

THE LANDAU–LIFSHITZ–BLOCH EQUATION: UNIQUE EXISTENCE AND FINITE ELEMENT APPROXIMATION

KIM-NGAN LE, AGUS L. SOENJAYA, AND THANH TRAN

ABSTRACT. The Landau–Lifshitz–Bloch equation (LLBE) describes the evolution of magnetic spin field in a ferromagnet at high temperatures. We consider a viscous (pseudo-parabolic) regularisation of the LLBE for temperatures higher than the Curie temperature, which we call the ϵ -LLBE. Variants of the ϵ -LLBE are applicable to model pattern formation, phase transition, and heat conduction for non-simple materials, among other things. In this paper, we show well-posedness of the ϵ -LLBE and the convergence of the solution \mathbf{u}^ϵ of the regularised equation to the solution \mathbf{u} of the LLBE as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$. As a by-product of our analysis, we show the existence and uniqueness of regular solution to the LLBE for temperatures higher than the Curie temperature. Furthermore, we propose a linear fully discrete conforming finite element scheme to approximate the solution of the ϵ -LLBE. Error analysis is performed to show unconditional stability and optimal uniform-in-time convergence rate for the schemes. Several numerical simulations corroborate our theoretical results.

1. INTRODUCTION

Micromagnetic modeling has proved itself to be an effective theoretical framework in describing magnetisation dynamics at sub-micrometre length scales. The framework of Landau–Lifshitz–Bloch equation (LLBE) [17, 18] overcomes a problem of the standard model of magnetisation which carries a significant limitation of being valid only at very low temperatures, far below the Curie temperature T_c [11]. The LLBE essentially interpolates between the standard model at low temperatures and the Ginzburg-Landau theory of phase transitions. It is valid not only below, but also above the temperature T_c . The LLBE has been successfully used to analyse magnetisation dynamics at high temperature [3, 11, 12, 32]. It is also widely used in the physics literature to model the heat-assisted magnetic recording (HAMR), a modern hard drive technology recently made available commercially [31, 46].

In this paper, we consider a deterministic form of the LLBE in which the temperature is raised higher than T_c . We assume that the effective field is dominated by exchange interactions, although it is straightforward to include the lower-order uniaxial anisotropy field and a time-varying external field in the equation. For simplicity of presentation, spin-torque effects due to electron conduction are also ignored, although it is again possible to include the adiabatic spin-torque term [38] of the form $(\mathbf{j} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u}$, where \mathbf{j} is a given current density. The spin polarisation $\mathbf{u}(t, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ at time $t \geq 0$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, where $d = 1, 2, 3$, satisfies the problem [12, 27]:

$$\partial_t \mathbf{u} = \kappa_1 \Delta \mathbf{u} + \gamma \mathbf{u} \times \Delta \mathbf{u} - \kappa_2 (1 + \mu |\mathbf{u}|^2) \mathbf{u} \quad \text{in } (0, T) \times \mathcal{D}, \quad (1.1a)$$

$$\mathbf{u}(0, \cdot) = \mathbf{u}_0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}, \quad (1.1b)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\nu}} = 0 \quad \text{on } (0, T) \times \partial \mathcal{D}. \quad (1.1c)$$

Here $\partial \mathcal{D}$ denotes the boundary of \mathcal{D} which is assumed to be smooth and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ is the outward normal unit vector. The positive coefficients κ_1 and κ_2 are phenomenological damping parameters, while γ is the gyromagnetic ratio (which can be positive or negative depending on the precessional direction of the particle). The constant μ is related to the equilibrium magnetisation magnitude. It is positive when the temperature is above the Curie temperature T_c . We assume throughout the whole paper that μ is positive. The case of negative μ , which occurs when the temperature is slightly below T_c (see [43]), can also be handled using the method in this paper with minor modifications.

Unlike the standard Landau–Lifshitz equation where its solutions are restricted to a sphere [19, 25], a distinctive property of the LLBE is that the magnetisation magnitude could vary in time and is no longer conserved. As a result, \mathbb{L}^∞ estimate of the solution is no longer guaranteed, and some estimates on the solution need to be done differently. Furthermore, numerical methods for the usual Landau–Lifshitz equation where the sphere condition is crucial are not applicable for the LLBE. To obtain better stability property and optimal convergence rate for the numerical solution, we consider a viscous regularisation of (1.1) by adding an extra term $-\epsilon\Delta\partial_t\mathbf{u}$ to (1.1a), where ϵ is a small positive real number. The resulting equation satisfied by the vector field $\mathbf{u}^\epsilon : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ is called the ϵ -LLBE, and the problem reads

$$\partial_t\mathbf{u}^\epsilon - \epsilon\Delta\partial_t\mathbf{u}^\epsilon = \kappa_1\Delta\mathbf{u}^\epsilon + \gamma\mathbf{u}^\epsilon \times \Delta\mathbf{u}^\epsilon - \kappa_2(1 + \mu|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon|^2)\mathbf{u}^\epsilon \quad \text{in } (0, T) \times \mathcal{D}, \quad (1.2a)$$

$$\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(0, \cdot) = \mathbf{u}_0^\epsilon \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}, \quad (1.2b)$$

$$\frac{\partial\mathbf{u}^\epsilon}{\partial\nu} = 0 \quad \text{on } (0, T) \times \partial\mathcal{D}. \quad (1.2c)$$

Starting from the same initial data $\mathbf{u}_0^\epsilon = \mathbf{u}_0$, the solution \mathbf{u}^ϵ to (1.2) will be shown to converge to the solution \mathbf{u} of (1.1) as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$. Similar ideas to approximate the solution of a PDE by its viscous (pseudo-parabolic) regularisation have been applied before, for instance in [36] for a class of parabolic equation, in [5] and [2] for the BBM equation, and in [33] for a class of nonlinear diffusion equations.

For any $\epsilon > 0$, equation (1.2a) is a vector-valued quasilinear pseudo-parabolic equation (or equation of Sobolev type), the analysis of which is mathematically interesting on its own. Well-posedness of a semilinear Sobolev equation with nonlinearities of sublinear growth was established in [7, 36] (see also [2] for the case where certain nonlinearities are unbounded). The analysis for a class of scalar-valued nonlinear pseudo-parabolic equations with bounded or globally Lipschitz nonlinearities was done in [15]. Global existence and finite time blow-up for such equations with polynomial nonlinearities were studied in [8, 44]. To the best of our knowledge, however, none of the available results are sufficiently general to cover problem (1.2).

Furthermore, the ϵ -LLBE (or simpler variants of it) is an important model of physical significance. For instance, the case $\kappa_2 = \gamma = 0$ gives a model for shearing flows of second-order fluids [41]. If $\gamma = 0$, this is the vector-valued viscous Ginzburg–Landau equation (or the viscous Allen–Cahn equation) used to model pattern formation and phase transition [21]. Such equation is also used to model heat conduction for non-simple materials involving two temperatures [10]. Similar equations are also investigated in [4] to model fluid flow through a fissured material, in [5] to model propagation of dispersive long wave, in [33] to study the problem of phase separation in viscous mixture, and in [34] to model population dynamics, among others.

Numerical methods to solve scalar-valued pseudo-parabolic equations (or equations of Sobolev type) exist in the literature. A finite difference method to solve the linear Sobolev equation is proposed in [14]. Numerical schemes to solve nonlinear Sobolev-type equations are studied in [15], where sub-optimal rate of convergence is derived in the L^2 -norm. A posteriori error estimates are studied in [42]. Various numerical schemes are proposed and analysed for the nonlinear Sobolev-type equations, for instance two-grid finite element method in [9], weak Galerkin finite element method in [16], space-time continuous Galerkin method in [45], among others. These schemes, however, mainly address the case where the nonlinearities are either bounded or globally Lipschitz, and is restricted to planar domain $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. Equation 1.2 considered in the present paper satisfies neither of these conditions.

As we have elucidated above, despite its importance and wide applicability to model various phenomena in the physics literature, rigorous analysis of numerical schemes to approximate the solution of (1.1) or (1.2) (or variants thereof) is not yet available. This paper aims to bridge this gap by proposing a stable, fully discrete linear finite element method to approximate the deterministic ϵ -LLBE (hence the LLBE as well) and proving an optimal order of convergence to the exact solution in \mathbb{H}^1 -norm. In order to achieve this, we will rigorously show the existence and uniqueness of regular solution to the LLBE and the ϵ -LLBE, building upon the initial results shown by the first author in [27]. A salient feature of the error estimate for the approximation of ϵ -LLBE derived here is that it holds uniformly in time, analogous to the result developed in [26] for a semilinear parabolic problem.

We remark that another regularisation (by adding the term $\epsilon \Delta^2 \mathbf{u}$) is considered in [20] for the stochastic LLBE, turning the equation into a fourth-order nonlinear stochastic PDE. A numerical method is then proposed to solve the equation and the rate of convergence to the exact solution is shown for $d \in \{1, 2\}$. Since we intend to work with a conforming finite element method, such regularisation is not utilised here to avoid using a C^1 -conforming finite element for a fourth-order problem, which can be computationally costly and difficult to implement, especially for $d = 3$.

To summarise, the main contributions of this paper include proving the following:

- existence and uniqueness of strong and regular solutions \mathbf{u}^ϵ to (1.2) (Proposition 2.10),
- existence of strong and regular solutions \mathbf{u} to (1.1) (Theorem 2.12),
- long-term behaviour of \mathbf{u} , i.e., $\|\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(\mathcal{D})} \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ (Proposition 2.13), as predicted by the physical theory,
- convergence in $L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{L}^2(\mathcal{D}))$ of \mathbf{u}^ϵ to the solution \mathbf{u} of LLBE as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ (Theorem 2.14), which implies the uniqueness of \mathbf{u} ,
- error estimates of the finite-element approximation to the solution \mathbf{u}^ϵ of the ϵ -LLBE problem (Theorems 3.3 and 3.4),
- optimal uniform-in-time error estimate of the proposed linear finite element scheme for the ϵ -LLBE problem (Theorem 4.3), which is verified by a series of numerical experiments.

We also propose a convergent finite element scheme for the LLBE (without regularisation), albeit with a suboptimal theoretical rate of convergence (Theorem 5.2).

As a by-product, we have a finite element scheme for the vector-valued viscous convective Allen–Cahn equation, where an error estimate in \mathbb{L}^∞ -norm can be derived for the case $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ (see Theorem 3.4).

The paper is organised as follows. First, we introduce some notations in the next section. In Section 2, we show the existence of strong solution to the problem associated with the ϵ -LLBE. We then develop in Section 3 a finite element approximation to the aforementioned problem and provide a uniform-in-time error estimate for this numerical scheme in Section 4. In Section 5, we analyse a numerical method to approximate (1.1) directly without regularisation. Finally, we present in Section 6 some numerical simulations to verify the theoretical rates of convergence.

2. EXISTENCE AND CONVERGENCE OF THE REGULARISATION SOLUTION

We first introduce some notations and elementary identities. For brevity, we denote by ∂_j the spatial partial derivative $\partial/\partial x_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, d$, and by ∂_t the temporal partial derivative $\partial/\partial t$. If X is a Banach space, the spaces $L^p(0, T; X)$ and $W^{k,p}(0, T; X)$ denote respectively the Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces of functions on $(0, T)$ taking values in X . The space $C([0, T]; X)$ denotes the space of continuous function on $[0, T]$ taking values in X . For notational simplicity, we will write $L^p(X)$ for $L^p(0, T; X)$. For $1 \leq p, q \leq \infty$ and $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, we write \mathbb{L}^p , \mathbb{H}^k , $L^q(\mathbb{L}^p)$, and $L^q(\mathbb{H}^k)$ for $\mathbb{L}^p(\mathcal{D})$, $\mathbb{H}^k(\mathcal{D})$, $L^q(\mathbb{L}^p(\mathcal{D}))$, and $L^q(\mathbb{H}^k(\mathcal{D}))$, respectively, and the corresponding norms are denoted by $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{L}^p}$, $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}^k}$, $\|\cdot\|_{L^q(\mathbb{L}^p)}$, and $\|\cdot\|_{L^q(\mathbb{H}^k)}$, respectively.

For any vector-valued functions $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$, we refer to [37] for the definitions of $\nabla \mathbf{u}$, $\Delta \mathbf{u}$, $\langle \nabla \mathbf{u}, \nabla \mathbf{v} \rangle$, $\langle \mathbf{w} \times \nabla \mathbf{u}, \nabla \mathbf{v} \rangle$, and $\langle \mathbf{w} \times \Delta \mathbf{u}, \Delta \mathbf{v} \rangle$. We also note that

$$2\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} = \nabla (|\mathbf{u}|^2)$$

and, if \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} satisfy suitable regularity assumptions and $\partial \mathbf{u} / \partial \nu = 0$, then

$$\langle \mathbf{u} \times \Delta \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} = \langle \Delta \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{u} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} = - \langle \mathbf{u} \times \nabla \mathbf{u}, \nabla \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2}. \quad (2.1)$$

Finally, throughout this paper, the constant c in an estimate denotes a generic constant which may take different values at different occurrences. If the dependence of c on some variable, e.g. T , needs to be highlighted, we will write $c(T)$. The notation $A \lesssim B$ means $A \leq cB$ where the specific form of the constant c is not important to clarify.

In this section, we establish the existence of the solution of the regularised problem (1.2) and prove its convergence to the solution of the LLB problem (1.1). We reiterate here that in (1.2), ϵ is a positive

constant, and \mathbf{u}_0^ϵ is chosen such that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \|\mathbf{u}_0^\epsilon - \mathbf{u}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^2} = 0. \quad (2.2)$$

It follows from (1.2a), after inverting the operator $I - \epsilon\Delta$ and integrating over $[0, t]$, that

$$\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{u}_0^\epsilon(\mathbf{x}) + \int_0^t (I - \epsilon\Delta)^{-1} \left(\kappa_1 \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon + \gamma \mathbf{u}^\epsilon \times \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon - \kappa_2 (1 + \mu |\mathbf{u}^\epsilon|^2) \mathbf{u}^\epsilon \right) (s, \mathbf{x}) \, ds.$$

As a consequence, \mathbf{u}^ϵ is infinitely differentiable in the temporal variable.

Multiplying (1.2a) by \mathbf{v} , using integration by parts and (2.1) we obtain, formally,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t), \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \epsilon \langle \nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t), \nabla \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \kappa_1 \langle \nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t), \nabla \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ = -\gamma \langle \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t) \times \nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t), \nabla \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} - \kappa_2 \langle (1 + \mu |\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)|^2) \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t), \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the terms on the right-hand side are well defined if $\mathbf{u}^\epsilon \in H^1(\mathbb{H}^1) \cap L^2(\mathbb{H}^2)$ and $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{H}^1$. Hence we define the solution of (1.1) and of (1.2) as follows.

Definition 2.1. Let $\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{u}_0^\epsilon \in \mathbb{H}^2$ be given.

(1) A function $\mathbf{u}^\epsilon \in H^1(\mathbb{H}^1) \cap L^2(\mathbb{H}^2)$ is a *weak solution* of (1.2) if $\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(0) = \mathbf{u}_0^\epsilon$ and, for any $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t \langle \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s), \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \, ds + \epsilon \int_0^t \langle \nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s), \nabla \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \, ds + \kappa_1 \int_0^t \langle \nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s), \nabla \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \, ds \\ + \gamma \int_0^t \langle \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s) \times \nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s), \nabla \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \, ds + \kappa_2 \int_0^t \langle (1 + \mu |\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s)|^2) \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s), \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \, ds \\ = 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{H}^1(\mathcal{D}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

A weak solution \mathbf{u}^ϵ is said to be a *strong solution* if $\mathbf{u}^\epsilon \in H^1(\mathbb{H}^2)$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t) = \mathbf{u}_0^\epsilon + \epsilon \int_0^t \Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s) \, ds + \kappa_1 \int_0^t \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s) \, ds + \gamma \int_0^t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s) \times \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s) \, ds \\ - \kappa_2 \int_0^t (1 + \mu |\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s)|^2) \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s) \, ds \quad \text{in } \mathbb{L}^2(\mathcal{D}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

In this case, (1.2) is satisfied for all $t \in (0, T)$ and almost all $x \in \mathcal{D}$.

