

On the Free Boundary Problems of 3-D Compressible Euler Equations Coupled or Uncoupled With a Nonlinear Poisson Equation

Tao Luo, Konstantina Trivisa, Huihui Zeng

Abstract

For the problem of the non-isentropic compressible Euler Equations coupled with a nonlinear Poisson equation with the electric potential satisfying the Dirichlet boundary condition in three spatial dimensions with a general free boundary not restricting to a graph, we identify suitable stability conditions on the electric potential and the pressure under which we obtain a priori estimates on the Sobolev norms of the fluid and electric variables and bounds for geometric quantities of free surface. The stability conditions in this case for a general variable entropy are that the outer normal derivative of the electric potential is positive on the free surface, whereas that on the pressure is negative. In the isentropic case, the stability condition reduces to a single one, the outer normal derivative of the difference of the enthalpy and the electric potential is negative on the free surface. For the free boundary problem of the non-isentropic compressible Euler equations with variable entropy without coupling with the nonlinear Poisson equation, the corresponding higher-order estimates are also obtained under the Taylor sign condition. It is also found that one less derivative is needed to close the energy estimates for the problem for the non-isentropic compressible Euler Equations coupled with a nonlinear Poisson equation when the electric potential satisfies the Dirichlet boundary condition under the stability conditions on the electric potential and the pressure, compared with the problem of the non-isentropic compressible Euler equations.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Background and motivations	2
1.2	Some remarks	4
1.3	Related works	6
1.4	Organization of the paper and notations	7
2	Preliminaries	8
3	The non-isentropic compressible Euler-Poisson equations	12
3.1	Regularity estimates	14
3.2	Energy estimates	24
3.3	Proof of Theorem 3.1	28
4	The non-isentropic compressible Euler equations	31
4.1	Regularity estimates	33
4.2	Energy estimates	38
4.3	Proof of Theorem 4.1	39
5	The isentropic Euler-Poisson equations	40
5.1	Regularity estimates	41
5.2	Energy estimates	45
5.3	Proof of Theorem 5.1	47

1 Introduction

1.1 Background and motivations

Consider the following free boundary problem of non-isentropic compressible Euler-Poisson equations or Euler equations in three dimensions:

$$D_t \rho + \rho \operatorname{div} v = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_t, \quad (1.1a)$$

$$\rho D_t v + \partial p(\rho, s) = \kappa \rho \partial \phi \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_t, \quad (1.1b)$$

$$D_t s = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_t, \quad (1.1c)$$

$$p = \bar{p} \quad \text{on } \partial \mathcal{D}_t, \quad (1.1d)$$

$$v \cdot N = \mathcal{V}(\partial \mathcal{D}_t) \quad \text{on } \partial \mathcal{D}_t, \quad (1.1e)$$

$$(\rho, v, s) = (\rho_0, v_0, s_0) \quad \text{on } \mathcal{D}_0. \quad (1.1f)$$

Here the velocity field $v = (v_1, v_2, v_3)$, density ρ , entropy s , and changing domain $\mathcal{D}_t \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ are the unknowns to be determined; \bar{p} is a positive constant, N is the exterior unit normal to the free surface $\partial \mathcal{D}_t$, and $\mathcal{V}(\partial \mathcal{D}_t)$ is the normal velocity of $\partial \mathcal{D}_t$; $\mathcal{D}_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is a given simply connected bounded domain, and (ρ_0, v_0, s_0) are given functions. We use the Einstein summation convention to denote $D_t = \partial_t + v^k \partial_k$ with $v^k = v_k$. The constant κ in (1.1b) is either 1 or 0. We assume that the pressure function $p(\rho, s)$ satisfies

$$p(\rho, s) \in C^{7-\kappa} \text{ and } p_\rho(\rho, s) > 0 \text{ for } \rho > 0, s \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (1.2)$$

When $\kappa = 0$, system (1.1) is the celebrated non-isentropic compressible Euler equations. When $\kappa = 1$, the potential ϕ is determined by

$$\Delta \phi + e^{-\phi} = \rho \text{ in } \mathcal{D}_t, \quad \phi = 0 \text{ on } \partial \mathcal{D}_t. \quad (1.3)$$

The model of (1.1) and (1.3) describes the motion of a plasma consisting of cold ions and hot electrons, which arises extensively in astrophysics, plasma physics and semiconductors. In this context, ρ denotes the density of ions, $e^{-\phi}$ the density of electrons (the electrons follow the classical Maxwell-Boltzmann relation under the massless assumption, cf. [37]), ϕ the electric potential field, v the velocity of the ions, $p(\rho, s)$ the pressure and s the entropy. The plasma considered in this paper is unmagnetized, consisting of free electrons and a single species of ions that form a compressible charged fluid.

The present work devotes to identifying the suitable stability conditions to obtain the a priori estimates on the Sobolev norms of the fluid variables and bounds for geometric quantities of free surface. System (1.1) with $\kappa = 0$ is just the non-isentropic compressible Euler equations, for which the local-in-time well-posedness of the free boundary problem was proved in [54] under the Taylor sign condition

$$-\partial_N p(\rho, s) > 0 \text{ on } \partial \mathcal{D}_t \quad (1.4)$$

for the case when the free boundary is an unbounded graph and the gravity effect is taken into consideration in the momentum equations, based on the approach of symmetrization of hyperbolic systems and the techniques developed in the study of weakly stable shock waves and characteristic discontinuities (see [8, 46, 49] for instance). Here and thereafter, we use the notation $\partial_N = N^i \partial_i$. The assumption that the free boundary is an unbounded graph in [54] is crucially used to flatten the boundary. For a problem in a general domain whose boundary is not a graph, it may be feasible

to reduce the problem into the case when the boundary is a graph by using multiple coordinates charts. However, it is quite technically involved because multiple of free boundary problems have to be solved simultaneously. Another issue in the local-in-time well-posedness theory in [54] is the loss of derivatives, which does not contain full a priori estimates, since the iteration schemes based on the linearization lose the regularity on the moving boundary, and the linearized problems do not preserve the full estimates of the nonlinear problems of which the full symmetry of the problems provided by the physical laws (for example, conservation laws) is used. In fact, it is proved in [54] that when the initial data of the fluid variables $(\rho_0, v_0, s_0) \in H^{m+7}$ and $\partial\mathcal{D}_0 \in H^{m+7}$ for $m \geq 6$, there is a local-in-time solution with $(\rho, v, s)(\cdot, t) \in H^m$ and $\partial\mathcal{D}_t \in H^m$ for $t \in (0, T]$ for some $T > 0$. The solution loses 7-derivatives.

The first motivation of this paper is to derive the nonlinear higher-order estimates without loss of derivatives for the free boundary problem of non-isentropic compressible Euler equations, (1.1) with $\kappa = 0$, when the free boundary is a general closed surface not restricting to graphs. It should be noted that this was achieved in [40] for isentropic compressible Euler equations which extends the estimates of [10] for the incompressible Euler equations. (See also [42] for the a priori estimates on an unbounded domain for isentropic Euler equations with gravity when the free boundary is a graph.) In the present work, we want to illustrate the role of variations of entropy to the free surface motions. In the isentropic case (that is, the entropy s is a constant), the pressure p is a sole strictly increasing function of density ρ , so that the enthalpy $h = h(\rho) = \int_1^\rho \lambda^{-1} p'(\lambda) d\lambda$, pressure p and density ρ are equivalent. One may take either one of them as an independent thermal dynamical variable. This is an advantage taken in the estimates in [40, 42]. Indeed, the enthalpy h is used in [40, 42] as an independent thermal dynamical variable which satisfies a nice wave equation, since the fact that $\rho^{-1} \partial p(\rho) = \partial h(\rho)$ is used when the momentum equation is divided by ρ . However, this does not hold anymore for a variable entropy s for $p = p(\rho, s)$.

When the compressible Euler equations couple with the electric potential field ϕ , that is, $\kappa = 1$ in (1.1), and ϕ is determined by the Dirichlet problem of a nonlinear Poisson equation (1.3), the situation becomes more intricate and interesting. New phenomena occur in this case compared with the case of $\kappa = 0$ in (1.1), in which the usual Taylor sign condition (1.4) is sufficient for our higher-order estimates. However, for the case of $\kappa = 1$ in (1.1) with ϕ satisfying (1.3), we need the following stability condition:

$$-\partial_N p(\rho, s) > 0 \text{ and } \partial_N \phi > 0 \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{D}_t. \quad (1.5)$$

In the isentropic case for the Euler-Poisson equations (that is, $\kappa = 1$ and s being a constant):

$$D_t \rho + \rho \operatorname{div} v = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_t, \quad (1.6a)$$

$$\rho D_t v + \partial p(\rho) = \rho \partial \phi \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_t, \quad (1.6b)$$

$$p = \bar{p} \quad \text{on } \partial\mathcal{D}_t, \quad (1.6c)$$

$$v \cdot N = \mathcal{V}(\partial\mathcal{D}_t) \quad \text{on } \partial\mathcal{D}_t, \quad (1.6d)$$

$$(\rho, v) = (\rho_0, v_0) \quad \text{on } \mathcal{D}_0, \quad (1.6e)$$

with potential ϕ being determined by (1.3) and pressure p satisfying

$$p(\rho) \in C^7 \text{ and } p_\rho(\rho) > 0 \text{ for } \rho > 0, \quad (1.7)$$

condition (1.5) for the non-isentropic case can be reduced to a simple one:

$$\partial_N(\phi - h) > 0 \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{D}_t, \quad (1.8)$$

due to $p = p(\rho)$ and $h = h(\rho) = \int_1^\rho \lambda^{-1} p'(\lambda) d\lambda$. We will discuss these stability conditions later in more detail. It is also found that, for the non-isentropic Euler-Poisson equations, under the stability condition (1.5), the Dirichlet boundary condition $\phi = 0$ on $\partial\mathcal{D}_t$ enables us to use one less derivative to close the higher-order estimates than that for the Euler equations. On the other hand, under the stability condition (1.8) for the isentropic Euler-Poisson equations, we still need the same order of derivatives as that for the Euler equations to close the higher-order estimates.

A critical part of the proof of the main results of this paper is the establishment of the higher-order a priori estimates for the free boundary problem of compressible fluids equations with variable entropy, to illustrate the role of variations of entropy to the free surface motions and deal with intricate coupling of fluid variables with the electric potential, for general bounded domains with free boundaries not restricting to graphs, by adopting the geometric approach developed in [10] for the incompressible Euler equations and used in [40] for isentropic compressible Euler equations. Our estimates in the present work are based on the following equations: the momentum equations for velocity v , the wave equation for pressure p with the sound speed as the wave speed (it should be noted the divergence of v also satisfies the same type of wave equation), the nonlinear elliptic equation for electric potential ϕ (it should be noticed that the elliptic equations for gravitational fields or warm plasmas discussed in, for instance [19, 21, 23, 41], are linear for potential), the transport equations for vorticity $\text{curl}v$ and entropy s . We will deal with the interaction of the surface wave, sound wave, entropy wave and electric wave in the paper.

We will construct higher-order energy functionals and estimate their time derivatives, motivated by [10]. Compared with that in [40, 42], the construction of these functionals are quite different even for the fluids variables of density, pressure and velocity, in addition to the entropy and electric potential. In [40, 42], the higher-order energy functionals involve the space-time mixed derivatives of velocity and pressure, while in our construction, only the space derivatives are involved for the velocity field, and the mixed space-time derivatives of pressure contain at most one space derivative. Moreover, we have terms $\sum_{r=0}^{5-\kappa} \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} |\partial^r s|^2 dx$ and $\sum_{r=0}^{4-\kappa} \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} |\partial^r \text{div}v|^2 dx$ for the non-isentropic flow, which is not needed in [40, 42], since the derivatives of divergence can be neatly controlled for the isentropic flow by the space-time mixed derivatives of the pressure and the higher-order functionals defined in [40, 42]. But this is not the case for the non-isentropic flow, in particular, the presence of the electric potential which satisfies a nonlinear elliptic equation makes the estimates of derivatives of $\text{div}v$ in terms of the other terms in our higher-order energy functionals extremely difficult. Therefore, we include the term $\sum_{r=0}^{4-\kappa} \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} |\partial^r \text{div}v|^2 dx$ in our higher-order energy functional constructions.

The analysis becomes much more involved when the electric field is taken into consideration. It should be noted that the equation for the electric potential ϕ in (1.3) is nonlinear, which makes the coupling of density, velocity, pressure, entropy, electric potential and the evolving geometry extremely intricate and highly nonlinear. Handling this coupling by various elliptic estimates is one of the main concerns of this paper. Indeed, a big challenge for free boundary problems of inviscid fluids is that the regularity of the boundary enters to the highest-order estimates, which is in particular so for the problem when $\kappa = 1$ studied in this paper due to the elaborate coupling mentioned above.

1.2 Some remarks

As mentioned in subsection 1.1, we identify the stability condition (1.5) for the free boundary problem of non-isentropic compressible Euler-Poisson equations, that is, (1.1) with $\kappa = 1$ and (1.3); and condition (1.4) for that of non-isentropic compressible Euler equations, that is, (1.1) with $\kappa = 0$. Indeed, the Taylor sign condition of the pressure, $-\partial_N p > 0$ on $\partial\mathcal{D}_t$, plays an important role to

the stability in the study of the free surface problems of inviscid fluids, excluding the Rayleigh-Taylor type instability, without which problems may become ill-posed. (See [17] for the problem of incompressible Euler equations.) For the problem of non-isentropic compressible Euler-Poisson equations, we find that only the Taylor sign condition for the pressure may not be adequate. In fact, it can be seen from (1.1b) that

$$D_t v \cdot N = -\rho^{-1} \partial_N p + \partial_N \phi \quad \text{on } \partial \mathcal{D}_t.$$

This means that the acceleration of the free surface $\partial \mathcal{D}_t$ is due to two parts, $-\rho^{-1} \partial_N p$ and $\partial_N \phi$. Therefore, we propose the stability condition (1.5) so that $D_t v \cdot N > 0$ on $\partial \mathcal{D}_t$.

The stability condition (1.5) for the general variable entropy case can be replaced by a neat and simple one in the isentropic case. For the isentropic problem (1.6) and (1.3), the stability condition we propose in the paper is (1.8). This is motivated by the equivalent form of (1.6b):

$$D_t v + \partial \mathcal{P} = 0, \quad \text{where } \mathcal{P} = h(\rho) - \phi. \quad (1.9)$$

Indeed, \mathcal{P} is a constant and $\partial \mathcal{P} = N \partial_N \mathcal{P}$ on $\partial \mathcal{D}_t$, thus on $\partial \mathcal{D}_t$.

$$(-\partial_N \mathcal{P})^{-1} D_t \partial^r \mathcal{P} - N^m \partial^r v_m = (-\partial_N \mathcal{P})^{-1} \partial^r D_t \mathcal{P} + (-\partial_N \mathcal{P})^{-1} \mathcal{R}_r,$$

where $\mathcal{R}_r = [D_t, \partial^r] \mathcal{P} + (\partial_m \mathcal{P}) \partial^r v^m$. This serves as boundary conditions when one performs the higher-order energy estimates.

Motivated by (1.4), one may attempt to try the following stability condition for the non-isentropic flow,

$$\rho^{-1} \partial_N p(\rho, s) - \partial_N \phi < 0 \quad \text{on } \partial \mathcal{D}_t.$$

However this does not work since one cannot write $\rho^{-1} \partial_N p(\rho, s) - \partial_N \phi$ as $\partial_N \mathcal{Q}$ for some scalar function \mathcal{Q} as in the isentropic case. This is a big difference between the isentropic and non-isentropic flows. Therefore, we believe the condition (1.5) is suitable for the problem of non-isentropic compressible Euler-Poisson equations given by (1.1) with $\kappa = 1$ and (1.3).

Motivated by [10], we define higher-order energy functionals consisting of boundary parts and interior parts. To define the boundary integrals, we need to project the equations to the tangent space of the boundary.

Definition 1.1 *The orthogonal projection Π to the tangent space of the boundary of a $(0, r)$ tensor α is defined to be the projection of each component along the normal:*

$$(\Pi \alpha)_{i_1 \dots i_r} = \Pi_{i_1}^{j_1} \dots \Pi_{i_r}^{j_r} \alpha_{j_1 \dots j_r}, \quad \text{where } \Pi_i^j = \delta_i^j - N_i N^j.$$

The tangential derivative of the boundary is defined by $\bar{\partial}_i = \Pi_i^j \partial_j$, and the second fundamental form of the boundary is defined by $\theta_{ij} = \bar{\partial}_i N_j$.

The energy functionals we choose in this article contain the $H^{5-\kappa}(\mathcal{D}_t)$ norm of the variables for the non-isentropic compressible problem (1.1), which ensures us to estimate the L^∞ -bound for the second fundamental form θ on the boundary. Recall that the projection formula

$$\theta = (\partial_N p)^{-1} \Pi \partial^2 p \quad \text{on } \partial \mathcal{D}_t$$

was used to estimate the L^∞ -bound for θ in [10] for the study of the free boundary problem for incompressible Euler equations. The reason why this can work in [10] is because one may obtain the L^∞ -bound for $\partial^2 p$ on $\partial \mathcal{D}_t$ independent of that for θ , which, together with the lower bound for

$-\partial_N p$ due to the Taylor sign condition, gives the L^∞ -bound for θ . However, we can only obtain, for problem (1.1) that

$$\|\partial^2 p\|_{L^\infty(\partial\mathcal{D}_t)} \leq C\|\theta\|_{L^\infty(\partial\mathcal{D}_t)}\|\partial^2 D_t^2 \rho\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{D}_t)} + \text{other terms}, \quad (1.10)$$

from which it is clear that the projection formula used in [10] to give the L^∞ -bound for θ cannot work directly for our problems. Here and thereafter, ‘‘other terms’’ means terms that do not affect those we single out to discuss, and C denotes a certain constant independent of the L^∞ -bound for θ . Indeed, (1.10) follows from Sobolev lemmas and the following estimates:

$$\|\partial^4 p\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{D}_t)} \leq C\|\Pi\partial^4 p\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{D}_t)} + C \sum_{0 \leq r \leq 3} \|\partial^r \Delta p\|_{L^2(\mathcal{D}_t)}, \quad (1.11a)$$

$$\|\partial^3 \Delta p\|_{L^2(\mathcal{D}_t)} \leq \|\partial^3 D_t^2 \rho\|_{L^2(\mathcal{D}_t)} + \text{other terms}, \quad (1.11b)$$

$$\|\partial^3 D_t^2 \rho\|_{L^2(\mathcal{D}_t)} \leq C\|\Pi\partial^3 D_t^2 \rho\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{D}_t)} + \text{other terms}, \quad (1.11c)$$

$$\|\Pi\partial^3 D_t^2 \rho\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{D}_t)} \leq 3\|\theta\|_{L^\infty(\partial\mathcal{D}_t)}\|\partial^2 D_t^2 \rho\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{D}_t)} + \text{other terms}. \quad (1.11d)$$

Here (1.11a) and (1.11c) follow from elliptic estimates, (1.11b) from the equation $\Delta p = D_t^2 \rho + \text{other terms}$, and (1.11d) from the projection formula.

In the study of the non-isentropic compressible Euler equations (1.1) with $\kappa = 0$, we use the same Taylor sign condition (1.4) but choose a new energy functional which contains the $H^5(\mathcal{D}_t)$ norm of p , instead of the energy functional chosen in [10] containing the $H^4(\mathcal{D}_t)$ norm of p , since it follows from Sobolev lemmas that L^∞ -bound for $\partial^2 p$ on $\partial\mathcal{D}_t$ can be bounded directly by the $H^5(\mathcal{D}_t)$ norm of p .

For the problem of the non-isentropic compressible Euler-Poisson equations (1.1) and (1.3) with $\kappa = 1$ under the stability condition (1.5), we use the stability condition $\partial_N \phi > 0$ on $\partial\mathcal{D}_t$ in (1.5), instead of the Taylor sign condition $-\partial_N p(\rho, s) > 0$ on $\partial\mathcal{D}_t$, and the projection formula

$$\theta = (\partial_N \phi)^{-1} \Pi \partial^2 \phi$$

to obtain the L^∞ -bound for θ . Indeed, one can obtain the L^∞ -bound for $\partial^2 \phi$ on $\partial\mathcal{D}_t$ independent of that for θ , which, together with the lower bound for $\partial_N \phi$ due to (1.5), gives the L^∞ -bound for θ . It should be noted that the energy functional chosen in this case contains the $H^4(\mathcal{D}_t)$ norm of the variables. However, for the problem of the isentropic compressible Euler-Poisson equations (1.6) and (1.3) under the stability condition (1.8), we can only obtain, noting $\Delta(h - \phi) = \rho^{-1} D_t^2 \rho + \text{other terms}$ and using the same derivation as that of (1.10), that

$$\|\partial^2(h - \phi)\|_{L^\infty(\partial\mathcal{D}_t)} \leq C\|\theta\|_{L^\infty(\partial\mathcal{D}_t)}\|\partial^2 D_t^2 \rho\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{D}_t)} + \text{other terms}.$$

So, the projection formula used in [10] to give the L^∞ -bound for θ cannot work directly for our problem under condition (1.8). Other than the energy functional chosen in [10] containing the $H^4(\mathcal{D}_t)$ norm of the variables, we choose a new one containing the $H^5(\mathcal{D}_t)$ norm, which gives the L^∞ -bound for $\partial^2(h - \phi)$ on $\partial\mathcal{D}_t$ directly by Sobolev lemmas.

1.3 Related works

In many important physical situations, fluid free boundary problems arise naturally. Such problems can be used to model a wide range of phenomena such as water waves, shape of stars, liquid drops, vortex sheets, etc, depending on the particular hypotheses on fluids. Much attention has been given to the case of homogeneous, incompressible, and usually inviscid fluids with applications in

oceanography through the water wave problem (cf. [1, 2, 5, 10, 12, 17, 35, 36, 38, 50, 56, 57, 61]). To solve those problems, important analytic and geometric techniques are developed. More recently, the methods developed for this situation have been brought to bear on models of more complicated fluids.

For incompressible inviscid flows, the local-in-time well-posedness in Sobolev spaces was first proved in [56, 57] for the irrotational case, and then in [1, 2, 5, 10, 12, 17, 38, 47, 48, 50, 61] for prominent progresses including the cases without irrotational assumptions, finite depth water waves, lower regularities, uniform estimates with respect to surface tension, in domains with corner, and etc; the global or almost global-in-time existence for water waves was achieved first in [18, 58, 59], and then in [3, 7, 16, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32] for recent developments on this topic including life-span estimates and the other long-time well-posedness for related problems; and the singularity formation was proved in [9, 15, 60]. One may refer to the survey [36] for more references. The major tools in the study of the above problems, except [10, 12, 17, 38, 50], rely on Fourier analysis, pseudo-differential operators and analysis on singular integral operators. In this paper, we adopt a more elementary geometrical approach of dealing with the coupling of the boundary geometry and interior solutions in the spirit of those developed in [10, 24, 25, 38, 40, 42, 43, 50, 51, 52], in particular, [10]. For compressible inviscid flows, the local-in-time well-posedness of smooth solutions was established for liquids in [39, 54] (see also [11] for zero surface tension limits); while for gases with physical vacuum singularity, the related results can be found in [14, 33, 44] for the local-in-time theories, and in [21, 22, 45, 62, 63] for the global or almost global-in-time ones.

For the physical vacuum free boundary problem with density tending to zero in the rate of $\rho^{\gamma-1}(x, t) \sim \text{dist}(x, \Gamma(t))$ (where $\gamma > 1$ is the adiabatic exponent) near the vacuum boundary $\Gamma(t)$ of the isentropic Euler-Poisson equations describing self-gravitating fluids modeling gaseous star in 3-D, the local-in-time well-posedness is obtained in [19], the unconditional uniqueness for $\gamma \in (1, 2)$ for general 3-D solutions and the local-in-time well-posedness for the radial solutions without the compatibility conditions of the derivative of the density at the center of symmetry was proved in [44], the global expanding solutions are constructed in [21], and the instability of the stationary solution and continued gravitational collapse for $\gamma < 4/3$ was proved in [34] and [20], respectively. It should be noted that those results are for isentropic fluids and the density vanishes on the boundary, while the problem considered in this paper is for the non-isentropic flow and the density is strictly positive on the boundary, so, the stability mechanisms are different. Moreover, the gravitation potential discussed in the above works has an integral representation in terms of density satisfying a linear elliptic equation of the form $\Delta\phi = k\rho$ for a positive constant k with the positive sign of $\Delta\phi$, which models one species of gas. Therefore, for the local-in-time well-posedness, the gravitational field appears as a lower-order term (see also [23] in the study of the local-in-time existence for the case that density is positive on the boundary). For the problem studied in this paper, the electric potential satisfies the Dirichlet problem of a nonlinear elliptic equation, which cannot be treated as the lower-order term. Moreover, $\Delta\phi$ does not have a definite sign which models two species charged particles of ions and electrons. All these make the coupling of interior solutions and the geometry of the free surfaces much stronger.

1.4 Organization of the paper and notations

The rest of the paper are organized as follows. In Section 2, we prepare the necessary materials including the geometry and regularity of the boundary, Hodge type inequalities, Sobolev lemmas, interpolation inequalities, elliptic estimates, estimates for the boundary, commutator estimates and derivations of higher-order equations for later use. In Section 3, we study the free boundary problem for the non-isentropic compressible Euler-Poisson equations, (1.1) with $\kappa = 1$ and (1.3)

under stability condition (1.5). The main results in this section are given in Theorem 3.1. The free boundary problem (1.1) with $\kappa = 0$ for the non-isentropic compressible Euler equations is studied in Section 4 with the main results given in Theorem 4.1. In Section 5, we investigate the free boundary problem (1.6) and (1.3) of the isentropic Euler-Poisson equations under the stability condition (1.8) with the main results given in Theorem 5.1. The main results in Sections 3-5 give the a priori estimates of the Sobolev norms of the fluid and electric variables and bounds for geometric quantities such as the second fundamental form and the injectivity radius of the normal exponential map, of free surface for the corresponding problems. The main general strategy of the proofs of these results is: identify suitable higher-order functionals, make appropriate a priori assumptions, estimate the necessary norms in terms of higher-order energy functionals, perform higher-order energy estimates, prove the main theorems by closing the a priori assumptions.

