

# A LORENTZ INVARIANT FORMULATION OF ARTIFICIAL VISCOSITY FOR THE RELATIVISTIC EULER EQUATIONS

MORITZ REINTJES\* AND ADHIRAJ CHADDHA\*\*

DECEMBER 30, 2024

**ABSTRACT.** The vanishing (artificial) viscosity method has played a fundamental role in the theory of classical shock waves, both by providing a mollified limit that identifies the correct physical (Lax admissible) shock waves, and as a guiding principle in the design of numerical difference schemes for simulating shock waves. However, for relativistic fluid flow, the underlying dissipation mechanism based on the Euclidean Laplace operator violates Lorentz invariance (and hence the speed of light bound)—the fundamental principle of Special Relativity. In this paper we introduce a simple dissipation mechanism for the relativistic Euler equations which is Lorentz invariant and consistent with the laws of Special Relativity. To establish basic consistency of the model for the study of shock waves, we prove existence and decay of Fourier Laplace mode solutions (implying dissipation), and we prove that 1-D shock profiles (viscous travelling wave approximations) exist if and only if the approximated shock waves are Lax admissible. Our analysis of shock profiles reveals an interesting simplification over classical artificial viscosity, leading to a one dimensional fixed point problem, due to the speed of light bound of Relativity.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Shock waves are central to the study of Fluid Dynamics and its numerous applications, because smooth solutions of the compressible Euler equations break down in finite time to form shock discontinuities whenever the flow is sufficiently compressive [5, 6, 32, 37]. Since Riemann’s original 1880 work on shock waves, their understanding has posed many mathematical challenges and it was not until the 1960’s that the “Riemann problem” (piece-wise constant discontinuous initial data) was solved by Lax in terms of the correct entropy solutions [31]. This was the building block of Glimm’s celebrated random choice method for solving the Cauchy problem in 1-D with general discontinuous initial data of bounded total variation [26]. Uniqueness of these Glimm scheme based solutions was only established decades later by Bressan [4], and only few results have been worked out for shock waves in multi-dimensions (cf. [12]), where uniqueness is no longer intertwined with the second law (entropy condition) of Thermodynamics [9, 8].

The vanishing viscosity method plays a fundamental role in the theory of shock waves, both, for generating the physical shock wave solutions and for studying shock waves as mollified limits. That is, smooth solutions to the compressible Euler equations with a Laplacian based dissipative pressure term in 1-D converge,

under the zero viscosity limit, to shock wave solutions of the  $2 \times 2$  (isentropic) Euler equations which all meet the correct entropy condition [44, 13, 28, 43], thereby generating physically correct (Lax admissible) shock waves. Conversely, the vanishing viscosity method is a powerful tool to study shock waves as smooth solutions at a mollified level, which is particularly important in the design of numerical schemes for simulating physical shock waves [12, 38]. All this is accomplished by basing the vanishing viscosity method on the Euclidean Laplace operator in spatial variables on the fluid variables as a mechanism for dissipation (so-called “artificial viscosity”), which correctly captures the physics of compressible fluid flow in the small viscosity limit, without turning to Navier-Stokes viscosity.

Relativistic fluids play an important role in Physics, with applications ranging from Cosmology to the study of stellar structures and black holes [10, 45]. Shock waves form in relativistic fluids whenever the flow is sufficiently compressive [11, 35]. The existence theory of Lax and Glimm for constructing shock waves was extended to the *relativistic* Euler equations by Smoller and Temple [39], see also [27]. Using classical Laplacian based artificial viscosity, Chen and Schrecker [7] as well as LeFloch and Yamazaki [33], succeeded to construct relativistic shock waves by the vanishing viscosity method. However, the Euler equations with Laplacian based dissipation violates Lorentz invariance<sup>1</sup> (and hence the speed of light bound)—the principle at the foundation of Special Relativity. Since one cannot expect to correctly model relativistic shock waves with viscous approximations that violate the basic laws of Relativity, the question arises what a suitable formulation of Lorentz invariant artificial viscosity—efficient for the study of relativistic shock waves—could be, a question of particular relevance for the design of numerical schemes.

In this paper we introduce a Lorentz invariant notion of artificial viscosity for the relativistic Euler equations, (see (1.3) below), and establish its basic consistency for the study of relativistic shock waves by proving decay of Fourier-Laplace modes (dissipation) and the existence of shock profiles for Lax admissible shocks. In our model dissipation is induced through the hyperbolic wave operator on the fluid four velocity in place of the Euclidean Laplacian. This model and its analysis is motivated by the pioneering work of Freistühler and Temple on formulations of Navier-Stokes type viscosity in Relativistic Fluid Dynamics [22, 23, 24, 25], where dissipation is based on the interplay of first and second order hyperbolic operators. A sophisticated global-in-time existence theory for dissipative smooth solutions for such hyperbolic-hyperbolic systems of equations, applicable to the equations in [22, 23, 24], has been developed by Sroczinski in [40, 41, 42], in the spirit of Kawashima’s work [14].

The formulation of relativistic Navier-Stokes type equations and the question of relativistic dissipation is subject of ongoing research and debate. This was initiated by Landau [30], followed by proposals of Eckart [16] and Israel-Stewart [29], as

---

<sup>1</sup>The Laplace operator is Galilei invariant, the basic invariance of Classical Mechanics, which is preserved by the classical Euler equations with classical artificial viscosity; but the Laplacian violates Lorentz invariance.

well as the theory of Extended Thermodynamics of Mueller-Ruggeri in [34]. More recently the topic was reinvigorated by Freistühler and Temple [22, 23, 24, 18], (see also [19, 20, 21, 36]), followed by independent proposals of Bemfica, Disconzi and Noronha in [2, 3] and by Kovtun in [15]. The model of artificial viscosity introduced here can be viewed as a simplifying toy-model for the Freistühler-Temple viscosity in [22, 23]. Earlier proposals of relativistic artificial viscosity based on the wave operator can be found in [21, Thm. 3] and [1], (we comment on differences between these models in the end of this section).

To introduce our model of relativistic artificial viscosity, consider a fluid with mass/energy-density  $\rho$ , pressure  $p(\rho)$  and the fluid 4-velocity  $u^\mu$ . The relativistic Euler equations governing compressible fluid flow without viscosity are

$$\partial_\nu T^{\mu\nu} = 0, \quad (1.1)$$

where  $T^{\mu\nu}$  is the energy-momentum tensor of a perfect fluid,

$$T^{\mu\nu} = (p + \rho)u^\mu u^\nu + p\eta^{\mu\nu}, \quad (1.2)$$

$\eta = \text{diag}(-1, 1, 1, 1)$  is the Minkowski metric of Special Relativity, and the fluid 4-velocity is assumed to satisfy the the speed of light bound in the form of the constraint  $u^\sigma u_\sigma = -1$ .<sup>2</sup> In this paper we propose and investigate what we call the *Euler equations with relativistic artificial viscosity*, (or *RAV Euler equations* for short),

$$\partial_\nu T^{\mu\nu} = \varepsilon \square u^\mu, \quad (1.3)$$

where  $\square = -\partial_{tt}^2 + \Delta$  is the D'Alembert operator and  $\Delta = \partial_{xx}^2 + \partial_{yy}^2 + \partial_{zz}^2$  the Laplacian, both taken component-wise on  $u^\mu$ , and  $\varepsilon > 0$  is a constant representing viscosity. We assume throughout the paper that  $p = p(\rho)$  is a barotropic equation of state with  $\frac{dp}{d\rho} > 0$ .

A major difference between (1.3) and the models for relativistic artificial viscosity in [21, Thm. 3] and [1], is that the coefficient matrix of the wave operator in [21, Thm. 3] and [1] both have full rank, while the equations in (1.3) when written in matrix form have, due to the speed of light bound, a coefficient matrix on the wave operator of non-full rank<sup>3</sup>, (as can be seen from the linearized equations (2.1) below). This paper is the first step of an investigation into the possibility and potential advantages of studying shock wave solutions of the relativistic Euler equations as viscous limits of (1.3). For this, we establish the basic consistency of the RAV Euler equations for the study of shock waves by proving that (1.3) is Lorentz invariant (Theorem 2.3), dissipative in the sense that all Fourier Laplace mode solutions decay (Theorem 2.1), and that shock profiles exists if and only if the shocks satisfy the Lax admissibility condition (Theorem 2.2). In Theorem 2.3 we also record the classical limit of (1.3). Interestingly, our analysis of shock

<sup>2</sup>We use natural units with the speed of light set to  $c = 1$ . We use the Einstein summation convention of summing over repeated upper and lower indices from 0 to 3, e.g.,  $\partial_\nu T^{\mu\nu} = \sum_{\nu=0}^3 \partial_\nu T^{\mu\nu} = \text{div}(T)^\mu$ . We raise and lower indices with the Minkowski metric  $\eta_{\mu\nu}$  and its inverse  $\eta^{\mu\nu}$ , e.g.,  $u_\mu = \eta_{\mu\nu} u^\nu$ .