(2) A function $\mathbf{u} \in H^1(\mathbb{L}^2) \cap L^2(\mathbb{H}^2)$ is a weak solution of (1.1) if \mathbf{u} satisfies (2.3) with $\epsilon = 0$. Similarly, $\mathbf{u} \in H^1(\mathbb{H}^1) \cap L^2(\mathbb{H}^2)$ is a strong solution if it satisfies (2.4) with $\epsilon = 0$.

It follows from embedding theorems, see e.g. [30, Lemma 1.2], that a weak solution also belongs to $C([0, T]; \mathbb{H}^1)$, while a strong solution also belongs to $C([0, T]; \mathbb{H}^2)$. In the remainder of this section, we show that the regularised problem has a weak solution (or a strong solution for more regular initial data) and that its weak solution converges to the weak solution of problem (1.1) as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$.

2.1. Faedo–Galerkin approximation. We first use the Faedo–Galerkin method to show that (1.2) has a unique solution.

Let $\{(\mathbf{e}_i, \lambda_i)\}_{i=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of eigenpairs of the negative Neumann Laplace operator, i.e., for all $i = 1, 2, \dots$,

$$-\Delta \mathbf{e}_i = \lambda_i \mathbf{e}_i \text{ in } \mathcal{D} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial \mathbf{e}_i}{\partial \nu} = 0 \text{ on } \partial \mathcal{D}.$$

We can choose the smooth eigenfunctions \mathbf{e}_i such that $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ forms an orthonormal basis of \mathbb{L}^2 .

Let $\mathcal{S}_n := \text{span}\{\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n\}$ and let Π_n be the \mathbb{L}^2 -projection onto \mathcal{S}_n . We consider the following approximation to (1.2): Find $\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(\cdot, t) \in \mathcal{S}_n$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon - \epsilon \Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon = \kappa_1 \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon + \gamma \Pi_n (\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon \times \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon) - \kappa_2 \Pi_n ((1 + \mu |\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon|^2) \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon) \quad \text{in } (0, T) \times \mathcal{D}, \\ \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0) = \mathbf{u}_{0,n}^\epsilon \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

where $\mathbf{u}_{0,n}^\epsilon \in \mathcal{S}_n$ satisfies, uniformly with respect to $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{u}_{0,n}^\epsilon - \mathbf{u}_0^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{H}^2} = 0. \quad (2.6)$$

This uniform convergence can be achieved if one chooses $\mathbf{u}_0^\epsilon = \mathbf{u}_0$ for all $\epsilon > 0$. It follows from (2.2) that

$$\|\mathbf{u}_{0,n}^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{H}^2} \leq c, \quad \forall \epsilon \in (0, 1), \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (2.7)$$

The following lemma gives local existence of the solution of (2.5).

Lemma 2.2. There exists $T > 0$ such that for any $t \in [0, T]$ the problem (2.5) admits a solution.

Proof. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $F_n^i : \mathcal{S}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_n$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, be defined by

$$F_n^1(\mathbf{v}) = \Delta \mathbf{v}, \quad F_n^2(\mathbf{v}) = \Pi_n(\mathbf{v} \times \Delta \mathbf{v}), \quad F_n^3(\mathbf{v}) = \Pi_n((1 + \mu|\mathbf{v}|^2)\mathbf{v}),$$

for any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{S}_n$. It is shown in [27, Lemma 3.1] that F_n^1 is globally Lipschitz while F_n^2 and F_n^3 are locally Lipschitz. The local existence of \mathbf{u}_n^ϵ follows at once. \square

In the remainder of this subsection, we prove a technical lemma which will be used in the next section.

Lemma 2.3. For any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{H}^1$, $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{H}^d$, and $\alpha > 0$, the following inequality holds:

$$\left| \langle \mathbf{v} \times \nabla \mathbf{w}, \nabla \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \right| \leq \Phi(\mathbf{w}) \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \alpha \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2$$

where

$$\Phi(\mathbf{w}) = \begin{cases} \frac{c^2}{\alpha} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \frac{c^2}{4\alpha^3} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^4, & d = 1, \\ \frac{3^3 c^8}{2^8 \alpha^3} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 + \alpha, & d = 2, \\ \frac{c^2}{4\alpha} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{H}^1} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{H}^2} & d = 3. \end{cases} \quad (2.8)$$

The positive constant c (given by the Gagliardo–Nirenberg inequality) depends only on the spatial domain.

Proof. We first prove the result for $d = 1$. By using Hölder's inequality, we have

$$|\langle \mathbf{v} \times \nabla \mathbf{w}, \nabla \mathbf{v} \rangle| \leq \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}.$$

The following Gagliardo–Nirenberg interpolation inequality

$$\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty} \leq c \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^{1/2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^{1/2}$$

implies

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \mathbf{v} \times \nabla \mathbf{w}, \nabla \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2}| &\leq c \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^{1/2} \left(\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^{1/2} + \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^{1/2} \right) \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ &= c \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} + c \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^{1/2} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^{3/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

The first term on the right-hand side of (2.9) can be estimated by

$$c \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \leq \frac{c^2}{\alpha} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \frac{\alpha}{4} \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2.$$

For the second term on the right-hand side of (2.9) we use Young's inequality

$$ab \leq \frac{a^p}{p} + \frac{b^q}{q} \quad \text{where} \quad \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1,$$

with

$$a = \alpha^{-3/4} c \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^{1/2} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}, \quad b = \alpha^{3/4} \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^{3/2}, \quad p = 4, \quad \text{and} \quad q = 4/3,$$

to obtain

$$c \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^{1/2} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^{3/2} \leq \frac{c^2}{4\alpha^3} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^4 + \frac{3\alpha}{4} \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2.$$

Thus, (2.9) gives

$$|\langle \mathbf{v} \times \nabla \mathbf{w}, \nabla \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2}| \leq c^2 \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \frac{1}{4\alpha^3} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^4 \right) \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \alpha \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2.$$

Next we consider the case when $d = 2$. Using Hölder's inequality again yields

$$|\langle \mathbf{v} \times \nabla \mathbf{w}, \nabla \mathbf{v} \rangle| \leq \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^4} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{L}^4} \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}.$$

The Gagliardo–Nirenberg interpolation inequality

$$\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^4} \leq c \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^{1/2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^{1/2}$$

yields

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \mathbf{v} \times \nabla \mathbf{w}, \nabla \mathbf{v} \rangle| &\leq c^2 \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^{1/2} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^{1/2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^{1/2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^{1/2} \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ &\leq c^2 \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^{1/2} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^{1/2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^{1/2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^{3/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Using Young's inequality again with

$$\begin{aligned} a &= \left(\frac{4\alpha}{3}\right)^{-3/4} c^2 \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^{1/2} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^{1/2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^{1/2}, & p &= 4, \\ b &= \left(\frac{4\alpha}{3}\right)^{3/4} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^{3/2}, & q &= 4/3, \end{aligned}$$

we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \mathbf{v} \times \nabla \mathbf{w}, \nabla \mathbf{v} \rangle| &\leq \frac{3^3}{4^4 \alpha^3} c^8 \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \alpha \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 \\ &= \left(\frac{3^3}{4^4 \alpha^3} c^8 \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 + \alpha\right) \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \alpha \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we consider the case $d = 3$. By Hölder's inequality, we have

$$|\langle \mathbf{v} \times \nabla \mathbf{w}, \nabla \mathbf{v} \rangle| \leq \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty} \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}.$$

The Gagliardo–Nirenberg inequality

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty} \leq c \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{H}^1} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{H}^2}$$

and Young's inequality imply

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \mathbf{v} \times \nabla \mathbf{w}, \nabla \mathbf{v} \rangle| &\leq c \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^{1/2} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{H}^2}^{1/2} \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ &\leq \frac{c^2}{4\alpha} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{H}^1} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbb{H}^2} + \alpha \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

completing the proof of the lemma. \square

In the next subsection, we show some bounds on the local solution \mathbf{u}_n^ϵ of (2.5), which implies its global existence. We also show that for each $\epsilon > 0$ the sequence $\{\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\}$ converges as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and its limit is the solution \mathbf{u}^ϵ of (1.2).

2.2. A priori estimates. We first rewrite (2.5) in the following equivalent form: for every $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t), \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \epsilon \langle \nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t), \nabla \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \kappa_1 \langle \nabla \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t), \nabla \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \kappa_2 \langle \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t), \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ = \gamma \langle \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t) \times \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t), \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} - \kappa_2 \mu \langle |\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)|^2 \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t), \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2}, \quad \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{S}_n, \end{aligned} \quad (2.10a)$$

$$\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0) = \mathbf{u}_{0,n}^\epsilon. \quad (2.10b)$$

The stability of the approximate solution \mathbf{u}_n^ϵ is established in the following lemmas.

Lemma 2.4. Assume that (2.2) and (2.6) hold. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $t \in [0, \infty)$,

$$\|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 + \epsilon \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds + \int_0^t \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^4}^4 ds \leq c, \quad (2.11)$$

where the constant c depends on $\|\mathbf{u}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^2}$, but is independent of n , ϵ , and t .

Proof. Letting $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)$ in (2.10a) and noting $(\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b}) \cdot \mathbf{b} = 0$ give

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \kappa_1 \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \kappa_2 \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \kappa_2 \mu \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^4}^4 = 0. \quad (2.12)$$

In a similar fashion, by choosing $\mathbf{v} = -\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t) \in \mathcal{S}_n$ in (2.10a) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \kappa_1 \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \kappa_2 \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \\ = \kappa_2 \mu \langle |\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)|^2 \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t), \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t) \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

Note that by applying integration by parts,

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_2 \mu \langle |\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon|^2 \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon, \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} &= -\kappa_2 \mu \langle \nabla (|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon|^2 \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon), \nabla \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ &= -2\kappa_2 \mu \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 - \kappa_2 \mu \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\| \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating (2.12) and (2.13) yields (2.11), thus completing the proof of the lemma. \square

Lemma 2.5. Assume that (2.2) and (2.6) hold. For any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the approximate solution \mathbf{u}_n^ϵ satisfies

$$\int_0^t \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds + \epsilon \int_0^t \|\Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds \lesssim \frac{1}{\epsilon^\alpha} \quad (2.14)$$

where

$$\alpha = \begin{cases} 1, & d = 1, \\ 3/2, & d = 2, 3. \end{cases} \quad (2.15)$$

Assume further that the following limits hold:

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \|\mathbf{u}_0^\epsilon - \mathbf{u}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^3} = 0, \quad (2.16a)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{u}_{0,n}^\epsilon - \mathbf{u}_0^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{H}^3} = 0 \quad \text{uniformly with respect to } \epsilon. \quad (2.16b)$$

Then, for all $t \in [0, T^*]$,

$$\|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds \lesssim 1, \quad (2.17)$$

where

$$\begin{cases} T^* = T, & d = 1, 2, \\ T^* \leq T, & d = 3. \end{cases} \quad (2.18)$$

The constant is independent of t , n and ϵ , but may depend on T^* .

Proof. Choosing $\mathbf{v} = -\Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t) \in \mathcal{S}_n$ in (2.10a) and using Hölder's inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \frac{\kappa_1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \frac{\kappa_2}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \\ = -\gamma \langle \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t) \times \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t), \Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t) \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \kappa_2 \mu \langle |\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)|^2 \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t), \Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t) \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ \lesssim \left(\|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty} \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty}^2 \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \right) \|\Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ \leq \frac{C}{\epsilon} \left(\|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty}^2 \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty}^4 \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \right) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \|\Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging the above equation, integrating over $(0, t)$, using successively (2.7), Sobolev's embedding $\|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty} \lesssim \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{H}^2}$, and Lemma 2.4 yield

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds + \epsilon \int_0^t \|\Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds \\ \lesssim 1 + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left(\|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{L}^\infty)}^2 \int_0^t \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds + \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{L}^\infty)}^2 \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{L}^2)}^2 \int_0^t \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty}^2 ds \right) \\ \lesssim 1 + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{L}^\infty)}^2 \int_0^t \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 ds \\ \lesssim 1 + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{L}^\infty)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Sobolev's embedding and Lemma 2.4 yield

$$\|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{L}^\infty)}^2 \lesssim \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{H}^1)} \lesssim 1$$

when $d = 1$, and

$$\|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{L}^\infty)}^2 \lesssim \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{H}^1)} \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{H}^2)} \lesssim \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{H}^2)} \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}$$

for $d = 2, 3$. Altogether, we have

$$\|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{L}^\infty)}^2 \lesssim \max\left\{1, \frac{d-1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}\right\}.$$

This implies (2.14).

To prove (2.17), we set $\mathbf{v} = 2\Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t) \in \mathcal{S}_n$ in (2.10a) and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + 2\kappa_1 \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + 2\kappa_2 \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \\ &= -2\gamma \left\langle \nabla \left(\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t) \times \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t) \right), \nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + 2\kappa_2 \mu \left\langle \nabla \left(|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)|^2 \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t) \right), \nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ &= 2\gamma \left\langle \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t) \times \nabla \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t), \nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + 2\kappa_2 \mu \left\langle \nabla \left(|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)|^2 \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t) \right), \nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ &\leq 2\gamma \left| \left\langle \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t) \times \nabla \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t), \nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \right| + 2\kappa_2 \mu \left| \left\langle \nabla \left(|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)|^2 \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t) \right), \nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \right| \\ &= R_1 + R_2, \end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 &:= 2\gamma \left| \left\langle \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t) \times \nabla \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t), \nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \right| \\ R_2 &:= 2\kappa_2 \mu \left| \left\langle \nabla \left(|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)|^2 \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t) \right), \nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Invoking Lemma 2.3 with $\mathbf{v} = \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon$, $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon$, and $\alpha = \kappa_1/3d$, we deduce

$$R_1 \leq \frac{\kappa_1}{3} \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \Phi(\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)) \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_2 &\lesssim \sum_{i=1}^d \left| \left\langle 2 \left(\partial_i \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t) \cdot \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t) \right) \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t), \partial_i \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \right| + \sum_{i=1}^d \left| \left\langle |\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)|^2 \partial_i \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t), \partial_i \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \right| \\ &\lesssim \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty}^2 \sum_{i=1}^d \|\partial_i \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \|\partial_i \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty}^2 \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ &\leq \frac{\kappa_1}{3} \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + c \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty}^4, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used Young's inequality and Lemma 2.4. Altogether, we deduce from (2.19) that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \lesssim \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty}^4 + \Phi(\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)) \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2.$$

Integrating with respect to the time variable we deduce, by using (2.16),

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds \\ & \lesssim 1 + \int_0^t \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty}^4 ds + \int_0^t \Phi(\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)) \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds. \end{aligned}$$

Now, by using the Gagliardo–Nirenberg inequalities and Lemma 2.4, we obtain

$$\int_0^t \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty}^4 ds \lesssim \int_0^t \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 ds \lesssim \int_0^t \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 ds \lesssim 1,$$

so that

$$\|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds \lesssim 1 + \int_0^t \Phi(\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)) \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds. \quad (2.20)$$

Recalling the definition of $\Phi(\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon)$ in Lemma 2.3 and invoking Lemma 2.4, we have the following estimates for $d = 1, 2$ and for all $t \in [0, T]$

$$\Phi(\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)) \lesssim \begin{cases} 1, & d = 1, \\ 1 + \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2, & d = 2, \end{cases}$$

where in the case of $d = 2$ we used the fact that $\partial \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon / \partial \boldsymbol{\nu} = 0$ to obtain the bound of $\|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2$ by $\|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2$. By using Lemma 2.4 again we deduce

$$\int_0^t \Phi(\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)) ds \lesssim 1. \quad (2.21)$$

By using Gronwall's inequality and (2.21), we infer (2.17), proving the lemma for $d = 1, 2$.

