

THE INCOMPRESSIBLE LIMIT OF THE EQUATIONS OF COMPRESSIBLE IDEAL MAGNETO-HYDRODYNAMICS WITH PERFECTLY CONDUCTING BOUNDARY

PAOLO SECCHI

ABSTRACT. We consider the initial-boundary value problem in the halfspace for the system of equations of ideal Magneto-Hydrodynamics with a perfectly conducting wall boundary condition. We show the convergence of solutions to the solution of the equations of incompressible MHD as the Mach number goes to zero. Because of the characteristic boundary, where a loss of regularity in the normal direction to the boundary may occur, the convergence is shown in suitable anisotropic Sobolev spaces which take account of the singular behavior at the boundary.

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider the equations of ideal Magneto-Hydrodynamics (MHD) for the motion of an electrically conducting fluid, where "ideal" means that the effect of viscosity and electrical resistivity is neglected (see [7]):

$$\rho_p(p^\lambda)(\partial_t + v^\lambda \cdot \nabla)p^\lambda + \rho^\lambda \nabla \cdot v^\lambda = 0, \quad (1.1a)$$

$$\rho^\lambda(\partial_t + (v^\lambda \cdot \nabla))v^\lambda + \lambda^2 \nabla p^\lambda + \mu H^\lambda \times (\nabla \times H^\lambda) = 0, \quad (1.1b)$$

$$(\partial_t + (v^\lambda \cdot \nabla))H^\lambda - (H^\lambda \cdot \nabla)v^\lambda + H^\lambda \nabla \cdot v^\lambda = 0. \quad (1.1c)$$

Here the pressure $p^\lambda = p^\lambda(t, x)$, the velocity field $v^\lambda = v^\lambda(t, x) = (v_1^\lambda, v_2^\lambda, v_3^\lambda)$, the magnetic field $H^\lambda = H^\lambda(t, x) = (H_1^\lambda, H_2^\lambda, H_3^\lambda)$ are unknown functions of time t and space variables $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$. The density ρ^λ is given by the equation of state $\rho^\lambda = \rho(p^\lambda)$ where $\rho > 0$ and $\partial\rho/\partial p \equiv \rho_p > 0$ for $p > 0$. The magnetic permeability μ is set equal to 1 without loss of generality. The coefficient λ is essentially the inverse of the Mach number. We denote $\partial_t = \partial/\partial t$, $\partial_i = \partial/\partial x_i$, $\nabla = (\partial_1, \partial_2, \partial_3)$ and use the conventional notations of vector analysis. The system (1.1) is supplemented with the divergence constraint

$$\nabla \cdot H^\lambda = 0 \quad (1.2)$$

on the initial data.

We study the initial-boundary value problem corresponding to a perfectly conducting wall boundary condition. Set $\Omega = \mathbb{R}_+^3 = \{x_1 > 0\}$ and let us denote its boundary by Γ . We also denote $Q_T = (0, T) \times \Omega$, $\Sigma_T = (0, T) \times \Gamma$ and denote by $\nu = (-1, 0, 0)$ the

Date: June 18, 2024.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35L50, 35Q35, 76M45, 76W05.

Key words and phrases. Compressible ideal Magneto-Hydrodynamics, Mach number, incompressible limit, singular limit, perfectly conducting wall.

unit outward normal to Γ . We are interested in the study of the initial-boundary value problem under the boundary conditions

$$v^\lambda \cdot \nu = 0, \quad H^\lambda \cdot \nu = 0 \quad \text{on } \Sigma_T. \quad (1.3)$$

System (1.1) – (1.3) is supplemented with initial conditions

$$(p^\lambda, v^\lambda, H^\lambda)|_{t=0} = (p_0^\lambda, v_0^\lambda, H_0^\lambda) \quad \text{in } \Omega. \quad (1.4)$$

We study the singular limit as $\lambda \rightarrow +\infty$. The limit equations to system (1.1) - (1.3) are

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\rho}(\partial_t + (w \cdot \nabla))w + \nabla\pi + B \times (\nabla \times B) &= 0, \\ \partial_t B + (w \cdot \nabla)B - (B \cdot \nabla)w &= 0 \\ \nabla \cdot w = 0, \quad \nabla \cdot H &= 0, & \text{in } Q_T, \\ w \cdot \nu = 0, \quad B \cdot \nu &= 0 & \text{on } \Sigma_T, \\ (w, B)|_{t=0} &= (w_0, B_0) & \text{in } \Omega, \end{aligned} \quad (1.5)$$

where $\bar{\rho} = \rho(0)$ and w_0 is such that $\nabla \cdot w_0 = 0$ in Ω and $w_0 \cdot \nu = 0$ on Γ and analogously for B_0 .

(1.1) - (1.3) is an example of initial boundary value problem for quasilinear symmetric hyperbolic systems with characteristic boundary. Because of a possible loss of derivatives in the normal direction to the boundary, see [5, 33], in general the solution of such mixed problems is not in the usual Sobolev space $H^m(\Omega)$, as for the non-characteristic case, but in the anisotropic weighted Sobolev space $H_*^m(\Omega)$ (the definition is given in the next section). Problem (1.1) - (1.3) was first studied by Yanagisawa and Matsumura [36]. As regards the loss of regularity for the solutions of the MHD equations, Ohno-Shirota [20] prove that a mixed problem for the linearized MHD equations is ill-posed in $H^m(\Omega)$ for $m \geq 2$. A general regularity theory for linear and quasilinear systems with characteristic boundary may be found in [21, 26, 27], see also [9]. The application to (1.1) - (1.3) is given in [25], where we prove the well-posedness in the sense of Hadamard in the space $H_*^m(\Omega)$. In [30] we improve the result of [25] as we show the solvability in the anisotropic Sobolev space $H_{**}^m(\Omega)$, hence obtaining a better regularity than in $H_*^m(\Omega)$. This also allows to decrease the smallest order of regularity from $m \geq 8$ to $m \geq 6$.

The initial-boundary value problem for the incompressible MHD equations (1.4) was studied in [24].

As is well-known from Fluid Mechanics, one can derive formally the incompressible models such as the Navier-Stokes equations, the Euler equations or the system (1.5) from the compressible ones, namely the compressible Navier-Stokes, Euler equations or the equations of ideal MHD. This corresponds to passing to the limit in the appropriate non dimensional form as the Mach number goes to zero. This formal derivation is the argument of many papers in the case of the Euler equations, see [3, 16, 17, 18], the papers [2, 10, 11, 34] where the phenomenon of the initial layer is considered; the papers [1, 23, 28] in the presence of the boundary. In the MHD case, the rigorous derivation of (1.4) from the non dimensional system (1.1) - (1.3) is shown in [4, 12, 14, 15, 16]. See also [6, 8, 13, 22] for the small Alfvén number limit.

In the present paper we show such derivation for the initial-boundary value problem (1.1)–(1.3). While for the periodic boundary conditions the analysis is essentially a repetition of that for the Euler equations, in our case we need completely different and much

more subtle arguments. Because of the above mentioned singular behavior at the boundary, we work in the anisotropic Sobolev space $H_{**}^m(\Omega)$.

The most difficult part is to prove the uniform estimate (2.10) in Theorem 2.2. Sections 3 and 4 are dedicated to this proof. We adapt the approach of [30], by first proving the a priori estimates of purely tangential and tangential and first order normal derivatives. Then we show separate a priori estimates of the higher normal derivatives of the non-characteristic part of the solution, that is the part corresponding to the invertible part of the boundary matrix, and the characteristic part of the solution. At this point it is crucial to exploit the higher regularity of the non-characteristic part in the function space $H_{***}^m(\Omega)$, with respect to the regularity of the characteristic part in the other space $H_{**}^m(\Omega)$. A particular care is needed for the proof of the equivalence of the weighted normal derivative with a function vanishing at the boundary, in terms of the anisotropic regularity of the function, and the conormal derivative. The proof of the uniform estimate is totally depending on the general structure (2.7) of the equations, as highlighted in [17], so we believe that the same method could work for other problems with characteristic boundary and a similar structure.

The convergence is shown in the presence of or without the initial layer in Theorems 2.3 and 2.4 respectively, depending whether the limiting initial velocity w_0 satisfies $\operatorname{div} w_0 \neq 0$ or $\operatorname{div} w_0 = 0$. For, we use a compactness argument and, in the first case, also exploit the asymptotic behavior of solutions to the linearized acoustic equations in the unbounded domain following the argument of [10]. A similar argument shows the strong convergence of the gradient of the total pressure, see (2.15), Theorem 2.4. The proofs of Theorems 2.3 and 2.4 are given in Sections 5 and 6, respectively.

Recently there appeared the paper [35], where the authors study the same problem with a different approach.

2. FORMULATION OF THE PROBLEM, NOTATIONS AND MAIN RESULTS

Let us introduce the total pressure $q^\lambda = \lambda p^\lambda + (1/2\lambda)|H^\lambda|^2$. In terms of q^λ the equation for the pressure (1.1a) takes the form

$$\frac{\rho_p^\lambda}{\rho^\lambda} \{ (\partial_t + v^\lambda \cdot \nabla) q^\lambda - \frac{H^\lambda}{\lambda} \cdot (\partial_t + (v^\lambda \cdot \nabla)) H^\lambda \} + \lambda \nabla \cdot v^\lambda = 0, \quad (2.1)$$

where it is understood that $\rho^\lambda = \rho(q^\lambda/\lambda - (1/2)|H^\lambda/\lambda|^2)$ and similarly for ρ_p^λ . Since $H^\lambda \times (\nabla \times H^\lambda) = (1/2)\nabla|H^\lambda|^2 - (H^\lambda \cdot \nabla)H^\lambda$, the equation for the velocity (1.1b) takes the form

$$\rho^\lambda (\partial_t + (v^\lambda \cdot \nabla)) v^\lambda + \lambda \nabla q^\lambda - (H^\lambda \cdot \nabla) H^\lambda = 0. \quad (2.2)$$

Finally we derive $\nabla \cdot v^\lambda$ from (2.1) and rewrite the equation for the magnetic field (1.1c) as

$$(\partial_t + (v^\lambda \cdot \nabla)) H^\lambda - (H^\lambda \cdot \nabla) v^\lambda - \frac{H^\lambda}{\lambda} \frac{\rho_p^\lambda}{\rho^\lambda} \{ (\partial_t + v^\lambda \cdot \nabla) q^\lambda - \frac{H^\lambda}{\lambda} \cdot (\partial_t + (v^\lambda \cdot \nabla)) H^\lambda \} = 0. \quad (2.3)$$

We rewrite (2.1)–(2.3) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{pmatrix} \rho_p/\rho & \underline{0} & -(\rho_p/\rho)H^\lambda/\lambda \\ \underline{0}^T & \rho I_3 & 0_3 \\ -(\rho_p/\rho)(H^\lambda/\lambda)^T & 0_3 & a_0^\lambda \end{pmatrix} \partial_t \begin{pmatrix} q^\lambda \\ v^\lambda \\ H^\lambda \end{pmatrix} + \\ & \begin{pmatrix} (\rho_p/\rho)v^\lambda \cdot \nabla & \lambda \nabla \cdot & -(\rho_p/\rho)(H^\lambda/\lambda)v^\lambda \cdot \nabla \\ \lambda \nabla & \rho v^\lambda \cdot \nabla I_3 & -H^\lambda \cdot \nabla I_3 \\ -(\rho_p/\rho)(H^\lambda/\lambda)^T v^\lambda \cdot \nabla & -H^\lambda \cdot \nabla I_3 & a_0^\lambda v^\lambda \cdot \nabla \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} q^\lambda \\ v^\lambda \\ H^\lambda \end{pmatrix} = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

where $\underline{0} = (0, 0, 0)$ and

$$a_0^\lambda = I_3 + (\rho_p/\rho)(H^\lambda/\lambda) \otimes (H^\lambda/\lambda).$$

It is well known that the constraint (1.2) can be seen just as a restriction on the initial value H_0^λ . Under this restriction, (2.4) is equivalent to (1.1). The quasilinear symmetric system (2.4) is hyperbolic if the state equation $\rho = \rho(p, S)$ satisfies the hyperbolicity condition:

$$\rho > 0, \quad \rho_p > 0. \quad (2.5)$$

We write (2.4) in compact form as

$$Lu^\lambda = A_0 \partial_t u^\lambda + \sum_{j=1}^n (A_j + \lambda C_j) \partial_j u^\lambda = 0, \quad (2.6)$$

where $u^\lambda = (q^\lambda, v^\lambda, H^\lambda)$ and where the coefficient matrices have the special structure (see [17])

$$A_j = A_j(u^\lambda, u^\lambda/\lambda) \quad j = 1, 2, 3, \quad (2.7a)$$

$$A_0 = A_0(u^\lambda/\lambda) \quad (2.7b)$$

$$C_j \text{ are constant symmetric matrices} \quad (2.7c)$$

$$A_\nu := \sum_{j=1}^3 A_j \nu_j = -A_1 \equiv 0 \quad \text{on } \Sigma_T. \quad (2.7d)$$

Let us define

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \nu & \underline{0} & 0 \\ 0 & \underline{0} & \nu & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$u_0^\lambda = (q_0^\lambda, v_0^\lambda, H_0^\lambda)$ where $q_0^\lambda = \lambda p_0^\lambda + (1/2\lambda)|H_0^\lambda|^2$. We rewrite (1.1), (1.2), (1.3) as

$$\begin{aligned} Lu^\lambda &= 0 & \text{on } Q_T, \\ Mu^\lambda &= 0 & \text{on } \Sigma_T, \\ u^\lambda|_{t=0} &= u_0^\lambda & \text{on } \Omega. \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

When, as in (2.8), we multiply matrices by vectors, vectors have always to be considered as column vectors.