<sup>3</sup>The existence theory in [40, 41, 42] requires full rank of coefficient matrices and does not apply to (1.3).

profiles of (1.3) reduces by the speed of light bound ( $u^\sigma u_\sigma = -1$ ) to a stability problem for a single scalar ODE, in place of a  $2 \times 2$ -system arising in Classical Fluid Dynamics. This indicates that the more geometric and restrictive framework of Relativity can be advantageous for the study of Fluid Dynamics, (a principle already alluded to in [11]), and we wonder whether this more geometric structure of relativistic fluids can be of benefit for the study of shock waves, for instance, in multi-dimensions.

## 2. STATEMENT OF RESULTS

Our first theorem establishes dissipativity of the Euler equations with relativistic artificial viscosity (1.3) in the sense that all Fourier-Laplace modes of the linearized equations are decaying. To be precise, we derive in Section 4 the linearization of (1.3) at a steady state solution  $(\rho_0, u_0^\mu)$  to be given by

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho + \kappa \nabla \cdot \vec{u} = 0 \\ \kappa \partial_t u_j + \sigma^2 \partial_j \rho = \varepsilon \square u_j, \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

where  $\vec{u} \equiv (u^1, u^2, u^3)$  are the spatial components of the fluid 4-velocity,  $\nabla = (\partial_x, \partial_y, \partial_z)$  is the spatial gradient,  $\sigma \equiv \sqrt{p'(\rho_0)} \equiv \sqrt{\frac{dp}{d\rho}|_{\rho_0}} > 0$  is the speed of sound,  $\kappa \equiv p(\rho_0) + \rho_0$ , and we assumed  $u_0^\mu = (1, 0, 0, 0)$  and  $\rho_0 > 0$  is constant. A Fourier-Laplace (FL-) mode solution of (2.1) is of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} \rho \\ \vec{u} \end{pmatrix} = \Psi e^{\lambda t + i \vec{\xi} \vec{x}}, \quad (2.2)$$

where  $\Psi \in \mathbb{R}^4$  is a fixed vector, and  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $\vec{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^3$  are the FL-modes determined by the so-called dispersion relation of (2.1). In our first result we establish existence and decay of FL-mode solutions.

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $p'(\rho) > 0$ . Then, for any  $\vec{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^3$  there exists some  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  such that the corresponding Fourier-Laplace mode (2.2) solves (2.1), and if  $\vec{\xi} \neq 0$ , then  $\lambda \neq 0$ . Moreover, any Fourier-Laplace mode solution (2.2) of (2.1) with  $\lambda \neq 0$  decays in the sense that  $\text{Re}(\lambda) < 0$ .<sup>4</sup>*

In our second theorem we establish that shock profiles of the RAV Euler equations in one spatial dimension exist and select the correct Lax admissible shock waves. Remarkably, the proof is simpler than can be expected from the theory of hyperbolic conservation laws ahead of time, because the relativistic speed of light bound reduces the system of ODE's describing travelling wave solutions of the RAV Euler equations to a scalar ODE. To be precise, substituting the traveling wave ansatz  $\rho(t, x) = \rho(\zeta)$  and  $u^\mu(t, x) = u^\mu(\zeta)$ , for  $\zeta = \frac{x-st}{\epsilon}$ ,  $u^2 = 0 = u^3$ ,  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ , into the RAV Euler equations (1.3), and expressing the normalization condition  $u^\sigma u_\sigma = -1$  (imposing the speed of light bound) in the form  $u^0 = \sqrt{1 + u^2}$

<sup>4</sup>Note that decay of FL-modes for linearizations at constant fluid 4-velocities  $u_0^\mu$  with non-zero spatial components cannot be inferred from Theorem 2.1, since FL-modes are not Lorentz invariant. For general  $u_0^\mu$ , as for general modes, our method seems inconclusive since the order of polynomials involved becomes significantly larger, but gives indications that decay of FL-modes should still hold.

for  $u \equiv u^1$ , we solve for the density as a function of  $u$  explicitly, and write the RAV Euler equations (1.3) equivalently as

$$\dot{u} = \frac{1}{1-s^2} \left( T^{1\nu} - T_R^{1\nu} \right) \zeta_\nu, \quad (2.3)$$

$$\rho(u) = \frac{1}{s-v(u)} \left( v(u) T_R^{1\nu} - T_R^{0\nu} \right) \zeta_\nu, \quad (2.4)$$

where  $v(u) \equiv \frac{u}{\sqrt{1+u^2}}$  is the classical fluid velocity,  $\zeta_\nu \equiv (-s, 1)$  and  $\dot{u} \equiv \frac{du}{d\zeta}$ . Equation (2.4) gives the density as an explicit function of  $u$ , and thereby reduces (1.3) to the scalar ODE (2.3), which leads to a significant simplification in the analysis of shock profiles of the RAV Euler equations.

Now, to state our result on shock profiles, we take  $s \in \mathbb{R}$  to be the shock speed of two constant states  $(\rho_L, u_L)$  and  $(\rho_R, u_R)$ , which satisfy the Rankine Hugoniot (RH) conditions

$$[T^{\mu\nu}] \zeta_\nu \equiv (T_L^{\mu\nu} - T_R^{\mu\nu}) \zeta_\nu = 0, \quad (2.5)$$

where  $\zeta_\nu = (-s, 1)$ , and  $T_{L/R}^{\mu\nu}$  denotes the energy momentum tensor (1.2) evaluated at  $(\rho_{L/R}, u_{L/R})$  respectively. We show in Section 5 that local solutions of (2.3) with initial data in between  $u_L$  and  $u_R$  extend to global solutions  $u(\zeta)$ ,  $\zeta \in (-\infty, \infty)$ , which converge asymptotically to  $u_L$  and  $u_R$ , because  $u_L$  and  $u_R$  are the only rest points of (2.3). Now, by convention  $u_L$  is the state on the left hand side of the shock surface  $\{x - st = 0\}$ , and  $u_R$  is the state on the right hand side of the shock surface, and thus the physically relevant solutions of (2.3) for the problem of shock profiles have asymptotics

$$\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow -\infty} (\rho(\zeta), u^\mu(\zeta)) = (\rho_L, u_L^\mu) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\zeta \rightarrow \infty} (\rho(\zeta), u^\mu(\zeta)) = (\rho_R, u_R^\mu). \quad (2.6)$$

Theorem 2.2 below establishes that the asymptotics (2.6) on solutions of (2.3) are equivalent to the Lax admissibility conditions for either 1- or 2-shocks, that is,

$$\lambda_1(u_R) \leq s_1 \leq \lambda_1(u_L) \quad \text{and} \quad s_1 \leq \lambda_2(u_R), \quad (2.7)$$

$$\text{or} \quad \lambda_2(u_R) \leq s_2 \leq \lambda_2(u_L) \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_1(u_L) \leq s_2. \quad (2.8)$$

Here  $s_i$  denotes the shock speed of the  $i$ -th shock curve,  $i = 1, 2$ , and

$$\lambda_1(u) \equiv \frac{v - \sigma}{1 - v\sigma} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_2(u) \equiv \frac{v + \sigma}{1 + v\sigma} \quad (2.9)$$

are the characteristic speeds of the relativistic Euler equations (1.1) in terms of the speed of sound  $\sigma \equiv \sqrt{\frac{dp}{d\rho}}$ . In summary, we prove in Section 5 the following result.

**Theorem 2.2.** *Assume  $(\rho_L, u_L)$  and  $(\rho_R, u_R)$  are constant states which satisfy the RH conditions (2.5) with shock speed  $s$ . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) *There exists a traveling wave solution  $\rho(t, x) = \rho(\zeta)$  and  $u^\mu(t, x) = u^\mu(\zeta)$ ,  $\zeta = \frac{x-st}{\epsilon}$ , of the RAV Euler equations (1.3) with asymptotics (2.6).*
- (ii) *The first Lax condition (2.7) holds with  $s = s_1$  if  $u_L$  and  $u_R$  are separated by a 1-shock, and the second Lax condition (2.8) holds with  $s = s_2$  if  $u_L$  and  $u_R < 0$  are separated by a 2-shock.*

Our third theorem establishes Lorentz invariance and the classical limit of the RAV Euler equations.