Now consider the case $d = 3$. Recalling the definition of $\Phi(\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon)$ in Lemma 2.3, we estimate the integrand on the right-hand side of (2.20) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)) \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 &\lesssim \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^4 \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 + \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \\ &\lesssim \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^4 \left(1 + \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2\right) + \left(1 + \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \alpha \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2\right), \end{aligned}$$

where we used Lemma (2.4) and [37, Lemma 3.3], and where α is an arbitrary constant. This together with (2.20) implies, by choosing α sufficiently small,

$$\|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds \lesssim 1 + \int_0^t \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^6 ds.$$

We infer (2.17) by using the Bihari–Gronwall inequality [6], completing the proof of the lemma. \square

Lemma 2.6. Assume that (2.2) and (2.6) hold. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in [0, T^*]$ where T^* is defined in (2.18), the approximate solution \mathbf{u}_n^ϵ satisfies

$$\|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 ds \leq c,$$

where the constant c is independent of n and ϵ .

Proof. Differentiating both sides of (2.10a) with respect to t we obtain, for all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{S}_n$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \partial_t^2 \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t), \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \epsilon \langle \nabla \partial_t^2 \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t), \nabla \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \kappa_1 \langle \nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t), \nabla \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \kappa_2 \langle \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t), \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ &= \gamma \langle \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t) \times \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t), \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \gamma \langle \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t) \times \Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t), \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ &\quad - \kappa_2 \mu \langle \partial_t (|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)|^2) \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t), \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} - \kappa_2 \mu \langle |\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)|^2 \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t), \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \end{aligned} \quad (2.22)$$

where $\partial_t^2 := \partial^2 / \partial t^2$. Choosing $\mathbf{v} = 2\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon$ and integrating over $(0, t)$, we deduce, after rearranging the terms,

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + 2\kappa_1 \int_0^t \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds + 2\kappa_2 \int_0^t \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds \\ &\quad + \kappa_2 \mu \int_0^t \|\partial_t (|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)|^2)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds + 2\kappa_2 \mu \int_0^t \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\| \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds \\ &= \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 - 2\gamma \int_0^t \langle \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s) \times \nabla \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s), \nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s) \rangle ds. \end{aligned} \quad (2.23)$$

Similarly to the proof of Lemma 2.5, we use Lemma 2.3 with $\mathbf{v} = \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon$, $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon$, and $\alpha = \kappa_1/4\gamma$ to estimate the last term on the right-hand side, and thus obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 ds \\ & \quad + \int_0^t \|\partial_t (|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)|^2)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds + \int_0^t \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\| \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds \\ & \lesssim \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \int_0^t \Phi(\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)) \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds, \end{aligned}$$

where the constant is independent of ϵ and n . Repeating the arguments in the proof of Lemma 2.5, we obtain and (2.21) imply

$$\|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 ds \lesssim \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2, \quad (2.24)$$

for $t \in [0, T^*]$. It remains to show the boundedness of $\|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2$ in (2.24). Letting $t \rightarrow 0^+$ in (2.10a), choosing $\mathbf{v} = \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0)$, and rearranging the resulting equation, we deduce after using Hölder's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \\ & = \langle \kappa_1 \Delta \mathbf{u}_{0,n}^\epsilon + \gamma \mathbf{u}_{0,n}^\epsilon \times \Delta \mathbf{u}_{0,n}^\epsilon - \kappa_2 (1 + \mu |\mathbf{u}_{0,n}^\epsilon|^2) \mathbf{u}_{0,n}^\epsilon, \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0) \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ & \lesssim \left(\|\Delta \mathbf{u}_{0,n}^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \|\mathbf{u}_{0,n}^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty} \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_{0,n}^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \|\mathbf{u}_{0,n}^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_{0,n}^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty} \|\mathbf{u}_{0,n}^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \right) \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.25)$$

The embedding $\mathbb{H}^2 \hookrightarrow \mathbb{L}^\infty$ and (2.7) yield

$$\|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \lesssim \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2},$$

which implies

$$\|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \lesssim 1.$$

This, together with (2.24), proves the lemma. \square

Lemma 2.7. Assume that (2.31) holds. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in [0, T^*]$ where T^* is defined in (2.18), the approximate solution \mathbf{u}_n^ϵ satisfies

$$\|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 ds \leq c,$$

where the constant c is independent of n and ϵ .

Proof. Putting $\mathbf{v} = -2\Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon$ in (2.22) and integrating over $(0, t)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + 2\kappa_1 \int_0^t \|\Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds + 2\kappa_2 \int_0^t \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds \\ & = \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 - 2\gamma \int_0^t \langle \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s) \times \Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s), \Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s) \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \\ & \quad + 2\kappa_2 \mu \int_0^t \langle \partial_t (|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)|^2) \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s) + |\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)|^2 \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s), \Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s) \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \\ & = \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + T_1 + T_2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.26)$$

We will estimate the last two terms on the right-hand side. Firstly, by Hölder's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 & \leq 2\gamma \int_0^t \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^4} \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^4} \|\Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \\ & \leq c \int_0^t \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 + \frac{\kappa_1}{2} \int_0^t \|\Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used Young's inequality and Sobolev embedding $\mathbb{H}^1 \hookrightarrow \mathbb{L}^4$. The constant c is independent of ϵ . For the last term, by similar argument we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_2 &\leq 2\kappa_2\mu \int_0^t \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^6} \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^6}^2 \|\Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \\ &\leq c \int_0^t \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^4 + \frac{\kappa_1}{2} \int_0^t \|\Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting these into (2.26) and adding the term $\|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2$ on both sides give

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 + \epsilon \|\Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \kappa_1 \int_0^t \|\Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds + 2\kappa_2 \int_0^t \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds \\ &\leq \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + c \int_0^t \left(1 + \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2\right) \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 ds, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used (2.11). By Gronwall's inequality (noting Lemma 2.6), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 + \epsilon \|\Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds + \int_0^t \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds \\ &\leq c \left(1 + \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2\right) \exp\left(\int_0^t 1 + \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 ds\right) \\ &\leq c \left(1 + \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the constant c is independent of ϵ and in the last step we used (2.17). To show the boundedness of $\|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2$, we can follow the same argument as in (2.25) with $\mathbf{v} = \Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(0)$ instead. This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

The results in Lemmas 2.4, 2.5, and 2.6 can be summarised as follows:

- If (2.2) and (2.6) hold then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(0,T;\mathbb{H}^1)} + \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{L^2(0,T;\mathbb{H}^2)} + \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{L^4(0,T;\mathbb{L}^4)} + \sqrt{\epsilon} \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(0,T;\mathbb{H}^2)} &\lesssim 1, \\ \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(0,T^*;\mathbb{L}^2)} + \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{L^2(0,T^*;\mathbb{H}^1)} &\lesssim 1, \\ \sqrt{\epsilon} \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(0,T^*;\mathbb{H}^1)} + \epsilon^{(\alpha+1)/2} \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{L^2(0,T^*;\mathbb{H}^2)} &\lesssim 1, \end{aligned} \tag{2.27}$$

where T^* and α are defined by (2.18) and (2.15), respectively.

- If (2.16) holds then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(0,T^*;\mathbb{H}^2)} + \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{L^2(0,T^*;\mathbb{H}^3)} + \sqrt{\epsilon} \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(0,T^*;\mathbb{H}^3)} &\lesssim 1, \\ \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(0,T^*;\mathbb{H}^1)} + \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{L^2(0,T^*;\mathbb{H}^2)} + \sqrt{\epsilon} \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(0,T^*;\mathbb{H}^2)} &\lesssim 1. \end{aligned} \tag{2.28}$$

The constants in (2.27) and (2.28) are independent of n and ϵ .

We conclude this section by some results on the regularity of the solution \mathbf{u} of the original problem (1.1). This solution satisfies the following weak equation: For every $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \partial_t \mathbf{u}(t), \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \kappa_1 \langle \nabla \mathbf{u}(t), \nabla \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \kappa_2 \langle \mathbf{u}(t), \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ &= \gamma \langle \mathbf{u}(t) \times \Delta \mathbf{u}(t), \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} - \kappa_2 \mu \langle |\mathbf{u}(t)|^2 \mathbf{u}(t), \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2}, \quad \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{H}^1, \end{aligned} \tag{2.29a}$$

$$\mathbf{u}(0) = \mathbf{u}_0. \tag{2.29b}$$

The Faedo–Galerkin approximation to this problem reads: For every $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n(t), \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \kappa_1 \langle \nabla \mathbf{u}_n(t), \nabla \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \kappa_2 \langle \mathbf{u}_n(t), \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ &= \gamma \langle \mathbf{u}_n(t) \times \Delta \mathbf{u}_n(t), \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} - \kappa_2 \mu \langle |\mathbf{u}_n(t)|^2 \mathbf{u}_n(t), \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2}, \quad \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{S}_n, \end{aligned} \tag{2.30a}$$

$$\mathbf{u}_n(0) = \mathbf{u}_{0,n}. \tag{2.30b}$$

In the following proofs, we will omit the dependence on t for brevity.

Lemma 2.8. Assume that the following limits hold:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{u}_{0,n} - \mathbf{u}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^3} = 0. \quad (2.31)$$

Then for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $t \in [0, T^*]$ (where T^* is defined in (2.18))

$$\|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds \leq c, \quad (2.32)$$

where the constant c is independent of n .

Proof. Putting $\mathbf{v} = -2\Delta^3 \mathbf{u}_n(t)$ in (2.30a) and integrating by parts, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + 2\kappa_1 \|\Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + 2\kappa_2 \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \\ &= -2\gamma \langle \mathbf{u}_n \times \Delta \mathbf{u}_n, \Delta^3 \mathbf{u}_n \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + 2\kappa_2 \mu \langle |\mathbf{u}_n|^2 \mathbf{u}_n, \Delta^3 \mathbf{u}_n \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ &= 4\gamma \langle \nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n \times \nabla \mathbf{u}_n, \Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + 2\kappa_2 \mu \langle \Delta(|\mathbf{u}_n|^2 \mathbf{u}_n), \Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

For the first term on the right-hand side, by Lemma 2.3 we have

$$|\langle \nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n \times \nabla \mathbf{u}_n, \Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2}| \leq \Phi(\mathbf{u}_n) \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \frac{\kappa_1}{2} \|\Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2.$$

For the second term, we use Hölder's inequality and the fact that $\mathbb{H}^2(\mathcal{D})$ is an algebra to obtain

$$|\langle \Delta(|\mathbf{u}_n|^2 \mathbf{u}_n), \Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2}| \leq c \|\mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{H}^2}^3 \|\Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \leq c + \frac{\kappa_1}{2} \|\Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2,$$

where in the last step we used (2.17). Rearranging the equation, integrating over $(0, t)$, and applying Gronwall's inequality yield

$$\|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds \leq c \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n(0)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \exp\left(\int_0^t \Phi(\mathbf{u}_n(s)) ds\right).$$

Note that $\int_0^t \Phi(\mathbf{u}_n(s)) ds \leq c$, where c is independent of n , by (2.17). This proves (2.32). \square

Lemma 2.9. Assume that the following limits hold:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{u}_{0,n} - \mathbf{u}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^4} = 0. \quad (2.33)$$

Then for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $t \in [0, T^*]$ (where T^* is defined in (2.18))

$$\|\Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\nabla \Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds + \|\Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \leq c, \quad (2.34)$$

where the constant c is independent of n .

Proof. Putting $\mathbf{v} = \Delta^4 \mathbf{u}_n(t)$ in (2.30a) and integrating by parts, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \kappa_1 \|\nabla \Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \kappa_2 \|\Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \\ &= -\gamma \langle \nabla \Delta(\mathbf{u}_n \times \Delta \mathbf{u}_n), \nabla \Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \kappa_2 \mu \langle \nabla \Delta(|\mathbf{u}_n|^2 \mathbf{u}_n), \nabla \Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ &= -\gamma \langle \Delta(\nabla \mathbf{u}_n \times \Delta \mathbf{u}_n), \nabla \Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} - \gamma \langle \Delta(\mathbf{u}_n \times \nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n), \nabla \Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ & \quad + 2\kappa_2 \mu \langle \Delta((\mathbf{u}_n \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_n) \mathbf{u}_n), \nabla \Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \kappa_2 \mu \langle \Delta(|\mathbf{u}_n|^2 \nabla \mathbf{u}_n), \nabla \Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

For the first term on the right-hand side, we use Hölder's inequality and the fact that $\mathbb{H}^2(\mathcal{D})$ is an algebra to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \Delta(\nabla \mathbf{u}_n \times \Delta \mathbf{u}_n), \nabla \Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2}| &\leq \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_n \times \Delta \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{H}^2} \|\nabla \Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \leq \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{H}^2} \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{H}^2} \|\nabla \Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{H}^3} \|\mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{H}^4} \|\nabla \Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Similar results can be obtained for the third and fourth terms:

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \Delta((\mathbf{u}_n \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_n) \mathbf{u}_n), \nabla \Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2}| &\leq \|\mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \|\mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{H}^3} \|\nabla \Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}, \\ |\langle \Delta(|\mathbf{u}_n|^2 \nabla \mathbf{u}_n), \nabla \Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2}| &\leq \|\mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \|\mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{H}^3} \|\nabla \Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

For the second term, the product rule, Hölder's inequality, and Sobolev embedding yield

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \Delta(\mathbf{u}_n \times \nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n), \nabla \Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} | &= | \langle \Delta \mathbf{u}_n \times \nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n, \nabla \Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + 2 \langle \nabla \mathbf{u}_n \times \nabla^2 \Delta \mathbf{u}_n, \nabla \Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} | \\ &\leq (\|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty} \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} + 2 \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty} \|\nabla^2 \Delta \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}) \|\nabla \Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ &\leq 3 \|\mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{H}^3} \|\mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{H}^4} \|\nabla \Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by using Young's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \kappa_1 \|\nabla \Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \kappa_2 \|\Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \\ \leq c \|\mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{H}^3}^2 \|\mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{H}^4}^2 + c \|\mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{H}^2}^4 \|\mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{H}^3}^2 + \frac{\kappa_1}{2} \|\nabla \Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging the equation, integrating over $(0, t)$, and applying Gronwall's inequality yield

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds + \int_0^t \|\nabla \Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds \\ \leq c \|\Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n(0)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \exp\left(1 + \int_0^t \|\mathbf{u}_n(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}^3}^2 ds\right). \end{aligned}$$

By using [37, Lemma 3.3] and (2.17), we have

$$\int_0^t \|\mathbf{u}_n(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}^3}^2 ds \lesssim \int_0^t \left(\|\mathbf{u}_n(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}_n(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \right) ds \lesssim 1.$$

This and assumption (2.33) prove the boundedness of the first three terms on the left-hand side of (2.34). To show the same property for the last term, we put $\mathbf{v} = \partial_t \Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n(t)$ in (2.30a). By Young's inequality, we then have, by using the same arguments as above,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 &= \kappa_1 \langle \Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n, \Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \gamma \langle \Delta(\mathbf{u}_n \times \Delta \mathbf{u}_n), \Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} - \kappa_2 \langle \Delta((1 + \mu|\mathbf{u}_n|^2)\mathbf{u}_n), \Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ &\leq c \|\Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + c \|\mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \|\mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{H}^4}^2 + c \|\mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 + c \|\mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{H}^2}^6 + \frac{1}{2} \|\Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

which implies, noting Lemma 2.4 and Lemma 2.5,

$$\|\Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \lesssim 1 + \|\Delta^2 \mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{H}^4}^2 \lesssim 1,$$

where in the last step we used [37, Lemma 3.3] to bound the term $\|\mathbf{u}_n\|_{\mathbb{H}^4}$ and then used the results obtained in the previous part of the proof. This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

2.3. Existence of the solution \mathbf{u}^ϵ . In the sequel, for brevity of notations, we write T instead of T^* . It should be noted that T^* can be strictly less than T when $d = 3$, which means that in three dimensions the solution can be local while it is global in one and two dimensions.

Let

$$\mathcal{X}_T := W^{1,\infty}(0, T; \mathbb{H}^2(\mathcal{D})) \cap L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{H}^3(\mathcal{D})).$$

First we prove the existence of solution \mathbf{u}^ϵ to (1.2).

Proposition 2.10. Consider $\epsilon > 0$ fixed.

- (i) Assume that (2.2) and (2.6) hold. Then there exists $\mathbf{u}^\epsilon \in H^1(\mathbb{H}^2)$ which is a strong solution to (1.2) in the sense of Definition 2.1. Furthermore, there exists a positive constant c independent of ϵ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{H}^1)} + \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{H}^2)} + \sqrt{\epsilon} \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{H}^2)} + \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^4(\mathbb{L}^4)} &\leq c, \\ \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{L}^2)} + \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{H}^1)} + \sqrt{\epsilon} \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{H}^1)} + \epsilon^{(\alpha+1)/2} \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{H}^2)} &\leq c, \end{aligned} \tag{2.35}$$

where α is defined by (2.15).

