

# LOW MACH NUMBER LIMIT OF STEADY THERMALLY DRIVEN FLUID

FEIMIN HUANG, WEIQIANG WANG, AND YONG WANG

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we establish the existence of strong solutions to the steady non-isentropic compressible Navier-Stokes system with Dirichlet boundary conditions in bounded domains where the fluid is driven by the wall temperature, and justify its low Mach number limit, i.e.,  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , in  $L^\infty$  sense with a rate of convergence. Notably, for the limiting system (1.3) obtained in the low Mach number limit, the variation of the wall temperature is allowed to be independent of the Mach number. It is also worth pointing out that the velocity field  $u_1$  acts like a ghost since it appears at  $\varepsilon$ -order in the expansion, but still affects the density and temperature at  $O(1)$ -order. In the proof, we design a new expansion, in which the density, velocity and temperature have different expansion forms with respect to  $\varepsilon$ , so that the density at higher orders is well-defined under the Boussinesq relations and the constraint of zero average. We also introduce a new  $\varepsilon$ -dependent functional space, allowing us to obtain some uniform estimates for high-order normal derivatives near the boundary.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction and Main Result	1
1.1. Introduction	1
1.2. Formulation and main result	3
1.3. The main ingredients in proof	6
2. Well-posedness of the Limiting System (1.8)	9
3. Existence of the Linearized Problem	10
3.1. Existence of linearized system (3.2)	10
3.2. Existence of linearized system (3.14) for $(\mu_0, \zeta_0)$	12
4. <i>A Priori</i> Uniform Estimates in Mach Number for (3.14)	18
4.1. Lower order estimates	18
4.2. Higher order estimates	20
5. Existence of Strong Solution of (3.14)	37
6. Proof of Theorem 1.1	38
References	42

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULT

1.1. **Introduction.** The steady non-isentropic compressible Navier-Stokes system reads

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(\rho^\varepsilon \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon) = 0, \\ \rho^\varepsilon (\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon + \nabla P^\varepsilon = \varepsilon \operatorname{div} \mathbb{S}(\nabla \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon), \\ \rho^\varepsilon (\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla) \theta^\varepsilon + P^\varepsilon \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon = \varepsilon \operatorname{div}(\kappa \nabla \theta^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon \Psi(\nabla \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon), \end{cases} \quad x \in \Omega \quad (1.1)$$

*Date:* July 24, 2024.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 76N10, 35Q30, 35Q35.

*Key words and phrases.* Steady non-isentropic compressible Navier-Stokes system; Low Mach number limit; Dirichlet boundary condition; Thermally driven fluid.

where  $\varepsilon > 0$  is the viscosity. Here  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  is a smooth bounded domain,  $\rho^\varepsilon, \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon$  and  $\theta^\varepsilon$  are the density, velocity and temperature respectively.  $P^\varepsilon = c_v \rho^\varepsilon \theta^\varepsilon$  denotes the pressure with  $c_v$  being the gas constant.  $\kappa > 0$  is the heat conductivity. The stress tensor  $\mathbb{S}(\nabla \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon)$  and the dissipation function  $\Psi(\nabla \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon)$  are defined by

$$\mathbb{S}(\nabla \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon) = 2\mu D(\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon) + \lambda \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon \mathbb{I}, \quad \Psi(\nabla \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon) = 2\mu D(\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon) : D(\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon) + \lambda |\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon|^2, \quad (1.2)$$

where  $\mathbb{I}$  is the identical matrix,  $D(\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon + (\nabla \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon)^t)$  is the deformation tensor,  $\mu > 0$  and  $\lambda$  are the viscosity coefficients satisfying the physical requirement:  $2\mu + 3\lambda \geq 0$ .

We denote  $\mathcal{M}_a$  as the Mach number. In the present paper, we consider the low Mach number limit, i.e.,  $\mathcal{M}_a \rightarrow 0$ , of (1.1) under the scaling  $\mathcal{M}_a = \varepsilon$  and  $|\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon| \lesssim \varepsilon$  (*cf.* [18]). Formally, assuming  $\frac{\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \rightarrow u$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , one derives the limiting system:

$$\begin{cases} \nabla(\rho\theta) = 0, \quad \operatorname{div}(\rho u) = 0, \\ \rho(u \cdot \nabla)u + \nabla P = \operatorname{div} \mathbb{S}(\nabla u), \\ \operatorname{div}(\kappa \nabla \theta) = (1 + c_v)\rho\theta \operatorname{div} u. \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

Many works have been made on the low Mach number limit of evolutionary isentropic /non-isentropic compressible Navier-Stokes system both with the well-prepared and ill-prepared initial data respectively, and we refer the interested readers to the survey papers [1, 10, 14] and the references therein. We also would like to mention recent works [15, 22], in which they justified the low Mach number limit of evolutionary non-isentropic compressible Navier-Stokes equations with large temperature variations and Navier-slip boundary conditions in bounded domains.

For the steady case, to the best of our knowledge, there are only a few results [3, 6, 7]. In 1987, Beirão da Veiga [3] established the existence and uniqueness for stationary solution of the non-isentropic compressible Navier-Stokes with small external forces near a rest state in  $L^p$ -setting, and justified the low Mach number limit from isentropic compressible Navier-Stokes with small external forces to the incompressible Navier-Stokes system. Later, Choe-Jin [6] established the existence of stationary isentropic compressible Navier-Stokes system with general large external forces when the Mach number is small, and then justified its incompressible limit. Recently, Dou-Jiang-Jiang-Yang [7] extended the result in [6] to the non-isentropic Navier-Stokes system. We would like to point out that  $O(1)$  temperature variations are not allowed in [3, 6, 7] since they essentially need the wall temperature to be around a constant and  $\nabla(\theta|_{\partial\Omega}) \lesssim \varepsilon$ . Consequently, the limiting system obtained in [3, 6, 7] is the incompressible Navier-Stokes system rather than (1.3).

We also would like to mention a very important progress [8, 9] made by Esposito-Guo-Marra-Wu on the low Mach number limit of the steady Boltzmann equation in bounded domains. They rigorously justified the hydrodynamic limit from the steady Boltzmann equation to the following ghost effect system:

$$\begin{cases} \nabla(\rho\theta) = 0, \quad \operatorname{div}(\rho u) = 0, \\ \rho(u \cdot \nabla)u + \nabla \mathbf{p} = \operatorname{div} \left[ \mu(2D(u) - \frac{2}{3} \operatorname{div} u \mathbb{I}) \right] \\ \quad + \operatorname{div} \left[ \frac{\mu^2}{\rho\theta} (K_1(\nabla^2 \theta - \frac{1}{3} \Delta \theta \mathbb{I}) + \frac{K_2}{\theta} (\nabla \theta \otimes \nabla \theta - \frac{1}{3} |\nabla \theta|^2 \mathbb{I})) \right], \\ \operatorname{div}(\kappa \nabla \theta) = K_3 \rho \theta \operatorname{div} u, \end{cases} \quad (1.4)$$

where  $K_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, 3$ ) are some constants. The ghost effect system is used to describe an interesting phenomenon that the flow is only driven by the variation of the temperature (*cf.* [11]). Since it is quite different from the usual heat flow driven by the difference of pressure, Y. Sone [21] suggested the name of ‘‘ghost effect’’ to such phenomenon because the vanishing small velocity field, playing

like a ghost, still affects macroscopic equations of temperature. This phenomenon was analyzed in [5] from the view of steady linearized Boltzmann equation between two parallel plates and in a circular pipe respectively. Later, by using the Hilbert expansion, Bardos-Levermore-Ukai-Yang [2] gave a formal limit from the Boltzmann equation to the ghost effect system. We refer [13] for the 1-D case with rigorous justification of the formal limit in [2]. The well-posedness of the ghost effect system was studied in [12, 16].

Compared with (1.4), the system (1.3) only loses some terms involving with derivatives of temperature up to third order in the momentum equation (1.3)<sub>2</sub>. Such discrepancy arises due to the fact that the compressible Navier-Stokes equation is only the first-order approximation of the Boltzmann equation, and some microscopic terms are already ignored in the level of compressible Navier-Stokes equations. Both (1.3) and (1.4) indicate that the  $O(1)$ -temperature and density are affected by the  $O(\varepsilon)$ -velocity. Inspired by the work [8, 9] made by Esposito-Guo-Marra-Wu, it is an interesting problem to study the low Mach number limit from (1.1) to (1.3) in smooth bounded domain.

**1.2. Formulation and main result.** In present paper, for any given Mach number  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we focus on the existence of strong solutions of (1.1) with  $o(1)$  temperature variations on the boundary, and its rigorous low Mach number limit to (1.3). Without of lose of generality, we assume  $|\Omega| = \int_{\Omega} 1 \, dx = 1$  and the gas constant  $c_v = 1$ . To avoid technicalities, we will consider the case that the transport coefficients  $\mu$ ,  $\lambda$  and  $\kappa$  are constants. As in [8], we supplement the velocity  $\mathbf{u}$  and the temperature  $\theta$  with following Dirichlet boundary conditions:

$$\theta^\varepsilon = T_w, \quad (\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon \cdot \vec{l}_1, \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon \cdot \vec{l}_2, \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon \cdot \vec{n}) = \varepsilon h(T_w)(\partial_{\vec{l}_1} T_w, \partial_{\vec{l}_2} T_w, 0) \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \quad (1.5)$$

where  $T_w = 1 + O(|\nabla T_w|)$ ,  $h(T_w)$  is a given smooth function of  $T_w$ ,  $\vec{l}_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , are the unit tangential vectors of  $\partial\Omega$ , and  $\vec{n}$  is the unit normal vector of  $\partial\Omega$ . Moreover, the total mass is prescribed:

$$\int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon(x) \, dx = M. \quad (1.6)$$

We consider the solution of (1.1) in the following expansion:

$$\rho^\varepsilon = \rho_0 + \varepsilon \rho_1 + \varepsilon^2 \rho_2 + \varepsilon^3 \rho_3 + \varepsilon^2 \rho_R, \quad \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon = \varepsilon u_1 + \varepsilon^2 u_2 + \varepsilon^2 u_R, \quad \theta^\varepsilon = \theta_0 + \varepsilon \theta_1 + \varepsilon^2 \theta_R. \quad (1.7)$$

Then substituting (1.7) into (1.1) and (1.5)–(1.6), and comparing the order of  $\varepsilon$ , one has

$$\begin{cases} \nabla(\rho_0 \theta_0) = 0, & \int_{\Omega} \rho_0 \, dx = M, \\ \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 u_1) = 0, \\ \rho_0(u_1 \cdot \nabla)u_1 + \nabla P_2 = \mu \Delta u_1 + \zeta \nabla \operatorname{div} u_1, \\ \kappa \Delta \theta_0 = 2(\rho_0 \theta_0) \operatorname{div} u_1, \\ \theta_0 = T_w, \quad (u_1 \cdot \vec{l}_1, u_1 \cdot \vec{l}_2, u_1 \cdot \vec{n}) = h(T_w)(\partial_{\vec{l}_1} T_w, \partial_{\vec{l}_2} T_w, 0) \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.8)$$

where we have denoted  $\zeta = \mu + \lambda$  and  $P_2 := \rho_2 \theta_0 + \rho_1 \theta_1 + C_1$ . Here the constant  $C_1$  is used to guarantee

$$\int_{\Omega} \rho_2 \, dx = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad C_1 = \frac{\int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\theta_0} (P_2 - \rho_1 \theta_1) \, dx}{\int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\theta_0} \, dx}. \quad (1.9)$$

From (1.8)<sub>1</sub>, we see  $\rho_0 \theta_0 \equiv P_0$  for some constant  $P_0$ . Observing (1.6), we chose  $P_0$  as

$$P_0 = \frac{M}{\int_{\Omega} \theta_0^{-1} \, dx}.$$

The existence and uniqueness of the strong solution  $(\rho_0, u_1, \theta_0, P_2)$  of (1.8) is established in Lemma 2.1 below, see also [9].

Motivated by [7], we require  $(\rho_1, u_2, \theta_1)$  to satisfy

$$\begin{cases} \nabla(\rho_0\theta_1 + \rho_1\theta_0) = 0, & \int_{\Omega} \rho_1 \, dx = 0, \\ \operatorname{div}(\rho_0u_2) = -\operatorname{div}(\rho_1u_1), \\ \rho_0(u_1 \cdot \nabla)u_2 + \rho_0(u_2 \cdot \nabla)u_1 + \nabla P_3 = -\rho_1(u_1 \cdot \nabla)u_1 + \mu\Delta u_2 + \zeta\nabla \operatorname{div} u_2, \\ \kappa\Delta\theta_1 = -\theta_0(u_2 \cdot \nabla)\rho_0 + \rho_1(u_1 \cdot \nabla)\theta_0 + \rho_0(u_1 \cdot \nabla)\theta_1 + (\rho_0\theta_1 + \rho_1\theta_0) \operatorname{div} u_1 \\ \quad + (\rho_0\theta_0) \operatorname{div} u_2 - 2\theta_0(u_R \cdot \nabla)\rho_0, \\ u_2 = 0, \quad \theta_1 = 0, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.10)$$

where we have denoted  $P_3 := \rho_3\theta_0 + \rho_2\theta_1 + C_2$ . Here the constant  $C_2$  is used to guarantee

$$\int_{\Omega} \rho_3 \, dx = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad C_2 = \frac{\int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\theta_0} (P_3 - \rho_2\theta_1) \, dx}{\int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\theta_0} \, dx}. \quad (1.11)$$

From (1.10)<sub>1</sub>, we see  $\rho_1\theta_0 + \rho_0\theta_1 \equiv P_1$  for some constant  $P_1$ . Since  $\int_{\Omega} \rho_1 \, dx = 0$ , the constant  $P_1$  should be chosen as

$$P_1 = \frac{\int_{\Omega} \rho_0\theta_1\theta_0^{-1} \, dx}{\int_{\Omega} \theta_0^{-1} \, dx}.$$

For the remainder  $(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)$ , it satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}[\rho_R(u_1 + \varepsilon u_2 + \varepsilon u_R)] + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 u_R) = -\operatorname{div}[u_R(\rho_1 + \varepsilon\rho_2 + \varepsilon^2\rho_3)] + r_1, \\ \mu\Delta u_R + \zeta\nabla \operatorname{div} u_R = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \nabla(\rho_0\theta_R + \rho_R\theta_0) + \rho_0(u_1 \cdot \nabla)u_R + u_R \cdot \nabla u_1 + \nabla(\rho_R\theta_1 + \rho_1\theta_R) \\ \quad + F^\varepsilon(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) + r_2, \\ \frac{\kappa}{\theta_0} \Delta\theta_R = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 u_R) - \frac{1}{\theta_0} \Psi(\nabla(u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + u_R))) + \frac{1}{\theta_0} (\rho_0\theta_1 + \rho_1\theta_0) \operatorname{div} u_R \\ \quad + \frac{1}{\theta_0} [\rho_0(u_R \cdot \nabla)\theta_1 + u_1 \cdot \nabla\theta_R] + \rho_1 u_R \cdot \nabla\theta_0 + \rho_R u_1 \cdot \nabla\theta_0 \\ \quad + \frac{1}{\theta_0} G^\varepsilon(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) + \frac{1}{\theta_0} r_3 + \frac{1}{\theta_0} (\rho_0\theta_R + \rho_R\theta_0) \operatorname{div} u_1, \\ u_R = 0, \quad \theta_R = 0, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \quad \int_{\Omega} \rho_R \, dx = 0, \end{cases} \quad (1.12)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} & F^\varepsilon(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) \\ &= \varepsilon [\rho_0(u_2 \cdot \nabla)u_R + u_R \cdot \nabla u_2 + u_R \cdot \nabla u_R] + \rho_1(u_R \cdot \nabla)u_1 + u_1 \cdot \nabla u_R + \rho_R u_1 \cdot \nabla u_1 \\ & \quad + \varepsilon^2 [\rho_1(u_R \cdot \nabla)u_2 + u_2 \cdot \nabla u_R + u_R \cdot \nabla u_R] + \rho_R(u_1 \cdot \nabla)u_R + u_R \cdot \nabla u_1 + u_2 \cdot \nabla u_1 + u_1 \cdot \nabla u_2 \\ & \quad + \rho_2(u_R \cdot \nabla)u_1 + u_1 \cdot \nabla u_R] + \varepsilon^2 \nabla(\rho_3\theta_R) + \varepsilon^3 [\rho_2(u_R \cdot \nabla)u_2 + u_2 \cdot \nabla u_R + u_R \cdot \nabla u_R] \\ & \quad + \rho_3(u_R \cdot \nabla)u_1 + u_1 \cdot \nabla u_R + \rho_R(u_R \cdot \nabla)u_2 + u_2 \cdot \nabla u_R + u_2 \cdot \nabla u_2 + u_R \cdot \nabla u_R] \\ & \quad + \varepsilon^4 [\rho_3(u_R \cdot \nabla)u_2 + u_2 \cdot \nabla u_R + u_R \cdot \nabla u_R] + \varepsilon \nabla(\rho_2\theta_R + \rho_R\theta_0), \end{aligned} \quad (1.13)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & G^\varepsilon(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) \\ &= \varepsilon [\rho_0(u_2 \cdot \nabla)\theta_R + u_R \cdot \nabla\theta_R] + \rho_2 u_R \cdot \nabla\theta_0 + \rho_R(u_2 \cdot \nabla)\theta_0 + u_R \cdot \nabla\theta_0 + u_1 \cdot \nabla\theta_1 \\ & \quad + \rho_1(u_R \cdot \nabla)\theta_1 + u_1 \cdot \nabla\theta_R] + \varepsilon^2 [\rho_1(u_2 \cdot \nabla)\theta_R + u_R \cdot \nabla\theta_R] + \rho_R(u_2 \cdot \nabla)\theta_1 + u_R \cdot \nabla\theta_1 + u_1 \cdot \nabla\theta_R \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \rho_2(u_R \cdot \nabla \theta_1 + u_1 \cdot \nabla \theta_R) + \rho_3 u_R \cdot \nabla \theta_0] + \varepsilon^3 [\rho_2(u_2 \cdot \nabla \theta_R + u_R \cdot \nabla \theta_0) + \rho_3(u_1 \cdot \nabla \theta_R + u_R \cdot \nabla \theta_1) \\
& + \rho_R(u_2 \cdot \nabla \theta_R + u_R \cdot \nabla \theta_R)] + \varepsilon^4 [\rho_3(u_2 \cdot \nabla \theta_R + u_R \cdot \nabla \theta_R)] + \varepsilon [(\rho_0 \theta_R + \rho_R \theta_0) \operatorname{div} u_2 \\
& + (\rho_0 \theta_R + \rho_R \theta_0 + \rho_1 \theta_1 + \rho_2 \theta_0) \operatorname{div} u_R + (\rho_1 \theta_R + \rho_R \theta_1) \operatorname{div} u_1] + \varepsilon^2 [(\rho_1 \theta_R + \rho_R \theta_1) \operatorname{div} u_2 \\
& + (\rho_2 \theta_R + \rho_R \theta_R) \operatorname{div} u_1 + (\rho_2 \theta_1 + \rho_1 \theta_R + \rho_R \theta_1 + \rho_3 \theta_0) \operatorname{div} u_R] + \varepsilon^3 [(\rho_2 \theta_R + \rho_R \theta_R) \operatorname{div} u_2 \\
& + \rho_3 \theta_R \operatorname{div} u_1 + (\rho_2 \theta_R + \rho_R \theta_R + \rho_3 \theta_1) \operatorname{div} u_R] + \varepsilon^4 [\rho_3 \theta_R \operatorname{div} u_2 + \rho_3 \theta_R \operatorname{div} u_R], \tag{1.14}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$r_1 = -\operatorname{div}(\rho_1 u_2 + \rho_2 u_1) - \varepsilon \operatorname{div}(\rho_2 u_2 + \rho_3 u_1) - \varepsilon^2 \operatorname{div}(\rho_3 u_2), \tag{1.15}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
r_2 = & \rho_0(u_2 \cdot \nabla u_1 + u_1 \cdot \nabla u_2) + \varepsilon [\rho_0 u_2 \cdot \nabla u_2 + \rho_1(u_2 \cdot \nabla u_1 + u_1 \cdot \nabla u_2) + \rho_2 u_1 \cdot \nabla u_1] \\
& + \varepsilon^2 [\rho_1 u_2 \cdot \nabla u_2 + \rho_2(u_1 \cdot \nabla u_2 + u_2 \cdot \nabla u_1) + \rho_3 u_1 \cdot \nabla u_1] + \varepsilon^4 \rho_3 u_2 \cdot \nabla u_2 \\
& + \varepsilon^3 [\rho_2 u_2 \cdot \nabla u_2 + \rho_3(u_1 \cdot \nabla u_2 + u_2 \cdot \nabla u_1)] + \varepsilon \nabla(\rho_3 \theta_1), \tag{1.16}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
r_3 = & [\rho_0(u_2 \cdot \nabla \theta_1) + \rho_1(u_2 \cdot \nabla \theta_0 + u_1 \cdot \nabla \theta_1) + \rho_2 u_1 \cdot \nabla \theta_0] \\
& + \varepsilon [\rho_1(u_2 \cdot \nabla \theta_1) + \rho_2(u_2 \cdot \nabla \theta_0 + u_1 \cdot \nabla \theta_1) + \rho_3 u_1 \cdot \nabla \theta_0] \\
& + \varepsilon^2 [\rho_2 u_2 \cdot \nabla \theta_1 + \rho_3(u_2 \cdot \nabla \theta_0 + u_1 \cdot \nabla \theta_1)] + \varepsilon^3 \rho_3 u_2 \cdot \nabla \theta_1 \\
& + (\rho_0 \theta_1 + \rho_1 \theta_0) \operatorname{div} u_2 + (\rho_2 \theta_0 + \rho_1 \theta_1) \operatorname{div} u_1 \\
& + \varepsilon [(\rho_2 \theta_0 + \rho_1 \theta_1) \operatorname{div} u_2 + (\rho_2 \theta_1 + \rho_3 \theta_0) \operatorname{div} u_1] \\
& + \varepsilon^2 [(\rho_2 \theta_1 + \rho_3 \theta_0) \operatorname{div} u_2 + \rho_3 \theta_1 \operatorname{div} u_1] + \varepsilon^3 \rho_3 \theta_1 \operatorname{div} u_2. \tag{1.17}
\end{aligned}$$

Since we put an extra term  $-2\theta_0(u_R \cdot \nabla)\rho_0$  into (1.10) as a source term, the singular terms (the terms involving  $\varepsilon^{-1}$ ) are skew-symmetric in the remainder equations (1.12). Though it will make (1.10) and (1.12) slightly coupled, the skew-symmetric property can eliminate the singular terms through integrating by parts in the energy estimates. This is a key point to derive the *a priori* uniform estimates for  $(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)$ .

Now, we state the main result of present paper:

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $\Omega$  be a  $C^4$ -smooth bounded domain and  $\nabla T_w \in H^4(\partial\Omega)$ . Let  $(\rho_0, u_1, \theta_0) \in H^5 \times H^4 \times H^5$  be the strong solution of (1.8) established in Lemma 2.1 below. There exists a constant  $c_0 > 0$  such that if  $|\nabla T_w|_{H^4} \leq c_0$ , then for any given Mach number  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ , there exists a unique strong solution  $(\rho^\varepsilon, \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon, \theta^\varepsilon) \in H^2 \times H^3 \times H^3$  in the form of expansion (1.7) to the boundary problem (1.1), (1.5) and (1.6), satisfying*

$$\left\| \frac{\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} - u_1 \right\|_{H^2} + \|\rho^\varepsilon - \rho_0\|_{H^2} + \|\theta^\varepsilon - \theta_0\|_{H^3} \leq C\varepsilon, \quad \|\nabla P^\varepsilon\|_{H^1} \leq C\varepsilon^2, \tag{1.18}$$

where the positive constants  $c_0$  and  $C$  are independent of  $\varepsilon$ .

**Remark 1.2.** *In Theorem 1.1, the variation of the wall temperature can be large compared with the Mach number  $\varepsilon$ .*

**Remark 1.3.** *The Dirichlet boundary condition for velocity in (1.5) can be generalized to*

$$(\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon \cdot \vec{v}_1, \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon \cdot \vec{v}_2, \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon \cdot \vec{n}) = \varepsilon(h_1(x), h_2(x), 0),$$

where  $h_i(x)$  can be any  $H^4$ -function on  $\partial\Omega$  with  $o(1)$ -norm.

**Remark 1.4.** *It follows from (1.18) and the Sobolev embedding that*

$$\left\| \frac{\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} - u_1 \right\|_{L^\infty} + \|\rho^\varepsilon - \rho_0\|_{L^\infty} + \|\theta^\varepsilon - \theta_0\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\varepsilon \rightarrow 0. \tag{1.19}$$

Compared with [8], in which the convergence is proved in  $L^2$  for general smooth bounded domain, (1.19) provides a convergence in  $L^\infty$ .

**1.3. The main ingredients in proof.** Now, we briefly introduce the main ingredients in our proof. First, the expansion (1.7) is carefully designed such that  $\rho_2, \rho_3$  can be well-defined under the Boussinesq relation and the constraints:  $\int_{\Omega} \rho_i dx = 0$  ( $i = 2, 3$ ). In fact, if one makes a symmetric expansion for density and temperature, that is, let

$$\rho^\varepsilon = \rho_0 + \varepsilon\rho_1 + \varepsilon^2\rho_2 + \varepsilon^2\rho_R, \quad \theta^\varepsilon = \theta_0 + \varepsilon\theta_1 + \varepsilon^2\theta_2 + \varepsilon\theta_R.$$

Then the Boussinesq relations in (1.8) and (1.10) may lead to

$$P_2 = \rho_0\theta_2 + \theta_0\rho_2 + \rho_1\theta_1, \quad P_3 = \rho_1\theta_2 + \rho_2\theta_1.$$

To define  $\rho_2$  and  $\theta_2$ , one has to require  $\rho_0\theta_1 - \theta_0\rho_1 \neq 0$ . However, this constraint is hard to verify since  $\rho_1$  and  $\theta_1$  are already solved from (1.10). Based on this observation, we design a non-symmetric expansion (1.7) for density and temperature such that there is a no extra restriction to define  $\rho_2$  and  $\rho_3$  satisfying the constraints of zero average under the Boussinesq relation once we solved  $P_2$  and  $P_3$ .

Next, noting that the systems (1.10) and (1.12) are slightly coupled, we shall take the following five steps to establish the existence of strong solutions of (1.10) and (1.12).

1. Motivated by [6, 7, 17], we first replace  $u_R$  by a given function  $\tilde{u}_R \in \mathcal{K}$  in (1.10) to get a new linearized system (3.2), where  $\mathcal{K}$  is defined as

$$\mathcal{K} := \{f \in H^3(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega) : \|f\|_{\mathcal{K}} =: \|f\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \varepsilon\|\nabla^3 f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} < \infty\}.$$

We point out that the  $\varepsilon$ -dependent functional space  $\mathcal{K}$  is introduced to deal with the uniform estimates of the highest normal derivatives of  $u_R$  since its boundary conditions are not available. By using a similar fixed-point argument as in the proof of the existence of (1.8), we prove that there exists a unique strong solution  $(\rho_1, u_2, \theta_1, P_3)$  of (3.2), see Lemma 3.1 for details.

2. For any given pair  $(\tilde{u}_R, \tilde{\theta}_R)$  with  $\tilde{u}_R \in \mathcal{K}$  and  $\tilde{\theta}_R \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap H^3(\Omega)$ , we consider a linearized system of (1.12) (that is, (3.14) below), where  $(\rho_0, u_1, \theta_0, P_2)$  is the strong solution of (1.8) established in Lemma 2.1,  $(\rho_1, u_2, \theta_1, P_3)$  is the strong solution of (3.2) established in Lemma 3.1, and  $(\rho_2, \rho_3)$  is defined in (3.11) through the Boussinesq relations. Motivated by [19, 20, 23], with the help of the effective viscous flux and the Helmholtz decomposition, we decompose the system (3.14) into two Laplace equations with Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions respectively, a classical Stokes problem and a steady transport equation. Then based on this decomposition, we design an elaborate approximate scheme to establish the existence the strong solution  $(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) \in H^2 \times \mathcal{K} \times (H_0^1 \cap H^3)$  of (3.14) for a specific viscous coefficients pair  $(\mu_0, \zeta_0)$  with  $\frac{\zeta_0}{\mu_0} \gg 1$  by making good use of the classical elliptic estimates, the Stokes estimates and the properties of steady transport equation, see Lemma 3.3 for details.

3. To generalize the existence of strong solution of (3.14) in Lemma 3.3 to any given viscous coefficient  $(\mu, \zeta)$ , as in [23], we need to show that the strong solution  $(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)$  of (3.14) enjoys *a priori* uniform estimate with respect to  $\varepsilon$  and continuous dependence on  $\mu$  and  $\zeta$ . The uniform lower order estimates of  $(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)$  can be directly obtained by the classical energy method due to the skew-symmetry of the singular terms (the terms involving  $\varepsilon^{-1}$ ) in (3.14).