Let us introduce some notations. Let $H^m(\Omega)$ be the usual Sobolev space of order m , $m = 1, 2, \dots$, and let $\|\cdot\|_m$ denotes its norm. The norm of $L^2(\Omega)$ is denoted by $\|\cdot\|$, the norm of $L^p(\Omega)$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, by $|\cdot|_p$. Let $\sigma \in C^\infty(\overline{R}_+)$ be a monotone increasing function such that $\sigma(x_1) = x_1$ in a neighborhood of the origin and $\sigma(x_1) = 1$ for any x_1 large

enough. Let us introduce the differential operator in the tangential directions (conormal derivative)

$$\partial_*^\alpha = (\sigma(x_1)\partial_1)^{\alpha_1}\partial_2^{\alpha_2}\partial_3^{\alpha_3}$$

where $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$, $|\alpha| = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3$. Given $m \geq 1$, the function space $H_*^m(\Omega)$ is defined as the set of functions $u \in L^2(\Omega)$ such that $\partial_*^\alpha \partial_1^k u \in L^2(\Omega)$ if $|\alpha| + 2k \leq m$. Derivatives are considered in the distribution sense. $H_*^m(\Omega)$ is normed by

$$\|u\|_{m,*}^2 = \sum_{|\alpha|+2k \leq m} \|\partial_*^\alpha \partial_1^k u\|^2.$$

In the sequel we will refer to $|\alpha| + 2k$ as to the order of the operator $\partial_*^\alpha \partial_1^k$. Thus the normal derivative behaves in H_*^m like a differential operator of order two. We also define other function spaces.

The space $H_{**}^m(\Omega)$, $m \geq 1$, consists of the functions $u \in L^2(\Omega)$ such that $\partial_*^\alpha \partial_1^k u \in L^2(\Omega)$ if $|\alpha| + 2k \leq m + 1$, $|\alpha| \leq m$. $H_{**}^m(\Omega)$ is normed by

$$\|u\|_{m,**}^2 = \sum_{\alpha,k} \|\partial_*^\alpha \partial_1^k u\|^2$$

where the sum is taken over all multi-indices α and indices k such that $|\alpha| + 2k \leq m + 1$, $|\alpha| \leq m$.

The space $H_{***}^m(\Omega)$, $m \geq 1$, consists of the functions $u \in L^2(\Omega)$ such that $\partial_*^\alpha \partial_1^k u \in L^2(\Omega)$ if $|\alpha| \leq m$ and if $|\alpha| + 2k \leq m + 2$ for $k \geq 2$, $|\alpha| + 2k \leq m + 1$ for $k = 1$. $H_{***}^m(\Omega)$ is normed by

$$\|u\|_{m,***}^2 = \sum_{\alpha,k} \|\partial_*^\alpha \partial_1^k u\|^2$$

where the sum is taken over all multi-indices α and indices k such that $|\alpha| + 2k \leq m + 2$ if $k \geq 2$, $|\alpha| + 2k \leq m + 1$ if $k = 1$, and such that $|\alpha| \leq m$. Clearly

$$\begin{aligned} H^m(\Omega) &\hookrightarrow H_{***}^m(\Omega) \hookrightarrow H_{**}^m(\Omega) \hookrightarrow H_*^m(\Omega) \subset H_{loc}^m(\Omega), \\ H_*^m(\Omega) &\hookrightarrow H^{\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor}(\Omega), \quad H_{**}^m(\Omega) \hookrightarrow H^{\lfloor \frac{m+1}{2} \rfloor}(\Omega), \end{aligned}$$

where $\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor$ and $\lfloor \frac{m+1}{2} \rfloor$ denote the integer part of $\frac{m}{2}$ and $\frac{m+1}{2}$, respectively. In particular $H_{**}^1(\Omega) = H^1(\Omega)$. For the sake of convenience we set $H_{***}^0(\Omega) = H_{**}^0(\Omega) = H_*^0(\Omega) = L^2(\Omega)$. Let X be a Banach space and let $T > 0$; then $C([0, T]; X)$, $L^\infty(0, T; X)$ denote respectively the space of continuous and essentially bounded functions defined on $[0, T]$ taking values in X . $C^k([0, T]; X)$ denotes the space of k -continuously differentiable functions on $[0, T]$ with values in X ; $W^{k,\infty}(0, T; X)$ is the space of essentially bounded functions together with the derivatives up to order k , defined on $[0, T]$ taking values in X . We define

$$\mathcal{C}_T(H_*^m) = \bigcap_{k=0}^m C^k([0, T]; H_*^{m-k}(\Omega)), \quad \mathcal{L}_T^\infty(H_*^m) = \bigcap_{k=0}^m W^{k,\infty}(0, T; H_*^{m-k}(\Omega));$$

the norm is (*ess sup* in the second case)

$$\|u\|_{m,*} = \sup_{[0,T]} \|u(t)\|_{m,*},$$

where

$$|||u(t)|||_{m,*}^2 = \sum_{k=0}^m \|\partial_t^k u(t)\|_{m-k,*}^2 = \sum_{|\gamma|+2h \leq m} \|\partial_*^\gamma \partial_1^h u(t)\|^2,$$

for $\gamma = (k, \alpha)$, $|\gamma| = k + |\alpha|$, $\partial_*^\gamma = \partial_t^k \partial_*^\alpha$. We also define

$$\mathcal{C}_T(H_{**}^m) = \bigcap_{k=0}^m C^k([0, T]; H_{**}^{m-k}(\Omega)), \quad \mathcal{L}_T^\infty(H_{**}^m) = \bigcap_{k=0}^m W^{k,\infty}(0, T; H_{**}^{m-k}(\Omega)),$$

with the norm (*ess sup* in the second case)

$$|||u|||_{m,**,T} = \sup_{[0,T]} |||u(t)|||_{m,**},$$

where

$$|||u(t)|||_{m,**}^2 = \sum_{k=0}^m \|\partial_t^k u(t)\|_{m-k,**}^2 = \sum_{\gamma,h} \|\partial_*^\gamma \partial_1^h u(t)\|^2,$$

the last sum being taken over all the indices $\gamma = (k, \alpha)$, $|\gamma| = k + |\alpha|$, $\partial_*^\gamma = \partial_t^k \partial_*^\alpha$, and h such that $|\gamma| + 2h \leq m + 1$, $|\gamma| \leq m$. Moreover we define the seminorm

$$||[u(t)]|||_{m,**}^2 = \sum_{k=0}^m \|[\partial_t^k u(t)]\|_{m-k,**}^2 = \sum_{\gamma,h} \|\partial_*^\gamma \partial_1^h u(t)\|^2,$$

the last sum being taken over all the indices $\gamma = (k, \alpha)$, $|\gamma| = k + |\alpha|$, $\partial_*^\gamma = \partial_t^k \partial_*^\alpha$, and h such that $1 \leq |\gamma| + 2h \leq m + 1$, $|\gamma| \leq m$. Similarly we define $\mathcal{C}_T(H^m)$, $\mathcal{L}_T^\infty(H^m)$ by using $H^{m-k}(\Omega)$ instead of $H_{**}^{m-k}(\Omega)$. The norm is denoted by $|||\cdot|||_{m,T}$. In the present context of the study of the singular limit as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, it is convenient to introduce in $\mathcal{C}_T(H_{**}^m)$ the following weighted norm

$$|||u|||_{m,**,\lambda,T} = \sup_{[0,T]} |||u(t)|||_{m,**,\lambda},$$

where

$$|||u(t)|||_{m,**,\lambda}^2 = \sum_{k=0}^m \|\lambda^{-k} \partial_t^k u(t)\|_{m-k,**}^2.$$

For each *fixed* λ , $|||u(t)|||_{m,**,\lambda}$ is equivalent to $|||u(t)|||_{m,**}$. Moreover we define the corresponding seminorm

$$|[u(t)]]|_{m,**,\lambda}^2 = \sum_{k=0}^m \|[\lambda^{-k} \partial_t^k u(t)]\|_{m-k,**}^2 = \sum_{\gamma,h} \|\lambda^{-k} \partial_*^\gamma \partial_1^h u(t)\|^2,$$

the last sum being taken over all the indices $\gamma = (k, \alpha)$, $|\gamma| = k + |\alpha|$, $\partial_*^\gamma = \partial_t^k \partial_*^\alpha$, and h such that $1 \leq |\gamma| + 2h \leq m + 1$, $|\gamma| \leq m$.

Given the system (2.7) for u^λ , we recursively define $u_0^{\lambda(k)}$, $k \geq 1$, by formally taking $k - 1$ time derivatives of the equations, solving for $\partial_t^k u^\lambda$ and evaluating it at time $t = 0$; for $k = 0$, $u_0^{\lambda(0)} = u_0^\lambda$. We set

$$|||u_0^\lambda|||_{m,**}^2 = \sum_{k=0}^m |||u_0^{\lambda(k)}|||_{m-k,**}^2, \quad |||u_0^\lambda|||_{m,**,\lambda}^2 = \sum_{k=0}^m \|\lambda^{-k} u_0^{\lambda(k)}\|_{m-k,**}^2.$$

We use the same notations for spaces of scalar, vector valued or matrix valued functions. Throughout the paper we will denote by C generic constants which may vary from line to line or even in the same line. Other constants are denoted by K_i , suitable increasing functions are denoted by Φ, Φ_i .

The following theorem gives the existence of solutions of (2.7) in $H_{**}^m(\Omega)$ for fixed λ . From it one can easily obtain an existence theorem for the original system (1.1) - (1.3) with p^λ instead of q^λ . The proof of the theorem may be found in [30]; the result improves the existence result in $H_*^m(\Omega)$ of Yanagisawa-Matsumura [36] and the author [25].

Theorem 2.1 ([30] Existence). *Let $m \geq 6$ be an integer and $\lambda > 0$. Let $\rho \in C^{m+1}$ and $u_0^\lambda = (q_0^\lambda, v_0^\lambda, H_0^\lambda) \in H^m(\Omega)$, $p_0^\lambda = q_0^\lambda/\lambda - (1/2)|H_0^\lambda/\lambda|^2$ be such that $\rho(p_0^\lambda) > 0$, $\rho_p(p_0^\lambda) > 0$ in $\bar{\Omega}$, $\nabla \cdot H_0^\lambda = 0$ in Ω . The data satisfy the compatibility conditions $v_0^{\lambda(k)} \cdot \nu = 0$, $k = 0, \dots, m-1$, $H_0^\lambda \cdot \nu = 0$ on Γ .*

*Then there exists $T_\lambda > 0$ such that the mixed problem (2.8) has a unique solution $u^\lambda = (q^\lambda, v^\lambda, H^\lambda) \in C_{T_\lambda}(H_{**}^m)$ with $\rho(p^\lambda) > 0$, $\rho_p(p^\lambda) > 0$ for $p^\lambda = q^\lambda/\lambda - (1/2)|H^\lambda/\lambda|^2$, $\nabla \cdot H^\lambda = 0$ in Q_{T_λ} . Moreover $\nu \cdot \partial_t^k v^\lambda(t)|_\Gamma \in H^{m-k-1/2}(\Gamma)$, $k = 0, \dots, m-1$, $\nu \cdot H^\lambda(t)|_\Gamma \in H^{m-1/2}(\Gamma)$, for each $t \in [0, T_\lambda]$.*

The following theorems give the results about the singular limit $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 2.2 (Uniform boundedness). *Let $m \geq 6$ be an integer and let the assumptions of Theorem 2.1 be satisfied. Assume that*

$$\|u_0^\lambda\|_m \leq K_1 \quad \forall \lambda \geq 1, \quad (2.9)$$

*where K_1 is independent of λ . Then for each $\lambda \geq 1$ there exists a unique solution $u^\lambda = (q^\lambda, v^\lambda, H^\lambda) \in C_T(H_{**}^m)$ of (2.8) in Q_T , where T is independent of λ . The solutions satisfy the uniform estimate*

$$\|u^\lambda\|_{m,**, \lambda, T} + \|\partial_t H^\lambda\|_{m-1,**, \lambda, T} \leq K_2 \quad \forall \lambda \geq 1, \quad (2.10)$$

with K_2 independent of λ .