(ii) Assume further that (2.16) holds. Then the strong solution \mathbf{u}^ϵ belongs to \mathcal{X}_T and satisfies, further to (2.35),

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{H}^2)} + \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{H}^3)} + \sqrt{\epsilon} \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{H}^3)} &\leq c, \\ \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{H}^1)} + \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{H}^2)} + \sqrt{\epsilon} \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{H}^2)} &\leq c. \end{aligned} \quad (2.36)$$

where the constant c is independent of ϵ .

Proof. We prove both parts of the proposition together. Fix $\epsilon > 0$. It follows from (2.27) that there exist $\mathbf{u}^\epsilon \in \mathcal{X}_T$ and a subsequence of $\{\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, which varies with ϵ and which we do not relabel, satisfying

$$\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon \rightarrow \mathbf{u}^\epsilon \quad \text{weakly}^* \text{ in } W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{H}^1) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (2.37a)$$

$$\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon \rightarrow \mathbf{u}^\epsilon \quad \text{weakly in } H^1(\mathbb{H}^2) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (2.37b)$$

where the convergence is not uniform with respect to ϵ . Since \mathbb{H}^1 is compactly embedded into \mathbb{L}^4 and \mathbb{H}^2 is compactly embedded into \mathbb{H}^1 , it follows from the Aubin–Lions Lemma and (2.37b) that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon - \mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{L}^4)} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon - \mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{H}^1)} = 0. \quad (2.38)$$

We now prove that \mathbf{u}^ϵ satisfies (2.3). It follows from (2.10a) that for any test function $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{H}^1$ and for every $t \in [0, T]$

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^t \langle \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s), \tilde{\Pi}_n \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds + \epsilon \int_0^t \langle \nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s), \nabla \tilde{\Pi}_n \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds + \kappa_1 \int_0^t \langle \nabla \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s), \nabla \tilde{\Pi}_n \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \\ &+ \gamma \int_0^t \langle \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s) \times \nabla \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s), \nabla \tilde{\Pi}_n \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds + \kappa_2 \int_0^t \langle (1 + \mu |\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s)|^2) \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s), \tilde{\Pi}_n \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (2.39)$$

where $\tilde{\Pi}_n$ is the orthogonal projection from \mathbb{H}^1 onto \mathcal{S}_n with respect to the \mathbb{H}^1 -inner product. We recall that, for all $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{H}^1$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\tilde{\Pi}_n \boldsymbol{\xi} - \boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{\mathbb{H}^1} = 0.$$

Thus, it follows successively from (2.37a) that, when $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^t \langle \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s), \tilde{\Pi}_n \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \rightarrow \int_0^t \langle \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s), \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds, \\ &\int_0^t \langle \nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s), \nabla \tilde{\Pi}_n \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \rightarrow \int_0^t \langle \nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s), \nabla \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds, \\ &\int_0^t \langle \nabla \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s), \nabla \tilde{\Pi}_n \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \rightarrow \int_0^t \langle \nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s), \nabla \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds. \end{aligned}$$

For the first nonlinear term in (2.39) we have, by using the triangle inequality and (2.28),

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int_0^t \langle \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s) \times \nabla \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s), \nabla \tilde{\Pi}_n \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds - \int_0^t \langle \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s) \times \nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s), \nabla \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \right| \\ &\leq \left| \int_0^t \langle \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s) \times \nabla \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s), \nabla (\tilde{\Pi}_n \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}) \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \right| + \left| \int_0^t \langle (\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s) - \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s)) \times \nabla \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s), \nabla \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \int_0^t \langle \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s) \times (\nabla \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon(s) - \nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s)), \nabla \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \right| \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{L}^\infty)} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{L}^2)} \|\nabla (\tilde{\Pi}_n \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v})\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon - \mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{L}^4)} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{L}^4)} \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ &\quad + \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{L}^\infty)} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon - \nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{L}^2)} \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ &\lesssim \|\nabla (\tilde{\Pi}_n \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v})\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \|\mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon - \mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{L}^4)} + \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_n^\epsilon - \nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{L}^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

The right-hand side converges to zero due to the definition of $\tilde{\Pi}$ and (2.38), implying the convergence of this first nonlinear term. Similar arguments can be used for the second nonlinear term in (2.39). Therefore, by taking the limit when $n \rightarrow \infty$ in equation (2.39), we obtain (2.3), i.e., \mathbf{u}^ϵ is a weak solution.

Estimates (2.35) and (2.36) follow by passing to the limit in (2.27) and (2.28), respectively, when n goes to ∞ . It also clear that (2.35) implies $\mathbf{u}^\epsilon \in H^1(\mathbb{H}^2)$ and (2.36) implies $\mathbf{u}^\epsilon \in \mathcal{X}_T$. Finally, we prove that \mathbf{u}^ϵ is a strong solution. Since \mathbf{u}^ϵ is a weak solution, we deduce from (2.3) and integration by parts that, for all $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t) &= \mathbf{u}_0^\epsilon + \epsilon \int_0^t \Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s) \, ds + \kappa_1 \int_0^t \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s) \, ds + \gamma \int_0^t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s) \times \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s) \, ds \\ &\quad - \kappa_2 \int_0^t (1 + \mu |\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s)|^2) \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s) \, ds \quad \text{in } \mathbb{H}^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to show that the above equation holds in \mathbb{L}^2 . Inequality (2.35) implies that all the linear terms belong to \mathbb{L}^2 . For the nonlinear terms, by using Minkowski's inequality, the continuous embedding $\mathbb{H}^2 \hookrightarrow \mathbb{L}^\infty$, $\mathbb{H}^1 \hookrightarrow \mathbb{L}^6$, and (2.37) we deduce that for any $t \in [0, T]$

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \int_0^t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s) \times \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s) \, ds \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \left\| \int_0^t (1 + \mu |\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s)|^2) \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s) \, ds \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ &\leq \int_0^t \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s) \times \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \, ds + \int_0^t \|(1 + \mu |\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s)|^2) \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \, ds \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{L}^\infty)} \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{H}^2)} + \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^1(\mathbb{L}^2)} + \mu \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^3(\mathbb{L}^6)}^3 \\ &\lesssim \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{H}^2)}^2 + \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^1(\mathbb{L}^2)} + \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{H}^1)}^3 < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that the nonlinear terms also belong to \mathbb{L}^2 and therefore \mathbf{u}^ϵ satisfies (2.4), i.e., it is a strong solution. This completes the proof of the proposition. \square

Next we prove stability of the strong solution \mathbf{u}^ϵ with respect to initial data.

Proposition 2.11. Let $\mathbf{u}_0^\epsilon, \mathbf{v}_0^\epsilon \in \mathbb{H}^r$, where $r = \max\{2, d\}$. Let \mathbf{u}^ϵ and \mathbf{v}^ϵ be the strong solutions associated with the initial data \mathbf{u}_0^ϵ and \mathbf{v}_0^ϵ , respectively, as given by Proposition 2.10. Then

$$\|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon - \mathbf{v}^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{L}^2)} \lesssim \|\mathbf{u}_0^\epsilon - \mathbf{v}_0^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{L}^2},$$

where the constant is independent of ϵ . This implies uniqueness of the solution \mathbf{u}^ϵ .

Proof. Let $\mathbf{w}_0^\epsilon := \mathbf{u}_0^\epsilon - \mathbf{v}_0^\epsilon$ and $\mathbf{w}^\epsilon := \mathbf{u}^\epsilon - \mathbf{v}^\epsilon$. Then it follows from (2.3) that, for any $\phi \in \mathbb{H}^1$ and $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \partial_t \mathbf{w}^\epsilon(t), \phi \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \epsilon \langle \nabla \partial_t \mathbf{w}^\epsilon(t), \nabla \phi \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \kappa_1 \langle \nabla \mathbf{w}^\epsilon(t), \nabla \phi \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ &\quad + \gamma \langle \mathbf{w}^\epsilon(t) \times \nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t), \nabla \phi \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \gamma \langle \mathbf{v}^\epsilon(t) \times \nabla \mathbf{w}^\epsilon(t), \nabla \phi \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ &\quad + \kappa_2 \langle \mathbf{w}^\epsilon(t), \phi \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \kappa_2 \mu \langle |\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)|^2 \mathbf{w}^\epsilon(t) + (|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)|^2 - |\mathbf{v}^\epsilon(t)|^2) \mathbf{v}^\epsilon(t), \phi \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.40)$$

Putting $\phi = 2\mathbf{w}^\epsilon$ in (2.40) and integrating we obtain, for any $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\mathbf{w}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\nabla \mathbf{w}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + 2\kappa_1 \int_0^t \|\nabla \mathbf{w}^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \, ds \\ &\quad + 2\kappa_2 \int_0^t \|\mathbf{w}^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \, ds + 2\kappa_2 \mu \int_0^t \| |\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s)| \mathbf{w}^\epsilon(s) \|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \, ds \\ &= \|\mathbf{w}_0^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 - 2\gamma \int_0^t \langle \mathbf{w}^\epsilon(s) \times \nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s), \nabla \mathbf{w}^\epsilon(s) \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \, ds - 2\kappa_2 \mu \int_0^t \langle (|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s)|^2 - |\mathbf{v}^\epsilon(s)|^2) \mathbf{v}^\epsilon(s), \mathbf{w}^\epsilon(s) \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \, ds. \end{aligned}$$

The last two terms on the right-hand side can be estimated as follows. For the middle term, by Lemma 2.3 we have

$$\left| \int_0^t \langle \mathbf{w}^\epsilon(s) \times \nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s), \nabla \mathbf{w}^\epsilon(s) \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \, ds \right| \leq \int_0^t \Phi(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s)) \|\mathbf{w}^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \, ds + \alpha \int_0^t \|\nabla \mathbf{w}^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \, ds$$

for any $\alpha > 0$, where Φ is defined in (2.8). Note that $\mathbf{u}^\epsilon \in \mathbb{H}^r$ by Proposition 2.10. Thus

$$\int_0^t \Phi(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s)) \, ds \leq c, \quad (2.41)$$

where c is independent of ϵ . For the last term, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \int_0^t \langle (|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s)|^2 - |\mathbf{v}^\epsilon(s)|^2) \mathbf{v}^\epsilon(s), \mathbf{w}^\epsilon(s) \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \right| &\leq \int_0^t \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s) + \mathbf{v}^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^6} \|\mathbf{w}^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^6} \|\mathbf{v}^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^6} \|\mathbf{w}^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \\
&\leq \int_0^t \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s) + \mathbf{v}^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 \|\mathbf{v}^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 \|\mathbf{w}^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \\
&\quad + \alpha \int_0^t \|\mathbf{w}^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 ds \\
&\leq c \int_0^t \|\mathbf{w}^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds + \alpha \int_0^t \|\mathbf{w}^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 ds
\end{aligned} \tag{2.42}$$

for any $\alpha > 0$, where in the penultimate step we used Young's inequality and Sobolev embedding $\mathbb{H}^1 \hookrightarrow \mathbb{L}^6$, and in the last step we used Proposition 2.10. Choosing $\alpha > 0$ sufficiently small, applying Gronwall's inequality, and noting (2.41), we obtain the required result. \square

2.4. Existence of the solution \mathbf{u} .

Theorem 2.12. Define

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Y}_T^1 &:= W^{1,\infty}(0, T; \mathbb{L}^2(\mathcal{D})) \cap H^1(0, T; \mathbb{H}^1(\mathcal{D})) \cap L^2(0, T; \mathbb{H}^2(\mathcal{D})), \\
\mathcal{Y}_T^2 &:= W^{1,\infty}(0, T; \mathbb{H}^1(\mathcal{D})) \cap L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{H}^3(\mathcal{D})) \cap L^2(0, T; \mathbb{H}^4(\mathcal{D})), \\
\mathcal{Y}_T^3 &:= W^{1,\infty}(0, T; \mathbb{H}^2(\mathcal{D})) \cap L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{H}^4(\mathcal{D})) \cap L^2(0, T; \mathbb{H}^5(\mathcal{D})).
\end{aligned}$$

If (2.2) and (2.6) hold, then there exists a strong solution $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{Y}_T^1$ to (1.1) in the sense of Definition 2.1. Furthermore, if (2.31) holds, then we have $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{Y}_T^2$. Additionally, if (2.33) holds, then $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{Y}_T^3$.

Proof. Using the same arguments as in the proof of Proposition 2.10, but starting with the Faedo–Galerkin problem (2.30), we can prove that there exists a weak solution \mathbf{u} to (1.1). The fact that $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{Y}_T^2$ when (2.31) holds follows from Lemma 2.8. Finally, the fact that \mathbf{u} belongs to \mathcal{Y}_T^3 when (2.33) holds follows from Lemma 2.9. The theorem is proved. \square

A remarkable property of the magnetisation spin field above the Curie temperature is that it will spontaneously relax towards the zero state in the long-run [24]. In other words, the solution to the LLBE $\mathbf{u}(t)$ converges to 0 as $t \rightarrow \infty$, which is also evident in the numerical simulations. We rigorously prove this physical fact in the proposition below.

Proposition 2.13. Assume that $\mathbf{u}_0 \in \mathbb{H}^2$. Let \mathbf{u} be a strong solution to (1.1) and let $p \in [2, \infty]$. For all $t \in [0, \infty)$,

$$\|\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^p} \leq e^{-\kappa_2 t} \|\mathbf{u}_0\|_{\mathbb{L}^p}. \tag{2.43}$$

Proof. First we consider $p \in [2, \infty)$. Putting $\mathbf{v} = |\mathbf{u}|^{p-2} \mathbf{u}$ in (2.29a) and rearranging, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{p} \frac{d}{dt} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbb{L}^p}^p + \kappa_1 \langle \nabla \mathbf{u}, \nabla (|\mathbf{u}|^{p-2} \mathbf{u}) \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \kappa_2 \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbb{L}^p}^p + \kappa_2 \mu \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbb{L}^{p+2}}^{p+2} = 0,$$

Note that, for $q \geq 0$,

$$\nabla (|\mathbf{u}|^q \mathbf{u}) = |\mathbf{u}|^q \nabla \mathbf{u} + q |\mathbf{u}|^{q-2} \mathbf{u} (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}).$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{p} \frac{d}{dt} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbb{L}^p}^p + \kappa_1 \left\| |\mathbf{u}|^{\frac{p-2}{2}} |\nabla \mathbf{u}| \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \kappa_1 (p-2) \left\| |\mathbf{u}|^{\frac{p-4}{2}} |\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}| \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \kappa_2 \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbb{L}^p}^p + \kappa_2 \mu \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbb{L}^{p+2}}^{p+2} = 0,$$

which implies

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^p}^p + p \kappa_2 \|\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^p}^p \leq 0,$$

so that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(e^{p \kappa_2 t} \|\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^p}^p \right) \leq 0.$$

Integrating and taking p -th root give

$$\|\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^p} \leq e^{-\kappa_2 t} \|\mathbf{u}_0\|_{\mathbb{L}^p}.$$

This proves (2.43) for $p \in [2, \infty)$. Letting $p \rightarrow \infty$ in the above completes the proof for the case $p = \infty$. \square

2.5. Rate of convergence of \mathbf{u}^ϵ to \mathbf{u} . We can now derive the convergence rate of the strong solution of the ϵ -LLBE to that of the LLBE.

Theorem 2.14. (i) Consider the case when $d \in \{1, 2\}$. Assume that $\mathbf{u}_0 \in \mathbb{H}^2$ and \mathbf{u}_0^ϵ is chosen such that (2.2) holds. Let \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{u}^ϵ be solutions of (1.1) and (1.2), respectively. Then for any $t \in [0, T]$

$$\|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t) - \mathbf{u}(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s) - \nabla \mathbf{u}(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds \lesssim \|\mathbf{u}_0^\epsilon - \mathbf{u}_0\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon^2, \quad (2.44)$$

where the constant depends on the coefficients of the equation and T , but is independent of ϵ . As a consequence, the solution of (1.1) is unique.