Throughout the rest of paper, C will denote a universal constant unless stated otherwise, which can change from one inequality to another. We will employ the notation $a \lesssim b$ to denote $a \leq Cb$, where C is the universal constant as defined above. We will use $C(\beta)$ and $C_k(\beta)$ to denote certain positive constants depending continuously on quantity β , which can change from one inequality to another. We will adopt the notation $\text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_t = \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} dx$.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we prepare the necessary materials for later use. These materials include the geometry and regularity of the boundary, Hodge type inequalities, Sobolev lemmas, interpolation inequalities, elliptic estimates, estimates for the boundary, commutator estimates and derivations of higher-order equations.

First, we give the following definitions.

Definition 2.1 *Let $\iota_0 = \iota_0(t)$ be the injectivity radius of the normal exponential map of $\partial\mathcal{D}_t$, that is, the largest number such that the map*

$$\partial\mathcal{D}_t \times (-\iota_0, \iota_0) \rightarrow \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \text{dist}(x, \partial\mathcal{D}_t) < \iota_0\} : (\bar{x}, \iota) \mapsto x = \bar{x} + \iota N(\bar{x})$$

is an injection.

Definition 2.2 *Let d_0 be a fixed number such that $\iota_0/16 \leq d_0 \leq \iota_0/2$, and η be a smooth cutoff function on $[0, \infty)$ satisfying $0 \leq \eta(s) \leq 1$, $\eta(s) = 1$ when $s \leq d_0/4$, $\eta(s) = 0$ when $s \geq d_0/2$, and $|\eta'(s)| \leq 8/d_0$. Set*

$$d(t, x) = \text{dist}(x, \partial\mathcal{D}_t), \quad N_i(t, x) = -\partial_i d(t, x), \quad N^j(t, x) = \delta^{ij} N_i(t, x),$$

and define

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_{ij}(t, x) &= \delta_{ij} - \eta^2(d(t, x)) N_i(t, x) N_j(t, x) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_t, \\ \zeta^{ij}(t, x) &= \delta^{ij} - \eta^2(d(t, x)) N^i(t, x) N^j(t, x) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_t. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, ζ gives the the induced metric on the tangential space to the boundary:

$$\zeta_{ij} = \delta_{ij} - N_i N_j, \quad \zeta^{ij} = \delta^{ij} - N^i N^j \quad \text{on } \partial\mathcal{D}_t.$$

Definition 2.3 *For the multi-indices $I = (i_1, \dots, i_r)$ and $J = (j_1, \dots, j_r)$, set $\delta^{IJ} = \delta^{i_1 j_1} \dots \delta^{i_r j_r}$ and $\zeta^{IJ} = \zeta^{i_1 j_1} \dots \zeta^{i_r j_r}$. If α is a $(0, r)$ tensor, define $|\alpha|^2 = \delta^{IJ} \alpha_I \alpha_J$. Then for the projection*

$(\Pi\alpha)_I = \zeta_I^J \alpha_J$, $|\Pi\alpha|^2 = \zeta^{IJ} \alpha_I \alpha_J$ on $\partial\mathcal{D}_t$. The L^p -norms of a $(0, r)$ -tensor α on \mathcal{D}_t and $\partial\mathcal{D}_t$ are denoted, respectively, by $\|\alpha\|_{L^p}$ and $|\alpha|_{L^p}$:

$$\|\alpha\|_{L^p} = \left(\int_{\mathcal{D}_t} |\alpha|^p dx \right)^{1/p} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq p < \infty, \quad \|\alpha\|_{L^\infty} = \text{ess sup}_{\mathcal{D}_t} |\alpha|,$$

$$|\alpha|_{L^p} = \left(\int_{\partial\mathcal{D}_t} |\alpha|^p ds \right)^{1/p} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq p < \infty, \quad |\alpha|_{L^\infty} = \text{ess sup}_{\partial\mathcal{D}_t} |\alpha|.$$

We need another geometric quantity ι_1 on $\partial\mathcal{D}_t$ of which it is easier to control the time evolution than ι_0 :

Definition 2.4 *Let $0 < \epsilon_1 \leq 1/2$ be a fixed number, and let $\iota_1 = \iota_1(t)$ depending on ϵ_1 be the largest number such that*

$$|N(t, \bar{x}_1) - N(t, \bar{x}_2)| \leq \epsilon_1 \quad \text{whenever } |\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2| \leq \iota_1, \quad \bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2 \in \partial\mathcal{D}_t.$$

The following Lemma shows that ι_1 is equivalent to ι_0 in conjunction with a bound of the second fundamental form.

Lemma 2.5 *Suppose that $|\theta| \leq K$, and let ι_0 and ι_1 be as in Definitions 2.1 and 2.4. Then*

$$\iota_0 \geq \min\{\iota_1/2, 1/K\} \quad \text{and} \quad \iota_1 \geq \min\{2\iota_0, \epsilon_1/K\}. \quad (2.1)$$

This is Lemma 3.6 in [10].

Lemma 2.6 *With the notations in Definitions 2.1-2.3, we have*

$$\|\partial\zeta\|_{L^\infty} \leq 512(|\theta|_{L^\infty} + 1/\iota_0) \quad \text{and} \quad \|D_t\zeta\|_{L^\infty} \leq 256\|\partial v\|_{L^\infty}. \quad (2.2)$$

The proof of this lemma follows from that of Lemma 3.11 in [10]. Indeed, it holds that

$$\partial N = \theta \quad \text{and} \quad D_t N_i = -N^k(\partial_i - N_i \partial_N) v_k = -N^k \bar{\partial}_i v_k \quad \text{on } \partial\mathcal{D}_t. \quad (2.3)$$

The following Lemma gives the Hodge-type inequality.

Lemma 2.7 *Let w be a $(0, 1)$ tensor and define a scalar $\text{div} w = \delta^{ij} \partial_i w_j$ and a $(0, 2)$ tensor $\text{curl} w_{ij} = \partial_i w_j - \partial_j w_i$. If $|\theta| + 1/\iota_0 \leq K$ and $\iota_1 \geq 1/K_1$, then for any nonnegative integer r ,*

$$|\partial^{r+1} w|^2 \leq C \left(\delta^{ij} \zeta^{kl} \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_k \partial_I^r w_j) \partial_l \partial_J^r w_j + |\partial^r \text{div} w|^2 + |\partial^r \text{curl} w|^2 \right), \quad (2.4a)$$

$$|\partial^r w|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \left(\|\partial^{r+1} w\|_{L^2} + K_1 \|\partial^r w\|_{L^2} \right) \|\partial^r w\|_{L^2}. \quad (2.4b)$$

The proof of this lemma follows from that of Lemmas 5.5 and 5.7 in [10].

Some elliptic estimates are given in the following Lemma.

Lemma 2.8 *Let $q = q_b$ on $\partial\mathcal{D}_t$ with q_b being a constant. If $|\theta| + 1/\iota_0 \leq K$ and $\iota_1 \geq 1/K_1$, we have for any $r \geq 2$,*

$$\|q - q_b\|_{L^2} \leq C(\text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_t) \|\partial q\|_{L^2}, \quad \|\partial q\|_{L^2} \leq C(\text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_t) \|\Delta q\|_{L^2}, \quad (2.5a)$$

$$\|\partial^2 q\|_{L^2} \leq C(K, \text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_t) \|\Delta q\|_{L^2}, \quad (2.5b)$$

$$\|\partial^r q\|_{L^2} + |\partial^r q|_{L^2} \leq C \|\Pi \partial^r q\|_{L^2} + C(K_1, \text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_t) \sum_{0 \leq s \leq r-1} \|\partial^s \Delta q\|_{L^2}, \quad (2.5c)$$

$$\|\partial^r q\|_{L^2} + |\partial^{r-1} q|_{L^2} \leq C \|\Pi \partial^r q\|_{L^2} + C(K, \text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_t) \sum_{0 \leq s \leq r-2} \|\partial^s \Delta q\|_{L^2}. \quad (2.5d)$$

The proof of (2.5a) follows from that of Lemma A.5 in [10], (2.5b) from Corollary A-4 in [43], (2.5c) and (2.5d) from Proposition 5.8 in [10].

The following Lemma gives some boundary estimates.

Lemma 2.9 *Let $q = q_b$ on $\partial\mathcal{D}_t$ with q_b being a constant and $\iota_1 \geq 1/K_1$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} |\Pi\partial^r q|_{L^2} &\leq 2|\partial_N q|_{L^\infty} |\bar{\partial}^{r-2}\theta|_{L^2} + C \sum_{1 \leq k \leq r-1} |\theta|_{L^\infty}^k |\partial^{r-k} q|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + C \sum_{1 \leq k \leq r-3} |\theta|_{L^\infty} |\partial_N q|_{L^\infty} |\bar{\partial}^k \theta|_{L^2}, \quad r = 2, 3, 4, \end{aligned} \quad (2.6a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} |\Pi\partial^5 q|_{L^2} &\leq 2|\partial_N q|_{L^\infty} |\bar{\partial}^3 \theta|_{L^2} + C \sum_{1 \leq k \leq 4} |\theta|_{L^\infty}^k |\partial^{5-k} q|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + C(K_1, |\theta|_{L^\infty}) \left(|\bar{\partial}^2 \theta|_{L^2} + |\bar{\partial} \theta|_{L^2} \right) \sum_{1 \leq k \leq 4} |\partial^k q|_{L^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.6b)$$

If, in addition, $|\partial_N q| \geq \epsilon$ and $|\partial_N q| \geq 2\epsilon|\partial_N q|_{L^\infty}$ on $\partial\mathcal{D}_t$ for a certain positive constant ϵ , then

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{\partial}^{r-2}\theta|_{L^2} &\leq \epsilon^{-2} |\Pi\partial^r q|_{L^2} + C\epsilon^{-3} \sum_{1 \leq k \leq r-1} |\theta|_{L^\infty}^k |\partial^{r-k} q|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + C\epsilon^{-2} \sum_{1 \leq k \leq r-3} |\theta|_{L^\infty} |\partial_N q|_{L^\infty} |\bar{\partial}^k \theta|_{L^2}, \quad r = 2, 3, 4, \end{aligned} \quad (2.7a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{\partial}^3 \theta|_{L^2} &\leq \epsilon^{-2} |\Pi\partial^5 q|_{L^2} + C\epsilon^{-3} \sum_{1 \leq k \leq 4} |\theta|_{L^\infty}^k |\partial^{5-k} q|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + C(K_1, |\theta|_{L^\infty}) \epsilon^{-3} \left(|\bar{\partial}^2 \theta|_{L^2} + |\bar{\partial} \theta|_{L^2} \right) \sum_{1 \leq k \leq 4} |\partial^k q|_{L^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.7b)$$

The proof of this lemma follows from that of Proposition 5.9 of [10] or Lemmas 2.8 and 2.9 of [43]. It should be noticed that on $\partial\mathcal{D}_t$,

$$\Pi\partial^2 q - (\partial_N q)\theta = 0, \quad (2.8a)$$

$$|\Pi\partial^3 q - (\partial_N q)\bar{\partial}\theta| \leq 3|\theta||\partial^2 q| + 2|\theta|^2|\partial q|. \quad (2.8b)$$

Indeed, ϵ appearing on the right-hand side of (2.7) can be chosen as

$$\epsilon = |(\partial_N q)^{-1}|_{L^\infty}^{-1} \min \{1, 2^{-1}|\partial_N q|_{L^\infty}^{-1}\}. \quad (2.9)$$

Lemma 2.10 *Let $q = q_b$ on $\partial\mathcal{D}_t$ with q_b being a constant. If $|\theta| + 1/\iota_0 \leq K$ and $\iota_1 \geq 1/K_1$, then*

$$|\partial q|_{L^\infty} \leq \|\partial^2 \Delta q\|_{L^2} + C(K, K_1, |\bar{\partial}\theta|_{L^2}, \text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_t) (\|\partial\Delta q\|_{L^2} + \|\Delta q\|_{L^2}). \quad (2.10)$$

The proof of this lemma follows from that of Proposition 5.10 of [10] or Lemma 2.11 of [43].

The following lemma gives Sobolev inequalities.

Lemma 2.11 *If α is a $(0, r)$ tensor, then*

$$|\bar{\partial}\alpha|_{L^4}^2 \leq C|\alpha|_{L^\infty} |\bar{\partial}^2 \alpha|_{L^2}. \quad (2.11)$$

If α is a $(0, r)$ tensor and $\iota_1 \geq 1/K_1$, then

$$|\alpha|_{L^\infty} \leq C(K_1) (|\partial^2 \alpha|_{L^2} + |\partial \alpha|_{L^2} + |\alpha|_{L^2}), \quad (2.12a)$$

$$\|\alpha\|_{L^6} \leq C(K_1)(\|\partial\alpha\|_{L^2} + \|\alpha\|_{L^2}), \quad (2.12b)$$

$$\|\alpha\|_{L^\infty} \leq C(K_1)(\|\partial^2\alpha\|_{L^2} + \|\partial\alpha\|_{L^2} + \|\alpha\|_{L^2}). \quad (2.12c)$$

If α is a $(0, r)$ tensor and $|\theta| + 1/\iota_0 \leq K$, then

$$|\alpha|_{L^4} \leq C(r, K, \text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_t)(\|\partial\alpha\|_{L^2} + \|\alpha\|_{L^2}). \quad (2.13)$$

The proof of (2.11) follows from that of Lemma A.1 in [10], (2.12) from Lemmas A.2 and A.4 in [10], (2.13) from Lemma A.7 in [10].

We also need the following transport formula. Notice a fact that for any function f ,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} f dx = \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} (D_t f + f \text{div} v) dx, \quad (2.14a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\partial\mathcal{D}_t} f ds &= \int_{\partial\mathcal{D}_t} (D_t f + f \text{div} v - f N^i \partial_N v_i) ds \\ &= \int_{\partial\mathcal{D}_t} (D_t f - f N^i \partial_N v_i) ds, \end{aligned} \quad (2.14b)$$

where we have used $\text{div} v = -\rho^{-1} D_t \rho = -\rho^{-1} \rho_p D_t p = 0$ on $\partial\mathcal{D}_t$, due to $p = \bar{p}$ on $\partial\mathcal{D}_t$. This implies, with the aid of $D_t \rho + \rho \text{div} v = 0$, that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} \rho f dx = \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} \rho D_t f dx. \quad (2.15)$$

The following commutator estimates are useful. Simple calculations show that for any function f , positive integer r and non-negative integer m ,

$$\sum_{1 \leq k \leq r} \left| \partial^{r-k} [D_t, \partial^k] f \right| \leq C(r) \sum_{1 \leq k \leq r} |\partial^k v| |\partial^{r+1-k} f|, \quad (2.16a)$$

$$|D_t^m [D_t, \partial^r] f| \leq C(m, r) \sum_{0 \leq i \leq m} \sum_{1 \leq k \leq r} |D_t^i \partial^k v| |D_t^{m-i} \partial^{r+1-k} f|, \quad (2.16b)$$

$$|D_t^m [D_t, \Delta] f| \leq C(m) \sum_{0 \leq i \leq m} (|D_t^i \Delta v| |D_t^{m-i} \partial f| + |D_t^i \partial v| |D_t^{m-i} \partial^2 f|). \quad (2.16c)$$

We also need the following useful inequality. It follows from the Hölder inequality that for any functions f and g ,

$$\|fg\|_{L^2} \leq \|f\|_{L^4} \|g\|_{L^4} \leq (\text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_t)^{1/6} \|f\|_{L^6} \|g\|_{L^6}. \quad (2.17)$$

Finally, we list here some higher-order derived equations from Euler-Poisson equations or Euler equations. It follows from (1.1b) that

$$D_t v_i + \rho^{-1} \partial_i p = \kappa \partial_i \phi, \quad (2.18)$$

which implies, due to $[D_t, \partial_i] = -(\partial_i v^k) \partial_k$, that

$$D_t \partial_j v_i + \rho^{-1} \partial_{ij} p = \rho^{-2} (\partial_j \rho) \partial_i p - (\partial_j v^k) \partial_k v_i + \kappa \partial_{ij} \phi, \quad (2.19a)$$

$$D_t \text{div} v + \rho^{-1} \Delta p = \rho^{-2} (\partial \rho) \cdot \partial p - (\partial_j v^k) \partial_k v^j + \kappa \Delta \phi, \quad (2.19b)$$

$$D_t (\text{curl} v)_{ij} = \rho^{-2} ((\partial_i \rho) \partial_j p - (\partial_j \rho) \partial_i p) + (\partial_j v^k) \partial_k v_i - (\partial_i v^k) \partial_k v_j. \quad (2.19c)$$

In view of (1.1a) and (2.19b), we see that

$$D_t^2 \rho - \Delta p = \rho \mathcal{H}_0 - \kappa \rho \Delta \phi, \quad (2.20)$$

where $\mathcal{H}_0 = (\operatorname{div} v)^2 - \rho^{-2} (\partial \rho) \cdot \partial p + (\partial_j v^k) \partial_k v^j$. This means for $r \geq 1$,

$$\Delta D_t^r p = D_t^{r+2} \rho - \sum_{0 \leq k \leq r-1} D_t^k [D_t, \Delta] D_t^{r-1-k} p - D_t^r (\rho \mathfrak{H}_0) + \kappa D_t^r (\rho \Delta \phi). \quad (2.21)$$

For the potential ϕ , it follows from (1.3) that

$$\Delta D_t^r \phi - e^{-\phi} D_t^r \phi = D_t^r \rho - \mathfrak{G}_r, \quad 1 \leq r \leq 4, \quad (2.22)$$

where $\mathfrak{G}_1 = [D_t, \Delta] \phi$ and for $2 \leq r \leq 4$,

$$\mathfrak{G}_r = \sum_{0 \leq k \leq r-1} D_t^k [D_t, \Delta] D_t^{r-1-k} \phi - \sum_{0 \leq k \leq r-2} D_t^k \left(e^{-\phi} (D_t \phi) D_t^{r-1-k} \phi \right).$$

3 The non-isentropic compressible Euler-Poisson equations

In this section, we study the free boundary problem for the non-isentropic compressible Euler-Poisson equations, (1.1) with $\kappa = 1$ and (1.3), under the stability condition (1.5). The main results are given in Theorem 3.1. We define the higher-order energy functionals as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_I(t) &= \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} \rho |v|^2 dx + \sum_{1 \leq r \leq 4} \int_{\partial \mathcal{D}_t} |\Pi \partial^r p|^2 (-\partial_N p)^{-1} ds \\ &\quad + \sum_{1 \leq r \leq 4} \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} (\rho \delta^{mn} \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r v_m) \partial_J^r v_n + |\partial^{r-1} \operatorname{curl} v|^2 + |\partial^{r-1} \operatorname{div} v|^2) dx \\ &\quad + \sum_{0 \leq r \leq 4} \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} (|\partial^r \rho|^2 + |\partial^r p|^2 + |\partial^r s|^2 + |D_t^{r+1} \rho|^2 + \rho_p |\partial D_t^r p|^2) dx, \\ \mathcal{E}_{II}(t) &= \sum_{0 \leq r \leq 4} \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} |\partial^r \phi|^2 dx + \sum_{1 \leq r \leq 4} \int_{\partial \mathcal{D}_t} \rho |\Pi \partial^r \phi|^2 (\partial_N \phi)^{-1} ds, \\ \mathcal{E}_{EP}(t) &= \mathcal{E}_I(t) + \mathcal{E}_{II}(t). \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

In order to state the main result, we set

$$\underline{\rho} = \min_{x \in \mathcal{D}_0} \rho_0(x), \quad \bar{\rho} = \max_{x \in \mathcal{D}_0} \rho_0(x), \quad \bar{s} = \max_{x \in \mathcal{D}_0} |s_0(x)|, \quad (3.2a)$$

$$\varepsilon_1 = \min_{x \in \partial \mathcal{D}_0} (-\partial_N p)(0, x), \quad \varepsilon_2 = \min_{x \in \partial \mathcal{D}_0} \partial_N \phi(0, x), \quad (3.2b)$$

$$K_0 = \max_{x \in \partial \mathcal{D}_0} |\theta(0, x)| + |\iota_0^{-1}(0)|, \quad (3.2c)$$

where $p(0, x) = p(\rho_0(x), s_0(x))$, and $\phi(0, x)$ is determined by the Dirichlet problem (1.3). With these notations, the main results of this section are stated as follows:

Theorem 3.1 *Let $\kappa = 1$ in (1.1b), and (1.2) hold. Suppose that*

$$0 < \underline{\rho}, \bar{\rho}, \bar{s}, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, K_0, \mathcal{E}_{EP}(0), \operatorname{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0 < \infty.$$

Then there exists a continuous function $\mathcal{T}(\underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \bar{s}, \varepsilon_1^{-1}, \varepsilon_2^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}_{EP}(0), \text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_0) > 0$ such that any smooth solution of the free boundary problem (1.1)-(1.3) for $0 \leq t \leq T$ with $T \leq \mathcal{T}$ satisfies the following estimates: for $0 \leq t \leq T$,

$$\mathcal{E}_{EP}(t) \leq 2\mathcal{E}_{EP}(0), \quad 2^{-1}\text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_0 \leq \text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_t \leq 2\text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_0, \quad (3.3a)$$

$$2^{-1}\underline{\varrho} \leq \min_{x \in \mathcal{D}_t} \rho(t, x), \quad \max_{x \in \mathcal{D}_t} \rho(t, x) \leq 2\bar{\varrho}, \quad \max_{x \in \mathcal{D}_t} |s(t, x)| \leq \bar{s}, \quad (3.3b)$$

$$2^{-1}\varepsilon_1 \leq \min_{x \in \partial\mathcal{D}_t} (-\partial_N p)(t, x), \quad 2^{-1}\varepsilon_2 \leq \min_{x \in \partial\mathcal{D}_t} \partial_N \phi(t, x), \quad (3.3c)$$

$$\max_{x \in \partial\mathcal{D}_t} |\theta(t, x)| + |\iota_0^{-1}(t)| \leq C(\underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \varepsilon_2^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}_{EP}(0), \text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_0). \quad (3.3d)$$

Remark 3.2 It follows from (2.4a) and (3.3b) that $\|v(t, \cdot)\|_{H^4(\mathcal{D}_t)}^2 \leq C\underline{\varrho}^{-1}\mathcal{E}_I(t)$.

To prove the theorem, We make the following a priori assumptions: for $t \in [0, T]$,

$$2^{-1}\text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_0 \leq \text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_t \leq 2\text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_0, \quad (3.4a)$$

$$2^{-1}\underline{\varrho} \leq \rho(t, x) \leq 2\bar{\varrho}, \quad |s(t, x)| \leq \bar{s} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_t, \quad (3.4b)$$

$$|\partial(v, p, s)(t, x)| \leq M \quad \text{and} \quad |\partial\phi(t, x)| \leq \bar{M} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_t, \quad (3.4c)$$

$$|\theta(t, x)| + \iota_0^{-1}(t) \leq K \quad \text{and} \quad \iota_1^{-1}(t) \leq K_1 \quad \text{on } \partial\mathcal{D}_t, \quad (3.4d)$$

$$-\partial_N p(t, x) \geq \epsilon_b \quad \text{and} \quad |\partial_N D_t p(t, x)| \leq L \quad \text{on } \partial\mathcal{D}_t, \quad (3.4e)$$

$$\partial_N \phi(t, x) \geq \bar{\epsilon}_b \quad \text{and} \quad |\partial_N D_t \phi(t, x)| \leq \bar{L} \quad \text{on } \partial\mathcal{D}_t, \quad (3.4f)$$

where $M, \bar{M}, K, K_1, \epsilon_b, \bar{\epsilon}_b, L$ and \bar{L} are positive constants. It follows from the maximal principle that for $t \in [0, T]$ and $x \in \mathcal{D}_t$,

$$\phi(t, x) \leq \max \left\{ 0, -\ln \min_{x \in \mathcal{D}_t} \rho(t, x) \right\}, \quad (3.5a)$$

$$\phi(t, x) \geq \min \left\{ 0, -\ln \max_{x \in \mathcal{D}_t} \rho(t, x) \right\}. \quad (3.5b)$$

Indeed, if there exists $x_0 \in \mathcal{D}_t$ such that $\phi(t, x_0) = \max_{x \in \bar{\mathcal{D}}_t} \phi(t, x)$, then $\Delta\phi(t, x_0) \leq 0$ and $e^{-\phi(t, x_0)} \geq \rho(t, x_0)$, due to (1.3). That is, $\phi(t, x_0) \leq -\ln \rho(t, x_0) \leq -\ln \min_{x \in \mathcal{D}_t} \rho(t, x)$. By the boundary condition $\phi|_{\partial\mathcal{D}_t} = 0$, we have (3.5a) for $t \leq T$ and $x \in \mathcal{D}_t$. By the same argument, (3.5b) holds for $t \leq T$ and $x \in \mathcal{D}_t$.

For the simplicity of the presentation, we may assume without loss of generality that

$$\text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_0 = 4\pi/3, \quad \underline{\varrho} = 2^{-1}, \quad \bar{\varrho} = 2, \quad \bar{s} = 1,$$

which implies, due to (3.4a), (3.4b) and (3.5), that for $t \in [0, T]$,

$$2\pi/3 \leq \text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_t \leq 8\pi/3, \quad (3.6a)$$

$$4^{-1} \leq \rho(t, x) \leq 4, \quad |s(t, x)| \leq 1, \quad |\phi(t, x)| \leq \ln 4 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_t. \quad (3.6b)$$

In view of (1.1a) and (1.1c), we see that

$$D_t \rho = -\rho \text{div} v, \quad D_t p = p_\rho D_t \rho = -\rho p_\rho \text{div} v, \quad (3.7)$$

which, together with $\partial \rho = \rho_p \partial p + \rho_s \partial s$, (1.2), (3.4c) and (3.6b), means that for $t \in [0, T]$,

$$|D_t \rho(t, x)| + |D_t p(t, x)| + |\partial \rho(t, x)| \lesssim M \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_t. \quad (3.8)$$

3.1 Regularity estimates

Proposition 3.3 *Let $\kappa = 1$ in (1.1b), then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{0 \leq r \leq 4} (\|\partial^r v\|_{L^2}^2 + \|D_t \partial^r(\rho, p, s, \phi)\|_{L^2}^2) + \|\partial^4 \operatorname{div} v\|_{L^2}^2 + \|D_t v\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& + \sum_{0 \leq r \leq 3} (\|D_t \partial^r(\operatorname{curl} v, \operatorname{div} v)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|D_t \partial D_t^r p\|_{L^2}^2) + \|D_t^6 \rho - \Delta D_t^4 p\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& + \|\partial D_t^5 \rho - \rho_p D_t \partial D_t^4 p\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{1 \leq r \leq 4} (|\partial^r(p, \phi)|_{L^2}^2 + |\Pi \partial^r D_t(p, \phi)|_{L^2}^2) \\
& \leq C(M, \bar{M}, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, \bar{\epsilon}_b^{-1}, L, \bar{L}) \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 4} \mathcal{E}_{EP}^i.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof consists of the following four lemmas, Lemmas 3.4-3.7. Since some estimates also hold for the non-isentropic compressible Euler equations, $\kappa = 0$ in (1.1b), we establish the estimates depending on κ for $\kappa = 1$ or $\kappa = 0$, which will be used for both cases.