If the divergence $\nabla \cdot w_0 \neq 0$, then the initial layer appears as for the Euler equations [2, 10, 11, 34].

Theorem 2.3 (Weak convergence). *Let the assumptions of Theorem 2.2 hold and let $(w_0, B_0) \in H^m(\Omega)$ where $\nabla \cdot B_0 = 0$ in Ω , $B_0 \cdot \nu = 0$ on Γ . Assume also that*

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow +\infty} (\|v_0^\lambda - w_0\|_{m, **} + \|H_0^\lambda - B_0\|_{m, **}) = 0. \quad (2.11)$$

Then

$$u^\lambda = (q^\lambda, v^\lambda, H^\lambda) \rightarrow (0, w, B) \quad \text{weakly} - * \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0, T; H_{**}^m(\Omega)), \quad (2.12a)$$

$$v^\lambda \rightarrow w \quad \text{strongly in } C_{loc}((0, T] \times \bar{\Omega}), \quad (2.12b)$$

$$H^\lambda \rightarrow B \quad \text{in } C([0, T]; H_{*,loc}^{m-1}(\Omega)), \quad (2.12c)$$

$$\rho^\lambda \rightarrow \bar{\rho} \quad \text{in } C([0, T]; H_{**}^m(\Omega)), \quad (2.12d)$$

as $\lambda \rightarrow +\infty$, where (w, B) is the unique solution of (1.5) with initial conditions

$$w|_{t=0} = P_S w_0, \quad B|_{t=0} = B_0,$$

where P_S is the projection onto the solenoidal subspace incident to the Helmholtz decomposition.

Remark 2.1. (i) In (2.12b), $(0, T]$ cannot be replaced by $[0, T]$ because in general w satisfies $w|_{t=0} = P_S w_0$ instead of $w|_{t=0} = w_0$, so that the initial layer develops since the convergence is not uniform near $t = 0$.

(ii) The convergence in $C([0, T]; H_{*,loc}^{m-1}(\Omega))$ is the convergence in $C([0, T]; H_*^{m-1}(\Omega \cap B(0, r)))$ for every $r > 0$; a Sobolev imbedding shows that it implies the strong convergence in $C_{loc}([0, T] \times \overline{\Omega})$.

The next theorem gives the strong convergence for well-prepared initial data.

Theorem 2.4 (Strong convergence). *Assume the hypotheses of Theorems 2.2 and 2.3. Let w_0 be such that $\nabla \cdot w_0 = 0$ in Ω , $w_0 \cdot \nu = 0$ on Γ and let $(w, B) \in \mathcal{C}_T(H^m)$ be the corresponding solution to (1.5). Assume also that*

$$\lambda \|\nabla q_0^\lambda\|_{m-1} + \lambda \|\nabla \cdot v_0^\lambda\|_{m-1} \leq K_1' \quad \forall \lambda \geq 1, \quad (2.13)$$

where K_1' is independent of λ . Then

$$\| \|u^\lambda\| \|_{m,**, \lambda, T} + \| \|\partial_t u^\lambda\| \|_{m-1,**, \lambda, T} + \lambda \| \|\nabla q^\lambda\| \|_{m-1,**, \lambda, T} + \lambda \| \|\nabla \cdot v^\lambda\| \|_{m-1,**, \lambda, T} \leq K_2' \quad (2.14)$$

for all $\lambda \geq 1$, where K_2' and T are independent of λ . Moreover as $\lambda \rightarrow +\infty$

$$q^\lambda \rightarrow 0, \quad v^\lambda \rightarrow w \quad \text{in } C([0, T]; H_{*,loc}^{m-1}(\Omega)), \quad (2.15a)$$

$$\lambda \nabla q^\lambda = \nabla(\lambda^2 p^\lambda + |H^\lambda|^2/2) \rightarrow \nabla(\pi + |B|^2/2) \quad \text{in } C_{loc}((0, T] \times \overline{\Omega}). \quad (2.15b)$$

Remark 2.2. (i) The existence of the solution (w, B) to (1.5) in the class $\mathcal{C}_T(H^m)$ is shown in [24]; the total pressure π in (1.5) is defined up to a constant and such that $\nabla \pi \in \mathcal{C}_T(H^{m-1})$.

(ii) From (2.2), (2.11)–(2.13) we know that $(\rho^\lambda \partial_t v^\lambda + \lambda^2 \nabla p^\lambda)|_{t=0} \rightarrow (\overline{\rho} \partial_t w + \nabla \pi)|_{t=0}$ and that $\lambda^2 \nabla p_0^\lambda$ is uniformly bounded; however we don't know whether this last term converges to $\nabla \pi|_{t=0}$. Therefore one can't obtain in (2.15b) a uniform convergence near $t = 0$. If $m \geq 6$, from (2.12c) we can obtain $\nabla |H^\lambda|^2 \rightarrow \nabla |B|^2$ in $C_{loc}([0, T] \times \overline{\Omega})$, so that we can improve (2.15b) to $\lambda^2 \nabla p^\lambda \rightarrow \nabla \pi$ in $C_{loc}((0, T] \times \overline{\Omega})$.

3. PROOF OF A PRELIMINARY A PRIORI ESTIMATE

In this section we drop for convenience the index λ . Suppose that the assumptions of Theorem 2.2 hold. Let a_0 , depending increasingly on ω^{-1} , be such that $0 < a_0 < 1$ and

$$2a_0 I_7 \leq A_0(u_0/\lambda) \leq (2a_0)^{-1} I_7 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \forall \lambda \geq 1.$$

Moreover, let $R > 0$ be such that

$$|\rho(p_0)| + |(\rho_p/\rho)(p_0)| \leq R/2 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \forall \lambda \geq 1.$$

Let u be a sufficiently smooth solution of (1.1)–(1.3), without giving for the moment the precise definition; it is understood that the following computation for deriving the a priori estimate can be carried out legitimately. Given $T > 0$, we assume that u satisfies

$$a_0 I_7 \leq A_0(u/\lambda) \leq a_0^{-1} I_7, \quad |\rho| + |\rho_p/\rho| \leq R, \quad (3.1)$$

$$\| \|u\| \|_{5,**, \lambda} \leq K \quad \text{in } Q_T, \forall \lambda \geq 1.$$

Lemma 3.1. *Let u be a sufficiently smooth solution of (2.7) satisfying (3.1). The matrices $A_0 = A_0(u/\lambda)$, $A = (A_1, A_2, A_3) = A(u, u/\lambda)$ of (2.4), (2.5) satisfy*

$$\| [A_0] \|_{m, **, \lambda} \leq \lambda^{-1} \Phi(R, K) \| u \|_{m, **, \lambda}, \quad (3.2a)$$

$$\| [A_j] \|_{m, **, \lambda} \leq \Phi(R, K) \| u \|_{m, **, \lambda} \quad j = 1, 2, 3, \quad (3.2b)$$

$$| \text{Div} \vec{A} |_{\infty} \leq \Phi(R, K), \quad (3.2c)$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$, $\lambda \geq 1$, where $\text{Div} \vec{A} = \partial_t A_0 + \sum_j \partial_j A_j$ and where Φ is a suitable increasing function independent of λ .

Proof. By the change of scale $\tau = \lambda t$, $\| [A_0(u(t)/\lambda)] \|_{m, **, \lambda} = \| [A_0(u(\tau/\lambda)/\lambda)] \|_{m, **, \lambda}$, $\| u(t) \|_{m, **, \lambda} = \| u(\tau/\lambda) \|_{m, **, \lambda}$. Lemma A.2 and Theorem A.1 yield (here ∂_* includes $\partial/\partial\tau$)

$$\begin{aligned} & \| [A_0(u(t)/\lambda)] \|_{m, **, \lambda} = \| [A_0(u(\tau/\lambda)/\lambda)] \|_{m, **, \lambda} \\ & \leq \| \partial_* A_0((u(\tau/\lambda)/\lambda)) \|_{m-1, **, \lambda} + \| \partial_1 A_0(u(\tau/\lambda)/\lambda) \|_{m-1, **, \lambda} \\ & \leq \Phi(R, K) \| u(\tau/\lambda)/\lambda \|_{m, **, \lambda} = \Phi(R, K) \| u(t)/\lambda \|_{m, **, \lambda} \\ & \leq \lambda^{-1} \Phi(R, K) \| u(t) \|_{m, **, \lambda} \end{aligned}$$

for all $\lambda \geq 1$. (3.2b) follows by a similar computation and Lemma A.3. Moreover we have $\text{Div} \vec{A} = \frac{\partial A_0}{\partial u} \lambda^{-1} \partial_t u + \sum_j (\frac{\partial A_j}{\partial u} + \lambda^{-1} \frac{\partial A_j}{\partial u/\lambda}) \partial_j u$. From Lemma A.2 we obtain (3.2c) since $\lambda^{-1} \partial_t u, \partial_2 u, \partial_3 u \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_{**}^{m-1})$ and $\partial_1 u \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_{**}^{m-2}) \hookrightarrow C_B^0(\bar{\Omega})$. \square

Observe that the differentiation of A_0 gives one λ^{-1} that can be associated to $\partial_t u$ and used as the weight for ∂_t in the H_{**}^m norms. This fact shows the importance of the dependence of A_0 only on u/λ , as pointed out in [17]. We will denote

$$\| |A| \|_{m, **, \lambda} = \| [A_0(u(t)/\lambda)] \|_{m, **, \lambda} + \sum_j \| [A_j] \|_{m, **, \lambda}. \quad (3.3)$$

Let U be a sufficiently smooth solution of

$$A_0 \partial_t U + \sum_{j=1}^n (A_j + \lambda C_j) \partial_j U = F, \quad (3.4)$$

where the matrix coefficients are evaluated at u and F is a given vector field. For convenience let us set $\int = \int_{\Omega} dx$.

Lemma 3.2. *Let the solution $U = (Q, V, W)$ of (3.4) (with $Q \in \mathbb{R}$ and $V, W \in \mathbb{R}^2$) be such that*

$$\text{either } Q = 0 \quad \text{or } V_1 = 0 \quad \text{on } \Sigma_T. \quad (3.5)$$

Then

$$a_0 \| U(t) \|^2 \leq a_0^{-1} \| U(0) \|^2 + \int_0^t (2 \int F \cdot U + | \text{Div} \vec{A} |_{\infty} \| U \|^2) ds, \quad (3.6)$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$, $\lambda \geq 1$.

Proof. We multiply (3.4) by U and integrate over Ω . An integration by parts and standard calculations give

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int A_0 U \cdot U = \int_{\partial\Omega} (A_1 + \lambda C_1) U \cdot U + \int (2F + \text{Div} \vec{A} U) \cdot U \quad (3.7)$$

Here we use $\partial_j(\lambda C_j) = 0$. In our case

$$(A_1 + \lambda C_1)U \cdot U = 2\lambda QV_1 \quad \text{on } \Sigma_T.$$

Thus, under (3.5), the boundary integral in (3.7) vanishes and (3.6) readily follows. \square

We use Lemma 3.2 to get the apriori estimate in $H_{**}^m(\Omega)$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $m \geq 5$. Let u be a sufficiently smooth solution of (2.7) satisfying (3.1) and $\alpha = (\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_3)$ a multi-index with $|\alpha| \leq m$ (α_0 stands for the index of ∂_t). Then $\partial_\star^\alpha u$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} a_0 \|\lambda^{-\alpha_0} \partial_\star^\alpha u(t)\|^2 &\leq a_0^{-1} \|\lambda^{-\alpha_0} \partial_\star^\alpha u(0)\|^2 + \\ &+ C \int_0^t \{ \Phi(K) \|\lambda^{-\alpha_0} \partial_\star^\alpha u\|^2 + \|A\|_{m,**,\lambda} \|u\|_{m,**,\lambda}^2 + \|u\|_{m,**,\lambda} \|\lambda \partial_1 q\|_{m-1,*,\lambda} \} ds, \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$, $\lambda \geq 1$, where the increasing function Φ is independent of λ .