(ii) If $d \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, $\mathbf{u}_0 \in \mathbb{H}^3$, and \mathbf{u}_0^ϵ is chosen to satisfy (2.16a), then

$$\|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t) - \mathbf{u}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 + \int_0^t \|\Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s) - \Delta \mathbf{u}(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds \lesssim \|\mathbf{u}_0^\epsilon - \mathbf{u}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 + \epsilon^2. \quad (2.45)$$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{u}^\epsilon - \mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}_0 = \mathbf{u}_0^\epsilon - \mathbf{u}_0$. We first prove (i). Choose $\mathbf{u}_{0,n}^\epsilon$ satisfying (2.6) such that \mathbf{u}^ϵ satisfies (2.35) and \mathbf{u} belongs to \mathcal{Y}_T^1 . By Definition 2.1, for any $\phi \in \mathbb{H}^1$ and $t \in [0, T]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \partial_t \mathbf{v}(t), \phi \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \kappa_1 \langle \nabla \mathbf{v}(t), \nabla \phi \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \gamma \langle \mathbf{v}(t) \times \nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t), \nabla \phi \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \gamma \langle \mathbf{u}(t) \times \nabla \mathbf{v}, \nabla \phi \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ & + \kappa_2 \langle \mathbf{v}(t), \phi \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \kappa_2 \mu \langle |\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)|^2 \mathbf{v}(t) + (|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)|^2 - |\mathbf{u}(t)|^2) \mathbf{u}(t), \phi \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} = -\epsilon \langle \nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t), \nabla \phi \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.46)$$

Putting $\phi = \mathbf{v}$ in (2.46) and integrating yield, for any $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{v}(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \kappa_1 \int_0^t \|\nabla \mathbf{v}(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds + \kappa_2 \int_0^t \|\mathbf{v}(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds + \kappa_2 \mu \int_0^t \|\mathbf{u}(s)\| \|\mathbf{v}(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{v}_0\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \int_0^t \left| \langle \nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s), \nabla \mathbf{v}(s) \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \right| + \gamma \int_0^t \left| \langle \mathbf{v}(s) \times \nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s), \nabla \mathbf{v}(s) \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \right| \\ & \quad + \kappa_2 \mu \int_0^t \left| \langle (|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s)|^2 - |\mathbf{u}(s)|^2) \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s), \mathbf{v}(s) \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (2.47)$$

We now estimate each term on the right hand side of (2.47). The first term can be estimated by using Young's inequality as follows:

$$\epsilon \int_0^t \left| \langle \nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s), \nabla \mathbf{v}(s) \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \right| \leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{\kappa_1} \int_0^t \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds + \frac{\kappa_1}{4} \int_0^t \|\nabla \mathbf{v}(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds. \quad (2.48)$$

For the second term, by using Lemma 2.3 we obtain

$$\int_0^t \left| \langle \mathbf{v}(s) \times \nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s), \nabla \mathbf{v}(s) \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \right| \leq \int_0^t \Phi(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s)) \|\mathbf{v}(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds + \frac{\kappa_1}{4} \int_0^t \|\nabla \mathbf{v}(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds. \quad (2.49)$$

For the last term, by the same argument as in (2.42) we have

$$\int_0^t \left| \langle (|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s)|^2 - |\mathbf{u}(s)|^2) \mathbf{u}(s), \mathbf{v}(s) \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \right| \leq c \int_0^t \|\mathbf{v}(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds + \frac{1}{4} \min\{\kappa_1, \kappa_2\} \int_0^t \|\mathbf{v}(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 ds, \quad (2.50)$$

where the constant c is independent of ϵ by (2.35). Altogether, (2.47), (2.48), (2.49), and (2.50) yield

$$\|\mathbf{v}(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\nabla \mathbf{v}(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds \leq c \|\mathbf{v}_0\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + c\epsilon^2 + c \int_0^t (1 + \Phi(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s))) \|\mathbf{v}(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds,$$

where we also noted that $\|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{L}^2)}$ can be bounded by a constant independent of ϵ by (2.35). Applying Gronwall's inequality, we obtain

$$\|\mathbf{v}(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\nabla \mathbf{v}(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds \leq c \left(\|\mathbf{u}_0^\epsilon - \mathbf{u}_0\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon^2 \right) \exp \left(c \int_0^t (1 + \Phi(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s))) ds \right)$$

$$\leq c \left(\|\mathbf{u}_0^\epsilon - \mathbf{u}_0\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon^2 \right),$$

where we used (2.21) in the last step. The constant c is independent of ϵ . Uniqueness of the solution \mathbf{u} follows immediately from (2.44).

Next, we prove (ii). We choose $\mathbf{u}_{0,n}^\epsilon$ and $\mathbf{u}_{0,n}$ such that (2.16b) and (2.31) hold. Repeating the above argument, we obtain (2.44) for $d = 3$. It follows from Proposition 2.10 and Theorem 2.12 that \mathbf{u}^ϵ satisfies (2.36) and that \mathbf{u} belongs to \mathcal{Y}_T^2 . Consequently, $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{H}^3$. Putting $\boldsymbol{\phi} = -\Delta \mathbf{v}$ in (2.46), integrating, and noting (2.1) we obtain, for any $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla \mathbf{v}(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \kappa_1 \int_0^t \|\Delta \mathbf{v}(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds + \kappa_2 \int_0^t \|\nabla \mathbf{v}(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla \mathbf{v}_0\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \int_0^t \left| \langle \Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s), \Delta \mathbf{v}(s) \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \right| ds + \gamma \int_0^t \left| \langle \mathbf{v}(s) \times \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s), \Delta \mathbf{v}(s) \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \right| ds \\ & \quad + \kappa_2 \mu \int_0^t \left| \langle |\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s)|^2 \mathbf{v}(s), \Delta \mathbf{v}(s) \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \right| ds \\ & \quad + \kappa_2 \mu \int_0^t \left| \langle (|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s)|^2 - |\mathbf{u}(s)|^2) \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s), \Delta \mathbf{v}(s) \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \right| ds. \end{aligned} \quad (2.51)$$

The second term on the right-hand side can be estimated by using Young's inequality and (2.36) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon \int_0^t \left| \langle \Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s), \Delta \mathbf{v}(s) \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \right| ds & \leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{\kappa_1} \int_0^t \|\Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds + \frac{\kappa_1}{5} \int_0^t \|\Delta \mathbf{v}(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds \\ & \leq c\epsilon^2 + \frac{\kappa_1}{5} \int_0^t \|\Delta \mathbf{v}(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds. \end{aligned}$$

For the third term, applying integration by parts and Young's inequality we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t \left| \langle \mathbf{v}(s) \times \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s), \Delta \mathbf{v}(s) \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \right| ds & \leq \int_0^t \|\mathbf{v}(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^4} \|\Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^4} \|\Delta \mathbf{v}(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \\ & \leq \int_0^t \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}^3}^2 \|\mathbf{v}(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 ds + \frac{\kappa_1}{5} \int_0^t \|\Delta \mathbf{v}(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used the Sobolev embedding $\mathbb{H}^1 \hookrightarrow \mathbb{L}^4$. For the second last term, it is easy to see that

$$\int_0^t \left| \langle |\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s)|^2 \mathbf{v}(s), \Delta \mathbf{v}(s) \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \right| ds \leq c \int_0^t \|\mathbf{v}(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 ds + \frac{\kappa_1}{5} \int_0^t \|\Delta \mathbf{v}(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds.$$

For the last term, by the same argument as in (2.42) we have

$$\int_0^t \left| \langle (|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s)|^2 - |\mathbf{u}(s)|^2) \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s), \Delta \mathbf{v}(s) \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \right| ds \leq c \int_0^t \|\mathbf{v}(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 ds + \frac{\kappa_1}{5} \int_0^t \|\Delta \mathbf{v}(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds, \quad (2.52)$$

where the constant c is independent of ϵ by (2.36). Altogether, (2.44), (2.51)–(2.52) yield

$$\|\mathbf{v}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 + \int_0^t \|\Delta \mathbf{v}(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 ds \leq c \|\mathbf{v}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 + c\epsilon^2 + c \int_0^t (1 + \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}^3}^2) \|\mathbf{v}(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 ds.$$

Applying Gronwall's inequality and using (2.36) again, we obtain (2.45), completing the proof. \square

3. FULLY-DISCRETE FINITE ELEMENT APPROXIMATION FOR THE ϵ -LLBE

In this section, we propose a finite element scheme for the ϵ -LLBE and provide error estimates of the approximation. Let \mathcal{T}_h be a shape-regular triangulation of the domain \mathcal{D} into intervals (in 1D), triangles (in 2D) or tetrahedra (in 3D) of maximal mesh-size h . We introduce the finite element space $\mathbb{V}_h \subset \mathbb{H}^1(\mathcal{D})$ to be the space of all continuous piecewise linear functions on \mathcal{T}_h .

Next, we introduce the Ritz projection $R_h : \mathbb{H}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{V}_h$ defined by

$$\langle \nabla R_h \mathbf{v} - \nabla \mathbf{v}, \nabla \boldsymbol{\chi} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} = 0 \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{\chi} \in \mathbb{V}_h, \text{ such that } \langle R_h \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{1} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} = 0. \quad (3.1)$$

The approximation property for the Ritz projection is assumed to hold [28, 35], namely for $s \in \{0, 1\}$, $p \in (1, \infty)$, and for any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{W}^{2,p}$,

$$\|\mathbf{v} - R_h \mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{s,p}} \leq ch^{2-s} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{2,p}}. \quad (3.2)$$

Moreover, if $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{W}^{2,\infty}$, then

$$\|\mathbf{v} - R_h \mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty} \leq ch^2 |\ln h| \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{2,\infty}}. \quad (3.3)$$

A linear finite element scheme for the numerical solution of the ϵ -LLBE can now be proposed. To discretize in time, let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k = T/N$. We partition $[0, T]$ into N uniform subintervals with nodes $t_n = kn$ for $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N$. We start with $\mathbf{u}_h^{(0)} = R_h \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(0)$ for simplicity. For $j = 1, \dots, N$, given $\mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)}$, we find $\mathbf{u}_h^{(j)} \in \mathbb{V}_h$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle d_t \mathbf{u}_h^{(j)}, \phi_h \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \epsilon \left\langle \nabla d_t \mathbf{u}_h^{(j)}, \nabla \phi_h \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \kappa_1 \left\langle \nabla \mathbf{u}_h^{(j)}, \nabla \phi_h \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \gamma \left\langle \mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)} \times \nabla \mathbf{u}_h^{(j)}, \nabla \phi_h \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ & + \kappa_2 \left\langle \mathbf{u}_h^j, \phi_h \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \kappa_2 \mu \left\langle |\mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)}|^2 \mathbf{u}_h^{(j)}, \phi_h \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} = 0, \quad \forall \phi_h \in \mathbb{V}_h, \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

where $d_t \mathbf{u}_h^{(j)} := (\mathbf{u}_h^{(j)} - \mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)})/k$. At each time step j , with a given function $\mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)} \in \mathbb{V}_h$, we obtain the unique solution $\mathbf{u}_h^{(j)} \in \mathbb{V}_h$ satisfying (3.4) by the Lax–Milgram lemma (noting that $\mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)} \in \mathbb{L}^\infty$).

Stability of the approximate solution, which holds unconditionally for an arbitrary number of iterations n , is shown in the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. For any $n = 1, 2, \dots, N \in \mathbb{N}$, there holds

$$\|\mathbf{u}_h^{(n)}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h^{(n)}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + 2k \sum_{j=1}^n \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h^{(j)}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \sum_{j=1}^n \|\mathbf{u}_h^{(j)} - \mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \leq \|\mathbf{u}_h^{(0)}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h^{(0)}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2.$$

Proof. Let $\phi_h = \mathbf{u}_h^{(j)}$ in equation (3.4). Noting the vector identity

$$2\mathbf{a} \cdot (\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}) = |\mathbf{a}|^2 - |\mathbf{b}|^2 + |\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}|^2, \quad \forall \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^3, \quad (3.5)$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{u}_h^{(j)}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{u}_h^{(j)} - \mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \left(k\kappa_1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h^{(j)}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h^{(j)} - \nabla \mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \\ & + k\kappa_2 \|\mathbf{u}_h^{(j)}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + k\kappa_2 \mu \left\| \left| \mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)} \right| \left| \mathbf{u}_h^{(j)} \right| \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Summing over $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{u}_h^{(n)}\|^2 + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h^{(n)}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n \|\mathbf{u}_h^{(j)} - \mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)}\|^2 + k\kappa_1 \sum_{j=1}^n \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h^{(j)}\|^2 + k\kappa_2 \sum_{j=1}^n \|\mathbf{u}_h^{(j)}\|^2 \\ & + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h^{(j)} - \nabla \mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)}\|^2 + k\kappa_2 \mu \sum_{j=1}^n \left\| \left| \mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)} \right| \left| \mathbf{u}_h^{(j)} \right| \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{u}_h^{(0)}\|^2 + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h^{(0)}\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

as required. \square

For any $t \in [0, T]$, we define $\boldsymbol{\rho}(t) := \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t) - R_h \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)$. It follows that $\partial_t \boldsymbol{\rho}(t) = \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t) - R_h \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)$ so that (3.2) implies, for $s = 0, 1$ and $p \in [1, \infty)$,

$$\|\boldsymbol{\rho}(t)\|_{\mathbb{W}^{s,p}} \leq ch^{2-s} \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{W}^{2,p}} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\partial_t \boldsymbol{\rho}(t)\|_{\mathbb{W}^{s,p}} \leq ch^{2-s} \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{W}^{2,p}}. \quad (3.7)$$

For any $j = 1, \dots, n$, letting $\boldsymbol{\rho}^{(j)} := \boldsymbol{\rho}(t_j) = \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t_j) - R_h \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t_j)$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} := R_h \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t_j) - \mathbf{u}_h^{(j)}$, we split the error $\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t_j) - \mathbf{u}_h^{(j)}$ into

$$\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t_j) - \mathbf{u}_h^{(j)} = \boldsymbol{\rho}^{(j)} + \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)}. \quad (3.8)$$

We will also frequently use the following inequality: If $\mathbf{v} \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{L}^p)$ for $p \in [1, \infty]$ and if $s_1, s_2 \in [t_{j-1}, t_j]$ for some $j = 1, \dots, N$ such that $s_1 < s_2$, then

$$\|\mathbf{v}(s_2) - \mathbf{v}(s_1)\|_{\mathbb{L}^p} \leq \int_{s_1}^{s_2} \|\partial_t \mathbf{v}(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^p} ds \leq k \|\mathbf{v}\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{L}^p)}. \quad (3.9)$$

We first prove an auxiliary result which will be useful in subsequent proofs.

Lemma 3.2. Let $\mathbf{v}^{(j)}$, $j = 1, \dots, n$, be a (finite) sequence of functions in \mathbb{H}^1 and \mathbf{w} be a function in $L^\infty(\mathbb{H}^1) \cap W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{L}^\infty)$. Assume that

$$\mathbf{v}^{(j)} - \mathbf{w}(t_j) = \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(j)} + \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)}.$$

Define, for $\boldsymbol{\phi} \in \mathbb{H}^1$,

$$\begin{aligned} H_1(\mathbf{v}^{(j)}, \mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) &= k \left\langle \mathbf{v}^{(j-1)} \times \nabla \mathbf{v}^{(j)}, \nabla \boldsymbol{\phi} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} - \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \langle \mathbf{w}(s) \times \nabla \mathbf{w}(s), \nabla \boldsymbol{\phi} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds, \\ H_2(\mathbf{v}^{(j)}, \mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) &= k \left\langle |\mathbf{v}^{(j-1)}|^2 \mathbf{w}(t_j), \boldsymbol{\phi} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} - \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \langle |\mathbf{w}(s)|^2 \mathbf{w}(s), \boldsymbol{\phi} \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for any $\delta > 0$, there exists a positive constant c depending on δ but independent of k and j such that

$$\begin{aligned} |H_1(\mathbf{v}^{(j)}, \mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)})| &\leq ck \left(\left\| \mathbf{v}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^4}^2 \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^4}^2 + \left\| \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(j-1)} + \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \left\| \nabla \mathbf{w} \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{L}^\infty)}^2 \right) \\ &\quad + ck^3 \left(\left\| \mathbf{v}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^4}^2 \left\| \nabla \mathbf{w} \right\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{L}^4)}^2 + \left\| \mathbf{w} \right\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{L}^\infty)}^2 \left\| \nabla \mathbf{w} \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{L}^2)}^2 \right) \\ &\quad + 4\delta k \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |H_2(\mathbf{v}^{(j)}, \mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)})| &\leq ck \left\| \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(j-1)} + \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \left\| \mathbf{v}^{(j-1)} + \mathbf{w}(t_{j-1}) \right\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 \left\| \mathbf{w} \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{H}^1)}^2 \\ &\quad + ck^3 \left(\left\| \mathbf{w} \right\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{L}^2)}^2 \left\| \mathbf{w} \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{H}^1)}^4 + \left\| \mathbf{v}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \left\| \mathbf{w} \right\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{L}^\infty)}^2 \right) \\ &\quad + 2\delta k \left\| \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 + \delta k \left\| |\mathbf{v}^{(j-1)}| \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

provided that all the norms on the right-hand sides are well defined.