**Theorem 2.3.** *The Euler equations with relativistic artificial viscosity (1.3) are (i) Lorentz invariant, and (ii) converge (formally) under the classical limit ( $c \rightarrow \infty$ ) to*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho + \nabla \cdot (\rho \vec{v}) = \varepsilon \vec{v} \cdot \Delta \vec{v} \\ \rho (\partial_t \vec{v} + \vec{v} \cdot \nabla \vec{v}) + \nabla p = \varepsilon \Delta \vec{v}, \end{cases} \quad (2.10)$$

where  $\rho(t, \vec{x})$  is the mass-density of the fluid,  $p(t, \vec{x})$  its pressure,  $\vec{v}(t, \vec{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^3$  its velocity,  $\Delta \equiv \partial_{xx}^2 + \partial_{yy}^2 + \partial_{zz}^2$  the Laplacian and  $\nabla$  the spatial gradient.

Since the proofs of Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 both use the Lorentz invariance of the RAV Euler equations, we first give the proof of Theorem 2.3, the topic of Section 3. The proofs of Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 are given in Sections 4 and 5, respectively.

As a final comment we explain how to extend the RAV Euler equations to General Relativity. For this, define the ‘‘viscosity tensor’’

$$T_\varepsilon^{\mu\nu} \equiv T^{\mu\nu} - \varepsilon \nabla^\mu u^\nu,$$

where  $T^{\mu\nu}$  is again the energy momentum tensor of a perfect fluid (1.2) but with  $\eta_{\mu\nu}$  replaced by a general Lorentzian metric  $g_{\mu\nu}$  and  $\nabla^\mu = g^{\mu\nu} \nabla_\nu$  denotes the covariant derivative (i.e., the Levi-Civita connection) of  $g_{\mu\nu}$ . The interaction of the matter fields  $T_\varepsilon^{\mu\nu}$  with the spacetime geometry—and hence the gravitational field—is governed by the Einstein equations coupled to the RAV Euler equations,

$$G^{\mu\nu} = 8\pi T_\varepsilon^{\mu\nu} \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla_\nu T^{\mu\nu} = \varepsilon \square_g u^\mu, \quad (2.11)$$

where  $G_{\mu\nu}$  denotes the Einstein curvature tensor of  $g_{\mu\nu}$  and  $\square_g \equiv g^{\mu\nu} \nabla_\nu \nabla_\mu$  denotes the D’Alembert operator associated to  $g_{\mu\nu}$ . Since the Einstein tensor is symmetric ( $G_{\mu\nu} = G_{\nu\mu}$ ), the fluids described by (2.11) are irrotational ( $\nabla_\mu u_\nu = \nabla_\nu u_\mu$ ). Since the Einstein curvature tensor is constructed to be divergence-free, the Einstein equations imply  $T_\varepsilon^{\mu\nu}$  to be divergence-free, and this implies the second equation in (2.11) on the matter fields in  $T_\varepsilon^{\mu\nu}$ , to which we refer as the ‘‘covariant RAV Euler equations’’.

### 3. LORENTZ INVARIANCE AND CLASSICAL LIMIT

In this section we prove Theorem 2.3. Part (i) of Theorem 2.3, the Lorentz invariance of (1.3), follows directly from  $u^\mu$  and  $\partial_\nu T^{\mu\nu}$  both transforming as vectors, and  $\square$  being invariant under Lorentz transformations. For completeness, we prove this now in detail. Let  $\Lambda_\alpha^\mu$  denote a Lorentz transformation, mapping a coordinate system  $x^\mu$  to coordinates  $\bar{x}^\alpha$  by  $x^\mu = \Lambda_\alpha^\mu \bar{x}^\alpha + a^\mu$ , where  $a^\mu \in \mathbb{R}^4$  is the vector of a constant spacetime translation, and  $\Lambda : \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4$  is a constant  $(4 \times 4)$ -matrix which preserves the Minkowski metric  $(\eta_{\mu\nu}) = (\eta_{\alpha\beta}) = \text{diag}(-1, 1, 1, 1)$  under tensor transformation,

$$\Lambda_\alpha^\mu \Lambda_\beta^\nu \eta_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\alpha\beta}. \quad (3.1)$$

Now, the fluid density and pressure transform as scalars, e.g.,  $\rho(x) = \rho(x(\bar{x})) \equiv \bar{\rho}(\bar{x})$ , while the fluid 4-velocity transforms as a vector,  $u^\mu = \Lambda_\alpha^\mu \bar{u}^\alpha$ . It follows that

the energy-momentum tensor (1.2) of a fluid transforms as  $T^{\mu\nu} = \Lambda_\alpha^\mu \Lambda_\beta^\nu \bar{T}^{\alpha\beta}$ , and thus

$$\partial_\nu T^{\mu\nu} = (\Lambda^{-1})^\gamma_\nu \partial_\gamma (\Lambda_\alpha^\mu \Lambda_\beta^\nu \bar{T}^{\alpha\beta}) = \Lambda_\alpha^\mu \partial_\beta \bar{T}^{\alpha\beta} \quad (3.2)$$

transforms as a vector. On the other hand, since

$$\square = \eta^{\nu\sigma} \partial_\nu \partial_\mu = \eta^{\nu\sigma} (\Lambda^{-1})^\beta_\nu (\Lambda^{-1})^\gamma_\sigma \partial_\beta \partial_\gamma = \eta^{\beta\gamma} \partial_\beta \partial_\gamma = \bar{\square} \quad (3.3)$$

transforms as a scalar,  $\square u^\mu = \Lambda_\alpha^\mu \bar{\square} \bar{u}^\alpha$  transforms as a vector. Combining this with (3.2), we conclude that (1.3) transforms as

$$0 = \partial_\nu T^{\mu\nu} - \varepsilon \square u^\mu = \Lambda_\alpha^\mu \left( \partial_\beta \bar{T}^{\alpha\beta} - \varepsilon \bar{\square} \bar{u}^\alpha \right), \quad (3.4)$$

which is the sought-after Lorentz invariance.

We now prove part (ii) of Theorem 2.3, the classical limit of (1.3). In order to take  $c \rightarrow \infty$  in a formal sense, we first reinsert the speed of light  $c$  into (1.3), which in coordinates  $x^\mu = (ct, x, y, z)$  gives

$$\partial_\nu T^{\mu\nu} = \varepsilon \square u^\mu \quad (3.5)$$

for

$$T^{\mu\nu} \equiv \left( \rho + \frac{p}{c^2} \right) u^\mu u^\nu + p \eta^{\mu\nu} \quad \text{and} \quad u^\mu \equiv \gamma(\vec{v}) \begin{pmatrix} c \\ \vec{v} \end{pmatrix},$$

with  $\gamma(v) = (1 - v^2/c^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ , Minkowski metric  $\eta = \text{diag}(-1, 1, 1, 1)$ , D'Alembert operator  $\square \equiv \eta^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \partial_\nu = -\frac{1}{c^2} \partial_{tt}^2 + \partial_{xx}^2 + \partial_{yy}^2 + \partial_{zz}^2$ , classical fluid velocity  $\vec{v}$ , and fluid 4-velocity  $u^\mu$  satisfying  $u^\mu u_\mu = -c^2$ .

Contracting (3.5) with  $u_\mu$  yields the relativistic conservation of mass-energy equation,

$$u^\mu \partial_\mu \rho + \left( \rho + \frac{p}{c^2} \right) \partial_\mu u^\mu = \varepsilon u_\mu \square u^\mu, \quad (3.6)$$

where we used that  $u_\mu \partial_\nu u^\mu = 0$  as a result of the normalization  $u^\mu u_\mu = -c^2$ . The relativistic conservation of 3-momentum equation is obtained by contraction of (3.5) with  $\Pi^{\mu\nu} \equiv \eta^{\mu\nu} + c^{-2} u^\mu u^\nu$ , (the projection orthogonal to  $u^\mu$ ), as

$$\left( \rho + \frac{p}{c^2} \right) u^\nu \partial_\nu u^\mu + \Pi^{\mu\nu} \partial_\nu p = \varepsilon \Pi^{\mu\nu} \square u_\nu, \quad (3.7)$$

using that  $\Pi_{\mu\nu} u^\nu = 0$  and, (by  $u_\nu \partial_\sigma u^\nu = 0$ ), that  $\Pi^{\mu\nu} \partial_\sigma u_\nu = \partial_\sigma u^\mu$ .