To get the uniform higher order estimates, we regard (3.14)<sub>2</sub> as an inhomogeneous Stokes problem, and by using the classical Stokes estimate [4, Theorems IV 5.2 and IV 5.8], we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_R\|_{H^2} + \left\| \frac{\nabla(\rho_0\theta_R + \theta_0\rho_R)}{\varepsilon} \right\|_{L^2} &\leq C(\|\rho_R\|_{H^1}\|\theta_1\|_{H^2} + \|\rho_1\|_{H^2}\|\theta_R\|_{H^1}) + C\|\nabla \operatorname{div} u_R\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + C\|r_2\|_{L^2} + \text{lower order derivatives of } (\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R), \end{aligned} \quad (1.20)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_R\|_{H^3} + \left\| \frac{\nabla(\rho_0\theta_R + \theta_0\rho_R)}{\varepsilon} \right\|_{H^1} &\leq C(\|\rho_R\|_{H^2}\|\theta_1\|_{H^2} + \|\rho_1\|_{H^2}\|\theta_R\|_{H^2}) + C\|\nabla^2 \operatorname{div} u_R\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + C\|r_2\|_{H^1} + \text{lower order derivatives of } (\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R). \end{aligned} \quad (1.21)$$

Therefore, to close these estimates, we have to control  $\|\theta_R\|_{H^2}$ ,  $\|\nabla \operatorname{div} u_R\|_{L^2}$  and  $\|\nabla^2 \operatorname{div} u_R\|_{L^2}$ . We divide these estimates into two parts : the interior part and the part near the boundary.

The interior part can be bounded by the classical energy estimate since the singular terms (the terms involving  $\varepsilon^{-1}$ ) in (3.14) are skew-symmetric, and will cancel each other out through integrating by parts. For the part near the boundary, we shall flatten the boundary. Noting the zero Dirichlet boundary condition of  $(u_R, \theta_R)$ , we can get the estimates of tangential derivatives for the part near the boundary via energy estimates as in the interior part.

The main difficulty is to estimate the terms involving the normal derivatives due to the lack of boundary conditions of the higher normal derivatives of  $(u_R, \theta_R)$ . To overcome this difficulty, we fully exploit the structure of (3.14) to see

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 u_R) = -\operatorname{div}[\rho_R(u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R))] + \dots, \quad (1.22)$$

$$(\mu + \zeta) D_3 \operatorname{div} u_R - \frac{D_3(\theta_0 \rho_R + \rho_0 \theta_R)}{\varepsilon} = -\mu[\Delta u_R^3 - D_3 \operatorname{div} u_R] + \dots, \quad (1.23)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{\theta_0} D_{33}^2 \theta_R - \frac{\operatorname{div}(\rho_0 u_R)}{\varepsilon} = -\frac{1}{\theta_0} (D_{11}^2 \theta_R + D_{22}^2 \theta_R) + \dots. \quad (1.24)$$

Then, in order to get  $\|D_3 \operatorname{div} u_R\|_{L^2}$  and  $\|D_{33}^2 \theta_R\|_{L^2}$  in the vicinity of boundary, denoting  $\chi_1$  by the smooth cut-off function satisfying  $\chi_1 \equiv 1$  in the vicinity of boundary, we multiply (1.22), (1.23) and (1.24) by  $-\chi_1^2 D_{33}^2(\theta_0 \rho_R)$ ,  $\chi_1^2 D_3 \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 u_R)$  and  $\chi_1^2 D_{33}^2(\rho_0 \theta_R)$  respectively to get

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \chi_1^2 \rho_0 |D_3 \operatorname{div} u_R|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega} \chi_1^2 \frac{\rho_0}{\theta_0} |D_{33}^2 \theta_R|^2 dx \\ & \leq -\mu \int_{\Omega} \chi_1^2 \{[\Delta u_R^3 - D_3 \operatorname{div} u_R] D_3 \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 u_R) + \frac{1}{\theta_0} [D_{11}^2 \theta_R + D_{22}^2 \theta_R] D_{33}^2 \theta_R\} dx \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} \chi_1^2 [D_3(\rho_0 \theta_R + \theta_0 \rho_R) D_3 \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 u_R) + D_{33}^2(\rho_0 \theta_R + \theta_0 \rho_R) \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 u_R)] dx \\ & \quad + \int_{\Omega} \chi_1^2 D_{33}^2(\theta_0 \rho_R) \operatorname{div}[\rho_R(u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R))] dx + \dots \\ & =: J_1 + J_2 + J_3 + \dots. \end{aligned}$$

For  $J_1$ , noting that  $\Delta u_R^3 - D_3 \operatorname{div} u_R$  does not include the term  $D_{33}^2 u_R^3$ , by the Hölder inequality, it can be bounded as

$$|J_1| \leq \frac{1}{8} \int_{\Omega} \chi_1^2 \rho_0 |D_3 \operatorname{div} u_R|^2 dx + \frac{1}{8} \int_{\Omega} \chi_1^2 \frac{\rho_0}{\theta_0} |D_{33}^2 \theta_R|^2 dx + \text{tangential derivatives of } (\nabla u_R, \nabla \theta_R).$$

For  $J_3$ , by the Sobolev embedding, one directly has

$$|J_3| \leq C[\|u_1\|_{H^3} + \varepsilon(\|u_2\|_{H^3} + \|\tilde{u}_R\|_{H^3})] \|\rho_R\|_{H^2}.$$

Notably,  $[\|u_1\|_{H^3} + \varepsilon(\|u_2\|_{H^3} + \|\tilde{u}_R\|_{H^3})]$  is a small coefficient. For  $J_2$ , by integrating by parts, it leads to

$$\begin{aligned} J_2 &= -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} \chi_1 D_3 \chi_1 D_3(\rho_0 \theta_R + \theta_0 \rho_R) \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 u_R) dx + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \chi_1^2 \int_{\partial\Omega} D_3(\rho_0 \theta_R + \theta_0 \rho_R) \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 u_R) dx \\ &= J_{2,1} + J_{2,2}. \end{aligned}$$

For  $J_{2,1}$ , using the Hölder inequality, for any small  $\tau > 0$ , one has

$$|J_{2,1}| \leq \tau \left\| \frac{\nabla(\rho_0 \theta_R + \theta_0 \rho_R)}{\varepsilon} \right\|_{L^2} + C_{\tau} \|u_R\|_{H^1}^2.$$

For the boundary term  $J_{2,2}$ , noting (1.22), we can represent  $\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 u_R)$  through other non-singular terms, and then we can control  $J_{2,2}$  in terms of  $\|(\rho_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2}$  with some small coefficients. Therefore, combining the above estimates with (1.20), we can control  $\|(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2}$  in terms of  $\|\rho_R\|_{H^2}$  with some small coefficients; see Lemma 4.6 for details.

However, it is still hard to apply the above arguments to control  $\|\nabla^2 \operatorname{div} u_R\|_{L^2}$  since it requires  $\|\rho_R\|_{H^3}$  to control the singular terms induced by the boundary terms in the process of integrating by parts, which cannot be closed by using (1.20)–(1.21). To circumvent the difficulty, we resort to controlling  $\varepsilon \|\nabla^2 \operatorname{div} u_R\|_{L^2}$ . That is the reason why we introduce the  $\varepsilon$ -dependent functional space  $\mathcal{K}$ . We rewrite (1.21) as

$$\varepsilon \|u_R\|_{H^3} + \|\rho_R\|_{H^2} \leq C(\|\theta_R\|_{H^2} + \|\rho_R\|_{H^1}) + C\varepsilon(\|u_R\|_{H^1} + \|r_2\|_{H^1} + \|\nabla^2 \operatorname{div} u_R\|_{L^2}). \quad (1.25)$$

Then we apply an elaborate  $\varepsilon$ -dependent energy method to control  $\varepsilon \|(\nabla^2 \operatorname{div} u_R, \nabla^3 \theta_R)\|_{L^2}$  in terms of  $\|\rho_R\|_{H^2}$ , and hence close the estimates of  $\|\rho_R\|_{H^2} + \|(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{\mathcal{K}}$  via (1.20) and (1.25). Precisely, for the singular terms involving  $\theta_R$  and  $u_R$ :

$$\varepsilon \int_{\Omega} D_{33}^2(\rho_0 \theta_R) D_{33}^2 \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 u_R) \, dx \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} D_3 \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 u_R) D_{333}^3(\rho_0 \theta_R) \, dx,$$

we control them via  $\|(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2}$  by using the Hölder inequality directly, while for the singular terms involving  $\rho_R$  and  $u_R$ :

$$\varepsilon \int_{\Omega} D_{33}^2(\theta_0 \rho_R) D_{33}^2(\operatorname{div} u_R) \, dx,$$

we apply  $D_{33}^2$  to (3.14)<sub>1</sub> and multiply the resultant equation by  $D_{33}^2(\rho_R \theta_0)$  to find a cancellation between bad terms; see Lemmas 4.7–4.9 for details.

4. With the help of the above uniform estimates of  $\|\rho_R\|_{H^2} + \|(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{\mathcal{K}}$ , we can further get the uniform estimates of  $\|\theta_R\|_{H^3}$  by using (3.14)<sub>1</sub> to remove the singular terms  $\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 u_R)$  in (3.14)<sub>3</sub> and the standard elliptic regularity. Noting the *a priori* uniform estimates depend continuously on the viscous coefficients  $(\mu, \zeta)$ , we can apply an elaborate continuity method as in [23] to generalize this specific pair of  $(\mu_0, \zeta_0)$  in Lemma 3.3 to any given viscous coefficients pair; see Lemma 5.1 for details.

5. For the existence of strong solution  $(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) \in H^2 \times \mathcal{K} \times (H_0^1 \times H^3)$  to the nonlinear coupled problem (1.10)–(1.12), we shall apply the Tikhonov's fixed point theorem to show the mapping  $(\tilde{u}_R, \tilde{\theta}_R) \mapsto (u_R, \theta_R)$  has a unique fixed point in the space  $\mathbf{K}_A =: \{(u_R, \theta_R) \in \mathcal{K} \times (H_0^1 \cap H^3) : \|u_R\|_{\mathcal{K}} + \|\theta_R\|_{H^3} \leq A\}$  provided that  $A$  is small enough, see Lemma 6.2 for details.

The rest of present paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we establish the existence of the strong solution to (1.8) via the Banach fixed point theorem. In Section 3, the existence of strong solution to (1.10) with replacing  $u_R$  by  $\tilde{u}_R$  is similarly proved. Then we also establish the existence of the strong solution  $(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) \in H^2 \times \mathcal{K} \times (H_0^1 \cap H^3)$  of (3.14) with a specific viscous coefficients pair  $(\mu_0, \zeta_0)$ . In Section 4, we will establish *a priori* uniform estimates of the strong solution of (3.14), including the lower and higher order estimates. In Section 5, with the help of *a priori* uniform estimates established in Section 4, we apply an elaborate continuity argument to extend the existence result in the case of specific viscous coefficients pair  $(\mu_0, \zeta_0)$  to the case of any given viscous coefficients pair  $(\mu, \zeta)$ . In Section 6, we shall use the Tikhonov fixed point theorem to establish the existence and uniqueness of the strong solution of the coupled nonlinear systems (1.10) and (1.12), and then complete the proof of Theorem 1.1.

**Notations:** Throughout this paper, we denote  $L^p(\Omega)$ ,  $W^{k,p}(\Omega)$  and  $W_0^{k,p}(\Omega)$  as the standard Sobolev spaces on domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  and  $p \in [1, \infty]$ . In particular, we denote  $H^k(\Omega) =: W^{k,2}(\Omega)$  and  $H_0^k(\Omega) =: W_0^{k,2}(\Omega)$ .  $C_c^k(\mathbb{R}^3)$  ( $0 \leq k \leq \infty$ ) represents the space of continuously differentiable functions up to the  $k$ th order with compact support over  $\mathbb{R}^3$ .  $a \lesssim b$  means there exists a constant  $C$  independent of  $\varepsilon$  such that  $a \leq Cb$ .





where  $K_1 > 0$  depends only on  $M, \mu, \kappa, m$  and  $\Omega$ . By Sobolev embedding and direct calculations, one has

$$\|\tilde{Z}_1\|_{H^{m-2}} + \|\tilde{Z}_2\|_{H^{m-1}} \leq K_2(\|\tilde{\theta}_0 - 1\|_{H^m} \|\tilde{v}_1\|_{H^{m+1}} + \|\nabla \tilde{\theta}\|_{H^m} \|\tilde{v}_1\|_{H^m}) \leq 2K_2\delta_0^2, \quad (2.6)$$

where  $K_2 > 0$  is constant depends on  $m$  and  $\Omega$ . Substituting (2.6) into (2.5), one has

$$\|v_1\|_{H^m} + \|P_2\|_{H^{m-1}} + \|\theta_0 - 1\|_{H^{m+1}} \leq 2K_1K_2\delta_0^2 + 2K_1|\nabla T_w|_{H^m}. \quad (2.7)$$

Then taking  $\delta_0$  small enough such that  $2K_2K_1\delta_0 \leq \frac{1}{2}$ , and then choosing  $|\nabla T_w|$  small enough such that  $2K_1|\nabla T_w|_{H^m} \leq \frac{1}{2}\delta_0$ , we obtain from (2.7) that

$$\|v_1\|_{H^m} + \|P_2\|_{H^{m-1}} + \|\theta_0 - 1\|_{H^{m+1}} \leq \delta_0,$$

which implies the linear mapping in (2.4) is bounded.

By a similar argument, for  $(\tilde{v}_1^{[k]}, \tilde{\theta}_0^{[k]}) \mapsto (v_1^{[k]}, \theta_0^{[k]})$  with  $k = 1, 2$ , one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \|v_1^{[1]} - v_1^{[2]}\|_{H^m} + \|P_2^{[1]} - P_2^{[2]}\|_{H^{m-1}} + \|\theta_0^{[1]} - \theta_0^{[2]}\|_{H^{m+1}} \\ & \leq K_3\delta_0(\|\tilde{v}_1^{[1]} - \tilde{v}_1^{[2]}\|_{H^m} + \|\nabla \theta_0^{[1]} - \nabla \theta_0^{[2]}\|_{H^m}) + K_3|\nabla T_w|_{H^m} \|\theta_0^{[1]} - \theta_0^{[2]}\|_{H^{m+1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

where  $K_3 > 0$  depends only on  $m$  and  $\Omega$ . Letting  $\delta_0$  and  $|\nabla T_w|_{H^m}$  small enough such that  $K_3(\delta_0 + |\nabla T_w|_{H^m}) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ , we get from (2.8) that the linear mapping in (2.4) is contractive. Hence, the Banach fixed point theorem implies that there exists a unique strong solution  $(v_1, P_2, \theta_0) \in H^m \times H^{m-1} \times H^{m+1}$  of (2.3) satisfying

$$\|v_1\|_{H^m} + \|P_2\|_{H^{m-1}} + \|\theta_0 - 1\|_{H^{m+1}} \lesssim \delta_0,$$

Moreover, let  $\rho_0 = P_0\theta_0^{-1}$  and  $u_1 = \rho_0^{-1}v_1$ , it is clear that  $(u_1, \rho_0, \theta_0, P_2)$  is the unique strong solution of (1.8). Therefore the proof of Lemma 3.1 is complete.  $\square$

### 3. EXISTENCE OF THE LINEARIZED PROBLEM

**3.1. Existence of linearized system (3.2).** Noting that (1.10) and (1.12) are slightly decoupled, we shall borrow the idea of [7] to establish the well-posedness theory of (1.10) and (1.12). Here, we would like to point out the systems (1.12) is more complicated than the ones in [7], it is hard to apply the arguments in [7] directly. For later use, we introduce following  $\varepsilon$ -dependent space

$$\mathcal{K} = \{f \in H^3 \cap H_0^1 : \|f\|_{\mathcal{K}} =: \|u\|_{H^2} + \varepsilon\|\nabla^3 u\|_{L^2} < \infty\}. \quad (3.1)$$

As mentioned in subsection 1.3, the  $\varepsilon$ -dependent functional space  $\mathcal{K}$  will be mainly used to deal with the highest normal derivatives of  $u_R$ . Let  $\tilde{u}_R \in \mathcal{K}$  be a given function, we consider the existence of (1.10) with replacing  $u_R$  by  $\tilde{u}_R$ , that is,

$$\begin{cases} \rho_0\theta_1 + \rho_1\theta_0 = P_1, & \int_{\Omega} \rho_1 \, dx = 0, \\ \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 u_2) = -\operatorname{div}(\rho_1 u_1), \\ \rho_0(u_1 \cdot \nabla)u_2 + \rho_0(u_2 \cdot \nabla)u_1 + \nabla P_3 = -\rho_1(u_1 \cdot \nabla)u_1 + \mu\Delta u_2 + \zeta\nabla \operatorname{div} u_2, \\ \kappa\Delta\theta_1 = -\theta_0(u_2 \cdot \nabla)\rho_0 + \rho_1(u_1 \cdot \nabla)\theta_0 + \rho_0(u_1 \cdot \nabla)\theta_1 + (\rho_0\theta_1 + \rho_1\theta_0)\operatorname{div} u_1 \\ \quad + \rho_0\theta_0 \operatorname{div} u_2 - 2\theta_0(\tilde{u}_R \cdot \nabla)\rho_0, \\ u_2 = 0, \quad \theta_1 = 0, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $(\rho_0, u_1, \theta_0) \in H^5 \times H^4 \times H^5$  be the unique strong solution of (1.8) established in Lemma 2.1 with  $\delta_0$  small enough. Then for any given  $\tilde{u}_R \in \mathcal{K}$ , there exists a unique strong solution  $(\rho_1, u_2, \theta_2, P_3)$  ( $\int_{\Omega} P_3 \, dx = 0$ ) of (3.2) satisfying*

$$\|(\rho_1, \theta_1, u_2)\|_{H^4} + \|P_3\|_{H^3} \lesssim \|\tilde{u}_R\|_{H^2} \|\nabla\theta_0\|_{H^2}. \quad (3.3)$$

**Proof.** Similar to the proof of Lemma 2.1, we shall use the Banach fixed point theorem to solve (3.2). By (3.2)<sub>1</sub>, one has  $\rho_1 = \frac{1}{\theta_0}(P_1 - \rho_0\theta_1)$  with  $P_1 = (\int_{\Omega} \rho_0\theta_1\theta_0^{-1} dx)/(\int_{\Omega} \theta_0^{-1} dx)$ . Let  $v_2 = \rho_0 u_2$ , then  $v_2|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div} v_2 &= -\operatorname{div}(\rho_1 u_1) = -\left(\frac{P_1}{\theta_0} - \frac{\rho_0\theta_1}{\theta_0}\right) \operatorname{div} u_1 - u_1 \cdot \nabla\left(\frac{P_1}{\theta_0} - \frac{\rho_0\theta_1}{\theta_0}\right) \\ &= \operatorname{div}\left(\frac{\rho_0\theta_1}{\theta_0} u_1\right) - P_1 \operatorname{div}\left(\frac{u_1}{\theta_0}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

Furthermore, it follows from (3.2)<sub>3</sub> that

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{\theta_0}{P_0} \mu \Delta v_2 + \nabla P_3 &= -\frac{\rho_0}{P_0} (u_1 \cdot \nabla \theta_0) v_2 - (u_1 \cdot \nabla) v_2 - (v_2 \cdot \nabla) u_1 \\ &\quad + \frac{\mu}{P_0} v_2 \Delta \theta_0 + \frac{2\mu}{P_0} \nabla \theta_0 \cdot (\nabla v_2)^t - \frac{1}{\theta_0} (P_1 - \rho_0 \theta_1) (u_1 \cdot \nabla) u_1 \\ &\quad + \frac{\zeta}{P_0} \nabla [\theta_0 (\operatorname{div}(\frac{\rho_0 \theta_1}{\theta_0} u_1) - P_1 \operatorname{div}(\frac{u_1}{\theta_0}))] + \frac{\zeta}{P_0} \nabla (v_2 \cdot \nabla \theta_0). \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

Combining (3.4), (3.5) and (3.2)<sub>4</sub> – (3.2)<sub>5</sub>, we can design a linear mapping  $H^4 \times H^4 \rightarrow H^4 \times H^4$ :  $(\tilde{v}_2, \tilde{\theta}_1) \mapsto (v_2, \theta_1)$

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} \operatorname{div} v_2 &= \operatorname{div}\left(\frac{\rho_0 \tilde{\theta}_1}{\theta_0} u_1\right) - \tilde{P}_1 \operatorname{div}\left(\frac{u_1}{\theta_0}\right) =: \tilde{Z}_3, \\ -\mu \Delta v_2 + \nabla(P_0 P_3) &= (\theta_0 - 1) \mu \Delta \tilde{v}_2 - \rho_0 (u_1 \cdot \nabla \theta_0) \tilde{v}_2 - P_0 (u_1 \cdot \nabla) \tilde{v}_2 - P_0 (\tilde{v}_2 \cdot \nabla) u_1 \\ &\quad + \mu \tilde{v}_2 \Delta \theta_0 + 2\mu \nabla \theta_0 \cdot (\nabla \tilde{v}_2)^t - \rho_0 (\tilde{P}_1 - \rho_0 \tilde{\theta}_1) (u_1 \cdot \nabla) u_1 \\ &\quad + \zeta \nabla [\theta_0 (\operatorname{div}(\frac{\rho_0 \tilde{\theta}_1}{\theta_0} u_1) - \tilde{P}_1 \operatorname{div}(\frac{u_1}{\theta_0}))] + \zeta \nabla (\tilde{v}_2 \cdot \nabla \theta_0) =: \tilde{Z}_4 \\ \kappa \Delta \theta_1 &= -\frac{\theta_0}{\rho_0} \tilde{v}_2 \cdot \nabla \rho_0 + \frac{\tilde{P}_1 - \rho_0 \tilde{\theta}_1}{\theta_0} (u_1 \cdot \nabla) \theta_0 + \rho_0 (u_1 \cdot \nabla) \tilde{\theta}_1 + \tilde{v}_2 \cdot \nabla \theta_0 \\ &\quad + \rho_0 \tilde{\theta}_1 \operatorname{div} u_1 + \theta_0 u_1 \cdot \nabla \left(\frac{\rho_0 \tilde{\theta}_1}{\theta_0}\right) - \tilde{P}_1 \theta_0 u_1 \cdot \nabla \left(\frac{1}{\theta_0}\right) - 2\theta_0 (\tilde{u}_R \cdot \nabla) \rho_0 =: \tilde{Z}_5, \\ v_2 &= 0, \quad \theta_1 = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned} \right. \quad (3.6)$$

where  $\tilde{P}_1 = (\int_{\Omega} \rho_0 \theta_0^{-1} \tilde{\theta}_1 dx)/(\int_{\Omega} \theta_0^{-1} dx)$ .

In view of (3.4) and  $u_1 \cdot \vec{n} = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$ , it is easy to check that the terms on the right hand side (RHS) of (3.6)<sub>1</sub> satisfies the compatible conditions. Therefore, it follows from [4, Theorems IV 5.2 and IV 5.8] and the classical elliptic theory that there exists a unique solution  $(v_2, \theta_1, P_3)$  ( $\int_{\Omega} P_3 dx = 0$ ) of the linear system (3.6) satisfying

$$\|v_2\|_{H^4} + \|P_3\|_{H^3} \leq K_1 (\|\tilde{Z}_3\|_{H^3} + \|\tilde{Z}_4\|_{H^2}), \quad \|\theta_1\|_{H^4} \leq K_1 \|\tilde{Z}_5\|_{H^2}, \quad (3.7)$$

where  $K_1 > 0$  depends only on  $\Omega$ . Noting that  $|\tilde{P}_1| \lesssim \|\tilde{\theta}_1\|_{L^2}$ , by Sobolev embedding and a direct calculation, one obtains that there exists a constant  $K_2 > 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{Z}_3\|_{H^3} &\leq K_2 \|u_1\|_{H^4} \|\tilde{\theta}_1\|_{H^4}, \\ \|\tilde{Z}_4\|_{H^2} &\leq K_2 (\|\theta_0 - 1\|_{H^4} + \|u_1\|_{H^4}) (\|\tilde{v}_2\|_{H^4} + \|\tilde{\theta}_1\|_{H^4}), \\ \|\tilde{Z}_5\|_{H^2} &\leq K_2 (\|\nabla \theta_0\|_{H^4} + \|u_1\|_{H^4}) (\|\tilde{\theta}_1\|_{H^3} + \|\tilde{v}_2\|_{H^2}) + K_2 \|\tilde{u}_R\|_{H^2} \|\nabla \theta_0\|_{H^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

Noting  $\delta_0 \ll 1$  in Lemma 2.1, we get from (3.7)–(3.8) that

$$\|v_2\|_{H^4} + \|P_3\|_{H^3} + \|\theta_1\|_{H^4} \leq \frac{1}{8} (\|\tilde{v}_2\|_{H^4} + \|\tilde{\theta}_1\|_{H^4}) + K_2 \|\tilde{u}_R\|_{H^2} \|\nabla \theta_0\|_{H^2}. \quad (3.9)$$

Under assumption  $\|\tilde{v}_2\|_{H^4} + \|\tilde{\theta}_1\|_{H^4} \leq 2K_2\|\tilde{u}_R\|_{H^2}\|\nabla\theta_0\|_{H^2}$ , it follows from (3.9) that

$$\|v_2\|_{H^4} + \|P_3\|_{H^3} + \|\theta_1\|_{H^5} \leq \frac{5}{4}K_2\|\tilde{u}_R\|_{H^2}\|\nabla\theta_0\|_{H^2}, \quad (3.10)$$

which implies the linear mapping in (3.6) is bounded. Similar to the proof Lemma 2.1, we can show the linear mapping in (3.6) is a contraction mapping if  $\delta_0 \ll 1$  in Lemma 2.1. Hence, it follows from the Banach fixed point theorem that there exists a unique a solution  $(u_2, P_3, \rho_1, \theta_1) \in H^4 \times H^3 \times H^4 \times H^4$  of (3.2) with  $u_2 = \rho_0^{-1}v_2$  and  $\rho_1 = \theta_0^{-1}(P_1 - \rho_0\theta_1)$ . Moreover, (3.3) follows directly from (3.10). Therefore, the proof of Lemma 3.1 is complete.  $\square$

**Remark 3.2.** *Since  $\tilde{u}_R \in \mathcal{K}$ , then  $\tilde{u}_R \in H^3(\Omega)$ , and one may improve the regularity of  $u_2$  and  $\theta_1$  into  $H^5 \times H^5$ . However,  $\|\nabla^5(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{L^2}$  will depend on  $\varepsilon$  due to the dependence of  $\|\tilde{u}_R\|_{H^3}$  on  $\varepsilon$ . Fortunately, the uniform bound of  $\|(u_2, \theta_1)\|_{H^4}$  established in Lemma 3.1 will be enough for us.*

Let  $P_2$  and  $P_3$  be the ones obtained in Lemmas 2.1 and 3.1, we define  $\rho_2$  and  $\rho_3$  by

$$\rho_2 = \frac{1}{\theta_0}(P_2 - \rho_1\theta_1 - C_1), \quad \rho_3 = \frac{1}{\theta_0}(P_3 - \rho_2\theta_1 - C_2), \quad (3.11)$$

where  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are the ones in (1.9) and (1.11) respectively. Applying Lemmas 2.1 and 3.1, we have following estimates:

$$\|\rho_2\|_{H^3} \leq C(\|P_2\|_{H^3} + \|\rho_1\|_{H^3}\|\theta_1\|_{H^3}) \lesssim (\delta_0 + \|\tilde{u}_R\|_{H^2}^2\delta_0^2), \quad (3.12)$$

$$\|\rho_3\|_{H^3} \leq C(\|P_3\|_{H^3} + \|\rho_2\|_{H^3}\|\theta_1\|_{H^3}) \lesssim \delta_0\|\tilde{u}_R\|_{H^2}(1 + \delta_0 + \|\tilde{u}_R\|_{H^2}^2\delta_0^2). \quad (3.13)$$

**3.2. Existence of linearized system (3.14) for  $(\mu_0, \zeta_0)$ .** Let  $\tilde{u}_R \in \mathcal{K}$  and  $\tilde{\theta}_R \in (H_0^1 \cap H^3)$ ,  $(\rho_0, u_1, \theta_1, P_2)$  be the unique solution of (1.8) established in Lemma 2.1,  $(\rho_2, u_2, \theta_2, P_3)$  be the unique solution of (1.10) established in Lemma 3.1, and  $\rho_2, \rho_3$  are given in (3.11). Now we consider following linearized system of (1.12):

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \operatorname{div} [\rho_R(u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R))] + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 u_R) = \mathfrak{R}_1, \\ \mu \Delta u_R + \zeta \nabla \operatorname{div} u_R - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \nabla(\rho_0 \theta_R + \rho_R \theta_0) = \rho_0(u_1 \cdot \nabla u_R + u_R \cdot \nabla u_1) + \nabla(\rho_R \theta_1 + \rho_1 \theta_R) \\ \quad + \tilde{F}^\varepsilon(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) + \mathfrak{R}_2, \\ \frac{\kappa}{\theta_0} \Delta \theta_R - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 u_R) = \frac{P_1}{\theta_0} \operatorname{div} u_R + \frac{1}{\theta_0}(\rho_0 \theta_R + \rho_R \theta_0) \operatorname{div} u_1 + \frac{1}{\theta_0} \tilde{G}^\varepsilon(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) + \mathfrak{R}_3 \\ \quad + \frac{1}{\theta_0} [\rho_0(u_R \cdot \nabla \theta_1 + u_1 \cdot \nabla \theta_R) + \rho_1 u_R \cdot \nabla \theta_0 + \rho_R u_1 \cdot \nabla \theta_0], \\ u_R|_{\partial\Omega} = \theta_R|_{\Omega} = 0, \quad \int_{\Omega} \rho_R \, dx = 0, \end{array} \right. \quad (3.14)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{R}_1 &=: -\operatorname{div} [(\rho_1 + \varepsilon\rho_2 + \varepsilon^2\rho_3)\tilde{u}_R] + r_1, & \mathfrak{R}_2 &=: r_2, \\ \mathfrak{R}_3 &=: \frac{1}{\theta_0}r_3 - \frac{1}{\theta_0}\Psi(\nabla(u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R))), \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