Proof. We first write $H_1(\mathbf{v}^{(j)}, \mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)})$ as:

$$\begin{aligned} H_1(\mathbf{v}^{(j)}, \mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)}) &= \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \left\langle \mathbf{v}^{(j-1)} \times (\nabla \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(j)} + \nabla \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)}), \nabla \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \\ &\quad + \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \left\langle \mathbf{v}^{(j-1)} \times (\nabla \mathbf{w}(t_j) - \nabla \mathbf{w}(s)), \nabla \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \\ &\quad + \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \left\langle (\boldsymbol{\eta}^{(j-1)} + \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j-1)}) \times \nabla \mathbf{w}(s), \nabla \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \\ &\quad + \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \left\langle (\mathbf{w}(t_{j-1}) - \mathbf{w}(s)) \times \nabla \mathbf{w}(s), \nabla \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \\ &=: T_1 + T_2 + T_3 + T_4. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

We now estimate each term on the right-hand side of (3.12). Firstly, by using Hölder's and Young's inequalities we have for the first term

$$\begin{aligned} |T_1| &:= \left| \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \left\langle \mathbf{v}^{(j-1)} \times (\nabla \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(j)} + \nabla \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)}), \nabla \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \left\langle \mathbf{v}^{(j-1)} \times \nabla \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(j)}, \nabla \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \right| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq k \left\| \mathbf{v}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^4} \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^4} \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\
&\leq ck \left\| \mathbf{v}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^4}^2 \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^4}^2 + \delta k \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have for the third term

$$\begin{aligned}
|T_3| &:= \left| \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \left\langle (\boldsymbol{\eta}^{(j-1)} + \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j-1)}) \times \nabla \mathbf{w}(s), \nabla \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \right| \\
&\leq k \left\| \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(j-1)} + \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{L}^\infty)} \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\
&\leq ck \left\| \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(j-1)} + \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{L}^\infty)}^2 + \delta k \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

For the second term T_2 , we have by using (3.9), Hölder's and Young's inequalities

$$\begin{aligned}
|T_2| &:= \left| \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \left\langle \mathbf{v}^{(j-1)} \times (\nabla \mathbf{w}(t_j) - \nabla \mathbf{w}(s)), \nabla \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \right| \\
&\leq \left\| \mathbf{v}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^4} \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}(t_j) - \nabla \mathbf{w}(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^4} ds \\
&\leq k^2 \left\| \mathbf{v}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^4} \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{L}^4)} \\
&\leq ck^3 \left\| \mathbf{v}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^4}^2 \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{L}^4)}^2 + \delta k \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for the last term T_4 we have, again by using (3.9),

$$\begin{aligned}
|T_4| &:= \left| \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \left\langle (\mathbf{w}(t_{j-1}) - \mathbf{w}(s)) \times \nabla \mathbf{w}(s), \nabla \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \right| \\
&\leq k^2 \|\mathbf{w}\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{L}^\infty)} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{L}^2)} \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\
&\leq ck^3 \|\mathbf{w}\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{L}^\infty)}^2 \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{L}^2)}^2 + \delta k \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Altogether, we deduce (3.10). To prove (3.11) we write $H_2(\mathbf{v}^{(j)}, \mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)})$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
H_2(\mathbf{v}^{(j)}, \mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)}) &= \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \left\langle |\mathbf{v}^{(j-1)}|^2 (\mathbf{w}(t_j) - \mathbf{w}(s)), \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \\
&\quad + \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \left\langle (|\mathbf{v}^{(j-1)}|^2 - |\mathbf{w}(t_{j-1})|^2) \mathbf{w}(s), \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \\
&\quad + \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \left\langle (|\mathbf{w}(t_{j-1})|^2 - |\mathbf{w}(s)|^2) \mathbf{w}(s), \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \\
&=: S_1 + S_2 + S_3.
\end{aligned}$$

By using Hölder's and Young's inequalities, together with (3.9), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
|S_1| &:= \left| \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \left\langle |\mathbf{v}^{(j-1)}|^2 (\mathbf{w}(t_j) - \mathbf{w}(s)), \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \right| \\
&\leq \left\| |\mathbf{v}^{(j-1)}|^2 \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \left\| |\mathbf{v}^{(j-1)}| |\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)}| \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \|\mathbf{w}(t_j) - \mathbf{w}(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty} ds \\
&\leq k^2 \left\| |\mathbf{v}^{(j-1)}|^2 \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \left\| |\mathbf{v}^{(j-1)}| |\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)}| \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \|\mathbf{w}\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{L}^\infty)} \\
&\leq ck^3 \left\| |\mathbf{v}^{(j-1)}|^2 \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \|\mathbf{w}\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{L}^\infty)}^2 + \delta k \left\| |\mathbf{v}^{(j-1)}| |\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)}| \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
|S_2| &:= \left| \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \left\langle (|\mathbf{v}^{(j-1)}|^2 - |\mathbf{w}(t_{j-1})|^2) \mathbf{w}(s), \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \right| \\
&\leq k \left\| \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(j-1)} + \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \left\| \mathbf{v}^{(j-1)} + \mathbf{w}(t_{j-1}) \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^6} \|\mathbf{w}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{L}^6)} \left\| \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^6} \\
&\leq ck \left\| \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(j-1)} + \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \left\| \mathbf{v}^{(j-1)} + \mathbf{w}(t_{j-1}) \right\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 \|\mathbf{w}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{H}^1)}^2 + \delta k \left\| \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
|S_3| &:= \left| \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \left\langle (|\mathbf{w}(t_{j-1})|^2 - |\mathbf{w}(s)|^2) \mathbf{w}(s), \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \right| \\
&\leq ck^2 \|\mathbf{w}\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{L}^2)} \|\mathbf{w}(t_{j-1}) + \mathbf{w}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{L}^6)} \|\mathbf{w}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{L}^6)} \left\| \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^6} \\
&\leq ck^3 \|\mathbf{w}\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{L}^2)}^2 \|\mathbf{w}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{H}^1)}^4 + \delta k \left\| \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Altogether, we obtain (3.11), proving the lemma. \square

We are now ready to prove the error estimate for the scheme (3.4).

Theorem 3.3. Assume that $\mathbf{u}_0^\epsilon \in \mathbb{H}^3$. For any $n = 1, \dots, N$, where $t_n \in [0, T]$, we have

$$\left\| \mathbf{u}_h^{(n)} - \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t_n) \right\|_{\mathbb{H}^1} \leq c(1 + ck)^{n/2}(h + k), \quad (3.13)$$

where the positive constant c is independent of h and k but may depend on ϵ .

Proof. For any $\phi_h \in \mathbb{V}_h$, the exact solution \mathbf{u}^ϵ of (1.2) satisfies, for any $\phi_h \in \mathbb{V}_h$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t_j) - \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t_{j-1}), \phi_h \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \epsilon \langle \nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t_j) - \nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t_{j-1}), \nabla \phi_h \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \kappa_1 \langle \nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s), \nabla \phi_h \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \\
&+ \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \gamma \langle \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s) \times \nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s), \nabla \phi_h \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds + \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \kappa_2 \langle (1 + \mu |\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s)|^2) \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s), \phi_h \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds = 0. \quad (3.14)
\end{aligned}$$

Subtracting (3.14) from (3.4), noting (3.8) and (3.1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\langle \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j-1)}, \phi_h \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \left\langle \boldsymbol{\rho}^{(j)} - \boldsymbol{\rho}^{(j-1)}, \phi_h \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \epsilon \left\langle \nabla \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} - \nabla \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j-1)}, \nabla \phi_h \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\
&+ k\kappa_1 \left\langle \nabla \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)}, \nabla \phi_h \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \kappa_1 \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \langle \nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t_j) - \nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s), \nabla \phi_h \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \\
&+ k\kappa_2 \left\langle \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} + \boldsymbol{\rho}^{(j)}, \phi_h \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \kappa_2 \langle \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t_j) - \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s), \phi_h \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \\
&+ \gamma H_1(\mathbf{u}_h^{(j)}, \mathbf{u}^\epsilon, \phi_h) + \kappa_2 \mu H_2(\mathbf{u}_h^{(j)}, \mathbf{u}^\epsilon, \phi_h) \\
&+ k\kappa_2 \mu \left\langle |\mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)}|^2 (\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} + \boldsymbol{\rho}^{(j)}), \phi_h \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} = 0, \quad (3.15)
\end{aligned}$$

where H_1 and H_2 are defined in Lemma 3.2. Putting $\phi_h = \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)}$ in (3.15), using the vector identity (3.5), and rearranging the terms, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2} \left(\left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 - \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \left(\left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 - \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \right) \\
&+ \frac{\epsilon}{2} \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} - \nabla \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + k\kappa_1 \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + k\kappa_2 \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \kappa_2 \mu k \left\| |\mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)}| |\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)}| \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \\
&= -k\kappa_2 \left\langle \boldsymbol{\rho}^{(j)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} - \left\langle \boldsymbol{\rho}^{(j)} - \boldsymbol{\rho}^{(j-1)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\
&- \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \kappa_1 \left\langle \nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t_j) - \nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s), \nabla \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds - \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \kappa_2 \left\langle \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t_j) - \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s), \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\gamma H_1(\mathbf{u}_h^{(j)}, \mathbf{u}^\epsilon, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)}) + \kappa_2 \mu H_2(\mathbf{u}_h^{(j)}, \mathbf{u}^\epsilon, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)}) - k\kappa_2 \mu \left\langle |\mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)}|^2 \boldsymbol{\rho}^{(t_j)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\
& \leq \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \left(ck \left\| \boldsymbol{\rho}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \left\| \boldsymbol{\rho}^{(j)} - \boldsymbol{\rho}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} + c \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \left\| \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t_j) - \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s) \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \right) \\
& \quad + \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} c \left\| \nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t_j) - \nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s) \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \\
& \quad + c |H_1(\mathbf{u}_h^{(j)}, \mathbf{u}^\epsilon, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)})| + c |H_2(\mathbf{u}_h^{(j)}, \mathbf{u}^\epsilon, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)})| + ck \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^6} \left\| \mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^6}^2 \left\| \boldsymbol{\rho}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\
& =: R_1 + \dots + R_5. \tag{3.16}
\end{aligned}$$

We now estimate each term on the right-hand side. Let $\delta > 0$ be given. For the first term, by (3.9) and Young's inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
R_1 & := \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \left(ck \left\| \boldsymbol{\rho}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \left\| \boldsymbol{\rho}^{(j)} - \boldsymbol{\rho}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} c \left\| \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t_j) - \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s) \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \right) \\
& \leq \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \left(ck \left\| \boldsymbol{\rho}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} + k \left\| \boldsymbol{\rho} \right\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{L}^2)} + ck^2 \left\| \mathbf{u}^\epsilon \right\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{L}^2)} \right) \\
& \leq \delta k \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + ck \left\| \boldsymbol{\rho}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + ck \left\| \boldsymbol{\rho} \right\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{L}^2)}^2 + ck^3 \left\| \mathbf{u}^\epsilon \right\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{L}^2)}^2 \\
& \leq ckh^4 + ck^3 + \delta k \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

For the second term, by Hölder's and Young's inequalities, (3.9), and (3.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
R_2 & := \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} c \left\| \nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t_j) - \nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s) \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} ds \\
& \leq ck^2 \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \left\| \mathbf{u}^\epsilon \right\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{H}^1)} \leq \delta k \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + ck^3.
\end{aligned}$$

For the term R_3 , we invoke Lemma 3.2 (with $\mathbf{v}^{(j)} = \mathbf{u}_h^{(j)}$, $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{u}^\epsilon$, $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{(j)} = \boldsymbol{\rho}^{(j)}$, and $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)} = \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)}$) and use (3.7) to obtain

$$R_3 := c |H_1(\mathbf{u}_h^{(j)}, \mathbf{u}^\epsilon, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)})| \leq ckh^2 + ck \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + ck^3 + 4\delta k \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2,$$

where we used Proposition 2.10 and Lemma 3.1 to obtain the boundedness of \mathbf{u}^ϵ and $\mathbf{u}_h^{(j)}$. Similarly,

$$R_4 := c |H_2(\mathbf{u}_h^{(j)}, \mathbf{u}^\epsilon, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)})| \leq ckh^4 + ck \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + ck^3 + 2\delta k \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 + \delta k \left\| |\mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)}| |\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)}| \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2.$$

Finally,

$$R_5 := ck \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^6} \left\| \mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^6}^2 \left\| \boldsymbol{\rho}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \leq ck \left\| \boldsymbol{\rho}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \delta k \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 \leq ckh^4 + \delta k \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2.$$

Altogether, we derive from (3.16) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \left(\left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 - \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \left(\left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 - \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \right) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} - \nabla \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \\
& \quad + k\kappa_1 \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + k\kappa_2 \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \kappa_2 \mu k \left\| |\mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)}| |\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)}| \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \\
& \leq ck(h^2 + k^2) + ck \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + 3\delta k \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + 8\delta k \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \delta k \left\| |\mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)}| |\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)}| \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2. \tag{3.17}
\end{aligned}$$

Choosing $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small so that the last three terms on the right-hand side can be absorbed to the last three terms on left-hand side, we deduce

$$\left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 - \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 - \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \leq ck(h^2 + k^2) + ck \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2.$$

Summing over $j = 1, \dots, n$, we deduce

$$\left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(n)} \right\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 \leq c(h^2 + k^2) + ck \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2.$$

Applying the discrete version of Gronwall's inequality [39, Lemma 1], we deduce that $\left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(n)} \right\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2$ is bounded by the right-hand side of (3.13). Using (3.7) and the triangle inequality, we obtain the required result. \square

Stronger result can be obtained in the case $\gamma = 0$. As mentioned in the introduction, if $\gamma = 0$, then equation (1.2) is commonly known as the vector-valued viscous Allen–Cahn equation. One could also add a term of the form $(\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}$ to the left-hand side of (1.2), where \mathbf{v} is a given divergence-free smooth vector field [29] to obtain the vector-valued viscous convective Allen–Cahn equation, which describes multiphase pattern formation in a viscous medium. We state this special case in the following theorem.

Theorem 3.4. Let $\gamma = 0$. Assume that $\mathbf{u}_0^\epsilon \in \mathbb{H}^3$. For $s = 0, 1$ and any $n = 1, \dots, N$,

$$\left\| \mathbf{u}_h^{(n)} - \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t_n) \right\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \leq c(h^{2-s} + k). \quad (3.18)$$

Furthermore, if $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and the triangulation of \mathcal{D} is quasi-uniform, then

$$\left\| \mathbf{u}_h^{(n)} - \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t_n) \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty} \leq c(h^2 + k) |\ln h|^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (3.19)$$

where c is a positive constant depending only on the coefficients of the equation.