We now compute the limit  $c \rightarrow \infty$  of (3.6) and (3.7). First, setting  $v^\mu \equiv u^\mu / \gamma(\vec{v})$ , we find using the Leibnitz rule that

$$\square u^\mu = \gamma(\vec{v}) \square v^\mu + O(c^{-2}), \quad (3.8)$$

since  $\gamma(\vec{v}) = O(1)$ ,  $\partial_\nu \gamma(\vec{v}) = O(c^{-2})$  and  $\partial_{\nu\mu}^2 \gamma(\vec{v}) = O(c^{-4})$ . Thus, since  $\square = -\frac{1}{c^2} \partial_{tt}^2 + \Delta$  and  $v^0 = c$ , we obtain

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \square u^\mu = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{for } \mu = 0 \\ \Delta v^j, & \text{for } \mu = j \in \{1, 2, 3\}. \end{cases} \quad (3.9)$$

To now compute the classical limit of (3.6), observe that

$$\partial_\sigma u^\sigma = \gamma(\vec{v}) \nabla \cdot \vec{v} + O(c^{-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad u^\sigma \partial_\sigma \rho = \gamma(\vec{v}) (\partial_t \rho + \vec{v} \cdot \nabla \rho). \quad (3.10)$$



Substitution of (3.10) into (3.6) yields

$$\gamma(\vec{v}) (\partial_t \rho + \vec{v} \cdot \nabla \rho) + \left( \rho + \frac{p}{c^2} \right) (\gamma(v) \nabla \cdot \vec{v} + O(c^{-1})) = \varepsilon u_\sigma \square u^\sigma,$$

and taking the limit  $c \rightarrow \infty$  we obtain the sought-after conservation of mass equation,

$$\partial_t \rho + \vec{v} \cdot \nabla \rho + \rho \nabla \cdot \vec{v} = \varepsilon \vec{v} \cdot \Delta \vec{v}, \quad (3.11)$$

interpreting  $\rho$  as classical mass density. To compute the classical limit of (3.7), we note that

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} u^\sigma \partial_\sigma u^\nu = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \partial_t \vec{v} + \vec{v} \cdot \nabla \vec{v} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \Pi_{\mu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \text{id}_3 \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $\text{id}_3$  denotes the identity on  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Substituting the above identities into (3.7), we obtain in the limit  $c \rightarrow \infty$  the sought after conservation of momentum equation

$$\rho \partial_t \vec{v} + \rho \vec{v} \cdot \nabla \vec{v} + \nabla p = \varepsilon \Delta \vec{v}. \quad (3.12)$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 2.3.  $\square$

#### 4. DISSIPATION - PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1

We now prove existence of Fourier-Laplace (FL-) mode solutions (2.2) of form  $\Psi e^{\lambda t + i \vec{\xi} \cdot \vec{x}}$  with  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $\vec{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^3$  to the linearized RAV-Euler equations (2.1), and prove decay in the sense that  $\text{Re}(\lambda) < 0$ . For this we first derive the linearization (2.1) of (1.3) at a steady state solution  $(\rho_0, u_0^\mu)$  on a formal level, assuming sufficiently smooth solutions.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Assume a constant density  $\rho_0 > 0$  and fluid 4-velocity  $u_0^\mu = (1, 0, 0, 0)$ . Assume  $(\bar{\rho}, \bar{u})$  is a smooth solution of (1.3) of form  $\bar{\rho} = \rho_0 + \varepsilon \rho$  and  $\bar{u}^\mu \equiv u_0^\mu + \varepsilon u^\mu$ , where  $\varepsilon > 0$  is constant. Then, for  $\varepsilon > 0$  sufficiently small, omitting terms of order  $O(\varepsilon^2)$ ,  $(\rho, u^\mu)$  solves the following linearization of (1.3),*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho + \kappa \nabla \cdot \bar{u} = 0 \\ \kappa \partial_t u_j + \sigma^2 \partial_j \rho = \varepsilon \square u_j, \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

where  $\bar{u} \equiv (u^1, u^2, u^3)$ ,  $\nabla = (\partial_x, \partial_y, \partial_z)$ , and  $\varepsilon > 0$  denotes viscosity.

*Proof.* To begin, set  $u^\mu = (0, u^1, u^2, u^3)$ , which implies the normalization  $\bar{u}^\sigma \bar{u}_\sigma = -1$  to hold within order  $\varepsilon^2$ -errors,

$$\bar{u}^\sigma \bar{u}_\sigma = u_0^\sigma (u_0)_\sigma + \varepsilon^2 u^\sigma u_\sigma = -1 + O(\varepsilon^2). \quad (4.2)$$

By Taylor expansion in  $\varepsilon$ , we find for the barotropic pressure law that

$$p(\bar{\rho}) = p(\rho_0) + \varepsilon \sigma^2 \rho + O(\varepsilon^2), \quad (4.3)$$

where  $\sigma^2 = p'(\rho_0)$ . Thus, the energy momentum tensor  $\bar{T}^{\mu\nu}$  of  $(\bar{\rho}, \bar{u})$ , up to order  $\varepsilon^2$ -errors, is given by

$$\bar{T}^{\mu\nu} = T_0^{\mu\nu} + \varepsilon \left( \kappa (u_0^\mu u^\nu + u_0^\nu u^\mu) + (\sigma^2 + 1) u_0^\mu u_0^\nu \rho + \sigma^2 \eta^{\mu\nu} \rho \right) + O(\varepsilon^2), \quad (4.4)$$



where  $T_0^{\mu\nu}$  denotes the energy momentum tensor of  $(\rho_0, u_0^\mu)$  and  $\kappa = p(\rho_0) + \rho_0$ . Taking now the divergence of (4.4) gives

$$\partial_\nu \bar{T}^{\mu\nu} = \epsilon \left( \kappa (u_0^\mu \partial_\nu u^\nu + u_0^\nu \partial_\nu u^\mu) + (\sigma^2 + 1) u_0^\mu u_0^\nu \partial_\nu \rho + \sigma^2 \eta^{\mu\nu} \partial_\nu \rho \right) + O(\epsilon^2). \quad (4.5)$$

Now, substituting (4.5) for the left hand side in (1.3), dividing by  $\epsilon$  and omitting terms of order  $\epsilon$ , yields the linearization

$$\kappa (u_0^\mu \partial_\nu u^\nu + u_0^\nu \partial_\nu u^\mu) + (\sigma^2 + 1) u_0^\mu u_0^\nu \partial_\nu \rho + \sigma^2 \eta^{\mu\nu} \partial_\nu \rho = \epsilon \square u^\mu. \quad (4.6)$$

The sought-after linearized equations (2.1) follow by substitution of  $u_0^\mu = (1, 0, 0, 0)$  and  $u^\mu = (0, u^1, u^2, u^3)$  in (4.6).  $\square$

We now write (2.1) equivalently as a matrix equation on FL-modes. For this, substitute the FL-modes  $\rho = \Psi^0 e^{\lambda t + i \vec{\xi} \vec{x}}$  and  $u^j = \Psi^j e^{\lambda t + i \vec{\xi} \vec{x}}$  into (4.1). It follows then that the linearized RAV-Euler equations (2.1) are equivalent to the matrix equation

$$M \cdot \Psi = 0, \quad \text{for} \quad M \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & i \kappa \vec{\xi}^T \\ i \sigma^2 \vec{\xi} & (\kappa \lambda + \epsilon \lambda^2 + \epsilon |\vec{\xi}|^2) I_3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.7)$$

where  $\sigma^2 \equiv p'(\rho_0)$ ,  $\kappa \equiv p(\rho_0) + \rho_0$ ,  $\rho_0 > 0$  constant and  $I_3$  denotes the identity matrix on  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . In our next lemma, we compute the dispersion relation  $\det(M) = 0$  associated to (4.7), which gives a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of FL-mode solutions. For this we now make without loss of generality the simplifying assumption that  $\vec{\xi} = (\xi, 0, 0)$  for some  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ , (this can always be arranged for by Lorentz transformation as shown in the end of this section).