Proof. We apply $\lambda^{-\alpha_0} \partial_\star^\alpha$ to (2.6) and obtain (3.4) with $U = U_\alpha = \lambda^{-\alpha_0} \partial_\star^\alpha u$ and

$$F = F_\alpha = -\lambda^{-\alpha_0} [\partial_\star^\alpha, A_0 \partial_t] u - \lambda^{-\alpha_0} [\partial_\star^\alpha, A_j \partial_j] u - \lambda [\partial_\star^\alpha, C_1 \partial_1] u. \quad (3.9)$$

Concerning the last term in (3.9) we observe that this term doesn't vanish even if the C_j are constant because $[\sigma(x_1) \partial_1, \partial_1] \neq 0$. On the contrary we have $[\partial_\star^\alpha, C_j \partial_j] = 0$ if $j \neq 1$. We observe that, by tangential differentiation along Γ of the boundary condition $v_1 = 0$, we can obtain $\partial_\star^\alpha v_1 = 0$ on Σ_T . Thus we can obtain the estimate for $\lambda^{-\alpha_0} \partial_\star^\alpha u$ from Lemma 3.2. It is enough to estimate F_α given by (3.9).

Expanding the first commutator we can write

$$[\partial_\star^\alpha, A_0 \partial_t] u = \partial_\star^{\alpha-1} (\partial_\star A_0 \partial_t u) + \partial_\star^{\alpha-2} (\partial_\star A_0 \partial_\star \partial_t u) + \dots + \partial_\star A_0 \partial_\star^{\alpha-1} \partial_t u, \quad (3.10)$$

where $\partial_\star^{\alpha-1}$ means ∂_\star^β for some multi-index β with $\beta_i \leq \alpha_i$ and $|\beta| = |\alpha| - 1$, and so on. Since $u \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_{**}^m)$ and $\partial_\star A_0 \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_{**}^{m-1})$ then, from Lemma A.4 (ii), with $n = 3$, we have $\partial_\star A_0 \partial_t u \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_{**}^{m-1})$, $\partial_\star A_0 \partial_\star \partial_t u \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_{**}^{m-2})$, $\partial_\star A_0 \partial_\star^2 \partial_t u \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_{**}^{m-3})$, and so on (with corresponding multiplicative inequalities), provided that $m - 1 \geq 4$. Again the differentiation of A_0 gives one more λ^{-1} which is then associated to $\partial_t u$. Then from (A.6), we get

$$\|\lambda^{-\alpha_0} [\partial_\star^\alpha, A_0 \partial_t] u\| \leq C \|A_0\|_{m,**,\lambda} \|u\|_{m,**,\lambda}, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (3.11)$$

provided that $m - 1 \geq 4$. Analogously we treat the commutator terms when $j = 2, 3$ and obtain

$$\|\lambda^{-\alpha_0} [\partial_\star^\alpha, A_j \partial_j] u\| \leq C \|A_j\|_{m,**,\lambda} \|u\|_{m,**,\lambda}, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad j = 2, 3, \quad (3.12)$$

again provided $m \geq 5$. In case $j = 1$ we have

$$[\partial_\star^\alpha, A_1 \partial_1] u = \partial_\star^{\alpha-1} (\partial_\star A_1 \partial_1 u) + \partial_\star^{\alpha-2} (\partial_\star A_1 \partial_\star \partial_1 u) + \dots + \partial_\star A_1 \partial_\star^{\alpha-1} \partial_1 u. \quad (3.13)$$

If we argument as above we can't obtain the desired estimate because we have $\partial_\star A_1 \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_{**}^{m-1})$, $\partial_1 u \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_{**}^{m-2})$ which yield $\partial_\star A_1 \partial_1 u \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_{**}^{m-2})$ from Lemma A.4 (ii). Differently, we consider that $u \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_{**}^m)$ gives $\partial_1 u \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_{**}^{m-1})$. Then Lemma A.4 (i) yields $\partial_\star A_1 \partial_1 u \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_{**}^{m-1})$, $\partial_\star A_1 \partial_\star \partial_1 u \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_{**}^{m-2})$, $\partial_\star A_1 \partial_\star^2 \partial_1 u \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_{**}^{m-3})$, and so on. Then from (A.5), we get

$$\|\lambda^{-\alpha_0} [\partial_\star^\alpha, A_1 \partial_1] u\| \leq C \|A_1\|_{m,**,\lambda} \|u\|_{m,**,\lambda}, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (3.14)$$

again provided $m \geq 5$.

Finally we consider the commutator arising from the large operator $\lambda C_j \partial_j$, which must be treated more carefully. For, it doesn't work to estimate directly $\|\lambda[\partial_*^\alpha, C_1 \partial_1]u\|$ but we have to consider the integral below. In what follows we use the following simple facts ($\sigma = \sigma(x_1)$):

$$\partial_1(\sigma \partial_1)^k = (\sigma' + \sigma \partial_1)^k \partial_1, \quad (\sigma \partial_1)^k(\sigma U) = \sigma(\sigma' + \sigma \partial_1)^k U. \quad (3.15)$$

Set

$$\partial_{\#}^\alpha = \lambda^{-\alpha_0} \partial_t^{\alpha_0} \partial_2^{\alpha_2} \partial_3^{\alpha_3}, \quad w = \partial_{\#}^\alpha u.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda \int [\lambda^{-\alpha_0} \partial_*^\alpha, C_1 \partial_1]u \cdot \lambda^{-\alpha_0} \partial_*^\alpha u = \lambda \int [(\sigma \partial_1)^{\alpha_1} \partial_1 - \partial_1(\sigma \partial_1)^{\alpha_1}] C_1 w \cdot (\sigma \partial_1)^{\alpha_1} w \\ &= \lambda \int [(\sigma \partial_1)^{\alpha_1} - (\sigma' + \sigma \partial_1)^{\alpha_1}] C_1 \partial_1 w \cdot (\sigma \partial_1)^{\alpha_1} w \\ &= -\lambda \sum_{h=0}^{\alpha_1-1} \binom{\alpha_1}{h} \int (\sigma')^{\alpha_1-h} (\sigma \partial_1)^h C_1 \partial_1 w \cdot (\sigma \partial_1)^{\alpha_1} w \\ &= -\sum_{h=0}^{\alpha_1-1} \binom{\alpha_1}{h} \int (\sigma')^{\alpha_1-h} (\sigma \partial_1)^h \partial_{\#}^\alpha \begin{pmatrix} \lambda \partial_1 v_1 \\ \lambda \partial_1 q \end{pmatrix} \cdot \partial_{\#}^\alpha (\sigma \partial_1)^{\alpha_1-1} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma \partial_1 q \\ \sigma \partial_1 v_1 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we use the second relation in (3.15) in the first row of the last scalar product and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & -\sum_{h=0}^{\alpha_1-1} \binom{\alpha_1}{h} \int (\sigma')^{\alpha_1-h} \{ (\sigma \partial_1)^{h+1} \partial_{\#}^\alpha v_1 \cdot \partial_{\#}^\alpha (\sigma' + \sigma \partial_1)^{\alpha_1-1} (\lambda \partial_1 q) + \\ & \quad + (\sigma \partial_1)^h \partial_{\#}^\alpha (\lambda \partial_1 q) \cdot \lambda^{-\alpha_0} \partial_*^\alpha v_1 \}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

We estimate (3.16) and obtain

$$|\lambda \int [\lambda^{-\alpha_0} \partial_*^\alpha, C_1 \partial_1]u \cdot \lambda^{-\alpha_0} \partial_*^\alpha u| \leq C \|v_1\|_{m,*,\lambda} \|\lambda \partial_1 q\|_{m-1,*,\lambda}, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (3.17)$$

From Lemma 3.2 applied to $\lambda^{-\alpha_0} \partial_*^\alpha u$ and (3.2), (3.11)–(3.14), (3.17) we obtain (3.8). \square

Lemma 3.4. *Let $m \geq 6$. Let u be a sufficiently smooth solution of (2.8) satisfying (3.1) and $\beta = (\beta_0, \dots, \beta_3)$ a multi-index with $|\beta| \leq m - 1$. Then $\partial_*^\beta \partial_1 u$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} & a_0 \|\lambda^{-\beta_0} \partial_*^\beta \partial_1 u(t)\|^2 \leq a_0^{-1} \|\lambda^{-\beta_0} \partial_*^\beta \partial_1 u(0)\|^2 + \\ & + C \int_0^t \{ \Phi(K) \|\lambda^{-\beta_0} \partial_*^\beta \partial_1 u\|^2 + \|A\|_{m,**,\lambda} \|u\|_{m,**,\lambda}^2 + \|\partial_1 v_1\|_{m-1,**,\lambda} \|\lambda \partial_1 q\|_{m-1,*,\lambda} \} ds, \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$, $\lambda \geq 1$, where the increasing function Φ is independent of λ .

Proof. We apply $\lambda^{-\beta_0} \partial_*^\beta \partial_1$ to (2.6) and obtain (3.4) with $U = U_\beta = \lambda^{-\beta_0} \partial_*^\beta \partial_1 u$ and

$$F = F_\beta = -\lambda^{-\beta_0} [\partial_*^\beta \partial_1, A_0 \partial_t]u - \lambda^{-\beta_0} [\partial_*^\beta \partial_1, A_j \partial_j]u - \lambda [\partial_*^\beta \partial_1, C_1 \partial_1]u. \quad (3.19)$$

From (2.2) we have that

$$\lambda \partial_1 q = -\rho(\partial_t v_1 + v \cdot \nabla v_1) + H \cdot \nabla H_1. \quad (3.20)$$

From the boundary condition $v_1 = H_1 = 0$ at Σ_T , it follows that $\partial_1 q = 0$ at Σ_T . By tangential differentiation along Γ , we can obtain

$$\partial_\star^\beta \partial_1 q = 0 \quad \text{on } \Sigma_T.$$

Thus an L^2 estimate of $\lambda^{-\beta_0} \partial_\star^\beta \partial_1 u$ follows by application of Lemma 3.2. Again it suffices to estimate F_β given by (3.19). Expanding the first commutator we can write

$$[\partial_\star^\beta \partial_1, A_0 \partial_t] u = \partial_\star^\beta (\partial_1 A_0 \partial_t u) + \partial_\star^{\beta-1} (\partial_\star A_0 \partial_1 \partial_t u) + \cdots + \partial_\star A_0 \partial_\star^{\beta-1} \partial_1 \partial_t u,$$

where $\partial_\star^{\beta-1}$ means ∂_\star^γ for some multi-index γ with $\gamma_i \leq \beta_i$ and $|\gamma| = |\beta| - 1$, and so on. Since $\partial_1 A_0 \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_*^{m-1})$ and $\partial_t u \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_{**}^{m-1})$, then, from Lemma A.4 (i) with $n = 3$, we have $\partial_1 A_0 \partial_t u \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_*^{m-1})$ (with corresponding multiplicative inequalities), provided $m - 1 \geq 4$. Since $\partial_\star A_0 \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_{**}^{m-1})$ and $\partial_1 \partial_t u \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_*^{m-2})$, then from Lemma A.4 (i) we have $\partial_\star A_0 \partial_1 \partial_t u \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_*^{m-2})$, $\partial_\star A_0 \partial_\star \partial_1 \partial_t u \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_*^{m-3})$, and so on, provided $m - 1 \geq 4$. Again the differentiation of A_0 gives one more λ^{-1} which is then associated to $\partial_t u$. Then from (A.5) we get

$$\|\lambda^{-\beta_0} [\partial_\star^\beta \partial_1, A_0 \partial_t] u\| \leq C \| [A_0] \|_{m, **, \lambda} \| u \|_{m, **, \lambda}, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (3.21)$$

provided $m - 1 \geq 4$. Analogously we obtain

$$\|\lambda^{-\beta_0} [\partial_\star^\beta \partial_1, A_j \partial_j] u\| \leq C \| [A_j] \|_{m, **, \lambda} \| u \|_{m, **, \lambda}, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad j = 2, 3. \quad (3.22)$$

Expanding the commutator with A_1 we can write

$$[\partial_\star^\beta \partial_1, A_1 \partial_1] u = \partial_\star^\beta (\partial_1 A_1 \partial_1 u) + \partial_\star^{\beta-1} (\partial_\star A_1 \partial_1^2 u) + \partial_\star^{\beta-2} (\partial_\star A_1 \partial_\star \partial_1^2 u) + \cdots + \partial_\star A_1 \partial_\star^{\beta-1} \partial_1^2 u.$$

Concerning the first term in the right hand side, as $\partial_1 A_1 \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_*^{m-1})$ and $\partial_1 u \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_*^{m-1})$ we obtain from Lemma A.3 that $\partial_1 A_1 \partial_1 u \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_*^{m-1})$, provided $m - 1 \geq 4$. Concerning the other terms in the expansion, we first consider that $A_1 = 0$ on Σ_T yields, by tangential differentiation, $\partial_\star A_1 = 0$ on Σ_T . Then we have $\partial_\star A_1 / \sigma \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_*^{m-2})$ from (A.9). Since $(\sigma \partial_1) \partial_1 u \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_*^{m-2})$ we obtain $(\partial_\star A_1 / \sigma) (\sigma \partial_1) \partial_1 u \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_*^{m-2})$, $(\partial_\star A_1 / \sigma) \partial_\star (\sigma \partial_1) \partial_1 u \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_*^{m-3})$, \dots , $(\partial_\star A_1 / \sigma) \partial_\star^{\beta-1} (\sigma \partial_1) \partial_1 u \in \mathcal{C}_T(L^2)$ (with corresponding multiplicative inequalities), provided that $m - 2 \geq 4$. Thus it follows that

$$\|\lambda^{-\beta_0} [\partial_\star^\beta \partial_1, A_1 \partial_1] u\| \leq C \| [A_1] \|_{m, **, \lambda} \| u \|_{m, **, \lambda}, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (3.23)$$

provided that $m \geq 6$.