Proof. In this case, it can be observed from the proof of Theorem 3.3 that the term H_1 in (3.15) vanishes. As such, we instead obtain a stronger estimate of the form

$$\left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{H}^1} \leq c(h^2 + k),$$

which is an estimate showing superconvergence of $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)}$. Inequality (3.18) then follows from (3.7) and the triangle inequality. Moreover, if the triangulation of \mathcal{D} is quasi-uniform, then by the discrete Sobolev inequality in 2-D [40, Lemma 6.4] we have the estimate

$$\left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty} \leq c(h^2 + k) |\ln h|^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Inequality (3.19) then follows from (3.3) and the triangle inequality. \square

4. UNIFORM-IN-TIME ERROR ESTIMATES FOR THE FEM APPROXIMATION OF THE ϵ -LLBE

If we examine the result in Theorem 3.3, it seems that the approximation error grows exponentially with the number of time steps. As such, estimate (3.13) will not be useful for assessing the approximation error in the long run. The aim of this section is to better approximate the long-run trajectory of the solution and derive error estimates for the approximation of the ϵ -LLBE that are uniform in time. Similar results are studied for the Navier–Stokes equation [22], a semilinear parabolic equation [26], and the parabolic p -Laplacian equation [23], to name a few. To this end, we need to derive decay estimates on the solution \mathbf{u}^ϵ and its finite element approximation $\mathbf{u}_h^{(n)}$ for time $t \in [\hat{t}, \infty)$. Here, \hat{t} denotes a sufficiently large time, which depends on the coefficients of the equation.

Since we are interested in small values of ϵ , we also assume that $\epsilon < \kappa_1/\kappa_2$ for simplicity of presentation. Similar decay estimate would still hold for bigger values of ϵ . We also assume that a global solution $\mathbf{u}^\epsilon \in \mathcal{X}_T$ exists (cf. Proposition 2.10), and thus instead of working with the Faedo–Galerkin solution \mathbf{u}_n^ϵ , we can work directly with \mathbf{u}^ϵ .

Lemma 4.1. Suppose $\epsilon < \kappa_1/\kappa_2$.

(i) For every $t \in [0, \infty)$,

$$\left\| \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t) \right\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 + \epsilon \left\| \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t) \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \leq ce^{-2\kappa_2 t}, \quad (4.1)$$

where the constant c depends on $\left\| \mathbf{u}_0 \right\|_{\mathbb{H}^2}$, but is independent of ϵ and t .

(ii) There exists \hat{t} depending on the coefficients in (1.2a) such that for $t \in [\hat{t}, \infty)$,

$$\|\partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \leq ce^{-\kappa_2 t}, \quad (4.2)$$

where c depends on $\|\mathbf{u}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^2}$ and \hat{t} , but is independent of t .

(iii) Furthermore, if $\mathbf{u}_0 \in \mathbb{H}^3$, then there exists \hat{t} depending on the coefficients of the equation such that for $t \in [\hat{t}, \infty)$,

$$\|\Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \leq ce^{-\kappa_2 t}, \quad (4.3)$$

$$\epsilon \|\Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \leq ce^{-\kappa_2 t}, \quad (4.4)$$

where c depends on $\|\mathbf{u}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^3}$, \hat{t} , and the coefficients of the equation, but is independent of t .

Proof. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_0(t) &:= \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2, & \Psi_1(t) &:= \|\nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2, \\ \Psi_2(t) &:= \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2, & \Psi_3(t) &:= \|\Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of (i): Repeating the arguments in the proof of Lemma 2.4, considering (2.3) instead of (2.10a), we obtain exactly the same equations as (2.12) and (2.13) with \mathbf{u}_n^ϵ replaced by \mathbf{u}^ϵ . Consequently,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \Psi_0(t) + 2\kappa_2 \Psi_0(t) \leq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{d}{dt} \Psi_1(t) + 2\kappa_2 \Psi_1(t) \leq 0, \quad (4.5)$$

resulting in

$$\Psi_0(t) \leq \Psi_0(0) \cdot e^{-2\kappa_2 t} \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi_1(t) \leq \Psi_1(0) \cdot e^{-2\kappa_2 t}.$$

Estimate (4.1) then follows.

Proof of (ii): Repeating the arguments in the proof of Lemma 2.6, we obtain analogously to (2.23)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \Psi_2(t) + 2\kappa_2 \Psi_2(t) + (2\kappa_1 - 2\kappa_2 \epsilon) \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \\ \leq 2\gamma \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^4} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^4} \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ \leq \frac{1}{2} \kappa_2 \epsilon \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \frac{2\gamma^2}{\kappa_2 \epsilon} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^4}^2 \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^4}^2 \\ \leq \frac{1}{2} \kappa_2 \epsilon \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \frac{2\gamma^2}{\kappa_2 \epsilon^2} \epsilon \|\nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^4}^2 \\ \leq \frac{1}{2} \kappa_2 \epsilon \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \frac{2c_0 \gamma^2}{\kappa_2 \epsilon^2} e^{-2\kappa_2 t} \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^4}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where in the penultimate step we used the embedding $\mathbb{H}^1 \subset \mathbb{L}^6 \subset \mathbb{L}^4$ and in the last step we used (4.1) with the constant c distinguished by c_0 . It follows from the Gagliardo–Nirenberg inequality and Young’s inequality that

$$\|\partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^4} \leq c \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^{1-d/4} \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^{d/4} \leq c \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \frac{\kappa_2 \epsilon^2}{2c_0 \gamma^2} \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2.$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \Psi_2(t) + 2\kappa_2 \Psi_2(t) \leq \frac{1}{2} \kappa_2 \epsilon \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \frac{2cc_0 \gamma^2}{\kappa_2 \epsilon^2} e^{-2\kappa_2 t} \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + e^{-2\kappa_2 t} \|\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2$$

Choose \hat{t} sufficiently large such that

$$\frac{2cc_0 \gamma^2}{\kappa_2 \epsilon^2} e^{-2\kappa_2 \hat{t}} \leq \kappa_2 \quad \text{and} \quad e^{-2\kappa_2 \hat{t}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \kappa_2 \epsilon.$$

Then for $t \geq \hat{t}$, we deduce

$$\frac{d}{dt} \Psi_2(t) + \kappa_2 \Psi_2(t) \leq 0,$$

which then yields (4.2).

Proof of (iii): Similarly to the proof of (i) and (ii), we follow the argument leading to (2.19) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \Psi_3(t) + 2\kappa_2 \Psi_3(t) + (2\kappa_1 - 2\kappa_2 \epsilon) \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \\ & \leq 2\gamma \left| \left\langle \nabla \left(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t) \times \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t) \right), \nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \right| + 2\kappa_2 \mu \left| \left\langle \nabla \left(|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)|^2 \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t) \right), \nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \right| \\ & =: R_1 + R_2. \end{aligned}$$

For the term R_1 , by using successively Hölder's inequality, the Sobolev embedding $\mathbb{H}^2 \subset \mathbb{L}^\infty$, [37, Lemma 3.3], Young's inequality, and (4.1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 &= 2\gamma \left| \left\langle \nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t) \times \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t), \nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \right| \\ &\leq c \|\nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty} \|\Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ &\leq c \left(\|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^1} + \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \right) \|\Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ &\leq c e^{-\kappa_2 t} \|\Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} + c \|\Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \kappa_2 \|\Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + c e^{-2\kappa_2 t} \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \frac{c}{\epsilon} e^{-\kappa_2 t} \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \kappa_2 \|\Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \frac{c}{\epsilon} e^{-\kappa_2 t} \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

By similar argument,

$$\begin{aligned} R_2 &\leq c \left| \left\langle (\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)) \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t), \nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \right| + c \left| \left\langle |\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)|^2 \nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t), \nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \right| \\ &\leq c \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^6}^2 \|\nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^6} \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ &\leq c \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 \left(\|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \|\Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \right) \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ &\leq c e^{-2\kappa_2 t} \left(\|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \|\Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \right) \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \kappa_2 \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \kappa_2 \|\Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + c e^{-4\kappa_2 t} \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Altogether, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \Psi_3(t) + 2\kappa_2 \Psi_3(t) \leq \kappa_2 \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \kappa_2 \|\Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + c \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} e^{-\kappa_2 t} + e^{-4\kappa_2 t} \right) \|\nabla \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2.$$

By choosing \hat{t} sufficiently large so that

$$c \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} e^{-\kappa_2 \hat{t}} + e^{-3\kappa_2 \hat{t}} \right) \leq \kappa_2 \epsilon,$$

we deduce

$$\frac{d}{dt} \Psi_3(t) + \kappa_2 \Psi_3(t) \leq \kappa_2 \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \quad \forall t \in [\hat{t}, \infty),$$

which together with (4.5) yields

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\Psi_0(t) + \Psi_3(t) \right) + \kappa_2 \left(\Psi_0(t) + \Psi_3(t) \right) \leq 0 \quad \forall t \in [\hat{t}, \infty).$$

This implies

$$\Psi_0(t) + \Psi_3(t) \leq e^{-\kappa_2 t} \quad \forall t \in [\hat{t}, \infty),$$

which yields (4.3).

Finally, it follows from (1.2a) that

$$\epsilon \|\Delta \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \leq \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \kappa_1 \|\Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \gamma \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty}^2 \|\Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \kappa_2 \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \kappa_2 \mu \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{L}^6}^6 \leq c e^{-\kappa_2 t},$$

where we used (4.2) and (4.3) in the last step. This proves (4.4). \square

In the following lemma, we derive a decay estimate for the finite element approximation of the solution \mathbf{u}^ϵ .

Lemma 4.2. Assume that $\epsilon < \kappa_1/\kappa_2$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\left\| \mathbf{u}_h^{(n)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \left\| \nabla \mathbf{u}_h^{(n)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \leq \left(\left\| \mathbf{u}_h^{(0)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \left\| \nabla \mathbf{u}_h^{(0)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \right) e^{-\lambda t_n},$$

where $\lambda = 2\kappa_2(1 + 2\kappa_2k)^{-1}$. In particular, $\left\| \mathbf{u}_h^{(n)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \left\| \nabla \mathbf{u}_h^{(n)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \rightarrow 0$ as $t_n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. From (3.6), writing $a_j := \left\| \mathbf{u}_h^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \left\| \nabla \mathbf{u}_h^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2$, we obtain

$$\frac{a_j - a_{j-1}}{k} + 2\kappa_2 a_j + (2\kappa_1 - 2\kappa_2\epsilon) \left\| \nabla \mathbf{u}_h^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \leq 0.$$

The result then follows from a discrete version of Gronwall's inequality [13, Proposition 3.1]. \square

We will exploit these exponential decay estimates to obtain an error estimate that does not deteriorate over a long time $t \in [\hat{t}, \infty)$. First, note that as a consequence of (3.7), (4.1)–(4.4), and the Sobolev embedding $\mathbb{H}^1 \subset \mathbb{L}^6$, we have, for $s \in \{0, 1\}$, $p \in [1, 6]$, and $t \in [\hat{t}, \infty)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\boldsymbol{\rho}(t)\|_{\mathbb{W}^{s,p}} &\leq ch^{2-s}e^{-\kappa_2 t}, \\ \|\partial_t \boldsymbol{\rho}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} &\leq ch^{2-s}e^{-\kappa_2 t}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

Furthermore, (3.9) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s_2) - \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s_1)\|_{\mathbb{L}^p} &\leq cke^{-\frac{\kappa_2 s_1}{2}} \quad \forall p \in [1, \infty], \\ \|\nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s_2) - \nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(s_1)\|_{\mathbb{L}^p} &\leq cke^{-\frac{\kappa_2 s_1}{2}} \quad \forall p \in [1, 6], \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

for any s_1 and s_2 satisfying $\hat{t} \leq t_{j-1} \leq s_1 \leq s_2 \leq t_j$ for some $j = 1, \dots, N$.

We are now ready to prove the main result of this section.

Theorem 4.3. Assume that $\epsilon < \kappa_1/\kappa_2$ and that $\mathbf{u}_0^\epsilon \in \mathbb{H}^3$. For any $n = 1, \dots, N$,

$$\left\| \mathbf{u}_h^{(n)} - \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(t_n) \right\|_{\mathbb{H}^1} \leq c(h + k),$$

where c is a constant independent of n , h and k (but may depend on ϵ).

Proof. Repeating the arguments in the proof of Theorem 3.3 and replacing (3.7) and (3.9) by (4.6) and (4.7), respectively, we obtain, similarly to (3.17),

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} \left(\left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 - \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \left(\left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 - \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \right) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} - \nabla \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + k\kappa_1 \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + k\kappa_2 \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \\ &\leq ck(h^2 + k^2)e^{-ct_{j-1}} + cke^{-ct_{j-1}} \left(\left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \right) + \delta k \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \delta k \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

We now choose $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small and let $j \geq j_0$ with j_0 sufficiently large so that the last three terms on the right-hand side can be absorbed to corresponding terms on the left-hand side. Putting

$$a_j := \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \epsilon \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2,$$

we deduce

$$a_j - a_{j-1} \leq ck(h^2 + k^2)e^{-ct_{j-1}}, \quad j \geq j_0.$$

Summing over j from j_0 to n yields

$$\begin{aligned} a_n &\leq a_{j_0-1} + ck(h^2 + k^2) \sum_{j=j_0}^{\infty} e^{-ct_{j-1}} \\ &\leq c(1 + ck)^{j_0} (h^2 + k^2) + ck(h^2 + k^2) \sum_{j=j_0}^{\infty} e^{-c(j-1)k}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used Theorem 3.3. The constant c depends only on the coefficients of the equation. Since $k \sum_{j=j_0}^{\infty} e^{-c(j-1)k}$ is bounded by a constant depending on j_0 , we obtain the required estimate for $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)}$. The required result then follows by the triangle inequality. \square

5. FULLY-DISCRETE FINITE ELEMENT APPROXIMATION FOR LLBE (WITHOUT REGULARISATION)

In this section, we discuss a finite element scheme for the LLBE (without regularisation) and provide error estimates for the approximate solution. As expected, due to the absence of the viscous regularisation term $\partial_t \Delta \mathbf{u}^\epsilon$, we are unable to analytically show an optimal order of convergence in the \mathbb{H}^1 -norm. Nonetheless, the numerical scheme is still provably convergent in the \mathbb{L}^2 -norm, with an advantage that the error of order ϵ due to the regularisation term could be avoided.

Letting $\epsilon = 0$ in (3.4), the following scheme is obtained: We start with $\mathbf{u}_h^{(0)} = R_h \mathbf{u}(0)$ for simplicity, where R_h is the Ritz projection defined in (3.1). For $j = 1, \dots, N$, given $\mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)}$, we find $\mathbf{u}_h^{(j)} \in \mathbb{V}_h$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \mathbf{d}_t \mathbf{u}_h^{(j)}, \boldsymbol{\phi}_h \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \kappa_1 \left\langle \nabla \mathbf{u}_h^{(j)}, \nabla \boldsymbol{\phi}_h \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \gamma \left\langle \mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)} \times \nabla \mathbf{u}_h^{(j)}, \nabla \boldsymbol{\phi}_h \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ + \kappa_2 \mu \left\langle |\mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)}|^2 \mathbf{u}_h^{(j)}, \boldsymbol{\phi}_h \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} + \kappa_2 \left\langle \mathbf{u}_h^j, \boldsymbol{\phi}_h \right\rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2} = 0, \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\phi}_h \in \mathbb{V}_h, \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

where $\mathbf{d}_t \mathbf{u}_h^{(j)} := (\mathbf{u}_h^{(j)} - \mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)})/k$. As before, the scheme is well-posed by the Lax–Milgram lemma. We also reiterate here that given an initial data $\mathbf{u}_0 \in \mathbb{H}^4$, there exists a global solution \mathbf{u} to the LLBE (cf. Theorem 2.12) with regularity

$$\mathbf{u} \in L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{H}^4) \cap W^{1, \infty}(0, T; \mathbb{H}^2).$$

Stability of the finite element solution in \mathbb{L}^2 , which we state below, continues to hold as in Lemma 3.1.

Lemma 5.1. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there holds

$$\|\mathbf{u}_h^{(n)}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + 2k \sum_{j=1}^n \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h^{(j)}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \sum_{j=1}^n \|\mathbf{u}_h^{(j)} - \mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \leq \|\mathbf{u}_h^{(0)}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 3.1 and is omitted. \square

We can now prove an error estimate for the scheme (5.1).

Theorem 5.2. Assume that $\mathbf{u}_0 \in \mathbb{H}^4$. For any $n = 1, \dots, N$, where $t_n \in [0, T]$, we have

$$\left\| \mathbf{u}_h^{(n)} - \mathbf{u}(t_n) \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \leq c(h + k),$$

where c is a constant independent of h and k (but may depend on T).