$\tilde{F}^\varepsilon(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)$  and  $\tilde{G}^\varepsilon(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)$  are the linearized forms of  $F^\varepsilon(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)$  and  $G^\varepsilon(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)$  respectively, i.e.,

$$\tilde{F}^\varepsilon(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) = \tilde{f}_1^\varepsilon(u_R, \theta_R) + \tilde{f}_2^\varepsilon(\rho_R) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{G}^\varepsilon(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) = \tilde{g}_1^\varepsilon(u_R, \theta_R) + \tilde{g}_2^\varepsilon(\rho_R),$$

where

$$\tilde{f}_1^\varepsilon(u_R, \theta_R) = \varepsilon[\rho_0(u_2 \cdot \nabla u_R + u_R \cdot \nabla u_2 + \tilde{u}_R \cdot \nabla u_R) + \rho_1(u_R \cdot \nabla u_1 + u_1 \cdot \nabla u_R)]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \varepsilon^2 [\rho_1(u_R \cdot \nabla u_2 + u_2 \cdot \nabla u_R + \tilde{u}_R \cdot \nabla u_R) + \rho_2(u_R \cdot \nabla u_1 + u_1 \cdot \nabla u_R)] \\
& + \varepsilon^3 [\rho_2(u_R \cdot \nabla u_2 + u_2 \cdot \nabla u_R + \tilde{u}_R \cdot \nabla u_R) + \rho_3(u_R \cdot \nabla u_1 + u_1 \cdot \nabla u_R)] \\
& + \varepsilon^4 \rho_3(u_R \cdot \nabla u_2 + u_2 \cdot \nabla u_R + \tilde{u}_R \cdot \nabla u_R) + \varepsilon \nabla(\rho_2 \theta_R) + \varepsilon^2 \nabla(\rho_3 \theta_R), \tag{3.16}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{f}_2^\varepsilon(\rho_R) &= \varepsilon \rho_R u_1 \cdot \nabla u_1 + \varepsilon^2 \rho_R (u_1 \cdot \nabla \tilde{u}_R + \tilde{u}_R \cdot \nabla u_1 + u_2 \cdot \nabla u_1 + u_1 \cdot \nabla u_2) \\
& + \varepsilon^3 \rho_R (\tilde{u}_R \cdot \nabla u_2 + u_2 \cdot \nabla \tilde{u}_R + u_2 \cdot \nabla u_2 + \tilde{u}_R \cdot \nabla \tilde{u}_R) + \varepsilon \nabla(\rho_R \tilde{\theta}_R), \tag{3.17}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{g}_1^\varepsilon(u_R, \theta_R) &= \varepsilon [\rho_0(u_2 \cdot \nabla \theta_R + \tilde{u}_R \cdot \nabla \theta_R) + \rho_2 u_R \cdot \nabla \theta_0 + \rho_1(u_R \cdot \nabla \theta_1 + u_1 \cdot \nabla \theta_R)] \\
& + \varepsilon^2 [\rho_1(u_2 \cdot \nabla \theta_R + \tilde{u}_R \cdot \nabla \theta_R) + \rho_2(u_R \cdot \nabla \theta_1 + u_1 \cdot \nabla \theta_R) + \rho_3 u_R \cdot \nabla \theta_0] \\
& + \varepsilon^3 [\rho_2(u_2 \cdot \nabla \theta_R + \tilde{u}_R \cdot \nabla \theta_R) + \rho_3(u_1 \cdot \nabla \theta_R + u_R \cdot \nabla \theta_1)] \\
& + \varepsilon [\rho_0 \theta_R \operatorname{div} u_2 + (\rho_1 \theta_1 + \rho_2 \theta_0) \operatorname{div} u_R + \rho_0 \theta_R \operatorname{div} \tilde{u}_R + \rho_1 \theta_R \operatorname{div} u_1] \\
& + \varepsilon^2 [\rho_1 \theta_R \operatorname{div} u_2 + (\rho_2 \theta_1 + \rho_3 \theta_0) \operatorname{div} u_R + \rho_1 \theta_R \operatorname{div} \tilde{u}_R + \rho_2 \theta_R \operatorname{div} u_1] \\
& + \varepsilon [\rho_3 \theta_R \operatorname{div} u_1 + \rho_2 \theta_R \operatorname{div} u_2 + \rho_3 \theta_1 \operatorname{div} u_R + \rho_2 \theta_R \operatorname{div} \tilde{u}_R] \\
& + \varepsilon^4 \rho_3 (u_2 \cdot \nabla \theta_R + \tilde{u}_R \cdot \nabla \theta_R) + \varepsilon^4 [\rho_3 \theta_R \operatorname{div} u_2 + \rho_3 \theta_R \operatorname{div} \tilde{u}_R], \tag{3.18}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{g}_2^\varepsilon(\rho_R) &= \varepsilon \rho_R (u_2 \cdot \nabla \theta_0 + \tilde{u}_R \cdot \nabla \theta_0 + u_1 \cdot \nabla \theta_1) + \varepsilon^2 \rho_R (u_2 \cdot \nabla \theta_1 + \tilde{u}_R \cdot \nabla \theta_1 + u_1 \cdot \nabla \tilde{\theta}_R) \\
& + \varepsilon^3 \rho_R (u_2 \cdot \nabla \tilde{\theta}_R + \tilde{u}_R \cdot \nabla \tilde{\theta}_R) + \varepsilon \rho_R [\theta_0 \operatorname{div} u_2 + \theta_0 \operatorname{div} \tilde{u}_R + \theta_1 \operatorname{div} u_1] \\
& + \varepsilon^2 \rho_R [\theta_1 \operatorname{div} u_2 + \theta_1 \operatorname{div} \tilde{u}_R + \tilde{\theta}_R \operatorname{div} u_1] + \varepsilon^3 \rho_R [\tilde{\theta}_R \operatorname{div} \tilde{u}_R + \tilde{\theta}_R \operatorname{div} u_2]. \tag{3.19}
\end{aligned}$$

Motivated by [19, 20, 23], to establish the strong solution of (3.14), we shall decompose (3.14) into the system (3.14) into two Laplace equations with Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions respectively, a classical Stokes problem and a steady transport equation with the help of effective viscous flux and the Helmholtz decomposition. This decomposition is helpful for us to construct approximate solutions. It follows from (3.14)<sub>1</sub> and (3.14)<sub>3</sub> that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\kappa}{\theta_0} \Delta \theta_R &= -\operatorname{div}[\rho_R(u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R))] + \mathfrak{R}_1 + \frac{P_1}{\theta_0} \operatorname{div} u_R + \frac{1}{\theta_0} (\rho_0 \theta_R + \rho_R \theta_0) \operatorname{div} u_1 \\
& + \frac{1}{\theta_0} [\rho_0(u_R \cdot \nabla \theta_1 + u_1 \cdot \nabla \theta_R) + \rho_1 u_R \cdot \nabla \theta_0 + \rho_R u_1 \cdot \nabla \theta_0] \\
& + \frac{1}{\theta_0} \tilde{G}^\varepsilon(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) + \mathfrak{R}_3. \tag{3.20}
\end{aligned}$$

Denoting  $w_R = \rho_0 u_R$ , one has from  $P_0 = \rho_0 \theta_0$  and direct calculations that

$$\operatorname{div} u_R = \frac{1}{P_0} \operatorname{div}(w_R \theta_0) = \frac{1}{P_0} w_R \cdot \nabla \theta_0 + \frac{1}{P_0} \theta_0 \operatorname{div} w_R, \tag{3.21}$$

$$\Delta u_R = \frac{1}{P_0} w_R \Delta \theta_0 + \frac{\theta_0}{P_0} \Delta w_R + \frac{2}{P_0} \nabla \theta_0 \cdot (\nabla w_R)^t. \tag{3.22}$$

Then it follows from (3.14)<sub>2</sub> that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu \theta_0 \Delta w_R + \nabla \tilde{P}_R &= \rho_0 [w_R (u_1 \cdot \nabla) \theta_0 + \theta_0 (u_1 \cdot \nabla) w_R + \theta_0 (w_R \cdot \nabla) u_1] - \mu w_R \Delta \theta_0 \\
& - 2\mu \nabla \theta_0 \cdot (\nabla w_R)^t - \zeta w_R \cdot \nabla \theta_0 + \mathcal{F}^\varepsilon(\rho_R, w_R, \theta_R) + P_0 \mathfrak{R}_2 \tag{3.23}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{P}_R := \zeta \theta_0 \operatorname{div} w_R - \frac{P_0}{\varepsilon} (\rho_0 \theta_R + \rho_R \theta_0) - P_0 (\theta_1 + \varepsilon \tilde{\theta}_R) \rho_R - P_0 (\rho_1 + \varepsilon \rho_2 + \varepsilon^2 \rho_3) \theta_R, \tag{3.24}$$

and

$$\mathcal{F}^\varepsilon(\rho_R, w_R, \theta_R) := P_0 \tilde{F}^\varepsilon(\rho_R, \frac{w_R}{\rho_0}, \theta_R) - P_0 \varepsilon \nabla(\rho_R \tilde{\theta}_R + \rho_2 \theta_R) - P_0 \varepsilon^2 \nabla(\rho_3 \theta_R). \tag{3.25}$$

As in [19, 20], we use the Helmholtz decomposition to set

$$w_R = v_R + \nabla q_R \text{ with } \operatorname{div} v_R = 0 \text{ and } v_R|_{\partial\Omega} = -\nabla q_R, \frac{\partial q_R}{\partial \vec{n}}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0.$$

Then it follows from (3.14)<sub>1</sub> and (3.14)<sub>2</sub> that

$$\Delta q_R = \operatorname{div} w_R = -\varepsilon \operatorname{div}[\rho_R(u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R))] + \varepsilon \mathfrak{A}_1, \quad (3.26)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mu\theta_0\Delta v_R + \nabla P_R &= \rho_0[w_R(u_1 \cdot \nabla)\theta_0 + \theta_0(u_1 \cdot \nabla)w_R + \theta_0(w_R \cdot \nabla)u_1] + \mu \operatorname{div} w_R \nabla \theta_0 \\ &\quad - \mu w_R \Delta \theta_0 - 2\mu \nabla \theta_0 \cdot (\nabla w_R)^t - \zeta w_R \cdot \nabla \theta_0 + \mathcal{F}^\varepsilon(\rho_R, w_R, \theta_R) + P_0 \mathfrak{A}_2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.27)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} P_R &:= \tilde{P}_R + \mu\theta_0 \operatorname{div} w_R \\ &= \theta_0(\zeta + \mu) \operatorname{div} w_R - \frac{P_0}{\varepsilon}(\rho_0\theta_R + \rho_R\theta_0) - P_0(\theta_1 + \varepsilon\tilde{\theta}_R)\rho_R - P_0(\rho_1 + \varepsilon\rho_2 + \varepsilon^2\rho_3)\theta_R. \end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

It follows from (3.14)<sub>1</sub> and (3.28) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\rho_R + \frac{\varepsilon^2(\mu + \zeta)}{P_0} \operatorname{div}[\rho_R\theta_0(u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R))] \\ &= -\frac{\varepsilon}{P_0}P_R + \frac{\varepsilon^2(\mu + \zeta)}{\rho_0}\mathfrak{A}_1 - (\rho_0 + \varepsilon\rho_1 + \varepsilon^2\rho_2 + \varepsilon^3\rho_3)\theta_R \\ &\quad - (\theta_0 - 1 + \varepsilon\theta_1 + \varepsilon^2\tilde{\theta}_R)\rho_R + \frac{\varepsilon^2(\mu + \zeta)}{P_0}\rho_R(u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R)) \cdot \nabla \theta_0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.29)$$

For later use, we denote

$$\mathcal{H}^2 = \{f \in H^2 : \varepsilon^2 \|\nabla^2 \operatorname{div}[f(u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R))]\|_{L^2} < \infty\},$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_0 &:= \|(\rho_0 - P_0, u_1, P_2, \theta_0 - 1)\|_{H^3} + \|(\rho_1, u_2, P_3, \theta_1)\|_{H^3} + \|(\rho_2, \rho_3)\|_{H^3} \\ &\lesssim \delta_0(1 + \|\tilde{u}_R\|_{H^2}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.30)$$

and

$$\mathcal{I}_1 := \mathcal{I}_0 + \|\tilde{u}_R\|_{\mathcal{K}} + \|\tilde{\theta}_R\|_{H^3} \lesssim \delta_0 + \|\tilde{u}_R\|_{\mathcal{K}} + \|\tilde{\theta}_R\|_{H^3}. \quad (3.31)$$

Hereafter, we denote  $C(\mathcal{I}_0)$  and  $C(\mathcal{I}_1)$  as two small positive constants depending on  $\mathcal{I}_0$  and  $\mathcal{I}_1$  respectively, and satisfying  $C(\mathcal{I}_0), C(\mathcal{I}_1) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\mathcal{I}_0, \mathcal{I}_1 \rightarrow 0$  respectively.

**Lemma 3.3.** *For any fixed  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ , there exist a positive constant  $K_0 \gg 1$ , and two positive viscous coefficients  $\mu_0$  and  $\zeta_0$  satisfying  $0 < \mu_0, \zeta_0 < 1$  and  $\frac{\zeta_0}{\mu_0} \geq K_0$  such that if  $\delta_0$  and  $\|\tilde{u}_R\|_{\mathcal{K}} + \|\tilde{\theta}_R\|_{H^3}$  are small enough, there exists a strong solution  $(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) \in H^2 \times \mathcal{K} \times (H_0^1 \cap H^3)$  of (3.14) with  $(\mu, \zeta) = (\mu_0, \zeta_0)$ . Moreover, it holds*

$$\|\rho_R\|_{H^2} + \|u_R\|_{\mathcal{K}} + \|\theta_R\|_{H^3} \leq C[\|\mathfrak{A}_2\|_{L^2} + \|(\mathfrak{A}_1, \mathfrak{A}_3)\|_{H^1}] + C\varepsilon[\|\mathfrak{A}_2\|_{H^1} + \varepsilon\|\mathfrak{A}_1\|_{H^2}]. \quad (3.32)$$

**Remark 3.4.** *We would like to point out that the positive constant  $C$  in (3.32) may blow up as  $\frac{\zeta_0}{\mu_0} \rightarrow K_0$ . Therefore, to establish the existent of the strong solution of (3.14) for any given  $(\mu, \zeta)$ , we still need to establish a priori uniform estimates depending continuously on  $(\mu, \zeta)$  in next section, see also [23].*

**Proof.** In the following, we shall use (3.20), (3.26), (3.27) and (3.29) to construct solution. Since the proof is very long, we divide it into three steps.

*Step 1.* Setting

$$(\rho_R^{(0)}, \theta_R^{(0)}, v_R^{(0)}, q_R^{(0)}) = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0), \quad (3.33)$$

and  $w_R^{(0)} = v_R^{(0)} + \nabla q_R^{(0)} = 0$ . Once  $(\rho_R^{(k)}, \theta_R^{(k)}, v_R^{(k)}, q_R^{(k)}) \in \mathcal{H}^2 \times (H^3 \cap H_0^1) \times (H^3 \cap H_0^1) \times H^4$  are given, we first construct  $\theta_R^{(k+1)}$  and  $q_R^{(k+1)}$  by

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{\kappa}{\theta_0} \Delta \theta_R^{(k+1)} = -\operatorname{div}[\rho_R^{(k)}(u_1 + \varepsilon u_2 + \varepsilon \tilde{u}_R)] + \mathfrak{A}_1 + \frac{1}{\theta_0} \tilde{G}^\varepsilon(\rho_R^{(k)}, \frac{w_R^{(k)}}{\rho_0}, \theta_R^{(k)}) + \mathfrak{A}_3 \\ \quad + \frac{P_1}{P_0 \theta_0} (w_R^{(k)} \cdot \nabla \theta_0 + \theta_0 \operatorname{div} w_R^{(k)}) + \frac{1}{\theta_0} (\rho_0 \theta_R^{(k)} + \rho_R^{(k)} \theta_0) \operatorname{div} u_1 \\ \quad + \frac{1}{\theta_0} [(w_R^{(k)} \cdot \nabla \theta_1 + \rho_0 u_1 \cdot \nabla \theta_R^{(k)}) + \frac{\rho_1}{\rho_0} w_R^{(k)} \cdot \nabla \theta_0 + \rho_R^{(k)} u_1 \cdot \nabla \theta_0] \\ \quad =: \mathcal{R}_1(\rho_R^{(k)}, w_R^{(k)}, \theta_R^{(k)}) \\ \theta_R^{(k+1)}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \end{array} \right. \quad (3.34)$$

and

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \Delta q_R^{(k+1)} = -\varepsilon \operatorname{div}[\rho_R^{(k)}(u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R))] + \varepsilon \mathfrak{A}_1, =: \mathcal{R}_2(\rho_R^{(k)}), \\ \frac{\partial q_R^{(k+1)}}{\partial \vec{n}}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \end{array} \right. \quad (3.35)$$

where  $w_R^{(k)} = v_R^{(k)} + \nabla q_R^{(k)}$ . It follows from standard theory of the Laplace equation with Dirichlet boundary condition (*cf.* [4, Theorems III.4.2]) that there exist a unique solution  $\theta_R^{(k+1)} \in H^3 \cap H_0^1$  of (3.34) satisfying

$$\|\theta_R^{(k+1)}\|_{H^3} \leq C \|\mathcal{R}_1(\rho_R^{(k)}, w_R^{(k)}, \theta_R^{(k)})\|_{H^1} \leq C(\mathcal{I}_1) \|(\rho_R^{(k)}, w_R^{(k)}, \theta_R^{(k)})\|_{H^2} + C \|(\mathfrak{A}_1, \mathfrak{A}_3)\|_{H^1}, \quad (3.36)$$

where we have used that fact

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{G}^\varepsilon(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)\|_{L^2} &\leq \|\tilde{g}_1^\varepsilon(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{L^2} + \|\tilde{g}_2^\varepsilon(\rho_R)\|_{L^2} \leq C(\mathcal{I}_1) \|(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^1}, \\ \|\tilde{G}^\varepsilon(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^1} &\leq \|\tilde{g}_1^\varepsilon(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^1} + \|\tilde{g}_2^\varepsilon(\rho_R)\|_{H^1} \leq C(\mathcal{I}_1) \|(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.37)$$

Noting (3.15) and (1.15), the solvability condition of (3.35) holds automatically. It follows from standard theory of the Laplace equation with Neumann boundary condition (*cf.* [4, Theorems III.4.3]) that there exist a unique solution  $q_R^{(k+1)} \in H^4$  with  $\int_\Omega q_R^{(k+1)} dx = 0$  of (3.35) satisfying

$$\|q_R^{(k+1)}\|_{H^3} \leq C \|\mathcal{R}_2(\rho_R^{(k)})\|_{H^1} \leq C(\mathcal{I}_1) \varepsilon \|\rho_R^{(k)}\|_{H^2} + C \varepsilon \|\mathfrak{A}_1\|_{H^1}, \quad (3.38)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon \|q_R^{(k+1)}\|_{H^4} &\leq \bar{C} \varepsilon \|\mathcal{R}_2(\rho_R^{(k)})\|_{H^2} \leq \bar{C} \varepsilon^2 \|\nabla^2 \operatorname{div}[\rho_R^{(k)}(u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R))]\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + C(\mathcal{I}_1) \varepsilon^2 \|\rho_R^{(k)}\|_{H^2} + \bar{C} \varepsilon^2 \|\mathfrak{A}_1\|_{H^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.39)$$

We would like to point out that the constant  $\bar{C} > 0$  in (3.39) depends only on  $\Omega$ .

Step 2. Next, we construct  $v_R^{(k+1)}$  and  $P_R^{(k+1)}$  by

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mu \Delta v_R^{(k+1)} + \nabla P_R^{(k+1)} = \rho_0 [w_R^{(k)}(u_1 \cdot \nabla) \theta_0 + \theta_0(u_1 \cdot \nabla) w_R^{(k)} + \theta_0(w_R^{(k)} \cdot \nabla) u_1] \\ \quad - \mu(\theta_0 - 1) \Delta v_R^{(k)} - \mu w_R^{(k)} \Delta \theta_0 + \mu \operatorname{div} w_R^{(k)} \nabla \theta_0 - 2\mu \nabla \theta_0 \cdot (\nabla w_R^{(k)})^t \\ \quad - \zeta w_R^{(k)} \cdot \nabla \theta_0 + \mathcal{F}^\varepsilon(\rho_R^{(k)}, w_R^{(k)}, \theta_R^{(k)}) + P_0 \mathfrak{A}_2 \\ \quad := \mathcal{R}_3(\rho_R^{(k)}, w_R^{(k)}, \theta_R^{(k)}), \\ \operatorname{div} v_R^{(k+1)} = 0, \\ v_R^{(k+1)}|_{\partial\Omega} = -\nabla q_R^{(k+1)}|_{\partial\Omega}, \end{array} \right. \quad (3.40)$$

with the constraint

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} P_R^{(k+1)} dx &= P_0(\mu + \zeta)\varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\rho_0} \mathfrak{A}_1 dx - \frac{P_0}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} (\rho_0 + \varepsilon \rho_1 + \varepsilon^2 \rho_2 + \varepsilon^3 \rho_3) \theta_R^{(k+1)} dx \\ &\quad + \varepsilon(\mu + \zeta) \int_{\Omega} \rho_R^{(k)} (u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R)) \cdot \nabla \theta_0 dx \\ &\quad - \frac{P_0}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} (\theta_0 - 1 + \varepsilon \theta_1 + \varepsilon^2 \tilde{\theta}_R) \rho_R^{(k)} dx := \mathcal{R}_4(\rho_R^{(k)}, \theta_R^{(k+1)}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.41)$$

It follows from the classical Stokes problem [4, Theorems IV.5.2 and IV.5.8] that there exists a unique solution  $(v_R^{(k+1)}, P_R^{(k+1)}) \in (H^3 \cap H_0^1) \times H^2$  of (3.40)–(3.41) satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_R^{(k+1)}\|_{H^2} + \|\nabla P_R^{(k+1)}\|_{L^2} &\leq C \|\mathcal{R}_3(\rho_R^{(k)}, w_R^{(k)}, \theta_R^{(k)})\|_{L^2} + C \|\nabla q_R^{(k+1)}\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\partial\Omega)} \\ &\leq C(\mathcal{I}_1) \|(\rho_R^{(k)}, w_R^{(k)}, \theta_R^{(k)})\|_{H^1} + C \|\mathfrak{A}_2\|_{L^2} + C(\mathcal{I}_0) \|v_R^{(k)}\|_{H^2} + C \|q_R^{(k+1)}\|_{H^3} \\ &\leq C(\mathcal{I}_1) \|(\rho_R^{(k)}, w_R^{(k)}, \theta_R^{(k)})\|_{H^1} + C(\mathcal{I}_0) \|v_R^{(k)}\|_{H^2} + C(\mathcal{I}_1) \varepsilon \|\rho_R^{(k)}\|_{H^2} \\ &\quad + C[\varepsilon \|\mathfrak{A}_1\|_{H^1} + \|\mathfrak{A}_2\|_{L^2}], \end{aligned} \quad (3.42)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\varepsilon \mu \|v_R^{(k+1)}\|_{H^3} + \varepsilon \|\nabla P_R^{(k+1)}\|_{H^1} \\ &\leq \bar{C} \varepsilon \|\mathcal{R}_3(\rho_R^{(k)}, w_R^{(k)}, \theta_R^{(k)})\|_{H^1} + \bar{C} \mu \varepsilon \|\nabla q_R^{(k+1)}\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\partial\Omega)} \\ &\leq C(\mathcal{I}_1) \|(\rho_R^{(k)}, w_R^{(k)}, \theta_R^{(k)})\|_{H^2} + C \varepsilon \|\mathfrak{A}_2\|_{H^1} + C(\mathcal{I}_0) \mu \varepsilon \|v_R^{(k)}\|_{H^3} + \bar{C} \mu \varepsilon \|q_R^{(k+1)}\|_{H^4} \\ &\leq C(\mathcal{I}_1) \|(\rho_R^{(k)}, w_R^{(k)}, \theta_R^{(k)})\|_{H^2} + C(\mathcal{I}_0) \mu \varepsilon \|v_R^{(k)}\|_{H^3} + C \varepsilon^2 \|\mathfrak{A}_1\|_{H^2} \\ &\quad + \bar{C} \mu \varepsilon^2 \|\nabla^2 \operatorname{div}[\rho_R^{(k)}(u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R))]\|_{L^2} + C \varepsilon \|\mathfrak{A}_2\|_{H^1}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.43)$$

where we have used (3.38)–(3.39) and the fact where we have used that fact

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{F}^\varepsilon(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)\|_{L^2} &\leq \|\tilde{f}_1^\varepsilon(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{L^2} + \|\tilde{f}_2^\varepsilon(\rho_R)\|_{L^2} \leq C(\mathcal{I}_1) \|(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^1}, \\ \|\tilde{F}^\varepsilon(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^1} &\leq \|\tilde{f}_1^\varepsilon(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^1} + \|\tilde{f}_2^\varepsilon(\rho_R)\|_{H^1} \leq C(\mathcal{I}_1) \|(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.44)$$

Here,  $\bar{C} > 0$  in (3.43) is independent of  $\mu$  and  $\zeta$ . Moreover, it follows from (3.42) and the Poincaré inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon \|P_R^{(k+1)}\|_{L^2} &\leq C \varepsilon \|\nabla P_R^{(k+1)}\|_{L^2} + C \varepsilon |\mathcal{R}_4(\rho_R^{(k)}, \theta_R^{(k+1)})| \\ &\leq C(\mathcal{I}_1) \|(\rho_R^{(k)}, w_R^{(k)}, \theta_R^{(k)})\|_{H^1} + C(\mathcal{I}_0) \varepsilon \|v_R^{(k)}\|_{H^2} \\ &\quad + C(\mathcal{I}_1) \varepsilon^2 \|\rho_R^{(k)}\|_{H^2} + C[\varepsilon^2 \|\mathfrak{A}_1\|_{H^1} + \varepsilon \|\mathfrak{A}_2\|_{L^2}] + C \|\theta_R^{(k+1)}\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.45)$$



Define  $w_R^{(k+1)} =: v_R^{(k+1)} + \nabla q_R^{(k+1)}$ , one directly has  $w_R^{(k+1)}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ .

*Step 3.* Finally, we construct  $\rho_R^{(k+1)}$  by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \rho_R^{(k+1)} + \frac{\varepsilon^2(\mu + \zeta)}{P_0} \operatorname{div}[\rho_R^{(k+1)} \theta_0(u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R))] \\
&= -\frac{\varepsilon}{P_0} P_R^{(k+1)} + \frac{\varepsilon^2(\mu + \zeta)}{\rho_0} \mathfrak{R}_1 - (\rho_0 + \varepsilon\rho_1 + \varepsilon^2\rho_2 + \varepsilon^3\rho_3) \theta_R^{(k+1)} \\
&\quad - (\theta_0 - 1 + \varepsilon\theta_1 + \varepsilon^2\tilde{\theta}_R) \rho_R^{(k)} + \frac{\varepsilon^2(\mu + \zeta)}{P_0} \rho_R^{(k)} (u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R)) \cdot \nabla \theta_0 \\
&=: -\frac{\varepsilon}{P_0} P_R^{(k+1)} - (\rho_0 + \varepsilon\rho_1 + \varepsilon^2\rho_2 + \varepsilon^3\rho_3) \theta_R^{(k+1)} + \mathcal{R}_5(\rho_R^{(k)}). \tag{3.46}
\end{aligned}$$

From the regularity theory of the steady transport equation (*cf.* [6, Lemma 3.5]) and (3.41), we know if

$$\varepsilon^2(\mu + \zeta) [\|u_1\|_{H^3} + \varepsilon\|u_2\|_{H^3} + \varepsilon\|\tilde{u}_R\|_{H^3}] \ll 1, \tag{3.47}$$

then there exists a unique solution  $\rho_R^{(k+1)} \in H^2$  with  $\int_{\Omega} \rho_R^{(k+1)} dx = 0$  of (3.46) satisfying

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\rho_R^{(k+1)}\|_{H^2} &\leq C\varepsilon\|P_R^{(k+1)}\|_{H^2} + C\|\theta_R^{(k+1)}\|_{H^2} + C\varepsilon\|\mathcal{R}_5(\rho_R^{(k)})\|_{H^2} \\
&\leq C(\mathcal{I}_1)\|(\rho_R^{(k)}, w_R^{(k)}, \theta_R^{(k)})\|_{H^2} + C(\mathcal{I}_0)\varepsilon\|v_R^{(k)}\|_{H^3} + C[\varepsilon^2\|\mathfrak{R}_1\|_{H^2} + \varepsilon\|\mathfrak{R}_2\|_{H^1}] \\
&\quad + \bar{C}\mu\varepsilon^2\|\nabla^2 \operatorname{div}[\rho_R^{(k)}(u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R))]\|_{L^2} + C\|\theta_R^{(k+1)}\|_{H^2}, \tag{3.48}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used (3.42)–(3.45). One also has from (3.46) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^2(\mu + \zeta)\|\operatorname{div}[\rho_R^{(k+1)} \theta_0(u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R))]\|_{H^2} \\
&\leq C\|\rho_R^{(k+1)}\|_{H^2} + C\varepsilon\|P_R^{(k+1)}\|_{H^2} + C\|\theta_R^{(k+1)}\|_{H^2} + C\|\mathcal{R}_5(\rho_R^{(k)}, \theta_R^{(k)})\|_{H^2} \\
&\leq C(\mathcal{I}_1)\|(\rho_R^{(k)}, w_R^{(k)}, \theta_R^{(k)})\|_{H^2} + C(\mathcal{I}_0)\mu\varepsilon\|v_R^{(k)}\|_{H^3} + C[\varepsilon^2\|\mathfrak{R}_1\|_{H^2} + \varepsilon\|\mathfrak{R}_2\|_{H^1}] \\
&\quad + \bar{C}\mu\varepsilon^2\|\nabla^2 \operatorname{div}[\rho_R^{(k)}(u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R))]\|_{L^2} + C\|\theta_R^{(k+1)}\|_{H^2}, \tag{3.49}
\end{aligned}$$

which leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^2(\mu + \zeta)\|\nabla^2 \operatorname{div}[\rho_R^{(k+1)}(u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R))]\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq \varepsilon^2(\mu + \zeta)\|\nabla^2 \operatorname{div}[\rho_R^{(k+1)} \theta_0(u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R))]\|_{L^2} + C(\mathcal{I}_1)\varepsilon^2\|\rho_R^{(k+1)}\|_{H^2} \\
&\leq C(\mathcal{I}_1)\|(\rho_R^{(k)}, w_R^{(k)}, \theta_R^{(k)})\|_{H^2} + C(\mathcal{I}_0)\mu\varepsilon\|v_R^{(k)}\|_{H^3} + C[\varepsilon^2\|\mathfrak{R}_1\|_{H^2} + \varepsilon\|\mathfrak{R}_2\|_{H^1}] \\
&\quad + \bar{C}\mu\varepsilon^2\|\nabla^2 \operatorname{div}[\rho_R^{(k)}(u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R))]\|_{L^2} + C\|\theta_R^{(k+1)}\|_{H^2}. \tag{3.50}
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (3.36)–(3.39), (3.42)–(3.45), (3.48)–(3.50), one concludes

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|(\rho_R^{(k+1)}, v_R^{(k+1)}, w_R^{(k+1)})\|_{H^2} + \|(\theta_R^{(k+1)}, q_R^{(k+1)})\|_{H^3} + \varepsilon\mu\|(w_R^{(k+1)}, v_R^{(k+1)})\|_{H^3} \\
&\quad + \varepsilon\mu\|q_R^{(k+1)}\|_{H^4} + \varepsilon^2\|\nabla^2 \operatorname{div}[\rho_R^{(k+1)}(u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R))]\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq C(\mathcal{I}_1)\|(\rho_R^{(k)}, w_R^{(k)}, \theta_R^{(k)})\|_{H^2} + C(\mathcal{I}_0)\varepsilon\mu\|v_R^{(k)}\|_{H^3} \\
&\quad + \bar{C}\frac{\mu}{\mu + \zeta}\varepsilon^2\|\nabla^2 \operatorname{div}[\rho_R^{(k)}(u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R))]\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad + C[\|\mathfrak{R}_2\|_{L^2} + \|(\mathfrak{R}_1, \mathfrak{R}_3)\|_{H^1}] + C\varepsilon[\|\mathfrak{R}_2\|_{H^1} + \varepsilon\|\mathfrak{R}_1\|_{H^2}]. \tag{3.51}
\end{aligned}$$

provided that  $\mu + \zeta < 1$  and (3.47) hold. Noting  $\bar{C}$  is independent of  $\mu$  and  $\zeta$ , we can choose two positive constants  $\mu_0$  and  $\zeta_0$  satisfying  $\mu_0 + \zeta_0 < 1$  and  $\frac{\zeta_0}{\mu_0} \gg 1$  such that  $\bar{C}\frac{\mu_0}{\mu_0 + \zeta_0} \leq \frac{1}{2}$  in (3.51).

Furthermore, noting (3.30)–(3.31), we can take  $\delta_0$  and  $\|\tilde{u}_R\|_{\mathcal{K}} + \|\tilde{\theta}_R\|_{H^3}$  small enough such that (3.47) holds and  $C(\mathcal{I}_0), C(\mathcal{I}_1)$  in (3.51) satisfy  $C(\mathcal{I}_i) \leq \frac{1}{2}$  ( $i = 0, 1$ ). Then, by iterative argument, we can derive from (3.51) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\rho_R^{(k)}, v_R^{(k)}, w_R^{(k)})\|_{H^2} + \|(\theta_R^{(k)}, q_R^{(k)})\|_{H^3} + \varepsilon\mu_0\|(w_R^{(k)}, v_R^{(k)})\|_{H^3} \\ & \quad + \varepsilon\mu_0\|q_R^{(k)}\|_{H^4} + \varepsilon^2\|\nabla^2 \operatorname{div}[\rho_R^{(k)}(u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R))]\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq C[\|\mathfrak{R}_2\|_{L^2} + \|(\mathfrak{R}_1, \mathfrak{R}_3)\|_{H^1}] + C\varepsilon[\|\mathfrak{R}_2\|_{H^1} + \varepsilon\|\mathfrak{R}_1\|_{H^2}] \end{aligned} \quad (3.52)$$

where  $C > 0$  is a constant depending only on  $\mu_0$  and  $\zeta_0$ .

Noting (3.34)–(3.35), (3.40) and (3.46), then by similar arguments, we can prove  $(\rho_R^{(k)}, w_R^{(k)}, \theta_R^{(k)})$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $H^2 \times \mathcal{K} \times (H_0^1 \cap H^3)$  for  $(\mu_0, \zeta_0)$ . It is easy to prove that

$$(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\rho_R^{(k)}, u_R^{(k)}, \theta_R^{(k)}) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\rho_R^{(k)}, \frac{1}{\rho_0} w_R^{(k)}, \theta_R^{(k)})$$

is a strong solution of (3.14) satisfying (3.32) with  $(\mu, \zeta) = (\mu_0, \zeta_0)$ . Therefore, the proof of Lemma 3.3 is complete.  $\square$

#### 4. A Priori UNIFORM ESTIMATES IN MACH NUMBER FOR (3.14)

As mentioned in Remark 3.4, in this section, we shall show any strong solution  $(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) \in H^2 \times \mathcal{K} \times (H_0^1 \cap H^3)$  of (3.14) enjoys *a priori* uniform estimates in  $\varepsilon$ , and is of continuous dependence on  $(\mu, \zeta)$ , which will play an essential role in establishing the existence of strong solution of (3.14) for any given viscous coefficients pair  $(\mu, \zeta)$  in Section 5. Hereafter, we assume that  $(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) \in H^2 \times \mathcal{K} \times (H_0^1 \cap H^3)$  is a strong solution of (3.14).

**4.1. Lower order estimates.** Noting that Dirichlet boundary conditions of  $(u_R, \theta_R)$  the singular terms (the terms involving  $\varepsilon^{-1}$ ) is skew-symmetric in (3.14), we can apply the standard the energy method to get following lemma:

**Lemma 4.1.** *For any  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ , there exist a small constant  $\tilde{\delta}_0$  such that if  $\delta_0 \leq \tilde{\delta}_0$  and  $\|\tilde{u}_R\|_{\mathcal{K}} + \|\tilde{\theta}_R\|_{H^3} \leq \tilde{\delta}_0$ , there exists a positive constant  $C$  independent of  $\varepsilon$  such that*

$$\|\rho_R\|_{L^2}^2 + \|(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^1}^2 \leq C\|(\mathfrak{R}_1, \mathfrak{R}_2, \mathfrak{R}_3)\|_{L^2}. \quad (4.1)$$

**Proof.** Multiplying (3.14)<sub>1</sub> by  $\theta_0\rho_R$ , (3.14)<sub>2</sub> by  $\rho_0u_R$  and (3.14)<sub>3</sub> by  $\rho_0\theta_R$ , then summing the resultant equations, one has from the Hölder and Poincaré inequalities that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu \int_{\Omega} \rho_0 |\nabla u_R|^2 dx + \zeta \int_{\Omega} \rho_0 |\operatorname{div} u_R|^2 dx + \kappa \int_{\Omega} \frac{\rho_0}{\theta_0} |\nabla \theta_R|^2 dx \\ & \leq [C(\mathcal{I}_0) + \frac{1}{16}] \left[ \mu \int_{\Omega} \rho_0 |\nabla u_R|^2 dx + \kappa \int_{\Omega} \frac{\rho_0}{\theta_0} |\nabla \theta_R|^2 dx \right] + C(\mathcal{I}_0) \|\rho_R\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|(\mathfrak{R}_2, \mathfrak{R}_3)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \quad + C\|\rho_R\|_{L^2} \|\mathfrak{R}_1\|_{L^2} - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} \rho_0 u_R \cdot \nabla(\rho_0 \theta_R + \rho_R \theta_0) dx - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 u_R)(\rho_0 \theta_R + \theta_0 \rho_R) dx \\ & \quad - \int_{\Omega} \rho_0 u_R \cdot \nabla(\rho_R \theta_1) dx - \int_{\Omega} \rho_0 u_R \cdot \tilde{F}^\varepsilon(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) dx - \frac{1}{\theta_0} \int_{\Omega} \rho_0 \theta_R \tilde{G}^\varepsilon(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) dx \\ & \quad - \int_{\Omega} \theta_0 \rho_R \operatorname{div} [\rho_R(u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R))] dx =: \sum_{i=1}^{10} I_i. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

For  $I_5 + I_6$ , by integrating by parts, one has

$$I_5 + I_6 = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 u_R)(\rho_0 \theta_R + \theta_0 \rho_R) dx - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 u_R)(\rho_0 \theta_R + \theta_0 \rho_R) dx = 0. \quad (4.3)$$

Similarly, for  $I_7$ , a direct calculation from the Hölder and Poincaré inequalities shows that

$$I_7 = \int_{\Omega} \rho_R \theta_1 \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 u_R) \, dx \leq C(\mathcal{I}_0) \|\rho_R\|_{L^2}^2 + C(\mathcal{I}_0) \mu \int_{\Omega} \rho_0 |\nabla u_R|^2 \, dx. \quad (4.4)$$

For  $I_8$  and  $I_9$ , noting (3.16)–(3.19), one has from the Hölder and Poincaré inequalities that

$$\begin{aligned} I_8 + I_9 &= - \int_{\Omega} \rho_0 u_R \cdot f_1^\varepsilon(u_R, \theta_R) \, dx - \int_{\Omega} \frac{\rho_0}{\theta_0} \theta_R g_1^\varepsilon(u_R, \theta_R) \, dx \\ &\quad - \int_{\Omega} \rho_0 u_R \cdot f_2^\varepsilon(\rho_R) \, dx - \int_{\Omega} \frac{\rho_0}{\theta_0} \theta_R g_2^\varepsilon(\rho_R) \, dx \\ &\leq C(\mathcal{I}_1) \left[ \mu \int_{\Omega} \rho_0 |\nabla u_R|^2 \, dx + \kappa \int_{\Omega} \frac{\rho_0}{\theta_0} |\nabla \theta_R|^2 \, dx \right] + C(\mathcal{I}_1) \|\rho_R\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

where we have used the fact

$$\int_{\Omega} \rho_0 u_R \cdot \nabla(\rho_R \tilde{\theta}_R) \, dx = - \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{div} \rho_0 u_R (\rho_R \tilde{\theta}_R) \, dx \leq C(\mathcal{I}_1) \|\rho_R\|_{L^2}^2 + C(\mathcal{I}_1) \mu \int_{\Omega} \rho_0 |\nabla u_R|^2 \, dx.$$

For  $I_{10}$ , by integrating by parts, one has

$$\begin{aligned} I_{10} &\leq -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \theta_0 [u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R)] \cdot \nabla(\rho_R^2) \, dx + C(\mathcal{I}_1) \|\rho_R\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \rho_R^2 \operatorname{div}[\theta_0(u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R))] \, dx + C(\mathcal{I}_1) \|\rho_R\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq C(\mathcal{I}_1) \|\rho_R\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

Substituting (4.3)–(4.6) into (4.2) and taking  $\delta_0$  and  $\|\tilde{u}_R\|_{\mathcal{K}} + \|\tilde{\theta}_R\|_{H^3}$  small enough, we obtain

$$\|\nabla u_R\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \theta_R\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(\mathcal{I}_1) \|\rho_R\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\rho_R\|_{L^2} \|\mathfrak{R}_1\|_{L^2} + C(\|\mathfrak{R}_2, \mathfrak{R}_3\|_{L^2}^2). \quad (4.7)$$

It remains to bound  $\|\rho_R\|_{L^2}$ . For any function  $\xi \in L^2(\Omega)$  with  $\int_{\Omega} \xi \, dx = 0$ , there exists a vector field  $q \in H_0^1(\Omega)$  such that

$$\operatorname{div} q = \xi \quad \|q\|_{H^1} \leq C(\Omega) \|\xi\|_{L^2}. \quad (4.8)$$

Multiplying (3.14)<sub>2</sub> by  $q$  and integrating the resulting equation over  $\Omega$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} \theta_0 \rho_R \operatorname{div} q \, dx &= -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} \rho_0 \theta_R \operatorname{div} q \, dx + \mu \int_{\Omega} \nabla u_R \cdot \nabla q \, dx + \zeta \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{div} u_R \cdot \operatorname{div} q \, dx \\ &\quad + \int_{\Omega} \rho_0 (u_1 \cdot \nabla u_R + u_R \cdot \nabla u_1) \cdot q \, dx - \int_{\Omega} \rho_R \theta_1 \operatorname{div} q \, dx - \int_{\Omega} \rho_1 \theta_R \operatorname{div} q \, dx \\ &\quad + \int_{\Omega} \tilde{F}^\varepsilon(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) \cdot q \, dx + \int_{\Omega} \mathfrak{R}_2 q \, dx. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

By taking  $\xi = \rho_R$ , we obtain from (4.8)–(4.9), (3.16)–(3.17) and the Hölder inequality that

$$\int_{\Omega} \theta_0 |\rho_R|^2 \, dx \leq C(\mathcal{I}_1) \int_{\Omega} \theta_0 |\rho_R|^2 \, dx + C[\|\theta_R\|_{L^2}^2 + \varepsilon^2 \|\nabla u_R\|_{L^2}^2 + \varepsilon^2 \|\mathfrak{R}_2\|_{L^2}^2], \quad (4.10)$$

where we have used the fact that

$$-\varepsilon^2 \int_{\Omega} \nabla(\rho_R \tilde{\theta}_R) \cdot q \, dx = \varepsilon^2 \int_{\Omega} \rho_R \tilde{\theta}_R \operatorname{div} q \, dx \leq C \varepsilon^2 \|\tilde{\theta}_R\|_{H^2} \int_{\Omega} \theta_0 |\rho_R|^2 \, dx.$$

Noting (3.31) and taking  $\delta_0$  and  $\|\tilde{u}_R\|_{\mathcal{K}} + \|\tilde{\theta}_R\|_{H^3}$  small enough, we have from (4.10) that

$$\|\rho_R\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C[\|\theta_R\|_{L^2}^2 + \varepsilon^2 \|\nabla u_R\|_{L^2}^2 + \varepsilon^2 \|\mathfrak{R}_2\|_{L^2}^2]. \quad (4.11)$$

Combining (4.7) and (4.11), using the Hölder and Poincaré inequalities, and taking  $\delta_0$  and  $\|\tilde{u}_R\|_{\mathcal{K}} + \|\tilde{\theta}_R\|_{H^3}$  small enough, we get (4.1). Therefore the proof of Lemma 4.1 is complete.  $\square$

As a byproduct of (4.1), one can obtain the uniqueness of the strong solution  $(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)$  of (3.14). Indeed, assuming  $(\rho_R^{(k)}, u_R^{(k)}, \theta_R^{(k)}) \in H^2 \times \mathcal{K} \times (H_0^1 \cap H^3)$  ( $k = 1, 2$ ) are two strong solutions of (3.14), one can apply similar arguments as in the proof of Lemma 4.1 to

$$(\bar{\rho}_R, \bar{u}_R, \bar{\theta}_R) =: (\rho_R^{(1)} - \rho_R^{(2)}, u_R^{(1)} - u_R^{(2)}, \theta_R^{(1)} - \theta_R^{(2)})$$

to get

$$\|\bar{\rho}_R\|_{L^2}^2 + \|(\bar{u}_R, \bar{\theta}_R)\|_{H^1}^2 \leq 0,$$

which yields the uniqueness. That is, we have following corollary.

**Corollary 4.2.** *The strong solution  $(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) \in H^2 \times \mathcal{K} \times (H_0^1 \cap H^3)$  of (3.14) is unique.*

**4.2. Higher order estimates.** We rewrite the momentum equation (3.14)<sub>2</sub> as non-homogeneous Stokes problem:

$$\begin{cases} -\mu\Delta u_R + \frac{\nabla(\rho_0\theta_R + \theta_0\rho_R)}{\varepsilon} = -\rho_0(u_1 \cdot \nabla u_R + u_R \cdot \nabla u_1) - \nabla(\rho_R\theta_1 + \rho_1\theta_R) + \zeta\nabla \operatorname{div} u_R \\ \quad \quad \quad - \tilde{F}^\varepsilon(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) - \mathfrak{R}_2, \\ \operatorname{div} u_R = \operatorname{div} u_R, \\ u_R|_{\partial\Omega} = 0. \end{cases} \quad (4.12)$$

By the classical Stokes estimates [4, Theorem IV.5.8], we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_R\|_{H^2} + \left\| \frac{\nabla(\rho_0\theta_R + \theta_0\rho_R)}{\varepsilon} \right\|_{L^2} &\leq C[\|u_1\|_{H^2}\|u_R\|_{H^1} + \|\rho_R\|_{H^1}\|\theta_1\|_{H^2} + \|\rho_1\|_{H^2}\|\theta_R\|_{H^1}] \\ &\quad + C[\|\tilde{F}\|_{L^2} + \|\mathfrak{R}_2\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \operatorname{div} u_R\|_{L^2} + \|u_R\|_{H^1}], \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_R\|_{H^3} + \left\| \frac{\nabla(\rho_0\theta_R + \theta_0\rho_R)}{\varepsilon} \right\|_{H^1} &\leq C[\|u_1\|_{H^2}\|u_R\|_{H^2} + \|\rho_R\|_{H^2}\|\theta_1\|_{H^2} + \|\rho_1\|_{H^2}\|\theta_R\|_{H^2}] \\ &\quad + C[\|\tilde{F}\|_{H^1} + \|\mathfrak{R}_2\|_{H^1} + \|\nabla^2 \operatorname{div} u_R\|_{L^2} + \|u_R\|_{H^1}], \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

where we have used the following interpolation inequality:

$$\|u_R\|_{H^2} \leq \delta\|u_R\|_{H^3} + C_\delta\|u\|_{H^1} \quad \text{for any } \delta > 0.$$

Taking  $\mathcal{I}_1 \ll 1$ , we deduce from (3.44), (4.13)–(4.14) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_R\|_{H^2} + \left\| \frac{\nabla(\rho_0\theta_R + \theta_0\rho_R)}{\varepsilon} \right\|_{L^2} \\ \leq C(\mathcal{I}_1)\|(\rho_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^1} + C[\|\mathfrak{R}_2\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \operatorname{div} u_R\|_{L^2} + \|u_R\|_{H^1}], \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

and

$$\varepsilon\|u_R\|_{H^3} + \|\rho_R\|_{H^2} \leq C[\|\theta_R\|_{H^2} + \|\rho_R\|_{H^1} + \varepsilon\|u_R\|_{H^1} + \varepsilon\|\nabla^2 \operatorname{div} u_R\|_{L^2} + \varepsilon\|\mathfrak{R}_2\|_{H^1}], \quad (4.16)$$

where we have used the fact

$$\|\nabla(\theta_0\rho_R + \rho_0\theta_R)\|_{H^1} \geq \frac{1}{C}\|\rho_R\|_{H^2} - \|\theta_R\|_{H^2} - \|\rho_R\|_{H^1}.$$

To close the estimate (4.15)–(4.16), we still need to estimate  $\|\theta_R\|_{H^2}$  and  $\|\nabla \operatorname{div} u_R\|_{L^2} + \varepsilon\|\nabla^2 \operatorname{div} u_R\|_{L^2}$ . As indicated in [7], the most difficult part is to estimate  $\|\nabla \operatorname{div} u_R\|_{L^2} + \varepsilon\|\nabla^2 \operatorname{div} u_R\|_{L^2}$ , which should be divided into the interior part and the part near the boundary.

For later use, we introduce some notations. Since  $\partial\Omega$  is compact, as in [6, 17], there are  $N$  cubes  $Q_1, \dots, Q_N$  such that

- $\partial\Omega \subset \cup_{k=1}^N \frac{1}{4}Q_k$ , where  $\frac{1}{4}Q_k$  means the cube with  $\frac{1}{4}$  times the size of the radius of  $Q_k$  and with the same center as  $Q_k$ ;
- For each  $Q_k$ ,  $Q_k$  intersects at most eight other  $Q_j$ 's;
- If  $w_k \in C^4(\partial\Omega \cap Q_k)$  is the boundary function, that is,

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega \cap Q_k &= \{x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \mid x_3 > w_k(x_1, x_2)\} \cap Q_k, \\ \partial\Omega \cap Q_k &= \{x_3 = w_k(x_1, x_2)\} \cap Q_k,\end{aligned}$$

then

$$\|\nabla w_k\|_{C^3(\partial\Omega \cap Q_k)} \leq \sigma \quad \text{for some small constant } \sigma \ll 1. \quad (4.17)$$

Let  $\Omega_0 := \Omega - \cup_{k=1}^N \frac{1}{2}Q_k$ , then

$$\Omega \subset \Omega_0 \cup (\cup_{k=1}^N \frac{1}{2}Q_k). \quad (4.18)$$

4.2.1. *Interior estimate.* We focus on the interior estimate of  $\|\nabla \operatorname{div} u_R\|_{L^2} + \varepsilon \|\nabla^2 \operatorname{div} u_R\|_{L^2}$ . Let  $\chi_0$  be a  $C_0^\infty$  function with  $\Omega_0 \subset \operatorname{supp} \chi_0 \subset \Omega'_0$  satisfying

$$\chi_0(x) \equiv 1 \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \chi_0(x) \equiv 0 \quad \text{for } x \in \overline{\Omega'_0}^c$$

where  $\Omega'_0 = \Omega - \cup_{k=1}^N \frac{1}{4}Q_k$ .

**Lemma 4.3** (Interior estimate of  $\|\nabla^2 u_R\|_{L^2}$ ). *For any  $\tau > 0$ , there exists a positive constants  $C_\tau$ , which depends on  $\tau$  but is independent of  $\varepsilon$ , such that*

$$\begin{aligned}& \mu \|\chi_0 \sqrt{\rho_0} \nabla^2 u_R\|_{L^2}^2 + \zeta \|\chi_0 \sqrt{\rho_0} \nabla \operatorname{div} u_R\|_{L^2}^2 + \kappa \|\chi_0 \sqrt{\frac{\rho_0}{\theta_0}} \nabla^2 \theta_R\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \leq \tau \left\| \frac{\nabla(\rho_0 \theta_R + \rho_R \theta_0)}{\varepsilon} \right\|_{L^2}^2 + C_\tau \|u_R\|_{H^1}^2 + C \|\theta_R\|_{H^1}^2 \\ & \quad + C(\mathcal{I}_1) \|\rho_R\|_{H^2}^2 + C \|\rho_R\|_{H^1} \|\mathfrak{R}_1\|_{H^1} + C \|(\mathfrak{R}_2, \mathfrak{R}_3)\|_{L^2}^2,\end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

where  $C > 0$  is a constant independent of  $\tau$  and  $\varepsilon$ .

**Proof.** We apply  $\nabla$  to (3.14) to get that

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} \nabla \operatorname{div} [\rho_R(u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R))] &= -\frac{\nabla \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 u_R)}{\varepsilon} + \nabla \mathfrak{R}_1, \\ -\mu \Delta \nabla u_R^k - \zeta \nabla(\partial_k \operatorname{div} u_R) &= -\frac{\nabla \partial_k(\rho_0 \theta_R + \theta_0 \rho_R)}{\varepsilon} - \nabla[\rho_0(u_1 \cdot \nabla)u_R^k + (u_R \cdot \nabla)u_1^k] \\ &\quad - \nabla \partial_k(\rho_R \theta_1 + \rho_1 \theta_R) - \nabla \tilde{F}^{\varepsilon, k} - \nabla \mathfrak{R}_2^k \quad (k = 1, 2, 3), \\ -\frac{\kappa}{\theta_0} \Delta \nabla \theta_R &= -\frac{\nabla \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 u_R)}{\varepsilon} - \frac{\kappa \nabla \theta_0}{\theta_0^2} \Delta \theta_R - P_1 \nabla \operatorname{div}(\theta_0^{-1} \operatorname{div} u_R) \\ &\quad - \nabla \{\theta_0^{-1} [\rho_0(u_R \cdot \nabla \theta_1 + u_1 \nabla \theta_R) + \rho_1 u_R \cdot \nabla \theta_0 + \rho_R u_1 \nabla \theta_0]\} \\ &\quad - \nabla [\theta_0^{-1} (\rho_0 \theta_R + \rho_R \theta_0) \operatorname{div} u_1] - \nabla(\theta_0^{-1} \tilde{G}^\varepsilon) - \nabla \mathfrak{R}_3. \end{aligned} \right. \quad (4.20)$$

Multiplying (4.20)<sub>1</sub>, (4.20)<sub>2</sub> and (4.20)<sub>3</sub> by  $\chi_0^2 \nabla(\theta_0 \rho_R)$ ,  $\chi_0^2 \nabla(\rho_0 u_R^k)$  and  $\chi_0^2 \nabla(\rho_0 \theta_R)$  respectively, then summing up the resulting equations, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}& \mu \|\chi_0 \sqrt{\rho_0} \nabla^2 u_R\|_{L^2}^2 + \zeta \|\chi_0 \sqrt{\rho_0} \nabla \operatorname{div} u_R\|_{L^2}^2 + \kappa \|\chi_0 \sqrt{\frac{\rho_0}{\theta_0}} \nabla^2 \theta_R\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \leq \frac{\mu}{16} \|\chi_0 \sqrt{\rho_0} \nabla^2 u_R\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\zeta}{16} \|\chi_0 \sqrt{\rho_0} \nabla \operatorname{div} u_R\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\kappa}{16} \|\chi_0 \sqrt{\frac{\rho_0}{\theta_0}} \nabla^2 \theta_R\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^1}^2 \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} [\chi_0^2 \nabla \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 u_R) \cdot \nabla(\rho_R \theta_0 + \rho_0 \theta_R) + \chi_0^2 \nabla(\rho_0 u_R) : \nabla^2(\rho_R \theta_0 + \rho_0 \theta_R)] dx\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \int_{\Omega} \chi_0^2 \nabla[\rho_0(u_1 \cdot \nabla u_R + u_R \cdot u_1)] : \nabla(\rho_0 u_R) \, dx - \int_{\Omega} \chi_0^2 \nabla^2(\rho_R \theta_1 + \rho_1 \theta_R) : \nabla(\rho_0 u_R) \, dx \\
& - \int_{\Omega} \chi_0^2 \nabla \tilde{F}(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) : \nabla(\rho_0 u_R) \, dx + \int_{\Omega} \chi_0^2 \nabla \mathfrak{A}_2 : \nabla(\rho_0 u_R) \, dx \\
& - P_1 \int_{\Omega} \chi_0^2 \nabla(\theta_0^{-1} \operatorname{div} u_R) \cdot \nabla(\rho_0 \theta_R) \, dx - \int_{\Omega} \chi_0^2 \nabla[\theta_0^{-1}(\theta_0 \rho_R + \rho_0 \theta_R) \operatorname{div} u_1] \cdot \nabla(\rho_0 \theta_R) \, dx \\
& - \int_{\Omega} \chi_0^2 \nabla\{\theta_0^{-1}[\rho_0(u_R \cdot \nabla \theta_1 + u_1 \cdot \nabla \theta_R) + \rho_1 u_R \cdot \nabla \theta_0 + \rho_R u_1 \cdot \nabla \theta_0]\} \cdot \nabla(\rho_0 \theta_R) \, dx \\
& - \int_{\Omega} \chi_0^2 \nabla(\theta_0^{-1} \tilde{G}^\varepsilon(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)) \cdot \nabla(\rho_0 \theta_R) \, dx - \int_{\Omega} \chi_0^2 \nabla \mathfrak{A}_3 \cdot \nabla(\rho_0 \theta_R) \, dx \\
& - \int_{\Omega} \chi_0^2 \nabla \operatorname{div}[\rho_R(u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R))] \cdot \nabla(\theta_0 \rho_R) \, dx + \int_{\Omega} \chi_0^2 \nabla \mathfrak{A}_1 \cdot \nabla(\theta_0 \rho_R) \, dx \\
& =: \sum_{m=1}^{16} I_m. \tag{4.21}
\end{aligned}$$

Now we control  $I_m$  ( $m = 5, \dots, 16$ ) term by term. For  $I_5$ , integrating by parts to see that

$$\begin{aligned}
I_5 &= -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{k,j=1}^3 \left[ \int_{\Omega} \chi_0^2 \partial_{jk}^2(\rho_0 u_R^k) \partial_j(\rho_R \theta_0 + \rho_0 \theta_R) \, dx - \int_{\Omega} \chi_0^2 \partial_{jk}^2(\rho_0 u_R^k) \partial_j(\rho_R \theta_0 + \theta_0 \rho_R) \, dx \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \int_{\Omega} 2\chi_0 \partial_k \chi_0 \partial_j(\rho_0 u_R^k) \partial_j(\rho_0 \theta_R + \rho_R \theta_0) \, dx \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{k,j=1}^3 \int_{\Omega} 2\chi_0 \partial_k \chi_0 \partial_j(\rho_0 u_R^k) \partial_j(\rho_0 \theta_R + \rho_R \theta_0) \, dx \\
&\leq \tau \left\| \frac{\nabla(\rho_0 \theta_R + \rho_R \theta_0)}{\varepsilon} \right\|_{L^2}^2 + C_\tau \|u_R\|_{H^1}^2 \tag{4.22}
\end{aligned}$$

for any  $\tau > 0$ .

