

Homogeneous incompressible Bingham viscoplastic as a limit of bi-viscosity fluids

Wassim Aboussi^{1,2*}, Fayssal Benkhaldoun¹, Ahmed Aberqi³, Abdallah Bradji⁴ and Jaouad Bennouna²

^{1*} Laboratory LAGA, CNRS, UMR 7539, Sorbonne Paris Nord University, Villetaneuse, France.

² Laboratory LAMA, Sidi Mohamed Ben Abdellah University, Faculty of Sciences Dhar El Mahraz, Fez, Morocco.

³ Laboratory LAMA, Sidi Mohamed Ben Abdellah University, National School of Applied Sciences, Fez, Morocco.

⁴ Laboratory LMA, University of Annaba, Faculty of Sciences, Annaba, Algeria.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s):

aboussi@math.univ-paris13.fr;

Contributing authors: fayssal@math.univ-paris13.fr;

aberqi_ahmed@yahoo.fr; abdallah.bradji@gmail.com;

jbennouna@hotmail.com;

Abstract

In this paper, the existence of a weak solution for homogeneous incompressible Bingham fluid is investigated. The rheology of such a fluid is defined by a yield stress τ_y and a discontinuous stress-strain law. This non-Newtonian fluid behaves like a solid at low stresses and like a non-linear fluid above the yield stress. In this work we propose to build a weak solution for Navier stokes Bingham equations using a bi-viscosity fluid as an approximation, in particular, we proved that the bi-viscosity tensor converges weakly to the Bingham tensor. This choice allowed us to show the existence of solutions for a given data $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbf{L}^2(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{T}; \mathbf{V}')$.

Keywords: Incompressible non-Newtonian fluid, Non-Newtonian fluid approximation, weak solution, Navier-Stokes systems, Bingham viscoplastic, existence of solutions.

MSC Classification(2020): 76A05 , 35Q30 , 76B03 , 76N06.

1 Introduction

As well known, the motion of a homogeneous incompressible fluid is governed by the Navier-Stokes system, which describes the balance of mass and momentum. The classical form of this equation is restricted to fluids whose stress-strain relationship is linear. This category of fluids is called Newtonian fluids. They have a simple molecular structure, e.g., water, air, and alcohol. The mathematical analysis of the Newtonian Navier Stokes equations are one of the leading research topics that attract the attention of researchers because of the many open questions around this system (see [7, 22, 14, 13]).

To study more complex fluids, such as molten plastics, synthetic fibres, biological fluids, paints, and greases, etc., it is necessary to consider a generalized Navier Stokes system that models the behavior of fluids whose viscosity depends on the rate of deformation (i.e., non-Newtonian fluids). This complex behavior is translated into a mathematical complexity which gives rise to complex stress-strain laws, such as the Carreau-Yasuda, Bingham, power law, Cross, Casson, Herschel-Bulkley, etc., for more details on the rheology and the non-Newtonian models, consult [9, 16, 17]. A rigorous mathematical existence theory for non-Newtonian fluids can be found in [8]. Among the various classes of non-Newtonian materials, those exhibiting viscoplastic properties are particularly interesting by their ability to strain only if the stress rate exceeds a minimum value. Many industrial processes involve viscoplastic fluid: mud, cement slurries, emulsions, foams, etc... The most commonly used model to account for this particular behavior is the Bingham model [6]. Eugene Bingham gave the initial mathematical expression in 1922 for one-dimensional flows. Later, Prager [20, 21] showed a generalized tensor formulation for multidimensional flows. From an analytical and numerical viewpoint, we cannot directly study the Navier Stokes Bingham problem since the stress tensor is unexplicit below the yield stress, moreover is a discontinuous operator (which prevents the use of [11]). Duvaut and Lions [12] exclude the stress tensor by passing to a variational inequality for the velocity field to overcome these difficulties. Another solution was proposed by Basov and Shelukhin [3], they proved the existence of weak solutions of the nonhomogeneous incompressible equation by using the Bercovier and Engelman model [4] as an approximation of the Bingham fluid. In [24], Shelukhin used the same approach but with a different approximate tensor.

Our work is based on the approximation of the Bingham tensor by the bi-viscosity tensor, which can be used for numerical simulation (see [5, 9, 15, 1]). Other regularization choices are possible, such as the Papanastasiou model [19] or the algebraic model proposed by Allouche et al. [2]. The reasons behind our choice is that the bi-viscosity operator is coercive, growing, monotonic and continuous, which are the conditions of an existence theorem given by [11]. The idea is to construct a sequence of approximate solutions using the bi-viscosity regularization and the theorem 1 [11], then pass to the limit to prove the existence of a weak solution.

In section 2, we give the setting of the problem and the functional spaces, then we present our theorem and we give some remarks about the weak formulation. The proof is shared over three sections; the first step is provided in section 3, where we propose an approximate problem and obtain a sequence of approximate solutions. The aim of section 4 is to prove various compactness results on the approximate solutions. Section 5 is devoted to passing to the limit in the approximate problem; in particular, we prove that the bi-viscosity tensor converges weakly to the Bingham tensor. In the last section, we prove the uniqueness of solutions.

2 Setting of the problem and main result

Let Ω be a smooth domain in \mathbb{R}^2 with Lipschitz boundary and Ω_T the open set $\Omega \times (0, T)$, where $T > 0$ is the final time.

We consider an unsteady flow of incompressible Bingham fluid in 2D which is governed by the following Navier-Stokes system

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u + (u \cdot \nabla)u - \nabla \cdot (\tau(Du)) + \nabla p = f & \text{in } \Omega_T, \\ \nabla \cdot u = 0 & \text{in } \Omega_T. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Here, u is the velocity vector, p is the pressure, and τ is the stress tensor where the strain tensor (shear tensor) is defined as

$$Du = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla u + \nabla u^t),$$

and $f : \Omega_T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ represents the external forces (such as gravity). The system (1) is equipped with the following initial condition

$$u(\cdot, 0) = u_0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad (2)$$

and the homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition

$$u = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T). \quad (3)$$

The Bingham stress-strain constitutive law is defined as

$$\begin{cases} \tau(Du) = \left(2\mu + \frac{\tau_y}{|Du|}\right) Du & \text{if } |\tau| > \tau_y, \\ Du = 0 & \text{if } |\tau| \leq \tau_y. \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Here, μ is the viscosity, τ_y is the yield stress and $|A|^2 = A : A$, where the inner product is defined as $A : B = \sum_{i,j} A_{ij}B_{ij}$. The Bingham tensor can be written

as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \tau(Du) = \left(2\mu + \frac{\tau_y}{|Du|}\right) Du & \text{if } Du \neq 0, \\ |\tau| \leq \tau_y & \text{if } Du = 0. \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

