deck, *J. Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics*, **94(5)**, 341-363 (2006) pages
- [15] Dyrbye, C., Hansen, S.O., *Wind Loads on Structures*, Wiley, New York (1997) pages
- [16] Farwig, R., Neustupa, J., Spectral properties in L^q of an Oseen operator modelling fluid flow past a rotating body, *Tohoku Math. J.* **62**, 287-309 (2010) pages
- [17] Fatone, L., Gervasio, P., Quarteroni, A., Multimodels for incompressible flows, *J. Math. Fluid Mech.* **2**, 126-150 (2000) pages
- [18] Gerecht, D., Rannacher, R., Wollner, W., Computational aspects of pseudospectra in hydrodynamic stability analysis. *J. Math. Fluid Mech.* **14**, 661-692 (2012) pages
- [19] Galdi, G.P., On the motion of a rigid body in a viscous liquid: A mathematical analysis with applications, *Handbook of Mathematical Fluid Mechanics*, Elsevier Science, 653-791 (2002) pages
- [20] Galdi, G.P., *An introduction to the mathematical theory of the Navier-Stokes equations. Steady-state problems*, Second edition. Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer, New York (2011) pages
- [21] Galdi, G.P., Steady-state Navier-Stokes problem past a rotating body: geometric-functional properties and related questions., *Topics in mathematical fluid mechanics*, 109-197, Springer Lecture Notes in Math., **2073** (2013) pages
- [22] Galdi, G.P., A time-periodic bifurcation theorem and its applications to Navier-Stokes flow past an obstacle, in *Mathematical Analysis of Viscous Incompressible Flow*, edited by T. Hishida, R.I.M.S. Kokyuroku (Kyoto University, Japan, 2015), pp. 1-27. arXiv:1507.07903 pages
- [23] Galdi, G.P., On bifurcating time-periodic flow of a Navier-Stokes liquid past a cylinder. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **222**, 285-315 (2016) pages

- [24] Galdi, G.P., Kyed, M., Time-periodic solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations. *Handbook of mathematical analysis in mechanics of viscous fluids*, 509-578, Springer, Cham (2018) pages
- [25] Gazzola, F., Pata, V., Patriarca, C., Attractors for a fluid-structure interaction problem in a time-dependent phase space, *J. Funct. Anal.* **286**, Paper No. 110199, 56 pp. (2024) pages
- [26] Gazzola, F., Patriarca, C., An explicit threshold for the appearance of lift on the deck of a bridge. *J. Math. Fluid Mech.* **24**, No.1, Paper No. 9, 23 pp. (2022) pages
- [27] Gazzola, F., Sperone, G., Steady Navier-Stokes equations in planar domains with obstacle and explicit bounds for unique solvability, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **238**, 1283-1347 (2020) pages
- [28] Gohberg, I., Goldberg, S., Kaashoek, M.A., *Classes of linear operators: I. Operator Theory*, Advances and Applications, Vol.49, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel (1990) pages
- [29] Heywood, J.G., The Navier-Stokes equations: on the existence, regularity and decay of solutions, *Indiana Univ. Math. Journal* **29**, 639-681 (1980) pages
- [30] Paidoussis, M., Price, S., De Langre, E., *Fluid-Structure Interactions: Cross-Flow-Induced Instabilities*, Cambridge University Press (2010) pages
- [31] Patriarca, C., Existence and uniqueness result for a fluid-structure-interaction evolution problem in an unbounded 2D channel, *NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl.* **29**, No. 4, Paper No. 39, 38 pp. (2022) pages
- [32] Sazonov, L.I., The onset of auto-oscillations in a flow, *Siberian Math. J.* **35**, 1202-1209 (1994) pages
- [33] Scott, R., *In the wake of Tacoma. Suspension bridges and the quest for aerodynamic stability*, ASCE Press (2001) pages
- [34] Williamson, C.H.K., Govardhan, S., Vortex-induced Vibrations, *Ann. Rev. Fluid Mech.*, **36**, 413-55 (2004) pages
- [35] Zeidler, E., *Nonlinear Functional Analysis and Applications*, Vol.1, Fixed-Point Theorems, Springer-Verlag, New York (1986) pages
- [36] Zeidler, E., *Nonlinear Functional Analysis and Applications*, Vol.4, Application to Mathematical Physics, Springer-Verlag, New York (1988) pages

DÉPARTEMENT DE MATHÉMATIQUE, UNIVERSITÉ LIBRE DE BRUXELLES, BOULEVARD DU TRIOMPHE 155, 1050 BRUSSELS - BELGIUM

Email address: `denis.bonheure@ulb.be`

DEPARTMENT OF MECHANICAL ENGINEERING AND MATERIALS SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH, BENEDUM ENGINEERING HALL 607, PITTSBURGH, PA 15261 - USA

Email address: `galdi@pitt.edu`

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, POLITECNICO DI MILANO, PIAZZA LEONARDO DA VINCI 32, 20133 MILAN - ITALY

Email address: `filippo.gazzola@polimi.it`