For  $I_m$  ( $m = 6, 7, 8, 9$ ), using Hölder inequality and integrating by parts, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{m=6}^9 |I_m| &\leq \frac{\mu}{16} \|\chi_0 \sqrt{\rho_0} \nabla^2 u_R^k\|_{L^2}^2 + C(\mathcal{I}_0) \|(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^1}^2 + C(\|\tilde{F}^\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\mathfrak{A}_2\|_{L^2}^2) \\
&\leq \frac{\mu}{16} \|\chi_0 \sqrt{\rho_0} \nabla^2 u_R\|_{L^2}^2 + C(\mathcal{I}_1) \|(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^1}^2 + C(\|\mathfrak{A}_2\|_{L^2}^2) \tag{4.23}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used (3.44) in the last inequality.

Similarly, for  $I_m$  ( $m = 10, \dots, 14$ ), we also integrate by parts to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{m=10}^{14} |I_m| &\leq \frac{\kappa}{16} \|\chi_0 \sqrt{\frac{\rho_0}{\theta_0}} \nabla^2 \theta_R\|_{L^2}^2 + C(\mathcal{I}_0) \|(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^1}^2 + C(\|\tilde{G}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\mathfrak{A}_3\|_{L^2}^2) \\
&\leq \frac{\kappa}{16} \|\chi_0 \sqrt{\frac{\rho_0}{\theta_0}} \nabla^2 \theta_R\|_{L^2}^2 + C(\mathcal{I}_1) \|(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^1}^2 + C\|\mathfrak{A}_3\|_{L^2}^2 \tag{4.24}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used (3.37).

For  $I_{15}$ , by using the Hölder inequality and Sobolev embedding, one has

$$|I_{15}| \leq C(\mathcal{I}_1) \|\rho_R\|_{H^2}^2. \tag{4.25}$$

Finally, for  $I_{16}$ , by using Hölder inequality, we obtain

$$|I_{16}| \leq C\|\rho_R\|_{H^1} \|\mathfrak{A}_1\|_{H^1}. \tag{4.26}$$

Substituting (4.22)–(4.26) into (4.21), we obtain (4.19). Therefore the proof of Lemma 4.3 is complete.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.4** (Interior estimate of  $\varepsilon\|\nabla^3 u_R\|_{L^2}$ ). *For any  $\tau > 0$ , there exists a positive constant  $C_\tau$ , which depends on  $\tau$  but is independent of  $\varepsilon$ , such that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \varepsilon^2 \mu \|\chi_0 \sqrt{\rho_0} \nabla^3 u_R\|_{L^2}^2 + \varepsilon^2 \zeta \|\chi_0 \sqrt{\rho_0} \nabla^2 \operatorname{div} u_R\|_{L^2}^2 + \varepsilon^2 \kappa \|\chi_0 \sqrt{\frac{\rho_0}{\theta_0}} \nabla^3 \theta_R\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \leq (C(\mathcal{I}_1) \varepsilon^2 + \tau) \|\rho_R\|_{H^2}^2 + C_\tau \varepsilon^2 \|u_R\|_{H^2}^2 + C \|\theta_R\|_{H^2}^2 \\ & \quad + C \varepsilon^2 [\|\rho_R\|_{H^2} \|\mathfrak{A}_1\|_{H^2} + \|(\mathfrak{A}_2, \mathfrak{A}_3)\|_{H^1}^2], \end{aligned} \quad (4.27)$$

where  $C > 0$  is independent of  $\tau$  and  $\varepsilon$ .

**Proof.** We apply  $\partial^2$  to (3.14) to get that

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} \partial^2 \operatorname{div}[\rho_R(u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R))] &= -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \partial^2 \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 u_R) + \partial^2 \mathfrak{A}_1, \\ -\mu \Delta \partial^2 u_R^k - \zeta \partial^2 (\partial_k \operatorname{div} u_R) &= -\frac{\partial^2 \partial_k (\rho_0 \theta_R + \theta_0 \rho_R)}{\varepsilon} - \partial^2 [\rho_0 (u_1 \cdot \partial u_R^k + u_R \cdot \partial u_1^k)] \\ &\quad - \partial^2 \partial_k (\rho_R \theta_1 + \rho_1 \theta_R) - \partial^2 \tilde{F}^{\varepsilon, k} + \partial^2 \mathfrak{A}_2^k \quad (k = 1, 2, 3), \\ -\frac{\kappa}{\theta_0} \Delta \partial^2 \theta_R &= -\frac{\partial^3 \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 u_R)}{\varepsilon} - P_1 \partial^2 (\theta_0^{-1} \operatorname{div} u_R) - \partial^2 [\theta_0^{-1} (\rho_0 \theta_R + \rho_R \theta_0) \operatorname{div} u_1] \\ &\quad - \partial^2 \{ \theta_0^{-1} [\rho_0 (u_R \cdot \partial \theta_1 + u_1 \cdot \partial \theta_R) + \rho_1 u_R \cdot \partial \theta_0 + \rho_R u_1 \cdot \partial \theta_0] \} \\ &\quad - \kappa [\partial^2 (\theta_0^{-1} \Delta \theta_R) - \theta_0^{-1} \Delta \partial^2 \theta_R] - \partial^2 (\theta_0^{-1} \tilde{G}^\varepsilon) - \partial^2 \mathfrak{A}_3. \end{aligned} \right. \quad (4.28)$$

We multiply (4.28)<sub>1</sub>, (4.28)<sub>2</sub> and (4.28)<sub>3</sub> by  $\varepsilon^2 \chi_0^2 \partial^2 (\theta_0 \rho_R)$ ,  $\varepsilon^2 \chi_0^2 \partial^2 (\rho_0 u_R^k)$  respectively and  $\varepsilon^2 \chi_0^2 \partial^2 (\rho_0 \theta_R)$ , and add the resultant equations together to get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \varepsilon^2 \mu \int_{\Omega} \chi_0^2 \rho_0 |\nabla^3 u_R|^2 dx + \varepsilon^2 \zeta \int_{\Omega} \chi_0^2 \rho_0 |\nabla^2 \operatorname{div} u_R|^2 dx + \varepsilon^2 \kappa \int_{\Omega} \frac{\rho_0}{\theta_0} \chi_0^2 |\nabla^3 \theta_R|^2 dx \\ & \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2 \mu}{16} \int_{\Omega} \chi_0^2 \rho_0 |\nabla^3 u_R|^2 dx + \frac{\varepsilon^2 \zeta}{16} \int_{\Omega} \chi_0^2 \rho_0 |\nabla^2 \operatorname{div} u_R|^2 dx + \frac{\varepsilon^2 \kappa}{16} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\rho_0}{\theta_0} \chi_0^2 |\nabla^3 \theta_R|^2 dx + C \varepsilon^2 \|(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2}^2 \\ & \quad - \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \chi_0^2 [\nabla^2 \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 u_R) : \nabla^2 (\rho_R \theta_0 + \rho_0 \theta_R) + \sum_{k=1}^3 \nabla^2 (\rho_0 u_R^k) : \nabla^2 \partial_k (\rho_0 \theta_R + \rho_R \theta_0)] dx \\ & \quad - \varepsilon^2 \int_{\Omega} \chi_0^2 \sum_{k=1}^3 \nabla^2 [\rho_0 (u_1 \cdot \nabla u_R^k + u_R \cdot \nabla u_1^k)] : \nabla^2 (\rho_0 u_R^k) dx \\ & \quad - \varepsilon^2 \int_{\Omega} \chi_0^2 \sum_{k=1}^3 \nabla^2 \partial_k (\rho_1 \theta_R + \rho_R \theta_1) : \nabla^2 (\rho_0 u_R^k) dx - \varepsilon^2 \int_{\Omega} \chi_0^2 \sum_{k=1}^3 \nabla^2 \tilde{F}^{\varepsilon, k} : \nabla^2 (\rho_0 u_R^k) dx \\ & \quad - \varepsilon^2 \int_{\Omega} \chi_0^2 \sum_{k=1}^3 \nabla^2 \mathfrak{A}_2^k : \nabla^2 (\rho_0 u_R^k) dx - \varepsilon^2 \int_{\Omega} \chi_0^2 \nabla^2 \mathfrak{A}_3 : \nabla^2 (\rho_0 \theta_R) dx \\ & \quad - \varepsilon^2 \int_{\Omega} P_1 \chi_0^2 \nabla^2 (\theta_0^{-1} \operatorname{div} u_R) : \nabla^2 (\rho_0 \theta_R) dx - \varepsilon^2 \int_{\Omega} \chi_0^2 \nabla^2 [\theta_0^{-1} (\theta_0 \rho_R + \rho_0 \theta_R) \operatorname{div} u_1] : \nabla^2 (\rho_0 \theta_R) dx \\ & \quad - \varepsilon^2 \int_{\Omega} \nabla^2 \{ \theta_0^{-1} [\rho_0 (u_R \cdot \nabla \theta_1 + u_1 \cdot \nabla \theta_R) + \rho_1 u_R \cdot \nabla \theta_0 + \rho_R u_1 \cdot \nabla \theta_0] \} : \nabla^2 (\rho_0 \theta_R) dx \\ & \quad - \varepsilon^2 \int_{\Omega} \chi_0^2 \nabla^2 (\theta_0^{-1} \tilde{G}^\varepsilon) : \nabla^2 (\rho_0 \theta_R) dx - \varepsilon^2 \int_{\Omega} \chi_0^2 \nabla^2 \operatorname{div}[\rho_R(u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R))] : \nabla^2 (\theta_0 \rho_R) dx \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \varepsilon^2 \int_{\Omega} \chi_0^2 \nabla^2 \mathfrak{R}_1 : \nabla^2 (\theta_0 \rho_R) \, dx =: \sum_{m=1}^{16} J_m. \quad (4.29)$$

Almost all  $J_m$  can be similarly estimated as in  $I_m$  in (4.21). For simplicity of presentation, we only focus on terms involving  $\nabla^3 \rho_R$ , that is,  $J_5$ ,  $J_7$ ,  $J_8$  and  $J_{15}$ . For  $J_5$ , we use the Hölder inequality and integrate by parts to see that

$$\begin{aligned} J_5 &= -\varepsilon \sum_{j,l,k=1}^3 \int_{\Omega} \chi_0^2 [\partial_{jlk}^3 (\rho_0 u_R^k) \partial_{jl}^2 (\rho_0 \theta_R + \theta_0 \rho_R) - \partial_{jlk}^3 (\rho_0 \theta_R + \theta_0 \rho_R) \partial_{jl}^2 (\rho_0 u_R^k)] \, dx \\ &= -\varepsilon \sum_{j,l,k=1}^3 \int_{\Omega} 2\chi_0 \partial_k \chi_0 \partial_{jl}^2 (\rho_0 \theta_R + \theta_0 \rho_R) \partial_{jl}^2 (\rho_0 u_R^k) \, dx \\ &\leq \tau \|\rho_R\|_{H^2}^2 + C_\tau \varepsilon^2 \|u_R\|_{H^2}^2 + C \|\theta_R\|_{H^2}^2 \quad \text{for any } \tau > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.30)$$

Similarly for  $J_7$  and  $J_8$ , by integrating by parts, one has

$$\begin{aligned} |J_7| &\leq C \varepsilon^2 \sum_{j,l,k=1}^3 \int_{\Omega} |\partial_{jl}^2 (\rho_R \theta_1 + \rho_1 \theta_R) \partial_k (\chi_0^2 \partial_{jl}^2 (\rho_0 u_R^k))| \, dx \\ &\leq C(\mathcal{I}_0) \varepsilon^2 \|(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2}^2 + \frac{\varepsilon^2 \mu}{16} \int_{\Omega} \chi_0^2 \rho_0 |\nabla^3 u_R|^2 \, dx, \end{aligned} \quad (4.31)$$

and

$$|J_8| \leq C(\mathcal{I}_1) \varepsilon^2 \|(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2}^2 + \frac{\varepsilon^2 \mu}{16} \int_{\Omega} \chi_0^2 \rho_0 |\nabla^3 u_R|^2 \, dx. \quad (4.32)$$

For  $J_{15}$ , it follows from integrating by parts that

$$\begin{aligned} |J_{15}| &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,l=1}^3 \varepsilon^2 \int_{\Omega} \theta_0 \chi_0^2 [u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R)] \cdot \nabla (\partial_{jl}^2 (\rho_R))^2 \, dx + C(\mathcal{I}_1) \varepsilon^2 \|\rho_R\|_{H^2}^2 \\ &\leq C(\mathcal{I}_1) \varepsilon^2 \|\rho_R\|_{H^2}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.33)$$

Using (4.30)–(4.33) and similar arguments as in Lemma 4.3, we obtain (4.27). Therefore the proof of Lemma 4.4 is complete.  $\square$

**4.2.2. Estimates near the boundary.** Motivated by [6, 17], to bound  $\nabla^2 \operatorname{div} u_R$  in the vicinity of the boundary, we straighten the boundary by a local coordinate. Recall the covering (4.18), since  $\partial\Omega$  is given locally by  $x_3 = w_k(x_1, x_2)$  (hereafter we omit the subscript  $k$  for notational convenience), it is convenient to use the coordinate

$$z_1 = x_1, \quad z_2 = x_2, \quad z_3 = x_3 - w(x_1, x_2).$$

then it holds that  $z_3 = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega \cap Q$  and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} = \frac{\partial}{\partial z_i} - \frac{\partial w}{\partial z_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_3} \quad (i = 1, 2), \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial x_3} = \frac{\partial}{\partial z_3}, \quad \det\left(\frac{\partial x}{\partial z}\right) = 1.$$

Let  $\hat{Q}$  and  $\hat{\Omega}$  be the images of  $Q$  and  $\Omega$  by the above coordinate transformation. We denote

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f}(z) &=: f(z_1, z_2, z_3 + w(z_1, z_2)) \quad \text{for any scalar function } f \text{ on } \Omega, \\ \hat{D}_m &= \frac{\partial}{\partial z_m}, \quad \Delta_z = \hat{D}_{11} + \hat{D}_{22} + \hat{D}_{33}, \quad \nabla_z = (\hat{D}_1, \hat{D}_2, \hat{D}_3), \quad \operatorname{div}_z \hat{v} = \hat{D}_1 \hat{v}_1 + \hat{D}_2 \hat{v}_2 + \hat{D}_3 \hat{v}_3. \end{aligned}$$



Then in  $\hat{\Omega} \cap \hat{Q}$ , (3.14) can be reformed as

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \operatorname{div}_z[\hat{\rho}_R(\hat{u}_1 + \varepsilon(\hat{u}_2 + \hat{u}_R))] = -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \operatorname{div}_z(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{m=1}^2 \hat{D}_m w \hat{D}_3(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R^m) + \hat{W}_1 + \hat{\mathfrak{A}}_1, \\ \mu \Delta_z \hat{u}_R + \zeta \nabla_z \operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_R = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \nabla_z(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\rho}_R \hat{\theta}_0) + \hat{\rho}_0(\hat{u}_1 \cdot \nabla_z \hat{u}_R + \hat{u}_R \cdot \nabla_z \hat{u}_1) \\ \quad - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (\hat{D}_1 w \hat{D}_3(\hat{\rho} \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R), \hat{D}_2 w \hat{D}_3(\hat{\rho} \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R), 0) \\ \quad + \nabla_z(\hat{\rho}_1 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\rho}_R \hat{\theta}_1) + \hat{W}_2 + \hat{F}^\varepsilon(\hat{\rho}_R, \hat{u}_R, \hat{\theta}_R) + \hat{\mathfrak{A}}_2, \\ \frac{\kappa}{\hat{\theta}_0} \Delta_z \hat{\theta}_R = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \operatorname{div}_z(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) + \frac{P_1}{\hat{\theta}_0} \operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_R + \frac{1}{\hat{\theta}_0} (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\rho}_R \hat{\theta}_0) \operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_1 + \frac{1}{\hat{\theta}_0} \hat{G}^\varepsilon(\hat{\rho}_R, \hat{u}_R, \hat{\theta}_R) \\ \quad + \frac{1}{\hat{\theta}_0} \{ \hat{\rho}_0(\hat{u}_R \cdot \nabla_z \hat{\theta}_1 + \hat{u}_1 \cdot \nabla_z \hat{\theta}_R) + \hat{\rho}_1 \hat{u}_R \cdot \nabla_z \hat{\theta}_0 + \hat{\rho}_R \hat{u}_1 \cdot \nabla_z \hat{\theta}_0 \}, \\ \quad - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{m=1}^2 \hat{D}_m w \hat{D}_3(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R^m) + \hat{W}_3 + \hat{\mathfrak{A}}_3, \\ \hat{u}_R|_{\partial \hat{\Omega} \cap \Omega} = \hat{\theta}_R|_{\partial \hat{\Omega} \cap \hat{Q}} = 0, \end{array} \right. \quad (4.34)$$

where  $\hat{W}_1, \hat{W}_2 = (\hat{W}_2^1, \hat{W}_2^2, \hat{W}_2^3)$  and  $\hat{W}_3$  are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{W}_1 &= \sum_{m=1}^2 \hat{D}_m w \hat{D}_3[\hat{\rho}_R(\hat{u}_1^m + \varepsilon \hat{u}_2^m + \varepsilon \hat{u}_3^m)], \quad \hat{W}_2^3 = -\zeta \sum_{m=1}^2 \hat{D}_m w \hat{D}_{33}^2 \hat{u}_R^m, \\ \hat{W}_2^j &= \mu \sum_{m=1}^2 [\hat{D}_{mm}^2 w \hat{D}_3 \hat{u}_R^j + 2 \hat{D}_m w \hat{D}_{m3}^2 \hat{u}_R^j - (\hat{D}_m w)^2 \hat{D}_{33}^2 \hat{u}_R^j] \\ &\quad + \zeta [\hat{D}_j w \hat{D}_3(\operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_R) - \hat{D}_j(\sum_{m=1}^2 \hat{D}_m w \hat{D}_3 \hat{u}_R^m) - \sum_{m=1}^2 \hat{D}_m w \hat{D}_j w \hat{D}_{33}^2 \hat{u}_R^m], \\ &\quad - \hat{D}_j w [\hat{D}_3(\hat{\rho}_R \hat{\theta}_1) + \hat{D}_3(\hat{\rho}_1 \hat{\theta}_R)] - \hat{\rho}_0 [\sum_{m=1}^2 \hat{u}_1^m \hat{D}_m w \hat{D}_3 \hat{u}_R^j + \sum_{m=1}^2 \hat{u}_R^m \hat{D}_m w \hat{D}_3 \hat{u}_1^j] \quad j = 1, 2, \\ \hat{W}_3 &= \frac{\kappa}{\hat{\theta}_0} \sum_{m=1}^2 [\hat{D}_{mm}^2 w \hat{D}_3 \hat{\theta}_R + 2 \hat{D}_m w \hat{D}_{m3}^2 \hat{\theta}_R - (\hat{D}_m w)^2 \hat{D}_{33}^2 \hat{\theta}_R] \\ &\quad - \frac{P_1}{\hat{\theta}_0} \sum_{m=1}^2 \hat{D}_m w \hat{D}_3 \hat{u}_R^m - \frac{1}{\hat{\theta}_0} (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\rho}_R \hat{\theta}_0) \sum_{m=1}^2 \hat{D}_m w \hat{D}_3 \hat{u}_1^m, \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{\hat{\theta}_0} \sum_{m=1}^2 [\hat{\rho}_0(\hat{u}_R^m \hat{D}_m w \hat{D}_3 \hat{\theta}_1 + \hat{u}_R^m \hat{D}_m w \hat{D}_3 \hat{\theta}_0) + \hat{\rho}_1 \hat{u}_R^m \hat{D}_m w \hat{D}_3 \hat{\theta}_0 + \hat{\rho}_R \hat{u}_1^m \hat{D}_m w \hat{D}_3 \hat{\theta}_0]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.35)$$

Here in (4.34), we slightly abuse the notations  $\hat{F}, \hat{G}$  and  $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_1, \hat{\mathfrak{A}}_2, \hat{\mathfrak{A}}_3$  to represent the corresponding forms of  $\tilde{F}, \tilde{G}$  and  $\mathfrak{A}_1, \mathfrak{A}_2, \mathfrak{A}_3$  in  $z$ -coordinate respectively. By (4.17), it is easy to check that

$$\|\hat{W}_2\|_{L^2} + \|\hat{W}_3\|_{L^2} \leq C(\mathcal{I}_1)\sigma \|\rho_R\|_{H^1} + C\sigma \|(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2}, \quad \|\hat{W}_1\|_{H^1} \leq C(\mathcal{I}_1)\sigma \|\rho_R\|_{H^2}, \quad (4.36)$$

$$\|\hat{W}_2\|_{H^1} + \|\hat{W}_3\|_{H^1} \leq C(\mathcal{I}_1)\sigma \|\rho_R\|_{H^2} + C\sigma \|(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^3}, \quad \|\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_1\|_{H^2} \leq C\|\mathfrak{A}_1\|_{H^2}, \quad (4.37)$$

$$\|(\hat{F}, \hat{G})\|_{H^1} \leq C\|(\tilde{F}, \tilde{G})\|_{H^1} \leq C(\mathcal{I}_1)\|(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2}, \quad \|(\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_2, \hat{\mathfrak{A}}_3)\|_{H^1} \leq C\|(\mathfrak{A}_2, \mathfrak{A}_3)\|_{H^1}, \quad (4.38)$$

where we have used the fact that  $\|\hat{f}(z)\|_{H_z^k} \lesssim \|f(x)\|_{H_x^k}$  for  $k = 1, 2, 3$  in the above inequalities. Hereafter, all the norms  $\|f\|_{H^k}$  means a local norm  $\|f\|_{H^k(Q)}$  for simplicity of notations.

**Step 1. Estimates of tangential derivatives.** Let  $\chi_1 \in C_0^\infty(\hat{Q})$  with  $\frac{1}{2}\hat{Q} \subset \text{supp } \chi_1 \subset \hat{Q}$  with

$$\chi_1(z) \equiv 1 \quad \text{for } z \in \frac{1}{2}\hat{Q} \quad \text{and} \quad \chi_1(z) \equiv 0 \quad \text{for } z \in \overline{\hat{Q}}^c.$$

It is worth mentioning that  $\nabla_z \chi_1 \lesssim \frac{1}{\sigma}$ . Similar to (4.20), we apply  $\hat{D}_j$  ( $j = 1, 2$ ) to (4.34) to get

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} & \hat{D}_j \text{div}_z [\hat{\rho}_R(\hat{u}_1 + \varepsilon(\hat{u}_2 + \hat{u}_R))] = -\frac{\hat{D}_j \text{div}(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R)}{\varepsilon} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{m=1}^2 \hat{D}_j(\hat{D}_m w \hat{D}_3(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R^m)) + \hat{D}_j \hat{W}_1 + \hat{D}_j \mathfrak{A}_1, \\ & -\mu \Delta_z \hat{D}_j \hat{u}_R^k - \zeta \hat{D}_{jk}^2 \text{div}_z u_R = -\frac{\hat{D}_{jk}^2(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R)}{\varepsilon} - \hat{D}_j [\hat{\rho}_0(\hat{u}_1 \cdot \nabla_z \hat{u}_R^k + \hat{u}_R \cdot \nabla_z u_1^k)] \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \hat{D}_j(\hat{D}_1 w \hat{D}_3(\hat{\rho} \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R), \hat{D}_2 w \hat{D}_3(\hat{\rho} \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R), 0)^k \\ & \quad - \hat{D}_{jk}^2(\hat{\rho}_R \hat{\theta}_1 + \hat{\rho}_1 \hat{\theta}_R) - \hat{D}_j \hat{F}^{\varepsilon, k} - \hat{D}_j \hat{\mathfrak{A}}_2^k - \hat{D}_j \hat{W}_2^k \quad k = 1, 2, 3, \\ & -\frac{\kappa}{\hat{\theta}_0} \Delta_z \hat{D}_j \hat{\theta}_R = -\frac{\hat{D}_j \text{div}_z(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R)}{\varepsilon} - \frac{\kappa}{\hat{\theta}_0^2} \hat{D}_j \hat{\theta}_0 \Delta_z \hat{\theta}_R - P_1 \hat{D}_j(\hat{\theta}_0^{-1} \text{div}_z \hat{u}_R) \\ & \quad - \hat{D}_j[\hat{\theta}_0^{-1}(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\rho}_R \hat{\theta}_0) \text{div}_z \hat{u}_1] + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{m=1}^2 \hat{D}_j(\hat{D}_m w \hat{D}_3(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R^m)) \\ & \quad - \hat{D}_j\{\hat{\theta}_0^{-1}[\hat{\rho}_0(\hat{u}_R \cdot \nabla_z \hat{\theta}_1 + \hat{u}_1 \cdot \nabla_z \hat{\theta}_R) + \hat{\rho}_1 \hat{u}_R \cdot \nabla_z \hat{\theta}_0 + \hat{\rho}_R \hat{u}_1 \cdot \nabla_z \hat{\theta}_0]\} \\ & \quad - \hat{D}_j \hat{W}_3 - \hat{D}_j(\hat{\theta}_0^{-1} \hat{G}) - \hat{D}_j \hat{\mathfrak{A}}_3. \end{aligned} \right. \quad (4.39)$$

We have following estimates on the tangential derivatives.

**Lemma 4.5** (Estimates of tangential derivatives). *For any  $\tau > 0$ , there exist two positive constants  $C_\sigma$ , which depends on  $\sigma$ , and  $C_{\tau, \sigma}$ , which depends only on  $\tau$  and  $\sigma$ , both independent of  $\varepsilon$ , such that for any  $j, l = 1, 2$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu \|\chi_1 \sqrt{\hat{\rho}_0} \nabla_z \hat{D}_j \hat{u}_R\|_{L^2}^2 + \zeta \|\chi_1 \sqrt{\hat{\rho}_0} \hat{D}_j \text{div}_z \hat{u}_R\|_{L^2}^2 + \kappa \|\chi_1 \sqrt{\frac{\hat{\rho}_0}{\hat{\theta}_0}} \nabla_z \hat{D}_j \hat{\theta}_R\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \leq \tau \left\| \frac{\nabla(\rho_0 \theta_R + \rho_R \theta_0)}{\varepsilon} \right\|_{L^2}^2 + (C(\mathcal{I}_1) + C\sigma^2) \|(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2}^2 + C_{\tau, \sigma} \|u_R\|_{H^1}^2 + C_\sigma \|\theta_R\|_{H^1}^2 \\ & \quad + C(\mathcal{I}_1) \|\rho_R\|_{H^2}^2 + C[\|(\mathfrak{A}_2, \mathfrak{A}_3)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\rho_R\|_{H^1} \|\mathfrak{A}_1\|_{H^1}], \end{aligned} \quad (4.40)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \varepsilon^2 \mu \|\chi_1 \sqrt{\hat{\rho}_0} \nabla_z \hat{D}_{jl}^2 \hat{u}_R\|_{L^2}^2 + \varepsilon^2 \zeta \|\chi_1 \sqrt{\hat{\rho}_0} \hat{D}_{jl}^2 \text{div}_z \hat{u}_R\|_{L^2}^2 + \varepsilon^2 \kappa \|\chi_1 \sqrt{\frac{\hat{\rho}_0}{\hat{\theta}_0}} \nabla_z \hat{D}_{jl}^2 \hat{\theta}_R\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \leq [C(\mathcal{I}_1) C_\sigma \varepsilon^2 + \tau] \|\rho_R\|_{H^2}^2 + C_{\tau, \sigma} \varepsilon^2 \|u_R\|_{H^2}^2 + C_\sigma \|\theta_R\|_{H^2}^2 \\ & \quad + C\varepsilon^2 [\|(\mathfrak{A}_2, \mathfrak{A}_3)\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\rho_R\|_{H^2} \|\mathfrak{A}_1\|_{H^2}] + C\sigma^2 \varepsilon^2 \|(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^3}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (4.41)$$

where  $C > 0$  is independent of  $\tau, \sigma$  and  $\varepsilon$ .