Proof. We note that in this case we do not have an estimate for $\|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h^{(j)}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}$ as in the case of Theorem 3.3, albeit its dependency on ϵ . Proceeding as before, we decompose the error $\mathbf{u}(t_j) - \mathbf{u}_h^{(j)}$ as $\mathbf{u}(t_j) - \mathbf{u}_h^{(j)} = \boldsymbol{\rho}^{(j)} + \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)}$ where $\boldsymbol{\rho}^{(j)} = \mathbf{u}(t_j) - R_h \mathbf{u}(t_j)$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} = R_h \mathbf{u}(t_j) - \mathbf{u}_h^{(j)}$. Instead of (3.17) we have, by using Lemma 3.2,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \left(\left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 - \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \\ & + k\kappa_1 \left\| \nabla \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + k\kappa_2 \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + k\kappa_2 \mu \left\| |\mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)}| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \\ & \leq ck(h^2 + k^2) \left(1 + \left\| \mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 \right) + ck \left(1 + \left\| \mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 \right) \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \\ & + \delta k \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 + \delta k \left\| |\mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)}| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

We now choose $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small so that the last two terms on the right-hand side can be absorbed to the left. Summing over $j = 1, \dots, n$, and noting the stability estimate in Lemma 5.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(n)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + \sum_{j=1}^n \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 + k \sum_{j=1}^n \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)} \right\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 \\ & \leq ck(h^2 + k^2) \sum_{j=1}^n \left(1 + \left\| \mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 \right) + ck \sum_{j=1}^n \left(1 + \left\| \mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 \right) \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \\ & \leq c(h^2 + k^2) + ck \sum_{j=1}^n \left(1 + \left\| \mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 \right) \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where c depends on T (but not on h or k). Applying the discrete Gronwall inequality and noting the stability estimate in Lemma 5.1, we have

$$\left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(n)} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \leq c(h^2 + k^2) \cdot \exp \left[k \sum_{j=1}^n \left(1 + \left\| \mathbf{u}_h^{(j-1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 \right) \right] \leq c(h^2 + k^2).$$

The required result then follows by invoking the estimate (3.2) and the triangle inequality. \square

Remark 5.3. Analogous to Theorem 3.4, a stronger (optimal) result in \mathbb{L}^2 can be obtained in the case $\gamma = 0$.

6. NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS

We perform several simulations for the scheme (3.4) using the open-source package FENICS [1]. The results are presented in this section. Since the exact solution of the equation is not known, we use extrapolation to verify the order of convergence experimentally. To this end, let $\mathbf{u}_h^{(n)}$ be the finite element solution with spatial step size h and time-step size $k = \lfloor T/n \rfloor$. For $s = 0$ or 1 , define the extrapolated order of convergence

$$h\text{-rate}_s := \log_2 \left[\frac{\max_n \|\mathbf{e}_{2h}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}}{\max_n \|\mathbf{e}_h\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}} \right], \quad k\text{-rate}_s := \log_2 \left[\frac{\max_n \|\mathbf{e}^{(2n)}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}}{\max_n \|\mathbf{e}^{(n)}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}} \right],$$

where $\mathbf{e}_h := \mathbf{u}_h^{(n)} - \mathbf{u}_{h/2}^{(n)}$ and $\mathbf{e}^{(n)} := \mathbf{u}_h^{(n)} - \mathbf{u}_h^{(n/2)}$. We expect for this numerical scheme, $h\text{-rate}_1 = k\text{-rate}_1 \approx 1$ as shown in Theorem 3.3. Furthermore, we also expect $h\text{-rate}_0 \approx 2$.

6.1. Simulation 1: Square domain. We take the domain $\mathcal{D} := [0, 1]^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and $t \in [0, T]$, where $T = 0.5$ and $k = 2.5 \times 10^{-3}$. The coefficients in (1.1) are taken to be $\kappa_1 = 5.0, \kappa_2 = 2.0, \mu = 1.0, \gamma = 50.0$, and $\epsilon = 0.001$. The initial data \mathbf{u}_0 is given by

$$\mathbf{u}_0(x, y) = (\cos(2\pi x), \sin(2\pi y), 2 \cos(2\pi x) \sin(2\pi y)).$$

Snapshots of the magnetic spin field \mathbf{u} at selected times are shown in Figure 1. In this configuration, one could see the formation of a Bloch wall around time $t = 0.2$, which is dissipating as time progresses. Eventually, the magnetisation vectors will decay to $\mathbf{0}$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Plot of \mathbf{e}_h against $1/h$ is shown in Figure 3a. Plots showing the decay of $\mathbf{u}(t)$ in $\mathbb{L}^2, \mathbb{L}^\infty$, and \mathbb{H}^1 -norms are shown in Figures 4a and 4b.

6.2. Simulation 2: Cube domain. We take the domain $\mathcal{D} := [0, 1]^3 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ and $t \in [0, T]$, where $T = 0.5$ and $k = 2.5 \times 10^{-3}$. The coefficients in (1.1) are taken to be $\kappa_1 = 5.0, \kappa_2 = 2.0, \mu = 1.0, \gamma = 50.0$, and $\epsilon = 0.001$. The initial data \mathbf{u}_0 is given by

$$\mathbf{u}_0(x, y, z) = (2 \cos(2\pi x), \sin(2\pi y), 2 \cos(2\pi y) \sin(2\pi z)).$$

Snapshots of the magnetic spin field \mathbf{u} at selected times are shown in Figure 2. Plot of \mathbf{e}_h against $1/h$ is shown in Figure 3b.




FIGURE 1. Snapshots of the magnetic spin field \mathbf{u} (projected onto \mathbb{R}^2) at given times for simulation 1. The colours indicate relative magnitude of the vectors.

6.3. Simulation 3: Testing $k\text{-rate}_1$. We take the domain $\mathcal{D} := [0, 1]^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and $t \in [0, T]$, where $T = 0.5$ and $h = 8 \times 10^{-3}$. The coefficients in (1.1) are taken to be $\kappa_1 = 0.02$, $\kappa_2 = 0.04$, $\mu = 0.5$, $\gamma = 0.05$, and $\epsilon = 0.001$. The initial data \mathbf{u}_0 is given by

$$\mathbf{u}_0(x, y) = (2 \sin^2(\pi x) \sin^2(\pi y), 4 \sin^2(2\pi x) \sin^2(\pi y), 8 \sin^2(\pi x) \sin^2(2\pi y)).$$

Plot of $e^{(n)}$ against $1/k$ is shown in Figure 5.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are partially supported by the Australian Research Council under grant number DP190101197, DP200101866, and DP220100937. Agus L. Soenjaya is also supported by the Australian Government Research Training Program (RTP) Scholarship awarded at the University of New South Wales, Sydney.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. S. Alnaes, J. Blechta, J. Hake, A. Johansson, B. Kehlet, A. Logg, C. N. Richardson, J. Ring, M. E. Rognes, and G. N. Wells. The FEniCS project version 1.5. *Archive of Numerical Software*, **3** (2015).
- [2] D. D. Ang and T. Tran. A nonlinear pseudoparabolic equation. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, **114** (1990), 119–133.
- [3] U. Atxitia, D. Hinzke, and U. Nowak. Fundamentals and applications of the Landau–Lifshitz–Bloch equation. *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics*, **50** (2016), 033003.
- [4] G. Barenblatt, I. Zheltov, and I. Kochina. Basic concepts in the theory of seepage of homogeneous liquids in fissured rocks [strata]. *Journal of Applied Mathematics and Mechanics*, **24** (1960), 1286–1303.
- [5] T. Benjamin, J. Bona, and J. Mahony. Model equations for long waves in nonlinear dispersive systems. *Philos. Trans. Roy. Soc. London, Ser. A*, **272** (1972), 47–78.
- [6] I. Bihari. A generalization of a lemma of Bellman and its application to uniqueness problems of differential equations. *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.*, **7** (1956), 81–94.
- [7] H. Brill. A semilinear Sobolev evolution equation in a Banach space. *J. Differential Equations*, **24** (1977), 412–425.
- [8] Y. Cao, J. Yin, and C. Wang. Cauchy problems of semilinear pseudo-parabolic equations. *J. Differential Equations*, **246** (2009), 4568–4590.






FIGURE 2. Snapshots of the magnetic spin field \mathbf{u} at given times for simulation 2. The colours indicate relative magnitude of the vectors.


- [9] C. Chen, K. Li, Y. Chen, and Y. Huang. Two-grid finite element methods combined with Crank-Nicolson scheme for nonlinear Sobolev equations. *Adv. Comput. Math.*, **45** (2019), 611–630.
- [10] P. J. Chen and M. E. Gurtin. On a theory of heat conduction involving two temperatures. *Z. Angew. Math. Phys.*, **19** (1968), 614–627.
- [11] O. Chubykalo-Fesenko and P. Nieves. *Landau-Lifshitz-Bloch Approach for Magnetization Dynamics Close to Phase Transition*, pages 1–28. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2018.
- [12] O. Chubykalo-Fesenko, U. Nowak, R. W. Chantrell, and D. Garanin. Dynamic approach for micromagnetics close to the Curie temperature. *Phys. Rev. B*, **74** (2006), 094436.
- [13] E. Emmrich. Discrete versions of Gronwall’s lemma and their application to the numerical analysis of parabolic problems. Research Report, TU Berlin, Fachbereich Mathematik, 1999.
- [14] R. E. Ewing. Numerical solution of Sobolev partial differential equations. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, **12** (1975), 345–363.
- [15] Y. Fan and I. S. Pop. A class of pseudo-parabolic equations: existence, uniqueness of weak solutions, and error estimates for the Euler-implicit discretization. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, **34** (2011), 2329–2339.
- [16] F. Gao, J. Cui, and G. Zhao. Weak Galerkin finite element methods for Sobolev equation. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, **317** (2017), 188–202.
- [17] D. Garanin. Generalized equation of motion for a ferromagnet. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, **172** (1991), 470 – 491.
- [18] D. A. Garanin. Fokker-Planck and Landau-Lifshitz-Bloch equations for classical ferromagnets. *Phys. Rev. B*, **55** (1997), 3050–3057.
- [19] T. Gilbert. A Lagrangian formulation of the gyromagnetic equation of the magnetic field. *Phys Rev*, **100** (1955), 1243–1255.
- [20] B. Goldys, C. Jiao, and K.-N. Le. Numerical method and error estimate for stochastic Landau–Lifshitz–Bloch equation, 2022.
- [21] M. E. Gurtin. Generalized Ginzburg-Landau and Cahn-Hilliard equations based on a microforce balance. *Phys. D*, **92** (1996), 178–192.
- [22] J. G. Heywood and R. Rannacher. Finite element approximation of the nonstationary Navier-Stokes problem. II. Stability of solutions and error estimates uniform in time. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, **23** (1986), 750–777.
- [23] N. Ju. Numerical analysis of parabolic p -Laplacian: approximation of trajectories. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, **37** (2000), 1861–1884.




(A) Order of convergence for simulation 1. Theoretical result: Theorem 3.3.



(B) Order of convergence for simulation 2. Theoretical result: Theorem 3.3.



(A) Plot of $\|\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}$ and $\|\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty}$ against time. Theoretical result: Proposition 2.13.



(B) Plot of $\|\nabla \mathbf{u}(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}$ against time. Theoretical result: Lemma 4.1.

- [24] N. Kazantseva, D. Hinzke, U. Nowak, R. W. Chantrell, U. Atxitia, and O. Chubykalo-Fesenko. Towards multiscale modeling of magnetic materials: Simulations of FePt. *Phys. Rev. B*, **77** (2008), 184428.
- [25] L. Landau and E. Lifschitz. On the theory of the dispersion of magnetic permeability in ferromagnetic bodies. *Phys Z Sowjetunion*, **8** (1935), 153–168.
- [26] S. Larsson. The long-time behavior of finite-element approximations of solutions to semilinear parabolic problems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, **26** (1989), 348–365.




FIGURE 5. Order of convergence for simulation 3.

- [27] K. N. Le. Weak solutions of the Landau-Lifshitz-Bloch equation. *J. Differential Equations*, **261** (2016), 6699–6717.
- [28] D. Leykekhman and B. Li. Weak discrete maximum principle of finite element methods in convex polyhedra. *Math. Comp.*, **90** (2021), 1–18.
- [29] J. Li, R. Lan, Y. Cai, L. Ju, and X. Wang. Second-order semi-Lagrangian exponential time differencing method with enhanced error estimate for the convective Allen-Cahn equation. *J. Sci. Comput.*, **97** (2023), Paper No. 7, 29.
- [30] J. L. Lions. *Quelques Méthodes de Résolution des Problèmes aux Limites Non Linéaires*. Dunod Gauthier-Villars, Paris, 1969.
- [31] A. Meo, W. Pantasri, W. Daeng-am, S. E. Rannala, S. I. Ruta, R. W. Chantrell, P. Chureemart, and J. Chureemart. Magnetization dynamics of granular heat-assisted magnetic recording media by means of a multiscale model. *Phys. Rev. B*, **102** (2020), 174419.
- [32] P. Nieves and O. Chubykalo-Fesenko. Modeling of ultrafast heat- and field-assisted magnetization dynamics in FePt. *Phys. Rev. Appl.*, **5** (2016), 014006.
- [33] A. Novick-Cohen and R. L. Pego. Stable patterns in a viscous diffusion equation. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **324** (1991), 331–351.
- [34] V. Padrón. Effect of aggregation on population recovery modeled by a forward-backward pseudoparabolic equation. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **356** (2004), 2739–2756.
- [35] R. Rannacher and R. Scott. Some optimal error estimates for piecewise linear finite element approximations. *Math. Comp.*, **38** (1982), 437–445.
- [36] R. Showalter and T. Ting. Pseudo-parabolic partial differential equations. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, **1** (1970), 1–26.
- [37] A. L. Soenjaya and T. Tran. Global solutions of the Landau-Lifshitz-Baryakhtar equation. *J. Differential Equations*, **371** (2023), 191–230.
- [38] M. D. Stiles, W. M. Saslow, M. J. Donahue, and A. Zangwill. Adiabatic domain wall motion and Landau-Lifshitz damping. *Phys. Rev. B*, **75** (2007), 214423.
- [39] S. Sugiyama. On the stability problems of difference equations. *Bull. Sci. Engrg. Res. Lab. Waseda Univ.*, **45** (1969), 140–144.
- [40] V. Thomée. *Galerkin finite element methods for parabolic problems*, volume 25 of *Springer Series in Computational Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 2006.
- [41] T. W. Ting. Certain non-steady flows of second-order fluids. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, **14** (1963), 1–26.
- [42] T. Tran and T.-B. Duong. A posteriori error estimates with the finite element method of lines for a Sobolev equation. *Numer. Methods Partial Differential Equations*, **21** (2005), 521–535.
- [43] W. Wang, M. Dvornik, M.-A. Bisotti, D. Chernyshenko, M. Beg, M. Albert, A. Vansteenkiste, B. V. Waeyenberge, A. N. Kuchko, V. V. Kruglyak, and H. Fangohr. Phenomenological description of the nonlocal magnetization relaxation in magnonics, spintronics, and domain-wall dynamics. *Phys. Rev. B*, **92** (2015), 054430.
- [44] R. Xu and J. Su. Global existence and finite time blow-up for a class of semilinear pseudo-parabolic equations. *J. Funct. Anal.*, **264** (2013), 2732–2763.

- [45] Z. Zhao and H. Li. Numerical analysis of a space-time continuous Galerkin method for the nonlinear Sobolev equation. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **531** (2024), Paper No. 127845, 24.
- [46] J.-G. Zhu and H. Li. Understanding signal and noise in heat assisted magnetic recording. *IEEE Transactions on Magnetics*, **49** (2013), 765–772.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, MONASH UNIVERSITY, CLAYTON 3800, AUSTRALIA

Email address: ngan.1e@monash.edu

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES, SYDNEY 2052, AUSTRALIA

Email address: a.soenjaya@unsw.edu.au

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES, SYDNEY 2052, AUSTRALIA

Email address: thanh.tran@unsw.edu.au