Let us choose some spaces. Let X be a Banach space, for each $1 \leq p < \infty$, we defined the following function spaces :

$$H = \{v \in L^2(\Omega), \nabla \cdot v = 0, \quad v \cdot n|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\},$$

$$V = \{v \in H_0^1(\Omega), \nabla \cdot v = 0\}.$$

These two spaces are Hilbert spaces equipped with the scalar products respectively induced by those of $L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^2)$ and of $H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^2)$, i.e

$$\|v\|_H^2 = \int_{\Omega} |v|^2 dx \quad \text{and} \quad \|v\|_V^2 = \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^2 dx,$$

We also use the following Bochner spaces:

$$L^p(0, T; X) = \left\{v \text{ measurable from } (0, T) \text{ into } X, \|v\|_{L^p(0, T; X)}^p < \infty\right\},$$

$$L^\infty(0, T; X) = \left\{v \text{ measurable from } (0, T) \text{ into } X, \|v\|_{L^\infty(0, T; X)} < \infty\right\},$$

where $\|v\|_{L^p(0, T; X)}^p = \int_0^T \|v\|_X^p$ and $\|v\|_{L^\infty(0, T; X)} = \sup_{t \in (0, T)} \|v\|_X$. The space

$E_{2,2}(V) = \{v \in L^2(0, T; V), \partial_t v \in L^2(0, T; V')\}$, is a Banach space equipped with the norm

$$\|v\|_{E_{2,2}} = \|v\|_{L^2(0, T, V)} + \|\partial_t v\|_{L^2(0, T, V')}.$$

Where V' is the topological dual of V , and we denote by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ the duality bracket between V and V' .

As in [11], we call $(u, \tau(Du)) \in E_{2,2} \times L^2(\Omega_T)$ a weak solution of the problem (1)-(4), if u satisfies (2) and for all $\varphi \in L^2(0, T; V)$ we have

$$\int_0^T \langle \partial_t u, \varphi \rangle + \int_{\Omega_T} \tau(Du) : D\varphi + \int_{\Omega_T} (u \cdot \nabla)u \cdot \varphi = \int_0^T \langle f, \varphi \rangle. \quad (6)$$

A similar formulation is given in [7], for the Navier Stokes equation in 2D.

The main result of this work is the following theorem.

Theorem 1 *Assume that $f \in L^2(0, T; V')$ and $u_0 \in H$, then the Navier Stokes equation for a Bingham fluid (1)-(4), has a weak solution such that*

$$u \in L^2(0, T; V) \cap L^\infty(0, T; H), \quad \partial_t u \in L^2(0, T; V'), \quad \tau(Du) \in L^2(\Omega_T).$$

- Remarks 1.** *Theorem 1, ensure the existence of a classical weak solution $(u, p) \in E_{2,2} \times \mathcal{D}'(\Omega_T)$, for the system (1)-(4). Indeed, if we define the distribution $T = \partial_t u + (u \cdot \nabla)u - \nabla \cdot (\tau(Du)) - f$, according to (6), we can take $\varphi \in \{\mathcal{D}(\Omega_T), \nabla \cdot \varphi = 0\}$, and we have $\langle T, \varphi \rangle = 0$. On the other hand, the De Rham theorem¹ [10, p. 114] ensures the existence of a primitive of any distribution that cancels on all test functions with null divergence (see [7, th. IV.2.5]). Then, we obtain the existence of $p \in \mathcal{D}'(\Omega_T)$ where $T = -\nabla p$, which implies the existence of functions (u, p) solution of (1)-(4) in $\mathcal{D}'(\Omega_T)$.*
2. *We note that this weak formulation is different from the one proposed in [24], where f must belong to $L^2(\Omega_T)$, but in our case, f belongs to $L^2(0, T, V')$.*
 3. *The Lions-Magenes theorem [7], implies that the weak solution u is continuous from $[0, T]$ into H .*

3 Approximate solutions

In this section, we will build an approximate problem by regularizing the Bingham tensor (4), with another operator that approximates the physical behavior of Bingham fluids and has some analytical properties. The regularizing tensor is given by the bi-viscosity model :

$$\tau_m(A) = \begin{cases} 2m\mu A & \text{if } |A| \leq \gamma_m, \\ \left(2\mu + \frac{\tau_y}{|A|}\right) A & \text{if } |A| > \gamma_m. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Where $A \in \mathbb{M}^{2 \times 2}$ and $\gamma_m = \frac{\tau_y}{2\mu(m-1)}$, $m \geq 2$. The idea of this approximation is to consider the Bingham fluid when $|\tau| \leq \tau_y$ (which is practically solid) as a highly viscous Newtonian fluid, by involving a second artificial viscosity $\mu_m = m\mu$. Therefore, the equation (8) can be viewed as an approximation of (6).

Theorem 2 *Assume that $f \in L^2(0, T; V')$ and $u_0 \in H$, then the approximate problem (1)-(3), (7), has at least a solution $u_m \in E_{2,2}$ in the following sense :*

$$\int_0^T \langle \partial_t u_m, \varphi \rangle + \int_{\Omega_T} \tau_m(Du_m) : D\varphi + \int_{\Omega_T} (u_m \cdot \nabla)u_m \cdot \varphi = \int_0^T \langle f, \varphi \rangle, \quad (8)$$

for all $\varphi \in L^2(0, T; V)$. Moreover, u_m is continuous from $[0, T]$ into H .

Proof This result is an application of theorem 1, proved by Dreyfuss and Hungerbühler in [11], in other words, we will check the hypotheses (NS0)-(NS2) given in [11].

Clearly, τ_m satisfies (NS0) since it is a continuous function, which justifies the choice of γ_m . It is easy to prove that $\tau_m(A) : A \geq 2\mu|A|^2$ and that $|\tau_m(A)| \leq \tau_y + 2\mu|A|$, so τ_m satisfied the growth and the coercive hypotheses (NS1).

To prove the strict monotonicity of τ_m , i.e. $(\tau_m(A) - \tau_m(B)) : (A - B) > 0$,

¹A constructive proof of the theorem is given by Simon in [25].