**Proof.** We first consider the estimate (4.40). We shall multiply (4.39)<sub>1</sub>, (4.39)<sub>2</sub> and (4.39)<sub>3</sub> by  $\chi_1^2 \hat{D}_j(\hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R)$ ,  $\chi_1^2 \hat{D}_j(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R^k)$  and  $\chi_1^2 \hat{D}_j(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R)$  respectively, and add the resultant equations together. Almost all terms can be estimated similarly as in the proof of Lemma 4.3, but we would like to

point out that the terms involving  $\nabla_z \chi_1$  arising from the process of integrating by parts will lead to  $C_\sigma \|(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^1}^2$ . Here, we only need to focus on the estimates of new terms, that is, the terms caused by boundary function  $w$ . First, we integrate by parts to see that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\hat{\Omega} \cap \hat{Q}} \chi_1^2 \sum_{m=1}^2 \left[ \hat{D}_j (\hat{D}_m w \hat{D}_3 (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R^m)) \hat{D}_j (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) + \hat{D}_m w \hat{D}_{3j}^2 (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) \hat{D}_j (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R^m) \right] dz \\
& + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\hat{\Omega} \cap \hat{Q}} \chi_1^2 \sum_{m=1}^2 \hat{D}_{jm}^2 w \hat{D}_3 (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) \hat{D}_j (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R^m) dz \\
& = -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\hat{\Omega} \cap \hat{Q}} 2\chi_1 \hat{D}_3 \chi_1 \sum_{m=1}^2 \left[ \hat{D}_m w \hat{D}_j (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) \hat{D}_j (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R^m) \right] dz \\
& + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \sum_{m=1}^2 \hat{D}_{jm}^2 w \left[ \hat{D}_3 (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R^m) \hat{D}_j (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) + \hat{D}_3 (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) \hat{D}_j (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R^m) \right] dz \\
& \leq \tau \left\| \frac{\nabla(\rho_0 \theta_R + \theta_0 \rho_R)}{\varepsilon} \right\|_{L^2} + C_{\tau, \sigma} \|u_R\|_{H^1}^2
\end{aligned} \tag{4.42}$$

for any  $\tau > 0$ , where we have used the vanishing of  $\hat{D}_j (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R)$  on  $\partial \hat{\Omega} \cap \hat{Q}$  for  $j = 1, 2$ . Similarly, by integrating by parts and using (4.36), one has

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\hat{\Omega} \cap \hat{Q}} \chi_1^2 \left[ \sum_{k=1}^2 \hat{D}_j \hat{W}_2^k \hat{D}_j (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R^k) + \hat{D}_j \hat{W}_3 \hat{D}_j (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R) \right] dz \\
& \leq \frac{\mu}{16} \|\chi_1 \sqrt{\hat{\rho}_0} \nabla_z \hat{D}_j \hat{u}_R\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\kappa}{16} \|\chi_1 \sqrt{\frac{\hat{\rho}_0}{\hat{\theta}_0}} \nabla_z \hat{D}_j \hat{\theta}_R\|_{L^2}^2 + C_\sigma \|(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^1}^2 + C \|(\hat{W}_2, \hat{W}_3)\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& \leq \frac{\mu}{16} \|\chi_1 \sqrt{\hat{\rho}_0} \nabla_z \hat{D}_j \hat{u}_R\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\kappa}{16} \|\chi_1 \sqrt{\frac{\hat{\rho}_0}{\hat{\theta}_0}} \nabla_z \hat{D}_j \hat{\theta}_R\|_{L^2}^2 + C_\sigma \|(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^1}^2 \\
& + C(\mathcal{I}_1) \sigma^2 \|\rho_R\|_{H^1}^2 + C\sigma^2 \|(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2}^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.43}$$

For the term involving  $\hat{W}_1$ , similar to (4.25), we have from (4.36) that

$$\int_{\hat{\Omega} \cap \hat{Q}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_j \hat{W}_1 \hat{D}_j (\hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) dz \leq C \|\hat{W}_1\|_{H^1} \|\rho_R\|_{H^1} \leq C(\mathcal{I}_1) \sigma \|\rho_R\|_{H^2}^2. \tag{4.44}$$

Combining (4.42)–(4.44) and applying similar arguments as in Lemma 4.3, we deduce (4.40).

Next, we consider the estimate (4.41). Similar to (4.28), we apply  $\hat{D}_{jl}^2$  to (4.34), and then multiply the first, second and third equation of the resultant system by  $\varepsilon^2 \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{jl}^2 (\theta_0 \rho_R)$ ,  $\varepsilon^2 \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{jl}^2 (\rho_0 u_R^k)$  and  $\varepsilon^2 \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{jl}^2 (\rho_0 \theta_R)$  respectively. Most of the calculations of (4.41) are very similar to (4.42)–(4.43) and the proof of Lemma 4.4 except the following term:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{jl}^2 (\hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) \hat{D}_{jl}^2 \left[ \operatorname{div}_z [\hat{\rho}_R (\hat{u}_1 + \varepsilon (\hat{u}_2 + \hat{u}_R))] - \hat{W}_1 \right] dz \\
& = \varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{jl}^2 (\hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) \hat{D}_{jl}^2 \operatorname{div}_z [\hat{\rho}_R (\hat{u}_1 + \varepsilon (\hat{u}_2 + \hat{u}_R))] \\
& - \sum_{m=1}^2 \varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{jl}^2 (\hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) \hat{D}_{jl}^2 [\hat{D}_m w (\hat{D}_3 (\hat{\rho}_R (\hat{u}_1^m + \varepsilon \hat{u}_2^m + \varepsilon \hat{u}_R^m)))] dz.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.45}$$

For terms involving with  $\hat{u}_2$  and  $\hat{u}_R$ , applying the similar integrating by parts arguments in (4.32), they can be controlled by  $C(\mathcal{I}_1) C_\sigma \varepsilon^2 \|\rho_R\|_{H^2}^2$  due to  $(\hat{u}_2, \hat{u}_R)|_{z_3=0} = (0, 0)$ .

For terms involving  $\hat{u}_1$  in (4.45), since we only have  $u_1 \cdot \vec{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$  in  $x$ -coordinate, we should be very careful when integrating by parts to remove the terms involving the third order derivative of  $\hat{\rho}_R$  in  $z$ -coordinate, that is, the following term

$$\int_{\hat{Q}_{\Omega\hat{\Omega}}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{jl}^2(\hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) [\hat{u}_1 \cdot \nabla_z(\hat{D}_{jl}^2 \hat{\rho}_R) - \sum_{m=1}^2 \hat{D}_m w \hat{u}_1^m \hat{D}_3(\hat{D}_{jl}^2 \hat{\rho}_R)] dz. \quad (4.46)$$

Noting that  $\vec{n} = \frac{(-\partial_{x_1} w, -\partial_{x_2} w, 1)}{1+(\partial_{x_1} w)^2+(\partial_{x_2} w)^2}$  and  $u_1 \cdot \vec{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$  in  $x$ -coordinate, one has  $-\hat{D}_1 w \hat{u}_1^1 - \hat{D}_2 w \hat{u}_1^2 + \hat{u}_1^3 = 0$  on  $z_3 = 0$ . It is clear that  $\int_{\hat{Q}_{\Omega\hat{\Omega}}} \hat{D}_m(\chi_1^2 \cdots) dz = 0$  for  $m = 1, 2$  due to  $\text{supp } \chi_1 \subset \hat{Q}$ . Now we integrate by parts to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{Q}_{\Omega\hat{\Omega}}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{jl}^2(\hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) [\hat{u}_1 \cdot \nabla_z(\hat{D}_{jl}^2 \hat{\rho}_R) - \sum_{m=1}^2 \hat{D}_m w \hat{u}_1^m \hat{D}_3(\hat{D}_{jl}^2 \hat{\rho}_R)] dz \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{Q}_{\Omega\hat{\Omega}}} \chi_1^2 \hat{\theta}_0 [\hat{u}_1 \cdot \nabla_z(\hat{D}_{jl}^2 \hat{\rho}_R)^2 - \sum_{m=1}^2 \hat{D}_m w \hat{u}_1^m \hat{D}_3(\hat{D}_{jl}^2 \hat{\rho}_R)^2] dz \\ &+ \varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{Q}_{\Omega\hat{\Omega}}} \chi_1^2 [\hat{u}_1 \cdot \nabla_z(\hat{D}_{jl}^2 \hat{\rho}_R) - \sum_{m=1}^2 \hat{D}_m w \hat{u}_1^m \hat{D}_3(\hat{D}_{jl}^2 \hat{\rho}_R)] (\hat{D}_{jl}^2(\hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) - \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{D}_{jl}^2 \hat{\rho}_R) dz \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{Q}_{\Omega\partial\hat{\Omega}}} \chi_1^2 \hat{\theta}_0 (\hat{D}_{jl}^2 \hat{\rho}_R)^2 [\hat{u}_1^3 - \sum_{m=1}^2 \hat{D}_m w \hat{u}_1^m] dz \\ &- \varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{Q}_{\Omega\partial\hat{\Omega}}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{jl}^2(\hat{\rho}_R) [\hat{u}_1^3 - \sum_{m=1}^2 \hat{D}_m w \hat{u}_1^m] (\hat{D}_{jl}^2(\hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) - \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{D}_{jl}^2 \hat{\rho}_R) dz \\ &- \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{Q}_{\Omega\hat{\Omega}}} (\hat{D}_{jl}^2 \hat{\rho}_R)^2 \text{div}_z [\chi_1^2 \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{u}_1] dz + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^2 \int_{\hat{Q}_{\Omega\hat{\Omega}}} (\hat{D}_{jl}^2 \hat{\rho}_R)^2 \hat{D}_3 [\chi_1^2 \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{D}_m w \hat{u}_1^m] dz \\ &- \varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{Q}_{\Omega\hat{\Omega}}} \hat{D}_{jl}^2 \hat{\rho}_R \text{div}_z [\chi_1^2 \hat{u}_1 (\hat{D}_{jl}^2(\hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) - \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{D}_{jl}^2 \hat{\rho}_R)] dz \\ &- \sum_{m=1}^2 \varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{Q}_{\Omega\hat{\Omega}}} \hat{D}_{jl}^2 \hat{\rho}_R \hat{D}_3 [\chi_1^2 \hat{D}_m w \hat{u}_1^m (\hat{D}_{jl}^2(\hat{\rho}_R) - \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{D}_{jl}^2 \hat{\rho}_R)] dz \\ &\leq C_\sigma \varepsilon^2 \|\rho_R\|_{H^2}^2 \|u_1\|_{H^3} \leq C(\mathcal{I}_1) C_\sigma \varepsilon^2 \|\rho_R\|_{H^2}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.47)$$

Therefore the proof of Lemma 4.5 is complete.  $\square$

**Step 2. Estimates of  $\varepsilon \|\hat{D}_3 \text{div}_z \hat{u}_R\|_{L^2}^2$ .** Since  $\partial_{z_3} \hat{u}_R|_{z_3=0}$  and  $\partial_{z_3} \hat{\theta}_R|_{z_3=0}$  are unknown, we cannot apply the standard energy method directly to obtain higher order normal derivatives. Motivated by [6, 7, 17], in order to get  $\hat{D}_3 \text{div } u_R$ , we have from (4.34)<sub>2</sub>  $\cdot \hat{e}_3$  that

$$\begin{aligned} & -(\mu + \zeta) \hat{D}_3(\text{div}_z \hat{u}_R) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \hat{D}_3(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\rho}_R \hat{\theta}_0) \\ &= -\hat{\rho}_0 (\hat{u}_1 \cdot \nabla_z \hat{u}_R + \hat{u}_R \cdot \nabla_z \hat{u}_1) \cdot \hat{e}_3 - \hat{D}_3(\hat{\rho}_R \hat{\theta}_1 + \hat{\rho}_1 \hat{\theta}_R) + \mu (\Delta_z \hat{u}_R - \nabla_z \text{div}_z \hat{u}_R) \cdot \hat{e}_3 \\ &- \hat{W}_2^3 - \hat{F}^{\varepsilon,3}(\hat{\rho}_R, \hat{u}_R, \hat{\theta}_R) - \hat{\mathfrak{X}}_2^3, \end{aligned} \quad (4.48)$$

where  $\hat{e}_3 = (0, 0, 1)^t$ . It is worth pointing out that

$$\mu (\Delta_z \hat{u}_R - \nabla_z \text{div}_z \hat{u}_R) \cdot \hat{e}_3 = \mu [\hat{D}_1^2 \hat{u}_R^3 + \hat{D}_2^2 \hat{u}_R^3 - \hat{D}_{13}^2 \hat{u}_R^1 - \hat{D}_{23}^2 \hat{u}_R^2], \quad (4.49)$$

where  $\hat{D}_{33}^2 \hat{u}_R^3$  is canceled.

**Lemma 4.6.** *For any  $\tau > 0$ , there exist two positive constants  $C_\sigma$ , which depends on  $\sigma$ , and  $C_{\tau,\sigma}$ , which depends on  $\tau$  and  $\sigma$ , both independent of  $\varepsilon$ , such that*

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mu + \zeta) \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{\rho}_0 |\hat{D}_3 \operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_R|^2 dz + \kappa \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \frac{\hat{\rho}_0}{\hat{\theta}_0} |\hat{D}_{33}^2 \hat{\theta}_R|^2 dz \\ & \leq (\tau + \sigma) \left\| \frac{\nabla(\rho_0 \theta_R + \theta_0 \rho_R)}{\varepsilon} \right\|_{L^2}^2 + (C(\mathcal{I}_1) + C\sigma) \|(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2}^2 + C \sum_{i=1}^2 \|\nabla_z \hat{D}_i(\hat{u}_R, \hat{\theta}_R)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \quad + C(\mathcal{I}_1) \|\rho_R\|_{H^2}^2 + C \|\mathfrak{R}_1\|_{H^1} \|(\rho_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2} + C \|\mathfrak{R}_2, \mathfrak{R}_3\|_{L^2}^2 + C_{\tau,\sigma} \|u_R\|_{H^1}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (4.50)$$

where  $C > 0$  is independent of  $\tau$ ,  $\sigma$  and  $\varepsilon$ .

**Proof.** We multiply (4.48) by  $-\chi_1^2 \hat{D}_3 \operatorname{div}_z(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R)$  to get

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mu + \zeta) \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \hat{\rho}_0 \chi_1^2 |\hat{D}_3 \operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_R|^2 dz - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{Q}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_3 (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\rho}_R \hat{\theta}_0) \hat{D}_3 \operatorname{div}_z(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) dz \\ & = -(\mu + \zeta) \int_{\hat{\Omega} \cap \hat{Q}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_3 (\hat{u}_R \cdot \nabla \hat{\rho}_0) \hat{D}_3 \operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_R dz - (\mu + \zeta) \int_{\hat{\Omega} \cap \hat{Q}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_3 \operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_R (\hat{D}_3 \hat{\rho}_0) \operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_R dz \\ & \quad + \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_3 \operatorname{div}_z(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) [\hat{\rho}_0 (\hat{u}_R \cdot \hat{u}_1 \cdot \nabla_z \hat{u}_R + \hat{u}_R \cdot \nabla \hat{u}_1) \cdot \hat{e}_3] dz \\ & \quad + \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_3 \operatorname{div}(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) \hat{D}_3 [\hat{\rho}_R \hat{\theta}_1 + \hat{\rho}_1 \hat{\theta}_R] dz + \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_3 \operatorname{div}(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) [\hat{W}_2^3 + \hat{F}^{\varepsilon,3} + \mathfrak{R}_2^3] dz \\ & \quad - \mu \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_3 \operatorname{div}(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) [(\Delta_z \hat{u}_R - \nabla_z \operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_R) \cdot \hat{e}_3] dz =: \sum_{m=1}^6 I_m. \end{aligned} \quad (4.51)$$

For  $I_m (m = 1, 2, \dots, 5)$ , using the Hölder inequality, one has that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m=1}^5 |I_m| & \leq \frac{\mu + \zeta}{4} \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \hat{\rho}_0 \chi_1^2 |\hat{D}_3 \operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_R|^2 dz + C(\mathcal{I}_0) \|(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^1}^2 \\ & \quad + C(\|\hat{W}_2^3\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\hat{F}^{\varepsilon,3}\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|\mathfrak{R}_2^3\|_{L^2}^2) \\ & \leq \frac{\mu + \zeta}{4} \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \hat{\rho}_0 \chi_1^2 |\hat{D}_3 \operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_R|^2 dz + C(\mathcal{I}_1) \|(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2}^2 \\ & \quad + C\sigma^2 \|(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2}^2 + C\|\mathfrak{R}_2\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (4.52)$$

where we have used (4.36)–(4.38) and (4.38) in the last inequality. For  $I_6$ , noting (4.49), we have

$$|I_6| \leq \frac{\mu + \zeta}{4} \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \hat{\rho}_0 \chi_1^2 |\hat{D}_3 \operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_R|^2 dz + C(\mathcal{I}_0) \|u_R\|_{H^1}^2 + C \sum_{i=1}^2 \|\nabla_z \hat{D}_i \hat{u}_R\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (4.53)$$

Substituting (4.52)–(4.53) into (4.51) to get

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mu + \zeta) \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \hat{\rho}_0 \chi_1^2 |\hat{D}_3 \operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_R|^2 dz - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{Q}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_3 (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\rho}_R \hat{\theta}_0) \hat{D}_3 \operatorname{div}_z(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) dz \\ & \leq C \sum_{i=1}^2 \|\nabla_z \hat{D}_i \hat{u}_R\|_{L^2}^2 + C(\mathcal{I}_1) \|(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2}^2 + C\sigma^2 \|(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2}^2 + C\|\mathfrak{R}_2\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.54)$$

To cope with the singular term on the left hand side (LHS) of (4.54), we multiply (4.34)<sub>1</sub> and (4.34)<sub>3</sub> by  $-\chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{33}^2(\hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R)$  and  $\chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{33}^2(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R)$  respectively to get

$$\kappa \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \frac{\hat{\rho}_0}{\hat{\theta}_0} |\hat{D}_{33}^2 \hat{\theta}_R|^2 dz - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \operatorname{div}_z(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) \hat{D}_{33}^2(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) dz$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{\kappa}{16} \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \frac{\hat{\rho}_0}{\hat{\theta}_0} |\hat{D}_{33}^2 \hat{\theta}_R|^2 dz + C \|\theta_R\|_{H^1}^2 - \kappa \sum_{i=1}^2 \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \frac{\hat{D}_{ii}^2 \hat{\theta}_R}{\hat{\theta}_0} \hat{D}_{33}^2 (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R) dx \\
&\quad + \frac{P_1}{\hat{\theta}_0} \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_R \hat{D}_{33}^2 (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R) dz - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{m=1}^2 \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_m w \hat{D}_3 (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R^m) \hat{D}_{33}^2 (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) dz \\
&\quad + \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \frac{\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\rho}_R \hat{\theta}_0}{\hat{\theta}_0} \operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_1 \hat{D}_{33}^2 (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R) dz + \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{33}^2 (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R) [\hat{\mathfrak{R}}_3 + \hat{W}_3 + \frac{1}{\hat{\theta}_0} \hat{G}^\varepsilon] dz \\
&\quad + \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{33}^2 (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R) \frac{1}{\hat{\theta}_0} [\hat{\rho}_0 (\hat{u}_R \cdot \nabla_z \hat{\theta}_1 + \hat{u}_1 \cdot \nabla_z \hat{\theta}_R) + \hat{\rho}_1 \hat{u}_R \cdot \nabla_z \hat{\theta}_0 + \hat{\rho}_R \hat{u}_1 \cdot \nabla_z \hat{\theta}_0] dz \\
&\quad + \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{33}^2 (\hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) \operatorname{div}_z [\hat{\rho}_R (\hat{u}_1 + \varepsilon (\hat{u}_2 + \hat{u}_R))] dz \\
&\quad + \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{33}^2 (\hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) (\hat{W}_1 + \hat{\mathfrak{R}}_1) dz =: \sum_{m=1}^{10} J_m. \tag{4.55}
\end{aligned}$$

For the second term on the LHS of (4.55), we integrate by parts to see

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \operatorname{div}_z (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) \hat{D}_{33}^2 (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) dz - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_3 \operatorname{div}_z (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) \hat{D}_3 (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) dz \\
&= \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \operatorname{div}_z (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) \hat{D}_3 (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) dz_1 dz_2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1 \hat{D}_3 \chi_1 \operatorname{div}_z (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) \hat{D}_3 (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) dz. \tag{4.56}
\end{aligned}$$

For the first term on the RHS of (4.56), we use (4.34)<sub>1</sub> to see that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \operatorname{div}_z (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) \hat{D}_3 (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) dz_1 dz_2 \\
&= \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{m=1}^2 \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_m w \hat{D}_3 (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R^m) \hat{D}_3 (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) dz_1 dz_2 \\
&\quad - \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \operatorname{div}_z [\hat{\rho}_R (\hat{u}_1 + \varepsilon (\hat{u}_2 + \hat{u}_R))] \hat{D}_3 (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) dz_1 dz_2 \\
&\quad - \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 (\hat{W}_1 + \hat{\mathfrak{R}}_1) \hat{D}_3 (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) dz_1 dz_2. \tag{4.57}
\end{aligned}$$

Using trace inequality, we can bound the last two terms on the RHS of (4.57) are bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned}
&C (\|\hat{\rho}_R\|_{H^2} + \|\hat{\theta}_R\|_{H^2}) \left[ \|\hat{\rho}_R (u_1 + \varepsilon (u_2 + \hat{u}_R))\|_{H^2} + \|\hat{W}_1\|_{H^1} + \|\hat{\mathfrak{R}}_1\|_{H^1} \right] \\
&\leq C(\mathcal{I}_1) (\|\rho_R\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\theta_R\|_{H^2}^2) + C \|(\rho_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2} \|\mathfrak{R}_1\|_{H^1}. \tag{4.58}
\end{aligned}$$

For the second term on the RHS of (4.56), by the Hölder inequality, for any  $\tau > 0$ , one has

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1 \hat{D}_3 \chi_1 \operatorname{div}_z (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) \hat{D}_3 (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) dz \leq \tau \left\| \frac{\nabla (\rho_0 \theta_R + \theta_0 \rho_R)}{\varepsilon} \right\|_{L^2}^2 + C_{\tau, \sigma} \|u_R\|_{H^1}^2. \tag{4.59}$$

Combining (4.56)–(4.59), one has

$$-\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \operatorname{div}_z (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) \hat{D}_{33}^2 (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) dz - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_3 \operatorname{div}_z (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) \hat{D}_3 (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) dz$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \tau \left\| \frac{\nabla(\rho_0 \theta_R + \theta_0 \rho_R)}{\varepsilon} \right\|_{L^2}^2 + C_{\tau, \sigma} \|u_R\|_{H^1}^2 + C(\mathcal{I}_1) \|(\rho_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2}^2 + C \|(\rho_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2} \|\mathfrak{R}_1\|_{H^1} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{m=1}^2 \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \partial \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_m w \hat{D}_3(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R^m) \hat{D}_3(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) dz_1 dz_2.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.60}$$

For  $J_3$  in (4.55), a direct calculation shows that

$$|J_3| \leq \frac{\kappa}{16} \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \frac{\hat{\rho}_0}{\hat{\theta}_0} |\hat{D}_{33}^2 \hat{\theta}_R|^2 dz + C \sum_{i=1}^2 \|\nabla_z \hat{D}_i \hat{\theta}_R\|_{L^2}^2. \tag{4.61}$$

For  $J_4$  and  $J_6$ , by using the Hölder inequality, one has

$$|J_4| + |J_6| \leq \frac{\kappa}{16} \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \frac{\hat{\rho}_0}{\hat{\theta}_0} |\hat{D}_{33}^2 \hat{\theta}_R|^2 dz + C \|(\rho_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^1}^2 + C \|\rho_R\|_{L^2}^2 \|u_1\|_{H^3}^2. \tag{4.62}$$

For  $J_5$ , we integrate by parts to get

$$\begin{aligned}
J_5 &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{m=1}^2 \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \partial \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_m w \hat{D}_3(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R^m) \hat{D}_3(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) dz_1 dz_2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{m=1}^2 \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} 2\chi_1 \hat{D}_3 \chi_1 \hat{D}_m w \hat{D}_3(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R^m) \hat{D}_3(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) dz \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{m=1}^2 \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_m w \hat{D}_{33}^2(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R^m) \hat{D}_3(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) dz,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.63}$$

which, together with the Hölder inequality and (4.60), implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
&-J_5 - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \operatorname{div}_z(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) \hat{D}_{33}^2(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) dz - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_3 \operatorname{div}_z(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) \hat{D}_3(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) dz \\
&\leq (\tau + \sigma) \left\| \frac{\nabla(\rho_0 \theta_R + \theta_0 \rho_R)}{\varepsilon} \right\|_{L^2}^2 + C\sigma \sum_{m=1}^2 \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{\rho}_0 |\hat{D}_{33}^2 \hat{u}_R^m|^2 dz + C_{\tau, \sigma} \|u_R\|_{H^1}^2 \\
&\quad + C(\mathcal{I}_1) \|(\rho_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2}^2 + C \|(\rho_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2} \|\mathfrak{R}_1\|_{H^1} \\
&\leq (\sigma + \tau) \left\| \frac{\nabla(\rho_0 \theta_R + \theta_0 \rho_R)}{\varepsilon} \right\|_{L^2}^2 + C\sigma \|u_R\|_{H^2}^2 + C_{\tau, \sigma} \|u_R\|_{H^1}^2 + C(\mathcal{I}_1) \|(\rho_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2}^2 \\
&\quad + C \|(\rho_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2} \|\mathfrak{R}_1\|_{H^1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.64}$$

For  $J_7$ , we get directly from the Hölder inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}
|J_7| &\leq \frac{\kappa}{16} \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \frac{\hat{\rho}_0}{\hat{\theta}_0} |\hat{D}_{33}^2 \hat{\theta}_R|^2 dz + C \|\theta_R\|_{H^1}^2 + C [\|\hat{\mathfrak{R}}_3\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\hat{G}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\hat{W}_3\|_{L^2}^2] \\
&\leq \frac{\kappa}{16} \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \frac{\hat{\rho}_0}{\hat{\theta}_0} |\hat{D}_{33}^2 \hat{\theta}_R|^2 dz + C(\mathcal{I}_1) \|(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2}^2 + C\sigma^2 \|(\rho_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2}^2 \\
&\quad + C(\mathcal{I}_0) \|\theta_R\|_{H^1}^2 + C \|\mathfrak{R}_3\|_{L^2}^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.65}$$

where we have used (4.36)–(4.38) in the last inequality.

For  $J_8$ , it follows from the Hölder inequality that

$$|J_8| \leq \frac{\kappa}{16} \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \frac{\hat{\rho}_0}{\hat{\theta}_0} |\hat{D}_{33}^2 \hat{\theta}_R|^2 dz + C(\mathcal{I}_0) \|(\rho_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^1}^2 + C \|\rho_R\|_{L^2}^2 \|u_1\|_{H^3}^2. \tag{4.66}$$

For  $J_9$  and  $J_{10}$ , one has from the Sobolev embedding and Hölder inequality that

$$|J_9| + |J_{10}| \leq C(\mathcal{I}_1) \|\rho_R\|_{H^2}^2 + C \|\mathfrak{R}_1\|_{L^2} \|\rho_R\|_{H^2}. \tag{4.67}$$

Combining (4.51)–(4.67), we obtain (4.50). Therefore the proof of Lemma 4.6 is complete.  $\square$

**Step 3. Estimates of  $\varepsilon \|\hat{D}_{j3}^2(\operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_R)\|_{L^2}$  ( $j = 1, 2$ ).**

**Lemma 4.7.** *There exists a positive constant  $C_\sigma$ , which depends on  $\sigma$  but is independent of  $\varepsilon$ , such that*

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mu + \zeta)\varepsilon^2 \sum_{j=1}^2 \int_{\hat{\Omega} \cap \hat{Q}} \chi_1^2 \hat{\rho}_0 |\hat{D}_{j3}^2(\operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_R)|^2 dz + \kappa\varepsilon^2 \sum_{j=1}^2 \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \frac{\hat{\rho}_0}{\hat{\theta}_0} |\hat{D}_{j33}^3 \hat{\theta}_R|^2 dz \\ & \leq C [\|(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2}^2 + \varepsilon^2 \|(\mathfrak{R}_2, \mathfrak{R}_3)\|_{H^1}^2] + C\varepsilon^2 \sum_{j,m=1}^2 (\|\nabla_z \hat{D}_{jm}^2 \hat{u}_R\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\hat{D}_{jmm}^3 \hat{\theta}_R\|_{L^2}^2) \\ & \quad + [C(\mathcal{I}_1)C_\sigma\varepsilon^2 + C\sigma] \|\rho_R\|_{H^2}^2 + C\sigma^2\varepsilon^2 \|(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^3}^2 + C\varepsilon^2 \|\rho_R\|_{H^2} \|\mathfrak{R}_1\|_{H^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.68)$$

where  $C > 0$  is independent of  $\sigma$  and  $\varepsilon$ .