**Lemma 4.2.** *Assume  $\vec{\xi} = (\xi, 0, 0)$ . A FL-mode (2.2) solves the linearized RAV-Euler equations if and only if  $\lambda$  and  $\xi$  satisfy the dispersion relation*

$$(\lambda^3 + \tilde{\kappa} \lambda^2 + \xi^2 \lambda + \tilde{\kappa} \sigma^2 \xi^2)(\lambda^2 + \tilde{\kappa} \lambda + \xi^2) = 0, \quad (4.8)$$

where  $\tilde{\kappa} = \frac{\kappa}{\epsilon}$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ .

*Proof.* Substituting  $\vec{\xi} = (\xi, 0, 0)$  into (4.7) reduces the matrix  $M$  to block diagonal form  $M = \text{diag}(M_1, M_2)$  with

$$M_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & i \kappa \xi \\ i \sigma^2 \xi & \kappa \lambda + \epsilon \lambda^2 + \epsilon \xi^2 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad M_2 = (\kappa \lambda + \epsilon \lambda^2 + \epsilon \xi^2) I_2. \quad (4.9)$$

Thus, since  $\det(M) = \det(M_1) \det(M_2)$ , the dispersion relation  $\det(M) = 0$  reduces to the sought-after equation (4.8).  $\square$

We now keep  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$  fixed and view each factor in (4.8) as a polynomial in  $\lambda$ . We next show that their non-zero roots all satisfy  $\Re(\lambda) < 0$ , which implies the sought-after decay of FL-modes. Note, the case  $\lambda = 0$  implies the trivial FL-mode  $(\lambda, \xi) = 0$  of a steady state, which we can ignore here.

**Lemma 4.3.** *For any  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ , there always exist some  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  which solves the dispersion relation (4.8), and if  $\xi \neq 0$ , then  $\lambda \neq 0$ . Moreover, any non-zero solution  $\lambda$  of (4.8) satisfies  $\Re(\lambda) < 0$ .*

*Proof.* Note first that, if  $\xi = 0$ , then (4.8) implies either  $\lambda = 0$  (the trivial case of a staddy state), or  $\lambda = -\tilde{\kappa} < 0$ . We now study the roots of the two polynomials in (4.8) separately for the non-trivial case  $\xi \neq 0$ . For this, set  $\lambda = a + ib$ , for  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ .

The first condition (4.8) gives rise to, i.e.,  $(\lambda^3 + \tilde{\kappa}\lambda^2 + \xi^2\lambda + \tilde{\kappa}\sigma^2\xi^2) = 0$ , is equivalent to

$$(a^3 - 3ab^2) + \tilde{\kappa}(a^2 - b^2) + \xi^2a + \sigma\tilde{\kappa}\xi^2 = 0 \quad (4.10)$$

$$(3a^2b - b^3) + 2\tilde{\kappa}ab + b\xi^2 = 0. \quad (4.11)$$

Equation (4.11) holds if either  $b = 0$  or  $b^2 = 2\tilde{\kappa}a + 3a^2 + \xi^2$ . In case  $b = 0$ ,  $a \equiv \Re(\lambda)$  satisfies

$$a^3 + \tilde{\kappa}a^2 + \xi^2a + \sigma\tilde{\kappa}\xi^2 = 0, \quad (4.12)$$

which directly implies that  $a < 0$ , since all coefficients in (4.12) are strictly positive, keeping in mind that  $\tilde{\kappa} > 0$ ,  $\xi^2 > 0$  and  $0 < \sigma < 1$ . In case that  $b^2 = 2\tilde{\kappa}a + 3a^2 + \xi^2$ ,  $a \equiv \Re(\lambda)$  satisfies

$$a^3 + \tilde{\kappa}a^2 + \frac{1}{4}(\tilde{\kappa}^2 + \xi^2)a + \frac{\tilde{\kappa}\xi^2}{8}(1 - \sigma) = 0, \quad (4.13)$$

which again implies that  $a < 0$ , since again all coefficients are strictly positive.

From the second condition in (4.8), i.e.,  $\lambda^2 + \tilde{\kappa}\lambda + \xi^2 = 0$ , one can directly compute

$$\lambda = -\frac{\tilde{\kappa}}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\tilde{\kappa}^2 - 4\xi^2}$$

which implies again  $\Re(\lambda) < 0$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

To complete the proof of Theorem 2.1 we now show that a general  $\vec{\xi}^T = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3)$  of an FL-mode in a frame  $\vec{x}'$  can always be reduced to  $\vec{\xi} = (\xi, 0, 0)$  by a spatial rotation without changing  $\lambda$ . That is, choosing a  $3 \times 3$  rotation matrix  $R$  such that  $R^T \vec{\xi}^T = \vec{\xi} \equiv (\xi, 0, 0)$ , the exponent of the FL-modes (2.2) transforms under the spatial rotation  $\vec{x}' = R\vec{x}$  as

$$\lambda t + i(\vec{\xi}^T)^T \vec{x}' = \lambda t + i(\vec{\xi}^T)^T R\vec{x} = \lambda t + i(R^T \vec{\xi}^T)^T \vec{x} = \lambda t + i\vec{\xi}^T \vec{x} = \lambda t + i\xi x.$$

Thus,  $\lambda$  is the same in both frames  $\vec{x}$  and  $\vec{x}'$ , so that Lemma 4.3 readily implies the sought after decay of the FL-modes  $(\lambda, \vec{\xi}^T)$  and  $(\lambda, \vec{\xi})$ . Note finally that spatial rotations are Lorentz transformations, which by Lorentz invariance of the RAV-Euler equations (established in Theorem 2.3, and which trivially extends to the linearized equations) map solutions of (4.1) again to solutions. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.1.

## 5. SHOCK PROFILES - PROOF OF THEOREM 2.2

To construct traveling wave solutions it suffices to assume one dimensional fluid flow in the direction of the  $x^1$ -axis, that is, we assume  $u^2 = 0 = u^3$  and set  $u \equiv u^1$ , which implies  $u^0 = \sqrt{1 + u^2}$  by the normalization condition  $u^\sigma u_\sigma = -1$ . We assume further that the speed of sound  $\sigma \equiv \sqrt{p'(\rho)}$  is bounded by the speed of

light,  $0 < \sigma < 1$ . Let  $(\rho_L, u_L)$  and  $(\rho_R, u_R)$  be two constant states which satisfy the Rankine Hugoniot conditions (2.5). We make the traveling wave ansatz

$$\rho(t, x) \equiv \rho(\zeta) \quad \text{and} \quad u(t, x) = u(\zeta), \quad (5.1)$$

for  $\zeta \equiv \frac{x-st}{\epsilon}$  and  $s \in \mathbb{R}$  fixed, and assume

$$\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow +\infty} u(\zeta) = u_R \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\zeta \rightarrow +\infty} \rho(\zeta) = \rho_R, \quad (5.2)$$

$$\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow -\infty} u(\zeta) = u_L \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\zeta \rightarrow -\infty} \rho(\zeta) = \rho_L. \quad (5.3)$$

Now, substituting the traveling wave ansatz (5.1) into the RAV-Euler equations (1.3) yields a first order ODE. That is, a direct computation then shows that  $\partial_\nu T^{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \dot{T}^{\mu\nu} \zeta_\nu$  and  $\square u^\mu = \frac{1-s^2}{\epsilon^2} \dot{u}^\mu(\zeta)$ , where  $\zeta_\nu = (-s, 1)$  and a dot denotes differentiation with respect to  $\zeta$ . The RAV-Euler equations are thus equivalent to

$$\dot{T}^{\mu\nu} \zeta_\nu = (1-s^2) \dot{u}^\mu(\zeta), \quad (5.4)$$

and integration in  $\zeta$  gives

$$\dot{u}^\mu(\zeta) = \frac{1}{1-s^2} T^{\mu\nu} \zeta_\nu + \theta^\mu \quad (5.5)$$

for integration constants  $\theta^\mu = (\theta^0, \theta^1)$ . Imposing the limits (5.2) in (5.5) determines the integration constants to be  $\theta^\mu = \frac{1}{1-s^2} T_R^{\mu\nu} \zeta_\nu$ , since in particular  $\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow +\infty} \dot{u}(\zeta) = 0$  by the first condition in (5.2). Similarly, imposing (5.3) together with  $\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow -\infty} \dot{u}(\zeta) = 0$  in (5.5) implies, by the Rankine Hugoniot condition (2.5), that  $s$  is the shock speed,

$$s = \frac{[T^{01}]}{[T^{00}]} = \frac{[T^{11}]}{[T^{10}]}. \quad (5.6)$$

We conclude that the RAV Euler equations (1.3) for the traveling waves (5.1) can be written equivalently as<sup>5</sup>

$$\dot{u}^\mu(\zeta) = \frac{1}{1-s^2} (T^{\mu\nu} - T_R^{\mu\nu}) \zeta_\nu. \quad (5.7)$$

Remarkably, by the speed of light bound—which lies at the foundation of Special Relativity—expressed through the normalization condition  $u^\sigma u_\sigma = -1$ , the RAV Euler equation (5.7) reduces to the scalar first order ODE (2.3) coupled to the explicit expression (2.4) for the density as a function of  $u$  alone.