Lemma 3.4 *Let $\kappa = 0, 1$ in (1.1b), then it holds that*

$$\|\partial^i v\|_{L^2}^2 + \|D_t^i p\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \mathcal{E}_I, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, 4, \quad (3.9a)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1,2} \|\partial^i(v, \rho, p, s)\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \sum_{i+j=0,1} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j(\rho, p)\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|D_t \partial s\|_{L^\infty}^2 \\
& + \|\partial^3(v, \rho, p, s)\|_{L^6}^2 + \sum_{i=2,3} \|D_t^i(\rho, p)\|_{L^6}^2 + \sum_{i+j=2} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j(\rho, p)\|_{L^6}^2 \\
& + \|\partial D_t^2 \rho\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i=1,2,3} |\partial^i(v, p)|_{L^2}^2 + |\partial D_t p|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K_1) \mathcal{E}_I,
\end{aligned} \quad (3.9b)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|(D_t^5 p, D_t \partial^3 \operatorname{curl} v, \partial D_t^3 \rho)\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i+j=3} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j(\rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 4} \|D_t \partial^i s\|_{L^2}^2 + |\partial^2 D_t p|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K_1)(\mathcal{E}_I^2 + \mathcal{E}_I),
\end{aligned} \quad (3.9c)$$

$$\|\bar{\partial}^i \theta\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}) \mathcal{E}_I, \quad i = 0, 1, 2. \quad (3.9d)$$

Proof. (3.9a) follows from (2.4a) and (2.5a). It follows from (2.4b) and (3.9a) that

$$|\partial^r(v, p)|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(K_1) \mathcal{E}_I, \quad r = 1, 2, 3, \quad (3.10)$$

which proves (3.9d), using (2.7), (2.9) and $|\Pi \partial^4 p|_{L^2}^2 \leq |\partial p|_{L^\infty} \mathcal{E}_I$. In view of (2.12b), (3.9a) and $|D_t^r \rho| \lesssim \sum_{k=1}^r M^{r-k} |D_t^k p|$ for $r = 1, 2, 3$, we see that for $r = 1, 2, 3$,

$$\|D_t^r p\|_{L^6}^2 \leq C(K_1) \mathcal{E}_I, \quad \|D_t^r \rho\|_{L^6}^2 \leq C(M, K_1) \mathcal{E}_I, \quad (3.11)$$

which, together with $|D_t^5 p| \lesssim \sum_{j=1}^5 M^{5-j} |D_t^j \rho| + |D_t^3 \rho| |D_t^2 \rho| + M |D_t^2 \rho|^2$ and (2.17), implies

$$\|D_t^5 p\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K_1)(\mathcal{E}_I + \mathcal{E}_I^2). \quad (3.12)$$

It follows from (2.12b), (2.12c), (3.9a) and (3.7) that

$$\sum_{r=1,2} \|\partial^r(v, \rho, p, s)\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|D_t(\rho, p)\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|\partial^3(v, \rho, p, s)\|_{L^6}^2 \leq C(K_1) \mathcal{E}_I. \quad (3.13)$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial^3 D_t \operatorname{curl} v| &\lesssim M (|\partial^4(v, \rho, p)| + |\partial^2 \rho| |\partial^2(\rho, p)|) + M^2 |\partial^3(\rho, p)| \\ &\quad + M^3 |\partial^2(\rho, p)| + M^4 |\partial p| + |\partial^2 v| |\partial^3 v| + |\partial^2 p| |\partial^3 \rho| + |\partial^2 \rho| |\partial^3 p|, \end{aligned}$$

which is due to (2.19c), then, we use (3.9a), (3.13) and (2.16a) to get

$$\|D_t \partial^3 \operatorname{curl} v\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K_1) (\mathcal{E}_I + \mathcal{E}_I^2). \quad (3.14)$$

In view of (1.1c), (2.16a), (3.9a) and (3.13), we see that for $1 \leq r \leq 4$,

$$\|D_t \partial^r s\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K_1) (\mathcal{E}_I + \mathcal{E}_I^2), \quad \|D_t \partial s\|_{L^\infty}^2 \leq C(M, K_1) \mathcal{E}_I. \quad (3.15)$$

It follows from (1.1a) that

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial D_t \rho| &\lesssim |\partial^2 v| + M |\partial \rho|, \quad |\partial^2 D_t \rho| \lesssim |\partial^3 v| + M |\partial^2(v, \rho)|, \\ |\partial^3 D_t \rho| &\lesssim |\partial^4 v| + M |\partial^3(v, \rho)| + |\partial^2 \rho| |\partial^2 v|, \end{aligned}$$

which gives, using (3.9a), (3.13) and (2.16a), that

$$\|(\partial D_t, D_t \partial) \rho\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \sum_{i+j=2} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j \rho\|_{L^6}^2 \leq C(M, K_1) \mathcal{E}_I, \quad (3.16a)$$

$$\sum_{i+j=3} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j \rho\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K_1) (\mathcal{E}_I + \mathcal{E}_I^2). \quad (3.16b)$$

Due to (3.7), we have $\partial^r D_t p = -\rho p_\rho \partial^r \operatorname{div} v + \mathfrak{F}_r$ for $r = 1, 2, 3$, where

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathfrak{F}_1| &\lesssim M |\partial v|, \quad |\mathfrak{F}_2| \lesssim M |\partial^2(v, \rho, s)| + M^2 |\partial v|, \\ |\mathfrak{F}_3| &\lesssim |\partial^2 v| |\partial^2(\rho, s)| + M |\partial^3(v, \rho, s)| + M^2 |\partial^2(v, \rho, s)| + M^3 |\partial v|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we use (3.9a), (3.13), (2.16a), (2.4b) and (2.12b) to obtain

$$\|(D_t \partial, \partial D_t) p\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \sum_{i+j=2} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j p\|_{L^6}^2 + |\partial D_t p|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K_1) \mathcal{E}_I, \quad (3.17a)$$

$$\sum_{i+j=3} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j p\|_{L^2}^2 + |\partial^2 D_t p|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K_1) (\mathcal{E}_I + \mathcal{E}_I^2). \quad (3.17b)$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial D_t^2 \rho| &\lesssim |\partial D_t^2 p| + M |(D_t^2, \partial D_t) p| + M^2 |D_t p|, \\ |\partial D_t^3 \rho| &\lesssim \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 1, 1 \leq j \leq 3} M^{4-i-j} |\partial^i D_t^j p| + |\partial D_t p| |D_t^2 p|, \end{aligned}$$

then it follows from (3.9a) and (3.17a) that

$$\|\partial D_t^2 \rho\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M) \mathcal{E}_I, \quad \|\partial D_t^3 \rho\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K_1) (\mathcal{E}_I + \mathcal{E}_I^2).$$

This, together with (3.10)-(3.17), proves (3.9b) and (3.9c). \square

Lemma 3.5 *Let $\kappa = 0, 1$ in (1.1b), then it holds that*

$$\sum_{i=1,2} \|\partial^i \phi\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|\partial^3 \phi\|_{L^6}^2 + \sum_{i=1,2,3} |\partial^i \phi|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(K_1) \mathcal{E}_{II}, \quad (3.18a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \|D_t^2(\rho, p)\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \sum_{i+j=0,1} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j v\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \sum_{i+j=2} (\|\partial^i D_t \partial^j v\|_{L^6}^2 \\ & + \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j(\rho, p)\|_{L^6}^2) \leq C(M, K_1)(\mathcal{E}_I + \kappa \mathcal{E}_{II}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.18b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\partial D_t^4 \rho\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i+j=3} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j v\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i+j+k=2} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j D_t \partial^k(\rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & + |\partial D_t^2 p|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K_1)(\mathcal{E}_I + 1)(\mathcal{E}_I + \kappa \mathcal{E}_{II}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.18c)$$

$$\|\partial D_t^5 \rho - \rho_p D_t \partial D_t^4 p\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K_1)(\mathcal{E}_I^2 + \mathcal{E}_I + 1)(\mathcal{E}_I + \kappa \mathcal{E}_{II}). \quad (3.18d)$$

Proof. Due to (2.4b), (2.12b) and (2.12c), one has (3.18a). It follows from (2.18) that $\partial^r D_t v = -\partial^r(\rho^{-1} \partial p) + \kappa \partial^{r+1} \phi$ for $0 \leq r \leq 3$, which leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & |D_t v - \kappa \partial \phi| \lesssim |\partial p|, \quad |\partial D_t v - \kappa \partial^2 \phi| \lesssim |\partial^2 p| + M |\partial p|, \\ & |\partial^2 D_t v - \kappa \partial^3 \phi| \lesssim |\partial^3 p| + M |\partial^2(\rho, p)| + M^2 |\partial p|, \\ & |\partial^3 D_t v - \kappa \partial^4 \phi| \lesssim \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 4} M^{4-i} |\partial^i(\rho, p)| + |\partial^2 p| |\partial^2 \rho|. \end{aligned}$$

This, together with (3.9a), (3.9b), (3.18a) and (2.16a), implies

$$\sum_{i+j=0,1} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j v\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \sum_{i+j=2} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j v\|_{L^6}^2 \leq C(M, K_1)(\mathcal{E}_I + \kappa \mathcal{E}_{II}), \quad (3.19a)$$

$$\sum_{i+j=3} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j v\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K_1)(\mathcal{E}_I + \mathcal{E}_I^2 + \kappa \mathcal{E}_{II}). \quad (3.19b)$$

In view of (2.20), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\partial D_t^2 \rho| \lesssim |\partial^3(p, \kappa \phi)| + M |\partial^2(v, \rho, p, \kappa \phi)| + M^2 |\partial(v, p)|, \\ & |\partial D_t^2 p| \lesssim |\partial D_t^2 \rho| + M |(D_t^2, \partial D_t) \rho| + M^2 |D_t \rho|, \end{aligned}$$

which gives, using (3.9b), (3.18a), (3.19a), (2.16a) and (2.16b), that

$$\sum_{i+j=2} \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j(\rho, p)\|_{L^6}^2 \leq C(M, K_1)(\mathcal{E}_I + \kappa \mathcal{E}_{II}). \quad (3.20)$$

Due to (2.20), $D_t^2 p = p_\rho D_t^2 \rho + p_{\rho\rho} (D_t \rho)^2$, (3.9b) and (3.18a), one obtains

$$\|D_t^2(\rho, p)\|_{L^\infty}^2 \leq C(M, K_1)(\mathcal{E}_I + \kappa \mathcal{E}_{II}), \quad (3.21)$$

which means, with the aid of (3.9a) and (3.9b), that

$$\|\partial D_t^4 \rho\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K_1)(1 + \mathcal{E}_I)(\mathcal{E}_I + \kappa \mathcal{E}_{II}), \quad (3.22)$$

since

$$|\partial D_t^4 \rho| \lesssim \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 1, 1 \leq j \leq 4} M^{5-i-j} |\partial^i D_t^j p| + \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq 1, 1 \leq j \leq 4 \\ 2 \leq i+j, 2 \leq l \leq 4-j}} M^{5-i-j-l} |\partial^i D_t^j p| |D_t^l p|.$$

As a consequence of (3.19a), (3.20) and (3.21), we prove (3.18b).

It follows from (2.20) that

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial^2 D_t^2 \rho| &\lesssim |\partial^4(p, \kappa\phi)| + M|\partial^3(v, \rho, p, \kappa\phi)| + M^2|\partial^2(v, \rho, p)| \\ &\quad + M^3|\partial p| + |\partial^2 v|^2 + |\partial^2 \rho||\partial^2(p, \kappa\phi)|, \\ |\partial^2 D_t^2 p| &\lesssim \sum_{0 \leq i, j \leq 2, 1 \leq i+j} M^{4-i-j} |\partial^i D_t^j(\rho, s)| + |\partial^2(\rho, s)||D_t^2 \rho| + |\partial D_t \rho|^2, \end{aligned}$$

which, together with (3.9b) and (3.18a), implies

$$\|\partial^2 D_t^2(\rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K_1)(1 + \mathcal{E}_I)(\mathcal{E}_I + \kappa \mathcal{E}_{II}).$$

Thus, we use (2.4b), (2.16a), (2.16b), (3.9b) and (3.18b) to get

$$\sum_{i+j+k=2} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j D_t \partial^k(\rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 + |\partial D_t^2 p|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K_1)(1 + \mathcal{E}_I)(\mathcal{E}_I + \kappa \mathcal{E}_{II}).$$

Hence, we prove (3.18c) by virtue of (3.19b) and (3.22).

Finally, (3.18d) follows from (2.17), (3.9a), (3.9b) and (3.18b) that

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial D_t^5 \rho - \rho_p D_t \partial D_t^4 p| &= |\partial D_t^4(\rho_p D_t p) - \rho_p D_t \partial D_t^4 p| \\ &\leq |\partial D_t^4(\rho_p D_t p) - \rho_p \partial D_t^5 p| + \rho_p |\partial D_t^5 p - D_t \partial D_t^4 p| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 1, 1 \leq j \leq 5, i+j \leq 5} M^{6-i-j} |\partial^i D_t^j p| + |D_t^2 p|^2 |\partial D_t p| \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq 1, 1 \leq j \leq 4 \\ 2 \leq i+j, 2 \leq l \leq 5-j}} M^{6-i-j-l} |\partial^i D_t^j p| |D_t^l p|. \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of the lemma. \square

Lemma 3.6 *Let $\kappa = 0, 1$ in (1.1b), then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i+j+k=2} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j D_t \partial^k v\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i+j=3} \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j(v, \rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{i+j=4} \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j(\rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i+j=2} \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j v\|_{L^6}^2 \leq C(M, K_1) \mathfrak{C}_1, \end{aligned} \quad (3.23a)$$

$$\sum_{i+j+k=3} \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j \partial D_t^k(\rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i+j=4} \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j v\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1) \mathfrak{C}_2, \quad (3.23b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i+j=4} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j(\rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 + |\Pi \partial^3 D_t p|_{L^2}^2 + |\partial^3 D_t p|_{L^2}^2 + |\Pi \partial^4 D_t p|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\quad + \|\partial^4 \operatorname{div} v\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, L) \mathfrak{C}_3, \end{aligned} \quad (3.23c)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i+j+k=3} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j D_t \partial^k(\rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|D_t^3 \Delta v\|_{L^2}^2 + \|D_t \partial^3 \operatorname{div} v\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\quad \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}) \mathfrak{C}_4, \end{aligned} \quad (3.23d)$$

$$|\partial^4 p|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}) (\mathfrak{C}_4 + \kappa \|\partial^3(\rho \Delta \phi)\|_{L^2}^2), \quad (3.23e)$$

$$\|\partial D_t^6 \rho - \Delta D_t^4 p\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}) (\mathfrak{C}_1^2 + \mathfrak{C}_2 + \mathfrak{C}_4 + \kappa \|D_t^4(\rho \Delta \phi)\|_{L^2}^2). \quad (3.23f)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{C}_1 &= (\mathcal{E}_I + 1 + \kappa\mathcal{E}_{II}) (\mathcal{E}_I + \kappa\mathcal{E}_{II} + \kappa\|D_t\partial^2\phi\|_{L^2}^2) + \kappa\|(D_t^2, \partial D_t)\partial^2\phi\|_{L^2}^2, \\ \mathfrak{C}_2 &= \mathfrak{C}_1 + \kappa\|D_t^3(\rho\Delta\phi)\|_{L^2}^2 + \kappa\|D_t^3\partial^2\phi\|_{L^2}^2, \quad \mathfrak{C}_3 = \mathfrak{C}_2 + \kappa\|\partial^2 D_t(\rho\Delta\phi)\|_{L^2}^2, \\ \mathfrak{C}_4 &= \mathcal{E}_I^3 + \mathfrak{C}_1 + \kappa\|D_t^2\partial\Delta\phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \kappa\|\partial D_t^2(\rho\Delta\phi)\|_{L^2}^2.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. It follows from (2.19a) that

$$\begin{aligned}|D_t^2\partial v - \kappa D_t\partial^2\phi| &\lesssim \sum_{0\leq i,j\leq 1} M^{2-i-j}|D_t^i\partial^{j+1}p| + M|D_t\partial(v,\rho)|, \\ |\partial D_t^2\partial v - \kappa\partial D_t\partial^2\phi| &\lesssim \sum_{0\leq i,j,k\leq 1} M^{3-i-j-k}|\partial^i D_t^j\partial^{k+1}p| \\ &+ \sum_{0\leq i,j,k\leq 1, 2\leq i+j+k} M^{4-i-j-k}|\partial^i D_t^j\partial^k\rho| + |D_t\partial p|\|\partial^2\rho\| \\ &+ |(D_t\partial, \partial D_t)\rho|\|\partial^2 p\| + \sum_{0\leq i,j\leq 1} |\partial^i D_t^j\partial v|\|\partial^{1-i} D_t^{1-j}\partial v\|, \\ |D_t^3\partial v - \kappa D_t^2\partial^2\phi| &\lesssim \sum_{0\leq i\leq 2, 1\leq j\leq 2} M^{4-i-j}|D_t^i\partial^j p| + |D_t\partial p|\|D_t\partial\rho\| \\ &+ |D_t^2\rho|\|\partial^2 p\| + \sum_{1\leq i\leq 2, 0\leq j\leq 1} M^{4-i-j}|D_t^i\partial^j\rho| + \sum_{0\leq i\leq 2} |D_t^i\partial v|\|D_t^{2-i}\partial v\|,\end{aligned}$$

which, together with (3.9b), (3.9c), (3.18b), (3.18c), (2.16a), (2.16b) and (2.12b), gives

$$\sum_{i+j=2} \|D_t^i\partial D_t^j v\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim C(M, K_1)(\mathcal{E}_I + \kappa\mathcal{E}_{II}) + \kappa\|D_t\partial^2\phi\|_{L^2}^2, \quad (3.24a)$$

$$\sum_{i+j+k=2} \|\partial^i D_t\partial^j D_t\partial^k v\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i+j=2} \|D_t^i\partial D_t^j v\|_{L^6}^2 \lesssim \mathfrak{C} + \kappa\|\partial D_t\partial^2\phi\|_{L^2}^2, \quad (3.24b)$$

$$\sum_{i+j=3} \|D_t^i\partial D_t^j v\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \mathfrak{C} + \kappa\|(D_t, D_t^2)\partial^2\phi\|_{L^2}^2, \quad (3.24c)$$

$$\sum_{i+j=3} \|D_t^i\partial D_t^j(\rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \mathfrak{C} + \kappa\|D_t\partial^2\phi\|_{L^2}^2, \quad (3.24d)$$

where $\mathfrak{C} = C(M, K_1)(1 + \mathcal{E}_I + \kappa\mathcal{E}_{II})(\mathcal{E}_I + \kappa\mathcal{E}_{II})$. We then have, using (2.16a), (2.16b), (3.9b), (3.18b) and (3.18c), that

$$\sum_{i+j=4} \|D_t^i\partial D_t^j(\rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \mathfrak{C} + \kappa(1 + \mathcal{E}_I)\|D_t\partial^2\phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \kappa\|D_t^2\partial^2\phi\|_{L^2}^2,$$

which proves (3.23a), by virtue of (3.24).

In view of (2.21), (2.19a), (2.16a) and (2.16b), we see that

$$\begin{aligned}|\Delta D_t^3 p - D_t^5 \rho - \kappa D_t^3(\rho\Delta\phi)| &\lesssim \mathcal{J}_1 \\ &+ \sum_{1\leq i\leq 2} |\partial^i v|\|\partial^{3-i} D_t^2 p\| + \sum_{0\leq i,j\leq 1} |D_t^i\partial^{j+1}v|\|D_t^{1-i}\partial^{2-j} D_t p\| \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{0\leq i\leq 2 \\ 0\leq j\leq 1}} |D_t^i\partial^{j+1}v|\|D_t^{2-i}\partial^{2-j} p\| + \sum_{\substack{0\leq i,j\leq 3 \\ i+j\leq 3}} |D_t^i\rho|\|D_t^j\partial v\|\|D_t^{3-i-j}\partial v\|,\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
|D_t^4 \partial v + \rho^{-1} D_t^3 \partial^2 p - \kappa D_t^3 \partial^2 \phi| &\lesssim \mathcal{J}_1 + \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 3} |D_t^i \partial v| |D_t^{3-i} \partial v| \\
&+ \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 2} M^{3-i} |D_t^i \partial^2 p| + \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 1, 2 \leq j \leq 3-i} M^{3-i-j} |D_t^i \partial^2 p| |D_t^j \rho|, \\
|\partial^2 D_t^3 \rho| &\lesssim \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 2, 0 \leq j \leq 3, 1 \leq i+j} M^{5-i-j} |\partial^i D_t^j(p, s)| \\
&+ \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq 2, 0 \leq j \leq 3, 0 \leq k \leq 2-i \\ 0 \leq l \leq 3-j, 2 \leq i+j, k+l}} M^{5-i-j-k-l} |\partial^i D_t^j(p, s)| |\partial^k D_t^l \rho|,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{J}_1 &= \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 3} M^{4-i} (|D_t^i \partial p| + \sum_{\max\{0, 2-i\} \leq j \leq 1} M^{1-j} |D_t^i \partial^j \rho|) \\
&+ \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq 2, 2 \leq j \leq 3-i \\ \max\{0, 2-j\} \leq k \leq 1}} M^{4-i-j-k} |D_t^i \partial p| |D_t^j \partial^k \rho| + M |D_t^2 \rho| |D_t \partial \rho|.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves (3.23b), with the aid of (2.5b), (2.16a), (2.16b), (3.9a) (3.9b), (3.18b), (3.18c) and (3.24).

It follows from (2.21) and (2.16a) that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\partial^2 \Delta D_t p - \kappa \partial^2 D_t(\rho \Delta \phi)| &\lesssim |\partial^2 D_t^3 \rho| + M |\partial^2 \rho| |(D_t \partial, \partial D_t) \rho| \\
&+ \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i, k \leq 2, 0 \leq j, l \leq 1 \\ i+k \leq 2, j+l \leq 1}} |\partial^i D_t^j \rho| |\partial^k D_t^l \partial v| |\partial^{2-i-k} D_t^{1-j-l} \partial v| + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 4} |\partial^i v| |\partial^{5-i} p| \\
&+ \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 2, 0 \leq j \leq 1} M^{4-i-j} (|\partial^i D_t^j \partial p| + \sum_{\max\{0, 2-i-j\} \leq k \leq 1} M^{1-k} |\partial^i D_t^j \partial^k \rho|) \\
&+ \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq 2, 0 \leq j, m \leq 1, 1 \leq i+j \\ 0 \leq k \leq 2-i, 0 \leq l \leq 1-j, 2 \leq k+l+m}} M^{4-i-j-k-l-m} |\partial^i D_t^j \partial p| |\partial^k D_t^l \partial^m \rho|,
\end{aligned}$$

which gives, with the aid of (3.9a), (3.9b), (3.9c), (3.18b), (3.18c) and (3.23b), that

$$\|\partial^2 \Delta D_t p\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1) \mathfrak{E}_3. \tag{3.25}$$

With (3.9), (3.18) and (3.25) at hand, we use (2.6) to obtain the bound for $\|\Pi \partial^3 D_t p\|_{L^2}$ in (3.23c), (2.5c) for $|\partial^3 D_t p|_{L^2}$, (2.6) for $\|\Pi \partial^4 D_t p\|_{L^2}$, (2.5d) for $\|\partial^4 D_t p\|_{L^2}$, and (2.16a) for $\sum_{i+j=4} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j p\|_{L^2}$, step by step. Due to (1.1a) and (1.1c), one has

$$\begin{aligned}
|\partial^4(\operatorname{div} v, D_t \rho)| &= |\partial^4((-\rho^{-1}, 1) \rho_p D_t p)| \lesssim M |\partial^2(p, s)|^2 \\
&+ \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 4} M^{4-i} |\partial^i D_t p| + \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 2, 2 \leq j \leq 4-i} M^{4-i-j} |\partial^i D_t p| |\partial^j(p, s)|,
\end{aligned}$$

which leads to the bounds for $\|\partial^4 \operatorname{div} v\|_{L^2}$ and $\sum_{i+j=4} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j \rho\|_{L^2}$ in (3.23c), using (2.16a), (3.9a), (3.9b), (3.9c) and the bound just obtained for $\|\partial^4 D_t p\|_{L^2}$.