Finally we consider the commutator arising from the large operator. Set

$$\partial_\#^\beta = \lambda^{-\beta_0} \partial_t^{\beta_0} \partial_2^{\beta_2} \partial_3^{\beta_3}, \quad z = \partial_\#^\beta \partial_1 u.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lambda \int [\lambda^{-\beta_0} \partial_\star^\beta \partial_1, C_1 \partial_1] u \cdot \lambda^{-\beta_0} \partial_\star^\beta \partial_1 u = \lambda \int [(\sigma \partial_1)^{\beta_1} \partial_1 - \partial_1 (\sigma \partial_1)^{\beta_1}] C_1 z \cdot (\sigma \partial_1)^{\beta_1} z \\
& = \lambda \int [(\sigma \partial_1)^{\beta_1} - (\sigma' + \sigma \partial_1)^{\beta_1}] \partial_1 C_1 z \cdot (\sigma \partial_1)^{\beta_1} z \\
& = -\lambda \sum_{h=0}^{\beta_1-1} \binom{\beta_1}{h} \int (\sigma')^{\beta_1-h} (\sigma \partial_1)^h \partial_1 C_1 z \cdot (\sigma \partial_1)^{\beta_1} z \\
& = -\sum_{h=0}^{\beta_1-1} \binom{\beta_1}{h} \int (\sigma')^{\beta_1-h} (\sigma \partial_1)^h \partial_\#^\beta \partial_1 \left(\frac{\partial_1 v_1}{\lambda \partial_1 q} \right) \cdot \lambda^{-\beta_0} \partial_\star^\beta \left(\frac{\lambda \partial_1 q}{\partial_1 v_1} \right) \\
& = -\sum_{h=0}^{\beta_1-1} \binom{\beta_1}{h} \int (\sigma')^{\beta_1-h} \{ (\sigma \partial_1)^h \partial_\#^\beta \partial_1 (\partial_1 v_1) \cdot \lambda^{-\beta_0} \partial_\star^\beta (\lambda \partial_1 q) \\
& \quad + (\sigma \partial_1)^{h+1} \partial_\#^\beta (\lambda \partial_1 q) \cdot \partial_1 (\sigma \partial_1)^{\beta_1-1} \partial_\#^\beta (\partial_1 v_1) \}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

Now we estimate (3.24) and obtain

$$|\lambda \int [\lambda^{-\beta_0} \partial_\star^\beta \partial_1, C_1 \partial_1] u \cdot \lambda^{-\beta_0} \partial_\star^\beta \partial_1 u| \leq C \| \|\partial_1 v_1\| \|_{m-1, **} \| \|\lambda \partial_1 q\| \|_{m-1, *, \lambda}. \tag{3.25}$$

From Lemma 3.2 applied to $\lambda^{-\beta_0} \partial_\star^\beta \partial_1 u$ and (3.2), (3.21)–(3.23) and (3.25) we obtain (3.18). \square

We decompose u as $u = (u^I, u^II)$ where $u^I = (q, v_1)$ and $u^II = (v_2, v_3, H_1, H_2, H_3)$. Accordingly we write the matrix coefficients of L in block form as

$$A_0 = \begin{pmatrix} A_0^{II} & A_0^{I II} \\ A_0^{II I} & A_0^{II II} \end{pmatrix}$$

and similarly for $A_j, C_j, j = 1, 2, 3$. Now we estimate $\partial_1 u^II$. We consider the rows 3 to 7 of (2.4) that we write as

$$(A_0^{II II} \partial_t + \sum_{j=1}^3 A_j^{II II} \partial_j) u^II = G \tag{3.26}$$

with

$$G = \begin{pmatrix} G_1 \\ G_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad G_1 = \begin{pmatrix} -\lambda \partial_2 q \\ -\lambda \partial_3 q \end{pmatrix}, \quad G_2 = \frac{\rho_p}{\rho} \frac{H}{\lambda} (\partial_t q + v \cdot \nabla q) + \begin{pmatrix} H \cdot \nabla v_1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.27}$$

Lemma 3.5. *Let $m \geq 6$. Let u be a sufficiently smooth solution of (2.8) satisfying (3.1), decomposed as above as $u = (u^I, u^II)$. Then u^II satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned}
a_0 \| \lambda^{-\gamma_0} \partial_\star^\gamma \partial_1^k u^II(t) \|^2 & \leq a_0^{-1} \| \lambda^{-\gamma_0} \partial_\star^\gamma \partial_1^k u^II(0) \|^2 + C \int_0^t \{ \Phi(K) \| \lambda^{-\gamma_0} \partial_\star^\gamma \partial_1^k u^II \|^2 \\
& \quad + (1 + \| \|A\| \|_{m, **, \lambda}) (\| \|u\| \|_{m, **, \lambda} + \| \|\lambda \partial_1 q\| \|_{m-1, **, \lambda} + \| \|\partial_1 v_1\| \|_{m-1, **, \lambda}) \| \|u\| \|_{m, **, \lambda} \} ds,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.28}$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$, $\lambda \geq 1$, and for any multi-index γ and integer $k \geq 2$ such that $|\gamma| + 2k \leq m + 1$. The constant C is independent of λ .

Proof. We apply $\lambda^{-\gamma_0} \partial_\star^\gamma \partial_1^k$ to (3.25) and obtain

$$(A_0^{II} \partial_t + \sum_{j=1}^3 A_j^{II} \partial_j) \lambda^{-\gamma_0} \partial_\star^\gamma \partial_1^k u^{II} = K', \quad (3.29)$$

where

$$K' = \lambda^{-\gamma_0} \partial_\star^\gamma \partial_1^k G - \lambda^{-\gamma_0} [\partial_\star^\gamma \partial_1^k, A_0^{II} \partial_t] u^{II} - \lambda^{-\gamma_0} [\partial_\star^\gamma \partial_1^k, A_j^{II} \partial_j] u^{II}. \quad (3.30)$$

Set $V = \lambda^{-\gamma_0} \partial_\star^\gamma \partial_1^k u^{II}$. We multiply (3.28) by V and integrate over Ω . An integration by parts (where we use $A_1^{II} = 0$ at Γ) gives

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int A_0^{II} V \cdot V = \int (2K' + \text{Div} A^{II} V) \cdot V \quad (3.31)$$

where $\text{Div} A^{II} = \partial_t A_0^{II} + \sum_j \partial_j A_j^{II}$. We have

$$\|\text{Div} A^{II}\|_{L^\infty} \leq C \|A\|_3 \leq C \|A\|_{5, **}. \quad (3.32)$$

We estimate K' in (3.30). We expand the first commutator in the form

$$\begin{aligned} [\partial_\star^\gamma \partial_1^k, A_0^{II} \partial_t] u^{II} &= \sum_{h=0}^{k-1} \partial_\star^\gamma \partial_1^{k-h-1} (\partial_1 A_0^{II} \partial_t \partial_1^h u^{II}) \\ &+ \sum_{h=1}^{k-1} \partial_\star^\gamma \partial_1^{k-h} (A_0^{II} \partial_t \partial_1^h u^{II}) + [\partial_\star^\gamma, A_0^{II} \partial_t] \partial_1^k u^{II}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

For the first term we observe that $\partial_1 A_0^{II} \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_{**}^{m-2})$ and $\partial_t \partial_1^h u^{II} \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_{**}^{m-2h-1})$ so that from Lemma A.4 we have $\partial_1 A_0^{II} \partial_t \partial_1^h u^{II} \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_{**}^{m-2h-1})$ because $m-2 \geq 4$. This allows to estimate the first term because $\gamma + 2(k-h-1) \leq m-2h-1$. We argue similarly for the second term in the right-hand side of (3.33). For the third term we argue as for (3.10). We obtain

$$\|[\lambda^{-\gamma_0} \partial_\star^\gamma \partial_1^k, A_0^{II} \partial_t] u^{II}\| \leq C \|A_0\|_{m, **, \lambda} \|u\|_{m, **, \lambda}, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (3.34)$$

provided that $m \geq 6$. In a similar way we get

$$\|[\lambda^{-\gamma_0} \partial_\star^\gamma \partial_1^k, A_j^{II} \partial_j] u^{II}\| \leq C \|A_j\|_{m, **, \lambda} \|u\|_{m, **, \lambda}, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad j = 2, 3. \quad (3.35)$$

Moreover, we expand the commutator with A_1 as

$$[\partial_\star^\gamma \partial_1^k, A_1^{II} \partial_1] u^{II} = \sum_{h=1}^{k-1} \partial_\star^\gamma \partial_1^{k-h} (\partial_1 A_1^{II} \partial_1^h u^{II}) + [\partial_\star^\gamma, A_1^{II} \partial_1] \partial_1^k u^{II}. \quad (3.36)$$

For the first summation we argue as before, while for the commutator we argue as for (3.13). We obtain

$$\|[\lambda^{-\gamma_0} \partial_\star^\gamma \partial_1^k, A_1 \partial_1] u\| \leq C \|A_1\|_{m, **, \lambda} \|u\|_{m, **, \lambda}, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (3.37)$$

provided that $m \geq 6$.

Now we estimate G . We have

$$\|\lambda^{-\gamma_0} \partial_\star^\gamma \partial_1^k G_1\| = \|\lambda^{-\gamma_0} \partial_\star^\gamma \partial_1^k \begin{pmatrix} \lambda \partial_2 q \\ \lambda \partial_3 q \end{pmatrix}\| = \|\lambda^{-\gamma_0} \partial_\star^\gamma \partial_1^{k-1} \begin{pmatrix} \partial_2 \\ \partial_3 \end{pmatrix} \lambda \partial_1 q\| \leq \|\lambda \partial_1 q\|_{m-1, **, \lambda} \quad (3.38)$$

because $|\gamma| + 2k \leq m + 1$ is equivalent to $|\gamma| + 1 + 2(k - 1) \leq m$; moreover we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\lambda^{-\gamma_0} \partial_*^\gamma \partial_1^k G_2\| \leq \|\lambda^{-\gamma_0} \partial_*^\gamma \partial_1^{k-1} \left\{ \frac{\rho_p}{\rho} \frac{H}{\lambda} (\partial_t \partial_1 q + v \cdot \nabla \partial_1 q) + \begin{pmatrix} H \cdot \nabla \partial_1 v_1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\}\| \\ & + \|\lambda^{-\gamma_0} \partial_*^\gamma \partial_1^{k-1} \left\{ \partial_1 \left(\frac{\rho_p}{\rho} \frac{H}{\lambda} \right) \partial_t q + \partial_1 \left(\frac{\rho_p}{\rho} \frac{H}{\lambda} v \right) \cdot \nabla q + \begin{pmatrix} \partial_1 H \cdot \nabla v_1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\}\| \\ & \leq C \| \|A\| \|m, **, \lambda\| (\| \|u\| \|m, **, \lambda\| + \| \|\partial_1 q\| \|m-1, **, \lambda\| + \| \|\partial_1 v_1\| \|m-1, **, \lambda\|), \end{aligned} \quad (3.39)$$

since

$$\| \|\frac{\rho_p}{\rho} \frac{H}{\lambda}\| \|m, **, \lambda\| + \| \|\frac{\rho_p}{\rho} \frac{H}{\lambda} v\| \|m, **, \lambda\| + \| \|H\| \|m, **, \lambda\| \leq \| \|A\| \|m, **, \lambda\|.$$

From (3.34), (3.35), (3.37)–(3.39), we obtain (3.28). \square

Now we give a direct estimate of the normal derivatives of the ‘noncharacteristic’ part of the solution q_1, v_1, H_1 .