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $\zeta_\nu = (-s, 1)$ , define the classical velocity  $v(u) \equiv \frac{u}{\sqrt{1+u^2}}$ , and assume  $v(u) \neq s$ . Then (5.7) is equivalent to*

$$\rho(u) = \frac{1}{s-v(u)} \left( v(u) T_R^{1\nu} - T_R^{0\nu} \right) \zeta_\nu, \quad (5.8)$$

$$\dot{u} = \frac{1}{1-s^2} \Phi(u), \quad \text{for} \quad \Phi(u) \equiv \left( T^{1\nu} - T_R^{1\nu} \right) \zeta_\nu. \quad (5.9)$$

<sup>5</sup>In (5.7), one can replace  $T_R^{\mu\nu}$  by  $T_L^{\mu\nu}$ , since  $T_R^{\mu\nu} \zeta_\nu = T_L^{\mu\nu} \zeta_\nu$  by the RH-condition (2.5).

*Proof.* Substituting  $u^0 = \sqrt{1+u^2}$  and its derivative  $\dot{u}^0 = v(u)\dot{u}$  into the first component of (5.7), gives

$$v(u)\dot{u} = \frac{1}{1-s^2} \left( T^{0\nu} - T_R^{0\nu} \right) \zeta_\nu. \quad (5.10)$$

Substitution of the second component of (5.7) for  $\dot{u}$  in (5.10) yields

$$v(u) \left( T^{1\nu} - T_R^{1\nu} \right) \zeta_\nu = \left( T^{0\nu} - T_R^{0\nu} \right) \zeta_\nu, \quad (5.11)$$

which we write equivalently as

$$\left( v(u)T^{1\nu} - T^{0\nu} \right) \zeta_\nu = \left( v(u)T_R^{1\nu} - T_R^{0\nu} \right) \zeta_\nu. \quad (5.12)$$

We now show that the expression on the left hand side of (5.12) is equal to  $\rho(s - v(u))$ . For this, using  $\zeta_\nu = (-s, 1)$ , observe that

$$\left( vT^{1\nu} - T^{0\nu} \right) \zeta_\nu = vT^{11} - (1+sv)T^{01} + sT^{00}. \quad (5.13)$$

Substituting  $T^{11} = (p+\rho)u^2 + p$ ,  $T^{01} = (p+\rho)u\sqrt{1+u^2}$  and  $T^{00} = (p+\rho)(1+u^2) - p$ , and separating terms multiplied by  $(p+\rho)$ , we find that

$$\left( vT^{1\nu} - T^{0\nu} \right) \zeta_\nu = -(s-v)p + (p+\rho)\Psi, \quad (5.14)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi &\equiv vu^2 - (1+sv)u\sqrt{1+u^2} + s(1+u^2) \\ &= vu^2 - u\sqrt{1+u^2} + s \\ &= -v + s, \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

as can be verified by direct computation using  $v = \frac{u}{\sqrt{1+u^2}}$ . Thus, substitution of (5.15) back into (5.14) gives us as claimed

$$\left( vT^{1\nu} - T^{0\nu} \right) \zeta_\nu = \rho(s-v). \quad (5.16)$$

Substituting (5.16) into (5.12), and solving for  $\rho$ , gives us the sought-after expression (5.8). Now, since  $\rho$  is a function of  $u$  alone, the second component of (5.7) turns directly into the sought-after scalar ODE (5.9). This completes the proof of Lemma 5.1.  $\square$

We first derive the Lax conditions (2.7) - (2.8) in the case that  $s = 0$ , and then obtain the Lax condition for general  $s$  by Lorentz transformation. For this, note first that the Rankine Hugoniot condition for  $s = 0$  imply  $[T^{01}] = 0$  for  $T^{01} \equiv (p+\rho)u\sqrt{1+u^2}$ , from which we infer that  $u_L$  and  $u_R$  have the same sign and thus are both non-zero whenever a shock discontinuity is present; the assumption  $v(u) \neq s$  of Lemma 5.1 is thereby met. Now, since (5.9) is a scalar ODE in  $u$ , the analysis of shock profiles is reduced to a one dimensional fixed point problem for (5.9). We now show that (5.9) has exactly two fixed points for  $u$  in between  $u_L$  and  $u_R$ , namely  $u = u_L$  and  $u = u_R$ .

**Lemma 5.2.** *For  $u$  in between  $u_L$  and  $u_R$ ,  $\Phi(u) = 0$  if and only if either  $u = u_L$  or  $u = u_R$ .*

*Proof.* Assuming  $s = 0$ , we find that

$$\Phi(u) = \left(T^{1\nu} - T_R^{1\nu}\right)\zeta_\nu = T^{11} - T_R^{11}, \quad (5.17)$$

where  $T^{11} = (p + \rho)u^2 + p$ . From this we directly find that  $\Phi(u) = 0$  if  $T^{11} = T_R^{11}$  or  $T^{11} = T_L^{11}$  by the Rankine Hugoniot condition for  $s = 0$ . Now, a direct computation shows that the density function (5.8) satisfies  $\rho(u_L) = \rho_L$  and  $\rho(u_R) = \rho_R$ . This implies that  $\Phi(u_L) = 0$  and  $\Phi(u_R) = 0$ .

We next prove that no more fixed points exists between  $u_L$  and  $u_R$ , by studying critical points. For this, we first express  $\Phi$  in terms of the classical fluid 3-velocity  $v \equiv \frac{u}{\sqrt{1+u^2}}$ . For this we substitute the equivalent expression  $u^2 = \frac{v^2}{1-v^2}$  into  $T^{11} = (p + \rho)u^2 + p$  in (5.17), which gives us

$$\Phi(v) = \frac{\Psi(v)}{1-v^2}, \quad (5.18)$$

for

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(v) &\equiv (p + \rho)v^2 + (p - T_R^{11})(1 - v^2) \\ &= p(v) + vT_R^{01} - T_R^{11}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.19)$$

where we used in the last equality that  $\rho(v) = -T_R^{11} + \frac{1}{v}T_R^{01}$  by (5.8). Since  $0 < v^2 < 1$  by the speed of light bound, it follows that the roots of  $\Phi(v)$  and  $\Psi(v)$  are identical. We now show that  $\Psi(v)$  has only one critical point, and thus at most two roots. A direct computation gives us

$$\Psi'(v) = p'(v) + T_R^{01} = \frac{1}{v^2}(v^2 - \sigma^2)T_R^{01}, \quad (5.20)$$

since  $p'(v) = \sigma^2\rho'(v)$  for  $\sigma^2 \equiv \frac{dp}{d\rho} > 0$ , and since  $\rho'(v) = -\frac{T_R^{01}}{v^2}$ . From (5.20) it follows that the only critical points of  $\Psi(v)$  are  $v = \pm\sigma$ . On the other hand, since the Rankine Hugoniot condition  $T_L^{01} = T_R^{01}$  for  $T^{01} = (p + \rho)u\sqrt{1+u^2}$  imply that  $u_L$  and  $u_R$  have the same sign, we conclude that  $\Psi(v)$  has at most one critical point in between  $v_L$  and  $v_R$ . In summary this shows that  $\Phi(v)$  has exactly two fixed points, namely  $v_L$  and  $v_R$ . This proves the lemma.  $\square$

Now, since (5.9) has only  $u_L$  and  $u_R$  as fixed points, it follows that any local solution with initial data lying in between  $u_L$  and  $u_R$  automatically extends to a global solution  $u(\zeta)$  on  $(-\infty, \infty)$  such that  $\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow -\infty} u(\zeta) = u_L$  and  $\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow \infty} u(\zeta) = u_R$ , in agreement with the parameter direction fixed in (5.2) and (5.3). We conclude that  $u_L$  is an unstable rest point, while  $u_R$  is asymptotically stable, which implies the inequality

$$\Phi'(u_R) < 0 < \Phi'(u_L) \quad (5.21)$$

where a prime denotes differentiation by  $u$ . From (5.21) we now derive the Lax admissibility conditions (2.7) - (2.8) and thereby complete the proof of Theorem 2.2. We begin by computing  $\Phi'(u)$  in (5.21).