It follows from (2.21), (2.16a) and (2.16b), that

$$|\partial \Delta D_t^2 p - \partial D_t^4 \rho - \kappa \partial D_t^2(\rho \Delta \phi)| \lesssim \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} |\partial^i v| |\partial^{4-i} D_t p|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i, k \leq 1, 0 \leq j, l \leq 2 \\ i+k \leq 1, j+l \leq 2}} |\partial^i D_t^j \rho| |\partial^k D_t^l \partial v| |\partial^{1-i-k} D_t^{2-j-l} \partial v| + M |D_t^2 \rho| |\partial^2 \rho| \\
& + \sum_{0 \leq i, j, k \leq 1} |\partial^i D_t^j \partial^{k+1} v| |\partial^{1-i} D_t^{1-j} \partial^{2-k} p| + M |\partial D_t \rho| |D_t \partial \rho| \\
& + \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 1, 0 \leq j \leq 2} M^{4-i-j} (|\partial^i D_t^j \partial p| + \sum_{\max\{0, 2-i-j\} \leq k \leq 1} M^{1-k} |\partial^i D_t^j \partial^k \rho|) \\
& + \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i, m \leq 1, 0 \leq j \leq 2, 1 \leq i+j \\ 0 \leq k \leq 1-i, 0 \leq l \leq 2-j, 2 \leq k+l+m}} M^{4-i-j-k-l-m} |\partial^i D_t^j \partial p| |\partial^k D_t^l \partial^m \rho|,
\end{aligned}$$

which, together with (3.9), (3.18), (3.23a) and (3.24a), means

$$\|\partial \Delta D_t^2 p\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim C(M, K_1) \mathfrak{E}_1 + \kappa \|\partial D_t^2(\rho \Delta \phi)\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (3.26a)$$

In view of (2.8), (2.11) and (2.13), we see that

$$|\Pi \partial^2 D_t^2 p|_{L^2} \leq |\theta|_{L^\infty} |\partial D_t^2 p|_{L^2} \leq K |\partial D_t^2 p|_{L^2}, \quad (3.27a)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Pi \partial^3 D_t^2 p|_{L^2} & \leq |\Pi \partial^3 D_t^2 p - (\partial_N D_t^2 p) \bar{\partial} \theta|_{L^2} + |(\partial_N D_t^2 p) \bar{\partial} \theta|_{L^2} \\
& \leq 3K |\partial^2 D_t^2 p|_{L^2} + 2K^2 |\partial D_t^2 p|_{L^2} + |\partial D_t^2 p|_{L^4} |\bar{\partial} \theta|_{L^4} \\
& \leq C(K) \sum_{i=1,2} (|\partial^i D_t^2 p|_{L^2} + \|\partial^i D_t^2 p\|_{L^2} |\theta|_{L^\infty}^{1/2} |\bar{\partial}^2 \theta|_{L^2}^{1/2}).
\end{aligned} \quad (3.27b)$$

We use (2.5c), (3.18c), (3.26a) and (3.27a) to get

$$\|\partial^2 D_t^2 p\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1) (\mathfrak{E}_1 + \kappa \|\partial D_t^2(\rho \Delta \phi)\|_{L^2}^2),$$

and use (2.5d), (3.9d), (3.18c), (3.26a) and (3.27b) to obtain the bound for $\|\partial^3 D_t^2 p\|_{L^2}$ in (3.23d). Then, the bound for $\|\partial^3 D_t^2 \rho\|_{L^2}$ follows from (3.9b), (3.9c), (3.18b), (3.18c) and that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\partial^3 D_t^2 \rho| & \lesssim \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 3, 0 \leq j \leq 2, 1 \leq i+j} M^{5-i-j} |\partial^i D_t^j(p, s)| \\
& + \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq 3, 0 \leq j \leq 2, 0 \leq k \leq 3-i \\ 0 \leq l \leq 2-j, 2 \leq i+j, k+l}} M^{5-i-j-k-l} |\partial^i D_t^j(p, s)| |\partial^k D_t^l p|.
\end{aligned}$$

The bound for $\sum_{i+j+k=3} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j D_t \partial^k(p, \rho)\|_{L^2}$ in (3.23d) follows from (2.16a), (2.16b), (3.9), (3.18) and the bound just obtained for $\|\partial^3 D_t^2(\rho, p)\|_{L^2}$. It follows from (2.19a) that

$$\begin{aligned}
D_t \Delta v_i + \rho^{-1} \partial_i \Delta p & = \delta^{lj} \left\{ \rho^{-2} (\partial_l \rho) \partial_{ij} p - (\partial_l v^k) \partial_{kj} v_i \right. \\
& \left. + \partial_l \left(\rho^{-2} (\partial_j \rho) \partial_i p - (\partial_j v^k) \partial_k v_i \right) \right\} + \kappa \partial_i \Delta \phi,
\end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}
|D_t^3 \Delta v + \rho^{-1} D_t^2 \partial \Delta p - \kappa D_t^2 \partial \Delta \phi| & \lesssim \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 2} |D_t^i \partial v| |D_t^{2-i} \partial^2 v| \\
& + \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i, j \leq 2 \\ i+j \leq 3}} M^{4-i-j} |D_t^i \partial^{j+1} p| + \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i, j \leq 2 \\ 2 \leq i+j}} M^{5-i-j} |D_t^i \partial^j \rho| + M |D_t^2 \rho| |\partial^2 \rho|
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i, j \leq 2, 1 \leq i+j \leq 3 \\ 0 \leq k \leq 2-i, 0 \leq l \leq 2-j, 2 \leq k+l}} M^{4-i-j-k-l} |D_t^i \partial^{j+1} p| |D_t^k \partial^l \rho|.$$

Then, the bound for $\|D_t^3 \Delta v\|_{L^2}$ in (3.23d) follows from (3.9), (3.18), (3.23a), (3.24a) and the bound just obtained for $\|D_t^2 \partial^3 p\|_{L^2}$. The bound for $\|D_t \partial^3 \operatorname{div} v\|_{L^2}$ follows from (3.9), (3.18), the bound just obtained for $\|D_t \partial^3 D_t \rho\|_{L^2}$, and that

$$\begin{aligned} |D_t \partial^3 \operatorname{div} v| &= |D_t \partial^3 (\rho^{-1} D_t \rho)| \lesssim \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i, k \leq 1, 0 \leq j \leq 3 \\ 1 \leq i+j+k}} M^{5-i-j-k} |D_t^i \partial^j D_t^k \rho| \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i, k \leq 1, 0 \leq j \leq 3, 0 \leq l \leq 3-j \\ 0 \leq m \leq 1-k, 2 \leq i+j+k, l+m}} M^{5-i-j-k-l-m} |D_t^i \partial^j D_t^k \rho| |\partial^l D_t^m \rho|. \end{aligned}$$

In view of (2.20), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial^3 \Delta p - \kappa \partial^3 (\rho \Delta \phi)| &\lesssim |\partial^3 D_t^2 \rho| + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 4} M^{5-i} |\partial^i (v, \rho, p)| + |\partial^3 v| |\partial^2 v| \\ &+ |\partial^3 \rho| |\partial^2 p| + |\partial^3 p| |\partial^2 \rho| + M(|\partial^2 \rho| |\partial^2 (v, \rho, p)| + |\partial^2 v|^2), \end{aligned}$$

which proves (3.23e), using (2.5c), (3.9) and the bound just obtained for $\|\partial^3 D_t^2 \rho\|_{L^2}$.

It follows from (2.21) and (2.16) that

$$\begin{aligned} &|\Delta D_t^4 p - D_t^6 \rho - \kappa D_t^4 (\rho \Delta \phi)| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{0 \leq i, j \leq 4, i+j \leq 4} |D_t^i \rho| |D_t^j \partial v| |D_t^{4-i-j} \partial v| + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 2} |\partial^i v| |\partial^{3-i} D_t^3 p| \\ &+ \sum_{0 \leq i, j \leq 1} |D_t^i \partial^{j+1} v| |D_t^{1-i} \partial^{2-j} D_t^2 p| + M |D_t^3 \Delta v| + |D_t^3 \partial v| |\partial^2 p| \\ &+ \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 2, 0 \leq j \leq 1} |D_t^i \partial^{j+1} v| (|D_t^{2-i} \partial^{2-j} D_t p| + |D_t^{3-i} \partial^{2-j} p|) + \mathcal{J}_2, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_2 &= \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 4} M^{5-i} (|D_t^i \partial p| + \sum_{\max\{0, 2-i\} \leq j \leq 1} M^{1-j} |D_t^i \partial^j \rho|) \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq 3, 1 \leq j \leq 4-i \\ \max\{0, 2-j\} \leq k \leq 1}} M^{5-i-j-k} |D_t^i \partial p| |D_t^j \partial^k \rho| + |D_t \partial p| |D_t^2 \rho| |D_t \partial \rho| \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq 3, 0 \leq j \leq 1, 1 \leq k \leq 4-i \\ 0 \leq l \leq 1-j, 2 \leq i+j, k+l}} M^{6-i-j-k-l} |D_t^i \partial^j \rho| |D_t^k \partial^l \rho|. \end{aligned} \tag{3.29}$$

This proves (3.23f), using (2.17), (3.9), (3.18), (3.23a), (3.23b) and (3.23d). \square

Lemma 3.7 *Let $\kappa = 1$ in (1.1b), then it holds that*

$$|\partial^4 \phi|_{L^2}^2 + |\partial^2 \phi|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|\partial^3 (\rho \Delta \phi)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, \bar{M}, K_1) \mathcal{E}_{EP}, \tag{3.30a}$$

$$\|D_t \phi\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \sum_{i+j=1,2} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j \phi\|_{L^2}^2 + |\partial D_t \phi|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, \bar{M}, K, K_1) \mathcal{E}_{EP}, \tag{3.30b}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i+j=3,4} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j \phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i+j=1,2} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j \phi\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \sum_{i=2,3} |\partial^i D_t \phi|_{L^2}^2 \\ & + \sum_{i=2,3,4} |\Pi \partial^i D_t \phi|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, \bar{M}, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, \bar{L})(\mathcal{E}_{EP}^2 + \mathcal{E}_{EP}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.30c)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i+j+k=2} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j D_t \partial^k \phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i+j=2} \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j \phi\|_{L^6}^2 + \|D_t^2 \phi\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|D_t^2 \partial \Delta \phi\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & + \|(\partial^2 D_t, \partial D_t^2)(\rho \Delta \phi)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, \bar{M}, K, K_1)(\mathcal{E}_{EP}^2 + \mathcal{E}_{EP}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.30d)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \|D_t^3 \phi\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \sum_{i+j=3} \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j \phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i+j+k=3} \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j \partial D_t^k \phi\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & + \|D_t^3(\rho \Delta \phi)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, \bar{M}, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, \bar{L}) \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} \mathcal{E}_{EP}^i, \end{aligned} \quad (3.30e)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \|D_t^4 \phi\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \sum_{i+j=4} \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j \phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial^2 D_t^4 \phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \|D_t^4(\rho \Delta \phi)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C(M, \bar{M}, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, \bar{L})(\mathcal{E}_{EP}^4 + \mathcal{E}_{EP}^3 + \mathcal{E}_{EP}^2 + \mathcal{E}_{EP}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.30f)$$

Proof. We assume $\kappa = 1$ in the proof. The bound for $|\partial^4 \phi|_{L^2}$ in (3.30a) follows from $|\Pi \partial^4 \phi|_{L^2}^2 \leq |\rho^{-1} \partial \phi|_{L^\infty} \mathcal{E}_{II}$, (2.5c) and

$$|\partial^3 \Delta \phi| \leq |\partial^3 e^{-\phi}| + |\partial^3 \rho| \lesssim |\partial^3 \rho| + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} \bar{M}^{3-i} |\partial^i \phi|;$$

that for $|\partial^2 \phi|_{L^\infty}$ from (2.12a), (3.18a) and the bound just obtained for $|\partial^4 \phi|_{L^2}$; that for $\|\partial^3(\rho \Delta \phi)\|_{L^2}$ from

$$|\partial^3(\rho \Delta \phi)| \leq |\partial^3(\rho e^{-\phi})| + |\partial^3 \rho^2| \lesssim \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 2} (M^i + \bar{M}^i) |\partial^{3-i}(\rho, \phi)|.$$

We multiply (2.22) by $D_t^r \phi$ to get

$$|\partial D_t^r \phi|^2 + e^{-\phi} |D_t^r \phi|^2 = \operatorname{div}(D_t^r \phi \partial D_t^r \phi) - (D_t^r \rho - \mathfrak{G}_r) D_t^r \phi,$$

which implies, due to $D_t^r \phi = 0$ on $\partial \mathcal{D}_t$, that for $1 \leq r \leq 4$,

$$\|\partial D_t^r \phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \|D_t^r \phi\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \|D_t^r \rho\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\mathfrak{G}_r\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (3.31)$$

In view of (2.16a), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathfrak{G}_1| & \lesssim M |\partial^2 \phi| + \bar{M} |\partial^2 v|, \quad |\partial \mathfrak{G}_1| \lesssim M |\partial^3 \phi| + \bar{M} |\partial^3 v| + |\partial^2 v| |\partial^2 \phi|, \\ |\partial^2 \mathfrak{G}_1| & \lesssim M |\partial^4 \phi| + \bar{M} |\partial^4 v| + |\partial^3 v| |\partial^2 \phi| + |\partial^2 v| |\partial^3 \phi|, \end{aligned}$$

which, together with (3.9a), (3.9b) and (3.18a), means

$$\|\mathfrak{G}_1\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, \bar{M}) \mathcal{E}_{EP}, \quad \|\partial \mathfrak{G}_1\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial^2 \mathfrak{G}_1\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, \bar{M}, K_1)(\mathcal{E}_{EP} + \mathcal{E}_{EP}^2). \quad (3.32)$$

Thus, we use (3.31), (2.16a) and (2.22) to obtain

$$\|D_t \phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \|(\partial D_t, D_t \partial) \phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Delta D_t \phi\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, \bar{M}) \mathcal{E}_{EP}.$$

Hence, (3.30b) follows from (2.5b), (2.16a), (3.9a), (2.12c) and (2.4b). Note that

$$|\partial(e^{-\phi} D_t \phi)| \lesssim |\partial D_t \phi| + \bar{M} |D_t \phi|,$$

$$|\partial^2(e^{-\phi}D_t\phi)| \lesssim |\partial^2D_t\phi| + \bar{M}|\partial D_t\phi| + (|\partial^2\phi| + \bar{M}^2)|D_t\phi|,$$

then it yields from (2.22), (3.30b), (3.9b) and (3.32) that

$$\|\partial\Delta D_t\phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial^2\Delta D_t\phi\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, \bar{M}, K, K_1)(\mathcal{E}_{EP} + \mathcal{E}_{EP}^2). \quad (3.33)$$

With (3.9d), (3.30b) and (3.33) at hand, we prove (3.30c) as follows. We use (2.6) and (3.30b) to obtain the bound for $|\Pi\partial^2D_t\phi|_{L^2}$, (2.5c) for $|\partial^2D_t\phi|_{L^2}$, (2.6) for $|\Pi\partial^3D_t\phi|_{L^2}$, (2.5c) for $\|\partial^3D_t\phi\|_{L^2}$ and $|\partial^3D_t\phi|_{L^2}$, (2.6) for $|\Pi\partial^4D_t\phi|_{L^2}$, (2.5d) for $\|\partial^4D_t\phi\|_{L^2}$, (2.12c) for $\|\partial D_t\phi\|_{L^\infty}$ and $\|\partial^2D_t\phi\|_{L^\infty}$, and (2.16a), (3.9a), (3.9b) and (3.18a) for the remaining terms, step by step.

The bound for $\|\partial^2D_t(\rho\Delta\phi)\|_{L^2}$ in (3.30d) follows from (3.9b), (3.30b), and that

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial^2D_t(\rho\Delta\phi)| &\lesssim |\partial^2D_t(\rho, \phi)| + (M + \bar{M})|\partial D_t(\rho, \phi)| + (M \\ &\quad + |D_t\phi|)|\partial^2(\rho, \phi)| + (M^2 + M\bar{M} + \bar{M}^2)|D_t(\rho, \phi)|, \end{aligned}$$

which is due to (1.3). Next, we prove

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i+j=2} \|D_t^i\partial D_t^j\phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i+j+k=2} \|\partial^iD_t\partial^jD_t\partial^k\phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i+j=2} \|D_t^i\partial D_t^j\phi\|_{L^6}^2 \\ + \|D_t^2\phi\|_{L^\infty}^2 \leq C(M, \bar{M}, K, K_1)(\mathcal{E}_{EP} + \mathcal{E}_{EP}^2). \end{aligned} \quad (3.34)$$

It follows from (2.16a) and (2.16b) that

$$|\mathfrak{G}_2| \lesssim \sum_{0 \leq r, j \leq 1, 0 \leq i \leq r} |D_t^i\partial^{j+1}v| |D_t^{r-i}\partial^{2-j}D_t^{1-r}\phi| + |D_t\phi|^2,$$

which implies, due to (3.9b), (3.18b), (3.30b) and (3.31), that

$$\|\mathfrak{G}_2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial D_t^2\phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \|D_t^2\phi\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, \bar{M}, K, K_1)(\mathcal{E}_{EP} + \mathcal{E}_{EP}^2).$$

Then, we use (2.5b) and (2.22) to obtain the bound for $\|\partial^2D_t^2\phi\|_{L^2}$ in (3.34); (2.12c) and (2.12b) for $\|D_t^2\phi\|_{L^\infty}$ and $\|\partial D_t^2\phi\|_{L^6}$; and (2.16a), (2.16b), (3.9b), (3.18b) and (3.30b) for the remaining terms, step by step. Due to (1.3), one has

$$\begin{aligned} |D_t^2\partial\Delta\phi| &\lesssim |D_t^2\partial(\rho, \phi)| + \bar{M}(|D_t^2\phi| + |D_t\phi|^2) + |D_t\phi||D_t\partial\phi|, \\ |\partial D_t^2(\rho\Delta\phi)| &\lesssim |\partial D_t^2(\rho, \phi)| + (M + |D_t\phi|)|\partial D_t(\rho, \phi)| + (M \\ &\quad + \bar{M})(|D_t^2(\rho, \phi)| + |D_t\phi|^2 + M|D_t(\rho, \phi)|), \end{aligned}$$

which give the bounds for $\|D_t^2\partial\Delta\phi\|_{L^2}$ and $\|\partial D_t^2(\rho\Delta\phi)\|_{L^2}$ in (3.30d), by virtue of (3.9b), (3.18b), (3.30b) and (3.34).

In a similar way to deriving (3.30b), we can prove

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_t^3\phi\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \sum_{i+j=3} \|D_t^i\partial D_t^j\phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i+j+k=3} \|D_t^i\partial D_t^j\partial D_t^k\phi\|_{L^2}^2 \\ \leq C(M, \bar{M}, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, \bar{L})(\mathcal{E}_{EP} + \mathcal{E}_{EP}^2 + \mathcal{E}_{EP}^3), \\ \|D_t^4\phi\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \sum_{i+j=4} \|D_t^i\partial D_t^j\phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial^2D_t^4\phi\|_{L^2}^2 \\ \leq C(M, \bar{M}, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, \bar{L}) \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 4} \mathcal{E}_{EP}^i, \end{aligned} \quad (3.35)$$

step by step, noting that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathfrak{G}_3| &\lesssim \sum_{0 \leq r \leq 2, 0 \leq i \leq r, 0 \leq j \leq 1} |D_t^i \partial^{j+1} v| |D_t^{r-i} \partial^{2-j} D_t^{2-r} \phi| \\
&\quad + |D_t^2 \phi| |D_t \phi| + |D_t \phi|^3, \\
|\mathfrak{G}_4| &\lesssim \sum_{0 \leq r \leq 2, 0 \leq i \leq r, 0 \leq j \leq 1} |D_t^i \partial^{j+1} v| |D_t^{r-i} \partial^{2-j} D_t^{3-r} \phi| \\
&\quad + \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 3} (|D_t^i \Delta v| |D_t^{3-i} \partial \phi| + |D_t^i \partial v| |D_t^{3-i} \partial^2 \phi|) \\
&\quad + |D_t^3 \phi| |D_t \phi| + |D_t^2 \phi|^2 + |D_t^2 \phi| |D_t \phi|^2 + |D_t \phi|^4,
\end{aligned}$$

which are due to (2.16). The bound for $\|D_t^3(\rho \Delta \phi)\|_{L^2}$ in (3.30e) follows from (3.30b), (3.34), (3.35) and that

$$|D_t^3(\rho \Delta \phi)| \lesssim |D_t^3(\rho, \phi)| + (M + |D_t \phi|)(|D_t^2(\rho, \phi)| + |D_t \phi|^2) + M^2 |D_t \rho|,$$

which is due to (1.3). The bound for $\|D_t^4(\rho \Delta \phi)\|_{L^2}$ in (3.30f) can be obtained similarly by noticing that

$$\begin{aligned}
|D_t^4(\rho \Delta \phi)| &\lesssim |D_t^4(\rho, \phi)| + (M + |D_t \phi|)(|D_t^3(\rho, \phi)| + |D_t \phi| |D_t^2 \phi| \\
&\quad + |D_t \phi|^3) + |D_t^2(\rho, \phi)|^2 + (M^2 + |D_t \phi|^2) |D_t^2 \rho| + M^3 |D_t \rho|.
\end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of the lemma. \square

3.2 Energy estimates

Proposition 3.8 *Let $\kappa = 1$ in (1.1b), then it holds that*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{E}_{EP} \leq C(M, \bar{M}, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, \bar{\epsilon}_b^{-1}, L, \bar{L}) \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 4} \mathcal{E}_{EP}^i. \quad (3.36)$$

The proof consists of the following two lemmas, Lemmas 3.9 and 3.10.

Lemma 3.9 *Let $\kappa = 0, 1$ in (1.1b), then it holds that for $1 \leq r \leq 4$,*

$$\frac{d}{dt} E_r \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, L) \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} (\mathcal{E}_I^i + \kappa C(\bar{M}, \bar{\epsilon}_b^{-1}, \bar{L}) \mathcal{E}_{EP}^i), \quad (3.37)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
E_r &= \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} \rho \delta^{mn} \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r v_m) \partial_J^r v_n dx + \int_{\partial \mathcal{D}_t} |\Pi \partial^r p|^2 (-\partial_N p)^{-1} ds \\
&\quad + \kappa \int_{\partial \mathcal{D}_t} \rho |\Pi \partial^r \phi|^2 (\partial_N \phi)^{-1} ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. It follows from (2.18) that for $r \geq 1$,

$$D_t \partial^r v + \rho^{-1} \partial^r \partial p - \kappa \partial^r \partial \phi = [D_t, \partial^r] v + \rho^{-1} \partial^r \partial p - \partial^r (\rho^{-1} \partial p),$$

which implies that

$$2^{-1} \rho D_t (\delta^{mn} \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r v_m) \partial_J^r v_n)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \delta^{mn} \zeta^{IJ} (\rho D_t \partial_I^r v_m) \partial_J^r v_n + 2^{-1} \rho \delta^{mn} (D_t \zeta^{IJ}) (\partial_I^r v_m) \partial_J^r v_n \\
&= \mathcal{H}_r - \kappa \bar{\mathcal{H}}_r - \operatorname{div} (\zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r p - \kappa \rho \partial_I^r \phi) \partial_J^r v), \tag{3.38}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}_r &= \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r p) \partial_J^r \operatorname{div} v + \delta^{mn} \{2^{-1} \rho (D_t \zeta^{IJ}) \partial_I^r v_m + (\partial_m \zeta^{IJ}) \partial_I^r p \\
&\quad + \zeta^{IJ} ((\partial_I^r \partial_m p - \rho \partial_I^r (\rho^{-1} \partial_m p)) + \rho [D_t, \partial_I^r] v_m)\} \partial_J^r v_n, \\
\bar{\mathcal{H}}_r &= \{\rho \zeta^{IJ} \partial_J^r \operatorname{div} v + \delta^{mn} (\rho \partial_m \zeta^{IJ} + \zeta^{IJ} \partial_m \rho) \partial_J^r v_n\} \partial_I^r \phi. \tag{3.39}
\end{aligned}$$

Due to $\partial_m p = (\bar{\partial}_m + N_m \partial_N) p = N_m \partial_N p$ on $\partial \mathcal{D}_t$, we have on $\partial \mathcal{D}_t$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&2^{-1} D_t ((\partial_N p)^{-1} \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r p) \partial_J^r p) \\
&= (\partial_N p)^{-1} \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r p) D_t \partial_J^r p + 2^{-1} (D_t ((\partial_N p)^{-1} \zeta^{IJ})) (\partial_I^r p) \partial_J^r p \\
&= \mathcal{L}_r - (\partial_N p)^{-1} \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r p) (\partial_J^r v^m) \partial_m p = \mathcal{L}_r - N_m \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r p) \partial_J^r v^m, \tag{3.40}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_r &= (\partial_N p)^{-1} \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r p) (D_t \partial_J^r p - \partial_J^r D_t p + (\partial_J^r v^m) \partial_m p) \\
&\quad + (\partial_N p)^{-1} \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r p) \partial_J^r D_t p + 2^{-1} (D_t ((\partial_N p)^{-1} \zeta^{IJ})) (\partial_I^r p) \partial_J^r p. \tag{3.41}
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have on $\partial \mathcal{D}_t$,

$$2^{-1} D_t (\rho (\partial_N \phi)^{-1} \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r \phi) \partial_J^r \phi) = \mathcal{R}_r - \rho N_m \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r \phi) \partial_J^r v^m, \tag{3.42}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}_r &= \rho (\partial_N \phi)^{-1} \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r \phi) (D_t \partial_J^r \phi - \partial_J^r D_t \phi + (\partial_J^r v^m) \partial_m \phi) \\
&\quad + \rho (\partial_N \phi)^{-1} \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r \phi) \partial_J^r D_t \phi + 2^{-1} (D_t (\rho (\partial_N \phi)^{-1} \zeta^{IJ})) (\partial_I^r \phi) \partial_J^r \phi.
\end{aligned}$$

In view of $\int_{\mathcal{D}_t} \operatorname{div} (\zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r p - \kappa \rho \partial_I^r \phi) \partial_J^r v) dx = \int_{\partial \mathcal{D}_t} N_m \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r p - \kappa \rho \partial_I^r \phi) \partial_J^r v^m ds$, (2.14b), (2.15), (3.38), (3.40) and (3.42), we see that for $r \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt} E_r &= \int_{\partial \mathcal{D}_t} D_t (|\Pi \partial^r p|^2 (-\partial_N p)^{-1} + \kappa \rho |\Pi \partial^r \phi|^2 (\partial_N \phi)^{-1}) ds \\
&\quad - \int_{\partial \mathcal{D}_t} (|\Pi \partial^r p|^2 (-\partial_N p)^{-1} + \kappa \rho |\Pi \partial^r \phi|^2 (\partial_N \phi)^{-1}) N^i \partial_N v_i ds \\
&\quad + \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} \rho D_t (\delta^{mn} \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r v_m) \partial_J^r v_n) dx = \mathcal{G}_r, \tag{3.43}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{G}_r &= 2 \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} (\mathcal{H}_r - \kappa \bar{\mathcal{H}}_r) dx + 2 \int_{\partial \mathcal{D}_t} (\kappa \mathcal{R}_r - \mathcal{L}_r) ds \\
&\quad - \int_{\partial \mathcal{D}_t} (|\Pi \partial^r p|^2 (-\partial_N p)^{-1} + \kappa \rho |\Pi \partial^r \phi|^2 (\partial_N \phi)^{-1}) N^i \partial_N v_i ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Due to (2.2) and (2.16a), one has that for $1 \leq r \leq 4$,

$$|\mathcal{H}_r| \lesssim |\partial^r p| |\partial^r \operatorname{div} v| + (M |\partial^r v| + K |\partial^r p| + H_r) |\partial^r v|,$$

$$|\overline{\mathcal{H}}_r| \lesssim (|\partial^r \operatorname{div} v| + (K + M)|\partial^r v|)|\partial^r \phi|,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} H_1 &= M|\partial(v, p)|, \quad H_2 = M|\partial^2(v, \rho, p)| + M^2|\partial p|, \\ H_3 &= M|\partial^3(v, \rho, p)| + M^2|\partial^2(\rho, p)| + M^3|\partial p| + |\partial^2 v|^2 + |\partial^2 \rho||\partial^2 p|, \\ H_4 &= M|\partial^4(v, \rho, p)| + M^2|\partial^3(\rho, p)| + M^3|\partial^2(\rho, p)| + M^4|\partial p| \\ &\quad + |\partial^2 v||\partial^3 v| + |\partial^2 \rho||\partial^3 p| + |\partial^3 \rho||\partial^2 p| + M|\partial^2 \rho||\partial^2(\rho, p)|. \end{aligned}$$