Lemma 3.6. *Let u be a sufficiently smooth solution of (2.8) satisfying (3.1).*

(i) *The pressure q satisfies the estimate*

$$\| \|\lambda \partial_1 q\| \|m-1, **, \lambda\| \leq \Phi(K) (\| \|u\| \|m, **, \lambda\| + \| \|v_1, H_1\| \|m, **, \lambda\|), \quad (3.40)$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$, $\lambda \geq 1$, for a suitable function Φ independent of λ .

(ii) *There exists $\lambda_0 \geq 1$ sufficiently large (dependent on $\| \|u\| \|_{5, **, \lambda}$) such that*

$$\| \|\partial_1 v_1\| \|m-1, **, \lambda\| \leq \Phi(K) \| \|u\| \|m, **, \lambda\|, \quad (3.41)$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$, $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$, for a suitable function Φ dependent on λ_0 but independent of λ .

(iii) *The components of the solution q_1, v_1, H_1 satisfy*

$$\| \|q_1, v_1, H_1\| \|m, **, \lambda\| \leq \Phi(K) \| \|u\| \|m, **, \lambda\|, \quad (3.42)$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$, $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$, for a suitable function Φ dependent on λ_0 but independent of λ .

Proof. We estimate the normal derivative of q from (3.20) by using Lemmata A.2, A.4. Specifically, for the critical term $v_1 \partial_1 v_1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \| \|v_1 \partial_1 v_1\| \|m-1, **, \lambda\| & \leq C \left(\left\| \frac{v_1}{\sigma} \right\|_{W_*^{1, \infty}(Q_T)} \| \|\sigma \partial_1 v_1\| \|m-1, **, \lambda\| + \| \|\sigma \partial_1 v_1\| \|_{W_*^{1, \infty}(Q_T)} \left\| \frac{v_1}{\sigma} \right\| \|m-1, **, \lambda\| \right) \\ & \leq C \left(\| \|\frac{v_1}{\sigma}\| \|_{3, **, \lambda}\| \| \|v_1\| \|m, **, \lambda\| + \| \|\sigma \partial_1 v_1\| \|_{3, **, \lambda}\| \left\| \frac{v_1}{\sigma} \right\| \|m-1, **, \lambda\| \right) \\ & \leq C \| \|v_1\| \|_{4, **, \lambda}\| \| \|v_1\| \|m, **, \lambda\| \leq C \| \|v_1\| \|_{5, **, \lambda}\| \| \|v_1\| \|m, **, \lambda\|, \end{aligned} \quad (3.43)$$

where for the last inequalities we have used Theorem A.4 and Lemma A.1(i). A similar argument gives

$$\| \|H_1 \partial_1 H_1\| \|m-1, **, \lambda\| \leq C \| \|H_1\| \|_{5, **, \lambda}\| \| \|H_1\| \|m, **, \lambda\|. \quad (3.44)$$

The estimate of the other terms in (3.20) is straightforward and so we obtain (3.40). For the estimate of $\partial_1 v_1$ we consider (2.1) that gives

$$\partial_1 v_1 = -\partial_2 v_2 - \partial_3 v_3 - \frac{\rho_p}{\lambda \rho} \{ (\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla) q - \frac{H}{\lambda} \cdot (\partial_t + (v \cdot \nabla)) H \}. \quad (3.45)$$

The most critical terms in the right-hand side of (3.45) are $v_1 \partial_1 q$ and $v_1 \partial_1 H$, that are estimated by applying the arguments used for (3.43) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\|v_1 \partial_1 q\|\|_{m-1, ** , \lambda} &\leq C \left(\|\|\frac{v_1}{\sigma}\|\|_{3, ** , \lambda} \|\|q\|\|_{m, ** , \lambda} + \|\|\sigma \partial_1 q\|\|_{3, ** , \lambda} \|\|\frac{v_1}{\sigma}\|\|_{m-1, ** , \lambda} \right) \\ &\leq C (\|\|v_1\|\|_{5, ** , \lambda} \|\|q\|\|_{m, ** , \lambda} + \|\|q\|\|_{4, ** , \lambda} \|\|v_1\|\|_{m, ** , \lambda}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.46)$$

$$\|\|v_1 \partial_1 H\|\|_{m-1, ** , \lambda} \leq C (\|\|v_1\|\|_{5, ** , \lambda} \|\|H\|\|_{m, ** , \lambda} + \|\|H\|\|_{4, ** , \lambda} \|\|v_1\|\|_{m, ** , \lambda}). \quad (3.47)$$

After estimating the other terms in the right-hand side of (3.45) we obtain

$$\|\|\partial_1 v_1\|\|_{m-1, ** , \lambda} \leq \|\|u^H\|\|_{m, ** , \lambda} + \frac{\Phi(K)}{\lambda} (\|\|u\|\|_{m, ** , \lambda} + \|\|v_1\|\|_{m, ** , \lambda}). \quad (3.48)$$

Considering that

$$\|\|v_1\|\|_{m, ** , \lambda} \leq \|\|v_1\|\|_{m, ** , \lambda} + \|\|\partial_1 v_1\|\|_{m-1, ** , \lambda},$$

see Lemma A.1(ii), we can obtain from (3.48) the estimate of the form

$$\|\|\partial_1 v_1\|\|_{m-1, ** , \lambda} \leq \Phi(K) \|\|u\|\|_{m, ** , \lambda}, \quad (3.49)$$

for all $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$ sufficiently large and for a suitable function Φ , that is (3.41). λ_0 depends on $\|\|u\|\|_{5, ** , \lambda}$.

Finally, from the divergence constraint (1.2) we readily obtain

$$\|\|\partial_1 H_1\|\|_{m-1, ** , \lambda} \leq \|\|H_2\|\|_{m, ** , \lambda} + \|\|H_3\|\|_{m, ** , \lambda} \leq 2 \|\|u\|\|_{m, ** , \lambda},$$

and from Lemma A.1(ii) we have

$$\|\|H_1\|\|_{m, ** , \lambda} \leq C \|\|u\|\|_{m, ** , \lambda}. \quad (3.50)$$

Analogously, from (3.41) we obtain

$$\|\|v_1\|\|_{m, ** , \lambda} \leq \Phi(K) \|\|u\|\|_{m, ** , \lambda}. \quad (3.51)$$

Then from (3.40), (3.50), (3.51) we have

$$\|\|q\|\|_{m, ** , \lambda} \leq \Phi(K) \|\|u\|\|_{m, ** , \lambda}. \quad (3.52)$$

The three estimates (3.50)–(3.52) give (3.42). \square

Set for convenience

$$\begin{aligned} M(t) = &\left(\sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} \|\|\lambda^{-\alpha_0} \partial_*^\alpha u\|\|^2 + \sum_{|\beta| \leq m-1} \|\|\lambda^{-\beta_0} \partial_*^\beta \partial_1 u\|\|^2 \right. \\ &\left. + \sum_{k \geq 2} \sum_{|\gamma| + 2k \leq m+1} \|\|\lambda^{-\gamma_0} \partial_*^\gamma \partial_1^k u^H\|\|^2 \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.53)$$

From Lemmata 3.1, 3.3 – 3.6 we first obtain

$$a_0 M^2(t) \leq a_0^{-1} M^2(0) + \int_0^t \Phi(K) \{M^2(s) + \|\|u(s)\|\|_{m, ** , \lambda}^2 + \|\|u(s)\|\|_{m, ** , \lambda}^3\} ds. \quad (3.54)$$

Then we observe that by definition

$$\|\|u(t)\|\|_{m, ** , \lambda} \leq M(t) + \|\|\partial_1 q(t), \partial_1 v_1(t)\|\|_{m-1, ** , \lambda}, \quad (3.55)$$

and from (3.40), (3.42), (3.48) we can obtain

$$\|\|\partial_1 q(t), \partial_1 v_1(t)\|\|_{m-1, ** , \lambda} \leq \|\|u^H(t)\|\|_{m, ** , \lambda} + \frac{\Phi(K)}{\lambda} \|\|u(t)\|\|_{m, ** , \lambda}.$$

Substituting in (3.55) and observing that $\|u''(t)\|_{m,**,\lambda} \leq M(t)$ we get

$$\|u(t)\|_{m,**,\lambda} \leq M(t) + \frac{\Phi(K)}{\lambda} \|u(t)\|_{m,**,\lambda}.$$

For λ sufficiently large, say for $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$ again, with λ_0 dependent on K , we obtain

$$\|u(t)\|_{m,**,\lambda} \leq \Phi_1(K)M(t), \quad (3.56)$$

for every $t \in [0, T]$ and $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$, for a suitable increasing function Φ_1 . We substitute (3.56) in (3.54) and obtain the following lemma:

Lemma 3.7. *Let u be a sufficiently smooth solution of (2.8) satisfying (3.1). Then there exists an increasing function Φ independent of λ such that $M(t)$, defined in (3.51), obeys the estimate*

$$M^2(t) \leq a_0^{-2}M^2(0) + \int_0^t \Phi(K)\{M^2(s) + M^3(s)\} ds. \quad (3.57)$$

for every $t \in [0, T]$ and $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$, with λ_0 dependent on K .

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.2

First of all we observe that (2.10) yields from (2.4) that $\lambda^{-1}u_0^{\lambda(1)}$ is bounded in $H^{m-1}(\Omega)$, uniformly in λ . By repeated differentiation in time we verify that $\lambda^{-k}u_0^{\lambda(k)}$ is uniformly bounded in $H^{m-k}(\Omega)$. It follows that

$$M^\lambda(0) \leq \|u_0^\lambda\|_{m,**,\lambda} \leq C_1(K_1) \quad \forall \lambda \geq 1,$$

where $M^\lambda(t)$ replaces $M(t)$, defined in (3.53), when $u = u^\lambda$. Since we have

$$A_0(u^\lambda(t)/\lambda) = A_0(u_0^\lambda/\lambda) + \int_0^t \frac{\partial A_0}{\partial u} \lambda^{-1} \partial_t u^\lambda(s) ds$$

and similar equations for the functions $\rho(u^\lambda(t)/\lambda)$ and $(\rho_p/\rho)(u^\lambda(t)/\lambda)$, by means of the imbedding $C([0, T]; H_{**}^{m-2}(\Omega)) \hookrightarrow C_B^0(\overline{Q_T})$ we show

$$|A_0(u^\lambda(t)/\lambda) - A_0(u_0^\lambda/\lambda)| \leq \Phi_2(\|u^\lambda\|_{m,**,\lambda,T})T,$$

$$|\rho(u^\lambda(t)/\lambda) - \rho(u_0^\lambda/\lambda)| + |(\rho_p/\rho)(u^\lambda(t)/\lambda) - (\rho_p/\rho)(u_0^\lambda/\lambda)| \leq \Phi_2(\|u^\lambda\|_{m,**,\lambda,T})T \quad (4.1)$$

for all $\lambda \geq 1$ and $t \in [0, T]$, and for a suitable increasing function Φ_2 . Let us choose K in (3.1) as

$$K = 2C_1(K_1).$$

We take $T > 0$ such that any solution $M^\lambda(t)$ of (3.57) obeys

$$M^\lambda(t) \leq 2a_0^{-1}C_1(K_1) \quad \forall t \in [0, T], \quad (4.2)$$

and we also assume that T is so small that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_2(2a_0^{-1}\Phi_1(K)C_1(K_1))T &\leq \min\{a_0, (2a_0)^{-1}, R/2\}, \\ 2a_0^{-1}\Phi_1(K)T &\leq 1. \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

It follows from (3.56), (3.57) and the Gronwall inequality, (4.1)–(4.3), that u^λ satisfies the uniform estimates

$$\| \|u^\lambda\| \|_{m,**, \lambda, T} \leq \Phi_1(K) \max_{t \in [0, T]} M^\lambda(t) \leq 2a_0^{-1} C_1(K_1) \Phi_1(K), \quad (4.4)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \| \|u^\lambda\| \|_{5,**, \lambda, T} &\leq \| \|u_0^\lambda\| \|_{5,**, \lambda} + T \| \|\partial_t u^\lambda\| \|_{m-1,**, \lambda, T} \\ &\leq C_1(K_1) + 2a_0^{-1} C_1(K_1) \Phi_1(K) T \leq 2C_1(K_1) = K \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_0, \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

and the other requirements of (3.1) on the interval $[0, T]$.