**Lemma 5.3.** *Assume  $s = 0$  and set  $\sigma \equiv \sqrt{\frac{dp}{d\rho}}$ , then*

$$\Phi'(u) = \frac{v^2 - \sigma^2}{v^2}(p + \rho)u, \quad (5.22)$$

when evaluated either at  $(u, \rho) = (u_L, \rho_L)$  or  $(u, \rho) = (u_R, \rho_R)$ .

*Proof.* For  $s = 0$ , (5.8) reduces to  $\rho(u) = -T_R^{11} + \frac{1}{v(u)}T_R^{01}$ , from which we get

$$\rho'(u) = -\frac{v'(u)}{v^2(u)}T_R^{01} = -\frac{1}{u^2\sqrt{1+u^2}}T_R^{01}. \quad (5.23)$$

From (5.9), we find for  $s = 0$  that  $\Phi(u) \equiv T^{11} - T_R^{11}$ . From  $T^{11} = (p + \rho)u^2 + p$  and (5.23) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi'(u) &= \frac{dT^{11}}{du} = 2(p + \rho)u + (u^2 + u^2\sigma^2 + \sigma^2)\rho'(u) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+u^2}}\left(2T^{01} - \frac{(1 + \sigma^2)u^2 + \sigma^2}{u^2}T_R^{01}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (5.24)$$

recalling that  $T^{01} = (p + \rho)u\sqrt{1+u^2}$  and  $\sigma^2 = \frac{dp}{d\rho}$ . Thus evaluation at  $u_R$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi'(u_R) &= T_R^{01} \frac{u^2 - (1 + u^2)\sigma^2}{u^2\sqrt{1+u^2}} \Big|_{u_R} = (p + \rho) \frac{u^2 - (1 + u^2)\sigma^2}{u} \Big|_{u_R} \\ &= (p + \rho) \frac{v^2 - \sigma^2}{v\sqrt{1-v^2}} \Big|_{u_R} = (p + \rho)u \frac{v^2 - \sigma^2}{v^2} \Big|_{u_R}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.25)$$

which is the sought-after expression (5.22) at  $u = u_R$ , while (5.22) at  $u = u_L$  follows by (5.25), since  $T_R^{01} = T_L^{01}$  in light of the Rankine Hugoniot conditions. This completes the proof of Lemma 5.3.  $\square$

Now, by (5.22), we write (5.21) equivalently as

$$\frac{v_R^2 - \sigma_R^2}{v_R^2}(p_R + \rho_R)u_R < 0 < \frac{v_L^2 - \sigma_L^2}{v_L^2}(p_L + \rho_L)u_L, \quad (5.26)$$

and since  $v^2 > 0$  and  $(p + \rho) > 0$ , condition (5.26) is equivalent to

$$(v_R^2 - \sigma_R^2)u_R < 0 < (v_L^2 - \sigma_L^2)u_L. \quad (5.27)$$

Now, by the Rankine Hugoniot condition for  $s = 0$ , we have  $[T^{01}] = 0$  for  $T^{01} \equiv (p + \rho)u\sqrt{1+u^2}$ , which, since  $(p + \rho) > 0$  and  $\sqrt{1+u^2} > 0$ , implies that  $u_L$  and  $u_R$  always have the same sign. Thus, considering first the case that  $u_L, u_R > 0$ , (corresponding to 1-shocks), it follows that  $v_L + \sigma_L > 0$  and  $v_R + \sigma_R > 0$ , and (5.27) is equivalent to

$$v_R - \sigma_R < 0 < v_L - \sigma_L \quad \text{and} \quad 0 < v_R + \sigma_R. \quad (5.28)$$

Now, since  $1 \pm v\sigma > 0$  by the speed of light bounds  $|v| < 1$  and  $0 \leq \sigma < 1$ , dividing (5.28) by  $1 \mp v\sigma$  yields directly the Lax condition for 1-shocks,

$$\lambda_1(u_R) < 0 < \lambda_1(u_L) \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \leq \lambda_2(u_R), \quad (5.29)$$

where the characteristic speeds (as computed in [39]) are

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{v - \sigma}{1 - v\sigma} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_2 = \frac{v + \sigma}{1 + v\sigma}. \quad (5.30)$$

Similarly, turning now to the case of 2-shocks by assuming  $u_L, u_R < 0$ , it follows that  $v_L - \sigma_L < 0$  and  $v_R - \sigma_R < 0$ . Thus (5.27) is equivalent to

$$v_R + \sigma_R < 0 < v_L + \sigma_L \quad \text{and} \quad v_L - \sigma_L < 0, \quad (5.31)$$

and dividing (5.31) by  $1 \pm v\sigma$  gives the Lax condition for the 2-shocks,

$$\lambda_2(u_R) < 0 < \lambda_2(u_L) \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_1(u_L) \leq 0. \quad (5.32)$$

The Lax conditions for general  $s \neq 0$  now follows by a Lorentz boost:

**Lemma 5.4.** *Under a Lorentz boost to a frame in which the 1-shock moves with velocity  $s_1$ , the Lax condition (5.29) turns into*

$$\lambda_1(u_R) \leq s_1 \leq \lambda_1(u_L) \quad \text{and} \quad s_1 \leq \lambda_2(u_R). \quad (5.33)$$

*Similarly, under a Lorentz boost to a frame in which the 2-shock moves with velocity  $s_2$ , the Lax condition (5.32) turns into*

$$\lambda_2(u_R) \leq s_2 \leq \lambda_2(u_L) \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_1(u_L) \leq s_2. \quad (5.34)$$

*Proof.* Instead of Lorentz transforming (5.29) and (5.32) directly, we transform equations (5.28) and (5.31). For this, by the velocity addition formula, observe that the fluid 3-velocities  $v$  in the frame moving with the shock wave (in which the shock speed is  $s = 0$ ) is given by

$$v = \frac{\bar{v} - s}{1 - s\bar{v}} \quad (5.35)$$

where  $\bar{v}$  is the fluid 3-velocity in the frame in which the shock wave moves with the constant speed  $s$ . Note that, since the density and the pressure are Lorentz scalars, the speed of sound transforms as a scalar as well. Thus, equation (5.28) transforms as

$$\frac{\bar{v}_R - s_1}{1 - s_1\bar{v}_R} - \sigma_R < 0 < \frac{\bar{v}_L - s_1}{1 - s_1\bar{v}_L} - \sigma_L \quad \text{and} \quad 0 < \frac{\bar{v}_R - s_1}{1 - s_1\bar{v}_R} + \sigma_R,$$

which can be written equivalently as (5.33), denoting for simplicity  $\bar{v}_{L/R}$  as  $v_{L/R}$ . In a similar fashion, replacing  $v_{L/R}$  in (5.31) by (5.35), a direct computation leads to the Lax condition (5.34) for the 2-shock.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 2.2:** Under the assumption that  $(\rho_L, u_L)$  and  $(\rho_R, u_R)$  are constant states which satisfy the RH conditions (2.5) with shock speed  $s$ , Theorem 2.2 asserts that the following statements are equivalent: (i) There exists a traveling wave solution  $\rho(t, x) = \rho(\zeta)$  and  $u^\mu(t, x) = u^\mu(\zeta)$ ,  $\zeta = \frac{x-st}{\epsilon}$ , of the RAV Euler equations (1.3) with asymptotics (2.6). (ii) The first Lax condition (2.7) holds with  $s = s_1$  if  $u_L$  and  $u_R$  are separated by a 1-shock, and the second Lax condition (2.8) holds with  $s = s_2$  if  $u_L$  and  $u_R < 0$  are separated by a 2-shock.

That (i) implies (ii) follows directly from the above constructions and Lemma 5.4. That is, by (i) it follows that  $u^\mu(t, x) = u^\mu(\zeta)$  solves the ODE (5.9) with



$\rho(t, x) = \rho(u)$  given by (5.8), such that the right hand side of the ODE (5.9) satisfies the inequality (5.21). Lemma 5.4 then implies the sought-after Lax conditions (2.7) and (2.8).