**Proof.** We apply  $\hat{D}_j$  ( $j = 1, 2$ ) to (4.48) and multiply the resultant equation by  $-\varepsilon^2 \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{j3}^2 \operatorname{div}_z(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R)$  to get

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mu + \zeta)\varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{\Omega} \cap \hat{Q}} \hat{\rho}_0 \chi_1^2 |\hat{D}_{j3}^2(\operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_R)|^2 dz \\ & = \varepsilon \int_{\hat{\Omega} \cap \hat{Q}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{j3}^2(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R) \hat{D}_{j3}^2 \operatorname{div}_z(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) dz + \varepsilon \int_{\hat{\Omega} \cap \hat{Q}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{j3}^2(\hat{\rho}_R \hat{\theta}_0) \hat{D}_{j3}^2 \operatorname{div}_z(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) dz \\ & \quad - (\mu + \zeta)\varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{\Omega} \cap \hat{Q}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{j3}^2(\operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_R) [\hat{D}_{j3}^2 \operatorname{div}_z(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) - \hat{\rho}_0 \hat{D}_{j3}^2 \operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_R] dz \\ & \quad + \varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{j3}^2(\hat{\rho}_R \hat{\theta}_1 + \hat{\rho}_1 \hat{\theta}_R) \hat{D}_{j3}^2 \operatorname{div}_z(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) dz \\ & \quad - \mu\varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_j [(\Delta_z \hat{u}_R - \nabla_z \operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_R) \cdot \hat{e}_3] \hat{D}_{j3}^2 \operatorname{div}_z(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) dz \\ & \quad + \varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{\Omega} \cap \hat{Q}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_j [\hat{\rho}_0(\hat{u}_1 \cdot \nabla_z \hat{u}_R + \hat{u}_R \cdot \nabla_z \hat{u}_1) \cdot \hat{e}_3] \hat{D}_{j3}^2(\operatorname{div}_z(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R)) dz \\ & \quad + \varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_j (\hat{W}_2^3 + \hat{F}^{\varepsilon,3} + \hat{\mathfrak{R}}_2^3) \hat{D}_{j3}^2 \operatorname{div}_z(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) dz =: \sum_{m=1}^7 J_m. \end{aligned} \quad (4.69)$$

It is clear that

$$|J_1| \leq \frac{(\mu + \zeta)\varepsilon^2}{16} \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{\rho}_0 |\hat{D}_{j3}^2 \operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_R|^2 dz + C\varepsilon^2 \|u_R\|_{H^2}^2 + C \|\theta_R\|_{H^2}^2, \quad (4.70)$$

and

$$|J_3| \leq \frac{(\mu + \zeta)\varepsilon^2}{16} \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{\rho}_0 |\hat{D}_{j3}^2 \operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_R|^2 dz + C\varepsilon^2 \|u_R\|_{H^2}^2. \quad (4.71)$$

Similarly, for  $J_m$  ( $m = 4, \dots, 7$ ), we get from the Hölder inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m=4}^7 |J_m| & \leq \frac{(\mu + \zeta)\varepsilon^2}{16} \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{\rho}_0 |\hat{D}_{j3}^2 \operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_R|^2 dz + C(\mathcal{I}_0)\varepsilon^2 \|(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2}^2 \\ & \quad + C\varepsilon^2 \left[ \sum_{m=1}^2 \|\nabla_z \hat{D}_{jm}^2 \hat{u}_R\|_{L^2}^2 + \|W_2\|_{H^1}^2 + \|F^\varepsilon\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\mathfrak{R}_2\|_{H^1}^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$



$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{(\mu + \zeta)\varepsilon^2}{16} \int_{\hat{Q}\cap\hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{\rho}_0 |\hat{D}_{j3}^2 \operatorname{div}_z(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R)|^2 dz + C\varepsilon^2 \sum_{m=1}^2 \|\nabla_z \hat{D}_{jm}^2 \hat{u}_R\|_{L^2}^2 + C\varepsilon^2 \|\mathfrak{R}_2\|_{H^1}^2 \\
&\quad + C(\mathcal{I}_1)\varepsilon^2 \|(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2}^2 + C\varepsilon^2 \sigma^2 \{\|\rho_R\|_{H^2}^2 + \|(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^3}^2\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.72}$$

where we have used (4.36)–(4.38).

To deal with  $J_2$ , we apply  $\hat{D}_{j3}^2$  to (4.34)<sub>1</sub> and multiply the resulting equation by  $\varepsilon^2 \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{j3}^2(\hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R)$  to get

$$\begin{aligned}
J_2 &= \varepsilon \sum_{m=1}^2 \int_{\hat{Q}\cap\hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{j3}^2(\hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) \hat{D}_{j3}^2(\hat{D}_m w \hat{D}_3(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R^m)) dz \\
&\quad - \varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{Q}\cap\hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{j3}^2(\hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) \hat{D}_{j3}^2 \{ \operatorname{div}_z[\hat{\rho}_R(\hat{u}_1 + \varepsilon(\hat{u}_2 + \hat{u}_R))] + \hat{W}_1 \} dz \\
&\quad - \varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{Q}\cap\hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{j3}^2(\hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) \hat{D}_{j3}^2 \hat{\mathfrak{R}}_1 dz =: \sum_{j=1}^3 J_{2,j}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.73}$$

For  $J_{2,1}$  and  $J_{2,3}$ , a direct calculations shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
|J_{2,1}| + |J_{2,3}| &\leq \frac{(\mu + \zeta)\varepsilon^2}{16} \int_{\hat{Q}\cap\hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{\rho}_0 |\hat{D}_{j33}^2 \hat{u}_R|^2 dz + C\sigma\varepsilon^2 \|u_R\|_{H^2}^2 \\
&\quad + C\sigma \|\rho_R\|_{H^2}^2 + C\varepsilon^2 \|\mathfrak{R}_1\|_{H^2} \|\rho_R\|_{H^2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.74}$$

For  $J_{2,2}$ , by similar arguments as in (4.46)–(4.47), we have

$$|J_{2,2}| \leq C(\mathcal{I}_1)C_\sigma\varepsilon^2 \|\rho_R\|_{H^2}^2. \tag{4.75}$$

We apply  $\hat{D}_j$  to (4.34)<sub>3</sub> and multiply the resultant equation by  $\varepsilon^2 \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{j33}^3(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R)$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\kappa\varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{Q}\cap\hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \frac{\hat{\rho}_0}{\hat{\theta}_0} |\hat{D}_{j33}^3 \hat{\theta}_R|^2 dz \\
&= \varepsilon \int_{\hat{Q}\cap\hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{j33}^3(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R) \hat{D}_j \operatorname{div}_z(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) dz - \varepsilon \sum_{m=1}^2 \int_{\hat{Q}\cap\hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{j33}^3(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R) \hat{D}_j(\hat{D}_m w \hat{D}_3(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R^m)) dz \\
&\quad - \kappa\varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{Q}\cap\hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{j33}^3(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R) [\hat{D}_j(\frac{\Delta_z \hat{\theta}_R}{\hat{\theta}_0}) - \frac{1}{\hat{\theta}_0} \hat{D}_{j33}^3 \hat{\theta}_R] dz \\
&\quad + \varepsilon^2 P_1 \int_{\hat{Q}\cap\hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{j33}^3(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R) \hat{D}_j(\frac{1}{\hat{\theta}_0} \operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_R) dz \\
&\quad + \varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{Q}\cap\hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{j33}^3(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R) \hat{D}_j(\frac{1}{\hat{\theta}_0} (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\rho}_R \hat{\theta}_0) \operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_1) dz \\
&\quad + \varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{Q}\cap\hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{j33}^3(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R) \hat{D}_j(\frac{1}{\hat{\theta}_0} \hat{G}^\varepsilon + \hat{\mathfrak{R}}_3 + \hat{W}_3) dz \\
&\quad + \varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{Q}\cap\hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{j33}^3(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R) \hat{D}_j \left\{ \frac{1}{\hat{\theta}_0} \{ \hat{\rho}_0(\hat{u}_R \cdot \nabla_z \hat{\theta}_1 + \hat{u}_1 \cdot \nabla_z \hat{\theta}_R) \right. \\
&\quad \quad \left. + \hat{\rho}_1 \hat{u}_R \cdot \nabla_z \hat{\theta}_0 + \hat{\rho}_R \hat{u}_1 \cdot \nabla_z \hat{\theta}_0 \} \right\} dz =: \sum_{m=8}^{14} J_m.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.76}$$

Applying the Hölder inequality and Sobolev embedding, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{m=8}^{14} J_m &\leq \frac{\kappa\varepsilon^2}{2} \int_{\hat{Q}\cap\hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \frac{\hat{\rho}_0}{\hat{\theta}_0} |\hat{D}_{j33}^3 \hat{\theta}_R|^2 dz + C\varepsilon^2 \sum_{l=1}^2 \|\hat{D}_{jl}^3 \theta_R\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|u_R\|_{H^2}^2 \\
&\quad + C\varepsilon^2 [\|\theta_R\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\rho_R\|_{H^1}^2 \|u_1\|_{H^3}^2 + \|\hat{G}^\varepsilon\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\hat{W}_3\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\hat{\mathfrak{R}}_3\|_{H^1}^2] \\
&\leq \frac{\kappa\varepsilon^2}{2} \int_{\hat{Q}\cap\hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \frac{\hat{\rho}_0}{\hat{\theta}_0} |\hat{D}_{j33}^3 \hat{\theta}_R|^2 dz + C \sum_{l=1}^2 \varepsilon^2 \|\hat{D}_{jl}^3 \theta_R\|_{L^2}^2 + C\varepsilon^2 \sigma^2 \|(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^3}^2 \\
&\quad + C(\mathcal{I}_1)\varepsilon^2 \|\rho_R\|_{H^2}^2 + C\|u_R\|_{H^2}^2 + C\varepsilon^2 \|\theta_R\|_{H^2}^2 + C\varepsilon^2 \|\mathfrak{R}_3\|_{H^1}^2, \tag{4.77}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used (4.36)–(4.38). Combining (4.69)–(4.77), we obtain (4.68). This completes the proof of Lemma 4.7.  $\square$

**Step 4. Estimate of  $\varepsilon\|\hat{D}_{j33}^3 \hat{u}_R\|_{L^2}$  ( $j = 1, 2$ ).**

**Lemma 4.8.** *There exists a positive constant  $C_\sigma$ , which depends on  $\sigma$  but is independent of  $\varepsilon$ , such that*

$$\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^2 \|\nabla_z^2 \hat{D}_j \hat{u}_R\|_{L^2} &\leq C\varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^2 \|\nabla_z \hat{D}_j \operatorname{div}_z u_R\|_{L^2} + C_\sigma \varepsilon \|u_R\|_{H^2} + C(\mathcal{I}_1)\varepsilon \|(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2} \\
&\quad + C_\sigma \|(\rho_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^1} + C\sigma \varepsilon \|(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^3} + C\varepsilon \|\mathfrak{R}_2\|_{H^1}, \tag{4.78}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $C > 0$  is independent of  $\varepsilon$  and  $\sigma$ .

**Proof.** Recalling (4.34)<sub>2</sub>, we turn to following auxiliary Stokes problem

$$\begin{cases} -\varepsilon\mu\Delta_z(\chi_1 \hat{D}_j \hat{u}_R) + \nabla_z[\chi_1 \hat{D}_j(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R)] = \varepsilon S_1, \\ \varepsilon \operatorname{div}(\chi_1 \hat{D}_j \hat{u}_R) = \varepsilon S_2, \\ \chi_1 \hat{D}_j \hat{u}_R|_{\partial\hat{\Omega}\cap\hat{Q}} = 0, \end{cases} \tag{4.79}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
S_1 &= -\chi_1 \hat{D}_j [\hat{\rho}_0 [\hat{u}_1 \cdot \nabla_z \hat{u}_R + \hat{u}_R \cdot \nabla_z \hat{u}_1]] - \chi_1 \nabla_z (\hat{D}_j (\hat{\rho}_R \hat{\theta}_1) + \hat{D}_3 (\hat{\rho}_1 \hat{\theta}_R)) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \chi_1 \hat{D}_j [(\hat{D}_1 w \hat{D}_3 (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R), \hat{D}_2 w \hat{D}_3 (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R), 0)]^t \\
&\quad - \chi_1 \hat{D}_j \hat{W}_2 - \chi_1 \hat{D}_j \hat{F}^\varepsilon - \chi_1 \hat{D}_j \hat{\mathfrak{R}}_2 - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \hat{D}_j (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\rho}_R \hat{\theta}_0) \nabla_z \chi_1 \\
&\quad + \zeta \chi_1 \nabla_z \operatorname{div}_z (\hat{D}_j \hat{u}_R) - 2\mu \nabla_z \chi_1 \cdot \nabla_z (\hat{D}_j \hat{u}_R)^t - \mu \hat{D}_j \hat{u}_R \Delta_z \chi_1, \tag{4.80}
\end{aligned}$$

$$S_2 = \chi_1 \operatorname{div}_z (\hat{D}_j \hat{u}_R) + \hat{D}_j \hat{u}_R \cdot \nabla_z \chi_1. \tag{4.81}$$

By direct calculations, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon \|S_1\|_{L^2} &\leq C(\mathcal{I}_1)\varepsilon \|(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2} + C\sigma \|\chi_1 \nabla_z \hat{D}_j (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R)\|_{L^2} + C\sigma \varepsilon \|(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^3} \\
&\quad + C\varepsilon \|\nabla_z \hat{D}_j \operatorname{div}_z u_R\|_{L^2} + C_\sigma \varepsilon \|u_R\|_{H^2} + C\varepsilon \|\mathfrak{R}_2\|_{H^1} + C_\sigma \|(\rho_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^1}, \tag{4.82}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\varepsilon \|S_2\|_{H^1} \leq C\varepsilon \|\nabla_z \hat{D}_j \operatorname{div}_z u_R\|_{L^2} + C_\sigma \varepsilon \|u_R\|_{H^2}, \tag{4.83}$$

where we have used (4.37) and (4.38) in (4.82).

Then applying the classical Stokes's estimates [4, Theorem IV.5.8], we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varepsilon \|\nabla_z^2 (\hat{D}_j \hat{u}_R)\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla_z (\chi_1 \hat{D}_j (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R))\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq C\varepsilon \|S_1\|_{L^2} + C\varepsilon \|S_2\|_{H^1}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq C(\mathcal{I}_1)\varepsilon\|(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2} + C\varepsilon\|\nabla_z \hat{D}_j \operatorname{div}_z u_R\|_{L^2} + C_\sigma\varepsilon\|u_R\|_{H^2} \\ &\quad + C\varepsilon\|\mathfrak{R}_2\|_{H^1} + C_\sigma\|(\rho_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^1} + C_\sigma\varepsilon\|(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^3} \end{aligned} \quad (4.84)$$

where we have used  $\sigma \ll 1$ . Therefore the proof of Lemma 4.8 is complete.  $\square$

**Step 5. Estimate of  $\varepsilon\|\hat{D}_{33}^2(\operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_R)\|_{L^2}$ .**

**Lemma 4.9.** *There exists a positive constant  $C_\sigma$ , which depends on  $\sigma$  but is independent of  $\varepsilon$ , such that*

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mu + \zeta)\varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{\Omega} \cap \hat{Q}} \chi_1^2 \hat{\rho}_0 |\hat{D}_{33}^2(\operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_R)|^2 dz + \kappa\varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \frac{\hat{\rho}_0}{\hat{\theta}_0} |\hat{D}_{333}^3 \hat{\theta}_R|^2 dz \\ &\leq C(\|(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2}^2 + \varepsilon^2\|(\mathfrak{R}_2, \mathfrak{R}_3)\|_{H^1}^2) + C\varepsilon^2 \sum_{j=1}^2 (\|\nabla_z^2 \hat{D}_j \hat{u}_R\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\hat{D}_{j33}^3 \hat{\theta}_R\|_{L^2}^2) \\ &\quad + [C(\mathcal{I}_1)C_\sigma\varepsilon^2 + C_\sigma]\|\rho_R\|_{H^2}^2 + C\sigma^2\varepsilon^2\|(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^3}^2 + C\varepsilon^2\|\rho_R\|_{H^2}\|\mathfrak{R}_1\|_{H^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.85)$$

where  $C > 0$  is independent of  $\sigma$  and  $\varepsilon$ .

**Proof.** We apply  $\hat{D}_3$  to (4.48) and multiply the resultant equation by  $-\varepsilon^2 \hat{D}_{33}^2 \operatorname{div}_z(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R)$  to get

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mu + \zeta)\varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{\Omega} \cap \hat{Q}} \hat{\rho}_0 \chi_1^2 |\hat{D}_{33}^2(\operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_R)|^2 dz \\ &= \varepsilon \int_{\hat{\Omega} \cap \hat{Q}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{33}^2(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R) \hat{D}_{33}^2 \operatorname{div}_z(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) dz + \varepsilon \int_{\hat{\Omega} \cap \hat{Q}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{33}^2(\hat{\rho}_R \hat{\theta}_0) \hat{D}_{33}^2 \operatorname{div}_z(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) dz \\ &\quad - (\mu + \zeta)\varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{\Omega} \cap \hat{Q}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{33}^2(\operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_R) [\hat{D}_{33}^2 \operatorname{div}_z(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) - \hat{\rho}_0 \hat{D}_{33}^2 \operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_R] dz \\ &\quad + \varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{33}^2(\hat{\rho}_R \hat{\theta}_1 + \hat{\rho}_1 \hat{\theta}_R) \hat{D}_{33}^2 \operatorname{div}_z(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) dz \\ &\quad - \mu\varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_3[(\Delta_z \hat{u}_R - \nabla_z \operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_R) \cdot \hat{e}_3] \hat{D}_{33}^2 \operatorname{div}_z(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) dz \\ &\quad + \varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{\Omega} \cap \hat{Q}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_3[\hat{\rho}_0(\hat{u}_1 \cdot \nabla \hat{u}_R + \hat{u}_R \cdot \nabla \hat{u}_1) \cdot \hat{e}_3] \hat{D}_{33}^2(\operatorname{div}_z(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R)) dz \\ &\quad + \varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_3(\hat{W}_2^3 + \hat{F}^{\varepsilon,3} + \hat{\mathfrak{R}}_2^3) \hat{D}_{33}^2 \operatorname{div}_z(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) dz. \end{aligned} \quad (4.86)$$

We apply  $\hat{D}_{33}^2$  to (4.34)<sub>1</sub> and multiply the resultant equation by  $\varepsilon^2 \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{33}^2(\hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R)$  to get

$$\begin{aligned} &\varepsilon \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{33}^2 \operatorname{div}_z(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) \hat{D}_{33}^2(\hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) dz \\ &= \varepsilon \sum_{m=1}^2 \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{33}^2(\hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) \hat{D}_{33}^2(\hat{D}_m w \hat{D}_3(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R^m)) dz \\ &\quad - \varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{33}^2(\hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) \hat{D}_{33}^2\{\operatorname{div}_z[\hat{\rho}_R(\hat{u}_1 + \varepsilon(\hat{u}_2 + \hat{u}_R))] + \hat{W}_1\} dz \\ &\quad - \varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{33}^2(\hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) \hat{D}_{33}^2 \hat{\mathfrak{R}}_1 dx. \end{aligned} \quad (4.87)$$

Finally, we apply  $\hat{D}_3$  to (4.34)<sub>3</sub> and multiply the resultant equation by  $\varepsilon^2 \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{333}^3(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R)$  to obtain

$$\kappa\varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \frac{\hat{\rho}_0}{\hat{\theta}_0} |\hat{D}_{333}^3 \hat{\theta}_R|^2 dz$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \varepsilon \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{333}^3(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R) \hat{D}_3 \operatorname{div}_z(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R) \, dz - \varepsilon \sum_{m=1}^2 \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{333}^3(\hat{\theta}_0 \hat{\rho}_R) \hat{D}_3(\hat{D}_m w \hat{D}_3(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R^m)) \, dz \\
&\quad - \kappa \varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{333}^3(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R) \left[ \hat{D}_3\left(\frac{\Delta_z \hat{\theta}_R}{\hat{\theta}_0}\right) - \frac{1}{\hat{\theta}_0} \hat{D}_{333}^3 \hat{\theta}_R \right] \, dz \\
&\quad + \varepsilon^2 P_1 \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{333}^3(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R) \hat{D}_3\left(\frac{1}{\hat{\theta}_0} \operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_R\right) \, dz \\
&\quad + \varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{333}^3(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R) \hat{D}_3\left(\frac{1}{\hat{\theta}_0} (\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R + \hat{\rho}_R \hat{\theta}_0) \operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_1\right) \, dz \\
&\quad + \varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{333}^3(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R) \hat{D}_3\left(\frac{1}{\hat{\theta}_0} (\hat{G}^\varepsilon) + \hat{\mathfrak{A}}_3 + \hat{W}_3\right) \, dz \\
&\quad + \varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{Q} \cap \hat{\Omega}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{333}^3(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\theta}_R) \hat{D}_3 \left\{ \frac{1}{\hat{\theta}_0} [\hat{\rho}_0 (\hat{u}_R \cdot \nabla_z \hat{\theta}_1 + \hat{u}_1 \cdot \nabla_z \hat{\theta}_R) \right. \\
&\quad \quad \left. + \hat{\rho}_1 \hat{u}_R \cdot \nabla_z \hat{\theta}_0 + \hat{\rho}_R \hat{u}_1 \cdot \nabla_z \hat{\theta}_0] \right\} \, dz. \tag{4.88}
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from (4.49) and the Hölder inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{\Omega} \cap \hat{Q}} \chi_1^2 \hat{D}_{33}^2(\operatorname{div}_z(\hat{\rho}_0 \hat{u}_R)) \hat{D}_3[(\Delta_z \hat{u}_R - \nabla_z \operatorname{div}_z \hat{u}_R) \cdot \hat{e}_3] \, dz \\
&\leq \frac{(\mu + \zeta)}{16} \varepsilon^2 \int_{\hat{\Omega} \cap \hat{Q}} \hat{\rho}_0 \chi_1^2 |\hat{D}_{33}^2 \operatorname{div} \hat{u}_R|^2 \, dz + C \varepsilon^2 \sum_{j=1}^2 \int_{\hat{\Omega} \cap \hat{Q}} \chi_1^2 |\nabla \hat{D}_{3j}^2 \hat{u}_R|^2 \, dz. \tag{4.89}
\end{aligned}$$

Noting (4.89), then applying similar arguments as in Lemma 4.7 to (4.86)–(4.89), we conclude (4.85). This completes the proof of Lemma 4.9.  $\square$

**Step 6.** *A priori uniform estimates of*  $\|\rho_R\|_{H^2} + \|u_R\|_{\mathcal{K}} + \|\theta_R\|_{H^3}$ .

Recall (4.18). Replacing  $Q$  by  $Q_k$  in Lemmas 4.5–4.9, summing up  $k = 1, \dots, N$ , and using Lemma 4.3, (4.1) and (4.15), we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2}^2 + \left\| \frac{\nabla(\rho_0 \theta_R + \theta_0 \rho_R)}{\varepsilon} \right\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\leq C(\mathcal{I}_1) C_\sigma \|\rho_R\|_{H^2}^2 + C \|\mathfrak{R}_1\|_{H^1}^2 + C \|(\mathfrak{R}_2, \mathfrak{R}_3)\|_{L^2}^2 + C_{\tau, \sigma} \|(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^1}^2 \\
&\leq C(\mathcal{I}_1) C_\sigma \|\rho_R\|_{H^2}^2 + C \|\mathfrak{R}_1\|_{H^1}^2 + C \|(\mathfrak{R}_2, \mathfrak{R}_3)\|_{L^2}^2, \tag{4.90}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have taken  $\tau$  and  $\sigma$  small enough first, and then  $\mathcal{I}_1$  small enough. Noting that

$$\|\rho_R\|_{H^1}^2 \leq C \left( \|\theta_R\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\rho_R\|_{L^2}^2 + \left\| \frac{\nabla(\rho_0 \theta_R + \theta_0 \rho_R)}{\varepsilon} \right\|_{L^2}^2 \right),$$

we obtain from (4.90) and (4.1) that

$$\|\rho_R\|_{H^1}^2 \leq C(\mathcal{I}_1) C_\sigma \|\rho_R\|_{H^2}^2 + C \|\mathfrak{R}_1\|_{H^1}^2 + C \|(\mathfrak{R}_2, \mathfrak{R}_3)\|_{L^2}^2. \tag{4.91}$$

Furthermore, using Lemmas 4.4, 4.7–4.10, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varepsilon^2 \|\nabla^2 \operatorname{div} u_R\|_{L^2}^2 + \varepsilon^2 \|\nabla^3 \theta_R\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\leq [C(\mathcal{I}_1) C_\sigma \varepsilon^2 + C\sigma + C\tau] \|\rho_R\|_{H^2}^2 + C_{\tau, \sigma} \|(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2}^2 + C_\sigma \|\rho_R\|_{H^1}^2 \\
&\quad + C\sigma^2 \varepsilon^2 \|(u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^3}^2 + C\varepsilon^2 [\|(\mathfrak{R}_2, \mathfrak{R}_3)\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\rho_R\|_{H^2} \|\mathfrak{R}_1\|_{H^2}], \tag{4.92}
\end{aligned}$$

which, together with using (4.90)–(4.91) and (4.16), yields that

$$\|(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2}^2 + \varepsilon^2 (\|u_R\|_{H^3}^2 + \|\theta_R\|_{H^3}^2) + \left\| \frac{\nabla(\rho_0 \theta_R + \theta_0 \rho_R)}{\varepsilon} \right\|_{L^2}^2$$

$$\leq C[\|(\mathfrak{R}_2, \mathfrak{R}_3)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\mathfrak{R}_1\|_{H^1}^2] + C\varepsilon^2[\|(\mathfrak{R}_2, \mathfrak{R}_3)\|_{H^1}^2 + \varepsilon^2\|\mathfrak{R}_1\|_{H^2}^2], \quad (4.93)$$

where we have taken  $\tau$  and  $\sigma$  small enough first, and then taken  $\mathcal{I}_1$  small enough. Here  $C$  is a positive constant independent of  $\varepsilon$ .

Noting (3.20), and using the classical elliptic estimate, we obtain from (4.93) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\theta_R\|_{H^3} &\leq C(\mathcal{I}_1)\|(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)\|_{H^2} + C\|(\mathfrak{R}_1, \mathfrak{R}_3)\|_{H^1} \\ &\leq C[\|\mathfrak{R}_2\|_{L^2} + \|(\mathfrak{R}_1, \mathfrak{R}_3)\|_{H^1}] + C\varepsilon[\|\mathfrak{R}_2\|_{H^1} + \varepsilon\|\mathfrak{R}_1\|_{H^2}]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.94)$$

Hence, combining Lemma 4.1 and the higher order uniform estimates (4.93) and (4.94), we have following proposition.

**Proposition 4.10.** *Let  $\tilde{u}_R \in \mathcal{K}$  and  $\tilde{\theta}_R \in (H_0^1 \cap H^3)$ . For any  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ , let  $\tilde{\delta}_0$  be given in Lemma 4.1. There exists a constant  $\tilde{\delta}_1 > 0$  with  $\tilde{\delta}_1 \leq \tilde{\delta}_0$  such that if  $\delta_0 \leq \tilde{\delta}_1$  and  $\|\tilde{u}_R\|_{\mathcal{K}} + \|\tilde{\theta}_R\|_{H^3} \leq \tilde{\delta}_1$ , Any strong solutions  $(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) \in H^2 \times \mathcal{K} \times (H_0^1 \cap H^3)$  of (3.14) satisfies following a priori uniform estimate:*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho_R\|_{H^2} + \|u_R\|_{\mathcal{K}} + \|\theta_R\|_{H^3} + \left\| \frac{\nabla(\rho_0\theta_R + \theta_0\rho_R)}{\varepsilon} \right\|_{L^2} \\ \leq C[\|\mathfrak{R}_2\|_{L^2} + \|(\mathfrak{R}_1, \mathfrak{R}_3)\|_{H^1}] + C\varepsilon[\|\mathfrak{R}_2\|_{H^1} + \varepsilon\|\mathfrak{R}_1\|_{H^2}], \end{aligned} \quad (4.95)$$

where  $C$  is a positive constant independent of  $\varepsilon$  and depends continuously on  $(\mu, \zeta, \kappa)$ . Here  $\mathcal{K}$  is the space defined in (3.1).

## 5. EXISTENCE OF STRONG SOLUTION OF (3.14)

With the help of a priori uniform estimate (4.95), as in [23], we shall apply a continuity method to show the existence of strong solution  $(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) \in H^2 \times \mathcal{K} \times (H_0^1 \cap H^3)$  of (3.14) for any given viscous coefficients pair  $(\mu, \zeta)$ .

**Lemma 5.1.** *For any fixed  $\mu > 0, \zeta > 0$  and  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ . Let  $\tilde{\delta}_1$  be given in Lemma 4.10. Then there exists  $\tilde{\delta}_2$  with  $\tilde{\delta}_2 \leq \tilde{\delta}_1 \leq \tilde{\delta}_0$  such that if  $\delta_0 \leq \tilde{\delta}_2$  and  $\|\tilde{u}_R\|_{\mathcal{K}} + \|\tilde{\theta}_R\|_{H^3} \leq \tilde{\delta}_2$ , there exists a unique strong solution  $(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) \in H^2 \times \mathcal{K} \times (H_0^1 \cap H^3)$ . Moreover, it holds that*

$$\|\rho_R\|_{H^2} + \|u_R\|_{\mathcal{K}} + \|\theta_R\|_{H^3} \leq C[\|\mathfrak{R}_2\|_{L^2} + \|(\mathfrak{R}_1, \mathfrak{R}_3)\|_{H^1}] + C\varepsilon[\|\mathfrak{R}_2\|_{H^1} + \varepsilon\|\mathfrak{R}_1\|_{H^2}], \quad (5.1)$$

where  $C$  is a positive constant independent of  $\varepsilon$ .

**Proof.** Let  $\mu_0$  and  $\zeta_0$  be given in Lemma 3.3. We take  $\delta_0$  and  $\|\tilde{u}_R\|_{\mathcal{K}} + \|\tilde{\theta}_R\|_{H^3}$  small enough such that Lemma 3.3 holds. For any  $t \in [0, 1]$ , we define

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_t &= (1-t)\mu_0 + t\mu, \quad \zeta_t = (1-t)\zeta_0 + t\zeta, \quad \mathfrak{R} = (\mathfrak{R}_1, \mathfrak{R}_2, \mathfrak{R}_3), \\ \mathcal{L}_t(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) &:= (\mathcal{L}_t^{(1)}, \mathcal{L}_t^{(2)}, \mathcal{L}_t^{(3)})(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R), \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_t^{(1)}(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) &= \operatorname{div}[\rho_R(u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2 + \tilde{u}_R))] + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 u_R), \\ \mathcal{L}_t^{(2)}(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) &= \mu_t \Delta u_R + \zeta_t \nabla \operatorname{div} u_R - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \nabla(\rho_0 \theta_R + \rho_R \theta_0) - \rho_0(u_1 \cdot \nabla u_R + u_R \cdot \nabla u_1) \\ &\quad - \nabla(\rho_R \theta_1 + \rho_1 \theta_R) + \tilde{F}^\varepsilon(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R), \\ \mathcal{L}_t^{(3)}(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) &= \frac{\kappa}{\theta_0} \Delta \theta_R - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 u_R) - \frac{P_1}{\theta_0} \operatorname{div} u_R \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{\theta_0} (\rho_0 \theta_R + \rho_R \theta_0) \operatorname{div} u_1 - \frac{1}{\theta_0} \tilde{G}(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) \end{aligned}$$

$$-\frac{1}{\theta_0} [\rho_0(u_R \cdot \nabla \theta_1 + u_1 \cdot \nabla \theta_R) + \rho_1 u_R \cdot \nabla \theta_0 + \rho_R u_1 \cdot \nabla \theta_0], \quad (5.2)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{X} &= \left\{ (\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) \in H^2 \times \mathcal{K} \times (H_0^1 \cap H^3) \mid \int_{\Omega} \rho_R \, dx = 0 \right\}, \\ \mathcal{Y} &= \left\{ \mathfrak{R} = (\mathfrak{R}_1, \mathfrak{R}_2, \mathfrak{R}_3) \in H^2 \times H^1 \times H^1 \mid \int_{\Omega} \mathfrak{R}_1 \, dx = 0 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

We shall prove that the set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T} &= \left\{ t \in [0, 1] \mid \text{for each } \mathfrak{R} \in \mathcal{Y} \text{ there exists a unique solution } (\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) \in \mathcal{X} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \text{of } \mathcal{L}_t(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) = \mathfrak{R} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

is not empty, open and closed, i.e.,  $\mathcal{T} = [0, 1]$ .