This, together with (3.9), (3.23c) and (3.30), gives that for $1 \leq r \leq 4$,

$$\|\mathcal{H}_r\|_{L^1} \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, L) \left(\mathcal{E}_I + \mathcal{E}_I^2 + \kappa C(\bar{M}, \bar{L}) \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} \mathcal{E}_{EP}^i \right), \quad (3.44a)$$

$$\|\overline{\mathcal{H}}_r\|_{L^1} \leq C(M, \bar{M}, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, L, \bar{L}) (\mathcal{E}_{EP} + \mathcal{E}_{EP}^2 + \mathcal{E}_{EP}^3). \quad (3.44b)$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} |D_t \partial^r p - \partial^r D_t p + (\partial^r v^m) \partial_m p| &\lesssim \sum_{1 \leq i \leq r-1} |\partial^i v| |\partial^{r+1-i} p|, \\ \|\partial^2 v\|(|\partial^2 p| + |\partial^3 p|)_{L^2} + \|\partial^3 v\| \|\partial^2 p\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \|\partial^2 v\|_{L^4} (\|\partial^2 p\|_{L^4} + \|\partial^3 p\|_{L^4}) + \|\partial^3 v\|_{L^4} \|\partial^2 p\|_{L^4} \\ &\leq C(K) \sum_{2 \leq i \leq 4} \|\partial^i v\|_{L^2} \sum_{2 \leq j \leq 4} \|\partial^j p\|_{L^2} \leq C(K) \mathcal{E}_I, \end{aligned}$$

which is due to (2.13) and (3.9a). Then, we use (3.9b), (3.23e) and (3.30) to get that for $1 \leq r \leq 4$,

$$\begin{aligned} &|D_t \partial^r p - \partial^r D_t p + (\partial^r v^m) \partial_m p|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}) \left(\sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} \mathcal{E}_I^i + \kappa C(\bar{M}, \bar{L}) (\mathcal{E}_{EP} + \mathcal{E}_{EP}^2) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.45)$$

In view of (2.3) and (2.16a), we see that $|D_t \zeta^{IJ}| \lesssim |\partial v| \leq M$ and

$$\begin{aligned} |D_t (\partial_N p)^{-1}| &\leq |(\partial_N p)^{-2}| (|D_t N^i| |\partial_i p| + |\partial_N D_t p| + |N^i [D_t, \partial_i] p|) \\ &\lesssim \epsilon_b^{-2} (M^2 + L) \quad \text{on } \partial \mathcal{D}_t, \end{aligned}$$

which implies, using (3.9b), (3.23c), (3.23e), (3.30) and (3.45), that for $1 \leq r \leq 4$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{L}_r|_{L^1} &\leq C(\epsilon_b^{-1}, M, L) (|\partial^r p|_{L^2}^2 + |\Pi \partial^r D_t p|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\quad + |D_t \partial^r p - \partial^r D_t p + (\partial^r v^m) \partial_m p|_{L^2}^2) \\ &\leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, L) \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} (\mathcal{E}_I^i + \kappa C(\bar{M}, \bar{L}) \mathcal{E}_{EP}^i). \end{aligned} \quad (3.46)$$

Similarly, we have $|D_t (\partial_N \phi)^{-1}| \lesssim \epsilon_b^{-2} (M \bar{M} + \bar{L})$ and $D_t \rho = \rho_p D_t p = 0$ on $\partial \mathcal{D}_t$, and use (3.18a) and (3.30) to get that for $1 \leq r \leq 4$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{R}_r|_{L^1} &\leq C(\epsilon_b^{-1}, M, \bar{M}, \bar{L}) (|\partial^r \phi|_{L^2}^2 + |\Pi \partial^r D_t \phi|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\quad + |D_t \partial^r \phi - \partial^r D_t \phi + (\partial^r v^m) \partial_m \phi|_{L^2}^2) \\ &\leq C(M, \bar{M}, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, \bar{\epsilon}_b^{-1}, \bar{L}) (\mathcal{E}_{EP} + \mathcal{E}_{EP}^2). \end{aligned}$$

This proves (3.37), with the help of (3.43), (3.44) and (3.46). \square

Lemma 3.10 *Let $\kappa = 0, 1$ in (1.1b), then it holds that for $0 \leq r \leq 4$,*

$$\frac{d}{dt}(P_r + W_r) \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, L) \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 4} (\mathcal{E}_I^i + \kappa C(\bar{M}, \bar{L}) \mathcal{E}_{EP}^i), \quad (3.47)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} P_r &= \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} (|D_t^{r+1} \rho|^2 + \rho_p |\partial D_t^r p|^2) dx, \quad r \geq 0, \\ W_0 &= \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} (\rho |v|^2 + \rho^2 + p^2 + s^2 + \kappa \phi^2) dx, \\ W_r &= \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} (|\partial^{r-1}(\operatorname{curl} v, \operatorname{div} v)|^2 + |\partial^r(\rho, p, s)|^2 + \kappa |\partial^r \phi|^2) dx, \quad r \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We use (2.14a) and $|D_t \partial D_t^r p - \partial D_t^{r+1} p| \lesssim M |\partial D_t^r p|$ to obtain that for $0 \leq r \leq 3$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} P_r &\leq \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} \{2|D_t^{r+1} \rho| |D_t^{r+2} \rho| + 2\rho_p |\partial D_t^r p| |D_t \partial D_t^r p| + (D_t \rho_p) |\partial D_t^r p|^2\} dx \\ &+ M P_r \leq \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} (|D_t^{r+2} \rho|^2 + \rho_p |D_t \partial D_t^r p|^2) dx + C(M) P_r \\ &\leq 2P_{r+1} + C(M) P_r \leq C(M) \mathcal{E}_I. \end{aligned} \quad (3.48)$$

For P_4 , we notice that

$$\begin{aligned} (\Delta D_t^4 p) D_t^5 \rho &= \operatorname{div}((D_t^5 \rho) \partial D_t^4 p) - \partial D_t^5 \rho \cdot \partial D_t^4 p \\ &= \operatorname{div}((D_t^5 \rho) \partial D_t^4 p) - (\partial D_t^5 \rho - \rho_p D_t \partial D_t^4 p) \cdot \partial D_t^4 p \\ &\quad - 2^{-1} D_t(\rho_p |\partial D_t^4 p|^2) + 2^{-1} (D_t \rho_p) |\partial D_t^4 p|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then, it follows from $D_t^5 p = 0$ on $\partial \mathcal{D}_t$, (2.14a), (3.18d), (3.23f) and (3.30) that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} P_4 &\leq \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} (2(D_t^6 \rho) D_t^5 \rho + D_t(\rho_p |\partial D_t^4 p|^2)) dx + M P_4 \\ &\leq 2 \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} ((D_t^6 \rho - \Delta D_t^4 p) D_t^5 \rho + \operatorname{div}((D_t^5 \rho) \partial D_t^4 p) - (\partial D_t^5 \rho \\ &\quad - \rho_p D_t \partial D_t^4 p) \cdot \partial D_t^4 p + 2^{-1} (D_t \rho_p) |\partial D_t^4 p|^2) dx + M P_4 \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} (|D_t^6 \rho - \Delta D_t^4 p|^2 + |\partial D_t^5 \rho - \rho_p D_t \partial D_t^4 p|^2) dx + (M+1) P_4 \\ &\leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}) \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 4} (\mathcal{E}_I^i + \kappa C(\bar{M}, \bar{L}) \mathcal{E}_{EP}^i). \end{aligned} \quad (3.49)$$

In view of (2.14a) and (2.15), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} W_0 &\leq 2 \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} (\rho |v| |D_t v| + |\rho D_t \rho| + |p D_t p| + \kappa |\phi D_t \phi|) dx + M W_0 \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} (\rho |D_t v|^2 + |D_t \rho|^2 + |D_t p|^2 + \kappa |D_t \phi|^2) dx + (M+1) W_0 \\ &\leq C(M, K_1) (\mathcal{E}_I + \kappa C(\bar{M}, K) \mathcal{E}_{EP}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.50)$$

where we have used (1.1c) to derive the first inequality; (3.9a), (3.18b) and (3.30b) to the last inequality. It follows from (2.14a) that for $1 \leq r \leq 4$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}W_r &\leq 2 \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} (|\partial^{r-1}(\operatorname{curl}v, \operatorname{div}v)| |D_t \partial^{r-1}(\operatorname{curl}v, \operatorname{div}v)| \\
&\quad + |\partial^r(\rho, p, s)| |D_t \partial^r(\rho, p, s)| + \kappa |\partial^r \phi| |D_t \partial^r \phi|) dx + MW_r \\
&\leq \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} (|D_t \partial^{r-1}(\operatorname{curl}v, \operatorname{div}v)|^2 + |D_t \partial^r(\rho, p, s)|^2 + \kappa |D_t \partial^r \phi|^2) dx \\
&\quad + (M+1)W_r \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, L) \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} (\mathcal{E}_I^i + \kappa C(\bar{M}, \bar{L}) \mathcal{E}_{EP}^i), \tag{3.51}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used (3.9b), (3.9c), (3.18b), (3.18c), (3.23c), (3.23d) and (3.30) to derive the last inequality. As a consequence of (3.48)-(3.51), we prove (3.47) and finish the proof of the lemma. \square

3.3 Proof of Theorem 3.1

The proof follows from Proposition 3.11, which is stated as follows.

Proposition 3.11 *Let $\kappa = 1$ in (1.1b), then there exists a continuous function $\bar{T} > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned}
2^{-1} \operatorname{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0 &\leq \operatorname{Vol} \mathcal{D}_t \leq 2 \operatorname{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0, \\
2^{-1} \underline{\varrho} &\leq \rho(t, x) \leq 2 \bar{\varrho}, \quad |s(t, x)| \leq \bar{s}, \quad x \in \mathcal{D}_t, \\
-\partial_N p(t, x) &\geq 2^{-1} \varepsilon_1, \quad \partial_N \phi(t, x) \geq 2^{-1} \varepsilon_2, \quad x \in \partial \mathcal{D}_t, \\
\iota_1^{-1}(t) &\leq 16K_0, \quad \mathcal{E}_{EP}(t) \leq 2\mathcal{E}_{EP}(0), \\
\|\partial(v, p, s)(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} &\leq 2\|\partial(v, p, s)(0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty}, \\
\|\partial\phi(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} &\leq 2\|\partial\phi(0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty}, \\
|\theta(t, \cdot)|_{L^\infty} + \iota_0^{-1}(t) &\leq C(\underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \varepsilon_2^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}_{EP}(0), \operatorname{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0), \\
|\partial_N D_t \phi(t, \cdot)|_{L^\infty} + |\partial_N D_t p(t, \cdot)|_{L^\infty} \\
&\leq C(\underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \bar{s}, \varepsilon_1^{-1}, \varepsilon_2^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}_{EP}(0), \operatorname{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0)
\end{aligned}$$

for $t \leq \bar{T}(\underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \bar{s}, \varepsilon_1^{-1}, \varepsilon_2^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}_{EP}(0), \operatorname{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0)$.

Proof. We use the Lagrangian map: let $x = x(t, y)$ be the change of variables given by

$$\partial_t x(t, y) = v(t, x(t, y)) \quad \text{and} \quad x(0, y) = y, \quad y \in \mathcal{D}_0.$$

For each t we will then have a change of coordinates $x : \mathcal{D}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_t$, taking $y \rightarrow x(t, y)$. The proof consists of three steps.

Step 1. We prove that for $t \leq M^{-1} \ln 2$,

$$2^{-1} \operatorname{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0 \leq \operatorname{Vol} \mathcal{D}_t \leq 2 \operatorname{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0, \tag{3.52a}$$

$$|s(t, x)| \leq \bar{s}, \quad x \in \mathcal{D}_t, \tag{3.52b}$$

$$2^{-1} \underline{\varrho} \leq \rho(t, x) \leq 2 \bar{\varrho}, \quad x \in \mathcal{D}_t. \tag{3.52c}$$

It follows from (2.14) that

$$\left| \frac{d}{dt} \operatorname{Vol} \mathcal{D}_t \right| = \left| \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} 1 dx \right| = \left| \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} \operatorname{div} v dx \right| \leq M \operatorname{Vol} \mathcal{D}_t,$$

which implies that

$$e^{-Mt}\text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_0 \leq \text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_t \leq e^{Mt}\text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_0.$$

Thus, we have (3.52a) for $t \leq M^{-1}\ln 2$. Since $D_t s = 0$, we have $s(t, x(t, y)) = s(0, x(0, y)) = s_0(y)$ and then (3.52b) holds for $t \leq T$. In view of (1.1a), we see that

$$\rho(t, x(t, y)) = \rho_0(y)e^{-\int_0^t \text{div}v(\tau, x(\tau, y))d\tau},$$

which implies

$$e^{-Mt}\rho_0(y) \leq \rho(t, x(t, y)) \leq e^{Mt}\rho_0(y).$$

Then, (3.52c) holds for $t \leq M^{-1}\ln 2$. Hence, we prove (3.52).

Step 2. We prove that there exists a continuous function $\tilde{T} > 0$ such that

$$-\partial_N p(t, x) \geq 2^{-1}\varepsilon_1, \quad \partial_N \phi(t, x) \geq 2^{-1}\varepsilon_2, \quad x \in \partial\mathcal{D}_t, \quad (3.53a)$$

$$\iota_1^{-1}(t) \leq 16K_0, \quad \mathcal{E}_{EP}(t) \leq 2\mathcal{E}_{EP}(0), \quad (3.53b)$$

$$\|\partial(v, p, s)(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} \leq 2\|\partial(v, p, s)(0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty}, \quad (3.53c)$$

$$\|\partial\phi(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} \leq 2\|\partial\phi(0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty}, \quad (3.53d)$$

for $t \leq \tilde{T}(K, L, \bar{L}, \underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \bar{s}, \varepsilon_1^{-1}, \varepsilon_2^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}_{EP}(0), \text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_0)$. Moreover, (3.52) also holds for $t \leq \tilde{T}$.

Due to (2.3), we have on $\partial\mathcal{D}_t$,

$$|D_t \partial_N p| \leq |D_t N^i| |\partial_i p| + |\partial_N D_t p| + |N^i [D_t, \partial_i] p| \leq 3M^2 + L,$$

which gives, using (3.2b), that for $t \leq 2^{-1}(3M^2 + L)^{-1}\varepsilon_1$ and $x \in \partial\mathcal{D}_t$,

$$\begin{aligned} -\partial_N p(t, x(t, y)) &= -\partial_N p(0, x(0, y)) - \int_0^t D_\tau(\partial_N p(\tau, x(\tau, y)))d\tau \\ &\geq \varepsilon_1 - (3M^2 + L)t \geq 2^{-1}\varepsilon_1. \end{aligned} \quad (3.54)$$

Similarly, one has that for $t \leq 2^{-1}(3\bar{M}^2 + \bar{L})^{-1}\varepsilon_2$ and $x \in \partial\mathcal{D}_t$,

$$\partial_N \phi(t, x) \geq 2^{-1}\varepsilon_2. \quad (3.55)$$

Let $\varepsilon_1 \in (0, 1/2]$ be a fixed constant (for example, $\varepsilon_1 = 1/4$), $\underline{\iota}_1$ the largest number such that

$$\begin{aligned} |N(0, x(0, y_1)) - N(0, x(0, y_2))| &\leq 2^{-1}\varepsilon_1, \\ \text{whenever } |x(0, y_1) - x(0, y_2)| &\leq 2\underline{\iota}_1, \quad y_1, y_2 \in \partial\mathcal{D}_0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.56)$$

Then we have from (2.1) and (3.2c) that

$$\underline{\iota}_1 \geq \varepsilon_1/(4K_0) \quad \text{and} \quad \iota_1(0) \geq \varepsilon_1/K_0. \quad (3.57)$$

It follows from (2.18) and (3.52c) that $|D_t v| \leq 2\underline{\varrho}^{-1}M + \bar{M}$ and

$$|v(t, x(t, y))| \leq |v_0(y)| + (2\underline{\varrho}^{-1}M + \bar{M})t \leq 2|v_0|_{L^\infty}$$

for $t \leq \min\{M^{-1}\ln 2, (2\underline{\varrho}^{-1}M + \bar{M})^{-1}|v_0|_{L^\infty}\}$ and $y \in \partial\mathcal{D}_0$. This implies

$$|x(t, y) - x(0, y)| \leq \int_0^t |v(\tau, x(\tau, y))|d\tau \leq 2|v_0|_{L^\infty}t \leq 2^{-1}\underline{\iota}_1 \quad (3.58)$$

for $t \leq T_1 = \min\{M^{-1} \ln 2, (2\underline{\varrho}^{-1}M + \bar{M})^{-1}|v_0|_{L^\infty}, (4|v_0|_{L^\infty})^{-1}\underline{\iota}_1\}$ and $y \in \partial\mathcal{D}_0$. In view of (2.3), we see that $|D_t N| \leq 2|\partial v| \leq 2\bar{M}$ and

$$|N(t, x(t, y)) - N(0, x(0, y))| \leq 2Mt \leq 4^{-1}\epsilon_1$$

for $t \leq (8M)^{-1}\epsilon_1$ and $y \in \partial\mathcal{D}_0$. This, together with (3.56) and (3.58), gives

$$\begin{aligned} |N(t, x(t, y_1)) - N(t, x(t, y_2))| &\leq \epsilon_1, \\ \text{whenever } |x(t, y_1) - x(t, y_2)| &\leq \underline{\iota}_1, \quad y_1, y_2 \in \partial\mathcal{D}_0 \end{aligned}$$

for $t \leq T_2 = \min\{T_1, (8M)^{-1}\epsilon_1\}$. So, it yields from (3.57) that for $t \leq T_2$,

$$\iota_1(t) \geq \underline{\iota}_1 \geq \epsilon_1/(4K_0). \quad (3.59)$$

It follows from (3.36) and (3.52) that there exists a continuous function $T_3 \in (0, M^{-1} \ln 2]$ such that

$$\mathcal{E}_{EP}(t) \leq 2\mathcal{E}_{EP}(0) \quad (3.60)$$

for $t \leq T_3(M, \bar{M}, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, \bar{\epsilon}_b^{-1}, L, \bar{L}, \underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \bar{s}, \text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_0)$. This means, with the aid of (3.9b), (3.18b) and (3.30c), that for $t \leq T_3$,

$$\|D_t \partial(v, p, s, \phi)(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C(M, \bar{M}, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, \bar{L}, \mathcal{E}_{EP}(0)).$$

Thus, there exists a continuous function $T_4 \in (0, T_3]$ such that

$$\|\partial(v, p, s)(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} \leq 2\|\partial(v, p, s)(0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty}, \quad (3.61a)$$

$$\|\partial\phi(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} \leq 2\|\partial\phi(0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty}, \quad (3.61b)$$

for $t \leq T_4(M, \bar{M}, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, \bar{\epsilon}_b^{-1}, L, \bar{L}, \mathcal{E}_{EP}(0), \|\partial(v, p, s, \phi)(0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty}, \underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \bar{s}, \text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_0)$.

In view of (2.12a), (2.12c), (2.4), (3.2a), (3.52c) and (3.57), we see that

$$|v_0|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|\partial(v, p, s, \phi)(0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty}^2 \leq C(K_0/\epsilon_1, \underline{\varrho}^{-1})\mathcal{E}_{EP}(0). \quad (3.62)$$

This, together with (3.54), (3.55) and (3.59)-(3.61), implies that (3.53) holds for $t \leq \tilde{T}$ for some continuous function $\tilde{T}(K, L, \bar{L}, K_0, \mathcal{E}_{EP}(0), \epsilon_1^{-1}, \epsilon_2^{-1}, \underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \bar{s}, \text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_0) > 0$, by choosing

$$\epsilon_b = \epsilon_1/4, \quad \bar{\epsilon}_b = \epsilon_2/4, \quad M = 4\|\partial(v, p, s)(0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty}, \quad (3.63a)$$

$$\bar{M} = 4\|\partial\phi(0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty}, \quad \epsilon_1 = 1/4, \quad K_1 = 32K_0. \quad (3.63b)$$

Clearly, (3.52) holds for $t \leq \tilde{T}$.

Step 3. We prove that there exists a continuous function $\bar{T} > 0$ such that

$$|\theta(t, \cdot)|_{L^\infty} + \iota_0^{-1}(t) \leq C(\underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \epsilon_2^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}_{EP}(0), \text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_0), \quad (3.64a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_N D_t \phi(t, \cdot)|_{L^\infty} + |\partial_N D_t p(t, \cdot)|_{L^\infty} \\ \leq C(\underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \bar{s}, \epsilon_1^{-1}, \epsilon_2^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}_{EP}(0), \text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_0) \end{aligned} \quad (3.64b)$$

for $t \leq \bar{T}(\underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \bar{s}, \epsilon_1^{-1}, \epsilon_2^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}_{EP}(0), \text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_0)$. Moreover, (3.52) and (3.53) also hold for $t \leq \bar{T}$.

It follows from (2.8a), (3.30a), (3.53), (3.62) and (3.63) that for $t \leq \tilde{T}$,

$$|\theta(t, \cdot)|_{L^\infty} = |(\partial_N \phi)^{-1}(t, \cdot)|_{L^\infty} |\Pi \partial^2 \phi(t, \cdot)|_{L^\infty}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq |(\partial_N \phi)^{-1}(t, \cdot)|_{L^\infty} |\partial^2 \phi(t, \cdot)|_{L^\infty} \leq C(\bar{\epsilon}_b^{-1}, M, \bar{M}, K_1, \mathcal{E}_{EP}) \\
&\leq C_1(\underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \varepsilon_2^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}_{EP}(0), \text{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.65}$$

which implies, with the help of (2.1) and (3.53), that for $t \leq \tilde{T}$,

$$\iota_0^{-1}(t) \leq \max\{32K_0, C_1(\underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \varepsilon_2^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}_{EP}(0), \text{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0)\}. \tag{3.66}$$

So, we may choose

$$K = 64K_0 + 4C_1(\underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \varepsilon_2^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}_{EP}(0), \text{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0). \tag{3.67}$$

With (2.10), (3.9d), (3.52), (3.53), (3.62), (3.63) and (3.67) at hand, we use (3.30b) and (3.33) to get that for $t \leq \tilde{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\partial_N D_t \phi(t, \cdot)|_{L^\infty} \leq C(M, \bar{M}, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, \text{Vol} \mathcal{D}_t, \mathcal{E}_{EP}) \\
&\leq C_2(\underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \varepsilon_1^{-1}, \varepsilon_2^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}_{EP}(0), \text{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.68}$$

Thus, we can choose

$$\bar{L} = 2C_2(\underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \varepsilon_1^{-1}, \varepsilon_2^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}_{EP}(0), \text{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0). \tag{3.69}$$

Similarly, we use (3.9b), (3.9c), (3.25), (3.30) and (3.69) to obtain that for $t \leq \tilde{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\partial_N D_t p(t, \cdot)|_{L^\infty} \leq C(M, \bar{M}, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, \bar{L}, \text{Vol} \mathcal{D}_t, \mathcal{E}_{EP}) \\
&\leq C_3(\underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \bar{s}, \varepsilon_1^{-1}, \varepsilon_2^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}_{EP}(0), \text{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0)
\end{aligned} \tag{3.70}$$

and then choose

$$L = 2C_3(\underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \bar{s}, \varepsilon_1^{-1}, \varepsilon_2^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}_{EP}(0), \text{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0). \tag{3.71}$$

It yields from (3.65), (3.66), (3.68) and (3.70) that (3.64) holds for $t \leq \bar{T}$ for some continuous function $\bar{T}(\underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \bar{s}, \varepsilon_1^{-1}, \varepsilon_2^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}_{EP}(0), \text{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0) > 0$ by choosing K, \bar{L} and L as in (3.67), (3.69) and (3.71), respectively. Clearly, (3.52) and (3.53) also hold for $t \leq \bar{T}$. This finishes the proof of the proposition. \square

4 The non-isentropic compressible Euler equations

In this section, we study the free boundary problem for the non-isentropic compressible Euler equations, (1.1) with $\kappa = 0$, under the stability condition (1.4). The main results are given in Theorem 4.1. For this, we define the higher-order energy functionals as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_E(t) &= \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} \rho |v|^2 dx + \sum_{1 \leq r \leq 5} \int_{\partial \mathcal{D}_t} |\Pi \partial^r p|^2 (-\partial_N p)^{-1} ds \\
&+ \sum_{1 \leq r \leq 5} \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} (\rho \delta^{mn} \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r v_m) \partial_J^r v_n + |\partial^{r-1} \text{curl} v|^2 + |\partial^{r-1} \text{div} v|^2) dx \\
&+ \sum_{0 \leq r \leq 5} \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} (|\partial^r \rho|^2 + |\partial^r p|^2 + |\partial^r s|^2 + |D_t^{r+1} \rho|^2 + \rho_p |\partial D_t^r p|^2) dx.
\end{aligned}$$

In order to state the main results, we set

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{\rho} &= \min_{x \in \mathcal{D}_0} \rho_0(x), \quad \bar{\rho} = \max_{x \in \mathcal{D}_0} \rho_0(x), \quad \bar{s} = \max_{x \in \mathcal{D}_0} |s_0(x)|, \\ \varepsilon_1 &= \min_{x \in \partial \mathcal{D}_0} (-\partial_N p)(0, x), \quad K_0 = \max_{x \in \partial \mathcal{D}_0} |\theta(0, x)| + |\iota_0^{-1}(0)|,\end{aligned}$$

where $p(0, x) = p(\rho_0(x), s_0(x))$. With these notations, the main results of this section are stated as follows:

Theorem 4.1 *Let $\kappa = 0$ in (1.1b), and (1.2) hold. Suppose that*

$$0 < \underline{\rho}, \bar{\rho}, \bar{s}, \varepsilon_1, K_0, \text{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0, \mathcal{E}_E(0) < \infty.$$

Then there exists a continuous function $\mathcal{T}(\underline{\rho}^{-1}, \bar{\rho}, \bar{s}, \varepsilon_1^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}_E(0), \text{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0) > 0$ such that any smooth solution of the free boundary problem (1.1) for $0 \leq t \leq T$ with $T \leq \mathcal{T}$ satisfies the following estimates: for $0 \leq t \leq T$,

$$\mathcal{E}_E(t) \leq 2\mathcal{E}_E(0), \quad 2^{-1} \text{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0 \leq \text{Vol} \mathcal{D}_t \leq 2\text{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0, \quad (4.1a)$$

$$2^{-1} \underline{\rho} \leq \min_{x \in \mathcal{D}_t} \rho(t, x), \quad \max_{x \in \mathcal{D}_t} \rho(t, x) \leq 2\bar{\rho}, \quad (4.1b)$$

$$\max_{x \in \mathcal{D}_t} |s(t, x)| \leq \bar{s}, \quad 2^{-1} \varepsilon_1 \leq \min_{x \in \partial \mathcal{D}_t} (-\partial_N p)(t, x), \quad (4.1c)$$

$$\max_{x \in \partial \mathcal{D}_t} |\theta(t, x)| + |\iota_0^{-1}(t)| \leq C(\varepsilon_1^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}_E(0)). \quad (4.1d)$$

Remark 4.2 *It follows from (2.4a) and (4.1b) that $\|v(t, \cdot)\|_{H^5(\mathcal{D}_t)}^2 \leq C \underline{\rho}^{-1} \mathcal{E}_E(t)$.*

We make the following a priori assumptions: for $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned}2^{-1} \text{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0 &\leq \text{Vol} \mathcal{D}_t \leq 2\text{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0, \\ 2^{-1} \underline{\rho} &\leq \rho(t, x) \leq 2\bar{\rho}, \quad |s(t, x)| \leq \bar{s} && \text{in } \mathcal{D}_t, \\ |\partial(v, p, s)(t, x)| &\leq M && \text{in } \mathcal{D}_t, \\ |\theta(t, x)| + \iota_0^{-1}(t) &\leq K \quad \text{and} \quad \iota_1^{-1}(t) \leq K_1 && \text{on } \partial \mathcal{D}_t, \\ -\partial_N p(t, x) &\geq \varepsilon_b, \quad |\partial_N D_t p(t, x)| \leq L, \quad |\partial_N D_t^2 p(t, x)| \leq \tilde{L} && \text{on } \partial \mathcal{D}_t,\end{aligned}$$

where $M, K, K_1, \varepsilon_b, L$ and \tilde{L} are positive constants. As in Section 3, we may assume without loss of generality that

$$\text{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0 = 4\pi/3, \quad \underline{\rho} = 2^{-1}, \quad \bar{\rho} = 2, \quad \bar{s} = 1,$$

which implies that for $t \in [0, T]$,

$$2\pi/3 \leq \text{Vol} \mathcal{D}_t \leq 8\pi/3, \quad 4^{-1} \leq \rho(t, x) \leq 4 \quad \text{and} \quad |s(t, x)| \leq 1 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_t.$$

Similarly, it holds that for $t \in [0, T]$,

$$|D_t \rho(t, x)| + |D_t p(t, x)| + |\partial \rho(t, x)| \lesssim M \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_t.$$

4.1 Regularity estimates

Proposition 4.3 *Let $\kappa = 0$ in (1.1b), then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{0 \leq r \leq 5} (\|\partial^r v\|_{L^2}^2 + \|D_t \partial^r(\rho, p, s)\|_{L^2}^2) + \|\partial^5 \operatorname{div} v\|_{L^2}^2 + \|D_t v\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& + \sum_{0 \leq r \leq 4} (\|D_t \partial^r(\operatorname{curl} v, \operatorname{div} v)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|D_t \partial D_t^r p\|_{L^2}^2) + \|D_t^7 \rho - \Delta D_t^5 p\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& + \|\partial D_t^6 \rho - \rho_p D_t \partial D_t^5 p\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{1 \leq r \leq 5} (\|\partial^r p\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Pi \partial^r D_t p\|_{L^2}^2) \\
& \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, L, \tilde{L}) \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 4} \mathcal{E}_E^i.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof consists of the following two lemmas, Lemmas 4.4 and 4.5.

Lemma 4.4 *Let $\kappa = 0$ in (1.1b), then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1,2,3} \|\partial^i(v, \rho, p, s)\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \sum_{i+j=0,1,2} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j(v, \rho, p)\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|D_t \partial s\|_{L^\infty}^2 \\
& + \sum_{i=2,3} \|D_t^i(\rho, p)\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \sum_{i+j=2} \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j(v, \rho, p)\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|\partial D_t p\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 5} \|(\partial^i v, D_t^i p)\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 4} \|\partial^i(v, p)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K_1) \mathcal{E}_E, \tag{4.2a}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i+j=3,4} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j(v, \rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i+j+k=2,3} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j D_t^k(v, \rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& + \sum_{i+j+k=3} \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j \partial D_t^k(v, \rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i+j=3,4} \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j(v, \rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 5} \|D_t \partial^i s\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i=1,2} (\|\partial^{i+1} D_t p\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial^i D_t^2 p\|_{L^2}^2) \\
& + \|\partial D_t^3 p\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1)(\mathcal{E}_E^2 + \mathcal{E}_E), \tag{4.2b}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i+j=5} \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j(\rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|(D_t^6 p, D_t \partial^4 \operatorname{curl} v)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Delta D_t^4 p\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& + \|\partial D_t^6 \rho - \rho_p D_t \partial D_t^5 p\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1)(\mathcal{E}_E^3 + \mathcal{E}_E^2 + \mathcal{E}_E), \tag{4.2c}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\|\bar{\partial}^i \theta\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}) \mathcal{E}_E, \quad i = 0, 1, 2, \tag{4.2d}$$

$$\|\bar{\partial}^3 \theta\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1})(\mathcal{E}_E^2 + \mathcal{E}_E). \tag{4.2e}$$

Proof. In a similar way to deriving Lemmas 3.4-3.6, we can prove (4.2) by noting that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\partial^4 D_t \operatorname{curl} v| & \lesssim \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 5, 1 \leq j \leq 6-i} M^{6-i-j} |\partial^i(\rho, p)| |\partial^j \rho| \\
& + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} |\partial^i v| |\partial^{6-i} v| + |\partial^2 \rho|^2 |\partial^2 p|, \\
|D_t^6 p| & \lesssim \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 6} M^{6-i} D_t^i \rho + \sum_{\substack{2 \leq i \leq 4, 2 \leq j \leq 3 \\ i+j \leq 6}} M^{6-i-j} |D_t^i \rho| |D_t^j \rho| + |D_t^2 \rho|^3,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
|\overline{D}_t^6 \rho - \rho_p D_t \partial D_t^5 p| &\lesssim |D_t^3 p| |D_t^2 p| |\partial D_t p| + |D_t^2 p|^2 (|\partial D_t^2 p| \\
&+ M |(D_t^2, \partial D_t) p|) + \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 1, 1 \leq j \leq 6, i+j \leq 6} M^{7-i-j} |\partial^i D_t^j p| \\
&+ \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 1, 1 \leq j \leq 5, 2 \leq i+j, 2 \leq l \leq 6-j} M^{7-i-j-l} |\partial^i D_t^j p| |D_t^l p|.
\end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of the lemma. \square

Lemma 4.5 *Let $\kappa = 0$ in (1.1b), then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i+j+k=4} \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j \partial D_t^k(\rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i+j=5} \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j v\|_{L^2}^2 \\
\leq C(M, K, K_1)(\mathcal{E}_E^3 + \mathcal{E}_E^2 + \mathcal{E}_E), \tag{4.3a}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i+j+k+l=3} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j D_t \partial^k D_t \partial^l(\rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Delta D_t^5 p - D_t^7 \rho\|_{L^2}^2 \\
+ \|D_t^4 \Delta v\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1})(\mathcal{E}_E^3 + \mathcal{E}_E^2 + \mathcal{E}_E), \tag{4.3b}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i+j+k=4} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j D_t \partial^k(\rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|D_t \partial^4 \operatorname{div} v\|_{L^2}^2 + |\partial^5 p|_{L^2}^2 \\
\leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, \tilde{L})(\mathcal{E}_E^3 + \mathcal{E}_E^2 + \mathcal{E}_E), \tag{4.3c}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i+j=5} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j(\rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 + |\partial^4 D_t p|_{L^2}^2 + |\Pi \partial^5 D_t p|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial^5 \operatorname{div} v\|_{L^2}^2 \\
\leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, L)(\mathcal{E}_E^4 + \mathcal{E}_E^3 + \mathcal{E}_E^2 + \mathcal{E}_E). \tag{4.3d}
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. It follows from (4.2), (2.5b), (2.16a) and (2.16b) that for $\kappa = 0$,

$$\sum_{i+j+k=4} \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j \partial D_t^k(\rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1)(\mathcal{E}_E^3 + \mathcal{E}_E^2 + \mathcal{E}_E), \tag{4.4}$$

where we have used

$$\begin{aligned}
|\partial^2 D_t^4 \rho| &\lesssim \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq 2, 0 \leq j \leq 4, 0 \leq k \leq 2-i \\ 0 \leq l \leq 4-j, 2 \leq i+j, k+l}} M^{6-i-j-k-l} |\partial^i D_t^j(p, s)| |\partial^k D_t^l(p, s)| \\
&+ \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq 2, 0 \leq j \leq 4 \\ 1 \leq i+j}} M^{6-i-j} |\partial^i D_t^j(p, s)| + |D_t^2 p|^2 |\partial^2(p, s)| + |D_t^2 p| |\partial D_t p|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

In view of (2.19a) and (2.16), we see that for $\kappa = 0, 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|D_t^5 \partial v + \rho^{-1} D_t^4 \partial^2 p - \kappa D_t^4 \partial^2 \phi| &\lesssim \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 4} |D_t^i \partial v| |D_t^{4-i} \partial v| + |D_t^2 \rho|^2 |\partial^2 p| \\
&+ \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 3} M^{4-i} |D_t^i \partial^2 p| + \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 2, 2 \leq j \leq 4-i} M^{4-i-j} |D_t^i \partial^2 p| |D_t^j \rho| + \mathcal{J}_2,
\end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{J}_2 is given by (3.29). This, together with (4.2), (4.4) and (2.16), implies that for $\kappa = 0$,

$$\sum_{i+j=5} \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j v\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1)(\mathcal{E}_E^3 + \mathcal{E}_E^2 + \mathcal{E}_E). \tag{4.5}$$

Due to (2.21), (2.16a) and (2.16b), one has that for $\kappa = 0, 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\partial^2 \Delta D_t^2 p - \kappa \partial^2 D_t^2 (\rho \Delta \phi)| \lesssim |\partial^2 D_t^4 \rho| + (|\partial^2 \rho| |D_t^2 \rho| + |\partial D_t \rho| |D_t \partial \rho|) |\partial^2 p| \\
& + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 4} |\partial^i v| |\partial^{5-i} D_t p| + \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i, j, k, l \leq 2 \\ i+k, j+l \leq 2}} |\partial^i D_t^j \rho| |\partial^k D_t^l \partial v| |\partial^{2-i-k} D_t^{2-j-l} \partial v| \\
& + \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 2, 0 \leq j, k \leq 1} |\partial^i D_t^j \partial^{k+1} v| |\partial^{2-i} D_t^{1-j} \partial^{2-k} p| + |\partial^2 \rho| |(\partial D_t, D_t \partial) \rho| |D_t \partial p| \\
& + \sum_{0 \leq i, j \leq 2} M^{5-i-j} (|\partial^i D_t^j \partial p| + \sum_{\max\{0, 2-i-j\} \leq k \leq 1} M^{1-k} |\partial^i D_t^j \partial^k \rho|) \\
& + \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i, j \leq 2, 1 \leq i+j, 0 \leq k \leq 2-i \\ 0 \leq l \leq 2-j, \max\{0, 2-k-l\} \leq m \leq 1}} M^{5-i-j-k-l-m} |\partial^i D_t^j \partial p| |\partial^k D_t^l \partial^m \rho| \\
& + \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i, j \leq 2, 0 \leq k \leq 1, 0 \leq l \leq 2-i, 0 \leq m \leq 2-j \\ 0 \leq n \leq 1-k, 2 \leq i+j+k, l+m+n}} M^{6-i-j-k-l-m-n} |\partial^i D_t^j \partial^k \rho| |\partial^l D_t^m \partial^n \rho|, \tag{4.6}
\end{aligned}$$

which means, with the help of (4.2) and (4.4), that for $\kappa = 0$,

$$\|\partial^2 \Delta D_t^2 p\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1) (\mathcal{E}_E^3 + \mathcal{E}_E^2 + \mathcal{E}_E). \tag{4.7}$$

Hence, we use the same way as that of proving (3.23c) to obtain that for $\kappa = 0$,

$$\sum_{i+j+k=4} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j D_t \partial^k (\rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, \tilde{L}) (\mathcal{E}_E^3 + \mathcal{E}_E^2 + \mathcal{E}_E), \tag{4.8}$$

where we have used

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\partial^4 D_t^2 \rho| \lesssim |D_t^2 p| |\partial^2 (p, s)|^2 + |\partial D_t p|^2 |\partial^2 (p, s)| \\
& + \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 4, 0 \leq j \leq 2, 1 \leq i+j} M^{6-i-j} |\partial^i D_t^j (p, s)| \\
& + \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq 4, 0 \leq j \leq 2, 0 \leq k \leq 4-i \\ 0 \leq l \leq 2-j, 2 \leq i+j, k+l}} M^{6-i-j-k-l} |\partial^i D_t^j (p, s)| |\partial^k D_t^l (p, s)|.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from (1.1a) and (2.20) that for $\kappa = 0, 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\partial^4 D_t \operatorname{div} v| = |\partial^4 D_t (\rho^{-1} D_t \rho)| \lesssim |\partial^2 \rho|^2 |D_t^2 \rho| \\
& + |\partial D_t \rho|^2 |\partial^2 \rho| + \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 4, 0 \leq j \leq 2, 1 \leq i+j} M^{6-i-j} |\partial^i D_t^j \rho| \\
& + \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq 4, 0 \leq j \leq 2, 0 \leq k \leq 4-i \\ 0 \leq l \leq 2-j, 2 \leq i+j, k+l}} M^{6-i-j-k-l} |\partial^i D_t^j \rho| |\partial^k D_t^l \rho|, \\
& |\partial^4 \Delta p - \kappa \partial^4 (\rho \Delta \phi)| \lesssim |\partial^4 D_t^2 \rho| + |\partial^2 v|^2 |\partial^2 \rho| + |\partial^2 \rho|^2 |\partial^2 p| \\
& + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} |\partial^i v| (|\partial^{6-i} v| + M |\partial^{5-i} (v, \rho)|) + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 5} M^{6-i} |\partial^i (\rho, p)| \\
& + \sum_{2 \leq i \leq 4, 2 \leq j \leq 6-i} M^{6-i-j} |\partial^i (\rho, p)| |\partial^j \rho|,
\end{aligned}$$

which, together with (2.5c), (2.16a), (4.2) and (4.8), implies that for $\kappa = 0$,

$$\|D_t \partial^4 \operatorname{div} v\|_{L^2}^2 + |\partial^5 p|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, \tilde{L})(\mathcal{E}_E^3 + \mathcal{E}_E^2 + \mathcal{E}_E). \quad (4.9)$$

It follows from (2.21), (2.16a) and (2.16b) that for $\kappa = 0, 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial \Delta D_t^3 p - \kappa \partial D_t^3(\rho \Delta \phi)| &\lesssim |\partial D_t^5 \rho| + \sum_{0 \leq i, j, k \leq 1} |\partial^i D_t^j \partial^{k+1} v| |\partial^{1-i} D_t^{1-j} \partial^{2-k} D_t p| \\ &+ \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} |\partial^i v| |\partial^{4-i} D_t^2 p| + \sum_{0 \leq i, k \leq 1, 0 \leq j \leq 2} |\partial^i D_t^j \partial^{k+1} v| |\partial^{1-i} D_t^{2-j} \partial^{2-k} p| \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i, k \leq 1, 0 \leq j, l \leq 3 \\ i+k \leq 1, j+l \leq 3}} |\partial^i D_t^j \rho| |\partial^k D_t^l \partial v| |\partial^{1-i-k} D_t^{3-j-l} \partial v| \\ &+ \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 1, 0 \leq j \leq 3} M^{5-i-j} (|\partial^i D_t^j \partial p| + \sum_{\max\{0, 2-i-j\} \leq k \leq 1} M^{1-k} |\partial^i D_t^j \partial^k \rho|) \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq 1, 0 \leq j \leq 3, 1 \leq i+j, 0 \leq k \leq 1-i \\ 0 \leq l \leq 3-j, \max\{0, 2-k-l\} \leq m \leq 1}} M^{5-i-j-k-l-m} |\partial^i D_t^j \partial p| |\partial^k D_t^l \partial^m \rho| \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i, k \leq 1, 0 \leq j \leq 3, 0 \leq l \leq 1-i, 0 \leq m \leq 3-j \\ 0 \leq n \leq 1-k, 2 \leq i+j+k, l+m+n}} M^{6-i-j-k-l-m-n} |\partial^i D_t^j \partial^k \rho| |\partial^l D_t^m \partial^n \rho| \\ &+ |D_t \partial p| (|\partial D_t \rho| |D_t \partial \rho| + |D_t^2 \rho| |\partial^2 \rho|) + |\partial^2 p| |D_t^2 \rho| |D_t \partial \rho|, \end{aligned}$$

which means, with the aid of (4.2), that for $\kappa = 0$,

$$\|\partial \Delta D_t^3 p\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1)(\mathcal{E}_E^3 + \mathcal{E}_E^2 + \mathcal{E}_E).$$

Then, we may employ the same way as that of deriving (3.23d) to get that for $\kappa = 0$,

$$\sum_{i+j+k+l=3} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j D_t \partial^k D_t \partial^l(\rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1})(\mathcal{E}_E^3 + \mathcal{E}_E^2 + \mathcal{E}_E), \quad (4.10)$$

where we have used

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial^3 D_t^3 \rho| &\lesssim \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i, j \leq 3, 0 \leq k \leq 3-i \\ 0 \leq l \leq 3-j, 2 \leq i+j, k+l}} M^{6-i-j-k-l} |\partial^i D_t^j(p, s)| |\partial^k D_t^l(p, s)| \\ &+ \sum_{0 \leq i, j \leq 3, 1 \leq i+j} M^{6-i-j} |\partial^i D_t^j(p, s)| + |D_t^2 p| |\partial D_t p| |\partial^2(p, s)| + |\partial D_t p|^3. \end{aligned}$$

Due to (3.28), one has that for $\kappa = 0, 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |D_t^4 \Delta v + \rho^{-1} D_t^3 \partial \Delta p - \kappa D_t^3 \partial \Delta \phi| &\lesssim \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 3} |D_t^i \partial v| |D_t^{3-i} \partial^2 v| \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq 3 \\ 0 \leq j \leq 2, i+j \leq 4}} M^{5-i-j} |D_t^i \partial^{j+1} p| + \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq 3 \\ 0 \leq j \leq 2, 2 \leq i+j}} M^{6-i-j} |D_t^i \partial^j \rho| \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq 3, 0 \leq j \leq 2, 1 \leq i+j \leq 4 \\ 0 \leq k \leq 3-i, 0 \leq l \leq 2-j, 2 \leq k+l}} M^{5-i-j-k-l} |D_t^i \partial^{j+1} p| |D_t^k \partial^l \rho| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + |D_t \partial p| (|D_t^2 \rho| |\partial^2 \rho| + |D_t \partial \rho|^2) + |\partial^2 p| |D_t^2 \rho| |D_t \partial \rho| \\
& + \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq 3, 0 \leq j \leq 2, 0 \leq k \leq 3-i \\ 0 \leq l \leq 2-j, 2 \leq i+j, k+l}} M^{6-i-j-k-l} |D_t^i \partial^j \rho| |D_t^k \partial^l \rho|,
\end{aligned}$$

which, together with (4.2) and (4.10), implies that for $\kappa = 0$,

$$\|D_t^4 \Delta v\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}) (\mathcal{E}_E^3 + \mathcal{E}_E^2 + \mathcal{E}_E). \quad (4.11)$$

It follows from (2.21) and (2.16a) that for $\kappa = 0, 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\partial^3 \Delta D_t p - \kappa \partial^3 D_t (\rho \Delta \phi)| \lesssim |\partial^3 D_t^3 \rho| + |\partial^2 \rho| |(\partial D_t, D_t \partial) \rho| |\partial^2 p| + |\partial^2 \rho|^2 |D_t \partial p| \\
& + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 5} |\partial^i v| |\partial^{6-i} p| + \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i, k \leq 3, 0 \leq j, l \leq 1 \\ i+k \leq 3, j+l \leq 1}} |\partial^i D_t^j \rho| |\partial^k D_t^l \partial v| |\partial^{3-i-k} D_t^{1-j-l} \partial v| \\
& + \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 3, 0 \leq j \leq 1} M^{5-i-j} (|\partial^i D_t^j \partial p| + \sum_{\max\{0, 2-i-j\} \leq k \leq 1} M^{1-k} |\partial^i D_t^j \partial^k \rho|) \\
& + \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq 3, 0 \leq j \leq 1, 1 \leq i+j, 0 \leq k \leq 3-i \\ 0 \leq l \leq 1-j, \max\{0, 2-k-l\} \leq m \leq 1}} M^{5-i-j-k-l-m} |\partial^i D_t^j \partial p| |\partial^k D_t^l \partial^m \rho| \\
& + \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 3, 0 \leq j, k \leq 1, 2 \leq i+j+k, 2 \leq l \leq 4-i-k} M^{6-i-j-k-l} |\partial^i D_t^j \partial^k \rho| |\partial^l \rho|,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies, with the aid of (4.2) and (4.10), that for $\kappa = 0$,

$$\|\partial^3 \Delta D_t p\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}) (\mathcal{E}_E^3 + \mathcal{E}_E^2 + \mathcal{E}_E).$$

Therefore, we use the same way as that of proving (3.23c) to obtain that for $\kappa = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i+j=5} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j (\rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Pi \partial^4 D_t p\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial^4 D_t p\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Pi \partial^5 D_t p\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& + \|\partial^5 \operatorname{div} v\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, L) (\mathcal{E}_E^4 + \mathcal{E}_E^3 + \mathcal{E}_E^2 + \mathcal{E}_E),
\end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

where we have used

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\partial^5 (\operatorname{div} v, D_t \rho)| = |\partial^5 ((-\rho^{-1}, 1) \rho_p D_t p)| \\
& \lesssim \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 5} M^{5-i} |\partial^i D_t p| + \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 3, 2 \leq j \leq 5-i} M^{5-i-j} |\partial^j (p, s)| |\partial^i D_t p| \\
& + |\partial^2 (p, s)|^2 (|\partial D_t p| + M^2) + M |\partial^3 (p, s)| |\partial^2 (p, s)|.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, it follows from (2.21), (2.16a) and (2.16b) that for $\kappa = 0, 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\Delta D_t^5 p - D_t^7 \rho - \kappa D_t^5 (\rho \Delta \phi)| \lesssim \sum_{0 \leq i, j \leq 5, i+j \leq 5} |D_t^i \rho| |D_t^j \partial v| |D_t^{5-i-j} \partial v| \\
& + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 2} |\partial^i v| |\partial^{3-i} D_t^4 p| + \sum_{0 \leq i, j \leq 1} |D_t^i \partial^{j+1} v| |D_t^{1-i} \partial^{2-j} D_t^3 p| \\
& + \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 2, 1 \leq j \leq 2} |D_t^i \partial^j v| |D_t^{2-i} \partial^{3-j} D_t^2 p| + M |D_t^4 \Delta v| + |D_t^4 \partial v| |\partial^2 p|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 3, 1 \leq j \leq 2} |D_t^i \partial^j v| (|D_t^{3-i} \partial^{3-j} D_t p| + |D_t^{4-i} \partial^{3-j} p|) \\
& + \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 5} M^{6-i} (|D_t^i \partial p| + \sum_{\max\{0, 2-i\} \leq j \leq 1} M^{1-j} |D_t^i \partial^j \rho|) \\
& + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq 4, 1 \leq j \leq 5-i \\ \max\{0, 2-j\} \leq k \leq 1}} M^{6-i-j-k} |D_t^i \partial p| |D_t^j \partial^k \rho| + |D_t^2 \partial p| |D_t^2 \rho| |D_t \partial \rho| \\
& + |D_t \partial p| (|D_t^3 \rho| |D_t \partial \rho| + (|D_t^2 \partial \rho| + M |(D_t^2, D_t \partial) \rho|) |D_t^2 \rho|) \\
& + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq 4, 0 \leq j \leq 1, 1 \leq k \leq 5-i \\ 0 \leq l \leq 1-j, 2 \leq i+j, k+l}} M^{7-i-j-k-l} |D_t^i \partial^j \rho| |D_t^k \partial^l \rho| + M |D_t^2 \rho|^2 |D_t \partial \rho|,
\end{aligned}$$

which proves, using (4.2), (4.4), (4.5) and (4.12), that for $\kappa = 0$,

$$\|\Delta D_t^5 p - D_t^7 \rho\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}) (\mathcal{E}_E^3 + \mathcal{E}_E^2 + \mathcal{E}_E).$$

Hence, (4.3) is a conclusion of (4.4), (4.5), and (4.8)-(4.12). \square

4.2 Energy estimates

Proposition 4.6 *Let $\kappa = 0$ in (1.1b), then it holds that*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{E}_E \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, L, \tilde{L}) \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 4} \mathcal{E}_E^i.$$

Proof. It suffices to prove that

$$\frac{d}{dt} E_r \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, L, \tilde{L}) \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 4} \mathcal{E}_E^i, \quad 1 \leq r \leq 5, \quad (4.13a)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} (P_r + W_r) \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, L, \tilde{L}) \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 4} \mathcal{E}_E^i, \quad 0 \leq r \leq 5, \quad (4.13b)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
E_r &= \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} \rho \delta^{mn} \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r v_m) \partial_J^r v_n dx + \int_{\partial \mathcal{D}_t} |\Pi \partial^r p|^2 (-\partial_{Np})^{-1} ds, \\
P_r &= \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} (|D_t^{r+1} \rho|^2 + \rho_p |\partial D_t^r p|^2) dx, \quad W_0 = \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} (\rho |v|^2 + \rho^2 + p^2 + s^2) dx, \\
W_r &= \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} (|\partial^{r-1} (\text{curl} v, \text{div} v)|^2 + |\partial^r (\rho, p, s)|^2) dx, \quad r \geq 1.
\end{aligned}$$

When $1 \leq r \leq 4$, (4.13a) can be shown by choosing $\kappa = 0$ in (3.37). In the case of $0 \leq r \leq 4$, (4.13b) can be proven by choosing $\kappa = 0$ in (3.47). So, it is enough to prove (4.13) for $r = 5$.