Vice versa, that (ii) implies (i) follows since the Lax conditions (2.7) and (2.8) imply the inequality (5.21). Thus, since by Lemma 5.2  $u_L$  and  $u_R$  are the only rest points of (5.9), and since by (5.21)  $u_R$  is stable and  $u_L$  is unstable, it follows that any local solution with data in between  $u_L$  and  $u_R$  (which exist by the Picard Lindelöf theorem) extends to a global solution with the sought-after asymptotics (2.6). The sought after traveling wave solutions is then obtained by reversing the steps between equations (5.4) to (5.9), and substituting  $\zeta = \frac{x-st}{\epsilon}$ . This completes the proof of Theorem 2.2.  $\square$

#### FUNDING

This research was supported by CityU Start-up Grant (7200748), by CityU Strategic Research Grant (7005839), and by General Research Fund (ECS 21306524).

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We thank Blake Temple, Matthias Sroczinski and, in particular, Heinrich Freistühler for sharing their deep knowledge on relativistic dissipation.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] J. Bärnin, “Spectral Stability of Shock Profiles for Hyperbolically Regularized Systems of Conservation Laws”, *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.* (2024) 248:125.
- [2] F. S. Bemfica, M. M. Disconzi and J. Noronha, “Causality and existence of solutions of relativistic viscous fluid dynamics with gravity”, *Phys. Rev. D* 98, (2018), 104064.
- [3] F. S. Bemfica, M. M. Disconzi and J. Noronha, “First-Order General-Relativistic Viscous Fluid Dynamics”, *Phys. Rev. X* 12, (2022), 021044.
- [4] A. Bressan, “The unique limit of the Glimm scheme”, *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.* 130 (1995).
- [5] T. Buckmaster, S. Shkoller and V. Vicol, “Formation of Point Shocks for 3D Compressible Euler”, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 76.9, (2022).
- [6] T. Buckmaster, T. Drivas, S. Shkoller and V. Vicol, “Simultaneous development of shocks and cusps for 2D Euler with azimuthal symmetry from smooth data”, *Ann. PDE* 8, 26, (2022).
- [7] G.-Q. Chen and M. Schrecker, “Global Solutions and Newtonian Limit for the Relativistic Euler Equations”, *Annals of PDE* 8:10, (2022).
- [8] G.-Q. Chen, J. Glimm and D. Lazarev, “Maximum Entropy Production as a Necessary Admissibility Condition for the Fluid Navier-Stokes and Euler Equations”, *SN Appl. Sci.* 2, 2160 (2020).
- [9] E. Chiodaroli, C. De Lellis and O. Kreml, “Global ill-posedness of the isentropic system of gas dynamics”, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 68.7, (2014).
- [10] Y. Choquet-Bruhat, *General Relativity and the Einstein equations*, Oxford University Press, 2009.
- [11] D. Christodoulou, *The Formation of Shocks in 3-Dimensional Fluids*, EMS Mono. Math., (2007).
- [12] C. Dafermos, *Hyperbolic Conservation Laws in Continuum Physics*, Springer Verlag (2016), fourth edition.
- [13] R. DiPerna, “Convergence of the viscosity method for isentropic gas dynamics”, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 91, pp. 1-30, (1983).

- [14] S. Kawashima, “Systems of a Hyperbolic-Parabolic Composite Type, with Applications of Magnetohydrodynamics”, PhD thesis, Kyoto University, (1983).
- [15] P. Kovtun, “First-order relativistic hydrodynamics is stable”, JHEP 10 (2019), 034.
- [16] C. Eckart, “The thermodynamics of irreversible processes. 3: Relativistic theory of the simple fluid”, Phys. Rev. 58, 919-924.
- [17] H. Freistühler, “Godunov Variables in Relativistic Fluid Dynamics”, arXiv:1706.06673.
- [18] H. Freistühler, “A class of Hadamard well-posed five-field theories of dissipative relativistic fluid dynamics”, J. math. Phys. 61, 033101, (2020).
- [19] H. Freistühler, M. Reintjes and B. Temple, “Decay and subluminality of modes of all wave numbers in the relativistic dynamics of viscous and heat conductive fluids”, J. Math. Phys. 62 (2021), 053101.
- [20] H. Freistühler, M. Reintjes and M. Sroczinski, “Uniform dissipativity for mixed-order hyperbolic systems, with an application to relativistic fluid dynamics”, J. Diff. Equ. 325 (2022), 70-81.
- [21] H. Freistühler and M. Sroczinski, “A class of uniformly dissipative symmetric hyperbolic-hyperbolic systems”, J. Diff. Equ. 288 (2021), 40-61.
- [22] H. Freistühler and B. Temple, “Causal dissipation and shock profiles in relativistic fluid dynamics of pure radiation”, Proc. R. Soc. A 470 (2014), 20140055.
- [23] H. Freistühler and B. Temple, “Causal dissipation for the relativistic dynamics of ideal gases”, Proc. R. Soc. A 473 (2017), 20160729.
- [24] H. Freistühler and B. Temple, “Causal dissipation in the relativistic dynamics of barotropic fluids”, J. Math. Phys. 59 (2018), 063101.
- [25] H. Freistühler and B. Temple, “On Shock Profiles in Four-Field Formulations of Dissipative”, Conf. Proc. “Hyperbolic Problems: Theory, Numerics, Applications. Volume I”, Springer Verlag (2022), pp. 251.
- [26] J. Glimm, “Solutions in the large for nonlinear hyperbolic systems of equations”, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 18 (1965), 697-715.
- [27] J. Groah and B. Temple, “Shock-wave solutions of the Einstein equations with perfect fluid sources: Existence and consistency by a locally inertial Glimm scheme”, Memoirs AMS, Vol. 172, No. 813, (2004).
- [28] F. Huang, Y. Wang and T. Yang, “Vanishing viscosity limit of the compressible Navier-Stokes equations for solutions to a Riemann problem”, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. 203 (2012), 379-413.
- [29] W. Israel and J. Stewart, “Transient relativistic thermodynamics and kinetic theory”, Ann. Phys. 118, (1979), 341-372.
- [30] L. Landau and E. Lifshitz, *Fluid Mechanics*, Section 127, London, Pergamon Press, (1959).
- [31] P.D. Lax, “Hyperbolic systems of conservation laws II”, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 10 (1957), 537-566.
- [32] P. Lax, “The Formation and Decay of Shock Waves”, The American Mathematical Monthly, 79.3, (1972), 227-241.
- [33] P. LeFloch and M. Yamazaki, “Entropy solutions of the Euler equations for isothermal relativistic fluids”, Int. J. Dyn. Sys. Diff. Equ. 1.1, (2007).
- [34] I. Müller and T. Ruggeri, “Extended thermodynamics”, Springer tracts in natural philosophy, vol. 37, (1993), New York, Springer.
- [35] R. Pan and J. Smoller, “Blowup of smooth solutions for the relativistic Euler equations”, Comm. math. Phys. 262, (2006), 729-755.
- [36] V. Pellhammer, “Oscillating Shock Profiles in Relativistic Fluid Dynamics”, Conf. Proc. “Hyperbolic Problems: Theory, Numerics, Applications. Volume I”, Springer Verlag (2022), pp. 341.
- [37] T. Sideris, “Formation of singularities in three dimensional compressible fluids”, Comm. Math. Phys. 101, (1985), 475-485.
- [38] J. Smoller, *Shock Waves and Reaction Diffusion Equations*, Springer Verlag, (1994).
- [39] J. Smoller and B. Temple, “Global solutions to the relativistic Euler equations”, Comm. Math. Phys. 156 (1993), 67-99.

- [40] M. Sroczinski, “Asymptotic stability of homogeneous states in the relativistic dynamics of viscous, heat-conductive fluids”, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 231 (2019), 91-113.
- [41] M. Sroczinski, “Asymptotic stability in a second-order symmetric hyperbolic system modeling the relativistic dynamics of viscous heat-conductive fluids with diffusion”, *J. Differ. Equ.* 268 (2020), 825-851.
- [42] M. Sroczinski, “Global existence and decay of small solutions for quasi-linear second-order uniformly dissipative hyperbolic-hyperbolic systems”, arXiv:2301.01685.
- [43] A. Szepessy and Z. Xin, “Nonlinear stability of viscous shock waves”, *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.* 122 (1993), 53-103.
- [44] L. Tartar, “Compensated compactness and applications to partial differential equations”, *Heriot-Watt Symposium*, Vol. 4. New York: Pitman Press 1979.
- [45] S. Weinberg, *Gravitation and Cosmology: Principles and Applications of the General Theory of Relativity*, John Wiley and Sons, 1st edition, (1972).

(\*) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CITY UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG, SAR HONG KONG  
*Email address:* moritzreintjes@gmail.com

(\*\*) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CITY UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG, SAR HONG KONG  
*Email address:* achaddha2-c@my.cityu.edu.hk