Since $\| \|u^\lambda\| \|_{m,**, \lambda, T}$ depends boundedly on the parameter λ (i.e. it is bounded uniformly for λ in the bounded intervals $0 < \lambda' \leq \lambda \leq \lambda''$), the uniform estimate (4.4) holds with a suitable constant for all $\lambda \geq 1$. This gives the first part of (2.10). Directly from (2.3) we obtain

$$\| \|\partial_t H^\lambda\| \|_{m-1,**, \lambda, T} \leq C \| \|u^\lambda\| \|_{m,**, \lambda, T}^2 \leq C(K_1), \quad (4.6)$$

which gives the second part of (2.10). The proof of Theorem 2.2 is complete.

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.3

From (2.10), we immediately deduce the existence of a subsequence, again denoted by u^λ , and functions (q^∞, w, B) such that

$$u^\lambda \rightarrow (q^\infty, w, B) \quad \text{weakly-* in } L^\infty(0, T; H_{**}^m(\Omega)) \quad (5.1)$$

as $\lambda \rightarrow +\infty$. Moreover, from the Ascoli-Arzelà theorem and Theorem A.5 we also deduce

$$H^\lambda \rightarrow B \quad \text{in } C([0, T]; H_{*,loc}^{m-1}(\Omega)).$$

Let S be the closure of $\{v \in C_0^\infty(\Omega); \nabla \cdot v = 0\}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ and G be the orthogonal complement of S in $L^2(\Omega)$. Then we have $L^2(\Omega) = S \oplus G$ by the Helmholtz decomposition. We denote by P_S, P_G the orthogonal projections in $L^2(\Omega)$ onto S and G , respectively. It is well known that $P_S, P_G \in \mathcal{L}(H^m(\Omega), H^m(\Omega))$ for $m \geq 0$. The convergence of v^λ is shown by applying the result of [10], which uses the dispersion of the acoustic part $(q^\lambda, P_G v^\lambda)$ of the flow in the unbounded domain. We write (2.1), (2.2), in the form (we use the notation of [10])

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t q^\lambda + \lambda \mu_1 \nabla \cdot v^\lambda &= \mathcal{G}^0, \\ \partial_t v^\lambda + \lambda \mu_2 \nabla q^\lambda &= \mathcal{G}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

where $\mu_1 = (\frac{\bar{\rho}_p}{\bar{\rho}})^{-1}, \mu_2 = (\bar{\rho})^{-1}, \bar{\rho} = \rho(0), \bar{\rho}_p = \rho_p(0)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}^0 &= (\frac{\bar{\rho}_p}{\bar{\rho}})^{-1} \{ (\frac{\bar{\rho}_p}{\bar{\rho}} - \frac{\rho_p^\lambda}{\rho^\lambda}) \partial_t q^\lambda - \frac{\rho_p^\lambda}{\rho^\lambda} [v^\lambda \cdot \nabla q^\lambda - \frac{H^\lambda}{\lambda} \cdot (\partial_t + v^\lambda \cdot \nabla) H^\lambda] \}, \\ \mathcal{G} &= (\bar{\rho})^{-1} \{ (\bar{\rho} - \rho^\lambda) \partial_t v^\lambda - \rho^\lambda (v^\lambda \cdot \nabla) v^\lambda + (H^\lambda \cdot \nabla) H^\lambda \}. \end{aligned}$$

Set $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{G}^0, \mathcal{G})$. Then we show

Lemma 5.1. *There exists a positive constant C independent of λ such that*

$$\|\mathcal{F}(t)\|_1 + \|\mathcal{F}(t)\|_3 \leq C \quad \forall \lambda \geq 1, t \in [0, T]. \quad (5.3)$$

Moreover, the first component $\mathcal{G}_1(t) \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ for any $\lambda \geq 1$ and $t \in [0, T]$.

Proof. The estimate (5.3) is an easy consequence of the uniform estimate (2.10). We only observe that we have

$$\left(\frac{\rho_p^\lambda}{\rho^\lambda} - \frac{\bar{\rho}_p}{\bar{\rho}}\right)\partial_t q^\lambda = (q^\lambda - |H^\lambda|^2/(2\lambda))\partial_t q^\lambda/\lambda \int_0^1 \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial p} \frac{\rho_p^\lambda}{\rho^\lambda}\right)(\tau(q^\lambda/\lambda - |H^\lambda/\lambda|^2/2))d\tau$$

which shows that $(\rho_p^\lambda/\rho^\lambda - \bar{\rho}_p/\bar{\rho})\partial_t q^\lambda$ is uniformly bounded in $C([0, T]; H_{**}^{m-1}(\Omega)) \hookrightarrow C([0, T]; H^3(\Omega))$ and in $C([0, T]; L^1(\Omega))$. $(\rho^\lambda - \bar{\rho})\partial_t v^\lambda$ is treated similarly. The second part of the lemma follows directly from the boundary conditions $v_1 = H_1 = 0$ on Γ . \square

Lemma 5.2. *There exists a positive constant C independent of λ such that*

$$\|P_S v^\lambda(t)\|_3 + \|\partial_t P_S v^\lambda(t)\|_3 \leq C \quad \forall \lambda \geq 1, t \in [0, T]. \quad (5.4)$$

Proof. From (2.10), v^λ is uniformly bounded in $C([0, T]; H_{**}^m(\Omega)) \hookrightarrow C([0, T]; H^3(\Omega))$. The first part of (5.4) then follows from $P_S \in \mathcal{L}(H^3(\Omega), H^3(\Omega))$. The second part follows from $\partial_t P_S v^\lambda = P_S \mathcal{G}$ and (5.3). \square

The rest of the proof proceeds as in [10, Lemma 4.3] and the following arguments. Thus we show $q^\infty = 0$ that, together with (5.1), gives (2.12a) and we show the convergence of v^λ as in (2.12b). Actually in [10] system (5.2) has only one and the same coefficient μ instead of μ_1, μ_2 , as we have. However by the change in scale $q^\lambda = \alpha r^\lambda$ where $\alpha = \bar{\rho}(\bar{\rho}_p)^{-1/2}$ we easily reduce to that case. We obtain

$$w(t) = P_S w_0 - \int_0^t P_S \{(w \cdot \nabla)w - (\bar{\rho})^{-1}(B \cdot \nabla)B\} ds. \quad (5.5)$$

The limit satisfies $w, B \in L^\infty(0, T; H^3(\Omega))$ and consequently $w \in Lip(0, T; H^2(\Omega))$ from (5.5). Then it follows

$$\partial_t w(t) = -P_S \{(w \cdot \nabla)w - (\bar{\rho})^{-1}(B \cdot \nabla)B\}, \quad w|_{t=0} = P_S w_0,$$

which is the abstract form of (1.5)₁. The passage to the limit in (2.3) is easily obtained by using (2.12a), (2.12c) and gives (1.5)₂. Since (1.5) has a unique solution in the above class $L^\infty(0, T; H^3(\Omega)) \cap Lip(0, T; H^2(\Omega))$ we have the convergence of the whole sequences. It follows from [24] that $w, B \in \mathcal{C}_T(H^m)$. Moreover we have

$$\lambda(\rho^\lambda - \bar{\rho}) = (q^\lambda - |H^\lambda|^2/2\lambda) \int_0^1 \rho_p(\tau(q^\lambda/\lambda - |H^\lambda/\lambda|^2/2))d\tau,$$

which is bounded in $C([0, T]; H_{**}^m(\Omega))$, so that (2.12d) readily follows.

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.4

We observe that (2.13) yields from (2.4) that $u_0^{\lambda(1)}$ is bounded in $H^{m-1}(\Omega)$, uniformly in λ . By repeated differentiation in time we verify that $\lambda^{-k+1}u_0^{\lambda(k)}$ is uniformly bounded in $H^{m-k}(\Omega)$. It follows that

$$\|u_0^{\lambda(1)}\|_{m-1, **} \leq C \quad \forall \lambda \geq 1.$$

Then we proceed as for (2.10), the only difference being in the different dependence on the weight λ^{-1} , and obtain

$$\|u^\lambda\|_{m, **} + \|\partial_t u^\lambda\|_{m-1, **} \leq C \quad \forall \lambda \geq 1, \quad (6.1)$$

which in turn gives from (2.4)

$$\lambda \|\nabla q^\lambda\|_{m-1,**,\lambda,T} + \lambda \|\nabla \cdot v^\lambda\|_{m-1,**,\lambda,T} \leq C \quad \forall \lambda \geq 1.$$

Thus (2.14) is shown. It readily follows that

$$\nabla q^\lambda \rightarrow 0, \quad \nabla \cdot v^\lambda \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } C([0, T]; H_{**}^{m-1}(\Omega))$$

and from (6.1), the Ascoli-Arzelà theorem and Theorem A.5,

$$q^\lambda \rightarrow 0, \quad v^\lambda \rightarrow w \quad \text{in } C([0, T]; H_{*,loc}^{m-1}(\Omega)),$$

that is (2.15a). Now we show (2.15b). We take the time derivative of (5.2)

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t q_t^\lambda + \lambda \mu_1 \nabla \cdot v_t^\lambda &= \mathcal{G}_t^0, \\ \partial_t v_t^\lambda + \lambda \mu_2 \nabla q_t^\lambda &= \mathcal{G}_t, \end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

where $q_t^\lambda = \partial_t q^\lambda$, $v_t^\lambda = \partial_t v^\lambda$ and so on. Set $\mathcal{F}_t = (\mathcal{G}_t^0, \mathcal{G}_t)$.

Lemma 6.1. *There exists a positive constant C independent of λ such that*

$$|\mathcal{F}_t(t)|_1 + \|\mathcal{F}_t(t)\|_2 \leq C, \quad \|P_S v_t^\lambda(t)\|_3 + \|\partial_t P_S v_t^\lambda(t)\|_2 \leq C$$

for all $\lambda \geq 1, t \in [0, T]$. Moreover, the first component $\mathcal{G}_{t1}(t) \in H_0^1(\Omega)$.

Proof. The proof follows as in Lemmata 5.1 and 5.2 by observing that \mathcal{F}_t is uniformly bounded in $C([0, T]; H_{**}^{m-2}(\Omega))$, v_t^λ is uniformly bounded in $C([0, T]; H_{**}^{m-1}(\Omega))$ and the imbeddings $H_{**}^{m-2}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow H^2(\Omega)$, $H_{**}^{m-1}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow H^3(\Omega)$ hold. \square

Now we repeat the argument of [10] for the solution to (6.2) and obtain

$$\partial_t v^\lambda \rightarrow \partial_t w \quad \text{in } C_{loc}((0, T] \times \overline{\Omega}). \tag{6.3}$$

By (2.10), (3.42) and Lemma A.4(ii) and Theorem A.4, we have that $(v^\lambda \cdot \nabla)v^\lambda$ is bounded uniformly in $C([0, T]; H_{**}^{m-1}(\Omega))$ with $\partial_t(v^\lambda \cdot \nabla)v^\lambda$ bounded uniformly in $C([0, T]; H_{**}^{m-2}(\Omega))$. Then the usual compactness argument gives the convergence of $(v^\lambda \cdot \nabla)v^\lambda$ to $(w \cdot \nabla)w$ in $C([0, T]; H_{*,loc}^{m-2}(\Omega))$ which yields

$$(v^\lambda \cdot \nabla)v^\lambda \rightarrow (w \cdot \nabla)w \quad \text{in } C_{loc}([0, T] \times \overline{\Omega}). \tag{6.4}$$

Analogously

$$(H^\lambda \cdot \nabla)H^\lambda \rightarrow (B \cdot \nabla)B \quad \text{in } C_{loc}([0, T] \times \overline{\Omega}). \tag{6.5}$$

Then (2.15b) follows from (1.5)₁, (2.2), (2.12d), (6.3)–(6.5).

APPENDIX A. PROPERTIES OF ANISOTROPIC SPACE

Several properties of the function spaces $H_*^m(\Omega)$, $H_{**}^m(\Omega)$, $H_{***}^m(\Omega)$ are contained in the following lemmas and theorems. These results provide basic tools for calculations in such spaces, in particular in $H_{**}^m(\Omega)$, that we use in the present paper. For the proofs see [19, 21, 26, 29, 31, 32]. If not explicitly stated, Ω is either \mathbb{R}_+^n or a bounded open subset of \mathbb{R}^n with C^∞ boundary Γ . Recall that $[n/2]$ and $[(n+1)/2]$ denote the integer part of $n/2$ and $(n+1)/2$, respectively.

Lemma A.1. *Let $m \geq 1$. (i) $H_*^{m+1}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow H_{**}^m(\Omega)$, $H_*^{m+1}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow H_{***}^m(\Omega)$.
(ii) The following characterizations hold:*

$$H_{**}^m(\Omega) = \{u \in H_*^m(\Omega) : \partial_\nu u \in H_*^{m-1}(\Omega)\},$$

$$H_{***}^m(\Omega) = \{u \in H_{**}^m(\Omega) : \partial_\nu u \in H_{**}^{m-1}(\Omega)\},$$

and there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\|u\|_{H_{**}^m(\Omega)} \leq C(\|u\|_{H_*^m(\Omega)} + \|\partial_\nu u\|_{H_*^{m-1}(\Omega)}) \quad \forall u \in H_{**}^m(\Omega),$$

$$\|u\|_{H_{***}^m(\Omega)} \leq C(\|u\|_{H_{**}^m(\Omega)} + \|\partial_\nu u\|_{H_{**}^{m-1}(\Omega)}) \quad \forall u \in H_{***}^m(\Omega).$$

Let us define the space

$$W_*^{1,\infty}(\Omega) = \{u \in L^\infty(\Omega) : Z_i u \in L^\infty(\Omega), i = 1, \dots, n\},$$

equipped with its natural norm. We have the following Moser-type inequalities.

Lemma A.2 ([19]). *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $m \geq 1$. (i) For all functions u and v in $H_*^m(\Omega) \cap W_*^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ one has $uv \in H_*^m(\Omega)$ and*

$$\|uv\|_{H_*^m(\Omega)} \leq C(\|u\|_{H_*^m(\Omega)} \|v\|_{W_*^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} + \|u\|_{W_*^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \|v\|_{H_*^m(\Omega)}). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

(ii) For all functions u and v in $H_{**}^m(\Omega) \cap W_*^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ one has $uv \in H_{**}^m(\Omega)$ and

$$\|uv\|_{H_{**}^m(\Omega)} \leq C(\|u\|_{H_{**}^m(\Omega)} \|v\|_{W_*^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} + \|u\|_{W_*^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \|v\|_{H_{**}^m(\Omega)}). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

(iii) Assume $F = F(u) \in C^m$ with $F(0) = 0$. If $u \in H_{**}^m(\Omega)$ is such that

$$\|u\|_{W_*^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq K,$$

then $F(u) \in H_{**}^m(\Omega)$ and

$$\|F(u)\|_{H_{**}^m(\Omega)} \leq C(K) \|u\|_{H_{**}^m(\Omega)}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Imbedding theorems for the anisotropic spaces $H_*^m(\Omega)$ follow in natural way from the inclusion $H_*^m(\Omega) \hookrightarrow H^{[m/2]}(\Omega)$ and the imbedding theorems for standard Sobolev spaces, see [21, 26, 29]. In particular, following this way one has the continuous imbedding $H_*^m(\Omega) \hookrightarrow C^0(\overline{\Omega})$ if m is such that $[m/2] > n/2$. This result is improved by the following theorem.

Theorem A.1 ([19]). *Let Ω be a bounded open subset of \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 2$, with C^∞ boundary or the half-space $\Omega = \mathbb{R}_+^n$. Then the continuous imbedding $H_*^{[(n+1)/2]+1}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow C_B^0(\overline{\Omega})$ holds. If $m > n/2$ then $H_{**}^m(\Omega) \hookrightarrow C_B^0(\overline{\Omega})$.*

The next theorems deal with the product of two anisotropic Sobolev functions, one of which may have low order of smoothness.

Lemma A.3. *Let $m \geq 1$ be an integer and $r = \max\{m, [\frac{n+1}{2}] + 2\}$. If $u \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_*^m)$ and $v \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_*^r)$ then $uv \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_*^m)$ and*

$$\| |u(t)v(t)| \|_{m,*} \leq C \| |u(t)| \|_{m,*} \| |v(t)| \|_{r,*}, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Lemma A.4. *Let $m \geq 1$ be an integer and $r = \max \{m, 2 \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + 2\}$. (i) If $u \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_*^m)$ and $v \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_{**}^r)$ then $uv \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_*^m)$ and*

$$\| \|u(t)v(t)\| \|_{m,*} \leq C \| \|u(t)\| \|_{m,*} \| \|v(t)\| \|_{r,**}, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

(ii) *If $u \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_{**}^m)$ and $v \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_{**}^r)$ then $uv \in \mathcal{C}_T(H_{**}^m)$ and*

$$\| \|u(t)v(t)\| \|_{m,**} \leq C \| \|u(t)\| \|_{m,**} \| \|v(t)\| \|_{r,**}, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

The next theorems are important for the estimate of conormal derivatives.

Theorem A.2 ([31]). *Let $m \geq 2$. Let $u \in H_*^m(\mathbb{R}_+^n) \cap H_0^1(\mathbb{R}_+^n)$ be a function and let U be defined by*

$$U(x_1, x') = u(x_1, x')/\sigma(x_1). \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Then

$$\|U\|_{H_*^{m-2}(\mathbb{R}_+^n)} \leq C \|u\|_{H_*^m(\mathbb{R}_+^n)}. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

In the second anisotropic space $H_{**}^m(\Omega)$ we have the following results.

Theorem A.3 ([31, 32]). *Let $u \in H_{**}^m(\mathbb{R}_+^n) \cap H_0^1(\mathbb{R}_+^n)$ for $m \geq 1$, and let U be the function defined in (A.7).*

a. *If $m \geq 2$ then*

$$\|U\|_{H_*^{m-1}(\mathbb{R}_+^n)} \leq C \|u\|_{H_{**}^m(\mathbb{R}_+^n)}. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

b. *If $m \geq 3$ then*

$$\|U\|_{H_{**}^{m-2}(\mathbb{R}_+^n)} \leq C \|u\|_{H_{**}^m(\mathbb{R}_+^n)}. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

In the third anisotropic space $H_{***}^m(\Omega)$ we have the similar result.

Theorem A.4 ([32]). *Let $u \in H_{***}^m(\mathbb{R}_+^n) \cap H_0^1(\mathbb{R}_+^n)$ for $m \geq 2$, and let U be the function defined in (A.7). Then*

$$\|U\|_{H_{***}^{m-1}(\mathbb{R}_+^n)} \leq C \|u\|_{H_{***}^m(\mathbb{R}_+^n)}. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

The last theorem provides a compactness result.

Theorem A.5 ([29]). *Let Ω be a bounded open subset of \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 2$, with C^∞ boundary. Let $m \geq 1$ be an integer. Then the imbedding $H_{**}^m(\Omega) \hookrightarrow H_*^{m-1}(\Omega)$ is compact.*

APPENDIX B. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The research was supported in part by the Italian research project PRIN 20204NT8W4-002.

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Alazard. Incompressible limit of the nonisentropic Euler equations with the solid wall boundary conditions. *Adv. Differential Equations*, 10(1):19–44, 2005.
- [2] K. Asano. On the incompressible limit of the compressible Euler equation. *Japan J. Appl. Math.*, 4(3):455–488, 1987.
- [3] H. Beirão da Veiga. On the sharp singular limit for slightly compressible fluids. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, 18(4):295–306, 1995.
- [4] G. Browning and H.-O. Kreiss. Problems with different time scales for nonlinear partial differential equations. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 42(4):704–718, 1982.

- [5] S. Chen. Initial boundary value problems for quasilinear symmetric hyperbolic systems with characteristic boundary. *Front. Math. China*, 2(1):87–102, 2007. Translated from Chinese Ann. Math. **3** (1982), no. 2, 222–232.
- [6] B. Cheng, Q. Ju, and S. Schochet. Three-scale singular limits of evolutionary PDEs. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 229(2):601–625, 2018.
- [7] J.P. Freidberg. *Ideal magnetohydrodynamics*. Plenum Press, New York-London, 1987.
- [8] S. Goto. Singular limit of the incompressible ideal magneto-fluid motion with respect to the Alfvén number. *Hokkaido Math. J.*, 19(1):175–187, 1990.
- [9] O. Guès. Problème mixte hyperbolique quasi-linéaire caractéristique. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 15(5):595–645, 1990.
- [10] T. Iguchi. The incompressible limit and the initial layer of the compressible Euler equation in \mathbf{R}_+^n . *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, 20(11):945–958, 1997.
- [11] H. Isozaki. Singular limits for the compressible Euler equation in an exterior domain. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 381:1–36, 1987.
- [12] S. Jiang, Q. Ju, and F. Li. Incompressible limit of the nonisentropic ideal magnetohydrodynamic equations. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 48(1):302–319, 2016.
- [13] S. Jiang, Q. Ju, and X. Xu. Small Alfvén number limit for incompressible magneto-hydrodynamics in a domain with boundaries. *Sci. China Math.*, 62(11):2229–2248, 2019.
- [14] Q. Ju, S. Schochet, and X. Xu. Singular limits of the equations of compressible ideal magneto-hydrodynamics in a domain with boundaries. *Asymptot. Anal.*, 113(3):137–165, 2019.
- [15] Q. Ju and J. Wang. Incompressible limit of ideal magnetohydrodynamic equations with a perfectly conducting wall condition. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 55(6):7549–7574, 2023.
- [16] S. Klainerman and A. Majda. Singular limits of quasilinear hyperbolic systems with large parameters and the incompressible limit of compressible fluids. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 34(4):481–524, 1981.
- [17] A. Majda. *Compressible fluid flow and systems of conservation laws in several space variables*, volume 53 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1984.
- [18] G. Métivier and S. Schochet. The incompressible limit of the non-isentropic Euler equations. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 158(1):61–90, 2001.
- [19] A. Morando, P. Secchi, and P. Trebeschi. Regularity of solutions to characteristic initial-boundary value problems for symmetrizable systems. *J. Hyperbolic Differ. Equ.*, 6(4):753–808, 2009.
- [20] M. Ohno and T. Shirota. On the initial-boundary-value problem for the linearized equations of magnetohydrodynamics. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 144(3):259–299, 1998.
- [21] M. Ohno, Y. Shizuta, and T. Yanagisawa. The initial-boundary value problem for linear symmetric hyperbolic systems with boundary characteristic of constant multiplicity. *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.*, 35(2):143–210, 1995.
- [22] B. Rubino. Singular limits in the data space for the equations of magneto-fluid dynamics. *Hokkaido Math. J.*, 24(2):357–386, 1995.
- [23] S. Schochet. The compressible Euler equations in a bounded domain: existence of solutions and the incompressible limit. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 104(1):49–75, 1986.
- [24] P. Secchi. On the equations of ideal incompressible magnetohydrodynamics. *Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova*, 90:103–119, 1993.
- [25] P. Secchi. Well-posedness for a mixed problem for the equations of ideal magneto-hydrodynamics. *Arch. Math. (Basel)*, 64(3):237–245, 1995.
- [26] P. Secchi. The initial-boundary value problem for linear symmetric hyperbolic systems with characteristic boundary of constant multiplicity. *Differential Integral Equations*, 9(4):671–700, 1996.
- [27] P. Secchi. Well-posedness of characteristic symmetric hyperbolic systems. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 134(2):155–197, 1996.
- [28] P. Secchi. On the singular incompressible limit of inviscid compressible fluids. *J. Math. Fluid Mech.*, 2(2):107–125, 2000.
- [29] P. Secchi. Some properties of anisotropic Sobolev spaces. *Arch. Math. (Basel)*, 75(3):207–216, 2000.
- [30] P. Secchi. An initial boundary value problem in ideal magneto-hydrodynamics. *NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl.*, 9(4):441–458, 2002.
- [31] P. Secchi. A higher-order Hardy-type inequality in anisotropic Sobolev spaces. *Int. J. Differ. Equ.*, pages Art. ID 129691, 7, 2012.

- [32] P. Secchi. Properties of anisotropic weighted Sobolev spaces. *In preparation*, 2024.
- [33] M. Tsuji. Regularity of solutions of hyperbolic mixed problems with characteristic boundary. *Proc. Japan Acad.*, 48:719–724, 1972.
- [34] S. Ukai. The incompressible limit and the initial layer of the compressible Euler equation. *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.*, 26(2):323–331, 1986.
- [35] J. Wang and J. Zhang. Incompressible limit of compressible ideal mhd flows inside a perfectly conducting wall. *arXiv:2308.01142v4*.
- [36] T. Yanagisawa and A. Matsumura. The fixed boundary value problems for the equations of ideal magnetohydrodynamics with a perfectly conducting wall condition. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 136(1):119–140, 1991.

INDAM UNIT & DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL, ENVIRONMENTAL, ARCHITECTURAL ENGINEERING AND MATHEMATICS (DICATAM), UNIVERSITY OF BRESCIA, VIA VALOTTI 9, 25133 BRESCIA, ITALY
Email address: `paolo.secchi@unibs.it`