Letting $\kappa = 0$ in (3.43), we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} E_5 = 2 \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} \mathcal{H}_5 dx - \int_{\partial \mathcal{D}_t} (2\mathcal{L}_5 + |\Pi \partial^5 p|^2 (-\partial_{Np})^{-1} N^i \partial_N v_i) ds,$$

where \mathcal{H}_5 and \mathcal{L}_5 are defined by (3.39) and (3.41), respectively. In a similar way to deriving (3.44) and (3.46), one has

$$\|\mathcal{H}_5\|_{L^1} \leq C(M, K) (\|\partial^5 (v, \rho, p, \text{div} v)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|H_5\|_{L^2}^2),$$

$$|\mathcal{L}_5|_{L^1} \leq C(\epsilon_b^{-1}, M, L)(|\partial^5 p|_{L^2}^2 + |\Pi \partial^5 D_t p|_{L^2}^2 \\ + C(K) \sum_{2 \leq i \leq 5} \|\partial^i v\|_{L^2}^2 \sum_{2 \leq j \leq 5} \|\partial^j p\|_{L^2}^2),$$

where

$$H_5 = |\partial^4 v| |\partial^2 v| + |\partial^3 v|^2 + |\partial^2 \rho|^2 |\partial^2 p| + \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq 4, i+j \leq 6} |\partial^i \rho| |\partial^j(\rho, p)|.$$

This, together with (4.2) and (4.3), proves (4.13a) for $r = 5$.

In a similar way to derive (3.49) and (3.51), we use (4.2) and (4.3) to get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} P_5 &\lesssim \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} (|D_t^7 \rho - \Delta D_t^5 p|^2 + |\partial D_t^6 \rho - \rho_p D_t \partial D_t^5 p|^2) dx \\ &\quad + (M+1) P_5 \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}) \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} \mathcal{E}_E^i, \\ \frac{d}{dt} W_5 &\leq \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} (|D_t \partial^4(\operatorname{curl} v, \operatorname{div} v)|^2 + |D_t \partial^5(\rho, p, s)|^2) dx \\ &\quad + (M+1) W_5 \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, L, \tilde{L}) \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 4} \mathcal{E}_E^i. \end{aligned}$$

So, (4.13b) holds for $r = 5$. We finish the proof of the lemma. \square

4.3 Proof of Theorem 4.1

The proof follows from Proposition 4.7, which is stated as follows.

Proposition 4.7 *Let $\kappa = 0$ in (1.1b), then there exists a continuous function $\bar{T} > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{-1} \operatorname{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0 &\leq \operatorname{Vol} \mathcal{D}_t \leq 2 \operatorname{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0, \\ 2^{-1} \underline{\varrho} &\leq \rho(t, x) \leq 2 \bar{\varrho}, \quad |s(t, x)| \leq \bar{s}, \quad x \in \mathcal{D}_t, \\ -\partial_N p(t, x) &\geq 2^{-1} \varepsilon_1, \quad x \in \partial \mathcal{D}_t, \\ \iota_1^{-1}(t) &\leq 16 K_0, \quad \mathcal{E}_E(t) \leq 2 \mathcal{E}_E(0), \\ \|\partial(v, p, s)(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} &\leq 2 \|\partial(v, p, s)(0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty}, \\ |\theta(t, \cdot)|_{L^\infty} + \iota_0^{-1}(t) &\leq C(\varepsilon_1^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}_E(0)), \\ |\partial_N D_t p(t, \cdot)|_{L^\infty} + |\partial_N D_t^2 p(t, \cdot)|_{L^\infty} &\leq C(\underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \bar{s}, \varepsilon_1^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}_E(0), \operatorname{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0) \end{aligned}$$

for $t \leq \bar{T}(\underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \bar{s}, \varepsilon_1^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}_E(0), \operatorname{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0)$.

Proof. The most part of the proof is the same as that of Proposition 3.11. As shown in Proposition 3.11, we can prove that there exists a continuous function $\tilde{T} > 0$ such that

$$2^{-1} \operatorname{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0 \leq \operatorname{Vol} \mathcal{D}_t \leq 2 \operatorname{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0, \tag{4.14a}$$

$$2^{-1} \underline{\varrho} \leq \rho(t, x) \leq 2 \bar{\varrho}, \quad |s(t, x)| \leq \bar{s}, \quad x \in \mathcal{D}_t, \tag{4.14b}$$

$$-\partial_N p(t, x) \geq 2^{-1} \varepsilon_1, \quad x \in \partial \mathcal{D}_t, \tag{4.14c}$$

$$\iota_1^{-1}(t) \leq 16 K_0, \quad \mathcal{E}_E(t) \leq 2 \mathcal{E}_E(0), \tag{4.14d}$$

$$\|\partial(v, p, s)(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} \leq 2 \|\partial(v, p, s)(0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty}, \tag{4.14e}$$

for $t \leq \tilde{T}(K, L, \underline{\varrho}, \bar{\varrho}, \bar{s}, \varepsilon_1^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}_E(0), \text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_0)$.

It follows from (2.8a), (2.12a), (2.4b), (4.14c) and (4.14d) that for $t \leq \tilde{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\theta(t, \cdot)|_{L^\infty} &= |(\partial_N p)^{-1}(t, \cdot)|_{L^\infty} |\Pi \partial^2 p(t, \cdot)|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leq |(\partial_N p)^{-1}(t, \cdot)|_{L^\infty} |\partial^2 p(t, \cdot)|_{L^\infty} \leq C_1(\varepsilon_1^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}_E(0)), \end{aligned}$$

which implies, with the help of (2.1) and (4.14d), that for $t \leq \tilde{T}$,

$$\iota_0^{-1}(t) \leq \max \{32K_0, C_1(\varepsilon_1^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}_E(0))\}.$$

So, we may choose

$$K = 64K_0 + 4C_1(\varepsilon_1^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}_E(0)). \quad (4.15)$$

In a similar way to deriving (3.68), we use (2.10), (4.2a), (4.2b), (4.14) and (4.15) to get that for $t \leq \tilde{T}$,

$$|\partial_N D_t p(t, \cdot)|_{L^\infty} \leq C_2(\underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \bar{s}, \varepsilon_1^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}_E(0), \text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_0).$$

Similarly, we use (2.10), (4.2b), (4.7), (4.14) and (4.15) to obtain that for $t \leq \tilde{T}$,

$$|\partial_N D_t^2 p(t, \cdot)|_{L^\infty} \leq C_3(\underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \bar{s}, \varepsilon_1^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}_E(0), \text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_0).$$

This finishes the proof of the proposition by choosing $L = 2C_2$ and $\tilde{L} = 2C_3$. \square

5 The isentropic Euler-Poisson equations

In this section, we investigate the free boundary problem (1.6) of the isentropic Euler-Poisson equations under the stability condition (1.8). The main results are given in Theorem 5.1. Let $h = h(\rho) = \int_1^\rho \lambda^{-1} p'(\lambda) d\lambda$, then the higher-order energy functionals are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(t) &= \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} |v|^2 dx + \sum_{1 \leq r \leq 5} \int_{\partial \mathcal{D}_t} |\Pi \partial^r (\phi - h)|^2 (\partial_N (\phi - h))^{-1} ds \\ &\quad + \sum_{1 \leq r \leq 5} \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} (\delta^{mn} \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r v_m) \partial_J^r v_n + |\partial^{r-1} \text{curl} v|^2 + |\partial^{r-1} \text{div} v|^2) dx \\ &\quad + \sum_{0 \leq r \leq 5} \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} (|\partial^r \rho|^2 + |\partial^r p|^2 + |\partial^r \phi|^2 + |D_t^{r+1} \rho|^2 + \rho_p |\partial D_t^r p|^2) dx. \end{aligned}$$

In order to state the main result of the present work, we set

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\varrho} &= \min_{x \in \mathcal{D}_0} \rho_0(x), \quad \bar{\varrho} = \max_{x \in \mathcal{D}_0} \rho_0(x), \quad \varepsilon_1 = \min_{x \in \partial \mathcal{D}_0} \partial_N (\phi - h)(0, x), \\ K_0 &= \max_{x \in \partial \mathcal{D}_0} |\theta(0, x)| + |\iota_0^{-1}(0)|, \end{aligned}$$

where $h(0, x) = h(\rho_0(x))$, and $\phi(0, x)$ is determined by the Dirichlet problem (1.3). With these notations, the main results of this section are stated as follows:

Theorem 5.1 *Suppose that (1.7) hold, and $0 < \underline{\varrho}, \bar{\varrho}, \varepsilon_1, K_0, \mathcal{E}(0), \text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_0 < \infty$. Then there exists a continuous function $\mathcal{T}(\underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \varepsilon_1^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}(0), \text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_0) > 0$ such that any smooth solution of the free*

boundary problem (1.6) and (1.3) for $0 \leq t \leq T$ with $T \leq \mathcal{T}$ satisfies the following estimates: for $0 \leq t \leq T$,

$$\mathcal{E}(t) \leq 2\mathcal{E}(0), \quad 2^{-1}\text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_0 \leq \text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_t \leq 2\text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_0, \quad (5.1a)$$

$$2^{-1}\underline{\rho} \leq \min_{x \in \mathcal{D}_t} \rho(t, x), \quad \max_{x \in \mathcal{D}_t} \rho(t, x) \leq 2\bar{\rho}, \quad (5.1b)$$

$$2^{-1}\varepsilon_1 \leq \min_{x \in \partial\mathcal{D}_t} \partial_N(\phi - h)(t, x), \quad (5.1c)$$

$$\max_{x \in \partial\mathcal{D}_t} |\theta(t, x)| + |\iota_0^{-1}(t)| \leq C(\underline{\rho}^{-1}, \bar{\rho}, \varepsilon_1^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}(0)), \quad (5.1d)$$

where $h = h(\rho) = \int_1^\rho \lambda^{-1} p'(\lambda) d\lambda$.

Remark 5.2 It follows from (2.4a) that $\|v(t, \cdot)\|_{H^5(\mathcal{D}_t)}^2 \leq C\mathcal{E}(t)$.

We make the following a priori assumptions: for $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{-1}\text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_0 &\leq \text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_t \leq 2\text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_0, \\ 2^{-1}\underline{\rho} &\leq \rho(t, x) \leq 2\bar{\rho}, \quad |\partial(v, p, \phi)(t, x)| \leq M && \text{in } \mathcal{D}_t, \\ |\theta(t, x)| + \iota_0^{-1}(t) &\leq K \quad \text{and} \quad \iota_1^{-1}(t) \leq K_1 && \text{on } \partial\mathcal{D}_t, \\ \partial_N(\phi - h)(t, x) &\geq \varepsilon_b, \quad |\partial_N D_t p(t, x)| \leq L && \text{on } \partial\mathcal{D}_t, \\ |\partial_N D_t \phi(t, x)| &\leq \bar{L}, \quad |\partial_N D_t^2 p(t, x)| \leq \tilde{L} && \text{on } \partial\mathcal{D}_t, \end{aligned}$$

where $M, K, K_1, \varepsilon_b, L, \bar{L}$ and \tilde{L} are positive constants. As in Section 3, it follows from the maximal principle that for $t \in [0, T]$ and $x \in \mathcal{D}_t$,

$$\min \left\{ 0, -\ln \max_{x \in \mathcal{D}_t} \rho(t, x) \right\} \leq \phi(t, x) \leq \max \left\{ 0, -\ln \min_{x \in \mathcal{D}_t} \rho(t, x) \right\}.$$

We may assume without loss of generality that

$$\text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_0 = 4\pi/3, \quad \underline{\rho} = 2^{-1}, \quad \bar{\rho} = 2,$$

which implies that for $t \in [0, T]$,

$$2\pi/3 \leq \text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_t \leq 8\pi/3, \quad 4^{-1} \leq \rho(t, x) \leq 4 \quad \text{and} \quad |\phi(t, x)| \leq \ln 4 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_t.$$

Similarly, one has, due to $\partial h = \rho^{-1} \partial p$, that for $t \in [0, T]$,

$$|D_t \rho(t, x)| + |D_t p(t, x)| + |\partial \rho(t, x)| + |\partial h(t, x)| \lesssim M \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_t.$$

5.1 Regularity estimates

Proposition 5.3 Let $h = h(\rho) = \int_1^\rho \lambda^{-1} p'(\lambda) d\lambda$, then it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{0 \leq r \leq 5} (\|\partial^r(v, h)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|D_t \partial^r(\rho, p, \phi)\|_{L^2}^2) + \|\partial^5 \text{div} v\|_{L^2}^2 + \|D_t v\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &+ \sum_{0 \leq r \leq 4} (\|D_t \partial^r(\text{curl} v, \text{div} v)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|D_t \partial D_t^r p\|_{L^2}^2) + \|D_t^7 \rho - \Delta D_t^5 p\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &+ \|\partial D_t^6 \rho - \rho_p D_t \partial D_t^5 p\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{1 \leq r \leq 5} (|\partial^r(h, \phi)|_{L^2}^2 + |\Pi \partial^r D_t(h, \phi)|_{L^2}^2) \\ &\leq C(M, K, K_1, \varepsilon_b^{-1}, L, \bar{L}, \tilde{L}) \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 7} \mathcal{E}^i. \end{aligned}$$

The proof consists of the following two lemmas, Lemmas 5.4 and 5.5.

Lemma 5.4 *Let $h = h(\rho) = \int_1^\rho \lambda^{-1} p'(\lambda) d\lambda$, then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1,2,3} \|\partial^i(v, \rho, p, \phi)\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \sum_{i+j=0,1,2} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j(v, \rho, p)\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|\partial h\|_{L^\infty}^2 \\ & + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} \|\partial^i h\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 5} \|(\partial^i v, D_t^i p)\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i=1,2} (\|\partial^i D_t h\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & + |\partial^i h|_{L^2}^2) + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 4} |\partial^i(v, p, \phi)|_{L^2}^2 + |\partial D_t(p, h)|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K_1) \mathcal{E}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.2a)$$

$$\sum_{i=4,5} (\|\partial^{i-2} h\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|\partial^i h\|_{L^2}^2 + |\partial^{i-1} h|_{L^2}^2) \leq C(M, K_1) (\mathcal{E}^2 + \mathcal{E}), \quad (5.2b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \|D_t \phi\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \sum_{i+k=2, j=0,1} \|D_t^i \partial^j D_t^k(\rho, p)\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|D_t^3(\rho, p)\|_{L^\infty}^2 \\ & + \sum_{i+j=1,2} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j \phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i+j=2} \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j v\|_{L^2}^2 + |\partial D_t \phi|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C(M, K, K_1) \mathcal{E}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.2c)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \|D_t^2 \phi\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \sum_{i+j=3,4} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j(v, \rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i=3,4} \|\partial^i D_t h\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & + \sum_{i+j+k=1,2} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j D_t \partial^k \phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i+j+k=2,3} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j D_t \partial^k(\rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & + \sum_{i+j=3} \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j(v, \rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i+j=4} \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j(\rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 + |\partial D_t^2 \phi|_{L^2}^2 \\ & + \sum_{i=1,2} (|\partial^{i+1} D_t(p, h)|_{L^2}^2 + |\partial^i D_t^2 p|_{L^2}^2) \leq C(M, K, K_1) (\mathcal{E}^2 + \mathcal{E}), \end{aligned} \quad (5.2d)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(D_t^6 p, D_t \partial^4 \text{curl} v)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial D_t^6 \rho - \rho_p D_t \partial D_t^5 p\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C(M, K, K_1) (\mathcal{E}^3 + \mathcal{E}^2 + \mathcal{E}), \end{aligned} \quad (5.2e)$$

$$|\bar{\partial}^i \theta|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}) \mathcal{E}, \quad i = 0, 1, \quad (5.2f)$$

$$|\bar{\partial}^2 \theta|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}) (\mathcal{E}^2 + \mathcal{E}), \quad (5.2g)$$

$$|\bar{\partial}^3 \theta|_{L^2}^2 + |\Pi \partial^5(p, \phi)|_{L^2}^2 + |\partial^5 \phi|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}) \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 4} \mathcal{E}^i, \quad (5.2h)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i+j=1,2} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j \phi\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \sum_{i+j=2} \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j v\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \sum_{i+j=3,4} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j \phi\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & + \sum_{i+j+k=2,3} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j D_t \partial^k v\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i+j+k=3} \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j \partial D_t^k(\rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & + \sum_{i=2,3,4} |\partial^i D_t \phi|_{L^2}^2 + |\partial^2 D_t^2 \phi|_{L^2}^2 + |\partial D_t^3 p|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, \bar{L}) (\mathcal{E}^2 + \mathcal{E}), \end{aligned} \quad (5.2i)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i+j=2} \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j \phi\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|D_t^3 \phi\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \sum_{i+j+k=3} (\|\partial^i D_t \partial^j D_t \partial^k \phi\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & + \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j \partial D_t^k(v, \phi)\|_{L^2}^2) + \sum_{i+j=3} \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j \phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i+j=4} \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j v\|_{L^2}^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \sum_{i+j=5} \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j(\rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 + |\Pi \partial^3 D_t^2 \phi|_{L^2}^2 \\
& \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, \bar{L})(\mathcal{E}^3 + \mathcal{E}^2 + \mathcal{E}), \tag{5.2j}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|D_t^4 \phi\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \sum_{i+j=5} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j \phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i+j=4} \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j \phi\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& + \sum_{i+j+k=4} \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j \partial D_t^k \phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Delta D_t^4 p\|_{L^2}^2 + |\Pi \partial^5 D_t \phi|_{L^2}^2 \\
& \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, \bar{L})(\mathcal{E}^4 + \mathcal{E}^3 + \mathcal{E}^2 + \mathcal{E}), \tag{5.2k}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\|D_t^5 \phi\|_{L^2} + \|\partial D_t^5 \phi\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, \bar{L})(\mathcal{E}^5 + \mathcal{E}^4 + \mathcal{E}^3 + \mathcal{E}^2 + \mathcal{E}). \tag{5.2l}$$

Proof. Since we can prove this lemma by the same idea of Lemmas 3.4-3.7 and 4.4, we only present the additional calculations needed here, especially on the higher-order derivatives of h and ϕ . The bound for $\|\partial^i h\|_{L^2}$ ($1 \leq i \leq 5$) can be derived easily from $\partial h = \rho^{-1} \partial p$ and the bound obtained for (ρ, p) , based on which we can get the desired bound for $\|\partial^i h\|_{L^\infty}$ ($1 \leq i \leq 3$) and $\|\partial^i h\|_{L^2}$ ($1 \leq i \leq 4$). Thus, the bound for $|\partial^i \theta|_{L^2}$ ($0 \leq i \leq 3$) follows from (2.7). So, we can use (2.6) to get the desired bound for $|\Pi \partial^5 p|_{L^2}$ and $|\Pi \partial^5 \phi|_{L^2}$. The bound for $|\partial^5 \phi|_{L^2}$ comes from

$$|\partial^4 \Delta \phi| \leq |\partial^4 e^{-\phi}| + |\partial^4 \phi| \lesssim |\partial^4 \rho| + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 4} M^{4-i} |\partial^i \phi| + |\partial^2 \phi|^2.$$

The bound for $\|\partial^i D_t h\|_{L^2}$ ($1 \leq i \leq 4$) follows from $D_t h = \rho^{-1} D_t p$ and the bound obtained for (ρ, p) , and that for $|\partial^i D_t h|_{L^2}$ ($1 \leq i \leq 3$) from (2.4b).

The bound for $|\partial^4 D_t \phi|_{L^2}$, $|\Pi \partial^5 D_t \phi|_{L^2}$ and $\|\partial^5 D_t \phi\|_{L^2}$ follows from

$$\|\partial^3 \Delta D_t \phi\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, \bar{L})(\mathcal{E}^2 + \mathcal{E}),$$

which is due to

$$\begin{aligned}
|\partial^3 \mathfrak{G}_1| & \lesssim \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 5} |\partial^i v| |\partial^{6-i} \phi| \quad \text{and} \quad |\partial^3(e^{-\phi} D_t \phi)| \lesssim \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 3} M^{3-i} |\partial^i D_t \phi| \\
& + (|\partial D_t \phi| + M |D_t \phi|) |\partial^2 \phi| + |D_t \phi| |\partial^3 \phi|.
\end{aligned}$$

In a similar way to deriving (3.23d), we can obtain the desired bound for $|\partial^2 D_t^2 \phi|_{L^2}$, $|\Pi \partial^3 D_t^2 \phi|_{L^2}$ and $\|\partial^3 D_t^2 \phi\|_{L^2}$, by noticing that

$$\|\partial \Delta D_t^2 \phi\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, \bar{L})(\mathcal{E}^2 + \mathcal{E}),$$

which follows from

$$\begin{aligned}
|\partial(e^{-\phi} D_t^2 \phi)| & \lesssim |\partial D_t^2 \phi| + M |D_t^2 \phi| \quad \text{and} \quad |\partial \mathfrak{G}_2| \lesssim \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} |\partial^i v| |\partial^{4-i} D_t \phi| \\
& + \sum_{0 \leq i, j, k \leq 1} |\partial^i D_t^j \partial^{k+1} v| |\partial^{1-i} D_t^{1-j} \partial^{2-k} \phi| + |\partial D_t \phi| |D_t \phi| + M |D_t \phi|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, (5.2l) can be shown with the aid of

$$|\mathfrak{G}_5| \lesssim \sum_{0 \leq r \leq 3, 0 \leq i \leq r, 0 \leq j \leq 1} |D_t^i \partial^{j+1} v| |D_t^{r-i} \partial^{2-j} D_t^{4-r} \phi|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 4} (|D_t^i \Delta v| |D_t^{4-i} \partial \phi| + |D_t^i \partial v| |D_t^{4-i} \partial^2 \phi|) + |D_t^4 \phi| |D_t \phi| \\
& + |D_t^3 \phi| (|D_t^2 \phi| + |D_t \phi|^2) + |D_t^2 \phi|^2 |D_t \phi| + |D_t^2 \phi| |D_t \phi|^3 + |D_t \phi|^5.
\end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of the lemma. \square

Lemma 5.5 *It holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i+j+k+l=3} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j D_t \partial^k D_t \partial^l (\rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|D_t^4 \Delta v\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, \bar{L}) (\mathcal{E}^3 + \mathcal{E}^2 + \mathcal{E}), \tag{5.3a}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i+j+k=4} \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j \partial D_t^k (\rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i+j=5} \|D_t^i \partial D_t^j v\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, \bar{L}) (\mathcal{E}^4 + \mathcal{E}^3 + \mathcal{E}^2 + \mathcal{E}), \tag{5.3b}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\|\Delta D_t^5 p - D_t^7 \rho\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, \bar{L}) (\mathcal{E}^5 + \mathcal{E}^4 + \mathcal{E}^3 + \mathcal{E}^2 + \mathcal{E}), \tag{5.3c}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i+j+k=4} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j D_t \partial^k (\rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|D_t \partial^4 \operatorname{div} v\|_{L^2}^2 + |\partial^5 (p, h)|_{L^2}^2 \\
& \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, \bar{L}, \tilde{L}) (\mathcal{E}^4 + \mathcal{E}^3 + \mathcal{E}^2 + \mathcal{E}), \tag{5.3d}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i+j=5} \|\partial^i D_t \partial^j (\rho, p)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial^5 \operatorname{div} v\|_{L^2}^2 + |\partial^4 D_t p|_{L^2}^2 + |\Pi \partial^5 D_t p|_{L^2}^2 \\
& \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, \bar{L}, L) \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 5} \mathcal{E}^i, \tag{5.3e}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\|\partial^5 D_t h\|_{L^2}^2 + |\partial^4 D_t h|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, \bar{L}, L) \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 5} \mathcal{E}^i, \tag{5.3f}$$

$$|\Pi \partial^5 D_t h|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, \bar{L}, L) \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 7} \mathcal{E}^i. \tag{5.3g}$$

Proof. In a similar way to proving Lemma 4.5, we can obtain (5.3) by virtue of the following additional calculations. To get the bound for $\|\partial^4 D_t^2 p\|_{L^2}$ and $|\partial^5 p|_{L^2}$ in (5.3d), we need the following estimates, respectively.

$$\begin{aligned}
|\partial^2 D_t^2 (\rho \Delta \phi)| & \lesssim |\partial^2 D_t^2 (\rho e^{-\phi})| + |\partial^2 D_t^2 \rho^2| \\
& \lesssim \sum_{0 \leq i, j \leq 2} |\partial^i D_t^j (\rho, \phi)| |\partial^{2-i} D_t^{2-j} (\rho, \phi)| + M^2 |(D_t^2, \partial D_t) (\rho, \phi)| \\
& \quad + (|\partial^2 (\rho, \phi)| + M^2) |D_t \phi|^2 + M (|\partial D_t, \partial^2 (\rho, \phi)| + M^2) |D_t \phi|, \tag{5.4} \\
|\partial^4 (\rho \Delta \phi)| & \lesssim \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 4} M^{4-i} |\partial^i (\rho, \phi)| + |\partial^2 (\rho, \phi)|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The following estimates are needed to derive (5.3a).

$$\begin{aligned}
|\partial D_t^3 (\rho \Delta \phi)| & \lesssim |\partial D_t^3 (\rho e^{-\phi})| + |\partial D_t^3 \rho^2| \\
& \lesssim \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 1, 0 \leq j \leq 3} |\partial^i D_t^j (\rho, \phi)| |\partial^{1-i} D_t^{3-j} (\rho, \phi)| + M^2 |D_t^2 \phi| \\
& \quad + M |(D_t^2, \partial D_t) (\rho, \phi)| |D_t \phi| + (|\partial D_t (\rho, \phi)| + M^2) |D_t \phi|^2 + M |D_t \phi|^3, \\
|D_t^3 \partial \Delta \phi| & \lesssim |D_t^3 \partial e^{-\phi}| + |D_t^3 \partial \rho| \lesssim |D_t^3 \partial (\rho, \phi)| + M |D_t^2 \phi| |D_t \phi|
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 3, 0 \leq j \leq 1, 1 \leq i+j \leq 3} |D_t^i \partial^j \phi| |D_t^{3-i} \partial^{1-j} \phi| + |D_t \partial \phi| |D_t \phi|^2 + M |D_t \phi|^3.$$

We use the following estimates to prove (5.3e) and (5.3c), respectively.