It follows from Lemma 3.3 that  $0 \in \mathcal{T}$ , which implies  $\mathcal{T} \neq \emptyset$ . Let now  $t_0 \in \mathcal{T}$ , then one has from *a priori* uniform estimate (4.95) that

$$\|\mathcal{L}_{t_0}^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{Y} \mapsto \mathcal{X}} \leq M_1$$

for some constants  $M_1 = M_1(\Omega, \kappa, \mu_{t_0}, \zeta_{t_0})$ . For any  $\sigma > 0$ , we can rewrite

$$\mathcal{L}_{t_0+\sigma}(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) = \mathfrak{R}$$

in the following form:

$$[\mathbf{I} - \sigma \mathcal{L}_{t_0}^{-1}(\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_1)](\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) = \mathcal{L}_{t_0}^{-1}(\mathfrak{R}).$$

Hence, it can be solved if

$$\sigma \|\mathcal{L}_{t_0}^{-1}(\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_1)\|_{\mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{Y}} \leq M_1 \sigma \|\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_1\|_{\mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{Y}} \ll 1$$

i.e.,  $|\sigma| \ll M_1^{-1} \|\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_1\|_{\mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{Y}}$ , where we have used the fact that  $\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_1$  is a bounded linear transformation from  $\mathcal{X}$  to  $\mathcal{Y}$ . Hence  $\mathcal{T}$  is open.

It remains to show that  $\mathcal{T}$  is closed. Let  $t_n \in \mathcal{T}$  and  $t_n \rightarrow t_0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Noting from (4.95) that for  $\delta_0$  and  $\|\tilde{u}_R\|_{\mathcal{K}} + \|\tilde{\theta}_R\|_{H^3}$  small enough,

$$\sup_{t_n \in [0, 1]} \|\mathcal{L}_{t_n}^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{Y} \mapsto \mathcal{X}} \leq \max_{t_n \in [0, 1]} M_1(\Omega, \kappa, \mu_{t_n}, \zeta_{t_n}) < C(\Omega, \kappa, \mu_0, \zeta_0, \mu, \zeta) < \infty \quad (5.5)$$

Set  $(\rho_R^{(n)}, u_R^{(n)}, \theta_R^{(n)}) = \mathcal{L}_{t_n}^{-1}(\mathfrak{R})$ , (5.5) implies that there exists a subsequence  $(\rho_R^{(n_k)}, u_R^{(n_k)}, \theta_R^{(n_k)})$  such that  $(\rho_R^{(n_k)}, u_R^{(n_k)}, \theta_R^{(n_k)}) \rightharpoonup (\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)$  weakly in  $\mathcal{X}$ . Then it is clear to check that  $(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)$  satisfy  $\mathfrak{R} = \mathcal{L}_{t_0}(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)$ . Therefore  $\mathcal{T} \equiv [0, 1]$ , which completes the proof of Lemma 5.1.  $\square$

## 6. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

We are in a position to establish the existence of nonlinear coupled systems (1.10)–(1.12). Motivated by [7], we use the following Tikhonov's fixed point theorem to achieve this.

**Theorem 6.1** (Tikhonov's fixed point theorem [20, Page 72, 1.2.11.6]). *Let  $K$  be a nonempty closed convex subset of a separable reflexive Banach space  $X$ , and let  $F : K \rightarrow K$  be a weakly continuous mapping (i.e., if  $x_n \in K$  and  $x_n \rightharpoonup x$  weakly in  $X$ , then  $F(x_n) \rightharpoonup F(x)$  weakly in  $X$  as well). Then  $F$  has at least one fixed point in  $K$ .*

For later use, we define a function space  $X$  by

$$X = H_0^1 \times H_0^1.$$

Then, for any a small constant  $A$ , we define a subset  $\mathbf{K}_A$  of  $X$  by

$$\mathbf{K}_A = \{(v, \vartheta) \in \mathcal{K} \times (H_0^1 \cap H^3) \mid \|v\|_{\mathcal{K}} + \|\vartheta\|_{H^3} \leq A\},$$

where  $\mathcal{K}$  is the space defined (3.2). By the lower semi-continuity of norms, it is easy to check that  $\mathbf{K}_A$  is convex.

For any  $(\tilde{u}_R, \tilde{\theta}_R) \in \mathbf{K}_A$  with  $A \leq \tilde{\delta}_2$  and  $\delta_0 \leq \tilde{\delta}_2$ , where  $\tilde{\delta}_2$  is the one given in Lemma 5.1, letting  $(\rho_1, u_2, \theta_1, P_1)$  be the solution of (3.2) given in Lemma 3.1,  $(\rho_2, \rho_3)$  be given in (3.11), and  $(\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)$  be the solution of (3.14) established in Lemma 5.1, we can define a nonlinear operator  $\mathcal{Q}$  from  $\mathbf{K}_A$  to  $X$  by

$$\mathcal{Q}(\tilde{u}_R, \tilde{\theta}_R) = (u_R, \theta_R).$$

To apply Theorem 6.1, we shall show  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{K}_A) \subset \mathbf{K}_A$  and  $\mathcal{Q}$  is weakly continuous for some small constant  $A > 0$ .

**Lemma 6.2.** *For any fixed  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ . Let  $\delta_0 \leq \tilde{\delta}_2$  with  $\tilde{\delta}_2$  given in Lemma 5.1. Then there exists a small positive constant  $A_0$  satisfying  $A_0 \leq \min\{\tilde{\delta}_2, 1\}$  such that for any given  $A \leq A_0$ , there exists  $\tilde{\delta}_3 > 0$  with  $\tilde{\delta}_3 \leq \tilde{\delta}_2$  such that if  $\delta_0 \leq \tilde{\delta}_3$ , then  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{K}_A) \subset \mathbf{K}_A$  and  $\mathcal{Q}$  is weakly continuous.*

**Proof.** Since the proof is very long, we divide into two steps.

*Step 1.* Recalling Lemma 2.1, (1.15)–(1.17), (3.3), (3.12)–(3.13), (3.15) and (3.30)–(3.31), one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathfrak{R}_1\|_{H^1} + \varepsilon\|\mathfrak{R}_1\|_{H^2} &\leq C\|\tilde{u}_R\|_{\mathcal{K}}(\|\rho_1\|_{H^3} + \varepsilon\|\rho_2\|_{H^3} + \varepsilon^2\|\rho_3\|_{H^3}) + C(\mathcal{I}_0) \\ &\leq C\delta_0(1 + \|\tilde{u}_R\|_{\mathcal{K}}), \end{aligned} \quad (6.1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathfrak{R}_2\|_{L^2} + \varepsilon\|\mathfrak{R}_2\|_{H^1} + \|\mathfrak{R}_3\|_{H^1} &\leq C(\mathcal{I}_0) + C[\|u_1\|_{H^3}^2 + \varepsilon^2(\|u_2\|_{H^3}^2 + \|\tilde{u}_R\|_{H^3}^2)] \\ &\leq C\delta_0(1 + \|\tilde{u}_R\|_{H^2}) + C\|\tilde{u}_R\|_{\mathcal{K}}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (6.2)$$

Substituting (6.1)–(6.2) into (4.95), we obtain from  $(\tilde{u}_R, \tilde{\theta}_R) \in \mathbf{K}_A$  that

$$\|u_R\|_{\mathcal{K}} + \|\theta_R\|_{H^3} \leq C\delta_0(1 + \|\tilde{u}_R\|_{\mathcal{K}}) + C\|\tilde{u}_R\|_{\mathcal{K}}^2 \leq C\delta_0(1 + A) + CA^2. \quad (6.3)$$

Taking  $A \ll 1$  and then  $\delta_0 \ll 1$ , we deuce from (6.3) that  $(u_R, \theta_R) \in \mathbf{K}_A$ , which implies that  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{K}_A) \subset \mathbf{K}_A$ .

*Step 2.* Recalling the definition of weakly continuous, to show  $\mathcal{Q}$  is weakly continuous, it suffices to show  $\mathcal{Q}$  is continuous on  $\mathbf{K}_A$  with respect to the norm of  $X$ .

Let  $(u_R^{(i)}, \theta_R^{(i)}) = \mathcal{Q}(\tilde{u}_R^{(i)}, \tilde{\theta}_R^{(i)})$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . In particular, Let  $(\rho_1^{(i)}, u_2^{(i)}, \theta_1^{(i)}, P_3^{(i)}) \in H^4 \times H^4 \times H^4 \times H^3$  be the solution of (3.2), and  $(\rho_R^{(i)}, u_R^{(i)}, \theta_R^{(i)}) \in H^2 \times \mathbf{K}_A$  be the solution of (3.14) for given  $(\tilde{u}_R^{(i)}, \tilde{\theta}_R^{(i)}) \in \mathbf{K}_A$  respectively. We denote

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\rho}_j &= \rho_j^{(1)} - \rho_j^{(2)}, \quad j = 1, 2, 3, \quad \bar{\rho}_R = \rho_R^{(1)} - \rho_R^{(2)}, \quad \bar{P}_3 = P_3^{(1)} - P_3^{(2)}, \\ \bar{u}_2 &= u_2^{(1)} - u_2^{(2)}, \quad \bar{u}_R = u_R^{(1)} - u_R^{(2)}, \quad \bar{\theta}_1 = \theta_1^{(1)} - \theta_1^{(2)}, \quad \bar{\theta}_R = \theta_R^{(1)} - \theta_R^{(2)}, \\ \bar{\tilde{u}}_R &= \tilde{u}_R^{(1)} - \tilde{u}_R^{(2)}, \quad \bar{\tilde{\theta}}_R = \tilde{\theta}_R^{(1)} - \tilde{\theta}_R^{(2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Then  $(\bar{\rho}_1, \bar{u}_2, \bar{\theta}_1, \bar{P}_3)$  satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \nabla(\theta_0 \bar{\rho}_1 + \rho_0 \bar{\theta}_1) = 0, & \int_{\Omega} \bar{\rho}_1 dx = 0, \\ \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 \bar{u}_2) = -\operatorname{div}(\bar{\rho}_1 u_1), \\ \rho_0(u_1 \cdot \nabla) \bar{u}_2 + \rho_0(\bar{u}_2 \cdot \nabla) u_1 + \nabla \bar{P}_3 = -\bar{\rho}_1(u_1 \cdot \nabla) u_1 + \mu \Delta \bar{u}_2 + \zeta \nabla \operatorname{div} \bar{u}_2, \\ \kappa \Delta \bar{\theta}_1 = -\theta_0(\bar{u}_2 \cdot \nabla) \rho_0 + \bar{\rho}_1(u_1 \cdot \nabla) \theta_0 + \rho_0(u_1 \cdot \nabla) \bar{\theta}_1 + (\rho_0 \bar{\theta}_1 + \bar{\rho}_1 \theta_0) \operatorname{div} u_1 \\ \quad + (\rho_0 \theta_0) \operatorname{div} \bar{u}_2 - 2\theta_0(\bar{u}_R \cdot \nabla) \rho_0, \\ \bar{u}_2 = 0, \quad \bar{\theta}_1 = 0, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (6.4)$$

By (6.4)<sub>1</sub>, one has

$$\bar{\rho}_1 = \frac{1}{\theta_0}(\bar{P}_1 - \rho_0 \bar{\theta}_1) \quad \text{with } \bar{P}_1 = \frac{\int_{\Omega} \theta_0^{-1} \rho_0 \bar{\theta}_1 dx}{\int_{\Omega} \theta_0^{-1} dx}. \quad (6.5)$$

Let  $\bar{v}_2 = \rho_0 \bar{u}_2$ , then by similar calculations as in (3.6), we can rewrite (6.4) as

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div} \bar{v}_2 = \operatorname{div} \left[ \frac{\rho_0 \bar{\theta}_1}{\theta_0} u_1 \right] - \bar{P}_1 \operatorname{div} \left[ \frac{u_1}{\theta_0} \right], \\ -\mu \Delta \bar{v}_2 + \nabla(P_0 \bar{P}_3) = (\theta_0 - 1) \mu \Delta \bar{v}_2 - \rho_0(u_1 \cdot \nabla \theta_0) \bar{v}_2 - P_0(u_1 \cdot \nabla) \bar{v}_2 - P_0(\bar{v}_2 \cdot \nabla) u_1 \\ \quad + \mu \bar{v}_2 \Delta \theta_0 + 2\mu \nabla \theta_0 \cdot \nabla (\bar{v}_2)^t - \rho_0(\bar{P}_1 - \rho_0 \bar{\theta}_1)(u_1 \cdot \nabla) u_1 \\ \quad + \zeta \nabla [\rho_0 \bar{\theta}_1 \operatorname{div} u_1 \theta_0 u_1 \cdot \nabla \left( \frac{\rho_0 \bar{\theta}_1}{\theta_0} \theta_0 \right) - \bar{P}_1 \operatorname{div} u_1 - \bar{P}_1 \theta_0 u_1 \cdot \nabla \left( \frac{1}{\theta_0} \right)] \\ \quad + \zeta \nabla (\bar{v}_2 \cdot \nabla \theta_0), \\ \kappa \Delta \bar{\theta}_1 = -\frac{\theta_0}{\rho_0} \bar{v}_2 \cdot \nabla \rho_0 + (\bar{P}_1 - \rho_0 \bar{\theta}_1)(u_1 \cdot \nabla) \theta_0 + \rho_0(u_1 \cdot \nabla) \bar{\theta}_1 + \bar{v}_2 \cdot \nabla \theta_0 \\ \quad + \rho_0 \bar{\theta}_1 \operatorname{div} u_1 + \theta_0 u_1 \cdot \nabla \left( \frac{\rho_0 \bar{\theta}_1}{\theta_0} \right) - \bar{P}_1 \theta_0 u_1 \cdot \left( \frac{1}{\theta_0} \right) - 2\theta_0(\bar{u}_R \cdot \nabla) \rho_0, \\ \bar{v}_2 = 0, \quad \bar{\theta}_2 = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (6.6)$$

Noting the smallness of  $\delta_0$ , by similar arguments as in (3.10), one has

$$\|\bar{v}_2\|_{H^3} + \|\bar{P}_3\|_{H^2} + \|\bar{\theta}_1\|_{H^3} \leq C \|\bar{u}_R\|_{H^1} \|\nabla \theta_0\|_{H^2}, \quad (6.7)$$

which yields that

$$\|\bar{u}_2\|_{H^3} + \|\bar{\rho}_1\|_{H^3} \leq C \|\bar{u}_R\|_{H^1} \|\nabla \theta_0\|_{H^2}. \quad (6.8)$$

Noting (3.11)–(3.13), we have

$$\|\bar{\rho}_2\|_{H^3} + \|\bar{\rho}_3\|_{H^3} \leq C \|\bar{u}_R\|_{H^1} \|\nabla \theta_0\|_{H^2}, \quad (6.9)$$

where we point out that  $P_2$ , which is determined by (1.8), remains unchanged for  $(\tilde{u}_R^{(i)}, \tilde{\theta}_R^{(i)})$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ).



For  $(\bar{\rho}_R, \bar{u}_R, \bar{\theta}_R)$ , it satisfies

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \operatorname{div}[\bar{\rho}_R(u_1 + \varepsilon(u_2^{(1)} + u_R^{(1)}))] + \varepsilon \operatorname{div}[\rho_R^{(2)}(\bar{u}_2 + \bar{u}_R)] = -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 \bar{u}_R) + (\mathfrak{R}_1^{(1)} - \mathfrak{R}_1^{(2)}), \\ \mu \Delta \bar{u}_R + \zeta \nabla \operatorname{div} \bar{u}_R = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 \bar{\theta}_R + \bar{\rho}_R \theta_0) + \rho_0(u_1 \cdot \nabla \bar{u}_R + \bar{u}_R \cdot \nabla u_1) + \nabla(\bar{\rho}_R \theta_1^{(1)} + \rho_R^{(2)} \bar{\theta}_1) \\ \quad + \nabla(\bar{\rho}_1 \theta_R^{(1)} + \rho_1^{(2)} \bar{\theta}_R) + (\tilde{F}^{\varepsilon, (1)} - \tilde{F}^{\varepsilon, (2)}) + (\mathfrak{R}_2^{(1)} - \mathfrak{R}_2^{(2)}), \\ \frac{\kappa}{\theta_0} \Delta \bar{\theta}_R = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \operatorname{div}(\rho_0 \bar{u}_R) + \frac{\bar{P}_1}{\theta_0} \operatorname{div} u_R^{(1)} + \frac{P_1^{(2)}}{\theta_0} \operatorname{div} \bar{u}_R + \frac{1}{\theta_0} (\rho_0 \bar{\theta}_R + \bar{\rho}_R \theta_0) \operatorname{div} u_1 \\ \quad + \frac{1}{\theta_0} \{ \rho_0(\bar{u}_R \cdot \nabla \theta_1^{(1)} + u_R^{(2)} \cdot \nabla \bar{\theta}_1 + u_1 \cdot \nabla \bar{\theta}_R) + \bar{\rho}_1 u_R^{(1)} \cdot \nabla \theta_0 \\ \quad + \rho_1^{(2)} \bar{u}_R \cdot \nabla \theta_0 + \bar{\rho}_R u_1 \cdot \nabla \theta_0 \} + \frac{1}{\theta_0} (\tilde{G}^{\varepsilon, (1)} - \tilde{G}^{\varepsilon, (2)}) + (\mathfrak{R}_3^{(1)} - \mathfrak{R}_3^{(2)}), \\ \bar{u}_R|_{\partial\Omega} = \bar{\theta}_R|_{\Omega} = 0, \quad \int_{\Omega} \bar{\rho}_R \, dx = 0, \end{array} \right.$$

where  $F^{\varepsilon, (i)}$ ,  $G^{\varepsilon, (i)}$ ,  $\mathfrak{R}_1^{(i)}$ ,  $\mathfrak{R}_2^{(i)}$  and  $\mathfrak{R}_3^{(i)}$  represent the terms in (3.16)–(3.19) and (3.15) with  $(\rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3, \rho_R, u_2, u_R, \theta_1, \theta_R)$  replacing  $(\rho_1^{(i)}, \rho_2^{(i)}, \rho_3^{(i)}, \rho_R^{(i)}, u_2^{(i)}, u_R^{(i)}, \theta_1^{(i)}, \theta_R^{(i)})$  respectively.

As in (3.30)–(3.31), we denote

$$\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_0 = \|(\rho_0 - P_0, u_1, \theta_0 - 1)\|_{H^3} + \max_{i=1,2} \{ \|\rho_1^{(i)}, u_2^{(i)}, P_3^{(i)}, \theta_1^{(i)}\|_{H^3} + \|(\rho_2^{(i)}, \rho_3^{(i)})\|_{H^3} \} \lesssim \delta_0, \quad (6.10)$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_1 = \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_0 + \max_{i=1,2} \{ \|\tilde{u}_R^{(i)}\|_{\mathcal{K}} + \|\tilde{\theta}_R^{(i)}\|_{H^3} \} \lesssim \delta_0 + \max_{i=1,2} \{ \|\tilde{u}_R^{(i)}\|_{\mathcal{K}} + \|\tilde{\theta}_R^{(i)}\|_{H^3} \}, \quad (6.11)$$

and  $C(\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_0)$  and  $C(\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_1)$  as two small positive constants depending on  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_0$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_1$  respectively satisfying  $C(\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_0), C(\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_1) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_0, \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_1 \rightarrow 0$ .

Using similar arguments as in the proof of Lemma 4.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{\rho}_R\|_{L^2}^2 + \|(\bar{u}_R, \bar{\theta}_R)\|_{H^1}^2 &\leq C(\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_1) [\|(\bar{\rho}_1, \bar{u}_2, \bar{\theta}_1)\|_{H^3}^2 + \|(\bar{\rho}_2, \bar{\rho}_3)\|_{H^3}^2 + \|(\bar{u}_R, \bar{\theta}_R)\|_{H^1}^2] \\ &\quad + C(\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_1) [\|\bar{\rho}_R\|_{L^2} + \|(\bar{u}_R, \bar{\theta}_R)\|_{H^1}^2] + C \sum_{j=1}^3 \|\mathfrak{R}_j^{(1)} - \mathfrak{R}_j^{(2)}\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (6.12)$$

A direct calculation shows that

$$\sum_{j=1}^3 \|\mathfrak{R}_j^{(1)} - \mathfrak{R}_j^{(2)}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_1) [\|(\bar{\rho}_1, \bar{u}_2, \bar{\theta}_1)\|_{H^3}^2 + \|(\bar{\rho}_2, \bar{\rho}_3)\|_{H^3}^2 + \|\bar{u}_R\|_{H^1}^2]. \quad (6.13)$$

Substituting (6.13) into (6.12), and using (6.7)–(6.9) and the smallness of  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_1$ , we obtain

$$\|\bar{\rho}_R\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\bar{u}_R\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\bar{\theta}_R\|_{H^1}^2 \leq C(\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_1) (\|\bar{u}_R\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\bar{\theta}_R\|_{H^1}^2)$$

which implies  $\mathcal{Q}$  is continuous on  $\mathbf{K}_A$  with respect to the norm of  $X$  provided  $\delta_0$  and  $A$  are small enough. Therefore the proof of Lemma 6.2 is complete.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 1.1.** Using Lemmas 6.1 and 6.2, we get a fixed point of  $\mathcal{Q}$  in  $\mathbf{K}_A$ , which implies the existence of solution

$$\begin{aligned} (\rho_1, u_2, \theta_1, P_3, \rho_2, \rho_3) &\in H^4 \times (H_0^1 \cap H^4) \times (H_0^1 \cap H^4) \times H^3 \times H^3 \times H^3, \\ (\rho_R, u_R, \theta_R) &\in H^2 \times \mathbf{K}_A, \end{aligned}$$

to the coupled systems (1.10)–(1.12). Furthermore, applying the same arguments in (6.4)–(6.13) again, and using the smallness of  $\delta_0$  and  $A$ , one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\bar{\rho}_1, \bar{\rho}_2, \bar{\rho}_3)\|_{H^3} + \|(\bar{u}_2, \bar{\theta}_1)\|_{H^3} + \|\bar{P}_3\|_{H^3} \leq C\|\bar{u}_R\|_{H^1}\|\nabla\theta_0\|_{H^2}, \\ & \|\bar{\rho}_R\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\bar{u}_R\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\bar{\theta}_R\|_{H^1}^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}(\|\bar{u}_R\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\bar{\theta}_R\|_{H^1}^2), \end{aligned}$$

which yields the uniqueness of solution  $(\rho_1, u_2, \theta_1, P_3, \rho_2, \rho_3, \rho_R, u_R, \theta_R)$  to the coupled systems (1.10)–(1.12). Moreover, we obtain from (4.95) that

$$\|\rho_R\|_{H^2} + \|u_R\|_{\mathcal{K}} + \|\theta_R\|_{H^3} + \left\| \frac{\nabla(\rho_0\theta_R + \theta_0\rho_R)}{\varepsilon} \right\|_{L^2} \leq C\|u_1\|_{H^3}^2 \quad (6.14)$$

where the constant  $C > 0$  is independent of  $\varepsilon$ .

Finally, let

$$\rho^\varepsilon = \rho_0 + \varepsilon\rho_1 + \varepsilon^2\rho_2 + \varepsilon^3\rho_3 + \varepsilon^2\rho_R, \quad \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon = \varepsilon u_1 + \varepsilon^2 u_2 + \varepsilon^2 u_R, \quad \theta^\varepsilon = \theta_0 + \varepsilon\theta_1 + \varepsilon^2\theta_R,$$

we obtain a unique solution  $(\rho, \mathbf{u}, \theta)$  of (1.1) satisfying the expansion (1.7) and (1.18). This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.  $\square$

**Acknowledgments.** Feimin Huang's research is partially supported by National Key R&D Program of China, grant No. 2021YFA1000800, and National Natural Sciences Foundation of China, grant No. 12288201. Yong Wang's research is partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China, grants No. 12022114 and No. 12288201, and CAS Project for Young Scientists in Basic Research, grant No. YSBR-031.

## REFERENCES

- [1] T. Alazard, A minicourse on the low Mach number, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. S*, 1 (2008), 365–404.
- [2] C. Bardos, C. D. Levermore, S. Ukai and T. Yang, Kinetic equations: fluid dynamical limits and viscous heating, *Bull. Inst. Math. Acad. Sin. (N.S.)*, 3 (2008), pp. 1–49.
- [3] H. Beirão de Veiga, An  $L^p$ -theory for the  $n$ -dimensional, stationary, compressible Navier-Stokes equations, and incompressible limit for compressible fluids. The equilibrium solutions. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 109 (1987), 229–248.
- [4] F. Boyer and P. Fabrie, *Mathematical Tools for the Study of the Incompressible Navier-Stokes Equations and related models*, Springer, New York, 2013.
- [5] C.-C. Chen, I.-K. Chen, T.-P. Liu and Y. Sone, Thermal transpiration for the linearized Boltzmann equation, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 60 (2007), pp. 147163.
- [6] H. Choe and B. Jin, Existence of solutions of stationary compressible Navier-Stokes equations with large force, *J. Funct. Anal.*, 177 (2000), 54–88.
- [7] C.-S. Dou, F. Jiang, S. Jiang and Y.-F. Yang, Existence of strong solutions to the steady Navier-Stokes equations for a compressible heat-conductive fluid with large forces. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* 103 (2015), no.5, 1163–1197.
- [8] R. Esposito, Y. Guo, R. Marra and L. Wu, Ghost effect from the Boltzmann theory, arXiv: 2301.09427v3.
- [9] R. Esposito, Y. Guo, R. Marra and L. Wu, Ghost effect from the Boltzmann theory: Expansion with remainder term. arXiv: 2301.09560v3.
- [10] E. Feireisl, Singular limits for models of compressible, viscous, heat conducting, and/or rotating fluids. In *Handbook of mathematical analysis in mechanics of viscous fluids*, pages 2771–2825, Springer, Cham, 2018.
- [11] F.-M. Huang, Thermal creep flow for the Boltzmann equation, *Chin. Ann. Math. Ser. B*, 36 (2015), 855–870.
- [12] F.-M. Huang and W. Tan, On the strong solution of the ghost effect system, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 49 (2017), pp. 3496–3526.
- [13] F.-M. Huang, Y. Wang, Y. Wang, and T. Yang, Justification of limit for the Boltzmann equation related to Korteweg theory, *Quart. Appl. Math.*, 74 (2016), pp. 719–764.
- [14] N. Jiang and N. Masmoudi, Low Mach number limits and acoustic waves. In *Handbook of mathematical analysis in mechanics of viscous fluids*, pages 2721–2770. Springer, Cham, 2018.
- [15] Q.-C. Ju and Y.-B. Ou, Low mach number limit of navier-stokes equations with large temperature variations in bounded domains. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* 164 (2022) 131–157.
- [16] C. D. Levermore, W. Sun and K. Trivisa, Local well-posedness of a ghost effect system, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 60 (2011), 517–576.

- [17] Y.-P. Li and J. Liao, Existence of strong solutions to the stationary compressible Navier-Stokes-Korteweg equations with large external force. *Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl.* 47 (2019), 204–223.
- [18] P.-L. Lions, *Mathematical Topics in Fluid Dynamics, vol. 2, Compressible Models*, Oxford Science Publications, Oxford, 1998.
- [19] A. Novotný and M. Padula,  $L^p$ -approach to steady flows of viscous compressible fluids in exterior domains. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* 126 (1994), 243–297.
- [20] A. Novotný and I. Straskraba, *Introduction to the Theory of Compressible Flow*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004.
- [21] Y. Sone, *Molecular gas dynamics. Theory, techniques, and applications.*, Birkhauser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2007.
- [22] C.-Z. Sun, Uniform regularity in the low Mach number and inviscid limits for the full Navier-Stokes system in domains with boundaries, arXiv: 2204.09799v2.
- [23] A. Valli, On the existence of stationary solutions to compressible Navier-Stokes equations. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* 4 (1987), no.1, 99–113.

(F.-M. Huang) ACADEMY OF MATHEMATICS AND SYSTEMS SCIENCE, CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, BEIJING 100190, CHINA; SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, BEIJING 100049, CHINA.

*Email address:* fhuang@amt.ac.cn

(W.-Q. Wang) ACADEMY OF MATHEMATICS AND SYSTEMS SCIENCE, CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, BEIJING 100190, CHINA.

*Email address:* wangweiqiang@amss.ac.cn

(Y. Wang) ACADEMY OF MATHEMATICS AND SYSTEMS SCIENCE, CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, BEIJING 100190, CHINA; SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, BEIJING 100049, CHINA.

*Email address:* yongwang@amss.ac.cn