$\forall A \neq B \in \mathbb{M}^{2 \times 2}$, we distinguish three cases:

Case 1: if $|A| \leq \gamma_m$, $|B| \leq \gamma_m$ and $A \neq B$, then

$$(\tau_m(A) - \tau_m(B)) : (A - B) = 2m\mu|A - B|^2 > 0. \quad (9)$$

Case 2: if $|A| > \gamma_m$, $|B| > \gamma_m$ and $A \neq B$ so

$$\begin{aligned} (\tau_m(A) - \tau_m(B)) : (A - B) &= \left(\left(\frac{\tau_y}{|A|} + 2\mu \right) A - \left(\frac{\tau_y}{|B|} + 2\mu \right) B \right) : (A - B) \\ &= 2\mu|A - B|^2 + \tau_y|A| + \tau_y|B| - \left(\frac{\tau_y}{|A|} + \frac{\tau_y}{|B|} \right) A : B. \end{aligned}$$

By using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (\tau_m(A) - \tau_m(B)) : (A - B) &\geq 2\mu|A - B|^2 + \tau_y|A| + \tau_y|B| \\ &\quad - \left(\frac{\tau_y}{|A|} + \frac{\tau_y}{|B|} \right) |A||B|, \end{aligned}$$

and we find

$$(\tau_m(A) - \tau_m(B)) : (A - B) \geq 2\mu|A - B|^2 > 0. \quad (10)$$

Case 3: if $|A| > \gamma_m$ and $|B| \leq \gamma_m$, so

$$\begin{aligned} (\tau_m(A) - \tau_m(B)) : (A - B) &= \left(\left(2\mu + \frac{\tau_y}{|A|} \right) A - 2m\mu B \right) : (A - B) \\ &= \left(\left(2m\mu + \frac{\tau_y}{|A|} \right) A - 2m\mu B - 2\mu(m-1)A \right) : (A - B) \\ &= 2m\mu|A - B|^2 + \left(\frac{\tau_y}{|A|} - 2\mu(m-1) \right) A : (A - B). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have $|A| > \frac{\tau_y}{2\mu(m-1)}$, which gives, in addition to the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality :

$$\begin{aligned} (\tau_m(A) - \tau_m(B)) : (A - B) &\geq 2\mu|A - B|^2 \\ &\quad + 2(m-1)\mu|A - B| \left(|A - B| + \frac{\tau_y}{2\mu(m-1)} - |A| \right). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

We also have $|A - B| + \frac{\tau_y}{2\mu(m-1)} - |A| \geq 0$, then $(\tau_m(A) - \tau_m(B)) : (A - B) > 0$. Finally, we can apply Theorem 1 of [11], with $n = p = 2$. \square

Lemma 1 *Form (9), (10) and (11), we deduce the following inequality*

$$(\tau_m(A) - \tau_m(B)) : (A - B) \geq 2\mu|A - B|^2, \quad \forall A, B \in \mathbb{M}^{2 \times 2}. \quad (12)$$

This inequality will be used somewhere in this paper.

4 Compactness of approximate solutions

The aim of this section is to prove some results on the sequence u_m .

Proposition 1 *The approximate solution u_m , constructed in Section 3, satisfied the following estimations*

- (i) *The sequence u_m is bounded in $L^2(0, T; V) \cap L^\infty(0, T; H)$.*
- (ii) *The sequence $(u_m \cdot \nabla)u_m$ is bounded in $L^2(0, T; V')$.*

- (iii) The sequence $\tau_m(Du_m)$ is bounded in $L^2(\Omega_T)$.
 (iv) The sequence $\partial_t u_m$ is bounded in $L^2(0, T; V')$.

In this paper, c denotes various constants independent of m .

Proof of (i) By taking u_m as a test function in the weak formulation (8), we obtain

$$\underbrace{\int_0^T \langle \partial_t u_m, u_m \rangle}_{:=I_m^1} + \underbrace{\int_{\Omega_T} \tau_m(Du_m) : Du_m}_{:=I_m^2} + \underbrace{\int_{\Omega_T} (u_m \cdot \nabla) u_m \cdot u_m}_{:=I_m^3} = \underbrace{\int_0^T \langle f, u_m \rangle}_{:=I_m} \quad (13)$$

Let us start with the integral I_m^1 , note that $u_m \in E_{2,2}$, so we use the Lions-Magenes theorem [7]

$$2 \int_0^T \langle \partial_t u_m, u_m \rangle = \|u_m(T)\|_H^2 - \|u_0\|_H^2,$$

then,

$$I_m^1 \geq -\frac{1}{2} \|u_0\|_H^2. \quad (14)$$

Now, we will prove the existence of a constant $k > 0$ independent of m , such that

$$I_m^2 \geq k \|u_m\|_{L^2(0,T;V)}. \quad (15)$$

The coercivity of the operator τ_m implies

$$\int_{\Omega} \tau_m(Du_m) : Du_m \geq 2\mu \|Du_m\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \quad (16)$$

On the other hand, the Korn inequality² ensures the existence of $K_{\Omega} > 0$ such that

$$\|\nabla u_m\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq K_{\Omega} \|Du_m\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \quad (17)$$

By integrating the inequality (16) on $[0, T]$, and using (17) we find (15).

For the third integral, we have

$$\int_{\Omega} (u_m \cdot \nabla) u_m \cdot u_m = \frac{1}{2} \sum_i \int_{\Omega} u_m^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} |u_m|^2 dx = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \nabla \cdot u_m |u_m|^2 dx = 0. \quad (18)$$

We also have

$$\int_0^T \langle f, u_m \rangle dt \leq \int_0^T \|f\|_{V'} \|u_m\|_V dt.$$

Using the ε -Young inequality with $\varepsilon = k$ (the same k in (15)) we obtain

$$I_m \leq \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \int_0^T \|f\|_{V'}^2 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \int_0^T \|u_m\|_V^2. \quad (19)$$

From (14), (15), (18) and (19) we deduce

$$\varepsilon \|u_m\|_{L^2(0,T;V)} \leq c + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \|u_m\|_{L^2(0,T;V)} + \frac{1}{2} \|u_0\|_H^2.$$

We conclude that u_m is bounded in $L^2(0, T; V)$.

Now we will show that u_m is bounded in $L^\infty(0, T; H)$. Let $\theta \in (0, T]$, then the function given by $\varphi_m = u_m 1_{[0, \theta]}$, can be a test function in the weak formulation (8) and we obtain

²For more details, see chapter 2 of [8].

$$\underbrace{\int_0^T \langle \partial_t u_m, \varphi_m \rangle}_{:=J_m^1} + \underbrace{\int_{\Omega_T} \tau_m(Du_m) : D\varphi_m}_{:=J_m^2} + \underbrace{\int_{\Omega_T} (u_m \cdot \nabla)u_m \cdot \varphi_m}_{:=J_m^3} = \underbrace{\int_0^T \langle f, \varphi_m \rangle}_{:=J_m}. \quad (20)$$

As proved in the first part of this proof, we use the Lions-Magenes theorem

$$J_m^1 = \int_0^\theta \langle \partial_t u_m, u_m \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \|u_m(\theta)\|_H^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|u_0\|_H^2, \quad (21)$$

moreover, we have

$$J_m^3 = \int_0^\theta \int_\Omega (u_m \cdot \nabla)u_m \cdot u_m = 0, \quad (22)$$

and thanks to the coercivity, we get

$$J_m^2 = \int_0^\theta \int_\Omega \tau_m(Du_m) : Du_m \geq 0. \quad (23)$$

By using the Hölder inequality and the boundedness of u_m in $L^2(0, T; V)$, we obtain

$$J_m \leq \|f\|_{L^2(0, T; V')} \|u_m\|_{L^2(0, T; V)} \leq c. \quad (24)$$

From (21), (22), (23) and (24), we deduce

$$\|u_m(\theta)\|_H^2 \leq c + \|u_0\|_H^2, \quad \forall \theta \in [0, T]. \quad (25)$$

Since c is independent of θ , the sequence u_m is bounded in $L^\infty(0, T; H)$. \square

Proof of (ii) To prove this point, we need the following lemma:

Lemma 2 *The space $L^2(0, T; V) \cap L^\infty(0, T; H)$ is continuously embedded into $L^4(\Omega_T)$.*

Indeed, according to the lemma 6.2 [18] we have $\|v\|_{L^4(\Omega)}^2 \leq c\|v\|_{H_0^1}\|v\|_{L^2}$, for any $v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. Then we get

$$\|v\|_{L^4(\Omega_T)}^4 \leq c\|v\|_{L^\infty(0, T; H)}^2\|v\|_{L^2(0, T; V)}^2.$$

So, $L^2(0, T; V) \cap L^\infty(0, T; H)$ is continuously embedded into $L^4(\Omega_T)$.

Form lemma V.11 [7],

$$\int_\Omega (u_m \cdot \nabla)u_m \cdot \varphi = - \int_\Omega (u_m \cdot \nabla)\varphi \cdot u_m, \quad \forall \varphi \in V. \quad (26)$$

Using Cauchy–Schwarz and Hölder inequalities, we obtain

$$\left| \int_\Omega (u_m \cdot \nabla)\varphi \cdot u_m \right| \leq \|u_m\|_{L^4}^2 \|\nabla\varphi\|_{L^2}. \quad (27)$$

Therefore,

$$\|(u_m \cdot \nabla)u_m\|_{V'} \leq c\|u_m\|_{L^4}^2.$$

Consequently,

$$\|(u_m \cdot \nabla)u_m\|_{L^2(0, T; V')}^2 \leq c\|u_m\|_{L^4(\Omega_T)}^4. \quad (28)$$

However, the sequence u_m is bounded in $L^2(0, T; V) \cap L^\infty(0, T; H)$ and according to the Lemma (2), u_m is bounded in $L^4(\Omega_T)$. Then $(u_m \cdot \nabla)u_m$ is bounded in $L^2(0, T; V')$. \square

Proof of (iii) Clearly, $(\tau_m(Du_m))_m$ is bounded in $L^2(\Omega_T)$. Indeed, we have

$$|\tau_m(Du_m)|^2 \leq c(\tau_y^2 + |Du_m|^2).$$

Therefore,

$$\|\tau_m(Du_m)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq c + c\|Du_m\|_{L^2}^2 \leq c + c\|u_m\|_V^2.$$

by using the first estimation, we obtain

$$\|\tau_m(Du_m)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)} \leq c. \quad (29)$$

□

Proof of (iv) Let us use again the weak formulation of the approximate problem. We have

$$\left| \int_0^T \langle \partial_t u_m, \varphi \rangle \right| \leq \left| \int_{\Omega_T} \tau_m(Du_m) : D\varphi \right| + \left| \int_{\Omega_T} (u_m \cdot \nabla) u_m \cdot \varphi \right| + \left| \int_0^T \langle f, \varphi \rangle \right|.$$

By using the Hölder inequality for each integral, we obtain

$$\begin{cases} \int_0^T |\langle f, \varphi \rangle| \leq \|f\|_{L^2(0,T; V')} \|\varphi\|_{L^2(0,T; V)}, \\ \int_{\Omega_T} |\tau_m(Du_m) : D\varphi| \leq \|\tau_m(Du_m)\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)} \|D\varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}. \end{cases} \quad (30)$$

Thanks to (27), and to the third estimation, we obtain

$$\left| \int_0^T \langle \partial_t u_m, \varphi \rangle \right| \leq c\|\varphi\|_{L^2(0,T; V)}. \quad (31)$$

It follows that

$$\|\partial_t u_m\|_{L^2(0,T; V')} \leq c. \quad (32)$$

□

5 Passing to the limit

In this section, we will construct a weak solution of (1)-(4) by using $\{u_m\}$ and some compactness results.

Proposition 2 *The following convergence is proved for subsequences which are denoted by $\{u_m\}$.*

- (i) $u_m \rightarrow u$ weakly in $L^2(0, T; V)$ and weakly-* in $L^\infty(0, T; H)$.
- (ii) $\partial_t u_m \rightarrow \partial_t u$ weakly in $L^2(0, T; V')$.
- (iii) $(u_m \cdot \nabla) u_m \rightarrow (u \cdot \nabla) u$ weakly in $L^2(0, T; V')$.
- (iv) $\tau_m(Du_m) \rightarrow \tau(Du)$ weakly in $L^2(\Omega_T)$.

Clearly, the function u satisfy equation (6). Moreover, It is easy to see that $\tau_m(Du_m)$ converges weakly to some ξ in $L^2(\Omega_T)$ but the principal difficulty will be to show that ξ is a Bingham tensor.

Proof of (i) The space $L^2(0, T; V)$ is reflexive, so from any bounded sequence, we can extract a subsequence which converges weakly in $L^2(0, T; V)$, then u_m converges weakly to u in $L^2(0, T; V)$. On the other hand, the space $L^1(0, T; H)$ is separable³ which gives the weak-* convergence in $L^\infty(0, T; H)$ of a subsequence of u_m , therefore we deduce (i). \square

Proof of (ii). We know that the differentiation operator with respect to time is continuous in the sense of distributions, it means $\partial_t u_m \rightarrow \partial_t u$, in the sense of distribution. But we proved that $\partial_t u_m$ is bounded in $L^2(0, T; V')$ which implies the weak convergence in this space, therefore we deduce (ii) by the uniqueness of the limit in $\mathcal{D}'(\Omega_T)$. \square

Proof of (iii) To prove this convergence we need the following strong convergence.

Lemma 3 *The sequence u_m converges strongly to u in $L^2(0, T; H)$ and almost everywhere in Ω_T .*

This lemma is based on the compactness lemma (Theorem 5.1 [18]).

We have $\partial_t u_m \rightarrow \partial_t u$ weakly in $L^2(0, T; V')$ and $u_m \rightarrow u$ weakly in $L^2(0, T; V)$, using the compactness lemma, we obtain the strong convergence of u_m to u in $L^2(0, T; H)$. Moreover, we can extract a subsequence which converges to u almost everywhere in Ω_T .

Now, we have to prove the weak convergence of $(u_m \cdot \nabla)u_m$ to $u \cdot \nabla u$ in $L^2(0, T; V')$. Due to the lemma 3, $u_m \rightarrow u$ a.e in Ω_T , then for all $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$ we have

$$u_m^i u_m^j \rightarrow u^i u^j, \quad \text{a.e in } \Omega_T. \quad (33)$$

We also have

$$\int_{\Omega} \left(u_m^i u_m^j \right)^2 dx \leq \|u_m^i\|_{L^4}^2 \|u_m^j\|_{L^4}^2.$$

Since, u_m is a bounded sequence in $L^4(\Omega_T)$, (Lemma(2)), we obtain

$$\|u_m^i u_m^j\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)} \leq c$$

Which gives, by applying Lemma 1.3 [18, p. 12], the following convergence

$$u_m^i u_m^j \rightarrow u^i u^j \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(\Omega_T). \quad (34)$$

Let $\varphi \in L^2(0, T; V)$, then $\int_{\Omega_T} u_m^i \partial_i u_m^j \varphi_j = - \int_{\Omega_T} u_m^i u_m^j \partial_i \varphi_j$ (according to (26)). (34), permits to conclude that

$$\int_{\Omega_T} u_m^i u_m^j \partial_i \varphi_j \rightarrow \int_{\Omega_T} u^i u^j \partial_i \varphi_j, \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow \infty.$$

Consequently,

$$\int_{\Omega_T} u_m^i \partial_i u_m^j \varphi_j \rightarrow \int_{\Omega_T} u^i \partial_i u^j \varphi_j, \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow \infty.$$

Finally, we proved that

$$\int_{\Omega_T} (u_m \cdot \nabla)u_m \cdot \varphi = \sum_{i,j}^2 \int_{\Omega_T} u_m^i \partial_i u_m^j \varphi_j \rightarrow \sum_{i,j}^2 \int_{\Omega_T} u^i \partial_i u^j \varphi_j = \int_{\Omega_T} (u \cdot \nabla)u \cdot \varphi,$$

for all $\varphi \in L^2(0, T; V)$. It follows that $(u_m \cdot \nabla)u_m$ converges to $(u \cdot \nabla)u$ weakly in $L^2(0, T; V')$. \square

³For more details you can see [23, Ch. 1]

Proof of (iv) To prove the weak convergence of $\tau_m(Du_m)$ to $\tau(Du)$, we start by proving that Du_m converges strongly to Du in $L^2(\Omega_T)$ (so almost everywhere in Ω_T).

Lemma 4

$$\int_{\Omega_T} (\tau_m(Du_m) - \tau_m(Du)) : (Du_m - Du) dxdt \longrightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Proof Let us set the following notations :

$$I_m^1 = \int_{\Omega_T} \tau_m(Du_m) : (Du_m - Du), \quad I_m^2 = \int_{\Omega_T} \tau_m(Du) : (Du_m - Du).$$

We proved that $(u_m - u) \in L^2(0, T; V)$, so we can use $(u_m - u)$ as a test function in the weak formulation of the approximate problem, and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \langle \partial_t u_m, u_m - u \rangle + \int_{\Omega_T} \tau_m(Du_m) : D(u_m - u) + \int_{\Omega_T} (u_m \cdot \nabla) u_m \cdot (u_m - u) \\ = \int_0^T \langle f, u_m - u \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that:

$$I_m^1 = \int_{\Omega_T} \tau_m(Du_m) : D(u_m - u) = J_m^1 - J_m^2 - J_m^3.$$

Where

$$\begin{aligned} J_m^1 = \int_0^T \langle f, u_m - u \rangle dt, \quad J_m^2 = \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} (u_m \cdot \nabla) u_m \cdot (u_m - u) dxdt, \\ \text{and } J_m^3 = \int_0^T \langle \partial_t u_m, u_m - u \rangle dt. \end{aligned}$$

Since $u_m \rightarrow u$ weakly in $L^2(0, T; V)$, then $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} J_m^1 = 0$.

On other hand, $J_m^2 = - \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} (u_m \cdot \nabla) u_m \cdot u$, and from convergence (iv),

$$J_m^2 \longrightarrow \int_{\Omega_T} (u \cdot \nabla) u \cdot u = 0.$$

For J_m^3 , we use the Lions–Magenes theorem :

$$\frac{1}{2} \|u_m(T) - u(T)\|_H^2 = \int_0^T \langle \partial_t (u_m - u), u_m - u \rangle dt + \frac{1}{2} \|u_m(0) - u(0)\|_H^2.$$

Moreover, $\int_0^T \langle \partial_t u, u_m - u \rangle dt \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$, this gives

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T \langle \partial_t u_m, u_m - u \rangle dt = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2} \|u_m(T) - u(T)\|_H^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|u_0 - u(0)\|_H^2.$$

To deduce that $u_0 = u(0)$ in H , we will prove that $u_m(0) \rightarrow u(0)$ weakly in H .

We know that $E_{2,2}$ is continuously embedded into $C^0([0, T]; H)$, then $u_m(0)$ is bounded in H . On the other hand, (i) and (iii) of proposition (2) imply that $u_m(0)$

converges weakly to $u(0)$ in V' . Consequently, we deduce that $u_m(0) \rightarrow u(0)$ weakly in H . Therefore, $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} J_m^3 \geq 0$, which implies that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} I_m^1 \leq 0. \quad (35)$$

Now, let us prove that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} I_m^2 = 0$. We know that the sequence u_m converges weakly to u in $L^2(\Omega_T)$, so, the sequence Du_m converges to Du in $D'(\Omega_T)$. In addition, $(Du_m)_m$ is bounded in $L^2(\Omega_T)$, then we deduce that

$$Du_m \rightharpoonup Du \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(\Omega_T).$$

On the other hand, $\tau_m(Du)$ converges strongly to ϕ in $L^2(\Omega_T)$, where:

$$\phi = \begin{cases} \left(2\mu + \frac{\tau_y}{|Du|}\right) Du & \text{if } |Du| > 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } Du = 0. \end{cases} \quad (36)$$

Consequently

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega_T} (\tau_m(Du_m) - \tau_m(Du)) : (Du_m - Du) \leq 0, \quad (37)$$

which, with the strict monotonicity of τ_m , gives

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega_T} (\tau_m(Du_m) - \tau_m(Du)) : (Du_m - Du) = 0.$$

□

Lemma 5 (Du_m) converges to Du strongly in $L^2(\Omega_T)$ and a.e in Ω_T .

This lemma is a consequence of Lemma 4 and Lemma 1. Recall that we have the following inequality

$$2\mu|Du_m - Du|^2 \leq (\tau_m(Du_m) - \tau_m(Du)) : (Du_m - Du). \quad (38)$$

Then, we deduce

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|Du_m - Du\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}^2 \rightarrow 0.$$

We know that $\tau_m(Du_m)$ converges weakly to an element ξ in $L^2(\Omega_T)$. So we must check that ξ is a Bingham tensor. The following proof is inspired by [24], where Shelukhin et al. studies the Bingham problem with periodic boundary conditions.

We fix the following notations

$$\Omega_T^+ = \Omega_T \cap \{|Du| > 0\}, \quad \Omega_T^0 = \Omega_T \cap \{|Du| = 0\}. \quad (39)$$

Part 1: Let us proof that $|\xi| \leq \tau_y$ a.e in Ω_T^0 . Define

$$A = \Omega_T^0 \cap \{|\xi| > \tau_y\}, \quad \varphi = \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} 1_A, \quad I = \int_{\Omega_T} \xi : \varphi,$$

$$I_m = \int_{\Omega_T} \tau_m(Du_m) : \varphi, \quad a = I - \tau_y \text{meas}(A).$$

Suppose that $\text{meas}(A) > 0$, then $I = \int_A |\xi| > \text{meas}(A)\tau_y$, therefore $a > 0$.

On the other hand I_m converges to I , i.e

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists M(\varepsilon) \in \mathbb{N} : \forall m \geq M(\varepsilon), \quad I - \varepsilon \leq I_m \leq I + \varepsilon.$$

We choose $\varepsilon = \frac{a}{2}$. Then, there exists $M(a)$, such that

$$I_m \geq \frac{a}{2} + \tau_y \text{meas}(A), \quad \forall m \geq M(a). \quad (40)$$

Let $m > \max(M(a), \eta)$, with $\eta = f_l \left(\frac{3\tau_y \text{meas}(A)}{a} + 1 \right) + 1$, where f_l is the floor function. Furthermore, we denote

$$\begin{aligned} A_m^1 &= \Omega_T \cap \{|Du_m| \leq \gamma_m\}, & A_m^2 &= \Omega_T \cap \{\gamma_m < |Du_m| \leq \eta\} \\ \text{and } A_m^3 &= \Omega_T \cap \{|Du_m| > \eta\}. \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} I_m &= \underbrace{\int_{A_m^1} 2m\mu Du_m : \varphi}_{:= I_m^1} + \underbrace{\int_{A_m^2} \left(2\mu + \frac{\tau_y}{|Du_m|} \right) Du_m : \varphi}_{:= I_m^2} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\int_{A_m^3} \left(2\mu + \frac{\tau_y}{|Du_m|} \right) Du_m : \varphi}_{:= I_m^3}. \end{aligned}$$

Now calculate

$$|I_m^1| \leq \int_{A_m^1 \cap A} 2m\mu |Du_m| \leq \frac{m}{m-1} \tau_y \text{meas}(A_m^1 \cap A), \quad (41)$$

$$\begin{aligned} |I_m^2| &\leq \tau_y \text{meas}(A_m^2 \cap A) + \int_{A_m^2 \cap A} 2\mu |Du_m| \\ &\leq \frac{m}{m-1} \tau_y \text{meas}(A_m^2 \cap A) + 2\mu \gamma_\eta \text{meas}(\Omega_T), \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

$$|I_m^3| \leq \frac{m}{m-1} \tau_y \text{meas}(A_m^3 \cap A) + 2\mu \|Du_m\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)} \sqrt{\text{meas}(A_m^3 \cap A)}. \quad (43)$$

From (40), (41), (42) and (43), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{a}{2} + \tau_y \text{meas}(A) &\leq \frac{m}{m-1} \tau_y \text{meas}(A) + 2\mu \gamma_\eta \text{meas}(\Omega_T) \\ &\quad + 2\mu \|Du_m\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)} \sqrt{\text{meas}(A_m^3 \cap A)}. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Due to the choice of η , we obtain $\gamma_\eta < \frac{a}{6\mu \text{meas}(\Omega_T)}$, and we have $\text{meas}(A \cap A_m^3) \rightarrow 0$, so

$$\frac{a}{2} + \tau_y \text{meas}(A) \leq \tau_y \text{meas}(A) + \frac{a}{3}. \quad (45)$$

Which is absurd, i.e. $\text{meas}(A) = 0$, thus $|\xi| \leq \tau_y$ a.e in Ω_T^0 .

Part 2: Let us prove that $\xi = \tau(Du)$ a.e in Ω_T^+ .

Set

$$B_m^1 = \Omega_T^+ \cap \{|Du_m| \leq \gamma_m\} \quad \text{and} \quad B_m^2 = \Omega_T^+ \cap \{|Du_m| > \gamma_m\}.$$

We have

$$W_m := |\tau_m(Du_m) - \tau(Du)|_{\Omega_T^+} = \left| 2\mu Du_m 1_{B_m^1} + F(Du_m) 1_{B_m^2} - F(Du) 1_{\Omega_T^+} \right|,$$

where, $F(A) = \left(2\mu + \frac{\tau_y}{|A|} \right) A$, then

$$W_m \leq \frac{m}{m-1} \tau_y 1_{B_m^1} + \left| F(Du_m) 1_{B_m^2} - F(Du) 1_{\Omega_T^+} \right|.$$

However, $Du_m \rightarrow Du$ a.e in Ω_T^+ and the function $X \mapsto F(X)$ is continuous, then $F(Du_m) \rightarrow F(Du)$ a.e in Ω_T^+ . On the other hand $1_{B_m^1} \rightarrow 0$ and $1_{B_m^2} \rightarrow 1_{\Omega_T^+}$, which gives $W_m \rightarrow 0$, i.e.

$$\tau_m(Du_m) \rightarrow \tau(Du) \quad \text{a.e in } \Omega_T^+.$$

Let $\psi \in L^\infty(\Omega_T)$ be such that $\psi|_{\Omega_T^0} = 0$. Let $Q' \subset \Omega_T$, $\theta_m = \tau_m(Du_m) : \psi$, and $\theta = \tau(Du) : \psi$.

Using the Hölder inequality, we obtain

$$\int_{Q'} |\theta_m| \leq \|\psi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_T)} \sqrt{\text{meas}(Q')} \left(\tau_y \sqrt{\text{meas}(\Omega_T)} + 2\mu \|Du_m\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)} \right). \quad (46)$$

Therefore θ_m is uniformly integrable on Ω_T and $\theta_m \rightarrow \theta$ a.e in Ω_T . This gives, thanks to Vitali theorem, $\int_{\Omega_T^+} \tau_m(Du_m) : \psi \rightarrow \int_{\Omega_T^+} \tau(Du) : \psi$.

On the other hand $\tau_m(Du_m)$ converges weakly to ξ in $L^2(\Omega_T)$, then $\tau(Du) = \xi$ a.e in Ω_T^+ .

Finally, we proved that $\tau_m(Du_m)$, converges weakly to a Bingham tensor and the proof is completed. \square

6 Uniqueness of solutions

In this section, we will prove that the problem (1)-(4) has a unique solution. To do this we are inspired by the uniqueness proof of the Newtonian Navier Stokes equation.

We consider u_1 and u_2 to be two weak solutions of (6) and introduce $u = u_1 - u_2$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \langle \partial_t u, \varphi \rangle + \int_{\Omega_T} (\tau(Du_1) - \tau(Du_2)) : D\varphi + \int_{\Omega_T} (u_1 \cdot \nabla) u_1 \cdot \varphi \\ - \int_{\Omega_T} (u_2 \cdot \nabla) u_2 \cdot \varphi = 0, \quad \forall \varphi \in L^2(0, T; V). \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\int_{\Omega_T} (u_1 \cdot \nabla) u_1 \cdot \varphi - \int_{\Omega_T} (u_2 \cdot \nabla) u_2 \cdot \varphi = \int_{\Omega_T} (u_2 \cdot \nabla) u \cdot \varphi + \int_{\Omega_T} (u \cdot \nabla) u_1 \cdot \varphi.$$

Let $t \in (0, T)$. Taking the function $\varphi = u1_{[0,t]}$ in (47) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t \langle \partial_t u, u \rangle ds + \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} (\tau(Du_1) - \tau(Du_2)) : Du \, dx ds \\ + \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} (u \cdot \nabla) u_1 \cdot u \, dx ds + \underbrace{\int_0^t \int_{\Omega} (u_2 \cdot \nabla) u \cdot u \, dx ds}_{=0} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Using the Lions-Magenes Theorem we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \|u(s)\|_H^2 + \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} (u \cdot \nabla) u_1 \cdot u + \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} (\tau(Du_1) - \tau(Du_2)) : Du \\ = \frac{1}{2} \|u(0)\|_H^2. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

According to (27) and Lemma(2) we have

$$\int_{\Omega} |(u \cdot \nabla) u_1 \cdot u| dx \leq c \|u\|_V \|u\|_H \|u_1\|_V. \quad (50)$$

Furthermore, we can easily prove the following inequality⁴

$$(\tau(A) - \tau(B)) : (A - B) \geq 2\mu |A - B|^2, \quad \forall A, B \in \mathbb{M}^{2 \times 2}. \quad (51)$$

From (51) and Korn's inequality we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} (\tau(Du_1) - \tau(Du_2)) : Du dx \geq \frac{2\mu}{K_{\Omega}} \|u\|_V^2. \quad (52)$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \|u(s)\|_H^2 + \frac{2\mu}{K_{\Omega}} \int_0^t \|u\|_V^2 ds \leq c \int_0^t \|u\|_V \|u\|_H \|u_1\|_V ds \\ + \frac{1}{2} \|u(0)\|_H^2. \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

Using Young's inequality, we get

$$\|u(s)\|_H^2 \leq \|u(0)\|_H^2 + c \int_0^t \|u\|_H^2 \|u_1\|_V^2 ds. \quad (54)$$

Thanks to the Gronwall lemma, we deduce that

$$\|u(s)\|_H^2 \leq \|u(0)\|_H^2 \exp\left(c \int_0^t \|u_1\|_V^2 ds\right), \quad \forall t \in [0, T].$$

Since $u(0) = 0$, we get the uniqueness of the weak solutions.

Corollary 1 (Energy equality) *The solution u is more than a classical weak solution. In fact, we have $u \in C^0([0, T]; H)$, moreover, for all $s_1, s_2 \in [0, T]$, u satisfies the following energy equality*

$$\frac{1}{2} \|u(s_2)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \int_{s_1}^{s_2} \int_{\Omega} \tau(Du) : Du = \int_{s_1}^{s_2} \langle f, u \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|u(s_1)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \quad (55)$$

⁴We can adapt the proof of the strict monotonicity of τ_m .

To prove the energy equality, we have only to take $\varphi = u1_{[s_1, s_2]}$ as a test function in (6) and use the Lions-Magenes theorem.

Corollary 2 (Variational inequality) *The weak solution given by Theorem 1 satisfies the following variational inequality, for all $\varphi \in L^2(0, T; V)$*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \langle \partial_t u, \varphi - u \rangle + \int_{\Omega_T} (u \cdot \nabla) u \cdot \varphi + 2\mu \int_{\Omega_T} Du : D(\varphi - u) + \tau_y \int_{\Omega_T} (|D\varphi| - |Du|) \\ \geq \int_0^T \langle f, \varphi - u \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

Proof Let us show the following inequality

$$\int_{\Omega_T} \tau(Du) : D(\varphi - u) \leq 2\mu \int_{\Omega_T} Du : D(\varphi - u) + \tau_y \int_{\Omega_T} |D\varphi| - \tau_y \int_{\Omega_T} |Du|. \quad (57)$$

Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and with the notation (39), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_T^+} \tau(Du) : D(\varphi - u) &= \int_{\Omega_T^+} \left(2\mu + \frac{\tau_y}{|Du|} \right) Du : D(\varphi - u) \\ &= 2\mu \int_{\Omega_T} Du : D(\varphi - u) + \tau_y \int_{\Omega_T^+} \frac{Du : D\varphi}{|Du|} - \tau_y \int_{\Omega_T} |Du| \\ &\leq 2\mu \int_{\Omega_T} Du : D(\varphi - u) + \tau_y \int_{\Omega_T^+} |D\varphi| - \tau_y \int_{\Omega_T} |Du|. \end{aligned}$$

We also have

$$\int_{\Omega_T^0} \tau(Du) : D(\varphi - u) = \int_{\Omega_T^0} \tau(Du) : D\varphi \leq \tau_y \int_{\Omega_T^0} |D\varphi|. \quad (58)$$

Hence, we deduce the inequality (57). This implies, jointly with (6), the variational inequality. \square

Remark 1 *The inequality (56) implies that u satisfies the variational inequality proposed by Lions and Duvaut in [12], i.e.*

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \partial_t u(t), \varphi - u(t) \rangle + \int_{\Omega} (u(t) \cdot \nabla) u(t) \cdot \varphi + 2\mu \int_{\Omega} Du(t) : D(\varphi - u(t)) \\ + \tau_y \int_{\Omega} (|D\varphi| - |Du(t)|) \geq \langle f, \varphi - u(t) \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

for any $\varphi \in V$. The proof of this result is given in [12, p. 300-301].

7 Conclusion and outlook

As mentioned in the introduction, this work aims to prove the existence of the Navier Stokes equation solution for an incompressible homogeneous fluid that follows the Bingham model. In the first step, we constructed an approximate problem using the bi-viscosity model, which behaves like a Newtonian

fluid under weak stress and like a non-Newtonian fluid when the stress rate is great than the yield stress. After this approximation, we applied the theorem presented by Dreyfuss and Hungerbühler in [11], and then a weak solution to the problem in question was constructed by passing to the limit. This analysis shows that the conditions of Theorem 1 [11] is sufficient but not necessary since the Bingham tensor does not satisfy them. Another essential advantage of our theorem is that the membership of the function f to the space $L^2(\Omega_T)$ is not necessary (which is the case in [24, 3]). The next objective is to extend Theorem 1 to a thixotropic Bingham model, i.e., the yield strength is linearly dependent on the structural parameter, which follows a first-order rate equation taking into account the decay and accumulation of the material structure. The study of the non-homogeneous case may also be the subject of future work. The convergence of the Bingham solution to The Newtonian solution, when $\tau_y \rightarrow 0$, can be proved. A long-term objective is to analyze the non-Newtonian Navier Stokes equation, more complicated than the Bingham model, as Herschel–Bulkley and Casson models.

References

- [1] A. Ahmadi and I. Karimfazli. A quantitative evaluation of viscosity regularization in predicting transient flows of viscoplastic fluids. *Journal of Non-Newtonian Fluid Mechanics*, 287:104429, 2021.
- [2] M. Allouche, I. Frigaard, and G. Sona. Static wall layers in the displacement of two visco-plastic fluids in a plane channel. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 424:243–277, 2000.
- [3] I. Basov and V. Shelukhin. Nonhomogeneous incompressible bingham viscoplastic as a limit of nonlinear fluids. *Journal of non-newtonian fluid mechanics*, 142(1-3):95–103, 2007.
- [4] M. Bercovier and M. Engelman. A finite-element method for incompressible non-newtonian flows. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 36(3):313–326, 1980.
- [5] C. Beverly and R. Tanner. Numerical analysis of three-dimensional bingham plastic flow. *Journal of non-newtonian fluid mechanics*, 42(1-2):85–115, 1992.
- [6] E. C. Bingham. *Fluidity and plasticity*, volume 2. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1922.
- [7] F. Boyer and P. Fabrie. *Mathematical Tools for the Study of the Incompressible Navier-Stokes Equations and Related Models*, volume 183. Springer Science & Business Media, New York, 2012.
- [8] D. Breit. *Existence theory for generalized Newtonian fluids*. Academic Press, 2017.
- [9] P. G. Ciarlet, R. Glowinski, and J. Xu. *Numerical Methods for Non-Newtonian Fluids: Special Volume*. Elsevier, 2010.
- [10] G. De Rham. *Variétés différentiables*. Hermann, Paris, 1973.
- [11] P. Dreyfuss and N. Hungerbühler. Results on a navier-stokes system with

- applications to electrorheological fluid flow. *International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 14(2):241–267, 2004.
- [12] G. Duvant and J. L. Lions. *Inequalities in mechanics and physics*, volume 219. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [13] G. Galdi. *An introduction to the mathematical theory of the Navier-Stokes equations: Steady-state problems*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.
- [14] P. Gilles and L. Rieusset. *The Navier Stokes Problem in the 21st Century*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2018.
- [15] S. Hosseini, M. Manzari, and S. Hannani. A fully explicit three-step sph algorithm for simulation of non-newtonian fluid flow. *International Journal of Numerical Methods for Heat & Fluid Flow*, 2007.
- [16] F. Irgens. *Rheology and non-newtonian fluids*, volume 1. Springer, 2014.
- [17] J. M. Krishnan, A. P. Deshpande, and P. S. Kumar. *Rheology of complex fluids*. Springer, 2010.
- [18] J.-L. Lions. *Quelques méthodes de résolution de problèmes aux limites non linéaires*. Dunod, Paris, 1969.
- [19] T. C. Papanastasiou. Flows of materials with yield. *Journal of rheology*, 31(5):385–404, 1987.
- [20] W. Prager. *Mécanique des solides isotropes au delà du domaine élastique*, volume 87. Gauthier-Villars, Paris, 1937.
- [21] W. Prager. On slow visco-plastic flow. *Studies in mathematics and mechanics*, pages 208–216, 1954.
- [22] J. C. Robinson and C. Pierre. Infinite-dimensional dynamical systems: An introduction to dissipative parabolic pdes and the theory of global attractors. cambridge texts in applied mathematics. *Appl. Mech. Rev.*, 56(4):B54–B55, 2003.
- [23] T. Roubíček. *Nonlinear partial differential equations with applications*, volume 153. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [24] V. Shelukhin. Bingham viscoplastic as a limit of non-newtonian fluids. *Journal of Mathematical Fluid Mechanics*, 4(2):109–127, 2002.
- [25] J. Simon. Démonstration constructive d’un théoreme de g. de rham. *CR Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math*, 316(11):1167–1172, 1993.