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial^3 D_t(\rho \Delta \phi)| &\lesssim |\partial^3 D_t(\rho e^{-\phi})| + |\partial^3 D_t \rho^2| \lesssim M^2 |\partial D_t(\rho, \phi)| + M^3 |D_t(\rho, \phi)| \\ &+ \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 3, 0 \leq j \leq 1} |\partial^i D_t^j(\rho, \phi)| |\partial^{3-i} D_t^{1-j}(\rho, \phi)| + M |\partial^2(\rho, \phi)| |D_t(\rho, \phi)|, \\ |D_t^5(\rho \Delta \phi)| &\lesssim |D_t^5(\rho e^{-\phi})| + |D_t^5 \rho^2| \lesssim \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 5} |D_t^i(\rho, \phi)| |D_t^{5-i}(\rho, \phi)| \\ &+ |D_t^3(\rho, \phi)| |D_t(\rho, \phi)|^2 + |D_t^2(\rho, \phi)| (|D_t^2 \phi| |D_t(\rho, \phi)| + |D_t(\rho, \phi)|^3) \\ &+ |D_t \phi|^4 |D_t(\rho, \phi)|. \end{aligned}$$

For $|\partial^5 h|_{L^2}$, it follows from $\Delta(h - \phi) = -\operatorname{div} D_t v = -D_t \operatorname{div} v - (\partial_i v^k) \partial_k v^i$ that

$$|\partial^4 \Delta(h - \phi)| \lesssim |D_t \partial^4 \operatorname{div} v| + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} |\partial^i v| |\partial^{6-i} v|,$$

which implies, due to $|\Pi \partial^5(h - \phi)|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim M \mathcal{E}$, that

$$|\partial^5(h - \phi)|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, \bar{L}, \tilde{L})(\mathcal{E}^4 + \mathcal{E}^3 + \mathcal{E}^2 + \mathcal{E}).$$

This, together with the bound obtained for $|\partial^5 \phi|_{L^2}$ in (5.2h), gives the desired bound for $|\partial^5 h|_{L^2}$. The bound for $\|\partial^5 D_t h\|_{L^2}^2$ (and hence $|\partial^4 D_t h|_{L^2}$) follows from

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial^5 D_t h| &\lesssim \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 5} M^{5-i} (|\partial^i D_t p| + M |\partial^i \rho|) + |\partial^2 \rho|^2 (|\partial D_t p| \\ &+ M^2) + |\partial^3 \rho| |\partial^2 \rho| + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3, 2 \leq j \leq 5-i} M^{5-i-j} |\partial^i D_t p| |\partial^j \rho|. \end{aligned}$$

Note that on $\partial \mathcal{D}_t$,

$$|\partial_N D_t h| = |(\partial_N \rho^{-1}) D_t p + \rho^{-1} \partial_N D_t p| = |\rho^{-1} \partial_N D_t p| \leq 4L \quad (5.5)$$

then we can use (2.6), and the bound obtained for $|\partial^i D_t h|_{L^2}$ ($1 \leq i \leq 4$) and $|\bar{\partial}^i \theta|_{L^2}$ ($1 \leq i \leq 3$) to prove (5.3g). This finishes the proof of the lemma. \square

5.2 Energy estimates

Proposition 5.6 *It holds that*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{E} \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, L, \bar{L}, \tilde{L}) \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 7} \mathcal{E}^i. \quad (5.6)$$

Proof. It follows from (1.9) that for $r \geq 1$,

$$D_t \partial^r v + \partial^{r+1}(h(\rho) - \phi) = [D_t, \partial^r] v,$$

which implies that

$$2^{-1} D_t (\delta^{mn} \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r v_m) \partial_J^r v_n)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \delta^{mn} \zeta^{IJ} (D_t \partial_I^r v_m) \partial_J^r v_n + 2^{-1} \delta^{mn} (D_t \zeta^{IJ}) (\partial_I^r v_m) \partial_J^r v_n \\
&= \mathcal{A}_r - \operatorname{div} (\zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r (h(\rho) - \phi)) \partial_J^r v),
\end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_r &= \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r (h(\rho) - \phi)) \partial_J^r \operatorname{div} v + \delta^{mn} \{2^{-1} (D_t \zeta^{IJ}) \partial_I^r v_m \\
&\quad + (\partial_m \zeta^{IJ}) \partial_I^r (h(\rho) - \phi) + \zeta^{IJ} [D_t, \partial_I^r] v_m\} \partial_J^r v_n.
\end{aligned}$$

Due to $\partial_m (h(\rho) - \phi) = N_m \partial_N (h(\rho) - \phi)$ on $\partial \mathcal{D}_t$, we have on $\partial \mathcal{D}_t$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&2^{-1} D_t ((\partial_N (h(\rho) - \phi))^{-1} \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r (h(\rho) - \phi)) \partial_J^r (h(\rho) - \phi)) \\
&= (\partial_N (h(\rho) - \phi))^{-1} \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r (h(\rho) - \phi)) D_t \partial_J^r (h(\rho) - \phi) \\
&\quad + 2^{-1} (D_t ((\partial_N (h(\rho) - \phi))^{-1} \zeta^{IJ})) (\partial_I^r (h(\rho) - \phi)) \partial_J^r (h(\rho) - \phi) \\
&= \mathcal{B}_r - (\partial_N (h(\rho) - \phi))^{-1} \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r (h(\rho) - \phi)) (\partial_J^r v^m) \partial_m (h(\rho) - \phi) \\
&= \mathcal{B}_r - N_m \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r (h(\rho) - \phi)) \partial_J^r v^m,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{B}_r &= (\partial_N (h(\rho) - \phi))^{-1} \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r (h(\rho) - \phi)) \{D_t \partial_J^r (h(\rho) - \phi) \\
&\quad - \partial_J^r D_t (h(\rho) - \phi) + (\partial_J^r v^m) \partial_m (h(\rho) - \phi)\} \\
&\quad + (\partial_N (h(\rho) - \phi))^{-1} \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r (h(\rho) - \phi)) \partial_J^r D_t (h(\rho) - \phi) \\
&\quad + 2^{-1} (D_t ((\partial_N (h(\rho) - \phi))^{-1} \zeta^{IJ})) (\partial_I^r (h(\rho) - \phi)) \partial_J^r (h(\rho) - \phi).
\end{aligned}$$

In view of $\int_{\mathcal{D}_t} \operatorname{div} (\zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r (h(\rho) - \phi)) \partial_J^r v) dx = \int_{\partial \mathcal{D}_t} N_m \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r (h(\rho) - \phi)) \partial_J^r v^m ds$, (2.14), (5.7) and (5.8), we see that for $r \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt} E_r &= \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} \{D_t (\delta^{mn} \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r v_m) \partial_J^r v_n) + \delta^{mn} \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r v_m) (\partial_J^r v_n) \operatorname{div} v\} dx \\
&\quad + \int_{\partial \mathcal{D}_t} \{D_t (|\Pi \partial^r (\phi - h(\rho))|^2 (\partial_N (\phi - h(\rho)))^{-1}) \\
&\quad - |\Pi \partial^r (\phi - h(\rho))|^2 (\partial_N (\phi - h(\rho)))^{-1} N^i \partial_N v_i\} ds = \mathcal{X}_r,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
E_r &= \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} \delta^{mn} \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r v_m) \partial_J^r v_n dx \\
&\quad + \int_{\partial \mathcal{D}_t} |\Pi \partial^r (\phi - h(\rho))|^2 (\partial_N (\phi - h(\rho)))^{-1} ds, \\
\mathcal{X}_r &= \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} \{2\mathcal{A}_r + \delta^{mn} \zeta^{IJ} (\partial_I^r v_m) (\partial_J^r v_n) \operatorname{div} v\} dx - \int_{\partial \mathcal{D}_t} \{2\mathcal{B}_r \\
&\quad + |\Pi \partial^r (\phi - h(\rho))|^2 (\partial_N (\phi - h(\rho)))^{-1} N^i \partial_N v_i\} ds.
\end{aligned}$$

In a similar way to proving (3.44) and (3.46), we use (5.2)-(5.5) to obtain that for $1 \leq r \leq 5$,

$$\|\mathcal{A}_r\|_{L^1} + |\mathcal{B}_r|_{L^1} \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, L, \bar{L}, \tilde{L}) \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 7} \mathcal{E}^i, \tag{5.10}$$

where we have used

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{A}_r| &\lesssim |\partial^r(h - \phi)| |\partial^r \operatorname{div} v| + (M |\partial^r v| + K |\partial^r(h - \phi)| \\
&\quad + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq r} |\partial^i v| |\partial^{r+1-i} v|) |\partial^r v|, \\
|\mathcal{B}_r| &\leq C(\epsilon_b^{-1}, M, L, \bar{L}) |\partial^r(h - \phi)| (|\Pi \partial^r D_t(h - \phi)| \\
&\quad + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq r-1} |\partial^i v| |\partial^{r+1-i}(h - \phi)| + |\partial^r(h - \phi)|).
\end{aligned}$$

Substitute (5.10) into (5.9) to give that for $1 \leq r \leq 5$,

$$\frac{d}{dt} E_r \leq C(M, K, K_1, \epsilon_b^{-1}, L, \bar{L}, \tilde{L}) \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 7} \mathcal{E}^i.$$

This proves (5.6), since the rest terms contained in \mathcal{E} can be dealt with by the same idea of Lemma 3.10 and Proposition 4.6. \square

5.3 Proof of Theorem 5.1

The proof follows from Proposition 5.7, which is stated as follows.

Proposition 5.7 *There exists a continuous function $\bar{T} > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned}
2^{-1} \operatorname{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0 &\leq \operatorname{Vol} \mathcal{D}_t \leq 2 \operatorname{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0, \\
2^{-1} \underline{\varrho} &\leq \rho(t, x) \leq 2 \bar{\varrho}, \quad x \in \mathcal{D}_t, \\
-\partial_N p(t, x) &\geq 2^{-1} \epsilon_1, \quad x \in \partial \mathcal{D}_t, \\
\iota_1^{-1}(t) &\leq 16 K_0, \quad \mathcal{E}(t) \leq 2 \mathcal{E}(0), \\
\|\partial(v, p, s)(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} &\leq 2 \|\partial(v, p, s)(0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty}, \\
|\theta(t, \cdot)|_{L^\infty} + \iota_0^{-1}(t) &\leq C(\underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \epsilon_1^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}(0)), \\
|\partial_N D_t p(t, \cdot)|_{L^\infty} + |\partial_N D_t^2 p(t, \cdot)|_{L^\infty} &\leq C(\underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \bar{s}, \epsilon_1^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}(0), \operatorname{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0)
\end{aligned}$$

for $t \leq \bar{T}(\underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \epsilon_1^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}(0), \operatorname{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0)$.

Proof. The most part of the proof is the same as that of Proposition 3.11. As shown in Proposition 3.11, we can prove that there exists a continuous function $\tilde{T} > 0$ such that

$$2^{-1} \operatorname{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0 \leq \operatorname{Vol} \mathcal{D}_t \leq 2 \operatorname{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0, \tag{5.11a}$$

$$2^{-1} \underline{\varrho} \leq \rho(t, x) \leq 2 \bar{\varrho}, \quad x \in \mathcal{D}_t, \tag{5.11b}$$

$$\partial_N(\phi - h)(t, x) \geq 2^{-1} \epsilon_1, \quad x \in \partial \mathcal{D}_t, \tag{5.11c}$$

$$\iota_1^{-1}(t) \leq 16 K_0, \quad \mathcal{E}(t) \leq 2 \mathcal{E}(0), \tag{5.11d}$$

$$\|\partial(v, p, \phi)(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} \leq 2 \|\partial(v, p, \phi)(0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty}, \tag{5.11e}$$

for $t \leq \tilde{T}(K, L, \bar{L}, \tilde{L}, \underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \epsilon_1^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}(0), \operatorname{Vol} \mathcal{D}_0)$, where we have used (5.5).

It follows from (2.8a), (2.12a), (5.2a), (5.2b) and (5.11) that for $t \leq \tilde{T}$,

$$|\theta(t, \cdot)|_{L^\infty} \leq |(\partial_N(\phi - h))^{-1}(t, \cdot)|_{L^\infty} |\partial^2(\phi - h)(t, \cdot)|_{L^\infty}$$

$$\leq C_1(\underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \varepsilon_1^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}(0)),$$

which implies, with the help of (2.1) and (5.11d), that for $t \leq \tilde{T}$,

$$\iota_0^{-1}(t) \leq \max\{32K_0, C_1(\underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \varepsilon_1^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}(0))\}.$$

So, we may choose

$$K = 64K_0 + 4C_1(\underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \varepsilon_1^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}(0)). \quad (5.12)$$

In a similar way to deriving (3.68), we use (2.10), (5.2c), (3.33), (5.11) and (5.12) to obtain that for $t \leq \tilde{T}$,

$$|\partial_N D_t \phi(t, \cdot)|_{L^\infty} \leq C_2(\underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \varepsilon_1^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}(0), \text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_0).$$

Similarly, we use (2.10), (5.2a), (5.2d), (5.11) and (5.12) to get that for $t \leq \tilde{T}$,

$$|\partial_N D_t p(t, \cdot)|_{L^\infty} \leq C_3(\underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \varepsilon_1^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}(0), \text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_0).$$

Again, we use (2.10), (5.2d), (4.6), (5.4), (4.14) and (4.15) to obtain that for $t \leq \tilde{T}$,

$$|\partial_N D_t^2 p(t, \cdot)|_{L^\infty} \leq C_4(\underline{\varrho}^{-1}, \bar{\varrho}, \varepsilon_1^{-1}, K_0, \mathcal{E}(0), \text{Vol}\mathcal{D}_0).$$

This finishes the proof of the proposition by choosing $\bar{L} = 2C_2$, $L = 2C_3$ and $\tilde{L} = 2C_4$. \square

Acknowledgement

Luo's research is supported by a grant from the Research Grants Council of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China (Project No. 11306621). Trivisa gratefully acknowledges the support of the National Science Foundation under the awards DMS-1614964 and DMS-2008568. Zeng's research is supported in part by NSFC Grants 12171267 and 11822107. This research was initiated during Luo's visit to the University of Maryland, College Park and Tsinghua University.

References

- [1] Alazard, T., Burq, N., Zuily, C.: On the water waves equations with surface tension. *Duke Math. J.* 158(3), 413-499, 2011.
- [2] Alazard, T.; Burq, N.; Zuily, C.: On the Cauchy problem for gravity water waves. *Invent. Math.* 198 (2014), no. 1, 71-163.
- [3] Alazard, T. & Delort, J.-M., Global solutions and asymptotic behavior for two dimensional gravity water waves. *Ann. Sci. Ec. Norm. Super.*, 48 (2015), 1149–1238.
- [4] Alazard, T. & Delort, J.-M., Sobolev estimates for two dimensional gravity water waves. *Asterisque*, 374 (2015), 241 pp.
- [5] Ambrose, D.M., Masmoudi, N.: The zero surface tension limit of two-dimensional water waves. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 58(10), 1287–1315 (2005)
 applications aal'hydrodynamique des fluides parfaits. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* 16 (1966), no. 1, 316–361.

- [6] Beale, J.T., Hou, T.Y., Lowengrub, J.S.: Growth rates for the linearized motion of fluid interfaces away from equilibrium. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **46**(9), 1269–1301 (1993)
- [7] L. Bieri, S. Miao, S. Shahshahani, and S. Wu, On the motion of a self-gravitating incompressible fluid with free boundary. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 355(1):161–243, 2017.
- [8] Blokhin, A.; Trakhinin, Y. Stability of strong discontinuities in fluids and MHD. *Handbook of mathematical fluid dynamics*, Vol. 1, 545–652. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2002.
- [9] Castro, A.; Cordoba, D.; Fefferman, C.; Gancedo, F.; Gomez-Serrano, J.: Finite time singularities for the free boundary incompressible Euler equations. *Ann. of Math. (2)* 178 (2013), no. 3, 1061-1134.
- [10] Christodoulou, D., Lindblad, H.: On the motion of the free surface of a liquid. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **53**(12), 1536–1602 (2000)
- [11] Coutand, Daniel; Hole, Jason; Shkoller, Steve: Well-posedness of the free-boundary compressible 3-D Euler equations with surface tension and the zero surface tension limit. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 45 (2013), no. 6, 3690–3767.
- [12] Coutand, D., Shkoller, S.: Well-posedness of the free-surface incompressible Euler equations with or without surface tension. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **20**(3), 829–930 (2007).
- [13] Coutand, D., Shkoller, S.: Well-posedness in smooth function spaces for the moving- boundary 1-D compressible Euler equations in physical vacuum, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **64**, 328–366 (2011).
- [14] Coutand, D., Shkoller, S.: Well-Posedness in Smooth Function Spaces for the Moving-Boundary Three-Dimensional Compressible Euler Equations in Physical Vacuum, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **206**, 515–616 (2012).
- [15] Coutand, Daniel; Shkoller, Steve, On the finite-time splash and splat singularities for the 3-D free-surface Euler equations. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 325 (2014), no. 1, 143–83.
- [16] Deng, Yu; Ionescu, Alexandru D.; Pausader, Benoit; Pusateri, Fabio , Global solutions of the gravity-capillary water-wave system in three dimensions. *Acta Math.* 219 (2017), no. 2, 213–402.
- [17] Ebin, D.G.: The equations of motion of a perfect fluid with free boundary are not well posed. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **12**(10), 1175–1201 (1987)
- [18] Germain, P.; Masmoudi, N.; Shatah, J. Global solutions for the gravity water waves equation in dimension 3. *Ann. of Math. (2)* 175 (2012), no. 2, 691-754.
- [19] Gu, Xumin; Lei, Zhen Local well-posedness of the three dimensional compressible Euler-Poisson equations with physical vacuum. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)* 105 (2016), no. 5, 662–723
- [20] Guo, Yan; Hadzic Mahir; Jang, Juhi: Continued gravitational collapse for Newtonian stars. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 239 (2021), no. 1, 431–552.
- [21] Mahir Hadzic, Juhi Jang: Nonlinear stability of expanding star solutions in the radially-symmetric mass-critical Euler-Poisson system, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **71** (2018), 827–891.

- [22] Mahir Hadzic, Juhi Jang: Expanding large global solutions of the equations of compressible fluid mechanics, *Invent. Math.* **214** (2018), 1205–1266.
- [23] Ginsberg, Daniel; Lindblad, Hans; Luo, Chenyun, Local well-posedness for the motion of a compressible, self-gravitating liquid with free surface boundary. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 236 (2020), no. 2, 603–733.
- [24] C. Hao & T. Luo, Free Boundary Problem of Incompressible Inviscid Magnetohydrodynamic Flows, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 212 (2014), no. 3, 805–847.
- [25] C. Hao & D. Wang, A Priori Estimates for the Free Boundary Problem of Incompressible Neo-Hookean Elastodynamics, *J. Differential Equations* 261 (2016), 712–737.
- [26] Ifrim, M. & Tataru, D., Two dimensional water waves in holomorphic coordinates II: Global solutions. *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, 144 (2016), 369–394.
- [27] Ifrim, M. & Tataru, D., The lifespan of small data solutions in two dimensional capillary water waves. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 225 (2017), 1279–1346.
- [28] Ifrim, M. ; Tataru, D. Two-dimensional gravity water waves with constant vorticity I: Cubic lifespan. *Anal. PDE* 12 (2019), no. 4, 903–967.
- [29] Ionescu, A. D. & Pusateri, F., Global solutions for the gravity water waves system in 2d. *Invent. Math.*, 199 (2015), 653–804.
- [30] Ionescu, A. D. & Pusateri, F., Global analysis of a model for capillary water waves in two dimensions. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 69 (2016), 2015–2071.
- [31] Ionescu, A. D. & Pusateri, F., Global regularity for 2d water waves with surface tension. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* 256 (2018), no. 1227, v+124 pp.
- [32] Ionescu, A. D.; Pusateri, F. Long-time existence for multi-dimensional periodic water waves. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 29 (2019), no. 3, 811–870.
- [33] Jang, J., Masmoudi, N.: Well-posedness of compressible Euler equations in a physical vacuum, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 68 (2015), no. 1, 61–111.
- [34] Jang, Juhi , Nonlinear instability theory of Lane-Emden stars. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 67 (2014), no. 9, 1418–1465.
- [35] Lannes, D.: Well-posedness of the water waves equations. *J. Am. Math. Soc.* 18(3), 605–54 (2005) .
- [36] Lannes, D.: The water waves problem: mathematical analysis and asymptotics. In: *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*, vol. 188. American Mathematical Society Providence, RI, (2013)
- [37] Lieberman, M.A., Lichtenberg, A.J.: Principles of plasma discharge and materials processing. A Wiley-Interscience Publication, New York: (1994)
- [38] Lindblad, H.: Well-posedness for the motion of an incompressible liquid with free surface boundary. *Ann. of Math. (2)* **162**(1), 109–194 (2005)

- [39] Lindblad, H.: Well posedness for the motion of a compressible liquid with free surface boundary. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 260, 319-392 (2005)
- [40] Lindblad, H. & Luo, C., A priori Estimates for the Compressible Euler Equations for a Liquid with Free Surface Boundary and the Incompressible Limit, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 71 (2018), no. 7, 1273–1333.
- [41] Lindblad, H., Nordgren, K.H.: A priori estimates for the motion of a self-gravitating incompressible liquid with free surface boundary. *J. Hyperbolic Differ. Equ.* **6**(2), 407–432 (2009).
- [42] Luo, Chenyun, On the motion of a compressible gravity water wave with vorticity. *Ann. PDE* 4 (2018), no. 2
- [43] T. Luo, H. Zeng, On the Free Surface Motion of Highly Subsonic Heat-Conducting Inviscid Flows. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 240 (2021), no. 2, 877–926.
- [44] T. Luo, Z. Xin and H. Zeng, Well-Posedness for the Motion of Physical Vacuum of the Three-dimensional Compressible Euler Equations with or without Self-Gravitation, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 213 (2014), 763-831.
- [45] Luo, T., Zeng, H.: Global Existence of Smooth Solutions and Convergence to Barenblatt Solutions for the Physical Vacuum Free Boundary Problem of Compressible Euler Equations with Damping, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 69 (2016), 1354–1396.
- [46] Majda, A. The existence of multidimensional shock fronts. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* 43 (1983), no. 281.
- [47] de Poyferre, T. & Nguyen, Q.-H., A paradifferential reduction for the gravity-capillary waves system at low regularity and applications. *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, 145 (2017), 643–710.
- [48] Ming, Mei; Wang, Chao, Water-waves problem with surface tension in a corner domain II: the local well-posedness. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 74 (2021), no. 2, 225–285.
- [49] Métivier, G. Stability of multidimensional shocks. *Advances in the theory of shock waves*, 255C103. *Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and Their Applications*, 47. Birkhouser, Boston, 2001
- [50] Shatah, J., Zeng, C.: Geometry and a priori estimates for free boundary problems of the Euler equation. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **61**(5), 698–744 (2008).
- [51] Shatah, J., Zeng, C.: A priori estimates for fluid interface problems. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 61(6), 848–876 (2008).
- [52] Shatah, J., Zeng, C.: Local well-posedness for fluid interface problems. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 199(2), 653–705 (2011).
- [53] Su, Qingtang, Long time behavior of 2d water waves with point vortices, arXiv:1812.00540 .
- [54] Trakhinin, Y.: Local existence for the free boundary problem for the non-relativistic and relativistic compressible Euler equations with a vacuum boundary condition. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* 62, 1551-1594 (2009).

- [55] X. Wang, Global solutions for the gravity water waves system: infinite depth setting and flat bottom setting, Ph.D. thesis, Princeton University, 2016, available at <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1845307995>.
- [56] Wu, S.: Well-posedness in Sobolev spaces of the full water wave problem in 2-D. *Invent. Math.* **130**(1), 39–72 (1997)
- [57] Wu, S.: Well-posedness in Sobolev spaces of the full water wave problem in 3-D. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **12**(2), 445–495 (1999).
- [58] Wu, Sijue, Almost global wellposedness of the 2-D full water wave problem. *Invent. Math.* 177 (2009), no. 1, 45–135.
- [59] Wu, Sijue, Global wellposedness of the 3-D full water wave problem. *Invent. Math.* 184 (2011), no. 1, 125–220.
- [60] Wu, Sijue, On a class of self-similar 2D surface water waves, arXiv: 1206.2208.
- [61] Zhang, P., Zhang, Z.: On the free boundary problem of three-dimensional incompressible Euler equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **61**(7), 877–940 (2008).
- [62] H. Zeng: Global Resolution of the Physical Vacuum Singularity for 3-D Isentropic Inviscid Flows with Damping in Spherically Symmetric Motions, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 226 (2017), 33–82.
- [63] Zeng, Huihui: Almost global solutions to the three-dimensional isentropic inviscid flows with damping in a physical vacuum around Barenlatt solutions. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 239 (2021), no. 1, 553–597.

Tao Luo
 Department of Mathematics,
 City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong
 E-mail: taoluo@cityu.edu.hk

Konstantina Trivisa
 Department of Mathematics,
 University of Maryland, College Park, USA
 E-mail: trivisa@math.umd.edu

Huihui Zeng
 Department of Mathematical Sciences,
 Tsinghua University,
 Beijing, 100084, China
 Email : hhzeng@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn